

Barcode - 4990010201274

Title - Indian Historical Quarterly vol.10

Subject - GENERALITIES

Author - Law, Narendra Nath, ed.

Language - english

Pages - 905

Publication Year - 1934

Creator - Fast DLI Downloader

<https://github.com/cancerian0684/dli-downloader>


Barcode EAN.UCC-13



4 990010 201274

THE INDIAN HISTORICAL QUARTERLY

Edited by
NARENDRA NATH LAW



THE INDIAN HISTORICAL QUARTERLY

IN 39 VOLUMES

The establishment of the Asiatic Society by Sir William Jones in the eighteenth century, the product of the early Europeans in India, to acquire and disseminate knowledge of Indian history, customs and manners of the Indian people left a blazing trail through its journals and proceedings. The coming centuries witnessed several savants delving deep in the subject and as a result, besides many books, several articles were published in the ever increasing journals and periodicals. To wit the untiring efforts of Cunningham, Max Muller, Stein, Princep and others can be cited.

Thus by the early twentieth century books, journals and periodicals had become so vast that it became a Herculean task for the scholars and researchers to find in one place all relevant materials required for their subject of research, particularly about Indian history and culture. They had to wade through an ocean of publications.

To alleviate the distress of these knowledge craving scholars Dr. Narendra Nath Law started a Quarterly—*The Indian Historical Quarterly*. The principal aim of this quarterly was to publish articles, notices, etc. dealing with Indian history and civilization.

(Contd. on next flap)

148158



THE INDIAN HISTORICAL QUARTERLY

Edited by
NARENDRA NATH LAW

Vol. X



CAXTON PUBLICATIONS

143158
29.6.87
S.D
C.B.

First Published 1934

First Reprint 1985

Published by :

CAXTON PUBLICATIONS
B-3/53, Ashok Vihar, Phase-II
Delhi-110052. India
Phone : 7112866

Printed at :

Efficient Offset Press, Dayabasti, Delhi

CONTENTS

(Vol. X. 1934)

ARTICLES

	PAGE
Age of the Brāhmaṇas	533
By Probodh Chandra Sen Gupta, M.A.	
Agriculture	288
By Ananta Kumar Bose, M.A.	
Ancient Gītā Commentaries	348
By Prof. Dr. F. Otto Schrader, PH.D.	
Baudh Plates of Raṇabhañjadeva year 58	473
By Adris Banerji, M.A.	
Caitanya as an Author	301
By Dr. S. K. De, M.A., D.LIT.	
Caṇdragupta Vikramāditya and Govinda	48
By V. V. Mirashi, M.A.	
Catustava	82
By Prabhubhai Patel	
Chronology of the Sena Kings of Bengal	728
By Dharendra Nath Mukherjee	
Damaged Śrīpur Plates	100
By L. P. Pandeya Sarma	
Dated Copper-plate Grant from Sundarban	321
By Dr. Benoy Chandra Sen M.A., PH.D., & Devaprasad Ghosh, M.A.	
Dharmas of the Buddhists and the Guṇas of the Sāṃkhyas	737
By Prof. Th. Stcherbatsky, PH.D.	
Domicile of the Author of Campū Bhārata	112
By V. B. Naik, M.A., LL.B.	
Dravidic 'Water'	37
By L. V. Ramaswami Aiyar, M.A., B.L.	
Durrani Menace and the British North-West Frontier Problem in the Eighteenth Century	624
By Narendra Krishna Sinha, M.A.	

Eastern Cālukyas	90
By Dr. D. C. Ganguly, M.A., PH.D.				
Events leading to the Ambēla Expedition	26
By R. R. Sethi, M.A.				
Evolution of Vijñānavāda	1
By Prof. Vidhushēkhara Bhattacharya				
Gandhāra Relief in the Indian Museum	344
By Jitendra Nath Banerjea, M.A.				
Great Goddess in India and Iran	405
By Prof. Jean Przyluski, PH.D.				
History of the Gurjara Country	613
By Dr. D. C. Ganguly, M.A., PH.D.				
Ideals of Tantra Rites	486
By Prof. Chintaharan Chakravarti, M.A.				
Indo-Greek Coin Types	509
By Harit Krishna Deb, M.A.				
Jaina Calendar	332
By Dr. Sukumar Ranjan Das, M.A., PH.D.				
Location of Kṛṣṇa's Capital Dvātavatī	541
By Dr. Nalini Kanta Bhattasali, M.A., PH.D.				
Mahānāṭaka Problem	493
By Prof. Sivaprasad Bhattacharya, M.A.				
New Varieties of Old Indian Coins	723
By Jitendra Nath Banerjea, M.A.				
Nirvāṇa according to the Tibetan Tradition	211
By Dr. E. Obermiller, PH.D.				
Old Brāhmī Inscription of Mahāsthān	57
By Dr. B. M. Barua, M.A., D.LITT.				
Old Vṛttikāras on the Pūrvamīmāṃsā Sūtras	431
By V. A. Ramaswami Sastri, M.A.				
Origin of the Pratihāra Dynasty	337
By Dr. D. C. Ganguly, M.A., PH.D.				
Pañcatantra of Vasubhāga	104
By A. Venkatasubbiah				
Pāṇini and the Ṛkprātisākhya	665
By Dr. Batakrishna Ghosh, PH.D.				

Panipat, 1761	258
By Sir Jadunath Sarkar, K.T., M.A., C.I.E.					
Persian and Greek Coins and their Imitations in Ancient India	67
By Dr. Surendra Kisor Chakraborty, M.A., PH.D.					
Pre-Aryan Elements in Indian Culture	14
By Atul K. Sur, M.A.					
Purānic Traditions	121
By N. Tripathi					
Quotations by Bhoja from the Kāmasutra	12
By Dasaratha Sarma, M.A.					
Rebellion of Shah Jahan and his Career in Bengal	671
By Dr. Sudhindra Nath Bhattacharya, M.A., PH.D.					
Relation between Civil and Military Authorities in the early days of British Rule	523
By Dr. Prakash Chandra, M.A., LL.B., PH.D.					
Rélations between early Buddhism and Brahmanism	274
By Mrs. C. A. F. Rhys Davids, M.A., D.LITT.					
Sohgaura Copper plate	54
By Dr. B. M. Barua, M.A., D.LITT.					
Studies in Ancient Geography	642
By Harihara V. Trivedi, M.A.					
Subhāṣitahārāvalī of Śrī Hari Kavi and some Poets enjoying the Patronage of Muslim Rulers	478
By Prof. Haradatta Sarma, M.A., PH.D.					
Tāranātha's History of Buddhism	551
By Drs. U. N. Ghoshal & N. Dutt					
Trilingual Inscription (1734 A.D.)	116
By Puran Chand Nahar, M.A., B.L.					
Unexplored Source of Mughal History (1526-1707)	453
By Prof. Sri Ram Sarma, M.A.					

MISCELLANY

	PAGE
Candragupta of Vāmana's Kāvya-lāṅkāra-Sūtras ... By Prof. Dasaratha Sarma, M.A.	... 761
Dravidian Features in Indo-Chinese Social Life ... By S. V. Viswanatha, M.A.	... 143
Four Ways and the Four Fruits of Pali Buddhism ... By Miss I. B. Horner, M.A.	... 785
Further Note on the Origin of the Bell Capital ... By Achyuta Kumar Mitra	125, 358
Home of Āryadeva ... By Dr. Nalinaksha Dutt, PH.D., D.LITT.	... 137
Identity of Vidyāranya and Mādhavācārya ... By R. Rama Rao	... 801
Kālidāsa in China ... By Prof. Sten Konow, PH.D.	... 566
Kaumudīmahotsava and the Date of Kālidāsa ... By Prof. Dasaratha Sarma, M.A.	... 763
Kośam. Inscription of <u>Aśoka</u> ... By Amalananda Ghosh, M.A.	... 575
Kuchean or Western Ārśi ... By Dr. P. C. Bagchi, M.A., LIT.D.	... 585
Mahārāja Caṇḍavarman of the Komatti Plates ... By Dines Chandra Sircar, M.A.	... 780
Name of the Author of the Nyāyasāra ... By Dasaratha Sarma, M.A.	... 163
Nāṭyaśāstra and the Abhinavabhāratī ... By Manomohan Ghosh, M.A.	... 161
Note on Jaina Hymns and Magic Squares ... By Hiralal R. Kapadia, M.A.	... 148
Note on the Śālaṅkāyanas ... By M. Rama Rao	... 158
Note on Sīṃhapura--Āryadeva's Birth-place ... By Dr. B. A. Saletore, M.A., PH.D.	... 368

Origin of the Pratihāras	584
By D. R. Mankad, M.A.					
Origin of the Pratihāra Dynasty	582
By Prof. Dasaratha Sarma, M.A.					
Origin of the Pratihāra Dynasty (A Reply)	762
By Dr. D. C. Ganguly, M.A., PH.D.					
Phallus Worship in the Veda	156
By Prof. Vidhushekhara Bhattacharya					
Professor J. P. Minayeff	811
By Miss Alexandra Schneider					
References pertaining to Agriculture in Jain Literature	797
By Hiralal R. Kapadia, M.A.					
Rīti and Guṇa in the Agni Purāṇa	767
By V. Raghavan					
Scribes of Bengal	571
By Promode Lal Paul, M.A.					
Sindhapura	373
By Dr. N. Dutt, M.A., D.LITT.					
Tattvasuddhi and Subjectivism	577
By Prof. S. Suryanarayanan, M.A.					
Vainyagupta Dvādaśāditya	154
By Dr. D. C. Ganguly, M.A. PH.D.					
Vedica	560
By Dr. Batakriṣṇa Ghosh, PH.D.					
Vyomaśiva, the author of Vyomavatī	165
By Dasaratha Sarma, M.A.					
Vyomaśiva Author of Vyomavati	576
By Kshetresa Chandra Chattopadhyaya, M.A.					
REVIEWS	167, 374, 593, 827	
SELECT CONTENTS OF ORIENTAL					
JOURNALS	197, 392, 605, 836	
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES	204, 400	

MAP

FACING PAGE

Saurāṣṭra and Junāgaḍ under the Gīrnār Hill	541
---	-----	-----	-----

PLATES

	FACING PAGE
The Old Brāhmī Inscription of Mahāsthān ...	57
Damaged Śrīpur Plates	
Plate I (reverse) ...	100
Plate II (obverse) ...	,,
Plate II (reverse) ...	102
Plate III (obverse) ...	,,
Trilingual Inscription (1734 A.D.) ...	119
Pillar base. Hypostyle hall of Xerxes. Persepolis ...	136
Capital from the work of Thothes at Karnak ...	,,
A Dated Copper-Plate Grant from Sundarban ...	321
A Jātaka scene from Gandhāra ...	344
Baudh Plates of Raṇabhañjadeva—year 58	
First Plate : Second Side ...	473
Seal of Mahārāja Raṇabhañjadeva ...	,,
Second Plate : First & Second Sides ...	475
Third Plate : Do ...	477
Two New Varieties of Old Indian Coins ...	723
The 'Dharmas' of the Buddhists and the Guṇas of the Sāṃkhyas ...	751

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

(Vol. X, 1934)

	PAGE
Aiyar, L. V. Ramaswami, M.A., B.L.	
Dravidic 'Water'	37
Bagchi, Dr. P. C., M.A., LIT.D.	
Kucuan or Western Ārsī	585
Banerjea, Jitendra Nath, M.A.	
A Gandhāra Relief in the Indian Museum	344
Two New Varieties of Old Indian Coins	723
Banerjee, Adris, M.A.	
Baudh Plates of Raṇabhañjadeva year 58	473
Barua, Dr. B. M., M.A., D.LIT.	
The Old Brāhmī Inscription of Mahāsthān	57
The Sohaura Copper-plate	54
Bhattacharya, Prof. Sivaprasad, M.A.	
The Mahānāṭaka Problem	493
Bhattacharya, Dr. Sudhindra Nath, M.A., PH.D.	
Rebellion of Shah Jahan and his Career in Bengal	671
Bhattacharya, Prof. Vidhushekhar	
Evolution of Vijñānavāda	1
The Phallus Worship in the Veda	156
Bhattacharya, Dr. Nalini Kanta, M.A., PH.D.	
Location of Kṛṣṇa's Capital Dvāravati	541
Bose, Ananta Kumar, M.A.	
Agriculture	288
Chakraborty, Dr. Surendra Kisor, M.A., PH.D.	
Persian & Greek Coins & their Imitations in Ancient India	67
Chakravarti, Prof. Chintaharan, M.A.	
Ideals of Tantra Rites	486
Chandra, Dr. Prakash, M.A., LL.B., PH.D.	
Relations between the Civil and Military Authorities in the early days of the British Rule	523
Chattopadhyaya, Prof. Kshetresa Chandra, M.A.	
Vyomaśiva Author of Vyomavati	576

Das, Dr. Sukumar Ranjan, M.A., PH.D.				
The Jaina Calendar	332
De, Dr. S. K., M.A., D.LITT.				
Caitanya as an Author	301
Deb, Harit Krishna, M.A.				
Indo-Greek Coin Types	509
Dutt, Dr. Nalinaksha, M.A., PH.D., D.LITT.				
Home of Āryadeva	137
Siṃhapura	374
Ganguly, Dr. D. C., M.A., PH.D.				
History of the Gurjara Country	613
Origin of the Pratihāra Dynasty	337
Origin of the Pratihāra Dynasty (A Reply)	762
The Eastern Cālukyas	90
Vainyagupta Dvādaśāditya	154
Ghosh, Amalananda, M.A.				
The Kośamī Inscription of Aśoka	575
Ghosh, Dr. Batakrishna, PH.D.				
Pāṇinī and the Ṛkprātisākhya	665
Vedica	560
Ghosh, Manomohan, M.A.				
The Nāṭyaśāstra and the Abhinavabhāratī	161
Ghoshal, Dr. U. N. & Dutt, Dr. N.				
Tāranāth's History of Buddhism	551
Horner, Miss I. B., M.A.				
The Four Ways and the Four Fruits of Pāli Buddhism	785
Kapadia, Hiralal R., M.A.				
A Note on Jaina Hymns and Magic Squares	148
Some References Pertaining to Agriculture in				
Jaina Literature	797
Konow, Prof. Sten, PH.D.				
Kālidāsa in China	566
Mankad, D. R., M.A.				
Origin of the Pratihāras	584
Mirashi, Prof. V. V., M.A.				
Candragupta Vikramāditya and Govinda	48

Mitra, Achyuta Kumar				
A Further Note on the Origin of the Bell Capital				125, 358
Mukherjee, Dharendra Nath				
Chronology of the Sena Kings of Bengal	728
Nahar, Puran Chand, M.A., B.L.				
Trilingual Inscription (1734 A.D.)	116
Naik, V. B., M.A., LL.B.				
The Domicile of the Author of Campū Bhārata	112
Obermiller, Dr. E., PH.D.				
Nirvāṇa according to the Tibetan Tradition	211
Patel, Prabhubhai				
Caṭustava	82
Paul, Promode Lal, M.A.				
Scribes of Bengal	571
Przyluski, Prof. Jean, PH.D.				
The Great Goddess in India and Iran	405
Raghavan, V.				
Rīti and Guṇa in the Agni Purāna	767
Rao, M. Rama				
A Note on the Śālaṅkāyanaṣ	158
Rao, R. Rama				
Identity of Vidyāraṇya and Mādhavācārya	801
Rhys Davids, Mrs. C. A. F., M.A., D.LITT.				
The Relations between Early Buddhism and Brahmanism	274
Saletore, Dr. B. A., M.A., PH.D.				
A Note on Siṃhapura—Ārya Deva's Birth-place	368
Sarkar, Sir Jadunath, KT., M.A., C.I.E.				
Panipat, 1761	258
Sarma, Prof. Dasaratha, M.A.				
Origin of the Pratihāra Dynasty	582
Quotations by Bhoja from the Kāmasūtra	12
The Candragupta of Vāmana's Kāvyaḷaṅkāra Sūtras	761
The Kaumūdīṅghotsava and the date of Kālidāsa	763
Vyomaśiva, the Author of Vyomavatī	165
Sarma, Prof. Haradatta, M.A., PH.D.				
The Subhāsitaḥarāvalī of Śrī Hari Kavi and some Poets enjoying the Patronage of Muslim Rulers	478

Sarma, Pandit L. P. Pandeya				
Damaged Śrīpur plates	100
Sarma, Prof. Sri Rama, M.A.				
An Unexplored Source of Mughal History (1526-1707) ...				453
Sastri, V. A. Ramaswami, M.A.				
Old Vṛttikāras on the Pūrvamīmāṃsā Sūtraṣ ...				431
Schneider, Miss Alexandra				
Prof. J. P. Minayeff	811
Schrader, Prof. Dr. F. Otto, PH.D.				
Ancient Gītā Commentaries	348
Sen, Dr. Benoy Chandra, M.A., PH.D. & Ghosh, Devaprasad, M.A.				
A Dated Copper-plate Grant from Sundarban ...				321
Sen-Gupta, Probodh Chandra, M.A.				
Age of the Brāhmaṇas	533
Sethi, R. R., M.A.				
Events leading to the Ambela Expedition ...				26
Sinha, Narendra Krishna, M.A.				
The Durrani Menace and the British North-West Frontier Problem in the Eighteenth Century ...				624
Sircar, Dinesh Chandra				
Mahārāja Candavarman of the Komarti Plates ...				780
Stcherbatsky, Prof. Th., PH.D.				
The Dharmas of the Buddhists & the Guṇas of the Sāṃkhyas				737
Sur, Atul Krishna, M.A.				
Pre-Aryan Elements in Indian Culture	14
Suryanarayanan, Prof. S., M.A.				
The Tattvasuddhi and Subjectivism	577
Tripathi, N.				
The Purāṇic Traditions	121
Trivedi, Harihar V., M.A.				
Studies in Ancient Geography	642
Venkatasubbiah, A.				
Pañcatantra of Vasubhāga	104
Viswanatha, V., M.A.				
Some Dravidian Features in Indo-Chinese Social Life ...				143

THE Indian Historical Quarterly

Vol. X

MARCH, 1934

No. 1

Evolution of Vijñānavāda*

There is an old tradition in this country which speaks of a relationship between the Vedānta or Upaniṣads and Buddhism; and the available facts show that the tradition is not without foundation. Indeed, so far as some of the vital points are concerned, the difference between the two systems is very slight. Śāntirakṣita says in his *Tattva-saṅgraha* (v. 330) that the defect in the system of the followers of the Upaniṣads is slight (*alpāparādha*). As a matter of fact, Buddhism owes much of its being to the Upaniṣads. Although it is true that like the Sāṅkhya system, it has rejected much of the Vedic religion relating to different rites and ceremonies, nevertheless it is equally true that, like the same Sāṅkhya system, it has drawn much from that religion, following its 'path of knowledge' (*jñānamārga*).

Buddhism admits with the Vedānta that the origin of the *saṃsāra* is due to ignorance (*avidyā*), which therefore is to be overcome. In both the systems desire (*kāma*) is the root cause of all sufferings, and, as such, it is rightly called by the followers of the Vedānta 'Great Evil' (*mahāpāpman*) and by Buddhism 'Death' (*Māra*, a synonym for *mṛtyu*, both being derived from the same root \sqrt{mr} 'to die'). Naturally therefore by destroying or conquering that evil one attains to immortality. In both the systems the notion of 'I' and 'mine' (*aham*

* Read at the Indian Oriental Conference, Baroda, December, 1933

and *mama*) which brings about one's bondage is to be shaken off, though the methods suggested for achieving this end are totally different. There are many more such points of mutual agreement of which the one we are concerned with here is Vijñānavāda which, as we shall see, found its first expression in the Upaniṣads and gradually developed into its accepted form in Buddhism.

It goes without saying that the Upaniṣads avowedly deal with *Brahmavāda*, and *Brahmavāda* and *Ātmavāda* are one and the same, there being no difference whatsoever, for the words *Brahman* and *Ātman*, according to the seers or teachers of the Upaniṣads, differ only in letters and not in sense or spirit. It is repeatedly shown therein that *Brahman* is nothing but *vijñāna*¹ or *jñāna*.² Thus *Brahmavāda* or *Ātmavāda* is, in fact, *Vijñānavāda*.

Now Brahman being, in fact, identical with *vijñāna* one naturally takes the former in the sense of the latter in such Upaniṣadic passages as the following (*Taitti.* III. 1):

‘That from which these beings are born, that by which, when born, they live, that into which they enter at their end, try to know that. That is Brahman.’³

And it is actually supported by the following in the same work (III. 5):

‘He perceived that Brahman was *vijñāna*, for from *vijñāna* these

1 विज्ञानमानन्दं ब्रह्म.—*Br. Uṣ.*, III., 9. 28. see also *Taitti. Uṣ.*, II. 5. 1. III. 5. 1; *Br. Uṣ.*, IV. 3. 7 (विज्ञानमय = विज्ञान).

2 सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म.—*Taitti. Uṣ.*, II. 1. 1. Śaṅkara comments: सत्यं ब्रह्म, ज्ञानं ब्रह्म, अनन्तं ब्रह्म । सत्यमिति यद्रूपेण यन्निश्चितं तद्रूपं न व्यभिचरति तत् सत्यम् । ज्ञानं ज्ञप्तिरवबोधो भावमाधनो ज्ञानशब्दः ।

Cf. *jñapti* in the above extract with the Buddhist term *vijñapti*. It is to be noted that as the Upaniṣadic texts under discussion here show, originally there was made no distinction between *jñāna* and *vijñāna*, as generally in such cases in Buddhist texts. The main function of the former is *arthamātrapativedha*, while that of the latter is *artharīśeṣapativedha*. Sometimes in Buddhism, too, no distinction of *jñāna* and *vijñāna* is observed. See Note 16.

3 यतो वा इमानि भूतानि जातानि, येन जातानि जीवन्ति, यत् प्रयन्त्यभिसंविशन्ति, तद् विजिज्ञासस्व, तद् ब्रह्म ।

beings are born; by *viññāna*, when born, they live and into *viññāna* they enter at the end.⁴

When somehow or other the above interpretation is accepted the following and the similar texts of the Upaniṣads are easily taken with reference only to *viññāna*:

‘Verily all this is ātman.’⁵

‘Brahman alone is all this.’⁶

‘All this is Brahman.’⁷

‘There is no diversity here. He who perceives here diversity goes from death to death.’⁸

Thus to say all this is Brahman or Ātman amounts to saying that all this is *viññāna*; or in other words, all this is a *pariṇāma* or *vicarta*⁹ of Brahman or *viññāna*.

Compare this with such passages as the following from Buddhist works:

‘O the sons of the Jina, the three planes are only *citta*.’¹⁰

‘This is only *vijñapti*.’¹¹

1 विज्ञानं ब्रह्मेति व्यजानात् । विज्ञानद्वयेव खल्विमानि भूतानि जातानि, विज्ञानेन जातानि जीवन्ति, विज्ञानं प्रयन्त्यभिमंविशन्ति ।

5 आत्मवेदं सर्वम् ।—*Ch. Up.*, VII: 25, 2; इदं सर्वं यदयमात्मा ।—*Br. Up.*, IV. 5-7.

6 ब्रह्मं वेदं विश्वम् ।—*Mund. Up.*, II. 2. 11.

7 सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म ।—*Ch. Up.*, III. 16. 1; ब्रह्म खल्विदं वाव सर्वम्—*Maitrī Up.*, IV. 6.

8 नेह नानास्ति क्वचन । मृत्योः य मृत्युमाप्नोति य इह नानेव पश्यति ।—*Br. Up.*, IV. 4. 19.

9 The word *pariṇāma* means ‘transformation’ or ‘modification’; and *vicarta*, in fact, conveys the same meaning, i.e. ‘changing from one state to another.’ Its use in Vedāntic sense, ‘illusory manifestation’ is not pre-Śaṅkara.

10 चित्तमात्रं भो जिनपुत्रा यदुत त्रैधातुकम् । See *Subhāṣitasamgraha* ed. Bendall, p. 19; *Daśabhūmikasūtra*; Advayavajra’s *Tattvaratnāvalī*, Gækwad Oriental Series, No. XL, p. 18; Lévi: *Materiaux pour l’étude du Système Viññānamātra*, Paris, 1932, p. 43.

11 विज्ञप्तिमात्रमेवेदम् ।—*Viñśatikā* of Vasubandhu ed. Lévi in *Vijñapti-mātratāsiddhi*, Paris, 1925, 1. See also *Pañjikā* on *Tattvasamgraha*, GOS., p. 550: विज्ञप्तिमात्रमेवेदं त्रैधातुकम्: *Laṅkāvatāra* ed. B. Nanjio, X. 77, p. 274: विज्ञप्तिमात्रं त्रिभवम् ।

According to the Buddhists, *citta*, *manas*, *viññāna*, and *viññapti* are synonyms.¹²

Now as evident from the above the external world has in fact no reality, and yet it appears to be. This appearance demands an explanation which is supplied by the *avidyā* of the Vedāntins and by the *rāsanā* of the Buddhists. It is *avidyā* or *rāsanā* that changes *viññāna* into the external phenomena, even as happens in illusion, mirage, dream, etc.

The idealistic interpretation of the Vedānta as given above is fully supported by Gaudapāda and a careful and close examination of his *Īgamaśāstra*, generally known by the name of *Māṇḍūkya-kārikā*, will bear out the statement. I shall quote here only a few lines from that work. Gaudapāda says (IV. 72):

चित्तस्पन्दितमेवेदं प्राद्यप्राहकवद् द्वयम् ।
चित्तं निर्विषयं नित्यमसङ्गं तेन कीर्तितम् ॥

'This duality having the subject and the object'¹³ is only the vibration of *citta*. *Citta* has no object, therefore it is said to be always *asaṅga* (i.e. having no attachment or relation to an object)'.¹⁴

Here *spandita* (= *spanda* or *spandana*) of *citta* implies the activity of mind, owing to which objects are represented.

The following *kārikās* from the same work may also be compared with their parallel verses from the *Laṅkāvatāra*:

¹² चित्तं मनो विज्ञानं विज्ञमिश्चेति पर्यायाः ।— *Vimsatikā*, p. 3; चित्तं मनोऽथ विज्ञानमेकार्थम् ।— *Abhidharmakośa*, ed. Poussin, II. 31; चित्तं मनो विज्ञानमिति तस्यैव (referring to *cetas*,) पर्यायाः ।— *Madhyamakavṛtti*, ed. Poussin, p. 203.

¹³ प्राद्यप्राहकवत्, lit. 'the perceiver and the perceptible'.

¹⁴ Cf. *Laṅkāvatāra*, p. 157. असङ्गं लक्षणं ज्ञानम् For चित्तस्पन्दित or चित्तस्पन्द cf. the following in the *Yogavāsistha* (III 67. 6-8) which is full of Viññānavāda:

स्पन्दास्पन्दस्वभावं हि चिन्मात्रमिह विद्यते ।
खे वात इव तत्स्पन्दात् मोक्षाय शान्तमन्यथा ॥
चित्तं चित्तं भावितं सत्स्पन्द इत्युच्यते बुधैः ।
दृश्यन्वाभावितं चैतदस्पन्दनमिति स्मृतम् ॥
स्पन्दात्स्फुरति चिन्मर्गो निःस्पन्दाद् ब्रह्म शाश्वतम् ॥

ऋजुवक्रादिकाभासमलातस्पन्दितं यथा ।

ग्रहणप्राहकाभासं विज्ञानस्पन्दितं तथा ॥ IV. 47.

‘As the movements of a fire-brand appear to be straight, or crooked, etc., so the vibrations of *vijñāna* appear as the perceiver and the perceptible.’

अस्पन्दमानमलातमनाभासमज्ञं यथा ।

अस्पन्दमानं विज्ञानमनाभासमज्ञं तथा ॥ IV. 48.

‘As a fire-brand when it does not move has no appearance (of its being straight, etc.) and (thus) is not born, so when the *vijñāna* does not vibrate it has no appearance (of the perceiver and the perceptible), and (thus) is not born.’

अलाते स्पन्दमाने वै नाभासा अन्यतोभुवः ।

न ततोऽन्यत्र निस्पन्दान्नालातं प्रविशन्ति ते ॥ IV. 49.

‘When a fire-brand moves the appearances are not produced from anything other than that; and when it is at rest they are not in a place other than that, nor do they enter then into that.’

विज्ञाने स्पन्दमाने वै नाभासा अन्यतोभुवः ।

न ततोऽन्यत्र निस्पन्दान्न विज्ञानं विशन्ति ते ॥ IV. 51.

‘When the *vijñāna* vibrates the appearances are not produced from anything other than that, and when it is at rest they are not in a place other than that, nor do they enter then into that.’

यथा स्वप्ने द्वयाभासं स्पन्दते मायया मनः ।

तथा जाग्रद्द्वयाभासं स्पन्दते मायया मनः ॥ III. 29.¹⁵

‘As in dream owing to illusion, the mind moves having the appearance of the duality (the subject and the object), so does it in the waking state owing to illusion, having the appearance of the duality.’

अद्वयं च द्वयाभासं मनः स्वप्ने न संशयः ।

अद्वयं च द्वयाभासं तथा जाग्रन्न संशयः ॥ III. 30.¹⁶

‘There is no doubt that in dream the mind though without a second is with the appearance of the duality, so is undoubtedly the mind in the

15 This *kārikā* occurs again in the last chapter (IV. 61) with only one variation, i.e. *calati* for *spandate* in both the halves.

16 This *Kārikā* is identical with IV. 62.

waking state with the appearance of the duality, though it is without a second.'

Let us read here a few lines from the *Lankāvatāra* (ed. B. Nanjio), the well-known work on the Vijñānavāda:

चित्तमात्रमिदं सर्वं द्विधा चित्तं प्रवर्तते ।

प्राद्यप्राहकभावेन आत्मात्मीयं न विद्यते ॥ III. 121; p. 209.

'All this is *citta*. It comes forth in two ways, in the form of the perceiver as well as of the perceptible. There is neither Ātman, nor anything belonging to it.'

चित्तमात्रं न दृश्योऽस्ति द्विधा चित्तं प्रवर्तते ।

प्राद्यप्राहकभावेन शाश्वतोच्छेदवर्जितम् ॥ III. 65; p. 181.

'There is only *citta*, and not the visible. The *citta* comes forth in two ways, in the form of the perceiver as well as of the perceptible. It is neither eternal nor has it annihilation.'

प्राद्यप्राहकभावेन चित्तं नमति देहिनाम् ।

दृश्यस्य लक्षणं नास्ति यथा बालैर्विकल्प्यते ॥ X. 58; p. 272.

'The *citta* of men inclines (towards its objects) in the form of the perceiver as well as of the perceptible. There is no characteristic of the visible, as imagined by fools.'

गन्धर्वनगरं यद्वदन्त्या च मृगतृष्णिका ।

दृश्यं ख्याति तथा नित्यं प्रज्ञया च न विद्यते ॥ X. 69; p. 272.

'As appears the castle in the sky, or mirage, so does always the visible; but in transcendental wisdom it does not exist.'

That the visible universe is the creation of *vijñāna*, or *manas*, or *citta* is found also in the *Maṇḍalabrāhmaṇopaniṣad* (Mysore, 1900, p. 12) where occur the following lines:

यन्मनस्त्रिजगत्सृष्टिस्थितिव्यसनकर्मकृत् ।

तन्मनो विलयं याति तद्विष्णोः परमं पदम् ॥

'The mind which is the author of the creation, continued existence, and dissolution of the three worlds, disappears, and that is the highest state of Viṣṇu.'

In the Vijñānavāda the theory of *Vijñaptimātratā* which is the same as *vijñānamātratā* is a very well-known one. Literally *vijñāna*

mātra means 'simply *vijñāna*,' and its state is *vijñānamātratā*. When the *vijñāna* does not perceive any object whatsoever, it rests only in itself. This state of resting of the *vijñāna* only in itself is called *vijñānamātratā*.¹⁷

According to the Vijñānavādins this *vijñānamātratā* is *mukti* 'deliverance.'¹⁸ On this we shall have an occasion to speak a few words more.

In Vedānta this *vijñānamātratā* is expressed by Gauḍapāda in his *Āgamaśāstra* (III. 38) as *ātmasamsthā jñāna* 'jñāna that rests in itself'.¹⁹

The following stanza in the *Kāthopanīṣad* (II.3.10) clearly points to this *vijñānamātratā*:

यदा पञ्चावतिष्ठन्ते ज्ञानानि मनसा सह । बुद्धिश्च न विचेष्टते तामाहुः परमां गतिम् ॥

'When the five instruments of knowledge stand still together with

17 Vasubandhu's *Trisatīkā* ed. Lévi, 28 ; *Vijñāptimātratāsiddhi* of Poussin, p. 585 .

यदा त्वालम्बनं ज्ञानं नोपलभते तदा । स्थितं विज्ञानमात्रत्वे ग्राह्याभावात्तदग्रहात् ॥

See *Lankāvatāra*, p. 169:

यदा त्वालंब्यमर्थं नोपलभते ज्ञानं तदा विज्ञप्तिमात्रव्यवस्थानं भवति ।

विज्ञप्तं ग्राह्याभावाद् ग्राहकस्याप्यभावः । तदग्रहणान्न प्रवर्तते ज्ञानम् ।

18 विदित्वा नैरात्म्यं द्विविधमिह धीमान् भवगतं

यमं तच्च ज्ञात्वा प्रविशति स तत्त्वं ग्रहणतः ।

ततस्तत्र स्थानान्मनस इह न ख्याति तदपि

तदख्यानं मुक्तिः परम उपलम्भस्य विगमः ॥

Mahāyānasūtrāṅkāra ed. Lévi, XI. 17.

Here the third line is explained thus :

ततस्तत्र तत्त्वविज्ञप्तिमात्रस्थानान्मनसस्तदपि तत्त्वं न ख्याति विज्ञप्तिमात्रम् ।

तदख्यानं मुक्तिः ।

19 ग्रहो न तत्र नान्यर्गश्चिन्ता यत्र न विद्यते ।

आत्ममंस्थं तदा ज्ञानमजाति यमतां गतम् ॥

See *Bhāgavadgītā*, VI. 25 .

आत्ममंस्थं मनः कृत्वा न किञ्चिदपि चिन्तयेत् ।

Bhīṣmacatapurāna, II. 1. 19 .

मनो निर्विषयं युक्त्वा ततः किञ्चन न स्मरेत् ।

This is in fact निर्विकल्प ज्ञान . See Poussin's *Vijñāptimātratāsiddhi*, (Volume II), p. 607. Gauḍapāda describes it (III. 33) as अकल्पक ज्ञान .

the mind, and when the intellect does not move, that is called the highest state.'

We have seen that Brahman is *vijñāna*. And I think it points to *vijñāptimātratā*. *Vijñāna* when it rests only in itself (*ātma-rāṣṭha*) is Brahman. This reminds us of the following in the Upaniṣads (*Ch. Up.* VII. 24. 1-2):

'Where one sees nothing else, hears nothing else, understands nothing else, that is the Infinite (*abhūman*).....The infinite is immortal.'

'Sir, in what does the Infinite rest?'

'In its own greatness—or not even in greatness'.²⁰

The exposition of Gauḍapāda is very clear here. He says (III. 46).

यदा न लीयते चित्तं न च विशिष्यते पुनः । अनिङ्गनमनाभासं निष्पन्नं ब्रह्म तत् तदा ॥

'When the *citta* does not fall into a state of oblivion, nor is distracted again, nor is unsteady, nor has it any sense-image, then it becomes Brahman'.²¹

This *vijñānamātratā* is, therefore, in fact, *Brahmabhāva* of the Brahmavādins. *Brahmabhāva* means the 'state of Brahman' or 'becoming Brahman'.²²

20 स्वे महिम्नि यदि वा न स्वे महिम्नि । Tr. by Max Muller, *SBE.*, vol. 1, p. 129. Here following Śaṅkara he writes "The Commentator takes *gadi vā* in the sense of, "If you ask in the highest sense, then I say no ; for the Infinite cannot rest in anything, not even in greatness: "

21 See my paper: *The Gauḍapādakārikā on the Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad in the Proceedings and Transactions of the Second (All India) Oriental Conference, 1922, p. 457-8 ; and Brahmahindu Up. :*

निरस्तविषयामङ्गं मंनिरुद्धं मनो हृदि । यदा याव्युन्मर्नाभावं तदा तत्परमं पदम् ॥ ५

तावदेव निरोद्धव्यं यावद्धृदि गतं ज्ञयम् । एतज्ज्ञानं च ध्यानं च अतोऽन्यो ग्रन्थविस्तरः ॥५

नैव चिन्त्यं न चाचिन्त्यमचिन्त्यं चिन्त्यमेव च । पक्षपातविनिर्मुक्तं ब्रह्म सम्पद्यते तदा ॥६

Maitrī Up., VI. 34:

यथा निरिन्धनो वह्निः स्वयोन्यावुपशाम्यति । तथा वृत्तिक्षयाच्चित्तं स्वयोन्यावुपशाम्यति ॥

Yogavāsistha, III. 67.8, already quoted once in Note 13 :

स्पन्दात्स्फुरति चित्तमर्गो निःस्पन्दाद् ब्रह्म शाश्वतम् ।

22 *Muṇḍaka Up.*, III. 2. 9 : म यो ह वै तत् परमं ब्रह्म वेद ब्रह्मैव भवति ।
He who understands the highest Brahman becomes Brahman.'

This is the *mukti* 'deliverance' of the Brahmavādians, and here on this point they entirely agree, as has already been shown²³ with the Vijñānavādins.

Now when the *citta* or *vijñāna* rests only in itself, or in other words, when there is *vijñānamātratā*, that state is described as 'non-perception (*anupalambha*)' there being no *citta* (*acitta*), 'supermundane (*lokottara*) *jñāna*,' 'incomprehensible (*acintya*),' 'good (*kuśala*),' 'eternal (*dhruva*),' and 'bliss (*sukha=ānanda*)'.²⁴

Now consider if there is any difference between this *vijñāna* and the *vijñāna* as Brahman of the Vedāntins.

Here on the authority of Vasubandhu and Sthiramati, *vijñāna*, as we have seen above, is eternal (*dhruva, nitya*) And there are other

23 See Note 18

24 The original from which these words are taken is in the *Triṃśikā*, and it runs as follows:

अचिन्तोऽनुपलम्भोऽसौ ज्ञानं लोकोत्तरं च तत्र । आश्रयस्य परावृत्तिर्द्विधा देहपुल्यहानितः ॥२६
२ एवानास्रवो धातुरचिन्त्यः कुशलो ध्रुवः । सुखो विमुक्तिकायोऽसौ धर्मव्योऽयं महामुनेः ॥३०

Here in the first *kārikā* अनुपलम्भः 'non-perception' is expressed as परम उपलम्भस्य विगमः 'extreme cessation of perception,' in the *Mahāyānasūtrāluṅkāra*, XI. 47. See note 18. For अचिन्त See Vasubandhu's *Triṃśikāraṇḍeśa*, 36:

चिन्तमावोपलम्भेन ज्ञेयार्थानुपलम्भता । ज्ञेयार्थानुपलम्भेन स्याच्चिन्तानुपलम्भता ॥

With reference to the words अनुपलम्भोऽसौ in the *Triṃśikā*, quoted above Prof. Poussin observes (*Vijñāptimātratāsaddhi*, p.603) "D'après le commentaire de Sthiramati les notes *anupalambha* 'sont se rapportent au Bodhisattva:" Undoubtedly Bodhisattva may rest in *vijñāptimātratā* (स्वचित्तधर्मतायां प्रतिष्ठितः), but, so far as the commentary of Sthiramati is concerned, those two words, I think, do not refer to a Bodhisattva, though his gradual success is shown. Sthiramati's introductory line (यदेव विज्ञप्तिमात्रतायां चिन्तमवस्थितं भवति) clearly shows that it is the *citta* in that state, which is referred to by the following stanzas including the words in question.

Sthiramati explains thus the words quoted in the body:

तत्र ग्राहकचित्ताभावाद् ग्राह्यार्थानुपलम्भाच्च अचिन्तोऽनुपलम्भोऽसौ । अनुचितत्वात्
लोकैः समुदाचाराभावात् निर्विकल्पत्वाच्च लोकादुत्तारणमिति ज्ञानं लोकोत्तरं च तदिति ।
(according to the Tibetan version अपरिचितत्वात् reading *hdris par ma byas
pa dan*)

अचिन्त्यस्तर्कगोचरत्वात् प्रत्यात्मवेद्यत्वाद् दृष्टान्ताभावाच्च ।

कुशलो विशुद्धान्मनत्वात् क्षेमत्वाद्नास्रवधर्ममयत्वाच्च ।

ध्रुवो नित्यत्वादक्षयतया ।

texts, too, that can be cited in support of the view.²⁵ But it is a well-known fact that the Buddhists hold the theory of 'momentariness' (*kṣaṇabhāṅgavāda*), and hence, according to them, *vijñāna* is also momentary, and not eternal as the Vedantins maintain. Śāntirakṣita while agreeing with them on many an important point differs from them saying that their system is defective, for *vijñāna* can in no way be eternal, as held therein.²⁶

This eternity of *vijñāna* of the Vijñānavādins refers, I think, to its continuity (*santāna-nityatā*),²⁷ and is not to be taken in the strict sense of the term, as maintained by the Vedantists. This explanation is supported by the *Jñānasiddhi* quoted in the foot-note, no. 25.

मुखो नित्यत्वादेव । यदनित्यं तद्दुःखं, अयं च नित्य इति । अस्मान्मुखः ।

25 अनादिनिधना शान्ता सर्वधर्मेश्वरी च सा ।

बिभ्रती सर्वरूपाणि सत्यद्वयसमन्विता ॥

—*Jñānasiddhi*, XV. 50 in *Two Vajrayāna Works*, GOS, p. 85: This refers to *cittadhārā*,

अनादिनिधनं शान्तं बोधित्तं, *Op. cit.*, p. 75.

ज्ञानं अमरणमलक्षणमघोषं प्रभास्वरमनभिलाप्यमिति ।

Op. cit., p. 85, See Suzuki: *Outlines of Mahāyāna Buddhism*, 1907, p. 348:

"Nirvāṇa is some times spoken of as possessing four attributes; (1) eternal (*nitya*), (2) blissful (*sukha*), (3) self-acting (*ātman*), and pure (*śuci*). It is eternal because it is immaterial; it is blissful because it is above all sufferings; it is self-acting because it knows no compulsion; it is pure because it is not defiled by passion and error."

See also *Visuddhi magga*, Vol. I, p. 294; *Saṃyutta Nikāya*, iv, 362, 369 ff:

असंखतञ्च बो भिक्खवे देसिस्सामि...सच्चञ्च पारञ्च सुदुहसञ्च अजरञ्च धु व च्च निप्प-
पञ्चञ्च अमतञ्च सिवञ्च..... ।

In the *Abhidhānappadīpikā* ed. Subhūti, 7, *dhura* is one of the synonyms for *nirvāṇa*.

26

नित्यज्ञानविवर्त्तोऽयं क्षितितेजोजलादिकः ।

आत्मा तदात्मकश्चेति संगिरन्तेऽपरे पुनः ॥

प्राण्यलक्षणसंयुक्तं न किञ्चिदिह विद्यते ।

विज्ञानपरिणामोऽयं तस्मात्सर्वः समीक्ष्यते ॥

तेषामल्पापराधं तु दर्शनं नित्यतोक्तिः ।

Tattvasaṅgraha, GOS, 328-330.

27 Cf. अनुत्पन्नप्रवृत्तिं ज्ञानम् in the *Taṅkāvatāra*, p. 157, and *pariṇāmanityatā* of the Sāṅkhyas. But against this see Jayanatabhaṭṭa's *Nyāyamañjarī*, 1895, (Part II) p. 464:

In conclusion, it may be observed that following the line of thoughts suggested above a very large number of passages in the Upaniṣads may easily be explained from the Vijñānavāda point of view. For instance, let us take the following two stanzas from the *Iśā Up.*, 6-7:

यस्तु सर्वाणि भूतानि आत्मन्येवानुपश्यति । सर्वभूतेषु चात्मानं ततो न विचिकित्सति ॥

‘When to a man who understands all the beings in the Ātman (i.e. *vijñāna*) and the Ātman (i.e. *vijñāna*) in all beings, he does not remain in doubt.’

यस्मिन् सर्वाणि भूतानि आत्मैवाभूद्विजानतः । तत्र को मोहः कः शोक एकत्वमनुपश्यतः ॥

‘When to a man who understands, the Ātman (i.e. *vijñāna*) has become all beings, what sorrow, what trouble can there be to him who beheld that identity (i.e. the identity of the *vijñāna* and the beings).’

It is, however, to be noted that the Upaniṣads do not say one thing, but various things. There are various thoughts and while some of them are more or less systematic, others are not so. Originally the Upaniṣads were meant not merely to guide one’s speculations, but to lead one along an active spiritual life. But that was found impossible owing mainly to the wide divergence in their thoughts. Consequently a strong necessity was felt for making up that difference; and the result was the composition of the *Brahmasūtras*. But unfortunately the question remained still unsettled, there being a number of schools of interpreters. The diversity of these interpretations is due specially to the different passages in the Upaniṣads, some of which do actually differ, and some are explained differently. Thus the interpretation of the Vedānta from the idealistic point of view is quite just, for there are actually some texts to that effect.

VIDYUSHEKHARA BHATTACHARYA

अथापि नित्यं परमार्थमन्तं मन्ताननामानमुपैषि भावम् ।

उत्तिष्ठ भिक्षो फलितास्तवाशाः सोऽयं ममाप्तः क्षणभङ्गवादः ॥

But truly speaking, as followers of the Middle Path the Vijñānavādins can not hold that the *vijñāna* is eternal, for according to them it should be regarded as one having neither eternity nor annihilation. The *Laṅkāratāra* (III.65, p.181) clearly says:

चित्तमात्रं न दृश्योऽस्ति द्विधा चित्तं प्रवर्तते । प्राण्यग्राहकभावेन शाश्वतोच्छेदवर्जितम् ॥

Pre-Aryan Elements in Indian Culture

(Some Additional Notes)

Elsewhere I have shown that the Mother goddess cult in India is of pre-Aryan origin.¹ It is well-known that feminine deities occupy a very prominent place in modern Hinduism. Yet they played a very insignificant rôle in the religion of the Ṛg-vedic Aryans. Indeed, the very conception of the supreme deity as a Mother goddess, which is an outstanding feature of modern Hinduism, was quite unknown to the Ṛg-vedic Aryans. In their pantheon male deities were supreme. But in the old pre-Aryan religion of India, a leading feature was the worship of the nude Mother goddess.² It is interesting to note that this conception of the Mother goddess as a nude woman survives to this day in the representation of such of the Hindu mother goddesses as Kālī, Śītalā, Chinnamastā etc. Śītalā, we are told in the Purāṇas, should always be represented in a state of perfect nudity. Indeed, she still takes that form in Jessore, Noakhali and Khulna, where she is regarded by the Pods as their main deity.³

Nudity and Fertility Cults

It seems that the idea at the root of the original conception of the Mother goddess as a nude woman was sympathetic magic.⁴ The idea

1 *Calcutta Review*, April 1931, pp. 227-237

2 It has been supposed that the predominance of Mother worship in India represents a survival from matriarchate, the prevalence of which, of course, had been attested by a considerable amount of evidence (J. E. Harrison, *Prolegomena to Greek Religion*, pp. 261, 499; Risley-Gait, *Census Report*, 1901, i, 448). Contrary to this I held the view that mother goddess cult originated from fertility cult as represented by the cult of the Mother Earth. The worship of the {Mother Earth was indissolubly connected with agriculture. The cult, therefore, arose among agricultural communities. And since among primitive folks agriculture is mostly done by the women, the goddess connected with the same naturally came to be conceived as a woman (*Cal. Rev.*, 1931, p. 234). The connection of the Indian Devi with the Earth goddess is shown by such of her appellations as Annapurnā, Śākambhari etc. The *Kālikāpurāṇa* also contains a śloka which states that the goddess Kālī is worshiped in her manifestation as earth. Referred to by Sten Konow, *JASB.*, N. S., XXI, 1925, p. 322.

3 *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, ii, 485.

4 Magical ideology falls under two categories:—contagious and homeopathic. In the former an effect is brought about by influencing something that comes in

was prompted by the desire to envisage, to increase and to glorify the spirit of fertility as personified in the Mother goddess. This idea is particularly evident from the fact that even in the rudest of the specimens the sexual attributes have been prominently indicated as the essential part of the design. And it ought to be noted here that as the fundamental idea embodied in these figures was religious and highly pragmatic, all ideas of obscenity were precluded, and they were simply a matter of fact statement of a deep-rooted belief.⁵

Parallelism between India and Sumer

On the subject of parallel features between the Mother goddess cult of Sumer and India, I should mention the following two in addition to what I have pointed out before.⁶

1. A system of sanctified prostitution was common to the cult both in Sumer and India. Throughout Western Asia, the Mother goddess was propitiated by a sort of mimetic (same as homeopathic) magic practised by women. This generally took the form of the sacrifice of

contact with the same. In the latter the event itself or its causes are dramatized to stimulate its occurrence.

5 *Clay Figurines of Babylonia and Assyria* by E. Douglas Van Buren, p. xlix.

6 "Foremost among these similarities are the following : (i) the Mother goddess in both the countries is conceived as a virgin yet she had a consort ; [This aspect of the conception of the Mother goddess is clear from the Tantras] (ii) the sacred animal of the Mother goddess in both the countries was the lion and that of her consort was the bull ; (iii) besides the performance of her feminine functions she was capable of doing purely male functions such as fighting. In Mesopotamian inscriptions she is constantly referred to as 'Leaderess of hosts in Battle.' The Indian goddess as is well-known was capable of doing the same thing. In the *Devī Māhātmya* section of the *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa* is narrated the story of how the gods being ousted by the Asuras implored the help of Durgā whereupon the latter took up arms and humiliated Mahiṣa the Asura and his hosts. (iv) The Mesopotamian goddess was intimately associated with the mountain. She is constantly called the "Lady of the mountain." The intimate connection of the Indian Mother goddess with the mountain is shown by her such names as Pārvatī, Haimavatī, Vindhyaśini etc. (v) And lastly the name of the Sumerian goddess Nana is still preserved in the name of the Indian Goddess Nanadevī, who has a famous temple at Hinglaj in Gujrat. Such fundamental similarities as above cannot be explained away as accidental."—*Col. Rev.*, 1913, pp. 235-236.

the virtue of women, married or unmarried, temporarily or for ever, in the service of religion to win the favour of the goddess.⁷ And such practices are also the characteristic feature of the Mother goddess cult of the Vāmācārī school in India.⁸

2. The sacrifice of human victims at the altar of the Mother goddess was common to both the countries.⁹

Sumerian Origins

Not only were there so many parallel features between the Mother goddess cults of India and Sumer, but it is curious enough that Kāmārūpa (northern Assam) which is the stronghold of the Mother goddess cult in India should be called "Saumāra" in the *Yoginītantra*. It is described as follows:—

pūrve Svarṇa-nadī yāvat Karatoyā ca pāścime/
dakṣiṇe Mandāśailāśca uttare Vihagācalaḥ//
aṣṭakoṇam ca Saumāraṃ yatra Dikkaravāsiniḥ///

"Saumāra, the abode of Dikkaravāsini is an octangular country, bounded on the east by the river Svarṇa (Sonkoshi), on the west by the river Karatoyā, on the south by the Mandā hills (Garo and Khasiya hills), and on the north by the hill called Vihagācala."¹⁰

7 Descriptions of such rites appear in Frazer's *Golden Bough, Adonis*, vol. iv, pp. 22-41 (The Thinker's Library edition).

8 In the Tantras great stress is laid on the fact that kulapūjā (worship of the goddess) cannot be done without having sexual intercourse with women. Compare in this connection the following verses quoted from the *Guptasamhitā*: *kula-śaktim vinū devī yo jayet sa tu pāmarah*..... In the *Niruttaratantira* it is said that a married woman would commit no sin if she forsakes her husband for kulapūjā: *virāhitapati-tyāge dūṣaṇam na kulārcaṇe*.

9 *Kālikāpurāṇa*, ch. 67.

10 *Yoginītantra*, ii. 44. "Archæologists are unanimous in their opinion that the Sumerians were an exotic people in Mesopotamia. Though the Sumerians had forgotten all tradition about their original home yet various traits in the Sumerian culture show conclusively that they had come from a mountainous country. The cult of their deities on high places and the popularity of mountain animals on the Sumerian seals suggest no less clearly that the Sumerians were a highland folk. Some of their traditions, such as the legend of the culture hero Oannes, a man-fish who swam up the Persian Gulf to Eridu, point to a southern origin and an arrival from overseas. They seem to be connected with India. We know that the first fortunes of

Popular Goddesses of Early India

Of the various early goddesses of popular origin, the one that I particularly referred to in my paper¹¹ is Vāsini, mentioned in the *Gṛhya-sūtra*. Another very important popular goddess of early India was Śrī. She is mentioned for the first time in the *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa*.¹² There she is described as a goddess of love and fertility, and offerings are significantly prescribed for her by the head of the bed.¹³ In the *Sirikālakāṇṇi Jātaka* (No. 192) *Siri Devī* is the daughter of *Dhatarattha*, one of the four *Lokapālas*. She is there made to say, "I preside over the course of conduct that gives lordship to mankind.....I am

Sumer were bound up with Indian intercourse. The regularity and intimacy of the intercourse with India is proved by the occurrence on Sumerian sites of objects imported from the Indus Valley, the oldest indisputable instances in the world of manufactured goods of precisely defined provenance being transported for long distance from the centre of their fabrication' (Childe, *The Most Ancient East*, p. 199). Could not the Sumerians come from Sumeru-parvata which figures so prominent in various Indian legends" (*Cal. Rev.*, 1931. p. 229). In this connection the following confirmatory statement of Mr. V. Gordon Childe would prove interesting: "The features are really similar, the way of dressing the hair is identical. The daggers from Harappa, again, belong, to the same tanged family as the Sumerian, but to a more primitive stage. The Indus and the Sumerian beakers have an unmistakable family likeness. The cylindrical vase of silver from Mohenjodaro invites comparison with the alabaster vessels of the same shape from Ur and Susa. The Sumerian and Indus toilet sets are in principle identical, and each shows the same peculiar construction of the looped head. Artistic devices like the use of shell inlays connect the two regions strikingly. Motifs like the trefoil and the rosette, even religious themes such as the monsters, are common to both countries. It is fantastic to suggest that the wheel and carts had been independently invented in both lands." V. Gordon Childe, *The Most Ancient East*, p. 211. We may also refer here to the passage in Genesis where the Sumerians are described as a "people who journeyed from the East and came into the plain of Shinar and dwelt there."

11 *Op cit.*, p. 237.

12 *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa*, xi. 4. 3. 1; Saphitā references cited by Scheftalowitz (*ZDMG.*, LXXV, 37-50) for both Śrī and Lakṣmī are dubious. Her relation to Viṣṇu is ignored throughout the Vedic period except at the close (Keith, *Religion & Philosophy of the Vedas*, p. 212).

13 This prescription specially occurs in the Sūtra literature (*Sāṅkhāyana Gṛhya sūtra*, ii, 14. 10 ff.) There she is coupled with *Bhadrakālī*, and offerings are respectively prescribed for them at the head and foot of the bed.

beauty, fortune and wisdom."¹⁴ According to the *Mahābhārata* she once lived with the Dānavas, then with the gods and Indra and perhaps thereby hinting at the fact that she was once worshipped by the non-Aryans.¹⁵

In the development of Paurāṇik Hinduism all these popular feminine divinities could be and were gradually incorporated into a consistent theological scheme, as manifestations of one goddess, who is either herself the Supreme power (śakti) or the power inherent in a male cosmic deity, such as Śiva. In popular sense, She is his wife. But in her own right she is absolute in her action, and in specific forms she engages in activities on behalf of the gods or men and these relation and activities form the themes of innumerable Paurāṇik legends.

Prototype of Śiva

That the pre-Aryan peoples of the Indus Valley not only worshipped the Mother goddess, but like the ancient peoples of Western Asia and the modern Hindus, paid their devotion also to a male cosmic deity is evident from the representation of a three-faced male deity depicted on a seal recovered from Mohenjo-daro.

"He is seated on throne with chest, neck and head quite erect and feet crossing each other. His arms are outstretched, his hands with thumbs to front resting on his knees. The posture is pervaded by the same spirit of concentration as the later Paryāṅka (cross-legged) āsana. On two sides of the figures evidently indicating the four cardinal points are engraved four animals, elephant, tiger, rhinoceros and buffalo. Below the throne are two deer standing with heads turned backwards."¹⁶

There is no doubt that we find here the proto-type of Śiva. We recognise here the germs of at least three fundamental concepts connected with the later Śiva, namely, that he is (i) Yogīśvara or Mahāyogī, (ii) Paśupati, and (iii) Trimukha.¹⁷

It appears from the published illustration of the seal—although the official archaeologists have missed it—that the deity wears ornaments on arms and possibly on neck too. This feature reminds one of the vedic Rudra, whose cult in later times was replaced by that of

14 *Museum of Fine Arts Bulletin, Boston*, XXV, 94.

15 *Mahābhārata*, xii. 225, 228.

16 Chanda, *Modern Review*, August 1932, pp. 158-159.

17 Keith, *Religion and Philosophy of the Vedas*, p. 144.

Siva. In the Ṛg-veda Rudra is described as wearing golden ornaments. Now it seems possible that Rudra in the Ṛg-veda was an Aryanised form of the pre-Aryan proto-Siva. This supposition to a certain extent finds support in the fact that the word Rudra in Sanskrit meaning 'red' is identical with the Dravidian word for 'red' Siva. Rudra, it must be noted, was not a very important deity in the Ṛg-veda. Only three hymns have been given to him, and he has been identified with Agni. In the study of Vedic religion it should always be borne in mind that the cult of Agni had the most predominant place in Vedic ritualism. And it seems probable that whenever a new deity had to be introduced in the Aryan pantheon, he had first to be recognised as a form of Agni or somehow associated with him. We can compare here, for instance, the cases of Kālī and Karālī, which goddesses were presumably of aboriginal origin, yet when introduced in the Vedic pantheon at once became identified with the cult of Agni. Two more instances would perhaps make my point clear. For instance, Sarva and Bhava, who according to the *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa* were respectively worshipped by the 'Easterners' (that is the Asurās who represented the original inhabitants of Vāṅgāmagadha) and the 'Bāhikas' appear as separate deities in the *Yajurveda*. But in the *Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā* they are identified with Agni along with other newly recruited deities as Aśani, Paśupati, Mahādeva, Isāna, Ugradeva and others. The cult of Rudra reached the high-water mark of its power and popularity in the period of the Brāhmaṇas, but even there he is still recognised as a form of Agni, showing thereby that the transitional period was not yet over. The identification of various deities with Agni and their close connection with each other made the process of their syncretism in Hinduism a very easy one. Thus the following deities described in the later Vedic literature as being forms of Agni, became in the Purāṇas synthetised into the Hindu Siva. They are Hara, Mr̥ḍa, Sarva, Śiva, Bhava, Mahādeva, Ugra, Paśupati, Saṅkara and Isāna. From all these evidences it appears as if there were in ancient India side by side with the popular feminine deities numerous male divinities as well, all or many of which gathered round the nucleus of Vedic Rudrāgni to give rise to the later cult of Siva. An observation of Keith on this point is very illuminating. He says:

“The question, however, arises whether in the late Rudra we have not the syncretism of more than one deity and possibly the influence of the aboriginal worship of the Aryans. It is certainly possible that forest and mountain deities or some kindred gods such as a vegetation spirit and even a god of the dead may be united with the Vedic lightning god to form the composite figure of the Yajurveda : the view preferred by Oldenberg that the god is really the same throughout the whole period and that it is the nature of the tradition which obscures the fact cannot be accepted in face of the obvious probability of development of religion and the admitted ease with which deities absorb some elements into the character. In the later Śiva there are many traces of conceptions commonly associated with vegetation spirits and his phallic cult is one which is condemned by the Rigveda but which doubtless remained as popular among the aborigines as it now is among Śiva worshippers throughout India.”¹⁸

Any way, it seems certain that by the time of the *Rāmāyaṇa* Śiva had already been exalted to the rank of a Supreme deity. Kauśalya, for instance, says in Ayodhyā Kāṇḍa (25, 45) :—*mayārcitā devagaṇā śivādayah*.

Cult of Liṅga and Yoni

In Hinduism Śiva and Śakti are worshipped not only in anthropomorphic forms, but also in the symbolic forms of Liṅga and Yoni. The existence of the cult of Liṅga and Yoni in the Indus Valley in pre-Aryan times is attested by the realistic representations of the phallus as well as ringstones. It seems probable that these pre-Aryan phallic worshippers are identical with the peoples who in later times dwelt in rich and prosperous cities (some even with a hundred gates) in the Indus Valley, and prejudice and indignation against whom find most eloquent expression in the following two passages of the *Rg-veda* :—

“The terrible God Indra, skilled in all heroic deeds, has with his weapons mastered these demons. Indra, exalting has shattered their deities ; armed with the thunderbolt he has smitten them asunder by his might. Neither demons impel us, Indra, nor, O puissant deity of a truth, any evil spirits. The glorious Indra defies the hostile being : not those whose God is the Śiśna approach our sacred ceremonies” (*RV.*, vii, 21. 4-5).

“Proceeding to the conflict, and desiring to acquire them he has gone to, and in hostile army besieged inaccessible places, at the same time when irresistible, slaying those whose God is the Śiśna, he by his craft conquered the riches of the city with a hundred gates” (*RV.*, X. 99. 3).

18 *Ibid.*, p. 148.

Linga Cult older than Mohenjo-daro

That the cult of the Linga in India is older than the chalcolithic period of Mohenjo-daro will be evident, if we only take back our research into the domain of pre-historic archæology. Such research shows conclusively that phallus played a considerable part in the religious and magical ideology of the pre-Aryan and non-Aryan peoples of India. There is, for instance, a very fine specimen of phallus dating from the neolithic times in the Foote Collection of the Madras Museum.¹⁹ It was found on the Shevaroy hill in the Salem district of the Madras Presidency. It is made of pale gneiss stone. Though the specimen has been much ravaged in the process of time, it still retains its original and highly realistic shape. It was no doubt used as an object of worship or as a charm against sterility.

Shevaroy hills in the Salem district is not the only place in India which has yielded a phallic symbol of neolithic times. Earthen phallic symbols dating from neolithic times have also been obtained from various places in the Baroda State in Gujrat.²⁰

Focus of Linga Cult

Most of the early specimens of phallic symbols have thus come from South India. Curiously enough, in Indian literary tradition at least one form of the cult, namely that of Bāṇa linga is connected with South India. For instance, according to the *Sūtasamhitā*:

“King Bāṇa was a special favourite of the great Mahādeva. He performed the worship by installing every day with his own hand a Siva linga. After he had worshipped Siva for a hundred years in this manner, the great god being highly pleased conferred on him a boon, speaking thus to him, ‘I give you fourteen crores of linga which are specially endowed. They are to be found in the Narmadā and other sacred streams. They will confer faith and salvation on their devotees.’”

Hemādri, the author of the *Caturvargaśintāmaṇi* also quotes Yājñavalkya to say:

“These lingas will ceaselessly roll by themselves in the stream of the river Narmadā. In ancient time Bāṇa absorbed in contemplation invoked Mahādeva who in compliance with his prayer is now residing on the mountain in the shape of the linga. It is for this reason that the lingas are known as Bāṇalinga. The same benefit that would accrue to a devotee by worshipping a crore of lingas would be

19 Robert Bruce Foote, *Foote Collection of Indian Pre-historic and Proto-historic Antiquities*, p. 61.

20 *Ibid.*, p. 139.

obtained by him by worshipping only one Bāṇalinga.....Those who daily worship Bāṇalinga found on the banks of the river Narmadū got salvation within their grasp."²¹

Elsewhere I have shown that the Aryans in India borrowed from the aboriginal inhabitants not only the cult of the liṅga but the name of the symbol as well.²² That it is of non-Aryan origin is shown by the opprobrious terms applied to the phallic worshippers in the Ṛg-veda. The paucity of phallic worship in the case of other Indo-European peoples lends support to this theory.

Liṅga Cult in Brāhmanism

The cult of the Liṅga became embedded in Brāhmanism in the Epic period. Earlier literature have no reference to the same. For the first time it appears in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, in which it is stated that wherever Rāvaṇa went he carried with him a Sivaliṅga of gold.²³ In the *Mahābhārata*, too, Sivaliṅga is mentioned in several places.²⁴

The cult seems to have been well-established in Hinduism in the second century before Christ. This is evident from a phallus symbol discovered at Gudimallam, a village situated at a distance of 6 miles to the north-east of Renigunta, a railway station on the Madras and Southern Marhatta Railways. It represents the phallus in a most realistic manner. It bears on its front a very beautiful figure of Śiva. It is dated a second century B.C.²⁵

The development of Śaktism gave a great fillip to the propagation of the cult. Throughout the Tāntrik literature we have the injunction that all religious merit will go in vain if one does not worship the liṅga.²⁶

Theriomorphism

I have already shown that animals formed an outstanding feature

21 Quoted in N. Vasu's *Social History of Kāmarūpa*.

22 "Beginnings of Liṅga Cult in India" in *ABORI.*, 1932.

23 We know from the Tantras that Sivaliṅgas could be made of metal, stone or earth.

24 *Mahābhārata, Anuśāsana*, v. 8 ff.; xv. 7510, 7516; cf. also *Droṇaparva* v. 961 ff.; xv. 9625 and 9631.

25 Gopinath Rao, *Hindu Iconography*, vol. II, p. 63 ff.

26 Cf. *Mahāvedatantra—ekayā dūrvayā vāpi yo 'rccayec chivaliṅgakam/ sarvadevasya śiṛṣe tu cārghyadānaphalaṃ labhet//*

of the religious ideas of the pre-Aryan peoples of India, while such ideas had practically very loose or no hold on the Aryans.²⁷

Dr. Keith observes:

“The place of animals in the Veda, is restricted and of comparatively late importance so far as it concerns direct worship of animals whether individual or specific as distinct from the theriomorphism of gods who are not animal gods and the use of animal fetishes. But the existence of these different ways in which an animal may seem to be defined renders it difficult in each case to say whether or not direct worship of animals is to be detected.”²⁸

Gods in Western Asia were often conceived as bull, and in their representation on archaic seals they were frequently represented as wearing bull's horns. From this I inferred that similar ideas might have also been prevalent among the Indus Valley folk, and it was from them that in later times the Aryans borrowed the ideas and called Indra ‘the Bull of Heaven’—an epithet which the Sumerians also applied to their Father God.²⁹ Later discoveries at Mohenjo-daro have confirmed my surmise. For instance, the proto-type of Śiva referred to above wears the bull's horns.³⁰

Hindu Daśavatāras

If theriomorphism of deities has been responsible (as suggested by me in my previous paper) for the growth of the idea of the *vāhanas* of Hindu deities, totemism, I think, has been responsible for the development of the theory of Hindu Dāśavatāras. It is most probable that the Hindu Avatāras are nothing but the culture heroes of the land. We know that three of them, Rāma, Kṛṣṇa and Buddha, were at least as such. Other Avatāras, such as fish, tortoise, boar and man-lion, might have been conceived as such because the culture heroes were born among totemic tribes having such names. This is not improbable. For in the Sumerian tradition, their culture hero was one Oannes, a man-fish who swam up the Persian Gulf to Eridu. This culture hero might have

27 *Op. cit.*

28 Keith, *Op. cit.*, p. 189.

29 Cf. *Atharva Veda*, iv. 11; i. 21; v. 48, 99; viii. 6. See my article in the *Cul. Rev.* referred to above.

30 Schematic representation of the Bull's head associated with Solar discs had previously been found from the pre-Aryan copper age site of Gungeria in the Balaghat sub-division of the Central Provinces. It was interpreted as a symbol of the Sun God.

reached Sumer from India, and he might have also been the prototype of the Hindu *Matsyāvatāra*.³¹ The existence of such species as man-fish is not improbable in view of the fact that from the *Yajurveda* onward we have in literature the mention of a genus man-tiger.³⁷

Indian Script Origins

Most of the modern scripts of North India are derived from the ancient Indian *Brāhmī* alphabet. The long continued controversy relating to the origin of the *Brāhmī* now seems to be set at rest by the discovery of the Indus Valley script.³⁸ For according to Mr. Langdon and Dr. Pran Nath, *Brāhmī* is a development of the early pictographic system of the Indus Valley.³⁹

Cannot there be a veiled hint of the indigenous origin of the Indian script in the legend that when *Vyāsa* wrote the *Mahābhārata* he employed *Gaṇeśa* or *Vināyaka* as his scribe? Now *Gaṇeśa* or *Vināyaka* has obviously an indigenous origin. He is one of the latest of the *Brāhminical* deities.⁴⁰ He appears for the first time in the *Yājñavalkya* as a demon taking possession of men and hindering their success. *Vināyaka*, too, was the name of a class of demons who flourished in ancient times. It may be that the Aryans either did not know or had a very imperfect method of writing and that when necessity arose for committing to writing the gradually accumulating storehouse of lore and legends, they borrowed a scribe from the indigenous tribe of the *Vināyakas*, who for his outstanding service in the cause of the preservation of Indian culture was ultimately ennobled and exalted to the rank of a god.

31 Compare in this connection the Egyptian deity *Raman* with axe in his hand with *Paraśurāma*.

37 Keith, *Rel. Phil. Vedas*, p. 197.

38 See "*Indian Script Palaeontology*" by Atul K. Sur, in *Cal. Rev.*, February 1933, pp. 261-265.

39 Langdon's article appears in Marshall's *Mohenjo-Daro* and Dr. Pran Nath's in *Indian Historical Quarterly*, December, 1931. See also Langdon's Introduction to G. R. Hunter's *The Script of Harappa and Mohenjo-daro*.

40 He is not mentioned in the *Rāmāyana* and some of the *Purānas*. He is also excluded from the original *Mahābhārata*.

41 *Yājñavalkya*, i. 270, 289, 293.

General Observations

My constant and repeated emphasis on the pre-Aryan elements in Hinduism might lead many to suppose that my aim has been to belittle or minimise the contribution of the Aryans to the sum-total of Hindu civilization. My motive is far from that. What I have tried to show in the foregoing pages is merely to explode the notion hitherto prevailing to the effect that the Hindu culture is composed entirely of Aryan elements. It is now obvious in the light of my discussion on the subject that such notion can no longer hold good. It is now practically a *fait accompli* that the pre-Aryan peoples of the Indus Valley were superior to the Aryans in material culture. Indeed, they were in enjoyment of many of the amenities of modern life. But intellectually the pre-Aryans were much inferior to the Aryans. The Aryan language was more excellent than anything which the pre-Aryans could boast of. And it was of this language that they made a lasting gift to the children of the soil. The refined character of their language, its delicate structure was susceptible to abstract thinking. It implied a mental outlook that tended to intellectual progress. The subtle spiritual conceptions inherent in such a mental outlook found its reflection in the religion of the R̥g-veda. It was this mental outlook, too, which left its indelible mark on the culture that evolved out of the absorption and assimilation of Aryan and pre-Aryan elements in the midland regions of India. Elsewhere where the Aryans went they have often been described as demolishers of original civilization.⁴² But in justice to the Aryans it must be said that their Indian brethren were not mere destroyers of civilization. They had creative genius too. Their creation was in the direction of cultural synthesis. From the Vedic times onward we have in literature a lasting testimony to this synthetic process. The result of this synthesis was a new culture—Hinduism. The incorporation of pre-Aryan religious elements in Hinduism is merely a part of that process.

ATUL K. SUR

42 Childe, *The Aryans*.

I.I.Q., March, 1934

Events leading to the Ambela Expedition

About the year 1823, appeared on the Yusafzai frontier one of those well-known adventurers, who have at all times managed to beguile the credulous and simple Pathan race for their own ends, and have been the means of creating discord, upheaving society, and fomenting rebellions, checked and crushed only with the utmost difficulty. This man was Syed Ahmad Shah of Bareilly. At one period of his life he was the companion-in-arms of the celebrated Amir Khan Pindari, who was himself a Pathan, born in the valley of Buner. Syed Ahmad studied Arabic at Delhi and then proceeded to Mecca by way of Calcutta. It was during this journey that his doctrines obtained the ascendancy over the minds of the Mahomedans of Bengal, which has ever since led them to supply their colony at Sittana with fresh recruits. It was in 1824 that the adventurer arrived by way of Kandahar and Kabul amongst the Yusafzai tribes of the Peshawar border, with about forty Hindustani followers.¹

Syed Admad came at a happy moment, for it was just the time to raise the spirits of the Yusafzais and other Pathans (which had been damped by the crushing defeat they and the Peshawar Sardars had suffered at the hands of Maharaja Ranjit Singh at the battle of Nowshera) by religious exhortation. He easily gathered recruits; and meanwhile his own following had been swelled to about nine hundred by malcontents and fanatics from Bengal.²

In 1827 he sallied out to lay siege to Attock, but after a slight preliminary success was utterly defeated by the Sikhs; and he then fled with a few companions to Swat, and gradually worked his way back through Buner to Yusafzai. With full faith in his miraculous powers the Pathans again assembled round him and in a two years' career of conquest he gathered the whole of Yusafzai under his

¹ Panjab Government Records (henceforth abbreviated as P. G. R.) Press List, vol. XXI, Serial No. 31, Letter No. 67, dated the 1st February, 1864. From the Secretary to the Government, Panjab, to the Secretary to the Government of India, Foreign Department, with the Governor-General.

² Ibid.

control. Unfortunately the holy man's love of money made his rule so oppressive that the Pathans rose against him and drove him across the Indus, where, after a stubborn battle against the Sikhs, he was overpowered and slain.³

Of his disciples who escaped with their lives, a portion found their way to Sittana, on the Mahaban mountain, about fifty miles above Attock on the right bank of the Indus. There they settled down to the depredation of the lower lands and the kidnapping and murder of peaceful traders on the highways, receiving occasional recruits and even subsidies from lower Bengal.⁴

The first collision of the British with them occurred in 1853, when the fanatics had abetted an offending tribe in hostilities against the former, boasting loudly of their prowess, but had fled precipitately before two Sikh regiments. Being then left alone, they returned to their evil ways and brought upon themselves a second punitive expedition under General Sir Sydney Cotton in 1858.⁵ Cotton attacked Sittana itself, inflicting severe loss on the troublesome Hindustanis, who fought doggedly and well; but it was felt at the time that the penalty exacted from them was insufficient. Two neighbouring tribes (Gaduw and Utmanzai) had engaged themselves to prevent the fanatics from re-occupying Sittana; so the latter built themselves a new village at Malka, some eleven miles to the north-west of their old settlement and on the northern slope of the Mahaban.⁶

But in 1861 they came down to a place named Siri, just overhanging their old haunt at Sittana, and commenced sending robbers

³ P. G. R. Press List, vol. XXI, Serial No. 31, Letter No. 67, dated the 1st February, 1861. From the Secretary to the Government, Panjab, to the Secretary to the Government of India, Foreign Department, with the Governor-General.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Vide Colonel Sir Herbert Edwardes' letter No. B of the 14th May, 1858, to the Secretary to the Government of Panjab, reporting the result of the operations of the force under Sir Sydney Cotton in 1858 against Punjtar and the Sittana fanatics.- P. G. R. Mss. File No. 24.

⁶ P. G. R. Mss. File No. 24, Letter No. 206/546, dated Hazara, the 11th July, 1863. From the Deputy Commissioner, Hazara, to the Commissioner and Superintendent, Peshawar Division.

into Hazara to carry off Hindu traders.' The offence of the Gaduns was that, in contravention of their agreement, they allowed free passage to the Hindustanis through their territory when proceeding on and returning from their kidnapping and marauding expeditions.⁷

In order to bring them to a sense of their responsibilities, the Utmanzais and Gaduns were accordingly placed under blockade, and on October 2, 1861 they came in and made their submission, and consented to enter into fresh engagements to exclude the Syeds and Hindustanis.⁸

⁷ The nature of these outrages is thus described by Lieut.-Colonel R. G. Taylor, the Commissioner of the Peshawar Division, in a dispatch: No. 165, dated September 11, 1863: "A trader loads his mules at one of our chief towns, and starts across country (though there have been extreme cases of the offence taking place on the highroad) to a village he hopes to reach by nightfall. On the road, in some lonely spot, he is seized, gagged, and taken aside into the jungle or some mountain nook, and there kept close under drawn swords till dark, when the whole party starts by well-known, but unfrequented, tracks to the mountainous river-board, where according to [one of Major Adams' informants, the victim is inserted into an inflated skin, and a brigand, mounting on it, ferries him over. Whatever the plan adopted, the unfortunate is whisked across the Indus, and when once over is fairly safe till his relations pay up the required ransom. His danger lies in the day dawning, or other obstruction occurring, before the kidnapping party reach the Indus, in which case the encumbrance, in the shape of a gagged idolator, must be got rid of. They would let him go if they could afford it, but his tongue will needs wag and describe locality and route, and, perhaps, recognise individuals; and so he is knocked on the head, and thrown into a mountain crevice."

Of the difficulties of exercising any preventive measures against these acts, the Commissioner observes in the same dispatch that, "From the nature of the country it has been found impossible to deal with these acts merely by protective Police arrangements. The actors are bold men, and actuated by a thirst for money for the actual needs of life, sharpened by hostility to us; while it would take the whole of the Hazara force one day to search one mountain, and at the end they would be quite knocked up and useless. What, then, could be hoped from a limited body of police in a tract of country containing a constant succession of such mountains? These are crimes which nothing but pressure on the head and source of the offence can check. The men who send out these brigands, and those who harbour and give them passage through their lands, must be reached and made to suffer and then, and then alone, will the activity of their emissaries be checked." Mss. File No. 24.

⁸ P. G. R. Mss. File No. 24, Letter No. 127, dated Peshawar, the 9th July, 1863. From the Commissioner and Superintendent, Peshawar Division, to the Secretary to the Government, Panjab.

⁹ P. G. R. Mss. File No. 24, Letter No. 165, dated the 11th September, 1863. From the Commissioner and Superintendent, Peshawar Division, to the Secretary to the Government, Panjab.

In the beginning of 1862, it was reported that the number of the Hindustanis had been increased, and several robberies having been committed by robbers dispatched by Syed Mubarik Shah (son of Syed Akbar Shah, the King of Swat) into the Hazara territory, it was recommended by the Panjab authorities that an expedition should be undertaken against Malka.

This recommendation accorded with the opinion of Major James, the Commissioner of Peshawar, then absent in England, and of the Rt. Hon'ble the Secretary of State for India, who in his dispatch No. 18 of April 7, 1862, wrote as follows: "I am disposed to agree with the Commissioner of Peshawar that it will eventually be necessary to expel the offenders by force of arms and that they will be a lasting source of trouble so long as they are permitted to remain in the neighbourhood."

The Supreme Government, however, were of opinion at that time that sufficient cause for undertaking an expedition had not been shown.¹⁰

During the autumn of 1862 and ensuing cold season, there was a considerable immunity from these kidnapping practices; but again in the spring of 1863 two murders were committed, which were generally attributed to Syed Mubarik Shah's men, and on July 5, it was reported that the Syeds and Hindustanis had suddenly re-occupied Sittana¹¹ and had renewed their old nefarious activity of thieving and murder. No attempt to prevent their doing so was made by the Gadun or Utmanzai tribe, and some of their members actually invited them.

These tribes, being called upon for their reasons for having thus broken the engagements they had entered into, only afforded evasive replies; the Gaduns laying the blame on the Utmanzais, and the Utmanzais on Gaduns,¹² and as the Syeds and Hindustanis were

10 P. G. R. Press List, vol. XXI, Serial No. 31, Letter No. 67, dated the 1st February, 1864. From the Secretary to the Government, Panjab, to the Secretary to the Government of India, Foreign Department, with the Governor-General.

11 P. G. R. Mss. File No. 24, Service Message No. 69, dated Peshawar, the 5th July, 1863. From the Commissioner and Superintendent, Peshawar Division to the Secretary to the Government, Panjab.

12 P. G. R. Mss. File No. 24, Letter No. 206/546, dated Hazara, the 11th July, 1863. From the Deputy Commissioner, Hazara to the Commissioner and Superintendent, Peshawar Division.

sending threatening messages to the Chief of Amb, a feudatory protected by the British Government, military measures were taken for maintaining a blockade against the Gadun and Utmanzai tribes, and militia were entertained for the purpose of protecting the territory of the Amb Chief.¹³ 142158

The Syeds and Maulvi Abdulla (the military leader of the Hindustani fanatics) were now acting with their Hindustani followers in the bitterest spirit against the British Government; the leaders of the colony expressly declared "they were embarked in determined opposition to the infidel," and called upon "all good Mahomedans to quit the friendship of the unbelieving, and join the would-be-martyrs of the faith." A letter to this effect was sent to the Chief of Amb.¹⁴

On the night of September 3, 1863, Maulvi Abdulla, with his Hindustanis, and accompanied, it was said, by Malik Esau of the Gadun tribe, attempted to attack the camp of the Guides at Topi. The attacking force had arrived within a short distance of the camp, when they came upon a cavalry patrol of one duffadar and four sowars, of the Guide Corps. The duffadar had been previously warned of the neighbourhood of a body of men, and on coming on an advanced party he immediately attacked them. Two men were cut down, and the rest, rushing back on the main body, communicated a panic, which ended in a general and disgraceful flight. The Hindustanis then erected a breastwork on the right bank of the Indus, from which they continued to annoy the picquet held by the levies at Naogiran.¹⁵

About the 10th of September, the Hassanzai tribe, instigated, it was supposed, by the Maulvi of Sittana, made an unprovoked attack on the hamlets in the little Shunglai valley of the black Mountain, in which the most advanced outpost of the Amb territory is situated.

13 P. G. R. Mss. File No. 24. Letter No. 28, dated the 15th September, 1863. From the Secretary to the Government, Panjab, to the Secretary to the Government of India, Foreign Department, with the Governor-General.

14 P. G. R. Mss. File No. 24, Demi-official letter dated the 11th September, 1863. From Lieut. R. Sandeman, Assistant Commissioner to the Commissioner and Superintendent, Peshawar Division.

15 P. G. R. Mss. File No. 24. Diary of H. H. Coxe, Deputy Commissioner, Hazara, dated the 10th September, 1863.

The fort was not molested, but some six or seven hamlets were destroyed, and one man, who resisted, was killed.¹⁶

The Hassanzais then threatened an attack on Chamberi, and a portion of the Mada Khels crossed the Indus with the intention of assisting them; but the frontier line having been greatly strengthened by the Amb authorities, the gathering broke up, and the Mada Khels recrossed the river. Shortly afterwards, the Hassanzais made an attack on the Amb levies on the Black Mountain border, in which one jemadar and seven men were killed, and several of the levies wounded.¹⁷

It was now considered that the time had arrived when it became absolutely necessary to have recourse to military operations.¹⁸ Hitherto the hostilities and provocations had been offered by detached tribes, but now, for the first time, the majority, if not the whole, of the Hazara border tribes were arrayed against the British Government. In the opinion of Sir Robert Montgomery, the then Lieutenant-Governor of the Panjab, it was perhaps possible, though very doubtful, to avert a campaign by making use of the feuds and factions of the different tribes to sow discord in their councils; but this could only put off the day of reckoning a little further. Delay, which with these tribes is little understood, might encourage other tribes to action, and a favourable opportunity might thus be lost for putting an end to the chronic frontier irritation which then existed. That an expedition against these tribes would be forced on the British Government sooner

16 Ibid.

17 P. G. R. Press List, vol. XX, Serial No. 2320, dated the 5th September, 1863. From the Commissioner and Superintendent, Peshawar Division, to the Secretary to the Government, Panjab.

18 Colonel Taylor, the Commissioner of the Peshawar Division, writing to the Secretary to the Punjab Government, in a dispatch No. 165, dated September, 11, 1863, remarks: "the Gaduns, contrary to express agreements, which they themselves acknowledge, but try to evade with an excuse of want of power to fulfil, which every peasant in the country knows to be false, have, in defiance or indifference regarding our displeasure, permitted, if not encouraged, the fanatic colony to return from Malka to their former position at Sittana. Unless this flagrant contempt of our power be visited upon them, we must not only lose authority and influence on the border, but it will be very certain to be visited upon us in a tangible form by other instances of open violation of agreements, aggression on our border, and general contempt of our authority which will force war on us most probably under less advantageous circumstances than those with which it may now be engaged in." P. G. R. Mss. File No. 24.

or later appeared inevitable, and condonation without chastisement would only be an inducement for them to repeat their offences.¹⁹

An expedition was accordingly sanctioned by the Supreme Government, the first object of which was effectually to rid the frontier of the chronic cause of disturbance—the Hindustani fanatics. Their mere expulsion from the right bank of the Indus upon their old posts—at Malka and on the south bank of the Barandu, was not considered enough; nor was it thought advisable that they should find shelter in Swat, and make that powerful tribe the future focus of disturbance on the frontier.²⁰

The Governor-General was of the opinion that the “punishment of the Gaduns was to be a secondary consideration to the primary one of crushing effectually the small, but troublesome, horde of fanatics; and with this purpose in view, the civil officer who accompanies the expedition should make it his object not only to discriminate carefully between those tribes who have as yet shown no sign of hostility and those who, through fear of the British Government approach in force, make professions of repentance; but also to hold out to the latter that their sincerity will be measured by the assistance they may render in capturing dispersed fanatics, and that by no other course can they atone for their complicity, and escape retributive measures.”²¹

With regard to the plan of operations, Colonel Taylor’s proposal was that the force should march to the head of the Gadun country, either direct from Topi via Bisake, etc., or by following the route of the expedition of 1858 to Mangal Thana and from there working across; and that it should be met near Sittana by a column advancing up the right bank of the Indus by crossing it at Rorgush. The Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab had suggested generally that the force should march in two columns and sweep the country on either

19 P. G. R. Mss. File No. 24, Letter No. 28, dated the 15th September 1863. From the Secretary to the Government, Panjab, to the Secretary to the Government of India, Foreign Department, with the Governor-General.

20 P. G. R. Press List, vol. XX, Serial No. 2352, Letter No. 639, dated the 24th September, 1863. From the Secretary to the Government of India, Foreign Department, with the Governor-General, to the Secretary to the Government, Panjab.

21. Ibid.

side of the Mahaban range by mounting its heights and thence dictating terms to the tribes.²²

The Supreme Government, however, laid down that 'whilst occupying the attention of the fanatics and their allies on the line of the Indus, in the neighbourhood of Sittana, the aim should be, if there be no serious military objections to this course, to push up a strong column to Mangal Thana and Malka so as to interpose between the fanatics and their line of retreat towards the Barandu, their posts on which might be occupied by a separate light column or by a detachment from the main column. The latter would, from Mangal Thana and Malka, then operate, in conjunction with our troops on the Indus line, against the fanatics; and though their extirpation may, as anticipated by Colonel Taylor, not be possible, yet their dispersion would, under such circumstances, be on the lines of direction favourable to their capture, if the co-operation of the well disposed sections of the tribes could be elicited.'²³

In a dispatch of the Secretary to the Government of India, Military Department, to the Adjutant-General of the Army, it was added that "the strength and composition of each column, and the route to be followed, can probably best be fixed by the General Officer commanding the troops, in consultation with the Commissioner accompanying the force."²⁴

Accordingly, on September 27, 1863, Colonel A. Wilde, commanding the Corps of Guides, under whose directions the blockade against the Gaduns had been conducted, submitted a memorandum through Brigadier-General Sir Neville B. Chamberlain who had been appointed to command the expeditionary force. In this document it was stated that the expedition of 1858, although successful, had not

22 P. G. R. Press List, vol. XXI, Serial No. 31. Letter No. 67, dated the 1st February 1864. From the Secretary to the Government, Panjab, to the Secretary to the Government of India, Foreign Department, with the Governor-General.

23 P. G. R. Press List, vol. XX, Serial No. 2352, Letter No. 639, dated the 24th September, 1863. From the Secretary to the Government of India, Foreign Department, with the Governor-General to the Secretary to the Government, Panjab.

24 P. G. R. Mss. File No. 24, Letter No. 411, dated the 25th September, 1863. From the Secretary to the Government of India, with the Governor General, Militia Department, to the Adjutant-General of the Army.

been conclusive as to its results. The Gadun tribe had not felt the power of the British Government; and although the Hindustanis had been turned out of Mangal Thana and driven from Sittana, they had retreated on Malka, more from the pressure put upon them by the Gadun tribe than from the defeats they had sustained from the British troops.

For the future peace of the border, Wilde said, the destruction of this colony of priests and fanatics was a necessity, and that they must be removed by death or capture from the hills, and a treaty made with the hill tribes not to allow them to reside in their territories.

He considered that the plan of campaign would have to be totally different in its nature from that pursued in 1858. The force to be employed would have to be a strong one, and it would be necessary to occupy temporarily the country to the north of the Mahaban; the military object in view being to attack the Hindustanis from the north, and force them to fight with their backs to the plains, operating, in fact, on their line of retreat, instead of, as before, advancing from the plains, driving them out of Mangal Thana and Sittana, and allowing them a safe retreat and passage into the hills.²⁵ To effect this, two columns were to be employed—the base of operations of one column being in the Peshawar Valley, and that of the other in Hazara.²⁶

The Peshawar column was to be assembled at Nawakila and Swabi Manairi, with the avowed object, as in 1858, of moving on Mangal Thana (which would be naturally expected); but, when ready to march, the column was to pass through the Ambela defile (or more properly, the Surkhawai pass) and occupy the village of Kogah, in the Chamla Valley, thirteen miles by a camel road chiefly over British territory, and stated then to be “easy in the extreme.” The next day the force was to march to Cherorai, sixteen miles, an open plain near the river Barandu, when, simultaneously with the occupation of Cherorai, the Hazara column was to drop down the Indus and drive

²⁵ This proposal, it should be noted, met in some way the suggestion made in the Secretary to the Government of India's letter No. 639, dated the 24th September, 1863.

²⁶ P.G. R. Mss. File No. 24, Letter dated the 27th September, 1863. From Colonel A. Wilde, to Brigadier-General Sir Neville B. Chamberlain.

the enemy out of Sittana, occupying that place; the Peshawar column moving on the third day to Malka.²⁷

The advantages of this plan of operations were thus reckoned: that the Gaduns, finding their country commanded by the force in the Chamla Valley, would keep quiet, and perhaps assist in capturing the defeated Hindustanis. That the operations would be in an open valley containing several fine villages and admitting of the employment of cavalry; whence also flying columns could be sent up the Mahaban, the northern slopes of which are easier than the southern. It also afforded the alternatives either of withdrawing to the plains through the Ambela pass, or by sending back the cavalry by that route and advancing the rest of the force either to Mangal Thana or Sittana, as might be found feasible.²⁸

There remained the question of the attitude of the neighbouring tribes. The Chamla valley is bounded on the north by the Guru mountain, six thousand feet high, which with the district to the north of it is the home of the Bunerwals. No trouble was anticipated from them, for they had no sympathy with the fanatics and held different religious opinions. Moreover, they formed part of the flock of the *Akhund* of Swat, rather a remarkable man, who was a kind of pontiff of Islam in those quarters and had denounced the fanatics as actual infidels.

Both the Bunerwals and the Swatis, who lay to the north-west of the fanatics, were expected to look with approval on the coming campaign; and the valley of Chamla itself belonged to a mixture of unimportant tribes, some friendly, some hostile towards the British. It was considered imprudent to sound any of the clans as to their feelings lest the plan of campaign should thereby be revealed, which was likely enough. It was anticipated by Colonel A. Wilde, that on the whole the entire affair should be ended in three weeks.²⁹

27 P. G. R. Mss. File No. 24, Letter dated the 27th September, 1863. From Colonel A. Wilde to Brigadier-General Sir Neville B. Chamberlain.

28 P. G. R. Press List vol. XX1. Serial No. 31, Letter No. 67, dated the 1st February, 1864. From the Secretary to the Government, Panjab, to the Secretary to the Government of India, Foreign Department, with the Governor-General.

29 P. G. R. Mss. File No. 24. Letter dated the 27th September, 1863. From Colonel A. Wilde to Brigadier-General Sir Neville B. Chamberlain.

The Governor-General approved of Colonel Wilde's suggestions and communicated it to Sir Hugh Rose, the Commander-in-Chief. The actual plan of operations was not laid before Sir Hugh, for it was not finally determined upon by the Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab until the last moment;³⁰ but none the less Rose lost no time in giving his opinion.

He pointed out first the danger of denuding Peshawar and other stations of troops and transport at the very moment, when, by entering the mountains at one point, the British should arouse excitement along the whole line. Next, he remarked that the proper equipment of even five thousand men (as proposed by the Punjab authorities), as regards supplies, ammunition and transport, for so difficult and arduous a duty would need far more time than had been allowed, and that the period allotted for active operations (three weeks) was too short. Finally he urged that hasty flying marches through the mountains had produced no satisfactory results in the past, and were not likely to produce them at present. He therefore advised a strict blockade of the district during the winter and the dispatch of a carefully prepared and equipped expedition in the spring.³¹ This sound common sense was however disregarded.

R. R. SETHI

³⁰ Colonel Wilde's proposal was personally submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor of the Panjab by General Chamberlain at Murree. It was discussed at a meeting convened by His Honour at which the following were present:-

Sir Robert Montgomery, General Chamberlain, Colonel Taylor, Mr. Forsyth and Captain Black. The proposal appeared to be sound, and his Honour decided that Colonel Taylor should at once proceed to the spot and in communication with Colonel Wilde, carry out the fullest enquiries regarding it. There was no time for a reference to his honour who agreed to the adoption of the route into the Chamla Valley, provided that after Colonel Taylor's enquiries, both he and the General continued to think it the best that could be adopted. Panjab Government Records, Mss. File No. 24, Letter No. 18, dated the 8th January, 1864. From the Secretary to the Government, Panjab, Military Department, to the Secretary to the Government of India, Military Department, with the Governor-General.

³¹ P. G. R. Mss. File No. 24, Letter dated the 7th October, 1863, from the Adjutant-General of the Army to the Secretary to the Government of India, Military Department. with the Governor-General.

Dravidic 'Water'

The absence of evidence (historical or inscriptional) regarding the past condition of the Dravidian dialects of central and north India, combined with the lack of information (beyond a certain anterior limit marked by the period of the oldest extant Tamil classics) about the literary speeches of the south, makes it difficult for the Dravidist to form an adequate idea of the chronology of inter-dialectal separation in Dravidian. The examination of the materials available to us reveals linguistic divergences among the dialects in vocabulary, morphology and phonology, more particularly (as we should expect) in vocabulary than in the other two departments. We have to note that these divergences, however vast they may be in certain cases, need not necessarily have been conditioned by the *sole* factor of chronological separation; for, they depend collectively on a number of factors, the operation of which may have varied in character and in intensity with different speeches or groups, after the ramification from the parent group had occurred. The linguistic divergences now observable, therefore, only provide a clue to what we might describe as 'cultural separation' induced by one or more of the following factors:—

(1) Normal internal change along independent lines due to isolation from the parent group; and the quickening of this change, brought about by social upheavals or historical factors like migration or colonisation, which need not necessarily have involved foreign influence.

(2) Linguistic 'merger' consequent on race mixture, and particularly here, the possibility of the influence of what has been described as "substrat" when one people adopt the language of another either as the result of subjugation or of peaceful penetration.

(3) Linguistic 'contact' resulting from race-contact, as a result of which one language may (chiefly on account of its 'cultural' superiority) influence another in the sphere of vocabulary.

The limitations of data, referred to above, prevent the Dravidist from illustrating or even satisfactorily defining these several factors for Dravidian, except probably for the southern speeches from a particular

stage downwards. The student of Dravidian Linguistics has, therefore, to content himself with constructing a picture of the inter-dialectal divergences as a whole on the basis of the data now available; and this picture represents to him the totality of the working of the different factors mentioned above.

None of these inter-dialectal divergences, it may be observed here, are (except probably for some features of Brahui, which yet remain to be worked out in comparison with other language-families) such as to throw doubt on the fact of the essential bond of oneness connecting together the different members of the Dravidian family.

Some of the main inter-dialectal variations in the phonology and morphology of Dravidian have been dealt with by me elsewhere.

As for the lexical divergences among the dialects, the student has to begin with an investigation of word-categories which in normal circumstances¹ might be expected to resist the process of displacement under foreign influence. Numerals, pronouns, names of family relationships, expressions denoting elementary colours, words denoting the activities of the five senses,—these are some of the categories where normally a certain degree of persistence could be expected and where divergences, when found to occur, would point to the deep-seatedness of one or more of the factors mentioned above.

I have tried to show in a separate paper² of mine that the two last-mentioned categories—expressions for 'colours' and words denoting the operation of the five senses—have, generally speaking, persisted in the different speeches, though the displacement of native words by foreign forms in certain cases is illustrative of some of the above-mentioned factors making for change.

To what category do the words for 'water' belong? Do they constitute a type which would offer resistance to the inroads of foreign influence, or, are they 'culture-words' subject to renewal and

1 The displacement of older words by new native words may be due to different factors. For I.E., see Hirt's *Indo-germanische Grammatik*, vol. 1., p. 193 ff. Some of the factors mentioned by Hirt for I.E. are traceable in Dravidian also.

2 "Dravidian Linguistic Perspectives," *Madras University Journal*, 1931; also my paper in the Ojha Commemoration Volume.

change? We know that at least one Indogermanic base for 'water' is widely represented in different speeches, Greek *hudor*, Sanskrit *udan*, old Irish *usce*, Anglo saxon *watar*, Latin *unda*. The Austro-asiatic speeches show³ a set of inter-allied forms for 'water', despite the spatial separation of the dialects: Santali *ḍāk*, Mundari *ḍāh*, Nicobar, *ḍāk*, Mon *ḍāk*, Stieng, Bahnar *ḍak*, *ḍiak*, Khmer *ḍik* etc. There exists in Austro-nesian a type extending from the Philippines to Sumatra, which (according to Brandstetter)⁴ "auf einer Wurzel beruht, die "sprudeln, fließen" bedeutet und als solche in verschiedenen Idiomen lebt". These illustrations would indicate that generally speaking the words for 'water' may be expected (in the absence of extraordinary circumstances) to have a fair degree of persistence in any one language-family.

I propose in this paper to examine the Dravidic bases for 'water' from this point of view.

Tamil *nīr* (water, juice, moisture etc.)

„ *īr* (moisture, smoothness, oiliness, minutenes)

„ *īr-am* (moisture, wetness, dampness)

„ *vellam* (rising water, inundation)

„ *taṅ-nīr* (cold water)

„ *taṅ* [colloquial] (water)

„ *ālam* (ocean, water, rain)

„ *aṅal* (flowing water, wave, ripple)

„ *kār* (blackness > dark cloud > rain > water)

„ *punal* (flowing stream > water)

„ *maḷai* (rain > water)

Malayāḷam *nīr* (water, juice, essence)

„ *taṅ-nīr* (cold water)

„ *vellam* (water)—the common modern word for 'water'.

„ *īr-am* } (wetness, moisture)
 „ *īr-am* }

Kannada *nīru* (water etc.)

„ *īra* (wetness, dampness)—rare classical word.

Telugu *nīru* (water)—literary word.

³ Kühn's *Beiträge zur Sprachenkunde Hinterindiens*, p. 210; Pater Schmidt's *Die Mon-Khmer Völker*, p. 85.

⁴ Brandstetter's *Mata-hari*, p. 14.

„ *nīḷḷu* [*<nīrulu*, plural of *nīru*]*—common word.*

„ *īvirī* }
 „ *īmirū* } (moisture, dampness)

Tulu *nīru* (water)

Badaga „ „

Tōda „ „

Koḷagu „ „

Iruḷa „ „

Kūi *nīru* (juice, essence)—probably a borrowing from NIA (Oriya).

siru

siro (water)

siroñji

sidru } (water)—described as a plural form, governing
sidru } plural verb (*vide* Winfield's *Gr.*, p. 15)

ésu (water)

Kūvi *éju* (water)

Kolāmi *ir* (water), *vide* Haig's lists, p. 190 of JASB, 1897

Gōṇḍi *ér* (water)

„ *eyar*—[Patna Gōṇḍi, *vide* LSI, vol. IV, p. 526]

Kaikadi *tañni* (water)

Korvi „ „

Brāhūi *dīr* (water, juice, essence)

Kurukh and Malto do not show related words, but commonly employ the loan *am*⁵ for 'water'.

Usage and Occurrence

Tamil. (1) The fundamental meaning of *nīr* is 'water'. This word has been current in Tamil, as in the other literary dialects, from the earliest known times. It is so firmly rooted in the southern speeches that it has been employed in a host of compound words:

Tam. *nīr-kōḷi* (water fowl)—verse 395 of *Puraṇānūru*

„ *nīr-āḍu* (to have a bath)

„ *sīru-nīru* (lit. 'small water' = urine)

⁵ The Tamil classical texts show *am*, *ām* (water) from a very early period (*vide* *Kalittogai*, 48). All these appear to have been very early borrowings from I.A.

- „ *ve-n-nīru* (hot water)
 „ *kaṇ-ṇīru* ('eye-water' = tears)
 „ *eḷa-nīru* (tender water of coconuts)
 „ *kaḷu-nīru* (water drained off when washing rice)
 „ *paṇi-nīru* (rose water)

Malayālam *nīr āḷu* (to take bath)—employed today to describe the bath of princes etc.

Mal. *nīr-eḷakkam* (lit. 'the stirring up of water' = fit of violent cold)

Telugu *nīru-kuppa* (ocean)

- „ *nīru-muttu* (lit. 'to touch water after passing urine': to urinate)

(2) In common parlance to-day, *nīru* in Tamil is not used as such to denote 'water'.

Among certain communities (particularly non-Brahmin) *taṇ-ṇīru* (cold water) is heard generally to designate 'water'. This compound is often corrupted in folk-speech as *taṇṇi*, *taṇṇī*, *teṇṇi*, *taṇṇī* in Tamil; cf. Kaikadi, Korvi *tanni*, *tenni* for 'water'.

The Brahmins (of Trichy, Tanjore etc.) employ *taṇ* or the Sanskrit loan *jalam* for 'water' when no special 'affective' connotation is conveyed, e.g., *kaṇ alamba taṇ*⁶ (or *jalam*) *koṇḍu vā!* (bring water for washing hands!); when 'drinking water' or 'pure water' is referred to, the Brahmins use the Sanskrit word *tīrtham* which is heard also as *tērdam*, *tīttam*, *tēttam* in the colloquial. *Vellam* in Tamil is restricted to large sheets of water or inundations.

The compound *taṇ-ṇīr* (or any of its corrupted variants heard among the masses) is not used by the Brahmins to denote 'water'; the compound, however, is heard in the expression *taṇ-ṇīr paṇḍal* (lit. 'cold-water shed': wayside inn where cold water is provided free for the use of wayfarers).

⁶ Cognates of this word occur in all southern dialects with the meaning 'coldness':—Kann. *taṇ* (coldness).

Tulu *sampu* (coldness), *sani* (to become cold).

Telugu *ṭaḍi* (wetness), *tsan-in tsan-ṇiḷḷu*, *ṭsaḷi*, (coldness).

Tam. *ṣaḷi*, Kann. *caḷi*, *sali*, Tulu *caḷi* (coldness) are allied. Sir Denys Bray queries if Brahui *selh* (winter) may be connected with these.

(3) *ir-am* (wetness, dampness, moisture) is a common word to-day. *ir-am* and its older form *ir* are as ancient in the language (so far as we know) as *nir*. The meanings of *nir* and *ir* in Tamil differ; but, as we shall see later on, they cannot be dissociated from each other as they appear to be structurally and semantically related. I may at once mention here that while in the southern speeches *ir ira*, *iram* mean 'moisture', 'dampness', some of its direct cognates mean 'water' in the central Dravidian dialects; conversely, even in the south *nir* has the meaning 'moisture', and in one compound word *ir* and *nir* are used alternatively to denote the same idea: Malayalam, Kannada *irulli*, *nirulli* (onion, 'Allium cepa').

(4) The other Tamil words for 'water' mentioned in the above list are purely literary, the meaning of 'water' having been derived secondarily in literary and poetic usage only.

Malayalam. (i) *nir*, though found with the signification 'water' in the old texts, is not used as such with this meaning in modern speech. This word is used, as in Tamil, in numerous compounds.

(ii) The common word for 'water' in Mal. is *vellam* which (as we have seen above) in Tamil denotes 'rising water, inundation'. The extension of the meaning of *vellam* in the west coast is probably due to the frequency and familiarity of floods and inundations in rainy Malabar.

(iii) The Sanskrit loans *jalam* and *tirtham* are also heard in Malayalam though much less commonly in the colloquial than among the Brahmins of Tamil *nadu*. *Jalam* involves no special connotation, while *tirtham* in Mal. is 'sanctified water'.

(iv) *iram*, *iram* (moisture, wetness) are common Mal. words. The form with the cerebral -r- is peculiar to Mal. A similar cerebral -r- appears to have cropped up in the stead of the alveolar -r- of *nir* in Mal. as we have instances of the "oblique" form with the alveolar group in expressions like *nirile varu pole* (like lines on water), etc.

Kannada. (1) *niru* is the common word for 'water'. It is also ancient, and found as the constituent of numerous compounds, as in Tamil. (2) *iru* (wetness) appears in Kannada as a rare old word.

Telugu. (1) *nīru* is the literary form and *nīllu* is the common colloquial word.

(2) *iviri*, *imiri*⁷ (wetness, dampness) are the Telugu representatives of Tamil *ir*, *iram*, etc

Tulu, Badaga, Tōda, Irula. All the lesser dialects of the south show *nīru* only for 'water'.

Kūi. *siru*, *siro*, *sironji* [appearing as *hironji* in eastern Kūi] are the common forms for 'water'. Winfield observes that *sidru* of the south is a variant of the above with a plural meaning governing a plural verb; cf., for the common use of the plural form, Telugu *nīllu*.

In his *Kūi Vocabulary*, Winfield also gives *êsu* to denote 'water',—probably a dialectal word corresponding to Kūvi *êju* (water), Gôṇḍi *êr* (water), etc.

Kūvi. Only *êju* is found for 'water'. Schulze uses only this word in his translation of the *Gospel of St. Luke*.

Gôṇḍi. Trench records *êr* in the Betul and Chindwara areas, but we find *eyar* (water) in Patna Gôṇḍi (*vide LSI.*, vol. IV, p. 526). No other words for 'water' are recorded for this speech. Gôṇḍi *kaṇ-êr* (tears), *aṭ-êr* (boiling water) are common compounds containing *êr* (water).

Kolāmi. Haig's lists show *ir* (water); the identity of structure with southern *ir* (wetness, moisture) may be noted.

Brāhūi. *dīr* (water, juice, essence) is the common word.

Classification and Analysis

The correspondence of Dravidian *nīr* to late OIA *nīra* has been an intriguing question from the time of Gundert and Caldwell. I would content myself with urging here two considerations militating against the possibility of the Dravidian word being an Indo-Āryan loan:—

(a) *nīr* in the southern Dravidian speeches is, so far as we know, a

⁷ The Telugu forms *iviri*, *imiri* (wetness) appear to be closely allied, but their structural connection with *ir* remains somewhat obscure.

Cf. however the following inter-allied forms of Dravidian: Tulu *begar*, *bemar* (sweat); Kann. *bevar*; Tm. *viyar*-, *ver*-; Mal. *nivar* (to rise); Mal. coll. *nīr* (to rise); Tam. *nimir*; Kann. *negar*. These illustrations might point to Tel. *iviri*, *imiri* being directly connected with a source-base from which *ir* itself arose; but as no semantic clues are available, one cannot be certain about this suggestion.

most ancient and widespread word with the meaning 'water'; no other word, so ancient and widely distributed, exists for conveying the elementary idea of 'water' in these speeches.

The fact that *nīr* (with the initial *n-*) is found only in the south Dravidian speeches (and in Kui?) does introduce an element of doubt; but as we shall see presently, it is not impossible to connect *nīr* with the forms for 'water' in the central Dravidian dialects.

(b) The absence of any convincing etymology, on an IE basis, for Sanskrit *nīra* is an important factor which, though only a somewhat negative piece of evidence, should be given a certain weight in the consideration of the question whether the Sanskrit word was loaned out to, or borrowed from, Dravidian.

In this connection, I would refer to Prof. Jules Bloch's observations in a recent paper of his (*BSOS*, vol. V, p. 739). "Skt. *nīra* is certainly Ca., Tam., *nīru*, Tel. *nīllu*; what the connection of this last words is with Bra. *dīr* on the one side, and on the other side with Ca., Ta., *īr*. Tel. *īmīri* 'moisture', Gôṇḍi *yēr*, Kūvi *ēju*, lastly Kūi *sīro* 'water', is not clear."

Among recent European scholars who are inclined to favour a native IE origin for Skt. *nīra*, we may mention Prof. Jarl Charpentier who regards the word as being connected probably with IA *nāra* 'water', Greek *naros* 'flowing' [*Le Monde Oriental*, vol. XIII, p. 9, vol. XVIII, p. 35]; but Prof. Charpentier is not certain about this point, as is implied in his statement: "*nīra* 'wasser' wahrscheinlich zu dem von mir behandelten *nāra* 'wasser' oder av. *īra* 'Anlauf, Angriff, Energie': *ar*—'sich in Bewegung setzen.'"

If, then, we consider Dravidian *nīr* to be native in this family, what probably is the relationship of this form to Tam. *īr-am*, *īr* (moisture), Kann. *īra* etc.? These latter forms are directly related in structure to Kolāmi *īr*, Gôṇḍi *ēr*, Kūvi *ēju* and Kui *ēsu*. The relationship of *īr*, etc. to *nīr* should be quite an ancient one, inasmuch as both groups are represented in the oldest literature of the southern speeches; it might therefore be somewhat hazardous to attempt a conclusive solution of the problem. Nevertheless, it would not be out of place here to refer to a certain view-point which might enable us to glimpse the possibilities.

The phenomenon of mutually allied ancient words with and without the initial nasal *n*- or *ñ*- is a remarkable feature of south Dravidian. A summary solution of the relationship of these two groups (e.g. that of Vinson⁸ who regarded the words *without* the nasal as having secondarily arisen after the dropping of initial *n*- or *ñ*-) could hardly be decisive in view of the individuality and independent affiliations of the ancient groups without the initial nasals. On the other hand, the possibility of *n*- being secondary is worth considering. I have discussed this postulate in detail elsewhere: here I need only observe that the origin of this nasal may have been dependant on one or more of the following factors:

(i) Influence of nasals already existing in the original form, which induced the nasalisation of the prophetic front glide-sound *y*- and then converted it into a full nasal.

(ii) Influence of the analogy of word-groups subjected to the change according to (i), on words which did not have original medial nasals.

(iii) Possible influence of *substrat*, whereby a language which abounded in initial nasals conditioned the creation of new forms with initial nasals side by side with the older words (without the nasals), and the differentiation of the nuances associated with each set.

The operation of (i) and (ii) appears to underlie the formation of at least a few south Dravidian instances, while (iii) is a possible factor (in other instances), which at present is but hypothetical.

II

Kolami *īr*

Gôṇḍi *êr*

⁸ Vinson *poses* the problem correctly but dismisses it with a summary explanation:—“*n* initial se supprime: *nimai* et *imai* “papire,” *naṇugu* et *aṇugu* “approcher,” *aṇṇu* et *naṇṇu* “atteindre,” *aviḷ* et *naviḷ* “se détacher,” et peut-être *igaḷ* “dédaigner” et *nigaḷ* “passer,” *egul* “rivaliser avec” et *nigar* “égaler,” *nīr* “eau” et *īr*, *īram* “humidité.” cf. peut être au-s *ierī* “brûler” et *neruppu* “feu,” *nayinar* “chef” et *aiyanar*, nom d’un dieu local, honorifique de *āryam* “seigneur.”

On page 46 Vinson observes “On peut citer les exemples inverses *yaman*, *naman*, (Skt. “le dieu la mort,”) et *nankūram* “once le navire” adapté de l’indoeuropéen.”

Kūvi *éju*Kūi *ésu*

Kolāmi *īr*, structurally identical with southern *īr*, shows the meaning 'water'. For the opening of *i-* to *e-*, we have analogies in Kūi-Kūvi: Kūi *ijo* (house) -cf. south Dr. *illu*, - Phulbani Kūi *eja*; Mal. *vīṇḍum* (again) - Kūvi *vēṇḍum* (again) [*<mīl-* 'to turn back'].

III

Kūi *sīro, sīru, sīro-ñji*,, *siḍru* [plural form]Brāhūi *dār*


It is difficult to account for the initial *s-* of Kūi and the initial *d-* of Brāhūi with reference to *īr* and *nīr*. I would, however, point out here a few parallel instances from Kūi and Brāhūi.

(a) Kūi *sēru* (team of oxen for ploughing) beside Tam. *ēru* (plough, team of oxen).

Kūi *sil, siḍ*, (not) - south Dr. *il, illa* (not). Whether indeed Kūi *s-* in these instances was the result of internal changes or of foreign influence we cannot determine with our present materials.

(b) Br. *dār* (who?)Tam. (*y*)*ār* (who?)Cf. Kur. *nē* (who?)Tulu (*y*)*ēr* (who?)Cf. Malto. *nē* (who?)Brāhūi *ditar* (blood)Kann. *nettar*Tel. *netturu* (blood)Gōṇḍi *nettar*Baḍaga *netru*

Here again, we cannot say whether these few analogies would warrant the postulate of a regular internal change.



(a) An old base for [in I] for 'water' has persisted in the south and in several dialects of central Dravidian; and a differentiation of meaning has cropped up in the south between the base with initial *n-* and that without this *n-*. It is noteworthy that the south alone prominently shows the base with *n-*.

(b) There does appear to exist a certain structural relationship between the forms under I on the one hand, and II and III on the other; but whether this connection was due to internal change or to foreign influence cannot now be determined.

L. V. RAMASWAMI AIYAR

Candragupta Vikramāditya and Govinda

In the Sangali¹ and Cambay plates² of Govinda IV there occurs the following verse about that Rāṣṭrakūṭa king:—

सामर्थ्ये सति निन्दिता प्रविहिता नेवाग्रजे क्रूरा
बन्धुस्त्रीगमनादिभिः कुचरितैरावर्जितं नाग्रजः ।
शौचाशौचपराङ्मुखं न च भिया पैशाच्यमङ्गीकृतं
त्यागेनासमसाहसैश्च भुवने यः साहसाङ्कोऽभवत् ॥

Dr. B. R. Bhandarkar has translated the above verse as follows:—
“Ignominious cruelty was not practised (by him) with regard to his elder brother, (though he) had the power; (he) did not obtain infamy by evil courses such as (illicit) intercourse with the wives of his relatives; (he) did not, through fear, resort to diabolical conduct which is indifferent to what is pure and impure; (and) by his munificence and unparalleled heroic deeds he became Sāhasānka in the world.”³ This verse has puzzled many historians. Dr. Sir R. G. Bhandarkar has, for instance, remarked in his *Early History of the Deccan*:⁴ ‘What this statement exactly means it is difficult to say.’ It is, however, now possible to give a satisfactory explanation of it in the light of recent researches in the Gupta history. Sāhasānka in that verse means Vikramāditya and undoubtedly refers to Candragupta II who assumed that title. The composer of that verse says that Govinda IV resembled Sāhasānka only in liberality and unparalleled daring but not in his evil actions. The first three lines of the verse enumerate three such actions committed by Sāhasānka i.e. Candragupta II viz. that he acted cruelly towards his brother, had illicit intercourse with his wife⁵ and undertook actions becoming an evil spirit, devoid of all considerations of purity and impurity. The first two lines of the verse thus corroborate the conclusion already

1 *IA.*, XII, 249. 2 *EL.*, VII, p. 36. 3 *Ibid.*, VII, 44.

4 3rd. ed., p. 125.

5 It is now clear that बन्धुस्त्री in the second line must be translated as ‘his brother’s wife’ and not as the ‘wives of his relatives’ as Dr. Fleet and Dr. Bhandarkar have done.

arrived at on the evidence of a verse in the Sanjan copperplate of Amoghavarṣa I⁶ and the story of Rawāl and Barkamāris in the *Majmalu-t-Tawarikh*, that Candragupta II killed his brother and married his wife. The third line also receives remarkable corroboration from a passage in the *Devī-Candragupta* discovered by Mr. Ramakrishna Kavi.⁸

That passage indicates how Candragupta conceived the plan of going to the Śaka king in the guise of a woman and killing him when he was unguarded. The introductory note in Sanskrit which summarizes the context of the passage shows that Candragupta had made up his mind to win over a Vampire (Vetāla) at night as a last resource, when every other means of rescuing Rāmāgupta's camp had proved of no avail. It was necessary for that purpose to go to a cemetery; but egress from the camp was impossible, as they were besieged on all sides by the enemy's forces. While Candragupta was thinking of some device to go out of the camp, there came a maid-servant of some lady, probably Mādhavasenā, with a bundle of garments and ornaments of Queen Dhruvasāminī which she had sent with her as presents for her mistress. Not finding her there, the Ceti kept the articles with Candra-

6 *EL.*, vol. XVIII, p. 248.

7 *JBORS.*, XV, 138.

8 This is cited by Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar in his article 'New Light on the Early Gupta History' in the *Mālavīya Commemoration Volume*, p. 207.

यथा देवीचन्द्रगुप्ते शकपतिना परं कञ्चमापादितं रामगुप्तस्त्वन्वावारमनुजिष्ठुः उपायान्तरागोचरे
प्रतिकारं निश्चि वेतालसाधनमध्यवस्यन् कुमारचन्द्रगुप्त आवेयेण विदूषकंणीतः । विदुः—भो सक्रं दाषिं
भवद्वा इमाये वेलाये मज्जं दारवाणं सचासादो पदादो पदं वि गंतुम् ।

नायकः (स्वगतम्)—अत्रोपायश्चिन्तनीयः ।

(प्रविश्य चिटी पटलकहस्ता) ।

चिटी—जयद् जयद् कुमारो । कुमार कहिं अञ्जुचा... [1] अञ्ज ख अञ्जुचा केषवि कारणेन
अयं विमथा कुमारं पेकुखामिति भणंती राचउतादो निष्कन्ता । इमं च सी देवीए ध्रुवदेवीए ससरोर-
परिभुतं पसाहणचं पसादीकदम् । गहीच कुमारस्स समीपे अञ्जुच अति मज्जमाणा चागदञ्चि
अवत्ते च पेकुखामि इमं जाव अञ्जुचं अचोसामि (निष्कान्ता) ।

विदुः—चाः दासीए दूधे । कि तव अहं भंडागारिचो (1) गच्छ पछेहि (इति यवनिकान्तरितः
स्त्रीवेशं कृत्वा निष्कान्तः) तदेवं अथवा निर्गमनोपाये चिन्तयमाने स्त्रीवेशः साधनमुपागतम् ।

gupta's companion Vidūṣaka and herself went out in search of her lady.⁹ The presence of Dhruvasvāminī's garments suggested to Candragupta the idea of going out of the camp in the guise of a woman. Whether he actually went to the cemetery and won over a Vetāla, the passage does not tell us. Here the verse in the Sāngali and Cambay plates cited above comes to our help. The third line refers to some actions of Candragupta, befitting an evil spirit and devoid of all considerations of purity and impurity. Evidently we have here a reference to such actions involving impurity as going to a cemetery and offering human flesh etc. to propitiate evil spirits.¹⁰ Readers of Bhavabhūti's *Mālatī-Mādhava* will remember the scene (Act V) in that drama in which Mādhava, the hero, despairing of getting Mālatī goes to a cemetery and offers human flesh to the evil spirits haunting that place, evidently to secure their help to win his ladylove. Did Candragupta succeed in winning over a Vetāla? Did the latter suggest to him the ruse of going to the Śaka king in the guise of Dhruvadevī? These questions cannot be answered definitely in the absence of more information from the *Devī-Candragupta* or some other source. But it is likely that subsequent events happened as indicated above. The association of a Vetāla with a Vikramāditya in the traditional stories recorded in the *Bṛhat-kathā* and its Sanskrit versions, would support the conjecture that the plot of the *Devī-Candragupta* was developed on these lines. The poet who composed the above stanza in the Sāngali and Cambay charters of Govinda IV has evidently drawn upon the *Devī-Candragupta* for his remarks about Candragupta.

There is one more point which strikes us as we read the above verse. It has been suggested that the conduct of Candragupta in marrying his brother's wife was not at all opposed to the law laid down in the Smṛtis.¹¹ The present verse shows that whatever may have been the state of things in the hoary antiquity of the Dharmasūtras, the union

9 There is no ground for Dr. Blandarkar's statement (*op. cit.*, 197) that the Ceṭi was directed to go to Candragupta with the garments by some Ajjukā of the royal family.

10. Cf. वीरहस्ताग्रासं गृहीत्वा वीरायाभिमतवरदानमिति श्मशानसिद्धयोगिनीमतम्। Jagaddhara. (*Mālatīmādhava*, Act IV). See *Kathāsuritsāgara* (Nirṇayasāgar ed.) pp. 393. 571 etc.

11 *Mul. Vol.*, p. 203.

with a dead brother's wife was considered reprehensible in the eighth and ninth centuries of the Christian era.¹² Was it tolerated in the Gupta age in consideration of Candragupta's unparalleled daring and his valuable services in the cause of Hinduism?

We have so far discussed this verse from the point of view of the early Gupta history. It has also a bearing on the history of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas which we now proceed to consider.

Referring to the contents of the present verse Dr. Sir R. G. Bhandarkar wrote in his *Early History of the Deccan*: 'What this statement exactly means it is difficult to say. But probably Govinda was believed to have encompassed his brother's death and the other accusations were whispered against him; and this is intended as a defence.' Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar also has drawn similar inferences while editing the Cambay plates. We have to see how far they are warranted by the evidence now available.

As already remarked, the composer of the present verse intended to show by comparison and contrast that his patron Govinda IV was superior to the well-known Gupta king Candragupta II Vikramāditya. There were, indeed, several points of similarity between these two kings. Indra III, the father of Govinda IV, was, like Samudragupta, a very ambitious king. Just as Samudragupta led a victorious campaign in the south, vanquishing a number of kings, so Indra III, though he had a much shorter reign, carried his arms to the Imperial capital of Kanauj and devastated it, ousting the Gurjara-Pratihāra king Mahīpāla I.¹³ As Samudragupta was succeeded by Rāmagupta who had a very short reign, so Indra III was followed by Amoghavarṣa II, who also reigned for a very short time; for he is assigned a reign of one year only in the Bhādāna grant of Aparājita.¹⁴ The Deoli and Karhad plates of Kṛṣṇa III also say that he went to heaven soon after

12 And so it was even in the Gupta age. The passages from the Nārada Smṛti cited by Dr. Bhandarkar evidently refer to *niyoga*. Cf. *Manu*, अथैव यवोयसो भार्या यवोयान् वायजस्त्रियम् । पतितौ भवतो गत्वा नियुक्तावप्यनापदि ॥ ...यस्या म्रियेत कन्याया वाचा सत्ये कृते पतिः । तामनेन विधानेन निजो विन्देत देवः ॥ यथाविध्यधिगम्येनां युक्तवस्तां युचिब्रतान् । मिथो भजेताप्रसवात्सङ्करसङ्गताहती ॥ IX, 58, 69-70.

13 Cf. Cambay plates, *EI.*, vol. VII, p. 38. 14 *EI.*, vol. III, p. 271.

his father's death, as if out of love for him.¹⁵ Again, Govinda IV was like Candragupta II known for his liberality and daring. As Dr. Bhandarkar has shown, "he had by his munificence earned for himself the *biruda* *Suvarṇavarṣa*. In the Cambay plates he is said to have weighed himself against gold, bestowed upon Brāhmaṇas no less than six hundred grants, together with three lacs of *Suvarṇas* and granted, for repairing temples and feeding and clothing ascetics, eight hundred villages, four lacs of *suvarṇas* and thirty two lacs of *drammas*. Such exuberant liberality no other prince of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty ever displayed so far as their records inform us."¹⁶ We have no detailed account of his daring deeds but we have no reason to doubt the veracity of the poet's description.¹⁷ It is no wonder, therefore, that Govinda IV became known in the world as *Sāhasāṅka* or *Vikramāditya*.

The poet assures us, however, that his patron did not resemble Candragupta in all respects. The latter had, for instance, committed three contemptible actions, while Govinda IV did none of these things. Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar thinks that this is a case of protesting too much and Govinda IV if not actually caused, at any rate hastened, the death of his older brother and usurped his throne. Govinda IV led, indeed, a dissolute life. He is described in the Khārepāṭan plates as 'an abode of the sentiment of love, surrounded by crowds of lovely women' and this description receives confirmation from the Deoli and Karhad plates of Kṛṣṇa III. But one would like to have stronger proof to support the charge that he caused or hastened his brother's death and had incestuous connection with his wife. We must remember that a similar comparison occurs in the Sanjān plates of Amoghavarṣa I.¹⁸ He is described therein as feeling ashamed when he was compared with a Gupta prince known for his liberality (evidently Candragupta Vikramāditya), as the latter had killed his brother, married his wife and usurped the throne. In the *Kācyaṁīmāṁsā* of Rājasekhara again we have a comparison

15 *Ibid.*, vol. IV, p. 283 and vol. V, pp. 193f. 16 *Ibid.*, vol. VII, p. 35.

17 From the *Vikramārjunavijaya* of Pampa we know that he routed a Cālukya chieftain Vijayāditya (see *EI.*, XIII, pp. 328-326) who was obliged to seek Arikesarin's help.

18 इत्वा भ्रातरमेव राज्यमहरहैर्वी च दीनस्तथा । लघं कोटिमल्लिखयत्किञ्च कर्त्तुं दाता स गुप्त-
स्यः । etc. *EI.*, XVIII, p. 248.

between Rāmagupta, the elder brother Candragupta and Kārtikeya, who, as I have shown elsewhere,¹⁹ was the Gurjara-Pratihāra king Mahīpāla I of Kanauj. It seems it was the practice of court-poets to institute such comparisons between their patrons and well-known princes of the Gupta dynasty and to show the superiority of the former over the latter. It would be unwise and unjust to see unintended insinuations in such comparisons.

Besides we have no other reference to the alleged evil actions of Govinda IV in any records of his successors, some of whom had little love for him and would not, therefore, have refrained from mentioning them if they had been true. As I have shown elsewhere,²⁰ Badḍiga-Amoghavarṣa III who succeeded Govinda IV probably fomented a rebellion among his feudatories which cost him his life. The Deoli and Karhād plates of Badḍiga's son Kṛṣṇa III refer to Govinda's dissolute life, but are silent about these charges. One of the arguments advanced by Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar in support of his inferences is that Govinda IV does not in his charters 'meditate on the feet on his brother' whom he had succeeded. We must note, however, that Amoghavarṣa had an extremely short reign of hardly more than a year. The court-poet who first composed the common portion of the Sāngali and Cambay plates, may not have considered it sufficiently important and may have, therefore, omitted his name. We have an analogous instance in Kalacuri inscriptions. Bālaharṣa, the son of Mugdhatuṅga Prasiddhadhavalā, a Kalacuri king of Tripurī, is mentioned in the Benares copper-plate of Karṇa²¹ but his name is omitted in the lengthy and fairly exhaustive list given in the earlier Bilhari inscription of the rulers of Cedi.²² The absence of Amoghavarṣa's name in the charters of Govinda IV cannot, therefore, be adduced to support the charge of the heinous crimes against Govinda IV.

V. V. MIRASHI

19 *IA.*, vol. XII (November 1933), pp. 201 ff.

20 *Annals of the Bhandarkar Institute*, vol. XI, pp. 361ff.

21 *Et.*, vol. II, pp. 297ff.

22 *Ibid.*, vol. I, pp. 252ff.

The Sohgaura Copper-plate

[Side-lights from Pāli Texts and Brāhmī Inscription of Mahāsthān]

It is well-known that there are up till now three critical editions of the Sohgaura Copper-plate, the first of which was published by Bühler (*Vienna Oriental Journal*, x, pp. 138 ff., *J.A.*, xxv, pp. 216 ff.), the second by Fleet (*J.R.A.S.*, 1907, pp. 510 ff.), and the third by myself (*ABORI.*, XI, pp. 32 ff.). The plate was intended to be put up as an official notice containing the direction as to how certain things stored up in store-houses built at two different places should be used. The main text of this plate, as made out by me, reads:

ete duve koṭhagalani tinayavani mathulocachamadamadabbalakan[i]
vala kayiyati atiyāyikaya no gahitavaya [-]

“These two store-houses, (the provisions of) fodder and wheat (and) the loads of ladles, canopies, yoke-pins and ropes are used in (times of) urgent need: (these are) not to be taken away.”

Bühler renders it: “These two store-houses..... require the storage of loads of.....for (times of) urgent (need). One should not take (anything from the grain stored).”

Fleet: “.....to meet any case of urgent need, but not for permanent use.”

The concluding phrase “not to be taken away” in my rendering does, of course, mean “not to be exclusively seized for use at random by any person.”

With reference to these attempts at the proper reading and rendering of the Sohgaura Copper-plate, Professor D. R. Bhandarkar commenting on the ‘Brāhmī Inscription of Mahāsthān, recently edited and published by him (*EI.*, XXI, part ii), observes: “.....the inscription, in spite of the fact that it has been revised thrice, has not yet been properly punctuated, read and interpreted. The last line should have been read *atīyāyikāya no gahitaraya*, ‘nothing should be taken in excess (of plenty)’. Our record [i.e. the Mahāsthān inscription] speaks of two *atīyāyikas*, one of which is *su-atīyāyika*. It is this *atīyāyika* which is probably understood at the end of the Sohgaura Copper-plate” (*Ibid.*, p. 89).

On the face of it, it is difficult to countenance the suggestion of

Professor Bhandarkar who has yet to convince us by literary usages in Sanskrit, Pāli and Prākṛt of the soundness of his rendering of *atīyāyikāya*. Is it not arbitrary to suggest that it means “in excess (of plenty)” or that the emergency in view of the Sohgaura Copper-plate is probably the same as that which is called *su-atīyāyika* in the epigraph of Mahāsthān?

The Sanskrit, Pāli and Prākṛt equivalents of the word *atīyāyika* occur respectively in the Kauṭīliya Arthasāstra,¹ the Rathavinīta-sutta² and Asoka's Rock Edict VI,³ and in all these instances, in the sense of ‘emergency’ or ‘any matter or occasion involving urgency.’ And this is precisely the sense, as I shall show anon (Note on the Mahāsthān inscription, *passim*), which fits in with the text of Mahāsthān relied upon by Professor Bhandarkar.

I need not cite once more the Jātaka references and the prescription of the *Arthasāstra*, as these are sufficiently utilised by Dr. Fleet and Professor Bhandarkar. But I must draw the reader's attention to the Gabbhīni-sutta in the Udāna (II, 6), the evidence of which has not as yet been taken into account in testing the interpretation of the Sohgaura expression ‘*cala*’ (Bühler's *chala*) *kayiyati atīyāyikāya no gahitarāya*’ previously offered by me in agreement, more or less with Bühler and Fleet.

The main interest of this Sutta lies in the fact that it introduces us to a royal store-house at Sāvattī, from which any man of religion, whether of the Samaṇa or of the Brāhmaṇa order, was allowed, under the rule then in force, to obtain as much oil or clarified butter as he needed for consumption on the spot but debarred from taking away anything out of the store for use elsewhere. This particular rule was so strictly enforced by the royal officers in charge that a wandering uscetic could think of no other convenient way of carrying oil out of it for another person stopping at some distance than filling his mouth with the liquid without actually swallowing it:

1 *Arthasāstra*, I. 15. 11: *Ātyakīke kātve mantriṇo mantri-pariṣadaṃ cāhūya brūyāt*.

2 *Majjhima-Nikāya*, I. p. 149: *kīncid eva accāyikam karuṇīyaṃ (urgent work) upajjeyya*.

3 R.E. VI: *ācāyika āropitaṃ (G), utīyāyike āropite (J)*.

“Tena kho pana samayena rañño Pasenadissa Kosalassa koṭṭhāgāre samanassa vā brāhmaṇassa vā sappissa vā telassa vā yāvadattham pātum diyyati no nīharitum. Atha kho tassa paribbājakassa etad ahosi: ‘Rañño kho pana Pasenadissa Kosalassa koṭṭhāgāre samanassa vā brāhmaṇassa vā sappissa vā telassa vā yāvadattham pātum diyyati no nīharitum, yan nunāham rañño Pasenadissa Kosalassa koṭṭhāgāram gantvā telassa yāvadattham pivitvā gharam āgantvā uggiritvāna dadeyyam.’”

Thus we trace a text in the body of the Pāli Canon furnishing us with a literary parallel where the royal store-house was meant for the distribution of oil and clarified butter among all men of religion for consumption on the spot. The rule then in force imposed or implied a twofold restriction: (1) that no one was to obtain a thing out of the store more than what was required for consumption on the spot, and (2) that no one was to carry anything out of the store for use elsewhere: *yāvadattham pātum diyyati no nīharitum*. The concluding words of the Sohgaura plate are: *cala kayiyati atiyāyikaya no gahitaraya*.


The verbal correspondence between the two expressions is:

yāvadattham diyyati > < *cala kayiyati*;
pātum no nīharitum > < *atiyāyikaya no gahitaraya*.

This hardly leaves room for doubt that the force of the negative particle *no* lies in the contrast intended to be made between *atiyāyikaya* and *gahitaraya*, precisely as between *pātum* and *nīharitum*.

Pāli literature speaks of three kinds of royal store-houses: (1) those forming the treasuries (*dhana-koṭṭhāgāra*), (2) those forming the granaries (*dhañña-koṭṭhāgāra*), and (3) those forming the warehouses or general stores (*vatthu-koṭṭhāgāra*).

The *koṭṭhāgāra* of the Pāli Sutta was a store-house with oil and clarified butter in stock for the benefit of all men of religion and that of the Mahāsthān inscription a store-house with paddy and other things for the benefit of the Savagiyas, while those of the Sohgaura plate were two store-houses with provisions of fodder and wheat for the benefit of the bullocks and other quadrupeds working as vehicles, and the loads of ladles, canopies, yoke-pins and ropes for the benefit of cartmen, drivers of chariots and carriages, and riders of horses and elephants, particularly, as it appears, for the benefit of caravanists.



The old Brāhmī Inscription of Mahāsthān

IHQ., March, 1934.

The old Brāhmī Inscription of Mahāsthān

The epigraph in question is an interesting old inscribed record of Bengal which has lately been edited with critical notes by Professor D. R. Bhandarkar for the *Epigraphia Indica* (vol. XXI, part ii, pp. 83ff.) and published without translation under the caption -'Mauryan Brahmi Inscription of Mahasthan'. As the text published does not contain any more than a tentative reading, attempted on the basis of an estampage and a photo-enlargement, some of his notes are not warranted by the text which may actually be made out. That, both in respect of the Brāhmī letter-forms and in that of the contents, the Mahāsthān epigraph bears resemblance to the Sôhgaura copper-plate is beyond dispute. Even in respect of age, one may be prepared to treat them as relics of one and the same ancient period of Indian history. But so far as the text of the Mahāsthān record goes, the Pāli Ābhini-Sutta (*Udāna*, II. 6) may be shown to throw more light than the Sôhgaura plate. The convenient way of dealing with the points concerning the epigraph is, of course, to offer a correct rendering of its text after ascertaining it with the aid of the estampage, the photograph and the original stone.

1. TEXT AS FOUND INSCRIBED

L. 1 — ? (n) ena¹ savagiyānaṃ (talada)na(sa)² | dumaṃ dina (sa)³

L. 2 --(m)āte⁴ | sulakhite puṃḍanagalate⁵ | etaṃ

L. 3 —(n)ivahipayisati | savagiyānaṃ⁶ (ca)⁷ .ine⁸

L. 4 —(dh) āniyaṃ | nivahisati | dagatiyāy(i)ke pi⁹ (a) - -

1 The first letter appears to have been a or ca.

2 Bhandarkar reads *Galadunasa*. Note that the upper part of the vertical stroke of *ta* is broken off with the result that it is apt to be mistaken for *ga*.

3 There is no space for any letter after *sa*....One may reasonably read (*su*).

4 Bhandarkar connects it with *mahā* supplied by him in L. 1.

5 The *anusvāra*-mark is misplaced as it appears just before *u*-mark of *pu*.

6 The estampage has clearly *savagiyānaṃ*, and not *saṃvagiyānaṃ*.

7 The letter may indeed be read *ca*.

8 Bhandarkar, *cha dine* [*tathā*]. How? There is no space for two letters after *dine*.

9 Bhandarkar, **ke d* [*evā*].

- L. 5 — (y)ikasi¹⁰ | suatīyāyikasi¹¹ pi | gaṃḍa — — — —
 L. 6 — (y)ikehi¹¹ esa koṭhāgāle kosam — —¹²
 L. 7 — —¹³

2. TEXT AS MADE OUT

(In it the thoughtless | marks are done away with.)

- L. 1 — [a] nena¹⁴ Savagiyānaṃ t[e]lad[i]nasa dumaṃ dina S[u-
 L. 2 — māte Sulakhite¹⁵ Puṃḍanagalate etaṃ
 L. 3 — nivahipayisati[.] Savagiyānaṃ ca [di]ne
 L. 4 — dhāniyaṃ¹⁶ nivahisati[.] Dagatīyā[i]ke pi a[gi-]
 L. 5 — [tiyā]yikasi suatīyāyikasi¹⁷ pi gaṃḍa[kehi]
 L. 6 — [kākani]yikehi esa¹⁸ koṭhāgāle kosam — —¹⁹
 L. 7 — — — [.]

3. TRANSLATION

By this [? token], should there be any oil or tree given to the Śaḍvargikus²⁰ [he, the person concerned] shall cause that to be con-

10 Bhandarkar, [dhāni] (y)ikehi.

11 The u- mark of su- is rather misleading, there being delusive marks below other letters, e.g., below ya of savagiyā* in L. 1.

12 Bhandarkar suggests [bhara-] after kosam. It is unlikely that there would be a syllable like ra.

13 Bhandarkar locates only two letters in L. 7.

14 According to Bhandarkar, -nena is the closing part of a word like vacanena or sāsanena. The remnant of the letter is a vertical stroke either of u or of ca.

15 It cannot be treated as an adjunct (=surakkhito) to Puṃḍanagala, in which case the form would have been sulakhitate; sulakhi (sulakṣmī) may be so treated.

16 This cannot be adopted as the closing part of such a word as lājadhāniyaṃ because the verb nivahisati would have been unidiomatic, if the place-name had not the ablative case-ending as in Puṃḍānāgalate.

17 Bhandarkar depending on the photo enlargement, reads su-atīyāyikasi. The photo, however, is misleading, as it gives prominence to several marks in stone, making them look like the u- sign.

18 Bhandarkar's dhāniyikehi is inappropriate, the required word being one denoting a kind of coin.

19 It is not likely that there could be any verbal form like bharaṇiye suggested by Bhandarkar; bhalaniye, of course, might be allowed.

20 Bhandarkar inclines to think that the word stands not so much for śaḍvargiyas, 'of the class-fellows, of the classmen', as for Saṃvaṅgiyas, '[members] of the Saṃvaṅgiya tribe.' Both of these suggestions seem to be wide of the mark.

veyed from S[u]mā, Sulakṣmī [and] Puṇḍranagara.²¹ [He] shall convey also the paddy given to the Ṣadvargikas. The treasure-chamber in this store-house [shall be filled] with *gaṇḍakas*²² and *kākaṇikas*²³ in emergency due to water, in emergency due to (fire), also in emergency due to parrots.²⁴

4. NOTES

The inscription is a small record of seven lines, incised on a circular seal of stone. The last line is effaced, leaving no trace of any letters. The seventh line consisted probably of a very few letters, and the loss is not great as one may easily guess how the record ended. But the upper part of the stone being missing, it is difficult to say definitely how it began. It is quite possible that the record began with the word *anena*.

The interest of the record centres round a body of men called Savagiyas and a store-house (*koṭhāgāla*) provided for them, undoubtedly at their residence, which was situated not far from Puṇḍranagara. The record speaks of four requisites: *tela* (oil), *duma* (tree), *dhāniya* (paddy), and two varieties of small coins, called *gaṇḍaka* (*gaṇḍaka*) and *kākaṇiyika* (? *kākaṇika*). The store-house had to be equipped with these requisites as provisions against three kinds of urgency or emergency (*atīyāyika*). The first part of it contains instructions as to the persons for whom, the place or places from which, and the things which were to be transported to the store-house, and the second part relates to coin provisions against certain emergencies.

21 If *sulakhite* and the word preceding it be treated as adjectives qualifying *Puṇḍranagalate*, the rendering will be: "from the lucky and prosperous city of Puṇḍranagara." In this alternative, *sulakhite* may even be equated with *surakṣita*, 'well-guarded'. If the intended reading be *samāte sulakhite*, *Samā* must be taken to be the name of the first locality in this case. There is also a remote possibility for such a rendering as: 'when the asterism Kṛttikā (*samātā=ṣaṭ-mātrikā*) is well observed (clearly visible).' Here, however, the grammatical difficulty is in construing *samāte* as the same locative singular form as *sa-mātari*.

22 *Gaṇḍaka* is a small piece of coin of the value of four cowries.

23 *Kākaṇika*, (=Skt. *kākaṇī*), too, is a small piece of coin of the value of twenty cowries.

24 *Suatīyāyika*=*sua-atīyāyika*, *sua* being=Pāli *suva*, Sk. *śuka*.

The persons who were the object of special royal care were those who had formed a distinct body, group, order or denomination. With Professor Bhandakar one must not think that they were the tribesmen of Vaṅga (Bengal). They were, according to the record, a body of men to whom gifts and donations were made by the citizens of Puṇḍra-nagara and the inhabitants of two neighbouring places, (townships), which are called Sumā and Sulakhi. The Gabbhini Sutta (*Udāna*, II. 6) clearly attests that some of the royal stores were kept up to supply all 'men of religion', of the *Samana* or of the *Brāhmaṇa* order, with oil and clarified butter (*tela*, *sappi*) for their consumption on the spot. Thus this Sutta and the text of the Mahāsthān inscription go to establish that the Savagiyas were members of a holy order. If the intended term be *Ṣaḍvargya* or *Ṣaḍvargika* (Pāli *Chabbaggiya*, *Chavaggiya*), the denotation is narrow or specific. Now, who were the Chabbaggiyas?

In early Buddhism, one must, first of all, take notice of the first five Buddhist converts, honoured as *Pañcaraggiyas* or 'the Band of Five Disciples'; then of the *Chabbaggiyas* who had formed a 'Band of Six Men with their adherents', always acting contrary to the real intent and purpose of the Vinaya discipline; and thirdly, of the band of men under the leadership of Devadatta and Kokālika. The Chabbaggiyas (=Chavaggiya)²⁵ figure in the Vinaya tradition as *alajjino pāpa-bhikkhū*, 'mischief-makers recklessly wicked',—'a set of bhikkhus taken as exemplification of trespassing the rules of the Vinaya', while Devadatta and his co-adjutants are notorious as *saṃgha-bhedakā* or 'schismatics', more determined in action and aggressive in policy. These schismatics had walked out in a body to form a distinct sect of their own creating certain well-known centres of their influence and activity, while the Chabbaggiyas with Assaji, Punabbasu, Paṇḍuka, Lohitaka, Mettiya and Bhummajaka as their leaders do not appear anywhere to have left the religious order of Sākyamuni, in spite of the fact that they, too, had formed a strong party of their own and worked with a set purpose at different centres, or that they had respected the rules of the Order more in breach than in obedience.

²⁵ For the spelling of the name, see *Pāli Dictionary* (P.T.S.) *sub voce* *Chabbaggiya*.

Devadatta was undoubtedly a terrible man, whose inimical action, directed personally against Buddha Gotama, is condemned and condemnable in history. But the early Buddhist texts clearly testify to the fact that his wicked plots were not employed until he had lost all chances of having his own way of amending some of the rules governing the life of the bhikkhus. He had insisted on having the following five special rules introduced and enforced:

1. That a bhikkhu shall live all his life in the forest;
2. That he shall depend for his subsistence solely on doles collected out-doors;
3. That he shall wear garments made by stitching together rags picked up from dust-heaps;
4. That he shall always live under a tree and not under a roof; and
5. That he shall never eat fish or meat.²⁶

The idea must have occurred to him due not so much to his Jaina and Ājīvika leaning as to the open criticism of the Buddhist position and mode of living from the side of the Jainas and Ājīvikas. In the opinion of an Ājīvika, it was rather possible that the Vindhya mountain would float in water than that a Buddhist śramaṇa living a life of ease and subsisting on sumptuous food could obtain liberation.²⁷ A Pāli Sutta records an occasion when the Jainas raised hue and cry in public condemnation of Buddha Gotama, giving out that he being invited to a house to take his meal, was eating meat, even knowing perfectly well that it was especially prepared for him (*uddisakata*).²⁸ The echo of this is to be found in the strong criticism of the Buddhist logic of meat-eating offered by a Jaina teacher in the *Sātrakṛtāṅga*, II. 6:

“They kill a fattened sheep, and prepare food for the sake of a particular person; they season the meat with salt and oil, and dress it with pepper.”

²⁶ *Vinaya*, Cullavagga, VIII. 1; Oldenberg's *Buddha*, pp. 160-161; N. Dutt, *Early History of the Spread of Buddhism*, p. 222.

²⁷ *Divyāvadāna*, p. 420: *Sākyeṣṣ-indriyuniqraho yadi bhaved Vindhyaḥ plaret sāgare.*

²⁸ *Aṅguttara-Nikāya*, vol. IV, p. 187.

“You are irreligious, unworthy men, devoted to foolish pleasures, who say that partaking heartily of this meat, you are not soiled by sin.”²⁹

Thus Devadatta came to espouse a cause of the Saṅgha which appealed to many who were of the same religious temperament and generated a tendency within it, which partook of the character of ascetic extremism avoided by Buddha. He was, moreover, a man who tried to acquire supernormal powers by psychical process.³⁰ The orthodox records would have us believe that his career was terminated by the terrible death of a sinner, and that all his influence died with him. This is far from true, because we are informed by I'a Hian, the earlier Chinese pilgrim, that his sect flourished at the time of his visit to Śrāvastī, paying “religious reverence to the three past Buddhas, but not to Śākyamuni Buddha.”³¹ The testimony of Hwen Thsang goes to prove that side by side with the ten *saṅghārāmas* or so in Karna-suvarṇa (in West Bengal) belonging to the Sammitiya sect of Hīnayāna Buddhism, there were three convents in which their inmates did not use thickened milk, following the directions of Devadatta.³²

The Vinaya texts represent the Chabbaggiyas as a set of bhikkhus under the leadership of Assaji, Punabbasu, Paṇḍuka, Lohitaka, Mettiya and Bhummajaka. Sāvattī, Rājagaha and Kīṭāgiri became the three great centres of their work and influence in the very lifetime of Buddha, Kīṭāgiri being a township of Kāsī,³³ situated between Benares and Sāvattī (*Cullavagga*, I. 13). These texts introduce us also to the Chabbaggiya bhikkhunis forming a set of bhikkhunis under the leadership of six female personalities bearing names corresponding to those of the leaders of the Chabbaggiya bhikkhus. These bhikkhunis are represented as the same sort of mischief-makers in the female section of the Order who often worked in alliance with the Chabbaggiyas of the male section.

29 Jacobi, *Jaina-Sūtras*, Part II, p. 416.

30 Beal's *Buddhist Records*, vol. II, pp. 8, 158.

31 *Ibid.*, vol. I, p. xlviii.

32 *Ibid.*, vol. II, p. 201.

33 *Majjhima-Nikāya*, Kīṭāgiri-sutta.

Buddhaghosa speaking of the leaders of the Chabbaggiyas, says that they were six comrades and all lads of Sāvatti.³⁴ They having decided to shun hard toil for livelihood by joining the Buddhist Order, got themselves initiated by Sāriputta and Moggallāna, and after studying the *mātikās* for five years began to think that the right course of life for them would be not to reside all in one place as there might be sometimes plenty of food (*subhikkha*) and sometimes scarcity (*dubbhikkha*). They selected Sāvatti, Rājagaha, and Kiṭāgiri as three suitable localities for their residence. Of these localities, Sāvatti was the most populous and flourishing city in the whole of Kāsī and Kosala, Rājagaha was similarly the most populous and flourishing city in the whole of Aṅga and Magadha, and Kiṭāgiri was a very fertile tract with abundance of rain-water enabling it to yield three harvests of food-grains. They instructed Paṇḍuka and Lohitaka to build *pariveṇas* (monastic abodes) in public places adjoining Sāvatti, laying out and maintaining the fruit and flower gardens for ministration to local needs as a means of gaining popular sympathy and recruits from among the lads of the neighbourhood. Mettiya and Bhummajaka were similarly instructed to choose Rājagaha, and Assaji and Punabbasu, Kiṭāgiri for their residence and work. Acting according to those instructions, they soon succeeded in gathering round them five hundred followers at each centre. Paṇḍuka and Lohitaka were good enough to move about in the country in the company of Buddha and not to foment a new cause of action, while the remaining four leaders not only violated the rules with impunity but fomented always fresh causes of action necessitating the framing and enforcement of new rules.³⁵

The Vinaya texts abound in references to the mischievous ways and objectionable conduct of the Chabbaggiyas on the male as well as the female side, so much so that the Vinaya Piṭaka would not, perhaps, have come into existence but for their thoughtlessness and whimsicalities. It is needless to expatiate on their caprices and iniquities. An *ex parte* judgment may be given blackening their character and declaring them to be all bad men and bad women. It is very likely that

34 The story of the Chabbaggiyas in the *Jātakatthorāṇṇanā* (Fausböll's *Jātaka*), the *Dhammapada-Commentary*.

35 *Samanta-pāsādikā*, Siamese ed., part II, pp. 127-129.

they had occasionally aroused public sentiment and aggravated popular feelings against them, prejudicing the cause of the Noble Order which had developed on the prestige of Gotama. It may be safely assumed that the current opinion about them was that their ways and manners were like those of worldly people and unworthy of the members of a religious order. And yet, had their case been so weak and prejudicial, how was it that they were not bodily expelled from the Saṅgha, that they were allowed to wander about in the country even in the company of Buddha, and that they could follow their own ways in spite of all restrictions and condemnations? The very fact that they were able to form and maintain a strong party of their own, a powerful body of workers at different centres, goes to prove that, like the first schismatics, they had a definite cause to expound, a clear plan of action to adopt, and a noble ideal of life to fulfil. The early records of the Vinaya may say that once by the mandate of the Order the Chabbaggiyas were expelled from Kīṭāgiri. But doubt still remains if they were the people to obey the mandate in fact? Taking all the Vinaya passages relating to the Chabbaggiyas into consideration, one cannot mistake that they were a strong body of workers. From the start their aim was to make their economic position secure and to create local centres of work ministering to the social needs of the people around and actively helping them in all matters affecting their honour and happiness. They laid out gardens, built huts, stored up food-stuffs, hushed up scandals, took an interest in the study of sciences and arts useful to the people, taking a normal view of human life, whether within the convents or within common homesteads.

Granted this, the only point which remains for consideration is whether the Chabbaggiyas of Buddhist tradition had completely ceased to be creating a tendency of life within the Order which partook of the character of worldly extremism, or the party which they had formed continued to exist and work as a separate sect even centuries after Buddha's demise. They must have persisted as a distinct Buddhist sect, if the *Savaggiyas* of the Mahāsthān record with their centre of work and influence near the prosperous city of Puṇḍranagara, be connected with the Chabbaggiyas (=Ṣaḍvargikas) of the Vinaya Piṭaka. One important point of resemblance between the two is that the former,

too, were men of influence and wise in the selection of a place near a flourishing city and localities which were rich in food-grains, oil and tree. And if the Buddhist Chabbaggiyas had a centre of influence near about Puṇḍranagara as the first Buddhist schismatics had their centre at Karnaśuvarṇa, in speaking of Buddhism in Bengal the historian will do well not to confound Buddhism of Sākyaṃuni with that of the Devadattikas, or that of the Śaḍvargikas.

In the present stage of our knowledge it is difficult to suggest any religious group other than the Buddhist Chabbaggiyas for identification with the *Saraggiyas* of the Mahāsthān inscription. But certain it is that the word *vargya* (= *vaggiya*) was employed to denote a religious group, e.g. *Vāsudevaratikā* (*Culla-Niddesa*, *Mahā-Niddesa*) = *Vāsudevarargya* (Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya*).

The next word calling for an explanation is *atīyāyika* which occurs in its locative singular form *atīyāyike*, *atīyāyikasi*. The Prakṛt form *atīyāyika* for the Sk. *ātyayika* and the Pāli *accāyika* is met with in the Sohgaura Copper-plate, as also in the Dhauli and Jaugada copies of Asoka's R.E. VI. In the Asokan text, precisely as in the Sohgaura plate (*atīyāyikāya*) and the Mahāsthān record, the word is employed as a substantative (*atīyāyike āloṇite*), and not as an adjective as in the Arthaśāstra (*ātyayike kārye*) and the Rathavināta-sutta (*accāyike karaṇīye*). The substantive use of the word, however, is not unknown in Pāli (cf. *mayham accāyikam n'atthi*, 'I have no urgent business', (Childers' *Dictionary*, sub voce *Accāyika*).

It is not correct to say with Professor Bhandarkar that the record speaks of two *atīyāyikas* only. Evidently it speaks of three *atīyāyikas*: *dagga-atīyāyika*, [*agi*]-*atīyāyika*, and *sua-atīyāyika*. In order to meet these three emergencies, the store-house was to be stocked with oil, trees and paddy and hoards of such pieces of coins as *gaṇḍakas* and (?) *kākaṇikas*.

The real sense of *atīyāyikasi* with the implied purpose may be brought out in the light of a Pāli parallel from the Nidhikaṇḍa-Sutta (*Khuddaka Pāṭha*): *atthe kicce samuppanne (atthāya me bhavissati)*. The Pāli Sutta mentions the following by way of typical illustrations of *attha-kicca* without exhausting the list:

*Rājato va durutassa, corato pīḷitassa vā,
inassa vā pamokkhāya, dubbhikkhe āpadāsu vā,*

while in other stock passages, one has a list of dangers: *rājato vā, corato vā, aggito vā, udakato vā*, etc.

The first emergency in view of the Mahāsthān record is *daga-atiyāyika*, 'one arising from the action of water' (*daga=daka udaka*, cf. Pāli *Daka-rakkhaso*). The second in view may have been 'one arising from the action of (?) fire (*agi*). The third in view is *sua-atiyāyika* (= *suca-atiyāyika*), 'one arising from the action of parrots (*śukāḥ*)'. Assuming the intended reading to be *sa-atiyāyika* (*śaḍātyayika*), the word might be taken to comprehend the six emergencies mentioned in the following Sanskrit śloka:

*Aśane, vyasane caiva, durbhikṣe, śatru-saikate,
rājadrāre, śmaśāne ca, yas tiṣṭhati sa bāndhavaḥ,*

or, in the alternative, as a term corresponding to *śaḍ-ītayaḥ*, six traditional causes of scarcity of food:

*Atirṣṭir anārṣṭir śalabhāḥ mūṣikāḥ śukāḥ³⁶
atyāsannāś³⁷ ca rājānaḥ, śaḍ ete ītayaḥ smṛtāḥ.*

The *Arthasāstra* (VIII. 4. 131) speaks of the following six causes of fatality:

Daira-pīḍanam-agnir-udakaḥ byūdhirdurbhikṣaṃ maraka iti.

B. M. BARTA

36 Variant *khagāḥ*.

37 Variant *pratyā*.

N.B.—I am much indebted to Mr. N. G. Majumdar for his courtesy in examining the original stone with me and checking my decipherment based at first on the estampage and the photo-enlargement reproduced in *E.I.*, XXI, part II.

The Persian and Greek Coins and their Imitations in Ancient India

India in ancient times evolved a coinage of her own. That the origin of the punch-marked coins—the earliest coinage of the country—is indigenous has been conclusively proved by Professors Rapson¹ and Bhandarkar². The views of some of the western scholars who wanted to prove the Babylonian, Persian or Greek indebtedness for the Indian system have been found to be erroneous.³ The weight, shape, the system of manufacture, the peculiar symbols with a few exceptions are all indigenous in origin; and the gradual stages by which this coinage reached its perfection can be clearly marked.⁴ The weight system is based upon the rati, the silver Dharaṇa or Purāṇa weighing 32 ratis (or 56 grains) while the copper Kārṣāpaṇa was equivalent to 80 ratis or 156 grains.⁵ The shape of the punch-marked coins was irregular—rectangular, square, polygonal or even triangular due to the peculiar system of manufacture.⁶ A metallic sheet of requisite thickness cut into small pieces and adjusted to the required units or their sub-multiples left no

Weights of the principal denominations of Greek coins, in grains.

	Attic	Agenitic	Persian
Distater or Tetradrachm	270		354
Stater or Didrachm	135	194	177
Himinstater or Drachm	67.5	97	88
Third or Tetrobol	45		59
Fourth or Triobol ...	33.75	48	44
Sixth or Diobol ...	22.5	32	29
Eighth or Trehemibol	16.8	24	22
Twelfth or obol ...	11.25	16	14

The Rhodian drachm weighed 60 grains. The term 'stater' means the standard coin and usually applied to didrachm but in some cases to tetradrachm and in Cyrene to the drachm. - *Encyclopædia Britannica*, vol. 17 (9th Ed.).

1 Prof. Rapson in *JR.A.S.*, 1895, p. 869.

2 Bhandarkar, *Ancient Indian Numismatics*, Lecture II.

3 *Ibid.*, pp. 39, 41, 118.

4 Chakraborty, *A Study of A.I.N.*, Ch. V, the Mode of Fabrication.

5 *Ibid.*, Ch. III, Weights and Coin-denominations.

6 Smith, *Catalogue of Coins in I.M.*, p. 134.

scope to any attention being paid to the uniformity of shape.⁷ The symbols punched on the coins had generally been in use in this country. Thus the Indian system with its peculiar features "precludes all idea of its having been derivative"⁸ and has been characterised as "the simplest of all."⁹

The honour of manufacturing coins for the first time in the West is given to the Lydians by Herodotus, though the claim of the Lydians is disputed by the Ionian Greeks. The Mermnadae kings of Lydia (about 700 B.C.) appear however to have begun the practice of punching the ingots of electrum, a natural alloy of gold and silver for the first time with official marks or symbols testifying to the weight of the metal.¹⁰ This innovation was taken up by the Ionian Greek cities of Asia Minor, who gradually engraved dies with the symbol of the state or city or its tutelary deity an animal, symbol.¹¹ The percentage of the metals, gold and silver, in electrum varied and this was a source of great difficulty to the merchants. The necessity for coins of pure metals with constant value led to the introduction of gold and silver coins. Croesus (circa 561 B.C.), the Lydian king is supposed to have been the first to use gold and silver coins instead of electrum.¹² This practice was continued by Darius the Great of Persia in his gold *darics* and silver *sigloi* or shekels.¹³

Pheidon the Argive king is supposed to have regulated the weights and measures of Peloponnese which were perhaps of Mycenaean origin. The tradition ascribing the first issue of Greek coins at Aegina to Pheidon (8th cent. B.C.) has to be rejected as too early,¹⁴ though it is almost sure that the first European coins were struck at Aegina¹⁵ "on the standard of Pheidon." The cities of Euboea-Chalcis, Eretria, Histiaea

7 Whitehead, *The Pre-Muhammadan Coinage of N-W. India*, pp. 40-41.

8 Macdonald, *The Evolution of Coinage*, p. 9.

9 *Ibid.*, p. 57.

10 Cotterill, *Ancient Greece*, p. 462.

11 *Ibid.*

12 Macdonald, *The Evolution of Coinage*, p. 8.

13 *Ibid.*

14 Percy Gardner, *The Earliest Coins of Greece Proper*, p. 2.

15 Cotterill, *Ancient Greece*, p. 462.

etc. began to issue coins in the 7th cent. B.C. based "on the gold standard of Babylon, which they divided according to the scheme of Pheidon." The types of the earliest coins of Athens were the owl or the amphora and were introduced for the first time by Solon.¹⁶ It was Peisistratus (561-60 B.C.) who first struck the *tetradrachms* with the head of Athena.¹⁷ This resulted in the furtherance of the Athenian commerce and the silver coins of Athens gradually secured a prominence and the Attic standard weight was adopted by Corinth, Eretria and other towns of ancient Greece.¹⁸ The Athenian coinage had so great a circulation through Hellas and so high a reputation for weight and purity that it was thought inadvisable to alter the old type. Hence the Athenian coins do not show such technical perfection as one might expect.¹⁹

Darius the Great, son of Hystaspes in his Behistan inscription claims to have conquered a portion of India, the Punjab region which was organised as a Satrapy.²⁰ From his time to the sack of Rome by the Goths was a period of about 1000 years and during this long period India "was more or less in constant communication with the West."²¹ A brisk trade was carried on and the three great trade routes of India with the West were (a) The Persian Gulf route, the easiest and perhaps the oldest, from the north of the Indus to the Euphrates, (b) the overland route via Balkh and (c) "the circuitous sea route, down the Persian and Arabian coasts to Aden, up the Red Sea to Suez, and from Suez to Egypt on the one hand and Tyre and Sidon on the other."²² It is but reasonable to expect that foreign coins came to this country in the course of commerce. The Persian, Greek, Parthian, Sassanian and a large number of Roman coins have been found in this country. The gold and silver coins of the Romans the *auri* and the

16 P. Gardner, *The Earliest Coins of Greece Proper*, pp. 15-22.

17 *Ibid.*, p. 2 and pp. 17-41.

18 *Ibid.*, p. 2.

19 Cotterill, *Ancient Greece*, p. 462.

20 *The Historians' History of the World*, vol. II, pp. 609, 613. Cunningham's *Coins of Ancient India*, pp. 12-15.

21 Rawlinson, *Intercourse between India and the Western World*, p. 155.

22 *Ibid.*, p. 2.

denari were current in Western India²³ and this drain of specie was bitterly condemned by Pliny. The drain amounted to 550,000,000²⁴ sesterces which is equal to 22,000,000 dollars. In the Madras Museum we have a collection of coins of the Roman Emperors excavated in Southern India. Those of Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius and Nero are numerous while "those of Domitian, Nerva, Trajan, and Hadrian are frequent."²⁵

As a portion of India, the Punjab and Sindh region, was added to the Persian Empire by Darius the Great (521-485 B.C.),²⁶ it is reasonable to infer that the *daric*, the standard coin of ancient Persia, was current within the limits of the Persian dominion. Darius is said to have minted the *darics* for the first time;²⁷ these weighed about 130 grains and had on the obverse the "figure of the great king hastening through his dominions armed with bow and spear" and an irregular incuse on the reverse.²⁸ But the gold coins had no extensive circulation in this country. The reason pointed out is its low price relatively to silver. In India the ratio between gold and silver was 1: 8, while the ratio maintained by the Persian mint was 1: 13.3.²⁹ So it would be always highly profitable to export gold for silver. This will explain the comparative paucity of the *darics* and Dr. Macdonald maintains that there in "no single instance do these bear counter-marks or any other indication that could possibly be interpreted as suggestive of a prolonged Indian sojourn."³⁰ But the *sigli* or shekels are frequently offered for sale specially in India. These are coins of silver weighing 86.45 grains each and twenty of these were equivalent to one *daric*.³¹ It is natural that on account of the relative cheapness of gold, the silver coins would flow into the country and remain in circulation. Many of the coins which have come down to us have peculiar counter-marks analogous to the punch-marks of the indigenous coinage of India and on some of them occur "characters which have been read as Brāhmī and

23 *The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea* (Schoff), p. 192.

24 *Ibid.*, p. 219.

25 *Ibid.*, p. 220.

26 Smith, *Oxford History of India*, p. 45.

27 *Cambridge Ancient History*, IV, p. 129.

28 *Cambridge History of India*, vol. I (Ancient India), p. 342.

29 *Ibid.*, p. 343.

30 *Ibid.*, p. 343.

31 *Ibid.*, p. 343.

Kharoṣṭhī letters.”³² M. Babelon however wanted to assign the punch-marked *sigloi* to Lycia, Pamphilia, Cilicia and Cyprus.³³ But all doubt about the Indian provenance has been set at rest by a recent discovery at Taxila³⁴ and we have not to depend upon inference that the *sigloi* “are fairly often disinterred from the soil of India itself,” though many of these might come over from Central Asia, Bukhara and Khorasan to the Punjab as “the nearest profitable market.”³⁵

In the Bhir mound the site of the oldest city at Taxila an earthenware *ghaḍā* was excavated. It contained a collection of coins and jewellery and was found about 6 ft. below the present surface. This stratum is supposed to belong to c. 3rd or 4th B.C. The pot is only 7 inches in height and contained 1167 silver coins and pieces of jewellery both gold and silver. The coins are generally punch-marked ones and included a few local Taxilian coins and were “of various shapes and sizes.” But the ‘unique value’ of this find consists in the presence in it “of three Greek coins fresh from the mint, two of Alexander the Great and one of Philip Aridaeus besides a well-worn *siglos* of the Persian Empire. The issues of Alexander and Philip bear on the obverse a head of Alexander wearing the lion-skin, and on the reverse, Zeus seated on a throne with eagle on his right hand and sceptre in left. Thus they closely resemble one another, though the legends and monograms on the reverse differ. The special interest attaching to the find of these freshly minted coins of Alexander and Philip Aridaeus is that apart from the fact that it is the first recorded find of these coins in India, it definitely confirms the previous conclusions as to the period when Indian punch-marked coins were in circulation, and also confirms the date previously arrived at for the upper strata of buildings on Bhir mound.”³⁶

Of the two types of the gold *darics* probably of Indian provenance the earlier one is assigned to c. 5th or 4th cent. B.C.

Type I:—on the obverse: the great king hastens to r., holds a


32 Rapson, *Indian Coins*, p. 3.

33 *Cambridge History of India*, vol. I, p. 344.

34 *Archæological Survey of India*, 1924-25, p. 45.

35 *Cambridge History of India*, vol. I, p. 342.

36 *Archæological Survey of India*, 1924-25, p. 48.



spear the strung bow and wear *kildaris* and *kandhys*; on the reverse: an irregular oblong incuse. This coin seems to have some similarity to the golden *daric* of Darius I Hystaspes,³⁷ "the *daric* of the earliest style."³⁸ Though the coin must be later than 480 B.C. yet it may with a great probability be assigned to c. 5th cent. B.C.

Type II:—is of a much later date. It is in imitation of the coins of Darius III Cadomannus (337-300 B.C.) and is assigned to after c. 331 B.C.⁴⁰ It is a double *daric* weighing 262.7 grains and is supposed to have been struck in India. On the obverse the Achæmenid king as archer half-kneeling to r., Greek letters behind and beneath and a symbol in front. "The inscription behind and beneath the figure of the king on the obverse is supposed to mean 2 staters= 1 mina." On the reverse "wavy bands," "irregular incuse, with conventional pattern formed by curved line in relief."⁴¹

As these double *darics* have either Greek monograms or letters, the conclusion seems to be reasonable that they were issued after the defeat of the Achæmenids by Alexander either from Babylon or other parts of the Empire. These surely made their way to India but it is extremely doubtful whether they were struck in India. Though some of the specimens were secured at Rawalpindi but the find-spots seem to be Bukhara in ancient Sogdiana.⁴²

The silver coins, the *sigloi* are also of two types. The earlier one (Type A) resembles *daric Type I* and is assigned to the 5th cent. B.C. It has a punch-mark on the obverse and on the reverse a symbol like triskeles.⁴³ One had a counter mark on the reverse resembling Brāhmī character *Yo*.⁴⁴ The Type B had a similar figure of the king but holds dagger instead of spear; two punch-marks on the obverse and 4 punch-marks on the reverse. The coins of this type are assigned to the 4th cent.

37 *Cambridge History*, vol. 1, p. 462; pl. I, no. 1.

38 Head, *Coins of the Ancients*, p. 5, plate 1, no. 17.

40 *Cambridge History of India*, p. 462.

41 Rapson, *Indian Coins*, plate I, no. 5, p. 3.

42 *Cambridge History of India*, p. 390, plate I, no. 6.

43 Rapson, *Indian Coins*, pl. I, no. 3.

44 *Ibid.*, pl. I, no. 4.

B.C.⁴⁵ The *siglos* discovered at Taxila must be earlier than the coins of Alexander the Great which are fresh from the mint, while the *siglos* is much worn; therefore it cannot be later than the 4th cent. B.C.

The number of Persian coins that came to the country in the course of commerce must have been very small, as is evident from the presence of only one *siglos* among 1167 coins of the Taxilian hoard recently excavated. These Persian coins though of foreign origin might have remained in circulation. A reference to the currency of foreign coins in Barygaza is met with in the *Periplus*;⁴⁶ and at present in some parts of China, Mexican dollars pass current.⁴⁷ The necessity for imitating the Persian coin in large number must have been very slight and the utmost that we can reasonably infer is that the coins that entered the country in the course of commerce remained in circulation and were necessarily equated in price to the amount of metal contained. Even though some of the frontier states in the Punjab imitated the Persian coins, on account of paucity it is practically impossible to identify them with complete certainty.

The earliest coins of Athens were the silver *didrachms* (a *drachm* of 65 grains) with the owl or amphora as the type and are assigned to the time of Solon.⁴⁸ The coinage of Athens thus appears related to that of Eretria in Euboea in weight "during the first half of the 6th cent. B.C."⁴⁹ The *tetradrachms* of Athens bearing the head of Athena with the 'archaic smile' began to be issued in the middle of the 6th cent. B.C. and the initiative is ascribed to the tyrant Peisistratus who however adopted a heavier weight called Attic, 67.5 grains being equal to a *drachm*.⁵⁰ The Athenian coins had a great circulation throughout Hellas and on account of its purity and weight were largely exported. The Attic silver coins gradually came to dominate the trade of the Aegian and drove off the inferior issues. "Even after the political

45 *Cambridge History of India*, p. 462, pl. I, no. 3.

46 *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*, pp. 41, 192, 219.

47 Spalding, *Foreign Exchange and Foreign Bills*, p. 154.

48 P. Gardner, *The Earliest Coins of Greece Proper*, p. 28.

49 *Ibid.*, pp. 2 and 28.

50 *Ibid.*, pp. 2, 36.

full of Athens, Xenophon could write that foreign merchants, who carried away from Athens not goods but the silver owls, did a good business, for they could anywhere part with them at a premium."⁵¹ Dr. Macdonald is very much sceptical about the statement 'that India was one of the many quarters of the ancient world into which the silver *tetradrachms* of Athens made their way, and also that imitations of Athenian coins are found from time to time in the Punjab.'⁵² He controverts the statement of Prof. Rapson and states that there are 'no trustworthy records of the actual discovery of 'owls' in India'⁵³ and the imitations of the Athenian *tetradrachms* acquired for the British Museum from Rawalpindi appear to be Central Asian in origin. He even goes so far as to reject any intimate "connection between India itself and those coins of Macedonian character which are usually described as being of Indian *provenance*."⁵⁴ But the Taxilian discoveries have considerably weakened the force of these statements. When the Persian *siglos* and the coins of Alexander the Great and Philip Aridaeus could be excavated in India, there can be nothing inherently improbable in the introduction of Athenian coins and their Asiatic imitations in India in the course of commerce. The imitations of Athenian *tetradrachms* are assigned to the period of 100 years before 322 B.C. when the Macedonians asserted their hegemony in Greece by bringing about the stoppage of coinage in Athens.⁵⁵ Dr. Macdonald restricts them to the fifty years from 350-300 B.C.⁵⁶ His statement "that a demand for local copies would only arise when the supply of originals ran short, and such a shortage could most readily be accounted for by connecting it with the paralysis that overtook the Athenian mint when the City was finally crushed beneath the heel of Macedon"⁵⁷ cannot be accepted in full. As a matter of fact Gardner assigns the barbarous imitations to the Persian Army that came to conquer Greece and in his

51 Gardner, *The Earliest Coins of Greece Proper*, p. 40.

52 *Cambridge History of India*, vol. I, p. 386.

53 *Ibid.*, p. 387.

54 *Ibid.*, p. 387.

55 Rapson, *Indian Coins*, p. 3 (para 9).

56 *Cambridge History of India*, vol. I. p. 462, pl. I.

57 *Ibid.*, p. 387.

opinion these belonged "to the end of the 6th cent. B.C. or the beginning of the 5th cent. B.C."⁵⁸ These 'barbarous copies' had a dot in the *theta* instead of crossed bar which was the earlier practice. Mr. Gardner points out that "a great proportion of the extant early *tetradrachms* is really of barbarous and imitative character."⁵⁹ It appears, considering all the circumstances, that Dr. Macdonald pushes the chronology rather late.

The Indian imitations of the Gorgon-head type coins of Eretria would fully bear out our view. The silver *Tetradrachms* of Eretria with the Gorgon-head preceded the Persian Wars i.e. 480 B.C. and are "contemporary with the early Athena types of Athens."⁶⁰ The Rākṣasa type coins are included by General Cunningham among the Taxilian coins. He informs us that he had two specimens and British Museum the third.⁶¹ One specimen only is included in the Indian Museum collection in Calcutta.⁶² Cunningham however does not give the exact find spots but it seems that he got his specimens in the Punjab. That these coins are the imitations of the Gorgon head coins of Eretria admit of no doubt. The specimen in Cunningham's *Coins of Ancient India*, Plate III, No. 7 is a close imitation of No. 25 Plate V in Head's *Coins of the Ancients*.⁶³ But the Indian origin of the coin is attested to by the metal used i.e. copper, the weight 75 grains, (a half *kārṣāpaṇa*) and the square shape. The head with short ears and protruded tongue is the exact reproduction of the Grecian Type. When we consider that the Gorgon-head type ceased to be minted after the Persian Wars, we are tempted to assign these imitations to 5th century B.C.⁶⁴ The introduction of the double-die system in this corner of India seems to be earlier than previously supposed⁶⁵ and it is reasonable to predict that for the use of dies,

58 Gardner, *Earliest Coins of Greece Proper*, pp. 37, 38.

59 *Ibid.*, p. 37.

60 *Ibid.*, p. 20.

61 Cunningham, *Coins of Ancient India*, p. 63, pl. III, no. 7.

62 Smith, *Catalogue of Coins in the Indian Museum*, p. 159, (No. 35).

63 Head, *Coins of the Ancients*, p. 10, pl. 5, figs. 24 and 25.

For other imitations, see Greek Coins Nos. (a) & (J), p. 310 of the *Cambridge Ancient History*,—First Volume of Plates.

64 Chakraborty, *A Study of Ancient Indian Numismatics*, pp. 212-214.

65 Smith, *Catalogue of Coins*, p. 147 (Taxila).

the Indians were at first indebted, at least in this part of the country, to the foreigners. The imitations of the Athenian Tetradrachms either in India or other parts of Western Asia need not all be assigned to the latter half of the 4th century B.C. and the statement that the ultimate *provenance* of these coins is the Middle East cannot be fully accepted.⁶⁶ When we have imitations of the Greek coins of the 6th and 5th centuries B.C. and the coins of Alexander and his successors of the 4th century B.C., there is no reason to infer that the Athenian Tetradrachms did not enter India or were not imitated in this country or that all belonged to the period 350-300 B.C. Some of them deemed to be Asiatic imitations might have Indian *provenance*, though we have to wait for future discoveries to secure full confirmation. The discovery of a number of silver drachms of Attic weight in the Punjab is vouched for by Cunningham.⁶⁷

The imitations of the Athenian Tetradrachms have been divided into two distinct types. The first class is a close approximation of the original model. It has on the *obv.* Head of Athena r., wearing helmet adorned with olive branches and on the *rev.* the legend AOE., owl r. and olive spray and crescent and in front a symbol.⁶⁸ In a few of these coins the legend is different AΓ and these are assigned to the Aigloi⁶⁹ who dwelt to the north of the Bactrians (Herodotus III, 92). The second class has the same type on the *obv.* though of a different style, behind a different symbol M; the *rev.* is similar to the first class but has a bunch of grapes behind.⁷⁰ Thus this second group is of a softer style, has a different monogram and the bunch of grapes as a symbol. Moreover in the manufacture of these coins a hinge or some such contrivance must have been used, as the types on both sides of the coins of the second class are adjusted with a nicety;⁷¹ and the second group has as submultiples the didrachms and drachms though these smaller denominations are based on a weight standard different from the Attic weight of 67.5 grains per drachm.⁷² In the third group

66 *Cambridge History of India*, vol. I, p. 387.

67 *Ibid.*, p. 388.

68 *Cambridge History of India*, p. 462, pl. 1, no. 7.

69 *Ibid.*, No. 8.

70 *Ibid.*, Nos. 9 and 10.

71 *Ibid.*, p. 387.

72 *Ibid.*, p. 387.

we have a number of drachmae and diobols similar to the second in which the Athenian "owl" is replaced by an "eagle" looking backwards though the bunch of grapes still appears and in one case is accompanied by a caduceus.⁷³

Dr. Macdonald refers to another class of silver drachms of Attic weight. These were found in the Punjab by General Cunningham. These have on the *obv.* Head of a warrior r., with a close fitting helmet, wreathed with olive and a border of dots; and on the *rev.* the legend *Sophytoy*, a cock r. and behind a Caduceus, with a border of dots.⁷⁴ This is assigned to 320 B.C. and "are struck from regularly adjusted dies and these dies have been cut by a Greek artist who signs himself M. or MN."⁷⁵ According to Dr. Macdonald these were designed after an Athenian prototype but there is no doubt as pointed out by Sir John Marshall that "these were copied from an issue of Seleucus Nicator"⁷⁶ and consequently anterior to Alexander the Great. These coins have the legend *Sophytes* which is supposed to be the Greek form of Sanskrit *Saubhuti*, the *Sopeithes* of Arrian and Strabo.⁷⁷ He is supposed to be the ruler of the "Salt Range at the close of the 4th century B.C." "But it is a debateable point whether it is the name of a prince or people. So long the prevailing opinion had been to take *Sophytes* to be the name of a prince."⁷⁸ But Mr. Jayaswal accepts the identification of *Sophytes* with *Saubhuti* which is taken to be the name of a state" adjoining the territory of the *Kathaoi*.⁷⁹ "The *Saubhuti* state," according to him, "extended up to the Salt Range." The *Ganapāṭha* of Pāṇini refers to *Saubhuti* and "Diodorus (XVII, 91) says that the cities subject to the sway of the *Sopeithes* "were governed by laws in the highest degree salu-

73 *Cambridge History of India*, p. 388, pl. I, nos. 12 and 13.

74 *Ibid.*, p. 388, pl. I, no. 17.

75 *Ibid.*, p. 388.

76 Sir John Marshall, *A Guide to Taxila* p. 24. Cf. *Coins of the Ancients*, pl. 28, no. 14.

77 *Cambridge History of India*, p. 388.

78 Rapson, *Indian Coins*, p. 3, pl. I, no. 8; Smith, *Catalogue of Coins*, p. 7.

79 Jayaswal, *Hindu Polity*, vol. I, pp. 65, 66.

tary” and “their political system was one to admire.”⁸⁰ The absence of any title *Basileus* is significant. The coin was merely the imitation of the prevailing type of Western Asia as in the case of the *Rākṣasa* type coins of Taxila.

The coins of Alexander the Great had been discovered at Taxila. These have on the *obv.* a head of Alexander wearing the lion skin (or Heracles) and on the *rev.* Zeus seated on a throne with an eagle on his right hand and sceptre in left and a monogram in front and around—*Basileus Alexandroi*.⁸¹ A few “copper coins of square Indian form” with the name of Alexander were, according to Prof. Rapson, struck in India by the Macedonian conqueror.⁸² These were at first attributed to Bactria; but from the metal used and the square shape, the more probable inference would be to take them to be the issue of the Indian states in subordination to Alexander the Great. A bronze piece in the Berlin Museum analogous to the ordinary issues of Alexander has nothing to ascribe it to India except its square form.⁸³ The shape however is due to an ‘accidental freak’ and according to Dr. Macdonald” the result of awkward handling by some workman in a western mint.” Another group of Alexandrine coins can safely be ascribed to the East. These have on the *obv.* Head of Zeus r. laureate and border of dots; on the *rev.* the head of Alexander; the legend *Alexandroy*, eagle standing r. on the thunderbolt with head reverted behind olive spray with berry and in front satrapal tiara. It is tentatively assigned to Seleucus I before c. 300 B.C. Dr. Macdonald thinks “that the evidence of provenance slight though it be, is all in favour of Central Asia,” and “the district whose needs Tetradrachms of the sort were meant to meet, lay beyond the confines of India.”⁸⁴ His first argument is that only one specimen is definitely known to have come from Rawalpindi while a diobol of similar type was with a dealer in 1906 at Tashkhend in Central Asia. Moreover these coins have points

80 Jayaswal, *Hindu Polity*, p. 66.

81 *Archæological Survey of India*, 1924-25, p. 48.

82 Rapson, *Indian Coins*, p. 4. (para 10).

83 *Cambridge History of India*, vol. I, p. 388.

84 *Ibid.*, p. 389.

of similarity with the second group of imitations of Athenian Tetradrachms—eagle with reverted head; the olive spray with leaves and a vine branch with grapes common to both. The weight standard has been characterised as “abnormal” and is supposed to have originated after Seleucus Nicator had given up all pretensions about the Punjab. To me however it seems to be a better proposition to take these coins to be the Indian imitations of the Macedonian coins. This would explain the introduction of the “new” weight standard. Three of these Tetradrachms weigh 217.5 grains (54.4 grs. \approx drachm.) Dr. Macdonald is confronted with a difficulty which he cannot explain, namely the use of a peculiar standard for a drachm of about 56 to 58 grains maximum in the place of the Attic drachm of 67.5 grains (maximum). This standard of 56 grains was used for the smaller denominations also—the didrachms and the drachms of the second group of coins consisting of the imitations of the Athenian Tetradrachms.⁸⁵ Another set of drachms and diobols were also minted in the same standard and their peculiar features were that “they were struck from regularly adjusted dies”⁸⁶ and had an eagle looking backwards in the place of the Athenian owl. If we accept the Indian weight standard for these coins struck on the so-called abnormal standard, we can have a satisfactory explanation and some clue as to their provenance.. The weight of 56 grains is surely based upon the weight standard of the silver Indian punch-marked coin of 32 ratis or 58 grains.⁸⁷ The weight of a rati based upon the guñjā seed can never be constant; the maximum weight for a Purāṇa of 32 ratis is found to be 58 grains (the weight standard for the precious metals). It is a known fact that in India the silver punch-marked coins the purāṇas are based upon a weight standard of 32 ratis or 56 grains while the copper coins had a different standard of 80 ratis or 146 grains. The slight diminution in the case of the extant coins might be due to two causes—the diminution in the weight of the rati—the guñjā seed and the wear and tear and also clipping which was widely prevalent in ancient times. The identity in weight between these

⁸⁵ *Cambridge History of India*, p. 387.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*

⁸⁷ Chakraborty, *A Study of Ancient Indian Numismatics*, p. 48.

foreign types under discussion and the Indian punch-marked silver coins cannot be accidental but must have been deliberately adopted. The most reasonable inference would be that these foreign-type coins are really Indian imitations in which the indigenous weight system was retained and this must have been convenient for those states which were actually habituated to the Indian standard. We have found a similar adoption of a foreign-type with the Indian weight in the case of Rākṣasa type coins from Taxila.

A silver decadrachm of Attic weight in the British Museum is the subject of controversy among numismatists. It has a monogram in which two Greek letters β and α had been combined and this is supposed to stand for *Basilaeus Alexandroi*—"Obv. Horseman, wearing conical helmet and cuirass overtaking and attacking two warriors retreating on an elephant; border of dots.—Rev. Male figure, wearing cuirass, cloak, and sword standing three quarter face towards l., with thunder bolt in r. and spear in l. in field l. monogram." Gardner assigned it to Bactria while Head came to the definite conclusion "from a careful study of the fabric that it belongs to Alexander's own time,"⁹¹ and that it records the historical event of his invasion of the Punjab in 326 B.C." The standing figure is supposed to be Alexander himself in the garb of Zeus and the scene according to him represents the retreat of Porus pursued by Taxiles as recorded by Arrian (V. 18) and he hazards the view that it might have been struck by Taxiles in his capital (Takṣaśīlā). V. Smith also accepted this view. But the conclusion is not supported by the find-spot which was in Bukhara. The result is therefore inclusive and we would not be fully justified in assigning it to Alexander the Great.

We can therefore divide the Indian imitations of foreign type coins into two sections. In the first class we should include the coins when the imitation was complete in type etc. (Rapson, *Indian Coins*, Pl. No. 6) and correct identification is very difficult. In the second class

88 Chakraborty, *op. cit.*, pp. 92-94, 97.

89 *Ibid.*, p. 96.

90 *Cambridge History of India*, vol. I, p. 463 (Pl. I, no. 16).

91 *Ibid.*, p. 390.

we have the drachm based on the standard weight of 56-58 grains; these were perhaps the issues of some of the silver using states in India—Sopythes and others. It will thus be evident that the Punjab and Afghanistan regions came under the influence of foreign coinage to such an extent that on occasions the purely Indian coins were perhaps supplanted or supplemented by imitations of foreign type coins. This was evidently the after-effect of the introduction of the coins of foreign types. The scepticism which dominated the controversy will be gradually removed; and perhaps further discoveries would definitely establish our conclusions. But it is sure that many issues which were previously assigned to Central Asia had India as their provenance and the amount of foreign influence on matters numismatic in the North Western region had been underestimated by Indian scholars.

SUBENDRA KISOR CHAKRABORTTY

Catustava*

When some of the verses¹ of the present work were first brought to light as early as 1896,² 1897,³ and 1898⁴ in the form of citations without any mention of their sources, nobody entertained the hope that they would be one day identified as belonging to one and the same work. It was after the publication of the *Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā* of Prajñākaramatī⁵ that one came to know the existence of a work called *Catustava* of Ācārya Nāgārjuna.⁶ In 1903 Prof. Poussin identified the Tib. version of this work⁷ in Index V to his edition of *MT*,⁸ and later on brought it out with a French translation in the pages of the *Musion* 1914. There he has identified all the verses mentioned above, with their Tib. versions in his notes on it.

The *Stotra* volume (*Bstod. Tshogs*) in the Tanjur does not speak of any treatise which bears the title *Catustava*.⁹ It seems, the fact that the author of this work was undoubtedly Nāgārjuna, led Prof. Poussin to go through some of the *stotras* attributed to the former in the *Bstod. Tshogs* and compare the verses therein with those cited in *BCP* as belonging to *Catustava*. He found those verses occurring in two¹⁰ of the many hymns¹¹ attributed to Nāgārjuna. This may have

* Contd. from p. 705, *III Q.*, vol. VIII.

1 1, 18, 19; 1, 13, 11, 4, 11, 19; 1, 21.

2 *Pañcakrama* in *Memoir de la Faculte de Letters de Gand*, fasc. 16, ch. IV, verses 1, 2.

3 *Mādhyamikarṣṭi*, Buddhist Text Series, Calcutta pp. 14, 17, 71, 148.

4 *Subhāṣitasamgraha*, ed. Bendall, p. 11.

5 *Bibliotheca Indica*, 1903; *Bouddhisme, Etude et Matériau*, 1898.

6 See *BCP*, pp. 420, 489, 533, 573.

7 *Op. Cit.* p. 626.

8 *Bibliotheca Buddhica*, IV, 1903.

9 *Bstod. pa. bži. pa* (according to the Tib. version of *BCP*. See *Tanjur*, Mdo. La. fols. 240 a. 6, 272 a. 1).

10 (1) *Dpe. med. par. bstod. pa*; (2) *'ig. sten. las. 'das. par. bstod. pa*. See Cordier, II, p. 5, No. 11, 12 or *Bstod. Tshogs*, Narthang edition, Vol. ka, fols. 74 b. 4; 75 b. 7; 76 a. 1; 77 a. 3.

11 See Cordier, II, pp. 3-6, Nos. 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 19, 20, 21 etc.

naturally led him to believe that the original work, *Cātustava*, as implied from the very name, was a collection of four *stavas* each of them having a different title. He assumed that two of them were *Nirāupamyastava* and *Lokūtīstava*. The assumption is quite convincing as it is based on the fact that the verses said to be of Ācārya Nāgārjuna's *Cātustava*,¹² do occur in those two texts. As regards the identification of the remaining two *stavas* he has said nothing definitely. But he takes them to be *Cittavajrastava*¹³ and *Paramārthastava*,¹⁴ for they are in the same volume just after the former two *stavas* and all of them are translated by the same persons.

Hitherto nobody has questioned this identification.¹⁵ But a closer examination of the question from the *Cātustava* in *BCP* will show that there is ample scope for further investigation in the matter. The verse¹⁶ cited in *BCP* p. 57, though expressly said to have been of this work, is not to be found in its edition by Prof. Poussin. This prompted me to undertake a further investigation of the remaining *stavas* attributed to Nāgārjuna in the *Bstod. Tshogs*. And as a result it came to my notice that the last two lines¹⁷ of the quotation in *BCP* referred to above, occur in the text of one of those *stavas*. It is *acintyastava*.¹⁸ It has also some verses¹⁹ similar to certain citations in *BCP*,²⁰ quoted without any mention of their sources. Moreover it resembles to the first two *stavas*, viz. *Nirāupamya*^o and *Lokūtīta*^o, more

12 See footnote 6.

13 *Sems. kyi. rdo. rje'i. bstod. pa.*

14 *Don. dam. par. bstod. pa.*

15 Even as recently as April 1932. Tucci accepts it in his "Two hymns of *Cātustava* of Nāgārjuna." *JR.A.S.*, April, 1932.

16 *utpannaśca sthito naṣṭa ukto loko 'rthatas tvayā/ kalpanāmātram ity-
asmāt sarvadharmāḥ prakāśitāḥ/ kalpanāpy asatī proktā yuyā śūnyam
vikalpyate//.*

17 The Tib. version is as follows:

*de. phyir. rtoq. (X gnas) pa. tsam. ñid. du/
chos. rnam. thams. cad. bstan. na. yin/
guñ. gi. ston. ñid. rnam. pa. brtags. pas/
rtoq. pa'i. med. par. brod. pa'i. ʔes//.*

18 *Bsam. gyis. mi. khyah. par. bstod. pa.*

19 Nos. 18, 27, 38, 39, 40.

20 Pp. 375, 528, 587, 590.

than the *Cittavajra*²¹ and *Paramārtha*²² do to them. The flow of arguments and the variety of things discussed therein lead one to think that the *stava* might have formed a chapter of a work in which *Nirāupamya* and *Lokātīta*²³ are included.

Now, as regards to the last *stava* in the *Catustava* there is nothing to decide its identity. The first line of the passage mentioned above could not be identified with any line in any other *stava* attributed to Nāgārjuna in the *Bstod. Tshogs*. It is not certain whether this chapter was translated at all into Tibetan, but supposing it was, it is to be found out from the remaining *stavas* of Nāgārjuna in the *Bstod. Tshogs*. In this volume, keeping aside the *stotras*,²⁴ there are five more *stavas*²⁵ supposed to have been written by this author.

Here it is necessary to note that as regards the style and method adopted in the first three *stavas* there is complete agreement. And so it is quite natural to assume that the same style and method should be found also in the fourth *stava* which hereafter is going to be identified.

Keeping this idea in view let us start with *Cittarajrastava*.²⁶ It is, in fact, a *stava* of *Bodhicitta*, and as such its text deals with the greatness of *Bodhicitta* and its *bhāvanā*. The direct addressing to a divine personality found in the first three *stavas* is apparently missing in it. Naturally we expect in it some of the Mādhyamika theories, but there is none. So I think it cannot be held with certainty that this *stava* forms the fourth chapter of the *Catustava*.

The *Paramārthastava*²⁴ and *Niruttarastava*²⁵ differ in their construction from the first three *stavas*. Every verse in them ends with a salutation to a personality which is *Paramārtha* 'absolute' and *Niruttara* 'one beyond which there is nothing'. The *Sattvārādhana-stava*²⁶ is composed in a metre different from that of the first three.

21 Cordier II, pp. 3 ff. *Bstod. Tshogs*, Nos. 10, 15, 18 and 23-28.

22 *Ibid.*, Nos. 13, 14, 17, 20 and 21.

23 *Sems. kyi. rdo. rjéi. bstod. pa.*

24 *Don. dam. par. bstod. pa.*

25 *Bla. na. med. pa'i. bstod. pa.*

26 *Sems. can. mgu. bar. bya. ba'i. bstod. pa.*

So I think, none of these three *stavas* can be taken with any certainty as a fourth *stava* of the *Catustava*.

The remaining *stava*, viz. *Stutyatitastava*²⁷ stands on a different footing from all the four *stavas* referred to above. It, unlike them, briefly deals with different theories of the Mādhyamikas, and as such agrees with the first three *stavas* of the *Catustava*. It may also be noted that it comes just after the *Acintya*^o in the volume of the *Bstod. Tshogs* and is translated into Tibetan by the very translators of the former.²⁸ Hence it seems to me that this *stava* forms the fourth chapter of the *Catustava*.

This is, however, a mere assumption which depends on another assumption that all the four *stavas* of the *Catustava* are translated into Tibetan and are included in the present edition of the Tanjur; but, in fact, it may not necessarily be so. The accuracy of the view may, however, be proved only if the MS. of the complete original work some day is found, or, a certain quotation, the source of which is expressly mentioned as *Catustava*, is available and identified with any verse of this *stava*.

The order in which these four *stavas* are printed in the present edition is based on that of their Tibetan translations in the volume of *Bstod. Tshogs*. It is not certain whether it is the original one or not. Moreover, if these four *stavas* are taken to have some relation with the *Buddhakāyas*,²⁹ the order of the latter, in the days of the author of the present work, will throw some light on this point.

