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AUSTRIA'S COMMERCIAL VENTURE IN INDIA IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

BY SIR R. C. TEMPLE, BART.

(Continued from Vol. XLVI, p. 286.)

Letter from Lieutenant Colonel William Boile to the President and Council of Bombay, dated Gogo, 31 October 1777.

Honble. Sir and Sirs

You have some time ago been informed of the accident which happened to the Imperial Austrian ship Giuseppe and Teresa, under my command, in the bay of Delhoa. A subsequent transaction there obliges me now to lay my complaints, on behalf of their Imperial Majesties, before you, against John Cahill, Captain of a ketch from your Presidency; the whole relation of which is briefly as follows.

On the 3d day of May 1777 I took formal possession of a certain district of land in the country called Timbo on the western side of the river Mafoume in the beforementioned bay from the Rajah Mohar Capell, who by a deed of sale and a treaty, solemnly executed the same day, gave up the property and sovereignty thereof, together with the sovereignty of the said river, to their Imperial Majesties for ever. There are at this time in the river Mafoume two ketches from Bombay under English Colours, one commanded by Captain John McKennie and the other by Captain John Cahill, the latter of whom having partly erected an Indian hut of cajan sticks, did on the 4th May wantonly erect a flagstaff and hoist thereon an English ensign within ten yards of the imperial flagstaff and even within the line of the guns we had planted upon taking possession. Wishing to avoid every act that would bear the smallest appearance of incivility, I therefore wrote the following letter to Captain Cahill.

To this letter Captain Cahill did not think proper to give any answer. Nevertheless, I sent several other polite messages to him by my officer, requesting he would take down his ensign, but the Captain still refused to comply, at one time pretending he was going to give a dinner on shore, and at last alluding he had bought the ground, or some part of it, himself. Upon this I assured Captain Cahill that if he really had purchased any

---

26 Letters Received at Bombay (1777), XLIII, 372-376.
27 The shrubby plant, Cajanus indicus (Malay këkang), producing the food stuffs known as daah, a substitute for pulse.
28 See ante., Vol. XLVI, p. 286.
ground that was comprehended within her Imperial Majesty’s territory, and could prove
his title to it, he should be perfectly secure of his property, subject to the sovereignty of the
power to whom the district was given up, agreeable to the usages and laws of nations in
similar cases. The Rajah Capell in the mean time having informed me there was no truth
in Captain Cahill’s assertion of any purchase, I prevailed on Captain McKenny to accompa-
ny my officer, whom I again sent to expostulate with Captain Cahill on the impropriety
of his conduct in endeavouring to obstruct the affairs of the Imperial Court, which I
informed the Captain was highly aggravated in his person, as not only acting without
authority from either the British Government or the East India Company, but as being
a person, as I was informed, not authorized (according to the laws of his own country)
to be even found on this side the Cape of Good Hope. But altho’ Captain Cahill now
thought proper to desist from his pretence of having purchased any ground, still he kept
his ensign flying close to the Imperial flag, till I was at last obliged to let him know
that if he did not lower it, I should send my own people to do it, and in that case I
would even pull down the few sticks he had set up towards building a hut, as I was
resolved not even a hut should be erected on her Majesty’s territory by any man, in
obstinate defiance of her Majesty’s sovereignty while I had power to prevent it.

Captain Cahill still paying no attention to the expostulation of my officer, or even of
his countryman Captain McKenny, I was reduced to the disagreeable necessity of
executing what I had threatened, and I accordingly ordered Captain Cahill’s ensign to
be taken down and carried on board his vessel.

I have been thus particular in my relation of this affair to convince you, Sirs, how
scrupulous I shall be on every publick transaction of acting in an offensive manner to
the unauthorized subjects of your Government. At the same time, I flatter myself you
will be equally ready to do my Sovereigns the justice of reprimanding Captain Cahill for
his obstreperous conduct.

Being safely arrived in the road of Surat, though much in want of assistance and
refreshment, particularly on account of several of my officers and crew, who were danger-
ously ill, I applied on that occasion by a letter of the 6th September, to Governor Boddam,
who referred me to the Nabob as the Moguls officer, informing me that the city of Surat
was the Moguls city under his government.

Accordingly, by means of Monsieur Anquetil de Briencourt his most Christian Majes-
ty’s [French] Consul at Surat, I made several applications to the Nabob for such assistance
only, as according to the constitution of the Moguls City, I knew he could not
refuse. The delicacy, however, of the Nabob upon those occasions was so great and
productive of delays so little reconcileable to the situations of men at the point of death,
as obliged me to repair to this port, where I and my people have been happier to find
speedier relief from the humanity of the sectaries of Brimha [Brahma, i. e., the Hindus,
apparently in this case, the Marathas].

These transactions and the nature of certain orders, which publick fame informs
me have been given to your Honourable Presidency for the obstruction of the business of her
Imperial Majesty’s subjects and ships, have induced me to dispatch the present sloop,
solely for the purpose of authentick information from your Honors upon subjects so
materially interesting to the honor of the Imperial flag and the interests of their
Imperial Majesties. Your answers to the following questions I shall therefore esteem as
a particular favour.
1. Whether the Imperial Austrian ships of Europe and the Imperial country ships of Asia will or not be admitted to the rights of hospitality and of trade in the British settlements of Asia on the same footing as are admitted ships of the same denomination of the French, Portuguese and other European Nations.

2d. Should the Nabob or Governor of the Mogul City of Surat, on any future occasion, act repugnantly to the laws of nations with respect to any vessel under my direction, whether am I to consider him as an independent prince, acting solely from his own authority or under that of the Mogul; so that any consequent act of resentment on behalf of their Imperial Majesties would not in any wise affect the British Government of Bombay, or any other part of Asia, or in your opinions, Gentlemen, tend to interrupt the harmony subsisting between the Courts of Vienna and London.

I have the honor to assure you that in the execution of the commissions with which I am entrusted, I shall most studiously avoid giving the slightest foundation for offence to any branch of the English Company's government, and I flatter myself I shall meet with the same exemption from those prejudices arising from a jealousy of commerce, which in less enlightened times have been the bane so frequently of human society.

I am with the most profound respect,

Gogo, 31st October, 1777.

Double, Sir and Sirs,

Received 16th November 1777 per Leopold. Your most obedient humble Servant,

WILLIAM BOLTS,

Lieut. Colonel in the service of their Imperial Majesties.

Letter from the Council at Bombay to the Court of Directors,

dated 30 November 1777. 29

Mr Bolts in the Austrian Ship Joseph and Theresa to our great surprize arrived at Surat Bar the 5th September. An Extract of your Commands dated the 21st of February had been previously sent thither, and the Chief and Council in consequence thereof, and of the further Orders we sent upon receiving Advice of the Ships Arrival, exerted themselves so much and with the Assistance of the Nabobs Influence threw so many obstacles in his way that Mr Bolts found himself unable to transact any Business there and sailed away for Gogo. The Chiefs at Surat and Broach will use every justifiable Method to prevent his meeting with Success, and we learn He has not yet been able to sell any part of his Cargo, but that he had sent to the Pundit of Ahmedabad to whom Gogo is subordinate offering him a Present of Rs. 25,000 annually in lieu of Customs, provided he will permit Him to establish a Factory and carry on a Trade there. He has since proceeded to Poonah [head-quarters of the Maratha Government] to negotiate this Business himself, but we shall exert our little Influence with the Durbar to defeat this Scheme, and You may be assured that no justifiable or legal Efforts shall be left untried to frustrate the Projects of these Adventurers.

We have sent the most strict Injunctions to all your Subordinate Settlements to have no Commercial or other Intercourse with the Persons concerned in this Ship, and to prevent any Investments whatever being made for them.

29 Bombay Letters Received, V, 250-251.
Consultation at Bombay Castle, 3 December 1777. 30

A Packet addressed to Mr Bolts on their Imperial Majesty's Service having been intercepted by Mr Lewis [British East India Company's agent] at Poonah and sent by him to the President, it is debated whether the same shall be opened and inspected, when a Letter is read from the Commander of the Sloop Leopold, purchased from the Portuguese by Mr Bolts and now in the Road, wherein he terms himself an Agent for their Imperial Majesties, and demands that the said Packet should be restored. On Consideration of which it is agreed to give it up. But Mr Carnac21 desires it may be minuted that as Mr Bolts is engaged in a Scheme so destructive to the Interests of the Company, he thinks every means should be made use of to defeat it, and it is therefore his Opinion that the Packet should be opened and the Contents inspected, as it may probably, from the anxiety of Mr Bolts' Agent to recover it, contain intelligence of Importance.

Consultation at Bombay Castle, 24 December 1777.32

As Mr Bolts has already been here a sufficient time to answer every purpose of getting Refreshment for the Imperial Sloop now here, the Secretary must signify the same to him, and require him to depart from this place without any further delay.

As we have reason to believe that there are a number of British subjects on board the Imperial Ship Joseph and Theresa and as we believe the Squadron is in want of Men, the same must be noticed to the Commodore and the Propriety of his taking them out of the Ship suggested to him.

Letter and Protest from Mr Bolts to the President and Council at Bombay, dated 24 December 1777.33

Honble. Sir and Gentlemen

I did not receive Mr Secretary Ravenscroft's answer, dated the 19th of November, to the Letter which I did myself the Honor of writing to you under Date of the 31st October, until the 13th Inst., owing to the very extraordinary interruptions of my Letters, which Your Honor &c. Gentlemen are well acquainted with, and which make the subject of the latter part of this address. I do not imitate your mode (unusual as I conceive it in the case before us) of answering by my Secretary, as I would not wish by any example of punctilio, much less of personal disrespect, to give cause of prejudice to the affray of my Sovereigns, who, I am sorry to say, Honble. Sir and Gentlemen, from Your answers, will not be able to collect much information of a satisfactory nature on the subjects of my last letter.

You are pleased to inform me in one Paragraph that "You cannot consider mere strangers in India as entitled to the same Privileges and attention in Your Ports as the Nations who have had Establishments and traded in the Country for upwards of a Century and a half by Virtue of Royal Grants and Pensions."

To this I must remark that all European Nations are strangers in India, and in their own respective Ports, while Peace subsists between them, are mutually entitled to that attention and freedom of intercourse which are founded on the general Laws of Society.

30 Bombay Public Consultations (1777), XLIV, 326.
31 The celebrated General John Carnac (1760-1800), then Second of Council at Bombay.
32 Bombay Public Consultations (1777), XLIV, 551-552.
33 Bombay Public Consultations (1777), XLIV, 568-573.
where not interrupted by particular Treaties. The Principles on which Your Honor &ca. Gentlemen herein appear to consider the Mogul's Pirmauns as essential to that Peace and Freedom of intercourse are to me perfectly unknown.

You are also pleased to inform me that "The English East India Company, by Pirmauns from the Mogul, are Governors of his Castle and Fleet at Surat, and as his allies must certainly be affected by any Acts offensive to his Government." I have very attentively considered the Petition said to have been presented to the Mogul Emperor in 1759 on behalf of the Honble. English East India Company, together with the Perwaans Husbulhookums and Firmauns [parwana, hasbul-hukm, farnon] said to have been obtained in Consequence thereof from the Mogul's Court, respecting their Government of the Castle and Fleet of Surat, as those authorities have been publickly acknowledged before the most respectable Tribunals of Great Britain. The Petition to the Mogul expressly prays that the Company might be invested with those offices for the purposes of protecting the Inhabitants and traders of all Denomination from injustice and oppression; and the Orders issued in Consequence recite the Petition to have been granted for the express purposes of preserving the Bar and Sea open to all ships and vessels, that the trade of all Merchants and pilgrims might meet with no trouble or impediment and they impose on the Company the strongest injunctions of "Care, Circumspection, justice and moderation" in the execution of those offices.

Regarding to those acknowledged documents and the immemorial established usages of the Mogul's City of Surat, The English East India Company, in the Character of the Mogul's Castle and Fleet, cannot permit, much less themselves occasion, in the name of the Nabob, any impediments of trade by the exaction of exorbitant and unusual duties, or even by any other breaches of humanity or acts of oppression, which were the very grounds on which they themselves dispossed the former Nabob of his Government. And altho' it were admitted that the English East India Company as Governor of the said Castle and Fleet might be at liberty to defend them when attacked, it would merely be as servants of the Mogul: but how "they must certainly be affected" as his allies against an European Nation in amity with Great Britain for any other act of reprisal, in retaliation of a breach of the Law of nations on the part of Nabob, is a point above my powers of discussion, and must be left to the decision of the Courts of Vienna and St. James, if ever occasion should be given for it. How far their Imperial Majesties have reason to be dissatisfied with the treatment their subjects have already received on the score of Trade and Hospitality at Surat, I leave Your Honor &ca. Gentlemen, to judge!

In another Paragraph I am farther acquainted "that circumstanced as I have been with Your Honble. Employers, I must be sensible I can expect no farther countenance or attention than what the Laws of Hospitality indispensably require."

Permit me to assure Your Honor &ca. Gentlemen, in answer to this Paragraph, that I have perfectly obliterated from my Memory all the injuries I have formerly received from the Honble. English East India Company. They are dead with their Author, and I wish never to revive their remembrance. But my present claim, having no relation to any former circumstances, but to that situation alone in which I have now the Honor to present myself, it is solely on behalf of their Imperial Majesties that all my applications will be made, when necessary, to the Representatives of the British Nation in every part of Asia. In this point of view, I "expect no countenance" for the very idea would be an
indignity to my Sovereigns; but as I shall endeavour on every occasion to pay the strictest attention to all national Rights of others, I shall also expect from you, Honble. Sir and Gentlemen, the same "attention" to those Rights, from which the smallest relaxation on my part or deviation on Yours might possibly be highly resented by our respective Sovereigns.

I come now, Honble. Sir and Gentlemen, to that subject which gives me the most lively concern, I mean the interception of my Letters by William Lewis Esqr., the British Minister at the Mahrattah Court at Poonah during my late Residence there, by Order of Your Honble. Board. The accompanying Affidavit sufficiently ascertains the fact, although abundance of other proof can be legally adduced if necessary. I assure you, Honble, Sir and Gentlemen, that the object of my Visit at Poonah was purely of a Commercial Nature, in execution of a trust reposed in me by her Imperial Majesty The Empress Queen of Hungary, &c., &c., which in no respect could tend to interrupt the peace or harmony subsisting between the British Government and the Mahrattahs, or any other of the Indian Powers. This open infracion, therefore, of the most sacred publick rights, in time of profound peace, added to the many obstructions I have already experienced by your Orders from the Indian Governments, make me conclude that a determinate resolution has been taken per fac ac et nefas [sic] to impede all intercourse between the Court of Vienna and the Princes of India, and wholly to destroy the peaceful and lawful trade of their Imperial Majesties' subjects in Asia. In this state of insecurity for transacting any business of their Majesties or their subjects, I have no other remedy left me than that of protesting, as I now most solemnly do, on behalf of my Sovereigns, Their Imperial, Royal, and Apostolick Majesties, against Your Honor &c. Gentlemen, as representatives of the British Government for the infraction of Right, which I now complain of, and for all the detriment and loss that may accrue to the property and persons of their Majesties' subjects on this side the Cape of Good Hope, in consequence of any order issued, or which may be issued directly or indirectly by Your Honble. Board, or by any other Agents or Representatives of the British Nation in Asia.

At the same time that my duty forces me to lay this Publick Protest before Your Honble. Board, permit me to assure You that I have the Honor to subscribe myself with the most profound Respect

Honble. Sir and Gentlemen

Your most obedient humble Servant

WILLIAM BOLTS, Lt. Col. in the service of their Imperial Majesties.

Bombay 24th December 1777.

Attestation of John Joseph Bauer.

John Joseph Bauer a native and heretofore inhabitant of Oldenburgh in the kingdom of Hungary¹⁴ but now actually resident at the British Settlement of Bombay maketh oath and saith that he the deponent was employed by William Bolts, Lieutenant Colonel in the service of their Imperial Royal and Apostolick Majesties the Empress Queen of Hungary, &c., &c., and the Emperor Joseph the second, to transmit from this Port of Bombay to him William Bolts then at the Mahrattah Court at Poonah, a letter on the business of their said Majesties; that accordingly on or about the twenty third day of November last past.

¹⁴ The Duchy of Oldenburgh in N. Germany, then under Austrian domination, but it seems to be a stretch of historical fact to call it in the Kingdom of Hungary.
he made or caused to be made application to the Honble. Wm. Hornby Esqr., President and Governor for all affairs of the British Nation at Bombay, to obtain a Permission or Pass for a Pattamar or Express to convey the said letter, which was accordingly granted by the said Honble. President; That on or about the said 23rd day of November 1777 last the Deponent hired, paid and dispatched an Express with the said Pass or permit and Letter directed to the said Lieutenant Colonel William Bolts at Poonah, that the said Express or Pattamar with the said Letter was seized at Poonah by or by the Orders of the British Agent there; and sent down to Bombay under a strong Guard of the British Indian Troops belonging, as this Deponent believes, to the Battalion called the Pily Phultum; that he the Deponent repaired to Poonah to inform the said Lieutenant Colonel Wm. Bolts of the interception of his Letters; that being arrived at Poonah on or about the 3rd day of this present month of December he the deponent was sent by the said Lieutenant Colonel Wm. Bolts with one or more Letters to William Lewis Esqr., the English Agent then Resident, at Poonah, to demand his reasons and authority for the said interceptions, and that the said Wm. Lewis Esqr. did then and there personally acquaint this Deponent in answer to the said Letters that he had sent all Mr. Bolts' Letters down to the Honble. the President and Council of Bombay, agreeably to the Order of his Constituents, the Honble. English East India Company, or of the said Honble. President and Council, which Orders he was obliged to comply with in Conformity to the duty of his station; or word[s] to that or the like effect: and further this Deponent saith not.

John Joseph Bauer.

Bombay Town Hall, 22 Decr. 1777.

Sworn before this Court sitting in Judgement.

Beck, Register.

N.B.—This Paper was attested in the usual Form by the Mayor and Notary Publick.

Letter from the President and Council at Fort St. George to the President and Council of Bombay, dated 3 January 1778.

We have paid attention to that part of your letter of the 3rd Ultimo which relates to the Austrian Enterprise under the direction of Mr Bolts, and have only to acquaint your Honor &c. that as the orders of the Company to this Presidency Correspond literally with the extract of their Commands which you have transmitted to us upon this subject, We shall readily cooperate with you to the utmost of our power in frustrating the success of a scheme which appears to be so prejudicial to their interests.

Letter from the Council at Bombay to the Court of Directors, dated 25 January 1778.

In our Address of the 30 November We mentioned the Arrival of the Austrian Ship Joseph and Theresa at Surat and of Mr Bolts having left that Place and proceeded to Gogo on account of the Obstruction thrown in his way by our Directions. We conclude that the Object of his Journey to Poonah was to obtain a Settlement at Gogo, and We shall be able to judge what Success He met with by his future Proceedings, but no Endeavours were wanting on our part to oppose his Design. It is surmised that Mr Bolts by making a Settlement at Delagoa means to make that Place his Magazine for European Commodities and from thence to pour them into India.

33 Pahili Paltan, i.e., The First Regiment, Bombay Native Infantry, formed in 1767.
34 Letters Received at Bombay (1778), XLIV, 41.
35 Bombay Letters Received, V, 285—289.
A Sloop named the *Leopold* purchased by Him from the Dutch at Surat arrived here the 16th November with a Letter from Him dated at Gago the 31st October, wherein He complained much of the Treatment He received at Surat, and put two Queries to Us which He requested We would answer. We accordingly sent Him a Reply by our Secretary.

Whilst Mr Bolts was at Poonah a Packet addressed to him superscribed "on their Imperial Majesty's Service" fell into the hands of Mr Lewis thro' the Mistake of the Pottamars, who thought it his duty to transmit it to Us. The Captain of the Sloop *Leopold* who had by some means gained Information of the Packet being intercepted, demanded it from us in the Name of their Imperial Majesties, and on Consideration of the matter it was thought best to give it up, but Mr Carnac desired it might be minuted that as Mr Bolts was engaged in a Scheme so destructive to the Interests of the Company, he thought every means should be made Use of to defeat it, and He was therefore of Opinion that the Contents of the Packet should have been inspected, as there was reason to conclude from the Anxiety of Mr Bolt's Agent to recover it that it contained Intelligence of Importance.

Mr Bolts himself arrived here from Poonah the 13th December, when We immediately resolved not to permit of his stay here beyond a reasonable time for procuring the necessary Supplies for the Sloop during her Voyage. He left this Place on the 24th when We had determined to require Him to depart, and on that Day He sent in a Letter and Protest commenting on our reply to his former Letter and protesting against us for the Interception of his Packet. We have to remark in Reply to his Complaint of the Disrespect shewn him by our Answer being sent thro' the Secretary that however much We might be disposed to pay all possible Respect to a Commission from so illustrious a Personage as the Empress Queen, We could not consistently show any Distinction to Mr Bolts who may justly be termed an Apostate from the Company's Service. With regard to our Replies to his Queries, We think they were as explicit as the Nature of his Queries required, and in our Interference with the Nabob of Surat to obstruct his commercial Views, We acted in exact Conformity to your Commands of the 21st of February which direct Us to make Use of our Influence with the Country Powers to counteract his Designs.

Four British Subjects deserted from Mr Bolts's Ship and have entered into your Service. Having received Information from them of their [sic] being several others on Board, We gave Notice thereof to Sir Edward Vernon* who has sent the *Cormorant* Sloop of War to make Enquiry into the Affair.

*Letter from the Council at Tellicherry to the President and Council at Bombay, dated 8 February 1778.*

The Resident [Richard Church] having wrote to the Prince of Chererra [Chinakkal] to send Nanah Puttersh [sic] hither, as he wanted to communicate to him the Orders received from your Honor &ca. . . . the latter arrived the 2d Instant . . . . The Resident...

---

*Admiral Sir Edward Vernon (1723—1794), Commander-in-Chief in the East Indies, 1776—1781.

*Letters Received at Bombay (1778), XLIV, 48—50.

*Paṭṭar, paṭṭara*, a Malayalam name given in Malabar to foreign Brāhmaṇas, who there are usually traders and money-lenders;
mentioned the report that prevailed of Mr Bolts being promised a Factory in the Princes dominions and that it would be contrary to the Treaties subsisting between the Company and the Palace of Colasiria. We expected the Prince would not grant any establishment to any European power in his Country besides the Company, which Nanah Putterah has reported to the Prince. The former said the Prince desired him to assure us he would strictly abide by that clause in the Treaty with the Honble. Company. But in this assurance we cannot place a firm reliance.

Bombay Diary, 13 March 1778.

Received the following Letter from Mr Bolts, which the President directed the Secretary to send round for the opinions of the Council, in consequence of which Mr Bolts’s request was refused.

Honble. Sir and Sirs

Being much in want of a little Salt for Ballast of the Vessel under my Command, now in this Harbour, I request your permission for taking in the same, which I shall esteem a particular favor, who am with the greatest Respect Honble. Sir and Sirs.

Your most obedient and humble Servant

WILLIAM BOLTS, Lieut. Colonel in the Service of their Imperial Majesties.

Consultation at Bombay Castle, 1 April 1778.

Mr Carnac now acquaints us that as Mr Bolts’s ship has been in this Port full three weeks, a time in his opinion more than sufficient for procuring Refreshments and Ballast, the avowed motive for his coming here, He shall, to exculpate himself, deliver in a Minute expressing his disapprobation of Mr Bolts being permitted to make so long a stay.

Consultation at Bombay Castle, 8 April 1778.

Mr Carnac lays before us the Minute he acquainted us last Council day he proposed delivering, respecting Mr Bolts, which is ordered to be entered after this Consultation.

Mr Ramsay thinking it necessary, in consequence of a Passage in Mr Carnac’s Minute, that his Conduct with respect to Mr Bolts should stand recorded, now delivers in a Minute which is subjoined to Mr Carnac’s.

Enclosures.

1. Mr John Carnac’s Minute respecting Mr Bolts.

It has been positively enjoined from home to all the Settlements that the most strenuous Efforts should be exerted to defeat the Austrian attempt to carry on an interloping trade in these Seas, and to frustrate the Voyage set on foot at Trieste for that purpose. This was the more necessary, as the expedition was projected and is conducted by a man who, from the time he lost our Service, has made it his principal study both at home and abroad how he could most effectually injure the English Company and their Servants.

Colasiria, Portuguese corruption of Kollattiri or Kolam (Kollam), North Malabar. Its rulers were formerly known as the Kollattiri Rajas and now as the Chirakkal Rajas.

Bombay Public Consultations (1778), XLV, 119.

Bombay Public Consultations (1778), XLV, 158.


Andrew Ramsay, Sixth, and last, of Council.
Mr Carnac is therefore amazed at, and cannot help thus publickly expressing his disapprobation of, Mr Bolts being permitted to remain so long with his Ship in our Harbour, particularly as his conduct since his arrival in India has not been such as to merit any indulgence from us. Having assumed a right of Dominion in the River of Delagoa, he ordered forcibly to be taken down the English Flag hoisted by the master of a vessel trading thither under our protection; he has been at Poona intriguing with the Minister most adverse to us, in the hope of being able to purchase some Establishment in the Gulph of Cambay and privilege of trading, which must have been hurtful to our Interests; and we learn from the subordinacy of Tellicherry that the disturbances excited in that district by Domingo Rodrigues are supposed to arise from a design of granting to Mr Bolts a License, which he is solicitous of obtaining, to form a Settlement at Bimliapatam. In strict compliance to the Orders of his Employers, Mr Carnac has scrupulously avoided all intercourse whatever with Mr Bolts, but from his being still here after the expiration of more than three weeks, without any ostensible reason for it, it may be presumed everybody has not been equally scrupulous, as there can be no other motive for so long a stay, but that he has a fair prospect of engaging some of our merchants in a contraband trade between this Port and the Factory he has set up in Delagoa River, whereby the Europe Staples may be introduced to this side of India by a new Channel, greatly to the detriment of the Company. Mr Carnac has strong reason for entertaining such a suspicion, as he has been assured by a free merchant of considerable credit that proposals had been made to him by Mr Bolts for engaging in this Traffic, so very advantageous as to prove a temptation too powerful to be generally resisted.

1st April 1778.

JOHN CARNAC.

2. Mr Andrew Ramsay's Minute respecting Mr Bolts.

As it may be inferred from Mr Carnac's minute that persons in Authority have been interested in the long detention of the Austrian ship at this Port, Mr Ramsay, as a member of the Board, who has been largely concerned in trade, thinks it necessary thus publicly to declare that he has had no interest therein directly or indirectly, nor has he had the least intercourse with Mr Bolts, not even in the common civilities due to a Stranger, which, but for his particular Predicament in respect to the Company and their Servants, Mr Ramsay would otherwise most certainly have shewn him.

ANDREW RAMSAY.

Letter from the Council at Tellicherry to the President and Council at Bombay, dated 24 April 1778.

We received information that Mr William Bolts in the Austrian Ship the Joseph and Theresa, arrived the 21st Instant at Billiapatam, with an intention of taking in Pepper there.

As this proceeding of Mr Bolts is an infringement of the Honourable Company's privileges of Trade, granted them by the Kings of Cologristis, and that he might not plead ignorance thereof, we immediately wrote him a letter, acquainting him therewith, and which was sent to Billiapatam by our Linguist [interpreter], who was directed to gain all the Information he could of Mr Bolts proceedings in general, and that in case he should discover Mr Bolts soliciting an establishment in any part of the Prince's Dominions he was

46 Biliapatam (Beliapatam) or Valarpatam, near Cannanore, in the Chirakkal Kind.
47 Letters Received at Bombay (1778), XLIV, 162-3.
to advise us thereof immediately, and to represent to the Prince the injury [sic] the Company will receive from such a breach of the privileges granted by his Ancestors to them.

Letter from the Court of Directors to the Council at Bombay,

dated 7 May 1778.45

We approve your conduct relative to Mr Bolts and also the behaviour of our servants at Surat, as stated in your general letter of the 30th of November.

As we have not received the copy of Mr Bolts’s letter, asserting a right to Delagoa in consequence of a grant said to have been made to Her Imperial Majesty, we cannot at present reply thereto. If that letter is not accompanied by any remarks of yours, you will not fail to state to us by the first opportunity, every circumstance attending the affair in question, with such information as may be procurable respecting the supposed grant of the country, the name and rank of the grantor, the time when granted, and likewise the particular authority by which Mr Bolts has ventured to remove the English Colours and to destroy the house mentioned in your letter.

Letter from the Council at Tellicherry to the Court of Directors,

dated 9 May 1778.46

Mr William Bolts in the Austrian ship the Joseph and Theresa arrived at Billiapatam the 21st ultimo, with an intention of taking in pepper there. As this proceeding of Mr Bolts is an infringement of the Honble. Company’s privileges of trade granted them by the Kings of Colastria, and that he might not plead ignorance thereof, we immediately wrote him a letter, acquainting him therewith, and which was sent by our linguist to Billiapatam, who was directed to gain all the information he could of Mr Bolts’s proceedings in general, and that in case he should discover Mr Bolts soliciting an establishment in any part of the Prince’s Dominions he was to advise us thereof immediately, and to represent to the Prince the injury the Company will receive from such a breach of the privileges granted by his ancestors; and as he persisted in trading in our districts after our having informed him of the Company’s privileges, we thought it unnecessary to enter into a further discussion of them, and determined to leave the whole to the judgement of our Superiors.

While the Imperial Ship remained at Billiapatam there was landed from her at that place many chests of arms; after which she proceeded to Goa, where she will winter; Mr Bolts and other gentlemen belonging to the above ship remain at Billiapatam.

As we heard the Prince of Cherrika was at Cotiote [Kottayam] the 3rd instant, Mr Samuel Stedman was ordered to wait upon him to confer with him on the subject of Mr Bolts’s views and proceedings: On Mr Stedman’s return, he informed us that he represented to the Prince the injury the Company would receive by Mr Bolts having in particular an establishment in his country, and that we expected from the treaties between him and the Company that he would not grant it. Upon which the Prince gave Mr Stedman the strongest assurances that he would not of his own will grant Mr Bolts an establishment, who he acknowledged was endeavouring at one, but would throw every obstacle in his way to prevent it, tho’ he believed Mr Bolts was going to the Nabob

45 Bombay Despatches, IV, 1450—1452.
46 Bombay Letters, Red, VI, 58—59.
Hyder Ally Caun [Haidar 'Ali Khan] to solicit for it, and we were sensible if he succeeded, it would be out of his power to refuse obeying it.

The Resident has addressed the Nabob and represented to him in the strongest light how detrimental it will be to the Company if he gives the Prince an order to grant Mr Bolts an establishment in his country.

Letter from the Council at Tellicherry to the President and Council at Bombay, dated 17 June 1778.\(^{10}\)

We wrote you last the 12th Ultimo. ... A few days after we were informed that Mr Bolts paid a visit to Ally Rajah at Cannanore, and from thence proceeded to Calicut in one of his barges. We understand his principal errand was to find out a proper spot there or at Beyapore [near Calicut] to build a Factory, but have not learnt whether he has succeeded. On the 1st instant he proceeded to Seringapatam [to Haidar 'Ali].

The Ship Joseph and Theresa on the 2nd of last month left Billiapatam for Goa, where she proposed staying the Monsoon, but was not able to reach that place, and returned to Billiapatam the 14th. On the 20th following, she passed this Port to the Southward, and we are since informed is gone to Pondicherry.\(^ {51}\)

On the 31st ultimo a Carriker [carrick, cargo-boat] arrived from Cannanore, and acquainted the Resident by order of Ally Rajah, that Mr Bolts had been soliciting a place at Cannanore for a Factory, but that Ally Rajah would not give him an answer before he knew if it would be agreeable or not to the Honble. Company. The Resident dispatched the Carriker the day after, with a letter informing Ally Rajah that the Company expected, from the amity existing between them, that he would not grant Mr Bolts's request.

Letter from the Council at Tellicherry to the President and Council at Bombay, dated 27 November, 1778.\(^ {52}\)

Mr Bolts arrived at Mangalore from Seringapatam the 21st Ultimo, and immediately hoisted the Imperial Colours on the spot of ground granted him there for a Factory. One Mr Fife, a dependant of Mr Bolts, is left in charge thereof. On the 2nd instant he arrived at Billiapatam, but has not yet hoisted the Imperial Colours there or at Mattamy.\(^ {53}\)

Letter from the Council at Tellicherry to the President and Council at Bombay, dated 3 December 1778.\(^ {54}\)

The Imperial Ship Joseph and Theresa arrived at Billiapatam the 30th Ultimo from the Coast of Coromandel, and we learn that some time before she left the Coast, Mr Bolts's

---

\(^{10}\) *Letters Received at Bombay (1778)*, XLIV, 204-205.

\(^{51}\) "The south-west monsoon having strongly set in on the Malabar coast, it was deemed unsafe to remain there any longer; we therefore took our departure from Mangalore on the 20th of May 1778, directing our course towards the gulf of Bengal; and in less than ten days, we came in sight of the Carnicobar islands. In one of the bays formed within those islands, we moored in twelve fathoms, and there remained until the S. W. monsoon was quite over, which was in the beginning of September." *Extract from the Diary of Nicodemo Fontana, surgeon of the Joseph and Theresa,* printed in *Asiatic Researches*, Vol. III, No. VII, pp. 149-163.

\(^{52}\) *Letters Received at Bombay (1778)*, XLIV, 206.

\(^{53}\) I have not succeeded in identifying this place. It is probably an error for Madakarn. See the letter of 4th February, 1779, infra.

\(^{54}\) *Letters Received at Bombay (1778)*, XLIV, 308.
Agent had made a Settlement on the Nicobar Islands, and that the Inhabitants of the four Islands of Soury [Chowra], Nicaoree [Nancowry], Tricantee [Trinkat] and Cachoule [Katchall] had joined in a body, and surrendered themselves to the Sovereignty of the Empress Queen, upon condition of having secured to them a due administration of justice, freedom of commerce and liberty of conscience.

Letter from the Council at Tellicherry to the Court of Directors, dated 4 February 1779.56

The Ship Joseph and Theresa lost her passage to Goa from Billiapattam in the beginning of May, and the 20th [following] passed this place for the Coromandel; she returned the 30th of November. We learn that Mr Bolts's agents had made a settlement on the Nicobar Islands. Mr Bolts on the 1st of June proceeded to Seringapatam, and obtained from the Nabob Hyder Ally a grant to establish factories at Mangalore, Carwar, and the Island of Maddacana,59 on which last he has hoisted the Imperial Colours. His ship proceeded from Billiapattam to Goa the middle of December, it is said to be repaired.

Letter from the Resident at Onore to the President and Council at Bombay, dated 12 February 1779.57

There was landed from the Austrian Ship Joseph and Theresa which came to the Port of Mangalore the beginning of December ninety six iron guns from one to four pounds caliber, two brass pieces of six pounds, ten thousand muskets and eight thousand round shots, intended for the Nabob, out of which he has yet only taken three thousand stand of arms and the two brass guns; the remainder of the muskets and guns are still there. Several copper utensils intended for setting on foot a sugar manufacture and distilling spirituous liquors were also landed, and Mr Bolts has left there two European gentlemen, Mr Fyce and Mr Brown with a doctor, at the Banksaul which the Government has allotted him. The same ship toucht at Carwar afterwards, and landed a small quantity of copper and iron for the use of the factory. Both at that place and Mangalore Mr Bolts had begun to build the Factory Warehouses, but when the walls were raised only a few feet a general stop was put to their proceeding further on them by the Governments people, under the pretence of wanting more distinct orders from the Nabob, and I have pleasure to acquaint your Honor &c. that Mr Bolts's Agents have not yet succeeded in securing any articles of Investment in this neighbourhood. It is true that Luximicant Sinoy [Lakshmiikanth Sinai] has been making offers for pepper in the Soudah [Sondai] Province, but we may possibly be able from this Factory to counteract his designs, for which end, I beg to assure you, not activity on our part will be wanting.

Bombay Diary 18 February 1779.58

Imported the Austrian Ship Joseph and Theresa, commanded by Mr William Bolts last from Goa.

Consultation at Bombay 18 March 1779.59

Read a Letter from Mr William Bolts as entered hereafter, in reply to which he must be acquainted that the Orders We have received from the Honble Company are not

---

55 Bombay Letters Received (1779), VI, 113-114.
56 The fort of Madakara, near Billiapattam.
57 Letters Received at Bombay (1779), XLV, 61-62.
58 Bombay Public Consultations (1779), XLVI, 107.
59 Ibid, 188.
of the nature he mentions, but that we expect to receive particular Orders respecting the Trade of the Subjects of their Imperial Majestys by the Ships of this Season, till when We will grant him the Liberty of the Port and all requisite Assistance and Supplies for the Imperial Ship Joseph and Theresa.

Enclosure.

Letter from Mr Bolts.

Honble. Sir and Sirs

Since my Arrival in this Port I have had the Pleasure to be informed that the Honble the United Company of Merchants of England trading to the East Indies have lately been pleased to issue Orders to their several Provinces in Asia to admit in their ports of the trade of such European Nations as are in amity with his most sacred Britanic Majesty. I therefore request the favour of information from your Honble Board whether (as I most sincerely hope) the subjects of their Imperial, Royal and Apostolic Majesties have the happiness to be included in the said general Orders, or whether there is any particular exception against the Colours of their said Majestys.

From the Obstructions which you, Honble. Sir and Gentlemen, know me to have met with in the conduct of the Expedition with which I have the honor to be entrusted, I flatter myself you will admit the Propriety of my requesting this Information, as being essentially necessary, as well for the satisfaction of their Imperial Majesties, my Sovereigns, as for the direction of my future Conduct. For such a determination of the Honble. Company may not only free their Majesties from the Expense of forming Connections with the Powers of Asia but also free me from the disagreeable necessity, to which I might be otherwise with reluctance reduced, of clashing or interfering in any respect with the Political Interests of Great Britain in India.

Permit me to assure you that this is my sincerest wish while I have the Honor of subscribing myself with the greatest respect

Honble. Sir and Sirs

Your most obedient and humble Servant

Bombay, 5th March 1779.

WILLIAM BOLTS, Lieut. Colonel in the Service of their Imperial Majesties.

Bombay Diary, 5 May 1779,60

Sailed the Austria Ship, Joseph and Theresa, commanded by Lieut. Coll. Bolts to Bengal.

Letter from the Council at Bombay to the Court of Directors, dated 30 April 1779.61

You have been advised from Tellicherry of the proceedings of Mr Bolts on the Malabar Coast . . . On the 18th of February Mr Bolts arrived at this place in the ship Joseph and Theresa, which was taken into the dock to receive some necessary repairs, and Mr Bolts having we presume had intimation of the directions contained in your

60 Bombay Public Consultations (1779), XLVI, 291.
61 Bombay Letters Received (1779), VI, 260-261.
commands of the 19th March 1778 respecting the trade of foreign ships, applied to us to be informed whether he should be allowed the benefit of those orders, or whether there was any exception against the subjects of their Imperial Majesties. [In] our answer, which is of a general nature we have declined granting him any intercourse of trade, for as the year before we had received very particular and special orders respecting the persons concerned in this enterprise, we were not altogether satisfied that those orders were superseded by your present commands, being inclined to think that if such had been your intention you would have said so expressly. We also hoped soon to be favoured with your particular instructions on this head in consequence of the representations we have before made to you.

Letter from the Resident at Onore to the President and Council at Bombay, dated 3 September 1779.62

The Austrian Vakeel at Carwar, Laximirant Sinoy, who was formerly in the Company's employ at that place and this Factory, has been very industrious for several months in sending agents to Soundah, Biligey, Sorobaw and other adjacent ports63 for making purchases of pepper, and he has even offered six and eight Rupees per Candy [Port. candil, candi, about 500 lbs.] more than the price the Company purchase this article for, and as farther encouragement he has promised to supply those parts with broad cloth, iron, lead and other Europe staples, which he gives out the Austrian ship will bring to Carwar in the month of November next, but we are happy to acquaint your Honor &ca. that all Luxim isempty's endeavours have hitherto proved fruitless, which we chiefly attribute to the low state of Mr Bolts's finances at Mangalore and Carwar, tho' we are apprehensive this Factory will feel the ill-consequence of these measures by raising competition among the Pepper Contractors. At the same time, we beg leave to assure your Honor &ca. that we constantly keep a vigilant eye on this material object of our Honble. Masters Interest.

Letter from the Council at Bombay to the Court of Directors, dated 30 April 1780.64

Mr Bolts in the Austrian ship Joseph and Theresa sailed for Bengal the 5th of May [1779]. The papers and Diary transmitted by the Hawks on her former dispatch contain the only information we are able to afford respecting the right asserted by Mr Bolts to Delagoa and the circumstance of his removing the English Colours. We however now send another copy of the letter from the Commander of a Country Vessel, which related the facts mentioned in our address of the 30th November 1777 and also of the letter from Mr Bolts dated the 31 October, containing his relation of the same circumstances. The factory left by Mr Bolts at Delagoa is we understand nearly if not entirely deserted.

(To be continued.)

61 Letters Received at Bombay (1779), XLV, 246-247.
62 Sonda, Bilgi and Siddapur in North Kanara, famous for pepper gardens. "Ports" is evidently a copyist's error for "parts" as all three places are inland.
64 Bombay Letters Received, Vol. VI.
NEW LIGHT ON GUPTA ERA AND MIHIRAKULA

BY K. R. PATHAK.

(Continued from Vol. XLVI, p. 296.)

Dr. Fleet’s discovery of the Mandasor inscription was very interesting and important. But his attempt to prove that the Mālava era was the same as the Vikrama era of 57 B.C. was a failure and looked like the attempt of a person who wishes, to use Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar’s words,33 “to determine the value of one unknown quantity by means of another unknown quantity, which cannot be done.” Nor was Dr. Fleet more successful in interpreting the date of the pillar inscription of Budhagupta when he said that the Gupta year 165 was a current year and that34 “in following Alberuni’s statement and adding two hundred and forty-one, what is really accomplished is the conversion of a given current Gupta-Valabhi year into an expired Śaka year, by which we obtain precisely the basis that is wanted for working out results by Hindu Tables, viz., the last Saka year expired before the commencement of the current Śaka year corresponding to a given current Gupta-Valabhi year; and that the running difference between current Gupta-Valabhi and current Śaka years is two hundred and forty-two.” That this view is erroneous will be obvious from a careful consideration of the following two equations which have been explained above—

Expired Gupta year \((a) 165 = (b) 406\) expired Śaka year.

\[
\text{Current Gupta year} (c) 166 = (d) 407 \text{ current Śaka year},
\]

Dr. Fleet has mistaken the expired Gupta year \((a) 165\) for a current year and made it correspond to the current Śaka year \((d) 407\) and drawn the wrong inference that the difference between current Gupta years and current Śaka years is 242 instead of 241. His final conclusion, which is also due to the above mistake, that35 “in the absence of any distinct specification to the contrary, we must interpret the years in Gupta-Valabhi dates as current years” is equally erroneous. Dr. Fleet attacks36 Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar’s view that “the addition of 241 would turn a past Gupta year into a past Śaka year; and the addition of 242, a past Gupta year into a current Śaka year.” But this view, which is found to be in accordance with the statements of the Jaina authorities and the Sārnāth inscription of Budhagupta, must now be accepted as final and decisive on the point at issue.

Let us turn to the date of the Morvi copper plate grant,37 which is thus expressed—

\[\text{पञ्चाशिर्या जुनंति समान विषयं केक} \]

\[\text{गोवार दलमे दुष्पल: षावरनमंकनकरमिद्} \]

This means that the king made the grant, when 385 years of the Guptas had expired, on the occurrence of a solar eclipse. The eclipse, therefore, occurred in the current Gupta year 586. Our equation is—

\[
\text{Expired Gupta 157} = 398 \text{ expired Śaka.}
\]

Now the expired Gupta 385 is 428 years later than the expired Gupta 157. By the addition of 428 to both sides we get the new equation—

\[
\text{Expired Gupta 383} = 826 \text{ expired Śaka.}
\]

The equivalent Śaka year 826 can also be obtained by adding 241 to 585. Therefore—

\[
\text{Current Gupta 586} = 827 \text{ current Śaka.}
\]

34 Gupta Inscriptions, Intro. p. 84.
35 Idem, p. 84, n. 1.
36 Idem, p. 129.
37 Gupta Inscriptions, Intro. p. 97.
The solar eclipse alluded to in the grant is therefore the one that occurred on the new moon of Mārgaśīrṣa, Saka 827 current, corresponding to the 10th November A.D. 904. There was a solar eclipse also in the following Saka year 828 current, on Jyeṣṭha Bahula Amāvāsyā, corresponding to the 7th May, A.D. 905. Dr. Fleet's view that this second eclipse is the one alluded to in the grant is untenable as the Saka year 828 is obtainable by adding 242 to the current Gupta year 586; and this is, as we have seen, against the statements of our Jaina authorities and the two Sārnath inscriptions. Nor can we accept his reading Gopte and his explanation of it as the name of a village; for on the analogy of the expression गूप्तानां वहने found in the two Sārnath inscriptions of Kumāragupta II and Budhagupta we must expect the reading गौते सतपत्ते in the Morvi grant. If the reading be गौते, it should be corrected into गौते. It is thus clear that Dr. Fleet's reading and interpretation of the date in the Morvi copper plate grant are positively wrong. On the other hand the decision of Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar on this interesting point is upheld by our Jaina authorities and the Sārnath inscriptions of Kumāragupta II and Budhagupta.

The connection of Kumāragupta II and Budhagupta with the main line of the Imperial Guptas may be exhibited in the following genealogical tree—

```
    Kumāragupta I
       /       \
     /         \
Skandagupta   Puragupta
       |       \
    /         \      \
Kumāragupta II Narasiṃhagupta
        \                    \
    /                          \      
Budhagupta II                 Kumāragupta III
```

The rule that Gupta years can be converted into Śaka years by adding 241, may be illustrated thus: Skandagupta ascended the throne in Gupta Saṅvat 136. In the very first year of his reign, the Gupta empire was invaded by the Hūṇas. Kālidāsa assures us that the Hūṇas, who enjoyed the reputation of being the most invincible warriors of their age, were still on the Vaiṣṇava (Vakṣa) or Oxus banks, when he wrote his well-known verses. The Hūṇa empire in the Oxus Basin was founded about A.D. 450. The date of the invasion of the Gupta empire by the Hūṇas and their defeat by Skandagupta, namely the Gupta year 136, must therefore be subsequent to about A.D. 450 by a very few years. By calculating 24 years backwards from Śaka year 304, corresponding to the Gupta year 153, we arrive at Śaka 370 (==A.D. 448) corresponding to the Gupta Saṅvat 129. Now the Gupta year 129 (A.D. 448) is the 36th regnal year of Kumāragupta I. In A.D. 448, in the reign of Kumāragupta I, the establishment of the Hūṇa empire in the Oxus Basin may be placed. That the year A.D. 448 is the exactly correct date of this event, while the year A.D. 450 is only approximate, will be shown hereafter. The Gupta year 136 (A.D. 455) is thus only 7 years subsequent to A.D. 448. Kālidāsa's reference to the Hūṇas being the most invincible conquerors of their age, and as being still in the Oxus Basin, must have been made between A.D. 448 and A.D. 455. Kālidāsa and Skandagupta were thus contemporaries. This argument needs no elaboration here, as it has been discussed at length in the introduction to my second edition of the Meghadūta (pp. 10, 11, 12) where it is shown that the fall of the Gupta Empire took place towards the close of the fifth century. Jinasena, who writes a
little less than three centuries later, has preserved to the world the oldest, and therefore the most reliable, text of the Meghadūta as yet discovered, while his pupil Meghadūta says that the Kumārasambhava was widely read in his time and was the delight of every class of people, young as well as old.38

From a comparison of the Eka pillar inscription of Buddhagupta and the Eka Boar inscription of Toramāṇa it can be conclusively proved, as has been shown by Dr. Fleet, that Toramāṇa came after Buddhagupta. The latest date for Buddhagupta is Gupta Saṅvat 180 corresponding to Śaka 421 or A.D. 499. Toramāṇa was the father of Mihirakula. Mihirakula was defeated by Yasodharman who was reigning in Mālava or Vikrama year 589 corresponding to Śaka 454 (A.D. 532). The first regnal year of Toramāṇa is mentioned in the Eka Boar inscription, while the 15th regnal year of his son Mihirakula is given in his Gwalior inscription. These two regnal years must fall between Gupta Saṅvat 180 and Mālava year 589, corresponding to Śaka 421 (A.D. 499) and Śaka 454 (A.D. 532) respectively, according to our Jaina authorities. It is worth noting that the inscription which records the defeat of Mihirakula by Yasodharman is not dated. But from another inscription of Yasodharman dated in Mālava or Vikrama year 589, the approximate date of Mihirakula is ascertained. This Mihirakula is believed by Dr. Fleet and other scholars to be identical with the famous tyrant Mihirakula, whose career has been described in such vivid colours by the Chinese traveller Huien Tsang and by Kalhaṇa in the Bājatararāja. On the other hand our Jaina authorities tell us that the early Gupta kings were immediately succeeded by the great tyrant Chaṭumukha-Kalāka, Kalkin or Kalkināja. He was a paramount sovereign. He was foremost among wicked men, a perpetuator of sinful deeds. He oppressed the world. He asked his ministers whether there were any people on earth who did not owe allegiance to him; the reply was, none but the Nirgranthas. He thereupon issued an edict that the first lump of food offered to the Jaina community of Nirgranthas at noon every day by pious people should be levied as a tax. The Jaina Nirgranthas are allowed by the rules of their religion to take their meal at noon once a day. If any difficulty occurs at that hour, they must wait for their meal till noon on the following day. The result of the tyrant Kalkināja’s edict was that the Nirgranthas were exposed to utter starvation. Unable to bear this spectacle, a demon appeared and killed the tyrant with his thunderbolt. Kalkināja then went into the hell called Ratnaprabhā, there to live countless ages and to endure misery for a long time.41 We may compare this account with the statement42 of Huien Tsang as regards Mihirakula—“the holy saints said, in pity, for having killed countless victims and overturned the law of Buddha, he has now fallen into the lowest hell, where he shall pass endless ages of revolution.”

We have seen that the tyrant Kalkināja was a paramount sovereign. The Mihirakula of the inscriptions also was a paramount sovereign, because he bowed down before none

38 Compare, for instance, Uṣṇīṣapūraṇa. Chap. 59, stanza 36—

इत्यादि विषयुक्तं च तदूपा विश्वविद्वार्तिक: ||

हस्ताक्षरप्रविष्टं कि न वेदिक विपुलपने || 36 ||

with कुष्ठासनवर्ष, ii, 55—

विषयोत्तर सारं सर्वं देशमुखतं ||


40 Gupta Inscriptions, pp. 150, 158, 162.

41 See the passage given at the end.

42 V. Smith’s Early History of India, 3rd ed., p. 319.
save the god Siva. The real meaning of the verse, in which this fact is stated, and which was misunderstood by the translators of the Gupta inscriptions, has been pointed out by the present writer and by Dr. Kielhorn. Like the Mihirakula of the inscriptions the tyrant Kalkiraja came immediately after the Early Guptas; that is, he overthrew the Early Gupta sovereignty. The Mihirakula of the inscriptions was therefore a tyrant and must be identical with the tyrant Mihirakula of Hiuen Tsang and of the Raajataragya. Then again, like the tyrant Mikirakula, the tyrant Kalkiraja (A.D. 472-542)14 was reigning in A.D. 520 when the Chinese pilgrim Song Yun visited this country, and was still on the throne when the Greek monk Cosmas came to India about A.D. 530. There is no denying the cogency of these arguments, which lead to the inevitable conclusion that Kalkiraja was only another name of the famous tyrant Mihirakula. It is to this great Huna conqueror that the Jaina author Somadeva, contemporary with the Raajtrakuta king Krijaparaja III, alludes when he says15—

नन्दकुलोऽसीप्तं भजनसः जांपुर्णिसः कालियामनदाकारिपीयवर्मिपिति राजनामापिति: पुष्प—  

The Jaina version of the story of Mihirakula has this advantage over the Buddhist and Brahmanical versions that, while the two latter afford no clue to the real date of the tyrant, the former gives the exact dates of his birth and death. Not only is the approximate date of the tyrant deduced from inscriptions and coins amply corroborated by the Jaina authors, but they supplement, in a material degree, the information which we owe to those two independent sources.

The famous tyrant Mihirakula, accounts of whose cruel deeds have been preserved to us in Buddhist, Jaina and Brahmanical literatures, was then born on the 1st of the bright half of the month Kartika in Shaka 394 expired, the cyclic year being a Magha-saṁvatsara, corresponding to A.D. 472. And he died at the age of 70 in Shaka 464 or A.D. 542. Jinasena assigns to him a reign of 42 years, while, according to Guṇabhadra and Nemicandra, he reigned 40 years. Deducting 2 or 40 from A.D. 542 we get A.D. 500 or A.D. 502. We shall accept A.D. 502 for the initial year of Mihirakula’s reign. His fifteenth regnal year must be A.D. 517. His father Toramaya’s first year may be safely taken to be A.D. 500, coming after Gupta Sāṃvata 180 or A.D. 499, the latest date for Buddhagupta. And the figure 52 found on Toramaya’s silver coins corresponds to A.D. 500, the initial year of his reign. If calculated backwards, the figure 52 brings us to A.D. 448,16 which is thus the exact date of the foundation of the Huna empire in the Oxus Basin.

The tyrant Mihirakula died in A.D. 542, just a century before Hiuen Tsang was on his travels, and exactly 241 years before Jinasena wrote his passage relating to the Guptas. Jinasena says that he owes his information to chroniclers who preceded him (कालियामनदाकारिपीयवर्मिपिति:). These chroniclers must be as near in time to the period of the Huna sovereignty as Hiuen Tsang himself. In the light of these facts we feel that we are in a position to discard as baseless the opinion of the Chinese pilgrim that Mihirakula lived ‘some centuries previously;
as it comes into conflict with the statements of the Jaina writers, which have been shown to rest upon contemporary Gupta inscriptions. On the same ground we should reject as valueless the view of Alberuni, admittedly a later writer than our Jaina authorities, that the Gupta era dated from the extermination of the Guptas. This erroneous opinion of Alberuni, coupled with his conflicting statements as to the difference between Sakas and Gupta years being 241, 242 or 243, led to a fierce controversy over the epoch of the Gupta era, which has raged now for more than 78 years since 1838, when Mr. James Prinsep discussed the date of the Kahaum pillar inscription of Skandagupta. A great step in advance was made when Dr. Fleet discovered his Mandasor inscriptions. But his method of proving that the Mala era was the same as the Vikrama era of 57 B.C. left a great deal to be desired. Now that we have placed his hypothesis on a footing of certainty, unqualified praise should be given to Dr. Fleet for his interesting discovery. But that he claimed more for his discovery than was its due has been already shown. Nor should we refuse to pay a well-merited tribute to Mr. D. R. Bhandarkar for his discovery of an earlier date in the Vikrama era, namely 461, referable to the reign of Candragupta II. Mention should be made here of the synchronism between Samudragupta and the king Meghavarsha of Ceylon discovered by M. Sylvain Lévi to whom our thanks are due. But this synchronism, valuable as it is, should be utilized not in proving the epoch of the Gupta era, as was suggested by some scholars, but in rectifying Ceylonese chronology, which is full of uncertainty, as various dates are proposed for king Meghavarsha. Nor should we omit to express our gratitude to Mr. Hargreaves who has lately discovered the two Gupta inscriptions, one of Kumargupta II dated Gupta Samvat 154, and the other of Budhagupta dated Gupta Samvat 157, which have enabled us, with the help of our Jaina authorities, to prove that the Gupta years between 153 and 157 are expired and not current years.

Thus the controversy, which has raged over the epoch of the Gupta era for more than 78 years, is finally set at rest.

*Extract from Guṇabhādra's Uttara-purāṇa, Chap. 76:*

```
| अधानब्राव सारसाम | अभिनव: शास्त्रिक: 15 द्वार | सध्यात्त सप्तवीरांक सुनिज्ञातिन्य विद्य: || 387 ||
| सयविजयविजीतानि लघुविद्याथ: || विद्वान: 188 ||
| वारसादंकनैनान्तिनानि नाम: || 389 ||
| सा गंगाविभिन्न स्वयंपादित्वाय स्वामिनि || 49 ||
| सानात सप्तस्वासिकः स्वाहितविद्यानि: 390 ||
| सहवतृष्णस्वयंपादित्वाय स्वामिनि: || विद्वान: 391 ||
| समारलिनायांतिनानि नामानी || विद्वान: 392 ||
| सानात सप्तस्वासिकः स्वाहितविद्यानि: || 393 ||
| सानात सप्तस्वासिकः स्वाहितविद्यानि: 49 ||
```

---

48 सांवालकारण which purifies the soul permanently by entirely destroying karma, or action. Cf. *Tattvārthā-Rājavārtika* II, 1, 2 and 10; *Benares* Ed. I, p. 69.
49 *Mahāvīra*. 
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[Text in Devanagari script]

---

394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412

30 So three Kanauja MSS, of the Jaina Matha, Kolhapur, and one Nagari Ms. of the late Manikdhog of Bombay. But I reject the reading in some Deccan college MSS, which gives no sense.
31 अत्य a pot; cf. पासियारा निगंबर.
32 अधार = बहार, food.
33 वा = हृद, अहंकार.
34 तथा तथापि (the name of the first hell).
35 सायणप्रयास: भीभेय: Tattvārthadāja-ārthika III, 38, 8 Benares Ed., II, p. 149.)
Extract from Trilokasāra, Palm-leaf M.S., p. 32:—

इयानी काखकणिणीहत्र्यसिद्धार्थे

नदि छोड़कर वेंस यमोलास्युंग संस्कृतिर्वृत्तिन्द्रहरू

समाजारो ती कल्याणी चशुचिनीगतिः महिवर्य समार्थ || 840 ||

भीदिनायणिगुलं, समां त्योह्वर नन्दपुरश्चिवधारको (१०२) पयशासुताराम गलता पन्चांश वि३३ कलाकृः

दामकारो जगवे नन्द प्राप्ति चतुर्केश्वरविधिवात (१५४) यस्यपि सम (३) महामिहिन्दन गलता

प्राप्ति कल्याणी जाराते

इयानी काखिण: कुर्याय पाठापकरानाथे

किं ते नसाहिकारे नव सुधा सरिप्रयाप्तरमाक || 841 ||

इयानी कथितं प्रका मन्तु सिद्धकोयवपराग || 110 ||

सकलकुमाराकपनुसमुद्धितकाहार: समाप्तमनकपयवपराग चतुर्केश्वरवात (४५) रामो निर्माण: सन्त

सर्वनिश्चितम: इप्पूति

अन्तर्य खण्ड सिध्याभिषेक अति कैविषाशाशा

निक्षणायते विलासो भी चाहनेयात्मिनिसने || 842 ||

अन्तर्य के अन्तर्य इति मानोनकिन: कधवति निरिम्या: सति हात पन्ना: पुष्टि से कृपायाय इति निरिम्यनवर्ना

नपीरायान निरिम्यनसने हायत भंवेन: (ना) प्रचारन मन्यीवा—

तपायकृति निरिते विकपतिन त्युं खुं के विशेषे \\n
इति निक्षेपने संविशेषार्थे चंसाहार गया मुणिणाः || 843 ||

तंवंत निरंधान गटपुर्ण विशेषज्ञ निरंधान दिति दिति सनीर्वण कृमि सनि

त्यजनासातशान ज्ञानाणार्या चामुपच: चतुर्केश्वरां न राजांनी निर्मित: स सुखा रस्मानांसो कुट्ट| |

पादाके जनसर्वसो सेतोतित्तर भिक्षु खरिण चरण

तां भवाके तत्त सुविधा भिक्षु रस्मानांसो 

सम्म ग्युद्व विद्य विनिर्दित समार्थ गत्वा सम्मिकता || 845 ||

समस्मार्थितत्त्वानानसात: राजा: सुनो जितंयत्तित्तर नितलक: संस्कृत्य घात्मा घात्मा सहिन सुर्या दारा

गच्छति

सं म देसपराणगि विद्यानार्यान या कुणादि सी मीरे वि

पराक खु न सुप्त सुर्यविनित्तर निक्षेप सन्त || 846 ||

तृकुमारमनिवन्धकाये प्रथम दृढ़ शीर्ष सम्मिकतानले हवायानन्तर करणी।

36 Also called भृगुनार.
37 No distinction is made between दृष्टि and अस्त्र in these passages.
38 This means 394 according to the principle अनाश्चर्यो विषालो गति: of तत्त्वादित्तिः (=2500)
39 विषालाविसिद्धयान्तरित: || Guchhadra, Uttarapunza, Chap. 81.
40 This is a mistake. See my paper on the date of Mahāvira, ante, Vol. XII, 22.
41 See fn. 56, above.
AN ADDITIONAL PROOF FOR THE GENUINENESS OF THE VRITTI
IN MAMMATA’S KÁVYAPRAKĀśA.

BY ROBERT ZIMMERMANN, S.J.; BOMBAY.

It has repeatedly been shown that Mamma is the author both of the Kārikās and the Vṛttis of the Kāvya-prakāśa. (See The Kāvya-prakāśa, ed. by Bh. V. B. R. Jhajakalkara, 2nd ed., Bombay, 1901. Introduction, Nr. 7, pp. 14-15; for the literature on the question see Z.D.M.G., LXVI, "Miscellaneous Notes on Mamma’s Kāvya-prakāśa," by V. Sukthankar, M.A., pp. 477-78, n. 2; Z.D.M.G., LXVII, "Indologische Studien," by Johannes Nobel, p. 33, n. 1.) As an independent, internal, proof for the common authorship of the Kārikās and the Vṛttis has been adduced so far: Mamma तु पूर्ववर्त, allās. X, sloka 8, the Kārikā on the Mālā Rūpaka. Jhajakalkara gives the argument in the following words:—

कारिकासु-प्रकाशसु भवति इत्युक्तवाक्यालीकाव्याचार्य ज्ञातविन्दुः पुरुषसु “माला तु पूर्ववर्त” . . .
कारिकासु प्रकाशसु [हृदयाकुमारवर्त यष्ट कारिकासु प्रकाशसु अविनाशी लिति] यागर्माण्यां आविष्कारांचे प्रकरणांचे हृदयाकुमारवर्त तथा हृदयाकुमारवर्त नागर्माण्यांचे कारिकासु प्रकाशसु, किंतु प्रकाशसु इत्यतः. Introd. p. 15.

There is, if I am not mistaken, another proof, though running on the same lines as contained in the very same sloka. The beginning of sloka 8: सांगमतदिऩरं त्रु दुष्कर्षयो त्रु दुष्कर्षयो of the "Entire" and the "Partless" Rūpaka. On the सांगमतदिऩरं the Vṛtti remarks: उक्तिनि प्राप्तस्मातां लघु जनमं (सांगमतदिऩरं). This express statement of the subdivision of the सांगमतदिऩरं into two sorts is made only here in the Vṛtti, nowhere in the Kārikā. It is true, the two kinds of लघु जनमं, the सांगमतदिऩरं and the प्राप्तस्मातां, have both in the Kārikā and the Vṛtti been treated of immediately before; but there only their respective character, which discriminates one from the other, has been pointed out; the two figures of speech are not spoken of as the two kinds of the उक्तिनि प्राप्तस्मातां. Thus the Vṛtti contains a new, explicit, statement. The Kārikā continues: निर्देशं तु दुष्कर्षयो. It emphatically —तु—lays stress on the difference of the निर्देशं कर्तव्यं from the लघु जनमं by saying that it is only of one kind.

From here the argument is the same as that based on माला तु पूर्ववर्त. The Kārikā supposes the Vṛtti; the Vṛtti, therefore, cannot have been written either later than the Kārikā, or—as we know on other grounds as well—by another hand. And as there is neither any internal nor external evidence for an interpolation, we have no reason to doubt the genuineness of the Kārikā or the Vṛtti on this point. The apparent deficiency of the Kārikā, on the other hand, is sufficiently explained by Mamma’s style, which often enough approaches the Sūtras in brevity. A doubt, moreover, about the genuineness of सांगमतदिऩरं त्रु दुष्कर्षयो could hardly be entertained without impunity for माला तु पूर्ववर्त, imperilling thus the traditional proof for the common authorship of Kārikās and Vṛttis.

But neither the traditional nor our own evince that the whole Vṛtti, as we have it now, has been written by Mamma. Cf. Nobel, "Indol. Stud." Z.D.M.G., LXVII, p. 35.

1 The force of language used by Jhajakalkara against the पूर्ववर्त, who hold the opposite view, is perhaps not quite in proportion with his argument. But it is only fair to say that, in spite of occasional mistakes in particular points, there cannot be two opinions on the general merit and usefulness of this edition of the Kāvya-prakāśa.

2 "Partless," for निर्देशं may be kept only for want of something better. भोग here has the meaning of attributive or secondary part, auxiliary, dependent member, serving to help the principal one, if we refer भोग to the subordinate metaphor in this सांगमतदिऩरं; or, as D. T. Chattoraj, The Kāvya-prakāśa of Mamma, allās. X, 2a. s. 1, 113, p. 45, it is to mean, a cause. "Thus भोग means that कर्तव्यं, where one metaphor is the cause of another metaphor," referring भोग to the principal metaphor.
THE WIDE SOUND OF E AND O WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO GUJARATI.

BY N. B. DIVATIA B.A.; BANDRA.

(Continued from Vol. XLVI, p. 304.)

I shall now address myself direct to the arguments contained in sub-heads (a), (b) and (c), noted above. I do not contend that, where and when रेगि were actually written in the earliest Maravāji Manuscripts for the रर-अर of a previous period, रर-अर were found in writing at any intermediate stage. I regard the रेगि as symbols of diphthongal sounds in these cases, but as rough attempts to symbolize approximately the wide sound that had come into the spoken language. The spoken रर-अर became अअ-अम and मर्म-मर्म in the mouths of the people and generated the wide sounds, य and छ. The late Sāstrī Vrajalal Kālidāsa wrote to me (in a letter dated V. 8. 1942, Bhadrāpada s. 15) that he had seen in the possession of a Maravāji Bhāṣa a manuscript copy of Maravāji Prikhīdaja Rājan in which he saw the following line:—

सकारार्ग् सकारार्ग राय नित जुड़ निवेश

and that, on being questioned about the inverted mātra stroke in रेगि and रो, the Bhāṣa explained that such was the practice in his country to denote the wide sound of रेगि and रो. It would be interesting to know how far this account tallies with Dr. Tessitori's experience and results of his examination of Maravāji Manuscripts, and during what period such practice obtained, if it did. Dr. Tessitori states in his present article (p. 79, l. 1-2) that Maravāji sometimes writes रेगि and sometimes रो रो to distinguish the wide sound. Could this alternative रो रो have anything to do with the inverted mātra of Sāstrī Vrajalal's Bhāṣa?!

Any way, the रेगि seem to be special symbols in the Maravāji Manuscripts for the wide sound; and the very fact that Dr. Tessitori was misled by them is significant; for, in the true spirit of the honest investigator, he tells us that he was incorrect when in his "Notes" he stated that the रर-अर of O.W. Rājasthāni became य-य (narrow रेगि) in modern Gujarātī and रर-अर (रेगि) in modern Maravāji; he admits that in both these languages the रर-अर become य, छ (अअ, wide). It is the reason which he gives for this mistake that is of particular significance. When he wrote the "Notes" (he informs us) he had never been in India and for information concerning pronunciation in Gujarātī and Maravāji he had completely to rely on the accounts given by others. Thus, away from the sound of spoken language, he was guided by the eye and the incorrect representations of informants. If this was so in the case of present times, when informants of some sort were available, how much more difficult it is for all of us when, even the possibility of such informants being out of the question, we have to depend solely on the written forms in manuscripts? It is therefore that I contend that the रेगि and रो of the manuscript need not as a matter of course, be taken as a proof that they were symbols of the rare, narrow diphthongal sound. In the circumstances, I bring into aid a condition within our present-day experience: In Hindi we find रेगि and रो written to express the peculiar widish sound of these vowels; we hear with our own ears that sound and we see with our own eyes the symbols; we also know that the रेगि and रो symbols in these cases are not of a recent date but

17 See his present article, p. 74, para 1.
fairly old. It is therefore permissible to infer that the रे-ओ of the earliest Māravāḍi Manuscripts were symbols, not of the narrow diphthong, but of the wide sound in आर and यर. These remarks practically dispose of all the three sub-heads (a), (b) and (c) given above. I may just add a remark or two in regard to sub-head (b): Dr. Tessitori's theory that रे-ओ were written for अह-अउ because the latter were pronounced as diphthongs (रे-ओ) would create a fresh case for reversion of phonetic process, at least in cases like वर-वर-रेः, यर-यो (Sanskrit) becoming अह-अउ (Prakrit and O. W. Rāj.) and again रे-ओ in early Māravāḍi. One might express the very doubt which Dr. Tessitori puts in the other case and say—it is not admissible that a language which began its existence by reducing रे-ओ to अह-अउ should have brought अह-अउ back to रे-ओ. I am myself not against the possibility of reversion. But in the present case, I have already stated that the रे-ओ of early Māravāḍi are not the old diphthongs but crude symbols for the wide sound. Next, if रे-ओ were really purely diphthongal in their sound (i.e., narrow) in the early Māravāḍi stage, it is not easily conceivable what possible could have turned them later on into the wide sound almost at a bound. The diphthongal रे-ओ have no affinity with the wide sound. In order to reach it they must pass back into अह-अउ, for even for passing into the narrow रे-ओ they first get split into अह-अउ, as I shall show later on. This sort of double reversion has no foundation in probabilities.

This being now position, the practical suggestion made by Dr. Tessitori to reintroduce the रे-ओ to express the wide sound does not appeal to me, for the simple reason that, being really the signs of the narrow diphthongal sound, they will not be true symbols of the wide sound, and are likely to create confusion between the two. For रे त will indicate narrow sound as in रे, गो, etc., and also the wide sound in रे, गर्हत etc.; this will create a situation similar to the one prevailing at present when रे त represent both the sounds narrow and wide, the only difference between the two situations being that, while तस्मास with रे-ओ are comparatively few, तदवास with अह-अउ will be found in a larger number. The source of confusion will thus remain all the same. In fact, Dr. Tessitori was really misled by the रे त signs before he visited India, and thought Māravāḍi did not possess even the narrow रे—ो as evolutions of अह-अउ, much less the wide रे—ो.

---

18 I pick up the following from the poet Bihārī's Sālakī (which was completed by him in V. S. 1719, i.e., over 250 years ago):

(1) कोने खोरिक गतन अनंताः कात्य कौमून।
   सोमन नाहिन बल मिलि पारंपर यो खौँ।
(2) आज कठि द्वरे नहे देवे नाये गौंम डैँ।
   रत्रैक निवास युगान न निवास न नैँ।
(3) कल्यं गति वनम नारी कौन जयी नित्य डैँ।
(4) पत लोहे गान वीर रेसर लोहे सब वैँ।
(5) का हार धार नयन नरें गहन नीति बाब।
(6) सोंते के भेदने हसे लेन कोई नाह नाच।
(7) कनक कनकें कोम्पें नारुध हुए बाब।
   बाब बाब बाबार है वह हर हर बाबार।
(8) माही तुढ़ौँ गाने बाबा की जीति गुजर।

For additional instances see Appendix B.
I shall now refer to a theory of Dr. Tessitori's which is given separately, outside the three reasons for differencing from me. In connection with his theory that original Prākrit अभ व passed into the wide ध through the intermediate step ध, he states that the fact that in manuscripts there are no instances of written ध for अभ is easily accounted for by the remark that all words with an अभ are (Prākrit) tatsamas and therefore they continued to be written according to the traditional spelling. All I would say to this is that it would not be enough that such words should only be written with अभ; if they were really tatsamas they would be required to be pronounced with अभ; and thus there would be no room for the intermediate ध.

I shall now supplement my answer to Dr. Tessitori's objections by giving the analytical examination of the problem, on which I base my hypothesis:

(A) If we carefully compare the sounds of, say—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gujarati</th>
<th>Mārāthy</th>
<th>Hindi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>बैंसां (Guj.)</td>
<td>बैले (M.)</td>
<td>बैला (H.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>बैंत (Guj.)</td>
<td>बैल (M.)</td>
<td>बैल (H.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>लौर (Guj.)</td>
<td>लौर (M.)</td>
<td>लौर (H.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(from Sanskrit लिङ्ग)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भांधु (Guj.)</td>
<td>भांधे (M.)</td>
<td>भांधा (H.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भांधक (Guj.)</td>
<td>भांधक (M.)</td>
<td>भांधक (H.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कांडी (Guj.)</td>
<td>कांडी (M.)</td>
<td>कांडी (H.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>चारस (Guj.)</td>
<td>चारस (M.)</td>
<td>चारस (H.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

as they are spoken by the people, we shall find marked differences in each of the three languages. While each is evolved out of the contextual vocalic groups अभ and अभ, the Gujarāṭī sound is a distinctly wide one (as in 'hat' and 'awl'), making a complete fusion of the अ and ध and अ and ध; the Marāthy sound leans more towards the ध and ध and makes the resulting diphthong narrow; while the Hindi sound, leaning more towards the अ of the vocalic groups (अभ—अभ), approximates the wide sound of Gujarāṭī up to a certain point but stops short there, and is not the same wide, fused, sound as the Gujarāṭī one. At the same time the last one (the Hindi sound) is not the pure diphthongal sound of Sanskrit, but resembles अभ—अभ a good deal, thus making the symbols झ and झ wrong indicators, strictly speaking.

(B) Let us now examine a few Gujarāṭī words with the wide sound, which have come from Arabic and Persian:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gujarāṭī</th>
<th>Arabic and Persian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>कांडा</td>
<td>कांडी</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गॉर्सा</td>
<td>गॉर्सा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>हॉर्रान</td>
<td>हॉर्रान</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अब्ब</td>
<td>अब्ब</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again these:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gujarāṭī</th>
<th>Arabic and Persian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>तांड</td>
<td>तांड</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कर</td>
<td>कर</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>शांड</td>
<td>शांड</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this latter set the steps of phonetic mutation are:

- कांड — कांड — कांड — कांड;
- तांड — तांड — तांड — तांड (तांड);
- हांड — हांड — हांड — हांड.
If we sound the आ- and आ in all these words, as also in the words वास्त, वव, कब्ज, गल्ल etc., we shall perceive the peculiar विस्तृत (open, wide) nature of the phonal phenomenon which alone can give the Gujarati विस्तृत, अ and आ.

(C) Now, examine the sound in the following words on the basis of accentuation:

I
(a) गल्लक गल्लर्क पढ़त ने
(b) चांलनरी चांलनाथ (चांलनाथी) चांलनाथी चांलनाथ
(c) अभास अभास (अभासार) अभास
d) पर्याय-पर्याय-पर्यायी पर्यायी पर्यायी (name of a village in Surat District).
(e) पर्याय-पर्याय-पर्यायी पर्यायी पर्यायी पर्यायी
(f) पर्याय-पर्याय-पर्यायी पर्यायी पर्यायी

II
(a) प्रेम प्रेम श्रवण
(b) काश्मीर काश्मीर काश्मीर काश्मीर
c) पुरुष पुरुष पुरुष पुरुष
d) आकाश आकाश आकाश आकाश
e) पालक पालक पालक पालक
(f) अन्तराल अन्तराल अन्तराल अन्तराल (Hin., अन्तराल=separate).

15 True, the case of गल्लर्क does not fall under the principle of consideration because of the long आ; but it is taken for that very reason, as the long आ furnishes a test and shows how the long आ which is necessarily accented, comes in the way of द्वितीय-समस्य-मार्ग.

Siddha Hemachandra VIII. i. 161 shortens this आ (गल्लर्क), but the glossary tells us—बहुलिकार द्वितीय-समस्य-मार्ग, thus giving an opening for option, and we may very well regard गल्लर्क and गल्लक as alternative forms.

20 Dr. Sir R. G. Bhāndārkar regards the आ in अन्तराल as a direct change from आ, as also आ in आकाश direct from आ, and the आ in पालक direct from आ. (See his Wilson Philological Lectures pp. 166, 145). But I believe these must pass through the shortening stage shown above.

21 Hemachandra (VIII. iv. 422) gives नवलक नवलक. This नवलक (नवलक) may be advanced as the origin of नवलक, and with apparent reason. But there are some strong points, in favour of अन्तरालक, as the origin of नवलक: they are—
(a) One of the Manuscripts of Si. He., gives the reading नवलक (as the एका of नवलक).
(b) अन्तरालक is used in Gujarati, as well as नवलक.
(c) एका or एका tacked on to एका by Hemachandra appears quite inexplicable and its arbitrary nature leaves a mystery, while अन्तरालक supplies a good explanation of the एका and एका.

Thus it seems that नवलक, an evolute of अन्तरालक before Hemachandra's time, was regarded by him as the एका of एका on the strength of the meaning and external similarity, and he was probably oblivious of the other phonetic phases, especially the loss of the unaccented initial syllable in अन्तरालक.

Sir R. G. Bhāndārkar (Philological Lectures, p. 168) gives Hindi अलेक अलेक in the sense of 'unexpected', and derives it from अन्तरालक. The sense in which अलेक (अलेक) is used in Gujarati is 'separate', and would favor the derivation from अन्तरालक. It would also be enlightening to ascertain the Hindi text where अलेक is used and what sense fits in there.

22 Here, although पालक leaves आ accented at the early stage, the accent gives way under the double influence of

(1) the loss of the conjunct, आ without the compensating lengthening of the preceding vowel, and
(2) the tendency to accentuate the second syllable in a word where the first syllable is unaccented and eventually therefore gets dropped.

(The change of आ in एका to एका indicates that the word is become a part of the whole compound, and hence the आ is eventually subordinated.)
In group I we observe that in the vocalic groups — (वर्तुम्म s), अन (अन्त्र) — अन (अन्त्र),
the accent is on the second member, whereas in group II it is on the first member, i.e.,
on अ. Now the स्थान of अ is कण्ठ and the wide sound is produced by a peculiar widths
of the कण्ठ or glottis. This विकृत nature of अ is thus the source of the wide sound in अ and अ, and it is helped by the अ and अ as noted under the last para. (B).

(To be continued.)

NOTES AND QUERIES.

MALAY CURRENCY IN TRENGGANU.

With reference to my articles on the Obsolete Tin Currency of the Federated Malay States, ante,
Vol. XLII, the capital amount on the State of Trengganu for 1916 by Mr. J. L. Humphreys,
has a most interesting note on currency, which I give below in extenso. An account of the tin
currency prevalent on the East Coast of the Malay Peninsula will be found on p. 101 of the above
quoted volume of this Journal.

The point is that the tin pith (or cash) ran by normal scale 400 to the dollar, but in reality
varied from 320 in Trengganu to 480 in Kelantan and even to 440 in Jering (Patani), the differences
being stated to be due to changes in the price of tin, in other words, to the value of the silver in
the dollar. We are now told that recently in Trengganu pith ran in relation to the “British dollar”
before its recent demonetization, 250 to the dollar, or double their face value, and that the
British dollar was converted to the official Straits Settlements dollar at 70 cents, the pith being
advanced to 2664 to the dollar, which is rightly called an “extremely inconvenient” figure. To
remedy the monetary confusion thus caused, Mr. Humphreys recommends the introduction of a
new coinage in full, 1. e., of the dollar and its parts, together with the depreciation of the pith to 400 to the dollar, thus bringing it back to its original normal value.

The names for the denominations of Malay currency are legion and many are quoted by me
in the articles above mentioned, but the name for the double piths, or half cent, given by
Mr. Humphreys, “white cent,” is now to me.

Excerpt from the Annual Report of the British Agent, Trengganu, for the Year 1916,
by J. L. Humphreys.

Currency.

The matter of the local subsidiary coinage required attention during the year owing to the
increase of counterfeit. These tokens, composed of a mixture of lead and tin, are of two
denominations, the white cent and the piths: they were formerly minted annually for charitable
distributions after the East month, and before the British dollar was demonetized bore a fixed relation
to it of 100 and 200; the Straits Settlements dollar and subsidiary coins were, of course, also current,
but in insufficient quantities. The British dollars were redeemed in 1915 at a rate of 70 Straits cents
to the dollar.

After their removal it became necessary to affiliate the local tin cents—which in the language
of the Trengganu peasant had now “lost their parent”—to the Straits dollar; the proportion fixed
was the extremely inconvenient one of 133.

The loss of the parent dollar, the complications of the money table (which act always to the
detriment of the peasant), and the increase of counterfeit, are destroying the former popularity
of the tin coins. Their ultimate disappearance is inevitable. At present they provide two denominations
of subsidiary coin lower than the silver coin and finance the petty kickbacks of the poorer
classes; their sudden removal would cause a general rise in the price of local commodities.

At the moment of writing the question of the subsidiary coinage generally is under the consideration
of Government, and it is hoped that measures will be taken to promote the establishment of a
new Straits currency. The depreciation of the white cent from 133 to the dollar to 200 and of the
pith from 266 to 400, together with a steady importation of Straits subsidiary coin, seem to be
obvious measures for hastening the disappearance of the former and discouraging the production of
counterfeit.

Analysis shows that the metal value, in tin and lead, is about 50 per cent. of the token value of
genuine and counterfeit alike. Redemption can only be made at a cost that Government will not
yet pay, and it is certain that the immediate removal of the small denominations would be felt
severely by the peasants, who hold 90 per cent. of the tin coins, and would suffer most from the
enhancement of prices that would follow. Measures to produce a gradual change will probably be
adopted.

R. C. TEMPLE.
AUSTRIA'S COMMERCIAL VENTURE IN INDIA IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

BY SIR R. C. TEMPLE, BART.

(Continued from p. 15.)

II

Measures taken at Fort William, Bengal.

Consultation at Fort William, 7 July 1777. 63

GENERAL Letters received by the Cormorant and Egmont. ... Of the letter dated 24th December 1776, Paragraphs 21 to 27, 64 Agree that the Governor General [Warren Hastings] be requested to write a letter to the Naib Suba [Nâb Sâbâdâr, Deputy Governor], advising him of this intelligence, and desiring him to send General Orders to the Officers of the Nizamût 65 to oppose the Officers and crew of the expected vessel in their attempts to land in any part of the Nabob's dominions and special orders to his Vâckeel 61 at the Presidency to apply for such aid from this Board as may be required for this purpose.

Agreed that an advertisement be published, forbidding the Company's Servants and all under the Company's protection to hold any commerce or other intercourse with Mr Bolts or the other Agents or Seamen of the expected Ship, or to supply them with money, goods, stores or any other assistance conducive to the execution of their plan.

The following Advertisement is accordingly published.

Fort William 7th July 1777. Advice having been received of an enterprise of trade set on foot by Mr William Bolts, late a servant of the Honble. East India Company, who is now on his way to India in a ship called the Joseph and Theresa, and the Honble. the Court of Directors judging it expedient to guard against any injury which their commerce may suffer by this undertaking, have thought proper to forbid their Covenanted Servants and all others under their protection to hold any commercial or other intercourse with him or any of the Agents or Seamen of the said ship, or to supply them directly, or indirectly, with money, goods, stores or any other assistance which may conduce to the execution of their plan. Notice is therefore given that a strict observance of this prohibition is expected and required. By order of the Honourable the Governor General and Council.

Consultation at Fort William, 26 July 1779. 69

The Governor General [Warren Hastings] informs the Board that he has received a letter from Mr William Bolts, dated on board the Joseph and Theresa the 23d instant, at Kedgeree, [Khijiri, at the mouth of the Húglí] and desires that the Orders of the Court of Directors dated the 24th December 1776, and the publication made in consequence on the 7th July 1777 may be read, to enable the Board to pass such further Resolutions and Orders as they shall think proper.

63 Bengal Public Consultations, (1777), XIX, 704-707. 64 See ante, XLVI., 279.
65 Nizamât, the Government of the Nawáb Nâzîm of Bengal, created by Clive in 1757 ruler of Bengal, Bihâr and Orissa in subordination to the Government of the East India Company. The Nawáb at this time was Mubâraknâddâla, youngest of the three sons of Mr Ja’îr ‘Ali Khân, 1770-1793.
61 Vâckeel, legal agent or representative of the Nawáb Nâzîm.
69 Bengal Public Consultations, (1779), XXXI, 525-531.
Read the above-mentioned Orders and Resolution.

Resolved that the following Advertisement be now published.

Advertisement respecting Mr Bolts.

Fort William 26th July 1779. Whereas the Governor General and Council were informed by the Honble. the Court of Directors in their letter of the 24th of December 1776 that an enterprise of trade had been undertaken by Mr William Bolts, formerly in their service in Bengal, who had embarked in a large ship, late the Earl of Lincoln, now the Joseph and Theresa, from the Port of Leghorn, or some other foreign European Port, laden with a valuable cargo of merchandise and with ordnance and ammunition and all kinds of military stores to a great amount, which were reported to be destined for the East Indies. In consequence of which information they were pleased to prohibit all commercial and other intercourse of the Company's servants and all others under the protection of this Government with the persons who had the conduct of the expedition or were concerned therein, and to shew a resentment adequate to the nature of the offence, they have been further pleased to command the Governor General and Council &c. to prevent the latter from being furnished by any persons subject to their authority with money, goods, stores, or any other assistance which may conduce to the success of the undertaking. Of which Orders public notice was given on the 7th July 1777. And whereas the Governor General and Council have received information that the said Mr William Bolts is actually arrived in this river [Húgí] on board the said ship Joseph and Theresa, they have thought it proper to cause this publication to be repeated that no persons may plead ignorance of the same, and further to declare their firm resolution effectually to execute the commands of the Honble. the Court of Directors, and to enforce them with rigour against all persons who shall be found offending against them. By Order of the Honble. the Governor General and Council.

Mr Francis. The Orders are very proper as far as they go. I myself shall adhere to them literally, but I apprehend they will answer very little purpose, if we do not take other measures. Mr Bolts' ship will proceed to Serampore [Strīrāmpur] or Chinsura. He will there unlade his cargo, and thro' the intervention of the Dutch or Danes accomplish every commercial object which he may have in view by coming hither, and which the Company seem to have it very much at heart to defeat. We cannot correspond with their intentions in this respect by any means so effectually as by using our weight and influence with the Nabob to induce him to order Mr Bolts' ship immediately to leave the river without landing any part of his cargo. No foreign ship can have a right to come into the Bengal River and to carry on traffic here without the permission of the Prince of the Country. This step will be effectual and much less likely to embarrass the Company in its consequences than any thing done directly by ourselves.

The Secretary begs leave to read to the Board the Resolution passed in Consultation the 7th July 1777, which contains an application to the Nabob somewhat similar to that proposed by Mr Francis.

Read the Resolution of 7th July 1777.

Agreed that the Governor General be requested to write a letter to the Nabob, referring him to the former letter of the 7th July 1777, and informing him that Mr Bolts is actually arrived.

10 Sir Philip Francis (1740-1748), member of the Supreme Council at Fort William.
11 Headquarters of the Danes and Dutch respectively, both situated near Húgí.
12 See ante, p. 29.
Consultation at Fort William, 12 August 1779.

The Governor General [Warren Hastings] informs the Board that he has received a report from the Master Attendant that eight sloops are arrived at Calcutta laden with cotton and other goods, which they received on freight from on board the Joseph and Thersea, the ship under the orders of Mr Bolts, that two other sloops have passed on to Chinsura, and that several more are coming up.

The Governor General sent for the Sarangs [sirhng, skipper] of the sloops, which had stopped at town, and received the following information from them.

That they had been engaged by Captain Dundas to carry down goods to the Royal Henry lying at Kedgeree. That on their arrival there an European came on board their sloop from Mr Bolts's ship and desired that as soon as they should have cleared their sloops of the goods brought down for the Royal Henry, to come along side and take in a cargo of cotton for Calcutta, for which they should be paid the customary price. That having delivered the goods for the Royal Henry they received a cargo of cotton from Mr Bolts's ship. That on their arrival at Calcutta, they were told to proceed on to Chinsura, for that the cotton could not be unloaded here. The Governor General adds that he has given directions to the Manjies [manji, master of a native boat] not to proceed further without an order from him.

[Here follows a list of the sloops and their owners.]

The Governor General also lays before the Board a letter to the Phousdar [fanjdar, chief police officer] of Houghley which, if approved, he recommends that the Commander in Chief be requested to give orders to the Officer Commanding at Chandernagore [Chandernagar] to comply with any applications which shall be made to him by the Phousdar of Houghly conformably thereto.

To Khan Jahan Khan, Phousdar of Houghly.

Notwithstanding the orders issued by this Government as well as by the Nabob to prohibit all trade or intercourse with Mr Bolts, eight sloops have come up the river with merchandise from his ship, three of which have passed Calcutta and will probably proceed to Chinsura: Should they have reached that place, it will not be advisable to interfere with them, but with respect to any others which may attempt to pass Chinsurah, it is necessary that you take effectual means to prevent them, and should you stand in need of any additional force, Captain Grant, who is stationed at Chandernagore, will, on your written application to him, afford it to you.

Approved the letter to the Phousdar of Houghly, and agreed that the Commander in Chief be requested to give orders to the Commanding Officer at Chandernagore to comply with any application which may be made to him by the Phousdar of Houghly for troops to prevent the sloops laden with Mr Bolts's goods from passing up the river. To obviate the consequence of any misunderstanding of the publication of the Company's Orders respecting Mr Bolts.

Resolved that the Custom Master be directed not to suffer any goods whatever imported by Mr Bolts's ship to be landed in Calcutta, and that the Collector of Government Customs be laid under the same prohibition and further enjoined to give orders to his officers to prevent any from being landed within the jurisdiction of his office.

Ordered that the Master Attendant be directed peremptorily to forbid the Sarangs of the sloops laden with Mr Bolts's goods to proceed further up the river with them.
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Consultation at Fort William, 2 September 1779.

The following letter from the Deputy Collector of Government Customs having been read at the Revenue Board on Tuesday last, the Minutes which are entered after it were then taken and sent in.

Honble. Sir,

A quantity of Redwood, the property of Mr. Bolts imported on the Sanctissimo Sacramento (a Portuguese ship) and now laden on boats to be transported on board his vessel, is stopped by the Officers of the Customs in consequence of your late orders. As the goods have not been landed but are removing from one foreign vessel to another, I request your orders, whether the redwood is to pass for Mr. Bolts's ship? And if in future he may be at liberty to export whatever goods he may think proper.

Government Custom House, 31st August 1779.

I have the honour to be &c.  (Signed) H. Scott, Dy. Cr. G. Customs.

Ordered that it lie for consideration, and in the mean time that the Collector be referred to the orders which he has already received respecting Mr. Bolts, and to the regulations of his office, leaving him to act conformably to those authorities.

The Secretary now informs the Board that the only special orders sent to the Collector of Government Customs respecting Mr. Bolts's ship was to forbid him from suffering any goods to be landed from them, but are silent with respect to the lading of other goods, and that the Collector in consequence is at a loss how to act.

Ordered that the Collector of Government Customs be informed that the Board expressly forbid him to pass any goods whatsoever belonging to Mr. Bolts, that if he has reason to suspect that the goods in question have been procured in Calcutta, the Board desire he will endeavor to trace and report the persons who furnished them to the Board, but if they have been purchased at either of the foreign settlements, it does not depend immediately upon him to collect the duties, the Fouzdar being in this case the proper officer who will take cognizance of the matter upon his representation.

Consultation at Fort William, 6 September 1779.

The following letter from Mr. Bolts was circulated on Saturday last, and the Minutes which are entered after it were returned.

Honble. Sir and Gentlemen,

In the month of July last I purchased and loaded on freight at Madras, upon a Portuguese vessel called the Sanctissimo Sacramento for Bengal, a quantity of redwood, the property of such of the subjects of Her Imperial Majesty, my sovereign, as are interested in the Asiatic Company of Trieste. Finding that at this Presidency all subjects of the British Government were publicly prohibited from having any intercourse with the subjects of Her said Majesty, on the arrival of the Portuguese vessel I did not attempt to land this redwood at Calcutta, but had it laden on four boats, in order to be conducted on board of one of the said Company's vessels now under my command in this river; I am now informed that the officers of your Custom House have stopped the said redwood on the river, and taken possession thereof; and as I am ignorant of the reasons which have occasioned this seizure I take the liberty of informing you that I have paid the English Company's

11 Bengal Public Consultations, (1779), XXXII. 317-319.
12 Bengal Public Consultations, (1779), XXXII. 356-358.
duties on this article at Madras, and am ready to pay any other legal demand that can be
made thereon by your Government. On these terms I request the favor of an order for its
being released.

Chinsurah 2d. September 1779.

(Signed) William Bolts,

Lieut. Col. in the Service of Their Imperial Majesties.

Mr. Barwell. By the orders of the Company we can hold no intercourse with Mr
bolts; of course can give no reply to his letter.

Consultation at Fort William, 29 September 1779. 

Read the following letter from Mr. Bolts.

Honble. Sir and Gentlemen,

On the second instant I did myself the honor of addressing you a letter relative to four
boats loaded with redwood, the property of the subjects of Her Imperial Majesty, my
sovereign, which, in consequence of your orders, were on the 27th of August past, seized by
your Custom House officers on the river, and conducted within the districts of your Town
of Calcutta. Not having had the honour of an answer to that letter, to which I beg
permission to refer, and much less obtained restitution of the redwood, I must now look
upon the said property as lost to Her Majesty's subjects, and shall therefore trouble you no
farther on that head.

At the same time, Honble. Sir and Gentlemen, I am sorry to be under the necessity of
informing you that other officers of your Government, at Fultah, have been extremely
troublesome, not only in obstructing the lawful business of Her Imperial Majesty's subjects
and insulting her flag, but in having even gone so far as to prevent the officers and men of
the ships under my command from obtaining provisions and the common necessaries of life.

It is not necessary for me to inform you, Honble. Sir and Gentlemen, that the commerce
under my directions is "under the protection of the Empress Queen, belonging to a
Company erected in Germany"; or that "this commerce is not contrary to any treaty at
present subsisting", since you have been formally advised thereof by the Honble. Court of
Directors for Affairs of the Honble. the United Company of Merchants of England trading
to the East Indies. But whatever may be the orders of that Honble. Court, perhaps too
much dictated by a commercial jealousy equally as ill-founded as at this period ill timed,
permit me to address myself to you on this occasion, not as to the agent of a commercial
society, but as to a tribunal appointed by an act of the British Legislature to the National
Government of the British Dominions in Asia. In this point of view it will be needless for
me to call to the recollection of gentlemen of so superior knowledge, what great events have
often sprung from small causes, or how easy a spark may at first be quenched, that in its
consequences must produce a conflagration.

I must confess after the amicable treatment which we have lately received at the other
British Presidencies of Bombay and Madras, where we have been permitted even to trade
on paying the established duties, and after seeing the friendly manner in which the ships
and subjects of other European States are received at the British Ports in Asia, it is matter
of the greatest astonishment to me, ignorant as I am of any differences subsisting between
our respective sovereigns, to find your Government here so extremely hostile towards the

76 Richard Barwell (1741-1804), member of the Supreme Council 1773-1781.
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colours and subjects of the Empress Queen. For admitting you may have a right to prohibit British subjects from all intercourse with those of Her Imperial Majesty, what right can you have to obstruct or oppose Her Majesty and Her subjects in their peaceful intercourse or licent commerce with those of her allies His Most Serene Majesty of Denmark, and the high and Mighty United States of Holland? Or what right can you claim to seize the property of Her Majesty's subjects, as in the case of the redwood, where ever you find it?

Earnestly desirous on my part of promoting peace and harmony, I have hitherto most cautiously forbore every act that could possibly give the least offence to your Government, and it is a conduct I wish to pursue during the whole period of my short stay in this river. Let me then conjure you, Honble. Sir and Gentlemen, by those ties of humanity which unite Great Nations together in peace and amity, to give such orders to the respective officers of your Government as may in future remove the causes of the complaints I now make, and thereby prevent any possible interruption of the harmony which I hope will long subsist between the August Courts of Vienna and St. James.

Chïnsura 18th September 1779.

I have the honor to be &c.

(Signed) WILLIAM BOLTS,
Lieut. Col. in the service of their Imperial Majesties.

Extract of a General Letter from the Council to the Court of Directors at Fort William, dated 14 January 1780. 78

We are to inform you that your orders prohibiting your servants and dependants from having any commercial intercourse or connection with Mr Bolts were published immediately on receipt of the General Letter which contained them, and again advertised on the arrival of that gentleman in July last. 79 Your wishes with respect to this gentleman have been so strictly attended to by us and by the officers of the Nizamut, in consequence of orders from the Nabob to that effect, that he was unable to land any part of the goods imported by his ships, the Joseph and Theresa and Kallowrath, either at Calcutta or any where below it. He addressed repeated letters to us on the subject, but we did not think ourselves at liberty, consistently with your instructions, to return him an answer to either of them. We believe however that his merchandize was received at Chinsura and disposed of to the Dutch.

As the President and Council at Bombay had not been equally vigilant to prevent the intercourse of persons under their authority with Mr Bolts, we found that some consignments of goods had been made both by European and Native merchants at that place to individuals here by the ships of Mr. Bolts, which we were induced on their claim to suffer the importation of.

Extract of a General Letter from the Council at Fort William to the Court of Directors, dated 5 April 1783. 80

With respect to the conduct which we observed towards Mr William Bolts, we were cautiously governed throughout by your orders concerning him, and have regularly reported the particulars of it to you in our General letter of the 14th January 1780. After having been forbid any intercourse with Mr Bolts, and having issued the prohibition of Trade with him generally to all the dependants of this Government by Public Advertisement, it was no: in our power to admit of any Good imported in his name to be passed thro' the Custom House.

It is within the memory of some of the Members that a letter of representation was presented from Mr. Bolts on the subject of some redwood belonging to him being detained by the Custom House officers, but we did not think ourselves at liberty to receive it.

(To be continued.)

78 Bengal Letters Received, XVIII, 16-17.
79 See ante, p. 29.
80 Bengal Letters Received, XX (unpaged).
DATE OF THE ÁBHĪRA MIGRATION INTO INDIA.

By N. G. Majumdar; Calcutta.

In his monograph on *Vaishnavism, Saivism and Minor Religious Systems,* Sir R. G. Bhandarkar has assigned the migration of the Ábhīras into India to the first century A.D. According to him the cult of child Krishna was a side-issue of Christianity and was imported by the Ábhīras (‘among whom the boy-god Krishna lived’) from outside India in the century following the crucifixion of Jesus Christ. Mr. Rāmaprasād Chanda in his work called the *Indo-Aryan Races,* has attempted to prove that the Ábhīras came into India long before Christ was born, and as such they cannot be credited with an importation of Christian traditions as alleged by Sir Rāmkrishna. I fully agree in the contention of Mr. Chanda, though I think his arguments are too weak to prove his theory.

Mr. Chanda refers to the word *ghosha* which occurs in the *Māhābhāshya* of Pataṅjali (II. 4. 10) and interprets it in the sense of Ábhīra settlement, which is the meaning put upon that word only by such late authors as Amara and Jayāditya. It cannot be proved that the word *ghosha* was understood in the same sense in the time of Pataṅjali as it was in the time of Amara and Jayāditya. On the other hand, it will follow from the very passage Mr. Chanda has quoted, that *ghosha* has been used here in an altogether different sense. In the passage in question, *Aryanivāsa* or Aryan settlement is stated as consisting of four units, *grāma, gosha, nagara* and *sāmanāha.* Here *ghosha* could have been taken to mean an *Ábhīrapalli,* i.e., a settlement of the Ábhīra race, if the Ábhīras had been Aryans. But in Pataṅjali, as I shall just show, they have been associated with the Sūdras, and in the *Vāyupurāṇa,* too, they have been pointed out as *Mlechchhas.* So *Ábhīrapalli* could not have been the sense of the *ghosha* of the above mentioned passage where the intention is to denote the units of Aryan settlement. I do not mean to say that *ghosha* exclusively denoted a unit of Aryan settlement. What I contend here is that, because a certain author wanted to give an example of an Aryan settlement the term *ghosha,* which was used to serve that purpose, could not be referred to in the sense of *Ábhīrapalli.* *Ghosha* which is grouped with such general terms as *grāma, nagara* and *sāmanāha,* could only have been taken in a general sense. It is like the rest, a unit of settlement and has nothing to do with one special class of people. The word has been used in this general sense also in the *Rāmāyāṇa* and the *Vāyupurāṇa.*

"राजकिंत्सनुपाय्यं मायामयर्पर्वम्।"
—Ayodhya, Ch. 83, V. 15.

"आयाननुपाय बाबाशं शंकेशं नगरणि च।"
—Vāyu, Ch. 33, V. 10.

1 p. 37. 2 pp. 84-85.

1 "कः पूर्वसबिन्नायाः मायी चोपे नगरं संवाह हृति।"
—Kielhorn’s *Māhābhāshya,* I, 475. For other references to the word *ghosha* in the *Māhābhāshya* see *ibid.* II, 117-118.

4 Ch. 37, V. 263.
The other argument adduced by Mr. Chanda to prove that the Ābhīras migrated to India before the birth of Christ, is that Kātyāyana, the predecessor of Patañjali, excludes the word mahāśūrdri from the operation of a certain rule of Pāṇini (IV. 1. 4). According to Amara and Kāśikā the meaning of this word would no doubt be Ābhīri. But it is neither a scientific nor a safe method to explain a text of the early second century B.C. in the light of an interpretation suggested by authors later by at least seven hundred years.

Whatever might be the value of the premises put forward by Mr. Chanda it is fair to acknowledge that his theory might have been substantiated from the Mahābhāṣya itself. I draw here the attention of scholars to one important passage of Patañjali, which, so far as my knowledge goes, has not yet been pointed out. The Ābhīras are actually mentioned by Patañjali in his gloss on the Vārtika-sūtra, “सामायिकविशेषवाचिनिद्वित द्रष्टानां सिद्धम्” The passage is quoted below:

सामायिकविशेषवाचिनिद्वित इत्यद्भवत वाचस्य || विषेष सामायिकविशेषवाचिनिद्वितेव न नवविभिचिक्षे द्रुतवािरम गोवलिकविनित न स्थायति || नेप सभा ||

The import of the above passage is that dvandva-compound should not be formed between a general term (सामायिक) and a particular term (विषेष). If this be so, there cannot be any dvandva compound like शुद्रभिरम, गोवलिकविनि, etc., for in these examples the words of each pair stand in relation of सामायिक and विषेष. Therefore if we want to have a dvandva compound in शुद्रभिरम, शूद्र must not be taken as a general term and भिरा as a particular term included within that term, though they are actually so. for, in that case, the meaning would be, an Ābhīra who is a Śūdra, which would satisfy only the requirements of a karmadhārāya compound and not a dvandva-compound. Here, the two terms are thus required to be understood as if they represent two different classes (jāti).

The legitimate inference which we can draw from the above, is, that the Ābhīras had settled in India and come to be associated with the Śūdras even in the time of Patañjali, who lived at any rate in the second century B.C. Therefore, their migration is to be placed at least three hundred years before the Christian era. The Vāyuśṛṣṭya tells us that, at the time when the portion referring to the Ābhīras was composed, they were not even counted as Śūdras, but were looked down upon as Mlečchhas. The period of its composition must therefore be placed prior to Patañjali. From the Vāyuśṛṣṭya we learn also that the Ābhīras had already settled in northern India and penetrated even to the far south. This is again indicative of the further antiquity of the Ābhīra migration into India.

5 Kielhorn’s Mahābhāṣya, I, 252.
6 Vāyuśṛṣṭya, Ch. 45, vs. 115, 126.
(D) Lastly, let us consider some apparent exceptions, and see how the accent affects the phonetic process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Prakrit or Apabhramsha, and further steps</th>
<th>Gujarati</th>
<th>Remarks as to causes, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) गर्वक</td>
<td>गहड</td>
<td>गढ़</td>
<td>The accent on क (which is guru because of the conjunct next after it) deprives the क in क्ष्य of its accent and consequent preponderance. Hence the श gets accented and its क is not रस्तट and therefore not dropped. Thus क्ष्य is not formed, which alone would give the wide घ. Consequently the श undergoes samprasadra, and thus ख and र unite into a narrow घ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note.—The accent here is to be considered as relative between क and घ (or घ) and not with reference to the word as a whole.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) क in क्ष्य is guru and hence accented;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) रार begins a new sense-bearing portion of the word;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hence the क of क्ष्य remains unaccented and the श gets accented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result—as above—क + र = घ (narrow).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) करस्तत्र:</td>
<td>करस्तत्र</td>
<td>करस्तत्र (= a colt)</td>
<td>Causes and results as above, mutatis mutandis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) वनतरक</td>
<td>वनतरक</td>
<td>मोर</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) मरतरक</td>
<td>मरतरक</td>
<td>मोर</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) अन्नतरक</td>
<td>अन्नतरक</td>
<td>अमोर</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) मतत</td>
<td>मतत</td>
<td>मग</td>
<td>The change of क to क (which can occur only if the letter is uninitial) shows that कत is only a part of the whole word. Consequently the accent, not falling on क, falls on श, which therefore undergoes samprasadra. Result—क + र = घ (narrow).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24 Dr. Tesitori would put दक here as a precursor of दक.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Prākrit or Apabhramsa, and further steps</th>
<th>Gujarāti</th>
<th>Remarks as to causes, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(7) विक्रियम्</td>
<td>विक्रय वास्तव</td>
<td>शे</td>
<td>The ṛ here is the residue of the beginning of the root portion of वि + क्र य, retains its predominance, and is thus accented, and escapes prati-sampradāna. Result—अ + ṛ = ṛ (narrow).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Note.—In उपविक्रियम्—उपविक्रय वास्तव the result is different (i.e., the अ has the accent on अ and hence the ṛ becoming subordinate becomes य, giving the broad sound in वेस्व), although the conditions are apparently similar to those in विक्रियम्, in that the य left from वेस्व is the initial syllable of the root portion of उप्य + वास्तव. The reason is that in उप्य the accent is on य to start with, and the loss of the unaccented initial य of उप्य (giving वास्तव as the next step) strengthens the accent on the य (अ, the evolute of य), which becomes initial in a compact root-like formation. वास्तव. Thus the accent falls on the अ of अर्थ and not on ṛ. One little fact may seem to go against this explanation, viz., that the elision of अ in क्र य would indicate that the root portion is not regarded as a separate word (such elision being always in the case of uninitial consonants). But it may be held rightly that for the purpose of accentuation the root-nature of क्र य is not entirely loyed to it, and hence its operation in changing the अ to र.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) नगरी</td>
<td>नगर्य नगरी</td>
<td>नगर्य, as in चांपान, अम्बान, वांकान, and such other names of towns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reason here may at first sight seem difficult to find. Dr. Tessitori accounts for the narrow sound by regarding the penultimate ṛ as a final one because the final अ is "quiescent" (vide p. 78 of his article under consideration). I think there is another and a better explanation. Although the अ, as beginning नगरी, would naturally be accented, yet it is the य (and its evolute, य) that is accented here, because नगर, as the second member in these compounds (चांपान, अम्बान, वांकान, etc.) is a subordinate element and hence the initial य occupies a secondary place and loses its accentuation in favour of the following syllable य and its evolute. य. As a result, the अ in अगर remains unaccented and its tendency to widen the glottis becomes inoperative, the य becomes य, and अ + ṛ unite into a narrow ṛ. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Prākrit or As-</th>
<th>Gujarāti</th>
<th>Remarks as to causes, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| अन्यकार | अपकार | अपकार | असेच | The आ in या is distinctly accented: in the shortened stage the आ in य retains this accent; hence the first आ in य is subordinate and unaccented; consequently य becomes इ and आ+इ (narrow).
| अवस्था | अवस्था | अवस्था | अनथेय 25 | With this may be contrasted the cases of भागाय and विचक where the आ, obviously accented, transmits its accent to its successor आ, and thus the first member in आত—आह is accented, yielding the wide आ—आ as a result. Also contrast the case of भारती (from भारत्वक—आउलत—(changed to त masc. feminine) आउलत. Dr. Tessitori derives the word thus; see his "Notes," § 148). Here too the conditions are the same, turning आ to भार.
| चाचारी | चाचारी | चाचारी | चाचारी | (a) च, coming between च and च, has to be emphasized in order to be pronounced distinctly and clearly, especially as all the three end in च;
| क्षस्त्रिका | क्षस्त्रिका | क्षस्त्रिका | क्षस्त्रिका | (b) The final च ending in च becomes subordinate;
| क्षस्त्रि | क्षस्त्रि | क्षस्त्रि | क्षस्त्रि | hence the च is predominant and accented, and the आ of च is unaccented. Result:—च becomes इ and आ+इ =इ (narrow).

25 "इत्य जापे हेमी ने अवथके पुरस्त्." (Premānanda; Nājākhyadna, XV.)
26 The भी ending of this word seems to be the result of a false analogy: the Hindi चीरेवी appearing like the plural of चीरेवा, and the Hindi masculine भी ending corresponding to the भी ending in Gujarāti.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit.</th>
<th>Prakrit or Aparabhrans, and further steps.</th>
<th>Gujarati.</th>
<th>Remarks as to causes, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (13) पर्वपली | पर्वपली पर्वदली पर्वदली (name of a village in the Surat District.) | પર્વપલી | (a) The अ in व is guru and accented; 
(b) The अ in श is also guru and accented; 
(c) व begins a new word (as in the case of No. 12 above); 
(d) ति. अ in व ends the first word of the compound; 
Result: as above,—अव—अव (अ) औ (narrow). |
| (14) बिचिकुड़ | बिचिकुड़ बिचिकुड़ | बिचिकुड़ | (a) बिच is guru and accented; 
(b) कू (क) is long and accented; 
Thus both are accented; 
(c) कू begins a new word (as above); 
(d) The अ in श ends the first word of a compound; 
hence the अ of श—श (i.e., the अ in अक) is subordinate and therefore unaccented. 
Result: —अ+क=औ (narrow). |
| (15) राष्ट्रकु | राष्ट्रकु राष्ट्रकु राष्ट्रकु | राष्ट्रकु | Causes the same as above, mutatis mutandis. Result: —अ+क=औ (narrow). |
| (16) मुहिऱ्य | मुहिहिड्न गुहिड्न | मुहिहिड्न | Note.—It need not be pointed out that the last two instances, विचिकुड़ and राष्ट्रकु are given here for the same purpose for which गम्भीर is included above, viz., to show how pratisampraśaśa is prevented by the long। |
| | | | (a) The उ is strong on account of the subsequent conjunct; 
(b) उच is a separate word, for the purposes of accent; 
(c) The final अ of मुहिफ occupies a subordinate position. 
Result as before: —अ+उ (क)=औ (narrow). |
All these facts, noted above, will go to show—

(a) that when, in the vocalic group अइ or अउ, अ is accented, the इ-उ, getting subordinate, the ultimate result is the wide sound, ऑ-अौ;  
(b) that, when in these groups the इ-उ are accented, their prominence leads to the uniting of अ and इ and उ and ऑ into the narrow ऑ and ऑ;  
(c) that the wide sound is akin to अइ-अउ rather than to अइ-अउ;  
(d) that the इ-उ, when subordinate, turn into ए-ए (and then ए-ए);  
and (e) that thus the wide sound is the result of अइ-अउ and the narrow one is the result of अइ-अउ.

I shall give two or three comparative instances from identical words to further illustrate pointedly the operation of these principles; I give them in the form of a genealogical tree for the sake of giving a clear impression:

I—गोरी (Sanskrit.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>गोरी (=कोरियों)</th>
<th>गोरी (नैयाणी)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Prākrit)</td>
<td>27 गोरी (=1. पार्वती)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(O.W.R.) गरी (=पार्वती)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. गरी—Guj.  
2. गरी—Guj. (the latter half of proper names like पर्वती, etc.)  
3. गरी (Guj.) (=a fair woman).

Also गरी from गिरी in old Gujarāti works).

Here, Gujarāti has (1) गी, (2) गरी, and (3) गरी, each in a different sense; and the phonetic processes are different, as under:

1. अइ—अइ—अइ—अइ: (it is to be noted in this case that the final इ becomes subordinate and turns into ए; whereas in (2) it remains prominent and preserves the अ of ई from becoming हूँत, and hence the ऑ stays on, and we have गरी).
2. अइ—अइ. (See note, just above, under (1).)
3. The ऑ has come direct from Prākrit under the operation of the general rule in Si. Hema. VIII-i-159. (I shall soon consider below the nature and genesis of this operation; I may only state here that in the contraction of ऑ to ऑ, the ऑ passes through ऑ, wherein ऑ is prominent and hence the narrow ऑ.)

II—गाईश (Sanskrit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>गाईश (Prākrit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O.W.R. गाईश (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गाईश (Guj.) (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गाईश (O.W.R) (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27 Vide Kundnapādacharita (Ed. by S. P. Pandit), V, 80; IV, 58; and I, 75, &c. Also Index to it.
We notice here अर changed to ओ in (2) गृह्य ब्रह्म and अर, changed to अ, in (3) मुसू, in the latter case the अ of अर, is so subordinate and अ so very predominant that, instead of the two uniting into a narrow ओ, the अ is lost and अ+अ remain as ओ in मुसू.25 The following lines in किर्मधलि प्रबंधक (V. S. 1512) will show the place of both मुसू and गृह्य in old Western राजस्थानी:

कोडे छ कोडीनि पनि 25 मुसूग्रामक मद नवनामाणि

(Khaśia III, st. 245.)

III—कवि (Apabhrāṃśā)

(कवि (O. W. R.) कवि (O. W. R.) कवि (Guj.) कवि (Guj.) कवि (O. W. R.) कवि (Guj.)

Here also the results, कवि and कवि, are as in मुसू (मुसू) and गृह्य, the only difference being that, while the अ in मुसू is long, that in कवि is short, and yet somehow occupies a prominence which ousts the अ off.

We may also contrast—वीरंवा, वंशवं, etc., which contain व as the final evolve of पुच through पुच, नृच, 20 with मुसूलिन from मुसूलिन, गुरहित; the point of contrast being that, in the latter case the अर unites into a narrow ओ because of the strong ओ, while in the former the strength is more than counteracted by the long ओ preceding it, and hence the change into ओ.

It may be objected: Is not this fixing of the accent an arbitrary procedure? What is the guide for fixing it? Does it not amount to begging the question when you fix the accent on the ओ or on the ओ (or ओ) according as the resulting sound is wide or narrow? My answer to the first and last question is—No; and to the second question the answer is furnished in the reason I shall just give for this answer in the negative. We have the guide and the test in certain instances where the accent is obvious and undisputable, e.g., परि, विनिर्द्व, अवश्य, अपराध, उपदेश, कत्याहि, गृह्य, गृहित, भारत, पारस, and the like; and in the light of these we detect the location of the accent in the other cases, always with good reason for the same. In this subsequent process if the method appears to be a priori, it has a justification and is not the same as begging the question; for the test indications have already disclosed to us the governing principle, and we trace it backwards.

25 The अ is extraordinarily subordinate in this case because it is in the initial syllable, and hence unsupported by a preceding syllable, and so it becomes नृचन. In the case of गृह्य, the accent on ओ gets lost when it becomes shortened, and hence the अ of अर gets accented.

Of course, the fact is that when people are inclined towards subordinating अ overmuch it becomes lost, and in the opposite case it acquires emphasis.

25 Karmaṇa Mantri's Shākaraṇa (V. S. 1528) also has मुसू and गृह्य in juxtaposition:

मुसू, गृह्य, नद नात्तिकां कपड़े उच्च ग्राम;

(Description of Ayodhyā.)

(This double-barrelled word must have been a conventional expression, it seems.)

Vimana-prabandh (V. S. 1568) has मुसू with a short ओ. (See Khaśia I, st. 55.)

25 The ओ becomes ओ by prati-वंशवं in these cases. I do not believe that मुसू-मुसू becomes मुसू and thus ओ; for in the case of मुसूलिन the steps are मुसू-उच्च, (not मुसू, मुसू, उच्छ).
from the visible results in cases of possible dispute, and see how it fits in. This method is, I believe, fairly permissible and frequently resorted to in all inquiries of this nature.

Dr. Tessitori ("Notes," § 10, 4) refers to the change of अ to ध (narrow) as visible in Prakrit and Apabhramśa, and cites Pischel, § 166. The instances given by Pischel are धरस् to धरस्, स्त्रिया to स्त्रिया, etc. Similarly the change of अ to ध is visible if we look behind and under the अच्छ्यस्त्र as given by Hemachandra; as in नीर्ण, etc., from नीर्ण, etc. (St. Hema, VIII-i-171) and औ for अ and ध (St. Hema, VIII-i-172). Similar is the principle underlying the अवृत्त, VIII-i-170, wherein the word presumably passes through an intermediate stage, वृत्त, (alternatively with वर्त which gives बीर in Hindi), and the क्ष अ in the mediative evolvees of गृहर and गृहक्षु first goes through a metathesis and the अ, thus derives becomes औ.

To this I would further add that the changes of दः to द and औ to औ, noted by Hemachandra in VIII-i-148 and 150 respectively, are not direct, single-stepped changes, but really through the intermediate steps अत्र and अत्र respectively; consequently all these changes to द-औ may be regarded as but changes from inherent अत्र-अत्र. The exceptional position of हरद्वाम्य (VIII-i-151, 152), as also that of धर्मज्ञन (VIII-i-162) and धर्मर (VIII-i-163), which note the change of द-औ in those cases to अत्र-अत्र, is really this:—All Sanskrit द-औ are in Prakrit changed to अत्र अत्र in the first instance, and, while in the exceptions just mentioned (द्रव्य, etc., and पौर्ण, etc.) they stop short at the hiatus form अत्र अत्र in all the remaining cases the contactual vowels thus arrived at move a step further and unite into द and औ respectively.

It will thus be seen that even in the Prakrit stage the tendency was for the union of अत्र and अत्र and औ to result into the narrow द औ. Of course, the wide sound was

31 Pischel's steps are काल-कालिन-कालिन-कालिन, I would prefer काल-कालिन (काल-काल-काल) for संस्कृतम्: it is latent in Sutras like St. Hema, VIII-i-171, 172, and VIII-i-149, under which नाम प्राप्त नाम and अप्राप्त नाम become अप्राप्त नाम and अप्राप्त नाम become अप्राप्त नाम and the अ of the causal becomes द (दानयति-दानं), obviously, through the change of द to द and द to द (Sampradāya); whereas कालिन for कालिन is not quite known change: the principle underlying इत्यादि व्यवहारः प्राप्तिः, or, better still, that underlying St. Hema, VIII-i-46, may cover the case by stretching a point. But we need not go so far, when the obvious and natural steps are available.

32 I base this theory on the difference in the essential formation of ध-औ and ध-औ. It is this: Sanskrit and Prakrit grammarians divide the vowels into सम्पूर्ण (simple), which are अ to द and अ to द (compound), which are ध to ध and ध to ध. They (the grammarians) do not make any further distinction in the latter division. I am inclined to differentiate these by further dividing them into संयौगिक (syndetic), which are ध to द and ध to द, and संयुक्त, which are ध to औ and ध to औ. The meaning is obvious: संयूक्त is fusion, and संयुक्त is mere admixture; we find in ध and औ the component simple vowels thoroughly fused together as in a chemical combination, while in ध and औ the component simple vowels stand joined together, as in a mechanical mixture. They are to the simple components what conjunct consonants are to the simple consonants composing them. Thus, while it would be easy for ध and ध to get split up into अत्र and अत्र as contactual vowels, it would be practically impossible for ध and ध to be so split up. Consequently ध-औ would seem to have no direct connection with ध-औ, and, in passing into the latter form, must necessarily first get split up into अत्र-अत्र.

I am half inclined to call ध-औ by the name संयूक्त instead of संयूक्त: but on second thoughts I adhere to the latter name, because (1) संयूक्त is conventionally used as the reciprocal of संयूक्त (as in the case of अक्षर); and (2) संयूक्त would indicate a closer union (an embrace) than संयूक्त which is a mere union, only a little more than mere contact.

Dr. Bhādrakār's distinction between ध-औ and अत्र-अत्र will prove interesting incidentally in this connection. (Fide his Wilson Philological Lectures, 81, 142 and 146.)
not known then; and no wonder, because the conditions for that sound were not present; viz., "अः-अः" as results of accent on अः. Consequently Dr. Tessitori's theory that अः-अः must pass through अः अः before forming the wide अः अः, will not fit in with all these principles noted above. A small indication will bear this out: Sanskrit अः becomes " in Prakrit in cases like the causal forms of verbs: कार्तिक-पारस, कार्तिक-कारप, नायिक-नायक and the like. (Vide Si. Hema. VIII-iii-149.) This " must obviously be the result of अः passing into अः. Similarly the change of त्र्य, etc., to त्र्य, etc., and of अः and अः to अः indicate the change of अः to अः first. This will show the nature of the union between अः and अः, and अः and अः, even when derived from अः-अः. It will be seen, thus, that अः and अः and अः and अः are the generators of the narrow अः and अः, while अः and अः those of the wide अः and अः. For it cannot be seriously contemplated that the narrow अः-अः thus formed turned all at once into the wide ones, or that अः and अः could generate both the sounds, narrow as well as wide.

I have already referred to Dr. Tessitori's gracefully frank admission that, when he wrote his "Notes", the wide sound of ए and ऑ (as अः अः) was never present before his mind, and he states there that अः and अः became " ( )" and " ( )". narrow. May it be that, now when he has discovered that both Gujarati and Mavaraj have the wide " ( ), the first impression still clings, of course partially, in so far as he regards the wide sound as resulting direct from अः-अः without an intermediate step? 33

One word more. It will be remembered that the wide sound of अः-अः was quite unknown to Prakrit or O. W. Rasthâni; and that it came into Gujarati and Mavaraj alone during the early history of their growth, probably about the early part of the seventeenth century of the Christian era. This period coincides with the time when the Moghul Empire had just been consolidated by Akbar, and Akbar's great efforts had brought Arabic and Persian literature into close contact with Indian literature. May I therefore venture a suggestion that this wide sound, which is peculiarly similar to, or at least extremely near, the wide sound of Arabic and Persian words of the types of हस्तांब and वनस्पत, was matured under the indirect influence of these foreign languages? It is certainly not unlikely that the sound in अ्य-अ्य should have recognized a close likeness in the foreign word हस्तांब or that in कारकी-कारकी should have found a similar correspondence in that of कारण, and that thus a silent current of phonical influence generated and established itself. I am aware that Hindi—the language of a province where the Moghul influence was wider and more powerful—has the sound not identically wide with Gujarati and Mavaraj. This can be very well accounted for by the comparatively sturdy character of the people speaking Hindi who tried to steer clear of this foreign influence, and only partially succeeded, for, after all, the similarity between the new indigenous sound and the foreign sound was really very close.

Finally, it is possible that the question may be asked—"If the wide अः अः are the results of अः-अः how could the formation contain ए and ऑ which comprise अः and अः, without the presence of ए and ए in the precedent stage?" The answer is this: As just observed, the wide अः अः are really new and, in a way, foreign sounds; they comprise (a) the foreign element,

and (b) the nature of ए and ऑ;

of these (a) is predominant and (b) subordinate, and this latter is contributed by the ए and ए remaining, as it were, in the form of a latent influence in the ए and ए. This need

33 I must here admit that, when I wrote my Note in the Indian Antiquary to which Dr. Tessitori has alluded, I had mistaken the circumflex over ए and ऑ ( ) for the grave ( ) when reading Dr. Tessitori's "Notes." The former marks the narrow sound and the latter the wide one.
not be regarded as if I gave up my whole case. The latent influence can exist for its limited operation and yet the final formation ( ब्र-ब्र ) remain as the dominant factor. 54

To summarize—my position amounts to this:

I. The wide sound in अ-आ in Gujarati (which is also a peculiarity of Mārvāṇi) comes from

(a) ए-ए in Prākrit, Apabhṛṣṭa, and O. W. Rājasthāni;

and (b) एह-एह in the same languages, through a subsequent step एह-एह by pratisampradāya (a principle at work in an extensive field).

NOTE:—

1. In both these cases the एह-एह assume the form एह-एह (by the loss of the द्वारक आ ) before taking the form of the wide sound.

2. एह-एह which also become wide अ-आ really pass through the एह-एह step by the movement of the ए to the initial syllable of words:

   न कहिते ( कहिते ) कहिते न कहिते ( कहिते )

II. The reasons for the above analysis are:

(a) एह-एह, if they combine, form ए-ए (narrow), as shown by the tendency ever since Prākrit and Apabhṛṣṭa periods; they cannot yield the wide sound by mere combination as they are;

(b) एह-एह (through एह-एह) generate the wide sound, as is manifest to the ear by actual perception;

(c) This wide sound, which did not start much earlier than the seventeenth century of the Christian era, and is confined to Gujarāti (and Mārvāṇ) is really foreign in its nature, and its advent was helped by the O. W. Rājasthāni ए-ए (in the एह-ए stage) finding a phonological affinity with the Arabic-Persian sound in ए-ए:

   वथन (वथन), (खार) खार, खबर (खबर);
   कहिते (कहिते), नकार (नकार, नकार, नकार);

these find, as it were, a phonological kinship with the types represented by हरि-हरि,

(d) This phonological phenomenon is determined by the position and movement of accent; if the accent is on the ए of the ए-ए, एह-एह, the resulting sound is wide, ए being कहिते and capable of विस्तार pronunciation; if the accent is on ए-ए, ए-ए, the resulting sound is ए-ए (narrow), ए passing first into ए-ए by sampradāya;

(e) The diphthongs ए-ए in Sanskrit were narrow in sound; the ए-ए in Marāṭhi taddhāvas (e.g., बेल, बोगा) are almost similar to the Sanskrit sounds; the ए-ए in Hindi taddhāvas (बेल, बोगा), although swinging to the side opposite to the Marāṭhi sound, i.e., inclining towards the wide sound, do not quite come up to the full wide sound in Gujarāti (and Mārvāṇ) taddhāvas;—consequently ए-ए would be misleading as symbols for this last-named wide sound, for which अ-आ would be perhaps the best symbols, especially as these were in vogue at one time in old manuscripts, if my information is correct.

I conclude now, but not without acknowledging my great debt to Dr. Tessitori whose learned labours have helped me in examining this question in all its bearings and enabled me to place my view before him and other scholars interested in this subject, in a spirit of friendly co-operation in the search for knowledge and truth.

54 This may be likened, in a way, to the principle underlying Pāṇini's sūtra स्थानिविषयः: (I.1-56), though it adds ए नीर्ति and thereby excludes अत्यन्तिक from its operation. I am aware the purpose of the sūtra is different. I simply apply the principle in a different way for my purpose. In fact, exclude the exception, अनालिक, i.e., a process similar to it, in this case.
Appendix A.
(See page 297, December, 1917, n. 3.)

The scope of अह-अउ is further restricted by the fact that, as a general rule, Sanskrit ए and ऑ are changed in Prakrit to ए and ऑ respectively, and the changes to अह and अउ are confined, as exceptions, to—

(a) Words in the प्रस्तावित्र group (Si. Hemachandra, VIII-i-151), or, optionally, to those in the प्रेक्षित्र group (Si. Hema. VIII-i-152);

(b) Words in the दृश्यप्रभाव group (Si. Hema. VIII-i-162), and, optionally, the word नर (Si. Hema. VIII-i-163);

And अह-अउ formations are otherwise evolved in—

(c) Words where the अह or अउ is derived by the elision of certain consonants united with the ह or ऊ, e.g.:

पालसन (पालसन), पालसन (पालसन), पालसन (पालसन), पालसन (पालसन—Guj.);

(d) Words which, in Prakrit, contain अह-अउ undergo a further transitional change by way of the shunting of the ह to the beginning of a word and precipitate अह-अउ, e.g.:

Guj.

गस्निं, गस्निं (गस्निं), गस्निं पालसन (पालसन), गस्निं

शिलिनक्ष, शिलिनक्ष (शिलिनक्ष), शिलिनक्ष (शिलिनक्ष)

शीतलक्ष, शीतलक्ष (शीतलक्ष), शीतलक्ष and the like.

In this last case, (d), however, the अह-अउ stage is merely a transitional one, a mere possibility, and therefore not likely to be found in actual writing. This may, therefore, be properly excluded from calculation for the purpose of finding out use in actual writing. Add to this the fact that all the words covered by the above groups do not necessarily yield corresponding words in Gujarati (or Maravadi).

This is in regard to medial अह-अउ. For the rest there is an extensive field of final अह and अउ in verbal forms and nominative singular of nouns and adjectives; e.g.:

कर, भाव, छ, etc.

क, भाव, छ, etc.

वृह, भव, छ, etc.

वृह, भव, छ, etc.

But the extensiveness of this field is compensated for by what I call the अन्वांस 25 nature of the sound in the resulting e and o, a fact recognized by Dr. Tessitori also.

Thus, as a result of all this, the cases of अह and अउ in actual writing will obviously be comparatively very few. In contrast to this अह-अउ, as derived from Sanskrit words by elision of certain consonants or change of ए to ए (where ए does not exist originally) will always be medial—rarely final (as in द्वै-द्व, and the like), and instances thereof will be larger in number. It is interesting to note that Hindi, which pronounces the final and medial wide ए and ऑ in a peculiar way, sometimes writes हो for है (=is).

25 A few exceptions may be noted: भ (bear) from नाण: नाण: छ (let be), from छ (असत्); ह्र (an interjection, meaning, "Do you see?", "Will you?", "as in कागज लड़कर ह्र!" You will write to me, will you?") from नाण: इद्व: नाण: ह्र; अ (असत्) from अउ-अउ.

These, especially as they are monosyllabic, emphasize the wide sound of the final ओ and ए; as will be perceived by contrasting the words with ओ (address of vocative), ए (chunam plastering), and ए (which), which all, of course, end in a narrow sound.
Appendix B.

(See page 25, January, n. 18.)

Tulsidāsa (died V. S. 1680) shows the following:—

1. मीलन निराहि कौन बोध वह (Lankā-Kāśīa).
2. आवरजत औरेक नगिज्ञा (Kishkindhā-Kāśīa).
3. तुम वेद विना मूर वैशाली (Aranya-Kāśīa).
4. सुस्ना तत्न चैत जरें (Kishkindhā-Kāśīa).
5. स व शिवल ऑरेकार्ध (Sundara-Kāśīa).
6. राहि राहने क्रम 36 विपरीत वह नाम (Aranya-Kāśīa).
7. बस्ति न पद्मान कठु रवी (Uttara-Kāśīa).
8. दुर्बुध कही कही कहाँ जाँ (Sundara-Kāśīa, Interpolated portion).
9. क्रम 36 उल्लम यह सिंहाज दो (Ditto ditto).
10. भव ज्ञाय वह सुनी न देखी सोहि (Uttara-Kāśīa).
11. मीलन ही न प्रवक्तरार बवी नवाब या हा दरा (Ditto).
12. भैं हत्तला भव दिये पह जानी (Ditto).
13. गोव जावयोहिं गुप गमुड मोक्षी भाषा नविस पुस्तुख दुबुड (Ditto).
14. निष्प्रतार धुंगे नववीना परदेस धुंगे सूतन खुंगी (Ditto).
15. भव बी मुल नीति चिं कठु (Ditto).
16. श्य नमस्त तब चभ छुटुआँ (Ditto).

A comparative study of these specimens will show that अर, अइ in instances like No. 15 and No. 13 are necessitated by the requirements of metre; है-भी in such cases would not have done. Barring this, we find है-भी in general use, and है-भी rare. It may be reasonably inferred that, while this state of mixed use of है-भी and है-भी—indicating the rise of है-भी—prevailed in Tulsidāsa's time, the है-भी practice was fairly well established about half a century after Tulsidāsa's death, when Bihāri wrote his "Satassai." Of course, a careful inspection of the original manuscripts would throw further light on this matter. I have had to depend on printed works only in this case.

The "Song of Jasavanta Sonigaro" (given by Dr. Tessitori in the article under notice, pp. 82-84) which is in old Marāvāḍi and contains है-भी in fair profusion, is placed by Dr. Tessitori soon after V. S. 1670. This would show its affinity with the similar practice in Hindi in Tulsidāsa's period.

36 क्रम is also found in other places:—

कहर रक्षकक क्रम हे अन्न (Lankā-Kāśīa).

करार क्रम कारण संपादरी (Bāla-Kāśīa).

This shows that, if क्रम did not exist between Apabhrāntaś and Hindi, क्रम preserved its व form side by side with the changed form क्रम:—a phenomenon no unusual in linguistic evolution. The करार here, for instance, retains the व and we have forms like नमर, द्रव also (see instance 13).
ASOKA NOTES, NO. XII

(No. XI appeared in Vol. XXXIX ante, for 1910, p. 64.)

BY VINCENT A. SMITH, M.A. (Oxon.)

Identification of Tamraparni in the Rock Edicts.

The name Tamraparni occurs twice in the Edicts, namely, in Rock Edict II. which asserts that ‘curative arrangements’ were organized ‘as far as Tamraparni’; and in Rock Edict XIII, which describes the ‘conquest by the Law of Piety,’ or ‘morality’ as extending to the same limit. The name undoubtedly is that written in Sanskrit as Tāmraparni (Tambraparni of Imp. Gazetteer), which is applied both to Ceylon and to a river which formerly flowed through the ancient Pāṇḍya kingdom and now traverses the Tinnevelly District. In the second edition of my Asoka (Oxford, 1909) I translated the name in both passages by “Ceylon”, but am satisfied that I was mistaken, and that the reference in both cases is to the river, not to the island. Asoka meant that his medical institutions and Buddhist propaganda extended into the Pāṇḍya territory. The Rock Edicts, as is now well known, were published in or about 257 B.C. At that date the relations of the Indian emperor with Ceylon had not begun. They did not come into existence until several years later, soon after the accession of Tissa as king of Ceylon, which event, according to Wickramasinghe, may be dated in 233 B.C. The reign of Tissa, who, like Asoka, bore the title Deva-nākya, lasted, as that of Asoka did, for about forty years. (Ep. Zeylanica, I, 81.) Consequently, it is impossible that the word Tamraparni in the Edicts should refer to Ceylon.

The Arthasastra of Kautilya or Chāṇakya, which was composed in the time of Asoka’s grandfather, and makes only one reference to Tāmraparnī, certainly treats the name as meaning the river. Chapter II of Book I, in which the various kinds of gems are described, mentions the Tāmraparnīka kind as being ‘that which is produced in the Tāmraparnī.’ The commentator explains the meaning by the note, ‘A river in the Pāṇḍya country.’ The river was famous as the seat of fisheries for both pearls and the chank shell (Turbinella rara). The ancient port of Korkail, then on the bank of the river and on the seacoast, was a place of extensive commerce and a centre of the gem trade. The gems, other than pearls, must have come chiefly from Ceylon, and the close commercial relations between the Pāṇḍya kingdom and the island may explain the transfer of the name Tāmraparnī from the river on the mainland to Ceylon. Prior to the accession of Tissa, in or about 233 B.C., Ceylon probably was known to India mainly as a place which supplied gems and spices to the mart on the Tāmraparnī, from which it was not distinguished.

The Tāmraparnī river was and is still a stream of exceptional importance on its own account, although its course, windings included, measures only about seventy miles. The catchment area receives both the S.W. and N.E. monsoons, with the result that the river is in flood twice in the year and offers unique facilities for the irrigation of rice. Its valley is the wealthiest portion of the Tinnevelly District. The river rises in the Potiyam or Potigai mountain, also called Agastya’s Hill, the Potalaka of Huen Tsang, 6800 feet high, which receives an annual rainfall of 300 inches, while the Tinnevelly plain receives only 25. The river is said to be mentioned in both the Aranyaka-parvi of the

---

1 Real, II. 233; Watters, II, 231.
Mahābhārata and in the Rāhuvaśākha. It is considered extremely sacred throughout its whole course, and especially at the falls in the hills. The Greeks called it Solen, which seems to be a variant form of Ceylon. It is remarkable that they, like the Indians, should apply the one name to the river and the island. The Potigai mountain appears as ‘Bettigo’ in Greek.

The port of Korkai, which used to be situated near the mouth of the Tāmrarpāṛṣi, but now is five miles from the sea, seems to have been the first settlement of civilized man in those parts. The ruin of Korkai and the other ancient ports in the neighbourhood undoubtedly is due to a gradual elevation of the land, and not to mere silting up by deposits of sand brought down by the rivers. The proof is given concisely by Caldwell in the following passage:

*I should not expect to find relics of the oldest period anywhere near the sea, as I consider it certain that the land has been slowly but steadily rising above the ancient sea level for ages, probably even before man made his appearance in the district. The rise of the land all through the historical period is, I think, capable of proof. Near Kulasekharam, a town and port of some antiquity, pieces of broken pottery are occasionally found imbedded in the grit stone, a marine formation abounding in sea shells of existing species, found all along the coast. I have a specimen in my possession found about a mile from the shore; but I regard this as proving, not the immense antiquity of the pottery, which does not appear to differ in the least from the pottery now in use, but rather the comparatively recent origin of some portions of the grit-stone.*

The long-expected edition of the edicts of Asoka by Professor Hultzsch was in the press when the war broke out in 1914. The work is not sufficiently advanced to be completed by anybody except the author. I have been permitted by the Clarendon Press to consult the small portion printed off which comprises the whole of the Rock Edicts in the Gīrmā recension and most of the Kālsī recension, but not the 13th edict or the close of the 12th. Dr. Hultzsch correctly renders the words ā Tampapāṇi in Edict II, Gīrmā, by ‘as far as the Tāmrarpāṛṣi’, and appends the note:

‘Here and in edict XIII Tāmrarpāṛṣi is usually taken to refer to Ceylon; but it is more natural to understand it by the river of this name in the Tinnevelly district, which was known to the author of the Rāmāyana (Bombay edition, iv, 41, 17). Cf. Mr. V. A. Smith’s note, ZDMG., 63, 211.’

Edict XIII in the Gīrmā recension is missing.

In edict II of the Kālsī recension we have the enumeration of foreign countries Cholā Paṇḍīya Sātiyapuṭa Kelaḷapuṭa Tampapāṇi, which Dr. Hultzsch renders:—
‘the Chola, the Pāṇḍiyas, the Sātiyaputa, the Kelaḷaputa, the Tāmrarpāṛṣi.’

His edition of the 13th edict in that recension is not at my disposal.

It is clear that in both edicts Tampapāṇi means the Tinnevelly river, not the island of Ceylon.

2 History of Tinnevelly, Madras, 1881, 5, 9-11, 19, 38. ‘Within India proper there have been local changes in the relative level of land and sea within recent geological times. . . On the east side of Bombay Island trees have been found imbedded in mud about 12 feet below low-water mark, while a similarly submerged forest has been described on the Tinnevelly coast. On the other hand, there is evidence to show that a part of the coast of Tinnevelly has risen and driven back the sea in the neighbourhood of Kāyal.’ (Imp. Gzt., 1907, I, 99, ‘Geology’ by T. H. Holland.)
THE ARTHASAstra EXPLAINS:

BY K. P. JAYASVAL, M.A. (OXON.), BAR.-AT-LAW; BANKIPore.

(1)

"PrAyA" of Rudradâman's Inscription.

The meaning of the term prAyA occurring in Rudradâman's inscription is now settled by Kauśîya's Arthasastra.

Hindu Law lays down a fixed system of taxation which no king acting under the Law could violate. He could neither introduce a new tax, nor could he enhance the rates fixed by the Common Law (Dharmastra). This, of course, was very inconvenient to an imperial system like that of the Mauryas, which had to maintain a large standing army and to carry on great wars. The system, therefore, had to have recourse to devices. It introduced and levied taxes without directly calling them taxes.