It is certain that the title of the work is *Catustava (bstod. pa. bzi. pa)*.³⁰ So far as my information goes, there is no reference to the four different *stavas* by their individual names anywhere³¹ in the published Skt. texts of the Mahāyānists. On the contrary, there is no mention of

27 *Bstod. pa. las. 'das. par. bstod. pa.*

28 Cf. Cordier II, p. 6, Nos. 19, 20.

29 See footnote 15. The interrelation between the four *stavas* and four *Buddhakāyas* as shown by Dr. Tucci may be modified in the light of the identification of the four *stavas* proposed by me.

30 See footnote 9.

31 Expect the *Nirāupamyastotra*. See footnote 15 and the *Lokātītastava* implied from the work *Lokātītastavadhāraṇi*. See *Cat. NDL.*, p. 255.

the title *Catustava* in the volume containing the *stotras* in the Tanjur, there being only individual names of different *stavas*. It seems that the *Bālabodhinī Tikā*,³² a commentary on the *Nirāupamyā* and *Paramārtha*°, lying with Dr. Tucci, too, does not speak of the work *Catustava*, nor the relation of the former two with the latter. Ācārya Candrakīrti (7th century A.C.)³³ and Advayavajra (11th century A.C.),³⁴ though familiar with the name of the author of the verses they cite, do not mention the name of the work in which they originally occur. It is only Prajñākaramati (9th century A.C.)³⁵ who names both the work and its author in his *Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā* only.³⁶

The name of the four chapters are: (1) *Nirāupamyastava*, (2) *Lokātita*°, (3) *Acintya*°, (4) *Stutyatīta*°. It seems the Skt. Ms. or Mss. from which the Tibetan translations were made, contained these *stavas* as independent treatises and not under the common title *Catustava*. The fact that one of the *stavas* of this work, viz., *Nirāupamyā*°, is found in the original Skt. in Nepal as an independent treatise, supports the above statement. I am inclined to think that the author originally wrote a number of *stavas* as independent treatises, but later on, a certain scribe collected and copied four of them in one Ms. If that was the case it is quite possible that Prajñākaramati mistook the volume as one single work and not a collection of several small treatises.

An apt example for this tendency to take a collection of different independent treatises as one work and name it as such, is the work *Advayavajrasaṃgraha* (GOS), a volume containing a number of small treatises of Ācārya Advayavajra. That this collection is not made by the author himself, but later on by some scribe, is evident from the fact that the Tib. versions³⁷ of these treatises are like those of indepen-

32 See the article mentioned in footnote 15

33 *History of Skt. Buddhism* by Nariman, p. 106. But Haraprasad Sāstri put him in the 5th century A.C. See *Buddhist Studies*, p. 832.

34 *SM.*, II, p. xci.

35 *Indian Teachers in Tibet* by P. Bose, p. 73.

36 As one does not find any quotation from *Catustava* in his *Abhisamayālamkāravṛttipiṇḍārtha*. Cordier III, p. 279.

37 Cordier II, pp. 213 ff; *Cat. NDL.*, p. 15.

dent treatises, and are not in the same order as that in the Skt. collection³⁷ and are not translated by the same persons at one time. The collection of *Dhāraṇīs*,³⁸ *Sādhanas*³⁹ and *Stotras*³⁸ are some other examples. Again, there is an opposite tendency, and it is this that a recognised collective volume is quoted under the individual names of its chapters and not in the common name of the whole work. For example, the *Pañcakrama*⁵⁹ of Nāgārjuna is not quoted by its name, but by the names of its chapters, in the commentary of the *Ācārya-caryācāya*⁴⁰ (wrongly known as *Caryūcaryavinīscaya*) and the *Subhāṣitasamgraha*.⁴¹

The name of each of the *stāvas* is due to the particular adjectives such as *Nirupama*, *Lokātīta* etc. of the Buddha, used in the initial verses of them, though they have no special significance with regard to the contents of the respective *stāvas*. In this connection it may be noted that I-Tsing in the records of his pilgrimage to India says that "Every talented man of letters has praised in verse whatever person he deemed most worthy of worship."⁴² He has also stated that Ācārya Nāgārjuna was no exception amongst them.⁴³ In the present work he seems to have invoked the Buddha with special reference to those of his characteristics which are in consonance with the theory of *Sarvasūnyatā*. The Buddha who is praised in these hymns is not a particular person, but the hypostasis of Law (*Dharmadhātu*) and as such *Lokātīta* or *Nirupama*. The following verses cited from other panegyric hymns of which we shall speak on some other occasion, will bear the testimony to such a conception of the Buddha:

aprameyam aśaṅkhyeyam acintyam anidarśanam |
*bhacato hi svarūpatvaṃ trayaiva jñāyate svayam |*⁴⁴

38 *Cat. NDL.*, pp. 252 ff., 264 ff., 237 ff.

39 See footnote 2.

40 *Bauddha Gāna o Dohā*, p. 28.

41 *Ed.*, Besdall, p. 9.

42 *A Record of the Buddhist Religion by I-Tsing*, trans. Takakusu, 1896, p. 158.

43 *Ibid.*

44 *Satapāñcāśikāstotra*, verse 153.

acintyaś cintyarigataḥ acintyo 'dbhutavikramaḥ |
*acintyaḥ sarvadharmāṇāṃ acintyo manasas tathā |*⁴⁵

According to both the sources Skt. and Tib. the author of the work is Ācārya Nāgārjuna.⁴⁶ Some of the works in which certain verses of these *stavas* are cited, mention his name as their author.⁴⁷ As to his identification it can be said without any hesitation that he is no other than the founder of the Mādhyamika school and the author of the *Madhyamakārikā*. This is also evident from the statements⁴⁸ of authors like Candrakīrti and Prajñākaramati who quote him with the adjective *Ācāryapūḍa* (slob. dpon. gyi. źal. śna.). This view is also supported by the subject-matter of these *stavas* which is different from that dealt with by the second Nāgārjuna belonging to the Vajrayāna school.

All the Tib. versions as available in the Narthang edition of the Tanjur are quite legible only with a few exceptions as shown in the footnotes of the texts concerned. If the Tib. version of some of the verses cited in more than one text are compared with those of them in the present text, it will be quite surprising to see that all of them, in a general way, agree with each other. For instance, all the four translations found in the works of different periods of Tib. II, 21, have striking similarity.

As regards the translators of these four *stavas*, *Nirauḥamaḥ*^o and *Lokātīta*^o are jointly translated by the Indian Paṇḍits, Kṛṣṇa (*Nag. pu*) and the Tibetan interpreter Jayaśīla (*tshul. rgyal. pa*). Both of them are reputed translators and a number⁴⁹ of treatises is said to

45 *Aryamañjuśrīnāmāśṭasatukam* in *Kien-Ch'ui-Tsan-Tsan, Bibliotheca Buddhica*, XV, 1913, p. 101. Cf. verses 33, 124-127 of the *Varṇanārhavarṇāstotra* of Matṛceṣṭa in *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. XXXIV, pp. 149 ff). See also titles like *Nirauḥamastotra* and *Aśukyastotra*, (*Op. Cit.*) and the work mentioned in footnote 44.

46 *BCP.*, p. 573; *Cordier*, II, pp. 5,6.

47 *AS.* p. 22: *Nāgārjunapādair apyuktam* (*klu. sgrub. kyi. źal. śna. nas. kyan*).

48 *MV.*, p. 413: *yathoktam ācāryapūḍaiḥ* (*slob-dpon. gyi. źal. śna. nas. ji. skad. du.....gsunis. so*); *MA.*, p. 23: *ji. skad. du. slob. dpon. kyi. źal. śna, nas. kyis.* (*Skt. yathācāryapūḍaiḥ*).

49 See A pp. to *Buddha Gāna o Dohā*, sv.

have been jointly translated by them. Nothing can definitely be said about the date of the former, as he could not yet be identified owing to the fact that there are many persons of the same name (*Kṛṣṇa*). The date of Jayaśīla is, however, known to be the eleventh century A.C., for he was the contemporary of Mahāprabhu Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna.

As to the *Acintya*⁵⁰ and *Stutya*⁵¹ they are jointly translated by the Kāśmīrian Paṇḍita Tilaka⁵⁰ (*thig. le.*) or Tilakakalaśa⁵¹ (*Thig. le bum. 70*) and the Tibetan interpreter Sūryakīrti (*ñi. ma'i. grags.*). The only thing that can be said about them is that they are later than Kṛṣṇa and Jayaśīla as the former are reported to have revised a translation made by the latter.⁵¹

As usual in most of the panegyric hymns, the present work, too, speaks of the dogma and the doctrine propounded by the Buddha. The work written by Ācārya Nāgārjuna, the systematiser of *Sarvāsūnyatā*, is naturally expected to contain the tenets of the Mādhyamika system, nevertheless they are not here dealt with systematically.

PRABHUBHAI PATEL

50 Both of them are identical. See Cordier III, pp. 302-3.

51 *Madhyamakāvataṅgārikānāma. Op. Cit.*

The Eastern Calukyas*

V

Vijayāditya III, Gunaga, etc., (A.D. 844—888).

Vijayāditya bore the surnames of Gunaga, Paracakrarāma, Raṅaraṅgaśudraka, Manujaparakāra, Vikramadhavala, Nṛpati-mārtanḍa, Birudaṅga-Bhīma, Bhuvanakandarpa, Arasaṅkakeśarī, Tripurāmartya-Maheśvara, and Tribhuvanāṅkuśa.¹

These four inscriptions of Vijayāditya's reign have been discovered:

(i) *The Mauslipatam(?) plates.*²

The inscription registers that the king granted the village of Traṇḍa(pa?)ru, in the Gudravāra-ṣaya to the Brāhmaṇa, Vinayādiśarman, an inhabitant of Urpuṭūru. The executor of the grant was Pāṇḍuraṅga, and the writer of the inscription was Kaṭṭa(y)a.

(ii) *The Ponangy plates.*³

The inscription records the grant of the village of Koḍamupporru (together with Poḍegu) to a number of Brāhmaṇas, residents of Poḍegu (or Poḍengu).

(iii) *The Guntur inscription.*

This is an incomplete inscription of the king's reign which was discovered in the Guntur District. The names of the villages granted and the donee are lost with the missing plates. The inscription gives some valuable historical information.

(iv) *The Uruvuṭūru inscription.*⁵

The inscription records the grant of the village of Uruvuṭūru to a number of Brāhmaṇas. The *Ajñapati* of the grant was Pāṇḍuraṅga and the engraver was a resident of Vijayavāda.

* Continued from vol. IX, 3. p. 741.

1 *EI.*, vol. IX, p. 55; vol. IV, p. 226; *SE.*, 1909, p. 108; 1913, p. 125; 1914, p. 84.

2 *EI.*, vol. V, p. 122.

3 *SE.*, 1909, p. 108.

4 *Ibid.*, 1912, p. 84.

5 *Ibid.*, 1913, APP. A, No. 3.

Uruvuṭūru is evidently identical with Uruṭūru, referred to above. Vijayavāḍa may be identified with Bezwada.

Two fragmentary inscriptions⁶ were discovered in the Ongole Taluk. One refers to Bejaya-Gunakanalla, which may be taken as a corrupt form of Gunaka-Vijayāditya. The second inscription reports that the temple, called Vijayaśarman, was erected during the reign of Vijayarāja. Vijayarāja, referred to, may be taken as identical with Vijayāditya III, as in this connection Vijayāditya III's generals Kaṇḍeyarāja and Pāṇḍuraṅga are mentioned. Vijayāditya was a great general. After his accession to the throne, he looked out for conquest and launched extensive military campaigns. He had two able military officers, Kaṇḍeyarāja and his son Pāṇḍuraṅga. Kaṇḍeyarāja was the commander of his army. During the 7th and 8th decade of the 9th century A.D. the Rāṣṭrakūṭas were holding sway nearly over the whole of the Deccan under Amoghavarṣa I Śrīvallabha (A.D. 814-878), whose son Kṛṣṇa or Kannāra was assisting him in the administration as a yuvarāja.⁷ A branch of the Pallavas was holding sway over Nolambavāḍi, modern Chitaldoorg and Tumkur Districts. The Gaṅgas were ruling in Gaṅgavāḍi, roughly the modern Mysore District. Another branch of the Pallavas was enjoying sovereignty in the North Arcot. The Pāṇḍyas won high renown under their leader Varaguna, who extended his sway up to the Pennar river at the cost of the Coḷas of Tanjore. The Kalacuris under their king Kokalla were governing the Dāhalaṃḍala.

Sometimes about this time, Vijayāditya accompanied by his two generals Kaṇḍeyarāja and Pāṇḍuraṅga and his counsel Vinayādiśarman went out for *digvijaya*. In the first phase of the war Kaṇḍeyarāja lost his life. An inscription reports that the above mentioned general died on the battle-field while fighting on behalf of Paracakra(rāma).⁸ Vijayāditya conquered and burnt the city of Nellurapura, modern Nellore.⁹ Next he fell upon the Pallavas of North Arcot, who were then ruled by Aparājita, apparently a successor of Nṛpatuṅga.¹⁰ Ukkala, which was also known as Śivacula-caturvedimaṅgala, was the chief city

6 SE., 1923, pp. 97-98.

7 Bom. Gaz., vol. I, pt. II, p. 411.

9 Ibid., 1914, p. 84.

8 SE., 1909, p. 108.

10 Ibid., 1906, p. 64.

of that Pallava kingdom.¹¹ Vijayāditya defeated the Pallavas and plundered their country. It is stated that he carried away the gold from the Pallavas.¹² He is also said to have burnt Acalapura. It cannot be suggested with certainty whether Acalapura is identical with Ukkala. Conquest of the Pallava country brought Vijayāditya on the border of the kingdom of the Coḷas of Tanjore. The supremacy of the Coḷa dynasty was established in Tanjore by Vijayālaya in 846 A.D.¹³ The Coḷa king was, at that time, hard pressed by the Pāṇḍya Varaguṇa Mārañjadaiyan, the king of Madura. An inscription, dated Śaka 792=870 A.D. was issued in the 8th year of Varaguṇa.¹⁴ Varaguṇa's inscriptions prove that he not only incorporated a part of the Coḷa country into his own kingdom but also advanced beyond it and conquered a portion of Toṇḍai-nāḍu up to the river Pennar (South).¹⁵ When the Coḷa country was thus overrun by the Pāṇḍyas, Vijayālaya appears to have taken shelter under Vijayāditya. An inscription¹⁶ tells us that Vijayāditya espoused the cause of the Coḷa king and gave him shelter. This Coḷa king was, in all probability, Vijayālaya. Vijayāditya succeeded in restoring the Coḷa country to Vijayālaya by defeating the Pāṇḍyas. An inscription credits him with a victory over the Pāṇḍyas.¹⁷ As regards Vijayālaya a record states that he seized the town of (Tanjore) Tañcūpuri as he would his wife.¹⁸

Vijayāditya's success in the south greatly consternated the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and their allies,—the Nolambas of the Chitaldoorg, Tumkur, and Salem Districts, and the Gaṅgas of Mysore. The earliest known king of the Nolamba-Pallava family was Maṅgala-Nolambādhirāja.¹⁹ Cāruponnera, the third king of this line, was a feudatory of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Govinda III. The known dates of Mahendra-Nolamba, the fifth king of the family, are Śaka 800 and 815=A.Ā. 878 and 893.²⁰ He was thus a contemporary of Vijayāditya III. His maternal uncle

11 *SI.*, vol. III, p. 12.

13 K. S. Aiyanger's *Ancient India*, p. 99.

14 *SE.*, Nos. 705-709 of 1906.

16 *Ibid.*, 1923, 839 of APP. B.

18 *Ibid.*, 1906, p. 66.

19 *EI.*, vol. X, p. 58.

20 *SE.*, No. 348 of 1901; *EI.*, vol. X, p. 68.

12 *Ibid.*, 1914, p. 84.


15 *Ibid.*, 1905, p. 54.

17 *SE.*, 1914, p. 84.

was Rājamalla-Vermaḍi, king of the Gaṅga country.²¹ Mahendra in conjunction with Rājamalla fought a battle with the Vaidumbas.²² When the Cālukya army under the leadership of Vijayāditya attacked the country of the Nolambas, the Gaṅgas of Mysore sent army to help the latter. Vijayāditya however had no difficulty in overcoming this odd force. He is said to have killed Maṅgi, the king of Nolambārāṣṭra, in battle. An inscription²³ of the reign of the Cālukya-Bhīma I registers that Vijayāditya cut off the head of Maṅgi in a fight with the Gaṅgas. It also gives us to understand that Maṅgi fomented rebellion among the Gaṅgas against the Cālukyas. Maṅgi appears to have been identical with Mahendra.

Next came the turn of the Gaṅgas. The Gaṅga kings who were contemporaries of Vijayāditya were Satyavākya-Rājamalla and his successor Satyavākya-Butuga. Rājamalla closed his reign in 870 A.D., and his successor in 909 A.D.²⁴ At the approach of the Cālukyas, the Gaṅgas took shelter in their fort, which stood on a hill. Vijayāditya overran the Gaṅga country and reached the border of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kingdom. Amoghavarṣa I deputed his son Kṛṣṇa for offering a suitable defence against the invading Cālukya army. The strength of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas was increased by the Kalacuri army, which was sent by the king Kokalla I under his son Śaṅkaragaṇa. The Rāṣṭrakūṭas and the Kalacuris were closely connected through matrimonial alliance. Kṛṣṇa's wife was the sister of Śaṅkaragaṇa.²⁵ The united strength of

21 *EL.*, vol. VI, p. 66; for the history of the Nolambas cf. *EL.*, vol. VI, p. 64; vol. X, p. 68. The genealogy of the Nolamba dynasty may be put thus:—



22 *EL.*, vol. X, p. 60.

24 *EL.*, vol. VI, p. 69.

23 *SE.*, 1918, p. 132.

25 *IA.*, vol. XII, p. 268.

the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and the Kalacuris was no match for that of Vijayāditya. Vijayāditya won a decisive victory over his enemies at a place called Kiraṇapuri. This city was forthwith burnt by the Cālukya army which then forced its way through the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kingdom. The Ederu grant²⁶ of Amma II states that Vijayāditya "having been challenged by the lord of the Raṭṭas, conquered the unequalled Gaṅgas, cut off the head of Maṅgi in the battle, defeated Kṛṣṇa and Saṅkila, burnt the city (of Kṛṣṇa). The Pithapuram inscription²⁷ of Mallapadeva reports that Vijayāditya III "played the game of ball on the battle-field with the head of Maṅgirāja, frightened Saṅkila, residing in Kiraṇapuri (and) joined by Kṛṣṇa, restored his dignity to Vallabhendra." Vallabhendra, referred to above, may be identified with Amoghavarṣa. The Kalachumbarru grant²⁸ of Amma II states that the Vallabha king paid great honour to the arms of Vijayāditya III. The examination of these evidences point out that Amoghavarṣa, at the outset, ignored the strength of Vijayāditya, but after the latter's victory over his son he esteemed him as a king of great power. The Malayapundi grant²⁹ of Ammarāja states that "Vijayāditya slew in a great battle Maṅgi, the king of the great Noḍambā-rāṣṭra, defeated the Gaṅgas, who took refuge on the peak of Gaṅgakūṭa, and terrified Saṅkila, the lord of the excellent Dā(ha)la, who was joined by the fierce Vallabha." The same inscription further tells us that Pāṇḍuraṅga burnt Kiraṇapura, the residence of Kṛṣṇarāja. An inscription³⁰

26 *SI.*, vol. I, pp. 39, 42.

27 *EI.*, vol. IV, p. 239.

28 *Ibid.*, vol. VII, p. 186.

29 Tat putraḥ Paracakrarāmāparanāmadheyah / hatvā bhūri-Noḍam-barāṣṭrō-nṛpatiṃ Maṅgimāhā-saṅgare Gaṅgānāśrita-Gaṅgakūṭa-śikharān nirjjitya saḍ-D(āha)lādhīsam Saṅkilam ugravallabhayutaṃ yo bhāyayitvā catus-catvāriṃśatam abdakāṃś ca Vijayādityo rarakṣa kṣitiṃ / (*EI.*, vol. IX, p. 51.)

Two stone slabs from the Madanapalle Tāluk of the Chitoor District refer to one Gaṇḍa-Saṅkali, whose brother-in-law died in a battle with the Coḷas at Bireyavalli (*SE.*, 1923, App. B, Nos. 300, 301). The Madras Government Epigraphist is inclined to identify this Saṅkali with the adversary of the same name of Vijayāditya III (*ibid.*, p. 100). But in view of the evidence given by the Malayapundi grant Saṅkila cannot but be considered as identical with Saṅkaraṅga, who was also known as Saṅkuka.

30 *SE.*, 1923, p. 98.

of Vijayāditya's reign lays down that the king deputed Pāṇḍuraṅga for conquest. A second inscription³¹ of his reign reports his conquest of Acalapura, victory over Śaṅkila and Kannara, and the fact of his burning of Kiraṇapura.

An inscription³² of Śaktivarman's reign gives us the additional news that Vijayāditya defeated one Badlega, who may be identified with the prince Baddiga of the Western Cālukya dynasty. His grandson Arikeśarin was the patron of the Kanarese poet Pampā. Pampā flourished in the middle of the 10th century.³³

Vijayāditya's success in other directions was not less significant. He invaded the country which corresponds to the modern Bastar State and burnt its capital Cakrakūṭa.³⁴ The name of the dynasty which held sway over that country about this period is not known. In the 10th and 11th centuries A.D. a Nāga dynasty is found to have been ruling there. The ancient country of Kosala lay to the north of the Bastar State. Vijayāditya III is said to have taken by force the elephants of the kings of Kosala.³⁵ The adversary of Vijayāditya in the Kosala country cannot be identified. The country did not still come under the supremacy of the Kalacuris. We are told that Kalingarāja, a descendant of one of the eighteen sons of Kokalla (A.D. 860-900), the king of Tripurī, having abandoned the ancestral land, acquired by his two arms this country of Dakṣiṇa-Kosala.³⁶ The Gaṅgas of Kaliṅga also felt the brunt of the sword of Vijayāditya. The Masulipatam plates³⁷ of Cālukya-Bhīma records that Vijayāditya took by force the gold of the Gaṅga king of Kaliṅga. The Pithapuram inscription³⁸ of Mallapadeva states that Vijayāditya received elephants as tribute from the Kaliṅga king. The above categories prove beyond doubt that Vijayāditya was a military leader of the highest order. Almost all the contemporary rulers of the south felt the strength of his arms. But his conquests were in most cases followed by incendiarism, rapine and plunder. In course of his military excursions he burnt not less than five great cities of the south.

31 *SE.*, 1923, p. 98.

32 *Ibid.*, 1918, p. 132; *EL.*, vol. V, p. 126.

33 *Bom. Gaz.*, vol. I, pt. II, p. 380.

34 *EL.*, vol. IV, p. 239.

35 *SE.*, 1914, p. 84.

36 *EL.*, vol. I, p. 37.

37 *SE.*, 1914, p. 84.

38 *EL.*, vol. IV, p. 210

Vijayāditya III built a temple known as Bejayeśvaram i.e. Vijayeśvaram.³⁹ He ruled for forty-four years, and closed his reign in 888 A.D.⁴⁰ He had no son to succeed him on the throne. He appointed his younger brother Vikramāditya, also known as Vikramāñka, as heir-apparent,⁴¹ but the latter seems to have predeceased him.⁴² Succession then fell upon Vikramāditya's son Cālukya-Bhīma.

Cālukya-Bhīma I, Viṣṇuwardhana (A.D. 888-922).

Cālukya-Bhīma I performed his coronation ceremony in Śaka 814=A.D. 892 i.e. four years after the date of his accession.⁴³ He bore another name Viṣṇuwardhana, and assumed the epithets of Tribhuvanāñkuśa, Droṇārjuna, Sarvalokāśraya, Parama-Brahmaṇya, and Ṛtasiddhi.⁴⁴

Altogether six inscriptions of Cālukya-Bhīma's reign have been discovered.

(i) *The Aṭṭili inscription, dated Śaka 814.*⁴⁵

The inscription records the grant of some lands in the village of Aṭṭili, situated in the Aṭṭili Viṣaya, to a person on the occasion of the king's coronation ceremony in Ś. 814=892 A.D.

The village Aṭṭili is identical with that of the same name, situated in the Tanuku Tāluk of the Kistna District.

(ii) *The Bezavada plates.*⁴⁶

The object of this grant is to record that the king, on the occasion of his coronation ceremony, granted the village of Kūkiparru, in the Uttara-Kaṇḍeruvāḍi Viṣaya, to a Brāhmaṇa, resident of Ummara-kaṇṭhibol.

(iii) *The Bezavada stone inscription.*⁴⁷

The stone slab bearing the inscription lies near the Govindamaṭha, on the Indrakīla hill at Bezavada, in the Kistna District. It reports that a temple was erected on the Indrakīla by one Caṭṭapa under the

39 *SE.*, 1923, p. 98.

41 *Ibid.*, vol. XVIII, p. 233.

43 *SE.*, 1909, p. 108; 1904, p. 84 *El.*, vol. V, p. 130; vol. XVIII, p. 227.

44 *SE.*, 1918, p. 131.

46 *El.*, vol. V, p. 127.

40 *El.*, vol. V, p. 130.

42 *Ibid.*, vol. IX, p. 55.

1918, p. 131; *SII.*, vol. I, p. 42;

45 *Ibid.*

47 *SE.*, 1918, p. 85, No. 833.

patronage of Viṣṇuwardhana, son of Vikramāditya, in the 17th year of the latter's reign.

Viṣṇuwardhana, referred to above, is identical with Cālukya-Bhīma I. The date corresponds to 909 A.D.

(iv) *The Anakapalle inscription.*⁴⁸

The inscription was discovered in a field in the Anakapalle Tāluk. It is fragmentary. It refers to Cālukya-Bhīma I, and the grant portion mentions Elāmañci-Kaliṅgadeśa, and Devarāṣṭra.

Elāmañci which was situated in Kaliṅga is identical with the modern Yellamancili. Devarāṣṭra is also mentioned in the Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudragupta.

(v) *The Vedatulūru grant.*⁴⁹

The object of the inscription is to record the grant of the village of Vedatulūru, in the Uttara-Kanḍieruvāṭi Viṣaya, to a number of Brāhmaṇas.

(vi) *The Adanki inscription.*⁵⁰

The inscription is engraved on a stone slab lying in a field at Adanki, in the Ongole Tāluk of the Guntur District. It refers to one Tribhuvanāṅkuśa, who was in all probability Cālukya-Bhīma I. It records that Pāṇḍuraṅga granted some lands in Dhammuvuram.

Cālukya-Bhīma, in the first year of his reign, made Pāṇḍuraṅga his commander-in-chief.⁵¹ He had also a general named Mahākāla, who was the son of Gāmakāmba. Gāmakāmba was the daughter of Nāgipoṭi, who was the foster mother of Cālukya-Bhīma.⁵² The early years of the reign of Cālukya-Bhīma were not free from trouble. Kṛṣṇa II, the son and successor of Amoghavarṣa I, invaded the Andhra country. He was accompanied by the Cālukya Baddiga, and the Lāṭa chief, who seems to have been the Mahāsāmantādhipati Akālavarṣa Kṛṣṇarāja.⁵³ All effort on the part of Cālukya-Bhīma for putting a check to the progress of the invaders met with signal failure. The whole of the Andhra country together with the Guntur

48 *SE.*, 1900 p. 108.

49 *SE.*, 1914, p. 84.

50 *EL.*, vol. XIX, p. 275.

51 *Ibid.*

52 *Ibid.*, vol. V, p. 134.

53 *IA.*, vol. XIII, p. 65; *EL.*, vol. XVIII, p. 227.

and Nellore Districts was taken possession of by the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. Kṛṣṇa put his own officers in charge of the numerous forts of that country. Shortly afterwards Pāṇḍuraṅga, the commander of the Cālukya army, rose equal to the occasion, and made brave attempts for rescuing the Andhra country from the domination of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. A series of battles were fought between the Cālukyas and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. A son of Cālukya-Bhīma killed the Rāṣṭrakūṭa general Daṇḍena-Guṇḍaya, but himself met his end in the battle at Niravadyapura. Pāṇḍuraṅga captured as many as twelve strongholds held by one (Vaso)-Boya, and brought under his control all the hill forts in the Veṅgi-naṇḍa.⁵⁴ The Rāṣṭrakūṭas were eventually driven out from the Andhra country, and Cālukya-Bhīma regained its throne. The Pampā-Bhārata reports that Baddiga defeated Bhīma in the battle. Bhīma, referred to, appears to have been identical with Cālukya-Bhīma. An inscription⁵⁵ of Amma I states that Cālukya-Bhīma illumined the Veṅgi country, which had been overrun by the Raṭṭa chieftains, just as by dense darkness after sun set. The Masulipatan grant⁵⁶ of Cālukya-Bhīma I records that the king defeated the army of Kṛṣṇavallabha together with his allies, and that before him fled as darkness before light, the vile kings of Karṇāṭa and Lāṭa. It further tells us that the king's son died on the battle-field of Niravadyapura, having killed the general of the Vallabha king named Daṇḍena-Guṇḍaya from the back of the elephant.

Cālukya-Bhīma I ruled peacefully during the remaining part of his reign.⁵⁷ He was benevolent and generous. An inscription⁵⁸ of Amma I records that Cālukya-Bhīma fulfilled like parents, friend or like a preceptor, the desires of the distressed, helpless, naked and ascetics.

Cālukya-Bhīma ruled for thirty years, and closed his reign in 922 A.D. He had two sons Vijayāditya and Vikramāditya of whom the former succeeded him on the throne.

54 *El.*, vol. XIX, p. 275.

55 *SI.*, vol. I, p. 42.

56 *SE.*, 1914, p. 84. Cf. Anakapalle Taluk inscription, *ibid.*, 1909, p. 108; 1918, p. 131.

57 *Ibid.*, 1909, p. 108.

58 *SI.*, vol. I, p. 42.

Vijayāditya IV, Kollabhiḡaṇḡa (A.D. 922).

Vijayāditya assumed the titles of Kollabhiḡaṇḡa, Gaṇḡa-bhāṣkara, and Kaliyarttyaṅka.⁵⁹ He is described as the ruler of Veṅḡi-maṇḡala and the Trikaliṅga forest.⁶⁰ Not a single inscription of his reign has yet been traced. Bhaṇḡanāditya, also known as Kuntāditya, was his general.⁶¹

The Rāṣṡrakūṡas who were driven out from the Andhra country by Cālukya-Bhīma I continued hostility against the Cālukyas during the reign of Vijayāditya. Vijayāditya fought with his enemies with all his might and after having broken down their power lost his life in an engagement at a place called Virajāpurī. An inscription⁶² of Saktivarman states that a son of Cālukya-Bhīma I planted a pillar of victory at Virajā(purī). An inscription⁶³ of Kulottuṅga Coḡa II reports that Vijayāditya IV died in a battle at Virajāpurī. A grant⁶⁴ of Amma I records that Vijayāditya "having destroyed the crowd of his (father's) foes by the strength of his arm (and through his valour, while his father was still living, and having conquered after (his father's death) the crowd of his enemies, and the association of his external foes by his extensive wisdom—went to Indra, in order to conquer one equal half (of Indra's throne)".

The chiefs of the Paricchedi family, who were vassals of the successors of Vijayāditya, were designated as the lords of the country of six thousand (villages)⁶⁵ on the southern bank of the Kṣṣṣnaverna river i.e. Kistna. A stone pillar inscription⁶⁶ at Prattipadu states that the Mahāmaṇḡalesvara Kusumarāja of this family was the lord of the town of Virajāpurī. Virajāpurī was evidently the chief town of the group of six thousand villages, situated on the south bank of the Kistna.

Vijayāditya ruled for six months only. He had two wives. The first wife gave birth to his son Amma I, and the second one named Melambā was the mother of Cālukya-Bhīma II.⁶⁷ Amma I succeeded his father on the throne.

D. C. GANGULY

59 *EL.*, vol. VI, p. 190; *SII.*, vol. I, p. 43. 60 *EL.*, vol. V, p. 134.

61 *SII.*, vol. I, p. 43. 62 *SE.*, 1918, p. 132. 63 *Ibid.*, 1917, p. 128.

64 *SII.*, vol. I, p. 42, v. 12 65 *EL.*, vol. VI, p. 227; *SE.*, 1917, p. 118.

66 *SE.*, 1917, p. 128. 67 *EL.*, vol. V, p. 138; vol. VII, p. 180.

Damaged Śrīpur Plates

(Containing the Seal of Mahājayarājā of Śarabhapur Dynasty)

In April 1929, at the ancient capital of Mahākosala Śrīpur now known as *Sirpur* in the Raipur District of C.P., we¹ found out two inscribed images—one of Buddha and the other of Śiva. On both the images the Buddhist formula is inscribed in the *Kuṭīla* characters of about the 7th century A.D., as also a broken *Toraṇa* with the Gajalakṣmī figure—the family emblem of the Somavaṃśi kings of Śrīpur.

Mr. Ram Ratan Lal Taluqdar informed us of a find of a set of three copper-plates with a seal, which were being sent to Benares for decipherment through Pandit Banshi Lal Dube. I called on Pandit Banshi Lal Dube at Raipur and saw the seal as well as the three plates, the first of which was partly damaged. The charter belongs to one of the Śarabhapur kings. The legend on the round Gajalakṣmī seal is in a fair condition of preservation and reads as follows:—

प्रपन्नतनयस्येदं विक्रमाक्रान्तविद्विषः ।

श्रीमतो जयराजस्य शासनं रिपुशासनम् ॥

There is nothing special in the text, which is but a true copy of other charters of this family found at Arang and Khariyar—with only the necessary changes of proper names such as of the village granted and the grantees. The names of the village and the district where it was situated, are lost.


The charter was issued from Śarabhapur and the engraver's name was *द्रोणसिंह* who engraved the Raipur and Khariyar plates also.²

In 1932 the Mahākosala Historical Society discovered another very important charter of this family at Thākurdiyā, a village 6 miles to the N.E. of Sarangarh town. This charter has two special features. It was issued not from Śarabhapur like all other charters of the family


1 I was accompanied by Mr. S. N. Lal Agarwala, Pleader of Raipur, and Mr. Ram Ratan Lal Taluqdar of Sirpur Estate.

2 Fleet, *Gupta Inscription*, p. 196; *EI.*, IX, p. 170

(A) Plate No. 1—Reverse




(B) Plate No. 11—Obverse



which have so far come to light but from Śrīpur. The donor was Mahā Pravara Rāja, a son of Mānamātra, as the legend on the seal describes (मानमात्रयुतस्येदं...श्रीमत्प्रवरराजस्य शासनं)

From the Khariyār charter of Mahā-Sudevarāja, we know that Prasannamātra was the father of Mānamātra. In the Mahākosala Historical Society there is a coin belonging to Prasannamātra whose name is engraved in beautiful box-headed characters. All these discoveries help us to give the genealogy of the Śarabhapur kings as follows:—



I reserve my comments on the reign of these kings for a future paper. The text of the charter is given below:—

1. 1 ॐ स्वस्ति शरभपुराद्विक्रमोपनतसामन्तमकु(ट)⁵ × ×

1. 2 प्रभा प्रसेकाम्बुधौतपादयुगलीरिपुविलासिनी × × × × ×

3 A silver coin of this king has been found.

4 The name of this king appears in the seal of Khariyār plates and in the legend of our newly discovered Thākurdīyā Plates of Pravararāja. Mahā Jayarāja was the 2nd son of Parsannamātra as is evidenced from the legend on the seal found in the Śrīpur Plates, which I describe here. Mānamātra had at least two sons. This is noteworthy that both Prasannamātra and Mānamātra assume the epithet 'mātra' instead of 'rāja,' as is the case with other three names, Pravara, Sudeva and Jaya, who have the titles 'Mahā' as well as 'rāja' before and after their personal names. But no copper inscriptions of either (Prasanna or Mānamatra) has yet come to light.

5 As regards the word मकुट in line 1. it appears to be an omission on the part of the engraver. On examination of the original plates discovered at Thākurdīyā, Sarangarh and Arang, I find that the letter म of the word मकुट remains the same in all of them instead of its correct form मु.

Compare: Sarangarh Copper Inscription of Mahā Sudevarāja:—

...राज्य महादेवी राजकुलैः मातापितृरात्मनश्च पुरयाभिवृद्धये

उदकपूर्व^१ etc. दत्तः

(EI., vol. IX, p. 281.)

1. 3 हेतुर्व्वसुवसुधां गाप्रद परम भाग(वतो) × × × × × × × ×
1. 4 नुध्यातश्री महासुदेवराजः व × × × × × × × ×
1. 5 वके प्रतिवासि कुटुम्बि नस्समाज्ञापयति) × × × × × ×
1. 6 यथास्माभिरयं ग्रामस्तृदशपतिसुख × × × × × ×

One thing is remarkable. This plate bears the name of Mahā-Sudevarāja, while the seal contains the name of his uncle Jayarāja. The Taluqdar of Sripur told me that when the charter first came to his hands, the seal and the three plates were all in tact. The ring joining the seal with the plates, was cut by him for taking estampages.

Was it that Jayarāja succeeded his nephew Sudevarāja, and although the plates had been prepared in Sudeva's life time, the charter could have been issued under the seal of his successor? Or was it through mistake that a wrong seal was fastened to a set of plates, there being two sets of seals as well as plates for being issued.

The 1st plate is broken


2nd plate (obverse)

1. 1 यावद्रविशशिताराकिरणप्रतिहतघोरान्धकारजगदवतिष्ठ
1. 2 ते तावदुपभोग्यस्सनिधिस्सोपनिधिरच्चाटभटप्रावेश्यस्सर्वक-
1. 3 रविसर्जितपूर्व्वनम्रपादैस्तैस्तिरीयपाराशरसगोत्रब्राह्म
1. 4 णकारणिककान्वीप्यस्वामिने दत्त[:]दानमप्यस्माभिरज्ञपि
1. 5 महादेवी राजकुलानाविज्ञाप्य स्ताम्ब्रशासनीकृतः ते यूयमे-
1. 6 वमुपलभ्यास्याज्ञाश्रवणविधेयभूत्वा यथोचितं भोगभाग


2nd plate (reverse)

1. 1 मुपनयन्तस्सुखं प्रतिवत्स्यथ । भविष्यतश्च भूमिपालाननु
1. 2 दर्शयति-दानाद्विशिष्टमनुपालनज्ञं पुराणे शास्त्रेषु निश्चित
1. 3 धियः प्रवदन्ति धम्मं । तस्माद्विजाय सुविशुद्धकुलश्रुताय दत्तां
1. 4 भुवं भवतु वो मतिरेव गोप्तुं ॥ तद्भवद्भिरप्येषा दत्तिरनु
1. 5 पालयितव्या व्यासगीताश्चासुक्तानुदाहरन्ति अग्नेरपत्यं प्र
1. 6 धमं सुवर्णं भूर्भेष्यावी सूर्य्यसुताश्च गावः । दत्तास्तत्रस्ते


(C) Plate No. II—Reverse




(D) Plate No. III—Obverse



(E) Plate No. III—Reverse



Back side (3rd Plate)



Legend on the Circular Gajalakṣmī Seal of the
'Thākurdiya Plates of Mahā Pravararājā



Gajalakṣmī seal
(bearing the name Jayarājā)

3rd plate (obverse)

1. 1 न भवन्ति लोकाः यः काञ्चनं गांच महीच दद्यात् । षष्टिं वर्षस
1. 2 हस्त्राणि स्वर्गं मोदति भूमिदः । आक्षेप्ता चानुमन्ता च तान्ये
1. 3 व नरके वसेत् । बहुभिर्वसुधा दत्ता राजभिः सगरादिभिः । यस्य
1. 4 यस्य यदा भूमिः तस्य तस्य तदा फलं । स्वदत्तां परदत्तां वा
1. 5 यत्नाद्रक्ष युधिष्ठिर । महीम्महीमतां श्रेष्ठ दानाच्छ्रेयोनुपाल-
1. 6 नमिति स्वमुखाज्ञया प्रवर्द्धमानविजयमंव ५ द्वि भाद्र दि १०

3rd plate (reverse)

उत्कीर्णं द्रोण सिद्धेण

I read the legend on the circular Gaja-Lakṣmī Seal of the Thākurdīyā Plates of Mahā Pravararāja as follows:—

मानमात्रमुत्स्येदं स्वभुजोपार्जितचित्तेः ।

श्रीमत्प्रवरराजस्य शासनं शत्रुशासनं ॥

L. P. PANDEYA

The Pañcatantra of Vasubhāga

In 1848 the first edition of the *Pañcatantra* was published in Europe by Kosegarten. Eleven years later, Benfey brought out a German translation of this *Pañcatantra*. The later researches of Prof. Hertel have shown this edition to be very uncritical, being based on manuscripts belonging to two different versions. The translation was embellished by Benfey with many notes in which he pointed out parallels in Europe to the stories contained in that *Pañcatantra*, and thus laid the foundation of the science of Comparative Folklore. Since then, numerous articles have been published relating to, and editions brought out by many scholars of, many versions of the *Pañcatantra* written in various languages. Among them, particular mention must be made of Prof. Johannes Hertel who has published the Sanskrit text of several versions of the *Pañcatantra*, and also given a comprehensive account of all the versions known of that book in his *Das Pañcatantra: seine Geschichte und seine Verbreitung* (1914), and of Prof. Franklin Edgerton who has given in his *Pañcatantra Reconstructed* what he considers to be the very wording of the book written by the original author, and also a short history of the better-known versions of the book in the appendix to vol. V of Tawney-Penzer's *Ocean of Story*. Both these scholars agree in thinking that all the *Pañcatantra* versions known to us are derived from a single codex which mentioned Viṣṇuśarman as the author, and which contained the stories of *Sāṅḍilī's Barter of Sesame, Ass in Panther's Skin, Iron-eating Mice*, etc. I shall hereafter call this codex VI.

This opinion is indeed right so far as the *Pañcatantra* versions known to these scholars are concerned. Recently however there have come to light the following four *Pañcatantra* versions that differ markedly from the *Tantrākhyāyikā*, Pūrṇabhadra's *Pañcatantra*, *Southern Pañcatantra*, *Textus simplicior*, and other versions descended from VI:

(1) Durgasiṃha's *Pañcatantra*. This version is written in the Kannada or Canarese language; and I have published a detailed ac-

count of it in the *Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik*, 6, 255 ff. and 7, 8 ff. It was written by Durgasiṃha who was a Great Minister for Peace and War under the Western Cālukyan emperor Jayasiṃha II or Jagadekamalla I (1015-1042 A.D.); and according to a stanza¹ found in a manuscript of the book contained in the Jaina Library at Art the book was finished on Monday, Caitra-śukladvādaśī of the cyclic year Prajāpati [=Saka 953 expired], i.e., on Monday, 8th March, 1031 A.D.

The name of the author of the *Pañcatantra* is given as Vasubhāga in this version.

(2) The *Tantri*, known also as *Tantri Kāmandaka*, *Tantrivākya*, or *Tantricarita*. This is written in Middle Javanese, and three versions of it, one written in prose, and two later ones written in verse, are current in Java.² A synopsis of the contents of these three versions is given by Dr. C. Hooykaas in his dissertation entitled *Tantri-de Middle-Javaansche Pañcatantra-bewerking* which was published in 1929; and a full translation (in the Dutch language) of the prose version was published by the same scholar in 1931.

The name of the author is given as Vasubhāga in one of the metrical versions; and this name Vasubhāga occurs many times in the prose version also as that of the author or speaker of the many Sanskrit verses that are given there.

According to Hooykaas, the *Tantri* was written not later than 1200 A.D.

(3) The Laotian *Pañcatantra*, known also but incorrectly, as *Mulla Tantai*. A synopsis of the contents of this book is given (in French) by Prof. Finot in the *BEFEO.*, XVII, 84 ff. This version too seems to have been written not later than 1200 A.D.

1 See the note published in the Kannada paper *Rāṣṭrabandhu* of 23rd February, 1931 by Mr. M. Govinda Pai. The stanza in question is corrupt and reads as—

ati-saṃpannate-vetta sad-guha-nivāsa-sthānam odā Prajā-
pati-saṃvatsara-Caitra-māsa-sita-pakṣa-dvādaśī tārakā|
pati-vāraṃ bare Pañcttantram esedatt idhātriyol Durga-nir-
mitam.....mada-lilā-puṣpit āmra-drumaṃ||

2 Similar versions written in Balinese, Madurese, etc., are current in Bali, Madura and other islands of the East Indian Archipelago.

The book gives the name of neither the author of the *Pañcatantra* nor of the Laotian translator.

(4) The Siamese *Pañcatantra* or the *Conversations of Nang Tantrai*. A French translation of this book,³ under the title *Les Entretiens de Nang Tantrai* was published by the late Prof. E. Lorgeou in 1924. The redaction used by him of this book (of which several exist) was a late one, written, it is conjectured by him, in about 1750 A.D.; but, as he has himself said, the original collection of which the Siamese book is a translation, is much earlier.

In this book too, nothing is said about the name of the Siamese translator or of the author of the original.

The very fact that the first two of the above-described versions mention Vasubhāga instead of Viṣṇuśarman, as the author of the *Pañcatantra*, shows that they cannot be descended from VI. This is the case with *Tantai* and *Tantrai* also; for, though these versions do not mention that Vasubhāga is the author of the *Pañcatantra*, they are, as pointed out by Hertel on p. 340, *op. cit.* (see also in this connection App. III in the above-mentioned dissertation of Hooykaas), closely connected with the *Tantri* and descended immediately from the same version of the *Pañcatantra* as the *Tantri*; that is to say, the *Tantai* and *Tantrai* too are derived from a *Pañcatantra* version which mentioned Vasubhāga as the author and are not descended from VI.

I have hence, in my article entitled "On the Reconstruction of the *Pañcatantra*" which was published in *ZII.*, VIII, 228 ff. (see also Table IV on p. 31 in *ZII.*, VII), formulated the conclusion that there are two chief recensions of the *Pañcatantra*, that of Viṣṇuśarman, and that of Vasubhāga. By far the great majority of the *Pañcatantra* versions now known to us belong to Viṣṇuśarman's recension and are descended from the archetype that I have called VI. The versions

³ I shall henceforth refer to the last-named three versions as *Tantri*, *Tantai* and *Tantrai* respectively. Likewise, I shall use the abbreviations 'Pañca,' 'Vi', and 'Va' for *Pañcatantra*, Viṣṇuśarman, and Vasubhāga, and the terms 'Vi versions' and 'Va versions' to denote the *Pañcatantra* versions descended from Vi. and Va. respectively, by Va being understood the archetype from which are descended all the versions that mention Vasubhāga as author.

belonging to Vasubhāga's recension are, on the other hand, only four in number, being those described above.

These four versions, it will be noted, are all written in languages other than Sanskrit; and in addition, the *Tantri*, *Tantai* and *Tantrai* are not so much *Pañcatantra* recensions as adaptations (like Nārāyaṇa's *Hitopadeśa*) of the *Pañcatantra*. The discovery therefore of versions of Vasubhāga's *Pañcatantra* written in Sanskrit would be of great value in the study of that book; and as it is not improbable that manuscripts of such versions still exist in private libraries⁴ of Paṇḍits in India, and particularly in that portion of the Deccan which is bounded on the north and south by the Godāvarī and Kāverī rivers, I propose to give here a brief account of Vasubhāga's version of the *Pañcatantra* and the peculiarities that distinguish it from Viṣṇuśarman's version of that work. This account is based on the above-described four works.⁵

1. As in Viṣṇuśarman's *Pañcatantra*, so in Vasubhāga's *Pañcatantra* too, there stands at the beginning a *kathāmukha* or introduction. This introduction however states that the name of the learned Brāhmaṇa who volunteered to teach the principles of the *Arthaśāstra* to the three princes was Vasubhāga-bhaṭṭa, and that he chose for this purpose five stories from that inexhaustible store-house of stories, namely, the *Bṛhatkathā*.

4 Or perhaps in public libraries even whose Sanskrit MSS have not been carefully examined and classified. I know, for instance, of some libraries in which all the *Pañcatantra* manuscripts are given under one heading (viz., *Pañcatantra*) without one word being said to indicate to which version (the *Textus Simplicior*, *Textus Ornatior* or Pūrṇabhadra's *Pañcatantra*, Southern *Pañcatantra*, Southern *Pañcatantra* Amplior, etc.) it belongs. I also understand from inquiries made that it is often the practice of paṇḍits or others entrusted with the work of examining and reporting upon Sanskrit MSS to put on one side all MSS of the *Pañcatantra* as not needing further examination. As a result, it sometimes happens that *Pañcatantra* MSS contained in public libraries too may turn out, on close examination, to contain interesting new stories, or new readings of stanzas and prose passages.

5 It is my hope that it will stimulate such readers of the *IHQ.*, as are zealous in the cause of truth and have access to collections of Sanskrit manuscripts, to examine the *Pañcatantra* MSS found there, and in case they chance to come across MSS of Vasubhāga's version, to publish detailed accounts of them in the *IHQ.* or at least to write to me about them.

The *kathāmukha* in Durgasiṃha's *Pañcatantra* contains an emboxed story; but it is difficult to say if such an emboxed story was contained in the Sanskrit *Pañcatantra* too which was the source of Durgasiṃha's work.

2. The order in which the five Books (*tantra*) occur in Vasubhāga's recension is different from that of Viṣṇuśarman's recension. If we represent the five books of Vi's recension by the letters ABCDE, then the order in which these books occur in Va's recension has to be represented by the formula AECDB. That is to say, the second and fifth books of Vi's recension have changed places in Va's recension and form its fifth and second books respectively.

There is a difference too in the titles of these books. In Vi's recension, they are called *mitra-bheda*, *suhṛt-lābha*, *sandhi-vigraha*, *labdha-nāśa* and *asamprekṣya-kāritra*. Compare the stanza

mitra-bhedoḥ suhṛt-lābhas sandhi-vigraha eva ca |
labdha-nāśam asamprekṣya-kāritram pañcatantrakam ||

That occurs in the *Southern Pañcatantra*. In Va's version, on the other hand, the titles of the corresponding books are *bheda*, *mitra-kārya*, *viśvāsa* (or better *aciśvāsa*), *vañcana* and *parīkṣā*. Compare the stanza

bhedoḥ parīkṣā viśvāśas caturtham vañcanam tathā |
mitra-kāryam ca pañcāite kathās tantrārtha-samjñakāḥ ||

That occurs in Durgasiṃha's *Pañcatantra*.

3. The following stories that belong, according to Edgerton, to the original *Pañcatantra* (i.e., to Vi's version of the *Pañcatantra*) are lacking in Va's version: *The Iron-eating Mice*; *Sāṃdilī's Barter of Sesame*; *Deer's former captivity* (Citrāṅga's story); *Ass in Panther's Skin*; *Elephant, Hares and Moon*; *Old Man, Young Wife and Thief*; and *Cuckold Carpenter*.

4. On the other hand, there are found in Va's versions the following stories that are not found in the (earlier) Vi versions:

(a) *Sage Durvāsas and Dog*. The sage Durvāsas once picked up a stray pup, and taking compassion on it, carried it with him to his hermitage. After a few days had passed, the pup became daring and mischievous and made itself a nuisance. The sage therefore changed

it into a monkey, and as this was still more mischievous, changed it into a deer. In this form however it was pursued by beasts of prey; and therefore the sage transformed it first into a tiger and then into a lion. On the lion beginning to kill the boys of the sages, he became angry, and transformed it again into a dog.

(b) *Ape and Ungrateful Hunter.* A hunter once aimed his arrow at an aged tiger and missed it. Being pursued by the angry tiger, he ran swiftly and took hold with his hands of the low-lying roots of a tree, but was unable to draw himself up. At this juncture, an ape came to his help and drew him up into the tree beyond reach of the tiger. The tiger then attempted to persuade the ape to give up the hunter (i.e., to push him down), but being unsuccessful, went its own way. The ape then went away from the tree in order to bring some fruits to appease the hunger of the hunter; whereupon the wicked man seeing its young ones, reflected that they would provide food for his family for a day or two, and taking them went away.

(c) *Magician who revived dead Tiger.* Once a foolish man who had learnt the art of extracting poison from snake-bitten persons and curing them, went about searching for snake-bitten persons in order to test his own proficiency. When passing through a forest, he saw a tiger there that had died of snake-bite, and set about reviving it disregarding the advice of passers-by not to do so. After he extracted the poison from the tiger and revived it, the tiger got up hungry, ate him and went on its way.

(d) *Race between Garuda and Tortoise.* Garuda once catches a tortoise and wants to eat it. The tortoise however persuades Garuda to enter into a pact that it should be spared in case it proved to be the winner in a race with Garuda (Garuda to fly along the seacoast and the tortoise to swim in the water). Arrangements were accordingly made for the race. The tortoise however held a conclave of his children and grand-children and instructed them that they should all station themselves, one by one, at regular intervals, through the whole length of the race-course, and show themselves and reply whenever Garuda called. This they did; and when Garuda, flying swiftly in the air, called out at intervals, 'Tortoise, where are you?', one of the tortoises would lift up its head and answer, 'Here I am ahead

of you'. Garuḍa thus found a tortoise ahead of him at the winning-post, and had to admit that the tortoise won the race.

(e) *Language of Animals*. The king of serpents once conferred a boon on a king that he would understand the speech of animals, but warned him at the same time that he would die if he disclosed to another what he had thus heard. One day, when the king and queen were together, he heard some ants speaking with one another and being amused at what they said, laughed loudly. The queen inquired the cause of such laughter, and protested that she would die if he did not reveal it to her. The king resolved that it was better that he should himself die after disclosing what he had heard to the queen, and went to the monastery to bestow some last gifts. When going, he heard a stag refuse to undertake a dangerous commission on behalf of his roe and, on the roe saying that she would die in that case, saying, "Then die; better that you should die than I. Do you think that I am like the king who wants to give up his own life to satisfy the whim of his queen?". The king, on hearing these words reflected within himself that even the animals acted more reasonably than he and going to the queen, told her that he would not tell her anything, that she might die if she wanted, and put her away.

(f) *Floating Rock and Dancing Apes*. For synopsis of this story, see *IHQ.*, VII (1931), 516 f.

(g) *No Milk without Milking*. For synopsis of this story too, see *IHQ.*, VII, 518 f.

(h) *Vararuci and Ogre (brahma-rākṣasa)*. The sage Vararuci who was wandering and visiting holy places was once passing through the Dandaka forest when a *brahma-rākṣasa* (ogre) saw him, and desiring to eat him, approached. Seizing Vararuci by the hand, he asked, "What is the way? What is the news? Who is happy, and who is served?" Vararuci, understanding his intention, gave him appropriate answers, and was allowed to go in peace.

5. The stories of *King Kacadruma (Kukudruma)* and of *The Avaricious Jackal* are found in both the Vi and Va versions; but the story-contents differ in each of these versions. The former story, in the Vi versions, is concerned with a jackal who fell in a vat of indigo and therefore became blue-coloured; in the Va versions, it is concerned

with a king named Kacadruma who turned out faithful and trusty servants from their offices, bestowed them on unworthy and incompetent persons, and was abandoned by them when the kingdom was attacked by enemies. The Vi versions relate, in the latter story, that a hunter who had killed a deer and was carrying its body, killed again a wild boar, and was killed by it. The Va versions, on the other hand, relate in this story that a hunter who had killed an elephant was killed by a snake which too was killed by him accidentally when falling.

These are the chief differences that distinguish the Va versions from Vi versions; and as they are such as can be noticed by even a cursory reader of *Pañcatantra* manuscripts, one can thus very easily find out if a MS belongs to Vasubhāga's recension.

A. VENKATASUBBIAH



The Domicile of the Author of Campū Bhārata

Students of Sanskrit are now aware of the existence of a Kāvya entitled Campū Bhārata by Ananta Bhaṭṭa. It was published by the Nirnaya Sagar Press of Bombay in 1919. Therein we are not told anything about the domicile, date and the scholarship of the author. The question of the domicile of the author of the Campū Bhārata, a land-mark in the history of the Campū style, is an important one. Here an attempt has been made to show that he belonged to South India, particularly Karnāṭak.

The Kāvya in question has twelve *Stabakas* and is written in Campū style as the very name of the book indicates. It is verse and prose mixed, a style with which the students of Kannada literature are well acquainted. We do not come across a Campū very often in Sanskrit literature; there are, in fact, a very few Sanskrit Campūs, which may properly be so called, except the Sanskrit dramas if we may so class them. Prof. A. B. Keith says: "The romances contain here and there a few stanzas but they are normally and effectively in prose; and the literary compositions styled Campūs, a name of unknown sense, differ vitally from them in that they use prose and verse indifferently for the same purpose."

Dr. Keith admits that the Campū style in its present technical sense is a later phenomenon. Let us now examine whether it is possible to trace the origin of the Campū style to Dravidian sources. Scholars of Kannada are aware that from the 9th to the 12th century Kannada poets wrote their works in the Campū style. This style is associated with the Jains and looked upon as the Jaina style. We are told of the Brahmin poet Rudrabhaṭṭa the author of the *Jagannāiṣavijaya* following the Jaina style inasmuch as he has written his work in Campū. We are also told that Kannada poets have invariably followed the definition of a Sanskrit Mahākāvya in so far as the eighteen descriptions are concerned. But here I hold a different opinion. Because the Kannada poets have not strictly observed the rule about the continuous metre throughout a *sarga* except the concluding one. We do come across the change of metre

almost at each succeeding verse. To elucidate my point, I may say that Kannada poets, if they use Campakamālā in one verse, use Utpalamālā in another and Mattebhavikrīḍita in the third and so on. In the history of Kannada literature, the Campū style occupied the field more than any other for no less than three centuries. But it is really very curious why this style was not so popular with the Sanskrit poets as it was with the Kannada poets. This question naturally leads us to make the conjecture that this style was foreign to Sanskritists, in the sense that it must have belonged to the Southerners. The process of welding of two cultures is always a slow one, so also is the process of borrowing styles. So naturally before this style became popular with the Sanskrit poets it must have been a very long time.

This is all with regard to the external influence on the style of this particular class of Kāvya.

Let me now turn to some internal evidences. One of these is the peculiar rhyming adopted in certain verses, e.g. in Stabaka I. v. 17.

क्षोणीपतौ यदकलं प्रति कृष्णसारम्
तृणीमुखे पतितपाणिनखाङ्कुरेऽस्मिन् ।
एणीकुलानि तरलैर्यमुनाजलानाम्
वेणीमिवाश्लिबलनैर्विपिने वितेनुः ॥

The second syllables of all the four lines of the stanza are identical. This is a feature universal in Kannada poetry. In the words of Nṛpatuṅga नुतशब्दालङ्कारदो लतिशायमी कन्नडके सततं प्रासम् it is quite essential for Kannada poetry to have the identity of second syllables in all the lines. This phenomenon recurs for more than fifty times in four Stabakas which have in all 332 verses. In Stabaka IV. 27 we have a similar phenomenon, viz. the identity of the second syllables not in all the four lines but only in two. The verse reads,

तिग्मेन त्राणेन जघान तस्मिन् युग्मे नराणामधिपः पुमांसम् ।
वातायुराकारमसौ महर्षेर्जातायुरन्तः सहसाललम्बे ॥

In verse No. 28 also we have just the same thing as in verse 27. In verse 32 also we come across this identity of second syllables in only two lines. Verse 37 is similar to verse 27. The list of verses where we meet with such phenomenon is given below in the Stabaka order :

- Stabaka 1:—17, 27, 28, 32, 37, 42, 61, 62, 68, 72, 74, 77, 83.
 „ 2:—6, 7, 16, 18, 29, 30, 40, 46, 47, 55, 66, 78, 81, 90, 109.
 „ 3:—2, 4, 8, 9, 18, 82, 114.
 „ 4:—14, 20, 31, 32, 48, 60, 64, 67.

This naturally leads us to conjecture that the author of the Campū Bhārata may have belonged to the Kannada country where one of the common characteristics of poetry is the peculiar rhyming of second syllables and that perhaps may be the reason why he is fond of the peculiar rhyming. His birth and surroundings must have naturally influenced his Sanskrit diction.

There are also other evidences to support our conjecture, for instance, we find in the third Stabaka an allusion to a custom prevalent among the Karnāṭaka ladies. In III. V. 34 we are told that Arjuna caught the fragrance emitted by the Cola ladies. The verse reads,

अक्षणां प्रचारादतिवर्तमानमालोकमालोकमसौ पयोधिम् ।

तटेन गच्छंस्तरसोपलेभे चोलीहरिद्रान्सुरभीन्समीरान् ॥

The commentator Rāmabudhendra explains— चोलीहरिद्रान्सुरभीन्समीरान् as follows:— चोलीनां चोलदेश्यांगनानां सखंधिनीभिः हरिद्राभिः मुखकुचादिलिप्ताभिः सुरभीन् सुगंधान् समीरान् वायून् उपलेभे लब्धवान् । चोलदेशं प्रापेत्यर्थः । चोलदेश्यस्त्रोणां प्रयेण हरिद्रालेप इति प्रसिद्धिः । Here we are definitely told of a local practice peculiar to Cola ladies, i.e., of besmearing the cheeks with turmeric powder. Even to this day this practice is prevalent among the South Indian and Karnāṭaka ladies. Nowhere else is it to be found. This allusion to local usage lends support to our conjecture.

There are other important evidences also in the same Stabaka. For instance, while describing Arjuna's travels in the south the poet has waxed eloquent on the existence of cocoanut palms and the river Kauvery in the Cola country. In III. 36 we have,

धृत्वा फलेषु सलिलानि कवेरजायाः साम्यं परीक्षितुमिवाभ्रतरिद्गुणौधैः ।

अभ्रं लिहैर्निविडतां तटनारिकेलैरालोक्य चोलवसुधामयमथ्यनन्दत् ॥

In III. V. 41 there is mention of the various products peculiar to the coast line, showing the familiarity of the poet with these products:

एलालङ्गतहृषिप्लिकापटीरताम्बूलिकाक्रमुकदम्पतिभावरम्याम् ।

उद्यानभूमिमुपगम्य तयाः स पार्थः सुख्यन्पितुः पदममन्यत बल्वजेभ्यः ॥

In III. 46 Gokarna Kṣetra is mentioned. Gokarna is a place of pilgrimage in North Kanara. It is very sacred to the Śaivas. In V. 48 we have been told that Arjuna bathed in the प्रभसतीर्थ which has been identified by Sir R. G. Bhandarkar with सोमनाथपट्टण.

Now considering all these evidences, we find that the poet had a personal knowledge of the southern region.

In I. 83 पट्टाभिवेकमभिलष्यति फालदेशे कुट्टाकभावकुतुकं कुहतेस्म भीम the word कुट्टाक is very important. The commentator explains it as कुट्टाकभावे मुष्टिकुट्टने. Rev. Dr. Kittel in his preface to Kannada--English Dictionary gives a list of words borrowed in Sanskrit from Kannada among which this is one. The very sound is un-Sanskritic and it is rarely found in the works written by genuine Sanskrit scholars. Here also we can trace the influence of vernacular over his vocabulary. Perhaps some scholars may explain away the use of this word as necessary for the sake of rhyming. In that case also they will be admitting the same influence inasmuch as the rhyming of the second syllable is universal in Kannada poetry.

In III. 123 we find शङ्कुलीरिव चचर्व कृशानुः. The commentator explains शङ्कुली as चक्राकृति भक्ष्यविशेष. शङ्कुली may be the Sanskritised form of चक्कुली of Kannada. In III. 106 क्षुत्प्रपीडयति मामयि वीरौ कुक्षिमेत्य चकितेव युवाभ्याम् there is a trace of vernacular construction. क्षुत् कुक्षिमेत्य does not sound well to the Sanskrit scholars' ears. But we meet with such construction in Kannada. For instance, people often say thus हसिबु वन्दु नन्नन्नु पीडिसुत्तदं. This will perhaps explain the un-Sanskrit nature of the phrase in question.

I shall now venture to place before the reader the most important piece of evidence to be found in II. V. 91:

ताटङ्के तरलमणिप्रभातरंगे तन्त्रंग्या मुखमभितस्तदा व्यभाताम् ।

मूर्तत्वं प्रकटमुपेत्य जागरुके वर्णे द्वे नयनविषाठयोरिवान्ते ॥

The commentator explains the meaning of वर्णे द्वे as ठवर्णे इव He further on says बहुदेशलिपिषु ठवर्णस्य मध्यबिन्दुकत्व-वर्तुलत्वदर्शनात् तत्त्वेन ताटङ्कयोर्दृष्टप्रेक्षा. Such मध्यबिन्दुकत्व can be found in Kannadaठ.

Trilingual Inscription (1734 A.D.)

Devipur is a village on the east bank of the river Bhāgīrathī, situated about 7 miles north of the city of Murshidabad in Bengal. Close by on the other bank of the river, stands the village Baranagar, associated with the memory of the famous 'Rānī Bhavānī' of Natore. During the earlier years of the 18th century, Devipur was the resort of religious men and mendicants from various parts of the country and contained several monasteries locally known as *ākḥṛās*. A few of these *ākḥṛās* are still existing and it is in one these that this inscription was discovered by me about ten years back.

The inscription is engraved on a thick hard black stone measuring about 28" × 14" × 7". The four borders of the rectangular slab are decorated with floral design. A dividing line runs through the middle of the stone and the lower half is again sub-divided into two compartments. In the upper register, there are five Hindi verses in four lines whereas the lower left-half contains six lines in Bengali prose and the right-half six lines of poetry in Persian. In addition to these there are the names of several Hindu deities recorded in the middle of each of the four ornamental border lines.

The inscription is in an excellent state of preservation and is now deposited in the Nabar Museum, Calcutta, by the courtesy of Mahant Ganapatidas Goswami, the High priest of the *ākḥṛā*. The record bears the date Samvat 1791 in Hindi, Śakābdā 1656 in Bengali and Hijri 1146 in Persian corresponding to 1734 A.D. It also bears the name of Gandharva Siṃha as the donor of a temple and a well.

The Trilingual inscription is unique inasmuch as it contains the three current languages of the country in their respective characters.

From the texts of the inscription we obtain the following facts: In the year 1791 of the Vikrama era on the third day of the new moon in the month of Vaiśākha corresponding to 1656 Śaka era and 1146 A.H. Rājā Gandharva Siṃha bought a piece of rent-free land to the south of village Devipur adjoining to village Bahadurpur, erected a temple of Viṣṇu (Hari), caused a well to be dug there and dedicated them to the god as an act of religious merit. The area of the plot is mentioned as measuring twenty-two *bighās* and eight *kāṭhās*, having on

the west the river bank, on the north Devipur, on the south and east Bahadurpur. In all the versions of the text we are told that the purchase was made from the wife of one Ratneśvara. The versions in Hindi and Bengali mention that the plot formed part of a garden belonging to Ratneśvara's wife while the Persian version speaks of the land as *lakhrāj* (rent-free) and that the same belonged to Išvarī Devī, widow of Ratneśvara, a Brāhmaṇa by caste. The scribe's name Rāmakṛṣṇa is noted in the Persian text.

The villages of Devipur and Bahadurpur still exist, and the tablet has been found in the former. I have not yet been able to find out the name of Gandharva Siṃha in any of the available annals of Bengal. The name is also no longer remembered by the people of the locality. Nevertheless it is certain that he must have been an important personage of the time. In Hindi he is designated as Nṛpa and Mahārāja. The Bengali text gives the full name as Mahārāja Gandharva Siṃha Bāhādar while in the Persian he is styled as Rājā Gandharva Siṃha only. Thus there is no doubt about the fact that he was one of the notable men of the province and therefore it may be possible to trace his line of descent. But from what we can gather from the inscription, it is probable that Gandharva Siṃha was not a Bengali. The reason is that the names of the four gods inscribed on the borders are not generally invoked by Bengali Hindus. These are Vāsudeva, Gaṇeśa, Raghunātha and Lakṣmaṇa. Excepting Gaṇeśa, the other names do not find favour with the Bengalis. These deities are more popular with the Hindus of Bihar and the United Provinces. Raja Gandharva Siṃha therefore must have been either a native of Bihar or some other country of the north. But the dialect of the Nāgarī text is clearly Maithilī. This fact coupled with other considerations suggests that Gandharva Siṃha possibly belonged to some district on the north of the Ganges in Bihar. There are even at the present day several landholders in Bengal specially in Murshidabad District, who claim their descent from families of other provinces.





The different eras mentioned in the Inscription

The Hindi verse begins with Vikrama Samvat, the most popular era in inscriptions, the Bengali text mentions the Śaka era while the


text in Persian gives both the Hijri era and the Regnal year, without the name of the reigning sovereign. The last date is mentioned as the 9th Shawwal of Hijri 1146 and the 16th year of the Jalus, which refers to Muhammad Shah, the reigning emperor at Delhi. The Governor (*Suba*) of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa at that time was Nawab Sujah-u-din Mahomed Khan and his capital was at Murshidabad. Gandharva Simha may have some connection with the court at Murshidabad where he was possibly living at the time. Devipur, not far from the metropolis, must have been at that time, a great religious centre and was therefore selected as the site for the dedication of temples and wells.

Orthography of the Hindi and Bengali texts

As already pointed out, the Nāgarī inscription which occupies the upper half of the slab is in Maithilī. The use of 'u' is very prominent. The corrupt spelling, due either to carelessness or ignorance of the scribe, is also noticeable in several lines of the text. The word 'nma' inscribed in the lower border is a striking illustration of such mistakes. The use of 's' (dental) is found in place of 'ś' (palatal) as, in Vaisāṣa, Ratanesura, Vīsa. In the next place, 'ṣ' frequently occurs in place of 'kha' thus vaisūṣa, ṣusi, ṣāli. The use of 'nu' peculiar in Maithilī and Bhojpurī is found along with the use of 'u' in such words as, saṃvatu, asthānu, bāgu, sumrana and mandilu. In ūttar, we come across a gross mistake of the scribe who adds 'u' to 'ū' in the third line. Like Prakrit, the use of 'n' for 'ṇ' is also obvious in such words as sumrana, parimāna, nibāna. The use of 'l' in place of 'r' in the word 'mandilu' in the fourth line is also not commonly found.

As to the orthographical peculiarities of the Bengali text the following may be noted. In the first place short 'i' has been used for long 'ī' e.g. in the second line 'stri' has been put for 'strī' in the third line, 'devi' for 'devī', for 'tī' in tritiyā 'ti'; 's' is used for 'ś' as also for 'ṣ' in such words as saka for śaka, vaisāṣa for vaisākha, sola for ṣola. But 'ṣ' and 'ś' are also used for 's'; thus māṣa for māsa and divaṣe in place of divase. The use of 'tri' for 'trī' in tritiyā is also interesting as it illustrates an old and corrupt form. Similarly the use of 'u' for 'ū' is also found in two places of the text, viz., in lines 4 and 6, where purva and kupa are used for pūrva and kūpa. The old form of writing 'ra' in Bengali as found here, is now obsolete and it is only current in Assam. Similarly the old forms of writing the words , ,  and  as found here, are also changed

Trilingual Inscription (1734 A.D.)



मंगलशुभकरैवसाधमासस्यदितीजाश्रीरामाधर्ममिंदुभूमोत्तरेनेशोममवोवीमोदुवपुत्रिअथोत्तम
 स्वाध्यापनातीप्रान्तभूमिस्त्रिनासादीश्रीहिसुभनूकाथप्राप्तोनशुकोनामिनयेयापुमावापरमानाथ
 प्रोपिमदप्रान्तमेयथपुत्रिअडानाश्रुतदेववापुत्रसपदिमभमात्रालोमडवदुदुपुत्रिणीबहून
 प्रवधानिावीषावीमपत्सप्रदेसाठविसगारिमानाहामिंदुवोन्व्यानिवास्मात्पानिमानाप्रान्ता

मंगलशुभकरैवसाधमासस्यदितीजाश्रीरामाधर्ममिंदुभूमोत्तरेनेशोममवोवीमोदुवपुत्रिअथोत्तम
 स्वाध्यापनातीप्रान्तभूमिस्त्रिनासादीश्रीहिसुभनूकाथप्राप्तोनशुकोनामिनयेयापुमावापरमानाथ
 प्रोपिमदप्रान्तमेयथपुत्रिअडानाश्रुतदेववापुत्रसपदिमभमात्रालोमडवदुदुपुत्रिणीबहून
 प्रवधानिावीषावीमपत्सप्रदेसाठविसगारिमानाहामिंदुवोन्व्यानिवास्मात्पानिमानाप्रान्ता

श्रीरामवापुत्रसपत्न्या

and replaced by different forms of कु, ङ, ल न्य as we find in modern writing and printing. In line 5 we find s̄ac̄ā for śac̄āna through the mistake of the scribe. The word most probably stands for modern Bengali chāppāna.

TRANSLITERATED TEXTS

Borders (In Nāgarī Script)

(Top) Śrī Kṛṣṇā Vāsudevju sadā sahai.

(Left) Śrī Raghunāthāya namaḥ.

(Bottom) Śrī Ganesāya namaḥ Śrīḥ.

(Right) Śrī Lachmanāya namaḥ.

Upper Half (In Nāgarī Script)

1. Sambatu 1791, Vaisāṣa māsa sudi tīja, / Śrī Nṛpa Gandharva Siṃha bhuya molale vayau dharmakovīja / Devapurī asthānu ya
2. ha vāgu gaṅgake tīra / jara ṣarīdi tīno soī Śrī Harisumra-
nako dhīra / Ratanesurakī nārīne dayau ṣusī kar mola : tha-
3. ri ropi mahārājane dharmapurī aḍola : ūttara Devīpura vase
pachima gaṅgā āli : meḍa Bāhādurpura lagī dachina
4. pūraba ṣāli : bīghā visa para doya hai āṭṭha vise parimāna
Hari mandilu kīnho tahā vādhyau kūpa nivana. 5.

Lower Half-Left (In Bengali Script)

1. Om Śrī Māhārāja Gandharva Siṃha Bāhādur Ratne
2. sarera stri sthāne bāga haite baiṣa bīghā āta
3. kāṭṭhā iha pāścīme Gaṅgāra āli uttare Devīpu-
4. ra purva dakṣina Bāhādurapura jara kharida laiyā
5. Sakābda Solāṣa s̄ac̄ā(nna) sane Vaisākha māsera a-
6. kṣayatrītiyā divaṣe Hari-mandira o kupa dilā.

Lower Half-Right (In Persian Script)

1. Rājā Gandharva Siṃha Bāhādur Bāgha karadanda jara
kharīda Śuda namuda andara habelī cāhasīrī afajīda.
2. me girapht aja nijda musamāta Tsvari devyā cobu da ahaliye a
Ratanesara junnāradāra mutabbaf bajuda.
3. bistau do bīghā moyāji hasta bisoye lākharaja, hadda magha-
riba auja dariyāye mouja dara mouja mijaj
4. Pūra Bāhādura hara do suda masarika o junuba dārada
jamīna, tā Sumāl hadda Devīpura mokerara Śuda, amīn
5. aja tawārikha nahuma Šabbāla daha u Šas sanah jālusa yaka
hajāra ū yakasada u cehala u Šas Hijri manuṣa
6. Aja khat Rāma-kṛṣṇa.

TRANSLATION (*Borders*)

- (Top) May auspicious Kṛṣṇa Vāsudeva ever help (me).
 (Left) Obeisance to auspicious Raghunātha.
 (Bottom) Obeisance to auspicious Gaṇeśa auspicious.
 (Right) Obeisance to auspicious Lakṣmaṇa.

(Nāgarī text)

1. The blessed king Gandharva Siṃha sowed the seed of meritorious action by purchasing land on the third day of the new moon in the month of Vaiśākha in 1791 Vikrama era.

2. The garden-land in Devapurī (literally, abode of the gods) was situated on the bank of the Gaṅges and the sober king (Gandharva Siṃha) bought the same with money (value) for the prayer of god Hari (Viṣṇu).

3. The wife of Ratneśvara was paid the price to her satisfaction and Mahārāja (Gandharva Siṃha) thus laid the foundation of something of a permanent nature in that auspicious place.

4. To its (garden-land) north there was the town of Devipur, to the west was the bank of the Gaṅges and on the southern and eastern boundaries there lay the village of Bahadurpur.

5. The area of the land was 22 bighas and 8 bisas (kāṭhās) and there a temple of Hari (Viṣṇu) was caused to be erected and a well excavated.

(Bengali text)

Om : The blessed Mahārāja Gandharva Siṃgh Bahadur purchased from the wife of Ratneśvar 22 bighas 8 kāṭhās of garden-land, bounded on the west by the bank of the Gaṅges, on the north by Devipur, on the south and west by Bahadurpur, and dedicated a temple to Hari (Viṣṇu) and caused a well to be excavated, on the third day of the new moon in the month of Vaiśākha in the 1656th year of the Śaka era.

(Persian text)

Rājā Gandharva Siṃgh Bahadur purchased land for cash and dug a well of drinking water in the garden which he bought from Musammāt Iswarī Devyā, the widow of Brāhman Ratneśvar. The garden contained 22 bighas 8 kāṭhās rent-free land having the course of the river Gaṅges on its western boundary, on the eastern and southern, the village of Bahadurpur, and on the northern, the village of Devipur. The date was the 9th of Shawwal 1146 A. H. the 16th year of the Jalus (regnal year). By the pen of Rāmakṛṣṇa (it was written).

The Purānic Traditions

(about earlier homes and migrations of the Indian Āryas)*

111

Division of the Southern Hemisphere and Oceania

Nāga Loka or the Indian Archipelago

The Southern Hemisphere too was similarly divided into Nāga Loka, the seven Pātāla countries and the Naraka land. To the south⁶⁶ of India, in the Indian Ocean there were many small hilly islands rising on the peaks of a mountain range called the Vidyutvān range, inhabited by a short statured people of cloud-blue colour enjoying short life, living on green fruits, roots, herbs and foliage like monkeys and cows. Besides these islands there were numerous small ones forming the Varhīadvīpa Varṣa and six other islands inhabited by various classes of people and containing mines of different metals and gems. The names of these six islands are (1) Aṅgadyīpa (? Berneo); (2) Yama⁶⁷ or Yavadvīpa (?Java); (3) Malayadvīpa (? Malayan Peninsula, or, Celebes and Malacus Islands); (4) Śaṅkhadvīpa and Kumudadvīpa (? Siam and Cambodia or New Guinea); (5) Kūśadvīpa (Coos island) and (6) Varāhadvīpa (? Philippine or Australia). Of these, the Aṅga dvīpa was full of Mleccha and other population, had a hill called the Cakra Mountain which contained numerous Nāga abodes, and, was regarded to be in the middle⁶⁸ or heart of the Nāga countries. The high beautiful Malayadvīpa, the land of gold and silver mines and of sandal forests, inhabited by many kinds of Mlecchas, had the Mahāmalaya⁶⁹ *alias* Mandāra mountains which had the hermi-

* Continued from vol. IX, p. 885.

66 Vā., 48; Bd., 52; cf. Rām., IV, 40 and 41.

67 Vā., (48, 19) calls it Yama, but Bd., (52, 19) and Rām., (IV, 40, 29-32) call it Yava.

68 Bd., 52, 17-18; Vā., 48, 17-18.

69 Bd., 52, 21-30; Vā., 48, 20-29 cf. Itś., III, 46, 57-62; Mat., 163, 74-78, cf. also Rām., IV., 40, 25; 41, 34-35.

tage of Sage Agasti and of many Siddhas. The Śaikhadvīpa also was inhabited by many kinds of Mlecchas and contained the palace of a Nāga king Śaikhā-Mukha. The Kumudadvīpa was inhabited by many pious people. In the Varāha island lived various tribes of Mlecchas and other nationalities. It was highly prosperous, and contained extensive rice fields and a beautiful hill called the Varāha from which flowed the river Vārāhī. The people here were worshippers of the Varāha incarnation of Viṣṇu.

Pātāla Continent

The Pātāla group⁷⁰ of countries or islands began from the Eastern⁷¹ sea but it is more definitely located as situated in the naval or heart⁷² of the Nāga Loka. It was pre-eminently the land⁷³ of the Nāgas and Asuras, and the latest order of the Asuras called the Daityas and Dānavas etc. after their defeat by the Devas of the continent were driven out to, and forced* upon it as permanent settlers under the custody and protection of Varuṇa who at the time was the overlord⁷⁴ of the major part of it. Pātāla region is described in glowing terms as the land of pleasure, peace, prosperity and happiness. The *Svarga* countries were no match to it in respect of health, wealth and beauty. The climate here was ever temperate and pleasant. It had seven divisions viz.— (1) Atala (2) Vitala or Sutala (3) Nitala (4) Talātala or Gabhastimita or Gabhastala (5) Mahātala (6) Śrītala or Rasātala and (7) Pātāla. The second Pātāla, i.e. Vitala is the land⁷⁵ of Aśvaśirā *alias* Hayagrīva where the Vedas received substantial development. The seventh Pātāla lay to the west of all, contained the capital of Vāsuki, called the Bhogavatīpura and also contained the charming populous abode of

70 For a description of the Pātāla countries *vide* Viṣ., II, 5; Bhāg., V, 24; Mat., 246; Vā., 50; Bd., 54; Br., 21; Mbh., Ud. 98-103.

71 *cf.* Mbh., Ud. 108, 12.

72 Mbh., Ud. 99, 1

73 Bhāg., V, 24, 8; Br., 214. 5; Bd., 54, 55; Vā., 50, 54. Viṣ., II, 5, 4; Mbh., Ud. 99, 1, 15; 100, 1.

* Mat., 47, 215, 63, 212, 233; 131, 5. Vā., 97, 99; 98, 68, 80, 86.

74 *Cf.* Mbh., Ud. 99, 11; 98, 15-17; 110, 3; Sabhā. 9.

75 *Cf.* Mbh., Ud. 99, 5; *cf.* Bd., 54, 22; Vā., 50, 21; *cf.* also Mbh., Ud. 99, 13-14

Bali. At the lowest or farthest end of this Pātāla there lived Ananta or Śeṣa Nāga of white-red colour, who was the personification of the Tāmasa nature of Nārāyaṇa, the creator, the progenitor of Rūdras and Agnis, and the emperor over all the Nāgas. Apparently this Ananta flourished in the southern part of South America or in the Antarctic region. The Pātāla continent contained many living⁷⁶ volcanoes. Presumably owing to the ravages of these volcanoes, the major portions of it have long sunk below the sea level⁷⁷ and is now beyond recognition.

Naraka Land

According to the *Viṣṇu* (II, 6, 1) Naraka region lies below the sea. The *Bhāgavata* (V, 26, 4-6) says that it is included in the three worlds (Svarga, Marttya and Pātāla) and is situated⁷⁸ in the extreme southern part of the earth, and, is surrounded with water. It is the name of a particular tract of the Pitṛ kingdom where the Pitṛganas of the *Agnisvātā* sect live and where the Yama with his *gaṇa* (tribe) holds his court of judgment. It is included in this earth (*ibid.*, 40) and is 99000 *yojanas* distant, and the route lies through a barren sandy hot desert with no trees or drinking water in the way to remove the fatigue of the weary traveller (*Bhāg.*, III, 30, 20-25). Both the *Mahābhārata* (Van., 199) and the *Brahma Purāṇa* (22, 214) give almost identical description with the exception that the distance according to them is 86000 *yojanas*. According to the *Matsya* (169, 13) it is in the neighbourhood of the Daitya and Nāga countries, i.e. the Pātāla continent, and, according to the *Harivaṃśa* (III, 12, 13) it is below the Pātāla land.

Originally Naraka appears to have been selected⁷⁹ for the deportation and incarceration of persons not observing the *Varṇāśrama dharma* and violating other social and moral laws.

76 Cf. *Mbh.*, Ud. 98, 18; 99, 17-19; cf. also *Mbh.*, Van. 188, 70-73.

77 The *Imperial Gazetteer of India* (Vol. I, pp. 298 and 381) makes casual references to a submerged Lemurian Continent, now under the Indian Ocean, in the south, which may be equated with the submerged Pātāla Continent, but the account of the *Gazetteer* is too meagre for any definite statement.

78 The *Rāmāyaṇa* (IV, 41, 44-45) also corroborates this.

79 Cf. *Vā.*, 56, 74-75; *Bd.*, 61, 71-72.

Now, the Purāṇas unanimously declare⁸⁰ that in the winter solstice, when the sun rises at the Amarāvati town, the capital of the Indra, it is midnight at Sañjāmanapura, the capital of Yama, sunset at Sudhā, the capital of Varuṇa, and midday at Vibhāvārī, the capital of Soma. When the sun rises at the capital of Varuṇa, it is midnight at Vibhā, and sunset at Amarāvati. When it is midday at Sudhā, the capital of Varuṇa, it is sun-rise at Vibhāvārī, midnight at Amarāvati, and sunset at Sañjāmanapura. This gives a very rough idea about the location of the capitals of four ancient important races, viz. the Devas, the Yama-Pitṛs, the Vāruṇas and the Soma Pitṛs. They are nearly 90° longitude apart from each other. Taking Amarāvati situated approximately on 110° East, Sañjāmanapura falls nearly on 20° East, Sudhā on 70° West, and the Vibhāvārī on 160° West. But this is only a very rough calculation.

Of the Purāṇas, the *Vāyu* and *Brahmāṇḍa* are considered to have best preserved the ancient ideas about the Pitṛs. "The fullest account is in the *Vāyu* and *Brahmāṇḍa* which are practically identical. The *Harivaṃśa* agrees closely therewith so far as its shorter version goes and a similar but brief account is given in the *Matsya* and *Padma* which are almost alike. Similar accounts are found elsewhere."⁸¹

N. TRIPATHI

(To be continued).

80 *Ibid.*, 55, 40-50; *Vā.*, 50, 94-105; *Mat.*, 121, 27-35; *cf.* *ibid.*, 11, 8, 8-17; *Bhāg.*, IV 21, 7-12.

81 Pargiter, *Ancient Indian Historical Traditions* p. 46.

MISCELLANY

A Further Note on the Origin of the Bell Capital

One of the corrections made by Dr. Coomaraswamy in his last note on the subject,¹ is that he did not say 'that the lotus supports of (the chamfer reliefs) at Bharhut had been meant to represent pillars (p. 215 of my paper)'. This is certainly true of his paper on 'Sri-Lakṣmī', where he assumes the identity of only the bell capitals with the *Padmapīthas* of the reliefs, both in regard to form and symbolism.² But in his first note on the lotus capital, he claims that "the lotus pedestal or seat (*padma-pīṭha*, *padmāsana*) represent one and the same form as seen (a) in the round, and (b) in profile, serving in both cases as a support, while (c) the same expanded lotus flower is represented in innumerable medallions, etc. These three aspects of the lotus are mutually explanatory. Naturally, the stalk can be seen in the full round or profile views; in the full round instance, it is represented by the shaft of the column."³ It will be noticed that the learned scholar concludes by extending the identity of the bell capitals with the lotus supports, as suggested earlier by him, to the Dhvaja-pillar as a whole, distinguished by such a capital. I doubt if the same position is maintained in his second note, where he claims only that 'both the pillars and the chamfer reliefs illustrated the use of the lotus as a support.'

Exception may, indeed, be taken to the curt way in which my deduction referred to above, was dismissed. But Dr. Coomaraswamy's views, as clearly defined (*supra*) in his second note, are liable to the construction that Dhvaja-pillars with bell capitals, or the latter by themselves and the lotus supports of Bharhut are two distinct sub-classes of lotus supports.⁴ But so long as the symbolic significance is supposed to be common to the entire class, we are required to find an explanation for the fact that the same figures, of men and women,

1 Origin of the Lotus Capital, *IHQ.*, vol. VII, (1931), pp. 747-50.

2 *Eastern Art*, vol. I, no. 3, (January, 1929), p. 179.

3 *IHQ.*, vol. VI, no. 2, June, 1930, p. 373. (Italics mine).

4 Such a conclusion is untenable, for if the Bharhut supports are symbolic at all, they must be regarded as truly pictographic representations of the supposed symbol and not as a sub-class of lotus supports.

of beasts, birds and flowers are not associated with both the subclasses. In the paper on "Śrī-Lakṣmī," again, Dr. Coomaraswamy offers to explain "why despite its seeming frailty," the lotus should "have come to be represented as the support of figure, such as those of deities or of divine animals." But it still remains to be proved that all the lotus supports of the chamfer reliefs have a symbolic significance, and that all the animals represented thereon are divine in character. Furthermore, it has been shown by me that the *Dhvaja-stambhas* are an entirely distinct class of objects, having nothing whatsoever to do with the Vedic cosmology of water.⁵ Dr. Coomaraswamy's rejoinder is that "the lotus must have been used as a general support symbol in and before the Maurya period," and that his theory "regards the lotus capital as simply the termination of a shaft, and not as a *cihṇa*."⁶ Is it not legitimate to infer from this that the definite connection of Śrī with the lotus in early iconography is of no specific significance? Perhaps that would be contradictory to his interpretation of the lotus support of deities and divine animals, viz. that "the lotus is the waters, and all things are born of the waters," "thou Earth art the back of the Waters," (*Yajur Veda*, IV, 1, 3 and 2, 8, and *Ś.Br.* VII, 4.1.8), even "this Earth lies spread on the Waters" (*Ś.Br. ibid.*) He denies having said that "the Vedic lotus

5 See *IHQ.*, VII, pp. 238-44. My translation of *Mahābhārata*, IV, 46, 3-6, on p. 242 may be inaccurate but that does not affect any of my conclusions. See my paper 'On the Dhvaja or Standard in India,' read before the Nineteenth Indian Science Congress and published in the *Morning Star*, Patna, for May-June, 1932, pp. 179-188. Dr. Coomaraswamy makes too much of the Lotus capitals of the Garuḍa Dhvajās of Bharhut, when there are so many others which do not exhibit the particular decoration.

6 *IHQ.*, vol. VII, no. 4, p. 748. Why not as a secondary symbol upholding the *cihṇa* above?

7 Śrī, 'who was born from a lotus springing from Viṣṇu's forehead,' is described as "*Padmasthā*." Brahmā, likewise born from a lotus, springing from the navel of Viṣṇu, is described as '*Kamalāsanastha*' - (*Bhagavad-Gītā*, 11. 15, *Brahmānamam īsam kamalāsanastham*). Śaṅkara's interpretation, viz. "*kiṃ ca Brahmānam caturmukham īsam-Ītāram prajānām kamalāsanastham pṛthivī padmāmadhye merukurṇikāsanastham ity arthaḥ*," justifies Mr. Havell's views about the World-Lotus, which are rejected by Dr. Coomaraswamy as of late origin, (vide his first note).

symbolism had a direct bearing on the animal standards."⁸ But I should recall his earlier remark (*Śrī-Lakṣmī*) that "the fundamental conception" (of the lotus symbol) "expressed in late Vedic literature and in early iconography is that of the waters as the support, both ultimate and physical, of all life, and specifically of the earth, whence there follows naturally the use as *āsana* and *pīṭha*. Thus, whatever the relation of the early bell capitals to Persian types may be thought to have been, it is certain that Indian symbolism provides a fully adequate explanation of the general form."⁹

The other interpretation of the lotus symbol is that of Foucher, Waddell, Havell, Hocart and Moret, according to whom it is primarily concerned with divine birth, of the "renaissance" of the deified dead in heaven, of the rebirth of the king symbolized in his consecration, of miraculous births, in short of generative force,¹⁰ which is also asso-

8 *IIIQ.*, VII, p. 748. I admit that he does not specifically refer to the animal standards. But cf. "The Chamber reliefs representing elephants supported by lotus flowers are of interest as analogous both with the elephants of the *abhiṣeka* types, and with the capitals of Maurya and other early stambhas." *Śrī-Lakṣmī*, p. 179.

9 Cf. "Early literary sources will be found to yield a satisfactory explanation of the use of the lotus as support.....The original symbolic significance of the lotus, as representing the waters which support the earth is very clearly stated, and there is no need to invoke the later mystical ideas about a world lotus and *maṇḍalas*." (Compare Note 6, where Śaṅkara on *Gītā*, 11. 15, is cited). --*IIIQ.*, VI, 2, p. 374. Again on foot note 1, *loc. cit.*, we are told that "there are more 'Vedic' elements in early Indian art than has yet been realised. To take another example" (he means an example other than the lotus support): "the inverted vessel is already used as a rain-cloud symbol in the *Iti-veda* (V. 85, 3-4), and appears as such, held in the trunks, of the dig-gaja of the *abhiṣeka* of Śrī Lakṣmī, in the second century B.C." Also, cf. "I have myself shown (in *Eastern Art*, 1928, p. 179 that the cosmic concepts underlying the use of the lotus as a support are already present in the Vedas."—*Rūpani*, April-October, 1930, p. 3. "The 'bell capital'is altogether too much unlike the Persepolitan form to be a direct loan, while on the other hand the morphology is clearly and readily explainable from Indian Vedic sources (cable moulding-stamens, abacus=pericarp, the whole bell-capital=padmapīṭha; "the lotus means the waters."—(*S.Br.*, VII, 4. 1. 8), vide *Journal of the Amer. Orient. Soc.*, vol. 51, p. 58.

10 Foucher, A.—*The Beginnings of Buddhist Art*, Paris, 1917, p. 21, n. 2.

Waddell, L. A.—*Lotus (in Buddhism) in Hastings' Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. VIII, 1915, p. 144; on the 'Om Maṇi' formula; *ibid.*, vol. VII, 1914, pp. 555-56.

ciated with lotus pools. Numerous texts illustrate the lotus in the above light, or as the haunt of spirits or divine beings.¹¹ In the ritual for the birth of Agni—Sun,¹² the lotus leaf represents the

Macdonell, A. A.—*Lotus (Indian)*. *Ibid.*, vol. VIII, pp. 142-144.

Havell, E. B.—*Indian Architecture*, London, 1927, pp. 15-16, 99.

Hocart, A. M.—'The Throne in Indian Art,' in *Ceylon Journal of Science*, Section G, vol. 1, 1924-28, pp. 117-118.

Moret, Alexandre—'Le Lotus et la naissance des dieux en Egypte,'—*Journ. Asiat.*, May, 1917, p. 499 ff.

11 *S.Br.*, VII, 3. 2. 14; 4. 1. 13. Agni takes refuge in the lotus leaf. *Atharva Veda Samhitā*, X. 8. 43. (Translation by W. D. Whitney, Harvard Oriental Series, vol. 8, Cambridge, Mass, 1905, II. p. 601). "The lotus flower of nine doors, covered with three strands (*Guṇā*)—what soulful prodigy (*yukṣa*) is within it, that the brahman-knowers know. According to Keith, in the mythology of modern Hinduism, "even flowers may be infested with ghosts."—*Mythology of all Races*, vol. VI, p. 249. In the Tet festival in Annam, the dead ancestors are invited to eat and drink their fill, when the altar of the ancestors is surrounded with flowers, among which the most conspicuous is the lotus. Frazer, Sir J. G.—*Adonis, Attis, Osiris*, 1914, vol. II, pp. 62-64. For Japan, see Hastings' *Encyclopædia*, vol. VI, 1913, Flower, p. 51. Cf. The external soul in flowers, "The Peasant who became king—Mackenzie, D.—*Egyptian Myth and Legend*, p. 44 ff; Frazer.—*Golden Bough* (abridged edition), London, 1923, p. 674.

12 In *Ṛg-veda*, VI, 16. 13, Agni is brought forth by Atharvan by rubbing from the Puṣkara or lotus flower. *Puṣkara* signifies *Puṣkara-parṇa* or lotus leaf, "*Puṣkaraparṇe hi Prajāpatiḥ bhumim aprathayat; tat puṣkaraparṇe aprathayadili, Srutah | Bhumiśca Sarvajagatū ādhārabhūteṭi puṣkaraparṇasya sarvajagaddhākataram—(Sūyāṇu).*" *Ātra puṣkaraśabdena puṣkaraparṇanāmā-lhidhīyata iti*/. See Macdonell, A. A.—*Vedic Mythology*, Strassburg, 1897, p. Cf. Ananikian, M. H.—*The Mythology of all Races*, vol. VII, (Armenian), 1925, pp. 43-45.

I do not think Dr. Coomaraswamy has done justice to the texts he quotes. IV. 1. 3. of the *Taittirīya Samhitā* of the Black Yajur School (translation by A. B. Keith, Harvard Oriental Series, vol. 19, Cambridge, Mass., 1914, pp. 292, note 4, & 293) is translated as follows:—

- (c) Thou art the back of the waters, expansive, wide,
About to bear Agni, least to be laid aside,
Growing to might as the lotus flower,
Do thou extend in width with the measure of heaven.
- (d) Do ye expanding be united;
Bear Agni of the dust.
- (g) Thee, O Agni, from the lotus,
Atharvan pressed out,
From the head of every priest.

womb of the god. This is explained not only by the fact that the lotus opens its petals as the Sun's rays touch them at the break of day and closes them at sunset, but also by the Indian physiological concepts, according to which the "uterus is shaped like a lotus flower which expands during the menstrual period and retains the semen, affixed to the ovum, and floating about in the catamenial blood." (*Agni Purāṇa*—Dutta, 341, 7-10). "Just as the petals of a full-blown lotus flower are gathered up (*saṃkucati*) when the day is over," says Suśruta in his *Samhitā* (*Śarīrasthāna*, III. 7), "so the uterus of a woman is shrunk (*saṃvriyate*) after the lapse of the menstrual period." In the hymn to the Aśvins (*Rg.*, V. 78.7) the

The Mantras IV. 1. 3 for the collection of clay for the fire altar are explained in V. 1. 4. (*Ibid.*, pp. 394-95) where we are told, "He gathers with a lotus leaf; the lotus leaf is the birth place (*yoni*) of Agni. Verily he gathers Agni with his own birth place." In IV. 2. 8 we have, "Thou art the back of the Waters, the birth place of Agni," (*Ibid.*, pp. 320-21) and again in V. 2. 6. 5, "He puts down a lotus leaf; the lotus leaf is the birth place of the fire; verily he piles the fire with his own birth place" (*Ibid.*, p. 410).

The *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa*, VII. 4. 1; 7-11 are translated by J. Eggeling as follows:—

(7) ".....He then puts down a lotus leaf (in the centre of the altar site); the lotus leaf is a womb: he hereby puts a womb to it (for Agni to be born from).

(8)the lotus means the waters and this earth is a leaf thereof: even as a lotus leaf lies spread on the water, so this earth lies spread on the waters. Now this same earth is Agni's womb, for Agni (the fire-altar) is this earth, since thereof the whole Agni is built up: it is this earth he thus lays down.....

(9) (He lays it down with Vāg. S. XIII, 2). "The waters' back thou art, the womb of Agni," for this earth is indeed the back of the waters, and the womb of Agni;—"around the swelling ocean," for the ocean indeed swells around this earth;—"growing great on the lotus;" that is, "growing, flourish thou on the lotus,"—"spread out with the extent, with the breadth, of the sky!" With this he strokes along (the leaf),—for this Agni is yonder Sun, and no other extent but that of the sky is able to contain him: he thus says (to the leaf), "Having become the sky contain him!"

(10) He then puts down the gold plate thereon. Now this gold plate is yonder Sun.....

(11) He puts it down on the lotus leaf;—the lotus leaf is a womb; in the womb he thus places him (Agni). Cf. *S.Br.*, VI. 4. 2. 2; VII. 3. 1. 9; VIII. 6. 3. 7.

stirring of the unborn babe, which has completed its tenth month, is compared to the ruffling of the Puṣkarinī or pool of lotuses by the wind.

According to *Taitt. Br.*, I. i. 3. 5ff., in the beginning there was only water and a lotus leaf standing erect out of it, when Prajāpati dived in the form of a Boar, rose up with a fragment of the earth and spread it on the lotus leaf, whence originated the universe. Agni was one of the gods born from the lotus. In the *Satapatha* ritual, the lotus leaf (=the sky-womb of Agni-Sun), deposited on the black antelope's skin (=Earth), have both of them to be touched, whereby concord is established between them "bearing within the brilliant, the everlasting . . . Agni." (*Ś. Br.*, VI. 4. 1. 8-12). The lump of clay (=the seed) is deposited within the lotus womb (VI. 4.1. 7), the lotus leaf being tied round it with a string, whence the seed kept within the womb does not escape. (*Ś. Br.*, VI, 4.3. 6-7). A gold plate is laid below the lotus leaf, Agni being thus placed within the womb. Brahmā, Śrī and Avalokiteśvara are other divinities produced on the lotus. According to *Taitt. Āraṇyaka*, I. xxiii. 1, when the universe was still fluid, Prajāpati was produced on a lotus leaf. Semi-divine beings similarly born are Padma-Sambhava of the Tibetan legends, a spiritual son of Amitābha, and Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī, a missionary of Buddhism in N. China. Vaśiṣṭha, the son of Mitra and Varuṇa, "born of their love (manasaḥ) 'or Uryaśī'" (Griffith) was laid by the Viśvedevāḥ on a *puṣkara* (*Rg.* VII 33. 11). In the *Āsaṅka Jātaka* (No. 380), "a being of perfect merit fell from the heaven of the Thirty-Three and was conceived as a girl inside a lotus in a pool; and when the other lotuses grew old and fell, that one grew great and stood." The seven steps taken by the new born Buddha are symbolized by the lotus. In the *Śrāvastī* miracle, the Buddha, sitting on a lotus created by the Nāga kings, Nanda and Upānanda, produced an array of lotuses with Buddhas seated on them. Susimā, the mother of the sixth Tīrthoṅkara, Padmaprabha, longed before his birth to sleep on a bed of red lotuses, with the result that her son was always of the colour of the red lotus, which he took for his emblem. In *Alambusā Jātaka* (No. 523) the nymph Alambusā had her navel marked with down like lotus filaments, the navel being regarded as "a procreative centre in various late Vedic texts,"

(Coomaraswamy, *Śrī-Lakṣmī*, p. 179, n. 8). The *Saudharma Puṇḍarīka*, the larger *Sukhāvati-Vyūha* (40-41) and the *Amitāyur Dhyāna Sūtra* (20, 23ff.) describe the miraculous rebirth in the Sukhāvati heaven on and through the lotus (cf. *Ś. Br.*, X. 5. 1-5). The lotus throne is explained by the ritual which makes the king, when sitting down on the throne, enter a womb which is the sky "in order to be reborn as the Sun high above his subjects."

"Thou art the back of the waters, the birth place of Agni" (*Ś. Br.*) refers to the concept of the Waters as the mothers of the god. Urvāṣī the Apsarā, who had been parted from her human mate by the Gandharvas, met him on the bank of a lotus lake called *Anyataḥ plakṣa*, where the Apsarases were playing in the shape of aquatic birds (*Ś. Br.* XI. V. 1). When it is recalled that the Gandharvas are lovers of women; that they inhabit the banyan and the fig trees and 'are asked to bless a wedding procession as it passes them;' that "with the apsarases they preside over fertility; and those who desire offspring pray unto them;" and that the apsarases "appear in constant conjunction with water, both in rivers, clouds, lightning and stars," the lotus pool and its swans associated with Śrī Lakṣmī appear clearly to be symbolic of fertility.¹³ According to the *Matsya Purāna*, 158, 26-41, the Fire god drank the emission of Śiva, which burst open his body and gushed forth as molten gold, whence originated a lake with golden lotuses. Thither repaired Pārvatī with her companions, played in the waters of the lake, adorned her coiffure with the flowers and sat down on its border, desirous of a drink. The Kṛttikās brought her the water from the lake in a leaf of the lotus plant, and the child she gave birth to on drinking it was called after them 'Kārttikeya'. Queen Madanasenā of the *Kathākośa* saw in a dream a lake adorned with a multitude of lotuses.

13 This revises my opinion that "the swan found on the vase and lotus medallions of Bharhut and also in the *Abhiṣeka* type of Śrī as represented in the Orissa caves is no more important than its association with the lotus pool" p. 215 of my paper. But I still maintain my conclusion that the "birds and animals on the lotus supports must have been designed with decorative intent on the lines of the Śrī and the Mithunas, in which the lotus may have an iconographic significance.

When the time was fully come, a son was born to her, called Padma-keśara. One of the dreams of Triśalā, when she conceived Mahāvīra, was about a lotus lake "whose flowers were licked by bees and mad drones." The water of the lotus lakes of the Sukhāvati heaven is characterized by the eight good qualities, among which are fertilizing qualities and productiveness. Pre-eminently a 'life giver', many healing powers were attributed to the lotus, and it features as an important ingredient of various drugs prescribed in the Hindu pharmacopœa (e.g. the *Boicer Ms.*). Secondly, it came to be regarded as an emblem of plenty and prosperity etc., and a relief on the Besnagar Kalpadruma shows it, giving birth, as it were, to coins. It is no wonder, therefore, that it should have been used as an offering to various deities and should itself be an object of veneration. Thus in the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, a golden lotus acquired from a Rākṣasī, which was "as it were, the lotus with which the presiding Fortune of the Rākṣasa's treasure plays, torn from her hand," is placed by a king in a beautiful silver vessel and dedicated in a temple made by him. The idea of representing deities as seated or standing upon the lotus or holding it in their hands, might have, therefore, originally referred to their miraculous births from the lotus, or to their magical powers as bestowers of fertility. Thus, a woman who seeks a fair son or daughter need only pray to Avalokiteśvara, who bears a lotus in his left hand, to secure her desire." (cf. *Amitāyurdhyāna Sūtra*, 24).¹⁴ The same must be the significance of the Mithunas of the Bharhut pillars standing on lotuses. From quite an early date, however, the idea must have been losing in strength. So that, at Bharhut, we have many instances of the decorative use of the lotus seat or pedestal. Thus in a given case the character of the lotus seat or pedestal,

¹⁴ Macdonell & Keith, - *Vedic Index of Names & Subjects*, I, 163, 536; II, 9; Keith, *Mythology of All Races*, VI, Boston, 1917, (Indian) pp. 278, 212, 94-95, 201; Sinclair Stevenson, *The Heart of Jainism*, pp. 24, 52; Tawney, *Kathāsaritsāgara*, vol. I, Calcutta, 1880, pp. 215-17; *Kathākośa*, London, 1895, p. 146; Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, pp. 85, 137. (Cf. Frazer - *Adonis, Attis, Osiris*, 1914, vol. I, p. 93). - The Baganda (Central Africa) belief that women can be impregnated by banana flowers.

symbolic or otherwise, can only be determined when the mythology or theology comes to our aid.

If the campaniform capital of the Dhvaja pillars and the battle-ensigns (supposing they were thus embellished), be interpreted as the lotus symbol, the connection between the fertilising powers of the lotus (symbolic of the womb) and the protecting genii which inhabit the Dhvajās, sometimes taking part in battles, would still remain a mystery. The lotus appears in the same role in Egyptian as in Indian mythology and iconography,¹⁵ and the British

15 Alexandre Moret, - *Le Lotus et la naissance des dieux en Egypte* - see *supra*. The conception of the lotus as a symbol of miraculous birth had already been systematized by the theologians of Heliopolis during the 5th dynasty (3000 B.C.). Ra, Nefertoum, Horus, Osiris, Horus the child, the four children of Horus, the four gods of the horizon, Bes are figured as seated or standing on the lotus. Some goddess hold in their hands lotiform sceptres; while Maat, Quedit, Nekhebit, Hekit come out of a lotus. Isis and Hathor carry lotus ornaments. Idem *The Nile and Egyptian Civilization*, London, 1927, pp. 70, 123-124 (fig. 33), 129, fig. 53), 370, p. VII, fig. 1, 389, 422. *Mythology of All Races*, vol. XII, 1918; Maxmüller, (Egyptian), pp. 12-13, 39-40, 50, fig. 48, 140-141, 156. fig. 163. *Ibid.*, vol. V, Boston, 1931; Langdon, (Semitic), pp. 29-30, fig. 13; Mackenzie, *Egyptian Myth and Legend*, pp. 186-7, 312; Petrie, Hastings' *ERE.*, VIII, p. 142, Lotus (Egyptian). For a carved wooden portrait head of Tutankhamen (discovered in his tomb by Mr. Howard Carter), representing him as "the young Sun-god emerging from a lotus flower which sprang out of the primeval waters when creation took the place of chaos", see *Illustrated London News*, May, 23, 1931, frontispiece. For the head of a lotus standard with a seated figure of Horus (Harpocrates), see Budge, E. A. W. - *British Museum Guide to the 4th, 5th and 6th Egyptian Rooms and the Coptic Room*, 1922, no. 95 (Harpocrates), also no. 94 (Bast), (see pp.54, 175-77, 275-76). For survival, distribution, etc. - Idem, *Amulets and Superstitions*, London, 1930, pp. 129, 206-207. Gisela Richter, *Catalogue of Engraved Gems of the Classical Style*, - The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 1920, No. 185, (Graeco-Roman). Walters, *Catalogue of the Engraved Gems and Cameos, Greek, Etruscan and Roman in the British Museum*, London, 1926, Orientalising gems Nos. 358, 359, 362, 379, 387, 388: Italic gems of Hellenizing style - 1021 (Eros issuing from lotus flower with fruits (?) in his hands): Graeco-Roman gems & pastes, 1476, 1754, 1791, 1797, 1798, 2874, 3084, 4066; Pryce, *Catalogue of Sculptures in the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities of the British Museum*, vol. I, pt. I, London, 1928, B. 329, 358, 456, 457; pt. II, 1931, C. 237-9, 336. Perrot and Chipiez, *History of Art in Phoenicia*, vol. II, London, 1885, fig. 148 and pp. 228-9, fig. 175 and pp. 245-46, 292, fig. 271 and pp. 348 ff., fig. 206 and pp. 269-70, 354-55, also figs. 272, 274,

Museum exhibits the head of a lotus standard with an effigy of Horus. But the Indian Śrī, Agni, Brahmā, etc., do not appear on the lotus standard. A pair of Garuḍa figures kneeling back to back on the lotus seat, evidently from the top of a Dhvaja column of mediæval date, are known from Bengal.¹⁶ But according to the myths, Garuḍa though connected with the solar cult, was born from an egg (*Mbh.*) and not from the lotus,¹⁷ so that his association with the sun flower is not specific. In this case the lotus seat does not retain the original symbolism of the lotus-womb, and no symbolic significance can be attached to the lotus capitals of the Garuḍa-dhvajas of Bharhut.¹⁸

276 and pp. 358-59 fig. 335 and p. 397. For Egyptian influence in Syrian Lotus decoration - *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. II, p. 330. Perrot & Chipiez, *History of Art in Chaldea and Assyria*, London, 1884, vol. I, pp. 303-307. Dalton, *The Treasure of the Orus*, London, 1926, p. xxvii, Nos. 38, 89-93, 103, 208. Farbridge in his *Studies in Biblical and Semetic Symbolism* (Trübner's Oriental Series), London, 1923, pp. 45-46 opines that "from Egypt this symbolism spread to India and the Far East." Cf. D'Alviella--*The Migration of Symbols*, Westminster, 1891, pp. 28-31. Two vases decorated at the base with a row of lotus petals have been discovered at Mohenjodaro,--Marshall, *Mohenjodaro*, p. 222, pl. lxxxvii, 2. I do not know of its symbolic use in the Indus civilization.

16 *ASIR.*, 1926-27, p. 209, pl. xliii, fig. E.

17 Fausboll, *Indian Mythology according to the Mahābhārata*, London, 1903, pp. 77-80. Cf. Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 152. - The Sun conceived as a bird, twice as Garutmat.

18 The placenta and the umbilical cord feature on certain Egyptian standards. The beliefs that the fortune of the individual is bound up with one or other of these portions of his body, so that if his navel string or placenta is preserved and properly treated, he will be prosperous; or that it is the seat of his double, or the haunt of his guardian spirit, are still extant. The man's navel-string is sometimes used as an amulet in war or when travelling. "In ancient Mexico they used to give a boy's navel-string to soldiers to be buried by them on a field of battle, in order that the boy might thus acquire a passion for war. No such connexion exists between the lotus symbol and the standards. Crawley, *The Mystic Rose*, [ed.-J. Besterman] London, vol. I, pp. 151-152; Frazer, *Golden Bough, Magic Art*, etc., vol. I, London, 1911, pp. 182-201; Adonis, *Attis, Osiris*, vol. II, London 1914, p. 158 n; *The Golden Bough* (Abridged), London, 1923, pp. 39-41.

The decorative variations from the standard form of the bell capital are explained by Dr. Coomaraswamy as due to the 'subordination of meaning to ornament', which is a part of the normal development that takes place in any art.' On this principle the earlier we go back in the life history of a design, the truer should we expect it to be the original motif to which the symbolic significance was attached. But, in the present case, we find that lotus capitals which can be readily recognized as such, do not occur before the Śuṅga period, so that the Mauryan capitals with their characteristic decoration remain unexplained. On the other hand a perfectly satisfactory explanation is offered by the diffusionist hypothesis. In the alternative we may assume with Mr. Havell that the Mauryan bell-capital was nothing more or less than the attempt of a foreign craftsman imbued with Hellenic ideas to represent the Indian lotus symbol¹⁹ and regard the Śuṅga lotus capitals as instances of reversion to the original Indian sign for the same.²⁰ In that case we would be called upon not only to determine the ideological value of the sign and the nature of its bearing upon the *Dikraja-stambhas*, but also to account for the composite capitals with the lotiform abacus as well as the undecorated bell-capitals of early architecture.

Nor can morphological considerations be left out of account. Unfortunately I find that like my other arguments the morphological divergences between the lotus supports and the bell-capitals, to which I drew attention in my last paper, have failed to convince Dr. Coomaraswamy. In the circumstances I can only emphasize the fact that there are a number of undecorated bell-capitals in early architecture, which demand that the solid shape of the moulding should be considered independently of its ornamentation. That the Achæmenian architects, too, attached greater importance to the solid shape of their campaniform base than to its ornamentation, is proved by the fact that the decoration of the Achæmenian prototype of the Mauryan capitals is only a modification of pattern which is applied elsewhere, (e.g. on the lower member of the capital), as well as by the existence of a

¹⁹ Havell, *Himalayas in Indian Art*, London, 1924, pp. 11-12; A. K. Mitra, *IIIQ.*, vol. V, no. 4, December 1929, pp. 695-96.

²⁰ A. K. Mitra, *loc. cit.*

class of bases in Achaemenian architecture having the same outline, but differing in ornamentation.²¹ (Fig. 1).

A. K. MITRA

21 Cf. Perrot and Chipiez, *A History of Art in Persia*, 1892, figs. 31, 32, 44, 190, 209-10.

Considered in this light, the diffusionist hypothesis has to maintain that the Mauryan craftsman took over the solid shape of the moulding (which, as Perrot and Chipiez remark *apropos* the Egyptian campaniform capitals, resembles the general lines of the family of the *campanulaceae* rather than to that of the *nyctagaceae* infra, pp. 129-30) from Achaemenian architecture, confining themselves in respect of ornamentation to a particular design, which was popularly imitated, as on the Taxila Cup.

The solid shape is not without its parallel in ancient architecture. I refer to a certain abnormal type of capital in the Festival Hall of Thutmosis III at Karnak having the solid shape of suspended bells (fig. 2), which probably comprise "an imitation of a kind of club or sceptre," (Cf. *Illustrated London News*, May 7, 1932, pp. 767-69). Perrot & Chipiez, - *A History of Art in Ancient Egypt*, London, 1883, vol. II, pp. 86-88, 104, 115-16, 120, 123; Capart, Jean, *Egyptian Art* (Dawson), London, 1923, p. 127, Pl. XIII, fig. 14. It is for specialists in Achaemenian architecture to determine whether the particular type of capitals supplied the motif for the Achaemenian bases. The scheme of decoration is the same on both, but the themes are different. Though the Record of the Building of the Palace at Susa (Dar. Sus. 1) specifically mentions the Ionians and Sardians as the stone masons working on the stone pillars (= *Stuna*, lines 45-49), the Egyptians seem to have had some share in designing the entire structure. "The artisans who the structure wrought, those were Medes and Egyptians" (lines 49-50). Kent, Roland, G. - The recently published old Persian Inscriptions, *Jour. Amer. Orient Soc.*, vol. 51, p. 189 ff.

Rene Grousset's observation on the foreign influences operating on Mauryan art may be interesting in this connection....."With this Achaemenid inspiration," says he, 'not only was Persia to make her influence felt in India, but so, too, were the various types of art from which that of the Achaemenids had drawn its inspiration: firstly Assyro-Babylonian Art (cf. C. L. Fabri - "un Element Mesopotamien dans l'art de l'Inde," *Journal Asiatique*, Paris, 1930), which influenced the representation of animals, and afterwards Egyptian art, which affected the column, while even the Greek art of Ionia had its effect upon the technique of the bas-relief; the diluted Hellenism which is subtly evident in the sculpture of Asoka may be traced to this indirect source, as well as to the coming of Seleucid workmen, which is equally possible." Rene Grousset, *India* (Civilisation of the East, vol. II, translated by C. A. Phillips, London, 1932, p. 86); Also Carotti, Dr. G.—*A History of Art*, vol. I, London, 1908, p. 344. "This new art.....is therefore the result of a local elaboration of absorbed and assimilated ancient Persian elements (therefore also of some of Egyptian and Chaldaeo-Assyrian origin), mostly in the capitals, which bear figures of animals."




Fig. 1

Pillar base. Hypostyle hall of
Xerxes. Eastern Portico. Persepolis
—Perrot & Chipiez




Fig. 2

Capital from the work of
Thothmes at Karnak.

Home of Āryadeva

The present writer did not expect that an advanced scholar like Pandit Vidhushekhar Sastri would rush to print just for the sake of reaffirming a statement, which the present writer was not prepared to accept without further evidences and into which in the course of a review of a book he had not the opportunity to go in detail. Many scholars before Pandit Vidhushekhar had made the statement that Āryadeva was the son of a king of Ceylon, and all of them derived their information from the Tibetan sources. With full knowledge of this fact, the object of the present writer was to throw some doubt on the statement that Āryadeva was a Ceylonese, his chief reason being that the Ceylonese chronicles nowhere speak of Āryadeva, nor of any king whose son was Āryadeva. The life-story of Āryadeva is a pure myth. He is said to have been born out of a lotus and adopted by a king whose dominion was known in Tibetan as *Scñ-ga-glin* (vide Taranath, Tib. text, p. 66). Candrakīrti or perhaps the Tibetan translator of his commentary wrote *Scñ-ga-la* for *Scñ-ga* (vide Taranath, *loc. cit.*). Buston (Obermiller's *Transl.* II, p. 130) also writes that Āryadeva was born "in the island of Sindhala in the petals of a lotus flower and was adopted by the king of that country." Likewise in the *Pag Sam Jon Zang*, the name of the country of Āryadeva is said to be *Scñ-ga-la*. Taranath and Buston clearly admit that though they have drawn their information from many sources, one of their principal sources was *Mañjuśrī-mūla-tantra*. A tentative edition of the Sanskrit original of this work was published a few years ago and has made it possible for us to check the Tibetan renderings here and there. In this work (vide p. 651) occurs the following stanza about the home and residence of Āryadeva :

अपरः प्रव्रजितः श्रेष्ठः सैहिकपुरवास्तवी ।

अनार्या आर्यसंज्ञी च सिंहलद्वीपवासिन ॥

The corresponding Tibetan passage (Kg. rGyud, XI, 472 b. 1.1) is:

gshan. yañ. rañ byuñ. dam. pa. ni
 siñ. gha. la. yi. groñ. na. gnas
 hphags. pa. min. la. hphags. pañi. miñ
 siñ. gha. la. yi. gliñ. na. gnas.¹

To put this in English: 'Another excellent self-born (sage) will appear in the town (groñ=*pura*) of Simhala. He though not an ārya will bear the name of ārya and dwell in the country (gliñ=*dvīpa*) of Simhala.

Buston has quoted this passage in his work. It is rendered by Dr. Obermiller (II, p. 114) thus:

"Moreover a holy monk
 Will appear in the villages of Simhala
 And though not a Saint, he will bear the name of Saint
 And have his abode in the island of Simhala."

A glance over the original Sanskrit text and its Tibetan rendering reveals that a confusion was made by the Tibetan translators between the words 'Simhaladvīpa' and 'Sainhikapura' which seems to be a misreading for *Sainhikapura*, a word derived from *Simhapura*. The Sanskrit text shows that Āryadeva belonged to *Simhapura* but he lived for some time in Simhaladvīpa.

In the Tibetan renderings, the first Simhala is said to be a *groñ*, which is used always for *pura*, hence the Tibetan *Mañjuśrīmūlatantra* and *Buston* mean that Āryadeva was born not in *Simhaladvīpa* but in Simhalapura, which is apparently due to the careless transliteration of *Sainhikapura* appearing in the Sanskrit original.

Gliñ in Tibetan, it must be admitted, is used invariably for *dvīpa*, hence *Señ-ga-gliñ* is *Simhadvīpa*. The word *dvīpa*, however, should not always be taken to mean an island, e.g. in *Viṣṇudvīpa*, *Badaradvīpa*, *Candradvīpa*, *Suvarṇadvīpa*, *Dhanaśrīdvīpa* (vide *Pag Sam Jon Zang*, Index, pp. xv, xxiv, c, cxlii). Hence *Señ-ga-gliñ* or *Simhadvīpa* need not necessarily be an island.

The present writer still entertains a hope to find out that Simhala-

1 The only difference noticeable between the original and its translation is the word *rañ. byuñ* (=svayambhū) instead of *Pracrajita*.

dvīpa is the name of a place in northern India, with which Ceylon was closely connected, as is the case with the name of many towns and provinces in Indonesia.

In any case, there is no doubt that Aryadeva was born in Simhapura. It is a well-known place of the north-west. Yuan Chwang also associates with it the name of Aryadeva. It is located at 700 li south-east of the Taxila district (vide Watters, I, p. 249). From Yuan Chwang's testimony and that of the *Jātaka* and the *Mahāvastu*, it is evident that Simhapura was not an insignificant place in the eyes of the ancient Buddhists. In the *Jātaka* (no. 422) occurs the tradition about the building of cities: Hatthipura, Assapura, Sīhapura, Uttara-pañcāla and Daddarapura. Sīhapura or Simhapura was a neighbouring kingdom of Hatthipura, apparently the well-known Hastināpura. In the *Mahāvastu* (II, pp. 95, 98) Simhapura is mentioned as the capital of king Sucandrima and is located near the Himalayas not far from Hastināpura. It is very likely the same Simhapura, to which the *Jātaka* refers, and of which Yuan Chwang speaks in his account. In the same work again (III, pp. 432, 238); two other Simhapuras are found mentioned, one a town of Kalinga and the other the home of Sākya-muni Tathāgata. In the *Mahāvastu* also Sīhapura is described as a town on the border of Kalinga. So from these evidences it appears that there were in ancient India at least two *Simhapuras* one in the north-west and the other in Kalinga.

In support of the present writer's surmise expressed in the review (*IIIQ.*, IX, p. 610) that Aryadeva's home should be sought for somewhere in the north, attention may be drawn to the following statements of Yuan Chwang and Watters:

“Deva P’usa of the *Chih-shih-tzu-kuo*. . . had come hither (i.e. Gaṅgādvāra) to lead the people aright. . . . The P’usa bent his head down to check and turn the stream. . . . One of the Tīrthikas said to him ‘Sir, why are you so strange?’ Deva answered ‘My parents and other relatives are in the *Chih-shih-tzu* country and as I fear they may be suffering from hunger and thirst, I hope this water will reach thus far, and save them.’ . . . ‘Sir, you are in error. . . your home is far away with mountains and rivers intervening to fret and agitate this water’. . . .”

Watters remarks on this as follows:—

“The Chih-shih-tzu-kuo or Simhala (?) country has been taken to be Ceylon, the country generally so designated, but it may be here the name of a country in India. Yuan Chwang, as will be seen hereafter,² probably knew that Deva was a native of South India and not of Ceylon.”

The point that needs examining here is the Sanskrit restoration of the Chinese word *Chih-shih-tzu-kuo* (for the Chinese letters, see Watters, II, p. 320). *Tzu* in Chinese means *putra*. So *Chih-shih-tzu-kuo* is equal to Simhadharaputrapura. Strangely enough Yuan Chwang does not use these letters for transliterating either Simhala or Simhapura (vide Watters, II, p. 326). The Chinese words for Simhala (Ceylon) is *Seng-ka-lo* and for Simhapura *Seng-ha-pu-lo*. The probable inference that can be drawn from Yuan Chwang's desire to translate and not transliterate the name of the birth-place of Aryadeva is that he found difficulty in reproducing in Chinese letters the sound *Saimhikapura* and so he had recourse to the other method, namely, of translating it, as is usually done in Chinese Buddhist texts. Now *Saimhika* in Sanskrit may be taken to mean *Simhaputra* and so Yuan Chwang put for it *Chih-shih-tzu*. It may therefore be stated that Yuan Chwang is corroborating the tradition preserved in the *Mañju-śrīmūlatantra*.

A better evidence in support of the Chinese translation *Chih-shih-tzu* is furnished by the *Divyāradāna* (p. 523) where the following story occurs:

भूतपूर्व^१ भिक्षुवः सिंहकल्यायां सिंहकेशरी नाम राजा राज्यं कारयति । तेन खलु समयेन सिंहकल्यायां सिंह नाम सार्थवाहः प्रतिवसति.....[तस्य] दारको जातोऽभिरूपोज्ञातयः ऊचुः—अयं दारकः सिंहस्य सार्थवाहस्य पुत्रो भवतु सिंहल इति नाम तस्य सिंहल इति नामधेयं व्यवस्थापितम् ।

In this story the merchant's son Simhala later on became the king of the country and colonised Tāmradvīpa, which thenceforward came

2 Vide Watters, II, p. 100. Watters, it seems, overlooks the fact that Deva spent a great portion of his time in South India and was not a native of the place.

to be known as Siṃhaladvīpa. In another paper (see *IHQ.*, VIII, pp. 98-00) I have discussed the meaning of *Chih-shih-tzu* used for denoting Siṃhala or (lit. Siṃhadharaputra-Pura). There it will be seen that Siṃhapura is located in Magadha.

If Chih-shih-tzu-kuo be the birth-place of Āryadeva, Candrakīrtti is quite justified in stating that Āryadeva's route was southwards when he was going Nāgārjuna. Śāstrīmahāśaya's contention that the Tibetan word *ḥoṅs* (= *āgatya*) remedies the defect of the statement of direction (*dakṣiṇadik*), as it was made by Candrakīrtti who was then living at Nalanda, appears to be a bit laboured. It is of no avail to enter into a discussion of the sense of the word *ḥoṅs* (= *āgatya*) on which Śāstrīmahāśaya lays so much emphasis. Usually the direction of coming or going is spoken of with reference to the subject, and we would expect a man living at Nalanda to say that 'so and so is coming from Ceylon northwards to Guntur' and *not* 'so and so is coming from Ceylon southwards to Guntur'. It is not also the usual practice to alter the direction of a movement just for the sake of putting the prefix *ā* to the root *gam*. To put Śāstrīmahāśaya's interpretation in English we have to say that "from Ceylon Āryadeva in a gradual course came in the southern direction to India."³ In the opinion of the present writer the best solution would be to locate the home of Āryadeva somewhere in the north, i.e. at Siṃhapura near Taxila, and this would obviate both the difficulties of the direction *tho-phyogs* (*dakṣiṇadik*) and *ḥoṅs* (*āgatya*). Candrakīrtti or very likely his Tibetan translator is not alone in making this confusion of a country of the north *Siṃhapura* with *Siṃhala* (Ceylon). In the *Nāgarī Pracāriṇī Patrikā* (vol. XIII, nos. 1 and 2), Mm. Ojha also points out a similar mistake committed by a mediæval writer, the author of *Padmāvat*, by identifying Singholi of the north-west with Siṃhala (Ceylon).

Coming now to the legend recorded in the Ceylonese chronicles about the settlement of Sīhabāhu's son in the outskirts of Vaṅga and Kalinga, the present writer meant that a new city was built up in the

3 In view of the Sanskrit text quoted above Śāstrīmahāśaya may reasonably contend that Āryadeva was living in Siṃhaladvīpa wherefrom he came to South India.

forest by the son of Sīhabāhu and it was named Sīhapura after the king. (Nagaram tattha māpesi, āhu Sīhapuraṃ ti taṃ,—*Mahāvamsa*, vi. 35). The people, who were companions of the prince, were called Sīhalā (Sīhalo, tena sambandhā ete sabbe pi Sīhalā,—*Mahāvamsa*, vii. 42), so there is no insuperable difficulty in regarding Sīhalā as the people who resided at Sīhapura. From the evidences of the *Mahāvastu*, *Jātaka*, *Divyāvadāna* and the Chronicles, it is clear that there were in ancient India at least two towns of the name of Sīhapura, one in Kalinga and the other in the north-west, and the latter seems to be more historical than the former. In all likelihood, the *Mahāvamsa* tradition of Sīhapura seems to have been derived from a similar tradition existent in the north-west, as suggested by the Chinese words *Chih-shih-tzu* and the story preserved in the *Divyāvadāna* (pp. 523-528). To this we may add the evidences brought forward by Geiger for establishing the influence of the north-western dialects of India on the Sinhalese language and thus show a closer connection of Ceylon with countries of the north-western parts of India.

In view of the exceedingly unsafe materials that we have to deal with for reconstructing our past history, the present writer thinks that it is better to leave a matter lacking sufficient evidence as a guess and not assert as a historical fact and thus avoid misleading other writers not working in this particular field. Guided by this consideration he just wanted to throw doubt on the widely accepted statement that Āryadeva was a native of Ceylon and demanded fresh evidences, about which Śāstrīmahāśaya has nothing to say. The probability of Sīhapura near Kalinga being the home of Āryadeva was just a suggestion; what was really contended for was that the home of Āryadeva must be sought for somewhere in India, and now the evidences set forth above confirm the suggestion that Āryadeva was a native of India, of a country in the far north.

Some Dravidian Features in Indo-Chinese Social Life

The social habits and standards of life among a people are the true criteria of their civilization. The influence of South India on the social institutions of the people of Indo-China and Java is distinctly noticeable. The East Indies, like South India, lies mostly within the tropics. The climate there is, therefore, hot and favourable to the growth of flora and fauna similar to those found in South India. From the geologist's point of view this region was contiguous to the Deccan plateau of India and formed with the latter one huge, now submerged, continent which extended as far as Australia, in the early history of mankind. This was given the name "Lemuria" by Sclater. It is no wonder, therefore, that the social usages and communal instincts of the people of the East Indies should resemble closely those that pertain to the people of South India. But apart from these natural aspects of affinity brought about by a cultural contact between these two tracts of land at a remote period of antiquity, we note certain developments in the social life of the people in the Far East which should have been due only to a borrowing from South India in much later times.

Social Life

Of the practices current among the population of the island of Java, which bear a close resemblance to some of the primitive practices found in South India, the following may be cited: the use of the weapon called boomerang; the practice of filing the teeth; tattooing etc.¹ In the Malay Peninsula and the adjacent countries the name *Kling* or *Keling* (probably derived from *Kalinga*) is generally applied to the people of peninsular India who trade thither or are settled in those regions. The European broadcloth is called in Burma by the name *thek-la-lat* which is the same as *takalāt* in Tamil or *śakalāsa* in Malayālam. It is also supposed that *Kyat*, a coin weighing 250 grains, current in Burma has a Telugu origin.²

1 Thurston, *Castes and Tribes*, Introduction.

2 *Ind. Ant.*, XV, 317.

Kaundinya Jaya Varman, one of the kings of Fou-Nan, is said to have sent to China a Buddhist preacher by name Nāgasena, who carried with him as a gift to the Chinese king an elephant carved in white sandal and two stūpas of ivory. Rudra Varman who succeeded Jaya Varman sent to the emperor of China an image of the Buddha made of sandal-wood (c. 520 A.D.). Similarly, it is mentioned that in a temple at Campā an image was found made of sandal-wood. Ivory and sandal-wood are peculiarly South-Indian products, and were among the rich articles of merchandise that were carried to the West from the Malabar Coast, in the ships of Solomon.

It is interesting that the people of Java, though Muslim in their faith, indulge even at the present day in a peculiar form of primitive dances and plays, which have for their themes stories drawn from the Indian epics, the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata*. These plays of Java which have come down from very early times are popularly known as 'Shadow-Plays,' and appear to be a direct descendant of the 'Pāvakkūttu' of Malabar. In these shows, dummy pieces of either leather or light pieces of wood, representing figures of heroes and heroines are displayed in public, to the accompaniment of vocal music, drums and cymbals. They are a favourite pastime with the masses of Malabar on the occasions of festivals in temples, and during certain seasons of the year. The *Pāvakkūttu* has for its plot only anecdotes from the *Rāmāyaṇa* and is peculiar to Malabar, particularly South Malabar. It is very likely that this institution was borrowed from Malabar and that it had not an independent origin in the islands of the Eastern Archipelago.

South Indian Place-Names

Even a superficial study of the place-names which are met with in Indo-China, Java etc. reveal the following results:—

1. Importation of Indian names, directly to denote places and divisions, e.g., Amarāvati, Kamboja, Campā, Mathurā, Pāṇḍuraṅga, Kelang, Paijitan etc.

2. Places in these countries are seen to end in *ūr* or *ura* (*pura*, *pulo*, the Dravidian term for village or township), e.g., Ankor, Sambor, Condor, Sinjore, Johore, Singapore, Selangore, Jalor, Lumpur,


Pangkor, Simalur, Bongor, Timor and Sañkapura, Puloway, Pulo-rondo etc.

3. Fortified places are known as *Koṭa* (compare Dravidian *Koṭṭai*), e.g., Reman Koṭa, Bharu Koṭa, Koṭa Salak, Koṭa Tampan, Koṭa Simpang, Koṭa Raya etc.

Pallava Titles of Kings

The later kings of Indo-China are seen to have styled themselves as 'Varman', and this title may have been a borrowing from the Pallavas of South India. Among the kings of Amarāvati are found the following:—Bhadra Varman (c. 400 A.D.), Sambhu Varman (590-630 A.D.), Indra Varman (875-890 A.D.), Siṃha Varman (1000 A.D.) and Rudra Varman (1069 A.D.).

The following is a fairly full genealogy of the kings of Fou-Nan known so far, all names ending in 'Varman':—



Some of these names look like having been borrowed from Pallava genealogy, e.g., Indra Varman and Iśāna Varman (cf. Parameśvara); and a few of them like Yaśo Varman and Rājendra Varman were, like the Colas, great builders.

Indian Epic-Themes and Saiva Siddhānta

Now to say a word about the literature and philosophy of these lands. The literati of Indo-China comprised the Śaivite, Vaiṣṇavite, and Buddhist priests. Naturally therefore both Hindu and Buddhist works of religion and philosophy abound in the Malaya Peninsula. Themes from the Hindu Epic of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and such episodes as *Arjuna-vivāha* (the marriage of Arjuna with Subhadrā) and the *Bhārata Yuddha* from the *Mahābhārata* were in favour, besides *Nītiśāstras*, *Dharmaśāstras*, *Tantra* texts, Dictionaries, and the *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa*. These were composed in the old literary language of the Javanese, which was commonly known as *Basa-kavi* or *kavi*, the language of poetry. There is abundant evidence of Tantrism in these lands with its *Devī* and the appurtenant mystic symbols, *vajra*, *ghaṇṭā*, *mudrā*, *maṇḍala* etc., all these being similar to the Tantra practices prevalent in Nepal and in Malabar. All their philosophy is supposed to spring from the principle of *Advaya*, which is "the primordial principle from which the world of phenomena is evolved." This is learnt from the important philosophical treatise of the Buddhists, the *Kāmahāyānikan* which gives an exposition of the Mahāyāna. This one energy without a second is spoken of as responsible for the creation of the Buddha as well as the *advayajñāna* (non-duality) based on it. This *advaya* is possibly derived from the *advaita* of Śaṅkara, which cult had its origin in Malabar, the birth-place of Śaṅkara.

Saivism had a strong hold in these far eastern lands, and traces of the religion of the Pāsupatas are in evidence in the Pa-ssu-wei, one of the priestly orders of Indonesia. We read in an inscription at Sdok Kak Thom that a king, Jayavarman of Camboja summoned from a *Janapada* a Brahman Hiraṇyadāma who was well-versed in *Siddha-vidyā*, and elaborated the rules contained therein for the worship of Śiva. The 'Royal God' *Siddha-vidyā* may literally mean the learning of the sages. Siddha is a term used peculiarly in Saiva philosophy to denote those that belong to the order of sages, who had knowledge of the past, present and future (*trikāla*) and who though of this world were not bound down to it, by material shackles. Inasmuch as this *vidyā* deals with the worship of Śiva, it seems to be a branch of Saiva philosophy. Hiraṇyadāma the teacher

who was also known as Śaiva Kaivalya, is said to have taught the king's priest four treatises known as *Vrah Vināśika*, *Nayottara*, *Sam-moha* and *Śiraścheda*. These are apparently Śaivite Tāntric texts. The king is then said to have ordered that only the members of the maternal family of Śaiva Kaivalya, men and women, should be *Yājakas* (sacrificers or priests), to the exclusion of others. Besides, in an inscription of another king of Kamboja we find it stated "that the king was an adept in *Saivottara Kalpa*." This latter implies rituals (*kalpa*) pertaining to the supreme cult of Śaivism, and Śaiva Kaivalya means only one who has the divine and eternal knowledge (*kevala jñāna*) of the Śaiva philosophy. All these seem to indicate that the Śaiva philosophy referred to may resemble what in Tamil land is called *Śaiva Siddhānta*.

.S. V. VISWANATHA

A Note on Jaina Hymns and Magic Squares

Indian hymnology does not merely consist of prayers or hymns in praise of the *Paramātman*, but it is also associated with *dhyāna*. In this connection, Dr. Giuseppe Tucci has rightly observed that the Hindu *stotras* are an efficient instrument by means of which the intelligence grasps the religious truth therein expounded, while in a second moment, the spirit focusses and visualizes as it were that same truth in a direct experience, and they are thus connected with mysticism.¹ This remark is in a sense applicable to *Jaina* hymnology, too.

That hymnology holds an important place in Jainism is borne out by the sacred works of the *Jainas*, where it is distinctly stated that this is one of the ways leading to liberation.² In these circumstances, it will not be a matter of surprise, if we come across a number of *Jaina stotras* composed in Sanskrit, Prakrit, Apabhraṃśa and the modern vernaculars, in a variety of styles, from the simplest to the most artificial.³ Some of these throw side-light on various other topics such as *mantras*, *yantras*, *suvarṇasiddhi*, principle of buoyancy, medicine, eatables, etc. This is not the place to deal with each of them, since this note is mainly reserved for magic squares.

Before I point out some of the magic squares embodied in or connected with the *Jaina* hymns, I may mention a few words about these interesting squares.

Out of the various works dealing with magic squares "Mathematical Recreations and Problems" (ch. V, pp. 129-147) by W. Rouse Ball and "Mathematical Essays and Recreations"⁴ (pp. 39-63) by Hermann Schubert may be specially mentioned. "Magic, white and

1 See *JRAS.*, April, 1932.

2 Vide *Uttarādhyāyana-sūtra* XXIX.

3 See Prof. Hermann Jacobi's Foreword to my edition of '*Bhaktāmara, Kalyāṇamandira and Namiṇa stotras*'. In this edition, in the Gujarātī introduction, I have classified the important *Jaina* hymns into chronological groups. As for the *Yamaka* literature of the *Jainas*, the reader is however referred to my Sanskrit introduction to *Sobhana-stuti* (pp. 1-10).

4 This work deals with magic polygons and cubes as well. W. S. Andrews also treats of magic cubes in his work *Magic Squares and Cubes* (Chicago, 1908).

black" (pp. 128-129) by Franz Hartmann M.D., too, discusses this subject to some extent. Here magic squares are styled as tetragrams.

This subject, which is fascinating to thinkers of a mathematical turn of mind, has been given a due place in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (14th Edn. vol. XIV, pp. 627-630)⁵ too.

The late Mahāmahopādhyāya Sudhākara Dvivedī has treated this subject in Sanskrit, furnishing us with some magic squares and a method⁶ of constructing them, in his *ṭippaṇī* on *Lālāvati*.⁷

Dr. Ketkar's *Mahārāṣṭrīya Jñānakōśa* deals with this subject in Marāthī, under the heading 'bhadraganīta' (vol. IX, sect. anīkaganīta pp. 24-25), and quotes there the following three verses:—

अष्टैकषट् च त्रिपञ्चसप्त च ।
 चतुर्नवद्वियुतिस्तु पञ्चदश ॥१॥
 अष्टैकशून्यं दशरुद्रशून्यं
 चत्वारि पञ्चद्वयसप्तरन्ध्रैः ।
 शून्यं च शून्यं रविषट्कवह्निः ॥२॥
 वाञ्छाकृतार्थं कृतमेकहीनं
 द्विके ग्रहे षोडशसप्तनागे ।
 तिथौ दिशायां प्रथमे द्विसप्त-
 षष्टत्रयाष्टौ च कुवेदबाणाः ॥३॥⁸

I shall now refer to the *Jaina* hymns which are associated with the odd-numbered and the even-numbered magic squares.⁹

Even magic circles and magic stars have also attracted the attention of mathematicians.

5 Here are mentioned names of some of the important works dealing with magic squares, in French language.

6 John Willis has composed a special work, shedding light in this direction. It is named as "*Easy Methods of Constructing Magic Squares and Cubes.*"

7 'Benares Sanskrit Series,' no. 153 (pp. 94-97), published in 1912.

8 Mr. Agashe, a friend of mine informs me about a verse which he had learnt from his father and which has the first foot the same as in this third verse, the remaining three being as under:—

“द्विके ग्रहे षोडशसप्तभिन्न
 अष्टौ तिथीदिक् प्रथमं च कोष्ठे
 द्विसप्तषट् अष्ट कुवेदपञ्च”

9 Besides these two types of magic squares, there are many more; e.g. magic squares (i) which are concentric, (ii) which have for summation the

Up till now I have noticed three such Prākṛt hymns.¹⁰ One of them is known as *Tijayapahutta* or *Sattarisayathutta*, and its authorship is traditionally attributed to Mānadeva Sūri, who has composed *Laghuśānti stotra*. The first hemistiches of the verses two to five¹¹ of this hymn give us the numbers forming a magic square of the fourth

25	80	ज्ञि	15	50
20	45	प	30	75
ज्ञि	प	ॐ	स्वा	हा
70	35	स्वा	60	5
55	10	हा	65	40

order, the sum of the numbers in each row, each column and each diagonal being 170. This is represented as shown in the adjoining diagram; for, the *māntrika bījas* are generally inserted in the central column and the row, as this is a *yantra*¹² used as an amulet after it is engraved on metal.

The second hymn¹³ styled as *Yugūddidevastotra* and composed by

number of year, (iii) which have magical parts, and (iv) which deal with only prime numbers.

10 I have seen a *viṃśatīyantra*, but I cannot say for certain whether it is associated with any hymn or magic square.

11 They are respectively as under:—

- पञ्चवीसा य असीया, पनरस पञ्चास जिखावरसमूहो
- वीसा पञ्चयाला वि य, तीसा पञ्चत्तरी जिखावरिदा
- सत्तरी पञ्चतीसा वि य, सट्ठी पञ्चेध जिखागणो एसो
- पञ्चपञ्चा य द्सेव य, पञ्चट्ठीं सहय चेव चालीसा.

12 This is styled as *Sarvatobhadrayantra* by Upādhyāya Meghavijaya in his work *Udayadīpikā*, noted by me in the Sanskrit introduction to my edition of the three stotras above referred to. Mānadeva Sūri has however designated it as *Sattarisayajanta* (*saptatisatayantra*), as can be seen from the following last verse of this hymn:—

“इय सत्तरिसयजंतं सम्मं मंतं हुवारि पडिलिहियं ।
दुरिआरिविजयवंतं निभंतं निरुवमरुचेह ॥१४॥”

There is found a variant *विजयतंतं* which, consequently suggests that this is a *Tantra*, too.

13 I have come across two Mss. of this hymn, in the Government collections of A. 1882-83 and 1892-95. They are numbered as 238 and 806 respectively and are deposited at the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.

The first and the last verses are as below:—

“जय सुरअसुरनरिद्विद्वदियपयपंकय !
जय देलडला'पुरवर्यस ! सेवयकयसंपय ! ।
किं पुणुभूअ सुमंततंति तुह जगआखादय !

Subhasundara does not seem to suggest¹⁴ directly magic squares, though, in its *avacūri*¹⁵ are given five magic squares as under:—

(1) 3rd order : sum 15

4	9	2
3	5	7
8	1	6

(2) 4th order : sum 32

8	15	2	7
6	3	12	11
14	9	8	1
4	5	10	13

(3) 5th order : sum 65

22	2 (3)	9	15	16
14	20	21	2	8
1	17 (7)	13	19	25
18	25 (24)	5	6	12
10	11	17	23	4

(4) 8th order: sum 260

64	2	3	61	60	6	7	57
9	55	54	12	13	51	50	16
17	47	46	20	21	43	42	24
40	26	27	37	36	30	31	33
32	34	35	29	28	38	39	25
41	23	22	44	45	19	18	48
49	15	14	52	53	11	11 (10)	56
8	58	59	5	6 (4)	62	63	1

(5) 9th magic square of the 3rd order.

	204		15		123			
71	64	69	8	1	6	44	37	4
66	68	70	3	5	7	39	41	43
67	72	65	4	9	2	40	45	3
26	19	24	44	37	42	53	46	51
69	21	23	25	39	41	43	48	50
22	27	20	40	45	38	49	54	47
35	28	33	80	73	78	17	10	15
96	30	32	34	75	77	79	12	14
31	36	29	76	81	74	13	18	11

231

धुत करिषु बहुभस्तिषुत मख्देवीनदया ! ॥१॥
 “इत्थं भेषजयन्त्रतन्त्रकलितैः सम्मन्त्ररत्नैश्चितां
 कृत्वा भीमुनिचन्द्ररस्तुत ! न नु ति 'देलुह'नेतस्तव ।
 लक्ष्मीसागरनामधेय ! कल्पाम्भोधे ! युगादिप्रभो !
 दुःस्थोऽहं श्मशुन्दराङ्गि युगलीसेवासुखं प्रार्थये ॥२४॥”

14 There is a reference in the last verse of this hymn that it deals with *hheṣaja* (medicine), *yantra* and *tantra*.

15 A small commentary in Sanskrit.

The first magic square is embodied in the first Sanskrit verse out of the three above referred to, if read from the bottom.

The second magic square, is what can be derived by applying the third verse quoted above, the vāñchā being 32. But it is rather faulty, since the number 8 is repeated therein.

The third magic square is erroneous,¹⁶ unless the numbers suggested in the brackets replace the preceding ones.¹⁷

The fourth magic square, too, is not free from mistakes, unless the numbers are corrected as pointed out in the brackets.

Strictly speaking, the last is not a magic square of the ninth order, though it presents such an appearance. It is rather a combination of magic squares of the 3rd order.

The third hymn is composed by *Dharmananda* who seems to have flourished in a century not later than the seventeenth; for, a Ms.¹⁸ of this hymn styled as *Catuṣṣaṣṭiyoginīmaṇḍalastuti* is written in Saṃvat 1697.

16 This mistake may be due to a slip on the part of the scribe.

17 In a Ms. of *Siddhāntasāroddhāra* (No. 1668 of the Government collection of A.D. 1892-95) deposited at B.O.R.I., we have the correct magic square.

18 See the Ms. No. 685 of the Government collection of A.D. 1892-95 deposited in B.O.R.I.

The verses between the 1st and the last¹⁹ supply us with numbers required to form a magic square of the 8th order as given below:—

	7	59	60	61	62	2	1
16	15	51	52	53	54	10	9
41	42	22	21	20	19	47	48
33	34	30	29	28	27	39	40
25	26	38	37	36	35	31	32
17	18	46	45	44	43	23	24
56	55	11	12	13	14	50	49
64	36	3	4	5	9	58	57

HIRALAL R. KAPADIA

19 जगमज्जिवासिणीयां जगसट्ठि विद्यासभावजुत्तायां ।
 चउसट्ठियोगिणीयां चउसट्ठिमंडलं पभण्णे ॥२॥
 सिरिधम्मनंदणेयां चउसट्ठिमंडलं पभणियं च ।
 बहुविषमवाहिनासं उवयारकरं जयउ लोए ॥२४॥

Vainyagupta Dvadasaditya

(A reply)

In the last issue of the *IHQ.*, (vol. IX p. 989) Dr. R. C. Majumdar criticised my article on "Vainyagupta Dvādaśāditya," published in a previous issue of the same journal (IX, p. 785). He finds it difficult to support all my conclusions on the subject, specially the most important proposition laid down by me viz., "Vainyagupta belonged to the imperial Gupta dynasty of Magadha, and that he ascended the throne of Magadha after Budhagupta, and ruled Bengal through his viceroys." Dr. Majumdar has not made any attempt to meet the points laid down by me in support of my theory. There is however, one evidence, which, in his opinion, almost conclusively proves the baselessness of my assumption. In the Gunaighar Plate Vainyagupta is designated as Mahārāja. Dr. Majumdar remarks that "the inscription of Vainyagupta, taken along with the coins, seems to show that he set up as an independent ruler in Samatāṭa, or some portion of it, and ruled as such till 507 A.D. The use of the title Mahārāja in an official land grant seems to be almost a conclusive argument against Dr. Ganguly's assumption that he was an imperial ruler of Magadha" (p. 989).

Dr. Majumdar's point of view, as laid down above, is a little bit abstruse. I may be right in thinking that according to Dr. Majumdar it was customary on the part of the independent rulers (issuing gold coins of heavy weight) to assume the title of Mahārāja, and anybody using this title must not be regarded as belonging to imperial rank.

Dr. Majumdar has, however, over-estimated the value of these titles Mahārāja and Mahārājādhirāja. The Pratihāra Mathanadeva, who was a vassal of the Imperial Pratihāra dynasty of Kanauj, used the title of Mahārājādhirāja (*EI.*, vol. III, p. 266). The Paramāra Siyaka II assumed both the titles Mahārājādhirājapati and Mahāmaṇḍalika-cūḍāmaṇi notwithstanding that he was a feudatory of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of the Deccan (*EI.*, XIX, p. 236). The Paramāra Dhārāvarṣa, chief of Mount Abu, also assumed these two titles at the same time (*IA.*, vol. LVI, p. 51).

I pointed out in my article on Vainyagupta that Mankuwar stone

inscription (*CII.*, p. 47), dated G.E. 129, designates Kumāragupta I as Mahārāja.¹ This illustration has not apparently satisfied Dr. Majumdar. He has in mind that this sort of thing cannot be found in royal grant. All the Vākāṭaka royal records designate the Vākāṭaka kings as Mahārāja (*CII.*, p. 233 ff.; *JASB.*, 1924, p. 58). The Balaghat plates of the Vākāṭaka Prthivīśena glorifies Pravarasena as an emperor and at the same time assigns him the title Mahārāja.²

Dr. Majumdar admits, and quite rightly, in his monograph on the Gurjara-Pratihāras (*J. Dep. L.*, vol. X) that the Pratihāra Vatsarāja, Nāgabhaṭa, and Bhoja were imperial rulers. The Barah Copper Plate of Bhoja (*EI.*, XIX, pp. 17, 18), dated Sam. 893, which is a royal grant, designates Vatsarāja, Nāgabhaṭa, Rāmabhadra, and Bhoja as Mahārāja. The Daulatpur Copper Plate of Bhoja (*Ibid.*, V, p. 211), dated Sam. 900, which too is a royal grant, uses Mahārāja for Vatsarāja, Nāgabhaṭa, and Bhoja.

All these evidences prove beyond doubt that the non-imperial rulers had not the sole right of using the title Mahārāja, and the assumption of this title by a king does not in any way prove his non-imperial position. Hence it cannot be regarded almost as a conclusive proof against my assumption that Vainyagupta was an imperial ruler of Magadha simply because he was given the title Mahārāja in his own grant. In these circumstances I do not see any reason to alter my view on the subject. I crave indulgence of the readers for the reiteration of my arguments below, with which an important addition has been made, in support of my theory:—

- (a) Vainyagupta issued heavy gold coins similar in type to those of the imperial Guptas.
- (b) Vainyagupta had Mahārāja, and Uparika-Mahārāja (feudatory and Viceroy) to serve under him (Gunaighar Pl.).
- (c) Vainyagupta like the imperial Gupta rulers assumed an epithet ending in 'āditya' (Coins).

1 The Riddhapur plate of the Vākāṭaka queen Prabhāvatiguptā designates Candragupta I and Samudragupta as Mahārāja (*JASB.*, 1924, p. 58).

2 samrājo Vākāṭakānām mahārāja-Śri-Pravarasenasya etc., *EI.*, vol. IX, p. 270, l. 4.

- (d) Several seals of Vainyagupta were discovered in the remains of Nālandā along with those of Harṣavardhana, Sarvavarman, Narasimhagupta, Kumāragupta and Budhagupta (*EI.*, XXI, pt. ii).

The error in mentioning the last known date of Kumāragupta I has not certainly vitiated my theory that 'when Skandagupta was fighting with the Hūnas and the Puṣyamitras on the western frontier of the Gupta empire, his elder brother, Puragupta I, on the death of Kumaragupta I, ascended the throne of Magadha. Skandagupta after his victory over his enemies proceeded to the capital, and with the help of the army at his command usurped the throne'.*

D. C. GANGULY

The Phallus Worship in the Veda

In a note on this subject in *IHQ.*, vol. IX 1933, p. 103, I attempted to show that the word *śiśnadeva* (*RV.*, VII. 21.5; X. 10.99) does not mean a 'phallus-worshipper,' the true sense of the word being nothing but 'lustful.' In support of this view, I quoted a number of words compounded with *-deva* as the second member. Here I want to add one word more to the list from Pāli, and it is *sassuderā*, Skt. *śvaśrūdevā*. Certainly it does not mean a 'mother-in-law-worshipper,' but 'one who respects and serves one's mother-in-law as a god.' This meaning is quite clear from the passages quoted below in which the word occurs:

Jātaka, vol. IV, p. 322:

itthiyā¹ jīvalokasmiṃ yā hoti samacārinī/
medhāvinī sīlavatī sassudevā patibbatā//

* About my decipherment of "Vainyagupta Dvādaśāditya" Mr. Allan writes me:—"I think you are quite right in reading the name Vainya(gupta). It was reluctantly that I called him Candragupta etc."

1 Here the reading adopted by Fausböll is *itthi yā* which can hardly be accepted owing to two reasons; first, in that case *itthi* should have been grammatically *itthī*; and secondly, the use of *yā* twice is unnecessary. The reading

Rouse has rightly expressed the significance of the word under discussion in his translation of the verse as follows:

‘When women virtuous, wise and good
here in the world are found,
True wives, to husband’s mother kind
even as in duty bound.’

Samyutta Nikāya, vol. I, p. 86:

itthīpi hi ekacciyā² seyyā po-ā janādhipa/
medhāvinī sīlavatī sassudevā patibbatā//

Mrs. Rhys David translates it thus:

‘A woman child, O lord of men, may prove
Even a better offspring than a male.
For she may grow up wise and virtuous,
Her husband’s mother rev’rencing, true wife.’

Here the last line excepting the last two words is for *sassudevā*.

VIDHUSHEKHARA BHATTACHARYA

itthiyo hanti in the Siamese edition, 2466 A.B., p. 311, which is given also in the footnote by Fausböll, is also not good because in that case in the following *gāthā*, No. 122 one would expect to see the use of plural number, but instead of it we have singular:

tādisāya sumedhāya sucikammāya nūriyā/
devā dassanam āyanti mānusiya amānusā//

This consideration has led me to suggest the reading *itthiyā* for Fausböll’s *itthi yā*. This *itthiyā* is from Buddhist Sanskrit *īstrikā* > *īstriyā*. See *Mahāvastu*, vol. I, 244. 5; 345. 5; and the note of Senart, p. 569.

2 In the PTS edition the reading *ekaccī yā* is not supported by the MSS used, nor can it be construed. *ekacciyā* = *ekaccā*, ‘certain’. In her translation (PTS) Mrs. Rhys Davis has not taken notice of this word.

A Note on the Śālaṅkāyanas

The Śālaṅkāyanas are one of the early dynasties of the Andhra country and played a prominent part in the post -Śātavāhana and the pre-Cālukyan period of that country's history. Many important points in the history of this dynasty have been misunderstood. It is my object now to draw the attention of scholars to some such mistaken notions.

I

What is the origin of the Śālaṅkāyanas? In solving this problem, Mr. Jayaswal writes.¹

“Piṣṭapura was the capital of Kalinga as noted in almost a contemporary inscription of the ‘Magadha dynasty’ ruling at Piṣṭapura and Siṃhapura. One of the earliest rulers of this ‘Magadha dynasty’ was Śaktivarman and probably the following ones were Candravarman and his son Vijayanandivarman. Vijayanandivarman changed the dynastic name from the ‘Magadha kula’ into Śālaṅkāyana dynasty. This must have happened in or after Skanda Gupta’s time. We find a successor of Vijayanandivarman (Vijayadevavarman) even performing a horse-sacrifice, i.e., declaring full independence. It is almost certain that the later Vākāṭakas, when they conquered Kalinga, were asserting their rights as relatives and successors of the Guptas, as well as their old rights of overlordship over this part of the country, and their assertions must have been against the Śālaṅkāyanas. This ‘Magadha kula’ was evidently the ruling family set up by Samudra Gupta or his successor..... The name of the first ruler must have been Guha.”

This view, however, deserves careful consideration. Śaktivarman, ruler of Piṣṭapura, is known from the Rāḡolu plates² which Prof. Dubreuil assigns³ to the middle of the 5th century A.D. He and many others ruled over Kalinga between 450 and 610 A.D.⁴ Candavarman and his son Vijyanandivarman whom Mr. Jayaswal takes to be the successors of Śaktivarman were members of the Śālaṅkāyana family. The Pedavegi plates⁵ show that they were the grandson and the great-grandson of Hastivarman, a contemporary of Samudra Gupta. Hastivarman’s son was Nandivarman I. Thus there is no room for

1 *History of India*, p. 127.

2 *El.*, XII, 2.

3 *AHD.*, pp. 93 f.

4 Deubreuil, *AHD.*, ‘The kings of Kalinga.’

5 *JAHRS.*, I-2, pp. 92-102.

Saktivarman in the Śālaṅkāyana genealogy. Nor is it true to say that Vijayanandivarman changed the dynastic name from the Magadhā family into the Śālaṅkāyana dynasty. Vijayadevavarman of the Ellore Prākṛt plates,⁶ who was the father of Hastivarman, the founder of the Śālaṅkāyana dynasty which flourished about the beginning of the 4th century A.D. was a śālaṅkāyana *Mahārāja*. Nandivarman's successor Vijayaskandavarman also called himself *Śālaṅkāyana Mahārāja Śrī Vijayaskandavarman*. Thus we find the name Śālaṅkāyana used both before and after the time of Nandivarman. It is not correct therefore to say that he changed the name of his family. The Śālaṅkāyanas were not a feudatory family set up by the Guptas as Mr. Jayaswal thinks. Ptolemy mentions a people called the Salankeni beyond Maisoloi, and Benagouron is said to have been one of their cities.⁷ Maisoloi is Masulipatam in the modern Kistna district and Benagouron is identified⁸ by Mr. D. C. Sircar with Veṅgi. The Śālaṅkāyanas ruled over the two districts of Veṅgi and Kuḍuhāra. The latter is identical with Gudivāda in the Kistna district. Thus the Śālaṅkāyanas answer to the description of the Greek geographer and may be said to have existed in the 2nd century A.D. Even the Ellore plates of Vijayadevarman point out the early existence of this family. These resemble the Māyḍavolu plates of the Pallava king Sivaskandavarman, who flourished in the last quarter of the 3rd century A.D. The Prākṛt language in which they are written confirms this ascription. In view of this it cannot be stated that the Śālaṅkāyanas rose to power after the Gupta invasion. To say that the name Magadhakula preceded the name Śālaṅkāyana is like putting the cart before the horse. Nor is it possible to accept Mr. Jayaswal's view that Vijayadevavarman succeeded Vijayanandivarman. The Pedavegi plates mention the successors from Hastivarman to Nandivarman II, and do not speak of Vijayadevavarman. As already stated, Vijayadevavarman has to be taken as the father of Hastivarman and as the first Śālaṅkāyana king. His performance of an *aśvamedha* does not, as Mr. Jayaswal thinks, signify his declaration of independence after the Gupta invasion, but indicates his conquest of the Brhatpalāyanas in

6 *El.*, IX, p. 56.7 *Geo.*, VII, i, 79.8 *IHQ.*, IX, p. 214.

the Kuḍuhāraṣaya. Thus Mr. Jayaswal's view quoted above seems to be the result of a confusion of separate and distinct historical facts.

II

What then is the true origin of the Śālaṅkāyanas? The Koṇḍamudi plates⁹ bring to light Jayavarman of the Br̥hatpalāyana family. Dr. Hultsch the editor of these plates, thought that they resemble the Mayiḍavolu plates of Śivaskandavarman, the Pallava king and assigned Jayavarman to the same period. The plates are dated in the 10th regnal year of Jayavarman. I believe that he ruled between 290 and 300 A.D. The object of the grant was to record the king's gift in the Kuḍuhāraṣaya. We find the later Śālaṅkāyanas making gifts in the same district.¹⁰ Vijayadevavarman performed an *āśvamedha* obviously as a token of his political ascendancy. No other member of his family has repeated the act. Vijayadevavarman has to be assigned to a period as near the beginning of the 4th century as possible. No other dynasty or king is known to have ruled in the Kistna district between Jayavarman and Vijayadevavarman.¹¹ It may be concluded therefore that Vijayadevavarman the *āśvamedhin* conquered the Br̥hatpalāyanas, glorified the Śālaṅkāyanas and performed an *āśvamedha* as a token thereof. This event took place about the beginning of the 4th century A.D.

M. RAMA RAO

⁹ *El.*, V, p. 315.

¹⁰ Cf. The two Kanteru grants in *JAHRS.*, vol. V; 1, pp. 21-32.

¹¹ All the previous writers have missed the chronological importance of the Ellore Prakrit plates and wrongly assigned Vijayadevavarman to a later date.

The Nāṭyaśāstra and the Abhinavabharati

I wish to discuss below of the principles connected with the interpretation of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* ascribed to Bharatamuni.*

The present text of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* (*NS.*) existed, according to some authorities as early as the 300 A.C. (P. V. Kane, Introduction to the *Sāhityadarpaṇa* p. xi; cf. A. B. Keith, *Skt. Drama*, p. 294). This view should be preferred to other opinions which date the work either as early as the 200 B.C. or as late as the 600 A.C.¹ Thus we see that the text of the *NS.* was already eight or nine centuries old at the time of Abhinavagupta. This length of time left an indelible mark of its ravages upon the work which was available even at the time of Abhinava in more recensions than one (Preface to the *NS.* in GOS, pp. 7-8; A. B. Keith, *op. cit.* p. 290). This commentator, as was very natural for a scholar in those days, followed the recension of the work that was available to him and probably did not know that there might be other recensions of the same. As a result of this, Abhinava's commentary loses much of its value. The modern scholarship which seeks to establish critically the text of the *NS.* from various recensions cannot be satisfied with Abhinava's rather onesided version.

Compared with Sāyana who commented on the Vedas, preserved more or less in a faultless fashion, Abhinava's position in commenting on the pseudo-Veda (= *NS.*) seems to have been unenviable. But even this luckier Sāyana has not been considered an infallible guide and authority in the Vedic interpretation. "We consequently hold," observes Prof. Rudolph Roth, "that the writings of Sāyana and other commentators must not be an authority to the exegete, but merely one of the means of which he has to avail himself in the accomplishment of

* Some students of the *NS.* has recently given in this connection rather undue weight to the *Abhinavabhārati*. (Vide Notes by Messrs. Mankad and Raghavan in *IHQ.*, vol. IX, pp. 973 f., 991 f. Hence the value of the work will be judged here.)

¹ See the present writer's paper on the date of the *NS.* published in the *Journal of the Department of Letters*, volume XXIV of the Calcutta University. In it the various data connected with the problem are discussed to show that the *NS.* existed about the beginning of the Christian era.

his task'' (Introduction to the *St. Petersburg Lexicon*). This observation of Roth has been followed by most of the Vedic scholars and may be said to have led to excellent results. This being so, we do not know why Abhinava's commentary, defective as it is, should be considered our only guide for the interpretation of the *NS*, and why we should not make our own attempts, in pursuance of the critical method, in understanding the text.²

True it is that Abhinava's commentary in some rare cases may give us in spite of its defects important help in interpreting the text of the *NS*. but to be sure of such help we shall have to use a critical edition of this commentary which is still wanting. It is highly doubtful that such an edition of this work will be made in near future; for, the utter incorrect nature of the *Abhinavabhāratī* which exists in two different recensions will preclude such a possibility for a long time. The testimony of the learned editor of the *NS*. of the GOS, on this point should not be disregarded. The poor results which followed his attempt at editing the *Abhinavabhāratī* are mostly to be attributed to the wretched condition of his materials. The text of this work as established by him creates difficulty on the following points:

1. It gives *nāṭya maṇḍapa* in which half the area is occupied by the stage and the tiring room. This goes much against our practical sense.³

2. In commenting on *NS*. VI, 10 (GOS) the *Abhinavabhāratī* says that the *nāṭya* has five members (*Pañcāṅga*) and *abhinayas* are three in number. But in the *NS*. itself we see that the *nāṭya* has been described as having six members (*ṣaḍaṅga*, VIII, 12 XXVII, Chowkhambā ed.) and this work recognizes four kinds of *abhinaya* (VIII. 9 Chowkhambā ed.) and deals exhaustively with all of them in its body.

Besides this, according to the MS. of the *Abhinavabhāratī* in the possession of the Calcutta University we find that the author of this text was not very well informed about the Prākṛit grammars and gramma-

² For different views see *IHQ.*, IX, pp. 973, 991.

³ See *IHQ.*, IX, pp. 975-976.

rians. For without making any comment on the Prākṛit section of the *NS.*; this author writes: विस्तारविजिज्ञासुः प्राकृतदीपिकादिकमवलोकयेत् । उत्पलविरचितायां च सूत्रवृत्तौ पद्धतौ स्फुटं पूर्णं च सर्वमस्तीति तत्रादरः कार्यः । Here the omission of the names of Vaiṛaruci, Caṇḍa and Bhāmaha, and the mention of names otherwise quite unknown are very significant. If the passage quoted above will prove to be from the hands of Abhinavagupta then any faith in his omniscience will have to be given up.

MANOMOHAN GHOSH

The name of the Author of the *Nyāyasāra*

The authorship of the *Nyāyasāra*, a well-known work on Hindu logic written about the middle of the tenth century is attributed to Bhā-sarvajña. Dr. S. C. Vidyābhūṣaṇa, while noting its peculiarity and close resemblance to the names of Sarvajña Mitra and Sarvajña Deva who lived in Kashmir about 775 and 1025 A.D. respectively, does not, probably for want of sufficient data, decide against its being the actual name of the writer. Following him, Prof. Keith accepted the name as Bhā-sarvajña.

But if we turn to the commentary of Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra on *Kārikā* 203 of their own work, the *Nāṭyadarpaṇa*, written about 1150 A.D., it becomes clear that Sarvajña, and not Bhā-sarvajña, was the name of the author of the *Nyāyasāra*. After mentioning the forms of address suited to the Jain and Buddhist ascetics, they lay down the general rule that 'the followers of the *Pāśupata* and such other sects should be addressed by the names current in their time with *bhā* prefixed to the names, and so Sarvajña should be addressed as Bhā-Sarvajña.'¹ Thus, we see that *bhā* is prefixed, merely out of courtesy, to the names of the *Pāśupata* teachers as *Śrī* is prefixed to

¹ मुनिर्निग्रन्थः शाक्यः सौगतः एतौ भदन्तेति । अपरः पाशुपतादिव्रती स्वसमय-
प्रसिद्धनामभिर्वाच्यः । यथा पाशुपतस्य भापूर्वं भासर्बज्ञ इत्यादिसम्भाषणम् । *Nāṭya-*
darpaṇa, (G.O.S.), p. 212.

those of the *Vaiṣṇava* teachers like Rāmānuja, Vallabha, Madhva, and Nimbārka.

That Sarvajña was a *Māheśvara* is generally admitted. In the opening lines of the *Nyāyasāra*, he says, 'Bowling down to *Śambhu* (*Maheśvara*), the supreme Lord of the universe, who by nature knows all truths, I shall explain *Pramāṇa*, and its definition and division, in order that children may understand them well.'² But, it is not generally known that Sarvajña was a *Māheśvara* of the *Pāśupata* school. His adherence to this sect can be indicated by the under-mentioned facts:

1. Sarvajña divides *Pramāṇa* into three kinds, *pratyakṣa*, *anumāna*, and *āgama*. He thus rejects *upamāna*, the fourth means of proof recognized by Gautama, Vātsyāyana, Uddyotakara and Vācaspati. The *Pāśupata* system has, on the other hand, the same division as adopted by Sarvajña in the *Nyāyasāra*.³

2. Sarvajña describes *Mokṣa* as the soul's attainment of eternal pleasure. In this he differs from Gautama and his commentators who describe it as 'absolute cessation of pain', while he agrees with the *Pāśupatas* who conceive of *Mokṣa* as the 'attainment of absolute lordliness' also.⁴

3. Sarvajña regards *Maheśvara* as the omniscient creator. Further it is expressly mentioned in the *Nyāyasāra* 'that final release is attained, in the Śaiva system, through the practice of the recognized forms of mental concentration, resulting in the direct visualization of *Maheśvara*'.⁵ In this also Sarvajña differs from the doctrines of Gautama and Vātsyāyana and the difference is most probably due to his adherence to the *Pāśupata* system.⁶

If Sarvajña had any important doctrinal disagreement with his predecessors in the matters of Nyāya, it is due to the in-

² Vidyābhūṣaṇa, *History of Indian Logic*, p. 357.

³ Vide the *Hindi Viśvakoṣa*, XIII, 402.

⁴ "अन्यत्र दुःखनिवृत्तिरेव दुःखान्तः, इह तु पारमेश्वर्यप्राप्तिश्च," – Mādhavācārya, *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*, Veṅkaṭeśvara edition, p. 264.

⁵ Keith, *Indian Logic and Atomism*, p. 264.

⁶ For *Pāśupata* teachings, see Mādhavācārya's *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*, Veṅkaṭeśvara edition, pp. 131-2.

fluence of the *Pāśupatī* tenets. It may therefore be concluded that Sarvajña was a *Pāśupata*, and was for that reason called Bhā-Sarvajña by his contemporaries and commentators,


DASARATHA SARMA

Vyomasīva, the author of Vyomavati

Guṇaratna and Rājasekhara mention Vyomasīva as the writer of the *Vyomavati* or *Vyomamatī*, a commentary on Praśastapāda's *Bhāṣya*.¹ According to Vardhamāna, he was anterior to Udayana, the writer of *Kiraṇāvalī*,² who flourished about 984 A.D. Now, though it is impossible to be certain about the time of Vyomasīva in the absence of his commentary or any other strong evidences in this connection, I would like to suggest that the writer of the *Vyomavati* was probably identical with the Vyomasīva mentioned in the undated inscription of Nārada, which though assigned by Professor Kielhorn,³ to the beginning of the 11th century might as reasonably be referred to the last quarter of the tenth century when Vyomasīva the commentator is believed to have flourished. From the details given in the inscription it may be safely inferred that Vyomasīva of Nārada wrote a learned commentary on Praśastapāda's *Bhāṣya* for therein he is described as being equal to Maheśa, Akṣapāda, Kaṇāda, Jaimini, Kapila, Bṛhaspati, Buddha, and Jina in Siddhānta, Nyāya, Vaiśeṣika, Mīmāṃsā, Sāṃkhya, Lokāyata, and Bauddha and Jaina philosophic systems. The identity of Vyomasīva the commentator with Vyomasīva of the Nārada inscription is rendered more probable by the fact that the latter does not call himself a Vedāntin and criticises Mīmāṃsā, Bauddha and Jaina philosophies in one of the verses. He was very likely therefore a teacher of Sāṃkhya or Nyāya or Vaiśeṣika or perhaps of the Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika only. The verses on which my opinion is based are:

1 Keith, *Indian Logic and Atomism*, p. 32.

2 *Ibid.* 1918, p. 131.



श्रीदार्याद्रु रभारदुर्वहधुरानिव्यूढवीर्योदयः

शिष्यः शिष्यवतां विशेषक इव प्रस्तावमुद्ग्यः सताम् ।

श्रीमान्व्योमशिवाह्वयः समभवत्तस्यापि तादृक्पुन-

र्यादृग्भूरिभिरुग्रमद्भुततमैस्तप्तैस्तपोभिर्भवेत् ॥

सिद्धान्तेषु महेश एष नियतो न्यायेऽक्षपादो मुनि-

गर्म्भीरे च कणाशिनस्तु कणाभुक्-शास्त्रे श्रुतौ जैमिनिः ।

सांख्येऽनल्पमतिः स्वयं च कपिलो लोकायते सद्गुरु-

बुद्धो बुद्धमते जिनोक्लिषु जिनः को नाथ नायं कृती ॥

यद्भूतं यदनागतं यदधुना किञ्चित्कचिद्बर्धते

सम्यग्दर्शनसम्पदां तदखिलं पश्यन्प्रमेयं महत् ।

सर्वज्ञः स्फुटमेष कोऽपि भगवानन्यः क्षिती शङ्करो

धत्ते किंतु न शान्तधीर्विषमदग्रौद्रं वपुः केवलम् ॥

अस्मिन्नुद्दामधानि प्रचुरतरतपःसीमि विख्यातनामि

सर्वानन्युक्त (सा) मि क्षितिभृदुरुभरस्पर्धिपुष्यदूरिभिः ।

संपन्नप्रेभिः सत्सु स्वयशमि निहितस्फारसारप्रथिभिः

विद्योत्सर्पन्महिभिः त्रिभुवनतिलकं के गुणा हन्त न स्युः ॥³

संलीनं मुख एव शाक्यकरिणामत्युजितं गर्जितं

वासाद्यस्य च जैनजम्बुकशतैर्दुर्व्याहतं संहतम् ।

सोढं जातु न जैमिनीयहरिणैर्लीलाकृतं हुंकृतं

तस्यान्यद्गणेशकाननपतेः किं स्यात्स्तुतं प्रस्तुतम् ॥⁴

Vyomaśiva was the disciple of Hṛdayaśiva, a disciple of Sadāśiva, the successor of Acyutaśiva.³ It seems that the word Śiva formed a special ending for the names of the heads of the monastery of Raṇipadra, now called Rāṇoda or Nāroda.

DASARATHA SARMA

3 *Prācīnalekhamāla*, vol. 11, (Nirnayasagara Press), p. 158.

4 *Ibid.*, pp. 158-9 and 161.

5 *Ibid.*, p. 158.

REVIEWS

THE USE OF THE CASES IN VEDIC PROSE, by Sukumar Sen, M.A., Lecturer in Comparative Philology, Calcutta University. Reprint from the *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, vols. VIII-X (1926-30) 176 pp.

Mr. Sen is one of the few Indian scholars who have specialised in Vedic research and his work certainly raises the hope that attempts for scientific research in an important branch of Sanskrit philology are at last going to be made in India. The enormous amount of material collected by him in the volume under review testifies to his great industry and proves him to be a conscientious worker in the field of Vedic philology. Moreover the subject he deals with is a very difficult and useful one. The monumental work of Oertel will still take years to finish and Delbrück's 'Altindische Syntax,' by no means antiquated and still indispensable, is in German and therefore not accessible to the general body of Indian students. Mr. Sen is therefore to be congratulated on his work. If in the following the duty of the critic compels the present reviewer to point out some of the weak points in Mr. Sen's work, it does not signify that he does not recognise its merits.

To begin with, a few words on the general character of the book. In a work on syntax everything depends on the classification of the different categories and the multiplication of examples of the same type is hardly justifiable unless the author intends to give a complete concordance of the whole literature as Oertel actually does. Mr. Sen has often given an amazing number of examples though however his categories are sometimes astonishing. Should not cognate nominative, accusative etc. have been dealt with together as a characteristic feature of the Indo-European verb? There is no justification for the long list of intransitive verbs (if any sharp distinction between transitive and intransitive verbs is at all possible!) become transitive when compounded with preverbs under the head of accusative when the

author is concerned simply, with the use of cases. (Besides, Mr. Sen has completely misunderstood PB. 21.15.3 *śaradam oḥadāyo 'bhisampacyante*. The acc. *śaradam* is not temporal as Mr. Sen thinks (p. 23) but is dependent on *abhi-*.) Previous workers in the same and allied fields have of course sometimes done the same, but that is hardly enough to justify this procedure. Passages taken from accentuated texts ought to have been always reproduced with the proper accent. Workers in the field of Vedic philology have to deal with minute details which would be hardly dreamt of by their colleagues in the field of classical Sanskrit, and the accent is precisely one of those indispensable factors for the study of these *minutiae*. Is it not a great burden on the student who is not always prepared to accept the author's interpretation of the passages to have to compare the original text for the accent when he wishes to satisfy himself as to whether the form in question is, say, an acc. pl. or a gen. sg.? In the field of Vedic research reference to texts is always to be given according to the standard editions and in the usually accepted way. Mr. Sen seems to have used the standard edition of AB. by Aufrecht but his method of giving reference to its passages is peculiarly his own. He gives reference to Brugmann's Greek grammar but does not say which edition he has used.

All these are however merely methodological shortcomings of the work under review and hardly detract anything from its real merits. Much more serious are the mistakes, sometimes of an unpleasant sort, in the details which every careful reader will discover in every part of the book. We shall confine ourselves here to a more or less close examination of his first chapter (10 pages) devoted to the nominative and note a few points taken at random from other parts of the work.

In dealing with the predicative nominative the author makes a separate category of the verbal phrase *rūpāṃ kar-*. This was not necessary, for it is well-known that *rūpāṃ kar-* is equivalent to *bhū-* (Delbrück, p. 103). The author suggests that the peculiar construction with *rūpāṃ kar-* arose out of the contamination of the two constructions *viṣṇur bhūtā* and *viṣṇo rūpāṃ kṛtvā*. This is of course impossible, for there is no reason why similar constructions with other words too would not have arisen in the same way. Had

it occurred in the older literature one might have considered it to be a sort of unconsummated Tatpuruṣa (an unconsummated Bahuvrīhi with *rūpá* may be found in RV. 1, 114, 5 *varāhám.....tveṣám rūpám*). As it is, its explanation has to be sought in the word *rūpá* itself. The similarity of meaning between *rūpá* and *várpas* is striking though etymologically they are not connected with each other (see my *Les Formations Nominales et Verbales en p du Sanskrit*, pp. 26-34). *várpas* is clearly used in the RV. in the sense of an artifice (almost exclusively in the stereotyped phrase *abhi várpasū bhūt*), perhaps the artifice of changing form at pleasure (*Ibid.*, p. 32). Exactly this meaning cannot be established for *rūpá* in the RV., but there is ample evidence to show that it was used chiefly to signify assumed or artificial form, and its Avestan counterpart *urūpaya-* (verb. den.) signifies according to Bartholomae "Scheinbilder, falsche Vorstellungen hervorrufen." It is no wonder therefore that the phrase *rūpám kar-* should be used in the Brāhmaṇas when the change of form had to be expressed. It will however always remain a matter of conjecture how in these phrases the word *rūpá* completely lost its independent substantive character and came to be used merely as a grammatical expression.

In dealing with the cognate nominative the author suggests that the verb 'to speak' was used impersonally in the original Indo-European. I am afraid, the author will not be able to substantiate this statement by facts. The author takes for granted that the so-called impersonal verbs were from the beginning subjectless, but that is far from certain. Is it not at least as likely that the subject of the 'Witterungsimpersonalia' was omitted because the names of the elements of nature were taboo? This explanation is forcibly suggested by the frequent use of such expressions as *yò 'yám pávate* for 'wind' and *yò 'sui tápati* for 'sun' in the Brāhmaṇas. Beginning with sun, wind, thunder etc. the category of these impersonalia might have been considerably extended later. The author further suggests that as an intermediate step between the subjectless constructions and those with an active agent as subject there are some constructions with an indefinite or relative pronoun as the subject "for the satisfaction of grammatical instinct." As examples

of such constructions he quotes TS. VI, 4, 8, 3 *táto vā́ idám̐ vyaúcchat*, etc. But cannot *idám* in this and other examples be adverbial? Quite a new category of instrumental nominative has been set up on the basis of the only passage AB. 7, 13, 7 (author's 33. 1. 7) *kiṃ nu malam* etc. But does an interrogative sentence of this kind prove anything?

“What is ordinarily the locative of distance, is sometimes put in the nom.” according to the author. The word “ordinarily” should not have been used here, for locatives of distance, strictly speaking, are not very common. All his examples on p. 156 cannot be accepted as containing locative of distance. The treatment of the nominative absolute is rather strange. The author suggests in bracket that the cases of nom. abs. are nothing but cases of anakolouthon. An ingenuous reader may conclude that nom. abs. is equivalent to anakolouthon. This is certainly not what the author has in mind, but does he not cut the ground under his own feet when he says that the passages concerned may be regarded as cases of anakolouthon? Indeed, the author has not been able to prove his case by means of his examples which cannot be regarded as well-chosen. The first passage is quite a normal one if Aufrecht's correction is accepted (without which it conveys no meaning at all), and the reading of the second passage is uncertain as the author himself admits. All the other examples are constructions with absolute in *-tvā* and therefore can prove nothing, for they themselves form a category apart, and in their case, as also in analogous cases in other languages, a different subject is often introduced into the principal sentence almost imperceptibly. Yet, if not exactly the nom. abs., at least what is called nominative of the psychological subject is found in various Indo-European dialects. Cf. Gr. *hoi dè philoi, én tis epistatai autois chresthai,.....ti phésomen autois éinai* “as for friends, if somebody knows how to deal with them,.....what should we call them?” (Xen.). Lat. *tu, si te dei amant, agere tuam rem occasiost* (Plautus). A more or less accurate Indian counterpart of these constructions may be found in the use of redundant resumptive pronouns; cf. SB. 1, 2, 5, 18 *devā́ ha vai saṃgrāmāṃ saṃnidhāsyántas té ho 'cuḥ*; 2, 1, 4, 15 *devā́n ha vā́ agní́ ūdhāsyámānāṃs tān asurarakṣasāni*

rarakṣuh, etc. Constructions such as these, so wide-spread among the Indo-European dialects, cannot be brushed aside as anakolouthon and must be regarded as a relic of the original Indo-European.

The author opens his section on elliptic constructions with the words "when the adverb *api* is used the subject is very often suppressed", and in illustration of this statement he gives several passages with *api*. In none of these passages unfortunately is *api* an adverb. In everyone of them it is a pre-verb compounded with *as-*. For instance, *api vo 'trā 'stu* (AB.) does not mean "you may have a share here also" but simply "let a share of this belong to you." *api+as-* signifies "to belong", "zu Theil werden" (BR). Evidently Mr. Sen has been misled by Keith who could not understand these constructions with *api+as-*, with or without *imesis*, in AB. Constructions with *api+as-*, specially in connection with *bhāgá* (as in the passages quoted by Mr. Sen), are very old; cf. RV. X, 71, 6 *ná tāsya vācy api bhāgó asti*. In rare elliptic constructions even the verbal element *as-* is absent sometimes. Cf. in this connection also the nominal compounds *apisoma* and *anapisoma* (JB.). Bhaṭṭoji's *sarpiṣo 'pi syāt* has nothing to do with these Vedic constructions as Mr. Sen thinks. Besides, the title "Elliptic Constructions" is a misnomer. The cases dealt with are simply those of brachylogy.

"Elliptic Constructions" is followed by "Peculiar Constructions." As the first peculiar construction the author has chosen a well-known sentence *agnír vai devānām addhātāmām* (SB. 1, 6, 2, 9), on which he makes the astonishing remark that "an indeclinable has been used here as the subjective predicate." Why should the simple adverb *addhātāmām* be the subjective predicate (whatever it may mean) here? The fact is that a verb form of *bhū* or *as-* has to be supplied in this sentence. Cf. KS. 30, 2: *tryanīkam asya prajā bhaviṣyati*. Accusative adverbs are often constructed with *bhū-* or *as-* in the Brāhmaṇas, but the verb form may also be omitted sometimes (Delbrück, p. 203). Under the same head the author's treatment of the *īśvará* passages gives as a surprise. He has calmly translated TS. 3, 1, 1: *tām īśvarám rákṣāṃsi hántoḥ* by "R. are liable to injure him." Has he been misled by Keith here too? If *īśvarám* in this passage is to be connected with *hántoḥ*, as it has to be, the only rendering possible

would be, "him who is capable of injuring the R." BR. (s.v. *īśvará*) have pointed out that only the nom. masc. sg. form of this word is used in this anomalous way. The acc. *īśvarám* is governed here by the preceding *nir ghnanti*. Whitney (§ 984) pointed out long ago that *īśvará* often does not agree in number and gender with the subject. To what a degree had *īśvará* become a purely grammatical expression without any independent value is best proved by those cases where it has been altogether dropped, cf. SB. 3, 1, 2, 21 *tám há 'dbhutam abhíjanitoh*. In RV. in the place of such *īśvará* constructions are found those with verb forms of *īś-*.

It is useless to pursue the author across the whole length of the book in this way, the review of the first ten pages will have amply demonstrated its merits and demerits. Let it be mentioned however in passing that the periphrastic perfect appears, although only once, already in the AV. and not in the Brāhmaṇas for the first time as Mr. Sen is inclined to think (p. 22). The author is very much surprised that the substitution of the dat. sg. ending for gen. sg. of feminine stems, which is such a common feature of the Brāhmaṇas, is wholly unknown in classical Sanskrit (p. 83). It may be pointed out however that traces of this substituted ending are abundant in Prākṛit (Pischel, § 375). Depending on Horn the author has said that similar phenomena are to be found also in the Avesta, but can any definite suggestion be made on this point in the face of the hopeless confusion in the use of cases in the Avesta? Cf. Wackernagel, III 6 15d, p. 40. The three passages quoted by the author (p. 84) to prove that the dative ending has been used also for the locative are wholly unconvincing. In the final chapter the author deals with the locative, and various uses of this case have been given. Yet one looks in vain for the locative of goal as a separate category, cf. RV. I, 1, 4 *sá íd devéṣu gacchati*, GB. 2, 5, 8 *nāke rohati* which Gaastra has "corrected" into *nākam*. The author needs not get diffident about the connection between *píbatoh* and *pátresu* (p. 161) in TS. 4, 5, 11, 1 *yé ánnesu vivídhyanti pátresu píbato jánān*. Such locatives of the vessel are quite common in the Brāhmaṇas.

A special feature of the book consists of various Greek and Avestan

parallels. Selected passages have been given fairly correctly though without much critical discrimination.

In spite of these shortcomings, the book will certainly prove to be useful as a collection of valuable materials to all those who can supply the necessary corrective.

BATAKRISHNA GHOSH

THE DYNASTIC HISTORY OF NORTHERN INDIA (Early Mediæval Period) by H. C. Ray, M.A., Ph.D. (London), vol. I, Pp. xl+663, maps 10, Calcutta 1931. Calcutta University Press.

In this volume covering 663 pages Dr. H. C. Ray gives an account of the dynasties that ruled in Northern India during the period of transition intervening between the decline of the Gurjara-Pratihāra empire and the Muslim conquest. Dr. Ray takes note not only of the paramount dynasties but also of the more important feudatory families. He takes his stand mainly on the evidence of contemporary inscriptions and literature, and his work is in a large measure free from the glaring inaccuracies and conjectures that are the usual concomitants of hasty attempts at writing dynastic annals by persons who have a pathetic faith in the value of tradition, however late or discrepant, and are unfamiliar with critical methods of study and investigation. An important feature of the work is the inclusion of a number of excellent maps which will undoubtedly be of great help to students.

The volume before us deals mainly with the dynasties that ruled in the extensive territories on the outskirts of the Gangetic Doab, watered by the Indus, the Bāgmatī, the Brahmaputra, and the Mahānadi. But we have also a few important chapters dealing with the kingdoms of Kanauj and Benares in the heart and centre of the *Madhya-deśa*.

The volume opens with a chapter on Sind. Dr. Ray wisely bases his account of this kingdom mainly on the chronicle of Balādhurī supplementing it with information gleaned from coins and works like the *Chach-nāma*. The second chapter—that on the Sāhis of Afghanistan and the Punjab—is, in some respects, the most interesting

in the whole volume. The author shows great industry and patience in piecing together the scraps of information gathered from various sources, literary, epigraphic and numismatic, and tells the thrilling story of the fall of the last outposts of the land of *al-Hind*, held by the *Shāh* of Kābul, the *Ratbal* or *Ratbīl* of Zābul and ar-Rukhkhaj and the *Satrap* of Zaranj, after a period of brave struggle. Regarding the mysterious potentate or potentates known to the Arabs as *Ratbīl*, *Rantbīl*, *Ratbal* or *Zunbīl* the conjecture may be hazarded that the original Sanskrit designation was *Rāṣṭrapāla* or *Janapāla*, comparable to *Rāṣṭriya* and *Janendra* of inscriptions, and very likely to be equated with *Khshathra pāvan* ('protector of the land') or *Satrap* of the Scytho-Parthian period, and also with *Deśagoptri* of the Gupta epigraphs. The form *Ratbal* may be compared to *Rājībāl* which stands for the Sanskrit *Rājyapāla*. The temple of the *Zūr* (p. 66) reminds one of *Shu* (or *Chu*)-*nalera* mentioned by the most famous of Chinese pilgrims in his account of *Tsao-ku-t'a* (= *Jāguḍa* = *Zābul*?). The *Ratbīl* of Zābul must be distinguished from the Kābul *Shāh* (p. 67) who, judging from the evidence of al-Bīrūnī, undoubtedly claimed Turki lineage and descent from the great *Kaṇiṣka*. The kingdom of the *Shāh* at one time extended from Kābul to *Nagarkoṭ*, but his identification with the Buddhist *Kṣatriya* king of *Kia-pi-shi* is not obvious, the more so because the Chinese pilgrim clearly distinguished this *Buddhist Kṣatriya* king from a Turkish potentate, the ruler of *Fu-li-shih-sa-t'ang-na* or the district round *Opiān*, who may have been the *Turuṣka* mentioned by *Kaṭhāna* (V. 149-55). The capital of the Hindu *Sāhis* seems to have been at *Udabhāṇḍa* or *Waihand*, and *Bhatinda* of *Firishta* is apparently a misreading or corrupt form of *Bahinda* or *Waihand* (cf. *Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī*).

Dr. Ray next deals with the royal houses of Kashmir, Nepal, Assam, Bengal, Bihār, Orissa, Kanauj etc. The account of these dynasties is enriched with a wealth of information that is truly amazing. When his book reaches a second edition he will, it is hoped, utilise the evidence of those records (e.g. the *Tiwarkhed* plates of the *Rāṣṭrakuṭa Nannarāja*) which have been published in comparatively recent times. While one may differ from Dr. Ray in regard to some of his statements or conclusions, none who has studied the volume can fail to bear testi-

mony to the industry and skill with which he has marshalled his facts and the critical caution displayed in the sifting of evidence.

H. C. R. C.

THE SPHOTAŚIDDHI of Ācārya Maṇḍanamīśra with the Gopālikā of Ṛṣiṣūtra Parameśvara edited by Vedaviśārada S. K. Rāmanātha Śāstrī. Super Royal 8vo. pp. xxiv+268+38, Madras, 1931.

The Doctrine of Sphoṭa occupies an important place in the history of Indian linguistic speculations. It tries to explain how the speech-sounds, as they are uttered, come to create the cognition of meaning. It may be formulated as follows: Our speech-sounds constitute only one of the endless varieties of sounds (*dhvanis*) of the world. While speaking, we emit through our vocal organs *varṇas* (=elements of speech-sounds) one by one; but as soon as these have been uttered in a particular order they make the hearer cognizant of a definite meaning. Now this capacity of producing cognition of a meaning, that is inherent in these *varṇas* has been called the S p h o ṭ a.

Connected though the doctrine is with great names such as Patañjali and Bhartr̥hari it does not enjoy favour with all the schools of Indian thinkers. Followers of the *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika* and the *Purva-Mīmāṃsā* systems reject the doctrine totally. The rejection of the doctrine by the followers of the latter system is not quite disinterested; for on allowing it to stand, words and sounds as they are, become deprived of all validity and hence all actions (*Karmakāṇḍa*) will prove to be futile.

This being the position of the doctrine of Sphoṭa in the Hindu thought the S p h o ṭ a ś i d d h i by Maṇḍana-Mīśra now edited and published for the first time in the Madras University Sanskrit Series (no. 6) should be considered as an important addition to the list of Indian philosophical texts. The special importance of the work lies in the fact that it was written by a Vedāntin to whom all the world including words and their meaning is nothing but an illusion (*māyā*). The learned editor, the Vedaviśārada Rāmanātha Śāstrī has done his work

well In a short prefatory note written in clear and elegant Sanskrit he has discussed among other things the identity of the author Maṇḍana-Miśra. His theory in this matter deserves serious consideration. It is generally believed that Maṇḍana-Miśra *alias* Sureśvar-ācārya who was first a disciple of Kumārila Bhaṭṭa became subsequently a *celā* of the great Śaṅkara. The editor seems to have shown cogent grounds for disbelieving such a story. If by the expression 'durvidagdha' (Kārikā, 2) the author of the *Sphoṭasiddhi* has referred as has been alleged by the author of *Gopālikā* (the commentary to the *Sphoṭasiddhi*), to Kumārila, then one finds it difficult to connect the two names as the teacher and the pupil.

But it must, however, be admitted that more satisfactory evidence should be adduced before finally accepting the theory of the editor. And in fact he has promised us something in this line in the introduction of the *Brahmasiddhi* which is also a work of Maṇḍana-Miśra and is going to be published in the Madras University Sanskrit Series.

The prefatory notes of the editor discusses also the life and works of R̥ṣiputra Parameśvara, the author of the *Gopālikā*. This commentator was born in the line of great scholars.

Besides the *Gopālikā* they are known to have written the following works: (1) *Mīmāṃsā-sūtrārthasaṅgraha*, (2) *Tattva-vibhāvanā*, (3) *Nītitattvāvirbhāva-vyākhyā*, (4) *Sradita-tarāṅginī* and (5) *Mīmāṃsā-kāśikā-ṭippanī*. The notices of these works given in the prefatory notes will be of great use to the scholars working in these lines.

Finally we congratulate the editor for this very useful edition of the *Sphoṭasiddhi* together with the *Gopālikā* furnished with two indices one of which traces the source of the majority of quotations in the latter (*Gopālikā*). The get-up and the printing of the work are quite satisfactory.

MANOMOHAN GHOSH

BEGINNINGS OF VIJAYANAGARA HISTORY by Rev. H. Heras, Studies in Indian History of the Indian Historical Research Institute. St. Xavier's College, Bombay. No. 4.

The present work is an important addition to the constant stream of publications that have appeared in recent years on the great Hindu empire of Mediæval India. Father Heras, whose earlier work, *The Aravidu Dynasty of Vijayanagara*, dealing with the later history of the Vijayanagara empire, has been favourably noticed by competent scholars, has now undertaken to throw light upon the obscure history of its origin. His conclusions which are based on an exhaustive and critical examination of the available sources, help to solve many problems that have hitherto defied solution.

The present work consists of two parts—the first bearing the title—The Foundation of the City of Vijayanagara—and the second being called—The Origin of the Saṅgama Dynasty. Of the many points dealt with by the author, only a few may be noticed. The story of the foundation of Vijayanagara by Mādharma (otherwise called Vidyāranya) was fabricated by the ascetics of the Śringerī-Maṭh in the beginning of the fifteenth century. The founder of the city of Vijayanagara (or rather of Anegundi, as the author would like to say in modification of his conclusions in the earlier chapters) was Vīra Ballāla III, the last great king of the Hoysala dynasty. The oldest name of the city was Śrī Vīra Vijaya Virūpākṣapura. The dynasty of Saṅgama was not of Telugu origin but came from the same great stock of the Yādavas as the Hoysalas and were probably related to the latter. Harihara I, the founder of the dynasty, was appointed by Vīra Ballāla III as his Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara of the North. After the extinction of the Hoysala dynasty the Kanarese country acknowledged the rulers of Vijayanagara as their legitimate kings, while the Telugu country repeatedly rebelled against them and at last submitted reluctantly to their domination.

The book is a valuable contribution to the history of Mediæval India and will deserve the serious consideration of every student of the subject.

U. N. GHOSHAL

THE HEADQUARTERS OF REALITY by Edmond Holmes
Methuen & Co. Ltd., London.

The treatise under review embodies the author's conviction that the Real of reals is to be found within and not without as declared by the

seers of India. The book is a challenge to Western thought. The author has sketched the dominant trend of Western thought from Aristotle down to the present time. Under the lead of Greek thought in general and of Aristotle's philosophy in particular, the Western mind has always inclined towards the externalist conception of reality: a conception which tends to lower reality to the dead level of mere existence. Such a conception of reality, ruling out as it does the supernatural in all its aspects and making the analysis of sense-experience the pathway to ultimate truth, leads at last to the open dualism of Nature and the Supernatural.

The author has conveniently divided the work into three parts. In the First Part of the Book the author has exhibited the dominant characteristics of Western thought. In the Second Part he turns for guidance to India. In the Philosophy of the Upaniṣads he finds the solution of the problem of Reality. The Real of reals, as the author confidently points out, is to be found in the unexplored World—formless, inconceivable, unimaginable—into which each of us is admitted through the portal of his own self-consciousness. In the Third Part he compares with one another the three schemes of life that emerge from the rival solutions of the problem of Reality—Supernaturalism and Normalism which we owe to the externalism of the West, and the Spiritual Idealism which we owe to the introspectiveness of Ancient India.

The Spiritual Idealism which, according to the author, provides us with a key to the solution of the problem of Reality has its difficulty too. It fails to supply us with a satisfactory account of the outward world—world of matter and form. Spiritual Idealism is never weary of telling us that the air of intrinsic reality which the outward world wears is illusory. The hypothesis of *Māyā*, however ingenious, cannot stand the crucibles of ratiocination. As long as we live, move, and have our being in discursive thought, we cannot perceive the undifferentiated unity in which the ultimate truth, as indicated by the seers of the Upaniṣads, consists.

Dualism is inherent in the nature of intellect. Intellect with its symbols, shibboleths, creeds and conventions, is not adequate to the grasp of the formless reality. Intuition, to which the author trusts for

the understanding of the reality, is something to which the intellectualists are quite unwilling to grant any status. Intuition, according to the seers of the Upaniṣads, is indefinable. It is a magic talisman which transfigures the whole existence of men into a new reality. The value of intuition as a means to the discovery of Reality will, to all intents and purposes, remain a sealed book to the intellectualists. The book, however excellent as a work of conviction and faith, will fail to create a deep and abiding impression until the people accept intuition as an apparatus for the grasp of the ultimate reality.

D. L. DE

INDO-ARYAN LITERATURE AND CULTURE (ORIGINS) by Nagendra Nath Ghose, M.A., B.L. The Book Company Ltd., College Square, Calcutta 1934. Pp. xxvi, 287.

This work is a remarkable contribution to the study of certain aspects of Indo-Aryan Culture, if not directly of its Literature. It begins ostensibly with the treatment of the much discussed theme of the Vrātya, with all its apparent absurdities and inconsistencies, as presented by the *Atharva-veda* and the ritualistic Śrauta texts; but in reality it comprehends in its wide scope a large variety of problems arising therefrom. The author's main concern appears to be the question of the Aryan and Non-Aryan rapprochement, and with this end in view he makes use of the scattered Vedic and Purāṇic clues to emphasise what he calls the very important Vrātya contributions to Indo-Aryan culture. He has therefore to rely a great deal upon the originally non-canonical but subsequently Brāhmanised sources, such as the apparently obscure Atharvaṇic texts and Purāṇic legends so richly furnish. The work is therefore essentially an attempt at synthetic interpretation, and develops, from the author's particular point of view, the Pṛthu-Vaiṇya legend, the origin of the Sūta-Māgadha and the Draupadī legend in connexion with the Kuru-pāñcāla cycle of epic stories, all of which are, with considerable forensic acumen, connected directly or indirectly with the Vrātya movement. The author in this way attempts to demonstrate that the Indo-Aryan culture, as we find it reflected in its religious and legendary literature, is a complex but synthetic product, the main ingredients of which are of Non-Aryan Vrātya origin,

but to which determinative direction was given by the organising trend of the Aryan mind. He locates the Vrātya centre in the east and brings together epic and Purānic indications to show that the synthesis of the two cultures was first brought about in the eastern kingdom of Magadha and was conditioned chiefly by the comparatively easy mechanism of the Vrātya conversion ceremony, which in his opinion was rather a political than religious ritual, its main object having been the absorption of larger man-power into the Aryan fold from its new environment.

On the author's main position with regard to the synthesis of Aryan and Non-Aryan cultures and its probable development in the east, which was aryanised at a comparatively late period, we believe there will be little disagreement. Modern research has been tending to establish this position from various points of view; but Professor Ghose's very suggestive and stimulating work will further support this tendency by its approach of the problem from the sociologico-cultural point of view. We consider this to be the chief value of his thesis. With reference to the many details, however, regarding his interpretation of particular texts or legends, or, to give a concrete example, his views regarding the Paisāca Prakrit, it is only natural that there should be inevitable differences of opinion. In this brief review it is not possible to enter into such details, but it is noteworthy that it is on the basis of these details that the author skilfully builds up quite a remarkable view regarding the value, from the point of view of culture-history, of the various epic and Purānic legends and traditions. There can be no doubt that in this respect his work is a challenge to consider these neglected sources for a proper re-construction of the history of Indo-Aryan culture as a whole. The work therefore should receive serious attention and invite further discussion. On the question of origins and culture-movements no one can be dogmatic; and, in spite of a certain emphatic note in his statements the author's treatment of materials and conclusions drawn therefrom cannot indeed be complacently ignored. We are glad that Professor Ghose has now turned his attention from law to literature, and brought his mature juristic abilities to bear upon problems of wider indological interest.

VEDIC STUDIES, vol. I, by A. Venkatasubbiah. 292 pp. Surabhi and Company. Mysore, 1932.

The author presents in the volume under review several papers published by him in the Indian Antiquary and the Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society in the years 1926-29. Each of these articles is devoted to the detailed discussion of the meaning of a particular Ṛg-vedic word, and, in all, fourteen such words have been discussed in this work, namely, 'nītya', 'śunám', 'indrasenā', 'śagmá', 'svásara', 'aratí', 'dán', 'pṛthak', 'yaksám', 'ábhva', 'admasád', 'nireká', 'smáddiṣṭi' and 'paḍbhíḥ'. It will be noted that much ink has been already spilt over most of these words. The author therefore has given proof of his courage in trying to determine the meanings of these difficult words, and it is all the more, remarkable, for, as he himself admits in his preface, instead of introducing any new method of inquiry or any new materials the author has simply followed the lead of Pischel and Geldner. Yet the result has been always different and the author thinks that it is principally due to the fact that when comparing parallel passages he has adhered to the ṚV. more strictly than Pischel and Geldner in their *Vedischen Studien*. This strict adherence to the method of Vedic interpretation followed by P. and G. explains the complete reticence of the author on the grammatical and etymological problems connected with the words discussed in the book. True, much cannot be expected of the art of etymology in determining the exact meaning of any particular word, but to ignore it completely in a work of this kind can be hardly regarded as a virtue at this time of day.

When confronted with the task of interpreting ancient texts the modern philologist has to always bear in mind the fact that exactly equivalent words are rare even among modern languages, and that when a wide gulf of time and space separates the language of the text to be interpreted from the modern dialect which is to be the medium of interpretation, to attempt to find an exactly equivalent modern word is tantamount to doing violence to the ancient text. The philologist has to always guard himself against the temptation to read modern meanings in ancient words. This was fully appreciated by Roth and Böhtlingk who contented themselves only with *suggesting* the meaning with the help of German equivalents but then let the original passages reveal the true meaning in all its apprehensible nuances. Specially in the case of ṚV., on whose apparently homogeneous body

is reflected a restless literary activity extended over many centuries, has their procedure to be adhered to, for here, through the extensive use of metaphors, all possible shades of meaning came to be attributed to the same word-symbol. Equation of conceptions which but partly overlap each other, though known all over the world among primitive peoples, is certainly one of the most striking features of the psychology of the Vedic Indians, as is amply proved by the absurd equations of which the Brāhmaṇas are full. Applied to the language this principle will inevitably give rise to a long chain of mobile conceptions shading off from each other sometimes beyond recognition—all however expressed by the same word-symbol! The onus on the student of the Veda is to trace the stretch of this chain, link by link, in their historical order. Etymology will come in handy to him in this task by suggesting to him in which direction he should look for the beginning of the chain, though however the etymological meaning may nowhere be pointed out in the extant texts. It is clear that in such a case to give a general sort of meaning susceptible of very wide application is to shirk the real task. The true historical procedure would be to proceed from the precise to the general. But the author of the volume has in most cases followed just the opposite course, and in his zeal to find a sense that would fit in all the passages concerned he has sometimes suggested meanings of such a comprehensive character that they can be hardly said to signify anything at all. Thus 'yakṣám' in his opinion signifies (1) being (concrete), i. e. all beings, the creation, world, universe etc. and (2) being (abstract), i. e. essence, substance, virtue, might, powers etc. (p. 161). One wonders what under the sun was not called 'yakṣá' by the Vedic Indians!

Yet all the meanings suggested by the author for the words discussed by him are not of this character. The opening word 'nítya', for instance, has been discussed much more sagaciously, but the result is surely surprising. He has fully demonstrated that in some passages at least, it should be regarded as equivalent to 'priyá'. But turning to the word 'priyá' the reader will be bewildered to find that, on the author's own showing, it often signifies 'ntya'! Thus when both 'nítya' and 'priyá' are but parallel moving streams of meanings can any real gain be achieved by linking them to each other? Comparative philology would have told the author that the usual meaning attached to 'priyá' is the original one, but he has ignored this only certain point in a sea of uncertainty. The treatment of the other words are much less satisfactory, for the author is every-

where anxious above all to find as comprehensible a meaning as possible. The second word 'śunám', in his opinion, again signifies 'priyá', but this time he has arrived at this conclusion not through comparison of parallel passages, but through analogy. The course of his analogy however is extremely intricate. Starting from the assumption that 'śunám' is sometimes equivalent to 'svám' but not always so, the author infers "from the analogy of the words 'priyá', 'vāmá' and 'jūṣṭa' or 'nītya', 'svá', and 'nijá', that mean both 'dear' and 'own', that 'śuná' too has these two meanings"! In dealing with the word 'śagmá' too the author evinces the same tendency to force one meaning on all the passages,—the particular meaning being 'śivá'—, although both the etymology and the frequent use of the word as an adjective of 'áśva' clearly show that in most cases it has to be translated by 'strong'. But by 'śagmāso áśvāḥ' our author understands "horses that draw the chariot comfortably" (p. 78). 'Svásara' is a difficult word to which Geldner devoted a brilliant article in the *Vedischen Studien* and as the result of his enquiry had to postulate three different meanings for the word. The author however has tried to cut the Gordian knot by suggesting that in all the passages 'svásara' signifies 'sandhyā'. This meaning is obviously impossible, for instance, in RV. 1, 3, 8 ā ganta...usrā iva svásarāṇi, for accusative of time dependent on a verb of motion is known only as adverb. The author himself suggests that here 'svásarāṇi' = 'svasaréṣu' (p. 91), but why ?

The word 'aratí' is used invariably as an appellative of Agni and it seems to express some relation between Agni on the one hand and heaven and earth on the other. The author therefore has drawn up a list of twenty-one items, each giving a particular characteristic of Agni in relation to heaven and earth, but immediately afterwards makes the astonishing remark that, "it becomes obvious that the first-mentioned twenty cannot be denoted by it". Without giving them a fair trial the author thus dismisses them abruptly and puts his faith on the twenty-first characteristic of Agni which is that he shines upon or illumines heaven and earth. Yet Neisser has conclusively proved that it is the ninth characteristic on the list,—namely Agni's messengership between heaven and earth, which is expressed by the word 'aratí'. For the wellknown word 'dán', which is almost universally recognised to be the gen. sg. of 'dám' (see Wackernagel, III, p. 244), the author proposes the meaning 'strength', 'power' etc. and like Pischel derives it from an hypothetical 'dams' (p. 119). This novel derivation is quite unnecessary, for 'dám' itself may easily signify 'strength' etc. The

author is of opinion that 'maksú' primarily signifies 'great, powerful' and only secondarily 'quick, swift, rapid' (p. 134). But Lat. 'mox' shows that the opposite is true. 'Nireká' has been derived from ni+ri- by the addition of the suffix-ka (p. 227) and it is taken to be synonymous with 'vāja'. But the meaning of 'vāja' is anything but certain and precise. Moreover the derivation proposed by the author is not very probable, for instances of '-ka' as a primary suffix are rare. It is definitely wrong to say that 'vāja' is derived from 'vaj-' (p. 222), for the existence of such a root cannot be proved. All the quotable forms may be regarded as those of the denominative stem of 'vāja' and in 'ójīyas' and 'ójiṣṭha' we have not a week-grade form of this hypothetical root but merely 'ójas' (Avestan 'aogah'). The word 'paḍbhīḥ' has been always a puzzle to Vedic scholars both on account of its form and meaning, and with this puzzle our author concludes his book. In his search for a very general and comprehensive meaning the author has struck on the meaning 'dhibhīḥ' (p. 266) for 'paḍbhīḥ', which he derives from (s) paś-. But it is very much to be doubted whether he will succeed in persuading anybody to accept his interpretation. So far as can be seen, in some passages at least, 'paḍbhīḥ' must be regarded as a flexional form of 'pád' in which the dental was cerebralised through analogy (see Wackernagel, I § 148a, pp. 171f.).

After all is said it must be admitted however that the work under review is a valuable contribution to Vedic philology. The meanings suggested by the author for the words discussed cannot stand, but the discussions themselves cannot be disposed off so summarily. The author is conversant with the methods of Vedic research and he also knows the Vedic bibliography. His translation of the Vedic passages are generally, controversial points apart, very accurate. The book cannot fail to please the lovers of Vedic lore.

BATAKRISHNA GHOSH

STUDIA INDO-IRANICA : Ehrengabe für Wilhelm Geiger, zur Vollendung des 75. Lebensjahres. Herausgegeben von Walther Wüst. Otto Harrassowitz, Leipzig, 1931; pp. XII+327.

Wilhelm Geiger, one of the most reputed masters of Aryan philology, requires no introduction at this time of day. There is hardly a branch of this vast subject but has been enriched by his contributions and his untiring and ceaseless activity.

As the long *Tabula Gratulatoria* shows, all the world has paid homage to the master on this occasion and from a glance at the table of contents it will be clear that scholars of every country took this opportunity to honour one of the greatest living savants of the present day and thus honour themselves. The Editor of the volume, Dr. Walther Wüst, a faithful disciple of the old master, has amply proved his love and respect for his guru by bringing out this volume and he has thus also earned the gratitude of the scholarly world, for, as the following survey will show, most of the essays contained in this volume are really very original and thought-provoking. We in India too have reasons to take pride in this volume, if not for the contributions which have come from India, at least for the great help rendered by the Parsee community in India at the instance of Sir Jivanji Jamshedji Modi to meet the expenses of printing this volume.

The volume begins with ten benedictory verses in Pāli composed by Rev. A. P. Buddhadatta Thera of Ceylon, a personal friend of Wilhelm Geiger. Then follow the articles of the contributors. A. M. Hocart in his article "Yakṣas and Vāddas" has discussed the vexed ethnological problem of the Vāddas and comes to the conclusion that they are the relic of an older population of Ceylon than the Sinhalese. They have been at first deeply influenced by the Yakṣas (a term which may cover more than one race) and then by the Sinhalese.

Theodor Zachariae, who has made his name famous by lexicographical studies, has touched a very interesting problem of folklore in his short article "Zu den Rätselhaften Antworten." He has pointed out how a story, which hinges on the riddle of making "two out of one," reappears in slightly varying forms in various countries at various times. J. Schick in his pretty long contribution "Die ältesten Versionen von Chaucers Frankeleynes Tale" has also dealt with a similar theme. Here he points out one Chinese and various Indian forerunners to this famous story in Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*. Ernst Leumann before his sudden death supplied J. Schick with an old Jaina version of this story occurring in Malayagiri's *Vyavahārabhāṣyapeḍh*. This Jaina version along with a German translation has been published here for the first time.

Leumann himself has published in the volume under review a long portion of Asaṅga's *Bodhisattvabhūmi* according to Wogihara's edition and rendered the text as clearly intelligible as possible by means of all the resources of printing technique.

Ludwig Bachhofer, the well-known writer on East-Asian art,

has contributed a short but very instructive article on the Gandhāra art. It has been hitherto generally taken for granted that the Gandhāra art owes its origin to Greek influence and the more a work of Gandhāra art shows signs of similarity with Greek or Hellenistic sculpture the older it should be. The author has stoutly controverted this theory and pointed out that the works of art dating from the fourth to fifth century A. D., brought to light by French excavators at Hadda near Jalalabad, show astonishing similarity with the works of Hellenistic art, and yet, as the interval of time is too long, Hellenistic influence of the second century B. C. cannot be made responsible for this remarkable fact. In a short article Dr. Bimala Churn Law has discussed various passages in the Pāli literature where 'Cetiya' has been mentioned and re-affirmed Kern's opinion that "all edifices having the character of a sacred monument are Caityas, but not all Caityas are edifices." Fick in his article "Die Gotras in den Pāli-texten" has tried to defend his position as stated in *Encycl. of Religion and Ethics*, vol. VI, pp. 353ff. against the sharp criticism of S. V. Karandikar, who in his 'Hindu Exogamy' has put forward the theory that the Gotras of the Brāhmaṇa priests were adopted by the Kṣatriyas. Mrs. C. A. F. Rhys Davids' article "Felsenriffe der versunkenen Sakyalehre" has a German title but it is written in English. The writer has exhibited much temperament and rhetorical powers in this article, all of which however might have been easily spared. Winternitz has once more discussed the problem "Kann uns der Pālikanon etwas über den älteren Buddhismus und seine Geschichte lehren?"—and contended that the Pāli canon is the most faithful of all and has better preserved the teachings of the Buddha than the Sanskrit, the Tibetan or the Chinese version, though, of course, every part of the Pāli canon should be taken with utmost caution.

The famous Semitist Fritz Hommel has contributed a very important and instructive article on the Semitic origin of Indian script. Among the various old Semitic scripts the author points out the Lihyanian script to be most akin to the Indian Brāhmī script. The comparative table appended to this highly interesting article leaves little doubt on that score.

Scheftelowitz has devoted a short study to the holy number 108 and comes to the conclusion that it is made up of 101 and 7 put together and the present reviewer has contributed an article in Sanskrit on the Vyāsamṛti as reconstructed from later Nibandhas and commentaries. Professor Hauer, an authority on Yoga in Europe,

has tried to give a satisfactory explanation of the Sūtras IV, 1-6 of the Yogasūtra. The author has shown that the real meaning of these sūtras has escaped all the commentators who tried to impose on them a magical significance which is quite incompatible with the metaphysical character of the fourth book of the Yogasūtra. Professor Oertel has pointed out two hitherto unnoticed cases of Prākritism in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad. 'Abhyāttaḥ' in Ch. Up., 3, 14, 2 is in his opinion a corrupt Prākrit form of 'abhyāptaḥ' which occurs in the parallel passage ŚB., 10, 6, 3, 2, because √dā + abhi-ā is otherwise quite unknown. It is impossible to connect this form with √at, as Śaṅkara has done, for the past participle of √at is 'atita' (see Nir. 4, 5). Also the obviously ungrammatical form 'pradhākṣīr' for 'pradhākṣīd' (Ch. Up., 4, 1, 2) has been explained as a Prākritism on the ground that a confusion between *d* and *r* is not at all seldom from RV. downwards. Betty Heimann in her contribution "Zur indischen Namenkunde" has touched an interesting problem of Indology. This is perhaps the first systematic attempt to grapple with the problem of Indian proper names since Hilka. A better exposition of this vast subject within the short compass of one article is hardly imaginable. Harit Krishna Deb in his article on "Vedic India and Minoan men" has put forward a number of very daring theories. The author is convinced that the Dorians and other races who swept across the Aegean area sometime during the latter part of the second millenium B. C. are identical with the Vedic Indians. He has courageously identified various tribes mentioned in RV. with those who fought against the Egyptians at about 1200 B. C. The Vedic tribal name Turvaśa is in his opinion an amalgam of the tribal names Teresh and Weshesh mentioned in Egyptian inscriptions.

In his paper "Ein Weiterer iranisch-hitischer Eigennamen in R̥gveda" Wüst has pointed out another Irano-Scythian proper name in RV. like 'Śr̥binda,' etc. The word 'ālakam' which occurs twice in RV. has hitherto been taken to mean 'empty', 'vain' etc, and grammatically it has been always interpreted as the adverb 'ālam' extended by the suffix -ka, conveying a contemptuous or diminutive sense. But a peculiar characteristic of this word has apparently escaped all Vedic scholars: the diminutive suffix -ka always takes the accent upon itself (cf. Pāṇini, V. 3, 71): anyá: anyaká, éka: ekaká, etc. Why then ālam: ālakam? This remarkable accentuation shows that 'ālakam' does not belong to this category at all. The only other category which suggests itself for the explanation of this word is that of 'ántaka,' 'vís̥vaka,' 'sómaka.' All

of them are however proper names. Ergo, 'álaka' is a proper name. In fact, according to the writer, RV. X. 108, 7 'réku padám álakam ā jagantha' conveys almost the same idea as Kālidāsa's 'gantavyā te vasatir alakā nāma yakṣeśvarāṇām' (Meghadūta verse 7). The author has then tried to locate this 'álaka' and after a highly instructive etymological disquisition connected it with Ossetic Aläg. A large portion of the article is devoted to discussions on the probable meaning of the word 'réku' which likewise occurs in RV. X. 108, 7. In spite of Sāyaṇa its connection with √ric is obvious and has been generally accepted, but only Hillebrandt before the present writer pointed out that réku belongs to the category of bhindú, dārú, jāyú, etc. and therefore must be of active meaning and not passive like riktá.

Four more articles by Jules Bloch, Franklin Edgerton, L. Renou and Max Walleser respectively make up the aggregate of Indological studies contained in this volume. All of them are of unusual importance for general linguistics. Jules Bloch discusses the Prākṛit word vaṭṭā (fem.) <Skt. vartman (neuter). It is well-known that many Skt. words in -an or -as become feminine in Prākṛit, such as addhā <adhvan, candimā <candramas, etc. The starting point of this change of gender is obviously nom. sing., where the ending -ā naturally suggests the feminine gender. But vaṭṭā <vartman cannot be explained in this way, for here the original word being of neuter gender in Skt. ends in short -a and not -ā in nom. sing. An intermediate masculine form *vartmā or *vaṭṭā is necessary to explain this transformation, which must have been facilitated, first, by the direct influence of the synonymous word adhvan (>addhā) and secondly by a general tendency of words signifying 'road' towards the animate gender: cf. Greek 'hodós, kéleuthos,' Latin 'via, callis,' Gothic 'vigs' etc.

Franklin Edgerton in a short article has dealt with the knotty problem of Skt. pronominal stems in -d. Skt. generic pronouns as well as personal pronouns assume, as is well known, forms ending in -d (or -t) in composition and derivations e. g. tad-vaśá: tad-īya, māt-kṛta: madīya, etc. Wackernagel suggested that the starting point of this development is to be sought in such tatpuruṣa compounds where acc. sing. in the first component is logical and necessary, such as tad-vaśá. But Edgerton rightly points out that of the half-dozen Ṛg-vedic compounds with tad- as prior member only tad-vaśá is a real tatpuruṣa, all others being bahuvrīhis as indicated by the accent (tád-), in which no such inflected acc. sing. form of the first component is necessary. Wackernagel's theory therefore does

not hold good. The explanation suggested by Edgerton is highly ingenious. He says that the whole phenomenon is based on a morphological analogy. He points out that with the exception of a-stems, almost all noun and adjective declensions use as 'stem' in composition and derivation a form which is identical with the neuter nominative-accusative singular. (e. g. vāri, madhu, bhartṛ, trivṛt, nāma, śreyas, etc.) and suggests that on the analogy of these declensions in the case of generic pronouns too the form for nom.-acc. sing. neuter came to be used in composition and derivation. This hypothesis does not obviously hold good in the case of personal pronouns. Edgerton therefore adopts the view expressed by Tamm that the forms mad-, tvad- etc. are made by form-analogy in imitation of yad-, tad- etc.

Renou's remarks "sur quelques particularités du suffixe en -k- en Sanskrit" are highly instructive. According to the author this guttural suffix was originally of an indeterminate semasiological value. Its function became gradually more and more defined, but only in those cases where it was strengthened by other elements: - aka- and -uka- in verbal adjectives and -ika- as adjective building suffix. The original suffix is retained however in a number of adverbs, such as árdhak, gabhiṣák, vṛthak, etc. As a simple element of increment the suffix -k- finds another suffix -t- in the same field: cf. gabhiṣat, tājāt, etc. Sometimes both these suffixes are appended to a word at the same time, e.g. mṛttikā (< mṛd). Perhaps this differentiation of suffixes was originally due to mere phonetic dissimilation. The writer then proceeds to explain various Vedic and classical forms in the light of the hitherto undetected character of this suffix.

Max Walleser in his article on the Sanskrit Dative. sing. masc. neuter has delved deep into glottogonical problems. The author boldly suggests that the dative ending -āya is nothing but a combination of the pre-verb ā with yā, the original second person sing. imp. of √yā. the whole suffix element would therefore mean "go to". In cases like pitr-e (< pitr-ai) √i was used instead of √yā according to the author.

The second or Iranian part of the volume under review has been enriched by contributions from the two greatest living masters in the field of Comparative Grammar, Jakob Wackernagel and Antoine Meillet. Wackernagel's contribution "Zur avestischen Wortkunde" is short, but it shows all the thoroughness and masterly treatment which is always associated with his name. The author points out that although Spiegel has rightly interpreted

the word 'vaēdayanā,' his etymology of same is wrong. Spiegel wanted to derive this word from √vid "to see" but Wackernagel gives three reasons which go to demolish this etymology, the most important of which is that in old Iranian no noun in -ayana derived from a verbal stem in -ay- is known. The same is the case also in RV., where without exception the suffix -ana- is attached immediately to the root syllable even when the noun in question is obviously connected with a verb in -ayati. It is quite clear in the case of causatives: árpaṇa: arpáyati, etc. As the same law holds good also for the Avesta, it is clearly of Indo-Iranian antiquity. 'vaēdayanā' cannot therefore be derived from the causative stem of √vid. The real nature of the word would be clear according to Wackernagel if we read 'vidayanā' instead of 'vaēdayanā.' It would thus give the normal form of the noun to be derived from √di + vi "to see." Confusion between *i* and *ī* is quite frequent in the Avesta and is the result of the fact, as shown in the well-known monograph by Andreas and Wackernagel, that in the original text-form the same sign was used both for *i* and *i*-diphthongs.

As an appendix to this short article Wackernagel discusses an exegetical problem of the Avesta which shows that Sanskrit helps us to understand not only the grammatical structure of Avestan words but renders great help also to get at the exact meaning thereof.

Meillet's short note is devoted to the Avestan word 'ṭkaēša,' but a much larger issue is involved in it. In recent years Meillet's school has developed the undeniable but somewhat dangerous theory that side by side with the aristocratic language there has been always a vulgar speech for which considerable concessions have to be made even in matters of phonetic laws. In the present article too Meillet has voiced forth this view in the following words: "Le vocabulaire 'populaire' est aussi instable qu'est stable le vocabulaire noble, et il admet des variations de toutes sortes." Meillet here suggests that the mobile prefix ṭ- which is clearly in evidence in the case of 'ṭkaēša,' is a characteristic of this "vocabulaire populaire". Moreover it appears that Iranian had an innate tendency to replace elegant words by 'popular' ones. Sanskrit has faithfully preserved the verbs 'átti' and 'pibati' dating from Indo-European times, but Iranian tends to replace them by a single verb meaning "to swallow".

Benveniste, the pupil of Meillet, has also contributed an article to this volume which throws further light on the relation between elegant and vulgar speech in Iranian. In four different passages in the Vidēvdāt the cock, the porcupine, the tortoise and the gnat

respectively has been described in almost the same language to possess a different designation in 'vulgar speech'. The elegant designations, apparently preferred by the Iranian author, are all highly artificial, the cock, for instance is named 'paro-dars' "one who sees first." Moreover it is significant that these so-called 'elegant' words have completely disappeared without leaving any trace in the modern Iranian dialects, while the vulgar words are still lingering. It is clear therefore that we have in these cases artificially coined words used only by the priest-craft. Neither is it a later tendency in Iranian, for already in *Yast VIII*, 51 a similar antithesis between elegant and vulgar speech is met with.

In his short note Nyberg has discussed two interesting phonetic laws of Iranian, and Jehangir C. Tavadia has made a minute study of the Middle Persian evidence of the Avestan conception of fire. One of the most original articles in this volume is Reichelt's "Beiträge zur soghdischen Grammatik." Sten Konow in a short note has tried to prove that the neuter gender was still alive in Khotanī Saka and Sir Aurel Stein in an article sent from the desert of Central Asia deals with a hitherto unknown "Persian Bodhisattva" in sculpture and painting. Sir Jivanji Jamshedji Modi has contributed a long article in which an attempt has been made to identify the grand Mobad Omid-bin-Ashawahist mentioned by Hamza Ispahani. G. Morgenstierne, who has made his name famous by his researches on the frontier dialects of India, has contributed a short story of an Afridi Sepoy in the original Afridi dialect along with an English translation. Otto Paul, a well-known writer on metre, has contributed a very interesting article on the verse form in Rückert's Hafiz translation. The author has tried to show how far Rückert has succeeded in preserving the original verse form in German and comes to the conclusion that if the poet had consistently made use of the characteristics of German verse he could have achieved better results.

The veteran Iranian scholar Jackson has contributed two very interesting notes on the Manichaean Confession-Prayer *Chuastuanift*, —a name which is familiar to everybody who took any interest in the Central Asian discoveries. Jackson argues on general grounds that the Turkish text of the Confession-Prayer must be a translation in spite of Radloff, one of the greatest authorities on Turkology. In the second note he gives a very ingenious etymology of the word '*Chuastuanift*'. Jackson suggests that the title of the Confession-Prayer should be read as *Xvāstavānift* (or *-ēft*), the division of words being *xv*(or *hu*)-*āstavān*-*eft*-, the last component being an

abstract formative. It is now quite clear that the whole word goes back to the Avestan verb $\sqrt{\text{stav}} + \bar{a}$ "to proclaim with praise, confess." The title of the prayer therefore literally means "good-confession-ess", or more freely "The Good Confessional".

Th. Dombart has contributed an interesting article on the representation of the arch of heaven by means of half a hexagon and the volume fittingly comes to an end with Merkel's personal appreciation of Geiger as a teacher of the science of religion.

BATAKRISHNA GHOSH

THE AGE OF THE IMPERIAL GUPTAS by the late Prof. R. D. Banerji, M.A. Published by the Benares Hindu University, 1933.

A pathetic interest attaches to this work, which is one of the latest products of the facile and vigorous pen of the late lamented Mr. R. D. Banerji. Originally delivered as the Manindra Chandra Nandy Lectures of the Benares Hindu University, 1924, it was revised by the author in 1929-30, but his life was cut short by cruel death before he could see the work through the Press. It is a matter of great rejoicing that the work has at length seen the light of day. Thanks are due to the authorities of the Benares Hindu University for at last making the work available in print. To it Mr. A. S. Altekar, Mr. Banerji's successor in the Ancient Indian History chair of the University, has contributed an appreciative preface which is nothing short of a pious act of homage to the memory of his illustrious predecessor.

The present work consists of six chapters which traverse the various aspects of the most brilliant age of ancient Indian history. The first chapter, which has the singularly inapt title of Chronology, traces the political history of the Imperial Guptas down to the time of their downfall. Here a few points call for notice. From the reference to a Mahakṣatrapa and a Kṣatrapa in an inscription of Kaniska I of the year 3 (=81 A.D., according to the author) it is held (p. 2) to be quite probable that north-eastern India even in the opening decades of the 4th century A.D. was ruled by a Scythian Great Satrap. This is, to say the least, quite unconvincing. As a matter of fact the references in Samudragupta's Allahabad pillar inscription and in the Chammak plate of the Vākāṭaka Pravarasena II, leave no room for doubt that

North-India, at least as far west as the upper Ganges basin, had been liberated from Scythian dominion before the rise of the Guptas. On page 3, the author states that the great Asoka was content with the title of *Rājan*. This is to ignore the fact that the great Maurya in nearly all his inscriptions applies to himself the further titles *Devānāmpriya-Priyadarśin*. Elsewhere (p. 10) the author suggests that the mysterious Kāca was a son of Candragupta I, who had lost his life very probably in the war of independence. Though this suggestion may have the merit of novelty, the arguments in its support are hardly convincing. On the same and the following pages the author takes for granted the equation of Candra of Meherauli pillar inscription with Candravarman of the *Susunia* Rock inscription and the king of the same name in the Allahabad pillar inscription, but the point should have been discussed at some length. The author fully accepts the tradition of Rāmagupta, son of Samudragupta and elder brother of Candragupta II, and he plausibly identifies the Śaka king figuring in the story with the last great Kuṣāna emperor, who had his capital probably at Mathura. On page 36 '6th century' is a serious misprint for 5th century A.D. In connection with the author's account of the following reigns, it is necessary to notice only one or two points. He rejects the proposed emendation of *Ayudhyamitrāmsca* of the Bhitari pillar inscription for *Paṣyamitrāmsca* "on account of the impossibility of the second syllable being *yu*" (p. 45). He refers not only to the Mathura pillar inscription of Candragupta II of G.E. 61 (App. II), but also to the newly discovered Tumain and Mandasor inscriptions of G.E. 116 and V.S. 524 respectively (pp. 49-59 and App. I). On the vexed question of chronology of the later Imperial Guptas he tacitly accepts (p. 52) the theory of a civil war between Skandagupta and his half-brothers, while he rejects the theory of a partition of the empire into a separate branch consisting of Puragupta and his three immediate successors.

The title of Chapter II "System of Administration and Peerage," is somewhat misleading. 'Peerage' implies a hereditary order of nobles; but the existence of such an order of nobles is nowhere suggested, much less proved, by the author. Nor is it possible to agree with some of the author's conclusions. On page 70 e.g., we are told that *Akṣapaṭalā-*

dhikṛta of the Gaya plate of Samudragupta is a new title. This ignores the reference to the *Akṣapaṭala* and its officers in the *Arthasūtra* (chap. II. 7), which is beyond doubt a pre-Gupta work. On the same page we have 'Valatkausham' which is a misprint for 'Valatkaushan.' The explanation of the title Kumārāmatya (pp. 71-74) is anything but satisfactory. It is difficult to understand how *pādīya* can be translated into 'equal to,' nor do we know on what authority the author distinguishes between Yuvarāja and Yuvaraja-bhaṭṭāraka, thus proving three classes of Kumārāmatyas, of whom one was equal in rank to a prince, and the second equal in rank to the heir to throne, while a third was equal in rank to His Majesty!!! The natural explanation of the title in question is to take *pādīya* for '*pādānudhyāta*' (subordinate to or dependent on) and Yuvarāja-bhaṭṭāraka to be a glorified form of Yuvarāja. This would point to the existence of only two classes of Kumārāmatyas, one attached to the staff of the Crown Prince (who generally acted as Viceroy), and the other to the staff of the Emperor. On page 77 the author leaves the official title 'taravara' unexplained, while his explanation of 'kulika' as 'banker' (p. 97) should have been supported by some good authority. Lastly the author's statements (p. 94) that "the literary evidence is altogether silent" on the land-revenue system of the Guptas is not supported by facts. For the valuable testimony of Fa-Hien (on which the author bestows but scant notice) proves that the land-revenue was assessed at an undefined (and evidently varying) proportion of the agricultural produce.

The third chapter which bears the title "Religious and Literary Revival" is on the whole the least satisfactory in the whole work. Here the author's exclusive reliance upon archaeological (and especially epigraphic) evidence to the complete neglect of the literary data has led him to present a very one-sided and imperfect picture. Thus as a result of his exhaustive analysis of the inscriptions of the period (pp. 102-7), he concludes that "Hinduism had benefitted (*read* benefited) greatly at the cost of the rival sects." How incomplete this account is will appear from the fact that the author has not a word to say about such striking movements as the development of the Buddhist dialectic by the great Vasubandhu (c. end of the fifth century) and his school, as well as the meeting of the famous council of Valabhi (980 or 993 A.M. = end

of the fifth or beginning of the sixth century A.D.) which under the presidency of the famous Devarddhi-kṣamāśramaṇa first committed the Jaina *Svetāmbara* canon into writing. We do not refer in this connection to the marvellous development of the Pāli commentary literature under Buddhaghosa and Dharmapāla or the wonderful propagation of Buddhism in China and in Indonesia in the fifth and following centuries, because this might be said to fall outside the scope of the author's work. The same imperfection may be traced in the author's detailed analysis (pp. 121-29) of the varieties of *Saiva*, *Vaiṣṇava* and *Saura* cults. This is wholly based on the contemporary inscriptions and fails to take account of such important literary works of the period as Varāhamihira's *Bṛhatsaṃhitā*.

Even more disappointing than the above is the author's account of the literary revival of the Gupta period. It is enough to mention in this connection that there is not the slightest reference to the prince of Sanskrit poets in the whole range of the third chapter. After this it does not come to us as a surprise to find that the author is blissfully oblivious of the existence of Iśvarakṛṣṇa, Praśastapāda and Śavara-svāmin, of Asaṅga, Vasubandhu and Diṇnāga, of Lāṭa, Āryabhaṭa J, Varāhamihira and Brahmagupta. The only example of the literary awakening of the Gupta age, which occurs to the author, is the recasting of the "majority of the *Purāṇas*" during the Gupta period (p. 108). But even here his statements are open to criticism. In the first place it is generally agreed that some of the Mahāpurāṇas (not the "majority of the Purāṇas") belong to the *beginning* of the Gupta period. In the second place we do not know on what authority he states (p. 109) that the *Sūtas* of the Vedic age were Kṣatriyas and that after the fall of the latter (?) their songs fell into the hands of Brāhmaṇa compilers.

The chapters on "Architecture and Plastic Art" (Chapts. IV-V) are the most original and valuable in the whole work. Specially in the former chapter the author has drawn upon the result of excavations undertaken by himself on Gupta sites while he was employed as an officer of the Archæological Department. We have room for a few of his important observations. He proves (pp. 133-34) the earlier view ascribing both the Mahābodhi and Bhitargaon temples to the Gupta period to be wrong. On pp. 135-136 the existing temples of the Gupta

period are arranged partly on stylistic and partly on palæographic evidence in a kind of chronological order. This is accompanied (pp. 137 ff.) by a detailed analysis of the monuments concerned. In course of this we learn (pp. 137-141) that the distinctive Gupta type of temple architecture survived in Malabar down to the end of the sixteenth century. The conclusion to which all this leads is best summed up in the author's own words (p. 158): "Gupta architects evolved a temple-type in which there was provision for a covered path of circumambulation surrounding the sanctum, which was closed on three sides and which provided one entrance only and an open porch in front In the Post-Gupta period we find the addition of a modest *Sikhara* without any other important changes."

In the chapter on Plastic Art the author distinguishes three principal schools, those of Mathura, Benares and Pāṭaliputra, indicating the characteristics of each school and the nature and extent of its influence. Next he deals (pp. 173-81) with the treatment of the human figure and the bas-reliefs. Other topics treated in the following pages include metal-work (pp. 184-5), the Caitya window-motif (pp. 185-9), the pillars and pilasters (pp. 191-3), the door-frames (pp. 194-200), the arabesque and creeper patterns (pp. 200-2), and the terracottas (pp. 207-28).

In the sixth and concluding chapter called "Coinage" the author contents himself for the most part with following the guidance of Mr. Allan of the British Museum, extracts from whose important Catalogue of coins are freely quoted by him. Occasionally he takes up an independent line as when he rejects (pp. 219-20), though on hardly convincing grounds, Allan's identification of Kāca with Samudragupta.

The value and interest of the present work are greatly enhanced by a list of no less than 41 plates at the end.

We have to observe in conclusion that in spite of the undoubted merits of this work there is still room for a more comprehensive monograph on the subject it treats. To take one example, we miss here a chapter on the economic conditions making full use of the epigraphic references to the industrial guilds and the literary references to the maritime trade and voyaging enterprises of the Age of the Imperial Guptas.

Select Contents of Oriental Journals

Acta Orientalia, vol. xii, pt. ii

- B. CH. SHASTRI.—*Identification of Relief belonging to the Gupta Temple of Deogad.* A temple in Deogad in the district of Jhansi is designated as the Gupta-temple, as it is in the style of the Gupta period. A scene depicted in relief in a niche of the temple has given rise to a divergence of opinion as regards its identification. The prominent figure in the same has been identified differently by different scholars with Śiva, Brahmā, and Nara-Nārāyaṇa. The present writer shows that description of the Nara and Nārāyaṇa incarnation as found in the Purāṇic literature corresponds with the representation in the relief.
- W. F. STUTTERHEIM.—*A newly discovered pre-Nāgarī Inscription in Bali.* The inscription under discussion is written on one side of a pillar in a pre-Nāgarī Indian alphabet partly in Sanskrit and partly in Old Balinese. On the other side the inscription is in Sanskrit written in the Kavi alphabet. Owing to the damaged condition of the record, only this much can be inferred that it speaks of a king who made conquests outside Bali. Śrī Keśarīvarmā mentioned in the Old Balinese portion of the inscription was very likely the king who ordered the expedition. The rather unusual use of two different scripts and languages in the same inscription lends colour to the view that the king wanted to awaken interest in the indigenous language among the Hindu traders, and in Sanskrit among the Balinese. A portion of the pre-Nāgarī division of the inscription being undecipherable, the date of the inscription has not been fixed with certainty. Prof. Sten Konow, the editor of the *Journal* however, has read this portion to indicate Saka 839 as its date.
- C. M. SCHNITGER.—*The Names of the Javanese King Jayanagara.* The names and appellations occurring in the two inscriptions of the Javanese king Jayanagara (1309-1328) indicate that the king was closely connected with Southern India.

Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient,
Tome XXXI. 1932; Fasc. 1 (Hanoi, 1933).

- LOUIS FINOT.—*Une Inscription Vishnouite d'Ankor.* The author here speaks of a fragmentary Sanskrit inscription addressed to Viṣṇu Puṇḍarikākṣa discovered at Kôk Thlôk. The author agrees with M. Coedès that this fragment and the other Viṣṇuite fragment discovered at Prah Pithu are parts of one and the same inscription. Important conclusions are drawn as to the identification of Paśodharagiri.
- R. C. MAJUMDAR.—*La Paléographie des Inscriptions du Champa.* The author claims to give here for the first time a systematic treatment of the palaeography of Champa and differing from Bergaigne concludes that the earliest Indian colonisers hailed from northern India and not from the south.
- J. PRZYLUCKI et F. LAMOTTE.—*Bouddhisme et Upaniṣad.* The joint authors have drawn here an interesting comparison between Buddhism and the Upaniṣads. At the first stage both Buddhism and the Upaniṣads preach not *jñānamārga* but *karmamārga*. It is shown further that both Buddhism and the older Upaniṣads describe the identical system of universe divided into three zones corresponding to the three psychic zones of deliverance,—*nirvāṇa* is still unknown. In the following period however this triad is replaced by a tetrad of zones,—*nirvāṇa* stage is reached herewith. In the succeeding period the system of universe becomes still more complex both in Buddhism and the Upaniṣads and the Saint has to pass through seven distinct stages before attaining deliverance. [B. K. G.]

Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, London Institution,
vol. vii, pt. ii

- M. J. BORAH.—*The nature of the Persian language written and spoken in India during the 13th and 14th Centuries.*
- BANARSI DAS JAIN.—*Isophones of the Orthographic gh-, bh-, dh-, etc., and of h- in the Ambala District.*
- SIEGFRIED BEHSING.—*Beiträge zu einer Milindapañha-Bibliographie.*

Calcutta Oriental Journal, vol. i, no. iv (Jan., 1934).

UMA DEVI.—*Convocation Address in Ancient India.* The instructions to be imparted by a preceptor to a pupil at the conclusion of his study, as given in the *Taittirīyopaniṣad*, has been reproduced here with English translation and notes.

PRAHLAD C. DIWANJI.—*The Date and Place of Origin of the Yogarāsiṣṭha*—shown in this note that Kātyāyana, Patañjali and Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita style of the *Yogarāsiṣṭha*, the writer of the paper comes to the conclusion that this philosophical poem could not have originally existed in its present form. Many dialogues, upākhyānas, and doctrinal statements did not form part of the original, as otherwise, Śaṅkara could not have totally ignored them. It is inferred that a poet living in Kashmir in the first half of the tenth century developed the nucleus of the *Yogarāsiṣṭha* into its present form. This poet was a contemporary of king Yaśaskaradeva of Kashmir mentioned by him in the work.

KSHITIS CHANDRA CHATTERJI.—*The Sāvanya of ṛ and ḷ.* It has been shown in this note that Kātyāyana, Patañjali and Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita were all aware of the difference between the articulation of ṛ and ḷ, though they had to regard these two vowels as *sāvanya*.

S. M. KATRE.—*Pāli Akkheyyam.* The note shows that the word *akkheyyam* found in the *Suttanipāta*, passage 308, is not related to Sk. *ākhyeya* (meaning 'to be pronounced') but to Sanskrit from the *akṣeya* or *akṣayya*.

P. K. GODE.—*Date of Uttarārāmaṛṭta-campū by Vyaṅkaṭa Kavi.* The inference has been drawn that the *Uttarārāmaṛṭta-campū* was composed by Veṅkaṭādhvarin about the middle of the 17th century A.C.

S. M. KATRE.—*Sanskrit Bhaginī and its Cognates.*

KSHITIS CHANDRA CHATTERJI.—*Some Grammatical Notes.*

(1) एहिमन्ये, (2) ज्ञातिचेलम् .

Ibid., vol. i, no. v (February, 1934)

KSHITIS CHANDRA CHATTERJI.—*The Mugdhabodha System of Grammar (continued).*

PRABODH CHANDRA BAGCHI.—*Some Aspects of Buddhist Mysticism in the Caryāpadas.* The paper deals with the special terminology of Sandhābhāṣā or “intentional speech” used in the Caryās in connection with the discussion of the esoteric doctrines of Buddhism. Boat, rat, elephant and other words found in the Caryāpadas cannot yield any sense if taken in their literal meaning.

P. K. GODE.—*Date of Sāhityasudhā—a Commentary on the Rasatarāṅgiṇī of Bhānudatta and identification of its author Nemasaḥ with Nem Shah II of the Jawhar line of chiefs in the Bombay Presidency (about 1650 A.D.).*

Calcutta Review, January, 1934.

CHARLOTTE KRAUSE.—*The Jain Canon and Early Indian Court Life.*

The canonical writings of the Svetāmbara Jainas contain materials which give an idea of the royal court in ancient India. The mosaic-floored, sweet-scented apartments with their costly furniture and various toilet requisites as also the royal processions with the gaudy train of followers constitute the subject-matter of some of the descriptions that are related to show the splendour of the court. There are also references to the observance of religious festivals by the inmates of the harem, the gay celebrations and happy rejoicings on auspicious occasions, the details of the daily routine of a king and many other events and activities in the palace.

Ibid., February, 1934

H. C. RAY CHAUDHURY.—*On a Lost Upākhyāna of the Mahābhārata.*

The *Mahābhārata* speaks of Ghaṭotkaca as *Brahmaṇadveṣin*, ‘hater of Brāhmaṇas’. But the extant *Mahābhārata* contains no Upākhyāna referring to any anti-Brāhmanical activity of Ghaṭotkaca. On the other hand, his hostility to a Brāhmaṇa is the theme of the *Madhyama Vyāyoga* of Bhāsa. From this it has been inferred that the *Upākhyāna* which had been the basis of Bhāsa’s theme once formed part of the *Mahābhārata*.

Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society,

vol. vii. pts. ii and iii (Oct. 1933 and Jan. 1934)

V. R. RAMACHANDRA DIKSHITAR.—*Sources of the Early Andhra History.* The sources of information for the history of the Andhra

kings in ancient India have been dealt with in this paper under four heads, viz. traditions as transmitted in literature, Sanskrit, Tamil and Pāli; accounts of foreign travellers in India; archaeology and epigraphy; and numismatics.

- P. SEETARAMIAH.—*History of the Gavaras*. Evidences have been put forward to show that the Gavaras, at present an agricultural caste in the Vizagapatam District in Madras were originally the inhabitants of Gauḍa. It is argued that the Komatis of South India also migrated to the place from Kāmatāpūra in Assam. The migrations of the people from Gauḍa and neighbourhood to the Telugu country took place during periods of political unsettlement. The 'Gavaras' and 'Komatis' in course of time became synonymous with merchants because they combined into a group and made a monopoly of trade in the Andhra and Karṇāṭa countries. Later on the communities separated owing to some dispute and took to different occupations.
- L. P. PANDEYA.—*An Inscription of Sūrya Varman of the Aśvapati family*.
- N. NARASIMHAM.—*The Kindoppa Copper-plate Inscription of Anantavarman of the Kalinga Kingdom*. This grant in Sanskrit contains names of three successive kings ending with the donor.
- C. NARAYANA RAO AND R. SUBBA RAO.—*Six New Eastern Ganga Copper-plate Inscriptions*.

Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society,

vol. xix, pt. 4 (Dec., 1933).

- D. B. DISKALAR.—*Tibeto-Nepalese War, 1788-1793*.
- DHIRENDRA CHANDRA GANGULI.—*Mālava in the Sixth and Seventh Centuries A.D.* The extent of the Mālava country in the 6th and 7th centuries and the names of its rulers together with an account of their activities have been determined here with the help of literary and epigraphic records.
- RAHULA SANKRITYAYANA.—*Sanskrit Restoration of Yuan Chwang's Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi*. This instalment contains the first two sections and a portion of the third.

Journal of Oriental Research, vol. viii, pt. 1 (Jan.-March, 1934).

- N VENKATARAMANAYYA.**—*The Date of the Accession of Nandivarman II Pallavamalla.* The conclusion reached in the paper is that Nandivarman II ruled over Kāñcī for 65 years in the period between A. C. 718-19 and A.C. 795-96. The writer believes that the reign commenced in the year 726 A. C. and ended in 791 A.C.
- C. P. S. MENON.**—*The Cross, the Svastika and Related Emblems.* It has been shown that the two symbols of the cross and the Svastika were known throughout the world from a very ancient time. The Cross denoted the four quarters of heaven or the four directions of the horizon, and the Svastika the celestial revolution; and thus they were originally associated with the Universe. Many other symbols like the Trisūla and the Triratna have developed either by the elongation or addition of one or more limbs.
- S. R. BALASUBRAHMANYAN AND K. VENKATARANYA RAJU.**—*Nārttāmalai and its Temples.* Two ancient cave-temples have been described.
- C. SIVARAMAMURTI.**—*The Artist in Ancient India.* Evidences have been adduced from literature to determine what sort of a status was enjoyed by an artist, amateur or professional, in the ancient Indian society, and how he actually worked with brushes and colours.
- A. VENKATASUBBIAH.**—*Writing of Books in Siddhiyoga.* The term *siddhiyoga* means a combination (*yoga*) of certain Nakṣatras with *vāras* (days) leading to success (*siddhi*). It has been pointed out in the paper that many ancient authors while giving hints as to the dates of composition of their works refer to particular *yogas*, taking place at the time. These references help to remove the obscurity if any that might remain regarding the time of composition.
- V. RAGHAVAN.**—*Nāṭyadharmī and Lokadharmī.* The meaning of the term *Nāṭyadharmī* and *Lokadharmī* form the subject-matter of this continued paper. *Nāṭyadharmī* is associated with the elements of idealism such as poetic language, music, and devices based on art and imagination. *Lokadharmī* relates to the elements of realism such as prosaic speech, and realistic representations of things and actions like eating, dressing etc. In the Sanskrit literature,

emphasis has been laid upon *Lokadharmī* side by side with *Nāṭyadharmī* both in regard to acting and painting.

T. R. CHINTAMANI.—*Sumantu-Dharmasūtra*. The text has been edited from a manuscript and citations from Sumantu as found in the various Smṛti digests but not occurring in the Ms. have been given in an appendix.

K. A. NILAKANTHA SASTRI.—*A Note on a Greek Text bearing on the Aśvamedha*. The description of an Indian sacrifice found in a Greek text on the *Life of Apollonius of Tyna* by Philostratus suggests that the classical Aśvamedha grew in its developed form out of this sacrifice which was at first performed on the bank of a river and was probably connected with the annual floods.

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, Jan. 1934.

H. HERAS.—*The Victory of Bhūti Vikramakeśarī over the Pallavas*. An inscription on the wall of a Koḍumbālūr temple in the Padukottai State speaks of a defeat of the Pallavas by Bhūti Vikramakeśarī, an Irukkavel chief who constructed the temple. The writer discusses the contemporary history of the Cālukyas, the Pallavas and the Irukkavels of Koḍumbālūr, and through a chronological list of these rulers drawn up by him comes to the conclusion that the defeat inflicted upon the Pallava army by Bhūti Vikramakesari took place about 670 A.C. during the reign of Parameśvaravarman I.

Journal of the Royal Society of Arts, January, 1934.

J. H. MACKAY.—*Further Excavation at Mohenjo-dāro*. This is a lecture delivered at the Royal Society of Arts, London. It deals mainly with the objects and buildings excavated at Mohenjo-dāro since 1927, and discusses the probable relation of the Indus Valley culture with other contemporary civilisations.

Man in India, vol. XIII, No. 4 (Oct.-Dec., 1933).

JOGESHI CHANDRA RAY.—*Food and Drink in Ancient India*. This instalment of the paper deals with food grains as mentioned in the literature from the Vedas up to the medical treatises of the 16th century. The information is gathered specially from the *Kauṭīlīya*.

Bibliographical Notes

The Architecture of Mānasūra, vol. IV, Sanskrit Text translated into English; vol. V: Plates Architectural and Sculptural; by Prasanna Kumar Acharya. Oxford University Press. London 1933.

The Hindu View of Art by Mulk Raj Anand. London 1933.

The Bronzes of Nālandā and Hindu-Javanese Art by A. J. Bernet Kempers. Leiden 1933.

Indian Sculpture by Stella Kramrisch. London 1933.

Geschichte der indischen Miniature malerei (History of Indian Miniature Paintings) by Hermann Goetz. Leipzig 1933.

Ajantā (Reproductions of the Ajantā frescoes) with explanatory text by G. Yazdani, an appendix on inscriptions by J. Allan. Part II. London 1933.

Ellora (Handbook of Verul) by S. B. P. Pratinidhi. London 1933.

Barhut, Book I: Stone as a story-teller by Benimadhab Barua. Calcutta 1934.

A Descriptive Catalogue of the Old Bengali Mss. in the Library of the Vāṅgīya Sāhitya Pariṣad (প্রাচীন বাংলা পুথির বিবরণ) compiled by Taraprasanna Bhattacharya. Calcutta 1933.

Catalogue of Sanskrit Mss. in the Panjab University, vol. I. Lahore 1933.

A Metrical Chronicle of Assam (অসমৰ পুৰণী বৃত্তী) edited by S. K. Bhuyān. Department of Historical and Antiquarian Studies, Assam 1933.

Selections from the Peshwa Daftar:

No. 30 Miscellaneous Papers of Shahu and his first two Peshwas;

„ 31 Selected Papers from the Jamav Section;

„ 32 The Private Life of the Later Peshwas;

„ 33 Shahu's Campaign against the Sidis of Janjira (Supplementary);

„ 34 Bassein Campaign (Supplementary);

„ 35 Capture of Salsette by the English;

„ 36 The first Maratha War.

—edited by G. S. Sardesai. Government Central Press. Bombay 1933-34.

- Miscellaneous Papers (Persiah) edited by M. Nizam. Government Central Press. Bombay 1933.
- Festschrift Moriz Winternitz, 1863-1933* published by O. Stein and W. Gampert. Leipzig 1933.
- Cursetji Eraschji Parry* (Oriental Studies in Honour of C. E. Pavry) edited by Jal Dastur Cursetji Pavry. London 1933.
- Prince of Wales Saraswati Bhavan Studies*, vol. VIII edited by Gopinath Kaviraj. Government Sanskrit Library. Benares 1934.
- Satkārya in der Darstellung seiner buddhistischen Gegner* von Walter Liebenthal. Berlin 1934.
- The Age of the Imperial Guptas* by R. D. Banerji. Benares Hindu University. Benares 1933.
- The Maukharis* by Edward A. Pires. Madras 1934.
- Vijayanagara: Origin of the City of the Empire* by N. Venkata Ramanayya. University of Madras. Madras 1933.
- Social and Political Life in the Vijayanagara Empire (A.D. 1346-1646)* in 2 volumes by B. A. Saletore. Madras 1934.
- Beginnings of Vijayanagara History* by H. Heras. Madras 1933.
- Studies in Pallava History* by H. Heras. Madras 1933.
- History of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas* by Bisheshwar Nath Reu. Jodhpur 1933.
- Ranjit Singh* by Narendra Krishna Sinha. University of Calcutta. Calcutta 1933.
- Outlines of Buddhism (A historical Sketch)* by Mrs. C. A. F. Rhys Davids. London 1934.
- The History of Buddhist Thought* by E. J. Thomas. London 1933.
- The Basic Conception of Buddhism* by Vidhushekhara Bhattacharya. Calcutta University. Calcutta 1934.
- The Mystery of the Mahābhārata*, vol. II: The Systems of Hindu Philosophy and Religion by N. V. Thadani. Karachi 1933.
- Education in Ancient India* by A. S. Altekar. Benares 1933.
- Indian Idealism* by Surendranath Das-Gupta. London 1933.
- Spinoza and Buddha* by S. M. Melamed. Chicago 1933.
- The History of North-Eastern India* extending from the foundation of the Gupta Empire to the rise of the Pāla dynasty of Bengal (c. 320-760 A.D.) by Radhagovinda Basak. Calcutta 1934.
- History of India (150 A.D.—350 A.D.)* by K. P. Jayaswal. Lahore 1933.

- Tungkhungia Burañjiora* (History of Assam 1681-1826) edited by S. K. Bhuyan. Bombay 1934.
- Les Formations Nominales et Verbales en p du Sanskrit* per Batakrishna Ghosh. Paris 1933.
- The Chronology of the Early Tamils* by K. N. Sivaraja Pillai. Madras 1933.
- The Indian Theatre: its origin and later development under European influence* by R. K. Yajnik. London 1933.
- L'Inde antique* by M. Masson-Oursel, H. de Willman-Grabowska and Philippe Stern. Paris 1933.
- Vers le Christ par le Vedānta II: Vallabha* translated from English by I. M. Guthier. Louvain 1933.
- Essentials of Advaitism* (An English Translation of Sureśvara's *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi*) by R. Das. Lahore 1933.
- Studies in Philosophy* by Harimchan Bhattacharya. Lahore 1933.
- A History of Indian Literature*, vol. II by M. Winternitz translated into English by Mrs. Ketkar. Calcutta University. Calcutta 1934.
- Hindu Law of Evidence* by Amareswar Thakur. Calcutta University. Calcutta 1934.
- Juristic Personality of Hindu Deities* by S. C. Bagchi. Calcutta University. Calcutta 1934.
- The Principle and Practice of Mahāyāna Buddhism* by D. W. Goddard. Thetford 1933.
- The Land-system in South India between c. 800 A.D. and 1200 A.D.* by Kishori Mohan Gupta. Lahore 1933.
- Some Aspects of the Vāyupurāṇa* by V. R. R. Dikshitar. University of Madras. Madras 1933.
- Kaṭṭalīya Studien*, vol. III: Finanzverwaltung und Wirtschaftsführung by Bernhard Breloer. Leipzig 1934.
- The University of Nālandā* by H. D. Sankalia. Madras 1934.
- Organisation militaire des Sikhs* by Prakas K. Sastri. Paris 1933.
- Beowulf and the Rāmāyaṇa* (A Study in Epic Poetry) by J. S. Peter. London 1934.
- R̥gveda* by H. N. Hooven. Athens 1933.

- The Linguistic Speculations of the Hindus* by Prabhat Chandra Chakravarti. Calcutta University. Calcutta 1933.
- Yoga, the Mystical Philosophy of the Brahmins and Buddhists* by J. F. C. Fuller. London 1933.
- Popular Yoga* (2 parts) by Kuvalayānanda. Lonavla 1933.
- The Living Religions of the Indian People* by N. Macnicol. London 1934.
- East and West in Religion* by S. Radhakrishnan. London 1933.
- Indian Religion and Survival: A Study* by Mrs. Rhys Davids. London 1934.
- Śrī Kṛṣṇa-Caitanya*, vol. I (A rational study on the basis of Śānta Mārga of the career and teachings of Caitanya) by N. K. Sanyal. Madras 1933.
- Evolution of the Thoughts in Bhagavadgītā* by Kumudranjan Ray. Calcutta 1933.
- Indian Psychology: Perception* by Jadunath Sinha. London 1934.
- Pūrveśāsiddham* (Analytisch Onderzoek aangaande het system der Tripādī van Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, by Herfan Eilderf Buiskool. Amsterdam 1934.
- Śrīmad-Bhāgavat* (Part X): An analysis in English by V. K. Ramanujachari. Kumbakonam 1934.
- Annual Report on South Indian Epigraphy* (for the year ending 31st March 1931). Government of India Publications. Delhi 1934.
- Uṇādisūtras* vol. I with the Vṛtti of Śvetavanavāsin; vol. II with the Prakriyāsarvasva of Nārāyaṇa edited by T. R. Chintamani. University of Madras. Madras 1933.
- Mānameyodaya* (a primer on Mīmāṃsā) by Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa edited with English translation and Notes by C. Kunhan Raja and S. S. Suryanarayan Sastri. Theosophical Publishing House. Adyar 1933.
- Bhāmatī of Vācaspati Miśra on Brahmasūtrabhāṣya of Saṅkarācārya* —the first four Sūtras with English translation and Notes by S. S. Suryanarayana Sastri and C. Kunhan Raja. T. P. House. Adyar 1933.
- Haṭhayogapradīpikā* by Svātmārāma Svāmin with Commentary of Brahmānanda: Part I (2nd ed.) English translation by Yog:

- Srinivasa Iyengar; Part II Sanskrit Text. T. P. House. Adyar 1933.
- Gheraṇḍasaṃhitā* translated into English by Sris Chandra Vasu. T. P. House. Adyar 1933.
- Yogasūrasaṃgraha* of Vijñāna Bhikṣu edited with an English translation by Ganganatha Jha. T. P. House. Adyar 1933.
- Spṛṣṭārthā Abhidharmakośavyākhyā* of Yaśomitra (Sanskrit Text romanised), pt. II edited by U. Wogihara. Tokyo 1933.
- Śrīmad-Bhagavadgītā* edited with Introduction, critical Notes and variants from old Kāśmīrī Mss. by S. N. Tadpatrikar. Poona 1934.
- Tantrāloka of Abhinavagupta* with the commentary of Rājānaka Jayaratha, vol. X edited by Madhusudan Kaul. Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies. Bombay 1933.
- Svacchandatantrā* of Kṣemarāja with commentary, vol. V, part B edited by Madhusudan Kaul. Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies. Bombay 1933.
- Praudhāmanoramā* with Haridikṣita's commentary and three sub-commentaries (chapters 1-5). Benares 1933.
- Vāgvallabha of Duḥkhabhañjana* with the commentary of Deviprasad edited by Damodar Sastri. Benares 1933.
- Kātyāyana-śrautasūtra with Devayājñikapaddhati*, Fasc. I edited by Vidyadhara Sarma. Benares 1933.
- Bṛhatī* (a commentary on the Mīmāṃsā-bhāṣya of Śabara) with Śālikanātha's Rjuvimalā, Fasc. 3 edited by Chinnaśwami Sastri. Benares 1933.
- Ṛg-vedasaṃhitā* with Sāyana's Commentary (Maṇḍala I) edited by V. K. Rajavade. Poona 1933.
- Vīramitrodaya of Mitra Misra* (vol. IX, 1: Śrāddhaprakāśa) edited by Padmaprasada Upadhyaya. Benares 1933.
- Śrāddhakalpalatū of Nanda Paṇḍita* (Fasc. 1) edited by Lakshmidhar Pant. Benares 1933.
- Ṛktantra -vyākaraṇa* (a Prātisākhya of the Sāma-veda) edited with notes and commentary of Suryakanta Sastri. Lahore 1933.
- Vārāha-Śrautasūtra* (of the Maitrāyaṇī Śākhā) edited by Caland and Raghuvira. Lahore 1933.
- Nyāyalīlāvati of Vallabhācārya* with the commentaries of Saṅkara

- Miśra, Vardhamānopādhyāya and Bhagīratha Thakkura. Fasc. 8. Benares 1933.
- Sāradātīlakatantra of Lakṣmaṇadeśikendra* (2 parts) edited by Arthur Avalon. Tantrik Texts. Calcutta 1933.
- Ātmatattvavireka of Udayanūcārya* with the commentaries of Raghunātha and Śaṅkara Miśra and a sub-commentary of Śrī Rāma (Fasc. 4) edited by Rajeshvara Sastri and Hariram Sastri. Benares 1933.
- Saduktikarṇāṃṛta of Śrīdhara-dāsa* (Anthology) edited by Ramavatar Sarma. Lahore 1933.
- A Commentary to the Kāśyapaparivarta* (A Mahāyāna treatise of the Ratnakūṭa class) edited in Tibetan and Chinese by Baron A. von Staël-Holstein. Peking 1933.
- Index to the Tibetan Translation of the Kāśyapaparivarta* by F. Weller. Cambridge, Mass. 1933.
- Das nordarische Sakische Lehrgedicht des Buddhismus*, Text and Translation by E. Leumann. Leipzig 1933.
- Harilīlāṃṛta of Vopadeva* with the commentary of Madhusūdana Sarasvatī. Benares 1933.
- Vākya-padīya of Bhartṛhari* with the commentary of Helārāja, vol. II, 6 edited by Damodar Sastri. Benares 1933.
- Sajjanendra-prayogakalpadruma* edited by Anantaram Sastri.
- Mīmāṃsādarśana with Śabara-bhāṣya and Tantravārtika* (Adhyāya 8-10, pāda 4). Poona 1933.
- Fragments de textes Koutchiens* (Udānavarga, Udānastotra, Udānālamkāra and Karmavibhanga) edited and translated into French by Sylvain Lévi. Paris 1933.
- A Manual of Ardhamāgadhī Grammar* by P. L. Vaidya. Poona 1933.
- Ancityaricāracorcā of Kṣemendra*. Benares 1933.
- Haṃsadūta of Rūpa Gosvāmin* edited with a commentary in Sanskrit and translated into Bengali by Bibhasprakas Gangopadhyaya.
- Samarāñcakaḥ of Haribhadra Sūri* (2 chapters) edited with Notes and English translation by M.C. Modi. Poona 1933.
- Uttarādhyāyī masūtra* (vibhāga 4) with the commentary of Kamalasaṃyama edited by Jayanta-vijaya. Agra 1933.
- Puruṣārthasiddhyupāya (Jainapracāsanarūpakoṣa) of Am 'acandra*

- Sūri* edited with English commentaries and translation by Ajit Prasad. Lucknow 1933.
- Kalpasūtra (Bārasi-sūtra)* with two versions of *Kālakācāryakathā*. Devchand Lalbhai Jain Pustakoddhar Fund Series. Bombay 1933.
- Vivāgasuya* (The eleventh Aṅga of the Jain Canon) edited with Notes by P. L. Vaidya. Poona 1933.
- Nītimañjarī of Dvā Dviveda* edited by S. J. Joshi. Benares 1933.
- Darśanodaya* (Epitome of Hindu Philosophical Systems) by Lakshmi-puram Srinivasachari. Mysore 1933.
- Vedasūtra* by Visvabandhu Sastri. Lahore 1933.
- Bhedaratna of Śaṅkaramiśra* edited by Suryanarayan Sukla. Sarasvatī Bhavana Texts. Benares 1933.
- Buddhapratimālakṣaṇa of Samyak Sambuddha* with commentary edited by Haridas Mitra. S. Bh. Texts. Benares 1933.
- Kiraṇāvalīprakāśa of Vardhamāna Upādhyāya* (Part I) edited by Badri Nath Sastri. S. Bh. Texts. Benares 1933.
- Bhedajayaśrī of Turkavāgīṣa Bhaṭṭa Veṅṇidattācārya* ed. by Tribhuvan Prasad Upadhyaya. S. Bh. Texts. Benares 1933.
- Sūdrūcāraśiromaṇi of Śeṣakṛṣṇa* (Part I) edited by Narayana Sastri Khiste. S. Bh. Texts. Benares. 1933.
- Smārtollāsa of Śivaprasāda* (Part I) edited by Bhagavat Prasad Sarma. S. Bh. Texts. Benares 1933.
- Bhedasiddhi of Viśvanātha Pañcānana Bhaṭṭācārya* edited by Suryanarayana Sukla. S. Bh. Texts. Benares 1933.
- Tantrarātna of Pārthasārathi Miśra* (Part II) edited by Gopal Sastri Nene. S. Bh. Texts. Benares 1933.
- Kālatattrarivecana of Raghunātha Bhaṭṭa* (Pt. II) edited by Nanda Kishore Sharma. S. Bh. Texts. Benares 1933.
- Kāvyaṅprakāśa of Mammata* (Part I) with com. edited by Sivaprasad Bhattacharya. S. Bh. Texts. Benares 1933.
- Kāvyaṅprakāśa* (ullāsa I, II and III) with 5 commentaries edited and translated into English by S. S. Sukthankar. Bombay 1933.
- Veda-bhāṣya-bhūmikāsaṅgraha*, with commentary edited by Baladeva Upadhyaya. Kashi Sanskrit Series. Benares 1934.

THE Indian Historical Quarterly

Vol. X

JUNE, 1934

No. 2

Nirvāṇa according to the Tibetan Tradition

I. Preliminary Remarks

What is Nirvāṇa?—All the Buddhist schools agree in the statement that it represents the cessation or extinction (*nirodha*) of the turmoil, the uneasiness (*duḥkha*) of phenomenal existence. But how is this cessation or extinction to be understood?—“It is the full annihilation of all the physical and psychical elements, of all the active forces,¹ of a personality,—eternal death, complete extinction where nothing remains, as we have it in the case of a light that has been blown out.” “It is a state of cataleptic trance attained by the Buddhist Arhat who is constantly merged in it, after having passed beyond the limits of the three Spheres of Mundane Existence² and attained the so-called Unaffected Plane³ which is not in the least subjected to worldly turmoil.” “It is the true essence of all elements of existence, free from all differentiation and dialectical construction,⁴ the Universe in its true nature as one great

1 *samskāra* = *ḥdu-byed*.

2 *dhātu-traya* = *kāma-gsum*, i.e. *kāma-dhātu* = *ḥdod-kāms*—the World of Gross Bodies or of Carnal Desire, *rūpa-dhātu* = *gzugs-kāms*—the World of Pure Matter or of Ethereal Bodies and *ārūpya-dhātu* = *gzugs-med-kāms*—the Immaterial Sphere.

3 *anāsrava-dhātu* = *zaq-med-kyi dbyiñs*.

4 Cf. *Abhisamayālaṅkāra-ālokā*, MS. 100b.4. निर्वाण्यस्मिन् सर्वविकल्पा इति निर्वाणं सत्यता ।

whole abiding in Eternal Peace, thus intuited by the meditator (*yogin*) who becomes one with it." "It is the state of Buddhahood, that of an omniscient being who has become free from all the obscurations (*āvaraṇa*), is possessed of unlimited powers and acts without effort for the sake of all living beings."⁵ In such totally different forms the question is answered by the representatives of the various Buddhist schools; in vain should we seek some uniformity here. It is owing to this fact that the problem of Nirvāṇa has for a long time been exceedingly complicated and difficult. A decisive step towards its solution has been made by Prof. Th. Stcherbatsky who in his great work "The Conception of Buddhist Nirvāṇa" has summarized the main teachings concerning Nirvāṇa as peculiar to the four principal Buddhist schools and has shown the process of evolution of the concepts in connection with the development of the Mahāyānistic doctrines, etc. We have now a clear aspect of what Nirvāṇa represents according to the main branches of Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna.

All the work that can be still done here is but to add details from new sources, confirming the points established by our revered teacher. A great number of these sources we find in the inexhaustible treasury of the Tibetan exegetical literature. In two previous works⁶ we had the occasion of mentioning two specimens of this literature, viz., the huge sub-commentaries on the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra* of Maitreya-Aśaṅga,—the *Legs-bśad-gser-phren* of Tsōṅ-kha-pa and the *Rin-chen-sgron-me* (= *Ratna-pradīpa*), alias *Phar-phyin-skabs-brgyad-ka* of Jam-yāṅ-shad-pa,—"The Omniscient Lama."⁷ As all the other commentaries of this kind, as for instance the works of Bustoṅ and other celebrated Tibetan scholars, the said two treatises contain a great

5 Cf. my translation of the Uttaratantra, *Acta Orientalia*, vol. IX, p. 184.

6 *Ibid.* (Introduction) and "Doctrine of Prajñā-Pāramitā" etc. *A.O.*, vol. XI, pp. 2-3.

7 *kun-mkhyen-bla ma*. On Jam-yāṅ-shad-pa (Sag-dbañ-brtson-hgrus Hjam-dbyaṅs-bzad-paḥi-rdo-rje = Vāgīndravīrya Mañjuḥṣa-hāsa-vajra) as one of the greatest Tibetan scholars and the founder of the Go-man (Sgo-man) school and of the Labrañ monastery, cf. Prof. Th. Scherbatsky, *Buddhist Logic*, vol. I, p. 57 and my "Doctrine of Prajñā-pāramitā" etc. *Acta Orientalia*, vol. XI p. 3.

number of smaller chapters dedicated to the investigation of special subjects which in the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra* and its Indian commentaries are mentioned only in a brief and summary form. So we have, for instance, in connection with the second topic of the first 'Adhikāra —the precepts and instructions received by the Bodhisattva during his course of training on the Path (*Sarva-ākāra-jñātā-adhikāra*),—the analysis of the two aspects of reality,⁹ a chapter devoted to the three jewels (*ratna-traya*), and so on. In our introduction to the translation of the *Uttaratantra* are given the main contents of such a separate chapter, viz., that concerning the theories about the *dhātu* (*gotra*) or the fundamental element of the saintly lineage.

In each of these special chapters the Tibetan authors discuss the subject on the basis of the most authoritative texts, scriptures and exegesis, and give abundant quotations from these texts which can be easily traced to their sources. For example, the chapter devoted to three Jewels is based upon the corresponding part of the *Uttaratantra*, that relating to the two Aspects of Reality upon the *Satya-draya-vibhāṅga* of Jñānagarbha, etc. etc.

The knowledge of the Indian sources by the Tibetan scholars and their dexterity in utilizing them are quite astonishing. The Tibetan compendia make us acquainted with passages from texts which have hitherto been known only by name from the indices of the Kangyur and Tangyur; the importance of these texts becomes thus apparent, and they are studied exclusively through the quotations of the Tibetan authors.

It is quite natural that we should expect in the works mentioned by us special chapters dedicated to such an important problem as that of Nirvāṇa. These chapters actually exist and have been utilized for the present study.

8 *avavāda = gdams-nag*. Cf. my "Doctrine of Pr.-pār," p. 73 and my Analysis of the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra*, pp. 33-50.

9 *Le.* the empirical or conventional reality (*samvṛti-satya = kun-rdzob-bden-pa*) and the absolute reality (*paramārtha-satya = don-dam-bden-pa*).

10 Cf. transl. pp. 123-148.

*II. The Analysis of the Theories concerning Nirvāṇa according to
Tsoṅ-kha-pa's Legs-biad-gser-phren*

This analysis is put in connection with the first *pada* of the dedicatory verse of the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra* in which it is said:—Saluted be (Prajñāpāramitā), the Mother of the Buddha, the Leader of the Śrāvakas and the Bodhisattvas, which, in the form of the omniscience regarding the objects of the empirical world¹¹ leads to pacification of the Śrāvakas who are desirous of attaining quiescence.

H a r i b h a d r a, in his small Commentary, the *Sphuṭārthā*,¹² comments on this verse as follows:—By means of the omniscience in regard to the empirical world, the Śrāvakas and the Pratyekabuddhas striving for quiescence are conducted to N i r v ā ṇ a *with* and *without residue*, the pacification of the defiling forces¹³ and of phenomenal existence.¹⁴

Now the mention of Nirvāṇa with and without residue (*sopadhiśeṣa* and *anupadhiśeṣa*) has been taken by T s o ṅ - k h a - p a as an opportunity for giving an exposition of the meaning of Nirvāṇa in general. We have here three principal sub-divisions, as follows:—

A. The Standpoint of the Hīnayānists

First of all, comes a discussion concerning the terms “Nirvāṇa with residue” and “Nirvāṇa without residue.” It is accordingly said:—Some explain the difference between Nirvāṇa with residue and that without it by saying that the former represents the full destruction of the elements constituting the principle of the origin (of phenomenal existence),¹⁵ whereas Nirvāṇa without residue is the destruction (of the said elements and) of those relating to the principle of phenomenal existence¹⁶ as well. This is incorrect. It is true that with the Arhat the force which necessarily ‘throws’ one into a new form of wordly

11 *sarva-jñatā* = *thams-cad-śes-pa-ñid* or *eastu-jñāna* = *gñi-śes*.

12 Tib. Hgrel-pa Don-gsal. Cf. “Doctrine of Pr. pār.”, p. 2, 11, 65.

13 *kleśa* = *ñon-moñs*.

14 *duḥkha* *slug-bsñal*.

15 *samudaya-satya* = *kun-ḥbyuñ-bden-pa*.

16 *duḥkha-satya* = *slug-bsñal-bden-pa*.

existence and the defiling forces are completely annihilated. It is however said in the *Sphuṭārthā*, the commentary of Yaśomitra that with the Arhats the influence of deeds committed by them at the time when they were ordinary worldlings,¹⁷ or of deeds of an indefinite character, good or bad, by which a new existence is conditioned, is not altogether absent. However, owing to the absence of the dormant defiling forces,¹⁸ the said deeds are incapable of calling forth a further existence in the Phenomenal World.

And in the *Pramāṇa-vārttika*¹⁹ we read:—The state of complete freedom from passion is connected with commiseration²⁰ or with (the remnants of) former deeds.—And moreover:—The deeds of him who is delivered from the thirst for Phenomenal Life²¹ are incapable of throwing him into a new existence, since the co-operating agents²² (i.e. the defiling forces) are annihilated. Thus, in the texts of the superior and inferior systems,²³ the existence of *karma* bearing the stamp of (former) defiling influence, has been spoken of several times.

Therefore the difference (between Nirvāṇa with a residue and that without it) is as follows:—

Nirvāṇa with residue is the state when the defiling forces (*kleśa*) are completely removed, but the continuity of the (five) groups of elements (*skandha*) is not yet stopped. Nirvāṇa without residue, in its turn, represents the state when the continuity of the (five) groups of elements (relating to phenomenal existence) likewise comes to an end.²⁴

17 *prthagjana* = *so-soḥi-skye-bo*.

18 *anuśaya* = *bag-lñal* or *phra-rgyas*. We find this passage in the *Abhidharmakośa-vyākhyā*, Ms. Minaev, 213a, 19-21:

न ह्यहंतां पृथग्जनावस्थायां कृतानि कुशलाकुशलानि पौनर्भविकान्यनियतानि कर्माणि न सन्ति । अनुशयवेकस्यास्तु तानि भवाभिनिर्वर्तने न समर्थानि ।

19 Tangyur, MDO., XOV.

20 This refers evidently to the Saint.

21 *bhava-trṣṇā* = *srid-paḥi sred-pa*.

22 *sahakārin* = *than-cig-byed-pa*.

23 *gñuñ goñ ḥog rnam-su*—the superior (i.e. such as the *Pramāṇa-vārttika*) and the inferior (i.e. such as the *Abhidharmakośa*).

24 Compare the passage in Jam-yañ's commentary according to which the four non-physical groups of elements continue to exist at the time of Nirvāṇa without residue. The said passage expresses the Mahāyānist point of view.

It is said in (Candrakīrti's) commentary on the *Yukti-ṣaṣṭkā*²⁵:—As regards Nirvāṇa with residue, (it is the state when) the (five) groups of elements only are left, the liberation from the bonds of defiling forces having been attained. Nirvāṇa without residue is characterized by the cessation of the continuity of the said groups of elements.²⁶ Such is the point of view of the opponents²⁷ (i.e. the Hīnayānists, directed against the Mādhyamikas.—(A group of) the followers of both the Hīnayānistic systems is of the opinion that, after the Arhat has given up the force which conditions the continuance of his life,²⁸ his consciousness at the final moment regenerates, but only to become merged in the Plane of Perfect Quiescence.²⁹

What is the essence of Nirvāṇa according to the Hīnayānists?

Of the two sets of elements, the conditioned or active³⁰ and the unconditioned or immutable,³¹ Nirvāṇa belongs to the latter. Now, the Kashmīrian Vaibhāṣikas³² admit three such immutable elements, viz., the two forms of Extinction (*nirodha*) and Space (*ākāśa*). To these three elements the Vaibhāṣikas of Central India³³ add a fourth, which they call *tathatā*, as we have it in the commentary on the *Jñāna-sāra-samuccaya*.³⁴

Accordingly, the *Tarkajvālā*³⁵ quotes a Vaibhāṣika text containing an expression of the point of view of the School of Central India:—The unconditioned elements are the two kinds of extinction, Space, and *tathatā*.³⁶—(The last term) is explained as follows:—*Tathatā* is the unreality (or the non-substantiality)³⁷ of all entities.³⁸

25 Tangyur, MDO. XXIV.

26 Cf. Abhis. ālokā, GOS., p. 128. न विद्यन्त उपधयः स्कन्धाः सर्वरागादिप्रहाणावशेषे शीभूतत्वेन शेषा यस्मिन्निर्वाणो तत्तथोक्तम् ।

27 *pūrva-pakṣa* = *phyogs-sñā*. 28 *āyuh-saṃskāra* = *tshel'i ḥdu-byed*.

29 *zi-baḥi dbyñs ḥbaḥ-ñig-par ḥdod*. Cf. Conception of Buddhist Nirvāṇa, p. 30—"there is a subtle consciousness which survives after Nirvāṇa."

30 *saṃskṛta* = *ḥdus-byas*.

31 *asaṃskṛta* = *ḥdus-ma-byas*.

32 Kha-che Bye-smra-ba.

33 Yul-dbus-kyi Bye-smra-ba.

34 Ye-śes-sññi-po-kun-las-btus-kyi ḥgrel-pa—*Jñāna-sāra-samuccaya-nibandhana*, the work of Bodhibhadra, Tangyur, MDO., XVIII.

35 Tg., MDO., XIX.

36 *de-bñin-ñid*.

37 *niḥsvabhāvatā* = *ño-bo-ñid-med-pa-ñid*.

38 *vastu bhāra* = *dños-po*.

It has the following characteristic forms:—(1) the absence (of an entity) before (its origination),³⁹ (2) the absence (of an entity) after it has disappeared,⁴⁰ the absence of one entity in another,⁴¹ and total absence (of entities that never existed).⁴² Such it is, being an eternal, unalterable essence. (Now, as regards the varieties of Nirvāṇa, both (the Hīnayānistic schools) considered it to represent extinction which is attained by means of analytic wisdom.⁴³ The difference is that the *Vaibhāṣikas* consider Nirvāṇa to have the character of a *contradictory negation*⁴⁴ (of Phenomenal Existence, i.e. a separate entity, something which is not *Saṃsāra* and is opposed to it), whereas the *Sautrāntikas*⁴⁵ take it to be the *absolute negation*⁴⁶ (i.e. the mere absence of the Phenomenal Elements).⁴⁷ This is explained in detail in the commentaries on the *Abhidharmakośa*. It has been said likewise by *Avālokita-vratā*⁴⁸ that those who consider (Nirvāṇa to be) a positive entity⁴⁹ are the representatives of the systems which hold it to be a separate reality.⁵⁰ These are the adherents of *Sāṃkhya*,⁵¹

39 *prāg-abhāva = śūn-med-pa.*

40 *pradhvaṃsa-abhāva = 'zig-nas-med-pa.*

41 *anyonya-abhāva = gcig-la-gcig-med-pa.*

42 *atyanta-abhāva = gtan-med-pa.* This *tathatā* of the *Vaibhāṣikas* of Central India is the same as the category of non-existence (*abhāva-pudārtha*) of the *Vaiśeṣika* system. Cf. below.

43 *pratīsamkhyā-nirodha = so-sor-brtags-ḥgog.*

44 *ma-yin-dgag.*

45 *Mdo-sde-ba.*

46 *med-dgag.*

47 Cf. *Conception of Buddhist Nirvāṇa*, p. 29 —“Nirvāṇathe absolute end of the manifestations (of the Phenomenal Elements), the end of passion and life without any positive counterpart.....means only the end of process of life.”

48 *Spyan-ras-gzigs-brtul-ḥugs, Prajñā-pradīpa-ṭīkā, Tg., MDO., XX, XXI, XXII.*

49 *dravya-sat = rdzas-yod.*

50 *bhāva = vastu dños-po.* Cf. *Conception of Buddhist Nirvāṇa*, p. 28.

51 *Grāns-can-pa.*

Vaiśeṣika,⁵² the Vaibhāṣikas, and the Yogācāras.⁵³ Those who do not maintain it to be a positive entity are the negators of its separate reality. These are the Tāmraśāṭṭīyas,⁵⁴ the Sautrāntikas and the Materialists.⁵⁵

[The following passage of the *Gser-phreñ* contains a quotation from the *Munimatālamkāra*⁵⁶,—an incorrect interpretation of the terms “with residue” and “without it.” It is of an exceedingly scholastic character and can have no special interest here.]

B. The Standpoint of the Yogācāras

The meaning of “Nirvāṇa with residue” and “Nirvāṇa without residue” is explained by the Yogācāras in the same manner as by the Hīnayānistic schools. As concerns the very essence (of Nirvāṇa according to the Yogācāras), it is spoken of in the *Nirṇaya-saṃgraha*⁵⁷ as “having the essential nature of the perfectly pure Absolute Essence of the elements.”⁵⁸ It is moreover stated that, according to the commentary on the Vibhāṣā,⁵⁹ the essence of Nirvāṇa with and without residue is the extinction, the termination (*nirodha*) of the process of worldly life.

According to this system, at the time of final Nirvāṇa, consciousness (that which is produced by defiling elements and *Karma*, and is influenced by them) does not exist. As concerns the two obscurations which are to be rejected on the Path,⁶⁰ they are not completely annihilated (with the Hīnayānistic Arhat); still as they have no basis,⁶¹

52 Bye-brag-pa.

53 Rnal-ḥbyor-spyod-pa

54 Gos-dmar-sde. Cf. below.

55 Ḥjig-rten-rgyañ-ḥphen-pa = Lokāyatika.

56 Thub-paḥi-dgoñs-rgyan; Tg., MDO., XXIX.

57 Tg., MDO., LII, LIII.

58 *dharmadhātu* = *chos-kyi dbyiñs*.

59 (?) Bye-bśad-ḥgrel-pa.

60 *lam-gyis spanñs-paḥi sgrib gñis*. It seems strange that the absence of two obscurations should be mentioned here, since it is well-known that the Hīnayānistic Arhat is supposed to reject only the first of the obscurations, viz. that of moral defilement (*kleśa-āvaraṇa*).

61 *rten med-pa*, in the form of the ordinary “doiled” consciousness.

they so to say vanish by themselves. It thus follows that as regards the removal⁶² (of the obscurations) there is no difference between the Hīnayānistic and the Mahāyānistic Nirvāṇa.⁶³ The difference consists in the action for the sake of other living beings (with the person who has attained the Mahāyānistic Nirvāṇa, i.e. the Buddha), and the absence of this kind of action (with the Hīnayānistic Arhat). It is accordingly said in the *Nirṇaya-saṃgraha*:—With him who abides in the plane of Nirvāṇa with residue⁶⁴ there can be an obscured and an unobscured state. As regards him who abides in the plane of Nirvāṇa without residue, a state characterized by obscuration cannot be admitted. Why that? Because every kind of differentiation (of separate entities)⁶⁵ and all depravity⁶⁶ are stopped in their course and annihilated. Now, if (the Arhat), similar to the Buddha, is not possessed of obscurations, why does he not exercise the activity of a Buddha?—To this we answer:—(The Arhat) has not made at the beginning (of his Path) the vow (of helping other living beings) and (the process of his) mind-concentration (is not characterized by such a vow). He belongs to a spiritual lineage of a lower order⁶⁷ and has no desire of arising (from the state of trance into which he is merged). For these very reasons he passes away into the Nirvāṇa (of the Hīnayānist, characterized by complete inactivity) and is consequently unable to act (as a Buddha).

C. The Standpoint of the Mādhyamikas.

In general, four kinds of Nirvāṇa are admitted by this school in accordance with the scriptures, as follows:—(1) Nirvāṇa as the true

62 *prahāṇa = spañs-pa.*

63 On this subject many discussions of a very subtle character are to be found in the various Tibetan manuals.

64 *phui-poḥi thug-ma dan-beas-paḥi mya-ñan-las-ḥdas-paḥi dbyiñs-sugnas-pa-tu.*

65 *nimitta = mtshan-ma.*

66 *dauṣṭhulya = gnas-ñan-len.* Acc. to *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha* (Tg. MDO. LVI 13b. 3-4) it is the seed of all defiling forces (*ñon-moñs-pa dan ñe-baḥi ñon-moñs-paḥi sa-bon = kleśa-upakleśa-bīja*).

67 *hīna-gotraka = dman-paḥi rigs-can.*

essence of existence (*prakṛti-nirvāṇa*),⁶⁸ (2) the non-stable or unlimited Nirvāṇa (*apratisthita nirvāṇa*),⁶⁹ (3) Nirvāṇa with residue (*sopadhīṣeṣa-nirvāṇa*)⁷⁰ and (4) Nirvāṇa without residue (*anupadhīṣeṣa-nirvāṇa*).⁷¹

The first of these represents the true nature of all elements of existence (the Universe as one great whole) devoid of all plurality⁷².—The second is Nirvāṇa peculiar to the Buddhas and the Bodhisattvas.—As regards the last two varieties (i.e. Nirvāṇa with and without residue), their meaning is:—

(a) With regard to the Hīnayānist Saint.—Nirvāṇa with residue represents the state when the Arhat (who has come to the end of the Path enjoys his last existence on earth). The Biotic Force which keeps the life of the Arhat on earth going on⁷³ is not yet stopped. Therefore, although the defiling forces are removed, there still exists a residue of worldly existence in the form of the five groups of elements, conditioned by the efficiency of previous *karma* and defilement.

If the aforesaid Biotic Force is cast away, the five groups of elements, in their gross form as constituting worldly existence cease to exist, and the Arhat assumes an existence in the perfectly pure Spheres, “within the petals of lotus-flowers”⁷⁴ and endowed with a spiritual, non-physical body.⁷⁵ This is regarded as “Nirvāṇa without residue.”

(b) With regard to the Mahāyānist Saint.—It is said in the *Kāya-traya-avatāra-mukha*⁷⁶.—

69 *mi-gnas-paḥi myan-ḥdas.*

68 *rañ-bzün-gyi myan-ḥdas.*

70 *thag-bcas myan-ḥdas.*

71 *lhag-med myan-ḥdas.*

72 *chos-rnams-kyi rañ-bzün spros-pa mthah-dag dan-bral-baho = sakala-prapañca-vinirmuktā dharmāṇāṃ prakṛtiḥ.*

73 *āyuh-samskāra = tshehi ḥdu-byed.*

74 *zin dag-paḥi ḥjig-rten-gyi khams-su pad-maḥi spubs-su.* Cf. Abhis.-ālokā, quoted and translated in “The Doctrine of Pr. Pār.,” p. 29 (*parisuddheṣu buddha-kṣetreṣu anāsravadhātāu samāhitā eva padma-puṣeṣu jāyante*).

75 *manomaya-kāya = yid-kyi rañ-bzün-gyi lus.* Cf. Uttaratantra, Transl. pp. 169, 170.

76 *Sku gsum-la ḥjug-paḥi sgo,* the work of N ā g a m i t r a. Tg. MDO XXIX.

Nirvāṇa as connected with the (five) groups of elements
Is put in connection with the two corporeal forms of the Buddha⁷⁷
(on the other hand), being free from all the (phenomenal) elements,
the Spiritual Body⁷⁸ represents Nirvāṇa without residue.

Thus the three Bodies of the Buddha are spoken of as Nirvāṇa with
and without residue.—In the *Suvarṇa-prabhāsa* it is further stated:—
With respect to these two (i.e. the two corporeal forms) it is said:
“Nirvāṇa with residue of Buddha, the Lord.” And, with regard to
the Spiritual Body it is said: “This is Nirvāṇa without residue.”
Such appears to be the meaning (of Nirvāṇa with and without residue)
as regards the Mahāyānist Saint.

(The part of the *User-phren* commenting on the first *pāda* of the dedicatory
verse of the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra* ends as follows:—

The views maintaining the reality of the individual Ego are the
root of all the defiling forces and of Phenomenal Existence. By means
of the omniscience in regard to the objects of the empirical
world (*sarvajñatā = vastu-jñāna*) the unreality of the Ego is cognized;
thus the views in favour of the reality of the Ego are put an end to.
And, as they vanish, Nirvāṇa, the liberation from all Phenomenal
Existence, is attained.

III. *The Analysis of the Subject in the Commentary of Jam-yon-shad-pa.*

Before passing over to the main subject we must say a few words
about the structure of this Commentary and give a short characteristic
of the method according to which it has been composed. As we have
already indicated in our “Doctrine of Prajñā-pāramitā” etc. and in
the Analysis of the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra*, the Commentary belongs to
the category of the so-called *yig-chas* or manuals, adopted in the
monastic schools of Tibet and Mongolia, a kind of literature which has
till now remained quite unknown to European scholars. According to

77 I.e. the Body of Bliss (*sambhoga-kāya*) and the Apparitional Body
(*nirmāṇa-kāya*). Cf. Buddh. Logic, vol. I p. 11.

78 Or: the Cosmical Body (*dharma-kāya = chos-sku*).

the opinion of the learned Lamas, a thorough analysis of every separate subject worth to be discussed, its examination *à fond* (*mthah-dpyod*), the establishment of a correct definition etc. can be made possible only by means of a regular controversy, during which all the incorrect points of view are refuted, and the true meaning is ascertained with the most pedantic accuracy and precision. In the monastic schools (*chos-grva*) no study can be thought of without such a controversy. We have either single disputants or whole classes of students discussing the most subtle matters in such a way. The *yig-chas*, like those of Jam-yan-shad-pa are the best specimens, the patterns, showing the method, according to which the controversies are to be conducted. As we have already indicated in our work on the Prajñā-pāramitā, the analysis of each subject is divided into three parts viz. the refutation of incorrect opinions (*gzan-lugs-dgag-pa*), the establishment of the author's own point of view concerning the definition of the item in question etc. (*ran-lugs-bzag-pa*), the refutation of objections that could be made with regard to the theses established by the author (*rtsod-spani*). The summary designation of the said three parts is: *dgag-bzag-spani-gsum*,—a specimen of the extreme abbreviations used in the Tibetan manuals.

Regarding the method of dispute itself, it deserves to be pointed out especially. It is the method of "sequence and reason" (*thal-phyir*) the establishment of which is ascribed to the Tibetan Lama Ch a p a C h o s k y i s e n - g e (= Dharmasimha). In the controversy the thesis maintained is put in the form of a syllogism. The latter in its turn is supported by a further syllogism, which is again vindicated by a third one, and so on. Their interconnection is established by turning the reason of every preceding syllogism into the thesis of every following one. The point to be established always ends with the word *thal* (*yin-par-thal* or *yod-par-thal*)—"it follows," and the reason—with the word *phyir* (*yin-paḥi-phyir* or *yod-paḥi-phyir*)—"because this is....." etc. These two words give the method of "sequence and reason" its name. The sentence ending with *phyir* of the first syllogism is repeated in the second with *thal* at the end, or usually in the abridged form: *der-thal*—"this follows" (i.e. it follows that the reason of the preceding syllogism is correct),

because.....(a new reason with *phyir* at the end).⁷⁹ This is done in order to maintain the validity of the reasons against the opponent, who can always reject them by meeting them with: *rtaḡs ma-gruḡ* (*liṅgam asiddham*)—"the reason is incorrect" or: *khyab-pa ma-byun* (*vyūptir na bhavati*)—"the concommittance is faulty."

Such chains of syllogisms are sometimes very long and tedious, and the matters discussed seem in certain places to lack the importance that is attached to them. But as a rule, the aim of this process of arguing—perfect precision in the definition of a term and the like is attained, as I had often the occasion to ascertain through personal experience.⁸⁰ Very often the chain of syllogisms ends with a reference to some highly authoritative text, as for instance, a sutra or some work of Nāgārjuna, Asaṅga, Vasubandhu etc. or of any of the celebrated Tibetan scholars. The quotation from such a text, if rightly applied, is considered to be indisputable.

Let us now see how the problem of Nirvāṇa is discussed in the manual of Jam-yañ shad-pa with the help of the method just described. It is here connected with the same dedicatory verse of the *Abhisamay-ālaṃkāra*, on which, as we have seen, the investigation of the subject in the *User-phren* is based. Haribhadra, in the small commentary, the *Sphuṭārthā* explains this verse as follows: By means of the omniscience in regard to the Empirical World,⁸¹ the Śrāvakas and the Pratyekabuddhas striving for quiescence, are conducted to Nirvāṇa with and without residue, the pacification of the defiling forces and of the Phenomenal Existence. On the foundation of this, Jam-yañ-shad-pa makes the following syllogism:—

The omniscience in regard to the Empirical World the subject of inference (*dharmin*) is possessed of functions of a special kind, (reason) because it leads the Śrāvakas and the Pratyekabuddhas⁸² who

79 Specimens of such syllogism will be given below.

80 I have held myself such controversies with the Lamas of the Dgaḡ-ldan-dar-rgyas-glin *viḡāra* of Transbaikalia.

81 *sarvajñatā* = *kun-śes-ñid* or *vastu-jñāna* = *gzi-śes*. Cf. "Doctrine of Pr. Pār." pp. 62, 66, 67, 75 sqq.

82 We have here for *ñan-thos* (= *śrāvaka*) *dañ ran-rgyal* (= *pratyeka-jina*) the extreme abbreviation: *ñan-rañ*.

are subjected to training on the Path⁸³ and to whom the said form of omniscience is accesible,—to Nirvāṇa with residue in the form of the five groups of elements, the remnants of Phenomenal Existence, and to that kind of Nirvāṇa which is free from such a residue.⁸⁴

After this we have the analysis of the different teachings concerning Nirvāṇa divided into the three principal parts—*dgug*, *b'zug*, and *span*. It must be remarked that the greater part of the text of the *gser-phreñ* referring to the subject has been incorporated by Jam-yañ-shad-pa in his analysis with most of the quotations made.

In the first part of the *mthañ-dpyad* the refutation of the opinions of others, we have first of all: Controversies concerning the Hīnayānistic conceptions of Nirvāṇa.

Only the following subjects are discussed:—

Is Nirvāṇa considered to be complete annihilation by all the Hīnayānists without exception or not? Some say: all the Hīnayānists⁸⁵ without exception come under the category of those who maintain that at the time of the final Nirvāṇa without residue the stream of all the psychical and physical elements becomes completely annihilated.

If this be so, it follows that among the Vaibhāṣikas and Sautrāntikas⁸⁶ there do not exist two different categories, viz. those who admit this complete annihilation and those who deny it, (reason) because there would be only those who maintain the complete annihilation of the psychical and the physical elements.⁸⁷

83 *śaikṣa* = *slob-pa*.

84 Skabs. I, 57b 1-2—*gzi-tes chos-can/byed-las khyad-par-can dan-ldan-te/rañ-rgyud-la ldan-paḥi nan-rañ slob-pa-rnums sdug-bsñal-gyi phuñ-po lhag-ma yod-med-kyi myañ-ḥdas der khrid-par-byed-paḥi-phyir/*.

85 Nan-thos-sde-pa = Srāvaka-vargiya. This is the usual summary designation of the Vaibhāṣikas and the Sautrāntikas taken together.

86 Bye-mdo, an abbreviation for Bye-amra-ba dan Mdo-sde-ba.

87 *bem-rig*; *bem* stands for *bem-po*—Matter.—Skabs. 57b 3-4—*kha-cig na-re/ nan-thos-sde-pa-la lhag-med myañ-ḥdas-kyi tshe bem-rig rgyun-ḥchad ḥdod-pa kho-nas khyab zer-na/ḥo-na Bye-mdo gñis-la de ḥdod mi-ḥdod gñis med-par-thal/ deḥi tshe bem-rig rgyun-ḥchad kho-na ḥdod-paḥi-phyir/*.

It is impossible to agree to this, (reason) because in fact (1) there are many Hīnayānists who admit the continuation of consciousness at the time of final Nirvāṇa, and (2) there are also those who admit the annihilation of the stream of consciousness, (so that the opinions of the different Hīnayānists regarding Nirvāṇa are by no means uniform).

The first argument is substantiated⁸⁸ (reason) inasmuch as (1) the two kinds of Sautrāntikas, viz. those following the *Abhidharmakośa* and those basing upon the *Pramāṇa-vārttika*, as well as (2) some of the Vaibhāṣikas adhering to the *Abhidharmakośa* admit (the continuance of consciousness at the time of final Nirvāṇa).

Again, the first (of the two arguments given last) is correct,⁸⁹ (reason) since (the Sautrāntikas) are of the opinion that the Arhat's consciousness at the time of passing away into Nirvāṇa becomes linked⁹⁰ (with a subsequent form of consciousness and cannot therefore be regarded as becoming completely annihilated). Indeed it is said in the *Pramāṇa-vārttika*:—Wherefore should we consider that which represents the consciousness of the Arhat as having no links (with subsequent forms of consciousness)?

And in the *Pramāṇa-vārttika-alamkāra*⁹¹ (of Prajñākaragupta, in the passages commenting on the verse quoted):—If we try to prove that the consciousness (of an ordinary living being) does not regenerate, (this by giving as an example the final (moment of) consciousness (of the Arhat), there will be no proper connection. Indeed, there is absolutely no contradiction between the fact of being the last (moment of) consciousness and the (possibility) of regeneration, which last point forms the object (of denial here)⁹².—

88 I.e. it is correct that there exist many Hīnayānists who admit the continuation of consciousness at the time of final Nirvāṇa.

89 I.e. it is right that the Sautrāntikas basing upon the *Pramāṇa-vārttika* and the *Abhidharmakośa* are of the opinion that at the time of final Nirvāṇa consciousness continues to exist.

90 *mtshams-sbyor-ba* = *anusam̐dhi* or *pratisam̐dhi*.

91 Tshad-ma-rgyan, Tg. MDO., XCIX, C.

92 We find many interesting indications to this passage in the Commentary of Khai-dub (Mkhas-grub) on the *Pramāṇa-vārttika* called *Rigs-paḥi rgya-mtsho*

It has moreover been said by Devendrabuddhi⁹³:—what contradiction is there in the fact that the consciousness (at the time of Nirvāṇa) becomes linked with other subsequent forms of consciousness? Between the point that is to be (negatively) established⁹⁴ and the proof (the last moment of consciousness) neither of the two forms of contradiction (that would be expected here, viz. that of efficient opposition and of mutual antiphrasis) does not exist.⁹⁵

To all this he (the opponent) replies:—(In spite of all that you have said) it follows nevertheless that at the time of final Nirvāṇa the stream of consciousness becomes annihilated,

(reason) as far as there is a final moment of the Arhat's consciousness. (If we acknowledge such a final moment, it necessarily follows that after it there is no consciousness any more; otherwise, how could we speak of a "final" moment).⁹⁶

The concomittance here is not correct,⁹⁷

(reason) since here we have "the final consciousness of the Arhat" in the sense of the last moment of consciousness included in the stream of phenomenal existence.⁹⁸ (It is "the last"), as far as it does not become

(=Nyāya-Sāgara, vol. XI of Khaṅ-dub's works). The author quotes Ravi Gupta according to whom "although the Arhat has attained Nirvāṇa without residue, the spiritual element which has become perfectly pure through the removal of the defiling forces continues to exist. It has only the seeming appearance that the Arhat has passed away like a light that is blown out, so that nothing is left of him. In reality this is not the case (44b 3-4)." Still more pregnant is the quotation from the Commentary of Jina (ibid., 44b 4-5): All the defective elements are annihilated, but this is not the case with consciousness, which is completely free from all defects (and continues to exist).

93 Lha; an abbreviation of Lha-dbañ-blo.

94 *bsgrub-par-bya-bu* = *sūdhya*, i.e. the absence of regeneration.

95 Sic. acc. to the subcommentary of Guñ-thañ Bstan-paḥi sgron-me. Cf. Buddhist Logic, vol. I, pp. 410, 411.

96 *dgra-bcom-pa tha-mahi sems yod-paḥi phyr* |.

97 The expression "final consciousness" or "last moment of consciousness" does not necessarily imply the total absence of every kind of consciousness after the said moment has elapsed.

98 *hkhor-uas bsdus-paḥi dgra-bco. i-paḥi sems tha-ma* = *saṃsāra-saṃgrhītam antyaṃ cittam arhataḥ*.

the *causa materialis*⁹⁹ of further (moments of) consciousness relating to the phenomenal world, (but does not mean that every kind of consciousness becomes annihilated).

The concomittance (in our argument) is right,

(reason) because only in this sense the said (moment of) consciousness is spoken of as 'the last.' (It is the last in the Saṃsāra) but this does not mean that it cannot be followed by other forms of consciousness that do not relate to the phenomenal world.

Indeed, it is said in the *Pramāṇa-viniścaya*¹⁰⁰:—

It may be said:—In such a case (i.e. if the continuation of consciousness after the attainment of Nirvāṇa is admitted), it follows that there is no reason for speaking about a 'final' moment.—This is not right.—'Final' means "not being the *causa materialis* of further moments of consciousness relating to a living being subjected to phenomenal existence.")

In such a manner only are we to understand all expressions as 'final,' 'last' etc., and in other places we have similar explanations likewise.

The second of the two main arguments (i.e. that there are Jñāyānists according to whom Nirvāṇa represents complete annihilation) is established,

(reason) since there are opinions (viz. of the Kashmirian Vaibhāṣikas and the Sautrāntikas) based upon the Scripture,¹⁰¹ which admit the full annihilation of consciousness. It is said in the Sūtra¹⁰²:—The stream of elements of a personality that has attained Nirvāṇa) is like a light that is blown out,—(the state) where the body¹⁰³ has withered, cognition is gone, where all feelings have disappeared, all forces are calmed, and consciousness itself is extinct.—This verse is interpreted by the above-mentioned schools literally.—

99 *upādāna-kāraṇa* = *ñer-len-gyi rgyu*.

100 *Rnam-ñes. Tg. MDO., XCV.*

101 *Luñ-gi rjes-hbrañs. Mdo-sde-ba.*

102 Translated in "Conception of Buddhist Nirvāṇa," p. 184.

103 "The body" (*lus*) stands here for "the material group of elements" (*rūpa-skandha*).

[After this we have similar chains of syllogisms referring to the Nirvāṇa of the Arhat according to the Yogācāra standpoint, as mentioned in the *Uscr-phren*¹⁰⁴ on the definition of *apratisthita-nirvāṇa*, on the definition of "Nirvāṇa with residue" and Nirvāṇa without residue",¹⁰⁵ etc.]

The second part of the analysis, the establishment of the author's own point of view (*ran-lugs-bzay-pa*)¹⁰⁶ is divided into four parts:—

A. The Standpoint of the Vaibhāṣikas. The general definition of Nirvāṇa according to the Vaibhāṣikas is as follows:—It is the extinction (of phenomenal existence), attained by means of analytic wisdom on the Path,¹⁰⁷ representing the full removal of the obscuration of moral defilement.¹⁰⁸ Among the elements of existence, divided as they are into two sets, the conditioned (*samskṛta*) and the unconditioned, immutable or eternal (*asamskṛta*), it belongs to the latter category and represents a contradictory negation (of phenomenal existence,¹⁰⁹ i.e. a positive counterpart of it). It is an independent (separate) reality, but it is at the same time an eternal entity which is not produced by causes and conditions.¹¹⁰

The concomittance is right since the Vaibhāṣikas admit that all the three immutable elements are real entities¹¹¹ or efficient entities¹¹².

104 Cf. above.

105 This part includes the indications about the existence of the four non-physical groups of elements after the attainment of final Nirvāṇa; these four groups form the non-physical body (*manomaya-kāya*) of the Arhat or the so-called "body of trance." Then follows a quotation from the *Laṅkāvatāra* (ed. Nanjio.

समाधिकार्यं संप्राप्य आकल्पान् प्रबुध्यते ।—p. 135) "having acquired the body merged in trance, (the Arhat) does not wake up till the end of an aeon," as well as from the *Sri-mālā-devi-siṃha-nāda-sūtra*, quoted in the *Uttaratantra-vyākhyā* (transl. p. 170 sqq.). Further on it deals with the existence of *karma* with the Arhats according to the *Abh.-kośa-vyākhyā*.

106 Skabs. I 61 sqq.

107 *pratisamkhyā-nirodha*.

108 *non-sgrib = kleśa-āvaraṇa*.

109 *ma-yin-dgag*. I.e. in the sense that it is "something which is not Samsāra," but not a negation in the sense of the mere absence of Samsāra.

110 In this place the author quotes the *Abhidharma-kośa*, I. 48—*nityā dharmā usamskṛtāḥ*.

111 *rdzas-grub*.

112 *don-byed-nus-pa = artha-kriyā-samārtha*. Then follows a quotation from the *Abhidharma-kośa*, I. 5.

The universal essence of these elements is permanence, and not the quality of being real entities, (since the latter quality is common to all elements of existence in general.) Therefore (the said immutable elements are counted apart (from all other elements) as three items (of a totally different kind). To them some of the Vaibhāṣikas add *tathatā*,¹¹³ thus counting four (immutable elements).

B. The standpoint of the Sautrāntikas. According to the Sautrāntikas, the definition of Nirvāṇa is: The extinction of Phenomenal Existence attained by means of analytic wisdom on the Path (*pratisaṅkhyā-nirodha*), representing the removal of the obscuration of moral defilement (*kleśa-āvaraṇa*).¹¹⁴ It is an immutable (unconditioned) element and is viewed as absolute negation.¹¹⁵ It is said in the *Abhidharma-samuccaya*,¹¹⁶ that Nirvāṇa with and without residue both represent extinction. In the admission of Nirvāṇa as extinction attained by means of analytic wisdom, the Hīnayānists agree with all the other schools, so that this is a tenet common to all the four systems.¹¹⁷

C. The Standpoint of the Yogācāra-vijñānavādins. According to the Vijñānavādins, the definition of Nirvāṇa is: The Absolute Essence of the elements (*dharma-dhātu*), freed from the obscuration of moral defilement attained by analytic wisdom on the Path.¹¹⁸

113 Cf. above.

114 Skabs. I. 62a, 2-3—*ñon-moñs spañs-paḥi so-sor-brtag-ḥgog de myan-ḥdas-kyi mtshan-ñid* / (the same definition as with the Vaibhāṣikas).

115 *med-dgag*. I.e. the mere absence of Samsāra without any positive counterpart. The two kinds of negation (*ma-yin-dgag* and *med-dgag*) are explained in the *Grub-mtha-ḥ-c-he-n-mo* of Jam-yañ-shad-pa (Aga ed. I 166b 6-167 a 1 sqq). As regards the first of these negations it always implies another item as opposed to that negated (*chos gzan ḥphen-pa*), whereas the second is defined as "that which is a direct exclusion of the point denied without any counterpart put in its stead" (167b 4-5—*dgag-bya dños-su-bcad-pas rtogs-par-bya-ba gan dgag-bya bkag-nas chos gzan mi-ḥphen-pa*). Cf. Buddhist Logic, vol. I, p. 397.

116 Aga ed. 65a 2.

117 *grub-mthaḥ bzihi lugs*.

118 *ñon-sgrib spañs-paḥi chos-dbyiñs so-sor-brtag-ḥgog*.

The varieties of Nirvāṇa (according to the Yogācāras) are :

1. Nirvāṇa with residue (*sopadhī-śeṣa-nirvāṇa*),
2. Nirvāṇa without residue (*anupadhī-śeṣa-nirvāṇa*), and
3. The unlimited Nirvāṇa (*apratīṣṭhita-nirvāṇa*).¹¹⁹

D e f i n i t i o n o f N i r v ā ṇ a w i t h r e s i d u e : It is the Nirvāṇa representing the state when the defiling elements are completely removed, and when merely the (five) groups of phenomenal elements exist as a remnant (of Saṃsāra). With this kind of Nirvāṇa there are two varieties more to be distinguished, viz. "Nirvāṇa with residue" of the Śrāvaka, and that of the Pratyekabuddha.

D e f i n i t i o n o f N i r v ā ṇ a w i t h o u t r e s i d u e : It is that Nirvāṇa in which not only the defiling forces are annihilated, but the five groups of phenomenal elements produced by the said forces are likewise destroyed.¹²⁰ This kind of Nirvāṇa has three varieties, in correspondence with the three Vehicles.¹²¹

D e f i n i t i o n o f t h e u n l i m i t e d N i r v ā ṇ a : It is that kind of Nirvāṇa which represents the liberation from the bad 'ends' (*anta*), extremes or limits of the disadvantageous states of phenomenal existence and of (Hīnayānistic) quiescence. The said disadvantageous states are the points which are shunned in this case. It is said in the *Vyākhyāyukti* :¹²² *anta* signifies (1) cessation, (2) end,¹²³ (3) part,¹²⁴ (4) proximity, (5) direction, and (6) something bad or disadvantageous.

D e f i n i t i o n o f t h e M a h ā y ā n i s t i c N i r v ā ṇ a : It is that kind of Nirvāṇa which represents the removal of both the obscurations (i.e. the moral and the intellectual).¹²⁵ The essence

119 *mi-gnas-paḥi myan-hdas*.

120 Skabs., I. 62b 1. *ñon-moñs spais-par ma-zad des bskyed-paḥi sdeq-bsñal-gyi phun-po yan spais-paḥi myan-hdas de lhag-med myan-hdas-kyi mtshun-ñid* |.

121 I.e. that of the Śrāvaka, the Pratyekabuddha, and the Mahāyānist.

122 Aga ed. 10a. 1.

123 The Skabs., has erroneously *hjug* instead of *mjug*.

124 Cf. *Abhis. lokā*, MS 71a, quoted in my Study of the Twenty Aspects of *Sūnyatā*, in the *IHQ.*, vol. IX, p. 178 अन्तो भागः .

125 *klesā-āvaraṇa* and *jñāya-āvaraṇa*.

of Nirvāṇa appears here as the absolute essence of the elements (*dharmadhātū*), free from every kind of additional defilement.

D. The Standpoint of the Mādhyamika-svāntantrikas.¹²⁶ According to the teaching of the Mādhyamika-svāntantrikas the definition of Nirvāṇa is: The extinction of phenomenal existence attained by means of the Path and representing (in the first place) the removal of moral obscuration. As regards the term *pratisaṃkhyā-nirodha*, it refers to the separation (*visaṃyoga*) from the worldly elements, attained by the so-called Unimposed Path¹²⁷, whereas the term *aprasaṃkhyā-nirodha* indicates the state when the said elements are stopped in their growth (but not fully extirpated).¹²⁸

As regards the varieties, we distinguish:—

1. Nirvāṇa with residue,
2. Nirvāṇa without residue, and
3. The unlimited Nirvāṇa.

Definition of Nirvāṇa with residue is: Nirvāṇa which represents the state when, although the moral obscuration is removed, there is still a connection with the remnant of Samsāra in the form of the five groups of phenomenal elements which have been “put into existence” by the force of previous *karma* and the defiling forces¹²⁹.—This kind of Nirvāṇa has two sub-divisions, viz. that of the Śrāvakas and that of the Pratyekabuddhas.

Definition of the Śrāvaka's Nirvāṇa is:—The Hīnayānistic Nirvāṇa which is characterized by the removal of the moral obscuration merely, without any removal whatsoever of the intellectual obscuration (or the obscuration of ignorance—*jñeya-āvaraṇa*), whether subtle or gross. Here we have the Nirvāṇa with and without residue as two different forms.

Definition of the Pratyekabuddha's Nirvāṇa: It is the Hīnayānistic Nirvāṇa characterized by the removal

126 Here we have in particular the views of the Yogācāra-Mādhyamika-Svāntantrika school, to which belongs the chief literature connected with the *Abhisamayālaṃkāra*.

127 *ānantarya-mārga* = *bar-chad-med-lam*. Cf. Doctrine of Pr.-pār., p. 41.

128 Cf. *Abhidharma-samuccaya*, Aga ed. fol. 13. b. 5—*gañ-ḥgog-la bral-ba ma-yin-paḥo*.
129 *las-ñon*—an abbreviation of: *las dan ñon-moñs-pa*.

of the moral obscuration and of the misconception concerning the reality of the external world.¹³⁰

Definition of the unlimited Nirvāṇa is the same as that of Yogācāra-vijñānavādins.¹³¹

Definition of the Mahāyānistie Nirvāṇa: It is the ultimate definite extinction (of Phenomenal Existence), the State in which both the obscurations are removed. It is, to speak otherwise, the removal of all the impediments to the attainment of the Omniscience of the Buddha.¹³² According to the *Uttaratantra*, this kind of Nirvāṇa is to be regarded as the ultimate form, devoid of the three or four obscurations.¹³³ It is described thus with a view to the four properties of the Council Body.¹³⁴

E. The Standpoint of the Prāsaṅgikas. According to the teaching of the Prāsaṅgikas, Nirvāṇa with residue is to be defined as that kind of Nirvāṇa in which there is a manifestation of (the Arhat's) mind possessing the representation of the objects corresponding to the six kinds of active consciousness,¹³⁵ as having a separate reality of their own.—As concerns the varieties there are two forms of this Nirvāṇa with residue, viz. that of the Śrāvakas and that of the Pratyekabuddhas. Nirvāṇa with residue is peculiar to the said individuals after the termination of the trance.¹³⁶

Definition of Nirvāṇa without residue:

130 *phyir-rol don hrzin-gyi rtog-pa = bāhya-artha-vikalpa.* Cf. Doctr. of Pr.-pār., p. 27.

131 Cf. Conception of Buddhist Nirvāṇa, p. 185, 204. The Yogācāras were evidently the first to introduce the idea of *apratisthita-nirvāṇa* and the Yogācāra-Mādhyamika-Prāsaṅgika school exclusively, and is not shared by the other schools, borrowed likewise the interpretation of the said kind of Nirvāṇa from them.

132 *rnam-mkhyen = sarva-ākāra-jñātā.*

133 Uttar. transl. p. 251.

134 *chos-sku = dharmo-kūya.*

135 *pravṛtti-vijñāna = hjug-kes.* That the Hinayānist Saint cognizes the unreality of the separate elements (*dharmā-nairātmya*), is the point of view of the Mādhyamika-Prasaṅgika school exclusively, and is not shared by the other schools, according to which the Hinayānists can cognize only the unreality of the Ego (*puṅgala-nairātmya*). The Prāsaṅgika point of view is expressed in the Mādhyamika-avatāra, B.B., p. 20.5 sqq.

136 *rjes-thob-tu = prstha-labdha-arasthāyām,*

It is that Nirvāṇa, connected with the state of complete absorption¹³⁷ in which there is, but with neither of the six forms of active consciousness, a representation of their objects as having a separate reality. (According to the Prāsaṅgikas) the two kinds of the Hīnayānist Saints first realize Nirvāṇa without residue, and then, after the termination of the trance, as they arise from it, they realize Nirvāṇa with residue. This is explained in the Commentary to the *Yukti-ṣaṣṭikā* and in the Sūtras.)

A. Review of the Literature Consulted .

The third part of the analysis of the subject in Jam-yan-shad-pa's commentary contains, as we have already indicated, the refutation of those opponents who have misunderstood the interpretation of the author. It would take too much place to give the contents of this part here; the questions discussed are again of an exceedingly scholastic nature and can have no special interest here. We can therefore proceed further on and summarize the materials contained in those parts of the two Tibetan works, which have served us as a basis.

Let us first take into consideration the sources, the literature consulted by the Tibetan authors. For the Hīnayānistic Nirvāṇa we have in the first place the *Abhidharmakośa* and Yaśomitra's Commentary thereon. Then, quoted by the Tibetan scholars as an authority acknowledged by the Sautrāntikas, there is the *Pramāṇa-vārttika* of Dharmakīrti with the commentary (*Alaṃkāra*) by Prajñākaragupta. We must remember that the logician or the critical school of Dignāga and Dharmakīrti partly adhered to the Sautrāntika point of view. Its representatives are known as the *Sautrāntika-Yogācāras*,¹³⁸ and their works do not bear the extremely idealistic character peculiar to the elder Yogācāra school of Asaṅga. Dignāga has openly declared that his logical system admits a realistic interpretation as well as an idealistic, and Dharmakīrti evidently hold the same view. Of his treatises, the *Nyāyabindu* and the *Pramāṇa-vārttika* (partly) conform to the Sautrāntikas views.

137 *māṃ-bzūg-tu* = *saṃāhita-avasthāyām*.

138 Cf. *Conception of Buddhist Nirvāṇa*, pp. 24, 25.

The statement of Jam-yān-shad-pa concerning "the Sautrāntikas following the *Pramāṇa-vārttika*" is therefore justified.¹³⁹

The Hīnayānistic views concerning Nirvāṇa are moreover expressed in the *Tarkajvālā* of B h ā v a v i v e k a or B h a v y a ,¹⁴⁰ in the commentary of B o d h i b h a d r a on Ā r y a d e v a's *Jñāna-sāra-samuccaya* and the sub-commentary of A v a l o k i t a v r a t a on Bhāvaviveka's *Prajñā-pradīpa*, containing a remarkable treatment concerning the systems (Buddhistic and non-Buddhistic) according to which Nirvāṇa is a real separate entity, and the systems which maintained the opposite view.

Of the three works mentioned above, it is particularly the *Tarkajvālā* which deserves our special attention as a text most important for the history of Indian philosophy in general. It begins with the exposition of the system supported by its author, i.e. the Mādhyamika-svātantrika.¹⁴¹ The following chapters contain an analysis of other systems, Buddhistic and Brāhmanical, viz. the Hīnayānistic schools, the Yogācāra system, Sāṃkhya, Vedānta etc. The investigation of the contents of this text will be the subject of my special study.

As concerns the Yogācāra views, only one text, viz. the *Nirṇaya-saṃgraha* of Asaṅga has been referred to. It is the second part of Asaṅga's *Yogacaryā-bhūmi*,¹⁴² containing the quintessence of the Mahāyānistic Abhidharma, viewed from the Yogācāra standpoint.

The part dedicated to the exposition of Nirvāṇa according to the Mādhyamika views contains quotations from the *Mūla-mādhyamika*, the *Uttaratantra*, the *Kāya-traya-avatāra* of N ā g a m i t r ā, the *Bodhicaryāvatāra*, etc. It seems to us that, in this latter part, the material given in the Tibetan commentaries is somewhat scanty. We could have expected here a fuller account on the basis of the *Prasanna-padā* and other works in which the subject is discussed in detail.

139 We must add here that the Tibetan tradition distinguishes between "the Logician Sautrāntikas" (*rigs-paḥi rjes-ḥbraṇs Mdo-sde-ba*) or the critical school, and "the Dogmatist Sautrāntikas" (*luṅ-gi-rjes-ḥbraṇs = āgama-anusāriṇaḥ*). The first is evidently meant here.

140 Legs-Idan-ḥbyed.

141 Cf. my translation of Bu-ston's History of Buddhism, vol II, p. 132, note 996.

142 *Ibid.*, vol. I, pp. 54-55.

B. The Hīnayānistic Conceptions of Nirvāṇa.

(We may now give a general idea of the different conceptions of Nirvāṇa on the basis of the information given by the two Tibetan manuals, adding materials from other sources where it proves to be insufficient.

We begin with the Hīnayānistic systems. As regards the Vaibhāṣikas, their main tenets are as follows:— Nirvāṇa is *pratisamkhyānirodha*, i.e. that extinction of Phenomenal Life which represents the separation¹⁴³ from all the mundane defiling elements and forces, attained by undefiled analytic wisdom. It is an eternal, immutable (*asaṃskṛta*) element, a separate reality (*bhāva = vāstu*), a real entity (*dravya-sat*),¹⁴⁴ the negation of Phenomenal Existence in the sense of its being a real counterpart of Saṃsāra and not the mere absence of the phenomenal elements. As concerns the question whether it represents something completely inanimate or not, it seems, that the Vaibhāṣikas were not unanimous on this point. According to Jam-yan-shad-pa some of them affirmed that the complete annihilation of consciousness at the time of final Nirvāṇa refers only to that kind of consciousness which is influenced by the defiling forces (*sāsrava*); it thus appears that they maintained the existence of some other kind of consciousness uninfluenced by defilement, which remains after the attainment of the final Nirvāṇa. Their conception of this consciousness was evidently similar to that of the Sautrāntikas who admitted the existence of a subtle spiritual element surviving after Nirvāṇa. Jam-yan-shad-pa does not tell us who these Vaibhāṣikas were and in his *Grub-mthah-chen-mo* we likewise find no indication on this subject. In any case we know that the idea of a spiritual principle uninfluenced by defiling agencies was already familiar to some of the 18 sects of early Buddhism, as for instance the Ekavyāvahārikas¹⁴⁵ who maintained the existence of “the mind (or spirit)

143 *visamyoḡa = bral-ba*. Abh.kośa-vyākhyā, B.B. I, p. 16, 18-20, 21

प्रतिसंख्यानमनासूवैव प्रज्ञा गृह्यते—तेन प्रज्ञाविशेषेण प्राप्यो निरोध इति प्रतिसंख्यानिरोधः

144 *Ibid.*, p. 17. 3, 4. द्रव्यसन् प्रतिसंख्यानिरोधः सत्यचतुष्टयनिर्देशनिर्विहत्वात् मार्ग-सत्यवदिति वैभाषिकाः।

145 Cf. Tarkajvālā, Jg. MDO., XIX. 163b. 3-4.

perfectly pure and radiant by nature¹⁴⁶ unobscured by the defiling elements, a theory which attained the highest degree of development in Mahāyāna, as we have it in the *Uttaratantra*. We know likewise that among the 18 sects the protest against the theory of Nirvāṇa as complete annihilation, the full extinction of every kind of life was making itself manifest.¹⁴⁷ It is therefore quite probable that a section of the Vaibhāṣikas was averse to the idea of Nirvāṇa as being eternal death and agreed with the Sautrāntikas in admitting a surviving spiritual element.

In connection with the Vaibhāṣika theories, we may speak of the school of the Vaibhāṣikas of Central India who acknowledged a fourth eternal immutable (*asamskṛta*) element, viz. the so-called *Tathatā*. From the characteristics of this element according to the *Tarkajvālā*, it appears to be quite identical with the "category of the Non-ens" (*abhāva-padārtha*) of the Vaiśeṣika system. Indeed it is a purely negative principle and its aspects are quite the same as those of the said category, viz. *prāg-abhāva*, the absence or the unreality of a thing before it became originated, *pradhvaṃsa-abhāva*, the absence of a thing after it has ceased to exist, *anyonya-abhāva*, the absence of one entity in another, and *atyanta-abhāva*, the total absence of entities that never existed. The *Tathatā* thus characterized has consequently nothing to do with the Ultimate Essence of existence in which sense the term is used by the Mahāyānists.

The conceptions of Nirvāṇa as a separate reality, a real entity (*bhāva = vastu = dravya-sat*) appears to be strange when contrasted with the view of those representatives of the Vaibhāṣika school according to whom Nirvāṇa is the complete extinction of every kind of life, the annihilation of all the material and mental elements and of all the forces likewise. What can there remain really existing, if the said three categories of elements are put an end to? But, however strange it may seem to us, just the blank created by the extinction of the elements is conceived as a reality. We have here again a resemblance with the Vaiśeṣika views, according to which the category of

146 *prakṛti-prabhāsvaṛa-citta = sems ran-bzin-gyis hod-gsal-ba.*

147 Cf. Conception of Buddhist Nirvāṇa, p. 30.

Non-ens (*abhāva*) must be regarded as something real. It is not without reason that Avalokitavrata mentions the Vaiśeṣikas and Vaibhāṣikas, side by side,—both are extreme realists and both the Vaibhāṣikas, as we have seen, partly, adhered to the conception of the lifeless character of Nirvāṇa.

Otherwise, if we remember all that has been said about the everlasting nature of the elements (*dharma-svabhāva*) and their manifestations in actual life (*dharma-lakṣaṇa*), it may likewise appear that the Vaibhāṣikas maintained Nirvāṇa to be the annihilation of *dharma-lakṣaṇa* only, whereas *dharma-svabhāva* according to them continues to exist.¹⁴⁸ The Tibetan commentators are however silent on this point.

The views of the Sautrāntika school concerning Nirvāṇa are in short as follows:—Nirvāṇa is the extinction of Phenomenal Existence, representing the separation from the active elements of life, attained through the undefiled analytic wisdom on the Path (*pratisaṃkhyā-nirodha*). (It is the negation of Phenomenal Life in the sense of being the mere absence of it; it is not a separate reality in itself (*vastu*) that could be opposed to Phenomenal Existence, as we have it according to the Vaibhāṣikas. After the attainment of final Nirvāṇa there remains the subtle consciousness, merged, as we stated in the *Gser-phren*, “in the plane of complete quiescence.”)

In the commentary of Jam-yai-shad-pa it is however said that some of the Sautrāntikas adhered to the conception of the final Nirvāṇa as being the full extinction of the material elements and of consciousness likewise. (And, as Nirvāṇa was according to them the mere absence of the Phenomenal Elements without any positive counterpart, it is clear that this branch of the Sautrāntika school must have viewed Nirvāṇa as mere annihilation and nothing else.) It is interesting to note that Avalokitavrata mentions the Sautrāntikas along with the Tāmraśatīyas¹⁴⁹ and the Lokāyatikas as those according to whom Nirvāṇa had no reality of its own.

148 Cf. Conception of Buddhist Nirvāṇa, pp. 23, 185.

149 In the *Ṭippanī* (*mchan-ḥgrel*) of the Lama *Bstan-pa ḥi sgron-me* of *Guñ-thaṅ* we have an extract from “a Tāmraśatiya text” (*Gos-dmar-sde paḥi gẓun*), Chilutai edition, 36a 6b 2:—*ji-ltar mar-me si-ba-ni/ sa-la ma-yin*

In the interpretation of the terms "Nirvāṇa with residue" (*sopadhi-śeṣa-nirvāṇa*) and "Nirvāṇa without residue" (*anupadhi-śeṣa-nirvāṇa*) both the Hīmayānistic schools agree. When the saint has reached the final limit of his Path, i.e. when all the elements of Phenomenal Life are extirpated by him, he attains Nirvāṇa. But, as long as the force which keeps his life on earth going on (*āyuh-samskāra*) is not stopped, it keeps together the five groups of elements constituting the personality of the Arhat which thus continues to exist as a residue of the previous Phenomenal Existence. As soon as the said force is stopped, the aggregate of the five groups is dissolved and the final Nirvāṇa without residue takes place. It is noteworthy that the force of *karma*, the originating factor (*samudaya*) of Phenomenal Existence is not considered to be completely absent with the Arhat; it is only incapable of producing a new existence in the Saṃsāra, being rendered powerless owing to the absence of the so-called *anusāyas*, i.e. the defiling forces which represent the root of Phenomenal Existence, remaining at the beginning of each new life in a dormant state only to develop subsequently,¹⁵⁰ so as to put in motion the force of *karma*. These are: desire (*rāga*), enmity (*pratigha*), ignorance (*avidyā*), false views (*dṛṣṭi*), and doubt (*vicikitsā*), fully discussed in the sixth chapter of the *Abhidharmakośa*. These are all extirpated by the Arhat on his Path.

(Now, in analysing the Hīnayānistic views regarding Nirvāṇa we meet with the following question: What difference is there, according to the Hīnayānistic schools, between the Nirvāṇa of the Buddha and that of an ordinary Śrāvaka Arhat? It seems to be especially difficult

*mkhah-la min/ phyogs-su mi-hgro phyogs-mtshams min/ mar zad ñi-tshe śi-ba
ltar/ sañs-rgyas mya-ñan-ñdas-pa yan/ sa-la ma-yin mkhah-la min/ phyogs-su
mi-hgro phyogs-mtshams min/ srid zad ñi-tshe ñdas-par hgyur/*—a light that
is extinguished exists neither on earth, nor in space, it neither moves in some
direction, nor is it localized anywhere: it has just ceased to exist as the oil
has gone out. Similar is the Buddha who has attained Nirvāṇa. He is neither
on earth, nor is he in space, he neither moves in any direction, nor is he
localized anywhere; his Phenomenal Existence has just ceased, and he is no
more.

¹⁵⁰ Compare Uttaratāntra, transl., p. 136.

to answer this question, if we take into consideration those Hīnayānists according to whom Nirvāṇa represents mere annihilation.) Indeed, from their point of view, both the Buddha and the Arhat pass away and absolutely nothing is left of them. Now, according to the *Abhidharmakośa-bhāṣya* (on Kāṇ. I. 1) the Śrāvakas and Pratyekabuddhas, even after they have attained Arhatship, are still possessed of ignorance, which though uninfluenced by defiling agencies, is an impediment to their cognition of all the subtle objects of the most remote time and place. With the Buddha this impediment does not exist. Moreover, the Buddha is possessed of the ten powers, the exclusive properties (*āveṇka-dharma*), etc., unattainable by the Śrāvaka and Pratyekabuddha.¹⁵¹ It is thus quite clear that the Hīnayānist schools acknowledge the superhuman character of the Buddha, his exclusive power of cognition, which makes him superior to the Arhats and to all other living beings. There is thus a vital difference between the Arhat and the Buddha with respect to the so-called "Nirvāṇa with residue," i.e. at the time when the Buddha continues to exist on earth. As regards the final Nirvāṇa "without residue," those Hīnayānists who maintained the theory of complete annihilation naturally considered that with the Buddha as well as with the Arhat all life becomes completely extinct. These Hīnayānists (Vaibhāṣikas and Sautrāntikas) must be contrasted with those representatives of the latter school who adhered to the conception of *dharma-kāya*, i.e. of a divine Buddha.

C. The Mahāyānistic Theories.

Let us now pass over to the Mahāyānistic theories, those of the Yogācāras and the Mādhyamikas. Two main points must be taken into consideration here. These are: (1) the Mahāyānistic Nirvāṇa, i.e. that of the Buddha as such and (2) the Nirvāṇa of the Hīnayānistic Arhat as conceived by the Mahāyānists.

We begin with the Yogācāras. (As regards the essence of Nirvāṇa according to this school, we are told that it represents "the perfectly pure Absolute Essence of the elements (*dharma-dhātu*).") This as we know is one of the many synonyms of the Absolute Reality

151 Cf. *Abh.-kośa-vyākhyā*, BB., p. 5.

(*paramārtha-satya*),¹⁵² and is explained in the commentary on the *Madhyāma-vibhāṅga* as “the cause (or the source) of all the saintly properties.”¹⁵³ All that is said about this absolute essence points to the fact of its being viewed as something unique and undifferentiated, a monistic spiritual principle.) The Yogācāra conception of *dharma-dhātu = paramārtha = Nirvāṇa* is most closely connected with the theory of the three aspects of existence peculiar to this school. As we know, the Yogācāras maintained that every individual existence represents a stream of consciousness which constructs an unreal objective external world (*abhūta-parikalpa*). No real differentiation of subject and object exists; the reality of the external objects as things in themselves is denied. There are only the moments of consciousness, the component elements of the stream of constructive thought, or, to speak otherwise, the individual ideas. These are dependent on causes and conditions; therefore the whole stream of constructive thoughts is called “the causally dependent aspect of existence” (*paratantra-srabhāva* or *paratantra-lakṣaṇa*).¹⁵⁴ On the foundation of it an objective external world is constructed, a world consisting of material and other elements, to which certain essences and qualities are ascribed. This is the constructed or imputed aspect (*parikalpita-srabhāva* or *parikalpita-lakṣaṇa*).¹⁵⁵ On the other hand we have the true essence of the causally dependent aspect viz. that of being devoid of the differentiation into subject and object and of all that is ascribed to the elements by our constructive imagination, i.e. devoid of the imputed aspect just mentioned.¹⁵⁶ This negation or unreality of all construction, in other words, the negation of separate and objective reality and the elements of existence represents their absolute nature (*pariniṣpanna-svabhāva* or *pariniṣpanna-lakṣaṇa*),¹⁵⁷ and as such, a synonym of *dharma-dhātu* and

152 Cf. *Madh.-vibh.*, I, 15.

153 *Sthiramati ad Madh.-vibh.*, p. 42. *आर्यधर्महेतुस्वाधर्मधातुः* (from Vasubandhu's commentary).

154 *gñan-dban-gi mtshan-kid (gñan-dban)*.

155 *kun-brtags-paḥi mtshan-kid (kun-brtags)*.

156 *Sthir. ad. Madh.-vibh.*, p. 20. *ग्राह्यग्राहकाभावः परिनिष्पन्नः स्वभावः* (from Vasubandhu's commentary).

157 *yon-s-su-grub-paḥi mtshan-kid (yon-s-grub)*.

paramārtha, the highest Truth. In the aspect of the latter: all elements appear as unique and undifferentiated and merged for ever in Nirvāṇa.¹⁵⁸ The Mādhyamika theory of the substantial identity between Saṃsāra and Nirvāṇa,¹⁵⁹ i.e. the theory that the absolute is immanent in the world¹⁶⁰ is thus acknowledged likewise by the Yogācāras. [As we have it clearly expressed in Asaṅga's *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha*, there is no essential difference between Saṃsāra and Nirvāṇa, since the causally dependent elements, the basis of existence, are at one and the same time possessed of the imputed and of the absolute nature. In their imputed aspect,¹⁶¹ i.e. imagined as something different, as real in their plurality, as active etc., the casually dependent elements constitute Phenomenal Life. On the other hand, in their absolute aspect,¹⁶² i.e. correctly intuited as an undifferentiated unity, the same elements represent Nirvāṇa. (The transition from Saṃsāra to Nirvāṇa consists in the change of the main point of view.¹⁶³ One must abandon the conception of the elements of existence as constructed by our imagination and fully concentrate one's mind upon their absolute nature (*pariniṣpanna-svabhāva*) or their ultimate essence (*dharmadhātu*). The mind of the meditator (*yogin*) who contemplates this essence introspectively becomes fully absorbed in it and coalesces with it "like one particle of water with another." Thus the ultimate essence (*dharmadhātu*) identical with Nirvāṇa, the object of the perfectly pure intuition of the *yogin* (*viśuddhy-ālambana*) is realised. In such a sense we have to understand the expression that "the essence of Nirvāṇa is *dharmadhātu*—the perfectly pure absolute nature of the elements.")

[Now, as the absolute is thus immanent in the Phenomenal World and there is no substantial difference between Saṃsāra and Nirvāṇa, it is impossible, with the Yogācāras and all Mahāyanists in general, to

158 Cf. my Introduction to the transl. of the *Uttaratantra*, p. 88 (Contents of the *Dharma-dharmatā-vibhaṅga*).

159 Cf. *Conception of Buddhist Nirvāṇa*, p. 232.

160 *Ibid.*, p. 34.

161 Lit.: "In the imputed part" (*kun-tu-brtags-paḥi chas-ni ḥkhor-baḥo*).

162 Lit.: "In the absolute part" (*yoṅs-su-grub-paḥi chas-ni myu-nan-las-ḥdas-paḥo*). *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha*, Tg., MDO., LVI 22a 4-7.

163 Cf. *Conception of Buddhist Nirvāṇa*, p. 34.

speak of an actual annihilation of the Phenomenal Elements, as we have it according to the Hīnayānistic schools. The process of concentration which we call the Path, the power of Yoga by which the transition from Saṃsāra to Nirvāṇa is attained, does not bring about the destruction of the said elements—it only conveys their complete metamorphose, their perfect transformation (*āśraya-parāvṛtti*)¹⁶⁴ into component elements constituting the personality of the Buddha. We read in the *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha*¹⁶⁵ about the essence of *parāvṛtti* as follows:—If the causally dependent essence in that part which is influenced by the obscurations and includes the sources of defilement (*saṃkleśa*),¹⁶⁶ i.e. the imputed nature or aspect is removed, the liberation from all the obscurations is attained, the power of governing all the elements (*sarva-dharma-vaśārtitva*)¹⁶⁷ is secured and owing to this the other side of the causally dependent nature, viz. that which contains the sources of purification (*vyavadāna*) is made manifest. The *Mahāyāna-sūtrālaṃkāra* of Maitreya-Asaṅga dwells upon the subject of *parāvṛtti* in detail in Chapter IX.

Very interesting is the description of the process of cognition conducive to the realization of Nirvāṇa as we have it in the *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha*.¹⁶⁸ The Bodhisattva, in contemplating the objects of the external world as they are constructed by our incorrect mental activity, i.e. as having each its particular essence, name, etc., comes to the insight that all this variety of representations of names and objects is only a murmur of the mind (*mano-jalpa*),¹⁶⁹ that the objects have no reality as things in themselves, and that all the essences and qualities ascribed to them are merely nominal. And, by means of the four methods of search¹⁷⁰ and the four varieties of full and correct cognition,¹⁷¹ he comes

164 *gnas-hgyur*.

165 Tg., MDO., LVI 43b 2-7.

166 *kan-nas-flon-moṅs-pa*.167 *chos thams-cad-la dbaṅ-sgyur-ba*.168 Tg., MDO., LVI 28a 1 sqq. This process of cognition refers to the 4 Degrees conducive to Illumination (*nirvedha-bhūgiya*). Cf. "Doctrine of Pr.-Pār." p. 34 sqq. and 'Analysis of Abhisamayālaṃkāra,' pp. 58-60.169 *yd-kyi brjod-pa*.170 *catasrah paryeṣaṇḍh = yoṅs-su-tshol-ba bzi*. Cf. *Bodhisattva-bhūmi*, ed. Wogihara, p. 58.171 *catvāri yathā-bhūta-parijñānāni = yan-dag-par' yoṅs-su-śes-pa bzi*. Ibid.

to the cognition that all these constructions of the mind, appearing as objects and names, represent but modifications of consciousness. Thus he develops a fully idealistic conception.¹⁷² The things, their names, the essences and qualities ascribed to them etc. are cognized as having no objective reality, although they appear to us as objectively real. We have here the well-known example of the rope which is mistaken for a serpent in the dark. The representation of the serpent is an illusion inasmuch as the serpent in reality does not exist. Those who have cognized this, become free from the conception of the non-existing serpent and become possessed of the notion of a rope. This, however, being examined more closely, proves likewise to be illusory, since in the rope we have not a unity, but a complex of elements, viz. colour, smell, taste, and tangible staff. On the foundation of the cognition of these component parts, colour and the rest the concept of the rope as a whole is put an end to. Similar is the case if we have the cognition of the absolute essence of the elements. From the constructions of the mind which appear as external objects, associated with the words by which they are designated, the conception of objective reality is removed, just as the notion of the serpent is removed from the rope. And, after this has taken place, the cognition of the thought-constructions as modifications of consciousness is finally likewise put an end to. Thus, the Bodhisattva, by penetrating into the essence of the objects as representations conditioned by a construction of the mind, penetrates into the imputed essence. By developing the idealistic conception, i.e. by taking the elements as modifications of consciousness (as they really are), he penetrates into the causally dependent essence (in the aspect of which the elements appear as component parts of one stream of consciousness). Into the absolute essence he penetrates through the removal of the subjective conception likewise. The idea of separate objects has disappeared, and there is no room for the construction of the mind to manifest itself in the form of the representations of objects. The latter, even as modifications of consciousness having a separate reality, appear no more. The Bodhisattva, being free from constructive thought regarding all the separate objects, obtains a

172 *ruam-par-rig-pa tsam-nid-du hjug-go.*

direct intuition of the ultimate essence of the elements (*dharmadhātu*).¹⁷³ At that time he becomes possessed of transcendental knowledge free from constructive thought¹⁷⁴ in which subject and object coalesce, and thus penetrates into the Absolute Essence (*pariniṣpanna-sabhāva* = *dharmadhātu* = *Nirvāṇa*), so as to become fully absorbed in

(This intuition of the Absolute and the Transformation of the elements begin with the first stage of the Bodhisattva (*pramuditā*)¹⁷⁶ or the Path of Illumination (*darśana-mārga*)¹⁷⁷) and is realized in its complete and final form at the end of the Path, along with full penetration into the essence of the Absolute, the full and definite transformation of the elements and the realization of the Cosmical Body (*dharmakāya*), the ultimate limit of existence, and the unique Divine Wisdom free from the differentiation into subject and object (*prajñā-pāramitā*). This is Buddhahood and the true Nirvāṇa.

In the perfectly pure plane (*anāsrava-dhātu*) of absolute existence

173 Cf. *Sūtrālaṅkāra*, VI. 7.

174 *nirvikalpa-jñāna* = *rnam-par-mi-rtoḡ paḥi ye-śes*.

175 We find a striking similarity between this intuition of the Absolute according to the *Yogācāras* and the cognition of the Supreme Brahma in the Vedānta system, as we have it spoken of in Śaṅkara's *Bhāṣya* on the *Māṇḍūkya-upaniṣad*. Even the same example of rope and the serpent has been used by Śaṅkara. So we read (p. 8, *Anandāśrama Sanskrit Series*, 1928)—
यस्य द्वैतप्रसङ्गस्योपशमेऽद्वैतप्रतिपत्ती रज्ज्वामिव सर्पादिविकल्पोपशमे रज्जुतत्त्वप्रतिपत्तिः—
'Through the pacification of the differentiation of duality and plurality, the cognition of the Monistic Essence is attained, just as, through the removal of the misconception of serpent etc. in regard to a rope, the true nature of the latter is cognized.—And (p. 40, on *Sūtra* 7 of the *Upaniṣad*):—सर्पादिविकल्पप्रतिषेधेनैव रज्जुस्वरूपप्रतिपत्तिवत् अत्रस्थस्यैवात्मनस्तुरीयत्वेन प्रतिपिपादयिषित्वात्। Just as, through the rejection of the imputation of the serpent etc., the true essence of the rope is cognized, in the same manner it is shown that the true essence of the Universal Soul (*ātman* = *brahman*), as it appears in its three states (i.e. as *vaiśvānara*, *taijasa*, and *prājñā*) is really the fourth aspect (*turiya*), i.e. the Atman as being the unique Essence of Universe, inexpressible, unthinkable, etc., the quiescence of all plurality (*prapañca-upaśama*).

176 *rab-tu-dgaḥ-ba*, Cf. *Sūtrālaṅkāra*, XIV. 29

177 *mthoṅ-lam*.

this Cosmical Body represents a unique undifferentiated principle;¹⁷⁸ it is the same with all the Buddhas.¹⁷⁹ At the same time, however, the Buddhas cannot be viewed as a unity from the standpoint of their previous bodily existence etc.¹⁸⁰ Therefore, according to the Mahāyānistic standpoint, “the numerous Bodhisattvas who have attained the state of a Buddha can neither be regarded as completely coalesced into one single substance, nor may they be viewed as a plurality of forms. The ideas of unity and plurality cannot be applied to Buddhahood.”¹⁸¹

The full penetration into the Absolute Essence, i.e. the full purification and the transformation of the personality (*āśraya-nivṛtti*) can be attained only by the Buddha. As regards the Hīnayānist Saint, the Śrāvaka Arhat and Pratyekabuddha, the position which is assigned to him by the Yogācāras belongs to the peculiar tenets of the school and is one of the points in which it disagrees with the Mādhyamikas. The Yogācāras, as we know, are the *Nānāyānāyavādīnāḥ*. This means that they maintain the view that there are three essentially different ‘vehicles’ or Paths to Salvation, each with a different result, in correspondence with the three varieties of the element of the Saintly lineage (*gotra*), viz. that of the Śrāvakas, Pratyekabuddhas, and Bodhisattvas, which three varieties are likewise regarded as being essentially different. Thus, as we have already indicated elsewhere, the Yogācāras admit the Nirvāṇa of the Hīnayānist Saint as being a definite final goal, and not a state of temporary pacification as we have it according to the Mādhyamikas, i.e. the adherents of the teaching of the “Unique Vehicle” (*eka-yāna*). Two kinds of Hīnayānistic Arhats are admitted by the Yogācāras. To the first class belong those who, having terminated the course of training on the Hīnayānistic Path, do not stop there, but, by the grace of the Buddha, are aroused from the state of absorption in which they abide, make their mental effort

178 Cf. my Introduction to the transl. of the Uttaratantra, A.O. vol. IX, p. 109.

179 Ibid. (quotation from Sūtrālamkāra, IX, 62 and Commentary).

180 Ibid. (quotation from Sūtrālamkāra, IX, 77 and Commentary).

181 Bu-ston, History of Buddhism, transl. vol. I, pp. 132-133.

or vow for the attainment of Buddhahood (*bodhi-citta-utpāda*), enter the Mahāyānistic Path, and gradually attain the state of a Buddha.

The second category are those Arhats for whom the attainment of personal quiescence is the sole aim.¹⁸² After the termination of the Hīnayānistic Path, all the elements relating to Phenomenal Life in the three spheres of mundane existence, are completely annihilated with the individual of this kind. And, after the attainment of "Nirvāṇa without residue" there remains the element of pure consciousness which is regarded as supermundane (*lokottara*) and as not being in the least subjected to the influence of the defiling forces (*anāsrava*). The Arhat is thus regarded as having assumed a purely spiritual form of existence (*manomaya-kāya*).¹⁸³ In this form he abides for ever merged in trance. His aim, viz., that of attaining quiescence for himself, is attained and the ultimate limit (*bhūta-koṭi*)¹⁸⁴ accessible to him is realized. This means that the idea of personal quiescence has taken possession of his mind, and, in accordance with the aim pursued by him, he becomes fully absorbed in the Hīnayānistic Nirvāṇa,—his ultimate limit,—without ever being able to arise from his absorption. And, as we have it very eloquently said in the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra*, the efforts of all the Buddhas taken together would be vain, if they would try to arouse such an Arhat from this state of perpetual trance. He has removed the defiling forces, but, since he has pursued only an egoistic aim and has never made the vow of acting for the weal of other living beings, the position of a Buddha and the altruistic activity connected with it are inaccessible to him.

^ \ The purification of the Absolute with such an Arhat is incomplete. The absolute intuited by him is only that which represents "the object of the wisdom conveying the purification from the obscuration of moral defilement."¹⁸⁵ It is the negation of the reality of the individual ego,—existence as constituted by the elements classified from the standpoint

182 *ṣi-ba bgyod-pa gcig-pu-pa*. Cf. "Doctrine of Pī.-Fār." p. 32, note. 3.

183 *yiḍ-kyi zan-bḥin-gyi lus*. See *infra*.

शमैकायनमार्गप्रतिलम्भक . and *Laṅkāvatāra*, p. 120.

184 *yuñ-dag-mthah*. See *infra*.

185 *kleśa-āvaraṇa-visuddhi-jñāna-gocaras tattvam*. Cf. *Bodhisattva-bhūmi*, p. 38.

of the four Truths of the Saint.¹⁸⁶ It is not that higher aspect of the Absolute Truth (*tattva=pariniṣpanna*) which represents the negation of the imputed separate reality of the elements, and as such forms “the object of the intuition which conveys the purification from the obscuration of ignorance.”¹⁸⁷ As Prof. Stecherbatzky rightly remarks,¹⁸⁸ there are many artificial constructions in the Yogācāra theories concerning Nirvāṇa. To one of these certainly belongs the teaching of the three ‘ultimate’ Paths to Salvation and the intermediate position of the Pīnayānistic Arhats/

(The views of the Mādhyamika school regarding final Salvation are much more natural. Nāgārjuna, in his *Nirupama-stava*¹⁸⁹ clearly says:—As the absolute Essence of the elements is unique and undifferentiated (with all living beings), (there can be no (essential) difference in the ‘vehicles’ or Paths conducive to its deliverance.—This means that there is only one ultimate end and aim. This is Buddhahood, full Enlightenment and the complete liberation of the absolute Essence.

In the *Uttaratantra* of Maitreya-Asaṅga and in the canonical fragments quoted in it we find this idea of Buddhahood as the unique ultimate aim expressed in many beautiful passages. In the first place we have to remember verse 83 of Chapter I⁹⁰:—

It (i.e. the absolute Essence) is the Cosmical Body, it is the (Buddha),—one with the Absolute,

It is the Highest Truth and climax of Saintliness, and it is Nirvāṇa, just as are the sun and its rays, so are its properties, indivisible; therefore there is no Nirvāṇa apart from Buddhahood.

186 *catvāry ārya-satyāni=hphags-paḥi bden-pa bḥi.*

187 *jñeya-āvaraṇa-vīśuddhi-jñāna-gocaras tattvam.* Bodh.-bhūmi, *ibid.*

188 Conception of Buddhist Nirvāṇa, p. 204.

189 *IHQ.*, vol. VIII, no. 2, p. 319, verse 21 (restored by P. Patel). compare *Abhisamayālamkāra*, I. 39.—धर्मघातोरसंभेदाद्यानभेदोऽस्ति न प्रभो ; धर्मघातोरसंभेदाद् गोत्रभेदो न युज्यते ।

190 Transl., p. 205:—*gan-phyir de-ni chos-sku de-ni de-bḥin-gḥegs/*

de-ni hphags-paḥi bden-pa don-dam mya-ñan-ḥdas/

de-phyir ḥi dan zer bḥin yon-tan dbyer-med-pas/

sañs-rgyas-ñid-las ma-gtogs mya-ñan-ḥdas-pa med//

The meaning of this is as follows: The Absolute Essence, the true essence of all the elements is in other words the Cosmical Body of the Buddha.¹⁹¹ It manifests itself in all living beings as perfectly pure by nature (*svabhāva-śuddha*),¹⁹² though concealed by the accidental defiling elements (*āgantuka-mala*).¹⁹³ With all living beings it is unique and undifferentiated, and therefore, at the time when all the obscurations ultimately and definitely disappear, it can be realized and intuited only in one way by all those who have come to the final goal of the Path to Salvation. The transformation (*parāvṛtti*) of the fundamental element of an ordinary personality into the Bodies of a Buddha¹⁹⁴ is considered to be the final result of the process of perfect purification. As we have already mentioned, the Absolute = Nirvāṇa is viewed as immanent in the World = Saṃsāra.¹⁹⁵ The phenomenal elements cannot be destroyed,¹⁹⁶ they are only transformed (*parāvṛtāḥ*) into the component elements of Buddhahood.

Now, the fundamental Essence of all the Elements, to speak in other words the Absolute is the perfectly pure quiescent principle,—it is Nirvāṇa. But this essence exists with every living being and represents its true fundamental nature (*dhātu, gotra*). Thus it follows that every living being is possessed of the element of Nirvāṇa which is introspectively intuited on the Path, till the mind completely coalesces with it and all the obscurations are removed.¹⁹⁷ The Absolute Essence thus fully realized represents the ultimate Nirvāṇa; at the same time it is the Cosmical Body (*dharma-kāya*), the Highest Truth (*paramārtha-satya*) and the Extinction of Phenomenal Existence (*nirodha-satya*). Such is the ultimate end and aim and no other.

191 *dharma-kāya* = *chos-sku*, cf. my Introduction to the Transl. of the Uttaratantra, p. 105 no. 3.

192 *ran-bkin-gyis dag-pa*.

193 *glo-bur-gyi dri-ma*.

194 Cf. Uttaratantra, Transl., p. 157, n. 3.

195 Ibid., p. 174.

196 Ibid. p. 134: "But nowhere is this Extinction spoken of as the destruction of any of the elements of existence."

197 On Nirvāṇa as intuited introspectively, cf. Laṅkāvatāra, ed. Nanjio, p. 99.

निर्वाणमार्यज्ञानप्रत्यात्मगतिगोचरम् Cf. also Uttaratantra, transl., p. 252 (II. 42)—The ultimate, highest Nirvāṇa, the Buddha's inconceivable introspection,

However, at the same time, the Eka-yāna-naya-vādins acknowledge the Nirvāṇa of the Hīnayānistic Arhats, the Śrāvakas and Pratyekabuddhas. In the Commentary on the *Uttaratantra* and in Haribhadra's *Abhisamayālamkāra-ālokā*¹⁹⁸ it is clearly shown that this Nirvāṇa is to be understood in the sense of a state of temporary pacification; it is "like a town amidst a wilderness, a resting-place for travellers tired of a long journey,"¹⁹⁹ an existence in the supermundane "unaffected" sphere²⁰⁰ in perpetual trance. Of the two obscurations, only that of Moral Defilement (*kleśa-āvaraṇa*) is removed by the Śrāvaka Arhat at the time of the termination of the Hīnayānistic Path. The Pratyekabuddha Arhat is considered to remove a part of the Obscuration of Ignorance (*jñeya-āvaraṇa*), viz. the conception of the reality of the external world.²⁰¹ But neither the one nor the other can come to full deliverance as long as they are Hīnayānists.

According to the *Uttaratantra-vyākhyā*²⁰² there are four impediments by which this full deliverance is hindered. First of all there is force of transcendental illusion (*avidyā-vāsanā*), owing to which the Arhat cannot become free from the differentiation of separate entities and is thus prevented from becoming fully absorbed in the unique Absolute Essence = Nirvāṇa.

(Now, with the ordinary living beings, the views maintaining the reality of the separate worldly objects call forth the passions and *Karma*, i.e. the activity of will, the dominating driving force of phenomenal existence. In a like manner, with the Hīnayānistic Arhat the force of transcendental illusion conditions a movement of the mind, an activity of will, as far as the consideration of separate realities is not put an end to. This is *Karma*, though free from the influence of defiling agencies (*anāsrava*),¹ but still representing an active force of life.) A state in which room is left for the acti-

198 Cf. "Doctrine of Pr.-Pār.," p. 29.

199 Śrī-mālā-devi-siṃhanāda-sūtra, Kangyur DKON (Ratnakūṭa) VI. 209b 2-3, quoted in *Uttaratantra-vyākhyā*, transl., p. 208.

200 *anāsrava-dhātu* = *zag-med-kyi dbyāns*.

201 Cf. "Doctrine of Pr.-Pār.," p. 32.

202 Transl., p. 170 sqq.

vity of *Karma* cannot represent the true Nirvāṇa in which every kind of *Karma* and emotion is pacified.²⁰³

As the ordinary *Karma* is the cause of repeated forms of existence in the Phenomenal World, in a similar way the “undefiled” *Karma* of the Arhat furthers the continuance of his so-called spiritual body (*manomaya-kāya*), i.e. of the four groups of non-physical elements. The stream of existence, though infinitely subtle is going on with all the constant changes accompanying it. The non-physical body of the Arhat undergoes the process of regeneration which, as it is said, takes place in an inconceivable manner.

Such is the so-called Nirvāṇa of the Hīnayānistic Arhat. According to the Eka-yāna naya-vādins it can endure for many aeons, but must invariably have an end: the Arhat is finally aroused from the state of absorption by the power of a Buddha, enters the Mahāyānistic Path and attains Buddhahood, the true Nirvāṇa with the four absolute properties of Purity,²⁰⁴ Unity,²⁰⁵ Bliss²⁰⁶ and Eternity,²⁰⁷ where the force of *Karma* can no more exercise its activity, and where there is neither repeated birth nor death, nor any of those changes which are connected with every kind of conditioned (*saṃskṛta*) existence.

The Bodhisattva, who from the outset belongs to the Mahāyānistic spiritual lineage (*gotra*), has the possibility of attaining the highest of all aims as the direct result of his Path, he need not pass through the intermediate state of Hīnayānistic Nirvāṇa. A position which to a certain extent resembles that of the Arhat is attained by the Bodhisattva on the eighth stage, “the motionless” (*acalā*).²⁰⁸ He is also possessed of a non-physical body produced by the undefiled *Karma*, and the subtle force of transcendental illusion still exists in him up to the time of its full extripation at the final moment of the Path.²⁰⁹ But this state is regarded as being infinitely superior to the

203 Ibid., pp. 133, 134 sqq.

204 *śuddhī*-(or *śuci*)-*pāramitā* = *gtsoñ-baḥi-pha-rol-tu-phyin-pa*. Uttaratantra, transl., p. 166 sqq. 205 *ātma-pāramitā* = *bdag-gi-pha-rol-tu-phyin-pa*. Ibid.

206 *sukha-pāramitā* = *bde-baḥi-pha-rol-tu-phyin-pa*. Ibid.

207 *nitya-pāramitā* = *rtaḡ-paḥi-pha-rol-tu-phyin-pa*. Ibid. 208 *mi-gyo-bu*.

209 Ibid., pp. 223, 225 (on the defilement removed by the *vajropama-samādhi*).

so-called Nirvāṇa of the Hīnayānist Saint, this is due to the altruistic activity exercised by the Bodhisattva and the proximity to the final result—the Nirvāṇa of the Buddha.²¹⁰

The attainment of the final Nirvāṇa by the Mahāyānist Saint and of the temporary state of Hīnayānistic Nirvāṇa by the Śrāvaka and Pratyekabuddha Arhat is otherwise called “the realization of the Ultimate Limit.”²¹¹ In the Tibetan manuals we find a special passage containing the explanation of this term. “The Ultimate Limit” (*bhūta-koti*) as we know is one of the appellations of the Absolute.²¹² In the teaching of the Path and Final Nirvāṇa it has the following meanings: (1) The Absolute Truth as perfectly revealed owing to the removal of the Obscuration of Ignorance,²¹³ (2) The Ultimate Limit in the sense of the Hīnayānistic Nirvāṇa, the pacification of Phenomenal Existence and the removal of the views maintaining the reality of the Ego. “The realization” (*sākṣātkaraṇa*) is to be understood as follows:—If the idea of attaining quiescence takes possession of the mind, all one’s thoughts and inclinations are solely directed towards it till the mind becomes so fully absorbed in it that an awakening from this state of absorption is no more possible.²¹⁴ The attainment of such a state means the realization of the Ultimate Limit. According to the Yogācāra theory of the “three Ultimate Vehicles” the Hīnayānist Saint can remain thus absorbed for ever, whereas the Eka-yāna-naya-vādins maintain that the power of the Buddha puts an end to this state. /

As regards the “realization of the Ultimate Limit” by the Buddha, it represents the absorption in the Absolute, with which the Buddha forms one indivisible whole characterized at the same time by altruistic activity, miraculous and free from effort (*anābhoga*).²¹⁵

Now after all that has been said it is quite clear that from the

210 Compare “the Wisdom near to the result” of the Bodhisattva and “that far from the result” of the Hīnayānist.”

211 *bhūta-koti-sākṣātkaraṇa = yan-dag-mthah mñon-du-byed-pa.*

212 Madh.-vibh., I, 41.

213 Sthiramati ad Madh.-vibh., p. 41.

214 Skabs., I, 109a 4.

215 Skabs., I, 109a 4—*de-bzhiñ-ñid-la mñam-par-bzūg-bzhiñ-du gñan-don hbad-med-lhun-grub-tu byed-pa-de. de-bzhiñ-ñid mñon-du-byas-paḥi tshad yin/.*

Mahāyānistic point of view the so-called Nirvāṇa of the Śrāvaka and Pratyekabuddha cannot be regarded as something desirable. It is called a 'fall,' an undesirable state of existence, just as its counterpart, viz., worldly life. Both are avoided by the Mahāyanist Saint, and the Mahāyānistic Nirvāṇa is accordingly characterized as the 'non-stable' (*apratisthita*), the liberation from the two undesired for states, viz. Saṃsāra and Hīnayānistic Nirvāṇa such as we know is the definition of *apratisthita-nirvāṇa* according to the Commentary of Jam-yan-shad-pa.

Both the Tibetan commentaries, however, give us insufficient information on this most important subject. We must distinguish here the philosophical and the ethical side. As regards the first the conception of *apratisthita-nirvāṇa* is most closely connected with the Mahāyānistic theory according to which the Phenomenal World = Saṃsāra is immanent in the absolute = Nirvāṇa. As from this point of view there is no real destruction of the Phenomenal Elements, and Nirvāṇa is not to be conceived as some separate reality that could be added to Phenomenal Existence, there can be no insistence (*pratiṣṭhāna*) upon the separate reality of Saṃsāra and Nirvāṇa.²¹⁶ It is interesting to note that the views according to which the phenomenal elements really become destroyed are characterized as nihilistic or annihilationistic (*uccheda-vāda*). It is also noteworthy that one of the terms used by the Tibetan scholars for the designation of Hīnayānistic Nirvāṇa is: *chad-paṭi myan-ḥdas = uccheda-nirvāṇa*.

(At the same time we have it stated that the conception of Nirvāṇa as an eternal separate reality is likewise false, it is an eternalistic heresy (*śāśvata-vāda*).²¹⁷ The cognition of the relativity of Saṃsāra and Nirvāṇa and their substantial identity conveys the non-insistence upon their separate reality; they are no more conceived as dialectically opposed, and the pacification of dialectical thought-construction represents the highest true form of Nirvāṇa. *Apratisthita* may be translated here by 'non-dialectical.'²¹⁸)

216 Uttaratantra, transl., p. 174.

217 Compare Laṅkāvatāra, ed. Nanjio. p. 99. शाश्वतोच्छेदविकल्पभाववजितम् ।

218 Uttaratantra, transl., p. 174.

But this is only one side of the matter. The teaching of *apratīṣṭhita-nirvāṇa* is moreover connected with the highest moral ideal of the Mahāyāna, viz. that of sublime altruistic activity. In the *Gser-phren* it is said that *apratīṣṭhita-nirvāṇa* is peculiar to the Buddhas and the Bodhisattvas as well. Now, as concerns the Bodhisattva, a well-known feature of his is the non-avoidance of the world in order to help the suffering living beings. Owing to his great wisdom he sees the misery of Phenomenal Existence and has no desire of leading the life of an ordinary worldly being. When, on his Path, he has attained the position of a Saint, and particularly the highest stage of Bodhisattva perfection, he has the possibility of putting an end to Phenomenal Existence and of attaining a kind of Nirvāṇa similar to that of a Hīnayānist Saint, i.e. a completely inactive state of perpetual trance.) But having made the vow of attaining the Perfect Supreme Enlightenment (*samyak-sambodhi*) of a Buddha and of helping all living beings, he has no wish of ending his Path in such an incomplete way. He prefers to exercise an altruistic activity in the Phenomenal World, with which he remains connected by not giving up the emotions and desires (*kleśa*) which a Hīnayānist Saint would have rejected in any case.²¹⁹ He thus neither takes his stand in the Phenomenal World, the fetters of which he has rejected, nor does he abide in Nirvāṇa as a state of inactivity and quiescence realized out of egoistic motives. In the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra* and in Haribhadra's Commentary thereon the fundamental element of the Bodhisattva's Saintly lineage (*dhātu = gotra*) is very pregnantly characterized as "the foundation of wisdom and commiseration, which prevent the Bodhisattva's abiding in Saṃsāra as well as (Hīnayānistic) Nirvāṇa, owing to the efficiency of his previous vows and of attainments."²²⁰

The position of the Bodhisattva, whilst he is still abiding on the Path, makes him capable of realizing the actual form of *apratīṣṭhita-nirvāṇa*, i.e. that which is peculiar to the Buddha²²¹ and the most

219 Cf. *Uttaratantra*, transl., p. 194 sqq. (quotation from the *Sāgramāti-pariprechā*) and N. Dutt, *Bodhisattva-prātimokṣa-sūtra*, *JHQ.*, VII. p. 268.

220 Cf. my *Analysis of the Abhisamayālaṅkāra*, p. 90.

221 *Uttaratantra*, transl., p. 175.

essential feature of which is altruistic activity in all its grandeur. The Body of Bliss (*sambhoga-kāya*) of the Buddha which is regarded as the manifestation of the two forms of divine wisdom, viz. that perceiving the equality, the unity of oneself and other living beings²²² and that which correctly discriminates the nature of all things cognizable²²³ is spoken of as abiding in the *apraṭiṣṭhita-nirvāṇa*.²²⁴ This means that innumerable emanations, the Apparitional Bodies (*nirmāṇa-kāya*) of the Buddha are constantly issuing from the Body of Bliss and manifest themselves as acting in this world for the sake of the living beings, thus representing the wisdom acting on behalf of others.²²⁵

The Buddha is thus constantly acting. There can be no break or cessation in his acts. That Nirvāṇa which the Buddha makes manifest here on earth, as the Mahāparinirvāṇa of the Buddha Śākyamuni is regarded by the Mahāyānists as being only the end of one of the innumerable manifestations of the Apparitional Body. Bu-ston in his 'History of Buddhism' after having given the description of the twelfth and last "act" of the Buddha, viz. Mahāparinirvāṇa, dwells upon the subject in detail. One of his sources here is the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra-ālokā* of Haribhadra, the corresponding passages of which have been condensed by him. It is directly said that Nirvāṇa, as manifested by Buddha on earth, is to be regarded as relating only to the Apparitional Body.²²⁶ In reality the Buddha cannot pass away, since he has brought to accomplishment all the factors which secure an eternal existence.²²⁷ These factors would be defective, if the Buddha's power of fulfilling the objects of the living beings could become exhausted, if the Buddha's commiseration could have an end, if the Buddha would become deprived of the controlling power over the biotic force which keeps his life going on in this or that form, if the *Karma*

222 *samatā-jñāna = mñam-ñid-ye-śes.*

223 *pratyaśekṣaṇa-jñāna = so-sor-rtoq-paḥi ye-śes.*

224 Cf. Bu-ston, transl., vol. I, p. 128, and Doctrine of Pr.-Pār., p. 47.

225 *kṛty-ānuṣṭhāna-jñāna = bya-ba sgrub-paḥi ye-śes.*

226 *Abhis.ālokā*, GOŚ. p. 130 एतच्च परिनिर्वाणमिष्टं निर्माणकायेन । Bu-ston, transl., vol. II, p. 68.

227 Ibid. सम्यगासंसारमधिकलस्थितिहेतवश्च बुद्धा भगवन्त इति ।

which brings to development the vital faculty ceases to exercise its influence, or if there would be no more living beings to be converted by the Buddha.²²⁸ Not one of these defective conditions is to be found with the Buddha. He has taken recourse to the four miraculous powers and can remain existing according to his desire for an aeon and more.²²⁹ The full accomplishment of the transcendental virtue of Charity by the Buddha and his abstaining from taking away life are also characterized as the factors by which longevity is secured.²³⁰

Thus, abiding eternally, the Buddha exercises his activity for the sake of all that lives.²³¹ He has attained Nirvāṇa, but this Nirvāṇa is *apratisthita*—it is not a rest, an inactive state of absorption, but represents on the contrary the highest form of activity. If in a certain region of the world the living beings to be converted by the Buddha no more exist, there are other innumerable regions in which such converts are sure to be present;²³² it is for their sake that the Buddha acts perpetually in this or that form. The very act of passing away to Nirvāṇa is regarded as being one of the many means of conversion.²³³ “The Buddha does not pass away into Nirvāṇa (i.e. Nirvāṇa in the sense of annihilation), and the doctrine does not cease to exist. But in order to bring the living beings to maturity, (the Buddha) can demonstrate his departure into Nirvāṇa.”²³⁴—And, owing to the miraculous power possessed by him, the Buddha manifests himself in the different regions of the world simultaneously, as we have it the *Śūraṅgama-samādhi-sūtra* quoted by Bu-ston. For a more detailed description of

228 Ibid. स्थितिहेतुवैकल्यं सत्त्वार्थमपादनशक्तिपरिज्ञानमहाकल्याण्यपगमादायुःसंस्कारावस्थापनवशिताभ्रंशाजीवितेन्द्रियविपाककर्मपर्यादानाद्बुद्धविनेयसत्त्वाभावतो वा भवतु ।

229 Ibid. यस्य कस्यचिदानन्द चत्वार ऋद्धिपादा आसेविता भाविता बहुलीकृता etc., cf. Bu-ston, transl., vol. II, p. 57.

230 Abhis. ālokā, p. 131. प्राणातिपातविरतिदानपारमितयोर्ह्यन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यामनल्पमायुःफलमुपवर्णितम् ।

231 Utlaratantra, transl., p. 256.

232 Abh.-ālokā, p. 131. एकत्र लोकघातौ बुद्धरूपविनेयजनाभावेऽपि लोकघात्वन्तरेष्वपरिमितेषु तद्भावात् ।

233 Cf. Bu-ston, transl., vol. II, p. 68.

134 न बुद्धः परिनिर्वाति न च भ्रमोऽन्तर्धोयते सत्त्वानां परिपाकाय निर्वाणं तूपदर्शयेत् ।
Bu-ston, transl., vol. II, p. 68.

the Buddha's activity we can refer to Chapters II and IV of the *Uttaratantra*.

Of such a nature are the manifestations of the Buddha in the world. At the same time we have it said that the Buddha exercises his activity, being in his true Absolute Essence, in his Cosmical Body (*dharma-kāya*) perfectly quiescent and motionless. He is eternal, uncognizable, undefinable, he represents the quiescence of all plurality (*prapañca-upaśama*), relating neither to the Phenomenal World, nor to Nirvāṇa (in the Hīnayānistic sense) and thus free from the limits of either of them.²³⁵ This Cosmical Body is the Absolute Unity, the true ultimate nature of all elements of existence (*paramātman*)²³⁶ and is the true Nirvāṇa.²³⁷ Now, in the section dedicated to the investigation of the three Jewels,—the Buddha, the Doctrine (or the Truth), and the Congregation, the *Uttaratantra* tells us that the true Jewel of the Doctrine in its pure and absolute form is the pacification or extinction (*nirodha*) of Phenomenal Existence, i.e. Nirvāṇa, of which the *Uttaratantra*, similar to the *Mūla-mādhyamika*, says that "it cannot be investigated neither as an Ens, nor as a Non-ens, nor as both Ens and Non-ens together, nor as something which is neither Ens nor Non-ens."²³⁸ This undefinable principle represents the true nature (*prakṛti*), of all elements of existence the essence of their Relativify (*śūnyatā*); at the same time the negation, the 'pacification' of all plurality. This is the so-called *prakṛti-nirvāṇa*, i.e. Nirvāṇa as the ultimate essence of existence, the unity of the Cosmos. It is in this aspect that all elements are characterized as "quiescent from the outset and by their nature merged in Nirvāṇa (*ādi-śāntāḥ, prakṛti-parinirvṛttāḥ*)."

The principle of extinction or pacification of Phenomenal Existence thus characterized is further spoken of as representing the Cosmical Body of the Buddha.²³⁹ Thus, from the standpoint of the Ultimate Reality, the Jewel of the Buddha and the Jewel of the Doctrine or the Highest Truth (*dharma-ratna*) are identical. "There can be no Nirvāṇa apart from Buddhahood."²⁴⁰ The Essence of

235 *Uttaratantra*, transl., p. 257.

236 *Ibid.*, p. 167 sqq.

237 *Ibid.*, p. 205

238 *Ibid.*, p. 131 cf. 'Conception of Buddhist Nirvāṇa,' p. 190-203.

239 *Uttaratantra*, transl., p. 133.

240 *Ibid.*, p. 205.

Nirvāṇa is a name for the Cosmical Body of the Buddha."²⁴¹ "The Buddha and his Nirvāṇa are one in regard to the Absolute."²⁴² So we have the unique absolute principle designated by the following synonyms:—

The Cosmical Body (*dharmakāya*)=the Absolute Truth (*paramārtha-satya*)=the Unique Essence of the elements (*paramātman*)=the Pacification of the Plurality (*prapañca-vpaśama*)=the Principle of Extinction or Negation of Phenomenal Existence (*nirodha-satya*)=Nirvāṇa in the true and ultimate sense.²⁴³

E. OBERMILLER

241 Ibid., p. 207 (quotation from the *Sri-malā-devi-siṃhanāda-sūtra*).

242 Ibid., *Kār.*, I, 86.

243 It is interesting to compare here the *Māṇḍūkya-upaniṣad*, *Sūtra* 7, the characteristic of the Supreme Brahman in the fourth (*turiya*), the ultimate aspect:—

अदृष्टमव्यवहार्यमग्राह्यमलक्षणमचिन्त्यमव्यपदेश्यमेकात्मप्रत्ययसारं प्रपञ्चोपशमं शान्तं शिवमद्वैतं
चतुर्थं मन्यन्ते स आत्मा स विश्वेयः ।

—unseen, inexpressible, imperceptible, devoid of characteristic marks, un-thinkable, undefinable, representing the unique ultimate essence, the quiescence of all plurality, perfectly calm, blissful and free from all differentiation.

Pānīpat, 1761

Introduction

Kāshirāja's account of the third battle of Pānīpat and of the events leading to it has been long recognised as by far the fullest and best source on that momentous struggle. It has been hitherto available only in the free English translation made by Lt. Col. James Browne in 1791 and published in the *Asiatic Researches*, III (1799), a reprint of which was issued on behalf of the Bombay University in 1926. The original Persian text has been supposed to be lost, but without reason, as there are copies of it in the British Museum (see Rieu's *Catalogue*) and I have traced one ms. of it in the United Provinces which, as its colophon records, was copied on 2 Rabi-ul-awwal 1199 (13 January 1785) at Dig in the camp of Emperor Shah Alam II by Sayyid Muhammad Husain Sadri. (Was it made for Major Browne, who was then the Resident with the Emperor?). The transcript which I have taken from this ms. covers 36 pages of 18 lines each, a line containing 5 inches of close writing. From this original I have made a faithful translation, because Browne has omitted many graphic details and made serious mistakes at places, the latter portion of his work being rather scamped. About a fifth of the contents of the original Persian book has been incorporated, sometimes in a paraphrase, but with one or two important additions, in Ghulām 'Alī's *Imād-us-S'adat*. Did he possess a longer version of the Persian text of it?

Kāshirāj Shivdev, a Deshasch Brāhman, was a secretary of Shujā-ud-daulah, the Nawāb of Oudh, and was present with his master throughout the campaign and the battle and took a personal part in the negotiations with the Bhān, the search for the slain Maratha chiefs, and their cremation. He wrote this account in 1780,—“nineteen years after the event and from memory” (as he says). The contemporary Marathi letters now published prove him to be very accurate, except for a few inaccuracies, which however can be easily corrected. The colophon suggests that the book was entitled *Kārcār-i Sadāshib Rāo Bhān wa Shāh Ahmad Abdālī*. [J. Sarkar.]

The rival armies marshalled for battle

[22] As soon as this conversation had taken place, the Marathā army, having advanced about a *kos* and a half from their entrenchment and planted their artillery chained together (*zanjirabasta*) in a line, fired one general salvo. Immediately on hearing the report of the guns, the Shāh [23], who had been sitting on horseback with his legs drawn up, keeping his cap on his knee and smoking a Persian long pipe (*qaliān*), handed the pipe to a valet (*khawās*), replaced the cap on his head, and said [to Nawāb Shujā-ud-daulah], "The news brought by your servant (i.e., Kāshirāj) has proved true," and he summoned his wazir and Shāh Pasand Khan. They were in the midst of their own contingents, but arrived promptly. The Shāh ordered Shāh Pasand Khān to take post on the left hand of Najib-ud-daulah's division, the wazir to stand in the central division, and one other sardar on the right of Hāfiz Rahmat and Dundī Khan, and then bade the trumpets sound to battle.

About this time a little glimmer of the Sun became visible, and the flags and standards of the enemy came in sight. They were coming on step by step, placing their artillery in front and lifting their banners in the regular order of an army. The Shah put his horse to the gallop, inspected from the front every one of his divisions (*ghul-hū*), and then entered his red (*qizilbāshi*) tent which was pitched one *kos* in front of his camp. The battle began.

This was the plan of the disposition of troops on the two sides:—

The Maratha divisions, counting from the east, were Ibrāhim Khān Gārdi, Dāmāji Gaikwād, Vital Shivdev, the Bhāu himself with Vishwās Rāo and the Household cavalry (*pāgā-i-hazurāt*), Jaswant Rao Puār, Shamshe Bahādur, and other sardars, Malhar Rao and Jankoji Sindhia. The guns, linked together with iron chains, were placed before all the bodies of troops, [with] rockets and other implements of war.

The Shah's forces, counting from the west,—

The artillery, tied together with iron chains, was drawn up in front, with rockets and other *matériel* of war; behind the guns the camels carrying *zamburaks* (swivel-guns), and behind these the tiger-

cub infantry of Persia (*sher-bacha-i-vilāyati*), Dundi Khan, Hāfiz Rahmat Khan, at a short distance Ahmad Khan Bangash, Ashraf-ul-wazirā Shah Wali Khan, Nawab Shujā-ud-daulah and Najib-ud-daulah. The *ghul* of Shāh Pasand Khan was on the left flank of Najib-ud-daulah in order that the Marathas might not assault them. The *ghul* of Barkurdār Khan and other Irāni Mughals was on the right hand side of Dundi Khan's division, at a short distance from the enemy corps facing it on that side, and out-flanking the *ghul* of Ibrāhim Khan Gārdi.

On 6th Jamād-us-sāni, the 8th lunar day of Paush Shudi of the Hindu calendar [=14th January 1761, which was really the 7th of Jamād-us-sāni], artillery rockets and muskets were discharged incessantly; like showers of rain the shots of guns, zamburaks, *jizails*, and rockets came from the enemy's side, but few people on our side were injured. The two armies advanced step by step towards each other, till only a short space was left between them. The enemy's cannon were larger and their shots [24] fell half a kos behind the Shah's troops. From our side guns were seldom fired; but from the division of the grand wazir, which was severely attacked, they were continuously discharged.

Ibrahim Khan Gardi attacks trans-Ganges Ruhelas

On the other side, Ibrāhim Khan Gārdi went alone to the Bhāu and told him from horseback, "Rām! Rām! You were highly displeased with me because every month I used to take from you, with bold insistence, order (*chittha*) for the cash payment of six lakhs of rupees. This month your treasure has been looted and we have got no order of payment. Never mind that; today I shall discharge my duty." Saying this, he put his horse to the gallop, rejoined his own division, and without delay lifted up his banners,—himself taking one flag and one musket in his own hands,—advanced and assaulted the division of Dundi Khan and Hāfiz Rahmat Khan with the greatest impetuosity. For a short time the discharge of guns and muskets was suspended. Leaving two *paltans* for watching in front of the Shah's troops in the *ghul* on his flank, he himself with seven *paltans* fell on the Ruhelas. The latter, also, displaying valour, came to grapple

with them in a confused mass. Of the Ruhelas eight to nine thousand were wounded or slain, and they were pressed extremely hard; few men were left with the three generals, Dundi Khan, Hāfiz Rahmat Khan and Ahmad Khan Bangash; but inspite of the excessive number of the enemy, they kept the field with a small number of men,—a thousand or five hundred or even less than that remaining around each of these three generals.

Hāfiz Rahmat Khan was a little unwell and had come in a *pālki*; he said, “Set my *pālki* down in front of Dundi Khan, so that I may be slain before his face.” The fighting was so close that one could not inquire about another. Dundi Khan came down from his horse and cried out, “Comrades! our life and honour are perishing. Bring me news of Hāfiz Rahmat Khan.”

The two *paltans* which had been sent against the flank *ghul* of the Shāh, also charged heroically and threw the enemy ranks into confusion.

For full four hours and a half musket firing and close fighting went on. About five or six *paltans* of Ibrāhim Khan Gārdi were slain or wounded. Dāmāji Gaikwād and others, who had been told off to support Ibrāhim Gārdi, exerted themselves well. Ibrāhim Khan Gārdi himself received two or three wounds from bullets, arrows and spears, and Dāmāji Gaikwād three wounds. From this you can imagine the condition of the other sardārs.

The Bhāu attacks the Abd'ali Wazir

[25] On this side, the division of Household cavalry (*hazurāt pāgā*) under Sadāshiv Rao Bhāu and some other sardārs and Vishwās Rao, attacked the division of the grand wazir Shāh Wali Khan. The fighting was so violent that earth and sky could not be seen, and the eye of heaven became dazzled at beholding this spectacle. About ten to twelve thousand troopers and seven or eight thousand infantry consisting of the tiger-cubs of Persia and Kābul [*Vilāyati Kābuli*] and one thousand *zamburak*-camels, were in the division of the grand wazir; the Marathas drank them up like the water of a river. ‘Atāi Khan, the son of the wazir’s paternal uncle, was slain; nearly three thousand Durrānis were put to the sword, and

the troops fell back. The grand wazir stood with a hundred or two hundred troops and fifty *zamburak*-camels with their knees tied together placed in front of him. He himself, clad in coat of mail gauntlets, helmet, breast plates and other pieces of armour of steel, dismounted from his horse and sat down on the ground. Just then Nawab Shujā-ud-daulah asked me, "The noise in the division of the grand wazir has ceased. Bring me intelligence as to the cause of it." So, I galloped on my horse there. The wazir was rubbing his forehead on the ground, and throwing dust into his mouth, so that froth was coming out of his mouth; he was abusing [his followers] saying, "Comrades! Vilāyat is far off. Whither are you going?" On seeing, me he cried out, "Quickly take a message to my son Shujā-ud-daulah Bahādur, that I am dying and that he should come to my aid." When I came back and reported to the Nawāb, he only said, "It is not proper for me to move from this place at this time. The enemy's *ghul* has arrived close at hand. If they form another plan and pierce [the line of battle] at this point, total disgrace would befall the army." The situation became more strained than before, and I got no opportunity for conveying this message [to the wazir].

Nawāb Shujā-ud-daulah with about two thousand horse, one thousand foot (whose arms were furnished by the State), *jizails*, etc., formed a corps (*ghul*), planted a line of twenty guns which he loaded with grape (*chharra*), and stood ready. None moved from the enemy's side against this body. Twice or thrice their swords and spears flashed in the sunlight at a distance, as if they were about to sally forth on a charge, but it did not take place, and the thing passed off safely for us.

Najib advances throwing up field-trenches

Close on the left hand of the corps of Nawāb Shujā-ud-daulah was Najib-ud-daulah with about six or seven thousand [cavalry and eight thousand] infantry. The Ruhela [26] infantry in front and the cavalry in the same formation (i.e., dismounted),—nay more, even Najib himself being on foot, advanced, throwing up earth-works [in the field]; that is to say, the sappers and others raised a breast-work of sand a few steps in front, one cubit high, which afforded shelter to

the infantry, and prepared trenches, and the Ruhela infantry came there and crouched down. In this manner they gained one *kos* and a half and arrived one *jizāil*-shot from the enemy troops opposite to them. Najib Khān used often to say, "I am the bride-groom of this battle-field. Everything rests on my head; the other [allies] are mere guests accompanying the marriage procession (*barūti*). What is done here will be done by me and to me." What can one ask about his sagacity and practical skill? He had no equal.

Najib overthrows Sindhia's corps

Najib was supplied with a vast quantity of rockets. Opposite to him stood the division of Jankoji Sindhia, and there was a deadly feud between the two. Time after time Najib fired a volley of two thousand rockets all at once from his trenches; their smoke darkened the ground and the sky, and their noise deafened the ears of the earth and the time. Although the opposite troops wanted to attack him, they got no chance from the salvoes of rockets, but were every minute convulsed by the shock of this fire.

On the left hand of Najib was the flank division under Shāh Pasand Khān. This general was very brave and experienced in war. He advanced with such vigour that the [confronting] Maratha corps had not the power to draw breath.

Abdali pushes up reinforcements to his hard-pressed divisions

From dawn to mid-day the battle raged with the same intensity, and a marvellous spectacle was seen. Although the loss on the Durrāni side was less [than that of the Marathas], yet from the fury and courage of the Marathas it seemed as if they were triumphing. At noon the Durrāni Shāh received intelligence of the confusion and dispersion among the troops of the [trans-Ganges] Ruhelas, the grand wazir, and the right flank. He immediately called for the *nasaqchis* (military provosts), and two thousand troopers of this class presented themselves. The Shāh ordered five hundred of them to go to his camp and striking with their arrows* all the camp followers, great and

* The ms. reading can be either *tir* (arrows) or *tabar* (axes).

and small, drive them up to the battle-field, caring for nothing else. The remaining 1,500 troopers were ordered to go with uplifted arrows, take post behind the line of battle, and fearlessly beat all who had run away from the battle-field. They began to ply their arrows mercilessly at the fugitive soldiers who were several thousands. [27] At this, the troops who had fallen back, numbering about six or seven thousand, were brought together in one place; and at the same time a small body of soldiers too arrived from the camp, to whom the Shāh added a detachment from his own retinue. Out of them three or four thousand men were told off to the right side to reinforce the flank division, and about ten thousand to support the grand wazir, with orders to ride with loosened reins from that place, lifting up their swords and other weapons, and charge the middle division of the Marathas. To the forces on the right and left flanks, under Shāh Pasand Khān and Najib and some other generals besides, he sent order that every time the grand wazir attacked the Maratha force, they too from the two flanks should put their troops to the charge and penetrate into the enemy's [central] division.

Vigorous Durrani counter-attack

At two *pahars* and four *gharis* of the day, the reinforcements arrived before the grand wazir. He at once took horse and charged the main Maratha division in which the Bhāu himself and Vishwās Rao were posted. From both hands the flank divisions [of the Durrāni army] also delivered attacks repeatedly. Najib ordered his body of infantry and cavalry—the latter being all unmounted,—to fire two rockets each all at the same time, so that in this assault ten or twelve thousand rockets were fired simultaneously, darkening the earth and the sky to the eyes of the people on both sides. The grand wazir who had fallen on the enemy's *ghul* fought for two *gharis* with sword, spear, lance, dagger and knife etc., so vehemently that it is indescribable. The Marathas, too, fought bravely as they ought to, with sword, *putta* and spear, sacrificed their lives.

Debacle of the Maratha army

When one *nahar* and two *gharis* of the day still remained, Vishwās Rao fell down from his horse on this battle-field. The news

was carried to the Bhāu; he sent word that the youth should be placed on the elephant of the *Khās jilāu* [*i.e.*, the one usually ridden by the Bhāu himself], on the back seat (*khawāsi*) of which Rajah Bāpu Pandit [Hingané] was seated. He himself, with a sword at his waist and a spear in his hand, delivered a most impetuous charge on the opposite division which the grand wazir commanded. For one *ghari* the two sides exchanged blows, when it was seen that in the twinkle of an eye the Maratha army vanished like camphor, and none remained in the field except heaps of corpses here and there.

Pursuit and slaughter of the Marathas

At the sight of this state of things, from our side all the troops, whether horse or [28] foot, made forced marches out of greed for plunder, and passing even beyond the habitations of Pānīpat slew and pursued the Marathas in whichever side they fled. It was a moon-lit night; the Shāh's troops carried on the pursuit for ten *kos* in every direction, slaying every one they could overtake. People were put to the sword beyond numbering. The surface of the land was covered with corpses; who could count them? In the Bhāu's camp were ten lakhs of men and women, soldiers, artisans of every kind, and other classes; all of them perished, only a few escaped with their lives. Besides [slaughter by the Durrānis], on the way the zamindārs slew many of the fugitives and plundered their property. Near Farrukhnagar, the zamindārs recognised Antāji Mānakeshwar as a general and took his life.