The Arthasastra calls them prAyAh (in the singular). This 'gift of affection' was to be realised during financial stringency ('PratyutpannaArthaPrâchhâna,' p. 240). This could be levied only once, presumably in one reign (sukridgeva na dvik prAyA, p. 241). If there was disappointment in the realisation of the prAyA the Minister of Revenue had to 'beg' it from the capital and the country after pointing out the importance of the object for which it was wanted (tasyâkaraṇe vā samhârâ kāryamapadîyena pravâ-va-jânapadôn bhiksheca, pp. 241-2). For better success, the king had also to beg (râjâ pravâ-va-jânapadôn bhikshêta). The agents of the Government were the first to give largely and they would put to shame those who paid little. 'Hiraṇya' (gold coin) was begged of the rich.

Another device was that titles or dignities, the privilege of using the umbrella of distinction, and what in Muhammadan times was called khillâs, were to be given for hiraṇya (vâdānaâ-aagâ-teṣaâ-vîsudhâbhâvâhârina hirâṇya samsârad, p. 242).

The prAyA amongst the rural population was realised at twenty-five per cent. of the agricultural produce, and at one-sixth of cotton and woollen goods, etc. Likewise the urban articles of trade and merchandise were also made to pay a high profit and capital tax ranging from 50 per cent. to 20 per cent. Theatrical people had to pay half of their salaries (p. 241).

It seems that this 'affection' tax was carried down to the time of Rudradâman and thus had a history of about four centuries, at least. That the 'affection' tax had been very much resented is proved by the fact of Rudradâman's publicly announcing its discontinuance. True to his coronation-oath (pratiṣñā) he realised only the taxes sanctioned by Hindu Law.3

---

1 Ep. Ind., VIII. 43, 44.


3 The oath exacted a promise to 'follow the Law.' Cf. Mâbh. Sûta, 59. 107.
(2)

The God-Idols of the Mauryas.

The old discussion on Patanjali's *Mauryaṁ kriyāyā dhānaṁ—archāḥ pratālpaṁ* ought to be considered now in the light of a datum in the *Arthaśāstra*.

The *prasyā* and sale of honours were not the only Mauryan devices to ease financial situation. Patanjali's remark 'the worships established by the Mauryas who wanted *kriyā* (money)' has reference to another of those devices.

In the same chapter (on Financial Stringency, ch. 90) one more method of raising money is given and that is by instituting new worships (p. 242). There was an imperial Department of Temples and Worships. The Minister in charge (विशंभर) was expected to help the Exchequer by various procedures. He had, for instance, to exploit the superstitious devotees (Svadādāhānān) of Nāgas by showing a real serpent in the Nāga-idol through secret human agency (p. 243). New dāvā had to be set up at night and *yuddhamānas* convened there to raise revenue from their offerings. According to Patanjali some of the objects of worship established by the Mauryas were still worshipped in his time (चारत्स: संविन्द्रवायत्सः), and amongst such worships were also the well-known 'Siva,' 'Skanda' and 'Vidākha' (सिवः स्कन्दः विधाकः इति), apparently, of Pātaliputra.

(3)

Nīvi of the Inscriptions.

The word *nīvi* occurring in the inscriptions has not been properly understood. The *Arthaśāstra* explains it.

*Nīvi* is a technical term of the Hindu secretariat. It means a 'despatch, 'document,' 'record' or 'file.' See *Arthaśāstra*, pp. 61, 62, 64. (चारत्स: संविन्द्रवायत्सः, समार-पुस्तकाणि-सर्वकालिक, etc.) The expression, like our modern 'red-tape,' is derived from the physical feature 'the string' which was tied round the despatch or returns.

The *nīvi* of the inscriptions has thus to be translated as 'document' or 'despatch,' and *akṣara-nīvi* as a permanent document.

(4)

"Thus saith Priyadarsī": 'Proclamations' not 'edicts.'

"Thus saith" was a technical style used in a certain class of royal documents. The style had come down from pre-Mauryan times. For Kautilya in his chapter on

4 On *Paśiṇi*, 5. 3. 99: जीविकायं वापण्यं।

5 It may be noticed that most of the gods mentioned in the *Arthaśāstra* (pp. 55-6) go back to the Maurya and pre-Mauryan times. Its Sīva and Vaiṣṇava may be compared with *Paśiṇi* Sīva (4.1.112), and Sīra-Vaiśnavan of the Mahā-Bhadra (on *Paśiṇi*, 6.3.26), and the Nāga and Śeri with the Nāga and Śeri of the Buddhist Sāstras. The *Aśinas* are vēdic. The histories of Maṭrī, Jayanta, Vaijayanta, Aparajita and Apratihata, however, are still to be traced.

6 Patanjali means by implication that the Mauryas did make a trade by instituting these idols (प्रतिक्रिया, v. 3. 96), and thus the limitation of *Paśiṇi* "अपराधः" 'where no trade is made' (only a livelihood is made, जीविकायं) falls in the case of the 'Sīva,' etc., of the Mauryas, which are called 'Śrava,' etc. (not Śrīva, etc.): अरण्य इस्तुप्रथेत तथेऽपि विभाति। शिवः स्कन्दः विधाकः इति। किं कारणं? मेघविलयस्यापि: इति.
Sasanadhkika or the Department of Royal Correspondence (pp. 70-75) gives ancient rules "संव शासनव्युक्तियों प्रथेयमुल्यचं" (p. 75). He quotes verses which by their very style prove themselves to be ancient.

"वज्राकारविज्ञानकेशा" are the royal communications which stand in the first padra of the first verse, others being Pari-kara, Nishapata, Pravakritika, Pari-lekha and Sarvatraga. We are not here concerned with the sasanas other than the first two—Prajnapana and Ajna. Prajnapana is described in these words: चा विज्ञानविलास परस्परं गद्यविश्वविवेचनम् (p. 73). The verse is difficult and the meaning obscure, but this much is clear and certain that the Prajnapana gave various advices or informations (विबोधकाः) and that it began with "Nama vijaya pitam," "It is notified hereby," or "evam aha," "Thus saith."

Thus the inscriptions of Asoka beginning with evam aha are all Prajnapanās: Proclamations, advising or informing the people. It is wrong to call them "edicts."

These Public Proclamations sometimes quote an ajna-lekha. Let us first discuss the characteristics of an ajna-lekha.

नुस्ताना नविनत्व निशाचार्याः भवति (p. 73).

"An order of the Master (Sovereign)—an order restraining or approving, issued especially to Government servants—bears the characteristics of an ajna-lekha."

An ajna-lekha is quoted in the Rock Series, section III. It is addressed to the bhriyus 'rajaikas', 'Pradesikas' and 'the council'. (Parisah = the Council of Ministers). Another ajna-lekha in cited in sec. VI of the Rock Series. It is issued to the Council of Ministers (Parisah). Both are marked by the style "evam maya ajnapitam."

These ajna-lekhas are included in the evam-aha documents of Asoka; they have no separate existence there. They contain one more class of writs, called by Kautilya a Prati-lekha, where a document is drafted in the king's own words (भव राजवंस्तिपति p. 74). A good example of this is the Jaugad Separate Record II, beginning with "Thus saith" but giving the loka-machnika text.

It would be, therefore, proper to call these inscriptions Prajnapanās or 'Public Proclamations.' "Edicts" are not correct. European scholars take "lipi" of dharma-lipi standing at the head of the series as denoting the character of these documents and they translate it by "edicts." But it can be demonstrated that lipi does not mean "edicts." In the Sāranath inscription Asoka says that two lipis of the same sasana were sent there. Lapi therefore means a 'despatch.'

1 Sasan does not there invariably mean "orders." Foreign correspondence was also called sasanas. द्रास्त्रप्रतिनव मा राजनं, तत्सृष्टिकर्मसारबिवचनम् (p. 70.)

2 The other styles of commenent are obscure. They probably are "taddiyatā chey-yadi tatvamasi asti" or "taddiyatām chet" ('you may give if') and "yadi tattvamasi" ('If it is true') and Rāja-samipe Parnātiram = aha (meaning obscure) "Enemy's document (cf.-कृपया, p. 73) come to the king says thus" (?).

3 As it is an ajna-lekha it must have been addressed to the Royal Parisah ('servants'), and not to the clergy as supposed by scholars. Cf. also my interpretation of the Parisah in sec. VI (ante, 1913, 282-34.)

4 Cf. also the lipi addressed to the Government of Kalinga.
Vinita of Asoka’s Inscriptions.

Vinita used in Asoka’s dharmō-lipi, section VI of the Rock series, has been translated by European scholars, with some diffidence, as a ‘carriage.’

We get the real sense if we refer to the Royal Time-Table given in the Arthasastra in the chapter on Royal Duty (pp. 37-39). The chapter emphasises utthana (energy): तमहृद्यसन्नावस्था: कुर्सित् (1st paragraph; p. 37). and again, राजा तिष्ठति अर्थस्वरूप- मुद्यन्ति (last lines, p. 39).

Now Asoka’s ‘edict’ VI is also on utthana; गलिलि तिष्ठति निज़ीली उद्ययित्वम्. Bearing this in mind we can proceed further.

According to the Arthasastra time-table the King was to attend to the questions of Defence and Finance early morning for 1½ hours (p. 37), and after that between 7-30 a.m. and 9 a.m. he had to entertain public petitions freely in the Throne-Hall,11 After that he went to have his bath and meals and private study (9—10-30 a.m.)12

That this time-table was acted upon by Chandragupta may be gathered from Megasthenes, who says that the King was being ‘shampooed’ while receiving petitions. This ‘shampooing’ would naturally refer to the hours before bath.

Asoka is really extending the hours for the petitions of the public. He says that he would attend to the artha of the people (cf. कार्याधिकार्य, AS.) even in the hours set apart for meals and study (“while I be taking food or I be in the palace”—Asoka). Then after the hours of breakfast and study, the Arthasastra again enjoins attending to public business—correspondence with the Council of Ministers (10-30—12 a.m.) after which he might have his (स्त्रीलिंग) rest and amusements (12—1-30 p.m.). Against this (स्त्रीलिंग), Asoka refers to his presence in his “garbhagāra.” This garbhga arā was most likely an underground cool room for स्त्रीलिंग in summer.13 In the after-noon, according to the Arthasastra time-table, the king would go to the military training grounds (सा वह स्वरूपा वृक्षारोपणकर्ता, p. 38) and himself would join the drill or vinaya (दृष्टिनिनाशनहम्मराज्य-भवानिवयात्र निनवच गददेव, p. 10). Against this we have Asoka’s vachas and vinitas, 14 Vinita, therefore, stands for vinaya or military exercise.

Vracha of Asoka’s Inscription.

Vacha (Girnar and Kalsi) would also refer to some military matter, as it occurs after garbhagāra corresponding to the ‘rest’ of the Arthasastra time-table. Mr. Vincent Smith restores vacha into vracha (Asoka, 1901, p. 129). The Kharosthi versions have vachas which in view of the eccentric orthography of those versions15 or our eccentric reading of that

---

11 ति तिष्ठन्ति विविधानवाः कार्याधिकार्य वर्त्तन (p. 37) उपस्थाननां कार्याधिकार्यनामाश्चतुर्भस्म कार्याधिकार्य (p. 38).
12 ति तिष्ठन्ति विविधानवाः कार्याधिकार्य वर्त्तन (p. 37).
13 Cf. with the bhumi-graha of the Arthasastra, p. 40.
14 ति तिष्ठन्ति विविधानवाः कार्याधिकार्य हेतुकर्ता वष्णुविषति उद्ययित्व विनयेत्रास्तराविनाश अर्थ
15 ति तिष्ठन्ति विविधानवाः कार्याधिकार्य वर्त्तन (Kalasi).
16 Cf. parśi-vedaka (VI) instead of prati-vedaka.
orthography, may represent both *vṛacha* and *vṛacha*. With regard to *vṛacha*, European scholars have translated the word as 'latrine'. No king in his senses would ask officers to announce the business of suitors in his latrine. The basis of the interpretation (*vṛacha*), therefore, strikes me as being a mistaken value. *Vṛacha* on the other hand gives a meaning which agrees with the data of the *Arthaśāstra*.

*Vṛacha* and *vṛacha* both equal to *vṛaja*. *Vṛachānti* in IV, XIII, Rock series (Shahbazgarhi) stands in the place of the Khalsa *yānti*, that is, *vṛachānti* = Sans. *vṛanjani*. Hemachandra gives *vṛachāhāi* for *vṛajati*. We may therefore take *vṛacha* and *vṛacha* as equivalents of the Sans. *vṛaja*.

*Vṛaja* in the *Arthaśāstra* is a technical term for the royal stables for horses, mules, bullocks, etc., and their breeding-farms.

Aśoka thus says that whether he be in the royal steed and cattle farms and stables or he be on the parade-grounds, reviewing animals or men, urgent petitions might be brought to his notice by the ushers (*prati-vedakas*).

The last stage of Aśoka's daily routine is his presence in the *udāna* or the Royal Gardens. The *Arthaśāstra* has, against it, the performance of the *sandhyā* in the evening (p. 38). Aśoka being a Buddhist had nothing to do with the orthodox prayer *sandhyā*, but he passed his time in the gardens which presumably was done in the evening. Before the evening hours, we have in the *Arthaśāstra*, the king 'thinking' of *vikrama* along with the Commander-in-Chief. If it meant military expeditions Aśoka had nothing to do with it either, as these had been given up by him. But if it meant military drill, it corresponded with Aśoka's *vīnita*.

(7)

**Vṛacha-Bhūmikas of Aśoka.**

*Vṛacha-bhūmikas* or *Vṛacha-bhūmikas* (Mansehra) of sec. XII of the Rock series *līpis* of Aśoka, in view of the interpretation of *vṛacha* in the last note, would "mean the officers of the Vṛaja-bhūmi." *Vṛaja-bhūmi* and *Vṛaja* are not the same. For the Royal *vṛajas* in the *Arthaśāstra* are nowhere connected with bhūmi; the technical term is *vṛaja* there, and not *Vṛaja-bhūmi*.

---

**Chandragupta**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Aśoka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9–10:30 a.m.</td>
<td>Meals and study</td>
<td>Meals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30–12</td>
<td>Correspondence with Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12–1:30 p.m.</td>
<td><em>Svira-vrāra</em></td>
<td>In the Palace; in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30–3 p.m.</td>
<td>Inspection of the military elephants</td>
<td><em>gurukshāna</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 4:30 p.m.</td>
<td><em>Vikrama</em> along with the Senāpati.</td>
<td>At the <em>vṛaja</em>;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30–6 p.m.</td>
<td>Sandhyā</td>
<td>Viśāla or military</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**


17 *Prati-vedakas* are not spies as translated heretofore but the ushers or the officers who announced the *arkhins* or suitors. This is the natural meaning, while the "spy" is forced, and unwarranted by the literature of the time.

18 We may tabulate a comparison between the two routines as follows:
We have, however, in one place another use of vraja. It is at p. 22 of the _Arthasastra_—

‘Narendra’ as another name of Chandragupta in the Puranas.

In discussing the Puranic data about the end of the Nanda and the beginning of the Maurya chronology, I could not understand a passage of the _Vāyu Purāṇa_ which read as 

Nandendha in the _Vāyu_ is clearly a corrupt reading. For the MSS. are not unanimous—

The correct form appears in the _Brahma Purāṇa_ as Narendra. I could not see its significance in 1919 when I wrote the paper on the Maurya chronology, and it appeared to me then as filling up some gap after the Maurya. Now as the nominative form has been found in MSS.

Narendra = Chandragupta.

The preceding passage mentions the destruction of the Nandas by Kauṭilya. Hence there is no doubt that the ‘Maurya’ of the _Matsya_ is equivalent to the ‘Narendra’ of the _Vāyu_ and _Brahma Purāṇa_. It thus becomes obvious that ‘Narendra’ is employed as another name of Chandragupta, and Narendra as another name of Chandragupta is confirmed by the _Arthasastra_. The _Arthasastra_ (p.75) gives a verse

—The Kauṭilya laid down the canons governing the issue of the _Sāstras_ for the benefit of Narendra.

23 For _vraja_ as a division of land see references in St. Peter’s Dist. where _vraja_ is opposed to forest and town. _Vraja-bhūmi_ may also mean the ‘province’ or ‘country’ of _Vraja_, around Mathura (Harivamāsa and Bhāsā); cf. _Vata-bhūmi_ of the Sabha-P. MBh. According to Megasthenes, the Kṛṣṇa cult was powerful in the _Vraja_ area. It is possible that Aśoka attempted to check the adverse criticism of Buddhism by the followers of that cult through his _Vraja-bhūmi _censors.

23 JBO, 1. 57.
Dipista and Drip of Asoka’s Inscriptions.

Prof. Hultzsch has corrected the old readings *dipista, dipa(pisista, dipapito* of Shahbazgarhi. He found that *dī* is really *ni* in each case, and he derived *nipista* from *nīpisita* ‘ground’ (*J.R.A.S.*, 1913, 653-54). Later on he inclined to connect it with the Persian *navištan*, ‘to write’ (*J.R.A.S.*, 1914, 97).

The *Arthasastra* saves us from the necessity of going to Persia for the derivation of *nipista*. In view of the explanation of *nī* offered above, it may be said with confidence that *nipi* in *nipista* stands for *nīvi*, and that *nipista* stands for *niśiya* or *niśikha.*

*Nipista* would thus mean ‘reduced into document’ or ‘recorded.’

If we compare this with the direction in the *Arthasastra* as to what matters were to be entered into *nibandha-pustaka* ‘*निक्षेप-पुस्तकथें कारणं*’ (p. 62), we might get some additional light. Certain facts—e.g., laws and customs (पक्ष ज्ञानपत्र चरित-तदल), treaties, subsidies allowed to foreign kings (निवासित चतुर्वद्यूतकम्—हस्ताक्षरित)—were to be recorded (निक्षेप-पुस्तकथें कारणं) in certain registers kept within wooden boards at the department of the Royal Archives in चालसेप्त. Likewise Asoka here is leaving certain directions to his sons and grandsons, and for them he is putting them on record (निवासितान्तर). The original *nīvi* must have been kept at the Imperial Akshapatana enclosed and tied within wooden boards.

As ‘*dīpi*’ has to be read as *nīpi* so probably *dhrama-dīpi* also has to be read now as *dhrama-nīvi*. *Dharma-nīvi* would mean ‘the Despatch (or ‘Document’) relating to the Dharma.’ This accords with the sense of *dharma-līpi* of the Ginnar and other editions.

*Līpi* there, as already pointed out by me, means a ‘despatch’ and not an ‘edict’.52

NOTES AND QUERIES.

10. Slaves from Madagascar for the Company’s Settlement at Sumatra.

17 October 1859. Letter from Edwin Yale and Company at Fort St. George to Benjamin Bloom and Company at Benzaulea. Your importunate desiers of a Supply of Coffeeyes [kafir, caffere, native of S. Africa] to Carry and serve your fortification has Persuaded us to send the Pearl Friggot to Madagascar for the procuy of them and to proceed from thence directly to you which we hope she will be Successfull in and pray send us a Particularly account of what h and how many you receive by them . . .


The Chief &c. at Benzaulea advising us the great want of Coffeeyes for the Rt. Honble. Company[,] Servido them, we have thought fit to employ your Shipp, She being newly and well fitted on this Voyage for the buying of Slaves att Malagasy, to which purpose we have laden and consigned to you for the Right Honble. Company. And account a proper and Sufficient Stock and Cargo and which we refer to your care and management. Hoping you will answer our orders and expectations therein, but having noe Settlement or People their to Recommed you to, we must leave the more to your Discretion . . . so can give you no more then a General advice to deport your Selves and negotiate your business with care, caution and prudence, that you may neither fall into Surplice by the Natives, or give them any just occasion of offence or your Carriage and dealing with them; and the loading being chiefly in Coffeeyes we would have you buy so many of them so your Shipp is able to Carry with Conveniency and Safety . . . Records of Fort St. George, Letters from Fort St. George, 1859, pp. 33, 53.

R. C. T.

---

1. Compare the change of *tha* or *tha* into *ta* in *kistati* (= *akṣaṅkha*?) in the same Rock (IV), Shahbazgarhi.
2. Supra 51.
AUSTRIA'S COMMERCIAL VENTURE IN INDIA IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.
BY SIR R. C. TEMPLE, Bt.
(Continued from p. 34.)

III. Obstructive Measures at Madras towards Individuals concerned in the Austrian Venture.

Letter from the President and Council at Fort St George to the Court of Directors, dated 17 October 1778.81

The Imperial Ship [Joseph and Theresa] arriving here the 4th Inst., we have given strict orders that there shall be no other Communication with her on shore but for fresh water and Provisions.

Letter from Nathaniel Green, Consul at Trieste, to the Earl of Suffolk,82 dated Trieste, 1 January 1779.83

I have heard talk of an intention to build some large ships; some hint also that they may be of force, but others say they are to be for the East India trade, which I am told is to be managed by a Company established here some time ago under the title of the Priviledged Company of Fiume, the Adventurers in which are of Brueells [Brussels], Antwerp &c. I am told that Bolts has certainly been in China and that the ship is on her return destined for this Port, or at least that her Cargo will be sent hither, also that the French will permit ships to be purchased and fitted out at Port L'Orient [Brittany] for carrying on this trade. I have from another part pretty sure intelligence that Bolts was about 6 months ago on the coast of Coromandel and had had some dispute with an English frigate about some sailors; that his agent Ryan died at Madras; that he sold copper at 12 Per Cent loss, but other goods tolerably well, and that the Dutch caused him much trouble by refusing him Provisions.

Letter from Sir Thomas Rumbold84 and the Select Committee at Fort St. George to Sir Edward Hughes,85 dated 2 March 1780.86

We think it necessary to inform you that we understand Mr Macey, late a Lieutenant in the French Service at Chandernagore, entered in Bengal as an officer on board the small Imperial Ship now in the road, and which is to sail for Europe in a few days. He is said to be an active intelligent man, and as his going from hence at this time may be of prejudice to the Company Affairs, we request you will take measures for preventing his departure in that ship.

81 Madras Letters Received IX. 178.
82 Henry, 12th Earl of Suffolk, died 6 March 1779, was Principal Secretary of State for the Southern Department from 1771-1779.
83 State Papers, Foreign, Germany (Empire), Vol. 221 (Public Record Office). The information in this letter, if exact, would be most interesting, as Fiume, now the great Hungarian port, has always been the rival of Trieste, the great Austrian port. I have, however, been unable to trace this Company among the Records in England. From Consul Green's letter of 11 July 1783 (see infra), the new venture seems to have been styled the "Imperial India (or Asiatic) Company" and to it Bolt resigned the exclusive rights of trade obtained from Maria Theresa in 1775.
84 Sir Thomas Rumbold, Bt. (1736-1791), Governor of Madras 1778-1780.
85 Admiral Sir Edward Hughes (1720-1794), commander in the East Indies 1773-1777 and 1778-1783.
86 Madras Select Committee Consultations (1780), LXIX. 319-320.
Letter from Sir Edward Hughes to Sir Thomas Rumbold and Select Committee, Fort St. George, dated Ship Superb in Madras Road, 5 March 1780.

I yesterday received your letter of the 2nd Instant, informing me Monsieur Macey, late a Lieutenant in the French Service at Chandernagore, was serving as an officer on board the small Imperial Ship in this Road, and as his going from hence might be of prejudice to the Company's Affairs, requesting me to take measures to prevent his departure in that Ship.

I am now to acquaint You that, in consequence of your request to me, I ordered an Officer of the Squadron to demand Monsieur Macey of the Commander of the Imperial Ship as a Prisoner of War, and he is now on board the Superb, where he cannot be well accommodated, to wait your Determination for the future disposition of him.

Deposition of Louis Macé at Madras, dated 25 March 1780.

Louis Macé, native of the Port of L'Orient in France, declares upon oath that at the time Chandernagore was taken by the English, the 17th July 1778, he was on board a Dutch Ship then at the Dutch Settlement on the River Hughley, called Barnagore [Baranagar] that from that time he resided at Serampore, a Danish Settlement in Bengal, till the 27th August following, when he went on board ship and landed at the Danish Settlement of Tranquebar, where he resided for a considerable time till he engaged himself as a Marine Officer in the Service of the Imperial Asiatic Company of Trieste, having to that end, on the 27th of May 1779, taken the oath of allegiance to Her Imperial Royal Apostolick Majesty, Maria Theresa Empress Dowager Queen of Hungary, &c. &c. &c., which oath was administered to him by her Lieutenant Colonel, William Bolts, in consequence of the full powers granted to him by her said Majesty, under the seal of the Empire and under her own hand, dated at Vienna the 27th March 1776, which full powers the said William Bolts has caused to be shewn to and read by this Deponent. And this Deponent further makes oath that he never was made a prisoner of war, or otherwise, in any part of the dominions of Great Britain. He deposes, moreover, that on the 5th of this Instant March, he, this Deponent, being then an Officer commanding on board the Imperial Ship le Comte Kollowra in Madras Road, the Colours of Her said Imperial Majesty being then hoisted on board the said Ship, a boat came from the squadron now under the command of Rear Admiral Sir Edward Hughes, with two officers armed on board the said ship, and by force took this Deponent and carried him on board the said Admiral's ship, called the Superb, at present in Madras Road, and he deposes that, notwithstanding the representation which this Deponent made to the said officers of his situation as above, they replied they were obliged to carry him with them as they acted under the orders of the abovementioned Admiral. And this Deponent further deposes that he was kept a prisoner on board the said ship the Superb till he signed his Parole of honor not to leave the District of St. Thomé which is in the neighbourhood of Madras and the actual residence of the said Admiral. That in consequence of his said Parole, this Deponent went to St. Thomé, and to this moment continues, with the permission of the said Admiral, to remain at Madras without having been able to obtain his full liberty, notwithstanding many
Representations which he has had the honor of making to the said Admiral and to the Council of Madras at Fort St. George, at whose requisition the said Admiral told him he had caused him to be seized on board the said ship le Comte Kollowratth.

(signed) MACE.

After having made Oath in the presence of the Lord Mayor John Hollond (to the above), he, on the 26th March 1780 signed and attested it under his hand and afterwards caused the Seal of the Court of Justice to be affixed thereunto and registred and attested his said signature to be true.

A true Copy, Madras the 30th March 1780.

(Signed) Louis MACE.

Consultation of the Select Committee at Fort St. George, 14 April 1780. 

The Secretary lays before the Committee the following Letter from Mr William Bolts—

Charles Oakeley Esqr.

Sir, I request the favor of your laying before the Board at their first Meeting the accompanying Papers, in order to be transmitted to Europe in the most regular Channel. I have the honor to be Sir

Your most Obedient humble Servant

William Bolts,
Lieut. Colonel in the Service of their Imperial Royal and Apostolick Majesties.

Madras, the 3rd April 1780.

Enclosures
1. Deposition of Louis Mace. 


To all whom it doth or may concern, I the underwritten William Bolts as Lieutenant Colonel in the Service of their Imperial Royal and Apostolick Majesties, namely Maria Teresa Empress Dowager of the Romans, Queen of Hungary and Bohemia &c, Archduchess of Austria, &c, &c, and Joseph the Second, Emperor of the Romans, Hereditary Prince of the States of Austria and Co-regent with his said August Mother, and also as Chief Director in India for all Affairs of the Society of Merchants united for carrying on the Trade of Asia from and to Trieste, Greeting:

 Whereas on the 5th day of March 1780, by order of Sir Edward Hughes Bart., Rear Admiral and Commander in Chief of His Britannick Majesty’s Squadron now at Anchor within the Roads and Jurisdiction of Madras, a Boat armed with Men and Officers belonging to the said Squadron came suddenly on board the Imperial Ship Count Kollowratth, then also peaceably at Anchor within the Jurisdiction aforesaid, Her said Imperial Royal and Apostolick Majesty’s Colours being then flying on board the said Ship Kollowratth, and did forcibly take from on board the said Ship Kollowratth one Lewis Mace by birth a native

50 Madras Select Committee Consultations (1780), LXIX. 509-518.
51 See ante, p. 58.
52 Probably named after Adolphe Frédéric, Comte de Kalkreuth, Prussian Field Marshal (1736—179—)
of Port L'Orient in France, but by Naturalization a subject of their said Imperial Royal Apostolick Majestys to whom he hath taken the due and customary Oaths of fidelity and allegiance, the said Louis Macé being then the Commanding Officer on board the said Ship Kollonwathy, did then and there forcibly take and conduct him on board Ship of the said Squadron of His Britannick Majesty under the Command of the said Rear Admiral.

And whereas on the sixth day of the said Month of March, another Boat armed with Men and Officers belonging to the said Squadron did come on board the said Imperial Ship Count Kollonwathy, did take from on board of her one Julius Lindeman, a Native of Germany, who was then Chief Carpenter on board, having duly entered himself upon the said Ship's Books under the usual penalties, and received his advance Money for the Voyage to Trieste, and did conduct the said Julius Lindeman on board His Britannick Majesty's Ship called the Busford.

And whereas several Applications have been made by and on behalf of me the said William Bolts in the Name of My August Sovereign Her said Imperial and Apostolick Majesty to the said Rear Admiral Sir Edward Hughes, Bart., for to procure the enlargement and delivery of the said Louis Macé and Julius Lindeman, but without effect.

And whereas I the said William Bolts do conceive that the said acts of the said Sir Edward Hughes are in general violations of the universally acknowledged Rights of Nations, and in particular Acts of Hostility against the Crown and Dignity of my Soveraigns.

And Whereas the said Louis Macé is a man well experienced in the celestial observations, on which I the underwritten greatly depended for the safe direction of the said Ship's path to Trieste, and the business of a Carpenter is so very material that without the said Julius Lindeman, whose place I have not been able to supply, the said Ship proceeds on her Voyage under great risques.

For all these reasons I have thought it my indispensable duty to protest against the British Government and against all persons who may have acted under the Authority thereof respectively, in the Name of my said August Soveraigns, for such reparation as may be justly due to them for the injuries which I the underwritten humbly conceive are done by the Acts aforesaid to the Imperial Crown and dignity and in the name of the said Society of Merchants united for carrying on the trade of Asia from and to Trieste, for such Losses, Charges and Damages as may already have arisen and been incurred, or which may hereafter accrue or be sustained on Account of the Premisses; and particularly in case of the Loss of the said Ship and her Cargo on her intended Voyage to Trieste.

I have therefore thus publicly protested and by these Presents do for and on behalf of the aforesaid publicly protest against the British Government and against the said Rear Admiral Sir Edward Hughes Bart., The Honble. the President and Select Committee and Council of Madras, and all others who may have acted in the Premisses under the authority of the said Government, at the same time assuring each Individual Member thereof that, impressed as I am with the highest Veneration for their public Stations and Characters, and persuaded in my own mind that they have acted in the Premisses in Conformity to the orders received from their Constituents, I hope they will construe this Act on my part as it really is, an Act proceeding from an indispensable obligation and duty, and not from any other motive whatever.
In Witness whereof I the said William Bolts have on the behalf aforesaid hereunto set my hand and Seal in Madras this third day of April in the year of our Lord seventeen hundred and Eighty.

In the presence of

THOS. BAMBRIDGE

JOHN MULLENS

Registered upon the Records of the Honble. the Mayor's Court at Madraspatam this 3rd day of April 1780.

WILLIAM BOLTS,

Lieut.-Colonel in the Service of their Imperial Royal and Apostolick Majesties.

JAMES TAYLOR, Register

Agreed that the Court of Directors be advised of this Proceeding of Mr. Bolts by the first Dispatch.

Consultation at Fort St. George, 5 February 1781. 93

Read the following Memorial from Mr James Hegner.

To the Honble. Charles Smith Esqr. President &c.

Member of the Select Committee, Fort St. George.

The humble Memorial of James Hegner

Sheweth

That Your Memorialist is Super Cargo of the Snow Vienna, Burthen 80 Tons, which Snow was bought by Nazareth Satur 94 of Rangoon, Merchant, for account of their Imperial Majestys, the the Cost whereof, with her outfitting, amounted to the sum of (7000) Seven Thousand Rupees. That in the Month of September 1780 the said Snow sailed from Rangoon for Nanceour (one of the Nicobar Islands, and the property of their Imperial Majestys), 95 under the Command of Captain Daniel Bowles. That the said Snow arrived at Nanceour in the month of December last. That in the beginning of this month, Lieutenant Staht, the Imperial Resident at Nanceour, appointed Your Memorialist Super Cargo of the said Snow, with orders to touch at Atcheen [Achin, in Sumat-a], where a Cargo would be ready. That your Memorialist sailed from Nanceour the 5th Inst., and after beating up to Windward to the 17th, the said David Bowles declared that it was not in his power to fetch Atcheen and that he must sail for Madras. That on the 26 Instant, being nearly in the Latitude of Madras, we descried the French Fleet consisting of Seven Sail and were immediately after visited by some Officers belonging to a 60 Gun ship, who, after examining our Passport and Commission, ordered us not to leave the Fleet, but to follow them, which we did accordingly, and went to the northward of Polyacott [Pulecat] on the night of the 27th, when, on account of the fast sailing of the said Fleet, we lost sight of them, and as they shewed no Lights, we tacked about and Anchored in the Roads of Madras on the same Evening, and the Cable having broke, we set go a Second Anchor.

That at Sunrise of the 28th Inst. We hoisted the Imperial Colours, and being in distress fired a Gun for a Boat to come on board; soon after which Captain Bowles wrote a letter by a Cattamaran to the Master Attendant to inform him of the Name and Owner of the said Snow. And your Memorialist wrote to Mr Agavally Satur, Merchant of

93 Madras Select Committee Consultations (1789), V. 251-255.
94 The two merchants named Nazareth and Agavally Satur were evidently Persian Armenians from Julfa near Isphahan. The name Satur is nowadays sometimes transformed into Ch serotonin.
95 See ante, p. 12-13.
Madras, to order an Anchor and Cable on board, who in consequence thereof applied to
the Master Attendant for that purpose; soon after which your Memorialist came on shore to
deliver his letter and spoke to Mr Agavally Satur about the want which they were in for
the Anchor and Cable.

Your Memorialist Sheweth that the Anchor and Cable was not sent, and the old Cable
having broke about three o'clock in the afternoon of the 27th Inst., the Snow began to
drive, and the Officer on board hoisted a Signal of Distress and fired again. Notwithstanding
which, no assistance came, and the Officer was then obliged to hoist his Sails in order
to prevent the Snow from driving on Shore. That the Indiamen thereupon fired seven
or more sharp loaded Guns at the Snow, some of which shattered her Sails and Rigging and
then sent three boats on board with men armed with Cutlasses, who came alongside, and
altho' no resistance was made to their boarding the said Snow, they fell on the Snow's
Crew with their Cutlasses, treated them very ill, broke up many Chests and plundered
the Vessell, as if it had belonged to an Enemy. That afterwards they made the Snow
fast to one of the Indiamen, but as the Boats had returned, the Rope was cut and the
Snow drove on Shore, where she is now lost.

Your Memorialist further Sheweth that Captain Bowles hath lost all his things, and
what Money he had on board; That the Mate suffered a Considerable Loss; The Imperial
Soldier Suwald lost all he had, was very much beaten and ill used, and with difficulty
saved his Life. The Lascars have lost every thing. That your Memorialists effects were
plundered to the amount of eighty Pagodas, besides the loss of 90 Pieces of Blue Cloth to the
value of 400 rupees.

Your Memorialist sheweth that throughout the whole of this misfortune from his first
arrival in the Place to the hour the Snow was driven on Shore, every Act of Respect
and Attention was shown to the Honble. Company by your Memorialist, by the Captain
and by every person on board the said Snow, and that, by hoisting their Colours and
afterwards hoisting signals of distress and firing Guns, it was evident that nothing was
intended by those on board the said Snow but to save their own Lives. That their Imperial
Majesties are at peace with his Britannic Majesty and with the Honble. East India
Company, and as an instance of the attention of the Subjects of their Imperial Majesties to
those of the British Nation, your Memorialist sheweth that Captain Williams who was
taken by a French Cruizer and landed at the Nicobars was entertained for three months
at the expence of the said Mr Staht, the Imperial Resident, and was granted a free passage
on the said Snow Vienna to Madras.

Your Memorialist therefore as the immediate Subject, and as being in' the employ of
their Imperial Majesties submits to the consideration of the Honble. the Select Committee
that the violence which has been thus offered to the Colours of their Imperial Majesties
and their Subjects, and the loss of property which, has followed therefrom, being entirely
unmerited, ought to be redressed, and your Memorialist hopes that your Honors will be
pleased to grant such redress as the Case appears to deserve.

JAMES HEGNER

Madras, 31st January 1781.

Agreed that the above Memorial be referred to the Company's Standing Counsel and
his opinion requested thereon.
Letter from the Company's Standing Counsel respecting Mr Hegner's Memorial, dated Fort St. George, 9 February 1781.66

To Mr Secretary Sullivan.

Sir,

I have received your favor of the 7th Inst. enclosing me, by Directions of the President and Select Committee, a Copy of a Memorial delivered to them by Mr James Hegner and desiring my opinion on the subject of it. But as it is necessary, to enable me to form an opinion how it would be proper to act upon this occasion, that I should know what the Captains complained of have to offer in their justification, I think it would be right to send them a copy of the Memorial for that purpose. At present having but a partial view of the subject, it is impossible for me to form a satisfactory judgement of it. I request that you will acquaint the Hon'ble. President and Select Committee with this circumstance and am &c.

BENJAMIN SULLIVAN

Letter from the Secretary at Fort St. George to Mr James Hegner, dated 16 February 1781.67

The Hon'ble. President and Select Committee have received your Memorial. The Subject of it is under the consideration of the Company's Standing Counsel. When his Opinion is reported, I shall have the Command of Government to reply fully to you on the points in Question.

Letter from the Earl of Hillsborough68 to the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the East India Company, dated St. James's, 21 September 1781.69

Count Belgioioso, the Imperial Minister, having presented to me, by Order of his Court, two Memorials complaining of the proceedings of Vice Admiral Sir Edward Hughes, the Governors of the Company's Settlements in India, and particularly of the Governor General, against the subjects of His Imperial Majesty, I transmit to you herewith copies thereof, and of a Declaration upon Oath of Louis Macé1 inclosed in one of the Memorials.

I shall by the first Conveyance write to Sir Edward Hughes for what regards the Charge stated against him, as I do not find any mention in his Letters to me of those matters, but in case you may have received intelligence of what may have passed between that Admiral or the Governors in India and the Emperor's Subjects, I am to desire you will communicate the same to me, together with your opinion concerning the propriety of the Admiral's and Governor's Conduct, and if you have received no such notice, it will be highly necessary that you transmit by the very first conveyance to the respective Governors Copies of the inclosed papers, so far as regards them, and that you direct them to send you, as soon

66 Madras Select Committee Consultations (1781), V. 350.
67 Madras Select Committee Consultations (1781), V. 350.
68 Viscount Hillsborough, 1st Marquis of Downshire, Principal Secretary of State for the Northern Department 1779–1782.
69 Miscellaneous Letters Received, Vol. 69, No. 88.
70 Louis Charles Marie Belgioioso, Comte de Barbrano, born 1728, was Maria Theresa's ambassador (and after her death ambassador for Joseph II. of Austria) in London from 1770 to 1783.
71 See ante, p. 68.
as possible, circumstantial Accounts of what has happened, for His Majesty's Information, that I may be enabled to give proper Answers to Count Belgioioso thereupon.

Enclosures.


The undersigned Envoy Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary from Her Imperial and Royal Apostolick Majesty has the honor of transmitting to Lord Viscount Stormont the annexed deposition upon oath of Louis Macé, a naturalized subject of Her Imperial and Royal Apostolick Majesty, made at Madras the 5th March 1780, by which his Excellency will see in what manner that officer, then commanding the Ship *le Comte Kallowrath,* carrying the Imperial and Royal Flag as Lieutenant, was seized in Madras Road by order of Rear Admiral Sir Edward Hughes and detained as a Prisoner.

Her Imperial and Royal Majesty having commanded the undersigned to demand of His Britannick Majesty's Minister that the said Officer should be set at liberty, he acquits himself of that command by this Memorial, with the more alacrity as he is convinced that an act of violence so manifestly contrary to all that is due to a Power in amity could never have had the approbation of His Britannick Majesty.

(signed) Le Comte De Belgioioso

Portman Square, 21st June 1781.

2. *Memorial from the Count Belgioioso to the Earl of Hillsborough,* dated 13th December 1781.

The undersigned Envoy Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary from Her Imperial and Royal Apostolick Majesty had the honor of transmitting to your Excellency a Memorial dated the 21 June last, to demand satisfaction and reparation for an insult offered to the Imperial and Royal Flag in Madras Road the 5th March 1780 by the English Rear Admiral Sir Edward Hughes, in the violent seizure of one Louis Macé, a naturalized Subject of Her Imperial and Royal Majesty, engaged in her Service as Chief Officer of the Imperial Ship *le Comte de Kallowrath,* and being at that time commanding Officer on board that Ship.

But the undersigned has since learnt that this insult was followed by another of the same kind on the day after the seizure of Louis Macé, the same persons having come a second time armed on board *le Comte de Kallowrath,* [sic] and having, notwithstanding the remonstrance of the Officers, taken one Lindeman, a German, an Imperial Subject, and who was Master Carpenter of the Ship.

Not are these open violations of the rights of nations the only acts of injustice that the subjects of Her Imperial Royal Majesty concerned in the Asiatick Company of Trieste have experienced from the British Governments in India, and particularly from that of Bengal, which not only by publick notice forbid all the subjects of its Colony to have any communication with Her Imperial and Royal Majesty's subjects, but even carried its violence so far as, on the 27th of August 1779, to cause to be seized and detained a considerable quantity of Caliaton Redwood purchased on their account, without assigning any reason.

---

1. *Miscellaneous Letters Received*, vol. 69, No. 92.
2. *David, 7th Viscount Stormont and 2 Earl of Mansfield (1727—1796), Secretary of State for the Southern Department 1779—1782.*
4. This term probably means redwood from Kaliot (in South Kanara) near Mangalore, where Bolts had established a factory.
whatsoever for so doing, notwithstanding the Lieutenant Colonel and Director of the said Asiatick Company, William Bolts, repeatedly claimed it on the 2nd and 18th September following, declaring that he had paid the Duties due to the English Company on that article at Madras and that he was ready to satisfy all legal demands which could be made on the part of the said Government.

It being impossible that proceedings so unjust towards the subjects of a Power in amity, and so contrary to all that might be expected from the reciprocal sentiments of the two Courts can have had the approbation of His Britannick Majesty, the undersigned has orders to state them here as a sequel to the abovementioned Memorial transmitted by him to his Lordship on the 21st June last, and to demand the satisfaction which the honor of Her Imperial and Royal Majesty's Flag, as well as the interests of her commerce and of her Subjects require.

Her Imperial and Royal Majesty having both the one and the other so much at heart, the undersigned finds it his duty to pray that his Excellency will honor him with an answer in order that he may be enabled to give an account to his Court of this official step, which he has, by its express orders, taken in this Memorial and in the former one of the 21st June last.

(signed) LOUIS COMTE DE BELGIOioso

Portman Square, the 13th September 1781.

Letter from Lord Hillsborough to the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the
East India Company, dated St. James's, 21 November 1781.7

On the 22nd instant I transmitted to you copies of two Memorials which had been presented to me by Count Belgioioso, the Imperial Minister here, complaining of ill treatment which some of the Emperor's subjects are stated to have received from the Company's Governors and servants in India.

It is with concern that I now enclose to you copies of another Memorial from the same Minister with additional complaints of the like nature, as also of the two Papers accompanying it, marked No. 1 and 2, and I am to signify to you His Majesty's Plesure that you do take the same into your Consideration and acquaint me, for His Majesty's information, with every Intelligence you may already have received from India relative to the Facts so repeatedly complained of, together with such information and observations as may enable me to give without delay as satisfactory an answer as possible to Count Belgioioso.

Enclosures.

1. Translation of a Memorial from the Count de Belgioioso to the
Earl of Hillsborough, dated 21 November 1781.8

It is with the most just regret that the undersigned Envoy Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary from Her Imperial and Royal Apostolick Majesty once more finds it his duty to prefer complaints to His Britannick Majesty's Minister respecting an Act of violence offered by a British India ship at Madras on the 27th January last to the Imperial Snow,

---

6 See ante, pp. 32-34.
7 Miscellaneous Letters Received, vol. 69, No. 201.
8 Miscellaneous Letters Received, vol. 69, No. 205.
called the *Vienne*, which on her voyage from Pegu on account of the Imperial and Royal Asiatick Company established at Trieste, in order to supply its factory on the Nicobar Islands with stores, was forced by a storm to take shelter in Madras Road, after having lost all her Anchors; excepting one, and having made a signal of distress, the crew of a British ship which was there on guard boarded her, beat the crew, broke open several Chests of the Imperial Ship and caused her to run aground and to break in pieces.

The particulars of this new violence is contained in the annexed Piece, the proofs of which are not only in the possession of the undersigned, but advice thereof must have been already certainly received at the Company’s India house in London. It will suffice to convince the Earl of Hillsborough of the necessity which the undersigned finds himself under to demand, in the name of his August Court, the punishment of the persons culpable, and reparation on the part of the Company, as well for the value of the Snow *la Vienne*, as for her Cargo, both of which were entirely lost on this occasion through the unheard of conduct of a Ship’s crew belonging to the Company who were on guard that day.

An Action as contrary to humanity as to the Laws of Nations leaves me no room to doubt but that it must have been committed without the knowledge and against the orders of their Superiors, but it is not the less of a nature to merit the most serious attention on the part of his Britannick Majesty’s Minister, whose equity is so well known. He will certainly see with concern how little a similar conduct on the part of the Commanders and Servants of the British India Company agrees with the sentiments which, on all occasions, he has charged the undersigned to make known to his August Court, on the constant amity of the King, and that after these repeated assurances founded on the strict reciprocal amity which so happily reigns between the two Courts, it was doubtless to be hoped in favor of His Majesty the Emperor’s subjects and of his flag, that at least they should meet with the same reception and assistance in the possessions of His Britannick Majesty in India which is granted to all the other European nations in amity with him.

It is consequently with a perfect confidence in the justice of His Britannick Majesty that the undersigned has the honor of addressing himself again to his enlightened Minister to represent to him instantly the necessity, not only of causing complete satisfaction to be made for these insults offered to the Imperial and Royal flags in the East Indies, but for preventing in future, by giving such Orders as the King may think most proper to the proper persons, the repetition of similar acts of injustice and violence towards the Emperor’s subjects and that the latter may, in case of necessity, find every reception and assistance that the British Flag and subjects have ever found so particularly in all the Territories of the Austrian Monarchy.

The undersigned in calling to my Lord Hillsborough’s recollection the two preceding Memorials which he had the honor of transmitting to him on the 21st June and 13th September last, and of which the present may be deemed a continuation, cannot at the same time avoid offering to his Excellency the accompanying Piece No. 2 [as] a proof of what he set forth in the Memorial of the 13th September, on the almost hostile behavior on the part of the Directors of the India Company towards the Imperial subjects concerned in the fitting out the Ship under the Imperial Flag commanded by William Bolts, Lieutenant Colonel in the Imperial service and a subject of the Emperor and King. This Piece being Copy of a notice published by the Governor General and Supreme Council of
Fort William, conformably to the orders of the Directors of the India Company against the said Ship and her Commander, it cannot admit the smallest doubt of the fact.  

This proceeding towards subjects of a Power in amity with Great Britain must by its nature strike the equitable and enlightened Minister of His Britannick Majesty too forcibly to render it necessary that any ulterior reflections should be added. It has not, however, been the first, it being known in 1776 that the Directors of the British India Company, on the 24th December in that year wrote to the Governors of their Settlements in India, giving orders that they should jointly and severally employ the most efficient means to thwart and undermine the undertaking of the Ship Joseph and Theresa, adding that if they could effect the failure of this first expedition, it would not be followed by a second.

The undersigned attending the honor of Lord Hillsborough's answer in order to enable him to give an account thereof to his Court, has the honor to renew the assurances of his respect.

LOUIS COMTE DE BELGIOIOSO

Portman Square, the 21st November 1781.

B. 1. Testimony of divers Persons to the Violence offered by a British East India Ship to the Imperial Snow, Vienne at Madras the 29th January 1781.  

We the here underwritten Pilot, Succany [sukkani, quartermaster of a ship] and Soldiers of the Imperial Snow Vienna, make according to truth the following Declaration—

The 27th of January of this year 1781, in the Afternoon, we all being on board of the said Imperial Snow Vienna, the wind blowing hard, our Anchor Cable broke and we began to drive: there being no Anchor nor Cable more on board, the Pilot hoisted and tied the Colours and fired a Gun for sign of Distress, and made sail in order to preserve the Snow from running on shore. Immediately the Indiamen fired several Guns sharp loaded at her, and sent some boats with Officers and sailors on board, who, without paying any Attention to the Remonstrances of the Pilot and other People, fell upon them with Swords and Pistols, treated them very ill and chiefly beat the Soldier very sorely. They broke up violently several Chests, and behaved entirely as in an Enemy's Vessel. The Time the Boats were on board the Snow, the Indiamen fastened her with a Rope, but as soon as the Boats had left her, they cut off the Rope, and let them drive on Shore, where she was entirely broken and lost. The truth of which declaration we testify herewith with our handwriting.

Madras, the 28th January 1781.  

(Signed) Michel Seewald, Soldier  
Piloto, Joan Garcia  
succano, Manoel Mendeff  
succano, João de Cruz

Immediately after the loss of the Snow Vienna, I went to the Notary Public, Mr Stephen Popham, the 27th January 1781, about 8 o'clock at night, but he then not being home, I waited upon him the 28th, as the next following day, early in the morning, in order to make a Protest against the Violence committed against the Imperial Snow Vienna, but Mr Popham

---

9 See ante, p. 30, for a copy of this document.  
10 Miscellaneous Letters Received, vol. 68, No. 298.
said he would not make any protest against his own Nation, but offered to draw up in my Name a Petition to the Governor and Council of Madras. Therefore, as I could not do better, I agreed to this Proposition, in order to try what Satisfaction I would be able to get. The Truth of this I testify hereby, and desire the Gentlemen who were present at this Transaction to testify the same by their Handwriting.

Madras 28th January 1781.
(Signed) James Hignier, [sic] Supercargo of the Snow Vienna
(signed) Nicolas Renaud
(signed) Agapeery Thaddeus Callandar

I was present at this transaction.


Letter from the Court of Directors to the Councils at Madras and Bombay, dated 25 January 1782.13

We transmit for your information and guidance copies of two letters from His Majesty’s Secretaries of State respecting Mr Bolts, together with the representations of Count Belgioioso, the Imperial Minister, and we strictly enjoin and charge you to take especial care that no just cause of offence be henceforth given to any subject of his said Imperial Majesty or to the subjects of any Prince or State whatever in amity with Great Britain.

* * *

In addition to what we have written in a former paragraph of this letter concerning the representations of His Excellency Count Belgioioso, the Minister of His Imperial Majesty, we further direct that you forthwith prepare and transmit to us as soon as possible, the most circumstantial account of all that has happened, together with reasons at large for your proceedings in every instance which has been made a ground of complaint, and which may enable His Majesty’s Secretary of State to return proper answers to the representations of His Excellency the Count Belgioioso.

Letter from Robert Ritchie to the Chairman of the East India Company, dated Venice, 6 May 1781.14

The two Imperial East India ships [the Joseph and Theresa and her consort] that arrived at Leghorn sometime ago are not to proceed to Trieste as was at first intended. Their cargoes are actually selling and to be sold at Leghorn. Mr. Bolts seems to be protected by the Grand Duke [of Tuscany]. An English merchant has, however, laid an attachment on all his effects.

Letter from the Court of Directors to the Councils at Madras and Bombay, dated 29 August 1781.15

We have been informed that the ship Great Duke of Tuscany, under Tuscan Colours, being an English vessel bought by Mr. Bolts since the French war commenced, with a valuable cargo from the Coast of Coromandel, was seized at the Cape of Good Hope by two French frigates and condemned by them in virtue of the French King’s declaration, the Dutch Governor not chusing to interfere. The same frigates are said to have taken in

---

11 This is also the name of a Jewish Armenian merchant of Julfa.
12 See ante, p. 30.
13 Bombay Dispatches, VI. 297, 388.
14 The Company’s agent at Venice.
15 Miscellaneous Letters Received, vol. 68, No. 221b. Bombay Dispatches, VI. 169—170.
that harbour an English Packet homeward bound, but from whence dispatched is not known to us, nor the name of the ship. We direct that you make a strict and particular enquiry whether any and who of our servants or persons under our protection were concerned in the above ship bought by Mr Bolts or had any interest therein which occasioned her condemnation, as also to make the most minute enquiry who of our servants or persons under our protection had any concerns or transactions in the promotion of any trade carried on by foreigners, or in furnishing them by any means with ships or vessels for the purpose of carrying on such trade or otherwise.

**General Letter from Fort St. George to the Court of Directors,**

*dated 31 August 1782.*

Upon Enquiry We found that the Ship *Great Duke of Tuscany*, mentioned in your Letter of the 29th August 1781, had been loaded and dispatched by Mr Bolts from Bengal directly to Europe and did not touch at this place. But as We wished to put your Commands in Effect to their extreme Extent, We ordered the Sea Customer’s Books to be examined to discover whether any Persons living under the Company’s Protection had been concerned in shipping goods in the vessels that were in this Port in 1780 under the Direction of Mr Bolts. The names of some European inhabitants now residing here were in consequence reported to be found as having shipped Merchandize on them, and We thought proper to call on those Persons to acquaint Us if they had acted upon this Occasion on their own Account or on the Account of others, and of whom. They have in answer declared a total ignorance of the whole transaction except in one instance of a very trifling Quantity, and that their names had probably been made use of by their Servants. We shall however make every possible further Enquiry into this Business for your Satisfaction.

*(To be continued.)*

**DEKKAN OF THE SATAVAHANA PERIOD.**

*By Prof. D.R. Bhandarkar, M.A., Calcutta.*

**CHAPTER I.**

**POLITICAL HISTORY.**

There is hardly anybody in the Dekkan who has not heard of Sātavāhana, or Sālivāhana as he is popularly known. Curiously, however, Sālivāhana or Sātavāhana is supposed to be the name, not of a royal family as it ought to be, but of an individual king. Various traditions are known about the birth of this prince and the origin of his name Sātavāhana. Somadeva in his *Kathāsaritsāgara* tells us that he was the son of a Yaksha named Sāta from the daughter of a sage. The union of this couple was not liked by the Rishis, and through the curse of the latter the former became a lion and lioness. When the son was born, the latter died and assumed her previous body. The son thereafter was one day being carried on his back by the lion father, and while the latter dismounted and the former went to the bank of a river close by to quench his thirst, a king called Dipakarni slew him with an arrow whereupon he at once became a Yaksha again. And because the boy was being carried by the Yaksha Sāta, he was styled Sātavāhana, (Śāṭh vāhanah yasya saḥ.) Jina-prabhasūrī in his *Tirtha-kalpa,* gives a different account. In Pratishthāna or Paiṭhan in Nizam’s Dominions there lived two Brāhmaṇ brothers in the house of a potter with their young
widowed sister. One day she went to the bank of the Godāvari to fetch water, when Sessa, king of serpents, became enamoured of her. He assumed the human form and had connexion with her against her will. In course of time she gave birth to a boy, who, when he grew up and played with his companions, used to become their king. And because he used to give them clay horses, elephants and other conveyances, he was called Sātavāhana (sāthāmi datāmi rājanāti yena sah Sātavāhanāh). Soon after, Vikramāditya, king of Ujjain, when he heard that he was to die at the hands of a virgin’s son, despatched his Vetāla or king of ghosts in search of him. Vetāla saw Sātavāhana and informed Vikramāditya. The latter came with a large army to destroy the child, but Sātavāhana, by means of an incantation communicated to him by his father Sessa, infused life into the clay figures with which he was in the habit of playing, and at once raised a large army. He gave battle to Vikramāditya, killed him, and instituted an era called Sālivāhana-śaka commencing with A.D. 78.

Such would have been our knowledge of the ancient history of the Dekkan, if we had had mere legends to go upon. Fortunately for us inscriptions have been found in sufficient numbers, and it is possible to construct a history which is reliable. If these inscriptions had not been found, to this day we should have continued believing that Sātavāhana was the name of a king and not of a dynasty and that he was the founder of the era beginning with A.D. 78. The latter question does not concern us here, and we may dismiss it with a few words. The phrase Sālivāhana-śaka, which is used at present in Mahārāṣṭra to denote this era, has really no meaning, because the word Saka has in no Sanskrit lexicon been given as signifying “an era.” And what inscriptions teach us is that up to the eleventh century it was called Śaka-bāla, Saka-nripa-bāla, or, as in an inscription at Badāmī in the Bijāpur district, Saka-nripa-rājyābhiseka-bāla, showing clearly that it was believed to be founded by a Saka king and that Sālivāhana or Sātavāhana had absolutely nothing to do with it. Let us now see in detail what we can know of the Sātavāhana dynasty from epigraphic records, which are the principal and most reliable source of our information here. These inscriptions have been engraved in caves at Nāsik, Kārle, Jumār, Kanheri and so forth. The names of some of the kings of this family mentioned in epigraphs occur also in the list of the Andhra dynasty enumerated in the Purāṇas, such as the Vāyu, Mātaya and Vīṣṇu. The founder of this family is therein described as Andhra-jātiya, i.e. as belonging to the Andhra race. It, therefore, behoves us to say a few words about the Andhras before the actual account of the Sātavāhana dynasty is concerned.

We learn for the first time about the Andhras from the Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa, a work which was certainly composed long prior to 500 B.C. Andhras are there represented as a Dasyu tribe living on the fringes of the Aryan settlements and to have descended from Viśvamitra. Evidently this means that they were a non-Aryan race, and that at the time when the Brāhmaṇa was compiled there was an admixture of blood between them and the Aryans, especially the hymn-composing Aryans. The next notice of this people is to be found in a well-known passage of Pliny, the Roman encyclopædist, whose information was doubtless derived from the writings of Megasthenes, who we know was an ambassador sent by Seleucus to the court of Chandragupta, the founder of the Maurya dynasty. He describes the Andhras, or the Andarā as he calls them, as a powerful race, “which possesses numerous villages and thirty towns defended by walls and towers, and which supplies its king with an army of 100,000 infantry, 2000 cavalry, and 1000 elephants.” From this we infer that about 300 B.C. the Andhra country was thickly inhabited and occupied by a large urban

---
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population, and their kingdom was then an important second-rate independent power of India. The next important notice of this people is supplied by Asoka’s Rock Edict XIII promulgated about 256 B.C. It speaks of many independent and feudatory princes to whose kingdoms the Maurya monarch dispatched missionaries. In this connection the king of the Andhras is mentioned, but his name is included in the list of those of the feudatory princes. We thus see that about 300 B.C. the Andhra king was independent but was a subordinate chief about 256 B.C. We know from Asoka’s inscriptions that Kaliiga was the only province which he conquered. Evidently the Andhras were deprived of their independence either by Chandragupta or his son Bindusāra.

We do not hear of the Andhras again till about 75 B.C. The Purāgas tell us that one Siśuka (Simuka) of the Andhra race uprooted not only the Kāervas, but also “whatever was left of the power of the Suṅgas,” who, we know, supplanted the Maurya dynasty to which Asoka belonged. It appears that the Kāervas, like the Peshwas of the modern day, usurped the power of their masters, the Suṅgas, and that Siśuka (Simuka) by supplanting the power of the Kāervas supplanted that of the Suṅgas also.⁶

The Telugu country lying between the rivers Kistna and Godāvari is called Andhra-deśa at present. But whether or not it was the original home of the Andhras, has been called in question. One Buddhist Jātakā,⁷ however, speaks of two traders going from the Seriva kingdom to a town called Andhapura situated on the Telavāha river. Andhapura certainly corresponds to the Sanskrit Andhrapura, and as pura is invariably used in early Pāli literature to signify a capital-town, Andhrapura must mean the capital town of the Andhra kingdom. The river Telavāha is either the modern Tel or Telingiri⁸ both not far distant from each other and flowing near the confines of the Madras Presidency and the Central Provinces. This, indeed, locates the original Andhra country which must, therefore, have comprised parts of both these provinces.

The name of the Andhra dynasty that came to power about 75 B.C. is Śatavāhana. There can be no doubt that the order of succession of its first three kings has been correctly given by the Purāgas, viz. (1) Siśuka (Simuka),⁹ (2) Krishṇa, and (3) Śrī-Śātakarṇi. Krishṇa, we are told, was a brother of Simuka and father of Śrī-Śātakarṇi. No record of Simuka has come to light, but of Krishṇa we possess an inscription in a cave at Nasik. It tells us that the cave was scooped out by the Mahāmātra Sramaṇa; inha ṣtant of Nasik, when Krishṇa of the Śatavāhana family was the king.¹⁰ Of the third prince, Śātakarṇi we have two inscriptions, the most important of which has been engraved in the cave at Nāṇaghāṭ, a pass in the Western Ghāṭa in the Poona District. Though it is mutilated, it is of great importance. In the same cave figures have been carved on the front wall with their names inscribed above them, which are supposed to represent the royal personages referred to in the big inscription. A combined study of these monuments gives us the following results. Śātakarṇi was the supreme ruler of Dakshināpatha (Dekkan). His queen was Nāganikā. They together performed a number of sacrifices, and Aśvamedha we are told was celebrated twice—which
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⁶ El., II. 471. ⁷ Vide Appendix A. ⁸ I. 111. 5-8. ⁹ I owe this suggestion to my friend Mr. K. P. Jayaswal. ¹⁰ Simuka is the name given by a Nāṇaghāṭ inscription (ASWI., V. 64, No. 2) and must therefore represent the correct original (ibid, 69-70). ¹⁰ El., VIII. 93, No. 22.
is a clear indication of Śatākaraṇi being a paramount sovereign.11 Nāganikā was the daughter of the Māharāthi Tranakayiro of the Angiya family. She had two sons, viz. Vedēśrī and Śaktisērī (Hakusērī). When the inscription was actually incised, Śatākaraṇi was dead and queen Nāganikā was regent during the minority of her son Vedēśrī. There can be no doubt that Śatākaraṇi was a powerful monarch. For the Hāthigumpha inscription gives us to understand that he was the ruler of the whole country to the west of Kaliṅga.12 Śatākaraṇi, it is true, has been styled the paramount sovereign of Dakshinēpatha, but it does not at all mean that his might was confined to the Dekkan only. His second inscription has been found on an arched gateway (toraṇa) of the celebrated stūpa at Sānchi13 in the Bhopāl State, Central India. This shows that Māḷavā also owned his sway, and it is quite possible that his power was extended still further north.

A long interval intervenes between the earlier and the later inscriptions of the Śatavahana dynasty. A period of 80 years has been unanimously allotted by the Purāṇas to the first three kings just described. According to this calculation the third king, viz., Śatākaraṇi, ceased to reign in A.D. 16. Gautamiputra (Śatākaraṇi), according to the Purāṇas, came to the throne in A.D. 133, which fits excellently as we shall see shortly. There was thus an interval of 117 years during which no Andhra inscription has so far been found. Of course, we can imagine that Vedēśrī, when he came of age, succeeded to the throne of his father Śatākaraṇi. His name, it is true, is nowhere mentioned in the Purāṇas, but as a king is described also by his epithets, it is possible that Apīlava or Apatāka may be another name for Vedēśrī. The Purāṇas show a remarkable agreement in point of the names and the lengths of the individual names. We may therefore provisionally fill up this long period with reigns recorded in the Purāṇas. It is true that no Andhra inscription has been discovered during this interval, but a good many epigraphic records are known which belong to this period. They clearly tell us that an alien dynasty had risen to power and had for a time eclipsed the glory of the Śatavahanas.

The name of the new dynasty was Kṣaharātṛa, and its members called themselves Kṣhattrapāṇa. The name Kṣhattrapa is worth considering. At first sight it seems tempting to take the name to mean Kṣhattrapāṇi pātiti Kṣhattrapah, the protector of the warrior class. But such a title is unknown to Sanskrit or Prakrit literature, and must be taken to have been borrowed from a foreign language—a conclusion strengthened by the fact that all the early chiefs of the Kṣhattrapāṇa families bear foreign names. Like the Greek term Satrap, Kṣhattrapa seems to be a Sanskrit adaptation of the old Persian Kṣhattrapāvan, "protector of the kingdom", which was used to denote the governor of a Persian province. Four Kṣhattrapa Houses have

---

11 Böhler wrongly supposes that the sacrifices narrated in the large Nāṅgāhē inscription were all performed by the queen Nāganikā. He himself admits that "according to the Śatras, women are not allowed to offer Śrauta sacrifices, and that the Brāhmaṇas who perform such sacrifices for them (stṛiyājaka) are severely blamed." It is true he further says, that "that prohibition does not apply to queens who may be conducting the government of a state, either independently or for minor sons," but this is a mere gratuitous assumption as no proof has been adduced by him in support of his position. Again, the Nāṅgāhē record speaks of Āsvamedha sacrifice as having been twice performed. It is inconceivable that Nāṅgāhē, even as queen-regent, celebrated it of her own accord and to indicate her paramount sovereignty. An Āsvamedha sacrifice is performed by a king who lays claims to universal monarchy by conquering all neighbouring princes, and as Nāganikā's husband Śatākaraṇi has been styled apratihatachakru, it is proper and natural to suppose that it was he who celebrated the sacrifice twice. What appears to be the case is that Śatākaraṇi it must be, who carried out the sacrifices referred to in the epigraph, and as all sacrifices are performed by Yajamanas along with their consorts, Nāganikā has been associated with him.

12 Lüders' List of Brāhmaṇa Inscriptions, No. 345.
13 Ibid, No. 346.
so far been traced in the different parts of India from their inscriptions and coins. A few isolated names of Kshatrapas and Mahākshatrapas have also been found, but the exact province of their rule not yet known. Two of the four Kshatrapa families ruled over Western India, but here we have to deal with only one of them. It was again only one prince of this family with whom we are directly concerned. His name was Nakabhāna, and it was he who seems to have wrested Mahārāṣṭra from the Sātavāhanas. He has been mentioned in no less than eight cave inscriptions. Of these six have been cut in Cave No. 10 of the Pāṇḍu Lēgā near Nasik, one in the Chaitiya cave at Kārle, and one in a cave at Junnar. All of these except the last specify the many charitable and publically useful works of Ushavadā, who calls himself son-in-law of Nakabhāna and son of Dīnīka. All these records give Nakabhāna's family name Kshaharāta which, in Prakrit forms, appears as Khaharāta or Khukharāta. For a long time Nakabhāna was the only Kshaharāta prince known to us. A few years ago, another Kshatrapa of the Kshaharāta clan, named Bhūmak, was brought to light by the celebrated numismatist, Prof. E. J. Rapson, by carefully reading the legends of certain coins wrongly attributed to Nakabhāna. He was the immediate predecessor of Nakabhāna in Rājputānā and Mālwa, but does not seem to have ruled over Mahārāṣṭra. A fragmentary inscription found by Dr. J. Ph. Vogel on the site of Gāneshrā, three miles west of Mathurā, revealed the name of yet another Kshaharāta, viz., Ghatāka, who, if the restoration proposed by him, is correct, was also a Kshatrapa.

It has just been mentioned that of the eight inscriptions which refer themselves to the reign of Nakabhāna, no less than seven describe the benefactions of his son-in-law Ushavadā (Rishabhādatta) and the latter's wife Dakhamātī (Dakshamātrī). Most of these charities stamp Ushavadā as a staunch adherent of the Brahmanical religion, and these we will describe in the next lecture. Ushavadā's other charitable works were the gifts of gold and river-side stones on the river Barjāsā and the bestowing of thirty-two thousand cocoanut trees at the village Nāmāgola on the congregation of Charakas at Pinātikāvāja, Govardhana, Suv匣amukha and Rāmatīrtha in Sopārāga. Among the works of public utility executed by him may be mentioned quadrangular dwellings for Brāhmaṇas and rest-houses at Bharukachha, Daśapura, Govardhana and Sopārāga and the establishment

\[16 \text{Ibid., Nos. 1099, 1131-1136 and 1174.} \]
\[17 \text{Ibid., 1912, pp. 121-2.} \]
\[18 \text{Ibid., Nos. 111 (EL VI, 9; AS, I., 1911-12, 128-9).} \]
\[19 \text{This name is not the Hinduised form of a foreign name as has been thought by some; for it has been mentioned in the Kāleśvara as the name of a Brāhmaṇa (SBE. XXII. 229). This name occurs also in Kāleśvara No. 11 (EL. VII. 66; AS, I., IV. 91) as the name of the father of one Mitradēvanaka, hailing from Dhenukākā, and bearing the expense of a pillar in the Kāleśvara cave. M. Senarīki identifies him with Ushavadā, son-in-law of Nakabhāna, and Prof. Rapson agrees with him (CIC. A. W. 2, etc., Intro. Ix). I am afraid I cannot accept this view. We have got an inscription of Nakabhāna's son-in-law in this case recording the grant of a village to the Buddhist monks residing in it. Evidently he made this grant after the cave was excavated. But as Mitradēvanaka incurred the expenses of carving one pillar in this cave, it is clear that his gift was in time prior to its excavation. Mitradēvanaka's father, Ushavadā, cannot, therefore, be the same as Ushavadā, son-in-law of Nakabhāna.} \]
\[20 \text{Barāsā corresponds with the Sanskrit Parāsā mentioned in the Mahabharata and the Pārāśaras and with the modern Banās, which is the name of two rivers in Rājputānā—one coming from Mount Abi and falling into the Gulf of Cutch and the other a tributary of the Chambal. The former river can hardly be meant, as it rarely contains any water except during the rains.} \]
\[21 \text{Perhaps Nāgolā on the Tīrā sea-board, four miles west of Sanjān, as proposed by Bhagwānlā Indraj.} \]
\[22 \text{These seem to be identical with the Charakas who are named in the stereotyped formula of the Buddhist texts (e.g., Mahātu, III, 412, vaivas-triika-charaka-parivājakā) and Jain texts, namely, a certain special category of Brahmanical ascetics (EL, VIII, 79).} \]
\[23 \text{This is Govardhan-Gaṇgāpur, six miles west of Nasik.} \]
\[24 \text{Sopārā near Basien in the Čhāpa district. A holy reservoir here is still called Raπa-kurda.} \]
\[25 \text{Modern Broach.} \]
\[26 \text{Mandasor (Fleet, GJ., 79, n. 2), which is on the borders of Rajasthan and Mālwa.} \]
of free ferries across and the erection of waiting places and  prapās or gratuitous distribution of drinking water on the banks of the Ibā, Pārādā, Damaṇa, Tāpī, Karabaṇa and Dāhānukā.  

Ushavadāṭa was no doubt a follower of the Brahmanical faith, but according to the catholic spirit of the age, he was by no means slow to extend his charities even to the Buddhist community. Thus his Kärle inscription speaks of his granting the village of Karajika for the support of the monks residing during the rainy season in the caves of Valāraka, which was unquestionably the name of the old place within whose bounds the caves were situated. Nāśik Cave No. 10, again, was caused by him to be cut in the Trirāsi hills in Govardhana. This cave, we are told, was spacious enough to accommodate twenty Buddhist monks during the rains. Like a true liberal donor Ushavadāṭa had made ample provision for their comfortable maintenance. Thus for supplying food to them, he purchased a field for 4,000 Kārśhāpāṇas on the north-west side of Govardhana. He also made a perpetual endowment of 3,000 Kārśhāpāṇas, 2,000 of which were deposited in one weavers' guild and 1,000 in another—both of Govardhana, and at the rates of one and three-fourths per cent per mensem respectively. The first investment yielded a sum of 240 Kārśhāpāṇas, of which a sum of 12 Kārśhāpāṇas was made over to every one of the twenty monks for his chīvāra or garments. From the annual interest of 90 Kārśhāpāṇas, accruing from the other deposit, each monk was granted a Kuśaṇa.  

The Jamnarcave inscription of the time of Naḥapāna records the gift of a cistern and a hall by Ayana (Aryanā) of the Vatsa gotra, his minister (nāgāyana). It is worthy of note that this epigraph specifies the date 46 and speaks of Naḥapāna as Mahā-kshatrapa, whereas the Kärle and Nāśik records give the dates 41, 42 and 45 and call Naḥapāna only a Kshatrapa. Naḥapāna struck both silver and copper coins. In point of weight, size and fabric, coins of the first class agree with the hemi-drachms of the Graeco-Indian princes, Apollodotus and Menander, which, as the author of the Periplus tells us, were up to his time current in Barugasa (Beach). Naḥapāna's silver coins were of extreme rarity until the discovery, ten years ago, of a hoard of at least 14,000 coins at Jogaltembhi in the Nāśik district. From an examination of the busts on the four specimens of Naḥapāna's coins in his possession Pandit Bhagwanlal Indraji had inferred that they were struck at different ages of the king and that whereas the earliest had the face of a man 30 years old, the latest, of a man 70 years of age.  

But the Jogaltembhi hoard conclusively proves that we have here faces varying not only in age but in every feature. The various types of the face which this hoard presents, viz., short-necked, straight-nosed, hook-nosed, low forehead and high forehead, lean face and fat face, cannot possibly represent one and the same individual even at different ages. The Rev. H. R. Scott, who has given a full account of this interesting and important find, solves the difficulty by saying that the heads represented are those of the members of Naḥapāna's family, who caused their own likenesses to be engraved on the coins whilst keeping the inscription of Naḥapāna unchanged, as he was the founder of the family. This does not however, meet the case, and it seems that these faces are not likenesses at all, but merely copies of Roman coins—an inference strengthened by the figures on plates accompanying Mr. Scott's article, "where the head-dress, the style of dressing the hair, the absence of moustache, and, above all, the shape of the head and features are very similar to the heads on coins of the Roman emperors of from 30 B.C. to A.D. 150"  

---

55 Bhagwānḍāl Indraji identifies Ibā with Ambikā, Pārādā with Pār, and Karabaṇa with Kāvērī—all in South Cūjrāt. Damaṇa, of course, is the Damaṇgāṇī river, and Dāhānukā the Dāhānū creek.
56 E.I., VII. 57–8.
57 This seems to be the name for the silver coins struck by Naḥapāna. See further in the text.
58 I.A., VIII.
59 JBBRAS., XXII. 223 and ff.
60 JRAS., 1890, 643.
61 JBBRAS., XXII. 236.
62 Ibid., 237.
63 JRAS., 1908, 551.
The obverse of Nahapâna’s silver coins bears Head of king just described and an inscription in the Greco-Roman characters. When only four specimens were known, this legend could not be deciphered, but with the find of thousands of his coins at Jogalātembhi it has now become possible to read it and was first read beyond all doubt by Mr. Scott who has found it to be an almost exact transliteration of the Brâhmî inscription on the reverse.

It runs thus:

\[ \text{PANIKU IAHAAPATAC NAHAAPANAC.} \]

Though this legend is essentially Greek, it contains the Roman H with the values both in his proper and tribal names.\(^{34}\) The reverse of the coins has, on the left, an arrow pointing downwards, and, on the right, a thunderbolt, with a pellet in between. It bears two legends—one in Brâhmî, and the other in Kharoshthi characters. The first reads Rajitā Kshavaratasa Nāhāpāṇasa; and the second, Rajitā Chkharatasa Nāhāpanasa. Nahapâna’s copper coinage is at present represented by a solitary specimen in the possession of Cunningham who found it in Ajmer. The obverse is engraved with a thunderbolt on the left and an arrow pointing downwards on the right. Of the inscription incised on it, only the letters Nāhāpâna have been preserved. On the reverse appears a tree, with large leaves, within railing. Pandit Bhagwanlal Indraji also is reported to have possessed two more specimens which came from Mandasor. Nothing is, however, known about their present whereabouts.

The extent of Nahapâna’s rule may be inferred from the places where his coins have been found and the localities where his son-in-law Ushavadāta made benefactions. It stretched as far north as Ajmer in Râjputānā and included Kāthiāwār, S. Gujarāt, Western Mālavā, North Kōkan from Broach to Sopārā, and the Nāsik and Poona districts. As some of his coins have been found at Junāgādh, Surāshṭra or Kāthiāwār must have been under his sway.

In one mutilated inscription in Nāsik Cave No. 10, a charity of Ushavadāta’s seems to have been made at Ujenī (Ujjain). This shows that Nahapâna’s kingdom comprised at least Western Mālavā. There can be no doubt that it extended as far northwards as Ajmer. For both at Ajmer and Pushkar his coins have been found. Besides that is proved by a postscript to Nāsik Inscription 10 in Cave No. 10. Therein we are informed that in the rainy season he had gone in the north, at the command of his lord who can be no other than Nahapâna, to relieve the Chief of the Uttamabhadbhadas who had been besieged by the Mālayas.

The Mālayas fled away at the mere sound of his approach and were all made prisoners of the Uttamabhadbhadas. Ushavadāta is represented to have thereafter repaired to the Poksharas, performed ablutions, and given three thousand cows and a village. Poksharas is obviously Pushkar, 7 miles west of Ajmer. The word actually used is Poṣharāṣi,\(^{35}\) the plural and not singular. Even to this day, not one or two but three, Pushkars are known—jyeshtha, madhya and kamisha all situated within a circuit of six miles. And as Ushavadāta bathed there and gave cows and a village, it shows that even so early as the 2nd century A.D., Pushkar was a centre of Brāhmānism. And the very fact that Ushavadāta here granted a village, which to be of real use must have been in the vicinity of this sacred place, shows that Nahapâna’s dominions stretched as far northwards as Ajmer and Pushkar. The Mālayas whom he defeated must, of course, be the Mālavas,\(^{36}\) who at this time were settled in the eastern part of Râjputānā, especially in the south-east portion of the Jaipur State.

---

\(^{34}\) Ibid., 1907, 1044.

\(^{35}\) This has been wrongly translated “Pokshara tanka” by M. Smuts (El., VIII, 79) and “Pushkara lakes” by Prof. Linder (List, No. 1131). So far as I know there is only one lake at Pushkar, but three different Pushkars are known within a circuit of six miles, as stated in the text.

\(^{36}\) As in the case inscriptions of this period e is sometimes replaced by y. I have no doubt that Mālaya equates here with Mālava. Thus the correct form of the name of Gautamputra Sātakarī’s son is Pulumāvī, as evidenced by the Parānas and his coins (Raspone’s CIC. —I. Wk., 20-22). But in the case inscriptions it is spelt Pulumiyi except in one instance. That the Mālavas were settled at this time in eastern Râjputānā is proved by their coins (Smith’s CCIM, I. 161-2).
It was, therefore, quite natural for Ushavadāta to have gone to Pushkar after inflicting a defeat on the Mālavas.

The concluding portion of Nāṣik Inscription 12 speaks of Ushavadāta having given to gods and Brāhmaṇs a gift of 70,000 Kārshāpaṇas, the value of two thousand Suvarṇas, counting 35 Kārshāpaṇas for one Suvarṇa. The reference here, as Prof. Rapson rightly says, must surely be to the contemporary gold currency of the Kushanas, which we must, therefore, suppose to have been prevalent in Nahapāna's kingdom. Neither the Indo-Bactrian princes nor the Indo-Scythian kings before the Kushanas are known to have struck gold coinage, which was for the first time introduced by Kadphises II., the second of the Kushana sovereigns. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Nahapāna was a viceroy of Kadphises II. There was yet another type of coins current in these parts but introduced by Nahapāna, which seems to have an intimate connection with the name of the Kushana family and to show that he was a subordinate of another Kushana ruler. Nāṣik Inscription 12 which speaks of Suvarṇas also makes mention, as stated above, of Kuṣaṇas, which were to be given to the Buddhist mendicants occupying Ushavadāta's cave. Ushavadāta deposited a sum of 1,000 Kārshāpaṇas at the monthly rate of ¼ percent, and yielding therefore an annual interest of 90 Kārshāpaṇas. This amount of 90 Kārshāpaṇas, we are told, was the Kuṣaṇa-mūla, i.e., the value of Kuṣaṇas. The word Kuṣaṇa has very much exercised all the editors of the Nāṣik cave inscriptions. M. Senart, however, has clearly shown that it must correspond with the word padika in the expression Chivirika šolasaka (sometimes bārasaka) padika cha māše utukāle and other similar phrases which occur in the Kaṇheri inscriptions. As the words Chivirika bārasaka of this expression are actually found in the Nāṣik record, the words Kuṣaṇa-mūla which immediately follow in it must, as correctly pointed out by M. Senart, be taken to correspond with padika cha māše utukāle of the Kaṇheri inscriptions.

Unfortunately, however, he takes it to mean "a monthly stipend, assigned to every monk during a certain period of the year, and probably to be applied to his food." This does not appear to me to be quite in order, because, as the last postscript of Nasik Inscription 10 informs us, Ushavadāta had already provided for the boarding of the monks by assigning a field. It seems more natural, therefore, to take Kuṣaṇa, like Padika (= Pratika), as denoting a specific coin. And to me the name appears to have been given to the silver coinage of Nahapāna, because he issued it for his overlord who must have been known as Kuṣaṇa, i.e., Kushana. We have instances of coins named variously after the kings who struck them. Thus we have Vighrapāla-drammas and Ajayapāla-drammas, no doubt, called after the proper names of the kings. Coins have also been named after the epithets or titles of kings. Thus Śrīmad-Ādīvarāha-drammas have been so styled after the epitheth Ādīvarāha of Bhoja I. of the Imperial Pratihāra dynasty. These coins are also called Śrīmad-Ādīvarāhas without the addition of the word drama. It is thus not unreasonable to suppose that Kuṣaṇa denotes the coins issued by Nahapāna for his suzerain who must have been commonly called simply Kushana. Was there any Kushana king who was also known by the mere name Kushana? Certainly this must be the Kushana sovereign referred to in the Taxila scroll inscription of the year 136. It is worthy of note that he is here simply styled Kushana with the titles Mahārāja Rājātirāja Devaputra without any specification of his proper name. I have elsewhere shown that he can be no other than Kujula Kadphises, or Kadphises I, as he is also known. It thus seems that Nahapāna was a viceroy not only of Kadphises II., but also of Kadphises I. Against this it might perhaps be argued that Kadphises I. flourished about the beginning of the fourth quarter of the first century A.D., whereas Nahapāna’s dates 41, 42, 45 and 46, which are unanimously taken to be years of the Saka era and thus...
range between A.D. 119 to A.D. 124 place him about the first quarter of the second century. It will, however, be shown shortly that Nahapāna was ruling as early as A.D. 85 and that consequently he was a contemporary of Kadphises I, also. Again, the principal characteristic of Nahapāna's coins is the imitation of the Roman head on the obverse, as stated above. This is exactly the characteristic of one type of Kadphises I's coins, in the head of whose obverse numismatists recognise the likeness of a Roman emperor though they differ in regard to the identification of the exact original.\(^4\) And what can be more natural than that Nahapāna, striking coins as viceroy of Kadphises I, should adopt the special features of his sovereign's money? The word Kuṣāna, therefore, indicates the currency started by Nahapāna as subordinate of the Kushana ruler Kadphises I., and the monks residing in Ushavadāta's cave were to be given each a Kuṣāna, i.e. Nahapāna's silver coin, for every month of the rainy season, just as the monks living in the Kaṅheri caves received each a Pañika, i.e., one Kārshāpaṇa, for every month of summer or the rainy season.

It will thus be seen that Nahapāna was a Ksatrapa of both Kadphises I. and Kadphises II. It is not necessary to suppose that Kadphises I. himself led an army and conquered Rājputānā, Central India and Gujarāt. It is possible that he may have sent Nahapāna to subjugate these provinces, of which the latter was afterwards made a Satrap. The name Nahapāna is of Zend-Persian origin, and he is,\(^4\) therefore, regarded as a Pahlava or Parthian. This is not at all impossible. His son-in-law, Ushavadāta, was a Saka, and it is, therefore, quite natural to expect Nahapāna to belong to a different clan, as was required by the matrimonial connection subsisting between them. And as Pahlavas at this period are constantly associated with Sakas not only in Sanskrit works but also in inscriptions, and as the name Nahapāna is Iranian, it is very likely that he was a Parthian. That he came from the north is also indicated by the use of the Kharoṣṭhī alphabet on his coins. The proper home of this script is Eastern Afghanistān and Northern Punjāb though its use extended as far south-west as at Bhāwalpur near Multān, as far south as Mathurā, and as far south-east as Kāṅgrā, in which regions it is generally found side by side with the Brāhmaḥ alphabet. Not a single inscription has been discovered in Kharoṣṭhī in Rājputānā, Central India, Gujarāt or the Dekkan, where Brāhmaḥ alone was used. And the very fact that Kharoṣṭhī occupies an equally important place with Brāhmaḥ in the coin legends of Nahapāna shows that he came from a province where Kharoṣṭhī alone was prevalent. It also shows that Nahapāna was not a mere adventurer who came southwards to carve out a kingdom for himself. The employment of Kharoṣṭhī on his coins, in the provinces where Brāhmaḥ alone was understood, shows that it was a script of his court and that he came from the north along with several scribes knowing Kharoṣṭhī. In this connection it will be interesting to note that a Nāṣik inscription\(^4\) speaks of a scribe called Vudhika who was a Saka and a resident of Daśapura, Nahapāna's capital. It seems tempting to suppose that he was probably one of the scribes who accompanied Nahapāna, when the latter was sent south by his Kushana overlords for the subjugation of territory.

The author of the Periplus in chapter 41 of his book informs us that next after Barake ( Dwārkā) follows the gulf of Barygaza (gulf of Cambay) and the sea-board of the region called Ariake being the beginning of the kingdom of Mambaras (or Nambanu) and of all India. The capital of the kingdom was Minaagara, whence much cotton was brought down to Barugaza (Broach). Pandit Bhāgwanlāl Indraji has rightly corrected Ariake into Abhangāra, the Prakrit form of Aparaṅktā, an old name of the western sea-board of India. M. Boyer had more than fifteen years ago shown cogent reasons for identifying Nambanu

\(^4\) Prof. Rapson recognises in it a likeness of Augustus (JC., 1897, § 15, 66), and Mr. V. A Smith of Augustus or Tiberius (EHI. 236; COIM. I. 66) and also of Caius and Lucius, grandsons of Augustus, (JRAS., 1906, p. 30, n. 1).\(^3\) JRAS., 1906, 215.\(^4\) EI., VIII. 95-6.
with Nahapāna. It was, however, left to Dr. Fleet to explain satisfactorily how the name Nahapāna could partly through the copyist's confusion and partly through phonetic influence be easily transformed into Mambanos or Nambanos.15 The late Mr. McCrindle has adduced strong reasons to hold that the Periplus was written between A.D. 80—89, and no scholar of repute has called this date in question. Nahapāna was thus alive circa A.D. 85, long before A.D. 124 which is the last known date for him. The capital of Nahapāna's territory, according to the Periplus, was Minnagara. The work also mentions another Minnagara, but this was the capital of "Scythia" and was situated in the delta of the Indus in Sind. The name has been taken to be a hybrid word meaning "a city of the Mins, the Scythians." Nahapāna's Minnagara has been identified by McCrindle with Indore,16 by Pandit Bhagwándâl with Janágadh,17 by Mr. Schoeff with Nagari north of Chitorgadh in Râjputâna,18 and by Dr. Fleet with Dohad in the Pâch Mahâls district, Bombay Presidency.19 It deserves to be noticed that Ptolemy, the Greek geographer, who wrote shortly after A.D. 150, refers to both these cities, and, what is more interesting, specifies both the latitude and the longitude of these as of other places. In regard to the inland Minnagara which was, no doubt, the capital of Nahapāna, he gives 115° 10' and 19° 30' as its latitude and longitude, which for Barugaza are 113° 15' and 17° 20'.20 Minnagara was thus nearly 2 east and 2 north of Barugaza, which, we know for certain, is Broach. The only old place which fulfills these conditions is Mandasor, the ancient Dāsapura. Dāsapura certainly was a place of importance in Nahapāna's time as it is mentioned in one of Ushavadâ's inscriptions along with such big cities as Sarpāraga, Govardhana and Bharukachha. Besides, it seems at this time to have been inhabited by some Sakas, as we see from a Nāsik cave inscription.21 I have often thought that it was impossible for Ushavadâ not to have made any benefactions at the capital town of Nahapāna and that consequently one of these four cities must have been his capital. But Ptolemy's geography no longer leaves this point in doubt.

As Dāsapura was the capital of Nahapāna's kingdom, the other three cities, viz., Sarpāraga, Govardhana and Bharukachha, must have been each the head-quarters of a district. Govardhana certainly was the principal town of an ādâra or district, as we learn from other Nāsik cave inscriptions of this period.22 This Govardhana is the large modern village of Govardhan-Gaigaipur, on the right bank of the Godâvari and six miles west of Nâsik. We have seen that a Junnar cave epigraph mentions an ādâya of Nahapāna called Ayama (Aryama). Ādâya, of course, has been used in inscriptions to signify the head officer of a territorial division. Thus Junnar seems to have been the head-quarters of the Mâmala district, which is mentioned in a Kârl inscription and which has been identified with Mâval. Nâsik inscription 14(a), as we have seen above, makes mention of Ujeni (Ujjaini), which, no doubt, was included in Nahapāna's dominions and must have been the head-quarters of a division called Avanti. There was yet another district called Kâpur-āhâra which is also referred to in one of Ushavadâ's inscriptions. It was at Chikhalapadra in this division that he granted 8,000 cocoanut trees. From the mention of the cocoanuts Chikhalapadra seems to have been on the coast and most probably is Chikhali, the principal town of a taluka in the Surat district, as suggested by Pandit Bhâgwanlâl Indraji. Kâpura is mentioned as the name both of the district and its head-quarters on a copper-plate grant of the Taṅkûta king Dahrasena found at Pârâj in the Surat Collectorate. Kâpura thus appears to correspond to the modern Surat district and was situated between the Sarpāraga and Bharukachha districts.

(To be continued.)

15 JRAS., 1907, p. 1043, n. 2. 16 IA., VIII. 149. 17 B. G., VIII. 487. 18 Periplus, p. 180. 19 JRAS., 1912, 788. 20 IA., XIII. 339. 21 EI., VIII. 93-6. 22 See, for example, Nâsik Cave Inscriptions Nos. 4 & 5, where Govardhana is mentioned as a place where an ādâya was stationed.
VIVEKAPATRAMALI

BY T. A. GOPINATHA RAO, M.A.; TRIVANDRAM.

In my article on the Arviliyamagalam plates of Śrīnagarāya II, contributed to the Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XII, an attempt was made to identify certain members of the family of the document (śāsana) writers of the later Vijayanagara dynasties with certain poets of Mullianagram. Since writing this article more materials have been accumulated, which enable me to review the situation in greater detail.

There are no less than fifty-five copper-plate documents belonging to a period intervening the reigns of Harihara II to Raĝa VI. in which the names of the following persons, the composers of the documents, are mentioned: namely, Sahhāpāti, son of Abhirāma, his sons Svayambhu, Kāmakōli or Kāmakshi and Gaṇapārya; his grandsons Rājanātha by Svayambhu: Krīṣṇākavi and Rāmakavi by Kāmakōli and Kāmay by Gaṇapārya; Kāmay's son was Sōmanātha. Then again the engravers of the śāsanas, are said to have been Muddana, Viraṇa I, Muddana II, Viraṇa II, Mallana II, Viraṇa III, Appana, Gaṇapārya, Viraṇa IV, Viraṇa V, Kāmay, Achyuta and Sōmanātha. The following table gives the details regarding the kings, the composers and engravers of their documents and other information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name of the King</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Engraver</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S. 130</td>
<td>Harihara I</td>
<td>Mallāyārādhyya</td>
<td>Nāgīdeva</td>
<td>Tīpūr, No. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>S. 1316</td>
<td>Bukka II</td>
<td>Mallāyārādhyya; son of Kōṭīśvarādhyya of the Agrēyagōtra and Yajūsākha</td>
<td>Nāgīdeva</td>
<td>Gōribidnār, No. 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S. 1318</td>
<td>Harihara II</td>
<td>Muddānāchārya</td>
<td>.........</td>
<td>Hāsān, No. 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S. 1319</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>.........</td>
<td>Nāgīdeva</td>
<td>T. Nārsī, No. 134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S. 1348</td>
<td>Praṇḍhadēvārāya</td>
<td>.........</td>
<td>Viraṇāchārya, son of Muddānāchārya</td>
<td>Tūmkūr, No. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>S. 1351</td>
<td>Dēvārāya II</td>
<td>.........</td>
<td>Muddana, son of Viraṇa (?)</td>
<td>Lūga māpaṇ Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>S. 1386</td>
<td>Im. Praṇḍhadēvārāya</td>
<td>Mallana, son of Kāmay of the Bhāradvījagōtra and Rīksākha (?)</td>
<td>Viraṇa, son of Muddana</td>
<td>Nagar, No. 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>S. 1386</td>
<td>Mallikārjuna</td>
<td>.........</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Tīrthahalī, No. 206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>S. 1396</td>
<td>Vīrūpāksha</td>
<td>.........</td>
<td>Mallana, son of Viraṇa</td>
<td>Mālavāla, No. 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>S. 1395</td>
<td>Mallikārjuna</td>
<td>.........</td>
<td>Viraṇa son of Muddana</td>
<td>Śrīraṅgapatna, No. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>S. 1429</td>
<td>Vīrāṇa Rāraśūha</td>
<td>.........</td>
<td>Mallana (son of Viraṇa)</td>
<td>Nagar, No. 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>S. 1429</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>.........</td>
<td>Viraṇa, son of Mallana</td>
<td>Kumbhakōnam Plates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>.........</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ś. 1433</td>
<td>Krīṣṇadēvārāya</td>
<td>Sahhāpāti</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Bēlūr, No. 79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† This is sometimes known also as the Vībhāgo-patramāla.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name of the King</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Engraver</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>S. 1437</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Viranāchārya, son of Mallana.</td>
<td>Nañjangod, No. 16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>S. 1438</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Pavugada, No. 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>S. 1444</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Kumbhakom Plates, No. IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>S. 1446</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Appanāchārya, son of Viranāchāri.</td>
<td>Hassan, No. 46.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>S. 1456</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Kumbhakom Plates, No. V.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>S. 1455</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Pavugada, No. 75.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>S. 1458</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Polepalli Grant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>S. 1461</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Belur, No. 197.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>S. 1462</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Savyambhu, son of Sabhapati; of Sāvarnya gōtra.</td>
<td>Úṇa māṇjēri Plates, Ep. Ind., Vol. III.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name of the King</td>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Engraver</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>S. 1463</td>
<td>Achyuta davaraya</td>
<td>Sabhapati</td>
<td>Viraşchārya</td>
<td>Yadavali Grant, Nāgamangala, No. 58.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>S. 1467</td>
<td>Sadasiva-dēvaraya</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Channapatna, No. 186.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>S. 1470</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Sva-yambhu, son of Sabhapati</td>
<td>Viraş, son of Viraş</td>
<td>Māmādipūndi Grant, Hāsan, No. 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>S. 1471</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Krishnapuram Grant, Tūmkūr, No. 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>S. 1493</td>
<td>Tirumalariya</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Viraş, son of Gaṇapārya</td>
<td>Shimoga, No. 83.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>S. 1497</td>
<td>Sriraiga II</td>
<td>Gaṇapārya, son of Sabhapati</td>
<td>Nārāyaṇa</td>
<td>Chiknayakanhalli, No. 39.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>S. 1517</td>
<td>Ativirarāma Pāṇḍya</td>
<td>Rājanāthakavi, son of Svayambhu</td>
<td>Purandara, the Rathakāra</td>
<td>Maligamaṇḍu Grant, Kūnīyār Grant, Kondyata Grant, Kallakurichi Grant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>S. 1524</td>
<td>Vēkāta I</td>
<td>Chidambarakavi, sister's son of Siyasūrya, king of poets</td>
<td>Kāmāyārya, son of Gaṇapārya, and brother of Viraṣ</td>
<td>Utsur Grant, Mulbāgal, No. 60.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>S. 1556</td>
<td>Vēkāta II</td>
<td>Rāmakavi, son of Kāmakoti, and grandson of Sabhapati</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Utsur Grant, Mulbāgal, No. 60.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>S. 1558</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Utsur Grant, Mulbāgal, No. 60.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>S. 1566</td>
<td>Raiga II</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Utsur Grant, Mulbāgal, No. 60.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>S. 1569</td>
<td>Raiga VI</td>
<td>Rāmakavi, son of Kāmakotī and grandson of Sabhapati</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Utsur Grant, Mulbāgal, No. 60.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>S. 1569</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Utsur Grant, Mulbāgal, No. 60.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the above tabular statement we may frame the following pedigree of the Śasānam Composers of the Vijayanagara Empire:

**Abhirāma**

**Sabhāpati.**

S. 1434—1463.

Composer of No. 1, Shimoga; No. 79, Bēlūr; No. 94, Hoḷalkere; No. 16, Naṇjangōśī; No. 30, Guṇḍalupet; No 6, Hāsan; No. 4, Pāvugadā; No. 167, Chāmarājapeti; No. IV of the Kumbhakōṭam Plates; No. 46, Hāsan; No. 153, Channapatna; No. 10, Chiknaṇyakanhaḷī; No. V of the Kumbhakōṭam Plates; No. 11, Kṛishṇarājapeti; No. 132, Hoḷalkere; No. 28, Chintāmaṇī; No. 75, Pāvugadā; No. 55, Maṇḍya; No. 126, Arsikere; the Polepalli Grant; No. 197, Bēlūr; the Yaṭjavallī Grant.

---

**Svayambhu.**

S. 1462—1493.

Composer of the Unamāṇījēri Plates; No. 186, Channapatna: No. 58, Nāgamaṇḍāla; the Mānḍyaḥ-pāṇḍi Grant; No. 7, Hāsan; the Kṛishṇāpuram Grant; and No. 1, Tumkūr.

---

**Kāmākṣi or Kāmakōṭi (?)**

Ś. 1505.

Composer of Varatāṇagārāma Pāṇḍya and Śrīvalabha Pāṇḍya's Grant, (Pudukōṭṭai Plates.)

---

**Gaṇapārya.**

Ś. 1497.

Composer of the Mareṇḍrapāḷḷi Grant.

---

**Rājanītha Kavi**

Ś. 1517.

Composer of the Dalavay Agrahāram Plates of Ativirāṇa Pāṇḍya.

---

**Krīṣṇa Kavi.**

Ś. 1510.

Composer of No. 83, Shimoga and No. 39, Chiknaṇyakanhaḷī.

---

**Rāma Kavi.**

Ś. 1556—1558.

Composer of the Kaḷa-kuruchi and the Utsūr Grants and No. 60, Mul-bāgal.
And that of the śāsanam engravers thus:

Genealogy of the Engravers of the Vijayanagara Grants.

[Muddana I.]

1. Viraṇāchārya I.


5. Viraṇa IV. S. 1429—1456. Engraver of Nos. 2 and 3 of the Kumbhakonam Plates; No. 1, Shimoga; No. 79, Bélur; No. 16, Nārjangū; No. 30, Gāndhipēt; No. 6, Hāsan; No. 167, Cāmarajapēna; No. 4, Kumbhakonam Plates; No. 153, Cānapēna; No. 10, Chiknayakanhalī; No. 5 of the Kumbhakonam Plates; No. 11, Kṛishnarajapēt; No. 132, Hoḷalakere; No. 55, Maṇḍya.

6. Apanāchārya I.
   S. 1446. Engraver of No. 28, Chintamaṇi; No. 126, Arskere; the Poleppali Grant; No. 197, Hāsan.


Gaṇapūrīya.

Viraṇa V.
S. 1493—1510. S. 1524
Engraver of No. 1, Tumkur Mangalam and No. 83, pāḍu Grant.

Kāmāya.
S. 1555—1558
Engraver of the Kuniyūr Grant and Konjiyātta Grant.

Achāyuta.
S. 1566—1569
Engraver of the Kāḷigakuruchi and the Utsūr Grants and No. 60, Mulbagal.

(To be continued.)
VAISHNVAVA WORSHIP AND BUDDHISM.

The date assigned by Sir R. G. Bhandarkar and other scholars to the rise of the Vaishnav cult is too well known to be quoted here. I want to draw attention to a piece of evidence which carries one aspect of Vaishnav cult to a period not later than 700—600 B.C. This was the worship of Trivikrama Vishnu, curiously enough the form of worship was the worship of foot-prints.

The worship was current even before Yaskha and was alluded to by a predecessor of his. That predecessor was Aurnavabha who was probably identical with the Teacher of that name in the Brihadaranyaka Upnishad. Aurnavabha is cited in several places by Yaskha who gives his Itihasisaka or legendary and historical interpretations of the Rigveda hymns.

Commenting on the well-known Bisah-Rishis (Bisah, n. 83-19) quotes skapadi first, who explains that Vishnu crosses 'all this' with three steps placing them on the earth, on the antariksha (horizon) and on the sky. (स्वर्या निर्मोहं निलोम प्रवोधयो निन्दो निन्दो निन्दो

Then he cites Aurnavabha who takes the verse in the sense that Vishnu literally and physically crossed in the past (वर्ष) in the manner described by Skapadi, stepping over the horizon, and sky, and he says 'in ascending (he stepped) at the Vishnu-pada on the Gayas Peak'.

Aurnavabha is referring to the first step prabhivilya and is giving the Itihasisaka's view current in his time by referring to the 'Vishnu-pada' at Gayas Hill from which place, they believed, Vishnu actually went up. The "Vishnu-pada" at Gayas Hill is still worshipped and was being worshipped in the days of and before the Vayu-Purana (600 A.D.).

The passage is not only important for the history of the Vaishnav cult, but throws light also on the religious history of early Buddhism. The custom of worshipping foot-prints, it shows, had been already an old institution before the time of the Buddha. It probably originated in this Vedic legend of Vishnu's stepping over the earth. His supposed foot-prints (Vishnu's-pada) were worshipped by the Aitihisakas and those who believed with them.

The passage also shows that Gayas had long become a sacred place before the Buddha went there to do his meditation. And it was a sacred place of the orthodox people who derived their cult from the Rigveda.

I take this opportunity of pointing out that the identification of the Trivikrama-Vaman Vishnu with Vasudeva was complete before the Baudhayana-Dharma-Sutras (see II, 5, 9, 10). Before the Baudhayana-Dharma-Sutras child-Krishna (Dmodara) and the cowherd-Krishna (Govinda) were known deities (ibid.) This disposes of the view held by Indian and European scholars that the Krishna worship in the child-form is post-Christ. The accepted date of the Baudhayana-Dharma-Sutras is "before 400 B.C." (Macdonell, Sanskrit Literature, p. 259.)

My own view which will appear in my Tagore Lectures is that the date is over-estimated by two centuries. In any case the cowherd and the child-god Krishna was worshipped here before Christ was born.

K. P. JAYASWAL.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

NOTES FROM OLD FACTORY RECORDS.

11. Company's officers obliged to go through the ranks.

13 December 1869. Letter from Elihu Yale and Council at Fort St. George to John Nicks and Council at Comore. We commend Mr. King’s martial Inclinations, but first he must well understand the duty of a Sergeant before he comes to an officer as those Gentlemen here did [whom] the Governor advanced in that Imploy, who served

1 For Gayas-Peak in the Jatakas, see J. L. 142.

2 The orthodox worship of foot-prints to-day is confined to Vishnu-pada (Vishnu's foot-prints) only.

3 Apparently he went there because it was a sacred place.

4 In the Anandavrama edition the twelve names Kesava, etc., are given separately. But see Bühler, S.B.E. XIV. The identity is established by the Vashikarana-Dharma-Sutra (lately published) which gives the praksa "Kesava" of the Baudhâyana mantra and calls them 'the twelve names'. (The date of the Vaishnavas in the present form is c. 200 B.C. Its earlier shape which can be easily detected goes back before the Buddha's time and Pâlini. It is quoted by Gautama and Baudhâyana and the quoted sûtras are to be found in the present Vaishnavas. I discuss its date and importance in my Tagore Lectures. The Mâ, known to European scholars, was a later book than the present one.)
AUSTRIA'S COMMERCIAL VENTURE IN INDIA IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

BY SIR R. C. TEMPLE, BR.

(Continued from p. 59.)

IV.—The Triestine Society of 1782.

Letter from Robert Ritchie to Peter Michell, dated Venice, 21 February 1783.²⁹

I NOW transmit the Prospectus of Mr Bolt's scheme, and should have done it some time ago had I seen any probability of his finding subscribers for the sum wanted; he seems, however, to have some chance now of being able to send out his ship one way or other, though I doubt much whether the subscription will be really, or only nominally, full. The scheme is printed in Italian, which I have translated into English, because some of the Gentlemen who may have the curiosity to peruse it, perhaps do not understand that language.

Convention relative to the expedition of the Ship "Cobenzel" by the Trieste Society from Trieste to the East Indies and China, and back to Trieste.²⁹

It is universally known that the underwritten Lieutenant Colonel William Bolts obtained from the Empress Queen Maria Teresa of glorious memory a Commission or Patent, with very extensive privileges, to establish a direct Commerce with the East Indies, dated the 5th of June 1775.

It is equally notorious that the trials made by him with several ships sent out on that voyage, in company with other persons, yielded on their return, considerable profits, insomuch that, under his co-direction, a Company was formed with a Capital of two millions of florins, divided in Actions (shares) among her Imperial Majesty’s subjects in the Low Countries.

It is flattering to him to have been, in this manner, the founder and restorer of this important and lucrative Commerce after it had been abandoned for half an age, and it will give him still greater satisfaction if he can succeed in animating the subjects of these hereditary States with trust and confidence with regard to this trade. To which end he offers the following proposals,

1. The abovewritten Mr Bolts, jointly with the underwritten Codirectors, and for account of the Trieste Society, will set out and dispatch for the East Indies and China, by the ordinary way of the Cape of Good Hope the new Imperial Ship called Cobenzel, of about 600 tons burden, now in this port of Trieste, furnished with experienced Officers, and commanded by Captain John Joseph Bauer, a subject of the Emperour, (Joseph II), and this ship will sail, at the farthest, within the month of March next.

2. Although the above ship, including her rigging, furniture, arms, &c., actually in readiness, cost Mr Bolts more than the sum of 130,000 florins, yet, to the Society now proposed, the ship and furniture shall be valued only at 110,000 florins; and in order to facilitate the balancing of accounts, he obliges himself to take back the ship, on her

²⁹ Secretary to the East India Company, 1768-1783.
²⁹ Miscellaneous Letters Received, vol. 72, No. 92.
²⁹ Miscellaneous Letters Received, vol. 72, No. 94.
²¹ Maria Teresa, Empress of Austria, died 29 Nov. 1780.
return to Trieste, for two thirds of the value she shall cost the Company when ready to sail, in the condition she may return from sea, with the rigging, furniture, arms, &c., belonging to her, so as they then happen to be, without pretence to any deduction for whatever accident may happen, which he expressly renounces by these presents.

3. This projected voyage, including the ship and cargo, a part whereof is already provided, as is well known, and a part not, requires a fund of four hundred thousand florins. This fund is to be divided into a hundred actions or shares, of four thousand florins each, and every proprietor is at liberty to purchase as many shares as he thinks proper, till the whole hundred are completed, and also a half, fourth, or eighth of a share, so that a greater number may partake of the profits which this foreign trade offers.

4. Mr Bolts, being convinced by experience and a long stay in India of the solidity of this undertaking, obliges himself to take for his own account fourteen shares, amounting to the sum of fifty six thousand current florins of Vienna.

5. As he has the jus and privilege for another similar voyage to India; therefore, in order to give the concerned in the present Adventure a greater prospect of gain, he promises and obliges himself that those among them who are unwilling to be interested in that voyage shall have the preference as far as the half of the sums they have subscribed to this, on condition that, thirty days after advertisement, they shall declare whether they chuse to be concerned in that separate adventure and how much.

6. To convince the Adventurers of the solidity of this enterprise, he obliges himself to warrant, and hereby does warrant, ten per cent. per annum as certain profit, from the day the ship Copenzel sails to her safe return, to each of the adventurers on the capital respectively advanced, and five per cent. from the day of disbursement till the day the ship sails, and from the day of her return till the final liquidation of the respective quotas.

7. All charges of whatever kind being deducted, as also the abovementioned ten and five per cents., the next profit of the voyage is to be divided into two equal parts, one of which to be subdivided among the adventurers according to their respective shares, and the other half becomes the property of Mr Bolts, in consideration of his having formed the project and ceded his privilege, and also by way of premium for his guarantee of a certain gain to each adventurer of ten and five per cent. as above.

8. Furthermore, the said Mr Bolts obliges himself not to withdraw or sell, cede or alienate his interest of fifty six thousand florins till all the adventurers are fully satisfied, not only in regard to their capital, but likewise the profit warranted or insured of ten and five per Cent., in conformity to the 6th article, and also the surplus that may fall to their respective shares on their half of the next gain, after all the charges are deducted.

9. To the end that the business of the projected expedition may be managed with good order and exactness, and in order to give a greater and more general faith and trust in the concerned, Messrs. James de Gabbiani, John Adam Wagner, and John Rossetti are appointed Directors conjointly with the said Mr Bolts, and it is hereby expressly stipulated that, without the consent of the Codirectors, neither he, nor in his absence, his Agent, Mr Edward Watts, shall assume the management of any business whatever relative to, connected with, or dependent on the said adventure.
10. In consequence, however, of the foregoing obligation, it shall be incumbent on
the Codirectors jointly with Mr. Bolts, to prepare and draw up the publick or private
advertisements to the Adventurers, to collect the money arising from the sale of the
actions, to realize and verify the fourteen shares taken by Mr. Bolts; to provide the goods
required for the voyage; to give the needful instructions to the Captain, Supercargo, and
other officers of the said ship; to get insurance done, not only on the capital, but also on
an expected or imaginary gain, as is usual in maritime trade; to sign letters of corre-
respondence, and whatever else is requisite in the execution of this undertaking; and in like
manner, after the return of the ship, to take care that the merchandise be landed,
sold, the produce got into Cash, charges paid, the respective dividends made, and
whatever else may be necessary or convenient for the general interest of the Society.

The money chest shall be kept under four keys, whereof Mr. Bolts or his Agent shall
have the custody of one, and one shall remain in the hands of each of the other three
Directors. In this chest shall be lodged not only the money received or to be received for
Actions, but also all the documents relative to the expedition, such as the bills of lading
signed by the Captain, the policies of insurance, and every voucher concerning the voyage
out and home.

The books shall be kept by Mr. Edward Watts, but under the constant inspection of
the Codirectors, who, jointly with Mr. Bolts, shall, in due time, get insurance done on the
cargo out and home, and likewise on an imaginary or hoped for profit, so as, in case of a
misfortune, which God forbid, the capital and interest of all the Adventurers may be
insured.

In like manner, they shall jointly give the requisite instructions to the Captain,
Supercargo and Officers, that, in case of any fortunate circumstance, particularly in Asia,
on the opportunity of this ships return to Europe, if a certain profit should be offered
independent of the fund of this Society, all such transactions may be done which are
usual in these parts, and from which a sure profit results, but not otherwise; and these
profits, independent of the Company's funds, shall be divided, that is, three fourths to
Mr. Bolts, and one fourth to the Adventurers, the commission of the Direction, as in the
following article, deducted.

In recompense for the pains and care of all the four Directors, they shall be allowed,
by way of commission and premium, two and a half per cent. on the whole amount
of the expedition outward, and two and a half per cent. on the sales of the homeward
cargo, after the ships return, that is, two fifths to Mr. Bolts, and three fifths for the
other three Directors.

On the safe return of the ship, with all convenient speed in regard to the interest of
the Company, the whole cargo shall be sold at publick sale; and when the accounts
are made up, all the charges are to be paid, and the ten per cent. and respective five per
cent. to the Adventurers, the commission to the Directors, premiums of insurance, and
whatever else falls to the charge of the common concern; and the remaining profit, hoped
for, shall be decided according to the seventh article.

In case of loss, the funds insured are to be recovered and brought into Cash, and the
capital, interest, and hoped for gain that have been insured are to be paid to the Adven-
turers in the manner above mentioned; and every thing is to proceed in a clear orderly
manner for the satisfaction of the concerned, who shall at all times have free access to see
the accounts and vouchers.
All the Adventurers, excepting the Directors, are at liberty to sell their shares, giving notice to the Directors for the registry; but the Directors shall not be responsible for the eventuality of this expedition, whether fortunate or not, having done their duty as indicated above.

Whoever chooses to accede to this Convention and social contract will be pleased to sign their names, and note the number of actions they desire to take, with an obligation to accept the bills at usance which the Directors shall draw for the value of the purchase as soon as the whole number of one hundred actions is completed.

Trieste, 17th December 1782.

We undersigned, elected and appointed for managing the affairs relative to the Association called the Trieste Society for the expedition of the Imperial ship Cobenzel, in conformity to the foregoing printed plan, declare that the subscriptions in Trieste till this day amount to the sum of 140,000 florins, and as soon as the subscriptions required are completed, the names and respective sums of all the Adventurers shall be published.

Trieste, the 20th December 1782.

(Signed) GUGLIELMO BOLTS,
GIACOMO DE GABBIATI
GIAN ADAMO VAGNER
GEO. ROSSETTI

Note on the Prospectus of the Triestine Company.

The foregoing prospectus is very interesting as showing the methods of the Austrian Company, known to the English as the Triestine Society (Societé Impériale Asiatique de Trieste) in raising funds for its voyages. Apparently the Society raised a separate subscription for each voyage, which was liquidated on its completion.

Put into modern commercial parlance and divested of its “wrapping,” the scheme developed in the prospectus is illuminating, as it tells us how funds for ventures were raised in the 18th century in Europe; and it shows incidentally that the Company promoters of that time were as “smart” as the most modern of their tribe.

On 20 December 1782, Bolts, in the name of the Triestine Society, promoted a special issue of shares for the voyage of the ship Cobenzel to India, China and the East, and back. The Directors were to be himself, as Managing Director, and three others. He was also to be the promoter.

The share capital was to be 400,000 florins (say £40,000), taking the Austrian florin at 2s. to be divided as to 260,000 florins into 520 20% preference shares of 500 florins each, held by the subscribers, and as to 140,000 florins into 35 unsaleable fully paid ordinary shares of 4,000 florins each, held by the Directors in the proportion of 14 by the promoter and 7 each by the other Directors. The preference shares were to receive on the promoter’s guarantee 5% from the date of subscription to the date of sailing, 10% during the voyage, and 5% from the date of return to the date of final liquidation. These dividends were subject to all the charges of the venture, including the Directors’ remuneration.

The Directors’ remuneration was to be 2½% on all sales during the voyage and 2½% on all sales after the ship’s return, payable in the proportion of ¼ to the promoter.
and \( \frac{1}{2} \) each to the other Directors.\(^{22}\) The balance of the net profits on the voyage, which were to include the value of the ship taken at \( \frac{3}{4} \) of the total capital (i.e., at 266,000 florins), and the guarantee of the promoter, was to be divided, half to the promoter and half to the shareholders. The ship was to be insured by the Society, and in case of loss the insurance money was to be available for dividend. Any incidental profits, i.e., any made during the voyage by trading in goods not included in the original cargo, were to be divided, \( \frac{3}{4} \) to the promoter and \( \frac{1}{4} \) to the shareholders.

The objects of the issue were to purchase the ship Cobenzel of 600 tons, valued at 130,000 florins, but sold to the Society by the promoter for 110,000 florins for the purposes of the issue, and to equip her and take her on a voyage to India, China and the East and back, the total cost of the scheme being estimated at 400,000 florins. The outward trade cargo was to consist of copper, gunpowder, iron, cloths and wine, and also porcelain, cannon, etc., as presents for Haidar Ali of Mysore and other Indian potentates; and the homeward cargo was to be pepper. It was stated in the prospectus that the promoter's previous voyage for the Society to the East had been very profitable.

The subscription to the issue was opened on 20 December 1782, the capital was fully subscribed by 23 June 1783, and the ship had commenced her voyage before 29 September 1783, but I have not been able to trace her arrival in the East. The promoter reserved the right to undertake arrangements for a similar voyage for the Society immediately on completion of those for the present one, and he set to work to raise funds for another venture to the East as soon as the Cobenzel had started on her voyage.

It will be seen from the foregoing statement that what Bolts did was this, He guaranteed his subscribers nominally 20%, but in reality only 5% \(^{23}\) on the capital they put up, 260,000 florins, risking thus 13,000 florins\(^{24}\); but he sold his ship to them for 110,000 florins in cash, so he made them pay handsomely for his guarantee. He also guaranteed to buy the ship nominally for 266,000 florins on her return, but the shareholders were to have her insured; and so if she was lost on the voyage he not only risked nothing, but got his share of the insurance money as owner of 14% of the total capital.\(^{25}\) If the ship returned safely, his share of the profit would cover the risk, as it would necessarily be great.\(^{26}\)

Thus he got 56,000 florins worth of shares (14% of the total capital as above noted) for nothing\(^{27}\); half the gross profit beyond 20% as the shareholders paid all the charges of the venture including his remuneration; three-fourths of any trading profit (beyond those on the proceeds of the outward and homeward cargo) made during the voyage; and one per cent. (\( \frac{1}{2} \) of 2 1/2%) on all sales of both the outward and homeward cargo which were always very high in those days.

It was these considerations that apparently made business men of the day accept his guarantee, as at that time he was practically bankrupt, the voyage of the Joseph and Theresa not being the success he would appear to have made it out to be. It is probable that he

---

\(^{22}\) I.e., 1% to the promoter and \( \frac{3}{4} \) to each of the other Directors.

\(^{23}\) That is until the return of the ship the only dividend payable on the prospectus was 5%, for the time before the ship started.

\(^{24}\) This was the outside risk, as the 5% it represented was only payable after deduction of expenses.

\(^{25}\) By the prospectus the insurance money was specially earmarked as available for dividend.

\(^{26}\) The value of the ship was also to be available for dividend.

\(^{27}\) His total outside risk was 56,000 florins for shares and 13,000 florins as guaranteed dividend against 110,000 florins, the price of his ship paid him by the shareholders.
had to give away a large share of his advantages in the prospectus to them for assistance in floating the issue, in a manner well known to the modern Company-promoter.

The object of giving Bolts three colleagues in the direction of the Society's venture was obviously to protect the shareholders, but they had individually so subordinate an interest in the concern that their control must have been shadowy.

One result of this story is to bring home to the present-day reader, with convincing clearness, what it meant to European merchants, even in the late 18th century, when 'their ships came home.'

Letter from Mr Nathaniel Green, Consul, to Mr Secretary Fox,  
dated Trieste, 9 May 1783.

Mr. Bolts is now at Vienna, soliciting Credit for the Value of One Hundred Thousand Florins in Copper and Gunpowder for the Cargo of the Ship Cobenzel, which is to be fitted out here for Bengal and China so soon as the Actions are all engaged, if the disputes among Mr. Bolts's Creditors do not throw Obstacles in the Way. This Expedition proposed (according to all Appearance) by Mr Bolts to amuse his Creditors, is to be carried on under the Firm &c, of La Societa Triestina. Mr Bolts and three Merchants of this Place are the Managers, and they hope, not only to send out this Ship, but also to find Funds in the same Way, that [is] by Shares or Actions, for sending out another immediately afterwards. All this affair is totally separate from those of the Antwerp Company to whom Mr Bolts has ceded his Octroi or exclusive Privilege for the East India Trade, which began in 1775 and its term will expire in 1785. Mr Bolts, however, notwithstanding this present very critical situation and his extensive Engagements, still contemplates his favourite Project of a Voyage to the North West Coast of America and round the Globe, for which intent he retains yet in is Service the People he first engaged to assist in that Enterprize, viz.

Mr Gilpin, Astronomer, who went the last Voyage with Captain Cook.

[G.] Dixon, Armourer in the same.

[Wm.] Walker, Joyner's Mate Do. and

[H.] Zimmerman, Mariner Do. This last is a Native of Spiers in the Palatinate and is the Man who has published in German a Relation of Captain Cooke's last Voyage.

Thus Mr Bolts's projects may produce two trading Companies instead of one, besides setting something of the same kind a going in Leghorn, from whence a Ship lately sailed under Tuscan Colours for East India, though perhaps its Voyage may terminate at the Isle of France, and Mr Sherriman, late of Madras, is now soliciting the Grand Duke for his Protection of another Ship for the Coast of Coromandel. There is some Ground to

---

20 Charles James Fox (1749-1806), Joint Secretary of State with Lord North, April—Dec. 1783.

21 Miscellaneous Letters Received, vol. 73, No. 180.

22 Mr. Edward Heawood informs me that in Kite's Life of Captain James Cook the name of G. Gilpin appears in the list of officers and men who went with Cook on his second (not last) voyage, 1772-1775. Gilpin's name figures among the supernumeraries as "servant" to the Astronomer on the Resolution, and he probably acted as assistant.

23 G. Dixon, Wm. Walker and Heinrich Zimmermann were all members of the crew of the Discovery in Cook's last voyage. Zimmermann's account, entitled Reise um die Welt mit Kapit. Cook, was published at Gottingen in 1781. A second ed. was published at Mannheim in 1782. In a note to the 1st ed. the author is said to have been a quartermaster in the Discovery, but in Kite's list (see previous note) he is styled coxsawain. I am indebted to Mr. B. G. Corney for this information.
believe that all East India Speculations would soon be laid aside in this Country if they were not supported by the Assistance of Englishmen and other Foreigners, and the Facility they find of fitting out Ships from English and other Foreign Ports. Next week I shall have the Honor to transmit some Notes on the Account which Mr. Bolts has lately presented to his Creditors on his stopping Payment.

P. S.—Some Presents for Hyder Ally [Haider Ali] are getting ready at Vienna, of what kind I know not, but believe the bulk small.

Letter from Mr. Green, Consul at Trieste, to Mr. Secretary Fox,
dated 23 June 1783.32

The Subscription of florins 400,000 for the Expedition of the Ship Cobentzel for Bengal and China for Account of Mr. Bolts and the Triestine Society as it is called (not the Imperial Asiatic Company) is now full, and the Ship is to be fitted out in all haste. Hyder Ally has given Commission for 150 Tons of Iron which is to go in this Ship. A messenger is to be dispatched by the Way over land to the Coast of Malabar. A Manufacturer named Martin, at, or near Marseilles, gives Mr. B. credit for a large Quantity of Cloth for this Voyage; a Person at Madeira offers him 200 Pipes of Wine for half ready Money and half credit at Thirty Months. Mr. Berthon of Lisbon writes to him that if he cannot immediately succeed in his Project here, He may find better Friends at Lisbon.

Letter from Consul Green to Mr. Secretary Fox,
dated Trieste, 11 July 1783.33

Mr. Bolts Ship, the Cobentzel, is to sail about the end of August for the Coast of Malabar, from whence she is to go to China. A Messenger will set out in a few days with Dispatches for Mangalore, where he is to wait the arrival of the Ship.

The great Ship building at Fiume for the Imperial India Company34 will not be ready for Sea till December next.

Letter from Consul Green to Mr. Secretary Fox,
dated Trieste, 25 July 1783.35

The Ship Cobentzel is to carry the Presents from His Imperial Majesty to Hyder Ally, Part of which I am told will consist in some Porcelain of Vienna and some Brass Cannon. The Present which Mr. Bolts brought from Hyder for the late Empress was Shulls and Diamonds, supposed to be worth about Thirty Thousand Florins. The Company hopes by the Favor of Hyder to be able to procure a Cargo of Pepper on the Coast, to bring home which, a Ship is to be bought there.

Letter from Consul Green to Mr. Secretary Fox,
dated Trieste, 18 August 1783.36

Two Days ago a gentleman named Campbell set out from hence with Dispatches from Mr. Bolts and the new Association called the Triestine Society, for Hyder Ally and for some Correspondents at Bombay. Their Ship, Cobentzel, will be ready to sail from hence in about three Weeks. She is to touch at Marseilles to receive a Quantity of Broadcloth, at Madeira for a large Quantity of Wine, and, I believe, also at Cadiz for some other Articles. It is pretended that She will be at Mangalore in the Month of May next, but I am told by some who understand the Nature of the Voyage and the Course of the Seasons that She cannot arrive on the Coast of Malabar till some Months later. Some

32 Miscellaneous Letters Received, vol. 73, No. 12.
33 Miscellaneous Letters Received, vol. 73, No. 54.
34 See infra letter of 29 Sept. 1783.
35 Miscellaneous Letters Received, vol. 73, No. 72.
36 Miscellaneous Letters Received, vol. 73, No. 121.
Englishmen who are Officers on board are very much dissatisfied with Mr B. who refuses to pay them, as he promised when his Affairs were in disorder, and he engaged them to wait till this period. Some others whom he had also brought here to serve in his Expedition to the North West of America by the Way of Cape Hoorn are now also in Dispute with him for their Pay and Discharge, both of which he refuses, and pretends he shall yet be able to put this Project in execution. This may be very uncertain, and I believe that he himself sees that this Country is not well adapted to his views nor can give hopes of Success to them. I know also that he has entered into Correspondence with Naples and hopes to be furnished with a Ship there and that Court will take some part in the Affair. He has also lately treated for an English Ship which is now here and offered £6,000 Sterling for the Voyage, but could not persuade the Captain to undertake it.

Letter from Consul Green to Mr Secretary Fox,
dated Trieste, 29 September 1783. 37

The Triestine Society have at length sent away their Ship Cobenzel for the Coast of Malabar and China. The Captain is Mr John Joseph Bauer, an Hungarian, Chief Mate Mr. Lindsay, Second Mr Moore, and Third Mr Smith, which three with two Petty Officers have made themselves Austrian Subjects. The Society is now in Treaty for another Ship for a second Expedition, conformable to the Privilege which Mr Bolts has reserved to himself in the Agreement with the Imperial Asiatick Company when he gave up the Octroy 38 to them.

Some Projects are in Contemplation for re-establishing the Course of India Trade by the Way of Suez, Cairo, &c. Some Proposals of such Tendency have been made both from hence and from some Englishman in India, to people of consideration in Egypt, who have given a very encouraging Answer.

Additional Paper on Austrian Trade in the East.

Unsigned Letter from Brussels, dated 11 April 1788, containing the general Tenor of the Instructions intended to be sent by the Emperor to the Consul General in India. 39

The Viscount de Waldkiers 40 has just now called on me to desire me to tell you that he cannot keep his promise of sending you to-day the heads of the instructions intended to be given by the Emperor to the Consuls General appointed in India, because the form and words of those instructions are not yet finally settled, and besides, their expedition in due form depends on other regulations now about to be taken to prevent effectually the abuse of the Imperial flag in India.

You know his only view in proposing to send you the copy or substance of the Instructions was that you might find some means of learning whether they are such as may be in all respects perfectly consonant with the wishes of those at the head of India affairs on your side of the water, in order that any alterations they think proper to hint might be made in them. Perhaps a general idea of them may answer that purpose which a few words will convey to you.

37 Miscellaneous Letters Received, vol. 73, No. 169.
38 This word is used in its now obsolete meaning of commercial privilege, exclusive right of trade.
40 Joseph Walcher, born 1718 at Lents, was Director of Navigation on the Danube and later a member of the Austrian Government.
They are directed to conform, as far as circumstances will admit of, to the existing maritime Regulations of the late Empress for Trieste and to those adopted in this Country—To take cognizance of all Ships which come within their district under the Imperial Flag—To cause the Captains and Officers [to] produce their Passports and requisite authority for carrying that Flag—To keep proper accounts and Registers of the whole, granting their certificate of such papers having been only produced and in the proper form, and they are to request of the Governors, &c. in India to pay no respect to the assumed Flag of such Ships as are not provided with such Passports and comply with these forms. And also upon the certainty of illegal proceedings of this nature, they are to ask the protection and assistance of all Governors &c. that they may be enabled to deal with such subjects unauthorized, according to the aforementioned regulations now making. And if those assuming the Emperor's Flag are not Imperial Subjects the Consuls or their Deputies or Vice Consuls are to give any public declarations or certificates of it which may be necessary to enable them in whose ports they are to seize them or deal with them as they please, renouncing all claims on that account on the part of the Emperor.

They are, on the other hand, to protect, as far as in their power, and endeavour to obtain protection from those in power, in favour of all Imperial Ships and Subjects duly authorized by His Majesty to trade beyond the Cape of Good Hope, to call them before them, hear and determine their disputes and differences among themselves, take depositions, grant certificates valid in Law here, give sentences to be executed subject to appeal here, and in short, to act in general as other Imperial Consuls do in foreign Countries, but always with the concurrence, where needful, and under the protection of the Governor &c. in whose Presidencies or Districts the Circumstances occur. They are to make proper Reports to the Emperor of their proceedings and in general to maintain, as far as in their power, good order and tranquillity among his subjects who trade to India or are there properly authorized—to encourage this trade and obtain for them such indulgences and favours as they may stand in need of, but to take care those placed thus under their authority commit no offence against the laws in the places they frequent, and should that happen, to assist as far as in their power in bringing them to justice and obliging them to make proper reparation.

You may look upon these as the chief principles and substance of the Instructions to be given to the Consuls General, and the Viscount de Walckiers would be glad you could learn whether any stronger restrictions or injunctions ought to be added for the satisfaction of the British Government or the East India Company. In that case, it will only require a hint from him to have it done, for Government here are determined to put a stop to all the abuses which have of late been committed under the Imperial Flag.

Our friend the Viscount is also very anxious to know if the orders are given for admitting those Consuls, especially the one in Bengal. I wish you could learn something about this and write to him, if you do not pay us a visit in your way to Paris, but we firmly expect to see you.

[THE END.]
VIVÉKAPATRAMĀLĀ.

BY T. A. GOPINATHA RAO, M.A.; TRIVANDRAM.

(Continued from p. 83.)

The Vivhāgapratramālā, a manuscript hitherto unpublished, whose existence was brought to my knowledge by Mr. Raigasvāmi Sarasvati, B.A., and which is a very late production, gives some account of the poets of the village of Mullārdram. It gives us some glimpses into the lives of a few of them, more especially, of Aruṇāginirāthā (otherwise known also as Śoṣādrināthā, &c.) and his son Rājanātha Kavi. It is stated therein that a Chōḷa king who went on a pilgrimage to Benares (Gaṅgākīkṣaṇa Rājēndra Chōḷadēva I. is evidently referred to here) was met there by a number of learned men of the village of Mandāra. This king being pleased with the erudition and character of these people took them with him to his dominions for the purpose of erecting temples for Śiva and settled them in the Kāṇchīmaṇḍala. They were eight in number and belonged to eight different gōtras; their names and gōtras are as follows:

1. Prāśādavallabha .......................... Kāśyapagōtra.
4. Subrahmaṇya kavi .......................... Śaṇḍilyagōtra.
7. Sōmanātha Dikshita ..................... Gōtama (Śāmaga) gōtra, and
8. Mallikārjunabhaṭṭa .......................... Śaikritigōtra.

After some time, the Chōḷa king granted them an agrahāra worth 450 nīshkas of gold, which was named Mēttaippāḍi (translated in Saṃskṛt as Talpāgiri) and which was divided into ten shares, of which eight were given to the abovenamed eight brāhmaṇas and two to the god of the local temple. In this village which was also known as the Rājanāthapura (perhaps after one of the donees, No. 3 of the above list), Rājanātha built a temple for Śiva and set up in it a liṅga which he called Rājanāthēśvara. The hill situated on the east of their village was called the Mēttaippāḍimalai.

The first of the donees, Prāśādavallabha Dikshita, had, by the grace of the god of Chidambaram (Puṇḍarīkapura), a son named Sabhāpati. The kings of the Chēra, the Chōḷa and the Pāṇḍya countries became his disciples; whenever Sabhāpati went out, a drum (dhakkā) mounted on an elephant used to be sounded to announce the advent of the illustrious poet. Hence he was better known as Dhakkā Sabhāpati. The great grandson of Dhakkā Sabhāpati was Bhāskarakrāya, the author of the Prasannakāvya. In this family was born the poet Tyāgarāja who set up a pillar of victory in the Kāmakōṭisvāraviśa (i.e., the Śaikarakēśārīya maṭṭha which is at present situated in Kumbhakōṇam). Tyāgarāja had two sons named Svāyambhu and Gurusvāmi.

The contemporaries of Svāyambhu in the other families were:

Dakṣīṇāmūrti Yajvā and Bhāskara Dikshita of the family of Bhāskara Dikshita of the Gautamagōtra; Vidyāpatimakhi, Divākarakavi and Suryabhaṭṭa of the family of the Rāja-nāthakavi of the Śāvartagōtra; Gurumūrtikavi and Śivasūrāmakhi of the family of Subrahmaṇya kavi of the Śaṇḍilyagōtra; Sivasūrāmakhi, Subrahmaṇya kavi, Rāmālīgāmakhi and Rāmāchandra of the family of Jaṭādhāraśa Dikshita of the Śrīvatsagōtra; Śaikarakāyavā, Nilakaṇṭhakakhi, Yaśanārāyaṇa and Anantakakhi of the family of Nilakaṇṭhakavi of the Bhrādavajgōtra; Rājanāthakavi and Vēṭaṭakakvi of the Gōtamanagōtra;
and Dēvārāma... of the family of Mallikārjunabhaṭṭa of the Sākṛītīgōtra; thus the original eight families consisted, in the time of Svayambhu, of twenty-one households.

Svayambha had a son named Sabhāpati, and Gurusvāmi had a daughter named Abhirāmāmbikā and a son called Sōmanātha, who were born twins. Abhirāmāmbikā was married to Rājanātha of the Gōtamagōtra; she attained her age in her 13th year, and in the Kali year 4400 expired (A.D. ... ) gave birth to a son named Sōṇādari (or Aruṇāgiri).

Of the twenty-one householders mentioned above seven left their native village Mettaippāṭi and began to reside in the village of Attyūr granted by Bukkarāya as an agrahāra to Brāhmaṇas. The king Bukka is described in the manuscript as one who had received the grace of the sage Vidyāraṇya, who was the giver of all desired objects and who was the establissher of several temples for Vishnu and Śiva. These seven people employed a Karnāṭaka brāhmaṇa and his brother as the Paṇḍī and accountant respectively on a fixed pay and another brāhmaṇa for doing pūjā in the local temple. These ten families lived in Attyūr cultivating their knowledge of Vedānta and other sāstras. They had friends in the adjacent village of Puttūr founded by the Chōla kings.

Sōṇādari (Aruṇāgiriṇātha) was sent to a teacher to learn all sāstras. While studying, his father who was anxious to have his son married, died. The boy was taken under his charge by his uncle Sōmanātha, for, his mother Abhirāmāmbikā committed sati with her deceased husband. After some time had passed, Aruṇāgiriṇātha found the wife of his uncle not at all kind to him; her ill-treatment made him run away from his uncle’s house. All along Sōmanātha was ignorant of the fact that his nephew was not accorded proper treatment by his wife and when he found the boy missing he set about searching for him. Three days after he found him on the river bank, his lips tinged red with betel. When questioned about the matter, he explained that feeling tired he slept away the previous night in the Śiva temple in Puttūr (Navagrahāra), meditating upon Vidyāpati, the god of that temple. He then dreamt that a person whose head was ornamented with the crescent moon, whose arms were adorned with bracelets of snakes, and who was accompanied by a number of children and four disciples approached him and spat in his mouth the betel he was chewing. Seeing that his lips were coloured red he got up to wash them in the river and therefore he happened to be then by the side of the river. Forthwith he burst into poetic effusion and ever since became a famous versifier and by his divine gift he attracted the attention of the then newly-crowned king Praudhādevaṇa Mahārāja and became a very intimate friend and companion of the king. He married Yajjāmbikā, a girl belonging to the Sāvarṇagōtra.

There was a pretty garden belonging to the crown, situated on the south of the village of Mettaippāṭi (Talpagrāma), on the east of Attyūr (Audumbarapura) and on the north-west of Puttūr (Navagrāma); the officer who was in charge of this garden was named Nilagiri. Once when Rukmiṇi, the queen of Praudhādevaṇa saw this garden she liked it so well that she desired to possess it and the king immediately made over this property to her.

The cows of the Brāhmaṇa villages near by used to enter the garden and destroy the valuable plants. Nilagiri protested against the straying cattle, but the brāhmaṇas paid no heed to his protestations. Then he detained the cattle and declined to liberate them: among those thus penned there were some cows belonging to Sōṇādri (Aruṇāgiri). Incensed at the insolence of Nilagiri, Sōṇādri appealed to the king not simply to order Nilagiri to liberate the cows, but to grant him the garden so that he might build an agrahāra on its site. The king, however, declined to interfere with the estate of his queen. Sōṇādri then left the kingdom of Praudhādevaṇa, it is stated, and proceeded to that of the Strātraṇa (Sultan) where by the cleverness of his composition he got access to his presence and pleased him very much. The court poet by name Anapaṭi, surnamed Kavimalla, came out with his characteristic drum, digiṣṭa, beating, to meet Aruṇāgiri in an intellectual wrangle: it was resolved that if Kavimalla was defeated by Sōṇādri he should deliver all his distinctions to
the latter. Unfortunately for him, he was overcome by Śoṇḍhri and lost his title and distinctions. The Sultan then decorated him with the distinguishing appellation of “Vidyā-dīna Śoṇḍhiri Kavi” and detained him for some time with himself. On one occasion Aruṇāgiri so pleased the Sultan with his poetic talent that the latter conferred upon him the title of ‘Diṅgim-aśravabhauma-kavi.’ Aruṇāgiri rendered the story of Rāma into a kāvya and a nāṭaka and wrote also several works on śāstras. Having thus distinguished himself in the court of the Sultan and having pleased him, Aruṇāgiri got a note of the Sultan ordering Praghadēvarāya to grant the queen’s garden near Puttūr to Aruṇāgiri (1). Praghadēvarāya, it is said, quietly gave away to Aruṇāgiri the garden belonging to his queen. Aruṇāgiri then ordered an agrahāra to be built there on the bank of the river Kuṭila; in the middle of which was constructed a temple for Śiva under the name of Sabhāpati and on the south-east corner another for Vishnu. This new village received five different names, namely, Praghadēvarāyapuram, Śravabhaumapuram, Diṅgimālayam, Trimanḍalam and Mūlāṇḍam.

Though Diṅgimakavisārvabhuma often caused panic in the minds of great poets, he never interfered with the lesser ones.

The above is an abstract of the contents of the Vībhāgapatramālā. From this we see that the so-called “deed of division” is nothing more than a panegyric on Diṅgimakavi-Sārvabhauma Aruṇāgirinātha. The genealogy of this person as gathered from the manuscript may be tabulated thus:

Prasādavallabha Dikshita of the
Kāyapagōtra.

| Dhakkā Sabhāpati.       |
| Son                      |
| Grandson                 |
| Bhāskarārya              |
| Author of Prasannakāvya |
| Tyāgarāja,              |
| who set up a pillar of victory in the Kāmakōṭiśvara Pūja. |

Svayambhu Gurasvāmi

Sabhāpati Śoṁanātha

Abhirāmāmbikā × Rājanāthā of the Gōtamagōtra.

Aruṇāgiri (alias Śoṇḍhri, 
received the grace of Śiva in becoming a poet; contemporary of Praghadēvarāya; rendered the story of Rāma into a kāvya and also a nāṭaka; obtained the birudas of Diṅgimakavisārvabhuma; defeated Anapāya, alias Kavimalla.

Yajnāmbikā of the Sārvatya-gōtra.
The members of the family of Svayambhu have left behind certain poetical works of theirs which also yield incidentally some information about them and their ancestors. The Subhadra-Dhanañjaya-Nâtaka, a Sañskrit play by Râmakavi yields the following genealogy:—

Râjanâtha

Svayambhuguru × Daughter

Râmakavi,
Author of the Subhadra-Dhanañjaya Nâtaka.

It is stated in this work that the author was a native of Mulâgam in the Tuñjira-manjâla and that he belonged to the Kâsyapagûtra. His ancestors were worshippers of Siva, and were called by the distinguishing title Aghoraśivâchâryas; these were held in great respect by Sârvabhaumakavi and others.