Plunder and prisoners taken in Bhāu's camp

What description can I give of the camp of the Marathas into which the Shāh's troops entered in search of plunder? Every trooper brought away ten or even twenty camels laden with money. The captured horses were beyond count, but none of them was of value, they came like droves of sheep in their thousands. Good elephants were taken, and also slave-girls and slaves of the same kind to the number of nearly thirty or forty thousand were captured alive.

Out of these about eight thousand persons, after being plundered,

took refuge in the open enclosure of Nawāb Shujā-ud-daulah's camp, and the Nawāb appointed a party of his Turki soldiers (*fauj-i-Mughali*) to guard them, so that none might slay them.

The Durrāni troops brought away a hundred or two hundred prisoners each and put them to the sword in the out-skirts of their camp, crying out, "When I started from *vilāyat*, my mother, father sister and wife told me to slay so many *kāfir*s for their sake after gaining the victory in this holy war, so that the religious merit of this act [of infidel-slaying] may accrue to them." In this way, thousands of soldiers and other people were massacred. In the Shāh's camp, except the quarters of the Shāh and his nobles, every tent had a heap of severed heads before it. One might say that this was verily Doomsday for the Marathas.

All the nobles presented their offerings (*nazar*) to the Shāh [in congratulation.] The Shāh rode out, viewed the battle-field from a distance, and entered his own tents. [29] All the nobles went back to their own quarters. When two *gharis* of the day still remained, the Durrānis of Barkhurdār Khan, who had found the corpse of Vishwās Rao with the elephant carrying it, took away the elephant and the ornaments [from his person], put the body in a *pālki*, and brought it to the portico (*deorhi*) of Nawāb Shujā-ud-daulah. The Nawāb, after paying a hundred *tuman* or Rs. 2,000 as a reward to them, kept the corpse. Ibrāhim Khan Gārāi had been captured wounded by the soldiers of Shujā Qulī Khan, a slave (*chela*) of Nawāb Shujā-ud-daulah, who kept him secretly in his own tent and informed the Nawāb. The Nawāb told him to keep him with care and secrecy and attend to the treatment of his wounds.

The Shāh's *nasaqchis* brought his order to the Nawāb to send the corpse of Vishwās Rao to the Shāh's court (*dari-khānah*) for his inspection. It was sent. The grand wazir and other chiefs of the Shāh and all men high and low in the camps of the Shāh and of the Hindustani generals, on beholding the body burst forth into praise of God, [crying out that] though he was an Indian, yet no man of such light colour and beautiful shape had come into their sight. His colour was that of the *champa* flower, he was a tender youth, his limbs well-formed, his arms reaching down to his knees, his eyes were half open. What is

more [surprising], inspite of death his colour had not changed; he looked as if asleep. He had one sword cut at the back of his neck, between the two ears, half a finger's length in depth, and a slight arrow-wound on his left eye-brow, which had severed about a finger's breadth of skin from that place, but it was still attached to his body. But not a drop of blood was seen on his coat or body.

On the arrival of this body [in the Shāh's camp], the Durrāni soldiers made a row, crying out, "This is the Pādishāh of the Hindūs. We shall dry [and stuff] his corpse and take it to our country;" so that they carried away the body to the quarters (*misl*) of Barkhurdār Khān and kept it close to the tent of Motilal Khatri Rura, the Khān's diwan. Nawāb Shujā-ud-daulah, on hearing of it, rode out, went to [30] the Shāh's presence, and in company with the grand wazir submitted to him, "Enmity extends only to the life-time of our enemy. It is the custom of Hindustān that after a victory the bodies of the chiefs of every tribe are given burial according to their own manner and rites. This course is a cause of good name [for the victor], while the contrary action is a cause of infamy. Your Majesty is a mere sojourner in this country, but we shall always have to deal with these Marathas. Let the dead body be given up to me that I may carry out the practice of this country."

For two days this matter was kept under discussion, but Najib-ud-daulah and other [Indian] sardārs also made the same request. In the course of this parley I had occasion to go once, along with Rāo Meghrāj, the wakil of Najib-ud-daulah, to the tents of Barkhurdār Khān and his diwān Motilal. The second time I went there alone. This diwān, on the second occasion, asked me, "Have you come for this negotiation only, or for anything else also?" I replied, "For other things also. Whatever comes up, I am ready for it." He took me into two tents: in one Rājah Bāpu Pandit, the envoy, lay wounded; I had a few words with him. Going to the second tent, I found there Rao Jankoji Sindhia sitting down wounded; with a saffron-coloured Burhānpuri scarf on his head, and a short tight drawer (*jāngiā*) of mixed silk and cotton made in Gūjrat on his legs. He bore a bullet wound and one spear thrust in his arm, and he had made a sling with his turban and thus kept his arm suspended from his neck. He was

a handsome youth, twenty years of age. On seeing me he hung his head down. I said to him, "Rāo Sāhib! Why do you do so? You have performed what valour demands. Long will the recital of these heroic deeds remain as your memorial on the pages of time." At this, he raised his head, and replied, "Yes, man is helpless against the will of God. If I had fallen on the battlefield, it would have been better. But through fate this [captivity] has happened. Now, these people are demanding ransom from me. That is not so difficult, but at this place the money cannot be got. You knew my father, and there is a [hereditary] friendship between my family and that of the Nawāb Sāhib. My father did good turns [to his father.] If the Nawāb [31] Sāhib now advances the money and secures the liberation of this man crushed by misfortune, I shall repay his kindness." I said, "The Nawāb Sāhib will not hesitate. What is the amount needed?" Motilal replied, "Seven lakhs of rupees has been mentioned, but the amount is not absolutely fixed, it can be settled for a little more or less."

Leaving that place I came to the Nawāb. He was sitting with Najib-ud-daulah on the same carpet and witnessing dances. I reported all the facts [of the open negotiation]. Najib-ud-daulah, on account of his great penetration in business and employment of spies, used to get correct intelligence; from some place the report of Rao Jankoji Sindhia having been captured alive had reached him too. I knew that this noble (Najib) had a mortal enmity with the Sindhia family. I therefore did not report to the Nawāb the matter of Jankoji at that time, but sat down at a distance from the assembly. Najib said to the Nawāb, "From the face of this man it appears that he has something else to communicate, but is not telling it because of my presence." The Nawāb replied, "What difference is there between you and me?" and summoning me ordered me, on the oath of the Ganges, to speak the truth. I had no help but to tell him.

Immediately on hearing of it, Najib-ud-daulah, who was an Aristotle in wordly cunning, became highly pleased. Outwardly he said to the Nawāb, "It is very well. Men show kindness to such persons on such occasions. Let the Nawāb Sāhib exert himself. Whatever is settled as ransom, I shall pay half of it and the Nawāb

Sāhib the other half." Ostensibly saying these words, he came out, and that very instant went to the grand wazir, and told him the facts. As Najib-ud-daulah desired the extirpation of the race of Sindhia and the grand wazir had enmity towards Barkurdār Khān, the wazir immediately took horse, went to the Shāh and reported the matter. The Shāh summoned Barkurdār Khān and put the question to him; he totally denied any knowledge of it. Then the grand wazir summoned me to give evidence, but even then Barkurdār Khān refused to make the admission. At last the Shāh sent *nasaqchis* to search his camp. That very moment Barkurdār Khān sent a message to his servants to slay Jankoji at once and bury him in some spot, and it was done. Thus perished Jankoji.

Ibrahim Khān Gardi put to death

Ibrāhim Khān Gārdi had come wounded into Nawāb Shujā-ud-daulah's camp, who [32] wished to send him secretly to his own subah. The news of it reached some nobles of the Shāh, and they reported it to him. The Shāh, summoning the Nawāb, opened a conversation with him in a very wheedling manner, saying, "You are my son, and through you I have gained this victory. I shall ask you one thing, tell me. I have heard that Ibrāhim Khān Gārdi is alive and in your camp." The Nawāb denied the fact. Then the Shāh administered an oath to him and put the question again. This time the Nawāb had no help but to admit it. As had been preconcerted, the Durrānis crowded together and entered the Shāh's tent, crying out, "This very man is our enemy. A vast multitude of our people have been slain through him. Give him up to us, or we shall fight the man who is protecting him." Nawāb Shujā-ud-daulah, laying his hands on his sword and shield, cried out, 'Here I am.' At that moment, the grand wazir, displaying his skill as a minister, took the Nawāb aside and persuaded him to entrust Ibrāhim Khān to him in safe custody for one week, after which he would be restored safe and sound to the Nawāb. The Nawāb [at first] apprehended treachery, but the grand wazir took an oath on the Holy *Qurān*. So the Nawāb had no help but to consign him to the wazir.

The Shāh summoned Ibrāhim Khān before him and asked, "Art

thou Ibrāhim Khān.?" He replied, "Yes." The Shāh said, "How is this [condition] worthy of a brave man?" The Gārđi replied, "No man has power over destiny. My master, namely the Bhāu, had met with his death two *gharis* before when I came to this state. If I survive and the Shāh takes me away with him, I shall sacrifice my life in his service even more devotedly." Then the Shāh sent him back to the charge of the grand wazir; his wounds were bandaged with poisoned dressing and his diet was filled one half with salt; so that on the seventh day, when [the Durrāni army] entered Delhi, he died. I write this from hearsay.*

The Shāh gained the victory. The next day, at dawn he put a splendid dress on and wore some jewels which Nādir Shāh had taken away from the treasure-house of the Pādishāh of India and which had fallen into Ahmad Shāh's hands after the death of Nādir Shāh. He rode out to view the battle-field. There were thirty-two mounds of the slain, some containing a hundred, some 500, 700, or 1,000 bodies, and at three or four places 1500 each. They had tied the skirts of their coats together, fought most energetically and fallen. The trench that the Bhāu had dug round his camp was full of corpses; while in addition to these, the bodies that lay around the city and in the jungle were beyond [33] calculation. The Shāh went into the city of Pāni-

* The Durrani history, *Husain Shahi* (pp. 73-74) gives the following account of Ibrahim's death: Ibrahim Khan Gardi was captured wounded, and taken to the Shah's presence. Although Shuja-ud-daulah and other sardars pleaded for him, the Shah declined to listen and replied, "My lord son! I repeatedly wrote to this atheist, offering him my royal favours and telling him, 'Thou art a Musalman and an Afghan by race. Out of regard for Islam and your race, come over to me and join my stirrups, and I shall grant you large estates.' But this wretch sent the reply, 'I do not know infidelity and Islam. I am this person's [*i.e.*, the Bhāu's] retainer, and shall fight against any one he bids me.' So, it is better to slay this apostate, who has strayed away from the right path." Then by order of the Shah, he was beheaded and his corpse flung away; afterwards ropes were tied to his feet and in this way his body was dragged through the Shah's camp and at last left as food for crows and kites. *Mujmil*, 132, confirms this.

Tarikh-i-Muzaffari (p. 190) says briefly, "By order of the Shah the wounded captive Ibrahim Khan was first confined in a cage and then beheaded." *Siyar* (iii, 61) agrees, "Ibrahim, after being taken prisoner, was for a short time made the laughing stock of the shameless ones of the field, and finally beheaded."

pat, made a pilgrimage to the shrine of Shāh Bu Ali Qalandar, and then came back to his tent.

Shujā-ud-daulah, taking hundreds of water-carriers with him, began to search for the corpses of the Maratha sardārs among the heaps of the slain, particularly for the body of the Bhāu great inquiry was made. Shashadhar Pandit and Ganesh Pandit, the Maratha *wakils*, and some other persons, who had been brought in as prisoners and who used constantly to remain with the Bhāu and other sardārs, were taken by the Nawāb with himself during the search for identifying him. The bodies of Jaswant Rāo Puār and [not named] the son of Pilāji Jādav and many other sardārs were found out. How many of these bodies could men lift up?

Next day, when a great search was being made for the Bhāu's body, a man came and said that a corpse was lying a little more than a quarter *kos* from the battle field, which looked like that of a sardār. Nawāb Shujā-ud-daulah went there and had the body washed. At the time of lifting it up, three pearls, each worth Rs. 200 or 300, dropped from it, which proved that he was a sardār. The Nawāb handed these three pearls to Shashadhar Pandit, the Maratha *wakil*. The men who were accompanying the Nawāb for the purpose of identifying the dead, when they saw this corpse, burst into tears and said that it was the body of the Bhāu. Some [natural] marks gave evidence for this opinion; on his thigh was seen a black mark (mole?) of the size of a copper coin, on his back the scar of the wound inflicted by Muzaffar Khān Gārdi with a dagger, on the sole of his feet the marks known as the fish and the lotus. He looked like a young man of 35 years and strongly built. The Bhāu used to make twelve hundred prostrations (*dandawat*, in Marathi *namaskār*) to the Sun every day, and the marks of this exercise were visible on his knees and palms.

At that time a Durrāni had come, and standing at a distance was looking at the spectacle and laughing. I told the Nawāb that this man was standing at a distance and laughing at his place, so that he probably knew the facts about this dead body. The Nawāb took him apart and questioned him. The man gave this detailed narrative, "During the battle I had observed this person was mounted on a large horse, and in the fight two horses were killed under him.

The third time he mounted a mare. At that time he received two wounds, one from a spear and the other from a bullet in his thigh, so that he fell down from his horse. Just then defeat overtook their army, but this youth kept up his spirit. He wore jewelled ornaments and a decorated dress, and was slowly [34] retiring from the battle-field on foot, with a short spear in his hand. Four or five of us troopers came up and surrounded him, lured by his jewelled ornaments, and asked him, "Friend! who art thou? If you are a sardār or even the Bhāu himself, speak the truth. You need have no fear of life. We shall conduct you wherever you wish." He gave no reply. One trooper of our party, getting angry, threw a spear at him, but he with his own spear wounded our companion. So, we had no help but to make a rush for slaying him. He struck two or three of us with his spear, but finally we cut his head off. The head is with another man." But this last statement was a concealment of truth, as the head was in the end secured from this very man.

The Nawāb placed on two elephants this body and that of Santāji Wāgh*, which latter had received about forty wounds from sword and other weapons, and brought them [to his camp] and reported everything to the Shāh. The Shāh, in order to please the Nawāb, ordered that these two bodies and that of Vishwās Rāo should be burnt according to the manner of the Hindus and all the customary funeral rites performed. He appointed twenty *nasaqchis* to prevent any one of the Durrānis from offering obstruction. The Nawāb consigned all the three bodies to me, saying that I was of the same race and country as they and could burn them according to our own rites. He sent Rajah Anup Gir along with the Shāh's *nasaqchis* to accompany me. With their help, I conveyed the corpses to a place between the camps of the Shāh and the Nawāb, washed them with Ganges water and burnt them with sandal wood. About two thousand runaways from the camp of the Bhāu were with me at the time of this cremation; they all asserted that in truth it was the body of the Bhāu. But owing to the head being missing, I had doubts if it was really his.

* Rajwade, vi No. 407 gives Anup Gir's account of the discovery of the bodies and their cremation, and 408 Kashiraj's report (also in *Selections from Peshwas' Daftar*, ii. 148.).

When two *gharis* of the day still remained, we after finishing the cremation returned to our houses. At night Nāwāb Shujā-ud-dāulah going to the grand wazir reported to him what that Durrāni trooper had told him. As the man was a retainer of Barkhurdār Khān, the wazir summoned him, and reassured him thus, "Have no fear of your spoils being taken away from you. I allow you to retain them. Where is the head of this body? Produce it." Then the Durrāni, having brought the head wrapped up in a napkin, placed it before the wazir. For identifying it, Rājah Bāpu Pandit, the *wakīl*, who had been captured alive, was summoned, and the head was shown [35] to him. He recognised it and said, "This is really the head of Śaṅkṣhiv Rāo Bhāu, who was my master. What is due to him is my responsibility. I beg that this head may be granted to me, so that I may burn it according to our custom." The wazir smiled and gave the head to Bāpu Pandit, sending him away with some *nasaqchis*. The Rājah cremated the head outside the Shāh's encampment. Then the death of the Bhāu was known for certain.

JADUNATH SARKAR

The Relations between Early Buddhism and Brahmanism*

We have an old literature of India handed down by a great class, later called caste, in her sodality called Brahmans, or as some still prefer to say, Brahmins—a literature which has remained peculiarly that of India herself. If we speak of Indian religious literature, we do not mean the Jain Aṅgas, we do not mean the Buddhist Tripitaka, nor any other literature; we mean the Vedas, the Brāhmaṇas, the Upaniṣads and what may be grouped as the Vedānta literature. The Jain scriptures have survived in, and remained of, India; the Buddhist Tripitaka has long been lost out of India; but no one would call either the typical literature of India. Hence it is very interesting to consider how either literature came to rise in India at all. Are these other literatures the result of movements in open opposition to that Indian type-literature? Did these movements arise as ignoring it (in so far as it was then in fixed, if oral form)? Or were those movements, from which these other literatures sprang, in sympathy and agreement with the dominant, the older, the still prevailing teaching, and did they only gradually break away from the mother-teaching?

Here is a very interesting historical problem, and not an easy one. Chiefly why? Because, to leave aside the question of Jainism, neither the older, the type scriptures, nor the Buddhist scriptures (the oldest we yet have) help us out in the least with any record of any rupture whatever, as following on an earlier state of agreement.

As to that, the very word for rupture or schism (*bheda*), I do not so far find in the type-scriptures reckoned as preceding, or as con-

* This is a lecture delivered before the Society for Promoting the Study of Religions at its headquarters, 17, Bedford Square, London on January 17th, 1934. By the courtesy of Mr. Loftus Hare, Hon. Editor of the Society's Transactions, I am permitted to publish it here before its appearance in those Transactions. The Lecture opened a series by different exponents on Great Religious Schisms.

temporary with early Buddhism. It does occur in the *Maitrī Upaniṣad*, which may more or less overlap the birth of Buddhism, but only in the meaning of parts of a whole, not religiously meant. Yet in just this *Upaniṣad* (vii, 9) we come across one passage, possibly a later accretion, which looks like a smouldering restiveness such as may precede open rupture. It runs: "men are saying that there should be attention to *dharma*, which is destructive of the Vedas and of other teachings (*śāstras*); hence one should not attend to this."

This is all, and we cannot say whether we have here any allusion to the prominence given in the risen Buddhist movement to the notion of Dharma as mainly replacing the Brahman term for God as working in man as an ever-moving monition—now by us termed 'conscience'. Deussen held that there was here a reference to Buddhism.

Anyway we do not find that this discontent emerged in any open rupture in such relations as there may have been between the nascent Buddhism and Brahmanism. And nowhere do we find reference, in Brahman literature of that date, to a body of teachers identified with this Dharma-teaching by name.

In the Buddhist scriptures there is plenty about *bheda* in the meaning of religious ruptures, reminding us of the anxieties on this score of St. Paul. But one and all such divisions were internecine; there is no reference in the Tripiṭaka about any rupture with the Brahmans. Four 'Councils' held to secure *saṅgīti* or a standardized scriptural reciting, are named in Pāli and Tibetan scriptures, but in all these the unity aimed at is one that has a Buddhist Saṅgha as its centre and not a Brahman priesthood. Nowhere is there any record known to me of a Council convened either by Brahman orthodoxy or Buddhist non-conformity to have it out between them. Neither are meetings on a smaller scale recorded, where convened Brahmans are found censuring Śākyan heterodoxy between themselves, or where convened Śākyans are found denouncing the main tenets of the religion as taught by Brahmans as such.

And so the question may arise: Did not Buddhism start outside Brahmanism from the very first? And thence the further question:—Did it start as neutrally disposed towards the established religion of the Brahmans? Or as open opponents of it? And if the latter, is it

possible its votaries could have escaped open and persistent censure and counter-opposition from the Brahmans?

Here we need to avoid making untrue parallels between this matter and the history of the central Church of Christendom and reforming bodies. There was nothing in Brahmanism resembling the ecclesiastical autocracy of the Holy Roman Church of the Middle Ages. We cannot truly say, that there could be neither secession from the orthodox church, nor independent start without the upstarts encountering the open hostility of that church. Brahmanism was concerned with two main things: the ancient ritual, partaking in which was not enforced on the laity, and the education of gentlemen's sons. We also come across Brahmans as official advisers of kings. A new body of missionaries, such as were the first Śākyaṅs (i.e. Buddhists) could steer clear of both these activities unscathed. There were many Brahman clans of celebrants, many houses receiving sons of Brahmans and of Kṣatriyas as resident pupils; there was room for all of them to work mainly independently, as there is with us in parallel matters. There was also no social feeling adverse to the free discussion of cultural topics, in which religion was not a specialized subject.

But in the early Buddhist or Pāli scriptures there is not a little which we can lay hold of as fairly good contributory evidence about the relations between Brahmans and early Buddhists—evidence which points, I hold, to something very vital for the first Buddhist teachings. It points to both agreement and disagreement. There is agreement with what was the internal religious teaching of the Brahmans; there is disagreement with what was the external observances among Brahmans. It is of the utmost importance that we keep this double relation in view. I take the former first.

It is unquestioned, that when the first Śākyaṅ mission began, the religion of the Ganges valley was, both as a taught cult and as a system of observances, predominantly Brahman. It is difficult for us of Europe to compare the status of these teacher-celebrants with anything similar in other cults. It was a sort of magnified tribe of Levi in Judaism. It attached value to hereditary descent comparable to what may be found in an exclusive aristocracy. It claimed monopoly in the right of teaching and repeating the (orally) fixed hymns and

mantras of authoritative religious doctrine. It claimed the right of training in such teaching the sons of nobles and its own children. It claimed a monopoly of conducting such ritual as was in accord with its body of oral sayings on the subject.

As to the inner teaching of matters spiritual, Brahmanism was itself still throbbing with a great religious reform, with a form of what we now call Immanence, of God as not externally conceived, as is for example, relatively true of Judaism and early Christianity, but as identical in nature with the very centre of human individuality. That is, of course, not with man's limited body, nor with any inner functioning that we might call mind or sense, but with the user of all these, with that who experienced by these, valued by these. In other words, the Brahman teacher had come to believe in God as identical with the self, soul, spirit of man, or with, as India more wisely said, "the man". This was a great change from the older Vedic way, which sought Deity, without, above, around, in rites and soma-juice. *This* said: 'seek God in your very self, your best self. You are That; seek That; know That; thus can you become safe, free from fear, bound for the Immortal.'

Here some may say: In that teaching Buddhism in a way is more like the older Vedism, for in the Pāli Suttas we find a personal Deity, not the impersonal 'Brahman' of the type-literature, but Brahmā, a masculine personage, as the one Creator and Disposer of things. Here is no reference to an immanent Deity.

Yes, and such a personification we also find in the very teachings of that immanence, in the older Upaniṣads. There also (if hardly ever) do we find Brahman as Brahmā, sitting on a throne in a heavenly hall and speaking to a human visitor. But with this difference from the Buddhist references:—In the Upaniṣad the personified Brahman is *identified with the human self*. "What 'Thou art", says the visitor, "That am I." So we see that it is a picturesque way, for youthful hearers, of making it possible to speak of the ineffable. Just as in the Old Testament prophets, the ineffable Deity, named with the groping utterance "I am That I am", is personified as revealing Itself as "The Lord" an autocratic monarch. The Upaniṣads called this way of speaking 'the two Brahmans': the phenomenal and the superpleno-

menal, the latter only to be described negatively as *akṣara*, *amṛta*.

But in the Buddhist reference we have the Brahmā picture left uncorrected; we have the phenomenal Brahmā only, with the identity with man left out. The immanent Brahman is there, in the Suttas right enough, but surviving only in compounds: *brahmacariya*, *brahmacakka*, *brahmabhūta* and *brahmacihāra*. And the lively presentations of a Brahmā, who is, not Alpha and Omega, but just the titular name for the governor of the Brahma-world, is due to the renaissance of Deity as personal that was going on in India when the *Piṭakas* were taking shape as literary compositions, perhaps some 300 years after the birth of Buddhism. With Brahmā as personal were coming up a masculine, not a neuter Śiva, and the Vedic Viṣṇu was reborn. (And it is not impossible that it was also in a later editing, that the old Upaniṣad came in for that more childish, if poetically more impressive vision of a regal Deity). And the later Buddhism was only conforming to the diction of its day, when it referred to this regal Brahmā in terms befitting a universal monarch, such as existed in the ancient tradition of the Cakravarti, and for that matter had, in the Mauryan dynasty, materialized as a political fact.

But let us go back those three centuries or more to the birthday of Buddhism, and find out, if we can, what were the relations between the first Śākya missionaries and Brahmans. There are many Suttas, roughly one hundred, telling of meetings between them. In almost every case the meeting is, in these Suttas, marked by courtesy on both sides. In some cases, where the Brahman visiting or visited is a magnate in property or learning or both, the Śākya Founder is treated with honour and his views are accepted. Where one young Brahman has shown marked rudeness, his teacher, of high fame, calls to apologize for him. There is shown a wish to obtain Gotama's view on several subjects, and this, not as in certain Jain interviews, for purposes of heckling and dispute, but in order to learn what a teacher of high standing thought. Even before Gotama begins his mission, we find him consulted by an earnest-minded Brahman as to what makes the (true) Brahman. I do not wish to over-estimate the respect here alleged as shown. The Suttas are the work of prejudiced com-

pillars, and we have no Brahman counterparts of these interviews. But it is evident that the Buddhist editors had retained no tradition of any chronic ill-feeling as existing between their founders and Brahmans.

Next, in all these talks, the central tenet of the Brahman teaching of that day, immanence, is never attacked by the Śākyaans nor brought up for debate by Brahmans. Let this never be overlooked, for overlooked it strangely is. Contradict me if I have overlooked anything to the contrary. For me, it is not merely contributory evidence; it is crucial. Never do we find Gotama (or his men) attacking Brahmans for seeing Deity in manhood, nor do we find him attacked by Brahmans for holding any contrary and therefore damnable view hereon. Never do Brahmans charge him, in these interviews, with denying either Deity (i.e. Brahman, Source and End of all), or the aspect of Brahman as man's very self in essence, as man's ideal Self. Consider, had the opposite been the case, how much the later Buddhist editors, in their detraction of the self, would have made of such debates. How would they not have shown their Founder triumphant over his opponents! Compared with the heat we can imagine in such non-existent attacks, the few occasions when Brahmans do come with a grievance are as very milk-and-water.¹ Consider how much those editors did make of such debates, when the issue did lie between the man as a real entity and as only to be 'got at' as so many *dhammas*, constituents of body and mind—I refer of course to the Patna Debates in Aśoka's day. There, the debaters maintaining man's reality were the surviving upholders of the old, the original tradition. It was its own house, which, in the opposite side, turned and rent Buddhism; it was not Brahmans.

A third point is, that in the older Anthologies of the Canon, the Tri-Piṭaka, the truly worthy, good man is over and over again called 'Brāhmaṇa'. To quote one of many in *Dhammapada* and *Sutta-Nipāta*:

"Whoso has come to know in every way decease of beings and their going to be, without attachment, wellfarer! awake! that man I call a Brahman!"

1 E.g. on behaviour towards the aged.

Do you not agree that it is putting a great strain on probability to judge, that the Śākyaans would have so termed the saint as revered by them—and that linked with the very words 'sugata, buddha' (wellfarer, awake) had the word 'Brahman' meant for them a man holding views they detested?

There is one more point hinting at a closer relationship between Brahman tenets and those of the Śākyaans, which is all I have time to add. This is, that of the ten or eleven chief disciples cited as often surrounding the Founder, eight were Brahmans, and only three or four of his own class.² I do not think this is taken up into our picture of the first missionaries as it should be. Do you say: But may not those Brahmans have been rebels, seceders from the tenets of their class? And may they not have come into the little band, because they thought it was out and up to oppose those tenets, that ritual?

Well, what is the record about the coming in of any of them? In the Canon we have only that of the two reckoned ever after as the 'chief pair': Sāriputta and Moggallāna. These are said to have been earnest seekers after *amata*, which we should call immortality. They were disgruntled with their teacher Sañjaya, but he was a noted sceptic or sophist, a man unlikely to have been teaching the sublime faith of the Upaniṣadic Immanence. But the quest of these two *was* Upaniṣadic, and *was* the then accepted Brahman creed. And yet it was in Gotama that they appear to have found their good guide, with no recorded abjuration of what they had taken as their ideal. They may have thought their Brahman teachers were not helping them in an adequate way. They were perhaps like Nicodemus the Pharisee, coming to Jesus by night, to get a better Way in religion, than he as a 'teacher in Israel' had found. There is no hint that Nicodemus objected to the teaching of Jewish religious tenets.

These three points are, I contend, strongly suggestive, that the first Śākyaans were as far from denying the Immanence accepted and taught in their day as were, say, John and Charles Wesley from denying

² Brahmans: Sāriputta, Moggallāna, Koṭṭhita, Kaccāna, Kassapa, and Sāriputta's brothers: Cunda, Revata, Kṣatriyas, Anuruddha, Kappina, Ananda, Rāhula.

the central teaching of Christianity. So much for the start of Buddhism in its relation to the inner religious teaching of the Brahman teaching of the young. Let us glance at evidence pointing to a much worsened relation, and finally to what amounts, on the Buddhist side to absence of relations.

If any person have read in the Pāli Suttas he may round on me and say: But look at what we find the Founder saying to young Brahmans about their teachers, say, in the *Tevijja Sutta* of the *Dīgha-Nikāya*. Is it not a very contemptuous sneering attitude, condemning them as men of faith merely, and not knowledge, and as no better than blind teachers of the blind.

This is quite true. And if we would save Gotama from being revealed as a man who said very inconsistent things, we must perforce choose one of two conclusions: Either this sneering attitude is earlier and the pleasant courtesies later, or the mutually respectful conversations are earlier and the sneering belongs to the editing of a later date. Holding the latter attitude he could not possibly have been welcomed and consulted as those scores of Suttas allege that he was. Nor could the respectful attitude have come later, when, as we can see, the Brahman teaching of Immanence was being ever more rejected by the Buddhist Saṅgha for an altogether worsened teaching about the man or self. The *Tevijja* has for me a core of very old teaching, for it shows both Śākyan and Brahman seeking salvation under the figure of a Way or Path (*mārga*), and it shows us in a most precious way, what that Way meant for the Śākyans, namely, works and not faith only, conduct not ritual. But to sneer at teachers for holding that the End of the Way was, is, always a matter of faith is impossible in the true teacher of religion. And no one held faith (*saddhā*) higher than did the Śākyans. It is the queerest error to hold, as I have seen Buddhist 'verts hold, that in Buddhism there is only knowledge, not faith. Let such read the Suttas more thoroughly.

It is fairly obvious that those *Dīgha Suttas* are very carefully compiled compositions made up from a number of oral sayings, and that into them comes much that is earlier, much that is later. It is not a thing I say lightly, nor with any charge of forgery. We have just to try to imagine the history of the changing, changed conditions

under which the compiling and the much amending of scripture (to which Buddhist chronicles bear witness) were made. And I say, that the lowered esteem of Brahmans as teachers is a later feature.

But to come to the new teaching itself: Was there anything in it to show agreement with, or disagreement from, the cultured religious teaching of the day?

This is a most important point, but it is one I have elsewhere discussed ("The Man", no. I *e.g.* *Transactions of the Society for Promoting the Study of Religions*). To sum up: (1) We find (if we read closely, and get behind the formulas) the Pāli Scriptures in agreement with the Brahman Immanence, namely, that what is there called 'self' bore the dual meaning of spirit and Holy Spirit; that man was as it were a dual self, the one, the ideal Self, being One who was to be sought after by the other, the actual self, as being the 'Goal', the 'Witness', the 'Guide', the 'Protector', the Judge of the actual self. (2) We find that his tenet is nowhere attacked as being a Brahman tenet, but that there is evidence of a tendency to substitute, for *attā* (self), *dharma* or sense of the 'ought-to-be' in man.

What then must there have been to cause a man to come forward as, not an opponent, but a reformer of things that Brahmaus were teaching? This: I find the early Buddhists soon taking up a standpoint involving certain disagreements with Brahmanism as to ritual observances, the paying deference because of birth or caste, and the weight attached, and to be attached in religion to conduct or morals. It is this external system that was weighed and found wanting, not the internal system of spiritual values. It is in those external matters that we find the Suttas critical of the established religious cult.

And here remember, that Buddhism was born in the Eastern half of the so-called Middle Country, or watershed of the Ganges and Indus, not in the Western. There is silence in the Buddhist scriptures about the country west of the junction of the Ganges and Jumna, save only in a rare sporadic way, such as reference to Ujjeni. I have it on scholars' authority, that eastern Middle Country Brahmanism was in a more morally lax, less organized state than was western Middle Country Brahmanism; hence, may be, the birth and growth of new reform movements in cult in the eastern half, such as Jainism and Buddhism.

The Suttas do not hesitate to hint that Brahman morals were lax, where the first Buddhists taught,³ albeit the class-respect claimed by Brahmans was none the weaker for that. Now, when we reflect, that the very central drive in the new mission work of the first Buddhists lay in this, that the one and only test for a religion lay in the life, the conduct of its votaries, and that this was not at all stressed in the Brahman teaching—all the moral injunctions in the Upaniṣads could go into a single page—we see here a wedge that was bound to force the new popular teaching apart from the established teaching. The Upaniṣad teaching would seem to have accepted the moral code as making just for social amenity; as what it was proper to do. It is true that we do find one or two isolated passages about man shaping his future life's welfare by his morals. But the teachings as a whole do not rub this in as do the Buddhist Suttas. And it is even possible, that in these few passages we may have glosses, inserted later, due to the grown influence, not of Buddhism only, but of more morally earnest Brahman editors.

I think, that if we look on these two new emphases as wedges: the negative emphasis of dissatisfaction with the importance attaching to rite and sacrifice, and the positive one emphasizing the cardinal importance of conduct in religion (that is, in man as a spiritual being not of earth only), we have the main and first cause of the young Buddhist cult beginning to diverge from the established Brahman cult. Had that first cause been dissatisfaction with the central Brahman teaching of the day, the teaching of Immanence, we should find this included in those other Sutta criticisms of Brahmanism: its externals in observances, its external moral ethical teaching. *But we do not.*

In fact, the shoe is on the other foot. There is one never-quoted Sutta in the Fourth Collection,⁴ showing the Founder censuring a Brahman for ruling out the reality of the self as agent in myself, in

3 In the *Brāhmaṇadhammika-Sutta* of the *Sutta-Nipāta*, Gotama is described as (a) consulted at Sāvattī by Brahmans as to his opinion of how Brahmans compared with their predecessors, (b) comparing them unfavourably with these, (c) not uttering a word of dissent with their religious beliefs, but only disparaging their moral standards.

4 *Anguttara*, iii, p. 337, P.T.S. ed.

yourself. The Brahman gives it as his opinion that there is no such agent. The Founder is recorded as saying: "Never have I have even heard of such an opinion; when you move leg or arm, don't you use initiative? If so, how can you say it is not you, the self, who take the initiative?" This may not be a true memory; or the disputer may have been a young Brahman sceptic of the Academy; or the word 'Brahman' may have been interpolated because, at the time of revising the scripture, the Brahman had become the typical dissentient, or holder of wrong view. But the Sutta deserves to come out from oblivion (*Anguttara-Nikāya*, iii, 238).

But there was, following these two wedges, another. Or to shift the metaphor: With those first leakages of disaffection towards the established religion the fission widened, and there flowed out disaffection with the central tenet of Immanence itself. Namely, the lofty uplifted idea of the man gradually gave way, and that in, I think, three stages of decline. *Firstly*, the man was shorn of the Ideal Man, deity as Self, the God-in-Man. *Secondly*, the man could not be identified as real save in this or that state of body or mind. This word 'state' (or thing) was the word *dhamma* used only and always in the plural, as we have in our collective plural: 'things', or 'ills', or 'interests'. When you seek the man you "can't get at him," (*na upalabbhatī*); you 'stumble' upon these dhammas, to use the word David Hume used, in a parallel grouping, many centuries later. *Lastly*, it was denied that there was any real man: there were *only* these things or states; they alone were real. Man was but a word for the complex of them.

Now all this growth in the third leakage may be found in the Sutta-Piṭaka, but with great variety in frequency and emphasis. Whenever you see the stock bit of catechism about man cannot be *ātmanā* because he is transient and suffers, you should read Man cannot be Deity; manhood is not Godhead. Here it is the Brahman *Ātmā* view that is denied. It is not atheism; there is plenty to show that man can become the Highest, the Uttermost, the Best, the Perfect, the very Goal if he follow the way of becoming, and if he become all that, he is Deity actually, not potentially only. But the term *Brahman* for that Highest was falling out of favour *together with* the dissent from

moral and external Brahmanism. Next, whenever you see, the man cannot be got at save through the mental items of *dhammas*, you have the working of the new psychology called Sāṅkhya or Analysis: the Humian phase in Buddhism. Finally, whenever you see a positive denial that there is any self whatever, not merely of a permanent self, an unchanging self, *but of any self*, you are in the later days of the mediæval scholastics a thousand years later, such as Buddhadatta and Buddhaghosa. These even denied there was a Wayfarer in the Way or Path, or a man saved in salvation, or a doer in doing:—Yes, in just so many words. Utter nihilism. Only ideas! I have found them anticipated, as yet, once in the Suttas, and once at an intermediate period, in the Questions of King Milinda. From the contexts I judge that both are later insertions, so different are they from their contexts, so badly do they fit. It were impossible to give details here and now. I can refer anyone to both and what I have said about them.⁵

This third leakage, in this threefold way, took time; it was more genuinely a leakage than were those first two ways of dissent, namely, with observances and with the importance of conduct. But it came gradually to make the resumption of the friendly relations of past centuries impossible, even when moral reform on the Brahman side might otherwise have gone far to knit, bring them once more into being.

It is curiously hard to elicit anything informative about the relations between Brahman and Buddhist in the centuries between Asoka and the dying out of Buddhism in India. We cannot gather from Asoka's injunctions to tolerance between religions whether he had these two in view at all. A century and a half after his day, in the Questions of Milinda, we find no bitterness about Brahmans, nor anything amounting to interest either. Their duties as a class are recited as just a matter of social tradition. Later again, in the *Jātaka Commentary*, in the "Ten Sorts of Brahman" Jātaka, the criticism of Brahmans in nine of the ten is put into the mouth not of a Buddhist, but of a *rājā*, rivalry between whose class and the Brahmans was old and social, not religious. And when finally we see the Bauddhas or Saugatas dis-

⁵ Buddhaghosa, in his *Visuddhi-magga*, gives no heed to Brahmans whatever, save to make passing comment on the immoderate eating to be seen in 'some' of them.

cussed in a Hindu Manual of a late mediæval date, the writer's concern is merely academic.


As to the waning out of Buddhism from practically the whole of India, and how far it may have been a result of its estrangement from the mother stem of Indian religion, this would need a separate treatment. There may once have been, to adapt Shakespeare "room enough in India for" both religions. But that day passed. Brahmanism (i.e. Hinduism) and Buddhism had to fight for life with the incoming Muhammadanism. Especially Buddhism, since in it the worship of the Highest, the Most, the Perfect was not nominally kept ever to the front.

Where, as in the case of decadent Buddhism, that Highest had become dimmed by concentration on, not the Most, but the More.....I mean, where *arahan* and *Buddha* had replaced Deity.....ejection was easier and quicker. Decadent Buddhism could not stand, and petered out through inherent decay in its religious ideals, and through India's insistence, in her own way, itself decadent, but not so decadent, on man's need of keeping the Most, the Highest, as his main quest.

To sum up: I have tried to show, that if we speak of Buddhism as arising within Brahmanism, we mean, not Brahman externals, either in attention to ritual, or relative want of attention to the religious importance of conduct. We mean, Buddhism started in agreement with the central religious tenets or principles of the Immanence in Brahmanism of that day. Next, that in drifting apart from Brahmanism, Buddhism, in not attaching importance to ritual and on attaching importance to the religious sanction of conduct, did so without any crisis arising such as we look for in schisms or ruptures. Next, that while drifting apart in this twofold way (ritual and conduct) it was inevitable that there should be dragged in 'a drifting apart' also in the central teaching of Immanence. In this way the lofty meaning of 'self' or spirit suffered in Buddhism the same worsening, though in a different way, which it has suffered in our days in Europe. For us, self means usually our worse self; for India self meant, means our best self; for Buddhism it came to mean something that was non-existent. This, the third and greatest phase in the breach in relations, was aided in two ways from non-Brahmanical movements: (i) the study of mind-ways as

apart from the man; (ii) the growth of monasticism, in which the standard of manhood was lowered to mean, not something capable of becoming Godhead, but something it was better to end. Finally I hold, that the exile from its parent stem should come more into account than it does when the causes of the decay of Buddhism in its native land are sought.

C. A. F. RIJYS DAVIDS



Agriculture

The Greeks while in India had heard of the tradition that the god Dionysos first yoked oxen to the plough, and made many of the people husbandmen instead of nomads, and provided them with the implements of agriculture.¹ Now Dionysos has been identified with God Śiva.² But this interpretation does not apply to all cases. We find Dionysos to be the same as Saṅkarṣaṇa because just as in Greece the former is associated with wine and plough so is the latter in India.³ Saṅkarṣaṇa is another name of Balarāma, who is usually represented as carrying the plough on his shoulders. We can, therefore, reasonably infer that Dionysos here is not Śiva but Balarāma.

The masses were occupied with agriculture. While classifying the people of India into seven classes or 'castes', Megasthenes observes that the husbandmen as a class were "far more numerous than the others."⁴ From certain passages in the Jain sūtras we come to know that lands and houses formed the main possession of a householder.⁵ Most probably agriculture was confined to the countryside; and the husbandmen with their wives and children dwelt in villages and did not go into the urban settlements.⁶ There was some agricultural activity in the towns or the cities also, for, the city of Aornos contained "as much good arable land as required for its cultivation the labour of a thousand men."⁷ So also, the fieldbounds of Campā

1 Arr. Ind. VII.

2 M'Orindle, VI. p. 64 fn.

3 Arr. Ind. VII.

4 Meg. Frag. 1.—Diod. II. 40. cf. Meg. Frag. XXXII.—Strabo XV. I. 40. "The second caste consists of the husbandmen, who form the bulk of the population"; cf. Meg. Frag. XXXII.; Arr. Ind. XI. "The second caste consists of the tillers of the soil, who form the most numerous class of the population". Megasthenes evidently spoke of India so far as it was under Candragupta Maurya. Cf. Meg. Frag. LVI; Pliny. H. N. VI. ".....Some till the soil....." cf. Meg. Frag. LVI. B.; Solin. 52.6.17; cf. Arr. Ind. XVI.

5 Uttar. XIII. 24; *ibid.*, IX. 49; cf. *Ac. Sū.*, 1. 2. 3. 3; *Ova.*, I; *Ac. Sū.*, 11. 7. 2. 4-6.

6 Meg. Frag. 1; Diod. II. 40; cf. *Apast.* 1. 32. 21; also *Baudh.* II. 3.6.33. Vide also *Camb. Hist. Ind.*, vol. I, p. 237; also the section on towns.

7 Arr. Anab. IV. XXVIII. Vide also *Itin. Alex.* 108 & 112.

were "turned up by hundreds and thousands of ploughshares and displayed far-reaching pleasant dykes."⁸ It will not be out of place here to mention that in the royal parks of Palimbothra, among the cultivated plants, there were some which received special care from the servants of the king.⁹ We have instances, however, of the urban people cultivating lands which lay around their cities, that is in the suburbs outside. Such lands existed round the city of Patala,¹⁰ and also around the city to which the Malloi (the Malavas) had fled for refuge when Alexander invaded their territory.¹¹

Very probably in urban as well as suburban areas agriculture was carried on, though naturally on a much smaller scale.

Agriculture was under state supervision, being superintended by commissioners.¹² It is, therefore, quite natural that the condition of agriculture, and the agriculturists was not bad.

The husbandmen were exempted from fighting and other public services; they could devote the whole of their time to tillage.¹³ But Megasthenes perhaps did not understand the real state of things, when he says that the husbandmen were exempted from fighting; the rules of caste, in fact, did not allow the husbandmen to wield arms in battle-fields.¹⁴

Unlike the Assyrian kings, the Indian kings could not possibly ask the agriculturist to take up arms in times of war. For, they could not override the *dharma* of the land. Thus when Alexander asked Taxiles whether he had more soldiers or husbandmen, he complained that as he was at war with Abisares and Porus, he required more soldiers than field-labourers.¹⁵ Could he not recruit soldiers from among the field-labourers? Surely not.

Perhaps as the king did not summon the agriculturists to take up arms in battlefields, he had to maintain a large standing army

8 *Op. sec. 1.* (In the Jain sacred works the descriptions contain much that is exaggerated).

9 *Aelian. XIII. c. xviii.*

10 *Arr. Anab. VI. xvii.*

11 *Ibid., VI. vi.*

12 *Ibid., VI. xii. cf. Meg. Frag. XXXIV; Strabo XV. I. 50-52.*

13 *Meg. Frag. I; Diod. II. 40.*

14 *Ibid., I; Diod. II. 41.*

15 *Hist. Alex. Q. Curt. Ruf. VIII. xii.*

at a great cost.¹⁶ Hence in one part of the country when the soldiers were fighting out the battles of their kings, in another part the husbandmen could be seen peacefully pursuing their work without any fear of danger.¹⁷

The husbandmen were of a very mild and gentle disposition.¹⁸ They were regarded as public benefactors by the people;¹⁹ they were regarded as a class that was sacred and inviolable;²⁰ even an enemy, therefore, did not come upon the husbandmen at work on their land and harm them in any way; thus they were protected from all injury.²¹ So we would *ipso facto* be led to suppose that in ancient India battles and wars did not affect agriculture or the people who were engaged with it. But it was not so invariably; when the aggressors came from outside India, they being foreigners, did not spare the agriculturists. Thus, for instance, when Alexander advanced upon the city of Patala the agriculturists there fled away in great terror.²² Similar things might have happened elsewhere too.²³

The husbandmen were dependent to some extent on neatherds, shepherds and hunters, that is, those who formed the third caste of Megasthenes, inasmuch as they freed the country from the pests with which it abounded, viz., wild beasts and birds which devoured the seeds.²⁴ They were also dependent on the artisans who fashioned the implements of agriculture.²⁵ According to Megasthenes these latter were not only exempt from paying any taxes, but they also received maintenance from the king.²⁶ The king tried to improve the condition of the agriculturists by convening Great Assemblies at the beginning

16 Meg. Frag. I; Diod. II. 41; *Ibid.*, XXXII; Arr. Ind. XII; *Ibid.*, XXXIII; Strabo XV. i. 47.

17 *Ibid.*, XXXIII; Strabo XV. i. 40; *Ibid.*, I; Diod. II. 36; *Ibid.*, XXXII; Arr. Ind. XI.

18 *Ibid.*, XXXIII; Strabo XV. i. 40.

19 *Ibid.*, I; Diod. II. 40.

20 *Ibid.*, Diod. II. 36.

21 *Ibid.*, Diod. II. 40. But some wicked persons intentionally injured the crops in the field.

22 *Ibid.*, XXXII; Arr. Ind. XI; *Ibid.*, XXXIII; Strabo XV. i. 40.

23 Many, for example, were sold into slavery, cf. Hist. Alex. Q. Curt. Ruf. IX. iv.

24 Meg. Frag. I; Diod. II. 41; *Ibid.*, XXXIII; Strabo XV. i. 40.

25 *Ibid.*, I; Diod. II. 40; *Ibid.*, XXXIII; Strabo XV. i. 40.

26 *Ibid.*, I; Diod. 40.

of every year and rewarding those scholars who discovered any means for improving the crops and the cattle.²⁷

Lands for agriculture were always low-lying; they were on a level lower than that of the village dwelling site, the homestead land.²⁸ The agricultural lands may be classified as (i) uplands, and (ii) lowlands.²⁹ Upland crops and low-land crops are familiar things among the agriculturists of to-day. But one peculiar feature of the cultivation of these uplands and lowlands was that both the classes of lands seem to have been sown by the ploughmen about the same time during the rainy season.³⁰ If the agricultural lands were really so sown, the present practice certainly differs from the past; for, at present the uplands and the lowlands are not sown simultaneously.

There were officers, who measured the lands constantly, as was done in Egypt, evidently for purposes of the assessment of revenue.³¹ This frequent measurement of lands was necessary, because many of the lands were subject to alluvion and diluvion.³² These officers belonged to the Irrigation Department. They have been identified with the Rājukas of Aśoka,³³ the Rajjugāhakas of the *Jātakas*, whose duty was to measure the lands with a rajju or rope.³⁴ The lands were measured by *niyattanas*.³⁵ One 'niyattana' was equal to two hundred cubits or forty thousand *hastas* square, that is, ten thousand yards square in English measurement.³⁶

From the Jain sources we get no information regarding the communal cultivation of land. On the other hand, almost all the passages referring to agriculture seem to suggest the existence of the system of separate cultivation.³⁷ In this connection it is worth noticing that the Jain sūtras were composed on the banks of the Ganges, that is, in

27 Strabo, XV. i. 39.

28 *Ibid.*, XV. i. 45.

29 *Ibid.*, XII. 12.

30 *Ibid.*, This is quite evident from the passage itself. Here no reference is made to any subsequent cultivation of either the upland or the lowland crops.

31 Meg. Frag. XXXIV; Strabo XV. i. 50-52.

32 Vide Ghosal, *Hindu Revenue System*, p. 172.

33 P. E. IV. vide also Raichowdhury, *Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind.* (2nd edn.), p. 199. King Hastipāla had an assembly-house for his rajjukas.

34 The rajjus were probably something like the modern chains.

35 *Uvās*. I. 19.

36 See Hoernle's notes on *Urās*. I. 19

37 *Ac. Sū.*, II. 10. 10.; *Uvās*. I. 19.

Eastern India. But Nearkos tells us that among some tribes land was cultivated by families in common. When the crops were collected, each person took away a load for his subsistence throughout the year. The remainder of the produce was burnt to provide them with a reason for setting to work again and not sitting idle.³⁸ Nearkos evidently spoke of conditions in the Indus valley.

Agricultural labour was carried on by the house-holders themselves. The husbandmen of Megasthenes³⁹ were perhaps freemen householders. In the Jain literature the term *gāhūvai* includes the husbandmen.⁴⁰ The husbandmen were probably helped by their sons and dependants,⁴¹ which led the Greek writers to think that among the people (of Mousikanos) it was a custom "to employ instead of slaves youngmen in the flower of their age, as the Cretans employ the Aphamiotai, and the Lacedemonians the helots."⁴²

But sometimes the landowners had their lands cultivated by labourers, who got only a part of the produce of the lands in lieu of wages. They were called *bhāgillas*. These *bhāgillas* were, however, very cruelly treated.⁴³

Besides wild beasts and birds there were certain idle and cruel men who were in the habit of injuring the crops.⁴⁴ We hear that sometimes, the householder or his sons themselves set fire to the corns out of anger for some reason or other.⁴⁵ Floods were another source of danger.

The Macedonians were struck by the amazing fertility of the soil.⁴⁶

38 Strabo, XV. i. 66. The crops were burnt for purposes of serving as manure for the next sowing.

39 Meg. Frag. I; Diod. II. 40; *Ibid.*, XXXII; Arr. Ind. XI; *Ibid.*, XXXII; Strabo XV. i. 40.

40 Uvās., 1. 2. There are innumerable references to the term in Ac. Sū., Uttar. Kalpasūtra and many other sacred books of the Jains.

41 Cf. Ac. Sū. I. 2. 5. 1, where the joint family members have been mentioned. Vide also Ac. Sū., II. 10. 10.

42 Strabo XV. i. 34.

43 Bhāgilla (bhāgila), possibly an equivalent of bhāgika. See *Sūtrakṛt.* II. 2, 63. We are not however, certain whether *bhāga* means a sixth part of the produce, as Prof. Jacobi thinks.

44 The crops named are kalama, masura, sesamum, mudga, beans, nispava, kulattha, ālisanda, clamiccha,—*Sūtrakṛt.* II. 2.63.

45 *Sūtrakṛt.* II. 2. 44.

46 Aelian, *Hist. Anim.* XII XXXII; Meg. Frag. I; Diod. II. 35; Pliny VII.2.

The soil near Mount Meros⁴⁷ favoured the growth of chance-sown seeds, and even laurel, spikenard, ivy and vine grew wild here.⁴⁸ The kingdom of Taxiles had a highly productive soil.⁴⁹ If we can rely on what Diodorus says, Alexander, after overcoming king Embisaros,⁵⁰ advanced through a country of surpassing fertility.⁵¹ This probably refers to the regions beyond the Hydaspes. Strabo says that the country beyond the Hypanis was very fertile,⁵² and this is corroborated by Arrian; the inhabitants of the region were good agriculturists.⁵³

About the reason of the fertilities of the soil Arrian in his *Anabasis* says that it is due to this fact that the plains of India were formed from the alluvial deposits of rivers.⁵⁴ Megasthenes also holds the same view.⁵⁵ Strabo says that after the subsidence of the floods, the half-dried soil, "though scratched into furrows by any common labourer", brought whatever was planted to perfection.⁵⁶ The other parts of India must have been equally fertile.

The falling of the rains⁵⁷ and the melting of the snow led to the overflow of the rivers.⁵⁸ Aristoboulos says that the Indian rivers were flooded by the rains from the north.⁵⁹ It is very interesting to note that flood and inundations often made vast changes in the surface of the country. Aristoboulos says "that when he was sent on some business, he saw a tract of land deserted which contained more than a thousand cities with their villages, for the Indus, having forsaken its proper channel, turned itself into another on the left much deeper into which it burst like a cataract, so that it no longer watered the country on the right, from which it receded, for this had been raised by the inundations not only above the level of the new channel, but even that

47 Mount Meros is modern Mar Koh. It lay near the city of Nysa (modern Nanghenhar, if Nysa be Nagara of Ptolemy). Nysa is ancient Noacha of Taxila --Silver Scroll Inscription.

48 Hist. Alex. Q. Curt. Ruf. VIII. X.

49 Plutarch's *Life of Alex.*, ch. LIX. See also Marshall's *Guide to Taxila*, p. 2.

50 Possibly king of Abhisara is meant.

51 Bib. Hist. Diod. Sic. XVII. xc.

52 Strabo XV. i. 37.

53 Arr. Anab. V. vi.

54 *Ibid.*

55 Meg. Frag. II.—Arr. Exped. Alex. V. 6. 2-11.

56 Strabo XV. i. 13.

57 This clearly refers to the rains and the melting of the snows in summer; Strabo. XV. i. 13.

58 Strabo, XV. i. 17; Arr. Anab. V. ix.

59 Strabo, XV. i. 19.

of the new inundations."⁶⁰ The excavation at Kumrahr and at Besnagar have shown that sometimes whole towns were buried underneath the silts newly deposited by the floods.⁶¹

The floods were very heavy; and the whole country lay under water. The rivers rose to the height of forty cubits, of which twenty filled the channels to the brim, while the other twenty swept away the plains.⁶² As a safeguard against the floods the towns in the Indus valley were usually built on 'mounds', that is, on elevated places; and in times of floods they looked like so many islands.⁶³ But in rural areas only the dwelling sites of the villages were on a raised level.⁶⁴ Megasthenes says that when the fields lay under water, large fishes crawled into them and at the time of the receding of waters, the husbandmen used to catch these fishes.⁶⁵ While the Macedonians encamped near the Akesines, they were obliged to shift their abodes to higher ground at the time of inundations.⁶⁶

Floods commenced about the time of the summer solstice⁶⁷ and ceased after the setting of the Arcturus.⁶⁸

The Greek writers do not mention that the floods caused any serious injury to agriculture. On the other hand, Strabo writes that seeds were sown even when the lands were still half-dried after the floods⁶⁹ have subsided.

Megasthenes says that famine never visited India and he adduces good many reasons for the same. First of all, there was an abundance of food-crops which included cereals, millet, pulses of different sorts, rice, bosporon and many others.⁷⁰ Next, India had a double rainfall in course of a year, one in winter and other in summer. On account of this double rainfall there was a double crop every year; and in case one of them proved a failure, the people were always sure of the

60 *Ibid.*

61 A. S. R., 1913, 14; 1912, 13.

62 Strabo XV. i. 18.

63 *Ibid.*64 *Ibid.*, XV. i. 45.65 Meg. Frag. LIX; *Hist. Anim.* XVI. 19.

66 (In summer solstice). Strabo XV. i. 18.

67 Rains fell in about the summer solstice, i. e. about the setting of the pleiades.

68 Strabo XV. i. 18.

69 *Ibid.*70 Meg. Frag. I; Diod. II. 36; cf. Strabo XV. i. 13; *Ibid.* XV. i. 20; Arr. Ind. V.

other. Besides, there was a usage, almost universally observed by the people, which might have prevented the outbreak of famines in India. In times of war the husbandmen were allowed to remain undisturbed inasmuch as the soldiers never ravaged an enemy's land with fire, nor cut down its trees.⁷¹ Megasthenes probably meant a general and protracted famine; for, famines were not quite unknown in ancient India. In *Antagaḍa-dasāo* the 'famine-food' for the Jain monks is mentioned.⁷² But then towards the end of Candragupta's reign, a terrible famine broke out in Magadha, which extended over twelve years. Such a prolonged famine must have resulted in serious economic dislocation throughout the country. It is very strange that Megasthenes does not make mention of this great incident. Possibly he left India before the famine occurred, that is, before about 302 B.C.

Rainfall

Just as in modern times, so also in the past, India enjoyed the benefits of a double rainfall. But Nearkos wrote that the plains of India were watered with rain in summer, but were without it in winter;⁷³ obviously, Nearkos wrote it from his experience. During the winter the Macedonians stayed in the craggy heights of the Hindukush, when mountains were covered with snow, and rains were not seen.⁷⁴ During the course of 'their ten months' sojourn, which occupied the whole of the late autumn, the winter and the following spring and the summer they saw no rain.⁷⁵

As to what Aristoboulos said about the rainfall of India there has been much misunderstanding. The followers of Aristoboulos in later times observed that the plains of India were not watered by rain.⁷⁶ In a passage where Strabo quotes Aristoboulos, it is said that the mountains and the regions at their foot received rains and snow, while the

71 Meg. Frag. 1; Diod. II. 36. For a recent explanation of this assertion of Megasthenes see Radharaman Gangopadhyaya's *Some Materials for the Study of Agriculture and Agriculturists in Ancient India*, pp. 112-126.

72 Meg. Frag. I; Diod. II. 36; Arr. Anab. V. IX.

73 Strabo, XV. i. 18.

75 *Ibid.*

74 *Ibid.*, XV i. 17.

76 *Ibid.*, XV. i. 24.

plains had neither.⁷⁷ By "regions at the foot of the mountains" Aristoboulos probably meant Taxila and the surrounding country, and by 'plains' he meant that part of India which lay between the Hydaspes and Patalene. For, he refers to the absence of rains in this part of India.⁷⁸ But he says that in the country beyond, rains and snow fell and lands were easily cultivated.⁷⁹ Here he is probably referring to the Upper Punjab and the mountainous regions of northwestern India or to the country west of the Indus between the Hydaspes and Patalene.⁸⁰

In the mountainous regions to the north-west of India rains were very heavy. In the country round about Nysa, modern Naghenhar, rains used to pour down so heavily that the bunches of grapes fell off in the vineyards.⁸¹ Aristoboulos writes that the Indian rivers were flooded by the rains from the north.⁸² In the mountainous countries of Paropanesene, Aspasioi and Assakenoi⁸³ rains set in early in spring and poured down day and night in torrents without intermission.⁸⁴ When the Macedonians were in Taxila, rains fell for the first time.⁸⁵ But the truth of this statement is doubtful; for they had already experienced heavy rainfalls in Paropamisadai, Aspasioi and Assakenoi.⁸⁶ During the course of their march eastwards from Taxila, the Macedonians saw that the whole country between Taxila and the Hypanis was being watered by heavy rains.⁸⁷

Kathiawad and the neighbouring regions were also subject to heavy rains;⁸⁸ we hear that the lake Sudaršana, which was built during the

77 *Ibid.*, XV. i. 13; cf. Ktesias. Frag. I; Bib. LXXII. p. 144.

78 Strabo, XV. i. 19. and 26.

79 *Ibid.*

80 For to the east there is the desert of Rajputana which was well known to the Macedonians (Herod. III. 98.). Here in the heat of the sands, there could not have been any snowfall, nor any rains. But in the country west of the Indus we have the mountains of Beluchistan where there were possibly falls of rains and snow. Cf. Vincent Smith, *E. H. I.*, 4th. edn., pp. 40-41.

81 Meg. Frag. XLVI; Strabo XV. i. 6-8.

82 Strabo XV. i. 19.

83 Paropanesene is the Hindukush. The territories of the Aspasioi and the Assakenoi are to be located in the valleys of Bajaur and the Panjkora.

84 Strabo, XV. i. 17.

85 *Ibid.*

86 *Ibid.*

87 *Ibid.*

88 *EL.*, VIII., 36; Fleet's Gupta Inscriptions, pp. 56-65.

reign of Candragupta Maurya, thrice burst out on account of heavy rains.⁸⁹ The *Arthasāstra* contains certain details about the rainfall in the different parts of India,⁹⁰ e.g., Anupā received twentyfour *dronas* of rainfall, Avanti 23 *dronas*, Jāṅgala (probably Kurujāṅgala) 16 *dronas*, Aśmaka⁹¹ 13½ *dronas* and the western countries and the borders of the Himalayas got an immense quantity of rainfall.⁹²

The following passage from the *Ācārāṅga Sūtra* gives a very brief description of the country during the rainy season; "when the rainy season has come and it is raining, many living beings are originated and many seeds just spring up, the roads between (different places) contain many living beings, seeds etc.....the foot-paths are not used, the roads are not recognisable."⁹³ From this it appears that the eastern Gangetic plain received a fair quantity of rain.

India, as Eratosthenes states, received her summer rains from the Etesian winds and from the vapours which arose from the rivers.⁹⁴ Rains used to set in early in spring, and lasted till the rising of the Arcturus, that is, the beginning of autumn.⁹⁵ So the rainy season extended over about six months. But this was the case only in the Indus valley, that is, western India.⁹⁶ In the Gangetic plains rains lasted for four months, and ceased only in the beginning of Mārgaśīrṣa.⁹⁷ In other words, in the eastern part of India rains set in in the beginning of Śrāvāṇa and lasted till the end of Kārtika or the beginning of Mārgaśīrṣa. From the Girnar inscription of Skandagupta we come to know that the rainy season followed the summer and that the country witnessed heavy rains in the month of *Proṣṭhāpada*, so that the period of rains roughly coincided with that of Gangetic plains.⁹⁸

89 *Ibid.*

90 In the *Arthasāstra* we find that the rain-gauge (*varṣamāna*) was used for measuring the rains in those days. It was a very simple contrivance. In front of store-houses, there were bowls (*kuṇḍa*) the mouths of which were wide as an *arutin*, that is, twentyfour *anṅulas*; and these served as rain-gauges.

91 Either the Aspasioi and the Assakenoi are meant or the Aśmaka kingdom of Deccan.

92 *Artha. S.*, II, 24.

94 *Strabo XV.* i. 13.

96 For, the knowledge of the Greeks about India was confined to the western part of our country.

98 Fleet's *Gupta Inscriptions*, pp. 56-65.

93 *Ac. Sū.*, II. 3. 1. 1.

95 *Ibid.*, XV. i. 17.

97 *Ac. Sū.*, II. 3. 1. 4.

Lands were irrigated with the waters of many rivers.⁹⁹ Quintus speaks of the river Ethimanthus which was used for irrigation by the people on its banks.¹⁰⁰ We are not, however, certain whether the waters of the Indus and tributaries were used for purposes of irrigation.¹⁰¹ Some rivers supplied water even for the nurture of garden vegetables.¹⁰² In fact, there was an extensive system of irrigation, though, of course there might have been lands which were cultivated without the help of irrigation.¹⁰³ In 1914 the remains of an irrigation canal of the Maurya or possibly pre-Maurya period were exhumed by Dr. Bhandarkar at Besnagar. The canal was seven feet broad and five feet and six inches deep.¹⁰⁴ King Mahāpadma Nanda extended several channels (*paṇāḍī*) for purposes of irrigation from Tanasuliya vāḍa to the capital town of Kalinga. The Archaeological Department has not been able to find out any trace either of the reservoir or of the channels.¹⁰⁵ This, however, shows the extent of care and attention paid by the ancient kings to matters of agriculture and irrigation.

Under the Mauryas also irrigation was under state supervision.¹⁰⁶ There was a special Irrigation Department maintained by the king. Megasthenes wrote, "some superintend the rivers; measure the lands, as is done in Egypt, and inspect the sluices, by which water is let out from the main canals into their branches, so that every one may have equal supply of it."¹⁰⁷ From this Vincent Smith infers that a water-rate must have been levied, and that there was 'a regular system of canals.'¹⁰⁸

99 Meg. Frag. I; Diod. II. 36-37 This explains why some of the officers of the Irrigation Dept. had to superintend the rivers. cf. Dion Chrys. Orate. XXXV. 434.

100 Hist. Alex. Q. Curt. Ruf. VII. ix.

101 Meg. Frag. I; Diod. II. 37. The most notable of the tributaries of the Indus were "the Hupanes, the Hudaspes and the Akesines"; Cf. Arr. Ind. IV. "We ought not.....canals". 102 *Ibid.*,

103 Meg. Frag. I; Diod. II. 35. The expression "greater part of the soil is under irrigation" implies that there were probably lands, which did not require to be irrigated.

104 A.S.R., 1914-1915, II, pp. 69-70.

105 J.B.O.R.S., 1917, pp. 425-472.

106 Meg. Frag. XXXIV; Strabo XV. i. 50-52.

107 *Ibid.*

108 Smith's *E. H. I.*, 4th edn., pp. 138-140; *Oxford History of India*, 2nd edn., p. 91; Asoka, (Rulers of India Series), p. 95.

The Girnar rock inscription of Rudradaman tells us that Puṣyagupta the Vaiśya, who was Candragupta's governor of the western provinces (*rāṣṭrika*), built a reservoir by making an embankment across a gorge of the hill for purposes of irrigation and named it 'Sudarśana'. But for some reason or other he could not construct the irrigation channels, and these were done by Yavanarāja Tuṣāspa, the viceroy of Aśoka.¹⁰⁹ The scheme was an ambitious one and it required much time and labour. Begun during the reign of Candragupta it was completed only in the reign of his grandson Aśoka.

In consequence of a double rainfall and an extensive system of irrigation the soil bore two crops in the course of a year.¹¹⁰ In the winter season wheat,¹¹¹ barley, pulses and many other esculents were sown;¹¹² and in the summer or rainy season rice, bosmoron, sesamum, millet and flax.¹¹³ Strabo ascribes a double crop also to the fruits.

Ploughing was perhaps carried on with the help of oxen. In the country of the Aspasioi Alexander the Great captured about 230,000 oxen. Out of them he selected those better in size and beauty and sent them to Macedonia to be employed in agriculture.¹¹⁴

Probably for a deeper ploughing some people employed elephants in agriculture; they regarded them as forming the main part of their stock in cattle.¹¹⁵

From what has been said above it can easily be inferred that big ploughs were employed in agriculture. In the *Uvāsagadasāo* the teeth of a *pisaya* have been compared with ploughshares.¹¹⁶

109 *Et.*, VIII, 36.

110 Meg. Frag. I; Diod. II. 35-36; Strabo XV. i. 13 and 20. *Ibid.*, XVI. iv. 2.

111 Meg. Frag. I; Diod. II. 36; Strabo, XV. i. 13.

112 Strabo, XV. i. 20.

113 *Ibid.*, XV. i. 13; Meg. Frag. 1; Diod. II. 36.

114 Arr. Anab. IV, xxv; cf. Itin. Alex. 105.

115 Meg. Frag. LV1; Pliny N. H. VI. See also N. C. Banerji's *Economic Life and Progress in Ancient India*, pp. 116, 121. Prof. Banerji's suggestion is that the employment of oxen even to the number of 12 implies either a deep ploughing or the hardness of the soil. But the theory of the existence of a deep ploughing is more probable than the theory of the hardness of the soil. The alluvial soil of North India is naturally soft, and some 20 years back, Dr. Spooner proved that the soil of Patna district has been extremely soft from time immemorial (*ASR.*, 1912-13. II).

116 *Uvās.* II, 94.

During the growth of the plants the cultivators had to take great care of the fields, as the weeds that grew by the side of the plants had to be removed.¹¹⁷ In the Jain literature¹¹⁸ where the cutting of the crops when ripe is referred to there is no mention of the sickle. Sickles must have been used, for at Taxila and Sarnath such implements were found in course of excavations. Affluent landowners had a large number of carts for carrying the grains from the fields to the barn-door;¹¹⁹ they also possessed a large number of boats which were perhaps employed for the same purpose.¹²⁰ It may be added here by way of an explanation that probably the rich landowners had large acres of land, which lay a long way off their houses or their barns. Then the seeds were dried in the sun.¹²¹ Threshing and husking processes have also been referred to by Strabo. He says that rice was husked in the same way as barley.¹²² In the *Ācārūṅga Sūtra* the winnowing of grains is mentioned.¹²³ The winnowing sieve was called *suppa*.¹²⁴ Besides winnowing, we hear of the grinding of grains on a rock (*silāe*) or 'on a piece of clay.'¹²⁵ The granary was called *piṇṇāgapinḍi*¹²⁶ or *khala*.¹²⁷ Now from the Vedic literature¹²⁸ we come to know that in the granary bundles of grains were beaten or trampled upon.¹²⁹ There were storehouses (*koṣṭhā* or *kolejjā* or *koṣṭhāgāra*¹³⁰) for the preservation of grains.¹³¹ The kings also used to keep storehouses for emergencies.¹³²

ANANTA KUMAR BOSE

117 *Sūtrakṛt.*, II. 2.11.

118 *Aṇuttar.*

119 This is based on the explanation of the term *Samvāhanichim* as given in the commentary. Though the commentary is of a later date, yet it seems that the explanation given there is probable, and has been taken from earlier commentators. For parts of the commentaries on Jain works are traditional, being handed down from teacher to pupil.

120 *Uvās.* 1. 121; vide also n. 119.

121 *Aṇuttar.*

122 Strabo XV. i. 18.

123 *Ac. Sū.* II. 1. 6. 8.

124 *Uvās.* II. 94.

125 *Ac. Sū.* II. 1. 6. 8.

126 *Sūtrakṛt.*, II. 6. 26.

127 *Ibid.*, II. 2. 44-46.

128 N. C. Banerji's *Economic Life and Progress in Ancient India*, p. 115.

129 *Ibid.*

130 *Uttar.* XI. 26

131 *Ac. Sū.*, II, 1. 7. 2.

132 Sohagaura Inscr. in *IA.*, 1896.

Caitanya as an Author

It has never been critically discussed whether Caitanya, with whose name the form of Vaiṣṇavism prevalent in Bengal is associated, ever wrote any religious or speculative works as did the founders of other Vaiṣṇava Sampradāyas. The pious imagination of his followers naturally loves to invest him with the highest academic glory and scholastic eminence. One at least of his early biographers, himself a highly trained scholastic theologian, puts in Caitanya's mouth long philosophical discourses, marvels of exegesis and elaborate sectarian theologising, even though this picture of Caitanya as a Śāstric Paṇḍit is not consistent with the general impression given of him in the biography itself as a devotee of great emotional capacity, surrendering himself more and more to rapturous abandonment. Even when a mere boy Caitanya is said to have possessed extraordinary precocity of intellect, and some of his learned biographers make out that he was a youthful prodigy, mastering all branches of learning at the age of fifteen. At the same time we are told that his fond parents were at first averse to sending the boy Caitanya to school for fear that learning would lead him, as it led his elder brother Viśvarūpa, to asceticism, and he was allowed to grow wild at will. Later on he was sent to one Viṣṇu Paṇḍita and Sudarśana for elementary education, and then to Gaṅgādāsa, who was chiefly a grammarian, for more advanced studies. It is probable that Caitanya displayed in his younger days a keenness and intelligence much above the average. He does not, however, appear to have cared much for deep or wide scholarship, and it is really not necessary to present him as a great scholar when his real greatness lies in other directions. His education was probably that of a well-born Brāhmaṇa boy at such a centre of learning as Navadvīpa, but his studies appear to have been chiefly confined to Sanskrit Grammar, especially Kalāpa Grammar,¹ and probably to some literature

¹ Vṛndāvana-dāsa tells us (*Caitanya-bhāgavata*, Ādi vii) that Caitanya's teacher Gaṅgādāsa was proficient in Grammar (व्याकरणशास्त्रे एकान्त तत्त्वविद्), and Caitanya's knowledge and teaching of Grammar are more than once mentioned.

and rhetoric² to which allusion is made. Although Navadvīpa was, and still is, famous for its teaching of New Logic (Navya Nyāya), there is however no evidence to show that Viśvambhara (ās Caitanya was then called) ever studied this subject. On the contrary, people noticing the keenness of his intellect, are said to have on one occasion wished that he had studied Nyāya and become a great Bhaṭṭācārya, which he was in their opinion sure to become.³

Caitanya's dialectic exploits of the period, during which he became a householder and set up a school like most educated Brāhmaṇas of the time, are made much of in his two orthodox biographies, but the descriptions of his scholastic triumphs are obviously exaggerated, and even appear as puerile. He is said, for instance, to have vanquished in disputation Keśava Bhaṭṭa Kāśmīrī, the well-known scholar and commentator of the Nimbārka sect. The account is given at some

Keśava Kāśmīrī, for instance, speaks contemptuously of his teaching of Grammar (शिशुशास्त्र व्याकरण पडाय ब्राह्मण, *C-Bh.*, Adi xi; व्याकरणमध्ये जानि पडाओ कलाप *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* Adi xvi, 32-35) which Caitanya himself admits as a matter of pride (प्रभु कहे व्याकरण पडाइ अभिमान करि, *C-C*, *loc. cit.*). Reference to Kalāpa is also made by Jayānanda in his *Caitanya-maṅgala*.

2 Caitanya himself is reported to have admitted that he made no serious study of Rhetoric (नाहि पडि अलङ्कार करेच्छु श्रवण, *C-C*, Adi xvi, 52), but in his alleged disputation with Keśava Kāśmīrī he is made to rely chiefly on his stray knowledge of this subject.

3 केह वले ए ब्राह्मण न्याय यदि पडे । भट्टाचार्य हय तवे कखन ना नडे ॥ (*C-Bh.*, Adi xi). No reliance can be placed on the legend narrated in the *Advaita-prakāśa* that Caitanya wrote a commentary on Nyāya, but threw the work into the Ganges out of compassion towards a Brāhmaṇa who had written a similar work but who was afraid lest it should be eclipsed by the more learned commentary of Caitanya. The legend is obviously inspired by the pious tendency of glorifying Caitanya by imputing scholastic eminence to him. The *Advaita-prakāśa*, the historicity of which work itself as well as the genuineness of the printed text is open to serious doubt, also speaks of a commentary on the *Srīmad-bhāgavata*, but of this there is no mention elsewhere. The legend that Caitanya was a pupil of Vāsudeva Sārvabhauma Bhaṭṭācārya need not be seriously considered. The Vaiṣṇava tradition delights to make a great academic figure out of Vāsudeva and assigns to him four distinguished pupils, viz. Raghunātha Śiromaṇi, the Naiyāyika; Raghunandana, the Smārta; Kṛṣṇānanda Āgamavāgiśa, the Tāntrika; and lastly, Caitanya. But Caitanya's pupilship, though plausible,

length in Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja's biography. What really happens in Viśvambhara's so-called disputation with this formidable scholar, who was the author of learned commentaries of the *Bhagavad-gītā*, the *Vedānta-sūtra* and other works, is somewhat strange. Viśvambhara requests Keśava to compose a hymn to the Ganges, on the banks of which they meet, and on Keśava's reciting *ex tempore* an astonishing series of verses on the subject, all that Viśvambhara does to silence him is to pick rhetorical and grammatical flaws of a rather fastidious kind in the verses cited.⁴ This is the whole extent of the learned disputation, and the account in its triviality is extremely disappointing. The disputation is omitted in other biographies of Caitanya. It is given for the first time by Vṛndāvana-dāsa, from which source obviously Kṛṣṇadāsa elaborates it. In the same way Viśvambhara is represented elsewhere as picking grammatical flaws in Iśvara Purī's poem. No concealment however is made here of the fact that Viśvambhara was chiefly a teacher of grammar to young pupils, and possessed some stray knowledge perhaps of rhetoric. All that these Navadvīpa legends tend to indicate is that Caitanya's youthful and thoughtless mind was at this time filled with the scholastic spirit and pride of learning of his native place, and that the sprightliness of his boyhood had developed into the pedantic but harmless arrogance of a young Pandit. One might even suspect sectarian loyalty in the biographers in making a veteran champion of the rival Nimbārka school suffer defeat at the hands of the youthful Caitanya; but, apart from pious credulity, the episode is poorly presented and is hardly worthy of a really great scholar, such as Caitanya's biographers make him out to have been. Keśava of Kashmir was the

appears to have no foundation in fact, for the accounts in his orthodox biographies do not mention this fact; on the contrary, they show that Caitanya's first meeting with Vāsudeva must have taken place at Puri, where the latter lived. Probably the venerable old scholar had already left Navadvīpa before Caitanya was old enough to be his pupil. In the accounts of Caitanya's early life no reference is made to Vāsudeva's teaching Caitanya, whose attitude at Puri was hardly that of a pupil towards his teacher. Vāsudeva appears to have been more of a Vedāntist than a Naiyāyika, and this is confirmed by his known commentary on Lakṣmīdhara's *Advaita-makaranda*.

4 For a good analysis of the academic aspect of this episode, see *Calcutta Oriental Journal*, December 1933, pp. 91-99, in which the writer of the article expresses his conclusion that "the entire episode looks very suspicious."

son of Śrīmaṅgala, śiṣya of Mukunda and pra-śiṣya of Sundara Bhaṭṭa, as he himself tells us in his various Sanskrit works. He was the author of learned commentaries on the *Brahmopaniṣad*, the *Bhagavad-gītā*, the *Śrīmad-bhāgavatā* (Sk. X) and other works; but the most well-known work for his school was his *Prabhā* commentary on Śrīnivāsa's *Kaustubha* commentary on Nimbārka's *Vedānta-pārijāta*.⁵ The meeting with Caitanya, as a matter of fact, is not unlikely, for Keśava lived in the latter part of the 15th and the beginning of the 16th century; but there can be no doubt that the account has been grotesquely exaggerated.

A study of the general trend of Caitanya's life will also make it clear that although he possessed great qualities of leadership and extraordinary powers over minds of men, he did hardly at any time of his career concern himself directly with the organisation of his followers. When he turned his face towards Puri immediately after his Sannyāsa at the early age of twenty-four and made his permanent residence there, he practically lost all direct touch with the active propagation of his faith in Bengal; and this was probably one of the reasons why the sect never achieved any real solidarity in its later history. Although a close connexion was kept up between him and his followers in Bengal, his departure must have been a great loss to a cause which had hardly had time yet to establish itself firmly. The later disruption of the sect, the organisation of which was left chiefly in the hands of Nityānanda, who appears to have possessed other views than Caitanya, was partly due to the lack of direct contact with the Master, whose personality was not only the strongest asset of the community but also the only powerful influence which could unify and organise it into a compact body. While the movement in Bengal fell into disorder after his death, the influence of his personal presence for long years at Puri has continued to make Orissa a stronghold of the Vaiṣṇava faith up to the present day.

Absorbed in his devotional ecstasies Caitanya does not appear to have ever sought to build up a cult or a sect. If such a cult or sect

⁵ Ed. in the *Pandit*, viii, ix; also ed. by Nityasvarūpa Brahmācārī, Vṛndāvana 1906.

gathered itself round him, it was due chiefly to the influence of his personality and the powerful appeal of his evident devotion. The enthusiasm of some of his more practical or more scholastically inclined disciples would feign see in him a great organiser and expounder of a system of theology, but neither propagating zeal nor theological ambition ever appears to have entered his simple life of intense religious emotional realisation. If some notable conversions were achieved, they were not the result of any direct missionary effort on his part, but, as the orthodox records themselves reveal, they were due to the powerful impression he could create on receptive minds by his outstanding religious personality. Even admitting that he could employ philosophy or theology as a weapon in argument, it was yet his vivid sense of spiritual truth which could cast a mystic spell and call forth a deep and lasting response. This wonderful spiritual influence could enthral men of great capacity and inspire them with a lifelong zeal for sectarian pioneering, laborious scholarship and devotional austerity; but to attribute this achievement to any conscious effort or purpose is to misread the whole trend of his life.

The later development of the sect and the cult, therefore, is chiefly the work of his disciples and associates. At the same time, one must guard against the error of supposing that the cult and the sect were entirely created by his followers to whom Caitanya was a mere figure-head or a willing instrument. Caitanya's personal relation to his leading disciples, as borne out by the orthodox records, clearly demonstrates that on the main lines of its growth and expansion the movement was directly inspired by the example of his life and experience, even if he did not actually persevere at the task. If he possessed the capacity, he never had in his emotional absorption either the time or the willingness to found a sect or a system; but from the very beginning the movement bore the impress of his personality and developed on the lines of his spiritual experiences, which formed its greatest and most powerful asset. This was the driving force by which the movement organised and propagated itself during his life-time, and which inspired his leading disciples to organise and propagate it after his passing away. As such this was his highest contribution to the sect and the cult. The standard of Vaiṣṇava life and devotion set up

by his own life, the new spirit of emotionalism which he imparted to traditional piety, the widespread emotional appeal of the new mode of Sāṅkīrtana which he developed, the sincerity and contagious passion of his realisation of the Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa cult, the expansive and liberating power of his catholic and simple ideas of worship, his devotional fancies about the Vṛndāvana settlement, his winning over of scholars and devotees who were to be the future organisers of the sect both on its practical and doctrinal sides and his inspiring them with a selfless love for the task,—in one word, his great religious life and personality clearly gave an initial direction and an impetus to the movement, which gradually organised itself in the hands of his followers into a definite sect and cult.

If Caitanya did not concern himself actively in the work of organising his followers, which was left mostly in the hands of Advaita and Nityānanda, still less did he take upon himself the work of a thinker or writer. However much intellectual pride he is reported to have possessed in his youth, he gave up his scholastic pursuits after his return from Gaya. A man of his great emotional capacity was hardly ever fit for serious or sustained intellectual effort, for which he never showed any particular bent, and which became more and more impossible as years went on. To a man of his temperament spiritual realisation was hardly a matter of speculative discussion. In spite of the fact that some of his scholastic biographers delight to depict Caitanya as a trained theorist expounding with precision a whole theological system and invest him with the omniscience of a Sāstric Paṇḍit,⁶ they also indicate that in his ecstatic absorption he was careless of mere Sāstric knowledge. The theology that is placed in his mouth is clearly the theology of a later day, in which these biographers themselves were severely trained. It must not also be forgotten that the significance of Caitanya's teaching, like the teaching of all great teachers, lies not so much in his special interpretation of this or that text, but in the reality and force of his inner spiritual experience, which gave him an extraordinary power over the minds of

⁶ In one place for instance Caitanya is represented as explaining a text in 61 different ways.

men. The whole trend indeed of Caitanya's life was against his being an exact scholar or thinker. When Caitanya closed his school after his return from Gaya he is reported to have shut up his books and said to his pupils that for him lessons were finished from that day. The words became almost literally prophetic, for in after-years he hardly ever read or wrote anything. The scholarly pursuits of a Paṇḍit, the pride of learning or the zest for dialectic disputations—all passed out of his life, which now began to move in an entirely different atmosphere. Outside the *Śrīmad-bhāgavata*, the newly discovered *Brahma-saṁhitā* and the devotional lyrics of Bilvaṅgala, Jayadeva, Vidyāpati or Caṇḍīdāsa he appears to have read next to nothing. It is misdirected zeal which invests him with the false glory of scholastic eminence; his true greatness lies in other directions, and his power over men came from other sources.

It is not surprising, therefore, that Caitanya wrote nothing with the exception of eight Sanskrit verses, which are given as the Sikṣāṣṭaka, and which are nothing more than expressions of his simple and passionate faith. All these eight verses are to be found under his name (cited as Śrī-bhagavataḥ) in the *Paḍyāraṇī* compiled by Rūpa Gosvāmin, who was an immediate disciple of Caitanya. Kavikauṣṭhapa in his *Caitanya-candrodaya* appears to negative the idea that Caitanya ever wrote anything about his doctrines. Ānandin in his commentary on Prabhācānanda's *Caitanya-candrāmṛta* distinctly states that Caitanya never composed any work, but he meets the objection of those who maintain the impossibility of propagating any devotional doctrine without such means by saying that even if Caitanya wrote nothing he transferred his own energy into his disciples like Rūpa and inspired them to reveal the doctrines.⁷ The attribution to him, therefore, of any specific work or specific doctrine is more a matter of pious belief than a positive historical fact. It is indeed difficult to say how much of the elaborate theologising which is piously put in his

7 *nunu granthādi-racanāṃ vinā līlādi-vistāraṇaṃ na syāt, granthādik ko'pi na kṛtaḥ śrī-kṛṣṇa-caitanyaena katham tad-vastu-prathanam iti vācyam | bhāgavatā cākhyaḥ grantha-karaṇābhāvād hṛdā brahmaṇi brahma-prakāśitorupe śrī-rūpādiṣu sveṣu hṛdī śaktiṃ sañcārya tat-tad-dvāreṣu sarvaṃ prakāśitam iti | |*

mouth was actually uttered by him, for these reported utterances of his are in fact faithful summaries of the highly scholastic works of the six Vṛndāvana Gosvāmins themselves, who as leisured recluses could devote their keen and highly trained minds to the construction of elaborate systems of speculation. It is not clear, therefore, how far these tenets of a later time actually represent Caitanya's views. No doubt Caitanya is represented by Kṛṣṇadāsa as commissioning Sanātana and Rūpa Gosvāmins to prepare these learned texts as the doctrinal foundations of the faith and suggesting to them elaborate outlines and schemes; but these outlines and schemes are so suspiciously faithful to the actual and much later products of the Gosvāmins themselves that this fact takes away whatever truth there might have been in the representation. That some such relation actually existed between the Master and his learned disciples is highly probable, but excessive zeal has represented it in a distorted perspective. It is also remarkable that while these Gosvāmins themselves make a general acknowledgment of the inspiration derived from Caitanya and his life, there is nowhere any acknowledgment of direct instruction or outlining of schemes to them by Caitanya.* The actual personal contact of Rūpa and Sanātana with

8 Sanātana Gosvāmin, for instance, in the 11th verse of his *Bṛhad-bhāgavatāmṛta* states:

भगवद्भक्तिशास्त्राणामयं सारस्य संग्रहः । अनुभूतस्य चैतन्यदेवे तत्प्रियरूपतः ॥

The word *anubhūtasya* here is significant. Sanātana does not anywhere say that he actually received any direct instruction in these matters, but that he is compiling what he *felt* about the character of Bhakti in Caitanya himself. At the end of the *Diḍdarśanī* commentary on the same work he says again:

स्वयं प्रवर्तितः कृत्स्नैर्ममैतद्विखनभ्रमः । श्रीमच्चैतन्यरूपोऽसौ भगवान् प्रीयतां सदा ॥

which speaks indeed of inspiration received from Caitanya, but not of direct instruction by him. Rūpa similarly speaks of inspiration derived from Caitanya (*hr̥di yasya prerāṇayā pravartito'haṃ carāka-rūpo'ṅ*); but there is nowhere in the works of the six Gosvāmins any acknowledgment of direct instruction by Caitanya, as alleged by Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja. Had it been a fact, it is improbable that they would have been silent about it. Nor is the fact mentioned in any other biography of Caitanya. The *Bhakti-ratnākara* informs us that Rūpa and Sanātana were already advanced in years and well trained in Śāstric knowledge, as well as predisposed to Vaiṣṇavism, when Caitanya met them; this must have been one of the reasons why Caitanya selected them for the special task of systematising the theology of the sect.

the Master was indeed very brief, while there is no evidence to show that Jīva, their nephew, ever had this good fortune. It is hard to believe that within the period of a few months at the most, they could have been instructed by Caitanya, as alleged, in the whole range and depth of the Bhakti-śāstra and in every such detail of theological doctrines as they set it forth in their elaborate and voluminous works which undoubtedly betray the learning of a life-time. It is certainly true that Caitanya inspired these men of great talent with a life-long zeal for the task, which made them scorn delight and live laborious days; he might have also suggested to them his own ideas of devotion born out of his own religious experience; and above all, his life itself must have furnished them a vivid text to enlarge and comment upon. But to hold Caitanya responsible for every fine point of dogma and doctrine elaborated by Sanātana, Rūpa and Jīva would indicate an undoubtedly pious but entirely unhistorical imagination.

It is worth remarking in this connexion that although Bengal Vaiṣṇavism presents itself as a deliberate historical religion promulgated by a definite founder, yet in the practical working out of the system the direct intuitive realisation or teachings of the founder do not expressly find a place. Except the usual obeisance and homage to Caitanya and general passages testifying to his identity with the supreme deity, there is nowhere in the extensive works of the three early authoritative Gosvāmins (Rūpa, Sanātana and Jīva) any direct reference to his personal views and teachings. These theologians and philosophers are chiefly concerned with the godhead of Kṛṣṇa and his Līlā as revealed in the older scriptures; and Kṛṣṇa in their theory is not an Avatāra but the supreme deity himself. They are almost entirely silent about Caitanya-līlā and its place in their devotional scheme, and it is somewhat strange that in presenting a system in Caitanya's name they rely exclusively upon older sources and do not refer at all to his direct realisation of spiritual truths. The divinity of Kṛṣṇa as the exclusive object of worship is elaborately established, but the divinity of Caitanya, which is implicitly acknowledged in the Namaskriyūs and miscellaneous devotional verses, is hardly ever discussed. It is said in the later Bengali biographies of Caitanya that these works themselves were not only inspired but were directly com-

communicated to these disciples by Caitanya himself. It may have been so, but there is no direct acknowledgment of this fact by the Gosvāmins themselves; and what appears to have been communicated (if we take the texts themselves as evidence) is not his own Anubhava but elaborate scholastic systems based on and developed from inherited Vaiṣṇava tradition. Nor is there any devotional interpretation of the personality of Caitanya and Caitanya-līlā as there is of the personality of Kṛṣṇa and Kṛṣṇa-līlā. There can be no doubt that the devout life of Caitanya inspired these faithful disciples, but in the actual building up of their systems of philosophy and theology, there is no reference to the life, personality or views of the Master himself. There is, on the other hand, an entire dependence on a complicated system of interpretation of older sacred texts, rather than upon any direct and vivid spiritual illumination. In these works of the Gosvāmins we reach indeed a high level of the emotional doctrine of Bhakti in the setting of a vital system of religious beliefs, and the life and personality of Caitanya must have been a powerful exemplification of these beliefs and doctrines, but we still move in an indefinite haze of mythology, sentiment and speculation derived from the Purānic tradition; while the intellectual seriousness or the ethical nobility of the tenets is hardly propounded with the force of direct realisation, inasmuch as they are completely merged in a floating mass of uncertain myths, legends and traditional beliefs. In all probability Caitanya himself never claimed any divine honours, but the piety of his devout followers exalted him as such, making him an incarnation not only of Kṛṣṇa but also of Rādhā. It is, however, remarkable that this doctrine of single or double incarnation is nowhere discussed by the six authoritative Gosvāmins. Nor do they anywhere recognise or inculcate as a creed the worship of Caitanya or his image, although this became a notable feature of the later development of the faith.

Whatever might have been the case, the fact remains that Caitanya never thought it necessary to emulate the founders of other Vaiṣṇava Sampradāyas in the writing of religious or speculative works himself, nor did he care much about himself putting together what he taught and practised. The only work that can be ascribed to him with certainty consists of the eight verses which are attributed to him in Rūpa

Gosvāmin's *Paḍyāvalī* (nos. 22, 31, 32, 71, 93, 94, 324, 337). The eight verses which are assigned here are also represented by Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja in the last chapter of his biography as having been uttered and explained by Caitanya himself, and they are named *Śikṣāṣṭaka* (C-C, Antya, xx, 64-65). Kṛṣṇadāsa states:

पूर्वे अष्ट श्लोक करि लोके शिक्षा दिला ।

सेइ अष्ट श्लोक आपने आखादिला ॥

Caitanya is made to recite and explain these verses to Svarūpa and Rāmānanda at Puri; but the word *pūrre* in the statement quoted above perhaps suggests that the verses were probably composed by him long before this. This supposition would explain the somewhat curious fact that the *Paḍyāvalī*,⁹ unlike most other works of Rūpa Gosvāmin, does not contain any Namaskriyā to Caitanya but that it still contains these verses assigned to Śrī-Bhagavat. It is probable that this anthology was an early compilation, which Rūpa Gosvāmin might have completed before he left Rāmakeli to become a professed follower of Caitanya. If this surmise is correct, then it is likely that these verses, which Caitanya probably composed in his younger days at Navadvīpa, were naturally included by Rūpa in his collection of Vaiṣṇava verses. The honorific epithet Śrī-Bhagavat is not inconsistent with the conjecture; for the glorification, or even deification, of Caitanya must have already begun at Navadvīpa and created the mass of miraculous Navadvīpa legends which Vṛndāvana-dāsa collects in his biography. We are also told by the *Bhakti-ratnākara* that Rūpa was already predisposed towards Vaiṣṇavism and Caitanya before he became an actual convert to Caitanyaism and that he was even at this early period already in touch with Navadvīpa. If this surmise about the inclusion of Caitanya's verses in an anthology which, even though compiled by one of his closest disciples, contains no Namaskriyā to him, be not acceptable, then one

9 A critical edition of this work by the present writer, based on 16 manuscripts, is being printed and will be published shortly in the Dacca University Oriental Publications Series. The numbering of the verse as well as attribution are cited here as they are in this edition. The verses are given almost in the same order as above in Kṛṣṇadāsa's work. These verses are found in all Mss of the *Paḍyāvalī* and are uniformly assigned to Caitanya.

must presume that these verses were added at a subsequent revision of the work. This alternative presumption, however, is open to the objection that if we presume subsequent revision and addition, it is inexplicable why a Namaskriyā to Caitanya could not also have been similarly added when the work was revised. Whatever might be the explanation, there is, however, nothing which would throw doubt on the genuineness of these verses, with the exception of the second verse given below, which is found assigned to one Madhusūdana in the *Subhāṣitāvalī* of Vallabhaḍeva. But this ascription of the *Subhāṣitāvalī* is undoubtedly overridden by the testimony of Rūpa Gosvāmin whom we can certainly take as a better authority on this point. These eight verses by Caitanya are in the order in which they are given in the *Padyāvalī*.

चेतोदर्पणमार्जनं भवमहादावाम्निनिर्वापणं
श्रेयः कैरवचन्द्रिकावितरणं विद्यावधूजीवनम् ।
आनन्दाम्बुधिवर्धनं प्रतिपदं पूर्णामृतास्वादनं
सर्वात्मस्नपनं परं विजयते श्रीकृष्णसङ्कीर्तनम् ॥१॥

नाम्नामकारि बहुधा निजसर्वशक्ति-
स्तत्रार्पिता नियमितः स्वरणे न कालः ।
एतादृशी तव कृपा भगवन्ममापि
दुर्दैवमीदृशमिहाजनि नानुरागः ॥२॥

तृणादपि सुनीचेन तरोरपि सहिष्णुना ।
अमानिना मानदेन कीर्तनीयः सदा हरिः ॥३॥

अयि नन्दतनूज किङ्करं
पतितं मां विषमे भवाम्बुधौ ।
कृपया तव पादपङ्कज-
स्थितध्रुवीसदृशं विभावय ॥४॥
नयनं गलदम्बुधारया
वदनं गद्गदरुद्धया गिरा ।
पुलकैर्निचितं वपुः कदा
तव नामग्रहणे भविष्यति ॥५॥

न धनं न जनं न सुन्दरौ
 कवितां वा जगदीश कामये ।
 मम जन्मनि जन्मनीश्वरे
 भवताद् भक्तिरहेतुकी त्वयि ॥६॥
 युगायितं निमेषेण चक्षुषा प्राश्रुषायितम् ।
 शून्यायितं जगत्यापि गोविन्दविरहेण मे ॥७॥
 आश्लिष्य वा पादरतां पिनष्टु मा-
 मदर्शनान्मर्महतां करोतु वा ।
 यथातथा वा विदधातु लम्पटो
 मत्प्राणनाथस्तु स एव नापरः ॥८॥

These verses are expressions of devotion simply. Their earnestness and depth of feeling cannot be mistaken, and it is not necessary to read any abstruse theological meaning into them. Apart from such theological bias, one can very well take them as the utterances of a god-intoxicated devotee surrendering his all and pining for his deity Kṛṣṇa. If in the last verse cited above, the devotee imagines himself as Rādhā longing for her beloved, it need not be taken as supporting the special theological creed that Kṛṣṇa incarnated himself in Caitanya both as Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā; for one of the essential modes of devotional realisation of this sect, as practised by Caitanya, consists of the practice of Rāgānugā Bhakti, an emotional state in which the devotee imagines himself as one of the dear ones of Kṛṣṇa.

In the *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* of Kṛṣṇadāsa, Caitanya is made to recite some other Sanskrit verses, but it is not clear if they were actually composed by him, e.g. *Ādi*, xvi, 82:

अम्बुजमम्बुनि जातं क्वचिदपि न जातमम्बुजादम्बु ।
 मुरभिदि तद्विपरीतं पादाम्भोजान्महानदी जाता ॥

Also *Madhya*. i, 211 (which Caitanya is stated to have spoken to instruct Rūpa) but the verse actually occurs in *Pañcadaśī* ix, 84:

परव्यसनिनी नारी व्यग्रापि गृहकर्मणि
 तमेवास्वादयत्यन्तर्नवसङ्गरसायनम् ॥

Another passage of a more sententious character is said to have been uttered by Caitanya (*Āntya* vi, 285); it exposes and censures the im-

proper expectations which a begging ascetic often entertains with regard to the alms he gets in his wanderings:

अयमागच्छत्ययं दास्यत्यनेन दत्तमयमपरः ।

समेत्ययं दास्यत्यनेनापि न दत्तमन्यः समेष्यति स दास्यति ॥

Also, Madhya ii, 45:

न प्रेमगन्धोऽस्ति दरोऽपि मे हरौ

क्रन्दामि सौभाग्यभरं प्रकाशितुम् ।

वंशीविलास्याननलोकनं विना

बिभर्मि यत् प्राणपतङ्गकान् वृथा

Jīva Gosvāmin in his *Bhakti-sandarbhā*, p. 477, cites the verse no. 39 of the *Padyāvalī*¹⁰ as being composed by the Bhagavat (*kali-yuga-pāranāvatāreṇa śrī-bhagavatā*) who sanctified the Kali-Yuga by his descent, a description which Jīva Gosvāmin also applies to the case of no. 32 (*trṇād api sunīcna*, cited above) which verse occurs in the *Sikṣāṣṭaka* ascribed to Caitanya as well as in this Anthology as Caitanya's. The *Caitanya-bhāgavata* puts the following half-verse in the mouth of Caitanya:

प्रासादाग्रे निवसति पुरः स्मेरवक्त्रारविन्दो

मामालोक्य स्मितसुवदनो बालगोपालमूर्तिः ॥

A Sanskrit work called *Gopāla-caritra* (Mitra, *Notices* iii, no. 1118) or *Rādhā-* or *Gopī-premāmṛta* (Mitra, *Notices* ii, no. 736), written in the form of a Sanskrit Campū with prose and verse, passes current as a work by Caitanya. It has been printed at the Radharaman Press, Berhampore and published at Murshidabad, 1335 B.S. = 1927 A.D.; but it is curious that the name of the author in the printed edition is given as Mohinī Mohana Lāhidī Vidyālaṅkāra of the village Malaṅga. Three of its verses (*Naukā-khāṇḍa*, nos. 12, 18, 19, pp. 33 and 36), however, are quoted in the *Padyāvalī* as nos. 275, 273 and 274; but two of these (nos. 274 and 275) are assigned by all our sixteen MSS of the

श्रुतमप्यौपनिषदं दूरे हरिकथामृतात् ।

यत्र सन्ति द्रवञ्चितकम्पाश्रुपुलकोद्गमाः ॥

Rūpa Gosvāmin in his anthology ascribes this verse to *Śrī-bhagavad-ryūsa-pādāh*.

Pañjāvulī to Manohara (Manoraka, DA) and the remaining one (no. 273) is given anonymously as *kuṣyucit*, although one of our MSS (PB) would assign even this verse to Manohara. On this, as well as on other grounds the attribution of the *Gopāla-caritra* or *Premāmṛta* to Caitanya is unjustifiable.

A commentary on Bilvamaṅgala's *Kṛṣṇa-karṇāmṛta* is ascribed to Caitanya-deva in R. G. Bhandarkar's *Report 1884-87* (Bombay 1894), p. 48, no. 326; but this is apparently a mistake for Caitanya-dāsa, who wrote a commentary, entitled *Subodhinī* on Bilvamaṅgala's poem. This Caitanya-dāsa appears to have been one of the Gosvāmins of Vṛndāvana at whose command Kṛṣṇadāsa wrote his Bengali biography of Caitanya.¹¹ He is said to have been a disciple of Bhūgarbha Gosvāmin and worshipper of the Gopāla-image at Vṛndāvana; sometimes he is identified with Caitanyadāsa-sena, son of Śivānanda-sena and brother of Paramānanda-dāsa-sena Kavi-karṇapūra. The commentary has been printed, but a good manuscript of the work exists in the Dacca University Manuscripts Library. In the concluding verse¹² there is a reference to Caitanya-dāsa's being a Govinda-pūjaka. It is a brief but good commentary which has been appropriated very largely by Kṛṣṇa-dāsa Kavirāja in his own commentary (*Sāraṅga-raṅgāḍā*) on Bilvamaṅgala's Stotra.

Various short collections of verses of the Stotra type are often found ascribed to Caitanya, but none of them appears to be genuine. They are either the works of Caitanya-dāsa referred to above or some less known Caitanya Gosvāmin or of even some anonymous scribblers, over the performance of which no sane criticism will ever be enthusiastic. But they are all piously attributed to Caitanya, after the old manner of lumping all anonyma upon a single author or personage of traditional repute. At any rate, if by any chance any of them prove to be genuine works of Caitanya, they would hardly redound to his credit. We have, for instance, in the Dacca University Manuscript collection a series of 25 eulogistic Kṛṣṇaite verses in Anuṣṭubh Śloka metre entitled *Premāmṛta-rasāyana*. One of the manuscripts (MS no. 2542) of the work

11 C-C, Adi viii, 69.

12 श्रीगोविन्दपदसेवाप्रभावदुदिता स्वयम् । टीका चैतन्यदासस्य कृष्णकर्णामृताश्रया ॥

ascribes it in the colophon to Caitanya thus: *śrī-jagaj-jīvanānanda-śrī-kṛṣṇa-caitanya-candra-mukha-nirgataṃ premāmṛta-rasāyanaṃ stotram*; but another manuscript of the same work (no. 3628) ascribes it in the colophon simply to Śrī-Caitanya Gosvāmin.¹³ Other works of the same type found in our manuscript collection are: *Yugaic-parihāra-stotra* (8 verses) and *Śrī-rūdhikāṣṭottarasūta-nāma* (a fragment of 17 verses in Anuṣṭubh Śloka metre). Many other sectarian compositions of this kind will possibly be discovered in other collections, but it is not necessary to waste time over these poor productions which no amount of misdirected zeal will be able to glorify even by the strange device of associating them with the name of Caitanya.

A Bengali version by Kṛṣṇakiṅkara-Dāsa of the Sanskrit *Bhakti-bhāva-pradīpa* of Jayagopāla-Dāsa, disciple of Sundarānanda,¹⁴ a MS of which, existing in the Dacca University collection (no. 3065), appears to have been copied in Śaka 1630=1708 A.D., quotes, however, several verses (sl. 8b to 21a, as given below) from the *Premāmṛta-rasāyana* referred to above, and ascribes the work distinctly to Caitanya (*viśeṣataḥ premāmṛte śrī-caityanenoktam*, fol. 164b). This testi-

13 This may or may not be Caitanyadāsa Gosvāmin.

14 This Sundarānanda may or may not be the Sundarānanda who is referred to by Kṛṣṇadāsa (C-C, Ādi xi, 23) as a disciple of Nityānanda and as belonging to the Nityānanda-śākhā. See also C-C, Antya vi, 61; C-Bh, Antya vi; *Gaura-gaṇoddeśa*, śl. 127. He is regarded in the later hagiology of the sect as one of the twelve Gopāls (*dvādaśa-gopāla*), an incarnation of Sudāman. This Kṛṣṇakiṅkara was probably the younger brother of Kāśīrāma-dāsa, the famous Bengali translator of the *Mahābhārata*; for from his Bengali *Śrī-kṛṣṇa-vilāsa* it appears that his original name Kṛṣṇa-dāsa was changed by his Guru, Gopāla (or Jaya-gopāla as here) Dāsa, into Kṛṣṇakiṅkara. The present Bengali version of the *Bhakti-bhāva-pradīpa*, however, has not been mentioned by Dinesh Chandra Sen nor noticed in any catalogue of Bengali manuscripts. The original Sanskrit work, however, has been noticed by Aufrecht (i, p. 290a). Another Sanskrit work by the same author, entitled *Bhakti-ratnākara*, is noticed by Rajendra Lala Mitra, *Notices* ix, no. 2918, p. 31. The name of the author, however, is given by Mitra as Gopāla Dāsa (and not Jaya-gopāla Dāsa), which appears to be a mistake; for one of the concluding verses cited by him from this work says: *prathayati jayt-sabdād yaḥ tu gopāla-dāsaḥ*. The date of composition of this work is given as Śaka 1511=1589 A.D. It is also quoted in the *Bhakti-bhāva-pradīpa* as *madīye bhakti-ratnākare*.

mony of a late work need not be taken as conclusive, but it indicates the fact that by this time the *Premāmṛta-rasāyana*, rightly or wrongly, came to be attributed to Caitanya. There are, however, several ascriptions in this Bengali version of the *Bhakti-bhāva-pradīpa*, which are positively wrong, and which certainly throw doubt upon the accuracy of the attribution to Caitanya. For instance, on fol. 170b it ascribes a verse to Rūpa which is stated to occur in the *Bhāgarata-saṅdarbha*.¹⁵ Neither is the *Bhāgarata-saṅdarbha* by Rūpa, nor does the cited verse occur in it. As the *Premāmṛta-rasāyana* Sotra, however, is short, consisting only of the 35 verses in Anuṣṭubh Sloka metre, we transcribe it in an Appendix to this essay as a curiosity which illustrate certain aspects of the later development of the cult. The theme is a description of Kṛṣṇa's qualities as contemplated by Rādhā, but it is really a Kṛṣṇaite Stotra of hardly any great merit. There is no inherent impossibility of its being Caitanya's own composition, unless it is by Caitanya-dāsa; but the question must be left open until there is more conclusive evidence to that effect.

S. K. DE

APPENDIX

प्रेमामृतरसायनस्तोत्रम् ❀

श्रीराधाकृष्णाम्यां नमः ।

एकदा कृष्णविरहाद् ध्यायन्ती प्रियसङ्गमम् ।

मनोबाष्पनिरासार्थं जल्पतीदं मुहुर्मुहुः ॥१॥

कृष्णः कृष्णोन्दुरानन्दो गोविन्दो गोकुलोत्तमवः ।

5

15 तथाहि भागवतसन्दर्भे रूपदेवस्य वचनम्—

तादृशभावं प्रथयितुमिह हि योऽवतारतामाप ।

आदुर्जनगणशरणां जयति चैतन्यविग्रहः कृष्णः ॥

* This transcription is based generally on Dacca University Library Ms no. 3628, with variants noted from Ms no. 2542. The first named Ms (marked here as A) in Bengali character consists of only one folio, having 14 and 15 lines respectively on its two pages: neatly written, fairly correct, modern script of probably the early 19th century. The second Ms (marked here as B) is much older, worn out and faded in many places; part of the first page (fol. 1b) being entirely indistinct and faded out. It consists of 3 folios (beginning on 1b and ending on 3a) of 9 lines to a page, excepting fol. 3a which contains 8 lines.

गोपालो गोपगोपीशो वल्लवेन्द्रो ब्रजेश्वरः ॥२॥	
प्रत्यहं नूतनतरस्तरुणानन्दविग्रहः ।	
आनन्दैकसुखस्वामी सन्तोषाक्षयकोषभूः ॥३॥	
आभीरिकाजनानन्दः परमानन्दकन्दलः ।	
शृन्दावनकलानाथो ब्रजाङ्गननवाङ्कुरः ॥४॥	5
नयनानन्दकुसुमो ब्रजभाग्यफलोदयः ।	
प्रतीक्षणातिसुखदो मोहनो मधुरद्युतिः ॥५॥	
सुधानिर्यासनिचयः सुन्दरः श्यामलाकृतिः ।	
नवयौवनसम्पूर्णः श्यामामृतरसाकरः ॥६॥	
इन्द्रनीलमणिस्वच्छो दलिताञ्जनचिह्नः ।	10
इन्दीवरसुखस्पर्शो नीरदस्निग्धसुन्दरः ॥७॥	
कर्पूरागुरुकस्तूरीकुङ्कुमाद्यङ्गधूसरः ।	
सुकुञ्चितकचस्त्वोक्षसञ्चारुशिखण्डकः ॥८॥	
मत्तालिविभ्रमत्पारिजातपुष्पावतंसकः ।	
आननेन्दुजितानन्तपूर्णशारदचन्द्रमाः ॥९॥	15
श्रीमङ्गलाटपाटीरतिलकालकरञ्जितः ।	
नीलोन्नतभ्रूविलासो मदालसविलोचनः ॥१०॥	
आकर्णारक्तसौन्दर्यलहरीदृष्टिमन्थरः ।	
घूर्णायमाननयनः साचीक्षणविचक्षणः ॥११॥	
अपाङ्गेज्जितसौभाग्यतरलीकृतचेतनः ।	20
ईषन्मुद्रितलोलाक्षः सुनासापुटसुन्दरः ॥१२॥	
गरुडप्रान्तोक्षसत्स्वर्णमकराकृतिकुण्डलः ।	
प्रसन्नानन्दवदनो जगदाह्लादकारकः ॥१३॥	
सुस्मेरामृतलावण्यप्रकाशीकृतदिङ्मुखः ।	
सिन्दूरारुणसुस्निग्धमाणिक्यदशनच्छदः ॥१४॥	25
पीयूषाधिकमाथीकसूक्तिभ्रुतिरसायनः ।	
स्निग्धललितस्तिर्यग्ग्रीवस्तैलोक्यमोहनः ॥१५॥	

2 नूतनस्तत्र B. 12 •कुङ्कुमाङ्गाङ्गधूसरः B 13 सुकुञ्चितकचस्वच्छो • A.
 20 •सौन्दर्य• for •सौभाग्य• A 21 सुनासापुष्ट • A
 24 सुस्मेरामृतसौन्दर्य A

कुञ्चिताधरसंसक्तकूजद्वेणुविनोदवान् ।	
कङ्कणाङ्गदकेयूरमुद्रिकाविलसद्भ्रजः ॥१६॥	
स्वर्णसूत्रमुविन्यस्तर्कास्तुभामुक्तकन्धरः ।	
मुक्ताहारोत्सवद्वचः स्फुरत्श्रीवत्सलाञ्जनः ॥१७॥	
आपीनहृदयो नीपमालावान् बन्धुरोदरः ।	5
सम्बीतपीतवसनो रसनाविलसत्कटिः ॥१८॥	
अन्तरीणधटीबन्धः प्रपदान्दोलिताञ्जलः ।	
अरविन्दपदद्वन्द्वकलादध्वनितनूपुरः ॥१९॥	
पल्लवारुणामाधुर्यसुकुमारपदाम्बुजः ।	
नखचन्द्रजिताशेषदर्पणेन्दुमणिप्रभः ॥२०॥	10
श्वजवजाङ्गशाम्भोजराजशरणपल्लवः ।	
वैलोक्याद्भ्रतसौन्दर्यपरिपाकमनोहरः ॥२१॥	
साक्षात्केलिकलामूर्तिः परिहासरसार्णवः ।	
यमुनोपवनश्रेणीविलासी व्रजनागरः ॥२२॥	
गोपाङ्गनाजनासक्तो वृन्दावनपुरन्दरः ।	15
आभीरनागरीप्राणनायकः कामशेखरः ॥२३॥	
यमुनानाविको गोपीपारावारकृतोद्यमः ।	
राधावरोधनिरतः कदम्बवनमन्दिरः ॥२४॥	
व्रजयोषित्सदाहृद्यो गोपीलोचनतारकः ।	
जीवनानन्दरसिकः पूर्णानन्दकुतूहली ॥२५॥	20
गोपिकाकुचकस्तूरीपङ्किलः केलिलालयः ।	
अलक्षितकुटीरस्थो राधासर्वस्वमम्पुटः ॥२६॥	
वल्लवीवदनाम्भोजमधुमत्तमधुव्रतः ।	
निगूढरसविद् गोपीचित्ताह्लादकलानिधिः ॥२७॥	
कालिन्दीपुलिनानन्दी क्रीडाताण्डवमगिडतः ।	25

3 ०कौस्तुभामुक्तमुन्दरः A

8 ०द्वन्द्वकलाध्वनित० A

9 ०वधूकारुणामाधुर्य० B

15 ०वृन्दारण्यपुरन्दरः B 18 ०राधावरुद्धनिरतः B ; राधावरोधनरतः

20 ०कुतूहलः B

23 ०वदनाम्भोजमधुपान० B.

24 ०रसविद् योऽपि B

25 ०ताण्डवमगिडतः A

आभीरिकाजनानङ्गरङ्गभूमिः स वै हरिः ॥२८॥	
विदग्धगोपवनिताचित्ताकूतविनोदवान् ।	
नानोपायनपाणिश्च गोपनारोगणावृतः ॥२९॥	
वाञ्छाकल्पतरुः कामकलारसशिरोमणिः ।	
कोटीकन्दर्पलावण्यः कोटीन्दुललितद्युतिः ॥३०॥	5
जगत्त्रयमनोमोहकरो मन्मथमन्मथः ।	
गोपसीमन्तिनोशश्वद्भावापेक्षापरायणः ॥३१॥	
नवीनमधुरस्नेहप्रियसोप्रेमसञ्चयः ।	
गोपीमनोरथाक्रान्तो नाट्यलीलाविशारदः ॥३२॥	
प्रत्यङ्गरभसावेशः प्रेमदाप्राणवल्लभः ।	10
रासोल्लासमदोन्मत्तो राधिकारतिलम्पटः ॥३३॥	
खेलालीलापरिश्रान्तिस्वेदाम्बुरुचिराननः ।	
गोपीस्वाङ्गलसत्श्रीमान् मलयानिलसेवितः ॥३४॥	
इत्येवं प्राणनाथस्य प्रेमामृतरसायनम् ।	
यः पठेच्छ्रावयेद् वापि स प्रेम लभते ध्रुवम् ॥३५॥	15
इति श्रीचैतन्यगोस्वामिना विरचितं प्रेमामृतस्तोत्रं सम्पूर्णम्॥	

1 ०रङ्गभूमिसुधाकरः B

2 ०वनिताचित्ताद्रित(ट)मोदकः B

10 ०प्रमदाप्राण० B

12 ०लीलापरिसङ्गः स्वेद० A ; रचिताननः B

16 इति श्रीजगज्जीवनानन्दश्रीकृष्णचैतन्यचन्द्रमुखनिर्गतं प्रेमामृतरसायनं
स्तोत्रं सम्पूर्णम् B

A Dated Copper-Plate Grant from Sundarban

I

The copper-plate, in question, was discovered, quite accidentally, during reclamation of land from the dense primitive forest in F Plot, West Sunderban, near the sea-coast of Bengal. The site which is situated in the islet of Rakhsaskhali, not far from the mouth of the river Hughly, is bounded by the vast expanse of water called the Satamukhi river on the west and the comparatively smaller estuary Burirtat on the east.¹ The copper-plate was discovered while excavating one of the many earth mounds scattered over the ground, each containing a square brick chamber with an extraordinary thick wall, surrounded by another thinner wall at a little distance. The chambers are now roof-less, but the thickness of the walls indicate that formerly they supported one or more storeys. The presence, however, of a Buddhist monument, referred to in the inscription, is significant. The historic importance of the forest land is not only attested by the remains of temples and stray sculptures in stone, but also by the existence, in the neighbourhood, of a village with the significant name "Pāthar-pratimā." It is also evident that this portion of Sundarban, now infested by wild beasts, was a flourishing centre of civilization, with the old course of the Ganges flowing by, at last up to the time of the Muhammedan invasion.

The inscription is written on one side, is plated with a thin lining of silver. Such silver-plated inscriptions are rather rare. Apart from the material and the valuable and interesting data contained in the grant,² the copper-plate contains, on the reverse, the only engraved

1 For exact location See *Varendra Research Society's Monograph No. 4. Rajshahi, 1930*; map facing p. 12.

2 It appears to me that contrary to our prevailing notion, just on the eve of the Muhammadan invasion, parts of lower Bengal did not recognize the Sena supremacy and were controlled by a hitherto unknown Pāla family, probably a branch of the Gurjara Pratihāras of Kanauj, who successfully raided and temporarily occupied portion of Bengal during the Imperial Pālas.

drawing of any importance as yet found, and represents the only Brāhminical composition so far discovered. Its iconographic and æsthetic significance, also, is of great interest.³

The engraving consists of a Vaiṣṇavite group on the upper part of the plate, comprising a striking image of sitting Viṣṇu, with a beflowered standard and sun-shade at the back and a kneeling devotee, probably Garuḍa in front. The peculiar character of the representation is further enhanced by the fact that Viṣṇu (hailed in the inscription as 'Bhagavānnārayāna'), which evidently belongs to the Nṛsimha variety, as warranted by the arrangement of the emblems in the four hands, is squatting gracefully in the Lalitāsana pose, on a wheeled chariot, in three-quarter profile. While the figure of Garuḍa (?) prominent for its staff under the armpit, remarkable mien, and impassioned appeal confronts the divinity in strict profile. The god is resplendent in his usual jewellery and embellishment but his attendant is characterised by a severe though affective treatment.

From the peculiar style and technical language, the piece can be safely ascribed to the latter part of the twelfth century A.D. The present engraving may also offer valuable clues to the development of Nepalese and Burmese painting, whose Bengali components have been long ago pointed out by Coomaraswamy⁴ and so clearly elucidated by Kramrisch⁵ recently. Its remote connection with Wayang pictures of Java and Bali is also equally obvious.

II

The inscription which is complete in 22 lines is engraved on one side of a single copper-plate measuring about 10½" × 8½" inches. A slice measuring half an inch in length has peeled off from the top, causing

3 A full description and critical estimate of the engraving is given by Mr. Devaprasad Ghosh, in the June number of the *Journal of the Indian Society of Oriental Art*, Calcutta.

4 Coomaraswamy, A. K., *History of Indian and Indonesian Art*. pp. 114, 146, 172.

5 Kramrisch, St., *Nepalese Paintings; Journ. Ind. Soc. Oriental Art*. Dec., 1933.

the disappearance of a portion of a name in the first line, a name which, if preserved in full, would have probably proved a valuable historical clue.

Another small part has similarly been lost at the bottom with the consequence that the day of the month, on which the inscription was engraved, cannot be precisely ascertained. There is besides a thin crack about 3" inches in length running from the bottom right through the middle of the last seven lines of the inscription, which has caused a slight disfigurement of some of the letters. In addition to this, one or two letters have been slightly damaged, probably in the course of the cleansing process to which the plate was subjected. The inscription is otherwise in an excellent state of preservation and is engraved in bold characters of the proto-Bengali script which was current in the 12th century A.D. Of the initial vowels, *a*, *ā*, *i* and *u*, which occur in the inscription, the first two are represented by forms which are almost completely modern. The form for *u* (*ubhau* in 1.16) shows a well-formed curve¹ towards the right as an accretion to the inward curvature of the vertical line, which has not been carried as in its modern prototype upward to reach the top-stroke.² The additional curve which is to be seen in the modern form above the top-stroke is also absent. The form for the initial *i* (*iti* in 1.19) calls for special notice as being somewhat uncommon. The signs for the medial vowels, excepting those for *u*, *ū*, *r*, are nearly the same as those found in the modern Bengali script. As regards the consonants, most of the signs as used in the record, notably those for *c*, *j*, *ṭ*, *t*, *d*, *dh*, *p*, *bh*, *l*, and *h*, are more or less in the intermediate or transitional stage. In some cases *r* is present with a dot, an essential accompaniment of the modern Bengali form. The transitional form for *ṛ* has been throughout used with one or two exceptions where the approximation to the modern sign is much closer (e.g. the first *ṛ* in *puṇyākarmāṇau*, 1.15). The *anunāsikā* is used once, e.g. in *anyāṃśca*, 1.5). The sign is given in a slanting

1 Cf. some Rāṣṭrakūṭa inscriptions of the 9th century, where a similar tendency is noticed. For illustration see Bühler, *Indische Palaeographie*, Tafel V, 5.

2 *Ibid.*, Tafel VI, X, 5.

position below the level of the top-stroke and may be contrasted with the form occurring in some copper-plate grants of the period.³ The sign for visarga generally employed in this inscription, consisting of two circles joined together, agrees with the one given as an alternative form in the copper-plate of Viśvarūpasena, son of Lakṣmaṇasena, preserved in the Museum of the Vaṅgīya Sāhitya Pariṣat, Calcutta.⁴ In respect of orthography, the peculiarities observed are the doubling of consonants with a superscript *r* and occasionally of *t* with a subscript *r*, the use of the same sign for *v* and *b*, the conjunction of a final *m* with a following *c*, and a tendency to leave Sandhi unformed in some cases. The language of the record is Sanskrit. With the exception of the usual imprecatory and didactic verses the inscription is throughout in prose.

The inscription is dated in the Śaka year 1118 (=1196 A.D.) and records the grant of a village called V(Dh)āmahithā by a Sāmantarāja Śrī Maḍommaṇapāla by name, to Mahārāṇaka Vāsudeva Śarmaṇ, a student of the Kāṇva branch of the Yajurveda. The Sāmanta is described as meditating on a Mahāmāṇḍalika whose name ends with Pāla and seems to begin with Śrī. The letter preceding 'Pāla' can be easily read as *s*, but there must have been another letter before it, while has been peeled off.⁵ Sāmanta Maḍommaṇapāla is mentioned in the record to have belonged to a Pāla family (l.3) which hailed from Ayodhyā⁶ and secured Purva-Khāṭikā where the village granted must have been situated. The name Khāṭikā will remind one of Khāḍī which is mentioned as a

3 *Ep. Ind.*, XIV, p. 160. ll. 35, 36, and Plate facing p. 161.; N. G. Majumdar, *The Inscriptions of Bengal*, Plate facing p. 88, l. 32.

4 *Ind. Hist. Quart.*, vol. II, no. 1, pp. 77-86, and Plates; *The Inscriptions of Bengal*, pp. 140-148, and Plates.

5 's' was probably part of a conjunct letter. The lost letter may have been single or conjunct with or without a medial vowel accompanying it.

6 For another reference to an Ayodhyā in a Bengal inscr. see Damodarpur copper-plate (d. 224 Gupta era), *Ep. Ind.*, XV, p. 113; XVII, p. 193). 'Ayodhyā' seems to be a familiar place-name in the district of the 24-Parganas. There are at least two villages of this name (Ayodhyānagar) within the Diamond Harbour subdivision, one belonging to the Pargana Azimabad and the other to Maidan-mahl. (=Maḍommaṇapala?).

bhukti in the Barrackpore grant of Vijayasena⁷ and as a *viṣaya* in the lost Sunderban copper-plate of Lakṣmaṇasena.⁸ A Pargana in Diamond Harbour subdivision is still known by the name of Khādī.⁹ It is likely that the Pūrva-Khāṭikā of the present record comprised the eastern portion of what was formerly called Khādī, and which is now represented by the pargana bearing the same name. It is interesting to note that there was a Buddhist monument (*ratnatraya-vahih* 1.17) in the neighbourhood of the village Vā(Dh?)mahithā. The formal communication of the gift of this village was made to ministers and other officers at Śrī-Dvārahaṭāka which was probably the chief town of Pūrva-Khāṭika. It will be noticed that the donor's predecessor, the Mahāmāṇḍalika, was a Śaiva (*Parama-Māheśvara* 1.1), his own attitude towards the deity Nārāyaṇa being friendly (*bhagarān-Nārāyaṇa-nirdroha* 1.2). In regard to the picture of a Vaiṣṇava worshipper to be seen on the other side of the plate, one wonders if it is a representation of the vassal himself.

The new inscription will be welcomed by scholars as a contribution to the history of Bengal in the 12th century A.D. Its importance is enhanced by reason of the date contained in it, for none of the inscriptions of pre-Muhammadan times, previously recovered in Bengal, are definitely known to be dated in the Śaka era.¹⁰ The present inscription which is to be placed before the Muhammadan Conquest is thus in a unique position as being the only record

7 *Ep. Ind.*, XV, p. 283.

8 For an abstract of the text see Majumdar, *op. cit.*, p. 171.

9 *Ibid.*, pp. 61, 170. One of the principal villages of this Pargana is also known by the same name. See Kalidas Dutt's article in Varendra Research Society's Monographs, Nos. 3 & 4; Hunter, *A Statistical Account of Bengal*, vol. I, p. 106, p. 355.

10 The Bāṅgaḍ Pillar-inscription of a Kāmbōja Gauḍapati is a probable exception. See *J. & Proc. A.S.B.*, VII, 1914, p. 619. But the matter is controversial. See *Vaṅgavāṇī*, a Bengali journal, 1330 B.S., pp. 249-252; *J. & Proc. A.S.B.*, 1931, p. 141. The Tipperah Plate of Harikūladeva Raṇavāṅkamalla(?) and the Chittagong plate of Dāmodara are later than the new inscription, being dated respectively in the Śaka years 1141 & 1165. See Kielhorn's List of Inscriptions of Northern India, Nos. 365, 366; D. R. Bhandarkar's Revised List, *Ep. Ind.*, XX, part IV, p. 151.

whose date is explicitly referred to the Śaka era. Muhammadan authority was inaugurated in Bengal within a decade of the date of the new record. Whether it was Lakshmanasena or one of his sons, who was seated on the throne of Gauda in 1196 A.D., the date of this inscription, is a question of chronology, on which there may be differences of opinion, but it is certain that the province was under the rule of some Sena king at the time. Our inscription does not refer to him by name, but it is highly probable that his identity has been concealed under the imperial title 'Mahārājādhirāja' applied in the record to an unnamed paramount sovereign. If our interpretation of the text is to be regarded as correct,¹¹ it will be seen that Sāmanta Maḍommanapāla whose gift is recorded in the inscription, was hostile to the suzerain ruler. It has already been noticed that the Khādī district in Western Bengal was included in the dominions of Lakṣmaṇa-Sena, but it appears from the present record that the Sena dynasty could no more hold this possession in tact as the Pālas from Ayodhyā are credited with having established their authority in the eastern part of the territory. Altogether the evidence furnished by our document seems to point to the conclusion that the control exercised by the central government in the province had already been weakened before the onslaughts of the Muhammadan invader resulted in the dramatic fall of Nudiah and thus put an end to the Sena rule some time in the neighbourhood of 1205 A.D. As to the Pāla chiefs mentioned in the new inscription, one may note as significant Maḍommanapāla's description as a 'dhavala sāmantarāja' which

11 The passage in question is capable of an alternative interpretation. The two titles, Mahārājādhirāja and Mahāsāmantādhipati, may be taken as applying to Maḍommanapāla himself, the expression 'vipakṣa-sāmanta' in that case meaning 'one whose sāmantas have been reduced to helplessness'. According to this view, the Mahārājādhirāja will be found to be the same as the sāmanta-rāja, which does not sound quite convincing, particularly in view of the fact that the Senas were still the dominant power in the province. For another instance of a Sāmanta making a similar grant in Bengal, see L. D. Barnett, *Ep. Ind.*, XVIII, pp. 60-64. The list of royal officials paying allegiance to the Sāmantarāja in the present inscription may be explained as more or less conventional. His immediate predecessor was a Mahāmāṇḍalika, a vassal chief. The Ramganj copper-plate of Išvaraghoṣa shows that authority over similar officials could be claimed by a Mahāmāṇḍalika. See *Inscriptions of Bengal*, pp. 147-157.

probably contains a clue regarding the origin of his family. The existence of a Nāyaka or Mahānāyaka, Pratāpadhavala by name, who was the ruler of Jāpila at least from 1214 to 1225 V.S., is known from his own inscriptions found in Bihar.¹² He was probably a feudatory of Vijayacandra, the Gāhaḍavāla king of Kanauj, whose name occurs in the former's Tārācaṇḍi Rock inscription. Pratāpadhavala's family seems to have survived the extinction of the imperial Gāhaḍavāla dynasty well into the 13th century, maintaining a precarious existence against the Moslem invaders for some time. The Rohtasgadh Rock-inscription of Pratāpa, dated V.S. 1279, in which is to be found a reference to his contact with the Moslems (Yavana-dalana-līlā-māṃsala—), is regarded by Kielhorn as a record of Pratāpadhavala's family.¹³ In identifying Pratāpa of this inscription as a descendant of the Jāpila Mahānāyaka Pratāpadhavala he cites the phrase 'dhavalayati dharitrīm' used in this document as containing a useful hint. Inscriptions of Govindacandra and Jayaccandra recovered from Bihar¹⁴ testify to the successful attempt made by the Gāhaḍavālas of Kanauj in establishing their authority in certain portions of that region, apparently at the cost of the Pālas who had been driven from Bengal by the Senas in the first half of the 12th century. There are also indications of hostilities between the Gāhaḍavālas and the Senas. It is not improbable that Pratāpadhavala appeared in Bihar in the wake of the movement that culminated in the eastward extension of the Gāhaḍavāla power. The date of the new copper-plate from Sundarban falls within the period when his family is supposed to have been still in existence. The suggestion advanced here that the 'dhavala-sāmantarāja' of this copper-plate grant may have been connected with the feudatories of Jāpila seems to be worthy of consideration.¹⁵

12 Tārācaṇḍi Rock-inscr., *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. VI, pp. 547-549; Rohtasgadh Rock-inscr., *Ep. Ind.*, V, p. 22, No. 152; Tutrahi Falls Rock-inscr., *Ep. Ind.*, IV, p. 311.

13 *Ep. Ind.*, IV, pp. 310-312.

14 Lar Plate. *Ep. Ind.*, VII, pp. 98-100; Maner plate, *J. & Proc. A.S.B.*, 1922, pp. 81-84; Bodhgaya Stone-inscr., *Ind., Hist. Quart.*, 1929, pp. 14-30. Also see Benares grant of Jayaccandra, *Ind. Ant.*, XVIII, pp. 129-34.

15 One should not, however, overlook the difficulties involved in the theory. The use of the Śaka era in the Sundarban plate and the absence of any reference

TEXT

- L 1 Om¹⁶ svasti || Parama-Māheśvara samasta-supraśasty =
upeta mahāmāṇḍalika Śrī-Śrī—pāla-dev = ānudhyātah
- L 2 Mahāsāmant = ādhipati-mahārāj = ādhirāja-vipakṣa-sā-
manta bhagavān = Nārāyaṇa-nirdroha-dhavalā-sāmanta-
rāja
- L 3 Śrī-Maḍommaṇapāla-devaḥ kuśalī | Ayodhyā-viniḥṣṛita-
Pāl = ūnvay = opārjjita-pūrvva-Khāṭik = āntahpāti-svī
- L 4 yamukti-bhūmau śrī-Dvārahaṭūke sam = upāgat = āśeṣa-
rāja-rājanyaka-rājaputtra-rājñī-sapt = āmatya yāvad = ekū
- L 5 pātra-rāṇaka-daṇḍanāyak = ārohak = āṅga-rakṣaka caṭṭa-
bhaṭṭa-sevakādīn | Anyāṃ = śc = ākīrttitān rāja-pād = opa-
- L 6 jīvinaḥ prativāsino janapadān¹⁷ brāhmaṇ = ottamān yath-
ārhaṇ mānayati bodhayati samādiśati ca | Vidi-
- L 7 tam = astu bhavatām | Vāmahithā-grām = oyam ratnatraya-
vahiḥ catuḥ-sīm = āvacchinnah sa-jala-sthalah sa-gartt-
oṣa-
- L 8 rah sa-jhāṭa-viṭapah s = āmra-madhūkah | A-caṭṭa-bhaṭṭa-
praveśah | A-kiñcit-kara-grāhya parihṛita-sarvva-pī
- L 9 ḍah ā-candr = ārkka-kṣīti-sama-kālam yāvāt¹⁸ Vārd-
dhīnasa-sagotrāya Yajur = vved = ānta(-r) = ggata-Kāṇva-
śākh = ai-
- L 10 ka-deś = ādhyāyine | Somadeva-pauttrāya Puruṣottama-
deva-puttrāya | Mahārāṇaka-Śrī-Vā-

to the surname 'Pāla' in the records of the Jāpila family are points that may throw some doubt on the suggestion advanced above. But it may be mentioned in this connection that there is a theory connecting Pratāpadhavala's lineage with the solar family. See *Ep. Ind.*, IV, p. 311, fn 10. Maḍommaṇapāla's forefathers belonged to Ayodhyā, the traditional seat of that family. Was Palapāla related to these feudatories? He assumes the title of 'Gauḍeśvara' in the Jaynagar Inscr. dated in the 35th year of his reign, which must be assigned to the 12th century. Palapāla's connection with the Imperial Pālas lacks definite proof. See Cunningham's *Archaeological Survey Report*, III, No. 33; *J. Bihar & Or. Res. Soc.*, 1918, pp. 496 ff.

16 Expressed by a symbol.

17 Read Jā°

18 Read yāvād

- L 11 sudeva-śarmmaṇe san = mittrāya | Mittra-dānena a-kara-
sūsanīkṛitya pradatt = osmābhiḥ | Tad = yuṣmā-
L 12 bhiḥ sarvvair = eva bhāvibhir = api bhokṛibhiḥ | Bhūmer =
apaharaṇa-pātaka-bhayāt¹⁹ dānam = idam = anu-
L 13 mody = ānumody = ānupālaniyaṃ | Prativāsibhiḥ karṣa-
kai = śca samucita-kara-bhara-pratyay = ādikaṃ-
L 14 pradānaiḥ sthātavyaṃ | Bhavanti e = ātra dharmu-
ānusāriṇaḥ ślokāḥ²⁰ | Bahubhir = vvasudhā dattā rājabhiḥ
Saga-
L 15 rādibhiḥ | Yasya yasya yadā bhūmis = tasya tasya tadā
phalaṃ || Bhūmiṃ yaḥ pratigrihṇāti yaś = ca bhūmiṃ
pra-
L 16 yacchati | Ubhau tau puṇya-karmu = āṇau niyataṃ svar-
gga-gāminau || Gām = ekāṃ svarṇam = ekāṃ ca²¹ |
bhūmer = apya-
L 17 rddham = aṅgulaṃ | Haran = narakam = āpnoti yāvad =
āhūti²²-samplavaṃ || Śaṣṭimva²³ rṣa-sahasrāṇi sva(r)gge.
L 18 vasati bhūmidah | Akṣeptā e = āvamantā ca dvayaṅca
narakam vrajet || Sva-dattāṃ para-dattā-
L 19 mvā²⁴ yo hared = vasudhām = imām | Sa viṣṭhāyāṃ kṛimir
= bhūtvā pitribhiḥ saha pacyate || Iti.²⁵
L 20 kamala-dal = āmbu-vindulolāṃ śriyam = anucintya ma-
nuṣya-jīvitaṅca | Sakalam = idam = udā.
L 21 hṛitaṅca buddhvā Na hi puruṣaiḥ para-kīrttayo
vilopyāḥ. ||
L 22 Śakābdā (h) III8 vaiśākha—diné—1 (?)

TRANSLATION

Ll. 1-3—Om Prosperity! The handsome vassal chief, Śrī-
Maḍommaṇapālā-deva, a sāmanta who is hostile to the Mahārājādhi-
rāja, the paramount lord of sāmantas, who is friendly²⁶ to the god
Nārāyaṇa, meditating on the Parama-Māheśvara, Mahāmāṇḍalika, Śrī
Śrī-pāla-deva endowed with all the marks of praise due to him, and
being in sound health.

19 Read bhayād =

21 Read - Ņca

23 Read ṃ varṣa-

25 Metre: Puṣpītāgrā

20 The metre of these verses: Anuṣṭubh

22 Read āhūta

24 Read - ṃ vā

26 nirdroha: lit. friendship or alliance.

Ll. 3-6—duly honours, informs and commands all the Rājans, Rājanyakas, Rājaputras, Rājñīs, the seven amātyas, the entire host of servants, headed by the Ekapātra, Rāṇakas, Daṇḍanāyaka, Ārohakas (riders), the aṅgarakṣakas (body-guard), Chaṭṭas, Bhaṭṭas, and all others depending for their livelihood on His Royal Highness, who are not mentioned, the prativāsins (dwellers), jānapadas (provincials), the principal Brahmins, who have assembled at Śrī-Dvārahaṭāka, the place of his own salvation, situated within Eastern Kāṭilā won by the Pāla family proceeding from Ayodhyā :

Ll. 6-10—Be it known to you that this village, Vāmahithā, outside the *ratnatraya*, with its four boundaries fixed, along with water and land, pits and barren grounds, woods and trees, with mangoes, and blossoms from which liquor is distilled; not to be entered by Chaṭṭas and Bhaṭṭas, immune from the realization of any kind of tax, with forced labour abandoned

Ll. 10-13—is given away by Us, as a friendly gift, being rendered into a grant free from all taxation, to the good friend, the Mahūrāṇaka Śrī-Vāsudeva-Śarmaṇ of the Vārdhīnasa gotra, student of a portion of the Kāṇva branch of the Yajurveda, son of Puruṣottamadeva, grandson of Somadeva,—to last as long as the Moon, the Sun and the Earth endure.

Ll. 11-13—Therefore, this gift should be approved and maintained by you and all the future rulers too, out of fear for the sin caused by theft of land.

Ll. 13-14—The dwellers and cultivators shall remain by virtue of all payments such as tax, cess (?) and toll, etc, which are due.

Ll. 14-21—Here are the verses in pursuance of dharma : Land has been given away by many kings, such as Sagara. Whosoever at any time possesses the land, to him then belongs the fruit. Whoever accepts, and whoever grants, land, both perform a sacred deed and always go to heaven. One who takes away a cow, a piece of gold or land measuring even half a finger gets into Hell (where one remains) till the Deluge is called. He who bestows land resides in heaven for sixty thousand years and he who takes it away or approves (of such action) lives in Hell for the same length of time. He who takes away land given either by himself or by others changes into a

worm and rots in filth with his forefathers. Therefore, the good deeds of others should not be annihilated by men, considering that fortune and human life are as unsteady as a drop of water on a lotus-petal, and also appreciating all that has been cited here.

L.22—The Śaka year 1118, on the day of Vaiśākha.*

BENOY CHANDRA SEN
DEVAPRASAD GHOSH

* Part I of the article is written by Mr. D. P. Ghosh and Part II by Dr. B. C. Sen.

The Jaina Calendar

The astronomic chronological period on which the Jaina system is based is the well-known quinquennial *yuga* or cycle. It is the same as that of the *Jyotiṣa-vedāṅga* and is described in the *Garga Saṃhitā* as is to be seen in the extant fragments of the latter work. According to Varāhamihira's *Pañcasiddhāntikā*, it formed the fundamental doctrine of Paitāmaha Siddhānta which also Varāhamihira considers as one of the more important Siddhāntas known at his time. References to this cycle are met with in the early history of Buddhism.

In the Jaina astronomy a *yuga* consists of five years and begins with Abhijit. The lunar year and also the solar year commence at the same point or day and end at the same point or day once in every cycle of 30 years which is equal to 6 cycles of five years each. The lunar year gains 6×2 months and thus completes one complete intercalary year. Similarly, the solar, the Sāvana or seasonal, the lunar, and the Nakṣatra years begin on the same day and end on the same day or simultaneously begin and end once at the end of 12 cycles of 5 years each i.e. 60 years. It must be noted here that the lunar year is really equal to 354 days $5\frac{50}{8}$ muhūrtas. In a cycle of five years, there are 60 Solar months, 61 Rtu months, 62 Lunar months, and 67 Nakṣatra months. Similarly, the intercalary Lunar year, the Solar, the Rtu or Sāvana, the Lunar and the Nakṣatra years will simultaneously begin and end once in a great cycle of 156 cycles of 5 years each, for 156×5 years make 744 intercalary Lunar years, 780 Solar years, 793 Rtu years, 806 Lunar, and 871 Nakṣatra years.

One Nakṣatra year = $327\frac{51}{87}$ days

One Lunar year = $354\frac{2}{8}$ days

One Rtu year = 360 days

One Solar year = 366 days

The intercalary lunar year = 383 days $21\frac{8}{2}$ m.

The moon moves and coincides 67 times with Abhijit in a *yuga* of 5 years. The sun meets with the same star five times in a *yuga*.

The names of the months are:—

Modern names	Jaina names
1. Srāvaṇa	Abhinanda
2. Bhādrapada	Supraṭiṣṭha

3.	Āsvayuja	Vijaya
4.	Kārtika	Prītivardhana
5.	Mārgaśīrṣa	Śreyān
6.	Pauṣya	Śiva
7.	Māgha	Śīśira
8.	Phālguna	Haimavān
9.	Caitra	Vasanta
10.	Vaiśākha	Kusumasambhava
11.	Jaiṣṭha	Nidāgha
12.	Āsāḍha	Vanavirodhi

The year or the *saṃvatsara* is of four kinds:—

(1) Nakṣatra-saṃvatsara = 12 Nakṣatra māśas = $12 \times 27\frac{2}{6}\frac{1}{7}$ days = 327 days + $\frac{5}{8}\frac{1}{7}$ day.

(2) Yuga-saṃvatsara (cyclic year) = 5 years.

(3) Pramāṇa-saṃvatsara.

(4) Saturn-year.

The first is of 12 kinds, as Śrāvaṇa, Bhādrapada etc ; when Jupiter completes the whole circle of constellations once, it is called a Nakṣatra-saṃvatsara of 12 years.

Lunar year = $29\frac{3}{8}\frac{2}{2} \times 12 = 354$ days + $\frac{1}{8}\frac{2}{2}$ day. Intercalary Lunar year = $383\frac{4}{8}\frac{4}{2}$ days. Saura or Solar year = $12 \times 30\frac{1}{2} = 366$ days.

Thus, once in 30 solar months there will be one intercalary lunar month. Hence in a *yuga* of 60 solar months there will be two intercalary lunar months. Each lunar month contains two parvas. Therefore, a lunar year contains 24 parvas, and an intercalary year 26 parvas.

The Pramāṇa-saṃvatsara is of five kinds: *Nakṣatra* (sidereal), *Rtu* (seasonal), *Cāndra* (lunar), *Āditya* (solar) and intercalary lunar. The *Rtu* and *Āditya*-saṃvatsaras are thus explained :—

2 Ghaṭikās make one Muhūrta.

30 Muhūrtas make one Day and Night.

15 Ahorātras (Days and Nights) make one Pakṣa.

2 Pakṣas make one month.

12 Months make one Year.

The year of 360 days and nights is a *Rtu-saṃvatsara*. This has got two more names, *Karma-saṃvatsara* and *Sāvana-saṃvatsara*. The former name is given on account of the fact that it is popular among the workmen. Karma month has no fraction and facilitates calculations in worldly transactions; the rest have fractions and so are not convenient for calculation

purposes. Sāvana means engagement in work. Hence that year which is chiefly agreeable to work is Sāvana year. The year of 360 days is called Karma and also Sāvana year. Similarly, the solar year is the time taken by the rainy and other seasons for completion of one revolution. It is, however, usual to assign 60 days to each of the seasons. Still each one of them has 61 days. Hence the solar year contains 366 days. In a *yuga* there are three ordinary lunar years of $354\frac{1}{2}$ days and two intercalary years of $383\frac{4}{2}$ days. Hence in a *yuga* there are 62 Lunar months and 67 Nakṣatra months.

Now, a solar year is equal to 366 days ; hence one solar month is $\frac{366}{12} = 30\frac{1}{2}$ days. A karma-saṃvatsara = 360 days ; hence one karma-month = $\frac{360}{12} = 30$ days. A lunar year = $354\frac{1}{2}$ days ; hence one lunar month = $\frac{354\frac{1}{2}}{12} = 29\frac{3}{2}$ days.¹ One Nakṣatra year = $327\frac{5}{7}$ days ; hence one Nakṣatra month = $\frac{327\frac{5}{7}}{12} = 27\frac{2}{7}$ days. An intercalary lunar year = $383\frac{4}{2}$ days ; hence one intercalary lunar month = $\frac{383\frac{4}{2}}{12} = 31\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{4}$ days.

In a *yuga* or cycle of 5 years or 1830 days, there are 60 solar months, or 61 Sāvana months, or 62 lunar months or 67 Nakṣatra months or 57 intercalary months, 7 days, $11\frac{2}{2}$ muhūrtas, for, an intercalary month = $31\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{4}$ days and therefore $\frac{1830}{31\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{4}} = \frac{226920}{3965} = 57$ months 7 days and $11\frac{2}{2}$ muhūrtas.

Again one lunar month is divided into two parts or parvas, the white half contains $\frac{29\frac{3}{2}}{2}$ days = $29\frac{3}{2} \times 15$ muhūrtas = $442\frac{6}{2}$ muhūrtas, and the dark half also $442\frac{6}{2}$ muhūrtas. A tithi or lunar day is equal to $\frac{2}{3}$ parts of a day as it is equal to $\frac{29\frac{3}{2}}{30} = \frac{1830}{62 \times 30} = \frac{61}{62}$ day. Hence a day being divided into 30 muhūrtas, a tithi will be equal to $\frac{2}{3} \times 30$ muhūrtas = $29\frac{3}{2}$ muhūrtas. The tithis are of two kinds : (1) day tithis and (2) night tithis. Both kinds are divided into a week of five lunar days, called (a) Nanda, (b) Bhadra, (c) Jaya, (d) Tuccha, (e) Pūrṇa, in the case of day tithis ; and (a) Ugravatī, (b) Bhogavatī, (c) Yaśomatī, (d) Sarvasiddhā and (e) Śubhanāmnī,

¹ The difference between a karma-māsa and a lunar month which is equal to $30 - 29\frac{3}{2} = 30/62$, makes Avamarātra. The difference due to one day is $1/62$. Hence in 62 days there will be one complete Avamarātra.

in the case of night tithis. Thus three weeks of day tithis and three weeks of night tithis will make fifteen complete lunar days.

The Jaina astronomical works mention five seasons, viz., rains, autumn, dewy, spring and summer. The seasons are of two kinds, the solar and the lunar. The solar season is equal to two solar months=61 days. The seasons commence with the Āṣāḍha month, though the cycle of 5 years commences with the 1st day of the dark half of the month of Śrāvaṇa. Here a connection may be sought with the word 'Varṣa' (year), and it is surmised that the year must have come to acquire this denomination from the fact of the year beginning with 'Varṣā' or rainy season. It may also be mentioned here that Kauṭilya, in his *Arthaśāstra*, says that the year in his time began with the summer solstice at the end of Āṣāḍha.²

Now to determine the season on any day, we are to count the number of parvas elapsed since the beginning of the cycle and multiply it by 15 in order to reduce them to lunar days; then we add the remaining days above the parva up to the day in question; next we deduct the Avama days at the rate of $\frac{1}{8\frac{1}{2}}$ per day; we then double the remainder and add again 61. Then we divide the sum by 122 and the quotient by 6; the latter quotient is the number of expired Rtus and the remainder divided by two gives the days of the current season. For example, to determine the season on the 1st Dīpotsava day, we have the number of parvas from the beginning of the cycle on the 1st day of the dark half of Śrāvaṇa to the day in question to be 7. Therefore $7 \times 15 = 105$ lunar days. Now $105 \times \frac{1}{8\frac{1}{2}} =$ nearly 2, i. e., two Avama rātris. Deducting this from 105, we have 103. Then $103 \times 2 = 206$, $206 + 61 = 267$, $267 \div 122 = 2 + \frac{23}{122}$, $\frac{23}{122} = 11\frac{1}{2}$. Then counting the seasons from Āṣāḍha we may say that two seasons are past and that 11 days have elapsed in the third season.

With regard to the question which season closes with what lunar day, we are to take the number of the season in question, double it, deduct one from it, double it again and then keep this product in two rows. One indicates the number of parvas and the other being reduced to half shows the number of lunar days (*tithis*). For example, to find on what lunar day the first season in a cycle happens, we get $1 \times 2 - 1 = 1$, again $1 \times 2 = 2$, keeping on two rows, as 2 2, we have the latter 2. The result is that 2 parvas

² Vide my article "On the Seasons and the Year-beginning of the Hindus," *I.I.Q.*, December 1928.

have elapsed and that on the Pratipat day the first Rtu closed. Similarly for the second season, we get $2 \times 2 - 1 = 3$, $3 \times 2 = 6$. Then we have 6 and 6. That is, 6 parvas have elapsed and that on the 3rd day the second season has closed, and so on.

Now in one sidereal revolution of the moon, the lunar seasons are six. Hence in a cycle of 5 years which is equal to 67 sidereal revolutions of the moon there are $6 \times 67 = 402$ lunar seasons. In one lunar season there are $4\frac{37}{87}$ days. Because one sidereal revolution of the moon = 6 seasons, one revolution = $27\frac{21}{87}$ days, and therefore, one season = $27\frac{21}{87} \div 6 = 4\frac{37}{87}$ days. The formula to determine the lunar seasons is as follows:— Multiply by 15 the number of parvas that have elapsed from the beginning of the cycle; then add the remaining number of days above the parvas, if any. Then deduct Avama rātris at $\frac{1}{2}$ per day. Then multiply the remainder by 134 and add to the product 305 and divide the sum by 610. The quotient is the number of Rtus. For example, to find the Rtu on the 5th day of the 1st parva from the beginning of the cycle, we get $5 - 1 = 4$, $4 \times 134 = 536$, $536 + 305 = 841$, $841 \div 610 = 1\frac{231}{610}$. Then the result is the first season. Taking the remainder 231, divide it by 134, this gives $\frac{231}{134} = 1\frac{97}{134}$, i.e. one day and $48\frac{1}{2}$ sixty-seventh parts of the second day have elapsed. To know what season there will be on the 11th day of the second parva from the beginning of the cycle, we get 1 parva having elapsed, $1 \times 15 + 10$ (as 10 days have elapsed up to the 11th day) = 25, $25 \times 134 = 3350$, $3350 + 305 = 3655$. $3655 \div 610 = \frac{3655}{610} = 5\frac{605}{610}$, i.e., 5 Rtus have elapsed. Now, $\frac{605}{610} = 4\frac{605}{610}$, i.e. 4 days and $34\frac{1}{2}$ sixty-sevenths of a day have elapsed after 5 Rtus.

In order to determine the closing day of a lunar season the following method is given:—As in the case of solar seasons, multiply the constant $\frac{305}{134}$ by one for the first and by $(2 \times \text{number of seasons} + 1)$ for the second and other seasons up to the last season. Then the quotient is the number of lunar days expired. For example, for the first lunar season, the constant is $\frac{305}{134}$; multiply by 1. Then $\frac{305}{134} = 2\frac{37}{134}$. Hence after 2 days and $18\frac{1}{2}$ sixty-sevenths of the third day the 1st lunar season attains completion. For the 402nd season, $\frac{305}{134} \times (2 \times 401 + 1) = \frac{305}{134} \times 803 = \frac{244915}{134} = 1827\frac{97}{134}$. That is, the 402nd season will be completed when 1827 days and $48\frac{1}{2}$ sixty-sevenths of a day after those days have elapsed.

Origin of the Pratihāra Dynasty

The Pratihāras are believed to have been a branch of the Gurjara tribe which, in the latter part of the 5th c. A.D., poured into India along with the Hūnas. There is at present no disagreement among the scholars in regard to this.¹ The theory of the Gurjara origin of the Pratihāras is entirely based on the evidence of a stone inscription, discovered in the village of Rajor or Rajorgadh, in the Rajgadh district of the Alwar state, Rajputana. It states that,² in V.S. 1016=A.D. 959, during the reign of Paramabhaṭṭāraka-mahārājādhirāja-Vijayapāladeva, who meditated on the feet of the Paramabhaṭṭāraka-mahārājādhirāja-Kṣitipāladeva, mahārājādhirāja-Parameśvara-Mathanadeva of the *Gurjara-Pratihāra* lineage, son of the mahārājādhirāja Sāvata, residing at Rājyapura, made some grants of land.

It is unanimously upheld that the expression Gurjara-Pratihāra, referred to above, means Pratihāra clan of the Gurjara tribe, and thereby conclusively proves that the Pratihāras were Gurjaras. But a critical examination of the passage in question discloses that it bears more reasonable interpretation. Kṣitipāla and Vijayapāla, mentioned in the above inscription, were unquestionably the kings who belonged to the Pratihāra dynasty of Kanauj.³ Rājyapura is Rajor where the stone slab was discovered. Gurjara was the name of a country. The Nausari grant⁴ of Pulakeśi Janāśraya, dated 738-9 A.D., mentions

1 Dr. Bhandarkar, *JBBR.15.*, vol. XXI—The *Gurjaras*. Dr. R. C. Majumdar, *Gurjara-Pratihāras: J. Dep. Lett.*, vol. X. Dr. Smith, *Early History of India*.

2 *El.*, vol. III, p. 263. *Paramabhaṭṭāraka-mahārājādhirāja-parameśvara-śrī-Kṣitipāladeva-pādānuḍhyāta-paramabhaṭṭāraka-mahārājādhirāja-parameśvara-śrī-Vijayapāladeva-pādānām abhipravarardhamāna-kalyāṇa-vijayarājye Samvatsara-śateṣu daśasu ṣoḍaś-ottarakeṣu Māghamāsa-sitapakṣa-ttrayodaśyām Śani-yuktāyām evaṃ Saṃ 1016 Māgha-śudi 13 Sanāvadya śrī-Rājyapur-āvasthito mahārājādhirāja-parameśvara-śrī-Mathanadevo mahārājādhirāja-śrī-Sāvata-sūnur Gurjara Pratihārānvaṃṣaḥ kuśalī*

3 *El.*, vol. VIII, App. 1, p. 12.

4 *Saindhavā-Kacchella-Saurāṣṭra-Cāvoṭaka-Maurya-Gurjarādi rājye etc.*, *Bom. Guz.*, vol. I, pt. 1, p. 109, fn.

Gurjara as a country. So also does the Ragholi plate,⁵ a record of the 8th c. A.D. The country of Gurjara is identical with the country of Gurjaratrā. The Daulatpur inscription⁶ of Bhoja records that the Deṇḍvānaka Viṣaya, modern Didwana in the Jodhpur State, Rajputana, was in the Gurjaratrā-bhūmi. An inscription⁷, in a temple at Kālañjara, states that Maṅgalānaka, modern Maglona, in the Jaipur State, in Rajputana, was situated in the Gurjaratrā-maṇḍala. There are indications in the Rajor stone inscription that Rajor and its neighbourhood formed a part of the Gurjara country.⁸ In this circumstance the country of Gurjara is to be taken to have extended from at least Didwana in the west to Rajor in the east, comprising the western part of the Jodhpur State, and nearly the whole of the States of Jaipur and Alwar.⁹

In the light of the above discussion the expression Gurjara-Pratihāra may very reasonably be taken to mean the Pratihāra family of the Gurjara country. Its object is to distinguish the Pratihāra family, to which Mathanadeva belonged from that of the Kānyakubja-Pratihāra, of which his overlord Vijayapāla, referred to at the beginning of the Rajor inscription, was a member. The ancient Indian records were not unfamiliar with this sort of expression. The Mādhnagar copper plate¹⁰ of Lakṣmaṇasena states that Sāmantasena was the head-garland of the clan of the Karṇāṭa-Kṣatriya. This evidently means that Sāmantasena was a member of the Kṣatriya clan of the Karṇāṭa country, and was distinct from that residing in Bengal.

Even, if the term Gurjara, in this connection, is taken to have referred to the tribe, the Gurjara origin of the Pratihāras cannot be definitely proved. It can well be taken to mean that Mathanadeva's

5 *Deśam Gaurjjaram etc.*, *El.*, vol. IX, p. 44.

6 *El.*, vol. V, p. 213.

7 *Ibid.*, p. 210, fn. 3.

8 *Gurjara-vāhita-samastu kṣetra etc.*, *Ibid.*, vol. III, p. 266, 1.12.

9 Hiuen Tsang tells us that Kū-che-lo is 1800 li (600 miles) north to Valabhi (Watters, vol. II, p. 249). Scholars are unanimous in thinking that Kū-che-lo is identical with Gurjara. But this is erroneous. Kū-che-lo is to be identified with Kacchella, referred to in the Nausari grant, which is distinct from Gurjara (See above, p. 1, fn. 4).

10 *Karṇāṭa-Kṣatriyānāmaṇi kula-śirodāma Sāmantasenaḥ* (*Inscriptions of Bengal*, vol. III, p. 110).

father belonged to the Gurjara tribe, and his mother was a member of the Pratihāra family. Sāmantasena of the Sena dynasty is said to have been the head-garland of the clans of the Brāhmaṇas and the Kṣatriyas.¹¹ The Guhila Bhaṭṭapaṭṭa, who flourished in the seventh century A.D., was a member of the Brahma-Kṣatra family.¹² They obviously signify that the father and mother of the founder of the Sena family of Bengal, and the father and mother of the founder of the Guhila family in the Gurjara country belonged respectively to the Brāhmaṇa and the Kṣatriya clans.

Hence the view that the expressions Gurjareśvara, Gurjaranātha etc., mean the Pratihāras because the latter were Gurjaras should be abandoned. In ancient Indian records we frequently come across the terms Gauḍeśvara, Mālayanātha, Cediśvara, Karṇāṭeśvara etc., but hardly Pāleśvara, Kalacuripati, Paramāranātha, etc. This suggests that the words *īśvara*, *nātha*, *pati* etc., were used as suffixes of the names of the countries, and not of tribes or families. The Pratihāras since the time of Vatsarāja were in possession of the Gurjara country,¹³ which they ruled through their vassals. But the expression Gurjareśvara (lord of Gurjara), occasionally mentioned in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa records, does not appear to have referred to Vatsarāja or any of his successor. The Baroda plate¹⁴ of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Karka, chief of Lāṭa, distinguishes between *Gurjareśvarapati* (master of the lord of Gurjara) and *Gurjareśvara*. Here Gurjareśvara-pati was evidently Vatsarāja's successor Nāgabhaṭa II, and Gurjareśvara (lord of Gurjara) was his feudatory. The Bagumra plate¹⁵ also distinguishes Mihira Bhoja from the Gurjaras.

Again, it will not be proper to assume that a particular country was known as Gurjara because of the fact that the Pratihāras settled there. The kingdoms over which the Pratihāras ruled were known as Mālava, Kanauj, Vallamaṇḍala and Gurjara. The Pratihārā Kakka, who was the ruler of Vallamaṇḍala, is said to have obtained

11 *Brahma-Kṣatriyānamajani kulāśirodāma Sāmantasena* (EI., I, p. 207, v. 5).

12 *Ibid.*, vol. XII, p. 13: *Brahma-Kṣatrānvito* etc., 1.5.

13 *Ibid.*, vol. V, p. 208.

14 *IA.*, vol. XII, p. 160

15 *Ibid.*, p. 179.

renown in Vallamaṇḍala, Gurjaratrā etc.¹⁶ The Pratihāra Vatsarāja, king of Mālava, and the Pratihāra Nāgabhaṭa II, and Bhoja, kings of Kanauj, granted lands in the Gurjaratrābhūmi.¹⁷ All these prove that Gurjaratrā or Gurjara was distinct from Mālava, Kanauj, and Vallamaṇḍala. Indeed Abū Zaid (A.D. 916), who never travelled in India and China, and who collected information from books and from travellers who visited the countries, states that Kanauj is a large country forming the empire of Jurz.¹⁸ Kanauj was at that time under the sway of the Pratihāras. But the more authentic Muhammadan historians, however, do not connect the Pratihāras with the Gurjara country. Al Mas'ūdi, who was one of the informants of Abū Zaid, mentions, in the same connection, about Balhara (Rāṣṭrakūṭa), the king of India, Baiura, the king of Kanauj, and about the king of Juzr (Gurjara).¹⁹ Al Bilādunī, when describing the military excursion of the Arabs in India, mentions the countries of Marmad, Mandal, Barūs, Uzain, Mālība, Baharīmad, Al Bailmān, and Jurz.²⁰ Of the countries mentioned, Barūs is Broach, Marmad is Marumāra, Uzain is Ujjain in Mālava, Mālība is Mālapa i.e. Western Ghats, Al Bailman is Vallamaṇḍala, and Jurz is Gurjara. Ujjain and Vallamaṇḍala were at that time ruled by the Pratihāras, and Gurjara was an independent kingdom.

Even, if for argument's sake, it is taken for granted that the expressions Gurjareśvara, king of Jurz, etc., signified the kings of the Pratihāra dynasty, it will not be fair to regard the Pratihāras as members of the Gurjara tribe. This point is definitely settled by a Gaṅga record. The Gaṅgas were not racially connected with the Gurjara tribe. But the Sravana Belgola epitaph²¹ states that the Gaṅga Satyavākya-Koṅguṇivarman (A.D. 978-984) became known as 'the king of the Gurjaras' by conquering the northern region for Kṛṣṇarāja III.

After all, we have at present no evidence to prove that the Pratihāras were a branch of the Gurjara tribe.

15 *El.*, vol. IX, p. 280.

17 *El.*, vol. V, p. 211.

19 *Ibid.*, pp. 22-25.

18 Elliot, vol. 1, p. 2, 10.

20 *Ibid.*, p. 260.

21 *Satyavākya-Koṅguṇivarman-dharmamahārājādhirājasya Kṛṣṇarājottara-dig-vijaya-vidita-Gurjar-ādhirājasya* etc. (*El.*, vol. V, p. 176, Ls., 6-8).

The Pratihārās, through their records, claim that they were descendants of the epic hero Lakṣmaṇa. The Jodhpur inscription²² of the Pratihāra Bāuka, dated V.S. 894, reports that “inasmuch as the very brother of Rāmabhadra performed the duty of a door-keeper (Pratihāra), this illustrious clan came to be known as Pratihāra.” Similarly the Gwalior praśasti²³ of Bhoja narrates that “all praise unto his younger brother, Lakṣmaṇa (Saumittrī), a stern rod of chastisement in war with Meghanāda, the destroyer of Indra’s pride, who served as the door-keeper (Pratihāra) (of Rāma), owing to his commandment not to allow others to enter. In that family, which bore the insignia of Pratihāra (door-keeper), and was a shelter of the three worlds, the king Nāgabhaṭa appeared.”

Needless to mention that this claim is evidently a myth. The epic hero Lakṣmaṇa was a Kṣatriya while the Pratihāras were originally Brāhmaṇas. But this claim of the Pratihāras may be explained in this way. Pratihāra was an important office in ancient times. This dynasty assumed the name Pratihāra because its founder occupied the office of the same name. That the name of the dynasty has close connection with the official designation, Pratihāra, is proved by the fact that the family continued, as the above verse tells us, to bear the insignia of the office of Pratihāra even when it attained to sovereign position. Dr. Fleet, while discussing the origin of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, remarks that²⁴ “in early times there was a class of officials named Rāṣṭrakūṭa which title seems to have designated the head man of a Rāṣṭra or province just as Grāmakūṭa designates the head man of a village. The Rāṣṭrakūṭas may have been feudatory and hereditary governors of provinces, who, when they rose to sovereign power, preserved their official title as a dynasty or family name.” Similar arguments hold good in the case of the Pratihāra dynasty also, Pratihāra was the name of a dynasty, and not of a tribe or a clan. The Ghatiyala inscription²⁵ of Kakkuka, dated 861 A.D., states that the Brāhmaṇa Hari-

22 *El.*, vol. XVIII, p. 97.

23 *El.*, vol. XVIII, p. 110.

24 *Bom. Gaz.*, vol. I, pt. II, pp. 384-385.

25 *Asit Pratihāra-vaṃśaguru saddevijāḥ śrī-Haricandra.*—*El.*, vol. IX, p. 279.

candra was the *Pratihāravamśa-guru*. The Jodhpur inscription²⁶ of the Pratihāra Bāūka, dated 837 A.D., records that Haricandra was a preceptor (of the Pratihāras) like Prajāpati, which means that Haricandra was a creator (founder) of the Pratihāra dynasty just as Prajāpati (Brahmā) was the creator of the living being. All these prove that Haricandra was the founder of the Pratihāra dynasty. The founder of the Pratihāra dynasty, as has been noticed above, held the office of Pratihāra. Hence, Haricandra, its founder, must have held that office for some time. He, however, in course of time, succeeded in attaining to kingly position. Later, his successors, in accordance with the general practice of the age, appear to have been inclined to give some mythical colour to the origin of their family. They, in course of their endeavour to find out something from the epic lore for the adjustment of their case, struck on the fact that Lakṣmaṇa, the younger brother of the hero of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, held the office of Pratihāra on a particular occasion under his elder brother. This admirably suited their purpose, and thenceforward they boldly put forward the claim that their family originated from Lakṣmaṇa.

The existence of three branches of the Pratihāra dynasty have hitherto been traced. One held sway over Vallamaṇḍala i.e. the territory around the city of Jodhpur, in Rajasthan, the other ruled in Mālava and Kanauj, and the third governed the Gurjara country. All these branches evidently originated from Haricandra. The Jodhpur inscription²⁷ of Bāūka states that “there was an illustrious Brāhmaṇa named Haricandra, who had the title (mark) Rohilladdhi, who was versed in the meaning of the Vedās and the Śāstras, and who was a preceptor like Prajāpati. That illustrious Haricandra married (first) the daughter of a Brāhmaṇa, and (as) second (wife), the Kṣatriyā Bhadrā, belonging to a noble family, and possessed of good qualities. Those sons who were born of the Brāhmaṇa wife became Pratihāra Brāhmaṇas. Those who were born of queen Bhadrā became drinkers of wine.” The same inscription further tells us that the Pratihāra dynasty of Valla-

26 *Dvijah śrī-Haricandr-ākhyah Prajāpati-samo guruḥ* | *Ibid.*, XVIII, p. 95.

27 *EL.*, vol. XVIII, pp. 97, 98.

maṇḍala were descendants of Haricandāra through his Kṣatriyā wife. The Pratihāras of Gurjara, who flourished in the middle of the tenth century A.D., and who were vassals of the Pratihāras of Kanauj, might have been remote descendants of the Pratihāras of Vallamaṇḍala. The Jodhpur inscription,²⁸ dated 837 A.D., states that apart from the Pratihāra dynasty of Vallamaṇḍala there was another line of the Pratihāra kings, who were born of the family of the Brāhmaṇa chief, and who were put into trouble by Mayūra i.e. the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of the Deccan, whose early capital was at Mayūrakhaṇḍi. We know the existence of only two branches of the Pratihāra dynasty in the first half of the ninth century A.D., one ruling in Vallamaṇḍala, and the other at Mālava and Kanauj. The fact of the terrible struggle between the Pratihāras of Mālava and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of the Deccan is well known to the students of Indian history. Hence the Pratihāra kings, born in the family of a Brāhmaṇa chief, may very reasonably be identified with the Pratihāra kings of Mālava. This Pratihāra dynasty obviously became Kṣatriya through matrimonial alliance.


D. C. GANGULY

²⁸ *Devīa-nṛpa-kulojūṃ sat-Pratihārabhūpaṃ* (*Ibid.*, p. 96).

A Gandhāra Relief in The Indian Museum

In the show case no. 1 in the Gandhāra room of the Indian Museum, Calcutta, is a fragmentary relief marked no. 5130. It is curved out of black slate as the Gandhāra sculptures usually are and it measures 3' × 7". It appears to have belonged to the frieze of a comparatively small votive stūpa. The museum records show that it hails from Swat valley in the North-Western frontier. The carving on a substantial portion of it on its right side has peeled off and its left shows a slanting break. In spite, however, of this considerable damage to it, enough still remains (as will appear from the accompanying plate) to justify an attempt in determining the subject matter of this illustration.

Beginning from the left, we find a male figure dressed in royal accoutrements shooting an arrow. A hill is depicted in front of him on the upper part of which is an animal running to right and on the lower part a lion peeping from its den; trees are shown growing from the hillside on the right. A heavily draped male figure seated on a raised seat on the other side of the hill is playing on a harp and a female figure is dancing; their faces are turned towards the right. In front of them is a big tree shown slightly aslant. Next, we find a man lying down and a female lamenting over her companion with her right hand raised. That they are the same couple shown on the other side of the tree is clearly indicated by the artist by his depiction of the harp near the head of the man. The grieving female figure is being forcibly grasped on her left upper arm by a royal figure (evidently the same figure we saw on the extreme left—he is similarly dressed and he carries the bow on his left arm). Lastly, we find the female figure being led away by the king whose head is lost. The relief breaks here and we do not know what more there were in continuation. The above description will show that the sculpture depicts a forcible abduction of a woman by a king after her male companion was shot by him. The scene of the abduction is laid in a hilly forest country where the couple had gone to indulge in music and dance.



A Jātaka scene from Gandhāra

I.H.O., June, 1934

Now, what may this story represent? It evidently does not depict any of the incidents from the present life of the Master, which are so copiously illustrated in Gandhāra. So, it may depict one of the stories connected with the past lives of the Buddha. If it does so, then we are at once apprised of the importance of this fragmentary relief. It is a wellknown fact that very few Jātaka stories are actually illustrated in Gandhāra. M. Foucher long ago pointed out that the four Jātaka stories which can be mainly recognised amongst the Hellenistic reliefs of Gandhāra are the Dīpaṅkara, Vessantara, Chadanta, and the Syāma Jātakas. It is true that Hiuen Tshang records the acclimatisation of a good many Jātaka stories in the Gandhāra region and its adjoining districts,¹ some of which do not appear in the Ceylonese com-

1 Hiuen Tshang refers to the following stūpas, among others commemorating incidents of several Jātaka stories:—(A) A great stone stūpa, above 300 ft. high, having marvellous sculptures, said to have been built by Aśoka, about two li to the east (in the *Life* south east) of the capital of the Na-ka-lo-ho country or region near Jalalabad. (B) Four or five li north of the city of Pu-se-ka-lo-fa-ti (Puṣkarāvati) was an Aśoka stūpa some 100 ft. high commemorating the incident of the Bodhisattva's dedication of his eyes in charity. (C) About 100 li to the north-west of this stūpa, was another which marked the place at which the Bodhisattva in his birth as Syāma was accidentally shot by the king Brahmadata but was later restored to life by Sakra; M. Foucher identified this stūpa with Periano Dheri, a mound near Charsadda. (D) Several stūpas said to have been built by Aśoka, in the environs of Po-lu-sha (modern Shahabaz-garhi), connected with the various incidents in the Vessantara Jātaka. (E) About 120 li n.n.e. from Po-lu-sha was an Aśoka stūpa to mark the spot where the sage Tu-chio (Ekaśṛṅga) once lived; M. Foucher, in his *L' Art Græco-Bouddhique du Gandhāra*, (tome II fasc. I, p. 265 fig. 438 *le père du Ṛṣi Ekaśṛṅga*—Musée de Calcutta. No. 2377; the illustration shows—from the left—trees in the back-ground, a doe grazing just in front of a bearded ascetic sitting on his haunches before his hut) reproduces a fragmentary relief which according to him depicts the incident (in the Jātaka Story) which led to the birth of the sage Ekaśṛṅga (Brahmanical Ṛṣyaśṛṅga). Foucher describes this relief as lying in the collection of the Calcutta Museum but the exhibits in the Gandhāra room of the same do not include it. A fragmentary relief, however, in the show case No. I of the same room and by the side of the relief under discussion, seems to depict another incident in the same story. (F) In the Udyāna country, near the capital Mang-kil, a stūpa commemorated the incidents of the Kṣāntivādin Jātaka (no relief illustrating it has so far been found among the Gandhāra specimens, but an elaborate one illustrating it is in the collection of the Sārnāth Museum). (G) Some distance

pilation of these legends, but are mentioned in their Chinese versions; but none amongst these has the slightest resemblance to the scene illustrated in our relief. However, there is one Jātaka, Candakinnara by name (no. 485 of the Jātaka collection) which substantially agrees with a portion of the illustration. The story runs thus:

While Brahmadata was reigning in Benares, the Bodhisattva was born as a kinnara in the region of the Himalayas; his name was Canda and he had a fairy wife Candā by name. One hot season the kinnara couple came down to the foot of the mountain and began to indulge themselves in music and dance, the male playing on a lute and the female singing and dancing to the tune, waving her soft hands. Guided by the sweet sound of music, Brahmadata, then ahunting in the same region, came near the couple and watched them from a secret place. Charmed with the beauty of the kinnarī, he thought of abducting her after killing her male companion. Actuated by this desire, he shot the kinnara dead. Candakinnarī, on seeing her husband fall down pierced by an arrow and perceiving that life was extinct in him, began to lament grievously over her dead husband. The king now came out of his hiding place and offered his love to the grief-stricken fairy who, in all fairness of things, indignantly refused his overtures. The king made repeated attempts to seduce her, but had to go away unsuccessful in the end. Śakra, however, took pity on the unfortunate fairy and had her husband restored to life.

As is clear from the perusal of the story, there is a close agreement between it and the relief up to a certain portion. The Jātaka refers to a denouement quite different from the one which seems to be indicated by the relief. There is no reference to the forcible abduction of the female fairy in the story. But the relief being fragmentary, we have no idea how the scene ended here. Or, is it possible that a different

from Mang-kil, a stūpa was erected by Aśoka, to mark the spot in which the Bodhisattva as king Sibi sliced his body to ransom a pigeon from a hawk (there is a relief in red spotted sand stone in the collection of the Indian Museum, Calcutta which depicts the incidents of this Jātaka; it evidently hails from Mathurā). (H) A few miles to the west of Mang-kil, Lu-hi-ta-ka tope was erected by Aśoka to commemorate the incident of king Maitribala's drawing his life-blood to feed five famished Yakṣas.

version of the same Jātaka was current in the region of Gandhāra? As regards the representation of the Kinnara couple in the relief, a point worth noticing is that they are shown as two ordinary human beings clothed in heavy drapery peculiar to the locality. According to ancient Indian literary and plastic tradition, Kinnaras had two different forms.² One a hybrid one with the body of a human being and the head of a horse and the other a normal human one; the idea being that the former typified beings inimical to man while the latter were friendly spirits.³ In one of the medallions⁴ of the Buddha Gaya railing pillars, a scene depicts the seduction of a man by a horse-headed female figure (referred to in Pali Jātaka texts as *Yakkhini assamukhi*). In an earlier relief, from Bharhut⁵ there is a scene from the Takkāriya Jātaka (the relief, which is fragmentary, is inscribed as *Kinnara Jātaka*); the Kinnara couple in front of the king are shown up to their knees and they appear to be wearing leaves of trees round the body.⁶ The Kinnarī Manoharā and her companions are invariably represented in human form in the depiction of several scenes from the Sudhana-Kumarāvadāna in Borobudur (Java).⁷ So, the fact that the couple in our relief are shown as ordinary human beings need not stand in the way of identifying it as representing perhaps a slightly different version of the Canda-Kinnara Jātaka.

JITENDRA NATH BANERJEE

2 Hybrid figures with the upper part of a man and the lower that of a bird are usually described as Gandharvas.

3 Barua and Sinha: *Bharhut Inscriptions*, p. 91.

4 R. Mitra: *Buddha Gaya*, p. 155, pl. XXXIV, fig. 2.

5 Cunningham: *Bharhut Stupa*, pl. XXVII, 5.

6 Grunwedel remarks "These secondary deities, then, may have been originally represented in the costume of the aborigines of India, which, by borrowing from the antique, resulted in the siren type." *Buddhist Art*, p. 48.

7 Foucher: *The Beginnings of Buddhist Art*, pp. 217-224, pl. XXXIV, 2.

Ancient Gītā Commentaries¹

Leaving out of account Nimbārka, whose original name is said to have been *Bhāskara cārya* (see Hall, *Bibliography*, p. 115), we have to admit the existence of at least two philosophers of that name.

The one is the well-known *Vedāntin*, critic of Śaṅkara, who is so often alluded to and quoted in the scholastic literature. His *Brahmasūtra-bhāṣya* has been available since 1903 as a volume of the Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series. Unfortunately he gives no clue in his work as to his family or Guru. If he belonged to the Śāṅḍilya Gotra,² he could have been an ancestor of another Bhāskara (Bhaṭṭa) and of that well-known astronomer Bhāskara as also of two poets called Trivikrama Bhaṭṭa the earlier of whom (c. 915 A.D.) is the author of the *Nalacampū*. This much at least is certain that his *Brahmasūtra-bhāṣya* must have been written after Śaṅkara's and before the *Bhāmatī*. For, his Bhāṣya is practically a critical recast of Śaṅkara's, while in the *Bhāmatī*, as pointed out by Mr. T. R. Chintamani (see *JOR.*, Madras, 1927, p. 387), he is himself criticised by Vācaspati in more than thirty places. The *Bhāmatī*, being Vācaspati's last great work, may have been written a considerable time after 842 A.D., the date of his *Nyāya-sūcī-nibandha*.³ And, since the latter is said to have been written sixty-six years after the demise of Śaṅkara, the latest possible date for Bhāskara's Bhāṣya would seem to be about seventy or seventy-five years after Śaṅkara, which would imply the possibility of Bhāskara

1 The following is essentially a review of Mr. B. N. Krishnamurti Sarma's valuable paper "Bhāskara—a forgotten Commentator on the Gītā" which has appeared in vol. IX of this Journal. The abbreviation *KRBh.* will be used for my work *The Kashmir Recension of the Bhagavadgītā*, Stuttgart 1930 (obtainable from The Punjab Sanskrit Book Depot, Lahore).

2 See the copper-plate inscription quoted by Paṇḍit Vindhyaśvarīprasāda Dvivedī in his *Bhūmikā* to his edition of Bhāskara's *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya*, and compare Winternitz, *Geschichte der Indischen Litteratur*, vol. III, p. 375, n. 4.

3 See Dasgupta, *H. I. Ph.*, vol. II, pp. 107 and 112. For reasons unknown to me Mr. Krishnamurti gives the date as 886 A.D.

having been a contemporary of Vācaspati. I do not see how from Mr. Krishnamurti's quotations from Vācaspati and Bhāskara (on p. 667, *loc. cit.*) "it will be clear that Bhāskara is *much earlier* than Vācaspati Miśra" (italics mine). He would, indeed, be earlier than even Pañnapāda, if Mr. Chintamani were right in believing "that Bhāskara had before him the Pañcapādikā." But it is surely inadmissible to make him, as Mr. K. does, a contemporary of Śaṅkara on the strength of Śaṅkara's criticism (in his Bhāṣya on *Bhag. Gītā* II, 10) of the *jñānakarma-samuccaya-vāda*, because this theory, in Mr. K.'s opinion, had not been taught by any Gītā commentator before Bhāskara. This is an altogether arbitrary hypothesis. If there were Gītā commentaries older than Śaṅkara's—and their existence is testified to by the latter itself—they are much more likely to have been written from some *samuccaya* standpoint (like that of the *Gītā* itself) than from one of *advaita*. There is, indeed, every probability that most, if not all, of those earlier Gītā commentaries⁴ were Vaiṣṇavite. For, we have no notice of any other pre-Śaṅkarite religio-philosophical community holding the *Gītā* in high esteem than those ancient Vaiṣṇavas (Bhāgavatas, Pāñcarātras, etc.) who made it the very foundation of their belief, while, on the other hand, it is but a cheap tribute to Śaṅkara's genius to credit him with having been the first to introduce the *Gītā* into the Advaita-Vedānta. I am afraid that the two other arguments Mr. K. has for the contemporaneity of Śaṅkara and Bhāskara are equally irrelevant. That the Ātman is *aṇu* (or *samkucīta*) while bound, but *vibhu* when liberated, is an idea as old as *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* (V. 2) and an established belief in the Āgamas, both Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava (for the latter see, e.g., *Ahirbudhnya Saṃhitā*, ch. XIV). Nothing entitles us to assume that of Vedāntins before Śaṅkara it was taught just by Bhāskara only. And, when the *Maṇimañjarī*, a work of the 14th century, tells us in one of its verses that Bhāskara, no sooner than he had heard a bit of Śaṅkara's Bhāṣya read out to him, covered his ears, this is, of course, mere poetical fancy of which there is still more in that ill-famed libel against Śaṅkara.

4 As also all Brahmasūtra commentaries preceding Śaṅkara's; See Dasgupta, *loc. cit.*, vol. I, p. 420.



Now, a *Gītā Bhāṣya* by Bhāskara has not so far been discovered. But thanks to Mr. K. we know now that there must have been one. For, as he shows, there are in Jayatīrtha's commentary on Madhva's *Gītā Bhāṣya* six passages (viz., in the *prastāva* and on *Bhag. Gītā* II, 54; VI, 7; III, 4; III, 42; and II, 47, respectively) referring polemically to Bhāskara's *Gītā* interpretation. The passages are very interesting and partly throw new light on Bhāskara's metaphysics. One of them shows Bhāskara to have rejected the vulgate text of *Bhag. Gītā* VI, 7 in favour of the Kashmir reading, as already noticed by me in my *KRBh.*, p. 16.⁵ I cannot, however, agree with Mr. K.'s finding that a view mentioned by Śaṅkara ad *Bhag. Gītā* XIII, 12 must be Bhāskara's because of its appearance of being implied in the latter's view as expressed by Jayatīrtha ad *Bhag. Gītā* II, 54. For, "the Infinite Brahman having me (Vāsudeva) as its Highest (Śakti)" (*aham Vāsudevōkhyā parā śaktir yasya tan matparam iti*), which is according to Śaṅkara the way as 'some' explain the *padaccheda* (*anādi matparam*) rejected by him, is clearly Pāñcarāta where Vāsudeva as both Vyūha and Avatāra, is, indeed, distinguished from the Absolute (*puruṣa*, *brahman*, etc.) and sometimes even from the (personal) Para Vāsudeva,⁶ whereas the view censured as Bhāskara's by Jayatīrtha, viz., *brahma- viṣṇumahēśvarāḥ te yasyāvayavabhūtāḥ sa Keśavaḥ paramātmā*, is exactly the reverse of the above, because it does not make Keśava (= Vāsudeva) the *śakti* of the Highest, but fully identifies him (as *Pūrṇā- ratāra*) with the latter.⁷ As to *Bhag. Gītā* VI, 7, I have elsewhere

⁵ Jayatīrtha, unaware of the Kashmirian recension, speaks of a conjecture by Bhāskara. Some Kashmirian readings have, as Dr. Sukthankar confirms to me, found their way into manuscripts of the vulgate, and it is thus that Bhāskara appears to have become acquainted with one or two of them. For, had his whole commentary been based on the Kashmirian recension, Jayatīrtha would not have failed to take him to task on other occasions and judge him much more severely. (I must apologize to Dr. Sukthankar for having referred to Dr. Belvalkar instead of to him in the Winternitz Congratulatory Volume, p. 47).

⁶ See my *Introduction to the Pāñcarātra*, p. 53, also 34-35.

⁷ The *padaccheda anādi matparam* is, by the way, not so very bad. For, it admits of the interpretation *aham paro yasya tan matparam*, i.e., *matsthāna- bhūtam* (so Puruṣottama), which is in perfect agreement with *Bhag. Gītā* XIV, 3 (*mama yonir mahad brahma*, etc.).

(*KRBh.*, pp. 14-16) discussed at great length this verse and expressed myself in favour of the Kashmirian (and Bhāskara's) reading; *parātmasu* has been misunderstood by Mr. K. : it cannot possibly be intended to mean "in regard to other selves," but must be a dvanda (*pareṣu... tathātmani*), as understood by the commentators.⁸

The second Bhāskara whom I proposed to bring to notice is the Kashmirian Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara, son of Divākara and pupil of Śrīkaṇṭha Bhaṭṭa of the guruparamparā started by Kallaṭa (he, Bhāskara, being the fifth after Kallaṭa).⁹ His *Śīrasūtra-vārttika* has appeared in print as part of vol. IV of the Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies. "He lived probably in the 11th century A.C." (Chatterji, *Kashmir Shaivism*, p. 36a) and is thus about two centuries later than the Vedāntin Bhāskara. It is, of course, to this Kashmirian Bhāskara and his (now lost) Gītā commentary, and not, as Mr. K. holds, to the Brahmasūtra-bhāṣyakāra,¹⁰ whose views he could not have approved of, that Abhinavagupta refers when he closes his gloss on *Bhag. Gītā XVIII, 2* with the remark that for a fuller explanation of that adhyāya *tatrābhavad-Bhaṭṭabhāskara* and others should be consulted (see *KRBh.*, p. 6). For, no other philosophical author called Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara is known to have existed in Kashmir, and it is utterly unlikely that Abhinavagupta should have here referred to an outsider; nay, this is well-nigh impossible, because he did not know the vulgate version of the Gītā on which, so far as our knowledge goes, all Gītā commentaries except the earlier Kashmirian one were based.¹¹ I have shown *KRBh.*, pp. 7-8 and

8 Quoted in full on p. 47 of my *KRBh.* I think that *parātmasu samāmatih* is the easier reading, because it involves no doubt as to the padaccheda (*paramātmā* or *param ātmā*) nor requires an adhyākāra (as of *hydi* in Madhva's case). But I admit that the easier reading is often not the original one and that, therefore, it might after all be wise to accept the adverb *param* ("in the highest degree") or else (as suggested by me in the *Festschrift Moritz Winternitz*, p. 46) understand *paramātmā* to mean the higher individual self as distinct from the lower one (*manas*) belonging to Prakṛti.

9 See J. C. Chatterji, *Kashmir Shaivism*, p. 36 (a).

10 Tridandimata-bhāṣyakāra, as he is called by Vardhamāna in his *Prakāśa* on the *Nyāyakuṣumāñjali*, ed. Bibliotheca Indica, p. 332.

11 My attention has been drawn to Abhinavagupta's comment on *Bhag.*

2) that in Kashmir there are no signs of acquaintance with the vulgate of the Gītā before the decline of the Pratyabhijñā school. It was probably introduced there through Śaṅkara's Gītā-bhāṣya and with other works of his and his school during the reign of the Kashmirian king Harsa (1089-1101).¹² That Abhinavagupta's reference is to the Śaiva Bhāskara and not to the Vedāntin may also be inferred from the title *bhaṭṭa* which was hereditary in Kallaṭa's line of pupils but appears neither in the colophons of Bhāskara's Brahmasūtra-bhāṣya nor in any of the references, collected by Mr. K., to his Gītā-bhāṣya.¹³

There, was then, a second Bhāskara who, like Śaṅkara's critic, also wrote a commentary on the *Bhagavadgītā*. As he was the fifth (and last) of Kallaṭa's successors, he may have been a contemporary of Abhinavagupta. Unfortunately the latter's reference to him is all we know of his *Gītā* commentary i.e., this commentary must have been a fuller work than Abhinavagupta's (which, is, indeed, one of the smallest existent). And from the fact that its author is mentioned in the first place by A., the other commentators being only referred to by the "etc." (*tatrābhavad-Bhaṭṭabhāskar-ādibhiḥ*), we must, I believe, conclude that A.'s interpretation of the Gītā (written to show its *gūḍhārtha* or esoteric meaning) was substantially in agreement with his. And this confirms our conclusion that the Bhāskara referred to by A. cannot be the Vedāntin. For, there is little agreement between Abhinavagupta and the Vedāntin Bhāskara: the philosophical standpoint is different, and the merely textual interpretation is also different.

Gītā VIII, 16 (*ābrahmabhuvanāl lokāḥ*, etc.) as being evidently directed against Śaṅkara and others following him. But nothing in A.'s wording is in favour of this opinion, and, for the reason given above, *sarvaiḥ* cannot possibly stand for *Śaṅkarādibhiḥ* but must refer to the Kashmirian Gītā commentaries previous to Abhinavagupta. By the way, Śaṅkara's explanation (*saha-brahma-bhuvanena*) of this śloka is just the reverse of what he teaches on *kramamukti* in his *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya*.

12 See in *JRAS.* my forthcoming paper "On the form of the Bhagavad-gītā contained in the Kashmirian Mahābhārata."

13 If still he is sometimes called *bhaṭṭa* elsewhere, as the editor of the Bhāṣya seems to insinuate, this may be due to a confusion with the Kashmirian Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara or the Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara of śrauta fame (Trikāṇḍamaṇḍana) or heaven knows what other Bhāskara.

At the very beginning of his Vyākhyā, Abhinavagupta is anxious to make it clear that the Bhagavadgītā is not meant to teach *jñānakarma-samuccaya* (ed., p. 8: *na tu jñānakarmaṇī samatayā samuccīyete ity atra tātparyam*); and ad *Bhag. Gītā* III, 42 he does *not* understand *saḥ* as referring to *kāmaḥ* but to *ātmā*,¹⁴ as do Śaṅkara and others.¹⁵ In metaphysics, the difference between the two is smaller, essentially, than that between Śaṅkara and Bhāskara, but still undoubtedly great enough to render it impossible for Abhinavagupta to recommend a commentator whose authorities (Brahmasūtra and Vedas) ignore, if not reject, his own sources of inspiration (Śivasūtra and Āgamas). But, as said above, it is unlikely that he knew him at all.

There is a Kashmirian Gītā commentary which is older than Abhinavagupta's, viz., the "Sarvatobhadra-nāma Bhagavadgītā vivaraṇa" (so the colophons) by R ā j ā n a k a R ā m a k a ṇ ṭ h a whose name also appears as the author of a Vivṛti on Kallaṭa's *Spandakārikās*. This Vivṛti has been published (as vol. VI of the Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies), whereas the Gītā commentary is still only available in manuscript form.¹⁶ That the Sarvatobhadra is older than Abhinavagupta's commentary is the conclusion to be drawn from the fact that the Rājatarāṅgiṇī mentions his brother Muktākāṇa along with Ānandavardhana, Ratnākara, and Śivasvāmin as the great poets who flourished during the reign of Avantivarman (c. 856-883), which agrees with what Rāmakaṇṭha tells us, in the concluding stanzas of his commentary, about his family, viz.: "There was in holy Kāṇyakubja a brāhmaṇa called Nārāyaṇa, a store-house of Vedic learning. In his lineage (*vaṃśe*)

14 Which, by the way, is (*pace* Rāmānuja) the only correct view, not merely because of the parallelism with *Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad* (III, 10), but also because according to *Bhag. Gītā* III, 40 the Evil One can penetrate into man only as far as his *buddhi* and, consequently, "he" who is "beyond *buddhi*" must be the one and only stronghold from which, according to III, 43, *kāma* can be successfully combated, i.e., the *ātman*.

15 Ad XII, 12 also A.'s *padacchedā* is not that of the commentator censured by Śaṅkara (*anādi matparam*), whom Mr. K. believes to be Bhāskara, but the common one.

16 Excepting the rather large number of extracts given by me in *KRBh*.

(a son) studded with his own high virtues was emitted (to life) and called Kaṇa. And by this (Kaṇa's) brother Rāma, who was like him, this commentary has been written."¹⁷ On the other hand there is the tradition that he was a pupil of Utpaladeva and thus a fellow-student of Lakṣmaṇa, one of the Gurus of Abhinavagupta. If this is true, his time must be the first half of the tenth century, and he would have been much younger than his brother. Abhinavagupta is silent about him, excepting possibly the fifth of his opening stanzas which can be understood to refer to the voluminousness and insufficient depth of R.'s work. Mr. Tadpatrikar rightly observes¹⁸ that his commentary gives the impression of his having been a *jñānakarmasamuccayavādin*; and this would indeed also account for Abhinavagupta's silence. The same scholar says: "The identity of this Rāmakaṇṭha is a little doubtful." He seems to mean that the Gītā commentator is not the same as the author of the Spandavivṛti. This is possible, but the reason given for it is insufficient.¹⁹

Older still than Rāmakaṇṭha's commentary, and, indeed, the oldest Gītā commentary of Kashmir Śaivism (though hardly the first Gītā commentary in Kashmir) is Vasugupta's *Vāsarī Tikā* which is unfortunately lost, with the possible exception of its first six chapters.²⁰ Vasugupta must have lived in the first half of the ninth century. Let us hope that the Research Department of the Kashmir State will see to it that Rāmakaṇṭha's commentary and what may still be there of Vasugupta's will soon be published.

Was there a Gītā commentary also by *Yā d a v a p r a k ā ś a* who was Rāmānuja's first teacher and taught a philosophy of *bhedā-*

17 Cf. S. N. Tadpatrikar, *Śrīmad Bhagavadgītā* (Pratinidhi Series No. 1). p. 8.

18 *Loc. cit.*, Notes, p. 1.

19 The colophons do not consistently give the name of the Gītā commentator as Rāmakaṇṭha, but about half of them call him Rāmakavi which agrees with *karivara* in one of the concluding stanzas. Such variations of names are, however, not uncommon. The colophons in *Spandavivṛti* call the author simply Rāma, except the last which gives his full name as Rājānaka Śrī-Rāmakaṇṭha.

20 See Chatterji *loc. cit.*, p. 37, who believes those six chapters to have been incorporated into a later Gītā commentary called *Lāsakī* (by Rājānaka Lasakāka) of which manuscripts are available.

bhedā of a more realistic (pluralistic) type than that of the Vedāntin Bhāskara? As a matter of fact, he is mentioned as a Gītā commentator by Vedāntadeśika. I cannot remember having seen any quotations from that work; if there are any, they should be brought to light.²¹

Vedāntadeśika's list of Gītā commentators, at the end of his comments on Rāmānuja's Gītābhāṣya on XVIII, 66, to which Mr. Krishnamurti calls attention, is welcome, even though it might not help us much. The order of the names (*Piśāca-Rantideva-Gupta-Śaṅkara - Yā'avaraprakāśa - Bhāskara-Nārāyaṇārya-Yajñāsvāmi-prābhīṭā-gaḥ*), which is evidently meant to be chronological, suggests that according to V. the three first-named have preceded Śaṅkara. Can the first, P i ś ā c a , have anything to do with that clumsy work called Paisāca-bhāṣya and ascribed to Hanumat?²² or are title and author's name a mere trick for hiding a modern compilation under the veil of antiquity? It looks like a bad réchauffé of Śaṅkara's Gītābhāṣya, but possibly copyists and editor have made it worse than it was.

At present, then, Ś a ṅ k a r a ' s Gītābhāṣya is still the oldest one we possess. There is therefore every reason for congratulating Mr. B. N. Krishnamurti Sarma on his having succeeded in showing that this Gītābhāṣya really is, or, to say the least, can indeed be, the work of the great Vedāntin.²³ For, this had so far been doubted by many a scholar, for some time also by the present writer. There were just these two possibilities: either the Bhāṣya is genuine, viz., a *juvenile* work of Śaṅkara's; or it is not his but the work of a later author who had not entirely assimilated the views of Śaṅkara and succeeded but imperfectly in imitating his language. I decided for myself in favour of the former view, but expected someone else to do the painstaking work of providing

21 It would be well if *everything* said by or about him would be collected as also the whole information available on Bhāskara, excepting, of course his published work which, however, also deserves to be translated. I suggest a booklet entitled "Bhāskara and Yādavaprakāśa" and giving first the extracts and then two sketches trying to reconstruct, as far as possible, the two systems.

22 Badly edited in the Anandāśrama Series, No. 44.

23 See "Śaṅkara's authorship of the Gītā-Bhāṣya," in *Annals of the Bhandarkar Research Institute*, vol. XIV, (1933), pp. 39-60.

the proof for it on strictly philological lines, viz., by comparing, with attention to every detail, Śaṅkara's Gītābhāṣya with his Brahmasūtra-bhāṣya. I thought of a more comprehensive inquiry than Mr. Krishnamurṭi's, but, seeing what he has done, ~~we~~ admit that he has sufficiently proved his case.²⁴ There remains one more point concerning the character of the Gītābhāṣya to which I wish still to call attention before concluding. If Śaṅkara's *praguru*, or, as some would have it, his direct teacher, was Gauḍapāda, how can it be accounted for that in this juvenile work of his, the Gītābhāṣya, he appears to be even less affected by Gauḍapāda's extreme idealism than in the Brahmasūtra-bhāṣya which rejects the Buddhist *vijñānavāda* and has but two quotations from the Māṇḍūkya-Kārikās (III, 15 and I, 16)? The Gītābhāṣya professes in its very introduction a standpoint widely different from Gauḍapāda's by declaring that the Lord, "ever possessed of *jñāna*, *aīśvarya*, *śakti*, *bala*, *cīrya*, and *tejas* (which are the six 'aprākṛta guṇas' of God in the Pāñcarātra!) and keeping control of the *mūlaprakṛti*, viz., his *vaiśnavī māyā* consisting of the three guṇas," condescended to be born, with a part of his (*aṃśena*), as Kṛṣṇa, son of Devakī by Vāsudeva. This is hardly what we should expect of an enthusiastic young pupil of Gauḍapāda! And would not such a one have felt irresistibly tempted to quote his guru's kārikā or at least to refer to him with one or two words at such passages as *Bhag. Gītā*

24 We are glad to learn that also the problem of the authorship of *Bṛhadāraṇyakoṇiṣad-bhāṣya* has been recently solved in favour of Śaṅkara, viz., by Miss Kaethe Marschner in her excellent thesis (for the Ph. D.) entitled "Zur Verfasserfrage des dem Śaṅkarācārya zugeschriebenen Bṛhadāraṇyakoṇiṣad-Bhāṣya" (Berlin-Charlottenburg, 1933). The authoress comes to the conclusion that there is nothing in that Bhāṣya which could not be attributed to Śaṅkara himself. The doubt as to the authorship seems to have crept up through the late Prof. Deussen who called attention (in "Sechzig Upanishad's des Veda," p. 478, n. 1) to Śaṅkara's accepting, in his *Bṛh. Up. Bhāṣya* on IV, 4, 17, an explanation of *pañca janāḥ* which is at variance with *Brahmasūtra* I, 4, 12 and is in Śaṅkara's commentary thereon added only as that of *kecit*. Miss. M. thinks that in this case Śaṅkara, after vacillating in his Sūtrabhāṣya, ventured in his Upaniṣadbhāṣya to discard Bādarāyaṇa. A more serious case is the totally different explanation of *bālyam* in *Sū.Bhā.*, III, 4, 10 and *Up.Bhā.*, III, 5, 1. But this again may simply mean a change of opinion.

II, 16 (comp. Gauḍ. Kār., IV, 31)? This complete silence is suspicious, and the sole explanation of it I can think of is that Śaṅkara wrote his Gītābhāṣya *before* becoming acquainted with the work of Gauḍapāda. The latter has undoubtedly played a part in Śaṅkara's evolution, but not, apparently, from the beginning and never an overwhelming one. This opinion would have to be modified, as to its latter part, only if the Māṇḍūkya-bhāṣya could be proved to be really a work of Śaṅkara.²⁵ For, then indeed we should have to assume a period in Śaṅkara's life in which he was obsessed by Gauḍapāda. For, not only the Sūtra-bhāṣya but also most, if not all, of Śaṅkara's Upaniṣad commentaries can apparently, for linguistic and internal reasons, not belong to a time *before* the Māṇḍūkya-bhāṣya. A minute examination, from all points of view, of the Māṇḍūkyabhāṣya is, at any rate, a great desideratum.

F. OTTO SCHRADEK

25 I have not so far seen any criticism of Pandit Vidhusekhara Bhattacharya's remarkable article "Śaṅkara's Commentaries on the Upaniṣads" (see Sir Ashutosh Mookerjee Silver Jubilee Volumes, vol. III, 1925-27) except Mr. T. R. Chintāmaṇi's paper "Śaṅkara—the commentator on the Māṇḍūkya Kārikās" (see pp. 419-425 of the Proceedings and Transactions of the Third Oriental Conference, Madras) which is sound but touches a few points only, and not, e.g., the objection to *duḥkḥātma ātmā*. Dasgupta without giving reasons, includes the Māṇḍūkya-bhāṣya in his list of works attributed to Śaṅkara which appear to him "to be his genuine works;" and equally A. Venkatasubiah and B. N. Krishnamurti Sarma in their stirring papers on the Kārikās and their relation to the prose text of the Upaniṣad make use of the Bhāṣya as a genuine work of Śaṅkara.—The other Bhāṣyas not ascribed by Vidhusekhara to the author of the Sūtra-bhāṣya are the Vākya-bhāṣya on Kenopaniṣad, the Bhāṣya on Nṛsiṃhapūrvatāpanīyā, and that on Śvetāśvatara. Among those which might have to be added to this list is Praśnopaniṣad-bhāṣya, because (as pointed out by Deussen, *loc. cit.*, p. 570, n. the explanation it gives of *jīvaḥana* (ad V, 5) is not identical with Śaṅkara's in his interpretation of the same Upaniṣad passage in his Bhāṣya on *Brahma-sūtra* I, 3, 13, but is only added there as the view of "another" commentator (*aparāh*). However, this case differs but little from the first mentioned in the preceding note and seems, therefore, to leave room for a similar explanation.

MISCELLANY

A Further Note on the Origin of the Bell Capital *

II

Dr. Coomaraswamy on the Diffusionist Hypothesis

Dr. Coomaraswamy finds fault with the diffusionist hypothesis on several grounds. I shall briefly discuss them as follows:—

(a) *Chronology*: I have said that ‘references to pre-existing stone columns in the edicts of Aśoka cannot be interpreted as denoting their existence much earlier than the reign of Aśoka or the Mauryan period, though some of them may be assigned to the two preceding reigns.’ (*IHQ.*, vol. VII, p. 227). Notwithstanding Megasthenes’ notice of Candragupta’s palace at Patna, our knowledge of his building activities can only be described as meagre, while of those of Bindusāra, we are completely ignorant. My theory does not require that Aśoka should have sent his architects to the ruins of Persepolis, burnt down more than sixty years earlier, in order to obtain material for the construction of ‘period architecture’ in India. In fact, I have got no contemporary literary document to show whether Mauryan architecture was the creation of Greek, Persian or Indian architects.²² As to the Persepolitan structures having been destroyed at the time, we know that in spite of the destruction wrought by fire and weather, “the site was never at any time forgotten. . . . Since the end of the 18th century, the curious traveller to Persia has noted with interest the ruins on the terrace at Persepolis, and from the description of early visitors we know that they greatly deteriorated during the past century. Their excavation has yielded few surprises, for the remains were all above the ground and the great stone columns are still to be seen standing upon the original level of the platform.”²³

* Continued from p. 136 of this volume.

²² But cf. *EI.*, vol. VIII, pp. 36-49; X Appendix (Lüders, H.), pp 99-100, No. 965, where Tusāspa, a Yavanarāja, is credited with the construction of certain *pranālis* in the dam of the Sudarśana lake at Girnar.

²³ Pijoan, Joseph - *A History of Art*, Barcelona, 1917, vol. I, p. 128.

“For about 150 years,” writes Curzon in his *Persia and the Persian*

(b) *Morphology*: The difference between Indian and Persian columns and capitals, alluded to by Dr. Coomaraswamy, has been pointed out not only by Prof. Chanda whom he cites, but some work has also been done by me in that connection.²⁴ As already stated these differences are satisfactorily explained in the diffusionist hypothesis.

(c) *Technique*: Dr. Coomaraswamy distinguishes between Persian and Mauryan architecture as follows:—

(i) *Persian*:

Material: Soft limestone.

Construction: result of a masonry technique, the tall columns being made up of superposed cylindrical sections.

(ii) *Mauryan*:

Material: hard sandstone of the Ganges valley.

Construction: had its immediate origin in carpentry: the smooth cylindrical column and the octagonal constructional type with square base are immediate reproductions of wooden forms.

In this connection we should note the following:—

(i) PERSIAN ARCHITECTURE.

Material: The limestone which supplied the building material at Pasargadai, Persepolis and Susa is one 'of good quality' and comes from "the upper geological stratum of the Iranian plateau, on the south of Teheran," and "some (of its) varieties are so fine, hard and close-grained as almost to deserve the name of marble."²⁵

Construction: "The hardness of the stone which the rocky soil

Question (vol. II, 148 ff.) in 1892, "the platform (of Persepolis) has been called Takht-i-Jamshid. . . . Its earlier name, which can be traced as far as the fourteenth century, and also still survives, was Chehel Minar, i.e. Forty Minarets or Spires, an allusion to the big columns of the Hall of Xerxes, which originally numbered many more, but have steadily dwindled for centuries."

24 Mitra, A. K.—'Mauryan Art,' *IIIQ.*, vol. III, no. 3, Sept. 1927, pp. 541-53.

25 Perrot and Chipiez—*A History of Art in Persia*, p. 47 and note 1. "Short of marble, to which in grain and surface tone it approximates, a finer material cannot anywhere be found." Curzon, *op. cit.*, p. 152.

of Persia yielded in great abundance," according to Perrot and Chipiez, "not only permitted, but counselled the employment of materials of great size. The highest columns at Persepolis, those the total height of which is almost twenty metres, are not made like the Grecian supports, of cylindrical drums of mediocre height, but are composed of two or three segments at most. Thus, in the sub-structure of the Takht-i-Jamshid platform are blocks 1 m. 50 cm. long, whilst the window and niche frames of the Palace of Darius were cut from one single block."²⁶ "Several steps" of the main staircase at Persepolis, "in one instance (noted by Ouseley, 1811) as many as sixteen or seventeen, are hewn out of a single block of limestone," each being 22½ ft. wide, 15 inches broad and less than 4 inches deep.

Origins: "We have," to quote Russell Sturgis, "in the Persian work of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. . . . the rapid introduction . . . of an architecture, wholly columnar, but with its columns so slender and so widely spaced that it almost certainly originated in the use of wooden columns, often set upon stone bases or in metal sockets, and carrying a superstructure of wood. Indeed, the wooden roof and ornamental cresting probably remained to the end; and helped in the development of a somewhat fantastic method of design."²⁷

(ii) MAURYAN ARCHITECTURE.

Material: The sandstones employed by the Mauryan architects come from the great Vindhyan system which 'provides incomparable sandstones and limestones'.²⁸ I am not sure, however, if the former is "almost as hard as marble."

Construction: The Dhvajastambhas are, so far as we know, made of two blocks of stone, one for the shaft and the other for the capital: a third block having been used for the wheel emblem of the Sarnath pillar. The late Mauryan pillars discovered in fragments at Sarnath in 1914-15 must have been made of three or four blocks of stone,

²⁶ Perrot and Chipiez—*Op. cit.*, pp. 69-70; Curzon, *op. cit.*, p. 151.

²⁷ Russell Sturgis—*A History of Architecture*, vol. I, London, 1906, p. 80.

²⁸ *Imperial Gazetteer*, vol. I, p. 62; vol. III, pp. 148-49.

though their shafts which were of no great height, were monolithic. The archstone from Patna testifies to a masonry technique.²⁹

Origins: I do not deny that Mauryan craftsmen took over certain motifs from contemporary wooden architecture. In fact the monolithic dail of Sarnath³⁰ is derived from a wooden prototype. But no carpenter would undertake its construction out of a single block of

²⁹ Stone construction in India dates from prehistoric times. Abundant evidence has been collected by Majumdar (Amri in the Indus Valley,—*India* in 1929-30, Calcutta, 1931, pp. 353-54; Ali Murad and Lohri, near Johi, Larkana District. - *India* in 1930-31, Calcutta, 1932, p. 484); by Hargreaves (Sohr Damb, Nal, in Baluchistan, Excavations in Baluchistan in 1925, Sampur mound, Mastung and Sohr Damb, Nal, *Memories of the Archaeological Survey of India*, No. 35, Calcutta, 1929; (see also Bühler, E.H. Gaorbands in Baluchistan, *ASIAR.*, 1903-04, pp. 194-201) and by Stein in Waziristan and Baluchistan, - An Archaeological Tour in Waziristan and N. Baluchistan, Calcutta, 1929. *Mem. ASI.*, No. 37). Stone built cities (*āśmanmayī purī*) are referred to in Vedic literature. Mitra, Rajendralala - *Indo-Aryans*, Calcutta, vol. 1, pp. 24-28; Chanda, Ramaprasad, - The Indus Valley in the Vedic period, *Mem. ASI.*, No. 31, pp. 3-4. At the Bhir mound, Taxila, the rubble masonry probably goes back to the 7th century B.C. *ASIAR.*, 1919-20, pt. I, p. 20 ff., and 1920-21, pt. I, p. 17ff. Stone masonry is mentioned in connection with Alexander's siege of Massaga, (McCrindle, J. W. - *The Invasion of India by Alexander the Great*, Westminster, 1896, pp. 194-195). By circa the 5th century, the stone mason (*Pāṣāṇa Koffaka*) is found to have been at work as far east as Rajgir.

For the origins of columnar architecture in India we need not turn only to the wooden posts and props that featured in Vedic building. At Siktagen Dor. in Gedrosia, Major Mockler and Sir A. Stein (An Archaeological Tour in Gedrosia, *Mem. ASI.*, No. 43, Calcutta, 1931, p. 67) found some round stone drums 8" high x 11" diam., evidently meant for supporting wooden posts. Masonary pillars and pilasters, rectangular in form have been unearthed at Mohenjo-daro, where a striking example of their use is in the pillared hall, discovered by Mr. Mackay, (Marshall, Sir John, *Mohenjo-daro and the Indus Civilization*, London, 1931, pp. 23-24, 160-165). Four square capitals, 12 inches along each side and some 6 inches in height, made of limestone, with a projecting upper hand, horizontally disposed and turning off at the corners into spiral volutes, have also been found in the same locality, (Marshall. *op. cit.*, 191, Pl. CXXX. 22, also p. 264). At the Siah Damb, Nundara valley, Stein unearthed certain collas with rectangular pillars of stone construction (Gedrosia, pp. 138-144). At the Bhir mound, Taxila, Marshall also discovered a large oblong hall with three curious square pillars of rubble masonry situated down in its middle, (*ASIAR.*, 1920-21, pt. I, pp. 22-23, Pl. XIV, b).

³⁰ *ASIAR.*, 1904-05, p. 68.

wood. This monument as well as the monolithic staircases from near the Jagat Sing Stūpa at Sarnath³¹ should be regarded as Indian products inspired by the tradition of the window and the niche frames of the Palace of Darius and the monolithic steps of the main staircase at Persepolis.

In 1927, while pointing out the non-Achaemenian character of the cylindrical but smooth shafts of the Mauryan Dhvaja-stambhas, I had suggested their derivation from wooden prototypes such as the funeral Sthūnā of Nandangarh.³² The Vedic hypostyle *Sadas* (sitting room) or Mitra-Varuṇa is described as *Sahasra-sthūna*.³³ The Vedic *sabhā* was an assembly hall, used for dicing, etc., and *Sabhā-sthūna* signifies a dicer,³⁴ “doubtless because of his constant presence there.” The epithet *Sahasra-sthūna* found in *Mahābhārata*, II, 49.48, à propos a *sabhā* where dicing is to take place.³⁵ Our hall of Kumrahr might have been just such a *sabhā* or *sadas* and might, conceivably, preserve the form of the old Vedic *sthūnā*³⁶ or wooden post in structural use.

On the other hand, the plain and unfluted appearance of the Mauryan shafts might have been occasioned by the difficulties presented by the material. It might also have been designed for presenting a deliberate contrast with the highly ornate member on its top. Above all, in tracing the cylindrical and tapering form of the

31 *ASIAR.*, 1907-08, pp. 64-65. The inscription (*op. cit.*, p. 73) is evidently much later (200-300 A.D.).

32 Mitra, A. K., ‘Mauryan Art’ *IIIQ.*, vol. III, p. 514, footnote 3; *ASIAR.*, 1906-07 (misprinted 1908-09), pp. 123-24, Pl. XL.

33 *Ṛg.*, II. 41.5:

Rājānāvanabhidrubā dhruve sadasyuttame/
sahasrasthūna āsāte-//

also V. 62. 6.

34 Macdonell and Keith, *Vedic Index*, vol. II, pp. 426-27.

35 Roy, P. C., *Mahābhāratam*, Sk. 1800:

sthūnāsahasraiḥ bṛhatim śatadvārām sabhām mama/
manoramām darśaniyām āsu kurvantu śilpinaḥ//

36 Macdonell and Keith, *op. cit.*, p. 488. The persistence of terminology alone cannot, however, be regarded as positive proof of a morphological survival. The hybrid character of the Achaemenian pillars, described as ‘stuna’ in the inscriptions, is a case in point.

Mauryan shafts to a wooden prototype, I was certainly wrong not to take into consideration the short, cylindrical and tapering pillars of rubble masonry, discovered by Marshall in the Pre-Hellenic strata at the Bhir mound, which seem to be exotic at Taxila.³⁷ I am, therefore, not now in a position to take for granted the wooden and indigenous origin of the cylindrical shaft of the Dhvaja-stambha, as advanced by me six years ago.

The evidence for the origin of the octagonal shaft is no less conflicting. Ganguli's³⁸ opinion (which is adopted by Dr. Coomaraswamy³⁹) that the form was derived from *Aṣṭāśra* or eight sided *yūpas* or (wooden) sacrificial posts, is apparently strengthened by Capart's view *à propos* the polygonal pillar in Egypt that it was derived from a wooden prototype,⁴⁰ as well as by the fact that an octagonal shaft (of wood) of a toraṇa pillar has been discovered by Mr. Monoranjan Ghosh,⁴¹ close to the wooden pallisades of Pataliputra. But we must not forget that the *yūpas* were cult objects having at their tops a wooden head ring (*caṣāla*), some eight or nine inches high, eight cornered; narrower in the middle like a mortar, and hollowed out as to allow its being fixed on the shaft. No such ring appears on these pillars. Further, the aforesaid toraṇa pillar has been exposed only to the depth of some 13 ft. and its date relative to the timber pallisades (which may or may not have been Pre-Mauryan) has not been ascertained. That the octagonal form is represented in the shaft on the Mauryan standard bowl of Sanchi, of course, proves nothing, as it may well have been derived from *contemporary* architecture or from objects like the *yūpas* which were not meant for structural purposes.⁴²

37 ASIAR., 1919-20, pt. 1, pp. 22-23.

38 Ganguli, Manomohan, 'Archit. from the Vedic period,' JBORS., vol. XII, 1926, pp. 192-215; 'Indian Archit. from the post-Vedic Period,' *Ibid.*, pp. 406-21; 'A Survey of Indian Archit.', *Ibid.*, pp. 464-76.

39 Coomaraswamy, *History of Indian and Indonesian Art*, p. 17, footnote 6. "octagonal columns are essentially Indian."

40 Capart, *op. cit.*, p. 111.

41 ASIAR., 1926-27, p. 138.

42 *Catalogue of the Sanchi Museum of Archaeology*, Hamid, K&K & Chanda, Calcutta. 1922, A. 10, Pl. VI.

In these circumstances, the fragment of an octagonal pillar of white marble from Taxila inscribed with the Aramaic edict of Aśoka,⁴³ is of considerable interest. According to Ganguli, it was made octagonal after the old Vedic tradition of the *yūpa*. "The reason will be best understood," says he, "if we try to find out, either in parts or in entirety, a single octagonal column in Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, Persia and Greece, which, according to the advocates of the Graeco-Bactrian School, furnished to India the models of art and architecture." It may be observed, however, that plain polygonal shafts with more or less numerous faces appear in Egyptian architecture, from very ancient times. "Some octagonal ones occur in the Vth dynasty. In the XIIth dynasty they are sixteen-sided, keeping the four main faces flat and slightly hollowing the others This was continued in the earlier part of the XVIIIth dynasty, but after that, the polygonal form almost disappears" (Petrie).⁴⁴

The German excavations at Ashur led to the discovery of the capital of a column made of black basalt, together with a portion of shaft, which is sixteen-sided, probably belonging to about the time of Tiglath Pileser I (1100 B.C.). An eight-sided basalt column, bearing an inscription of Shamh-i-Adad, the son of the former, was also unearthed at the same place. At Karambs an octagonal column was discovered apparently belonging to the Parthian period.⁴⁵ In the circumstances, it is to be noted that, whereas, the Mauryan artists used the Vindhyan sandstone (unless when working on the living rock), (a) the Taxila column was cut from white marble⁴⁶ and (b) was found at a place which stood on the highways of commerce then com-

⁴³ Marshall, Sir John, *A Guide to Taxila*, Calcutta, 1921, pp. 9, 77-78, Pl. XIII (a); Herzfeld, *Et.*, vol. XIX, pt. VI, April, 1928, pp. 25-53, and Pls.

⁴⁴ Petrie, W.M.F., *Arts and Crafts of Ancient Egypt*, pp. 67-68; Capart, *op. cit.*, pp. 111-113; Perrot & Chipiez, *H.A.I.A. Egypt*, II, p. 95.

⁴⁵ Percy, S.P., *Mesopotamian Archaeology*, London, 1912, p. 167, and footnote.

⁴⁶ Limestone is available at Taxila from the neighbouring ridge of hills stretching along this tract of country from N.E. by E. to S.W. by W.—Marshall, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

municating with Iran, Mesopotamia and W. Asia, (where the Aramaic script employed in the pillar edict prevailed). These considerations forbid our unreserved acceptance of Dr. Coomaraswamy's dictum that 'octagonal columns are essentially Indian,'⁴⁷ and raise the question whether the appearance of octagonal columns in Indian architecture was not due to inspiration from the Middle East.

Dr. Coomaraswamy on the origin of the Lotus Capital

Dr. Coomaraswamy has never explicitly stated that the lotus (so called Bell) capital (as he terms it) was "of W. Asiatic origin at some pre-Achaemenid period." Adverting to "the Asokan lotus or 'bell' capital" and the Achaemenian pillar bases, he remarks, however, that "the two types are to be regarded as parallel derivatives from older forms current in Western Asia. Northern India. . . . had long formed part of the Western Asiatic cultural complex; inheritance of common artistic traditions, rather than late borrowing, affords the key to Indo-Persian affinities."⁴⁸ As we have no evidence whether the said 'older forms' had been also current in Northern India when it "formed part of the W. Asiatic cultural complex" (pp. 3 & 11 of his History), and as the common existence of a few traits like painted pottery does not necessarily create any presumption in favour of other traits or trait elements, I think my deduction in question is not unjustified.

Again, if the Persian and Mauryan forms are really parallel derivatives from older forms current in W. Asia, as Dr. Coomaraswamy

⁴⁷ Coomaraswamy, *op. cit.*, p. 17. footnote 6.

A small octagonal weight of stone (Vs. 647) has been unearthed at Mohenjodaro, *ASIR.*, 1925-26, p. 96. But the Indus Valley pillars were quadrangular in form. From Bardi, Dist. Ajmere, comes a fragment of a hexagonal shaft (of marble), incised with a record which has been claimed to be of pre-Mauryan date, but may not be pre-Asokan, *Indian Antiquary*, December, 1929, p. 229. For hexagonal columns in Egypt see Gwilt, J. (Revised by Papworth, W.) *Encyclopaedia of Architecture*, London, 1899, p. 37.

⁴⁸ *Idem.*, *History of Indian and Indonesian Art*, p. 17, footnote 6. Cf. Fabri, C.L., *Mesopotamian and Early Indian Art Comparisons*, 1932, pp. 222-253, specially p. 232.

assumes, the latter may be presumed to have been characterized by equally close resemblance with them, and their invention could not have taken place at a date far removed in antiquity from their appearance in Iran and India. But Dr. Coomaraswamy does not tell us if he has come across any moulding in W. Asiatic architecture or in that of the Indus Valley which satisfies the above conditions. A peculiar moulding like this could not have appeared independently and simultaneously in all the culture foci lying between the Mediterranean and the Ganges valley. So that we have to localize the exact source from which bell capital might have been inherited by Achaemenian and Mauryan architectures and determine the manner of its appearance in Iran and India. This source may have been in Egypt or in Iran, but the fact remains that the Achaemenian architects gave it a distinctive physiognomy which again is reflected in the Mauryan mouldings. Chanda⁴⁹ and myself are, therefore, agreed upon the point that the remarkable affinities between the Achaemenian pillar base and the Mauryan capital, in general shape as well as in small details are explained only on the diffusionist hypothesis, and this view has been accepted by Bachhofer⁵⁰ and Rene Grousset.⁵¹ If, again, we recognize in the distinctive features of the Mauryan school the survival of "an architecture related to the older art of W. Asia, already current in India before the Mauryan period," as suggested by Dr. Coomaraswamy, we have not only to define the exact nature of the relationship of that pre-Mauryan architecture with those of W. Asia and trace its survival on Indian soil, but also to explain the revolutionary changes in technique and workmanship exhibited by Suiga

49 Chanda, R., 'The Beginning of Art in Eastern India etc.' *Memoirs of Archaeological Survey of India*, No. 30, pp. 29-30.

50 Bachhofer, Ludwig—*Early Indian Sculpture*, vol. I, Paris 1929. p. 4.

51 Grousset (*op. cit.*, pp. 84-87), describes the lower moulding of the Mauryan capital as that 'of a bell shaped reversed lotus' (cf. *supra*, note 21, for Perrot and Chipiez on the shape of the Egyptian campaniform capitals, which resembles the general lines of some flowers belonging to the family of the *campanulaceae* rather than that of the *nymphaeaceae*). In agreement with Chanda he has 'no hesitation in regarding this highly important innovation (*viz.* Maurya art) as the effect of Graeco-Persian influence.' Cf. Roger Fry, *The Arts of Painting and Sculpture*, London, 1932, p. 85.

art and architecture as contrasted with the Mauryan. Curiously enough, the characteristic Mauryan varnish is retained in Sarnath work (inscribed) of the first century B.C.,⁵² and probably also in Patna work of a similar date, so that its absence in Suiġa work from Sanchi, Bharhut, etc., also demands an explanation.

In short, in dealing with problems of this type, greater importance should always be attached to the evidence of archaeology rather than to *a priori* considerations. In the present case the archaeological evidence is admitted by Dr. Coomaraswamy when he says that "in all probability some western, probably Achaemenid, influence is present in Aśokan art."⁵³

ACHYUTA KUMAR MITRA

52 *ASIAR.*, 1914-15, pp. 111-117, 120-126. and Pls.

In *Rūpan*, April-October, 1930, p. 3, Dr. Coomaraswamy in reviewing Dr. Bachhofer's *Indian Sculpture*, concedes that "the technique of polishing sandstone may perhaps be of foreign origin; but we must remember that the Indians were expert in polishing small hardstones (gems) and even in working sandstone (Bhir monud and Sankisa discs) before Aśoka." Is it suggested that the techniques of polishing small gems and varnishing sculptures and architectural monuments are one and the same? By what criterion are the Taxila discs assigned to the pre-Aśoka times? Cf. Marshall, Sir John, *Mohenjo-daro*, etc., pp. 62-63. Pls. XIII, fig. 14, CLIX, figs. 9 & 10.

53 *Rūpan*, April-October, 1930, p. 4. In the same review (p. 3) Dr. Coomaraswamy exclaims, "Can anybody seriously doubt that wooden 'bell' capitals and others with addorsed animals, existed in India before the time of Aśoka?", cf. *Spedizione Italiana De Fillippi Nell' Himalaya, Caracorum E Turchestan Cinese* (1913-14, Serie II, vol. 9; R. Biasutti E.G. Dainelli I Tipi Umani E Bologna Tav. XXXII, fig. 1; LII, fig. 1; LVIII, fig. 1; also Stein, Sir A., *On Alexander's Track to the Indus*, London, 1929, pp. 63-64. It is not unlikely that bell capitals made their first appearance in Indian Art during the reigns of Candragupta or Bindusāra. That possibility, however, is no proof of its existence in pre-Mauryan wooden architecture.

A Note On Simhapura—Ārya Deva's Birth-Place

In his learned article (above *IHQ.*, X. pp. 139 ff.) on 'the Home of Ārya Deva,' Dr. Nalinaksha Dutt brings forward formidable arguments in support of his theory, viz. that Simhapura was in the north-west of India. His arguments on the whole seem to be quite sound. But there are one or two statements which Dr. Dutt makes that may be questioned. He writes thus:—"In any case, there is no doubt that Ārya Deva was born in Simhapura. It is a well-known place of the north-west." From the evidence of the *Mahāvastu*, the *Jātanakas*, *Diryāradāna*, and the *Chronicles*, it is clear, Dr. Dutt asserts, that "there were in ancient India at least two towns of the name of Sīhapura, one in Kalinga and the other in the north-west, and the latter seems to be more historical than the former".¹

We may certainly concede to the statement that there may have been two or more towns bearing the same name in ancient India. But with latter part of Dr. Dutt's assertion we cannot agree on historical grounds. That the Simhapura of Kalinga is less historical than the Simhapura of the north-west—the exact location of which is as yet a matter of uncertainty—, we are not prepared to admit. On the strength of literature and epigraphical records, we may assert that the Simhapura of Kalinga was a great centre which has figured in the annals of India and Ceylon.

We shall first turn to Ceylon to find out some definite evidence of the importance of the Simhapura of Kalinga. This city gave that island a great dynasty of kings. Epigraphical evidence tells us that the kings Niśśanka Malla and Sāhasa Malla were sons of the Kalinga king Gōparāya of Simhapura. King Sri-Jayagōtra (i.e., Gōparāya) is called the glory of the "dynasty which reigned in the city of Simhapura".² King Sāhasa Malla, who ascended the throne in A.D. 1200,³ is styled thus:—"The glorious Sāhasa Malla, lord of the Simhalas, the head of the Kalinga dynasty, having come here from Kalinga,....."

1 *IHQ.*, X. p. 139.

2 *Ibid.*, p. 142.

3 Edward Müller, *Ancient Inscriptions of Ceylon*, I, pp 128-129 London, 1883.

4 *JRAS.*, for 1909, pp. 327, 331.

descended from the unbroken line of kings of Kalinga emperors who in the glorious line of the Ikṣvāku family had reduced all cakravartis under one umbrella whom Śrī Gōparāja had generated 'from the womb of the great queen Bahidāloka at Siṃhapura.....'⁵

The *Mahāvamṣa* relates that Tilokasundarī, the queen of Vijayabāhu I, was a princess of Kalinga.⁶ Three relatives of this queen, one of whom was named Madhukannava, are said in the same Chronicle to have come to Ceylon from Siṃhapura.⁷

Do literary and epigraphical records of the mainland confirm the evidence of Ceylonese epigraphs and chronicles about the existence of Siṃhapura or Siḥapura in Kalinga? The earliest evidence is found in the Tamil classic *Maṇimekhalai*. *Maṇimekhalai's* mother in the shape of an image at Vañji, relates that two princes "cousins by birth and ruling respectively in Siṃhapura and Kapila in the fertile country of Kalinga, fell to fighting against each other in great hatred. This war between Vasu and Kumāra left the country desolate for six gāvudās (leagues), and made it impossible for any body to approach on account of the prevalence of the war. A merchant Saṅgama by name with his wife, eager after profit, went there to sell jewellery and other articles at Siṅgapuram".⁸

We are unable, it has to be confessed, to identify for the present the two princes mentioned in the Tamil classic. Likewise are we uncertain about the exact identity of the following king mentioned in connection with the same Siṅgapuram or Siṃhapura. An undated epigraph informs us that a Pallava king named Candrāditya erected a rock-cut temple dedicated to Śiva at Siṃhapura.⁹

The existence of a dynasty of kings at Siṃhapura in Kalinga is vouched for by inscriptions found in that province. The Kōmāra plates of king Caṇḍavarman relates that the ruler, who is called a

5 Müller, *Ann. Ins. Cey.*, I., p. 136; see also *JRAS.*, for 1913, p. 518.

6 *Mahāvamṣa*, ch. 59, v. 29. Colombo, 1877. King Vijayabāhu I is said to have reigned from A.D. 1054 to A.D. 1109. *JRAS.*, for 1913, pp. 519-520.

7 *Mahāvamṣa*, ch. 59, v. 46; *JRAS.*, 1913, p. 520, n. 1.

8 *Maṇimekhalai*, BK. XXVI, p. 187, Dr. S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar's ed.

9 *Epigraphical Report for the Southern Circle for 1916*, p. 114.

glorious Mahārāja, issued his grant from his victorious (city) of *Siṃhapura*.¹⁰ Dr. Hultzsch's remarks on the reason for identifying this ruler with a member of the *Sālanikāyana* dynasty, given in the course of editing the *Kōmarti* plates, may be recalled here.¹¹ From the same city (the victorious *Sīhapura*), the glorious Mahārāja Umavarman the lord of *Kaliṅga*, who was devoted to the sect of (his) father, made a specified grant in the thirtieth regnal year of his reign.¹² This town called *Siṃhapura* or *Sīhapura* has been identified with *Śiṅgūpuram* between *Chicacole* and *Narasannapetta*.¹³ It is also spelt *Śiṅgāpuram*.¹⁴

Dr. Nalinaksha Dutt makes another statement:—"Coming now to the legend recorded in the Ceylonese chronicles about the settlement of *Sīhabāhu's* son on the outskirts of *Vaṅga* and *Kaliṅga*, the present writer meant that a new city was built up in the forest by the son of *Sīhabāhu* and it was named *Sīhapura* after the king".¹⁵ The reference given is to the *Mahāvamśa*, VI, 35. Dr. Dutt perhaps refers to the same town on p. 139.¹⁶ This does not seem to be so. In the chapter on the coming of *Vijaya*, as given in the *Mahāvamśa*, we are told that *Sīhabāhu* accepted the offer of kingship of the *Vaṅgas* but "handed it over to his mother's husband and he himself went with *Sīhasīvali* to the land of his birth. There he built a city, and they called it *Sīhapura*, and with forest stretching a hundred *yojanas* around he founded villages. In the kingdom of *Lāḷa*, in that city did *Sīhabāhu*, ruler of men, hold sway when he had made *Sīhasīvati* his queen".¹⁷ It thus appears that that *Sīhapura* mentioned in the *Mahāvamśa* in connection with *Sīhabāhu*, was not on the borders of *Vaṅga* and *Kaliṅga* but in *Lāḷa* (or *Rādha*), i.e., modern *Gujarat*.

10 *Epigraphia Indica*, IV, p. 145.

11 *Et.*, IV, p. 143.

12 *Et.*, XII, p. 6.

13 *Ibid.*, p. 4.

14 Sewell, *Lists of the Inscriptions in the Madras Presidency*, I, p. 9.

15 *IHQ.*, X, pp. 141-142.

16 No source for this piece of information is given but we are supposed to refer to *Jātaka* No. 422; *Yuan Chwang*, I, p. 249 (Watters); and *Mahāvamśa*, II, 95, 98; III, 432, 238 ff.

17 Geiger-Bode, *Mahāvamśa*, p. 53.

Dr. (then Mr.) Radha Govind Basak identified this *Sihapura* in *Lāṭa* with the *Siṃhapura* mentioned in the *Belava* copperplate of king *Bhojavarmadeva* dated in the fifth (regnal) year of the king.¹⁸ The editor Dr. Sten Konow rightly commented on the above saying that we knew of princes whose names ended in *varman*, and who ruled from *Siṃhapura* and who were kings of *Kaliṅga*.¹⁹

We may digress a little here and examine the *Belava* plates of king *Bhojavarmadeva* more minutely in order to find out that the *Siṃhapura* of *Kaliṅga* has figured not only in the history of Ceylon, the Tamil and Telugu lands but also in the annals of Bengal as well. King *Bhojavarmadeva* was a ruler of Eastern Bengal. The *Belava* plates relate, among other details, the following—that “the *varmans*, mailing themselves with their hairs standing on end in their enthusiasm for the three Vedas”,.....occupied *Siṃhapura* which may be likened to the cave of lions.²⁰ We may identify the *Siṃhapura* mentioned here with the *Siṃhapura* of *Kaliṅga*, and not, as Dr. Basak affirmed, with the *Siṃhapura* in *Lāṭa*; and we may likewise assert that the *varmans* referred to in the *Belava* plates belonged to the same family to which the *Kaliṅga* kings *Caṇḍavarman* and *Umavarman* belonged. The following reasons confirm our assertions:

(a) The *Bṛhatproṣṭha* grant of *Mahārāja Umavarman* being thus: “Om! Hail! From the victorious *Sihapura*, the lord of *Kaliṅga*, the glorious *Mahārāja Umavarman*, who is devoted to the feet of his father”, etc.²¹

This may be compared with the beginning in the *Belava* plates: “.....the glorious *Bhoja* who meditated on the feet of the *Mahārājādhirāja Sāmalavarmadeva*.....”²²

The titles *Kaliṅgādhipati* (lord of *Kaliṅga*) and the expression “devoted to the feet of (the lord) (hi) father” were borne also by

18 *El.*, XII., p. 37.

19 *Ibid.*, p. 37, n. 2.

20 *El.*, XII., p. 41.

21 *Ibid.*, p. 6.

22 *Ibid.*, p. 42. *Mahārājādhirāja Sāmalavarman* is taken to be the father of king *Bhojavarmadeva*. But this is only a supposition. For vv. 9-14 do not give us any reason for affirming that *Sāmalavarman* was the father of *Bhojavarmadeva*. The remarks of Drs. Sten Konow and Basak may be read here.

kings Caṇḍavarman, Vijayanandivarman, and Nandaprabhañjavarman as well.²³

(b) In the Bṛhatproṣṭha plates king Umavarman "commands the ryots, accompanied by all (others) in the village of Bṛhatproṣṭha, while making the grant."²⁴

King Bhojavarman in the Belava plates "duly pays respect to, and informs and instructs all the required Rājans, Rājanyakas, etc. (a great many named), the citizens, and the cultivators, the Brāhmaṇas and the Brahmakula elders" on the occasion of making his grant.²⁵

(c) The Bṛhatproṣṭha plates of king Umavarman end thus: "(The above edict) was written by M.....vara, the son of Haridatta, who was placed in charge of the Record Office (*akṣapaṭala*) of the district (*deśa*)."²⁶

King Bhōjavarmadēva's grant ends thus: "Signed (i.e., by the king). After this, signed by the Mahākṣapaṭalika (Records Keeper)."²⁷

The similarity in the mode of beginning, continuing and ending their grants, as shown above, suggests that these rulers may have belonged to one and the same stock. We are not here concerned however with the exact relationship that existed between kings Caṇḍavarman, Umavarman on the one hand, and king Bhojadevarman on the other; but we may note that the above mentioned records and literature contain irrefutable proof of the existence of *Siṃhapura* in *Kaliṅga*.

B. A. SALETORÉ.

25 *EL.*, XII, p. 43.

26 *Ibid.*, p. 4.

27 *Ibid.*, p. 43.

23 *Indian Antiquary*, V. p. 176; XIII. 48; *EL.*, IV., p. 143.

24 *EL.*, XII, p. 6.

Simhapura

Dr. B. A. Saletore has questioned two of my statements made in the paper "Home of Āryadeva" written in reply to Prof. Vidhusekhar Sastri's contention that the home of Āryadeva was in Sīhala (Ceylon). What I contended for is that Āryadeva's home was at Sīhapura, which should be located somewhere in Northern India, and suggested that there were two Sīhapuras, one in north-western India and another in Kalinga. I had to prefer the former mainly for lack of evidences in favour of the other place excepting the tradition of the *Mahāvamsa*. Now that Dr. Saletore has brought forward a number of additional evidences supporting the historicity of Sīhapura of Kalinga, the little doubt left in mind about the Ceylonese tradition regarding Sīhapura has been removed.

Dr. Saletore's statement that the town of Sīhapura founded by Sīhabāhu was not on the borders of Vaṅga and Kalinga but was in Gujerat is not however supported by the *Mahāvamsa*. I would like in this connection to refer Dr. Saletore to a few passages in the work :

- (i) The mother of Sīhabāhu accompanied the merchants who were going towards Magadha (ch. vi, 4)
- (ii) The mother with the son and daughter left the forest and first met her cousin, who was a Senāpati posted by the king of Vaṅga to control the border country (*paccantaśādhana*) (ch. vi, 16)
- (iii) The people of the border-country made their complaint about the lion to the king of Vaṅga, (hence the *paccanta-gāma* must have been within his dominion) (ch. vi, 23)
- (iv) It was just across the border country that the *jātibhūmi* of Sīhabāhu was situated (ch. vi, 34).

And so how can it be identified with a place in Gujerat?

N. DUTT

REVIEWS

JIVANI-KOṢA, Vol. I (*Bhāratīya-Paurāṇiku*) by Pandit Sasibhusan Vidyalankara. Demy Octavo, pp. 2200, Calcutta.

A Comprehensive Dictionary of Indian mythology has long been a desideratum for the furtherance of Indological studies. Pandit Sasibhusana Vidyalankara has earned the gratitude of the students of Hindu culture by compiling and publishing such a work. The volume under review is the first part of his great dictionary (written in Bengali) of the mythical and historical person-names of the different countries of the world. The other parts which are in preparation will deal with Indian and non-Indian historical characters as well as non-Indian mythology.

The volume under review treats of the Indian mythological person-names collected from all possible sources such as the Vedas, Brāhmaṇas, Upaniṣads, Sūtras, Epics, Purāṇas, Upapurāṇas and Dharmasāstras. Pandit Vidyalankara has most laboriously and patiently ransacked eighty-four Sanskrit works—a number of which has not been translated, and given almost all available pieces of information regarding the different mythological heroes and heroines of India. These being furnished with references to source-books will prove most useful to scholars who will have anything to do with Hindu Mythology. It is written in good literary style of Bengali, which encourages the greatest possible use of *Tatsama* words.

As far as our knowledge goes such an exhaustive work on Indian mythology has not yet been published in any Indian language.

To give an idea of the very comprehensive character of the work it may be mentioned that the article on Viśvāmitra covers nearly four of its closely printed pages and is replete with information collected from the R̥g-veda, Manusamhitā, Rāmāyaṇa, Mahābhārata, Harivaṃśa, Devībhāgavata and Matsya, Kūrma, Vāmana, Viṣṇu, Śiva, Śkanda and Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇas. The articles on Viṣṇu and Śrī Kṛṣṇa cover respectively fifteen and forty-six pages and the lists of references are proportionately long. It may confidently be hoped that the present work

will remain for a long time a standard work of reference on Hindu mythology.

It is an arduous task Pandit Vidyalankara has performed by completing the first part of his great work, and we hope that the remaining parts also will be completed and published in due course.

M. M. GHOSH

ŚRIMAD-BHAGAVAD-GĪTĀ, edited with numerous variants from old Kashmirian MSS, an introduction and notes, by S.N. Tadpatrikar. Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. Pratinidhi Series No. 1. Poona 1934.

This little work, giving us a fresh edition of the text of the *Gītā* with Kashmirian variants, follow up the work of Prof. F. Otto Schrader, who brought to light in 1930 the Kashmir recension of the text, along with two commentaries thereon belonging to the 10th century. The editor of the present text has utilised six Kashmirian MSS of the Bhandarkar Institute Library and noted the *variae lectiones* occurring therein. He has not claimed that his effort is to produce a critical edition of the *Gītā* text, nor even of the Kashmirian version; but an examination of the interesting variants noted by him shows that his effort has not been entirely unfruitful. His study has at least established the suggestion of Schrader that the *Gītā* exists in more recensions than one, and that it is necessary to examine them carefully before the textual problems connected with this much discussed work can be satisfactorily settled. From another point of view, however, the new readings do not appear to possess much substantial value. In spite of their great importance in the text-history of the work, it is difficult to be convinced of the absolute worth of the new readings. It is true, as the present editor's labours have amply demonstrated, that the Kashmirian recension in many places improves the Vulgate text and clears up many obscurities, the differences do not yet very materially affect the general substance of the work.

Turning to the larger questions raised but not finally settled by the editor in his lucid and suggestive introduction, one feels that here

there are possibilities of sharper difference of opinion, although the problems cannot indeed be finally solved without further collection and examination of data. For instance, the present reviewer's views regarding the Nārāyaṇīya episode and its relation to the *Gītā* differ from what is said in the introduction, and agree generally with the conclusions arrived at by Miss Dasgupta in *IHQ.*, vii, p. 358 and viii, p. 81 (1931-32) that the Nārāyaṇīya episode probably represents an earlier and independent tradition. The suggestion of the editor, again, regarding the Kṣatriya origin of the *Gītā* is indeed not new, having been already propounded by Grierson and others; but here also the present reviewer finds that the evidence in favour of this hypothesis is hardly conclusive. These differences of opinion, however, which are inevitable on such controversial questions, do not affect the reviewer's appreciation of the present study. The attempt is modest indeed, but it is undoubtedly suggestive and full of interest, and it very worthily follows up the editor's previous studies in the Kṛṣṇa-Problem published in the *Annals of the Bhandarkar Institute*.

S. K. DE

KAVYAPRAKĀṢA, Ullāsas, I, II, III, with five commentaries, edited with an Introduction, English translation and Explanatory Notes, by S. S. Sukthankar. The Bombay Book Depot, Girgaon, Bombay 1933.

There are not many technical Sanskrit texts which have been so much commented upon and so often printed as the deservedly popular *Kāvya-prakāśa*, which, for many reasons, has been regarded as one of the standard works on Sanskrit Poetics. The chief interest of the present edition, when there are so many in the field, lies in the publication of several important commentaries along with the text. The first three chapters of the work, which are printed here, are certainly difficult and require elucidation, but from the theoretical point of view, the fourth and especially the fifth might also have been included. Of the commentaries, the *Pradīpa* of Govinda, the *Uddyota* of Nāgeśa and the *Prabhū* of Vaidyanātha Tatsat have already been published several

times, but they are, in spite of their late date, undoubtedly some of the best commentaries on the text, and afford the best means of understanding it. But to the student of Alamkāra literature the most interesting feature of the present edition is the addition of two important commentaries hitherto unpublished, namely, the *Saṅketa* of Ruyyaka, which is one of the earliest commentaries composed by an independent writer on Poetics, and the *Bāla-cittānurañjanī* of Narahari Sarasvatīrtha, which is more extensive but less-er perhaps in importance. It is a pity, however, that the limited scope of the edition did not allow the publication of more than three chapters of these two new commentaries.

The text and the accompanying commentaries have been edited with care, and, in spite of a few unfortunate misprints, neatly printed. The English translation is literal and faithful, but because of this very merit it does not sometimes read well in the foreign tongue. The English explanatory notes are clear, painstaking and useful, but in some places defective expression appears to make the statements somewhat strange and misleading. Misprints, however, appear to be more frequent in this part of the work, and errors like अपदर्थोऽपि (Notes, p. 36) for अपदार्थोऽपि, which is not included in the Errata, are apt to be annoying. In spite of these minor defects, we welcome this fresh edition of an important text, especially for the new materials that it publishes for the first time. We hope that the editor will find time to continue his labours, and publish the remaining chapters, for which undertaking he seems to be eminently well equipped.

S. K. DE

The ABHINAYA-DARPAṆA of Nandikeśvara, critically edited with Introduction, English Translation, Notes and Illustrations, by Manomohan Ghosh. Calcutta Sanskrit Series, no. 5. Calcutta 1934.

The publication of this work forms an important addition to our rather inadequate knowledge of certain aspects of the less frequently studied subject of the Nāṭya, Nṛtta and Nṛtya, on which original texts, so far published, cannot be said to be too numerous. The substance of

the present work was already known from an English translation made from obviously imperfect materials and published under the title of the *Mirror of Gestures* by Coomaraswamy and Duggirala (Cambridge, Mass., 1917). A critical edition of the text itself, which was little known but which was important for the study of the history of ancient Indian Dance and Histrionic Art, was long expected; and it is a happy idea to include it in the newly started Calcutta Sanskrit Series, which has already distinguished itself by the undertaking of several important works.

The work, attributed to a mythical or semi-historical Nandīkeśvara, summarises the established code of histrionic gestures and movements meant to be scrupulously followed by the actor. It is a brief manual chiefly of the Āngika Abhinaya, which is treated here with perhaps greater clarity and fulness than what is found in the frankly corrupt and unsystematic text of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* of Bharata. The substance of the work in some parts probably goes back to a very early time, but the editor is wise in holding that in its present form the work as a whole cannot be placed very early. There is definite evidence to show that it existed in its present form at the beginning of the 13th century, and it may have existed a few centuries earlier; but in the present state of our knowledge of the subject in general and of the text in particular, a more precise dating cannot be safely attempted.

Though based upon only two complete manuscripts, eked out by three fragmentary ones, the text appears to be as well edited as the materials permit. The translation is much fuller and improved; and the critical apparatus is all that could be desired. The informations supplied in the interesting and well written introduction, concerning the work itself and its relation to the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, the *Saṅgīta-ratnākara* and other texts on the subject, are fairly full and painstaking; and there is hardly any relevant feature of such an edition which has been overlooked. The illustrations are well chosen, and the printing and general get-up of the book does credit to the Series. There is a useful glossary of technical terms, but an index of the verses might also have been included.

MEGHASANDESA OF KALIDASA' edited with Mallinātha's commentary and translated into English by G. J. Samayaji. 24+4+116+120 pp. Sri Rama Press. Madras.

The *Meghasandesa*, generally called *Meghadūta* in the northern side of India, is one of the best productions of Kālidāsa and is a favourite study with the Sanskrit reading public. Every serious student of Sanskrit literature in this country goes through this short elegiac poem of one hundred and forty-four stanzas in *Maṇḍākrāntā* metre. It won the admiration of Goethe, and its theme, the banished yakṣa requesting a passing cloud to carry messages suggested to Schiller the idea of making the flying clouds the messages of the captive Mary in the *Maria Stuart*. So it is in the fitness of things that there are many editions of the text of the *Meghasandesa* with various commentaries ancient and modern published both in India and abroad.

In the present edition, the text has been fully annotated and translated into English, and in the Introduction extending over 24 pages, the editor has dealt with all the important topics regarding the poet and his work. The probable date of Kālidāsa has been discussed in the light of evidences collected up to now. The editor is inclined to place the poet in the first century B.C. The appreciative remarks about the poem and the review of its subject matter are illuminating and well considered. The industry put in by the editor is manifest in his notes and explanations so copiously supplied at the end of the book. Following generally the excellent commentary of Mallinātha he has taken due note of the views of other commentators who differ in their interpretations of the most suggestive among the stanzas of the *Meghasandesa*. Of the existing commentaries on the poem, those written by Mallinātha, Caritravardhana, Vallabhadeva and Dakṣiṇāmūrtinātha as also the *Vidyullatā* are well-known. The text of Mallinātha's commentary has been fully given in this edition and interesting points from the *Vidyullatā* have been discussed in the notes. Thus the edition will suit not only the University students for whom it may be chiefly intended, but will also prove valuable to those who are interested in the intensive study of this beautiful gem of poems.

D. BHATTACHARYYA

22

SRI HAMSADŪTA OF RŪPA GOSVAMIN edited with a Sanskrit commentary and translated into Bengali by Bibhas Prakas Gangopadhyaya. iv+188 pp. Calcutta 1934.

The *Haṃsadūta* belongs to the class of lyrical poetry popularly known as *Dūtakāvya*. The *Meghadūta* of Kālidāsa is the earliest known specimen of the class in which the passing clouds have been made messengers of love. Since Kālidāsa's time, various writers have composed poems, in which either inanimate objects or irrational creatures are the carriers of the messages.

Rūpa Gosvāmin, the author of the *Haṃsadūta*, was born towards the end of the 15th century and served as a royal officer at the court of Alauddin Hussain Shah of Gaud. He had a versatile genius and a facile pen. He wrote poems and dramas and also treatises on different subjects like grammar, rhetoric and dramaturgy. The poet came under the influence of Śrī Caitanya and composed almost all his works with the set purpose of disseminating and explaining the Kṛṣṇa cult. Most of these works were written during the first half of the 16th century.

The poem under review, though said to have been composed before the author's actual conversion into the Caitanya Order, deals with the emotional aspect of Bengal Vaiṣṇavism. It describes how Lalitā, a confidante of Rādhā requested a swan to carry the news of Rādhā's love-lorn condition to Kṛṣṇa who had gone to Mathurā leaving his beloved Rādhā to Vṛndāvana.

The stanzas are composed in the Śikharinī metre. Their number, as found in the *Kāvyaśaṃgraha* of Jīvānanda and the *Kāvyaśālā* of Hirachand, is 142, while in the Vasumatī Press edition of Calcutta, it is 101. The present editor has adopted the longer version and added a short Sanskrit commentary on the same. He has translated the Sanskrit stanzas into Bengali, sometimes supplying good explanatory notes. Some of the verses of this poem have been quoted by Rūpa Gosvāmin in his two later works, the *Ujjvalanīlamanī* and the *Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhu* and have been consequently explained by Śrī Jīva and Viśvanātha in their commentaries on those two works. In regard to the exposition of these verses, the explanations put forward by the two authoritative writers have naturally been taken as the basis by the present commentator Mr. Gangopadhyaya. In other cases, he has interpreted the verses in

the light of the well-known Rasa theories propounded by the Vaiṣṇava authors of Bengal. The work is printed in the Bengali script, perhaps in the expectation that it will readily commend itself to the readers in Bengal. We confidently hope that the edition will be welcome to the lovers of lyrical poetry permeated by thoughts and feelings associated with the erotic mysticism of the Bengal Vaiṣṇavas.

D. BHATTACHARYYA

THE HISTORY OF NORTH-EASTERN INDIA by Radha Govinda Basak, M.A., PH.D. The Book Company, Calcutta, 1934. 340 pp. and a map.

Dr. Basak is to be congratulated for this valuable publication, which embodies the results of a long study of epigraphic and other materials relating to the history of North-Eastern India during the period *circa* 320-760 A.D. The word 'History,' as used in the title of the book, has, of course, to be taken in a limited sense, as very little space is devoted in it, to the literary, cultural and economic aspects of the period. Some of the chief points of the author, which deserve particular attention, are his interpretation of the Mehaurali pillar inscription and identification of King Candra of that record with Candragupta I, and his exposition of the various land-sale documents discovered in North Bengal. From these documents the author has fully demonstrated that the Province of Puṇḍravardhana formed an integral part of the Gupta Empire, that the sway of Budhagupta, who had a long reign, extended from Malwa to Bengal, and that the Imperial Guptas were in power at least up to the first quarter of the 6th century A.D. Another point of interest is that the District Officers stationed during those days in Bengal, who were under Provincial Governors directly appointed by the Crown, were assisted, at their respective headquarters, by an Advisory Board representing the various local interests. Most of the views expressed by the author testify to a very creditable handling of epigraphic materials. It is a relief to find that King Yaśovarman of the Nālandā inscription, attributed by its editor to the 6th century A.D., has been correctly dated to the 8th century and identified with the king of that name mentioned in the *Gaṇḍa-vaho*

(p. 209). There are some matters, however, in which Dr. Basak's views are open to criticism. His acceptance of Puṣkaraṇa of the Rock inscription at Susunia in the Bankura District, with modern Pokhran in Rajputana (p. 14), does not seem to be tenable in view of Mr. Dikshit's explorations in the vicinity of Susunia, where an ancient site Pokharan actually exists (*Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India*, 1927-28, pp. 188-189). The author has dismissed without adequate grounds the reading of the numeral 73 or 79 occurring after the word 'Samvat' in the Ashrafpur copper-plate of Devakhadga (p. 203). Dr. R. C. Mazumdar, who has suggested this reading, refers the year to the Harṣa era (606 A.D.). This would place Devakhadga towards the end of the 7th century A.D., a date that tallies well with the palaeography of the record, as also with the identification, commonly accepted, of I-tsing's 'Rājabhata, King of Samataṭa' with Rājarājabhata, son of Devakhadga, mentioned in the copperplate. Barring these minor points, the book will be found generally acceptable to those who care for a systematic and accurate treatment by a scholar who has made himself an authority in his subject. It will also serve as an admirable text-book for the advanced students of Ancient Indian History.

N. G. M.

INDO-TIBETICA by G. Tucci, published by Reale Accademia D'Italia, Roma, part I (1932), pp. 158+plates XLIII; part II (1933), pp. 1-101 (with a map).

Tibet has furnished modern scholarship with valuable documents of Indian thought. It was in 1920 that Berthold Laufer's German translation of the Tibetan work on the Hindu canons of painting, entitled *Das Citralakṣaṇa*, was introduced by the present reviewer to the Indian scholars through the pages of the *Collegian* (Calcutta). Since then indology comprising as it does also the studies in Indian art has grown considerably on account of the research activities of Indian scholars. Even Tibetan is today not unknown to quite a few of them. Today, therefore, it is not an entirely new world that Tibet exhibits to

the Indian indologists whether from the standpoint of general culture or of Buddhism or even specifically of art. But the publications in 1932 and 1933 of the Italian Academician Prof. Giuseppe Tucci, who early this year completed his fourth visit of archaeological explorations in Tibet,¹ (*Cal. Rev.*, April, 1934) have placed before the Orientalists a valuable and humanistic mass of well-digested documents. And from his interpretations of socio-religious and art-literary data one is almost tempted to believe that from now on Tibetan will bid fair to commence rivalry, to a certain extent, with Chinese as a source for the study of Hindu-Buddhistic civilization as propagated in Northern and Eastern Asia as well as for a proper orientation to the growth of the diverse currents of life in the Indian subcontinent itself.

The interest of Tucci in Tibet is an expression,—an eminently idealistic one,—of Fascist Italy's expansion in the realm of world-culture. It is to Fascist energism that Italy owes her first central Academy. The *Reale Accademia d'Italia* (Royal Academy of Italy) was established in 1928. Since the Academy intends to "promote Italian culture in foreign countries" it believes that the best means of achieving this result would be for Italian scholars to "interest themselves in the things of the vast world" and to present to the Germans, Frenchmen, English people and Americans things bearing on those lands and peoples, thereby "compelling them to take note of the intellectual activity of the Italians."

The investigations into Indo-Tibetan literature, art and religion presented by Tucci are of course studies in extra-Italian subjects. And they are of such worth that the scholars of the world will recognize them as solid acquisitions to knowledge.

Tucci's studies in Indo-Tibetan culture have been published in two volumes. The first volume is entitled "*Me'od Rten*" e "*Ts'a Ts'a*" *nel Tibet Indiano ed Occidentale* (*Me'od rten* and *Ts'a ts'a* in Indian and Western Tibet), a contribution to the study of Tibetan religious art and its significance (158 pages, 43 Tables, 1932).

The work is based on two Tibetan texts and a large number of small figures. Those who know neither Tibetan nor Italian would still find the study attractive because of the beautiful plates which render Tibetan Buddhism visible in quite an agreeable form. Indeed,

the morphology of Tibetan art as exhibited here serves to bring the people of Tibet nearer to the Indian people than has been possible to believe up till now. The indices also should be helpful to indologists from various angles of vision. Special attention may be invited to the names of geographical places as well as of gods, masters, and *Siddhas*.

The *caityas* or *stūpas* of India are known as *mc'od rten* in Tibet. In many of these Tibetan *stūpas*—although not in all—are to be found a small window through which it is usually possible to see the empty space inside the structure. It is in this empty space that are seen collected a number of objects known as *ts'a ts'a*. These objects are small figures and may be of diverse forms, for instance, representing a *stūpa*, or a Buddhist divinity. The *ts'a ts'a* may even be nothing but one of those formulæ which embody the gist of Buddhism.

The work is thus a study mainly in the architecture and to a certain extent in the sculpture of Tibet as influenced by Buddhist thought and practice.

Treatises on iconography are mentioned in the Tibetan translation of Indian texts in Tanjur collection. It is generally held that manuals of architecture are not to be found in this collection. But according to Tucci the Tibetans knew more of Indian literature than collected together in Kanjur and Tanjur. Besides, as Laufer points out in *Das Citralakṣaṇa*, a treatise on the marks of *caityas*, translated by Lotsava Bu ston, is mentioned in the *bs Tan agyur 'i Č'o*. Then, on the authority of Cordier, it is possible to speak of a Tibetan treatise dealing with the parts of a *caitya*, entitled *Caityasaṃvibhāga*, which is to be found in a section of *bsTan agyur*. This is undoubtedly a fragment because it lacks the usual title in Sanskrit, the names of the author and the translator as well as the place where the translation was done. But it contains precise indications relating to the parts of which a *caitya* is composed as well as the proportions to be observed while constructing it. Tucci is therefore positive that the architectural terminology in connection with the construction of *caityas* used by the Tibetans was derived almost entirely from Indian masters. The fragment contains a classification of the eight fundamental types of *caitya* corresponding to models existing in India. This classification is in full agreement with the material in the Tibetan text on the subject reproduced in the

book with Italian translation. The text in Tucci's volume is a copy of the fragment in *bsTan agyur* with a few modification derived perhaps from Bu-ston.

The eight fundamental types of caitya or *stūpa* were often described in Tibetan literature and it is possible to trace four treatises at the present moment. Extracts from two Tibetan texts are reproduced by Tucci, one covering as it does five pages in print, from a work by bLo-gros-bzan-po, and the other from *Vaidūrya*, *Vyasel* (which is a commentary and supplement to the largest Tibetan work on astrology). This second text covers three pages and a half. Translations of the two extracts are given in Italian. Be it observed, *en passant*, that these are the only texts accessible to the author. Both these extracts deal with the architecture of *stūpas* and the methods of constructing them.

The author has found the technical terms used in these texts not always easy to explain. Besides, Tibetan philology is still in its non-age, as he regrets.

bLo-gros-bzan-po has cited Sahaja-Vilāsa as his authority and followed him closely. There is some difference between this text (A) and that of *Vaidūrya* (B). The discrepancies are noted below :

Name of Stūpa	Place of Stūpa	Suddhodana (A & B)
1 Descent from Heaven (A and B)	Kapilavāstu (A and B)	Suddhodana (A and B)
2 Great Illumination (A and B)	Magadha (A) Rājagṛha (B)	Ajātasatru (A) Bimbisāra (B)
3 Great Miracle (A) First Preaching (B)	Kuśinagara (A) Benares (B)	Mallas (A) Pencā Vaggiya (B)
4 Preaching (A) Great Miracle (B)	Benares (A) Jetavana (B)	Brahmadatta (A) Licchavi (B)
5 Kanika (A) Descent from Heaven of thirty three goods (B)	Vaiśāli (A) Sānkāśya (B)	Prince of Licchavi (A) Inhabitants of the locality (B)
6 Victorious (A) Reconciliation (B)	Srāvasti (A) Rājagṛha (B)	Prasenajit (A) Jeta and others of Magadh (B)
7 Luminous (A) Victorious (B)	Tśadga (A) Vaiśāli (B)	Suncidala (A) Inhabitants of the city (B)
8 Totous formed (A) Nirvāṇa (B)	Tikacaśi (A) Kuśinagara (B)	Indrasvāmin (A) Mallas (B)

Evidently the printers' Devil is responsible for the unfortunate transposition of types in the table at p. 22 which renders the classification entirely different from the Italian translation of the second text as given on pp. 127-129. Perhaps it should not be difficult to get page 22 replaced by a fresh one. The table presented in the present review follows the Italian translation but has been arranged in a form different from that given by the author, in order to render easily obvious the discrepancies between the texts A and B.

A whole section is given over to the description of the *ts'a ts'a* collected by the author in Ladakh, Spiti, Kunavar and Guge. These are 156 in number and have been classified as follows:—

I. Printed seals bearing the figure or figures of *stūpa*: 44.

II. Impressions bearing figures:

(a) Single gods, such as Vairocana, Amitābha, Akṣobhya, Ratnasambhava, Śākyamuni, Lokanātha, Avalokiteśvara, Mañjuśrī, Vajrapāṇi, Saṃvara, Mahākāla, Kārttikeya, Mañjuśrī, Vajrasattva, Vijaya, etc: 91.

The rivalry between Vajrapāṇi and Śiva and the former's *digvijaya* form the subject matter of a Sanskrit text in late Gupta character, at present in the possession of the Nepal Government. The author has reproduced the text and has furnished an Italian translation. The Sanskrit text is interesting and will be easily understood by those indologists who do not know Italian.

The figure of Kārttikeya appearing, as it does, in a Tibetan *ts'a ts'a* will certainly have some appeal to Bengali readers. The author considers it to be the first example of this type of iconography.

(b) Gods in groups: e.g. Ṣaḍakṣari, Lokeśvara, Mañdhara, Vajrapāṇi, Mañjuśrī, Amitābha, Akṣobhya, etc: 13

(c) Guru and *Siddha*: 11.

III. In the forms of *stūpa*: 8.

IV. Bon po, some non-Buddhistic or pre-Buddhistic divinity of the Bon-po pantheon (original Tibetan): 1

The volume contains 43 well-done plates which should serve to add immensely to the knowledge of Tibetan, Buddhist anthropology and art-forms.

The second volume is entitled “*Rin c'en bzañ po e la Rinascita del Buddhismo nel Tibet intorno al Mille*” or “*Rin c'en bzañ po and the Renaissance of Buddhism in Tibet round about 1000 A.C.*” (101 pages, Map of Tibet, 1933).

Rin c'en bzañ po was known generally as the Tibetan *Lotsara* who built many temples and translated the *Prajñāpāramitā*. But in Tucci's presentation of this Tibetan monk-scholar-saint we come into living contact with what may aptly be described as the I-tsing or rather the Yuan-Chuang of Tibet, and by all means one of the most remarkable personalities of mediæval Eur-Asia.

It was Rin c'en bzañ po who rescued Buddhism from degenerating into Tantric ritualism on the one hand as well as from being swallowed up by the pre-Buddhistic and non-Buddhist religion of the Bon gods. An epoch of spiritual renaissance for Tibet and Tibeto-Indian cultural intercourse commenced with him. It is to the new spirit embodied in him that we have to ascribe the missionizing activities of the Bengali Atīśa and the Kashmiri Somanātha in Tibet. One can easily understand, therefore, why Tibetan historians describe Rin c'en bzañ po's work as the “second penetration of Buddhism” in Tibet.

The literary work with which Rin c'en bzañ po's name is associated may be classified into three groups as follows:—

1. *Sūtra and Tantra*

- 1 *Laghusaṃvaratantra*
- 2 *Abhidhānottaratantra*
- 3 *Sarvatathāgatākāya-cākṣittarahasyaguhyasamāja*
- 4 *Māyājālamahātantrarāja*
- 5 *Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā*
- 6 *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*
- 7 *Ghaṇṭīsūtra*

Altogether, seventeen works are mentioned in this group. Among Rin c'en bzañ po's collaborators are found such Indian names as Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna, Śraddhākaravarman, Padmākaravarmān, Kāmālagupta and Dharmasribhadra, some of them being mentioned more than once.

II. Commentaries on Sūtras

- 1 Translation and revision of Haribhadra's *Abhisamayā-
lankārālokā*
- 2 Translation of *Durbodhaloka*
- 3 „ of *Hastābalaprakaraṇa*
- 4 Revision of the translation of *Bodhicaryāvatāra*
- 5 Translation of *Pāramitāyānabhāvanāṅkramopadeśa*
- 6 „ of *Saptaguṇaparivartanākhathā*
- 7 „ of *Dhyanasaddharmavyavasthāna*
- 8 „ of *Trisaraṇagamanaṣeptati*
- 9 „ of *Yogāvatāropadeśa*
- 10 „ of *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasaṃhitā*
- 11 „ of *Śālihotrīyāśvāyurvedasaṃhitā*.

Thirty-three works are mentioned in this group. The following Indian names are to be found among collaborators: Subhāṣita, Dīpaṅkara, Śraddhākaravarman, Kamalagupta, Dharmasribhadra, Padmakaravarman, Prajñākaravarman, Gaṅgādharma, Buddhahadra, Jānār-dana, Atīsa and Buddhaśīśānti.

III. Commentaries on Tantras

- 1 Translation of *Viśeṣastotraṭīkā*
- 2 „ of *Kāyatraya-stotravicaraṇa*
- 3 „ of *Deśanāstava*
- 4 „ of *Buddhābhiṣekanāmastotra*
- 5 „ of *Saptatathāgatastotra*
- 6 „ of *Bhagavadabhisamaya*
- 7 „ of *Vajrayoginīstotra*
- 8 „ of *Mṛtyucañcanopadeśa*
- 9 „ of *Ṣaḍāṅgayogaṭīkā*
- 10 „ of *Guhyasamūjamandalaśidhi*
- 11 „ of *Amṛtakunḍalisādhanā*
- 12 „ of *Mukhāgama*
- 13 „ of *Yamārisādhanā*
- 14 „ of *Kośalālaṅkāra*
- 15 „ of (in part) the commentary to *Tattvasaṃgraha*

- 16 ,, of *Pratiṣṭhāvidhi*.
 17 ,, of *Vajraśāstraṅgīdhāraṅgīkā*
 18 ,, of *Sthiracakrabhāvanā*
 19 ,, of *Nayatrāyapraśāpa*
 20 ,, of *Tattvasārasaṃgraha*

The list contains 108 titles. The following names among collaborators are Indian :

Janārdana, Śraddhākaravarman, Padmākaravarman, Dharmasribhadra, Buddhakaravarman, Śraddhākara, Buddhaśīśānti, Śraddhākaravarman, Atīśa, Kamalagupta, Subhāṣita, Prajñāśrīgupta, Vīryabhadrā, Kamalagupta, Tathāgatarakṣita, Vijayaśrīdharā, Devākara, Subhūtiśrībhadrā, Kanākavarman.

It is to be observed that Rin c'en bzai po obtained co-operation from the scholars of Tibet also. But their number was very limited. In the third list no Tibetan collaborator is mentioned. The second list has only one Tibetan name, Śa kya blo gros. In the first list we come across the names of two Tibetan collaborators, T'sul k'rims yon tan and Ses rab legs pa. These three lists alone ought to furnish materials for further investigation into the work of "Indian Pundits in the Land of Snow," such as was initiated by our Sarat Chandra Das.

Seventyfive Pandits are known to have been invited by the royal patrons of Rin c'en bzai po from India in order to help him in his literary work. Some of them were his own *gurus* from whom he had received direct initiation while on pilgrimage in India.

He was in India thrice and spent altogether seventeen years. His first Indian voyage was confined to Kashmir and lasted seven years. It was to Eastern India, perhaps to Vikramāśilā, that he went out from Tibet during the second voyage. The third voyage took him again to Kashmir.

He was 87 years old when he met Atīśa who was invited to Tibet by the king of Guge. He died in his 98th year.

Rin c'en bzai po was an encyclopædist and in his sweep of Buddha-lore he covered the entire system of ideas, practices, rituals, esoteric exercises, mystical experiences and what not, such as belonged to the Indian Buddhists of all ages. And since his mission consisted in transplanting Indian Buddhism in its entirety,—both the spirit as well as the

letter of Buddhist life,—he could not be content with simply translating the literary documents. He sought to furnish his father-land with the permanent abodes of Buddhist faith in “brick and mortar.”

Tradition ascribes to him the construction of 108 temples and other buildings, and practically every village claims a chapel said to have been built by him. He was a great architect, sculptor and painter all boiled into one. What is more important, he knew where his limitations as builder or artist lay and sought to make up for them by inviting creative artists from India. Tibet is dotted over with numerous edifices such as served to give a “local habitation and a name” to the new spiritual urges of the people.

His temples and *stūpas* are rich in frescoes and wooden carvings and sculptures. The architecture, sculpture as well as painting are very often as much Indian in inspiration as Tibetan. The artists of India, be it observed here, went to Tibet not only from Nepal and Bengal, as is generally believed, but also and in large numbers from Kashmir.

The chief of the three principal temples, the monastery of Rad nis, was furnished with numerous statues of wood, copper and bronze representing not only Buddha and Avalokiteśvara but also the divinities of the *Guhyasamāja* cycle. The walls were painted with Tantric pictures. A Tripitaka of 468 volumes was likewise deposited in it.

The Tantric system introduced by Rin c'en bzai po is known as Kashmir systems. Kashmir plays an important part in Tibetan Buddhism and for obvious reasons. Fugitives from Kashmir took shelter in Western Tibet on account of tyranny at home. The rulers of Western Tibet are said to have found it difficult to cope with the responsibilities of hospitality on account of limited resources and were compelled to restrict the permission for residence to a period of not more than three years.

The renaissance of Buddhism in Tibet coincides with its decay and virtual disappearance in India. The literary and artistic activities of Rin c'en bzai po assume thus a special importance in the mediæval history of Eur-Asia. It is as a great Asian of the tenth century that this *Lotsava* has a place in the cultural experience of mankind.

Extracts from three Tibetan texts in Tibetan script cover fourteen pages. One is from *Deb t'er snon po*, the second from *C'os 'byun di Pad ma dkar po* and the third from *rGyal rabs*. These three are the most valuable genealogical and historical works on Tibet.

The biography (*nam t'ar*) of Rin c'en bzai po was written by Jnān di K'ri t'añ, one of the most famous of the master's four disciples. Tucci's work is based on one of the three versions of this biography as well as on the genealogical histories mentioned above.

BENOY KUMAR SARKAR

Select Contents of Oriental Journals

Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute,

vol. XV. pts. i-ii (Oct.-Jany., 1934).

A. VENKATASUBBIAH.—*Pañcatantra Studies*. It has been discussed how some stories of the *Pañcatantra* have been remoulded in the different versions. By a comparison of the variant readings in these versions, the original forms of some of the verses of the *Pañcatantra* have also been suggested.

JUGALKISHORE MUKHTAR.—*Samantabhadra's Date and Dr. Pathak*. The traditional view among the Jainas is that Samantabhadra, the well-known Jaina author, flourished in the 2nd century A. C. But Dr. K. B. Pathak assigns him to the 8th century on the assumption that Samantabhadra in his works attacks Dharmakīrti and Bhartrhari, and had a direct disciple in Lakṣmīdhara. Evidences have been adduced in the present paper to show that the assumption made by Dr. Pathak is not correct.

BIMALA CHURN LAW.—*Geographical Data from Sanskrit Buddhist Literature*.

MANOMOHAN GHOSH.—*The Ādibharata and the Nāṭyasarvasvadīpikā*. The writer is of opinion that the *Ādi-bharata* and *Bharata* mentioned in Rāghavabhaṭṭa's commentary on the *Śākuntala* refer to two different recensions of the *Bharata-Nāṭyāśāstra* and not to two separate works. The expression like *ādibharate* and *ādibharataśāstre* do not prove the separate existence of a work called *Ādibharata*. They have been used for Bharata's *Nāṭyāśāstra*, the first work on dramaturgy, as against later works such as the *Nandi-bharata* and the *Mataṅga-bharata*.

H. R. KAPADIA.—*Ethico-religious Classifications of Mankind as embodied in the Jaina Canon*.

P. K. GODE.—*Date of Caritravardhana, Commentator of Kumārasambhara and other Kāvya—Between A.D. 1172 and 1385*.

—*Antiquity of a few spurious verses found in some Mss. of the Meghadūta of Kālidāsa*. Two verses of the *Meghadūta*

believed generally to be spurious were known to scholars living about the 13th century A.D.

.—*A commentary on the Kumārasambhava called Śabdāmṛta by Kāyastha Gopāla (son of Balabhadra) and its probable Date—Middle of the 15th century.*

Journal of the American Oriental Society,
vol. 54, no. 1 (March, 1934).

L. C. BARRET.—*Three Paippalāda Fragments.* From the last page of the facsimile of the birchbark manuscript of the Kashmirian *Atharvaveda*, three fragments have been published.

Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society,
vol. XX, part i (March, 1934).

K. P. JAYASWAL. *Some unpublished Seals.* Ten seals have been described in the paper, seven being assigned to the Maurya period and three to subsequent times. Of the Mauryan seals, the names of Budhaputra, Devarakṣita, Hasika and Siddharakṣita appear on four seals. One seal is taken to be a mould for casting Mudrās (passports), and two are gold signet rings with designs that could be referred to the Mauryan age. Three post-Mauryan seals are of Kumāradāsa, Rudradeva and Dhava Sarma.

.—*Six Unique Silver Coins of the Śuṅgas.* The coins have legends with the names of Sumitra, Ajadeva, Sūryamitra, Dhanadeva, Aśvaghoṣa and Agnimitra.

G. R. HUNTER.—*Unknown Pictographic Script near Ramtek, C.P.* There occurs an inscription on the exposed portion of the surface of a rock mostly covered with the brick ruins of a palace of the 5th century A.C. The rock is on the side of the Mansar Tank lying at a distance of three miles from Ramtek in the Central Provinces. The same pictographic signs are found to be repeated nine times. One of the signs resembles a bull's head and another a conch. It is guessed that this inscription is in the script of a people that lived in the Central Provinces before the Aryan invasion.

NANALAL C. MEHTA.—*The Tripod Symbol (Sthāpanūcārya of the Śvetāmbaras).*

K. P. JAYASWAL.—*Kandahā Inscription of King Narasiṃhadeva of Mithilā (Oinwār Dynasty), dated Ś. 1357 = 1435 A.D.* The inscription records the construction of a temple dedicated to the sun under the orders of king Narasiṃhadeva, a contemporary of the poet Vidyāpati. The date found in the inscription as calculated by Mr. Jayaswal is equivalent to Śaka 1357 or A.C. 1435 which points to the time when Vidyāpati lived.

—*Dating in Lakṣmaṇasena Era.* In Mithilā, mss. and documents are dated in the *La. Saṃ* or Lakṣmaṇasena Era. But the initial year of this era is uncertain due to differences in the different mss. The writer of this note explains the cause of this confusion. In the time of Akbar, the Fasli era of lunar reckoning was promulgated in 1556 A.C. In order to obtain the *La. Saṃ*, people began to deduct a fixed figure from the current Fasli year. Thus the *La Saṃ* associated henceforth with the Fasli year came to be based on a lunar calculation instead of luni-solar as heretofore and became inaccurate.

UMESHA MISHRA.—*Mīmāṃsāsūtrasarvasa and its Author.* This is an Introduction to the *Mīmāṃsāsūtrasarvasa*, a commentary on Jaimini's *Mīmāṃsāsūtra*, the available portion of which has already been published in the previous issues of the Journal. The author of the commentary, though not mentioned in the mss., is known to be Halāyudha Bhaṭṭa who was attached to the court of king Lakṣmaṇasena of Bengal in the 12th century A.C. The commentary as published extends up to the fourth pāda of the third chapter of the Sūtra. In it the commentator has copied extensively either from the *Sāstradīpikā* of Pārthasārathi or the *Tantravārttika* of Kumārila adding only a little here and there.

G. RAMADAS.—*The Initial Date of Gaṅga Era.* Discussions in the paper point out the flaws in the arguments of those who try to establish that the Gaṅga Era was started from the year 495-96 A.C.

JOGENDRA CHANDRA GHOSH.—*The Date of the Patna Museum Plates of Raṇabhaṅjadeva.* The chronogram giving the date in this charter recording the grant of a village to the god Vijesara by the queen of Rāṇaka Raṇabhaṅjadeva has been read afresh by the writer of this

note as 1009-10 A.C. It is also suggested that this Raṇabhañja may be the same as Raṇasūra of Takkanalādam (Dakṣiṇa Rādha).

.—*The Dates of Tirlīngi and the Jiriṅgi Grants.* The reading of the date given in the Tirlīngi copper-plate grant has been corrected here into *aṣṭāsīti* instead of *aṣṭāvīṃśati* suggested by others. This date is considered to be in the Gaṅga Era, and according to the writer falls in the year 582-583 A.C.

The date given in the Jiriṅgi plates of Indravarmā should not, according to the writer, be interpreted as 309. It should be 39 equivalent to 534-535 A.C.

RAMA SHANKAR TRIPATHI.—*The Maukharis of Kanauj.* The paper deals with the history of the Maukhari dynasty which came into prominence in Northern India in the 6th century A.C. and established itself at Kanauj.

KALIPADA MITRA.—*On the Methods of Punishment and Disgrace in Folklore.*

JAYA CHANDRA VIDYALAMKARA.—*Ulūka Country.* On the strength of a reading found in an old ms. of the *Mahābhārata*, it is stated in this note that Ulūka mentioned in the Digvijayaparvan of the *Mbh.* in connection with Arjuna's northern conquest is a misreading for Kulūta, which was the ancient name of the modern Kullu.

.—*Mount Viṣṇupada.* The well-known Mahrauli Lion Pillar originally stood on the Viṣṇupada mountain whence it was brought to its present site in Delhi, according to tradition, by Anaṅgapāla in the eleventh century A.C. The writer locates this in the Siwalak or the Solasiṅgī range near the river Beas mainly on the evidence of the *Rāmāyaṇa* which mentions *Viṣṇoḥ pādām* while describing a route for messengers.

KALIPADA MITRA.—*Unity between the Deity and the Devotee.* It has been shown that the aspiration of a Hindu devotee to merge in the deity through meditation has found expression even in the plastic art of India. The Viṣṇu image of Erān is a representation of king Samudra Gupta in his personal dress, and the representation of Viṣṇu-Varāha and Prthivī at Udayagiri were really a delineation of Candra Gupta II rescuing Dhruvādevī. The appearance of the Siva image with a bejewelled crown and other features in the

Bhumara temple in the Nagodh state befits equally a king and Maheśvara. This tendency to represent the deity by an image of the devotee had migrated to Further India. A temple of Po Klaun Garai in Champa contains a *linga* on which there is the head of a male divinity presumably of Siva, with the physiognomy, dress and ornaments of a Champa king. This is nothing but the identification of the founder king of the temple with god Siva. In the Sivaguru images from Java also, Agastya, a faithful worshipper of Siva is portrayed with features commonly found in Siva, pointing thus to the unity of the worshipper and the worshipped.

PARAMATMA SARAN.—*The Date and Place of Sher Shah's Birth.* The account of Abbās Sarwāni's *Tarikh-i-Sher Shāhi* along with other confirmatory evidences shows that Sher Shah was born in December, 1472 A.C. in the Pargana of Bajwarū and not in 1486 in Hissar Firoza as hitherto believed.

Journal of Indian History,
vol. XIII, part i (April, 1934).

M. G. de HERESY.—*On a Writing Oceanique of Neolithic Origin.* This is an English version of M. Heresy's lecture delivered before the French Pre-historic Society. The hieroglyphic script discovered at Harappa and Mahenjo-daro has been compared with an ancient inscription found on tablets from the Island of Paques (Easter Islands) in Australia. The lecturer has pointed out a similarity between the signs of the Indus script and those of the tablets.

M. GOVIND PAI.—*The Genealogy and Early Chronology of the Early Kadambas of Banavāsi.*

DINES CHANDRA SIRKAR.—*Samudra Gupta's Aśvamedha Sacrifice.* The writer in this article refers to the rulers of Southern India who are said to have performed the Aśvamedha sacrifice; and concludes that Samudra Gupta got the inspiration for celebrating the Horse-sacrifice from his connection with the southern countries.

T. K. JOSEPH.—*A Mādhava-Vidyāraṇya of the Eleventh Century A.D.* One Mādhava *alias* Vidyāraṇya is mentioned in a work called *Brahma-pratiṣṭhā* as having lived in the eleventh century A.C.

ABDUL AZIZ.—*The Imperial Treasury of the Greater Mughals.* An

account of the diamonds known to be associated with the reigns of Akbar, Jahāngīr, Shā Jahān and Aurangzeb has been given and incidentally some famous diamonds of the world have been described.

Journal of Oriental Research,

vol. VIII, part ii (April-June, 1934).

- S. S. SURYANARAYANA SASTRI — *Substance and Attribute in Saiva Siddhānta.*
- A. VENKATASUBBIAH.—*Pūrṇabhadra and his Pañcatantra.* Against Hertel's opinion that Pūrṇabhadra was the author of a *Pañcatantra*, evidences have been adduced to show that he only revised the book.
- V. R. RAGHAVAN.—*Kriyākalpa.* Kriyākalpa is a name used clearly for the Alamkāra-śāstra in Vātsyāyana's *Kāmasūtra*, Vālmīki's *Rāmāyaṇa* and in a way in Daṇḍin's *Kāvyaḍarśa*. So it is inferred that the name was in use before Bhāmaha's time.
- C. R. SANKARAN.—*Accentuation in Sanskrit Determinative Compounds.*
- N. VENKATARAMANAYYA.—*The Reddi Kingdom of Rajamahendry.*
- C. SIVARAMAMURTI.—*The Artist in Ancient India.* References are given from literature to the habits and customs of the artists as also to the art criticism in ancient India.

Journal of the University of Bombay,

vol. 11, pt. iv (January, 1934).

- M. S. COMMISSARIAT.—*Studies in the History of Gujarat.* It is an account of the activities of Śāntidās Jawahari, the great Jain Magnate of Gujarat in the 17th century. The important part played by him in the history of Gujarat has been pointed out in the paper.
- H. HERAS.—*Three Forgotten Pallava Kings.* The activities of the three Pallava kings Naṅakkāsa, Śāntivarman and Caṇḍadaṇḍa who are only mentioned in the inscriptions of the Kadambas of Vanavāsi are the subject-matter of this article. They lived in the second half of the 5th and the first half of the 6th centuries of the Christian era.

D. V. KALE.—*Development of Constitutional Ideas in the History of the Marathas.*

Man in India,

vol. XIV, no. 1 (January-March, 1934).

JOGESHI CHANDRA RAY.—*Food and Drink in Ancient India.*

SARAT CHANDRA RAY.—*Caste, Race and Religion in India.* Current theories about the origin of the Indian caste system have been discussed.

Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society,

vol. XXIV, no. 1 (April, 1934).

SARAT CHANDRA MITRA.—*Notes on Popular Religion in Bihar.*

G. B. BUDHAKAR.—*Is the Advaita of Śaṅkara Buddhism in Disguise.* This is an attempt to prove that Śaṅkara is not indebted to the Vijñānavadā and Sūnyavāda of Buddhism for the conception of Advaita Philosophy but has drawn upon the more ancient Advaita literature.

C. HAYAVADANA.—*Date of Iṣṭasiddhi.* The writer's conclusion is that the *Iṣṭasiddhi* was written about the 11th century A.C. and not in the 9th as suggested by some.

S. SRIKANTHA SASTRI.—*Studies in the Indus Script.* Continued.

Bahitya Parisat Patrika (Bengal),

vol. XI, no. 3.

JANARDAN CHAKRAVARTI.—*Kalaṅkabhāṅjana of Rādhā attributed to Caṇḍīdāsa.* This gives the text with annotations of a story found in a manuscript of Chittagong, exonerating Rādhā of the charge of faithlessness levelled against her for her love for Kṛṣṇa. In two places of the story it is attributed to Caṇḍīdāsa.


VISVESVAR BHATTACHARYA.—*Fatehabad.* The author seeks to identify Fatehabad, the well-known Muhammadan town, with the village Gerda four miles to the south-east of Faridpur, a district town in Eastern Bengal.

NITYADHAN BHATTACHARYA.—*Rāmacandra Kavikeśari or Dviija Rāmacandra.* An account is given here of Poet Rāmacandra (1793-1845), and his works. c.c.

Ibid., vol. XI, no. 4.

BIBHUTIBHUSAN DATTA.—*Acārya Āryabhata and his Followers.* This paper gives a detailed account of the celebrated astronomer Āryabhata (5th century A.C.) and his school.

JOGENDRA CHANDRA GHOSH.—*Family history of Muktarāma Sen; Author of the poem Śāradāmaṅgala.* c.c.



Bibliographical Notes

- Origin and Development of Religion in Vedic Literature* by P. S. Deshmukh. Bombay 1934.
- A New Approach to the Vedas* (An Essay in Translation and Exegesis) by Ananda K. Coomaraswamy. London 1933.
- L'Indo-Aryan, du Vêda aux temps modernes* by J. Bloch. Paris 1934.
- Mystery of the Mahābhārata*, vol. III: *The Story and the Essence of the Epic* by N. V. Thadani. Karachi 1934.
- Mahābhārata: A Critical Study* by Pramathanath Mallik. Calcutta 1934.
- Script of Harappa and Mohenjo-daro and its connection with other Scripts* by G. R. Hunter. London 1934.
- Catalogue of Coins in the Panjab Museum* (Coins of Nadir Shah and Durrani Dynasty) by R. B. Whitehead. Lahore 1933.
- Annual Report on South Indian Epigraphy* (for the year ending 31st March 1931). Madras 1934.
- Secret Lore of India and the One Perfect Life for All* by W. M. Teape. Cambridge.
- Yuga and Western Psychology* by Geraldine Coster. Oxford 1934.
- Sakti or Divine Power* by Sudhendu Kumar Das. University of Calcutta. Calcutta 1934.
- Sāktas* by E. A. Payne. London 1933.
- Indo-Aryan Literature and Culture* (Origins) by Nagendranath Ghosh. Calcutta 1934.
- Uebersich über die Aras̄yaka-Literatur* by Leumann—Aus dem Nachlass hrsg. by W. Schubring. Hamburg 1934.
- Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques*, Deuxième volume: 1932-1933. l'Institut Belge des Hautes Etudes Chinoises. Bruxelles 1933.
- Mughal Empire in India* (1526-1761), part I by S. R. Sharma. Bombay 1934.
- History of the Paramāra Dynasty* by D. C. Ganguly. University of Dacca. Dacca 1933.
- Administration of Justice during the Muslim Rule in India* by Wahed Hussain. University of Calcutta. Calcutta 1934.

Main Currents of Maratha History by G. S. Sardesai. Bombay 1934.

Selections from the Peshwa Daftar :

No. 37 The Karnatak Expeditions of Madhavrao I (1761-1772).

„ 38 Madhavrao Ballal and Nizam.

„ 39 Administrative Papers of Madhavrao I (1761-1772).

„ 40 Miscellaneous Papers of Peshwa Balajirao.

—edited by G. S. Sardesai. Government Central Press.

Bombay 1934.

Kālidāsa: His Period, Personality and Poetry, vol. I by K. S.

Ramaswami Sastri. Vanivilas Press. Srirangam 1934.

Philosophy of Bhedābheda by P. N. Srinivasachari. Madras 1934.

Zur Verfasserfrage des dem Śaṅkarācārya zugeschriebene Brhadāraṇyakopaniṣadbhāṣya by Kaethe Marschner. Berlin-Charlottenburg 1933.

Metaphysik des Buddhismus (Versuch einer philosophischen Interpretation der Lehre Vasubandhu und seiner Schule) by J. Kitayama. Stuttgart 1934.

Annual Bibliography of Indian Archæology for the year 1932, vol. VII.

Kern Institute. Leyden 1934.

Bibliographie Bouddhique, Tome IV-V (May 1931, May 1933) compiled by various scholars. Paris 1934.

Messages of Kṛṣṇa by A. S. Wadia. New York 1934.

Outline of Hinduism by F. H. Smith. London 1934.

Die Ophthalmologie (Uttaratantra of Suśruta)—Uebersetzt, textkritisch bearbeitet und mit Concordanztabellen zu Bhavamisra versehen von A. A. M. Esser. Leipzig 1934.

Mirabai: Her Life and Writings by Anath Nath Basu. London 1934.

Sphuṭārthā Abhidharmakośavyākhyā of Yaśomitra (Sanskrit text romanised), pt. III edited by U. Wogihara. Tokyo 1934.

Saddharmapūṇḍarīka-sūtra (Sanskrit text romanised) edited by U. Wogihara and C. Tsuchida (Fasc. 1). Tokyo 1934.

Pañcaviṃśatisūhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā (vol. I) edited with Introduction and critical Notes by Nalinaksha Dutt. Calcutta Oriental Series. Calcutta 1934.

Siddhāntabindu of Madhusūdana with the commentary of Puruṣottama edited and translated into English with Notes by Prahlad

Chandrashekhar Divanji. Gaekwad's Oriental Series. Baroda 1933.

Iṣṭasiddhī of Vimuktātman with his own commentary edited by M. Hirianna. G.O.S. Baroda 1933.

Sabara-bhāṣya on the Mīmāṃsāsūtra translated into English (vol. I, Adhyāyas I-III) by Ganganatha Jha. G.O.S. Baroda 1933.

Nāṭyaśāstra of Bharata (vol. II: chs. VII-XVIII) edited by Ramkrishna Kavi. G.O.S. Baroda 1934.

Sanskrit Texts from Bali edited by Sylvain Lévi. G.O.S. Baroda 1933.

Bodhicaryāvatāra of Śāntideva translated into Bengali by Hariharananda and edited by Gopaldas Chowdhury in two parts. Govindakumar Sanskrit Works. Calcutta 1934.

Abhinayadarpaṇa of Nandikeśvara edited with English Translation, Notes and Illustrations by Manomohan Ghosh. Calcutta Sanskrit Series. Calcutta 1934.

Kaulajñānavinirṇaya with other minor Texts of the School of Maṅsyendranātha edited by Prabodh Chandra Bagchi. Calcutta Sanskrit Series. Calcutta 1934.

Mātrkābheda-tantra edited by Chintamani Bhattacharya. Calcutta Sanskrit Series. Calcutta 1934.

Khaṇḍakhādyaḥ translated into English with Introduction and Notes by Prabodh Chandra Sen Gupta. University of Calcutta. Calcutta 1934.

Bṛhatī of Prabhākara (Tarkapāda) edited by Ramanatha Sastri. University of Madras. Madras 1934.

Paṭyāvalī of Rūpa Gosvāmin edited by Susil Kumar De. University of Dacca. Dacca 1934.

Mahābhārata (Adiparvan, Fasc. 7) edited by V.S. Sukthankar. Poona 1933.

Mūnimeyarahasyaślokarārttika edited by L. Srinivasachar. Mysore 1934.

Vedabhāṣya-bhūmikā-saṃgraha (a collection of Sāyaṇa's Introductions to his Vedic commentaries) edited with Introduction and Notes by Baladeva Upadhyaya. Benares 1934.

L'Īśvaragītā (text from the *Kūrmapurāṇa*) traduction par P.E. Dumont. Paris 1933.

Jambhāladatta's Version of the Vetālapañcaviṃśati edited and tran-

slated into English by M. B. Emeneau. American Oriental Series. New Haven, Connecticut 1934.

Commentary of the Nirukta by Skandasvāmin and Maheśvara (chaps. 7-13) edited by Lakshman Sarup. Lahore 1934.

Collected Sanskrit Writings of the Parsis edited by S. D. Bharucha. Bombay 1934.

Anekārtharatnamāñjuṣā (containing Samaya-sundara's Aṣṭalakṣārthi etc.) edited by Hiralal Rasikdas Kapadia. Bombay 1933.

Samantapasādikā of Buddhaghosa (commentary of *Vinaya Piṭaka*) vol. IV edited by J. Takakasu and Makato Nagai. Pali Text Society. London 1934.

Paramatthadīpanī Itivuttakatthakathā of Dhammapālācriya (vol. I) edited by M. M. Bose. P.T.S. London 1934.

Anguttara-nikāya, vol. III (the books of fives and sixes) translated by E. M. Hare. P.T.S. London 1934.

Nitiśāstra—Oud-Javaansche tekst met vertaling uitgegeven door R. Ng. Poerbatjaraka. Bibliotheca Javanica. Bandoning.

Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa.—Het Oud-Javaansche Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa, vertaald door J. Gonda. Bibliotheca Javanica. Bandoning.

Vedā Śākhā (in Sanskrit) by Bhajan Lal. Bharatpur.

Explorations in Sindh (during the years 1929-1931) by N. G. Majumdar. Memoirs of the Archæological Survey of India. Delhi 1934.

THE Indian Historical Quarterly

Vol. X

SEPTEMBER, 1934

No. 3

The Great Goddess in India and Iran

Even today the populations of India venerate a Great Goddess whose cult is attested in every epoch from the time of the Vedic period. An analogous divinity was invoked by the Achaemenid kings. And the two goddesses, the Indian and the Iranian, are related to the Great Mother of Asia Minor. The birth and diffusion of these cults are explained, probably, by the existence of matriarchal institutions.¹ In fact, the belief in a goddess, the superior of the masculine gods, could scarcely be developed except in societies where women enjoy important privileges. It is not at all probable that the Indo-European or Semitic peoples have had from the beginning an organization of this kind. When these populations make their entrance into history, their juridical institutions show sometimes a trace of the matriarchate. But one knows that the vocabulary of the ancient Indo-European and Semitic languages contains a notable proportion of words of foreign origin; it is clear that external influences at a very early date made a deep impression on the peoples who spoke these languages. The matriarchate, which does not fit in with their institutions as a whole, may possibly be an heritage from an earlier civilization.²

¹ Account and bibliographic notes in Cumont, (*Les Religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, chap. III); J. G. Frazer, (*Atys and Osiris*, XII).

² For the function of woman and the traces of the matriarchate in Asiatic society, see the facts brought together by G. Contenau in his *Manual d'archéologie orientale*, t. i, p. 293 et suiv.).

The publication of the great work of Sir J. Marshall's *Mohenjo-daro and the Indus Civilization* calls once more our attention to this problem. There have been found in the valley of the Indus a large number of female figurines, most of which represent the same type and portray a woman, standing, almost nude, wearing a girdle, a necklace and a headdress. With these figurines which are, it is supposed, representations of the Goddess Mother, Sir J. Marshall has compared others which have been found by Sir A. Stein in Baluchistan, which consist merely of a head and torso and bear a very close resemblance to the Cretan and Mycenaean figurines.

It is known that figurines like those of the valley of the Indus and of Baluchistan have been found in the regions which extend between Persia and the Aegean Sea, especially in Elam, Mesopotamia, Asia Minor, Syria, Palestine and as far as the Caucasus and Egypt. It is generally admitted that they portray the Great Goddess whose cult appears in Western Asia. "The correspondence, however," says Sir J. Marshall, "between these figurines and those found on the banks of the Indus is such that it is difficult to resist the conclusion that the latter also represent a Mother or Nature Goddess. . . and this conclusion is strengthened by the fact that the range of these figurines now extends practically without a break from the Indus to the Nile, over tracts that are not only geographically continuous, but which in the Chalcolithic Age were united by common bonds of culture."³

In this way the discovery of very ancient images and the study of the old religions of India and of the Near-East lead us to presume that the populations of these vast territories venerated a Great Goddess who was at first a Goddess Mother. I propose to show that the comparison of the names of the goddess confirms the testimony of antiquity and explains, up to a certain point, the diffusion of this cult. I shall study then the myths and the rites which have been associated with the goddess. Finally I shall show the existence of her cult from a period, long before the conquest of India by the Aryans, up to the present time.

³ J. Marshall, *Mohenjo-daro*, p. 50.

I

After having enumerated the gods to whom the ancient Persians sacrificed, Herodotus, I, 131 proceeds to say: It is to them alone that they have sacrificed from the beginning; but they have learned, in addition, from the Assyrians and the Arabs to sacrifice to Ourania. The Assyrians call Aphrodite Mylitta, the Persians Mitra."

M. Benveniste, who has recently commented on this text, admits like his predecessors, that the goddess of whom Herodotus speaks is the same as the one whom the Iranians called Anāhita and the Greeks Anaitis and who in Middle-Persian represents the planet Venus under the name of Anāhīd (*The Persian Religion*, p. 28). The same author adds (*Ibid.*, p. 62):

"Besides, the Avestic form Anāhita, 'the immaculate,' conforms neither with the Greek Anaitis nor the Pehlevi Anāhīd, name of the planet Venus, both of which have a long *i*. In all probability Anāhita is the resultant of an adaptation, the ancient name of the goddess being Ardvī."

I have not the intention of considering here whether Ardvī is more ancient than Anāhita. I make the statement only, along with M. Benveniste, that Ardvī and Anāhita are two names of the Great Goddess and that she was identified with Artemis in Lydia from the 1st century of our era (Keil, in *Anatol. Stud. presented to Sir W. M. Ramsay*, p. 250).

In his work on *Les Fouilles de Doura-Europos* M. Franz Cumont has described the temple of Artemis which was probably the most important of that city and shows that the divinity "was not really the Greek Artemis but the great indigenous divinity Nanaia" (p. 196). The assimilation of the Hellenic Artemis to Nanaia is moreover of frequent occurrence. An inscription of the Roman period, discovered in the Piræus, records a vow to Artemis Nanaia.

It seems that the cult of the Great Goddess was common to the Hellenic, Iranian and Semitic populations, and that this divinity enjoyed a wide celebrity under the names of Ardvī, Anāhita, Nanaia, Artemis. No one of them is completely explicable in the Indo-European or Semitic languages: Artemis is obscure in Greek as

Ardvī⁴ in Iranian and Nanaï in Semitic. Anāhita, which seems clear when isolated in Avestic, has no longer a certain origin when compared with the Greek Anaitis or with the Pehlevi Anāhīd.

Let us compare Ardvī and Artemis. These two names are formed out of the same elements, slightly modified: from *ard* to *arte* the difference is trifling and the same is true between the finals *vī* and *mi* (s). This similarity in the names of a mythical person cannot be due to chance. One has no reason to suppose that there was a transfer from Iran into Greece or inversely, and besides a direct borrowing would not explain the deformations that have been observed. One is, therefore, led to suppose that the two forms have both diverged from a more ancient original. Artemis and Ardvī are probably two words borrowed by Greek and Iranian from Pre-Hellenic languages.

The Lydian form is akin to the Greek name: *sfardak artimul* probably means, according to Lattmann, "of Sardinian Artemis (or to Sardinian Artemis)" (*Sardis*, vi, I, 69; cf. A Smieszek, RO, iv, 267). Here is probably the point of departure. The Etruscan name corresponding to Artemis is Artume (P. Ducati, *Etruria Antica* I, p. 103). One knows that in the languages of Asia Minor, *m* and *w* are often interchangeable. If the Lydian *artimul* has become the Etruscan *artume*, one can also suppose a form **artuwi* that the Iranians would have pronounced Ardvī. In case that this name could really have meant "the gentle" this epithet must have been felt as a euphemism, for gentleness was probably not a trait of the powerful Ardvī.

"The cult of Nanaïa" says Fr. Cumont, "goes back to the origins of history. She was, strictly speaking, the goddess of Erech (Ourouk) or Orchoe, which is situated to the south of Babylon near the Euphrates. At an early period she was assimilated to I-hitar and was

4 Bartholomae suggests with reservations (s. v. Ardvī) the following etymology: "Eig. wohl 'die Feuchte, Feuchtigkeit.' ai. vgl. *rdū*, Johansson II, 2,27." But in compounds such as *rdūdara*, *rdūpā*, *rlūvrdh*, *rdu* "seems to be for *mrdu* "gentle" (Cf. P.W s.v.); the signification "damp" is unsatisfactory. One may suppose that *rdu*^o may have helped to modify, by a popular etymology, the primitive name of Ardvī. That would then be, like Anāhita, the result of an adaptation.

adored, not only in Mesopotamia, but also in Iran. Towards the year 2295 B.C., she was brought to Susa, where her temple in the Greek period was still in existence. In 164, Antiochus IV failed in an enterprise directed against another of her sanctuaries at Elymas. She penetrated as far as Bactriana where her name is found on the coins of the Indo-Scythian kings of the 1st century of our era. Towards the north, she was established in Armenia in the valley of the Lykos. In the Greek world she was, as we have seen, introduced by Oriental merchants to the Piraeus and to Alexandria, where a Nanaion was used as a storehouse for archives."

"The discoveries made at Doura are in keeping with the complex character and the manifold aspect of this "great goddess of all the earth" assimilated at the same time to Artemis and to Ishtar. Like the latter she was at first a divinity of fecund nature, she who fosters reproduction. Her very name probably means 'Mother' It is then natural that a statue of Aphrodite might be placed in her temple."

"But as the Babylonian Ishtar or the Celestis of Carthage, Nanaia was also a warrior goddess, the protector of combats and the dispenser of victory."

Nanaï is a Semitic name of the goddess. The form that is attested by the cuneiform texts is transcribed Nanā, *ā* final being used to denote a vocal element which may have been *ai*. It has been supposed that Nanā is one of those 'Lallnamen' which are used in the most diverse languages to designate the mother, and Kretschmer has brought together for Asia Minor a quantity of names of the type Nana, Nanna. As for Nanaï, it should be derived from Nana by the addition in Semitic of *ī* possessive.

This attractive theory does not perhaps take into sufficient account the ominous character of divine names. We may suppose that besides her popular name which was used as a common designation and which could be 'Mother' or 'Mamma,' the goddess had her proper name which was not necessarily very different from the first, but which was not to be profaned by daily use. In India, for example,

5 Kretschmer, *Einleitung in die Gesch. der Gr. Sprache*, 1896, p. 341 and f.; Cumont, "*Doura-Europos*," p. 198, n. 4).

mātā, *ambū*, 'mother,' are current names of the Goddess Mother, which do not prevent her from having as her own other more personal names. If Nanaï be derived from Nana by the addition of an *i* possessive, then Nana would be the original form. Now it is only by a comparison of the different names of the goddess that one can see if this postulate is justified.

One finds among all the Semitic peoples the belief in a Great Goddess who is one of the highest mythical entities: Atargatis or 'Atar 'ate in Syria, Athtar in Arabia, Ishtar in Babylon, Astarte in Phœnicia, Tanit in Carthage, etc. Almost all the names in this series are comparable: *atar(gatis)*, *'atar('ate)*, *athtar*, *ishlar*, *astar(te)*. Tanit only is at variance. Let us compare Anaïtis, Nanaï and Tanit. In these three names one finds a common element *anaï/ani* which follows, in two cases, dental *n* or *t*. The principal objection to the comparison of the three names is that this initial dental is sometimes pure (*t*), sometimes nasal (*n*).⁶ May not one suppose that these three forms are derived from a Pre-Semitic original which contained a sound intermediate between *n* and *t*? This conjecture is confirmed indirectly by the facts. In Asia Minor, especially in the Western provinces, the name of Anaïtis is occasionally written Tanais (Roscher, *Ierikon*, p. 332, 45; Daremberg and Saglio, s. v. Diana, p. 152).⁷ There are besides apart from the name serious reasons for considering Tanai(s) as closely allied to Nanaï. The goddess of fecundity is naturally also that of the waters which insure fertility. That is why in Iran Ardvī is at the same time the name of the Great Goddess and that of a mythical river. Tanais, the name of the Great Goddess

6 In tant, which is the usual transcription, the second vowel varies. In fact TNT, which is known through inscriptions only, has an uncertain vocalisation. Moreover, the identification of Tanit with Artemis is proved by the fact that the name abcTNT has for equivalent Artemiḡoros. C. E. Meyer, *ZDMG*, XXXI, 716 ff.; Pauly-Wissowa, Supplement III, 162.

7 Roscher admits that Tanais is an "Umformung." But this deformation was doubtless possible because the name of the goddess was a borrowed word and the initial sound lent itself to confusion. Besides if in the original, the initial was a dental, imperfectly nasalized, Nanaï and Tanai(s) show an equal degree of divergence.

in Asia Minor, designates in the 'Scythian' country the river which later was called the Don (Cf. J. Rozwadowski, *Don-Tanaïs et les Cimmériens*, RO, II, pp. 142-144). The name of the Don has for a long time been connected with the Ossetic *don* 'water, river,' avest. *dānav* "river, stream," skr. *dānu* "fluid, drop, dew." But as Rozwadowski has observed, there is a very marked difference of final letter, of initial and of quantity between Tanaïs and *dānav*. If Tanaïs and *dānav* were, as it seems, borrowed from Pre-Aryan languages, we must, perhaps, see in Tanaï/Nanai an ancient name of the water or of the river, later changed to Nana in order to resemble a 'Lallname'.⁸

We cannot separate from the series Anaïtis, Nanai etc., the Semitic goddess Anat. The origin of her name is also obscure: Babylonian according to some, Hittite according to others. "In any case, her cult must have been widely spread in ancient Palestine. Toutmes III (1501-1447) found there a city called Bet Anat, that is to say, "temple of Anat" apparently that of which Jewish writers knew in the tribe of Nephtali. Some took the goddess for patroness of their children: as an evidence may be cited the name of the Anati at the period of Tell-el-Amarna. A stele recently found at Beisân informs us that Anat was the great goddess of this important city in the time of Seti I. She was called there "queen of heaven and lady of all the gods" (A. Lods, *Israël*, p. 153).

"Anat, whose cult penetrated into Egypt in the time of the great Pharaonic conquests, is usually represented by the Egyptians with material attributes. The goddess, who had a clergy at Thebes from the time of the reign of Toutmes III, is represented as clothed, seated on a throne and holding in her right hand the lance and shield and in her left the battle axe. In the eyes of the Canaanites, she was above all the incarnation of feminine fertility, she who engenders love and who bestows maternity" (A. Lods, *Ibid.*, p. 154-155). In this way

⁸ One cannot separate the name of the Don from that of the Danube. Danuvius can be the result of a Celtic adaptation. There is reason for thinking that the name of the Danube as that of the Don, perpetuates in European languages a Pre-Indo-European name of the river and of the goddess which is intermediate between *dānav* and *tanaïs*.

Anat is closely akin to Anaitis who, in Iran, was also a goddess of warlike courage and also of fecundity.⁹

Finally we have the following series:—

Iran	Anaitis,	Anāhita,	Anāhīd,
Palestine	Anat		
Syria, Asia Minor	Nanaï,	Nanā,	
—	Tanais		
Carthage	TNT		

For the origin of these forms, it seems that one can find an original such as *Tanaï/Nanaï* to which it is possible to add in Semitic the sign of the feminine *t*. The diphthong *ai* is sometimes reduced to *a* or *i*. This simplification, however, appears only in the forms, of which the vocalisation is somewhat uncertain. The initial, imperfectly nasalized, should be a variable sound, intermediate between *n* and the pure dental, which may be written *t* or may even disappear completely.¹⁰ An analogous sound existed perhaps in the Austro-Asiatic languages. The word for 'water' is there found under the following forms: Mon *daik*, Boloven, *tiak*, Bahnar *dāk*, Khmer *tik*, Annamite *nüök*, a relation which allows us to find in the common source of Austro-Asiatic languages a half-voiced initial from which have issued in the modern languages *d*, *l*, *n*. Now the Austro-Asiatic languages constitute a large part of the Pre-Aryan substratum and their connection, if not their kinship, with Sumerian is very probable.¹¹

In the Vedic Mythology, the gods have a limited power and they

9 Cf. Benveniste, *The Persian Religion*, p. 27-28. Ishtar had already this double character: from the most remote antiquity, she was at the same time a martial divinity and the goddess of fecundity (G. Contonau, *La déesse nue babylonienne*, p. 120-122).

10 In the same order of ideas, note the presence in Pre-Aryan languages of a sound intermediate between *t*, *d* and *l*, as is especially shown in the variations of the first consonant in the name of Ulysses in Greek. The name of this hero is in Etruscan *Utuse* (Cf. Ducati, *Etruria Antica*, I, p. 109).

11 In the *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique*, XXVI, fasc. 3, p. 227 and f., I have observed the lexicological resemblances between Sumerian and Austro-Asiatic, while reserving the problem of their kinship. M. Rivet, who has taken up the question in *Sumérien et Océanien* believes in the kinship of Sumerian and of an extensive group which he calls "Océanien."

have ascendancy over the goddessess. Aditi is clearly an exception to this rule: her sovereignty is unlimited and she is superior to the gods. She is therefore akin to the Great Goddess of Asia Minor, for in the couple Cybele-Attis "the first place belonged to the woman, a remainder of an age of the matriarchate" (Cumont, *Religions Orientales*, p. 60).

The supremacy of Aditi is especially noticeable in the following stanza (*R̥g Veda*, I, 89, 10, quoted and commented upon by *Jaiminīya-upaniṣad-brāhmana*, 1, 41):

"Aditi is the heaven; Aditi is the atmosphere;

Aditi is mother, she is father, she is son;

Aditi is all the gods (*viśve devā*) and the five sorts of beings;

Aditi is that which is born; Aditi is that which is to be born."

One could not characterize more clearly the omnipotence and the immensity of Aditi which make of her a power superior to the gods, a polymorphous and pantheistic figure. In consequence, *aditi* has become in Vedic an adjective signifying "unlimited, inexhaustible;" it is also a name signifying the infinite extent of the sky (*R̥v.*, V, 62, 8). But the origin of the word is obscure. Keith (*Religion and Philosophy of the Veda*, p. 215) recalls the former theories, especially that of Geldner for whom Aditi signifies "plenitude, undividedness," while for Oldenberg the sense is "liberty, absence of bonds." Keith is in favour of the theory of Macdonell for whom Aditi signifies "innocence." Negelein (*Weltanschauung*, p. 103) proposes the equivalent "Unermesslichkeit." All these authors see in Aditi an abstract notion that has been personified, but the various senses which have been proposed are a proof of the obscurity of the term.

In the Vedic mythology, Aditya derived from Aditi designate a class of powerful gods, the foreign origin of whom has been suspected for a long time. The fact that these gods bear the name of their mother, places them along with her in a line of uterine filiation, but it does not agree with Indo-Aryan institutions as a whole.

Aditi, mother of the gods, is akin to the Great Goddess of Asia Minor. Her name can be related to that of Anaïtis, especially if one admits that the dental *n* imperfectly nasalized, may have been borrowed without nasalization: in an intervocalic position, this sound

has been noted by means of the voiced *d* according to the common tendency in Indo-Aryan, and the diphthong *ai* has been reduced to *i*.

In fine, the name of the Great Goddess appears in the Semitic and Indo-European languages under forms which may be reduced to two types: the first, defined by the equivalents Artemis/Ardvī, is common to Greece and Persia; the second, which seems derived from an original Tanai/Nanai, passed from Pre-Aryan world to Iran and to India. The names of the former type may have been borrowed directly from Pre-Aryan languages by Iranian and Greek. But if the termination *ti* common to Anaitis and to Aditi is the mark of the feminine, one must probably admit a Semitic intermediate between the original Tanai/Nanai and the Iranian and Vedic borrowed words.

II

In the study of the cult of the Great Goddess, two extremes must be avoided: one of which consists in seeing particular traits only, the other in generalizing too much. If through a liking for precise details, we see no more than the particular nuance of a certain belief, we shall never attain to more than a fragmentary view of the real: if through a liking for the abstract, we dwell too much on general characteristics, our view of the real will, in this case, be unduly simplified. The truth lies between these two extremes.

Statuettes of the Goddess Mother have been found in the countries of ancient civilization which extend between the Indus and the Aegean Sea. The resemblance between these statuettes is such that one is inclined to suppose that at the prehistoric era, the same cult was propagated from the Mediterranean Sea as far as India. In fact, similar beliefs and practices were imposed throughout this vast domain upon peoples the most diverse, Asianics and Pre-Aryans, Semitics and Indo-Europeans. Here is a contradiction for those who proclaim on every occasion the irreducible originality of races, who are always contrasting the Orient and the Occident. Is it not disturbing to see peoples very dissimilar possessing in common the cult of a Goddess Mother? Thereupon the generalizing spirits are eager to triumph. "The Goddess Mother" they say, "is a figure which one finds everywhere. To exalt the Mother, what is more natural? Is it not an idea which

could come to all " I admit readily that one finds goddess-mothers in many countries. But the divinity of whom we are speaking is not only a goddess who has brought forth; she has another distinctive trait: she is superior to all the gods. She is at the same time the Goddess Mother and the Great Goddess. Surely we have here a somewhat strange conception, one which cannot be found everywhere. The Greeks and the Latins had a Goddess Mother, Hera, Juno, but she was not superior to Zeus or to Jupiter. Here we have to deal with a conception by no means uncommon, since one finds it throughout a large part of the civilised world, and yet it is not one which is inherent generally in the human mind.

In the first place, let us try to find in what societies the idea could originate and develop. It does not require much reflexion to perceive a necessary link between the juridical institutions of a people and their religion. Let us take a society where the father of the family has an unlimited authority over wife and children, can dispose of their persons at his pleasure and does not allow them the smallest share in his resources. If this people honour a divinity more powerful than the others, it is more than probable that this god is a Father God. In ancient Rome where the *pater familias* enjoyed despotic powers, Jupiter was, as his name indicates, a Father God.

Let us now take a society which is within our reach and the organization of which depends upon opposite principles, for example, in the animal world, the society of bees. In the hive, the male element is thrust into the background. Preponderance belongs to the female. The mother, or the queen as we say, is at the same time she who gives life and she who brings prosperity to her people. Imagine the bees making for themselves a religion. Do you not think that above all other beings, at the summit of the universe, they will place a Goddess Mother? Reasoning by analogy, we are led to suppose that the idea of a divinity, who would be at the same time mother and sovereign, must have originated in a society where the feminine element was preponderant. Today such societies are rare. The great peoples whose influence is most apparent in universal history: Indo-Europeans, Semites and Chinese, have a social organization based upon the patriarchate. It is true that one observes here and there, in the great Indo-

European, Semitic and Chinese civilizations, institutions which are contrary to the strictly patriarchal form but they are exceptions.

If now we observe savages, that is to say, peoples which are considered primitive and which are, in fact, only retrograde or arrested groups, we see that certain tribes have a patriarchal organization, the members of the family being grouped under the power of the father or of the grandfather or of the representative of the common ancestor; but others have a very different organization: the child is connected, not with its father but with the maternal family. Thereupon, certain observers, wishing to simplify, declare that one is in the presence of a matriarchal organization, in opposition to the patriarchal regime. This manner of expression is, in many cases, inexact. A child can live in the maternal clan and bear the name of its mother without being, for all that, in the power of its mother. In certain tribes, this child is placed under the authority of its maternal uncle. In consequence, although the filiation is uterine, the power does not belong to the mother and one cannot, with regard to these tribes, speak of a matriarchate.

This does not mean that there have never been organized human societies under the law of the matriarchate. At the dawn of history, during what is called the prehistoric period, we see the peoples of the Ancient World making an effort to unify themselves. Everywhere the regime of the clan and of the tribe gives place to political organizations of a wider scope: confederations, kingdoms, empires. Among these groupings which then make an appearance, some have an organization definitely matriarchal or, to use a better term, they are gynocracies: woman in them enjoys a privileged situation; she wields a large share of authority in the family and in the State. Unfortunately much is lacking in our knowledge of the details of this organization. It is probable that in certain regions, the gynococracy was confined to the patrician caste and that feminine powers had a religious origin. What makes it possible for us to perceive in some measure the importance of the matriarchate, are the traces which this regime has left in the organization of peoples who have made a late entry into history.

Now one observes in India and in Iran, at the historic epoch, the

remains of a very ancient religion which seems to have been, in its beginning, connected with a matriarchal or gynococratic organization. We are now concerned in reconstructing, at least in its essential traits, the religion of the Great Goddess and in showing what has survived of her myths and of her cult in the ancient religions of India and of the Near East. We shall examine the myths in which her divine nature is revealed, and the rites of which her cult is composed.

A stanza of the *R̥g Veda*, already quoted, defines Aditi in the following manner:

“Aditi is the heaven; Aditi is the atmosphere.....”

We must now endeavour to explain the effort of abstraction by means of which the ancient Sages attained so broad a conception.¹² We shall see that in speculating on the divine nature of the Great Mother, one was of necessity forced to attribute to her an unlimited capacity, a power without measure, a universal competency.

The fundamental idea is the notion of a mother, that of a goddess who fosters reproduction. This idea, in the divine plane, is expressed by the myth of a goddess, the mother of the gods. When the Romans adopted the cult of the Great Goddess of Phrygia, she took in the Occident the name of the Great Mother of the gods, *Magna Mater Deorum*. But the first peoples, who adored her, could not confine to the gods the sphere of her activity. She who has engendered all the gods is most certainly the originator of men and other beings. It is by the efficacy of her power that they continue to grow and to multiply. The Great Goddess is then at the same time the mother of gods and of men; through her the cattle increase and the plants grow. All that has life manifests her power. A figure so majestic, soon became the centre of a cult in which all the peoples participated: pastoral and agricultural, nomadic and stationary, barbarian and civilized. Sages devoted to abstraction and the simplest minds could meet in a common sentiment of veneration for a goddess who is the incarnation of our profoundest instincts and symbolizes perfectly the unity and the immensity of the cosmos.

¹² It is probable that in the countries where the myth of the Great Goddess was born, many local cults have been progressively unified; but we have not yet grasped in detail the process of this unification.

It was probably under the influence of the Babylonian civilization that these ideas were most clearly and most completely formulated. The Sumerians followed by the Assyro-Babylonians are the authors of a system, the leading and fundamental idea of which is the unity of the cosmos. Three hundred and sixty is the number of the days of the year and of the degrees, of the circle. The same measures are valid for extension and duration, consequently time and space are under the same numerical norm. All which is, lives from the same life: men, animals, plants, the very stars, pass through periods of growth and decline.¹³

These speculations of a character quasi-scientific may easily be brought into agreement with the belief in the immensity of Aditi. We see that the Great Goddess reigns over all the cosmic space; from her beings past and future are brought into existence. That is to say that her sovereignty is extended over the infinite realms of time and space. At this stage a monotheistic conception is not yet realized, because Aditi is only the first in a numerous pantheon; but we are close upon monotheism, for Aditi is, so to speak, the sum of all the gods who have issued from her.

Evidently such high conceptions were not within the grasp of all minds. In all religions, dogmas are conceived of in a different manner by the philosopher and by the common herd. By the side of the abstract notions which gathered about the Great Goddess, certain myths were destined to give her a more concrete image. It was in this manner that she was adored, sometimes as the goddess of the waters, sometimes as the goddess of war.

In the *Avesta*, Ardvī does not only designate the Great Goddess; it is also the name of a mythical river. This river comes down from the mountain, Hukairya, and flows towards the lake Vourukaśa. This river is the source of all the waters of the earth. All the rivers, therefore, all the water-courses have a single source and this heavenly source is no other than the Great Goddess. Ardvī is not solely the mother of all living beings; she is also the mother of waters.

13 D. Berthelot, *L'Astrobiologie et la pensée de l'Asie: essai sur les origines des sciences et des théories morales. (Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale. 1932, No. 3, p. 293).*

An analogous myth is found in India and there also we have reason to think that it is as ancient as the cult of the Great Goddess. In India, the mythical river is the celestial Ganges. It falls into a mysterious lake of the Himalayan region and it is from this reservoir that all the waters of the earth have their source. In this way, as in Iran, all the rivers, all the water-courses have the same celestial source and the name of the heavenly river designates also the Great Goddess.

The extension in the Occident, before the Indo-European invasion, of the cult of the Great Mother, the divinity of the waters, allows us to explain the Hellenic legend of the Danaïdes. It is scarcely a matter of doubt that the Danaïdes, condemned to fill eternally in hell a cask with holes, really personified the incessant flux of springs, rising from the subterranean world. According to Strabo their punishment is no more than an historic allegory. These princesses, who came from Egypt to Argos, brought there the methods of irrigation in use in their country. Springs were dug and the Argives had an inexhaustible water supply. It is likely that in order to explain the introduction into Greece of a foreign method of irrigation, an Egyptian origin was assigned to the princesses, but the essential element of the myth is probably Pre-hellenic. It is no chance resemblance between the name of the Danaïdes, who personify the springs, and Tanaïs, ancient name of the Great Goddess and of the divine River which is the origin of all the water-courses. Tanaïs must then be the mother of the Danaïdes. But the Greek legend connects them with a hero-father, Danaus. The change of sex in his person is probably one of those modifications which myths undergo when they pass from a matriarchal society into a milieu where the organization of the family is different. A final trait which arrests our attention is the sanguinary character of the legend. With the exception of one only, all the Danaïdes massacre their husbands. As we shall see presently, the Great Goddess is a cruel and murderous divinity. The Danaïdes are of the same family.

So the ancient religions of India, Iran and Europe have a common myth, that of the Great Goddess the divinity of Fecundity and of the Waters. A moment's reflexion is sufficient in order to perceive a necessary link between the two ideas. Water is the origin of all life,

of all prosperity. In a prolonged drought everything perishes; the earth brings forth no harvests; food is lacking for men and beasts. Evidently it is in the nature of things that the goddess of Fecundity should be also the goddess of the Waters.

Another association of ideas, which seems more strange to us, has made of the Great Goddess a warlike divinity. Almost everywhere in the Semitic world as well as in that of Iran, she is the goddess of battle. One would expect to see rather a masculine god presiding over martial activities. But let us not forget that war, with its cortège of epidemics and of privations, is among the scourges of humanity and is the cause of the greatest number of victims. In mediæval India the Goddess Mother was renowned for her cruelty. This fact gives us a clue to the enigma. The Great Goddess is warlike because war is one of the forms of death. She who presides at the production of beings also provides for their destruction. This is a truth of all times which we also find in the words of our Ronsard:

“Car l’amour et la mort ne’s qu’une nême chose.”¹⁴

To return to ancient times. Why are death and reproduction closely connected? Because, with the resources which they had at their disposal, men could not be very numerous. In the societies of remote antiquity, the number of those who find means of subsistence is strictly limited. That is why we observe in many countries, even up to the historic period, institutions which make one shudder *viz.*, infanticide and the murder of the aged. The aged are killed so that the young may have something to eat. Girls are killed so that boys may be fed. It is the death of the former which allows the latter to be born and to grow. The Goddess Mother is the incarnation of this cruel necessity, for she is one of the forms of Destiny. Like the gardener who uproots the old plants to prepare for future harvests, she destroys in order that she may create anew. These two aspects of her activity are linked together by an iron law, and this is why the Goddess Mother presides over battles in Iran, while in India she appears as the goddess of small pox. It seems that in Iranian the ancient name of the Great Goddess has become an epithet which may signify the

14 “For love and death are one and the same.”

Gentle. Really she was anything but gentle. Durgā in India was cruel; but those whom she struck blessed her sovereign hand and, to make her propitious, gave her gracious names like the Gentle or the Immaculate.

We now must examine the attributes of the goddess and shall see what they teach us indirectly with regard to her cult. These attributes are the bundle of rods which she holds in her hand and her thick fur cloak.

In a hymn of the Avesta which is consecrated to the Goddess Anāhita, she is represented holding in her hand a bundle of rods. M. Benveniste has noted that the Accadian gods have also in their hands a bundle of rods and this analogy may be explained by the fact that these gods are like Anāhita gods of vegetation or, rather let us say, of fecundity.¹⁵ Sir J. Frazer has compared among a great number of peoples, practices which consist in striking persons, animals or plants, with green leaves, freshly cut branches or rods. This whipping is destined either to renew the life of the beings so struck, or to increase their vigour or their reproductive power. Since the flagellation is a rite which stimulates fecundity,¹⁶ it is natural that the Goddess Mother should be represented holding the rods in her hand. These boughs are at the same time the sign and the instrument of the prosperity which the goddess gives. If this explanation is exact, the rites of flagellation formed a part of the cult of the Great Mother. Certain

15 It seems, as M. Benveniste has indicated (*The Persian Religion*, p. 57), that the rods of Anāhita were borrowed from a foreign cult and that the rods may be compared to the sheaf of branches that the Accadian gods carried. In these conditions, we may distinguish between, on the one hand the *barsman* of the Avesta related to the *barhis* of the Vedas, and on the other the rods of Anāhita. It is true that the latter are called *barsman* in the Avesta. This word then contains two distinct notions; it designates, sometimes a support, a kind of cushion, related to the Vedic *barhis*, sometimes a bundle of rods that the gods of fecundity hold in their hands. It may be shown that the former notion, strictly Aryan, is not very far removed from the latter. In every case, the *barsman* was used, either to isolate or to strengthen and these two uses have a connection in magic.

16 *The Golden Bough* 3rd ed., part vi. "The scapegoat," pp. 255-274. Cf. S. Reinach, *La Flagellation rituelle, Cultes, Mythes et Religion*, I, p. 180 et suiv.

facts lead us to suppose that this was really so. This is the way in which Strabo describes the practices of the Magi: "After having made a libation of oil, mixed with milk and with honey which they poured on the ground, they remained chanting a long time, holding a handful of rods of tamaris."¹⁷ Here the priests are represented holding in their hands the attribute of the goddess. It is true that Strabo does not say what gestures were made with these rods, but it may be conjectured from the testimony of others. At Rome, the festival of Cybele and of Attis was inspired by the cult of the Goddess Mother, as it was celebrated in Phrygia. This festival was held from the 15th to the 27th of March. Now the 24th of March was in the calendar a day called *sanguis*: on this day the priests of the Goddess scourged themselves and cut their flesh, their shrill cries mingling with the sound of flutes. Then during a mysterious vigil, the initiated was regarded as united with the Great Goddess.¹⁸

In Arcadia, children were flogged in the presence of Artemis and we know that Artemis represents in Greece the Great Goddess of Asia Minor. In a village of Laconia, sanguinary legends were current concerning Artemis. It was said that in order to appease the goddess, they had formerly been obliged to offer human sacrifices. Later these sacrifices had been transformed into a flogging of young boys before the idol. One of the Greek names of the goddess was Artemis Phakelitis, a name derived from *phakelos* which means a sheaf of branches. She was adored under this name in Sicily and in Southern Italy. In Arcadia, there was a sanctuary of Artemis where women underwent a self-imposed flagellation. In other Greek cities, it was at the festival of Demeter that the worshippers of the goddess beat one another with whips made of the bark of trees.¹⁹

We have now sufficient knowledge of the subject to understand a Vedic term, the obscurity of which has hitherto baffled interpreters.

17 The branches of tamaris were used in certain cases of ritual flagellation. Cf. Chwolsohn, *Die Ssabier und der Ssabismus*, II, 34 quoted by Sir J. Frazer, *ibid.*, p. 264.

18 Cumont, *Les Religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, chap. III.

19 Daremberg and Saglio, *Dictionnaire des Antiquités*, s.v. Diana.

In a hymn of the *Atharva Veda* (ix, 1) consecrated to the goddess mother Aditi, one finds a compound *madhukasā* which means literally "honey-whip." It has been supposed that this mysterious whip was an instrument destined to beat milk and that it was called "honeyed" because by it the sacrifice was made to be as sweet as honey. Such fancies are not very convincing. In re-reading the text one sees that *madhukasā* is one of the epithets of the Goddess Mother. She is called "she whose whip is honey" because honey is, among all other aliments, that which gives vigour just as the whip of Aditi is a stimulant as she is the goddess of fecundity. Here is a proof that in Vedic India the whip, like the rods in Italy and in Greece, was the attribute of the Goddess Mother and that, perhaps, there was scourging in her honour.

Just now I spoke of the garment of Aditi, though this would appear strange as the ancient statuettes of the Great Goddess represent her as almost naked, adorned merely with jewels. It is true that in the *Avesta*, Anāhita is described clad in a sumptuous mantle of beaver, embroidered with gold. Is it possible to bring into agreement the testimony of the texts and that of the statues?²⁰

In the study which he has devoted to the naked goddess of the Babylonians, M. Contenau has called our attention to the figure of a woman, completely naked, depicted on the cylinders as standing in a hieratic attitude. This goddess is often smaller than the other persons. She is in the company of a divinity clad in an ample cloak, made of a material with a long nap, which is called *kaunakès*. Some archæologists have wished to see in these scenes the representation of the descent of Ishtar into hell, when stripped at each gate of one of her garments, she appeared naked before Allat. At this moment she is conquered, imprisoned, confined in the subterranean dungeon. It would seem that the Babylonian cylinders really allude to this myth. In certain cases, they represent not the descent into hell but rather the events which followed. Upon her return to earth, the goddess recovers her powers. She grows tall and her garments are restored.

²⁰ Coomaraswamy, *Bulletin of the Museum of Fine Arts*, XXIV, 1926, p. 59. The figure 12 shows the persistence of the ancient type in India.

The craftsmen who decorated the cylinders must have placed together two images of Ishtar, small and naked one symbolizing the goddess confined in the subterranean world, like the grain that is buried during winter or as Proserpine, the captive of Pluto, and the other tall and clothed, representing, like Ceres, the vegetation during summer, when the plants attain their fullest growth and are covered with foliage.

This interpretation is found to be indirectly supported by researches undertaken in different parts of the Mediterranean world. M. Picard in studying the most ancient representations of Artemis has indicated that this goddess had at first her seat in a tree²¹. On the other hand, the Semites venerated a goddess named Ashera or Ashrat. Ashera in Hebrew signifies "sacred stake." One may then suppose that this goddess was thought of in the likeness of a tree trunk without branches. Now the documents of Ras Shamra, recently deciphered by M. Virolleaud,²² show the importance of this divinity who seems to have played in the Phoenician world before the time of the year 2000, the part of the Great Goddess, Mother of the Gods.

If the Great Goddess is a tree, one can depict her in two ways—as a trunk either bare, or covered with foliage. Whence came the idea of fashioning this heavy garment which we call *kaunakès*. By the flutings of its surface where it is thought that ruffled flounces may be seen, the *kaunakès* of Babylonian statues suggest the image of a vegetal garment, like the straw mats which gardeners use to cover greenhouses or better still those cloaks of reeds or rushes which are worn by peasants of the Far East as a protection against inclement weather.²³

It is probable that the myth of the goddess either naked, or covered with leaves, took possession very early of the mind of agricul-

21 *Ephèse et Claros*, pp. 377, 487-88, 523

22 *Syria*, xxi, p. 193 et suiv. and xxii, p. 113 et suiv. Cf. Dussaud, *Le Sanctuaire et les dieux phéniciens de Ras Shamra*. (R. H. R., 1932, p. 275).

23 It is generally admitted, since the researches of Henzey, that the "kaunakès" was a garment of an animal origin. I do not pretend to say that certain divinities and the Great Goddess may not sometimes have been clad in fur. My belief is, merely, that the "kaunakès" made of meshes of wool laid in flounces, could not have been the imitation of the skin of an animal:

tural peoples. Thenceforth the heavy mantle of the *kaunakès* could only be the symbol of luxuriant vegetation, the symbol of fecundity and prosperity. From this point of departure, we can explain two series of rather puzzling facts, one *viz.*, the widespread use of a thick fur garment in parts of the ancient world where the climate made the wearing of it unnecessary, even uncomfortable, and the other *viz.*, that garment is called by a borrowed name at Rome (*gaunacum*), in Greece (*kaunakès*), and in India (*goṃaka*).

Pliny tells us that that under the Etruscan domination, in the time of Servius Tullius, the woollen material, held in highest esteem, was that which he calls "undulata vestis," an appellation which agrees exactly with the image of the Chaldean *kaunakès*.²⁴ Besides, the word "*kaunakès*" has as equivalent in the Latin vocabulary, a borrowed word "*gaunacum*."²⁵ We also know that King Servius had clothed the statue of Fortune with a certain number of "*togae praetextae*" which were preserved in the wardrobe of the goddess up to the time of the death of Sejanus. Now Fortune, goddess of Prosperity, is no other than the Oriental Great Goddess introduced to Rome by the Etruscans. According to the legend, Tanaquil had fashioned with her own hands for King Servius a royal toga of "*kaunakès*" and this toga was seen by Varron in the temple of Fortune.²⁶

If these facts are linked together, it becomes evident that the Etruscans introduced to Rome at the same time as the cult of the Great Goddess, this hairy stuff, of Oriental origin, which the Greeks called "*kaunakès*" and the Latins "*gaunacum*." This stuff was used to clothe the goddess, and the *kaunakès* was at the same time a symbol and a promise of prosperity, for it represented the foliage with which plants are covered in the time of renewal. It was logical that togas should be made of it, not for the goddess only, but also for the king, for such a garment

if it had been fur, the wool would have been arranged in a more regular manner. It must then be that the remembrance of another model had been preserved and this must have been made of slender stalks, arranged in layers, one above the other like the tiles of a roof.

24 Heuzey, *Une étoffe chaldéenne, le Kaunakès* (Revue archéologique, 1887).

25 *Une étoffe orientale, le kaunakès*, (JIAS., April 1931, pp. 339-47).

26 Heuzey, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

could not fail to bring happiness to the king and to assure in his person the prosperity of the kingdom.

We see now under the influence of what superstitions, the use was widely spread in the ancient world of an inconvenient and costly garment. This garment brought happiness, for it was the garment of Fortune. Its use was perpetuated in Greece up to the time of Aristophanes and the great comic poet was amused by it.

In a scene of the "Wasps," Bdelycleon offers to his father Philocleon a luxurious cloak of "kaunakès." When he perceives the stuff with which his son wishes to clothe him, the old judge rebels:

"By all the gods" he says, "what is this plagued coat?"

Bdelycleon—Some call it *persis*, others *kaunakès*.

Philocleon—Really, I would' take it for a sheepskin of the hamlet of Thymoetes.

Bdelycleon—Your mistake is not at all surprising, for you have never been to Sardis; you would know that among the Barbarians, this stuff is woven at great cost. This mantle alone has eaten up a full talent of wool.

Philocleon—One should call it wool-eater, rather than kaunakès.

The old man then complains that they have clothed him with an oven; he begs them to bring him a hook "to get myself out," he says, "before I am melted."

How is it comprehensible that a garment so costly and so uncomfortable should be so widely in use from Italy to India and should have continued to be worn for centuries, were it not for ancient superstitions that were deeply implanted in the human mind?

III

The preceding pages throw light upon one of the most difficult problems of the history of Indo-Iranian religions. Striking analogies have for a long time been observed between the Iranian Zervān and the Indian Kāla: both of them personify Time and Destiny; from their power which is without limit, not a being escapes. In view of these analogies, we are tempted to inquire whether India has borrowed from Iran the cult of Kāla or whether, on the contrary, the two cults have

developed independently. Scheftelowitz has devoted an essay²⁷ to the study of this problem. Relying chiefly upon texts of a late origin, he dismisses any relationship between the Indian Kāla and the Iranian Zervān. The investigation of this question must be again undertaken and the early Buddhist testimony must be taken into account. At this point, we may perceive a new aspect of the problem.

Along with the two solutions considered by preceding investigators,—the independence of Kāla and of Zervān or the direct filiation of the one from the other, there is place for a third solution. Are not Kāla in India and Zervān in Iran both *avatāras* of the Great Goddess? If this conjecture should be correct, the analogy between Zervān and Kāla would be explained by a common ancestry. Along with a possible influence Zervanism upon Indian thought, there is the other probability that Zervanism and Kālavāda are both in an equal degree connected with the cult of the Great Goddess.

The Magi, according to Diogenes Laertes, had certain divinities which were both male and female. (Diog. Laert. *Proem.* I, 7). "We must understand this peculiarity" says M. Benveniste, "to apply to Zervān alone, for it is emphasized by the sarcastic Christian arguments against Zervanism in the Acts of Anāhīd: 'How can you say that Fire and the Stars are children of Hormized conceived and begotten by him or by anotherIf Hormized has conceived and begotten within himself, he is androgynous, like his father Zervān, as the Manicheans say.' This is indeed the peculiarity of Zervān." (*The Persian Religion*, pp. 113-114). In the system which we call Zervanism, Zervān is "the supreme god, identified with the starry heaven, representing Time. This god has engendered two twin gods, one of whom is bright and the other dark. These two gods originally may have represented day and night or, it may be, the principles of good and of evil." (Nyberg, *Cosmogonie et Cosmologie mazdèones* in *J.A.*, Oct.-decembre 31, p. 240). In short Zervān is not,

²⁷ *Die Zeit. als Schicksalsgottheit in der indischen und iranischen Religion*," in *Beiträge zur indischen Sprachwissenschaft und Religionsgeschichte*, 408 Heft. About Kālavāda, cf. also Otto Schrader, *Über den Stand der Indischen Philosophie zur Zeit Mahāvīras und Buddhas*, Leipzig, 1902.

strictly speaking, a father god or a goddess mother: he is at the same time father and mother; he is a hermaphrodite.

This strange figure is probably the result of the combination of two mythical conceptions: that of the goddess mother which, from a very remote antiquity, was current among the Asianic peoples and that of the father god; current among the Indo-Europeans and the Semites. When these populations came into contact, we know that the latter borrowed the cult of the goddess mother. Thenceforth the pantheon would comprise by the side of a father god the sovereign of the universe, a goddess mother of equal omnipotence. To which should be assigned the higher place? In order to settle this dispute, the father god and the goddess mother were combined to form a single hybrid entity, both masculine and feminine, an hermaphroditic divinity.

An analogous combination appears in India as early as the Vedic period. Dyaus is one of the rare Indian gods who is certainly known to have existed at the time of the Indo-European period. He appears in the *Rg Veda* as the genitor from whom have issued Uṣas, the Aśvins, Agni, Parjanya, etc. Representing the Sky, he is often coupled with the Earth (Pṛthivī). He is above all a male god and a father god like Zeus and Jupiter; yet, nevertheless, the sky and the Earth are sometimes called the goddess mothers and not unfrequently the word Dyaus is feminine (Keith, *Religion and Philosophy of the Veda*, p. 95).

In Zervanite mythology, the names *asoqar*, *frasoqar*, *zaroqar* form with Zervān a tetrad (Schæder, *Ursprung und Fortbildungen des manichæischen Systems*, p. 161 and fol.). These names are not, strictly speaking, proper nouns but rather compound common nouns, the final element of which is the word *kara*. "Zaroqar" says M. Nyberg, "is exactly parallel to *marsokara*, the first element *zaro* belonging to the root *zar* "to grow old, to languish" (Skr. *jar-*), from which are the Avestic *zairina* (*Altiran. Wörterbuch*, col. 1681), *a-zarma-*, *a-zarsant-* (*ibid.*, col. 224-225), *zaurvan-* "old age" (*ibid.*, col. 1684), a word which popular etymology has perhaps found again in Zervān,²⁸ neop. *zārmān*

28one must probably seek in the word (*zardān*) an allusion to the root *zar*—"grow old", the notion of old age being especially connected with the god of time.....; but we have there perhaps a popular etymology and the true derivation of the word remains still obscure" (Nyberg, *op. cit.*, p. 52).

of the same meaning, etc.” Zervān is then represented in this tetrad as the god “who makes virile, who makes splendid, who makes old.” To match Zaroqar, India offers an analogous entity “Decay” who in the Buddhist *Jātaka* appears in the form of a man Jara²⁹ and in the Epic under the aspect of a rākṣasī Jarā.³⁰ So we have in Iran an omnipotent hermaphroditic god, called Zaroqar as the god who makes old. In India, the same conception is embodied in a person of an ambiguous character, either masculine or feminine. Jarā does not seem to have been of great importance, at least not in literature, but epic India knew another couple said to be the highest of destinies, Kāla-Kālī.

That Kāla personifies Time is a fact that no one will deny. Although Kālī is probably the feminine form of this god, she is always connected with Kālas, because Kālī was early confused with Umā, and so this goddess became the wife of Śiva. “Although Kālī (as Śyāmā),” says Hopkins, “shows that the popular etymology connects Kālī with “black,” it is probable that the goddess in this form is related rather to Kali, the genius of destruction” (*Epic Mythology*, p. 226). Nevertheless, it seems extreme to connect Kālī with Kali or with the adjective *kāla* “black.” This cruel divinity personifies probably female Time as the destroyer; like her, she is inseparable from Kāla “time.” Already the authors of the *St. Petersburg Dictionary*, although they have classified Kālī under the adjective *kāla* “black,” have accurately stated: “here, as in the case of Kāla the surname of Śiva, one has had perhaps in mind, by the side of the notion of “black,” that also of Time which destroys everything.” R. G. Bhandarkar desists from making a choice, because after having cited; Kālī as one of the names of Durgā, he translates “black or female time as destroyer.” (*Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism and minor religious systems* p. 142).

The double figure Kāla-Kālī is indeed a continuation of Jara-Jarā and these doubles, like the hermaphrodite Zervān, are closely connected with a myth more ancient, I mean, that of the Great Mother, goddess of reproduction and of death, all-powerful as Destiny. In the 1st

29) Cf. *Jātaka*, n° 454; *Mahābhār.*, 16, 128f.

30) Cf. *Mahābhār.*, 2, 715, 720f. 7, 8224.

section of the Ādi parva, Sañjaya says to Dhṛtarāṣṭra who is in a state of desperation: "Time createth all things and Time destroyeth all creatures. It is Time that burneth creatures and it is Time that extinguisheth the fire. All states, the good and the evil, in the three worlds, are caused by Time. . . Knowing, as thou dost, that all things past and future and all that exists at the present moment, are the offspring of Time, it behoveth thee not to throw away thy reason." These words recall to us the myth of Zervān who engenders the principles of good and evil. They also seem to ring like a paraphrase of the stanza of the *R̥g Veda* which describes Aditi thus:

"Aditi is the heaven; Aditi is the atmosphere.

Aditi is mother; she is father; she is son.

Aditi is all the gods and the five kinds of beings.

Aditi is that which is born; Aditi is that which is to be born."

In attempting to connect Kālī with the ancient Vedic goddess Aditi, I am not, I believe, at variance with the testimony of the epics which represent Āpyā (Durgā) as the goddess of the Śabarās, Pulindas, Barbaras and other wild tribes, and as fond of wine and flesh. Bhandarkar has supposed that her two names Karāla and Kālī "came into use when at an early age Rudra was identified with Agni, whose flames, which are considered his tongues, have those two names and five others." And he adds: "That an aboriginal element should have contributed to the formation of Rudra's consort in later times as it did in earlier times towards the formation of Rudra himself as he is represented in the Śatarudriya, is a matter that might be expected" (*Ibid.*, p. 144).

We have no reason for contrasting the religion of the aboriginal populations of India with that of Asianic populations. On the contrary, we have every reason for comparing them. Kālī, the divinity of the Śabarās, Pulindas and other wild tribes, has an aspect, not very unlike that of Aditi-Anāhita. / Even before Vedic times, the Aryans were found in contact with populations who adored a great Mother and this contact, prolonged up to the modern era, explains the persistence of the same beliefs throughout the course of centuries.

Old Vṛttikāras on the Pūrva Mīmāṃsāsūtras

Jaimini's *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtras* have been commented on in different periods by different authors who were subsequently known as *Vṛttikāras*. Unfortunately none of these *vṛttis* is available now, but some idea can be formed of them from the references in Śabarāsvāmin's *Bhāṣya* and Kumārila's *Vārttika*.

1. *Upavarṣa*.

Prominent and most probably the earliest among them is the *Vṛttikāra Upavarṣa* who is generally known by the honorific title '*bhagavān*.' Śabarāsvāmin in his *Autpattikasūtra-bhāṣya*¹ and Śaṅkarācārya in his *Devatādihikaraṇa-bhāṣya*² make mention of '*bhagavān Upavarṣa*.' Śabarāsvāmin in his *Bhāṣya* on II. 3. 16³ refers to a *Vṛttikāra* whom he subsequently calls '*bhagavān ācārya*.' This *Vṛttikāra* mentioned in high reverence is identified by Kumārila⁴ in his *Vārttika* with *Upavarṣa* who alone is, among the *Vṛttikāras*, generally associated with the title '*bhagavān*.'

The identity of *Upavarṣa* with the *Vṛttikāra* referred to by Śabarāsvāmin in his *Bhāṣya* on I. 1. 5, is however questioned by Mr.

1 अथ गौरित्यत्र कः शब्दः ? गकारौकारविसर्जनीया इति भगवानुपवर्षः ॥ I. 1. 5.

2 वर्णा एव तु शब्दा इति भगवानुपवर्षः ॥ I. 3. 8 (28)

3 'विशये प्रायदर्शनात्'—किमिहोदाहरणम् ? न तावत्सूत्रेण परिगृहीतं..... वृत्तिकारवचनात्प्रतिज्ञां संशयञ्चावगच्छामः । अत्र भगवानाचार्य इदमुदाहृत्य 'वत्समालभेत' 'वत्सनिकान्ता हि पशव' इतीमं संशयं उपन्यस्यति स्म—किं यजिमदभिधान एवालभतिः उतालंभमात्रवचन इति । II. 3. 16.

4 "सूत्रेष्वेव हि तत्सर्वं यद्वृत्तौ यच्च वार्तिके ।

सूत्रं योनिरिहार्थानां सर्वं सूत्रे प्रतिप्रितम् ॥"

—इति ये वदन्ति, तान्प्रत्युच्यते । न किञ्चित्साधनमप्रदर्शितविषयं स्वार्थं साधयति । सूत्रकारेण चेह हेतुमात्रमुपन्यस्तम्.....तस्मादगमके सूत्रे सति अवरयं दोषप्रतिसमाधानार्थं वृत्तिकारादिभिर्यतितव्यं.....इदं सूत्रकारेण नोपात्तमिदं वृत्तिकारेणेति प्रदर्शनार्थमेतद्वर्णयन्ति । तदिह भगवानुपवर्षः किलामिहोदाहेन धेनुदोहाधिकारे श्रुतमिदं वाक्यमुदाहृतवान्—वत्समालभेतेति । [II. 3. 16, pp. 602-608, Anandasrama edition].

P. V. Kane. He contends⁵ that Upavarṣa is separately mentioned by name by Śabara and that as such, the two cannot be identical. Dr. Gangānātha Jha, on the other hand, proves⁶, on the authority of Maṇḍanamiśra's *Mīmāṃsānūkrāmāṇikā*, that the Vṛttigrantha in the Bhāṣya of Śabara on I. 1. 5 extends to the end of ātmavāda even. So it is to be admitted that Śabara does not quote *verbatim* from the Vṛttikāra⁷ and that he refers to one and the same person in two places, once by the name Vṛttikāra and a second time as Upavarṣa. This view is strengthened by the following additional evidences. Pārthasārathimiśra in his *Sāstradīpikā* identifies the Vṛttikāra referred to in Śabara's bhāṣya on I. 1. 5 with Upavarṣa :—
 वृत्तिकारस्त्वन्यथेयं ग्रन्थं वर्णयाम्भकारेत्येवमादिनोपवर्षमतेन⁸ । Rāmakṛṣṇa commenting on this passage in his *Yuktisūchaprāpūraṇī* supports this identification :— अत्र भगवता वृत्तिकारेण तस्य निमित्तपरीष्टिरित्येवमादिसूत्र-
 त्वयमन्यथा व्याख्यातम् : तत्र व्याख्यानं वृत्तिकारस्त्वित्यादिना ग्रन्थेन भाष्यकृता दर्शितम् ।
 ग्रन्थकारोऽपि तद्दर्शयितुमाह—वृत्तिकारस्त्विति । उपवर्षमतेन सूत्रत्वयमन्यथा कृत्वा
 व्याचष्टे भाष्यकारः । केन ग्रन्थेनेत्यपेक्षायां वृत्तिकारस्त्वित्यादिना भाष्यग्रन्थः पठितः ।⁹

5 See his paper on 'Gleanings from the *Sābarabhāṣya*' in *JBBRAS.*, 1921.

6 See his paper on 'Vṛttigrantha' contributed to the Fourth Oriental Conference (a summary of which only this writer was able to see).

7 See Dr. A. B. Keith's *Karmamīmāṃsā*, p. 8. "It is probable, however, that the citation from the Vṛttikāra is only a resumé, not a verbatim quotation and that Śabarasyāmin is responsible for the reference to Upavarṣa, the Vṛttikāra's proper name, and for this view support may be derived from the mode in which the Vṛttikāra and Upavarṣa are referred to by Kumārila elsewhere (II. 3. 16)."

8 *Sāstradīpikā*, Nirṇayasāgara edition, p. 48.

9 *Sāstradīpikā*, *yuktisūchaprāpūraṇī* N.S. ed. p. 48. References to the Vṛttikāra or to Upavarṣa in the *Yuktisūchaprāpūraṇī*, pp. 59, 74, 88, 92 establish the extent of the Vṛttigrantha in the *Sābarabhāṣya* at least to the beginning of the *Ātmavāda*. The two different explanations of the sūtra औत्पत्तिकस्तु^० as given in the *Bhāṣya* by Śabarasyāmin—one at the outset and another after the *Citrākṣopa*—confirm this view. The *Ātmavāda* in the *Bhāṣya* also might have been, in every probability, taken from Upavarṣa's Vṛtti on the *Brahmasūtra*, III. 3. 53. Compare Śaṅkarācārya's *Bhāṣya* on III. 3. 53 :

शास्त्रप्रमुख एव प्रथमे पादे शास्त्रफलोपभोगयोग्यस्य देहव्यतिरिक्तस्यात्मनोऽस्तित्वमुक्तम् ;
 सत्यमुक्तं भाष्यकृता, न तु तत्रात्मास्तित्वे सूत्रमस्ति । इह तु स्वयमेव सूत्रकृता तद्वदित्वमाक्षेप-
 पुरस्सरं प्रतिष्ठापितम् ।...अत एव चाकृष्याचार्येण शबरस्वामिना प्रमाणालक्षणे वर्णितम् ।
 अत एव च भगवतोपवर्षेण प्रथमे तन्त्रे आत्मास्तित्वप्रसङ्गी शारीरके वक्ष्याम इत्युद्धारः कृतः ।

In the sūtra II. 3. 16 also, Śabaravāmin and Kumārilabhaṭṭa expressly say that the Vṛttikāra gives viśaya and viśaya for that adhikaraṇa, and the 'bhagavān ācāryaḥ' in the Bhāṣya is none other than the 'bhagavān Upavarṣa' in the Vārttika, and the Vṛttikāra referred to both in the Bhāṣya and Vārttika is, therefore, Upavarṣa.

(a) His Personality.

The personality of the famous Vṛttikāra Upavarṣa is a subject of learned controversy. Professor Mm. S. Kuppusvami Śāstrī holds¹⁰ that Upavarṣa is identical with Bodhāyana. Dr. S. Krishna-svami Iyengar maintains¹¹ that they are two different authors. The *Prapañcahṛdaya* mentions¹² the two, Bodhāyana as the author of the Vṛtti, Kṛtakoṭi, on the 20 chapters of *Pūrva* and *Uttara-Mīmāṃsāsūtras* and Upavarṣa, as the author of a summary of the *Kṛtakoṭi*. The *Mañimekhalai* refers¹³ to one Kṛtakoṭi (along with Vyāsa and Jaimini) as an Ācārya who has formulated eight pramāṇas. Dr. S. K. Iyengar tries¹⁴ to identify this Kṛtakoṭi of the *Mañimekhalai* with Bodhāyana, the author of the Vṛtti Kṛtakoṭi of the *Prapañcahṛdaya*, on the ground that the name Kṛtakoṭi might be applied to both the author and the work.

The identity of these authors i.e. either of Upavarṣa with Bodhāyana or of Bodhāyana with Kṛtakoṭi may have to be re-studied in the light of the following evidences :—

(I) Upavarṣa, it is contended, has established the *vibhūtra* of *ātman* in his Vṛtti III. 3. 53 of the *Brahmsūtras*, a resumé of which we have now got in the *ātmaśāstra* of the *Śābarabhāṣya* on I. 1. 5 of the *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtras*. Bodhāyana, on the other hand, has, it is believed, enunciated the doctrine of *Jīvañutra* in his Vṛtti on the *Brahmasūtras* ; and Rāmānuja, in the opening words of his *Śrībhāṣya*, says that he closely follows *Bodhāyana Vṛtti* ; and so, he proceeds further to establish the doctrine of *Jīvañutra* in his

10 Vide his paper on "Bodhāyana and Dramiḍācārya—two old Vedāntins presupposed by Rāmānuja" submitted to the Third Oriental Conference, Madras.

11 Vide his 'Mañimekhalai in its Historical Setting' pp. 91-92.

12 *Prapañcahṛdaya* (Trivandram Skt. Series XLV, p. 39).

13 "Discoursing on the instruments of knowledge.....he pointed out that three teachers were recognised as of authority among them, namely Vedavyāsa, Kṛtakoṭi and the faultless Jaimini. These three have recognised instruments of knowledge to be ten, eight and six respectively." [Dr. S. K. Iyengar's 'Mañimekhalai in its Historical Setting', p. 189.]

14 *Ibid.*, p. 92.

Bhāṣya. If Bodhāyana were not the person to speak of the *Jīvānūtvā*, then Rāmānuja would not have ventured to elucidate that doctrine in vehement opposition to the *Jīvavibhūtvā* held by the Advaitins, since it is one of the fundamental doctrines of Viśiṣṭādvaita.

(2) The Kṛtakoti of the *Mañimekhalai* accepts eight pramāṇas. Bodhāyana, the famous Vṛttikāra of the *Pūrva* and *Uttara Mīmāṃsāsūtras*, cannot be possibly belived to have accepted eight pramāṇas but only six or less than six (according to commentators). So the authority of the *Mañimekhalai* which is only a *romance*¹⁵, should not be taken seriously. The contention that the number of the pramāṇas depends on the principle of classification has to be viewed in the light of the fact that the pramāṇas constitute the fundamentals of every system of Indian philosophy. This becomes quite evident from a passage in ch. XXVII of the *Mañimekhalai* itself. "Six are the systems that are founded on the basis of those instruments of knowledge : (1) Lokāyata, (2) Bauddha, (3) Sāṅkhya, (4) Naiyāyika, (5) Vaiśeṣika and (6) Mīmāṃsā¹⁶." These systems are separately mentioned on the basis of their differences in accepting pramāṇas (i.e.).

One pramāṇa—pratyakṣa by the Lokāyatikas or Cārvākas ;

Two—pratyakṣa and anumāna by the Bauddhas and the Vaiśeṣikas ;

Three—pratyakṣa, anumāna and śabda by the Sāṅkhyas ;

Four—pratyakṣa, anumāna, upamāna and śabda by the Naiyāyikas ;

Six—pratyakṣa, anumāna, upamāna, śabda, arthāpatti and anupalabdhi, by the Mīmāṃsakas (Bhāṭṭas) as well as by the Advaiti-Vedāntins.

(b) His Date.

The date of Upavarṣa is as unsettled a question as that of his identity. He may be roughly assigned to the period between 100 B.C. and 200 A.D. i.e. after Patañjali and before Śabarāsvāmin. According to the view that the Vṛttigrantha in Śabara's Bhāṣya on I. 1. 5 extends to the end of the Bhāṣya thereon, it is clear that the Vṛttikāra who is none other than Upavarṣa, has mentioned and refuted the doctrine

15 Vide A. B. Dhruva's Introduction to his edition of Diinnāga's *Nyāyapraveśa*—p. xv (Gaekwad's Oriental Series, No. XXXVIII).

16 Dr. S. K. Iyengar's translation in his '*Mañimekhalai in its Historical Setting*', p. 192.

of the *samudāyaśabda*, otherwise known as *sphoṭa* of the Sanskrit grammarians, chiefly of Patañjali. And it is Patañjali who first enunciated the doctrine that the *sphoṭaśabda* is both *vācaka* and *arthapratyāyaka*,¹⁷ though Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and others had directly or indirectly spoken of the *nityatva* of *śabda*, *artha* and their *sambandha*, before Patañjali. This fact proves well that Vṛttikāra Upavaṛṣa is subsequent to Patañjali.

Mr. T.R. Chintamani in his paper on the 'Date of Śaṅkarācārya,'¹⁸ suggests that Upavaṛṣa might be placed about 200 B. C. between Patañjali and Kātyāyana. His main reason for this view is that Upavaṛṣa allows the Caturthī samāsa in the compound—'ब्रह्मजिज्ञासा' in the sūtra—'अथातो ब्रह्मजिज्ञासा' and that this Caturthī samāsa is sanctioned by Kātyāyana by the Vārttika—अश्वधासादीनामुपसंख्यानम्, but overruled by Patañjali who says:—अश्वधासादयस्तु षष्ठीसमासा एव. *This is not convincing.* It may also be argued that the Vṛttikāra Upavaṛṣa would have, in all probability, known all the injunctions of Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Patañjali regarding this Caturthī samāsa and would not have exclusively *in all instances* followed the dictum of the grammarians—यथोत्तरं मुनीनां प्रामाण्यं¹⁹, so in this case, he might have followed the Vārttikakāra.²⁰

17 See the writer's article on the 'Doctrine of Sphoṭa' in the *Annamalai University Journal*, vols. I, II.

18 *Journal of Oriental Research*, Madras, vol. III, part I. (1929).

19 The violation of this dictum by the eminent Mīmāṃsaka—Śabarāsvāmin—can be well illustrated from his Bhāṣya : On X. 8. 1(4) the Bhāṣyakāra writes—नन्वनुयाजसम्बन्धेन शब्दस्य सुबन्तसंबन्धेन समास इति वार्तिककारो भगवान्काल्यायनो मन्यते स्म । वाचनानर्थक्यञ्च स्वभावसिद्धत्वादिति । नेति भगवान्पाणिनिः । स हि 'विभाषा' इति प्रकृत्य ईदृशं समासमुक्त्वान् । सद्वादित्वाच्च पाणिनेर्वचनं प्रमाणम् । असद्वादित्वान्न काल्यायनस्य । असद्वादी हि विद्यमानमपि अनुपलभ्य ब्रूयात् । तस्मात्पर्युदास इति The Combination 'न+अनुयाजेषु' in the Vedic passage—'नानुयाजेषु ये यजामहं करोति' is not samāsa, since, according to Pāṇini, the samāsa-vidhi is optional, though Kātyāyana, his successor, has made it a nityavidhi. Here Pāṇini, the Sūtrakāra, is called a satyavādin (truth-speaker) while Kātyāyana, the Vārttikakāra, an asatyavādin (liar). So the authority of Pāṇini is followed in preference to that of the Vārttikakāra.

20 In the light of this interpretation, it may be observed that Śaṅkarācārya's criticism on the Vṛttikāra (as endorsed by Vācaspatimiśra in his *Bhāmātī* on I. 1. 1) is not an adverse criticism ; and that Śaṅkara, a later exponent of the Vedānta sūtras, can be said to have closely followed the said Vyākaraṇa dictum and have explained the compound as a (कर्मणि) षष्ठीसमासा।

A parallel instance of this *Caturthī samāsa* can be cited here from Śabarāsvāmin's Bhāṣya on 1. 1. 1. धर्माय जिज्ञासा धर्मजिज्ञासा, सा हि तस्य ज्ञातुमिच्छा । No doubt, Kumārila Bhaṭṭa, a later exponent of the Mīmāṃsāsūtras, like Śaṅkara of the Vedānta sūtras, has felt the unsoundness of this *Caturthī samāsa* and has *ably but laboriously* got over the difficulty by the explanation that the Bhāṣya passage in question does not constitute the exact *vigrahavākya* but only indicates by *Caturthī* that the dharma is the final fruit or goal of the discussion and that the *Ṣaṣṭhī samāsa* is suggested also in the *Vivarāṇa bhāṣya*—सा हि तस्य ज्ञातुमिच्छा by the genitive तस्य . This is not the only instance where a later commentator is driven to ingenious devices in his anxiety to justify his original author. Kumārila's Vārttika on 1. 3. 1 gives us another instance :—

प्रमाणायां स्मृतां स्पर्शनं व्यामोहः, स्पर्शने प्रमाणे स्मृतिर्व्यामोहः (भाष्यं) । प्रमाणमयते याति मूलभूतां श्रुतिं यतः । क्विबन्तादयतेस्तस्मात्प्रमाणा स्मृतिरुच्यते (वार्तिकं) ।

In such cases the commentator makes clear not so much the meaning of the passage as his own respect for grammar. If the *Caturthī samāsa* were an accepted factor in Sanskrit even in instances where there is no *prakṛti-vikṛtibhāva*, then Kumārila would not have ventured to say that the first passage in the Bhāṣya does not give the *vigraha*. Nowhere is such a thing seen or accepted as the *vigrahavākya* without the *vigraha* and the *vivarāṇavākya* with the same.²¹ Most probably, Śabarāsvāmin might have taken the *Caturthī samāsa*—‘धर्माय जिज्ञासा’ from Upavarṣa's Vṛtti (which requires further proof) and as such, he might have in this instance followed Vṛttikāra Upavarṣa and not Patañjali.²²

21 Appayya Dikṣita remarks in his *Kalpataru-parimata* 1. 1. 1 “अथश्वासादिषु चतुर्थीगमारा इति वार्तिककारमतम् । एतदवलम्बनेनैव धर्माय जिज्ञासा धर्मजिज्ञासेति शबरस्वामिभिश्चतुर्थीसमासस्समाश्रितः” (p. 75, Nirṇayasagara edition). Would not this quotation be sufficient to prove that to Śabarāsvāmin Kātyāyana is a greater authority in grammar than Patañjali (though he has declared on another occasion Pāṇini as a greater authority than Kātyāyana) ?

22 Eminent Mīmāṃsakas like Kumārila Bhaṭṭa who came to the field after Upavarṣa and Śabarāsvāmin honour Upavarṣa with the title *Mahābhāṣyakāra* and this well emphasizes the fact that in matters of grammar, Upavarṣa, to them at least, is a more eminent authority than Patañjali. Compare the Bhāṣya on 11. 1. 1—तेनोच्यते—तृतीयायाः स्थाने द्वितीयेति । Kumārila comments on this Bhāṣya thus—‘प्राधान्यविवक्षेव न्याय्या । ततश्च तृतीयार्थमिद्विरिति मत्वा महाभाष्यकारेणोक्तं—तृतीयायाः स्थाने द्वितीयेति (Anandasrama ed., p. 412). Someśvarabhaṭṭa

(c) His Views.

Vṛttikāra Upavarṣa's views as referred to by Śabarāsvāmin and others do differ considerably from those of the Bhāṣyakāra. From the Bhāṣyakāra's extract of the Vṛttigraha on I. 1. 5, the Vṛttikāra's explanation of the three sūtras—तस्ये निमित्तपरीष्टिः : सत्संप्रयोगे पुरुषस्येन्द्रियाणां बुद्धिजन्म तत्प्रत्यक्षमनिमित्तं विद्यमानोपलम्भनत्वात् ; आत्पत्तिकम्तु शब्दस्यार्थं न सम्बन्धस्तस्य ज्ञानमुपदेशोऽव्यतिरेकश्चार्थेऽनुपलब्धे तत्प्रमाणं वादरायणस्यानपेक्षत्वात् (I. 1. 3-5)—may be summarised as follows :—

The sūtra—तस्य निमित्तपरीष्टिः— is not a *nimittapratijñāsūtra* as explained by the Bhāṣyakāra ; the particle 'न' is to be inserted and the sūtra, therefore, means that the Nimitta—authority—on dharma, viz. Codanā (as explained by the Codanā sūtra) need not be further examined, since all the pramāṇas including Codanā are well-known and their self-validity—स्वतः प्रामाण्य—also is unquestionable.

But it may be argued that the pramāṇa, for example, the pratyakṣa, is sometimes, not valid in that it produces a wrong cognition like 'this is silver' where there is no silver except a conch-shell ; so also other pramāṇas like anumāṇa (inference) that have the sole basis on the pratyakṣa ; hence all pramāṇas including śabda (codanā) are to be examined and well defined.

To this the Vṛttikāra replies that the pratyakṣa is never non-valid and that the instance cited is only a semblance of pratyakṣa-jñāna (प्रत्यक्षाभ्रम) since it is succeeded by a contradictory cognition like 'नात्र रजतं' or 'नेदं रजतं'—there is no silver here or this is not silver. He interprets the former part of the fourth sūtra—'सत्संप्रयोगे पुरुषस्येन्द्रियाणां बुद्धिजन्म तत्प्रत्यक्षम्'—as the definition of the valid perception—सत्प्रत्यक्ष—by transposing the words 'तत्', and 'सत्', and distinguishes the sat-pratyakṣa from the pratyakṣābhāsa in that that in the latter the sensory organs like the eye have contact with something else with which the cognition is not at all concerned. 'यद्विषयं ज्ञानं तेनैव संप्रयोगे इन्द्रियाणां बुद्धिजन्म सत्प्रत्यक्षं ; यदन्यविषयज्ञानं अन्यसंप्रयोगे भवति न तत्प्रत्यक्षम् ।' After giving the manifold conditions under which the sat-pratyakṣa and pratyakṣābhāsa arise, he finally characterizes the

remarks on this Vṛttika—अस्मिन्ने वार्थे भगवदुपवर्षसम्मतिप्रदर्शनार्थं गुणभावे चेति भाष्यं व्याचष्टे—ततश्चेति । स्थानशब्देन गुणभावस्य द्वितीयार्थता निरस्तेत्याशयः । स महाभाष्यकारेण न कर्तव्येति वर्णितेत्युपवर्षे महाभाष्यकारशब्दप्रयोगाच्चैवं व्याख्यातः' (Nyāyosūtrā, Chaukhamba ed., p. 632).

pratyakṣābhāsa otherwise known as the *asamācīnapratyaya* thus:—
 “यस्य च दुष्टं करणं यत्र च मिथ्येति प्रत्ययः स एवासमीचीनः प्रत्ययो नान्य इति”—
 ‘where the perciever’s sensory organ is affected by some defect and where the contradictory cognition like ‘this is not silver’ arises, there is certainly the non-valid perception and not any other.

Then the Vṛttikāra proceeds to explain the validity of cognitions on the basis of their presenting real objects. Here he refutes the theory of *nirālambanā* and *sūnyatā* of cognitions as held by some Buddhists (Yogācāras). They hold the view that all *pratyayas* (cognitions) stand on a par with the cognitions in dreams and as such, are devoid of any *viṣaya* or real object.²³ Against these the Vṛttikāra holds that the cognitions in the waking state need not be *nirālambana* on the ground that there arises no cognition contradicting the reality or existence of the object (*viṣaya*). But the cognitions in the dreams are *nirālambanas* since the mind, though weak in its half-drowsiness, is yet capable of creating within its own vision all kinds of objects, quite unreal and momentary.

Even this view that the external objects are nothing but the *ākāras* (forms) of the cognitions i.e. that there is no external object except the *ākāra* of the internal cognition, is refuted by the Vṛttikāra. He argues that there is no *ākāra* or form of the cognition and that the form that is externally known belongs to the *Viṣaya* like a pot and that this external form, viz., the *Viṣaya* is perceived by all alike. Moreover, it is to be admitted that in all kinds of cognition the objects of cognitions are first cognised and the cognitions are afterwards inferred by the middle term—*jñātātā* in a syllogism like—घटो विषयतासम्बन्धेन ज्ञानविशिष्टः, स्वरूपसम्बन्धेन ज्ञाततावत्त्वात् . This idea is well explained by the Bhāṣya—न ह्यज्ञातेऽर्थे कश्चिद्बुद्धिमुपलभते । ज्ञाते त्वनुमानादवगच्छति । तत्र यागपद्यमनुपपन्नम् ।²⁴

Having thus established the external objects as real and different from the cognitions, the Vṛttikāra gives the definition of other *pramāṇas*—अनुमानं, शब्दः उपमानं, अर्थापत्तिः and अनुपलब्धिः । Anumāna is

23 Compare the syllogism—सर्वोऽपि प्रत्ययः निरालम्बनः प्रत्ययत्वात्, स्वाप्रत्ययवत् .

24 This Bhāṣya being a part of the Vṛttigrantha, is taken by the Bhāṭṭas (Kumārila Bhaṭṭa and his followers) as the favourable authority to establish their theory that all cognitions are to be inferred only from the *Jñātātā*—*Jñātātā* as the middle term in syllogism noted above, in contrast with the Prābhākara view that each cognition presents three things—*त्रिपुटी*—viz., the *ज्ञान* (cognition), the *ज्ञाता* (the cogniser) and the *ज्ञेय* (the object).

defined thus :—“Inference²⁵ is the apprehension of a thing not before the subject, by reason of the perception of some other thing, between which and the first object we know an invariable connection to exist” (Keith. p. 27). *Śabda*²⁶ or *Śabdabodha* (verbal knowledge) is the apprehension of an object not presented to the senses, by the cognition of words. *Upamiti*²⁷ is the apprehension of an object not presented to the senses, by the cognition of the similarity (between the cognised and uncognised objects). *Arthāpatti* (presumption) is a separate means of proof and the Vṛttikāra defines it thus :—*Arthāpatti*²⁸ or presumption is that whereby a thing is established without which another thing that actually exists in experience (either in perception or verbal cognition) cannot be accounted for. *Anupalabdhi* is another means of proof and it is defined by the Vṛttikāra thus :—*Anupalabdhi*²⁹ is the non-existence of the five kinds of means of cognitions, by which arises the cognition of *abhāva* (नास्ति).

The latter part of the sūtra—‘अनिमित्तं विद्यमानोपलम्भनत्वात्—is taken by the Vṛttikāra as an *ākṣepa* of (objection to) the Codanāprāmānya already established by the sūtra—‘चोदनालक्षणोऽर्थो धर्मः’. The Pūrvapakṣin argues that the authority of Codanā on dharma in the Vedic passages like ‘अग्निहोत्रं जुहुयात्स्वर्गकामः’ is quite alright, since it refers to the utterly unknown fact, *viz.*, that the Agnihotra is the cause of Svarga ; but in passages like ‘चित्तया यजेत पशुकामः’ which enjoins the *Ītrā* sacrifice as the means for the attainment of cows by the sacrificer even in this birth, the prāmānya cannot be established, so long as the sacrificer is not at present bestowed with as many cows as he has desired. So on the basis of the *pratyakṣabādha*, the authoritativeness (*prāmānya*) of passages like ‘चित्तया यजेत पशुकामः’ which possess an *aihikaphala* and of passages like ‘अग्निहोत्रं जुहुयात्स्वर्गकामः’ which possess an *āṃuṣmikaphala*, is again objected. The *hetu* (middle term) is to be thus explained : if anything exists, it is to be experienced and so, if it is not experienced, it means it does not exist. Hence these passages are no authorities—*animittas*—on dharma.

25 अनुमानं ज्ञातसम्बन्धस्यैकदेशदर्शनादेकदेशान्तरेऽसन्निकृष्टेऽर्थे बुद्धिः [Sābaru-
bhāṣya I. 1. 5.].

26 शास्त्रं शब्दविज्ञानादसन्निकृष्टेऽर्थे विज्ञानम् (*Ibid.*).

27 उपमानमपि सादृश्यं असन्निकृष्टेऽर्थे बुद्धिमुत्पादयति (*Ibid.*).

28 अर्थापत्तिरपि दृष्टः श्रुतो वार्थोऽन्यथा नोपपद्यते इत्यर्थकल्पना (*Ibid.*).

29 अभावोऽपि प्रमाणाभावो नास्तीत्यस्यार्थस्यासन्निकृष्टस्य (*Ibid.*).

This, *prima facie*, is refuted in the *Siddhāntasūtra*—*श्रौत्यत्तिकस्तु+ अनपेक्षत्वात्*. The relation between śabda and artha, viz., vācyavācakabhāva or pratyāyyapratyāyakabhāva is apauruṣeya—not invented by man and is eternal. This rule is applicable to the words in loka and in the Vedas. Hence, so long as there is no bādhapratyaya,—cognition to the contrary to what is enjoined by the Vedic passages like ‘अग्निहोत्रं जुहुयात्स्वर्गकामः’—the prāmāṇya of their passages cannot be questioned. The argument that the citreṣṭi does not produce for the sacrificer its fruit, viz., cows, immediately after its performance by him, falls to the ground since it is held that this and all other sacrifices of *aihikaphala* are capable of producing their fruit sometimes in this birth (if all other causes are very effective) and sometimes only in any one of subsequent births of the sacrificer. Hence is the remark³⁰ that the paśu, putra etc. are both *aihika* and *ānuṣmika phalas*.

This is explained by the former part of the sūtra—‘श्रौत्यत्तिकस्तु शब्दस्यार्थेन सम्बन्धस्तस्य ज्ञानम्’—i.e. against the view held by the Pūrvapakṣin it can be maintained that since the relation between śabda and artha is autpattika i.e. nitya, there arises only a (valid) knowledge of the sacrifice, Agnihotra, as the cause of Svarga, from the Vedic injunction ‘अग्निहोत्रं जुहुयात्स्वर्गकामः’; so also in the instances of other injunctions like ‘चित्रया यजेत पशुकामः’. The ideas conveyed by these vidhis are neither known by any other means of knowledge like pratyakṣa, nor contradicted by any subsequent valid cognition. Hence the authority of all Codanās on dharma is established.

Then the Vṛttikāra has taken up the question of the eternity of śabdārthasambandha again for discussion. First, he calls the sambandha *vācyavācakabhāva* and says that other well-known sambandhas—samnyoga, samvāya etc. cannot be described as subsisting between śabda and artha. And to establish this *nityatra* of the sambandha, he establishes first the *nityatra* of the two sambandhin.—śabda and artha. In this connection he criticises the doctrine of the *samudāya śabda*, which is nothing but the sphoṭa of the Vaiyākaraṇas, chiefly of Patañjali. To the Sūtrakāra Jaimini and the Vṛttikāra Upavarṣa śabda is nothing but varṇa—the articulate sound which is audible when it is manifested by nādas; and this varṇa or group of varṇas becomes vācakapada—word possessing the significative potency (abhidhā) and the cognition of the last varṇa

30. Vide IV. 3. 9 : the second Varṇaka of the *Yogasiddhyadhikaraṇa*.

of a word coupled with the impressions left by the cognitions of the previous varṇas of the word is *arthapratyūyaka*, (the conveyer of artha). Artha is generality—जाति and it is eternal. Hence their relation, viz., *rācyarācakabhāva* is also *nitya* (eternal).

The word 'उपदेशे' in the sūtra explains the time-honoured continuity of the relation between śabda and artha. It means (by the) 'knowledge of the ever-existing relation'—'सिद्धवदुपदेशात्'. If there were any person to create the relation between śabda and artha, he would have ventured to do that by uttering some words having some import. This implies the existence of the relation between words and senses before this man could create it. On the other hand, every body knows that he must have first learnt that relation from his parents who also, while young, must have in their turn learnt the same thing from their parents and so on and so forth. This proves well the eternity and ever continuity of the relation between śabda and artha. This is the view of the Mīmāṃsakas.

This idea is further confirmed by the word—'अव्यतिरेकश्च' in the sūtra. It means that the relation, for example, between the word 'गो' and the animal possessing a fleshy fold, tail etc. is understood by all in all times and climes and the reverse of it is not experienced anywhere or in any time.

The part of the sūtra—अर्थेऽनुपलब्धे—again explains that the man who is supposed to have created the relation between śabda and artha is not known, and if any one had done so, he would have been remembered by posterity as Pāṇini and other great authors are.

Again, the Codanā is an authority on dharma since it is apauruṣeya and as such, is not dependent on any other means of knowledge—स्वतः प्रमाणं. This is explained by the part of the sūtra—'तत्प्रमाणमनपेक्षत्वात्'. Only in the world, the *āptatva* (the honesty and sincerity) of the speaker is to be ascertained by other means, and even there, the cognition that one derives from the words of the speaker *arises* ever valid since all Mīmāṃsakas declare that all *Pramāṇas* (means of knowledge or proof) are स्वतः प्रमाण (self-valid) i.e. the causes of a cognition generate the cognition and its validity as well.

The word 'बादरायणस्य' in the sūtra explains that the *codanā prāmāṇya*—validity of the vidhivākyas thus established is also acceptable to Bādarāyaṇa, the author of the Vedāntasūtras.

The Bhāṣyakāra Śabarasyāmin does not entirely follow the

Vṛttikāra's explanation of these three sūtras. To him, the sūtra—'तस्य निमित्तपरीष्टिः—'is only a pratijñāsūtra of the nimitta or means of knowledge of dharma. The sūtra—'तत्संप्रयोगे'—explains that the pratyakṣa is not a pramāṇa (authority) on dharma since it is the means of knowledge of what exists at the time of cognition. Dharma does not exist during the time of cognition and it is to be attained by human exertion or activity. The former part of this sūtra constitutes more or less the definition of pratyakṣa (perception), yet it does not primarily aim at that, except that it asserts that the pratyakṣa arises only when *there is relation between an object then existing and the sensory organs*, and therefore, is *animitta*—is not the means of the knowledge of dharma.³¹ Consequently, the pramāṇas—*anumāna*, *upamāna* and *arthāpatti*, all of which are dependent on pratyakṣa, are not the means of the knowledge of dharma.³²

The sūtra 'श्रौतपत्तिकस्तु' explains the fact that there is no *anupalabdhi pramāṇa* on dharma since the Codanā is already spoken of and is to be established as the eternal source of dharma which is of supernatural character (*alaukika*). The word 'श्रौतपत्तिक' means *nitya* (eternal). So the part 'श्रौतपत्तिकस्तु शब्दस्यार्थेन सम्बन्धः' means that the relation between śabda and artha is eternal. The word 'तु' contradicts the *prima facie* view that there is no pramāṇa like pratyakṣa on dharma. That dharma is cognised as non-existent by the *anupalabdhi pramāṇa*³³ is refuted by the latter part of this sūtra—तस्य ज्ञानम्. The Codanā like 'अग्निहोत्रं जुहुयास्त्वर्गकामः' is *Jñāpaka* of dharma—capable of producing a valid knowledge of a sacrifice like the Agnihotra as the cause of Svarga. It is an *Upadeśa* i.e. it produces a cognition presenting the Agnihotra sacrifice as the cause of Svarga—a fact which is neither known by other pramāṇas like pratyakṣa, nor contradicted by any succeeding cognition. Hence it is *pramāṇa*—अनधिगताबाधितार्थविषयकज्ञानजनकम्. This idea is further emphasized by the phrases 'अर्थेऽनुपलब्धे' and 'अव्यतिरेकश्च'. The part 'तत्प्रमाणं बादरायणस्य अपेक्षत्वात्' means that Codanā is a valid authority on dharma since it is not dependent on any other means

31 Compare the syllogisms suggested in this sūtra—

(१) प्रत्यक्षं तत्संप्रयोगजं प्रत्यक्षत्वात् (२) प्रत्यक्षं विद्यमानोपलम्भनं तत्संप्रयोगजत्वात्
(३) प्रत्यक्षं धर्मा (धर्मा) निमित्तं विद्यमानोपलम्भनत्वात् ॥

32 प्रत्यक्षपूर्वकत्वाच्चानुमानोपमानार्थोपत्तीनामप्यकारणत्वमिति । *Sābarabhāṣya*, I. 1. 4.

33 अनुपलब्धिरपि नास्ति यतः—“श्रौतपत्तिकस्तु+अनपेक्षत्वात्” | (*Ibid.*), I. 1. 5.

of proof or knowledge ; and that this siddhānta is acceptable not only to Jaimini but also to Bādarāyaṇa.

Further references to Vṛttikāra Upavarṣa are found in the *Sūbarabhāṣya* and Kumārila's *Vārttika* ; but as they are not very important in elucidating his views, they are not dealt with in detail here. But they are important in other directions.

The Bhāṣya passage in II. 1. 4 'तेनोच्यते—तृतीयायाः स्थाने द्वितीयेति' is commented on by the Vārttikakāra thus :—['प्राधान्याविवक्षैव न्याय्या'] ततश्च तृतीयार्थसिद्धिरिति मत्वा महाभाष्यकारेणोक्तं—'तृतीयायाः स्थाने द्वितीयेति.'³⁴ While commenting on this Vārttika, Someśvara in his *Nyāyasudhā* identifies this Mahābhāṣyakāra with Upavarṣa.³⁵ This proves that even in grammar, Vṛttikāra Upavarṣa is considered, at least by the later authors in the *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtra*, as a greater authority than Patañjali, the famous Mahābhāṣyakāra.³⁶

34 Anandāśrama edition, p. 412.

35 देवतोद्देशद्रव्यत्यागप्रक्षेपाख्यधात्वर्थलयसमुदायरूपं जुहोत्यर्थं प्रति देवताया द्रव्यस्य वा कर्मत्वायोगात् जुहोतियोगे कर्मणि द्वितीयानुपपत्तेः तृतीयार्थवाचित्वानभिधानात् या परीष्टिर्निमित्तानां कर्तव्येत्युपपादिता सा महाभाष्यकारेण न कर्तव्येति वर्णितेत्युपवर्षं महाभाष्यकारशब्दप्रयोगाच्चैवं व्याख्यातः । [Chaukhamba edition, p. 632].

36 In the *Nyāyaratnākare*, Pārthasārathimīśra refers to a Vṛttyantara when he comments on the Vārttika—'अनुमानाद्यभिन्नत्वान्नोक्तां जयपराजयौ । वध्यघातकभावेन यौ सर्पनकुलादिषु' ॥ (Verse 50—Arthāpattīpariccheda of Sloka-vārttika—[Chaukhamba edition, p. 463]. 'वृत्त्यन्तरे सर्पनकुलयोरेकस्य जयमन्यस्य पराजयं +अर्थापत्युदाहरणं दत्तम् ; तत्किं भाष्यकारेण नोक्तं ? अत आह—अनुमानादिति. (*Ibid.*) Whether this Vṛtti belongs to Upavarṣa is not known.

Whether the references to a Vṛttikāra in the Mantralakṣaṇādhikaraṇa (II. 1. 7) and in the Brāhmaṇalakṣaṇādhikaraṇa (II. 1. 8) of the *Sūbarabhāṣya* apply to Vṛttikāra Upavarṣa are not definitely known. In these instances, the definitions of the mantra and brāhmaṇa as given by the Vṛttikāra are not accepted by the Bhāṣyakāra. अभिधानस्य चोदकेष्वेवंजातीयकेष्वभियुक्ता उपदिशन्ति मन्वानधीमहे+लक्षणमुक्तं—

ऋषयोऽपि पदार्थानां नान्तं यान्ति पृथक्कृशः ।

लक्षणेन तु सिद्धानामन्तं यान्ति विपश्चितः ॥

नचैतद्भृत्तिकारेणोदाहरणापदेशेनाख्यातम् । एतदपि प्रायिकमेव (II. 1. 7). वृत्तिकारस्तु शिष्यहितार्थं प्रपश्चितवान्... ..

हेतुर्निर्वचनं निन्दा प्रशंसा संशयो विधिः ।

परक्रिया पुराकल्पो व्यवधारणकल्पना ॥

In the *Indriyakāṃādihikaraṇa* (II.2.11) of the *Sābarabhāṣya* there is a reference to a Vṛttikāra who gives the view that in the instances of फलगुणवाक्यसु like 'दध्नेन्द्रियकामस्य जुहुयात्' the धात्वर्थ [होम] is related to the arthabhāvanā viz., pravṛtti as an āśraya of the dravya enjoined in that vākya as the फलकरण.³⁷ The view is accepted by all later Mīmāṃsakas including Sabarasvāmin. So, this Vṛttikāra might be, in all probability, the Vṛttikāra Upavarṣa himself.³⁸

उपमानं दर्शितेषु विधयो ब्राह्मणस्य तु ।

एतस्यात्सर्ववेदेषु नियतं विधिलक्षणम् ॥

एतदपि प्रायिकम् । *Sābarabhāṣya*, II. 1. 8.

In the *Saṅkhyābhedādihikaraṇa* (II. 2-7) Sambhubhaṭṭa refers to a Vṛttikāra as giving the Viśayavākya—'आमनमस्यामनस्य देवा इति तिस्र आहुतीर्जुहोति' for discussion. He says in his commentary on the *Bhāṭṭadīpkā*—
एतच्चोदाहरणं वृत्तिकारेण दर्शितमप्यत्र संख्यायाः कर्मसामानाधिकरण्येन क्रियागत-
भेदकत्वस्य स्फुटत्वेन पूर्वपक्षानुत्थानात् अयुक्तमिति नुशब्देन सूचयन् तदभिप्रायेण
भाष्यकारेणोदाहरणान्तरे भेदाभेदां चिन्तता ; तां चिन्तां दर्शयति-भाष्यकारेणत्विति ।
(Nirṇayasāgara ed. of *Bhāṭṭadīpkā* with Prabhāvali, p. 179.) Whether this Vṛttikāra is Upavarṣa himself is not definitely known. The Bhāṣyakāra has found nothing for discussion in the passage given by this Vṛttikāra, in view of the fact that the saṅkhyā (number) belongs to the dhātvartha (कर्मसामानाधिकरणा संख्या) । So he has given another passage—'सप्तदश प्राजापत्या-
न्यशूनालभते,' where the saṅkhyā—सप्तदशत्व—belongs to the dravya—paśu and not to the dhātvarthakriyā. Hence there is scope for discussion where the saṅkhyā (number) distinguishes the धात्वर्थक्रिया ।

37 जुहुयादिति शब्दस्यैतत्सामर्थ्यं यद्वोमविशिष्टं प्रयत्नमाह । न त्वत्र होमः साधनत्वेन विधीयते । साध्यत्वेन विशिष्टस्तु प्रयत्नो वाक्येन दध्याश्रितोऽवगम्यते । अतएव च वृत्तिकारेणोक्तं—“होममाश्रितो गुणः फलं साधयिष्यति” । (Anandaśrama edition p. 549).

38 In his Vārttika on II. 3. 10. Kumārila refers to a Bhāṣyakārāntara yastvāivādhikarṇo भाष्याकारान्तरेणाग्नेः फलवदफलत्व-प्राकृतवैकृतत्व-नित्यानित्यत्वो-त्तरवेदिविकारत्वविचारः कृतः ; स उदाहरणान्तरेष्वधिकरणान्तरसिद्ध इहासंबद्धोऽपि स्मरण-मात्रदर्पेणोपन्यस्त इत्युपेक्षितव्यः । (Anandaśrama edition pp. 612-613.) Here Bhaṭṭasomeśvara's remark on this Vārttika may be noted with advantage :—
भाष्यकारान्तरकृतानि तु चिन्तान्तराणि कस्मान्नेन भाष्यकृता दर्शितानीत्याशंक्याह—
यस्त्विति । (p. 949). Who is this Bhāṣyakāra is not known. The *Nyāyasūdhā* makes clear that he is a Bhāṣyakāra who lived earlier than Sabarasvāmin.

Again, Kumārila in his Vārttika on II. 3.13 refers to a Vṛtṭyāntara or

It has been already explained³⁹ that the Vṛttikāra Upavaṛṣa has been referred to in II. 3. 16 by Bhāṣyakāra Śabarāsvāmin and by Vārttikakāra Kumārīlabhaṭṭa, both of whom have closely followed him in explaining that adhikaraṇa.

In III. 1. 3 of the *Sābrabhāṣya* is referred⁴⁰ to a the honorific title 'bhagavān' and this 'bhagavān Vṛttikāra, with Vṛttikāra' might be Vṛttikāra Upavaṛṣa. Kumarīla's Vārttika on this Bhāṣya gives the Vṛttikāra's explanation in some detail and may, therefore, be noted with advantage⁴¹ :— According to the Vṛttikāra, the sūtra—'द्रव्यगुणसंस्कारेषु बादरिः' is not a Pūrvapakṣa-sūtra. It explains that the *aṅgatra* among dravya, guṇa, and saṃskārakarmas is constant (*naiyamika*) while the *aṅgatra* among the agent [कर्तृ], the action [कर्म], and the result [फल], as explained by the sūtra—'कर्मण्यपि जैमिनिः फलार्थत्वात्, फलं च पुरुषार्थत्वात्, पुरुषश्च कर्मार्थत्वात्' is relative (*āpekṣika*) i.e. they are to be understood as both *pradhāna* and *aṅga* in relation to different objects. No doubt, the dravyas like *vṛhi*, guṇas like *āruṇya* and saṃskāras like *prokṣaṇa* can also be said to be both *pradhāna* and *aṅga* in relation to different objects and as such,

Bhāṣyāntara,—वृत्त्यन्तरे तु चत्वार्येव भेदकारणानि शब्दान्तरसंज्ञागुणफलान्युदाहृतानि+ तस्मादैकशब्दे सत्येव कारणान्तराद्भेदमपश्यतः शब्दान्तरकल्पनं तत्रभवतो भाष्यान्तरकृतः । (Anandaśrama edition p. 620). This Vṛtti or Bhāṣya might belong to one Bhāṣyakāra other than Vṛttikāra Upavaṛṣa.

39 Vide the beginning of this paper.

40 अथेदानीमत्र भगवान् वृत्तिकारः परिनिश्चिकाय—द्रव्यगुणसंस्कारेष्वेव नियतो यजिं प्रति शेषभावः । आपेक्षिक इतरेषाम् । यागस्य द्रव्यं प्रति प्रधानभावः फलं प्रति गुणभावः । फलस्य यागं प्रति प्राधान्यं पुरुषं प्रति गुणता । पुरुषस्य फलं प्रति प्रधानता औदुम्बरी सम्मानादि प्रति गुणत्वम् । तस्मात्सम्मताऽवधारणा—द्रव्यगुणसंस्कारा यागं प्रति नियोगतो गुणभूता एवेति । (*Sābrabhāṣya*, pp. 663-664).