Again in another work, the Sômavalli-yógânanda prahasanâ, its author Aruñagiri gives his genealogy as follows:—

Diañimakavi, the opponent of
Nâgaakavî, the court poet
of the Bâljâlas

Kaviprabhu of the Sâmavêda

Sabhâpati Abhirâmanâyikâ md.,

Râjanâthadesika Aruñagiri

(Author of the Sômavalli-yógânanda
prahasanâ).

The Bhágavata-champu is another work written by Râjanâthakavi, son of Sôganagirinâtha.

The two kâvyas, the Sâluvedhyudayam and the Achyutarâyâbhyudayam, sung in praise of the deeds of valour of the Vijayanagara kings Sâluva Narasiâma and Achyutarâya are claimed to have been composed by a poet called Râjanâtha. In the former work the poet Râjanâtha states that he was the son of Sôgâdrinâtha; therein we see him bear a long string of birudas, rather high-sounding in their purport; they are:

1. Diñimaka-vi Sârvabhauma, Diñimakavi Râjanâtha.
5. Navanâtaka-bharatâchârya.
7. Pratibhâta-kavi-kunîjâra-paîçânâna.
10. Chatur-vrîtti-Sârvabhauma.
17. Saiva-sāstra-jivātuv, and

Of these a very large number of the birudas qualify Aruṇagiri or Sōnadrinātha than glorify his son; the son born of the merits of such a great man as Aruṇagirīśa who bore almost all the foregoing birudas, was Rājanāthakavi, the author of the Sālubhāhyodayam. But in the Achuṭarāyābhyodayam not even the name of the father of the poet is given; one thing, however, is certain, namely, that the author of the Achuṭarāyābhyodayam and the Bhāgavata Champu are identical, as will be observed from the introductory verses in both, extracts of which are given in the appendix; the authors of these two poems were the contemporaries of Achyutadēvarāya. The verse beginning with dharmilla-sāvīlādākara is found, without the least change, in both poems. From the facts detailed above some feel inclined to dissociate the two Rājanāthas, the authors of the Sālubhāhyodayam and of the Achuṭarāyābhyodayam and treat them as two different persons; there is also apparently some ground for their doing so, because, the one deals with the history of a king who lived at least 25 years earlier than the king whose exploits are recorded in the second poem. It might also be stated that it cannot be that the title-less Rājanātha (the grandfather of the highly-sounding-titled Rājanātha, whose father's name even is not mentioned), was the author of the kāvya dealing with a later king and his grandson, the composer of the kāvya dealing with the history of the earlier king. One gets out of this difficulty, if one admits that the author of the Sālubhāhyodayam, the Achuṭarāyābhyodayam and the Bhāgavata-champu was one and the same person, Rājanātha, the son of Aruṇagiri. If this conclusion is admitted, as it must be, the genealogy of the poets of Mullaṇḍram could be shown as related to that of the śāsana writers of the Vijayanagara kings thus:

Kaṭhavagōtra
Abhirāma
(Dīndimagrabhū)
Sabhāpati
Abhirāmanṣākkā
married to Rājanāthadeśīka
Gōtamagōtra
Kaviprabhu, the opponent of Nāgānaṅkāvī
Svayambhu—married to Sister
Sōnagiri or Aruṇagiri-
rinātha (possessor
several birudas)

Gaṇapārāya
Kāmakhi or
Kamakī
c
Svayambhu—married to Sister
Sōmanātha

Kāmaya
Kriṣṇakāvī
Rāmakāvī
Rājanāthaka-
vī
Rāmakāvī
(author of the
Subhadrā-
Dhanakāvī)
Rājanāthakāvī
(author of the Sal-
uvābhāhyodayam, the
Achuṭarāyābhy-
odayam and the Bhāga-
vena-champu)

The identification of the śāsana writers of the kings of Vijayanagara with the poets of Mullaṇḍram is based upon the following considerations:

(i) The poets of Mullaṇḍram and the śāsana writers of the Vijayanagara kings bear the same names.
(ii) They both have written the eulogies of the kings of Vijayanagara.
(iii) They both were the protégés of the Vijayanagara kings and possibly because,
(iv) as the poets, according to the Vīṇkāpatramālā were the followers of the Śrīkaṇṭhāgama and bore the high-sounding title Aghorāsvīdāchāryas, were able to induce the family guru of the Vijayanagara kings, Kriṣṇaṅka Pādita to exert his influence with the kings to procure for them the hereditary position (mirśī) of the śāsana writers of the kings.
The above are the only reasons which induced me to take the poets as identical with the śāstra writers. How far this identification is tenable it is too much to say at present. Future research alone should bear out or contradict this identity.

As regards certain facts mentioned in the *Vivēkapatramālā*, a few words of explanation are necessary. First, it is stated that the ancestors of the poets of Mullāṇḍram were originally the inhabitants on the banks of the Ganges and that when a Chōja king went on a pilgrimage to Benares, he met those learned men and took them with him and settled them in Tōṇḍai-nāṭu. If the statement is true, the Chōja king is, as has been already remarked, Rājendra-chōjādēva I. who conquered all the countries as far north as the Ganges and as a consequence was better known as Gaṅgaikōṇḍachōla. It was after his name the city of Gaṅgaikōṇḍa-chōjālapuram and the superb temple in its centre were constructed and the former made the capital by that king. This fact of his having brought some Saiva Brāhmaṇas of the Āgamānta school on his way from the banks of the Ganges is also referred to in his work the commentary on the Siddhānta-Sārvāvalī of Trilochanaśivāchārya by Anantāśivāchārya. And we know from the inscriptions of Rājarāja I. and his son Rājendra-chōjādēva I. that they preferred the Brāhmaṇas of Lāta, Gauja, &c., countries to be maṭhādhipatis and piṭūjīri in temples. Thus there is some truth in the statement made in the *Vivēkapatramālā*.

The next fact stated therein is that the original immigrants into the Tōṇḍai-nāṭu were the followers of the Śrīkaṇṭhāgama. The present inhabitants of the village of Mullāṇḍram who trace their descent from the poets mentioned in the *Vivēkapatramālā* now assert that they are not Āgamāntins but Vēdāntins belonging to the Vaśama sect. One of them is to-day the guru of the oilmonger caste (Vāṇiyan). It is very hard to believe how they could have become Vaśamas if they trace their lineage from persons who once bore the title of Aghoraśivāchāryas.

Again Mullāṇḍram is stated to have been the native village of Doṅḍimakavī and that it also bore the name Prauḥādēvarāyapuram. An inscription (No. 396 of the Madras Epigraphist's Collection for 1911) found in Mullāṇḍram “records that the Mahājanaś of Prauḥādēvarāyapuram olias Agaram-Mullāṇḍram including the poet Doṅḍimakavī, assigned house sites to certain stone-masons in the Kaṃṭalaterra. This charter was engraved on the temple of Tandānīśvaram-uṭīyār.” This is dated in the cyclic year Raṇḍra. Another record belonging to the same place (No. 397 of 1911) dated S. 1472, Sādhāraṇa records “Gift of land by a Brāhmaṇa lady to the shrine of Āṅgāmalaināṭha built by her, in the temple of Svaṃbhunāṭha for the merit of herself and her husband Kumāra Doṅḍimār Āṅgāmalaināṭhar.” If S. 1472 was Šādhāraṇa, Raṇḍra adjoining Šādhāraṇa will be the Saka years 1423 or 1483, the earlier perhaps being more probable. From these two inscriptions we learn that the ages of the Kavi Doṅḍima and perhaps of his son Kumāra Doṅḍimār Āṅgāmalaināṭhar were about the middle of the 15th century of the Saka era which falls in the reign of the Vijayanagara king Aćhyutādēvarāya—a fact which clearly shows that the author or authors of the Śālevābhīyudayam, the Aćhyutārābhīyudayam and the Bhāgavata-champū should necessarily have lived only in the reign of Aćhyutādēvarāya and not before. The inscriptions further inform us that another name of the village Mullāṇḍram was Prauḥādēvarāyapuram, as mentioned in the *Vivēkapatramālā*. 
According to the *Vedántadēśika Vaibhavaprabhāsikā* of Doḍḍayāchārya of Chōlaśingapuraṇam, Védántadēśika, the great Viśistadvaita Āchārya, the founder of the Vaiṣājagalaṇi sect of the Srivaishnavas, is said to have had a philosophical wrangle with a Ṛṣiśimā-Sārvabhauma Kavi. This Ṛṣiśimā-Sārvabhauma Kavi is herein said to be the author of a work called *Rāgabhavabhya-dyayam* and that to excel this composition Védántadēśika is said to have written *Yādavabhya-dyayam*. We know from other sources that Védántadēśika lived for over a hundred years from S. 1191-1293 (= A.D. 1269-1371). Therefore the opponent of the Srivaishnavachārya must be an ancestor of Aruṇāgarinātha (in his mother’s side).

Again, Nainārāchārya, the son of Védántadēśika, a contemporary, like his father, of Sarvajñāsirīhā Nāyaka, is reported to have defeated in a philosophical discussion a poet of the court of the prince abovenamed, known by the appellation of Sākalya-Malla. This must be the Kavimalla who was overcome by Ṛṣiśimakavi Aruṇāgarinātha, as evidenced by one of his titles, Kavimalla-galla-tāciṇa-paḻu.

The *Vivekapatramālā* contains an absurd statement that Aruṇāgarinātha, incensed by the conduct of the keeper of the queen’s garden near Mettaippāţi, complained against him to the king Prauṇḍādēvaraya and requested him to present him with the garden, so that he might construct there an *agrahāra*, that Prauṇḍādēvaraya refused to give it and that thereupon Aruṇāgar went to the Sultan of Delhi and got an order from the latter to Prauṇḍādēvaraya to cede the garden in favour of the poet. Even supposing that the Sultan of Delhi is a mistake for the Sultan of one of the five kingdoms into which the Bahmani kingdom broke, we fail to understand what right the Sultan had to issue an order to be obeyed by Prauṇḍādēvaraya and how the Vijayāraga king endured the conduct of this most disloyal and dangerous poet and settled him down in the midst of his loyal subjects. But the village of Muḷḷāṇḍram is actually called Prauṇḍādēvarayapuram, a fact which clearly bears out the fact that it was made an *agrahāra* by Prauṇḍādēvaraya. Perhaps it might be argued that after all, it might be that the king first felt some difficulty in conferring his queen’s garden to the Brāhmaṇ poet, but later on was pleased by his conduct and his learning to grant it to Aruṇāgarinātha. But this supposition cannot be upheld, because the age of Aruṇāgar is far behind that of Prauṇḍādēvaraya and therefore the one cannot be the donee and the other the donor.

From all these petty contradictions and absurdities contained in the *Vivekapatramālā* we can assert without fear of contradiction that the work is not one written in the life-time of Aruṇāgarinātha but long after it, the chief source of information being the traditions current in the village of Muḷḷāṇḍram at the time of its composition.

A number of places, etc., occur in the *Vivekapatramālā*; they are Rajanāṭhapura, otherwise known as Talpagiri, the Talpagiri hill near the *agahāra* of that name, Audumbarapura and Navāgarhāra (N. grāma). These are absurd literal translations of the Tamil names Mettaippāţi, Atiyur and Puttir—all three of which are in the Arni division of the North Arcot Distric. Muḷḷāṇḍram is also there.

*(To be continued.)*
A CONTRIBUTION TOWARDS THE EARLY HISTORY OF INDIAN PHILOSOPHY.  

BY HERMANN JACOB.

[Translated with permission by Dr. V. A. Sukthankar, Ph.D., Indore.]

The Indians have no historical tradition regarding the origin of their six philosophical systems; the general belief that they are very ancient has been most effectively strengthened, if not occasioned, by the circumstance that their originators, who are believed to be the authors of the Sūtras, are called Rṣis, i. e., “Seers of olden days.” Being free from such prejudices, philological research has arrived, on the ground of general considerations, at a relative chronology of the six systems, or rather, of three pairs of systems, as each two of them have always been closely allied with each other. The two Mīmāṃsāsas, as regards their contents, are closely associated with the Revelation; their followers are the Vedic theologians. The representatives of Sruti. Sākhya and Yoga hold the later religious ideal: asceticism and contemplation instead of sacrifice; their followers are representatives of the Smṛiti. Vaiśeṣika and Nyāya do not stand in an intimate relation to any strata of the elder literature, neither the Revelation nor the Tradition. They form the Philosophy of the learned man of the world, the Pandit. Thus three chief directions of Philosophy get clearly marked, each of which has for its representative, one of the classes of the Brahman community. The first draws its concepts and ideas from the Revelation; the second propounds a rational scheme of the world through bold speculation; and the third tries to bring it into systematic coherence through the examination of the facts of experience. As Sruti, Smṛiti and Sāstra are the three successive stages of the development of the Indian spiritual life, the chief philosophical schools belonging to each of them, stand also in a similar relation of time to each other.

This much can be gathered from general considerations with a fair degree of certainty. Recently, however, we have acquired a positive starting point for constructing the history of Indian philosophy, and to expound it is the object of these lines. It is found in Kautilyam, a treatise on state-craft by Kautilya or Vishnu Gupta, which has very lately become accessible. The author is best known by the name of Chāṇaka; he was the first Imperial Chancellor of the Mauryas, and overthrew the last of the Nanda princes and helped Chandragupta, the Kanāpakottoc of the Greeks, to the throne, as he himself says in the last verse of his work:—

yena śātram ca śāstram ca Nandarājagatā ca bhūḥ

amarṣeṇa 'ddhṛitāny āśu tena śāstram idaṁ kṛtam

---

1 The translator is a former pupil of Prof. Jacob.

2 This assertion will be proved more thoroughly in the course of this Essay. For the present it should be remembered that in works which are religious but do not belong to the Veda, such as the Purāṇas, the Śākhya ideas constitute the philosophical back-ground.

3 The oldest work of a non-religious character which has the doctrines of Vaiśeṣika and Nyāya for its philosophical basis is the Charaka Saṁhitā: for Vaiśeṣika see I. 1, 43 ff., 63 ff.; for Nyāya see III. 8, 24 ff.

Thus the composition of the Kauṭilyaṇa must be placed about 300 B.C., so long as no proof is brought forward to show that it is an old forgery. 5

Kauṭilya treats in the first Adhikaraṇa (Vidyāsamuddēśa) of the four branches of learning (Vidyās) :—1 Ānvīkṣiki, Philosophy; 2 Trayī, Theology; 3 Vārttā, Science of Industries, and 4 Daṇḍaṇīti, State-craft. The second Adhyāya gives the views of different authorities regarding the number of the Vidyās (the Mānavas accept three [2-4], the Bārhaspatyas two [3 & 4], the Ausānasas only one [4]), and then explains that under Philosophy are to be understood Sāṅkhya, Yoga and Lokāyata (Sāṅkhya Yogo Lokāyatāṃ cety ānvīkṣiki).

Then the text continues:

dharmadāharmau trayyām, arthanarthaṃ vārttāyām, nayānayaṃ daṇḍanītyām, balābale cā’ī tāsāṃ hetubhir anvik-amāṇaḥ lokasyo ‘pakaroti, vyasane’ bhuvaye ca buddhim avasthā- payati, prajñāvākyakriyā vaśārādyam ca karoti :
pradīpas sarvavidyānāṁ upāyas sarvakarmaṇāṁ !
āsrayas sarvadharmacāṇāṁ saśvad ānvīkṣiki matā ||

"In as much as philosophy examines (religious) merit and demerit in Theology, profit and loss in the Science of Industries, right and wrong policies in State-craft, and also discusses, with reasons, the relative importance of these (three sciences), it serves mankind, gives correct insight into prosperity and adversity and lends sharpness of intellect and cleverness in business and speech:—

Philosophy has always been considered to be the lamp of all the sciences, a means of performing all the works, and the support of all the duties."

According to Kauṭilya the essence of philosophy lies in systematic investigation and logical demonstration; in his judgment these conditions are satisfied only (ītī) by Sāṅkhya Yoga, and Lokāyata.

Now it will be of interest to place by the side of the above remark of Kauṭilya concerning the essence of ānvīkṣiki, Vātsyāyana’s exposition of the same subject as given in Nyāya-Bhāṣya (I.1, I). I shall give here the passage, together with a few comments by Uddyotakara (6th century A.D.) on the same in his Vārttika. 6 The occasion for the exposition of this subject in the Nyāya-bhāṣya is the question why in the Nyāya-Sūtra sixteen categories, pramāṇa, prameya, saṃśaya, etc., should be introduced when saṃśaya and the rest are included in the first two, viz. :—"the means of knowledge" and the "right knowledge." Vātsyāyana admits it and then continues: imās tu chatasro vidyāḥ prthak prasthānāḥ prasabhrītām anugrahāyō 'padāyante, yāsām caturthi 'iyam ānvīkṣiki nyāyavi-dyā: "But these (i.e., the well-known) sciences, of which this philosophy or the science of Nyāya is one," 7 are taught for the benefit of men, in so far as each of them has its special subject." On this Uddyotakara comments: catarṣa imā vidyā bhavanti, tās ca prthak-prasthānāḥ: agnihotraḥvahanādiprasthānāḥ trayā, ṣaṃśakṣaṭadiprasthānāḥ vārttā svāmya-

5 Hillebrandt has identified the quotations and references in the Classical Literature (Loc. cit., p. 4 ff.) To these evidences of the genuineness of the work may be added, as we shall immediately see, those from the Nyāya Bhāṣya of Vātsyāyana of the 4th or 5th century A.D. Further indications will be given in the course of this essay.

6 Bibl. Ind., p. 13.

7 Chaturthi is to be understood in the sense of the Indian Grammar (Pāṇini, V. 2, 48) as a word, and not to determine the order of enumeration; because, according to Kauṭilya, the ānvīkṣiki stands in the first place, and Vātsyāyana, as we shall see, follows Kauṭilya. Hence Chaturthi means here the Vidyā which completes the number four.
mātyānauvidhyāyini daṇḍanītīḥ, saṃśayādi-bhedānuvīdhāyini āniṃśika. "These sciences are four in number and each has its separate subjects; those of Theology are agnikotra, sacrifices, etc.; those of the Science of Industries are plough, cart, etc.; those of Statecraft are Prince, Minister, etc.; Philosophy treats of 'Doubt and the remaining (categories)." Vātsyāyana continues after the passage just translated: tasyāḥ prthihvakraśānām saṃśayādayaḥ padārthāḥ; teṣām prthihvavacanam antareṣaḥ 'tmanvādyamātrām iyam syād, yatho 'paniṣadabḥ. "Its (i.e. of philosophy) special subjects are the categories "Doubt," etc.; if these are not taught separately it would be nothing more than a doctrine of Ātman (or redemption) like the Upanisads." Uddyotakara says: tasyāḥ saṃśayādiprasāthānām antareṣaḥ 'tmanvādyamātrām iyam syāt. tataḥ kim syāt? adhyātmavādyamātrāvad Upaniṣadāvādāvat trayaṃ eva 'ntarbhāva iti catustyaṁ nivarteta." Without these special subjects "Doubts," etc., "it (philosophy) would be nothing more than a doctrine of the Ātman, like the Upanisads. What would that come to? It would then be, like the doctrine of Upanisadās, included in Theology, as it would be nothing more than a doctrine of redemption; and then the number of Vidyās would not be four." A few lines after the passage we have discussed, Vātsyāyana defines the Āniṃśika in this way: pramāṇair arthaparikṣaṇāṃ nyāyaḥ, pratayahāgamāśritam anumānām, sa anvīksā pratyakṣāgamābhyaṃ ikṣitasya anvīksa'yaṃ anvīksa, tavyā pravartata ity anvīkskī nyāyavidyā nyāyasāstrāṃ. "The examination of a subject by means of the right means of knowledge is called demonstration (nyāyas). The inference depends upon sense perception and communication (āgama); it is reflection (anvīksā), i.e., subsequent knowledge obtained from what one has already learnt through perception and communication: the Āniṃśika has to do with this reflection and is thus the science of demonstration, the Nyāya Śāstra."

And Vātsyāyana concludes the Bhāṣya in the following way: Se'yaṃ anvīkskī pramāṇādibhiḥ padārthāḥ vibhājanāṇāṃ; pradānāḥ sarvāvidyāyām upāyaḥ sarvakarmaṇām | āśrayaḥ sarvadharmaṇāṃ Vidyoddhāsa prakṛtā iṣād idaṃ tattvajñānaṃ niśreyasādhiṃ gamaḥthāṃ vāhādyāyam veditavyaṃ; iha tvadhyātmavādyāyam ātmād tattvajñānaṃ, niśreyasādhiṃ gamaḥ 'pavarga prāptaḥ.

"This our Philosophy arranged according to "categories," means of knowledge," etc., is praised by (Kauṭilya in the Adhyāya) Vidyoddhāsa as a lamp of all the sciences, a means of performing all the works, and the support of all the duties. One has to ascertain in the case of the different sciences wherein the knowledge of truth that is said to lead to the proposed goal lies. But here in this science of redemption (Adhyātma Vidyā) the knowledge of truth refers to the Soul, etc. (1.1.9) and the attainment of the highest goal is the acquisition of salvation."

In this exposition of Vātsyāyana, there are three points which are of importance for our investigation: (1) The statement of Kauṭilya that there are four sciences, not more and not less, has acquired unquestioned currency; the views which disagreed with his and were mentioned by him (see above p. 102) seem to have been definitely set aside.

(2) Vātsyāyana makes the claim for the Nyāya Philosophy to be the Āniṃśika KAT E OXHN in the sense which Kauṭilya gives to it.

---

8 Some MSS. read adhyātmavādyā. Both, words are used synonymously; cf. the next passage from the Vārttika.
9 In another place also Vātsyāyana shows his indebtedness to Kauṭilya. At the end of his Bhāṣya on 1.1.4, he says: paramataḥ apratīśidham anumataḥ iti tatraṇayuktiḥ. The last adhyaya of Kauṭilya discusses the 33 "Rules of Method" (tantra-yañdayaḥ) after which the chapter is named. The 19th tantra-yañda reads: paravāyayam apratīśidham anumataṁ (quis facet consciente videatur) hence Vātsyāyana has borrowed this maxim.
(3) He expressly designates it as an *Adhyātma Vidyā*, i.e., as a Philosophy which recognises the *ātman* and would help it to its redemption.

Now as regards the second point the claim of the Nyāya Philosophy to be the true Ānvikṣikī is, as a matter of fact, thoroughly justified; as it, together with the Vaiśeṣika, fulfills the conditions demanded by Kaṭṭhika in a higher degree than other philosophical systems. And this is recognised also by others. The commentator to Kāmandaki’s *Nītiśāstra* 2, 7 (ānvikṣikī ātma-vijñānam) says that *Ānvikṣikī* is annamānavidyā Nyāyadarśana-vaiyākādictā; and Madhusūdana Sarasvatī explains ānvikṣikī to be Nyāya (nyāya ānvikṣikī pāćādhyāyi Gautamena praṇītā). All the more it is therefore of importance that Kaṭṭhika does not mention by name Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika, while enumerating the systems recognized by him as Ānvikṣikī. From this we can draw the inference with certainty that at his time, i.e., 300 B.C., Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika had not yet received the recognition as philosophical systems, not to speak of the existence of the *sūtras* of Gautama10 and Kaṭṭhika in the form in which they are now before us.

In his enumeration of the philosophical systems recognised by him as Ānvikṣikī Kaṭṭhika mentions after Śaṅkhyā and Yoga the Lokāyata (Sāṃkhya Yogo Lokāyataṃ cety ānvikṣikī). The Lokāyata system is known to us only from references to it in Brahmanical, Buddhist and Jain Philosophies, all of which are agreed in their abhorrence of this infidel philosophy. Mādhava in his Sarvadarśana-saṅgraha devotes the first chapter to it and calls its founder, Cārvaka as *nāstika siromaṇi*, “an arch-heretic.”

The Lokāyata doctrine is a gross materialism:—The senses alone give correct knowledge, the material things alone (the four elements Earth, Water, Fire, and Wind) are real; there is no immaterial soul, but the spirit arises from a certain mixture of these elements just as the intoxicating effect of a drink is produced by the fermenting ingredients of the same; the Vedas are a fraud just as everything they teach. These are the fundamental principles of the system and on this point all the records are in complete agreement.

Now it is difficult to believe that Kaṭṭhika, who acknowledges the entire social order founded on the Vedas, meant this grossly materialistic system by that Lokāyata which he puts on the same line together with Śaṅkhyā and Yoga as a representative of Ānvikṣikī. And still there is no doubt about it, because the Lokāyata doctrine is ascribed to Bṛhaspati, the teacher of the gods, and many of the verses handed down to us are put in his mouth. There was also a *Niti-sāstra* which was likewise ascribed to Bṛhaspati. Kaṭṭhika refers to his teaching in the second *adhyāya*: vārttā daṇḍanītī cetā Bṛhaspatyāḥ; sansvarāṇamātram hi trayi lokāyatrāvīda iti. “The followers of Bṛhaspati recognise only two sciences: the science of Industries and the science of State-craft, while Theology is seen to be only a fraud11 by him who understands life.” Here we

---

10 Gautama is, of course, not the founder of the Nyāya system, but he only helped one school of the Naiyāyikas to obtain general recognition. Thus Vaiśeṣika mentions in I. 1. 22 that some Naiyāyikas maintain that the inference consisted of ten parts instead of five as taught in the *sūtra*. Perhaps also the true explanation of the three kinds of inference, which Vaiśeṣika gives in I. 1. 5 did not arise for the first time after the composition of the *sūtra* but had existed before. It is worth noticing that Caraka, III., 8, 24 ff. gives for the use of physicians a short compendium of Nyāya which in part entirely agrees with our Nyāya; but in details differs considerably from it. Have we perhaps here to trace a collateral school of Nyāya which existed by the side of that of Gautama?

11 Here *Sanscara* must have the same meaning as the Māhāyānistic *sanskṛt* which corresponds to *Mādhyamik* of the Vedānta. It will be to the purpose to compare the saying (*dbhāṣyaka*) quoted by Mādhava (loc. cit. p. 2) agnihotram trayo vedi trayo vedi trayo vedi trideśam bhāmagnātīnam: buddhi puruṣa ‘ahāmānām jīvike’ti Bṛhaspati. This verse has been quoted in *Prabodhacandrodaya* II., 26.—Kaṭṭhika mentions the Bṛhaspatyas several times, e.g., pp. 29, 63, 177, 192. The *Niti*-teachings of Bṛhaspati, which Draupadi expounds in *Mahābhārata* III., 32, are at any rate as orthodox as one can wish!
have evidently to do with the same repudiation of the Revelation as is known to be the founder of this Materialism. And that this Brhaspati was known to be the teacher of gods can be seen from the fact that a School, 12 which was a rival to the Barhaspatyas, that of the Avasanas, is traced back to Ushanas, i.e., Taukra or Kavya Ushanas, the teacher of the Asuras. The Barhaspatyas were not merely a school of philosophy but also a school of Smriti, like the Manava, the Parasara and Ausanasas, whom also Kautilya mentions.

We thus understand how he comes to place the Lokayata in the same line with Sankhya and Yoga. Because these systems are also considered to be Smritis. Sankara expressly designates them as Smritis in Brahma Sutra, II, 1, 1—3 and Badarayana was of the same view, as can be seen from the wording of the sutas, 13 even though he mentions only the Yoga by name. 14 That the old Sankhya had the character of Smriti is seen also from its method of teaching, of which it was so characteristic to expound its principles through similes and parables, that the Sankhya Sutra, which is certainly a pretty modern work, devotes them to the whole of its fourth chapter, the Akhyayikadhyaya. Svaraksha similarly testifies that the Akhyayikas were an integral part of the old Sankhya; Karka 72 runs:—

saptatyam kila ye ‘rthas te ‘rthah krtsanasya sastitantrasya ||
akhyayikavirahitah paravadarivarjita’sapi ||

Sankhya Yoga and Lokayata thus belong to the same stratum of ancient Indian Literature and hence Kautilya could mention them together. We know, indeed, that Sankhya and Yoga are two ancient systems—sanatane decc (mati). The Mahabharata says of them, XII, 349.72—nevertheless the positive testimony of Kautilya is not to be underestimated. We now know for certain that Sankhya and Yoga existed at least 300 B.C. and indeed as philosophical systems which were based on logical demonstration (anviksika), and not only in the form of intuitive speculation, as the so-called “Epic Sankhya”, which is only a popularized variety of the real Sankhya.15

All the same we cannot assert that the Sankhya and Yoga of Kautilya’s time are identical in the details of their teaching with these systems as they are known to us in the Sankhya Karka and the Yoga Sutra. These are rather the last stages of their development and as there intervened between the beginning and the end of this development from seven to eight centuries, if not more, changes in detail cannot but occur, as indeed we can see from the fact that the teachings characteristic of Sankhya and Yoga (pratitantaraisiddanta)

12 The notorious Sukanatt, from which once G. Oppert proved that the ancient Indians possessed guns, is certainly a later fabrication.

13 Smrti=sanavakasha-dosaprasanga iti ceta ‘nyasmyt-sanavakaha-dosaprasangat (1); itreshlam canupadheh (2); etena yogah pratyakta (3).

14 He did not need to mention the Sankhya as the whole of the first Adhyaya in its polemical part is directed against it. Thibaut explains (SBE., Vol. XXXIV p. XLVI): “It is perhaps not saying too much if we maintain that the entire 1st Adhyaya is due to the wish, on the part of the Sutakara, to guard his doctrine against Sankhya attacks.” Only on this supposition can the beginning of the 2nd Adhyaya be understood:—in the 1st Adhyaya the attempts of the Sankhyas to interpret individual passages from the Scriptures as a proof of their teachings, were rejected. The first Sutra of the 2nd Adhyaya rejects the claim of the Sankhya to be considered authoritative as Smriti, and the 2nd Sutra says that the rest of its teachings found no support in the Holy Scriptures.

15 Compare W. Hopkins, The Great Epic of India, p. 97 ff.
as explained by Vatsyayana in Nyāyadarśana I. 1. 29 do not quite correspond with our knowledge of these systems.\(^{16}\)

We saw above that Kauṭilya in his enumeration of Philosophical systems passes over Vaiśeṣika and Nyāya; this must evidently be due to their not existing at his time. He does not mention the Mimāṃsā, because he must have considered it not as a systematic Philosophy (\textit{Avuśikī}), but as a branch of study belonging to Theology. He does not indeed mention it expressly in his concise survey of Theology (\textit{Trayi}) in Adhyāya 3: ‘The four Vedas and the Itihāsāveda along with the six Vedāṅgas.’ But we may assume that the Pūrva Mimāṃsā (Adhvāra-Mimāṃsā) was included as a subsidiary branch of Kalpa (especially of the Srauta Sūtras)\(^{17}\) under this Vedāṅga. Kāmandaki who belongs to the school of Kauṭilya mentions the Mimāṃsā by name:

\begin{quote}
\textit{aṅgāni vedā cātvāro mīmāṃsā nyāyavistaraḥ | dharmaśāstraḥ purāṇaḥ ca trayi dharmān ca trayi 'daṃ sarvam ucyate ||}
\end{quote}

One thus sees that Kauṭilya’s enumeration of what belongs to Theology did not go much into details; that even the \textit{Purāṇa} and \textit{Dharmaśāstra} belong to it, follows from his explanation of \textit{Itihāsa}, p. 10. Had he given a similar account of the Vedāṅgas he would certainly have mentioned the Pūrva Mimāṃsā. But whether the Uttara Mimāṃsā, the Vedāṅta existed as a school of Philosophy is doubtful. Because the \textit{Sūtra}, as I have shown elsewhere,\(^{18}\) can scarcely be older than the 3rd century A.D. But on the other hand it mentions a succession of teachers\(^{19}\) from which we can conclude that a school of the exegesis of the \textit{Upaniṣads} already existed in early times. This be as it may, there was for Kauṭilya no occasion to mention the Uttara Mimāṃsā as this also must be reckoned as pertaining to Theology.

Still a few words regarding the Buddhistic Philosophy by which I here understand, of course, not the dogmatic speculations of the canon\(^{20}\) but metaphysical and epistemological theorising, such as the Kaśyapavāda or the doctrine of the momentariness of existence, against which the whole Philosophy of later times had to wage a bitter war. Had this doctrine, which must have required at least as much acuteness for being maintained, as its opponents evinced in refuting it, been in existence at the time of Kauṭilya, it is quite conceivable that he, having recognised the infidel Lokāyata as a systematic Philosophy, would not have denied the same recognition to a heretical system, if it only had deserved the name of Philosophy (\textit{Avuśikī}). Such an inference, however, must not be drawn. Because a real statesman like Kauṭilya could easily come to terms with the theoretical unbelief of Brihaspati as long as there were no practical consequences to follow from it. It is not, however, reported that Brihaspati wanted to set aside the political and social institutions resting on Brahmanical groundwork, to maintain which was, according to Kauṭilya, the highest duty of a prince. But the Buddhists and Jainas took up another standpoint with regard to this important question; and that must have been the reason why this Brahman writer on state-craft ignored their Philosophy.

\textit{\(^{16}\) Cf. P. Tuxen, \textit{Yoga}: Copenhagen, 1911, p. 10 ff.}

\textit{\(^{17}\) SBE, XXXIV, p. XII.}

\textit{\(^{18}\) JAOS., XXXI, p. 29.}

\textit{\(^{19}\) Deussen, \textit{System des Vedanta}, p. 24.}

\textit{\(^{20}\) If Kauṭilya had considered these worth his trouble to know he must have regarded them as different branches of heretical Theology. He, however, recognised the Brahmanical Theology, the \textit{Trayi}, as a \textit{vidyā} worthy of study. Cf. Manu XII. 25,}

\begin{quote}
yā Vedāntaḥ kṣatrayo yā ca kā sa kauṭīyaḥ | sarvās tā nirphalāḥ prāyya tamoṣṭhā hi tāḥ smṛtāḥ ||
\end{quote}
We have seen that according to Kauṭilya the number of Vidyās is four. He lays great emphasis on this number. For he first puts forth the views of the three schools, which differ from him. Those of the Mānavas, Bāhrāspatyaś and Aṣṭānāsas, who maintain that the number of viyāsas is respectively 3, 2 and 1; and he continues: catasra eva viyāt iti Kauṭilyaḥ, tābhir dharmāraṇeḥ yad viyāt, tad viyānāṃ viyātvam. “Kauṭilya teaches that there are four Vidyās not more and not less. They are called viyāsas because through them one learns (vidyāt) Dharma and Artha.” From these words one can gather that he was the first, who not only taught that the number of the viyāsas was four, but also recognized the Āṇvikśikī as a special Vidyā. For he says about the Mānavas that they included Āṇvikśikī in Theology. It is not that they denied the Āṇvikśikī but they did not admit it to the rank of an independent Vidyā and hence connected it with Theology. As far as two Mānasmāśas are concerned, they were perfectly justified in doing so. Sāṅkhya and Yoga, however, could be looked upon as different branches of Theology, because as we have seen they were considered as Śmrtis. That the Mānavas knew both these philosophical systems can be seen from the circumstance that Manu, who certainly is to be considered a later offshoot of this school, makes a considerable use of Sāṅkhya and Yoga ideas in the theoretical part of his work. Kauṭilya’s innovation thus consists in the fact that he recognized Philosophy to be a science by itself, inasmuch as it has its own method of treatment. And therefore he can bring in the Lokāyata, the character of whose contents must exclude it from the Trayā. Had the conception of the Āṇvikśikī, as Kauṭilya grasped it, been current before him, the Bāhrāspatyaś would have considered the number of the Vidyās not to be two (Vārttā and Dāṇjanīti) as we saw above; but would have mentioned the Āṇvikśikī as the third Vidyā. Because they themselves were followers of Lokāyatam which was recognised by Kauṭilya as the Āṇvikśikī. Hence when we find in Gautama’s Dharma Sāstra (XI, 3) the statement: trayāṃ āṇvikśikyāṃ cābhivinitaḥ, “(The Prince) should be well schooled in Theology and Philosophy”, we may presume that the passage is a later interpolation. J. Jolly classifies the work with the revised Dharma Sāstra. The combination referred to by Gautama: of Trayā and Āṇvikśikī, is not at all mentioned by Kauṭilya; probably it arose from the efforts of an enthusiast, who was anxious to emphasise the authority of Veda and Brahmanas for every duty of a prince, as Gautama himself does elsewhere. All other authors recognise four Vidyās. The passage that has been translated above from the Nyāya Bhaṭṭya shows that for Vatsyāyana the number four had almost canonical authority, as he bases upon it his argument to prove that the Nyāya Sāstra must be called the true Āṇvikśikī. I shall soon bring forward further evidence to show that the view of Kauṭilya that there are four Vidyās, received general recognition. But in one point all the later writers are agreed, as opposed to Kauṭilya, viz., in demanding that the Āṇvikśikī is at the same time Ātmavidyā. We saw above that the author of the Nyāya Bhaṭṭya requires of the Āṇvikśikī that it should not be merely an Ātmavidyā; but should have subject-matter peculiar to itself. Nevertheless he claims towards the end of the passage translated above, that the Nyāya Sāstrā is not only the Āṇvikśikī but also Ādhyatma-vidyā, a Philosophy, which

---

21 Traya várttā daṇjanīti cāti Mānavaḥ. trayiviṣeṣo by Āṇvikśikī ’ti.
22 “Recht und Sünde,” in Grundriss der indoar. Phil. p. 5.
23 If the tradition (SBE, II., p. XLI) according to which Gautama is supposed to be the grandson or great-grandson of Usānas, can be taken seriously, Gautama must have belonged to the school of the Aṣṭānāsas; but this recognized, according to Kauṭilya, only one Vidyā; daṇjanīti ekā vidyā ’by Aṣṭānāsaḥ.
recognises the existence of the soul and leads it to salvation. The idea obviously is that only that Philosophy which at the same time is Ātma Vidyā has a claim for recognition. In this way not only was Lokāyata excluded, which Kauṭilya had recognised, but also the Buddhistic systems which probably arose as dangerous opponents of Brahmanical Philosophy only after Kauṭilya’s time, in the centuries immediately before and after the beginning of our era. In order to defend itself, the Brahmanical Philosophy assumed the role of Jñanamārga, “the way of Salvation depending upon Philosophical knowledge.” This means exactly the same as the demand that the Philosophy should also be an Ātma Vidyā. It shows that in the authoritative circles of Brahman society a decided movement had started in favor of exclusively orthodox views.

This transformation had already taken place when Kāmandaki, belonging to the school of Kauṭilya, wrote his Nītisāra. While discussing the four Vidyās in the second Sarga, he says:

ānvikṣiki ātmavidyā syād ikṣāṇāt sukhadākhayoh ।
iṣamānas tayā tattvam harasokau vyudasyati||

“The Philosophy must be an Ātma Vidyā inasmuch as through it one understands the nature of pleasure and pain; (the prince) realising the truth from it, overcomes exultation and grief.”

Prof. C. Formichi discussed the question of the age of Kāmandaki’s Nītisāra at the XIth International Congress of Orientalists held at Rome (“Alcune osservazioni sull’ epoca del Kāmandakiya Nītisāra,” Bologna 1899)—and showed that Kāmandaki was comparatively late (a contemporary of Varāhamihira or a little older). From his arguments, which I supplement in details, the matter seems to stand as follows:—While enumerating the Ministers Kāmandaki mentions, in IV, 33 (tādṛk sāṅvätsaro ‘py asya āyotsāhāstrārthacintakah) praśāṃbhiddhānakaḍalo horāgaṇītattavativ ||). The astrologer after the Purohita, whereas Kauṭilya concludes his remarks regarding the Ministers with the latter without referring to the astrologer; and does not at all mention the Mauhārīka along with the ministers, but places him in the same rank with the Physician and the head-cook (p. 38). During the interval between Kauṭilya and Kāmandaki Greek astrology (Horā) came in vogue and the astrologer came to stand high in the esteem of kings, as the “Great Seer Garga” testifies:

Kṛṣṇāṅgopāgadakuserāḥ horāgaṇītāñjibhikam ||
yo na pujayate rājā sa nāśaṃ upagacchati ||
yas tu samyag vijayāti horāgaṇītasamhitāḥ||
abhayareyāḥ sa narendraṇa svikartavyo jayaiṣṭhā||

According to this, Kāmandaki must have lived at the earliest in the 3rd or 4th century A.D. The date so determined explains also the fact, that the proof given by Kāmandaki for the existence of the Soul, I. 20 agrees in general with Nyāya Dārśana I. 1. 10 and Vaiśeṣika Dārśana, III. 2. 1, and his proof for the existence of the ‘inner sense’ (Manas) I. 30 agrees almost literally with Nyāya Dārśana, I. 1. 60 (cf. Vaiśeṣika Dārśana, III. 2. 1). For, as I have shown elsewhere, the Nyāya Dārśana in the form in which it is now before us, cannot well be placed earlier than the 3rd century A.D. But it may be pointed out that Kāmandaki combines these Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika ideas with those that are borrowed from Sākhya and Yoga (I. 28, 30b to 35), and thus he prepares an eclectic philosophy in usum delphini. On the other hand Kauṭilya

24 Brhatāṣṭhitā adhy. 2. 25 JAOS., XXXI, p. 9 ff.
attaches importance to philosophy in so far as it exercises the princes in logical thinking; and the contents of the system do not seem to him to matter much, as he recognises even the infidel Lokāyata, along with Saṅkhya and Yoga. This clearly indicates a great difference in point of view between Kaṭhila and his later follower Kāmandaki.

An older witness is Manu. According to Kauṭiliya the Manavas recognised only three Sciences, because they included Philosophy in Theology (trayi vārttā daṇḍanitāś cē 'ti mānavāḥ; trayi vīśeshāhū ṣāṅkhāki 'ti). Hence one may expect Manu to recognise only three Vidyās; but he mentions four, just like Kauṭiliya, because he, like the latter, separates Philosophy from Theology; however he demands that the Ānvikṣiki shall be an ātma vidyā (VIII, 43):

traividyabhyaṃ trayiṃ vidyāṃ daṇḍanitīṃ ca śāvatiṃ
ānvikṣikiṃ cā 'tmavidyāṃ vārtottarambhāṃ ca lokatah||

"The king should learn) from Brahmins well versed in Vedās, Theology, the everlasting State-craft and Philosophy which teaches the nature of the Soul and learn the works taught in the Science of Industries from people who understand it." We thus find the same views in Manu as in the Nyāyabhāṣya and in Kāmandaki. They based their teachings on Kauṭiliya modifying the latter to suit the orthodox tendencies of the time which set in after Kauṭiliya, probably after the dissolution of the system of Government introduced by the heretic Emperor, Asoka. That the account of Philosophy as we find it in Kaṭhilyam could not hold good a few generations after the life-time of Chāṇakya, speaks for the genuineness of its text that has come down to us.

I may recapitulate the results of our investigation by saying that the Mīmāṃśā, Saṅkhya, Yoga and Lokāyata already existed in the 4th century B.C., whereas Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika and probably the Buddhistic Philosophy also came later into existence.

THE PRATĪHĀRA OCCUPATION OF MAGADHA.

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

In my monograph on the Pālas of Bengal I had stated that "Magadha was annexed by the Gūrjara-Pratīhāras to their dominions, and after Nārāyaṇapāla we find the names of the Gurjara princes in the votive inscriptions of Magadha."¹ The discovery of two inscriptions in the province of Bihār has thrown new light on this period and has now enabled us to determine the extent of the occupation of Magadha by the Pratīhāras more precisely. The Vaiśākapāla inscription of the 7th year of Nārāyaṇapāla's reign proved that up to that date Gayā was in the possession of Nārāyaṇapāla. The Bhāgalpur grant of Nārāyaṇapāla proves that up to the 17th year of his reign Mudgagiri or Munger was in his possession. A small brass image bearing a votive inscription on its back was discovered in Bihār Town two or three years ago. At present it is in the Museum of the Baṅgīya Sāhāya Parisad at Calcutta. The image is that of a goddess with four hands

seated in the ardhaparyanka posture. The inscription is incised on the back of the throne of the image. It reads:


Translation.

"The pious gift of Thāraka son of the Rāṇaka Ucha (Utsa), (dedicated) in the year 54 of the reign of the illustrious Narāyaṇapāladeva."

This new inscription proves that Narāyaṇapāla reigned for at least fifty years and that in the 5th year of his reign Uddanapura or Bihar was included in his dominions. The characters of the two Prathihāra inscriptions discovered in the Gayā District show a marked resemblance to the characters of the Vishnupāda inscription of the year 7 of Narāyaṇapāla and therefore it would be safer to place these two records after the Vishnupāda inscription but before the Bodhagayā-pedestal-inscription of the reign of Gopāla II. This proves that after the 7th year of Narāyaṇapāla Gayā and Western Magadha were occupied by Gurjara, but Uddanapura or Bihar Town and Eastern Magadha continued to be ruled by the kings of the Pāla dynasty.

The Gunierya inscription of Mahendrapāla, a tentative reading of which was published by me in my monograph on the Pālas is being republished now. I edit it from a photograph kindly lent to me by Dr. D.B. Spooner, B.A., Ph.D., F.A.S.B., Superintendent, Archaeological Survey, Eastern Circle:

Text.

1. Samvat 9 Vaišākha.
2. Sudi 5 Sri-Guṇa.
3. -carita Sri-Mahendrapāla
4. -la-deva-rājye deva-dha
5. -rmm[ojg]an Paramēpāsaka
6. -vanika Haridatta putra Sri (? la) pa . . .

Translation.

"In the year 9 on the 5th day of the bright half of Vaiśākha, in the reign of the illustrious Mahendrapāla, at the illustrious Guṇacarita, the pious gift of Sṛpā (? la) son of the merchant Haridatta."

The record is incised on the pedestal of an image of Buddha which has been placed inside a modern shrine near Gunierya.

The continued occupation of Eastern Magadha by the Pālas during their struggle with the Gurjara Pratihāras can now be proved from a number of records:

1. The Vishnupāda inscription of the 7th year of Narāyaṇapāla.
2. The Bihar inscription of the 9th year of Narāyaṇapāla. This inscription was found among the specimens collected by the late Mr. A. M. Broadley in the subdivision and therefore it proves that Eastern Magadha was in the possession of Narāyaṇapāla up to the 9th year of his reign.

1 Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol. V., p. 63; pl. XXXI.
3. The Bhagalpur grant of Nārāyaṇapāla of the year 17. This proves that Mudgagiri or Munger was in the possession of Nārāyaṇapāla up to the 17th year of his reign.

4. The Bihar image inscription of the year 54. Though the find...pot of this image is uncertain, the mention of Uddanapura in the record proves that the city was included in the dominion of Nārāyaṇapāla in that year. There is a blank between the years 17 and 54 and in these thirty-seven years the Gurjaras may have temporarily occupied Eastern Magadha. Such occupation could not have been of a permanent nature as Eastern Magadha was in the occupation of Nārāyaṇapāla in his 54th year.

5. No records of the reign of Rājapāla, son of Nārāyaṇapāla, were known when my monograph on the Pālas was published. Two or three years ago Mr. Puran Chand Nahar, M.A., B.L., Zamindar of Azimganj, Murshidabad, discovered an inscription of Rājapāla in the Jain temple at Bargaon near Bihar in the Patna District of Bihar and Orissa. Bargaon is the site of the ancient Nālanda. A Jain temple, amidst the ruins, is the oldest temple at that place. Mr. Nahar informs me that there are four stone pillars at this place, all of the same design. The record is incised on one of these pillars. Mr. Nahar has kindly supplied me with four inked impressions of this record from which I edit it. It consists of five lines; the language is incorrect Sanskrit verging on Prākrit. The object of the inscription is to record the visit (?) of one Vaidyanātha (Vaidyanātha), son of Manoratha of the merchant family, to the temple in the month of Mārga (śīra) in the 24th year of the reign of the illustrious Rājapāla (Rājapāla).

Text.
1. Om Samvat 24 Mārga śīra
2. Sri-Rājapāla-deva-rā-
3. -je Vanika-kule Manora-
4. -tha-sūtena Sri-Vaidyanātha
5. Devathāne paraṇavata

Translation.

“In the year 24, the — day of Mārga (śīra), in the reign of the illustrious Rājapāla (Rājapāla) the illustrious Vaidya-nātha (Vaidyanātha) son of Manoratha of the merchant family, bows in the temple.”

This inscription proves that Rājapāla reigned for at least 24 years and in that year Nālanda, and most probably the whole of South Bihar belonged to him. This is the first inscription of Rājapāla that has been discovered as yet. Two inscriptions of Gopāla II., the son and successor of Rājapāla have been discovered; one at Bargaon and the other at Bodh Gaya. These prove that Gopāla II. recovered the whole of Bihār from the Gurjaras. Only one record of Vigrahapāla II. has been discovered as yet. It is the colophon of a MS. copied in the 26th year of his reign. But this does not help us in determining the western limit of the Pāla kingdom. Mahāpāla I., the son of Vigrahapāla II., possessed the whole of Bihār and a series of records prove that Mahāpāla I., Mahāpāla II., Nāyapāla, Vigrahapāla III. and Rāmapāla ruled over Eastern Magadha.

* Read Vaidyanātha.
* Read Prasamati. The form prasamati for prasamati is to be found in one of the Barabar cave inscriptions where we have: Açjyra-Śri-Delānanda prasamati Sidhāvatara.
THE WEEK-DAYS AND VIKRAMA.

The late Dr. Fleet argued (JRAS., 1912, p. 1039) that the Jewish calendar of the week-days found its way into India after Europe received it from the Jews, that is, in the third century of the Christian era. If India received the week-days from outside it must have been from Syria direct, not via Europe. The evidence is twofold. The Śāndikārajagāvatām (Dīniyagāvatām) mentions these days (p. 642).1 In the 3rd century it was translated into Chinese. Dr. Fleet tried to get over this evidence by saying that the days are not to be found in the Chinese translation. But the natural explanation is that it being rather difficult to express week-days in Chinese, the translator left them out. The other evidence is more ancient. The Baudhāyana Dharma-sūtra (Bühler, II. 5. 9. 9)2 prescribes tarpas to the week-days or their planets in the same order as we know them here or as Europe learnt centuries after the Baudhāyana-Sūtras from the Semitic world.

The point comes before us in connexion with the Gāthā-Śapta-Śati, where one of the day-names occurs.

Even if we knew the week-days in the first century A.D., as is clearly proved by the Āvadāna referred to, the date of the Gāthā-Śapta-Śati need not be lowered from the 1st century A.C., which was the date assigned to it by Sir R. Bhandarkar. My friend Mr. D. R. Bhandarkar’s argument in the Bhandarkar Memorial Volume loses its force in the face of the Āvadāna and the Baudhāyana Dharma-sūtra.

The Gāthā-Śapta-Śati mentions Vikrama (V. 64), a fact which was not known to me when I published my theory in 1913 on the identity of Vikrama with one of the two Sātavāhana kings, either the one who conquered Nāhapaṇa or the one who succeeded him. The theory apparently appealed at the time, as I was fortunate to receive a letter from one of the greatest Indian scholars, Mr. Haraprasād Shāstri, who signified his acceptance of my view. The theory, or rather the mythology about the non-existence of Vikrama circulated by early Indianists in their imperfect knowledge, is fit to be given up.3 I might point out that the new Jaina datum (see my article on Kalki)4 places the end of Nāhapaṇa (Nahavāṇa) in 58 A.C. The authority which I had before me in 1913 placed him a few decades earlier.

The new material makes the identification doubly strong. Nāhapaṇa was the Śaka of the popular tradition who was taken captive, and whose rule was ended by Vikrama. It is impossible for the Hindu public to have forgotten the great conqueror, the son of Gautami who destroyed so many oppressors of “dharma.” The Jaina book Vīra-charitra also connects Vikrama with Śudraka Sātavāhana.5 The Sātavāhana (= Sālavāhana) origin of the Vikrama explains the confusion in the popular tradition, which connects Sālavāhana with Vikrama.

K. P. JAYASWAL.

---

1 Apparently she did, as in old literature we have only pabhā.
2 Not only *some* as supposed by Fleet. All the week-day (grahas) names are there.
3 Rāhu and Ketu were originally separate as in the Ānanda Rāma ed. of the BDhS. They make up the nine grahas. The Āvadāna also has got Rāhu and Ketu.
4 It has been given up, for Fleet and others do admit that there was a Vikrama, but they say he was a foreigner.
5 Acta, 1917, April.
6 IS., XIV. 97 ff.
UNTIL recently our sole authority for the history of this dynasty, which ruled in Khândesh for 225 years, was the industrious but careless and uncritical Frishta, but the publication in 1910, by Dr. Denison Ross, of the first volume of Zafar al-Wâlihi bi Muzaqar wa Âlikh (An Arabic History of Gujarât), placed at our disposal an original historical sketch of the family, on which the Burhân-i-Ma‘âsir, first brought to notice by Major J. S. King, who published in 1900, under the title of The History of the Bahmani Dynasty, an abstract translation of the introductory portion of the work, which had already appeared in The Indian Antiquary, also throws some light. The history of the small state of Khândesh which, though surrounded by the three large kingdoms of Gujarât, Mâlwa, and the Dakan, contrived to maintain some measure of independence and outlived all its powerful neighbours is not unworthy of study, and a comparison of the authorities now available may enable us to reconstruct it with some degree of accuracy.

Frishta, our first authority, attributes the foundation of the state to Malik Râja, son of Khânjahân Farûqi, whose forbears, he says, had served Aslal-din Khalji and Muhammed bin Tuglaq of Dihili, and who had himself held high office under the latter monarch. On the death of Khânjahân his son Malik Râja, as often happens in a country in which nobility is not hereditary, found no means of advancement and was content to serve as a trooper in the bodyguard of Firûz Shâh, the successor of Muhammed bin Tuglaq, in which humble capacity he still found means to indulge in his favourite pursuit, the chase. On one occasion Firûz, during his disastrous retreat from Sind to Gujarât across the Rann of Kachchh, while hunting wandered far from his camp and was resting, weary and hungry, under a tree when he saw a solitary sportsman with a few hounds. He asked him whether he had any food with him and the hunter produced such coarse food as he usually carried and placed it before the emperor, who, being struck by his host’s superior manners and address, asked him who he was, and was astonished to learn that the son of so important an amir, with whom he had been well acquainted, was serving him in so humble a capacity. Firûz, on his return to Dihili, appointed Malik Râja to the command of 2,000 horse and conferred on him, for their maintenance, a small fief on the borders of Baglâna, in the district afterwards known as Khândesh. Here a victory over Bahârji, the Râhtor raja of Baglâna, compelled that ruler to acknowledge the suzerainty of Firûz and enabled Malik Râja to send to Dihili fifteen elephants. This service was rewarded by promotion to the command of 3,000 horse and by the government of the whole province of Khândesh. Malik Râja was able, in his remote province, to maintain a force of 12,000 horse and, as the province could not support this force, he augmented his revenue by raids into Gondwâna and the territories of various petty rajas. Towards the end of the reign of Firûz, when the authority of Dihili grew ever feeble, Malik Râja anticipated his neighbours in Gujarât and Mâlwa, and in 1382 ceased to remit tribute and began to conduct himself as an independent monarch.

Such is Frishta’s account of the foundation of the state and the origin of its ruler, but the title of Khânjahân is not to be found in the lists of the amirs of Aslal-din Khalji and Muhammed bin Tuglaq given by Ziya-al-din Barani; and Abdallah Muhammad, author
of the Zafar-al-Wālih, gives a different and more probable account. According to him Rāja Ahmad, as he styles the first ruler of Khāndesh, was the son of Khvāja Jahān, minister of "Ala-al-dīn Bahman Shāh, the founder of the Bahmanī dynasty of the Dakan. In his history of this dynasty Firishta mentions no amir under this title, and says that Saif-al-din Ghūrī was vazir throughout the reign of Bahman, but the Burhān-i-ma’āṣir describes Khvāja Jahān as one ‘Ain-al-dīn, an amir in the service of Muḥammad bin Tughlaq, who, with his son Muḥammad, deserted his old master and joined ‘Ala-al-dīn Ḥasan. When ‘Ala-al-dīn Ḥasan ascended the throne of the Dakan as Bahman Shāh he conferred the title of Khvāja Jahān on his father and that of Shīr Khān on the son and rewarded the former with the government of Gulbarga, the capital of the new kingdom. This Khvāja Jahān is certainly not identical with Saif-al-dīn Ghūrī, who is mentioned by Firishta as holding the government of Gulbarga in addition to the post of prime minister, but we may assume that he was an important amir at the court of Bahman Shah and it is probable that he held the Government of the city of Gulbarga while Saif-al-dīn held that of the whole province.

Abdullāh Muḥammad goes on to say that on the accession of Muḥammad I Bahmani, in 1358, Khvāja Jahān retained the post of vazir until his death, and was succeeded therein by his son Ahmad; not Muḥammad, as in the Burhān-i-Ma’āṣir. This is further evidence that he was not identical with Saif-al-dīn Ghūrī who, after an interval passed in retirement, was reappointed vazir, and died in harness at the age of 107 on April 21st, 1397, one day after the death of his master Muhammad II Bahmani, whom Firishta wrongly styles Māḥmūd. It even seems doubtful whether Ahmad can be identified with Muḥammad, Khvāja Jahān’s son, though the two names may be confounded. It is more likely that Ahmad was a younger son of Khvāja Jahān, not mentioned in the Burhān-i-Ma’āṣir. Ahmad, according to Abdullāh Muḥammad, disagreed with Muḥammad I Bahmani and set out for Daulatābād where was the samt Zain-al-dīn, whom he approached as a disciple. The saint welcomed him as a disciple and said ‘Well done Rāja Ahmad!’ Rāja meaning Sultān, so that Ahmad took it as a good omen. This account of Ahmad’s disaffection and of his interview with the samt Zain-al-dīn of Daulatābād enables us to trace his career. Bahman Shāh had a nephew, Bahram Khān Māzandarānī, the son of his sister, whom he married to one of his own daughters and always addressed as ‘son’, and whom he appointed to Daulatābād, one of the four great provincial governments of the kingdom. Bahram resented the accession of his brother-in-law, Muḥammad I, and seems to have expected that he would inherit, on the death of his uncle and father-in-law, at least a share of the kingdom, if not the throne itself; for in 1363, while Firūz Shāh of Dihli was in Gujarāt, to which province he had retreated on the failure of his first expedition into Sind, Bahram sent a mission to him from Daulatābād1 and invited him to make an attempt to recover the Dakan, promising him his assistance. It was impossible for Firūz to abandon his enterprise against Sind, in which was involved the imperial prestige, but the envos were encouraged to believe that after Sind had been reduced to obedience an expedition to Daulatābād would be undertaken.

In 1365-66 Bahram Khān, having won over to his cause many of the amirs of the neighbouring province of Berar and secured his financial position by retaining for his own

---

1 This is the correct title of this king, called by Firishta and European authors who follow him Atā-al-dīn Ḥasan Kāṅgu Bahmanī. See J.A.S.B., Vol. LXXIII, part 1, extra No. 1904; Imperial Gazetteer of India, ii, 385; and Zafar-al-Wālih, i, 159.
2 i, 532.
3 Turkish Firūz Shāhī, by Shams-i-Siraj ‘Affī’, p. 224.
use several years’ revenue from Berar as well as from his own province, rose in rebellion, and at the same time sent another mission to Firuz, who was now at Dihli, whither he had returned after bringing to a successful conclusion his expedition to Sind. This expedition had, however, exhausted his military ardour, and he was loth to undertake a campaign in the south, where the power of the Bahmanids was now firmly established. He therefore replied tauntingly to the envoys that they had been among those who had rebelled against their sovereign, Muhammad bin Tughlaq, and that if the course of events was not to their liking they had only themselves to blame.

It is clear that Raja Ahmad was a partisan of Bahram. When he left his king’s court he turned towards Daulatabad and sought the saint Zain-al-din who, as is evident from Firishta’s account of this rebellion, supported Bahram against his cousin and brother-in-law, gave the rebels sanctuary, and behaved towards Muhammad I, after his success as only one whose personal safety was secured by a superstitious veneration for his sanctity would have ventured to behave. With the progress of the rebellion we have no further concern. The rebels were defeated and banished to Gujarat, but of Raja Ahmad we are told that he entered the service of Firuz, so that he seems to have been a member of one of the two missions sent to the imperial court, either of that sent to Gujarat in 1363 or, more probably, of that sent to Dihli in 1365-66. ‘Abdallah Muhammad repeats the story of the service rendered to Firuz when he was hungry and weary in the hunting-field and says that he asked Raja Ahmad to choose his reward, and that he asked for and received a grant of the village of Thalner, known as Karvand. ‘Abdullah Muhammad gives no further details of his history, beyond saying that he established his independence in 1382, and Firishta’s brief record of his progress until this year may be accepted as correct.

Raja Ahmad perhaps chose Thalner as an obscure corner whence he might safely harass his enemies, the Bahmanids, secure of assistance, in the last resort, from the Imperial power of Dihli; but that power began to decline from the day of his investiture with his small sief, and the senile incompetence of Firuz and the disorders due to the wrangles and feebleness of his successors were but the prelude to the final crash, the invasion of India by Taimur, which dissolved the frail bonds which bound together the provinces, until the Sayyids, who succeeded the Tughlaq dynasty, could call little but the city of Dihli their own.

The example of Raja Ahmad in Khândesh was soon followed by his more powerful neighbours, Dilavar Khan Ghuri in Malwa and Muzaffar I in Gujarat, and Ahmad, instead of raiding the powerful kingdom of the Dakan, was forced to seek alliances which should enable him to maintain a measure of independence, for though the policy of preserving a balance of power might protect his small state from utter extinction he could not hope to preserve his importance if he allowed the bark of his policy to drift down the stream of events with no other guidance than the fluctuating policy of his neighbours. Raja Ahmad, or Malik Raja as he is styled by Firishta, first turned towards Malwa, and married his daughter to Husang, son and eventually successor of Dilavar Khan, whose assistance against Gujarat he thus purchased. With Dilavars’s assistance he expelled the officers of Muzaffar I of Gujarat from the town and district of Nandurbâr, which were long a bone of contention between Gujarat and Khândesh just as were the Dâhâ of Raichur between the Bahmani Kingdom.

5 Firishta, i, 557.
7 Firishta, i, 560.
and Vijayanagar and, at a later date, Sholapur between Bijapur and Ahmednagar and Patheri between Ahmednagar and Berar. Raja Ahmad probably believed that he could commit this act of aggression with impunity, for Musaffar was then engaged in warfare, but he would not submit tamely to this insult and, suspending his operations against the Hindus, marched at once to Nandurbar, expelled Raja Ahmad, and besieged him in his own capital of Thalner. Musaffar, however, had yet to establish his authority in his own kingdom, where the continuance of his rule was threatened by turbulent Rajputs, and asked but to live in peace with his Muhammadan neighbours, so that Ahmad found no difficulty in obtaining terms and Musaffar withdrew after obtaining from Ahmad satisfactory assurances that the district of Nandurbar would not again be molested.

Raja Ahmad died on April 29, 1399, and was buried at Thalner. The distinctive epithet of Faruqi applied to his dynasty is derived from his claim to descent from Umar, the second orthodox Khalifah of the Muslims, who was entitled al-Farouq, 'the Discriminator (between truth and error)." Ahmad's descent from 'Umar is thus given by Firishta 8—Malik Raja (Ahmad), son of Khangah (Kvaja Jahân), son of 'Ali Khan, son of 'Utmân Khan, son of Sham'un, son of Ashath Shâh, son of Sikandar Shâh, son of Tahah Shâh, son of Daniyal Shâh, son of Ashath Shâh, son of Urmiyâ Shâh, son of Ibrahim Shâh Balkut, son of Adham Shâh, son of Mahmud Shâh, son of Ahmad Shâh, son of Muhammad Shâh, son of A zam Shâh, son of Asghar, son of Muhammad Ahmad, son of Muhammad, son of 'Abdullah, son of 'Umar the Discriminator.

Raja Ahmad left two sons Nasir (not Nasir, as he is called in the Imperial Gazetteer of India) entitled Jahangir Khan, who succeeded him, and Hassan, entitled Malik Itikfar. According to Firishta Raja Ahmad had intended to divide his small dominions permanently between his two sons, leaving Nasir ruler of the greater part of the state, but establishing Hassan as permanent and independent governor of the town and district of Thalner. Nasir established his authority throughout the eastern districts of Khandesh, which appear to have been neglected by his father, captured the hill fortress of Asirgarh by stratagem from the pastoral chieftain called by Firishta Asa Ahir, from whom it took its name, and by the command of Zain-al-Din, the spiritual guide of his family, who came from Daulatabad to visit him, founded the city of Burhanpur which, in accordance with Zain-al-Din's injunction, he named after the great saint Burhan-al-Din, who is buried in the hills above Daulatabad. On the southern bank of the Tapti, which Zain-al-Din refused to cross, Nasir founded, on the spot where the saint lodged, a mosque and a village, which he named Zainabod.

Having thus established himself in eastern Khandesh Nasir resolved, by expelling his brother Hassan from Thalner, to extend his authority over the whole state, and to this end sought aid of his brother-in-law, Hushang Shâh, who had succeeded his father on the throne of Malwa. Hushang sent his son Ghazni Khan to the assistance of Nasir, and in 1417 Thalner was captured and Hassan was imprisoned by his brother. Hassan had sought aid of Ahmad I of Gujarât, but assistance had not reached him in time and Nasir, partly with the object of forestalling the interference of Gujarât in the domestic affairs of Khandesh and partly, doubtless, with that of repairing his father's discomfiture, attacked Nandurbar. On the arrival of reinforcements sent by Ahmad of Gujarât Nasir fled to Thalner and Ghazni Khan to Mandu, and Malik Mahmund, an amir of Gujarât, besieged Nasir in Thalner
and the latter was obliged to purchase place by paying tribute and swearing fealty to Ahmad Shâh, and in return received from him the title of Khân and some of the insignias of royalty. It was also agreed that Hasan, Našîr's brother, should remain at Ahmad's court as his brother's representative, or, in other words, as a hostage. Hasan seems to have been by no means loth to assent to this arrangement, and made his home in Gujarât, where he was safer than if he had remained within his brother's reach.

From this treaty we may date the estrangement between Khândesh and Mâlwa, for Našîr undoubtedly resented Ghazni Khân's pusillanimous desertion of him, which had left him no choice but to humble himself before Ahmad of Gujarât. The residence of Hasan of Khândesh in Gujarât sowed the seed of a close alliance between the two states, as will be seen hereafter, but Našîr was not prepared at once to throw himself into the arms of Ahmad Shâh of Gujarât, and was soon enabled to form another alliance. The old animosity against the Bahmanids had by now been forgotten, and in 1439 Ahmad Shâh Bahmani, who had recently been at war with Hâshang Shâh of Mâlwa and, although he had inflicted a crushing defeat upon him, desired still further to weaken his adversary and to extend his own influence in the state on the northern border of his kingdom, proposed to Našîr an alliance between his eldest son, 'Alâ-al-din Ahmad, and Našîr's daughter, Âghâ Zainab. The alliance suited both parties, for it provided Našîr with a powerful ally both against Ahmad of Gujarât, by whom he had recently been humiliated and against Hâshang of Mâlwa, from whom he was estranged, and Ahmad Shâh Bahmani with a useful ally against Hâshang.

The alliance was almost immediately tested. In the following year Kanha, Râja of Jhâllâwâr, fled from the wrath of Ahmad of Gujarât and attempted to purchase the protection of Našîr Khân by the gift of some elephants, but was told that the ruler of Khândesh could not venture to face alone the wrath of the Sultan of Gujarât. Našîr Khân furnished him, however, with a letter of recommendation to Ahmad Shâh Bahmani, who sent a force to his aid, and the troops of the Dakan and Khândesh attacked, nominally in the interest of the fugitive râja, Nandurbâr, the frontier district of Gujarât. They suffered a defeat, and a stronger force sent by Ahmad Bahmani under the command of his son, 'Alâ-al-din Ahmad, the son-in-law of Našîr Khân, had no better fortune. The Dakans withdraw to their own country, leaving Khândesh at the mercy of the justly incensed Gujarâtis, who overran it and forced Našîr Khân to take refuge in the hill country until their thirst for plunder and revenge was sated, when he returned to Burhânpûr.

The match between 'Alâ-al-din Ahmad and Âghâ Zainab was not happy. 'Alâ-al-din Ahmad, who succeeded his father on the throne of the Dakan on Feb. 27, 1435, led an expedition two years later into the Konkan and, having defeated the Râja of Sangamshwar and reduced him to the condition of a vassal, married his beautiful daughter, who received the name of Zibâ Chihra ("beautiful face"). Âghâ Zainab who, as the principal queen, had the title of Malika-yi Jahân, was slighted for the younger and more beautiful Hindu princess, and in her jealous wrath wrote to her father, Našîr Khân, complaining of her husband's neglect. Našîr Khân, after obtaining the consent of Ahmad Shâh of Gujarât, the necessity for which indicates the change in the relations between the two states, avenged his daughter's wrongs by invading Berar, where many of the amirs welcomed him owing to his descent from 'Umar, and caused the Khatbah to be recited in his name. 'Abîd-al-Qâdir Khânjahân, the loyal governor of Berar, shut himself up in Narnâla and appealed for assistance to his king, 'Alâ-al-din Ahmad. A force of the best troops of the Dakan under the
command of Khalaf Hasan Baṣri, Malik-al-Tujjar, was sent into Berar and found Naṣır Kān awaiting it at Rohankhē. Naṣir Kān was utterly defeated and fled to his hill fortress of Laling, whither Malik-al-Tujjar followed him, after burning and destroying all the public buildings in Burhānpūr and laying waste the fertile plains of Khāndesh. An attempt to surprise Laling failed but Naṣir Kān, who attacked the Dakanis with 12,000 horse and a large force of foot, suffered a second severe defeat, which so preyed upon his mind that it is said to have contributed to his death, which occurred on Sept. 20, or, according to another account, Oct. 1, 1437. He was succeeded by his son, 'Ādil Khān I, after whose accession Malik-al-Tujjar, hearing that a force was advancing from Nandurbar to relieve Laling, retired to the Dakan with his plunder, which included seventy elephants and many guns.

'Ādil Khān reigned without incident until 1441, when he died, either on April 30 or on May 4, and was succeeded by his son Mubārak Khān, who likewise reigned without incident until his death on June 5, 1457, when he was succeeded by his son Malik 'Aīnā, who assumed the title of 'Ādil Khān II.

'Ādil Khān II was one of the most energetic and most powerful rulers of Khāndesh. He established his authority over the rajas whose territory was included in or marshaled with his own, including the rajas of Gondwāna, and compelled them to pay him tribute, he suppressed the depredations of the Kolis and Bhils thus making the roads throughout his dominions safe for travellers, he strengthened and extended the defences of Asīrgarh, he fortified Burhānpūr by building a citadel on the Tāpti, and he carried his arms as far as Jhārkhand, now known as Chātiya Nāgpūr, from which exploit he was known as Jhārkhandi Sultan. The author of the Zafar-al-Walīh evidently did not understand this title for he erroneously attributes one bearing a slight resemblance to it to Mubārak Khān, 'Ādil Khān's father and predecessor, who, he says, was known as Chaukanda, a word without meaning but bearing some resemblance to a Hindi word meaning "square," the applicability of which is not clear. Firishta's account of the origin and application of the nickname is undoubtedly correct.

The alliance with Mālwa had terminated with Ghazni Khān's desertion of Naṣir Khān in 1417, that with the Dakan had ended in disaster and humiliation, and since Malik-al-Tujjar's invasion of Khāndesh the Fāṛqālī had learnt to regard the king of Gujarāt as their natural protector, had recognized his suzerainty, paid him tribute, and maintained an agent at his court. 'Ādil Khān II, flushed with his successes over Hindūs and aborigines, believed that the time had come when he could stand alone, and failed to remit tribute to Gujarāt and to appoint an agent to represent him there. Maḥmūd Baikarah, who had succeeded to the throne of Gujarāt in 1458, accordingly sent an army to reduce him to obedience and 'Ādil Khān, who was forced to seek refuge in Asīrgarh, obtained peace on the payment of all arrears of tribute and henceforward remained obedient to Maḥmūd of Gujarāt. The author of the Zafar-al-Walīh says that this invasion of Khāndesh occurred in 1459-60, but from what we know of the history of Gujarāt Maḥmūd can hardly have had leisure to invade Khāndesh in that year and it is far more probable that 'Ādil Khān II ventured to defy Gujarāt towards the end of his reign, when his successes had increased his power and inspired him with confidence, than at its beginning when he had no reason to believe that he could throw off his allegiance. Moreover from an event which occurred during his visit to Maḥmūd Shāh, his designation of a distant relative as his heir, he being then childless, it is probable that he was then advanced in years, for had been a young man with a prospect of begetting
children he would not have been likely to imperil the rights of a son who might be born to him by naming a distant relative as his heir. It appears therefore that 1499-1500, the date given by Firishta for the invasion of Khandesh by Mahmūd Baikarah, is correct. After his reconciliation with his suzerain, 'Ādil Khān visited Gujarāt and was kindly received, and the author of the Zafar-al-Wālīh says that he associated much with Mahmūd Baikarah and was on most intimate terms with him. He was childless and the heir-presumptive to the throne of Khandesh was his younger brother, Dā'ūd Khān, a feeble and worthless prince. There was at the court of Mahmūd Baikarah a child, 'Alam Khān, who was directly descended in the male line from Hasan Khān, Malik Iltikār, the younger brother of Naṣir Khān who, after having been captured and imprisoned by his brother, had been sent to Gujarāt, where he and his descendants had lived ever since, the objects of the special favour of the kings of that country. Hasan Khān married a relation, probably a sister, of his benefactor, Ahmad I of Gujarāt and left a son, Ghaźni Khān, who married Ahmad Shāh's daughter and left by her a son, Qaṣīr Khān, who married the daughter of the Sultan of Sind and left a son, Aḥsan Khān, who was married by Mahmūd Baikarah to his daughter, the sister of Muṣaffar II of Gujarāt, and left a son, 'Ālam Khān, who was related to 'Ādil Khān II no more nearly than in the ninth degree, but was regarded almost as a member of the royal house of Gujarāt. Firishta, in his heading to the reign of 'Ālam Khān, who eventually succeeded under the title of 'Ādil Khān III, makes him a son of Naṣir Khān, but this is absurd, for he was certainly a child about 1500 and Naṣir had died in 1437. If we supported 'Ālam Khān to be a posthumous son of Naṣir he would have been seventy-one years of age at the time of his accession in 1500, when he was certainly a young man. Moreover Firishta contradicts himself, by correctly describing 'Ālam Khān as daughter's son to Mahmūd Baikarah of Gujarāt, who was fourteen years of age in 1458, so it is obvious that he cannot have been a son of Naṣir Khān.

One day towards the end of his reign 'Ādil Khān II, who was visiting Mahmūd Baikarah, was sitting with him in the hall of the palace at Chāmpānṭr, when the conversation turned on 'Ālam Khān, who was then in the room. Mahmūd evidently wished that he should be well provided for, and 'Ādil Khān embraced and fondled the engaging child and at length promised Mahmūd that he should succeed him on the throne of Khandesh.

Shortly after adopting his young cousin as his heir 'Ādil Khān II, died. Regarding the date of his death there are some discrepancies. Firishta gives it, as Rabi-al-awwal 14, 897 (Jan. 15, 1492) but this date, which differs by more than ten years from that given by any other authority, may be at once discarded, for Firishta himself contradicts it twice, first in stating that 'Ādil Khān II, having succeeded on Rajab 12, 861, reigned for forty-six years, eight months, and twelve days, which period brings the date of his death to Rabi-al-awwal 24, 908 (Sep. 27, 1502), and secondly in stating that 'Ādil Khān's successor, Dā'ūd Khān, died on Jamādī-al-awwal 1, 914, after a reign of eight years, one month, and ten days, according to which statement the date of 'Ādil Khān's death would be Rabi-al-awwal 20,906 (Oct. 14, 1500). The author of the Zafar-al-Wālīh gives the date as Rabi-al-awwal 15,907 (Sep. 28, 1501) which divides almost equally the period between the two dates found by calculation from Firishta's statements regarding the duration of the two reigns and may be accepted as correct. Mr. Stanley Lane Poole, in his Mohammedan Dynasties, gives the date of 'Ādil Khān's death and Dā'ūd's ascension as 1503, for which
his authority seems to be the "Useful Tables," published by the Asiatic Society of Bengal, but what the authority for those tables is I do not know. The Muntakhab-al-Lubāb, a work which, so far as its account of the dynasties of the Dakan goes, is admittedly a mere epitome of Firishta, gives the date as Sep. 27, 1501, so that it is clear that the date given in the Bombay text of Firishta is a misreading.

According to the Burhān-i-Maʿāṣir, a most untrustworthy authority for the reigns of the earlier Niğām Shāhī kings of Ahmadnagar, ‘Ādil Khān II, who is described as ‘Ādil Shāh, was succeeded on the throne of Khāndesh, in accordance with his will, by his son "Maḥmūd Shāh Fārūqī," whose presumption in styling himself Shāh aroused the wrath of Maḥmūd Baikarah of Gujrat. A long and confused account of the invasion of Khāndesh by Maḥmūd, of Ahmad Niğām Shāh’s expedition to assist "Maḥmūd Fārūqī," and of the defeat and dispossession of Maḥmūd Baikarah follows. Another version of this story is given by Firishta in the only passage in which he quotes the Burhān-i-Maʿāṣir, called by him the "Waqaʾi-i Niğāmshāhīyyah" which says: "Ali Sannoñi was writing in the reign of Burhān Niğām Shāh II, and which he never lived to finish," but in this version Maḥmūd Baikarah is represented as coming to attack and Ahmad Niğām Shāh to support ‘Ādil Khān II, and the mythical "Maḥmūd Shāh Fārūqī" is not mentioned. Firishta credits the story, as well he may. Not only has Sayyid ‘Ali been obliged to juggle with the chronology of the Fārūqī dynasty, but he has invented a Fārūqī ruler who never ascended the throne and fathered a son on the childless ‘Ādil Khān. The motive for the invention of the story was doubtless a desire to conceal the dispossession of Ahmad Niğām Shāh, who was at this time attempting to wrest the fortress of Daulatabad from the brothers Sharaf-al-din and Wajih-al-din and beat a hasty and undignified retreat, hearing that Maḥmūd Baikarah was marching through Khāndesh to the relief of the fortress.

On the death of ‘Ādil Khān II, Maḥmūd Baikarah took no steps to obtain the throne for his protégé Alam Khān, the adopted heir, and ‘Ādil Khān’s brother Dā’ūd Khān would have succeeded peacefully had not a strong party among the amirs of Khāndesh been bitterly opposed to him and proclaimed instead of him his infant son Ghaznī Khān; but Ghaznī Khān’s party was overcome and Dā’ūd Khān retained the throne.

It is almost impossible to follow the events of Dā’ūd’s brief but troubled reign. According to Firishta Dā’ūd entertained the design of annexing part of the Niğām Shāhī dominions and to this end committed some acts of aggression. It seems impossible that so feeble a monarch should wantonly have provoked so powerful a neighbour, but there is no doubt that Ahmad Niğām Shāh invaded Khāndesh in this reign, though according to the Burhān-i-Maʿāṣir it was not until after Dā’ūd’s death that he attempted to enthron in Burhānpur a pretender, Alam Khān Faruqī, not to be confounded with the protégé of Maḥmūd Baikarah, who bore the same name. The silence of the author of the Burhān-i-Maʿāṣir is easily

17 A’in-i-Akbâr, Colonel Jarrett’s translation, ii, 227, n. 2.

18 ii, 189. Major J. S. King, in his preface to The History of the Bahmanī Dynasty, says, “Though the two authors (Firishta and the author of the Burhān-i-Maʿāṣir) were contemporaries and probably met one another in Ahmadnagar neither makes any mention of the other," and adds, in a note referring to Firishta, “he never mentions the Burhān-i-Maʿāṣir unless he alludes to it under some other title. Professional jealousy probably accounts for this. But the work quoted by Firishta as the Waqaʾi-i-Niğāmshāhīyyah is undoubtedly the Burhān-i-Maʿāṣir, Major King is, however, quite right in saying that Firishta does not mention the Burhān-i-Maʿāṣir in the long list of authorities cited at the beginning of his history.
explained, for A‘mad’s invasion of Khândesh brought him no glory and he was ignominiously expelled from the country. From a comparison of the Zafar-al-Walîh with Firishta it appears that Hisâm-al-dîn, an amir of Khândesh who was one of Dâ’ûd Khân’s principal opponents, invited A‘mad Ni‘âm Shâh to aid him in overthrowing Dâ’ûd. A‘mad invaded the country, bringing with him his protegé, ‘Alâm Khân, and laid it waste. Dâ’ûd, who probably dared not appeal to Mazmûd Baikarah of Gujarât, lest he should bring another pretender into the field, applied for aid to Naṣir-al-dîn Shâh of Mâlwa who, in 1504, sent a force under Iqâlân, one of his amirs, to aid him. Iqâlân Khân expelled A‘mad Ni‘âm Shâh, but before leaving the country insisted that the Khâbanah should be recited in Burhânpur in the name of his master, Naṣir-al-dîn Shâh, with which humiliating demand Dâ’ûd was forced to comply. ‘Alâm Khân fled with his protector, A‘mad Ni‘âm Shâh, and for the remaining four years of his life Dâ’ûd Khân reigned in peace, dying on Aug. 28, 1508.

After the death of Dâ’ûd his son Ghiyâzî Khân was, according to Firishta, raised to the throne by Malik Rîsâm-al-dîn and the other amirs, but was poisoned by them after ten days. According to the Zafar-al-Walîh Ghiyâzî Khân had been poisoned during the lifetime of his father, but the discrepancy is of little consequence, for Ghiyâzî Khân never actually reigned and almost immediately after the death of Dâ’ûd A‘mad Ni‘âm Shâh reappeared in Khândesh with his protegé, ‘Alâm Khân.

The descent of this ‘Alâm Khân is not precisely known, but there is nowhere a hint that he was an impostor. According to Firishta he was “of the offspring of the Farrîq Suhâns”; the Zafar-al-Walîn calls him “a relation of Dâ’ûd”; and the author of the Burham-i-Ma‘âr says that he was “of the stock of the rulers of Asir.” It is probable that he was far nearer in blood to Dâ’ûd than was the other ‘Alâm Khân, who was protected by Mazmûd Baikarah. It will be convenient to distinguish the two pretenders as ‘Alâm Khân of Gujarât and ‘Alâm Khân of A‘madnagar.

‘Alâm Khân of Gujarât now thought that it was time to assert his claim to the throne of Khândesh and his mother applied to her father, Mazmûd Baikarah, for assistance, which was readily given. In November or December, 1508, only three or four months after the death of Dâ’ûd, Man, Mazmûd Baikarah set out from Châmpânir for Thalner, then held for A‘mad’s protegé, styling himself ‘Alâm Shâh.

The position in Khândesh was now as follows:— ‘Alâm Khân of A‘madnagar and Malik Hisâm-al-dîn the Mughul, the leader of the A‘madnagar party in Khândesh, were at Burhânpur, where they were joined by A‘mad Ni‘âm Shâh of A‘madnagar and ‘Ala-al-dîn ‘Imâm Shâh of Berar, whom Hisâm-al-dîn had summoned to his aid; Malik Lâdan, the leader of the Gujarât party in Khândesh, had shut himself up in Asî garh, where he was besieged by the partisans of ‘Alâm Khân of A‘madnagar; and Mazmûd Shâh Baikarah and his protegé, ‘Alâm Khân of Gujarât, were advancing on Thalner. Thalner surrendered, and on hearing of its fall A‘mad Ni‘âm Shâh and ‘Ala-al-dîn ‘Imâm Shâh fled for refuge to Gâwîlgâh, leaving 4,000 troops in Burhânpur to support their candidate for the throne. Mazmûd then sent two of his amrs, Sayyid ‘Arâf Khân and ‘Azîz-al-Mulk against Hisâm-al-dîn and ‘Alâm Khân of A‘madnagar, and the troops of A‘madnagar and Berar fled from Burhânpur so that Hisâm-al-dîn was obliged to provide for his own safety by sending the pretender off to the Dakan and making his submission to Mazmûd Baikarah. Malik Lâdan had forestalled him, and there was now no obstacle in the path of ‘Alâm Khân to the throne. On April 1, 1509, Mazmûd Baikarah held a court at Thalner and installed his protegé ‘Alâm Khân, who now took the title of ‘Adîl Khân III, as ruler of Khândesh, conferring on him,
as though he had been a mere officer of Gujarát, the title of A‘rām-i-Humārūn. Malik Lādan received the title of Khānjahān and Malik Hisām-al-dīn that of Shahrār and Māhmūd, after giving his nephew four elephants and 300,000 taqas, returned to Gujarât.

In the meantime A‘mād Nisān Shāh had returned to the frontier of his own kingdom and ventured to send a letter to Māhmūd Baikarah requesting him to grant to ‘Alām rīān, who had taken refuge at the court of A‘mād Nagar, some small share in the dominions of his forefathers. To the letter, which Aḥmad, who had revolted from his master, Māhmūd Shāh Bahmanī, had imprudently addressed as from one king to another, no written reply was vouchsafed, but the envoy who bore it had to endure an unpleasant interview with Māhmūd, who wrathfully asked how one who was a rebellious slave had dared to address him as one king writing to another, instead of embodying his requests in the form of a humble petition, and closed his homily with a threat that such insolence, if repeated, would not go unpunished.

‘Abdīl Kān III, now established on the throne of Khandesh, still further cemented his alliance with Gujarát by marrying a daughter of Sultān Muzaffar, who afterwards succeeded to the throne of Gujarát as Muzaffar II. One of his first acts was to cause Malik Hisām-al-dīn Shahryār, who was again plotting with Ahmad Nisān Shāh, to be assassinated. The dispatch of a large force from Gujarát averted a danger which threatened the state from the direction of Ahmadnagar, and the reign of ‘Abdīl Kān III was not marked by any noteworthy event until his death, on Aug. 25, 1520, when he was succeeded by his son, Mu‘ammad I., who is generally known as Mu‘ammad Shāh, from his having been summoned to the throne of Gujarát, which he never lived to occupy.

The history of Mu‘ammad Shāh’s reign is to a great extent that of Bahādur Shāh of Gujarāt, with whom he always acted in concert and by whom he was designated heir to the kingdom of Gujarāt. In 1527 a quarrel arose between Burhān Ni‘ām Shāh I of Ahmadnagar and ‘Alā‘ al-dīn ‘Imād Shāh of Berar, which was composed for a time by Bahādur Shāh of Gujarāt, who took the king of Berar under his protection. In the following year Burhān and Amīr Barīd of Bīdar invaded Berar, and Muḥammad Shāh, who regarded ‘Alā‘ al-dīn ‘Imād Shāh as a protegé of his uncle, Bahādur Shāh, at once responded to his appeal for help and marched to his assistance. Burhān I and Amīr Barīd severely defeated ‘Alā‘ al-dīn and Muḥammad Shāh in the neighbourhood of Māhūr and Muḥammad fled to Asfiyargarh, leaving all his artillery and elephants in the hands of the victors, and at once appealed to Bahādur Shāh for assistance. Bahādur Shāh, Muḥammad Shāh, and ‘Alā‘ al-dīn ‘Imād Shāh then marched to Ahmadnagar and Burhān I fled to the protection of his fortress capital, Daulatābād; but Bahādur’s intervention in a quarrel which was regarded as a purely domestic affair in the Dakan and his announcement that he had annexed Berar aroused the resentment and apprehensions of the other kings of the Dakan, and Ismā‘īl ‘Abdīl Shāh of Bījāpur and Sultān Qulī Qutb Shāh of Golconda, as well as Amīr Barīd of Bīdar, sent contingents to the aid of Burhān, whereupon Bahādur, fearing lest his communications with his own country should be endangered by the rainy season, which was approaching, hastened to make peace. It was agreed that the fortress and district of Māhūr should be restored to ‘Alā‘ al-dīn ‘Imād Shāh and that Burhān should return to Mu‘ammad Shāh the elephants, guns, and other booty which he had taken from him the year before. Bahādur’s nephew was, of course, indemnified at once, and he and his uncle returned to their kingdoms, but Bahādur considered that he had already done sufficient for Berar and failed to enforce the stipulation regarding the restoration of Māhūr. The kings of the Dakan, who bitterly
resented ’Alā-ʾal-dīn’s appeal to the powerful king of Gujarāt, were in no mood to see his wrongs righted, and Māḥūr remained in the possession of Būrān.

This companionship in arms increased the intimacy between Bahādur and Muḥammad and Bahādur not only permitted his sister’s son, whose ancestors had been content with the title of Kāhān, to assume the royal title, but was accustomed to give him a seat beside him on his throne, and it was probably now that he openly acknowledged him as heir-presumptive to the throne of Gujarāt.

In 1530 Bahādur again visited Būrānpūr and seemed inclined, in response to an appeal from the King of Berar, to attack Ahmādānagur once more, but Muḥammad, who had nothing to gain from a strife which would convert Ahmādānagur into a permanent enemy of Khāndesh, came forward as a peacemaker, and his counsels prevailed. Early in 1531 Muḥammad accompanied Bahādur on his expedition into Mālwa, in which he captured Māndū on March 28, 1531, and subsequently, after reducing to obedience the Bājpūts who had acquired power in that country, in which operation he was much assisted by Muḥammad annexed Mālwa to Gujarāt.

In 1534-35 Muḥammad assisted Bahādur in his siege of Chītor, which ended in the capture of that fortress, and in the same year accompanied him in his flight from Humāyūn’s army at Mandasor to Māndū. Bahādur fled from Māndū to Chāmpānīr, whither he was pursued by Humāyūn, and thence to Kāṭhīwād. Humāyūn’s expedition into Mālwa and Gujarāt had much alarmed the kings of the Dākan, who were convinced that he intended at once to recover the Southern Kingdoms for Dīlī, and Būrān I. of Ahmādānagur, Ibrāḥīm ʿĀdil Shāh I. of Bījāpūr, Sultaṅ Quli Qutb Shāh of Golconda, and Daryā ʿImād Shāh of Berar formed an alliance against him, but their apprehensions were premature, for Humāyūn, who was harassed by the activity of Bahādur’s amīrs and disturbed by news of the progress made by the already formidable Shīr Shāh, was unable to maintain his position in Gujarāt and retired to Māndū and thence, on Bahādur Shāh’s return from Dīlī to Chāmpānīr, to Dīlī.

Humāyūn, on retiring to Dīlī, left some of his amīrs in Mālwa to retain possession of the province, and Muḥammad Shāh of Khāndesh was engaged, under the orders of Bahādur Shāh, in expelling these intruders, when he received news that Bahādur had been drowned on Feb. 13, 1537, at Dīlū, whither he had gone to treat with the Portuguese under Nuno da Cunha, and that the affairs of Gujarāt were in great confusion owing to the return of the Mughul, Muḥammad Zamān Mīrzā, from Hindūstān and the Panjāb. Muḥammad Shāh was summoned by the amīrs, in accordance with his uncle’s will, to ascend the throne of Gujarāt, but before he could reach Chāmpānīr he died, on May 4, 1537, and was buried in Būrānpūr.

On the death of Muḥammad Shāh an attempt was made to raise to the throne his young son Ahmad, but the majority of the amīrs supported the cause of Muḥammad’s brother Mubārak. Ahmad died, or was probably put to death, and Mubārak ascended the throne, using the royal title which, in the case of Muḥammad, had been recognized by Bahādur Shāh of Gujarāt. The death of Muḥammad Shāh had left the throne of Gujarāt vacant, and the amīrs of that country were obliged to seek their king in Khāndesh, where Bahādur, in order to secure an undisputed succession in Gujarāt for his nephew, Muḥammad Shāh of
Klândesh, had imprisoned his younger brother, Laṣīf Khán. Laṣīf Khán was now dead but had left a son, Maḥmūd, and a deputation from Gujarāt, headed by the amīr Ikhtiyār Khán, waited on Mubārak Shāh and demanded the surrender of Maḥmūd. The demand was a disappointment to Mubārak, who had hoped that the choice of the amīrs of Gujarāt would fall on him, and he demurred to surrendering Maḥmūd but, on the amīrs of Gujarāt assembling their forces and assuming a threatening attitude, delivered him to Ikhtiyār Khán, who carried him off to Gujarāt and there enthroned him as Maḥmūd III. The history of Gujarāt during the early part of Maḥmūd’s reign is the history of contests between the leading amīrs of the kingdom for the possession of the king’s person and the regency which such possession involved and two amīrs entitled ‘Imād-al-Mulk and Daryā Khán, having slain Ikhtiyār Khán, quarrelled with one another. ‘Imād-al-Mulk was worsted by his confederate in the contest for the possession of the young king and fled to Klândesh, where he took refuge with Mubārak Shāh. Daryā Khán and Maḥmūd III pursued him and were met by Mubārak at Dānkrī. Mubārak was defeated but the Gujarātis refrained from following up their success and ‘Imād-al-Mulk fled to Māndū and took refuge with Qādir Khán, one of the old amīrs of the Khālji kings of Mālwa who, on the expulsion and retirement of Humāyūn’s officers from Mālwa, had assumed the government of the country and entitled himself Qādir Shāh. According to Firishta,19 Maḥmūd now, in fulfilment of a promise which he had made to Mubārak when they were fellow-prisoners in Asīrgārā during the life-time of Bahādur and Muḥammad, surrendered to Kländesh the town and district of Nandurbār.

It was in Mubārak’s reign that the army of Kländesh first measured swords with the troops of Akbar, and defeated them. In 1561 an imperial army under the command of Adham Khán, Akbar’s foster-brother, conquered Mālwa and expelled Bāz Bahādur, the son and successor of Shujā’at Khán, Shīr Shāh’s viceroy of that province, who had assumed independence as the power of the short-lived Sūr dynasty of Dihlī declined. Bāz Bahādur took refuge in Burhānpūr, and was followed thither in 1562 by the brutal Pīr Muḥammad Khān, Akbar’s governor of Mālwa, who committed the most terrible atrocities in Kländesh, plundering and laying waste the country and slaughtering its inhabitants without regard to age or sex. He captured Burhānpūr and ordered a general massacre of its inhabitants in which many pious and learned men perished. Mubārak and Bāz Bahādur shut themselves up in Asīrgārā and Tufāl Khán, who had usurped the government of Berar and imprisoned Daryā Shāh, the last of the ‘Imād Shāhī dynasty, came to their assistance. The allies marched to attack Pīr Muḥammad who, anxious to save the plunder which he had collected, retired before them without fighting. On reaching the Narbada Pīr Muḥammad and his officers were attacked and defeated by their pursuers and fled in confusion across the river, in which Pīr Muḥammad was drowned. All historians agree in regarding his fate as God’s judgment on the atrocities which he had committed in Mālwa and, above all, in Kländesh. As Budāoni says, “the sighs of orphans, the weak, and the captives did their work with him.” As a result of the defeat of Pīr Muḥammad Bāz Bahādur temporarily regained possession of Māndū.

(To be continued.)
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अयापारस्य हिंसुसबासी
सेनेक वर्षराघव बाणप्रस: हसः
नमस्तेदेहु कृत्याधिकारयः
समां विन्यासम् वभाषण सर्वारुः
प्रधान प्रयासर्य पावम् सांत्विन म: सांस्करम्
अतिनिजार्थोऽनुजाकरी संस्करण महारहिं म: सम्पर्क
(के) निवास काराकर समाधिनीं वव्य समम्
पावम् वा काव्यभाषा वारी भौतिकाः मान्यमेव च
इति गुणवत् सयं सादृश्यः प्रशिक्षितम्
अम: ते: प्रमोदाधाराविशिष्टं कर्तीर्भः
वुजानकः कर कर्नमण्डः कर्मणुक्तमुष्टिः
पावसनान्ते दहक्षणामात्रकुमारणमुङ्गम्
शानं च सौभ वहनम् गिर्याः
चाससुगुरुः नित्या संहते संकृतं
कुल्नीवासीलीविवास कुष्टं
ते लंगायाराकु: भामसांनाम
सिलमुखैं लोगालकारितामि
सुभुद्यातूनमिल्लामुङ्गम्
द्वारागुरुनानो नाथुः हिन्ने प्रसेित
विश्वमेव चो वर्णे वर्णे
गावत्सरशः स्तवासकारितामि
स्तुर्दस्थयं वहनमयी रूपम्
वशनो'द्वीनां: स्वस्तुः
स नाम च च यस्य दुसरस्ततिः
रात्यां यांस्यांस्यांस्यां श्रवणं विधिः
प्रणामां काव्यकारान्त: काव्यम्
पत्राः गुरुविनिवासीलिविवासीलिकाः
काव्याः वर्णावकारानां पत्राः
उनामांकारिताय वैरो हिन्ने
विश्वमेवां विनाशीमां दुदाकारितामि
अद्वान्त्याः (क्र) सत्यां शुचियां सस्कारमिति
कुल्नीवासां बालानामरितामि: काल्पिकानि हि
ततः समां विदुयां पावनविनायिनामानि
पावसनां च यस्य दुसरस्तति पद्यः विदुयाः
गौड़ोऽह यस्य बनासानां प्रहस्य प्रेमे
सर्वनाम: चतुर्वो यस्य नामाकरणम् व: तनतः
नव जिवयानं विदुयां सामान्यं शिामरं वव्य
हिंसेनामां विदुयां नामानां शिामरं वव्य
हिंसेनामां विदुयां नामानां नामोऽसंस्करते
वालिनुवार्ष्ट्रुः व पाण्डुमुङ्ग
हिंसेनामां विदुयां नामानां शिामरं
वासवान्तः सभी विनियांत: ने
वेषं च शैशानिः वासवान्तः
हिंसेनां तेन भक्तिस्वरूपः
पुरुषवालिका पूर्वायंिका सलिवंि हैं।
अंकुम्बराधमणुसारं पश्वमारिकाह॥
तत्त्वपूणमित्वां जु हस्तिकृं पश्व ह्वरित॥
पश्वहेमसः हस्तं देवालयानुमवतोऽऽ॥
कार्यवत् हृदभेदसानी मौलन स्वेदोऽऽ॥
वाक्याः साक्षातः शाक्तिः साक्षात् मन्त्रम्॥
धितवाचनमत्रुण्माणा नाराज्जान प्रतात्त्त॥
सामसः मीतास्थे अथात् (हे) तल्लायकुमुः॥
पद्येवादस्तु संह्यत्वा इति सत्सतिसंयंकाः॥

॥ इति बिवेकप्रभुमाला ॥

प्रातानां वेदान्तं न सहे जन्यमपेतिरवाः
श्रुत्वेदक्रमेव मुनिः शाश्वतं दिनेषमः सर्वः।
मानुक्केलकुबारसिकृं नयवार्तसः सुनन्दसुः;
भूभर्ची किमयात्रा कणां तत्त्वाद सम्भवी बल्ल्यमावत॥

॥ गुरुरामक्षिरस्वर्तमुद्धतिन्यानः।

अर्थतं शिलाकाठीमनुष्ठितात् गुरुरामक्षत्रिः छृः शुनराधमणुसः नाम नाराज्जान।
तत्र हेमसः हस्तं देवालयानुमवतोऽऽ॥

तत्र केवल नवमी सत्त्वमः
शीतीः धूमा कार्यमयीः
वर्तमानविवर्धिकारिः
प्रत्यावरी पत्रसम्प्रेषिः॥

अष्ठि च।

सात्त्विकविवाहमेव वर्तवाची बहुतुं।
शुभोत्सवातः सवसु कुश्म्वोस्वर्वातिक वानु॥
लेखाकाठीभुवनं नवरूपं शुभभुवनं।
वैष्णविकयातिरः भवागायतसः श्रीमरणसः।
एनामकरोत्कृत्त भिक्षुधममः स रामः कः।
काव्यमुक्तमेव व्याख्यातिहरि शुभभुवनं च।

॥ राजनाक्षितमृगतात्रांकृ॥

अर्थुतं भवेत् श्रीहुसदवुसृं।
श्रेयसिद्धेऽवर्ते गोर्वतांनाह॥
वनमात्रेऽवर्तदायवाच।
पूर्वाः पूर्वेऽवं धरण॥
पकाविद्वाहिनिधरसम्प्रेषे।
स्वामिनिवनस्यातुणुगीनासु।
भावेरीत्रिषुमधुकरसः
रघुवंशमधुकरशः
वधारा भगवानः वृक्षारोऽसः
मुपतालस्मिनं
आद्यपकलमधुकरसः
स्वकलमधुकरशः
परिमच्छेष्ठलयः विराजः
वृक्षारोऽसः
पन्न्या पितृविष्णुवधारसः
नवाचत्वः निःस्बप्रवेस्तः
पुष्चात्मकस्मी पुरवाससः
पुष्चात्मककृतिसः
कलिनिनां जनकी जनकी
बेदोजनकीः दरक रजनया
निःस्बाभिस्मलुकिपूर्वः
नेतृः प्रवाहर्पदस्वः
पाणी वहस्ती सतिवरासाः
वाणी पुराणी वधारस्तिनी व्यासः
सुपनेश्वरः सुभववक्षः
सुपनेश्वरः सुभववक्षः
पारंतिकविशिष्यकायः
पारंतिकविशिष्यकायः
कर्यं न वजनं मुतिः कालिनासः
मद्यदृष्टिकांश्चकारः
पुराणी वृषभुविनां चा
प्रेणः पुराणः विनानी वाणि
कर्णी नवनां कविताणि कोशः
अश्रितोऽकामिः अन्तः तेषसः
प्रभोपिलुकाः पतितं च पारः
प्रथमं वृषभेनां कालिने
सन्ति सबन्धोऽगुरी तन्त्रस्यभिः
कुलायतांगाय कुनो न मृदुः
पारंतिकशिवाखुशवः
कर्णा मुहर्वा कालिने कालिने
सन्ति सबन्धोऽगुरी तन्त्रस्यभिः
कुलायतांगाय कुनो न मृदुः
पारंतिकशिवाखुशवः
कर्णा मुहर्वा कालिने कालिने
सन्ति सबन्धोऽगुरी तन्त्रस्यभिः
कुलायतांगाय कुनो न मृदुः
पारंतिकशिवाखुशवः
कर्णा मुहर्वा कालिने कालिने
सन्ति सबन्धोऽगुरी तन्त्रस्यभिः
कुलायतांगाय कुनो न मृदुः
समन्धी योगान्तर्द्दा नाम यहसनम्

अर्थतः हलु परेन्द्रमहानाथकर्मः सामवेदपरमहाविभिन्नवर्तकं अवदापोवाकवितात्यावास्मिकितस्तथर्यत्रस्तस्मात्
रथंकर्मकः कल्याणेश्वर्यः नागाजनविनायकसिद्धिः महादेवः काविनोऽपि पुरा । वीरपाणि विद्याधरसिद्धिः
अर्थशास्त्रभारसिद्धिः समर्पितात्यावास्मिकितस्तथर्यत्रस्मात् श्रीरामसिद्धिः श्रीरामकमाथसिद्धिः श्रीरामकमाथसिद्धिः
श्रीरामकमाथसिद्धिः श्रीरामकमाथसिद्धिः श्रीरामकमाथसिद्धिः श्रीरामकमाथसिद्धिः श्रीरामकमाथसिद्धिः 
श्रीरामकमाथसिद्धिः श्रीरामकमाथसिद्धिः श्रीरामकमाथसिद्धिः श्रीरामकमाथसिद्धिः 
श्रीरामकमाथसिद्धिः श्रीरामकमाथसिद्धिः श्रीरामकमाथसिद्धिः श्रीरामकमाथसिद्धिः श्रीरामकमाथसिद्धिः
[Text not legible due to obfuscation]
PLATE I.

POLISHED HAMMERSTONE FROM SINGHBHUM.
ON A PECULIAR POLISHED HAMMERSTONE FROM
SINGHBUH, CHOTA NAGPUR, INDIA.

BY H. C. DAS-GUPTA, M.A., F.G.S.; CALCUTTA.

The implement to be described here is included among a number of stone implements presented to the Geological Department of the Presidency College, Calcutta, by Mr. Subodha Krishna Biswas, M.Sc., who came across them in the course of his professional work as a geologist in the district of Singhbhum. According to Mr. Biswas the specimens were obtained from two different localities: one of them, Nadup or Ladup, is about 5 miles south of Kalimati Railway Station (Lat. 22°46', Long. 86°17') and the other is about a mile and a half east of the workings of the Cape Copper Company at Matigara (Lat. 22°38', Long. 86°26'). Both these localities are in Dhalbhum and are mostly inhabited by the Kols and the Santhals, while the implements were all found among the débris at the mouths of ancient copper mines. The rocks which were utilised in preparing the specimens are hornblende-schist, a rock which is very common in the area, though according to Mr. Biswas in the exact localities where the specimens were obtained the strata are phyllitic and quartzitic showing that the rocks used for the manufacture of the implements must have been brought there by persons, the remnants of whose handcraft they are.

A number of implements from Chota Nagpur has been described by a number of workers including the late Dr. Wood-Mason and the Rev. P. O. Bodding. But the specimen under notice is of an unusual type and accordingly a short description of it is desirable.

The implement, as the accompanying Plate I. shows, is broken and has a thickened head followed by a portion which is flat. A specimen somewhat similar to this has been described by Mr. Rivett-Carnac from Banda in the United Provinces, and there is a plaster cast of it exhibited in the Archaeological collections of the Indian Museum, Calcutta. These two specimens, however, differ from each other markedly both in the shape of the head and of the remaining portion— the latter being quite cylindrical in the Banda specimen while, as already mentioned, it is quite flat in the specimen from Singhbhum. There is also a marked difference in the nature of the head which in the Banda specimen has a portion—about one-fifth—protruding beyond the cylindrical part while no such protuberance is present in the Singhbhum specimen. In the latter, however, the boundary between the head and the flat portion is very marked, though it is not equally well pronounced on both faces, while any such marked boundary is altogether wanting in the Banda hammer. The head shows evidence of wear resulting in three well-marked concavities. The flat portion is only partially present and there is no indication regarding its real length.

It is rather difficult to say definitely anything about the use to which this peculiar implement was put. But in consideration of the fact that it was found among the débris at the mouth of old pits dug for copper-ores, it may be supposed that it was used as a hammer to break the cupriferous rocks—the precise way in which the hammer was used being, however, doubtful—e.g., whether it was a double-headed hammer with a handle attached to it, or a single-headed hammer, the flat part preserved being used as a handle. The sharp boundary between the flat part and the head would lead one to suspect that it was double-headed, but then the somewhat large size of the flat part is rather difficult to account for; while, if the flat part is supposed to be used as a handle, it may be argued

that a cylindrical pattern would have served the purpose better. Mr. Rivett-Carnac believes that the Banda implement might have been used as a pivot.

The specimen was obtained from the second of the two localities above referred to, and the collection also includes one pounder and two stone arrow-heads.

It may be mentioned here that at a meeting of the Asiatic Society of Bengal Sir Thomas Holland exhibited some grooved stones and ground pebbles found in Singhbhum and used by a past and unknown generation of gold miners.  

TRIMURTIS IN BUNDELKHAND.

BY RAI BAHADUR HIRALAL, B.A., M.R.A.S.; DAMOH.

A perusal of Mr. Naḷēṣa Aiyar's article on the Trimūrti image in the Peshāwar Museum contributed to Sir John Marshall's Annual¹ for 1913-14 (which has just appeared) has suggested this supplementary note. In the Deputy Commissioner's bungalow at Damoh, which I am just occupying, there is an image of a Trimūrti, which is somewhat peculiar and conforms Rao Sahib Krishna Shastri's remark quoted by Mr. Aiyar that "Brahma, Vishnu and Siva being all directly or indirectly recognized to be identical with the sun, there is every possibility of the Trimurti figures representing the sun-god." The photo of the Bangaon Trimūrti, which is reproduced in the accompanying Plate II, actually represents the sun with all his emblems and accompaniments. In front of the standing figure, there is the broken image of Chhāyā (Sun's wife) below which sits the Sārāhi or chariot-driver holding the reins of seven horses, of whom only three can be seen, the rest being broken. There are three side figures, the bull-faced Mahadeva in a sitting posture, surmounted by Vishnu standing with feminine grace and holding the Gada (mace) in his hand, while on the opposite side stands the bearded Brahma, all these three combining into the main figure of the sun described before. At the top there are figures of two females shooting with a bow and arrow, apparently the other wives of the sun, who along with Chhāyā, form the three Saktis, or counterparts of the Hindu Triad.

This is, moreover, a unique representation of sun worship by one of those six classes of adorers, who regard the sun in the triple form to which reference is made by Sir R. G. Bhāndārkar in his "Vaishnavism, Saivism and minor religious systems." Speaking on the sect of Sauras he remarks in § 115, p. 152, that "some worship the orb of the sun who has just arisen as Brahmadeva, the creator, others the sun on the meridian as Śiva, the destroyer. He is also regarded as the originator. Some regard the setting sun as Vishnu, the protector, and considering him as the cause of the creation and destruction also, as the highest entity worship him. There are some who resort to all the three as a triple form." The Bangaon statue would be easily recognised as one in which the suns are conceived in a triple form.

A minute scrutiny of the image would show that the sun-god wears top-boots up to his knees, terminating into a curl at the foot end in a Pesauri or Peshāwar fashion. This is another interesting point, confirming the identity of the image with sun worship incorporated from foreign sources. Again quoting from Sir Rama Kṛishṇa, that learned savant remarks in para 116 of his book as follows:—"The form of the idol of the sun worshipped in such temples is described by Varāhamihira (Brihatsaṁhitā, Chap.58.), but the features mentioned by him which have a significance for our present purpose are that

---

² See pp. 276-280.
³ In 13 miles north of Damoh. The image lying in the Deputy Commissioner's compound was brought from that place about 4 years ago.
⁴ Compare Mr. Aiyar's remarks in his footnote No. 2 on page 278 of the Archaeological Report for 1913-14, where he says:—"It must be borne in mind that Vishnu being regarded as the preserver performs the role of the mother of creation. Hence we find that in certain Purānas Vishnu is described as the Śakti or female counterpart of Śiva. It is no wonder, therefore, that in the figures under consideration the portion allotted for Vishnu is carved with feminine grace."
PHOTO OF TRIMURTI FOUND IN BANGAON 13 MILES FROM DAMOH,
his feet and legs should be enclosed or covered up to the knees and he should be dressed in the fashion prevalent in the North (V. 46) and that he should be encircled by an Ayavaiga (V. 47). Accordingly the images of the sun that are found in the temples mentioned above have boots reaching up to the knees, and a girdle round the waist with one end hanging downwards. This last is a Persian feature as we have already seen and the other also must have the same or similar origin. It certainly is not Indian. The Bangaon statue wears top-boots exactly as described above. It is somewhat curious that the booting idea should have been extended to images of Vishnu in a sitting posture. In a village named Madhī in the Pannā State I recently saw a figure of Vishnu wearing shoes. This god also happens to be a Trimūrti carved in the centre of the door of a ruined temple. The figure is six-handed, unlike the Bangaon Trimūrti which is eight-handed, apparently representing four hands of Vishnu and two of Mahādeva and Brahmā each. The Madhī Trimūrti holds in its left hands, a Triśūla (trident) in one, and a lotus in the second, the third being open, with the thumb bent towards the centre of the palm. The right hands hold a lotus in one, and a Mrigāṅka (deer symbol) in the second, the third being broken. These symbols show what deities are combined in the Trimūrti, the Triśūla and Mrigāṅka being symbols of Śiva, the lotus of Vishnu and the open hand with thumb bent of Brahmā. In the left corner is carved the figure of a bull and on the right, that of Garuḍa, but I could not find the Haṁsa (Swan) the conveyance of Brahmā represented there. This is the central panel on each side of which there is one, separated by figures of gods and goddesses. In the right panel are carved Śiva and Pārvati and in the left Vishnu and Lakṣmi. The intervening figures between the panels consist of two rows of goddesses and gods, the first row representing eight goddesses (Ashṭamārāḥ) five being depicted on the right and three on the left with a figure of Gaṇeśa at the end and the second row eight figures of Vishnu, four on each side of the central panel. Below this there is a second row of panels with Vishnu and Lakṣmi placed in the central one. The right side panel has the figures of Brahmā and Brahmāśī and the left one of Śiva and Pārvati. The intervening place between the central and side panels is occupied by the Navagrahas, four being represented on the right side and five on the left. This is a most beautiful piece of work executed apparently about the same period as that of Khajurāhā, the old capital of the Chandellas, now included in the Chhatarpur State.

In Khajurahā itself there is a temple dedicated to a Trimūrti, with an inscription dated A.D. 953-54. But the side heads of that Trimūrti are not human. One is lionine and the other porcine. This Trimūrti is named Vaikuntha in the inscription, which is peculiar as a name of a god. I quote below the invocation, which explains the form of the subsidiary heads, which the image bears:

वाक्यान्वितां विकरशाचिन्तनसौन्तः पातारुपस्य तन्मयसंयुक्तां संतोत्सुच्यन्ति त्रिविकुलः ||

May that Vaikuntha protect you, who, frightening the whole world with his roaring, as boar and as man-lion, slew the three chief Asuras, Kapila and the rest, (who were) terrible in the world, (and who) possessed one body, which by the boon of Brahmā enjoyed freedom from fear (and) could be destroyed (only) by (Vaikuntha) having assumed these forms!

This Trimūrti of Khajurahā is four-handed and is therefore popularly known as Chaturbhujā, which in the abstract is correct as it was intended to represent Vishnu as the predominant deity, which is apparent from the invocatory salutation recorded at the beginning and end of the inscription referred to above, running as it does "Namo bhagavate Vāsudevaya" (Adoration to the Holy Vāsudeva). Curiously enough at the

---

1 About 35 miles north-east of Damoh and about 50 miles from Khajurāhā.
end of the record is added another invocation "Namaḥ Svaite" (Adoration to the Sun), just after Namo bhagavate Vāsudevāya, which incidentally discovers the mind of the writer, who certain identified Vishnu with the sun, thus further confirming the theory of Rao Sahib Krishna Shastri to which allusion has already been made. It may be further noted that these Trimurtis show that in Bundelkhand Vishnu was the predominant deity of this place, unlike the South where Siva was generally allotted that honour.

Khajurāh, Maghi and Bangaon are all in Bundelkhand, but curiously enough the first has a four-handed Trimurti, the second six-handed and the third eight-handed. Varāhamihira describes a Vishnu image as one of 8, 6, 4 or even 2 hands. The Maghi and Bangaon images as noted above are booted, but the Khajurāh one as reported by the Divān of the Chhatarpur State does not wear boots. I am sorry I omitted to examine carefully the feet of the Khajurāh Trimurti when I saw it in December 1916 and a photo is not available to test this point with confidence. Dr. Spooner to whom I am indebted for drawing my attention to Sir Ramkrishna’s remarks has in the matter of top-boots kindly called my attention to the analogous red top-boots which are (or were) worn by Christian Bishops at their ordination. Some authorities consider that they too are derived from the same source as those of the Sūrya which gives us an unexpected bond between the Christian prelates and the Hindu sun god.

MISCELLANEA.

DATES OF PĀNINI AND KĀTYAYANA.

The time of Kātyayana is denoted by a vārttika of his which does not seem to have yet been noticed. On Pānini 2.1.80 Kātyayana’s note, 4.1.219-224, which fixes his time between the Parthian and Patañjali, i.e., 248-180 B.C. ‘Śākṣa’ and ‘Pārthaśiva’ are in sāmāndhikārana: “the Pārthivhas who are Śākas (or Śakas).” No other meaning of the example is possible in view of the grammatical rule. The form Pārthiva has to go back to the original form of their ethnic name Parhsata (Darius’ inscr.) which soon changed in Persia and India.1 Apparently in the time of Patañjali the form had changed and he could not recognise it, hence the absurd meaning the sākha-bhejina (vegetable-eating) kings.

If we put Kātyayana between 248 to 200 B.C. we would be very near the mark. It is noteworthy that Kātyayana calls the Parthians ‘Śākas’. This is confirmed by their title Ar.Sēkēs or the ‘Ruling Saka’.

In 275 B.C. devān-prīya is a well recognized word (Āsoka’s iners.) It must have been so for some time past. If Pānini lived about 300 B.C. (a date which is so much emphasised by M. Lévi), he could not have laid down the rule pataḥ kāraśām (6.3.31) which would give absolutely a bad meaning to the expression.2 The expression obviously came into being and use after Pānini’s time. We must take 150 or 100 years before 275 B.C. (Āsoka) to get at Pānini’s period. He thus can in no case be placed about 300 or 235 B.C. Consequently Pānini’s Yavana must have been the Greeks who were in the service of the Persian emperor (cir. 500 B.C.) at Taxila or at some other place.

I may here remind once more that the Buddhist tradition placing him under Nanda (which would be Nandavardhana)2 takes him to cir. 450 B.C.

Kātyayana’s vārttika on Pānini 6.3.21 giving devān-prīya is another indication of Kātyayana’s time. The word had become very important in Kātyayana’s time, for he gives one separate vārttika devān-vyākhyā (Pānini, 6.3.21) to the expression. He could have tackled it on the preceding vārttika. But he does not do so. The reason was its importance, it being the imperial title in his days.

It had been the imperial title for some generations, as Āsoka calls his predecessor ‘former devān-prīyas’. In the time of Patañjali it was a term of courtesy even in the orthodox people. It had therefore no Buddhist or Āsokan significance about it. Its wide-spread use is testified by its employment in Ceylon in Āsoka’s time. This shows that the expression had come into existence in the language for some time. And even if this time was only a century, M. Lévi’s view that the Yavana of Pānini refers to Alexander’s Greeks or the later ones, must be dislodged. The kings before Āsoka alluded to as devān-prīyas would be probably more than two and certainly more than one. The title would thus go back to the time of Chandragupta I if not to the time of Nanda. Pānini in the face of the imperial title could not have said “the pendulus is retained in attempt.” He must have therefore lived before Chandragupta at least, and therefore before Alexander’s Greeks.

K.P. Jayaswal.

---

1 Parhsata in the Nāyāsāstra; sāk-Pahava in inscriptions; Parhsata or Pahava in Manu.
2 Patañjali uses it in a good sense and so also Kātyayana.
3 See my paper on the Sañjika Chronology, JBOBS., vol. I.
BOOK NOTICES.

DAVVA-SÄNGHA (DRAVYA-SÄNGHA) by NEMICHANDRA SIDDHÄNTA-CHAKRAVARTI, with a commentary by BRAHMADÉVA, edited with introduction, translation, notes and an original commentary in English by SARAT CHANDRA GHOSHAL, M.A., B.L., Saraswati, etc., and published by Kumar Devendra Prasad, the Central Jaina Publishing House, Arrah (India.), 1917, pp. lxxxi and 103.

This is an excellent edition of a philosophical work of the Digambara sect of the Jains. It is not often that we lay our hands on a book published in India which is so neatly got up and generally so carefully edited. The editor and the publisher have done almost everything that could be calculated to make the perusal of this rather abstruse work attractive and easy to readers not acquainted with the technicalities of Jaina metaphysics. Besides the introduction in which he discusses the date of the work, and gives an account of the other books written by its author, the editor, Mr. Ghoshal, has provided an appendix giving notes on various important points, four indexes for convenience of reference, and over eight charts illustrating the analysis of the Jaina categories. For the help of Western scholars who do not find it convenient to read the Devanagari script, all the Prákritic Gāthás or verses, their Sanskrit renderings, and also the verbal analysis or Padaspāths have all been given both in Nāgārī as well as Roman alphabets. The Sanskrit commentary by Brahmadeva has been given in original. In the English commentary which evinces much learning and research, the editor has generally followed the interpretation given by Brahmadeva and has enriched it with copious extracts from other Jaina works bearing on the subjects discussed. The translation is generally a good piece of work, though we might differ from the editor in the rendering of an expression here and there.

DAVVA-SÄNGHA is a short work of 58 verses in Jaina Prákrit in which the author enumerates, classifies and defines the six DRAVYAS or substances (spirit, matter, space, time, dharma and adharma) into which all concepts in the universe are divided and also the seven TATTVAS or fundamental categories (dharma, bandha, sajna, nirjard and moksha); and finally, he indicates the path to the liberation of the soul through perfect faith, perfect knowledge and perfect conduct.

The author, Nemichandra Siddhānta-Chakravarti flourished at the end of the tenth century A.D. and was the preceptor of the celebrated Chāmuḍešvara who erected at Śravara Bēlojī in Mysore, the colossal monolithic statue (57 feet high) of Gommatesvara of which Ferguson writes, "nothing grander or more imposing exists out of Egypt."

Two imperfections of this otherwise scholarly work, we venture to point out. Mr. Ghoshal has not indicated any varia lectione nor stated what text of this important work he has adopted. There have already been three other printed editions of this work and some manuscripts have been noticed by scholars. Certainly he could have examined some of them and collated the different readings wherever there might be any. Another desideratum is the absence of any remarks on the language in which it is written. We may hope that should a second edition of this work be called for, these apparent defects will be removed.

We should not omit to thank the enterprising publisher, Kumar Devendra Prasad, the founder of the Central Jaina Publishing House, Arrah, for making this valuable work available in this useful form; let us hope that in the near future he will be able to fulfil his promise of presenting us with similar scholarly editions of the other works of his series of "The Sacred Books of the Jainas."

H. C. CHAKLADAR.


This is another work printed by the same enterprising publishing house at Arrah. The author, himself an ardent Jaina of the Digambara school, has in this book the object, as he puts it, of "pointing out the practical scientific method of self-realisation" according to Jaina philosophy. With this end in view he has enumerated, and furnished an interpretation of, the TATTVAS or categories of fundamental truths of the universe, an accurate knowledge of which is essential for the realisation of NIRVĀNA. The Jaina possess an
uncommon genius for division and subdivision which to an uninitiated reader might appear to lead to a tangle, Mr. Champat Rai realises this difficulty of the lay-reader and has been eminently successful in furnishing a rational interpretation, intelligible to modern readers, of the principles of his creed, and we are thankful to him for this service towards the better understanding of Jaina doctrines.

The learned writer has not, we fear, been equally successful in his endeavour to show the relation between Jainism and Hinduism, which he has attempted to do in a lengthy appendix. Here he is evidently out of his element and his very enthusiasm for Jainism has led him to make dogmatic statements based on insufficient grounds. It is very difficult to follow him, for example, when he tells his readers that "Hinduism in its very inception was an offshoot of Jainism. In course of time it fell under demonic influence" (p. 230). Hardly any modern student of philosophy will assent to his dictum that the six systems of Hindu philosophy "are neither happily conceived, nor characterised by scientific or philosophical precision" (p. 224). We doubt very much if Mr. Jain will be able to carry his readers along with him when he says: "The structure of Vedic mythology is based on a foundation of fragmentary truths taken from the Jaina siddhánta" (p. 191). It is needless to multiply these instances, but what we have already quoted will show that our author is not a very reliable guide in comparative religion or philosophy.

H. C. CHAKLA DAR.


This work purports to be a critical study of the metaphysics, ethics and history of Jainism from the point of view of the Śvetāmbara sect of the Jains, and the joint authors have made an attempt to harmonise the ancient doctrines of Jainism with the teachings of modern science and philosophy. Besides being a compendium of philosophy according to the Śvetāmbara school, it is a mine of information on many other topics relating to Jainism. It gives a history of the Jaina Church and of the rupture and split that led to the creation of the sub-sects, and it also provides interesting accounts of the festivals, places of pilgrimage, literature, art and architecture of the Jains. Besides, there are five appendices; the first discusses the date of Chandragupta, the next gives English translations of the Armanas and āsanavas granted by the Mughal Emperors and others to the Śvetāmbara Church concurring upon it the right of possession over places of Jaina worship and pilgrimage; the remaining appendices furnish lists of the Jaina gātas and āsanavas, of the Tirthāṅkaras, and of the heads of the gachchhakas, respectively.

We cordially welcome this handbook of Śvetāmbara Jainism as it puts before the general reader what the followers of that faith have to say in favour of their own religion. The joint-authors have tried to vindicate the claims of Jainism as a rationalistic form of religion, and in doing so they have instituted a comparison between Jainism and the Indian philosophical systems on the one hand and the modern European systems on the other. It must be admitted that the joint-authors have done fair justice to this very difficult task, and the attitude of toleration in which they have done it is really commendable. We trust this book will help, by clearing up the metaphysical principles underlying Jainism, to dispel much misconception about it.

The work is, however, not satisfactory with regard to the historical portions. The authors have put down dates of many important events about which there is much controversy, without attempting either to establish them or to indicate the sources from which they have drawn them. Their discussion of the date of Chandragupta does not throw any additional light on this important point, nor have they summarised our present knowledge of the date of that monarch.

We regret the many typographical blemishes in this book; misprints disfigure almost every one of its pages; letters and words have not often been omitted. Then again, no care has been taken in the transliteration of the numerous Sanskrit and Prakrit words that had to be used in this work. Careless transliteration sometimes combined with imperfect proof-reading have made many expressions in the book under review quite unintelligible. For illustration—we quote a few at random—Pravakasāvāsā (p. 88); Saubhāvi (p. 63); Śāntaka (p. 2); Jyotirasā (p. 83); Sāvāntasā (p. 683); the same word is transliterated as saubhāvī, saubhāvī and saubhāvī on the same page (88). The list could very easily be enlarged, and we trust the authors will take care to get rid of these serious, but easily remediable defects, in a subsequent edition.

H. C. CHAKLA DAR.

[May, 1918]
THE FARUQI DYNASTY OF KHANDESH.

BY LT.-COLONEL T. W. HAIG, C.M.G.

(Continued from p. 124.)

In the summer of 1564 Akbar himself marched to Mándú from Ágra and his amírs captured the fortresses held by officers who had not yet submitted. Among the places so captured was Bijağár, which was held by ‘Izzát Khán for Mubárak Sháh. The fortress was surrendered conditionally, and it was agreed that Mubárak should give a daughter in marriage to Akbar, should give her in dowry the districts of Bijağár and Handiya and should henceforth cause the Khátáb to be recited in his dominions in the name of Akbar. Mubárak’s daughter was conducted to the imperial court by Akbar’s surnuch, I’tímad Khán. The treaty with Akbar made no alteration in the status to which the rulers of Khándesh had long been accustomed. They had for many years been subject to the suzerainty of Gujarát and though it appears that the feeble Mahmúd III had not ventured to assert this suzerainty they now merely exchanged their former allegiance to Gujarát for allegiance to the emperor. It does not appear that Akbar intended to regulate the succession to the throne or to interfere in any way in the internal affairs of Khándesh except in so far as those affairs affected the foreign policy of the state, but he certainly assumed control of its foreign policy and expected the assistance of a contingent of troops whenever the imperial army was engaged in operations in the neighbourhood of Khándesh.

Mubárak died on December 19, 1566, and was succeeded by his son Múhammad Sháh II., a wild and generous prince, who left all power in the state in the hands of his minister, Sayyid Zain-al-din.

Meanwhile the affairs of Gujarát had fallen into great confusion. Mahmúd III had been murdered in 1554 and left no male issue. The leading amírs raised to the throne a young man named Raží-al-Mulk, who was said to be a descendant of Aḥmad I and who succeeded under the title of Aḥmad II and was assassinated in 1560. There appeared to be no male heir of the royal house left, for Mahmúd III, who dreaded a disputed succession, had been in the habit of ensuring that no woman of his harem ever gave birth to a living child, but the minister, I’tímad Khán, produced a child named Nándú, and by swearing that the boy was the son of Mahmúd III by a maidservant of the harem whom he had saved from Mahmúd’s barbarous and unnatural treatment, induced the amír to acknowledge him, and he was raised to the throne under the title of Muṣaffar III. In 1567 I’tímad Khán, in order to rid himself of the importunity of Changíz Khán, another leading amír, who was demanding additional fiefs with a view to extending his power, contrived to embroil Changíz with Múhammad II by sending him to recover Nandurbár, which had always belonged to Gujarát until it was surrendered by Mahmúd III in fulfilment of his promise, to Mubárak II of Khándesh. Changíz Khán marched to Nandurbár, occupied it, and emboldened by his success, advanced to Thalner. Múhammad II induced Tufání Khán of Bhanor to assist him in repelling the invader and the allies marched to Thalner. Changíz Khán, being too weak to withstand them, entrenched himself and, when he perceived that the enemy was resolved to bring him to battle, lost heart and fled. Muḥammad and Tufání pursued him, taking much plunder, and reoccupied Nandurbár.

In 1568 Changíz Khán defeated the minister I’tímad Khán and expelled him from Gujarát, and the wretched king, Muṣaffar III, became a mere tool in the hands of any one
of the amirs who could for the time obtain possession of his person. The genuineness of his descent from the royal house had always been suspected and was now openly impugned and Muḥammad II of Khāndesh deemed the occasion opportune for asserting his claim to the throne, which was undoubtedly superior to that of Muṣafar, and invaded Gujarāt with an army of 30,000 horse. He advanced to the neighbourhood of Aḥmadābād but the amirs of Gujarāt assembled an army of seven or eight thousand horse, utterly defeated him, and compelled him to retire to Asīrghār. Shortly afterwards Khāndesh was overrun and plundered by the princes known as the Mirzās, distant cousins of Akbar, who had recently sought refuge, whence they might trouble Akbar, in Gujarāt, but had quarrelled with Changīz Khān and fled from the country. Muḥammad II assembled his army with the intention of punishing them, but before he could take the field they had fled and passed beyond the confines of his kingdom.

In 1574 Murtazā Niẓām Shāh I of Aḥmadnagar conquered and annexed the kingdom of Berar, carrying off from the fortress of Narnāla, where they had been confined, all the members of the ‘Imād Shāhī family. He then marched against Bidar.

The annexation of Berar by Aḥmadnagar, which threatened to upset the balance of power in the Dakan, was most distasteful both to ‘Ali ‘Ādil Shāh I of Bijāpur and to Ibrāhīm Qutb Shāh of Golconda, and the latter sent a secret mission to Muḥammad II of Khāndesh urging him to attempt the recovery of Berar from Aḥmadnagar, and promising help. A pretender to the throne of Berar, representing himself to be the son of Daryā, the last of the ‘Imād Shāhī dynasty, appeared at the same time in Khāndesh and sought Muḥammad’s aid. It appears to have been the ambition of Muḥammad’s minister, Sayyid Zain-al-din, that committed Khāndesh to the support of the pretender’s claim, and Muḥammad, according to Firishta, placed at his disposal a force of 6,000 horse which, when it entered Berar, was reinforced by seven or eight thousand of the adherents of the ‘Imād Shāhī dynasty; but according to the Burhān-i-Ma‘āṣir, the author of which would be likely to magnify the difficulties with which Murtazā Niẓām Shāh had to contend, Muḥammad II. sent into Berar, an army of nearly 20,000 horse, under the command of Sayyid Zain-al-din, having received encouragement and material assistance from ‘Ali ‘Ādil Shāh as well as from Ibrāhīm Qutb Shāh. Berar had not settled down quietly under its conquerors and even one amir of Murtazā Niẓām Shāh had rebelled. On hearing of the approach of the invaders the amir appointed by Murtazā Niẓām Shāh to defend his conquest assembled at Elichpūr, the capital to concert measures of defence with Khurshid Khān, their leader. It was decided that the army of occupation was not strong enough to withstand the invaders and Khurshid Khān withdrew to Gāwilgārḥ, where he was besieged by the army of Khāndesh. The rest of the Aḥmadnagar amirs withdrew from Gāwilgārḥ and attacked another force of the invaders, which was besieging Narnāla, but were defeated and fled southwards to join Murtazā Niẓām Shāh, who was preparing, at Údgīr, to invade the small kingdom of Bidar. They were overtaken by the army of Khāndesh and again suffered a severe defeat, apparently on the banks of the Pengunga, in which river many were drowned. A remnant of the fugitives reached Murtazā Niẓām Shāh’s camp at Údgīr in sorry plight, and Murtazā at once perceived that the expedition against Bidar must be abandoned if he wished to recover and retain Berar, and marched northwards with his whole army, sending ahead an advanced guard of picked troops under the command of Sayyid Murtazā Sabzavārī. The army of Aḥmadnagar
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reached Bālpūr and on its approach the army of Khāndesh fled to Burhānpūr, and as the invaders continued their march northward Muḥammad II left Burhānpūr and took refuge in Asīrgārh. Murtuza I captured and sacked Burhānpūr and then marched towards Asīrgārh sending Chāngīz Khān in command of his advanced guard. A force of seven or eight thousand horse which was sent by Muḥammad II against Chāngīz Khān was defeated and the whole army of Ahmādnagar advanced against Asīrgārh. The main body of Muḥammad's army was encamped about the fortress, but fled on the approach of the invaders, leaving its camp and baggage behind, and was pursued as far as the borders of Akbar's dominions. The army of Ahmādnagar then formed the siege of Asīrgārh. The siege was likely to be protracted and as Muḥammad II was most anxious to come to terms negotiations were opened which terminated in a treaty under which the army of Ahmādnagar agreed to evacuate Khāndesh on payment of an indemnity of 900,000 musaffaris.  

Muḥammad II did not long survive his disastrous attempt to add Berar to his dominions, and died in 1576, leaving a young son, Ḥasan Khān and a uterine brother, Rāja 'Ali Khān, to dispute the succession. Firishta says that Rāja 'Ali Khān was at Akbar's court at Agra at the time of his brother's death, and Ḥasan Khān was enthroned but was deposed in favour of Rāja 'Ali Khān on the latter's return from Agra, but the Zafar al-Walīh gives a detailed account of the events immediately following Muḥammad's death. It seems that Rāja 'Ali Khān was present at his brother's deathbed, and Lād Muḥammad, the paymaster general, who entered while the question of the succession was under discussion, insisted on the enthronement of Ḥasan Khān, in the hope of profiting by a share in the guardianship of a minor sovereign. The other amirs readily acknowledged the boy but Rāja 'Ali Khān obtained the consent of Sayyid Zāin-al-dīn, the vazīr, to an arrangement under which he became his nephew's guardian and king in all but name. This arrangement remained in force until an extensive plot for the assassination of Rāja 'Ali Khān was discovered. Its author was 'Ali Khān, the maternal uncle of Ḥasan, and the leading conspirators were Ḥasan's mother, Ṭaḥīḥan, governor of Burhānpūr, and Khānjahān. The plot was discovered by means of an injudicious attempt by 'Ali Khān to gain over 'Arāb Khān al-Yāfī, who was a devoted adherent of Rāja 'Ali Khān and disclosed the plot to his master. The conspirators were put to death, except Ḥasan's mother, who was generously pardoned, and Ḥasan was deposed, so that Rāja 'Ali Khān became king in name, as well as in fact. According to Firishta Rāja 'Ali Khān, seeing that Akbar had obtained possession, not only of Hindūstān and Bengal, but also of Mālwa and Gujarāt, refrained from exciting his wrath by assuming or using the title of Shāh and always regarded himself as his vassal, while maintaining, on the other hand, the most friendly relations with the independent kings of the Dakan. This statement is not correct, at any rate of the early days of Rāja 'Ali Khān's reign. According to the Zafar-al-Walīh Rāja 'Ali Khān assumed the title of 'Adīl Shāh IV, by which he is always described in that work, and he seems at first to have cherished the idea that the kings of the Dakan, by maintaining an unbroken and united front, might be able to check the extension of the Mughul empire beyond the Narbada, or at all events beyond the northern frontier of Berar, but he was a wise monarch, and must soon have realized that it was impossible to unite the quarrelsome rulers of Ahmādnagar.

Firishta says a million, but on this point the Burhān-i-Muḍīr is probably the better authority. It may be that the additional hundred thousand was a gift to the minister who arranged the treaty. This was usual in the Dakan.
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Bidar, Bijăpūr, and Golconda, even in a cause in which their common interest was indisputably bound up.

It is true that neither in Firishta nor in any history written in Northern India is Rāja ‘Ali Khān ever referred to by the title of Shāh, but it is extremely doubtful whether the kings of the South often used this title in their correspondence with the imperial court, and it is quite clear that Rāja ‘Ali Khān never so used it. The title of Rāja, which he always used and by which he is known even in imperial chronicles, was probably adopted by him, in imitation of the founder of his dynasty, as a word which etymologically bore the same meaning as Shāh and at the same time could not be objected to by an emperor who numbered among his vassals many territorial rulers bearing the same title. But it also seems certain that the more exalted title of ‘Ādil Shāh was employed, not only within the limits of Khāndesh but also in Rāja ‘Ali’s correspondence with the kings of the South. It will, however, be more convenient to refer to him as Rāja ‘Ali, both because that is the title under which he is more generally known, and because his title of ‘Ādil Shāh is apt to be confounded with the titles of the ‘Ādil Shāhī Kings of Bijăpūr.

For some reason which is not quite clear Rāja ‘Ali Khān made Lād Muḥammad, who had been the first to advocate the acknowledgement of Ḥasan Khān as king, his minister, and gave him the title of Āṣaf Khān.

The first recorded act of Rāja ‘Ali Khān’s name does not display him in the light of a royal tributary of Akbar. Both Muḥārak II and Muḥammad II had paid tribute to Akbar and in 1579 Shāh Budāgh Khān, governor of Mālwa, sent his son ‘Abd-al-Muṭṭab Khān to demand payment of the tribute according to custom. Rāja ‘Ali Khān replied to ‘Abd-al-Muṭṭab’s demand that he collected his revenue for his army and was accountable to his army for it. ‘Abd-al-Muṭṭab was returning to Mālwa with this answer when Rāja ‘Ali Khān’s army, which was following him, came up with him on the bank of the Narbada. His mission was not strong enough to cope with an army, but ‘Abd-al-Muṭṭab Khān, who was a notorious coward, fled across the Narbada without waiting to ascertain what the intentions of the leaders of the army were. He himself was nearly drowned, and his elephant, his banners, and his kettle-drums were carried back as trophies to Asīrghar. This episode is not mentioned in any of the histories of Akbar’s reign, but the author of the Zafar-al-Walīḥ tells us that Shāh Budāgh Khān was highly displeased with his son for his conduct on this occasion, which certainly did not tend to advance the imperial prestige.

In 1584 an event occurred which tended to turn Akbar’s eyes towards the Dakān. The insolence and absolute predominance in Ahmadnagar of the minister, Ṣalābat Khān, who had a monopoly of access to his feeble-minded master, Muṭṭaḥa Niṣām Shāh I which enabled him to issue such orders as he pleased, had long disgusted many amirs in the state, and none more than Sayyid Muṭṭaḥa Sabzavārī, governor of Berar, and his principal lieutenant, Khudāvand Khān. Their resentment against Ṣalābat Khān reached such a pitch that they assembled the army of Berar and marched on Ahmadnagar with the avowed object of overthrowing the minister and releasing the king from his bondage to him. On December 9, 1584, they were attacked at the pass of Jēr, two leagues from Ahmadnagar, by the royal army, and utterly defeated. They fled through Berar, and the small force which was detailed to pursue them allowed them no opportunity of repairing their defeat. They therefore crossed into Khāndesh with the object of invoking the aid of Akbar in their quarrel with the constituted authority in Ahmadnagar and in the belief that Rāja ‘Ali Khān would
observe towards them at least a benevolent neutrality; but the policy of inviting imperial interference in the domestic affairs of the Dakan was very far from commending itself to him and when his attempt to divert them from their purpose failed he sent against them a force which pursued them as far as the Narbada, the frontier of his kingdom, and took from them such elephants, horses, and baggage, as they had been able to save in their flight.