41 वृत्तिकारमतेन सूत्रचतुष्टयमन्यथा व्याख्यास्यन्नाह—'अथात्र भगवानिति' । नैवेदानीं बादरिमतेन पूर्वपक्षः किन्तर्हि 'शेषः परार्थत्वा'दिति सामान्येन लक्षणमुक्त्वा तस्यैव विषयप्रदर्शनद्वारेणोत्तरः प्रपञ्चः क्रियते । तत्र पूर्वव्याख्यायां द्रव्यगुणसंस्कारेष्वेव शेषत्वमित्येवमवधारणं पूर्वपक्षे कृतं, इदानीन्तु सिद्धान्तरूपेणैवाप्रतिषेधेनानुमतं कृत्वा लक्षणप्रपञ्चाभ्यां शेषत्वं वर्णयिष्यते । द्रव्यगुणसंस्कारेषु शेषत्वमेवेत्यवधारयति । अतश्च द्रव्यगुणसंस्काराः शेषत्वेन शेषित्वं न प्रतिपद्यन्ते । शेषत्वं पुनः अनियतत्वाद्यागफलपुरुषेष्व- 'स्त्येवेति तत्प्रतिपादनार्थान्युत्तरसूत्राण्यवकल्पन्ते । तस्मादापेक्षिकशेषशेषित्वमात्रमेवैभिः सूत्रैः प्रतिपाद्यते । तथा च भाष्ये दर्शितं—'ततश्चद्विप्रकार एव शेषनिषमो नैयमिक आपेक्षिकश्चेत्युक्तं भवति' (pp. 663-664)

their *aṅgatva* is changing : for example, the *vr̥hi* is an *aṅga* of the Darśapūrṇamāsa sacrifices (ब्रीहिभिर्यजेत), while it is *pradhāna* of the saṃskāra like prokṣaṇa (ब्रीहिन् प्रोक्षति); so also are the *āruṇya-guṇa* and prokṣaṇa saṃskāra. But the position of the sacrifices like Darśapūrṇamāsa, of the phala like Svarga, and of the yajamāna the sacrificer is entirely different from that of the dravya, guṇa and saṃskāra. They become, in turn, both *pradhāna* and *aṅga* to one another in a cyclic order. The sacrifices like Darśapūrṇamāsa are *pradhānas* in relation to (the dravyas and) the *puruṣa* the sacrificer, while they become the *aṅgas* of the phala like Svarga; and the same sacrifices can be regarded as an *aṅga* of the sacrificer (*puruṣa*) in that that he is the enjoyer of the phala and as such, is the *pradhāna* of the phala. Similarly, the sacrifices, once the *pradhāna* of the *puruṣa*, become indeed the *pradhāna* of the phala which is an *aṅga* of the *puruṣa*. So also the phala which is the *pradhāna* of the *yāga*, becomes also the *pradhāna* of the *puruṣa* who is the *aṅga* of the sacrifice. So also the *puruṣa*, the *pradhāna* of the phala, becomes the *pradhāna* of the *yāga* which is an *aṅga* of the phala; and since he is an *aṅga* of the *yāga*, he becomes also an *aṅga* of the phala produced by the *yāga*. Such a cyclic process of *aṅgāṅgibhāva* as this, cannot be explained with reference to dravyas, guṇas and saṃskāras.

The Bhāṣyakāra has, however, explained in the sūtra—‘द्रव्यगुणसंस्कारेषु बादरिः’ the *prima facie* view i.e. the *aṅgatva* is, according to Bādari, nothing but उपकारकत्व which subsists among dravya, guṇa and saṃskāra, and others—*puruṣa*, *pradhāna*, *yāga* and phala—cannot be, strictly speaking, the *aṅgas* (since their *aṅgatva* is over-lapping, as explained above). In the three sūtras—कर्मण्यपि जैमिनिः फलार्थत्वात् etc. the Bhāṣyakāra elucidates the Siddhānta view that *pārārthya* (as explained by the sūtra—शेषः परार्थत्वात् III. 1-2) is the *aṅgatva* and it can be as well, explained in the *pradhāna-yāga*, *puruṣa* and phala, though it is a little over-lapping.⁴²

42 Further references to Vṛttyantarakāras and to Vṛttikāra are found in the *Sābarabhāṣya*, and Kumārila’s *Vārttika*. They may or may not apply to Vṛttikāra Upavaṣa, yet they are noted here.

(१) उपवीतं लिङ्गदर्शनात्सर्वधर्मः स्यात्—अतः परं षट् सूत्राणि भाष्यकारेण न लिखितानि, तत्र व्याख्यातारो विवदन्ते, नृस्यन्तरकारैस्तु सर्वैर्व्याख्यातानि । (Tantra Vārttika III. 4). This extract is important in that that it throws considerable light on the fact that between Śabarāsvāmin the Bhāṣyakāra,

In the *Śābarabhāṣya* many unidentified verses, mostly ślokas (in the anuṣṭubh metre) are cited⁴³ with prefatory notes ; of them, one verse deserves here special scrutiny. एवं हि पदवाक्यार्थन्यायविदः श्लोकमामनन्ति—कुर्यात्क्रियेत कर्तव्यं भवेत्स्यादिति पञ्चमम् । एतत्स्यात्सर्ववेदेषु नियतं विधिलक्षणम् । Adhyāya IV. 3-1 (3).

and Kumārilabhaṭṭa the Vārttikakāra, there was a long interval when many a commentary on the Bhāṣya has been written though even one of them has not yet been published.

(२) उच्यते—भवत्यप्रस्मरणमपि प्रयोजनमित्युक्तम् । वृत्तिकारेण तत्कार्यमितीति चेत् सूत्रकारस्याप्यविशेषो वृत्तिकारेण । *Śābarabhāṣya*, Adhyāya V. 1. 1.

(३) 'शास्त्रं चैवमनर्थकं स्यात्'—वृत्तिकारस्तु मेने—गानशास्त्रमौक्थिक्यमनर्थकं स्यादिति । *Ibid.*, VII. 2. 1 (6)

(४) प्रतिपदाख्याने तु गौरवं परिहरद्भिः वृत्तिकारैः सर्वसामान्यः शब्दः परिगृहीतः प्रकृतिवत् इति । *Śābarabhāṣya*, VIII. 1. 2 (2).

(५) तदुक्तं वृत्तिकारेण—न वा शब्दपूर्वको ह्यर्थसम्प्रत्ययः तस्मादर्थनिष्पत्तिः इति । *Śābarabhāṣya*, X. 4. 13. (23).

43 (१) श्लोकमुदाहरन्ति—

(a) आधानं पौर्णमास्यां चेद्वत्ते दर्शं करिष्यते ।
अनंगं पितृयज्ञश्चेत्तत्रैव न करिष्यते ॥

Śābarabhāṣya, Adhyāya IV. 4. 8. (21).

(b) 'पश्वङ्ग' रशना चेद्यद्ये कस्मिन्बहून्नियुञ्जीत ।

प्रतिपशु रशना कार्या यूपे चेद्द्वैरशन्यं स्यात् ॥' *Ibid.*, IV. 4. 9. (24.)

(c) 'प्राकृतात्कर्मणो यत्र तत्समानेषु कर्मसु ।

धर्मप्रदेशो येन स्यात् सोऽतिदेश इति स्मृतः ॥' *Ibid.*, VII. 1. 1. (12.)

(d) 'वितीर्य हि महज्जालमृषिः सञ्क्षिप्य चाब्रवीत् ।

इष्टं हि विदुषां लोके समासव्यासधारणम् ॥' VIII. 1. 2 (2)

(२) श्लोकमुदाहरन्ति—

(e) 'साधारणं भवेत्तन्त्रं परार्थं त्वप्रयोजकः ।

एवमेव प्रसंगः स्याद्द्विद्यमाने स्वके विधौ ॥' *Ibid.*, XII. 1. (1)

प्रसंगशब्दार्थोऽन्यैरुक्तः—एवमेव प्रसंगः० XI. 1. 1 (1).

(३) (f) श्लोकश्च भवति—

'स्वर्युपाङ्गमिति चेदेकस्यैव समञ्जनम् ।

बहूनामेकयूपत्वे सर्वेषान्तु समञ्जसम् ॥' *Ibid.*, IV. 4. 10. (28.)

(५) (g) यथा—

'नीलोत्पलवनेष्वथ चरन्तश्चारुसंरवाः ।

नीलकौशेयसंवीताः प्रणश्यन्तीव कादम्बाः ॥' *Ibid.*, I. 1. 7. (24.)

Mr. T. R. Chintamani in his paper 'On the date of Śaṅkarācārya' is of opinion that this verse might in all probability be from the work of a Sundara Pāṇḍya who is believed, as suggested by Mm. S. Kuppusvami Sastrigal⁴⁴, to have flourished before Kumārila and Śaṅkara, and written a Vārttika-grantha on the Pūrva and Uttāra Mīmāṃsāsūtras. He also thinks that his Vārttika might be a commentary on the Vṛtti of Upavarṣa and as such, it existed even before the Bhāṣya of Śabaravāmin. He bases his argument mainly on the śloka in Kumārila's Vārttika in II.3.16—'सूत्रेष्वेव हि तत्सर्वं यद्वृत्तौ यच्च वार्तिके । सूत्रं योनिरिहार्थानां सर्वं सूत्रे प्रतिष्ठितम्'—which he believes as Kumārila's own having reference to a Vṛtti (Upavarṣa's) and a Vārttika (Ācārya Sundara Pāṇḍya's) on the Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtras. But this interpretation is erroneous, as Kumārila is evidently quoting an old Kārikā :—इति ये वदन्ति तान्प्रत्युच्यते. This Kārikā lays down a general rule for commentators of all sūtras—Vṛttikāras (or Bhāṣyakāras) and Vārttikakāras, viz., whatever is explained by the commentators is to be based on the sūtras i.e. would be the meaning of the sūtras themselves (since the sūtras are considered to be a mine of all interpretations). So Kumārila's work also must come under the general term of Vārttika; so also Upavarṣa's Vṛtti, Śabaravāmin's Bhāṣya and any other work of this kind. So this verse has no special reference to Upavarṣa's Vṛtti or to Ācārya Sundara Pāṇḍya's Vārttika.⁴⁵

(h) 'इतः पश्यसि धावन्तं दूरे जातं वनस्पतिम् ।

त्वां ब्रवीमि विशालाक्षि या पिनक्षि जरद्ववम् ॥' *Ibid.*, IV. 3. 5. (11.)

(i) 'ईजाना बहुभिर्यज्ञैर्ब्राह्मणा वेदपारगाः ।

शास्त्राणि चेत्प्रमाणं स्युः प्राप्तास्ते परमां गतिम् ॥'

Ibid., V. 2. 12. (23.) and X. 8. 14. (42.)

Some of these verses might be from the pen of Vṛttikāra Upavarṣa.

44 Vide his paper on 'Problem of identity in the cultural history of Ancient India —' *Journal of Oriental Research*, Madras 1927, part I.

45 It may be even urged here that Ācārya Sundara Pāṇḍya's authorship of the kārikās cited by Śaṅkarācārya at the end of his *Samanyāyādhikarṇabhāṣya* is yet to be determined (in view of the fact that these kārikās are, according to the commentaries on the *Pañcapādikā* and the *Sūtasamhitā*, from the pen of Ācārya Sundara Pāṇḍya, but according to Nārāyaṇa Sarasvatī's Vārttika, a commentary on the Śāṅkarabhāṣya on the Brahmasūtras, from the pen of Gauḍapādācārya (vide Mm. Anantakrishna Sastri's edition of the *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* with nine commentaries, vol. I, pt. II, pp. 1245-1246).

II. Bhavadāsa.

Next to Upavarṣa comes Bhavadāsa in chronological order. No tangible evidence has yet been found for fixing the date of this Vṛttikāra ; but if the *Prapañcahṛdaya* is to be relied upon, Bhavadāsa may be placed as subsequent to Upavarṣa and before Śabarasvāmin i.e. about A. D. 100.

That Bhavadāsa flourished before Śabarasvāmin is well supported by literary evidences. The very beginning of the Bhāṣya⁴⁶ of Śabarasvāmin in the Jijñāsādhikaraṇa is, according to Kumārila's *Ślokarārttika*,⁴⁷ open to six interpretations ; and of these, the second is the *upālambhapakṣa*, the condemnation or refutation of the old interpretations of the sūtras by the Vṛttikāra like Bhavadāsa⁴⁸. While explaining the stutipakṣa, Kumārila himself mentions the Vṛttikāra (referred to in the *upālambhapakṣa*) by his

⁴⁶ लोके येष्वर्थेषु प्रसिद्धानि पदानि तानि सति संभवे तदर्थान्येव सूत्रेष्वित्यवगन्तव्यम् ।
नाध्याहारादिभिरेषां परिकल्पनीयोऽर्थः परिभाषितव्यो वा; एवं वेदवाक्यान्त्येवैभिव्याख्यायन्ते ।
इतरथा वेदवाक्यानि व्याख्येयानि स्वपदार्थाश्च व्याख्येया इति प्रयत्नगौरवं प्रसज्येत ।

⁴⁷ 'लोक इत्यस्य भाष्यस्य षडर्थान्सम्प्रचक्षते' । etc. *Ślokarārttika*, I. 1. 1 verses 26 and 27.

⁴⁸ वृत्त्यन्तरेषु केषांचिन्नौक्तिकार्थव्यतिक्रमः ।
शब्दानां दृश्यते तेषामुपालम्भोऽयमुच्यते ॥
अथात इत्ययं लोके नानन्तर्ये प्रयुज्यते ।
तस्मात्तादर्थ्यमेतस्य परिभाषादिभिर्भवेत् ॥
प्रसिद्धहानिः शब्दानामप्रसिद्धे च कल्पना ।
न कार्या वृत्तिकारेण सति सिद्धार्थसंभवे ॥

Ibid., I. 1. 1, verses 33-35.

Pārthasārathimīśra in his *Nyāyaratnākara* observes: 'उपालम्भपक्षं परिगृह्णाति—वृत्त्यन्तरेष्विति । केषाञ्चिद्भवदासादीनां वृत्त्यन्तरेषु । कीदृशः पुनरुपालम्भ इति तत्स्वयं दर्शयति—अथात इति । पदद्वयमर्थद्वयवाचि लोकप्रसिद्धमपि भवदासेनैकपदीकृत्यानन्तर्यमात्रार्थं व्याख्यातं, तदयुक्तमिति-उपालम्भ इति ।' *Chaukhamba ed.*, pp. 11 and 12. *Sucaritamīśra* in his *Kāśikā* also observes:—

वृत्त्यन्तरेष्विति—केषांचिद्धि भवदासादीनां वृत्त्यन्तरेषु शब्दानामलौकिकोऽर्थ उपवर्णितः
.....क पुनः भवदासेनालौकिकार्थग्रहणं कृतं यदेवमुपालम्भ्यते, अत आह—अथात
इति । ...भवदासेन चोक्तम्—'अथात इत्ययं शब्द आनन्तर्ये प्रयुज्यते' इति ।
(*Ślokarārttika*, with *Kāśikā*. Trivandrum Series, pp. 13 and 14).

name 'Bhavadāsa' :—'प्रदर्शनार्थमित्येके केचिन्नानार्थवादिनः । समुदायादवच्छिद्य भवदासेन कल्पितात्⁴⁹ ।'

Devasvāmin, another famous Bhāṣyakāra on the *Pūrvamīmāṃsā-sūtras*, begins his Bhāṣya on XV. 2-1 (of the Śaṅkaraṣaṅga kāṇḍa) with the introductory note⁵⁰ that he has reproduced the Bhāṣya of Bhavadāsa in the pāda (referred to) which begins with the sūtra—'अपूर्वात्तथासोमः'; and this well indicates that Devasvāmin was posterior to Bhavadāsa.

According to the *Prapañcahṛdaya*, Bhavadāsa is the author of a Vṛtti on the 16 chapters of the *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtras*. His Vṛtti, though criticised by Śabara, Kumārila and their followers, was considered by Devasvāmin as a *bhāṣya* and as such, it was a guidance for him, though he has, (as the *Prapañcahṛdaya* states) attempted only a summary of Upavaṣa's Vṛtti on the *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtras*.

It has been already said that Śabarasvāmin in his opening Bhāṣya (I.1.1) condemns Bhavadāsa's interpretation of certain sūtras. From Kumārila's Vārttika and its commentaries,⁵¹ it is known that Bhavadāsa has considered 'अथातः' in the sūtras—'अथातो धर्मजिज्ञासा' as one word, in the sense of 'after'—आनन्तर्य. Similarly, it is also known that he has divided the pratyakṣa sūtra into two main parts—the former as giving the definition of pratyakṣa and the latter, emphasizing its non-validity on dharma. These views are, however, refuted by Śabarasvāmin, Kumārila Bhaṭṭa and other subsequent authors on the *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtras*.

49 The Nyāyaratnākara on this Vārttika observes:- नानार्थमपि पदद्वयमेकीकृत्यानन्तर्यमात्रार्थतया भवदासेन कल्पितं पृथक्कृत्यावयवस्यैवाथशब्दस्याष्टमाद्याथशब्दवदानन्तर्यार्थत्वं स्वयुक्त्या वर्णयितुं पदार्थकथनमिति (pp. 21; 22).

50 अस्मिन्पादेऽपूर्वात्तथासोम इत्यारभ्या पादपरिसमाप्तेः भावदासमेव भाष्यमिति ॥

51 वर्णयते सूत्रभेदेन येन प्रत्यक्षलक्षणम्' etc. (*Śloka-vārttika*). The Nyāyaratnākara observes:- भवदासेनैतत्सूत्रं द्विधा कृत्वा सत्संप्रयोग इत्यादि प्रत्यक्षमित्येवमन्तं प्रत्यक्षलक्षणपरम्, अनिमित्तमित्यादि तस्य धर्म प्रत्यनिमित्तत्वपरं व्याख्यातं, तदुपन्यस्य दूषयति—वर्णयत इति ॥ (pp. 133-134.)

Kāśikā observes:- तदिदं वृत्त्यन्तरेऽनिमित्तादवच्छिद्य तत्प्रत्यक्षमित्येवमन्तं लक्षणपरं व्याख्यातम्, तदुपन्यस्य दूषयति—वर्णयत इति (Trivandrum Series, pp. 204).

III. Bhartṛmitra.

According to Pārthasārathimīśra's *Nyāyaratnākara*⁵², Bhartṛmitra is referred to by Kumārila in his *Śloka-vārttika*—'प्रायेण सर्वा मीमांसा हन्त लोकायतीकृता । तामास्तिकपथे कर्तुमयं यत्नः कृतो मया' (verse 10). He was, according to Kumārila, an ācārya who had introduced many *apasiddhāntas* into the system of the *Pūrvamīmāṃsā* and then made it *laukāyātika*—a nāstika-darśana. On the authority of the *Nyāyaratnākara* which mentions some of the *apasiddhāntas* of Bhartṛmitra (नित्यनिषिद्धयोरिष्टानिष्टं फलं नास्ति), Mm. S. Kuppusvami Sastrigal in his paper on the Prābhākara school of Karmamīmāṃsā⁵³, puts forth the suggestion that 'Prabhākara was not (perhaps) the founder of the Prābhākara school, which, according to P. Miśra's *Nyāyaratnākara* must have represented in the ante-Kumārila period of Mīmāṃsā by writers like Bhartṛmitra ; (and) probably Bhartṛmitra was the author of the *Prābhākara-vārttika*.....But Mm. N. S. Anantakrishna Sastrigal in the English introduction⁵⁴ to his edition of Nandīśvara's *Prabhākaravijaya* contends that if Bhartṛmitra were ever the founder of the Prābhākara school, then Prabhākara would not have commented on the *Śābarabhāṣya* ; and that Bhartṛmitra could not, therefore, be the original propounder of the Prābhākara doctrines. *In either case it is not definitely known whether he has written a Vṛtti on Jaimini's sūtras or a commentary on Śabara's Bhāṣya*. That the Vārttikakāra quoted by Śālikanātha in his *Prakaranapañcikā* is Kumārila and not Bhartṛmitra is also accepted by all scholars⁵⁵, since the majority of the kārīkās cited by Śālikanātha can be traced out in Kumārila's *Śloka-vārttika* and the rest, in his *Bṛhaṭṭikā*⁵⁶.

52 ननु मीमांसायाश्चिरन्तनानि भर्तृमित्रादिरचितानि व्याख्यानानि विद्यन्ते, किमनेनेत्यत आह—प्रायेणेति । मीमांसा हि भर्तृमित्रादिभिरलोकायतैव सती लोकायतीकृता नित्यनिषिद्धयोरिष्टानिष्टं फलं नास्तीत्यादि बहुपसिद्धान्तपरिमहेणेति तामास्तिकपथे कर्तुं वार्त्तिकारम्भयत्नः कृतो मयेति । Chaukhamba edition, pp. 3-4.

53 Vide Proc. of the Second Oriental Conference, Calcutta. pp. 410-11.

54 *Prabhākaravijaya* (Sanskrit Sahitya Pariṣad Series), pp. 1-4.

55 Vide Mm. S. K. Sastrigal's paper on 'Further Light in the Prābhākara School of Karmamīmāṃsā' submitted to the Third Oriental Conference, Madras (1924); and Mm. N. S. Anantakrishna Sastrigal's. Introduction to his edition of Nandīśvara's *Prabhākaravijaya* (संस्कृतसाहित्यपरिषद्ग्रन्थमाला).

56 See Pandit A. Chinnasvami Sastri's paper on 'Kumārila Bhaṭṭa and Prabhākara Miśra' submitted to the Fourth Oriental Conference. Allahabad (1926); Pandit K. S. Ramasvami Sastri's paper on 'Forgotten Kārīkās of Kumārila' in

Yāmunācārya in his *Siddhitraya*⁵⁷ refers to Bhartṛmitra as one of the Pūrvācāryas who have commented on the *Uttaramīmāṃsā-sūtras*. But unfortunately, none of his works has yet seen the light of day and as such, nothing can be definitely said of the nature of his works and views in philosophy. Jayantabhaṭṭa, in his *Nyāyamañjarī*⁵⁸, mentions him as a Mīmāṃsaka in two places. Mukulabhaṭṭa in his *Abhidhāvṛttimātrkā*⁵⁹ honours him with the title *ācārya* and ascribes to him the famous oft-quoted verse,—

‘अभिधेयेन सामीप्यात्साहचर्यात्समवायतः ।
वैपरीत्यात्क्रियायोगाल्लक्षणा पञ्चधा मता’ ॥

He may be placed between Śabarasyāmin and Kumārila Bhaṭṭa i.e. A. D. 300—650. From the remark of Kumārila cited above it is clear that his attempt in writing the Vārttika on the Śābarabhāṣya is to make the Mīmāṃsā system of philosophy an āstikadarśana, which, according to the *Nyāyaratnākara*, was, however, interpreted by Ācāryas like Bhartṛmitra as a nāstikadarśana. Had Bhartṛmitra flourished before Śabarasyāmin, Kumārila would have said the same in reference to the Bhāṣyakāra, as he has expressed in the ātmavāda in l. 1. 5 his high reverence for him as an āstika-śiromaṇi—
“इत्याह नास्तिक्यनिराकरिष्णुरात्मास्तितां भाष्यकृदत्र युक्त्या”⁶⁰.

V. A. RAMASWAMI SASTRI

Journal of Oriental Research, Madras, vol. 1, part II, and his paper on ‘Kumārila’s Bhaṭṭikā’ submitted to the Third Oriental Conference, Madras (1924).

57 Benares edition, pp. 4-5.

58 मीमांसकानान्तु नावश्यमाकाशमेव श्रोत्रं, कार्यार्थापत्तिकल्पितं तु किमपि करण-
मात्रं प्रतिपुरुषनियतं श्रोत्रमिति नातिप्रसङ्गः । तथाच भर्तृमित्रः—पवनजनितसंस्कारपक्षो
भवतु तथापि नातिप्रसङ्गः । नियतदेशस्यैव तत्र संस्कारात् । Vizayanagaram Sanskrit
Series, p. 213.

(२) यत्तु भर्तृमित्रस्तमेव संस्कारं श्रोत्रेन्द्रियमभ्युपैति (तदिदमपूर्वकं किमपि
पारिडल्यम्) *Ibid.*, p. 226.

59 Nirṇayasāgara edition, p. 14.

60 Bhartṛhari is believed by some to have written Vṛttis on *Pūrva* and *Uttara Mīmāṃsāsūtras*. But none of them is available now. As there are strong evidences to prove that he has elucidated most of the important doctrines of both the *Pūrva* and *Uttara Mīmāṃsāsūtras* in his famous *Vākyapadīya*, would it be far-fetched to suggest that he has not written any commentary on these Sūtras? (Vide my paper ‘On the doctrine of Sphoṭa,’ *Annamalai University Journal*, vol: I, no. 2, p. 235 foot-note).

An Unexplored Source of Mughal History (1526-1707)

The Mughal period of Indian history is the best studied period of pre-British India, but still there is a large mass of unexplored materials. The collections of official and private correspondence of the period occupy a very prominent place among these neglected sources and it is the object of this paper to bring out the importance of these collections lying scattered in different libraries of India and Europe.

When under Akbar's patronage Persian became the court language in India, Hindu and Muslim aspirants to Government service alike began to acquire a knowledge of the language. Scholarship at that time meant a knowledge of Persian. It was the language of the cultured society as well as of official correspondence. Naturally Persian scholarship meant a proficiency in the art of writing letters, official and private. The profession of private secretary came into being, Munshis, Peshdasts, and Readers were in requisition in the service of great court dignitaries and provincial administrators. Soon a standard of private and public correspondence came to be adopted and it became the ambition of professional secretaries and private correspondents to come up to that standard. This in its turn brought about a demand for the works of famous secretaries and scholars as models for correspondence. The result was that great impetus was given to a movement for bringing together in one place their letters, and thus many collections of famous secretaries' letters were made. Thus, fortunately for us, unintentionally a storehouse of historical information was built up which, as we shall soon see, can yield very fruitful results.

Besides these collections made on literary grounds, we have official correspondence of the periods preserved elsewhere. The standard Persian chronicles of the period often contain interesting letters written by the emperors, governors and other officials. This correspondence has long been available to historical students in the standard

editions of the Persian texts and it is not my intention to say anything about it here.

But there is a unique collection of original official correspondence available at the Record office in Jaipur. About twenty-seven thousand of original letters had been catalogued there till 1929 including 307 letters from the emperors and princes, 2627 reports from the Raja's agents to his principals, 9298 letters to the Maharajas, and papers about account, more than 10000 miscellaneous letters and 3400 drafts. The dates of these letters range between 1606 and 1717. There are letters of 1606, 1622 to 1627, 1646 to 1661, 1664 and 1665, 1669 to 1671, 1676 to 1681, 1688 to 1717. This correspondence embraces all varieties of officials papers—

حسب الحکم - فرمان - مجلہ - پرانہ -
 دستک - یان داشت - نشان - حسب الامر
 پتہ تشخیص دیہات - تمسک - طومار - روز نامچہ غلہ
 فرن - فارغ خطی - مظہر - یان - داشت پیش - کش
 یان - داشت جاگیر داران سند - فرن عرض - داشت -
 پتہ قبولیت -

Thus we have personal despatches of the emperors, letters written by emperors' orders, emperors' orders on letters received, letters of princes, exemptions, ordinary official orders, memorandum, security bonds, statement of disputed facts, papers terminating civil or revenue demands, daily accounts of corn, accounts, notes of hand for money received, papers laying down the settlement of land revenue, the acceptance deeds of cultivators and officials, submissions of officials, sanads, list of Jagirdars in Jaipur, list of Peshkashs to governors and emperors. Here are letters from Jahangir, Nur Jahan, Dawar Bakhsh, Shah Jahan, Dara, Begum Sahiba, Aurangzeb, Durga Dass Rathor, Maharaja Ajit Singh of Jodhpur besides the reports of the Raja's representatives at the imperial court or the provincial capital. These last form a very important source of historical information. Besides a representative at the court of provincial governor, Maharajas of Jaipur maintained their agents at the imperial court who acted as a connecting link between the emperors and the Maharajas. Their correspondence, besides throwing light on the position of the Rajput

Rajas under the Mughal emperors, touches many affairs of importance. The Jat rebellion in Muttra and the surrounding districts under Aurangzeb, the Mughal government of Kabul, the war of succession, Dawar Bakhsh's brief reign, Assamese campaign of 1669 and 1671, imperial expedition against Mahārāṇā Raj Singh, the religious policy of Shah Jahan and Aurangzeb, the rebellion of Gujars in Deoli, Marhatta campaign of Aurangzeb, prince Akbar's rebellion, Aurangzeb's campaign against Bijapur, the only detailed notices of Guru Gobind Singh and his relations with Aurangzeb, siege of Udgir under Shah Jahan (1636), Mughal expedition to Nurpur (1641), Shah Jahan's rebellion of 1627, capture of Nagpur (1636) are, among others, some of the episodes in the Mughal history, light on which is thrown by these papers. Besides this they illustrate, as nothing else does, Mughal administrative practices, the actual methods of revenue settlement and collection, the quarrels between jagirdars and civil government, the decision of cases in appeal by the emperor, financial methods of the Mughal government, land transactions of this period, realization of debts, farming of land revenue, the relations between the Mughal emperors and the Rajputs, rate of interest, discounting of Hundis, enforcement of prohibition under Aurangzeb, Mughal monopoly of salt manufacture, the buildings of Shah Jahan, relations between different Mughal commanders serving in the same expedition, news-writers, their duties, temptations and difficulties. The detailed working of Mughal administration in its various phases in Rajput states and imperial territories all stands revealed here. Thus these papers are extremely useful for the reigns of Jahangir, Shah Jahan and Aurangzeb.

I have besides noticed some seventy collections of the letters of the Mughal period in different libraries of India. The letters themselves cover a very wide period and some of the collections were made much later. The reign of almost every Mughal emperor is represented in these collections which may be divided into two classes. One represents the correspondence of the emperors themselves including the complete drafts of their despatches, warrants of appointment, instructions to ambassadors, governors, commanders and other high officers, besides rough notes, orders, memorandum and private letters.

I

We have for Akbar's reign

1. *Jarida Framin Salatin-i-Delhi* (MS in the library of the Muslim University, Aligarh). It contains letters written by Akbar to Khan-i-Khanan, Shahbaz Khan, Raza Ali Khan and Hakim Humayun Gilani besides orders containing detailed instructions to Akbar's officers for the government of the cities and country side addressed not to the governors as the text of the *Mirat-i-Ahmadi* (I, 163) has it but to all ranks of officers and commanders of expeditions.

2. *Letters of Abul Fazal* (printed). Despite the late Dr. V. A. Smith's belief that these documents do not contain much matter of historical importance inaccessible elsewhere—an opinion formed without reading the letters either in the original or in translation—the examination of the first part of the volume which alone contains Akbar's letters, has convinced me of their great historical importance. To mention one instance only: these letters contain Akbar's official declaration of faith as a Muslim after he had been accused of unbelief by his more orthodox brethren in faith with an account of the work he had performed in the service of Islam.

For the reign of Jahangir we have

3. *Guldasta-i-Framin-Jahangiri* (MS in the library of Sir Salar Jang at Hyderabad). Besides other interesting pieces it contains Jahangir's letter to Shah Jahan when he rebelled against his father.

4. *Insha-i-Har Karan* by Munshi Har Karan, son of Mathra Dass Multani and secretary to I'tbar Khan (printed and translated into English) and compiled between 1034 and 1040 A.H. Its chief interest lies in its preserving official forms of letters of appointment thereby throwing light on the functions of different officials and Mughal administrative practices. It contains a letter of authority exempting a particular trader from the payment of Baj and Zakat. Another mentions appointment of arbitrators in a civil suit. There are many letters to local officials in cases heard in appeal by the emperor. Detailed instructions about the assessment and collection of land revenue are to be found here. No student of Mughal administrative practices can afford to neglect this important source.

For the reign of Aurangzeb we have several collections most of which have been described by Sir Jadu Nath Sarkar in his new edition of *Studies in Mughal India*. He has not however described their subject-matter. His description concerns the editors of the correspondence rather than the nature of the correspondence. There are some however that he has not included in his analysis.¹

5. *L. O. Persian*, MS 370, besides notes on Shah Jahan's administrative system contains some notes for letters of Aurangzeb. The author Mir Abul Hasan *alias* Mir Kalan compiled it in 1185 A.H. (1771-1772).

6. *Munshait*, a MS in the library of Sir Jadu Nath Sarkar, contains among other things a very interesting letter of Aurangzeb to Amadit-ul-Malik giving him detailed instruction about the reception to be accorded to Prince Akbar who was reported to be ready to return to obedience. It describes the delicate ceremonials observed between a Mughal nobleman and a Mughal prince when they met.

7. *Kalimat-i-Aurangzeb* compiled by Inayat Ullah contains in 60 folios, 152 notes of Aurangzeb, addressed to 21 persons mostly about public affairs. It contains besides other less interesting pieces, a letter of Aurangzeb to Akbar blaming him for his trusting the Rajputs. Another gives instructions to his officers about Akbar's raids on the frontier. A very important find is an order for the general arrest and execution of Sikhs whenever found on account of the disturbances created by them near Lahore. Another letter contains reference to Sahu's objections against the scheme of studies Aurangzeb had laid down for him with a view to convert him to Islam. Some letters elucidate the much vexed question of Aurangzeb's relations with European merchants in his empire. Thus this letter-book is a mine of historical information.

8 & 9. *Kalimat-i-Taibat* is found in two recensions. The

1 I have studied the transcripts of the originals made for Sir Jadu Nath Sarkar in 19 volumes covering some 6000 pages and I am grateful to him for his courtesy in putting these papers at my disposal. It is to be hoped that the Jaipur Darbar would open its Record office to students of Indian history and give them access to these papers which throw so much light on Mughal administrative practices as apart from theoretical principles.

Rampur MS contains about 500 orders and notes of Aurangzeb which were later on reduced to the form of Royal orders by Inayat Ullah Khan, the compiler of this collection. The A.S.B. MS contains 670 notes and letters of Aurangzeb. (The printed *Ruqqiat-i-Alamgiri* also bears this title in one or two places). It contains another of the rare references to the Sikhs to be found in the Persian writings of the seventeenth century. This is a reference to many thousands of the Sikhs advancing towards the North Western frontier and their destruction by the Afghans. Besides it throws very useful light on many dark corners of Mughal administration.

10. Aurangzeb's despatches to Jai Singh (National Library, Paris, and Sarkar) refer to the war of succession and the campaign against Shivaji and the Deccan. They reveal Aurangzeb's methods of conducting warfare. There is a letter in reply to Jai Singh's conferring on him the power of making assignment of Jagirs to officers serving under him in the Deccan thus explaining the relations between Provincial Government and the imperial commanders sent on expeditions. A reference to Jaswant Singh's desertion from, and attack on, Aurangzeb's army draws from Aurangzeb an angry comment.

The diplomacy of the war of succession is revealed here in many of the letters.

11. A British Museum MS *Ruqqaim-i-Karaim*, compiled by Sayed Ashraf Khan, contains 116 letters of Aurangzeb to Shah Alam, Shaista Khan, Asad Khan, Mir Abdul Karim and Mohammad Azam. In two places the names of addresses are missing. On the margins of the MS are letters mostly from the printed text of Aurangzeb's letters. The compilation besides throwing light on many points of historical interest explains the actual relation between the emperor and his commanders and governors.

12. *Ruqqiat-i-Alamgiri* (printed) contains 181 letters of Aurangzeb. It contains a Shah Jahan's daily programme of work which differs in certain respects from the one given in *Badshah Nama* and adopted by Sir Jadu Nath Sarkar. Aurangzeb is found advising his grandson, Mohammad Azim, to get himself weighed against different metals and corn twice a year in order to safeguard himself against bodily and spiritual ills. In it we find the daily cares of an emperor's life exhibited as also

Mughal administrative practices in their actual working. The powers of commanders and governors, the relations between officials and newswriters, regulations about the assessment and collection of land revenue, the position of Hindus at court, Mughal ceremonials, provision of pension for the relatives of dead officers are all found reflected here. The Jat expeditions of Aurangzeb's reign, the Balkh campaign of Shah Jahan's reign, cause of Dara's failure are also referred to here. Aurangzeb is found insisting that his sons should not return the presents of Amirs and thus cause a loss to the public treasury.

13. *Dastur-ul-Amal-i-Agahi* compiled by Aya Mal Jaipuri contains 231 letters of Aurangzeb. Shah Jahan, Shah Alam, Azam Shah, Akbar, Karm Baksh, Muaz-ud-Din, Azim-ud-Din, Bedar Bakht, Abul Hasan Aana Shah, Shaista Khan, Asad Khan, Inayat-ullah Khan, Feroz Jang, Amir Khan are some of the persons to whom those letters have been addressed. It contains Aurangzeb's will, and a sort of appendix wherein are brought together some wise saws, things to forget, factors making for a long life, and 14 causes of poverty.

14. *Ihkam-i-Alamgiri* of Nur Ullah cover 305 folios. They contain probably the only reference contemporary in Persian works of Guru Gobind Singh's struggle against Aurangzeb's officers and measures taken in the siege of Chamkaur. The levy of Jizya, Aurangzeb's relations with Europeans, his Rathor troubles, his order forbidding the appointment of Rajputs as Subahdars and Fojdars all find a place here. A rather interesting letter details the judicial procedure in a Mughal court, the employment of Vakils, striking of issues and the division of the burden of proof, service of summons and the agency employed for that purpose. Aurangzeb's relations with Raja Bhim Singh and Ajit Singh are also related here.

15. *Adab-i-Alamgiri*, besides letters of prince Akbar contains 628 letters of Aurangzeb, about half the number written in Shah Jahan's reign. They throw a flood of light on the period and reveal Aurangzeb in training. They form a valuable means of estimating Aurangzeb's character and throw light on many vexed questions. We find Shah Jahan reprimanding Aurangzeb for his exhibition of anti-Hindu policy. We can form an estimate here of Aurangzeb's relations with Shah Jahan's officers. Aurangzeb's letters written during his own

reign provide an important source of information. We are thus not left dependent on the accounts of the chroniclers alone and are in a position to check their accounts.

Miscellaneous Collections

16. *Faiyaz-ul-Qawānīn* compiled by Nawab Mohammad Ali Hassan Khan contains in its 688 pp. letters of Humayun, Akbar, Jahangir, Shah Jahan and Aurangzeb besides those of Dara and Murad. Murad's letters to Aurangzeb are particularly important as throwing a flood of light on the vexed question of their relations during the war of succession. The first chapter (covering pp. 10 to 366) alone contains letters of kings and princes, including therein some of the letters received by the Mughal emperors from foreign potentates to the capital. Pages 367 to 697 contain letters of officials and private citizens and the book is rounded off by a description of India.

17. *Ruqquat'-i-Inayat Khan Rasikh* compiled by Inayat Khan contains the letters of Babur, Humayun, Akbar and Shah Jahan, besides some of the letters written to them as well.

18. *Bahar-i-Sukhan* by Mohammad Salih Kambhu, author of *Amal-i-Salih*, contains many letters of Shah Jahan as also of Aurangzeb to rulers of Basra, Balkh, Turan, Persia, Herat and governors of Kandahar besides many letters of Khan-i-Doran. It is invaluable for study of the Mughal foreign policy. It covers 329 pp.

19. *No Badah-i-Munir* contains Aurangzeb's letters to Qutub Shah of Golkanda, Abbas of Persia, a letter of Prince Aurangzeb to Mohammad Adil Shah and an account of his conquest of Bedar in Shah Jahan's reign.

II

The second group of letter books contains the correspondence of Mughal officers, private and official. It has to be remembered that there is not a single collection of the letters of non-officials. Everyone who knew enough Persian to attain to any eminence as a writer was sure of a job under the Mughal government in some capacity. Persian scholarship was a passport in securing employment in the Mughal Secretariat or under some Mughal noble or administrator. Thus all other letter books can be brought under this heading. Of course private letters as well as official correspondence have come down to us

in these letter books. In some cases they are much more important and yield more valuable results than the letters of the Mughal emperors. The emperors touch upon broad questions of general policy alone, light on which some times is thrown from other sources as well. But these letters from provincial administrators, secretaries, and minor imperial officials throw light on many obscure corners of Mughal history.

These letters are arranged according to the reigns of different Mughal emperors. We have

For the reign of Humayun

20. *Inshai-Usafi* covering 119 pages compiled by Mohammad Usaf for the use of his son Rafi-ud-Din in 1533. Its importance lies in its collections of warrants of appointment and patents of office obviously in Humayun's time. It is very useful in tracing the origins of many offices about which historians have been ranging themselves on the side of Sher Shah and Akbar.

21. *Inshai-i-Nami*, compiled by Khwand Amir, the famous historian. This again like No. 20 contains official forms and requires to be studied in detail for a history of the institutions.

For the reign of Akbar

22. *Ruqqi'at Hakim Abul Fateh Gilani* covering 100 pages consists of the private letters of this famous Hakim of Akbar's court. Some of them refer to important public events.

23. *Ruqqi'at i-Abul Fazal* contains Abul Fazal's letters to his friends and contemporaries compiled by Nur Mohammad. It shows a side of Abul Fazal's character which is obviously hidden from us as we try to study him from his other writings. This is different from the printed collection of Abul Fazal's letters.

24. *Inshai-Faizi*, contains Faizi's letters to his friends, contemporary literary persons and officials.

We have already spoken of the standard collection of Abul Fazal's letters.

For the reign of Jahangir

25. *Inshai-Abdul Latif* compiled by Abdul Latif contains letters of Lashkar Khan, Qasim Khan, Hashim Khan, Abdulla Khan, Bakshi

of Agra, Diwan of Kabul, Diwan of Gujarat, Bakshi of Gujarat, Khan-i-Khanan Abdur Rahim and various other dignitaries at the Mughal court.

26. *Inshai-Inayat Ullah*, compiled in 1609 contains many letters of historical importance.

For the reign of Shah Jahan

27. *Munshiat Tabrezi* contains Shah Jahan's correspondence with the king of Golkanda.

28. *Ruqqi'at-Shah Abbas the second* contains letters to Dara, Murad, Aurangzeb, Shah Jahan, ruler of Bijapur, Governors of Multan and Qandahar and Mir Jumla besides instructions to his ambassadors in India.

29. *Inshai-i-Brahman*.

30. *Chahar Chaman-i-Brahman* by Munshi Chandar Bhan of Lahore. No. 29 represents a very popular and often printed collection of letters. No. 30 is divided into 4 parts, the first two are descriptive, parts 3 and 4 contain among other things letters by the writer to Shah Jahan, some of the high officials at court, and Chandar Bhan's relatives.

31. *Ruqqi'at-i-Baidil*, these letters of this famous poet contain his personal adventures, illustrate difficulties of travel, shed light on the literary history of the times and illuminate some aspects of social history of Shah Jahan's reign.

32. *Inshai-Ibrahim* compiled by Mirza Ibrahim Turkman in 1654 contains letters written to the emperor, his prime minister, the Bakshi and many other high officials concerning Shuja's assumption of the government of Kabul and the affairs thereof. It records the proselytizing activity of Shah Jahan's commanders who converted 5,000 persons to Islam during the expedition to the country of Sankar Dev.

For the reign of Aurangzeb

33. *Insha-i-Roshan Kalam Bhupat* by Bhupat Rai, Munshi to Nawab Ra'd Anduz Khan, Fojdar Banswara, contains his master's cor-

respondence which deals with the cares and anxieties of a Mughal Fojdar's life.

34. *Khatut-i-Shivaji* contains letters of Aurangzeb to Akbar, Shiva III, Trumbak, commander of Naraula, and Ram Chand. Akbar's letters to Sambhaji and some of his courtiers detail his movements in Rajputana and relate the story of his stay in the Deccan. There are some letters of Shivaji, including the famous letter to Aurangzeb protesting against the levy of the 'jizya' written by Nil Prabhu to Shivaji's instructions. The Marhatta raids in the Mughal territories are recalled by Shivaji's proclamation, letters of his officers and of some Mughal officers of the districts concerned. Letters exchanged between Akbar and Aurangzeb also find place and there is a letter from Dalair Khan to Shivaji.

35. Letters to some Mughal emperors (National Library, Paris, 704) is mainly important as containing reference to the Rajput War and Akbar's rebellion.

36. *Nigar Nama Munshi Malik Zada* written jointly with his son Meghraj contains private letters, official correspondence, and warrants of appointments.

37. *Riyaz-ul-Wadud*, compiled by Aizad Bakhsh Rasa on July 12, 1681, contains letters to Aurangzeb, and some minor Mughal officials besides the story of the conquest of the fort of Bijapur.

38. *Karnama-i-Jaithamul* contains letters written by Jaithamul on behalf of his master Mu'tabir Khan. The last date mentioned is November 30, 1705. It mostly covers Mu'tabir Khan's service in the Deccan and contains reference to the European traders in India particularly the Portuguese and the English, mutiny of the Mughal soldiers for arrears of pay in the Deccan, capture of Sambhaji, and Dhannaji's raids.

39. *Ruqqi'at-i-Nawazish Khan* in 90 pp. contains the letter of Mukhtar Beg Nawazish Khan, Governor of Kashmir. He served with distinction in Malwa, Burhanpur, Kashmir and Gujrat. His letters deal with diverse subjects which interested Mughal Mansibdars of rank. The complaints of soldiers clamouring for their arrears, difficulties in collection of the arrears of land revenue and the instalments of Taqavi, the attack of Abbas Pathan on Ujjain at the head of 5,000

men, and difficulties experienced by Mughal Mansibdars in managing their distant jagirs are all reflected here.

40. *Ruqqi'at-i-Khwaja Hasan*, the poet laureate, was compiled in the reign of Aurangzeb in 1666 and throws a flood of light on literary friendships, social life, the position of the litterateurs at the Mughal court and other connected problems.

41. *Inshai-Farsi* contains the reply of the Mughal officers at Surat to Shivaji's demands on the city.

42. *Carnatic Records*, preserved in the Record Office, Madras, besides other interesting facts, record the remission of the salt tax in 1668.

43. *Mujmut-i-Munshiat* from the State Library, Rampur, contains a collection of letters written by several Munshis on their own behalf or on behalf of their masters. Mukhlis Khan, Rai Kunjman, Munshi Balkrishen Mehta, Udairaj, Atta Ullah, Rai Sobha Chand are some of the writers. Among the correspondents addressed are several princes, Governor of Ahmedabad, Diwan of Agra, Diwan of Ajmer, Deputy Governor of Kabul and Governor of Berar. There is a letter of Aurangzeb reprimanding Bedar Bakht for receiving a bribe from an applicant for the office of Deputy Governor of Berar and another to the Deputy Governor of Kabul.

44. *Surat Factory letters* for the years 1695 and 1696 are mostly concerned with the European traders in Surat.

45. *Insha-i-Zarbakhsh* compiled by Sayyid Mohammad Zayi Chughtai, a Mughal officer, who served in Bengal and Bihar under Nawab Sabar Khan, son of Nawab Amir Khan. It is divided into two parts, the first deals with the non-official correspondence and the second contains imperial orders, letters from princes, warrants of appointments, and security bonds for service. An official letter of the Bayutat-i-Sadar to his provincial subordinate in Assam throws interesting light on the disposal of the prizes of War. Some of the letters use the Ilahi calendar introduced by Akbar. There are many models written as standards for different occasions. A model supplies the form in which returns for daily receipts are to be submitted. Two letters speak of the conquest of Jonagarh in the 33rd year and of Rajwara which had not hitherto been conquered by the Muslim armies

46. *Nuskha-i-Aish Afza* compiled by Saif Khan is dedicated to Aurangzeb and tells us of his religious views and opinions.

47. *Insha-i-Jan Muhammad* who was a Munshi of Raja Daulatmand Khan, a noble under Alamgir. It throws a good deal of light on social history, religious policy and administrative practices of the period.

48. *Majmua az Bias* contains many letters about Aurangzeb's coronation, the Khutba that was adopted, the legend on the coins that was ultimately settled upon.

49. *Farāmin-i-Muhammad Shahi-o-Ba'za-i-Shahan-i-Salf* contains some letters of Aurangzeb mostly granting stipends to theologians and needy scholars, imams of mosques, Mu'azzans, and endowments for lightening tapers on certain tombs. Certain grants are very interesting. The caller to prayers at Imtyaz Garh is granted 14 Tanka Alamgiri and half a seer of oil daily in the 45th year of Aurangzeb's reign. Another grant is made for keeping a mosque lighted, for providing drinking water to the thirsty and mats to sit upon for the travellers. A rather startling find is a grant of annas four daily to a Hindu astronomer Malhar Bhat from the revenues from Sair of Bab Nagar.

50. *Jami-ul-Qaranin* compiled by Khalifa Shah Muhammad of Qanoj in 1674 has been printed.

51. A collection of letters covering 265 pp. in the India Office Library (Eh , 2118) contains Abul Fazal's letters to Akbar, Salim, and Daniyal and a group of letters of Aurangzeb's reign. One of the letters mentions that a Hindu temple at Muttra, we are told, attracted pilgrims of all religions.

52. *Mi-yar-ul-Adrak* by Tughra, a poet of Jahangir's time contains a letter of Qazi Nur Ullah to Abul Fazal.

53. A collection of letters mostly of Aurangzeb's reign at Bankipur contains a letter in verse of Shah Jahan to Jahangir and Jahangir's reply thereto when Shah Jahan had rebelled against his father.

54. *Insha-i-Inayat-Ullah*, compiled in 1609, is a very useful MS. in the Kapurthala State Library.

55. *Ruqqi'at-Hassam* by Abul Hassan, Secretary to the Governors of Orissa (1655 to 1670) was compiled in 1669-70. It contains a detailed history of Orissa not to be found elsewhere. The duties of

provincial officers, Mughal revenue practices, destruction of temples by Aurangzeb's orders, relations between Mughal officers serving in different departments are all reflected here. There are letters written by the author on his own behalf, letters written by the orders of Shaikh Abul Khair, Turhai't Khan, Governor of Orissa under Shah Jahan, and Shaista Khan, his successor under Aurangzeb. Among the correspondents are Shaikh Abdur Rashid, Fojdar Chakla Maidni Pur, Mirza Muhammad Beg Diwan, Mir Jumla, I'taqab Khan Bakhshi, Saiyad Agha, Havaladar Sakakul, Pir Khan, Fojdar Talmal, Raja Mukand Dev, Mian Muhammad Jan, Vazir Diwan-i-Orissa, Aurangzeb, Abad Khan, Sadar-ul-Sadur, Mir I-ma'il Diwan, Mirza Abul Hassan, Diwan Tan Orissa and Bengal, Muhammad Moman Fojdar Malwa, Raja Raghunath Diwan, Qutub-ul-Mulak of Golkanda, Asad Khan Bakhshi, Laskhar Khan, Governor of Bihar, and Saif Khan, Governor of Kashmir, Ahmad Khan, Deputy Qazi. Thus the questions found in its 236 pp. deal with all sorts of topics. We find in its pages the Governor of Orissa taking a loan of Rs. 10,000 from the State against the mortgage of his house at Delhi, the payment of a relief of Rs. 1,00,000 by the Zamindars of Orissa at succession, the Mughals demanding a half of the produce in land revenue in Orissa and consequent desertion of villages, and castration of children in the Deccan. The Mughal Governor of Orissa at any rate exercised control over his Bakhshi to the extent of demanding his presence at a particular place with all relevant papers. In view of the fact that the cultivators in Mughal India are supposed to have enjoyed the right of challenging the state demand of land revenue, it is interesting to find here the Zamindars of Orissa so challenging the demand of land revenue and insisting on a survey of the land, and the preparation of an estimate of produce. The case seems to have gone against them; they were fined Rs. 5,000. Besides there are various official letters of authority issued by the emperor or by the provincial officers.

56. *Insha-i-Hamid-ud-Din* in 313 pp. covers the reigns of Shah Jahan and Aurangzeb. The last date mentioned is 1677. Its author was Fojdar at Jullundhur, he was present at the siege of Golkanda in 1655-56, and served as the Deputy Governor of Malwa. This collection includes letters to the emperor, his own friends, relatives, and some

brother Mughal officials. There are letters referring to disturbance in Malwa, Doab and Bihar. It depicts the plight of the inhabitants of the Jullundhur Doab under Aurangzeb. A Hindu from Hoshiarpur (in the Punjab) was converted to Islam. After living as a Muslim for some time, he was reconverted to Hinduism. On this being reported to the Mughal authorities, he was arrested and subsequently imprisoned. The Hindus of Hoshiarpur closed their shops as a mark of protest and a good deal of diplomacy had to be used before business was resumed. Shafi, who refused to acknowledge Muhammad as the prophet of God, was stoned to death by the Muslims, some one complained to the emperor against this lynching process and we find rigorous inquiries made in order to ascertain what had happened. No one seems to have been punished for this taking the law into their own hands. There are warrants of various appointments.

57. A British Museum MS. (*Sloan MS.* 3582), partly copied for Sir Jadu Nath Sarkar, contains many letters about Aurangzeb's operations in the Deccan. An interesting item is the record of a judicial trial before a Mughal officer. A Farman of Shah Jahan dated March 25, 1650 remits all duties on elephants brought for the court.

58. *Parasnis MS.* contains among various other items letters of Murad to Shivaji and Shahji written in 1649; letters of Aurangzeb to Shivaji in 1657 and during the war of succession, in 1655, 1666 and 1668. Aurangzeb's diplomacy during the war of succession can be studied from some of these letters. A letter dated September 5, 1665 announces the conferment of the rank of a commander of 5000 on his son, that of December 12, 1665 congratulates him for the part he played in the operations against Bijapur and sends him some gifts, by a letter dated April 5, 1666, he is called to the court and the letter of March 9, 1668 confers the title of Raja on him. Besides these there are some Farmans of Aurangzeb as well in this collection.

59. *Haft Anjiman* consists of the letters written by Tali' Yar, a Hindu convert who was Munshi to Rustam Khan and Raja Jai Singh. He died on June 16, 1675. The present collection was made by his son Hamayat Yar in 1698-1699 (1110 A.H.). Three fragments have been discovered in Benares, Delhi and Paris. It consists of an introduction and seven books. The first book contains Rustam Khan's letters

to Shah Jahan while he was serving at Kabul. It mentions local disturbances in Aligarh, reports conquests of the fort Jaroli, complains about a drought and consequent shortage of corn, recommends an officer for appointment as his deputy, reports sending of 5 falcons, notes repeated thefts in the countryside and measures taken to combat them, and submits explanation for audit objections blaming his Diwan. The letters from Kabul form a very interesting collection. The first speaks of his assumption of office as a governor. We have then letters detailing his early measures there, the arrangements in the independent tribal country, transfers and re-transfers of officers, building of a brick pavement in the streets of Kabul, sending spies to Balkh and Bokhara including a Hindu, son of Rajrup, the arrangements made for keeping the country under Mughal control, and the expenses of government in Kabul. Many of the letters recording measures for the defence of the country read, to our surprise, like the communiques issued by the Government of India from time to time about its North-Western Frontier policy. These letters supply about the Mughal government in Kabul some information which is scarcely to be found elsewhere.

Book II contains letters of Raja Jai Singh from Thatta and gives detailed information about Jai Singh's movements there. His pursuit of Dara Shikoh, the diplomacy of Aurangzeb towards the Rajput rulers, the attitude of local officers are all found reflected here. Book III contains Raja Jai Singh's letters from the Deccan and are invaluable for Aurangzeb's relations with Shivaji as also with the kingdoms in the Deccan. Both these books deserve publication and I hope soon to be able to edit them and, of possible, publish them. Book IV contains Rustam Khan's letters to Shah Jahan's sons as also Mirza Raj Jai Singh's letters to these princes and princesses. Dara's position at the court is clearly reflected here, Rustam Khan not only requests for his intercession with the emperor but directly asks for orders in connection with many important matters. Book V is divided into five sections. The first gives Rustam Khan's correspondence with the Mughal officials, dealing with various problems of administrative interest. There are letters to Asad Ullah Khan, Taqrib Khan, Qasim Khan, Sadar-ul-Sadur, the Bakhshi and Muazim Khan, the prime minister. The second section contains

Jai Singh's letters to the imperial officials and supplement his letters to the emperor given in Book III. Ja'far Khan, Shaista Khan, Bakshi Muhammad Amin-ul-Mulak, Fidai Khan, Amir Khan, Asad Khan, and Aqil Khan are some of the officials addressed. The third section consists of his letters to Mughal officials serving in the Deccan. Dalair Khan, Saf Shikan Khan, Mukhtar Khan, Iraj Khan, Mirza Rustam, Daud Khan, Bhojraj, Haji Shafi' Khan are among his colleagues and subordinates in the Deccan who are thus addressed. Thus Book III with these parts of Book V forms our primary source of information about Aurangzeb's Marhatta campaigns. The fourth section includes letters to the rulers of the Deccan, Adil Khan and Abul Hasan, a treaty between Jai Singh and Adil Khan, letters to Deccanese officials, Nek Nam Khan, Mulla Ahmad, Vyankoji Bhaunsa, Bahlol Khan, Abul Khair and Jadu Rai. In the last section are included letters of Jai Singh to Mughal ambassadors accredited to the courts of Bijapur and Golkanda. These again are very useful in our interpretation of this period of Indian history. Book VI deals with the personal correspondence of the author and contains some notes on Rustam Khan. There are letters to certain minor Mughal officials as well. Its last part consists of eleven letters of Jai Singh to his son Kanwar Ram Singh, letters to his agent at the imperial court and letters to one Dala, Mir Shikar, Jamal Khan and Malik Rangidass. Book VII is divided into three sections, which are again sub-divided. Letters of Udairaj written in the reign of Aurangzeb and Shah Jahan are collected here. His private letters, written to fellow officials serving under Raja Jai Singh, letters to Dalair Khan, Kanwar Ram Singh, Saf Shikan Khan, Nawab Aqil Khan, Tahir Khan, Mughal Khan, Nawab Khan Jahan Bahadur, Munshi Chandar Bhan, Mehta Trimbak Dass, Malik Rangidass and others are here brought together. There is a letter from Todar Mal Bayutat-i-Deccan to Shah Jahan, and two letters of Shivaji to Aurangzeb.

Next to *Adab-i-Alamgiri*, *Haft Anjman* forms the most valuable collection of the letters of the Mughal period.

60. *Biaz-i-Farsi* (A.S.B., 390).

61. *Khatut-i-Mutrufaraq Insha* (A.S.B., 391).

62. *Majma* (A.S.B., 225).

These three collections of miscellaneous letters contain many letters of the Mughal period.

63. *Manshurat* (2351 Bankipur).

64. *Gulshan-i-Balaghat* by Abdul Wahab (A.S.B., 1310).

65. *Maktubat-i-Muhammad* by Ma'sum, author of *Tarikh-i-Hind* and *Tarikh-i-Sindh*, contains many interesting letters.

66. *Biaz* (1088 Bankipur) contains many letters of the Mughal period.

67. *Ruqqat-i-Tughra* by Mulla Tughra Mashhadi and author of a number of tracts known to orientalists as *Rasail-i-Tughra* covers the reign of Jahangir, Shah Jahan and Aurangzeb.

A reference to the standard histories of the Mughal emperors and Mughal institutions reveals the fact that most of these works have not been utilized by their authors, excepting of course, Sir Jadu Nath Sarkar who has used most of the MSS concerning the reign of Aurangzeb. He has briefly described them as well in the Bibliography at the end of the second volume (first edition) of Aurangzeb. But so vast is the material in the letter-books that, centred as his attention was on political history mostly, even he has not been able to make full use of them in his published works. It is often complained that history of India as now told mostly consists of accounts of the affairs of its kings and queens. No wonder, the contemporary chroniclers were more concerned with the history of Indian rulers. But here in these letter-books we have a virgin field of inquiry where the masses sometimes, but the middle classes generally, reveal themselves as never before and nowhere else. Contemporary friendship and hatred, relations between great nobles and their literary clients, and the world of scholarship, all stand reflected here. Private letters of the period throw a flood of light on the social and cultural history of the times, e.g. Abul Fazal's personal letters (as distinct from the *Insha-i-Abul Fazal*). Letters of Faizi, of Abul Fateh Gilani reveal a side of Akbar's reign which we miss elsewhere. But it is in the domain of administrative history that these letter-books prove of immense value. Mughal administration has so far been mainly studied in its theory; rules and regulations, imperial orders, and reference in official chronicles have so far


formed its main foundation. But here in these letters we can study Mughal administration in its actual working. The *Ain* may lay down 'one-third' as the share of the state in the produce of the land, but when the letters from Orissa tell us that 'a half' was claimed and collected by the state there we have to revise our opinion. The *Ain* may lay down one set of duties for the provincial governors and later regulations may expand them, but it is from the actual letters of provincial governors serving in different parts of the empire that we can learn the actual amount of power exercised by them, their control over their own staffs, the relations between the provincial Diwans, Bakhshis, and the governors, and the position occupied by an imperial commander sent at the head of an expedition in a province with respect to the governor thereof. The regulations about the Newswriter's may help us in classifying them but how the institution worked in practice can only be learnt from these collections of letters. How far was the farming of the jagirs practised? What was the value of land, the rate of interest, the yield of gardens in this period? For answer we must turn to this source. As mentioned already the evolution of administrative institutions can be studied with more profit from the warrants of appointments and patents of office preserved in the letter-books of Humayun, Akbar, Shah Jahan and Aurangzeb. From the evidence available here we can better form an opinion as to the position of Sher Shah and Akbar as administrator-innovators than is usually formed by a discussion of the subject based mostly on the negative evidence, if not on guess work. But more than anything else they form a check on the statements of Mughal chroniclers. Sometimes our authorities disagree or we may even find the same author contradicting himself. Take the case, for example, of the war of succession and the question of the relations between Murad and Aurangzeb. Our authorities are hopelessly divided on the question. Bhim Sen and Isher Dass positively assert that Aurangzeb promised Murad the throne, *Alamgir Nama* would not have us believe it. But the letters that passed between Murad and Aurangzeb are conclusive and leave no room for doubt that Aurangzeb lured Murad by false hopes. Or, again, the official chronicles may leave us hanging in the air at the most critical time. We know that almost all Rajput chiefs sided with Aurangzeb in the war of succes-

sion but no adequate explanation thereof is forthcoming. Again the answer is to be sought for in the pages of these letter-books.

Thus study them as we might, these letter-books form a very useful source of information. And their bulk and extent are staggering. As said before the Jaipur Records in their partial transcripts in possession of Sir Jadu Nath Sarkar alone cover 6000 pages. A very conservative estimate would put the total at about 12,000 pages. It is time that students of Indian history turned to these documents and I am sure they would not have to turn from them without profit.

SRI RAM SARMA

Bauddh Plates of Raṇabhañjadeva—year 58



First Plate: Second Side



Seal of Mahārāja Raṇabhañjadeva

Baudh Plates of Raṇabhañjadeva Year 58

The grant under discussion was discovered in the little state of Baudh in Orissa. The exact find spot is not known. It consists of three substantial Copper plates measuring 7½" by 4¾" of which only the first plate is inscribed on one side. The plates are held together by means of a thin ring of copper which passes through a round hole on the right side of each plate. A round seal 1" in diameter is soldered to the ring, the legend on the seal reads *Śrī-Raṇabhañjadecasya*, above there is a crescent, and below it a Bull.

The grant was originally noticed by late Mr. R. D. Banerji, and has also been utilised by Mr. Binayak Misra.¹ The plates were handed over to me for decipherment by Pandit Tarakesvar Gangoly, and impressions were taken by Mr. Paramananda Acharya, the State Archaeologist, Mayurbhanj. My grateful thanks are due to both these gentlemen for various facilities received. The plates are in excellent condition, and the inscription is very neat and clear. The grant is exactly similar in style and composition to the Baudh plates of the year 54.² In line 5 *Gandhāta* is mentioned as the father of the king (*pitā-nṛpasya*). Line 12 tells us that the king was born in the family sprung from the egg (*caṃṣā-prabhaḥ-āṇḍaja*). The donor is styled *Paramamāheśvara Mahārāja Śrī-Raṇabhañjadeca*, lord of Ubhaya Kṣiṅjali.

The characters of the grant belong to the Ganjam variety of the Northern alphabet.³ Of the initial vowels the text contains *a* in *anavarata* (l.11), *ā* in *āṅgīrasa* (line 19), *i* in *iti* (l.48), *u* in *uktañ-ca* (l.26), *e* in *ecam* (l.24), and *o* in *Oḍra* (l.21). As regards the medial vowels we find two different forms of *ā*, one by a small stroke on the right side of the alphabet e.g. *saṃhāra* (l.1) and also by a full stroke parallel to the alphabet (*vikarāla* l.1), *u* is to be found in *prapātu* (l.2),

1 R. D. Banerji, *History of Orissa*, vol. i, pp. 171-72; B. Misra, *Dynasties of Medieval Orissa*, Calcutta, 1933, p. 16 No. 8.

2 *El.*, vol. xii, pp. 321-25.

3 *Ibid.*, vol. vii, pp. 101ff; and vol. ix, p. 272.

ñ sign occurs in *bhūtala* (1.5). The following consonants also deserve notice. *Kha* consists of a curve with loops at both ends (*saṅkhyāh* 1.4). *Ja* in this grant shows a curve to the left of the left limb with a short loop to the right, and the right limb is a straight line at a tangent from the serif (*mahārāja* 1.13). Two different forms of *tha* has been used in this grant (compare *hatha* in 1.3 with *nātha* in 1.12); two forms of *pa* are also found (*pātra* 1.2) and *pādānu* (1.13). Lingual *s* without any acute angle is to be found in *bhaviṣyad* (1.14). Amongst the ligatures *kṣa* in *pakṣa* (line 3) may also be noticed. The sign for *ṇ* and *ñ* are the same, while there is a special sign for final *t* in *Dhṛtipurāt* (line 16).


The language of the record is Sanskrit; there are three verses in lines 1-6, the rest of the inscription with the exception of imprecatory verses is in prose. As regards orthography, the sign for *va* denotes both *va* and *ba*. *Visarga* has been used many times wrongly. Double *ta* has not been used before *ra* in *ātupatram* (line 2).

The object of the charter is to record the grant of the village of *Turullā*, in the *viṣaya* of *Tullāsrīga*, to a brāhmaṇa named *Subhādāma* of the *Bharadvāja gotra* and who was a student of the *Kāṇva śākhā* of the *Yajurveda*. The donee had emigrated from the village of *Ṭakāri* in the *Sāvāṭhi* country to the *Bhaṭṭa* village of *Tadalā* in the *Ḍdra* country. The grant was made on the fifth day of the bright half of *Phālguna* in the 58th regnal year of the king on the occasion of a Solar eclipse (*rāhu-grasta divākaram*). The charter was issued from *Dhṛtipura* and was composed by the minister of peace and war (*sāndhi-vigrahika*) *Himadatta*, and was inscribed by *sucarṇakāra Devala*.


Among the geographical names mentioned, attention must be drawn to the village of *Ṭakāri* in the *Sāvāṭhi* country. In our opinion *Ṭakāri* should be regarded as the vulgar form of the name *Ṭarkkāri*, and *Sāvāṭhi* as *Srāvastī*. This inference is not at all arbitrary. In a land grant of *Mahābhavagupta*, a place named *Ṭa(Ṭa)kāri* is mentioned.⁴ In the *Katak* plates of *Mahāsivagupta-Yayūti* the phrase *Takkāra-pūrva-Bhāradvāja-gotrāya* occurs.⁵ In the *Mandhata* plates of *Devapāla* and *Jāyavarman II*, a place called *Ṭakāri-sthāna* is men-

4 *El.*, vol. iii, p. 348.

5 *Ibid.*, p. 353.



Second Plate: First Side



Second Plate: Second Side

tioned.⁶ From the land grant of Jayabhañjadeva discovered at Antirigram in the Ganjam district, we learn that the king granted the village of Rengarada in the *viṣaya* of Khiñjaliya-gaḍa on the occasion of a lunar eclipse to a brāhmaṇa named Jagadhara, an immigrant from the village of Ṭakāri in Madhyadeśa.⁷ As regards Sāvathī we might mention that in a newly discovered land grant of Vākpati-Muñja dated V.S. 1038, Śrāvastī is mentioned as Sāvathika.⁸ We may therefore assume that our suggestion is correct. The point that will engage our attention now is that the present record states that Ṭakāri was in Sāvathī; while most of the records quoted above place the village in Madhyadeśa. This seemingly discrepant evidence can easily be harmonised if we remember the extent of Madhyadeśa in different centuries. Manu's definition of Madhyadeśa is not true of all times. According to *Hsuan Tsang*, (7th C.), Central India extended from the Sutlej to the head of the Gangetic delta, and from the Himalayas to the Narmada.⁹ According to the *Kāvya-māmsā*, Madhyadeśa was bounded on the north by the Himalayas, on the south by Vindhya, on the east by Sarasvatī and on the west by Benares. According to the Buddhist literature, Puṇḍravaradhana was the eastern limit of Madhyadeśa. If we accept the testimony of the above authorities, then we have to admit that Śrāvastī was in Madhyadeśa. Therefore the village of Ṭakāri in Śrāvastī and Ṭakāri in Madhyadeśa seems to be one and the same village.

The plates are now kept in the Museum of Archaeology, at Baripada, the chief town of Mayurbhanj State.

Text.*

FIRST PLATE : SECOND SIDE

1. Om¹⁰ Siddhiḥ || ¹¹Samhāra-kāla-hutabhug-vikarāla-ghora-sambhrānta-kiṃkara-kṛtānta-nitānta-

6 *EL.*, vol. ix. p. 103ff.

7 *Ibid.*, vol. xix, pp. 41-45.

8 *List of Exhibits in a Conversazione held to celebrate the 150th Anniversary of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, p. 9.

9 Cunningham, *Ancient Geography*, p. 375.

* Edited from the original plates.

10 Expressed by a symbol.


11 Metre : Vasantatilaka


2. bhindam¹² [1*] bhinn-āndhak-āsura-mahūgahan-ūtapatra(m*)¹³
tad = bhairavaṃ Hara-vapur = bhavataḥ prapātuḥ¹⁴ (1*)
¹¹Durvā-
3. ra-vāraṇa - raṇa- pratipakṣa-pakṣa - lakṣmī - hath- ūpraharan-
occlita¹⁵-pratāpā(h*) [1*] *Bhañjā* narā-
4. dhipatayo vahavo vabhuvur = udbhutayo = tra¹⁶ bhuvi bhūrīḥ-
sahasra-saṅkhyāḥ¹⁷ [||] (2*) ¹¹Teṣāṃ kule sakala-
5. bhūtala-pāla-mauliṃ¹⁸-māl-ārcit-āñhri(ghri)-yugala(10) vala-
vāṃ(n)ṛpo = bhuh¹⁹ [1*] śrī-*Gandhātā*(h*)-prakaṭa-pau
6. ruṣa-ra(s)mi-cakra-nirddārit-āri-hṛdayo = sya pitā ṛpasya [||*]
(3*) Nānā-mānāyaymā-
7. n - ānyonya - lagna - gaja - vāji-ghaṭā-bhaṭ-augha-saṅghaṭa²⁰-
ghora-samara-nirddārit-āri-nare-
8. ndra-vṛnda-lakṣmī²¹-samūhaḥ-hatha-haraṇa- prakāṭita - vika-
ṭa-paṭa-puruṣakāra²²-pratāp-ūti-
9. krānt-āneka-sahasra-saṅkhyā²³-vikhyāt-otkhyāta²⁴khadga-bhrā-
jīṣṇu-bhujā-vajra-*Bhañja*-bhūpatiḥ
10. purā(d*)²⁵-*Dhṛtipurāt* [||*] Śarad-amala-vahala-jaladhara
ddhavalā²⁶-yaśaḥ-paṭala-kamala-mā-
11. l-ālanḁṛta-sakala-dig-vadhū-vadanoh²⁷ anavarata-pravartta-
māna-nānā-sanmāna-dā

SECOND PLATE : FIRST SIDE.


12. n-ānandita-ni(h*)śe(ṣa*)- svajana- dina²⁸- duḥkhit-ānatha--jana-
mano-(vano*) vaṃśa-prabhav-aṇḁajah²⁹ *Parama-*
13. *māheśvaro* mātā-pitr-pādānudhyāto *Bhañj-āmala* kula-ti-
laka³⁰ *Mahārā-*
14. *ja-śrī - Raṇabhāñjadeva*(h*) kuśalī[||*] *Khiñjalī - maṇḁale*
bhaviṣyad-rājā-rājanak-ānturaṅga-kumā
15. rāmātya - mahāsāmanta - brāhmaṇa-purogamat³¹ = anyamś = ca
daṇḁapāsika-cchaṭa³²-bhaṭa.-

12 read *bhinnaṃ*.13 read *ūtapattraṃ*.14 read *prapātu*.15 read *otsalita*.16 read *bahavo vabhuvur = udbhutayo = ttra*.17 read *saṅkhyāḥ*.18 read *mauli*.19 read *bhut*.20 read *saṅghaṭṭa*.21 read *Lakṣmī*.22 read *paṭu-puruṣakāra*.23 read *saṅkhyā*.24 read *vikhyātotkhāta*.25 read *prabhūti-pūrād*.26 read *bahala-jaladhara-dhavalā*27 read *vadano*.28 read *dīna*.29 read *aṇḁaja-vaṃśa-prabhāvah*.30 read *tilako*.31 read *purogamān = anyāṃś = ca*.32 read *chāṭa*.





Third Plate: First Side



Third Plate: Second Side

16. vallubha-jātīyāṃ(n) manayath-ārhaṃ³³ mānāyati bodhayati
samādisayati³⁴ c=ānyat || Sa-
17. rrvataḥ śīvam=asmākaṃ viditam=astu bhavatāṃ || *Tulla-*
*śṛṅga-viṣaya-sammandha*³⁵ *Turallā-*
18. grāmaś=catu(ḥ*)-sīmā-paryanta sa-nidhis=co=panidhi³⁶ mātā-
pitṛir³⁷=ātmanaś=ca puṇy-ā-
19. bhivriddhaya³⁸ śa(sa)lila-ddh(dh)ārā-puraḥsāreṇa vidhinā [||*]
Bhāradvāja-gotra³⁹ Āṅgīrasa-Vārihaṣpatya⁴⁰
20. Bhāradvāja-pravarāya Yajurveda-caraṇāya Kāṇva-śākhā-
dhyāine || *Sāvathī-deśa Takā*
21. ri-vinirggata⁴¹ |⁴² Oḍra-viṣaya(ye) Bhaṭṭa-Tadalā-vāstavya
Bhaṭṭa Vṛṣabhadāma-sutaḥ *Śubha-*
22. *dāmāya* vidhir-vvidheya suvidvānaṃ⁴³ Rāhugrasta-Divāka-
ra(ṃ) |⁴² tāmraśāsana⁴⁴ pratipadi
23. to=smābhiḥ pāramparya-kul-āvatarena yavad=Ved-ārtha⁴⁵
vacanena.....

SECOND PLATE : SECOND SIDE

24.
25.⁴⁶

THIRD PLATE : SECOND SIDE.

50.Śrī-Raṇabhañjadēvasya pravarddhamāna⁴⁷-vija
51. -yarājye saṃvatsare aṣṭa-pañcaśatame Phālguna-śukla-
pakṣa-pañcamyāṃ likhitam
52. sandhivigrahīyā⁴⁸ Himadatena [||*] Utkirṇam(ca*) suvarna
(ṇa)kārika Devalena [||*]lāmchitam⁴⁹ Mahārā—
53. jakīya-mudrena ||

ADRIS BANERJI

33 read yath-ārhaṃ.

34 read bodhayati-samādisati.

35 read saṃbuddhaḥ.

36 read sanidhiḥ soṇnidhiś=ca.

37 read mātā-pitror.

38 read vṛddhaye.

39 read gotrāya.

40 read Bārhaspatya.

41 read rinirgatāya.

42 The punctuation is superfluous.

43 read vidhi-vidheya-saṃvidhāna-vidhinā.

44 read tāmra-śāsanaṭvena.

45 read yavad=vedānu.

46 Lines 24-25 contain usual imprecatory verses. As these have appeared many times with other grants of this king, I have deleted these from the text. Interested persons, however, may consult the following books for the same: *El.*, vol. xii, pp. 321ff.; *JBORS.*, vol. vi, p. 175; *Ibid.*, pp. 165ff.; *Ibid.*, vol. ii, pp. 167-77.; and *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, vol. xiv, pp. 134-41.

47 read pravarddhamāne.

48 read sādihivigrahika.

49 read lāmchhitam

The Subhāṣitahārāvalī of Śrī Hari Kavi and some Poets enjoying the Patronage of Muslim Rulers

From the eleventh century onwards down to the seventeenth century A.D., India has produced a fairly good number of Sanskrit poets. The Muslim chroniclers of this period have left no account of them. Their names and verses are found scattered in the various anthologies composed during this period. This period, therefore, may be called "the Anthology Period" in Sanskrit literature. The following published anthologies preserve a vast mine of information about the poets of this period.

1. *K a v ī n d r a v a c a n a s a m u c c a y a*, edited by F. W. Thomas (Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta, 1911).

2. *S a d u k t i k a r ṇ ā m ṛ t a* of Śrīdharadāsa, edited by the late Mahāmahopādhyāya P. Rāmavatāra Śarmā, with a critical and historical Introduction by Dr. Har Dutt Sharma (The Punjab Sanskrit Book Depot., Lahore, 1933).

3. *Ś ā r ṅ g a d h a r a p a d d h a t i*, edited by P. Peterson (Bombay Sanskrit Series).

4. *S u b h ā ṣ i t ā v a l ī*, edited by P. Peterson (Bombay Sanskrit Series).

But a vast amount of the anthology-literature is still in manuscript form and so it is not possible now to construct a history of this period.

One of the most important of these anthologies is the *S u b h ā ṣ i t a h ā r ā v a l ī* of Śrī Hari Kavi. The Ms. (described by Peterson in his second report, pp. 57-64 and no. 92; Poona, xviii A, 92 of 1883-4) is incomplete, written by more than one scribe and has irregular numbering of verses. The author, Śrī Hari Kavi, seems to have been a poet of high order. He boasts of himself in the following verse:—

येनैकः कवितावतारसमये ग्रन्थः समुक्तासित-
स्तस्या एव सुविश्रमे पुनरहो बन्धः परो निर्मितः ।
तस्या लास्यविधां कृतास्तु बहवस्ते ते प्रबन्धोत्तमाः
सोऽयं कोऽपि हरिः कविः कविरविज्योतिःकणां दीन्यति ॥

fol. 33a, v. 123.

Hari Kavi has been called a contemporary of Akbar (1556-1605 A.D.) by M. Krishnamacharya in his book, *The Classical period of Sanskrit Literature*, p. 126 (Madras, 1906). Mr. Krishnamacharya says, "His poetic fame got him the name of *Akbarīya Kālidāsa*. His native country however appears to be the Dekkan and he betrays a very close acquaintance with the literature of his country. His *Hārāvalī* is a wise collection of verses, many of which belong to Kashmirian poets." This account of Mr. Krishnamacharya seems to be incorrect. Hari Kavi cannot be identified with *Akbarīya Kālidāsa*. For, in his *S u b h ā ṣ i t a h ā r ā v a l ī*, whenever Hari quotes his own verses he says at the end *Hari-kaver mamāyam* or *Hari-kaver mamaite*. Again, he quotes three verses of *Akbarīya Kālidāsa*. Had these verses been his own, he would have certainly added something like *Hari-kaver mama*. Moreover, in the autobiographical verse quoted above, Hari Kavi never even hints at such an identity. Again, we find two verses (different from those in the *H ā r ā v a l ī*) of *Akbar-Kālidāsa* quoted in the *R a s i k a j ī v a n a* of Gadādhara Bhaṭṭa (about 1660 A.D. See my article "Some unknown Sanskrit Poets of Mithilā," published in the *Jha Commemoration Volume*). One of these verses, viz., *hemāmbhoruha-pattane*, etc., is quoted in two Mss. of the *S ā r ṅ g a d h a r a p a d d h ā t i* and ascribed to *Kālidāsa* (See *Karīndravacasamuccaya*, p. 34); and we find *Sārṅgadhara* quoted in our *H ā r ā v a l ī*. Again, as Hari Kavi quotes the verses of *Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha*, he cannot be a contemporary of Akbar. Therefore, he must have flourished in the middle of the 17th century A.D.

Hari Kavi was the pupil of *Nārāyaṇa*, one of whose verses he quotes and refers to it as *Śrī-Nārāyaṇa-guru-caraṇānām*. His youngest brother was called *Cakrapāṇi Kavi* and he is referred to by Hari Kavi as *matkanīṣṭhabhrāta* or *asmadanuja-Cakrapāṇikavi*. It seems that our poet had other brothers as well, but we find no account of them. This *Cakrapāṇi* differs from the *Cakrapāṇi* mentioned in the *Karīndravacasamuccaya* (p. 37), *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* (p. 53) and *Padhyāvalī* of *Rūpagosvāmin* (fol. 26a, v. 258).

Among the various other poets Hari Kavi mentions the names of the following with reverence; as, I. *Rāmajitpaṇḍitānām*, II. *Lakṣmī-*

dharapādānām, III. Mādhavapurīpādānām, IV. Mahīśvarapurīpādānām, V. Madhusūdanasarasvatīnām, VI. Anantadevānām, VII. Śrī Kṛṣṇapaṇḍitānām, VIII. Śrī Rāghavacaitanyānām, IX. Śrī Bopadevapaṇḍitānām, X. Gopināthapaṇḍitānām, XI. Somajidbhaṭṭānām.

It is possible to make a conjecture that these people were either Hari Kavi's contemporaries or preceded him shortly. For example, we learn of a Rāmajitpaṇḍita, who was the author of *Nibandhanavānīta*, mentions Ananta Bhaṭṭa, Hemādi, Mādhava and Nirṇayāmṛta, and who flourished between 1400-1600 A.D. (Kane, *Hist. Dharma.*, p. 572). Lakṣmidhara is probably identical with Lakṣmidharācārya, son of Viṭṭhalācārya, son of Nṛsiṃhācārya, son of Rāmacandrācārya, father of Anantācārya, pupil of Anantānanda-Rāghunātha Yati and Śrī Kṛṣṇa Sarasvatī. He is the author of *Nāmacintāmaṇi*, *Nyāyabhāṣkāra* and *Bhagavannāmakāumudī* (C.C.I, 538a). The following verse of his in the *Hārāvālī* (fol. 24a II, v. 12) seems to be from either *Nāmacintāmaṇi* or *Bhagavannāmakāumudī*.

श्रीरामेति जनार्दनेति जगतां नाथेति नारायणे-
 ल्यानन्देति दयापरेति कमलाकान्तेति कृष्णेति च ।
 श्रीमन्नाममयामृताब्धिलहरीकल्लोलमग्नं मुहु-
 मुह्यन्तं गलदध्रुनेत्रमवशं मां नाथ नित्यं कुरु ॥

Mādhavapurī, Mahīśvarapurī (identical with Maheśvaratīrtha?) and Madhusūdana Sarasvatī are evidently the names of the Saṃnyāsins. With the help of Aufrecht's *Catalogus Catalogorum* we can reconstruct their *guruparamparā* as follows:

Govindānanda
 (author of *Ratnaprabhā*
 on Brahmasūtra-Sāṅkarabhāṣya).

|
 his disciple

|
 Nārāyaṇatīrtha, author of *Bālabodhinī*, a
 comm. on Ātmabodha of Sāṅkarācārya.
 His age is about 1600 A.D. See *Sarvadar-
 śanasamgraha*, B.O.R.I. ed., p. 574. He

|
 Rāghunātha.

is most probably identical with Nārāyaṇa Sarasvatī, who wrote *Śārīrakabhāṣyavārtika* in 1592 A.D. He seems to be the preceptor of Hari Kavi.

|
his disciple
Maheśvaratīrtha.

Mādhavapurī

|
his disciple

Maḥbusūdāna Sarasvatī (1560 A.D.)

Anantānanda-Raghunātha Yati

Śrī Kṛṣṇa Sarasvatī

|
their disciple

Lakṣmīdhara (Ācārya),

author of *Bhagavannāmakaumudī* etc.

|
his son

Anantācārya.

I am not quite sure whether we can identify our Anantadeva and Śrī Kṛṣṇa Paṇḍita with Anantācārya and Śrī Kṛṣṇa Sarasvatī mentioned above. Rāghava-Caitanya is mentioned in the *Sārāṅgadhara-paddhati* also. Vopadeva Paṇḍita flourished in the 13th century. The latter is therefore much older than our poet. I have not been able to identify Gopinātha Paṇḍita and Somajit Bhaṭṭa.

Considering all this evidence, it will not be wrong to conclude that our author lived in the Moghul period and was a contemporary of Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha.

Here are some verses of our author, his preceptor and his youngest brother:—

अपारतरमंसारपारावारतिनीर्यया ।

बहुधा वमुधापारभारहारं हरिं नुमः ॥

श्रीनारायणगुरुचरणानाम् (fol. 26, v. 21).

श्रीनारायणपादपङ्कजरजःपुञ्जप्रसङ्गादियं
 वाणी विश्वविमोहिनी हरिकवेः कण्ठात्समुन्मीलति ।
 यामापीय सुधानिधानकलशीसंबाधिबिम्बाधराः
 स्वर्वालाः परिशीलयन्ति न बुधाः सानन्दमुत्कण्ठिताः ॥
 गौराङ्गी कलगीतपंच [म] सुधावेणीतिरस्कारिणी-
 निर्यत्पार्वणचन्द्रमोऽन्तरकरश्रेणीरसग्राहिणीः ।
 मन्दारप्रकरद्रवन्नवरसद्रोणीमदद्रोहिणीः
 पुष्पान्तीः पिब संमदं हरिकवेर्वाणीर्मनोहारिणीः ॥
 हरिकवेर्ममैतौ । (fol. 38, vv. 201-2).

सुधाधाराकाराः सरसतरमाकण्ठकुहरं
 कवीनामापीय श्र[व]णचुलुकैः सूक्लिलहरीः ।
 अमान्तं तच्छेषं नयनजलरोमाश्रपदतः
 किरन्ति स्वच्छन्दं किल कतिपये सूक्ष्ममतयः ॥
 अमरसरितः पूराकारान् रसाद्भृदयान्तरे
 किल हरिकवेर्वाचःपेशान्विधाय सुधामुचः ।
 पुलकमुकुलैः शीर्षान्दोलैः परिस्फुटमद्भुतं
 विदधति महाहादं जातं क्वचित्कतिचिद्बुधाः॥
 हरेः सुरैर्वाणीः हृदि निशितवाणीः क्लयतां
 कवीनां शूराणामिव रमणसंवादसमरे ॥
 सकल्पान्तर्भ्रम्या भवति रसमूर्च्छोदकनिधेः
 कथं नो चेते स्युः पुलकजलमभिन्नतनवः ॥
 हरिकवेर्ममैते । (fol. 41, vv. 254-6).

कृपापाङ्गायस्य श्रयति रसनां शुभ्रवसना
 जनानां प्रत्यूहाः सपदि विलयं यान्ति विपुलाः ।
 प्रसर्पन्ते कान्ताश्रपलनयनान्ताश्च निकटं
 स नः सिद्धिं बुद्धिं दिशतु भगवानेकरदनः ॥
 मत्कनिष्ठभ्रातुश्चकपाणिकवेः । (fol. 10a).

श्लाघ्य[घ]न्ते महिमानमद्य कवयः स्वीयं न ह्यश्रान्तराः
 के के काव्यकराः परन्तु गरिमा श्री चकपाणोर्गुरुः [रोः ?]
 बिम्बद्वेषिदले यदास्यकमले क्षोदाभदन्तामले
 वाग्देवी कमलेव विश्वहृदयप्रहादिनी खेलति ॥
 मत्कनिष्ठभ्रातुश्चकपाणिकवेः । (fol. 33, v. 124).

The following poets mentioned in the *Rasikajivana* and *Hārāvalī* enjoyed the patronage of Muslim rulers: i. Bhānu kara, ii. Akabarakālidāsa, and iii. Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha.

Bhānukara was a contemporary of Sher Shah (1540-1545) and Nizam Shah and seems to have enjoyed the patronage of both. As Nizam Shah is the title of all the kings of the Nizam Shahi dynasty, Bhānukara refers to Boorhan Nizam Shah I (1510-1553) who was the contemporary of Sher Shah. He refers to a certain Hindu King Vīra Bhānu in two of his verses, but it is difficult to identify this king. Bhānukara seems to have enjoyed a great popularity as 64 of his verses are quoted in the *Rasikajivana* and *Hārāvālī* quotes 11 verses. Bhānukara flourished in the middle of the 16th century A.D. Following are a few of his verses in some of which he praises his patrons.

From *Rasikajivana*:

लङ्काधामनि वीरभानुनृपतेः प्रेक्ष्य प्रतापोदयं
प्रत्यागारमधीरनीरजदृशो भूयो हुताशभ्रमात् ।
क्षुब्धद्राणि विधूतपाणि विगल[त्रीविस्थल—?] प्रस्खलद्—
बाष्पश्रेणि विलोलवेणि दयितं कण्ठस्थले बिभ्रति ॥

fol. 13, v. 22.

क्षोणीकाम निजामशाह भवतः प्रौढप्रतापानलै [लैर—]
द्रागेवं द्रवरूपतामुपगते चामीकराणां चये ।
भ्रश्यद्वासवधामधोरणि मुहुर्मज्जद्गहप्रामणि
त्रस्यत्कामिनि निष्पतद्वनि(?)तलं[टं ?] मरोः [मेरोः] समुः ाति ॥

fol. 1. 13.

विद्वद्गोष्ठीवरिष्ठ प्रतिभटदमन श्रीनिजाम प्रतीमः
कृत्वा त्वत्कीर्तिगाथां वहति गणविधि पद्मयोनिः कठिन्या ।
वकारेखा गुरुणाममृतकरकलाकम्बुमल्लीमरालः[लाः ?]
शुद्धा लेखा लघूनां विसभुजगनभोनिन्नगादन्तिदन्ताः ॥

fol. 15, v. 45.

वाहव्यूहखुरक्षत्तां वसुमतीं संवीक्ष्य मूर्च्छावतीं
भेरीभङ्गतिचञ्चलेन पयसा वारांनिधिः सिञ्चति ।
दिग्बाला तनुते निजामनृपतेर्वातं पताकांशुकै—
धूर्लीधोरणिरश्विनीसुतमिव प्रष्टुं दिदं धावति ॥

fol. 18, v. 72.

भेरीभङ्गतिभिस्तुरङ्गनिनदैः कुम्भीन्द्रकोलाहलैः
प्रस्थाने तव वीरमान दलितं ब्रह्माण्डभाण्डोदरम् ।
आधाय ज्वलति प्रतापदहनैरङ्गैः पुनर्वेधसा
तारानायकतारकासुरसरिद्वयाजादिवायोजितम् ॥

fol. 19a, v. 76.

प्राचीमहीधरशिलाविनिवेशितस्य धाराधरस्फुरदयोधनताडितस्य ।
तप्तायसस्य तपनस्य कणा विकीर्णाः खद्योतपोतसुषमां स्फुटमावहन्ति ॥
fol. 115a, v. 93.

अम्बरमेष रमण्यै यामिन्यै वासरः प्रेयान् ।
अधिकं ददौ निजाङ्गादथ सङ्कचितः स्वयं तस्थौ ॥
fol. 816, v. 107.

From *Hārāvālī*:

वीणामङ्गे कथमपि सखीप्रार्थनाभिर्निधाय
स्वैरं स्वैरं सरसिजदशा गानुमारब्धमेव ।
तन्त्रीबुद्धया किमपि विरहक्षीणदीनाङ्गवल्ली—
मेनामेव स्पृशति बहुशो मूर्च्छना चित्रमेतत् ॥
fol. 34, v. 70.

श्लोकाद्धे वा तदद्धे यदि हि विनिहितं दूषणं दुर्दुरूढैः
किं नः छिन्नं तदा स्यात्कविकुलविदुषां काव्यकोटीश्वराणाम् ।
वाहाश्चेद् गन्धवाहाधिकसुभगरयाः पञ्चषाः काणखजाः
का हानिः सेरसाहृत्तितिकुलमणोरश्वकोटीश्वरस्य ॥
fol. 42, v. 273.

Following verses are ascribed to Akbariya Kālidāsa:—

From *Rasikajivana*:

हस्ताम्भोजाभिमाला नखशशिरुचिरश्यामलच्छायवीची
तेजोऽग्नेर्धूमधारा वितरणकरिणो गण्डदानप्रणाली ।
वीरश्रीवेशिदण्डो लवणिससरसीबालशैवालवल्ली
वेत्तत्यम्भोधरश्रीरकबरधरणीपालपाणां कृपाणी ॥
fol. 14a, v. 29.

हेमाम्भोरुहपत्तने परिमलस्तेयी वसन्तानिल—
स्तत्रत्यर्यरिव यामिकैर्ममधुरै-[र्मधुरै-]रारब्धकोलाहलः ।
निर्यातस्त्वरया व्रजन्निपतितः श्रीखण्डपङ्कद्रवै—
र्लिप्तो केरलकामिनीकुचतटे खञ्जः शनैर्गच्छति ॥
fol. 108, v. 18.

From *Hārāvālī*:

स्मेरे चन्द्रावतंसे हसति सकुतुकं षण्मुखे सोपहासं
पश्यत्यालीकदम्बे गणसदसि शिशुकीडनं प्रेक्षमाणे ।
मामेति व्याहरन्त्यास्तुहिनगिरिभुवः कम्पमानाग्रपाणेः
कर्षन्ती कर्णकेलीकिशलयमवताद्वालहेरं[ब]शुण्डा ॥
fol. 15a.

कृशा कर्कशा केसरित्वग्व[गृ]ताङ्गी
द्विषत्तर्जिनी गर्जिनी युद्धमध्ये ।

हसतासितारातिगर्वातिचर्वा
करालानना कालिका पालिका मे ॥ fol. 29a, v. 68.
जरीजृंभदंभोजिनीपुञ्जशङ्का
मिलन्मत्तमैलिन्दमाला जटालाः ।
किमन्यैरधर्यैरगर्यैरपुन्यैः
करिष्यन्ति नः शर्म कालीकटाक्षाः ॥ fol. 29a, v. 69.

In the *Rasikajivana* we find three verses of Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha. All of them are identified as follows:

- 1 तावथापय दिवसान्, fol. 34a, v. 254 (= *Rasagaṅgādhara*, p. 330, *Kāvya-mālā* edn.).
- 2 दिगन्ते श्रूयन्ते, fol. 40, v. 225 *Rasagaṅgādhara*, p. 402)
- 3 आरामाधिपति fol. 47a, v. 296 (= *Bhāminī-vilāsa*, I.30)

Out of the five verses ascribed to Jagannātha, in the *Hārāvālī* the following two are traceable:—

- 1 आमूलाद्रत्नसानोर्मलयवलयितात्, fol. 33a, v. 121 (= *Rasagaṅgādhara* p. 94)
- 2 गिरां देवी वोगा०, fol. 40a, v. 224 (*Bhāminīvilāsa* IV. 39). The Ms. reads the last two lines—अहो तस्याप्यस्यामतुलभणितौ परिडतपतेः, स्पृहा न स्यादाकर्णयितुमथ कस्यामलमतेः । The reading in the *Bhāminīvilāsa* is वचस्तस्याकर्ण्य श्रवणमुभगं परिडतपतेरधुन्वन् मूर्धानं नृपशुरथ वायं पशुपतिः ॥

I have not been able to identify the three following verses, in two of which Jagannātha refers to a certain Gaṅgādhara who might have been his contemporary.

- 3 वितण्डाहेत्वाद्यैरतिविततवाक्यैरपि नृभिर्न जेयोऽसौ विद्वज्जनसदसि गङ्गाधरबुधः ।
पुरारिप्रोच[ञ्च]ञ्जटिलो(?)दूनितशिरस्तटिन्यंभःपूरोपमवचनवाचालि[त]मुखः ॥
fol. 33a, v. 122.
- 4 समीपे संगीतस्वरमधुरभङ्गी मृगदृशां विदूरे दानान्धद्विरदकलहोद्दामनिनदः ।
बहिर्द्वारे तेषां भ्रति हयहेषाकलकलो दृगेषां ते येषामुपरि कमले देवि सदया ॥
- 5 उरस्यस्य भ्रश्यत्कबरभरनिर्यत्सुमनसः पतन्ति स्वर्वालाः स्मरपरवशा दीनमनसः ।
सुरास्तं गायन्ति स्फुरिततनु गङ्गाधरमुखास्तवार्यं दृक्पातो यदुपरि कृपातो विलसति ॥
fol. 67a, vv. 598-9.

HARADATTA SHARMA

Ideals of Tantra Rites

The tantras, as a whole, the Śāktaism, specially, have been almost unequivocally condemned by scholars, Indian and foreign alike. Some of them went so far as to suggest that the Tantras were compiled with a view to the preaching of licentiousness among the people in general—the Tantras were nothing but the Kāmasāstra in a garb. A number of them even welcomed the total annihilation of this class of literature for the good of the unsuspecting mass. It was this pronounced unfavourable attitude of influential personages to this branch of literature that was responsible for the comparative neglect of Tāntric literature when a keen spirit for a sifting and careful study of all branches of Sanskrit literature was abroad. The extreme difficulty in, and almost the absence of any possibility of, gathering any sense of many of the portions of the vast literature without the help of a properly qualified teacher also stood in the way of its proper appreciation. Consequently curious misconceptions are found to have prevailed both with respect to the literature and doctrines of the system.

A careful and sympathetic study of the literature will, however, go to show that the ideal of the Tantras is the realisation of the identity of the Individual Soul with the Supreme Soul. And the various rites in Tāntric worship will be found on a close study to be so conceived as to help this realisation in a graduated scale. The first principle of Tāntric worship is that a worshipper should identify himself with the deity he worships.¹ And hence the Tantras give preference to what is called the internal worship (*antaryāga*) as also to pure meditation (*bhāvanā*). The followers of Samaya School even disregard external worship and practise meditation for the realisation of the self.²

1 देवी भूत्वा तु तं यजेत्—*Gandharva Tantra*, viii. 2.

2 Lakṣmīdhara's *Commentary on Anandalahari*, Mysore edition. p 110.

Also, अन्तर्यागात्मिका पूजा सर्वपूजोत्तमा प्रिये । बहिः पूजा विधातव्या यावज्ज्ञानं न जायते ॥
—*Vāmakeśvara Tantra* (Chapter 51).

The Tantras, and almost all the sects, have philosophical opinions of their own. As a matter of fact, like the six Brāhmanical systems five Tāntric systems of philosophy—each for one principal school—are recognised.³ The philosophical doctrines of the various sects as well as of the sub-sects are however found scattered in different parts of the extensive Tāntric literature. They require to be put together and studied systematically. But what little is known of them indicates their close connection with Vedāntic ideas. Śakti or the supreme Goddess is identified with the supreme Brahman even in the different Purāṇas and Upapurāṇas.⁴

The Śākta system of yoga provides a complete code of self-discipline. The elaborate rites of worship and the yogic practices often go hand in hand. The internal worship of the Tantras has a close contact with these practices.

Partheistic ideas are sought to be ingrained in the minds of Śakti-worshippers even during the time of worship.⁵ It is Śakti that pervades the entire universe.⁶ She is all in all. She is the author of creation, preservation and destruction of the world.

It is true that side by side with the higher things provision is found to have been made in the Śākta Tantras for rites that appear to be highly objectionable and derogatory from an ethical standpoint; for they pertain to the use of what are called five *mahātmas* as well as even more objectionable things like seminal and menstrual discharges of men and women, dead bodies of human beings, the performance of six mischievous and cruel magical rites. But a close scrutiny of the works prescribing these rites will reveal that comparatively a very small section of the extensive literature of the Tantras deals with these rites. Almost an insignificant portion, for instance, of the comprehensive Tāntric compilation of Bengal, e.g., the *Tantrasāra* of Kṛṣṇānanda is devoted to them. Besides, these rites are prescribed not for the people

3 Nilakaṇṭha's *Comm. on Devībhāgavata*, IV. 15.12.

4 Nilakaṇṭha *op. cit.*, Introduction, p. 29, (Haricaran Basu's edition).

5 शक्तिरूपं जगत् सर्वं यो न जानाति स नारकी as quoted in *Tantrasāra*, P. Sastri's edition, p. 651.

6 आराध्या परमा शक्तिर्यया सर्वमिदं ततम् —*Devībh.*, III. 9.33.

in general but for only the select few—only a certain section of the Śāktas. Even all members of the Kaula sect of the Śāktas—a sect notorious for these rites—were not to follow this form of worship. The Pūrvakaulas though following this path did only resort to symbolical representation of the objectionable things.⁷ Higher castes like Brahmīns and followers of paths other than the Kaula are also required to use substitutes for these objects.⁸ Even Kṣatriyas are not to drink wine even for religious purposes; they may only offer it to the deity.⁹ Long extracts quoted from *Śyāmāpradīpa* in the *Haratatradīdhiti*¹⁰ give list of substitutes for these things, e.g., cheese for semen, offering of particular flower in a particular posture for sexual intercourse, milk etc. for wine, and fruits for meat.

Absolutely allegorical and yogic interpretations were also sometimes given to these rites. According to these interpretations wine referred to the intoxicating knowledge of the supreme Being, control of speech was the taking of wine and so forth.¹¹ The Pañcatattvas of the Vaiṣṇavas, again, are nothing but *Gurutattva*, *Vāṛṇatattva*, *Mantratattva*, *Dhyānatattva* and *Devatattva*.

7 श्रीचक्रस्थितनवयोनिमध्यगतां योनिं भूर्जहेमबस्त्रपीठादौ लिखितां पूर्वकौलाः पूजयन्ति ।
तरुण्याः प्रत्यक्षयोनिमुत्तरकौलाः पूजयन्ति—Lakṣmidhara, *op. cit.*, p. 130.

यत्नासवमवश्यन्तु ब्राह्मणस्तु विशेषतः ।

गुडाद्रिकं तदा दद्यात्तान्ने वारि सृजेन्मधु ॥

8 *Tantrasāra*, P. Sastri's edition, p. 651.

9 तेन क्षत्रियादीनां मुख्यस्य दानेऽधिकारः न पाने—*Ibid.*, p. 651.

10 pp. 57-8 of the work by Harakumar Tagore.

11

यदुक्तं परमं ब्रह्म निर्विकारं निरञ्जनम् ।

तस्मिन् प्रमदनं ज्ञानं तन्मद्यं परिकीर्तितम् ॥—*Vijāyatantra*.

कुलकुरण्डलिनी शक्तिर्देहिनां देहधारिणी ।

तया शिवस्य संयोगे मैथुनं परिकीर्तितम् ॥—*Ibid.*

गङ्गायमुनायोन्नेभ्ये नतस्यौ द्वौ चरतः सदा ।

तौ मतस्यौ भक्षयेद् यस्तु न भवेन्मतस्यसाधकः ॥—*Āgamasāra*.

मा-शब्दाद् रसना ज्ञेया तदर्शान् रसनाप्रियान् ।

सदा यो भक्षयेद्देवि स एव मांससाधकः ॥—*Ibid.*

The above extracts are taken from two Bengali works, e.g., *Sādhana-kalpa-latikā* and *Vāmākṣepā*.

It has of course to be admitted that these interpretations are far-fetched and apologetic: there is a spirit of euphemism even though they agree in some cases with internal worship and Tāntric yoga. Even if revolting rites were prescribed, they were prevalent with all their vulgarity only among a very limited few. Sects of the Śāktas other than the Kaulas are forbidden in very strong terms from taking part in any of the rites meant for the Kaulas. It is probably with a view to save the ordinary people from these alluring practices that the non-Kaula texts sometimes find fault with the rites and doctrines of the Kaulas. And far from having anything that might even appear to be objectionable some of the non-Kaula sects of the Tantras are found to contain much that is laudable. The total prohibition of animal sacrifice in the Pārānanda school,¹² the dignified spiritual tone of the followers of the Samaya school, not to speak of the non-Śākta schools, cannot fail to attract the notice of keen and sympathetic students.

Utmost care and proper precaution were taken to guard against the possible degeneration that these rites might bring in. Religious use of wine, meat and other things are prescribed with sufficient reservation. Their use simply for the sake of pleasure and enjoyment is condemned in very strong terms. It should not be supposed, states the *Kulārṇava*, that religion consists in a mere enjoyment of these things, for then drunkards and meat-eaters would all be regarded as highly religious personages.¹³ Subtle and, to all appearances, absurd, may seem to be the distinction between the religious and ordinary use of these things. Such a distinction was, however, not only recognised but strictly emphasised. It was also realised that this hair-splitting distinction would be more than impossible for ordinary people to comprehend and failures, which were only natural, to observe the rules for their use and preserve a perfect mental equilibrium at the time of their

12 पारानन्दस्याष्टविधहिंसनाभावान्मध्यमं पारानन्दो वर्जयेत्—

Pārānanda-Sūtra, Gækwad's Oriental Series, p. 13.

13

मद्यपानेन मनुजो यदि सिद्धिं लभेत वै ।

मद्यपानरताः सर्वे सिद्धिं गच्छन्तु पामराः ॥

मांसभक्षणमात्रेण यदि पुण्या गतिर्भवेत् ।

लोके मांसाशिनः सर्वे पुण्यभाजो भवन्ति हि ॥—*Kulārṇava*, II, 117-18.

use, would be frequent doing more harm than good. It was for this reason that difficulties and pitfalls lying in the path of this form of worship were often exaggerated to overawe people who might feel a fascination for it. The Kaula form of worship that prescribes the use of the five *M*'s, viz., *matsya* (fish), *māṃsā* (meat), *madya* (wine), *madrā* (particular kind of food), *maithuna* (sexual intercourse) though regarded as highly efficacious—nay the best form of worship has been stated in definite terms to be more difficult than all difficult things of the world. The practice of the Kaula path, says the *Kulārṇava*, is even more difficult than lying on blades of swords, catching hold of the neck of a tiger and holding a snake (in the hand).¹⁴ The rites pertaining to this form of worship were not allowed to be performed in public but they were carefully kept secret so that the ordinary run of people might not feel tempted to imitate them. Severe were the penances prescribed for persons who took to these things only for the sake of enjoyment. Heated wine was to be poured into the mouth of one who drank it for the sake of pleasure in order that his mouth might be purified.¹⁵ Persons using these things for secular purposes were doomed to eternal damnation.¹⁶

This peculiar form of worship was prescribed only at a very advanced stage of spiritual development when the extreme type of self-control had been achieved, when the things that normally cause distraction could create no mental disturbance. The characteristics of a true

- 14 कृपाणधारागमनाद् व्याघ्रकण्ठावलम्बनात् ।
भुजङ्गधारणान्नूनमशक्यं कुलवर्त्तनम् ॥—*Kulārṇava*, II, 122.
- 15 सुरापाने कामकृते ज्वलन्तीं तां विनिक्षिपेत् ।
मुखे तथा विनिर्दग्धे ततः शुद्धिमवाप्नुयात् ॥—*Kulārṇava*, II, 129.
- 16 अर्थाद् वा कामतो वापि सौख्यादपि च यो नरः ।
लिङ्गयोनिरतो मन्त्री रौरवं नरकं व्रजेत् ॥—*Tantrasāra*, P. Shastri's
edition, p. 649.

अद्वैतभावरहितो द्वन्द्वचित्तोऽथ कामुकः ।
देवताभावरहितो लौल्यभावेन वा पुनः
परशक्तिं समागच्छेत् स भवेद् गुरुतल्पगः ॥
संसाराम्बुनिधेः पारं करोति विधिना च सा ।
नरकाम्बुनिधौ शक्तिः क्षिपत्यविधिना च सा ॥

—*Gandharva Tantra*, 37, 14-15.

Kaula, fit to undertake these practices, as enumerated in different Tāntric texts clearly indicate this and these cannot but evoke respect and admiration for a Kaula. This was almost the final and most difficult test that a spiritual aspirant had to face. Persons who dared to follow this extremely difficult path were quite appropriately called Vīras or heroes. The objects that in the usual course of things were known to bring in degeneration were expected to secure salvation for them.¹⁷ The way of the Kaulas was therefore stated to be extremely incomprehensible—beyond the power of comprehension of even the yogins.¹⁸ The real Kaula is he who is not in any way affected by things that cause the affection of even divine beings.¹⁹ Hence these rites were to be performed under the guidance and supervision of properly qualified teachers. For a novice, unaware of the secrets of the worship, intending to perform it and attain success through it would be as ridiculous as one who wishes to cross the ocean with bare hands.²⁰

It can thus in no way be supposed, as some well-known scholars have done, that the Tantras preached licentiousness in the form of these rites—that they were Kāmasāstra in a garb. As a matter of fact, however, they aimed, as will be seen from what has been stated above, at complete self-control demonstrated not only by abstinence from but also by participation in objects of enjoyments.

But whatever be the directions of Tantra texts and Tāntric teachers in the matter, it is unfortunately a sad and undeniable fact that the actual practices of a good many people are so extremely vulgar and anti-religious that they rightly serve to rouse the contempt of the people at

17 यैरेव पतनं द्रव्यैर्मुक्तिस्तैरेव साधनैः ।

18 कौलो धर्मः परमगहनो योगिनामप्यगम्यः—

Last verse of the seventh chapter of the *Īcārasāra* or *Mahācīnācāra Tantra* which as found in some MSS of the work.

19

अहो पीतं सुराद्रव्यं मोहयेन्निदशानपि ।

तन्मद्यं कौलिकः पीत्वा विकारं नाप्नुयात्तु यः ।

मद्ध्यानैकपरो भूयात् स भक्तः स च कौलिकः ॥

—*Pārānanda-Sūtra*, Gækwad's Oriental Series, p. 16.

20

कुलधर्ममजानन् यः संसारान्मोक्षमिच्छति ।

पारावारमपारं स पाणिभ्यां तर्तुमिच्छति ॥

—*Kulārṇava*, II. 47.

large not only for them but for the Tantra system of religion as a whole. It was really difficult to follow to the letter the strict injunctions of the sūstras and a certain amount of misapplication was inevitable. It is also not unlikely that manipulation and even fabrication of Tāntric texts was practised by interested persons of a depraved character. This sort of thing went on even in comparatively olden times as is testified to by some of the Tāntric works themselves. The *Kulārṇava* says that there were people, who being devoid of any traditional learning, would preach imaginary things in the name of Kaulaism.²¹ Even in these days, it is stated, there are people who falsely pose as scholars of Tantras and give currency to unauthorised views that go against the views of the Tantras.²²

It is apparently for the presence of these heterodox things that two classes of Tantras were distinguished—Vedic and un-Vedic or authoritative and unauthoritative. Owing to the practice of mutual mud-throwing that prevailed among different sects the literature of one sect was ruthlessly criticised and ungraciously condemned by another. It would thus appear, in the first instance, to be almost impossible to find out the really authoritative and good works of the system. But this cannot baffle the scrutinising eye of the painstaking scholar.

And no one can reasonably find fault with the entire system on account of the prevalence of certain unauthorised rites or owing to the circulation of a number of unauthoritative texts. A careful study of at least the well-known and representative works of the system is expected to help to distinguish the good things from the really bad, and remove the misconceptions with regard to it and lead to a proper appreciation of it by giving an idea of the real nature of its doctrines. And it is a happy sign of the times that several individual scholars and institutions have taken up in right earnest the study and publication of Tāntric texts.

CHINTAMARAN CHAKRAVARTI

21

बहवः कालिकं धर्मं मिथ्याज्ञानविडम्बकाः ।

स्वयुद्धया कल्पयन्तीत्यं पारम्पर्यविवर्जिताः ॥

—*Kulārṇava*, II, 116.

22

अद्यत्वेऽपि हि दृश्यन्ते केचिदागमिकच्छलात् ।

अनागमिकमेवार्थं व्याचक्षाणा विचक्षाणाः ॥

—*Āgamaprāmāṇya* of Yāmunācārya, (Benares edition), p. 4.

The Mahānāṭaka Problem

Śāradātanaya, the author of the *Bhāvaprakāśana* (13th century A. C.) while treating of the five varieties of *nāṭaka*, based on the fundamental principles of *vṛtti*, *sandhi* and *lakṣaṇas* as pioneered by the dramaturgist Subandhu, refers to *Mahānāṭaka* as another way of nomenclature (प्रतिनिधि¹) of the fifth and the more elaborate variety, styled समग्र in Subandhu's language. Viśvanātha, the author of the *Sāhityadarpaṇa* (14th century—first-half) concludes his account of the *nāṭaka* (the *rūpaka* per excellence) by a reference to the *mahānāṭaka*² as its most rigid and bulky variety, just in compliance with the code and canons of the theorist and instances the *Bālarāmāyaṇa*.³ From a comparison of the characteristics as noted by these two writers it appears that the *mahānāṭaka*, referred to by the former writer is not the name of a specific work but of a genus. There is, however, a second reference to the *Mahānāṭaka* in the *Bhāvaprakāśana*,⁴ which, if our printed text is reliable, can only be to a work called the *Mahānāṭaka*.

The verse alleged to be cited therefrom is, however, from an earlier Rāma-drama, *Rāghavānanda* by name, according to the

1 The *Bhāvaprakāśana* (G.O.S.), p. 241:—सर्ववृत्तिविनिष्पन्नं सर्वलक्षणसंयुतम् ।
समग्रं तत्प्रतिनिधिर्महानाटकमुच्यते ॥ The word प्रतिनिधि in the sense of example is of rare occurrence in literature. The sense here accepted is the one apparently sanctioned by authorities. Cf. Daṇḍin's enumeration प्रख्यप्रतिनिधी चापि in the list of words denoting सादृश्य ।

2 एतदेव यदा सर्वैः...महानाटकमूर्चिरे ॥ (Chap VI). The term ऊचिरे would suggest that here, as elsewhere, Viśvanātha was drawing from older sources. Viśvanātha does not seem to know of a dramatic work called महानाटक ।

3 Rājasekhara, the author of the work, does not know महानाटक as a sub-class of *nāṭaka* even. The remark in the प्रस्तावना—'ब्रूते यः कोऽपि दोषं महदिति सुमति-बालरामायणेऽस्मिन्' is significant.

4 P. 279. "तद्रामोऽहं यदीत्यादिमहानाटककल्पितम् । The verse is रामोऽयं भुवनेषु... विपर्ययाद्यदिपुनर्देवो... । (रामोऽसौ is a variant).

attested evidence⁵ of several commentators on the *Kāvyaṭīkā*⁶ in which work also it is quoted. The manner of reading of the verse is a bit objectionable.⁷ No other *alaṅkāra* work, mediæval or modern, is known to quote from the *Mahānāṭaka*.⁸ It is sheer fanciful surmise to ascribe to Dāmodara Miśra,⁹ one (very likely the earlier) redactor of the *Mahānāṭaka* so early a date as the 11th century. To posit even the existence of the hypothetical *Mahānāṭaka*, the simplest and shortest text—a text which may be regarded as the nucleus of both the recensions now available—before the 12th century is certainly hazardous in view of the fact that works like the *Durghaṭavṛtti* of Śaraṇadeva, the *Ṭīkāsarvasva* of Sarvānanda and the *Uṇḍivṛtti* of Ujjvaladatta, which are marvellously all-embracing in their quotations, cite not a single passage from the work.¹⁰

As is well-known, the *Mahānāṭaka* has drawn profusely from such well-known Rāma-dramas as the *Mahāvīracarita*, *Uttararāmacarita*, *Anargharāghava*, *Bālarāmāyaṇa*, and *Prasannarāghava*—it has drawn no less from the *Chalitarāma*, *Rāmābhudaya*, *Udattarāghava*, *Rāghavānanda*, works no longer available but known from references or quotations in the texts of the *alaṅkāra* writers, particularly in the works of Abhinavagupta and King Bhoja. With the *Dūtāṅgada* of Subhaṭa¹¹ it has no less than nine verses in common. Not merely this. Both the recensions utilise verses from

5 Mānikyacandra in his *Saṅketa* regards it as a speech of Kumbhakarna, and so does Vaidyanātha Tatsat in the *Udāharaṇa-candrikā*. Nāgoji in his *Uddyota* thinks that it is Vibhīṣaṇa's speech in the same drama, while one of the earlier commentators Śrī-Vidyā Cakravartin curiously enough thinks it to be the speech of a messenger (T. S. S. No. 97, p. 199).

6 *Kāvyaṭīkā*, chap. IV. v. 109.

7 भुवनेषु.....विपर्ययाद् यदि पुनर्द्वो न । तत् does not form a part of the verse.

8 The alleged reference in the *Daśarūpa* is indecisive, because the mss. evidence is not unanimous and conclusive. The verse कपोले जानक्याः करिकलभदन्तद्युत्तिमुषि found quoted in the *Kāvyaṭīkā* of Rājasekhara and shown by the Editor, *G. O. S.* as of the *Mahānāṭaka*, is presumably from an older Rāma-drama; *vide* also our remark in f. n. 3.

9 As has been done for example in *Sanskrit Literature* (by A. A. Macdonell).

10 Dr. S. K. De's statement that the Vikramāditya referred to in Madhusūdana Miśra's version (Madhusūdana, acc. to Dr. De's reckoning, is also a later redactor) may have been king Lakṣmaṇa Sena of Bengal (*IIIQ.*, Sept. 1931) is a bold one, when one remembers that much of the literature of this time has been drawn from in the above work.

11 The reference is to the shorter version (*Kāvyaṭīkā* edn.) and not to the longer one, a mss. of which is preserved in the India Office collection.

works like the epic *Rāmāyaṇa* of Vālmīki, the *Adhyātma-Rāmāyaṇa*,¹² the *Padmapurāṇa* and the court epics like the *Raghuramaṅśa* ; and there are mss. of the work which contain verses taken from the *Bhaṭṭikāvya* and the *Jānakīharāṇa*. It is also fairly certain that some other *mahākāvya*s like the *Raghuvilāsa* and the *Rāmacarita* of Abhinanda¹³ (which latter work is now available in print, being published in the (A.O.S.) known from references in the works of Bhoja and his followers were drawn upon. Of the Rāma-dramas utilised, the *Prasannarāghava* of Jayadeva is the latest in point of time—(here it must be stated that it is idle ingenuity to hold that the verses common to this drama and the *Dūtāṅgada* with those in other works were taken from our work by those poets).

Both the recensions (in their present form as preserved even in oldest mss.¹⁴ use verses found in the *Dūtāṅgada* as also from the *Prasannarāghava*. In their present form no less than 17 verses are taken from Jayadeva's drama (the upper limit to whose date must be the 13th century). Further than this¹⁵ in the present state of our knowledge concerning the dramas utilised by the redactor of the *Mahānāṭaka* we cannot go. On the other hand, it can be safely asserted that the work in either recension existed before 1400 A. C. Vidyāpati Thakkura, the Vaiṣṇava poet of

12 The verse जयति रघुवंशतिलकः in *āryā* (appearing in Madhusūdana's recension, R. T. I. 3) is taken from the *Adhyātma-Rāmāyaṇa* (*Uttarakāṇḍa* I. 1). As will be noted later, the atmosphere throughout the work is surcharged with the same spirit as in the *Adhyātma-Rāmāyaṇa*.

13 The verses मूर्धा जाम्बवतोऽभिवन्द्य (R. T. ५१३०), लाङ्गूलेन गभस्तिमान् (Jv. ५१३४), करौकसि त्वमुषितश्चिरमेव (Jv. ५४६) । किं दूरमिन्दुमुखि (Jv. ५१६५ and Dāmodara VI. 20—present in both the versions) are from Gauḍa Abhinanda's *mahākāvya Rāmacarita*. One Bengal mss. of the *Mahānāṭaka* has the verse अथ माल्यवतः प्रस्थे (I. 1. *Rāmacarita*) as the opening verse in Act V.

14 No mss. of this work, which is more than 250 years old, is known to exist. The Mss. F (our text) described by Dr. De in his paper on the '*Mahānāṭaka Problem*' (*IIIQ.*, 1931) is just 200 years old and is written in the Bengali script. Of a dozen other mss. examined by us, one in Devanāgarī script, (which, representing the recension of Dāmodara, omits many verses found in the printed edition of that recension) in the possession of the A. S. B. (III. C. 84) cannot be said to be more than 200 years old on palaeographical grounds. The Benares Sans. College Mss. no. 1980 is however a little more than 250 years old, being transcribed in *Samvat* 1726.

15 The *Dūtāṅgada* of Subhaṭa, being written about 1200 A. C., is presumably earlier than the *Prasannarāghava*.

Mithilā, who was well-known for his scholarship as well,¹⁶ according to current tradition, has utilised a verse¹⁷ found in the *Mahānāṭaka*.¹⁸ The Bengali poet, Kṛttivāsa Ojḥā, the foremost of the pioneers in the work of adaptation and translation of the great epic, the *Rāmāyaṇa*, uses the peculiar verse¹⁹ रामं लक्ष्मणपूर्वजं..... (a verse in the नान्दी of Madhusūdana's recension—1.5. R. T.²⁰). A still closer terminus would be reached if we hold the verses ascribed to Hanūmat (at least three verses amongst these are found in the later recension of the work) in the *Śārṅgadharapaddhati*,²¹ compiled in 1363 A. C. This, coupled with the fact that the *Sāhityadarpaṇa* while noticing the sub-class *mahānāṭaka*, does not seem to know this peculiar work, which, though a misnomer, if current and popular in his time, he could not have passed aside, would give 1300 A. C. as the upper limit of our work.

16 Vidyāpati's interest in literature in general is evinced for example by his causing scribes to write out a mss. of a very valuable commentary on the *Kāvya prakāśa* by Śrīdhara, a transcript of which copy is preserved in the collection of the A. S. B.

17 The *padā* of Vidyāpati agrees more closely with the text in the earlier recension (इदानीमन्तरे जाताः...).

18 The well-known *padā*—“यंहुक विरहडरे चीर चन्दन उरे हार न देला । सो अब गिरि नदी आंतर भेला ॥”—is an obvious paraphrase of the *Mahānāṭaka* verse हारो नारोपितः etc. [Dāmodara Miśra's recension—printed edition V. 25, Madhusūdana's recension IV. 24 (R. T.)]. For dates of Vidyāpati and Kṛttivāsa *vide* Dr. D. C. Sen's *A History of Bengali Language and Literature* (3th edn.).

19 This is the first of the verses utilised as *maṅgalācāraṇa* by Kṛttivāsa in his rendering of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. The next two verses दक्षिणे लक्ष्मणे धन्वी... रामाय रामचन्द्राय... show that these are not the composition of the translator himself, who, according to the custom prevalent amongst writers of *Bhāṣā-Rāmāyaṇa* (a custom scrupulously followed by Tulsidāsa, the well-known Hindi translator) introduces Sanskrit verses at the beginning of each *kāṇḍa* of his work. Like the 39 stanzas appearing in the bigger recension of the दूतज्ञेद, it is in mixed metre (what scholars would call the उपजाति). Cf. the dictum, ...पादा यदीयावुपजातयस्ताः । इत्थं किलान्याम्बपि मिथिताम् वदन्ति जातिष्विदमेव नाम ॥

20 In this paper references to printed editions of the work, unless otherwise stated, would be in the case of Madhusūdana's recension, to Rāmatāraṇa Siromaṇi's edition (Calcutta, 1870) and to the Venkateswar Press edition (Bombay, Saṃvat 1966) in the case of Dāmodara Miśra's recension. Those to Jivānanda's edition are shown as Jv.

21 The S.P. knows, it would appear, the *Mahānāṭaka*. See *infra*.

With the lower limit we are not concerned—for the compiling of the *Mahānāṭaka*, of adding to and supplementing it was going on even so late as 1870, in spite of the printing press—a point made clear by a comparison of the editions of Candrakumāra and of Rāmatāraṇa Śiromaṇi with that printed in 1840 by the late Maharaja Kalikrishna Deb Bahadur of Sobhabazar, Calcutta.

There is one point to be noted here and that is this. Scholars and historians of Sanskrit literature have been so much carried by the wide popularity of the work and the legendary account relating to it as to ascribe to it a degree of antiquity, which this 'nondescript composition' (in the language of H. H. Wilson) can hardly lay claim to. Not to say anything of Max Müller, who thought that "it (the work) carries us back to the earliest stage of development of the Indian drama," we have even now scholars²² who think that the limiting date arrived at in our paper in this way is too late a date to be accepted. For reasons, which are to be discussed later, this late work became highly favourite with a certain section of the learned public and conceived as it was in a spirit of repetition and elastic plagiarising, was tortured and twisted to different proportions and different shapes in different parts of the Indian continent.

Curiously enough, this difference in form and arrangement of the work has monopolised the attention of many a scholar with the result that the really important issue has been overshadowed or shelved aside. Indeed Prof. Pischel's remark that 'there are as many *Dutāṅgas* as there are mss.'—applies with equal, if not with greater, force to the *Mahānāṭaka*. Dr. De in his valuable analysis of the mss. material at his disposal for the recension of Madhusūdana notes "the close agreement in mss. belonging to a particular locality." If such mss. are examined, separated by a time-distance of say fifty years, it will be noted that there have been additions and accretions in the later mss. Of course, the method of arrangement very generally remains the same. The 'two' recensions that are usually admitted are really two forms of arrangement of the work in their earliest form—the same verses arranged or grouped in different ways in different localities, to each of which, as years passed, different verses have been added and pitchforked. The re-

22 E. g. Dr. De in the paper referred to above... "The tradition (that referring to the writing of the work) which agrees more or less in the three versions of the story certainly suggests the redaction of an old anonymous work, or at least the writing of a new work with the embodiment of old matter."

sult has been that the two forms, originally derived from the same source, betray such pronounced differences that it has become difficult to recognize the affinity connecting them. Thus Dāmodara's redaction contains 14 Acts, the story being carried up to the killing of Rāvaṇa, the *Uttarakāṇḍa* story being but faintly hinted at in two verses at the end ; while Madhusūdana's recension, the one prevalent in Bengal, is in 9 or 10 Acts²³, carries the story in the minutest details right up to the end of the *Uttarakāṇḍa*. The former is clumsy and unmethodical, the latter methodical and elaborate in arrangement (सन्दर्भ्य सञ्जीकृते).²⁴

With this account of the chronology and text of the work, let us discuss the various views offered by scholars as to how the work originated and see whether we can, from its contents, arrive at any clue to the solution of the problem connected therewith. Pischel, who had advocated the theory of the shadow-(Puppet)-play as the source of the Indian drama, was impressed with the resemblance of the *Mahānāṭaka* to the *Dūtāṅgada*, a work which calls itself a *chāyā-nāṭaka* and being, as it were, for the time being under the spell of Max Müller, thought the work to be, if not very old, at least primitive in form, and design. Lüders supported Pischel's contention and thought the *Mahānāṭakā* to be one of the earliest specimens of the *chāyānāṭaka*. The term *chāyānāṭaka* is nowhere met with in any of the works of dramaturgy. The designation was significant in this respect that it not only followed closely the spirit and sense of classical dramas, but also borrowed largely from them.²⁵ As such it was a late product and had no right to be recognized as a variety of dramatic entertainment. It would be idle curiosity to dilate on its practical use—for the authenticity of the tradition concerning these few *chāyānāṭakas* as being actually represented may well be questioned.—The *Dūtāṅgada* has all the characteristics²⁶ of the classical drama, as far as technique and canons of dramaturgy are concerned. But the *Mahānāṭaka* fulfils none of these requirements—it is not a drama at all. As we have noted above, the *Mahānāṭaka*, later in conception than the *chāyānāṭaka* and *Dūtāṅgada*, drawing largely as it does from the many well-known and popular Rāma-dramas, and

23 The mss. seem to favour the ten-Act-division, though the printed editions have got nine Acts.

24 In the colophon to the Act-endings (मिश्रश्रीमधुसूदनेन.....सञ्जीकृते).

25 Cf. the last verse in the *Dūtāṅgada* (p. 15 Kāvya-mālā edn.)—स्वनिर्मितं किञ्चन गद्यपद्यबन्धं कियत् प्राक्कनसत्कवीन्द्रैः । प्रोक्तं गृहीत्वा...सुभटेन नाट्यम् ॥

26 E. g. the definitive *prastāvanā* and the use of the Prākṛtas.

being an ambitious undertaking, could well have taken upon itself that title, as if to outrival the *chāyānāṭakas*.²⁷ There is, however, one very important resemblance between the two works, which scholars, obsessed with their fanciful theories of dramatic forms, have sadly missed. Both the *Mahānāṭaka* and Subhata's work *Dūtāṅgada* were meant to satisfy the minds, you may call the whims and conceit-loving fancies of pedantry-ridden assemblies.²⁸

Prof. Sylvain Lévi seems to suggest that the *Mahānāṭaka* is an adaptation and compilation of dramas for stage purposes. Winter-nitz²⁹ expresses himself to the same effect. In addition to the very serious objection of the work being not a drama at all, this view is open to criticism because of the work being abnormally diffuse and full of repetitions and in view of a considerable portion of it being too high and ingenious for use as a work meant to be understood by all and sundry. In these days we are naturally reminded of the achievement of the Kerala stage when we speak of a work as being an adaptation. Of course, the *chākkṃyārs* or professional actors in that quarter of the Indian continent were also expert in narrating *prabandhas*,³⁰ as the *kathakas* do in Bengal—but the upholders of this view insist on their presentation on stage when they talk of the *Mahānāṭaka* as an adaptation. The many plays and puns on words, the choice puzzles and intricacies and what-not, would severely tax the minds of the actors as it would the imagination of the audience

27 Cf. the ref. in XIV. 69 in Dāmodara's recension (अश्न्यात्मा सेतुर्विभवति महानाटक इव). The पुंलिङ्ग use of the word नाटक is not sanctioned by grammar. It is obvious that the verse is the composition of a later interpolator, who cannot, however, in all probability, be later than 1700 A. C. The commentator Mohanadāsa takes the word in the sense of a 'great dance'. If any pun is intended by the writer of this verse, i. e. if this be a reference to the work itself, then here we have a hint to the presentation of a drama—a piece abounding in music and dance. But the present text in both the forms betrays no use of *raṭaga*, *hāra* and *māṅkya*, something akin to which might be in the minds of men who defined महानाटक in its actable aspect (vide नाटकं नृत्तवारा(चारा)द्वयं तत् समग्रमितारितम्—*Bhācuprakāśana*, p. 241).

28 Someśvara (13th century) in his *Kīrtikaumudī* (1. 24) thus refers to the achievement of Subhata—मुमटेन पदन्यासः स कोऽरिसमितो कृतः । येनाधुनाऽपि धीराणां रोमाञ्चो नापर्चायते ॥

29 Vide his Foreword to P. Anujan Achan's edition of the *Bhāgavadujjākīya* (1925)...“the *Parāpas* and the *Mahānāṭaka* are compilations.”

30 *Ibid.*, the Editor's Introduction (p. xviii).

and are surely to be regarded as too much exacting.³¹ The statement of a commentator (*circa* 1600 A. C.) on a dramatic work written in transparent simple Sanskrit and highly favourite with the professional actors³² is enough to dismiss this theory about the *Mahānāṭaka*.

Prof. Keith is convinced of the lack of really dramatic skill in a great portion of the work as well as of its having nothing in common in point of technique with the drama proper. But while realising the patent fact that it is a literary *tour de force*, holds, as if in deference to the views of his predecessors, that "it was redacted in preparation for some forms of performance in which the dialogue was plentifully eked out by the director and other actors³³." Dr. S. K. De, who only recently has dwelt on this in a searching and elaborate manner, has conscientious objections to the work being styled a *tour-de-force*³⁴ though in a manner he admits that it was conceived in a period when the decline of the classical Sanskrit drama had set in and was meant for a 'more cultivated and sophisticated audience.'

In Dr. De's opinion works like the *Mahānāṭaka* are "not mere literary exercises but represent a living form of quasi-dramatic performance"³⁵ and "should be explained in relation to the *Yātrā* to which it bears a distinct kinship." This last assertion appears to have some basis on fact when we look to the underlying current of *bhakti*, the elaborate stage-directions (occasionally met with at least in Dāmodara's recension), and to the form of the dialogue which has its counterpart in works of the *Samvāda* type, where very rarely more than two actors have to take part. One serious objection to this theory is that the work, at least in its practical and popular form, is a late one and could better have served its purpose if it were written in the *bhāṣās*, some of which were then in a flourishing state. If Dr. De's suggestion in connection with the *Dūtāṅgada*³⁶ that 'the

31 The prose *cūrṇakas* are just the opposite of what they should have been and show the working of the pedant in them.

32 तदपि कृशाशयावशकुशीलवमात्रहिता.....कृतिः ॥ (the last but one verse in the commentary on the *Bhagavadajjukīya*).

33 Keith, *Sanskrit Drama*, p. 271.

34 *IHQ.*, 1931, pp. 551-552.

35 *Ibid.*, p. 552.

36 *Ibid.*, p. 551. By the term 'popular festive entertainments' Dr. De refers to the *Yātrās* as composed in the dialects or vernaculars (at least that is what I take him to mean). The *Dūtāṅgada* was composed about 1200 A. C. There would be no point in this assertion, especially on the question of its bearing on the *Mahānāṭaka*-problem, if the reference intended be to the popular forms of

popular festive entertainments like the *Yātrā* probably acted on the literary drama' is to be accepted, it may be asked, 'why should it be embodied in Sanskrit, a tongue unintelligible to the general public for whom alone such works were meant?' Moreover, in the *Yātrā* the lyric element is the preponderating element, nay it is all-in-all. It would be very risky to hold that the bulk of verses in the work supplied this element. To think that the occasional chorus speeches (e.g. the speeches of the Vaitālika), like the '*Juḍir gān*'³⁷ of later days (later than the mediæval *Yātrā* in its pure form), represented this is a farfetched idea, at best a subterfuge. In the *Yātrās* the centre of attraction lay in the feeling-nucleus, directly and immediately effected—in the work before us more often than not it lies in the cleverness of expression and in the indirectness of presentation.

The real solution of the problem would be to regard the work certainly as a '*tour-de-force*' conceived and assayed in an age in which ingenuity, and exuberance of hyperbolic fancy, the outcome of the desire to shine in society through cleverness, had taken the place of real artistic merit, sacrificing sentiment to sentimentalism, and suggestiveness to bland tautologous expression. In their desire to outrival, the later interpolators committed often very unhappy tortures on grammar and metre.³⁸ The work was meant as a handy and convenient manual for the professional *kathakas* or narrators of *Purāṇic ākhyānas*, who had in it just those elements as would suffice to make their listeners affected and moved no less by the feeling element as by the form and manner of expression in the spirit of works like the *Vidagdhamukhamanḍana*.

(i) The first contention is borne out when we analyse the text, and look to its content and manner of arrangement and picking up of

Sanskrit drama such as *dombī*, *rāsaka* etc., which might have been dragging their listless lease of life then. Vide the present writer's *A Note on the Popular Element in the Classical Sanskrit Drama* (*Proceedings of the Second Oriental Conference, Calcutta, 1922*).

37 It is to be remembered that such speeches are rather rare in the *Mahānāṭaka* text as preserved to us. To suppose that all the narrative and descriptive stanzas in the work shown in Mahārāja Kalikrishna's edition as the speech of the director (सूत्रधार) were so utilized would lack support from the established practice of the *Yātrāwallas*.

38 E. g. in XIV. 69 (Dāmodara's recension), XII. 19 (यतिभङ्ग in the last line), III. 17 (R. T.); IV. 57 (Dāmodara's recension = v. 235 in Kalikrishna's edition); XIV. 8 (Dāmodara's recension); XIV. 23 (यतिभङ्ग in the third line); and in III. 59, V. 36, II. 1, V. 40, V. 70, VI. 95, IX. 24.

verses from other sources. The redactor here—and this is the case in both the redactions—hunting after *vidagdhatā* based on verbosity and tricks of expression on one side—(feats occurring much more prominently in Dāmodara's recension) and intellectual ingenuity and a turn to sentimentalism on the other—does not often cull the best and most artistic verses, not even those that have a dramatic force and pose, what one may call the 'beauties' of the poets concerned, but those that would take the listener back by surprise and tax his brain-powers.³⁹

(ii) Among the verses that have not yet been traced to their sources—and these are roughly half the total number—there are many that appear to be the compositions and improvisations of the redactors. Some of the finest of them⁴⁰ impress us, not by their suggestion but by their peculiar, sonant, (लालित्य) artificial forms of expression⁴¹ As instances in hand we may note the verses often met with in the exposition of the *kathakas* :—

कमठपृष्ठकठारमिदं धनुर्मधुरमूर्तिरसौ रघुनन्दनः ।

कथमधिज्यमनेन विधीयतामहह तात पणस्तव दारुणः ॥ (I. 26. R.T. |

गृहीते हरकोदण्डे रामे परिणयोन्मुखे ।

पस्यन्दे नयनं वामं जानकीजामदग्न्ययोः ॥ (I. 28. R. T.)

(iii) A considerable number of the verses is in the nature of श्लोक-पूरण or समस्यापूरण themes, very often indulged in the assemblies of the refined (*vidagdha*.)⁴² Sometimes the redactor indulges himself to such an extent that he casts all sense of proportion to the winds and gives us verse after verse, as if with the object of illustrating these fanciful ways of verse-composition. As instances in hand⁴³ one may note

39 The redactor indirectly refers to this *sine qua non* of recognition in the verso क्लोवानामेव युद्धेषु प्राणत्वाणाय राम धीः । लज्जाप्रशान्त्यै संसत्सु मूर्खाणामिव मूर्खता ॥ (XIV. 30. Dāmodara's recension). Whatever may be said of his achievement by present day critics, he was a विदग्ध amongst विदग्धs.

40 E. g. II. 23 (R. T), III, 16 (R. T), III. 53 (R. T), III. 84 (R. T), XIII. 88, XIV. 81, XIV. 85

41 This is also the characteristic in the prose connecting-links—where not unoften we find long compounds in the set form peculiar to the *Gauḍī rīti*

42 E. g. VI. 87 and VI. 45, XIV. 45 (Dāmodara's recension) in (R. T.)
IV. 32 (R. T.) } VI. 33 प्रदीयतां...मैथिली, VII. 7 (=Jv. VI. 27),
& VI. 45, IV. 22, 24 (R.T.).

43 Also in XII. 35 & XIII. 38, XIV. 29, XIV. 46, XIV. 45 (दिवाय तस्मै नमः) ; the verse क्षीणीमुज्जति (the verse 353 in K. K.) in imitation of नमत्कमठकर्परं (Jv. ६१२६) ; Jv. ३१८० and Jv. ३१८१ ; Jv. ११४४, ११४५ and ११४६ ; Jv. ३१२८ and ३१२६ ; Jv. २११७ and २१२५ ; Jv. ३१३४ and ६१११३ (from the *Udāttarāghava*),

the expression तद्भ्रममैशं धनुः appearing in *Anargharāghava* (IV. 21), [which is embodied in our text (R. T. I. 39)] imitated in another verse उत्क्षिप्तसह...तद्भ्रममैशं धनुः (R. T. I. 33), the clever way of filling up the idea as in गंगां पिबामि यमुनां सह सांगरेण (XI 17), or in the utilisation of the antique verse containing मयाप्तं रामत्वं कुशलवसुता न त्वधिगता (X.29) appearing in Dāmodara's recension and जीवद्भिर्न च...श्रूयते (R. T. VII. 59).⁴⁴

(iv) There are some *prahelikās*⁴⁵ also in this work – which are just in keeping with the atmosphere of ingenuity and conceit typified in works of the *vidagdhas* and which are quite out of place in works, meant for stage representation.⁴⁶

As instances in hand we may note the verse XIV.56 (अङ्गारमध्ये जलजं विभाति), XII. 5 (चन्द्रोदये नृत्यति चक्रवाकी), and the oft-quoted verse

अर्धरात्रे दिनस्यार्धे चार्धचन्द्रेऽर्धभास्करे ।

रावणेन हता सीता कृष्णपक्षे सिताष्टमी ॥ (R. T. III. 67)

present in both the recensions, which has taxed the commentators not inconsiderably and the verse

राजवंश्यो न शूरो हि कश्चिशूरो न भूमिभुक् ।

राजपुत्रो गुणैर्युक्तः.....मे ॥

present in the recension of Madhusūdana alone (R. T. VII. 2).

(v) The use of the *citrārāsa* device, or as Bhoja and the author of the *Bhāvacaprakāśana* would put it, the *saṅkara* or the *vyatikara* of *rasas*⁴⁷ (their wonderful conglomeration) is also a proof of the redactor, having a clever and ingenuous model before him.⁴⁸

44 Also in VI. 67, VII. 7, X. 12 out in Dāmodara's recension.

45 E. g. VI. 27, IX. 41 (R. T.), XI. 6. (सूर्योदये रोदिति चक्रवाकी) (in Dāmodara's recension also Jv. (३१४८ दाहृषदोस्तु का भिदा)

46 Cf. Daṇḍin's dictum— क्रीडागोष्ठीविनोदेषु...परव्यामोहने चैव सोपयोगः प्रहेलिकाः ॥ *Kāryādarśa*, III and Bharata's statement of the requisities of a dramatic work meant for representation on the stage—(मृदुललितपदाद्यं गूढशब्दार्थहीनं जनपदसुखबोध्यं...XIX. 118. *Kāvya-mālā* edn. the *Nāṭyaśāstra* and Viśvanātha's *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, (Chap. VI, Kārikās 211-212).

47 Bhoja, *Sarasvatikanṭhābharana* (V. 28), p 476, and *Bhāvacaprakāśana* pp. 27 and 132.

48 Bhoja would call them as instances of चित्ररस e.g. I. 33., XIV 15, XII. 17 (in Dāmodara's recension), चित्रभाव e. g. Jv. २१११, or चित्रानुभाव e.g. in IX 8 (R.T.).

That the work served as a ready handbook for *kathakas* is well known to those who are familiar with their practice and procedure. Saturated as it was through and through with an under-current of *bhakti*⁴⁹, it was just the sort of work which would function and enjoy popularity with those whose business it was to narrate the story of Rāma in the cleverest possible way, quite on a line with the mode of teaching and story-narration as in the *Adhyātma-Rāmāyaṇa*, the work very highly prized by the professional reciters of *Purāṇas*. The so-called प्रस्तावना and प्रशस्ति portions of the work, the occasional references in dialogue न रामस्यास्येन्दुर्नयनविषयोऽभूदकृतिनो...जटायोर्जन्मेदं... (IV. 13), तैलोक्ये शालिकृत्याय (VIII. 27), verses like भावोऽनिशं कुशिक-नन्दन पादयोर्मे... (R. T. IV. 59) and मनसि वचसि काये (R.T.IX. 104.) prove that the work could not have been used as a purely academic venture only to startle, amaze and waylay like the *Vidagdhamukhamanḍana*; the long drawn lectures on the incontrovertibility of *karman* and the inscrutability of fate (e. g. XIV. 46 49, 93) as well as the all powerfulness of *prāktana* are just the things harped on a thousand times in the *Purāṇas* and have been introduced to amuse and instruct the minds of the people who learnt the lesson and mission of life from the *kathakas*' narrations of the Purāṇic tales. The gnomic *subhāṣitas*⁵⁰ culled from the *Pañcatantra* and other works which have embodied in them the experience of the Indian people from time immemorial are here utilised in their proper setting and form and are the types of didactic instruction indulged in by the *kathakas*. The long descriptive passages (we are not referring to the description of the marital life of Rāma and Sītā—which was only introduced from the standpoint of वैदग्ध्य), often in prose are just the sort of crammed extracts found in the manuals of the *kathakas*. And the last but not the least point to be noted in this connection is the introduction of prose comments on verses and the general remarks with such words इत्यभिप्रायः (e.g. on pp. 28, 29, 32, 207, 211)⁵¹ which are minimised in the recension of Madhusūdana, in which a dramatic or rather quasi-dramatic turn was sought to be emphasized to keep pace with the name or title of the work.

49 The opening verses in both the versions and verses (XIV. 94) पुरायं भक्त्या-ज्जनेयप्रविरचितमिदं यः शृणोति.....show the *ārambha*.

50 E. g. the string of verses in Dāmodara's recension IX. 13-27; as also Jv.IX ३१२३, ४१६, ४१४८ etc....

51 The references are all to the printed edition of Dāmodara's recension.

It is not at all strange that such a work, conceived, developed and elaborated in a period when the anthologist and the *kathaka* were abroad as determining forces of the literary output of a people, should be associated in critical tradition with the names of King Bhoja of Dhārā, the author of the *Sṛṅgāraprakāśa* and the *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa*, a greater name than that of whom it is difficult to mention amongst the collectors of precious literary gems and of Hanumat, the monkey-warrior, well-known for his devotional fervour. The association of the former with the work is a legend which the modern critic would rule out ; but the fact remains that in the list of works quoted or referred to by that royal author in his two encyclopædic treatises are found no less than twenty works dealing with the *Rāmāyaṇa*, most of which are apparently dramas. The account at the end of the work in the earlier recension⁵² is only a modest acknowledgment of the deep debt of gratitude which the original compiler owes to him for having at his disposal ready-made quotations to be utilised for his purpose. Dāmodara Miśra only arranged these verses in order and the later redactor Madhusūdana Miśra in a different land as also with a different view-point arranged them more methodically (सन्दर्भ्य सञ्जीकृते) and with the dramaturgist's definition of the sub-class *Mahānāṭaka* before him (as we have shown above, this sub-class came to be recognised in the works of theorists sometime between the tenth and the thirteenth centuries) divided it into ten acts.⁵³ As we have a manuscript in existence of Dāmodara's recension which is about 200 years old and which

52 रचितमनिलपुत्रेणाथ वाल्मीकिनाब्धौ निहितममृतबुद्ध्या प्राङ्महानाटकं यत् ।
सुमतिमृपतिभोजेनोद्धृतं तत् क्रमेण प्रथितमवतु विश्वं मिश्रदामोदरेण ॥ The commentator Mohanaḍāsa takes क्रमेण with भोजेनोद्धृतम्. The present-day student of the history of Sanskrit literature would like to take उद्धृतम् in the sense of 'cited' (in his works the *Sṛṅgāraprakāśa* and the *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa*), and to construe क्रमेण (in course of time) with मिश्रदामोदरेण प्रथितम् । The statement महानाटकं विश्वमवतु which is almost parallel to the poet Bhavabhūti's assertion पाप्मभ्यश्च पुनातु वर्द्धयतु च श्रेयांसि सेयं कथा proves to the history student that it was an epic or narrative undertaking, the फलश्रुति of which is noted with a nicety.

53 It is likely that the original work was not divided into Acts—as some mss. in the Dacca collection would warrant. As has been printed out by Dr. De, most of the mss., unlike the printed texts published by Rāmatāraṇa Siromaṇi and Jivānanda, divide the work into 10 *aṅkas*. The mss. of Dāmodara's recension (in A. S. B.) has, however, the Act divisions.

contains 14 acts⁵⁴ as in the printed edition, it is clear that Dāmodara, the earlier redactor, used the name *Mahānāṭaka*, not quite mindful of the implications it involved save and except in this that the divisions of the play were to be designated as *āṅkas*. The later redactor arranged the प्रस्तावना, नान्दी and even a प्ररोचनावाक्य to make the work have a near approach in form to the *nāṭaka*. In the text of the earlier redactor (or was it in that of some follower of his version ?) the original epic or narrative nucleus has remained intact. The opening verse कल्याणानां निधानं कलिमलमथनं.....as well the verse towards the end रम्यं श्रीरामचन्द्रप्रबल.....are indications, if any indication is necessary, that to the minds of those that used it, it was out and out a work of the *ākhyāna* type, very ingenious in its form and content. As the first verse was not in order with the form of a drama, those of a later age thought it prudent to have नान्दी verses of the set type preceding it⁵⁵ in the text. Towards the end also the very nice verses we now have in the printed edition (at least some of them were in the original simpler text of Dāmodara, as proved by citation in the *Śārṅgadhara-paddhati* and use in the recension of Madhusūdana) were reshuffled and redistributed and some left out to suit their end.

The alternative title of the work is *Hanūman-nāṭaka*. To those who could believe in the legendary account of the composition of the work (and none can do it now) this title presents no difficulties. As we have noted above, the *Śārṅgadhara-paddhati* ascribes nine verses to one Hanūmat, two of which (90 and 1248) are found in Madhusūdana's recension of the work (they are I, 2 and VI, 67 in R. T.); in Dāmodara's recension the latter only appears as XIV. 77. Verse No. 4010 of the *Śārṅgadhara-paddhati* कोऽहं ब्रूहि सखे...shown as महानाटक्य is (with a slight difference in the mode of reading the lines) IV. 27 (R. T.) and V. 12 in Dāmodara's recension. Was this way of naming the author an oversight on the part of the anthologist, for like all anthologists, he names authors and not works in pointing

54 चतुर्दशभिरेवाङ्कैर्भुवनानि चतुर्दश । श्रीमहानाटकं धत्ते केवलं ब्रह्म निर्मलम् ॥

55 The earliest known mss. in Bengali script of the work in the Dacca University collection and the Devanāgarī mss. in the collection of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, both about 200 years old, do not contain this verse. But that does not vitiate the argument put forward. Mohanadāsa, not a very recent commentator, (a complete mss. of his commentary no. 439 in Peterson's *Fifth Report*, being dated *Samvat* 1768) notes variants in this verse.

out sources ? The poet Hanūmat (this may just as well be a pseudonym) appears to be well-known to Śārṅadhara as the writer of devotional stanzas (Nos. 123-125, 128, 133, 4166), none of which do find a place in our work. In the work before us Hanūmat plays a more important part and is more intimately connected with the dialogue than other characters save Rāma. If we leave out narrative verses in this connection, as well as other verses found in earlier sources, we find that in a considerable number of these Hanūmat represents the spirit of service and devotion,⁵⁶ which is what we find eulogised and held up as a model in Purāṇic *ākhyānas*. In the earlier redaction just near the close of the work we find a dozen, verses (XIV. 77-88)⁵⁷ which are spoken by Hanūmat as the *praśasti* of Rāmacandra—very fine verses in their way. These are verses to be noted particularly; any connection they had with the name *Hanūman-nāṭaka* for the play is purely a matter of surmise. A parallel to this, however, is to be found in the पुराकालीय रामायण,⁵⁸ as told by Jāmbavat in the *Padmapurāṇa*.

It appears from a comparison of the *bhāṣā-Rāmāyaṇas* (esp. those written in Bengali by writers⁵⁹ like Kṛttivāsa, Ananta, Kavicandra, Raghunandana Gosvāmin—and to a certain extent the Hindi *Rāmāyaṇa*) that the indebtedness of a good number of them for their manner and matter to the *Mahānāṭaka* is greater than is generally known. In several portions (e. g. in the *Uttarakāṇḍa* narration) Kṛttivāsa's *Rāmāyaṇa* closely follows the *Mahānāṭaka*.⁶⁰ The *Āṅgada's Rāybār* portion, which, according to scholars, is Kavicandra's composition, however, has for its source the *Dūtāṅgada* verse (No. 22 in the *Kāvya-mālā* edition) also utilised in the *Mahānāṭaka* (R. T. VII. 14.) and need not, therefore, be regarded as spurious. While some of these writers in vernacular literature were proficient in Sanskrit, a

56 E. g. VI. 14, VII. 43-44. (in Dāmodara's recension).

57 We meet with five more verses in one mss. of Dāmodara's recension preserved in the collection of A. S. B.

58 *Padmapurāṇa, Pātālakaṇḍa* Chap. 71 (Bangabasi edn., Calcutta).

59 For their date and their indebtedness to the *Mahānāṭaka* vide *supra* and Dr. Dinesh Ch. Sen's *History of Bengali Language and Literature*.

60 Of course, in Madhusūdana's recension, the recension familiar in Bengal. There are some verses in both the recensions which may afford some help in determining the date and locality of the inception of this compilation. A few (e. g. II. 13 only in Dāmodara's recension.....VII. 2 (Dāmodara)=VI. 24 (R. T.) and VI. 18 (Dāmodara=VI. 15) may require a closer study.

good number had to depend on the narrations of the *kathakas*, according to their own admission.

Thus the *Mahānāṭaka* has carried the tradition and ideas of fairly old writers indirectly through the race of *kathakas* (who are, because of changed environment, no longer held in high repute and whose race is consequently fast becoming extinct) with whom it has ever been a cherished asset, hardly inferior in importance to the original *Rāmāyaṇa* of the *ādi-kavi* or the *Ādhyātma-Rāmāyaṇa*.

SIVAPRASAD BHATTACHARYA

Indo-Greek Coin-Types

In discussing the different deities on Indo-Greek coins, Mr. Whitehead observes that "probably the locality where the coin was struck would determine the god to whom it would be dedicated. It is common for the coins of some one ruler to bear the images of more than one deity."* Analogy with Hellenistic practice outside the borders of India encourages the belief that some coin-types were local.

Zeus Enthroned - KAPISI

Direct proof that some Greek deities were installed as tutelary divinities of cities ruled over by the Indo-Greeks is available. On the reverse of one type issued by Eucratides we find the figure of Zeus Enthroned, with the fore-part of an elephant to the right and a 'pilos' or pointed cap to the left, bearing the Kharoṣṭhī legend *Kaviṣiye nagaradevatā* "the city divinity of Kaviṣi" (Kāpiṣi).† It is no doubt significant that such a label specifying the status of the Greek deity in Indian script and language should have been required: we may regard it as an announcement of the elevation of the Hellenic deity to the rank of a city-divinity of Kāpiṣi. Later Indo-Greeks who minted the type omitted the label, apparently recognizing its superfluity.

City-goddess - PUSKALAVATI

Another coin shows on the obverse the figure of a goddess in a Greek garb, "wearing a mural crown, the emblem of a Greek civic divinity, and holding in her right hand a lotus as the tutelary deity of the city of Lotuses (*Puṣkalāvati*). The accompanying Kharoṣṭhī legend des-

* Punjab Museum Catalogue, vol. I, p. 6.

† City-divinities (*nagara-devatā*) are alluded to in the *Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra*, Pk. II, ch. 4 (*nagara rāja devatā*) in connexion with the topic 'Foundation of Fortresses.' It is not unlikely that the 'forepart of elephant' and the 'pilos' symbolize the people called *Astakenoi* and *Aspasioi*, inhabiting the region between the rivers Kābul and Indus, for whom there are independent coin-types figuring the "Elephant" and the "Mounted Dioscuri"; see pp. 515-16. Amyntas and Hermæus adopt the 'pilos' as head-dress on their Kāpiṣi coins.

cribes her as 'the goddess of Puṣkalāvati' (*Puṣkalavati devata*); and it is quite possible that her name may lie hidden in the three illegible Kharoṣṭhī characters on the left (-*save*).'' On the reverse of this piece occurs the figure of a bull, described as such in the accompanying legends, in Kharoṣṭhī (*uṣabhe*) as well as in Greek (*tauros*). Since the coinage of this region continued for several centuries to exhibit the bull, it is permissible to think that this animal was an object of special devotion in the locality.¹ We may perhaps also ascribe to local reverence the appearance of various animals on Indian 'pre-Hellenic' coins; so that the piece just described would illustrate the manner in which an anthropomorphic tutelary divinity was combined with an old-established animal-motif found on the earlier indigenous mintage. It is noteworthy that no monarch's name occurs on this exemplar of Puṣkalāvati mintage: the city was apparently being administered as a 'republic' with a constitution modelled on the Greek city-state.

What appears to be the same deity, but dressed in Indian robes, figures on certain coins issued by Pantaleon and Agathocles. On the *obv.* there is 'maneless lion,' with the Gk. legend *Basileos Pantaleontos* or *Basileos Agathokleous*; the *rev.* shows the deity, lotus in hand, with the Brāhmī legend *rajine Patalevasa* or *rajine Agathakleyasa*. It must be a type initiated by Pantaleon and followed by Agathocles. The device 'maneless lion' seems to have been suggested by the personal name Pantaleon. The other prince Agathocles gives, on a very Indian type of his mintage ('Stūpa: Tree within railing'), besides the transliteration *Agathakleyasa*, a Prakrit rendering of his own name as *hitajasame*, in the Kharoṣṭhī script; bearing witness to a desire for making his name understood by his Indian subjects. On another type of Agathocles ('Stūpa: Symbol'), we find only this Prakrit rendering in Kharoṣṭhī, the transliteration being omitted. Later Indo-Greeks forsook the Brāhmī script and the practice of translating their own names on their coinage. Perhaps, the knowledge of Greek amongst their Indian subjects made such progress that it was not felt necessary to exhibit a translation. Whatever the reason for the later phenomenon, there can be no doubt that both Pantaleon

¹ *Cambridge Hist. of India*, p. 557.

and Agathocles were deeply affected by Indian influence in devising their coins. We should not be surprised therefore to find them figuring on their mintage the tutelary deity of Puṣkalāvati, lotus in hand, dressed in Indian mode. No support can be lent to the usual view that the figure is an Indian dancing-girl, for such a subject would be abhorrent to all numismatic tradition in India.

Cunningham records that the find-spots of the coins of Pantaleon and Agathocles are, Western Punjab, Kabul and Kandahar. This agrees fairly with the localization of their common type, with the 'maneless lion' on *obr.*, in Puṣkalāvati. The same goddess appears later, with the *cornucopia* instead of the *lotus*, on coins of Philoxenus and Hippostratus.²

Some connexion of both Pantaleon and Agathocles with the cult of Nysa appears to be suggested by the circumstance that both struck a type in nickel—a peculiar metal—with a bust of Dionysus on *obv.* and a 'maneless lion' touching vine with paw on *rev.*; for, as we know from classical sources, the people of Nysa convinced Alexander of their special association with Dionysus and the vine cult.

Athene Promachos - SAKALA

Of all the coin-types, that characterized by a representation of "Athene Promachos" is the most important. It is a type used by no less than fourteen successive monarchs, commencing with Menander, and claims the distinction of having been adopted by an Indian prince, Bhadrayaśas. Professor Rapson locates this type, as well as the type 'Apollo: Tripod', in eastern Punjab. I propose to assign the 'Athene Promachos' type more definitely to Sākāla, the capital of Menander, described as very prosperous in the *Milindapañha*, and known to

2 I have seen a copper coin in the collection of Mr. A. Ghose, procured from the Taxila region, with one side blank, depicting *caitya*, 'pile of balls' (? Hindu temple) and a standing figure, veiled, carrying *cornucopia*; cf. Rapson, *Indian Coins*, pl. I. 11. The specimen seems to indicate an attempt to introduce a purely Greek deity at Puṣkalāvati, before the compromise reflected in the republican type showing the goddess with lotus in hand, instead of *cornucopia*. Upon coins of Penkoloas, who derives his name from the city, the goddess figures once more with the lotus.

Ptolemy (2nd century A.D.) as bearing the alternative designation 'Euthymedia,' rightly emended to 'Euthydemia' and connected with Euthydemus, the founder of the family to which Menander belonged. The continuity of the type 'Athene Promachos' answers perfectly to the unbroken prosperity of Sākala from the second century B.C. to the second century A.D. A rival claim of the type 'Apollo: Tripod'—the only other type that might be thought of in connection with Sākala—must be rejected on the sole but sufficient ground that there are no issues of Menander bearing this type, which would be inexplicable if the type had belonged to his capital. It is accordingly not surprising to find that, on the copious silver mintage of Menander, the types are practically confined to 'Athene Promachos'—a fact noted by Cunningham—his other silver types being few and rare. *The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea* (c. 70 A.D.), a handbook for Græco-Indian commerce, relates that 'ancient drachmæ are current in Barygaza bearing inscriptions in Greek letters and the devices of those who reigned after Alexander, Apollodotus and Menander.' Here we seem to have a clear allusion to the circumstances that the types established by Apollodotus and Menander were taken up and continued by some of their successors.

Elephant: Bull - NORTH-EASTERN PUNJAB

There is one type which can with confidence be localized in north-eastern Punjab: it is the type 'Elephant: Bull' common to the coinage of Apollodotus, Heliocles, Maues, Azilises, Azes, Zeionises (satrap) and Rudravarmā. The type is essentially Indian and must have been borrowed first by Apollodotus from the native currency. We may determine the locality where the type was current from the circumstance that, on coins of this type minted by Rudravarmā, both Brāhmī and Kharoṣṭhī legends occur. This shows that it belongs to an area where both scripts, Brāhmī and Kharoṣṭhī, were in vogue. The same characteristic may be noticed in the mintage of Dharūghoṣa and of Amoghabhūti. Judging by every indication we are led to think of north-eastern Punjab.³ Epigraphic corroboration is provided by the Kanhiara inscription, executed in duplicate on the same stone, in Brāhmī as well

³ Cf. *Camb. Hist. Ind.*, p. 527.

as in Kharoṣṭhī. Agreeably to this location, we find Dharāghoṣa imitating the coins of Azilises—a clear sequel to close proximity.

Apollo: Tripod - SOUTH-WESTERN PUNJAB

The type 'Apollo: Tripod' is probably to be located in south-western Punjab, adjacent to the area of the type 'Elephant: Bull'; a variety, 'Apollo: Diadem' being peculiar to Apollodotus I, struck probably on the occasion of his coronation. Such a location is suggested by the circumstance that we have only two types from Apollodotus I—'Elephant: Bull' and 'Apollo: Tripod' (the type 'Apollo: Diadem' being merely a variety)—one of which ('Elephant: Bull') has to be assigned to north-eastern Punjab. An interaction between the two types, natural to neighbouring localities, is evidenced by the existence of the types 'Elephant: Tripod' and 'Bull: Tripod'. The former bears the name of Zoilus Soteros who also minted the type 'Apollo: Tripod'. The latter bears no legend but is usually ascribed to Apollodotus II who likewise minted the 'Apollo: Tripod'-type. Whatever we may think of the latter ascription, we cannot ignore the fact that the types 'Elephant: Tripod' and 'Bull: Tripod' are linked not only by the reverse-device but also by their employment of the 'beed-and-reel' ornament, of Seleucidan parentage, employed by the earlier Indo-Greeks(—) Eucratides, Plato, Heliocles—but abandoned by their successors till the age of Hippostratus. We may surmise that the capital of Apollodotus I lay in the vicinity of *M u l t a n* which, by virtue of its strategic position, could maintain itself as an independent kingdom in later times. The antiquity of Multan is attested by a reference in Utpala (cited by Alberuni)⁴ to its changes of designation in different *yugas*; it having been originally called Kāśyapapura, then Hamsapura, Bagapura, Sāmbapura,⁵ and then Mūlasthāna. Alberuni (II, 184) records further that 'the Hindus of Multan have a festival which is called *Sāmbapurayātrū*; they celebrate it in honour of the *S u n*, and worship him'.

4 *India*, ed. Sachau, I, 298.

5 The reading adopted by Sachau is *Sāmbhapura* which should be corrected to *Sāmbapura*. Has *Bagapura* anything to do with *Bhagadatta* of Mahābhārata?

Yuan Chwang describes the Sun-temple at Multan as 'magnificent and profusely decorated', adding that 'the image of the Sun-deva is cast in yellow gold and ornamented with rare gems . . . The kings and high families of the five Indies never fail to make their offerings of gems and precious stones (to this Deva)'. Such splendour and reputation with royalty should lead us to think that the Sun-worship at Multan was, already in the 7th cent. A.D., an ancient royal institution, possibly going back to the days of Apollodotus I who may well have been the first to establish here the cult of the Greek Sun-god Apollo, constituted into the tutelary deity of his capital, Multan.

One adaptation of the 'Apollo: Tripod'-type set up by Apollodotus I stands to the credit of Euthydemus II; the 'bust of Apollo' on *obr.* being affiliated, in point of portraiture, to the royal bust, evidently implying a naïve assumption of divinity. Its localization may be sought for somewhere in Ariana, west of the Indus, not far away from the dominions of Apollodotus, since the type is in nickel—a peculiar alloy characteristic of his age and apparently not used for money struck east of the Indus—and since, as we shall see (p. 518 *infra*), Euthydemus II minted types connecting him with Shorkot and Sehwan.

Nike - NICAËA

We find many of the Indo-Greeks figuring 'Nike' on their mintage. The idea of connecting the type with *N i c a e a*, the Greek city planted by Alexander on the eastern bank of the Jhelum where he defeated Porus, has been suggested already.

It must be remembered however that there was another Nicæa in the Kabul region, already in the days of Alexander. Noteworthy also is the circumstances that coins of the 'Nike'-type struck by Sanabares, Orthagnes, Gondophernes, Abdagases and Pacores all bear on *obr.* a 'Bust of King' in *P a r t h i a n* style; so that 'Nike' in such cases may be reasonably traced to a Parthian prototype such as is found on coins of Vonones I.

King on prancing horse (= *Bucephalus*) - BUCEPHALA

The type bearing on the *rev.* 'king on prancing horse' I propose to assign to *B u c e p h a l a*, the other Greek city planted by Alexander

on the western bank of the Jhelum, opposite Nicæa. It was minted by Antimachus Nikephorus, Philoxenus, Hippostratus, Nikias, Hermæus (with Calliope); and the coins of Nikias are confined to the *Jhelum district* wherein Bucephala was situated. It is clearly related to the decadrachm struck by Alexander after his victory over Porus, figuring the conqueror mounted on a *prancing horse* (= Bucephalus), pursuing Porus seated on a caparisoned elephant.⁶ We cannot fail to note that coins of this type, even those minted by Hermæus whose other coins betray a sad lack of technical skill, are without exception executed in good Hellenistic style such as we might expect in mint-products of a Greek city. The persistent Hellenism of Bucephala was highly esteemed by Plutarch (1st-2nd century A.D.), and the city is mentioned by Ptolemy.

Pilei of Dioscuri - TAXILA

Eucratides initiated two coin-types connected with the worship of Castor and Pollux corresponding to the Indian *Āsvins*. One type shows the pointed caps (*pilei*) of the Dioscuri, with palms. The type has been assigned to Taxila. It occurs on the mintage of Antialcidas whose rule over Taxila is attested by the Besnagar inscription of Heliodorus; it occurs also on the issues of Liaka Kusulaka, a satrap of Maues, whose name is mentioned in the Taxila copper-plate inscribed in the 'year 78' in the reign of *mohārāja mahamta Moga*, identified with Maues.⁷

Mounted Dioscuri - ASPASIOI

The other type represents the Dioscuri mounted on steeds, and is adhered to by only one other Indo-Greek prince, Diomedes. It may perhaps be connected with the *Aspasioi*, a people encountered by Alexander in the mountainous district watered by the Kunar or

⁶ Smith, *Early History of India*, 3rd ed., pl. facing p. 72, no. 1; see also volume II of plates in *Camb. Anc. Hist.*, 10, and *Camb. Hist. Ind.*, pl. I. 16.

⁷ The year 78 may be referred to the Vikrama era. Some coins of Maues are dated in the Seleucidan era (A/T = 'year 301'). His bust occurs on coins of his protégé Sanab (who also issued coins dated I/T = 'year 310') as well as on coins of his satrap Rajuvula (of the 'Athene Promachos'-type).

Alishung, not far from Kāpiśī which formed part of the empire of Eucratides; *Aspa* corresponding to Iranian *Aspa*, Sanskrit *Āśva*, 'steed'.

Elephant - **ASTAKENOI**

According to Strabo (XV. 27): "Next to the Kophes there comes the river Indus. The regions between these two streams are possessed by the *Astakenoi*, the *Masianoi*, the *Nysaioi*, and the *Aspasioi*," (McCrinkle's translation). The *Astakenoi* may be plausibly connected with Skt. *hasti*, 'elephant'; and the coin-type 'Bust of ruler: Elephant' becomes assignable to this area. We have such coins from Heliocles and Antialcidas amongst Indo-Greeks; and both are known to have held territories near the *Astakenoi*-area.

Heracles - **SHORKOT**, etc.

Glancing over other types issued by the Indo-Greeks, we come across two which seem explicable in the light of statements made by Strabo. Megasthenes has recorded a Greek impression of the fact when he notes: "The Sibai, it is said, were the descendants of the men who had accompanied Heracles in his expedition. They had preserved tokens of their descent, for they wore skins like Heracles and carried the club and had the figure of a club branded on their oxen and mules." The Sibai are obviously the Sibis of Indian tradition. Conformably to Greek mentality, we may suppose that the 'Heracles'-type was established by the Indo-Greeks in recognition of the special divinity of the Sibis.

Where the Sibis had their seat may be surmised fairly from such evidence as we possess. An inscription incised on a cauldron discovered at *Shorkot* belonging to the 4th century A.D., contains the name *Sibi-pura*, applied apparently to the locality where the cauldron was found.⁸ *Shorkot* would thus appear to have been regarded as the capital of the Sibis at least as early as the 4th century A.D. The limit is pushed back to the 4th century B.C. by the assertion of Quintus

⁸ In *Matsya Purāna*, (ch. 121), the river Sindhu (Indus) is said to flow past *Sibapaura*.

Curtius: "Then he (Alexander) came to the tract of country where the Hydaspes falls into the Acesines from which he fell down the confluences of these rivers into the territory of the Sobii." He then landed his forces, marched 250 stadia (=30 miles, approx.) into the country and took the capital. There can be little doubt that the Sobii are Sibis; the *o* being preserved in the name S h o r k o t. Raverty has shown that the Chenab river formerly pursued a course to the east of S h o r k o t.⁹

The Sibis (Śivis) are, in the *R̥g-veda* (VII. 18. 33), allies of P a k t h a s, Bhalānasas, and other tribes against king Sudās.¹⁰ Vedic scholars connect *Paktha* with *Pakhtu* and *Paṣtu*, the names applied still to the dialects prevailing amongst the Pathans, in Afghanistan east of the Helmund river as well as in the North-West Frontier province roughly corresponding to ancient Gandhāra. The tribal name *Bhalānas* has likewise been authoritatively connected with the name of Bolan Pass. It cannot therefore be considered a risky guess to connect with the tribal name S i b i the name S i b i applied to a town in Baluchistan, of great strategic importance, about 88 miles S.E. of Quetta, not far from the Bolan Pass. Assurance on the proposed connexion is provided by the find, at Quetta, of a bronze (or copper?) statuette, 2¼ feet high, depicting Heracles with lion-skin.¹¹ The town S i b i was known under the name S i w i to Shah Beg Khan who found it flourishing and preferred it to Quetta, as a place of residence, when forced to evacuate Kandahar.¹²

Possibly also, the river-name *Zhobi-Zhob*, which gives the district Zhob (east of Quetta) its name, is a cognate of the tribal name S i b i; a more correct form being *Iziob* (according to Raverty).¹³

Below Shorkot, further down the river Indus, we come across another town-name clearly connected with the Sibis. This is S e h w a n, known to the early Arab writers as S i w i - s t a n.¹⁴

9 *JASB.*, 1892, pp. 343-6.

10 Some of these tribes have been identified by the present writer with tribes figuring on Egyptian monuments as allied against Mineptah and Rameses III; see *Studia Indo-Ironica* (Leipzig, 1932), pp. 177 ff.

11 *JASB.*, vol. lvi, pt. i, p. 163, pl. X.

12 Raverty, *op. cit.*, p. 312 n.

13 *Ibid.*, p. 306n.

14 *Ibid.*, p. 315 n.

Another area of Sibi-settlement is indicated by coins found at Nagri, near Chitor, bearing the legend *Majhimikaya Sibi janapada*, 'of the Sibi-janapada, in Mādhyamikā.' We know from Patañjali that Mādhyamikā was besieged by the Greeks shortly before he wrote about it in his *Mahābhāṣya*; and, in view of Strabo's assertion that it was Menander who penetrated furthest, we may assign the Heracleian coin-types ('Club', 'Lion-skin') of Menander to this region.¹⁵

The varieties of 'Heracles'-type may be localized conjecturally. Euthydemus I strikes the variety 'Heracles seated on rock'. That it pertains to some such city as Sibi in Ariana is indicated by several circumstances. Euthydemus I never owned much territory east of the Indus which formed the boundary between India and Ariana as known to Eratosthenes and Strabo (3rd-1st century B.C.). There are 'Saka' issues of the type 'Heracles seated on rock' bearing the name of Euthydemus, evidently struck during the Saka occupation of Ariana. The only Indo-Greek ruler to follow the type is Agathocleia (with Strato I), which would be strange if the type had belonged to India proper. A revival of the variety, finally, is noticeable in the mintage of Spalagadames and Spalahores (1st century A.D.), whose coins mostly come from the region known as Ariana.

With Shorkot or *Sibi-pura* we may specifically associate the variety 'Bust of Heracles' occurring in the coinage of Euthydemus I, Demetrius, Euthydemus II, Lysias, Theophilus and Strato I. Its continuity shows its importance and justifies its assignment to the Sibi-capital.

Of the three remaining varieties, all representing Heracles in a standing posture, one is found only on the mintage of Lysias: it depicts the demi-god not only with the 'club' and the 'lion-skin' but with the additional attribute 'palm'. In view of the local type of Taxila being 'Palms and pilei of Dioscuri', we are led to think of a

¹⁵ There is a place called *Asind*, on the river Khari, about 50 miles south of Ajmir, which I would identify with *Asinda* of Ptolemy (§ 60) who places a town *Theophila* about one degree due south of *Asinda*. The name is reminiscent of the Indo-Greek prince Theophilus whose coin-types are exclusively Heracleian; and the locality is near Nagri, where Sibi-coins occur. Excavation in this region may solve the problem some day.

region not very far away, particularly because we possess joint coins of Lysias and Antialcidas, and the rule of Antialcidas at Taxila is attested by the Besnagar epigraph. It looks likely that Lysias possessed all the territory between the Indus and the Jhelum, south of the Salt Range which would prove to be some sort of a natural boundary. We cannot, however, on that score, restrict the dominions of Lysias to the region east of the Indus, which flowed in these days much further east than now.¹⁶ If the Sibi-area has been rightly held to have embraced the region watered by the Zhobi river, some important town in this region may claim to be considered as the locality where Lysias minted his unique type representing Heracles with 'palm.'

Ptolemy's *Geography* will probably help to throw some light. He names only *two* cities between the Indus and the Jhelum, namely, Ithagouros and Taxila, Ithagouros being to the north-east of Taxila; so that both lay north of the Salt Range. South of that Range, the geographer enumerates no other town; but he gives a list of twelve places 'along the river' (scil. the Indus), namely: Embolima, Pentagramma, Asigramma, Tiansa,¹⁷ Aristobathra, Azika, Pardabathra, Piska, Pasipeda, Sousikana, Bonis, Kolaka. Of these, Embolima has been identified with Amb¹⁸ and must in any event be placed above the junction of the two rivers, Indus and Kabul. I propose to identify Tiansa with T a u n s a, near the place where the combined waters of the Luni and the Sangar join the Indus. It must have been an important site.

We may also conjecture that the confluence of the Punjab rivers was a point of great strategic importance and was marked by some fortified city which is probably named in Ptolemy's enumeration but which defies identification at present owing to the shifting of the rivers. The 'confluence' would be in the Sibi-area, and may claim a Heracleian coin-type. Alternatively, we may reserve a type for B a n a g a r a, a town named by Ptolemy along with S a b a n a (possibly S i b i) as lying to the west of the Indus "at some distance." This B a n a g a r a seems identifiable with M i n n a g a r a of "Scythia" in the *Periplus*.

16 Raverty, *op. cit.*, p. 301 ff.

17 The reading is given by Renou in his ed. of Ptolemy.

18 But see Stein, *On Alexander's track*, where it is placed higher up.

The coin-type in which Heracles is depicted crowning himself, occurs on the mintage of Demetrius and Theophilus, and re-appears later on the coins of Spalahores and Spalagadames (with the name of Vonones¹⁹ on *obv.*). This indicates territory west of the Indus. Since the only other type minted by Theophilus ('Bust of Heracles') is reasonably ascribed to Shorkot, we may perhaps localize at Banagara or the confluence the type 'Standing Heracles, crowning himself.'

If now we assign to Sehwan (Siwi-stan) the type 'Standing Heracles, holding diadem,' we would hardly be very wide of the mark. The type was issued by Euthydemus I, Euthydemus II and Zoilus Dicæus. Such a location harmonizes with the fact that Euthydemus II strikes the type 'Bust of Heracles' indicating dominion over Shorkot, as also the type 'Apollo: Tripod' plausibly associated with a region not far removed from Multan (p. 5 supra). Mithradates I of Parthia struck this type, some specimens being dated 140-39 B.C., apparently after his conquests in the direction of India. The same Parthian monarch also minted the types "Bust of Heracles: Elephant" and "Bust of ruler: Mounted Dioscuri," attesting conquest of Shorkot and the Aspasioi.

The different varieties of the 'Heracles'-type, as minted by the Indo-Greeks, may be thus localized. The result is conveniently shown below in tabular form:

SEHWAN	BANAGARA	TAUNSA	SIBI	SHORKOT	SIBI-COLONIES
Standing Heracles, holding diadem	Standing Heracles, crowning himself	Standing Heracles, with palm	Seated Heracles	Bust of Heracles	Attributes of Heracles, e.g. club, Lion-skin
Demetrius Euthydemus I Zoilus	Demetrius Theophilus Spalahora Spalagadama (‘Vonones’-group)	Lysias	Euthydemus I Agathocleia and Strato I Spalahora Spalagadama	Euthydemus I Demetrius Euthydemus II Lysias Theophilus Strato I	Menander

19 Probably identical with Vonones I of Parthia (c. 8-11 A.D.).

Zeus with thunderbolt - SWAT VALLEY

Another Indian divinity which the Greeks recognized as their own *Z e u s O m b r i o s*". Unfortunately, the locality where this worship prevailed is not defined by Strabo. A Zeus-cult in the Kāpiśī region is, as we have seen, concretely indicated by the "Zeus enthroned"-type of Eucratides; but there it is not Zeus Ombrios (i.e. 'the Rainy'). Some connection with Gandhāra seems to be implied by two considerations. The Græco-Buddhist art of Gandhāra invariably depicts a thunder-bearing figure known under the name Vajrapāṇi as attending on the Buddha; in later times, Vajrapāṇi appears as a Bodhisattva. He seems to have been originally nothing less than thundering *I n d r a* who was made subordinate to Buddha when Buddhism gained the upper hand in this area. As early as the *R̥g-veda* (I. 32), we meet with references to Indra's Rain-inducing capacity, thanks to his thunder he so effectively wielded against the dragon Vṛtra that was withholding the rains. On the analogy of Vedic Dual Divinities like Mitra-Varuṇa, we may well suppose that, with the advent of Buddha-worship into a region where the cult of the Rainy Indra prevailed, there was evolved the dual divinity, *B u d d h a - I n d r a*; and that the Buddhist artists, taking their cue from the dominant Buddha-worshippers, made Indra an attendant upon Buddha. It is noteworthy that the occurrence of Vajrapāṇi as an invariable attendant upon Buddha is characteristic of Græco-Buddhist art—a circumstance pointing to Gandhāra and proximate regions, colonized most profusely by Greek settlers, as the cradle of this Dual Divinity. If this indication can be taken as a guide, and the certain ascription of the 'Zeus enthroned'-type to Kāpiśī be considered alongside of it, we may with some confidence look for a localization of the type 'Standing Zeus, with thunderbolt' within an area answering to Gandhāra or its immediate neighbourhood.²⁰

20 Yuan chwang (Beal, *Records etc.*, p. 125 associates the Swāt Valley region (called U-chang-na) with a tale of Buddha "when he was Śakra" i.e. Indra). Perhaps the fusion of the two cults was helped by recognition of affinity between *Ś a k r a* and *Ś ā k y a*.

Aśoka also seems to refer a *t h u n d e r - c u l t* in this area, if Bühler was right

The type 'Standing Zeus holding thunderbolt' was first struck by Heliocles, to the Attic as well as to the Indian weight-standard. It afterwards re-appears, along with the 'Seated Heracles'-type of Heliocles, on coins of the Vonones-group found more plentifully at Kandahar than at Begram or in the Punjab. A variety, showing the thunderbolt on the point of being hurled by Zeus was issued by Archebius alone among the Indo-Greeks and recurs on Indo-Scythian mintage. We may assign the type and its variation by Archebius perhaps to the Swat Valley regions yielding the most numerous specimens of Græco-Buddhist sculpture figuring Vajrapāni, and not far from the site of N y s a where Alexander came across an early Greek colony devoted to Dionysus.

HARIT KRISHNA DEB

in reading.....*Viśavajri-Yona--Kamboja-Gandhāra* instead of.....
Viśavasi.....as read now-a-days; the *viśavajri* corresponding to Skt. *Viśva-Vajrin*.
 We know of the *Viśva-Vajra* cult in later times.

The Relations between the Civil and Military Authorities in the early days of British Rule

The history of a trading corporation which started with the sole desire of pursuing commerce, yet gradually extended its activities over the political sphere until at last it became the undisputed sovereign power in India must always remain something of a mystery. But whenever an institution is set up with one particular end in view and is used later for purposes for which it was never designed, the result is always unsatisfactory. The transition is necessarily painful and slow. The military annals of the East India Company afford many striking illustrations on the point. But perhaps the most crucial and baffling problem which confronted the company during the early stages of their rule was the relations which should subsist between their civil and the military authorities.

From the time that the Company established their several factories, it became necessary to enrol guards for their protection. But these men really consisted of ill-disciplined Europeans and native peons, more fitted to be called chowkidars than soldiers. In 1668 Bombay was transferred by Charles II to the Company and on that occasion the garrison which formed a detachment of King's troops accepted the Company's service.¹

The real beginning of the Company's army may be dated from 1748 when an appreciable number of recruits was raised at Madras to meet the menace of the French. This force was commanded by Major Lawrence who received his commission from the Company. The example of Madras was soon followed by Bengal where Clive after the Battle of Plassey raised a separate establishment for that presidency. The foundation being thus laid, the army continued to grow.²

1 One of the causes which had induced the King to part with the island is specially noteworthy. This was the violent disputes which had broken out between Sir George Lucas, the Governor of Bombay, and the Company's representative at Surat, on account of the former as an officer of the King claiming precedence over the latter.—*The Army in India and its Evolution* (1924), p. 3.

2 For a brief account see Sir George Chesney, *Indian Polity* (1894).

But apart from the Company's army, it must be emphasized that there was a small force of His Majesty which had found its way to India. The first regiment was the 39th Foot which reached Madras as early as 1754, took part in the relief of Calcutta two years later, and also participated in the victory of Plassey. It was then broken up, but in 1758 several new regiments arrived in Madras in pursuance of the plan of the elder Pitt to meet the French in all parts of the globe. In 1759 one of these regiments was transferred to Bengal and Eyre Coote, the Officer Commanding, was appointed by the Company their Commander-in-Chief. This is a significant fact, for it shows that over the joint forces—the Company's as well as the King's—the command was vested not in an officer belonging to the Company's service but to the King's.

The existence of two rival armies side by side occasioned much of the future trouble. Each derived its authority from a different source. The officers of the Royal troops were appointed by the British Commander-in-Chief and were responsible to him. The officers of the Company's forces, on the other hand, were appointed by the Court of Directors and took their orders from them. The regulations also by which promotions were determined and discipline maintained were distinct for each of the two forces. And yet in spite of all these differences, they served as a common whole out of which officers were selected for garrison or field duty. It is clear, therefore, that the system was highly objectionable, although some degree of unity was achieved by the fact that the entire army was understood to be under the control of the Governor and Council in each presidency.³

But there was a perceptible tendency on the part of the Royal troops to belittle the authority of the Government and sometimes openly to set it at defiance. They could not forget that they derived their own authority from the King, while the President and Council were merely the representatives of a mercantile company. The events of the Second Mysore War may be cited as illustrative instances.

On the eve of its commencement, Sir Eyre Coote, the Commander-

³ Much interesting information on the subject is contained in the *Report of the Select Committee on Military Affairs* (1832).

in-Chief, enunciated the theory of military independence in unmistakable terms. His view was that the Royal army or navy was not bound to yield unquestioned obedience to the civil power but could exercise its own discretion; and that the powers of the Government were limited solely to making a request for assistance, which could be granted or refused according to the judgment of the Commander-in-Chief or the Admiral. He stated, "The President and Council of every settlement must certainly be the judges, when or how, the service of His Majesty's forces, either of fleet or army, appears to be necessary for their protection or defence, and immediately from themselves the requisition must come to the Admiral or myself. We are then to be the judges whether the circumstances so represented to us render it necessary to comply with the requisition, and for our conduct therein in granting or refusing it, we are answerable to His Majesty."⁴ In other words, the executive and the military were co-ordinate authorities with equal powers. Admiral Hughes was as uncompromising as Coote. He censured an officer roundly for proposing to proceed with his ship to Bengal on the application of the Madras Government, and declared that, "neither the Governor-General and his Council nor any other Presidency of the Company shall meddle in the command of His Majesty's ships serving under me."⁵

It is impossible that the Government could have allowed to go unchallenged the pretensions of the Royal forces. Under the law the Governor and Council were responsible for the civil as well as the military affairs of the presidency in their charge, and to have withdrawn their control from the military field would have amounted to an abdication of their authority. In these circumstances it was idle to expect that the war could be carried on with any amount of success. The Government and the army instead of helping each other indulged ceaselessly in mutual recriminations.⁶ Lord Macartney, the Governor, tried to win over the Commander-in-Chief by cordiality and good

4 India Office MSS. The Home Miscellaneous Series, 149, pp. 472-3.

5 H. C. Wylly, *Sir Eyre Coote*, p. 327.

6 Cf. Madras letter to the Directors, Oct., 31, 1782, Home Miscellaneous, 171, pp. 41-138.

humour. "In fact, I court him like a mistress, and humour him like a child," he wrote to Macpherson.⁷ But Coote obstinately refused to give way.⁸ He demanded that he should be invested with uncontrolled command over all the forces serving in the Carnatic, and he was supported by the Supreme Government. It is indeed surprising that Warren Hastings should have for a moment countenanced such a claim which annihilated the power of the executive altogether. But the reasons are probably to be found partly in his conviction that it were better to concentrate all authority in the Commander-in-Chief rather than allow it to be disputed by rival antagonists, and partly in the jealousy which he entertained against Lord Macartney. The latter had a number of advantages on his side. A man of marked ability and with high social connections, he had had considerable experience in the diplomatic and consular service. He possessed also the doubtful privilege of being the Governor-General designate and therefore a rival of Warren Hastings.⁹

On a strong representation by the Madras Government, the plenary powers of the Commander-in-Chief were allowed to be withdrawn. Thereupon Sir Eyre Coote threw up his command in disgust and proceeded to Bengal on the plea of ill-health.

He was succeeded by Major-General James Stuart, the senior officer in the Royal army, who received the Company's Commission as Commander-in-Chief. But from the beginning he adopted the same ungracious and implacable attitude as had disfigured the relations of his predecessor with the Government. Without expressly declaring himself to be independent of the civil power he came perilously near

⁷ J. Barrow, *Some Account of the Public Life of the Earl of Macartney*, 1, p. 140.

⁸ Possibly one of the reasons for the weakness of Macartney's position was that unlike Hastings he had not received his commission of appointment as 'Governor and Commander-in-Chief,' *Home Miscellaneous*, 24, pp. 214 & 158.

⁹ Hastings had no great love for Macartney. On Feb., 24, 1784 he wrote to his wife: "I would give one half of my life for the certainty of beginning the other half with you tomorrow. But I would not wish even for the immediate possession of such a blessing at the purchase of such mortification as to be thrust out of my seat by such fellows as Lord Macartney, Mr. Francis, and Gen. Richard Smith."

it, and on one occasion when asked to interfere in a case where an officer of His Majesty's troops had refused to comply with a requisition from the civil authorities, he maintained that there were circumstances when a requisition of Government concerning the employment of His Majesty's troops might be refused by the Officer Commanding.¹⁰

It is unnecessary here to recall the various instances of Stuart's disobedience, except to point out that the Government felt compelled in September 1783 to take the decisive step of dismissing him from the Company's service. At the same time they appointed Major-General Sir John Burgoyne, the next senior officer in His Majesty's service to take the command. This they did because the dismissal of Stuart from the Company's service in their view involved also the loss of his rank in the King's service which could be valid so long only as he was in that service or else employed by the Company.¹¹

The events following the dismissal of General Stuart deserve to be narrated in some detail. Burgoyne was at once saluted as the new Commander-in-Chief, but he had doubts whether his elevation was legal. He thought, and this was the prevailing opinion in the Royal troops, that the Government were not empowered to dismiss a king's officer. He, therefore, sought an interview with the Governor to whom he explained that if Stuart had been guilty of great crimes, he should be secured, and then 'I should know what to do', but that so long as he was free, he must obey him as his superior officer. He added that Stuart had told him in conversation that he would send orders that night to the King's troops.¹²

This created no doubt a grave situation. Here was a dismissed officer threatening to issue orders to a section of the army and that army willing to obey him. Macartney wisely decided to detain Burgoyne and in the meanwhile effected the arrest of Stuart.

By his timely action the Governor prevented a possible civil war. Colonel Pearce, a distinguished servant of the Company who was himself present on the scene, thus alluded to the episode: "In regard to the

10 W. J. Wilson, *History of the Madras Army* (1882-3), 11, p. 81.

11 *GOG.*, Sept., 17, 1783.

12 Sir John Burgoyne's *Narrative*, Home Miscellaneous, 178, p. 324.

seizure of Stuart, when he wanted to set the King's and Company's troops at variance, Macartney is absolutely right, so I have told Hastings; and so I think he was in dismissing him. If he had not been seized, there would have been a civil war here....."¹³

Following the arrest of Stuart, Burgoyne suspecting that the Government were about to appoint Colonel Lang of the Company's service as the new Commander-in-Chief, told them that Stuart having been put under arrest and orders having been given to prevent the admission of any person to him, or to permit him the use of pen, ink, and paper, he looked upon himself as the Commander of the King's forces, being now the senior officer.¹⁴ The implication of Burgoyne that Stuart ceased to be the head of the Royal army not by virtue of the Company's dismissal, but because of the physical impossibility of discharging his duties is interesting.

The Government, however, promoted Colonel Lang to the rank of Lieutenant-General and directed him to assume the command of the army. His promotion was due to a desire to vest the command of the Company's troops as well as the King's in the same person, as had been the custom hitherto, and as there was no officer in the latter above the rank of Major-General, he became the senior officer in the entire army.

The Royal officers resented this sudden¹⁵ promotion of Lang, because it involved the supersession of six of their own number, who had been previously superior to him.¹⁶ They held a meeting at which it was unanimously decided to receive no orders except from Burgoyne, and he forthwith issued an order to the King's troops calling upon them to obey him as their Officer Commanding. The view of Burgoyne was that though the Company could deprive him of the command of their own forces they could not do so with regard to the King's troops. Later happily sober counsel prevailed. Burgoyne with another senior officer withdrew from the camp, leaving the command of the Royal army to a Lieutenant-Colonel who being inferior to Colonel Lang was enjoined

13 *Bengal, Past and Present*, Oct.-Dec, 1910, p. 201.

14 *Narrative*, p. 333.

15 Usually the promotion is by stages. Col., Maj-Gen., Lieut-Gen.

16 They were 4 Major-Generals and 2 Colonels. Cf. Gen. Stuart's Memorial, March 1784, Home Miscellaneous, 178, p. 373.

to obey his orders. The threatening split between the King's and Company's forces was thus averted.

It is impossible to put the blame exclusively on the Government or the Royal officers for this imbroglio. The supersession of six officers was a grave affair whose only fault had been to interpret perhaps too rigidly their rules of discipline.¹⁷ The explanation offered by Macartney for the unusual promotion of Lang was that the Royal troops were merely auxiliaries and that the Commander-in-Chief must belong to the Company's service; but this was clearly opposed to existing practice. He had observed: "That the King's forces serving in India could only be regarded as auxiliaries; and that if the Government entrusted to him was deprived of all the officers senior to the King's..... the office of Commander-in-Chief must be filled by an officer on the Company's regular establishment, though only a subaltern promoted on the necessity of the moment."¹⁸

The question of Lang's confirmation occasioned an interesting difference of opinion between the home authorities.¹⁹ The Court of Directors wanted him to be confirmed, hoping thereby to create a precedent for the appointment of the Commander-in-Chief from their own forces. The Board of Control while approving his appointment as a temporary measure were opposed to making it permanent. They had, some weighty arguments on their side. Lang's confirmation would have meant the permanent supersession of some of the King's officers besides creating an anomalous situation. For under the law only the military member of the Governor-General's Council could be the Commander-in-Chief in India (who was superior to the provincial Commanders-in-Chief) and since the existing officer possessed a lower rank than Lieutenant-General Lang, a superior office would have been filled by a junior person.

Ultimately Lieutenant-General Sir John Dalling of His Majesty's service was appointed Commander-in-Chief of Madras. General Lang was recalled but was given a handsome consolatory pension.²⁰

17 Sydney to Directors, March 21, 1784.

18 Quoted in a debate at the India House, May 5, 1797 Home Miscellaneous, 454. pp. 33-34.

19 Madras Draft Despatches, vol. 1, Draft dated Oct., 1, 1784.

20 Madras Despatches, XI, p. 561.

Care was also taken to prevent a repetition of the circumstances which had led to Lang's promotion. On the advice of Lord Sydney, Secretary of State, Lieutenant-General Robert Sloper who was about this time appointed Commander-in-Chief in India received a Letter of Service from the King, "which will give effect and operation to his commission of Lieutenant-General and entitle him to exercise the command appertaining to that rank among His Majesty's troops in the East Indies so long only as he shall continue in the service of the Company; and that when he shall cease to be in that employment, his right of commanding or serving with His Majesty's forces in the East Indies shall likewise determine."²¹

At the same time an effort was made to define the relations which should obtain between the civil and military authorities. In a memorandum prepared on the subject by Sir George Young, the Secretary for War, it was laid down that all orders issued to the troops should come from the Officer Commanding, who in his turn was to receive his orders from the Government respecting the marching of troops, their disposition, and the like. The Government, however, were not to interfere in any manner with details of regimental duty and discipline.²²

It was, however, felt that the best way to ensure happy relations between the two branches of administration and also to eradicate other existing evils was to bring about a fusion between the King's and the Company's forces. This idea was not only emphasized by Young but embodied in the famous Military Plan of 1794 of which the author was Lord Cornwallis. But nothing substantial was done. In 1809 the discontent of the Madras army flared into open revolt and the events of thirty years ago were repeated with some similarity. The Commander-in-Chief sharply reprimanded an officer who had dared to appeal against his decision to the Government, "an act of disrespect for which he would have been brought to trial had General Macdowall remained in India."²³ Notwithstanding the fact that the General had resigned and left the country, the Government considered it necessary to dismiss him publicly on the ground that he had made "insinuations grossly dero-

21 Madras Despatches, XI, p. 541.

22 Home Miscellaneous, 84, p. 521.

23 Wilson, III, p. 247.

gatory to the character of the Government and subversive of military discipline and of the foundation of military authority.”²⁴

The events of Madras when referred to the Supreme Government led them to define clearly and boldly the respective position of the civil and military authorities in India.²⁵ As the document is of great constitutional interest no apology is needed for making extensive quotations from it. They observed that the subordination of the army to the State was a proposition too well established and understood to have been openly questioned in any quarter. The weapons with which the army was furnished were to be used for fighting the battles of its country and otherwise promoting public peace under the direction and command of the Sovereign and his Government. The subordination of the military to civil power was held to be imperative: “A deliberative army and a deliberative navy are both disqualified for the discharge of the proper and honourable duties which form their true distinction, and when their deliberations end in concert and combination the public peace is endangered.” They considered next the question whether the Commander-in-Chief should be a member of the Council or not and expressed the opinion that this was a matter of expediency rather than of right, the only necessary thing being that he should be consulted not only on military but also civil affairs. But if he was a member of the Council, he had precisely the same character and duties as his colleagues: “He is not the representative of the army in any sense of the word, and still less in the sense which may perhaps have been intended of his being charged in Council with the separate interest of the army as distinct from those of the public, and the general service of the Company.” They conceded that generally in matters of discipline he had exclusive authority, but maintained that the Governor in Council had the right to interfere where such power had been grossly abused. Lastly the relations of the military officers *inter se* were defined. “As a general principle,” the Government stated, “a military officer is not only justified in obeying an order of his superior, but is bound to do so without regard to the quality of the order.” There was, however, one important exception, *viz.*, that

²⁴ Wilson, III, p. 248.

²⁵ Home Miscellaneous, 696, pp. 225-309.

criminal orders which included orders in the furtherance of open and determined opposition to Government were not to be obeyed and that anybody who did so became personally responsible for his conduct.

PRAKASH CHANDRA

Age of the Brāhmaṇas

The Brāhmaṇas are the books which describe how and when the Vedic rituals or sacrifices used to be performed in ancient India. The most important Brāhmaṇas are the *Śatapatha*, the *Aitareya*, the *Kauṣītaki*, and the *Taittirīya*. There are reasons to believe that none of these works were composed at any definite date; they all carry certain traditions mostly astronomical which tend to show the time when the Vedic rituals first began to be performed and the historical references tend to point to the time when these were completed. So far as can be judged at present these works took a full thousand years if not more for their development into the present form. There are reasons for this hypothesis that these Brāhmaṇas were begun before the time of the Pāṇḍavas and finished after their time. But the date of the Pāṇḍavas has not yet been finally settled—the first researchers, Sir William Jones, Buchanan, Wilford and Davis in the early part of the nineteenth century came to the conclusion that the Pāṇḍavas flourished about 1400 to 1200 B. C.; Pargiter's estimate is, that they lived about 950 B. C.; whereas the orthodox Hindu views are (1) that the date of the Pāṇḍavas was 3102 B.C., the beginning of the astronomical Kali age, (2) that according to Varāhamihira, the astronomer, it was 2449 B. C., which marked the beginning of a distinct era known as Yudhiṣṭhira's era, (3) while according to the Purāṇic astronomer they lived about 1471 B.C.¹

In the present paper we shall, from the astronomical references, try to find the superior limit to the date when the Brāhmaṇas began to be composed. These references have not yet been interpreted in a way which seems to be very logical. The present interpretation of these references will lead to discussions which may finally settle the date of the beginning of the Brāhmaṇas, as also the time of the Pāṇḍavas.

Astronomical References

There are many astronomical references in the Brāhmaṇas which are collected in Dikṣita's work *Bhāratīya-Jyotiḥśāstra*, pp. 12-69.

¹ The faulty and inconsistent dynastic lists of the Magadhan kings in the Purāṇas make the time of the Pāṇḍavas as lying between 1950 and 2250 B.C. Cf. Pargiter's *Dynasties of the Kali Age*, pp. 14-18 also pp. 68-69.

Some important references were noted by Weber. We shall use only those references which indicate the positions of the solstices and the equinoxes at the earliest Brāhmaṇa period.

(a) The first reference for our use is from the *Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa*, XIX 3.

“On the new moon of Māgha he rests, being about to turn northwards; these also rest, being about to sacrifice with the introductory *Atirātra*; thus for the first time they obtain him; on him they lay hold with the *Caturriṃśa*; that is why the laying hold rite has its name. He goes north for six months; him they follow with six-day periods in forward arrangement. Having gone north for six months he stands still being about to turn southwards; these also rest, being about to sacrifice with the *Viśvant* day; thus for the second time they obtain him. He goes south for six months; they follow with six-month periods in reverse order. Having gone south for six months he stands still, being about to sacrifice with the *Mahā-rata* day; thus for the third time they obtain him. In that they obtain him thrice, and the year is in three ways arranged. Verily (it serves) to obtain the year. With regard to this this sacrificial verse is sung.

Ordaining the days and nights,
Like a cunning spider,
For six months south constantly,
For six north the sun goeth

For six months he goes north, six south. They should not consecrate themselves at this time; the corn has not arrived, the days are short; shivering they come out from the final bath. Therefore they should not consecrate themselves at this time. They should consecrate themselves one day after the new moon of *Caitra*; the corn has come, the days are long, not shivering they come out from the final bath. Therefore that is the rule.”² (Keith's translation).

² स वै माघस्यामावास्यायामुपवसत्युदङ्ङावत्स्यन्नुपेमे ऋमन्ति प्रायणीयेनातिरात्रेण यक्ष्य-
माणास्तदेनं प्रथममाप्नुवन्ति तं चतुर्विंशेनारभन्ते तदारम्भणीयस्यारम्भणीयत्वं स षणमा-
सानुदङ्ङेति तमूर्ध्वैः षडहैरनुयन्ति स षणमासानुदङ्ङित्वा तिप्रते दक्षिणावत्स्यन्नुपेमे
वसन्ति वैशुवतीयेनाहा यक्ष्यमाणास्तदेनं द्वितीयमाप्नुवन्ति स षणमासान्—दक्षिणैति तमावृत्तैः
षडहैरनुयन्ति स षणमासान्दक्षिणो त्वातिप्रत उदङ्ङावत्स्यन्नुपेमे माहाव्रतीयेनाहा यक्ष्य-

From this passage we gather that at the new moon of *Māgha* the sun arrived at the winter solstice, and at the new moon of *Caitra* the winter was over—that the length of the winter was two months from the winter solstice.

The new moon of *Māgha* is the new moon which follows the full moon at the *Maghā*. We shall take *Maghā* to mean the star α Leonis or Regulus, as a *Nakṣatra*, at the time of the Brāhmaṇas, meant a star group and not one-twentyseventh part of the ecliptic.

(b) There is another reference in the *Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa*, V, i.

“Next as to the four monthly sacrifices. He who prepares the four monthly sacrifices, begins on the full moon night in the *Phalgunīs*. The full moon night of the *Phalgunīs* is the beginning of the year; the latter two *Phalgunīs* are the beginning, the former two the end. Just as the two ends of what is round may unite, so these two ends of the year are connected.”³ (Keith's translation).

From this passage we gather that at the full moon at the *Uttara Phalgunī* (β Leonis) marked the beginning of the year; the full moon at the *Pūrva Phalgunī* (δ Leonis) marked the last day (or night) of the year. *Uttara Phalgunīs* (β Leonis and β Virgo) were the head and the *Pūrva Phalgunīs* (δ and θ Leonis) were the tail of the year and that the head and the tail were coincident.

मणास्तदेनं नृतायमाप्नुवन्ति तं यत्तिराप्नुवन्ति वेधा विहितो वै संवत्सरः संवत्सरस्यैवान्यं तदुतैषापि यज्ञगाथा गीयते ।

अहोरात्राणि विदधद् ऊर्णा वा इव धीर्यः
षण्मासो दक्षिणा नित्यः षड्दङ्ङेति सूर्यः ।

इति षड्द्वेष उदङ्मासानेति षड्दक्षिणा तद्वै न तस्मिन् काले दीक्षेरन्नागतं सस्यं भवति दहरकाश्यहानि भवन्ति संवेपमाना अबभृथादुदायन्ति तस्मादत्र न दीक्षेरन्धैवस्यामावास्याया एकाह उपरिष्टाद् दीक्षेरन्नागतं सस्यं भवति महान्त्यहानि भवन्त्यसंवेपमाना अबभृथादुदायन्ति तस्मादेतत् स्थितम् ।

कौषीतकि ब्राह्मणम्, अध्याय १६।३

³ अथातश्चातुर्मास्यानां चातुर्मास्यानि प्रयुञ्जानः फाल्गुन्यां पौर्णमास्यां प्रयुञ्क्ते मुखं वा एतत्संवत्सरस्य यत् फाल्गुनी पौर्णमासी मुखमुस्तरे फल्गू पुच्छं पूर्वं तद्यथा प्रवृत्तस्यान्तौ समेतौ स्यातामेवमेवैतौ संवत्सरस्यान्तौ समेतौ ।

कौषीतकि ब्राह्मणम् अध्याय ५।१।

What was then, the exact beginning of the year? Does this beginning mean the vernal equinox or the winter solstice?

A similar beginning of the year is stated in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*⁴ and also in the *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*.⁵

The first passage quoted by us says that the sun arrived at the winter solstice at the new noon of Māgha; this we have taken on the authority of some very learned Vedic scholars, as the new moon following the full moon at the star Regulus. A fortnight later the sun would undoubtedly arrive at some point diametrically opposite to a point lying between the stars δ and β Leonis. Hence our passage (a) shows that somewhere between δ and β Leonis lay the summer solstitial point at that time. This is in full agreement with our passage (b) quoted above: when the full moon took place at the star δ Leonis it was the last night of the year and the full moon at the star β Leonis marked the first night of the new year.

(c) Again in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, Kāṇḍa II, Chapter I, Br. 2, 3, we have

“These (Kṛttikās) do not swerve from the east, all other stars swerve from the east.”⁶

This means that the Kṛttikās rose exactly at the east or that the declination of the star η Tauri or Alcyone was nil.

The star η Tauri has a north celestial latitude, hence the vernal equinoctial point was by some degrees ahead of this star. We shall now see that all these statements are consistent in the sense in which we have understood them.

Determination of the solstices at the earliest Brāhmaṇa age and its date: In 1931 the mean celestial longitudes of the following stars are given below:—

Star	Celestial long.	Celestial lat.
Kṛttikā or Alcyone	59° 1' 44"	4° 2' 26"
Rohiṇī or Aldebaran	68° 49'	
Maghā or Regulus	148° 53' 14"	
P. Phalgunī or δ Leonis	160° 22"	
U. Phalgunī or β Leonis	170° 38'	

4 6 Prapā, 2, 1, 18, or Ch. 6, 2, 2 18; Weber's *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, Eggeling's translation VI Kāṇḍa, 2 Adhyāya, 2 Br., 18.

5 *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*, 1, 1, 2, 8.

6 एता ह वै प्राच्यै दिशो न च्यवन्ते । सर्वाणि ह वाऽन्यानि नक्षत्राणि प्राच्यै दिशश्च्यवन्ते ।

According to the first passage the sun reached the winter solstice a fortnight after the full moon at the star Maghā or Regulus.

In 1931 the mean long. of Regulus = $148^{\circ}53'14''$

„ the position in long. of the Sun

at full moon at Maghā = $328^{\circ}53'14''$

Sun's motion in half a

synodic month ... = $14^{\circ}33'10''$

Hence in 1931, the long. of the Winter Solstitial

point of the Brāhmaṇas = $343^{\circ}26'24''$

The present long. of the Summer Solstice of

the Brāhmaṇas... ... = $163^{\circ}26'24''$

The present long. of the δ Leonis ... = $160^{\circ}22'$

It appears that the indicated summer solstice of the Brāhmaṇas is 3° ahead of the star δ Leonis.

Again from the third passage taking the obliquity of the ecliptic at the time of the Brāhmaṇas to have been 24° , we get the result that when the Kṛttikās rose exactly at the east, the vernal equinox was $9^{\circ}1'$ ahead of the Kṛttikās. Now the longitude of the Kṛttikās in 1931 was $59^{\circ}1'44''$; hence the present longitude of the vernal equinox of the Brāhmaṇas is $68^{\circ}2'44''$ and that the present longitude of the summer solstitial point of the Brāhmaṇas = $158^{\circ}2'44''$, which is about $2^{\circ}20'$ behind the star δ Leonis.

As pointed out above that from the passage (a) the summer solstice falls 3° ahead of the same star. None of these statements are to be taken as exactly accurate; we thus infer that the Brāhmaṇa summer solstitial point very nearly coincided with the star δ Leonis whose mean longitude in 1931 was $160^{\circ}26'$ nearly, and that the total shifting of the equinoxes $70^{\circ}26'$ which at the rate of 72 years per degree corresponds to 5071 years and the earliest date of the Brāhmaṇas is 3141 B. C. The date of the beginning of the astronomical Kali age is curiously enough 3102 B. C. Thus the earliest date of the Brāhmaṇas practically coincides with the beginning of the astronomical Kali age.

Position of the Vernal equinox

Now Long. of δ Leonis in 1931	$160^{\circ}26'$
„ „ α Tauri „ „	$68^{\circ}49'$
Difference ...	$91^{\circ}37'$

Here we come across with a peculiar situation of the Brāhmaṇa vernal equinoctial *colure*, coinciding very nearly with the star Rohiṇī or α Tauri. In the *Mahābhārata*, Vanaparva, Ch. 230,

Stanza 10, we have it recorded that the "Rohiṇī become the first star", when the 28th nakṣatra was omitted from the total number of nakṣatras.

We have thus shown that the three passages from the Brāhmaṇas are consistent and that all point to the conclusion that the Brāhmaṇa summer solstice coincided with the star Pūrva Phalguni or δ Leonis and that the vernal equinox was near about the star Rohiṇī or Aldebaran, that the earliest date of the Brāhmaṇas was the same as the beginning of the astronomical Kali age or 3102 B. C.

Weber and Prey—their misinterpretations

Weber, as we learn from Eggeling's translation of the *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa*, part III, p. 179, held the view that in the older division of the year the first or spring season began with the month of Phālguna, that is the month when the full-moon is in conjunction with the Uttara Phalgunī. We beg to differ from him. It is definitely stated in passage (a) that the spring set in with the new moon of Caitra i. e. half a synodic month later than the full moon at the star Spica or Citrā. Again spring was not always the first season of the year. It was the first season for the Gavāmayana sacrifices, whereas in the performances of the Cāturmasya sacrifices winter (the two months following the winter solstice) was undoubtedly regarded as the first season of the year.⁷ In some cases the sacrifices were also begun one day after the new moon of Caitra as quoted in passage (a) above. This was undoubtedly the beginning of the spring, and one month after that was the equinoctial day. Now Caitra was the synodic month of which the full moon took place at the star Citrā or Spica; the new moon of Caitra happened half a synodic month after this full moon.

The long. of Spica in 1931 = $202^{\circ}53'41''$

Sun's motion in $\frac{1}{2}$ synodic
month = $14^{\circ}33'10''$ (i)

Sun's motion in (30 + 1) or
31 days = $30^{\circ}33'14''$ (ii)

The sun's long. at opposition
at Spica in 1931 = $22^{\circ}53'41''$ (iii)

Sum of (i) (ii) and (iii) = $68^{\circ}0'5''$

This result is practically the same as what we obtained as the long. in 1931 of the vernal equinoctial point of the Brāhmaṇas, in our

⁷ *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa*, Kāṇḍa II, Ch. 6, Br. 3, 11-12.

determination on the basis that "the Kṛttikās do not swerve from the east."

From what has been shown above according to the *Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa*, spring was the best season for beginning of sacrifices, and spring may be mentioned in many places as the first season. But we do not find any reason for connecting the full moon day of Phālguna with the beginning of spring; in that case the the full moon day of Caitra would be the equinoctial day which would make the time of the Brāhmaṇas about 300 A.D., a result which is admitted on all hands as impossible. Hence Weber's interpretation does not appear justifiable.

Winternitz has quoted the authority of Prof. Prey who opines that the statement that "the Kṛttikās never swerve from the east" corresponds to 1100 B. C. at Kurukṣetra.⁸ With due deference to Prof. Prey we venture to say that we cannot agree with him. In our opinion that explanation alone is valid which will hold equally for all the three statements we have quoted above. Prof. Prey's explanation could not possibly make consistent all these astronomical references in the Brāhmaṇas, as ours has done.

We are thus led to the conclusion that the Brāhmaṇas began at about the beginning of the astronomical Kali Yuga or 3102 B. C. This therefore is the superior limit to the date of the Brāhmaṇas.

The lower limit to the date of the Brāhmaṇas

We now turn to the other or the lower limit to the date of the Brāhmaṇas. Both the *Aitareya* and the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇas* mention the names of Janamejaya Pārikṣita and Satānika Sūtrājita.⁹ Hence the Brāhmaṇas were completed after the time of the Pāṇḍavas. The Pāṇḍavas again were prior to the time of *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*. This Upaniṣad mentions the name of Kṛṣṇa as the son of Devakī: "Ghora Āngirasa, after having communicated this (view of the sacrifice) to Kṛṣṇa, the son of Devakī¹⁰ etc." (Max Müller). As to the time of the Upaniṣads, we

8 Winternitz's *History of Indian Literature*, vol. I, p. 298.

9 *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, IV, VIII, 21 also *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, XIII, Kāṇḍa, V, 4, 2.

10 तद्वत्तदुधोर आङ्गिरसः कृष्णाय देवकीपुत्रायोक्त्वावाचापिपास ।

Chāndogya III, 17th Khaṇḍa (268)6. See also Max Müller's translation of the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, p. 52. The *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* also mentions a king

have a passage in the *Maitrāyaṇī Upaniṣad*, VI, which runs as follows:—

“It has been also said elsewhere; food is the cause of all this (world of living beings), and time of food. The sun is the cause of the time; and nature of time is made up of the space-moments etc.,—composed of twelve months, identical with the year. One half thereof belongs to Agni, one half to Varuṇa. Again the half commencing with the asterism Maghā and (ending with) the half of Sraviṣṭhā belongs to Agni, while the sun performs his southern journey; the half in the inverse order beginning with the constellation (Aśleṣā) sacred to the serpents and ending with the other half of Sraviṣṭhā belongs to the moon (Soma), while the sun performs his northern journey.”¹¹ (Cowell).

This passage indicates that at the time of the *Maitrī Upaniṣad*, the summer solstice coincided with the first point of the constellation Maghā. According to our oldest system of nakṣatra division as given in the *Pañca Siddhāntikā*, this constellation of Maghā had its beginning at 6° behind the star Regulus.

In 1931 the long. of Regulus = 148° 53' 14".

Hence the shifting of the summer solstice from that time till 1931 A.D. = 148° 53' 14" - 6° - 90° = 52° 53' 14".

This corresponds to 1880 B.C. nearly.

Hence as the time of the Pāṇḍavas is earlier than the time of the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*—which again being earlier than the *Maitrī Upaniṣad*, it may be inferred that the Pāṇḍavas must have lived before the date we have arrived at viz., 1880 B. C.

Thus we are inclined to take the age of the Brāhmaṇas as the period between 3102 and 2000 B.C.

In the next paper we propose to show that the summer solstice at the time of the Pāṇḍavas passed through the star Regulus itself.

PRABODH CHANDRA SEN-GUPTA

of Kāśī named Brahmadata Caikitāneya, I, 3, 24. Cakitana is mentioned in the *Mahābhārata*, Bk. VI, Ch. 25, 5, or the *Gītā*. Ch. I, 5. This Brahmadata of Kāśī may be the son of Cakitāna of the *Mbh*. It is therefore not unlikely that this Upaniṣad is also later in time than the Pāṇḍavas.

¹¹ अथान्यात्राप्युक्तमन्नं वा अस्य सर्वस्य योनिः कालश्चाग्नस्य सूर्यो योनिः कालस्य तस्यैतद् रूपं यन्निमेषादिकालात् सम्भृतं द्वादशात्मकं वत्सरमेतस्याग्नेयमर्द्धमर्द्धं वासुणं मघाद्यं श्रविष्ठाद्दान्तमाग्नेयं क्रमेणोत्क्रमेण सार्पाद्यं श्रविष्ठाद्दान्तं सौम्यम् ।



JUNAGAD UNDER THE GIRNAR HILL



- (1) The conical rock, about 12' high, with the Aśokan and other inscriptions, on the way to the Girnār Hill.
- (2) The probable site of the Sudarśana lake.
- (3) The Girnār peak.

Location of Kṛṣṇa's Capital Dvāravatī*

In the present state of archæological exploration in India, archæological evidences (leaving aside those for the Indus civilization) for the political history of India prior to Buddha appear to be almost totally absent. We are fairly well-acquainted with the picture of northern India of Buddha's time. We see in it quite a number of kingdoms, large and small, with teeming and cultured population; and big towns and cities with numerous buildings in stone and brick, and citizens prosperous, energetic and gay; and merchants with fabulous riches. I hope no one will contend that all these had a past and they must have taken millenniums to develop. Why, then, are archæological evidences not forthcoming? Are archæological evidences of the existence of Indian kings and Indian civilization previous to the 6th century B.C. totally absent? In answer, we must repeat the wail of the late Dr. V. A. Smith and say:—"Very little has been done yet to reveal the secrets of the most ancient sites in India." (*Early History of India*, 3rd ed., p. 31 fn.). The exploration of Girivraja, capital of Jarāsandha, was given only a preliminary handling by Sir John Marshall and the report published in the *ASIAR.*, 1905-6. In 1912-13, Mr. Jackson carried out some private reconnaissance of this pre-historic city and published the results of his survey with a map in the *ASIAR.*, 1913-14. This is all that archæology has done for this far-famed site so intimately associated with the heroes of the *Mahābhārata*,—a site pre-eminently suited for excavation and exploration, because it is entirely free from the obstruction of human habitations. Has any serious attempt been made to copy or decipher "the long rambling inscription" in curious shell characters in the Bawan Ganga defile, on the spot which is still pointed out as the arena on which Bhīma and Jarāsandha fought with each other? Even the publication of a faithful and accurate copy of this curious inscription and thereby placing the puzzle before the eyes of the students of

* Read at the Seventh Oriental Conference, Baroda, 29th December, 1933.

epigraphy, has not been considered a necessity. The only representation of this inscription available appears to be the small photograph published on p. 120 of Mr. Muhammad Hamid Kurashi's book on the monuments of Bihar and Orissa (*Archæological Survey of India*, New Imperial Series, vol. LI). The same story can be told of Indraprastha and other Paurāṇic sites.

In the absence of archæological evidence, we have no other course but to fall back on the Purāṇa literature for the location and identification of Purāṇic sites. The materials, though meagre and unsatisfactory, yield important information. In this paper, our object is to locate the site of Dvāravatī, (Dwaraka)—to which place the Yādavas migrated for safety from Jarāsandha's aggression, after having left Mathurā in a body.

That the present Dwārakā situated on the apex of the Kāthiāwād peninsula is a rather modern place with plagiarised sanctity, is well-known. It is also well-known that Kṛṣṇa's Dwārakā was engulfed by the sea soon after his death, and the site is still known as Mūla-Dwārakā on the sea, about 22 miles east of Prabhāsapattana or Somnāth.

Our earliest and most trustworthy source of information regarding the location of Dwārakā is the *Mahābhārata*, in which there are certain indications which hardly fit in with the situation of Dwārakā on the sea-shore, about 22 miles east of Somnāth and about 60 miles south of the Raivataka or Girṇār Hills.

The first detailed notice of the migration of the Yādavas from Mathurā to Dvāravatī is to be found in the 14th Chapter of the Sabhāparva, where Kṛṣṇa recounts before Yudhīsthira the oppression of Jarāsandha on the Yādavas and their consequent migration to Dvāravatī. The passage is worth quoting in extenso:—

इति सञ्चिन्त्य सर्व्वेस्म प्रतीचीं दिशमाश्रिताः ।

कुरास्थलीं पुरीं रम्यां रैवतेनोपशोभिताम् ॥

ततो निवेशं तस्याश्च कृतवन्तो वयं नृप ।

तथैव दुर्गसंस्कारं देवैरपि दुरासदम् ।

स्त्रीयोऽपि यस्यां युध्येयुः किमु वृष्णिमहारथाः ।

तस्यां वयममित्तन्न निवसामोऽकुतोभयाः ॥

आलोच्य गिरिमुख्यं तं मागधं तीर्णमेव च ।
 माधवाः कुरुशार्दूल परां मुदमवाप्नुवन् ॥
 एवं वयं जरासन्धादभितः कृतकिल्बिषाः ।
 सामर्थ्यवन्तः सम्बन्धाद्गोमन्तं समुपाश्रिताः ॥
 त्रियोजनायतं सद्य त्स्किन्धं योजनावधि ।
 योजनान्ते शतद्वारं वीरविक्रमतोरणम् ॥

* * * *

वयश्चैव महाराज जरासन्भभयात् तदा ।
 मथुरां संपरित्यज्य गता द्वारवतीं पुरीं ॥

A free translation of this passage is given below :—

“Having ruminated thus, we fled towards the west to the beautiful town of Kuśasthalī, the beauty of which was enhanced by the hill Raivataka. After having settled there, we repaired the fort of the place and made it invulnerable even to the gods. The women even can defend the place, not to speak of the great heroes of the Vṛṣṇi race. We are now living there and know no fear. Having observed the strong position of the great hill and thinking that we have at last escaped danger from the king of Magadha, my people are now exceedingly glad. Thus, suffering injury from Jarāsandha, we, though quite able to defend ourselves, have thought it discreet to take shelter under the Gomanta, i.e. Raivataka hill. The hill is three *Yojanas* in extent, has three peaks, each at the interval of a *Yojana*, and has 100 passes at the end of each *Yojana* where the gates are the valour of the heroes. Thus we, O Mahārāja, left Mathurā out of fear from Jarāsandha and went over to the city of Dvāravatī.”

From this important passage, the following points stand out clearly :—

(i) Kuśasthalī and Dvāravatī are two names of the same town and it was under the shadow of the Raivataka or Gomanta hill, and protected by it.

(ii) The town existed even before the migration of the Yādavas and was evidently lying forsaken.

(iii) There was a very strong fort there, which the Yādavas

repaired. With repairs, it became so strong that even women could fight under its protection.

(iv) The Raivataka hill was three *Yojanas* in extent. Taking four miles to a *Yojana*, the extent was about 12 miles. The extent of the Raivataka hill is given as 12 × 12 miles on modern Survey Maps also.

(v) There is no indication that this original Dvāravatī was on the sea.

This passage of the Sabhāparva is fairly conclusive and shows that the original Dvāravatī was situated very near the Raivataka hills. Certain passages in the Ādiparva also support this conclusion.

The Pāṇḍavas received possession of half their ancestral kingdom and settled in Indraprastha. Soon after, Arjuna had to go on a voluntary exile for breaking the conditions regarding visit to Draupadī. After visiting all the holy places of Eastern India, he wended his way towards the west by the coast of the Indian Ocean and ultimately arrived at Prabhāsa, the situation of which is well-known, on the southern coast of Saurāṣṭra. The Yādavas had already migrated there and were at that time settled in Saurāṣṭra, ruling with their capital at Dvāravatī. Kṛṣṇa had contracted a firm friendship for his cousin Arjuna when they met at the time of the *Svayamvara* of Draupadī. When news reached Kṛṣṇa that Arjuna was on an all-India tour and had arrived at Prabhāsa, he hurried there to meet him. After spending some pleasant time in this fascinating sea-side *tīrtha*, Kṛṣṇa took him to the Raivataka hill, where a charming residence had already been prepared for the reception of Arjuna. Thence he was taken to Dvāravatī, where he resided happily for a long time.

The Raivataka or the present Gīrnār hill is about 50 miles north of Prabhāsa-pattana or Somnāth. The site of the Dvāravatī-on-the-sea is only 22 miles direct east of Somnāth. If Dvāravatī at this period had been situated on the sea, Kṛṣṇa certainly would have taken him there first and then to the pleasure resort on the Raivataka. First going 50 miles northwards to Raivataka and then again returning more than the same distance to reach Dvāravatī is a curious peregrination and can only be explained by the fact that in approaching Dvāravatī from the south, Raivataka lay on the way, and so Kṛṣṇa made Arjuna halt there on one of its pleasure resorts. This movement of Kṛṣṇa and

Arjuna from Prabhāsa to Raivataka and then to Dvāravatī certainly indicates that Dvāravatī at this period was not on the seashore, but near Raivataka.

The story of the abduction of Subhadrā appears to lead to the same conclusion.

The *Raivataka-Yātrā* or the festival of the visit to Raivataka takes place in the month of Phālguna in modern times. The festival seems to be as old as the *Mahābhārata* and we meet with a vivid description of it in the 220th Chapter of the Ādiparva. Palaces were erected in the dales and valleys of the Raivataka hill and stocked with all objects of enjoyment. The Yādavas,—men and women, young and old, gaily attired, streamed to the hill. Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna were also in the crowd and there the heart of Arjuna was captivated by the beautiful maiden, Subhadrā, half-sister of Kṛṣṇa. Arjuna, under the advice of Kṛṣṇa, resolved to carry the girl away forcibly and marry her. As the festival extended over a number of days, there was enough time and a fast courier was despatched to Yudhiṣṭhira at Indraprastha, asking for his permission to so bold a venture. The loving Yudhiṣṭhira of course promptly gave the permission and Arjuna made himself ready for the romantic adventure. The festival of the Raivataka-hill was still on and Subhadrā had gone as usual on a visit to the Raivataka. She had finished worshipping the sacred hill and was returning towards Dwārakā when Arjuna suddenly seized her, lifted her on his own chariot and started for Indraprastha, as fast as he could. The guards of Subhadrā immediately carried the news of the sensational abduction to Dwārakā and immediately the alarm clarion was sounded and a war-council of the Yādavas hurriedly summoned. On the advice of Kṛṣṇa, however, they decided to condone Arjuna's abuse of Yādava hospitality and marry Subhadrā to Arjuna.

Now, if Dvāravatī at this period had been situated on the sea, 60 miles south of the Raivataka hill, the whole episode would have been differently described. The abduction of Subhadrā just after she had finished her pious acts of worship on the Raivataka and was proceeding towards Dvāravatī, and the immediate carriage of the news to Dvāravatī show that the city must have been located at this period near the Raivataka hills.

But when we meet with Dvāravatī again in the Maṣalaparva of the *Mahābhārata*, we find it undoubtedly situated on the sea. After the catastrophic Maṣala strife and after the death of Kṛṣṇa and Balarām, Arjuna led the remnants of the Yādava hosts with the Yādava women and children out of Dvāravatī, and the sea engulfed it. So the present Mūla-Dwārakū appears to have been the second site of Dvāravatī and not the original site.

For purposes of historical investigation, the apocryphal *Harivaṃśa* is a rather confused literary source, undoubtedly later and less authoritative than the *Mahābhārata*. But even this book yields useful information.

A genealogy of the kings who reigned in Saurāṣṭra previous to the Yādava occupation is given in chapters X and XI of the *Harivaṃśa*. The progenitor was the Vaivasvata Manu. His son was Prāṃśu. Prāṃśu had a son Saryāti by name. Saryāti's son was Anartta who gave his name to the whole country of Saurāṣṭra, so that it is also called the country of Anartta. Anartta's son was Reva, who is recorded to have inherited the kingdom of Anartta and the city Kuśasthalī or Dvāravatī. This would show that Dvāravatī existed before Reva's inheritance. Reva's son was Raivata, who gave his name to the famous Raivataka hill, now known by the name of Girnār. He was fond of music. The *Harivaṃśa* records that he took his daughter Revatī along with him and went over to Brahmāloka to listen to Brahmā's music. In his absence, his sons were driven out from Kuśasthalī or Dvāravatī by Rākṣasas and they were forced to take shelter in different countries. Thus Dvāravatī was left desolate and the valiant Yādavas, under the leadership of Kṛṣṇa, had no difficulty in occupying the capital and the country.

This account, shorn of Raivata's journey to Brahmāloka, (which may be only some place near about, famous as the seat of a reputed professor of music), sounds perfectly historical. It also agrees with the account of the *Mahābhārata* and explains how the Yādavas obtained possession of a ready-made city and had only to repair the strong fort there to convert it into a formidable stronghold against aggressors. That this Dvāravatī was close to the Raivataka hills is seen from the 112th, 113th and 115th chapters of the *Harivaṃśa*, which give details

about the migration of the Yādavas from Mathurā. Unfortunately, there is a confusion in these passages between the Dvāravatī by the Raivataka hill and Dvāravatī on the sea. But there are some passages which can apply only to the Dvāravatī near Raivataka.

Kṛṣṇa, anticipating that Jarāsandha would not allow them to stay peacefully in Mathurā, was on the look-out for a new settlement. Garuḍa, his attendant, had informed him that the city of Kuśasthalī which belonged to Raivata and which had been taken forcible possession of by the Rākṣasas, was now lying forsaken, as the Rākṣasas had gone away. Garuḍa suggested that this city might provide a safe retreat for the Yādavas and he went with Kṛṣṇa's approval to reconnoitre the place. On his return, he reported favourably and suggested,—

रैवतं च गिरि श्रेष्ठं कुरु देव सुरालयम् ।

नन्दनप्रतिमं दिव्यं पुरद्वारस्य भूषणम् ॥ ११२।११०

“Do thou make the excellent hill Raivataka the house of gods, equal in excellence to paradise, the jewel beautifying the exit from your city.”

This shows that the exit from Dvāravatī was guarded by the Raivataka hill.

When the Yādavas migrated from Mathurā and arrived in Saurāṣṭra, they met a vast country, sea-girt and with copper-coloured sand and soil:—

तत्र रैवतको नाम पर्वतो नातिदूरतः ।

मन्दरोदरशिखरः सर्वतोऽभिविराजते ॥

तत्रैकलव्यसंवासो द्रोणेनाभ्युसितश्चिरम् ।

प्रभूतपुरुषोपेत सर्वरत्नसमाकुलः ।

विहारभूमिस्तत्रैव तस्य राज्ञः सुनिर्मिता ।

नाम्ना द्वारवती नाम स्वायताष्टापदोपमा ॥

केशवेन मतिक्रान्तं पुर्यथे विनिवेशिता ।

निवेशं तत्र सैन्यानां रोचयन्ति स्म यादवाः ॥

“Not far was the hill Raivataka, looking fine with high peaks like the Mandara in all aspects. On that hill, thickly populated and containing all sorts of jewels, Drona lived for a long while and

Ekalavya too. That king built a spacious pleasure resort there like a dice-board, and that received the name of Dvāravatī. Kṛṣṇa resolved to make that his city and the Yūdavas also approved of garrisoning it." (112+27-30).

This passage certainly cannot apply to Dvāravatī-on-sea.

Chapter 115th of the *Harivaṃśa* describes the building of Dvāravatī by Kṛṣṇa. Chapter 155 again describes the building of Dvāravatī. The first description shows that Kṛṣṇa had practically finished building Dvāravatī, when he thought of Viśvakarmā as the proper architect for such a work. Viśvakarmā came and pronounced the place too cramped and wanted to reclaim spacious land from the sea and then build Dvāravatī. The second description gives the following boundaries for Dvāravatī.

On the east, the Raivataka hill.

On the south, the creeper-begirt forest of Pañcavarṇa.

On the west, a forest of small trees, looking like a rainbow.

On the north, the Venumān hills.

It is evident that Dvāravatī on the sea, which is sixty miles south of the Raivataka hill, can never have the Raivataka hill on the east. This can apply only to some city directly on the west of the Raivataka. And, the record of the building of Dvāravatī twice appears only to be a rather confused reflection of the fact that the Dvāravatī was originally situated near the Girnār hill and a second Dvāravatī was built on the sea afterwards.

Now let us take the aid of archæology and the accounts of Hiuen Tsang.

1. Hiuen Tsang (640 A.D.), records about the capital of Saurāṣṭra thus:—"Not far from the city is a mountain called Yuh-chen-to (Ujjayanta) on the top of which is a Saṅghārāma. The cells and galleries have mostly been excavated from the mountain side." Beal, vol. II, p. 269.

So, close to the Ujjayanta=Raivataka=Girnār hill, a city existed when Hiuen Tsang visited Saurāṣṭra.

2. The famous inscribed rock half-a-mile east of the walls of the city of Junāgaḍ, contains, as is well-known, the 14 Rock Edicts of Aśoka, as well as two other inscriptions,—one, of the time of Skandagupta.

and the other of the time of the Śaka Satrap Rudradāman. These inscriptions (Fleet's *Gupta Inscriptions*, p. 56; *Epigraphia Indica*, vol. VIII, pp. 36ff.) tell us of a city near the site of these inscriptions. Rudradāman's inscription gives the name of the city as Girinagara, a name which still survives in the modern name Girnār, given to the hill Raivataka. This inscription recounts the interesting history that a large tank called the Sudarsana was formed at the time of Maurya Candragupta (313-290 B.C.) by damming up some streams rising on the Raivataka and these dams were strengthened at the time of Aśoka Maurya.

We know of only one city near the Girnār hills, and that is the present Junāgaḍ.

The antiquity of the place is written on its very face,—on its noble fort which goes by the name of Uparkoṭ and dominates the surrounding plains of Kathiāwāḍ. The discovery of an inscription of the time of the son of Rudradāman at the Uparkoṭ fort which begins: "Here, in Girinagara,.....," (Burgess: *Report on the Antiquities of Kathiāwāḍ and Cutch*, p. 140) is an additional corroboration. Girinagara and Junāgaḍ must be identical and Prof. Altekar has also taken that view. (*Ancient Towns and Cities in Gujaraṭ and Kathiāwāḍ*, p. 20).

I quote below two descriptions of the fort at Uparkoṭ.—

"The old citadel is built upon an elevation (cf. the name Girinagara), of the limestone which appears to cap over the granite at the base of the hills; and on which the city of Junāgaḍ is situated. The Uparkot is a noble specimen of eastern fortification. its walls being unusually high, with immense bastions. The materials for these have been taken from a wide and deep ditch, which has been scarped all round it. There is only one gateway and narrow entrance from the westward.....Lieut. Postans, *JASB.*, 1838, p. 874).

".....The fort at Junāgaḍ, now known as the Uparkot. This fort lies on a most commanding position in the town of Junāgaḍ and about one and a half miles west of the koly Girnār hill. Its massive walls and strong defences must have made it a very formidable stronghold to attack before the days of artillery. From its walls, the whole country could be seen and in course of time, the town of Junāgaḍ came to be built round it, which in its turn was surrounded by a strongly

fortified wall thus making the citadel doubly secure." (Wilberforce-Bell, *History of Kathiāwād*, p. 55).

It has been shown that Junāgaḍ with its exceptionally strong fortification is the Girinagara of the Maurya times, standing a mile and a half west of the Raivataka hills. The history of the city thus goes from modern times to 300 B.C. Kṛṣṇa's original Dvāravatī, with its extraordinarily strong fortification, also stood west of the Raivataka. Though there is the difficulty of bridging the gulf of about a thousand years that separate Candragupta Maurya from Kṛṣṇa, it would not be wrong to come to the conclusion that modern Junāgaḍ, which was known as Girinagara in Kṣatrapa and Maurya times has been in existence from even remoter times and is the same city which the Yādavas occupied and knew as Dvāravatī.

And, very curiously, the present town of Junāgaḍ is actually shaped like a dice-board to which Dvāravatī is compared in the *Harivaṃśa*, with four elongated projections from a central square,—the northern, eastern and southern sides being clearly seen at a glance.

In Junāgaḍ, therefore, still stands almost in perfect condition a fort whose antiquity goes back to as early a time as that of the fortifications at Jarāsandha's capital Girivraja.

N. K. BHATTASALI

Taranatha's History of Buddhism*

(Translated from German Version of A. Schiefner with emendations)

XII

EVENTS OF THE TIME OF THE THIRD COLLECTION

After this time there lived in Kashmir a king Siṃha (*Sen. ge*) who took ordination (*rab. tu. byuñ = pravrajyā*) and assumed the name Sudarśana (*legs. mthoñ*). He obtained arhathood and taught the had heard law in Kashmir. When Kanishka, the king of Jalandhara, this (teaching), he became very believing, came to Kashmir, which lay to the north, heard the teaching from the venerable Siṃha-Sudarśana, showed great veneration to all the *caityas* of the north and entertained many times the Bhikṣusamgha of the four regions. At that time the bhikṣu Sañjayin (= *yan. dag rgyal*) having learnt much from an arhat, became influential, and obtained from the householders and brāhmaṇas ample provisions, and carried on religious discussions with 200,000 monks. At this time there took place (in the Saṅgha) the division into eighteen different schools but they lived together without much quarrel. In Kashmir there lived a Brāhmaṇa (called) Śūdra, possessing an inconceivable store of requisities (*yo. byad = pariṣkāra-Tr.*) (for mirians with his company of 5,000 bhikṣus, and thus spread the three school of Vaibhāṣika with his followers, and to the foremost of the Sautrāntikas (the monk called) Sthavira, highly respected by the Kashmirians with his company of 5,000 bhikṣus, and thus spread the three piṭakas widely. The Āgamas of the Sautrāntikas at this time were *Drṣṭāntamūlāgama* (*luñ. dpeñi. ḥphreñ. ba*), *Piṭakadharmamuṣṭi* (*sde. snod. ḥtjin. pa ḥi dpe. ḥkhyud*), etc. At this time there came from the east Ārya Pārśva who was an arhat and an accomplished scholar. He gave out the prophecy-(*vyākaraṇa*-)sūtra, the *Kāñcanamūlāvadāna*, which was preserved by some learned Sthaviras, and contained the dream

* Continued from *IHQ.*, vol. VIII, p. 252.

of king Kṛkin,¹ as well as several other very rare sūtras. When king Kanishka heard this, he gathered all bhikṣus in the Kuṇḍalavanavihāra (*sna. rgyan. nags kyi. gtsug. lag. khan*) of Kashmir, and prepared (as is said by the Kashmirians) the third collection of the words. Others however say that the collection took place in the Kuvana monastery in Jalandhara, and most scholars agree with this last view. According to the narratives of the Tibetans, 500 Arhats, 500 Bodhisattvas, 500 ordinary Paṇḍitas gathered together and prepared the collection; although this does not contradict the Mahāyānic view, the foremost Buddha-scholars, however, were at that time called 'Mahābhādanta' since the designation of Paṇḍita did not exist; for this reason the designation of 500 Paṇḍitas is not correct; more correct appears to be the tradition that Vasumitra and 400 bhādantas were present there as is stated on a page of "the abstract of a detailed history of the succession of the teachers," an Indian work, translated by hGos. gshon. nu. dpal. But also this Vasumitra should not be taken to be the same as the great teacher of the Vaibhāsikas. Further, as these persons had taken pains with regard to the teaching of the Srāvakas, it is well to suppose, in agreement with the history of the Srāvakas, that although it is said that 500 Arhants and 500 Tripiṭakadhara Mahābhādantas prepared the collection, 500 Arhants were added here in order to increase the importance of the teaching; in any case, however, the number of Arhants was less and that those who had attained the fruits, namely, the Srotāpannas, etc., made up the number of 500. Before the appearance of Mahādeva and Bhadra, the number of those who used to attain the fruits was great, but after these two had brought confusion into the teaching and a disruption had set in the number of those who attained fruits greatly decreased because the bhikṣus did not devote themselves to *yoga* but gave their thoughts to the strife. Therefore, the number of Arhants at the time of the third collection was small. Towards the end of the life-time of king Virāsena and during the whole period of the reign of kings Nanda and Mahāpadma, and at the beginning of the life-time of king Kanishka, i.e., during the life-time of these four kings, the schism in

1 For the dream, see Buxton, transl., I, p. 98.

the Saṃgha took place; the bitter quarrel lasted for 63 years but (calculating) with the earlier or later, this or that, the schism lasted nearly 100 years. When this strife was made up at the time of the third collection, all the eighteen schools were recognized as so many forms of teaching;² the *Vinaya* was put into writing, the *Sūtras* and the *Abhidharma*, which were in earlier times not put into writing, were so recorded, but that which had been recorded were purified. At this time there appeared among men all Mahāyāna texts, which some bhikṣus who had attained *anūtpattikadharmakṣānti* carried forward for a little while but as this did not spread very much the strife among the Śrāvakas ceased. The twelfth section: the events of the time of the third collection.

² Buxton, transl., I, p. 98.

XIII

EVENTS AT THE BEGINNING OF THE GREAT PROPAGATION OF MAHĀYĀNA

After the Third Collection had taken place and king Kanishka had died, there lived, in the north in the land of Aśmaṣarānta, to the west of Kashmir and near Tukhāra, a householder Jaṭi possessed of immeasurable wealth. He showed veneration to all *caityas* of the north. Inviting the Vaibhāsika-bhadanta Vasumitra, belonging to Maru, a country lying in the west, and Tukhāra-bhadanta Ghoṣaka, (*dbyans. sgrog.*), he maintained 300,000 monks for twelve years, and at last he had the wish to obtain the highest insight. As an indication of the fulfilment of his wish, the flowers given (by him) as offering remained unfaded for one year, and the lamp lasted as long; the sandal powder as well as the flowers flung away remained held up in the air, the earth quaked, musical sounds were heard, and so forth. In his Puṣkalāvati palaces, the son of king Kanishka maintained one hundred arhants and 10,000 bhikṣus continuously for five years; in the east in Kusumpura lived the brāhmaṇa Viduḥ, who made ready innumerable books of the Tripiṭaka and offered them as gifts to the bhikṣus. In each of the Tripiṭakas there were 100,000 ślokas, such 1,000 copies were prepared by him, and to each of these copies was attached (*spel. ba*=conjoined—Tr.) an offering of requisites in inconceivable quantities. In the town of Pāṭaliputra lived the Arhant Ārya Aśvagupta who had cast away astrology [*dus. mi sbyor*] and meditated upon the eight vimokṣas (*de. ni. rnam. par. thar. pa. brgyad. la. bsam. gtan. paḥo*). As he learned the teaching, Nandimitra and other Arhats by proper exertion (*ci. rigs = yathāyogaṃ*-Tr.) realised the truth in various ways. In the west lived the king Lakṣāśva who exerted considerably for the teaching of Buddha. In the south-west, in Saurāṣṭra there was a brāhmaṇa Kulika (*rigs. ldan*); when he heard that the Sthavira Arhat Nanda had comprehended the Mahāyāna teaching, he invited him in order to hear from him the Mahāyāna discourses. At this time appeared all at once in divergent regions numberless *Kalyāṇamītras* of Mahāyāna teaching; all these

had heard the teaching from Āryāvalokiteśvara, Guhyapati, Mañjuśrī, Maitreya, etc., and acquired the *Dharmasantāna-Samādhi* (*chos. kyi. rgyan. gyi. tiñ-ñe. ḥrtjin*); there appeared Mahābhaddanta Avitaraka, Vigatarāgadhvaja, Divyākara Gupta, Rāhulamitra, Jñānātala, the great upāsaka Saṅgatala and other teachers of the Law, 500 in number. At this time there were the *Ārya Ratnakūṭadharmaparyāyaśatusāhārikā* in 1,000 sections, *Āryāvataṃsaka* in 100,000 discourses and 100 chapters; *Ārya Laṅkāvatāra* in 25,000 ślokas, *Ghanavyūha* in 12,000 ślokas, *Dharmasaṅgīti* in 12,000 ślokas, and a number of other works being portions of the Sūtras procured from the gods, nāgas, gandharvas, rākṣasas and various other regions, but mostly from the land of nāgas.

The brāhmaṇa invited a number of these teachers; when the king Lakṣāśva heard this news, he became more faithful and wished to invite the 500 teachers of law. He asked the ministers how many teachers of law (*dharmadeśakā = chos. smra. ba*) there were, and was answered "five hundred" and how many hearers of the law, the answer was "five hundred."

The king thereupon thought that there were many teachers of law but few students (*slob. ma*). He therefore erected upon the top of Mt. Abhu, five hundred Vihāras to each of which he invited a preacher of the law (*dharmavācaka*) whom he provided with all requisites. From the pariṣad of the king himself, as many as five hundred persons with strong disposition took ordination (*pravrajyā*) and increased the number of students of Mahāyāna. Thereafter the king wished to have books written and enquired how many books formed the Mahāyāna piṭaka (*de. snod*). When he was told that generally, they cannot be measured but there were now 10 million ślokas, the king said that although so many, he wished to have them written down. He had them written down and gave them to the bhikṣus. Later on these works were taken to Śrī Nālandā. Thereafter these, 1500 bhikṣus who followed the Mahāyāna teachings composed numberless sūtras. They were of irresistible understanding, (*apratihatabuddhi = blo. gros. thogs. pa. med. pa*) and had developed faith (*kṣānti*) and were able to exhibit before the people their miraculous power and make a little display of higher knowledge (*abhijñā-vikrīḍā*). Thereafter the fame of Mahāyāna spread in all directions and as this did not please the Srāvakas, they declared that

the Mahāyāna teaching was not the word of Buddha because the followers of Mahāyāna applied their minds to meditation (*yogāvacara*), they took ordination (*pravrajyā*) according to the 18 different schools, and lived mostly with them. Though there were only a few Mahāyāna teachers among the thousands of Śrāvakas, yet the Śrāvakas could not suppress them. At that time there were in Magadha two brothers, the brāhmaṇas, Mudgaragomin Siddhapati and Śaṅkarapati who rendered offerings to the family deity Maheśvara but were nevertheless versed in the heterodox as well as orthodox systems. Mudgaragomin alone had doubts (*vicikitsā*) and held Maheśvara in honour; Śaṅkarapati on the other hand was very believingly devoted to Buddha. They procured for themselves on the advice of their mother the swift-footed (*kṣipra-pāṇī*) and betook themselves to the king of mountains,—Kailāśa. There in the abode of Maheśvara they perceived the white bull which he rode and the goddess Umā plucking flowers, etc. At last, they saw the god Maheśvara himself sitting on a lion and giving discourses. Gaṇeśa took them by the hand and seated them near Mahādeva. At that moment there came flying from the Mānasa Lake 500 Arhants. Mahādeva showed them veneration, washed their feet, entertained them and then heard their teachings. Although they now came to know that there were none superior in knowledge to Buddha, and Mahādeva also told them in reply to their question that the salvation could be obtained only through the Buddha-mārga and not through any other way. Full of joy they returned home, gave up their Brāhmaṇa dress, adopted the precepts of an upāsaka and thoroughly learnt the principles of all yānas. In order to distinguish between the merits and demerits of the believers in Buddha and Tīrthikas, Mudgaragomin composed the *Viśeṣastava* (*khyad. bar. du. hphags. rñhi. bstod. pa*) on the merits and Śaṅkarapati composed *Devātīśastotra*¹ (*lha. las. phul. du. byin. bar. bstod. pa*) and when these had spread to all market places and royal palaces, the people began mostly to recite them (i.e. the *stava* and the *stotra*). Mudgaragomin and his brother made provision for living requisites for 500 bhikṣus of the Śrāvaka (yāna) in Vajrāsana and for 500 Mahāyānists in Nālandā. It was Nālandā which was formerly the birth place of the venerable

1 Cf. *Buston, trans., II, p. 181.*

Śāriputra and it was also the place where he finally vanished from existence with 80,000 Arhants. In the meanwhile the Brāhmaṇa village became deserted and there remained only the caitya of the venerable Śāriputra to which king Aśoka made large offerings and built a great Buddha temple. When later on the first 500 Mahāyāna bhikṣus counselled together and came to know that they had delivered the Mahāyāna teaching at the place of Śāriputra they took it to be a sign that the teachings of the Mahāyānists would spread widely; but when they further learnt that the same was also the place of Maudgalyāyana, they took it to be a sign that the teaching would be very powerful; but the teaching did not prosper very well. Both the brāhmaṇa brothers and the teachers erected 8 Vihāras and placed there the works of the whole Mahāyāna teaching. Thus, (we see) that the first founder of Nālanda Vihāra was Aśoka, the developer of the place of learning was the 500 Ācāryas, Mudgaragomin and his brother, the next enlarger was Rāhulabhadra and the greatest expander was Nāgārjuna. The thirteenth section: events at the beginning of the great propagation of Mahāyāna.

XIV

EVENTS OF THE TIME OF THE BRAHMAṆA RAHULA

King Candanapāla was the ruler of Aparāntaka. This king is said to have lived 150 years and reigned for 120 years. He brought to the temples and the Saṅgha great offerings and it appears, according to the accounts, that no one rendered more services than him to the religion of Buddha. At that time the brāhmaṇa Indradhruva, friend of the king, after invoking the king of gods, received from him the science of words (Grammar). As it was written down as he delivered it, it was known by the name *Indravyākaraṇa*. It contains 25,000 ślokaṣ and the work is known as the grammar taught by the god. At the time when the king was appointed to the rulership, the great Ācārya and brāhmaṇa Rāhulabhadra came to Nālandā. He took ordination from paṇḍita Kṛṣṇa and learnt the Piṭakas of the Śrāvakas. Some, however, say that he was ordained by the Bhadanta Rāhulaprabha and that Kṛṣṇa was his paṇḍita (teacher). But this Kṛṣṇa is not the same as the one whose name occurs in the succession of teachers. Although, he heard the teachings from Ācārya Avītaraka (*nam. par. mi. toy*) and some others, he learnt the Sūtras and Tantras of Mahāyāna mainly from Guhyapati and other higher gods, and spread the Mādhyamika teachings. Simultaneously with this Ācārya, lived the eight Mahābhadas of the Mādhyamika teachings, viz., Bhadanta Rāhulagarbha, Ghanasa and others. The venerable Sarvanivaraṇa-viṣkambhin appeared in person to Bhadanta Prakāśadharmamaṇi after the latter had acquired *anutpattikadharmakṣānti* (Geduld in der Lehre des Nichtgeboren-werdens). He procured from the under-world the ancient *Mahāsamaya* (see Burnouf, *op. cit.*, p. 222) in 100,000 sections and 1000 chapters. Further many disciples of the first 500 Ācāryas acquired many Sūtras and Tantras, hitherto unknown, and since this time all the three forms of Tantras were established, viz., *kriyā-*, *caryā-*, and *yoga-tantras*, and diverse works on the *Anuttarayoga*, viz., *Guhyasamāja*, *Buddhasamayōga*, *Māyājāla*, etc. At this time appeared in the city of Sāketana the bhikṣu Mahāvīra, in the country of Vārāṇasī the Vaibhāṣika Mahābhada-danta Buddhadeva, and in the land of Kashmir the great Sūtra-Ācārya

Bhadanta Śrīlābha. By them the Śrāvakayāna was propagated. It should be noted that the four Bhandantas Dharmatrāta, Ghosaka, Vasumitra and Buddhadeva were regarded as the great Ācāryas of the Vaibhāsikas, and every one of them is said to have had 100,000 disciples. The following were valued as the leading works of the Vaibhāsikas, viz., *spel. ma. gsum. gyi. phren, gdams. nag. bryga. ba* which were enlarged by the Ācāryas. One must not confuse this Dharmatrāta with Dharmatrāta, the compiler of *Udānavarga*,¹ and this Vasumitra with two others of the same name, of whom one is the author of *Śāstraprakaraṇa* (*bstan. bcos. rab tu byed. pa*) and the other of the *Samayabhedoparacanacakra*² (*gshun. lugs. kyi. bye. brag. bkod. paḥi. hkhor. lo*). According to the tradition of the Guhyasamāja school one should place at this time the king Viśukalpa in the country of Odiviśa as the contemporary of Candanapāla. At this time in Kuru land was brāhmaṇa Dharmika, who in this land and the surrounding regions established 108 Buddha temples and gave them away for residence to the preachers of Mahāyāna-dharma. In the town of Hastināpura, the brāhmaṇa Yogin, (*brtson. ldan*), who was considerably rich, built 108 temples and made them seats for 108 Dharma-preachers of the Vinaya School (*ldul. ba. rtzin. pa = Vinayadhara-Tr.*). At the time appeared in the east, in the country of Bhaṅgala, king Haricandra, the first of the line of Candra. In the *Mantramārga*, he obtained *siddhi*, built palaces with the five kinds of jewel stones and decorated the surrounding walls with representations of the three kinds of existences (*tri-bhava-Tr.*); in wealth he vied with the gods, he erected the temple of Vidyādhara, around which there were 1000 steps. It was the time of Śrī Saraha or the Mahābrahman Rāhula Brahmaçārī and the time of appearance of the 500 Yogacaryā teachers. Lastly during his life-time, most of the Mahāyāna-sūtras with the exception of the *Śatasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā* came into existence. The 14th section, the events of the time of the brāhmaṇa Rāhula.

U. N. GHOSHAL

N. DUTT

1 The work is found in Tanjur, vol. *du* of the Sūtras, with a commentary of Prajñāvarman.

2 Or *Nikāya-bheda-upadarśana-saṃgraha*. See Buxton, transl., I, 122.

MISCELLANY

Vedica

I. *kakúd* : *kakúbh* : **kakúh*

The forms *kakúd* and *kakúbh*, evidently variants of one and the same stem, are quite common in RV. The existence of a third form **kakúh* of the same stem can be easily inferred from the secondary derivative *kakubhá* (without the usual *vrddhi*-strengthening of the initial vowel, see Whitney § 1209 g), analogous to *kakubhá* (VS.) derived from *kakúbh*.

The question now arises, which of the three forms is the original one and how the other two have been developed out of it.

The problem cannot be solved with the help of Lat. *cacūmen*, for although the assimilation of the labial *bh* with *m* is obviously easier than that of *d* or (*g*)*h* with it, the latter two kinds of assimilation are also possible in Latin (Sommer, *Handbuch*, pp. 230-231; Walde s. v.). We have therefore to rely exclusively on the internal data of Sanskrit.

Now, all the three forms can be satisfactorily explained if we start from *kakúbh* as the original form. The form **kakúh* can be easily derived from *kakúbh* if we only remember that in Sanskrit *h* often appears in the place of *bh*,—cf. *gráh-* : *gr̥h-* at the side of *grabh-* : *gr̥bh-* (Wackernagal, I § 217 b, p. 251). In order to explain the stem form *kakúd* we have to remember that in Sanskrit there is a peculiar aversion to the sound-complex *-bbh-*. A consonantal stem with a final labial would in normal course give rise to this sound-complex when it takes anyone of the case-suffixes with initial *bh*. Yet, excepting in the older Sāmaveda Brāhmaṇas, consonantal stems with a final labial regularly change their final into guttural or dental for no other reason than to avoid the sound-complex *-bbh-*. Thus forms like ‘*uṣṇikkakubbhyām*’ are actually found in Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa and Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa. But *triṣṭúbhīḥ*, *anuṣṭúbhīḥ* are the usual forms in the Taittirīya texts, although the stems in question are *triṣṭúbh-* and *anuṣṭúbh-* respectively. In RV. however, in analogous cases, a dental is introduced instead

of this guttural to serve the same purpose, if the consonantal stem is not simply changed into a vowel one (as *kṣapābhiḥ* from *kṣap-*), cf. *adbhiḥ adbhyāḥ* from *ap-* (Wackernagel, III. § 131 b, p. 241). This dissimilatory dental is sometimes found also in the Taittirīya texts as Wackernagel (*loc. cit.*) has pointed out, cf. *saṃsṛdbhiḥ* (TBr.) from *saṃsṛp-*. Supposing now that our Ṛgvedic stem *kakúbh* had taken a case-suffix with initial *bh-*, *-bhyām* for instance, what would be the likely form it would have given rise to (always bearing in mind that the sound-complex *-bbh-* has to be avoided) ? Even apart from the fact that the dissimilatory guttural is met with for the first time in the later Taittirīya texts it is quite out of the question here, for the kakophony of a form like **kakugbhyām* could hardly have been tolerated in Sanskrit. We have to assume therefore that the stem *kakúbh* gave rise to forms like **kakúdbhyām*, **kakúdbhyaḥ* etc. when it came in contact with case-affixes with initial *bh-*. It is quite obvious that the stem *kakúd* was abstracted out of these forms.

It is clear, therefore, that of the three congeneric Ṛgvedic stems discussed above, *kakúbh* is the original one, from which *kakúd* and **kakúh* were derived at a later date. This solves also a problem of Latin. Lat. *cacūmen* can henceforth be unhesitatingly derived from **kakubhmen* and the other possibilities **kakudmen* and **kakughmen* need not be considered at all.

II. *kaśyāpa* : *kaśāpa* : *kacchapa*

The etymology and morphology of the word *kacchapa*, which occurs for the first time in *Nir.*, IV, 18, is quite obscure. Indeed Yāska (*loc. cit.*) gives a characteristic etymology of this word: *kacchapaḥ kaccham pāti kacchena pāti 'ti vā kacchena pibatī 'ti vā*, and as the word *kaccha* "marsh" is well attested from the epics downwards Yāska's etymology may seem to be plausible at first sight. Yet this etymology has to be rejected, for *kacchapa* cannot be separated from *kaśyāpa* which is of at least Indo-Iranian antiquity.

In the earliest relevant Vedic passages the word *kaśyāpa* does not signify "tortoise" but, to all appearance, a group of divinities, perhaps of the solar circle. Thus the second hemistich of the mantra TS. V, 6, 1, 1 *hīraṇya varṇāḥ śúcayaḥ pāvakā, yāsu jātāḥ kaśyāpo yāsv agniḥ* has the significant variant *yāsu jātāḥ savitā yāsu agniḥ* (AV. 1, 33, 1). Yet already from VS. (cf. VS. XXIV, 37 ; AB. II, 6, 15 ; SB. VII 5, 1, 5 etc.) *kaśyāpa* signifies

“tortoise” like kacchapa, and that this is the original meaning of the word is proved by Avestan kasyapa “tortoise”. Semasiologically, therefore, there is no gulf to bridge up between kaśyāpa and kacchapa and morphologically too the resemblance between these two forms is so great that it is impossible to separate them from each other. Yet the passage of -śya- (under the accent) into -ccha- is quite unknown in Indic philology. In none of the Prākṛit or Middle Indian dialects does -śya- become -ccha-. How to explain the strange form kacchapa then, if it is really to be derived from kaśyāpa ?

To give the reply to this question in advance, I suggest that kacchapa is to be directly connected with kaśśapa, a variant form of kaśyāpa. In *Vājasaneyi Prātisākhya*, IV, 157 it is actually mentioned that the word kaśyapa, when it signifies “tortoise” and is not used as a proper name, is pronounced like kaśśapa. This gemination of ś due to following y is of course of Prākṛitic origin (Wackernagel, 1 § 198 note, p. 227).

In order to understand this passage of -śś- into -cch- it is necessary to consider what was the actual pronunciation of ś in ancient India. There is ample evidence in the behaviour of ś in Sandhi to prove that this spirant was very much like a mute of the corresponding homorganic series. In fact, the similarity between ś and the palatal mutes is much greater than that between ṣ and the cerebral mutes or s and the dental mutes. And this is just what could be also otherwise expected, for, as distinct from Sanskrit s (or ṣ), ś is derived from an original Indo-European mute. In euphonic combinations ś readily changes into k (before s) or ch (after dentals). The Sandhi of final n shows most clearly its fundamental difference from the other sibilants. A final n is palatalised by a following ś (svapan śete > svapañ śete), but it remains unchanged before s or ṣ (mahān san, tān ṣaṭ). Phonetically it is difficult to imagine that a pure spirant would thus be able to palatalise a preceding n. We have to assume that in the case of ś the opening was so small that it was hardly distinguishable from a palatal mute,—thence its capacity to palatalise a preceding n. In the Sandhi of final t the sibilant ś exerts exactly the same influence as the mute c and moreover itself becomes a palatal mute. All this shows that in actual pronunciation ś was very much like a palatal mute. There is therefore *a priori* nothing extraordinary, if -śś- changes into -cc(h)-.

Instances of such a change can be actually pointed out in

Sanskrit ; R̥gvedic *ducchúnā* is evidently derived from *duṣ + śunā* (Wackernagel, I § 133, p. 156). It is quite clear here that the form *ducchúnā* is to be directly connected with **duś + śuna*. A similar passage of -śś- into -cch- has to be assumed perhaps also for *pr̥chāti*. Its nominal derivative *praś-nā* clearly shows that the pure root ends with ś (<I.-E. *k̄*), and this ś combined with the inchoative suffix (I.-E. -*sk̄*-) has given rise to -cch- in *pr̥chāti*. Thus we find here that I.-E. -*ksk̄*- has developed into -cch- in Sanskrit. Now s between two mutes was dropped already in the original Indo-European, and I.-E. *k̄* of course becomes ś in Sanskrit. The entire development of the I.-E. sound-group in question may therefore be expected to have been *ksk̄ > k̄k̄ > śś > cc(h)*. In this way I.-E. **pr̥ksketi* has become *pr̥chāti* in Sanskrit. Yet Lat. *posco*, O. H. G. *forskōn* etc. would seem to suggest that of the sound group *ksk̄* rather the initial *k̄* than the medial s was dropped in this case in the I.-E. era. Sanskrit *pr̥chāti* would have to be derived in that case simply from **pr̥sketi*, which is doubtless equally possible. R̥gvedic *ducchúnā* however is in every way an impeccable example and is sufficient to postulate the passage of -śś- into -cch- as quite a normal one in Sanskrit. The h of -cch- however is not phonetic here. Perhaps it would be best to assume with Wackernagel (I § 134, p. 157) that the more frequent combination -cch- has been substituted here for the less frequent -cc-. The same sound substitution has to be assumed also for those cases where t + ś gives rise to -cch- in Sandhi.

Thus -cch- being the normal result of the phonetic development of -śś- it may be unhesitatingly concluded that *kacchapa* is derived from *kaśśapa* mentioned in *Vājasaneyi Prātisākhya*, IV, 157.

In conclusion it may be mentioned that the apparently abnormal ś in Persian *kaśaf* (<Avestan *kasyapa*) is due to a middle Iranian phonetic law which changed every sy into ś (see Henning, *Zeitschrift f. Indol. u. Iranist.*, IX, p. 207, for further references).

III. *pedú = elephant ?*

Dr. P. C. Bagchi has recently (*IHQ.*, IX, pp. 263 ff.) suggested that Vedic *pedú* is etymologically connected with *pil-*, *peḍ-* etc. and that it signifies "elephant". But there is no reason why the old etymology of *pedú*, which connected it with Avestan *pazdayeiti* (Bartholomae, *ZDMG.*, XXXVI, p. 585; Kuhn's *Zeitschr.*, XXVII, p. 361; Wackernagel, *Altind. Gramm.*, I § 34

a, p. 37) and pazdu > Mod. Pers. pazd-ak (Bartholomae, *Altiran. Wörterb.*, Col. 885 ; Wackernagel, *Sitzungsb. d. kgl. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss.*, 1918, p. 405) should be given up, and moreover it is quite clear from the Vedic passages that the meaning of pedú is not elephant.

The próton pseudos of Dr. Bagchi's etymology is that he has taken pedú to be a common noun when it is clearly a proper name in RV. and AV. The word paidvá is a derivative of pedú (see Whitney, § 1208 e) and signifies "something belonging to Pedu." Now, even if that "something" is an elephant it is not at all proved therewith that the same meaning has to be attributed also to pedú. But the "something" in question is in reality not "elephant" but "horse" as the R̥gvedic passages clearly show :

RV. I, 116, 6 yám ásvinā dadáthuḥ śvetám ásvam agháśvāya śśvad it svastí, tád vām dātrám máhi kīrtényam bhūt paidvó vājí sádám íd dhávyo aryáḥ "O Ásvins, the white horse you have given to the one with bad horse—a blessing for ever—, this gift of yours be praised; the horse (!) of Pedu (paidvó vājí) is to be always invoked for the patron (arí)." Here in the first part reference is made to the Ásvins' gift of a horse to an unknown person and the second part mentions the vājin of Pedu. If it is now found that the Ásvins made a gift of a horse to Pedu, nobody will perhaps demur to the conclusion that the person anonymously referred to in the first part of the above verse is none but Pedu and that Pedu's vājin mentioned in the second part can be nothing but Pedu's horse. Now passages are not wanting in RV. which actually speak of Ásvins' gift of a horse to Pedu; cf. RV. I, 118, 9 yuvám śvetám pedáva índrajūtam ahihánam ásvinā 'dattam ásvam "(O) Ásvins, you gave to Pedu the serpent-killing horse spurred on by Indra." It is clear therefore that paidvó vājí in RV. I, 116, 6 signifies "Pedu's horse." The word vājin here cannot be taken in its literal sense vejanavant (Sāyaṇa, who however understands horse, not elephant, by the word) and applied eventually to elephant as Dr. Bagchi (*Ibid.*, p. 263) has done. As in numerous other passages, in this passage too vājin signifies 'horse'. pedú occurs 5 times and paidvá twice in RV; the former is always a proper name and the latter always signifies "Pedu's horse" in the passages concerned, which however need not be further discussed here.

If we now cast about for an etymology of pedú, after thus freeing it from its ungrounded connection with pil-, peḍ- etc., it would appear at first sight that it is derived from the weak perfect stem of

the root pad-. The accent of pedú would indeed seem to favour this etymology, but as the weak perfect stem ped- of pad- occurs only in the Brāhmaṇas for the first time it has to be rejected. Moreover the suffix -u is not otherwise known to be taken by similar metaplastic stems. I have tried to show elsewhere* that in all apparently analogous cases, such as Perú, péru, céru, -keru etc. the actual suffix is -ru and not -u. We have therefore to fall back upon the etymology suggested by Bartholomae and accepted by Wackernagel, according to which pedú is to be connected with Avestan pazdu. Phonologically there is nothing in the way of this etymology, and semasiologically too the fact that Av. pazdu signifies an insect is no difficulty at all, for many ancient Indian historical names are nothing but names of birds and beasts; we have only to remember Tittiri, Suka, Varāha, Kukkura etc. Moreover, as Wackernagel (*Sitzungsb. d. kgl. preuss. Akad. Wiss.*, 1918, p. 406) has pointed out, pedu actually signifies an insect in the *Kausika-Sūtra* (32, 21; 35, 4).

Dr. Bagchi further suggests (*Ibid.*, p. 264) that the obscure word pétva (RV. VII, 18, 17) is the same as paidvá. But even apart from all other considerations the accent of pétva clearly shows that it is not at all a secondary derivative with the suffix -a and therefore cannot be compared to paidvá.

BATAKRISHNA GHOSH

* In a paper accepted for publication in *Journal Asiatique*.

Kālidāsa in China

In the last issue of the *Indian Historical Quarterly*, vol. IX, pp. 829 ff., M. Louis Finot has tried to show 'that, at a relatively late time, Kālidāsa was not entirely unknown in China, at least through the medium of some miscellany of anecdotes such as the Bhojaprabandha.' He has been led to this conclusion by the fact that an unnumbered palm-leaf, found in a Buddhist monastery in the province of Che-Kiang, contains a reference to a well-known traditional tale about Kālidāsa and the initial stanzas of his three Kāvya.

It seems to me that no such inference can be drawn from the single leaf in question. It has been inserted in a Buddhist palm-leaf manuscript, and it must, as shown by the late Professor Kielhorn,¹ have been written in Bengal in the 13th century A.D. Its contents are, according to M. Finot's excellent analysis, such that they could not be understood by anybody who was not acquainted with the traditional lore about Kālidāsa. But since it is a stray leaf, without any connexion with the manuscript in which it was found, it only proves that the Bengali writer knew this tradition, and by no means that it was known in China.

The narrative itself to which the leaf refers has interested me since I first learnt to know about it some forty years ago, and I should, therefore, like to offer some remarks.

As shown by M. Finot, the leaf mentions the Brahmin Vararuci, the sabhā of Bhojadeva, Sarasvatī, Kālīcētī, and Kālidāsa, and contains an enigmatic word *uśaṃṭara*, with a Sanskrit stanza containing words beginning with the four syllables of this word. After the name of Kālidāsa we further read: Sarasvatī, asti kaścit vākviśeṣaḥ.

M. Finot rightly explains the corrupt passage as containing a variant of a story told by Tāranātha: The king Bhīmaśukla of Benares wanted his daughter Vāsantī to marry Vararuci. She however, declined, because she thought herself superior to him in learning. Vararuci then suggested that she should marry his own teacher, who

¹ *JRAS.*, 1894, pp. 836 ff., quoted by M. Finot.

was hundred times more learned than himself. He came across a Magadha cowherd, who was cutting a branch on which he was sitting, and justly inferred that he had to do with a fool and that he would be revenged, if the princess were to marry him. He dressed him up as a Brahmin, taught him to repeat the words *om svasti*, and not to answer any questions when he came into the royal presence. The poor herdsman, however, got confused at the critical moment, and said *usātara* instead, whereafter Vararuci explained that these syllables contained a blessing on the king:

Umayā sahito Rudraḥ Saṃkarasahito Viṣṇuḥ
ṭaṃkārasūlapāṇiś ca rakṣantu Śivaḥ sarvadā.

Everything else went according to Vararuci's plan, and the herdsman was married to the princess, whereafter Vararuci departed for the south. The bridegroom faithfully kept silence, but was betrayed when he came to see an ox painted on the wall of a temple. The princess then understood that he was a cowherd. She tried in vain to teach him, and then sent him about to gather flowers. He on his part came into the habit of going every day to worship a Kālī image. Some day one of the maids of the princess hid behind the image and thence presented the herdsman with a pill, which he swallowed in the belief that it came from the goddess, and at once he became wise and learned, and was henceforward known as Kālidāsa.

M. Finot observes 'that our palm-leaf is the exact counterpart of the account of Tāranātha, except that the king is Bhojadeva of Dhārā instead of Bhīmaśukla of Benares, and perhaps that the name of the princess is Sarasvatī instead of Vāsantī,' and he further states that the tale is not found in the Bhojaprabandha.

The words 'Sarasvatī asti kaścid vāgviśeṣaḥ' he translates: 'Sarasvatī is a variety of Vāc.'

It will be seen that Tāranātha's narrative is rather fragmentary, and, more especially, it does not explain how Vararuci could come to describe the cowherd as his guru. The meaning of the syllables *usātara* was, moreover, unknown to him. He has evidently drawn on secondary, half understood, sources.

A priori we might therefore maintain that the version of the palm-leaf, with the mention of Bhojadeva, is more original, the more so

because it is evidently older, Tāranātha having finished his 'History of Buddhism' in A.D. 1608.

The tale about the herdsman Kālidāsa is also known from other sources. A 'traditional account of Kālidāsa current in Mysore' has been published by Ravaji Vasudeva Tullu, *Ind. Ant.*, VII, 115, and a third version is found in Merutuṅga's *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, which was finished in A.D. 1306, (*vide* pp. 6 ff. of the edition, Bombay 1888). This latter text is much better arranged than Tāranātha's account, and of more interest in connexion with our palm-leaf.

The scene is in Avanti at the court of King Vikramāditya. His daughter Priyaṅgumañjarī was sent for instruction to Vararuci, to whom, however, the young lady soon gave grave offence through her disrespectful jokes. He cursed her that she should marry a herdsman, but she vowed that she would only marry somebody who was still more learned than he. As the king wanted to find a suitable husband for her, Vararuci some day went into the wood and there met a herdsman whom he asked for water. As there was no water at hand, the cow-herd asked him to take milk instead, and added *karavadīm vidhehi*. Now *karavadī* was a wood which Vararuci did not know from any dictionary, wherefore the herdsman laid his hand on his head, made him sit down under a buffalo-cow, and make a *karavadī*, i.e. joining of his two hands as a cup. Since he had laid his hand on his head and taught him a new word, Vararuci found that he was in a way his guru, took him to the palace and, in the course of six months, succeeded in making him repeat the words *oṃ namaḥ Śivāya*. When he had mastered the difficult blessing, Vararuci brought him to the king, but the poor wretch got confused, *sabhākṣobharaśāt*, failed to repeat what he had been taught, and said *uśaraṭa* instead. Vararuci then, as in Tāranātha's version, explained these syllables as standing for:

Umayā sahito Rudraḥ Saṃkaraḥ śūlapāṇibhṛt
rakṣatu tvā mahīpāla ṭaṃkārabalagarvitaḥ.

The king was pleased and the princess married the buffalo-herdsman. He had been taught by Vararuci to keep silence, wherefore the princess tried to test him in giving him a manuscript to correct. He then proceeded to cut the individual letters out, and since then the *jāmāṭṛ-suddhi*, the proof-reading of the son-in-law, was everywhere talked

about. One day he saw a painted buffalo-herd, forgot everything else, and shouted out to the buffaloes in his old way. The princess understood that he was a buffalo-herdsman, and looked down on him with contempt. He felt this and began to worship Kālī. The king was afraid lest his daughter should become a widow, sent a distinguished maid to him, and she raised him, saying that she was pleased with him. The real Kālī then got afraid that she might lose her prestige, and granted him her favour. The princess heard about this, went to the spot, and said *asti kaścīd vāgrīśeṣah* (that is, a different new speech), and afterwards the herdsman was known as Kālidāsa, and composed three Kāvya, *Kumārasambhava*, etc.

It is evident that the palm-leaf mainly agrees with this version, and not with that of Tāranātha, only the names of the king and his daughter are different. Instead of *Kālīcetī* we must evidently read *Kālī*, *ceṭī*, both Kālī and the Maid-servant occurring in the story. That Sarasvatī was the name of the princess is evident from the fact that she is introduced as speaking the words *asti vāgrīśeṣah*. And at the end of the whole we have, just as in the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, an enumeration of the three Kāvya. The palm-leaf simply contains the various headings of the narrative.

The substitution of Bhojadeva for Vikramāditya is probably also a later development. It is *a priori* likely that the home of the popular tale was Mālwā, to which country Kālidāsa, who is so well acquainted with Ujjayinī and its lore, probably belonged, and it can hardly be doubted that the tales connecting Kālidāsa with Bhoja are later than the tradition according to which he was a poet at the court of Vikramāditya. From Mālwā the tales have spread to the Marāṭhā country and, as we have seen, to Mysore. The word *karavādī*, is evidently connected with Marāṭhi *karavaṭī*, cocoanut-shell, and late Sanskrit *karoṭī*, basin, cup. The *jāmāṭṛśuddhi* lives forth in Marāṭhi *dzāwāṭ śodh*, which has been thoroughly misunderstood in Mainwaring's *Marathi Proverbs* (Oxford 1899.)

Instead of Tāranātha's *uśaṭara* and the reading *uśaṃṭara* of the palm-leaf, Merutuṅga has, as we have seen, *uśaraṭa*, but it is evident that he had no idea of the meaning of these akṣaras, a fact which seems to prove that he drew on older sources, which were only partly intelligible

in his days. *A priori* it is hardly possible to choose between *uśāṭara* and *uśarata*, and the Sanskrit stanza does not help us, because the wording is, in both cases, so arranged as to follow the sequence of the akṣaras. We may only state that the Merutuṅga version, where only one god, Kālidāsa's iṣṭadevatā, is mentioned, is in itself more likely than the other one, where Viṣṇu is also introduced. We could only hope to arrive at certain results if we were able to explain the akṣaras themselves. I have always thought that they can be explained, but I cannot prove the point.

Let us recall the situation. The herdsman is brought into the sabhā, and is taken with fright. Since he does not remain silent, his utterance must have something to do with his fear, and one might guess that he would say: 'leave me alone,' or, 'get out of the way,' if he wanted to take to his heels. It is hardly possible to make anything out of *uśāṭara*, but *uśarata* might be a plural imperative, corresponding to Sanskrit *utsarata*, get away.

If I am right, we might think of Māgadhī, where *s* becomes *ś*, but then we would expect *uśalada*, and should be unable to explain the *r* and the *ṭ*. The latter must be due to the preceding *r*, but I do not know of any parallel from the Prakrits, including Pāli, where the personal termination is cerebralized. With regard to the palatal *s* it seems permissible to compare the universal pronunciation of *s* and *ś* in Mārwarī, cf. Grierson, *On the modern Indo-Aryan Vernaculars*, § 334 (Appendix, *Ind. Ant.* Oct. 1933). We have every reason for assuming that this pronunciation is old, and that it was considered as rustic and boorish by the refined citizens of Ujjayinī.

It seems to me that we have every reason for assuming that the popular story about the foolish herdsman who later on became the famous poet Kālidāsa is comparatively old; that it rose in Mālwa, where rulers such as Vikramāditya and Bhojadeva were successively mentioned as the patrons of the poet; that it was subsequently also localised in Benares and perhaps elsewhere; that it was known in Bengal in later times, but that we have no reason for believing that it was ever current in China.

The Scribes of Bengal

It is a well-known fact of Indian history that with the foundation of the Pāla empire about the middle of the eighth century A.D. a new movement in sculpture began in Gauḍa and Magadha. The Indian Museum, the Varendra Research Society Museum in Rajshahi and the Dacca Museum are replete with the works of the Gauḍa-Magadha school. The Tibetan historian Tāranātha wrote that this school was started by Vītapāla and his son Dhīmān in the reign of Dharmapāla, the second Pāla emperor, and that its activity was not confined within the borders of the Pāla empire.¹ The paintings discovered in Nepāl and the close similarity between the styles of architecture of the Pāla empire and of Java, noticed by a series of scholars, go to confirm the statement of Tāranātha. But not only the higher branches of art and architecture were cultivated with a zeal and skill that did great credit to the artists but the epigraphic evidences also show that even a minor art like incising letters on stone or copperplates reached a high state of perfection in Bengal. The kings of other parts of India thought it a great privilege to have their *praśasti's* engraved by a Gauḍa Kāyastha or a scribe of Bengal. The Deopārā Inscription of Vijayasena (now in the Indian Museum) inscribed by Śūlapāṇī, "the crest-jewel of the guild of Varendra artists" is a fine specimen of the works of the Gauḍa Kāyasthas and even a cursory glance at it cannot but strike the visitor with the beauty of clearness and fineness of the workmanship of the artist.

The following inscriptions written outside Bengal by the Gauḍa Kāyasthas clearly show how the kings of other parts of Northern India engaged Gauḍa scribes to engrave their records:

1 Schiefner, *Geschichte des Buddhismus*, pp. 279-80.

Inscriptions	Scribes
1. The Aṃhsad Inscription ² of Adityasena of the Later Gupta dynasty of Maghada. (one of the known dates is 672 A.D.).	Sūkṣmaśiva, a native of Gauḍa.
2. The Māraujamura Charter ³ of Yayāti Mahāśivagupta of Kośala (of about the middle of the 9th century A.D.).	Rudra Datta, son of the brother of Siṃhadatta and grandson of Harṣadatta, a Gauḍa Kāyastha.
3. The Stone Inscription ⁴ of Yaśavarmā, the Candella king of Jejakabhukti in Bundelkhand. Dated 1011 Vikrama Saṃvat.	Jadda, son of Jayagunna, a Gauḍa Kāyastha.
4. The Inscription ⁵ of the time of Cahamāna Dulbharāja. Dated 1056 V.S.	Mahādeva, a Gauḍa Kāyastha.
5. The Stone Inscription ⁶ of Dhaṅgadeva of Jejaka-bhukti. Dated 1173 V.S.	Jayapāla, a Gauḍa Kāyastha.
6. The Nadol Stone Inscription ⁷ of Rāyapāla of Marwar. Dated 1198 V.S.	Ṭhākura Pethada, son of Vādiga, a Gauḍa Kāyastha.
7. The Lādṇu Inscription of Sādharāṇa ⁸ of Jodhpura. Dated 1373 V.S.	Dāndā, son of Dalu and grandson of Mahiya, a Gauḍa Kāyastha.

The Inscriptions of the Kośala Guptas have revealed the fact that the Kośala Gupta kings from Janamejaya and his successors had many Bengali Kāyasthas as their officers and Mr. B. C. Majumdar, the learned editor of the plates from Sonpur⁹, has suggested that this was perhaps due to the political relations of the Kośala Guptas with Bengal. The same may be said of the Aṃhsad Inscription of Adityasena. As some portion of northern Bengal was within his kingdom, he might have engaged a Gauḍa Kāyastha (perhaps one of his subjects) to inscribe his

² Fleet. *Gupta Inscriptions*. No. 42, p. 208.

³ *JBORS.*, 1916, p. 45.

⁵ *Ibid.*, vol. 14, Appendix.

⁷ *Ibid.*, vol. 11, p. 37.

⁹ *Ibid.*, vol. 11, p. 103; *JBORS.*, 1916, p. 45; See B. C. Majumdar's *Sonpur*,

pp. 30-31, 115-116; also *Typical Selections from Oriya literature*, Introduction to vol. I, p. 16.

⁴ *Ep. Ind.*, vol. 1, p. 123.

⁶ *Ibid.*, vol. 11.

⁸ *Ibid.*, vol. 12, p. 17.

inscription. But the fact is that with the foundation of the Pāla empire there arose a new style of architecture in Bengal and that the Gauḍa Kāyasthas were in the service of the kings of other different parts of India to engrave their records with whom no political relation (as in the case of the Kośala Guptas and of Ādityasena) can be traced. Therefore when the whole matter is viewed comprehensively and from the point of the view of the expansion of the Pāla style of architecture, the conclusion almost forces on ourselves that the degree of perfection attained by the scribes of Bengal in the art of incising letters on stone surpassed that of the other parts of northern India. It seems that these artists were highly honoured by the kings of other parts of India and along with the great events of their reigns the names of these artists were also inscribed because to them these kings owed the fine execution of their records.

It will not be out of place to mention here that a question has been raised also whether the word 'goṣṭhī' used in the Deopārā Inscription of Vijayasena to describe Śūlapāni as the "crest-jewel of the Varendra artists"¹⁰ is to be taken to refer to a guild of the artists. It is a remarkable phenomenon of ancient Indian history that every art and craft had a separate guild or corporation¹¹ of its own. When the degree of perfection of this particular art and its unique expansion outside Bengal are borne in mind, there is nothing to be wondered if the artist had organised a guild of their own and given it the name of their country to which they belonged.

Another question of great importance for the social history of Bengal also rises in this connection. In the genealogical books of the Kāyasthas it is claimed that they are the descendants of Citragupta and that writing was their original occupation. In all the epigraphic records cited above the scribes have been called Gauḍa Kāyasthas. The fact is that the Kāyasthas gained distinction outside Bengal as scribes and it becomes almost clear that scribing was perhaps their main occupation. In the Dāmodarpur plates we find that in the administrative work the Viṣayapati (the district officer) was assisted by four members repre-

10 N. G. Majumdar, *Inscriptions of Bengal*, vol. III.

11 Dr. R. C. Majumder *Corporate Life in Ancient India*. ch. 1.

senting the most important interests of those days and one of the four members was the *prathamakāyastha*. The learned editor of these plates has suggested that the word *prathamakāyastha*¹² may be taken either as the representative of the Kāyasthas as a class or the chief scribe (like a Chief Secretary of the present day). But if it is conceded that writing was the chief occupation of the Kāyasthas, the interest represented by *prathamakāyastha* in the government of the country is the same in whatever sense that word may be taken. It may then be said, without any fear of contradiction that the Kāyasthas by their occupation exerted considerable influence and enjoyed a high status in the society as early as from the fifth century A.D.

PRAMODE LAL PAUL

¹² R. G. Basak, *Ep. Ind.*, vol. 15, p. 113

Kosam Inscription of Kanishka

This new record of the reign of Kanishka is found inscribed on the pedestal of a Bodhisattva image of red sandstone, about four feet high, which is now preserved in the Allahabad Municipal Museum. Like most of the valuable antiquities of the Museum, this image too was recovered from the ruins of Kosam, the site of ancient Kauśāmbī (*JRAS.*, 1927, pp. 689 ff.). The image resembles Aśvaghoṣa's Bodhisattva image at Sārnāth in execution, though not in size (Daya Ram Sahni, *Catalogue of the Museum of Archaeology at Sārnāth*, no. B(a)1), with this distinction that instead of the crouching lion between the feet, we have here a lotus.

That the image and its inscription belong to the reign of Kanishka was known long ago but its publication was not undertaken by anyone. Recently, in the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* of Calcutta, dated June 7, 1934, (published again in the *Calcutta Review*, July, 1934, pp. 83-84). Mr. Kunja Govinda Goswami first published the inscription with the text, translation and notes. Now that it has already been made public, I take the liberty of giving below my own reading of the inscription, which differs in some details from that of Mr. Goswami.

The inscription runs to two lines, but the letters (save those at the beginning of the lines) are extremely obliterated and in some cases we have to take recourse to imagination to fill up the lacunae

L. 1. [Ma]h[ā]r[ā]jasya Kaṇ[is]ka[sya saṃ 20 ?] 2—pa—di 8
b[o]dh[i]sat[t*]va[m] pra[ti-]

L. 2. [sṭhā]payati Bhikhuṇī Buddha[mitrā] [te]p[i]ṭak[ā]
Bhagavato Buddhasa pakame.

In the 22nd (?) year of Mahārāja Kanishka—in the fortnight, on the eighth day, the nun Buddha(mitrā), versed in the Tripitaka, set up the image of the Bodhisattva, in the promenade of the Lord Buddha.

The date portion of the inscription is difficult to read. Mr. Goswami read the figure for the year as 2, but I think there is another figure before it, probably the symbol for 20. In that case, the inscription is not the earliest record of Kanishka's reign, and loses some of its importance.

The last word has been read by Mr. Goswami as ca[m]kame.

The Tattvasuddhi and Subjectivism

The *Tattvasuddhi* is a work on Advaita-vedānta, ascribed to one Jñānaghanapāda. It is repeatedly referred to by Appayya Dīkṣita in his *Siddhāntaleśasāṅgraha*, and from these references Mr. Makhanlal Mukherjee¹ has tried to reconstruct and present the central teaching of the work as a variety of the doctrine of *Drṣṭi-srṣṭi*, the view that cognition is itself creation, that *esse* is *percipi*. The principal reference to the *Tattvasuddhi* is in the commencement of the second chapter of the *Siddhāntaleśa*, where it is cited as maintaining the view that difference is not perceptually cognised, the function of the sense-organs being the cognition of reality as such, not as diversified. Such a view seems to provide for one grade of reality alone ; and the transition to the position that whatever is cognised is created, with and by the cognition, seems easy to make. *Prima facie* there is a case for making out the author of the *Tattvasuddhi* to be a *Drṣṭi-srṣṭi-vādin*.

This, however, need not be the last word on it, for, happily, a manuscript of the work is available.² That this is the work referred to by Appayya Dīkṣita is abundantly clear since at least two of the views cited by Appayya can be traced here. One of these is the view that even perception establishes non-duality. This commences on the second page with the words “किं च, प्रत्यक्षेणाप्यद्वैतं साधयितुं पश्यामः, तस्य सन्मात्रविषयत्वात्” and goes on through pages 3 and 4. The other is the explanation of God’s omniscience³ ; since God has perceived all past things at the time they existed, they appear to Him constantly even as they did then, there being no cause of fresh obscuration in His case, as possessing the residual impressions produced by those manifestations, His uninterrupted memory of those objects is intelligible ; similarly since Brahman is endowed with the power of *māyā* and since *māyā* even prior to creation is transformed into the manifestation of all things to be created in conformity with the unseen accumulated potencies of the *jīvas*, for Brahman as the witness thereof, there is knowledge of future things as well.

This elaborate demonstration of Brahman’s omniscience may well

1 *IHQ.*, IX. 4, pp. 912-922.

2 In the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras, R. No. 2897. : : folio 13 et seq., esp. folio 18;

make one pause before identifying the *Tattvasūddhi* view with solipsism. And the doubt gains strength from the fact that even the view about the non-dual reality alone being primarily cognised in perception is taken from Maṇḍana Miśra, as proved by a quotation from the *Brahmasiddhi*: “लब्धरूपे क्वचित् किञ्चित् तादृगेव निषिध्यते” etc. ; and Maṇḍana is certainly not a *dr̥ṣṭi-sṛṣṭi-vādin*⁴, believing as he does in the creation of the world by *Īsvara*, who is distinct from the *jīvas* and is the content of the nesciences of which they themselves are the loci.

The *dr̥ṣṭi-sṛṣṭi-vādin* does not believe in a God distinct from the cognising *jīva* ; a God even if admitted can be nothing more than the creation of the *jīva* ; similarly he cannot recognise the current distinction between dream and waking or between the released and the bound ; indeed, as Appayya says, he has one solution in which he washes off all the difficulties that clog his theory, the dream analogy. He, the dreamer, is alone real ; everything else is just a dream. A position which admits God as Creator, and the relative permanence and reality of the external world is as far removed from this as any non-dualistic system can be ; for, in the last resort, even the most realistic type of Advaita cannot but admit that God's causation is like the causation of dreams, that it involves no change in Himself and that the external world is a superimposition. But in so far as distinction can be made within this general position, the *Tattvasūddhi* does not incline to *dr̥ṣṭi-sṛṣṭi* solipsism. In the following pages are set out a few extracts to establish this ; they will be found to relate to Brahman's creatorship and the empirical permanence and reality of the world.

1. *Īsvara* is other than the *jīvas* and is the creator of the world. Brahman is the material cause and controller of the world.

(1) On page 13, the inquiry is started as to whether an omni-

4 The view that he was the founder of *dr̥ṣṭi-sṛṣṭi-vāda* is favoured by some because of a misapprehension. Maṇḍana and after him Vācaspati hold to a plurality of souls and a plurality of nesciences located in them. The conclusion seems inevitable that each *jīva* through his nescience is the creator of a separate world and that the common world postulated by empirical usage is only a consilience of illusions. This, however, is only one possible interpretation, the one given by Madhusūdana Sarasvati in his *Siddhāntabindu* ; but as pointed out by Brahmānanda in the *Binduṭīkā*, this is not the orthodox interpretation as given in the *Kalpataru* etc. Both Maṇḍana and Vācaspati insist on the creatorship of *Īsvara*. How this is consistent with the rest of their teaching has been considered by us in the Introduction to the *Bhāmati Catuṣṭī* (Theosophical Publishing House, Adyar).

scient *Īsvara* exists as other than the *jīva* in bondage: किं संसारि-
विलक्षणः सर्वज्ञ ईश्वरो नाम कश्चिदस्ति किं वा नेति । After noticing in the
subsequent pages some attempts to establish the Lord and His
omniscience through reasoning, it is said on folio 17 that the author
holds to the existence of God, not because of perception and infer-
ence, but because of Scripture: अत्र समाधिरभिधीयते; न प्रत्यक्षानुमानान्या-
मीश्वरं प्रतिपादयामहे, किं तु वेदान्तवाक्यावष्टम्भात्; तथा हि, 'यः सर्वज्ञः
सर्ववित्,' 'तस्य भासा सर्वमिदं विभाति...इत्यादिश्रुति-शतेन ईश्वरे सर्वज्ञे अवगम्यमाने
कथमसौ नास्तीति ब्रूयात् ?

(2) सकल-जगदुपादान-कारणत्वात् संवित्-स्वरूपत्वाच्च सर्वाभेदेन साक्षात्करणम् तावत्
सिद्धम् । Here *Īsvara* being the material cause of the world is ex-
plicitly declared (Folio 18).

(3) तथा च ब्रह्मणो माया-शक्तिमत्वान् मायायाश्च सृष्टेः प्रागेव सृज्यमान-निखिल-
पदार्थ-स्फुरण-रूपेण जीवाद्यनुसारेण विवर्तमानत्वात्, तत्साक्षितया तदुपाधिकस्य
ब्रह्मणोऽपि तत्साधकत्व-सिद्धेः अनागत-वस्तु-विज्ञानोपपत्तिः । It is clear that no
jīva is at liberty to create whatever he fancies, but that *māyā* trans-
forms itself in conformity with the adṛṣṭa of each *jīva*, even prior to
creation, that Brahman knows these forms of *māyā*, is thus instru-
mental in creation and is omniscient as knowing even future objects
in this way (p. 18).

(4) चेतनमेव ब्रह्मजगदुपादानमधिष्ठातृ च । The intelligent Brahman alone
is the material cause and controller of the universe.

(5) अनिर्वचनीय-मायोपाधिकं ब्रह्मैव जगदुपादानम् । Brahman alone as
conditioned by the indeterminable *māyā* is the material cause of the
world.

(6) अतो वेदान्त-वाक्य-तात्पर्य-समधिगतम् ब्रह्म स्वमायावेश-वशेन समस्त-बाह्या-
ध्यात्मिक-प्रपञ्चाकारेण विवर्तिते । Brahman that is understood as the one
purport of all Vedānta texts, as associated with its own *māyā*, illus-
orily transforms itself into the whole universe, external and internal
(p. 31).

II. Relative permanence of the world :

(1) प्रत्यभिज्ञा हि वस्तुनः पूर्वापरकाल-सम्बन्धावमर्शेन स्थायित्वमेव साधयति,
न क्षणिकत्वम् । Recognition establishes permanence alone, not momen-
taneity since it refers to the relation of the thing to two times, earlier
and later (p. 46).

(2) मृदादि-कारणस्य प्रत्यभिज्ञया स्थायित्व-प्रतीतिः । In the case of causes like
clay permanence is known by recognition (p. 149).

III. Recognition of empirical reality :

(1) आ संसार-विमोक्षाद् यथाप्रतिभासं माया-विजृम्भित-प्रमाण-प्रमेय-भेद-व्यवहाराभ्युपगमात् । Till final release from bondage, there is admitted empirical usage of differences like cogniser, cognised etc. as evolved by māyā (p. 1).

(2) तस्मान्मन्तार्थवादानां विधिम् प्रत्युपयोगित्वेऽपि देवताविग्रहवत्त्वादौ जगत्-सर्ग-प्रलयादौ च प्रत्ययोत्पादकत्वात् तस्य च बाधानुपलब्धेः कर्मणि शब्दे च विरोधा-भावात् सर्गादि-प्रतिपादन-द्वारेण शेष्युपकारसम्भवादुपपद्यतेतरामेव प्रामाण्यम् । This passage seeks to establish the validity of the texts about creation etc., though they are not the purport of Scripture, on the ground that they are unsublated and are of some use to the principal purport; such justification of the creation texts is inconsistent with the view that cognition is creation (p. 70).

(3) ब्रह्मण एव परमार्थ-सत्यत्वेऽपि प्रातिभासिकस्यापि दृश्य-प्रपञ्चस्य यथाप्रतिभासम् व्यवहाराभ्युपगमाङ्गत्वादि-समस्त-व्यवहारोपपत्तेः । The empirical reality of the world of experience is admitted here (p. 60).

(4) तत्र किम् तत्तुवेदक-प्रामाण्य-हानिः, आहोस्विद् व्यवहारज्ञता-लक्षण-प्रामाण्य-हानिरिरि वक्तव्यम् ; पूर्वस्मिन् अस्मदिष्टमेव चेष्टितं भवतापीति नास्माकमनिष्टापत्तिः । उत्तरस्मिन्नुष्ण-जल-विज्ञानस्य देहात्मप्रतीतेश्च अयथार्थत्वेऽपि व्यवहारकारणत्व-दर्शनात् स्वप्न-विज्ञानस्येव आ प्रबोधात् प्रपञ्चस्य मिथ्यात्वेऽपि तद्विषयज्ञानस्य आ परमार्थतत्त्व-बोधात् व्यवहाराङ्गतोऽपत्तेः सकल-लौकिक-वैदिक-व्यवहारोपपत्तिः । This passage distinguishes between the validity that consists in making known the truth and the validity that consists in accord with empirical usage. The latter is possessed even by the cognition of the world ; for just as dream cognition is valid within its own sphere till one wakes up, even so the world cognition is valid in the empirical sphere till there arises the realisation of the world's unreality ; for it is only this which is inconsistent with the empirical usage (pp. 93-94).

(5) द्वैत-प्रत्यक्षस्य अद्वितीयागम-बाध्यत्वेऽपि न शुक्ति-रजत-ज्ञान-तुल्यत्वम् व्यावहारिक-बाधाबाधवैषम्यात् । Everything short of absolute reality is not to be dumped into one category of unreality ; for on the ground of sublation or non-sublation by experience, a distinction is possible there too ; the former is merely apparent, like the cognition of nacre-silver ; the latter is the empirical real, e. g. normal perception of difference (p. 98).

(6) यद् यदाकारम् विज्ञानम् तत् तदालम्बनम् दृष्टम् यथा परमार्थ-रजतम् ।

The use of the word "paramārtha" distinguishes it from nacre-silver, recognising for it a higher grade of reality.

(7) अद्वितीय-प्रमाणस्य तत्त्वावेदकत्वेन प्रामाण्यम् ; द्वैत-प्रतिभासस्य पुनरासंसार-विमोक्षाद्व्यावहारिकम् अतत्त्वावेदकत्वेन प्रामाण्यम् ; ततश्च समस्त-लौकिक-वैदिक-व्यवहारः । This passage makes the same distinction and has the same import as passage (4) (p. 159).

It will be seen from a consideration of passages (4), (5) and (7), under the third heading that it does little justice to the author to say that according to him "every case of ordinary perception is illusory."⁵ "The facts of (determinate) perception of the jug etc., are false, having nothing to distinguish them from the illusory perception of a piece of silver in the mother-of-pearl,"⁶ and that the position is to be "characterised as *sattā-draividhya-vāda*."⁷ The position is no doubt different from what the writer calls the *ekasattā-vāda* of the *Nyāyasūdhā* ; but it may be more adequately described as the *sattā-traividhya-vāda*. And those who adopt this view of three grades of reality are not subjectivists except in so far as all Advaitins have to be classed as such. The account given in the *Siddhāntaleśa* is necessarily meagre and one legitimately wonders whether the writer in the *Quarterly* has not been induced to wander farther afield than is justifiable. Monistic thought in India is not exhausted by the two varieties of *dr̥ṣṭi-sṛṣṭi-vāda* ; as the writer himself notices, there is a *sṛṣṭi-dr̥ṣṭi-vāda* too. The view that particularity and difference are due to super-imposition is common to this view also, yet it does not become a form of subjectivism. The criticism of the view that difference is perceived is taken over almost bodily from the *Brahmasiddhi* ; a very short and compressed abridgment of the argument is found in the *Bhāmatī* on the *Samanvaya-sūtra*. Yet no one has maintained seriously or with success that Maṇḍana or Vācaspati is a subjectivist. How far the interpretation of the *Nyāyasūdhā* position is correct it is impossible to say, as the material to hand is very meagre and no manuscript seems to be available yet. But in the case of the *Tattvasūddhi* at least it seems clear that a study of the text itself will make it difficult to accept the view that the work is an exposition of the *dr̥ṣṭi-sṛṣṭi-vāda*.

S. S. SURYANARAYANAN

⁵ *IIIQ.*, IX. 1, p. 921

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 914.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 917.

Origin of the Pratihāra Dynasty

In his interesting article, appearing in the June issue of the *Indian Historical Quarterly*, 1934, Dr. D. C. Ganguly writes as follows :

'The Pratihāras are believed to have been a branch of the Gurjara tribe which, in the latter half of the 5th century A.D., poured into India along with the Hunas. *There is at present no disagreement among the scholars regarding this.* The theory of the Gurjara origin of the Pratihāras is entirely based on the evidence of a stone-inscription, discovered in the village of Rajor *It is unanimously upheld that the expression Gurjara-Pratihāra (in the inscription) means Pratihāra clan of the Gurjara tribe* But a critical examination of the passage in question discloses that it bears more reasonable interpretation.....The expression Gurjara-Pratihāra may very reasonably be taken to mean the Pratihāra family of the Gurjara country. Its object is to distinguish the Pratihāra family, to which Mathanadeva belonged from that of the Kānyakubja Pratihāra, of which his overlord Vijayapāla, referred to at the beginning of the Rajor inscription, was a member.'¹

The above lines would, certainly, have not been written if the learned writer had gone through the works of Mm. Pandit Gaurishankar Hirachand Ojha, and Rao Bahadur C. V. Vaidya who anticipated some years back many of the conclusions now independently arrived at by him, and disproved conclusively the theory that the Pratihāras were Gurjaras. We find the following paragraph in the Rao Bahadur's *History of Medieval Hindu India*, vol. II, 1st edition, 1924 (p. 3):—

'The first argument adduced is that a minor Pratihāra dynasty...calls itself Gurjara-Pratihāra in an inscription found at Rajor. Now since the Pratihāras never call themselves Gurjaras, these Pratihāras call themselves so, simply to distinguish themselves from other Pratihāras, and the method of such distinction is the natural one, viz. that based on the mention of the country of residence ...'

To the paragraph he adds the following note :—

'The phrase Gurjara Pratihāra need not be interpreted to mean Pratihāras who were Gurjaras, but should be interpreted as Pratihāras of the Gurjara country.'

Again, there is nothing new about Dr. Ganguly's conclusion that the dynasty assumed the name Pratihāra, because its founder occupied

1 The italics and the words within brackets are mine.

the office of the same name. Regarding this point, Mm. Pandit Gaurishankar Hirachand Ojah wrote in 1925 as follows:—

‘जैसे गुटिल, चौलुक्य (सोलंकी), चाहमान (चौहान) प्रादि राजवंश उनके मूलपुरुषोंके नाम से प्रचलित हुए हैं वैसे प्रतिहार नाम वंशकर्ता के नाम से चला हुआ नहीं, किन्तु राज्याधिकार के पद से बना हुआ है ।’²

On the point, however, Dr. Ganguly has arrived at a new conclusion. He thinks that the terms *Gurjareśvara*, the king of Jurz, etc. do not signify the kings of the Pratihāra dynasty. But as regards this, he would perhaps change his opinion on going through the following verse:—

गौडेन्द्रवंगपतिनिर्जयंदुविंदग्धसद्गूर्जरेश्वरदिगर्गलतां च यस्य ।

नीत्वा भुजं विहतमालवरक्षणार्थं स्वामी तधान्यमपि राज्यंछ(फ)लानिभुंक्ते ॥³

Herein the term *Gurjareśvara* refers to the Pratihāra king Vatsarāja. Further, one need not be afraid of the term *Gurjareśvara*. It does not prove that the Pratihāras were Gurjaras. As pointed out by the Mahāmahopādhyāya, the term *Gurjareśvara* simply means the ruler of Gurjara country or Gujarat, and not a ruler belonging to the Gurjara tribe. A parallel example is to be found in the expression: जगाम मालवेशस्य करवालःकरादपि ।⁴ In this, the word मालवेश means the ruler of Malwa, and not one belonging to the Mālava tribe. As to why the Pratihāras were called *Gurjareśvaras* by the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, though they were the kings of Kanauj, we can do nothing better than quote the opinion of Rao Bahadur C. V. Vaidya who writes⁵:—

‘As the Arabs of Sind were on the east bounded by the Gurjarāṭra country which was then the name of South Rajputana, and as the country was ruled by the Pratihāras it was but natural that the Arabs called the country and the king by the name of Jurz, and indeed the Rāṣṭrakūṭas called them Gujars for the same reason.

The point seems to have been partly clear to Dr. Ganguly for he

2 *History of Rajputana*, vol. I, p. 147.

3 Baroda grant, *EI.*, vol. XII, p. 160.

4 *Kīrtikaumudī*, Canto II, verse 10.

5 *History of Medieval Hindu India*, vol. II, p. 3.

himself adduces the pertinent example of the Gaṅga Satyavākya-Konguṇivarman. The Gaṅgas were neither Pratihāras nor Gurjaras. Yet Satyavākya Konguṇivarman earned the title 'Gurjjarādhirāja' by conquering the northern region for Kṛṣṇarāja III.

DASARATHA SARMA

Origin of the Pratihāras

In an article entitled 'Origin of the Pratihāra Dynasty' (*IHQ.*, X, 2, pp. 337 ff.), Dr. D. C. Ganguly argues that the Pratihāras were originally Brāhmaṇas. I have nothing to say about this, but I wish to point out that the same conclusion was arrived at by Mr. M. P. Mehta in his book *Mevādānā Guhilo* published in 1933. It is written in Gujarati and it is possible that it has remained a closed book to the general student world outside Gujarat. Mr. Mehta's main thesis in that work is to prove the Brāhmaṇa, rather Nāgara Brāhmaṇa origin of the Guhilas of Mevād. But he has also incidentally proved the Brāhmaṇa origin of the Cālukyas, Paramāras, Cauhānas, Pratihāras and the Sena kings of Bengal.

He has proved the Brāhmaṇa origin of the Pratihāras by quoting the Mandor inscription of Bāuka (V.S. 894, A.D. 837) and the two Ghaticāla inscription of Kakkuka, the brother of Bauka (V.S. 918, A.D. 861) and by showing that Hariścandra, a Brāhmaṇa, was the original ancestor of the Pratihāras. It will be seen that the same inscriptions have been relied upon by Dr. Ganguly.

D. R. MANKAD

1 The work has been published by Mr. M. P. Mehta, Nilakantha Mahadev Street, Bhavnagar (Kathiawad).

Kuchean or Western Ārsi

A forgotten language of the Indo-European family.

Prof. Sylvain Lévi has just published a work called the *Fragments de Textes Koutchéens*. This book contains the fragments of the ancient Kuchean translations of four Buddhist texts, viz. the *Udānavarga*, *Udānastotra*, *Udānālamkāra* and *Karmaribhaṅga*. Some of these fragments belong to the collection of the Pelliot Mission, some to the Stein and a few others to the Russian Mission. An earlier British collection of manuscripts from Central Asia, placed at the disposal of Hoernle, also contained some Kuchean manuscripts and these also were sent to M. Lévi for decipherment and interpretation.

The present work contains the Kuchean texts, their French translation, a vocabulary with references to the forms of words in a cognate dialect called "Tokharian A," comparative notes and an Introductory Essay in which various problems relating to the language and the country in which it was spoken have been treated.

The texts written in the Kuchean language which were previously published contained the fragment of some medical treatises originally translated from a text similar to Caraka and Suśruta. The fragments belonging to the Weber and Macartney collection were edited and published by Hoernle in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* 1901 (Extra number 1, Appendix) but for want of necessary materials Hoernle was unable to interpret it. M. Lévi studied some fragments of a similar treatise belonging to the Pelliot collection and these fragments are all bilingual containing the Sanskrit text by the side of its Kuchean translation.

Besides these medical treatises and some passports noticed by M. Lévi all the literary remains of ancient Kuchean so far published are fragments of Buddhist texts. M. Lévi previously published some bilingual portions of *Dharmapada* and a Kuchean translation of the Vinaya of the Sarvāst. jda school.

Udānavarga has been edited from Kuchean mss. coming from different collections namely of Pelliot, Stein, Hoernle (Weber-Macartney) and Berezowski. The Sanskrit *Udānavarga* for a long time known only from its Chinese and Tibetan translations are

now available from publications of Lévi, de La Vallée Poussin, Pischel and N. P. Chakravarti relating to Sanskrit mss. discovered by various Archæological Missions in Central Asia. The Kuchean fragments contain translations from most of the Vargas of the *Udānavarga* I-II, IV, VIII-IX, X, XII, XVI, XVII-XVIII, XIX-XX, XXII, XXIII, XXVIII, XXIX, XXXI, XXXII, XXXIII, and they show that a complete translation of the text once existed in Kuchean. The variety of mss. also proves that the text was widely read in the monasteries of Kucha.

The other two texts *Udānastotra* and *Udānālamkāra* are as yet unknown in their original. The former is a collection of verses eulogising each of the *vargas* of the *Udānavarga* and the latter is a sort of versified commentary of the *Udānavarga* which explains the verses and also relates the circumstances under which a particular verse of the text had been pronounced by Buddha. Both these texts are not bilingual and in the present state of our knowledge it is difficult to say if they were translated from Sanskrit or were originally composed in Kuchean.

The 4th text has been called by Lévi *Un Poème en Koutchéen sur la Rétribution des Actes (Karmavibhaṅga)*. It consists of a few fragments in the Pelliot collection of a Kuchean text which has been proved to be the metrical paraphrase of a Sanskrit Buddhist text called the *Karmavibhaṅga*. The ms. of this Sanskrit text was discovered by M. Lévi from Nepal in 1922. It has now been edited and published by him in a work in which he has given all the parallel texts from Pāli, Tibetan, Chinese and Kuchean, as well as illustrations from plastic representations of some of the stories of the text in the bas-reliefs of the famous temple of Borobodour in Java. In this work M. Lévi has studied the text in its various aspects and has brought out the importance of the text in Buddhism of different countries.

One of the most important archæological discoveries of the 20th century is no doubt Kuchean, an independent language of the Indo-European family which had long fallen into oblivion. The explorations undertaken by the different missions, the Russian, British, French, German as well as the Japanese in different parts of Central Asia brought to light fragments of ancient manuscripts and writings of other description and it is from them that some scholars in France and Germany discovered the two dialects of an Indo-European language long forgotten but once spoken in the northern parts of Eastern Turkestan, in the region of Kucha and Karashar. Of the two dialects which have been so long marked A and B the first has been

deciphered and interpreted from the mss. of the German collection of Grünwedel and Von Lecoq by Messrs. Sieg and Siegling. The second dialect has been deciphered and interpreted by M. Lévi from the French collection of mss. made by the Pelliot mission. Other mss. written in this dialect and belonging to the collection made by the British, Japanese and Russian missions were also placed at the disposal of M. Lévi. The documents written in A dialect came from the region of Karashar and its neighbourhood whereas those in the B dialect were discovered in the region of Kucha and its adjoining places.

Scholars have not been as yet unanimous in naming this language. While M. Lévi cautiously suggested that the A dialect should be called Karasharian and the B dialect Kuchean, Messrs. Sieg and Siegling preferred to call them Tokharian A and B and maintain that they represent the two dialects of the forgotten language spoken by the Yue-chis or the Indo-Scythians. Their only evidence was the colophon of an Uigur text called *Maitrisimit* (Skt. *Maitreyasamiti*). The colophon which is in the Uigur language says that the work was originally translated from the Indian text into Toxri and from Toxri into Turkish (*anatkak t̄il̄intin torri t̄il̄inca yaratm̄is...torri t̄il̄intin t̄ürk t̄il̄inca aqtarm̄is*). As a translation of the *Maitreyasamiti* in the A dialect had been discovered by the German Mission it was maintained that this latter was the basis of the Turkish translation and that the A dialect is no other than the Toxri or Tokharian mentioned in the colophon of the Uigur text. Such an argument cannot be deemed conclusive, particularly in matters of the antiquities of Central Asia which was the meeting place of a large number of people and languages in ancient times. It is thus quite conceivable that the translations of the Skt. *Maitreyasamiti* existed also in languages other than the A dialect and that Toxri had nothing to do with it.

M. Lévi has again discussed the problem in his present book and shown that in the present state of our knowledge we cannot establish any connection between the two dialects and ancient Tokharian. The Tokharians lived in a country far away from the region of Kucha and Karashar. Their country called by the Chinese *Tu-ho-lo* (Skt. *Tukhāra*) is located according to the Chinese evidence in the Upper valley of the Oxus between the Hindukush on the south and the Oxus on the north whereas the Pamirs formed its western boundary. Besides the name of the people in all its ancient forms—Skt. *Tukhāra*, Grk. *Tokharoi*, Chinese *Tu-ho-lo*

—is pronounced with a strong aspirate while there is no aspirate in any of the two dialects A and B.

None of the two dialects again has any connection with the Indo-Scythians or the Yue-chis. The earliest Chinese evidences about this people tell us that in the middle of the 2nd century B. C. their hordes being defeated at the hands of the Hiung-nus retired to the west and settled down in the valley of the Oxus where Chang-kien met them in 128 B. C. Those who were left behind and took shelter amongst the barbarians living along the southern steppes of Eastern Turkestan came to be known as the Little Yue-chis. According to the *Wei Lio* which deals with the history prior to the middle of the 3rd century A. D. the Great Yue-chis, settled in the valley of the Oxus, gradually extended their suzerainty on the kingdoms of *Ki-pin* (Kashmir), *Ta-hia* (Bactriana), *Kao-fu* (Kabul) and *T'ien-chu* (India). Kumārajīva who lived towards the end of the 4th and beginning of the 5th century A. D. identifies the Little Yue-chis with the Tukhāras. The country which they occupied is located by some of the Chinese sources in the Pamirs. In short, none of the two divisions of the Yue-chis or the Indo-Scythians can be said to have settled in the northern region of Eastern Turkestan in which Kucha and Karashar are situated. It is therefore useless to try to connect the two dialects with the Indo-Scythians in the present state of our knowledge.

On the other hand, there is ample evidence to show that the two dialects were known to the outsiders as the languages of the localities in which they were spoken, namely Kucha and Karashar. M. Lévi in an earlier article (*Le Tokharien B, Langue de Koutcha, J. L., 1913, pp. 311-380*) brought out in details the important rôle of Kucha in the ancient history of Eastern Turkestan and in the transmission of Buddhist civilisation to China. The Chinese sources record the important events of the history of this country from the middle of the 2nd century B. C. to the 11th century A. D. During this long period of her history Kucha often appears as the unquestionable mistress of the countries along the northern route of Eastern Turkestan; she often appears fighting with the invading Chinese forces for her independence. When defeated she appears as an ally of China but to re-assert her independence at the earliest opportune moment. Kucha was converted to Buddhism at an early period and for a long time the Buddhist scholars of the country played an important part in the transmission of Buddhism in China. Some of them were instrumental in translating Buddhist texts into Chinese and amongst them the name of Kumārajīva remains immortal. It is again a monk of Kucha

named Li-yen who seems to have been one of the oldest authors of a Sanskrit-Chinese lexicon for the use of the Chinese Buddhist scholars. In some cases the Chinese translations clearly seem to have been made from the Buddhist texts existing in the 'language of Kucha'. M. Lévi has shown that some of the early transcriptions of Buddhist terms in Chinese were made from the Kuchean words, e.g., Sha-men-Kuch. *ṣamāne* (Skt. śramaṇa), sha-mi-Kuch. *ṣanmir* (Skt. śramaṇera), po-ye-t'i-Kuch. *pāyti* (Skt. pāyantika), etc. In the account of the travels of Wu-k'ong written in 787 A.D. four independent languages of the "Four Chinese Garrisons of Central Asia" are recognised and these are the languages of Kucha, Karashar, Kashgar and Khotan.

The rôle of Karashar as far as it can be gathered from the Chinese records is comparatively less important than that of Kucha. In the present work M. Lévi has collected all the available informations on Karashar and Turfan, the country in his neighbourhood. These two countries comprised the area in which the A dialect was spoken because most of the documents written in the A dialect have been discovered from this area. Karashar in the Chinese record is mentioned as Yen-k'i and under its allied forms and in the records of Hiuan Tsang as A-k'i-ni. The original of this name has now been discovered from the Central Asian record by Prof. Lüders. The country in some of these documents is clearly mentioned as *Agnideśa*. Turfan occurs in the Chinese annals under the name Kao-tch'ang. The rôle of these two countries in the political history of Eastern Turkestan as well as in the transmission of Buddhist civilisation to China is quite pale when compared to that of Kucha.

Prof. Lüders has discovered the names of some kings of Karashar from the Central Asian records. These names end in the word *Arjuna* e.g. Indrārjuna, Candrārjuna etc. On the other hand, in the Chinese records 'Po' which means 'white' is a regular title of the kings of Kucha. As Arjuna also means 'white' in Sanskrit it has been suggested that 'Po' is nothing but a Chinese translation of the title Arjuna. Arjuna in the B dialect occurs under the form *Arcuni* (e.g. Ksemārcune).

Under these circumstances it is possible to conceive that the two countries Kucha and Karashar played quite distinct rôles in the history of Eastern Turkestan and there is every justification in considering the two dialects as local languages of the two countries Kucha and Karashar.

But is it possible to find a common name which may comprise the two dialects, A and B? In some of the documents written in the

A. dialect there is reference to an Ārsī speech—e. g. *ārśi kantu*, *ārśi nu kantwā*, *ārśiniṣkramā(ntam)*, *ārśi-lāñcinam* etc. The grammatical construction of some of these passages shows that the word *ārśi* was treated as a foreign word, because it appears without an inflexion which is contrary to the spirit of the language. M. Lévi has shown that Ārsī represents a local pronunciation of Chinese *An-si* (lit. Pacified West), a name given to this region in the middle of the 7th century A.D. when the country was annexed to China. Though this is a late name, M. Lévi has suggested that for the sake of convenience it may be used as the common name of the two dialects and the A dialect spoken in the region of Karashar may be distinguished as *Eastern Ārsī* and the dialect spoken in the region of Kucha as *Western Ārsī*.

These two languages have appeared to be dialects of an Indo-European language hitherto unknown. This language has been considered as a western dialect of Indo-European because the Indo-European prepalatals are represented in it by *k* as in Latin *centum* e. g. in dialect B. *kante* (the word for 100), *okdh* (the word for 8). *naksentr* (cf. Skt. *naśyati*), etc. But Prof. Meillet in his "Linguistic Remarks" on this language has uttered a word of caution by saying that this simple fact that the prepalatals are represented in the Ārsī languages by *k* is not sufficient to authorise us in grouping it with the *centum* languages. The Oriental dialects of Indo-European namely the Indo-Iranian, Slavonic, Baltic, Albanian and Armenian, as far as these consonants are concerned, do not represent the state of any common period of these dialects. The Sanskrit forms with *j* and Armenian with *c* show clearly that the language had at least arrived at the mid-occlusive stage and it appears to be most probable that in the common state of the Oriental speeches the prepalatal pronunciation was a little palatalised: *k'*, *g'* etc. A regression of *k'* towards *k* was therefore possible. As far as the gutturals are concerned if we want to prove that Kuchean belonged to the Western group of Indo-European languages it will be necessary to show from it the labio-velar element of the Latin series *quid*. But its trace is not very clear in Kuchean. Under these circumstances it is safer to consider the two dialects of the Ārsī speech as an Indo-European language quite independent of all hitherto known languages of that family. In this language the greatest confusion of the consonants takes place. The four kinds of Indo-European occlusives—surds, aspirated surds, sonants and aspirated sonants are reduced to only *p*, *t*, *k*. The two kinds of guttural occlusives—the prepalatal and velar—can be distinguished only in a few cases and with great difficulty. The

palatal *c* is only a form of dental *t* before prepalatal vowels and before *v*. There are however two series of occlusives in this language—*p, t, k*, and *p, dh* (rather *t* because it is also a surd) and *k* but the distinction between these two series depends on facts of pronunciation resulting from the internal development of the language and has no etymological value which can be now clearly ascertained.

It is more difficult to determine the vowel changes in this language because in matters of vowel changes in Indo-European the starting points are often uncertain. M. Meillet records the following changes in the Arsi languages : *e* strongly yodised has either become *(y)a* whence *a* or *(y)e* whence *io, o*, but *e* also represents the ancient *e* ; *o* has become *e*. As the alphabet was borrowed from India, in the writing the Arsi languages distinguish between long and short but from the transcriptions of Sanskrit words in these languages it becomes evident that the notation does not represent the difference in quantity. The short and long in the writing do not correspond to the short and long of Sanskrit.

From a study of the transcription of Sanskrit words in Kuchean it has been also clearly ascertained that Kuchean did not possess any sonant stops except nasals, it did not possess any aspirates and its vowels were distinguished by quality. Some examples will make it clear :

Consonant changes—

- i. *k < g*, *aḥaru* from Skt. *agaru*, *aśvakānta-aśvagandhā takaru—tagara*
- ii. *c < j*; *pṛṅkarac-bhṛṅgarāja*, *cagala-jagala* *Cinasena-Jinasena*
- iii. *t < d*, *Saṅkatasa-Saṅghadāsa*, *tinar-dīnāra* *tanapate-dānapati*
t < ḍ, *pitari-wiḍārī*
nt < ṅḍ, *prapuntarik-prapuṅḍarika*
nt < nd, *kuntark-gundraka*
- iv. *p < b*, *prahati-bṛhatī*
mp < mb, *nicitakampa-nīcakadamba*
p < v, *punarnapa-punarnavā*, *śāripa-śārivā*.

Loss of aspiration—

- t < dh*, *veteni-vedhini*, *Putamitre-Buddhamitra*
t < dh, *matu < madhu*, *saintava-saindhava*
t < t, *musta-mustā*
t < d, *meta-medā*
t < ṭh, *pāta-pāṭhā*

Bibliography

1. Etude des Documents Tokhariens de la Mission Pelliot by S. Lévi with "Remarques Linguistiques" by A. Meillet—*JA.*, 1911, pp. 431-464.
2. Etude des Documents Tokhariens de la Mission Pelliot by Lévi with "Remarques Linguistiques" by A. Meillet—*JA.*, 1911, pp. 119-150.
3. Un fragment Tokharien du Vinaya des Sarvastivadias (Hoernle Collection) by S. Lévi—*JA.*, 1912, pp. 101-116.
4. Le "Tokharien B la Langue de Koutcha"—by S. Lévi *JA.*, 1913, pp. 311-380.
5. Les noms et nombre en Tokharien B by A. Meillet, *MSL.*, XLVII, pp. 281-294.
6. Remarques sur les formes grammaticales de quelques textes en Tokharien B. (formes verbales) by Lévi and A. Meillet *MSL.*, XVIII
7. Remarques sur les formes grammaticales.....(formes nominales) by S. Lévi and A. Meillet, *MSL.*, XVIII, pp. 381-423.
8. Les Nouvelles Langues Indo-Européens trouvées en Asie Centrale—by A. Meillet, *Revue de Mois* 1912, XIV, p. 20., [*BEEEO.*, XII, 148].
9. Etymologies Tokhariennes by G. Grierson, *J.L.*, 1912, pp. 339-44; [In this article Sir G. Grierson has compared some of the Kuchean words with words of the so-called Paisācī group of languages].
10. Tokharian Prātimokṣa Fragment by S. Lévi, *JRAS.*, 1913, p. 109.
11. Kuchean Fragments (of Prātimokṣa, Prāyaścittika and Pratideśanīya) by S. Lévi—in *Manuscript Remains from Eastern Turkestan*, ed. by Hoernle, pp. 357 ff.
12. Sanskrit names of Drugs in Kuchean by A. C. Woolner, *JRAS.*, 1925, pp. 623 ff.
13. Mahā-karmavibhaṅga et Karmavibhaṅgopadeśa (with the Kuchean text by S. Lévi, Paris 1932.
14. Fragments de Textes Koutchéens, S. Lévi—*Cahiers de la Société Asiatique* 1933.
15. Besides these another fragmentary Kuchean text seems to have been published in 1912 in *Festschrift V. Thomsen* (pp. 164 ff.) but I have not been able to consult it.

REVIEWS

EARLY HISTORY OF KĀMARŪPA by Rai Bahadur K. J. Barua, Shillong, pp. xvi+342, 1933.

We welcome the publication of the *Early History of Kāmarūpa*. It deals with matters which require careful and steady research and we congratulate Rai Bahadur Kanaklal Barua on this brilliant achievement of his. As the history of Kāmarūpa is still in the making, the present writer takes this opportunity to point out in detail the statements, about which he differs from the author. Some of the information which the author derived from the reviewer's writings, have not been put properly, and so the reviewer intends to point them out also. To save space, we shall just mention the page numbers of the book and the points on which we differ along with reasons.

Preface p.v: What General Jenkins sent to the Asiatic Society as "Dharmapāla's" plates was not one of the two sets of plates of Dharmapāla that have been published by me: if the author had read the अतिरिक्त संयोजनी ओ संशोधनी in the *Śāsanāvalī* (pp. 209-210) along with the *Kāmarūpa Rājāvalī*, (pp. [33]—[34]), he would have seen that the plates were of Ratnapāla.

P. 1: 'Sailālaya' was the name of the grandfather of Bhagadatta, and not of Bhagadatta.

P. 11 fn. "Khasa (Khāsis)" is very doubtful. 'Khasa' is still the name of a Nepalese tribe.

P. 35 fn.: Here, as in many subsequent footnotes, the author has confused '*Kāmarūpa Śāsanāvalī*' with '*Kāmarūpa Rājāvalī*,' published in the same volume.

P. 45: That the king of Kāmarūpa had a Tibetan Buddhist as a teacher does not prove that the king was a Buddhist. The kings of Kāmarūpa were liberal minded and showed respects to these learned Sramaṇas.

P. 51: Suṣka Kauśikā cannot be the old channel of the Kosi. The Sanskrit name of 'Kosi' is 'Kauśikī' and not 'Kauśikā.'

Pp. 52-53 fn. (with an asterisk). The author refers to Rennell's Map

and says that "the Karatoyā was only a branch of the Teesta and bifurcating from it flowed towards the East through Ghorāghāt, but now it is a river to the west of the Teesta." We cannot accept this, for, if the Karatoyā was on the east of the Teesta, how could it cross the Teesta and flow on the west of the river? There must have been something wrong in Rennell's Map. That the Trisrotā (Teesta) flowed, even in ancient times, east of the Karatoyā is proved from chapter 78 of the *Kālikāpurāṇa*. The rivers in Kāmarūpa are mentioned there in order from west to east. The Karatoyā is mentioned in verse 7, and then after enumeration of several rivers eastwards, the Trisrotā is mentioned in verse 43.

Pp. 52-53: The author says that the land donated by Bhūti-varman lay in Puṇḍravardhana Bhukti, but (after Bhūti-varman's time) was taken away by Mahāsena Gupta: and that, after Śaśāṅka's defeat Bhāskara reoccupied it and renewed the grant to Brāhmaṇas (see Nidhanpur plates). If this was a fact, the donated land would have been designated as belonging to Puṇḍravardhana Bhukti. The renewal was necessitated on account of burning of Bhūti-varman's plates (*vide* the last verse in the Nidhanpur grant), and not on account of reoccupation of Puṇḍravardhana Bhukti by Bhāskaravarman, in which case the fact would have been mentioned in Bhāskaravarman's inscription.

Pp. 56-57: In the *Kāmarūpa Rājāvalī* (Introduction to *Śāsanāvalī*) I have stated that Supratiṣṭhitavarman, elder brother of Bhāskara succeeded his father though he ruled only for a short time: but previously I held the opinion that he died before he could succeed his father. The subsequent discovery of the Nālandā seal of Bhāskaravarman wherein the name of Supratiṣṭhitavarman is mentioned, has led to this change of opinion. The seal recorded the names of the predecessors of Bhāskaravarman as did the inscription in the Nidhanpur grant, and this persistent mention of Supratiṣṭhitavarman in these official records has removed my doubt about Supratiṣṭhita's occupation of the throne of Kāmarūpa.

Pp. 65-70: Bhāskara issued his Nidhanpur grant from 'Karna-suvarṇa-skandhāvāra' and so some learned writers (including the author) believe that the kingdom held by Śaśāṅka (i.e. Karna-suvarṇa) came under the permanent sway of Bhāskara and Rai Bahadur Rama-

prasadī Chandā goes so far as to say that Bhāskara transferred his capital from Kāmarūpa to Karṇasuvārṇa (*Prarāsī*, Vaiśākḥ, 1339 B.S., p. 65). Skandhāvāra means 'camp' as well as 'capital': and the present reviewer is still disposed to apply here the former signification.

The renewal of the grant was made during the early part of Bhāskara's reign, when, along with Harṣa, he occupied Karṇasuvārṇa temporarily. This was in the first decade of the 7th century A.D. It was a temporary occupation because Yuan Chwang, who came to visit India in the third decade of the 7th century, mentioned Śaśāṅka as a 'recent king' of Karṇasuvārṇa. When Śaśāṅka finally lost Karṇasuvārṇa either by death or defeat, Harṣa occupied it and included it in his empire. An ambitious monarch of Harṣa's type would not surely allow another king, however friendly to him, to have suzerainty over a kingdom acquired by him though with that friend's assistance. After Harṣa's demise, of course, when his empire disintegrated, Bhāskara might have occupied Karṇasuvārṇa (and other provinces) and consequently, be styled 'king of eastern India' thenceforth.

That Karṇasuvārṇa was not the capital of Bhāskara is proved by the fact that Yuan Chwang mentioned the capital to be in Kāmarūpa while giving description of that kingdom, which he entered after having crossed a large river (which was Kolotu, i.e., Karatoyā). Bhāskara, who was the king of Kāmarūpa, through which the sea-like Brahmaputra flowed, possessed a powerful navy and so his offer to Yuan Chwang to place his navy at the pilgrim's disposal was quite possible. The country up to Tāmralīpti was under Harṣa's sovereignty and so there could be no objection or obstruction against Bhāskara's navy to pass through a friendly territory and on a business that was quite non-military.

Bhāskara was more diplomatic than valorous; he was so much afraid of Śaśāṅka that he sent an ambassador to that rising monarch, Harṣavardhana, soliciting his friendship, sending him presents that included the famous umbrella and valuable royal ornaments used by his illustrious predecessors. Harṣa welcomed this offer and made friendship with Bhāskara, who by parting with the umbrella that could be used only by the lord paramount over the earth, betrayed his want

of ambition. Harṣa utilized him as much as possible against the common enemy Śaśānka but certainly did not make him lord over the conquered territory. Bhāskara, however, was the scion of a very ancient dynasty and as such, Harṣa showed him respect.

Mr. Chanda's theory is that Harṣa, having conquered Śaśānka, brought the latter's kingdom under his suzerainty and then allowed Bhāskara to hold its charge as a vassal under him (*Pravāsi*, Vaiśākh, 1339 B.S., pp. 65-66). So Bhāskara, who was an independent sovereign of Kāmarūpa, became a mere vassal (according to Mr. Chanda) under Harṣa in respect of Karṇasuvarna. Would it be wise and honourable for Bhāskara to transfer his capital from a kingdom, of which he was the sovereign, to a country where he was a vassal? Moreover Bhāskara made alliance with Harṣa with a view that he might not bow to any one except Mahādeva; how could he then become a vassal which would necessitate bending his head to Harṣa? So in the reviewer's opinion Bhāskara did not become a ruler of Karṇasuvarna until after Harṣa's death.

Pp. 93-95: The donees of Bhāskara's grant are styled 'Nāgara' Brāhmaṇas, evidently because some of their names end with 'datta' 'mitra' 'dāsa' 'nāga' 'basu' 'gupta' 'pālita' 'kuṇḍa' 'sena' etc., which are nowadays the titles of non-Brāhmaṇas. The reviewer holds that these really formed part of proper names and they were not surnames. All of these Brāhmaṇas bear the surname of 'svāmin,' which proves that they were highly respectable persons. I have demonstrated (*vide* pp. 6-9 of the *Kāmarūpa Śāsanāvalī*) that the ancestors of the Sāmpradāyika Brāhmaṇas—even now highly respectable—in the Sylhet district were amongst the donees of the Nidhanpur grant, and this fact goes a great way to show the hollowness of the assumption that they (i.e., the Nāgara Brāhmaṇas, if those donees were Nāgara Brāhmaṇas at all) 'subsequently became non-Brāhmaṇas.'

P. 120: The locality of Vanamāla's grant cannot be definitely stated to have been within Gauḍa. It was west of the Teesta, but that does not signify that it was beyond the Karatoyā also (*vide* also my previous remark on pp. 52-53).

P. 124: The rock inscription at Tezpur, as read by the late Mm. Haraprasad Sastri, does not contain any reference to 'mid-stream':

but in his translation, the learned Sastri introduced that word (mid-stream) and the author has evidently followed him without carefully consulting the inscription, and remarked that the inscription prohibited fishing boat from going to mid-stream.

P. 125: The author has no authority for his statement that 'this inscription was recorded about the 9th year of the king's reign,' as there is no record of Harjara's regnal year in the inscription.

The name Tārā of the queen of Harjaravarman is not correct. In verse 15 of the inscription, the name is 'Śrīmattarā.' 'Śrīmat' is a part of the name. The mistake is due to the author's following Sir Edward Gait's reading which is wrong.

P. 138: The second grant of Ratnapāla was made in the 36th year of his reign and not 26th year. (*Vide* the Extra Errata et Corrigenda, pp. 209-210 to my *Śāsanāvalī*).

P. 143, fn: The original home of the donees of Dharmapāla's first grant might have been Śrāvastī of Uttarakośala, but their home during Dharmapāla's reign was in Śrāvastī in Gauḍa near Kāmarūpa. The original Śrāvastī perhaps was at that time in ruins.

Pp. 151, *et. seq*: It is difficult to agree with the author against Sir Edward Gait that there was Buddhism in Kāmarūpa. Yuan Chwang's statement is decisive. That there were so many Brāhmaṇa families in one Agrahāra (Brāhmaṇical village) mentioned in the Nidhanpur grant goes to show that Brāhmaṇas from other provinces came here in numbers, as those provinces were under the influence of the Buddhists.

The author's attempt to show traces of Buddhism in Assam (at p. 317) from the word 'Saraṇ' (initiation in the Assamese Vaiṣṇavism) used in imitation of the Buddhist formula 'Buddham saraṇaṃ gacchāmi' is not very sound. The word 'Saraṇa' occurs in the Gītā—cf. सर्वधर्मान् परित्यज्य मामेकं शरणं ब्रज (XVIII—66).

P. 189: Kāmalāṅka is not, according to the reviewer, on the Burmese coast. In the songs of Mayanāmatī, is mentioned a 'Kāmlāknagar' which is probably a corruption of Kāmalāṅka. In that case it is in the district of Tipperah. Comilla, according to the late historian Raj Krishna Mukherji, is the modern representative of Kāmalāṅka.

Pp. 190, *et. seq.*: The author (following Sir Edward Gait) makes Vaidyadeva, the king of (the whole of) Kāmarūpa, which was conquered by Rāmapāla, who according to him 'annexed the whole of Prāgjyotiṣa' which 'became a bhukti within Gauḍa' (p. 194); that is, whatever portion of Kāmarūpa was conquered by Rāmapāla, became a part of Gauḍa. So in Vaidyadeva's grant, there is no mention of Kāmarūpa as a separate kingdom, but it is mentioned as (a tract) 'in the east.' Gauḍa was subsequently conquered by Vijayasena and the separate mention of Kāmarūpa along with Gauḍa in his Deopara Grant (गौडेन्द्रमद्रवदपाकृत-कामरूप-भूपम्) shows the existence of Kāmarūpa as a distinctly separate kingdom. Of course, some one interprets 'अपाकृत-कामरूपभूपम्' as adjective to गौडेन्द्रम्: but this would be appropriate if the very king of Gauḍa conquered by Vijayasena was himself the conqueror of Kāmarūpa, which, as is well known, had been conquered by Rāmapāla long before. According to the author (who follows R. D. Banerjee's theory) Vaidyadeva threw off the yoke of the Pāla rulers four years after the overthrow of Tiṅgyaḍeva, i.e. when he made his (Kamauli) grant, yet he was not styled as the 'king of Kāmarūpa' in the inscription as well as in the seal.

As to 'Vaidargarh' (not Vaidyargarh) in Kāmarūpa, the local tradition assigns it to Arimatta, and it may have some significance other than the 'Fort of Vaidyadeva.'

I cannot agree with the author that the name of a place ending in 'kuchi' must be in the district of Kāmarūpa and nowhere else, I think, 'kuchi' has something to do with 'koch' and probably refers to places inhabited by the Koch tribe, and if 'krauñci' in Vaidyadeva's (and also in Vallabhaḍeva's) grant be a Sanskritization of 'kuchi' then it only proves that there were Koch settlements on the borders of Bengal.

In this connection, it may be pointed out that the present reviewer did not state that the portion of Kāmarūpa conquered by the Gauḍa king Rāmapāla, included "nearly the whole of the tract, which subsequently got the name of 'Kāmatā'." I stated that the tract was a big piece of land in the south-west (of the then) Kāmarūpa, (see *Kāmarūpa Rājāvali*, p. [41] fn. 3). The author seems to have overlooked fn. 4 on the same page relating to the 1st grant of Dharmapāla. The kingdom of Kāmarūpa was perhaps bigger than Gauḍa, and the kings were very

powerful. To suppose that Rāmapāla conquered the whole of Kāmarūpa, would be underestimating the prowess of the mighty rulers of the great kingdom of Kāmarūpa. Even Jayapāla, who, according to the author, was overthrown by Rāmapāla, was extolled with the adjective 'अचिन्त्यधामन्' (of unthinkable lustre) in the Silimpur inscription (verse 22), (see *Epigraphia Indica*, vol. XIII, p. 292).

Although there is no mention at all of Kāmarūpa (or Prāgjyotiṣa) either in the main part of the inscription or the seal, yet that the land donated is described as a 'Prāgjyotiṣa Bhukti' and 'Kāmarūpa Maṇḍala' is looked upon as a decisive proof that Vaidyadeva was the king of (the whole of) Kāmarūpa. The kingdom of Kāmarūpa, it seems, had no such divisions as 'Bhukti' or 'Maṇḍala'—as these terms are never found in any of the Kāmarūpa inscriptions. But in Gauḍa, there were 'Bhuktis' and 'Maṇḍalas'; the land to be granted by Vaidyadeva was to be given a 'Bhukti' and a 'Maṇḍala'; according to the Gauḍa custom probably, the officer in charge of the affair utilized the two synonyms of the kingdom to which the land had formerly belonged—one (Prāgjyotiṣa) was made a 'Bhukti,' the other (Kāmarūpa) a 'Maṇḍala.' This is a proof that the transaction was not made in the kingdom of Kāmarūpa, in which case the grant would not have mentioned *Bhukti* or *Maṇḍala*, as no such divisions existed there.

In order to make Vaidyadeva the king of the whole of Kāmarūpa the rulers of the Pāla dynasty including Jayapāla had been rendered extinct about half a century earlier. Ratnapāla had a reign of about 40 (not 30) years and Dharmapāla also reigned till he became old. To the Pāla kings an average period of 25 years (at least) should be assigned, and so if Jayapāla was the son of Dharmapāla (and so his immediate successor) then Jayapāla might have ruled over Kāmarūpa up to the 6th decade of the 12th century. If Umapati mentioned in *Chāndogaparīṣiṣṭa* (vide *Kāmarūpa Rājāvali*, p. [37]) has been correctly conjectured to be Umapati Dhara; then, Jayapāla was a contemporary of Vijayasena and Lakṣmanasena. The author, however, has passed over this point (re: Umapati Dhara).

P. 304: Sylhet was never under the Jaintia kings, and only the southern part of Sylhet—about one-tenth of the whole district—is supposed to have been under the Tipperah kings, about 12 or 13 hundred

years ago. The Sahajiyā cult, as found in Sylhet, is a recent introduction and is a sub-sect of the Vaiṣṇavas. Sylhet never came under the influence of Buddhism, and it is a firm conviction of the present reviewer that Tāntric religion is not an evolution of Buddhism.

P. 310: Madhura-bhāva, or the idea of sweetness of Śrīcaitanya should not be associated with sexual pleasure.

P. 322: Nārāyaṇa Deva was a native of Bengal and his Bengali poem *Padmapurāṇa* is very popular among the residents of the eastern part of East Bengal. His descendants still live in a village in Mymensingh. *Suk-nanni* (i.e. the composition of Sukavi Nārāyaṇa), is very likely an Assamese recension of the Bengali book.

P. 323: Narottam Thākur is a great name in the Vaiṣṇava literature of Bengal. He was a native of Western Bengal.

P. 327: Purnānanda Paramahaṃsa was a native of Mymensingh where his descendants are still living. His work *Ṣaṭ Cakra* should not therefore have been mentioned here: nor was he a writer of the Pre-Nārāyaṇa period as he was a contemporary of Naranārāyaṇa. (*Vide*, the article '*Pūrṇānda Girī Kāmākhyā Mahāpīṭha*' in my *Prabandhāṣṭaka*).

Appendices: English translations of some of the copperplates have been published as appendices, excepting those already published in *JASB*. But the omission of Indrapāla's second (i.e. Gaukuchi) grant that has not as yet been translated into English is probably an oversight, due perhaps to the fact that the first half of this grant is the same as that of his first (Gauhati) grant, a translation whereof was published in the *JASB*. The last part of the inscription in the second grant is very interesting, and along with the translation, a facsimile of the last plate should have been given as it contains some pictures.

P. 340: Addenda to p. 158, line 8—Not only the kings of the dynasty of Brahmapāla were 'Votaries of Tantricism' but even the dynasty preceding thereto were of Tāntric initiation. The Tāntric mark of āñji (ॐ) is found at the commencement of the copperplate inscriptions of Vanamāla and Balavaman of the Śālastambha dynasty. The corner of the first plate of Bhāskaravarman is broken and the mark there is not visible—it has been read as ॐ—but I suspect this also might have been āñji. The worship of the divine pair, Kāmeśvara and Mahāgaurī, probably symbolized in the 'Amulet of Bhagadatta' preserved

even now at Guhāinīmāri in Kuch Behar, is certainly indicative of the Tāntric worship. (Vide *Kāmarūpa Rājāvali*, p. [32] fn. 2).

P. 341: Addenda to p. 193, ll. 6-11—The present reviewer never stated that “Dharmapāla ruled over the eastern part of Kāmarūpa simultaneously with Tiṅgyadeva and Vaidyadeva who ruled over western Kāmarūpa.’ His statement is that Vaidyadeva ruled over a portion of the south-western part of Kāmarūpa only and that Dharmapāla ruled over the whole kingdom *minus* the above portion. The grant to Himaṅga was made in the 3rd year of Dharmapāla’s reign. The conquest of the portion by Rāmapāla occurred subsequently.

P. 341: Addenda to p. 198—ll. 18-21—Mr. N. G. Majumdar’s statement regarding conflict of an ancestor of Vallabhadeva with Vijayasena, as conjectured by the author also, may be correct: but the author’s view that Vallabhadeva’s state was a feudatory one under the suzerainty of Kāmarūpa is of doubtful accuracy. Vallabha’s inscription has no mention whatever of Kāmarūpa but was modelled on Bengal inscriptions. ‘Koñci’ in the names of villages need not be adduced as a proof of their being included in Kāmarūpa. On the other hand, one of the places (in the grant) was named Maitaḍa, and there is still a village called Mitāḍa in the Manikganj subdivision of the Dacca district. There is no doubt about the fact that the small kingdom, whereof Vallabha was the heir-apparent, lay in the proximity of Bengal: it is proved also by the fight of Rayarideva with the Bengal king, but the persons and places mentioned including the name of the mother of Vallabha indicate a less civilized locality than East Bengal of the 12th century.

In conclusion, one cannot but praise the book and its author for the excellent materials collected by him. In the vernacular books on the history of Assam, only a few pages are devoted to the ancient and mediæval (i.e. pre-Koch-Ahom) period, and the incidents recorded are mostly imaginary and based on hearsays and traditions. In Sir Edward Gait’s *History of Assam*, the accounts given of that period cover only 14 pages, even in its second edition published about ten years ago. It is therefore a matter of no small credit to the author that the above-mentioned period has in this book covered 200 pages of solid information. I am exceedingly delighted to see this publication by one of the worthiest sons of

Assam, having as his co-workers, some of his distinguished compatriots, such as Srijut Sarat Chandra Goswami, Professors Suryya Kumar Bhuiyan and Bani Kanta Kakati.

PADMANATH BHATTACHARYYA

MUGHAL KINGSHIP AND NOBILITY by Ram Prasad Khosla, M.A. (Punjab), B.A. (Oxon), I.E.S., Principal, T. N. J. College, Bhagalpur. Fellow and Syndic of Patna University, &c. The Indian Press Ltd., Allahabad, 8½ × 5, pp. iv + 311, 1934.

Mr. Khosla's handy little volume, *Mughal Kingship and Nobility*, throws considerable light on one of the neglected sides of Mughal history. The political history of the period has been written, the economic, social and other questions have been discussed in detail but the Mughal Constitution has not received the notice it deserves. As Lord Bryce points out in the *American Commonwealth*, chapter CXXIII on the development of political institutions and habits, a conception of the economic and social life of the United States could be explained only by studying whether those phenomena are due to permanent or transitory causes; by noting "the tendencies which seem likely to continue to affect the social and intellectual life of the time." These realised facts and intimate tendencies make up a Constitution. To study Mughal institutions without reference to the Constitution they inhere in has so far been a serious drawback.

Mr. Khosla has attempted to fill up this gap, to give a sympathetic account of the constitutional problems which existed during the Mughal period. To quote the author's own words, "The position of the Mughal King, his relations with the Church and Nobility, the law of Succession, the administration of justice are some of the important topics discussed;" and Mr. Khosla discusses them in easy, clear and concise English.

The style seems to have been deliberately kept simple and lucid so that the book may be easily intelligible even to the average student and the average layman interested in the subject.

The history with which Mr. Khosla presents us is of a kind utterly unfamiliar in matter as well as style. No new or original theories have been advanced—the author himself disclaims any such intention—but

an attempt has been made to give a distinct and concrete shape to what existed in a vague and undefined form. In discussing these problems the author exhibits a keen sympathy for and a judicious insight into the social, political, and religious ideals, of which the Mughal Constitution was the outcome. His profound erudition and brilliant exposition gradually unfold in eleven illuminating chapters the 'grand traits' appearing in Mughal history and forcing upon the reader the conclusion that behind the mass of seemingly unrelated particulars there lies a pattern, a dominating idea which determines, independently of all external influence, not only the form which its art and religion will take, but equally the nature of its political development. Actually it remoulds our attitude to the past and thereby helps to suggest an attitude to the present and the future. Himself a specialist in Persian sources, the author's discussion ranges over every important problem in religion, law and politics, yet there is never a touch of the mere antiquarian or the pedant.

The author's estimate of Aurangzeb may not be adequate. A sympathetic account of that greatest of Mughal Emperors has yet to be written. But the author leaves no sources unexplored.

On the whole, an admirable book—admirable in design as well as in execution.

AZIMUDDIN AHMAD

NAYAKUMARACARIU OF PUŞPADANTA, critically edited with Introduction, Notes, Glossary and Indexes, by Hiralal Jain. The Devendrakiriti Jaina Series, vol. I, pp. lxiii+209, Berar, 1933.

Of all the different phases of the Indo-Aryan language Apabhraṃśa has received the least attention from the Indologists. This undeserved indifference to Apabhraṃśa is mostly due to want of suitable texts. Hence the patrons and promoters of the Devendrakiriti Jain Series deserve the best thanks of the scholarly world for their undertaking to publish good editions of Apabhraṃśa works of which the volume under review is a specimen.

Nayakumāra or Nagakumāra is well known in Jaina legends. According to the learned editor no less than eighteen works are known

to have been written about the career of Nāgakumāra, and in different languages, viz., Sanskrit, Prakrit, Apabhraṃśa, Hindi, Tamil and Kanarese. This at once shows the great popularity the story of Nāgakumāra enjoyed among Jains in different parts of India. Among the different versions of the story, that given by Puṣpadanta seems however to be the oldest. Hence the present work is important for the study of Jaina legends. But in other studies too, it may give us useful help. For example, it contains occasional references to contemporary political divisions of India, social customs, arts, amusements, fashion, luxury and trade etc. Besides these, some legends traceable in the Purāṇas and epics have also been referred to in it. All these have been carefully gathered by the editor in the well written and elaborate introduction. The editor has also given an interesting discussion about the Nāgas, on the basis of data gathered from epics, Purāṇas, and other Sanskrit works and Buddhist literature, and inscriptions. His treatment of the Puṣpadanta, the author of the work, whom he places on good grounds in the 10th century A.C. is quite exhaustive. An analysis of the work given in English as well as a conspectus of the grammar of the work has enhanced the utility of the present edition. The discussion on the metres of the work is valuable.

On the whole the work may be said to have been edited well, though it may still be possible to differ from the learned editor on certain points. In reconstructing the text he has not taken any one or any group of his mss. as the basis. We wished very much to know which according to his opinion is the best ms. and why. As for his normalising of all *na*'s to *ṇa* there cannot be any objection but the case of *v* versus *b* is different; and readings of mss. on this point should have been included in the footnotes. An omission of variants in case of readings differing in having or not having *anusvāra* has also been not judicious. More care on these points would have made this work more useful to the students of linguistic science.

MANOMOHAN GHOSH

Select Contents of Oriental Journals

Acta Orientalia, vol. XII, parts iii, iv (1934).

F. B. J. KNIPPER.—*Zur Geschichte der indo-iranischen s-Präsentia.*

Archiv Orientalni, vol. VI, No. 2 (June, 1934).

VIDHUSHIEKHARA BHATTACHARYA.—*Loan Words in Tibetan.* Eighty-nine Tibetan words have been given here with their corresponding Sanskrit or Prakrit forms to show that the words were taken direct from those languages.

Calcutta Oriental Journal, vol. I, No. 6 (March, 1934).

MALATI SEN.—*The Kāśikā and the Kāvyaḷaṃkārasūtra-vṛtti.* It has been shown from internal evidences that Vāmana, the author of the *Kāśikā*, is different from the author of the *Kāvyaḷaṃkārasūtra-vṛtti*.

—*The Prayoga Chapter of the Kāvyaḷaṃkārasūtra-vṛtti with an Original Commentary in Sanskrit.*

Ibid., vol. I, No. 7 (April, 1934).

KSHITIS CHANDRA CHATTERJI.—*Grammatical Doctrines and Technicalities in the Kāvya.*

PROBODH CHANDRA BAGCHI.—*A Note on the Language of the Buddhist Dohās.* New evidences have been put forward in support of the view that the language of the Buddhist Dohās is a Western Apabhraṃśa and is in no way an Eastern Apabhraṃśa as held by some.

KOKILESWAR SASTRI.—*Vidyā and Avidyā.*

MALATI SEN.—*The Kāśikā and the Kāvyaḷaṃkārasūtra-vṛtti.*
(Continued).

K. M. SHEMBAVNEKAR.—*The Gotra of Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa.* The writer is of opinion that Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇa was of the same gotra with Bhāradvāja Droṇa, because of his ill-concealed partiality for

Aśvatthāman as also for a feeling of personal indignation at the unjustifiable murder of Drona.

KSHITIS CHANDRA CHATTERJI.—*The Tārīkās and Sanskrit Grammar.*

P. K. GODE.—*Kṛṣṇabhṭṭa's Commentary on the Raghuvamśa and the Chronological Limits (A.D. 1385).*

KSHITIS CHANDRA CHATTERJI.—*Kavikalpadruma with the Commentary Kāvya-kāmadhenu.* Edited with short explanatory notes and different readings.

Ibid., vol. I, No. 8 (May, 1934).

KSHITIS CHANDRA CHATTERJI.—*Kirātārjunīya (Canto. I) with Commentaries of Devarājajavan and Vidyāmādhava.* The unpublished commentaries discuss many points not touched by other commentators and in some cases suggest explanations more reasonable than those of Mallinātha.

Ibid., vol. I, No. 9 (June, 1934).

K. R. PISHAROTI AND V. K. R. MENON.—*Vāstu-vidyā—A treatise on Architecture.* The work has been translated into English with diagrams.

NARENDRA KUMAR MAJUMDAR.—*Dhīkoṭikaraṇa of Śripātī.* This treatise on the calculations of eclipses has been rendered into English with notes.

Calcutta Review, (July, 1934).

KUNJAGOVINDA GOSVAMI.—*A Newly discovered Inscription of Kanishka.*

This epigraph, according to the writer, is the earliest available Brāhmī inscription of Kaniska's time, recording in the second year of his reign the erection of a Bōdhisattva statue by a nun Budhamitrā.

DIGAMBAR KASINATH GARDE.—*The Vidūśaka in Sanskrit Drama.* The nature and activities of the Vidūśaka as found in Sanskrit dramas in general and Kālidāsa's dramas in particular have been discussed here.

Ibid., (August, 1934).

NIRMAL KUMAR BOSE.—*Caste as a Social Phenomenon.*

Ibid., (September, 1934).

UMESHCHANDRA BHATTACHARJEE.—*Problem of Time in Indian Thought,*

NIRMAL KUMAR BOSE.—*Caste through the Ages.*

Indian Art and Letters, vol. VII, no. 2.

K. DE B. CODRINGTON.—*An Introduction to the Study of Islamic Art in India.*

COUNTESS G. DE CORAL-REMUSAT.—*Concerning Some Indian Influences in Khmer Art as exemplified in the Borders of Pediments.*

EUGENE CAVAIGNAC.—*The Seleucid Tradition in India and its Persistence.*

C. E. A. W. OLDHAM.—*Recent Archæological Work in Mysore.*

Indian Culture, vol. I, No. 1 (July, 1934).

S. K. DE.—*Some Bengal Vaiṣṇava Works in Sanskrit.*

R. C. MAJUMDAR.—*Indo-Japanese Literature.*

A. BERRIEDALE KEITH.—*The Date of Zoroaster.*

Journal of the American Oriental Society,

vol. 52, No. 2 (June, 1934).

W. F. ALBRIGHT AND P. E. DUMONT.—*A Parallel between Indic and Babylonian Sacrificial Ritual.* The Vedic and Babylonian sacrificial rites have been compared and extraordinary similarities pointed out. The writer of the paper is of opinion that the horse-sacrifice goes back to Indo-European times or it may have come from the Indo-Iranians who had borrowed it from another people of the great plains. The Babylonians adopted the practice of sacrificing the horse from Indo-Iranians and transferred the rituals connected with the ancient bull sacrifice to the horse-sacrifice.

Journal of the Greater India Society,

vol. I, No. 2 (July, 1934).

G. COEDES.—*On the Origin of the Sailendras of Indonesia.*R. C. MAJUMDAR.—*The Struggle between the Sailendras and the Cholas.*J. PRZYLUCKI.—*Indian Colonisation in Sumatra before the Seventh Century.*E. OBERMILLER.—*The Term Śūnyatā and its different Interpretations.*

The paper deals with the different meanings which have been attached to the word* Śūnyatā by the different Buddhist schools, Hīnayānic and Mahāyānic, and reviewed here mainly on the basis of a Tibetan commentary on the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra*.

H. MEINHARD.—*Ancient Indian Culture in Bali.***Journal and Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal,**

vol. XXIX, No. 1.

SUNDRA LAL HORA.—*Worship of the Deities Olā, Jholā and Bon Bībi in Lower Bengal.*CHINTAHARAN CHAKRAVARTI.—*A new Indian Version of the Story of Solomon's Judgment.*

HIMANSU BHUSAN SARKAR.—*Date of the Introduction of the Śaka year in Java.* From the mention of a date in some mythical chronology of Java, it is known that the Javanese year begins in 456 A.C. The author of this paper suggests that this year marks the advent of the Śakas into Java as they had been driven out from India perhaps at this time by Skandagupta. From this period, inscriptions in Java began to be dated in Śaka Era.

JOGENDRA CHANDRA GHOSH.—*The Chhindas of Magadha and Gaudeśvara Madhusena.* It is surmised that Gaudeśvara Madhusena mentioned in the colophon of a Buddhist manuscript was a Sena king of Bodh Gayā. In spite of Madhusena's title 'Gaudeśvara', the Buddhist Senas were under the kings of Magadha where the Chhindas, identified with the Chikkores, were ruling at the time. The Senas are styled Pīṭhipati and Ācārya, as they occupied a sacred seat and were religious teachers of the Chhinda family.

.—It is known from an inscription recording the setting up of an image of Bhagavati by king Indravarman III of Champa that the king was well-versed in a number of Indian Śāstras including a grammatical treatise of Jinendra and the *Uttarakalpa* of the Saivas. Jinendra's work refers to the *Kāśikā-Vivaraṇapāñjikā* or the *Nyāsa* by the Buddhist scholar Jinendrabuddhi who resided in Bengal. The *Uttarakalpa* is also a work of Tāntric Saivism specially prevalent in Bengal. So these two works were probably taken to Champa, from Bengal.

SUNDRA LAL HORA.—*Worship and Propitiation of Wild Animals at Uttarbhag, Lower Bengal.*

KALIPADA MITRA.—*Side-light on Ancient Indian Social Life.* Information has been gathered here mainly from the Pāli commentary *Vimānavatthu-aṭṭhakathā* regarding social life in ancient India. The items discussed include the celebration of festivals, the activities of thieves, the naming of the city-gates, the influence of the courtesans, the relation between the husband and wife, as also that between the mother-in-law and the daughter-in-law, the institutions of marriage and slavery, the popular way of expressing joy, the various arts and crafts, dresses, and ornaments.

CHINTAHARAN CHAKRAVARTI.—*A Note on the Age and Authorship of the Tantras.* The conclusion arrived at in the note is that some of the Tantras are very old going back as early as the beginning of the Christian era. As regards the authorship, it is pointed out that in spite of the fact that a divine origin is claimed for the Tantras, and their authors are not mentioned, some of them give clue for finding out the real authors.

SARAT CHANDRA MITRA.—*On a few Ancient Indian Amulets and Charms.*

T. A. WELLSTED.—*Notes on the Vākātakas of the Central Provinces and Berar, and their Country, 4th to 8th century A.D.*

HARIDAS MITRA.—*Sadāsira Worship in Early Bengal: A Study in History, Art and Religion.*

GEORGE P. CONGER.—*Cosmic Persons and Human Universes in Indian Philosophy.*

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, (April, 1934).

RAGHU VIRA.—*Implements and Vessels used in Vedic Sacrifice.*

GIUSEPPE TUCCI.—*The Ratnāvalī of Nāgārjuna.* This is an edition and a translation of the first chapter of the *Ratnāvalī* of Nāgārjuna from a ms. recently acquired from Nepal. The work is in the form of a discourse to a king on *dharma* (mystic and spiritual laws).

R. G. BHATNAGAR.—*Śabhā, Grāmaṇī, Sthapati etc., in the Sūtra Literature.*

C. C. DAS GUPTA.—*On a New Type of Brāhmī ja inscribed on some Ancient Indian Coins.*

Ibid., (July, 1934).

E. H. JOHNSTON.—*The root Rap in the R̥gveda.*

DINES CHANDRA SIRCAR.—*A Note on the Name of the last great Sātavāhana King.* It is pointed out in the note that the name of the last great Sātavāhana king as found in the inscriptions and on coins is (Śrī) Yajña-Sātakarṇi and not Yajñaśrī-Sātakarṇi which name is mentioned in the Purānas and has been accepted by scholars as correct.

Journal of the Royal Society of Arts, vol. LXXXII,

No. 4265 (August, 1934).

RAMAPRASAD CHANDA.—*Art in Orissa.* This is a lecture on the art of the mediæval temples of Orissa delivered at the Royal Society of Arts, London. The sculptures described here relate to Śaktism at Jajpur, Mahāyāna Buddhism in the hill tracts of Cuttack, and Saivism at Khiching in the Mayurbhanj State, covering a period of about six centuries (700-1300 A.C.).

Journal of the University of Bombay, vol. II, part VI (May, 1934).

A. N. UPADHYE.—*The Prakrit Dialect of Pravaracanasāra or Jaina Sauraseni.*

A. D. PUSALKAR.—*Critical Study of the Works of Bhāsa with special reference to the Sociological Conditions of his Age as revealed in those Works.*

Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik, Band 9, Heft 3.

V. R. RAMACHANDRA DIKSHITAR.—*The Marumakkattāyam and the Sangam Literature.* This institution of the Marumakkattāyam which the writers on social science designates as 'mother-right' is prevalent among the Nairs of Malabar. It can be traced back to the primitive culture in which maternity was given a higher place than paternity. According to the writer of this paper, no reference to the Marumakkattāyam can be found in the Śāngam literature, though this ancient institution must have existed in Malabar at the time when the Śāngam works were written.

HELMUTT VON GLASENAPP.—*Die Lehre Vallabhācārya* (the teachings of Vallabhācārya).

THE Indian Historical Quarterly

Vol. X

December, 1934

No. 4

History of the Gurjara Country

(Early Mediæval Period)


In the early mediæval period the country of Gurjara extended in any case up to Didwana in the Jodhpur State, Rajputana in the west, and up to Rajore in the Alwar State in the east, comprising thus the eastern part of the Jodhpur State, and nearly the whole of the Jaipur and Alwar States.¹ Gurjaras were those who lived in the Gurjara country, and Gurjaresvara or Gurjaranātha was he who ruled it. It has hitherto been maintained by most of the scholars that the expressions, Gurjaresvara and Gurjaras, mentioned in the early records, referred respectively to the Pratihāra king and the Pratihāras of Mālava and Kanauj. The above identification of the Pratihāras with the Gurjaras is based on the assumption that the Pratihāras were a branch of the Gurjara tribe.

I have shown in my article on the "Origin of the Pratihāra Dynasty" that at present there is no evidence to prove the Gurjara origin of the Pratihāras. On the other hand, indications are available to show that the Pratihāras and the Gurjaras were two distinct peoples. Thus:

(a) Al Bilādurf² mentions the names of the countries viz., Uzain, Máliba, Bailmán, Jurz, etc., which were invaded by the Arabs

¹ See "Origin of the Pratihāra Dynasty," in *IHQ.*, vol. X, p. 337. The names Gurjara and Gurjaratrā are identical. In the late mediæval period Gurjara was the name of the modern Central and Northern Gujarat. Śrīdhara's Devapattana inscription mentions it as Gurjaratrā. (*EI.*, vol. II, p. 445).

² Elliot., vol. I, p. 126.



of Sindh. At this time Ujjain and Bailmán or Vallamāṇḍala, which were distinct from Jurz or Gurjara, were ruled by the Pratihāras.

- (b) The Rāṣṭrakūṭa records mention about the Gurjaras. The Nilgund inscription³ of Amoghavarṣa reports that the Gurjaras dwelt on the hill fort of Citrakūṭa.
- (c) The *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*⁴ refers, in the same connection, to the (Pratihāra) Bhoja, and the Gurjareśvara Alakhana.
- (d) Pampā's report⁵ indicates that the Gurjararāja, and (the Pratihāra) Mahīpāla were two different personages.
- (e) Al Ma'sūdī⁶ makes a distinction between the kingdom of Bauūra (Pratihāra) and the kingdom of Jurz.

The history of the Gurjara country can be traced from the early years of the seventh century A.D. The successors of Dadā. I of Lāṭa claim that they were born in the *Gurjara nṛpavaṃśe* i.e. in the royal family of the Gurjara country.⁷ Prabhākaravardhana, father of Harṣavardhana, defeated the Hūnas and conquered Gurjara, Gandhāra, Lāṭa, and Mālava.⁸ The Cālukya Pulikeśin II vanquished the Lāṭas, Mālavas, and the Gurjaras.⁹

A Guhila dynasty is found ruling the modern Jaipur State, the ancient central Gurjara country, from the middle of the seventh century A.D. down to the middle of the tenth century A.D. We have reasons to believe that the expression, Gurjara, mentioned in the records of this period, refers to these Guhilas. The history of this Guhila dynasty is mainly drawn from an inscription¹⁰ found engraved in the wall of a ruined temple near the great tank at the town of Chatsu, twenty-six miles south of the city of Jaipur, Rajputana. The place appears to have been the capital of this branch of the Guhilas.¹¹ Twelve kings of this dynasty are known. The ninth king Harṣa was a contemporary of the Pratihāra Bhoja (A.D. 836-892). Hence Bhatr-

3 *El.*, vol. VI, pp. 102-3.

5 See below, f. n. 36.

7 *IA.*, vol. XIII, p. 82.

9 *El.*, vol. VI, p. 10.

11 Cunningham, *ASI.*, vol. VI, p. 116

4 *BK.*, V, vs. 150-151.

6 Elliot, vol. I, pp. 22-23.

8 Cowell, *Harṣa-carita*, p. 101.

10 *Ibid.*, vol. XII, p. 10.

paṭṭa, the first known king of the dynasty appears to have flourished in the middle of the seventh century A.D.

Bhatṛpaṭṭa was born in the family of Guhila, and was a Brahma-Kṣatriya. His son was the king Isānabhaṭa. Isānabhaṭa's son was the king Upendrabhaṭa, whose son was the king Guhila. Guhila's son was Dhanika. The Dabok inscription states that Dhanika, son of Guhila, was a vassal of the Mahārājādhirāja Dhavalappa. The inscription was found at Dabok in Mewar. Dr. Bhandarkar reads the date of the inscription as (G.E.) 407 = A.D. 726, and identifies Dhavalappa with Dhavala of the Maurya dynasty. It suggests that Guhilas of Gurjara acknowledged the suzerainty of the Mauryas for some time. Dhanika was succeeded by his son Āuka. Āuka flourished in the middle of the eighth century. He appears to have suffered a defeat at the hands of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Dantidurga. The Daśāvatāra cave temple¹² inscription states that Dantidurga completed the acquisition of sovereignty by subjugating the rulers of Sandhu (Sindhu), Kāñci, Kaliṅga, Kosala, Mālava, Lāṭa, Tānka, etc. He performed the *Hiraṇyagarbha* ceremony at Ujjain. His army conquered Tīrakṣīti, and did something in *this palace*, which was built and beautified by the Gurjara king. It has been suggested that the expression '*asmin saudhe*' refers to the temple in which the inscription is engraved. In that case we are to assume that the Daśāvatāra temple or part of it was excavated by the Gurjara king sometimes before 750 A.D. It seems very much unlikely. It appears to have referred to a temple in the Gurjara country. The Sanjan copper plate¹³ of Amoghavarṣa reports that Dantidurga made the Gurjara lord and others door-keepers when at Ujjayinī the *Hiraṇyagarbha* ceremony was performed by the Kṣatriyas. The Gurjara lord, who was probably the Guhila Āuka, is not connected with the *Hiraṇyagarbha* ceremony by the Daśāvatāra cave temple inscription.

Āuka's son was Kṛṣṇarāja. It was probably during the reign of this Kṛṣṇarāja that the Pratihāra Vatsarāja of Mālava annexed Gurjara to his dominion. Vatsarāja granted lands, in the Gurjaratrā bhūmi.¹⁴ The

12 Arch. Sur. Western India, *Inscription from the Cave-temples of Western India*, by J. Burgess. p. 95.

13 *EI.*, vol. XVIII, p. 252.

14 *Ibid.*, vol. V, p. 212.

Baroda plate of Karkarāja,¹⁵ dated 812 A.D., states that the master of the lord of Gurjara was repulsed by Karkarāja's father Indrarāja of Lāṭa. This master of the lord of the Gurjaras was none other than the Pratihāra Vatsarāja. Kṛṣṇarāja was succeeded by his son Saṃkaragaṇa.

Saṃkaragaṇa appears to have been a contemporary of the Pratihāra Vatsarāja's successor Nāgabhaṭa II. Nāgabhaṭa was expelled from Mālava by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Govinda III sometimes between A.D. 808 and 812.¹⁶ Saṃkaragaṇa wrested the kingdom of Kanauj from Cakrāyudha and Dharmapāla, and placed Nāgabhaṭa on its throne. The Chatsu inscription¹⁷ reports that Saṃkaragaṇa, having defeated the general, conquered the empire of the Gauḍa king, and presented this to his master. He also made an attempt to regain the throne of Mālava for his overlord, but was repulsed by Karkarāja of Lāṭa, a vassal of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Govinda III. The Baroda plates of Karkarāja¹⁸ states that "for the purpose of protecting (*the king of*) Mālava, who had been struck down, caused his arm to become the excellent door-bar of the country of the lord of the Gurjaras who had become evilly inflamed by conquering the lord of Gauḍa and the lord of Vaṅga, his master (i.e. Govinda III) thus enjoys (*his*) other (*arm*) also as (*embodying all*) the fruits of sovereignty."

Saṃkaragaṇa's queen was Yajjā, who gave birth to Harṣarāja. Harṣa succeeded his father on the throne. He was a contemporary of the Pratihāra Bhoja. Bhoja granted lands in Gurjaratrā.¹⁹ During this period Devapāla of Bengal, son of Dharmapāla, is said to have crushed the pride of the lord of Gurjara.²⁰

The Chatsu inscription²¹ reports that Harṣa, conquering all the

15 *IA.*, vol. XII, p. 163.

16 See my *History of the Paramāra Dynasty*, p. 13 ff.

17 *Pratijñāṃ prāk kṛtvodbhaṭakarighaṭāsaṃkaṭaraṇe bhaṭam jitvā Gauḍa-kṣitipam avanīṃ saṃgarnhṛtāṃ / Balād dāsīṃ cakre (pru)bhucaraṇayor yaḥ praṇayinīṃ tato bhūpaḥ sobhūjjitabahuraṇaḥ Saṃkaragaṇaḥ // v. 14. EI.*, vol. XII, p. 14.

18 *Gauḍendra-Vaṅgapati-nirjjaya-durvvidugdhu-sad-Gurjjareśvara-dig-argalatāṃ ca yasya / nitvā bhujam vihata-Mālava-rakṣaṇārtham svāmi tathānyam api rājya-cha (pha) lāni bhukte // IA.*, vol. XII, p. 160, 11. 39-40.

19 *EI.*, vol. V, p. 212.

20 *Gauḍalekhamālā*, p. 81.

21 *Jitvā yaḥ sakayānudicyanṛpatin Bhojāya bhaktyā (da)ḍau Saktān saikata Sindhulamghanavi(dhau) Srivamśajān vājinah // v. 19. EI.*, vol. XII, p. 15.

kings of the Udīcya country, presented to Bhoja the horses, which were born of the Srī family, and which were expert in traversing the Indus. Udīcya may mean 'being in the north', or the country to the north and west of the river Sārāvati. Apte²² tells us that it is a country to the north-west of Sarasvati. Udīcya here means the Punjab, which is on the north of the Gurjara country, and which was in all probability conquered by Harṣa. Bhoja, after this achievement of Harṣa, obviously, became the sovereign chief of Ṭhakka or the Punjab. The *Rājatarāṅgiṇi* throws some light on the subject. It states that Śaṃkaravarman, king of Kashmir (A.D. 883-902), "who had as the advance-guard of his army nine lakhs of foot-soldiers, three hundred elephants, and a lakh of horsemen, was wholly bent on the conquest of Gurjara."²³ "The firmly rooted fortune of Alakhana, king of Gurjara, he uprooted in battle in a moment and made long grief rise (in its place)."²⁴ "The ruler of Gurjara gave up to him humbly the Ṭakka land, preserving (hereby) his own country, as (if he had saved) his own body (at the sacrifice) of a finger."²⁵ "He caused the sovereign power which the superior king Bhoja had seized, to be given up to the scion of the Ṭhakkiya-family, who had become his servant in the office of chamberlain."²⁶ Alakhana's ally was the illustrious Lalliya Śāhi, whose capital was Udabhāṇḍa.²⁷ Bhoja, referred to above, has rightly been identified with the Pratihāra king of the same name. The country of Ṭakka is identical with Ṭhakka, modern Punjab. Fleet²⁸ remarks on the above verse of the *Rājatarāṅgiṇi* that 'some dominions of the Punjab, which were conquered by Bhoja were reconquered by Śaṃkaravarman'. If Fleet's view proves to be true, it is to be maintained that Śaṃkaravarman by wresting the Punjab from Alakhana, the king of Gurjara, put an end to the sovereign authority of Bhoja over that country. It has already been seen that Harṣa conquered Udīcya country, which is identified with the Punjab, for Bhoja. Hence Alakhana is to be identified with Harṣa or his successor.

22 *Sans. Eng. Dictionary.*

24 *Ibid.*, V, 149.

26 *Ibid.*, V, 151.

28 *IA.*, vol. XV, p. 110, fn. 81.

23 Stein, vol. I, *BK.*, V, vs. 143-144.

25 *Ibid.*, V, 150.

27 *Ibid.*, vs. 152-155.

Harṣa is mentioned in the Chatsu inscription as *Dviija* i.e. a Brahmin. He was succeeded by his son Guhila II, born of the queen Sillā. Guhila was apparently a contemporary of the Pratihāra Mahendrapāla, as his father Harṣa was a contemporary of Bhoja. It was only during the reign of Mahendrapāla the Pratihāra empire extended up to Gauḍa.²⁹ This achievement is not attributed by any record to Mahendrapāla. The Chatsu inscription³⁰ tells us that Guhila conquered the king of Gauḍa, and levied tribute from the princes of the east. It is very likely that the eastern countries were conquered by Guhila for Mahendrapāla. The vanquished Gauḍa king was Nārāyaṇapāla.

Rajjā was the queen of Guhila. She was the daughter of Vallabharāja, a king belonging to the Paramāra family. Guhila was succeeded to the throne by his son Bhaṭṭa, who was a contemporary of the Pratihāra Bhoja II, and Mahīpāla. During the latter part of the reign of Mahendrapāla the Pratihāra empire was torn asunder by internal dissensions. Mahāsāmanṭādhipati Guṇarāja was trying to assert independence, but he was brought under control by Uṇḍabhaṭa, a vassal of Mahendrapāla at Siyadoni. Uṇḍabhaṭa was overthrown by the Mahārājādhirāja Dhruva during the reign of Bhoja II.³¹ It seems that the Guhilas of the Gurjara country entered into a hostility with the Candellas of Jejākabhukti. Candellas were socially connected with the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, and were probably supported by the latter. The Karhad plate³² of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛṣṇa III states that "on hearing the conquest of all the strongholds in the southern region simply by means of his (Kṛṣṇa II's—A.D. 878-915) angry glance, the hope about Kālañjara and Citrakūṭa vanished from the heart of the Gurjara." The Nilgunda inscription³³ of Amoghavarṣa connects Gurjara with Citrakūṭa.

The Candella Yaśovarman is stated to have been the burning fire to the Gurjaras.³⁴ Shortly after 915 A.D. the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Indra III, accompanied by the Cālukya Narasiṃha, invaded North India. Bhaṭṭa came to the rescue of Mahīpāla I, but both of them were defeated by the

29 *ASI.*, 1925-26, p. 141.

30 *El.*, vol. XII, p. 15, v. 23.

31 *Ibid.*, vol. I, pp. 173, 175; *IA.*, vol. XVII, p. 202.

32 *El.*, vol. V, p. 289.

33 *Ibid.*, vol. VI, p. 102.

34 *El.*, vol. I, pp. 126-132.

southerners, who then plundered Kanauj.³⁵ Pampā in his *Vikramārjunavijaya* states that³⁶ “when preparing for victory he (Narasimha) captured the champion elephants which marched in front, and penetrating and putting to flight the army of the Ghurjararāja secured the victory and eclipsed Vijaya (or Arjuna),—this Narasimha. Terrified at the army of this Naraga, which fell like a thunder-bolt, Mahīpāla fled in consternation, not stopping to eat or sleep or rest. His own horse he bathed at the junction of the Ganges and the sea, thus becoming celebrated; and by his own friend destroying the qualities and character of ‘(?) Sanga, established with pride the victory of his arm.’” The Gurjararāja, referred to, was in all probability Bhaṭṭa. Bhaṭṭa eventually succeeded in repulsing the Deccan king and his allies. The Chatsu inscription reports that³⁷ “the southern sea presented gems to Bhaṭṭa seeing that the latter, at the bidding of his master, defeated the king of the Deccan.

Bhaṭṭa married Purāśā, the daughter of one Vīruka. He had through this queen his son Bālāditya, who succeeded him on the throne. Bālāditya was also known as Bālārka and Bālabhānu. Bālāditya’s wife was Raṭṭavā, the daughter of the king Śivarāja of the Cāhamāna family. She gave birth to three sons Vallabharāja, Vighararāja, and Devarāja, and died early. The Chatsu inscription,³⁸ referred to above, was issued by Bālāditya. It records that the king erected a temple to Murāri in honour of his deceased wife. One Bhānu composed the eulogy.

It is not known whether Bālāditya was succeeded by any of his son on the throne. Nothing further is known about this dynasty. In the second half of the tenth century king Sāvaṭa of the Pratihāra family is found ruling over the eastern part of the Gurjara kingdom. He was succeeded by his son Mathanadeva who was a vassal of the Pratihāra Vijayapāla of Kanauj.³⁹ In the latter part of the tenth century the

35 *Ibid.*, vol. VII, p. 38.

36 By L. Rice, pp. 3-4.

37 *Akrāntā vīkṣya sainyai...rvvitaṭirbhagnanānāna(gau)dhāḥ bhīto bandhādivālaṃ punarumṛdumarudvepamānormmibūhuḥ | yasyādāddakṣiṇābdhiḥ samiti jītavato Dākṣiṇātyūnkṣitīśānisūdesādaseṣānlasadasamaruco velayā ratnarājih||*
EI., vol. XII, p. 16.

38 *Ibid.*, p. 13.

39 *Ibid.*, vol. III, p. 268.

Gurjara kingdom appears to have been absorbed into the kingdom of the Cāhamanas.⁴⁰

The Guhilas of the Gurjara country, whose history has already been stated above, were one of the most powerful dynasties that ruled in India during the period under review. Though they acknowledged the sway of the imperial Pratihāras, they were the real power behind the Pratihāra throne. They, on more than one occasion, saved the Pratihāras from utter ruin when the latter, having been deprived of their kingdom, were wandering hither and thither. Śaṃkaragaṇa conquered the kingdom of Kanauj for Nāgabhaṭa, Harṣa established the authority of Bhoja in the Punjab, and Guhila extended the Pratihāra empire up to north Bengal. When Mahipāla fled away at the approach of Indra III, it was Bhaṭṭa who offered a brave opposition to the invaders and drove them out from North India. The reason why this dynasty, owning so much resources, continued to acknowledge the hegemony of the imperial Pratihāras, cannot now be ascertained. It is significant that the fall of the imperial power of the Pratihāras synchronised with the fall of this Guhila dynasty. After the middle of the tenth century A.D. the Pratihāras of Kanauj only dragged their existence for some time till they finally lost their political power.

The early Arab geographers, and the historians of Sind, frequently mention about the kingdom of Jurz, which is accepted as identical with Gurjara. In order to make a correct estimate of their reports in this connection I quote below all the necessary passages from Elliot's *History* (vol. I.):

(a) Merchant Sulaiman.

Sulaimán visited India several times. The first part of the work *Salsi-latu-t Tawárikh*, bearing the date 237 A.H. = 851 A.D., was written by Sulaimán. It states that "the Balhará has around him several kings with whom, he is at war, but whom he excels. Among them is the king of Jurz. This king maintains numerous forces and no other Indian prince has so fine a cavalry. He is unfriendly to the Arabs, still he acknowledges that the king of the Arabs is the greatest of kings. Among the princes of India there is no great foe of the Muhammadan faith than he.

40 *Et.*, vol. II, p. 116.

His territories form a tongue of land. He has great riches, and his camels and horses are numerous. Exchanges are carried on in his state with silver (and gold) in dust, and there are said to be mines (of these metals) in the country. There is no country in India more safe, from robbers." "These three states (viz. Tāfak, Balharā and Jurz) border on a kingdom called Rhumi, which is at war with that of Jurz. The king of Rhumi is at war with Balharā as he is with the king of Jurz. His troops are more numerous than those of Balharā, the king of Jurz, or the king of Tāfak."⁴¹

(b) Abú Zaid.

Abú Zaid never visited India. He completed the work *Salsilatu-t Tawārīkh*, which was begun by Sulaimán, by reading and by questioning travellers to India and China. He met Al Mas'údī, whom he refers to as a trustworthy person, at Basra in 303 A.H. (=916 A.D.), and derived some information from him.

Abú Zaid makes an attempt to give a picture of the social condition of India, and remarks that "these observations are especially applicable to Kanauj, a large country forming the empire of Jurz."⁴²

(c) Ibn Khurdadba.

Ibn Khurdadba was an official under the Khalifs, and during his leisure made geographical researches. He died in 300 A.H. (=912 A.D.). He never travelled in India. He states that "the greatest king of India is Balharā, or "King of Kings." "The next eminent king is he of Tāfan; the third is king of Jāba; the fourth is he of Juzr; the Tāta-riya dirhams are in use in his dominions. The fifth is king of 'Ana; the sixth is the Rahmī, and between him and the other kings a communication is kept by ships. The seventh is the king of Kāmrun, which is contiguous to China."⁴³

(d) Al Mas'údī.

Al Mas'údī, a native of Bagdad, visited India and many other places for more than once. He was an authentic writer and acute observer. Ibn Khaldún says, "Al Mas'údī in his book describes the state of nations and countries of the east and west, as they were in his age, that is to say,

41 Elliot, vol. I, p. 4.

42 *Ibid.*, p. 10.

43 *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14.

in 330 (332) A.H. = 930 (932) A.D. He became through this (*Murūju-l Zahab*) work the proto-type of all historians to whom they refer, and whose authority they rely in the critical estimate of many facts which form the subject of their labours." He died in Egypt in 345 A.H. (=956) A.D.).⁴⁴ In the chapter VII of his book it is stated that "one of the neighbouring kings of India, who is far from the sea, is the Bauūra who is lord of the city of Kanauj. This is the title given to all the sovereigns of that kingdom. He has large armies in garrisons on the north and on the south, on the east and on the west, for he is surrounded on all sides by war-like kings."⁴⁵

Chapter XVI of the same work reports that "King of India is Balharā; the king of Kanauj, who is one of the kings of Sind, is Bauūra. This is a title common to all kings of Kanauj. There is also a city called Bauūra after its princes, which is now in the territories of Islam, and is one of the dependences of Multān..... This Bauūra, who is the king of Kanauj, is an enemy of the Balharā, the king of India."⁴⁶

Next it is stated that "Bauūra, king of Kanauj, has four armies, each consisting of 70,00,000 or 90,00,000. The army of the north fights with the Musulmans and the prince of Multān, and the army of the south fights with Balharā, king of Mānkīr." "The Balharā possesses many war elephants. This country is also called Kamkar. On one side it is exposed to the attacks of the Jurz; a king who is rich in horses and camels, and has a large army." The military forces of the king of Tāfan, who is on friendly terms with Moslems, are less than others mentioned above i.e., Balharā, Bauūra and the king of Jurz. "Beyond this kingdom is that of Rahma, which is the title for their kings and generally at the same time their name. His dominions border on those of the king of Jurz, and on one side on those of the Balharā, with whom he is frequently at war. The Rahma has more troops, elephants, horses, than the Balharā, the king of Jurz, and of Tāfan."⁴⁷

(e) Al Idrīsī.

Al Idrīsī settled in Sicily at the court of Roger II. He never travelled in India. He was born towards the end of the eleventh century

44 Elliot, vol. I, pp. 18-19; Sprengers, *Mas'ūdī*, Preface.

45 Elliot, vol. I, p. 21. 46 *Ibid.*, pp. 22-23. 47 *Ibid.*, pp. 23, 25.

A.D. He prepared his work viz., *Nuzhatu-l Mushtak*, by consulting various authors. The book tells us that "the greatest king of India is Balharā. After him comes the Makamkam, whose country is Sāj. Next the king of Sāfan or Tāban, then the king of Jāba, then the king of Jurz, and then the king of Kāmrun whose states touch China."⁴⁸

Pratihāras. There cannot be two opinions that Al Mas'ūdī was the most

(f) Al Bilādurī.

Al Bilādurī lived in the court of Khalif Al Mutawakkal. He died in A.H. 279 = A.D. 892-93. His work *Futūhu-l Buldān* is one of the earliest Arabic chronicles. "It brings down the history of events to the close of the reign of Mu'tasim, A.H. 227 = A.D. 842. Bilādurī does not seem to have visited India. His book reports that Junaid "sent a force against Uzain and he also sent Habid, son of Marra, with an army against the country of Māliba. They made incursions against Uzain, and they attacked Bahārimād and burnt its suburbs. Junaid conquered al Bāilmān and Jurz."⁴⁹

All that we know about Jurz from the early Moslem writers have been stated above. It clearly appears from Bilādurī's report (p. 613) that Jurz was the name of a country, and it does not in any case indicate the authentic of all the early Moslem historians. He clearly distinguishes the king of Jurz from Bauūra (Pratihāra), the king of Kanauj. The statement of Abū Zaid viz., 'Kanauj is a large country forming the empire of Jurz', cannot in any way overrule that of Al Mas'ūdī. Abū Zaid based his conclusions on secondhand information, and one of his informants was Al Mas'ūdī. Elliot⁵⁰ remarks that "Renaud suggests Kanauj as the seat of this monarchy (i.e. the monarchy of Jurz), but Mas'ūdī places the Bauūra or Bodha there at the same period." According to Ibn Idrīsī it occupied the fifth position as a political power in India. Hence Jurz, referred to by the early Moslem writers, may be identified with the Guhilas of the Gurjara country, who, as we have seen, maintained enormous military power.

D. C. GANGULY

48 Elliot, vol. I, p. 76.

49 *Ibid.*, p. 126.

50 Vol. I, p. 4, fn. 2.

The Durrani Menace and the British North-West Frontier Problem in the Eighteenth Century

With the breaking up of the Mughal Empire, the British merchants began to make themselves secure in Bengal. By their victory at Plassey in 1757, they were able to put their nominee Mir Jafar Ali Khan in power and use him as a puppet. The East India Company, the *de facto* sovereign of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa (Midnapore), naturally began to take some interest in the events that happened in Northern India, although these were not ~~their~~ concern. During the latter half of the eighteenth century, the Afghan menace, real or fancied, was one of the important factors of North Indian history. The British newsletters, the proceedings of the Select Committee, the correspondence between the Governor and the rulers of the country, throw a flood of light on the British attitude towards the Durrani invaders and their allies. After the British victory at Buxar in 1764, with the nominal king becoming a British pensioner, Oudh a dependent buffer state, and Mir Qasim Ali Khan, the expelled Nawab of Bengal, a wanderer looking for help,—the Afghan invaders became a menace to the British. Colonel Richard Smith, for some time Commander-in-Chief, wrote:—

“We must not flatter ourselves that after having acquired territorial possessions to the amount of nearly three crores of rupees yearly, that we shall be able to sit down quiet unconcerned spectators of what passes within the Empire.”¹

The British attitude to the Durrani menace and the steps taken or proposed to be taken therefore forms an important part of the history of the 18th century.

As early as 1757, we find the British in Bengal taking notice of the Durranis. In the proceedings of the Select Committee of that year is recorded, that “by the favour and goodness of God, Abdally is returning by continual marches to his own country.”² Between 1757 and 1761, however, many important events happened that shaped the

1 Select Committee Proceedings, 27th March 1767. Colonel Smith's *Minutes*, p. 172.

2 *Ibid.*, 21st Feb.—26 Dec. 1757, p. 110.

British attitude. Ali Gauhar, the Shahzada, invaded Bihar in 1759 but had to evacuate it. After the assassination of his father Emperor Alamgir II in November 1759, he assumed the imperial title and as Emperor Shah Alam II invaded Bihar for the second time in 1760 but after an initial success against Rām Nārāyan was defeated by Major Caillaud and compelled to retire. He invaded for the third time in 1761, but was completely defeated by Colonel Carnac (15th January) and sank into a puppet sovereign receiving from the English an allowance of Rs. 1000/- a day.³ In the meantime Ahmad Shah Abdali had emerged as the triumphant victor in the decisive Maratha-Abdali contest at Panipat. These events naturally created a very difficult position for the British. Shah Alam II wanted to be restored to the capital of his ancestors. Major Carnac, who was watching Shah Alam, informed the Select Committee that Abdali was working in the interest of Shah Alam and that Shah Alam had a strong party of his own but as he was in the power of the British, much would depend on their attitude to him. Major Carnac's own opinion was thus recorded:—

“Very few days must bring to light Abdallah's (Abdali) resolutions; if he gets up the Shahzada in his father's throne, the prince will have no occasion for our assistance and in such case the moment we are apprised of the certainty thereof we ought in our opinion to dismiss him taking care to escort him clear of our dominions.”⁴

Two days after this letter had reached the Calcutta authorities, came the news of the Third Battle of Panipat, transmitted by one Ballav Das from Shah Jahanabad (12th Jamadussani or 19th January). The first information contained many wrong details but these were corrected later. In its main outlines the report of the news-writer was no doubt correct:—

“The defeat of Sadashoorow, the destruction of the Deccan army, the victory gained by the king of kings is an undoubted fact without the least exaggeration a most wonderful victory has fallen to the king of kings Nawab Shuja-ud-Daulah Bahadur exerted himself greatly in this battle and his forces signalised themselves. This has gained him great favour from his Majesty.”⁵

3 *Calendar of Persian Correspondence*, vol. I, nos. 968-1078. This allowance was increased to Rs. 1800/- a day.

4 Select Committee Proceedings, 15th March 1761, pp. 69, 70.

5 Select Committee Proceedings, 17th March 1761, p. 77.

The Afghan victory at Panipat in 1761 naturally caused the British some concern. A letter from Zinat Mahal, mother of Shah Alam, to Shah Alam, conveyed to him the news that Ahmad Shah Abdali had arrived at the Delhi fort and was impatient for the arrival of Shah Alam. When approached by the partisans of Shah Alam, Abdali is said to have remarked:—

“I before sent a sirpach etc. but he did not come; to repeat is not proper; it is better that Shah Alam come himself, then I will put his country into his hands and depart.”⁶

Timur Shah, son of Ahmad Shah, told Zinat Mahal:—

“God forbid that Shah Alam should suffer himself to be led away by the advice of ill-designing men and delay coming.”⁷

The British then heard the news from Delhi that Abdali had arranged with several chiefs for two crores of rupees of which ninety lakhs were to be paid by Shuja-ud-Daulah. He was to raise this amount from the Maratha country and from the revenue that was in arrears in Bengal which was estimated at seventy lakhs. In the Afghan camp it was further proposed that to enforce his demand Shuja-ud-Daulah was to take 13,000 Afghan horse and Ahmad Shah himself should remain at Agra to send him reinforcements. It was even reported that forces were already on march.⁸ Thus the British in Bengal found themselves threatened with fresh disturbances in consequence of Abdali's victory, assuming, of course, that the news transmitted was correct.