The two amirs reached the court of Akbar, who appointed each of them to the command of 1,000 horse and sent a message to Râja 'Ali Khân commanding him to restore the plunder he had taken from them, which order was promptly obeyed. At this time Akbar received another fugitive whose presence reminded him that there was work to be done in the Dakan. This was Bürhân-al-dîn, the younger brother of Murtâzâ Nîzâm Shâh, who was no longer safe in his brother's dominions and fled to Agra by way of the Konkan and Gujarât. In August, 1585, Akbar, who was obliged by the death of his brother, Mûhammad Hâkîm Mirzâ, at Kâbul, to march towards the Panjâb, appointed his foster-brother, Mirzâ 'Aziz Kûka, Khân-i-A'gam, governor of Mâlwa. With Khân-i-A'gam's arrival in Mâlwa began, Râja 'Ali Khân's troubles. His true sympathies were with the independent kings of the Dakan, but his own kingdom formed the outpost of imperial aggression against theirs; he could not trust them to join whole-heartedly with him in any resistance to that aggression and it was impossible for him alone to stem its tide.

Khân-i-A'gam, having made Handiya his headquarters, demanded of Râja 'Ali Khân, early in 1586, passage through Khândesh for the army with which he proposed to invade the A'hmadnagar kingdom. Râja 'Ali Khân replied that the passage of so large a force would devastate his small kingdom and suggested that the best line for an army advancing from Mâlwa to invade A'hmadnagar lay through Kherla, in north-eastern Berar, and, on the rejection of this proposal by Khân-i-A'gam, appealed for help to A'hmadnagar. Salâbat Khân, the regent of A'hmadnagar, largely reinforced the army of Berar, which had its headquarters at Elichpur, and placed it at the disposal of Râja 'Ali Khân. In the meantime the imperial amirs, of whom many disapproved of Khân-i-A'gam's enterprise, were quarrelling among themselves, and Mîr Fatâlî Shîrâzi, whose duty it was to keep the peace between them, was much harassed. Khân-i-A'gam could ill spare Mîr Fatâlî Shîrâzi, whose services in the turbulent camp were invaluable, but the unexpected opposition of Râja 'Ali Khân called for the intervention of his ablest negotiator, and Mîr Fatâlî Shîrâzi was sent to Asîrgârâh. In Râja 'Ali Khân, whose object it was to prevent the invasion of the Dakan without appearing to oppose the imperial policy, Mîr Fatâlî Shîrâzi met his match. Râja 'Ali Khân secretly invited the army of Berar to invade his kingdom, in order that it might appear that in opposing the designs of Khân-i-A'gam he was acting under compulsion. As the army advanced he sent his minister, Aṣâf Khân, to Mîr Fatâlî Shîrâzi to warn him that he stood in great danger and to conduct him on his way back to Handiya. Fatâlî Shîrâzi had no choice but to retire and when Aṣâf Khân left him his retirement speedily became a flight. On his arrival in Handiya Khân-i-A'gam so rated him for his failure that he refused any longer to serve under him and withdrew with his contingent into Gujarât. Khân-i-A'gam whose force was dwindling away, was now goaded into action. He invaded Berar and attempted an attack on Kherla, which was disastrous to the horses of his cavalry, but he plundered some of the northern districts of Berar and on March 20, 1586, sacked Elichpur, which had been left defenceless by the advance of the army of Berar into Khândesh. In the meantime the army of Berar, under the command of Mirzâ Mûhammad Taqî, having been royally entertained by Râja 'Ali Khân, had advanced, together with the army of Khândesh, towards
Handiya, and, on learning that Khan-i-A'gam was plundering in Berar, attacked and burnt that town and at once turned southwards in pursuit of the imperial troops, whom they largely outnumbered. The imperial troops plundered Bâlâpûr and the amirs of the Dakan army pressed on so rapidly in pursuit that only a few of their troops could keep pace with them. An indecisive action was fought at Chândûr, but Khan-i-A'gam would not stay his flight towards Nandrûr, for which town he was making in the hope of being able to persuade his brother-in-law, the Kháncháhân, who was then Governor of Gujarût, to join him in invading the northern districts of the Dakan. His flight was so rapid that he was even obliged to maim some of his elephants to prevent their falling unjured into the hands of the enemy. His troops reached Nandrûr on April 10, 1586, and as the Khancháhân could not then join Khan-i-A'gam in his enterprise hostilities ceased and the armies of Berar and Khândesh retired.

The Dakan thus enjoyed a brief respite from foreign aggression, but the progress of events in Aḥmadnagar favoured Akbar's designs. On June 14, 1588, Murtaṣâ Nîgâm Shâh I, the madman, was murdered by his son Husain Nîgâm Shâh I, who succeeded him and was himself murdered a few months later, when the party in Ahmadnagar who had embraced the heretical Mahdaví doctrines raised the throne to the boy Ismá'il, son of Burhân-al-din, who had fled from Aḥmadnagar and taken refuge at Akbar's court.

Burhân, who had lately been employed by Akbar in the Bangash country, where he had done good service, was now the undoubted heir to the throne upon which a faction had placed his youthful son, and Akbar dispatched him to Mâlwa in order that he might attempt to secure it, at the same time sending instructions to Khan-i-A'gam and Râja 'Ali Khán to give him all the assistance in their power. Burhân refused, however, the help which Khan-i-A'gam offered him, on the ground that his people would resent his appearance in his country at the head of a foreign army; the true reason for the refusal being evidently the desire to avoid laying himself under an inconvenient obligation, and invaded Berar with only his own contingent of 1,000 horse and 300 musketeers. Leaving Elichpûr on his right he marched on Bâlâpûr, but was defeated by the commandant of that post and fled back to Mâlwa.

On receiving the news of the failure of Burhân's first attempt to recover his throne Jamâl Khán the Mahdaví, who was now supreme in Ahmadnagar, attempted to inveigle Burhân to Aḥmadnagar by means of a proposal that he should come himself and take possession of his kingdom, but Burhân was too wary thus to deliver himself into the hands of his adversary.

Burhân now perceived that he could not recover his kingdom without foreign aid, and sank his pride. Râja 'Ali Khán, in obedience to Akbar's orders, not only prepared his own army for the field but wrote to Ibrâhîm 'Âdil Shâh II of Bijâpûr and his powerful minister, Dîlavâr Khân the African, proposing that the army of Bijâpûr should invade Ahmadnagar from the south simultaneously with its invasion from the north by Burhân and his allies. Dîlavâr Khân gladly seized the opportunity of striking a blow at Ahmadnagar and invaded the Nīgâm Shâhî dominions from the south while Burhân and Râja 'Ali Khán invaded Berar. This double attack caused much dissension in Ahmadnagar but Jamâl Khán ultimately decided first to turn southwards, and trusted to the army of Berar to check Burhân's advance. He defeated the army of Bijâpûr but almost in the moment of victory learnt that the army of Berar had gone over to Burhân, and he was obliged to turn northward without delay. He was pursued by the army of Bijâpûr, which had not been broker by its defeat, and now harassed him by cutting off his supplies. On reaching Aḥmadnagar
he learnt that Burhán and Rāja 'Ali Khān had advanced as far as Rohankhed, a small town lying on the slopes of the plateau of southern Berar, and were there awaiting him with 7,000 horse and forty elephants. He pressed on to meet them, but defection and desertion had been rife in his army ever since he had taken the field, and of the 10,000 horse which he had led against the army of Bījpūr no more than 3,000 remained to him. The battle of Rohankhed was fought on April 5, or, according to other accounts, on May 7, 1591.24 From the first Jamāl Khān's army had no chance of victory. Habashi Khān, one of his amirs, deserted, with nearly 1,000 horse, to the enemy, his gunners refused to fire, and his cavalry was checked by a slough into which they rode. Jamāl Khān in desperation charged the enemy at the head of a small body of cavalry and received a musket ball in the forehead, which killed him on the spot; Khudāvand Khān, his principal lieutenant, was cut down while attempting to flee, and the young king, Ismā'il Shāh, was captured at a short distance from the field.

All authorities agree in assigning the chief, if not the sole credit for this victory to Rāja 'Ali Khān. Burhán had a small contingent of his own followers and adventurers from the imperial army, and he had been joined by the amirs of Berar and other deserters from the army of Ismā'il Niğm Shāh and Jamāl Khān, but Rāja 'Ali Khān's troops formed by far the greater part of the invading army and he probably supplied nearly all the elephants and artillery. During the battle, which lasted but for a short time, Burhán, by agreement with Rāja 'Ali Khān, stood aside with instructions not to interfere unless the day should appear to be going against the army of Khandesh. The arrangement was creditable to the political acumen of Rāja 'Ali Khān and Burhán, though it is probable that Akbar would have preferred a greater measure of activity on the part of Burhán, who would thus have been presented rather as Akbar's candidate for the throne than as a legitimate sovereign seeking his hereditary right. But for those who had the interests of the kingdoms of the Dākan at heart it was most undesirable that Burhán's appearance on the scene in his quest of a throne should be marked by an act of open hostility against his prospective subjects.

Rāja 'Ali Khān, having congratulated Burhán on his road to the throne being now open, retired to Burhānpūr, with Jamāl Khān's elephants and artillery as his reward, and Burhán marched on to Aḥmadnagar, where he ascended the throne without opposition as Burhán Niğm Shāh II.

The death of Burhán on April 13, 1595, and the subsequent disputes regarding the succession gave Akbar the pretext which he had long desired for direct interference in the affairs of the Dākan. He had been bitterly disappointed in Burhán II who, instead of proving to be the obedient vassal of his expectations, had asserted his independence and taken his own course, and the Akbarnāma, the official history of Akbar's reign, inveighs against his gross ingratitude. On his death his elder son, Ibrāhīm Niğm Shāh, who was distasteful to a majority of the amirs on account of his birth, his mother having been an African, was raised to the throne, and his younger son Ismā'il, who had already occupied it for a short period before his father's accession, was blinded. Ibrāhīm was slain in a battle between his partisans and his enemies on Aug. 7, 1595, and Miyan Manjhu raised to the throne a youth named Aḥmad, whom he represented to be the son of Muḥammad Khudābanda, sixth son of Burhán Niğm Shāh I (1509-1553), and imprisoned Bahādur, son of Ibrāhīm Niğm Shāh, in the fortress of Jond. The African amir, who had been partisans of Ibrāhīm and knew Aḥmad to be supposititious, refused to acknowledge him and rallied to the support of the

---

24 The Akbarnāma has April 5, and Firdausta (ii, 2917) and the Burhān-i-Mādīr have May 7.
famous Chând Bibi, daughter of Hussein Niğâm Shâh I and widow of ‘Ali ‘Adil Shâh I of Bijâpûr, who had returned to Ahmadnâgar since her husband’s death and now stood forth as the champion of the lawful heir, the infant Bahâdûr Niğâm Shâh.

The African amîrs besieged Miyan Manjhum in Ahmadnâgar, and he betrayed the cause of the Dakan by appealing for assistance to Sultan Murâd, Akbar’s second surviving son, who was now viceroy of Gujarât. Murâd’s instructions from his father covered this contingency, which had been expected, and the prince marched towards the Dakan. At the same time the viceroy and amîrs of Maulâ, at the head of whom was ‘Abd-al-Rahîm Khânkhânân, in accordance with Akbar’s orders, marched to the Dakan in concert with the prince.

The position of Râja ‘Ali Khan was now one of great difficulty. Akbar’s armies were about to undertake the enterprise which he had always dreaded and deprecated, and had once actively opposed, the subjection of the first of the independent kingdoms of the Dakan which lay in their way. During the lifetime of Burhân Niğâm Shâh II the poet Faîji was sent as an envoy from the imperial court both to Ahmadnâgar and to Khândesh, and his mission, which had not been brilliantly successful in Ahmadnâgar, was believed to have secured the adhesion of Râja ‘Ali Khan, whose sympathy with the kings of the Dakan and whose opposition to Khân-i-Azam’s filibustering expedition were well known, but it was deemed advisable to send at this time another envoy, who should not only assure himself of Râja ‘Ali Khan’s acquiescence in the invasion of Ahmadnâgar, but should convert him into an active ally. To this end he was to offer him the coveted district of Nandurbâr, which had for some time past formed part of the imperial province of Gujarât, and though the bribe, together with other considerations, secured its object, Râja ‘Ali Khan did not acquiesce in the armed intervention of the empire in the domestic affairs of Ahmadnâgar until he had made an appeal for help to Ibrihîm ‘Adil Shâh II of Bijâpûr and had been disappointed. At length he was compelled to join the Mughuls and accompanied them with his army to Aâmhdnâgar, taking part in the siege of that city, which was opened on December 26, 1595, and closed on March 23, 1596,25 on which date was concluded the treaty under which Chân Bibi, regent of Ahmadnâgar, ceded the province of Berar to the emperor Akbar.

The besieged garrison of Ahmadnâgar had some hopes of assistance from Râja ‘Ali Khan, on account of his known sympathies with the kingdoms of the Dakan, but they were ultimately disappointed. The author of the Burhân-i-Ma‘âsir writes, ‘Traditions of the old friendship of Râja ‘Ali Khan, ruler of Khândesh, still remained, and he maintained an uninterrupted intercourse with those within the fort, so that they were enabled, by his means, to introduce any supplies that they might require, and occasionally, when a body of gunners came from the other forts in the kingdom to reinforce those in Ahmadnâgar, they were able to enter the fortress by the connivance of Râja ‘Ali Khan, and greatly strengthened the defence. When this matter became known to the prince (Sultan Murâd) he removed Râja ‘Ali Khan from the position which he occupied and placed that section of the trenches under the command of Râja Jagannâth, who was one of the great Râjpût amîrs, and thus all ingress and egress were stopped. In the course of the siege, and while it was at its height, Râja ‘Ali Khan, being instigated thereto by Akbar’s amîrs, sent to Chân Bibi Sultan a letter, saying, “I purposely accompanied the Mughul army into this country with the object of preserving the honour of the Niğâm Shahi dynasty. I know

---

25 This is the date given in the Burhân-i-Ma‘âsir. According to the Akbarnâma terms were concluded and the imperial forces retired on March 2, 1596.
well that this fortress will, in a short time, be captured by the Mughuls. See that you
shun not the fight, but protect your honour, and surrender the fort at the last to the prince,
who will give you in exchange for it any fort and any district in this country that you may
choose. The honour of the Nisām Shāhī house is, owing to the connection between us, the
same to me as the honour of my own house, and it is for this reason that I, laying aside all
fear of arrow or bullet, have come to the gate of the fort, and I will bring Chánd Bībī
Sūltān to my own camp.” When the defenders received this letter their dismay and confu-
sion were greatly increased, and they were struck with terror, for they had relied much on
Rāja ‘Ali Khān, and they now almost decided to surrender, but Afsāl khan did his best
to pacify them and to calm their fears, and sent Rāja ‘Ali Khān a reply, saying, “I wonder
at your intellect and policy in sending such a letter to Chánd Bībī Sūltān, and at your
endeavouring to destroy this dynasty. It was you who went forth to greet the Mughul
army, and it was you who brought them into this country, and the Sūltāns of the Dakan
will not forget this. Soon, by the grace of God, the Mughul army will have to retreat,
and then Chánd Bībī Sūltān will be in communication, as before, with the Sūltāns of
the Dakan. It will then be for you to fear the vengeance of the heroes of the Dakan, and
‘to tremble for your house and for your kingdom!” When this reply reached Rāja ‘Ali
Khān he was overcome with shame for what he had written, and the Mughul Aṃtra gave
‘up all hope of taking the fortress.’

(To be continued.)

DEKKAN OF THE ŚĀṬAVĀHANA PERIOD.

BY PROF. D. R. BHANDARKAR, M.A.; CALCUTTA.

CHAPTER II.

POLITICAL HISTORY—(continued from page 78 above).

The reign of Nahapāna, though it began gloriously, came to a disastrous end. He
was defeated and killed in battle by Gautamiputra Śatakarni of the Śāṭavāhana dynasty.
In Cave No. 3 at Nasik has been cut a large inscription, which sets forth a long panegyric
of this king. We shall soon give a somewhat detailed account of this record, but here we
may notice only two epithets used in connection with Gautamiputra Śatakarni and coming
immediately one after the other. The first calls him the uprooter of the Kshaharāta race
and the second the restorer of the glory of the Śāṭavāhana family. 1 The first epithet,
making allowance for the exaggeration which it obviously contains, indicates that he
certainly killed, if not all the Kshaharātas, at least those who ruled over Mahārāṣṭra,
Gujarat and Central India. Otherwise there is no sense in his being represented to have
re-established the glory of the Śāṭavāhana dynasty to which he pertained. We know that
the Śāṭavāhanas had held Northern Mahārāṣṭra and some parts of Central India before
these came under the sway of Nahapāna. It is true that these epithets alone do not
necessarily prove that Gautamiputra Śatakarni turned his arms against Nahapāna himself
and killed him. But this can be easily inferred from certain facts revealed by the
Jogalembhāi hoard. The total number of coins from the lot examined by Rev. M Scott
was 13,250. Only one-third of this number consisted of Nahapāna’s own coins, the
remaining two-thirds being those of Nahapāna re-struck by Gautamiputra Śatakarni. 2

1 E1., VIII. 60, l. 6.
2 JBBRAS., XXII. 224.
It is worth noting that in this second class of coins, *i.e.* those re-struck by Śatakarnī, there was not a single one belonging to any prince other than Nahapâna, as would certainly have been expected if any such ruler had really intervened between them, especially as these coins numbered upwards of 8,000. I think, the evidence supplied by this hoard is conclusive that Śatakarnī destroyed Nahapâna.

The extent of Gautamiputra's territory may be inferred from the description given of him in the big Nasīk Cave inscription referred to above. Therein he is said to have been king of the following countries:

1. **Asika.**—This country has been mentioned by Varāhamihira, but he does not tell us where exactly it was situated.

2. **Asaka.**—This evidently is Assaka, the Prakrit form of the Sanskrit Āśmaka. This must be the country watered by the lower Godāvari, consisting of the south-east parts of the Nizam's Dominions and the Godāvari District of the Madras Presidency. Its capital Potana or Potali has been mentioned in the Pāli literature.

3. **Mulaka**—is the country with Pratishṭhāna or Paṭhān as its capital.

4. **Surāśṭra**—is Surāśṭra, corresponding to modern Kāśṭhīwār.

5. **Kukura**—probably modern Gujarāt.

6. **Aparānta.**—The word literally means the Western End. Ptolemy, who was contemporaneous with Gautamiputra and Pulumāvi divides Arikaśa (Āparantaka) into four sections, two on the seaboord and two situated inland. Of those on the sea-coast the northern corresponded to the Thāṇa and Kolābā Districts and the southern to the Ratnāgiri and North Kanara Districts. Of the inland parts the northern was nearly coincident with the country watered by the upper Godāvari, and the southern included the Kanarese-speaking districts of the Bombay Presidency. Both the northern sections belonged to the Sādion (Śatavahānas).

7. **Anāpā.**—A district on the upper Narmadā with Mahishamātī as capital. Mahishamātī has been identified with Māndhātā in the north-west corner of the Central Provinces.

8. **Vidabha**—is of course Vidarbha. It corresponds to the western portion of Berar and the valley-country west of it.

9. **Ākaravantia**—Mālwa. I take this whole as one name. This is clearly indicated by the fact that in the Junāgādh inscription it is qualified by the word Pārvapara, which means both the eastern and western divisions of the Ākaravantia country, and not the eastern

---

3 In the Sutta-nipāta (V. 977) the Assaka (Āśmaka) country has been associated with Mulaka, exactly as it has been done in this inscription. In the edition of the Sutta-nipāta by V. Faubolle the reading Alaka is wrongly adopted in the text (Vs. 977 and 1010-1), and the variant Mulaka noticed in the foot-notes. The Sutta-nipāta distinctly tells us that the capital of Mulaka was Paṭīṭhāna (Paṭhān) and that Assaka was situated immediately to its south along the river Godāvari.

4 Jāt. III, 3 and 15.

6 Sir Ramkrishna Bhandarkar identifies it with that portion of Bājputānā which is called Kio-chlo-lo by Hien Chen Thang (Yuan Chwang) (Trans. Inter. Or. Cong., 1874, 212-3; EHD., 17, n. 4). According to Pandit Bhagwanlal it denotes "probably part of East Bājputānā" (B. G., 1, i. 30 n. 7). But as in this and Ruddenman's Junāgādh inscription Kukura is associated with Aparānta, it seems to be part of Gujarāt.

7 Above XIII, 325-7 and 366-7.

8 JRAS., 1910, 445-6.

9 Pargiter, Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa, 338.
Åkara and the western Avanti country as has been taken by Pandit Bhagwânâlî Indrajî. The latter proposal is against the Sanskrit idiom. Avanti, of course, is another name for Ujjayâni (Ujjain), and Åkara, I think, is identical with the ancient midland town of Ågar, 40 miles NNE. of Ujjain from which the Bania caste Agarval derives its name.

Gautamiputra is also styled ‘lord’ of the following mountain ranges:
1. Vîjha = Vindhya, here denoting the portion of the Vindhya range east of Bhopâl.
2. Achhavata = Rikshavat—‘the Sâtpurî Hills, and the hills extending through the middle of Berar and the south of Chutîâ Nâgpur nearly into West Bengal.’
3. Parivata = Pâriyâtra, the portion of the Vindhya range, west of Bhopâl.
4. Sahya = the Sahyâdris.
5. Kânhagiri = Krîshnagiri, doubtless the mountain on which Kâpherî in the Tâmâ district is situated and from which it derives its name. It is mentioned as Kâhyasala = Krîshnâsâlâ in inscriptions of Kâpherî Caves.
6. Mâcha—not identified so far.
7. Sirîjana = Srîstana, probably the same as Srî-sâlîa or Srî-parvata, the name of a mountain on the river Kistnâ in the Karnul District.
8. Malaya—the southern portion of the Western Ghâts.
9. Mahinda = Mahendra, the great range between the Mahânadî and Godâvari in Eastern India—the Eastern Ghâts.
10. Setaagiri—not yet identified.
11. Chakora. The Mârkandeya Purâna mentions it along with Srî-parvata (Sîrijana). It may have been in the same locality.

The specification of the mountain ranges is apt to lead one to suppose that Gautamiputra was the lord of the whole Dakshinapatha or Southern India. Their mention, however, need not mean that he was the lord of each whole range. If part of any range ran through his dominions, it would justify a panegyrist in calling him its lord. That Gautamiputra was not the master of the whole of Southern India is clearly proved by the fact that Ptolemy, while referring to his son Pulumâvi who reigned jointly with him, speaks not of one but of six kings as ruling over different parts of Dakshinapatha, along with Pulumâvi. Thus we have not only Polemaios (Pulumâvi) reigning at Paithâri but also Bâleokuros at Hippokoura, Kerolothro (Keralaputra) at Karoua (Karûf), Pandion (Pâdîya) at Modoua (Madurâ) and so forth. The list of the countries, however gives us a better idea of the extent of Gautamiputra’s territory. It shows that he held the whole of the country watered by the Godâvari, Berar, Mâlwâ, Kâthiawâr, Gujarât and Northern Konkan.

The object of the large inscription alluded to above (Inscription No. 2) is to record the grant of Nâsî Cave No. 3 to the Bhadrayanîya sect of Buddhist monks by Gautami.
mother of Śatākarṣi and grand-mother of Pulumāvi. The inscription, it is worthy of note, refers itself to the reign of Pulumāvi and not Śatākarṣi, and is dated the 13th day of the second fortnight of summer of the 19th regnal year of the former. On the same day the village of Sudaśana in the Govardhana district was granted for the maintenance of the Cave (Inscription No. 3) by the lord of Dhanaṅkāḷa, who must be Gautamīputra Śatākarṣi and the village of Pasājīpadaka by Pulumāvi for painting it (Inscription No. 2). In the 22nd year, however, in lieu of Sudaśana the village of Samali-pada in the same district was given, not by Śatākarṣi but by Pulumāvi (Inscription No. 3). It seems that before this cave, i.e. Cave No. 3 at Nāsik, was excavated the Bhadrāyaniya mendicants were living in some of the caves already existing on the hill which in the inscriptions is called Trirāmi. For the maintenance of these mendicants Gautamīputra Śatākarṣi granted a piece of land in the village of Aparakakhaṇḍī in the 18th year, i.e. one year previous to the excavation and presentation of the cave to the Bhadrāyaniyas (Inscription No. 4). But the village could not be inhabited and the field could not be tilled. Another piece of land was therefore given in the year 24 by Śatākarṣi who was here joined by his mother in the making of this gift (Inscription No. 5).

It is supposed by Bühler and Bhagwanlal Indraji that the dates of Inscriptions Nos. 4 and 5 in which Gautamīputra Śatākarṣi is mentioned as the donor must refer to his reign and those of Inscriptions Nos. 2 and 3 to the reign of Pulumāvi who alone figures there as the grantee. It is, therefore, contended that Śatākarṣi and Pulumāvi reigned separately, the latter after the former, even so far as Mahārāṣṭra was concerned and that Śatākarṣi was dead when Cave No. 3 was granted to the Bhadrāyaniyas. Sir Ramkrishna Bhandarkar, on the other hand, contends that all these dates pertain to the reign of Pulumāvi and that he reigned conjointly with his father, the former over Mahārāṣṭra and the latter over the hereditary Śatavahana dominions. The latter view alone can be correct. For in Inscription No. 5 Gautamīputra Śatākarṣi, who is the donor there along with his mother, issues a grant in favour of Buddhist monks, who it is expressly stated, were staying in the cave which was the pious gift of theirs. This cave which was a pious gift of Śatākarṣi and his mother must doubtless be Cave No. 3 which, as we have seen above, was excavated and given over to the Bhadrāyaniyas. But then we have also seen that this cave was presented to these monks in the 19th regnal year, not of Śatākarṣi but of Pulumāvi. Inscription No. 2 does not leave us in any doubt on this point. Evidently Śatākarṣi was living when the cave was granted to the Bhadrāyaniyas, otherwise how could he possibly make any grant to these monks while they were dwelling...

---

7 The words Ya amhe hi sava 19 gi pa 2 dina 13 Dhanakāṣṭasampyaṇaṁ ya eto pavaśu... daco have very much puzzled the antiquarians. Pandit Bhagwanlal Indraji, Bühler and M. Senart take Dhanakāṣṭasampyaṇaṁ to stand for Dhanakāṣṭa-straṇasātra. I cannot understand how these Sramaṇa could have granted the village of Sudaśana. Besides, the word Sramaṇa nowhere occurs in cave inscriptions and in the sense of Buddhist mendicants. Dhanakāṣṭasampyaṇaṁ must, therefore, be taken as equivalent to Dhanakāṣṭa-sthāmineti and connected with daco as is done by Sir Ramkrishna Bhandarkar (EHD., 18, n. 2). The letters amhe preceding the date I split up into the two words amhe hi and amhe I take in the sense of 'we' and connect with daco.

8 M. Senart supposes that Nāsik Inscription No. 4 calls Gautamīputra Śatākarṣi lord of Benāṅkata. I however prefer to read Benāṅkata evaṁu with Bühler and Pandit Bhagwanlal, and take Benāṅkata to be the place where the king's army was encamped. Similarly in Nāsik Inscription No. 3 I prefer to read Navanaṁ evaṁu instead of Navanāṁ evaṁu and suppose that Pulumāvi issues his order from a locality called Navanara.
in the cave presented to them? Further, as Inscription No. 2 is dated in the reign of Pulumāvi notwithstanding that his father Sātakarṣī was alive, the only possible conclusion is that the former was ruling over Mahārāṣṭra and the latter over the old Andhra territory, and that consequently all the dates of the inscriptions just noted must refer to the reign of Pulumāvi alone.\(^{19}\)

Klaudios Ptolemaios, writing his record of India shortly after A.D., 150 speaks of at least three kings ruling over different parts of Western India. Thus he tells us that Ozene was the capital of Tiastenes, Baithana of Siro Ptolemaios, and Hippokoura of Baleokouros.\(^{20}\) Ozene is, of course, Ujjain, and Baithana is Paithan on the Godavari, the ancient Pratishtāna, in Nizam’s dominions. Hippokoura has not been definitely identified, some taking it to be Kolhāpur and others Hippargi in the Bijāpūr district.\(^{21}\) Of the royal names Tiastenes obviously corresponds to Chashṭana, the founder of the second Kshatrapa dynasty, which we know wielded sway over Kāśi, Gujarāt and Mālwā and which seems to have immediately succeeded Nāhopāna’s family. Siro Ptolemaios is Śrī-Pulumāvi, son of Gautamiputra Sātakarṣī, and Baleokouros is Vilīvāyakura, name of a king whose coins have been found at Kolhāpur. These three princes have, therefore, been regarded as contemporaries of one another.

Diverse views have been expressed in regard to the relation in which Chashṭana stood with Nāhopāna, on the one hand, and with Gautamiputra Sātakarṣī, on the other. Pandit Bhagwanlal Indraji to the last held that Chashṭana was a contemporary, though not a subordinate, of Nāhopāna.\(^{22}\) According to Dr. Fleet Chashṭana was Nāhopāna’s co-regent or viceroy at Ujjain just as Bhumaka was in Kāśi.\(^{23}\) Prof. Oldenberg and Dr. Burgess regard Chashṭana as the satrap of Gautamiputra Sātakarṣī, the Andhra conqueror of Nāhopāna.\(^{24}\) Prof. Rapsön and Mr. V. A. Smith, however, consider that he was a satrap of the Kushana sovereigns who ruled over North India.\(^{25}\) Now, Chashṭana’s coins have been found in Kāśi, Gujarāt and even as far north as Ajmer and Pushkar. His capital, as Ptolemy tells us, was Ujjain. It seems that if we exclude the Poona and Nāsik districts, his dominions were co-extensive with those of Nāhopāna. It is not, therefore, probable that both Nāhopāna and Chashṭana ruled simultaneously or that Chashṭana was a viceroy of Nāhopāna. Again, his foreign title Kshatrapa and the use of the Kharoṣṭhī alphabet on his coins clearly show that Chashṭana was a viceroy, not of Gautamiputra Sātakarṣī, but of some northern alien power. The view held by Prof. Rapsön and Mr. Smith, viz. that he was a satrap of the Kushana family, is therefore, the only plausible one. It appears that after the destruction of the Kshaharāta family, the Kushana overlords appointed Chashṭana to be a satrap and dispatched him to save as much of Nāhopāna’s territory as was possible from the clutches of the Sātavāhanas. Chashṭana seems to have performed his task not unsatisfactorily, because, as the find spots of his coins show, the Poona and Nāsik districts were the only two provinces from Nāhopāna’s territory which he did not hold.

But it may be asked: how is it that Nāsik Inscription No. 2 makes Gautamiputra Sātakarṣī the lord not only of Ākarāvanti (Mālwā) but also of Surāśṭra (Kāśi)?

\(^{19}\) For a full discussion of the subject, see my article in *JBBRAS*, XXIII. 69 and ff.

\(^{20}\) Above, XIII. 359 and 366.

\(^{21}\) *EHD.*, 44; *BG.*, I. i. 541

\(^{22}\) *BG.*, I. i. 32.

\(^{23}\) *JRAS.*, 1913, 993 and n. 1.

\(^{24}\) *CIC.-A.Mk.*, Intro, cvi; *EHI.*, 210-11.

\(^{25}\) *ASWI.*, iv. 37, n. 4.
just those provinces which were under the sway of Chashtana! The answer is simple. The date of this inscription is the 19th regnal year of Pulumavī. What is its Christian equivalent? If we suppose, as is commonly held, that Nahapana was killed in battle shortly after the year 46 (= A.D. 124) the last date we have for him, Pulumavī’s nineteenth regnal year must correspond to circa A.D. 145. Now no less than six stone inscriptions have been discovered in Cutch, bearing the date 52 and referring themselves to the conjoint reign of Chashtana and his grandson Rudradāman. It appears that in the year 52 (= A.D. 130) Chashtana was Mahākṣatrapa and his grandson Rudradāman Kaṭhātrapā, governing Kaōchhēha and Surāshṭra. It was therefore between A.D. 130 and 145 that Gautamiputra Sātakaṛi seems to have wrested Mālwā and Kāthiāwār either from Chashtana or Rudradāman, but most probably from the former. The story appears to be simply this. Gautamiputra Sātakaṛi and his son Vāsishthiputra Pulumavī came from the south-east to regain the provinces lost to their family, overthrew Nahapana circa A.D. 126, and re-established their power over the north-west part of Mahārāshṭra. Not being content with this, they soon turned their arms against another dynasty of foreigners—the Kaṭhātrapā dynasty that came immediately after Nahapana and succeeded in wresting their dominions also about A.D. 145. This is also clear from a rock inscription of Rudradāman at Junāgaḍh in Kāthiāwār. In this record men of all castes are represented to have gone to Rudradāman and chosen him as their lord for protection. If Rudradāman had succeeded Chashtana in the natural course of things, people of different castes would not have repaired to him and selected him as their protector. Evidently his family seems to have lost the kingdom and he to have regained it. This is also indicated by the boast of Rudradāman in the same inscription that the title of Mahākṣatrapa he had won for himself and not inherited. He was by no means slow to retrieve the glory of his family. For the same Junāgaḍh epigraph speaks of Rudradāman as the lord of Akarivanti, Surāshṭra, Kuṅura and Aparānita—just those countries ruled over by Gautamiputra Sātakaṛi according to Nashik Inscription No. 2 as stated above. Now the date of the Junāgaḍh epigraph is (Saka) 72 = A.D. 150, and the date of the Nashik inscription, we have seen, is about A.D. 145. It must be, therefore, between 145 and 150 A.D. that Rudradāman succeeded in reconquering the provinces lost to his family. Again, it is worthy of note that Rudradāman is represented to have twice subdued Sātakaṛi, the lord of Dakshināpatha, but not to have destroyed him in consequence of his relationship with him not being remote and to have acquired a good name on that account. It will be seen that this Sātakaṛi can be no other than Gautamiputra Sātakaṛi.

26 I was the first to discover these inscriptions (PRASI.-WC, 1905-06, 35); yet, curiously enough, my name has not been mentioned in ASI.-AR, 1905-06, 166-7. A detailed summary of their contents has been published by me in PRASI.-WC, 1914-15, 67. The date of these inscriptions is thus expressed: Rājā Chashtana Yāmokapuṭrasa rājā Rudradāmaṣa Jayadāmapuṭrasa vṛarē vaśva dvi-paṭhās 56 2 Phagana-bahutasa deśityam 15 2. At first I was inclined to supply paurasa after Yāmokapuṭrasa, and refer the date to the reign of Rudradāman (JBBRAS, XXIII, 65). Mr. R. C. Majumdar of the Calcutta University has kindly offered the suggestion that the date had better be referred to the conjoint reign of Chashtana and Rudradāman. I entirely accept this suggestion which is a very happy one. This at once does away with the necessity of supplying the word paurasa—an addition which seems to be highly improbable when we have to make it not to one but to six records that were found in Cutch and which even though it is made does not render the passage entirely free from straining. It, therefore, seems that Jayadāman died and was succeeded to his Kaṭhātrapā rank by his son Rudradāman during the life-time of Chashtana himself.

27 EI., VIII, 43, l. 9.

28 Ibid., 44, l. 15.
Nâsik Inscription No. 5 tells us that he was alive at least up to the 24th regnal year of Puğumâvi, which must correspond to A.D. 150—the date of the Junâgañâ inscription. Now, in what relationship could this Sâtakarâpi have stood with Rudradâman? In this connection one Kashheri inscription is invariably referred to. It records the grant of a minister of the queen of Vâsishthiputra Sâtakarâpi. Her name is lost, but she is said to have been the daughter of a Mahâkâshatrapa called Rudra. Rudra may of course stand for Rudradâman, Rudrasimha or Rudrasena—all belonging to Chashâna's family. But, according to Bühler, the form of the letters is of the time of Rudradâman. Vâsishthiputra Sâtakarâpi was thus Rudradâman's son-in-law. The metronymic Vâsishthiputra clearly shows that the former was, like Puğumâvi, a son of Gautamputra Sâtakarâpi. Gautamputra Sâtakarâpi was, therefore, the father of Rudradâman's son-in-law. Sâtakarâpi's connection with Rudradâman was thus by no means intimate and can be described as "not remote," as has been done in the Junâgañâ inscription.  

Gautamputra Sâtakarâpi was succeeded by his son Puğumâvi. We have seen above that he was ruling conjointly with his father, the former over Mahârâshtra and the latter over Andhra-deśa. After the death of Sâtakarâpi, Puğumâvi seems to have become ruler of Andhra-deśa also. For we have an inscription on the Amarâvatî stâpa in the Kistnâ district which distinctly refers itself to his reign. His coins also have been found in the Kistnâ and Godâvari districts, showing clearly that he had succeeded to his ancestral kingdom. Puğumâvi died about A.D. 158, and was succeeded by his brothers, Siva-Sri-Sâtakarâpi and Śri-Chandra-Sâti. Coins of these two last have been found, which, so far as the numismatic style is concerned, are closely connected with those of Puğumâvi. Besides, they three have the common metronymic Vâsishthiputra. This shows that they must all be brothers. According to the Matsya Purâna, Puğumâvi was succeeded by Siva-Sri, who can, therefore, be no other than Siva-Sri-Sâtakarâpi of the coins. With this prince I identify Vâsishthiputra Sâtakarâpi, son-in-law of Rudradâman, who, as I have remarked before, has been mentioned in a Kashheri cave inscription. Siva-Sri-Sâtakarni must thus have been succeeded by Śri Chandra-Sâti. We do not know who came immediately after this last king. But of the two Sâtavâhana princes who remain to be noticed, Sakasaena was certainly earlier than Yajañâ-Sâtakarâpi on palaeographic grounds. The name of the first prince occurs in two records inscribed in a cave at Kashheri, but seems to have been wrongly deciphered. Three years ago I had occasion to examine the inscriptions personally. I also took stampages of the portions which contained his name. And on a careful comparison I was convinced that the real name of the king was not Sakasaena but Sìrâ-Sâta. Commonsense also would lead us to doubt the correctness of the first reading. For the first line has been read as: Śidhârâ rañco Madhariputasa Svâmi-Sakasaena. Now, it is worthy of note that wherever we meet with a Sâtavâhana name in an inscription, it is invariably prefixed with the honorific Sìrî (=Śri). Thus we have Sìrâ-Sâtakarni, Sìrâ-Puğumâvi, Sìrâ-Yajañâ-Sâtakarni, and so forth. And the two Kashheri inscriptions just referred to alone become an exception, if we read Sakasaena. Pandit Bhagawanlal Indraji

29 For a detailed consideration of this question see JabBRAS., XXIII. 72-3.
30 Lüders' List, No. 1248.
31 OIC.-AMK., 20-3.
32 Ibid, Intro. xl.
33 ASWI., V. 79 and 82.
was nearer to the truth when he proposed to read also *Sirisena.*\(^34\) As a matter of fact there is absolutely no doubt as to the first two letters being *Siri.* And the next two almost certainly are *Sāta*—a reading which is fortified by the fact that we know a Sātavāhana prince of exactly this name from coins found in Western India.\(^35\) The last Sātavāhana king whose name has been preserved is, as mentioned above, Gautamiputra Sri-Yajña-Satarkarṇī. One inscription of his has been found in Chenna in the Kistna district and three in Mahārāṣṭra—two in a Kāshēri and one in a Nāsik Cave.\(^36\) This shows that both the Andhra-āsa and Mahārāṣṭra continued to be under the Sātavāhanas up to this time. Nay, he seems to have extended his sway far beyond as is indicated by the find-spots of his coins. Some of these have been found not only in Gujarāt but also in Kāthiāwār and Eastern Mālwā. He, therefore, appears to have wrested these provinces from the Kṣatrapa dynasty of Ujjain as Gautamiputra Sātarkarṇī did sometime before him.

After Yajña Sātarkarṇī Mahārāṣṭra seems to have been lost to the Sātavāhana dynasty. This appears to have been caused by the irruption of the Ābhiras. In a cave at Nāsik we have got an inscription which refers itself to the reign of the Ābhira king Iśvarasena, son of Śivadatta.\(^37\) In Mālwā, Gujarāt and Kāthiāwār we find coins of a king called Iśvaradatta who, though he styles himself a Mahākṣatrapa, was an intruder. He has been looked upon as an Ābhira, and it is quite possible that the names of the Ābhira king and his father referred to in the Nāsik inscription were really Iśvaradatta and Śivasena, and not Iśvarasena and Śivadatta. The father is not called a king, and if he had really been a ruler, the word *rājña* would certainly have been conjoined with his name. The son alone, therefore, seems to have been a king and made himself so. And it seems to me that it was one and the same Ābhira prince, viz. Iśvaradatta, who conquered not only Mālwā, Gujarāt and Kāthiāwār but also Mahārāṣṭra. I have elsewhere shown\(^38\) that Iśvaradatta is to be assigned to A.D. 188–90. This certainly places him immediately after Yajña Sātarkarṇī.

Though the Sātavāhanas were deprived of Mahārāṣṭra or Western Dekkan about the end of the second century A.D., they for sometime retained possession of Eastern Dekkan. We have thus coins of Sri-Rudra-Satarkarṇī, Sri-Krishna-Satarkarṇī and Sri-Chandra (II) found in Central Provinces and Andhra-āsa only and not at all in Western India.\(^39\) If we assign an average reign of 15 years to each one of these kings, the Sātavāhana power came to an end in the first half of the third century A.D. On the Jagayapetta stupa in the Kistna district, we have three inscriptions belonging to the reign of Śri-Virapurushadatta of the Ikshvāku family. On palaeographic grounds the records have been ascribed to the third century. It, therefore, seems that the extinction of the Sātavāhana rule was caused by a northern dynasty called Ikshvāku.

**To be continued**

---

\(^{34}\) *JBBRAS, XII.* 407–9.

\(^{35}\) *AJ.,* I. 96; *ASWi.,* V. 75 and 79; *El.,* VIII, 94.

\(^{36}\) *ASi-AR,* 1913–14, p. 230.

\(^{37}\) *CIO-AMk.,* p. 1.

\(^{38}\) *El.,* VIII. 88.

\(^{39}\) *CIO-AMk.,* Intro., & ff.

\(^{40}\) *ASSI,* I. 110.
ON THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE KAUTILIYA.

BY HERMANN JACobi; BONN.

(Translated from the German by V. S. Sukthankar, Ph.D.; Poona.)

There can be no doubt that the Kautiliya is one of the oldest monuments of the classical Sanskrit literature; from the whole range of this literature up to the earliest times one can cite numerous instances of quotation and borrowing that go to prove the acquaintance with this work and the recognition of its authority.1 But already A. Hillebrandt, to whom we owe the first really critical inquiry concerning the Kautiliya, has expressed a doubt regarding its authorship; at p. 10 of his monograph cited in the footnote, he says: "We cannot assume that Kautiliya himself is the sole author of the text in question. It only originates in his school, which quotes often the opinions of other teachers and opposes to them (after the manner of Sūtras works) expressly the view of Kautiliya himself, at times expressing the latter in the form of direct maxims." In other words the opinion of Hillebrandt is that just as in the Sūtras the view of the alleged author is cited with his name, while in reality that particular work only arises in his school, so also the expressions ʻiti Kautiliyaḥ or neʻiti Kautiliyaḥ, which occur 72 times, reveal the fact that the Kautiliya could not have been the work of Kautiliya himself, but must have arisen in a school of his, the existence of which we are led to postulate. Now the editor of the text has already, in my opinion, conclusively refuted this argument in his Preface, p. XII: "But when certain occidental scholars judging (or rather misled) by current usage, according to which no author when he sets forth his own view puts down alongside of it his name, hold the opinion that works which contain the names of Bādarāyana, Bodhāyana, etc., in formulae like ʻiti Bādarāyanaḥ, ity āha Bodhāyanaḥ, ʻiti Kautiliyaḥ, etc., are not composed by these persons, their view is based on the ignorance of the usage of the ancient Indian scholars. For, when an author, after refuting [833] the views of his opponents, wishes to express his own views, he must either speak of himself in the first person or specify his name. The use of the first person, which involves the bringing into prominence of one's own person, is opposed even to this day to the sentiment of Indian scholars; they rather would take pains to conceal their personality. Consequently those authors could not help giving their own names when they were stating their own views. For this reason it is not right to assert that our Arthaśāstra was written not by Kautiliya himself but by some one from the circle of his pupils, notwithstanding the frequent repetition of the formula ʻiti Kautiliyaḥ in the work."2

The occurrence of the expression ʻiti Kautiliyaḥ is, as far as I know, the only argument that has been advanced against the authorship of Kautiliya. But this evidence is, as we must grant Shama Shastri, inconclusive. On the other hand, it would not do either to look upon it as a positive proof of his authorship; for, one does come across cases in which he who is named as the author in the way mentioned above, is not the real author; for instance, Jaimini and Bādarāyana, as they mutually quote each other, cannot be the authors of the two Mīmāṃsā Sūtras; for, that the two Mīmāṃsā Sūtras could have been produced approxi-

---

* [To the Rev. Father Dr. Robert Zimmermann, S. J., Ph.D., are due my most sincere thanks for having kindly undertaken to go over the translation in manuscript and for having improved upon my unaided efforts; the more so as, owing to the difficulties in the way of communicating with the author of the article, the translation could not be submitted to him for the benefit of revision. It is hardly necessary to add that I am solely responsible for the errors and imperfections of the translation.—V. S. S.]


2 Translator.
mately at the same time seems impossible on account of the extreme dissimilarity of their styles, and perhaps also by reason of their mutual differentiation as pārva and uttara. If we, therefore, provisionally leave out of consideration the specific statements of the author of the Kauṭilya regarding his personality and confine our attention to the occurrence of his name in the formula iti Kauṭilyah, it would be after all possible to imagine that Kauṭilya might not be the author of the Arthaśāstra that is called after him. It would then be a work of an indeterminate period of composition, and would be without that significance for the 'culture history' (Kulturgeschichte) which, I am convinced, it possesses. The great importance of this question calls for a detailed inquiry, which is to occupy us in the sequel.

When we say that a work had its origin in the school of a certain individual person after whom it is named, we must assume two things: 1. that the alleged author was the founder of a school that acknowledged him as such in the sense that he, either materially or formally, brought the development of a 'discipline' to a certain completion and, through its being regularly handed down from teacher to pupil, made a new beginning; 2. that the 'discipline', that had been handed down in that manner and perhaps also amplified as regards minor details through discussion and controversy, was put forward in the form of a book by some subsequent adherent of the school. Can we make these assumptions in the case of the Kauṭilya?

[834] That Kauṭilya could have been the founder of a school in the above sense is hardly conceivable in the light of what we know from history of the position of this man. For, according to the unanimous voice of tradition, which makes itself heard already in the Kauṭilya (yena sṛstra ca sṛstram ca Nandarājagatā ca bhūḥ | amarev eva darśitānāh), he had played a leading part at the time of the founding of the Mauryan Empire and became the first Chancellor of the State that was soon to grow to such prodigious dimensions. This office imposed on him undoubtedly a task to which only a man endowed with extraordinary powers could be equal. That such a man might have 'formed a school' among the statesmen and diplomats of his time—as we might say of Bismarck—may be unhesitatingly admitted; but that he had founded an academy is difficult to believe. Just try and imagine Bismarck at the end of the day's work, if there was at all an end to it, lecturing to a number of Assessors on the theory of politics and administration! Hardly less preposterous is it to imagine that Kauṭilya, the Indian Bismarck, should collect pupils around himself like a common Pandit, instruct them in the Arthaśāstra, and in this manner found a school of the Kauṭilyas. On the other hand, it is quite compatible with the character of a great statesman, nay even a ruler, that he should deal with the subject of his avocation as a part of it in theoretical treatises, as indeed was actually done by Frederick the Great. Therefore, if one may speak of a school of Kauṭilya in any sense of the term whatever, then such a school could have originated not with Kauṭilya personally, but only through the medium of the Arthaśāstra written by him. In other words the book does not owe its existence to the school, but the school to the book. It is perhaps not superfluous to point out that the word school is used in the last sentence in two widely different senses. In the former case—that is, had Kauṭilya himself founded the school—the word school signifies the sequence of teachers and pupils, guṇaśīyaśaṃtāna, in the latter the totality of the followers of his doctrines, laṣṇatānaśaṃtāta.

3 It is true that in the first Act of the Mudrāraksasā he is represented as one. But the author of this drama, who lived a millennium after Cāṇakya's time, depicts the age of his hero after the pattern of his own.
Now, what do we know in reality about a school of the Kautiliyas? The solitary fact which could be adduced in favour of its postulation is that Kāmandaki, the author of the Nitisāra, calls Viṣṇugupta, i.e., Kautilya, his guru (II.6). In this instance guru can clearly not be taken in its strict sense; for, since Kāmandaki (as was shown above 1911, p. 742) can at the earliest be placed [835] in the third century A.D., he could not have been a contemporary of the minister of Candragupta. In other words, in Kāmandaki’s mouth guru signifies either the Great Master of the Science or the paramparama guru. But the latter appears on his own saying not to have been the case. For, after praising Viṣṇugupta and his deeds in the introductory verses of his work (I.2-6), he proceeds to say:

darināt tasya sudṛśo vidiyānām pārāśīvanah |
ṛjavidya-priyataya samkṣiptagranthān arthavit ||
upārzane pālanc ca bhūmer bhūmīvaram prati |
yat kincid upadeśyāno rājavidya vidād maṇām ||

"From out of the teaching (darināt = śastrāt C.) of this sage, whose gaze has penetrated to the deepest fundament of all sciences, shall we, as friends of the Science of Kings, teach only a small part concerning the acquisition and preservation of territory on the part of the prince, abridged in form, but of like contents (arthavit, C.: artha[tas] tu tāvān eva yasya tal), to which the masters of the Science of Kings have given their assent." As Kāmandaki in this instance scribes the attribute samkṣiptagrantha to his work, therefore, contrasted with it, the original that served as the source must needs be called viśṭrāṅga, with which only the Kautiliya could have been meant. This, undoubtedly, he means by dariāνa, as indeed also Vaiśeśika, and Nyāya-Darśana are the usual designations of these two Sūtras. Our conclusion that the source used by Kāmandaki was the Kautiliya is supported by his quotation II.6: vidiyāt catasra eva i'tā iti no gurudarśanam, which is almost identical with Kautiliya, p. 6, catasra eva vidiyā iti Kaiśvilah.4 In any event in Kāmandaki we find no reference to āgama or āmnāya as we indeed might expect if he had learnt the doctrines of Kautilya not from his work, but in his "school," i.e., if Kautilya had been his paramparama guru.

To estimate, however, the relation of Kautilya to Kāmandaki adequately, we must draw attention to two facts that are hinted at by Kāmandaki himself in the verses translated above. In the first place it is to be noted that he, in addition to the authority of Kautilya, appeals to the consensus of the savants of the science (rājavidya vidād maṇām), that is to say, he takes into consideration [836] other authorities, older and newer, when their doctrines have received general recognition. Thus we can explain divers points of difference between Kāmandaki and Kautilya as, for example, those dealt with above 1911, p. 742. A further instance concerns the doctrine of the mandala (‘political sphere’) and its constituents to which Kautilya, p. 259, refers very briefly without mentioning any authorities, obviously as a matter of little practical value.5 But here was a field for idle theorists. Kāmandaki cites VIII.20-41 a great number of different theories, in some cases giving the names of their exponents. Thus it follows that he is not a

---

4 XI.68 Kāmandaki refers to the views of Kautilya concerning the number of ministers in the Council of State (mantrī mantrāmangalātā): yathādāmbhavam ity anye; cf. Kautiliya, p. 29: yathādāmbhavam iti Kaiśvilah. His including Kautilya under the anye would not be intelligible, if he had belonged to a School of the Kautilyas. But in the mouth of a compiler who, in addition to his chief authority had consulted others as well, it is unobjectionable. On this question see the immediate sequel.

5 Interesting is Manu’s procedure in this respect. VII.156 he teaches, what according to Kāmandaki, VIII.28 is the view of Uśanas, and VII.167 that of the Mānavas (6.35). Thus we have here a combination of the two views, which we may expect to find in the Bhīṣmekā Manuśrī. Beyond this, however, no direct connection of Manu with the doctrines of the Mānavas communicated by Kautilya is demonstrable, see above 1911, p. 743.
biased partisan of his master. The second peculiarity of his work that deserves notice is that he presents only one small section of the Arthaśāstra (yat kintic.). He omits everything that is concerned with the actual reality of the life in the State, the State affairs proper, such as Administration, Control of Trade and Commerce, Administration of Justice, etc., in fact, those very things which impart to the Kautilya an incomparable value in our eyes; or at least he does not go beyond the most general maxims. Surely he was no statesman but a typical Pandit; in fact, even his work is characterised by his commentator, p. 137, as mahākāvyavasvarūpa, i.e. didactic poetry. The subjects which chiefly interest him are those that bear on abstract concepts, and may be discussed even by laymen with a vraisemblance of political discernment: such parts of the Śāstra, for instance, as have offered material to Bhrāvi in sarga 1 and 2 of the Kirātjuniya, and Magha in the 2nd sarga of the Siśupālavadhā for their descriptions and for many ingenious bons mots. Such is not the case with a science that is handed down traditionally and studied in a school, but rather with a Śāstra which the author knows principally from books and from which he concects his own. In any case we cannot appeal to Kaṃandaki for establishing the actual existence of a school of the Kautilyas, which is, in fact, here the point at issue.

So far we have been treating of the school 'as an indefinite abstraction; it is absolutely necessary that we now come to the actual facts of the case and try to determine the importance of the school for the development of the Arthaśāstra. We find information regarding it [837] in what Kautilya says concerning the sources utilised by him. This question will now be subjected to a detailed examination.

As authorities are mentioned in the Kautilya the following: the ācāryah 53 times, apara twice, eke twice, Mānavāh 5 times, Bhraspatyāh 6, Auśanasāh 6, Bhāradvājah 7, Viśalakṣah 6, Pārasārah 4, Pārasārah once, Pārasārah once (for the latter two we ought perhaps to read Pārasārah), Pīṣunāh 6, Kaupadantaḥ 4, Vātavyādhiḥ 5, Bāhundantiputraḥ 1, Ambhiyāh (perhaps a mistake for ācāryah ?); besides these, six authors are mentioned once each, but probably not as authors of Arthaśāstras, see above 1911, p. 959. Kautilya thus refers to his predecessors 114 times—all instances wherein either he differs from them, or they differ from one another—and then he expresses his own views with iti Kautilya or ne'ti Kautilyāh (altogether 72 times); only once, p. 17, we find in a verse etat Kautilyadarsanam. This frequency of contradiction appears to me to disclose unmistakably an individual author with a pronounced critical tendency and is in entire harmony with the words of Kautilya quoted above, that he had reformed the Arthaśāstra without consideration in quite an independent manner (amareṣa ud'hrīmaṇ āṣa). If the Kautilya had originated in his school a long time after Kautilya's death, and only reproduced those of his doctrines that in the meantime had attained general recognition, would people have taken the same interest in carefully noting all those points in which the doctrines of Kautilya differed from those of his predecessors? And would they have called his opponents ācāryah; ought not the founder of the school to be the only ācāryah for them?

Now it is highly remarkable that two rather large sections of the work, pp. 69-156 and pp. 197-263, contain no reference to divergent views. The former would have included the whole of the adhyāyapracāra (pp. 45-147), if antagonistic views had not been mentioned on pp. 63 and 68. At both these latter places the question is about the measure of punishment for losses which the responsible overseers are guilty of (p. 63), and also about how to trace their crimes,6 p. 68. Both these questions relate really to the Criminal Proce-
dure and have nothing to do with Administration, the subject-matter of the adhyakṣa-pra-
cāra. The other section includes the 4th and 5th adhikaraṇas: kaṇṭakāśodhanam and
yogavartaṇam up to the last adhyāya of the latter, which deals with a topic unconnected
with the preceding one, namely, [338] what should be done in the event of a prospective
vacancy of the throne. These two sections, in which no reference is made to any
antagonistic views, have this in common that they do not deal so much with general
principles as rather contain detailed practical hints: the adhyakṣa-pracāra regarding
Administration, Inspection of Trade and Commerce, the other about Police, Budget and
similar subjects. They are things about which the doctrinaire does not worry himself, but
which for the practical politician are of the utmost importance; and on which after all
only such a person can give an authoritative opinion as has taken an active part in the
affairs of the State. If Kauṭilya does not avail himself of the opportunity of entering into
controversy in connection with these parts of his work, the reason probably is that
his predecessors never having dealt with these subjects, no opportunity offered itself.
In the introductory remarks of his work the use of the expression prāyañca appears to show
that he had some such idea in his mind: pṛthivyā lābe pālane ca yāvanti arthādstraṇi
pravacāryaḥ prasthāpitāni, prāyañca tāni saṃkṣipti' kām idam arthādstraṇam kṛtam.
(To be continued.)

THE REVISED CHRONOLOGY OF THE LAST GUPTA EMPERORS.

BY RAMESH CHANDRA MAJUMDAR, M.A.; CALCUTTA.

The Bhitari Seal of Kumāragupta II. has added three new names to the list of the
Gupta Emperors. Dr. Hoernle who announced this important discovery in JASB.,
Vol. LXVIII, Part I, p. 88, undertook at the same time a discussion about the chronology
of these kings and arrived at the following conclusions about their dates:—

Paragupta, A.D. 470—485
Narasiṅhagupta (Bālīḍīṭya), A.D. 485—530
Kumāragupta II, A.D. 530 (accession).

Dr. Hoernle's views have been generally accepted by scholars. Thus Mr. V. A. Smith
placed the accession of the three kings respectively in 480, 485 and 535 A.D., while
Mr. Allan refers it to A.D. 480, 485 and 530.¹

A few inscriptions, recently discovered, seem however to invalidate the above conclusions.
As none of these inscriptions has been published in detail, it will simplify matters
if a short description of each of them is given at the outset.

1. The first in point of importance is an inscription on a Buddhist image discovered
at Sarnath. The announcement of this discovery together with a reading of the dated
portion was published in the Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India.
Part I, p. 22.² Through the kindness of Mr. R. D. Banerjee of the Indian Museum I
had an opportunity of examining the stamages of this and the two following inscriptions.
I read the dated portion as follows:

Vāraka Śata Gupṭānā sa-chalupāṇī'adutta bhūmiṇa rakṣati Kumāragupte māhe
Jyaśīśhe). . . .

"In the year one hundred and fifty-four of the Guptas, in the month Jyaśīśha, while
Kumāragupta was protecting the earth."
2 & 3. The second and the third inscriptions were also incised on Buddhist images discovered at Sarnath. The announcement of their discovery together with a translation of the dated portion was published in the Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey referred to above.

In one of these inscriptions a considerable portion of the line containing the date is quite illegible but enough remains to show that the two inscriptions belonged to the same year and were probably dated in identical words. I read the second inscription as follows:

Gupta\textsuperscript{\textdegree} samatikhrante sapta-pahi ch\textdegree\textdegree-ad-uttare ite sam\textdegree\textdegree\textdegree\textdegree\textdegree prihvin Budhagupte pro\textdegree\textdegree\textdegree\textdegree\textdegree ati.

"When one hundred and fifty-seven years of the Guptas had passed away, and Budhagupta was ruling the earth."

The third inscription reads: . . . pta pa(ch\textdegree\textdegree)\textdegree\textdegree d\textdegree\textdegree uttare ite sam\textdegree\textdegree\textdegree\textdegree\textdegree prithvim Budhagupte x pro\textdegree\textdegree\textdegree\textdegree\textdegree ati Vais\textdegree\textdegree\textdegree\textdegree\textdegree haka-mase sap\textdegree\textdegree\textdegree\textdegree\textdegree mate.

4. A copper-plate of the time of Budhagupta has been discovered at Damodarpur in the district of Dinajpur, Bengal. It records a grant of land in the Pun\textdegree\textdegree\textdegree\textdegree\textdegree ravardhana-bhukti. It is now in the possession of the Varendra Research Society along with four others belonging to the Gupta period. Short notices of these inscriptions have been published in p. 273 of the Indo-Aryan Races by Ramakrishna Prasad Chanda.
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Let us now examine the grounds on which Dr. Hoernle based his chronological theory. He accepted as true the statement recorded by Yuan Chwang that Mihirakula was defeated by king Bālāditya of Magadha, and identified this Bālāditya with Narasimhagupta of the Bhitari Seal on the ground that the latter "calls himself Bālāditya on his coins." He then pointed out that as Mihirakula's final overthrow in India took place in about A.D. 530 "it follows, that Bālāditya in whose reign Mihirakula's overthrow took place must have reigned down to about A.D. 530." and accordingly adjusted the dates of Puragupta, Narasimhagupta and Kumāragupta II.

This argument is considerably weakened by two considerations. In the first place, we need not lay too much stress on a tradition recorded by Yuan Chwang, specially when we remember that his information about Mihirakula was anything but satisfactory and that the credit of defeating Mihirakula is given to Yasodharman in the Mandasor Inscription.

In the second place, the identity of the Bālāditya of Yuan Chwang and Narasimhagupta Bālāditya is anything but certain, for we know from a Sīrnāth stone inscription that there were at least three kings of the same name. Under these circumstances the evidence on which Dr. Hoernle based his chronological scheme must be pronounced to be very weak. It might have been provisionally accepted in his days in the absence of any other evidence, but we must be prepared to give it up as soon as more definite information is forthcoming. Such informations are furnished by the inscriptions noticed above and it is therefore high time to reconstruct the whole chronological scheme on this new basis.

It will follow from what has been said above that the total period of the reign of Puragupta and Narasimhagupta cannot possibly be more than 18 years, from A.D. 456-6 to about A.D. 473-4 the earliest date of Kumāragupta II. This in itself is not inadmissible but the difficulty is caused by the fact that we have to place during the same period, the great emperor Skandagupta whose known dates range from A.D. 456-7 to A.D. 467-88. This raises once more the question of relationship of Skandagupta to Puragupta, a question which has never been satisfactorily answered. As Skandagupta had certainly ascended the throne in less than a year's time within his father's death, Puragupta could not possibly have succeeded him. Puragupta could therefore be either (1) the successor, (2) the contemporary or (3) identical with Skandagupta. Let us now consider the probability of each of these points of view.

(1) Dr. Hoernle looked upon Puragupta as successor of Skandagupta and this view has been generally accepted. As he held that Narasimhagupta ruled in A.D. 530, he naturally argued that the interval of 75 years between this date and the earliest recorded date of Skandagupta can be more easily filled up by two generations including three reigns than by two generations including only two reigns, i.e., by assuming that Skandagupta and Puragupta
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5 Dr. Hoernle has now considerably modified his theory. See JRAS., 1909, op. 128-9. He would now identify Puragupta with Skandagupta and place the latter's death at about A.D. 485, the other portions of the chronological scheme remaining intact. The other scholars, however, have accepted the original chronological scheme laid down by Dr. Hoernle apparently on the same grounds as were put forward by him. It is therefore necessary to examine these grounds.


8 This is clearly proved by the fact that he places Mihirakula "some centuries ago" although the latter must have flourished hardly more than a century before him.

9 Fleet's Nos. 33, 34.

10 Fleet's Gupta Inscriptions, No. 79.

11 See footnotes above.
were brothers, succeeding one another and being themselves succeeded by Narasinhagupta." 12
According to the new scheme of chronology put forward above the interval between the latest date of Skandagupta and the earliest date of Kumāragupta II. is reduced to only 6 years, and not only does it invalidate Dr. Hoernle’s arguments, but it seems also to be fatal to his conclusions. For if we hold Puragupta to be the successor of Skandagupta the two reigns of Puragupta and Narasinhagupta would have to be crowded in the short space of less than 6 years, a theory not deserving of serious consideration without strong evidence in its support.

(2) Dr. Fleet was of opinion that “there was a formal division of the Early Gupta territories in the generation of Skandagupta and Puragupta or some disension between them.” 13 This implies that both Skandagupta and Puragupta were contemporary kings over different portions of the Gupta Empire.

The Bhitari Stone Pillar Inscription of Skandagupta records his achievement as crown prince and as well as emperor, and we are told that he erected there an image of the god Vishnu in order to increase the religious merit of his father. It is, therefore, certain that he succeeded his father in those parts of his dominions. 14 The Junāga jih Rock Inscription of the year 138 15 records that Skandagupta selected Parnādatta as his governor over Surāshśra, and the latter appointed his son Chakrapālīta as the governor of the city. We are told that Chakrapālīta renewed the embankment of the Sudarśana lake in the year 137. Skandagupta must, therefore, have come into the possession of the western parts of his empire immediately after his father’s death. These considerations seem to show that Skandagupta inherited the empire intact from his father and there could not possibly have been any formal division of the Gupta Empire on the death of Kumāragupta I.

It may be contended that Puragupta rebelled against his brother at a later date and carved out a dominion for himself and his successors. This view is, however, opposed to the testimony of coins.

It is a well-known fact that Kumāragupta I. introduced a new type of silver coinage for the home territories of the Gupta empire and this type is commonly found in the eastern portion of the Gupta empire. Skandagupta imitated this type of coins; four of them are dated in 141, four others in 146 and one in 148. This shows that Skandagupta was in possession of those parts down to the end of his reign. On the other hand, the available coins of Puragupta are all of the ‘Archer’ type and closely resemble in style Skandagupta’s heavier issues which, according to Mr. Allan, belong to a later period of the reign and to the most eastern Gupta dominions. 16 These numismatic considerations certainly do not favour the theory of a division of the Gupta empire in Skandagupta’s reign, or the contemporaneity of the reigns of Skandagupta and Puragupta.

(3) We next come to the question of the identity of Puragupta and Skandagupta. The Bhitari seal of Kumāragupta II. favours the supposition. It traces the genealogy of the Gupta dynasty from Gupta up to Kumāragupta I. and then continues: “His son (was) the Mahārājājādiḥrāja the glorious Puragupta, who meditated on his feet (tattpadanudhyāta) (and) who was begotten on the Mahādevi Anantadevi.”

As Dr. Hoernle admitted, the expression *tatpādānudhyāta*, applied to Puragupta in the Bhitari seal, seems to indicate him as having been the immediate successor of his father rather than a remoter successor of him. As Skandagupta is known to have been the immediate successor of his father, the natural presumption is that Puragupta was but another name of Skandagupta. This view was discarded by Dr. Hoernle on the ground that it seemed "hardly probable that in such genealogies the same person would be called by different names" and even when later on he assumed the identity of the two he was at a loss "how to account for the two names of the same person." 10

Such instances of double names are, however, not unknown even in the Gupta dynasty. Chandragupta II had a second name Devagupta and both the names occur in the genealogical list of the Vākāṭaka kings. Thus in the Chammak village grant of Mahārāja Pravarasena II, the donor's father, is said to have married Prabhāvati-Guptā, daughter of the Mahārāja Jādhirāja Sri-Devagupta, while a copperplate grant of Rudrasena calls the same Prabhāvati-Guptā, daughter of Chandragupta II. Another instance may be quoted from the inscriptions of the Pāla dynasty. The fourth king of this dynasty is generally known as Vidgāhāpāla, but in the Bādal pillar inscription of the time of Nārāyaṇapāla, he is mentioned under the name of Sūrapāla. These instances are calculated to obviate the objection raised by Dr. Hoernle against the identity of Puragupta and Skandagupta.

Numismatic considerations also support the identity of Skandagupta and Puragupta. All the coins attributed to Puragupta are exactly similar to the coins of Skandagupta with the difference that on one coin alone the two letters *Pu, ra* are written vertically beneath the left arm of the king in place of the letters *Sk, nda*. As a matter of fact, before the discovery of the coins with the letters *Pu, ra* the other similar coins, now attributed to Puragupta, used to be attributed to Skandagupta. If it is assumed that Skandagupta had a second name Puragupta, all these coins may be without any difficulty attributed to Skandagupta himself.

On the whole, therefore, the new inscriptions seem to be fatal to the accepted view that Puragupta succeeded Skandagupta. They certainly favour the supposition that the two names were identical although they do not absolutely preclude the theory that Skandagupta and Puragupta were rival kings.

As has been pointed out above, Budhagupta can no longer be looked upon as a mere local ruler. We learn from Inscription No. 4 that his kingdom included Pūrṇāvardhana or Northern Bengal, from Nos. 2 and 3, that it extended up to Sārnāth, and from the Eras stone pillar inscription that it included the country between the rivers Narmadā and Jamuna. He must be said, therefore, to have been in possession of a fair portion of the Imperial Gupta territory, if not the whole of it, and there remains no ground for relegating him to the position of a local ruler.

Now, the Sārnāth inscriptions (Nos. 2 and 3) definitely prove that Budhagupta was ruling there in 578 G.E. or A.D. 477. The Bhitari seal of Kamāragupta II places this monarch as well as his two predecessors in an unbroken line of succession from Kumāra-
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18 Ibid.
19 Ibid.
20 Ibid.
21 Above, 1912, p. 225.
22 Allen's *Gupta Coins*, pl. cit.
gupta I. It would follow therefore that the reign of Kumáraragupta II was closed before A.D. 477, at least in the Sarnáth regions, and this inference is in full agreement with the Sarnáth Inscription (No. I) which gives us the date A.D. 473-4 for Kumáraragupta II.

As a result of the foregoing discussions the following reconstruction of the chronology of the last Gupta emperors may be offered with confidence on the basis of the newly discovered inscriptions mentioned above:——

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kings</th>
<th>Known dates</th>
<th>Probable period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Skandagupta or Puragupta</td>
<td>A.D. 456-7—467-8</td>
<td>A.D. 456-468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or Skandagupta and Puragupta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Narasinghagupta</td>
<td>Nil.</td>
<td>A.D. 468-472</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relation of Budhagupta to his predecessor cannot be easily determined. It is natural to look upon him as the immediate successor, if not the son, of Kumáraragupta II, but it is not impossible that he was a successful rebel in the west who had gradually forced his way to the imperial throne. The fact that no gold coins of Budhagupta have been discovered as yet, is certainly difficult to explain. It may be supposed that the coins bearing simply the 'Aditya legends' like Prakásáditya and Dwásáditya really belonged to him, though at present there is no evidence to show that they were so. On the other hand, it may very well be that he did not survive his usurpation of the imperial throne for a sufficiently long time to institute the gold coinage.

The reconstructed Gupta chronology clears up our knowledge about the history of the period in some respects. To take only one instance, the history of the so-called later Guptas becomes more definite and more consistent. The beginning of this dynasty cannot be placed later than the commencement of the sixth century A.D., because the fourth king of this dynasty, Kumáraragupta, who also belonged to the fourth generation of kings, was a contemporary of Jánavarman and therefore lived in the middle of the 6th century A.D. According to the hitherto accepted chronology of the last Gupta emperors, the first half of the 6th century is covered by the two reigns of Narasinghagupta and Kumáraragupta II, the former of whom died in about A.D. 530. We have thus to suppose that the first four kings of the later Gupta dynasty were contemporaries of these Gupta emperors, although the available evidence shows that all of them ruled over Magadha. The scheme of Gupta chronology reconstructed above gives a very natural explanation of the origin of the later Guptas. The last lineal descendant of the mighty Gupta emperors died some time after A.D. 473-4. The throne was then occupied by Budhagupta whose latest known date is A.D. 494-5. We have no definite information of any other Gupta king occupying the imperial throne of Magadha and this is quite consistent with the supposition that a new dynasty of local kings, probably scions of the Gupta Emperors, was established at Magadha at the beginning of the 6th century A.D.

In conclusion, I may refer to an article on the "Gupta Era and Mihirakula" contributed by Mr. K. B. Pathak to the Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume, recently published by the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. He has read the 5th word in the Sarnáth
Inscription No. 1 as Śāsati instead of rakshati, but the latter reading is quite clear on the estampage. Besides, he holds Kumāragupta of the Sārnāth inscription to be the son and successor of Skandagupta, and different from Kumāragupta of the Bhittari seal. Further, he takes Budhagupta II (sic) as son and successor of Kumāragupta of the Sārnāth Inscription. As he furnishes no reasons for these hypothesis, I am unable to discuss them in the present paper. I do not know of any evidence which either establishes the existence of Budhagupta II or proves the relationship assumed to exist between Skandagupta, Kumāragupta of the Sārnāth Inscription, and the so-called Budhagupta II.

BOOK NOTICE.


PROF. JACKSON, the general editor of the Series, is to be congratulated for the success of his pupil Dr. Quackenbos, who, by bringing out this critical edition of the poems of Mayūra and the Candīśataka, has not only preserved the reputation of the Columbia editors but has actually increased it. To handle and study the artistic and nice volumes of this series is a pleasure to a Sanskrit scholar whose hard lot is to read old and worn-out MSS. or cheap Indian editions. In the Introduction Dr. Quackenbos has very ably discussed anything and everything concerning Mayūra, the contemporary and rival of Bāṣabhāṣṭra. His criticism of the poems is just. Original and romantic indeed are the following remarks on the origin of the Candīśataka:—"I cannot refrain from hazarding the suggestion that perhaps the Candīśataka was written by Bāṣa to propitiate the anger of his wife by praising the foot with which she had spurned him. The reader will remember how Mayūra, while eavesdropping, heard a lover’s quarrel in progress between Bāṣa and his wife. Bāṣa was saying: ‘O faithful one, pardon this one fault; I will not again anger thee.’ But she spurned him with her foot, and Mayūra heard her ankle tinkling. Then Bāṣa recited a propitiatory stanza (Gatāpragā hṛtik krishnaṁ eva sūrya eva Pradīpaṁ eva nidrīvaśasam uṣṣayaṁ ghrūṇaṁ eva; Prasānandanto mānaṁ tujaṁ na tatātipi krutham aho: Kuca-prayatnayo hṛdayamopani te subhāṁ kathāṁ) in which he addressed his angry spouse as subhāra, ‘fairbrowed’. Thereupon Mayūra, unable to restrain his propensity for punning, interrupted the quarrel and said: ‘Don’t call her subhāra; Subhāra was one of the six kṛṣṇīkā, the Pleiades, who were accounted the six mothers of Skanda; Cāṣṭā was his seventh mother but Cāṣṭā, which, punningly, means ‘Don’t call her fairbrowed, but a vixen.’ May not, therefore, the title Cāṣṭiśataka have the underlying meaning of ‘The Hundred stanzas to the Vixen?’ The matter is all legend, or mostly all; but speculation, even in legend, is not without interest." (p. 247, footnote). Simultaneous propitiation of one’s Deity and lady-love is not unknown in Sanskrit literature (e.g., Kalpaṇa, in his Rājatarangini, VII. 1, refers to Śiva’s simultaneous praise of Sandhyā and of his consort) and double entendre is the play of Sanskrit poets and commentators. If the suggestion of Dr. Quackenbos be communicated to orthodox Sanskrit paṁrṇī, we may soon expect a Śrīgārvapāṭyatāla of the Candīśataka which would be a parallel to the devotional interpretations of the Amaśatāka, the Cauvapaṅkaśā and the Śrīgārvatāka of Kaḷidāsa.

The text of the poems has been edited critically. The Mayūraśataka has been printed for the first time from the unique birch-bark Śrīnd Maśa in the Tübingen University Library. The other poems were printed many times in India and Dr. Quackenbos has given all the different readings of those editions and also the readings of the śokas as quoted in the various anthologies, works on poetics, etc. The translation is a faithful one following the interpretation of the commentators printed in the Kaḷyāṇamāla editions of the Śrīyāśataka and Cāṣṭiśataka. The editor has also added various explanatory notes.

We have noticed all its good features. As for its defects, there are a few mistranslations and a few misleading notes as examples of which we may mention the following: (1) p. 21—purā maṃvatijayināṃ Śrī Ujjayinī purī: ‘Formerly in . . . Amāravatī Ujjainī, Śrī Ujjayinī.’ (It ought to be ‘in Śrī Ujjainī which surpassed Amāravati—the city of the Lord of Devas.’) (2) p. 272—
subject matter is the parāśrama of Pārtha (Arjuna) in defeating the army of the Kauravas and recovering the cows of Virāṭa. The author is Prahlādana deva, the younger brother and Yuvardja (A.D. 1162-1207) of king Dhāṁavṛṣa, the Paramāna ruler of Chandravati and Mount Abu. Prahlādana was famous as a warrior, philanthropist and poet. The author of the Kṛitiśāmudrī says that this royal bard made the Goddess of Learning, who was afflicted with sorrow on account of the death of Muñja and Bhoja, again happy by dramatizing a beautiful story. He also describes our poet in a prakāśi as the incarnation of Svarūpaśaṃbakti (Goddess of Learning) or of the heavenly cow. Though these descriptions have been prompted by what Viśkhādatta refers to (in his Mudrārākṣa) as “Svāmī śāstraśāstrāh kṛtiyasya mahābhāṣāravi tuṣṭāh prabhā vāstrotīśpeat sa kham.” This Viśvāyoga exhibits our royal bard’s skill in drawing word-pictures and in delineating the Śvābhāvīkālaraśā as an example of which I quote below:

Gopān-astravaśāvastivā sasya hṛdayānūtra-
Hambhāvūrāvā-yuṣmiḥ kākṛtaḥ kāraṇya-pratikṣā-
UDHORHĀVAITRAVAYO-PRĀYASUH HRTAḥ VRAYA-PRĀYAS-
TAMANYA-ETÉH KURUPATIKHAṬA (Hṛtā?) MĀRASA-
TARNAKĀNAHM.

It contains many fine passages some of which reminds the reader of similar incidents described in the Vṛṣamakāra and the Dhānaṁjaya-vijaya-vyāyoga which treats of the same subject. Though our poet is skilful in writing fine verses and is thus really a prabhādula (gladdened), he is not very artistic in the manipulation and development of the plot. His style is Gauṣū. He introduces, in his Pratāpanā, a Śhāpaka in addition to the Śrīhāṣṭha. The Prakīrt passages insert y to avoid hiatus (the Va-truti of Jaina Prakīrt)—a peculiarity probably due to the fact that the MSS. belonged to Jaina Bhāhāra. The editor has performed his duty very satisfactorily; his introduction is learned, and there are only a few printing mistakes (e.g., read hṛtā for hātā in the Hoka quoted above, vārṇavāra for varṇāhara in p. 13, adṛgya, viḍyāyatam for adṛgyavṛtyātām.)

Sūrendranath Majumdar Sastri.
THE VAULTING SYSTEM OF THE HINDOLA MAHAL AT MANDU.*

BY CAPTAIN K. A. C. CREWELL, R.A.F.

LOOKING through the Annual Report of the Archeological Survey of India for 1903, I was much struck with the interior of the Hindola Mahal at Mandu, which I think must possess one of the most remarkable vaulting systems in India. This building is T-shaped in plan, and consists of a great Durbar Hall (Plate I, A) 88½ feet long by 24½ feet broad and 38½ feet high, forming the stem, and a cross-piece in two storeys. The ground floor of the latter is taken up by passages, storerooms, a stairway and a broad ramp leading to the upper floor, where there is another fine hall, a glimpse of which is seen through the window over the door at the end of the Durbar Hall.

As may be seen, the vaulting system of the great Durbar Hall consists of a series of transverse arches evenly spaced; the backs of these arches are filled up level, but the roofing between them had disappeared as long ago as 1842. These transverse arches may have been connected either by a series of barrel-vaults running at right angles to the axis of the hall, or by means of beams of wood or stone. Mr. Consens suggests "that the roof was supported on wooden beams, which have been carried off, as has happened in so many buildings at Bijapur and other places." In view of the tremendous abutment provided (Plate I, B) it is difficult to believe that it can have been roofed with anything lighter than stone. I venture to suggest that it was roofed by a series of barrel-vaults resting on the transverse arches, and my reason for doing so will become clear in the course of this article.

The great feature of this vaulting system which immediately strikes one is that, owing to the roof being carried on fixed points spaced well apart, the wall between them becomes merely a curtain wall, which may be pierced at will and lateral lighting obtained, as in Gothic vaulting. With a simple barrel-vault running from one end of the hall to the other it is very difficult to do this. I shall therefore attempt to trace this somewhat unusual solution to its earliest type, a type in which this potentiality for lateral lighting is not realised, and in which the arches, placed seldom more than six or seven feet apart, are roofed with stone slabs and never vaulted. This primitive type can be traced back to the commencement of the Christian era, when it is found in Nabatean tombs still existing in the Jebel Hauran (the country lying S.E. of Damascus).

The Nabateans, who were once thought to have been Aramaeans on account of their language, have been shown by Noldeke and others to have been true Arabs who made use of Aramaic for literary purposes—all their inscriptions are in Aramaic—because Arabic had not at that time developed into a literary language. Our knowledge of them may be said to date from the Hellenic period, when we hear of Antigonus sending his general Athenaeus against them in 312 B.C., previous to which we know practically nothing about them. At this time they were nomads, without agriculture; nevertheless they were great traders. The first ruler (rapannos) of whom we hear is Aretas, with whom Jason, the High Priest, sought refuge in 169 B.C. The Nabateans got their chance on the fall of the empire of the Ptolemies and the Seleucids, and their kingdom may be said to date from Erotimus.

* Reprinted with additions from the Journal of the Royal Institute of British Architects.


2 Archaeological Survey, Annual Report, 1903, p. 32 n.

3 Mace, Y. S.
about 110-100 B.C. In 84 B.C., the Nabataean king Aretas III. took Damascus from Antiochus XII.; it was recovered by Herod, 23 B.C., but it again changed hands nineteen years later, being taken by Aretas IV. in 4 B.C. In A.D. 106 the Nabataean kingdom, which now comprised Bostra (Hauran) and Petra, was converted into a Roman province (Provincia Arabia) by Cornelius Palma, the Roman governor of Syria. 4

As might be expected, the architecture of the Hauran was governed by local conditions. Like the mountains of the Hauran, the entire region is one in which black basalt is the only rock, except at its southernmost extremity, where limestone appears as a building stone in the ruins of Kuṣair al-Hallabat. 5 The country does not produce any timber, and this quite material necessity became the mother of invention and led to the discovery of new constructive methods. Thus the arch, the sole means of covering wide spaces, became the principal element of construction and a series of parallel arches supporting ceiling slabs (Fig. 1) served to cover most of their halls. 6

![Fig. 1.](image)

The architecture of this region is divided by Butler into five groups:—(1) The Prehistoric—a rough megalithic style without any indication of date; (2) The Nabataean; (3) The Roman; (4) The Christian; (5) The Muhammadan. The first historical period is the Nabataean, the earliest monument of which that can be accurately dated is placed by him c. 60 B.C. It may, of course, have begun somewhat earlier, and it lasted until A.D. 106 when the Roman period commenced, and continued until the time of Constantine. The Roman and Christian periods have much reduced the Nabataean remains, but many scattered details of very characteristic ornament and numerous inscriptions in Nabataean script remain.

Butler, like De Vogüé, emphasises the fact that "the architecture was the most truly lithic that the world has ever seen; it was entirely of stone, sometimes even to the doors and window shutters." It offers a marked contrast to that of Northern Syria in plan, principles of construction and ornamental details—in all those things that go to make up style. For the roofing of all narrow apartments stone slabs were employed; when the width did not exceed 9 feet the space was reduced by corbels to about 6 feet, and slabs slightly over this length were placed across. The wall was always carried up above the corbels to weight them and keep them in place. When broader spaces were to be roofed an arch was thrown across, the haunches of the arch were filled up level with the side walls, and long slabs were laid from these side walls to the central line of support thus provided. Corbeling was used at the same time to further help the cross slabs. In roofing a space that was very long as well as over 9 feet in width, two or more transverse arches were used, giving a series of transverse supports all down the hall. The Druses of the Hauran build their houses in this fashion at the present day.

Tombs were wholly or partially excavated in the ground and paved, walled and roofed with stone. One of the earliest found is described and illustrated by Butler. It is roofed with arches which support slabs (Fig. 2), and eight stelae with Nabataean inscriptions were found in it.

Fig. 2.

7 Butler, Ancient Architecture in Syria, p. 68.
8 Butler, Architecture and other Arts, p. 310.
9 Ancient Architecture in Syria, p. 206 and ill. 185. Another p. 207, also illustrated.
Some examples of this form of roofing were published by De Vogüé fifty years ago. Recently the ground has been thoroughly gone over by the Princeton Expedition, which has published and described many new buildings. Confining myself to those which are dated, I have compiled the following list:

A.D.
345. Church of Julianos at Umm al-Jamal.¹⁰
371. Pratorium at Umm al-Jamal.¹¹
412. Kaşr al-Bā'īş, near the western border of the southern Haurān. A Greek inscription states that it was built in the reign of the Emperor Arcadius under the dux Phil. Pelagius, A.D. 412.¹²
430-1. A small house at al-Majdal, in which it occurs on the ground floor.¹³
508 (?) Church No. 1 at al-Umtā'iyah. Inscription gives date which may possibly be A.D. 508.¹⁴
515. Church of S. George at Zor'ah, dated 410 of the Era of Bosra (= A.D. 515).¹⁵
578. House of Flavios Soos—a Roman-Nabataean name—at al-Haiyāt.¹⁶
624-5. Monastery of S. George at Sameh. This date is exceedingly late for a Christian inscription to be found in situ in Syria, as Islam had been proclaimed and Christian Arabia was on the point of extinction. Bosra, however, had not fallen and the country was still under the protection of the Empire.¹⁷

Let us now stop a moment to examine the exact raison d'être of this roofing system. Being a country of stone, the people naturally had a predilection for the lintel, and used it wherever possible. Where, however, this was not possible they used the arch, and it may well be asked, why did they not make the arch continuous, and thus form a barrel-vault? I think the answer must be that, as they were not acquainted with the Mesopotamian method of building a vault without centering by using flat-bricks in rings sloping backwards at a considerable angle against a head wall, any barrel-vault built by them would have required considerable timber for the centering—a serious matter. By building a series of separate arches, however, the same piece of centering could be used over and over again as soon as one arch had set, thus reducing the timber required to an absolute minimum, and their favourite lintel method could be used as a final covering. In all these early buildings, however, the fact that the roof is borne on points of support spaced at regular intervals permits the piercing of the side walls for lateral lighting. Yet out of the large number of examples—some thirty or forty—described by De Vogüé and Butler, there are not many in which this opportunity has been realised, and even in these cases it has only been made use of in a timid and halting manner, small square windows pierced at irregular intervals, and not in each bay, being all that is attempted.

The Persians must have been acquainted with this system at a fairly early date, since it is found in the palace built about 50 miles south of Mosul at Hatra¹⁹ (or al-Hadr) by the Parthians, (Plate II, B) whose dynasty came to an end in A.D. 226. It was left to the keen architectural insight of the Persians to realise its potentialities fully and to carry it to its final

---

¹¹ Ibid., pp. 160-166.
¹² Ibid., pp. 81-83.
¹³ Ibid., pp. 120-122.
¹⁴ Ibid., p. 92.
¹⁷ Ibid., p. 85.
¹⁸ Andrae (Dr. W.). Hatra. Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft. Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen, Nos. 9 and 21. It occurs in Room 15—see Abb. 21 and 22.
development. They were responsible for two innovations, (a) they were the first to use barrel-vaults to connect the transverse arches, thus making it possible to place them farther apart, (b) they pierced windows in each of the curtain walls between these arches and thus obtained excellent lateral lighting, so that when Dieulafoy saw the ruins of the earliest building of this type, he was irresistibly reminded of a Gothic cathedral.

This building, known as Tak Eivan or Kut Gāpān, stands at Karkh. This town, which is known in Syriac as Karkhā de Ladān, was founded by Shapur II. who died A.D. 379. Although seen by Rawlinson in 1838, 19 it was first surveyed and described by Dieulafoy some thirty years ago. 20 It is raised on a sub-basement connected with an immense rectangular enclosure, to which it probably formed a monumental gateway. In its present state it consists of a gallery about 60 feet long by 27 feet broad (Plate I,C), which originally formed one of the arms of a long hall, the centre of which was occupied by a dome. Each arm was spanned by transverse arches (arcos-doubleaux) brought up level and joined by barrel-vaults (formerets). Plate II,A shows Phène Spiers' restoration and Figs. 3 and 4 explain the vaulting system in detail. The curvature of the transverse arches was found to correspond to a radius equal to half the width of the hall, hence semi-circular arches are shown in the restoration. If we bear in mind the restrictions imposed by longitudinal lighting, the very great step forward here taken will be realised.

We now come to a building which every writer, with the exception of Professor Max van Berchem, 21 has regarded as Muhammadan. This is Kuṣair Kharāneh, which stands in the country lying east of the Jordan, the Moab of the Old Testament, or the steppe of

---

20 L'Art Antiquit de la Perse, tome V, pp. 79-87.  
Balqa, where so many of the Umayyad Khalifs passed a great part of their lives. Our vaulting system occurs in three halls on the upper floor, but although the transverse arches are joined with barrel-vaults, windows are not pierced in the bays (Plate II,D). In this respect it is unique among Muhammadan buildings vaulted in this fashion, which fact appears to me to lend further support to Prof. van Berchem’s views as to its pre-Muhammadan date. As for the date of Kharâneh, a terminus-ad quem is fortunately provided by the preservation on its walls of the last three lines of an inscription painted in black and copied by Dr. Moritz, which runs, “...Amir said it and Abd al-Malik the son of Ubayd wrote it on Monday three days remaining from Muharram of the year ninety-two (A.D. 710).” Dr. Moritz suggests that Abd al-Malik was probably a member of al-Walid’s suite on his return from the visit to Mecca, which he made in A.H. 91, (709), and which is recorded by Tabari and Ibn al-Athir.

A few hours west of Kharâneh stands Kuṣair ‘Amrah, first seen by Professor Musil in 1898, and completely surveyed by him in 1900 and 1901 under the auspices of the Imperial Academy of Sciences of Vienna. The feature, of course, which concerns us is the hall roofed with three barrel-vaults resting on transverse arches with windows in the bays between them (Plate II,D), but the unique feature of the building is its rich and well-preserved wall-paintings which are fortunately combined with inscriptions enabling us to fix its date within very narrow limits. The two most important pictures are one representing the Khalif enthroned, with an Arabic inscription too damaged to be deciphered, and another—a group of six figures—representing the enemies of Islam, four of whom may be identified by their inscriptions as Kaisar (the Emperor of Byzantium), Roderick (the Ostrogoth), Chosroes (King of Persia) and Negus (King of Abyssinia). It must therefore have been built after A.D. 711 when the Arabs first came in contact with Roderick at the battle of the Guadalete. On the other hand, Professor Musil has brought together detailed historical evidence from the Kitâb al-Aghâni and other works to show that it must have been built by the Umayyads, who have been shown both by himself and by Lammens to have been real Arabs of the desert, fond of hunting, wine, poetry, and the free open-air life, hating towns and neglecting their capital, Damascus, whenever possible—Muhammadans in name but not by temperment. Especially was this the case with Walid I, a half-Bedouin, who already, when heir to the throne, had selected the steppe of Balqa (Moab) as his dwelling place. He combined with this a real craze for building and the Kitâb al-Aghâni especially mentions pleasure palaces built by him. Professor Musil suggests that just as Tûba, lying in the Wadi Ghadaf, probably corresponds with Aghdafa so it is probable that Kuṣair ‘Amrah—half bath, half hunting-box—must be one of the Umayyad palaces mentioned in early Arabic literature, concealed under a name that is modern. As the Umayyad dynasty came to an end in A.D. 750, this fixes the other limit. Basing his opinion on convincing arguments as to the identification of the two remaining figures which, however, I cannot enter into here for want of space, Professor van Berchem has narrowed down the probable date to A.D. 712-715.

This fixes the date, more or less, for a building scarcely a mile away, known as Hammâm as-Sarakh, since its plan and dimensions, as well as the number and arrangement of its rooms, are almost identical. One chamber even is roofed with three barrel-vaults resting on transverse arches with windows in the bays, just as we have already seen (Plate II,D).

---

22 Ausflugs in der Arabia Petraea : Mêlange de la Faculté orientale, Beyrouth, tome III, p. 422.
24 La bâda et la bira sous les Omayyades : Mêlange de la Faculté orientale, Beyrouth, tome VI, pp. 91-112.
VAULTING SYSTEM OF HINDOLA MAHAL, MANDU.

Plate II.

A. Tak Hatra: (From Dr. W. Andrade: Harra.)
B. Hatra: (From Dr. W. Andrade: Harra.)
C. Kaur Khirnur: (From Dr. Moxon: Anflog in der Aryan Periosis.)
D. Kusur Ana: (From Dr. Moxon: Anflog in der Aryan Periosis.)

K. A. C. CREWSELL.
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Butler has also published a description of an exceedingly early mosque at Kusair al-Hallabat. It measures 10.10 m. by 11.80 m. and is divided by two rows of five arches carried on columns and engaged piers (Fig. 5). The walls are levelled up above the arches and barrel-vaults are turned upon them. He suggests that it belongs to the eighth or ninth century. This mosque has a concave mihrab, which he expressly states was built with the walls, and not added afterwards. As the concave mihrab does not go back to the earliest days of Islam, this is important, as it gives us a clue to its date. According to Makrizi, the first to introduce the concave mihrab was 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-Aziz when he restored the mosque at Medina by order of the Khalif Walid, A. H. 87-88 (705-706). The mihrab was copied from the Christian apse and for this reason was received with some reluctance by Islam, in fact it is defined as the least holy part of the mosque and the Imam is earnestly warned not to take up his station within it. In keeping with this statement, the exceedingly early mihrab in the mosque-courtyard of the eighth century palace of Ukhaidir is entirely without decoration, and is a simple rectangular recess roofed with a semi-dome set on horizontal brackets; the archivolt consists of a double ring of voussoirs. Though the first Egyptian mosque was built by 'Amr ibn al-'As in A.D. 642 it was not given a concave mihrab until its third enlargement in A.D. 710. The mosque at Kusair al-Hallabat must therefore have been built after A.D. 706 at the latest. On the other hand, it is scarcely likely to be later than the early part of the ninth century, as it has not a distinctively Muhammadan appearance, and we know from ninth-century buildings at Samarra, and from the mosque of Ibn Tulun at Cairo (A.D. 876-879), that strong individuality had been acquired by that time.

The last early instance that I shall quote occurs in the palace of Ukhaidir, discovered by Massignon in 1908, and by Miss Bell, independently, in 1909. An interesting example of our vaulting system is found in one room (Miss Bell's Room 32) in which the windows are not pierced, but simply blocked out (Plate III, A. and Fig. 6). This palace may be placed c. A.D. 750.

The finest and most beautiful example to be found in the Middle East is undoubtedly Khan Orchma at Baghdad (Plate III, C), which will at once be recognised as having the closest possible affinity with the Hindola Mahal, indeed it would be difficult to find anywhere two interiors so nearly identical. Dienlafou and General De Beylié attribute this building to the twelfth century, and Baron von Oppenheim says that it doubtless belongs to the times of the Khalifate (ended A.D. 1258). I find, however, that Commander J. E. Jones, who saw it in 1846, states that it bears the date 758 (= A.D. 1356-7). This is

---

27 Ibid, pp. 74-77 and Appendix xvii-xix.
28 Bell (G. L.), Palace and Mosque at Ukhaidir, pp. 147-151.
29 Prone et Samarra, p. 33.
the year in which the Merjaniyeh Mosque was built, of whose endowment Khan Ortma forms part. Perhaps the dating inscription may have since disappeared.

Regarding the date of the Hindola Maqal, Capt. Barnes states\(^\text{12}\) that it cannot be fixed with exactitude, as no inscriptions were discovered during the repairs, and he had not succeeded in finding a specific reference to it in any history. He considers it, however, to be one of the earliest Muhammadan buildings at Mandu. This is probable for two reasons, (a) its sloping walls which recall fourteenth-century buildings at Delhi, (b) the fact that a large number of the facing stones bear on their inner sides the images of Hindu gods or remains of Hindu ornament, while broken images were found mixed indiscriminately with the rubble core. He suggests that the building which most resembles in its sloping walls and decorative features is the tomb of Muhammad Tughlaq at Delhi (d. 1324). However, I do not think we need assume that it is quite as old as that. Firstly, one would expect the style of a provincial building to lag some forty or fifty years behind that of the capital;\(^\text{33}\) secondly, the tomb of Muhammad Tughlaq is the very earliest in Delhi with sloping walls; there are several later examples which may have influenced the Mandu architect.


\(^{33}\) As an example of this I would cite the following case taken from the field of palaeography. As is well known, the Kufic character was employed for all historical inscriptions in Egypt down to the fall of the Fatimid dynasty. The curved character, however, was employed in Syria before this event, e.g., on the minbar made by order of Nur ad-Din for the mosque at Aleppo. This minbar is dated H. 564 (1168), and was moved by Saladin to the mosque of el-Asak at Jerusalem, where it still is. It is illustrated in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, Vol. I, plate VIII. The latest historical inscription in Kufic in Cairo is in the Mosque of as-Salih Tala'i and is dated H. 555 (1160). The earliest in the curved character is dated 576 (1180-1). In the large towns of the provinces the last Kufic inscription (Alexandria) is dated H. 583 (1187-8) and the first in the curved character (Alexandria) is dated in the same year. In the small towns of the provinces the last Kufic inscription (Kus) is dated H. 598 (1172) and the first in the curved character (Deshe) is as late as H. 594 (1177). See M. van Berchem: *Corpus Inscriptionum Arabicarum*, I, p. 719.
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A. Ukhaidir: Miss Bell's Room 32.
(From Dr. Oskar Reuther: Ocheidir).

B. Aiwan in the ruined palace of Machi, near Hawzdar.
(From G. P. Tate: Seistan).

C. Khán Orthma, Baghdad.
(From Sarre-Herzfeld: Archäologische Reise im Euphrat- und Tigris-Gebiet).

K. A. C. CREBBELL.
This view receives further support from the historical evidence. Mândû was finally conquered by the Muhammadans in 1305, and was ruled by governors appointed from Delhi until Dilâwar Khân declared himself independent in 1401. Like his predecessor, Dilâwar Khân, although he spent several months of the year at Mândû, resided at Dhâr, and Mândû only became the capital on the accession of Hûshang (1405-1434). Although Mândû owed most of its splendour to Hûshang, we know from inscriptions that Dilâwar Khân also erected buildings there, viz., the Târâpur Gate33 and the mosque named after him. This mosque,34 as well as the Lat Masjid at Dhâr, built by him in 1405, are both constructed, like the Hindola Maâhal, of Hindu remains. I think, therefore, on historical and archaeological grounds, that the Hindola Maâhal was probably built in the first quarter of the fifteenth century, either by Dilâwar Khân or Hûshang, the chances being in favour of the former.

Before closing I give here (Plate III, B) an interesting example of an aiwân vaulted in this fashion.35 This building stands at Machi, near Hauz-dâr on the trade route through Seistan, and was perhaps built about A.D. 1600.

Postscript.—In the first part of this article, when speaking of Kaîr Khârâneh, I said that Prof. M. van Berchem did not accept the view that it is a Muhammadan building. His reasons for doing so are as follows. Kuâir 'Amrah is not fortified, and no one would expect it to be since the Umayyads, masters of a great part of Asia, had no need to fortify their residences when these lay well within the boundaries of their empire. On the other hand Kharâneh as well as Mashita, Tûba, 'Amman and Abyad, are fortified buildings of Mesopotamian type adapted to the plan of the castra of the Roman limes, such as Qastal. He discusses the matter at considerable length, and concludes that the hypothesis which attributes these buildings to the Ghassanides, who were Syrians and Christians, is improbable owing to the complete absence of Christian symbols and the presence of fragments of images at Mashita, as well as the Dionysiac interpretation of the façade suggested by Clermont Ganneau. Further, Mashita and Kharâneh are strongly influenced, if not entirely inspired, by Persia and Mesopotamia. Now the Lakhmids were of Mesopotamian origin, and the inscription of Nemâra proves that at the commencement of the fourth century the Lakhmid king Imru'l-Qais was allied with the Romans and Persians, and that his rule extended to the Roman boundary east of the Haurán. He may well have felt the need of frontier forts and Tûba, Ammân, Mashita and Kharâneh form just such a line of advanced posts towards the west. Prof. van Berchem therefore places them in the fourth century. I submit that in the series of buildings dealt with in this article, Kharâneh, by reason of the absence of windows in the bays, falls more naturally into the fourth than into the eighth century, and that support is thus lent to Prof. van Berchem’s theory.

35 Tate (G. F.) Seistan, plate to face, p. 136.
THE FARUQI DYNASTY OF KHANDESH.

By Lt.-Col. T. W. Haig, C.M.G.

(Continued from p. 149.)

The peace was not long kept between the imperial troops and the armies of the Dakan. Each side accused the other of bad faith, but there appears to have been some excusable difference of opinion as to the position of the southern frontier of Berar, and the Dakans, who accused the Mughuls of breaking the peace by occupying Pāthri and other places beyond the limits of Berar, attacked some Mughul posts which were unquestionably within that province. The Mughuls could adduce some evidence to show that Pāthri was included in Berar, and there seems to be no doubt that the responsibility for the renewal of hostilities lay with the rulers of Aḥmadnagar, who, having obtained help from Bījāpūr and Golconda, decided to make an attempt to expel the imperial troops from Berar. Ābān Khān of Aḥmadnagar appealed for help to Ibrāhīm 'Adī Shāh II of Bījāpūr, who sent to his assistance a force, well supplied with artillery, under the command of his best officer, the eunuch Suhail Khān. A contingent under Mahdī Quli Khān was also supplied by Muḥammad Quli Qutb Shāh of Golconda, and the allied army of the Dakans, 60,000 strong, marched towards Sonpat on the Godāvari, about fifteen miles from the town of Pāthri. The Khān Khānān, who had his headquarters at Jālna, at once assembled his forces and himself went to Shāhpūr, to inform Sultān Murād of the impending danger. The prince wished to take the field in person but the Khān Khānān, whether from selfish motives or in the interest of the imperial cause, dissuaded him from this course, and himself assumed command of the field force with Shāhrūkh Mīrzā. The imperial army, which mustered no more than 20,000 horse according to Firishta, 26 or 15,000 according to the Akbarnāma, marched to Āshī, to the north of the Godāvari, and there entrenched itself, halting for fifteen days before venturing to attack the enemy. The battle began on Feb. 8, 1597, according to Firishta, and on Feb. 17 according to the Akbarnāma. The various accounts of this extraordinarily complicated battle differ in detail, but agree in all the main particulars, and display the lack of discipline and cohesion in oriental armies. In the army of the Dakan the contingent of Aḥmadnagar occupied the centre, that of Bījāpūr the right, and that of Golconda the left. In the imperial army the Khān Khānān and Shāhrūkh Mīrzā commanded the centre and Rāja 'Alī Khān and Rāja Jagannāth the right and left. As the imperial troops advanced to the attack Suhail Khān opened fire with his artillery and put two or three thousand horse out of action, Rāja 'Alī Khān with thirty of his principal officers and 500 of his men being slain. The two wings of the imperial army were defeated and put to flight, so that many of the men hardly rested until they had reached Shāhpūr, more than a hundred miles distant, where their accounts of the total defeat of the imperial troops so alarmed Sultān Murād and his tutor, Muḥammad Sādiq Khān, that they prepared to retire from Berar. In the meantime the Khān Khānān and Shāhrūkh Mīrzā had not only stood their ground in the centre of the imperial army but had pushed back the army of Aḥmadnagar and captured the Bījāpūr artillery, which they were enabled to do by the disposal of the Bījāpūr contingent who, being assured of victory, and scattered in all directions in search of plunder. The battle had not begun until late in the afternoon, and when night fell the Khān Khānān and Shāhrūkh Mīrzā, with the small force that remained to them, held their ground on the field, while Suhail Khān, who, though he believed the defeat of the imperial army to be complete,
had retained the royal guards of Bijāpūr near his person, bivouacked within a bowshot of the remnant of the Mughuls, neither party being aware of the propinquity of the other until, after a watch of the night was passed, the Bijāpūrīs lit their fires. The Khāñkẖānān then opened fire with his artillery and that which he had captured on Suhail Khān’s position, and at intervals through the night caused the great drums to be beaten, thereby rallying around him many fugitives, so that before the morning he had assembled 4,000 men to oppose to the 12,000 who had gathered round Suhail Khān. During the night the imperial troops, finding no trace of Rāja ‘Alī Khān or his contingent, hastily concluded that he had either fled or deserted to the enemy, and plundered his camp. Accounts of the circumstances in which the battle was renewed in the morning differ. According to one version the Khāñkẖānān refrained from taking the offensive, believing that Suhail Khān would ask for terms, and the Mughuls were attacked by the Dakānis when they went down to the river in the morning to slake their thirst; but according to the other version the Mughuls attacked the enemy with loud shouts before it was light. There is no discrepancy regarding the result of the battle. The Bijāpūrīs were utterly defeated and fled towards Naldrug, Suhail Khān who had been wounded, escaping with difficulty. The contingent of Ahmadnagar and Golconda, which had been put to flight on the previous day and had barely rallied where the Bijāpūrīs were defeated, fled headlong and in sorry case to Ahmadnagar and Haidarābād. Forty elephants and all the artillery of the Dakānis were captured.

When the corpses of Rāja ‘Alī Khān and his valiant contingent were discovered those who had plundered his camp were overwhelmed with confusion, and it would appear that his banner, kettle-drums, and elephants were restored. His body was carried to Burhānpūr and was there buried, with great pomp, in the Daulat Maidān. He was succeeded in Khāndesh by his son Qādir Khān, who assumed and used the title of Bahādur Shāh. The prince bitterly resented the unfounded suspicions of his father’s good faith and the plundering of his camp and, with less wisdom but more honesty than his father, consistently opposed Akbār. Sulṭān Murād sent him congratulations on his accession and invited him more than once to visit him at Shāhpūr, but Bahādur Shāh evaded the invitation on each occasion, urging as his excuse the lack of a suitable force to accompany him,—a sufficiently pointed reference to the losses which his state had suffered by its activity in the imperial cause. He could not, however, refuse Murād’s offer of a contingent of 4,000 horse to be placed under his command, and his proposal to marry a daughter of the Faruqī house, and he gave to the prince a cousin german of his own.

Bahādur’s reign was troubled by dissensions between his amirs, but he was no roi fainéant and usually contrived to follow his own course, which was disastrous to him in the end.

On May 1, 1599, Shaikh Abul Fażl, Akbār’s secretary, who had been appointed to the Dakān, arrived in the neighbourhood of Burhānpūr and was courteously welcomed by Bahādur, who urged him to remain for some time in the city as his guest. Abul Fażl insisted, however, on continuing his march to join Sulṭān Murād, but was delayed by wind and rain and was overtaken by Bahādur Shāh. He took advantage of Bahādur’s forcing his company upon him to urge him to aid in the conquest of the Dakān, but Bahādur temporized and suggested that he should send his son Kabir Khān, with a contingent of 2,000 horse, to join the imperial camp. He again urged Abul Fażl to stay with him in Burhānpūr, but Abul Fażl again declined, saying that he would have acceded to the request had Bahādur agreed to join the imperial army in person. Bahādur then attempted to conciliate Abul
Fażl with gifts, but he declined them on the ground that his imperial master supplied all his needs.

Sulṭān Murād, who had long been drinking heavily, succumbed to the effects of his intemperance before Abul Fażl, whom he was avoiding, could overtake him, and on May 12, 1599, died at Dihārī, on the Purna, of delirium tremens or alcoholic poisoning.

It was at this time that Bahādur for some reason, probably because it had virtually become an imperial city, conceived a dislike to Burhānpūr and resolved to destroy it and to build with its materials a city at a distance of about ten miles from it, which he proposed to name Bahādurpur, but the people of Burhānpūr protested strongly against this proposal. They had no objection, they said, to his building a new city for himself, but objected to the destruction of Burhānpūr, which had been founded in honour of the saint Burhān-al-dīn and bore his name. Bahādur then denied that he had any intention of destroying Burhānpūr, but proceeded with the building of Bahādurpur, beginning with his own palace. When this was completed he assembled Sayyids, amirs, and all the principal men of the state with poets, singers, and ministrels, and gave a great feast.

Sulṭān Dāniyāl, Akbar’s youngest son, was appointed to the Dakan in the place of his brother, Sulṭān Murād, but travelled in a very leisurely manner towards the seat of his new government, and did not reach Burhānpūr until January 1, 1600. After his arrival in Burhānpūr Bahādur Shāh imprudently refused to wait on him or to acknowledge his arrival in any way. Dāniyāl was much enraged, and though he was understood to be marching southwards, under his father’s orders, to besiege Aḥmadnagar, and had already sent order to Abul Fażl to refrain from opening the campaign, which task had been reserved for him, he halted in Burhānpūr and summoned the amirs of Berar to his aid, with a view to punishing Bahādur for his insolence. To all demands for reparation for the insult, which included the payment of an indemnity, Bahādur returned temporizing replies, and Dāniyāl would probably have besieged him in Asirgār, had he not received peremptory orders from his father to continue his march towards Aḥmadnagar. Akbar was himself on the way to the Dakan, and was now at Ujjain. He had intended to spend some time in Mālwa, but on learning of the attitude of Bahādur resolved to march at once to Burhānpūr. In order to appease Dāniyāl and to leave Bahādur a loophole for escape Akbar feigned to believe that Bahādur, having learnt of the emperor’s impending arrival, had scrupled to pay his respects to the prince before paying them to the emperor himself. On Dāniyāl’s leaving Burhānpūr Bahādur sent him a present and sent his son, Kabīr K̲h̲ān, to set him on his way, but when K̲h̲vāja Maudūd arrived at his court, as Akbar’s envoy, to inquire into the circumstances of the slight put upon the prince he found Bahādur immovable. He took the position that it would have been derogatory to him, as a king, to make the first visit to a mere prince and instead of making the offerings which Akbar had expected, both as tribute and as reparation for the slight put upon his son, he sent only four inferior elephants. Akbar sent to Abul Fażl, who was hastening from Berar to join him, orders to visit Bahādur Shāh and to offer him forgiveness on condition of his appearing at court and making his submission, but the mission failed and on April 8, 1600, Akbar arrived before Burhānpūr and on the following day sent K̲h̲ān-i-ʿAṣam and other officers to form the siege of Asirgār. Abul Fażl was appointed governor of Khândesh and sent his brother, Shaiḵ Abul Barakāt, and his son, Shaiḵ ʿAbd-al-Raḥmān, in different directions with troops, to establish the imperial authority in the country. Muṣaffar Ḥusain Mīrzā was sent to Lāling where three of Bahādur’s amirs, Fūlād K̲h̲ān the African, Rūp Rāj, and Malik Shīr, were assembled with their troops.
Fulad Khan submitted, and slew Rup Rai, who attempted to prevent him from deserting, so that all Rup Rai’s elephants and other property fell into the hands of Muazzar Husain Mirza. At the end of May Bahadar attempted to open negotiations with Akbar, sending his grandmother and his young son to the imperial camp with sixty elephants, and promising to give his daughter in marriage to Sultan Khurram, the son of Sultan Salim (Jahangir), but it was evident that these negotiations were only a device to gain time until provisions should become so scarce and dear that Akbar would be obliged to retire, and Bahadar was informed that nothing but unconditional personal submission would be accepted.

On June 21 a force under Qar Baig and other officers captured the Sapan hill, from which the Khandeshis had been able to harass the besiegers of Asirgarh, and the whole of Bahadar’s forces were driven inside the fortress; and on August 13 Malik Shair and the garrison of Laling, who had surrendered to Khvaja Fatallah, were brought to court.

On Sept. 22, further overtures for peace made by Bahadar were rejected, but the siege made slow progress, for many of the imperial officers had received bribes from Bahadar, and Abul Faiz was sent to infuse fresh vigour into its prosecution. The garrison was reduced to great straits, for Bahadar had permitted many refugees from his kingdom, to the number of 18,000, with their horses and cattle, to enter the fortress, and the insanitary conditions arising from the presence of so large a number of people and animals in a confined space were aggravated by the putrefaction of the vast stores of grain which the fortress contained, and a pestilence broke out among men and beasts, so that large numbers perished. The plight of the garrison facilitated the capture of the fort of Maligarh, a large outwork situated to the north-west of the main fort and on the lower slopes of the hill, which fell on Dec. 9.

Bahadar Shauk’s chief anxiety was to escape the disgrace of formally surrendering Asirgarh, but although he had been able to buy many of the officers in the besieging force it was evident that Akbar intended to remain in Khandesh until the fortress fell. It was therefore decided that an attempt should be made to evade the surrender by a stratagem. Bahadar Shauk was to fulfill Akbar’s conditions by appearing before him at Burhanpur, in the hope that the emperor would be content with this formal act of submission on the part of the ruler and would confer the government of Khandesh on him as a vassal, following a common practice in such cases, so that the formal surrender of Asirgarh would be avoided. In the event of this expectation being disappointed it was decided that the fortress should hold out and that Bahadar should avert Akbar’s wrath from himself by representing the garrison as rebels who defied his authority. Accordingly he agreed to wait upon Akbar on condition that the government of Khandesh was bestowed upon him and that he was allowed to release the imprisoned members of the Faruqi family, for it was the custom in Khandesh to imprison all members of the ruling family except the reigning king.

No attempt at regulating the issue of rations in the fortress had been made and discontent was rife, for large numbers of those who had taken refuge there were suffering from scarcity and want. The garrison, learning that Bahadar proposed to desert them, sent a deputation to him to announce that they would not permit him to leave the fortress alone, but would accompany him. At length Sadat Khan, one of the leading amirs, was permitted to go to the imperial camp to arrange preliminaries with the emperor, and carried with him a large quantity of treasure from the fortress to assist him in his negotiations. He was accompanied by his contingent of troops and a large retinue of private servants and turned traitor. Having made terms for himself he entered Akbar’s service and disclosed the state
of affairs in the fortress. Muqarrab Khan was next sent to the imperial camp and, having obtained Akbar’s promise that Bahadur should be maintained in his kingdom, returned to the fortress and persuaded Bahadur to descend to the imperial camp and make his submission. Bahadur left the fortress with the leading men of his army and was received at some distance from Akbar’s camp by the Khan-i-A’jam and by him conducted into the imperial presence. “And that,” says the author of the Zafar-al-Walih, “was the end of his reign over his kingdom and his mountain.”

Bahadur’s stratagem failed, for he soon discovered that Akbar’s promise to maintain him in his kingdom was contingent on the surrender of Asirgarh, and as the fortress continued to hold out the promise was held to be void. From the Akbarnama it would appear that the obstinacy of the garrison was due to secret instructions from Bahadur, but the author of the Zafar-al-Walih gives a different account. He says that among those who remained in the fortress was Malik Yaqut, Muqarrab Khan’s father, who was old and blind, and he assembled in the royal palace in the fortress all the sons of Mubarak Shah and their sons, and said to them, “The fortress is as it was and the garrison is as it was. Which of you will accept the throne and will protect the honour of your fathers?” And not one of them answered him anything, and he said to them, “Would to God that ye were women!” And they excused themselves; and it happened that as he was defending the fortress there came up to it his son Muqarrab Khan with a message from the king, and Malik Yaqut said to his son, “May God not show me thy face. Go down to Bahadur and follow him.” And he went down and obeyed his order, until at length in the assembly of Abul Fazl he stabbed himself in the belly with his dagger, in abasement that his father was not content with him, and he died. But Malik Yaqut Sultan, when he despaired of all the offspring of Mubarak Shah, went out to his house, made his will, bathed himself, and had his shroud brought. Then he summoned his family and went out to the mosque which he had built, and prayed, and distributed benefactions and gave alms, and he caused to be dug a grave in a spot which he desired, and then he ate opium, for his jealous patriotism was strong upon him, and he died and was buried there. And they said, “Search for a text in God’s book,” and this was found, “Say: O my servants who have transgressed to your own hurt, despair not of God’s mercy, for all sins doth God forgive! Forgiving and merciful is He!” May God pardon him and have mercy upon him! Then the people of the fortress were summoned to come down and take assurance, and in accordance with their answer Shaikh Abul Fazl of Dihli went up the mountain and took his seat on the stone platform known as that of Taf’ul Khan, and gave permission to them to descend with their families, and this they did, and the reduction of the fortress in A.H. 1009 (A.D. 1600-01) was attributed officially to Shaikh Abul Fazl.

The beginning of the rule of the Faruqis in Burhanpur was in A.H. 784 (A.D. 1382) and from that date the name of Burhanpur (as applied to the province) was disused, and the province was known from them as Khandesh ("the country of the Khans") of the dependencies of Dihli, and in the reign of Bahadur Shah, son of ‘Adil Shah, after 225 years, the province was again, as formerly, included among the dependencies of Dihli. And the kingdom is God’s, be He praised!

The exact date of the surrender of Asirgarh, as given in the Akbarnama, was January 26, 1601, which may be taken as the date of the extinction of the dynasty founded in 1382 by Raja Ahmad or Malik Raja, and according to the same authority it was not Shaikh Abul Fazl himself, but his son, Shaikh ‘Abd-al-Rahman, who received the surrender of the fortress.
According to Khâfi Khân, the author of the Muntakhab-al-Lubâb, all the treasure of the Fârûqis and much buried treasure of the former Hindù chiefs of Asîrgâr fell into the hands of Akbar’s officers, and in the same work there is an interesting story of a superstition connected with the fortress. It is said that there was a large rock in the Tapti near Burhânpur and that when the city was founded in obedience to the posthumous instructions of the saint Burhân-al-dîn, conveyed through the saint Zain-al-dîn, the latter said that so long as the rock should retain its shape the kingdom should belong to the Fârûqis, but when it assumed the shape of an elephant the kingdom should pass from them. Akbar heard this story, and being impatient for the fall of Asîrgâr, the siege of which was long protracted, employed sculptors to cut the stone into the likeness of an elephant. His action, with the evidence of faith in the old prophecy which it displayed, disheartened Bahâdur and hastened the surrender of the fortress. It is evidently to this circumstance that Firishta refers when he says that the outbreak of sickness in the fortress was attributed by the besieged to the arts of sorcerers employed by Akbar.

The author of the Muntakhab-al-Lubâb also says that the siege of the fortress lasted for nearly four years, beginning in the early part of A.H. 1008 (July-August 1599) and ending at the beginning of A.H. 1012 (June, 1603), but on this point the evidence of the Akbarname, written by Shaikh Abul Fażl, who took part in the siege, and of Firishta and the author of the Zâfar-al-Wâlih, both of whom were contemporaries, while the latter had an intimate personal acquaintance with many of the principal actors, is conclusive.

The author of the Zâfar-al-Wâlih, who was for a time in the service of Fâlâd Khân, one of the amirs of Râja ‘Ali Khân (‘Abd Shâh IV) and Bahâdur Shâh, gives the following character of Bahâdur: ‘In his reign the mighty were humbled and those of low degree were exalted, he who laboured not obtained advancement and he who was honest fell behind; and he divided among low fellows the baser sort the jewels and rich stuffs which his fathers had amassed and collected together all that promoted sensual enjoyment, and all manner of unlawful pleasure became common; and he aroused wrath in the breasts of his father’s ministers, so that they were prepared to welcome even a disaster that might bring peace. Nevertheless there were in Bahâdur some praiseworthy qualities, such as assiduity in alms-giving at fit seasons; and with equal justice he distributed alms to the well-being of those who were in want, and very willingly to Shaikhs and Sûfis who claimed to work miracles, even though these were doubtful. Nor was he without trust in God, and would always say mash’dallâh (‘please God’) when he undertook any business.’

This sketch does not much exalt Bahâdur in our eyes. He was evidently weak, sensual, and strongly tinged with superstition. His petulant and foolish defiance of Akbar was evidence rather of lack of understanding than of strength of character, and he certainly entered upon the undertaking without counting the cost.

Mention has already been made of the Fârûqî princes whom it was the custom of the house to imprison lest the succession should be disturbed, and we have seen that the faithful Malik Yaqût, when Bahâdur left the fortress, assembled these princes and unsuccessfully tried to rouse their spirit by inviting one of them to ascend the vacant throne. The circumstances of their lives had not been such as to foster in them a spirit of enterprise. When the fortress was finally captured over fifty of these unfortunate princes, all of whom sprang from Mubârak Shâh II, the ninth ruler of the line, fell into Akbar’s hands. Their genealogy is as follows.
Mubarak Shah II, died 1566.

I. Muhammad Shah II, died 1576.
   1. Hasan Khan.
      i. Qasim Khan.
      ii. Ibrahim Khan.

II. Raja 'Ali Khan ('Adil Shah IV) died 1597.
      i. Kabir Khan.
      ii. Muhammad Khan.
      iii. Sikandar Khan.
      iv. Mustafar Khan.
      v. Mubarak Khan.
   2. Ahmad Khan.
      i. Mustafar Khan.
      ii. 'Ali Khan.
      iii. Muhammad Khan.
   3. Mumud Khan.
      i. Vali Khan.
      ii. Ibrahim Khan.
   4. Tahir Khan.
   5. Masud Khan.
   7. Daughter married to Vali Khan.
   8. Daughter married to Nasir Khan.

III. Da'ud Khan.
   1. Fatih Khan.
   2. Muhammad Khan.

IV. Hamid Khan.
   1. Bahadur Khan.

V. Qaisar Khan.
   1. Latif Khan.
      i. Habib Khan.
      ii. Ibrahim Khan.
   2. Dilarvar Khan.
   3. Murtaza Khan.

VI. Bahram Khan.
   1. Aadam Khan.
   2. Musa Khan.

VII. Shir Khan.
   1. Ismail Khan.
   2. Ahmad Khan.

VIII. Giazi Khan.
   1. Ahmad Khan.

IX. Darya Khan.
   1. Muhammad Khan.
   3. Mustafar Khan.
X. Sâhib Khan.
   1. Tâhir Khan.
      i. Sikandar Khan.
      ii. Ibâhîm Khan.
   2. Sîdq Allâh Khan.

XI. Daughter married to Farid Khan.
   1. Dilâvar Khan.
      i. Tâj Khan.

In addition to these descendants there were:

1. Muhammad Khan, son-in-law of Chând Khan, whose name does not appear in the genealogy, probably because he was dead, but who was evidently a member of the royal house.

2. 'Ali Khan, son-in-law of Hasan Khan, only son of Muhammad Shâh II.

From this genealogy we learn that the youthful Hasan Khan, son of Muhammad II., was not, as the Zafar-al-Wâlih would lead us to suppose, put to death by his uncle, Râja 'Ali Khan, who supplanted him, but lived to marry and to have a family of at least two sons and a daughter.

The ultimate fate of all these princes is unknown, but according to the Akbarname they were presented to Akbar, who ordered that they should attend regularly at court in order that he might judge of their fitness for advancement.

Firishta, at the conclusion of his account of the rulers of Khândesh, makes one of his few original contributions to history. He tells us 28 that in A.H. 1023 (A.D. 1614) he visited the fort of Asîrgarh in company with Khâja Husain Turbatî, who had held an important post in the service of Sultan Dâniyâl. After describing the fortress, he writes:

'They say that when Akbar Pâdsâh had conquered the fortress and returned to Agra, he, in consequence of his attachment to the ways of the unbelievers, sent orders that the great Friday mosque in the fortress should be destroyed, and an idol temple erected on its site, but Sultan Dâniyâl, who was then in Burhânpur, did not obey the order, and purposely neglected to carry it out, so that it was never given effect to.'

There is no reason to doubt this statement of Firishta. He was a good Muslim and was probably much scandalized by the report of the order which Akbar had issued, but he always writes with the highest respect of Akbar and his natural impulse would have been to conceal a fact so damaging to a great monarch whom all Muslims are anxious to claim as one of themselves, despite his well established unorthodoxy. The order is only one instance out of many, though perhaps the most marked, of Akbar's hostility to Islam.

List of the Faruqi Rulers of Khândesh.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Raja</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Râja Ahmad, or Malik Râja</td>
<td></td>
<td>April 29, 1399.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>'Adîl Khan I.</td>
<td></td>
<td>April 30, or May 4, 1441.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>'Ain Khan ('Ainâ), 'Adîl Khan II., Jhârkhandi Sultan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sep. 28, 1501.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Dâ'ûd Khan</td>
<td></td>
<td>April 1, 150.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>'Adîl Khan III.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aug. 25, 1520.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Muhammad Shâh II.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1576-77.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Asîrgarh captured by Akbar.]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Reign Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nasir Khan</td>
<td>Muhammad</td>
<td>1389-1397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Umar Khan</td>
<td>Nasir Khan</td>
<td>1399-1411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adil Khan</td>
<td>Umar Khan</td>
<td>1411-1441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Muhammad Khan</td>
<td>Adil Khan</td>
<td>1441-1457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Amin Khan</td>
<td>Muhammad Khan</td>
<td>1451-1468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Amin Khan</td>
<td>Adil Khan</td>
<td>1469-1476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Adil Shah</td>
<td>Amin Khan</td>
<td>1477-1479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Husain Khan</td>
<td>Adil Shah</td>
<td>1480-1487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Muhammad Shah</td>
<td>Husain Khan</td>
<td>1488-1496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Amir Khan</td>
<td>Muhammad Shah</td>
<td>1497-1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Husain Shah</td>
<td>Amir Khan</td>
<td>1500-1502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Qutb Khan</td>
<td>Husain Shah</td>
<td>1502-1507</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ON THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE KAUṬILĪYA.

BY HERMANN JACOBI, OF BONN.

(Translated from the German by V. S. Sukthankar, Ph.D.; Poona.)

(Continued from p. 161.)

As is evident from this quotation, by आचार्यां Kauṭilya means his predecessors. And when he introduces a doctrine with the words इति आचार्यां, he must be referring to them all collectively or at any rate to the majority of them, except when he adds इति eke or इति apare, pp. 164, (185) 338. Only in one instance, p. 320, is the meaning of आचार्यां to be restricted to the three oldest schools which will presently be mentioned; because, after quoting the opinion of these आचार्यां, the author proceeds to enumerate the views of the rest of the authorities which differ from them.

The authorities that are actually mentioned by name are of two kinds: the schools and the individual authors; the former indicated by the name in the plural, the latter in the singular. Four schools have been named: the मानवाख, बारहसपताख, अशार्याख and भारदार्श. The first three are connected with each other, because four times (pp. 6, 29, 177, 192) they are quoted one after the other, and once only (p. 69) in connection with the भारदार्श. One may, therefore, conclude that those three were looked upon as the older and the more respected schools and the भारदार्श as a later one. To the same conclusion point the names as well; for, the former are derived from divine persons but the latter only from a राज. These six schools, however, were not exclusively schools of भारदार्श; they dealt with the धर्मसास्त्रa at the same time. For, in the chapter of the Kauṭilya dealing with Administration of Justice (धर्मसास्त्रियa) the above-mentioned three schools have been quoted twice (pp. 177, 192), and the आचार्यां, apare, eke nine times. On the other hand, in many धर्मसास्त्रas as, for example, [889] Bodhāyana, Gautama, Vasiṣṭha, Viṣṇu, Manu, etc., have the duties of the king been laid down. We thus perceive that both subjects, Law and Politics, were intimately connected with each other and probably taught in one and the same school. Therefore a doubt may be entertained as to whether there were any schools exclusively for भारदार्श.

The remaining authorities, which are spoken of in the singular number, namely, भारदार्ख, विशालाख, पिनाख, कामपदाख, वातवाख, and बाहुदार्श, must refer to individual authors. For, if these persons had also been looked upon as founders of schools, then like इति भारदार्ख, also इति ब्राह्मदार्ख ought to have been said; but we invariably find only the singular इति भारदार्ख. This difference of nomenclature makes it clear that Kauṭilya distinguished between schools and individual authors.

A close examination of the passages in which the later authorities have been named reveals a remarkable fact, namely, that they invariably occur in the order given above with the भारदार्ख standing behind विशालाख. On one occasion (pp. 13 ff.) the whole series is enumerated; three times (pp. 321, 320-322, 325-323), the first six members; once (pp. 27 ff.) only the first four; and once (p. 380) only the first two. In two passages (pp. 320 ff., 325 ff.) Kauṭilya refutes them one after the other in succession; in the remaining places the refutation of each author is attributed to the next following. The idea that the sequence is meant to be chronological, which lies near at hand, must be abandoned after a close scrutiny of the first-named places. On pp. 320 ff. is discussed the relative value of the seven prakṛtis: सुर्य, आदित्य, जनपद, दुर्ग, कौ, दास्यa and mitra. According to the आचार्यां, their importance diminishes in the order given above. On the
contrary Bhāradvāja exchanges the places of 1 and 2, Viśālaṅkaḥ of 2 and 3, the Pārśārāha of 3 and 4, and so on right through the series. In the other passage (pp. 325 ff.) the discussion is about the three kopajāh and the four kāmājā dosāh; Bhāradvāja looks upon the kāmājā dosāh as more heinous than the kopajāh; Viśālaṅkaḥ, the second kopajā as worse than the first; the Pārśārāha, the third worse than the second; and in the same way the kāmājā dosāh are gone through maintaining the same stereotyped sequence of authors, and the same fixed scheme. The question whether the historical development could have taken place in this manner, according to an unalterable programme, need not be seriously discussed. That Kautūliya had not meant the series to be a chronological one, can besides be demonstrated in another way. For, according to it, Bhāradvāja ought to be the oldest author. Now Bhāradvāja attacks (p. 253) a doctrine that is explicitly attributed to Kautūliya and is subsequently [840] refuted by the latter. Bhāradvāja should accordingly have been not the oldest but the most modern author, and besides a contemporary of Kautūliya himself! Probably the serial sequence expresses the degree of estimation which Kautūliya entertained in regard to the respective predecessors, and Bhāradvāja stood in the eyes of Kautūliya the lowest in the scale. Kautūliya utilised, as is absolutely certain in two cases and more or less probable in the remaining, the names of his predecessors for staging an imaginary controversy as a means of enlivening his discourse! This solitary artifice strikes one as something extraordinary in a manual of instruction otherwise so sober and pertinent. It was the first step towards an artistic representation that was taken by a great writer and that remained without issue. Such liberty could be taken by a great master; it would be something unheard of in the case of a pedagogue.

From the data of the Kautūliya we can infer regarding the development of the Arthasastra that it was at first cultivated and handed down in schools and that subsequently individual authors wrote on the subject. This evolution was already completed before the time of Kautūliya, whose work bears the stamp of a strong individuality, both as regards the form and the contents. This same development, first only a scholastic tradition and then individual productions, may be demonstrated also for the Kāmāśāstra, which, as was shown above 1911, p. 962, belongs to the same literary category as the Arthasastra. Thus, if we except the mythical founder of the Kāmāśāstra, Nādin, the attendant of Siva, and the semi-legendary author Svetaketu, son of Uddālaka, then the first writer on Kāmāśāstra, whose work was known to and [841] used by Vātsyāyana, according to his own testimony (pp. 6

---

\[ 1 \] Vātsyāyana mentions, pp. 78 f., a doctrine of Audālaki; the commentary also one on p. 77, and p. 86 assigns a verse to him. Further, p. 4, the commentary quotes two verses according to which Audālaki did away with the promiscuity of wives and with the consent of his father composed, as an ascetic, the Kāmāśāstra (sūkhaṃ śīstram). Audālaka sets forth Bhār. Ār. VI. 4, 2 ff., the doctrine of rite secundum and teaches the use of two mantras from which a man was permitted to have sexual relation with any woman during her menses. There must have thus actually existed a certain promiscuity of wives. We ought also perhaps to interpret the story of Jabalā and her son Śatyaśākama, Chand. Up. IV. 4, 2 in the same way (and not as rendered by Deussen that Jabalā in her youth knocked about a good deal working as a maid-servant). According to Mbh. I. 122, Svetaketu did away with the promiscuity of wives, because he was indignant at seeing that a strange Brahman should actually avail himself of the right which his father (theoretically) recognised. From what tradition has to report concerning the father and son, it is therefore explicable why the composition of a Kāmāśāstra was attributed to Svetaketu. Nor do I wish to question the fact that doctrines relating to the Kāmāśāstra were current under his name. In this connection it may be mentioned that Āpastamba I. 5, 14 ff. counts Svetaketu among the modern authors, Jolly, Recht und Sute, p. 3 (Grundris).
was Bāhavravya Pāṇḍula. Now it is very remarkable indeed that Vātsyāyana quotes the Bābhaviyās four times (pp. 70, 96, 247, 303). The conclusion is that here we have a school in which the doctrines of its supposed or actual founder, Bābhavrya Pāṇḍula, were traditionally handed down. The rest of the authorities named by Vātsyāyana, treat of the seven parts of the Kāmaśāstra severally, which cannot therefore be looked upon as products of distinct schools. For, it is indeed not possible to assume that there ever existed distinct schools which had specialised only in subjects like the Science of Courtesans, Seduction of a Maiden or Intercourse with Prostitutes. The respective works are, as Vātsyāyana himself unequivocally states, written by definite individuals:
Dattaka, Cāriya, Suvarṇābhā, Ghotakamukha, Gonardiya and Kucumāra. As was shown above, 1911, p. 959, note 2, Ghotakamukha and Cāriya are also mentioned in the Kaūṭīya and Gonardiya in the Mahābhāsya. As out of the above-named authors Dattaka is, according to Vātsyāyana, the oldest and had been commissioned by the courtesans of Pañaliputra to write his work, therefore he must have lived, as I have stated in the above-cited place, at the earliest in the second half of the fifth century b.c.: for Pañaliputra became the capital of Magadha only in the middle of that century. It clearly follows, therefore, that individual authors had begun writing on the subject already in the fourth century B.C.  

Vātsyāyana himself finally being the last author is now to be considered. Vātsyāyana is the gotra name, the personal name is Mallanaga (Com. p. 17: Vātsyāyana iti svagotrānimitā samākhyā, Mallanaga iti śāntakārikā). Already Subandhu calls the author of the Kāmaśūtra Mallanaga, (p. 89) to which passage the commentator adds a quotation from the Viśvukṣa. The personal name renders it indubitable that the Kāmaśūtra is not the work of a school but that of an individual writer. Moreover, Vātsyāyana was the regenerator of the Kāmaśūtra, which in his time was utsanakapam, all but extinct. That he is much later than Kautilya, I have shown above, 1911, pp. 962-3, foot-note 1; he can scarcely be prior to the third century A.D.

1 To the reasons already adduced for assuming a considerable difference in point of time between Kautilya and Vātsyāyana may be added that the latter looked upon abstinence from meat diet as meritorious (māyābhaṣaṇaḥ abhyāsāḥ, āśirvad eva nirdaṇghaḥ dharmaḥ, p. 12), while in Kautilya's time there was no such thing. In the sāndhyākṣa a number of animals are named which should not be slaughtered (especially in the abhayacanas), but meat diet was not tabooed. For, otherwise Kautilya would not give rules regarding the sale of meat, e.g., “only the flesh of freshly slaughtered animals and cattle (catturāṣṭāṃd) should be sold, and it should be devoid of bones; the bones ought to be compensated with meat of the same weight. No animal should be sold of which the head, feet and bones have been severed, which has an offensive smell or had fallen dead.” The disinclination towards meat-eating has been on the increase since very early times. In the time of Brahmanas some already forbade beef; while, on the other hand, Yājñavalkya raises no objection to tender beef, Śatapatha Brāhmaṇ III 1. 2. 21; in later times many Brahman asetics were converted to complete vegetarianism. The motive power in this movement appears to be the duty of ahīṃsā imposed upon the fourth Āśrama, kṣemā parivartanā (also in Kautilya, p. 8: apateṁ ahīṃsād). Buddhists and Jainas raised the ahīṃsā, though not at the outset, still with certainty in later times, to a general religious commandment. Asoka's example and edicts must have exercised the most powerful influence. In the Mahābhārata occurs a polemic against animal sacrifice and the recommendation of vegetable sacrifice as a substitute for it. The prohibition of meat-eating follows naturally the abstinence from killing. In India extreme principles become established in the long run: the more stringent rule appears to be the more correct one: the Indians fight shy of cultivating lax habits. An important rôle was played in these matters probably by the women. Do they not appear even nowadays as the guardians of the orthodox tradition, though the men might be prepared to renounce it ?
The transition from the scholastic treatment of a ‘discipline’ to its presentation in literary works, which we can follow in equal measure in two separate subjects, was caused probably by the growth of these sciences, which rendered their separate treatment and specialisation inevitable. Simultaneously a change in the form of its presentation must have set in. While those text-books which were the products of schools, such as the śrauta-, dharma-, grhyasūtras, the two Mīmāṃsā sūtras, exhibit the śūtra style, the works of individual authors such as Yāska’s Nirukta, Patañjali’s Mahābhāṣya, Vātsyayana’s Kāmasūtra (in spite of its designation as sūtra) are of a different type. By the side of dogmatic exposition discussion comes more and more into prominence. The sūtra style changes into the bhashya style. The Kauṭiliya has also its place in these stages of development: alongside of sections in which the author attempts the shortness of the sūtras, there are others where the author indulges in a certain amount of breadth and prolixity after the manner of the Bhashyas. In point of fact the author of an old Tikā on Kāmandaki’s Nītisāra (pp. 136 and 138) designates the Kauṭiliya as Kauṭalyabhāṣya and an anonymous ārya of unknown origin added at the end of the Kauṭiliya says:

If then our Kauṭiliya is the Bhashya and we know nothing about another work, a Sūtra, of Kauṭiliya, nor can we even imagine what that Sūtra should be like, to which the Kauṭiliya could stand in the relation of a Bhashya, it appears to me that the above statement that Viśṇugupta himself is the author of a Sūtra and a Bhashya must be interpreted to mean that the Kauṭiliya is at once Sūtra and Bhashya. It would not be, for that matter, the only instance of a Bhashya that was not a commentary to any Sūtra: another example is the Prāñastapādabhāṣya, which is an entirely independent treatise on the Vaiśeṣika system and in no sense a commentary on the Sūtra of Kaṇāda. The designation Bhashya for those kinds of works did not, however, come into vogue, as we see that Vātsyayana on the contrary gives the title Kāmasūtra to his work.\(^9\)

Generally speaking it must be emphasised that the free exposition of the sciences in the form of literary works does not import a complete breakdown of the primeval institution of the Vedic school. People may have adhered to the old method in Vedic ‘disciplines’ and others similar to these, and given that method a scholastic turn, conformable to the particular subject in hand, in the case of others. The first might have been the case with the two

---

8 For the age of the Upādhyāyanirapakṣa Tikā, from which the editors have given in the Bibl. Ind. extracts with their own additions (see bhūmika, p.1), the fact that the author calls Vātsyāyana aṃmadāyaṃ appears to be decisive (p. 136 where he quotes a passage from the Kāmasūtra, p. 3 of the edition). This statement could not very well have been smuggled into the text by the editors. On the other hand the quotations from Kullukaballa to Manu, VIII. 155-157 on pp. 211 ff., from Sāhityadarpaṇa (III. 146 f.) on p. 278, from Mūdrārākṣasa, p. 223 (cited according to a printed edition of the drama!) are undoubtedly additions by the respective editors: arthaprakāśārtham.

9 The spelling Kauṭiliya is rendered certain through the derivation of the name from kuta (kutāth kumbhāhānyāḥ = kutānā ṛṣiḥ); com. to Kāmandaki 1. 2 and Hemacandra Abhidhānasa. III. 517 com. Does perhaps the form Kauṭiliya rest on a popular etymology? Kauṭiliya denotes ‘falsity, cunning’ and, in the tradition, that is just the prominent characteristic of Cāṇakya, cf. the stories about him in the Pareṣṣārpaṇa, VIII. 194 ff., particularly 352-376, as also the Mūdrārākṣasa.

10 The case is quite different with the use of the designation sūtra with the Jainas and Buddhists. They were influenced by the religious literature of the Brahmanas. The name āyā for the oldest portions of the Jaina canon shows that most clearly; for it the redāygos had evidently served as model.
Mimāṃsās, of which it was noted above that both the alleged authors quote each other. For, as the exegesis of the Vedas, theoretically dealt with in the Pārva-Mimāṃsā, was developed in the schools of the Srauta-Sāstra and followed in practice, it is probable that the scholastic method of the latter was introduced into the former. Later the Uttara-Mimāṃsā followed in the wake of the older branch.

With the Vedic schools should not be confounded the academic schools, even though the latter were moulded after the pattern of the former. We shall elucidate the difference by a reference to the later philosophic schools, about which we are better informed. A philosophical system must have been originally the vigilantly guarded property of a school; for, as in accordance with the Indian custom the disputant that was vanquished in public disputation had to acknowledge the victor as his guru, it was disadvantageous that the train of thought of any disputant should be known beforehand to his antagonist. At a later stage of development when the knowledge of the system could no longer be kept secret, there took place the composition of the respective Sāstras. Here we find the actual authors mentioned by name in the case of the Vaiśeṣika—and Nyāyadarsana: Kañciḍa the Kāśyapa for the former, and Aksāpada the Gotama for the latter. Now the interpretation of the Sūtra became the task of the school, while, on the other hand, in the case of the Vedic school it consisted in its traditional preservation. When therefore ultimately the exegetical activity of the school results in a written exposition in the form of a Bāṣya, the science acquires a standing independent of a school exclusively devoted to it; henceforth its cultivation lies mostly in the hands of Pandits who do not form a corporate school in the original sense. It may be that the scheme roughly sketched here has to be modified in details in regard to other ‘disciplines’; but in every case one may assume the following three stages: 1. during the initial stages of development of a ‘discipline’, its existence is bound up with the school or schools devoted to it; 2. through the composition of the Sūtra a certain amount of completion is attained and the activity of the school is, in the first place, directed towards the interpretation of the Sūtra but is incidentally also concerned with supplementing the material contained in it; 3. the composition of the Bāṣya ushers in the dissolution of the school as such, in place of which steps in the scholastic and scientific study. It may here be added that eventually the Sūtra becomes a purely

11 For a science the living tradition is naturally of great importance in India. But it does happen that the agama becomes extinct and is subsequently revived. So Bhartṛhari appends at the end of the second book of the Vākyapadīya a résumé of the history of grammatical studies up to his own time. He relates among other things how the study of the Mahābhāṣya, which then existed only in manuscript, was revived by the Ācārya Candrapāṇi and others (B. Liebich, Das Datum Candragominus und Kaṇāda, p. 7). Also similarly, as Prof. Von Sīcherstānkī informs me, the study of the ancient Nyāya in Sūtras, Bāṣya, Vārttika and Tātparya-ālika has been brought into vogue again in our time through the editions of these works, after being supplanted for centuries by the Tattvavācta-income and the literature connected with it.

12 One of the most modern schools that we know of, that of the Dhvani-doctrine has gone through the three stages set forth above in barely a century, see my remarks in ZDMG., vol. 56, pp. 403 ff. (pp. 14 ff. of the off-print). Through the Dhvanyāloka the Dhvani-doctrine became the common property of the Pandits; from that time forward one can speak of a Dhvani-school only in the figurative sense of māndūka-māndūka. In the grammatical school of Pāṇini the activity of the individual authors appears to have attained great importance already in the second phase. The case of the medical schools may again have been quite different; if, that is, we might believe in the intimations of the Upamitabhavaprāśakā Kathā, pp. 1210 ff., a medical school was constituted through the pāṭha of a Sanshita.
literary form, especially when its author writes simultaneously also a commentary; this took place when the sciences detached themselves entirely from the school proper.

We have set forth the foregoing reflections regarding the different kinds of schools in India in order to clear up the point whether the Kauñšīliya could be the product of a school. If such were the case, we ought to expect a Sūtra-work, as, however, the Kauñšīliya is not a Sūtra but rather a Bhāṣya, which designation is also expressly given to it by an ancient author; therefore the work is presumably that of an individual author, as shown by many a peculiarity, material and formal, which has come to our notice in the course of our inquiry. We must now investigate if there is reason for doubting the common Indian tradition that Kauñšīliya himself is the author of the work under discussion.

In the first place, it must be emphasised that, as already shown by Hillebrandt, throughout the Indian middle ages Kauñšīliya was with one accord looked upon as the author of the Arthaśāstra under reference. I single out only the evidence of Daṇḍin, who places in the mouth of a character in the Daśakumārīca. Chap. VIII, the words: iyam (scil. daṇḍinathī) idāṁ uśāraya-Vivaraṇopadeśa Māuryārthe saṁbhāśaṃ uśārasāraḥ samvita-ipta; here with is the time, the author, purpose, extent of the work most definitely given, in complete accordance with the data of the Kauñšīliya itself. The passages in which the facts in question are given are, in addition to the opening sentence of the work quoted above verbatim, the last verse of I 1, of II 10, and the last three verses at the very end of the work. The first question is: whether these verses may not be later additions. This supposition is impossible in the case of the end verses of I 1 and II 10. For were we to strike off these verses, then those chapters would lack the usual metrical conclusion. There is in the Kauñšīliya (as in the Kāmasūtra) the rule that every chapter must end with at least one verse.13 Further, as regards the three verses at the end of the work, it is well-known that that is the place where authors give information about themselves and their work; it must be specially emphasised that the Kāmasūtra, which in other respects also agrees in outward form with the Arthaśāstra, ends with eight verses containing information about the work, the sources, the author, the purpose and the justification. Lastly, the introductory words, which, indeed, do not contain Kauñšīliya’s name, cannot be dispensed with and find besides their parallel in the Kāmasūtra, where similarly, before the enumeration of the Prakaraṇas, but in greater detail, the relation of the work to its sources has been set forth. Accordingly the expunging of the doubtful passages would result in gaping blanks; the amputation is therefore not feasible.

Let us now examine the contents of the above passages. The introductory words say that the contents of the works of all previous masters have been compressed in the Arthaśāstra before us. If the Kauñšīliya were the product of a school it would have in that case appealed to the tradition of the school itself and not to older teachers, who would be looked upon as the leaders of rival schools. The wording of this passage points thus to an individual author, independent of every school. The same follows from the end verse of I 1, which reads as follows:

sukhagrahāṇaśauṭiyām tattvārthapadanisācitam!
Kauñṣīliyenā kṛtām śāstraṃ vimuktagranthavistaram ||

13 Only an apparent exception to this rule is XIV 1, where a mantra in prose follows the last verse; for, this mantra is probably a gloss intended to supplement the agnimantra mentioned in that verse. Otherwise when mantras are laid down (XIV 3), the directions for use are always appended to them introduced by the words: durya prayogaḥ. There are no such directions in this instance.
"Kauṭilya has composed this manual easy to understand and to study; exact as regards subject, ideas and words; free from prolixity." These appear to be the words of the author of a book intended for self-instruction. A text-book intended for the use of schools does not need to be sukhaṣṭādaśa viśeṣa; the teacher, the school is concerned with its exposition.

The second verse runs:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{śaṃsārastra}yā ṣaṃkramaṇa pravagam upalabhya ca \\
\text{Kauṭilyena narendra-rāthe śāsanasya vidhiḥ kṛṣṇa}
\end{align*}
\]

"After scrutinising all Śāstras and with due regard to practice, Kauṭilya has formulated these instructions concerning documents for the benefit of kings." This verse refers only to the particular chapter śāsanādāhikāra; Kauṭilya claims special credit for it, probably as this subject was either not dealt with at all before him or at any rate not dealt with sufficiently well. The personal note is here unmistakable. Would a school compiler boast of having provided for the wants of a king?

The verses at the end of the work read:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{evaṃ śāstraṃ idam yuktam etāhīs tantrayuktibhiḥ} \\
\text{avāpyau pālane cokta m lokapāsyā parasya ca} \\
\text{dharmam arthaḥ ca kāmaḥ ca pravarayati pāti ca} \\
\text{[ 847 ] adharmānarthavivideśān idam śāstraṃ nihanti ca} \\
\text{yena śāstra ca śāstra ca Nandarāja-gatā ca bhūk} \\
\text{amarṣevo'dhārtyāy āyī tāna śāstraṃ idam kṛṣṇa}
\end{align*}
\]

Thus has this Śāstra that leads to the acquisition and preservation of this and the other world been set forth along with these methodic concepts. This Śāstra brings about and protects Justice, Prosperity and Enjoyment and also dispels Injustice, Detriment and Displeasure. This manual has been composed by him who quickly and angrily rescued at once the Science, the Art of War and the Earth that had passed to the Nanda King."

The first of these three verses refers to the last chapter (concerning methodic concepts) and to the first words of the book: pṛthivīa lābhe pālane ca. The second verse promises the attainment of the trivarga to him who knows this Śāstra, as is done in a similar way, in partly identical words in the Kāmasūtra, p. 370: dharmam arthaḥ ca kāmaḥ ca, etc. Lastly, the end verse tells us, with surpassing conciseness, who the author is, not through the specification of his name, which had occurred already twice, but through the recounting of his distinguished services. That is not self-praise: they are the words of a man who stands at the pinnacle of his fame. But in spite of his self-consciousness, which is not veiled by any sham modesty, one does feel in the words of the Chancellor of Candragupta a certain amount of courteous consideration in so far that he does not specify the name of the master whom he has raised to the throne; for, it might in this connection have called forth his disfavour. Kāmandaika, on the other hand, who could glorify the great master irrespective of any such consideration, praises as his work the overthrow of the Nandas and the raising to the throne of Candragupta, each in one stanza (I. 4. 5). If some one in later times had added a praśasti to the book, it would surely have been a lengthy eulogium like Kāmandaika's.—What the words amarṣevo 'dhārtyāy āyī in the last verse referred to the Arthaśāstra imply, deserves to be discussed more fully. Amaṃsa is, taking
it in its widest sense, the irritation caused by the conduct of the opponent; 14 the primary meaning of *uddhāta* is something like "restoring to its rights" and is according to its object to be translated differently: with reference to the Science it may be rendered with something like "reform." The sense of Kauṭilya's words very probably is that he [848] is vexed over the narrow-mindedness of his predecessors, and that he has without a moment's hesitation (āśu) thrown overboard their dogmatism; it implies the sense of contempt in which the "Professors" are held by the statesmi-... which even Bismareck was at no pains to conceal. This standpoint of Kauṭilya finds expression in his work, on the one hand in the frequent rejection of the doctrines of the ācāryas, on the other hand, in the admittance of important matters into the Śāstra which his predecessors did not deal with there, but which in a serviceable hand-book of Politics could not very well be left out. The agreement obtaining between the words of Kauṭilya and the character of his work, and the personality that characterises them would be difficult to understand, if those were not the very words of the author. A later writer who wanted to palm off his own lucubration or that of his school on the name of the famous statesman, would surely have faltered somewhere. From this view-point the higher criticism must acknowledge the authenticity of the Kauṭilya.

Many will perhaps find it difficult to bring themselves to believe in the authenticity of the Kauṭilya for the reason that literary forgeries have been in India the order of the day from time immemorial on an extensive scale. For is it not a forgery when a work is given out as revealed (*prakta*) by Manu, Yājñavalkya, Vyāsa or some god or Rṣi? But a forgery in the name of a historical personality with studied adaptation of the work on that of the latter would be no longer a *pia frausa* but a refined imposture, which has no counterpart in the Indian method. For this case would be quite different from that when, for instance, some tractate or commentary is attributed to Saṅkarā through the putting down of his name at the end of the chapter; the Kauṭilya is a masterly product of the highest rank and recognised as such through a long series of centuries. He who could write such a work must have suffered from a morbid lack of self-consciousness, were he to send it out into the world under the name of another in order to assure its recognition.—Another mis-statement commonly made by authors in India is one which is rather a *suppresso veri* than a direct falsification, and consists in the publishing of the work under the name of the patron who brought about the composition, more or less influences or even supervises it, instead of under that of the author himself; a well-known instance is that of the works going under the name of Bhoja, king of Dhārā. Such an origin is impossible in the case of the Kauṭilya on account of the way explained above in which Kauṭilya looks upon the composition of the work as a personal achievement; and even if such were the case, the question of the age of the work would not be affected by it. On the other hand, I do not wish [849] to dispute that Kauṭilya may have had collaborators for certain parts of his work, especially for such as deal with technical details; officers engaged in the respective branches of administration may have supplied the material and he may have only attended to its editing. A similar state of things may be observed elsewhere, for example, in the commentary of

14 Compare the definition in the Rasagaṇḍhatara, p. 88: *parakṣyāydvaidhāndānāparādhajanyo maunayeḻkarṣuṇyi-dikāraṇābhadāv cītavṛttiśeṣe 'marṣaḥ'. Similarly already in Bharata, p. 89: *amaṃga namā vidyāśevaradhanaśabādēśeṣe 'pamānilasaṇya vā samut-padyate*. These definitions are applicable primarily to poems and dramas.
Arjunavarmadeva to the Amarakusa, in which one believes to be in a position to distinguish between the words of the princely author and the learned disquisitions of his Pandits. But even this reservation does not vitiate the authenticity of the Kautšiṣya.

Lastly, one might hesitate to accept the fact that just the Kautšiṣya should survive as the only literary monument of those early times, for which the "habent sua fata libelli" would offer no satisfactory explanation. I too do not look upon its preservation merely as a matter of an unexpected, lucky chance, but would emphasise that epoch-making works of master-minds, to which category the Kautšiṣya undoubtedly belongs, have this advantage over other merely creditable productions that they do not get antiquated but, on the contrary, attain the dignity of a canon. Similarly out of a slightly older epoch has been preserved the Nirukta of Yāska, and from slightly more modern times the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali. The high esteem in which these works are held protects them not merely from the tooth of time but also from the hand of the meddlesome interpolator. In the latter respect was the Kautšiṣya further protected through the enumeration of the Prakāśas contained in it and the specification of its extent like similar data in the Kāmasūtra also. We have, therefore, a certain guarantee for the fact that our text has not undergone any considerable addition; whether any curtailment has taken place will be revealed by a critical study of the work.

The outcome of our investigation is, on the one hand, that the suspicion against the authenticity of the Kautšiṣya is unfounded, and, on the other, that the unanimous Indian tradition according to which the Kautšiṣya is the work of the famous minister of Candragupta, is most emphatically confirmed through a series of internal proofs.

---

VĀTSYĀYANA AND KĀLIDĀSA.

In Act IV of the Śāktatāta Kālidāsa has got the famous verse, Svābhāvāna gurān, etc. Kāyapa in this verse advises Śāktatāta as to how she should behave herself in her husband's house. The third foot of the verse bhāyīśha bhava daksinā parijāne bhogeshu = anutekini is rather interesting as it clearly shows that Kālidāsa was indebted to Vātsyāyana for the idea and language of this passage. A lady who is ekā-charita must possess according to Vātsyāyana, among other qualities, bhogeshu anutekhi and parijāne daksināyum (Kāmasūtra, IV, 1, 39-40). This similarity of language and idea seems to be a clear proof of Kālidāsa's borrowing from Vātsyāyana.

In the third foot of the verse from the Śāktatāta quoted above, according to some reading we get bhāygesha instead of bhogeshu. In the light of the Kāmasūtra it would be now justifiable to alter bhāygesha into bhogeshu once for all.

Accepting Prof. Jacob's theory that the third century A.D. should be fixed as the date of Vātsyāyana, the same period should also be now put down as the lower limit of the date of Kālidāsa.

N. G. MAJUMDAR.

---

15 It may further be emphasised here that in the latter classical period there was no longer any certain tradition concerning the pre- and early classical writers and that therefore they could not be distinguished in that period. Thus the lexicographers (Trikāyaśāstra, II 385 f., Abhidhānābhikṣaṇi, III 517 f.) identify the following writers with Kautšiṣya: both the Vātsyāyanas (Mallaṅga and Pakjīlarāman), Drāmila and Aṅgula. Is it perhaps due to this confounding of Vātsyāyana with Kautšiṣya that the commentator to the Kamandakīya, as remarked above p. 19), note 8, calls the author of the Kāmasūtra asmadguru?

16 The above article of Prof. Hermann Jacob appeared in the Sitzungsberichte der königlich Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1912, No. XXXVIII.
NOTES AND QUERIES.

SPREAD OF HOBSON-JOBSON IN MESOPOTAMIA.

The war has naturally brought about a new crop of Hobson-Jobsonisms and corruptions of English and European languages which are beginning to be reported and are worth collecting from the commencement for the sake of future students of philology.

Mr. Edmund Candler, the representative of the British Press in Mesopotamia, is responsible for those contained in the following extracts taken from a letter published in the (London) Observer on the 12th May 1918.

A.—Hobson-Jobsonisms.

1. Imshi. Imperative of Ar. verb mash, to go: go, get out. To vanish, a vanisher (one who vanishes). "There was a small port on the Euphrates where the villagers were called ‘imshis’ by the British rank and file. The word, with its Djinn-like [Ar. jinni, generic term for supernatural beings of darkness] suggestion of disappearance, is very apt."

2. Makoo. Contracted form of Ar. mi yakin, it is becoming nothing. There is none, not to be had, out of stock. "I only know of one instance in which ‘makoo’ has been applied to an individual, and that is Makoo Effendi—[Mr. Never has], a picturesque dignified old gentleman, a sort of general factotum, contractor and agent, whom we have inherited from the Turk. He stands with the palms of his hands turned up and resting on his hips, his eyes fixed on the far horizon empty of hope, the personification of ‘makoo’. ‘If you talk about work,’ said a subaltern to me, ‘he falls all of a tremble and spins out ‘makoo’ by the yard.’"


4. Marionette. Ar. mandrat, a turret: the minarets of a mosque. "The other day I heard a corporal talking about the ‘domes and marionettes of Baghdad.’"

B.—Corruptions of European words.

1. Sham din dafar. Fr. chemin-de-fer: a railway. "An Arab asked me the other day where the new ‘shemin duffer was going to be.’"

2. Sataronbil, terumbil. An automobile, motor car. "The men of the desert call our motors ‘tronbilla’ or ‘terumbilla,’ a truly onomatopoeic word."

3. Antika. Any ‘antique.’ "The urohin who holds out a faked curio at Babylon asks you to buy an ‘antica.’ " [This is an old expression in the Near East through the Italian antica. The Editor heard it used continually in the bazaar in Cairo 50 years ago. The expression used in enquiries then was usually, and tak kaha antica? Is there any antique with you? Have you any ancient gems?].

4. Kuntrachi. A contractor. Fr. contrat and Turki chi, an agent, a handler. "The contractor is the ‘kontrakchi’ (contrat and chi, the Turkish termination that implies agent). [Cf. masch aleh, the ‘lamp man,’ the ‘male kitchen-maid,’ or ‘tweenie’ of the Anglo-Indian household: lit. the man who handles the lamps (properly torches, masch al).—Ep.]."

5. Damful. To deceive. "At Aden I hear the Arabs have coined a verb from an English expletive, ‘damful,’ which is conjugated in all its moods and tenses. ‘I damful you’ [damfaltuk], ‘you damful me’ [damfaltani], with the Arab inflection.”

6. Finish. To finish, end, be done for. "It has spread from Basrah to Samarra and to the remotest villages of the desert. A familiar greeting from the Arabs as we went up the Tigris was ‘Turk finish,’ and it was always accompanied with an eloquent gesture of finality.”

R. C. TEMPLE.
HAVING formulated our hypothesis let us proceed to examine a few legends which clearly refer to pre-Mussulman times. In the History of Gujerat we read that the Brahmins of Sind refused to become Shrimāl Brahmanas. "The angry Sindh Brahmanas in their own country worshipped the sea. At their request Samudra sent the demon Sarika to ruin Shrimāl. Sarika carried off the marriageable Brahman girls. . . . Shrimāl became waste. . . . When they heard that the Shrimāl Brahmanas had returned to their old city and were prospering, the Brahmanas of Sind once more sent Sarika to carry away their marriageable daughters. One girl, as she was being haled away, called on her house-goddess and Sarika was spell-bound to the spot. King Shripunj came up and was about to slay Sarika with an arrow when Sarika said "Do not kill me. . . . let your Brahmanas at their weddings give a dinner in my honour and let them also marry their daughters in unwashed clothes. . . . On this Sarika fled to Sind. And in her honour the people both of Shrimāl and of Jodhpur still marry their daughters in unwashed clothes."

This extract clearly indicates that in Sind the orthodox Hindus had given up the worship of celestial deities and were water worshippers. It is true the sea is specified but the connotation is vague. Even Punjabi Mahomedans to this day call the Indus the "sea".

That the crocodile was demoniac may be gathered from the strange lycanthropic tale incorporated in the Mahābhārata. Arjun was roving through Western India in search of adventure and had apparently reached the lakes of the Lower Indus flood plain. "Dragged by the renowned Arjuna to the land, that crocodile became a beautiful damsel . . . .

"Who art thou, O beautiful one? What for hast thou been a ranger of the Waters?"

. . . . The damsel replied, saying, "I am, Oh mighty armed one, an Apsara sporting in the celestial woods. I am, Oh mighty one, Varga by name." . . . . and then she describes how she and four others (dear to Kuvera), Sauravaya, Samichi, Vudonda and Latā, tempted a Brahman, who cursed them. "Becoming crocodiles range ye the waters for a hundred years. . . . An exalted individual will drag ye all from the water to the land. Then ye will have back your real forms."

Now this tale is pure lycanthropy and is all the stranger because this form of magic is so rare in India. The name of the leader of the Apsaras, Varga, is to be noted. One must assume that the Beast, the terror of the jungle, the incarnation of foul murder, is not in Sind either the panther (Marathi wāgh), or the tiger (Sk. vyāghra), but the crocodile (Sis. wāgho). In Europe the Beast was the wolf (Norse vargr, Saxon varag) and from the terror inspired by its ferocity was evolved the whole conception of the werewolf. In Sind the Beast was eventually lost in an all-embracing Hinduism. A curious parallel of absorption in Catholic Christianity will be found in the most holy miracle, which St. Francis worked when he converted the very fierce wolf of Agobio.

---

3 Little Flowers of St. Francis, ch. XXI. For the terror inspired by the crocodiles among the Jews, see Job, ch. 41 R.V.
Does the mythical ‘makara’ represent the contribution of Brahmanical Sind to Catholic Hinduism? One Puranic legend, quoted in the History of Gujerat, refers to the conquest of Mayuradwaja of Gujerat by Makaradhvaja of Sind. This fight is considered to represent the contest in which the Mers from Sind, as allies of the Huns, overthrew the Gupta viceroy of Kathiawar. It is significant that the Mers fought under so repellent a standard.

What the classical idea of the Makara was may be gathered from the gloss incorporated in Sir William Jones’ translation of the Institutes of Manu (VII. 187). “On the march let him form his troops...like a macara or sea-monster, that is, in a double triangle with apices joined. In the Mahabharata the formation literally reproduces the crocodile form.

Part II.

Introduction.

The first part of this article was based on customs observed in Lower Sind regarding the river cult and the few remarks of reticent villagers. In central Sind the attraction of the shrine of Uderolal results in less reticence and fuller details are available. The problem is, how did the cult survive the subtle blandishments of Buddhism and the more violent methods of the Arabs. Regarding the former, Huen Tsang is clear, though a Sindi characteristic appears, then as now—no tale, no religion. It took an aeronaut arhat to convert the denizens of the Indus flood plain. “Since then generations have passed and the changed times have weakened their virtue, but as for the rest they retain their old customs.” Arab methods may be conveniently studied in the Chachnamá.

In the story of the Incarnation of the River God not only have the details of the cult at Uderolal been described in full but the caste customs of the Thakurs have been elaborated—not because of an essential connection with religion as illustrative of how completely a foreign control has been established over a purely local religion, centuries after it might reasonably be supposed to have died out, and of how it is maintained by the custom of exogamy.

In the cult of Khwaja Khizr the Thakur was less successful. Apparently it had already become esoteric before the Thakur arrived and the most he could do was to assert that the deity worshipped near Sukkur was identical with the incarnate Uderolal.

The Story of the Incarnation of the River God.

At the beginning of the eleventh century, when Marak was king of Tatta and Aho was his vezir, the Hindus of Sind were greatly oppressed—so much so that their sacred threads were removed and their top-knots cut off, that they might be converted into Islam. Tatta was at that time the capital of Sind. The Hindu pancháyat of Tatta thereupon approached the king with a request that they might be relieved from so great a tyranny, but the king utterly refused saying that they must obey his order for he desired only one religion in his realm. Then the pancháyat asked for a respite of three days on the expiry of which they would make a final reply. The older members of the pancháyat, who were learned in the Sástras and the Bhagavad Gáta, the most holy books of the Hindus,
called to mind a śloka of the third book of the Bhagavad Gītā, wherein it is written, "Whenever the dearest ones of God are oppressed or their ritual interfered with, God, becoming incarnate, will protect those dear to him."  

Remembering, then, this śloka they resolved to go in a band to the bank of the river at Tatta, where they offered prayers for three days continually. At the close of the third day a voice was heard coming from the River, saying, "Eight days from to-day I shall be born at Nasarpur in the house of Ratanrai Arora, who is Asharm by Viran and Tina by caste. I shall be called Uderolal. My mother's name is Deoki. Do you therefore request the king that after eight days he and his vazir should come to me there to discuss your religious differences. I shall gladly dispose of them. Meanwhile the king should stay his hand."

The panchāyat became of good cheer and with hearts emboldened returned to the city strewing flowers on the road. They related their tale to the king who agreed to postpone matters. After eight days on Friday the first day of Chaitra in the year 1007 Samvat Uderolal was born in the aforementioned house at Nasarpur. The king then sent his vazir Aho to Nasarpur to enquire into the statement of the Hindus; first asking the name of the father he came to the house of Ratanrai, where he learnt that a child named Uderolal had actually been born. In those days Nasarpur was also on the bank of the Indus. Aho entered the house with some of the elders of Nasarpur and indeed found the child in a cradle. After a few moments the babe had become a youth of sixteen years of age, again he became a black-bearded man, and yet again after a short while a grave old white-bearded man. Much astonished he humbly requested the babe to accompany him to Tatta for the king had summoned Him in connection with a dispute regarding the Hindu religion. He replied that the vazir should go in advance to Tatta and then He Himself would appear on the bank of the river at Tatta what time the vazir remembered Him. The vazir set out from Nasarpur and after three days reached Tatta. On the fourth day while standing on the bank of the river he remembered the words of Uderolal Sahib and to his surprise at once saw Him emerging from the river at the head of a regiment armed with swords and other weapons. The vazir was astonished to see such an army coming from the river and begged Uderolal to send it back again as there was no question of a fight; the king merely desired His presence. Uderolal thereupon commanded the army to return to the river, while he accompanied the vazir to visit the king.

On seeing God thus incarnate the Hindus collected in large numbers, rejoicing in Him and conducted him with great pomp to the king. The vazir then related all that he had seen, introducing Uderolal by name and reporting that he was considered as the guru of the Hindus. The king arose to receive Him and enquired of the vazir the name of the new incarnation. The vazir replied that He was known both as Uderolal and as Zinda Pir. He was called Zinda Pir because He was their personal God, though the meaning of Zinda Pir is this, that Zinda means living and Pir means a guru or a teacher. The king thereupon addressed Uderolal, saying that as He was held to be an incarnation by the Hindus, He should advise them to give up the worship of stocks and stones and become Mahomedans.

---

6 The reference is perhaps to Bhagavad Gītā, III, 35: There's more happiness in doing one's own Law without excellence than in doing another's Law well. It is happier to die in one's own Law; another's Law brings dread.—(L. D. Barnett, Temple Classics).
whereby there would be one religion throughout the country. Uderolal replied that the world is the creation of God and all is according to His nature, wherefore he should abandon his plan and cease from tyrannising over the Hindus. A reference to the Śāstras or to the Koran would show that God had created all things in His wisdom and in the fullness of His wisdom had He created many religions. To Him Hindus and Turks were alike. Those who remember Him are those who are nearest and dearest to Him. It would be better therefore for the king to follow His (Uderolal's) advice and abandon his plans.

The king asked the vazir as to what should be done to Uderolal; he replied that the king should be firm, that he should bind Uderolal and cast him into prison. The king issued orders accordingly but his men could not capture Uderolal. At times his body changed to air, at times to water, at times it was itself; thus their efforts were fruitless.

Failing in this the king and his vazir turned their thoughts to converting the Hindus to Islam by force. On hearing this they became terrified but Uderolal calmed their fears and commanded Fire to destroy the houses and places of the Turks. While this fire was raging through the town the king and the vazir with all the Mahomedan ryots bowed before Uderolal and begged for pardon, offering to obey all His orders. Uderolal commanded that all should be free in their own religion and that Hindus should not be persecuted for the future. The king submitted to this and Uderolal, first consoling the Hindus, returned to Nasarpur and lived with his father.

On reaching the age of twelve he asked his brothers Somo and Bhandar to give up their worldly affairs and to join him in founding their new Thakurai or Darîpanthi religion. This they refused to do and remained in their business. Uderolal then ordered his cousin Pugar to bear his commands and to found the new religion. He agreed and was led to the bank of the river, where, while bathing, he saw the true form of Uderolal and many other wonders. By the grace of Uderolal his mind and heart were open and, understanding, he saw what remained to be seen.

Returning from the river Uderolal made him his disciple and gave him seven things:

(i) Jot ... جوت or lamp.
(ii) Timahli or jhari ... A pot containing sacrificial water for distribution in cups to Hindus.
(iii) Robe ... ...
(iv) Drum ... Capable of emitting various notes,
(v) Crown ...
(vi) Deg ... دیگ A large metal pot for cooking rice.
(vii) Teg ? ... A sword.

Somo and Bhandar, the brothers of Lal Sahib, now became jealous of Pugar and wished to drive him away. Lal Sahib, however, informed them that Pugar was the only person fit to be his disciple; if they wished to share in his service and its rewards and to be respected as was Pugar, let them take the Timahli and distribute water from it to the

---

7 At the present day the jot is in the possession of the Thakurs of Schwan and the crown with the chief of the Thakurs, who resides at Alipur (Punjab). There is no trace of the other gifts.
Hindus, whereby they too would be respected as Thakurs and obtain wealth, reputation, and believers. 8

After the establishment of the new religion Uderolâl Sahib came riding on horseback, spear in hand, to Jhái-jo-Goth, some eight miles from Nasarpur, and halted in a large open space. A Mahomedan, who was there, on being asked who the owner was, replied that he himself was. Uderolâl informed him that he wished to purchase the land, but the Mahomedan before selling wished to consult his wife. He went off to do so and on his return found Uderolâl, whom he had left in the full blaze of the sun, standing beneath a large tree that had suddenly grown up on the land. The Mahomedan was astonished particularly by the miracle, and offered the land gratis to Him, provided he might receive the income accruing to the temple, which would be built on the spot. Uderolâl granted the request. Further, he struck his spear in the ground and, bringing to light many diamonds and rubies, told him that all was his for the gathering. The Mahomedan declined everything except the income of the temple. Uderolâl confirmed the grant and was immediately swallowed up by the ground, himself, his horse and his spear and was never seen again.

When the news of this event spread abroad, the king, Marakh, sent his vazir to enquire into the matter; if the information was true he should build a fine mausoleum over the spot in commemoration of Uderolâl. The Thakur Pugar also arrived at the place and as they could not agree among themselves about the construction of the mausoleum they decided to watch during one whole night and to carry out whatever orders a voice from underground should give. While keeping their vigil they heard a voice declare that the king, wealthy as he was, should build the mausoleum in fitting style and that the Hindus should build another place adjoining it in which should be maintained the lamps. In fact, it is said Uderolâl considers Hindus and Mahomedans alike and would rejoice if both would worship at his tomb, adding that He is not dead; His name of Uderolâl or Amarlâl indeed signifies the everlasting one.

The order was obeyed and the two places, still in existence, were built side by side. Mahomedans do not go to the jot building, but Hindus go to both. Five lamps are maintained up to the present time and lit at night-fall in the tomb, where a Mahomedan sits to collect the offerings. These lamps are lit by the Hindus and all service is done by them, such as sweeping the floor, cleaning the tomb and offering flowers. The Mahomedans only collect the money offerings. In the jot building lights are kept burning day and night.

The holy tree, which grew up while the original owner went to consult his wife, still survives. It is worshipped and no common person is allowed to touch it. The seeds of this tree, if swallowed like pills, are a certain specific for senility. Pugar Sahib had also constructed a well and a rest-house (bhandâro) for travellers, which still exist. The well is considered sacred as the Ganga or Jumna.

A fair is held annually on the first day of Chaitr (Cheti chand) at Jhái-jo-goth (Uderolâl) and all Uderolâl’s followers from Sind, the Punjab, Cutch and elsewhere come.

---

8 The Thakurs of Nasarpur are in consequence known as Somais. The followers of Pugar are Bhudâi Thakurs. These latter are so called from Budho, the son of Pugar in his old age. The Thakurs of Schwan and of the Punjab are Budhais. There are Budhais also in other parts of Sind.
A large market is opened during the fair. A fair is also held on the first day of every month at Uderolál and a mid-yearly fair is held on Asu chand. At Nasarpur also fairs are held as at Uderolál at the place where he was born, the place being considered holy and jôt being maintained there.

On the island of Bukkur a fair is also held on Cheti chand. After Uderolál had disappeared at Jhai-jo-Goth he appeared again at Bukkur emerging from the rock. He was seen and people still worship Him as Zinda Pir in the temple built over the spot. Here a light is perpetually maintained in a cave. From the Sakrant of Srawan to the Sakrant of Bado the Hindus at Sukkur lock the doors of the holy place of Zinda Pir for forty days and no one but the care-taker is allowed to enter. He too approaches the place not in a boat but swimming on an earthenware pot (muki) with his eyes bandaged. He but adds oil to the lamp and trims the wick. After the expiry of forty days a great fair is held when many baharânás (water balloons) and much rice are distributed.

At Uderolál the service is in the hands of a Bairagi, who has been placed in charge by the Thakurs. From him no accounts are taken and he is in fact his own master with his own chelas to succeed him. He, however, serves all Thakurs who visit Uderolál. It is he who adorns the tomb with its rich trappings on every day of the new moon, on every Friday, and on every thirteenth day of the moon a golden turban and a rich piece of cloth are laid upon the tomb. At the same time people offer rice cooked with sugar (gur) and baharanás, of which the former is eaten and the latter thrown into the well.

At other places where there are disciples, as at Sehwan and Shikarpur, will be found temples for the jôt where, lamps are maintained night and day. At every temple or, as in Hyderabad city, at every road-side shrine, a jhâri full of water is also maintained near the jôt. Both are worshipped symbolically and equally. Morning and evening prayers must be offered before the jôt and the jhâri, or, if possible, on the river-side before running water. A Thakur as part of his worship should morning and evening ceremonially cast rice and sugarcandy into the river. At “Uderolál” He is addressed as Lâl Udero Sain (the holy leader), Ratanâji Sher (the lion of the house of Ratanrai, and Baga Bahar Sher (Lion of the white sea).

The Daryâpanthis are monotheists and worship no other gods nor are they idolaters. Their only religious books are the Janâm bakhî (the story of Uderolál, in verse from which the foregoing story is taken) and other poems and writings in praise of Uderolál.

Women partake in the worship of Uderolál. From ancient times they visit the central place of the cult to pray for children, seating and bumping themselves at the time of prayer on a wishing-stone. They pray too on many accounts, on behalf of their husbands, for wealth or for health. When going to the river to ask such requests they carry sweet rice in a jhâri which must not be opened on the way. The whole is thrown into the river as also other offerings of rice and sugar to the accompaniment of hymns in praise of Uderolál. Finally, they draw their sâri (rawa or châdar, the body cloth) slightly across their breast and beg for the required boon. Such prayers should be offered on Friday, the 13th day or a new-moon day. In other respects there is no special ritual or place specially set apart for women.
Mahomedans do not go to Nasarpur, they never eat with Hindus either at Nasarpur or Uderolâl.

In this religion there is no place for Brahmans though a few Brahmin mendicants may be found at Uderolâl. The controlling persons are Thakurs, who maintain their position by the most unusual custom of exogamy.

It has already been noted that the two principal sections of the Thakurs are the Somâï and the Budhâïs. The latter centre upon Sehwan and are the more respected persons. There is a third sub-division known as the Ghoraïs, who centre around Mêhar and have their own followers. The story runs that they are the descendants and disciples of a poor man who lived with some Budhâïs (who are known also as Vardharis) as a temple servant. One day when the Thakur arose early in the morning and ordered his horse to be prepared as he wished to go to the river, this man came and knelt before him like a horse saying that he was the horse and that the Thakur Sahib should ride him to the river. The Thakur rejoiced and told him that he might now leave the temple and obtain his own disciples who should henceforth be known as Ghoraïs. When Ghoraïs approach a village where other Ghoraïs live they neigh like a horse before entering it.

The custom of marriage among Thakurs is this. No Thakur may marry from a Thakur family; more especially a Budhâi may not marry from a Somâï Thakur family for all Thakurs are brothers. A Thakur may not even marry from a Daryâpanthi family which is reckoned among his own disciples. A Thakur may marry from any Punjabi-Hindu family, e.g., Arora, Lanjâra (سرخی قراقرم), Supareja (سرخی بند), Khirâ (سرخی قراقرم), Rabar (سرخی بند); Kukareja (سرخی بند), Chânwala (سرخی قراقرم). They do not marry from among Sindhi Lohanas nor from among the Thakurs of Punjab. Conversely, too. Thakur daughters must be given to Punjabi families. Among the rank and file of the Daryâpanthi religion marriage is a question of social position. Daughters may be given to castes or sub-sections of equal standing but not to those of lower esteem though daughters may be taken from such (hypogamy) or from within the same section (endogamy). Socially Budhâïs will have no intercourse with Somâïs, as Pugar, their ancestor, was the honoured disciple of Uderolâl.

Thakurs are, ordinarily speaking, a priestly class and when personally they have a sufficient number of followers they are absolved from the necessity of working for their living. Otherwise they enter Government or private service or engage in trade.

The story of Uderolâl, Lal Wadero, the holy chieftain, is remarkable from many points of view. The incarnation of the God of Nature, the God of Sind, the River God, is assigned a definite and comparatively recent date. It may be that the Hindu revival spring from the persecution of a petty Sumro prince during the latter part of the 10th century just previous to the inroads of Mahomed of Ghazni; it may be, however, rather later and represented a reaction against the strength of the agents of Ghazni kings. Probably the latter is a better explanation in view of the close connection of the Thakur family with the Punjab. One may picture to oneself the break up of Brahmanical rule in the Punjab, the flight of large classes to Sind, the "capture" of local Hinduism in the 11th century, just as in the 17th and 18th centuries a new swarm of Uttarâdis came, partly to avoid local persecution and partly to avail themselves of trading facilities under the Mogul régime.
Nextly the great and persistent strength of a non-Brahmanical religion, purely monotheist and still pure in its worship, not at all idolatrous, yet essentially Hindu in its connection and philosophy, is a feature which cannot be passed over. Strangely enough Schwan, Shivistan, one great home of the Thakurs, was a religious settlement of the Guptas, whence the cult of the great god Siva was to spread over Sind. The cult did not spread far. Only one daughter-colony, that of Pir Patho, is known and their elements of both the Saivite and Daryapanchi religions have been caught up with Buddhism and Sufism and remoulded into a strange Moslem cult.

Again, the unsuccessful attempt to connect up the religion with the cult of Krishna must be noted.

The revival of religion preparatory to the Incarnation is professedly inspired by the Bhagavad Gītā but this is again nowhere referred to nor does it form any part in the modern Daryapanchi religion or in any branch of it except at Bohāra. Yet another and, apparently, a Vishnuvite attack was made on the worship of the God of the Waters. Jhimpir is a popular place of resort for Hindus in the old Mogul pargana of Sonda or Sondro. The story, as related in the Tuhfat-ul-kirām, is as follows:—"Sontra"* is another important place. Until recent times there was a large fort here. Its name was Bhim-kot and Hindus frequently visit it as a place of pilgrimage. There is a spring of water at the place; the water trickles from beneath a cliff. The spring is an interesting phenomenon of nature. The locality is commonly known as Jhim. The place also possesses a stone which the Hindus worship as a deity.

The servants of this place say that a party of virgins took this stone and threw it into the river. On their return they found the stone on the exact spot whence they had removed it. Seeing this the virgins thrust their hands into the sleeves of connivance (i.e., they were ashamed to touch it again)."10

The geography of the story calls for some notice. In the Tuhfat-ul-kirām Nasarpur is stated to have been founded on the banks of the Sangro Wah in the 16th century and that its glory had departed by the 18th century. The topographical maps still show the old course of the Sangro Wah and Dhorro Phital running due south parallel with the line of the Ganja Hills but far to the east of them. Does the Sangro Wah represent an old course of the Indus and, if so, how could it run from Nasarpur to Tatta, which lies far to the south-west? The vagaries of the river constitute of course the only problem in Sind and in the days before it was harnessed by huge riverain embankments nothing definite could ever be postulated as to its course. The move from Nasarpur to Jhaijo-Goth probably represents an attempt to keep the cult located on the river bank though the river is now many miles west of Uderolal. Curiously enough the canal running past Shahdadpur towards Brahmanabad is still known as Marakh Wah. This disposes of the possibility of the Indus lying east of Shahdadpur and gives respectability to the history of the tale.

Khwaja Khizr.

On a small island near Bukkur stands the ziarat of Khwaja Khizr. He is identified by Mussalmans with the River God, the Living God, Zinda Pir as he became manifest there.

---

9 The town of Sonda is eight miles from Jhimpir station and midway between it and Jhertock to the north-east are some Buddhist ruins. There is no trace of Bhim-kot. A large tumulus, unexplored, overlooks Jhimpir. Any spring is a phenomenon in Sind.

10 As evidence of the pre-Mussalman existence of Vishnuism, see the name of the capital of (Central) Sind in Hsin-Teang's account. Pi-şhen-p'o-pu-lo = Bishnavpur or Vishnvur. — Beal, II. p. 272.
This identification is based on the similarities of the two personalities, on the fact that both are eternal, that both derive their power from the fountain of life. Here there was no Mussalman buried on a spot held sacred by Hindus, as at Sehwan, no attempt as at Uderolal to combine persons of both religions as servants of one incarnation. The identification was complete, the cult was esoteric and uncongenial ritual, such as the cult of the Satyun or Virgins, was separated out.

The period of the identification is an extremely difficult problem. Does it date from the days of the Arab conquest or from the time when Multan was a centre of Sufi learning and missionaries of all types wandered through the land working subtly as leaven.

Who Zinda Pir was we have discussed. El Khizr, in Arabic legend, was the vazir of Dhoulkarnain, the two-horned one, Alexander the Great, who drank of the Fountain of Life, through the virtue of which he will live till the day of judgment. To Mussalmans in distress he appears clad in green robes—whence his name. 11

In the fourth book of the adventures of Hatim Tai will be found a life-like picture of Khwaja Khizr in the character of a "white magician." He was a man of venerable appearance dressed in green apparel, who guided Hatim Tai from an enchanted desert, who released him from the clutches of a magic tree, who taught him the charm of the ninety-nine names of God, which is however of no avail unless "you keep yourself pure and never utter a falsehood; every day you must devoutly purify yourself with water, and never break your fast till set of sun, nor must you repeat the charm at an improper time." Later when he finally released Hatim Tai from Sam Ahmar's power, Iblis, the Devil (on whom be curses) informed the latter that they should fight no more—"over the unerring decrees of the Almighty I have no power or control. The Eternal hath willed that Hatim's fame should be perpetual and he hath commissioned the prophet Khwaja Khizr (on whom be peace) to assist him in his bold undertakings." This Moslem charm finds such a strange analogue in Hinduism that one is tempted to believe that it is a borrowed one. "O Illustrious one, listen to the one hundred and eight names of the sun as they were disclosed of old by Dhanmye to the high-souled son of Pritta! Dhanmye said 'Surya, Aryamen, Bhaga . . . the merciful Maitreyya.' These are the 108 names of Surya of immeasurable energy as told by the self-create. For the acquisition of prosperity I bow down to thee, Oh Bhaskara, blazing like unto gold or fire, who is worshipped of the gods and the Pitris and the Yakhas and who is adored by the Asuras, Nisacharas and Siddhas. He that with fixed attention reciteth this hymn at sunrise obtaineth wife and offspring and riches . . . "12

Once in this guise of a divine helper Khwaja Khizr appears in Sindhi legend. Mullah Daud of Sehwan was an accomplished and learned man; his son Nur-ul-haq, when a child, was very weak in mind and forgetful; his father tried hard to teach him the Koran but the boy could remember nothing. His father then shut him up in a cell and paid no heed to his lamentations and weeping. The boy was indeed a blessed soul, for in that confinement he had a vision of Khwaja Khizr, who addressed him: "Child, why liest thou low thus? Get up. Henceforth whatever thou readest will remain in your memory." At once the Koran shone in his mind, there and then he repeated them aloud and shouted to his father and mother who took him out; their instructions were welcomed by him; he remembered promptly whatever he was taught and gradually became a very learned man. He was surnamed Ta'lib-i-ibn Ustad—the seeker of the Preceptor's knowledge—and Mushta'qi—

11 The Koran, Everyman Ed., p. 186. 12 Mahabharata. Vana Parva, ch. III.
enthusiastic—was his nom-de-plume. His poetry was greatly appreciated by Mirza Sahib—that illustrious poet of Persia, when he saw this poet of Sind in the course of his travels in Persia.

Simple though this identification may be, there is still considerable doubt attached to it, as though the Baloches are in some measure disciples of the River God, a cult which they seem to have adopted in Sind several centuries ago, they are unable to fix their choice of the personality of their Pir.\textsuperscript{13} Khwāja Khizr in one Baloch ballad takes the place of the archangel Mikail in the heavenly hierarchy and is at times variously identified with Elijah or Ilias and the River God. In the delta of the Indus Khwāja Khizr is held to be the brother of Ilias.

The Khulisat has no reference to this ziarat but Manucci mentions it\textsuperscript{14} though under an ill-written name. “At a short distance from the fort (of Bakkur) towards the north was a little island known as Coia Khitan, where is a tomb held in great veneration by the Moors.”

According to an “ex-Political”\textsuperscript{15} the date on the mosque of Khwāja Khizr ziarat is A.H. 341 (= 952 A.D.) The story of its being built is that “a shepherd named Baji, whose hut stood where the Mahal of Baji, one of the divisions of the town of Rohri, now stands, observed at night a bright flame burning at some distance from him. Thinking it had been kindled by travellers, he sent his wife to procure a light from it but, as often as she approached, it vanished. She returned and told her husband; and he disbelieving the report went himself and then discovered that it was indeed a miraculous manifestation. Awe-struck with what he had seen he erected a takiyah, or hermit’s hut, on the spot and devoted himself as the fakir to the religious care of the place. Soon after this the Indus altered its course and abandoning the walls of Alor, encircled the ground on which the takiyah of Baji stood and which is now called the island of Khwāja Khizr.

“There is another story which relates that the Rajah of Alor was desirous of possessing the beautiful daughter of a merchant who resided in his city. The unhappy father, unable to oppose the wishes of the king, entreated that a respite of eight days might be allowed to him, and having spent that time in fasting and prayer he was miraculously conveyed with his daughter and all his wealth to the island Khizr, the river at the same time deserting the city of Alor.”

The violence of the river has given rise to a characteristic Sindhi proverb—“Who has drowned the place? Khwāja Khizr,” which means that one must not grumble at the tyranny of a great man but submit.

Khwāja Khizr appears once in history. Qutb Saheb, Qutb-uddin Bakhtyar Kaki of Ush, settled at Delhi and died in the year A.D. 1236. He obtained his name Kaki from his ability to produce hot cakes (kak) from his armpits. Khwāja Khizr, who “still regulates the wealth and the price current of grains,” appeared to him in a dream and gave him the power of prophecy.

Now it is very remarkable that the date quoted by Mr. Eastwick corresponds very closely with that given in the Uderolāl legend. At the same time the story of Qutb Saheb shows that by the beginning of the 13th century the identification of Khwāja Khizr with the River God (? Nature God) was complete. It seems indeed that the invasions of Mahomed of Ghazni must have hammered into the understandings of the Sindhis that,

\textsuperscript{13} L. Dames, Popular Poetry of the Baloches, p. 141. \textsuperscript{14} Storia do Mogor, I, 326. \textsuperscript{15} Dry Leaves from Young Egypt, by an ex-Political. H. B. Eastwick.
Hindu or Mussalman, they were of one stock supported by the same river and bound together by common interests. Whether matters were clinched by a sudden diversion of the river is doubtful in spite of the persistence of the legend, for no sudden diversion or catastrophe could carve a way of the river of the size of the Indus across a range of hills or line of high ground.

We must think rather of political events moulding and reviving old creeds, think of the Hindus as worshipping the river and of the Mahomedans with a veneer of Arabic learning, carrying on to the full all their old customs and folklore. What spot should be holy if not that to which the pullo went on pilgrimage annually, that which breasted every year the floods which overwhelmed the land. The early years of the 11th century gave the Sindhi much to think about and one result was the realisation by Hindus and Mahomedans that both could worship at the same shrine and pray for help, for both worshipped the living God. The cult of Uderolal was developed by foreigners who brought their own ideas of their saviour as a warrior; that of Khwaja Khizr was more primitive and aboriginal. In it the God moves through the rivers seated on a pulla, and so every year the first pulla caught in the season must be offered as a sacrifice to the River God. In both cases the religion is the same but the background is different, the setting is different. The Uderolal legend clearly shows how the effort was made by the Thakurs to capture the earlier form of their own religion and to what extent they succeeded, for they can but assert that Zinda Pir is the same as Uderolal. The cult of Uderolal has become purely anthropomorphic in the hands of the Thakurs. From the cult of Zinda Pir by a few stages of evolution a true conception of Godhead may still be developed.

Part III.

Within a mile of Mai Pir's coppice is the shrine of Ahmed Pir or Hot Hakim—the Pir of the Jackals. This composite saint has two Khalifas, a Sheikh and a Murghar Baloch. The Khalifa of Mai Pir is a Sheikh. In both cases the annual ceremony depends upon the Hindu calendar and my Mussalman informants were in doubt as to whether the anniversary of Mai Pir fell in Naheri (Marga) or Poh (Pausha). It is probably in Naheri as the Jackal Pir's anniversary is Poh 12th.

The first point of interest is that a certain cure for rabies is for the person bitten to go to Hot Hakim's shrine and drink holy water and ashes. This form of medicine is a common one; Pir Patho's ashes are a specific for any ordinary complaint. The 'ashes' are simply wood ashes prepared on a sanctified spot. Now in Balochistan Bibi Dost is the popular physician for this terrible illness of rabies and it was not by mere chance that Baloches captured one-half of the cult of Mai Pir and set up their own Khalifa (a Murghar) and invented their own saint (Hot Hakim). It would appear that the strict rule preserving the virginity of Mai Pir had necessitated the separation of 'Ahmed Pir.' A former connection is certainly indicated by a Sheikh being Khalifa at either shrine, while though the medicine is obtainable at Ahmed Pir's shrine, it is at Mai Pir's that the jackals are fed ritually. It is illustrative of Baloch superstition that they did not attempt to restore Mai Pir's cult but were satisfied with that of Ahmed Pir (Hot Hakim), however much they had formerly had faith in Bibi Dost.

In fact, one is tempted to believe that the jackal almost became the Beast associated with the Vegetation Deity, but did not, being too contemptible. It is formidable only
when rabid and Bibi Dost, Madonna, healed her votaries—if, as Mr. Tate sagely remarks, they are not fated to die.

That the whole ritual is of great antiquity is obvious.

(a) It occurs separately in Sind and Balochistan.
(b) In Sind it is part of the cult of the Virgin Mai.
(c) It depends upon the Hindu calendar.
(d) Rice is the only offering made to the jackals at Mai Pir’s shrine.

The question is at what stage of pre-history the cult arose.

In this character as “wolf-god”, Apollo is usually regarded as he who keeps away wolves from the flock, yet offerings were laid out in his honour just as in Mai Pir’s case. A still closer parallel in ritual will be found in the association of jackals with the Roman Ceres, a “Mediterranean” deity, linking up whose cult with the East is the well-known incident in the legend of Samson, where “fox” is noted in the margin to connote “jackal.” Further, one may cite the elaborate discussion by Mr. B. A. Gupte in his work on Hindu Holidays, where the details of the worship of Lakshmi are related at considerable length and a not unreasonable conclusion drawn that Lakshmi was purely a vegetation goddess. Thus, diffused throughout the Middle East is a popular Ceres cult; to fix its origin or development would throw considerable light on the wanderings of people.

We may at least draw our own conclusions with regard to Sind: they require primitive man to be neither a believer in totems nor altogether animistic. He was of necessity very matter-of-fact, childish and fearful for good reason of the bigness of the world.

(i) Tribal religion is indissolubly connected with economics.
(ii) Nature, red in tooth and claw, was a reality to primitive man.
(iii) Divine help was the only remedy for rabies, or, in other words, rabies was one (“the only”) illness that mattered that he could not understand.

The first and second propositions are truisms, though often forgotten, and the third is but a special case of the second. Others barely need elucidation. One obviously is the classification of the genus canis as dog and non-dog, the dog being the domestic servant and non-dog all the allied wild species. This classification is presumably still that of the N.-W. Frontier, where wolves are said to be inbred with dogs in every third generation. Another is the dependence of medicine upon religion, this subject opening up a wide field for discussion on the psychological aspect of Fate, it being the residuum, the incomprehensible, after all the old wives’ medicines, the “tried remedies” of hakims and raids have proved ineffective. We are no more advanced in “Physician, heal thyself.”

One further conclusion remains. It is a favourite axiom of anthropologists that the concept of maternity as a matter of observation precedes that of paternity, which is, pace Mendel, a matter of conjecture. It naturally follows that, the worship of the River being local and that of Ceres general, the worship of the Living God of the Indus was grafted upon the worship of Mother Nature, by a more advanced race, who ventured into the flood plains and waxed fat upon agriculture. One might talk of Aryans and non-Aryans, for we think we know the Aryans, but criticism has dulled the virtues of the Aryan touchstone and the non-Aryans have still to be classified. One non-Aryan race we certainly know of locally, a pigmy brachycephalic race of hunters, who worshipped the sun after their Prometheus had taught them the use of fire, builders of dolmens and—but the subject of the Stone Age requires separate treatment.
ALLEGED BUDDHIST INFLUENCE IN THE SUN TEMPLE AT KONARAK.

BY GURU DAS SARKAR, M.A.; CALCUTTA.

It was Raja Rajendra Lala Mitra who seems to have first suggested in his Antiquities of Orissa that like Darpan, the place of Ganesha, Konarak, the place of the Sun, "may fairly be suggested to have been Buddhist" (Ant. Orissa, Vol. II, p. 148). In his much earlier work Stirling—the first western worker in the field of Orissa History—makes no mention of such a theory in the chapter dealing with the great temple of the Sun, though he expatiates at some length on the architectural remains and the beauties of the door-frame carved in black chlorite.

Dr. Mitra apparently based his theory on the existence of a car-festival in Konarak. Popular belief and the accounts in the existing religious works like Kapila Saṁhitā seem to indicate that this extinct festival was one of some importance. It appears to have been once a sort of article of faith in these parts—that the person who witnessed the car-festival held in this sea-side shrine had the privilege of seeing the Sun God in a corporeal existence (Śārīra Rāja). "Maitreyākṣheye vane puṇye rathayātrā-mahotsavam je paśyanti nārā bhaktyā te paśyanti tanu ravel," (Kapila Saṁhitā, Chap. VI).

The presence of an Aśoka inscription at Dhauli not far from Bhubaneswar—the city of numerous temples—and the mention in Yuan Chwang's work of about a dozen stūpas built by the Emperor Aśoka in the Odra tract was regarded in Dr. Mitra's times as a sufficient basis for holding many of the principal shrines in Orissa as primarily of Buddhist origin.

In the passage referred to above (quoted by Dr. Mitra from the translation of Stanislaus Julien) there is a reference to the extraordinary prodigies exhibited at some of these stūpas, and to the scholastic activities of some ten thousand monks who studied 'the great vehicle' in some hundred local monasteries where heretics and men of the faith lived 'pell mell'. It seemed to have been argued that as Buddhism was once in such a flourishing condition in the province of Orissa, it was quite reasonable to suppose that other shrines within 3 or 4 days journey from Dhauli would still contain lingering traces of their Buddhist origin either in ceremonials or in the architecture and sculpture. Dr. Mitra also lays considerable stress on a passage from the Foe-ku-ki, of which an English translation from the French rendering by MM. Remusat, Klaproth and Landresse seems to have been available in Calcutta at least 27 years before Dr. Mitra published his great pioneer work. The passage in question refers to the observance in ancient Pātaliputra of a car-festival, a close analogue of which the Chinese Pilgrim saw in a festival in Buddhist Khotan on his way to India. The description of the ceremony seems to have made a deep impression on the Indian Orientalist and the car-festival per se seems to have been regarded as a special feature of the Buddhist faith.

The Khaṇḍagri caves lying within a few hours journey from Dhauli—once regarded as the habitation of Buddhist monks—have now been proved to be of Jaina origin from the Hāṭhigumpha inscription of King Kharavela supposed by Bhagwanal Indrajit to be of the 2nd century B.C. (Actes du sixième congrès des Orientalistes, Vol. III, pp. 174-77, and Mr. K. P. Jayaswal's paper in JBORS, December, 1917) and the following three minor inscriptions: (1) the inscription referring to the Jaina Monk
Śūpā-chandra (in Navāraṇi Gūmpā), (2) the inscription of the Chief Queen of Khālavela (in the Manchāpurī cave), and the (3) Udyota Keśari inscription in the Lalatendra Keśari Gūmpā, supposed on epigraphical grounds to date from the 10th century A.D. (Ep. Ind., Vol. XIII, pp. 160, 165-166).

The emperor Aśoka flourished in the 3rd century B.C. If only after the lapse of a century or two, Jainaism could leave such lasting evidence of its long continuance in the Kumāra and Kumāri Hills in close proximity to Dhauli, it is difficult to understand why Buddhism should be dragged in to account for the existence of a thirteenth century Solar Temple which copper-plates of Ganga Kings (Narasiṃha Deva II and IV, JASB., 1906 and 1905) agree in attributing to Narasiṃha Deva I (Langulya Narasiṃha or Narasiṃha of the tail), a king whose name is also mentioned in this connection in Abul Fazāl's Ain-i-Akbarī.

Mr. M. M. Chakravarty has, after very minute and careful calculations, ascertained the periods of reign of the respective kings of the Ganga dynasty in Orissa and there cannot be the least hesitation in accepting (1238-64) as the period of first Narasiṃha's reign—(JASB., part I, 1903). Mr. V. A. Smith also agrees in holding that the Konarak temple was built in the 13th century though he assigns the period between A.D. 1240 to 1280. The only inscription found at Konarak on the pedestal of an image since removed to the Indian Museum, though undated, may safely be assigned on paleographic and other grounds to the third quarter of the 13th century as has been done by Mr. M. M. Chakravarty in his note in the JBOCS., Vol. III, part II, p. 283.

Though the palm-leaf record at Puri ascribes the erection of the temple to a mythical king of the Keśari dynasty—one of the so-called Caesars of Orissa as Dr. Rājendra Lāla Mitra was pleased to style them—there are in the remains at Konarak no trace of any earlier structure which might reasonably lead to the presumption that the present foundations were laid on the ruins of an earlier shrine.

The late Dr. Fleet, in his paper on the Somavānś Kings of Kātak, rightly disbeliefes the temple-chronicles and puts forth convincing arguments in favour of the supposition that except the two Somavānś kings of the 11th century—Yāyāti Keśari or Mahāvīra Guptā and Janmejaya Mahāhava Guptā—the other Keśaris styled Kūrma, Varāha, &c., are mere figments of the chronicler's imagination (Ep. Ind., Vol. III, pp. 324, 336, et seq.). Except the inscription of Udyota Keśari mentioned above no other inscription or copper-plate has been found of any other Keśari king. In Sandhyākara Nandī's Rāmacarita (Asiatic Society Memoirs, Vol. I, p. 146, and p. 36, fītā of śūloka 5), there is mention of one Karna Keśari. But of this king also no inscription or any

1 Mr. Jayaswal says in his paper on the Hāthisgūmpā inscription of the emperor Khālavela (JBOCS., December, 1917, p. 448), that before the time of Khālavela there were temples of the Arhats on the Udayagiri Hills as they are mentioned in the inscription as institutions which had been previously in existence.

2 Mr. B. C. Majumdar is of opinion that these kings had their raj at Sambalpore although their territories extended to Chandwar or Cuttack in Orissa (Ep. Ind., Vol. XI, p. 102).

3 Sinha iti Dāndābhubhtībhūpatiradbhātraprabhāyākākarakamālamākula—tulitokalesakarna—keśari sarityavallabha-kumbhasamvabo Jayasimhā.
other reliable epigraphic evidence has yet been discovered. If Purandara Kesari, referred to in the Palm-leaf record, had really existed and been the builder of this important temple, Choda Ganga's descendants would hardly have tried to filch the honour from him and in all likelihood some of the inscriptions of these monarchs would have set forth details about the earlier origin of the temple. It may be argued that as the Kesari kings were staunch Hindus according to tradition and popular belief, their connection with the temple, even if proved to be a historical fact, would not be of much help to the supporters of the theory of Buddhist origin. But even in this regard there seems to be a divergence of opinion. Some architectural ornaments on the temple such as Gaja-Simha or elephants surmounted by lions or leogrieffs, have been explained in a manner more clever than convincing—as the symbols of the triumph of the Hindu Kesari kings, represented by the lions, over Buddhistic faith—of which elephant representations are said to be the special symbols. It is thus suggested, inspite of reliable evidence to the contrary, that the mythical Kesari transformed or built up anew in parts a shrine originally Buddhist, and in token of his dominance put up these huge figures on the pyramidal roof of the temple as prominent sculptural decorations. The assertion that lions were the symbols (Lānchhana) of the Kesari kings, still remains to be proved.4

The seal of the Murañjamura copper-plate of Yayati Kesari (JBO&L, March, 1916) is a figure of Sri or Kamalātmikā and that on the copper-plate of Janamejaya (described in Ep. Indi., Vol XI, p. 95, et. seq.) is the representation of a man in a squatting posture. It would thus appear that no evidence is forthcoming at present to connect the temples with any line of kings anterior to Ganga Dynasty. The Udyota Kesari Jaina inscription at Khapōgiri further proves that during the reign of this king with the Kesari title (of about the 10th century A.D.), no intolerant persecution of heretical sects had taken place. In India it is hardly safe to theorize about the creed of the builders of a sacred shrine merely from the way the temple is fashioned or from its architectural or sculptural remains. Like Buddhist stūpas, Jaina stūpas have also been discovered, and Hindu curvilinear temples like those of the Jainas are by no means uncommon. It has therefore been rightly held by modern authorities like Mr. V. Smith that works of art and architecture should be classified with regard to their age and geographical position only, and arbitrary divisions formerly favoured by specialists like the late Mr. Fergusson according to the so-called religious styles have now been abandoned. We have so far been able to show that there is nothing in the geographical position of Konarak or in the age or style of the temple which would lead to a reasonable inference as to any Buddhist influence. We shall now examine the so-called Buddhist indications which are said to be still lingering in the name of the place, the traditions regarding past ceremonies, the

4 The stone image of an elephant surmounted by a lion is also met with in the Doumar Layna (grotto), one of the Hindu Śaiva caves in Ellora (Monumenta de L'Hindusthan par M. Langlé, Tome II, plate contra), p. 87). Mr. B. C. Majumdar has kindly suggested to me that the fabulous strength of the king of beasts could best be indicated by a design in which he is shown as tearing open the skull of huge elephants. In Sanskrit literature the capacity of lions to strike down the huge pachyderms of the forest seem to be emphasized in passages such as bhīvarī niyagam kari-rāja kumbham.
peculiar style of architecture and the subject of some of the principal decorative sculptures.

As regard traditions, as to the so-called Buddhist ceremonies, much has been made of the car-festival or Ratha Yâstrâ, as already alluded to. Whatever may be the origin of this festival there is no doubt about the fact that the system of perambulation in cars and other conveyances appear to have been early adopted as an integral part of some of the Hindu observances.

In the Agni Purâna, we find, even in connection with such a rather unimportant affair as the consecration of hand-written books or manuscripts that after the Pratishthâ ceremony the book is to be perambulated (apparently round the city or town) in cars or elephants ‘Rathena hastinâ vâpi bhrâmâyet pustakam naraîh.’ (Vol. I, p. 186, chap. 63, v. 16, Biblioth. Indic.) Thus it would appear that mere perambulation or carrying to and fro in cars of an image or simulacrum cannot always be taken as a Buddhist observance—especially in a period when Buddhism had no longer any hold on the province.

In his otherwise excellent monograph on Konarak published under the authority of Government Mr. Bishan Swarup tries to make out a strong case in favour of the “Buddhistic” theory. The name Kona Kone or Kona Kona occurs in certain verses in the copper-plates of Narasingha Deva II (J.A.S.B., 1896, p. 251, and of Nrisimha Deva IV, (J.A.S.B., 1895) referred to above (Kona Kone Kutir Kamachikara Dushma rashme) कोणा कोण कुटिर कनभिकर दुष्म पाणे. The common-sense inference from this is that the place was known at the time as Kona Kone or Kona and the word Konarak means only the Arka or Sun God at Kona. This explanation (simple as it is) has met with the approval of so careful a scholar as Mr. V. A. Smith (History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon, p. 28, foot-note). Mr. Bishan Swarup, however, makes bold to assert that Konakona is an abbreviated or corrupted form of Konâ Kamana or Konâ Gamana, the name of one of the previous Buddhas (Konarka, p. 85). Whether phonetic decay can account for this change seems to be very much open to doubt, but when the ingenious author of Konarka proceeds to account for the last two syllables in Konarak by bringing forward from the Sanskrit dictionary, Amarakosha (1, 1, 15), the word Arka Bandha as one of the appellations of Buddha—one though convinced of the ingenuity of the explanation can hardly accept it as a correct or scientific statement of actual facts.

Then as regards the form, the temple looks like a huge car furnished with wheels—beautifully sculptured in the plinth. There are still some remains of big stone horses, which Mr. Havell regards as splendid specimens of Indian sculpture. Any one acquainted with Indian iconography would admit that the Sun God is represented as being drawn by seven horses in a car driven by his charioteer Arûpa. Though there is nothing to show that the number of these horses at Konarak were increased at any subsequent date, Mr. Bishan Swarup supposes—I do not know on what authority—that the number of horses in this car pagoda was originally four and was increased to seven at some later date (Konarka, p. 89). He was apparently thinking of some sculpture at Bodh-gaya, reference to which will be made in a subsequent part of the paper, wherein Apollo is said to be represented as being drawn in a car with a team of four horses.
The key-stone of the Buddhistic theory appears to be the subject represented in some of the sculptures in the temple and it is necessary to consider them *seriatim*.

Much has been made of the abundance of elephant figures not only in the various friezes of the temple, but also in the elaborately sculptured altar or Ratna-Vedi. In Konarak there are not only elephant friezes, but goose friezes as well, and there are cornices containing rows of processions of horsemen and infantry. While it must be admitted that elephant figures are met with in some of the oldest Buddhist remains such as the Aśokan cave known as the *Lomasa Rishi Guhā* in the Barabar Hills, similar sculptures are also to be found in structures almost contemporaneous with Konarak temple such as the temple of Hoysaleswar, an undisputed Hindu shrine supposed to have been built between A.D. 1117 and 1288. In the Hoysaleswara temple in Southern India there are amongst the animals depicted, figures of horses, elephants and Sārdalas (lions) and the last were believed by some to be the symbols of Hoysala Ballalas, even as the lions or leo-griffs in Konarak sculptures were taken to be the emblems of the Kēsārs. Architectural ornaments of this description are also not quite uncommon in Ellora Caves. M. Langlès says in describing the Ādiṇātha Sābbha in Ellora (Tome II, p. 79), "On a aussi pratiqué de petites retraites (Nos. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18) couvertes d'une multitude innombrable de sculptures. L'extérieur est orné, d'éléphants de lions et autres animaux." A careful study of these with reference to Sanskrit works has convinced the modern scholars of the prevalence of "a canonical scheme of decoration" of which such frieze-borne figures formed a part. (History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon, by V. Smith, p. 42, foot-note 2.)

The Khajuraho group of temples are believed to have been erected between the 4th and 8th century of the Christian era and in the precincts of one of them—the temple of Viṣvanātha—there is a colossal elephant carved out of stone. Elephant figures are also to be met with in the Ellora Caves. The huge stone-elephants at Konarak considered by connoisseurs to be not less vigorous in execution than the much-belauded horses of the Sun cannot therefore be regarded as something singular or exceptional. The picture of a boy and elephant in the Konarak altar reminds Mr. Bishan Swarup of the Jātaka story which describes how the mother of the future Buddha saw in a prophetic dream that a white elephant was entering into her womb by piercing one of her sides. Mr. Swarup further mentions that Buddha himself was born as an elephant-keeper or driver in one of his incarnations (Konaika, p. 88). On this slender foundation is based the identification of the sculpture as illustrative of the Jātaka story. Mr. Swarup identifies another part of this very altar as depicting the meeting of Samba—the son of Krishna—and the Sun God, after the former had been cured by the special favour of the latter—of the dread disease of leprosy—the result of paternal curse for a thoughtless indiscretion. If the boy and elephant had merely been illustrative of a Jātaka story, it is only natural to suppose that the continuity of the subject should be maintained in the adjoining panels as well—as is said to be the case in regard to some of the far-famed sculptures at Boro Budur, but to identify at the same breath two such neighbouring sculptures, forming component parts of a single altar piece, as depicting the Buddhistic Jātaka and Hindu Pauranic legends, can hardly be regarded as a satisfactory way of reconciling facts with theory. The prevalence of so-called Buddhist ornaments like the goose-frieze, the elephant-frieze and the Barājānā or ornament consisting of reproductions of a water-weed on the pilasters, the scroll work of Nāgas, and

5 The goose-frieze is found in the Ašokan pillars, e.g., the pillar at the entrance of the Indian Museum, and Barājānājī decorations are met with in the remains at Bodh-Gaya. There is a prominent goose-frieze in the semi-circular moonstone at Anurachchepura, which is over-topped by a mixed frieze of lions, horses, elephants and bullocks (Plate 90, Viśvakarma, pt. VII, published by Dr. A. K. Coomaraswamy).
Nāgakanyās, and the figure of Lakshmi on the lintel, seem only to indicate that like
that of Makara in Hindu ornaments, in Toranas (gateways) and water-spouts (Annual
Report of Archeological Survey of India, 1903-4, p. 227), the use of these architectural
devices extended far back into the Buddhist age. In the meadieval period these
conventional ornaments and decorations seem to have been adopted by architects in
southern and south-eastern part of India. Similarly in some Buddhist stūpas miniature
productions of these sacred structures are found in the ornamental pilasters. It would be
as safe to ascribe the existence of a temple to Buddhist influence because of the existence
of the Bāṇājānījī decoration, goose-friezes or elephant friezes as it would be to attempt
to lay at the door of Buddhism the type of Saiva temple of the Bengal School6 (of
17th century) which are still to be found in some parts of Nadia and other Bengal
districts—simply because the pilasters of these buildings contain reproductions of
temples in miniature.

The sculptural representation of trees found in the plinth have been taken to
stand for the sacred Bodhi-Tree of the Buddhists. In the Jaina caves at Khajurāh,
trees enclosed in railings are also found carved in relief. Tree-worship is prevalent
among the Hindus to this very day. Kalpadruma, the legendary Tree of Desire
described in sacred literature, the model of which used to be constructed in gold and given
away as Mahā-dāna, may also have some influence in determining the motif of such
architectural ornaments. That a Kalpadruma existed at Konarak like the Vaitāvura
at Puri appears clear from the Kapilā Sanhitā from which the following translation of
an extract is given in Dr. Mitra’s work. “There exists an all-granting tree named
Arka-vaṇa adorned by numerous birds and at its foot dwell many saints and whoever
goes to the salvation-giving bāṇian tree becomes, for certain, indestructible. For
the good of animated beings Śūrya himself has become the tree and those who recite
the excellent mantras of Śūrya under its shade in three fortnights attain perfection.”
(Ant. Orissa, Vol. I, p. 147.) Under the circumstances these trees, should I think, be
taken as conventional decorations only. As regards the semi-ophid Nāga and Nāgini
figures represented singly and in couples, usually forming part of the beautiful scroll
work and said to be an evidence of Buddhist Architecture (Konarka, p. 86), Mr. M.
Ganguly in his work on Orissa has pointed out (Ganguly’s Orissa, p. 177-78), that in
the Mahābhārata Ādi-parba, mention is made of the thousand Nāgas, the offsprings of
Kasyapa. Even to this day when performing pūjā of the Serpent Goddess Manasa,
the name of the principal eight Nāgas—Vasuki, Padma, Mahā-padma, Takshaka, Kulira,
Karkata Śāhkha, &c.—are duly recited. Mr. Ganguly holds—I think with the majority
of Hindu opinion in his favour—that these demigod-like Nāgas were probably
borrowed by Buddhism from Hindu sources. At any rate there is no reason to suppose
that every Nāga representation found in Hindu temple should be the outcome of
Buddhist cult, simply because there is mention of Nāgas in Buddhist sacred books.
this does not in any way militate against the generally accepted opinion that a certain
amount of resemblance is noticed among the Buddhist Nāga figures as represented on
the tope of Sanchi and Bharhut, and the Nāga representations of the later Brahminical
period as found in the south-eastern (Orissa) temples.

6 Mr. R. K. Mukerji, referring to this class of temples in the chapter on “Building and Carving”
in his Foundation of Indian Economics, observes: “In the older brick temples the spaces between
the curved lines and roof-base and on the sides are covered with carvings. . . . there are also mixed
panels of rosettes or geometrical patterns and in some instances miniature temples are piled one above
the other along the arched openings” (p. 247). A temple of this kind has been described by the present
writer in his article on the remains at Erinagar (Nadia) in the Journal of the Sāhaya-Parishād (Vol.
XIII, p. 236).
The Indian sculptors of old never carved their names underneath the works of art coming from their chisels nor described the subject which they represented in the various sculptures. Hindu iconography as a science is still of recent origin. To this may be ascribed the conflict of opinion which is so often noticed in regard to the identification of sculptures by different scholars and sometimes ludicrous mistakes are made because of the partiality or bias towards a particular theory.

Instances of such clashing opinions are by no means uncommon in regard to the Konarak sculptures. The well-known "Teaching Scene" has been taken by Mr. Swarup to represent Buddha in the act of delivering a sermon or imparting religious teaching to some of his disciples (op. cit., p. 86). Dr. A. K. Coomaraswamy, a scholar well learned in Hindu and Buddhist lore, describes this in his Viśvakarma, Part VII, plate 72, as Vaishāvāvī Guru. Any one who has the opportunity of examining this picture carved in chlorite or the beautiful reproduction of it as given by Dr. Coomaraswamy will admit that there is nothing in it peculiarly Buddhistic, which may confirm Mr. Swarup's identification.

There is another representation, known as the "Archery Scene," which Mr. Swarup considers to be the illustration of an incident from Sarabhaṅga Jātaka (op. cit., p. 87). Buddha, though he was without any previous training, is said to have defeated all his competitors in an archery competition. Among the local people this sculpture is said to illustrate the shooting of arrows by Parasurāma. In the Hindu sacred books there is mention of an incident referring to Parasurāma's reclaiming land from the sea-bed by shooting arrows. Whether the mound or projection in the sculpture which the arrows are represented as piercing through is meant for a sea-side cliff or is due merely to a wrong idea of perspective is more than what can be asserted with confidence. As instances are not wanting of representations of purely secular incidents—such as hunting scenes—among the Konarak sculptures there need be no objection in taking this at least as a secular feat in archery. Among these sculptures some have been identified as pictures of Pauranic incidents such as marriage of Sita and killing of Mahishāṣaṭa and accepted as such without cavil even by Mr. Bishan Swarup. A number of images of Hindu deities such as Bishnu, Sūrya, Ganges, Bālagopala and Brahmāpi, &c., have also been discovered among the ruins. It does not seem therefore probable that among Hindu Pauranic sculptures of this description, illustrations of Buddhist Jātaka stories would also find a place in a scattered disconnected sort of way. Mr. Bishan Swarup identified one of these stone-carved pictures as Buddha with Muchalinda the Serpent God (op. cit., p. 87) and the two small female figures standing on the sides were declared to be Sujātā the wife of the rich Sreṣṭhī, who brought the Enlightened One food after his prolonged abstinence, and her maid-servant Punnā. Mr. Swarup's objection to the group being a Hindu Vaishnavite image lies in the fact that ordinarily Vishnu is depicted as lying on the Ocean of Milk with the serpent Sesa or Ananta, spreading its hoods over his head.

In the catalogue of exhibits published on the occasion of the centenary of the Indian Museum, 1913, there is a description of an authentic Buddha and Muchalinda image (No. 6290 of the Catalogue). It is noticeable that in this sculpture Buddha is represented as seated on the head of the Serpent God. Serpent hoods are found also on the head of the image of the Jain Tirthaṅkara Pārśvanātha. It does not seem quite safe, therefore, to classify an image as Buddhistic merely from the accompanying serpent symbol. In his comprehensive work on Hindu Iconography, Mr. T. A. Gopinātha Rao describes a Vishnu image of the Bhogasthānaka order, in which the god is shown in a standing posture with the serpent's hood over his head, flanked on two
sides by the figures of Lakshmi (Goddess of Wealth) and Prithvi (The Earth Goddess). In a silver statuette of Vishnu discovered in the village of Churāi in Bengal (given in plate No. 24, of Mr. R. D. Banerji's History of Bengal) the god is shown as standing upright and has over his head a sort of arch which seems to be made of hoods of serpents. While there may be still some doubt as to the definite classification of this so-called Muchalinda sculpture, the statement that it is an image of Buddha cannot be held to have been established. On the lintel of the beautifully carved chlorite doorway of the temple well-known as a memorable production of Orissa art, is depicted the image of Śrī or Mahā Lakṣmī, a fact which is sought to be made one of the strongest proofs of the theory of the Buddhist origin of Konarak ruins. The goddess Śrī has been described in the Matsya Purāṇa in the chapter dealing with the Sun God and other minor gods and goddesses (Chap. 26, Slokas 40 to 46) and it mainly agrees with the noticeable features of the deity ordinarily depicted in the sculptures. As Mr. B. C. Majumdar has shown in one of his learned articles in the Bengali magazine, Sāhitya (Sāhitya 1312 B. S., p. 131-138), these Śrī images are identical with Kamalāsūkha, one of the Daśamahāvidyās of the Hindu Pantheon. It will appear from Mr. M. Chakravarty's learned notes on Dhauli and the caves of Udayagiri and Khaṇḍagiri (Calcutta, 1903), that the images of Śrī, Gaja-Lakṣmī or Mahālakṣmī and pictures of trees, &c., are common alike to Hindus, Buddhists and Jainas. Even to this day trees, are represented in Jaina places of worship and Kalpadruma of the sacred lore 8 has by no means fallen into oblivion. Śrīmūrtis are not peculiar only to Buddhist stupas at Sanchi, but reproductions of these figures are met with in Orissa as in the Lakṣmī temple in Jagannātha enclosure, Puri.

Mr. D. R. Bhandarkar, in the Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey, Western Circle, 1904, gives an interesting account of the Hindu temple of Narasimhā Nātha situated in another part of the province of Orissa. The temple which he ascribes to 9th century or to an earlier period has got a chlorite door-frame somewhat resembling the one at Konarak and in the lintel is depicted the image of Lakshmi and two female attendants bearing flyskips and over the head of the goddess are represented two elephants holding aloft two water-jugs in their trunks. Professor Bhandarkar referring to plate No. 1, and p. 71, of Fergusson and Burgess's Cave-Temples of India, observes: "It is no wonder that Lakshmi image should be found on the lintel of the temple—as these are met with alike in the ancient caves of Kālī and the temples of Southern Orissa." Like the Sevāṣṭika, Śrī or Kamalāsūkha figure seems to have been looked upon as a beneficient symbol and as such was adopted as a sort of conventional decoration by Hindu architects, especially in connection with sacred places of worship.

The erotic sculptures at Konarak—the likes of which are also found in other Orissa temples—have also been brought into requisition in the attempt to establish the Buddhist claims. These pairs of human figures in various attitudes (bandhas) are taken to be due to the influence of the Tāntriks of the Left Path School. The pro-Buddhist

---

7 Bhārata-Bhāgavata, 5.165; Nārada Tattva, 5.165; 91; Purāṇa, 5.239; Śivaparāsāra, 5.199; Bhārataparāsāra, 5.185; 120; Kalpa-Sūtra, 5.24; Kārṣṭunā, 5.21; Śaktīsaṃhitā, 5.1; 94; 120; Saṅgīta-Pañcaratna, 5.21; 94; 120; Nāraka-Bhāgavata, 5.21; 94; 120; 9

8 In Khāravela's inscription there is mention of a Kalpa Tree (in gold) given away by the Emperor with leaves on (JIBOzs, December 1917, p. 463). Mr. K. P. Jayaswal refer to Hemādi's Chaturanga Chintāmaṇi for description of this Mahādāna (Dānakāyana 5), a fact which seems to show that ceremonies of this kind like the conception of the tree itself were essentially Hinduistic in character.
arguers assert that the union of these erotic pairs is a crude way of representing the union of Buddha and Prajñā (wisdom) (Konarka, p. 63). In direct contradiction to this theory it has been stated by a writer in a vernacular journal that the object of these carvings was to prevent the austere devotees of Buddhism from approaching the neighbourhood of the temple. This view may be dismissed without much comment as under some of its degraded Tāntrik forms, a good deal of license seems to have been allowed to followers of the faith. Sir J. G. Woodroffe in his preface to Mr. M. Ganguly’s book on Orissa, has referred to Dr. Maeterlink’s mention of the occasional existence of a type of erotic representation on the walls of Gothic cathedrals. It has been justly held that mere sentimental or spiritual explanation of these sculptures do not explain away their bearing as a natural landmark in the evolution of human faith and morality, and one is reminded of Kraft Ebbing’s well-known dictum that “sexual feeling is really the root of all ethics and no doubt of aestheticism and religion” (Psycho. Sex, p. 2). Messrs. Stephen and Catherwood in the course of their explorations in Central America discovered ruins of huge edifices in the cornices of which were found depicted symbols of an erotic character ‘membra conjuncta in coitu’ (Squier’s Serpent Symbols, p. 48). Mr. Westropp mentions having met with the symbol in temples and public buildings at Panuco (Primitive Symbolism, p. 33). It is interesting to observe that like the sculptors illustrating the descriptions in Kāmasūtra on the steps of Mahāmāyā or Rāmchandārī temple and on the porch of the Sun Temple at Konarak, he explains these pictures as representing in various manners the union of two sexes. Another remarkable feature of similarity in religions so diverse as Mexican and East Indian is the worship of the Sun God in Mexico, which appears to have been interconected with the worship of the Phallic symbol. Representations similar to those which Dulaure found carved or painted at Panuco were observed by Bertram on the sacred edifices at Tlascalla, where among the local creek tribe heliolatry was strongly in evidence. No connection has yet been established between the religious cults of India and Mexico and what appears to have been a stage in the natural evolution of human faith or as it has been called—a ‘cosmic process,’ should not be hastily ascribed to a degraded form of any particular religion. One is therefore inclined to hold that these erotic figures by no means establish the Buddhist origin which is claimed for Konarak. It may be stated in this connection that according to Hindu works like Utkalakhaṇḍu (Chap. XI) sculptures of this description are carved with a view to prevent the buildings being struck by lightning. (Vaiḍūryapāda-bhītya-vāraṇāśtham, वानपालि-पीर्याशिर शास्त्रांसि, &c.). Mr. V. Smith whose attention seems to have been drawn to such Sanskrit texts has also remarked that “such sculptures are said to be a protection against evil spirits and so serve the purpose of lightning-conductors” (History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon, p. 190, foot-note). In the Agnīpurāṇa also, we find directions regarding the representations of these human couples in certain parts of sacred buildings (Agni. Vol. I, p. 356, Ed. Biblioth. Indic. Ch. 104–50. Mithunai pādāvanraṇhi Sākhā-śesahaḥ vihāṣhayet नियुप त:ः पारवस्त्रानि शाश्वा देवेन्द्र नियंत्रितत). It has also been asserted that according to the Śīlpa Sāstras, it was customary to depict on the temple buildings scenes portraying the nine principal sentiments (Rasa) and the erotic passion or Śrināṭa Rasa being the first in the category, has naturally come to occupy a more prominent place. These explanations coming as they do from Hindu sources, certainly go to show that carvings of this kind were not the hallmark of any particular creed. Not content with the so-called indirect evidence of once prevailing Buddhism, an attempt has been made to silence all dissentients by making a bold assertion to the effect that there is an image of Buddha at Puri which can be traced to Konarak. The image of Sun in the Sun Temple at Puri is said to have been removed from the Konarak temple and there is also
a tradition recorded in the Palm-Leaf Temple annals (Mādiā Pañjī) which lend support to this. In the Sun Temple there is another partly mutilated image which the Pāgās or the custodians of the temple declare to be that of Indra, the Hindu Jupiter Pluvius. Mr. Swarup declares this image to be that of Buddha (Konarka, p. 84), an identification which would naturally lend a strong support to his own theory. Mr. Swarup’s opinion in this matter cannot, however, be accepted as final as we find that a very different view has been put forth by an independent scholar, after a minute and careful personal inspection. In an article in the Modern World, July 1913, Mr. Himangshu Sekhar Banerji, B.L., who took careful measurements of the altar at Konarak and the pedestal of the images in the Puri Sun-Temple, has described the similarity of the so-called Buddha, with that of the Moon-god, in the Navagraha frieze at Konarak and in view of the tradition that the Moon was also worshipped there along with the Sun, he is inclined to hold that the image in question is that of the Moon. If there had been anything peculiarly Buddhistic about the image which was likely to lead to a satisfactory identification, the fact would hardly have escaped the attention of modern researchers. Mr. M. Ganguly, whose work on Orissa is probably the latest of its kind from the pen of an Indian scholar, has also been careful not to hazard such a guess. Mr. Swarup’s identification can therefore only be regarded as ‘proven’ under the circumstance.

Some of the Indian writers are so much obsessed with ‘Buddhist’ theories that we find in a vernacular work on Puri Shrines (Puri Tirtha) by Mr. Nagendra Nath Mitra, a statement to the effect that there are big images of Buddha on the pyramidal roof of the Konarak porch or Jagmohan. We had an opportunity of inspecting these images at close quarters, having risked a climb to the roof with the help of the local chowkidar. Being four-headed they are popularly believed to be representations of Brahma. Mr. Swarup with Mr. Longhurst of the Archaeological Survey (Arch. Survey Report, E. Circle, 1906), so far differs from the popular identification as to take these images for representation of Siva or Maheśvara, the matted locks being considered a fifth head on the strength of certain passages quoted from Hindu Texts. The author of “Konarka” monograph seems to be under no illusion that these images were made to represent the founder of Buddhism in any of the varying attitudes (Mudrā), but Mr. N. Mitra seems to go a step further even than other theorists of this school. Mr. Swarup, in view of his own peculiar views, seems to be anxious to relegate the Solar cult to a very subordinate position, and enunciates the view that it could never make a stand as a distinct or separate creed having subsequently become absorbed in the Saivite faith—the Sun God coming to be regarded as one of the eight forms of Siva or Rudra. To an unsophisticated person the obvious object of this assertion would appear to be that if Sun-worship were reduced to a mere ‘subsidiary cult,’ it would be easier to attribute the building of this famous temple to a once flourishing and widely prevalent faith like Buddhism. Heliolatry seems to have once been fairly established in this land—from the temple of Martand 9 in Kashmir in the far north to that of Konarak in the southern shore. In Punjab, Multan (Mulasthn) on the Chenab (Chandrabhāga) was an ancient seat of Sun-worship. (Cunningham’s The Ancient Geography of India, p. 232). Mr. N. N. Vasu quotes Varāha Purāṇa (178, 49-55) to show that Sun images were consecrated by Śambu, the Pauranic founder of the cult at Muttra, Multan, and Ujjain (Introdt. to Vraja Parikramā), and in Vairāgya Purāṇa also there is mention of Multan and Chandrabhāga in connection with heliolatrous rites (Viṣṇavism, Saivism, etc., by Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, p. 153). In Central India the shrines of the Sun God were not quite a negligible factor (Report Arch. Survey, W. India, Vol. IX, pp. 73-74, one of the interesting remains of early

9 Built by king Lalitāditya in the 8th century between A.D. 24 to 760.
heliolatry in the Gwalior inscription of Mihirakula, now in situ in the Indian Museum, Calcutta, which records the erection of a Sun temple by this blood-thirsty son of the White Hun Toramana, in the 15th year of his reign, i.e. about A.D. 530. (Fleet No. 37.) Mr. D. R. Bhandarkar in his interesting progress report of the Archeological Survey, W. Circle, 1905-06, pp. 51-52, describes a 7th century Sun temple at Basantgadh in Sirohi, and a 8th century one at Osia in Jodhpur State, both of which are rich in artistic sculptures. M. Langlès describes a Sun God in the peristyle or verandah of the cave at Ellora Djenouassa (Jānvasā)—a Śaiva cave which may be ascribed to 8th or 9th century (Le toit du verandah ou peristyle sur les murailles du quel on a sculpté . . . Souria (le soleil) tranée dans son char par sept chevaux, p. 89, Tome II).

There is an old Sun Temple at Gaya to the north of the Vishnupāda Temple, the sacred shrine which contains according to Hindu belief the foot-print of Viṣṇu. The Sun in this temple is as usual shown as being drawn in a seven-horse car. The image is important in the sense that the sculptor has followed the description of the God as given in the Hindu scriptures instead of taking for his model the standing figure with two archer companions said to be an adoption of Greek Apollo found on an Aśoka railing in Bodh-Gaya, to which reference has already been made.

If the Apollo model had no influence in determining the nature of the image at Gaya itself, it is not likely that it would have any influence on the 13th century artists at Konarak. Gaya is not the only place in Bihar containing traces of Solar worship. In an open courtyard inside the temple of goddess Pattanēswari, the guardian deity, according to the local Hindus of the city of Patna, was found a big image of the Sun God.11

A twelfth century chlorite Sun image found at Rajmahal on the border of Bengal, has been thought deserving of a notice in Mr. V. Smith's History of Fine Art and Sculpture. In Bengal itself instances are not unknown of the Sun God being worshipped under a totally different name as the result of forgetfulness or misconception on the part of local inhabitants. Mr. Brajendra Nath Banerji in the Journal of the Sāhiya Parishad, describes the so-called image of Shashti (the guardian goddess of infants) worshipped at Chinsurah which is in reality an image of the Sun God with the usual top-boots and lotuses in both hands (Journal of the Bangiya Sāhiya Parishad, Vol. XVIII, p. 193). Mr. Nikhil Nath Roy in his history of Murshidabad, describes an image of a Sun God seated on a horse known as Gaṅgāditya, which is still worshipped in the village Amarakund, lying not far from Berhampore, the headquarters of the Murshidabad district. In the Kandi subdivision in the same district the Sun God is regularly worshipped at Jenu Rajhati, and also at Gokarna, Pātāndā, under the name of Kuśāditya (Journal of the Sāhiya Parishad, Vol. XIV, p. 144). Not long ago the late Dr. Bloch discovered at Māhā the image of a Sun God of the Āditya class. Some of the Sen Kings of Bengal—who flourished before the Mahomedan conquest—were Sun-worshippers and Kāśīvāna in the Edīpur Grant (JASB, Vol. X. 1914, p. 103).

10 The shrine evidently belongs to Buddhist times, and proves that Sun-worship as a distinct cult was even then in vigorous existence. Inside the temple is an inscription in the era of Buddhas Nārāyaṇa, year 1113. (List of Ancient Monuments of Bengal, p. 290. Above Vol. X. p. 341.)

11 The image is no longer worshipped and was lying neglected when the writer of this note visited the shrine with some delegates to the last Bengali Literary Conference held at Bankipur.

12 It is interesting to note that lingering traces of heliolatrous rites are still to be observed in the Chhau (Sansk. Chhaisa) festival of Bihari and up-country women.
describes himself as Parama Saura. The Solar cult which was once so wide-spread and has left such important archaeological evidence of its influence cannot be called a ‘subsidiary’ one, and there appears to be no proper foundation for the idea that at Konarak the Sun worship had flourished like a parasite on the ruins of a once popular Buddhist place of worship.

It is not the place to discuss the relative merits of the theories as to whether the Sun worship ultimately got merged or incorporated in Narayanic or Vaishnavic cult or in the Saivaic one, though certain facts are certainly in favour of the former supposition. It is worthy of note that at Vrindaban, one of the principal seats of modern Vaishnavism, Sun is even now worshipped in a temple on the tila of twelve Adityas, and at Muttra another sacred place of Vaishnivite pilgrimage there is a Sun temple on the Surya Ghāt or Surya tirtha where according to Hindu belief Bali, the lord of the Pātañ regions, obtained from the Sun God the jewel Chintāmani as a reward of the austerities practised by him. In the copper-plate grants of Kesava Sena, and Viśvarāpa Sena (J.A.S.B., Vol. L.XV. Pt. I. p. 9), after the opening words Namo Narāyaṇaya (Salutation to Narāyaṇa) occurs the ihoṣa (vande Arabindabana-vāṇḍhabam—vadhakāra-kārīni-buddhabhutana-mattramuktihetum) Salutations to Thee Thou friend of the lotus plants and deliverer of the three worlds from the prison of darkness, &c. That the stanza is to be taken as referring only to the Sun God hardly requires any comment. In reference to the Martand temple is also mentioned ‘the local name of Vishy as the Sun God.’ In popular parlance the Sun God is even to this day referred to in Bengal as Surya Narāyaṇa. A carved stone in the Indian Museum—known as Surya Narāyaṇa Śīla—on the top of which is sculptured the lotus symbol of the Sun seems to bear convincing testimony to the union of the two tenets. At any rate, so far as Konarak is concerned, there seems to have been no such clashing of rival Hindu sects and the claims now rashly advanced on behalf of Buddhism restrict the discussion to the actual influence, if any, exercised in this part of Orissa by the Buddhist faith alone. In the Arch. Survey reports there is no mention of any Buddhist remains found at Konarak. Nowhere on the temple do we find any representation of the characteristic Buddhist symbol of Tri-ratna. Messrs. Vincent Smith and Havell in their well-known works on Indian Art and Sculpture have made no observations on this point. Mr. R. D. Banerji, now Superintendent, Archaeological Survey, Western Circle, who had on more than one occasion studied the Konarak remains on the spot declared to me that nothing Buddhist has yet been found on the site in the course of excavations made by the officers of the Archaeological Survey. Mr. M. Ganguly also maintains a discreet silence and does not commit himself to the views enunciated by Mr. Bishan Swarup.

As we have shown above the so-called evidence adduced in support of the pro-Buddhist theory is exceedingly unsatisfactory, as Dr. Rājendra Lāla Mitra himself admits,11 and so long as no new results of archaeological or epigraphical discoveries are forthcoming to corroborate such statements no accurate or scientific writer should speak of Buddhism or Buddhist influence in connection with the Konarak ruins.

12 “The evidence available is certainly exceedingly unsatisfactory, but without the assumption of previous sanctity and celebrity it becomes difficult to account for the selection of a seashore for the dedication of so costly and magnificent a temple as the Black Pagods” (Ant. Orissa, Vol. II. p. 148). As regards the inaccessibility or loneliness of some of the wellknown sacred places of the Hindus, one is tempted to quote from the beautiful lay-sermon of Sir Rabindranath Tagore “What is Art?” (Personality, p. 29-30 & 32), in justification of the selection of such beautiful sites.
SAMĀJA.

BY N. G. MAJUMDAR, Esq., B.A.; CALCUTTA.

Professor D. R. Bhandarkar in his discussion on Asoka’s Rock-edict I in which the king condems the samāja but shows his leaningness towards a particular kind of it, has culled from many sources various references to the word samāja. He has clearly shown from Brahmanical and Buddhist literature that there were two kinds of samāja, and that the great monarch wanted to taboo that particular kind in which, animals out of number, were, as a rule, slaughtered and “the meat formed one of the principal articles of food served.” Regarding this point I do not think any reasonable doubt can possibly be entertained. But what was the second kind of samāja? Prof. Bhandarkar has shown good reason to suppose that in this samāja “the people were entertained with dancing, music, and other performances,” which according to Rock-edict I was considered Śāhukumātā or excellent by king Asoka?

The above theory of Prof. Bhandarkar, I am glad to say, is strongly confirmed by the following evidence. First, I want to point out that the word samāja in the sense of theatrical performance has been used by Vatsyāyana in his Kāmasūtra where he describes it as a sort of religious observance. The passages which refer to it are translated below:

“On the day of a fortnight or month, sanctioned by prevailing custom (prajñāđata) those who are attached to (the service of) the temple of the Goddess of Learning must hold a samāja.”

“Actors coming from other places should give them a performance (prakshayakam).”

“On the second day (after their performance) the actors should invariably receive marks of honour from those (engaged in the service of the Goddess of Learning).”

“Then they might repeat the performance or be discharged according to the taste (of the audience).”

“And in adversity or in festivity they (should) help one another.”

“And honour and help to the itinerant (actors) who have (already) entered into the covenant is the duty of a Gaṇa.”

From the above quotations it appears that samāja meant a sort of theatrical performance. We further notice that it had great religious importance inasmuch as it was customary to hold it in temples of Sarasvāti who was no doubt considered to be the presiding deity of the dramatic art.

In the Jātaka also samāja has been used in the above sense. From the Kāyavēra-jātaka (No. 318) it appears that in those days there were companies of itinerant actors (naṭa) whose business it was to move from place to place and show their performances, which are called samāja, in villages (gāma), towns (nigama) and cities. A courtezan, in the above Jātaka, is in deep love with her husband who has run away. In order to trace him back she calls together some professional actors, and addresses them thus: ‘Tumhākam agamanathānam nāma nāthi, tumhe gāma-nigama-rāvadhāniyo gantva samajjam katvā samajja-mañjaile pathamam eva imaṁ āsī samajja-mañjaile pathamam eva imaṁ gāyeyāthā (‘ti naše sikkhāpenti pathamam gāthān vavvā), etc. . . . . .

Te Bārajasalo nikkhamitvā tattha tattha samajjam karontā pathamam eva gāyeyāthā.’ In this passage samajja must mean theatrical performance and samajja-mañjaile, the stage.

The samajja which is described in the Kāmasūtra and to which there are references in the Jātaka would correspond to the second kind of samajja as described by Prof. Bhandarkar. But this is not the only sense in which the word has been used in the Jātaka. Turning to Fausboll, VI, 277 we come across the passage Pasa malle samajjasmin

1 Ante, 1913, 255-58.
2 Kāmasūtra, Chowkramā Sanskrit Series, 49-51.
3 Fausboll, Jātaka, III, 61-2.
poṃenti digvai bhujam. We further learn that this samāja was maṇḍhātiṃaṇcha which the commentator explains as maṇḍhāṇīṃ upari buddha-maṇḍa. This word must mean, therefore, here at any rate, a stage for the purpose of a wrestling combat. It should be noted also that a stage can but occasionally serve this purpose for which alone, however, open space is always preferable. The commentator explains no doubt, samajjasmin b malla-raiga, but that meaning cannot be the only meaning for reasons just noted—a conclusion which is forced upon us from a comparison of the two instances of the Jātaka referred to above. In the first of these I have already shown samāja cannot, of course, mean a malla-raiga for the simple reason that naṭaś play on it.¹

Prof. Bhandarkar has noticed that raiga and prekhaṅgara are used synonymously with samāja. I have not the least doubt that here samāja means the place where plays are enacted just like 'theatre' which has a double meaning. 'Preshaṅgara' is the same as 'prekhaṅgārika,' the construction of which is described at length by Bharata in his Nātyaśāstra (II, 8, etc.). In the description of samāja in the Kāmasūtra, as we have already seen, the word prekaṅgākām means a performance. From these the conclusion becomes unavoidable that samāja was primarily a technical word for theatre. I do not doubt, however, that games, contests of animals, etc., were also exhibited in a samāja which practice is common even now. A stage, therefore, serves two objects, primarily, the enactment of a drama, and secondarily, the exhibition of games. These were also what samāja used to serve in Ancient India.

But the question that arises here is: which of the above two senses would suit the samāja which a king like Asoka considers excellent? Dr. Thomas takes it in the sense of 'a celebration of games or rather contests' (JRAI., 1914, 393-4). But then, why should Asoka show a special predilection for it in one of his own religious writs? There is no evidence to prove that the celebrations of games was 'looked upon as a religious observance in his days. On the other hand there is evidence to prove that samāja in the sense of theatrical performance was really looked upon as religious. I have already referred to the testimony of Vatsyayana to this point. But this is not all. In the Rāmāyana, e.g., the theatre is pre-eminently looked upon as a sign of prosperity of a country (rāṣṭravardhana). In the following passage it has been said, that in a kingless country utsavas and samājas which delight the actors and dancers never flourish:

Nārāyake jānapade prahṛṣṭhuśaḥkaraṇaṃ rāṣṭravardhanāḥ. —Ayodhyā, c. 67, 15.

It follows, therefore, that the king patronized the theatre which was regarded no doubt as an instrument of educating the people.

In view of what is stated above, we are now in a position to understand Asoka's liking for this particular kind of samāja, and this explains why he was so eager to record his sympathy with it. It may be noticed here that if our interpretation is correct it is the first inscriptive evidence of a king supporting the stage in India. Besides this there are in record two other inscriptive evidences proving the same fact, viz., the Nāsim Cave inscription of the 10th year of the reign of Vasiṣṭhiputra Fulumayi and the Hāṭhigumpha inscription of the Emperor Khāravela. M. Senart in editing the former inscription, took samāja in the sense of 'assembly.'² But that word has to be interpreted in a different sense now. In l. 5 of the Hāṭhigumpha inscription, it has been recorded that the king, who was himself a master of music ('gandhavā-veda-budho'), entertained his capital, in

¹ As to the fact that samāja was sometimes celebrated on the top of a hill which was first pointed out by Prof. Bhandarkar and the which Dr. Thomas has again drawn our attention, we may cite the case of the Jogimārā cave at Ramgarhi Hill which according to the late Dr. Bloch was the site of a theatre flourishing there at least about the second century n. c.—Archaeological Survey Report, 1903-4.

² Epi. Ind., VIII, 61.
the third year of his reign, by ‘Usava-samāja,’ just like Puḷumāyi. It was worth noticing here, that in the record dāṇḍa (?) nata-gita-vādila-saṇḍaśaṇāṭi is mentioned over and above Usava-samāja—kārāṇḍaṇāṭi. This makes clear that in those days samāja or theatre did not merely consist of dancing and music. These are then instances to show that the Hindu theatre began to receive State support from very early times.

HATHIGUMPHA INSRIPTION.

MRSRS. K. P. JAYASWAL and R. D. BANERJI have placed the students of Indian Antiquity under a deep obligation by having made accessible to them, for the first time, a reliable version of the very important inscription of King Kharavela at Hathigumpha (JBO, 1917, pp. 425-507). Mr. Jayaswal has further increased the value of his publication by adding a learned introduction and various notes for clearing up the subject, and it may be confidently expected that ere long the contents of this valuable inscription will be fully utilised for studying the history of the period. Before this can be done, however, we must arrive at a definite understanding about the date of this record. I propose, therefore, to discuss this point in some detail in the following pages.

The various theories entertained on the subject have been summarised by Mr. R. D. Banerji, on pp. 488-489, in his note. They may be divided into two classes. According to one, there is a direct reference to a date in line 16 of the record; according to the other, there is no date in line 16 but there are references to some events elsewhere (11. 6 and 11) in the record from which an idea of its approximate date may be formed.

Both Mr. Jayaswal and Mr. R. D. Banerji have endorsed the first of these theories, and have unequivocally pronounced that the record does contain a date in line 16—‘In the time of King Muriya [Chandragupta] which had elapsed by hundred and sixty-five years’—according to Mr. Jayaswal (pp. 449-451) and ‘in the era of the Maurya kings, one hundred and sixty years increased by five . . .’ according to Mr. Banerji (p. 492). In spite of this difference of interpretation, which, by the way, is not insignificant, both the scholars take their stand upon the same reading, viz. “Pān-āntariya-sati-vasa-sate Rāja-Muriya-kāla.” The correctness of this reading (with slight unimportant modifications) has hitherto been conceded even by those (e.g. Dr. Fiee) who were not disposed to look upon it as containing a date, for there seemed to have been very little ground of doubt in the facsimile given by Pandit Bhagwān Lal Indraji. Now that an impression has been prepared on approved scientific method, it is time to examine closely the original words as they stand in the record. Fortunately, Mr. Banerji has taken a separate impression of the ‘dated portion’ (see Plate IV) and it may be hoped, therefore, that we have here the best mechanical estampe of the portion that we may ever hope to obtain.

Now any one who even cursorily glances at Plate IV must at once come to the conclusion that the letters read as “Saṭnii va sa” are far from clear. In the first place the second letter can be hardly read as ‘ti’. This may be verified by a comparison of the other ‘tīn’s in the record, e.g. that of ‘Choysa (or ?a) ti’ in the same line ‘Rāṭhīkā’ in l. 6, and ‘Aṭhama’ in l. 7. The next letter read as ‘va’ looks like ‘ta’ for its lower limbs are not joined and there is no sign that they were ever so joined. The third letter, read as ‘sa’, looks more like ‘pa’ than anything else; the left limb of ‘sa’ is entirely wanting for we cannot suppose that the same stroke served both as the right limb of ‘ta’ (or, va) as well as the left limb of ‘sa’.

It thus appears to me, that, so far at least as the facsimile goes, there is no justification for the reading ‘sati-vasa-sate’. In the absence of this reading, there remains no trace whatsoever in the inscription, of any direct reference to a date.

Now, conceding for a moment, that the record really contains the date 165, of the era of Muriya [Chandragupta] or of the Maurya kings as contended by Mr. Jayaswal and Mr. Banerji, and is to be placed in about 161 B.C., let us see what result follows. The record, as interpreted by these two scholars, mentions in line 6, that king Kharavela, in his fifth year, brought into the capital the canal excavated by king Nanda three centuries before. As Mr. Banerji has shown (p. 493), this would mean that king Nanda was master of Kāliṅga in about 465 or 469 B.C. Mr. Banerji would identify

---

7 To show further that it was really a full-fledged theatrical performance in the sense that actual dramas were enacted on the stage, I should like to draw the attention of scholars to the occurrence of the word māka, i.e. drama, in the Jātkā (IV, 103).
8 Fiee no doubt suggested some alterations, but he fully admitted the possibility of this reading. See his reading quoted by Mr. Banerji on p. 491.
him, not with the earliest ruler of the Nanda Dynasty, but with the earliest king of the Pauranic list whose name contains or is supposed to contain the adjunct Nanda, i.e. Nandivardhana. We leave out of consideration, for the moment, the fact that the name is given as Nandivardhana in all the authentic Purāṇas, that the corrupt Bhaeishya Purāṇa alone gives the name as Nandavardhana, that none of the Purāṇas count him or his successor among the Nanda kings and that there is no justification therefore to dub him as Nanda I. as Mr. Banerji has done on the authority of Mr. Jayaswal. We take for granted that Nandivardhana, or Nandivardhana, of the Śisunagā dynasty was on the throne in 465 B.C. (taking the later date). This would place Ajātāsattu's reign, according to Mr. Jayaswal's calculation, between 568 and 334 B.C., or rather earlier, as we may justly suppose that king Nandivardhana was for some years on the throne of Magadha before he could excavate a canal in Kaliṅga. Now this not only runs counter to the present accepted view about the date of the death of Buddha but is also opposed to the orthodox view, accepted by Mr. Jayaswal, that the Buddha died in the 8th year of Ajātāsattu's reign (see, e.g., the Synchroonistic table of Mr. Jayaswal in Appendix C of his paper on the Saisunaka and Maurya Chronology, etc., published in JBORS, Sept. 1915. Reprint p. 49). The date of the Hāthigumpha inscription, as interpreted by Mr. Jayaswal and Mr. Banerji, thus upset the accepted date of the Gautama Buddha and therewith the whole chronological system based upon it. Such far-reaching conclusions can be accepted only on the basis of clear and positive evidence. But as has been seen above, the line 16 of the record which is the keystone of the whole structure is far from being clear and positive.

Attention may be drawn in this connection to the ways in which idioms expressing dates have been interpreted by these scholars. We have three such expressions, viz., ti-vasa-sata in line 6, terasa-vasa-sata in line 11, and the alleged sāthi-vasa-sata in line 16. They have taken the first two in the sense of 300 and 1300 respectively, but have interpreted the last as 100, while it is clear that, to be consistent, they should have explained it as 6,000. According to the usual meaning the first two expressions ought to be taken in the sense of 113 and 103, respectively. These would upset many theories started by Mr. Jayaswal. Thus, for example, there would be no basis for the suggestion that we have in line 11 a reference to the Kaliṅga hero who flourished at the time of Mahābhārata war, or that there was a careful chronicle in Orissa at the time of Kharavela which could go back 1,300 years. But by far the most important results would follow if we take ti-vasa-sata to mean 103 on the analogy of the so-called sāthi-vasa-sata. For then we have to place a Nanda King in Kaliṅga in the year 54 of the Maurya era, and this by itself would go far to prove that there is something wrong in the system of chronology adopted by the authors of the paper.

Mr. Banerji has maintained that even apart from the question of the true reading of line 16, Dr. Fleet's views about the date of the record were grossly inconsistent in themselves. In this I cannot follow him, and it is but due to the memory of the illustrious scholar that his case should be fairly represented. As shown by Mr. Banerji (p. 494) Dr. Fleet concluded from some details in line 11 that the eleventh year of Kharavela fell in the 113th year after the conquest of Kaliṅga by Aśoka, and that Kharavela therefore ascended the throne of Kaliṅga, 111 years after the anointment of Aśoka. Mr. Banerji then adds, "Now, according to Dr. Lüders, Kharavela caused an aqueduct that had not been used for 103 years since king Nanda or since the Nanda kings, to be conducted into the city, in the 8th year of his reign. This view is also shared by the late Dr. Fleet." (P. 494). It becomes easy of course to show that the two views are incompatible with each other. The fact, however, is that there is no reason to suppose that the particular view of Dr. Lüders was also shared by the late Dr. Fleet. His published writings on the subject, referred to by Mr. Banerji, contain no such thing and Mr. Banerji should have given full reference before advancing such a charge against the late lamented scholar. He was too critical a scholar for such inconsistencies and I maintain that his view, so far as it goes, is perfectly consistent in itself. It may be mentioned in this connection that Mr. Banerji has fallen into similar error in his criticism of Lüders' view. Kharavela, according to it, would not be four years of age, as Mr. Banerji maintains in l. 22. p. 496, but 11 years of age when Aśoka died.

R. C. MAJUMDAR.
THE WIDE SOUND OF E AND O IN MARWARI AND GUJARATI.

BY DA. L. P. TESSITORI, BIKANER.

I had already dealt with the subject of the present paper in a note published in appendix to my "Progress Report on the work done in connection with the Bardic and Historical Survey of Rajputana during the year 1915," and had hoped that I had therein given the genesis of the wide sound of e and o in Marwari and Gujarati, as distinct from the narrow sound, with sufficient lucidity and documentation to convince everybody. But in this I was mistaken and a contradictory article by Mr. N. B. Divatia, recently appeared in this Journal, now obliges me to take up the same subject again and remove some shades of doubt which it has cast on my conclusions.

In the note to which I have just referred, I had shown that every ə, ə (wide) of Marwari and Gujarati is derived from an aɪ, aʊ of the Old Western Rajasthani, whereas every e, o (narrow) is derived from O. W. Rajasthani e, o, or, in some few cases, O. W. Rajasthani ɪ, ɛa, ʊa, ɔa. With regard to the former change I had pointed out that the manuscripts indicate that it was affected through a process of contraction, that is, through suppression of the hiatus, the intermediate step being the diphthongs ai, au, (ए औ ए). Thus O. W. Rajasthani aɪ, through ai, gave Marwari-Gujarati ə, and similarly O. W. Rajasthani aʊ, through au, gave Marwari-Gujarati ə. Seeing that the spelling ai, au is found in most, if not all, of the earliest manuscripts of Marwari and Gujarati, and that it is still used by accurate Marwari writers to represent the wide sounds ə, o, and at the same time considering that this ai, au spelling is not only etymologically accurate but also very significative in that it graphically represents the genesis of the sounds themselves, I had suggested that it might be adopted, or rather readopted, in Gujarati to distinguish the wide sound (ə, o) from the narrow sound (e, o).

It is known to everybody that one of the deficiencies of modern Gujarati orthography is the use of a unique sign to indicate both ə, o and e, o.

Shortly before the publication of my note Mr. Divatia had in the same Journal proposed a theory according to which the e, o of Gujarati was devolved from O. W. Rajasthani aɪ, aʊ, not through ai, au, but through aya, ava (ay, av). In reply to this, I had in

---

1 Jour. As. Soc. of Beng., N.S., XII, 1916, pp. 73 ff.
3 I use a grave accent (') to represent the wide sound and an acute accent ('') to represent the narrow sound.
4 I give below a specimen which I have taken at random from a manuscript about 50 years old containing the "Khyāta" of Bikaner by Sūnjhāyaca Dayālā Dās (MS. No. 1 of Descr. Cat. of Bard. and Hist. MSS., Sect. i, pt. ii): धाक्कर धारासाला अध्यक्षीयारा सूपाक धाक्कर पव्वालुप धाक्कर धाक्कर धाक्कर पव्वालुप धाक्कर धाक्कर धाक्कर धाक्कर धाक्कर धाक्कर धाक्कर धाक्कर धाक्कर धाक्कर धाक्कर धाक्कर धाक्कर
5 A Note on Some Special Features of Pronunciation etc. in the Gujarati Language, Vol. XLIV, pts. DLII and DLVI, January and May 1915.
my note given some reasons which, I believe, conclusively dismiss Mr. Divatia's explanation, but he has not been persuaded by them and in his new article on the subject still clings to his theory and not only maintains that ē, ō are derived from aya, ava, but also that the result of the contraction of ai, aū, if this contraction ever takes place, is not ē, ō, but ē, ō.

Naturally, in the beginning of his new article Mr. Divatia examines the arguments given by me against his theory and tries to dismiss them, but how! Instead of removing them from his path, he simply walks round them and gets beyond. One of my arguments is that there are no sure instances of any ai, aū of the O. W. Rajasthani having changed to aya, ava in any stage of this language. To prove the contrary, my opponent splits the vocal compounds ai, aū into their two elements and fetches instances of isolated i, u having passed into ya, va in the later stage of the O. W. Rajasthani if not in Gujarati itself! The only instances of the pretended change ai > aya which Mr. Divatia is able to quote, are vaya[r], ⁶ payas[r], baya[h]āi, and paya[h]āi. I had already explained these forms as incorrect readings due to the habit of the scribes to write ya for i. But Mr. Divatia does not accept this explanation and ransacks some O.W. Rajasthani texts in search of examples like nīcarī, Ṣuva[r]dī, Rāma[y]a, etc., which in his opinion prove that the scribes instead of showing a tendency to write ya for i, show a tendency to write i for ya. But i is the regular spelling in all these cases and does not represent a tendency of the scribes, but a tendency of the language! The fact is that the tendency of the scribes to write ya for i is not only indisputable but also much more widely established than Mr. Divatia imagines, for it is found in Prakrit manuscripts as well. To cite only one case. Of the two manuscripts collated by Prof. H. Jacob for the edition of his Māhārāṣṭrī Erzählungen, A and B, the former reads gāyam for gāma (p. 73) and payas[r]io for pa[a]s[ri]o (p. 63), and the latter kayava[a] for kau[n]ya (p. 61) and vaya[r]a for va[r]a (p. 60).⁷

Another of my arguments was that it is not admissible that a language which possesses a tendency to samprasad[r]a even greater than Apabhraṣṭa itself, should at the same time possess a tendency to anti-samprasad[r]a, to use Mr. Divatia's expression. In other words, it is not admissible that the O. W. Rajasthani after changing kava[a] into kau[n]a should have reversed the process and changed kau[n]a into kava[a] back again. Mr. Divatia clings to this example and discovers that Apabhraṣṭa kava[a] is derived from Prakrit ka[ti] < ko-upa <Skt. kaḥ punah (l), and that the O. W. Rajasthani form ka[ti]a itself is only a return to the old Prakrit form! This is of course all in perfect accordance with Mr. Divatia's principle.

⁶ Also vaya[r]ā, evidently a tatenma in part modelled on caya[r].
⁷ These examples probably show that the O. W. Rajasthani scribes who wrote vaya[r]a and paya[s]rā were not thereby introducing a change in the regular spelling, but only perpetuating an inaccuracy which had become traditional. From the grammatical point of view these forms with oya are no less foreign to the O. W. Rajasthani than they are to the Māhārāṣṭrī, and if they do not represent an actual change in the case of the latter, much less can they represent an actual change in the case of the former. They are evidently anomalous spellings which for reasons difficult to detect were more frequently used in the case of some particular words than in the case of others. Had it been the case of an actual change these spellings would apply to all words alike. Mr. Divatia has not ignored this objection, but being unable to remove it, he has contrived to discredit it by admitting the possibility of the impossible. According to him it is quite natural that oya should be found “only in certain words,” for “changes in a language cannot proceed on regular lines of uniform march; some forms will linger, some progress, go backwards and forwards, till a final settled state is reached.” Thus vaya[r]a, paya[s]rā and the like are only instances of words which felt the change that was beginning to come, in advance of the others. Needless to say, this theory of precocious and tardy words and of pendulum-like oscillations backwards and forwards is new and would require to be proved.
that languages. "go backwards and forwards", but the generally accepted principle is very different from this. 8

My third and last argument was that when the Marwari and Gujarati scribes found that the spelling ai, au no longer corresponded to the actual pronunciation, they did not alter it into aya, ava, but into ai, au. Evidently, by the time when ai, au were introduced into use—about the sixteenth century A.D.—the two elements in the vocal compounds ai, au had been blended together into diphthongs and were then pronounced as diphthongs. This is, perhaps, the strongest and most decisive of all my arguments in that it proves that during the period of transition from O. W. Rajasthani to modern Marwari-Gujarati, if not earlier, the tendency of the language was to fuse the two elements in the groups ai, au into one, not to divaricate them further by amplifying them into aya, ava. But Mr. Divatia easily disposes of this argument by refusing to believe that early Gujarati manuscripts contain the spelling ai, au. Even if this was the case, it would suffice to know that the spelling is found in Marwari manuscripts, but that it is found in Gujarati manuscripts as well is a matter that can be easily ascertained by Mr. Divatia himself if he only cares to complete his researches, which, as he states, are "limited in extent in this respect." 9

In conclusion, none of Mr. Divatia's replies to the arguments given by me against his theory, does really hit the point, much less can these replies demolish my criticism. However, Mr. Divatia has satisfied himself if no others, and thinking that he has cleared his path of all obstacles, proceeds on. I shall not follow him into all his details, but will confine myself to examining the two or three main points in his discussion and conclusions. He begins by suggesting that if aya, ava (as developments of ai, au) were not actually written, except in a few cases, "they were potential developments as precedent conditions requisite for the production of the wide sound (έ, ó) which comes on the final a being lost through want of accent...

8 The other examples with which Mr. Divatia tries to show that a va of the Apabhraśka after becoming u in O. W. Rajasthani can revert to va in Gujarati, are: devura > desvara, deula > devula, and deura > devura. Here the reversion of sampradāraśa is only apparent. In several old Marwari manuscripts (e.g., MS. No. 15 of Descr. Cat. of Bard. and Hist. MSS., Sect. ii., pt. i, Sanvat 1615-34), I have found the spelling va for u coming after a long vowel. Thus: rāmva for rāu, rāvuta for rāuta, rāvula for rāula, nilvulī for nose, Sbhāvula for Sbhāvuta, etc. Evidently, we have here insertion of va-sruti between u and the preceding long vowel, and it is this va-sruti that has given rise to the modern va. Thus O. W. Rajasthani deula first becomes deula, through insertion of va-sruti, and then, by dropping the u, devula. There is no question of reversion of sampradāraśa here.

9 Not only is the spelling ai, au found in early Gujarati manuscripts, but it is very often found side by side with the old spelling ai, au, a circumstance that shows better than anything else that the former spelling is the immediate successor of the latter and that there are no intermediate steps like aya, ava between them. Here is an illustration of the above-mentioned case, taken from the first page of a manuscript in my possession, written, apparently, towards the middle, if not the end, of the seventeenth century. . . . and containing a Gujarati bādavabodha to a "Jambuaeśvara," a Jain work: भैलिक राय एव उपदेश वेदी लीलास्ती छांति तिभार एक वेदवा महत्त्वक नं tmrachān. . . . बारस स्म भयं करण साही वेदवोकं विचार वेदान्ती ग्यालो छांति . . . , etc. It will be noticed that in the above extract, ai, au are used side by side, whereas au is constantly represented by o. This is not a mere graphic peculiarity of the manuscript, but it is a general fact that while early Gujarati manuscripts as a rule always represent è by ai, they very seldom represent è by au, but either use the old form ai or the newer form o. Marwari manuscripts are more consistent in this respect and use both ai and au. The Gujarati manuscript cited above is only one of many I could cite in which ai is used side by side with ai. Indeed, the practice of writing ai is so prevalent in early Gujarati manuscripts that I am very much puzzled to explain how a Gujarati scholar can assert that he has never come across any instance thereof!
thus giving ay, av as the causative principle of the broad sound." Translated into practice, this means that O. W. Rajasthani karai to become modern Marwari-Gujarati karé, had to pass through the stages: karaya > karay, the entire process being as follows:

1. karai > 2. karaya > 3. karay > 4. karé.

There is no room for the karai of the manuscripts here, but this is no stumbling-block for Mr. Divatia as he has already disposed of the inconvenient form karai by denying its existence. Anyhow, one would like to ask, in what does karay differ from karai? For it is clear that it must differ in something, otherwise the third phase would represent no progress in respect to the first. My opponent’s reply to this question can hardly be expected to be any other but this: that the last letter of karai is a distinct i separated by hiatus from the preceding a, whereas the last letter of karay is an indistinct i attached to and forming one syllable with the preceding a. Well, if it is so, is this not tantamount to admitting that the second syllable of karay is a diphthong? And if it is a diphthong, is not ai its proper expression?

I think I can guess whence Mr. Divatia’s idea of the intermediate phase aya, ava has sprung from. He has seen that in modern Gujarati the ai, au of tat-samasa (e.g. daiva, gaurava) is pronounced differently from the ē, ō of tadbhava, while on the other hand aya, (ava) of tatsamas and semi-tatsamas (e.g. samaya, paja, nayava, karari) is pronounced very much like ē, ō, and has concluded that aya, ava are akin to ē, ō, and ai, au remote from it. If this was Mr. Divatia’s line of thought, he has made here a double mistake: firstly in assuming that tadbhava ai, au were necessarily pronounced in exactly the same way as tatsama ai, au, 10 and secondly in imagining that aya, ava are correctly written in all cases when they are pronounced ē, ō. Forms like samaya, paja, nayavā, etc., are as commonly met with in O. W. Rajasthani and modern Marwari-Gujarati, are really incorrect spellings for samāi, pāi, nāi or samāi, pāi, nāi, respectively. In my article mentioned above I had suggested that in all these tatsamas or semi-tatsamas the transition of aya to ē must have taken place through the intermediate step ai, but I had been unable to adduce any instances of this passing of aya into ai then, as up to the time of writing that article I had met with none in the manuscripts I had examined. Since then I have found many instances of ai < aya in the Tāva Jāta Si rāi Chanda by Vijñā Sūjā, a Diuṣāla poem, whereof a copy dated Saṃvat 1629 is preserved in the Darbar Library in the Fort of Bikaner, 11 and in a few other manuscripts.

Continuing, Mr. Divatia quotes some etymologies which in his opinion prove that O. W. Rajasthani ai, aii when accented on the a, give aya, ava and hence ē, ō in Marwari-Gujarati, and when accented on the i, u, give ē, ō. Unfortunately, a large proportion of these etymologies are incorrect, and some instead of proving what they are intended to prove, prove exactly the contrary. To point out only a few inaccuracies:

\[\text{a} \text{merū} \text{is not from a} \text{nairū, but from a} \text{naerū (Ap.)},\]
\[\text{the resultant of ma} \text{mgala is not mē} \text{ga} \text{la, but mē} \text{ga} \text{la},\]
\[\text{vērē does not come from va} \text{rāi but from *vērāi (Ap.) > vērāi, vērai (O. W. Raj.)},\]
\[\text{Rāṭhura is not from Rāṭhāi} \text{ra, but from Rāṭhāi} \text{ra.}\]
It is not exactly clear what Mr. Divatia means by the accent which he thinks is always present on the one or the other element of aï, aï. He can hardly mean the old Sanskrit accent, for his accent does not fall on the same syllables on which the Sanskrit accent would fall, besides, the Sanskrit accent does not always support the theory that aï, aï give é, ô only when accented on the a. What he probably means by accent is a stress or greater emphasis possessed by one of the two vowels in contradistinction from the other, but if he means this stress, he has a very peculiar way of defining and locating it. In some places he speaks of the “preponderance” of one vowel over the other. From the examples he gives of the preponderance of i or u over the preceding a, it appears that he finds the reasons of this preponderance in the fact that the i, or u, is “guru,” i. e., prosodically long either by in nature or by position. Thus in Čitakāra > Čitāra it is an u long by nature that predominates, whereas in Pañcaulli > Pañcāulli > Pāndūli it is an u long by position. Now, this is all very well, or at least it would be if the etymologies given were all correct, but these are examples of aï > ô, not of aï > ó!

I have noted that several of the i’s and u’s which Mr. Divatia understands as predominating, belong to the initial syllable of a suffix or of the second member of a nominal compound. This is probably a mere coincidence which my opponent possibly has not even noticed, but should he ever think of this and come out some day with a new theory according to which an i or u forming part of the initial syllable of a suffix or of the second member of a nominal compound predominates over the terminal a of the word to which it is appended and gives rise to é, ô, I think I have better forestall him now by quoting a few etymologies which show that such is not the case:

Skt. prā-hara > Ap. pa-hara > O. W. Raj. pa-hura > Marw.-Guj. pōhra “A watch of the day”;
O. W. Raj. kabārā-īta > Marw.-Guj. kabārīta “A bowman”,
O. W. Raj. pākhāra-īta > Marw.-Guj. pākhārīta “An armoured horse”;
Skt. su-a-jana > Ap. sa-(y)a-nā > O. W. Raj. sa-a-yā > Marw.-Guj. sēyā “A relative or friend”;

12 Cf. the cases following :-
Skt. karīna > O. W. Raj. kaiyu > Marw.-Guj. kēra “Capparis Aphylla”;
Skt. nāgya > Ap. nāgya > O. W. Raj. nāgāra > Marw.-Guj. nāra “City of …”;
Skt. āta > Ap. sā(y)a > O. W. Raj. sāy > Marw.-Guj. śāy “Hundred”;

13 Patronymics in āta and names of towns or villages in āra are often pronounced narrow nowadays, but the evidence of old manuscripts shows that the o in these terminations was in origin wide, but the former is perhaps the more frequent in old and accurate manuscripts, and, anyhow, the fact that the manuscripts, though often writing o for ạ, never write ọ for ô, is a sufficient reason for concluding that the ạ in these terminations must necessarily have been wide in origin.
I have remarked above, incidentally, that some of the etymologies which Mr. Divatia produces in order to show that ai, aï gave ē, ō, and aya, ava gave ē, ō, are incorrect and instead of proving what they are intended to prove, prove exactly the contrary. My opponent will no doubt be surprised to learn this, and still more to learn that his theory is not only fallacious, but is the perfect reversion of the truth. Guided by “the perception of the ear,” Mr. Divatia asserts that ē, ō can only be the result of aya, ava, and that the contraction of ai, aï can only give ē, ō. The real facts are precisely the contrary: ai, aï gives ē, ō, and aya, ava gives ē, ō. Of the former change I need give no illustrations as I believe I have sufficiently proved it in my note to which I have referred above, and which as I have tried to show, has not been in the least impaired by Mr. Divatia’s adverse criticism. I shall therefore confine myself to show how aya, ava contracts into ē, ō. One of Mr. Divatia’s examples is ghañerū, and another kasaṅī. The correct etymology of these two words is as follows:

Skt. ghana-taram > Ap. ghava-(y)arū > O. W. Raj. and Guj. ghañerū “Plentiful”,

Here we have a real instance of the change of aya to ē and of ava to ō. Mr. Divatia represents the change as having taken place through an intermediate step ai, aï, and thus makes the two examples agree with his theory, but these aï, aï are not the regular ai, aï of the O. W. Rajasthani, but merely hypothetical forms which have no more reality than Mr. Divatia’s potential steps ai > aya, aï > ava, supposing that the latter were justifiable. Two other instances of aya > ē, ava > ō, which are unconsciously given by Mr. Divatia himself, are the following:


I now proceed to give some additional instances of my own:

O. W. Raj. bāra-vaññ > Marw.-Guj. bājō “A footstool”,
O. W. Raj. kara-vaññ > Marw.-Guj. kara “Vanguard”,
It will be noticed that in all the above examples the $ya$ or $va$ which combines with a preceding $a$ to form $e$ or $o$, is initial in the second member of a nominal or verbal compound. This is a very important circumstance, because it contains in itself the reason why the $ya$ or $va$ in all these cases did not undergo *samprasadana*. I have said above that *samprasadana* is one of the most marked features of the O. W. Rajasthani, and that every $ava$ of the Apabhraṣṭa is changed into $aui$ in the former language. But when $va$ is initial in a word or comes immediately after a prefix, *samprasadana* does not take place. Thus Ap. $vaïra$ remains $vaïra$ in O. W. Rajasthani, and similarly $a-vasa$ remains $a-vasa$, but $panmai$ becomes $naïmai$. Mr. Divatia has made the mistake of overlooking the fact that initial $va$ cannot undergo *samprasadana* and has given a series of etymologies in which he presupposes two conditions incompatible with one another: the existence of a stress or accent on a $va$ or $ya$ initial in the second member of a compound, and the weakening of this $va$ or $ya$ into $u$, $i$. It is obvious that so long as the $va$ in *kasa-vaṣṭi* retains the stress or emphasis which naturally falls on the initial syllable of every word, it can never undergo *samprasadana*. The form *kasaṭī* can only be possible, if at all, when the word *kasa-vaṣṭi* has ceased to be considered as a compound and the $va$ has lost its stress or has transferred it to another syllable. 14 As a matter of fact, this has happened in the case of *kasaṣṭi*, and we have of this word two parallel developments: (a) *kasa-vaṣṭi > kasaṭī*, and (b) *kasaṣṭi > kasaṣṭi* 15 > *kasaṭī*.

In all the examples of the change $aya > e$, $ava > o$ which have been given above, the $ya$ and $va$ are initial, a condition which is essential in O. W. Rajasthani for the production of the narrow sound. But if we step out of the boundaries of the O. W. Rajasthani into the domains of Apabhraṣṭa and Prakrit, we find that here the change $aya > e$, $ava > o$ is not confined to cases when $ya$ and $va$ are initial, but extends to other cases as well. Thus we find *lava* (< Skt. *laṇa*), *lava* (< Skt. *lava*), *ovi* (< Skt. *avādhi*), etc. I need not give more examples of this kind because the reader can see them for himself in Pischel’s *Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen*, §§ 153-4, but what I wish to remark here is that the change $aya > e$, $ava > o$ is not a peculiarity of the O. W. Rajasthani, but rather the continuation of a process which was already in operation in the early Prakrit-Apabhraṣṭa stage.

But to revert to the $e$, $o$ sound. Certainly I need not waste time to emphasize the absurdity of Mr. Divatia’s suggestion that this sound was probably matured under the influence of certain Arabic and Persian words. Mr. Divatia must be very little persuaded of the plausibility of his own derivation of this sound, if he finds it necessary to supplement it with such hypotheses. No, Arabic and Persian could not be responsible for the birth of $e$, $o$ in the least, and to accuse them of sharing the paternity of these sounds is ridiculous, just as ridiculous as it would be to impeach English, because it possesses words, like “hat”, and “hot”, whereof the vowels are pronounced much like the $e$, $o$ of modern Gujarati! But why, instead of going so far in search of foreign influences, why not lay greater stress on the analogy of the $e$, $o$ of Marwari-Gujarati with the $ai$, $au$ of Hindi? The latter sounds are identical with the former, except that they represent a slightly earlier stage, the very same

14 Cases of this kind are not unheard of. Cfr. *tāvāra* (< *tāru-nara*), and *hēmara* < *hēmāvāra* (< *haya-nara*).

15 I have found the form *kasaṣṭi* used once in Somasundaram’s *bhāṣā-bodha* to Dharmadeva’s “Uvesamālī”, 473. Its derivative *kasaṭī* is used in Hindi (Bates, p. 111). Mr. Divatia cannot possibly claim this form *kasaṭī* as evidence in support of his theory that an $a$ followed by an accented $u$ gives $o$, because, as I have remarked above, the $u$ in *kasaṇḍi* cannot be accented.
stage, I believe, of the Marwari-Gujarati diphthongs ai, au as they must have been pronounced previous to their transition into the wide vowels e, o.

I cannot conclude this note without a remark on the pronunciation of e, o. As I had already pointed out in my former note on the subject, there is in modern Marwari-Gujarati a marked tendency to pronounce e and o less wide when they are final, than in other cases. Here under the term final I comprehend also an e or o forming part of the penultimate syllable of a plurisyllable ending in a quiescent a. In some cases, the vowel is actually heard as narrow, thus the words: avélá "will come", róvé "is crying", Bhatnér "Bhatner", ghóró "horse", karó "do!", Nágóró "Nagor", Ráthôra "Rathor", Rînâmalóta "a son or descendant of Rînâmalá", are generally pronounced: avélá, róvé, Bhatnér, ghóró, karó, Nágór, Ráshór, Rînâmaló. Here etymology and the evidence of the old manuscripts are our only guide for recognizing in all these vowels which are now heard as narrow, an originally wide vowel whereof the value has subsequently been modified. Were we to rely only on the "actual perception of the ear" and disregard the evidence of the manuscripts and of etymology, we should incur into the same error as Mr. Divatia who misunderstood véré for véré, Ráthôra for Râthôra, and Guhîlôtâ for Guhîlôtâ. The "actual perception of the ear" is often most fallacious, but etymology is a faithful guide, and so are old manuscripts in this special case. In fact, accurate Marwari manuscripts always maintain with scrupulous accuracy the distinction between e, o and ê, ô by representing the former by the signs ã, ò, and the latter by the signs ë, ò.

In this connection I may here reiterate the practical suggestion which I had already made in my previous note: that when the question of revising the present imperfect spelling of Gujarati comes to be reconsidered, the signs ã, ò—which were formerly used in Gujarati and are still used in Marwari—should be readopted to represent the wide sound of e and o. Etymology and manuscript tradition show that the above-mentioned signs are the only legitimate and correct ones and their readoption in Gujarati would have, besides others, the great advantage of better conforming the orthography of this language with that of Hindi and making it more easily intelligible in other parts of the country.16

16 I have purposely refrained from alluding in the course of this note to a misinterpretation of a passage in my former note which my opponent makes and emphasizes as if in order to condemn me with my own words. A reply to this point might have been interpreted as a personal controversy. In my former note I had taken the opportunity of correcting an inaccuracy into which I had fallen in the first chapter of my "Notes on the Grammar of the Old Western Rajasthani, etc.", by representing the result of O. W. Rajasthani ã, ù, as ê, ô in Gujarati and ã, au in Marwari. This means that, misunderstanding the use of the signs ã, ù in Sir George Grierson's Linguistic Survey of India, Vol. IX, Pt. ii, to indicate the ê, ô sound of Marwari, I had concluded that this sound does not exactly correspond with the ê, ô of Gujarati, which in the modern writing is inaccurately represented by ã, ò, and only after coming to India I discovered that the ê, ô of Marwari and the ê, ô of Gujarati are exactly the same and identical sound. But Mr. Divatia misinterprets my words so as to take them to mean that "Dr. Tesitori ... thought Mavrâdî did not possess even the narrow ê—ô as evolutes of ã, ò, much less the wide ê—ô" (!), and in another place, referring to "Dr. Tesitori's gracefully (sic) frank admission", says that "when he wrote his "Notes" the wide sound of ë and o ... was never present before his mind, and he states there that ã and ò became ê (ã) and ô (ò) narrow "(!) Here evidently Mr. Divatia assumes that in my "Notes" I had used ê, ô to represent the Gujarati narrow sound, but how arbitrary this assumption is is shown by the fact that in my "Notes" I have never indicated in writing the distinction between the wide and narrow sound of ê, o in Gujarati, but following the modern Gujarati spelling, I have represented both by ê, ô.
VĂRTTĂ—THE ANCIENT HINDU ECONOMICS.

BY NARENDRA NATH LAW, M.A.; B.L., P.R.S.; CALCUTTA.

Stray expressions of thought in ancient Europe on the material interests.

Though the science of economics is essentially modern, stray expressions of thought on the material interests may be traced back in Europe to the time of Hesiod (8th century B.C.), whose Works and Days is a long versified dissertation embodying directions for practical guidance in the material concerns of life, such as the making of ploughs, sowing, planting, reaping, threshing, supervision of slave-labourers, weaving of cloths, management of dogs, horses, oxen, etc., shearing of sheep, felling of wood, sea-trade. The European writers subsequent to Hesiod were occupied in a very large measure with thoughts about political constitutions. In spite of this feature, we meet with economic precepts and anticipations of later economic researches in some of the writings.

Plato (429 or 427—347 B.C.)

Plato has given us a few economic thoughts and analyses, some of which are correct even according to modern criticism. These may be gathered from the Republic, Laws, and the dialogue called Sophist. The Eryxias, a short dialogue, treats of wealth; but it is considered spurious and does not go deeper or farther than the aforesaid works. Plato recognizes the economic basis of political society, the importance of the division of labour and also of the primary occupations such as agriculture, cattle-rearing and artisanship, domestic exchange of commodities, foreign commerce, and currency; and touches the subjects of distribution of property, money-lending, interest on loans and overdue accounts, and such other topics. Though many of his ideas are crude and unscientific, they furnish germs of much serious thought to later writers. His economic speculations, however, are found in mixture with his treatment of political and ethical questions which occupy the primary place, and are not disintegrated yet as a separate subject.

Xenophon (circa 430-357 B.C.)

Xenophon's Economics treats of the management of the household consisting of the family with its dependants and requiring property for its maintenance. Incidentally, he touches the subjects of agriculture, manufactures, trade, foreign commerce, nature of money and some other kindred topics. His precepts for the management of private property show much sense and sagacity, but his views on the subjects just mentioned are not in advance of his times except in one or two instances.

Aristotle (384-322 B.C.)

It was Aristotle who first reached the conception of a special science or art of wealth, though he never treated it apart from ethical and political considerations. He used the word chrematistike sometimes as equivalent to kletike, i.e., acquisition in general, and some-

---


3 Xenophon's work on the revenues of Athens contains some practical suggestions for their improvement.

4 Palgrave, op. cit., 'Xenophon,' and Ingram, op. cit., pp. 13, 14.
times in the narrower sense of that kind of acquisition that is rendered possible by exchange and money. The appended table 3 of the divisions of acquisition will show that he divided wealth into three classes, natural, intermediate, and unnatural. Hunting of wild animals or of slaves,—the "living tools", is considered a "natural" mode of acquisition as also the first division of chrematistike, on account of their having the same relation to the household as mother's milk to the young, or ordinary food to the graminivorous or carnivorous animals. The "intermediate" acquisition is thought to be somewhat removed from nature and hence its name. This gulf reaches its farthest limit in the "unnatural", with exchange for its instrument. Wealth is defined to be "a number of instruments to be used in a household or in a state." None of the modes of acquisition should be pursued immoderately, as domestic economy is not identical with amassing wealth, nor statesmanship with finance. The foundations of an "art of acquisition" quite apart from the "art of household management" were thus laid. 6 The term oikonomike continued to denote as before household management, chrematistike (or kletike) being used to stand for the predecessor of modern economics. "Political economy" as the name of the science of wealth was first used by a French author in the title of his work Traité de l'Economic Politique published in 1615. 7 Aristotle dwells on diverse topics of economics which I need not reproduce. Suffice it to say that with him originated the conception of a distinct "science or art of wealth".

Stray expressions of thought in the ancient East on the material interests.

The Chaldæans reached a high degree of excellence in agriculture making the soil yield a good many raw products. Their methods were first transmitted to the Greeks and afterwards to the Arabs, and practised long after the disappearance of the Chaldæan civilization. The people of Irak under the Abbaside Caliphs followed those methods while the

---

3 The art of acquisition (kletike; but chrematistike is sometimes used in this wide sense).
I. Hunting (a) of wild beasts, (b) of those who are by nature slaves.
II. Chrematistike, the science or art of wealth.
(1) Natural, including
(a) keeping of cattle, flocks, &c.
(b) agriculture (including cultivation of fruit-tree's
(c) bee-keeping.
(d) keeping of fish.
(e) keeping of birds.
(2) Intermediate,
(a) wood-cutting.
(b) mining.
(3) Unnatural (= metabletike, exchange).
(a) trade (commerce and retail trade).
1st, ship owning.
2nd, carrying trade.
3rd, shop-keeping.
(b) money-lending (usury).
(c) labour for hire.
1st, of the skilled artisan.
2nd, of the unskilled.

---

5 Ingram, op. cit., p. 45. 'Economia' meant but 'domestic management' according to Bacon.
work entitled *Nabataean Agriculture* of Ibn Wahshiyah (the Nabataeans being an Arab people on the east and south-east of Palestine) preserves according to one body of opinion, a reflection of those methods. In the opinion of E. Renan, it is possible that the method which is taught in them goes actually back, as far as the processes are concerned, to the most ancient periods of Assyria; just as the *Agrimensores lahitn*, so recent in regard to the editing of them, have preserved for us customs and ceremonies which can be explained only by the *Brahmāṇas* of India and which are consequently associated with the earliest ages of the Aryan race. Agricultural treatises on clay were deposited in one or other of the sacred libraries in which the priests of each city used to collect documents of all kinds.

China.

Dr. Chen Huan-Chang's "Economic Principles of Confucius and his School" makes it clear that in the writings of Confucius (552-479 B.C.) and his disciples were imbedded remarks bearing on the administration of wealth, its relation to the various social sciences, the principles that should underlie the production, distribution and consumption of wealth, and public finance. It should not be thought that there was a separate systematic exposition of all the principles. They are, on the contrary, found scattered throughout their sacred writings and require to be scraped together to show that Confucianism is a great economic in addition to being a great moral and religious system, containing many an early "anticipation of the accepted economic teachings of today."

**India:** Vārāṭā emerges as a branch of learning in the epic period.

In India, the subject treating of wealth emerged very early as a special branch of learning under the name Vārāṭā. It is implied in the use of the expression *tiṣṇav-vidyāḥ* in the *Rāmāyana* which points to the inference that Vārāṭā crystallized as a branch of learning most probably in the epic period. A few *Purāṇas* record that the group of occupations signified by the word came first into existence in the *tretā* age, and we find its appearance as a branch of learning in the *Rāmāyana*, the great epic of that age.

**The relation of Vārāṭā to Arthaśāstra in the Kauṣūṃya.**

In the *Kauṣūṃya, Vārāṭā* is mentioned as dealing with 'wealth and loss of wealth' (*arthā-nārathau*) while the scope of the *Arthaśāstra* is laid down thus: "arthā (wealth or 'goods') is the object of man's desire; the inhabited land (or country) is artha; that science which treats of the means of acquiring, preserving, and developing the said land or country is Arthaśāstra (science of man's material concerns)." Arthaśāstra deals with wealth, but as good government is the *sine qua non* of peaceful acquisition of wealth, it treats of polity also. Arthaśāstra thus concerns itself with the economic development of the country but

---

8 Memoir upon the age of the work entitled "Nabataean Agriculture" (in French), p. 38, as quoted in G. Maspero's *Dawn of Civilization*, p. 770, fn. 5.
9 For the information in the paragraph, see G. Maspero, op. cit., p. 770.
10 *Rāmāyana, Ayodhyā-kāṇḍa, ch. 100, śūk. 68*, mentions three divisions of learning of which one is vārāṭā.
11 *Vāyu-Purāṇa, ch. 8, śūk. 134; Matsya-Purāṇa, ch. 140, śūk. 1-3; Brahmāṇa-Purāṇa, ch. I, śūk. 107; ch. 8, śūk. 195; ch. 63, śūk. 4 (same as Matsya-Purāṇa, loc. cit.)
12 *Kauṭūṃya, Bk. I, vidyānusthāna, p. 7-9*; *Dharmākṣhara-vārāṭāya, Nāyānaya daṇḍāntiṣṭha, Ch. Anu-Purāṇa, ch. 238, śūk. 9; Kāmakaūya, ch. 2, śūk. 7.
13 Ibid., Bk. XV, *tantrayuktiya, p. 424.*
has to do in a large measure with polity (daśāniti) which helps to create and maintain the condition precedent of economic development.\textsuperscript{14} The relation between vārttā and Arthaśāstra appears therefore to be that the former is the general name of the branch of learning that treats of wealth alone while the latter deals with it in combination with polity, and other subjects having more or less intimate connection with vārttā and daśāniti.\textsuperscript{15}

Arthaśāstra a sub-type of Itihāsa-Veda; how far this is additional clue to the time of emergence of Vārttā.

Having noticed the relation of Vārttā to Arthaśāstra we are led to enquire whether the sub-sumption of the latter under Itihāsa-Veda as done by Kauṭilya\textsuperscript{16} can furnish any clue to the time of emergence of the subject and thereby that of Vārttā, for Itihāsa is mentioned in the Atharva-Veda,\textsuperscript{17} Taittiriya-Brāhmaṇa,\textsuperscript{18} Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa\textsuperscript{19} and various other Vedic works\textsuperscript{20} as a branch of learning. The implication of the term as given by the commentators is not expressly in favour of its inclusion of the six sub-types of learning as represented in the Kauṭilya. Moreover, the Vedic texts themselves mention very often Purāṇa and Itihāsa side by side as a compound expression, which seems not to support their relation to each other as genus and species; for if the words bore the meaning given in the Kauṭilya the mention of Itihāsa would have obviated the necessity of citing Purāṇa separately. We are not therefore in a position to say that the denotation of the word Itihāsa in the aforesaid Vedic passages is the same as that of the Kauṭilya. It may be supposed that the word Itihāsa may be found in use in post-Vedic Sanskrit\textsuperscript{21} or Pāli\textsuperscript{22} and Jaina\textsuperscript{23} literature with the denotation it bears in Kauṭilya’s treatise, but so far as I see, the evidences in the light of their current interpretations do not favour the supposition.

Thus the aforesaid meaning of Itihāsa in the Kauṭilya stands alone unless it is said that the meaning should be read into the word in the passages of works chronologically


\textsuperscript{15} The contents of the Kauṭilya Arthaśāstra lead us to infer that the subjects of administration of justice, polity including art of war and inter-statal relations, building of forts, town-planning, &c., formed part of the Arthaśāstra in view of their bearing on polity and economics though of course those subjects, that had a comparatively distant connection with them, received proportional attention and space in the working up of the treatise.

\textsuperscript{16} Itihāsa-Veda includes (1) Purāṇa, (2) Itivṛtta, (3), Ākhyāyikā, (4) Udāharaṇa, (5) Dharmaśāstra, and (6) Arthaśāstra.—(Kauṭilya, Bk. I, udāharaṇa-yogak, p. 10.)

\textsuperscript{17} Atharva-Veda, XV, 4.

\textsuperscript{18} Taittiriya-Brāhmaṇa, III, 12, 8, 2.

\textsuperscript{19} Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa, XI, 5, 8, 4-8; XIII, 4, 3, 3 ff; XIV, 5, 4, 10; 6, 10, 8; 7, 3, 11.

\textsuperscript{20} E.g., Taittiriya-Āṃṣasya, II, 9 and 10; Śāṅkhyāyana-Śravaṇa-Sūtra, XVI, 2, 3 ff; Atalāyana-Śravaṇa-Sūtra, X, 7, 1 ff; Śāṅkhyāyana-Grihya-Sūtra, I, 24, 8; Atalāyana-Grihya-Sūtra, III, 3, 1-3; Hūygakshin-Grihya-Sūtra, II, 19, 6. Cf. Brähmadārmaśastra-Upānishad, VI, 4, 10; IV, 1, 2, 6; 11; IV, 5, 11; Maśita-yaṣṭi-Upānishad, VI, 33; Chāndogya-Upānishad, III, 1-4.

\textsuperscript{21} E.g., Gauḍarā, VIII, 6; Vīshṇu, XXX, 38; LXXIII, 16; Baudhāyana, II, 5, 9, 14; IV, 3, 4; Manu, III, 232; Vāyu-Purāṇa, ch. I, šlok. 200. Vīshṇu-Purāṇa, Pt. I, ch. 1, šlok. 4. Agni-Purāṇa, ch. 271, šlok. 10. Bhrāgasvata-Purāṇa, Skanda I, ch. 4, šlok. 20.

\textsuperscript{22} E.g., Sūtra-Nipāta, Mahāvagga (Śasanavātu) [SBE., vol. X], p. 98 mentions Itihāsa as the fifth Veda; Pārāyanavagga (vathugāṭha) [SBE., vol. X], p. 189. Questions of Miśinda [SBE., vol. XXXV], pp. 6, 247.

\textsuperscript{23} Kalpa-Sūtra [SBE., vol. XXII], p. 221 mentions Itihāsa as the fifth Veda.
anterior or posterior to the Kauṭiliya. In that case also the separate mention of Purāṇa will present difficulty in the way of accepting the signification *in toto*. The relation therefore of Arthaśāstra or Itihaśa as set forth in Kauṭiliya’s work does not furnish us with any additional clue as to the time of emergence of vārttā.

The process of emergence of Vārttā. Its use to denote certain occupations and trade.

Side by side with the signification of vārttā as a division of learning (vidyā), we find its use as a collective name for the occupations of the third caste,26 the Vaiśyas, viz., roughly speaking, agriculture, cattle-rearing and trade. The allotment of distinct means of livelihood to each caste must have preceded the raising of the vṛtti or means of livelihood of the Vaiśyas to the status of a division of learning for greater specialization in the same in order to make it more effective for the fulfilment of the objects it sub-served. This use of vārttā as signifying certain occupations and trade is found in Sanskrit works from the Rāmāyaṇa downwards. A few instances are cited in the foot-note.25

The elements of vārttā in this sense are agriculture, cattle-rearing and trade according to certain texts;26 while, according to others, money-lending is added to them as the fourth item.27 Vārttā formed the means of subsistence of the third caste, which Manu 28 details as agriculture, cattle-rearing, trade, and money-lending which are further detailed in subsequent passages: “A Vaiśya must know the respective value of gems, of pearls, of coral, of metals, of (cloth) made of thread, of perfumes, and of condiments.” He must be acquainted with the (manner of) sowing seeds and of the good and bad qualities of fields and he must perfectly know all measures and weights. Moreover, the excellence and defects of commodities, the advantages and disadvantages of (different) countries, the (probable) profit and loss on merchandise, and the means of properly rearing cattle. He must be acquainted with the (proper) wages of servants, with the various languages of men, with the manner of keeping goods and (the rules of) purchase and sales.” It will be seen that these details of works are necessitated by the three or four principal duties of the Vaiśyas mentioned above. In the Kauṭiliya,29 however, vārttā denotes only agriculture,

26 Vārttā, according to the Kauṭiliya, is also the means of livelihood of the Śudras (Kauṭiliya, vidyā-samuddeṣaḥ, p. 7).

25 Rāmāyaṇa, Ayodhya-Kānda, Ṛām. 47. Mahābhārata, Śānti-Parva, ch. 68, āś. 35; Sabaḥ-Parwa, ch. 5, āś. 70. Bhāgavatī, XVIII, 44; Kauṭiliya, vidyā-samuddeṣaḥ, p. 8. Vāyu-Purāṇa, ch. 8, āś. 128, 130, 134; ch. 24, āś. 103. Vishnu-Purāṇa, ch. 6, āś. 20, 32; Bhāgavata-Purāṇa, Skanda 7, ch. 11, āś. 15; Skanda 10, ch. 24, āś. 20, 21; Skanda 11, ch. 29, āś. 33; Brahmāṇḍa-Purāṇa, ch. 8, āś. 130 (same as Vāyu-Purāṇa, ch. 8, āś. 134); ch. 26, āś. 14 (same as Vāyu-Purāṇa, ch. 24, āś. 103); Lānga-Purāṇa, ch. 28, āś. 43; ch. 21, āś. 16 (same as Vāyu-Purāṇa, ch. 24, āś. 103); Bhavishya-Purāṇa, Brahma-Parwa, ch. 44, āś. 10; Nārada-Purāṇa, Atri-Saṃhitā, āś. 14, 15.

27 Kauṭiliya, Bk. I, vidyā-samuddeṣaḥ, p. 4,—krishi-paśupālye vaṇijyā cha vārttā; dhäusera-ranaya-kupya-viha-śuddhādarpakāri (i.e., agriculture, cattle-rearing and trade constitute vārttā; it is useful in that it brings in grains, cattle, forest-produce, labour, &c.). Cf. Kāmaṇḍakīya, ch. 2, āś. 14; and Questions of Miśinda (SBE, vol. xxxv), p. 247 (IV, 3, 26).

28 Manu’s commentary on Mahābhārata, Śānti-Parva, ch. 5, āś. 70 (with commentary); Bhāgavata-Purāṇa, Skanda 10, ch. 24, āś. 21—

krishi-vaṇijyā-gorakṣaḥ kusidam turyamuchyate.
Vārttā chaturvīdāḥ taba vayaḥ govyātthayō viśeṣaḥ.

29 Manu (SBE.), iv, 329-332. The various duties contemplate their performance by various sections of the Vaiśyas and not by every individual Vaiśya.
The learners and teachers of Vârta or its branches.

The application of the principles of Vârta within the state by competent men was the look-out of the sovereign. In view of this exigency, the sovereign had to learn vârta with perhaps special attention to its more useful sub-divisions, viz. agriculture, cattle-rearing and trade from teachers having special knowledge thereof. Kauṭilya includes vârta in the course of study prescribed for the prince, the subject being taught by superintendents of government-departments (adhyakshâh) having not merely a theoretical but also a thorough practical knowledge of the same and who were in charge of various agricultural, industrial and commercial operations of the state. The prince also learnt arthasâstra from competent professors.

It seems that the two higher castes, eligible as they were to the study of all the branches of learning, could learn Vârta like the Vaiśyâs either in order to have a merely general knowledge of the subject or, according to particular needs, to have a special knowledge of some or all of its branches. The Brâhmaṇas learnt the subject sometimes perhaps for the sake of making their education all-round, and sometimes for the purpose of teaching it to their pupils; for the Brâhmaṇas were teachers not merely of theology and philosophy but also of economics, polity including the art of warfare and use of weapons, as also the practical or fine arts, and accomplishments. Only a few instances will suffice. Râma and his cousin were taught the use of some weapons by Viśvâmîtra, the Pâñjâvas the military art along with the use of weapons by Droṇâchâryya. The various branches of learning together with the sixty-four kalâs were learnt by Krîṣhṇa from his preceptor Sâmpadipani. Thus the members of the first caste were often masters and teachers of the practical arts, though of course it should be admitted that the knowledge and practice of vârta were the special obligation of the Vaiśyâs, just as the knowledge and practice of daṇḍaniti (polity) the special charge of the Kahattiriyas. The members of the fourth caste were, as it appears from several Sanskrit texts, debarred from literary or scientific culture, but, according to Kauṭilya, they were eligible to the means of subsistence included in vârta and had therefore at least the practical knowledge required for the purpose and transmitted from one generation to another through apprenticeship of some form or other.

Manner of treatment and extant literature.

The manner of treatment of vârta or its sub-topics in the treatises on the subjects, so far as we can judge it from the evidences at our disposal, was rather concrete, though, of course, general maxims and wise saws, the generalizations that were the results of long experience were not wanting in them. The economic treatises of the ancients whether of Greece or India could not be like their namesakes of the present day. The aim of the works on vârta was more or less practical, their primary object being the guidance of the traders, agriculturists, cattle-rearers, artisans, artists, and directors of industries, and the concrete mode of treatment of the subjects in those books was determined by this practical purpose. I have appended at the end of this discourse names of extant treatises on the various arts

\[\text{Râmaâyana, Ayodhyâ-kâga}, 100, \text{âlx. 68}; \text{Mahâbhârata, Suthâ-Pareś}, \text{ch. 5, âlx. 76.79.}\]

\[\text{Manu, VII, 43—}\
\text{Traividyebhhasrayîn vidyâddhândanîti aha ââvatiâm,}\
\text{Anvikahiâm châtmâvidyâm vârtârambhâm âcha lokatah.}\
\text{—cf. Viśvâvâkyya, I, 311; Aghâ-Puraśa, ch. 238, âlx. 8.}\]

\[\text{Kauṭilya, Bk. I, Vîrddhâlâkâreya, p. 10.}\]

\[\text{Ibid.}\]
and crafts and such other subjects as are classed under vārttā in two Lists, the first of which contains the names of manuscripts, and the second names of printed works. So far I have not come across any work entitled Vārttā-Sāstra dealing with the entire subject in a general way. The absence of such a book in the Lists cannot be a bar to the recognition of the other works mentioned therein as appertaining to vārttā in view of what we find in regard to the three other divisions of learning Anvākshiki, Trayā, and Daṇḍanāti; for I do not think there are any works entitled Anvākshiki or Trayā; though there are admittedly hundreds of works on philosophy and theology. Similarly in framing the list of more than 150 works on Daṇḍanāti or its sub-topics, which I have collected and published elsewhere, I have not come across any book with the title Daṇḍanāti. It is not essential that books must always be named after the divisions of learning to which they belong, and it is not a fact that books named otherwise cannot appertain to those divisions of learning. Most of the works named in the lists are on one or other of the sub-topics of vārttā or on a group thereof, treating of architecture, sculpture, painting, examination of precious stones, agriculture, nourishment of plants, treatment and cultivation of trees, laying out of gardens, cow-keeping, handicrafts, construction of carriages and ships, &c. We do not expect to find in these works an attempt to elicit economic laws by an inductive and deductive study of man and his diverse activities in relation to the utilisation of nature. The analogy of the handling of polity in the available treatises on the subject points also to the same inference. We find in them details as to the duties of various government servants from the Viceroy to the lowest menial, how the State-departments should be administered, how war is to be waged and inter-state relations maintained, and so forth, and not any abstract discussions of the origin and development of State, nature and seat of sovereignty and such-like.

(To be continued.)

A NOTE ON THE YAVAPĀLĀS OR JAJAPELLAS OF NARWAR.

BY M. B. GARDE, B.A.; GWALIOR.

In his Coins of Medieval India (p. 90) Sir A. Cunningham gives the following genealogical table of a family of kings whom he calls 'Rajputs of Narwar'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accession.</th>
<th>Dates from inscriptions and coins.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samvat.</td>
<td>A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1294</td>
<td>1237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1312</td>
<td>1255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1312</td>
<td>1255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1335</td>
<td>1278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1347</td>
<td>1290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This list was compiled from inscriptions and from the dates furnished by the coins and other sources known to Cunningham. Four inscriptions relating to these kings are mentioned by him, namely:—

No. 1. At Rai, dated S. 1327 = A.D. 1270, in the time of Asalla Deva.
No. 2. At Dahi, dated 1337 = A.D. 1290, mentioning Gopāla Rāja.
No. 3. At Surwaya, dated 1348 = A.D. 1291, in the time of Gaṇapati Rāja.
No. 4. At Narwar, dated S. 1355 = A.D. 1298, in the time of Gaṇapati.

1 Cunningham gives another defective list of these kings in his A. S. Reports, Vol. II, p 216.
2 Coins of Medieval India, p. 90.
As none of these inscriptions mentioned the family name of the kings or supplied any clue to the identification thereof, Cunningham contented himself by calling the dynasty ‘Rajputs of Narwar.’ And this vague appellation or its equivalent “princes of Narwar” has been given to this dynasty in books on chronology, numismatics and history published since.

Recently however, five more inscriptions of this dynasty have been discovered by me, two of which are valuable as supplying the hitherto unknown name of the dynasty and further as clearing away certain misconceptions about Châhâja of Narwar, the founder of the dynasty.

A stone inscription on a Jain Temple at Bhimpur about 3 miles from Narwar - dated in V. S. 1319 in the reign of Å sala Deva contains the following verses:—

\[ \text{etc., etc.} \]

The facts of historical importance gleaned from this passage are that there was a race of kings named Jâjâpâla; that in that race was born Sûri Ya(pa)rdmâjîrâja; and that he was succeeded by Châhâja.

In another stone inscription found in the kacheri at Narwar, dated in V. S. 1339 in the reign of Gopâla, occurs the following text:—

\[ \text{etc., etc.} \]

This passage tells us that Châhâja of Narwar was born in a noble family which was called after a legendary hero named Jâjâpâla; that the current popular form of the family-name was Jâjapella; and that Châhâja captured from enemies Nalagiri, i.e., Narwar, and other big towns.

On combining the information supplied by these two records we learn that the family name of the kings of Narwar hitherto known by the rather vague title ‘Rajputs of Narwar’ was Jâjapella. The alternative form ‘Jâjâpâla’ specified in the Bhimpur inscription appears to be a learned Sanskritised form of the popular Jâjapella. We further learn that Châhâja’s immediate ancestor was Sûri Yâramâjîrâja or Paramâjîrâja and not Malaya Varmma as supposed by Cunningham (Coins of M. India, p. 90). Yâramâjîrâja however does not appear to have ruled over Narwar for we learn from the Narwar kacheri inscription that it was Châhâja who conquered Narwar from enemies.

---

5 These stones have now been deposited in the State Museum at Gwalior.

4 A copper-plate inscription of this Malaya Varmma dated V. S. 1277 has been lately discovered at Kureshâ in Gwalior State, from which it is clear that Malaya Varmma did not belong to the Jâjapella family of Narwar but was a Pratihâra.
The new historical information noticed above is important as it clears away the obscenity that hitherto hung over the history of the Chāhaḍa Deva of Narwar.

A Muḥammadān historian named Mawālānā Minhāju-d-dīn informs us that in A. H. 631 or 632 (= A. D. 1234 or 1235) the forces of Shamsu-d-dīn Altamsh defeated at Ranthambhor a powerful ruler of the name of Rāṣā Chāhaḍa Achāri who sustained another defeat in A. H. 649 (= A. D. 1251) near Narwar at the hands of Ulugh Khān. According to Cunningham, Raverty held that two different Hindu chiefs were intended here. But Mr. E. Thomas thinks them to be one and the same. Cunningham says 'Major Raverty's opinion is not without support, but I am inclined to agree with Thomas. I found my conclusion on the title of Achāri which is given to Ranthambhor Chāhaḍa in this account and to the Narwar Chāhaḍa Deva in all the accounts.' Recently Rai Bahadur Daya Ram Sahni in his article on the Rataul plate of the Chāhamāna Chāhaḍa Deva (of Ranthambhor) supports the identification of the Chāhaḍa of Ranthambhor with his namesake of Narwar. His conclusion is based on three arguments:

1. The type of characters used in the Rataul plate inscription of the Chāhamāna Chāhaḍa fits in very well with the time of the Chāhaḍa of Narwar.

2. His second authority is the historian Minhāju-d-dīn referred to above.

3. His third argument 'is afforded by numismatic records. The coins of Chāhaḍa discovered at Narwar and other places are of two kinds, namely, those issued by him as an independent ruler and secondly those struck by him as a tributary to Altamsh. The coins of both these kinds are of the bull and horseman type like those of the Chāhamāna rulers, and what is more, those of the first kind also bear on the reverse the legend of Asāvari Sri Sāmanta Deva which occurs only on the coins of the Chāhamāna Sōmeśvara and his son Prithvirāja.'

Now this identification of the Chāhamāna Chāhaḍa of Ranthambhor with his namesake of Narwar, which was generally favoured by writers on the subject in the light of facts hitherto known, is clearly refuted by our newly found inscriptions of Bhimpur and Narwar kacheri, which as already noticed inform us that the Chāhaḍa of Narwar was a Jajvapāla or Jajapella and not a Chāhamāna.

The arguments adduced by previous writers in favour of the identification of the two Chāhaḍas are also not unimpeachable. Let us examine them:

1. The paleographical argument afforded by the Rataul plate can show nothing more than that the Chāhamāna Chāhaḍa was a contemporary of the Chāhaḍa of Narwar and not that they were identical.

2. As for the statement of the historian Minhāju-d-dīn it is seen from Cunningham's remarks quoted above, that opinion is divided as to whether the two accounts of the historian really refer to one and the same Hindu chief. It is just possible that the two Chāhaḍas were contemporary of each other and the historian identified them through oversight.

3. The numismatic evidence also is not convincing. Coins of the Narwar Jajapelias Chāhaḍa, Āsala or Āsalla, and Gaṇapati have been found hitherto. The coins of the two latter princes are represented by only one type showing on the obverse a rude figure of a horseman and on the reverse, a legend specifying the name of the prince preceded by the word

---

8 Cunningham, Coins of Medieval India, pp. 90-91, where the authority quoted is Raucri's Translation of Tabqat-i-Nasiri, pp. 731 and 824. See also Duff's Chronology of India, pp. 184 and 194.

6 Pathan Kings of Delhi, p. 67.

7 Cunningham, C. M. I., p. 91.

8 Cunningham, C. M. I., p. 73, Nos. 8-10.
rimat, and a date below. Of the coins of Chāhaṣa’s three different types have been traced:

No. 1. This type is exactly similar to that of the coins of Āsala and Gaṇapati mentioned above.

No. 2. This type bears on the obverse a figure of a horseman and the legend Sri Chāhaṣa Deva, and on the reverse, a bull and the legend Asavari Sri Śāmanta Deva.

No. 3. This type is similar to type No. 2 with one difference, namely, that the legend on the reverse is replaced by Asavari Sri Somasoraladeva.

The definite find places of these three different types of Chāhaṣa’s coins have not been recorded. It is likely that coins found elsewhere have been confused with those found at Narwar. To me it appears that the coins of type No. 1 alone belong to the Chāhaṣa of Narwar as they resemble the known coins of his descendants Āsala and Gaṇapati. While types Nos. 2 and 3 are to be referred to the Chāhamāna Chāhaṣa of Ranthambhor as they are copied from the Chāhamāna type. This view is supported also by Cunningham’s remark that the title Achāri (or Asavari) does not appear on the Narwar coins. The title Asavari is absent only in type No. 1 of Chāhaṣa’s coins which alone, to judge from Cunningham’s remark, must have been found at Narwar.

If this view is correct the title Achāri (Asavari) rightly belongs only to the Chāhamāna Chāhaṣa of Ranthambhor. And the assignment of that title to the Chāhaṣa of Narwar by Muhammadan historians is probably due to confusion arising from the fact that the two Chāhaṣas were nearly contemporary.

Having thus explained away the arguments adduced by previous writers in favour of the identification of the two Chāhaṣas we may safely conclude on the authority of the Bhimpur and Narwar kacheri inscriptions that the Chāhaṣa of Narwar and the Chāhaṣa of the Rataul plate or of Ranthambhor were two different persons. The former was a Yajvapāla or Jajapella and the latter was a Chāhamāna.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

SPREAD OF HOBSON-JOBSON IN MESOPOTAMIA.

With reference to the words quoted by Sir Richard Temple (ante, p. 196) from Mr. Edmund Candler’s article in the (London) Observer of 12th May 1918, I may give here some further examples of Hobson-Jobson from an article in the Daily Telegraph of 14th March 1916 by the same writer.

1. Kellek. Ar. kālek, a large skin raft.

2. Mahākaja. Ar. mahākajah, a large river sailing boat. “These local river craft make a picturesque fleet, with their high-forward-sloping masts, huge rudders, lateen sails, and cut-away prows, pointed and barbed. They are painted like the Chinese junk, but with Arab designs and characters, the star and crescent and figures like the signs of the Zodiac, generally white on a point of green, or red, or yellow. Each boat carries a large clay oven like an anthepa, and the poop is baoned over for the crew. They have been compared to the Nile dahabiyah, but I am told that they are more after the pattern of the ‘naguer’ of the Soudan... The mahākaja carries anything from fifteen to seventy tons. She can make ten miles a day, towed against the current, and four to six miles [sic] knots an hour with a following wind.”

3. Ballum. Ar. ṣalum (see ante, p. 196). “The Arab name for the long, narrow, canoe-shaped boats of the country, the gondolas of Basra... It is punt ed or paddled, according to the depth of the water.”

4. Gufar. Ar. gəfār, a river tub. “Another boat indigenous to the Tigris is the cauldron-like gufar of Baghdad... It is made of reed backed with wooden uprights plastered over with pitch from the bitumen wells of Hilt.”

A. G. Ellis.

\(^{11}\) Cunningham, C. M. I., p. 73, Nos. 5 and 6. See also Thomas, Pathan Kings of Delhi, p. 75 No. 45. This ṣāh is ignored by Rai Bahadur Daya Ram (Ep. Ind., Vol. XII, p. 224.)


\(^{13}\) Thomas, Pathan Kings of Delhi, p. 70, No. 40; Cunningham, C. M. I., p. 92, No. 4.
THE STRATAGEM USED BY ALEXANDER AGAINST PORUS
ALLUDED TO IN THE A'IN-I-AKBARI.

BY VINCENT A. SMITH.

MR. H. BEVERIDGE has drawn my attention to two passages in the A'ın-i-Akbārī as translated by Jarrett (vol. iii, pp. 330, 392), which allude to a stratagem practised by Alexander against Porus. Neither passage specifies the nature of the operation. The earlier one states that Alexander ‘by stratagem put him (Porus) to rout.’ The second, an allusion in Akbar’s ‘Happy Sayings’, intimates that Akbar did not believe the story, his words being reported as: ‘The legend of Alexander’s stratagem against Porus does not carry the appearance of truth.’ Evidently the tale must have been of a marvellous, incredible character. Jarrett, commenting on the later passage, suggests that the allusion must be to the ruse by which Alexander succeeded in crossing the Hydaspe. That suggestion cannot be correct, because the Persian and Muslim traditions treat the Macedonian invariably as a legendary personage. They never betray the slightest knowledge of the authentic accounts of the Indian campaign, except in so far as that the name ‘Fār’ may be taken as the equivalent of Porus. I have looked through Captain H. Wilberforce Clarke’s translation of Nīṣāmī’s Sikandar-nāma (London, Allan, 1881), which gives the Sikandar legend at immense length in cantos xlvi-xlvi. Alexander is there represented as having invaded China through ‘Tibat’, and as having advanced even into Russia. Those absurd stories are supported by a mass of fictitious correspondence, but the poem does not mention the ‘stratagem’ which forms the subject of this note.

Mr. Beveridge holds that the allusions in the A’īn refer to the tale related by ‘Abdullah bin al Moqaffa in his preface to the Arabic version of Kalila and Dimna, and mentions that Silvestre de Sacy pointed out at p. 49 of his edition of that work (Paris, 1816) that it had been used by Abū-l-Fazzāl. Silvestre de Sacy’s book apparently is wanting in the Oxford libraries, but is in the library of the Royal Asiatic Society. Mr. Beveridge has been good enough to communicate the French text from page 15. It is unnecessary to print that extract, because I have found in the Monier Williams collection at the Indian Institute at Oxford a rare English work which serves the purpose more conveniently and seems to be little known. The title is:—


Page 1 gives

‘The Preface of Ali, the son of Alshah Faresi [i.e., Alshah Fārsī, the Persian; also known as Bahnūd son of Saḥwān].

Alexander, having overcome the kings of the West, turned his arms toward the East……. Afterwards directing his course towards China, he in his march summoned Four, at that time King of India, and renowned for his wisdom and great power, to declare himself his vassal; but Four on the contrary made immediate preparations for resistance……. Alexander……. determined to call to his aid the experience which he had acquired, and to employ stratagem to secure his success. For this purpose
he began by ordering an intrenchment to be formed round his camp in the mean-
time he ordered the artificers in his train, many of whom he had taken from the different
cities on his march, to make hollow figures of brass [nahās نَحَاس] 1 representing horses
and men, caparisoned and equipped in a manner to give them the appearance of regular
cavalry and to be filled with naphtha and sulphur, and placed in front of his line, intending
that the combustible materials should at the very commencement of the battle be set on fire.
Four had placed his elephants in the front rank, which, advancing to meet the figures of brass
which were simultaneously pushed on, no sooner touched them with their trunks, than,
being rendered furious by the heat, they threw down those who were on their backs, and
then suddenly turning round, took to flight, and trod under their feet and crushed all they
met.

Four and Alexander then engaged in mortal combat. 'Alexander, taking advantage
of the moment when he was off his guard, struck him a blow, which made him fall from his
horse, and with a second laid him dead at his feet. The Indian army renewed the combat
......but finding at length all resistance to be ineffective, they accepted the terms which
the conqueror offered them.'

Another version of the story is given by Firdausi in the Shāhānāma. Mohl's abstract
in French is reprinted by Dowson in Appendix A to vol. vi (p. 476, note 2) of The History of
India as told by its own Historians. According to the poet the horses and riders, exceeding
a thousand in number, were constructed of iron, the joints being soldered and riveted with
copper. Note 1 on the same page states that a similar tale was related concerning the
mythical Prester John of Abyssinia, who adopted the expedient against the son of Chingiz
Khân. It is not worthwhile to pursue the variations of the legend through other books.

It is impossible to doubt that Mr. Beveridge is right in maintaining that the story,
as related in the Arabic and Persian works named, is that referred to by Akbar and Abu-I
Fagl. Akbar showed his good sense in rejecting the fantastic legend.

NOTES ON KĀLIDĀSA.

BY PROF. H. B. BHIDE, M.A., LL.B.: BHAVNAGAR.

(1) Early References.

References to Kālidāsa may be direct or indirect. By direct reference I mean the
mention of the name of Kālidāsa or his work. By indirect reference I mean the mention
or indication of, or the reference to, a story or the incidents in a story, or any other
peculiar feature found in the works of Kālidāsa.

Bāṣa is the earliest writer who directly refers to Kālidāsa. The following couplet from
the Harshacharita is well-known:

विर्गासुन न या कस्य कालिदासस्य शूलिकामुः
पौर्णिमेपुराणात्तरा मधुररूपमिव जाते ||

But it is not so well-known that the Harshacharita contains another, though indirect,
reference to Kālidāsa. On the death of Prabhakarvardhana, his elder son Rājyavardhana
consoles Harsha in the following words amidst others:—लोकरक्षकवादार नान्दावरि बुद्धि तिनं
पुरुषकुशेन, भृत्ताविदारिदात्तश्रीवि बृहत् या स्वामा, महादार्शनमहाभाष्यप्रकरितिपर दिवापि या शरणेन, गोविन-
श्रोतेभ्यंनिनिश्चित्तन्ते दुनमवदे या मननेन || (p. 179). ² In this passage all the references except the first-
are to personages that figure in Kālīdāsa's works. Of these the most significant is the reference to Dilipa and Raghu. Raghu is said to be the son of Dilipa and this relationship between the two rests solely on the authority of the *Raghu-vāsa*; it is not affirmed by the *Rāmdyāya* or by the *Purāṇas*. We may therefore reasonably conclude that Bāna relies upon the *Raghu-vāsa* when he makes Raghu the son of Dilipa. Thus this constitutes another and indirect reference to Kālīdāsa by Bāna.

There are some other passages in the *Harshacharita* which may show that Bāna is influenced, perhaps unconsciously, by Kālīdāsa's works. These passages are given below:

1. अवि न... नवाहुश्च जन्मपमीयावतः पितरी | प्रजामितः बन्धुरण्यो राजस्तः। p. 158.

   Compare with this the following:

   स पिता पितारसासी के व जन्महनस:।
   राग्नु. I. 24.

   बेदे बेद बिश्वासवानुजः सिरपण्ड बन्धुरा।
   स ल पापायल तासें हुव्लसं।।
   साकुतला VI.

2. न न दानाम्य बहुस्व गुरुङः विवितिषाणा रातिरिच्छ विभवनवनासामान्येऽपूः। p. 167.

   May it be that Bāna had in his mind Canto IV of the *Kumārasambhava* when he put these words in the mouth of Yāsoma?

3. अनाल न सं दक्षिणा... बेदे मनुष्यस्तरा राजस्तहस्ता हस्य पदधारणामधारणरूपङ्गानुसह।।

   कुञ्जिहंपणाः भक्षणात्।। p. 188.

   This reminds us of the following lines from the *Meghadūta*:

   प्राणश्रियतनपिन्नद्वि तामास्वातिनिधित्वामेद्
   ब्रह्महार्ष्येन भुगण्डिशीर्षाम्रे वर्षकृत्यार्त्तमाय।।
   तेनैन्द्रियं हिन्यागमसिद्धसं।।

4. बेदे न भृत्यस्वाभावनालमितिन्या माणन्यां स्मारकां: कोकिकमा काक्षा इव कामुल्या हस्तकथा

   विव्य-भाषामाध्यमव न चेतावले।। p. 190.

   The idea here may be traced to the following lines from the *Śākuntala*:

   प्राणश्रियतनपिन्नद्वि तामास्वातिनिधित्वामेद्
   मन्दविति: पद्वम्: खाद्य पापायलित।।

5. बेदे न भृत्यस्वाभावनालमितिन्या माणन्यां स्मारकां: कोकिकमा काक्षा इव कामुल्या हस्तकथा।। p. 192.

   Compare with this:

   किवदश्वस्वाभावनालमितिन्या माणन्यां स्मारकां: कोकिकमा काक्षायां विव्य-भाषामाध्यमव न चेतावले।।
   राग्नु. II. 52.

I now come to a predecessor of Bāna.

Generally Bāna is supposed to be the earliest author who refers to Kālīdāsa. But there is a still earlier writer whose work contains references to Kālīdāsa. As will be seen later on, these references are indirect in the sense I have explained above. The writer I mean is Subandhu, the author of the romance *Vāsavadattā*. He is believed to be a predecessor of Bāna. Dr. Satishachandra Vidyabhushan supposes him to be a contemporary of Bāna. Without entering into a controversy on the point here, I may state that the grounds he advances do not appear to me to be conclusive and that I therefore associate myself with the scholars who hold that Subandhu preceded Bāna.
Subandhu's Vāsavadattā is a well-known work. It seems to have served as a model to Bāha who much improved upon his model in his great work Kādambarī. Subandhu's work contains unmistakable references to certain episodes and incidents in the Rāghuvrāja and the Śākuntala. These references occur in three passages. In two of them, the story of Dilipa as given in the Rāghuvrāja is referred to, while in the third are referred to the incident of the curse of Durvāsas which plays such an important part in the Śākuntala and the Suvayamvāra of Aja and Indumati described in the Rāghuvrāja. Let me quote the passages:

1. द्वितीय द्व मुद्रकिष्कणारूर्फँ शाक्तिमयुः (रामायणाम्) सम्ब. कर्नःकेतूरामम� pp. 16-17. 2

2. किन्न प्रपालिता वशयः किन्नपितामहेश्वराः किन्न न प्रदश्चिमोऽहोत्: सुर्यमयः किन्न न कृत्य नरेश्वरवानमिति बद्विश्वं विव। &c. p. 134.

3. अस्म्यविष रूपितमयुक्त्याळमः। . . . . हुन्य दनवन्दी नलस्यः कृते सनवस्तेवशस्मवायः सुहाकृतान्तोऽहण्यायानागादिगणो बसून। अफलधेव दुप्प्तस्यः कृते शाक्षत्ता दूर्विक्षः। वायुमन्नवायुः। p. 80.

In (1) the name of Dilipa's wife occurs, and it is given only by Kālidāsa. What is more important is the word शाक्तिमयुः; therein we see the reference to the episode so beautifully described in Canto II of the Rāghuvrāja. The reference in (2) will be understood from the following verses which occur in Canto I of the same epic. The context is that Vaiishītha is explaining to Dilipa the reason why Dilipa was without a son:

यूना शाक्तिगुणमण्डल नवीययो यती गायत्र्यः।
आरतीक्षानववामण्डलाय गुरुमाणि पदवः || ६७ ||
धर्मोद्विन्दुरासुवर्णासामि स्थनः।
प्रवश्चिमण्डलायान्तर्यं गायत्र्यान गायत्र्यायः || ६८ ||
अधुपालिः में वास्तवतः न नवंशि करते।
नवनन्त्रासामर्पण्यं प्रेयतेऽथ धार्य या || ६९ ||

It is clear that this part of the story is referred to in (2). In (3), the allusions are to two incidents, one in the Rāghuvrāja and the other in the Śākuntala. The first is to Indumati's choice of Aja which is the subject-matter of Canto VI. The second is to the incident of the curse of Durvāsas on which hinges the plot of the Śākuntala.

In some places, Subandhu uses words and phrases which may point to his acquaintance with some of Kālidāsa's works. A few such cases may be illustrated.

4. When describing the morning time he says अस्म्यकालान्तिक जीवितार्धापुरात्मकः... कामिनीयस् (p. 28). The idea here, and especially the word जीवितांशुराशिकाणिन्द्रियाय at once puts us in mind of the following verse:

रामायणार्थाः सत्तात्र दुर्सेन दुर्सेन निधारित:।
गणपतिविश्वनामाशिता जीवितायांशीति जगत्य सा।||

Raghu. XI. 20.

5. Again, see

नुस्खलोकस्यं नवसुवन्तीयानायांसुवकारानासुवकाराध्योऽस्मानिः। . . . (कन्याकृतिः)
शाक्षेऽर्जन। p. 24.

The references to pages are from the edition of Vāsavadattā by Jivananda Vidyasagar.
It brings to our mind these verses from Canto VII of the Raghuvamśa:

कपिराज्यस्यस्मात् सदाचिदानन्दसः।
वायस्कं शासनं कर्त्तव्यं सर्वसंस्कारं वर्ण। ॥ २२ ॥

पर्वतराज्य सत्यसिद्धि प्रवीणवस्त्रीदिवसः।
सत्यशास्त्रः प्राचीनवस्त्रीस्त्रयः। ॥ २३ ॥

(6) Lastly, in दर्शनमित्रि विवेकाचार्यार्मणो नमो नन्देशु दुर्भिविवेकाचार्यार्मणो (कष्ट्यकामकर्षणस्य) (p. 32), the peculiar meaning of the word विवेचना is worth notice. In this clause the word has two meanings: one is मोह (liberation) and the other विवेचन (highest felicity). If we take the former, there is an apparent विवेचन which is removed if we take the word in the latter sense. In the former sense the word विवेचन is used in the Sākuntala. Dushyanta, on seeing Sākuntala exclaims: 'अर्जुनं न तथापीर्भवाम्।' Kālidāsa is perhaps the only writer of the early times who has used 'विवेचन' in this sense; Subandhu who was ever on the lookout for an opportunity to use त्रेक्ष्य might have picked up the word whose other meaning enabled him to employ the त्रेक्ष्यमाला.

As regards the question of Subandhu's indebtedness to Kālidāsa whose priority in point of time to Subandhu is consequential thereupon, the last three quotations may not be looked upon as a conclusive proof of it, but the first three are clearly so; because the references they contain are to incidents which are narrated nowhere except in the works of Kālidāsa. Therefore, in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, we may conclude that the original source of these allusions is the works of Kālidāsa. In this light their importance cannot be too much emphasised. They form a very important landmark earlier than any hitherto known, in arriving at the date of the premier poet of India—a vexed question with which I shall deal some other time.

(2) Kālidāsa and Bāravi.

Bāravi is one of the earliest Sanskrit authors. From his Kirāṭārjunīya I adduce a few passages which find a close parallel in the works of Kālidāsa.

KĀLIDĀSA.

कृष्णरथस्यकवित्र अनुपरित्
से एव पवित्र गुलाम पवित्र। ॥

Raghu. XIV. 67.

अर्जुनो विजयवधानः सानिन्द्रेयः।
वदनिलं वापसिन्द्रे। ॥

R. XVII. 45.

विष्णुवि प्रायोजितः
सि नारायणधारिः। ॥

R. XVII. 49.

न धमकस्मकामाः सानिन्द्रेयः।
वदनिलं वापसिन्द्रे। ॥

R. XVII. 57.

गुणो दुर्विन्योगोऽयूः
सि नारायणधारिः। ॥

R. I. 22.

BĀRAVI.

कृष्णरथस्यकवित्र अनुपरित्
से एव पवित्र गुलाम पवित्र। ॥

I. 9.

अर्जुनो विजयवधानः सानिन्द्रेयः।
वदनिलं वापसिन्द्रे। ॥

I. 11.
वसूलि या गाथक बही न मन्युना
स्यमे इघें निलकषराणस्।
सुखपरिवर्तन रसिक सत्ते जयि वा
निहत्त रथवेन स धर्मविनिनयम्।॥

I. 13.

स्यमे प्रकृतत/android गुणपरिशुताना
वसूलमाणस् वसूलि नेपिनी।

I. 18.

भृगुणां साधितैण्: तुषः
स वेद नि-वेदभाष्यं तस्मानकी।
भृगुमहोर्स्य सहसरस्यिनि
प्रात्यधै चासुपविलिकः फलः।॥

I. 20.

अनुश्रुति धिरोनिन्धवानी
नराधीपमाणिविनासु शास्त्रम्।

II. 21.

अनवभृताचित्रत
वर्णमविवधारावस्था
मन्दान्ते लेखा बाहुगत्राहार।

II. 41.

अमरामाणीसायुः
ञ्चाबाणकृतत्वस्तवमस्ति।
सुकर्षस्रवासहिपुणु
रत्नमूलान्ति महामनि।॥

II. 50.

सुमीयाबन्धु शहतु निर्मिति देशः।

VII. 15.

पण्ड पदवति भवायन्यपेशपि।

IX. 70.

न शुचि: खालु कौशल्यवर्त निपानः
स्यमेव दत्ति वया नन्द्रो मुखि ने।
निरंतर कार्यान्वयन अवतः
कथवन्यं हितिशिपिण रिः वा।॥

XIII. 6.

सिद्धि वण्डवति वण्डवालो
परेरेणू: प्रस्थतेऽः।
अवधवकारी तद्वातां
धनं एव मनीमपिण:॥ R. I. 25.

विनं वेदमेव स्यमे
राजश्युक्तमेव वृः।॥ R. XVII. 66.
सिद्धिनुस्वलवध्वननामने
दानरस्वप्रतिध्व वाचिया।॥ R. IX. 4.
तस्य श्रवणनमनस्य
सुधाकारकृतमित्र च।

न तत्त्व मन्दर राही
न्यस्तम्यासिदिप्ते:।
अभूतनन्वासिदिप्ते। R. XVII. 48.

नम्रमुखवा: समारन्वा:
प्रस्वस्ववा निररथवा।
नगेशालिनिपोऽगन:।
सत्य गृहु विपेषिते।॥ R. XVII. 53.

पुरुपांतरसत्त्रणे
सरसान्तरस्तानु।
पुरु: विरोग्मुक्तवाला।। R. XVII. 79.
...भिव: संभवस्मीपुऽ
श्वायवलिनिवासवा।।... R. VII. 41.
(3) A difficulty in the Meghadūta.

The several commentators and annotators of the Meghadūta have failed to satisfactorily solve the difficulty of reconciling the following three passages:—

(1) आशाध्वा प्रमणविषिः ( प्रथमविषिः ) केषानारितसार्थि
वर्णाेवपरिपवर्णस्वशेषंवत् ।

V. 2.

(2) प्रवासस्य मनान्तः विविधवा जीविताचरणाय
षुतेर्वेण तृत्यक्षालमया हर्जिस्वर्णमहुःसिद्धि ।

V. 4.

(3) शास्त्राय मुक्तनारायणस्वयं प्रधानी लोकमार्गसंबोध्यस्य
मनस्स्वासनानव चासुनि लोकस्मृतिः सीताविभा ।

V. 116.

Both the readings in the first passage are open to objection as being difficult to be reconciled with the other two passages. The reading प्रमण० is objected to on two grounds. (A) In v. 4. Srāvāṇa is said to be प्रवासस्य, i.e., proximate. Such, however, would not be the case if the Yaksha had seen the Cloud on the first day of Āshāāda, because, the whole of Āshāāda had to elapse before Srāvāṇa commenced. (B) Secondly, we are told further on that the remaining period of exile was few months and that the curse was to come to an end on the eleventh Tithi of the bright fortnight of Kārttika. If we count from the first day of Āshāāda, the period unto the eleventh Tithi of the bright fortnight of Kārttika comes to be four months and ten days, that is, ten days in excess of the period mentioned. These considerations lead Vallabha, one of the commentators, to reject the reading प्रमण० and approve of प्रमण०. This word literally means ‘on the ending day’: but it can be taken to mean ‘on one of the last days.’ This reading no doubt enables us to get rid of the first objection urged against प्रमण०; because Srāvāṇa then becomes proximate, as required by verse 4. But the second objection reappears in a new form. With the reading प्रमण० there was an excess of ten days; with the reading प्रमण० there will be found, on calculation, a deficiency of about fifteen days, even if we construe the word most literally and take the day to be the tenth Tithi of the dark fortnight of Āshāāda. Thus we are left to choose between an excess of ten days over or a deficiency of about fifteen days in the required period.

Mallinātha who prefers the reading प्रमण० tries to refute the objections brought against it in the following manner. As regards the first objection, he says that what is intended by प्रवासस्य is proximity in general of the months of Āshāāda and Srāvāṇa, so that the proximity of Srāvāṇa to Āshāāda may be construed to mean the proximity of Srāvāṇa to any day of Āshāāda and to the first day in particular in the present case (केषानारितसार्थि ‘प्रमणविषिः’ हृति पात्र कृष्णषेष्वकल्पाभ्युद्यतिः।) As to the second objection, he says that the reading प्रमण० being equally liable to a similar objection, it is better to select the reading प्रमण० (कृष्णषेष्वकल्पाभ्युद्यतिः) that the proximity of Srāvāṇa to Āshāāda is to be construed too literally but we are to have four months approximately.

So far as I know no attempt has been made to meet these difficulties by offering a better and more satisfactory explanation. I venture to offer one and it may be taken for what it is worth.
Let us clear the ground before we proceed with the explanation. Let us consider the data supplied by the text, so that the problem may be clearly grasped. The data are four. (1) On a certain day of Ṣādāha the Yaksha saw the Cloud to whom he entrusted a message to be conveyed to his beloved. This day is to be fixed by us bearing in mind the two readings प्रथम and प्रवत्त. (2) Sṛṣaya was proximate to that day. (3) The curse was to come to an end on the eleventh Tīthi of the bright fortnight of Kārttika. (4) Lastly, the period from the day on which the cloud was sent to the last day of the curse was four months. These data are given and we are required (a) first to determine the day on which the message was delivered to the Cloud by the Yaksha and (b) secondly to prove the correctness of one of the two or both readings accordingly.

Here it is best to proceed from the conclusion to the beginning. We are told that the curse was to end on the eleventh Tīthi of the bright fortnight of Kārttika. If we count four months backwards from this day, we see that the day on which the Yaksha saw the Cloud must have been the eleventh Tīthi of the bright fortnight of Āśadāha.

This, however, apparently lands us in a great perplexity. Neither of the readings प्रथम and प्रवत्त fits in with our calculation and we know of no third reading. The word प्रवत्त may mean either 'on the first day' or 'on one of the first days' of Āśadāha, but the eleventh Tīthi of the bright fortnight of Āśadāha is not the first day of the month, nor any stretch in the meaning of the word प्रवत्त makes it 'one of the first days' of the month. I think it is too much to take the first day of Āśadāha to extend beyond the first ten days. In neither case, again, can Sṛṣaya be said to be pratyaśanena to that day. Similarly, the eleventh day of the bright fortnight of Āśadāha cannot be the prasamadivasa Āśadāha in either of the two senses which we have explained above. Under these circumstances, only two alternatives seem possible; either the expression छुटो नालाना should not be construed too literally or the poet should be taken to have overlooked the inconsistency. Is there no getting over this dilemma?

I think there is one way out of the difficulty thus created. As has just been made clear the difficulty arises because the eleventh Tīthi of the bright fortnight of Āśadāha cannot be made the प्रवत्त or प्रवत्त of Āśadāha and प्रवत्त to Sṛṣaya. This difficulty is bound to remain insurmountable so long as the arrangement of months is taken to be what Fleet calls southern 3 or Amānta ('ending with the conjunction') arrangement in which the bright fortnight precedes the dark fortnight of the month. If however we proceed on the basis of the Pūrṇimānta ('ending with the Full Moon') arrangement, the difficulty will be seen at once to vanish; at least one reading, प्रवत्त, will be found to give intelligible sense. The eleventh Tīthi of the bright fortnight of Āśadāha can then be taken to be a प्रवत्त in the sense that it is one of the last days of Āśadāha because the bright would then be the second fortnight of the month and only four days after the next month Sṛṣaya would commence. Thus Sṛṣaya would also be Pratyāśanena to that day. In this manner the lines quoted in the beginning of this note can be satisfactorily reconciled and explained. And looked at from this point of view, the reading प्रवत्त will have to be preferred to प्रथम;  

3 See Gupta Inscriptions: Introduction, p. 79.
the latter remains unintelligible whichever of the two arrangements of months we take as the basis of our calculation.4

Can we conclude from this that in Kālidāsa's days the Pārśimāṇa arrangement was the one generally current and not the Amānta one?

(4) Second difficulty.

I have met with another difficulty, not in the Meghadūta but in the Raghuvamsa. I have not been able to solve it and I wish to bring it to the notice of scholars with a hope that some one will be able to do it.

In the ninth Sarga of the Rāghu the poet is describing the Spring. The description opens with this verse:—

अयं समावहृते कुदुम्बिनितविमित्र सेवितेन्द्रनाथाप्रियपम्।
मकुकुलतेरसद्रस्यार्जिन्यं सत्पुर्वितति विकल्पम्॥ २५॥

The difficulty occurs in the verse which follows:—

विगमुनुवेंद्राधुपिताः हिंग रथयुजा परिसंत वाहनः।
विनमुर्दीि रामिहिन्दराधुपितवर्भवनपलय नगस्मयवः॥ २६॥

I give Mr. Nandargikar's translation of this verse: "Desirous of going to the quarter presided over by the Lord of Wealth (Kubera) the Sun, having his horses turned back by his charioteer, left the Malaya mountain brightening the dawn by removing the frost." The same phenomenon is similarly described in the 3rd Sarga of the Kumāra-sambhava. The poet says:—

कुड़ेरुङ्गति विगमुनुवेंद्राधुपिताः सन्ध्यास परिसंत विलुप्तः।
विकल्पलय ग्रथम् सुखेन स्वर्णतः क्वलिभित्वान्तर्सिद्धि॥ २६॥

4 A second explanation of ब्रह्म is suggested. It is proposed to take the word ब्रह्म in the sense, 'the best,' i.e., the holiest. In Ashādha, the eleventh day of the bright fortnight is the only day which is observed as a holiday and a very sacred one: that should, therefore, be taken as the ब्रह्म of Ashādha. In this rendering one difficulty is got rid of; v. 2 is certainly rendered consistent with v. 116. But the other difficulty remains; the month Śrāvaṇa is not pratyakṣana to the eleventh day of the bright fortnight of Ashādha, unless as I have suggested the arrangement of months is Pārśimāṇa.

In the case of ब्रह्म also another interpretation is suggested. It is to be explained thus:—भ्रम: अश्विनि पशु: न। परशुवर्ती नित्यां तत्सिद्धिः। Śana is to be taken in the sense of 'coolness', so ब्रह्म will mean 'on a cool day'. Even this explanation, however, is no way better in that it does not avoid the one or the other of the two difficulties. Even if the 'cool day' be the eleventh Tithi of the bright fortnight of Ashādha, Śrāvaṇa is not pratyakṣana to it. To avoid this if we take that day to be towards the end of the month, the period of four months as mentioned in v. 116 falls short of fifteen days at least. If, however, the Pārśimāṇa scheme be accepted, this interpretation may be allowed by supposing that the eleventh day of the bright fortnight was perhaps too when the Yaksya saw the Cloud, but then the necessity of assigning this meaning no longer exists as the ordinary meaning taken by Vallabha serves the purpose equally well or perhaps better.

It will be observed as regards these other meanings of ब्रह्म and ब्रह्म that whatever the meaning they are taken to have they do not render the verses consistent unless the Pārśimāṇa arrangement is accepted. I lay emphasis not so much on the meaning of the words ब्रह्म and ब्रह्म as on the fact that the verses yield consistent sense only when construed in a way such as I have suggested.
In these passages the poet seems to mean that with the commencement of the Spring (गोष्ठ: सनायते) the Dakshinayana, i.e., the Sun's southward journey, came to an end and the Udagayana, i.e., the Sun's northward march, commenced. The Sun is said to be desirous of going to the North (विविधपुरुष) and therefore to have had 'his horses turned back' (परिवर्त्ततः वन्यस्वरूपते). In the verse from the Kumdra, the Sun is said to be 'ready to proceed' towards the North (गमनः पवः). All this clearly shows that according to the poet the time of the commencement of the Udagayana coincided with the time of the commencement of the Spring. Now if we look to the Indian Calendars we see therein that the Dakshinayana ends on some day in the month of Pausha; this day which is called the Makara-sankrânti day (the day of the Sun's entering the Makara Rāsi) generally corresponds to the 13th or 14th January every year. This is the conventional ending of the Dakshinayana. Actually it ends on the 23rd of December every year, i.e., about 21 days earlier than the supposed Makara-sankrânti. Next, the Spring (वसन्तः) really begins with the Mina Rāsi (the Sun entering the Mina Rāsi), i.e., about two months after the Makara-sankrânti; this generally takes place in the month of Phâlguna. How are we then to reconcile what Kâlidâsa says with the present-day facts as we observe them?

A similar discrepancy is visible in the description of the hot season (घर्षण). In the 16th Sarga: the poet describes the Grishma and the following are the opening verses:

अयस्य राजस्वविशेषातैरिवेशायाम्युज्जातदानविधम्
विगुणार्यकुषनानधारागमं यमं विभवं निविद्यतुमयम् ॥ ४६ ॥
अगस्त्य पद्मवणसरसोमिन विलुध्रा मायमाति सरिवेस ॥ ४७ ॥

The first verse describes the advent of the Grishma. For our purpose the second verse is more important; it is thus translated by Mr. Nandargikar:—"The Sun having come back near from that side of the Equator which is marked by Agastya, the northern quarter began to produce the oozing of snow on the mountain Himalaya as though it were a flow of tears cool with joy." The point to be noted here is this: When the Grishma set in (चन्द्राणि अगस्त्याः), the Sun came back (सनायते) near (सनायते) the North from the South in which the star Canopus rises and sets (अगस्त्यास्वतिकलस्यान). What is meant by the Sun coming back near the North is that the Sun came nearer the Celestial Equator, to the South of it, and was about to cross it after a month or so. So far as the poet himself is concerned, he is consistent in these two descriptions of the Vasanta and the Grishma. To reach the Equator from the Vernal Equinox the Sun takes three months. If according to the poet the advent of the Vasanta coincides with the commencement of the Udagayana, it is clear the Grishma will commence one month before the Sun crosses the Equator; because the Vasanta lasts two months. Thus the poet can very well say that the Sun is near the North when the Grishma sets in. When the Equator is crossed the Sun will be in the North. If we now turn to the Indian Calendar we find that the Grishma commences one month after the Sun has crossed the Equator. Of the six months that the Sun takes for the northward journey, the first two constitute the Siitra season; the next two the Vasanta and the last two the Grishma. The Equator is crossed during the Vasanta, one

---

5 I have calculated on the basis of the Amânta arrangement of months. Pârśimânta arrangement will involve slight changes; but it will not affect my point, namely, that the Spring commences two months after the Udagayana begins.
month after its advent; and one month after the crossing the Grašma commences. The northernmost point of the journey is reached (that is to say the Udaγayana ends) at the end of the Grašma. 6

Thus in the case of the Grašma also as in the case of the Vasanta, a difference of two months is to be seen. According to the poet the Grašma begins two months after the Udaγayana begins; while according to the Calendar it begins four months after the beginning of the Udaγayana.

The question is how to explain this discrepancy.

I should like to have one point made clear for those who may attempt to solve the question. It may be thought that the discrepancy can be explained away by taking into consideration the effects of the Precession of the Equinoxes and then calculating the difference that has crept in during the period intervening between Kālidāsa and the present generation. But so far as I can see the question appears to be insoluble on purely astronomical and mathematical calculations, simply because of the wrong assumptions which the poet seems to have made. The following are my reasons.—The phenomenon of seasons does not depend upon and therefore is not produced by the Precession of the Equinoxes. Seasons are caused by the variations in the severity of the heat generated by the rays of the Sun, and this depends exclusively on the Sun’s position relative to the Earth alone. When the Sun reaches the southernmost point (that is, when the Dākshināyana ends) the Sun’s rays produce the minimum amount of heat; therefore about that time there must occur the cold seasons. In other words, the two months preceding the Sun’s reaching the Vernal Equinox and the two months following are bound to be cold months; and these correspond to the Hemanta and the Śīśira seasons of the Indian Calendar. The preceding two months comprise the Hemanta and the following the Śīśira. The Precession of the Equinoxes does not affect the heat-producing capacity of the Sun’s rays. What it does is that it causes an apparently retrograde movement on the part of the Sun along the Celestial Equator. This no doubt leads to a change in the time of the commencement of the seasons but indirectly and in a way having no bearing of the question before us. For instance, about 6000 years before, the Vasanta might have been beginning in the month Mārgasīrsha, whereas it now begins in Phālghuna; but then there must have been a corresponding change in the time for the end of the Dākshināyana and the beginning of the Udaγayana, which must have been occurring two months earlier, i.e., in the month Āśvina. So that even then a period of two months must be intervening between the close of the Dākshināyana and the advent of the Vasanta. I therefore think that in this instance Kālidāsa cannot be justified on purely mathematical grounds. On what other ground he can, if at all, be justified I leave to scholars to decide; I only hope this our premier poet of India does find some justification at the hands of some able scholar.

A few other astronomical allusions that may throw light on the question I propose to discuss in the next note.

(To be continued.)

6 Of course all this is according to the conventions of the Indian Calendars. Accurate calculations will show that the beginning of the Vasanta, the crossing of the Celestial Equator by the Sun and such other events, will have to be antedated by about 21 days in each case. But as I have said above, this change will not affect my argument, as the change will have to be made throughout and its effects in one place will be neutralised by those in the other.
VĀRTTĀ — THE ANCIENT HINDU ECONOMICS.
BY NARENDRA NATH LAW, Esq., M.A., B.L.; CALCUTTA.

(Continued from p. 241.)

Conclusion.

Thus it appears that a branch of learning for the study of wealth developed in India, the time of its emergence being roughly indicated by the fact that it is first referred to in the Rāmāyana and was posterior to the allotment of particular occupations to the Vaiśya caste. In Greece, it was Aristotle who first reached the conception of a special science or art of wealth in the fourth century B.C., though stray thoughts on the material concerns of life had commenced to be expressed by earlier writers. The emergence of Vārttā in India as a distinct branch of learning was very probably earlier than Aristotle’s conception of a similar branch of learning in Greece. The Chaldaean had reached a high degree of excellence in agriculture and their methods had been transmitted to the Greeks and Arabs; and it is likely that they left in their libraries clay treatises on agriculture which are all lost to us. The “Nabataean Agriculture” appears to be the only work that seems to contain a reflection of the methods of agriculture. We have, however, no evidence to show that the Chaldaeus had developed a branch of learning devoted to the study of the material interests of the people. As to China, Dr. Chen Haun-Chang’s work makes it clear that many economic concepts and principles were imbedded in the writings of Confucius and his disciples, but he does not make out that the great philosopher was the originator of a distinct subject of study, conducive to the preservation and improvement of the material concerns of life. In India, this branch of learning developed early on the soil and was intended to give a scientific direction to the economic activities of the people. This literary type taking its rise in the triple occupation of the Vaiśya caste included at first within its scope three occupations alone, viz., agriculture, cattle-rearing, and trade. References to this branch of learning lie scattered not only in Sanskrit literature from the epics downwards but also in Buddhist and Jain works which point to the wide currency acquired by the subject in early times. In the Kalpa-Sūtra, for instance, the Arhat Rishabha “during his reign taught, for the benefit of the people, the seventy-two sciences, . . . the sixty-four accomplishments of women, the hundred arts, and the three occupations of men.” The three occupations are evidently the well-known triplet “agriculture, cattle-rearing, and trade,” which we find expressly mentioned in the Milinda-Paṇha as “kasi, vanijja, gorakhha”, and the teaching of these occupations implies that vārttā in its primary sense had risen to be a division of learning.

The scope of this science of wealth after its fullest expansion came to embrace all the branches of knowledge bearing on wealth and stood side by side with the three other divisions of human knowledge,—Ānvikṣiki, Trayi and Daṇḍaniti. These four literary types

---

45 Kalpa-Sūtra (SB., vol. xxii), p. 282. Prof. H. Jacobi commenting on the passage says: "The arts, as those of the potter, blacksmith, painter, weaver, and barber, each of which five principal arts is subdivided into twenty branches, are inventions and must be taught; while the occupations, agriculture, trade, etc., have everywhere developed, as it were, of themselves" (the italics are mine). The last remark in this passage does not seem to be justified; for "the three occupations of men" mentioned by the Kalpa-Sūtra refer evidently to "agriculture, cattle-rearing and trade."

46 Milinda-Paṇha (Tranckner’s ed.), p. 178.
divided among themselves the whole field of human knowledge, and may, from this standpoint, be considered as standing on the same level of importance; but from the other view-point, from which Kautilya looks at them, viz., the creation of conditions that make the pursuit of learning possible, Daṇḍaniti (Polity) is given the first place on account of the peace and order it brings about in the State and thereby makes it possible for the people to pursue the other branches of learning.\footnote{See Kautilya, Bk. I, Viṣṇu-Samuddeśaḥ, p. 7.}

Epigraphic confirmation of the existence of Vārttā as a branch of learning and its teaching by professors in a college comes from a South Indian Inscription\footnote{Śīła-sāgara at Taidagundy, No. 103 (L. Rice’s Mysore Inscriptions, v. 397).} which records that in the Śrīnagandhāruṇa agrahāra “were professors skilled in medicine, in sorcery (or magic), in logic, in the art of distorting people by incantation, in poetry, in the use of weapons, in sacrificing, . . . . . and in the art of cookery to prepare the meals. While its groves put to shame the groves of Nandana, such was the glory of that great agrahāra that all the surrounding country prayed to be taught in the four Vedas, their six vedāṅgas, the three rival divisions of mimāṃsā, the tarka and other connected sciences, the eighteen great purāṇas, the making of numerous verses of praise, the art of architecture, the arts of music and dancing, and in the knowledge of all the four divisions of learning which were possessed by the Brāhmaṇs of the Śrīnagandhāruṇa agrahāra.”

The four divisions of learning mentioned in the passage imply vārttā as one of them, and some of the arts that have already been classed under vārttā have also been separately mentioned as being taught in the agrahāra. The inscription belongs probably to the 12th century A.D. and testifies to the fact that up to that time at least, vārttā as a branch of learning did not yet become in India the unfamiliar or obsolete subject of later years.

\[\text{Note.}—\text{Some of the important Catalogues of manuscripts have been consulted first-hand instead of through Aufrecht’s Catalogus Catalogorum in view of the definitive and descriptive details that such consultation can furnish.}\]

There are chapters in the Purāṇas and other Sanskrit works like the Viṣṇudharmottara devoted to various topics of Vārttā. As these chapters do not require any special mention, they have been omitted in the Lists.

There are a good many MSS. on minerals and their chemical actions mentioned in Dr. P. C. Roy’s History of Hindu Chemistry and Dr. B. N. Seal’s Positive Sciences of the Ancient Hindus. Only those portions, if any, of the MSS. that treat of the processes by which they can be reduced into raw materials for the production of articles of commercial value can come within the scope of Vārttā.

It is not possible to discuss the dates of the various works mentioned here. Apart from the difficulty of the task itself, a good many of the works are out of reach and perhaps not available for copying or consultation. It cannot be denied that some of them are of recent composition but even these may be the lineal descendants of the older ones in which latter, however, the treatment of their respective subjects might be seen in greater freedom from influences which, multiplied by the lapse of time, tend to put it away from its ancient orthodox line.]
LIST I.

Available Manuscripts on Vārttā or its Sub-Topics.

(1) Manushyālayachandrika.—"Tachchu-Śāstra, a primer of architecture in 65 stanzas with Malayalam translation and notes."


(4) Ratnapariksha.—"On gems and their qualities, etc. Some described are imaginary." Ibid, p. 141.


(6) Vāstusānkhya, deposited with Paṣṭīt Syāmāchara, Benares.—"An extract of Toṣarānanda, very rare, complete and incorrect."


(7) Vāstu-Rāja-Vallabhā, by Maṇḍānasūtradhāra.—"A treatise on Vāstu."

Remark ibid. Ibid, p. 56.

(8) Vāstu-Viehāra. by Viśvakarma, deposited with Gaurinatha Sāstri, Benares.—"A treatise on Vāstu; very old, complete and correct." Ibid, p. 56.

(9) Vāstu-Pradīpa, by Vasudeva, deposited with Umāśaṅkara Misra, Azamgarh.—"Rare, recent, complete and correct." Ibid, Pt. X, p. 56. No. 1.

(10) Vāstu-Prakāsa, deposited with Bālābhārī Sapre, Benares.—Remark ibid. Ibid, p. 56, No. 2.


(15) Kriyasaṅgraha-Pañjikā.—“A catalogue of rituals by Kuladatta. It contains among other things, instructions for the selection of a site for the construction of a Vihāra and also rules for building a dwelling-house.”


(16) Ratnaparikshā.—“On the merits and defects of precious stones and jewels of Buddha Bhaṭṭāchāryya. The articles noticed are diamond, pearl, emerald, carbuncle, ruby, sapphire, lapis lazuli, bhishma (?) crystal and coral. The work is in Sanskrit verse and its meaning is explained in Newār prose. As usual in Sanskrit works of this class, great importance is attached to good and ill luck the jewels are calculated to bring on under particular astrological and other circumstances.” _Ibid_, p. 291, No. B. 50.

(17) Rajavallabha-Maṇḍana, by Maṇḍana Sūtradhāra (age 1578 Samvat, complete).—“On architecture. In the colophon it is stated that Maṇḍana, a Sūtradhāra or architect who was in the service of Kumbhakarṇa, king of Medapāta, composed the work and by his devotion to Gaṇapati and to his teacher and the propitiation of the Goddess of Learning he expounded the art of building as taught by the Munis. (EE, Appendix II.) Medapāta is Mevāḍ and a king of the name of Kumbha ruled over the country according to Tod from A.D. 1419 to 1469. He had a taste for the arts and constructed many temples as well as strongholds. It is not unlikely therefore he had in his service persons who read the literature of architecture and who could compose such treatises as the one under notice.”


(37) Pakshimunushyālayalakṣaṇa. Author not mentioned. P. D. Same as above.—“Subject—Silpa.” The construction of aviaries dealt with in this MS. is likely to be interesting. Ibid, Vol. I, p. 471, No. 6030.


(43) Manushyālayachandrīkā, by Arunadatta. P. D. Mahārājā of Travancore. MS. No. 1 of this List bears this name but its author has not been mentioned.—“Subject—Silpa.” Ibid, Vol. I, p. 475, No. 6108.


(64) Chatvarimāt-vidyā (i.e., forty branches of learning). *Ibid*, Vol. II, p. 230, No. 2407. The subject being 'mantra' as mentioned by Oppert, we do not expect from it more than an enumeration of the branches of learning.


(73) Kaideva.—This work may have some bearing on agriculture.—"On Botany." Quoted three times in the *Nirñaya-sindhu*. *Auf*, Pt. I, p. 128.


BOOK NOTICE.

THE BEGINNINGS OF SOUTH INDIAN HISTORY. By S. KRISHNASWAMI AIYANGAR. Madras University Special Lectures on Indian History and Archaeology. Second Series, Madras. The Modern Printing Works, Mount Road. 1918. Price, Rs. 3-12-0.

These lectures strike me as an honest attempt to present to the student the actual facts as ascertained to date of the earliest known definite history of South India without any trimmings. They are to my mind the most valuable for that and all the more creditable to the lecturer, as he himself is a South Indian. Indeed he has gone out of his way to state all the facts—epigraphic or other that have come before him, so as not to allow "patriotism to take command of evidence," and he has tried to avoid the pitfall of making too much of epigraphical and too little of other forms of evidence. Here, I am entirely with him.

I am glad to note that the author is aware that the old charge against Indian History of a total want of chronological data will gradually have to be abandoned as untenable. I am of those who believe in the establishment in due course of a set of chronological facts of a reliable character, in regard to early Indian History, and that the labour of contributors to such a Journal as this for so many years will not prove to have been in vain. In compiling a "popular" history of India from the earliest times to the latest a few years ago, which had necessarily to be very brief, I felt myself astonished to find how very far towards a sufficiently definite chronology for general purposes scholars and researchers had gone in the last 35 to 40 years. My own impression is, as an old student of history of all sorts, that if you know enough and understand enough of what ancient writers meant to convey or report, you can dig actual facts of history out of almost any ancient records or writings. At any rate it is worth the while of scholars to enter on the study of the old documents in this spirit, for they will in time be duly rewarded.

Patience and time will solve most puzzles and explain historical references in the most unlikely places. Thirty-five years ago I collected and began to publish the Legends of the Punjab, taken down verbatim from wandering bards; and one of the early heroes, with every kind of folklore fastened on to his memory, was King Sirkap. At that time no one knew and no one could conjecture who was referred to. We know now that Sirkap was one of the cities on the site of Taxila and that the modern Punjabi bard is still perpetuating in his own fortune the memory of the actual Sikka and perhaps Indo-Bactrian rulers of that spot in the centuries round the commencement of the Christian era.

I notice that the author lays no claim to great antiquity for the history of Southern India. In the present state of knowledge perhaps this is wise, but I cannot help thinking that as time goes we shall find that this can be properly carried back further than is now recognised. Civilization—and therefore history—must have been very old there.

In a brief notice like this it is impossible to enter into any argument on details and I content myself with expressing gratitude for what the book contains—much that is of real value to students, especially to the younger sort, and much that every mature student can take seriously into consideration.

R. C. TEMPLE.
HOME OF KĀLĪDĀSA.

In the Kāvyadāsa Danḍin contrasts between two schools of Sanskrit poetry, the Vaidarbhā and the Gauḍīya (I. vs. 40-100). The ten qualities Śīla, praśāda, sāmatā, etc. are, according to him characteristic of the former. But they are not so with the poets of the latter who seldom observe them. The great difference that lies between the two schools, is illustrated by Danḍin with reference to certain specific examples. He first cites a passage from the Vaidarbhā school and then by way of contrast cites another from the Gauḍīya school.

To explain the praśāda gūpa Danḍin (I. v. 45) says:

"प्रसादः परस्त्रीमितेऽस्वगीतयःखःस्पर्शः शयं।
त्तमुनि त्तमलिङ्गवर्णवल्लभम्। रोचकः।"

The expression lākṣaṁ lākṣaṁ tānok is a fragment of the following verse of Śākuntala:

"सर्वशैलमुल्लिं शैलेशनापि रचयिला
मलिङ्गाधिह्वसंज्ञ लभी ततुः।"

The mere fact that Danḍin quotes Kālīdāsa to illustrate the Vaidarbhā school of poetry is not so important, for he is regarded as a pre-eminently Vaidarbhā poet by other rhetoricians. What is however, more important is that we get, from him a valuable hint in regard to the part of the country to which the greatest poet of India belonged. In the Kāvyadāsa (I. vs. 44, 46, 54, 60, 82), the poets of the two schools are qualified by such adjectives as Gauḍīya, Gauḍiyaka and Adākṣaṇiya, Adākṣaṇa, and Vaidarbhaka and Dēkhaṇiya, respectively. From this, it is clear that according to Danḍin the poets of these two schools were also inhabitants of the two countries after which they were designated. This is also the view taken by the author of the commentary called Hridayagama published by Rao Bāhādur M. Rai gāhārya from Madras. To silence those who would argue that Kālīdāsa might as well have imitated the Vaidarbhā school without having anything to do with the Vaidarbhā country, it is necessary to point out that the sense which we put forward here is also corroborated by the early rhetorician Vāmana, who flourished in the 8th or 9th century A.D. According to him, rīti means Viśeṣha-pada-rācaland (I. ii, 7), and is of three kinds, the Vaidarbhā, Gauḍī and the Pāchhīki:

"शा बैरागी गङ्गाजली पाकाली चाय।"

After stating this Vāmana writes:

"किशोरसवसस्वर ब्रजस्वल: कालाणां गृहां वन्यपरागः।
विशेषान्तः महर्षिविनोयः सूत्रः। कालिकपर: स्वरस्य दवस्यां नस्तमालाः। न गुप्तविनावः किशोरसुवृत्त: कालाणाम।"

The substance of the foregoing passage is that each school took the name of the country in which it flourished. The poets of a country developed one particular style of poetry and that particular style became peculiar to that country. This led to the rise of the various schools and this was why they were designated after the names of countries. Thus according to Vāmana, who no doubt represents the current tradition of his age, the Vaidarbhā school was established in Vādaṁ which, according to Cunningham, roughly corresponds with the territory extending from near Burhanpur on the Tāpti and Nānder on the Godavari to Ratanpur in Chittisgarh, and the Nānuagadha near the source of the Mahānadi. According to Vāmana, the Vaidarbhā school is superior to all other sister-schools by reason of its being saṃgraha gūpa, i.e., possessing all the ten qualities of poetry, ojas, praśāda, etc. To illustrate this Vāmana quotes the well-known stanza from Sākuntala:

"Gāhāntamahādā nīpaśaṇīla
śrīnair-mukha-tādāma,
" etc. This quotation, immediately following the above definite statement of the author, that the Vaidarbhā school means that school which originated in Vaidarbha, seems to denote that Vāmana believed Kālīdāsa to have been a native of Vaidarbha. This tradition, recorded again by an author who comes only a few centuries after Kālīdāsa, must be looked upon as the most valuable piece of evidence we hitherto had, in fixing the home of the great poet.

N. G. MAJUMDAR.

1. This has been brought to our notice by Dr. Barrett—JRAS., 1915, p. 555.
5. Ibid, p. 17.
6. Ancient Geography of India, p. 526.
8. It should be noticed here that M. M. Pandit Haraprasad Sāstrī mainly depending on the flora of Kālīdāsa concludes that the poet must have belonged to W. Mūlā.—JEORS. 1915, p. 15.
SIDE-LIGHTS ON OMICHUND:

An Echo of the Intrigues before Plassey.

BY SIR RICHARD CARNAC TEMPLE, BR.

SOME years ago Sir George Forrest, in the course of his researches into the life-story of Robert Clive, found among the Clive MSS. belonging to his descendant, the Earl of Powis, two documents in Armenian (Plates I and II). Plate I shows an original letter addressed to Aghas Petros and signed in the Panjabi character, "Amirchand" (Omichund). Plate II shows an unsigned copy of it, with a footnote, "Copy of Mr. Mirchand's letter." Neither document bears a date.

There is nothing to show why Clive should have got possession of both the original and the copy and have so carefully preserved them, beyond the fact that the letter is addressed to Aghas Petros and indicates that he and Omichund were closely connected in some transaction of a confidential nature with Wâch, a legitimate Bengali form for the name of William Watts, the Chief of the East India Company's Factory at Kâsimbazar from 1752 to 1758. But a reference to the Orme MSS., preserved at the India Office supplies the explanation.

During the collection of matter for his History of the Military Transactions of the British Nation in Indostan, Orme laid under contribution all the great actors in the drama of the foundation of our Indian Empire, including Clive and his immediate associates, and had copies and translations made of the papers and information supplied to him. Among a series of letters written by William Watts to Colonel Clive between the 29th December 1756 and the 27th June 1757 is a letter, dated the 8th June 1757, covering the Armenian document under discussion; but in order to understand both the document and its covering letter, it is necessary to review briefly the situation in Bengal at that period.

The events leading up to the determination of Surâjudaulâ, Nawâb Governor of Bengal, to oust the British from his jurisdiction have been ably set forth by Mr. S. C. Hill in the Introduction to his Bengal in 1756-57. From this it appears that in May 1756 orders were issued for the seizure of Kâsimbazar Factory, of which William Watts, then an old servant of the Company, had been Chief since 1752. On the 1st June, Râi Durâleh, the Nawâb's diwan, attempted to force his way into the Factory, but meeting with resistance, he treacherously persuaded Watts on the following day to pay a complimentary visit to the Nawâb at Murshidâbâd. Watts was seized and the Factory was subsequently surrendered by Matthew Collett, the next senior official.

Then occurred the Tragedy of the Black Hole and the capture of Calcutta on the 20th-21st June; and meanwhile Watts and Collett were kept with others of the Company's servants, in prison at Murshidâbâd, and subjected to much insult until the 24th June, when the Chiefs of the French and Dutch Factories at Chandernagore and Chinsurah obtained their liberty for them and became sureties for their appearance when required by the Nawâb. They repaired to Chandernagore where they remained until the 13th August, when they joined the surviving members of the Bengal Council at Fulta on the Húgli, whether the refugees from Calcutta had fled.

<sup>1</sup> Orme MSS., India, Vol. IX, pp. 2265-2317.

<sup>2</sup> Close to Murshidâbâd, the Nawâb's headquarters.
On the 20th August 1756, Watts was appointed a member of the locally constituted Secret Committee of the Bengal Council, the other members being Roger Drake, the Bengal President, Major James Killpatrick, the chief military officer, and J. Z. Holwell, the hero of the Black Hole. Immediately after the arrival of Admiral Watson's squadron with Colonel Clive for the relief of Calcutta, bringing orders from the Court of Directors in England for the foundation of a regularly appointed Select Secret Committee, Watts became one of its members and attended its first meeting on the 12th December 1756.

Calcutta was retaken on the 2nd January 1757 and Roger Drake reinstated as President. Then followed the attack on Hâgli and a Treaty with the Nawâb on the 9th February. One of the conditions privately accepted was that the British should have a representative at the Nawâb's Court, and Watts was selected for the office. His appointment was agreeable to Surâjuddaula, who considered him a weak man, but Clive and the Bengal Council judged him fit for the post, "being very well versed in the country language, and in their politics and customs." His position was a delicate one. He was charged to effect by diplomacy the fulfilment of the Treaty and all the objects which the Council had in view, such as complete restitution for losses sustained and a guarantee that no fortification should be erected on the river below Calcutta.

Watts was accompanied by a native adviser and agent, a Hindu merchant at Calcutta named Amir Chand, but known to contemporary Europeans and ever since as Omichund. He was a Panjabi who for many years had acted as an agent for the English in their annual investment of Indian goods in Bengal, chiefly saltpetre. There were constant disputes with him and the other merchants who contracted with the Company, and in consequence, the Bengal Council changed its policy in 1753 and began to deal directly with the producers at the various "airungs" (factories) without the intervention of agents. Although Omichund continued to be the medium for the supply of certain goods, chiefly again saltpetre, this proceeding on the part of the Council naturally affected his friendly feelings towards the English and threw him into the arms of the native government, especially as he had been held in high esteem by Alivardi Khân, Surâjuddaula's grandfather and immediate predecessor.

Apparently Omichund miscalculated his influence with the young Nawâb and therefore deemed it wise to regain the favour of the English, for from the time of the expulsion of the Company's servants from Calcutta he used every effort to render himself invaluable to the Secret Committee. This, however, did not prevent the Bengal Council from issuing an order in January 1757 for the sequestration of his goods on suspicion of his complicity in the proceedings leading up to the Black Hole episode, but as no direct proof could be found, the order was rescinded. Omichund then induced Clive to take action on his behalf, with the result that he was allowed to accompany Watts to Murshidâbâd, on the 17th February 1757, as confidential adviser and agent, and from the letters of Watts preserved among the Orme MSS., he at first appears to have justified Clive's confidence in his loyalty.

---

2 Afterwards the celebrated Select Committee, finally developing into the Foreign Department.
4 As early as 1744 we find him in partnership with "Deechunud" (Dtp Chand), a Patna merchant, dealing always in saltpetre, the name of the firm being then "Omichund Deechunud," as the Europeans understood it. The partnership was apparently dissolved in 1748, after which date both Omichund and Deechunud contracted separately. *J. O. Records, Coast and Bay Abstracts*, vol. V.
6 The part he actually played in the Tragedy has never been cleared up.
7 *Orme MSS., India*, vol. IX, p. 2265.
On the 3rd March 1757, Watts wrote, "I must do this justice to Omichund to say he is indefatigable in the Company's interest; his assistance is of the utmost service to me he declares he will convince the Company and the whole world of his attachment to their service." On the 26th he reported, "Omichund is indefatigable in the service of the Company and if ever man deserved their favour he does; he is always with me, and as I am convinced of his superior understanding, I always consult him and am persuaded he is sincere and hearty in the cause of the English; and if our advice is thought worthy to be listened to, I do not doubt we shall be able to be of advantage to the Company and particulars hitherto I think I have not erred." Again, on the 11th April, Watts wrote, "As Omichund has a superior understanding and as I am persuaded it is greatly for his interest we should be successful, I therefore consult him on all occasions, which I hope you will approve of." His illness, a few days later, caused Watts great anxiety: "Omichund is ill; if any accident should happen to him, we shall miss him greatly."11

During the first two months of Watts's stay at Murshidabâd Omichund's assistance was invaluable, and it was he who persuaded Surajuddaula to allow the English to attack the French in Chandernagore in March 1757, as a reprisal for assistance reported to have been treacherously given to the perpetrators of the Black Hole. After the capture of the place, Jean Law, Chief of the French at Kasimbazar, endeavoured to re-establish his influence with the Nawab, but the more attractive promises of the Company's agents prevailed, and Watts eventually gained the upper hand. Nevertheless, although the Nawab withdrew his protection from the French, he was still suspicious of the designs of the English, and on Clive's demand for the complete fulfillment of the Treaty of the 9th February 1757, his attitude towards Watts became threatening.

Surajuddaula had by this time rendered himself odious to a large proportion of his subjects as well as to the Europeans in his dominions, and Omichund now devised a scheme to depose him. The particulars were first communicated, on the 17th April, to Luke Scrafton,12 who had apparently been sent to Murshidabâd in connection with the Company's business at Kasimbazar Factory. Omichund's idea was to obtain the support of the Seths, the powerful Hindu financial community of Bengal, and with their help and that of the British to set up Yar Lutf Khan,13 a military adventurer and an officer in high command in the Nawab's army. On the 20th April Omichund had an interview with "Juggutseet," (Jagat Seth),14 the head of the fraternity, who seems to have received his suggestion with favour, and with the sanction of Watts, he visited Yar Lutf Khan on the 23rd, when preliminary conditions were arranged.15 Omichund was now at the height of his power, and Scrafton warned Clive not to allow him too much latitude, as he "wants to have the whole honour to himself and cannot bear that any one should interfere."16 It is at this point that Khwaja (or Agha) Petros comes prominently into the story.

12 Ibid, pp. 2324-2326. Scrafton was one of the emissaries employed by Clive to treat with the Nawab after the retaking of Calcutta. He was appointed Resident at Murshidabâd when Mir Jafir was made Nawab Nasir.
13 Mir Khudayâr (also Khudadâd) Khan Lâtî, called by Watts "Meir Godau Yar Cawn Laitty" (Osma MSS, India, vol. IX, p. 2299), with many curious variants, including "Murgodaunyer Cawn Luttee" (Ibid, vol. X, p. 2409). He had been brought to Murshidabâd by the Seths, which may have been one reason why Omichund counted on their support.
14 Osma MSS, India, vol. IX, pp. 2326-2328.
16 Ibid, p. 2330.
Petros Arratoon, usually known as Coja (Khwâja) Petrus (Petrose) was an important Armenian merchant, whose brother Grigor Arratoon (Gorgin Khan) was a general of Mir Kásim.\footnote{Son-in-law of Mir Ja'fír and the second Nawâb Nâzîm.} He had resided in Calcutta since 1748 and had rendered valuable service to the English at the time of its capture and in the negotiations following its recapture. He seems to have accompanied Watts and Omichund to Murshidâbâd, as he is mentioned in a letter of the 18th February, immediately after their arrival,\footnote{Orme MSS., India, vol. IX, p. 2267.} and subsequent letters show him to have been employed as an emissary by both Watts and the Nawâb. On the 24th April 1757, Mir Ja'fír,\footnote{Afterwards the first Nawâb Nâzîm of Bengal appointed by the English.} Surajuddaula's Bakhshi or Paymaster General, who had previously agreed to countenance Yâr Lutf Khân's pretensions but had since been approached by the Seths as a more suitable candidate, sent for Petros\footnote{Orme MSS., India, vol. IX, p. 2391.} and desired him to tell Watts that he could secure the adhesion of the Nawâb's chief officers in support of his own claims if these were put forward. "This scheme," Watts considered, "more feasible than the other"\footnote{Op. cit., loc. cit.} and he urged its adoption by Clive, who readily acquiesced, since he was doubtful of the wisdom of setting up so comparatively unimportant a man as Yâr Lutf Khân, while Mir Ja'fír, brother-in-law of the late Nawâb Governor, Alivardi Khân, was a personage of weight and influence.

This change of candidates placed Omichund in an awkward position, for he could not hope to have any ascendency over Mir Ja'fír, the Seths' nominee, and he therefore seems to have determined to get what he could out of the Nawâb and at the same time to revenge himself on both the Seths and the British for overriding his support of Yâr Lutf Khân. Ranjit Rai, the Seths' broker, was pressing the Nawâb for the payment to his clients of a sum agreed on by the Treaty of the 9th February, and Omichund seized the opportunity to suggest that if negotiations were conducted solely through him, the Nawâb might evade this and other obligations. Surajuddaula accordingly flouted Ranjit Rai and ordered a large sum of money to be paid to Omichund in consideration of his advice. Such conduct naturally roused the anger of the Seths, who not only declined to be associated with Omichund but used all their influence to set Mir Ja'fír against him.

Watts, however, showed no distrust of Omichund until the 14th May. On that day,\footnote{Hill, Bengal in 1756-57, vol II, pp. 380-382.} in reply to a letter of the 8th, in which Clive had suggested that an ample reward should be granted to the agent for his services, Watts strongly opposed a proposition to give Omichund 5 per cent. on whatever money he may receive on the new contract,\footnote{Op. cit., loc. cit.} and added, "As I by no means think he merits such a favour or has acted so disinterested a part as I once imagined, I have not mentioned the 5 per cent. to him." To support his attitude, Watts gave the details that had recently come to his knowledge of the trick played on Ranjit Rai narrated above, together with other proofs of overreaching duplicity, greed and general untrustworthiness on the part of Omichund. Three days later Watts, again wrote to Clive, repeating his distrust and reporting an interview, detrimental to the interests of Mir Ja'fír, that Omichund had had with the Nawâb. In this letter Watts charges his former confidant with dishonesty, calls him a liar, and winds up with, "I have learnt many particulars relating to Omichund too tedious to mention at present, but they will astonish
you." On the 20th May, in a postscript to another letter to Clive, he remarks, "We are deceived and Omichund is a villain, but this to yourself." Watts now, as far as possible, employed Petros in the room of Omichund, though he was careful not to arouse the suspicions of the latter. Petros was thus the principal go-between in the negotiations with Mir Ja'fir, who would have nothing to do with Omichund, whom he styled "an intriguing Gento [Hindu] without fortitude or honesty." But Clive considered it dangerous to oppose him openly, although he had by this time the lowest opinion of him.

Having regard, therefore, to what was looked on as Omichund's treacherous nature, two treaties with Mir Ja'fir were drawn up: a false one containing a clause providing him with a substantial gratuity, and another, the true one, omitting any mention of him. Watts was instructed to flatter Omichund and lull any doubts that he might express by telling him that the Select Committee were "infinitely obliged to him" for the pains he had taken "to aggrandize the Company's affairs," and further, "that his name will be greater in England than ever it was in India." In reply, Watts wrote, on the 23rd May, "We [Luke Sraffton and himself] shall either deceive Omichund as you mention, or pretend to have dropped the scheme and leave him entirely out of the secret, whichever on consultation we judge the most secure."

Watts, Omichund and Petros were all this time still in Murshidabad, from whence Watts was anxious to escape to Calcutta before Surajuddaula could become aware of the plot to depose him. But in consequence of Omichund's intrigues with the Nawab and his officers, it was necessary to induce the former to depart before the others, and he was persuaded to set out for Calcutta with Sraffton on the 30th May. On the way down, however, he managed an interview with Rai Durlabh at Plassey (Palasi, eight miles from Murshidabad) during which Watts surmised that he disclosed the conspiracy with Mir Ja'fir, while he himself got the first inkling of the contents of the false treaty.

On the 3rd June Omar (Aumee, 'Umru) Beg, Mir Ja'fir's confidential agent, was provided with copies of both treaties for his master's inspection, and on the 5th Petros took Watts concealed in a dooley to the palace of Mir Ja'fir at Murshidabad, and there the real treaty, drafted by the Select Committee, was signed. Watts effected his escape a week later, on the evening of the 12th June, and it was during this period that the Armenian document, the subject of this paper, was received and transmitted to Clive.

From the evidence available, the letter in question could not have been written before Omichund left Murshidabad on the 30th May 1757, or after the 8th June, the date of a letter from Watts to Clive mentioning its receipt.

On the 5th June Clive wrote from the French Gardens (Calcutta) to Watts at Murshidabad: "You assured Mr. Sraffton, that Oomychund once gone, you had no

---

28 The exact dates when the false treaty was shown to Omichund and when he found that he had been duped do not appear in the Records now available, but according to Orme (History, vol. II, pp. 158-159) the first inkling Omichund had of the false treaty was during a visit to Rai Durlabh on the night of the 30th May, and he first saw it on the 10th June through bribing a scribe (Ibid, p. 163), and was told of the real treaty by Clive and Sraffton on the 30th June (Ibid, pp. 181-182).
further obstacle to a conclusion, then why this delay? Surely you are deceived by those you employ, or you have been deceiving me, and all your aim was to get away Omychund. The affair [of the conspiracy to depose Surājū'ddaula] is now publicly talked of, and if it does not take place within a short time after the receipt of this, I will set it aside, being determined not to undertake it in the Rains."

Watts replied, on the 8th June, vindicating himself from Clive’s accusations: "I have not been duped as you must know by this time, and be convinced Omychund has been the occasion of the delay. As a further proof I inclose you Copy and translate of a letter from him to Petrus [Khwāja Petros]. Please to send for Petrus’s brother [Grigor Arratoon] and ask him upon oath if Omychund did not dictate and he write such a letter to his brother. If this will not satisfy you, and Omychund’s address has more weight than my proofs, I will send you the original letter with his own signing. Let me beg of you to comply with this request not to divulge what I have inclosed or wrote you to Omychund, till I am in a place of security, as he is implacable in his resentments, and may be induced to discover everything by writing up here in order to sacrifice Petrus and me to his resentment. The Nabob and Meer Jaffier are at open variance, and it’s apprehended troubles between them will soon ensue; the latter is supported by Laittee, Roydlubb, Juggutsseat and others, but of this I shall write you more certainly in the evening."

The only document that Watts appears to have enclosed to Clive on the 8th June was the copy (Plate II) of the Armenian letter, and finding his mistake, he wrote again on the 11th, sending the translation, and no doubt the original. This accounts for the original, the copy and the translation being all three in Clive’s possession, and the first two being handed down to his descendant.

Watts’s letter of the 11th June, written on the day before he left Murshidabad, runs as follows:—

"I have this moment received yours of the 10th. Meer Jaffier and the Nabob continue with their forces armed night and day; Roydlubb is faithful. Many Jemidars have sworn to join Meer Jaffier in case of an attack. Upon it’s appearing that you favour Meer Jaffier’s cause, I imagine the Nabob will be deserted by most of his people, and you will have little else to do than the trouble of a march. As we hourly run the risk of a discovery and of course being then at least made prisoners, and as there is no depending upon the arrival of Cossids, your last being 3 days in the way, if I do not hear from you to morrow, I am determined to set out the next day. We are already suspected of wanting to run away; this the whole town talk of. Meer Jaffier has sent to me to get away as soon as possible. This incloses Omychund’s letter to Petrus."

The enclosure is in reality a free translation of a part of the Armenian letter under discussion, no doubt given to Watts by Petros himself.

---

34 Orme MSS., India, vol. IX, p. 2316. I give below reasons for identifying Grigor Arratoon as the "brother" mentioned, though of course there may have been others.
35 These names are Yâr Lutf Khan Lâti, Râd Durlabh and Jagât Seth, the chief of the Seths. The first two were with Surâjū’ddaula’s forces at Plassey (23rd June 1757), but refused to fight, which supports the statement in Watts’s letter.
37 Jemadar (jamo’ddar), military commander.
38 Cossid (gâsid), messenger.
"Omichund’s compliments to Petrus. There’s letters gone for Mr. Watts to forbid his coming down till permission is given from hence. You and I are one. Let us consider what is for our own interest and act so as to make it pass that we have had the whole management of this affair. If our friend is not set out, keep him a few days; affairs are not yet settled here; hereafter I will write you the particulars. You have a good understanding therefore there’s no occasion to write you much. Our success depends upon each other. All my hopes are in you.”

We are now in a position to discuss the document itself, and I begin with a transliteration thereof, followed by a translation and a free rendering.

Transliteration and Notes by Mr. S. M. Gregory.

(Plates I and II.)


Sâhâpis hâghîhâtan [46] khârtzri.

Asâtz ‘qâni qâlames’ [47]: asâtz ‘wor griem’ Amîrchandan. Sâhâpis ghullughûman
mochv ghûo woch.

Menâtz yes dû min amq. Inch miez lev lini aryves. Lev mârdi [50]: derân hramân [51]
Yev en bâryekâmân wor hramânôtzh khêt golêzta, yêkêla bharlyà thae woch, qânî or
hetâtznes; zîra [53] dherêvas têghas máslahâtan [54] chi yeel. Máslahâtan lini hakûtz
lâzûnmin [55] kegrîem hramânôtzh.

---

39 Ar.-Pers., sâhîb-i-râkhdog, lord of lords.
40 Turki, Aghâ, a great nobleman, lit., elder brother.
41 Ar.-Pers., ‘arz,’ a petition, a respectful request: ‘be it humbly known.’
42 Turki, qullûq, servio (qui, slave. Urdu, qull, servant); ‘in your service, to you.’
43 Ar.-Pers., unq, time.
44 Ar.-Pers., fikrmand, anxious.
45 Amîrchand, correct, Panjâbi form of the well-known name Omichund.
46 Ar.-Pers., haqiqat, real state of affairs, the truth.
47 Ar.-Pers., kâlam, words.
48 Pers. bandagi, service, devotion, compliments.
49 Wâchîn, to Wâch, Bengali form of the name of Mr. William Watts, Chief at Kâsimbâzâr.
50 Pers., mârdi, manliness, boldness.
51 In the original letter, between the first word of the eighth line, mârdi, and the fourth word
sâkhe, there are two contractions, replaced in the copy by arz, the fourth word in the eighth line, mean-
g to do or perform, which makes sense, but does not at all convey the meaning of the original, as the
contractions for which it is substituted, derân hramân, mean ‘the management.’
52 Ar.-Pers., khâthirjam’a, tranquil, at ease.
53 Turki, zîrd, because.
54 Ar.-Pers., marqîbat, affair, transaction, deliberation.
55 Ar.-Pers., lâzîm, necessary expedient.
Addition to the Copy (Plate II).

Mārmīrchadīn 63 grīn nāghlan. 64

Translation by Mr. S. M. Gregory.

To the most illustrious Sāhibs, Agha Petros.

Be it humbly known in the service of him to whom the above is written, that up to the present time we have no favour [letter] from the Sāhib. We are very anxious, and hearing of Amīrchand’s arrival I came to the Pavillion. 65 I enquired into the real state of things about the Sāhib.

Amīrchand told me to write these few words. He sends his compliments of devotion in the service of the Sāhib. He says that they have written to Wāch from here that so long as we do not write, no one is to come.

It remains that you and I are one. What is good for us, do that. Be thoroughly manly, so that the management of everything is ours till the end. And be tranquil about your home. And if the friend who is to come with you has arrived, whether it is good or not, delay him for a few days, as deliberations here are not yet. Deliberations over, I will write to you tomorrow what is necessary.

It is not expedient to write details of circumstances, because you are a wise man and because my advantage is yours and yours mine. My whole affair I leave open to your inclination. No more.

(Addition to the copy.)

Copy of Mār Mirchand’s letter.

Free Rendering.

To Agha Petros.

We have had no letter from you up to the present and have become very anxious, so hearing of Amīrchand’s arrival, I came to the Pavillion (Gaurthi) to enquire into the real facts about you.

Amīrchand has told me to write to you for him. He sends his compliments and says that Wāch (Watts) has written to you, to say that no one is to come until he hears from us.

56 Hindi, bēurd, details.
57 Pers., dānd, wise.
58 Pers., mārd, a man.
59 Ar.-Pers., kull, all, entire.
60 Ar.-Pers., nā, inclination.
61 Ar.-Pers., zidda, the ordinary shortened ending of a Persian or Muhammadan letter in India, zidda hadd-i-adab, more would be the limit of respect: ‘your obedient servant.’ In the original but not in the copy, just above the last word zidd, there appears the Armenian letter chu with two marks to the left of it, which no doubt represent the letter wa, so that the word would read wuch, ‘nothing.’ A usual ending to Armenian letters in India at that period was zidda wuch ‘no more,’ in imitation of the Persian ending above mentioned.
62 The signature is in Panjābī characters, but the last three signs are not at all clearly written. However, as Amīrchand is a common Panjābī name, they no doubt are meant for r-ch-d, i.e., rchand, with the bindi, n, omitted.
63 Mārmīrchand in the copy seems to be a slip of the pen for Amīrchand.
64 Ar.-Pers., māz, a copy.
65 For the reason for thus translating Gaurthi in the text, see infra, p. 187.
Plate I.

Original document in Armenian signed by Ami Chand.
Plate II.

Rough copy of No. I.
For the rest, he says that you and he are of the same mind and asks you to act in your oint interests boldly, so that the management of the whole affair shall appear to be in your own hands until the end of the business. He says you are not to worry about your home because he is here, and you should delay the departure of the friend (Watts) for a few days, in any case, as the business is not yet settled. As soon as it is settled he will write at once what it is necessary for you to do.

It is not expedient to go into details because you know them and you are both in the same position, and he leaves the whole affair to you to deal with as you think best.

Date and Address of the Letter.

It will be seen, then, from the general evidence available, that the date of Omichund's letter to Agha Petros is narrowed down to the week between the 30th May and 8th June 1757, and from the correspondence quoted in this discussion it can be actually fixed as during the night of the 30th-31st May, for the following reasons.

It was written by Omichund from a place apparently called Gaurthi, of which more anon, to Petros who was then at Murshidabād. It could not have been written at the latter place, nor after Omichund reached Calcutta, as he did not arrive until the 8th June, and it was received before that date at Murshidabād. So it must have been written on the way down, and Petros thought that his brother Grigor was present when it was written. On the 3rd June Watts complains to Clive, and he said that Omichund's four hours visit to Roydullub [Rāi Durlabh] at Plassy has been the cause of the set-back in the negotiations with Mir Ja'fīr. From Orme we learn that Omichund twice gave Scrafton the slip on the way to Calcutta, at Kasimbázār and at Plassy, on the night of the 30th May, and that he did not see him again after his second absence until 3 p.m., on the 31st. In the interval Omichund had had his conference with Rāi Durlabh, at which Grigor Arratoon must have been present and this was when he had the letter written to Petros. Rāi Durlabh, Surājuddaula's diwan was then in favour of Mir Ja'fīr's claims; Grigor, the brother of Petros, was, as Gorgin Khān a genoral in the service of Mir Ja'fīr's son-in-law. At the conference Omichund heard a rumour of a treaty between Mir Ja'fīr and the English which deprived him of his claims, and his only chance of defeating it was to get Watts to remain at Murshidabād and thus fall into the hands of Surājuddaula. Accordingly, he first persuaded Rāi Durlabh, and apparently Grigor also, to waver in their allegiance to Mir Ja'fīr, and then induced them to let him dictate a letter to Petros, with the sole object of delaying the departure of Watts and so upsetting the scheme in favour of Mir Ja'fīr. This does not imply that either Rāi Durlabh or Grigor was aware of his real motive.

Omichund's plan miscarried because Petros remained loyal to Mir Ja'fīr and the English, and on the further journey down to Calcutta, Scrafton managed to allay the suspicions which gave rise to the letter.71

The whole evidence thus shows that the letter was written in the early hours of the 31st May 1757.

---

67 See Watts's letter of the 8th June, quoted above. Petros must have told Watts that he thought his 'brother' wrote the letter or Watts would not have used the terms he employed in writing to Clive. It is quite likely in the whole circumstances that Grigor Arratoon was present and there is nothing in the history of the time to show that any other brother of Petros was of sufficient importance for Clive to employ him in a confidential capacity. The fairest assumption is that Grigor was the 'brother' meant by Petros, and it is not likely from the language in which the letter is couched, that the term 'brother' merely meant some unnamed relative.
68 Orme MSS., India, vol. IX, p. 2313.
70 Orme, op. cit., loc. cit.
71 Ibid, p. 159.
The name Gaurthi, the place from which the letter is said to be written, is obscure. No such town or village in the neighbourhood of Plassey can be traced on any 18th century map, but it must have been close to Plassey and in the camp of Râi Durlabh. A contemporary plan of the battle of Plassey by Major Rennell, reproduced in Broome’s History of the Bengal Army and also by Mr. Hill in his Bengal in 1756-57, vol. I, p. cxv, gives “the Nawâb’s Hunting House” on the river, close to Plassey Grove. As Râi Durlabh was the Nawâb’s dicein, his headquarters were no doubt in that building. Assuming this to be the case, we may take it that Gaurthi is a corruption of chauthri, through a metathesis chaurthi, such as is common in India, and it would then mean a pavilion in a garden (châbûtra), just the kind of place where such an interview as that between Râi Durlabh and Omichund would take place at night. 72

All students of the period covering the career of Omichund are indebted for this additional light on his methods of dealing with the English to the discovery by Sir George Forrest of the Armenian letter and its copy. Both documents have been deciphered, translated and annotated by Mr. S. M. Gregory, formerly of the Federated Malay States Civil Service, and it was by the help of Mr. Gregory’s accurate translation that I was able to identify it with the incomplete and free rendering supplied to Watts and handed over to Clive. My thanks are also due to two Armenian friends, Mr. John Apcar and Colonel G. M. Gregory, for assistance leading to the decipherment by Mr. S. M. Gregory of documents which proved a stumbling-block to many scholars.

The language of the letter is that of an inferior addressing a superior, which shows that Watts was not quite correct in saying that the letter to Petros had been written by his brother. 73 What Petros meant to convey was that his brother was present and was aware of its contents. There is, in fact, no indication of the scribe’s name.

The original (Plate I) is written in a difficult cursive hand, full of contractions, even of foreign words, sometimes marked by a line (pativa) drawn above the contracted words in the familiar European manner, and sometimes without any signs to mark them. The copy is, however, clearly written in a fine legible hand, despite the contractions.

The language of the letter is a vulgar form of the Julfa dialect of Armenian, current in India in the 18th century, in which the use of foreign words was common. Indeed, as will be seen from the footnotes, the letter is full of Persian, Turki, and even Hindustani terms adapted to Armenian colloquial forms.

Reviewing the conditions surrounding this remarkable letter, one cannot help considering what would have happened had Agha Petros acted as Omichund desired and kept Watts in Murshidâbâd until Surâju’d-daulla had him in his power. Clive’s letter of 5th June 1757 to Watts (supra, pp. 182-3) shows that had Watts failed in his mission, as he would have done if Omichund had had his way, Clive, for some months at any rate, would have dropped his scheme of deposing Surâju’d-daulla and setting up Mir Ja’fîr as Nawâb Nâzîm under British suzerainty, and the world-famous battle of Plassey would not have been fought. No doubt so worthless a prince as Surâju’d-daulla would not long have retained his power, and no doubt Clive would in time have found means to obtain supreme authority in Bengal, but it would have had to be achieved in some other way. There was nothing then but the loyalty of Agha Petros to prevent the success of Omichund’s proposal and a complete change in the story of British supremacy in India as we know it. The letter we have been discussing therefore just missed being of the first importance to history.

72 For the derivation, senses and uses of the chathri, see Travels of Peter Mundy, ed. Temple (Hak. Soc.), vol. II, pp. 26 and f., 44-45.

73 See the letter of the 8th June 1757, quoted above, p. 183.


(116) Krishi-Vishaya, by an unknown author. The first few ślokas quoted in the catalogue are identical with those of Parāśara’s Krishi-saṅgraha printed at Calcutta (1322 B.S.), but the last śloka quoted in the same does not coincide with that of the latter.—"A guide to agriculture." R. L. Mitra’s Notices of Sanskrit MSS. (Calcutta 1871), vol. I, p. 179, MS. No. ccxxvii.


(118) Maya-Mata, alias Maya-Silpa, alias Pratishtā-Tantra.—"A treatise on architecture founded on the canons of Maya, a Dānava, who is reputed to have built a palace of Yudhishthira. . . . . . . It is remarkable in being less devoted to religious ceremonies and astrological disquisitions than the Mānasārā.


(119) Visvākarmiya-Silpa.—"A treatise on the manual arts attributed to Visvākarmā, the divine architect.

Contents:—Origin of Visvākarmā, derivation of the word takshaka (carpenter), vardhaki (sculptor), &c. 2. Height of man in different ages of the world; wood and stone for the formation of images. 3. Sacraments for sculptors and carpenters. 4. Halls for the consecration of Siva and other gods. 5. Proportions of the images of the planets and liṅgams. 6. Formations of cars. 7. Consecration of cars. 8. Forms of Brāhmaṇi, Māheśvari and other goddesses. 9. Sacrificial or Brāhmaṇical thread. 10. Sacrificial threads of gold, silver, and muŗja fibre: the different sides where images of gods and goddesses are to be placed; qualities of a kind of stone called ‘Hemaisāla’ or golden stone to be found to the south of the Meru mountain. 11. Images of Indra, Māheśvari and other gods and goddesses. 12-13. Crowns, crests and other head-ornaments. 14. Movable and fixed thrones for images; crests and other ornaments for the


(136) Manavala-Narayana-Satakam.—"(3) "Vasiyar perumai," the honour of merchants. The merchants must skillfully conduct their own business. They must not lay on too large profits. Whosoever comes to them, they must preserve an even and correct balance. If the dishonest come, offering to leave a pledge, they must give them no loan; but if the honest come, and only ask a loan without pledge, they must give it. In writing their accounts, they must not allow of a mistake, even if no more than the eighth part of a mustard seed. They will assist a (public) measure, even to the extent of a crore (of money). Such is the just rule of a mercantile class."

(4) "Vellarher perumai," the honour of agriculturists. The Vellarher, by the effect of their ploughing (or cultivation) should maintain the prayers of Brâhmaṇas, the strength of kings, the profits of merchants, the welfare of all—charity, donations, the enjoyments of domestic life, and connubial happiness, homage to the gods, the Śastras, the Vedas, the Purāṇas, and all other books; truth, reputation, renown, the very being of the gods, things of good report or integrity, the good order of castes, and manual skill; all these things come to pass by the merit (or efficacy) of the Vellarher's plough." *Ibid.*, p. 15, No. 2108.

(137) Nava-Sastra.—"On ship-building and navigation. But the work is chiefly astrological. Some directions are given respecting the materials and dimensions of vessels." *Ibid.*, vol. III, p. 6, No. 2226. The same work is called Kappal Śastra at p. 444 of the above catalogue.

(138) MS. No. 790, Sec. 30 (name not given) deals with miscellaneous arts, mechanics, building, &c.—"On the art of constructing forts, houses, fanes; of settling a village; navigation and variety of other similar things enumerated as taught in 36 works, the names of which are given (in the MS.)." *Ibid.*, vol. III, p. 350.


(147) Kalāsāstra.—“Name of a work by Viśākhila.” Mentioned in Monier Williams’ Sanskrit-English Dictionary under the word ‘Kalā.’

(148) Chitra-Bhārata.—Mentioned in Monier Williams’ *op. cit.* under the word ‘chitra’. It seems to be a work on painting.


(150) Silpa-Sāstra.—A treatise in Tamil, said to have been originally composed in Sanskrit by Miçēn. *Indian Antiquary,* vol. V (1876), pp. 230-237, 293-297.

**LIST II.**

*Printed works on Vārta or its Sub-Topics.*

1. Rājavallabhamārgānatam, by Mađāna, son of Śrīkhetra.—“A metrical treatise on architecture in 14 adhyāyās; edited with Gujarati translation and over 100 plates and diagrams by Nārāyana Bhārati. *Yasavanta Bhārati* (Baroda, 1891).” Stated to have been composed at Udaipur in Samvat 1480. A *supplementary catalogue of Sanskrit, Pāli and Prākrit books in the Library of the British Museum* (acquired during the years 1892-1906) by Dr. L. D. Barnett, p. 715.

2. Viśvakarmaprabhāsā.—“A work on architecture attributed to the god, Viśvakarna. With a Hindi translation by Saktidhara Sukula for Munshi Pālārām and hence jointly with the text styled Pālārām-Vilāsa, pp. IV, 304 (Lucknow, 1896). The preface states that the work, first communicated by Brahmat to Siva was thence transmitted successively to Garga, Parāśara, Brāhadpratha and Viśvakarna.” *Ibid.,* p. 715.


4. Laghu-Silpa-Jyotisha-Sara.

5. Viśvakarma-Vidya-Prakāśa.


7. Vāstu-Ratnavalī.

8. Vāstava-Viehitra-Praśna.


10. Silpadhi-Priddhi.

11. Yukti-Kalpa-Taru, edited by Pandit ślavarchandra Śastri with a Foreword by the present writer.


INDRASENĀ.

BY A. VENKATASUBBIAH, M.A., Ph.D.; MYSORE

In stanza 2 of the Rigveda-Samhita, X. 102 occurs the word Indrasena which is taken by Geldner (Vedische Studien; 2, p. 1) as denoting Mudgalāni (or the wife of Mudgala) mentioned in stanzas 2 and 6 of the same hymn. This hymn is obscure and the most diverse views have been held about its import. Bergaigne (Religion Védique; 2, p. 280ff.) thinks that the hymn depicts liturgical symbolism; Henry, (Journal Asiatique; 1895, II, p. 516 ff.) that it refers to the methods employed in primitive divination, and Bloomfield (ZDMG., 48, p. 547), that the hymn refers to heavenly, i.e. mythological events and not to human events. Similarly, Profs. Macdonell (Vedic Index, II, p. 167) and Keith (J.R.A.S., 1911, p. 1005 n). Profs. Geldner and Oldenberg, on the other hand, consider that it is an ākhyāna or itihāsa hymn and that it describes a chariot-race in which Mudgala's wife took prominent part. For literature connected therewith, see Oldenberg, Rigveda-Noten, II, p. 318.

In p. 1328 ff. of the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1910, Mr. Pargiter has attempted to throw some light on this hymn with the help of certain details contained in the Purāṇas about Mudgala, who is, according to the Nirukta (9. 3. 2. 3.) and the Sarvaṇukramāṇī, the son of Bṛhitṛyaśva and the author of this hymn. With the help of these details, Mr. Pargiter has constructed the following genealogy:

\[
\text{Bṛhitṛyaśva} \\
\text{Mudgala} \\
\text{Brahmishṭha = Indrasena} \\
\text{Vadhryaśva = Menaka} \\
\text{Divodasa}
\]

And, from this genealogy, he has arrived at the following conclusions respecting the persons named in the hymn:

1. Mudgala was a rāja of the North Paścāchāla dynasty and yet might also be regarded as a rāshi.

2. Mudgalāni, whose name is not mentioned, was obviously Mudgala's wife, as is generally agreed.

3. Indrasena was the daughter-in-law of Mudgala, being the wife or rather the queen of his son Brahmiṣṭha.

4. Vadhri, in stanza 12, seems to refer to Indrasena's son and Mudgala's grandson Vadhryaśva.

5. Ke'ī, mentioned in stanza 6, was the sdrathi or charioteer who drove Mudgalāni in the race.

Mr. Pargiter is therefore disposed to interpret the hymn in accordance with the above conclusions.

In the note referred to above, Mr. Pargiter has collected the information given by the Purāṇas about Mudgala only and has not brought out anything new about Indrasena.  

1 In the opinion of these scholars (and of Śāyaṇa also), Indrasena is not a proper name at all, but a common name meaning 'Indra's bolt.' This word therefore has not been accorded an entry in the Vedic Index.
although Geldner had long ago pointed out that her name occurred in the Mahābhārata (Calcutta ed., 3. 113. 22; 4. 21. 11) where she is described as Nārāyaṇī and as the wife of Mudgala. It is therefore my object to give here some details about this Indrasena which I have been able to gather from the South Indian text of the Mahābhārata as it is printed in the Kumbhakonam edition.

The stanzas referred to by Geldner in his Vedic Studien are found in this edition on p. 186 of the Vana-parvan (Ch. 114; 23, 24) and p. 47 of the Vīrdha-parvan (Ch. 24; 19-22). In both these places, this text reads Nālāyanī instead of its doublet form Nārāyaṇī; and it thus indicates that Indrasena, the wife of Mudgala, was the daughter of Nala. She must therefore be identified with the Indrasena, who, we read in the Naḻpākhyāṇa, was born to Nala of Damayanti.

This inference is confirmed by the following story found in chapters 212 and 213 of the Adīparvaṇ (p. 359ff.), where it is related by Vyāsa to king Drupada with the object of overcoming his repugnance to the marriage of his daughter with five men (the five Paṇḍava brothers):

"Krishṇā, the daughter of Drupada, was, in her former birth known as Indrasena. She was then the daughter of Nala and was married to the rishi Maudgalyā who was old and mere skin and bones, who was reeking with a smell which was other than pleasant, whose hair had become white and the skin furrowed with wrinkles, who was afflicted with leprosy, whose skin and nails were peeling off, who was repulsive to look at and who was extremely irritable, harsh, jealous and fanciful. The blameless Indrasena used to serve her husband faithfully and to eat what was left of his food (uch-čhīśa) after he had eaten. One day, the thumb of Maudgalya came off when he was eating his food; and, Indrasena, when she sat down to the remnants, unconcernedly threw it away and consumed the food left without any feeling of disgust. Her husband was much pleased at this act of wife's devotion, said that he would grant her a boon, and asked her often what she desired. Indrasena, being thus frequently urged, begged of the rishi that he should sport with her, first dividing himself into five persons, and later becoming one person again.

"The rishi, owing to the power of his austerities and his yoga, accordingly sported with Indrasena for many years, now making himself into five men, and again, as one man, in Indraloka, Meru and other places. Indrasena thus came to the front of pātivratas in the same way as Arundhati and Sītā; and she attained a greater distinction in this respect than even her mother Damayanti."
"While the rishi Maudgalya thus played with Indrasena, many years elapsed and the rishi became weary (vyarajyata) of sensual pleasures. He therefore resolved to abandon this luxurious course of life and to practise austerities (tapas) in a retired place. On this resolve being announced to Indrasena, she fell down on the earth and earnestly besought the rishi not to leave her as her desire for sensual pleasures (kama-sevana) was still unsatisfied. The rishi grew wroth at this bold and impudent request and uttered a curse that she should be born as the daughter of Drupada, the king of the Pañchālas, and have five husbands.

"Grieving at this curse, and with her craving for sensual pleasure unsatisfied, Indrasena, too, repaired to a forest and practised austerities in order to please Śiva. That god, being pleased at the austerities, showed himself to Indrasena and conferred a boon on her that she would in her next birth, have five husbands."

The story, I may observe, is not peculiar to the South Indian text, but is found in some of the editions of the Northern text also, though not in all. Here, too, these editions have the form Nārīṇyānī instead of Nālīyānī. It should be noted that the wording of the text—
Damaṁtyātā cha mātus sa viśesam adhikam yāyau—
 informs us in an unmistakable way that Indrasena, who is described as Nālīyānī and as the wife of Maudgalya, was the daughter of Damayanti.

This story is very interesting and confirms the correctness of Gelder's interpretation of RV. X. 102 in several respects:

1. Thus, it is clear from the above story that Indrasena, mentioned in stanza 2, is the same as the Mudgalani mentioned in st. 2 and 6, and that she is the wife of the Mudgala mentioned in st. 5 and 9 and not his daughter-in-law as Mr. Pargiter would believe.

Mr. Pargiter seems to have been misled here by the use of the word Mudgala instead of the more correct form Maudgalya. Such negligence however, in the matter of adding patronymic suffixes is fairly common not only in the epics and Purāṇas, but in the Rgveda also. See, for example, ZDMG., 42, p. 204ff. where Oldenberg has shown that the word Vasishtha is used in the Rgveda to denote not only the original Vasishtha but his descendant as well.

As regards the word Mudgala itself, we have already seen above that the Mahābhārata in one place (III.114.24) uses that word to denote Mudgala's son (who, in I.212.213 is called Maudgalya). Similarly, it relates in the Vana-parvan (Ch. 261) the story of a Mudgala (whether the same as Indrasena's husband or a different person, there is no means of saying) who was offered, because of his zeal in giving gifts, the privilege of going to heaven in his mortal body (saviśrīva-svara) but refused to avail himself of it. In this story, the hero is called Mudgala (in III. 260. 38; III. 261. 3, 11, 14, etc.) and Maudgalya (in III. 261. 6, 14, 25, 33, etc.) indifferently. And in the Bhāgavata, X. 21. 34 the word Mudgala is used of the father of Divodāsa, i.e., to denote Vadhyrāśva, the grandson of the original Mudgala.

There is thus no doubt that the Mudgala mentioned in st. 5 and 9 of RV. X. 102 is identical with the Mudgala of the Mahābhārata, III. 114.24, with the Maudgalya of the

* The text, I may here note, calls Maudgalya's wife as Mahendrasend in one place—I. 212. 17.
2. The story also supports the opinion of Geldner (p. 1) and Oldenberg (p. 318, n. 2) that Mudgala was a Brahmin against those of Henry and Pargiter who believe that he was a king.

3. The story gives, as can be seen above, a graphic description of the decrepitude (abgelebtheit) of Mudgala, a point about which Bloomfield and Oldenberg seem to be sceptical.

Mudgala's decrepitude is thus well-attested and can be taken as a certain fact. It is not, however, quite so certain that it was this decrepitude, which, as Geldner believes, prevented him from riding the chariot himself in the race and led him to substitute his wife Indrasenâ in his stead. A passage 8 of the Kâthaka-Samhitâ (X. 5; Vol. I, p. 130) which relates the story of a chariot-race between Vâmadeva and Kusidâyi shows that it was not usual for women to take part in such races. Indrasenâ, too, who was the daughter of Nala, a noted charioteer, 9 must naturally have known more of chariots and their driving and of races than her husband the Brahmin rishi. These facts offer, in my opinion, sufficient explanation as to why Mudgala did not himself ride in the race but sent his wife Indrasenâ instead as rider.

4. In interpreting st. 6 of the hymn, Geldner has followed Sâyâra in thinking that Mudgâlânî (i.e., the wife of Mudgala) was both the rider (râthi) as well as the charioteer (sârathi) in the race. He has therefore accepted (p. 8) Sâyâra's dictum 10 that the word kesî in that stanza stands really for the feminine form kesiî. Further on, however, Sâyâra has given another explanation 11 according to which Kesînî was the charioteer. I am disposed to think that this last explanation is correct and that this Kesînî is, perhaps, identical with the Kesînî that was employed by Damayantî to observe the actions of, and to carry messages to, Bâhuka (i.e., Nala) in the Nalopâkyâna. 12

5. Regarding Geldner's interpretation of st. 11 of the hymn—an interpretation which is not acceptable to Bloomfield, Oldenberg, and Pargiter,—the story related above shows that the sense which Geldner attaches to the first half of that stanza is quite correct—

7 I am, however, very doubtful that Mudgala's son was named Brahmishâ. From the footnotes given by Mr. Pargiter on p. 1329 (loc. cit.) it can be seen that, out of eight Purâñas which he has used to construct the genealogy in question, only two contain the word Brahmishâ. In both these places, it is preferable to regard this term as a common noun (= the best of Brahmins; a brahmârshi) rather than as a proper name. The corrupt text of the Harivamśa, too, which uses the word brahmârshi in this context, favours this view.

8 Ludoig has, in his Rigaevâ (III. 171), set down a table where he has shown Vadhvyâva, the father of Divodâsa, as the son of Devavan—a view accepted by Macdonell (Vedic Index, I. 376). Though there is not much evidence in favour of this view too, I have here provisionally adopted it for lack of a better-attested genealogy.

9 Vâmadeva cha vai Kusidâyi châمانor ajîm aytân | taśya Kusidâyi purâvâyâtidrutsa kôha raâ nyâmâît | sa dvityâm upa paryâvartata | lâhmâm vâ . . . khaśâm vâ chhetsyâtitì | sa Vâmadeva ukhîya agnim abhîhata . . . ||

10 Mahâbhârata, Vanaparvan, 64. 2; 69. 28-31; 70. 18, etc.

11 aśa vâ kesî kesînî sârâthir asya.

12 Mahâbhârata, III. Ch. 72, 73.
as to be surprising when one bears in mind that Geldner did not know of the story related above by the Mahābhārata. He has there rightly interpreted the sentence parivṛtakte pātīvidyam ānāt and has remarked that after winning the race and thus pleasing the old Mudgala, the net advantage gained by Indrasena was not much to speak of, and that, on the whole, she was rather disappointed than otherwise. The correctness of this opinion is fully borne out by the above story, which relates, as we have already seen, how Maudgalya was pleased with his wife, offered her a boon, sported with her as she desired, but left her before her desires were satisfied and thereby disappointed her.

6. In the light of what has gone above, Mr. Pargiter’s opinion that vadhri in st. 12 refers to Indrasena’s son seems to me to be quite untenable.

In the course of the above discussion, we have met with the names of two women, Damayanti and Indrasena, that were regarded as patterns of patrikṛta. These two were related to each other as mother and daughter. It is therefore interesting to find further that Ahalya (wife of Gautama and mother of Satānanda, etc.) who is also regarded as a pattern of chastity, was the daughter of Vadhryasva, the son of Indrasena (Bhāgavata, IX. 21. 34).

We can now rewrite Mr. Pargiter’s genealogical table as follows:

```
    Bhṛṣimyaśva
     |       |
Mudgala  Nala = Damayanti
     |       |
Devāvān = Indrasena
     |       |
Vadhryaśva = Menakā
  |       |
Divodāsa
     |       |
        |       |
        Ahalyā = Gautama
```

Of these names, all except Bhṛṣimyaśva, Nala, Damayanti, and Menakā are found in the Rgveda.

NOTES AND QUERIES

“A FAUQIR’S CURE FOR THE CHOLERA.”

(Selected from the Native Newspapers).

Prince of Wales Island Gazette, 9th October 1822.

The wife of a barber at Etabaunee Mobarak-poor, which lies to the north of Kritnaung, aged about 24, was seized with the Cholera Morbus, in the month of Asur. A Fakir, who came to the house to ask alms, hearing of this, said to the Barber (sic) that if he would permit him, he could make a cure for his wife. As no doctor was to be had in the village they, according to the advice of the Fakir, made her take some green leaves of Siddhi leave, and bound her hands and legs 8 inches asunder with a piece of rope. This stayed the symptoms of the disease, and after an hour they unloosed the knots. However, she was quite intoxicated by the draft she had taken and slept in the night soundly. The next morning she found herself quite recovered. The Barber wanted to make some present to the Fakir, who sojourned there that day; but the latter declined the offer. He said that any one might be cured of the Cholera Morbus by that draft, and therefore we have given publicity to it for the good of the Public.

R. C. T.

1 Referring apparently to some place in India and not to a place in Prince of Wales Island (Penang).
2 It looks as if the paragraph had been translated directly from some Indian native paper.
3 A misprint for Asun (Aswina), (October).
4 Siddhi = bhang, Indian hemp (Cannabis sativa),
THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE WESTERN CHÂLUKYAS OF KALYÂNî.

BY A. VENKATASUBBIH, M.A., PH.D.; MYSORE.

The chronology of the Western Chalukyas of Kalyânî was originally determined by Dr. Fleet in his Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts (revised edition published in the Bombay Gazetteer, 1896, Vol. I, Part 2, pp. 277-584) by the help of dates recorded in the inscriptions of these kings. And this account was, later, confirmed by Kielhorn who has included most of these dates in his List of Inscriptions of Southern India (EI., Vol. 7, App.), and has given a synchronistic table for Southern India in EI., Vol. 8, App., based on the results of these dates. I subjoin here from that table the names of the Western Chaluken kings with their (initial) dates:

- Taila II. .................. 973
- Satyâraya .................. 998
- Vikramâditya V. .......... 1009
- Jayasimha II. ............. 1018?
- Sômesvara I. ............ 1044
- Sômesvara II. .......... 1068
- Vikramâditya VI. ......... 1075
- Sômesvara III. ...... 1128
- Jagadîkamalla II. .... 1139
- Taila III ............... 1154
- Sômesvara IV.............. 1184-1189

The List of Inscriptions referred to above contains 83 verifiable dates of the Chalukyas, of which, however, 18 have been characterised by Kielhorn as slightly irregular and therefore needing emendation, and 35 as wholly irregular. Thus the number of verifiable dates used by him and Dr. Fleet for purposes of chronology as they stand is less than half of those that are at hand.

I have shown in my book, Some Śaka Dates in Inscriptions, that the great majority of these 'irregular' dates are regular enough to indicate to us with certainty the days on which the events recorded happened. I have also shown on p. XII of the Introduction of that book that the correct equivalents of some of these dates make untenable the acceptance of the dates proposed by Drs. Fleet and Kielhorn for the commencement and the end of the reigns of some W. Chaluken kings. I therefore propose to give here a revised chronology of these kings, utilising for this purpose not only the 45 dates (of KLSI.) that have been rejected as irregular, but also the verifiable dates contained in the several volumes of the Epigraphia Carnatica and the Reports of the Madras Epigraphists.

---

1 The following abbreviations have been used in the course of this paper:

IA. for Indian Antiquary.
EC. " Epigraphia Carnatica.
EI. " Epigraphia Indica.
(K.) Lisi. " (Kielhorn's) List of Inscriptions of Southern India, App. to EI., Vol. 7.
(V.) SSDI. " (Venkatasubbiah's) Some Śaka Dates in Inscriptions.

The English equivalents of the dates of the inscriptions cited below, have been, for the most part, calculated by me for the first time in accordance with the principles indicated in my book, SSDI. Of such equivalents, those which are certain (through their being calculated on the strength of more than one verifiable detail) are here printed in thick type.

2 I may observe here that I have, by reference to ink-impressions, verified the text published in these volumes of the more important inscriptions that I have made use of in writing this paper.
The connection between the later Chalukyas of Kalyan and the earlier Chalukyas of Badami is traditionally given as follows:

- Satyasraya Vijayaditya
- Satyasraya Vikramaditya II
- Satyasraya Kirttivarman II
- Bhima I.
- Kirttivarman III.
- Taila I.
- Vikramaditya III
- Bhima II.
- Ayyana I.
- Vikramaditya IV
- Taila II.

Of these, nothing is known, beyond the mere mention of their names, of Bhima I, Kirttivarman III, Taila I, Vikramaditya III, and Bhima II.

Ayyana I is said to have married a daughter of Krishna and to have begot on her a son named Vikramaditya IV. This Krishna has been, with great probability, identified with the Rashtrakuta king Krishna II (884-913), which places Ayyana somewhere about A.D. 930.

His son was Vikramaditya IV, who, it is related, married Bonthadevi, daughter of the Kalachuri Lakshmana-deva. No inscriptions seem to have been found of his time; and it thus seems that he did not reign as king.

In Ec., Vol. XI, Mr. Rice has published an inscription (CD. 25: p. 13) which at first sight seems to belong to his reign. This epigraph records that, in the year Shaka 892, on Sunday which was the thirteenth day of the bright fortnight of Pausa, and the day of the uttarayana-Sa.kranti when the Mahadajadhiraja Paramesvara Parameshottara [Vikramaditya-deva], beloved of the goddess of wealth and of the Earth, was reigning; and the Mahadadanta Pandaras of the Chalukya family was in charge of the nishna, nishdana, nishvara and dasa of the Kadamba-ja one thousand, Pandayana, (the same as above) made a grant of 12 gaudyaganas on behalf of a tank and of the Tribhuvana [mallas] -Udayana of Pidjagere. Although the record does not specify the reigning king as being a Chalukya, the mention of the word Tribhuvanash [mallas] in connection with the temple may be taken as indicating that the reigning king Vikramaditya was a Chalukya. And as the date cited corresponds quite regularly to 23rd January, 970, one is tempted to identify this Vikramaditya IV, father of Taila II, and to infer that he, too, had perhaps the cognomen of Tribhuvanamalla like his Sambhavas Vikramaditya V and Vikramaditya VI.

And in favour of such a supposition can also be construed the fact that the provinces of Nolambayadi and Kadamba-ja were always the strongholds of the Chalukyas. Thus, after the overthrow of the Western Chalukyas of Badami by the Rashtrakutas, we find governors of the Chalukya family ruling in these provinces, namely, the Mahadadanta Sudrakayya, father of the Pandaras mentioned above who was the governor of Kadamba-ja in 967, followed, later, in this office by his son Pandara. And similarly, after the overthrow of the Chalukyas by the Kalachuryas, we again find that the authority of the Chalukyan emperors Jagadnakamalla III and Somavara IV Tribhuvanamalla was acknowledged, if not really, at least nominally, in these provinces.

Although there is thus nothing inherently improbable in the above supposition that Vikramaditya IV was ruling with supreme titles in A.D. 970, there are three things that tend to cast a doubt on its correctness. These are—(1) the fact that the reading of [Vikramaditya-deva] in the inscription, seems, so far as can be judged by an ink-impression of it, to be doubtful; (2) the further fact that, according to an inscription (Krisi, No. 104), the reigning king at that time was the Rashtrakuta Nityavarsnasha-Kottiga who was followed in 972 by Kakka II; and (3) the evidence of numerous Chalukyan inscriptions that it was Taila II (son of Vikramaditya IV) who dispossessed the Rashtrakutas of their sovereignty.

These facts, however, are not conclusive and can all be otherwise explained. I nevertheless think it better that one should wait until some more evidence is forthcoming before one gives a place to Vikramaditya IV among the Chalukyan emperors.
His son was Taila II Āhavamalla, who completely overthrew the Rāshtrakūtas and became ruler in their stead. The date of his coming to power is given in a Gadag inscription (KLISI. No. 140) as the year Srimukha, which must be taken as the southern luni-solar Srimukha which corresponded to Saka 895 (= A.D. 973).

The earliest verifiable date we have for him is recorded in a Sagol inscription (KLISI. No. 141) and corresponds to 7th July, 978; the latest is recorded in a Tālūkdr inscription (KLISI. No. 145) and corresponds to 20th September, 996.4

Among his feudatories and officers (see F. DKD., p. 428) must be mentioned the MahāĀnandādhipati Sāntivarman of the Māṭūra family who was ruling the Sāntaligd one-thousand, the Eṣenād seventy, and other divisions in A.D. 991 (EC. VIII, Sb. 477; p. 158); the MahāĀnandā Jātārasa who was ruling the Kadambaligd one-thousand in 992 (EC. XI, Dg. 114; p. 129); and the Mahāānandālāsvara Chaṭṭu or Chaṭṭāyya who was ruling the Banavāse twelve-thousand in A.D. 986 (EC. VIII, Sb. 413; p. 148).

An inscription at Hunavalli (EC. VIII, Sb. 529; p. 169) seems to indicate that Taila was resigning from Banavāse as headquarters in 985; and another inscription at Ānēgondi (in the Nizam's dominions), that he was resigning from Pampe7 or Hampe on the southern bank of the Tungabhādrā as headquarters in 988.

He was succeeded in 998 by his son Irivabēṣānga Satyāśraya, who is said in an inscription at Hiri-Chavutti (EC. VIII, Sb. 234; p. 76) to have been resigning in Saka 921, Vīkārīn or A.D. 999. The earliest verifiable date for him is 22nd March, 1002 given in an inscription at Gadag (KLISI. No. 146); the latest, 26th July, 1008 given in an inscription at Manawallī (KLISI. No. 148).

He was succeeded in about 1006 by Vikramāditya V Tribhuvanamalla, eldest son of his brother Daśavarman or Yāśovarman. The earliest verifiable date for this Vikramāditya is 10th October, 1010 given in an inscription at Nellūru (EC. VIII, Sb. 471; p. 156); the latest, 29th December, 1012 given in an inscription at Karamahalla (EC. VII, Sk. 237; p. 259).

Among his feudatories and officers (see F. DKD. p. 434) must be included the Mahāānandālāsvara Chaṭṭāyya mentioned above and the Mahāānandālāsvara Kundamarasara, who were the governors of the Banavāse twelve-thousand province in 1010 and 1012.

Vikramāditya V seems to have been succeeded in A.D. 1014 or a little earlier by his younger brother Ayyāna II. His name appears in the list of Chālukyan kings given by eight inscriptions8—three at Belghāme (EC. VII, Sk. 110; p. 149; Sk. 130; p. 177; with

---

4 VSSDI., p. 125; No. 193.
5 For a brief account of some chiefs of this line, see Dr. Fleet in EI. XI, p. 5. Dr. Fleet has, however, there made use of some only out of the many inscriptions in EC. VIII that mention the chiefs of this family.
6 A brief notice of this and other inscriptions at Ānēgondi is given by Mr. Shama Shastry in the Journal of the Mythic Society, Vol. VII, p. 285 ff. It is much to be desired that these inscriptions be properly edited.
7 This was, later, the capital of the Vijayanagar Empire.
8 There are four other inscriptions—EC. VII, Sk. 100; 137; 185 and EC. VIII, Sb. 277—which also seem to point to the succession and reign of Ayyāna II. They all relate that there were two kings who reigned after Irivabēṣānga Satyāśraya and before Jayasimha II. The name of the earlier of these two kings is given by all as Vikramāditya, while the name of his successor is given as Ayyāna by Sk. 185 and as Daśavarman by the other three. All these four inscriptions commit a curious mistake in the genealogy by making Jayasimha II stand in the relation of a nephew to Vikramāditya V.
a date corresponding to 23rd January, 1072; Sk. 123; p. 164, of about 1158); one at Chikka-
Mágadi (EC VII, Sk. 197; p. 213) of about 1181; one at Vuçri (EC VIII, Sb. 233; p. 74)
with a date corresponding to 12th January, 1139; one at Bhrâta (ibid., Sb. 328; p. 116)
of about a.d. 1158; and two at Harîhare (EC XI, Dg. 41, p. 82; Dg. 35, p. 69) the
former with a date corresponding to 26th October, 1147. He seems to have reigned for a
short time only, which fact perhaps explains why no inscriptions of his reign have been so
far discovered and why his name has been left out in the genealogies contained in many
inscriptions.

He was succeeded by his younger brother Jayasîmha II who had the cognomen of
Jagadêkamalla. He is represented by an inscription at Kojakâri (EC VIII, Sb. 16; p. 5)
as reigning in Saka 937, Râkshasa or in a.d. 1015, and by another inscription at Saña
(EC VII, Sk. 125; p. 265) as reigning in Saka 938, Nala, or in a.d. 1016.

The earliest verifiable date for him are 13th May, 1017 given in an inscription at Salûr
(EC VII, Sk. 285; p. 258) and 22nd December, 1017 given in an inscription at Belgaóme
(EC VII, Sk. 126; p. 173—KLISI. No. 152); the latest date is 25th April, 1042 given by
two inscriptions at Áchâpura (EC VIII, Sa. 108 bis and 109 bis; p. 211ff.).

Among his feudatories and officers (see F. DDK., pp. 436, 437) must be mentioned the
Mahâsîmantâdhhipati Sàntaya or Sàntivarman (EC VIII, Sb. 60-64), the Mahâsîmantâdhhipati
Álayya who is the Mahâsîmantâdhhipati Jayasihha or Siûga-sàva, son of above (EC VIII,
Sb. 184; p. 64)—all of the Mâhâra family, and governors of the E[nâ]j seventy and other
divisions in 1032, 1036 and 1037; Jagadêkamalla Nuôamba-Pallava-Permmâna of the
Pallava lineage, who had the titles of Samadhigata-pañcë mahâkâda and Sripûrthivallabhâ
and was ruling the Kadamalâge one-thousand, the Kogali five-hundred, the Ballakunde
three-hundred, etc., in 1022 (EC XI, Mk. 10; p. 161); Udayaditya-sàva and Jagadêkamalla
Immaô-Nuôamba-Pallava-Permmâna, successors of the above, who were ruling the same
provinces with the same birudas in 1033 (EC XI, Dg. 71; p. 111) and 1037 (EC XI, Dg. 126;
p. 131); Mûkaraô, brother of the Mahâmangalëévâra Kundâmarasa, and ruler of the Sàntalâ-
ge one-thousand in 1025 (EC VIII, Sa. 7; p. 178); the Mahâsîmantà Satyahraya, son of
the above Kundâmarasa and ruler of the Sàntalâge province in 1030 (EC VII, Sk. 30; p. 92);
Brahmadéva' who was ruling the Banâvâse twelve-thousand in 1032 (EC VIII, Sb. 191;
p. 62); the Mahâmangalëévâra Bijjarasa or Bijjaô of the Chàlukya lineage and his brother
the Mahâsîmantà Gîçaraô who was ruling the Sàntalâge province in 1042 (EC VIII, Sa. 108
bis, p. 211); the Mahàmangalëévâra Madhumârêdevà mentioned in a Katê-Bennûr
inscription of 1025 (No. 490 of 1914); and the Mahâmangalëévâra Rêvarasa mentioned in
a Yêwûr inscription of c. a.d. 1040 (EI. XII., p. 269).

His capital or headquarter was at Tagarîla in 1032 (EC VII, Sk. 20a; p. 98) and at

9 VSSDI., p. 128; No. 203.
10 The Mahâsîmantâdhhipati Álayya is represented by the inscription as having been the governor
of the Banâvâse twelve-thousand and the Sàntalâge one-thousand provinces. He was killed at some
time before 24th December, 1037 in a fight at Kappasaô with the Mahâsîmantà Kundâmarasa.
11 This Brahmadéva was the ruler of the Nâgarâkeàna seventy in 1029 (EC VII, Sk. 81; p. 108).
12 That is, No. 490 of the Madras Epigraphist's collection for 1914; and similarly in other such
references.
Jayasimha was succeeded by his son Somesvara I, who had the double biruda of Trailokya-malla-Ahamalla. The earliest date for him is 23rd January, 1043 given by an inscription at Belgaum (EC, VII, Sk. 323; p. 273 = KLISI, No. 160)\(^{13}\) and another at Huli (KLISI, No. 159).\(^{14}\) He died on the 29th or 30th of March, 1068 by entering the waters of the Tuqabhadra as is related in another Belgaum inscription (EC, VII, Sk. 136; p. 181).

Among his queens (see F. DKD, p. 438) must be included Hoysala-devi who was his piriya-arasi or senior queen and was ruling from Kalyani as capital\(^{13}\) on 24th December, 1053 (EC, VII, Hl. 1; p. 275). And among his feudatories and officers (see F. DKD, p. 439) must be mentioned the Mahamayaldeva Lakshmanasa who was the governor of the Banavase twelve-thousand in 1067 (EC, VII, Sk. 19; p. 88); Trailokya-malla Naani-Nojamba-Pallav-Permnana, who, with the birudas of Samadhi-gata-paicha-mahasabda and Sriprihthevallabha, was ruling the Kadamaliga one-thousand, Kogali five-hundred, and Ballukunde three-hundred in 1047 (EC, XI, Dg. 20; p. 49); his successor Narasingha-deva, who, with the same birudas, was ruling the above provinces in 1049 (EC, XI, Jl. 10; p. 151); Chorayadeva, son of the above (EC, XI, Jl. 10; p. 151); the Mahasamanas Eragarasa and Siriyanarasa of the Ahihaya family (EI, XII, p. 292); the Mahamayaldeva Satyarayadeva of the Matura family who was ruling the Eshnadal seventy and other divisions in 1057 (EC, VIII, Sb. 500; p. 163); the Mahapradhana Dushandayaka Rupabhanjayya who was governing the 18 agraharas and the vajjadarvula in 1065 (EC, VII, Sk. 110; p. 197); the Dushandayaka Udayaditya who was ruling the Banavase and Santalighe provinces in 1065 (EC, VIII, Sb. 249; p. 78); the Mahamayaldeva Trailokya-malla Vira-Santara who was ruling the Santalige one-thousand in 1062 (EC, VIII, Nr. 58; p. 278); and the Mahamayaldeva Trailokya-malla Bhujabala-Santara who was ruling the same province in 1067 (EC, VIII, Nr. 59; p. 279).

We learn from a Belgaum inscription (EC, VII, Sk. 169; p. 197) that his capital or headquarter in 1067 was Kadaravalli or Kadaroli.

He was succeeded by his eldest son, Somesvara II, surnamed Bhuvanaikamalla, who was anointed on the throne on 11th April, 1068 (EC, VII, Sk. 136; p. 181) about 13 days after the death of his father. The latest date for him is 24th January, 1076 given by an inscription at Kadaroli (KLISI, No. 178).\(^{16}\)

An inscription at Torevanda (EC, VIII, Sb. 239; p. 108) dated, seemingly, in 1069 shows that his capital (neveliṇu) at that time was Baikapura; and another at Niralgi (F. DKD, p. 444) dated in 1074 also relates that the king was then at Baikapura. It would thus seem that Somesvara II lived more at Baikapura than at Kalyani. To the list of his feudatories given by Dr. Fleet (DKD, p. 443), we must add the name of the Kadamba Mahamayaldeva Kirttivarman II who was ruling the Banavase province in 1071 (EC, VIII, Sb. 387; p. 112).

\(^{13}\) VSSDI, p. 134; No. 216.

\(^{14}\) VSSDI, p. 129; No. 294.

\(^{15}\) Dr. Fleet has pointed out (DKD, p. 440, n. 8) that the earliest mention of Kalyani as capital is in an inscription at Kembhavi of 1053. To this we have now to add the Honnali inscription likewise dated in 1053. As an inscription at Muttagudur (EC, XI, Hr. 65, p. 205) mentions that Trailokya-malla was ruling from Bandasikeya-ghatja in 1051, it seems likely that the capital was removed to Kalyani at some time in 1052 or 1053.

\(^{16}\) VSSDI, p. 114; No. 160.
Sōmēśvara II was succeeded by his brother Vikramāditya VI who forcibly deposed Sōmēśvara and had himself anointed on the throne. It is difficult to determine in which year this event took place. For, on the one hand, we have seen from the Kādarōji inscription that Sōmēśvara II was the reigning king on 24th January, 1076. On the other hand, an inscription at Hulēgundi (EC. XI, Ch. 82; p. 32) records that, when the reign of the Mahārājādhīhirāja Paramāśvara Paramahāṭāraka Tribhuvanamalla-dēva was ever increasing in prosperity, the Mahāśānta Maigiy-Echāya who was a dweller at the lotus-feet of the Mahārājādhīhirāja Paramāśvara Trailokyamalla-Nojamba-Pallava-Permpānacjī Jaya-
siśa-dēva (i.e. of prince Jayasiśha III), and who was ruling the Sūlgallu seventy, made a grant of lands to some temples on the occasion of uttarāyana-saṅkrānti on Monday, the eighth day of the dark fortnight of Pushya in the year Saka 995, Pramāṇa. And, similarly, an inscription at Hūvinasa-agallī (No. 127 of 1913) records that the king Tribhuvanamalla, while he was encamped at Gōvindavājī, made the grant of a village to a temple on the occasion of vyāpsadī on Friday, the eighth day of the dark fortnight of Phālgunī in the year Saka 993, Sāhdāraṇa. The dates of these two inscriptions correspond quite regularly to Monday, 23rd December, A.D. 1073 and Friday, 25th February, A.D. 1071; and they show that in 1071 and 1073 it was Vikramāditya VI and not his brother Sōmēśvara Bhuvana-
Kamalla who was recognised as sovereign ruler in the Kegali five-hundred and the Kadam-
balige one-thousand province (of which the Sūlgallu seventy was a subdivision).

The overlapping dates of these epigraphs go to show that Vikramāditya VI made himself independent of Sōmēśvara II and assumed sovereign titles at some time before December, 1073 or February, 1071, that he and Sōmēśvara were both ruling as emperors for some time, and that ultimately Sōmēśvara was dispossessed of his sovereignty at some time after 25th December, 1074 (KLISI. No. 177) or 23rd January, 1076 (KLISI. No. 178). The inscriptions thus confirm the account given by Bhāṣa in his Vikramāṇaśākōvaśāchārīta (canto IV, V, VI) that Sōmēśvara II was a weak and tyrannical ruler who oppressed, and alienated the affections of his subjects, that he meditated evil towards his brother Vikramāditya, and that Vikramāditya, learning of this, left the capital with his brother Jayasiśha and a large force, defeated the army sent against him by Sōmēśvara, and eventually deposed him and had himself crowned as emperor.

On p. 83ff. of my book (SSDI), I have discussed the question of the starting-point of the Chālukya-Vikrama era which was founded by Vikramāditya after he had himself anointed as emperor. I have there shown that the majority of the dates recorded in that era favour the view that the era began in the year A.D. 1076. And I am accordingly disposed to think that the correct equivalent of the date recorded in the Wadjērī inscription is Thursday, 11th February, 1076, and that Vikramāditya was anointed as emperor on that day or shortly before that day. As he had assumed imperial titles at some time before December, 1073 (or February, 1071), as we saw above, there is thus an interval of two (four) years and some months between that event and his anointment on the throne.

(To be continued.)

17 I may here add that since I wrote those pages I have examined nearly a hundred more dates recorded in that era and that the great majority of these dates, too, have confirmed me in the view expressed above.

11 For a discussion of the equivalents of this date, see VSSDI., p. 84.
MAURYANA.

BY ARUN SEN, B.A. (CANTAB.); CALCUTTA.

In connection with my lectures to the Post-Graduate Students of the Calcutta University I have had occasion to study Mauryan Sculpture. I find I am unable to agree with the various theories archaeologists have hitherto promulgated. The reasons which lead me to this conclusion are set forth in this paper with the hope that they will receive an impartial consideration from scholars interested in the subject.

The theories referred to resolve themselves into the following:—

1. Mauryan Sculpture was executed by a Persian.
2. Ditto imitated from Persian.
3. It may have been done by an Asiatic Greek.


The theories are based upon the following:—

1. Some Asokan pillars which unfortunately want both abacus and capital, e.g., Delhi Topra, Delhi, Meerut, Allahabad, Lauria Araraj, Sanchi, Rummindei, Nigliva.
2. Columns more or less complete, e.g.—
   (i) Sarnath.
   (ii) Saukisa.
   (iii) Lauria Nandangarh,—(a) Lion.
   (iv) Ditto —(b) Bull.
   (v) Bakhira.
3. Certain other sculptures in the round which we shall deal with later.

To take the columns first,—

(i) They all apparently lack a base. I have nowhere found any reference to one. At any rate in the only column which appears to have successfully resisted the ravages of time, the Barbarian and the Archaeologist, there is no base.

(ii) Then comes the shaft, which is round and highly polished—extremely elongated, and in most cases slightly tapering. The Bakhira column, however, is short, very thick and not tapering. From the slight attenuation towards the top, archaeologists have concluded a wooden origin,—why, I fail to see. I did not know what the trunk of a tree tapered towards one end. And even if it did, it would not prove anything. If the tree stumps used in modern huts be taken as a clue (they do not taper in the least bit) of this later.

(iii) Then comes the capital—which contains the following decorations:—
   (a) 4 wheels alternating with the 4 animals, the lion, bull, horse and the elephant in Sarnath.
   (b) In Saukisa—the lotus followed by the so-called honey-suckle, then the rush ornament carved all round. This is placed above the "cable ornament" and "the bead and reel." I apologise for the terminology, which I here adopt to save confusion.
   (c) In both the Lauria Nandangarh Columns—the row of geese with heads downwards apparently pecking at something. This according to Vincent Smith is in bas-relief. Ideas of basso, mezzo and alto do not appear to be a constant quantity.
(d) In Bakhira—it is a rectangle above the cable.
(e) In Allahabad—there is the so-called honey-suckle, etc. In most it is circular—except at Bakhira where it is rectangular.

(N.B.—What is called a honey-suckle ornament by some is called a palmette by Vincent Smith. Apparently they are not sure which plant it is supposed to represent).

In each case these decorations surmount "a bell capital"—"so-called" because firstly it is not a capital, and secondly it is not a bell. The eye which does not trace in it a representation of a lotus—an inverted lotus must be singularly blind.

(iv) The Abacus, which is invariably zoophorous.
(a) In Sarnâth the animals are four lions.
(b) Sañkisa—1 elephant.
(c) Lauria Nandangarh—1 lion.
(d) Ditto—1 bull,
(e) Bakhira—1 lion.

We must discuss the general characters of these columns before we begin to ascertain whether there is any resemblance with Persian which the Persomaniacs fancy they have detected.

(a) These columns do not support any wall, or any cornice—there is not the faintest trace of any building anywhere. They are simply landmarks of the progress of the piety of the monarch. (b) They are all in grey sandstone. (c) They are highly polished and hence there is no scope for the addition of any kind of plaster, stucco or clay. (d) The high polish also negatives the superimposition of any colour. (e) Nor is there any reason to believe that they were encased in metal or enamel plate. (f) The technical quality of the whole is of a highly developed kind. It bears the stamp of the uttermost decadence, this presupposing the existence of the two previous periods of art of this type—the classical and the primitive. The extraordinary realism of each detail cannot fail to attract notice, nor the infinite care which has been devoted to the delineation of each detail. The rapid and easy transition in any sculptured piece, from relief of one kind to another, from basso to mezzo, from mezzo to alto, without any abruptness, (vulgarily without chipping off a bit of a brittle material like sandstone), also the delicate modelling, e.g. of the legs and the body of the elephant, the geese, the tendrils (?) of the lotus—all are indications of an advanced stage of sculpture. The proportions which would make them classical sculpture are there, only the Promethean spark is absent. It is not primitive—because it is not in the least degree stiff. We must now come to details:

(1) Material.—Aśokan columns are invariably made of monolithic grey sandstone. In Persia various materials are used—a limestone of good quality—some varieties are so hard as to deserve the name of marble—so fine, so hard and so close-grained. These rocks vary in colour—from light to deep-grey, with here and there yellowish and dark brown tones. Other materials—artificial stones, burnt brick, crude brick, also a kind of plaster—white and as hard as stone—are used (Perrot and Chipiez, pp. 47-48). It is clear that the materials used in Persia were different and there is no evidence that they were familiar with grey sandstone. It would have taken them some time to adapt themselves to the exigencies of the strange material. Their first attempt with a new material could hardly have yielded such "precious" products. It is one of the axioms of Art that a new material baffles the artist for ages, before it ultimately yields to him.
(2) Base.—I have observed above that Maurya columns have no base—in Persia they invariably have that appendage. And the reason is not far to seek—if Persian structures are inspired by the huts of peasants, such as those that we see now and which doubtless existed in profusion in those times, the reason becomes apparent. The truth is that Persian structures are built from wooden models—and some stone was necessary to prevent the access of damp to the wooden columns. See Perrot and Chipiez, p. 98. The Persian base presents an infinite variety—a rectangular piece and above it, a series of concentric circles bulging in the middle; a bell highly decorated with rosettes, &c., and above a round superstructure, &c. (Observe that this bell does not present any point of similarity with the lotus or even a conventionalised lotus—there is not the faintest indication of a leaf, a petal or tendril). Also a highly conventional ornament of a highly decorative type which is utterly divergent from any decoration found in India. See Perrot and Chipiez, pp. 88, 89, 91 and 93; for other bases, Dieulafoy II, pp. 82-85.

(3) Shaft.—In India it is plain, round, highly polished. In Persia there is no mention of any polish. That would not be necessary, because of the coating of paint, plaster or metal which would usually be added. Secondly, it is almost invariably fluted. The only coincidence is that they sometimes taper in Persia (Dieulafoy), in India almost invariably. The base would naturally have to be heavier and therefore thicker to counteract the law of gravitation with the increase of length. This would be eminently necessary. The respective height cannot be compared from photos—which are at best misleading. In Persia columns are never monolithic, in the Mauryan period, always. It is very strange that Indian art which merely imitated Persian should have made that experiment at the very outset.

The vast majority of Persian shafts are fluted, three given in Dieulafoy are plain—II, p. 83, figs. 59, 60 and 61. But evidently the plaster (which would be fluted) has peeled off. All these three are very rough in appearance which is opposed to the spirit and grain of Persian art. Lastly Perrot and Chipiez assert—(p. 87)—"It is fluted in all instances save in the façades of the Necropolis at Mersepolis (Pl. I) and the single column that still remains of the Palace of Cyrus in the upland valley of the Polvar (fig. 11). In the latter case the building dates from a time when Persian art had not constituted itself and was as yet groping to strike out a path of its own. On the contrary the rock-cut tombs which are coeval with the Palaces of Darius and Xerxes, and if in them the shaft is plain it was because the vaults stood a considerable height above ground. To have them fluted would have reduced the column still further and divested it from a frank clear aspect."

(4) Capital.—The lower element of all capitals in India is a lotus—represented with extraordinary realism—with even the veins, and the slight curves found at the tip of the leaves. (N.B.—Mauryan Art is always realistic—Persian Art never.) The inverted lotus bulges at the bottom, narrows down in the middle and again bulges at the top—exactly as a full-blown lotus would do. Below this, there is the "cable" as well as above it, together with the "bead and reel." The prototype of the cable is the rope, (as well as of the reel) and the bead must also have been found in profusion in India (if it is really a bead). As Mokan art was eminently realistic, they transferred these common objects to stone (unless it be the contention of the European archaeologist that Indians borrowed the rope from the West). What is called a bead and reel may also be a different variety of rope. Nothing similar is found in Persia—to judge from the plates in Perrot and Chipiez,
Above this is a round (or rectangular) piece with a bas-relief of various plants. Fergusson failing to find an analogy in Persia has to rush to Assyria for a prototype. What he calls the honey-suckle is dubbed a palmette by Vincent Smith as has been stated above. At any rate one discerns a lotus on the flat, an ornament which must have been meant to represent a plant of the screw-piece variety, (or even a fading lotus), the last must have been leaves swaying with the wind and curled up in various manners—treated of course as decoration. Figure 5 in Fergusson, page 57, is misleading—it is essentially different from that in the Indian Museum, also from the plates in Vincent Smith—(probably another case of a theory based on an incorrect illustration).

The Sārnāth column presents a different type. The four animals alternating with wheels are represented with great fidelity. The modelling is delicate, the bull is typically Indian and the transition from basso to alto (which is the insignia of an extremely advanced art) is very clear; some of the spokes of the wheel appear to be in deeper relief than others. (Wiekoff observes that it was to the credit of Roman art to have discovered "Illusionism," which is utterly absent in Greek art. To explain the term in a crude manner: illusionism is the gradation of a relief—where the artist begins with a few scratches on his medium and gradually intensifies his depth. After attaining his maximum depth he allows it to die down again). The four animals represent the four points of the compass—North, South, East, West. In Persian art, we strive in vain to discover any similarity to any of these features. The lowest point is a decorative bell—without any bulging—without any delineation of any of the veins of the lotus—with the lines pointing strictly downwards. This is connected with the next element by a pyramidal decoration.

The next is a bulging cylinder supporting egg-shaped ovolo—engraved with a pattern. Above the egg-shaped ovolo, we find a plaque with the same pattern; and lastly, above this and just below the abacus is a unique and typical ornament with five cylinders separated by straight lines and terminating on both sides with brackets ending in rosettes—three being four rosettes on each side, two above and two below separated by blank spaces. I shall not comment on the perspicacity of those who observe any resemblance between an abacus of this type and an Indian abacus.

(N.B.—There is no gradual transition in relief in any of these decorations judging from plates.) The vast majority of Persian capitals conforms to this type, while in one or two the abacus is made to rest on the shaft. See Perrot and Chipiez, pp. 91-95, 326, 328, 336, Dieulafoy, Vol. II.

(5) Abacus.—The Aśokan entablature is zoophorus. In Sārnāth, four lions are placed in close juxta-position. Regarding it from the front we see two lions only with the backs to each other (exactly contrary to the Persian design). In the others single animals are depicted—the bull, the elephant and the horse (apparently in Rummindei). They are all extremely realistic (which is antagonistic to Persian sculpture). The curves of the body, of the face, and the hair are executed with extreme precision, the mane falls in ringlets, (concealed ringlets), the protuberance of the cheek muscles, and the deep shading beneath; the nostrils, the pucker of the flesh around the curve of the tongue, the sweep of the eye, the straight pose of the leg, with the slightly perceptible muscle—all these differ from the Persian art, which treats the animals as conventionalised designs. These lions indicate a sense of form which, however, has deteriorated immensely. It is the art of an aesthete—a sense of form without rhythm.
In the elephant we find the broad generalisation which is so characteristic of Indian sculpture. There too the same characteristics are evident. The bull recalls even a medieval painting or sculpture, the curves are sweeping, the hump, the well-rounded body, the slack ears (which are even marked inside), the easy fall of the legs—do not certainly recall Persia.

We shall now describe the differences with Persian animals.

The animals represented in Persia are also the lion and the bull—but the lion is a conventional design with horns. The animal is thick set and the curve of the neck is exaggerated, the mane is scanty and brushed, being engraved with straight cuts with the chisel, the ear is straight and stiff, the lobe is a curve (goose), the eye is wider, the nose is aquiline, terminating in a stump, there are horses, the legs stick out at right angles, three cheek muscles are represented (not one as in India).

What is called the bull is a unicorn. The proportions of the animal are not as well-rounded or delicate. The horn is of an ogee shape, the neck is an absolute arch, four lines are drawn over the eyes. Fillettes (with rosettes) are attached wherever possible. The legs protrude in a characteristic manner. It is a design, not an animal, not of the same world as the Indian bull. There is just one representation of an Indian bull in Persepolis—Perrot and Chipiez, p. 407; but the sculptor betrays his want of skill, it is the crude attempt of an artist who is endeavouring to create something entirely novel. It is a bas-relief not a sculpture in the round, it is not as slack as the Indian prototype, the mouth is of a different shape, the udder is not wholly shown—it is a mere elongated specimen. (From indications like these we can argue that Persia borrowed motifs and styles from India.)

These animals on the Persian entablature are placed in their characteristic position to support the wooden beams on top, which are made to rest on the horns, and on the backs surmounted by a stone, and that is the invariable rule.

Now that we have dealt with the animals, we shall pass on.

(1) If a Persian artist had executed Asokan sculpture, he would have carved an essentially Persian thing or at least would have betrayed his nationality by the representation of some feature characteristically Persian. No adaptation would seem to be necessary and the Persian column would have served Asoka's purpose just as well.

(2) If an Indian had merely imitated from Persia,—

(i) there would be some Persian characteristic in his art;
(ii) the art would not have been realistic, but conventional;
(iii) if Flinders Petrie is correct that a design is borrowed from a natural form then very many of the Persian designs must have been borrowed from that primitive art, of which Maurya is the decadence—e.g., the Persian palmette must have been derived from the Indian lotus;
(iv) the spirit of Mauryan art would not have been so essentially divergent—there would have been more colour and less sombreness. Mauryan art never stoops to those subterfuges, with which artists of every age have tried to conceal their lack of thought;
(v) the numerous decorations of Persia (or at least some of them) would have been represented. It is useless to multiply arguments to refute an absurdity.
Lastly, we come to sculpture in the round:

(3) Sculpture in the round: of which we found three of the Maurya period:

(1) Colossal female statue from Besenagar.
(2) Ditto Mathurā Museum.
(3) Ditto Victoria and Albert Museum

(which is in red sandstone, a material never employed in Persia).

From (1) we irreputably conclude the existence of a very old art before it. Mark how well the plaited hair is represented, how clear are the incisions for the eye, how careful and how aesthetic the execution of the jewellery, e.g., in the rings of the Mekhāla, each one is smaller than the one which follows (cf. Wickhoff). The same remark may be applied to the folds of the cloth in front. The drapery presents unique features.

In (2) the same characteristics are seen—the eyes are straight-cut (typical of Indian art), the ears are long, the arms are well-rounded and smooth, there is also the typical protuberance of the belly, the folds of the garments hanging down in front are marked with clear outlines. The cords bound round the body are very definite, the pose is typical, the chest broad, the waist thin, the belly treated like the figure 8, the support of the body on one leg, the other leg being slightly bent forward—he has no beard. In vain we look for the stylisés figures of Persia, for winged monsters, and long processions of sycophants bowing down before the King of kings. In Persia there is practically no sculpture in the round, the monsters guarding the entrances are direct importation from Assyria where the number of legs indicate the absence of development of sculpture. The bas-reliefs are confined to a few themes—king with heavy beards, and before him a long train of courtiers, one standing behind the other, all in the same position. There is no generalisation of form—other figures are all alike—the dress is different, the pose is different—in short there is no feature in common. Even an outsider who compares the combat of the lion and the bull in Perrot and Chipiez, p. 434, might draw an illuminating conclusion. The wheel depicted in Perrot and Chipiez, p. 404, is totally divergent from the Asokan wheel. Some of the figures are covered over with enamel—which is the last degradation of sculpture.

In Persia art is full of all that is banal and vulgar—features which are absent in India.

And a person who still persists in saying that Indian art is derived from Persia must be blind, dull and perverse.

Sir John Marshall seems to think that the style is Perso-Greek and the figures were carved by a Bactrian. It is hard to realise the full import of this statement. If he means that the style is Persian, the technique Greek, the handiwork Bactrian and the soil Indian, the onus of proving this apotheosis of internationalism is on him. From the standpoint of the Philosophy of Æsthetics, this combination would be unjustifiable. If the style is Persian the other incidents would tend to be Persian, and so on.

Greek Art.—The contention of some critics who discern a similarity between Mauryan and Greek art does not call for any comment. As Gardner points out, Mauryan art is more mature than Greek art of the same period,—a fortiori from colonial Greek art. I quote Vincent Smith (p. 63)—“But—as Professor Percy Gardner observes—there can be no doubt that Indian art had an earlier history. The art of Asoka is a mature art, in some respects more mature than the Greek art of the time, though of course, far inferior to it at least in our eyes.” It is unfortunate that we have to quote Gardner to prove what is apparent even to the untrained observer.
THE TERM ASHASHU IN ROCK SERIES XIII.

The passage

"iha cha sa[vre]shu cha aṃteshu ashashu pi yojanasa[te]shu yatra Antiyoko nama Yonāraja . . . . . . ava Taṃbapaṇṇiya"

has been translated by Bühler as follows—'both here. . . . and over all his neighbours, even as far as six hundred yojanas, where the King of the Yonas, called Antiyoka dwells. . . . . . . as far as Taṃbapaṇṇi'—Ep. Ind., II, 471.

This is the accepted translation.

The expression under consideration is Ashashu. European scholars have taken it as equivalent of Ā-shaṭṣu, 'up to six'. This interpretation is objectionable. Sha for six is nowhere met with in Pāli. In Aśoka's inscriptions themselves we have for six sādu, as in "Pillar Edict" IV (saṅkhiṣati). The chief emphasis is on asashu, because pi is after that and not after yojanaśatēshu. This is a further indication that the word has got nothing to do with six. For, why should six be emphasised? Six by itself is in no way extraordinary. The value of the yojana is now known: 4.54 miles (Fleet, Translation of Kaṇḍiya's Arthāśāstra, p. 541). If the old interpretation is accepted the distance between Syria (where Antiochus was living) and Pāṭaliputra would be roughly 2,500 miles. But this is far too short of the overland route from Patna to Syria. It is also noteworthy that for 'as far as' in the same inscription eva (as in 'ava Taṃbapaṇṇiya') is used.1

I am inclined to interpret asashu as a country-name: 'Here and all over the neighbouring countries, even in (that part of) Asia where Antiochus (dwells), which is 100 yojanas (in length).' This was the place where Aśoka had achieved his chārmavijaya or conquest by religion. In other words, not throughout the whole of the Empire of Antiochus but in Syria only he succeeded in propagating Buddhism, and this portion of Syria, according to the information received by the Emperor (evidently from his missionaries) was 100 yojanas in length. Hundred yojanas will be above 450 miles, a measurement which tallies very well with the actual measurement of Syria under Antiochus. Yojanaśatēshu qualifies the preceding Ashashu.2

The Greeks associated the name Asia with the country east of Greece. The limit was not definite to the east, but it was more closely connected with the immediate east (Asia Minor and the neighbourhood). Aśoka is using the expression as the Greeks at the time, or rather the court of Antiochus, used it. Asia originally was an eastern term and Aśoka is employing not the Greek feminine form but the base with the Indian inflexion to denote a country. It is noticeable that the pronunciation is preserved in all the recensions, the ś is not allowed to become dental. Probably in the time of Aśoka Persia was distinguished by its name from the rest of Western Asia, Asia Minor and Syria, which alone were called Asia in the narrow sense.

1 The use of ś is, however, not unknown, for instance, see Rock II (Gimār—[Taṃbapaṇṇi]).

2 Another possible interpretation is "Even in Asia, over hundreds of yojanas."
IDENTIFICATION OF SOME OF THE POST-
ANDHRARAJITYA RULERS OF THE
PURANIC LIST.

(1) Satrap Vanaspata.

The Vāyu-Purāṇa, after it closes the so-called Andhra Dynasty, gives a brief notice of the dynasties which sprang up while the Andhras were still reigning (अन्नाया सिसिला; पृष्ठ तीन विशेष: समु:; 37, 352), whom the other Purāṇa imply to have been a subordinate to the Andhras (सतावर्णार्य) by their term bhrītyānusya. After them there are described mushroom, contemporaneous dynasties and communities (विवाहतूनवाले विवाहसंगितायाः, 37, 384). Amongst the latter there is one name which we can probably identify with the Vanaspata of the Sāranatha inscription of Bala.

It is Viśvapārī (37, 271). It is spelt as Viśvapārī in the Vāyu, as Viśvapārī in the Brahmāda, as Viśvapārī in Hall’s MS. of the Vāyu, and as Viṣvapārī and Viśvapārī in the Bhāgavata. Out of these we may assume Viśvapārī as the nearest form of the original word. As in the case of Kuśāla=Kunāla, we may assume a confusion between Viśvapārī and Viņaspārī or rather between Vīnaspārī and Viņaspārī, the latter in its turn becoming Sanskritised as Viśvapārī.

Now Vīnaspārī can be easily recognised as the Vanaspata of the Sāranatha statue inscription.

The history which we get of Vīnaspārī is noteworthy for two points:

(a) it gives us the extent of the empire or Kaṇṇāraka (if my identification be correct);
(b) it gives us also the administrative policy of Vīnaspārī, and therefore probably of his race, in India.

The Vāyu gives 10 śīkdrarhas to this man, which is the longest account of an individual ruler in the post-Mahā-Bhārata list. Vanaspārī’s was recent history in the authority from which the Vāyu borrowed it, as it is stated there he is called (374). No doubt his contemporaries were very much impressed by him; he was “in battle as powerful as Viṣṇu.”

The complete passage is as follows:—

The purport of the last two lines in the copy of the Brahmagāda which was before Hall is expressed differently, viz., “the king committed suicide by throwing himself into the Ganges.” Here the Brahmagāda as I have noticed in several other instances seems to give a more faithful account.

---

1 Bibliotheca Indica edition by Rajendra Lala Mitra, 1888. In many particulars it contains valuable information which the other editions and also the MSS. which I have seen in Calcutta do not contain.

2 These rivals were five (संयोग: पञ्च), viz., the Āḷhās, the Gardabhras, the Śakas, the Yavanas, the Tushars (= Tokhari). The Marudra or Murudra the Maunas, and the Andhras (acc. to the Mahāyāna, the Śrī-Paṇḍu Andhras, 273; 17, 18, 23) evidently followed the five contemporaries of the Andhra Sātāvāhanas. Their periods are given in the Vāyu 37, 352 to 358.

3 Wilson takes the संयोग: viz., “on their close,” but the Purāṇa never use this term to denote the close of a dynasty. They use ुच्छिन्न, anuta, pariṣṭiya. The periods given to them also prove, in the light of verified facts, that the specified five dynasties did spring up under the Sātāvāhana régime.


5 Cf. Sūtrāyana (M., 273, 6) = Sūtrāyana.

6 The form Vānaspārī (with p instead of the p only as in the Sāranatha inscription) seems to be more correct. A rājapūrī clan called “Banāspārī” were living in the days of King Prithvirāja Chauhāna. Āḷhā and Udala, whose heroism is sung in ballads in Hindustan, were Banāspārīs who were regarded as a low race, as none would give girls to them in marriage. These Banāspārī Rājputa may be still living near Mahoba, the centre of Āḷhā and Udala. They are found at present in the district of Mīzāpur, U.P.

7 I do not find it in the Bombay edition.
BOOK-NOTICE.


Almost a century ago, Captain James Grant Duff published his monumental work. Since then many new manuscripts illuminating many dark corners of Maratha history have been brought to light. The labours of scholars like Rajwade and Parasnath have been mainly devoted to the sifting and editing of these documents, but very little has been done for making the results of their researches available in a handy form to the public in general. Mr. Sardesai's Marathi Riasat, written in Marathi, is a closed book to the ordinary student who does not know that language.

The late Mr. Ranade's little volume gives much food for thought and points out an altogether new angle of vision, but the great scholar died too early to finish his work, and many of the new documents now available, were still undiscovered in his time. The necessity of a work as has been now undertaken by Messrs. Kingaid and Parasnath is therefore undeniable.

In dealing with Maratha history, we are confronted with the double danger of being either led astray by the prejudice and bias of earlier European writers, or of being hopelessly entangled in the thickets of legends in which the Maratha chroniclers revelled. For the first hundred pages, the path before our authors lay clear and straight.
Mr. Kincaid has nicely summarized the work of one of the greatest Indian scholars, Sir Ramkrishna Bhandarkar, and for the Muhammadan period he has depended mainly on Ferishta. His charming style makes the volume extremely readable, and we have no doubt that Messrs. Kincaid and Paramis will have a hearty reception from those who have no leisure to enter into the intricacies of the history of the Marathas.

For the materials of Shivaji's biography, our authors have depended on four Bakhars. The earliest of these is the Sabhaasad, and written only a few years after Shivaji's death, it is to our estimate, the most trustworthy. It is to be noted that Shivaji had been depicted even in his life-time, and although Sabhaasad's credibility was not much above the average, his Bakhar wants many of the wonderful anecdotes to be found in the later chronicles. The next important Bakhar is that of Chitnis and it is twice as large as the Sabhaasad. Captain Grant Duff mainly relied on Chitnis. The Shivadigijayika Bakhar is the biggest of the three and abounds in many improbable stories. It is on this Bakhar that our authors have mainly relied. Yet its authorship and date of composition are very uncertain, and for all we know it may be a spurious work. In spite of all that Messrs. Nándurbadkar and Dândekar, the joint editors of the Shivadigijayika, have to say, it is very difficult to believe that Khando Ballal Chitnis could have been its author. The question, however, has been already discussed by Mr. Rajwade, and for further discussion we should refer the reader to a volume of selections from the Bakhars to be shortly published by the Calcutta University. Yet it may be incidentally mentioned here, that a few years ago Prof. Jadu Nath Sarkar obtained from the India Office Library a copy of a dated Persian manuscript work—Tarikh-i-Shivaji. Its style leads Prof. Sarkar to think that it is not an original work but a translation of some Marathi Bakhar, and its curious agreement with the Shivadigijayika, both in subject matter and in general arrangement, further leads him to believe that the latter work is nothing but a new edition of the original Bakhar of which Tarikh-i-Shivaji is a translation. The Shivadigijayika therefore, in its present form could not have been written earlier than the last decade of the 18th century, and it is extremely unsafe to rely on the traditions and legends compiled by the unknown chronicler. Without any comment, our authors mention that incident of the Bijapur butcher, although Sabhaasad, who as a contemporary ought to have known better, is silent about it. Mr. Kincaid says that Bhavani of Tuljapur was hidden and saved from sacrileges of Afzal Khan, although Sabhaasad clearly states that she was pounded in a mill.

We do not know whence the authors gather that Tanaji Malasure and other companions of the great hero were introduced to him by his guardian Dadaji. Messrs. Kincaid and Paramis simply quote letters after letters from the Shivadigijayika. But in case Rao Bahadur Paramis has not discovered them in original, they should be rejected as altogether untrustworthy. Credulous as our authors seem to be, the extravagance of the Bakhar of their preference is at times too much for them. For instance, they have not been able to accept the Shivadigijayika version of the Shaita Khan incident, although shorn of its exaggeration it has the support of Sabhaasad and Chitnis.

Again in this history of the Maratha people, we look in vain for a good description of Shivaji's administrative system or any account of his navy. The chapter devoted to the Pandharpur movement might have been much enlarged and the fabricated genealogy of Shivaji discarded on the strength of the temple inscription of Mesh (see Rajwade). The transliteration of some Persian names is incorrect, as in the case of Fulad Khan Kotwal. Mr. Kincaid misled by the error of the Bakhars, calls him Polad Khan. He is, however, to be congratulated for his appreciation of the national aims of Shivaji. And in spite of its few defects this volume will be an excellent guide for the uninstructed readers of the Bakhars, who lack the necessary geographical knowledge. Here they will find an excellent compilation of the anecdotes of Shivaji and the story of his life chronologically arranged. Messrs. Kincaid and Paramis's work will enable them to master these initial difficulties that beset the study of the Bakhars.

S. N. Sen.
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Adil Schāh, I of Bījāpur, 'Ali, 142; II, 146 or Ibrahim, 148; IV, 'Ali Khan Rāja, 143, f.; 182–186
Adil Schāhi kings ... 144
Adisparian, the, and Krisha (Indrasenā) ... 281 & n.
Ādivarsha, epithet applied to Bhoja I ... 76
advertisement, E. I. Co.'s, referring to Wm. Bolts ... 29, 30, 34
Afsān Khān, and Bhawāni of Tuljapur ... 300
Agamānta School of Brāhmaṇas, and Mul- laṇḍram ... 99
Āgar, N.N.S. of Ujjain, possibly Akara ... 151
Agaram-Mullaṇḍram, Praudhādevavarāya- puram, or Mullaṇḍram ... 99
Agastya's Hill, Pettiypam ... 48
age, of the Bhagavadgītā ... Sup. 28–33
Aghnā, modern Tuba ... 174
Aghoriaśvaḥarya, title of the poets of Mullândram ... 98, f.
Agni, and Buddha ... Sup. 10
Agobio, wolf of St. Francis ... 197
Agra, and Akbar ... 186
agriculture, 233 and the Chaldæans, 234 & n., 235 & n., 237 & n., 235, 240, f.; or Rasi ... 256 & n.
Agrimensores latine, the ... 235
āhūnā ... 189, n.
Ahmad I, of Gujarāt, 116, f., 141; II., or Rasti- al-Mulk ... 141
Ahmad Khān ... 184
Ahlmad Rāja, reputed founder of the Fārūqī dynasty, and the saint Zain-ad-din, ... 114–117; 182, 183, f.
Ahmad Shāh Bahmani, and Khandesh ... 117; 186
Ahmad-Bābā, and Khandesh ... 112
Ahmadagar, and Khandesh, 120, 123, f.; and Barar, 142, f.; and Akbar, etc. 144–148; 178–180
Ahmedavud, tn., and Austria's commercial venture in India ... 3
Ahmed Pīr, Hot Hakim, Pīr of the Jackals ... 207
'Ain-ad-din, Khvāja Jahān, ancestor of the Fārūqī dynasty of Khandesh ... 114, 186
Aīn-i-Abbari, the, 210; and the stratagem used by Alexander against Porus ... 245, f.
Aītareya-Bṛāhmaṇa, and the first mention of the Andhras ... 70
Aītavan, vaulted building at Machi (Seistan) ... 177
Aītātātra, k., date ... 224
Ajmer, and Nahapāna's coins ... 75
Ajīā-kekha, an order ... 52 & n.
Akara, and Āgar ... 151
Akkārvati, Malāvā, and Gautamiputra, etc. ... 150; 153, f.
Akbar, and literature, 44; and Khandesh, 124; 141–144; 170–183; and the Dakan, 144; 148; and Islam, 185; and Alexander's stratagem against Porus ... 245, f.
Affarānwa, the, and the Dakan, etc., 147 & n., 148, n., 178; 183; 186
Akkāhāyu-nāv, and Nīv ... 51
'Ālā-al-dīn Bahman Shāh, founder of the Bah- mani dynasty ... 114 & n.
'Ālā-al-dīn Khalji, of Delhi ... 113
Albērūni, and the Gupta-Valabhi year, etc. ... 16; 20
INDEX

Anūpa, (in modern C. Provinces) and Gau-
tamiputra ........................................ 150
Anvikśiki, philosophy, 102—107, 109; Antik-
śikī  .................................................. 238, f.; 241; 236
Apabhramśa, or Prakrit and the wide sound of
E and O, 37—40; 42, 43, 47 n., 48; 226, 227 n., 231
Aparajīta, g. ........................................... 51, n.
Aparnakhaṇi, vil. in Nasik grant ................ 162
Aparāntikā, and Ariaka, 77; Aparānta, West-
ern coast of India  .......................... 150, n.; 154
Apostamba's Dharmasūtra ........................ Sup. 29, f.
Apsahā inscription  ................................ 162
Aptavā, Apitaka, possibly Vedāeri .......... 72
Apollo, wolf g., 208; and sun, at Bodh Gaya, 212; 219
Apollodotus, coins of  .......................... 74
Aparīthakarṣaṇa, g. .................................. 51, n.
Aparīthakarṣayya, title of Śātakarni  ................ 72, n.
Arab, conquest of Sind  .......................... 205
Arabia, Christian .................................... 172
Arabic words and Gujarati, 28; and Indian
literature, 44—46; inscrip. in Kusār 'Amral, 174; or Muslim, tradition of Alexander .... 246
Arabs, and Nabateans, 169; the Umayyads, 174; and the River cult, 198; Chaldæan agri-
culture ............................................. 234, 256
Aramaic, and the Nabateans ..................... 169
Aryan-pura, the, and the Tāmrānpuri, riv. ... 48
Aradius, Imp. ......................................... 172
arches, vaulted, etc. of the Hindola Mahal,
Māndū ................................................. 169—174
architecture, of the Haurān, 170; prehistoric, etc. .......................... 170, n., 171, 172, n.
Arédas, first known Nabatean ruler, 169; III.
and IV., and Damascus ................................ 170
Ariake, Aparāntikā, 77; or Ariakes .............. 150
Aristotle, and economics, etc. .................... 233, f.; 256
Arivijāmāgalam plates, of Śrīnagarīya II. .... 79
Arjuna, and the crocodile, 197; or Arjuna,
Pārtha, 168; and the Bhagavadgītā, Sup. 5; Indra, Śrīnaka, other names of, Sup. 10, 13 & n.; 14; 20; 33—35
Arjuna .................................................. Sup. 12, 13
Arka-Vāṭa tree, and the Kalpa-druma tree .... 214
Armēnian letter of Omnichund, see Sīdelights
on Omnichund ...................................... 265
Arratoom, Petros (Khwaja Petrus) and Grigor
(Gorgian Khan) Armenian merchants in Bengal
(1757) .................................................. 265, 269—274
arrow-heads, stone, from Chota Nagpur ...... 136
Art, Indian, Persian, etc., see Mauryas ...... 291
art, of acquisition, (klitiķe) or science, of wealth 234 & n.; 256

Aleppo, mosque at .................................. 176, n.
Alexander the Great, or Dhoukarnain, 205;
and Poros  ........................................... 245, f.
Alexandria, and the last Kufic inscrips., 176, n.;
visited by Indian Sages  ........................ Sup. 15, 10
al-Hadr, or Hatra  .................................. 172
al-Haïyāt, example of vaulted roof at ........ 172
'Ali Khān, Rāja, Šâd Khān IV  .................... 143, f.; 186
Alivardī Khān and Omnichund ................. 266—268
Allahabad Pillar  ..................................... 191, f.
al-Majdāl, example of vaulted roof  .............. 172
al-ʿUmal nicely, vaulted roof of church  ........ 172
al-Walid, and Mecca  ................................ 174
Amarā, author, and the words ghīshka and mukh-
ādārī ................................................... 35, 36
Amarakunju, near Berhampore, and the Sun
god ...................................................... 219
Amarāvati, stūpa inscription  ..................... 155, 167
Amarālā, Uderolah  .................................... 201
amaśa, meaning of  .................................. 193
amūd, meaning of  ................................... 74, 75 & n.
Ambikā, Iba, rīv. ..................................... 73, 74
Amerio, and Austria's commercial adventure,
90, 92; and erotic sculptures ..................... 217
Amirchand, Omnichund  ............................. 256, f.
Amma, fort, Haurān dist. ............................ 177
Amrīb al-ʿĀq, built the first Egyptian mosque 175
Amshīyoka, Amshītus  ................................ 297
Anapāya, prince of Kavimalla  ..................... 95
Ancient Hindu Economics, or Vārtakā, 233—241 ;
275—279
Andares, the Andracas ................................ 70
Andhapura, Andhāpura  ................................ 71
Andhra, race, Pliny's description, 70, 71; territ-
ory, and Pulumāvi, 153; rulers .................. 298
Andhrabhṛitya (post-) rulers of the Purunio
list, identification of  ............................ 298
Andhra-desa, the Telugu co., 71; 155; and the
Śātavahānas .......................................... 166
Anēgandhi inscrip. ................................... 287 & n.
asa, oldest portion of Jain canon  ................ 190, n.
Angirasa Ghora, guru of Kṛṣṇa Devaki-
putra ................................................... Sup. 9
Aiguil, writer, and Kautilya  ...................... 195, n.
animal, and vegetable sacrifices  ................. 189, n.
animals, in Mauryan sculptures ................. 291, f.; 294, f.
Antigonos, and the Nebateans .................... 169
antīka, any antique, Hobson-Jobson .......... 196
Antiochus, Antiyoka  ................................ 297
Antiochus XII, and Damascus ..................... 170
Antwerp, and the Privileged Company of
Fiume, etc. ............................................ 37; 90
Amsantri, the consenter  ........................... Sup. 31
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>INDEX</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>artha, wealth or goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthadāstra, (The), Explains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthadāstra, see Authenticity of the Kautilya,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthadāstra, refers to the Tāmraprapa riv.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthadāstra, and philosophy, 101, n. ; and Vārttā,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthadāstra, relation of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aruna, charioteer of the Sun-god</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arunagiriṇātha, Sāndrānātha, etc., poet of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muniṣṭhram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aruyman, Ayama, minister to Nahapāna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aryan, settlements, and the Andhras, 70 ; race.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arvānīdeśa, Aryan settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asaṅka, Assakes, co., (Sana. Asaṅka) and Gautamiputra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assala Deva, Rai inscr. of, 241, f. ; or Asala, coins of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asketica, Brahman, and vegetarianism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>astāka, term in Rock Series XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ashes, sacred, as medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ashtamadāra, eight goddesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Askti, scene of a battle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia, British settlements, etc., in, and Austria's commercial venture in India, 3, 5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Minor, Indian Mission in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asiatic, Greek and Mauryan Sculpture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asiatic Company of Trieste, see Trieste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asita, co., unidentified, and Gautamiputra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astarāḥ, fort, 116, 118, 121, f. ; 124, 142-146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asaṅka, Asaṅka, and Mulaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asoka, Notes, (from Vol. XXXIX, p. 64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. XII, Identification of Tampāpani in the Rock Edicts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asoka, inscriptions, Notes on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asoka, inscrps., 52 ; 56 ; 71 ; 138 ; 209, f. ; his time-table of works, etc., 53, f. ; and Buddhism, 55, n. ; heretic emp., 109 ; and akūśad, 189, n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stūpas, in Odra district, 209, date, 210, rail; 219, Rock Edict I and the word Sambhū, 221, and Kalinga, 224 ; and art, see Mauryana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asrama, the fourth, and akūśad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as-Salih Talā'ī Mosque, Cairo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assyria, and agriculture, 235, and Indian sculpture, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atmena, sacrifice and Śtākarni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avāsāstāra, veterinary science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aavina, Vedic gods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aatken, (Ain. Aatken)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aenaccus, general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ativirārāma Pāṇḍya, copperplates of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ātman, redemption</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>INDEX</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ātma-Vidyā philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ātulyā, N. Arcot district, Brāhmaṇa settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auddālikā, a doctrine of, and the Kāma-sāstra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audumbarapura, N. Arcot district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustine, emp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustus, Tiberius, on coins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurvāvāha, probably the Teacher in the Brihad-āraṇyaka Upanishad, and the worship of Trivikrama-Viṣṇu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aurṣages, factories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aśvānasā school of philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aśvānasās, rivals of the Barhāspatyaśās, 102, 105, 107 &amp; n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria's Commercial Venture in India, in the Eighteenth Century, (contd. from Vol. XLVI, p. 280)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria's Commercial Venture in India, in the Eighteenth Century, (contd. from Vol. XLVI, p. 280)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authenticity of the Kautilya, 157-161 ; 187-195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>automobile, astārōnāl, et., Hobson-Jobson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avadana, the, and the week days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avanti, 78 ; Ujjayini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avātāra theory, and Krishna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayama, Ayman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayyangara I, Bādami Chāḷukya k.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>INDEX</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bābhavya Paśchāṭa, supposed first writer on Kāmāsāstra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bādāli pillar inscr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bādāmi, inscr. and the sāka era, 70 ; co., the Chāḷukyas of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bādarāyaṇa, author, and a Māmāvādā Sātra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baga Bahar Sher, Uderolā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baghdād, the Khan Orthma mosque, 175 &amp; n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baglāns, sief, and Malik Rāja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahādur Shāh, Qadr Ḫān of Ḫāndesh, and Akbar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahādurpur, near Barhāspatyaśā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bahārād, spiced dough balls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāhmāni, dyn., 113, f. ; or Bāhmanidas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāhrām Ḫān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāhula, Nāla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bairagi, temple attendant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bākthana, Prithan, ancient Pratishthāṇā, cap. of Siro Pulemaios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bākkur, fort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāla, his Sāranātha inscr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāḷādīyā, Narasimhamunja, date, 161, and Mihrakula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bala, and Gautamī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balsukuros, k., 151 ; Vilivyayakura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bali, g., and the Sun god</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballepatam, Beliapattum or Valarpattanam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>near Cananore, and Austria’s commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>venture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baloch, and the River god</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balochistan, and Bibi Dost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balka, Steppe, Moab, ruins near</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banbridge, E. I. Co.’s servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Başa, first reference to Kalidasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāgabhāṣṭa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bānās, two rivers of the name in W. India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band, U. P., stone implement from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandankeya-gahta, Chalukya cap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangon, in Bundelkhand, Trimūrti image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankapura, Chalukya cap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barojhānti, temple ornament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barake, Dvārakā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargaza, ancient Nālanda, inscr. at.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bārhaspatyasis, school of philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnagoro, Bārānagar, Dutch settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnāsā, Sans. Parnāsā, and the Baṅgas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barrel-vaults in roofing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barth, on Krishna, Sup. 10, 14 ; and Bhakti, Sup. 15, 16, n.; 27, n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barugaza, Broach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barwell, Rich., E. I. Co.’s servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barygaza, Cambay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basantagaj, in Sirohi, sun temple at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāsā, and the bellum (boat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baudhāyanam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bādhakṣaraṇa, and the week days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baur, Austrian captain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beck, Mr., E. I. Co.’s servant, Bombay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beef, as food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginnings of South Indian History, Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgāme, inscr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgoioso, Count, Austrian Ambassador in London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bellum, (Ar. belam) boat (Hobson-Jobson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benares and Gaṅgai-kondā Rājendrā Chōḷādeva I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengal, Gulf of Benga, and Austria’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benar and Bhanerā, 117, f.; 121–124; 141–145; and Akbar, 148; 178; and Sulîn Dāni-yāl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benagar, female statue from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bettigo, Greek form of Potigai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beypore and Wm. Bolts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhadrāyanīya monks, and the Nasik Caves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhāgalpur grant, and Madgagiri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhāgavatādītā, Garbe’s Introduction to the, Sup. 1–36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhāgavata-Čampa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhāgavatādītā, the, and Sind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhakti, oldest evidence of the word, Sup. 14; idea, in India, and Christianity, etc. Sup. 15–17: 19, f.; 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhakti-yoga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhandar, brother of Uderolāl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhandarkar, Sir R. G., and the Abhiras, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhandarkar, D. R., and the Vikrama era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhang, Indian hemp, and cholera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhairavā, and the Arthakāstra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāhūrāgī, inscr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāhūrā, 109; and Kalidasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bharat tope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bharukachha, modern Broach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāhākarāyya, of Mullaṇḍram, author of the Prasannakērya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bābāya and Śatra styles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāhāwāl of Tulapur, and Afzal Khan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāhāwāl of Tulapur, and Afzal Khan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāhūmaka, Kāhātrapas k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bībī Dost, Saint, in Bālechistan, 207; Madonna, 208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bīhar, inscr. from, 109; or Uddānāpura, 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bīhārī, poet, quotations from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bījāgarh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bījāpur and Ahmadnagar, 146–148; 178, f.; the butcher incident of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bīkāner, 225 &amp; n.; Darbar Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bīkhīrī column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bīl-balam, bill-bellum, a river boat, Hobson- Jobson, 196; or bellum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bīlgī, Bīlgey, in N. Karana, and Austria’s commercial venture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bīlūna, on Sōmēśvara II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Būllāpattam, Būllāpattam and Wm. Bolts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bindusāra and Āsōka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>birchas, of Arunagirinath, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bīsnāvpur, Vīshnupur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bitumen, wells, at Hitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Hole of Calcutta, and Omichund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Pagoda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloom, Ben., E. I. Co.'s servant, Benoolen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boddam, governor at Surat, and Wm. Bolts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodhagaya-pedestal inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodh-Gayā, inscription of Gopala II., 111; Sculpture, 212; 213, n.; sun temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodhāyana, and the Arthashāstra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodhi-tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bohāra, tn., and Uderolal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Böhtlingk, and the Bhagavadgītā, Sup. 1; 3; 22; 30; 34; 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolts, Wm., Lieut-Col., see Austria's commercial venture in India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bombay, see Austria's commercial venture in India, 1, ff.; finds of submerged trees on the Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boots, on Trimurti image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boro Budur, sculptures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boora, Era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bostra, Haurān, Nabatean kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowles, Dan., Capt. of the Snow Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahmā, Brīhma g., 2; and the sun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahmadeva, writer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahman, image, Konarak temple, 218; the Bhagavadgītā, Sup. 2; 3; and Krishna, Sup. 4; 5; and the Sages, Sup. 16; and Krishna, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahman, ascetics, &amp; vegetarianism, 189, n., 190, n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brāhmaṇa, and Gaṇgākonda Cholādēva I., etc., etc., 94, f.; brass, 180, n.; and the Agrimensores latinae, 235; and the Bhagavadgītā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahmāṇī, image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahmanical, version, of history of Mihirakula, 19; faith, and Ushavadā, 73 &amp; n.; 74; rule, and the Panjab, 203; ritual, and the Bhagavadgītā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahmans, and the Bhagavadgītā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahmanas, and Usavadā, 73; 76; or Brahmins, of Sind, 197; and Uderolal, 203; and Vārttī, 240; and Christianity, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahmāsastra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brāhma, inscrip. on coins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahmīsha, son of Mudgala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brèncourt, M. Anquetil, French Consol, Surat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brihaspati, and the Lokāyata philosophy, 104 &amp; n., 105, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British, Government, etc., and Austria's commercial venture in India, 2–7; 65–68; 93; and Omichund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broach, and Austria, 3; ancient Bharukachha, 73 &amp; n.; or Baraga, 74; and cotton, etc.77, 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Mr., with Wm. Bolts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brüssel, Bruxelles, and Austria's commercial venture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddha, law of, and Mihirakula, 18; 54, n.; and the elephant, etc., in carving, 213; 215–218; death of, 224; and the Bhagavadgītā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhism, and Aśoka, 55, n.; in Syria, 297; and Vaishñava worship, 54; and the River Kout, 196; and the Dārmikāpānum religion, 204; and Orissa, 209, f.; and Hinduism, etc., 214; 217, 218; and the Vēghavēta religions, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist, version of the story of Mihirakula, 19; monks, and Ushavadā, 74; monks, and the Nāsik Caves, 151, f.; image inscrip., Sārnāth, 161, f.; ruins, in Sind, 204, n.; influence, in Sun temple, in Konarak, 209; ornaments, etc., in temples, 213, 214; works, and economics, 256; relics, 299; influence, in the Bhagavadgītā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhisitic, philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budhists, and ašā, etc., 189, n.; 190, n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budhagupta, pillar inscrip., 16, 20; date, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budhā, or Verdharis, Thakur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bühler, the late Dr., and the age of the Agastambha Dharmāsāstra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bukha II., copperplates of, 79; and Brahmaṇa, 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bukkur, i., and Uderolal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bundelkhand, Trimurti from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burford, British ship (18th cent.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burhan-ad-din, Saint, and Burhanpūr, 116; 180; 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burhan-ad-din, of Ahmadnagar, 145, f.; Nizām Shāh II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burhan-i-Ma'dir, and the Fārōqi dynasty of Kandahār, 113, f.; and the Waqāt-i Nizām-aḥāiyah, 120 &amp; n.; 121; 142; 143, n.; 147, n.; 148 &amp; n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burhanpūr, cap. of the Fārūqi dyn., 116–118; 120–125; 142; 179–183; 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler, H. C., and Nabatean architecture, 170 &amp; n.; 172 &amp; n.; 174, n.—175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byzantium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadiz, and Wm. Bolts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cæsarea, of Orissa, Kesari kings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cahill, Capt. J., and Austria's commercial venture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairo, Ibn Talūn mosque, 176; the as-Salih Tala'i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX

Caius, on coins ........................................ 77, n.
cojin, Cajanus Indicus, (Malay, kōchang) ..... 1 & n.
dal plant ................................................. 234
Calcutta, and Austria's commercial venture, ... 31–34; and Suraj-dinda, etc., 266–269; 273
Calendar, Jewish, and India ........................ 112
Calipha, Abbaside ...................................... 234
Callendar, A. J., witness for Wm. Bolts .......... 68
Callius, and Wm. Bolts ............................... 234
Cambay, and Wm. Bolts, 10; or Barygaza .... 77
Campbell, agent for Wm. Bolts ...................... 91
Čānaka, 158, n.; and the Mundrārākṣa, etc., ... 48
Cand, ancient, in Kalinga, and Hāthigumpha inscrip. 223, f.
candil, candi (Candy) Portuguese measure .... 15
Čārāgataka, a work by Bānu, suggested origin of ... 167
Čandragupta, and Kauśilya, 159; 193; 195; ... 53
see Chandragupta
Čānana, and Wm. Bolts .............................. 12
Capo, of Good Hope, and Austria's commercial venture 2; 6; 68; 85; 93
Capell, Rajah Mohan, of Delaware, and ... 4 & n.; 8–10
Wm. Bolts .......................... Capital of Asokan pillars 291; 293, f.
Car festival, in Konarak, etc., 209; or Ratha ... 212
Yārā .......................... Čāraka ................................................ 104, n.
Čārāyana, and the Kauśilya .......................... 189
Čarne, Gen. J., and Austria's commercial venture ... 2; 6; 68; 85; 93
Car, and Austria's commercial venture ........... 8–10
Carnicobar, ialis, and Austria's commercial venture 12, n.
carrick, carricar, cargo boat ....................... 12
Čarēkasa, founder of the Lokāyaka philosophy 104
Carwar, tn., and Wm. Bolts .......................... 13; 15
cash, tin pitis ............................................ 28
cuṣa, of Qastal ........................................... 177
Cave, inscriptions, Nasik, 70, f.; 73–78, n.; 151 ... 153; 222; Khaṇḍagiri 209; 211; 214; 216;
Udayagiri, etc. ......................................... 210
ceremonies, in temples, etc. .......................... 211, f.
Ceres, g. .................................................. 208
Ceylon, ancient Tambapanni and India, 48; Greek Solen 49
Ceylonese Chronology, uncertainty of ........ 20
chabātra, garden, and Gaurthi ...................... 274
Čaṭhāna, the, and Arabs in Sind ........................ 198
Čhālāda, Čhālāda, Raṇā, Čhālāmāna Čhālāda of Ranthambhor and Čhālāda of Narwar 243, f.
Čhālāda Deva, Rajput, founder of Narwar dyn. 242–244
Čhālāna, and Bhaktī ...................................... Sup. 20
Chakora, hill, and Gautamiputra ........................................ 151
Chakrapālita, officer under Skandagupta 162, n.; 164
Čhalōsan, and agriculture ................................ 234; 265
Čhalūkya, western, Kalyāni Chronology of ...... 265–290
Čhamak, vil., grant by Pravarasena II ................ 165
Čhāmpā, tn. ............................................... 121; 123
Čhāmuna, Raya, and the Śravanga Belgoḷa statue 130
Čhānaka, 48; Visnugupta or Kauśilya, 101; 109; (Cānaka, 158, n.; 190, n.) see Kauśilya, ... 157, f.
Čhandra, and the Ābhira ................................ 35, f.
Čhānd Bibi, regent of Ahmadnagar .................. 18, f.
Čhandanagar, and Austria's commercial venture, 31; 57, f.; and Calcutta refugees, 265; attacked by British .... 207
Čhāndrabhāgā, Čhenab, riv. .............................. 218
Čhandragupta, his daily routine, 55–55; and Seleus, etc., 70, f.; and Čānaka, 101; 138; date, 140; 159; and Hāthigumpha inscrip. 223
Čhandragupta II, date, 20; or Devagupta ........ 165
Čhāndravati, Paramāra co. .......................... 168
Čhāndwar, and Cuttack ................................ 210, n.
Čhānpī, Čhānpī ............................................. 141–143
Čhank shell, Turbinella roba, fisheries .......... 48
Čhora, ascetics ........................................... 73 & n.
čhāri, races, and women ....................... 281; 283
Čhāsantana, founded the second Kahatrapa dyn. ... 153–155
Čhātur, form of Satur .................................. 61, n.
Čhātukāśikālādāstra, the, sixty-four kālās, ... 239
Čhātuṁkukā, Kalkin, Kalkin, or Kalkirāja ........ 18
Čhauṭri, and Gaurthi ................................. 274 & n.
chemin-de-fer, sham-in-dofar, Hobson-Jobson. 106
Čhenab, Chandrabhāgā riv. ............................. 218
Čhen Ḥan-Chu, Dr., on Confucius and economics .......... 256
Čherulika, Chiraikal .................................... 8:11
Čhāndogya-panḥkāda, the, and Krishṇa, ... Sup. 9 & n.; 11, 12
čhif, festival, and sun worship ........................ 219, n.
Čhāhāya, wife of the sun, image ..................... 136
Čhídambaram, Pundārikesvara ........................ 94
Čhikaṭ, Čhikaṭapadra, in Kāpur ........................ 78
Čikka-Māgḍi inscrip. ................................. 288
Čhink, children, and Uderolāl, 262; slaughter of, in Bethlehem ....... Sup. 16
China, and Austria's commercial venture, 57; 85; 88–92; and economics, 235; 256; and Alexander ........ 245
Čhingiz Khiān .............................................. 246
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index Entry</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China, Kistna dist., Sātavāhana inscr.</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinsura, and Austria's commercial venture, 30, 31, 34; Shašhti image at, 219; and Calcutta refugees</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chintāmani, jewel</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chirakkal, Cherrika, on Malabar coast, ancient Kollattiri</td>
<td>9 n., 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chitor, siege of (1534)</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chōvra, monk's garment</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chola kings and Muñandram</td>
<td>94; 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cholera, a Faqir's cure for</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choeroy, k. of Persia</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chota Nagpur, stone implements from, 135 or Chūtiya Nagpur</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chua, Soury, a Nicobar in.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chromate tukite and kētite, science or art of wealth, etc.</td>
<td>233, 234 &amp; n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ, Jesus, date of, and the Abhira immigration into India, 35, 36; worship, and the cult of the Child Kriṣṇa</td>
<td>84; Sup. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian, era, 36, 44; architecture, in the Haurān, 170; 175; inscr. in Syria, 172; influence, in the Bhagavadgītā</td>
<td>Sup. 28, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christianity, and the cult of the Child Kriṣṇa, 38; and the wolf of Agobi, 197; and Bhakti, etc.</td>
<td>Sup. 15 &amp; n., 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christians, the Ghasanides</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronology of the Western Chāluksya of Kalyāṇi</td>
<td>285-290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronology, revised, of the last Gupta emperors</td>
<td>161-167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chronology, Ceylonese, uncertainty of</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churū, vil., in Bengal, Vishnu statue in</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church, Rich., Resident, Tellicherry</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church, of Julianos, Umm-al-Jamal and others, vaulted roofs of</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chūtiya Nāgpūr, ancient Jhārkhand, 118; or Chota Nagpur</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clay records and agriculture</td>
<td>235; 256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clive, Robt., and Omichund, etc.</td>
<td>265-269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cloth, blue, merchandise, 62; trade in</td>
<td>89, 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clothes, unwashed, for brides</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloud-messenger</td>
<td>251 f., 253 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobensel, Austrian ship</td>
<td>68; 85-92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coia Khitan (Manucci) for Khwāja Khizr</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coigne, Strach Settlement</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coins, of Toramana, 19; Roman, 74; of Nahapāna, 73-77; his Jogaṭembi hoard, 149, f.</td>
<td>89, 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coins, of Vijayavakura, 153; Mālaya, of Philip, etc. 75, n.; 155, f. of Bālādīya, 183, 166;</td>
<td>251, f.; 253, n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coins of Medieval India, etc.</td>
<td>241 n., 243 &amp; n., 244; of the Yamas, 299; of Vāsudeva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colastria, Port, Kōlattiri</td>
<td>9 &amp; n., 10, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collett, Matt., E. I. Co.'s servant and Kāsim-bāzār</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colours, flag, ensign, English, and Austria's commercial venture, 1, 2, 10, 11, 15; Imperial, of Austria</td>
<td>12-14; 33, f. 64, 66; 92, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>columns, or pillars, Ashokan, etc.</td>
<td>291, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commercial venture in India, see Austria's 1, ff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee, Select, and the Foreign Dept. 266 &amp; n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company, (Imperial India) of Fiume, etc.</td>
<td>57 &amp; n.; or Society, Commercial, of Wm. Bolts, 85-87; Imperial Asiatic, 57 n., 58; 64; 66; 91, 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company, E. I., and Austria's commercial venture, 15; 57; 68; 69; 85, n.; slaves for, 56; officers, obliged to go through the ranks, 84; and Omichund</td>
<td>266, f. 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>composers, of Vijayanagara copperplates, engravers of āsanas, lists of, 78-81; pedigree of āsana composers</td>
<td>82, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confucius, and wealth, or economies</td>
<td>235, 256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conquest, of Gujarat, 198; Arab of Sind</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contractor, kuntrauchi, Hobson-Jobson</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution towards the Early History of Indian Philosophy</td>
<td>101, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook, Capt.</td>
<td>90 &amp; n. 58; 89: 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>copper, trade in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>copper-plate, documents, Vijayanagara, lists of, with composers, etc. 79, ff; grant of Rudgeuna II, 165; Narasimha Deva II, 210, 212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>countries, (and mountains) ruled by Gautamiputra Śātarkaśi</td>
<td>150, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corruptions, of European words in Mesopotamia</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmas, monk, and India</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmic Illusion, or Mayá</td>
<td>Sup. 3: 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cotton, etc., trade, and Wm. Bolts, 31; and Broach</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>countries, (and mountains) ruled by Gautamiputra Śātarkaśi</td>
<td>150, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>courtesans, science of</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cowherds and Kriṣṇa, 84; and Christ, and Kriṣṇa, Sup. 15; cowherd-maidens and Kriṣṇa</td>
<td>Sup. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crocodile, wāko, in Sind, 197; and the Jews, 197 n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crown, of Uderolāl</td>
<td>200 &amp; n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruz, João de, Austrian pilot</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word/Phrase</td>
<td>Page(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datta, and the courtesans of Pāṭatiputra</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dā'ūd Khān, of Khānedsh</td>
<td>119-121, 184-186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daunālābād</td>
<td>114-116, 120, 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, J., and the Bhagavādītd</td>
<td>Sup. 30, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawala-Sāṅgaha (Dravya-Sāṅgaha) by Neōni-chandra Śīdhānta-Chakravarti, (Book Notice)</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>death of Maria Teresa, 85, n. ; of Buddha, 224; and God</td>
<td>24, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deepchund, Dip Chand, partner of Omichund</td>
<td>266, n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deification, of founders of sects in India, of Krishna</td>
<td>Sup. 9, 11, 17, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dekkan, of the Satatavaha period</td>
<td>69-78, 140-156, see Dakkan 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delhi, ancient buildings, etc. 176, f.; Topra; 291; see Dihl 113; ancient Kurufield</td>
<td>Sup. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deposition, regarding Austria’s commercial venture</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department, of worship and temples, Mauryan institution</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desūk, and the curved character</td>
<td>176, n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devagupta, Chandragupta II</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devaki, m. of Krishna</td>
<td>Sup. 9, 11, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devānu-priya, title of Tiss and of Asoka, 48; or Dvēndra-priya</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dévarāya IV., copper-plates of development, of the Bhāgavata religion</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devil, the, Iblis</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Vogüé, and Nabatān architecture, 170, n.</td>
<td>117, n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dhakā, drum</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhakkā Sabhāpāti, or Sabhāpāti</td>
<td>94, 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhār, Lat Masjid</td>
<td>177, n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhārāvarsha, k.</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharma-nīeti, and dharma biyi</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharmaśāstra, 50; and Arthashastra</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharmaśāstra, work by Apastamba, antiquity of</td>
<td>Sup. 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dharmayuktas</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhauili, Asoka inscrip.</td>
<td>209-211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhoukarna, Alexander the Great</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhītarāsa, k.</td>
<td>Sup. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhvani-doctrine</td>
<td>191, n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digambara, Jain sect</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dīhī, and Khānedsh, 113-116; etc., 123, f. ; 182; see Delhi</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilāwar Khān, and Māndū</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilīpā, character</td>
<td>247, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dīnāma, drum</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diśīma-Sārvabhaumakavi, Sōkōri or Aruṇagiri, 96–99; author of the Rāghavabhū tymadga</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dionysos, Siva. Sup. 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipakarnā, k., and the Yakshā Śāta</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dipīta and dipī, of Aśoka inscrip.</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discipline, disciplines, Vedio</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon, armuror, with Capt. Cook, and Wm. Belts</td>
<td>90 &amp; n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctrines of the Bhagavadgītā. Sup. 20–29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>documents, (saṅgānas) Vijayānagara, writers of</td>
<td>79 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dogs, in Sīnd cult</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dollar, etc, Strait Settlements</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dowmar Layna, Savka cave, Ellora</td>
<td>211 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drake, Roger, President, Bengal Council</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drāmāla, and Kauṭiliya</td>
<td>195 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Droṭāchārya, and the Pāṇḍavas</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drum, dhakkā, 94; or diśīma, 95; and Uderi-lal</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drupada, and Indrasena</td>
<td>281 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Druses, of the Haurin, their houses</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundas, Capt. of the Royal Henry</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durbar Hall, Hindola Mahal, Mānd</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durvāsas, curse of</td>
<td>248 : 251 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duryodhana</td>
<td>Sup. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch, the, and Austria's commercial venture</td>
<td>30 &amp; n.; 34 : 57 : 58 : 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duty, in the Bhagavadgītā</td>
<td>Sup. 20, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dvīta, sage</td>
<td>Sup. 15, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwārkā, Baraske</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dynasties, reigning with the Andhras</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edicts, Rock, and the identification of Tambapadi, 48, f.; edicts, not proclamations.</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edilpur grant of Keśava Sena</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt, and Wm. Bolts, 92; the first Mosque</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in, 175; and the Kufic character</td>
<td>176 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekata, sage, and Svatadvipa</td>
<td>Sup. 15, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el-Askā mosque, Jerusalem</td>
<td>176 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elephant, symbol of Buddhism, etc.</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; n.—214; 216</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elichpūr</td>
<td>142 : 145 f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elijah, Iliās, and Khwāja Khizr</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El-Khīzr, master of Alexander the Great, and Mussalmans</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellora, cave, 211 n., 213; Sun temple</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emancipation, the five ways of</td>
<td>Sup. 23 : 27 : 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emperor, of Austria, and Austria's commercial venture, 92, f.; of Byzantium</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emperors, see Gupta</td>
<td>161 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empire, Gupta 163; of the Pontolies and Selucids</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empress, Maria Teresa</td>
<td>85, 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endogyam, and the Thakurs</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England, and Omichund</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English, the, and Austria's commercial venture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 : 15 : 57, f.; 91, f.; and Omichund, 266</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attack the French, 267; or British, 268 ; 273, f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engravers, etc, of copperplates, etc.</td>
<td>79 ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistles, of St. Paul, and the Bhagavadgītā, Sup. 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equinoxes, procession of</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Era, Eras, Malava and Vikrama, etc, 6 : 20; the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gupta, 20; 162; Christian, and the date of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aḥhīras, etc., 36 : 44, 45; of Boes, 172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chālukya-Vikrama</td>
<td>290 &amp; n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erān, pillar inscrip, of Budha-gupta, Boar inscrip. of Toramāṇa</td>
<td>18 : 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>erotic, sculptures, Konarak, etc.</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. America, 217; see</td>
<td>Sup. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erotismus, date</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eryxias, work by Plato, and economics</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe, and Austria's commercial venture, 3;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staples, in India, 15; Ancient, and sway expressions of thought on the material interests. 233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European, Nations, and India, 4; commodities, for trade in India, 7 (or staples) 10 ; 15 ; words, corruptions of, 196 ; Indogist, and the age of the Bhagavadgītā Sup. 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europeans, and Surāj-dānāla</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exogamy, in cult of the River God, Sind 198 ; 203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extracts, from the Uttarapaddhā of Guṇabhadra. 20, f. ; and the Trikoḷadūla Palm-leaf Ma. 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory, Factories, Austrian, in Delagoa Bay, 10; 15; Cannanore, 12; the Nicobars, 13; 61; 66; Kaliot, 64, n.; British, at Onore</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory Records, Old, Notes from</td>
<td>56; 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faizi, poet, and envoy to Khândesh</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faqir’s cave for cholera</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farnán, Mogul, 5; see firmans</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fáruqi dynasty, of Khândesh 113, ff; 141, ff; 178, ff; Fatimah idy dynasty</td>
<td>176, n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fauydar, poushdar, chief police officer, Huggil, 31; or fouzdar</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female, statues, from Besenagar, etc.</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferishta, and Maratha history, 300; see Firishtta</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fife, Mr., and Wm. Bolts, 12; or Fyf,</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finish, to be done for</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firaulas, on Alexander and Porus</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firishta, on the Fáruqi dynasty of Khândesh, 113—116; 118—121; 124; 142—144; 147, n.; 178; 183; 185; see Ferishta</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>firmans, Mughal, to Švétánbara church, 140; see firmán</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firuz Sháh, and Malik Ráya, etc.</td>
<td>113—116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fume, Privileged Company of, 57 &amp; n.; ship-building centre</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flag, see colours</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flavius Seos, house at Halyát</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Float, the late Dr. J. F., and the Málava era, etc., 16, f.; and inscriptions, 18, 20; 223 &amp; n.; 224; and the W. Chálukyas, 285 &amp; n;</td>
<td>287 &amp; n; 289 &amp; n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana, Nicholas, surgeon on the Joseph and Theresa</td>
<td>12, n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foot-prints, and Trivikrama Vishnu worship, 84 &amp; n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Department, from Select Committee. 266, n.</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort St. George, and Austria’s commercial venture</td>
<td>7; 56—59; 61—63; 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort William, and Austria’s commercial venture</td>
<td>31—34; 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox, C.J., Joint Sec. of State</td>
<td>90 &amp; n; 91; 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis, Sir Wm., and Wm. Bolts</td>
<td>30 &amp; n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French, trade, etc., and Austria’s commercial venture, 3; 57; 58; 61; and English, at war, 68; aid the English, 295; attacked by, 267; 269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday’s mosque, Asirgarh</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulta, on the Húgli, and Calcutta refugees</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Für, possibly Porus</td>
<td>245, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadaq inscr.</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gañapati Ráya, his Surwyaya inscr. and coins</td>
<td>241; 243, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gañesha, g., in image, 137; and Darpán</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gañeshá, W. of Mathurá, inscr. at</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ganga, kings, and Orissa</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gañgaiakónja Rájendrá Chojadevá L., and Mandàra</td>
<td>94; 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauges, riv., and the poets of Mullahdám</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbe’s Introduction to the Bhagavadgítid Sup.1—36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garcia, Joan de, Austrian pilot</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garuda, g., image</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sáthá-Saptá-got, the, and Vikrama</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauñiyâ, School of Sanskrit poetry</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaurhí, in Bengal, Omichund’s letter from, 272—274; and chaúthri</td>
<td>274 &amp; n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gautama, quoted the Vaikñána, 84; 104 &amp; n.; and the Nyáya system, and Usánas, 107 &amp; n.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gautama, and Ahaláya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gautami, father of Nahápána</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gautami, Balásirí, m. of Gautamiputra</td>
<td>151 &amp; n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gautamiputra Sátkarí, date, 72; coins of, etc., 149; Lord of the mountain ranges, and the Nasik caves, etc.</td>
<td>151—156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayá, and Nárayanapála, 109; inscr., 110,111; Sun temple</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayá-Peak, Vishnupada</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geldner, on the Rigastra-Saúsvat</td>
<td>280—284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genealogical tree, Gupta, 17; table</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genealogy, of the ēsarnam engravers of the Vijayanagar Empire, 82; of the poets of Mullahdám, 96—98; of Fáruqi dynasty, 183—186; of Indrasená</td>
<td>280; 283; n. 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentoo, Hindu</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuineness of the Vrîttas in Mammat’s Kavyaprakása, an additional proof for</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George, see Fort St. George</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghasanidees, Christians, buildings attributed to them</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghátáka, possibly a Kăhatrapa</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghazni kings, and the Hindu revival in Sind</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghazni Kháán</td>
<td>184; 186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghøyás, sub-division of the Thakurs</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gosha, unit of the Aryan settlement, etc.</td>
<td>35 &amp; n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghønokammhás, and the Kauñůlya</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilpin, astronomer, with Capt. Cook, and Wm. Bolts</td>
<td>90 &amp; n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginnar inscr.</td>
<td>54; 78 &amp; n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goa, and Austria’s commercial venture</td>
<td>11; 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God, and god-heroes of the Mauyras, 51 &amp; n. of the River, 198; of the Waters, Uderolálá, 203, f. 206; in the Bhagavadgítid, Sup. 2, 5, 6, 11 &amp; n. 12, 13, 17, 19—21, 23, f. 26, 28, 32, 34, f.</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goddess, of learning, temple of</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX

Guptas, Imperial, genealogical tree, 17; Early, and Kalkiraja, 19; in inscrip. 161, f.; the later, 168; and Schwan 204
Gupta-Valabhi year, etc. 16; and Saka 17
Gur, sugar 202
Gurjara-Pratiharas and Magadha, 169; and Bihār 111
Gurusvāmi, son of Tyāgarāja, 94; family of, 95, f. Gurudīya, sequence of teachers and pupils 158
Gwalior inscr., of Toramān, 18; of Mihirakula, 219; Museum, and the Narwar inscr. 242, n.

Haidar 'Ali Khan, Nabob, and Wm. Bolts, 12; 89; see Hyde 'Ali 13
Haksiri, Śaktiśā 13
Hāmid Khan 184
Hammām as-Sarakh, building in Moab 174
hammerstone, from Singhbhum 135, f. Hampe, Fampe, Vijayanagar cap 287
Happy Sayings, a work by Akbar 245
Hārāḥā inscr., and Isānavarman 162
Hardy, Ed., and the Bhagavadgītā Sup. 17
Haribhara, copperplates of, 79; Haribhara, inscr. 288
Hārī-Hara, Visnū and Siva Sup. 20
Harrāvardhana, patron of Mayurā 168
Harsacharita, the, and Kālidāsa 246, f
Hartmann, Franz, and the Bhagavadgītā Sup. 1
Hasan Khān, 143; Malik Ḥīlīkhār 186
Hasan Shāh 183, f.
Haebu-l-Mukum 5
Hātiguṇḍā inscr. 72; 209; 222–224
Hatim Tai, and Khwāja Khizr 205
Hatr, al-Hadr, S. of Mosul, vaulted roof building 172
Haurān, Bostra, architecture of 170, f.; 177
Hauke, the ship 15
Hegner, J., and Austria's commercial venture 61–63
Heliohauty in Thascalla, 217; in India, 218, 219 & n.
Hemachandra and the wide sound of E and O, 27, n. 43: 44: 46
Hemp, Indian bhang, and cholera 284 & n.
Hesiod, 8th cen. B.C., author of Works and Days 233
Hillerbrandt, A., and the Kauṭilya 181 & n. 192
Hillborough, Earl of, Sec. of State 64, 65 & n.
Himālaya, Himāgiri, etc., ancient Himavat Sup. 32
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>INDEX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hindi, and the wide sound of E and O, 24; 26; 27, n.: 39, n.: 43-47 & n.: 228, n.: 231 & n.: 232

Hindola Mahal at Mândú, vaulting system of, 168, ff.

Hindu, gods, ornaments, etc. in Hindola Mahal, 176; remains, and mosques, 177; revival, in Sind, 203; calendar, and Mai Pir, 208; customs, in temples etc. 211, f.; and Buddhist ornaments, etc. 212-217; temple, sites. 220, n.; theatre, 223; or Gentoo, 269; religion, and Kṛishṇa .......... Sup. 10

Hindu Economics, the Ancient, and Vṛttādī 233, ff.; 256, ff.; 275, ff.

Hinduism, and Jainism, 146; in Sind, 197, f.; 205; and Kṛishṇa .......... Sup. 11

Hindus, or Mārāthās, 2; and Māndesh, 118; in Sind, 197-205; 207; and tree worship, 214; 220, n.

Hindustan, and Akbar .......... 143

Hipparge in Bijapur dist., 153; and Hippokou-va, cap. of K. Paleokouros, not definitely identified .......... 151; 153

Airāṣya, gold coin, as a tax .......... 50, 51

Hiri-Chavati, Kāluśika inscr. at .......... 267

History, of the Maratha People, Book-Notice, .......... 299, f.

History, Early, of Indian Philosophy, a Contribution towards .......... 101, ff.

History, S. Indian, Beginnings of, Book-Notice. 263

History, political, of the Dakkan, of the Sā távahan period .......... 69, ff.; 149, ff.

History, of early Buddhism .......... 84

Hitt, bitumen wells of .......... 244

Hüen Tsang, on Mīhirakula, 18; date, 19;

Yuan Chwang, 150, n.; and Sind .......... 198; 204, n.

Hobson-Johnson, in Mesopotamia, spread of .......... 196; 244

Hoernle, Dr., and the Guptas, 161; 163 & n.—165

Holland, High and Mighty United States of .......... 34

Holland, John, Lord Mayor of Madras .......... 59

Holtzmann, and the Bhagavadgītā, Sup. 1 & n.— 4; 10, 11; 29, n.; 32, n.; 33, n.

Holwell, J. Z., hero of the Blackhole of Calcutta .......... 266

Home of Kālidāsa .......... 264 & n.

Hopkins, E. W., and the Bhagavadgītā, Sup. 1-6, n.: 8, & n.: 10, n.; 11, n.: 15, n.; 18, 19, n.; 21; 24, 28, n.; 30, n.

Hornblende-schist, rock, implements of .......... 135

Hornby, Wm., E. I. Co's servant, and Wm. Bolta 7

Hot Hākim, Ahmed Pir, Pir of the Jackals .......... 207

Houglé, tn. Hūggl .......... 31

Housa-kūṇi, q. to Sāmakṣa-vara .......... 289

Housaleswar, temple .......... 213

Hughes, Sir Ed., Commander, E. Indies, and Austria's commercial venture, 57 & n.—59; 63, 64

Hūggl, riv., and tn., and Austria's commercial venture, 29, f.; (Houglé) .......... 31; 285, f.

Hūkumādī, inscr. .......... 290

Hūkumādī, inscr. .......... 289

Hützsch, Dr., and the Tambapasi riv. 49; and the word dipta, etc. .......... 56

Humāyūn, emp., and Mandasor, etc. .......... 123


Hūpa, conqueror, Mīhirakula; empire, in Oxus Basin .......... 19

Hūpas, and the Guptas, etc. .......... 17

Hunavalli, inscr. .......... 287

Husain Nizām Shāh I .......... 146; 148

Hūshāng, governor of Māndū .......... 177

Hūvinaḥadagalli, inscr. .......... 290

Hydaspe, and Alexander .......... 245


Hyperrgamy, and the Daryāpanthis, 203; and the Thakurs .......... 208

Ibā, Ambuki? riv. .......... 74 & n.

Iblis, the Devil .......... 205

Ibn-al-Athir historian .......... 174

Ibn-Tūlūn, mosque in Cairo .......... 175

Ibn Wahshiyah, author of Nebatun Agri- culture .......... 235

Ibrāhīm 'Adil Shāh II, of Bijāpur .......... 148; 178

Identification of some of the Post-Andhra- bhūrya Rulers of the Punician list .......... 298

Identification of the poets of Mūlāndram and the Sāvasa writers of the Vijnaya- gara kings, 98, 99; of Kṛishṇa-Vishnu, with Brahmin .......... Sup. 19

Idol, temple, and Akbar, 185; god idols of the Mauryas .......... 51 & n.

Ikshvāku, sage, and the Yoga teaching Sup. 32

Ikshvāku, dy., and the Sāvatvāhana dy. .......... 156

Ilās, Elījah .......... 206

Imād Shāhī, dy. .......... 142

image, images, Trimūrti, in Peshawar Muse- um, 136, f.; at Sārāvā, 161, f.; in Hindola Mahal, Māndū, 176; fragments, at Masīhā, 177; of Buddha, in Hindu temple, 217, f.; of Sun god .......... 219 & n.

Imām, the, and the mahādāva .......... 175

Imperial Majesties of Austria .......... 1: 3—9;

11, f.: 14, f.: 32—34
INDEX

implements, stone, from Singhbhum ... 135
Irourquis, Lakhmis k., and the Romans ... 177
inskii, (Arab maskii), to go out, etc., Hobson-Jobson ... 196
incarnation of the River God, in Sind, 198, f.; of Uderolâl ... 203
India, and Austria's commercial venture, 1, f.; 29, f.; 37, f.; 85, f.; visited by Song Yun and Cosmas, 19; Abhrâ migration into, 35, f.; & Ceylon, 48; changes, in level of land and sea, 49; and the Jewish calendar, 112; invaded by Taimûr, 115; and Mîhirakule, 163; and the vaulting system, 169; and magic, 197; and Yuan Chwang, 209; and temple sculpture, 211, f.; other sculptures, 293; and women's orthodox xy, 159, n.; and tradition of sciences, 191, n., 192; and literary forgeries. 194; and sun worship, 218; medieval, coins of, 241 n.; the Bhadrâma, and Vârttika, 235: 239: 256, f.; and King "Four," (Alexander), 245, f.; and Kâlidâsa, 264; and Ormehund, 269: 272, n.; and the British, 274; and Vinaspâra, 298; and religious system, 222; Central, and Gautamiputra, 149, 151; North, and the Kushânas, 153; South, or Daksinâpâta, 71, 72; and Gautamiputra, 151: 154; West, and the Kâshârakas, 73; Kings of, 153; and the Śâtâvâhana dyn., 156; and Arjun, 197; and the Bhagavadgîthâ, Sup. 1 & n., 2: 7: 9: 11: 13-16; and Christ Sup. 16; 18; North and South ... Sup. 19
Indian Philosophy, A Contribution towards the Early History of ... 101, f.
Indian, campaign of Alexander, 245; History, see Beginnings of, 253; calendar, 254, 255 & n.; goods, in Bengal, 266; hemp, or dhãng, 284 & n.; bull, Sârnâth Pillar, 294; other sculptures, 295; South, inscript. and Vârttika, 257; Spiritual life, and the Bhagavadgîthâ, Sup. 2; mysticism, Sup. 7; Sages and Christianity, Sup. 13; people and renunciation, etc. Sup. 25; 28; 29
Indians, ancient, and guns, 105, n.; and the Bhagavadgîthâ, Sup. 4; and the Greeks, Sup. 16; and Krishnâ ... Sup. 20
Indies, E., and Austria's commercial venture, ... 30; 85; 88; 89
individual soul, see soul ... Sup. 25; 37, 28
Indo-Bactrian, rulers of the Panjab ... 263
Indologists, European, and the age of the Bhagavadgîthâ ... Sup. 29
Indra, g., Jupiter Phivus, image, 218; Govinda, and Krishnâ ... Sup. 10
Indraloka, and Maudgalya ... 281
Indrasena ... 280, f.
Indus, riv., called the sea, 197; and Uderolâl, etc. ... 199; 204; 206-208
industries, sciences, and Vârttika ... 102-104; 109
influence, Buddhist, in the Son temple, Konarak, 269; Buddhist, and Christian, in the Bhagavadgîthâ ... Sup. 28
Inscriptions, the Hâthigumphâ ... 223
Inscriptions, Âsôka, Notes on ... 297
Inscriptions, Amâravati-stâpa, 155; Andhrâ, 71; Anâgandâ, etc., 287 & n.; Arabic, 174: 176 & n.; Âsôka, (edicts 48, 49: 71); 51-53; 56; 138; 297; Bâdami, 70; Belgaum, 287 & n.; Bhagapur grant, 109; 111; Bhitari seal, 161-166; Bihâr image, 169 & n.;-111; Bodh Gaya, 110, f.; Buddha-gupta, etc. 16 & n.; 18 & n.; 50; Chândâlyuka (W.), 285-290; Christian, in Syria, 172; on coins, 75; 241, f.; Copper-plate, 79-81; 162; 165; 210-212; 220; 242; of Darius, 138; Eran stone pillar, 18; 165, f.; Gîzmar, 54; 78 & n.; Greek, 75; 172; Gumeriya, 110; Gupta, etc., 19, f.; 50-57; referring to Gupta history, 101-167; Gwalior, 18; 219; 242, n.; Harâna, 162; Hâthigumphâ, 72; 209; 222, f.; Junâgâdh, 150 & n.; 151 & n.; 154, f.; 162, n.; 164; Junnar Cave, 70; 73; 74; 78; Kâhâvâla pillar, 20; Kalsi, 53; Kâñhâeri, 70, 76; 151; 155; Kûlê, 70; 73 & n.; 74; Kâhâvâla, etc., 216; Kôja-kâni, 288, 289 & n.; Kôsarâk, 216 & n.; Krishnâ, 71, 72, n.; Kâshâraka, 70-73, 75; Mâgadha, 109, f.; Mandasore, etc., 16 & n.; 60; 163; Mûndâ, 177; Nahâpâna, 72; 74; 75; Nânpâghâttâ, 71, n.; 72, n.; Nasik, 74, 75 & n.; 149-166; Nebrasian, 169-171; Pala, 156; of Râjârajâ I, etc., 99; Râtaul plate, 243; Sande, 288; Sâranâthâ, 298 & n.; Sârnâth, etc. 16 & n.; 17, 161-167; Sogal, 287; Sâtakarni, 71 & n., 72 & n.; Stone, Bhitari, 161-166; Eran, 118; 165, f.; of Narwar Rajput, 241-244; Sûpa, Amârâvati, 155; Jagayyapeta, 156; Sûraehi, 72; in Syria, 172; Temple, Bhimpur, 242; Khajûrâho, 137; Sun, 219, n.; Talakumudry, 257, n.; Talgund, 273; Taxila Scroll, 76; Vishnupâda, 110; Wadageri, etc., 290; on Dekkan history, 70-78 & n.; referring to Shiva ... 300
intercourse, with prostitutes ... 189
interests, material, stray expressions of thought on, in ancient Europe, 233; in the ancient East ... 234, f.
invasion, Huns, of the Gupta empire, 17; of India, by Taimûr, 115; of Khândesh, 118, ff.; of Mahmûd of Ghâzni ... 206
Irak, and the Abbasid Caliphs ... 234
iron, trade in ... 89; 91
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index Entry</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ísánavarmman, and Skandagupta</td>
<td>163 ; 166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam, in Syria, 172 ; 174 ; and the mihrob, 175 ; and Akbar, 185 ; in Sind</td>
<td>198 ; 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isle of France, and Wm. Bolts</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ismā’il Shih, k.</td>
<td>146, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ísvara, the sun, 137 ; or Vibhava, Kṛṣṇa</td>
<td>Sup. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ísvaradatta, coins of</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ísvarasena, Ābhira k.</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Íthāsa-Vedā, and the Arthādāstra</td>
<td>236 &amp; n ; 237 ; 239, n ;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jabāla, story of</td>
<td>186, n ; 207, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jackals, and Ahmed Pir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jagadeksamalla, Jayasimha II, W. Chālukya k.</td>
<td>285 ; 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jagayyapeta, stūpa inscpr.</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahāṅgir, Sulpān Salim</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahāṅgir, Nasir Khān of Khāndesh</td>
<td>185, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaimini, and the Mināvatā Sūtra</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaina, authorities, and Gupta dates, etc., 18 ; and Mihirakula, 19 ; literature, 20, 21, n. ; Matha, at Kolhapur, Kannada MSS. from, 21, n ; origin of the Khāpiṇḍagiri caves, 209 ; and Hindu, and Buddhist, ornaments in temples, 216 ; works and economics</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaina, and ahimāsā, 180, n. ; and the term sūtra</td>
<td>190, n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jainism, Indian and European philosophical systems, and Hinduism, 140 ; in the Kumārī Hills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaipur, and the Mālavas</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jajepella or Jayaṇavāla dynasty</td>
<td>241, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janam-bakti, Story of Uderolāl and the Daryāpanthīs</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janmōjayā Mahābhāva Gupta, Somavānā k, 210 ; copper-plate of</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasavanta Sonigarō, Song of</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason, High Priest, and the Nebatans</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaṅgākhaśita Dichita, poet, of Muljāndram</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayādāman</td>
<td>154, n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayādiyā, and the word ghosha</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayanta, g., in the Arthādāstra</td>
<td>51, n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayasimha II, W. Chālukya k., 285 ; Jagadikamalla, 288, f. ; III</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jebel Ḥaurān, S.E. of Damascus, Nebatian tombs</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jemo Bajati, etc., near Berhampur, and the Sun-god</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jering, (Patāni) and tin ṗitīs</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerusalem, the el-Aksa mosque</td>
<td>178, n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus Christ</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish, calendar, and India</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews, and the crocodile</td>
<td>197 &amp; n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jhai-jo-Goth, tn., in Sind, and Uderolāl, 201,</td>
<td>f ; 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jhajakṣara, and the Kaṇyāprakāṣā</td>
<td>23 &amp; n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jhari, timāhil, waterpot</td>
<td>200 ; 202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jāṅkhand, modern Chūtiya Nāgpūr, and Adil Khān II of Khāndesh</td>
<td>188 ; 186, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jhimpir, Hindu resort in Sind</td>
<td>204 &amp; n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinaprabhasū, and Śāṭavāhana</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinasena, and the Mgapattāna, 17 ; and Mihira-kula, etc.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jīnāmārāga, Brahmanical philosophy</td>
<td>108, Sup. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jūnā-Yoga</td>
<td>23, Sup. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jodhpur, marriage custom</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jogāe bhi, Nāsik dist, and of Nāhāpāna's coins</td>
<td>74, f ; 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jogimārā cave, Ramgarh Hill, and samāja</td>
<td>222, n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph, emp. of Austria, 6 ; 59 ; (II)</td>
<td>63, n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph and Thierry, or Guiseppe, Austrian ship, 3 : 4 ; 7 ; 10—14 ; 22 ; formerly Earl of Lincoln</td>
<td>30, f ; 57 ; 67, f ; 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jöt, lamp of Uderolāl</td>
<td>200 &amp; n ; 202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julfa, near Isphahan, 61, n. ; 68, n. ; dialect</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julians, Church of, at Umm-al-Jamal</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junāgaḍh inscr., 150 &amp; n. ; 151 ; 154—156</td>
<td>162, n. ; 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junnar ; cave inscr., 70 ; 73, f. ; tn, Maghal head-quarters</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jupiter, Pluvius, Indra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabīr Khān of Khāndesh</td>
<td>179, f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kādhāng (Malay) Ceylanus Indicus, dōl plant</td>
<td>1, n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kachchha, and Rudradāman</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kādambarti, a work by Bāla</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kādaravjī, or Kādārojī, Chālukya cap. 289 ; inscr.</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kadphises I. Kujula-Kadphises, and Naha pānā, 76, f ; II, his gold coinage, etc.</td>
<td>76, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kafrī, Caffree, native of S. Africa</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kahhum pillar inscr.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaisar, emp. of Byzantium</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalachouryas, overthrew the Chālukyas</td>
<td>286, n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalhaṇa</td>
<td>18 ; 167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalidāsā, Notes on</td>
<td>246, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalidāsā, home of</td>
<td>264 &amp; n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalidāsā, and the Huns, 17 ; 167 ; and Vātsalya, date, 195 ; and the Bhagavadgīthā, Sup. 30 ; and the word Himālaya</td>
<td>Sup. 32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kašyapa .................................................. 216
Katak, and the Somavānsi kings, 210; Chand- 
war, 210, n.; caves .................................... 216
Katchall, Cachoule, a Nicobar island ........ 13
Kathārasitaśāgara, a work by Somadeva, men-
tions Śātavāhana ....................................... 69
Kaṭhiāwar, ancient Suraṇṭa, Suraṇṭa, 100; 
and the second Kaṭhatrapa dyn., etc., 153; 
156; and Sind ......................................... 198
Kātyāyana, and the word mahādāiri, 36; date, 
and Pāṇini .............................................. 138 & n.
Kauṭilya, the, on the Authenticity of, 157, ff.; ........................................ 187, fl.
Kauṭilya, the, and Vārttī, 235 & n.— 238 &
n., 239, n.; 240 & n.; 257
Kauṭilya, Chāṇakya, author of the Arthāśāstra, 
48: 50—52; and the Nandās, 55; Vīśu-
gupta, 101 & n.—104 & n.; 106 & n.—109; 
see Kauṭilya .............................................. 157, ff.
Kauṭilya, the, ............................................ 101—103, n.
Kāveri, Karabaṃga, riv. ................................ 74 & n.
Kavi-Dīpṇa, Dīpṇa-kavi .................................. 99
Kavimalla, Anapāya, court poet, defeated by 
Sōṇaśri .................................................... 95: 100
Kaviprabhu, poet ........................................ 98
kṛtya, of Rāma ........................................... 96
Kāvyā Uṣanas, Uṣanas or Śūkra ................ 105
Kṛṣṇaprabāva, a work by Mammaṭa, additional 
proof of the genuineness of the Vṛtīs on 
it .......................................................... 23
Kedergere, Khusir, tn., and Austria’s commer-
cial venture ............................................ 29; 31
Kelantan, tn., and value of tin pittis .......... 28
kellak, (Ar. kolek), large skin raft, Hobsa-
jonen ....................................................... 244
Kembhāvi, inscrip. ..................................... 289, n.
Keropoulos, Keralaputra, k. ....................... 181
Kēṣari, dyn., Cæsars of Orysa, 210; and the 
lion symbol ............................................. 211 & n.; 213
Kēṣava, a name of Kṛṣṇa ............................ Sup. 10, n.
Kēṣava Sena, Edilpur grant of, 210; copper-
plate ...................................................... 220
Kēśl, charioteer of Muditalai, 780; or Ke-
šini ........................................................ 283
Kētū, planet .............................................. 112
Khaṭṭāhān, author of the Muntakabb-al-Lubūd. 
183
Khaṭharāta or Khaṭharāta, family name of 
Nahapāṇa ................................................ 73
Khajurhā, near Bundelkhand, Trimurti image 
from ...................................................... 137 & n.; 138
Khajuraho, group of temples ..................... 213
Khaliﬁate, mosque of the time ................... 175
Khaliﬁ Walid, and the mīhrāb ................. 175
Khaṇḍagiri, Jaina caves ............................. 209; 211; 214; 216
Khánjahan, Fārūqi, officer under Muhammad bin Tughlaq of Delhi, and ancestor of the Fārūqi dynasty, 113; or Khvaja Jahān, 114; 116; 143
Khân Mthankân, officer, 148; 178, f.
Khāfa Úrtūma, mosque, Baghdad, 176, f.
Khānān, 175, f.
Kharhâne, Kār, or Kusair Kharâneh, 173, f.; 177
Khârove, k., and the Hâthigumpha inscriptions, 209; 210 & n.; 222-224
Khârshthi, inscriptions on Nahapana’s coins, 75; 77; on Chashtana’s, 163
Khijiri, Kodgree, at Hûgu mouth, 29; 31
Kullūta, Muhammadan term, and hirânya, 50
Khozan, car festival, 209
Khuurav, Sultan, son of Jahângir, 181
Khubab, recited, in name of Nasir Khan, 117; 121; and of Akbar, 141
Khvaja Jahân, and Khândesh, 114
Khvaja Khîz, cult in Sind, 198; vihar, 204, f.; and Mâkârl, Elîjah, etc., 206, f.
Kishârnâ, the late Prof., and the W. Châlukyas, 234 & n.; and the Bhagavatâgita, Sup. 12
Killing, slaughter, and meat eating, 189, n.; 221
Kiltipatrick, Major, J., Bengal C., 286
King, Mr., E. I. Co.’s servant, 84
Kings, of Nahapana, extent of, 75, f.
Kings, Vijayanagara, and their copperplate engravings, 79, ff.; science of, etc., in the Arthasastra, 159; 187; 193
Kirtivarman III, Bâdami Chalukya k., 236
Kûbâb-al-Aghâhîn, and buildings in Kusair Amrâh, 174
Kucho-lo, co., and Kukura, 150, n.; knowledge, divisions of, 256, f.; or learning, 239, n.; Kodakani inscriptions, 298
Kollâtirî, Kollâtând or Colastria, in N. Malabar, now Cherakkal, 9, n.
Kolâpur, and Hippou Kouara, coins from, 153
Koarâk, Sun temple, alleged Buddhist influence in, 209, f.
Konkan, and the Dakan, 117
Konon, the, and Ta’bîb-i-ibn, 200
Korkai, on the Tamraparni river, ancient port for gamh trade, 48; early settlement of civilised man, 49
Krishna, g., the Child, 35; or Dâmodara, 84; Govinda, the Cowherd, 84; cult, mentioned by Megasthenes, 55, n.; Sup. 18; and the Dâyâpanthi religion, 204; and Sampadanis, 240; in the Bhagavadgîta, Sup. 2, ff.
Krishnâ, dr. of Drupada, or Indrawân, 290
Krishnâ, Andhra k.
Krishnâ II, Râshtrakûta k.
Krishnâdeva-râya, copperplates of, 79, f.

Krishnaism, and Christianity, Sup. 15; 16; 18, n.
Krîhsnâ, Šâtakarna, 148
Krîshnârâjâ III, Râshtrakûta k.
Krîyâsakti, Paudity, family guru of Vijayanagara kings, 98
Kaharârâ, (and Kahharâ) family name of Nahapana, 73; dyn., and the Śâtvârâhânas, 72; and Gautâmiputra Šâtakarna, destruction of, 153
Kaharâpa, title of, Châshmâna, etc., 153
Kaharâpa, Persian title, 7
Kahatriyas, and dâsanâtî, 240; or Kahatrîyas, and Spiritual life in India, etc., Sup. 9; 12; 14; Sages, and yoga teaching, Sup. 33
Kṣetika, acquisition, and chemistike, 233
Kubera, lord of wealth, 253
Kulc, character in inscriptions, 176 & n.
Kûjula Kadphises, Kadphises I, 76
Kukura, probably Gujarât, 150 & n.; 154
Kula-khârapatânâm, etc., and port, significant grit-stone finds near, 49
KumârÂgupta I, date, 17; 163, f.; II, inscriptions of, etc., 20; 161-167, III, 17; 167
Kundrasambhava, a work by Kâlidâsa, 18
Kunârdhâ, contractor, 196
Kuru-field, modern Delhi, Sup. 20 & n.
Kurus, and Krishna, Sup. 10; 11
Kus, and the last Kusio inscriptions, 176, n.
Kusair al-Hallâbât, ruins, 170; mosque, 175
Kusair ‘Amrâh, E. of Jorda, probably Umâyad palace, 174; 177
Kusair Kharâneh, Kharâneh, 173
Kusqâ, Kusqas, possibly coins from Kusqâna, 74; 76, f.
Kushâna, dyn., and currency, 76
Kut-Gâpân, Tak Eivan, building, 173

Ladup, Nadup, 130
Lakhmid, dyn., 177
Lakshmi, image, 137; 216; vegetarian goddess, 208
Lakshminâth Sinâi, Luximistant Sinoy, agent for Wm. Bolts, 13; 15
Lalitâditya, and the Sun temple, Martand, 218, n.
Lâl Sahib, 200; Lâl Udero Skin, holy leader, 202; Lâl Wadero, names of Uderolâ, 203
Lassen, on Krishna, Sup. 11; 13, n.; 14, n.; 18; 31
Lât Masjid, Dhâr, 177
Lauria Anaranj, Lauria Nandangar, Asêkan pillars, 291; 293
INDEX

Law, Jean, French chief, Kasimbázár
Law-code, of Manu, 238; of Apastamba
Lawes, (Plato) and economics
learning, goddess of, 221; divisions of, 239; n.
knowledge
legend, of Krishna and Indra, Sup. 9; of
Buddha, Sup. 10; Mahabhára; of, Bhakti
and Christianity
Lehnhorn, and Wm. Bolts
Leopold, Austrian ship
letter, Armenian, of Ormichund
Lewis, E. I. Co.'s agent, and Wm. Bolts
lighting, in vaulted roofs
limes, Roman
Lindeman, Julius, Austrian seaman
lion, symbol, of Káši kings
kipi, despatch, etc.
literature, Arabic, Persian, and Indian
Sanskrit, and economics
Lokáyata, philosophy
London and Vienna, courts of; see St. James
Lorinser, and Christianity, the Bhágavadgíthá
Low countries, and Austria's commercial
venture
Lucius, on coins

Macey, Lieut., of Chandernagore, and Austria's
commercial venture, 57; or Mace 58–60; 63, f.
Macha, range, unidentified
Machi, in Siestan, vaulted roofed palace ruins
Madagascar, and E. I. Co.'s slaves
Madakara, or Mattamy, 12; or Madacacuna, 13;
fort near Balisapatam
Mathia, vil. near Bandelkhand, Vishnú Tri-
múrti from
Madhusúdana, g.
Madhyadesa, and the Pándavas
Madír, g., in the Arthádástra
Madonna, Bibi Dost
Madras, and Austria's commercial venture,
32, f.; 57–67
Madura, Madoura
Mofoome, riv., E. Africa
Magadha, Prathíhára occupation of
Magadha, and the Guptas, 162, 166; 189; and
the Nandas, 224; and Vinashpári
Mágha, and Kauśílya

magic, in India
Mahabhára; the, and animal sacrifices, 189, n.
and the crocodile, 197, f.; and Váritá, 238;
and the name Indrasená, 281–284; and
the Bhágavadgíthá, Sup. 1 & n., 2: 4: 5 n.,
6, n.; 8–13, n.; 15, & n.; 18–20; 28–32 & n.
Mahásíva, Adiparvá, and Nágas
Mahábháshya, of Patánjali, and the word
gosha, 35 & n.; 36 & n.; 195; and Krishna,
Sup. 12 & n.; date
Mahádeva, Trimúrti
Mahádevi, Anantadevi
Mahaíl (Ar. mahayalah) river sailing boat,
Hobson-Jobson
Mahá-kahatrapa, title of Náháná, 74; of
Chashána, etc.
Mahárájásíriá, title of Purá Gupta
Maháráshtra, and the Sárábháya-sáká, etc., 70;
73; and Gautamiputra Sátakarí, etc., 149
182: 184; and the Ábráás
Maháräj, and the wide sound of E and O, 226, n.
Mahásíva Gupta or Yáyáti Káši, Soma-
vanála k.
mahádátri, meaning of
Mahendrás, Mahinda, the Eastern gatég
Mahendrápalá, Guneriya inscr., of
Mahésvará, or Siva images
Mahipálá I. and Biháar
Máháshmati, cap. of Añepá
Mahmúd III., of Gujarát, 124; and Khándesh 141
Mahomed of Ghazná, and Sind
203: 208
Mahomedáns, Panjabí, and the Indus
197; and Uderollá
199; 201; 203
maiden, seduction of
Mái Pír, Virgin
207, f.
Makara, Macara, sea-monster, and Hinduism
198: 214
Makaradhvaja of Sind, and Mayúradhvaja of
Gujarat
198
makoo, contraction of Ar. mÍ yakbÍ, there is
none; Hobson-Jobson
196
Makrúzi, and the introduction of the mårád
175
Malabar, and Austria's commercial venture
14: 91, f.
Málava, and Vikrama, era
Málavas, and Málayás, 76 & n.; and Usáva-
dáta
76
Malay currency in Trengganu
28
Malaya, southern part of W. Ghátá
151; 253
Málayás, Málavas and UthamahabÁrtras
76 & n.
Malaya Varma Deva, Rajput k. of Narwar,
421; a Pratháhára
242, n.
Málígarh, fort, and Akbar
181
Malik 'Ainá, of Khándesh, Ádil Mán II
118
Malik Rája, reputed founder of Khándesh, 113;
or Rája Ahmad
114, f.*; 182; 185, f.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>Mallanagha, personal name of Vatsayana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Mallikarjuna, copper-plates of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Mallikarjunabhaṭa, poet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. 30</td>
<td>Mallinatha, and the Bhagavadgītā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Mālā, and Bhūmikās, 73; and Khandesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>115-118; 121; 123; and Akbar, 124; 143-146; 148; 180; or Akaravanti, 169; and the 2nd Kshatrapa dynasty, 153; and the Śāñkarāja, 72; 154; and Bhadgupta, 162; E., and the Abhāra dynasty, etc., 156; W.; and Kālidāsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264, n.</td>
<td>Mānapola, dist., Māval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Mambaras, Nambanus, 77; or Nahapāna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Mammatā’s Kṛṣṇapradāsa, an additional proof of the genuineness of the Vṛtta on it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>mandrat (Ar.) minaret, and marionette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>Manasa, serpent goddess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. 32</td>
<td>Māravaka Dharmaśūtra, and the Bhagavadgītā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Mārvah, School of Philosophy, or Mārvah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102, 107, 109</td>
<td>Manavalli, inscrip.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Mandara, vi, and Mullahram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Mandasore, inscrip. and Dr. Fleet, 16; 20; 163; 73, n.; 173; and Nahapāna’s coins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Daśapura, 73, n.; 173; and Nahapāna’s coins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169, ff.</td>
<td>Mārū, the vaulting system of the Hindola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Mahal at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15, 91</td>
<td>Mārū, and Akbar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Mangalore, and Austria’s commercial venture, 12 &amp; n.; 13; or Mangulore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Mānjarī, manjee, master of native boat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Manu, and the Sākhyā and Yoga systems, 109; and Kautilya, 159, n.; and Vārttā, 227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>&amp; n.; code and Kautilya, 238; and the Bhagavadgītā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. 32</td>
<td>Manucci, and the Šāravat of Khvaja Khizr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>MSS., Kannada, 21, n.; Trilokasāra Palmleaf, extract from, 22; Mārvadī, etc., and the wide sound of Ê and O, 24, f.; 44-47; 225, n.; 229, n.; 232; and Vārttā, 241; 257; 258—263; 275-279; see Orme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265, n.</td>
<td>Manuvīra, the, and the Mahābhārata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. 32</td>
<td>Marakh, k. of Tatta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198, 201</td>
<td>Marakh Wah, canal, in Sind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Maratha People, a History of, Book-Notice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>Mārāṭhās, Hindus, and Wm. Bolts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 &amp; n.</td>
<td>Markāṭhī, and the wide sound of E and O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Mārvadī, MSS., and the wide sound of E &amp; O, 24, f.; 44-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Maria Theresa, and Austria’s commercial venture, 57, n.; 58, f.; 63, n.; death of marionette, (Ar. mandrat), minaret, Hobson-Jobson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>marriage, customs of Thakurs of Sind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Marselles, and Wm. Bolts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Martand, Kashmir, Sun temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225-233</td>
<td>Marwari, the wide sound of E and O in it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>māshi, Ar., to go, and imāshi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Mashta, frontier fort, Hauran dist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>material, of Asokan pillars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>material interests, stray expressions of thought on, in Ancient Europe, 233; in the Ancient East, 234, f.; or concerns, 236, ff.; and the Chakdine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Māth inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>Mathurā museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>mati, earthen pot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Muttam, for Madakara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. 24—27</td>
<td>matter, the theory of, the Bhagavadgītā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281, ff.</td>
<td>Mauryas, their god-idoles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Māvaj, Māvala, dist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Max Müller, and the Bhagavadgītā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. 13</td>
<td>Māyā, m. of Buddha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. 3; 7</td>
<td>Māyā, the Cosmic Illusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>má yakām, Ar., it is becoming nothing, and mākoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167, f.</td>
<td>Mayura, contemporary and rival of Bāna-bhaṭṭa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>McKennie, Capt. J., 1; or McKenny, and Wm. Bolts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>meat-eating, 189, n.; and samāduja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Mecca, and al-Walid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Medinah, mosque, and the miḥrāb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Meher pillar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251, ff.</td>
<td>Megasthenes, on Chandragupta, 53; 55, n.; and the Andhras, 70; and Kitāb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Memon, in Sind, Ghūrā centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>memorials, in Austria’s commercial venture 61—66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Menander, coins of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Mendeṣ, Manoel, Austrian quartermaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Merjanīyeh mosque, date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>Mera, from Sind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234, n.</td>
<td>Meru, mt., 168; and Maudgalya, 281; and Svetadvipa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>Mesopotamia, the spread of Hobson-Jobson in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Mesopotamian method of vault-building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233, unnatural exchange</td>
<td>metobleite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Mettaippādi, Sansk. Talpagiri, an agrahāra, N. Arcot dist.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX

Mexico, and the Sun-god... 217
Michell, Peter, E. I. Co.'s servant 85
migration, Áhira, into India 35, f.
Mihirakula, and the Gupta Era, New Light on 16, f.
Mihirakula, defeated, 163 & n.; and early hololatry 219
mirādā, the, date of introduction 175
Mikail, Archangel, and Khwāja Khizr 206
Mīmāṃsā, system of philosophy, 106; 109; 257; and the Vedanta. Sup. 6 & n., 7 & n., 8; 34
Mīmāṃsā Saîtras 157
Mīmāṃsāsa, two, 101; 106, f.
minbar, in mosque, and carved character 176, n.
Minnāhu-d-din, historian, and Chāhāda Achāri 243
Minnagara, cap. of Nahapana's kingdom, 77; several places of the name, identification of 78
mirādā, hereditary position 98
Mir Jāfīr, Nawāb Nāzim, 267, n.; 268 & n.; and Omichund, 269; 273; Meer Jaffier... 270; 274
Mir Kāsīm, son-in-law of Mir Jāfīr 268 & n.
Mir Khudāyār Khān Lātí, Yar Lutf Khān 267 & n.
Mirzās, overran Ghondesh 142
Mirza Saḥib, and Ta'lib-i-ibn Ustad 206
Mīchchhāra, the, Abharas 35, f.
Moāb, the steppe of Balq 173, f.
Modoura, Madura 151
Moṣul, Empire, 44; rule, in the Panjab 203
Moṣula, of Surat and Wm. Bots, and the E. I. Co. 2, 3, 5
Monastery of St. George, in Sameh 172; monasteries, in Orissa 209
money-lending, 233; and Vārītā (money) 234; & c. 237, f.
monks, Buddhist, and Ushavadāta 74-76
monotheistic religion, established by Krishṇa, Sup. 9; II; 16; or monoteism, Sup. 17; 21
monotheists, the, Dārjāpaṇthiṣ 292; 294
Moon-god, image 218
Moors, and Khwāja Khizr 206
Morvi, copper-plate 16, f.
Moslem, cult, in Sind 204, f.
Mosques, at Kusair al-Hallabād, Medina, first Egyptian, Ibn-Tūlūn, (Cairo), Khan Ortha, etc., 175 & n.; Merjaniyeh, Aleppo, al-Akṣa (Jerusalem) as-Saḥīb Talāṭi, 178 & n.; Dīlāwār Khān, Laṭ Masjid at Dhar, 177; Asirgarh, 185; of Khwāja Khizr... 206
Mount, Abu, 163; Meru 168; 281; Sup. 15
Mountain ranges, in dominions of Gautamiputra 151
Mrīgāka, deer symbol 137
Mubārak, of Ghondesh, 123, f.; II, and Akbar... 144
Mubārak Khān, of Ghondesh, 118; I... 185, f.
Mubārak Shāh, of Ghondesh, and Akbar, 141; 182; II... 183-186
Mubārak'uddaula, Nawāb Nāzim of Bengāl. 29, n.
Mudgagiri, Mungir, and Nāṛṇyaṇāpaṇa 109; 111
Mudgala, rājā of N. Pañhāla dyn., or a rājā 280; 282-284
Mudgaliṇē, wife of Mudgala, and Indrasena... 280, 282
Mudrārākṣa, the, and Kauṭilya, 158, n.; or Cāṇakya 190, n
Mughal, emperors, their firmans, etc., to Śvētāmbara Church, 140; empire, 143; and the Dakan... 148, f.
Mughals, and the Dakan 178, f.
Muḥammad I., Bahmani, 114, f.; II, 114; 143; and Akbar 144
Muḥammad I., of Ghondesh 122
Muḥammad bin Tughlaq, of Delhi, 113-115; tomb 176
Muḥammad Quli Qoṣb Shāh of Golconda 178
Muḥammad Shāh I., Muḥammad I. of Gujrat 185, f.
Muḥammad Shāh II., of Ghondesh, 141, f.; 184-186
Muhammadan, architecture, of the Haurān 170; 175, f.; period, of Maratha history 300
Muhammadans, the, Umayyāda, 174; and Māndū 177
Munjacs, co., and Gautamputtra 150 & n.
Mūlaṣṭhān, Multān 218
Mullandāram, poets of, and the dāsana writers of the Vijayavargavera dynasty, 79; and Māndāra, 94; 97, f.; or Pradhādēvarāyaparam. 99, f.
Mullens, J., Austrian sailor and Wm. Bots 61
Multān, and Sufi learning, 205; or Multānsh, and Sun worship 218
Munger, Mudgagiri 109; 111
Muntakhab-al-Lubāb, the, and the Fārūq 183
Murād Shāh, 148; 179; death of 180
Muraṣjāmura copper plate of Yāyāti Kesarī 211
Muriya, Chandragupta 223
Murshidābād, and Wm. Watts, etc. (1757) 265 & n.—270; 273, f.
Murtazahsa, Nasīm Shāh I., of Aṣhmadnagar 142-146
Museum, Indian, 294; Mathurā, Victoria and Albert 296
Muishta'qi, nom-de-piama of Ta'lib-i-ibn Ustad 205
Muslim, tradition, of Alexander 145 (Arabic). 246
Muslims, and Khwāja Khizr 204; and Hindus 205; 207
Muttagadār inscr. 209, n.
Muttra, and Sun worship 218; 220
Muzafrar I., of Gujrat, 118, f.; II, 122; III... 141, f.
Muzafrār Huṣain Mirzā, and the Dakan 180, f.
Nārgol, Nānāṅgola .......................... 73, n.
Narnālā, tn. .................................. 142
Narwar Kocher inscrip. .......................... 242, ff.
Naṣarpur, in Sind, and the River god, etc. 198; 200–204
Nāsik inscrips., 70, f.; 73–78, n.; 151–153; 222
Naṣir Kān, of Khāṇḍesh and Jahāṅgir 186
naṭa, itinerant actors ............................. 221, f.
naṭaka, or dramas, of Rāma .......................... 96; 223, n.
Nature, g., and Uderolā 203; 206
Navāgrama, etc., Puttur, in N. Arcot 95; 100
Nawāb Surāju d'daula, and the British, 265 & n.; 270
Nayapālā, k., of E. Magadh 111
Neopolis, at Persepolis 293
Negus, k. of Abyssinia ............................. 174
Nellūm inscrip. ................................. 287
Nemāra inscrip. ................................. 177
Nemchandra, on Mihirakula 19
New Light on the Gupta Era and Mihirakula (contd. from Vol. XLVI, p. 296) 10, ff.
New Testament, and the Bhāgavatādī Sup. 29
Nicks, J., E. I. Co.'s servant ........................... 84
Nicobar Isl. and Austria's commercial venture, 13; 61; 62; 66
Nigiliva, pillar ................................. 291
Nīlākaṭāhaṭa, Brāhmaṇa, of Mandāra .......................... 94
Nīrgranthā Jains, and Kālkīrāja 18
Nīruktā of Yāskā ............................... 195
Nīrveda, the word, and the Bhāgavatādī Sup. 28
Nachdāra, a work by Kāṃdakani, 104; age of, 108; and Kauṣīya 109
Nachādstra, political ethics .......................... 239
nīrī and akṣheya-nīrī, explained .......................... 51
Nīgam Shāhī kings of Ahmādanagar .......................... 120; 148, f.
Nizāmat, Government of the Nawab Nazim of Bengal, etc. 29 & n.; 34
Note, on the Yajavālās or Jajapellas of Narwar 241, ff.
Notes, from Old Factory Records .......................... 86; 84
Notes on Kālidāsa, I. Early references, 246, ff.; II, Kālidāsa and Bhāravi, 249, f.; III, A Difficulty in the Meghadūta, 281, f.; IV, Second Difficulty, in the Rāhuvamśa 253, ff.
Notes, on Asoka Inscriptions—the term Aśhakṣu 297
Nṛsinha, form of Viṣṇu .......................... Sup. 6, n.
Nṛvarma, Rajput k. of Narwar 241
Nuno da Cunha, Port. governor of Diu 123
Nūr-ad-Dīn, and the Aleppo mosque .......................... 176, n.
Nyāya, philosophy 101 & n.; 104 & n.; 106; 108; 109
Nyāya-Bhāṣya, the. 102 & n.; 103 & n.; 107; 109
Nyāya-Sāstra ................................. 103; 107
Nyāya-Sūtra .................................. 102; 104, n.
INDEX

O and E, the wide sound of, with special reference to Gujarātī (contd. from Vol. XLVI, p. 304) . . . 24, ff.; 37, ff.; 225, ff.
Oakley, Ch., E. I. Co.'s servant . . . . 59
Occupation, Pratīhāra, of Magadha . . . . 109, ff.
Octroi, exclusive privilege of trade . . . . 90; 92
Oḍra, stūpas . . . . 209
Economics (Xenophon) . . . . 233
Officers, of E. I. Co., obliged to go through the ranks . . . . 84
vikonomie, household management . . . . 234
Old Factory Records, Notes from . . . . 56; 84
Oldenberg, and Buddhā . . . . Sup. 10
Oldenburgh, Duchess . . . . 6 n.
Oṃ, holy syllable . . . . Sup. 6 n.
Omar, (Aumee, 'Umbr) Beg, agent for Mir Jā'fīr . . . . 269
Omichund, New Light on . . . . 265, ff.
Onore, tin., E. I. Co. . . . . 13; 15
origin, Indian, of the Bhagavadgītā. . . . Sup. 28
Orissa, shrines in, 209, f.; ornaments, of, 216 f.; 224
Orme, MSS., and India, 265 & n.; 266 & n.; 267, n.; 268, n.; 269, n.; 270, n.; 273 & n.
Ösih, Jodhpur State, Sun temple . . . . 219
Ostrogóth, Roderick . . . . 174
Oxus, Vaṅsū, riv., 17; and the Hūma emp. . . . 19
Ozene, Ujjini, cap. of k. Tiastenes . . . . 153

padika, patika, a coin . . . . 76, f.
pahāli pallā, Pily Phultum, first regiment . 7 & n.
paintings, wall, in Kusār 'Amrah . . . . 174
Paṭṭanā, 69; Paṇṭhan, Baithana, Pratishtáhana, etc. . . . . 150 & n.; 151; 153
Pāla, dyn., of Bengal, 109—111; inscrs. . . . . 165
palaces, ruined, in the Hauran, 172; 174; of Cyrus, Darus and Xerxes . . . . 293
Pāli, texts . . . . Sup. 10, n.
Palm-leaf, MS., the Trilokasūtra, extract from, 22; record, Puri, 210; temple, Puri . . . . 218
Pampe, Hampe . . . . 287
Pāfechālas, Aryans . . . . Sup. 13, n.
Pāfechāli . . . . 264
Pāfecharātra, and Bhāgavata, Sup. 12; and Nārada, Sup. 15; and Christianity . . . . Sup. 16; 18—20
Pāṇḍavas, and Droṇāchārya, 240; and Kṛishṇa, Indraprasthā, 281, f.; and Kṛishṇa, etc. . . . . Sup. 9: 11—13: 20
Pandion, Pāṇḍya k. . . . . 151
Pāṇḍya, co., and Asoka institutions . . . . 48

Pāṇini, and the wide sound of E and O, 46; on Siva, etc., 51, n.; 84; and Kātyāyana, dates of, 138; and the Kṛishṇa sect, etc. . . . . Sup. 12; 13 & n.; 17
Panjab, and Akbar, 145; and the Thakurs . . . . 203
pantheistic doctrines, and the Bhagavadgītā. . . . Sup. 3—5; 19: 35
panther, wāgh . . . . 197
Panuco, tn., and erotic sculptures . . . . 217
Pār, Pārāṇī, riv. . . . . 74 & n.
Paramādirāja, Yaramādirāja . . . . 242
Pārāṣārāh, school of philosophy . . . . 157, f.
Parāśūrāma, in temple sculpture . . . . 215
Pārīji, Surat dist., Dahraena grant at . . . . 78
Pārgīter, Mr., and the Rigveda-Samanītī, 280 . . . . 282—284
Pārisā, council of ministers . . . . 52 & n.
Paroṣiṣṭaparna, the, and Çāsaṅka . . . . 190, n.
Parvata, Pāriyātra, part of the Vindhya range . . . . 151
Parāśāsta, governor of Surajāstra, under Skandagupta . . . . 164
Pārāśāsta, Ārāma, riv. . . . . 73, n.
Pārāśikārāna, Ṛṣyga, of Parāśāstra . . . . 168
Prahlādanādeva, Book-Notice . . . . 168
Parthia, and St. Thomas, etc. . . . . Sup. 15; 16
Parthian, rise, date . . . . 138
Parthians, and vaulted roofing, 172; or Pārthīvas . . . . 138
Pārāva, g., image . . . . 137
parvaṇa, Mogul . . . . 5
Pāṭaliputra, and Maurya worship, 51; the courtesans of, and Duttaka, 189; car festival, etc. . . . . 209; 297, f.
Patanjali, and Mahābhāṣya and the word-ghosha, 35, f.; 195; and Maurya worship, etc., 51 & n.; 138; and Kṛishṇa, etc., Sup. 12 . . . . 17; 22; 33
Pāthri, and the Mughals . . . . 178
Patīṭhāna, Paṇṭhan . . . . 150, n.
Patna . . . . 291
puṭṭamār, express messenger . . . . 7: 8
Pattanasvari, temple, and the Sun-god . . . . 219
Paṭtar, Patteh, Paṭṭara (Malayalam), foreign Brāhmaṇs . . . . 8 & n.

Pearle, the frigate . . . . 56
pedigree, of the saṃsunā composers of the Vijayanagara empire . . . . 81
Pelagios, phil. dux, and Kašr al-Bā'ik . . . . 172
pepper, trade, and Bimliapatam, 10; 11; 13; 15: 89; 91
periods, of the Bhagavata religion . . . . Sup. 19
Periplus, the, and Greek coins . . . . 74; 77; 78
Perriman, J., Capt. of the Pearle . . . . 56
Persepolis, the Necropolis, etc. . . . . 293; 295
Persia, 174; 206; and Mauryan sculpture . . . . 191—197
Persian lang., and Gujarati words, 26; and Indian, 44, f.; tradition, and Alexander etc. 243, f.
Persians, and vaulted roofing, etc. 172; 177
Petra, Nabatean co., and Rome 170
Petros, see Arratoon 268
Phallic symbols, in temples 217
Philosophical systems, Indian, European, and Jainism 140
Philosophy, Indian, 101—109; and religion, combination of 14
Phirmaun, trade, Mogul 4:5
Phonetid process, and the wide sound of E and O 37
Phousdar, faujdar, 31; foudar 32
Pillars, of victory, 94; 96; 213, n.; see Mauryana 291, f.
Puigdattakaváda, n., and Ushavadáta 73
Pir Muhammad Khan, governor of Malwa 124
Pir Patho, cult of 204:207
Pisáijipada, vil., in Násk grant 162
Pischel, Prof., and the wide sound of E and O 43 & n.
Pi-shen-p'o pu-lo, for Bishnavpur, Vishnupur 204, n.
Pitís, cash, in Trengganu 28
Rlassay, Palásí, battle, etc., and Omichund 269, f.; 273, f.
Plato, and economics 233 & n.
Plan, and the Andhras 70
Poets, of Mullandram, see Vivekapatram 79, ff.; 94, ff.
Pokharas, Pushkar, W. of Ajmer, three places of the name 75 & n.
Polémaios, Sri-Pulumávi 151:153
Politics, first use of the name 234
Political history, of the Dákkan, of the Sáta-váhana Period 69, ff.; 149, ff.
Politics, 236; 240:257; see Dánamiti 102
Polycat, Polycat 61
Polycherry, and Wm. Bolts 12
Poonah, and Wm. Bolts 3, 4:6, 7, 8:10
Popham, Step., E. I. Co.'s servant 67, f.
Porcelain, trade in 89; 91
Port L'orient, and Austria's commercial venture 57—59
Portuguese, trade, in India 3:4
Porus, and the stratagem used by Alexander 245, f.
Potalaka, Potigai (Greek Bettigo) 48, f.
Potana, Potali, cap. of Asäka 150
Potiyam or Potigai, mt., or Agasty's Hill 48, f.
Powder, stone, from Chota Nagpur 106
Preatorium, at Umm-al-Jaml 172
Prahládanadeva, Paramára Yuvarája, writer 168
Prájñá, wisdom 217
Prájádándas, public proclamations of Asäka 52
Prákrit or Apabhramsa, and the wide sound of E and O 25, f.; 37—41; 43—45; 231
Prárya, gift of affection, a tax 50, f.
Prédas, gratuitous distribution of water 74
Prápti-yoga 223
Prásadavallabha, ancestor of Arunagiri 94:96
Prasannakrýa, a work by Bhákarkárýa 96
Prathára Occupation of Magadhá 109, ff.
Prátiýája, coronation oath 50
Pratihára, or Paithan, birthplace of Sáta-váhana, 69; cap. of Mulaka, 150; Bāiñhána 133
Prátiyádákas, ushers 54 & n.
Práudhadvárayá, k., copper plates of 79
Maharaya, and the poet Sogádrināthá 95:96:100
Práudhadvárayapura, or Mullandram 99, f.
Právarasena II., Channak grant of 165
Pródei, and red craton 28
Prehistoric architecture 170
Pre-Mussalman, times in Sind 197
Prester, John, of Abyssinia, legend of 246
Princeont expedition and architecture in the Hauran 172
Prítíhí, earth goddess 216
Prítivirá, Cháhámána k., coins of 243
Priyadarśi, and Asoka 51
Proclamations of Priyadarśi, 51; prájádánas 52
Prospectus, of Wm. Bolts' Company, 85, ff.; note on 88, ff.
Prostitutes, intercourse with 189
Province Arabia, Nabatéan kingdom 170
Ptolemaios, Klaudios, and W. India 153
Ptolemy, on Mianagara, 78; contemporary with Gautamiputra, etc. 150,151
Ptolemies, fall of their empire 169
Pugar, disciple of Uderolá 200, 201, n. & 203
Pulicat, Polycat 61
Pulla, fish 207
Pulumávi and Pulumáyi, 75: Pólemaios. 150—155
Púndarikapurá, Chhadambaram 94
Púndarávahana-bhukti, N. Bengal 162:165
Pura, (Páli) meaning, capital town 71
Paragupta, 17; date, 161, f.; and Skandagupta, suggested identity of 163 & n.—166
Paráña literature, and the Bhagavatpátá 8, 9:30:32
Paránas, and the Andhras, etc. 71, f.; and Várta, etc. 235 & n.—239 & n.
Purandara Kesari, possibly a Somavása k. 211
Puranic list, and Post-Ándhrabhútiya rulers, identification of 298
Puri, tn.; and the palm-leaf record, 210; and the Vatesvara tree, 214; temple ornaments, etc. 216, f.
Purushottamus, g. 211
Pushkar, Pokharas, W. of Ajmer 75 & n. 76
Puttur, Navágrahá, N. Arecot, and Sónádrinátha 95, f.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>Qadr Khán Bahádur Sháh of Khánshád 179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>qastal, a castra 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>guffah, gufar, a river-tub 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Quli Qutb Sháh of Golconda, 122; and Humáyün 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Qub Saheb, Qutb-ud-din Bakhtyar Kaki of Ush, and Khwája Khizr 206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>rabies, cure for 207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>Raghu 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>Raghuvarsha, the, and the Tamraparni riv., 49; and Baga, etc., Subandhu's reference to, 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>—249; a difficulty in 263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Ráhu, planet 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>Rai, inscrip., of Asalla Deva 241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269; 273</td>
<td>Rai Durlabh, Dusána to Suráju'd-daula 269; 273, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114; 182; 185</td>
<td>Rája Ahmad, reputed first ruler of Khánshád 114; 182; 185, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144; 145; 183</td>
<td>Rája 'Ali, 'Ali Khán, or Adil Sháh IV 144; 145; 183, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94; 96; 98</td>
<td>Rájanátha, son of Arupagiri, possibly two poets of the name 94; 96; 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Rájanáthapura, 94; or Talpagiri 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Rájanáthavara, líną, at Rájanáthapura 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Rájarája I, inscrip. of 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>Rájasirkap, Panjab Sáka hero 263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41; 42; 44; 225</td>
<td>Rájastháni, and the wide sound of E and O, 41; 42; 44; 225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Rájatarangini, the, and Mihirakula 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>Rájendraladáva I, Gabaigaiçoḍa Chólā 94; 99, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>Rájimalah, and the Sun-god 219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Rájpútañá, and Bhúmaká, 73; and the Malavas 73; f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Rájpúta of Narwar, genealogical table of 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Rájyapálá, Baraon inscrip. of 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>Rámá, kólya of, 96; and Várdha, 238; and Víśvánmítra, 240; and Vishág 241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Ráma-ism 19; f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Rámakavi, author of the Sams. Subhadra-Dhanapatya-ńīkā 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97; f.</td>
<td>Sup. 4: 9; 19; 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Ránapálá, and E. Magnánda 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Ránpítha, tn., and Usabhadáta 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Rámdyága, the, and the word ghesha, 35; and Várdha, 35; &amp; n. 233; &amp; n. 237; &amp; n. 238; &amp; n. 256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 &amp; n. 10</td>
<td>Ramsay, And., of Bombay, and Wm. Bolts, 9 &amp; n. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Raíga II, copperpluses of, 79; VI 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>ranks, E. I. Co.'s officers obliged to go through 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>Ranthambhor, district and battle 243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>raso, sentiments, symbols of, in temples 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>Raśhrakútás, and the W. Chálukyas of Bádámi, 286, n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Raśhrakútás k., Kriśnarája III 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Ratanrai, Arora, a name of Uderolál 199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>Rataul plate inscrip. 243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Ratha Yátra, Car festival 212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Ratnápíth, Uderolál 202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ratnaprabha, a hell, and Kalkirája 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>ruca, sdrí, bodycloth 202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ravencroft, Mr., E. I. Co.'s servant 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Raust-al-Mulk, Ahmad III, of Gujarat 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26; 28</td>
<td>re-birth, and birth, in the Bhagavadgétá Sup. 25: 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>record, palm-leaf, in Puri 210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Records, Old Factory, Notes from 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>redwood, from Kaliot, Austrian trade in 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32—34; 84 &amp; n.</td>
<td>references, to places mentioned in copper-plate grants 32—34; 84 &amp; n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>reformadoe, volunteers 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Religion, monotheistic, of Krishna, etc. Sup. 9; 15; and philosophy 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Renau, Nic., Austrian seaman 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>Republic, The, (Plato) and economics 233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161; ff.</td>
<td>Revised Chronology of the Last Gupta Emperors 161; ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30; 31</td>
<td>revised, of the Bhagavadgétá, date Sup. 30; 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203; f.</td>
<td>Revival, Hindu, in Sind 203; f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Rigveda, and monotheism Sup. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280; 282; 283 &amp; n.</td>
<td>Rigveda-Sapthá, and the name Indrasená, 280; 282; 283 &amp; n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Rigkkhat, or Achhavata, Satpura Hills 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Ṛishabhadatta, and Ushavadáta 73; &amp; n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68; 85; ff.</td>
<td>Ritchie, R., E. I. Co.'s agent, Vienna 68; 85; ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197; f.</td>
<td>River cult in Sind, see Religion in Sind 197; f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48; f.</td>
<td>Rock Edicts, identification of Tamaparí 48; f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71; inscrip.</td>
<td>Rock edicts, L, 221: 297 &amp; n. XIII, 71; inscrip. 71; inscrip.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154; 162; n.</td>
<td>Junagadh 154; 162; n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Roderick, the Ostrogoth 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rodríguez, Domingo, of Tellicherry, and Wm. Bolts 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Rohankhé, battle 147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Roman, Emperors, coins of, 74; and Kadphises, 77; architecture, in the Haurân, 170; 177; art 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>Romans, and the Lakhmid k. Inrulque, roofing, systems, see Vauliting System 294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Rossetti, J., and Wm. Bolts' Company 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54; n.</td>
<td>routines, of Asoka, and Chandragupta 54; n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Roy, Protép Chandra, and the Bhagavadgétá 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 n.</td>
<td>Sup. 1 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Œús, seers of olden days, and Indian philosophical systems 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index Item</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudra, or Śiva</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudradāman, 50; and Gautamiputra Śātakarni, etc.</td>
<td>154 &amp; n.: 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudra-Śātakarni</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudrasena, copperplate grant of ruins of Kuṣair-al-Hallabāt, etc.</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rulers, Fārūqi, of Khāndesh, list</td>
<td>185, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rulers, Post-Andhrabhṛṭya, of the Parni list</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumbold, Sir Thos., gov. of Madras</td>
<td>57 &amp; n., 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rummeendi Pillar, 291; inscrip.</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan, agent for Wm. Bolts</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabandhu, and Mallănāṅga</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabhpāti, and Śiva</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabhpāti, Dākāṭa Sabhpāti, ancestor of the poets of Mullandram, 94, f.; a second of the name</td>
<td>96; 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sacred thread, cut</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sacrifices, in Māṇḍapā inscrip.</td>
<td>71, 72 &amp; n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>animal and vegetable, 189, n.; in the Bhagavadgītā</td>
<td>6 &amp; n., 7, n.: 18; 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sādāśīvā-dēva-rāya, copperplate of</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedinon, the Śātavāhana</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sages, Indian, and Śvetadvipa, and Alexandria, Sup. 15, 16; Kahatriya, and Yoga teaching, Sup. 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahya, Hills, Sahyāḍris</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Francis</td>
<td>197 &amp; n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George, fort, and Austria's commercial venture, 7: 56–59; 61–63; 69; 84; monastery, in Sameh</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. James, court of, and Vienna, 5: 63; 65; or London</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul, Epistles of, and the Bhagavadgītā, Sup. 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Thomas, and Parthia</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Thomas, near Madras</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śaiva Brāhmaṇas, and Rājendrā Chōlādeva I</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śaka, year, 16, 17: era, 20: 76; rulers of the Panjab</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śakā-kāla, Śakā-nripokāla, and other variants</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śakalaya-Malla, court poet, and Nainārācharāhārya</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śakapūṇi, on Trivikrama Viṣṇu worship</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śākās, and Daśāpura, 78; the Pārthivas</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śākasanas, Sirī-Śāta, k.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śakti, female counterpart of Śiva</td>
<td>136 &amp; n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śaktiśāri, Hakuśiri, son of Śātakarnī</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śikuntala, the, 247–249; and Subandhu</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakyāma, Yāma</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saladin, and the el-Aksa mosque, Jerusalem</td>
<td>176, n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saitma, Sulṭān, Jahangir</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śālīvāhana, Śālīvāhana</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śīlīvāhana-śaka</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltspetre, trade in</td>
<td>266 &amp; n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śālūr, inscrip.</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śālvadhūhanyadāyam, a kāvyā, attributed to Rāja-nātha</td>
<td>97–99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śāluva Narasīthu, Vijayanagara k.</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>salvation, in the Bhagavadgītā</td>
<td>Sup. 25, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>samājā, word in Rock Edict I</td>
<td>221, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samarrā, and Muhammadan buildings</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāmba; son of Krīṣṇa</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sambapore, and the Somavāṃsi kings</td>
<td>210, n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sambu, and the Solar cult</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāndipani, preceptor of Krīṣṇa</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sameh, example of vaulted roof, at</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samjaya, charioteer</td>
<td>Sup. 20: 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šāmkara</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śāmkhya, system of philosophy, 102: 105 &amp; n.: 107–109; and the Bhagavadgītā, Sup. 14: 22–26: 28: 34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śāmkya-Yoga, monoteism, Sup. 6 &amp; n.: 8: 17: 19: 21: 27: 35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samson, legend</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samudra, and the Brahmans of Sind</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samudragupta and Meghadvarṇa of Ceylon</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saṅgītā, unit of a settlement</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tanaḷa, Mughal, to Śvetāmbara Church</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śāśi, stāpa, inscrip. 72; or topeś, 214; pillar</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandeśa, Vaidyakṣa, and Sophia, the, Sup. 15; or Saṅkara-bhāṣya, and the Bhagavata-Pancharātra religion</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saṅkarāchārya māṭaḥ, or Kāmakōṭṭāvāra piṭha,</td>
<td>94: 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śāṅkhya, philosophy</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saṅkṣa, column</td>
<td>291, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanakrit, and the wide sound of E and O, 25: 26: 28, n.: 37–41; 43 &amp; n.: 46; 229 &amp; n., 230; in inscrip., 111; texts, and Vārītā, 238 &amp; n., 239: 256; and the Sudras</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanakrit Poems, by Mayūra, and Bāṇa’s Candī-Sataka, Book-Notice</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saṅkṛatā, inscrip.</td>
<td>52; 298 &amp; n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarasvatī, and dramatic art</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sārathī, charioteer, of the sun</td>
<td>136: 280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarthāna, native skipper</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sārika, demon</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarmath, inscrips, 16, f.; image, etc. 161–163; 166, f.; column</td>
<td>291, f. 294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sāsana, orders, 52, n.; documents, 79; writers of the Vijayanagara kings</td>
<td>98, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sāsana, composers and engravers of the Vijayanagara empire, pedigree, etc.</td>
<td>82, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śāsto, stage of development</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāta, Yaksha, father of Sātavāhana</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satākārī, Andhra k., 71 &amp; n.; 72 &amp; n.; lord of Dakshināpātha</td>
<td>154, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sētrābānil, terumbil, automobile</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sātavāhana, Period of the Dekkan, 69, ff.; 149, ff.</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sātavāhana king, and Vikrama</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sātāpurā hills, Achhavata</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sātse, a work by Bihārī</td>
<td>25, n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sastra, sacrifice</td>
<td>Sup. 6 &amp; n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satur, two merchants of the name, and Austria's commercial venture</td>
<td>61 &amp; n., 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sātavata, followers of Krishna</td>
<td>Sup. 9, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sātakārī, son of Jahlālā</td>
<td>186, n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sātāsraya, W. Chālukya k.</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sātāsraya Kirttivarman II., Chālukya</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bādāmī k.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sātāsraya Vijayāditya, Chālukya of Badāmī</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sātāsraya, Vikrama-dītya II., Chālukya k.</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satyam, Virgins, cult of</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāuras, sect</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāyāyids, and Dīlī</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools, Vedic and Academic</td>
<td>190—192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences, of courtesans, 189; of Indies, 72; 102—104; 109; of kings, 159; expositions of, 190—194; or art, of wealth</td>
<td>234; 256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott, Revd. K., and coins of Nahapāna</td>
<td>74, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott, H., Customs officer, Cacutta</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srafftion, Luke, and Omichund, 267 &amp; n.; 269 &amp; n. 273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Script, Nabataean</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sculpture, remains, of old Indian, 212; see Mauryana</td>
<td>291, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scythia, co., in Sind</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sea, and the Indus</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seduction, of a maiden</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sehwān, in Sind, and Uderolāl, etc.</td>
<td>200; 202—205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select Secret Committee, later the Foreign Department</td>
<td>266 &amp; n., 269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seleucids, fall of</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seleucos, and Chandragupta</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen, dyn., Bengal, sun worshippers</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senart, on Krishna</td>
<td>Sup. 10, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serampore, Sirāmpur, and Wm. Bolts</td>
<td>30; 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serengapatam, and Wm. Bolts</td>
<td>12, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sérivas, ancient Andhāpurā</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>serpent, in temple sculpture</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sēsa, serpent, reputed father of Sātavāhana</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setāgiri, 'hills, unidentified</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setha, Bengal Hindu financial community, and Omichund, etc.</td>
<td>267 &amp; n.; 268; 270, n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>settlement, Aryan, units of</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlements, projected Austrian, in Gogo, 7; Bimilipatam, 10; Nicobar, 13; E. I. Co.'s, in Sumatra, 56, 57; Dutch, etc., Baranagore, 58; sex, and ethics, etc.</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shahbāzgajhi, inscrip.</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shamin, dafur, chemin-de-fer</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shamsu-d-dīn Altamsh, and Rāgā Chāhāda</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaṣṭhi, goddess, guardian of infants</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherriman, Mr., and Wm. Bolts</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shēr Shāh, and Humāyūn</td>
<td>123, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shikarpur, and Uderolāl</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shivaji, deified</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shivistana, Shewan, and the Śiva cult</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrīmālī Brahmans, and Brahmans of Sind</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shrine, of Uderolāl, in Sind, 198; shrine, in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orrisa</td>
<td>209, f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shripunj, k., and Sarika, demon</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siddapūr, Sorebaw, in N. Kanara</td>
<td>15, n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidāh, bidāh, bhag, and cholera</td>
<td>264; 265, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side-lights on Omichund</td>
<td>265, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silpa-sāstra, mechanical science, etc.</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sind, see Religion in, 197, ff.; and Firūz Shāh,</td>
<td>112—115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singhbhum, Chota Nagpur, polished hammer-stone from</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śrī-Sātā, Śrīsena, Saka-sena, coins of</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śrīrāṇa Śrīstana, probably Śrī-Śaila</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīrkap, c. on Taxila Site</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīro-Polemais, Śrī-Pulumāvi</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śāsuka, Śāmsuka, Andhra conqueror</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śīva, and Mihīrakula, 19; and the Mauryas, 51 &amp; n.; temples, etc., and the Brāhmaṇas of Mandāra, 94—97; and the Sun-god, 136 &amp; n.; 137; or Rudra, 218; Dionysos, Sup. 18;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viṣṇu Hari-Hara</td>
<td>Sup. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śīvadatta, Ābhira k.</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śīva-Śrī-Satākārī, coins of, etc.</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skanda, worshipped by the Mauryas</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skandagupta, 17; his Kāhun pillar inscrip.</td>
<td>20; and Puragupta, suggested identity, 161—167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slaughter, and killing, 189, n.; 221; of Bethlehem</td>
<td>Sup. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slaves, for E. I. Co., Sumatra</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Hon. Chas., President, Madras</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smrīti, stage of development in Indian spiritual life</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow Vienna, Austrian ship</td>
<td>61, f.; 65—67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society, Triestine, (see Company)</td>
<td>85, ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sogal, inscrip.</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solar, eclipse, 16, f.; cult, see Sun Temple, Konarak, 209, ff.; theory, and Buddha. Sup. 10, f.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solen, probably variant of Ceylon, Greek for Tāmrapartha riv.</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somadeva, Jaina author, and Mihīrakula, 19; and Sātavāhana</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somaś, Somaï, Thakurs, Nasspur</td>
<td>201: 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śōmanātha Dikshita, of Mandāra</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Somavallii-gopananda-prahasena, a work by Arunagiri 97 & n., 125, n.

Somavami, kings of Katak 210

Someshvara, Chahamana k., coins of 243

Someshvara I., W. Chalukya k., 285; or Trailokya-kumalla Athavamalla, 289; II., 285, or Bhuvanaikamalla, 289, f.; III., IV. 285

Somu, brother of Uderolall 200

Soma-drishtā, Arunagirinathā, poet of Mullanjam 94-98

Somagiri, Arunagirinatha 98

Sondā, Soundah, in N. Kanara, and Austria’s commercial venture 13: 15, n.

Song of Javantiva Sonego, date 47

Song Yong, Chinese pilgrim, on Mihirakula, etc. 19

Sophist, Dialogue, (Plato), and economics 293

Sopparanga, and Sopparā, cap. of an ancient dist. 73 & n.; 78


sound, the wide, of E and O, (contd. from Vol. XLVI, p. 304) 24, ff.; 37, ff.; 225, ff.

Spirit, the theory of, in the Bhagavadgītā 225

Sup. 24-26; 31; 34

Spiritual, life, Indian, stages of, 101; and the Kāshatryas 9

Spring, in the Raghuvamśa 253; 254 & n.

springs, in Sind 204 & n.

śraddhāshāna, superstitious devotees 51

Śravaṇa Belgoḷā, in Mysore, statue in 139

Śrī, goddess, in the Arthaśāstra, 51, n.; and Mahā Lakhmī 216

Śrī-ChandraŚatī, k., coins of 155, f.

ŚrīkālaḤyama, the, and the poets of Mullanjam 89, f.

Śrnangaraṇa II., the Arvīḷīmāgalam plates of 79 śrīnāṭa rasa, erotic passion, and temple sculpture (see erotic, 216) 217

Śrī-parvata, Śrī-ṭanja, hill 161

Śrī-Pulamāvi, Śrī Pulomasī 163

Śrīrāngī, II., copperplates of 81

Śrī-Saila, k., Śrīṣṭana 151

Śrīvallabha, and Varatunga Pāṇḍya, copperplates of 81

step, the, in ancient India 222

Stahāt, Lieut., and Austria’s commercial venture 61, f.

staples, Europe staples, and Austria’s commercial venture 10; 15

State-craft, (see Daṇḍaniti), 102 science of 102-104; 109

statues, Gommatasvara, at Śravaṇa-Belgoḷā, 139; female, Besenagar 296

Stedman, Sam., E. I. Co.’s servant 11

Steppe of Balqa, Moab, and the Umayysa 173, f.

Sthāngunduru, agraḥara, subjects studied there 257

Stone, inscrs., Bhimpur 242

Stormont, Viscount, Sec. of State 64 & n.

Strait Settlements, coinage of 28

Strategem, of Alexander, against Porus 245, f. 245, f.; stūpa, Sañcī, 22; 216; Buddhist and Jainā, 209; and Odra 209

Subandhu, and Kālidāsa 247, f.

Subba-Chandra, Jain monk 210

Subhadrā-Dhanājayaṇyatasaka, play, by Rāma-

kavi 97; 125, n.

Subrahmanyakavi, scholar of Māṇḍara 94

Sudarśana-laika 162, n.; 164

Sudasaṇa, vil., in Nasik cave grant 152 & n.

Śūḍrās Śālavāhana, and Vikrama 112

Śūdras, and Abhiras, 35, f.; and Vārāhā, 237 n.

Śukra, in Sind 202

Śukra, Kāvyā Uṣanas, Uṣanas 67

Śuli, Ben, of Fort St. George 63

Śultan, Suratāna, and Śopālī, 95, f.; Murād, 173-180; Salim, Jahāṅgīr, Khurānī, and Kānpānī 181; 185, f.

Sumatra, E. I. Co.’s settlement 56

Sun Temple, Kanarak, alleged Buddhist influence in 209, f.

Sun, and Brahmapa etc., 136; 138; worship in Mexico, 217; in the Raghuvamśa, 253-255; and Buddhī, Sup. 19; Śurya 32

Śūrīgas, and Śūrīka 71

dūpokadraśa, cooking 239

Superb, E. I. Co.’s ship 58

Śūr, dyn., of Delhi 124

Śūruj’daula, and Omichund, etc., 265-270:273; 270

Śūrāpāla, Vigrāhāpāla 165

Śurāšṭra, Kāṭhīwādī, 150; 153; and Gaṅga-
miputra, etc. 154; 164

Śuraṭ, Mogul’s city, and Wm. Bolte, etc. 2: 3: 5; 8; and Kapura 78

Śurasītha, Śurāsaṭra 150

Śurwaysa, inscr. of Gopapati Raṇā 241

Śurya, Sun g., 138; or Śūrya, 214; and the warrior caste 32

śūra, style, and bhāṛa style 190-192

Śuvannamukha, tn., and Uṣavādāta 73

Śuvannābha, writer 189

Śuvanna, coins 76

Śvayambhu, son of Tyāgarāja, of Mandāra, possibly two of the name 94-96
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Śvetadvipa, White Island, and the Sages
Nārada, etc. .... Sup 15 & n.; 16
Śvetaketu, and the Kāmaśītra .... 188 & n.
Śvetāmbara, Jain sect .... 140
Śvetāvatara Upanishad .... Sup. 14: 15
Śvetavāhā, and other variants, names of Arjuna .... Sup. 13
Syria, and the week days, 112; and architecture, etc. 170—172; 176, n. ; and Antiochus. 247
Systems, Philosophical, of India .... 101: 104 —106

Tabari, historian .... 174
Tafṣul Ḥāsh, stone seat, Ḥāndesh .... 162
Taila I., Bādami Chālukya k., 286; II., 285, 286 & n.; or Ahavamalla, 287; III. 285
Tamār and India .... 115
Tak Eivan, building near Karkh .... 173
Tākiya, hemit's hut .... 206
Tālqund, inscr. .... 287
Tālib-i ibn Ustad, or Mushtaqi, Sind legend .... 205
Talapagiri, Maitaippādi, or Rājanāthapura. 94; 100
Tamaas, sacrifice .... Sup. 6, n.
Tambapani, riv., identification of .... 48, f.; 297
Tāmaraparפי, riv. .... 48, f.
Tamānumudrī, totality of followers of a doctrine .... 158
Tarih-i Shīviji, Persian work .... 300
Tātpādābhādyata, expression, applied to Purnagupta .... 164, f.
Tetta, cap. of Sind, and Uderolāl .... 198, f.; 204
Tattus .... 139
Tezila, Scroll, inscr. 76; tn., 138; and Sirkap .... 263
Taylor, J., of Madrasapatam, etc. .... 61
teg, sword .... 200
Tel, Telengir, and the Telavāhā riv. .... 71
Telang, on Bhakti .... Sup. 15 & n.; 28; n. ;—32
Tellicherry, and Austria's commercial venture, etc. .... 8—12 : 14
Telugu, co., Andhārasa .... 71
Temples, of Śiva and Viṣṇu, 94, 96; of the Sun, Kanarak, etc., 209, ff.; and worship department, Maurian institution .... 51
terms, explained, in the Arthadāśstra .... 5, ff.
territory of Gautamiputra .... 190
Tessitori, Dr., and the wide sound of E and O, 37 & n.—39; 43—47; 225, ff.
texts, on Vārtā, etc. .... 238—240
Thalke, and Uderolāl, 200 & n.; 201 & n. : 202:
and exogamy .... 203: 207
Thalner, vil., Karvand, and Raiā Ahmed, 115, f.; 121: 141
The Divine Song, Bhagavadgītā .... Sup. 2, 3, n.
The Practical Path, by Champat Rai Jain, Book Notice .... 139
theatre, etc., and samajā .... 221—223 & n.
Theism, and the Bhagavadgītā. Sup. 3—6, n.; 8, n.
Theology, trāṣṭi .... 102—104; 106, f.; 109
Thomas, St., and Partia .... Sup. 15
Tiberius, or Augustus, on coins .... 77, n.
Tibet, Tibet, and Alexander .... 245
tiger, vīṭghra .... 197
Timbo, near Delagoa Bay, and Wm. Bolts .... 1
Tinnevelly dist., ancient Pandya kingdom .... 48
Tiritha-kalpa, a work by Jina-prabhāṣaṇī .... 69
Tirumalarāya, copperplate of .... 81
Tissae, k. of Ceylon .... 48
tombs, Nabatean, and vaulted roofs, etc., 169: 176; of Muhammad Tughlaq, 176; of Uderolāl .... 201, f.
Toudainâdu, and Mullândram .... 99
Toraṇā, Erān Boar inscr., etc. .... 18, f.
Toresvanda, inscr. .... 289
Trade, Austrian, in S. India .... 59, f.
tradition, and Alexander .... 245
tragedy, Black Hole .... 265; 266 & n.
Trailokyamala, birula of Somesvara I. .... 289 & n.
Traité de l'Economie Politique (1615) .... 234
Tranquebar, Danish settlement .... 58, f.
transmigration, of the soul .... Sup. 21
trāṣṭi, theology, 102; 106, f.; 109: 238: 239 & n.; 291; 256
treas, with Surājuddaula, etc. .... 266—269; 273
trees, in temple carvings, etc. .... 214; 216 & n.
Trengganu, and Malay currency .... 28
Treaty, of Vārtā .... 233
Triest, and Austria's commercial venture, 9; 32
51 & n.; 58—60: 64: 68; Society of .... 85, ff.
Trilokasāva, palm-leaf MS., extract from .... 22
Trimurtis in Bundelkhand .... 136, f.
Trinak, Tricuttē, Nicobar isl. .... 13
Trite, sage, and Śvetadāśtra .... Sup. 15, f.
Trivikrama Viṣṇu worship .... 84
Tuba, frontier fort, Haurān .... 174; 177
Tughlaq dyn. .... 115
Turks, and Uderolāl .... 200

Udayagiri, mt., 168; temples on, 210, n.; caves, 214
Uddalaka, and the Kāmaśītra .... 188 & n.
Uddāyapura, Bihar .... 110, f.
Uddhāra, meaning of .... 194
Uddoyotakara, early writer .... 102, f.
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Uderolali, see Religion in Sind ........................................ 197, ff.

UDAYAVANA, royal gardens ............................................. 54

Udyastra Kesari, inscrip .................................................. 210, f.

Ujjain, Ozara, cap., of Chhatarra, etc., 153; 166;
and Akbar, 180; and Sun worship .................................. 218

Ujayini, Ujena, 78; Avanti .............................................. 151 ; 167

Ukhavirat, palace, ruins, etc. ........................................ 175

Ulugh Khan, and Rana Chhaoa Achbar .................................. 243

Umar, Khalifah, or at-Firdaus, ancestor of the
Faruq dynasty .............................................................. 116, f.

Umar ibn 'Abd al-Aziz, and the mihlab ............... 175

Umayyad Khalifs, Arabs, 174; a power in C.
Asia ........................................................................... n.

Umm-al-Jamal, Church etc., with vaulted roof .......................... 172

Unati, example of vaulted roof, at ................................. 172

Upanishads, the, and the Bhagavadgita ............... Sup. 14; 15; 31 n; 35

Usas, sakra, etc., 105; and Gautama ....................... 107, n.

Vahavata, two of the name, 73 n; his benefactions .................................................. 74; 78

Usury, see money-lending .............................................. 234, n.

Uttamabhadras, and Malayas ........................................ 75

Uttaraditya, in Sind ......................................................... 203

Uttara-pradga, extract from .................................. 20; 22, n.

Uthdha, energy ................................................................ 53

VARTTI, the Ancient Hindu Economics, 233, ff. .......................... 226, ff.; 275, ff.

VEDAVADGITA, romance by Subandhu ....................... 247, ff.

Vaisisthputra Pushmavu, and Nahapanu, 154; inscrip. of .................................................. 222

Vaisisthputra Satakaipa .................................................. 155

Vasudeva, g., and Trivikrama-Vamana
Vishnus, 81; 137, f.; in the Bhagavadgita .......................... 131; 170; 131; 170

Vatesvara tree, Puri ......................................................... 214

Vatsayana, and Kautilya, 102 n; 104 n; 106 n; 108 n; and the Kama-k&str, 188 n; and
Mallanaga, etc., 189 n; and Kaliadas, two of the name, 105 n; and
sadha .......................................................... 221, f.

Vaulting system of the Hindola Mahal, Mandu .................................................. 169, ff.

Vagupurusa, the, and the Abhiras .................................. 35; 36; n.

Veda, the, and Krishna, etc. ......................................... Sup. 13; 21; 28

Vedanta and the Bhagavadgita .................................. Sup. 5; 9; 34, f.

Vedanta-deepika, founded the Vajagalai Sri-Vaih-
navas sect .......................................................... 100

Vedanttins, and Agamantins ........................................ 99

Vedic, legend, of Vishnu, 81; Schools, 190, f.;
works, and Varti, 236 n; and the Bhagavadgita ............... Sup. 6; 7 n; 11

Vedic, son of Satakaipa .................................................. 72

Vegetable, and animal, sacrifices, 189 n; god, 207, f.

Venice .......................................................................... 85

Vedanta, Medieval, copperplates of ...................... 81

Venture, commercial, see Austria's ......................... 1, ff.

Verma, Sir E., Commander-in-Chief, E. Indies ..................... 29, n.

Vetala, ghost k., and Satavahana .................................. 70

Vibhagapratama, a name for the Vibhagaprat-
amada .......................................................... 79, n.

Vibhava, Isvara and Krishna ........................................ 190

Victoria and Albert Museum ...................................... 296

Victory pillar, at Kamakottasa, Benares .................. 94; 96

Vidhada, Vidhara, etc., and Gautamputra, 130; and the Vaidhara School of Poetry ................... 264

Vidyapati, g. ................................................................. 95

Vidyaranja, sage ........................................................... 95

Vidyasa, and Kautilya, 102—104; 107 n; 109 n; 237

Vienna, and Austria's commercial venture ................. 3; 5; 6; 34; 86; 90; 91

Vignapala, II, Ill., inscrips. of, etc., 111; or
Strapala ................................................................. 165

Vijayanagar, dyn., gdana writers of, and the
poets of Mullanad, 79, ff.; pedigree of the
composers, etc. .................................................. 82, f; 98

Vikrama, and Malava, etc., 16; 29; and the
week-days .................................................................. 112 n; 112

Vikramaditya, k. of Ujjain, 70; Ill., 286 n; IV,
286 n; V, 285, 286 n; Tribhuvanamalla, 287 n; 61

Vacha, and Vrocha, words in Asoka inscrip. 63, f.

Vaeeel, vaeeil ................................................................ 29 n; 29 n

Vadhyanava, Vadhri, son of Indrasena .................. 229; 284

Vaidhara School, of poets ............................................ 264

Vashyagatha, g. ............................................................... 51, n.

Vatsalyika, system of philosophy, 104; 106; 208

Vatsalyika ................................................................. 190, f.

Vaidhava worship and Buddhism, etc. ............... 84; 220

Vaidrawana, g. .............................................................. 51, n.

Vajiyas, and Varti, 237 n; 238; 240; 256;
and emancipation ..................................................... Sup. 27

Vakasha, kings ............................................................... 165

Vakshi-tara, Vaksa, Osuna, riv. ....................................... 17

Valapati, Valapati, Balaapati ........................................ 10, n.

Vallabha, commentator, 251; 253, n; and the
Krishna sect ........................................................... Sup. 19; 20

Valura, caves ................................................................. 74

Vansjish, cattle-rearing ................................................. 256

Varahamihira, 108; and Sun, idols ......................... 136; 138; 150

Varatunga Pandy, Svalabha, copperplate of ............... 81

Vardhara, or Buddhara, Thakurs .................................. 203

Varga, Aparas leader ...................................................... 197

Vargh, Vargav, wolf ........................................................ 197

Vedika-sthara, Patafijali's gloss to, and the
Abhiras .................................................................. 36
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Vilivāyakura, Baleoukour, coins of ........................................ 153
Vinaśphari, and Vanasparas ............................................. 298, f.
Vindhya, Vījha, mts ......................................................... 151
vinīta, word, in Aśoka inscrip ........................................... 53: 54 & n.
Vira Nāriśāna, copperplate of ............................................. 79
Virapurushadatta, Śrī Ḍakhvāku, k ....................................... 156
virgins, cult ........................................................................ 205: 208
Virūpākṣha, copperplate of ................................................. 79
Viśākhā, worshipped by the Mauryas ................................ 51
Viśnu, Temples, 95, f.; and the Sun, 136 & n.: 137: 220; image, etc., 164: 216; Trivikrama worship, 84; in the Bhagavatītīd, Sup. 2: 4, 5, n.: 6, n.: 11: 17: 18
Vishnuism, pre-Mussalmans, 204, n.; in the Bhagavatītīd ................................................................. Sup. 14: 19
Vishnupāda, on Gaya Peak, 84 & n.; 219; inscrip ................................................................. 109, f.
Vishnupur, Pī-šen-pō-pu-jo ................................................. 204, n.
Vishnubita, atake on Uderolāl ........................................... 204
Vishnugupta, Kauṭiliya, or Chānaspya ................................ 101: 159: 190
Vīśvāmitra, and the Andhras, 70; and Rāma, 240
Vīśvabhā, Vīśvabhātika, etc., and Vanaspara, 298
Vīśvāruša Sena, copperplate of ......................................... 220
Vieškotatramdā, the ....................................................... 79, ff.; 94, ff.; 125, ff.
volunteer, reformedoe ..................................................... 84
vraja, vrajas, divisions of land ........................................... 55 & n.
Vīndabana, and Sun worship ............................................ 220
Vṛttā, in Māmasta’s Kātyā Prakṣā, an additional proof of the genuineness of ........................................... 23
Vudrī, inscrip ........................................................................ 288
Vyāsā, and the story of Indrasena ...................................... 281; Sup. 20

Wadagāri inscrip ................................................................. 290
udgh, panther ..................................................................... 197
udgha, crocodile .................................................................. 197
Waid I, Umsayyad Khalifa, 174; and the mihrdab ................................................................. 175
Walker, man with Capt. Cook, and with Wm. Bolts ................................................................. 90 & n.
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GARBE'S INTRODUCTION TO THE BHAGAVADGĪTĀ.*
TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN BY N. B. UTGİKAR, M.A.; POONA.

Preface.

[Text p. 5] Of translations of Bhag, and of treatises over it, there is certainly no lack. A new translation and investigation of the famous poem is not however superfluous, since Böhtlingk in his "Bemerkungen zur Bhag," 2 has shown how much yet remains to be done for an exact understanding of the text of the Bhag. Böhtlingk's remarks conclude with the words: "An unprejudiced examination of the philosophical contents of the Bhag, influenced by no commentator is certainly very much to be wished for, if coming from a scholar familiar with the philosophical systems of India." If the great scholar—only recently snatched away from us—be right in holding this view, and if I might reckon myself—on the ground of my work for the Indian Philosophy—as amongst those qualified for such a work, I need have no scruples in putting forward the result of (my) all-sided and searching investigation of the Bhag.

1.—The Bhagavadgītā in its Original Form.

[Text p. 6] The days when the Bhag, because of the loftiness of its thought and of its language excited in Europe nothing short of enthusiastic rapture, are long gone by. We are—in spite of phantastic theosophists like Franz Hartmann—grown more sober and more critical, and do not any more shut our eyes to the manifest shortcomings and weak points of the poem. Even now the still prevailing view in India is of the homogeneity 3 of the Bhag., though this view has been often enough refuted by German scholars. Already in 1926 had W. von Humboldt in his well-known essay "On an Episode of the Mahābhārata known under the name of Bhag.," p. 53, said: "The interpolations and additions can with great probability be conjectured even if one be not in the position to single them out;" and again p. 54, "the relationship of the individual doctrines would probably have been stronger if indeed the idea of unity had prevailed from the very first design of the work." With greater decisiveness has Weber after him [Ind. Stu. II, 394 (1853)] expressed himself on this point: "The Bhag. can be regarded only as a combination of partly very different kinds of pieces." A. Holtzmann, Das Mahābhārata, II., pp. 163-165, emphasises the necessity of the supposition that the Bhag. might have been recast; so also E. W. Hopkins in his Great Epic of India, 1902, speaks more than once (p. 205, p. 234) of the rewritten Gītā (rewritten by a modernizing hand). In what way Hopkins thinks that the Gītā might have been rewritten is to be seen from his older work The

* [Garbe's (German) Introduction to his (German) Translation of Bhagavadgītā appeared at Leipzig in 1905.]

1 A comprehensive review of the MSS., editions and translations of the Bhag, and of its native commentaries and of the explanatory treatises thereof by European scholars is given by A. Holtzmann, Das Mahābhārata, II. 1892, pp. 121-153. Since the appearance of Holtzmann's work no year has passed but has added in India further contributions to the literature on the Bhag.


3 Protāp Chandra Roy says in his translation of the Mahābhārata, VI. 75, note: "The text of the Gītā has come down to us without, it may be ventured to be stated, any interpolation."
Religions of India, p. 389, [Text p. 7] where it is said: "This Divine Song (or Song of the Blessed One) is at present a Krishaite version of an older Vishnuite poem and this in turn was at first an unsectarian work, perhaps a late Upanishad." Again at p. 399, Hopkins says: "It is noticeable that although Krisha (Vishnu) is the ostensible speaker, there is scarcely anything to indicate that the poem was originally composed even for Vishnu," As would be evident from what follows, I do not share this view of the American scholar. The conviction, however, that the Bhag. has not reached us in its original form but has undergone essential transformations, is now, however, shared by most of the Indologists outside India. Still this conviction has not up to now led any one to separating the later parts of the Bhag. And this for conceivable reasons—since any such attempt exposes the critique quite too much to objections and contradictions. Because of the importance which the Bhag., however, possesses for the Indian spiritual life, it appears to me to be in the religio-historical interests of the (present) moment, that such a task should be ventured. The translation that I offer in the sequel will neither be polished nor smooth, but will be quite literal, and will contain therefore in smaller type those parts, which according to my view are interpolated by a later hand. In this I have proceeded on the following considerations.

A. Holtzmann (op. cit., pp. 163, 164) is on account of the inconsistencies in the Bhag. led to the conclusion that "We have before us a Vishnuite revision of a pantheistic poem. We must distinguish between an older and a later Bhag. The older poem was a philosophico-poetical episode of the old genuine Mahabharata, being composed with a pantheistic tendency." [Text p. 8] When I read this statement the conviction grew strongly on me that the fact was just the opposite of this. Just before the passage quoted above, Holtzmann correctly shows how the theological idea of the poem must be regarded as a contradiction with itself. "On the one hand, the pantheistic and thoroughly impersonal World-Soul, on the other, the extremely personal and realistic Krisha-Vishnu, incorporated as a human being; and we are called upon to believe that these two principles are identical." Because of this contradiction the investigation must, as a matter of fact, proceed to distinguish the later component parts of the Gita from the older ones; but in my opinion the investigation should not be carried on after Holtzmann's fashion.

The whole character of the poem in its design and execution is preponderantly theistic. A personal God Krisha stands forth in the form of a human hero, expounds his doctrine, enjoins, above all things, on his listener, along with the performance of his duties, loving faith in Him and self-surrender; and then discloses Himself as an act of especial grace in His super-mundane but withal personal form, and promises to the faithful as a reward for his faith, that he would be united with Him after his death, and would be admitted into the fellowship of God. And by the side of this God—(who is) delineated as personally as possible, and who dominates the whole poem—stands out frequently the impersonal neutral Brahman, the Absolute, as the highest principle. At one time Krisha says that He is the sole Highest God who has created the world and all beings and rules over it all; at another

* Of interpolations and changes (made) in the Bhag. Hopkins treats, Religions of India, 300 and 429 (top).
time, he expounds the Vedantic doctrine of Brahman and Mâyā—the Cosmical Illusion, and expounds as the highest goal of a human being that he be freed from the World-Illusion and become Brahman. These two doctrines—the theistic and the pantheistic—are mixed up with each other, and follow each other, sometimes quite unconnected and sometimes loosely connected. And it is not the case that the one is represented as a lower, exoteric, \[Text p. 9\] and the other, as the higher esoteric doctrine. It is nowhere taught that the Theism is a preliminary step to the knowledge of the reality or that it is its symbol, and that the pantheism of the Vedânta is the (ultimate) reality itself; but the two beliefs are treated of almost throughout as though there was indeed no difference between them, either verbal or real.

One might seek to disregard the contradictions in the Bhagā, with the explanation that there was not to be expounded in the Bhagā any consistent system, but that it was only a poet speaking there, who received and fashioned thoughts as they streamed into his mind, without paying any heed to the inconsistencies that are to be found at various places.\(^5\) Any such view regarding the Gitā is quite erroneous. The Gitā is certainly no "artistic work which the all-comprehending vision of a genius has created." The play of inspiration is indeed oftentimes perceptible; not seldom, however, there are (merely high-) sounding, empty words with which an idea that has been already quite often explained, is repeated; and occasionally the literary expression is exceedingly faulty. Verses are bodily taken over from the Upanishad literature, and this is certainly what a poet filled with inspiration would never have done. The workings of Sattva, Rajas and Tamas are systematised with a truly Indian pedantry, and much indeed besides this could be brought forward to prove that the Gitā is not the product of a genuinely poetic creative impulse, but is partially a purely artistic didactic poem for the propounding of certain definite religio-philosophical ideas.\(^6\) The inconsistency pervading through the greater part of the Gitā \[Text p. 10\] cannot, therefore, be overcome by relying on the poetic character of the poem. One can remove the inconsistency only by the supposition that out of the two heterogeneous doctrines that are put in the mouth of the personal God Krishna, one must be a later addition. And if this be the case, could we really doubt that we must reject the pantheistic doctrine (as a later addition) and not the theistic one, as Holtzmann does?

\(^5\) Von Humboldt, p. 93, says: "There is (in the Gitā) a sage that speaks in the fulness and enthusiasm of his knowledge and of his feelings, and not a philosopher brought up in any school, who divides his material in conformity to a settled method, and arrives at the last steps of his doctrines through the clue of a set of systematic ideas."

\(^6\) Böhltingk in his Bemerkungen (p. 6, end) says: "The Gitā contains by the side of many high and beautiful thoughts, not a few weak points: contradictions (which the commentators have tried to pass over as excusable), repetitions, exaggerations, absurdities and loathsome points." Hopkins, Religions of India, p. 390, names the Bhagā as a characteristic work of the Hindu Literature "in its sublimity as in its puérilities, in its logic as in its want of it;" and p. 399 (bottom), "an ill-assorted cabinet of primitive philosophical opinions." Hopkins passes the following judgment (p. 400) on the poetic worth of the Bhagā. "Despite its occasional power and mystic exaltation, the Divine Song in its present state as a poetical production is unsatisfactory. The same thing is said over and over again, and the contradictions in phraseology and meaning are as numerous as the repetitions, so that one is not surprised to find it described as 'the Wonderful Song, which causes the hair to stand on end.'"
One might, however, object that the Indians themselves have not at all seen any inconsistency in this combination of Pantheism and Theism; in many other passages of the Mahābhārata (e.g. just at its commencement, Anukramaṇikāparvan, vv. 22-24), in the Purāṇas and elsewhere, Krīṣṇa, i.e. Viṣṇu, is indeed often enough identified with the universal Soul. And in the system of Rāmānuja, the Brahman is conceived to be thoroughly personal.—as an all-powerful, all-knowing and all-merciful Ruler of the Universe which is pervaded by His godly spirit. Why should not have (therefore) the author of the Gitā composed the poem under this belief itself in which the theistic and the pantheistic elements lay side by side?

[Text p. 11] To this I reply as follows. The identification of Krīṣṇa with Brahman, his being regarded as the universal Soul, belongs to a period posterior to the original Bhag.—a period filled with syncretic inclinations. This can be proved from the Gitā itself as it has come down to us.

As is well-known, Krīṣṇa comes to be regarded as the Supreme Principle first in the later parts of the Mahābhārata. The Gitā, however, does not belong to its later interpolations. The Gitā, even in the revised form in which it lies before us, is regarded rightly as one of the older episodes of the Mahābhārata. (Holtzmann, op. cit., part II, 121; Hopkins, Great Epic, 205, 402.) Indeed Holtzmann (I, 127) would “ascrIBE the oldest parts of the Bhag, unhesitatingly to the older poem.” Even if I do not subscribe to this latter statement still on ground of its language and its metre, the relative antiquity of the Bhag cannot be doubted.7 With this also quite fits in (the circumstance) that in the Gitā Krīṣṇa stands forth almost thoroughly as a person, and that his identification with Brahman is expressed in clear words only in a few passages (which also will be discussed more closely shortly). I shall here only call attention to Bhag. VII. 19: “At the end of many lives the man of knowledge approaches me realising that Vāsudeva is everything. Such a high-souled person is very difficult to find.” That is, Krīṣṇa was very seldom regarded as the all (or Brahman), but he was almost always regarded as a personal God. Does not the reviser of the Gitā express here in quite clear words that the identification of Krīṣṇa with Brahman was at his time first in process of growth? In the first verse of the twelfth Adhyāya, which in my opinion belongs to the older poem, those who revere the unchangeable and unknowable Brahman are placed in opposition to the Theists who worship Krīṣṇa, with a preference for the latter (verse 2), and with a remark that the difficulties in the way of the Theists for obtaining eternal welfare are lesser [than for the Aryakta-Upāsakas] (verse 5).

[Text p. 12] Hopkins, Great Epic, 398, characterises the third of the periods postulated by him in the development of the Mahābhārata-text in these words:—“Re-making of the epic with Krīṣṇa as all-god, &c.”; for the preceding second period, [a Mahābhārata tale with Paṇḍu heroes, lays and legends combined by the Puranic diakonists] Hopkins lays

7 For more on this point, see part IV of this Preface.
down "Krśňa as a demi-god." On the ground of this close-fitting theory—a theory which in its essentials is quite convincing to me—I believe Hopkins cannot possibly be regarded as holding that Krśňa had developed from a demi-god immediately to an all-god, from a half god to a universal being. In between lies naturally the transition from half (demi-) god to God, and his identification with Vishňu. Only after the Krśňa cult had reached that point in its development, could the one god be identified with the Universal Soul; an event furthermore which signifies more the degradation of the Brahman conception than the exaltation of the personal God.

The original Bhag. has been composed during that period in which Krśňa-Vishňu had become the highest (or we might simply say, the) God of Brähmanism; and in the period when Krśňa began to be identified with Brahma and a Vedântic turn to be given to Krśňaism in general, originates the pantheistic revision of the poem as it lies before us now; and then originate also those constituent parts (of the poem) which in my translation I have exhibited as additions. Indeed, I have already indicated that Krśňa first appears in the Gâlā to be identified with Brahma only very sporadically. Many times [Text p. 13] the conceptions of Krśňa and of Brahman are placed in juxtaposition (but) as quite different from each other, so that it almost makes an impression as though the reviser might have shrunk from asserting quite emphatically the identity of Krśňa and Brahman because of the distinctly theistic character of his subject-matter. Arjuna indeed says to Krśňa (X, 12): "Thou art the Highest Brahma", and in the passage already cited, it is said "Vâsudeva is All" (VII, 19). [Similarly in XI, 40]. However VIII, 1, Arjuna asks—"What is the Brahman?", and Krśňa answers (v. 3) not that "I am Brahman" but says "Brahman is the unchanging highest principle" and gives a different explanation of himself in v. 4 b. In XIV, 26-27 Krśňa says, "He who serves me with an unswerving devotion is fit to become one with Brahma, because I am the substratum of Brahma." In XVIII, 50-53, it is taught how the perfected one reaches Brahma; but immediately thereafter (vv. 54, 55) we hear that having become Brahma, he compasses devotion for Krśňa and that consequently he enters into Krśňa.

In these passages, then Krśňa and Brahman are quite distinctly distinguished from each other. It is not only here that they are separate, but (they are so) everywhere through the whole poem (excluding of course those passages where the Vedântic reviser has mixed up and completely identified with each other the two ideas). In the older poem Krśňa speaks of himself—and Arjuna of Krśňa—as an individual, a person, a conscious God-head. In the additions made at the time of the revision, the neutral Brahman steps in as the highest principle and is occasionally identified with Krśňa. To summarise therefore, in the older poem is preached Krśňaism based philosophically on Sâkhya-yoga:

---

8 I might as well leave out of account Joseph Dahmann’s theory regarding the homogeneous character of the Mahâbhârata—a theory that is shared by no non-Indian scholar.

9 Of this identification of Krśňa with Vishňu and the reason thereof I shall treat at length in a different connection in part II of this Preface.

10 Even in the description of the Rishis, Mbh. VI, Adh. 68 (Calc. Edition), Krśňa is viewed quite emphatically in a personal capacity.
the Vedānta philosophy [Text p. 14] is taught in the additions (made at the time) of the revision.\textsuperscript{11} Of course it is known long since that the doctrines of the Sāmkhya-yoga are for the most part the basis of the philosophical ideas of the Bhag, and that by their side, the Vedānta considerably recedes to the back-ground. How often are Sāmkhya and Yoga mentioned by name, while (the word) Vedānta comes only once (Vedāntakrit, XV. 15) and that too in the sense of Upanishad.\textsuperscript{12} So then even if we think only of the rôle which the philosophical systems play in the present Gītā, and if we hold in view the irreconcilable difference between the Sāmkhya-yoga (on the one) and the Vedānta (on the other hand), — a difference which can only be overcome by distinguishing older and newer parts (in the Gītā), — the Vedāntic portions of the Bhag. would be proved to be over again as un-original. Were we, therefore, to investigate the Gītā either from the religious or from the philosophical point of view, [Text p. 15] the same result would be attained in either case.\textsuperscript{13}

Since Mīmāṃsā and Vedānta are most closely bound up with each other in the philosophical literature of Brāhmaṇism, it is conceivable that the reviser of the Gītā should have ushered in Mīmāṃsā tenets as well, along with Vedāntic views, in this popular work, more religious than strictly philosophical. That the poem itself inveighs against the performance of Vedic works (II. 42-46, and XVIII. 66) has not prevented the reviser (of Gītā) from making additions in which he brings in his ritualistic stand-point and impressively recommends (III. 9-18, IV. 31) the Vedic sacrificial work.\textsuperscript{24} The sacrifice was in the older poem (IV. 25 and ff. and elsewhere), thoroughly understood in a metaphorical spiritual sense.

\textsuperscript{11} The additions made (to the Gītā) at the time of the revision are related to the original Bhag. as the subsequently interpolated Uśtratāpanīya to the older Pārvatāpanīya in the case of the Nrisīnhadāpanīya Upanishad. Weber (Ind. Stud., IX, 54) has characterised the two parts of this Upanishad in the following words: "The great difference of the two from each other can be seen quite clearly. The Pārvatāpanīya is purely exoteric and is concerned only with the forms of belief of one (particular) sect, which reveres the Nrisinha form of Vaiṣṇava the highest expression and the most exalted form of godhood; and it (i.e. the Pārvatāpanīya) is based essentially on the standpoint of the Yoga system. The Uśtratāpanīya is, on the other hand, purely esoteric, and is concerned only with the identification of the All-Soul—the highest Atman, i.e. Brahma— with the Universe, and more particularly with representing its identity with the holy syllable Om, the different parts of which are in their turn represented as containing the Universe, and stands essentially on the standpoint of the Vedānta system." Thus in the Nrisīnhadāpanīya Upanishad also, the Yoga doctrine based on Theism is the older (view), and the Vedāntic doctrine the later one. Moreover, it has been shown in part IV of this Preface that the reviser of the Bhag. has utilised the Uśtratāpanīya.

\textsuperscript{12} Vedānta. has generally this sense, very often in Mahābhārata, cf. Hopkins, Great Epic, 93.

\textsuperscript{13} Even in the so-called quintessence verse of the Gītā, XI, 55 (Sarva-āstara-Sāra or so forth according to the commentators) there is nothing of Vedāntic doctrine.

\textsuperscript{14} The description of the Tamas kind of sacrifice, XVII, 13, "where there are no prayers and no gifts" might probably occasion the view whether it must here be intended to speak approvingly of the sacrifices prescribed in the Mīmāṃsā. The description of the Sātvat kind of sacrifice, however, in v. 11 as being "performed by those who do not expect any reward therefrom" is against this view. The object of the author in these verses is to bring together under his scheme of Sātvat,
Ever since the Bhag. was completed as it has come down to us, it has served to the later poets as a model—even with all its admixture, inconsistencies and vagueness—which all, the Indian mysticism can put up with. After the pattern of the Bhag. are composed [Text p. 16] the Anuśāgī (Mbh. XIV., Ad. 16-51,) the Īśvara Gītā (Kūrmap. II. Ad. 1-11), the Vyāsa Gītā (Kūrmap. II. Ad. 12-34.) and indeed many other pieces besides, not to mention the borrowings from the Bhag., e.g. in Mbh. III. 120 and in the Pāṃcharātra Section, Mbh. XII, Adh. 341 and ff., compare particularly Bhag. XI, 15 and ff., and Mbh. XII, verse 12914 and ff. (Calc. edition).

I have read the Bhag. six or seven times during the course of the year, and the impression has ever strengthened itself on my mind that the Vedāntic and the Mīmāṃsik parts are unoriginal. I have therefore ventured to carry into practical execution the idea of separating the above named parts of the Bhag., not as the result of any abrupt conceit, but on the basis of a slowly accumulating conviction. (By) thus (separating the particular parts) it appears to me that there is (by this process) nowhere caused any real gap in the Bhag., rather the interrupted relationship of the various passages is further restored;—thus, for instance, quite decidedly by removing the passages III. 9-18; VI. 27-32; VII. 7-11; VIII. 20; IX. 6. A better confirmation of my theory (than this) cannot possibly, I believe, be expected.

If I might still bring forward a circumstance in favour of my opinion, it is the use of the word "Māyā" which occurs six times in the Bhag. Among those passages the word Māyā has at IV. 6 and XVIII. 61 the old sense of "miraculous power"; (these passages in my opinion are old since they treat of Īśvara) but the word has at VII. 14 (twice), 15, and 25, the technical Vedānta meaning of the world-appearance, Cosmic Illusion. Over and above this word, which for the religio-philosophical development of India is of very great interest, [Text p. 17] I will not seek to support my theory with (other) literary investigations; and just now I refrain from the possible attempt of bringing to bear on the case literary, stylistic or metrical arguments: because the revision of the Gītā has not naturally been carried on so mechanically that the Vedāntic and the ritualistic pieces were put in whenever any occasion presented itself as being favourable, and that the old constituent parts of the work scrupulously preserved. It is rather to be supposed that because of the exigencies of the interpolations, most of the poem has been shaped anew. However the old Bhag. has not thereby suffered so radical a transformation of its character that

Rajas and Tamas the different kinds of sacrifices known to him in civilized life of his community, but not thereby to recommend the Vedic sacrifice and the tenets of the Mīmāṃsik. The same is the case with the veneration of the Brāhmaṇas in v. 14 and of the practice of Veda-recitation in v. 15. In XVIII. 5-6, sacrifice, alms-giving and austerities are recognized as means of purification. Still, however, it is emphasized that one should not practice them with a view to their results [and this is opposed to (the tenets of) Mīmāṃsik.]

15 Rajendralāla Mitra, Catalogue of Bikaner (MSS.), 201, No. 436.
16 For more on this point, see the Appendix "On the passages in the Bhag. not originally belonging to it."
the interpolated passages are not for the most part even now recognisable as such in the new work. Though the interpolations are distributed very unequally on the eighteen Adhyāyas, it can well be supposed that the original Gitā must have consisted of a smaller number of Adhyāyas. Its division into eighteen Adhyāyas is presumably fashioned after that of the Mahābhārata into eighteen pareaus; perhaps the eighteen Parāsas were also known at that time.

The passages expurgated by me are, as already said, mainly of a Vedântic and Mîmâṃsic import. Other passages are also expunged on other critical grounds, the reasons of which are set forth in the Appendix. One hundred and seventy out of the seven hundred verses of the Bhag. fall away in this way; if the twenty-four verses at the beginning and at the end which might or might not belong to the original Gitâ, are to be deducted from this number, there are one hundred and forty-six (of these interpolated verses), or more than one-fifth of the whole.

I do not cherish the illusion that according to the method outlined above I might have succeeded in taking out all the unoriginal parts of the Bhag. At the time of the revision there might have been added many other verses besides, of which no word might have been existing in the original poem; means are, however, wanting to decide them as unoriginal, and I should not venture upon pure guess. W. von. Humboldt's remarks on p. 46 of his work make it appear that this great scholar was inclined to make the genuine Gitâ [Text p. 18] end with the eleventh Adhyāya. Hopkins, Great Epic, 225, calls the verses of Mbh. VI. 830-1382, i.e. just the first fourteen Adhyāyas of our poem, "the heart of the Gitâ." I admit unhesitatingly that the later Adhyāyas contrast unfavorably with the preceding ones; I would not however, therefore, venture to declare them to be outright later additions, but would suppose that, as it so often happens, the skill of the composer has failed him as he approached the end. That many of the fundamental teachings of the Gitâ are for the first time brought into clear light in passages of the eighteenth Adhyāya (vv. 55, 66) speaks for the genuineness of the later Adhyāyas.

My translation of the Bhag. will in a convenient manner enable the reader to pass lightly over what I regard its un-genuine passages, and thus to secure a faithful representation of the original form (of the Bhag.). In any case, my attempt at reconstructing (the original Bhag.) removes all the most glaring contradictions that pervade the whole poem in its present form, creating ambiguity and vagueness. It represents a Gitâ the religious character of which is purely theistic, and the philosophical character of which closely corresponds to the doctrines of the Śāṅkhyâ-Yoga. Clear though the result of my investigation appears to me personally, I still expect to meet with opposition (from others). This opposition is principally to be expected from the side which regards the Śāṅkhyâ as nothing else than a "muddling up" of Vedânta, though this standpoint in itself does not necessitate the rejection of the result I have arrived at.

When however Hopkins, p. 234, says that the heart of the poem differs in style from its beginning and ending, he does not indeed regard in this passage the beginning of the Gitâ as belonging to the "heart." How is this to agree with his statement above?
II.—The Origin of the Doctrines of the Bhagavadgita.

[p. 19]. For a correct estimation of the contents of the Bhag. it is necessary that we should realise its historical antecedents, in so far as we can gather them with an approximation to truth from the means at (our) disposal. We shall use for that purpose only a part of the huge material regarding Krishña and the Krishña-cult. Even this material is, however, very much complicated and does not yield quite easily to any attempt to secure a clear and homogenous apprehension regarding the progress of Krishña-ism. An attempt of this kind is beset by the danger of some essential and chronological violence being done to the statements contained in our sources. Whether I might have succeeded in steering clear of this danger, is for others to decide. I can only say that I have constantly placed this pitfall before my eyes.

In the epoch in which the Kshatriyas played a prominent part in the reformation of the spiritual life of Ancient India—according to my view they had the leading of it—there was established a valiant warrior, Krishña, the son of Vasudeva and Devaki, a monotheistic religion which spread itself first amongst his co-tribals the Yadavas, Satvatas or Vrishnis, and, then, beyond the range of that tribal communion. This view was first put forward only by way of a hypothesis by R. G. Bhandarkar in connection with his exposition of the Râmânuja system and its antecedents (Report on Search for Sanskrit MSS. in Bombay Presidency, 1883-84, Bombay 1887, p. 74); but this view can (now) be securely established. In connection with this, there are principally to be taken into consideration the following three lines of evidence, which mutually support and supplement each other. First, Krishña Devakiputra is, as is well known, mentioned already in Chhândogypanshād III, 17, 5 as the pupil of Aûgrasa Ghora, in a very remarkable [p. 20] way in connection with doctrines which bear a distinctly ethical character. Secondly, is to be mentioned the rôle which Krishña, the renowned hero of the Yadava clan and the ally of the Pândavas, plays in the older parts of the Mahâbhârata—the rôle, viz., as a warrior, counsellor, and expositor of religious doctrines. The Petersburg Dictionary, II, 413, already speaks of the "natural connection" of the hero famed in the Mahâbhârata with the teacher Krishña mentioned in the Chhândogypanshād, and this connection should not be severed unnecessarily. Thirdly, there is another circumstance to be mentioned as belonging to this point, viz., that the patronymic of Krishña, viz. "Vasudeva," meets us in a large number of cases, and used earlier than the personal name, as the designation of God, and is primarily found specially amongst the members of that clan to which Krishña according to the Mahâbhârata belonged. This circumstance is therefore of primary importance since the deification of the founders of sects in India is a general custom, and does not date first with the rise of neo-brahmanism since the close of the 12th century a.d., as held by Barth, Religions de l'Inde, 137.

If these lines of evidence were to be combined, the way, I should think, is shown to us for our understanding of what Krishña Vasudeva once was in reality. From the tangle of tradition, legend and myth, with which the conception of Krishña is overgrown, there can be peeled out as kernel a victorious hero who at the same time was the successful founder of a religion.

18 See my Beitrag zur indischen Kulturgeschichte (Berlin 1903), Aufsatz I.
20 R. G. Bhandarkar, loc. cit., p. 73.
The contradictions which the character of Khâsa exhibits in the Mahâbhârata have led Ad. Holtzmann to the view that two different persons might be mixed up together in the Khâsa of the epos. This recourse, however, has been long since recognised to be unnecessary, since the contradictions can quite satisfactorily be explained through the revision effected in the old Kuru-epos, according to which (i.e., the old kernel) Khâsa was an antagonist of the Kuru, and a person [p. 21] full of trickery and cunning; in the present Pândava-epos, Khâsa is glorified as a friend and helper of his heroes.2

Weber also supposed on mythological grounds that in the Khâsa of the epos and of the Hindu religion different persons bearing this name—one human and one or more (!) mythological personalities—might have coalesced together (Zur Indischen Religionsgeschichte, eine Kürsorische Übersicht, Stuttgart 1899, pp. 28 and 29—Eng. Trans. by Grierson Ind. Ant., Vol. 30, 1901, p. 285 ff.). However, the way in which Weber presumes “some such mythical basis” and arrives at his opinion by means of various possibilities, affords no exact insight into the way of reasoning through which he had reached his conviction in the matter, and offers no help to a critical analysis of his standpoint.

Still less convincing to me is the phantastic theory brought forward by Senart and Barth regarding Khâsa’s having originally a purely mythical aspect. Senart in his essay on the legend of Buddha, sees in Khâsa as much as in Buddha, a sun-hero, a popular form of the atmospheric Agni, and A. Barth, Religions de l’Inde, pp. 100, 103, [The Religions of India, English Translation (1882), Trübner’s Oriental Series, p. 172] shares his opinion. At the latter place Barth says: “Considered in his physical derivation, Khâsa is a figure of complex quality, in which there mingle at length myths of fire, lightning, and storm, and in spite of his name (Khâsa signifies “the black one”) of heaven and the sun,” and further below he puts forward the statement that in Khâsa’s parents Vasudeva and Devaki, “we recognise concealed the ancient pair, the celestial man and the Apsaras.” Weber also who otherwise gives a very sound view regarding the gradual elevation of Khâsa from a human being to godhood, has given a mythological interpretation to many of the purely human references to Khâsa. He understands Vasudeva as “Indra son”, Ind. Stud. I. 432; XIII. 333, note 2; and in Ind. Streifen, III. 428, he says [p. 22]: “The close relationship of the legend of Khâsa with Indra, the Vedic representation of the thunder god, was already [even before Senart] regarded as certain, Indra being called ‘Govind’ and Khâsa ‘Govinda’, because of the common relation of both to Arjuna,” i.e., because Arjuna is represented—like so many other heroes of Indian legends—as a son of Indra. This followed, in the present case, from the fact that Arjuna was known to be a name of Indra in the Vedas.12

The striking refutation which Oldenberg urges against the solar theory of Senart in relation to Buddha, cannot indeed be the same way be made applicable to Khâsa, since in this case there are wanting such older materials of a thoroughly reliable genuineness, as are to be found in the old Pâli texts regarding the life of Buddha. The analogy

1 L. Von Schroeder, Indiens Literatur und Kultur, p. 480.
2 Weber likewise finds it a great riddle (Ind. Stud., XIII. 355, note 5) how Khâsa might have come to have the names Kesava and Govinda. There is nothing less puzzling than this to any one who sees in Khâsa a human being. The epithet Kesava shows that Khâsa had long curling hair, or was supposed to have such hair-dress; and Govinda “the herd-obtainer” simply denotes the victorious in battle. That there is no sufficient ground for supposing that the bye-name Govinda might be a Prâkrit form of Gopendra “the prince of the herdsmen” has been already mentioned in the Pañcabhanga Dictionary.
is, however, none the less very instructive. If the solar theory about Buddha is in itself shown to be an error—Senart himself has deemed it necessary in the second edition of his "Essai", to make a considerable concession to the historical view—then, by a parity of circumstances, the solar theory in the case of Krishna might not well stand. In the Krishna myth we should not see the "basis" from which the conceptions of the person of Krishna might have been evolved; on the other hand, we must see in the Krishna-myth purely mythological ideas which are engrafted on Krishna, after he was raised to Godhood. From this standpoint all the difficulties that are inherent in the solar atmospheric [p. 23] theory regarding Krishna, vanish, and from this point of view the circumstance that many of the Krishna-myths recur with much peculiar characteristics in the apocryphic biography of Buddha, is not (therefore) to be wondered at.

Every unprejudiced historical consideration of our material shows us Krishna in the oldest period as a human being, and later,—in a progressive development as half-god, god, and all-Soul. If in the mythology of Hinduism Krishna is represented as a God assuming human shape, or as an incarnation of Vishnu, it is simply the reversal of the real relation, as is to be observed elsewhere quite distinctly in the myths that bring about the transformation. As a matter of fact, Euhemerism is quite justified in our present case.

Krishna is therefore as much a real personality as Buddha; and his parents also—Devaki and Vasudeva—were no mythological or allegorical persons, but human beings like (Krishna) himself. The question has naturally been raised as to what fundamental causes the deification of Krishna might be due to. Some (Weber, Ind. Lit. Gesch. 1 p. 78, note 68—English Trans. 1892, p. 71; note 68; Ind. Stu. XIII, p. 349, note; Holtzmann, Arjuna, p. 61) declare this to be a riddle; on the other hand, the services which Krishna rendered in bringing about the victory of the Pāṇḍavas are mentioned in this connection. Schroeder, Indiens Literatur und Cultur, p. 332, finds it reasonable and natural that "these new rulers of the Madhyadeśa were ready [p. 24] to insist and to promulgate the reverence shown to their national hero by their allies, and were at great pains to magnify the glory of the hero who had now become their hero as well;" and p. 333, he says (in agreement with Lassen, Ind. Alterthumskunde, I, 282.), the Pāṇḍavas, the heroes of the Mahābhārata appear as the furtherers of the Kṛishṇa-worship. As against this, it is to be remarked that the deification of Krishna has been brought about in a time when the help which the Yādavas had once rendered to the victors of the Kuru-tribe, did no longer possess any actual interest. Quite naturally the reason of Krishna's deification is—as has been already stated above—due to his being the founder of the monotheistic religion of his tribe; and this on account of the numerous analogies which the religious history of India presents to us from (the time of) Buddha down to quite modern times.

Regarding the original essence of this religion it can only be said that it was popular and independent of the Vedic tradition and of Brahmanism, and that most probably it

21 Hopkins, Religions of India, p. 466, says that the Divine man of the Mbh. "must be the same with the character mentioned in the Chāndogya Upanishad, 3-17-6." On page 466. (end), however, Hopkins strikes out a different way of explanation: "It cannot be imagined, however, that the cult of the Gangetic Kṛishṇa originated with that vague personage whose pupilage is described in the Upanishads," and on the next two pages he declares Krishna to be an anthropomorphic God. This deduction of the otherwise very ingenious and lucid scholar appears to me not to be happy. In Fausboll's Indian Mythology according to the Mahābhārata, London 1903, p. 121, Krishna has been treated of in a remarkable manner with reference to the Hari-vanśa, the Bhāgavata Purāṇa and other later works.
laid from its very start great emphasis on the moral side of which there is dreadfully too little in the Brahmanical religion and philosophy. We might compare above, and think of the rôle which duty plays in the Bhag. Other passages of the Mahâbhârata might be brought forward to support the view that the Kâshâna is has—from the very beginning—an ethical religion of the Kshatriyas; e.g., Mahâbhârata VI. 3044, 3045 (Calc. edition.)

Râjarshiâm udârâśâh âhasevâvanivartinâm
Sarvâdharmpadânanâm tvam gatir Madhusûdana

"Thou, O Madhusûdana, art the resort of the noble royal-sages who never turn back from fight and with whom all behests (of duty) preponderate."

In Kâshâna's religion God is named "Bhagavat"—"the noble one," a word used in India since very ancient times to denote the godly and holy beings. Along with this word there came to be used in course of time other epithets: [p. 25] Nârâyâna, Purushottama, as well as the patronymic and the personal name of the founder of the religion. As the oldest names of the sect occur (first in the 12th book of the Mahâbhârata) Bhâgavata and Sâtavata; the latter is derived from the clan of Kriṣṇa. Later than both these names is the name Pâścharâtra, which occasionally signifies a particular subdivision of the sect, but which is generally used as equivalent to Bhâgavata. With this (latter) name only I shall designate in the sequel the followers of the Kâshâna-religion, because I regard this as the original name.

If we were now to enquire about the time when Kâshâna lived and established his religion, we shall have to place him according to Çhâna Up. III. 17-8, a couple of centuries before Buddha; and if there is any historical nucleus in Kâshâna's participating in the war of the Pândavas with the Kauravas, (and his participation I believe to be real) he will have necessarily to be still carried back to a higher antiquity. The existence of the sect founded by Kriṣṇa is indeed, confirmed for the first time by literary evidence of the 4th century B.C.; it is from Pâṇini, IV. 3-98, where is laid down the formation of the word "Vâsudevaka" in the sense of "a worshipper of Vâsudeva." The alternative explanation given in the Mahâbhâsha, adhâva naivâd &c., 24 evidently appears as the correct one. 25 In the passage from Pâṇini, [p. 26] Vâsudeva is not the epithet of the Kâshâna Kriṣṇa, but of the highest being. As against this it cannot be urged that in the passage under consideration "Arjunaka" in the sense of "a worshipper of Arjuna" stands by the side of "Vâsudevaka." For inasmuch as Pâṇini has mentioned both of these forms in close connection with each other, he must not have thought of Arjuna as the friend and companion in arms of the human Kriṣṇa; on the other hand, Pâṇini must have conceived of Arjuna in that individuality in which he stands forth in.

24 Kielhorn reads in his edition tatra-bhavata, which is certainly wrong.
25 Cf. Weber, Ind. Stud., XIII, 348 ff. Weber seems in the statement of the Mahâbhâsha regarding the worship of Vâsudeva (something) less than Teleng, whom he controverts and who correctly explains Vâsudeva in the passage quoted as "a name of the Supreme Being." Against the view of Teleng that the Mahâbhâsha proves the worship of Kriṣṇa as the highest being, Weber urges, p. 353, that numerous other passages of the Mahâbhâsha refer to Kriṣṇa Vâsudeva as a hero and half-God. In these passages, however, Patañjali has simply utilised the material from the epic stories. If the renowned commentator quotes legendary stories known to him in which Kriṣṇa is mentioned as a semi-divine hero, to illustrate grammatical instances, it does not militate against the fact that Patañjali in other places refers to the worship of Vâsudeva as the highest God,—a worship that had spread wide amongst the people in his time. Cf. also on this point R. G. Bhandarkar, Indian Antiquary, III, 18.
the Bhag. (excepting its prologue) and in which he must have been generally known in Pāṇini's time, viz., as Krishṇa's disciple to whom the religious truth was disclosed by the Supreme Being, and who in consequence must be regarded as the preacher and promulgator of that religion. The way of worship, which should have brought into vogue the two derivatives, Vasudevaka and Arjunaka, must have been a different matter; in essence, however, both the words signify the same thing, viz., a follower of the Bhāgavata religion, and it is for this reason that Pāṇini has mentioned them simultaneously.²⁶

I have above fought resolutely against the theory of the mythical origina of Krishṇa. When I first investigated the theory regarding its probability, I became doubtful for a long time—because of the name Arjuna,—whether after all the theory might not be a true one, since the two names Krishṇa and Arjuna convey—in spite of us—[p. 27] an allegorical or naturalistic impression. The words indeed have led even Weber (Zur ind. Religions Geschichte, pp. 28-29) to think in a similar fashion. However, such impressions being dependent on the etymology of names, and one quite too oft in an error, and give rise to an allegorical meaning or some other mysterious explanation where the simple and the most natural meaning was intended. I (need) remind only of Mayā, the mother of Buddha. The names Krishṇa and Arjuna are often to be met with in India, and Krishṇa besides as that of a poet in the Rigveda. If now two persons bearing these names (sic. Krishṇa and Arjuna) appear in close relation with each other, the circumstance is indeed very striking; but still it is not necessary for us therefrom to recognize in them—say—an embodiment of day and night or some such other thing; on the other hand, this circumstance might lend itself to a very simple explanation in two ways. Either the conception of Arjuna as a counterpart of Krishṇa was freely invented when the latter was enveloped up in legend; in such cases the people are fond of a parallelism of names, and the name Arjuna had especially in this case a double justification as being the name of the hero, in which the tribe of the Pandavas, i.e., the sons of the “white one”, was to a certain extent individualised;²⁷ or there was really amongst the Pandavas a friend and follower of Krishṇa bearing the name Arjuna. If now we were to decide for the second of these two [p. 28] alternatives, we might guess that “Arjuna” might have been originally a by-name, i.e., the short form of a by-name, which originated from our hero having had a team of white horses. Arjuna also bears in the Mahābhārata the surnames Svetavāhana, Svetavāhana, Svetāśva, Sītāśva. In this case too, viz., to this genesis of the name Arjuna, might also have

²⁶ An entirely different view of our (present) Pāṇini-passage has been expressed by Hopkins, Great Epic, p. 385, note 2: “The whole “evidence” at its most eviencing is that Pāṇini knew a Mahābhārata in which the heroes (Krishṇa and Arjuna) were objects of such worship as is accorded to most Hindu heroes after death.” Had Pāṇini really thought of only some such worship, it is in the highest degree surprising that he should have chosen just these two names, which from the point of view of religious history, are of very great significance and are from the same point of view associated together closely.

²⁷ Lassen sees, not only in Arjuna but also in Krishṇa, the personification of a tribe, and holds the two heroes as representatives of two Aryan tribes, differentiated from each other by white and dark skin complexion. See Ind. Altertumskunde, I, p. 789 and ff., particularly p. 791. “The differentiation according to colour must have some meaning, and this can only be that the Pāṇḍavas like the Yādavas who are represented by Krishṇa, both belonged to the Aryan people who had immigrated earlier, but that both had, through the influence of climate, become more dark-complexioned than the youngest immigrants from the North, the former therefore being called “black” in opposition to the latter.” How does this, however, agree with the fact that Arjuna himself is often characterized in Mahābhārata as having a dark complexion? Cf. Hopkins, Great Epic, p. 383.
contributed (Arjuna’s) contrast with Kṛishṇa (in colour). It can scarcely be thought that Arjuna has been from the very first a real personal name. Cases of colour-epithets becoming individual names (of persons) have indeed been quite extraordinarily common in India since very remote times. In addition to Kṛishṇa, Arjuna and Pāṇḍu, I might name Asita, Kapila, Chitra, Nila, Rama, Rohita, Lohita, Virupa, Sukla, Syama, Syāmaka, Syāva, Syāvaka, Sveta, Hari, Harita. If it therefore follows from this list—which could certainly be still enlarged—that every kind of colour has been utilized to serve as basis for (coining) personal names, I cannot still decide for the supposition that the friend and disciple of Kṛishṇa might have borne as a child the name Arjuna; since the play of chance that might have brought together two persons of the names Kṛishṇa and Arjuna (black and white) would be (indeed) too remarkable and (therefore) improbable; had it been “black” and “red” or “black” and “yellow,” the probability would have been greater (that there was such a person who bore the name from his infancy).

The development of the Bhagavata religion, which, according to the usual view, dates from the medieval ages of India, but which, according to my opinion, as set forth above, commences much earlier, proceeded along two lines—viz., the speculative one and the deepening of the religious sentiment.

The genuine Indian disposition to combine Religion and Philosophy and the strong speculative tendency in particular of the Kshatriya caste, resulted in a philosophical basis being given to the Bhagavata religion, when an interest in philosophical questions had laid possession far and wide of all classes of society in ancient India. For this purpose were utilized the two oldest systems (of Philosophy) which India has produced, viz., Saṅkhya and Yoga.28 [p. 23] The way in which a philosophical basis was thus given to the Bhagavata religion can indeed be recognized quite distinctly in the Bhag., the proper devotional manual of that sect. Besides I might here as well refer to a conjecture which I have put forward in my Saṅkhya Philosophy, p. 56. In place of “the old Vishnu-ism with a Saṅkhya-metaphysics” which A. Barth, Religions de l’Inde p. 117 arrives at, because of the many traces of a dualistic theory of the Universe, to be found in Vishnu-ite works, we shall have probably to substitute simply “the religion of the Bhagavatas,” which indeed at a later period merges into Vishnu-ism, and to which the Bhāgavata religion has transmitted its views.

R. G. Bhandarkar, Report, p. 74 (bottom) speaks of the “religion of Bhakti or Love and Faith that had existed from times immemorial.” So high an antiquity for (the existence of) Bhakti—a trustful and confiding devotion to God—should not only have been asserted, but proved as well. So long as the latter is not the case it cannot really be held as probable that Bhakti has been the peculiar characteristic of the Bhāgavata religion from the very beginning, although this conception has in later times supplied it and its offshoots with their most important characteristics. The question regarding the age and the origin of Bhakti is of such an importance for our (present) consideration that we must investigate it somewhat closely.

As the oldest evidence for the word Bhakti in the above-mentioned sense might be mentioned the concluding verse of the Śvetāvatara Upanishad: “yasya deve para bhaktiḥ,” “he who has the highest devotion for God,” and the use of this word has

---

28 Compare Lassen, I. A. K., III, p. 1123.
contributed along with other reasons to the oft-repeated assertion of the post-Christian origin of the Śvetāvatara Upanishad.\textsuperscript{39} I do not believe that this supposition is justified; [p. 30] and just for this reason—that many verses of the Śvetāvatara Upanishad are already to be come across in the original Bhag. which according to my view (see below, Ch. IV of this preface) dates from a pre-Christian period. If it could really be proved as Śaṅkara makes us understand, that the Brahma-Sūtras oftentimes allude to the Śvetāvatara Upanishad, then the existence of the latter in pre-Christian times could be completely vouched for. In determining the antiquity of the idea of Bhakti in India we might, however, leave for a short time this point out of our consideration.

Weber has on oft-repeated occasions asserted the borrowing of the (conception of) Bhakti from Christianity, and in making this assertion, he has principally relied upon the remarkable legend contained in the twelfth book of the Mahābhārata which says that the sages Nārada (Adh. 337, Cal. ed.), Ekata, Dvita and Trīta (Adh. 338) had gone to the Svetadvipa, “the white island,” or “the island of the white ones,” and that Nārada brought back with him from there the Pāṇḍava doctrine there expounded to him by Nārāyaṇa. Weber’s explanation that this statement could only be explicable “if we recognize therein a tradition of the journey of Indian saints to Alexandria and of their having incurred there an acquaintance with Christianity,” is, at the first sight,\textsuperscript{30} very tempting. When we read in the Mahābhārata that the white men living in the Svetadvipa were filled with the highest passion for the one invisible God Nārāyaṇa (Mahābhārata, XII. 12,708) and that they worshipped him in their hearts with lowly muttered prayers (Mahābhārata, XII. 12,787), the whole, to be sure, sounds as extraordinarily Christian. Lassen himself—who otherwise has firmly set himself against Weber’s theory regarding the influence of Christianity in the development of Kṛṣṇa-ism—is, by reason of this portrayal of the Svetadvipa, led to the supposition (Ind. Altertum. II, 1118, 1119) [p. 31] that “certain Brahmans might have learnt to know of Christianity in a land lying to the north-west of their mother-country and might have brought to India some Christian tenets;” he is of the opinion that this land might be Parthia “since the tradition that the apostle Thomas had preached gospel in this land is old.”

After reading that remarkable section (of the Mahābhārata) I cannot, however, convince myself that there is contained in the legend the historical kernel which Weber and Lassen believe to find therein. The account is so marvellous and phantastic that I can only perceive therein the representation of a purely mythical land of blessed existence. The view of Barth (Religions de l’Inde, page 132 [=English Trans., Trübner’s Oriental Series, p. 221] and of Telang\textsuperscript{32} that there lay here purely a product of poetic fancy appears to be thoroughly conclusive. The Svetadvipa lies north-east (XII. 12,703) or north XII. 12,774) of the Mount Meru (and) on the other side of the Milky Ocean; the white

\textsuperscript{39} Eg., by Weber, Ind. Stu., I. 421-423; and Röer in the Preface to his translation of the Upanishad, Bibl Indi., Vol. XV., p. 36.


\textsuperscript{32} Pratāpa Chandra Ray, Mahābhārata trans. XII, p. 762 note, following Telang’s preface to his metrical translation of the Bhag., a work not accessible to me. Hopkins also, Religions of India, pp. 431, 432, does not find any trace of Christianity in the Svetadvipa epistles.
resplendent residents of this land have no sense (organs), live without nourishment, are exuberantly odoriferous and are sinless; they blind by their lustre the eyes of sinful men and are further described with other fabulous particularities (XII. 12, 704, and ff.; see specially Sama-mushka-chatuskoti.) When we now remember that the Indians had had in their own land, for centuries together, sufficient contact with the Greeks, it appears to me unbelievable that an Indian mission in Alexandria, Asia Minor or Parthia should have brought back home impressions, which could have served as the basis of any such legend, developed in relatively so short a time. In favour of the supposition, [p. 32] that nothing substantial seems to lie at the back of the story, might be mentioned this circumstance—amongst others—that the sages Ekata, Dvita and Trita are called the sons of the god Brähma, and more especially the fact that it is Nārada who makes that fruitful journey to Svetādvisa; because Nārada often emerges forth in the Indian literature serving as the intermediary between gods and men, and his home is as much in the heaven of the gods as on the earth of mortals. Moreover, the whole narration, in spite of the apparently Christian traces referred to above, bears a thoroughly Indian character.

Weber, loc. cit., is further of the opinion that the name Christ, son of the divine (?), Virgin after it became famous in India, might have reminded the Indians of (the name of) Krīṣṇa, the son of Devaki (i.e., evidently of the divine goddess,) and thus it might as well be “that numerous Christian themes and legends, specially those of the birth of Christ amongst cowherds, of the stable and the asylum being the place of his birth, of the Bethlehemite slaughter of children, of the taxation of Emperor Augustine and such others reappear in the Indian legends of Krīṣṇa.” According to the showing of Weber’s suggestive essay “On the Krīṣṇajanmāśṭami,” however, the Christian elements in the Krīṣṇa-myth are to be referred to so late a period that they hardly need be considered in connection with the question here treated of; and some traces, for which Weber supposes a Christian origin, are with certainty ascribed to a pre-Christian period (cf. Bhandarkar, Indian Antiquary, III, p. 14 ff.). Weber’s opinion that we have probably to recognise even in the first century A.D. an influence of Christianity on India and more particularly on the doctrines of Pāncharātras is already refuted sufficiently by Lassen. I. A. K., II. 1121-1128; further, other weighty authorities have raised their voice against Weber’s theory.

No shadow of evidence has therefore up to now been brought forward to support the theory that [p. 33] the conception of Bhakti, with which we are immediately concerned, is derived from Christianity. The religious significance contained in the word Bhakti has nothing exclusively about it that is specifically Christian. Not only have devotion to God and faith in Him developed themselves gradually in other monotheistic religions: but even beyond the circle of monotheistic ideas, the two conceptions are to be found.22 And particularly in India we possess all the essentials on (the strength of) which we have to regard Bhakti as an “indigenous” fact as Barth says; since monotheistic ideas are to be found prevalent from (the time of) the Rgveda onward through almost all the periods of the religious history of India, and the powerful longings after the Divine, peculiar to the Indian soul from yore, must have developed such sentiments as Divine Love and Divine Faith in a popularly conceived monotheism.

22 Barth, Religions de l’Inde, 132 (— English Translation, p. 220-1).
Edmund Hardy, *Lit. Centralblatt*, 1903, No. 38, sp. 1269, points out that the word *bhakti* (its Pāli form *bhatti*) is to be found in the sense of "love", "self-resignation", in *Jātaka*, V. 340, 3, 6; 352, 11, and refers to *Theragāthā*, V. 370, where the word passes into the specific sense of "devotion to God." In this latter sense, might also be mentioned *Pāṇini*, IV. 3. 95 in conjunction with (Sūtra) 98 (following). From these passages it follows that the word Bhakti has been used in the secular sense of "love", "devotion", "attachment", in the fourth century B.C., and that during the same period, a way was being prepared for the employment of the word to denote the relation of man to God. Even though "the bhakti which is spoken of (in *Pāṇini*, IV. 3, 95) be the same as the one treated of in the rules 96 to 100, and is to be understood only in the simple sense of "love", "devotion"—according to rule 96, it is applicable to inanimate things such as cake or pastry as the *Calcutta Scholia* explains it"—(Weber, *Ind. Stud.*, XIII. 349, 350), still the connection of the word "Bhakti" with Vāsudeva in rule 98 is at least [p. 34] a proof that in *Pāṇini's* time the use of the word Bhakti in the sense of "devotion to God" was in process of growth; and the opinion of Patañjali on this passage referred to above (regarding Bhakti with reference to *Tatrābhagavata*) proves that this sense of Bhakti was quite current in the second century B.C., and indeed much earlier. The supposition that the use of the word Bhakti in a specific religious significance might have been caused by a conception imported from outside, can be thus refuted.

Though indeed "devotion to God" can thus scarcely be claimed (as belonging) to the original Bhāgavata religion, still the belief of the Vāsudeva-worshippers was in any case permeated by this sentiment before the Bhag. came to be composed; since a new idea is (usually) explained in a manner unlike the one followed in the case of Bhakti as treated in the Bhag., where this conception is ever and anon summoned forth as something self-evident.

If we were now to divide the development of the Bhāgavata religion into (different) periods, the first period must reasonably be allowed to last so long as this religion led a solitary life outside (the pale of) Brahmanism. In this first period, which might be reckoned as running from an indeterminate beginning to about 300 B.C., fall, probably, all the religio-historical events discussed hitherto in this section, i.e., briefly put, (a) the founding of the popular monotheism by Kṛiṣṇa Vāsudeva, (b) its being philosophically equipped with (tenets of) Sāṁkhya-yoga, (c) the deification of the founder of that religion, and (d) as I believe, the deepening of the religious sentiment on the basis of Bhakti.

The second period is characterised by the brahmanisation of the Bhāgavata religion and the identification of Kṛiṣṇa with Viṣṇu. The great popularity of the legends and myths with which the personality of Kṛiṣṇa was surrounded must have excited the interest of the Brahmans; however, the basis for equating Kṛiṣṇa with Viṣṇu [p. 35] was indeed first given to them when Kṛiṣṇa was definitively elevated to the dignity of a God from a tribal hero. Against this view it might be objected that just as Rāma, as a purely human hero, came to be regarded as the Brahmins as an incarnation of Viṣṇu, and has become divine primarily in consequence of this identification, why should we not similarly say that Kṛiṣṇa as a (human) hero came to be regarded as an incarnation of Viṣṇu? To this it is to be replied that the fact of the matter lies indeed very differently in the two cases. Rāma, tender, pious and self-resigning, and a rigid moralist was a genuine Brahmanical character, that could more easily be assimilated to the Viṣṇu-cult than the popular conception of the powerful and active Kṛiṣṇa, about whom the Brahmins indeed knew
quite well from tradition that he had rejected the authority of the Veda and had withstood the Brahmanical theory of sacrifice—the great source of income of the Brahmins—(cf. Bhagavadgītā) in the same way as it was done after him (Krishṇa) by one greater than him, i.e. by Buddha, with greater results. Even Saṅkaracārya at a time when the Bhāgavatas had long since been immersed into Brahmanism, refers, towards the end of his critique of the Bhāgavata-Pañcaratra-religion (Com. on Brahma-Sūtra, II. 2, 42-45) to the anti-Vedic character of the sect. How can it be doubted that the Brahmins had admitted the Bhāgavatas into their own (Brahmanical) ranks—quite reluctantly indeed, but with a correct apprehension of the many advantages accruing therefrom, in order to be able to counteract the influence of Buddhism all the more successfully! Before Krishṇa Vāsudeva had become to the Bhāgavatas a spiritual being, could the Brahmins with any show of justification bring it about that Krishṇa showed an inner relationship with the Brahmanical Vishṇu? With the older character of Krishṇa—his being a man and a warrior—as it survived in the epical stories, the Brahmins could readily accomodate themselves, since they could rely on their convenient Avatāra theory.

As the oldest evidence for the identification of Vishṇu with Nārāyaṇa-Vāsudeva, the God of the Bhāgavatas, [p. 36] Weber mentions, Ind. Stu. XIII, 353, note 1, the passage in the Mahānārāyaṇa Upanishad=Taityriya Āranyaka X. 1-6. As, however, we cannot yet say as to when this Upanistad-compilation might have been grafted on to the Taityriya Āranyaka as it last book, this evidence loses all worth for chronological purposes. Quite different, however, is the circumstance known long since that Megasthenes in his account (of India) describes Krishṇa—under the name Herakles—as an avatāra of Vishṇu. The parallelism of Herakles with Dionysos (=Śiva) proves, pace Weber, Ind. Stu. II. 409, 410,—that Krishṇa was, at the time when Megasthenes lived in India, no more regarded as simply a tribal hero, but was already looked upon as Vishṇu, i.e., as an incarnation of his. The identity of Karṣṇa with Vishṇu was therefore already firmly established between 302 and 288 B.C., and the Krishṇa-worship proper cannot be said to have arisen for the first time in the fifth and sixth centuries A.D., as Weber had opined many years ago (Ind. Stu. I, 400, note at the end).

In the meanwhile we can place the identification of Krishṇa with Vishṇu and the antecedent deification of Krishṇa not much before 300 B.C., since during the second period in the development of the Mahābhārata text,—a period which Hopkins, Great Epic, 318, reckons on good grounds but naturally with the reservation of reasonable probability, from 400-200 B.C.—Krishṇa is known only as a demi-god (“no evidence of Kashṇa’s divine supremacy”). The supposition is not indeed unjustifyable that the remodellers of the Epic might have stuck to that character of Krishṇa, which, in spite of his deification, he possessed in the popular tradition; they could not have, however, held themselves aloof, for any long period [p. 37] from the Brahmanical conception of the identity of Krishṇa-Vishṇu after this (conception) had been once raised to (a point of) dogma.

---

23 Incidentally it might be added that Baŋgana (== Vāsudeva) is to be found as the name of a King, manifestly a short form of a theophoric proper name, and, “evidently an Indo-Scythian one” on numerous coins belonging to a period just preceding and following our (i.e. the Christian) era (Weber, Ind. Stu. XIII, 353, note 2). In this circumstance we could have an additional evidence—if it be still required—for the existence of Krishṇa-worship in a period preceding the birth of Christ.
This second period of the Bhāgavata religion could be, I believe, fixed from 300 B.C. to about the beginning of our (i.e., the Christian) era. In any case the original Bhag. might be assigned to this period (and in making this remark I do not wish to express myself just now regarding its date,) since in (the genuine parts of) the work, Krishna is not still identified with Brahman, but is designated oftentimes as Vishnu; (of the three passages X. 21, XI. 4 and 30, the last two belong to the old poem) and since the passage IV. 6-8 contains a reflection of the Aśvāmitra theory.

The third period of the Bhāgavata religion for which I would postulate the period from the beginning of our (Christian) era to the commencement of the twelfth century, is specially characterised by the identification of Krishna-Vishnu with Brahman; in spite of the vedantisation of Krishnaism, however, the older Sāṅkhya-yoga elements hold on. In the former part of this period the remodelling of the Bhag. has taken place.

Along with this pantheistic conception of God which has been brought about quite consistently with the (spirit of the) time, there was developed an erotic comprehension of Krishna, quite in consonance with the dual metaphysico-sensual nature of the Hindu character; this latter view reveals principally in describing Krishna’s love-sports with the cowherd-maidens, which are at the same time explained in a mystic sense. The allusions to Krishna’s pastoral life are to be traced back to the supposition that Krishna as a human being was born in a pastoral people and had attained fame as their leader.

[p. 38] I might date the fourth period (in the history) of the Bhāgavata religion with its systematisation by Rāmānuja in the first-third of the twelfth century. The system of Rāmānuja that, as is well-known, still counts at the present day numerous followers not only in Southern India, but has also obtained wide currency as an important form of faith among many Brahmin families in Northern India, has been described most lucidly by R. G. Bhandarkar at the place referred to above. When however Bhandarkar says at the end of page 74: “It was Rāmānuja’s endeavours to . . . . . . . seek a Vedantic and philosophic basis for the religion of Bhakti or Love and Faith . . . . . . . , and thus the Pāñcharātra system which was independent of the Vedas beforehand, became a system of the Vedānta or an Upaṇiṣadā system,” the statement is positively incorrect. And for this reason: the fundamental Vedantic ideas were not first pushed by Rāmānuja into the religion of Bhakti; on the contrary they had found their way there many centuries before him, a fact disclosed to us by the Bhag., the Bhāgavata Purāṇa and other texts. I might (here as well) object to another mistaken view to be occasionally met with, viz., that Vishnuism is distinguished into Rama-ism and Krishna-ism according as it has a tendency to contemplation and speculation, or one to inordinate enjoyment of life, and that therefore the system of Rāmānuja, or for matter of that the religion of the Pāñcharātras, is to be regarded as Rāma-ite. Indeed, the Krishna-ite sect founded by Vallabhāchārya about A.D. 1500 has inordinate enjoyment of life written on its banner, and the lower classes

34 In the latest parts of the Mbh. and in Harivamsa; this development, as is well known, reaches its climax in Gitagovinda.

35 Cf. also Sarvasvadāranasūrya, ch. IV; Wilson, Essays and Lectures, ed. R. Rost, I. 34-36; Colebrooke, Misc. Essays, ed. Cowell, in the Article on the Pāñcharātras or Bhāgavata I. 437-443; K. M. Baservat, Dialogues on the Hindu Philosophy, 401 and ff.; Hopkins, Religions of India, p. 496 and ff.

36 This view was first propounded by Wilson, Essays and Lectures, I. 38, note and, 40, and Colebrooke, Misc. Essays, 21, 211, (contra, however, p. 439).
amongst the followers of Chaitanya, who at about the same time refashioned the religion of Bhakti in a popular manner, [p. 39] and in a spirit of opposition to Brahmanism, insisting on an ardent and ecstical devotion to Krishna, can be scarcely distinguished in point of their morality from the followers of Vallabhacharya. From this, however, no conclusion a posteriori could be drawn regarding the age when Krishnaism became speculative like the Rama-ism. And as regards the system of Ramana, there are Rama-ite elements pervading it, in as much as, for instance, Rama like Krishna is looked upon as a Vibhava—a manifestation of Isvara; and finally, every (point of) difference involved in the two conceptions of Krishna and Rama is generally reduced to the lowest extreme—just as indeed Vishnu and Siva are also merged together in the one personality of Hari-Hara; however, the system of Ramana is in its basis thoroughly Krishna-ite as it is a continuation of the Pancharatra religion, the Krishna-ite character of which need not be proved, but is already guaranteed by the name of its God—Vasudeva.

Among the modern works in which the doctrine of Bhakti is developed in agreement with those of the Bhag., the first place is taken by the Saudilyasutras an imitation of the (older) philosophical Sutras.

I have here followed in a brief exposition the development of the Bhagavata religion from the time of the Bhag. (and) beyond (as well) for the sake of completeness, as for the fact that Krishnaism, from the time of the compilation of the Bhag. has obtained a preponderating significance in the religious life of the Indians, a significance none the least due to the powerful influence of this poem.

PART III

The Doctrines of the Bhagavadgita.

The situation of the dialogue between Krishna and Arjuna is well known; still a short sketch of the same might perhaps be welcome to some that might consult this work. The Kauravas and the Pandavas, after many years' quarrel, march against each other, prepared for open battle, to the Kuruksetra—the province of modern Delhi—[p. 40] with their respective armies and allies. Although the two families, being closely related with each other have an equal claim on the name Kuru or Kaurava, this epithet is usually confined to the members of one party, i.e., to the blind old king Dhritarashtra, his uncle Bhishma, and to the former's sons, the eldest of whom is Duryodhana; only Arjuna, in spite of his belonging to the other party, is six times called in the Bhag. a scion of the Kuru or by some such name.77 The course of the battle is narrated to the blind king Dhritarashtra by his charioteer Sanjaya, on whom Vyasa, the reputed author of the Mahabarata, had conferred the supernatural power of knowing all the events of the war. The dialogue between Krishna and Arjuna occupies one of the first places in this narration of Sanjaya, and this dialogue is called—to quote its full name—Bhagavadgitanishad a secret lore expounded by the revered one, though usually shortened into Bhag. or even simply called Gita. At the sight of his close relatives pitched in the hostile camp, Arjuna is reluctant to begin the battle, and is lectured to by Krishna, who in his human form stands by Arjuna's side as his charioteer, upon the behests of duty. Krishna's admonitions and instructions strengthen themselves in the sequel, and in the eleventh Adhyaya Krishna discloses himself to Arjuna as the sole God and the Ruler of the Universe, who has assumed the form of a Yadava hero.

77 See the Index of Proper Names in the edition of Schlegel-Lassen, s. v. Kuru.
Hopkins, *Great Epic*, 384, regards the *Gitā* as a "purely priestly product"; this view appears to me to be a gross misinterpretation of the essence of this poem, in which the *Veda* and the Brahmanical ritual is censured and the lustful covetousness of the Brāhmaṇas severely criticized (II. 42-46). It is just therein that the *Gitā* is not a priestly [p. 41] product that lies principally the religio-historical significance of the work.

In so far as it concerns the tenets of the "re-fashioned" *Bhag*, one might still refer even to-day to the well-thought out work of W. von Humboldt, whose famous treatise maintains its value, though the scholarship of our days evidently differs from him on a few points, and though, in my opinion, that profound scholar often sees too much meaning as lying (hidden) in the words of the *Gitā*.

If we were now to keep in view the original and not-yet-Vedāntisised *Gitā*, as I have tried to peel it out from its present form, it is hardly necessary to allude to the fact that it shares the common Indian beliefs regarding the transmigration of the soul, the retributive power of actions and the possibility of freedom from the distressing revolution of lives.

Not only the characteristic feature of the *Bhag*, according to which devotion to God is the climax of all knowledge, marks out the poem as a text-book of the Bhāgavatas; but this fact is also recognisable from its epithets for God (Krṣṇa, Vāsudeva, Bhagavat, Purushottama). I find the Bhāgavata doctrine in a special but important point in the *Gitā*, viz., in XV. 7, where God says that the individual soul has proceeded from him and is a part of himself.38 We have seen in part II above that the knitting together of the monotheism with the tenets of the Śaṅkhyā-yoga is above all a process characteristic of the Bhāgavatas.

This knitting together necessitates, in various ways, a forced interpretation and a distortion of the two systems; since thus only could the theism of the Bhāgavatas be provided with the tenets of the avowedly atheistic Śaṅkhyā system and with those of the Yoga system, only outwardly furnished with a formal theistic appearance. [p. 42] If therefore the *Bhag* discloses numerous discrepancies from the genuine Śaṅkhyā-yoga doctrines, i.e., from the doctrines as expounded in the respective text-books of the two systems, it would be entirely a mistake to perceive here an older stage of the Śaṅkhyā-yoga.

The Śaṅkhyā system is mentioned by name six times in the *Gitā* (II. 39, III. 3, V. 4, 5, XIII. 24, XVIII. 13, cf. also XVIII. 19,) and its fundamental tenets are set forth in their unmixed purity at II. 11-16, 18-30, III. 27-29, V. 14, VII. 4, XIII. 5, 19 and ff. Besides, the whole poem is permeated by the influence of the Śaṅkhyā tenets, and principally by the theory of the three Gūnas. However the terms of the Śaṅkhyā (system) are not quite always used in the *Bhag*, in their technical sense, but constantly in a sense which is in keeping with the current literary usage. Thus buddhi, ahaṅkāra and manas, in many places, to be sure, denote the three internal organs of the Śaṅkhyā system, but buddhi and manas occasionally meet us in the sense of “mind, heart, understanding, view,” and ahaṅkāra in the sense of “egoism, pride.” Prakṛiti too is not always matter—or the primal matter—but stands in the sense of “nature, essence, natural condition” at III. 33 IV. 6, VII. 4, 5, 20, IX. 8, 12, 13, XI. 51, XIII. 20, XVIII. 59; similarly ātman has not

always its philosophical sense, but is to be translated as "essence", "mind", &c. Thus Saṅkara explains "atman" as the internal organ, and often enough by "antahkāraṇa", e.g., at V.21, VI.10, 36, 47; XIII.24; though in these cases it would be well to take it in the sense of the empirical self (i.e. of the Viśhñūtman of the text-books) connected with its limitations. In many places (IV.21, V.7, VI.10) the commentators go to the length of even explaining "atman" as the body.

The relation between the Bhāgavata religion and the Yoga tenets rests on reciprocal influences. The Bhāgavatas have taken over the conception of Yoga, [p. 43] but have explained it differently, and given the word the sense of "self-surrender to God, devotion concentrated on God." On the other hand the Yoga system has taken over the idea of God from the Bhāgavata religion. I have shown at great length in the Encyclopaedia of Indo-Aryan Philology and Antiquity, III.4, p. 50, how the idea of God is understood in the Yoga-sūtras, and how it is ushered into the system of the (Yoga) doctrines in a completely superficial, unconnected manner, disturbing the connection (of the sūtras). If one were to eliminate from the Yoga-sūtras (those sūtras viz.) I.23, 27, II.1, 45, that treat of God, there would be caused in the text no lacuna; on the other hand, something would drop away which militated against the entire presumptions of the Yoga system. If indeed the borrowing over of the conception of God into the Yoga system signifies a concession to the Bhāgavatas, the same is the case in a higher measure with Íśvara-praṇidhāna (mentioned in Yoga-sūtras I.23, II.1, 45) in the sense of self-surrender to God, in which Rajendralāla Mitra, Yoga Aphorisms, p. 28, has already recognised a borrowing from the Bhakti system, i.e., from the religion of the Bhāgavatas. Íśvara-praṇidhāna is perfectly synonymous with Yoga from the Bhāgavata point of view.

I must leave it undecided whether the many-sided rôle which Yoga plays in the Bhāg., entirely conforms with the position it has occupied in the Bhāgavata religion, or whether the author of the Gītā did not utilise in a very great measure the tenets of the Yoga system. I am, however, inclined to accede to the first alternative. The words yoga, yogin or other radically connected forms, occurring quite often in the Bhāg., had necessarily to be rendered in the translation by a series of different expressions. Sometimes the meanings so imperceptibly pass into each other that one is apt to become doubtful as to what meaning to choose. The following passages in part, [p. 44] though they do not contain the word yoga, treat evidently of the yoga practices which form the subject-matter of Patañjali's text; IV.27, 29, 30; V.27, 28; VI.10 ff.; VIII.8-14; XVIII.33. In the great majority of the passages, however, yoga, yogin and other verbal derivatives of the root yuj have a significant meaning characteristic of the Bhāgavatas, and designate respectively self-surrender to God, devotion to him, and a self-surrendering devout saintly being. Further, yoga when it is connected with karman, stands (III.3, 7, V.1, 2, IX.28, XIII.24) in its original sense of, "performing or carrying out of the work." 

Relying on this sense of the word, there appears in Gītā the Yoga doctrine (particularly in the third Adhyāya and V.2 ff.) explained away as the doctrine of conscientious discharge (of one's duties), and placed in opposition to the Sāmkhya, which is called the theory of correct

---

33 "The Bhaktimārga is connected with the Yoga and has developed out of it." Jacobi, Göt. Gel. Anz., 1897, p. 277.

40 The instrumental yogena possesses to our literary sense, in such cases directly or approximately, the meaning of a preposition "by means of." Cf. Böhltlingk, Bemerkungen Zur Bhāg., III. 3, XIII. 24.
knowledge. This peculiar explanation of Yoga, however, must not have first been brought forward by the author of the Bhag.; one might rather regard the recognition of both the ways of salvation—the Jñānamārga and the Karmamārga—which are mentioned side by side in Bhag. III. 3, XIII. 24 (at the latter passage Sāṃkhya-yogena is used in the sense of Jñānamārga) and which without being particularly mentioned stand side by side in the poem, as a tenet peculiar to the Bhāgavatas. The Karma-yoga of the Bhāgavatas though later mixed up with the ritualistic Karmamārga, preserves however in the Bhag. its genuine sense of "conscientious performance of one's duties without (regard for) personal interest." The Jñāna-yoga of the Bhāgavatas consists of a knowledge of God and a knowledge of nature in the Sāṃkhya sense, and involves in itself the renunciation of all actions.

It certainly merits consideration that even in so late a stage of development of the Bhāgavata religion as in the system of Rāmānuja, the first two of the [p. 45] five ways that lead to emancipation are called the Karma-yoga and the Jñāna-yoga. Rāmānuja's third way of salvation is Bhakti-yoga (already mentioned in Bhag., XIV. 26); the fourth, the Prapatti-yoga is an offshoot of the Bhakti-yoga, and the fifth, the Advaitādīśamāna-yoga is evidently a modern addition.

Finally, the word yoga meets us in the Bhag. in a still different sense, which indeed has been developed from the conception of "action", viz., in those passages where the yoga of the God is spoken of, i.e., his wondrous power (IX. 5, X. 7, 18, XI. 8, 47) or where God, in accordance with this sense, is called yogin "possessing wondrous power" (X. 17) or yogeswara "the lord of wondrous power" (XI. 4, 9; XVII. 75, 78).

We might now proceed to exhibit in a short sketch the tenets of the genuine Bhag., i.e. the Bhāgavata doctrine provided with elements of Sāṃkhya and Yoga, much differently explained. It may not be very desirable to follow the sequel of thought of the Bhag. (step by step,) since it deviates from one thought to another, and continually mixes with one another the different recognised standpoints, all the more so in its practical aspects.

We begin with the theoretical (lit. systematic) part of the Bhag. and first with the idea of God. God is—as would be scarcely necessary to repeat after the preceding remarks—a conscious, eternal, and all-powerful being "the beginningless great Ruler of the World" (X. 3). He is not only different from the changing world, but is also different from the immutable soul of the human being (XV. 17-19); He is therefore a spirit in a different and higher sense than the Atman of the creatures. When it is said (VII. 4-6) that God possesses two forms—a higher spiritual one, by means of which the world is held up, and a lower [p. 46] material one, out of which everything proceeds—which according to the Sāṃkhya belongs to the Prakṛti, it is not to be understood that matter constitutes a half of God's being; it is rather meant that matter follows its blind course not independently by itself, but acts under the guidance of God; in other words, God works in matter, and acts by it. This is placed quite beyond the range of doubt in other passages of the Bhag. God deposits the seed in matter for being unfolded (XIV. 3-4); he is likewise the father of all beings, while matter is to be compared to the womb of a mother (XIV. 4). God directs the origin, development and dissolution of the Universe (IX. 7, 8, 10), and in this sense he calls himself the origin and the end of the
entire world (VII. 6, X. 8), and identifies himself with Death (XI. 32.) All the conditions of beings originate from him (X. 4-5); He directs their destiny, i.e. rewards them according to their deeds, and makes the beings revolve in the circle of births “like unto the figures of a puppet show” (XVIII. 61). Whatever God does, comes to pass only for the sake of the world, for, to God himself there is no wish to be fulfilled and no object to be striven after (III. 22, 24). “Every time when Right is on the wane, and Wrong rampant,” God, who exists from all eternity and is immutable, creates himself anew, i.e. takes a new form of incarnation “for the defence of the good and the annihilation of the wicked, and thus to securely establish the Right” (IV. 6-8). Since the deed of God is an action of the matter ruled by him, and never originates from an egoistic motive, God is not bound down by his actions (IV. 13, 14; IX. 9). He can therefore be never ensnared in world-existence. The visionary picture of God in the 12th Adhyāya is a dramatic production, intended to work on the phantasy (imagination), but is of little significance for the proper doctrines of the Gītā.

The relation of God to the world of mankind does not entirely conform to a rigid law of recompense; [p. 47] on the other hand, God loves human beings who know him and are devoted to him with all their hearts (VII. 17, XII. 14-20; XVIII., 64, 65, 69), and he emancipates from all sins everyone who resorts to him entirely (XVIII. 66). In this passage (and also at XVIII, 56, 58, 62, 73) is indeed to be found the doctrine of divine favour (Praśādā) which we come across in some of the Upanishads of the middle period 42 (Katha, Sêta, Mundaka), and which as a consequence plays so predominant a part in the Indian sects.

Even though God directs the world-process, it is however matter, as we saw above, which does all work (III. 27, V. 14, XIII. 20, 29). From the primordial matter, originates the world, into which it goes back (VIII. 18, 19); the idea of evolution and reabsorption as much as the conception of the world-periods is therefore taken over from the Śāṅkhya system. All the theories in the Bhagavadgītā regarding matter generally agree with those of the Śāṅkhya system. The three guṇas play here (in the Bhagavadgītā) the same rôle as in the Śāṅkhya system; they affect by their actions the soul in bondage (XIV. 5 ff.), and the results of their activity make themselves felt in life step by step, as has been set forth in a very thorough fashion in Adhyāyas XVII and XVIII. The physiological exposition of the internal organs and the senses is that of the Śāṅkhya system (III. 40 42; XIII. 5). All these similarities, however, are not for the doctrines of the Bhagavadgītā of that much significance as the fundamental theory regarding the nature of matter borrowed over from the Śāṅkhya, from which proceeds the philosophical consideration in Adhyāya II. Though indeed matter is not something created by God, still it is present from eternity onward, and it unceasingly underlies all progress and change. All its products and effects are finite; its actions, such as joy and sorrow, come and go, and therefore it is not right that one should be influenced by them (II. 14).

[P. 48] In contrast to the mutability of what matter gives rise to, stands the immutability of the spirit. As a matter of fact, the spirit (the soul, the self) is to that degree like matter in that both are eternal and imperishable; since what is, has ever been, and will always be; “to a non-existing thing, no existence can be imparted; to the existing,
no non-existence" (II. 16); but the great difference between matter and spirit consists in this that the spirit is never capable of change. When it is said (XIII. 21) that the spirit enjoys the (manifestations of the) guṇas, and that its attachment to these guṇas is the primary cause of the spirit’s rebirth, the real point is simply a picturesque way of expression, which is entirely to be explained in accordance with the Sāṇkhya view. As a matter of fact, the spirit dwells in life, absolutely not doing anything—"neither acting nor causing one to act" (V. 13-15), and remains untouched by all actions and influences of matter. This has been expounded in a noble language in the second Adhyāya of the Bhag. He who therefore knows that the spirit is the true self "I" that leaves an old body and enters into a new one, just as a man casts off old clothes and takes new ones (II. 22), and knows that the spirit can neither be changed nor destroyed, he is not grieved at the sorrow and death of anyone, i.e., at those things which affect only the destructible body.

All this is pure Sāṇkhya philosophy; in spite of this, however, the apprehension of the spiritual principle in the Bhag is essentially different from that in the Sāṇkhya philosophy: not exclusively philosophical, but appreciably religious. The individual soul does not, according to the Gītā—which expounds the belief of the Bhagavatas—possess from all eternity a separate existence, but it has detached itself as a part of the Divine Soul (XV. 7; cf. also XVI. 18; XVII. 6). The expression namai vādāno jīvaloke jīvabhātah samāstanah (XV. 7) is so clear that one must be indeed a credulous follower of Sāṇkara to understand the word aśīta in this important passage, in a Vedāntic sense as equivalent to "an imaginary, an apparent part." The individual souls are therefore of [p. 49] divine origin; they appear in conjunction with matter, which in itself is not in the position of bringing about any change, but which has given rise to life and consciousness in the world. The duty of a man is to so behave himself that his soul could return back to its starting-point—the God.

With this we might proceed to the practical part of the doctrines of the Gītā. Here, to begin with, stand the two ways of salvation in contrast with each other, one of which consists in the renunciation of life and in striving after knowledge, and the other, in dutiful and disinterested actions. Although this second way of salvation is in many places regarded as the better one (III. 8, V. 2, XVIII. 7), and according to the whole connection of the Gītā is to be looked upon as the proper ethical ideal of the poem, still, the author (of the Gītā) who, according to what I have said above, is a faithful interpreter of the Bhagavata tenets in their practical teaching as they were prevalent in his times, has not ventured to cast off the way of emancipation (consisting in) renouncing the world and in abstract knowledge. The view that freedom from the cycle of births could be won through meditation by absolutely detaching oneself from the world, was, from centuries ago, so firmly rooted in the thoughtful circles of the Indian people, that it could not be any longer seriously contended against. There remained no other alternative but to let the two ways pass current side by side, and to propound that right action as much as knowledge—the latter presupposing the non-performance of works (the state of non-action)—would lead to emancipation. Since, therefore, in the Gītā sometimes the one and sometimes the other standpoint emerges forth, and occasionally the ideal of quietism is distinctly held superior to that of actions (VI. 3), there have arisen inconsistencies and confusion, which could have been avoided in any definite rejection of the quietistic standpoint.

[p. 50] The two standpoints are in the Gītā squared with each other on the explanation

---

1 Compare also the so-called quintessence verse, XI. 55.
that the discharge of duty, which is done without any regard for consequences and without any selfish interest, loses its retributive power, and that consequently, for the doer thereof, the world no longer continues to be. According to this view, such kind of work therefore, is the same as the non-doing of work (incidental) to the path of knowledge.

The knowledge to be attained through the quietistic path of salvation is, in many passages of the Gītā, described entirely in conformity with the Sāṁkhya system, as (consisting in) differentiation between spirit and matter (XIII. 23, XIV. 19); and as a result of this differentiation, the release of the knowing man from the necessity of rebirth is stated irrespective of his behaviour (XIII. 23). This might be regarded as an isolated recognition of the genuine Sāṁkhya ideal. In general, according to the standpoint of the Bhag., the knowledge that brings about emancipation is not confined (only) to distinguishing spirit and the matter; on the other hand, this recognition of difference might simply be regarded as a sine qua non of the knowledge of God, which primarily leads man in truth to the highest weal.

The other path of salvation—the selfless performance of duty—is preached in the Bhag., at every step in a great variety of expressions. The performance of duty would not generally lead to its goal so long as it is accompanied by any hope of the reward. One should do the ordained (duty) without attachment, in repose and equanimity (of mind), pervaded by a uniform sentiment towards everyone, treating alike the agreeable and the disagreeable, joy and sorrow, success and failure, without any wish and without any personal interest whatsoever. The deeds of one, who acts in this state of mind, unconcerned with the ephemeral products of matter (II. 14), and entirely in accordance with the commands of Duty, and after the Divine pattern (III. 22), dedicating to God the fruit of all his actions—[p. 51] such deeds do not lie within (the domain of) the law of recompense (IV. 22, 23; IX. 27, 28; XVIII. 12, 17). The injunctions that are laid down here, postulate the rejection of the performance of Vedic works; this rejection being expressed without any reservation in the original Gītā. All ceremonies, indeed, of the Brahmanical ritual entirely serve selfish wishes, and therefore stand in sharp contrast to the ethical ideal of the Gītā. It is therefore said (XVIII. 66) "Leave off all holy observances," and at II. 42-45 is expressed open scorn at the reward of the Veda, which refers only to the material world, and can hold forth only the prospect of an ephemeral reward (cf. also IX. 20, 21). Indifference to what the Śruti teaches is likewise a condition precedent for the obtainment of salvation (II. 52-53). That there is pure Sāṁkhya doctrine underlying all this insistence need scarcely be mentioned.

Whichever of the two ways of salvation one might betake oneself to, one must overcome the difficulties inherent in the constitution of one's nature. When it is said (III. 33) that "beings follow (their) nature," and when at XVI. 1 and ff. there is a distinction made between men as those who are born to a divine (inheritance of) nature, and those to a demonic one, this predestination is to be regarded as a working of the former karmāṇi. There is no word in the Gītā of predestination as such; on the other hand, the presupposition of moral freedom can be recognized as (pervading) the work quite through. One is entirely at liberty whether he would or would not fight against the hindrances that lie in the way of emancipation, and whether he would strive after a lower or after a higher ideal. In the way of the realization of this last, innate ignorance (avidyā)
places itself in opposition (v. 15) to the Jñānayoga; (in the case) of the Karmayoga, greed—likewise innate in human nature—which is a veritable enemy of mankind (III. 37, 43); [p. 52] want of faith and scepticism also are likewise fatal (IV. 40). As a serviceable means of successfully opposing these obstructions, there are recommended several of the yoga-practices (V. 27, 28, VI. 10 and ff., VIII. 10, 12 and ff.). In the case of one who does not succeed in submerging these obstructions, his yoga-practices are not thereby rendered useless; since such a man is born again in the best of environments, and finally does reach the highest goal (II. 40, VI. 41 and ff.).

The most important of those claims which the Gītā makes on the man seeking emancipation, I shall now finally refer to. As is known, the Bhag. is the song par excellence of Bhakti, the faithful and devout love to God. Devotion to God, (proceeding) as much from the path of knowledge, as from selfless performance of duty, leads with unconditioned certainty to the goal. The whole poem is permeated by this sentiment—to preach this doctrine was the whole poem composed. From devotion to God, springs knowledge of God (XVIII. 55), and this knowledge so works that the faithful offers up all deeds to God and leaves the fruit thereof to his care. Without distinction of birth or former behaviour, Bhakti guarantees to every one the certainty of emancipation—even to the wicked, to women, to the Vaisyas and to the Sudras (IX. 30-32). The main point, however, is not simply a mere transitory emotion of love: on the other hand, the whole being of a man must be permeated by an unaltering (ananya, avyabhichārin) devotion to God. If this be the case, the thoughts of a man on the point of death are (naturally) fixed on God. Particular emphasis is laid on this point in the Bhag. (VIII. 5, 9, 10, 13), since a man enters in that state of existence (bhāva) which he contemplates at the time of death.45

In what light are we now to regard the condition of a man freed from worldly existence and made one with God? [p. 53] Is it unconsciousness as is taught in the Sāṁkhya-yoga? When the soul returns to its place of origin, is it individuality, which it once bore separately from and as a part of, the divine soul, obliterated? Most of the expressions which the Gītā uses to denote the existence of the emancipated (soul) are colourless, and are of no help in giving an answer to this question: siddhi (XII. 10, XVI. 23), parā siddhi (XIV. 1), parā or paramā gati (VI. 45, VIII. 13, IX. 32, XVI. 22, 23), pada anāmaya (II. 51) and Śākhata pada avayā (XVIII. 56). Along with this, the Bhag. also designates the state of the emancipated soul diversely as quietude (śānti) or as the highest repose (parā or naśīthaśi Śānti (IV. 39, V. 12, XVIII. 62), and by this is meant not the obliteration of consciousness for all eternity, but a state of blissful freedom of the soul, existing on individually, in the presence of God. The Bhag. offers no explanation of how indeed a soul can have a conscious existence without any reference to matter as is postulated by the Sāṁkhyayoga. Evidently this is a view originating in the oldest period of the Bhāgavata religion, and has ever since represented a dogma of the Bhāgavata faith; and for this reason also it came about that when this religion was furnished with Sāṁkhyayoga elements, this dogma was not supplanted by the mutually contradictory doctrine of the two systems. Out of the logical difficulties that follow from this, the faith of the believers helped them out.

That the author of the Bhag. as a matter of fact saw in the going of the emancipated soul to God, a continuance of conscious individuality, can be proved from the following

---

44 See the passages in Jacob’s Concordance.
45 For the results of this theory, compare Barth, Religions de l’Inde, 133 (= English Trans., p. 228).
passages of the poem. Krishna says VII. 23, "those that worship God, go to God; while these that revere me, go to me," and at IX. 25, he repeats the same promise somewhat more fully. That the "going" to the Devas (or to the Pitris and Bhūtānī, IX. 25) can only mean a conscious continuance of an individual being, is clear. [p. 54] As the "going" to Krishna (or God) is spoken of along with that, no other meaning could have been intended by this "going", because of the parallelism and the correspondence of the expression (yā with the accusative). If one were still doubtful regarding this conclusion, I might refer him to XIV. 2, where God describes the emancipated (ones) with the words, mama sādharṇyam āgatāh “those who have attained sameness of essence with me.” Sādharṇya does not signify oneness, sameness, identity (aikya, aikātmika, tādātmika) but qualitative equality. From this it follows that emancipation, according to the Bhag., is to be regarded as an elevation of the soul to God-like existence, as an individual continuance in the presence of God. In this connection it might further be mentioned that in XVI. 23, the condition of the emancipated is, after being described as siddhi and parā gati, called "sukha," happiness, bliss.

The doctrines here briefly worked out are to be met with not only in Bhag. but also in many other passages of the Mahābhārata; and, of course, the entire series of ideas of the refashioned Vedāntisized Gitā, is not to be regarded as something standing isolated in the Mahābhārata.\(^6\) I believe, however—and the supposition is not over-bold—that the Gitā is the source from which these doctrines might have spread to other parts of the Epos, apart from these plagiarisms and imitations mentioned above, which can clearly be recognized as such.

I have now to offer a few words of observation on the question regarding the Buddhist and the Christian influence in the Bhag. Buddhist influence might be detected in the recommending of the golden mean in VI. 16, 17, [p. 55] and this supposition would gain ground by a reference to the occurrence of the word Nirvāṇa in the immediately preceding verse, VI. 15. As evidently the application of the word Nirvāṇa is not entirely confined to Buddhist literary usage, (Brahmanirvāṇa occurs four times in the refashioned Gitā), and as the idea of the thoughtful moderation (the golden mean referred to above) could be explained on the ground of common human reflection, the Buddhist influence in this passage might be regarded as very much doubtful, resting at most on very far-fetched reasons. And the pessimism which comes up to notice at XIII. 8 is not to be referred back to the Buddhist influences, but must be derived from the tenets of the Sāṅkhya philosophy, which in this, as in other respects, lies at the root of Buddhism.\(^7\)

More important is the question regarding the influence of Christianity on the Bhag., an influence which is often asserted and as often refuted. Any Christian influence in the original (genuine) Gitā is as, I think, quite precluded by its age, which I trust I shall establish with some degree of probability in the next part. I would also refer to what I tried to make good above regarding the genuine Indian origin of Bhakti. That there is a historical possibility of the author of the refashioned Gitā being acquainted with the tenets of

\(^6\) The parallel expression IV. 10 madhātram āgatāh “have reached my state” finds its explanation in this passage.

\(^7\) Compare Hopkins, Religions of India, p. 401 (top).

\(^8\) The treatments of this question in Telang, Introduction, p. 24 and ff., rests on the erroneous supposition that the Gitā is anterior to Buddhism.
Christianity, is to be conceded; however, I do not think that any one has succeeded in raising this possibility into probability or into certainty. To me personally, there is no idea to be met with in the Gītā that could not be explained satisfactorily on the basis of the vast treasure of thought, or on that of the proper spiritual inheritance of the Indian people. In this question, I hold myself at a standpoint quite the opposite of F. Lorinser, who in the preface, notes, [p. 56] and appendix to his metrical translation of the Bhag. (Breslau, 1869) asserts his conviction with an earnestness and zeal, which might win esteem even from an opponent, that "not only did the author of the Bhag. know and probably utilise the writings of the New Testament, but also generally did weave into his system Christian ideas and views" (page v). Lorinser would even prove from which parts of the New Testament a larger number of "sentences are borrowed," and from which a lesser number of them; that the "epistles of St. Paul in their entirety, with the exception of the Thessalonians and the Philemon have been utilised" (p. 285). In this strain does he proceed. Lorinser was certainly a good theologian. In this case, however, he trod into a province with which he was not sufficiently familiar. That the Indian words appear in his writings very often in a false orthography and with false articles, is not purely an accident, but a symptom of the fact that he was not equipped with the requisite philological knowledge with which to judge of things Indian. Had Lorinser been more closely familiar with the history of the development of Indian thought, he would not have drawn so very emphatic conclusions from the "resemblances" collected together by him. These resemblances are for the most part entirely of a vague nature. They relate to likeness in thought and expression, which however finds its explanation in the similarity of the back-ground (lit. characteristics) of the New Testament of the Bhag. Even Weber who was inclined to concede to the Christian influence in India a wide field to range over, says Ind. Liter. Gesch, p. 367 (=English Trans. p. 238, Note 252a) that Lorinser has estimated much too highly the bearing of his argument, and that the question whether to postulate or not any acquaintance of the Bhag. with the tenets of Christianity is still sub judice. Besides, Lorinser's theory has been refuted by such reputed sound scholars as E. Windisch, John Muir, Max Müller, C. P. Tiele and Telang, with such conclusiveness, [p. 57] that I need not refute it in detail any more.49

PART IV.

The Age of the Bhagavadgītā.

Among those works which have contributed most to the understanding of the Bhag., ranks, without doubt, K. T. Telang's English Translation of the poem 50 in the Sacred Books of the East, Vol. VIII, Oxford 1882. Telang's attempt, however, to prove for the Bhag. a high antiquity,—an antiquity higher than Apastamba's Dharmasūtra—has rightly found no countenance amongst the European Indologists. In the preface to his translation, p. 34, Telang, after an extensive argumentation, comes to the conclusion that the Gītā must be, in any case, older than the third century B.C., though we cannot say how much. Since we now know through Bühler's investigations that the

49 Compare A. Holtzman, Das Mahābhārata und Seine Teile, part II, p. 152.

50 The second edition of the work of 1898 though not much different (from the first edition) is unfortunately not accessible to me.
Apastamba Dharmasstra is to be placed in the fourth or fifth century B.C., the Gitā must, according to Telang’s line of argumentation, belong at least to the fifth century B.C.

The entire reasoning of Telang is critically examined by Böhtlingk in the beginning of his Bemerkungen and has been proved to be completely baseless. The proofs (offered) by Telang are in fact so weak that one might wonder how a man of his learning and acumen should not have recognized their superficiality, if there were not (indeed) a psychological influence to account for this. To Telang, as to every Hindu,—how much soever enlightened—it is an article of faith to believe in so high an antiquity of the Bhag. And where such necessities are powerful criticism indeed comes to an end.

The task of assigning a date to the Gitā has been recognized by every one [p. 58] who has earnestly tried to solve the problem, as being very difficult; and the difficulties grow (all the more) if the problem is presented twofold, viz., to determine as well the age of the original Gitā as also of its revision. I am afraid that generally speaking, we shall succeed in arriving, not at any certainties, but only at probabilities in this matter.

If we first take into consideration the Gitā in its present form, we might—in fixing its lowest limit—leave out of consideration all the testimonies for its existence that are posterior to Kālidāsa. Kālidāsa is the oldest author who refers to the Gitā and that he does so is firmly established by Telang (Introduction, p. 29). Of the two confirmatory passages which Telang brings forward the second one particularly is convincing, viz., Kumārasambhava VI. 67, where Angrās says to the Himālaya: sthāne tvām sthāvaram rātmānam Vīṣṇum āhuh manneśbhaḥ. "Rightly do the wise call thee Vīṣṇu in the shape of a mountain." The reference is here (as already pointed out by the commentator Mallinātha) unmistakably to Bhag. X. 25, both in form and in sense. To Kālidāsa, therefore, who is to be carried back to the middle of the fifth century A.D., the Gitā was an authoritative work. We might therefore set down A.D. 400 circa as the lower limit of the Gitā.

It is not, however, to be supposed that the present Gitā first originated in a time that lies very near to this lower limit as fixed by us. The revision of the poem belongs to that period in the development of the Mahābhārata text which Hopkins, Great Epic, 398, places between 200 B.C. to A.D. 100-200 (Remaking of the epic with Kṛiṣṇa as all-god, intrusion of masses of didactic matter, addition of Purānic material, old and new). As a matter of fact, however, the present Gitā [p. 59] could be mostly attributed to the second half of this period. This follows from the fact that a considerable time must have elapsed before some one could venture to subject the original Gitā to a thorough revision and transformation. From the consideration, therefore, of the age of the genuine Gitā which too I shall forthwith try to fix, the revision of the Gitā could not have taken place earlier than the first or second century A.D.; and if I were to fix upon the second century (as the period of the revision), I would still be placing it somewhat earlier than is usually the case (to do), and earlier than what John Davies, for instance, (The Bhag., 183,

11 See Bühler’s preface to his translation of this work.—[SBE. XIV].
12 The first passage is to be read a Raghuvansha, X. 31 and not 67, as stated in Telang’s work.
13 See the latest literature on the question by W. Klemm.—ZDMG. 58, 290.
194, 200) has done, who with Lassen and Weber accepts the third century A.D. The Gitā as it has come down to us cannot be much later than this. The history of the development of the Mahābhārata text teaches that. [p. 60] That the revision cannot be older depends principally on further reasons to be investigated. Such reasons are afforded by the following considerations.

In a verse of the Bhag. (XIII. 22) which belongs to the revised version, and in the Nṛśimhatā. Upanishad, II. 9.2, the two words Upadraśtri (the overseer) and Anumantri (the consenter) stand side by side, and the latter of these two words is very rare that none can doubt the historical relation of the two passages. As in all other relations to the Upanishad literature the Bhag. is the borrowing party, so in this case also, we have to regard in this passage of the Nṛ-Tā-Upanishad the prototype, and in the first quarter of Bhag. XIII. 2 the copy thereof, because the word Anumantri, as an epithet of one form of the highest spirit, has been preserved in its originality in the Nṛ-Tā-Upanishad through the entire contents of the text; since Anumantri is synonymous with Anuvijñātri formerly used in this Upanishad, and this latter is spoken of as existing a form of the Atman in the second part (II. 2.8, 10, 13, 14; 3, 1, 6.14; 8, 6, 7; 9.33 here Anuvijñātri is used by the side of Upadraśtri). Now Weber, Ind. Lit. Gesch. 2 p. 186 (= English Trans., p. 167) has placed the Nṛ-Tā-Upanishad in the 4th century A.D., though later, Ind. Stu. IX, 62, 63, this date is reiterated only with reservation. As a matter of fact, however, it follows from Weber’s statements at the latter place that the reason on which he has based this date is not tenable. Weber had had, with regard to many Indian works, a disposition to bring them down chronologically, and this is true also of the Nṛ-Tā-Upanishad. In any case, however, this secondary Upanishad—and with it the Uttarāśṅāpaniya, latterly attached thereto—that comes into consideration as the source of the above-mentioned verse of the Bhag, should be placed in post-Christian period; and its being utilized by the reviser of the Bhag. points to the fact that he must not have in any case lived earlier than the second century A.D. The striking remark of John Davies, The Bhag., 3 p. 192, and ft.,

The manifold resemblances which the Gitā bears in thought and expression to the Upanishads of the oldest and intermediary classes, do not prove the antiquity of the poem, because this is to be regarded simply as a dependence of the Gitā on texts partly belonging to a considerably high antiquity. Tvelang, in his notes to his translation of the poem, SBE. VIII, has referred to numerous parallelisms from the Brāh. Chān. Kaus., Īṣa, Kaṭha, Munja, Pṛṣṇa, Mastra, and Śvetā. Upanishads, but so far as I can see, verbal or almost verbal borrowing of verses or parts thereof is confined to the Kaṭha and Śvetā. Upanishads:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bhagavadgitā</th>
<th>Kaṭha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II. 19</td>
<td>Kaṭha II. 19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 20</td>
<td>Kaṭha II. 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. 42</td>
<td>Kaṭha III. 10 (cf. VI. 7.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. 13</td>
<td>Śvetā III. 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. 9</td>
<td>Śvetā III. 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. 11</td>
<td>Kaṭha II. 15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII. 13, 14</td>
<td>Śvetā III. 16, 17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV. 1</td>
<td>Kaṭha VI. 1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For fixing the date of the Bhag. its relationship with the later Upanishads only could be turned to any account, as indeed I shall soon below similarly utilise one such relationship (of the Bhag.) with the Nṛśimhatāpīnī, undoubtedly a secondary Upanishad.
that our poem is closely related to the Purāṇa literature in its mythological and literary characteristics, [p. 61] points in the same direction:—“In fact it is impossible to read the Bhag, and the Purāṇas without feeling that we are treading upon the same ground.” The view that had become prevalent for a long time that the Purāṇas represent a later phase of literature connected with the Mahābhārata must now be well-nigh revised, since Hopkins has now proved that the eighteen Purāṇas were known before the completion (of the text) of the Mahābhārata. Apart from this, however, the similarity between the character of the Bhag. and the Purāṇas is to be regarded as a proof that the present Gītā cannot possibly be placed before the second century A.D.

In this connection, I might also urge one more linguistic consideration, which in its singularity is not indeed devoid of great importance. Bhag. X, 25 which belongs to the later revision contains the word Himalaya, the modern form of the older Himavat, this (latter) however, as is well known, still surviving in the later literature. According to the showing of the Petersburg Dictionary, Kālidāsa is the oldest author of any definite date, who employs the form Himalaya (and similar new forms Himāgiri, Himādri). Even though the word Himalaya might indeed have been used before (the time of) Kālidāsa, still the use of that word makes an impression of relative lateness. I therefore believe as a whole, that even though I might not have brought forward any cogent proof, I would not be going much wrong if I were to place the refashioned Gītā in the second century A.D.

If we now fix our attention on the genuine Gītā it is unfortunately impossible to arrive at any chronological result on (the basis of) a resemblance with the Maṇava Dharmāśāstra. W. von Humboldt has already drawn attention to the parallels between Manu’s law book and the Bhag. However there is only one verse which (with a minor difference) [p. 62] is common to both the works; viz., Bhag., VIII. 17—Manu I. 73. Telang in the preface to his metrical translation of the Bhag. p. 115 is naturally of the opinion, in accordance with his conviction of the high antiquity of the Gītā, that Manu might have extracted the verse from the Gītā. However the thing could be just the other way, and besides there is still the third possibility that it might be a verse loosely floating about, belonging to the Brahmanical tradition, which both the works might have utilized independently of each other. When, further, Hopkins, Great Epic, pp. 19, 22, is, after a thorough investigation of the Mahābhārata and of the Manusmṛiti, firmly convinced that the present form of the text of Manu is later than the old Epic but older than the didactic Epic, while, Bühler (Preface to his Translation of Manusmṛiti, p. 98) declares our Maṇu-text as later than our Mahābhārata, the attempt to utilize the above-mentioned similarity for purpose of fixing the date of the original Gītā, is completely hopeless.

I believe, however, that the investigation regarding the age of the genuine Gītā could be carried to a definite result with a closer examination of another passage. At the beginning of the fourth Adhyāya which everyone regards as being old, Krishṇa says that he had taught in the preceding ages the secret of the Yoga doctrine to Vivasvat (=Śūrya, the sun, the birth-place of the warrior caste, sarva-kṣatriya-vaiśā-vaśa-viṣṇu-bhātya Adīdīyana as Madhusudana says) and from him it passed on to Manu, Ikṣvāku and the old sages of the

56 See now all of them put together by A. Holtzmann, Das Mahābhārata IV, 127 (top).
57 In Holtzmann, op. cit.
Kshatriya class (Rājarshi). In course of time, however, the Yoga doctrine on this earth [p. 63] passed into oblivion and it was then being preached by Krishna to Arjuna once more.

How does this now in reality affect the antiquity and the vicissitudes of the Yoga doctrines? That the Yoga system is pre-Buddhistic is evident from the investigations of Kern (Buddhism, Vol. I, 470 and ff.) and of Jacobi, Nachr. d. Gött. Ges. d. Wiss. 1896, 45 ff. We know nothing of importance with regard to this system during the period between Buddha and Patañjali, and what is said in the Bhag., IV. 2 regarding the decadence of the Yoga system (sa kālena iha mahatā yoga nashtah) might well correspond with this historical reality. The composition of the Yoga-Sūtras by Patañjali must have taken place at about the same time as that of the Mahābhāṣya, i.e., in the middle or in the second half of the second century B.C. I now venture to assert that the Yoga-Sūtras in which the Yoga doctrines were fixed and infused with new life, must not have existed, or at least must not have acquired a general recognition and currency, at the time when the original Gītā came to be composed; otherwise it would not have been possible to put into the mouth of Krishna at the above-mentioned passage of the Bhag. the words regarding Yoga referred to above; since a poet generally makes his hero-speak about events which are to be regarded as having occurred in a very remote past in such a manner as would correspond to the state of things existing in his own times. I therefore conclude from Bhag. IV. 1-3 that the author of the genuine Gītā did not know the Yoga-Sūtras, and that he therefore lived before Patañjali, presumably in the first half of the second century B.C. The contents and the language of the Bhag. speak against a much higher date thereof.

If it were to be urged against this position that the Yoga in the Bhag. might be different from that treated of in the Yoga-Sūtras, it might be replied that the present far-fetched sense of Yoga in the Gītā as "Self-surrender," "Devotion," presumes the original conception of Yoga as "concentration of thought," [p. 64] and that the words Yoga, Yogin are still used in the Bhag. in their technical original sense.

According to my view, therefore, the genuine Gītā originates in the first half of the second century B.C., and the remodelling of the poem in the second century A.D.

Postscript.—In concluding this translation, the translator gladly acknowledges the help he received from others. Dr. Belvalkar of the Deccan College suggested the idea of translating the work for the benefit of the Senior Sanskrit Students of that College. Dr. Gune of the Ferguson College very kindly read portions of the translation in manuscript.—N. B. U.

28 "It is remarkable that in this place it is not the priests but the kings that are mentioned as the ancient custodians of the Bhag."—Holtmann, Das Mbh., II, 157. It would be more correct to say "as the ancient custodians of the Yoga doctrine expounded in the Bhag."
APPENDIX

Regarding the passages of the Bhag. not originally belonging to it.

I. 1-19—These verses are shown in a smaller type (in the translation), because they relate to a description of the great battle in the midst of which the Bhag. (Mbh. VI (Bhishma-parva) Adh. 25-42) has been interpolated. Adhyāya 43 connects itself with v. 19 (of the Bhag) and the first three verses of this Adhyāya are in any case interpolated. In this Adhyāya the description of the uppraisal caused before the battle is again resumed, and it was necessary for the narrator to have done this, in order to remind the reader of the situation after the interpolation of the Bhag. Adhyāya 43, v. 3 ed.—sahā vai vibhajahamyanta as sabahas tumulo bhava—it is a verbal repetition of Adhyāya 25, v. 13 ed. Before the Bhag. was interpolated, verse 4 of Adhyāya 43 followed therefore immediately after verse 19 of Adhyāya 25, the former with the statement that the gods and demi-gods arrived (on the scene) to witness the mighty war.

The Bhag. besides begins not with verse 1—as the traditional view holds—but only with v. 20 of the 25th Adhyāya. This indeed follows from the fact that in v. 20 Arjuna sees the enemy in battle order face to face; but according to the foregoing account he must have already seen the battle-array of the opposite party; thus in vv. 14, 15 he already shows himself (prepared) to open the attack, because he steps into the general war-cry with his horn. Perhaps also the word atha at the beginning of v. 20 is an external mark intended to show the beginning of the Gītā.

II. 17—A Vedāntic interpolation, necessitated by the mutual contrast (referred to in the sequel) between the transitioness of the bodies, and the eternity of the spirit, that always takes new bodies and to which alone relate the expressions in the masculine genitive case in the following verse.

II. 72—A Vedāntic appendage.

III. 9-18—An interpolation of the Māthā theory, which does not quite fit in with the connection. Verse 19 connects itself immediately with v. 8. In this latter verse Arjuna is asked to do the niyata karma, i.e., to fight; in the passage interpolated, the significance of the sacrifice is imparted to the word karman. The interpolation concludes in vv. 17-18 with the description of a man who no more finds any use in the ritualistic regulations, and who is generally averse to action. Verse 19 and ff. stand in glaring contrast to these two verses.

III. 23—Spurious for the reason stated by Bühlingk: "23h = IV. 11-b as already observed by Schlegel. The present tense there (in the latter case) is in order, but in the case on hand, one would have expected the optative (to correspond with the one in 23a) IV. 11 is therefore older than 3.23." To this it might be added that the wording of the second line of our (present) verse has quite a different meaning than in IV. 11.

IV. 24—A Vedāntic-ritualistic appendage which mars the context, and which might have been occasioned by Brāhmaṇa in v. 25 (to the latter is to be compared brahmacharya).

IV. 31, 32—A Vedāntic-ritualistic interpolation in the description of the sacrifice understood in a spiritual sense.

IV. 34—Interpolation for the purpose of recommending the scholastic discipline of the Brāhmaṇas. Line 2 conflicts with the circumstance that it is Kṛṣṇa himself who is instructing Arjuna.

IV. 35—Vedāntic interpolation.

V. 6, 7, 10, 12-22, 24-26—Vedāntic interpolations.

VI. 27-32—Vedāntic interpolation, quite explicitly to be recognised as such, in that v. 33 is directly connected with v. 28.

VII. 7-11, 14, 15, 19, 25, 26, 29, 30—Vedāntic interpolations; vv. 7-11 interpret an exposition resting on a fundamental tenet of the Śākhya (Philosophy). V. 28, according to which no one knows God, is along with v. 25, excluded for the reason that it contradicts v. 24, according to which, only the unknowing ones understand Him not.

VIII. 1-4 i.e. 20-28; IX. 1-6—Interpolations, based as they are on the standpoint of the Vedānta and the Brāhmaṇic theory regarding the auspicious and insurmountable time for death (VIII. 23-27), with the superficial nature of which, the original Gītā has indeed nothing to do. The whole character of the poem shows that. In IX. 7, 8 is resumed the consideration of (the point contained in) VIII. 18, 19.
IX. 16-19—A pantheistic interpolation in the midst of a description of the different kinds of the worshippers of God.

IX. 29—To be recognised as an interpolation because of its Ādīvatic character and because of the contradictions which the first line presents to other passages of the Bhagavadgītā. Bühling remarks on this verse: “Krishna says here that he acts evenly with everyone and that no one is odious or agreeable to him. How is this to agree with XII. 14 (better 13) and ff.?—and we might add—with V. 29 VII. 17, XVIII. 64, 65, 69! All these passages in which Krishna either styles himself as the friend of all beings, or speaks of those persons who are dear to him, belong to the original Gītā, since they are not tinged with Ādīvatic complexion.

X. 12-42—An elaborate exposition from the Vedantic standpoint, at length degenerating into insipid details of a previous subject. An imitation of X. 20-39 is to be found in the Śvetāśvatā Kāmrakaraṇī II. 7, 3-17: the text in the Bhagavadgītā, however, has quite a Purāṇic character.

One might suspect whether the first verse of the eleventh Ādhyāya might not also belong to this large interpolation. It is curious that Arjuna should at this place say ‘(when there are eight more Ādhyāyas still to follow)’ that his perplexities had disappeared as a result of Krishna’s instructions. At the end of the poem XVIII. 72 Krishna (for the first time naturally asks Arjuna how it (his advice) affected him in general; and Arjuna’s statement (v. 73) has its proper sense and justification there. I shall not however attach too much importance to any such want of consideration in the poem.

XI. 7, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19—Pantheistic interpolations. When it is said in these verses that the divine person of Krishna remains in it, the whole world and the gods and all beings and all things beside, and that this body is without beginning, without centre (lit. middle part) and without end, the whole stands in flagrant contrast with what follows; since in vv. 20-23 the worlds and all supernatural beings look at Krishna with astonishment and wonder, and this cannot be said of them, if they were contained in him; and in v. 32 Krishna says that he was about to do what an omnipresent being, pervading the whole universe, could not have said of himself.

XII. 37-40—Vedantic interpolation.

XIII. 2—Vedantic interpolation. Krishna styles himself here as the knower of the field in all the fields (as the soul in all the bodies); how could he then still hold in prospect in v. 3 any instruction regarding him who is the knower of the field?

XIII. 4—An interpolated verse, since the appeal to the Upanishads and to the Brahmastra (and therefore to the Vedantic sources) scarcely fits in, the principle of life in the sequel being described according to the theory of Śāṅkhyā-yoga.

XIII. 12-16, 27, 28, 30-33—Vedantic interpolations. Verse 27 appears to be fashioned in a Vedantic sense after the pattern of v. 29. With regard to v. 31, it is doubtful whether it is to be expunged along with its neighbours. If the verse however might have belonged to the original poem, paramātman ought to stand here quite in the sense of dhātva as in VI. 7 and XIII. 22.

XIV. 26, 27—Vedantic appendage. The question asked in v. 21 is answered by vv. 22-25.

XV. 12-15—An interpolation that disturbs the connection, and is based on the standpoint of Vedānta and Brahmanic theology.

XVII. 23-28—An appendage regarding the use of the expressions om, tat, sat and asat, with a Vedantic starting-point. The whole theory is here and in the Bhagavadgītā generally as little used as possible externally also this passage proves itself as being subsequently interpolated, since the enumeration, based on the disposition previously mentioned in v. 7, comes to an end with v. 22.

XVIII. 45, 46—Interpolated verses because of the Vedantic expression Yena sarvaṁ idam tattvaṁ in v. 46. V. 45 stands in close connection with v. 46.

XVIII. 50-54—Vedantic interpolation. When in these verses it has been mentioned as to how the perfected one goes to Brahman, we might ask as to why he should be admitted in v. 55 into union with Krishna, the personal God. Verse 54 forms a transition to the interpolated text of the original poem though in a clumsy manner, since one that has become Brahman has no more any occasion to compass the highest devotion to Krishna.

XVIII. 74-78—Sanjaya’s concluding remarks, appended, for reason of the (poem’s) insertion in the Mahābhārata.