If Shuja-ud-Daula in the name of Abdali made this demand, it was of course very difficult to give him an answer. Abdali was not declaring in favour of any one as Emperor with a view, as the British thought, to appropriate the royal revenues. Two courses were open to the British,—(i) to acknowledge Shah Alam II as Emperor and to espouse his cause openly, or (ii) to continue to keep him under protection and wait till Ahmad Shah declared his intention before he returned to his country. They could, under normal circumstances, expect Abdali to go back before the heat and the rains began, because these two seasons caused much sickness among the Afghan soldiers. But if Shah Alam

6 Select Com. Proc., 17th March 1761, p. 77.

7 *Ibid.*, p. 79.

8 *Ibid.*, 24th March 1761, p. 112.

was recognised by the British as Emperor, Abdali would regard this as a challenge to him. But Shah Alam, if so recognised, could tell Shuja-ud-Daulah that as he had already received the amount due, he must not enter Bihar. Had such a course of action been decided upon, it would have been necessary for British troops to advance up to the Caramnassa. A third course was also proposed and discussed, *viz.*, to open friendly negotiations with Shuja-ud-Daulah through Shah Alam II, and the Nawab of Oudh acting as a mediator between Shah Alam and Abdali. Ahmad Shah could then be told that the revenues of Bengal were being much wasted by political disturbances and even if some money could be collected that would not be sufficient to meet the expenses of the march of Shah Alam to Delhi. Thus they could gain time until Abdali would have to return to Afghanistan. In any case, however, it was proposed that "an army should march in good time to the banks of the Caramnassa to help the negotiation."⁹ The British also feared that if such a war was precipitated with the name and prestige of Abdali to support the enemies of the British, other European powers might also take advantage of it, and the Company's power still in its infancy would be thus exposed to great danger. The Select Committee was however informed by Major Carnac that though the letter of a Jesuit from Lucknow confirmed the news that Shuja-ud-Daulah had bargained with Abdali for the revenues due from Bengal,¹⁰ the danger would not come because the troubles in Delhi were far from ending and there was also the fear of the Peshwa advancing northwards. It was decided that should such an invasion occur, the British would cross the Caramnassa and confine the theatre of war to Shuja-ud-Daulah's country. Soon, however, the same Jesuit informed from Lucknow that Shuja-ud-Daulah had given up the plan.¹¹ The British did not know at that time that after a Shia-Sunni riot between the followers of Shuja-ud-Daulah and the Durrani, he had left the Durrani Camp and in a fit of anger withdrawn to his own province

⁹ Select Com. Proc., 24th March, 1761, pp. 112, 113, 114.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 20th March, 1761, p. 124.

¹¹ From Major John Carnac to Select Committee, 24th March 1761. Select Committee Proceedings, 3rd April 1761, p. 133.

on the 7th March.¹² About the middle of April 1761, information reached Calcutta that Abdali had actually left Delhi and was on his way back to his own country.¹³

Abdali nominated Shah Alam II as the Emperor; before he left Delhi, he placed Shahzada Mirza Jewan Bakht on the throne as Naib to his father and Shah Alam's siccas were coined in all parts of the Empire. Abdali had written to Mir Jafar Ali Khan and Lord Clive (Colonel Sabit Jang) to be obedient to the will of Shah Alam. Vansittart who had succeeded Clive wrote back to Abdali that Mir Jafar Ali Khan had relinquished the Subahdarship of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa and Mir Qasim Ali Khan had been appointed in his place. He was obedient to the Emperor who had been escorted to Patna and if necessary would even be escorted to Delhi.¹⁴ The Afghan alarm continued through the years 1762, 1764 and 1765. Mir Qasim felt that the Durrani menace affected him no less than the English.¹⁵ Rumours, sometimes true, sometimes false, continued to reach the authorities in Bengal as was inevitable under such circumstances. Of course the state of things became very different in the year 1765, after the battle of Buxar, the grant of the Dewani and the forming of a close alliance with Wazir Shujaud-Daulah. There was now nobody on the 'Masnad' of Murshidabad who could count for anything. Bengal was not merely the British "sphere of influence" from the point of view of European politics but from the military and political point of view it was a British dominion, and Oudh came under the 'doctrine of hinterland.' Therefore Ahmad Shah's expedition of 1767 caused greater flutter in Bengal than before.

Muhammad Riza Khan and Raja Shitab Roy informed the Governor and the Select Committee that Ahmad Shah was coming to India at the instigation of Mir Qasim and the Ruhelas, that he had crossed the Attock and was within sixty *kos* of Lahore, Shitab Roy further reported that Mir Qasim had entered Shah Jahanabad with the intention of going to the Shah.¹⁶

12 Sarkar—*Fall of the Mughal Empire*, vol. II, p. 376.

13 Select Committee Proceedings, 17th April, p. 147.

14 *Calendar of Persian Correspondence*, vol. I, no. 1012.

15 *Ibid.*, nos. 1444, 1532.

16 *Ibid.*, vol. II, 11 A, 11 B, Feb. 2, 1767.

The British in Bengal were naturally apprehensive that Mir Qasim would use his money and all his powers of persuasion to induce Abdali to try to restore him. It was proposed therefore to bring together the entire available English force against Abdali, and as the main body of Abdali's army consisted of cavalry the English should avoid the plains and in case of actual invasion they should bring him to action in an enclosed country. Lord Clive wrote that the best place in his opinion would be

"On this side of the Soan as near the Ganges as possible which will be our security against any disastrous event. Our army thus situated, I do not entertain the least doubt of defeating him—formidable as he is."¹⁷

There was also open the easier means of buying him off, and he was certainly more intent on taking money than on making conquests but in that case, as Clive wrote

"It will tarnish the lustre of our arms and after his departure may encourage some of our neighbours to disturb the tranquillity of the provinces."¹⁸

An alarming news reached the British in Bengal that Ahmad Shah after taking Lahore was marching with a large army to Delhi. The Calcutta authorities naturally concluded that Mir Qasim had prevailed on him to attempt to conquer Bengal, and restore him. The Governor and the Select Committee were anxious to concert measures for security and also to give protection to the allies. In accordance with the provisions of the treaty concluded by Clive with the king and Shuja-ud-Daulah in 1765 the British had promised to help them in repelling every attack on their dominion with all the forces "as far however as may be consistent with their own safety."¹⁹ That clause gave the British an opportunity to back out and confine their operations to the limits of Bihar. But in that case those allies might join the enemy and such conduct would shatter the prestige of the British for ever by "exhibiting so glaring an instance of narrow and selfish policy."²⁰

It was decided that an English army should take post at Serajpore. The Emperor and the Wazir would thus be convinced of good faith. The Jats and the Ruhelas would be inspired by the British example.

17 Political Proceedings, 16th Jany. 1767, pp. 47, 48.

18 *Ibid.*

19 Select Committee Proceedings, 23rd Feb. 1767, p. 13.

20 *Ibid.*, p. 131.

Even the Marathas would be encouraged to offer resistance. Abdali himself, in such circumstances, might give up the attempt, when convinced of the firm attitude of the British. It was arranged that five battalions of the third brigade with six field pieces should occupy Serajpore. When Abdali would reach Delhi and show his intention to proceed further, the second brigade was to remain between Mirzapore and Chunargar and the remaining battalions of the third brigade to proceed to Serajpore. At the same time the first brigade would advance to Bankipore leaving a battalion at Monghyr. If Abdali advanced one stage further, the second brigade was to march to Serajpore and the first brigade from Bankipore to convenient posts on this side of the Caramnassa. If a general action became necessary, the soldiers at Serajpore should be reinforced by grenadiers of all brigades and the parganah battalions but the first brigade was not to be weakened as it would be a frontier guard against the incursions of any detachment of the main army of Ahmad Shah.²¹

But Colonel Barker from Allahabad wanted a more forward policy. He wrote,—

“Abdallah has made two day’s march on this side of Serrahind. He has already written circular letters to the different powers to wait on him on his approach to Delhi. These letters have occasioned much consternation, and they are watching the motives of each other. Nudjib Khan is already on his march with 20,000 Rohillas. Dhoondi Khan, Hussain Rhamut Khan will also join.”

Nawab Shuja-ud-Daulah was naturally very nervous. If he did not respond to the call of Ahmad Shah he would have to bear the resentment of Abdali. He feared also that as Ahmad Shah would approach nearer, Shah Alam would slip away and join him.²² He

21 Select Committee Proceedings, 23rd Feb. 1767, pp. 133, 134; 3rd March, 1767, p. 139.

This was the British plan of defence against an Abdali attack. It is interesting to compare it with the plan suggested by Sir Arthur Wellesley and Sir J. H. Craig in 1798 when Shahzeman’s threatened invasion made Lord Wellesley think of the defence of the exposed British frontier.

22 The British also had their suspicions of the Emperor (*Calendar of Persian Correspondence*, II. no. 225). To the Wazir “The king recommends that the Shah should be opposed at Patna and not in the Allahabad or Oudh country. What can His Majesty mean by so unaccountable a piece of advice unless he intends to throw himself blindly into the Shah’s hands.”

therefore wished the British army to take the field at once. The Marathas could also be invited to join but he very much wanted the English to conquer the Ruhela country beforehand. He hoped that in that case the Jats, the Rajputs and other powers would join them instead of joining the Afghans. He added,—

“We may stop the current while it is small, but when increased by many rivers the torrent must force all opposition.”²³

Colonel Barker feared that if Abdali arrived at the capital, all the powers would give him money and even Shuja-ud-Daulah might join him.

“Strong are the passions and I make no doubt, strong are the resentments of this youngman,” and he might again appear in opposition to the British. The king was already getting ready to welcome Abdali, scraping a nazranah for him. All these circumstances, in the opinion of Colonel Barker, provided an argument in favour of a more publicly proclaimed decisive line of action.

Colonel Barker was authorized by the Select Committee to acquaint the Wazir with the measures that the British proposed to take. If the Wazir thought that a public declaration would animate the Jats and the Ruhelas to unite in defence against Abdali, they might also be informed.²⁴

Colonel Smith, who was to set out from Calcutta and take up the command of the army, was himself a member of the Select Committee. He wrote a very strongly worded minute in which he advocated advance to the frontier and public avowal of the intention to oppose Abdali. He was for very ‘spirited measures.’ He advised that—

“The second brigade should immediately be ordered to march to Allahabad and the first to occupy Cantonments at Bankipore—the most convincing proof to the Jats, Rohillas and Shuja-ud-Daula that your plan of operations is determined on as alarm was to be thrown out that whoever did not enter into a confederacy with the English would be treated as an enemy.”²⁵

He made a suggestion that as the British Indian army was composed entirely of infantry and artillery, the Shah would have a superiority of horse and he could thus harass his enemies beyond measure.

²³ Select Committee Proceedings, 24th March 1767, p. 155.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 159.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, Colonel Smith's *Minute*, pp. 174-76.

He would therefore try to induce Shah Alam and Shuja-ud-Daulah to increase the number of their cavalry. He also advised that a corps of Mughal cavalry should be raised by the Company.²⁶

In accordance with the resolutions of the Select Committee the Governor wrote to Shuja-ud-Daulah and Raghunath Rao, requesting the former to open a correspondence with the Jat and Ruhela Chiefs. They were to be told that the English were determined to protect their allies and that they must name the side they were going to take. The letter to Raghunath Rao also conveyed the same sentiment. Sir Robert Barker had a conversation with Raghunath Rao's Vakil who said that his master had received a letter from the Shah in which he had been requested not to interfere with the affairs of the northern provinces as he had no intention of making war with the Marathas. Ahmad Shah wrote that he only wanted to bring Shuja-ud-Daulah and other Sardars to account, particularly the former for the booty he had taken by plunder from the unfortunate Mir Qasim Ali Khan.²⁷

On receiving this intelligence the second brigade was ordered to march to Allahabad, and the first brigade to Bankipore. The king and Shuja-ud-Daulah were asked to increase their cavalry. Colonel Smith was authorized to raise a body of Mughal horse. The Presidencies of Bombay and Madras were requested to send such supplies of forces as they could afford. The military store-keeper was ordered to send to Patna 24 founders of new construction, barrels of fine Bengal powder, new tumbrils, field carriages and chests of small arms.²⁸

But very soon news came of the success of the hovering and harrassing tactics of the Sikhs. The Muhammedan powers of Northern India for whom Abdali had done so much were either lukewarm or hostile. Abdali had every reason to feel disgusted. Moreover as the Governor of Bengal noted evidently with pleasure and wrote to that effect to Shuja,—“So long as he could not defeat the Sikhs decisively or come to terms with them, he could not penetrate very far into India”,²⁹ with his rear so unsecured. Late in March 1767, Sir Robert Barker from

²⁶ Select Com. Proc., 24th March, 1767, Col. Smith's *Minute*, pp. 174-76.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, Camp at Caramnassa, 20th Dec. 1766.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 186.

²⁹ *Calendar of Persian Correspondence*, II, no. 52, Feb. 14 1767.

Allahabad informed the Commander-in-Chief that Abdali was going back, that he had compromised with some of the Muhammedan leaders of Northern India for a sum of 25 lakhs of rupees and he had made no demand from the king, Shuja-ud-Daula or any of the Chiefs in alliance with the British.³⁰ According to the evidence of the British records the furthest advance of Abdali was within six day's march of Delhi. Thus Mir Qasim to whom he had held out hopes and had blazoned it forth was left to shift for himself. "He gave a very curt reply to Mir Qasim Ali Khan and went to his own country."

The prevalent view is that this was the last invasion of Ahmad Shah Abdali. But from British records we find that he also led an invasion into the Punjab in 1769. Whether the news of this invasion was genuine in its nature or merely the fruit of imagination of an Afghan bugbear we have no other means to verify.

Gholam Md. Khan informed Najib-ud-Daulah that Abdali was at Kabul towards the end of April, 1768, whence he sent his artillery to Attock. The arrangement was that Selim Shah and Jahan Khan with four other Sardars would cross the Attock and settle in Kashmir, Multan and Lahore; these three Subahs were conferred on Selim Shah. Selim Shah wrote to Shuja Khan Subahdar of Multan asking him to be ready and appointed Nurud-din Khan to the Subahship of Kashmir. Selim Shah's army consisted of 12,000 Mughals and Durranis, and as many Uzbek Tartars. Najib's Vakil in Abdali's Court informed his master that the Shah would march towards India when the cold season would set in.³¹ Sir Richard Smith, the Commander-in-chief had also intelligence of the approach of Abdali. He wrote—

"I have no authentic advices of it, yet the Vizir Shuja-ud-Daula speaks of the Shah's coming to Delhi a certainty."³²

Then came the news of the advance of Abdali to Lahore (letter dated 25th Feb. 1769). Shuja-ud-Daulah was suspected of carrying on negotiations with the Shah. We should note that the British attitude towards Abdali had changed. They were now bolder

³⁰ Select Committee Proceedings, 9th April 1767.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 20th July 1768. (News from Najib-ud-Daula's Camp, p. 465).

³² *Ibid.*, 1st March 1769 (date 17th Feb.).

in their tone, and this might have been due to a consciousness of the failure of Abdali and the very remoteness of the present danger. Not only in this letter but in the entire official correspondence of this period there was a lurking suspicion of the motives of Shuja-ud-Daula.

The Calcutta authorities wanted Colonel Smith to procure very early and authentic news of the progress of Abdali particularly in view of the fact that they wanted to recall the brigade at Allahabad in order to help Madras, very hard pressed by Haidar Ali as also out of motives of economy.³³ The furthest advance of Abdali as reported in this expedition was up to Emanabad 20 *kos* distant from Lahore. Very soon came the news of his march back towards Attock.³⁴ So the Governor thought that one battalion of the European regiment and half a company of artillery should be left at Allahabad and the rest recalled. It is said that the precipitate retreat of Abdali was due to the fact that 12,000 of his troops, dissatisfied probably with the small success they had hitherto, deserted him and marched back to Kabul.³⁵ Thus in his last expedition this great warrior had to drink the cup of humiliation to its dregs. The Sikhs had baffled him, his Muhammedan allies had failed him and now his soldiers deserted him. There could be no more conclusive proof of his failure than the fact that his own soldiers lost their faith in his ability to make conquests in India or to get them plunder here.

Ahmad Shah died in the beginning of June 1773. He was succeeded by his son Timur Shah then twenty six years of age. Having obtained undisturbed possession of his father's kingdom he gave way to his natural indolence. He had sufficiently bitter experience of governing the Punjab for one year from May 1757 to April 1758 when in spite of the terror of his great father's name he had miserably failed. He naturally left the Punjab to itself. His only important military undertaking was the reconquest of Multan which he successfully effected but there was no possibility of his coming into collision with the

33 Select Com. Proc., 21st March 1769.

34 *Ibid.*, To the Hon'ble H. Verelst from Richard Smith.

35 *Calendar of Persian Correspondence*, vol. III, Introduction; vol. II, no. 1499 Aug. 1, 1769. From Raja Parsudh Roy—"The news from these parts is that Shah Abdali had come as far as the Jhelum, when owing to dissensions among his followers, he was compelled to return to his own country."

main body of the Sikhs in that region. The Governor Lord Cornwallis was informed of this pacific inclination of the successor of Ahmad Shah by Gholam Muhammad Khan from Kabul who was of opinion that Timur Shah had no designs upon Hindustan.³⁶ An irregular correspondence was however maintained between the two powers and Mr. Richard Johnson was the British agent in correspondence with Kabul.³⁷ But as was the characteristic of decadent Muhammadan states, though Timur had very little power he had very large pretensions. He wrote the following letter to Lord Cornwallis which speaks for itself:

“At the first rise of this everlasting family when the victorious banners of his blessed majesty wavered in the wide plains of Hindustan and the city of Delhi came into his possession Alamgir was honoured with the Sultanat after his death, his blessed majesty continued the dominion of that country to Shaw Alum, the son of Alamgir..... We also continued that conduct towards Shaw Alum. At this time we have heard that Golam Cadeer Khan Yusufzai, commonly called Rohilla formed a league with unworthy and thoughtless people, established another on the throne and threw confusion into every affair of the Sultan as protection and assistance to that king is incumbent on and even worthy of this everlasting house and your lordship is one of the connections of this house and the friend of that, we therefore communicate our orders that you join your own forces with other European commanders for your credit and reputation and form the danger of annihilating Golam Cader the ungrateful and his unfortunate allies, and re-establish Shaw Alum in the possession of Sultanat and power..... Be not dilatory. Our mind is bent on it. These are our *positive orders*. Effect the annihilation of Golam Cader and show your zeal for this house and gratitude to Shaw Alum, and inform us of all particulars.”³⁸

This letter is significant. It shows how low the Durrani dynasty had fallen so soon after the death of its founder. The atrocities of Gholam Kadir, the helpless condition of Shah Alam II moved the king of Kabul no doubt but he contended himself with issuing “positive orders” to the British Governor of Bengal and others who would not

36 Foreign Dept., Secret and Political, 1789, 26th January, no. 2.

37 Foreign Secret Consultation, 20th Oct., 1786, no. 32. Shah Alam II maintained a correspondence with Timur Shah. The resident at the court of the Nawab of Oudh informed Warren Hastings—“The king has at Abdul Ahut Cawn’s instigation written to Timur Shah a very long letter inviting him to come to his assistance and proposing a double marriage between their children”—11th Oct. 1775—*Forrest Selections*, II, p. 442.

38 Foreign—Secret and Political Consultation, 1789, 26th January, no. 3.

certainly obey him unless it suited their own interests. The reply was sent in the courteous language of diplomacy that "God be praised" that Shah Alam was already restored.³⁹ From the point of view of the stability of the Afghan monarchy Timur's non-intervention was the right policy, but the tradition that the Kabul monarchy would come to the aid of the Timurids in distress was still very strong and Shah Alam II the helpless sovereign continued to hope in vain. Mahdhoji Sindhia rescued him and restored his nominal authority but in the poems that he wrote for his own solace we find how much he expected of the Afghan monarch.

"Bright northern star from Qabul's realms advance,
Imperial Timur poise the avenging lance.
On these vile traitors quick destruction pour,
Redress my wrongs, and kingly rights restore;"⁴⁰

The Indian world was out of joint and Timur Shah was neither fitted nor inclined to be its saviour.

On the death of Timur Shah, Zeman Shah ascended the throne in May 1793. As soon as he made his position secure from the hands of his rivals, he decided to invade India. A paper of intelligence from Kabul, received on the 27th August, 1793, gave the British an idea of the resources of this Kabul king who intended to invade India. In the royal treasury there was one crore in gold mohurs and four crores in silver. Eighty lakhs of rupees were given to the royal troops at the time of coronation on account of arrears of pay. The Nazim of Multan was in attendance. The Vakils of the Governor of Kashmir were also there. Prince Mirza Ahsun Bakht of the Imperial family came to Peshawar. He was asked to wait in Multan.⁴¹ This prince of the royal family of Delhi was possibly instrumental in stimulating the ambition of Shah Zeman. Shah Alam made a pathetic appeal that he stood greatly in need of Durrani support, mentioned the decayed splendour of the Empire and the absence of faithful servants and pleaded for regular correspondence. From the internal evidence of the letters that passed between them, it is clear that a marriage negotiation was going on between

³⁹ Foreign—Secret and Political Consultation, 1789, 20th Feb., no. I.

⁴⁰ Francklin—Shah Alam, Appendix IV.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 6th Sept. 1793, no. 10. Paper of Intelligence from Kabul.

the two families.⁴² The nomination of Mirza Akbar Shah as the future successor of Shah Alam was approved by Shah Zeman, who condescended to write to Akbar Shah,— “We now honour you with the rank of heir-apparent to His Majesty Shah Alam.”

A firman on sanad of appointment was also sent.⁴³ Tipu Sultan of Mysore was in close correspondence with him. He wrote in 1769 to Shah Zeman,—

“It is become proper and incumbent upon the leaders of the faithful, that uniting together, they exterminate the infidels. I am very desirous of engaging in this pursuit my exalted ambition has for its objects a holy war.”⁴⁴

Again he wrote,—

“The supremacy of the English was the source of evil to all god’s creatures.”⁴⁵

Shah Zeman promised to march very soon with his ‘conquering army.’ Curiously enough even in December 1796, Sir John Shore, the Governor-General, wrote that he was far from entertaining an opinion that Zeman Shah would approach Hindustan. But in case of such an event Colonel Palmer, Resident with Daulat Rao Sindhia, was authorized to deliver a letter to him, “assuring himself beforehand of friendly reception.” The letter only contained sentiments of consideration, regard, solicitations for welfare.

In 1797, the Resident reported skirmish of Shah Zeman with the Sikhs and his entry into Lahore. He was engaged according to the newswriter in repairing the Lahore fort, sending letters to Multan, Bahawalpur and other places for contingents. Information also came to the effect that Zeman Shah was definitely going to march to Delhi. Roy Sing, one of the Sikh chiefs of the Cis-Sutlej region, who had also occupied the country in the neighbourhood of Saharanpur, informed the

42 Political Consultation, 5th Dec. 1796, nos. 20-22.

43 The subservience and flattery of Shah Alam knew no bounds. The language of his letters makes this clear—“The Almighty inscribed on the tablet of your destiny—With my aid he shall greatly conquer” “your enemies have perished like moths in the flame or like the tree Chunar when an inward fire consumes.”

44 *Asiatic Annual Register*, 1799. Secret correspondence between Zeman Shah and Tipu Sultan, 1796.

45 Foreign Political Consultation, 1796—2nd Dec. no. 19.

English about the determination of the Sikhs to resist Zeman Shah and added

"The supreme being did before expel the Abdalis from the country and overwhelmed them and he will now do the same."⁴⁶

Zeman Shah's retreat from Lahore was reported by the English to Rajah Pertaub Singh on the 11th March 1797 and it was added

"Had he proceeded to disturb the quiet of the Nawab Vizier or the Company's territory there is no doubt but he would have been repelled with disgrace."⁴⁷

Sir John Shore the Governor-General very rigidly interpreted the policy of non-intervention as formulated by the self-denying ordinance of the Act of 1784. But though he had allowed the Nizam to be crushed at Kharda and the Maratha power to become a menace he was certainly not hesitant in his relations with Oudh. In this matter no shilly-shallying was possible as Oudh formed the very first line of British defence and Shah Zeman was in Lahore trying, if the Sikhs and his enemies in the west would permit, to come to Delhi and play the part of another Ahmad Shah Durrani. On the death of Asaf-ud-Daulah in 1797, his nominee a youngman named Wazir Ali was recognised as his successor. But when four months after Shore found out that he was incapable of ruling, his social status was low and his rule would lead to chaos he himself went to Lucknow, reversed his old arrangement and installed Sadat Ali, Asaf-ud-Daulah's brother as the ruler. A new treaty was concluded with him and he ceded Allahabad, strategically so very important, to the English. This solitary instance of spirited action on the part of Sir John Shore can only be explained by the Afghan menace.⁴⁸ Still Sir John Shore's preparedness for an Afghan war compares very unfavourably with that of Lord Clive in 1767 or Lord Wellesley in 1798.

It is interesting to note that the Sikhs, thus threatened by the Durrans after about thirty years, tried to find allies, and attempts were made by individual chiefs to enlist British support. Reference has already been made to Roy Singh. Another Sikh chief Jassa Singh

46 Foreign Pol. Cons., 9th June 1797, no. 63.

47 *Ibid.*, no. 66.

48 The significance of this departure from the policy of non-intervention is pointed out by P. E. Roberts in his *History*.

Ramgarhia(?) also tried to induce the British to co-operate with the Sikhs. In his opinion though the ambitious schemes of the 'Afghans were empty, yet following the principle "Be not too sure that the forest is empty, perhaps a tiger may be crouched in it," the Khalsa prepared himself for resistance and the Kabul Chief retreated immediately. Jassa Singh added,—“If a system of mutual co-operation were adopted, it is certain that his expulsion would not require any great exertion of our joint endeavour.”⁴⁹

In June 1798 a letter was written to Sir John Shore by Zeman Shah in which the Afghan sovereign announced his desire “of visiting Hindustan at a proper season to chastise enemies and encourage friends.”⁵⁰ In this vaunting letter the Governor-General was assured that if the sentiments of the English were ascertained to be friendly, they could be perfectly at ease and “continue to walk in the path of allegiance and fidelity.”⁵¹

Lord Wellesley succeeded Sir John Shore in May 1798, and this letter reached his hands. We now find British foreign policy characterised by a promptness and a vigorous initiative all its own. The exposed condition of the North-West Frontier at once engaged the attention of the great Pro-consul. The designs of the Afghan sovereign were apparent. Wellesley's impression was that Shah Zeman would, if he could, try to penetrate into the most opulent and flourishing parts of Northern India. He should be checked at the greatest possible distance from the British frontier and the best plan would be to enter into a defensive league with the Sikhs, Rajputs and Sindhia.⁵² Major-General Craig to whom he addressed this despatch, regarded an alliance with the Sikhs and the Rajputs as impracticable because communications would have to be carried through the dominions of Sindhia and any independent communication would excite his jealousy. He argued that Sindhia should be won over in the first instance. Moreover the British could not offer any advantage to the Sikhs to induce them to co-operate. Certain-

49 Foreign Department—Political Consultation, 4th Sept. 1799, nos. 38, 39.

50 *Ibid.*, 23rd Nov. 1798, nos. 10, 11.

51 *Ibid.*

52 Owen, *Selections from Wellesley's Despatches*, Earl of Morington to Major General Sir Henry Craig, K.B., Sept. 16, 1798.

ly they themselves would not advance to the Sikh' frontier to co-operate with them as that would be strategically unsound and, stationed on the Maratha frontier, they would be of no use to the Sikhs. But if the Raja of Patiala, a powerful prince whose territory bordered on that of the Marathas, could maintain his position and keep his army unimpaired, an advance could be made up to his dominion.⁵³ Sir J. H. Craig had a correspondent at Karnal, a friend at Amritsar to keep him informed of the latest events. Sir Arthur Wellesley advised the Governor-General that the line of the Jumna would be the best for the defence of the North-West Frontier against Zeman Shah.

"It must be recollected that Abdallah beat the Marathas driving them from the Doab over the Jumna. It is most fertile spot and ought not to be given up in a hurry. Allahabad must be secured. If the passage of the Jumna be prevented as long as the Ganges is navigable, the army in the Doab can be supplied with ease thence by means of boats."⁵⁴

He also argued in favour of a *corps de reserve* somewhat near Chunar because,—

"An army of cavalry acting against infantry in an extended country is so likely to give its adversary the slip and get to its rear."

He also recommended the establishment of small fortified forts of the nature of mud forts of the Carnatic.⁵⁵ In his view the danger was serious because his advance of Zeman Shah would synchronise with a war with Tipu. They would therefore have to detach troops to the Carnatic and replace them in Northern India. "Thus might make it necessary to call upon the Nawab of Oudh either to regulate or dismiss his force."⁵⁶

The dangers of the invasion of Shah Zeman proved to be more apparent than real. The Durrani government was so little on its guard on the Western frontier and Shah Zeman had so much of disaffection and rivalry to get rid of in Afghanistan itself that the project of an Indian expedition was bound to fail in any case. But British' statesmen did

53 Owen, *op. cit.*, Major General Sir J. H. Craig to the Earl of Morington, 6th Oct. 1798, Cawnpore.

54 Owen, *Selections from Wellington's Despatches*, To the Hon'ble Wellesley, 10th Nov. 1798.

55 *Ibid.*, Memorandum on the defences of Oude.

56 *Ibid.*

not know all this in 1798-99. To them the capacity of Shah Zeman "seemed sufficient," and he appeared to have "restored the Durrani affairs to the train in which they were left by Ahmad Shah."⁵⁷ The possibility of a Muhammedan combine, a concerted attack of the Kabul monarch and the Mysore ruler was a sufficiently serious threat especially as there was also the French danger. If only Lord Wellesley had known, he would have recorded the same opinion of Shah Zeman as Bismarck had of Napoleon III—'great though concealed incompetence'.—

Lord Wellesley claims that the missions he sent to Persia first of Mehdi Ali Khan and then of Captain Malcolm,—

"were responsible for the active measures adopted by the Court of Persia that produced the salutary effect of diverting the attention of Zeman Shah from his long projected invasion of Hindustan the assistance afforded by Mehdi Ali Khan under my orders to Prince Md. Shah originally enabled that prince to excite those commotions which have recently terminated in the defeat of Zeman Shah, in his deposition from the throne and in the entire extinction of his power. To the consolidated and active government of Zeman Shah has succeeded a state of confusion in the country of the Afghans highly favourable to our security in that quarter."⁵⁸

Thus disappeared the Durrani menace, and Lord Wellesley must be credited with initiating that policy of friendship with Persia and the Sikhs that was later so successfully followed by Lord Minto in 1808-1809.

NARENDRA KRISHNA SINHA

⁵⁷ Elphinstone, *Account of the Kingdom of Caubul*, vol. II, p. 311.

⁵⁸ Owen, *Selections from Wellesley's Despatches*, To the Hon'ble Secret Committee of the Hon'ble Court of Directors, Sept. 28th, 1801.

Studies in Ancient Geography*

(*Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa*)

Out of the eight Cantos (I.III-X) of the *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa* containing geographical materials Canto LVII describes Bhāratavarṣa in detail with her mountain ranges, hills and rivers. Here are also mentioned the countries grouped according to its five main regions. Canto LVIII depicts India as resting on Viṣṇu in the form of a tortoise looking eastward, and distributes its various peoples over the several parts of his body. This Canto repeats many of the names mentioned in the preceding Canto, and preserves, unlike the preceding one, a nine-fold division of India.

In the following pages is given an alphabetical list of topographical names embodied in the Purāṇa (vide also *IHQ.*, IX, p. 471). The edition used by me is that of the Rev. Dr. K. M. Banerjea, and published in the *Bibliotheca Indica* in 1862. I have utilised Pargiter's translation and notes.

The following points in connection with the list should be noted :

1. Names occurring in Canto LVII are usually classed as countries as suggested by the word *janapada* (LVII. 33 etc.), whereas the names in Canto LVIII refer to peoples as is evident from the reading *janā madhyanivāsinaḥ* (LVIII. 9) and *janās samsthitāḥ* (LVIII. 37) etc. In the cases of names occurring in both the Cantos, they are styled as countries, and in such cases different figures of references are given.

2. Words enclosed within small brackets show different readings, but this device has been resorted to only when the suggested name is alphabetically similar to a name preserved in the text, e.g., Andha (Andhra?).

3. Words used as descriptive epithets in the text are also noted as

* Continued from *IHQ.*, vol. IX, no. 2, p. 478. For abbreviations used see *ibid.*, p. 471; other abbreviations are: Ś=Śaka; K=Kuśa; Km=Kctumāla; V=Varṣa; Par.=Pargiter's *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa*; p=a people; c=a country; r=a river; l=a lake; mt=a mountain; o=an ocean.

Words denoting the eight quarters, such as N.W. etc., when otherwise not specified, must be taken as followed by the expression 'of Bhāratavarṣa.'

different names to avoid confusion and to make the list more exhaustive.

Examples of this type are:

Agnījya, Ghosasaikhya, Aṅgulapramukha etc.

4. Names in square brackets are supplied from the tribal appellations, e.g., [Yaśomatī]—A river (LVIII. 46) from the mention of the Yaśomatyaṣ as a people.

*The Topographical information contained in the
Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa*

A

Akaṇin—p. in S., LVIII. 22.

Agnījya—p. in N., LVIII. 43.

Aṅgataka—p. in W., LVIII. 35.

Aṅgulapramukha—p. in Km. V., LIX. 14.

Añjana—(1) mt. in E., LVIII. 11.

(2) mt. to W. of Meru, LV. 10.

Atharva—c. in C.R., LVII. 33.

Adrija—r. rising from the Vindhya mts., LVII. 21.

Adhama—p. in N., LVIII. 44.

Adhrāraka—c. in E., LVII. 42.

Animadra—c. in N., LVII. 40.

Anikata—c. in W., LVII. 49.

Antargiri—c. in E., LVII. 42.

Antardvīpa—p. in N., LVIII. 43.

Antaśśirā—r. rising from the Rkṣa mts., LVII. 25.

Andha (Andhra?)—c. in S., LVII. 48.

Annaja—c. on the Vindhya mts., LVII. 55.

Annadāraka—p. in NE., LVIII. 51.

[Aparānta]—The Western Region, LVII. 49-52; LVIII. 34.

Aparānta—c. in N. (?), LVII. 36.

Abhīsūra—p. in N.E., LVIII. 49.

Amoghā—r. in Km. V., LIX. 15.

Ambāla—p. in N., LVIII. 45.

Arunoda—l. to E. of Meru, LV. 3. See Varuṇoda.

Arkaliṅga—c. in the C.R., LVII. 33.

Arthakāraka—c. in Kr. D., LIII. 23.

- Udayagiri—mt. in E., LVIII. 13.
 [Udicī]²—The N.R., LVII. 35-42.
 Udumbara—p. in C.R., LVIII. 9.
 Udbhida—(1) c. in K.D., LIII. 25.
 (2) c. in S., LVII. 48.
 Urukarma—c. in N.W., LVIII. 40.
 Uṣṇa—c. in K.R.D., LIII. 23.

U

- Urṇa—c. in N., LVII. 41, 57.
 Ūrdhvakarna—p. in S.E., LVIII. 16.

R

- Rkṣa—One of the seven mt. ranges of Bhā., LVII. 10, 25.
 Rṣabha—mt. in S., LVIII. 27.
 Rṣika—p. in S., LVIII. 27.
 Rṣikulyā—(1) r. rising from the Mahendra mts., LVII. 28.
 (2) r. rising from the Śuktimat mts., LVII. 29.
 Rṣyamūka—mt. in S., LVII. 14; LVIII. 24.

E

- Ekapāda—p. in N.E., LVIII. 51.
 Ekapādapa (oka)?—p. in E., LVIII. 14.
 Ekaśṛṅga—mt. to S. of Meru., LV. 7.
 Ekeṣaṇa—p. in W., LVIII. 36.
 Elika—p. in S.E., LVIII. 17.

Au

- Aukhavana—p. in S., LVIII. 26.
 Aupadha—c. in N., LVII. 40.

K

- Kaṅka—p. in C.R., LVIII. 8.
 Kaccha—c. in S., LVIII. 28.

² I have taken names embodied in verses 38-39 of Canto LVII as included within the northern region and not in the northwest as Pargiter does, since this Canto preserves the fivefold traditional division of India.

Kimpuruṣa—A part of J.D., LIII. 34, 36; LVI. 20, 22; LIX. 29;
LX. 1.

Kirāta—p. along the eastern limit of Bhā., LVII. 8; in N.,
LVII. 40, 57; LVIII. 44; in S.W., LVIII. 31; in
N.E., LVIII. 50.

[Kiṣkindhā]—c. on the Vindhya mts., LVII. 53; LVIII. 18.

Kīcaka—c. in N.E., LVIII. 48.

Kukkuṭa—mt. to W. of Meru., LV. 10.

Kuñjara—mt. in S., LVIII. 28.

Kuntaprāvaraṇa—A hilly country in N., LVII. 57.

Kuntala—c. in C.R., LVII. 32; S., LVII. 48.

Kunyatāladaha⁴—p. in N.W., LVIII. 39.

Kumāra—c. in Ś.D., LIII. 21.

Kumārī—r. rising from the Suktimat mts., LVII. 29.

Kumuda—mt. in S., LVIII. 26.

Kumudvatī—r. rising from the Ṛkṣa mts., LVII. 24.

Kuru—A part of J.D., LIII. 35; LVII. 56; LVIII. 42.

Uttara-kuru, LIX. 18, 29; LVI. 18.

Kuruṭa—p. in N.E., LVIII. 51.

Kurumin—c. in W., LVII. 50.

Kururvāhya—p. in C.R., LVIII. 9.

Kulaṭa—p. in N.E., LVIII. 49.

Kulira⁵—mt. to E. of Meru, LV. 4.

Kulya—c. in C.R., LVII. 32.

·Kuśa—One of the seven D., surrounded by Sarpissamudra,
LIII. 24; LIV. 6.

Kuśala—c. in Kr. D., LIII. 23.

Kuśottara—c. in Ś.D., LIII. 21.

Kusuma—c. in S., LVII. 46.

Kuhaka—c. in N., LVII. 41.

4 A compound (Par., p. 375 n.).

5 I have taken the names of mts. contained in the list (LV. 4-5) as standing not to the east of Mandara as the text (LV. 4) reads, but to the east of Meru. Strictly speaking, the reading should be *Meroh Pūrreṇa* in view of the fact that the verses following it mention mountains standing to the south, west and north of Meru. This point is corroborated by the inclusion of the name Mandara in the same list.

- Kuhū—r. rising from the Himālaya mts., LVII. 17.
 Kūṭasāila—mt. in Bhā., LVII. 14.
 Kṛtamālā—r. rising from the Malaya mts., LVII. 27.
 Kṛtasmara—mt. in Bhā., LVII. 14.
 Kṛpā—r. rising from the Śuktimat mts., LVII. 50.
 Kṛṣṇa—mt. to the W. of Meru, LV. 10; in Km. V., LIX. 12.
 Kṛṣṇā—r. rising from the Sahya mts., LVII. 26; LVIII. 25.
 Ketumat—c. in Śāl. D., LIII. 27.
 Ketumāla—(One of the nine parts of J.D., LIII. 35; LIV. 14, 31;
 LVI. 15; LIX. 12, 17.
 Kevala (Kerala?)—c. in S., LVII. 45, 53.
 Kaikeya—c. in N., LVII. 37; LVIII. 42.
 Kailāsa—mt. to S. of Meru, LIV. 24; LV. 8; LVIII. 41.
 Kokaṅkaṇa (Kokanada?)—p. in W., LVIII. 35.
 Koṅkaṇa—p. in S., LVIII. 21.
 Kola—(1) mt. in S., LVIII. 23.
 (2) p. in S., LVIII. 25.
 Kolāhala—mt. in Bhā., LVII. 12.
 Kośala—c. in C.R., LVII. 32, 54; in E. LVIII. 14;
 in S.E., LVIII. 16.
 Kohalaka—p. in N., LVIII. 45.
 Kaurañjaka—mt. range in Bhadrāśva V., LIX. 5.
 Kauruṣa—Same as Karuṣa; Dakṣiṇakauruṣa, LVIII. 27.
 Kauśikā—r. rising from the Himavat mts., LVII. 18; LVIII. 50.
 Kramu—r. rising from the Viudhya mts., LVII. 23.
 Krauñca—(1) One of the seven D., surrounded by Dadhi-
 Samudra, LIII. 24; LIV. 6.
 (2) p. and a group of mts. in N., LVIII. 42.
 (3) c. in S., LVIII. 23.
 Kṣudravīṇa—p. in N., LVIII. 42.
 Kṣurādri—mt. in W., LVIII. 34.
 Kṣemaka—c. in Pl. D., LIII. 30.
 Kṣemadhūrta—p. in N., LVIII. 47.

Kh

- Khāñjana—mt. in W., LVIII. 34.

Kharasa—p. in N., LVIII. 46.

Kharmaka—mt. in E., LVIII. 11.

Khasa (Khaśa)—(1) A hilly country in N., LVII. 56.

(2) p. in C.R., LVIII. 6; in E., LVIII. 12;
in N.E., LVIII. 51.

G

Gaṅgā—r. rising from the Himavat mts. LVI. 1-5, 19; LVII. 16.

Gajāhvaya—p. in C.R., LVIII. 9.

Gaṇavāhya—p. in S., LVIII. 25.

Gaṇḍakī—r. rising from the Himavat mts., LVII. 18.

Gandhamādana—mt. to S. of Meru, LIV. 19, 20, 28; LVI. 7.

Gandharva—p. in N.E., LVIII. 52.

Gabala—c. in N., LVII. 36.

*Gabhastimat—One of the nine parts of Bhā., LVII. 6.

Gararāśi—p. in N., LVIII. 46.

Gāndharva—One of the nine parts of Bhā., LVII. 6.

Gāndhāra—c. in N., LVII. 36; LVIII. 46.

Gālava—A hilly country in N., LVII. 57.

Guda—p. in C.R., LVIII. 7.

Gurusvara—p. in W., LVIII. 36.

Guruha—p. in W., LVIII. 36.

Gurgaṇa—A hilly country in N., LVII. 56.

Godāvarī—r. rising from the Sahya mts., LVII. 26, 34.

Gouarddha—p. in S., LVIII. 23.

Gomatī—r. rising from the Himavat mts., LVII. 17.

Gomanta—(1) mt. in Bhā., LVII. 14.

(2) c. in E., LVII. 44.

Golāṅgūla—c. in S., LVII. 45.

Govardhanapura—A city in S., LVII. 34.

Gauragrīva—p. in C.R., LVIII. 7.

Gh

Ghora—p. in W., LVIII. 36.

Ghoṣa—p. in N.E., LVIII. 51.

Ghoṣasaṅkha—p. in C.R., LVIII. 6.

C

- Cakora⁶—mt. in Bhā., LVII. 15.
 Cakramuñja⁷—mt. to E. of Meru, LV. 4.
 Cakrāvartā—r. in Bhadrāsva V., LIX. 7.
 Caṇḍakhāra—p. in N.W., LVIII. 38.
 Candrakānta—mt. in N. Kurus, LIX. 22.
 Candradvīpa—An island near the N. Kurus, LIX. 28.
 Caudrabhāgā—r. rising from the Himavat mts., LVII. 16.
 Candreśvara—p. in E., LVIII. 12.
 Carṃakhaṇḍika—r. in N., LVII. 36.
 Carmaṇvatī—r. rising from the Pāripātra mts., LVII. 20.
 Carmapaṭṭa—c. in S., LVIII. 25.
 [Citrakūṭa]—mt. in Bhā., LVIII. 23.
 Citrakūṭā—r. rising from the Vindhya mts., LVII. 21.
 Citrotpalā—r. rising from the Vindhya mts., LVII. 22.
 Civiḍa—p. in N., LVIII. 43.
 Cīna—c. in N., LVII. 39.
 Cīraprāvaraṇa—p. in N.E., LVIII. 52.
 Culika—c. in N., LVII. 40.
 Cūlika—p. in W., LVIII. 37.
 Cedi—p. in S.E., LVIII. 16.
 Caitraratha—A forest on mt. Mandara, LV. 2; LVI. 5.
 Cola—p. in S., LVIII. 23.

J

- Jaṭhara—(1) mt. to E. of Meru, LIV. 22.
 (2) p. in S.E., LVIII. 16.
 Jambū—(1) One of the seven D., surrounded by Lavaṇa-Samudra, LIII. 32; LIV. 5, 6, 8-10; LVI. 19; LVII. 1.
 (2) r. rising from Gandhamādana, LIV. 29-30.
 (3) mt. in E., LVIII. 11.
 Jayanta—One of the seven mt. ranges in Km. V., LIX. 12.
 Jalada—c. in S.D., LIII. 21.

6 The reading here is *Cakorūśca* which may be taken as *Cakora* or *Ca+kora*.

7 The reading is *Cakramuñja* which may be taken as one word or *ca+kramuñja*.

Jalagamudra—One of the seven oceans, surrounding Pu. D.,
LIV. 7.

Jāguda—c. in N., LVII. 40.

Jārudhi—mt. to N. of Meru, LJV. 25; LV. 13.

Jīmūta—c. in Śāl. D., LIII. 27.

Jñeyamallaka—c. in E., LVII. 43.

Jyotiṣika—p. in C.R., LVIII. 7.

T

Takṣaśilā—A city in N., LVIII. 44.

Tamasā—r. rising from the Vindhya mts., LVII. 22.

Tāpasūśrama—p. in S., LVIII. 27.

Tāpī—r. rising from the Ṛkṣa mts., LVII. 24.

Tāmasa—(1) mt. to E. of Meru, LV. 5.

(2) c. in N., LVII. 41, 57.

Tāmraka—mt. to S. of Meru, LV. 6.

Tāmrāipta (Tāmao)—c. in E., LVII. 44; LVIII. 14.

Tāmraparṇī—r. rising from the Malaya mts., LVII. 27; LVIII. 28.

Tāmravarṇa—One of the nine parts of Bhā., LVII. 6.

Tārakṣura—p. in W., LVIII. 35.

Tilaṅga—p. in S., LVIII. 28.

Tuṅgaṇa—c. in N., LVII. 41. Same as Tvaṅgaṇa.

Tuṅgaprastha—mt. in Bhā., LVII. 13.

Tuṅgabhadrā—r. rising from the Sahya mts., LVII. 26.

Tumbura, Tumbula—c. on the Vindhya mts., LVII. 54.

Tuṣāra—c. in N., LVII. 39.

Tuṣṭikāra—c. on the Vindhya mts., LVII. 55.

Tośala—c. on the Vindhya mts., LVII. 54.

Trigarta—A hilly country in N., LVII. 57; LVIII. 43.

Tridivā—(1) r. rising from the Vindhya mts., LVII. 23.

(2) r. rising from the Mahendra mts., LVII. 28.

Trinetra—p. in N.E., LVIII. 52.

Triśikha—mt. to N. of Bhā., LVI. 14.

Traipura—c. on the Vindhya mts., LVII. 54; LVIII. 17.

Tvaṅgaṇa—p. in N.E., LVIII. 49. See Tuṅgaṇa.

Trikūṭa—mt. to S. of Meru, LV. 6.

D

- Dakṣiṇāpatha—The Southern region, LVII. 45-49.
 Dakṣiṇodadhi—A sea to which the river Alakanandā enters, LVI. 11.
 Daṇḍaka—c. in S., LVII. 47.
 Dadhisamudra—One of the seven oceans surrounding Kr. D.,
 LIV. 7.
 Darada—(1) c. in N., LVII. 38.
 (2) p. in S.W., LVIII. 32.
 Davada—p. in N.E., LVIII. 49.
 Daśamālika—c. in N., LVII. 37.
 Daśārṇa—c. on the Vindhya mts., LVII. 53; LVIII. 18.
 Daśārṇā—r. rising from the Vindhya mts., LVII. 21.
 Dārva—A hilly country in N., LVII. 41, 57.
 Dārvāda—p. in N.E., LVIII. 51.
 [Daśapura]—A city in S., LVIII. 22.
 Dāsameya—p. in N., LVIII. 47.
 Dāseraka—p. in N., LVIII. 44.
 Dīrghagrīva—p. in W., LVIII. 37.
 Dugdhasamudra—One of the seven oceans, surrounding S.D., LIV. 7.
 Dundubhi—c. in Kr.D., LIII. 23.
 Durga—c. in W., LVII. 49.
 Durgā—r. rising from the Rkṣa mts., LVII. 25.
 Durjayanta—mts. in Bhā., LVII. 14.
 Durdura—mt. in S., LVII. 12; LVIII. 21.
 Dṛṣadvatī—r. rising from the Himavat mts., LVII. 17.
 Devakūṭa—mt. to E. of Meru, LIV. 22; LIX. 3.
 Devaśaila—mt. to E. of Meru, LV. 5.
 Devikā—r. rising from the Himavat mts., LVII. 18.
 Drāvāṇa—p. in S.W., LVIII. 31.
 Drāviḍa—p. in S.W., LVIII. 32.

Dh

- Dhanuṣmat—mt. in N., LVIII. 41.
 Dharmadvīpa—An island (doab?) in S.E., LVIII. 17.
 Dharmabaddha—p. in N.W., LVIII. 40.
 Dharmāraṇya—A forest in C.R., LVIII. 7.

Dhruva—c. in Pl.D., LIII. 30.

Dhūtapāpā—r. rising from the Himavat mts., LVII. 17.

Dhūrtaka—p. in S.W., LVIII. 32.

Dhṛtimat—c. in K.D., LIII. 26.

N

Nandana—A forest to S. of Meru, LV. 2; LVI. 8.

Narmadā—r. rising from the Vindhya mts., LVII. 21, 51.

Nāgagiri—mt. in Bhā., LVII. 13.

Nāgadvīpa—One of the nine parts of Bhā., LVII. 6.

Nābhi—One of the nine parts of J.D., LIII. 34.

Nāmavāsaka—c. in S., LVII. 46.

Nārikela—p. in S.E., LVIII. 17.

[Nāsika]—A city in S., LVII. 51; LVIII. 24.

Nikaṭa—p. in S., LVIII. 20.

Nirvindhya—r. rising from the Ṛkṣa mts., LVII. 24.

Niścīrā—r. rising from the Himavat mts., LVII. 18.

Niṣadha—One of the great mt. systems of J.D., LV. 5;
LIV.9, 22, 23; LVIII. 18.

[Niṣadha]—c. on the Vindhya mts., LVII. 54; LVIII. 18.

Niṣadhāvatī—r. rising from the Ṛkṣa mts., LVII. 24.

Nīpa—p. in C.R., LVIII. 6.

Nīla—(1) One of the great mt. systems of J.D., LIV. 9, 22, 23;
I.V. 12.

(2) mt. range in Bhadrāśva V., LIX. 4.

Nīhāra—A hilly country in N., LVII. 56.

Nūpā—r. rising from the Pāripātra mts., LVII. 20.

Nṛsiṃha—p. in N.W., LVIII. 39.

Naiśika—c. in S., LVII. 48. (From Nāsika?).

P

Pañcadaka—p. in W., LVIII. 35.

Pañcaśaila—mt. to S. of Meru, LV. 8.

Paṭu—c. on the Vindhya mts., LVII. 54.

Pataṅgaka—mt. to S. of Meru, LV. 6.

Payoṣṇī—r. rising from the Ṛkṣa mts., LVII. 24.

Para—p. in S., LVIII. 25.

- Parnaśavara—p. in S.E., LVIII. 19.
Parnaśālāgra—mt. range in Bhadrāśva V., LIX. 5.
Palāśinī—r. rising from the Śuktimat mts., LVII. 30.
Pallava—c. in N., LVII. 36.
Paśupāla—c. in N.E., LVIII. 48.
Pablava—p. in S.W., LVIII. 30; N.E., LVIII. 50.
Pākhaṇḍa—p. in C.R., LVIII. 8.
Pāñcāla—p. in C.R., LVIII. 8.
Pāṇḍura—mt. to W. of Meru, LV. 10.
Pāṇḍya—p. in S.W., LVIII. 31.
Pārada—(1) c. in N., LVII. 37.
(2) p. in S.W., LVIII. 31.
Pāraśava—p. in S.W., LVIII. 31.
Pārā—r. rising from the Pāripātra mts., LVII. 20.
Pāripātra—(1) mt. to W. of Meru, LIV. 23; LV. 10.
(2) One of the mt. ranges in Bhā., LVII. 11, 20;
LVIII. 8.
Piṅgala⁸—(1) mt. to W. of Meru, LV. 9.
(2) p. in N., LVIII. 45.
Piñjara—mt. to W. of Meru, LV. 9.
Piṛsomā—r. rising from the Mahendra mts., LVII. 28.
Pīpāthaka—mt. to S. of Meru, LV. 7.
Pippalaśroṇi—r. rising from the Vindhya mts., LVII. 22.
Piśācikā—r. rising from the Vindhya mts., LVIII. 22.
Puṇḍra (Pāṇḍya?)—c. in S., LVII. 45.
Puṇya—An island near N. Kurus, LIX. 28.
Puruśādaka—Cannibals dwelling on the Sea-Coast in E., LVIII. 13.
Pulinda—c. in S., LVII. 47; W., LVII. 50.
Puṣkara—One of the nine D., LIII. 19; LIV. 5, 6.
Puṣkala—c. in N., LVII. 39; LVIII. 44.
Puṣpa—mt. in Bhā., LVII. 14.
Puṣpaka—mt. to N. of Meru, LV. 13.
Puṣpajā—r. rising from the Malaya mts., LVII. 27.
Pūrṇotkata—mt. in E., LVIII. 13.

⁸ See f.n. no. 3 above.

- Pota—p. in Km. V., LIX. 14.
 Paurava—p. in N.E., LVIII. 52.
 Paurika—c. in S., LVII. 48.
 Pravaṅga—c. in E., LVII. 43.
 Pravijaya—c. in E., LVII. 43.
 Prākara—c. in Kr.D., LIII. 23; in K.D., LIII. 25.
 Prāgjyotiṣa—c. in E., LVII. 44; LVIII. 13.
 [Prācī]—The eastern region of Bhā., LVII. 42-44.
 Prāpta—p. in N., LVIII. 43.
 Plakṣa—One of the seven D., surrounded by Ikṣu-Samudra,
 LIII. 18, 29, 30; LIV. 6.

Ph

- Phalguṇaka—p. in W., LVIII. 36.
 Phalguluka—p. in W., LVIII. 36.

B

- Baṅga—p. in S.E., LVIII. 16.
 Bahirgiri—c. in E., LVII. 42.
 Bahubhadra—c. in N., LVII. 37.
 Bālika—p. in N.W., LVIII. 39.
 Bāhudā—r. rising from the Himavat mts., LVII. 17.
 Brahmottara—c. in E., LVII. 43.
 Brahmapura—A city in N.E., LVIII. 50.

Bh

- Bhadragaura—mt. in E., LVIII. 13.
 Bhadradvīpa—An island near the N. Kurus, LIX. 28.
 Bhadrasomā—r. in the N. Kurus, LIX. 23.
 Bhadrā—r. in Bhadrāśva V. LIX. 7.
 Bhadrāśva—One of the nine parts of J.D., LIII. 35; LIV. 14, 31;
 LV. 21; LVI. 7; LIX. 4.
 Bharadvāja—c. in N., LVII. 39.
 Bhavācala—mt. to E. of Meru, LV. 4.
 Bhārata—One of the nine Varṣas, LIII. 40,41; LIV. 31; LV. 21;
 LVI. 22; LVII. 2, 3, 5, 58, 60; LVIII. 1, 2, 4, 73;
 LIX. 1.

- Bhārgava—c. in E., LVII. 43.
 Bhīmarathā—r. rising from the Sahya mts., LVII. 26.
 Bhīrukaccha—c. in W., LVII. 51.
 Bhūtiyuvāka—p. in N., LVIII. 46.
 Bhṛgukaccha—p. in S., LVIII. 21.
 Bhogaprastha—p. in N., LVIII. 42.
 Bhogavardhana—c. in S., LVII. 48.
 Bhojya—c. on the Vindhya mts., LVII. 53.

M

- Magadha—c. in E., LVII. 44; LVIII. 12.
 Maṇimegha—mt. in W., LVIII. 34.
 Maṇisāila—mt. to E. of Meru, LV. 4.
 Maṇivāka—c. in S.D., LIII. 21.
 Matsya—c. in C.R., LVII. 32; LVIII. 7, 16.
 [Mathurā]—A city in C.R., LVIII. 7.
 Madra (Madraka)—c. in N., LVII. 36; LVIII. 45; in E., LVII. 44.
 Madhu—mt. to W. of Meru, LV. 9.
 [Madhyadeśa]—The central region of Bhā., LVII. 32-33.
 Manuga—c. in Kr. D., LIII. 23.
 Mandagā—r. rising from the Suktimat mts., LVII. 29.
 Mandara—mt. to E. of Meru, LIV. 19, 20; LV. 1, 4 (?), 5;
 LVI. 4; LVII. 12.
 Mandavāhinī—r. rising from the Suktimat mts., LVII. 29.
 Mandākinī—r. rising from the Vindhya mts., LVII. 21.
 Mayūra—mt. to N. of Meru, LV. 13.
 Maraka—p. in N.E., LVIII. 51.
 Malaka—c. in C.R., LVII. 33.
 Malaya—One of the seven mt. ranges in Bhā., LVII. 10, 28;
 LVIII. 21.
 Malla—c. in E., LVII. 44.
 Mahāgaurī—r. rising from the Ṛkṣa mts., LVII. 25.
 Mahāgrīva—p. in S.E., LVIII. 17.
 Mahādruma—c. in S.D., LIII. 21.
 Mahānada—r. rising from the Vindhya mts., LVII. 21.
 Mahānila—mt. to E. of Meru, LV. 4.

- Mahābhadrā**—(1) A lake to N. of Meru, LV. 3; LVI. 17.
 (2) mt. to W. of Meru, LV. 9.
- Mahārāṣṭra**—c. in S., LVII. 46; LVIII. 23.
- Mahārṇava**—o., LVI. 18; LVIII. 32.
- Mahāsaila**—mt. to S. of Meru, LV. 7.
- Mahī**—r. rising from the Pāripātra mts., LVII. 19, 51.
- Mahendra**—One of the seven mt. ranges in Bhā., LVII. 10, 29;
 LVIII. 21.
- Māṭhara**—c. in N., LVII. 37.
- Māṇḍavya**—p. in N.W., LVIII. 38; N., LVIII. 46.
- Mānakalaha**—p. in N., LVIII. 45.
- Mānada**—c. in E., LVII. 43.
- Mānava**—mt. in E., LVIII. 11.
- Mānavartika**—c. in E., LVII. 43.
- Mānasa**—(1) c. in Śāl. D., LIII. 27.
 (2) A lake on Gandhamādana, LV. 3; LVI. 8.
- Māruta**—p. in C.R., LVIII. 8.
- Mālava**—p. in N. (?), LVIII. 45.
- Māhiṣaka**—c. in S., LVII. 46.
- [Mithilā]—c. in E., LVIII. 12.
- Mudakara**—c. in E., LVII. 42.
- Muni**—c. in Kr. D., LIII. 23.
- Mūṣika**—c. in S., LVII. 46.
- Mṛṣika**—p. in S.E., LVIII. 16.
- Mekhalāmuṣṭa**—p. in E., LVIII. 14.
- Megha**—mt. to N. of Meru, LV. 13.
- Medhāvin**—c. in Ś.D., LIII. 21.
- Meru**—One of the seven mt. systems of J.D., LIV. 9, 14, 23, 27,
 30; LV. 3, 4, 8, 11, 14; LVI. 3, 8, 16; LX. 8, 11.
- Maināka**—mt. in Bhā., LVII. 13.
- Mauli**—p. in Km. V., LIX. 14.
- Maulika**—c. in S., LVII. 48.

Y

- Yamunū**—r. rising from the Himavat mts., LVII. 17;
 LVIII. 42.

Yavana—p. at the west end of Bhā., LVII. 8; and in N.E.,
LVIII. 52.

[Yaśomatī]—r. in N., LVIII. 46.

Yena—p. in N.E., LVIII. 48.

Yaudheya—p. in N., LVIII. 47.

R

Raṅkṣu—r. rising from the Himavat mts., LVII. 18.

Raṅgeya—c. in E., LVII. 43.

Ratnavat—mt. to S. of Meru, LV. 7.

[Rasū]—r. in N., LVIII. 42.

Rājanya—p. in N., LVIII. 47.

Rūjaśaila—mt. to S. of Meru, LV. 7.

Rucaka—mt. to S. of Meru, LV. 6.

Rūpapa—c. in W., LVII. 50.

Raivata—mt. in Bhā., LVII. 14.

Rocana—mt. in Bhā., LVII. 13.

Rohita—c. in Śāl. D., LIII. 27.

L

Loṅkā—A city in S., LVIII. 20.

Lampāka—c. in N., LVII. 40.

Lambana—c. in K.D., LIII. 25.

Lavaṇasamudra—o. surrounding J.D., LIV. 7; LVI. 15.

Lāṅgūlinī—r. rising from the Mahendra mts., LVII. 29.

Lolana—p. in N.E., LVIII. 50.

[Lohita (Lohitya)]—r. in E., LVIII. 13.

V

Vaka⁹—p. in N., LVIII. 42.

Vaṅkṣu¹⁰—r. in Km. V., LIX. 15.

Vaṅjulā—r. rising from the Vindhya mts., LVII. 22.

9 The reading is *Kuruvakāḥ*. It is not evident whether this is a compound or one single name.

10 The reading is *Vaṅkṣusyāmā*. But *Syāmā* as a river is again mentioned in the next line.

- Vaḍavāmukha—p. in S.W., LVIII. 30.
 Vatsa¹¹—p. in C.R., LVIII. 6.
 Vadanadantura—p. in E., LVIII. 12.
 Vadantika—p. in N., LVIII. 45.
 Vanadāraka—c. in S., LVII. 48.
 [Vanarāṣṭra]—c. of forests in N.E., LVIII. 49.
 [Vanavāhya]—c. of forests in N.E., LVIII. 50.
 Vanitāmukha—p. in S.W., LVIII. 30.
 Vamana—p. in W., LVIII. 35.
 Vamśakarū—r. rising from the Mahendra mts., LVII. 29.
 Varūha—mt. to N. of Meru, LV. 13.
 Varuṇoda—Same as Aruṇoda, LVI. 6.
 Vardhamāna—(1) p. in E., LVIII. 14.
 (2) mt. range in Km. V., LIX. 12.
 Varvara—c. in N., LVII. 38; LVIII. 31.
 Valāva¹²—p. in N.W., LVIII. 39.
 Vaśya—One of the nine parts of J.D., LIII. 34.
 Vasudhāra—mt. to S. of Meru, LV. 7.
 Vasumat—mt. in N., LVIII. 41.
 Vājikeśa—p. in W., LVIII. 37.
 Vāṭadhāna—c. in N., LVII. 35; LVIII. 44.
 Vāṭasvana—mt. in Bhā., LVII. 13.
 Vāricara—p. in S., LVIII. 25.
 Vāruṇa—One of the nine parts of Bhā., LVII. 6.
 Vāhyatodara¹³—c. in N., LVII. 39.
 Vāhyū—r. rising from the Sahya mts., LVII. 26.
 Vāhlika—c. in N., LVII. 35.
 Vitastū—r. rising from the Himavat mts., LVII. 17.
 [Vidarbha]—c. in S., LVII. 47; LVIII. 17.

11 Pargiter reads Vatsa (child) and informs that it would be better to read *Vatsāḥ*, 'The Vatsas' (p. 351, n. †).

12 This might also be read as *Vala+arastha* (Par., p. 375, n. ¶).

13 Pargiter reads *Bāhyato narāḥ* which he translates, as 'the races of men outside' (p. 320). But this Canto mentions countries comprised within the five traditional regions and hence the mention of 'races outside' would be out of place here.

- Vidiśā—r. rising from the Pāripātra mts., LVII. 20.
 [Vidiśū]—c. on the Vindhya mts., LVII. 54.
 Videha—c. in E., LVII. 40; LVIII. 8.
 Vindhya—One of the seven mt. ranges in Bhā., LVII. 11, 23, 47,
 53-55; LVIII. 16.
 Vipāsū—(1) r. rising from the Himavat mts., LVII. 18.
 (2) r. rising from the Vindhya mts., LVII. 22.
 Vipula—mt. to W. of Meru, LIV. 20, 21; LVI. 13.
 Vipraśastaka—p. in W., LVIII. 34.
 Vimāṇḍavya—p. in C.R., LVIII. 6.
 Virajūkṣa—mt. to N. of Meru, LV. 13.
 Viśākhavat—mt. to S. of Meru, LV. 6.
 Viśāla—mt. range in Km. V., LIX. 12.
 Viśoka—mt. range in Km. V., LIX. 12.
 Vīrahotra—c. on the Vindhya mts., LVII. 55.
 Vṛka—c. in C.R., LVII. 33.
 Vṛtraḡhni—r. rising from the Pāripātra mts., LVII. 19.
 Vṛṣadhvaja—mt. in E., LVIII. 11.
 Vṛṣabha—mt. to N. of Meru, LV. 12; LVI. 18.
 Vṛṣavat—mt. to E. of Meru, LV. 4.
 Vegavāhini—r. rising from the Vindhya mts., LVII. 23.
 Veṇī—r. in S., LVIII. 22.
 Veṇu—mt. to E. of Meru, LV. 5.
 Veṇuka—p. in N., LVIII. 45.
 Veṇumatī—r. in W. and N.W., LVIII. 36, 39.
 Veṇyā—(1) r. rising from the Ṛkṣa mts., LVII. 24.
 (2) r. rising from the Sahya mts., LVII. 26.
 Veṇvā—r. rising from the Pāripātra mts., LVII. 19.
 Vetravatī—r. rising from the Pāripātra mts., LVII. 20.
 Vedamantra—p. in C.R., LVIII. 6.
 Vedavatī—r. rising from the Pāripātra mts., LVII. 19.
 Vedasmṛti—r. rising from the Pāripātra mts., LVII. 19.
 Vaṇava—c. in K.D., LIII. 25.
 Vaitaraṇī—r. rising from the Ṛkṣa mts., LVII. 24.
 Vaidūrya—(1) mt. to W. of Meru, LV. 9.
 (2) mt. in S., LVIII. 24.

- Vaidyuta—(1) mt. in Bhā., LVII. 13.
 (2) c. in Śāl. D., LIII. 27.
 Vaibhraja—(1) A forest on mt. Vipula, LV. 2; LVI. 13.
 (2) mt. in Bhā., LVII. 12.
 Vaiśikya—c. in S., LVII. 47.
 Vyāghragrīva—p. in S.E., LVIII. 17.
 Vyāghramukha—mt. in E., LVIII. 11.

S

- Śaka—p. in C.R., LVIII. 6.
 Sakulī—r. rising from the Vindhya mts., LVII. 23.
 Śaṅkha—mt. in S., LVIII. 24.
 Śaṅkhakūṭa—mt. to N. of Meru, LV. 12; LVI. 17.
 Śaṅkhavatī—r. in Bhadrāsva V., LIX. 7.
 Satadru—r. rising from the Himavat mts., LVII. 17, 37.
 Sarkara—p. in W., LVIII. 35.
 Savadhāna—p. in N., LVIII. 44.
 Savara—c. in S., LVII. 47.
 Śāka—(1) One of the seven D., surrounded by Dugdha-Samudra,
 LIII. 22, 30; LIV. 6.
 (2) p. in Km. V., LIX. 14.
 Śākabhava—c. in Pl. D., LIII. 29.
 Śātaka—p. in N., LVIII. 46.
 Śātaśṛṅgin—mt. to N. of Meru, LV. 13.
 Śāntika—p. in W., LVIII. 34.
 Śālmali—One of the seven D., surrounded by Surā-Samudra,
 LIII. 26, 28; LIV. 6.
 Śālmaveśmaka—p. in W., LVIII. 35.
 Śālva—p. in C.R., LVIII. 6.
 Śikhara—mt. to S. of Meru, LV. 6; LVI. 9.
 Śiprā—(1) r. rising from the Pāripātra mts., LVII. 20.
 (2) r. rising from the Ṛkṣa mts., LVII. 24.
 Śiva—c. in Pl. D., LIII. 30.
 Śisīra—c. in Pl. D., LIII. 29.
 Śisīrākṣa—mt. to W. of Meru, LV. 9.
 Śītānta (Śītārta)—mt. to E. of Meru, LV. 4, 17; LVI. 6.

- Śītoda—l. to W. of Meru, LV. 3; LVI. 14.
 Sukti—mt. in S., LVIII. 24.
 Suktimat—One of the seven mt. ranges in Bhā., LVII. 10, 30.
 Suktimatī—r. rising from the Vindhya mts., LVII. 23.
 Subhra—p. in E., LVIII. 12.
 Sūdra—c. in N., LVII. 36; LVIII. 31.
 Sūrasena—p. in C.R., LVIII. 7.
 Sūlakāra—c. in N., LVII. 40.
 Sūlika—c. in N., LVII. 41.
 Śṛṅgavat—mt. to N. and W. of Meru, LIV. 25; LV. 10.
 Śṛṅgin—A great mt. system of J.D., LIV 9
 Sailika—p. in S., LVIII. 20.
 Sailūṣa—c. in Ś., LVII. 46.
 Saivāla—mt. range in Bhadrāśva V., LIX. 4.
 Ṣoṇa—r. rising from the Vindhya mts., LVII. 21.
 Syāmaka—p. in N., LVIII. 47.
 Syāmā—r. in Km. V., LIX. 15.
 Śrīparvata—mt. in Bhā., LVII. 15.
 Sveta—(1) mt. range in J.D., LIV. 9.
 (2) c. in Śāl. D., LIII. 27.
 Svetaparna—mt. range in Bhadrāśva V., LIX. 4.
 Svetodara—mt. to S. of Meru, LV. 7.

S

- Sakṛtraka—A hilly country in N., LVII. 57.
 Saṅketa (Sāketa?)—p. in C.R., LVIII. 8.
 Sadānīrā—r. rising from the Pāripātra mts., LVII. 19.
 Sabindu—mt. to E. of Meru, LV. 5.
 Samūla—mt. to S. of Meru, LV. 7.
 Saraja—c. on the Vindhya mts., LVII. 53.
 Sarasvatī—r. rising from the Himavat mts., LVII. 16; LVIII. 7.
 [Sarasvatī]—r. in W., LVII. 51.
 Sarpissamudra—One of the seven seas, surrounding K.D., LIV. 7.
 Sahasraśikhara—mt. to W. of Meru, LV. 10.
 Sahya—One of the seven mt. ranges in Bhā., LVII. 10, 27, 34.
 Sānumat—mt. to N. and S. of Meru, LV. 12, 6.

- Sārgiga—p. in S.W., LVIII. 31.
 Sārdana—p. in N., LVIII. 43.
 Sāvitr—A forest on mt. Supārśva, LV. 2; LVI. 16.
 Sinibālī—r. rising from the Rkṣa mts., LVII. 24.
 Sindhu¹⁴—(1) r. rising from the Himavat mts., LVII. 16.
 (2) r. rising from the Pāripātra mts., LVII. 19.
 (3) c. in N., LVII. 36; LVIII. 30, 32.
 Simhala—p. in S., LVIII. 27.
 Sitā—r. flowing towards E. of Meru, LVI. 5-7; LIX. 7.
 Sukaṅkavat—mt. to E. of Meru, LV. 4.
 Sukumāra—c. in S.D., LIII. 21.
 Sukhodāya—c. in Pl. D., LIII. 29.
 Supārśva—mt. to N. of Meru, LIV. 20, 21; LVI. 16.
 Suprayogā—r. rising from the Sahya mts., LVII. 26.
 Sumīna—c. in W., LVII. 50.
 Sumerujā—r. rising from the Vindhya mts., LVII. 23.
 Surakṣa—mt. to W. of Meru, LV. 9.
 Suratha—c. in K.D., LIII. 25.
 Surathā—r. rising from the Vindhya mts., LVII. 21.
 Surasa—mt. to W. of Meru, LV. 9.
 Surāṣṭra—c. in W., LVII. 52.
 Sutāsamudra—One of the seven seas, surrounding Śāl. D., LIV. 7
 Sūtpalāvātī—r. rising from the Malaya mts., LVII. 27.
 Sūrpakarna (Sūrpa° ?)—mt. in E., LVIII. 11.
 Sūrya—mt. in S., LVIII. 26.
 Sūryakānta—mt. in N. Kurus, LIX. 22.
 Sūryāraka (Sūrpāraka?)—c. in W., LVII. 49.
 Sairiṣṭha—p. in N.E., LVIII. 50.
 Somā—r. rising from mt. Supārśva, LVI. 16-18.
 Saumya—One of the nine parts of Bhāl., LVII. 6.
 Sauvīra—c. in N., LVII. 36; LVIII. 30.
 Strivāhya—p. in N.W., LVIII. 39.
 Svakambalā—r. in Km. V., LIX. 15.

14 The reading in LVIII, 32 is *Sindhukālakavairatāḥ*, which is evidently a compound though its different elements are not intelligible. (Par., p. 370, n. *).

Svarakṣu—r. rising from the mt. Vipula, LVI. 13-15.

Svarasa—mt. in Bhā., LVII. 13.

Svargabhaumānavadyaka¹⁵—p. in N.E., LVIII. 51.

Svarṇaśṛṅgin—mt. to N. of Meru, LV. 13.

Svāpada (Śvāpada?)—c. in W., LVIII. 50.

H

Haṃsanābha—mt. to N. of Meru, LV. 12.

Haṃsamārga—A hilly country in N., LVII. 41, 56.

Hari—(1) mt. range in Km. V., LIX. 12.

(2) One of the Varṣas, LX. 4-5.

Harīta—c. in Śāl. D., LIII. 27.

Harṣavardhana—c. in N., LVII. 38.

Havirvarṣa (Harivarṣa ?)—c. in J.D., LIII. 34.

Hārabhūṣika—c. in N., LVII. 37.

Hārika—p. in S.E., LVIII. 18.

Hiṅga—p. in N.E., LVIII. 52.

Himavat—A great mt. system to S. of the Hemakūṭa mts., LIV. 9,
24, 26; LV. 8; LVI. 10; LVII. 18, 59; LVIII. 32, 41;
LIII. 36, 40.

Hiraṇmaya—One of the Varṣas of J.D., LX. 14.

Hiraṇya—c. in J.D., LIII. 34.

Hiraṇvatī—r. flowing in Hiraṇmaya, LX. 14.

Hūṇa—p. in N., LVIII. 45.

Hemakūṭa—A great mt. system to N. of the Himālaya mts., LIV. 9,
26; LVIII. 18.

Hematāraka—p. in N., LVIII. 46.

Haihaya—p. in W., LVIII. 34. †

HARIHARA V. TRIVEDI

15 This seems to be a compound name (Par., p. 383, n. †††).

† I must renew my deep obligations to Dr. N. N. Law, the editor of this Journal, for his valuable suggestions.

Pāṇini and the Ṛkprātiśākhyā

Much has been written on the relation between Pāṇini and the Prātiśākhya, but hardly any definite result has been achieved on this point, and the best treatment of the subject is still to be found in Weber's introduction to the Vājasaneyi Prātiśākhyā. The main difficulty in the way of fixing the relative chronology of these texts lies in the fact that both Pāṇini and the Prātiśākhya have largely drawn upon a common grammatical tradition, so that even the most striking similarity between the two texts cannot prove the indebtedness of one to the other. Progressive use of grammatical *termini technici* may serve as a criterion, but this too cannot be fully relied upon, for it has to be remembered that the texts in question have very probably undergone various rehandlings at different times.

As for the specific problem of Pāṇini and the Ṛkprātiśākhyā, Max Müller in his introduction to the latter pointed out long ago that all the four sūtras of Pāṇini (I, 1, 16; VI, 1, 127; VIII, 3, 19; 4, 51) in which Śākalya has been mentioned by name have their more or less exact counterparts in the Ṛkprātiśākhyā and concluded that Pāṇini borrowed these sūtras from the latter. Yet Max Müller could not carry conviction, for Hannes Sköld, for instance, in his "Papers on Pāṇini" has completely turned the table against him. But there are actually certain indications, which, to all appearance, conclusively prove the dependence of Pāṇini on the Ṛkprātiśākhyā, though however it is always possible that the whole or a part of the latter underwent a rehandling at a later date.

It appears that Pāṇini I, 1, 16 (*sambuddhan śākalyasye 'tāv anārṣe*) has never been understood even by the ancient Indian commentators.¹ Accepting the obvious *anuvṛtti* of *ot* from the preceding sūtra the Kāśikā explains it in the following way: *sambudhīnimitto ya okārah sa śākalyācāryasya matena pragṛhyasaṃjño bhavati, itīśabde 'vaidike parataḥ* "the *o* which is of vocative

1 This sūtra has not been directly quoted in the Mahābhāṣya and therefore Sköld considers it to be spurious. Yet when commenting on the following sūtra Patañjali assumes the *anuvṛtti* of "Śākalya," which clearly shows that Pāṇini I, 1, 16 too was known to him.

origin is to be called *pragṛhya* in the opinion of Ācārya Śākalya when a non-Vedic *iti* follows'. But what is this "non-Vedic" *iti*? In the Kāśikā and the later commentaries it has been taken to signify the word *iti* in non-Vedic literature. But such an interpretation is not at all admissible, for Pāṇini never uses the word *anārṣa* or *avaidika* to indicate a linguistic phenomenon peculiar to non-Vedic Sanskrit. In fact, this "non-Vedic" *iti* is nothing but the *iti* of the *padapāṭha* of the Ṛgveda employed to indicate the fact that the preceding word is *pragṛhya*, and the real meaning of the above sūtra of Pāṇini is "The *o* of vocative is *pragṛhya* when Śākalya's non-Vedic *iti* follows." It is well known that Śākalya, the author of the *Padapāṭha* and the *Ṛkprātiśākhya* (later recension by Śaunaka) uses the word *iti* in the *pada*-text of the Ṛgveda after a *pragṛhya* word of the *saṃhitā*-text. As this *iti* is not present in the sacred *mantra* it is quite intelligible that it should be called *anārṣa*, *avaidika* etc., and as it occurs only in the *Padapāṭha* of Śākalya it may be called Śākalya's with equal propriety. Even the word *anārṣa* in this sūtra of Pāṇini is not accidental. The *Samhitā*-text is called *ārṣi-saṃhitā* in the *Ṛkprātiśākhya*. It is obviously with reference to this "ārṣi" text that Pāṇini calls this symbolical *iti* "anārṣa".

If this interpretation of Pāṇini I, 1, 16 is correct it has to be admitted that Pāṇini has directly drawn upon the *Ṛkprātiśākhya* in this case. It cannot be argued that Pāṇini has taken this rule from some other grammatical work of Śākalya, for what other work than the *Ṛkprātiśākhya*, which exclusively deals with the phonetic changes of the *Padapāṭha* of the *Ṛksaṃhitā*, would mention this symbolical *iti*? Needless to say, Pāṇini I, 1, 16 has its exact counterpart in the *Ṛkprātiśākhya*. In sūtra 69 the *Prātiśākhya*² lays down *okāra āmantritajaḥ pragṛhyāḥ* "the *o* originated out of vocative is called *pragṛhya*", and sūtra 155 (*prakṛtye 'tikaraṇāḍau pragṛhyāḥ*) shows that this *pragṛhya* remains unchanged when *iti* follows.

It may be objected however that according to the above interpretation Pāṇini I, 1, 16 would cease to be a *vaikalpika* sūtra as it has been always considered to be, and, what more, it will then have to be regarded as an absolute rule about Vedic Sanskrit. Strange as it may appear, this and the three following sūtras actually seem to be meant exclusively for Vedic Sanskrit although there is no indication in the text of Pāṇini to that effect, unless it is assumed

2 The *Ṛkprātiśākhya* will be quoted according to Müller's edition.

that the name of Śākalya implies in this group of sūtras that they are to be applied to the Vedic language only. This is certainly a serious departure from the usual methodology of Pāṇini, in whose system reference to older authorities only signifies that the sūtra in question is *vaikalpika*. But to all these apparent anomalies there is an obvious explanation which is fully satisfactory: in all these sūtras Pāṇini had been but copying the Ṛkprātiśākhya which deals exclusively with the Veda. Indeed Pāṇini always quotes his authorities in the genitive when he means to say that the sūtra in question is *vaikalpika*, and in I, 1, 16 too he has quoted Śākalya in the genitive. But in the other sūtras, when the name of an authority is quoted in the genitive, the word *matena* has to be supplied after it, so that *sphoṭāyanasya* in VI, 1, 123 signifies "in the opinion of Sph." and *cākravarmanasya* in VI, 1, 130 signifies "in the opinion of Cākr." But there is no room for the word *matena* after *śākalyasya* in I, 1, 16 if it is interpreted in the way suggested above: Pāṇini here simply speaks of Śākalya's *iti* (i. e. the symbolical *iti* of the Padapāṭha), he is not quoting Śākalya's opinion. Thus if "*śākalyasye 'tau*" in I, 1, 16 is taken to mean "when Śākalya's *iti* follows" and not "in the opinion of Śākalya when *iti* follows," as the traditional commentators have understood, it will give us not only a better meaning of I, 1, 16 but also explain why this and the following three sūtras have no scope in the non-Vedic language.

It is interesting to note how Patañjali *cum suis* was involved in difficulties on account of his failure to understand the meaning of the word *śākalyasya* in P. I, 1, 16. Patañjali himself recognised that P. I, 1, 17-18 constitute but one sūtra, and yet he was constrained to split it up into two because he considered it to be a *vaikalpika sūtra* on account of the *anuvṛtti* of "*śākalyasya*." But according to the interpretation suggested above, Pāṇini I, 1, 17-18 would be no *vaikalpika sūtra* at all and would simply mean "the particle *u* is lengthened and nasalised when Śākalya's non-Vedic *iti* (i. e. the symbolical *iti* of the Padapāṭha) follows," and this is exactly what is laid down in the Ṛkprātiśākhya, Sūtra 76: *ukāraś ce' tikaraṇena yukto rakto 'pṛkto drāghitaḥ śākalena* "and *u* too is *pragṛhya* when it is connected with *iti*, nasalised, not followed by a consonant (*apṛkta*) and lengthened by Śākala." It is impossible to resist the conclusion that here too Pāṇini has directly borrowed from the Ṛkprātiśākhya. Pāṇini's *uñah ūṇ* (I, 1, 17-18) considered as constituting one and the same sūtra conveys therefore a fully intelligible meaning, provided it is not taken to be a *vaikalpika sūtra*. Indeed, in trying to thrust upon it a *vaikalpika* meaning Patañjali and his

successors in the field have distorted the meaning of this sūtra and given rise to hypothetical word-combinations which perhaps never existed in the language. Juxtaposition of *u* and *iti* is difficult to imagine in the actual language. Such a combination is possible only in the Padapāṭha, and Pāṇini, or rather the Ṛkprātiśākhyā from which Pāṇini copied this rule, had in view only those special cases of *u* in which it is lengthened and nasalised before the symbolical *iti*, the sign of *pragṛhya*. But Patañjali *cum suis* misconstrued all. In their opinion Pāṇini's *uñah ūm* prescribes three different alternatives for the euphonic combination of *u* with *iti*: (1) *u iti*, when *u* is *pragṛhya*; (2) *ūm iti*; and (3) *v iti*. In order to justify this interpretation they were even compelled to split up Pāṇini's original one and undivided sūtra into two, although the juxtaposition of *u* and *iti* is hardly possible in the actual language.

If the above interpretation of Pāṇini I,1, 16-18 is correct it would reflect no glory on the author of these sūtras, for it will not only prove that he borrowed these sūtras from the Ṛkprātiśākhyā but also that he borrowed these sūtras without understanding them. It has been pointed out that the corresponding sūtras of the Prātiśākhyā deal with euphonic combinations of the symbolical *iti* of the Padapāṭha. But what interest can have Pāṇini in such euphonic combinations when he is writing a grammar of the actual language?

Coming to sūtra I,1, 19 we are again confronted with an anomaly. It has not been indicated either in the Mahābhāṣya or in the Kāśikā that this is a rule which has its scope only in the Vedic language, but it is a fact that the *pragṛhya* vowels *ī* and *ū* in loc. sg., of which Pāṇini speaks here, are met with only in the Ṛgveda (cf. Wackernagel, III §86c, §97b). There is apparently only one way of explaining this anomaly. According to the interpretation of sūtra I,1, 16 suggested above, the word *śākalyasya* has been used there not only to characterise the symbolical *iti* of the Padapāṭha but also to indicate that the sūtra in question is to be applied to the Vedic language alone (the *iti* in question being possible only in the Padapāṭha of Vedic texts). Now, if this "śākalyasya" is assumed in Sūtra I,1, 19 by *anuvṛtti* it may be actually taken to be meant for the Vedic language alone. Both the Mahābhāṣya and the Kāśikā are however unanimous that there is no *anuvṛtti* of "śākalyasya" in this sūtra. But it is certain that Pāṇini assumed the word "śākalyasya" also in I,1, 19. Pāṇini here refers to *pragṛhya ī* and *ū* in loc. sg. used only in Vedic language. But Wackernagel (III §97b) has pointed out that in the case of *ū* there is nothing to show that in the Saṃhitā-text it has been actually treated as *pragṛhya*. In the

Padapāṭha however this *ū* of loc. sg. , along with the analogous *ī*, is always treated as *pragṛhya*. It is quite clear therefore that Pāṇini could never have laid down this rule had he not been familiar either with the Padapāṭha or with the Ṛkprātiśākhyā which deals with the euphonic laws of the Padapāṭha. In either case Pāṇini would naturally refer to Śākalya. But it is very unlikely that Pāṇini had personal knowledge of the Padapāṭha,—his amazing mistakes, both of omission and commission, when dealing with the language of the Veda, would hardly countenance such a theory. It may be safely concluded, therefore, that the Ṛkprātiśākhyā is the direct source of Pāṇini I, 1, 19, with which its sūtra 73 is identical in meaning, though not in form. Anuvṛtti of “*śākalyasya*” being thus ascertained, Pāṇini I, 1, 19 (*īdūtan ca saptamyarthe*) has to be interpreted as “Śākalya’s *ī* and *ū* functioning as locative case-suffix are also *pragṛhya*”. This interpretation would on the one hand indicate the sūtra to be exclusively meant for the Vedic language, and on the other, explain the anomaly that the shorter case-suffix *ū* in loc. sg., although apparently not treated as *pragṛhya* in the Saṃhitā text, has been actually described as such in this sūtra. This interpretation is therefore in every way superior to the traditional one given by Patañjali etc., according to which it means “*ī* and *ū* too are *pragṛhya* when functioning in locative sense.”

It is hardly necessary to emphasise the point that we are concerned here with the Padapāṭha of Ṛgveda alone, for Śākalya, mentioned by Pāṇini, is known to have been the Padakāra of this text only. Pāṇini’s rules of *Pragṛhya*, as interpreted above, should therefore be expected to conform to those followed in the Padapāṭha of Ṛksaṃhitā alone. They would naturally apply also to the rules of *Pragṛhya* followed in the Padapāṭhas of other Vedic texts exactly following Śākalya’s system, though however such a text is difficult to find.

The whole group of sūtras in Pāṇini I, 1, 16-19 is therefore to all appearance directly taken from the Ṛkprātiśākhyā, though however it is quite possible that at the time of borrowing the Prātiśākhyā was much different from what it is to-day. Many other sūtras of Pāṇini seem to have been taken from the same source, but in their case determined sceptics may still demur to such a conclusion. But from Pāṇini’s section on accent it is possible to point out at least another sūtra in whose case it is again quite evident that Pāṇini is the borrower and the Prātiśākhyā the lender. It is Pāṇini’s last sūtra but one (VIII, 4, 67).

The sūtra runs as follows: *no ’dūttasvaritodayam agāryyagūlāra-kāśyapūnām* “not when an udātta or svarita follows, excepting in

the opinion of Gargya, Gālava and Kāśyapa.” The whole problem here hinges on the word *udaya* which has been used here in the sense of *para*. Nowhere else has Pāṇini used the word *udaya* in this sense and therefore all his commentators were at a loss to know how to explain this strange technical term. So far as can be seen, Patañjali has nowhere referred to this sūtra. The author of the Kāśikā however has given an altogether fantastic explanation which has been none the less devoutly accepted by subsequent commentators. According to the Kāśikā the word *udaya* has been used here *maṅgalārtham*. The Subodhinī develops this point in the characteristic way. The author of this recent sub-commentary says that the grammar begins with the propitious word *vṛddhi* (*vṛddhir ādaic*), the word *śiva* occurs in the middle of it (*śivaśamarīṣṭasya kara* IV, 4, 143), and it is but fitting that the propitious word *udaya* should be used towards its end. All this ingenuity is however simply *peine perdue*, for the word in question is evidently taken from the Ṛkprātiśākhya, in which the word *udaya* is regularly used in the sense of *para*. The compound *udāttasvaritodayam* in the above sūtra of Pāṇini is evidently a defective pāda of an *anuṣṭubh* verse. It is certainly no mere accident that this pāda is repeatedly met with in the Ṛkprātiśākhya. The compound *udāttasvaritodayam* actually occurs in sūtra 203 of this Prātiśākhya which is exactly equivalent to Pāṇini VIII. 4, 67 (read with the preceding sūtra). Can it be doubted under these circumstances that Pāṇini directly copied the first part of this sūtra from the Ṛkprātiśākhya and in so doing inadvertently imported into his grammar also the technical term *udaya* which is quite foreign to his system? This shows again that Pāṇini has not only copied the Ṛkprātiśākhya, but he has copied it mechanically, perhaps without even understanding what he was copying.

BATAKRISHNA GHOSH

Rebellion of Shah Jahan and his Career in Bengal

Disputed succession and the consequent rivalry and jealousy amongst princes of the royal blood, ending in their revolt against the reigning sovereign, were the curse of the Mughals in India. Salim was the first to rebel against his father Akbar; Khusrau did the same against Jahangir, only to be followed by his brother Khurram, better known as Shah' Jahan.

Third in seniority, Shah Jahan was, in energy, ability, and military talents, the first and foremost amongst his four brothers, and was marked out to be the heir-apparent to the throne. But his hopes of a peaceful succession were frustrated, mainly on account of the jealousy and intrigues of the ambitious and powerful Queen Nur Jahan, and driving the prince into open rebellion against his father towards the end of 1622. It was a critical moment in the history of the Mughal empire. The frontier province of Qandahar on the north-west, a commercial centre of great importance and the bone of contention between the Persian and Mughal sovereigns since the time of Humayun, had just been recaptured by Shah Abbas of Persia, and its immediate recovery was essential. Prince Shah Jahan was the man of the hour. He had won great success in the Deccan war, and had a large army and abundant resources at his command. But instead of employing them against a formidable foreign enemy, he was compelled to waste them in an internal conflict. The result was doubly disastrous. The hope of the recovery of Qandahar remained unfulfilled, while the Mughal government was drained of millions of money and deprived of the services of some of its greatest men. In fact, this revolt, which lasted well over three years, threw the whole empire into great confusion and 'deeply injured the Imperial interest in Afghanistan, on the north-western frontier, as well as in the Deccan.'¹

¹ *History of Jahangir*, p. 395.

To this important episode of Mughal history, only a passing reference is to be found in current text books—those of Vincent Smith, Elphinstone, Lane Poole, and Keene—a more detailed treatment is noticeable in the works of a number of European scholars, notably Gladwin, Dow, and Stewart. Gladwin's account of Shah Jahan's rebellion is quite accurate so far as it goes, and is based mainly on the *Maasir-i-Jahangiri* of Kamgar Khan, of which it is really 'an intelligent summary.' Dow, on the other hand, relying chiefly on the *Iqbalnamah-i-Jahangiri* of Motamad Khan and the *Shah Jahannamah* of Muhammad Amin Kazwini, supplies a more exhaustive account, which is not always accurate and requires careful scrutiny with the help of contemporary works not used by him. Stewart, on his part, utilised most of the standard Persian chronicles, including the *Riyazu-s-Salatin*, besides the work of Dow. But his narrative shows too much dependence on that of Dow, with the inevitable result that some of the errors of the latter have crept into his own (cf. the details of the battle of Raj Mahal). A more palpable defect of Stewart is his faulty chronology of the rebellion.

The last worker in the field, worthy of note, is Professor Beni Prasad, the author of the *History of Jahangir*. He has given us, for the first time, a careful, critical, and fairly detailed narrative of the rebellion, utilising all available materials (excepting the *Baharistan-i-Ghaibi* to which we shall refer presently), and, in this sense, may be said to have anticipated my work. But many interesting and important details (e.g. the details of the battles near Akbarpur. c. end of April, 1624, and on the bank of the Tons, c. end of October, 1624, the full history of the conquest and administration of Bengal by the rebel prince, and the part played by the Portuguese chieftains of Bengal in the rebellion) have been necessarily left out by Dr. Beni Prasad as beyond the scope of a handy, complete, history of the reign of Jahangir. The object of the present paper is to make an intensive study of only one important episode in that reign.

The discovery within recent times of some new valuable materials has made a minute study of Prince Shah Jahan's rebellion quite feasible. Our most noteworthy original source is the Persian manuscript *Baharistan-i-Ghaibi*. It professes to be a history of

Bengal and Orissa during the period 1608-24 A.D., written by an Imperial officer named Mirza Nathan, later on created Shitab Khan by the Emperor Jahangir. While the authenticity and wealth of material of the *Baharistan* for the history of Bengal in general may now be taken to have been widely recognised,² its value as a source, so far as the present topic is concerned, cannot be over-estimated. Mirza Nathan joined the ranks of the rebel prince Shah Jahan soon after he had defeated the Bengal viceroy Ibrahim Khan Fathjang, c. end of April, 1624, and continued to act as one of his most trusty lieutenants in Bengal till February, 1625. His account of the rebellion is therefore as valuable as that of an "eye-witness." It is also exhaustive (covering about 72 pages of the manuscript—folios 292a-328a), and thus well compensates for the paucity of materials noticeable in the official Muslim chronicles of the period.

What enhances its historical value is the fact that it is the only story of the rebellion, so far available, from the side of Prince Shah Jahan. Hitherto we had to rely entirely for the history of this episode on the Memoirs of Jahangir, and on other works manifestly based on them. These are really the accounts of the enemy of the rebel prince and of his adherents, and are necessarily very brief in their scope and much prejudiced in their outlook. It is only after the discovery of the *Baharistan* that this subject can be treated from a more or less impartial standpoint, and in details of almost absolute accuracy and contemporary authenticity.

In the light of new materials so obtained, I have ventured to offer Fathers S. Manrique and J. Cabral of the fall of Hugly (1632) throw new light on the activities of the Portuguese officers and adventurers in regard to this revolt.

In the light of new materials so obtained, I have ventured to offer a thorough and detailed study of the rebellion of Prince Shah Jahan, with special reference to his career in Bengal, Bihar, and Orissa.

² For a detailed discussion regarding its historical value and contents, see Sir Jadunath Sarkar's article in *JBORS.*, March, 1921, and the present writer's *A History of Mughal North-East Frontier Policy*, Introduction, 7-9.

I. THE OUTBREAK OF SHAH JAHAN'S REVOLT.

In the month of March, 1622, the fort of Qandahar was laid siege to by the Persian king Shah Abbas. His professions of friendship and goodwill, through diplomatic envoys, had so lulled the suspicions of the Mughal Emperor Jahangir that the defence of that important frontier post was entirely neglected. It thus fell an easy prey to the Persians, after a siege of about a month and half.³

The Mughal Emperor, being in a weak state of health for some time, had repaired to Kashmir. At the news of the attack on Qandahar, he hastened down to Lahore to organise the defence. Prince Shah Jahan, who had already won fame as a great military commander by his exploits in Rajputana and the Deccan, was then stationed in Burhanpur. He was ordered to proceed to the relief of Qandahar with the entire Deccan levy.

Shah Jahan was in a really difficult situation. The declining health of his father had already brought the question of succession, in which he was greatly interested, to the forefront of Imperial politics. By the murder of Khusrau, he had removed one obstacle from the way. He feared nothing from his second brother Parvez, a hard drinker, ease-loving and indolent, who was sure to have an early death. His one formidable rival was the youngest brother Shahriyar. He too was personally unfit for the royal office, being feeble in body and mind, and had in fact no political ambition, but he was dragged into public life by Nur Jahan, who made him her son-in-law and her nominee for the throne.

Equally shrewd, capable, and ambitious, the son and the step-mother were anxious to get rid of each other, so as to be free to exercise absolute authority after the death of the Emperor. The siege of Qandahar afforded Nur Jahan an opportunity of inducing her docile husband to send Shah Jahan away to that distant frontier. The latter clearly saw

³ For the Qandahar affair, see *Tuzuk-i-Jahangiri* (Sir S. Ahmad's text) & Eng. Trns. by Rogers and Beveridge [henceforth abbreviated as *Jahangir* (R&B.)] II, 230, 233-4, 240-45, 246-7; *Iqbalnamah-i-Jahangiri* (Bibliotheca Indica series) henceforth referred to as *Iqbalnamah*, 19-2; *Muntakhab-ul-lubab* (henceforth referred to as *K. Khan*), I, 320-27. *History of Jahangir*, 346-47, 348-49, 355.

through the clever move of his adversary, and at first sought to evade the arduous task imposed on him. But when this proved fruitless, he hedged in his acceptance with so many conditions for his own safety that it amounted practically to a refusal. Jahangir was much enraged, and commanded the prince to despatch his troops immediately to court, but he still hesitated and delayed. Just at this moment of extreme tension, a bloody dispute between Shah Jahan's men and the agents of Nur Jahan's son-in-law, over the possession of the *jagir* of Dholpur, brought matters to a crisis.⁴

Nur Jahan fully exploited this incident to discredit her rival and deprive him of the sympathy and affection of his father. Shah Jahan was not only sharply rebuked for his insolence and disloyalty, but was also forbidden the court, and once more peremptorily ordered to send back his army. Some of his *jagirs* in North India were also transferred to Shahriyar, though he was asked to choose holdings of equal value in the Deccan.⁵

2. SHAH JAHAN PROCEEDS FROM THE DECCAN TOWARDS AGRA, BUT IS DEFEATED AT THE BATTLE OF BILOCHPUR.

Alarmed at the growing estrangement of his father and sincerely anxious to placate him, Shah Jahan sent an envoy with a letter of apology. But owing to Nur Jahan's machinations, he was refused a hearing. Finding that nothing but his ruin would satisfy the Queen, the prince became desperate, and, in December, 1622, unfurled the standard of revolt at Mandu, whence he proceeded with his entire army towards the north.⁶

Jahangir prepared himself, under the inspiration of his Queen, to meet the foreign as well as the internal enemy as best he could. While prince Shahriyar was sent, under the guardianship of Mirza Rustam, against the formen, prince Parvez was summoned from his *jagir* in Bihar and appointed, with the veteran general Mahabat Khan nominally as his

4 *Jahangir* (R. & B.), II, 231, 234-36. *Iqbalnamah*, 193-4. *Maasir-ul-Umara*, Bib. Indica Series Eng. Trns. by Beveridge [henceforth abbreviated as *M.U.* (Beveridge)]. I, 149-50. *History of Jahangir*, 348-51.

5 *Iqbalnamah*, 196. *M.U.* (Beveridge), I, 150; *History of Jahangir*, 352.

6 *Jahangir* (R. & B.), II, 238-39, 246-47; *History of Jahangir*, 353, 355; *Padishahnamah* (Bibliotheca Indica Series), II, 339-40 *K. Khan*, I, 350-31.

subordinate but really in chief command, to deal with the latter. Jahangir himself soon left Lahore and marched, *via* Nur Sarai, to Delhi (Feb., 1623), in order to watch developments.

From Mandu, Shah Jahan rapidly advanced towards Agra, apparently with a view to capturing the fort and intercepting the royal treasures under orders of removal to Delhi. But owing to the foresight and prudence of Asaf Khan, the *vizir*, and Itibar Khan, the commandant of the Agra fort, the removal was postponed. The fortifications of Agra having already been strengthened, an attempt to storm it was not considered feasible, and the rebel prince contented himself with robbing some of the nobles of the city (which was not well-protected) and plundering their houses. He then marched rapidly along the Jumna towards Delhi. Near Bilochpur, he met the Imperialists headed by Mahabat Khan, with the van under Abdullah Khan Firozjang. Shah Jahan suffered a heavy defeat in that battle, and lost his able Brahmin lieutenant Sundar, *alias* Raja Bikramjit. The only redeeming feature was the winning over of the Imperial commander Abdullah Khan to his side.⁷

Jahangir was greatly elated at this victory, and lavishly rewarded his officers. His next act was to urge Mahabat Khan, who had meanwhile been joined by Sultan Parvez, to pursue the vanquished prince. Prince Dawar Bakhsh, son of Khusrav, was at the same time despatched to Gujarat, under the charge of Khan Azam, to wrest that province from the hands of the officers of Shah Jahan.

3. SHAH JAHAN RETIRES TO THE DECCAN.

In the meantime the rebel prince had hastened back to the fort of Mandu.⁸ At the news of the entry of the Imperial generals into the province of Malwa, across the pass of Chandaghat (between Ajmere and

⁷ For details of the battle, see *Jahangir* (R. & B.), II. 245-256; *Iqbalnamah*, 203-4; *Maasir-i-Jahangiri*, 194a *et. seq.* *Reign of Jahangir* by F. Gladwin (henceforth referred to as *Gladwin*), 64; *History of Jahangir*, 359-361.

⁸ G. S. Ojha (*Rajputanekā Itihās*, III. pp. 824-25) suggests on the authority of some standard Rajput annals that Shah Jahan halted at Udaipur on his way back to Mandu, after his defeat at Bilochpur, made friends with its ruler Mahārāṇā Karṇa Singh, and secured the services of his younger brother and commander-in-chief Raja Bhim Singh.

Malwa), he moved forward to face them, with an army of 20,000 horse, 300 elephants, besides a large park of artillery. But he soon changed his plan, and, avoiding an open encounter, tried to harrass the enemy by guerilla warfare. Mahabat Khan, however, proved more than a match for Shah Jahan. He met the new tactics quite effectively, and, at the same time, succeeded in inducing many of the leading officers of the rebel prince to desert him. Panic-stricken and suspicious about the loyalty of his remaining followers, Shah Jahan crossed the Narbada, and, having secured the fords of that river with the help of his trusty officer, Bairam Beg, retired to the stronghold of Asir, whence he moved who had joined the party of the rebel prince with his eldest son Darab to Burhanpur. More desertions followed. Khan Khanan Abdur Rahim, Khan, also attempted to secede, but, on being unsuccessful, both father and son were placed under surveillance.⁹

4. SHAH JAHAN SUFFERS FRESH REVERSES AND DISAPPOINTMENTS.

The cause of the rebel prince suffered in Gujarat as well. That province, which had long been in his possession, was now reoccupied by the Imperial officers. Abdullah Khan, the local governor, was forced to retire, and he rejoined his master at Burhanpur after many vicissitudes of fortune (c. early in Sept., 1623).¹⁰

In great distress, Shah Jahan now sought foreign aid, and sent envoys to the courts of Ahmadnagar and Bijapur, but neither of these states responded. Being on the verge of war, they were vying with one another in securing the help of the Mughal Emperor, and were unwilling to injure their case by adopting the cause of a helpless rebel.

The prince at last decided to make peace and submit to the Emperor. Negotiations were accordingly opened with Mahabat Khan. Neither Mahabat Khan nor Sultan Parvez was really willing to come to terms; moreover, the former decided to play with the peace more to throw the unfortunate prince off his guard and lead him into further troubles. The plan succeeded. The Khan Khanan, who was wavering in his loyalty to Shah Jahan, was sent to confer with Mahabat Khan. But

⁹ *Jahangir* (R.&B.), II, 271-74; *Gladwin*, 65-66; *History of Jahangir*, 363-64.

¹⁰ For details, see *Jahangir* (R. & B.), II. 261-67, 268-69; *Iqbalnamah*, 206-10; *M.U.* (Beveridge), I. 493; *Gladwin*, 66-68.

before he could reach his destination, some Imperialists, taking advantage of the carelessness of the troops guarding the fords, on account of the peace negotiations, managed to cross the Narbada one night and fall upon the rebels. Bairam Beg, their commander, was taken unawares, and, unable to cope with the enemy, fled.¹¹

All talk of peace was now over. The Khan Khanan, in spite of his solemn oath to stand by the rebel prince, rejoined the Imperialists, who moved forward across the Narbada without any opposition to hunt down Shah Jahan in Burhanpur.

5. SHAH JAHAN DECIDES TO LEAVE FOR BENGAL.

No other way being open to him, the rebel prince decided to leave the Deccan altogether and create for himself a new sphere of influence, whence he could try his luck again. This was found in Bengal.

On account of its peculiar physical features, geographical isolation, and chronic political confusion, Bengal had afforded, particularly during the Mughal period, a tempting field to many daring adventurers, and often a safe asylum to helpless refugees. It had once been seized by the Afghan chief Sher Khan, who had soon to make room for his Mughal adversary Humayun, and it now offered to prince Shah Jahan, the great-grandson of the latter, a shelter from the relentless pursuit of his enemies.

The political situation in Bengal at that time seemed to be favourable to the rebel prince. Though owing to the indefatigable energy and perseverance of Alau-ddin Islam Khan (1608-13), most of the powerful Afghan and Hindu zamindars had been subdued, political disaffection was still rife, and could at any moment assume a formidable character. Bahadur Khan, zamindar of Hijli, and the king of Tipperah, amongst others, were at that time giving much trouble to the existing viceroy Ibrahim Khan Fathjang. Further, Musa Khan, the most powerful amongst the zamindars of south-eastern Bengal, who had, after his subjection, rendered valuable services to the Mughal Emperor in Bengal as well as in Kamrup, had just died. His son and successor Masum Khan, a hot-headed and fickle youth of eighteen or nineteen,

¹¹ *Jahangir* (R. & B.), II. 278-79; *History of Jahangir*, 370-71; *M.U.* (Beveridge), I. 379.

was not likely to tread in the footsteps of his father, and, in fact, proved for a time a pliant tool in the hands of Shah Jahan.

While these internal complications appeared to be welcome to the rebel prince, the external dangers threatening the province of Bengal also, in a way, proved to be useful to him. The frontier outposts in Jessore and Bhulua had been suffering from repeated inroads of the Feringhi pirates of Sandip and the king of Arrakan respectively, and Shah Jahan could naturally count upon their help in fighting the common enemy—the Mughal Emperor. The most effective means of holding the riparian plain of Bengal against the enemy was a strong navy, and it could easily be supplied by the powerful king of Arrakan and the Feringhi adventurers and the zamindars of lower Bengal. Substantial help in the same direction might also be expected from the Portuguese settlers in Hugly and Pipli, then under the rule of one Miguel Rodrigues.¹²

Thus, to the resourceful mind of Shah Jahan, Bengal appeared to be a good substitute for the Deccan, not only as a base of operations, but also as a recruiting ground and a source of supplies in the inevitable contest, and to Bengal he prepared to go at the end of the autumn of 1623.

6. SHAH JAHAN PASSES THROUGH GOLCONDA TO MASULIPATAM.

The shortest and safest route to that distant province lay through the domain of his former enemy, the king of Golconda. Shah Jahan accordingly left Burhanpur, crossed the Tapti, though it was in high flood owing to heavy rains, and marched in a south-easterly direction. But he was given no rest. Under the orders of the Emperor, or rather of the Queen, Prince Parvez and Mahabat Khan continued to pursue him even across the flooded Tapti, and marched on for forty *kos* as far as the *praganah* of Ankot. Shah Jahan increased his pace and reached the fort of Mahur, whence he entered the territory of Golconda and begged the help of its ruler.

That monarch found himself in a difficult position. He could not afford to displease the Imperialists by harbouring the rebel prince, lest they should retaliate by helping his own enemy, the king of Bijapur.

¹² *History of the Portuguese in Bengal*, p. 60, footnote.

Nor could he turn Shah Jahan away forthwith, for this would lead to an immediate conflict with the prince, who had already reached his domain at the head of an army. So he took a middle course. He sent Shah Jahan a small amount of cash and some goods, and, at the same time, instructed the officers to offer him supplies and also help him otherwise, so that he might pass through the kingdom as quickly as possible.¹³

Shah Jahan took the hint and promised that he would leave Golconda territory in fifteen or twenty days, without causing any harm to the people. But he could not traverse the long territory of Telingana within that time, and actually took about twenty-four days to reach the port of Masulipatam (Nov., 5).

7 SHAH JAHAN'S PARTY.

The small town was in great excitement at the news of the approach of Shah Jahan with his army. In spite of his solemn undertaking to spare the life and property of the citizens, two-thirds of them left the place in hot haste. The rebel prince, however, was true to his word and behaved well towards those who did not move. He stayed in Masulipatam for five days, giving his men a much-needed rest after the severe strain of continuous marches in rains and foul weather. His army had now dwindled to about 4,500 cavalry and 12,000 infantry, including camp followers. Besides this, he had 500 elephants and a number of transport camels.¹⁴ Amongst the more prominent of his officers were Abdullah Khan Firozjang, the commander-in-chief, Darya Khan Rohilla and his sons, Babu Khan and Bahadur Khan, Khidmat-

¹³ *Jahangir* (R. & B.), II. 290-91; Sir W. Foster's *English Factories in India, 1622-23*, 313; *History of Jahangir*, 374; *Journal of Indian History*, II. (1922-23), 11-12.

¹⁴ *English Factories in India (1622-23)*, 314; *Journal of Indian History*, II. 12; *History of Jahangir*, 374. *Some years' Travels into Africa and Asia* by T. Herbert (henceforth abbreviated as Herbert), 89, has about the same figure—4,000 horse and 300 elephants. But a Dutchman named Jan Libænsær, the master of a ship which had arrived at Masulipatam on October 17, 1623, who personally met Shah Jahan, gives a much higher estimate of the rebel army—14,000 horse, 1,500 elephants and 2,500 camels (*Hague Transcripts*, Series, I, Vol. VI. No. 216, quoted in *English Factories in India (1622-23)*, 316, foot-note)—which seems rather incredible.

purast Khan and Rumi Khan, the artillery officers, Darab Khan (son of Khan Khanan Abdur Rahim), Shujaat Khan (*alias* Sayyid Jafar), Wazir Khan, Nasir Khan (*alias* Khawajah Sabir), Bairam Beg Turkaman (later on entitled Khan Dauran), Raja Bhim, Raja Sardul, and Rao Manrup.

8. SHAH JAHAN ENTERS ORISSA.

On November 10, 1623, Shah Jahan struck his camp at Masulipatam, and, turning towards the north-east, soon entered the Mughal province of Orissa, through the Chhatar Diwar Pass.¹⁵

The new plan of operations of the rebel prince did not come as a surprise to his father. In fact, he had long ago anticipated it and had appointed Mirza Rustam governor of Allahabad, with orders to oppose Shah Jahan in case he advanced towards Bengal. At the news of his imminent entry into Orissa, Prince Parvez and Mahabat Khan (who returned to Burhanpur for the rains after Shah Jahan had been driven to seek refuge on foreign soil) were ordered to move towards Allahabad and Bihar, and, if necessary, to Bengal, to prevent the rebel prince from securing a footing there. Another Imperial general, Khan Jahan, was asked to remain in Agra, ready for an emergency. A *farman* was also issued to Ibrahim Khan Fathjang, the viceroy in Bengal, that he should always be on the alert and offer vigorous opposition to Shah Jahan. He was directed to similarly instruct his nephew Ahmed Beg Khan, the governor of Orissa, so that the rebel prince might be repulsed even before he could reach Bengal.¹⁶

9. ORISSA OCCUPIED UNOPPOSED.

Though Ibrahim Khan played his part quite well, his nephew

¹⁵ *Jahangir* (R. & B.) II. 298 (Elliot & Dawson's *History of India*, VI 390-91); *Padishahnamah*, I. 333; *K. Khan*, I. 343; *Gladwin*, 69; *Journal of Indian History*, 1922-23, 12; *History of Jahangir*, 375. The Dutchman, Jan. Libæner, tells us that at Masulipatam Shah Jahan 'made overtures to the Dutch to accompany him to Bengal, offering, among other things, to hand over to them the castle of Surat: but Libæner pleaded inability to do anything in the absence of his chief'. This story remains totally uncorroborated, and does not seem to be worthy of credit.

¹⁶ *Jahangir* (R. & B.), II. 280-81, 294-95. *Iqbalnamah*, 216 (E. & D., VI. 408) *Baharistan*, pp. 291b-292a. The suggestion [Stewart, *History of Bengal*, (henceforth abb. as *Stewart*), 142, and *History of Jahangir*, 375] that the authori-

totally failed to meet the situation. He was engaged in a punitive expedition against the zamindar of Khurda. At the news of the arrival of Shah Jahan at Manpur,¹⁷ the cowardly governor gave up the campaign and hastily withdrew to Pipli, the seat of his government, whence he moved to Katak, twelve miles to the north-east. Though equipped with five to six thousand cavalry, Ahmed Beg Khan did not venture to face the invader even there, but retreated further with his family to Burdwan, and next to Akbarnagar.¹⁸ The only thing he did to check the progress of the rebel prince was to lay waste the pasture lands he passed through.¹⁹

Orissa thus came into the possession of Shah Jahan without any struggle. He marched to Khurda, always careful to safeguard his line of retreat by means of suitable garrisons at strategic points. Raja Purushottam Dev, the leading zamindar of the province, tendered his submission here, along with the Bhanja chief (of Mayurbhanj), and the zamindars of Nilgiri, Panchira,²⁰ and the neighbouring places. From Khurda, Shah Jahan triumphantly moved to Katak, halting there for some time to make necessary arrangements for the administration of the occupied area. Muhammad [Taqi was appointed governor of Orissa, with Katak as his headquarters, after he had been promoted to the mansab of 5,000 and honoured with the title of Shah Quli Khan.²¹

ties in Bengal and Orissa seem to have been altogether ignorant of Shah Jahan's movements requires modification, as the evidence of the *Baharistan*, which is definitely contrary, appears to be supported in substance by the *Tuzuk* and the *Iqbalnamah*.

17 *Akbarnamah* (Beveridge, III. 969) locates the fort of Manpur between Orissa and Telingana.

18 The statement of Gladwin (p. 69), repeated by Beni Prasad (*History of Jahangir*, p. 376), that Ahmed Beg Khan fled to Dacca does not appear to be accurate. There is no suggestion to that effect either in the *Tuzuk* or in the *Iqbalnamah*, while the *Baharistan* (p. 292a) states definitely that Ahmed Beg halted at Akbarnagar, where he was soon joined by his uncle.

19 *Jahangir* (R. & B.), II. 299. *Baharistan*, 292a; *Iqbalnamah*, 217-18 (*E. & D.*, VI. 408); *M.U.* (Beveridge), I. 155-56; *Riyazu-s-Salatim*, Eng. trans. by Maulavi Abdu-s-salam [abbreviated as *Riyaz* (A.S.)], 188; *Gladwin*, 69; *History of Jahangir*, 375-76.

20 Nilgiri is 11 miles south-west-west of Balasore: Panchira (Pachera of the MS.) is west of the Baitarani, 24 miles west of Bhadrak.

21 *Baharistan*, 292a-92b: *Stewart*, 143.

10. SHAH JAHAN'S NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE PORTUGUESE AT KATAK AND THEIR FAILURE.

It was here that Miguel Rodrigues, the Portuguese governor of Hugly and Pipli, apparently apprehensive of an attack on the latter settlement, came to pay his respects to Shah Jahan, and presented him with five sea-elephants, and a sum of one hundred thousand rupees in cash, besides many jewels and other valuables. The rebel prince, extremely anxious to secure Portuguese help, particularly in ships and artillery, proved far from hostile and heartily reciprocated this friendly gesture. He loaded the Portuguese chieftain with rare gifts from Kashmir and other places in India, and also gave him a few fine Iraq and Turkish horses, besides ornamented saddlery and a sword.

No substantial gain, however, seems to have accrued to Shah Jahan as a result of this friendly interview, for the Portuguese chief refused to be a party to his contest with the Mughal Emperor, and after three days' stay in Katak, formally took leave of the prince.²²

Shah Jahan was really disappointed and also enraged at this denial of help, but he prudently refrained from fighting the Portuguese at that time, and prepared to resume his march towards Bengal. He soon

²² *Baharistan*, 292a; Manrique (*Catholic Herald of India*, 1918, 354): *History of the Portuguese in Bengal*, 128.

There seems to be some confusion regarding the details of this affair. While the standard Persian works are totally silent with regard to Shah Jhan's negotiations for the help of the Portuguese in Bengal, the accounts current (*Stewart*, 143, Marshman's *History of Bengal*, (Bengali version), 46; *History of Jahangir*, 376) appear, in some respects at least, to be misleading.

The testimony of Mirza Nathan, the author of the *Baharistan*, and that of the Jesuit Father Sebastian Manrique, who was present in Bengal at the time of the siege of Hugly, 1632, taken together, may be regarded as conclusive. Mirza Nathan, naturally enough, distorts the unfamiliar name of the Portuguese chieftain, but he describes him fairly correctly, in his own way, as 'the *subahdar* of the king of Portugal, and ruler of the ports of Hugly and Pipli—the latter in the outskirts of Orissa'. Writing as a partisan of the rebel prince, Nathan attempts to palliate the discomfiture of his master at the hands of the Portuguese chieftain, which is more explicitly described by Manrique and, after him, by Fr. Catrou and Asiaticus. It should also be noted that the interview took place neither at Burdwan (as Stewart and Campos suggest), nor at Dacca (as Manrique says), but really at Katak (as Nathan definitely states), for this seems to be the most probable in view of the attendant circumstances.

reached Midnapore, the frontier town of Mughal Orissa on the east, whence a few more stages of march brought him to the vicinity of Burdwan.

11. BURDWAN BESIEGED AND ULTIMATELY CAPTURED.

Mirza Salih, son of Mirza Shahi, was at that time the Imperial *faujdar* of Burdwan. He had already rejected the invitation of Ahmed Beg Khan to join him in his abject flight to Akbarnagar, and prepared for a gallant defence. Abdullah Khan now attempted to win him over to the side of Shah Jahan, but Salih stood firm and sped up his defensive works.²³

Finding it difficult to storm the well-fortified city of Burdwan, Shah Jahan laid siege to it forthwith. Abdullah Khan, Darya Khan, Shujaat Khan, Nasir Khan, Raja Bhim, and Raja Sardul, amongst others, combined to press Salih hard. Khwajah Daud (a nephew of the late Usman Afghan), and Khwajah Ibrahim (younger brother of Usman) appear to have joined Shah Jahan at this time, and both took part in the siege.

The Imperial *faujdar*, who began so well, soon proved incapable of continuing his defence. He wasted much of his time in convivial parties, and soon gave up fighting altogether. At last he was compelled to surrender himself to Abdullah Khan. Owing to the entreaties of his wife, the life of Mirza Salih was spared, but he had to forfeit all his properties, and was called upon to render personal service in the train of Shah Jahan.

Burdwan was occupied at once and given as a fief to Bairam Beg. The rebel prince next marched towards Akbarnagar, otherwise known as Raj Mahal.²⁴

12. IBRAHIM KHAN, THE VICEROY OF BENGAL, PREPARES TO OPPOSE SHAH JAHAN AT AKBARNAGAR.

Meanwhile Ahmed Beg Khan had reached Akbarnagar, whence he sent swift couriers to his uncle, the Bengal viceroy, at Jahangir-

²³ *Jahangir* (R. & B.), II. 298-99; *Iqbalnamah*, 218.

²⁴ *Jahangir* (R. & B.), II. 298-99; *Iqbalnamah*, 219 (*E. & D.*, VI. 409); *Baharistan*, 292b, *M.U.* (Beveridge), I. 379; *Riyaz* (A.S.) 188; *History of Jahangir*, 377.

nagar, informing him of the speedy advance of the rebel prince. Ibrahim Khan Fathjang took immediate action. He had first to make adequate arrangements for defending the province against the old enemies, the Feringhi and Magh raiders from Chittagong, before he could proceed to deal with the new one. So he sent Mirza Baqi, the *bakh'shi*, with 1,000 cavalry, to strengthen the frontier *thanah* of Fulduli, and also provided for the defence of the other strategic outposts in Jessore, Bhulua, Tipperah, Sylhet, and Kachar. He then put Khwajah Idrak, the chamberlain of the viceregal palace, in charge of the defence of the capital, with a force of 500 cavalry and 1,000 matchlockmen. With the rest of his army, including about 6,000 cavalry (Herbert, 89) and 100 elephants, and a large park of artillery, and a fleet of 300 war-boats under his admiral Mir Shams, besides a large number of *Jalea*²⁵ boats belonging to a country-born Portuguese named Manoel Tavares, and the war-boats of the premier Bengal zamindar Masum Khan, son of Musa Khan, Ibrahim Khan hastened to face the rebel prince at Akbarnagar.

In eleven days the destination was reached. A place of great strategic importance, Akbarnagar had been made the seat of government of the Bengal *subah* by Raja Man Singh, who renamed it as Raj Mahal in 1596. The river Ganges skirted it on three sides, while on the fourth, the land gradually rose till it merged itself in the Raj Mahal hills. A strong fortress was built by the Raja on the bank of the river, and a busy city gradually grew up around it.

The old fort was still strong but had lost its strategic value, for the river having now receded nearly a *kos*, it was no longer accessible to war-boats and was unfit for defence by land and water. So Ibrahim Khan abandoned the old fort, and moved one *kos* further down to a place on the river bank where his son lay buried. He enclosed the tomb with a strong wall, and garrisoned it with nearly 4,000 men, including some Portuguese gunners, headed by his nephew Mirza Yusuf, assisted by Jalayer Khan (Mirak Bahadur Jalayer), Mirza Isfandiyar, Mirza Nurullah and others. He himself and his other nephew, Ahmed Beg Khan, with the remaining forces and the elephants, crossed the

25 See *History of the Portuguese in Bengal*, 59, footnote.

river and entrenched in a place called Akbarpur, now included in Maldah. The fleet remained midway to help the land army and facilitate supplies.²⁶

13. SHAH JAHAN OCCUPIES AKBARNAGAR AND BESIEGES IBRAHIM KHAN'S NEW FORT ACROSS THE GANGES.

On his arrival at Akbarnagar, Shah Jahan first occupied the old abandoned fort and then took possession of the city itself. With a view to winning Ibrahim Khan over to his side, the rebel prince next sent two envoys, Itimad Khan (Khwajah Idrak) and Asaf Khan (Mirza Jafar), to him. He was given the choice of continuous service in Bengal under the nominal control of Sultan Aurangzib (the third son of Shah Jahan), or of a free passage back to court, in case he preferred it. The Bengal viceroy promptly rejected the offer. Rather than dishonour himself, he would die in the service of his master.²⁷

Peace measures having failed, Shah Jahan prepared himself for war. Fully conscious that in his position delays were dangerous and that his success depended only on prompt and vigorous action, the rebel prince ordered Abdullah Khan and Darab Khan, with a large train of artillery, to storm the new Imperialist fort, and a vigorous assault on the same followed. When this proved ineffective, it was laid siege to. Darya Khan Rohilla, Babu Khan Barlas, and all other Afghan adherents were at the same time asked to cross the Ganges higher up, at an obscure ford near Pointee,²⁸ and attack Ibrahim Khan's main camp at Akbarpur.

²⁶ *Baharistan*, 293a; *Iqbalnamah*, 219 (*E. & D.*, VI. 409); *M.U.* (Beveridge), I. 156, 455; *Gladwin*, 69; *Stewart*, 143; *History of Jahangir*, 377-78.

The real reason for the abandonment of the old fort does not appear to have been its largeness or the insufficiency of the Imperial garrison, as the *Iqbalnamah* and the *Riyaz* suggest, but it was rather the loss of its strategic value, owing to a change in the course of the river, as the *Baharistan*, the *Maasir*, and the work of Gladwin clearly point out.

²⁷ *Jahangir* (R. & B.), II. 299; *Baharistan*, 293a; *Iqbalnamah*, 218-19 (*E. & D.* VI. 408-09); *Riyaz* (A. S.), 189; *Gladwin*, 70; *Stewart*, 143-44; *History of Jahangir*, 377-78.

²⁸ Pointee is about thirty miles due east of Raj Mahal (vide Rennell's *Bengal Atlas*, No. IV).

14. REPEATED FIGHTING OVER THE PASSAGE OF THE GANGES.

The Bengal viceroy now became anxious to prevent the crossing of the river by the Afghans, and sent Ahmed Beg Khan, with 2,000 cavalry and 100 elephants, against them. Though he marched without any rest, Ahmed Beg reached his destination just too late, and found that Darya Khan and his 500 Afghan soldiers had already crossed over with the help of some merchant-vessels; but as the horses had not yet been transported, the Afghans were moving rather slowly on foot. Determined to expiate his past folly, Ahmed Beg at once led a vigorous cavalry charge upon Darya Khan. But the latter took up a position on an elevated ground and fought so gallantly that Ahmed Beg was at last compelled to retire. Next morning, Ahmed Beg rallied his forces, but the opportune moment had passed away. Darya Khan's horses had all safely landed at night, and he now easily overpowered his opponent, who escaped only with a small following.²⁹

The news of this victory was particularly welcome to the rebel prince. His weak point had been the dearth of war-boats: without them, he could neither press the siege of the Imperial fort hard, nor attack the viceregal camp across the Ganges. Thanks to Darya Khan's efforts, his main difficulty was now overcome, so that an assault on Ibrahim Khan appeared quite feasible.

Shah Jahan now directed all his energies towards a final contest with Ibrahim Khan. He knew quite well that if the latter were defeated in battle, the fall of his fort would only be a question of time. So he withdrew Abdullah Khan from siege work, which was now entrusted solely to Darab Khan, assisted by Khidmat-purast Khan and Rumi Khan of the state artillery, and sent him at the head of 1,500 cavalry, with Raja Bhim and his Rajput levy, to reinforce Darya Khan.

Much dispirited on account of the reverses already sustained, Ibrahim Khan now made a desperate attempt to prevent a union of the two forces. He deputed his admiral Mir Shams with the entire fleet, assisted by Masum Khan and his war-boats, and Manoel Tavares (the Portuguese chieftain) and his *Jalca* boats, to dispute the passage of

²⁹ *Iqbalnamah*, 220 (*E. & D.*, VI. 409); *Baharistan*, 293b; *M.H.* (Beveridge), I. 455; *Riyaz* (A. S.), 190-91; *Gladwin*, 71.

the river by the reinforcing army. But these persons had already been in treasonable correspondence with the rebel prince, and made only a show of fight, with the result that Raja Bhim and Abdullah Khan crossed over at night and joined Darya Khan without much trouble.³⁰

The combined forces marched all night and came upon Ibrahim Khan early next morning. They were at once drawn up in battle array, in a position of great advantage, with the river on one flank and a dense forest on the other.

15. BATTLE OF AKBARPUR, *c.* END OF APRIL, 1624: DEFEAT AND DEATH OF IBRAHIM KHAN.

In the engagement that followed, Ibrahim Khan did his best, but without any success. The repeated defeats had particularly unnerved his nephew Ahmed Beg Khan and also weakened his forces, which now consisted of about 700 cavalry. Ibrahim Khan himself had only about 1,000 horsemen, mostly raw recruits, to depend on, for his tried soldiers lay scattered, some garrisoning the new fort of Akbarnagar, and others engaged in the war-boats under the command of Mir Shams who had proved a traitor. The Imperialist forces were, however, arranged in three divisions—the van (consisting of 800 cavalry) under Sayyid Nurullah, the centre under Ahmed Beg Khan, while the rear was commanded by Ibrahim Khan himself.³¹

The battle was well-contested for a time, but Nurullah's troopers afterwards gave way. Ahmed Beg Khan, on his part, fought hard; he too was soon wounded and compelled to retire. Ibrahim Khan continued the contest, but most of his soldiers, already panic-stricken, deserted him, and, with only a handful of followers, he fought on till he was slain unrecognised.³²

³⁰ *Baharistan*, 294a, *Tatimmat*, p. 383; *Iqbalnamah*, 220 (*E. & D.* VI. 409-10); *M.U.* (Beveridge), I. 455; *Riyaz* (A. S.), 191; *Gludwin*, 71; *History of Jahangir*, 378.

³¹ The *Iqbalnamah* and the *Muasir-ul-Umara* state that Ahmed Beg Khan formed the reserve, and the former add that Ibrahim Khan was in the centre. The version of the *Riyaz*, which is slightly different, appears to be more probable and has been followed.

³² *Iqbalnamah*, 220-21 (*E. & D.*, VI. 410); *Baharistan*, 294a; *M.U.* (Beveridge), I. 156, 455; *Riyaz* (A. S.), 191-92; *Gludwin*, 72; *Stewart*, 144-45; *History of Jahangir*, 378-79. The *Iqbalnamah*, and, after it, the *Riyaz*, give a very

16. FORT OF AKBARNAGAR OCCUPIED BY SHAH JAHAN.

The defeat and death of the Bengal viceroy was the signal for the fall of his fortified post at Akbarnagar, which came about as follows. Simultaneously with the despatch of reinforcements to Darya Khan, Shah Jahan had sent Wazir Khan, an officer of his personal staff, to Darab Khan, asking him to press the siege close. Khidmat-purast Khan (*alias* Reza Bahadur, the adopted child of Wazir Khan), the officer-in-charge of the artillery,³³ now applied fire to mines already laid under the fort in three different places. These exploded, blowing away two turrets, and making a breach, forty yards wide, in the fort wall. The garrison, under Mirza Yusuf, now made a desperate attempt to prevent the entry of the rebel forces, and was successful for a time. Not only were the besiegers repeatedly repulsed, but some of the officers, Abid Khan *diwan*, Mir Taqi *bakhshi*, and Khwajah Sher, were killed, and a few more captured. Baffled in their efforts, they suspended hostilities at night and dared not resume them even next morning.

But when the day had far advanced, the news of the fall of Ibrahim Khan in battle spread, and it deeply depressed the garrison. Further resistance being now given up, the storming party rushed in and the place was carried. Some of the garrison cast themselves into the river in despair, some were put to the sword, while others, who were fettered by their families being in the hands of the enemy, tendered their submission. Amongst those who escaped were Ahmed Beg Khan, Mirza Yusuf, and Jalayer Khan.³⁴ Ahmed Beg fled towards Jahangirnagar

detailed account of this battle, particularly of the disposition of the combatants, which is only briefly treated in the *Baharistan* and the *Maasir*. It appears that in spite of the depleted ranks of the Imperialists, the two forces were almost equally balanced, though the troops of Shah Jahan were probably better mounted.

³³ The author of the *Iqbalnamah* does not name the artillery commander, who is styled Rumi Khan by Kamgar Khan, and, following him, by Gladwin, Dow, Stewart, and Beni Prasad. There is no reason to disbelieve the author of the *Baharistan*, who names him as Khidmat-purast Khan—a person mentioned elsewhere (p. 234) in the *Iqbalnamah* as well. Rumi Khan appears to have been the officer second-in-command, and subordinate to Khidmat-purast Khan.

³⁴ Gladwin (72) and Beni Prasad (379), apparently on the authority of Kamgar Khan's work, include Mirak Jalayer amongst the captives, but the author of the *Baharistan* states that he escaped to Jahangirnagar.

by land, but the rest proceeded thither by boat, along with the treacherous admiral Mir Shams and his accomplices, Masum Khan and Manoel Tavares.³⁵

Abdullah Khan cut off the head of the deceased viceroy and presented it to Shah Jahan. The chivalrous prince ordered the corpse of the valiant Khan to be brought from the field of battle with due honour, and, when this was done, he put the head in its proper place and laid Ibrahim Khan to rest by the side of his son, in accordance with his cherished desire.³⁶

The battle of Akbarpur (a. April 20, 1624), followed by the surrender of the new Imperial fort at Akbarnagar, decided the fate of Bengal which now came into the possession of Shah Jahan. The victorious prince proceeded triumphantly to Jahangirnagar, with a view to seizing the treasures and war-materials deposited there, and also to making adequate arrangements for the administration of the conquered tract.

Before leaving Akbarnagar, the rebel prince adopted an interesting method of driving the wavering Imperialists into submission. He ordered that two pictures, illustrative of the last engagement, should be drawn as early as practicable. In them Abdullah Khan appeared

35 *Iqbalnamah*, 221 (*E. & D.*, VI. 410); *Baharistan*, 294b-95a; *K. Khan*, I, 344-46; *M.U.* (Beveridge), I. 156; *Riyaz* (A. S.), 192-93; *Gladwin*, 72; *Stewart*, 145; *History of Jahangir*, 379. There is some obscurity and confusion regarding the details of the hostilities which culminated in the defeat and death of Ibrahim Khan and the capture of his fort. While the *Tuzuk* stops abruptly just before these occurrences, the *Iqbalnamah* treats them in a brief and rather confusing manner. It is only in the *Baharistan* that we get a detailed and clear story, which agrees with that furnished by the *Maasir-ul-Umara*. In the light of new information available, some of the misconceptions still current might easily be removed. One is the frequent change in movements, in course of the struggle, on the part of the Bengal viceroy and his nephew Ahmed Beg Khan, suggested obviously by the *Iqbalnamah*. The *Baharistan* and the *Maasir* make it quite clear that both these officers, with their own harem and families of the other leading Imperialists, were, from the beginning of the contest, encamped on the left bank of the Ganges at Akbarpur, and there the decisive battle took place. The other misconception which seems to persist is with regard to the location of Ibrahim Khan's new fort. The standard Persian works all agree that it was only a *kos* distant from the old fort, and not at Teliagurhee as Dow and Stewart tell us.

36 *Baharistan*, 297b.

seated on a tiger, with a drawn sword in his right hand and the head of Ibrahim Khan in his left. When the pictures were properly framed, one was sent to Mukhlis Khan (the *diwan* of Bihar, who had been ruling the province on behalf of Sultan Parvez), through a messenger, along with a *farman* in which he was asked to tender his submission and also to deliver Patna peacefully, or suffer in default the same fate as that of Ibrahim Khan. The other was despatched to Kamrup, with another *farman*, similarly worded, demanding the allegiance of the officers of that frontier tract.

Shah Jahan then suitably rewarded his followers with *jagirs* or promotions in rank. Raja Bhim was given extensive *jagirs* and appointed to rule Akbarnagar, while Khwajah Saadat and others were awarded with fiefs in Munghyr. Suitable titles were also awarded, such as 'Sher Khan Fathjang' to Darya Khan Rohilla, and 'Dilwar Khan' to Babu Khan Barlas.³⁷

17. SHAH JAHAN CAPTURES JAHANGIRNAGAR (Dacca) UNOPPOSED AND SECURES A RICH BOOTY.

The rebel prince moved towards Jahangirnagar in boats, a good many of which had been captured during the last conflict. He first halted at Maldah, whence *farman* was issued to Mirza Nathan (entitled Shitab Khan), an Imperialist officer of Kamrup who had already joined the ranks of the rebel prince, ordering him temporarily to manage the affairs of that place. Shah Jahan next stopped at Pulsarai Pathari, whence he moved to Pandu to pay respects to the famous saint Shaikh Nur Qutb Alam who lay buried there. He granted a sum of four thousand rupees for the upkeep of the sacred tomb, and, after a march of four stages, reached Ghoraghat.³⁸

Itimad Khan was at this stage sent forward to demand the submission of the fugitive Imperial officers and the widow of Ibrahim Khan in Jahangirnagar. The latter, alarmed at the news of the fall of her husband in battle, had made an unsuccessful effort to escape to Patna with her valuables. She was now compelled to submit, along with Ahmed

³⁷ *Baharistan*, 297b.

³⁸ *Baharistan*, 298a, 299b; *Iqbalnamah*, 221 (*E. & D.*, VI. 410); *Riyaz* (A. S.), 193.

Beg Khan, Mirza Yusuf, Jalayer Khan, Mirza Isfandiyar, and Mirza Nurullah.

From Ghoraghat Shah Jahan went to Shahzadapur, whence, after a journey of four stages, he reached Jahangirnagar (c. beginning of May, 1624) without any opposition.³⁹

Though the rebel prince treated the officers and the widow of Ibrahim Khan well, so far as their personal freedom was concerned, he did not refrain from laying hands on their personal effects. Besides these, he seized the immense state treasures and vast war-materials which he found in the viceregal capital. In addition to a sum of 10,00,000 rupees of the Royal treasury, 25,00,000 rupees belonging to the widow of the viceroy, and 5,00,000 to Jalayer Khan were appropriated by him. A large quantity of silk-stuff, aloes wood, and other rarities, 500 elephants, 400 horses, and, above all, the entire artillery and flotilla of the Bengal *subah* now passed into the hands of Shah Jahan.⁴⁰

18. SHAH JAHAN'S ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS IN BENGAL.

Shah Jahan again lavishly rewarded his officers out of the spoils seized in Jahangirnagar, and then turned his attention towards administrative affairs in Bengal and Kamrup, where almost all the old officers had to make room for his own tried followers. Darab Khan, who had so long been under a cloud of suspicion,⁴¹ owing to the treasonable conduct of himself, and, more clearly, that of his father, the Khan Khanan, was now restored to favour. He swore fidelity to the rebel prince and was appointed to be the viceroy of Bengal, with an increment in his mansab to 6,000 personal and 5,000 horse. His elder son Aram Bakhsh,

³⁹ *Baharistan*, 299b-300a.

⁴⁰ *Iqbalnamah*, 222 (*E. & D.*, VI. 410); *Riyaz* (A. S.), 195; *Gladwin*. 72; *Stewart*, 145-46; *History of Jahangir*, 379.

⁴¹ According to the *Iqbalnamah*, 222, followed by the *M.U.* (Beveridge, I. 452), *Riyaz* (A.S.), 195, *Gladwin*, 72-73, and *History of Jahangir*, 380, Darab was kept in confinement till the entry of Shah Jahan into Jahangirnagar after his victory at Akbarnagar. But this does not appear to be strictly accurate for the *Baharistan* clearly refers to Darab's participation in the siege of Akbarnagar. His services at that time were obviously appreciated, because according to *K. Khan's* work (I. 345-46), Shah Jahan richly rewarded Darab Khan after he had gathered the immense spoils at the viceregal capital.

and his nephew (son of Shah Nawaz Khan) were also promoted in rank to 1,000 personal and 1,000 horse, but they were retained as hostages, along with Darab's wife and a daughter. Mirza Mulki was promoted to the mansab of 500 personal and 200 horse and appointed *diwan*, Mirza Hidayetullah to that of 400 personal and 50 horse and made *bakhshi* (pay master of the troops) and *waqia-navis* (official newswriter), while Malik Husain, the nephew of Ihtamam Khan (late admiral of the Bengal flotilla), was selected as the *khazanchi* (cashier). Adil Khan and Bahar Khan, admirals of the Bengal fleet, were, however, retained in service; the former continued to stay at Jahangirnagar, but the latter had to accompany Shah Jahan.

As regards the administration of the smaller units within the province, detailed information is not available. Ali Khan Neyazi was promoted to the mansab of 2,000 personal and 1,500 horse, and Mirza Baqi (*bakhshi* of the late Ibrahim Khan) to that of 500 personal and 400 horse, and posted to the frontier *thanahs* of Jessore and Bhulua respectively. But Mirza Salih, *thanahdar* of Sylhet, was allowed to retain his post.⁴²

19. SHAH JAHAN'S ALLIANCE WITH THE KING OF ARRAKAN.

Shah Jahan stayed at Jahangirnagar for a week (c. first week of May, 1624), occupying the beautiful viceregal palace there. Prior to his departure, he received an embassy from the king of Arrakan, who, according to the *Baharistan*, 'was the lord of 10,000 war-boats, 1,500 elephants, and 10,00,000 infantry'. He desired the friendship of the rebel prince and presented him with a sum of 1,00,000 rupees in cash. Shah Jahan was highly gratified at this friendly move on the part of such a powerful monarch, and loaded him with costly presents. A *farman* was also issued in which the Magh king was assured uninterrupted sovereignty over his domain in return for his promise to be friendly to the officers of Shah Jahan in Bengal. A purely defensive alliance was obviously the only outcome of this diplomatic mission, and the desire of the rebel prince for active support from the Magh king or the Portuguese officials

⁴² *Iqbalnamah*, 222 (*E. & D.*, VI. 410; *Baharistan*, 300a-b; *M.U.* (Beveridge), I. 452; *Riyaz* (A.S.), 195; *Gladwin*, 72-73. *Stewart*, 146; *History of Jahangir*, 380.

in Bengal appears to have remained unfulfilled, though non-official Portuguese help was for a time forthcoming.⁴³

20. SHAH JAHAN'S AMBITIOUS PROGRAMME.

Master of Bengal and Orissa, Shah Jahan was not the man to sit idle and flatter himself with his exploits. He now felt himself free to make a serious effort to subjugate Bihar. With Bengal, Bihar, and Orissa in his possession, Shah Jahan could easily proceed westward, conquer Allahabad and Oudh, and ultimately march triumphantly upon Agra, the capital. But he had not a moment to lose. True, he had stolen a march over Prince Paivez and Mahabat Khan and hurried across Orissa and Bengal while they were still in their quarters in Burhanpur. But the former had already struck his camp and was expected every moment to arrive and put a check to the successes of his rebellious brother. Shah Jahan's entire programme must therefore be carried out before this would happen.

21. SHAH JAHAN RETURNS TO AKBARANAGAR WITH A VIEW TO CONQUERING BIHAR.

The rebel prince started on his return journey by boat, while he directed his general Abdullah Khan to march with the land army towards Akbarnagar. Shah Jahan first halted at Khizirpur, on the bank of the Lakhya,⁴⁴ in the vicinity of which was a place of great sanctity where the footprints of the Prophet were enshrined. It was known as Kadam-rasul or Rasulpur, being originally a settlement of a number of merchants from the Holy land of Arabia. Shah Jahan visited the sanctuary

⁴³ *Baharistan*, 3005. Though the evidence of the *Baharistan* remains uncorroborated, there is no reason to doubt this incident, for common interests might well breed the parties together. It is necessary in this connection to dispose of a statement made by Phayre (*History of Burma*, 177), on the authority of the Arrakanese chronicles, that Meng Khamaung, the king of Arrakan, for a time occupied Dacca, taking advantage of the political confusion caused by Shah Jahan's rebellion. The Persian chronicles do not all support this suggestion, which, apart from any other consideration, appears to be an anachronism, for the defeat and death of Ibrahim Khan at the hands of the rebel prince occurred only at the end of April, 1624, and this was full two years after the death of Meng Khamaung, which took place in 1622 (according to Phayre).

⁴⁴ One mile north-east of Narayanganj and nine miles from Dacca.

and endowed it with a sum of 1,000 rupees. He next proceeded towards Bikrampur, whence Wazir Khan was sent back to Jahangirnagar to prepare an assessment roll for the Bengal *subah*. The next place visited was Kalakopa,⁴⁵ and then an unnamed place near Jatrapur,⁴⁶ on the bank of the Ichamati. Four more marches brought the rebel prince to Alai-pur, on the bank of the Padma. A severe gale destroyed many war-boats here, and the prince himself had a narrow escape. After a further march of five days, Shah Jahan reached Akbarnagar.⁴⁷

He halted for three days only. Excepting Mumtaz Mahal, the young princes, and their personal attendants, the rest of the harem and the valuables were retained in Akbarnagar. A change in the government of that city was now effected, Raja Bhim was relieved by Itimad Khan, and Muhammad Salih (late *faujdar* of Burdwan) was appointed *bakhshi* and *waqia-navis*. A sum of 20,000 rupees was invested in the erection of a new palace under the direct supervision of the new *bakhshi*, but the work was long delayed, being finished only when Shah Jahan returned to Akbarnagar after his defeat on the bank of the Tons.⁴⁸

Leaving behind a detachment for the protection of Akbarnagar, Shah Jahan rapidly proceeded towards Patna, encamping *en route* at Pointee where Wazir Khan rejoined him. Raja Bhim was now sent in advance to attack Patna and conquer Bihar.

22. RAPID SUBMISSION OF THE IMPERIAL OFFICERS AND ZAMINDARS OF BIHAR.

That province, assigned as a fief to Prince Parvez, had long been left in charge of his *diwan*, Mukhlis Khan, with Iftikhar Khan and Sher Khan Afghan as *faujdar*s. Alarmed at the news of the approach of Raja Bhim towards Patna, the feeble-hearted *diwan* hastily fled towards Allahabad with all his property and also that of his master. Sharply rebuked for his cowardice, he took poison and died.⁴⁹

Raja Bhim entered Patna and took possession of the entire province without any resistance. Shah Jahan arrived a few days later and pro-

45 On the bank of the Ichamati, about 17 miles south-west of Dacca.

46 17 miles west of Sabhar, Dt. Dacca.

47 *Baharistan*, 300b-301a.

48 *Baharistan*, 301a, 323a.

49 *Iqbalnamah*, 222 (*E. & D.*, VI, 410-11); *Baharistan*, 301a, 307b; *K. Khan*, I. 346; *Riyaz* (A.S.), 195-96; *Gludwin*, 73; *Stewart*, 146; *History of Jahangir*, 380.

ceeded to set the affairs of Bihar in order. The leading zamindars and Imperial officers voluntarily tendered their submission and were suitably rewarded. Raja Narain Mal Ujjainiya and his brother Pratap were the first to submit, and were honoured with a mansab of 5,000 personal and 5,000 horse and of 3,000 personal and 2,000 horse respectively. Raja Narain Mal, son of Raja Bhas (Bhar?) Mal Bains, and the Raja of Buxar soon followed and were honoured as befitting their position. Sayyid Mubarak, the Imperial commandant of the impregnable fort of Rhotas, surrendered the keys to the rebel prince and joined his ranks. This was a distinct gain, for the fort afforded a safe asylum to the families of Shah Jahan and of his officers during the uncertain issue of the approaching campaign.⁵⁰

23. GOVERNMENTAL CHANGES IN BIHAR.

Suitable administrative arrangements were then made. Bairam Beg Turkaman, the *jagirdar* of Burdwan, was posted governor of Bihar, having been promoted to the mansab of 5,000 personal and 5,000 horse. The command of the fort of Rhotas was entrusted to Sayid Muzaffar, an officer of the personal staff of Shah Jahan, with a mansab of 700 personal and 500 horse, and Sayyid Mubarak, the old commander, was removed to Kara Manikpur (in the Doab), which was conferred on him as a fief. Abdullah Khan, who had so long been serving faithfully as the commander-in-chief, was now rewarded with extensive *jagirs* in Bihar, which included Tajpur, Purnea, Hajipur, and Darbhanga.⁵¹

24. SHAH JAHAN PLANS THE CONQUEST OF ALLAHABAD, OUDH, AND BENARES.

Shah Jahan now prepared to hurry through the rest of his ambitious programme. He arranged his army in three divisions. The first was placed in charge of Abdullah Khan, with orders to proceed (across the Gumti) through Jaunpur towards Allahabad and attack the strong fort there. Mirza Rustam Qandahari, the gallant commandant, had refused the overtures of Shah Jahan for a voluntary surrender of that

⁵⁰ *Iqbalnamah*, 222-23 (*E. & D.*, VI. 411); *Baharistan*, 303b, 304b; *K. Khan*, I. 346; *Herbert*, 90; *Riyaz* (A.S.), 196; *Glodwin*, 73; *Stewart*, 146; *History of Jahangir*, 380-81.

⁵¹ *Iqbalnamah*, 223 (*E. & D.*, VI. 411); *Baharistan*, 303b, 304b; *M.U.* (Beveridge), I. 379; *Riyaz* (A.S.) 169; *Glodwin*, 73; *Stewart*, 146.

fort and resolved to defend it with all his might. The second army, consisting mainly of his Afghan followers, was sent in charge of Darya Khan Rohilla (Sher Khan Fathjang) to take possession of Oudh. With the third division, including the Rajput levy of Raja Bhim, under his direct command, and assisted by a park of artillery in charge of Khidmat-purast Khan and the greater part of the Bengal flotilla under the admiral Mir Shams, and also by the war-boats of the Bengal zamindars, headed by Masum Khan of *Bhati*, Shah Jahan proposed to advance towards Benares, marching through Ghazipur and Jaunpur.⁵²

25. ABDULLAH KHAN OCCUPIES JAUNPUR AND THEN ENCAMPS OPPOSITE ALLAHABAD.

Abdullah Khan and Darya Khan moved about the same time. Before the former reached the ford of the Gumti near Jaunpur,⁵³ Jahangir Quli Khan (son of the late Azim Khan Mirza Koka), the governor of that place, had vacated it and fled towards Allahabad. Jaunpur was at once occupied by Abdullah Khan, who, pursuing the fugitive hotly, came to the town of Jhusi on the Ganges, opposite Allahabad, where he encamped. He sent Nasir Khan with 5,000 cavalry up that river towards Burhai,⁵⁴ to escort his family therefrom. Nasir Khan, in spite of the strong opposition of the Imperialist zamindars of the locality, succeeded in his enterprise. Attempts to storm the fort of Allahabad being considered dangerous, preparations were now set on foot to lay siege to it forthwith.⁵⁵

26. DARYA KHAN OVERRUNS OUDH AND HALTS AT MANIKPUR.

Darya Khan, the commander of the second army, proceeded towards Oudh at the head of 12,000 Afghan cavalry, in the company of Babu Khan Barlas, Bahadur Khan, Haidar Khan, and other chieftains. He

⁵² *Iqbalnamah*, 222-23 (*E. & D.*, VI. 411); *Baharistan*, 303b; *Riyaz* (A.S.), 196; *Gladwin*, 73; *Stewart*, 146; *History of Jahangir*, 381.

⁵³ The *Iqbalnamah* suggests the ford of Jausa—rather Chause—and it has been followed by the author of the *Riyaz*, *Gladwin*, and *Beni Prasad*. But the ford referred to appears to have been rather that of Jaunpur, as the *Tatimma* (*E. & D.*, VI. 411 footnote) has it

⁵⁴ About 27 miles north-west of Allahabad (*Rennell's Atlas*).

⁵⁵ *Iqbalnamah*, 223 (*E. & D.*, VI. 411); *Baharistan*, 306a; *M.U.* (*Beveridge*), I. 455; *Riyaz* (A.S.), 196-97; *Gladwin*, 73; *Stewart*, 147.

easily overran that province and came to Manikpur, where he encamped on the Ganges, near the ford of Kara-Manikpur, with a view to guarding it against the Imperialists already on their march from the Deccan.⁵⁶

27. SHAH JAHAN MARCHES TO JAUNPUR.

Shah Jahan left Patna last of all, on the 3rd of June, 1624, owing to an illness of Mumtaz Mahal. He first encamped at Moneer.⁵⁷ Despatches from his generals began to arrive regarding their own activities and the movements of the enemy. Abdullah Khan reported the capture of Jaunpur, followed by his march towards Allahabad, and added that the whereabouts of the Imperialist commanders were still not definitely known. Shah Jahan resumed his advance and soon reached the bank of the Ganges (c. middle of June, 1624).⁵⁸

By this time the rains had already set in, but, owing to the sultry heat of the season, heavy casualties in men and animals occurred daily in the prince's camp. When the ford of the Ganges at Chausa⁵⁹ was reached, an additional difficulty confronted him. This was the transportation of the elephants, with a natural dislike for water, across the river, which was in high flood. This was, however, skilfully and safely accomplished by Mirza Nathan, who had joined the prince (from Kamrup) just before he left Patna.⁶⁰ When the confluence of the Gumti and the Ganges was reached, another despatch arrived from Abdullah Khan regarding his encampment at Jhusi. The Khan requested his master to hasten to Jaunpur and to send him reinforcements, particularly war-boats, for capturing Allahabad.⁶¹

Shah Jahan quickened his pace and reached Jaunpur four days later. He now concentrated all his energies on the capture of Allahabad.

56 *Baharistan*, 306b; *M.U.* (Beveridge), I. 455; *Gladwin*, 73; *Stewart*, 147.

57 More than 20 miles west of Patna, to the south of the confluence of the Son with the Ganges.

58 *Baharistan*, 304a-304b.

59 A well-known ford about 8 miles south-west of Buxar.

60 The *Baharistan* (305a-b) offers interesting details. Mirza Nathan tied one end each of two strong ropes to the collar and back of an elephant and the other ends to the prow of each of two *kosaks*, which then pulled the animal slowly across the river.

61 *Baharistan*, 304b-306a.

The Bengal flotilla and the fleet of the vassal zamindars, which had so long been moving with him, were now despatched to the aid of Abdullah Khan. This enabled the latter to leave Jhusi, cross the Ganges, and encamp in Allahabad ready for the siege. The vacant post was, however, at once occupied by a strong detachment led by Mutaqid Khan and Shujaat Khan. The position of the rebel general was further strengthened when the artillery under Khidmat-purast Khan joined him. Shah Jahan also took steps to prevent the arrival of reinforcements to the Imperial garrison at Allahabad. Raja Bhim and other vassals were accordingly directed to proceed (from Jaunpur) to Arail across the Ganges (south-west of Jhusi) and set up a *thanah* there, while Darya Khan Rohilla, who had already been posted to guard the ford of the Ganges, higher up, at Manikpur, was asked to be particularly vigilant and avoid a surprise.⁶²

28. ALLAHABAD FORT CLOSELY BESIEGED.

A last attempt to induce Mirza Rustam Beg to surrender the fort of Allahabad having failed, Abdullah Khan began the siege in co-operation with the fleet. At first all went well with the rebel prince. Though the Imperialist commandant offered a vigorous defence, he soon found himself hemmed in on all sides by the besiegers, and there appeared no hope of reinforcements from any quarter. The unremitting fire of the artillery gradually so depleted the ranks of the garrison that the fall of the fort was imminent. Everyday hundreds of *ahdis*, and also *amirs* deserted to the rebel side. First, Zabardast Khan Dakhni, next, Shaista Khan, the *kotwal* (chief of the city police), and, after them, many more officers swelled the ranks of the rebel prince.

29. SIMULTANEOUS ATTACK ON CHUNAR FORT.

Greatly encouraged by the prospect of the capture of the strategic fort of Allahabad, Shah Jahan sent a force of 15,000 cavalry, under the command of Wazir Khan, assisted by Sarandaz Bahadur and the leading vassal chiefs of Bihar, to seize the fort of Chunar from the hands of its commandant, Gopal Jadun, who had refused to give it up. The chances

⁶² *Baharistan*, 306a-b; *Iqbalnamah*, 223 (*E. & D.*, VI. 411); *Riyaz* (A.S.), 197; *Gladwin*, 73; *Stewart*, 147; *History of Jahangir*, 381.

for the success of this new venture were greatly enhanced by an unexpected occurrence. Kunwar Pahar Singh, second son of Raja Bir Singh Deo Bundela, owing to enmity with his father, now joined Shah Jahan with an army of 8,000 horse and 15,000 foot, along with his five brothers. The Rajput prince was given the mansab of 5,000 personal and 5,000 horse, and his brothers were also suitably honoured. The party was then sent to reinforce Wazir Khan. A combined assault on the fort of Chunar followed, and its fall appeared to be certain.⁶³

Just at this moment, there was a change in Shah Jahan's fortune. To realise the reason for this set-back, we have to turn our attention to a different quarter and review the activities of the Imperialists there.

30. ACTIVITIES OF PRINCE PARVEZ AND MAHABAT KHAN IN THE DECCAN DURING SHAH JAHAN'S OPERATIONS IN NORTH INDIA.

Ever since Prince Parvez and Mahabat Khan had given up the pursuit of Shah Jahan near the borders of the kingdom of Golconda, they were busy resettling the affairs of the Deccan much disturbed by the rebellion. Adil Khan, the king of Bijapur, and Malik Ambar, who held sway in Ahmadnagar, were now at war, and both eagerly sought Mughal help. The astute Mahabat Khan threw in his weight with the weaker side, and entered into an alliance with Bijapur. But the formalities could not be concluded for long, owing to the delay in the arrival at Burhanpur of Mullah Muhammad Lari, the chief minister of Bijapur. Meanwhile Prince Parvez, in response to the insistent summons of his father to proceed towards Bengal and put down Shah Jahan, started from the headquarters, leaving Mahabat Khan to deal with the Bijapur affair. But he moved with his army only to the outskirts of Burhanpur, and encamped at Lalbagh, apparently unwilling to fight his powerful brother single-handed.⁶⁴

It was only when Mullah Muhammad Lari had reached Burhanpur, about the middle of August, 1624, that the Imperial generals felt themselves free to march towards the north-east. Their enforced stay in the

⁶³ *Baharistan*, 308a-308b; *Herbert*, 90, corroborates the attack on Chunar, but suggests that it was actually captured.

⁶⁴ *Jahangir* (R. & B.), II 295-96; *Iqbalnamah*, 224-28 (*E. & D.*, VI. 411-12); *History of Jahangir*, 382.

Deccan, combined with the glaring incompetence and cowardice on the part of most of the officers of Bengal, Bihar, and Orissa, had in the meantime enabled Shah Jahan not only to gain an untrammelled authority over those provinces, but also to attempt, with the prospect of equal success, the capture of Allahabad.

31. THE IMPERIAL GENERALS LEAVE BURHANPUR AND REACH KARA ON THE GANGES, OPPOSITE MANIKPUR.

Prince Parvez and Mahabat Khan now sought to make up for their delay, and left Burhanpur, even in the midst of the rains, for Allahabad. Marching through Malwa, they crossed the Jumna near Kalpi, and then proceeding further encamped on the bank of the Ganges near Kara, opposite Manikpur. A *farman* was now issued applauding Mirza Rustam for his gallant defence of Allahabad and exhorting him to hold out till their arrival.⁶⁵

Further progress of the Imperialists was for a time checked. The Ganges was in high flood, and all the passages of the river, particularly that between Kara and Manikpur, were held by the strong Afghan contingent under Darya Khan, who had also seized upon all available boats.

32. DARYA KHAN VACATES OUDH AND RETREATS TO ALLAHABAD.

It was only the culpable negligence and idleness of the rebel commander at this important moment that enabled the Imperial army to cross the Ganges without any opposition. The lavish honours bestowed on account of his meritorious services had completely turned the head of Darya Khan and increased his natural arrogance and haughtiness. On top of this, he now became too much addicted to wine, and totally ignored the advice of his officers to keep watch over the fords. His inaction left the resourceful Mahabat Khan free to collect about 30 boats from the friendly zamindars of the neighbouring places, with the help of which he crossed the Ganges one night with 6,000 cavalry at a place forty *kos* above the fords. He then marched fast down the river and suddenly fell upon the rebel army under Darya Khan. It was easily defeated, and the Afghan commander hastily retired towards Allahabad, evacuating Oudh altogether.⁶⁶

⁶⁵ *Baharistan*, 307b; *Stewart*, 147.

⁶⁶ *Iqbalnamah*, 229 (*E. & D.*, VI. 413); *Baharistan*, 308a-308b; *M.U.*

33. ABDULLAH KHAN RAISES THE SIEGE OF ALLAHABAD.

The cowardly retreat of Darya Khan from Manikpur, and the consequent unimpeded advance of the Imperial generals to the succour of the garrison in the Allahabad fort, so much alarmed Abdullah Khan that he thought it expedient to raise the siege without delay and withdraw to Jhusi, whence he reported to Shah Jahan about the changed state of affairs. Now that Sultan Parvez and Mahabat Khan had already crossed the Ganges and were fast approaching Allahabad, it was advisable for the rebel prince to march from Jaunpur and unite all the forces for common action.⁶⁷

34. SIEGE OF CHUNAR ALSO ABANDONED.

Shah Jahan was much perturbed at this disheartening news. He sent an urgent message to Wazir Khan to raise the siege of Chunar and join him without delay. This was done, and Allahabad and Chunar thus slipped from the hands of the rebel prince when a last vigorous effort might have made him the master of both.⁶⁸

Before his departure from Jaunpur, the rebel prince took care to send Mumtaz Mahal, and princes Dara Shikoh, Shuja, and Aurangzib, to the fort of Rhotas, where Itimad Khan, with the rest of the harem as well as the valuables from Akbarnagar, had already arrived. Abdu-s Salam, the *Khan-i-saman* (high steward of the prince's household), who was in charge of the whole party, duly reached Rhotas, and Sayyid Muzaffar, the commandant of the fort, reported the news to his master.⁶⁹

(Beveridge), I. 456; *Riyaz* (A.S.), 198; *Stewart*, 117. The *Iqbalnamah* is practically silent with regard to the carelessness and incapacity of Darya Khan, which really turned the tide against Shah Jahan, but this is clearly suggested by the *Baharistan* and is confirmed by the *Maasir*.

⁶⁷ *Baharistan*, 308b; *Gladwin*, 74; *History of Jahangir*, 382.

The real reason for the abandonment of the siege of Allahabad by Abdullah Khan has not so far been clearly indicated. It was neither the 'smallness of forces of the rebel commander' (*Gladwin*), nor 'the reputation and prestige of the Imperialist general Mahabat Khan' (*History of Jahangir*) so much, as the singular incompetence of Darya Khan, paving the way for the rapid advance of the Imperialists upon Allahabad, that led Abdullah Khan to withdraw.

⁶⁸ *Baharistan*, 309a.

⁶⁹ *Baharistan*, 308b; *Gladwin*, 74.

35. SHAH JAHAN MARCHES FROM JAUNPUR TO FACE THE IMPERIALISTS NEAR BAHADURPUR.

With his mind at ease about the safety of his family, Shah Jahan left Jaunpur for Benares, where Abdullah Khan, Darya Khan, Raja Bhim, Shujaat Khan, and Mutaqid Khan, with the Sayyid, Afghan, and Rajput forces, and the Bengal flotilla, supplemented by the fleet of the Bengal zamindars, joined him.⁷⁰ With the combined army and the fleet, the rebel prince then crossed the Ganges and marched towards Allahabad. But he did not proceed as far as that city, and encamped a few miles down the Ganges near Bahadurpur.⁷¹

36. PORTUGUESE HELP IN WAR-BOATS REACHES FROM BENGAL.

Darab Khan, the viceroy of Bengal, who had in the meantime been ordered to send reinforcements from the Portuguese in Jahangirnagar, took immediate action. Manoel Tavares (who had joined the rebel prince at the time of the battle of Akbarpur), and another native Portuguese chieftain named D. D'souza, with a large number of their war-boats of various kinds—*Ghurabs*, *Jaleas*, *Pustas* or *Fustas*, *Machuas*,⁷² etc.—were accordingly despatched to the aid of Shah Jahan.⁷³

Meanwhile Prince Parvez and Mahabat Khan had reached Allahabad, to the intense relief of the garrison and Mirza Rustam Beg. The defences of the place were strengthened, and a strong force, led by Muhammad Zaman, the *bakhshi* of Prince Parvez, assisted by Allah Yar Khan and Nazar Bahadur, was sent to Jhusi. The Imperial generals who were accompanied by Mirza Raja Jai Singh of Ambar and Raja Gaj Singh of Marwar, then continued to march with their army along the banks of the Ganges, and encamped opposite the entrenchments of Shah Jahan.

70 According to the *Tatimma* (*E. & D.*, VI. 394), the *Maasir* (Beveridge, I. 456), and *Gladwin* (p. 74), Abdullah Khan, Darya Khan, Raja Bhim, and others retreated to Jaunpur, prior to their joining Shah Jahan at Benares, but the *Baharistan* states that the generals moved straight towards Benares and joined their master there.

71 Bahadurpur, in Benares District, is about 32 miles south-east of Allahabad.

72 For a detailed description of these war-boats, see Prof. S.C. Mitra's *History of Jessore-Khulna* (in Bengali), vol. II, pp. 209-12.

73 *Baharistan*, 309a.

37. SHAH JAHAN'S SUCCESSES IN THE EARLY STAGES OF THE CONTEST NEAR BAHADURPUR (c. END OF SEPTEMBER, 1624).

In the early stages of the contest which began near Bahadurpur, about the end of September, 1624, the Imperialists, owing to their lack of war-boats, suffered great losses at the hands of Shah Jahan, who had at his command not only the entire fleet of the Bengal *subah*, but also the war-vessels of the vassal zamindars there. A heavy fire from the war-boats, combined with the action of the artillery on land, daily caused injuries, some of them proving fatal, to about 500 to 1,000 men and 400 to 500 animals. Moreover, this cut off all access of the Imperialists to the river bank, and they were threatened with starvation. Greatly emboldened by the success of their cannonade, the rebel forces made three separate attacks in one week upon the camp of Prince Parvez, but they failed to capture it.⁷⁴

To guard against treachery and dissensions in his ranks, Shah Jahan had instituted a strict censorship not only in his camp, but also in all the provinces under his control, the officers of which were ordered to intercept all objectionable letters and to send them forward for disposal. One such letter of Bairam Beg (Khan Dauran), governor of Bihar, addressed to Darab Khan, the governor of Bengal, was intercepted. Shah Jahan at once took action, recalled Bairam Beg, and sent Wazir Khan to take charge of the government at Patna.⁷⁵

Owing to an act, rash and indiscreet, on the part of one of the officers of Shah Jahan, he suffered, at this stage, a temporary loss. Bairam Beg, who had been compelled to join Shah Jahan on account of his treacherous designs, grew very anxious to retrieve his honour. He planned a sudden attack on the Imperial outpost at Jhusi under Muhammad Zaman, and attempted to carry it out with his own small following,⁷⁶ unaided by the main army. Accompanied by his son Hasan Beg, and two Afghan officers, Khwajah Ibrahim and Khwajah Daud (relatives of the late Usman Afghan), he started one night from the prince's camp, and, marching continuously, reached Jhusi next morning, when he and his comrades and their horses were all dead tired.

74 *Baharistan*, 309b.

75 *Baharistan*, 310a-310b; *M.U.* (Beveridge), I. 378.

76 4,000 cavalry, according to *Herbert*, which seems rather incredible.

A sharp action followed, in which Bairam Beg was killed, and his son and the Afghans, who were all wounded, fled from the field.⁷⁷

The need for wiping off the stain of this defeat was keenly felt, and the rebel prince now made a fresh effort to dislodge the Imperialists from their entrenchments. The fleet and the artillery renewed their activities, and the Rajput forces under Raja Gaj Singh of Jodhpur were now vigorously attacked and reduced to great straits. Raids upon the Imperialist camp followed, in one of which even the tent-equipage of the Rajput chief Gaj Singh was seized and many of his followers slain. The turn of Sultan Parvez soon came. His camp also was successfully attacked, and some of his personal effects, including his bedstead, were carried away.⁷⁸

Unable to cope with the growing depredations, the Imperialists had recourse to a stratagem. They retired from the contest, drawing the jubilant enemy after them near a narrow bend of the Ganges, on the banks of which guns had already been mounted. They then opened fire on the unsuspecting rebels, creating great confusion in the ranks. It was with considerable difficulty that Shah Jahan's admiral, the Bengal zamindars, and their Portuguese comrades, managed to retreat, leaving behind two of the war-boats.

The Imperial generals treated the captives very brutally. Their hands were lopped off, while their feet were fastened with nails to the boats, which were then turned adrift. As a high wind was blowing, the vessels soon sank, taking the mutilated prisoners down with them, and all attempts of their comrades at their rescue proved fruitless. Though this incident cast a gloom over the entire navy and checked its activities for some time, artillery operations continued with unabated vigour.⁷⁹

⁷⁷ *Baharistan*, 310b; *Herbert*, 91; *M.U.* (Beveridge), I. 379. The *Mausir* furnishes a confusing account of this episode, which is clearly narrated in the *Baharistan*.

⁷⁸ *Baharistan*, 313a-313b. [I may be permitted to point out that the prolonged hostilities near Bahadurpur have not hitherto been noticed, but the *Baharistan* supplies graphic details in this connection].

⁷⁹ *Baharistan*, pp. 313a-313b.

38. CHANGE IN THE SCENE OF WARFARE—SHAH JAHAN ENCAMPS ON THE BANK OF THE TONS.

At this time there was a change in the scene of warfare owing to a new move on the part of Mahabat Khan. Profiting by the absence of any opposition from the enemy fleet, he decided to cross over to the north bank, with a view to entering into a close combat with the rebel prince. With the help of some boats supplied by friendly zamindars of the neighbourhood, this was soon accomplished.

Shah Jahan was really alarmed. He thought it inexpedient to meet the Imperialists in their new position of advantage and resolved to proceed further up to a more favourable point. In a night's march from his camp near Bahadurpur, he reached the confluence of the Tons and the Ganges, whence he advanced up the former river to a short distance, and encamped on its east bank in the midst of a forest region.

The place was well chosen. With his front covered by the river Tons and his right flank by the Ganges, Shah Jahan naturally expected that his naval strength would here be utilized to the best advantage. Moreover, in case of defeat, he could from this place retire direct to the stronghold of Rhotas (where his whole family and valuables had already been collected), unhampered by the Imperialists. The surrounding territories being hilly and clad with forests could not easily be traversed by the enemy.⁸⁰

To ensure the safety of his family, the rebel prince now sent reinforcements under Khidmat-purast Khan to the fort of Rhotas. He next engaged himself in making preparations for the impending contest, personally supervising the erection of stockades, the throwing up of earthworks, and the mounting of guns upon them.

39. THE IMPERIALISTS ENTRENCH OPPOSITE SHAH JAHAN'S CAMP.

Meanwhile the Imperial generals were not idle. Following Shah Jahan, they moved up the north bank of the Ganges and encamped at a place named Kantit,⁸¹ about two miles north of the confluence with

⁸⁰ *Baharistan*, 314a; *Iqbalnamah*, 232 (*E. & D.*, VI. 413); *M.U.* (Beveridge), I. 458; *Stewart*, 147.

⁸¹ There is some confusion in the Persian works regarding this place. The *Iqbalnamah* (Persian text, p. 232 footnote), however, names the place correctly as Kantit (in Mirzapur District, U. P.; the *Ain-i-Akbari*, vol. II also mentions it).

the Tons. Their further advance was, however, checked for two reasons. All the fords on the Ganges and its tributary, the Tons, were being vigilantly guarded by the war-boats of Shah Jahan, and all available boats in the neighbourhood had also been taken under his possession.

40. SHAH JAHAN ATTEMPTS TO DRAW REINFORCEMENTS FROM BENGAL.

An effort was now made to draw further reinforcements from Bengal. Darab Khan was accordingly directed to join the main army, leaving the province in charge of his younger son Mirza Afrasiyab. Though more proofs of Darab's disloyalty had appeared in the form of two treasonable letters, one addressed to him by his old father, the Khan Khanan (in service with the Imperialists), the other from his elder son, Aram Bakhsh (in the camp of the rebel prince), Shah Jahan deemed it wise to condone his guilt. But Darab Khan, persisting in his evil ways, evaded the summons on the pretext of an imminent attack on his province by the king of Arrakan. To keep up a show of loyalty, he, however, sent Mirza Afrasiyab, with 1,000 cavalry and 200 war-boats, to the aid of Shah Jahan.⁸²

41. CONSPIRACY BETWEEN THE BENGAL ZAMINDARS AND THE PORTUGUESE CAPTAINS OF WAR WITH MAHABAT KHAN, AND ITS EFFECTS ON SHAH JAHAN'S CAUSE.

Before the reinforcements reached him, an act of great treachery had ruined the prospects of the rebel prince. Masum Khan, the leading zamindar of Bengal, with his comrades and the Portuguese captains, Manoel Tavares and D. D'souza, entered into a conspiracy with Mahabat Khan. Mir Sufi, who was the tutor of one of the sons of Shah Jahan and his great favourite, also took a prominent part in this affair, and induced a nephew of Raja Satrajit of Bhushnah, a vassal, to join him. It was arranged that in return for the Imperial favour, the conspirators would retire, at the earliest possible moment, with the entire fleet, to Bengal, imprison Darab Khan unless he would openly join them, and then stir up revolt amongst the other faithful adherents of Shah Jahan. Mir Shams, the admiral of the Bengal flotilla, was not, of course, directly a party to the conspiracy, but he came to know about this affair very soon and yet did nothing to frustrate it.

In accordance with their plan, the conspirators remained with the war-boats on the Ganges, on the idle plea that these were too large to ply on the shallow waters of the Tons. To avoid rousing suspicion, they sent a few small boats, the oarsmen of which co-operated in the erection of stockades on that river. These also were recalled, and one night the Bengal zamindars and the Portuguese chiefs withdrew with all the boats, their guns and equipment, along with a large amount of goods seized from some of the richly laden vessels of the prince. What was more outrageous, they also forcibly carried away some women of the harem.⁸³

This was a serious blow to the moral prestige and the material strength of Shah Jahan. On the eve of what was destined to be the most decisive engagement in his whole rebellious career, the help which was most needed was suddenly withdrawn. The naval superiority—the only advantage that could have counted against the consummate military genius of Mahabat Khan—was gone, and the exploits of Bahadurpur were never to be repeated. For the fleet of the Bengal province, on which Shah Jahan had now solely to depend, was very small, and, by itself, would be of little avail. In the event of a defeat, his line of retreat towards Bengal was also threatened. But the dislocation of the commissariat arrangements caused by the withdrawal of the boats was a matter of more immediate consequence to the rebel prince.

When the disquieting news was communicated to Shah Jahan next morning, he despatched an urgent messenger to his officers in Bihar and Bengal, asking them to be on their guard and intercept the traitors, and, if possible, to send them back to service, but this bore no fruit.

42. THE IMPERIALISTS EASILY CROSS THE GANGES AND THE TONS AND CONFRONT SHAH JAHAN.

Mahabat Khan, on the other hand, was not slow to take advantage of the new situation. The defection of the Bengal zamindars and the

⁸³ *Iqbalnamah*, 231-32 (*E. & D.*, VI. 413); *Baharistan*, 314b; Father Cabral on the Fall of Hugly, 1632 (*Catholic Herald of India*, 1918, pp. 111-13); *History of the Portuguese in Bengal*, 129; *History of Jahangir*, 382. The account of the *Iqbalnamah* is really very brief and excludes the Portuguese altogether. The *Baharistan* gives a fuller story, emphasising the part played by the Portuguese in the plot, which is well corroborated by Fr. Cabral's narrative.

Portuguese captains of war meant practically the evacuation of all the fords on the Ganges and the Tons so long held on behalf of Shah Jahan. This enabled the Imperial general to pass over the confluence of the Ganges and the Tons unopposed and encamp opposite the enemy entrenchments. His next attempt, to cross the Tons, proved to be difficult on account of the formidable opposition offered by the artillery and archers of the rebel prince. Skirmishes, however, went on for several days, in which daily casualties exceeded 100 on each side. At last Mahabat Khan succeeded in crossing the river, one night, with 4,000 cavalry and 700 elephants, and he was followed soon after by Raja Bir Singh Deo Bundela with 7,000 cavalry, 12,000 infantry, and 200 elephants. Sultan Parvez was the last to cross over, with the rest of the army.⁸⁴

43. SHAH JAHAN HOLDS A COUNCIL OF WAR AND DECIDES TO GIVE IMMEDIATE BATTLE.

The two forces now stood face to face with one another on the eastern bank of the Tons. Shah Jahan called a council of war in which Raja Bhim advocated an immediate attack; but Abdullah Khan and other officers were of opinion that as circumstances had changed it was not wise to risk a general engagement. A better course would be to evade the Imperial army and advance upon Delhi, by way of Oudh and Lucknow, and, failing that, to fall back on the Deccan again. As later events showed, it was a sound advice; but the proud Rajput refused to listen to it, for such marching and moving about was against the code of warfare of his race. He went so far as to declare that unless fighting was begun at once he would withdraw with his army. His voice ultimately prevailed, and Shah Jahan gave orders for immediate action.⁸⁵

44. BATTLE OF THE TONS—DISPOSITION OF THE COMBATANTS.

The disposition of the combatants was as follows. On the side of Shah Jahan, the Afghans, under Darya Khan Rohilla, formed the

⁸⁴ *Baharistan*, 315b, 316b.

⁸⁵ *Iqbalnamah*, 232 (*E. & D.*, VI. 413); *Riyaz* (A. S., 198; Gladwin, p. 74; Stewart, 147; *History of Jahangir*, 383.

vanguard, with Nasir Khan, Ahmed Beg Khan, Mirza Isfandiyar, Mirza Nuru-d-din, Sohrab Khan, and Saadat Yar occupying its centre. The Afghan commander was also accompanied by Khwajah Ibrahim, Khwajah Daud, Bahadur Khan, Sardar Khan, and Dilwar Khan, and by the cavalry detachment sent by Darab Khan from Bengal, as also by a large number of war-elephants. Numerous gun-carriages, some drawn by elephants, others by oxen, with a strong contingent of musketeers, were placed for the protection of the van under Rumi Khan, who had, in the absence of Khidmat-purast Khan (sent to Rhotas), been made the chief artillery officer. Next to the Afghans was Abdullah Khan, the commander-in-chief, with all the Mughal mansabdars, and a strong corps of cavalry and many elephants. As was customary with the Mughals, Shujaat Khan (Sayyid Jafar) and the other Sayyids were honoured with a place in the centre of Abdullah Khan's army. Raja Bhim, with his Rajput soldiers, was put in charge of the right wing, while Kunwar Pahar Singh, with the Raja of Ratanpur and other zamindars, was to lead the left. A moving column, led by Sher Khwajah and Sarandaz Bahadur, was directed to aid the two wings when necessary. With a large number of cavalry and some elephants, Shah Jahan himself took his post in the centre, assisted by the Rajput chief Rao Manrup.

The arrangement of the Imperialist forces is not known in detail. The Sayyids, with a strong force of cavalry and war elephants, appear to have led the van, which was protected by numerous gun-carriages drawn by elephants. Raja Bir Singh Deo Bundela and other vassal zamindars of Kalpi, Allahabad, and Agra formed the right wing with their own cavalry and musketeers and some state elephants, while Raja Gaj Singh of Jodhpur with his own followers and some more elephants occupied the left. Prince Parvez and Mahabat Khan, with Khan Alam and the entire Mughal forces and the remaining elephants, were in the centre, assisted by Mirza Raja Jai Singh of Jaipur (grandson of Raja Man Singh) and his own troopers.⁸⁶

⁸⁶ *Baharistan*, 317a-17b. Authorities differ widely regarding the number and

45. BATTLE ON THE TONS (c. END OF OCTOBER, 1624) DESCRIBED.

The battle on the bank of the river Tons began on the morning of October 26, 1624, (Saturday, the 13th Muharram, 1034 A.H.). The time was inauspicious according to Sayyid Sharfu-d-din, the famous astrologer of Ghazipur, still Shah Jahan did not abstain from fighting.

The artillery and the vanguard of the Imperialists began action by an attack on Shah Jahan's forces in the van. Darya Khan for a time offered strong defence, in co-operation with the artillery commander Rumi Khan. But the superiority of numbers of the Imperial van afterwards enabled it to outflank the Afghans under Darya Khan, and many of the gun-carriages were also captured. Finding that the van was about to be overpowered, Raja Bhim moved from the right to assist it, and, after a gallant effort in which he received twenty-one wounds, was slain. The death of the Rajput commander threw his soldiers into great confusion, and they speedily dispersed. Sher Khwajah, who did his best to save the Raja, also fought valiantly till he was killed.

Though deprived of the help of the right wing, Darya Khan continued the struggle and nearly succeeded in defeating the Imperial-

disposition of the forces joining battle on the Tons, as the following table will illustrate:—

	Iqbalnamah	Baharistan	Riyaz	Gladwin	Dow
Shah Jahan's army	{ 19,000 horse	180,000 horse, 190,000 foot, 2,400 elephants, 1,500 gun-carriages	Not more than 10,000 in all	10,000 in all	Exceeding 40,000 horse
Imperial army	{ -----	80,000 horse, 100,000 foot, 1,900 elephants, more than 400 gun-carriages	40,000 in all	40,000 in all	More than Shah Jahan's levy

Mirza Nathan's (*Baharistan*) figures, when added together, appear to be too high. Quite in contrast with his general veracity, he not only overestimates the military strength of Shah Jahan (thus differing from the almost unanimous opinion of the Persian chroniclers regarding the overwhelming number of the Imperialists), but also furnishes an exceedingly large number even for his enemies, probably with a view to emphasising the magnitude of the issues involved.

As regards the disposition of the two parties, Mirza Nathan, however, supplies a clear and minute account, while that furnished by the authors of the *Iqbalnamah* and the *Riyaz* is rather vague and brief, the narratives of Gladwin, Dow, Stewart, and Beni Prasad being no better.

ists. Had Abdullah Khan joined him at that moment, he could have easily been successful. But the seed of rivalry and jealousy between Abdullah Khan and Raja Bhim, and also between Darya Khan and Abdullah Khan, had been sown in the course of the siege of Allahabad, and this now germinated. Abdullah Khan not only refrained from giving help to Raja Bhim till his death, but also refused aid to Darya Khan when he was sorely in need of it.

What is worse, Abdullah Khan, at this stage, altogether withdrew from the contest. This action on the part of the commander-in-chief naturally led to great disorder in the rebel camp, and Darya Khan too, with the Afghans retreated. On top of this, Kunwar Pahar Singh Bundela and his Rajput troops now joined the Imperialists.

Undaunted by the withdrawal of his chief officers and men, Shah Jahan plunged into the thick of the enemy lines, and when one charger was killed he mounted another and continued fighting till the end of the day. When night came on, it was found that his forces had dwindled to a handful of personal followers, and Shah Jahan was at last persuaded to give up his desperate venture and retire.⁸⁷

46. SHAH JAHAN SEVERELY DEFEATED.

The battle on the Tons thus ended in complete defeat for Shah Jahan. This really decided his fate, and all subsequent efforts to

⁸⁷ For details, see *Baharistan*, 317b-19a; *Iqbalnamah*, 232-33 (*E. & D.*, VI. 313-14); *Herbert*, 90-91; *K. Khan*, I. 346-56; *M.U.* (Beveridge), I. 455-56; *Riyaz* (A. S.), 198-200; *Gladwin*, 75; *Stewart*, 147-48; *History of Jahangir*, 333-84: M. M. Gauri Shankar Ojha's *Rajputanekā Itihās*, III, pp. 825-828, is particularly useful for the part played by the Rajput princes in the battle.

The treatment of this important battle in current histories appears to have left much room for improvement. The standard Persian chronicles supply a very brief account of the affair, and this, obviously, is the cause of the paucity of detail noticeable in the works written in English, such as those of Gladwin, Stewart, and Beni Prasad. The *Baharistan* alone supplies a full account, which is confirmed in substance by the Rajput chronicles, the *Iqbalnamah*, and Herbert's book, and is followed by the *Maasir-ul-Umara*.

The *Iqbalnamah* depicts Abdullah Khan in a noble rôle, fighting valiantly till the last by the side of his master. But, according to the *Baharistan*, supported, to some extent, by Herbert, his criminal inaction, due to his jealousy and hostility towards Raja Bhim and Darya Khan, followed by his hasty retreat, led to the ruin of Shah Jahan's affairs.

retrieve the cause then lost were in vain. The morale of his followers was so affected by this reverse that they began to desert him in large numbers. Shah' Jahan himself lost his self-confidence so much that he did not venture any more to meet his opponents in an open battle. The provinces of Bengal, Bihar, and Orissa that had so long remained in his possession were now gradually lost, and the rebel prince was soon driven, for the second time, to be a wandering exile.

47. CAUSES OF THE IMPERIALIST SUCCESS.

The great victory won by the Imperialists appears to have been due partly to the superior military talents, tact, and persuasive eloquence of their general Mahabat Khan, and partly to the dissensions prevalent in the camp of Shah Jahan. When the battle was about to begin, Mahabat Khan caused an incalculable loss to his adversary by inducing the Bengal zamindars and the Portuguese captains to retire with the war-boats to Bengal. Again, in the early stages of the battle, the Imperial general, by his skilful manoeuvring, not only outflanked the vanguard of the prince, but also captured many of his guns. This was not all. Afterwards, he won over Kunwar Pahar Singh to the side of the Emperor. The discomfiture of Shah Jahan was, however, completed by internal discord which reached the climax when the commander-in-chief failed to co-operate with his Rajput and Afghan comrades and at last hastily withdrew from the field of battle.

48. SHAH JAHAN RETREATS TO RHOTAS, PATNA, AND FINALLY TO AKBAR-NAGAR.

In great distress, Shah Jahan crossed the hills near Khiragarh at night, and was joined next morning by many of his fugitive officers, including Abdullah Khan and Darya Khan. The retreat was continued till the fort of Rhotas was reached after a march of four days. The rebel prince being in too precarious a position to punish his negligent and quarrelsome subordinates was compelled to utilise their services afresh. At first he decided to send Abdullah Khan and Darya Khan ahead for the protection of Patna. But this plan was changed at the instance of Mumtaz Mahal, and, after a three days' halt in Rhotas, Shah Jahan himself moved towards Patna with his generals and his entire family and valuables, leaving the fort in charge of the old and

tried servant Kotwal Khan, assisted by his son-in-law Khidmat-purast Khan, Sayyid Mustafa, and Kunwar Das, brother of the late Raja Vikramjit. At the end of three days' march, he reached Patna, where he was welcomed by Wazir Khan, the officer in charge (c. beginning of November, 1624.⁸⁸

The Imperial generals, immediately after their success, pursued Shah Jahan only for a short distance; for their losses in the engagement were considerable, and their soldiers and horses, much fatigued by long and continued marching, needed rest. The temptation of collecting the enormous booty, including war-elephants, was also irresistible. After a week's rest, the Imperialists resumed their pursuit, and encamped on the bank of the river Son, *en route* to Patna.

The news of the rapid advance of the enemy so much perturbed Shah Jahan that he decided to evacuate Patna without contest and retire to Akbarnagar. Anxious to secure his line of retreat, he sent a *farman* to Shitab Khan, who held charge of Akbarnagar, to proceed at once to the pass of Gurhee (Teliagurhee), the strategic gateway of Bengal, and set up a fortified post there. When this was finished, a force of 3,500 matchlockmen under Kamalu-d-din Husain (entitled Nasir Khan), assisted by a park of artillery under Rumi Khan, was sent to garrison it. From Patna the fugitive prince continued his journey towards Akbarnagar, reaching there about January 8, 1625, more than seven months after he had left it in triumph for Bihar and Allahabad.⁸⁹

49. EVENTS IN BENGAL, BIHAR, AND ORISSA DURING SHAH JAHAN'S OPERATIONS IN ALLAHABAD AND OUDH.

In spite of rapid changes in his fortune during this eventful period, the control of Shah Jahan over the provinces of Bihar, Orissa, and Bengal, had not been much impaired. This had mainly been due to the loyalty and devotion of Wazir Khan and Shah Quli Khan, the

⁸⁸ *Iqbalnamah*, 233-34 (*E. & D.*, VI. 414); *Baharistan*, 319a-320a; *Riyaz* (A.S.), 200; *Gladwin*, 75; *Stewart*, 148; *History of Jahangir*, 384. Dr. Beni Prasad's statement that Abdullah Khan was left behind in Rhotas is not borne out by the authorities.

⁸⁹ *Iqbalnamah*, 239 (*E. & D.*, VI. 416); *Baharistan*, 320a, 324b; *Riyaz* (A.S.), 201; *Stewart*, 148; *History of Jahangir*, 384.

governors of Bihar and Orissa, and Shitab Khan, the officer in charge of Gaur, with headquarters at Akbarnagar.

While our information regarding the activities of the first two officers is rather meagre, much is known about the valuable services rendered by the third one.⁹⁰ Shitab Khan had parted with Shah Jahan in Jaunpur (early in June, 1624) to assume charge of his new office, with his territorial jurisdiction clearly defined. It was to extend to *parganas* Shahzadapur-Yusufshahi on the south-east, Burdwan on the south-west, Pointee on the north-west, and to the borders of Mathiabhanga (in Koch Bihar) on the north-east. The rest of the province of Bengal, however, continued to be ruled by Darab Khan.

50. VARIOUS ACTIVITIES OF SHITAB KHAN AT AKBARNAGAR IN THE INTERESTS OF SHAH JAHAN.

From Jaunpur, Shitab Khan proceeded to Patna, travelling by way of Chausa and Ghazipur. Thence he moved to Akbarnagar (c. middle of July, 1624). One of his earliest acts was to issue an order to his subordinates not to cause any harm to the widow of Ibrahim Khan (the Bengal viceroy), who had then been living in a palace opposite to the tombs of her husband and son.⁹¹

About the beginning of August, 1624, Murad Bakhsh, the fourth son of Shah Jahan, was born in Rhotas. Mumtaz Mahal, the mother of the infant prince, in the absence of the father in camp in Bahadurpur, directed Shitab Khan to supply perfumes to celebrate the happy occasion. He procured a large quantity of ambergris, *araq*s, musk, rose-water, *jaffran*, *khuskhus* etc. and delivered them personally at Rhotas.⁹²

90 Though the detailed account furnished by the author of the *Baharistan* is primarily of biographical value, it incidentally throws new light on the contemporary history of Bengal, particularly in relation to Shah Jahan's revolt, about which very little is known.

91 *Baharistan*, 307a.

92 *Baharistan*, p. 309b. We are told that thirty *seers* of ash-coloured sea ambergris, two *mans* of *khuskhus*, 2,000 navels of musk deer from Northern China and Khotan, five *mans* of *ambarina* (a perfume compounded of ambergris, musk, and aloe wood), 2,000 bottles of *araq bid-i-mushk* (Egyptian willow and *araq fashsh* (fruit of an African carob tree), 2,000 bottles of *araq bahar* (a species of odiferous herb), besides 10,000 phials of rose-water and five *mans* of *jaffran* were presented on this occasion.

Later on, during the protracted encounter with the Imperialists in the vicinity of Bahadurpur, Shitab Khan, in co-operation with Wazir Khan, served the cause of Shah Jahan not only by a vigilant censorship of all letters passing through Akbarnagar, but also by ensuring a regular supply of provisions to Rhotas and of munitions and money to his camp. The arsenal at Akbarnagar was worked day and night, and, in a short time, four thousand *mans* of gunpowder and eight thousand *mans* of lead and iron balls were manufactured. Besides these, a sum of 700,000 rupees was also sent in eight instalments to enable the rebel prince to defray the cost of war.⁹³

Shitab Khan next carried out a revenue survey and settlement of the *parganahs* of Tajpur and Purnea included in the *jagirs* of Darya Khan Rohilla, with the help of an Afghan *amir*, and one thousand Hindu subordinates trained in the assessment methods of Raja Todar Mal.⁹⁴ Another meritorious act done by him was the suppression of a raid upon the *parganah* of Bastah, which had been given in fief to Mirza Nazafi, by a daring adventurer named Sayyid Muhammad. Without any reference to the *jagirdar* or the governor of the province, the Sayyid suddenly attacked the *parganah* (from the direction of Orissa) and began to realise the revenue on his own account. As the times were critical, peaceful measures were adopted by Shitab Khan to deal with the usurper, and he was at last persuaded to withdraw, on promise of an extensive *jagir* in the *nawwara parganahs* (assigned for the main-

93 *Baharistan*, 311a-311b. The Ganges being in high flood, Shitab Khan devised an ingenious method of transportation of the huge sum of money across the river. The silver coins were placed in 100 purses of 1,000 rupees each. 100 pieces of rope were then procured, the length of each of which approximated the average depth of the river. Each purse was fastened tight with one end of a rope, while with the other end were tied five dried pumpkins; the purses and the pumpkins were then all loaded in boats, the underlying idea being that in case the boats should sink, the pumpkins, which always float in water, would easily indicate the position of the purse.

94 *Baharistan*, 311b. An interesting incident recorded at this stage (312a) illustrates the worldly wisdom of Shitab Khan. As it was customary on all festive occasions to read the *khutba* (in public prayer) in the name of the reigning sovereign, Shitab Khan, on the occasion of the celebration of the *Id* festival at Akbarnagar instructed the preacher to associate the name of his new master, the rebel prince Shah Jahan, with the old--the lawful Emperor Jahangir.

tenance of the fleet) in Bengal, till then held by Raja Satrajit of Bhushnah'. After this success, Shitab Khan was for some time busy recruiting a force of 5,000 horsemen on behalf of one of his colleagues, Shah Quli Khan, the governor of Orissa.⁹⁵

51. SHITAB KHAN SAVES AKBARNAGAR FROM THE RAIDS OF THE TREACHEROUS BENGAL CHIEFTAINS.

The treacherous retreat of the Bengal zamindars and the Portuguese chieftains with the war-boats, on the eve of the battle of the Tons, offered an excellent opportunity to the faithful officers of Shah Jahan in Bihar and Bengal of proving their worth. Shitab Khan fully utilised it, and, by timely measures, saved Akbarnagar from the depredations of the enemy.

The details of the affair may here be briefly related. The deserters had moved rapidly down the Ganges till they arrived at Patna. Wazir Khan, the local governor, was taken by surprise, and the rebels set fire to the city and also looted the bazars with impunity. They then resumed their journey towards Akbarnagar.

Meanwhile the emissary sent by Shah Jahan to give warnings to his officers against the rebellious chieftains had overtaken the latter at Patna, and then moved ahead towards Akbarnagar to inform Shitab Khan about them. The Khan strengthened his defences and also communicated the news of the advance of the enemy to Darab Khan, the Bengal viceroy. His son Mirza Afrasiyab, who had at that time far advanced from Jahangirnagar with reinforcements for Shah Jahan, was persuaded by Shitab Khan to rejoin his father and co-operate with him in the defence of the capital of Bengal.

Akbarnagar was now carefully guarded. While Muhammad Salih, the *waqia-navis*, was deputed with a force of cavalry and matchlockmen and some 20 elephants to protect the residence of the widow of Ibrahim Khan, Shitab Khan himself with the rest of the army—3,000 cavalry and 5,000 matchlockmen—and the elephants patrolled the city.

A tumult arose when the enemy fleet appeared, but Shitab Khan kept firm and maintained discipline in his ranks. After a few hours'

⁹⁵ *Baharistan*, 312b-13a, 316a-b.

futile bombardment and a similar fruitless attempt to land and plunder the city, the rebels retired towards Jahangirnagar. An attempt to induce Shitab Khan to join them was also made, but without success.⁹⁶

52. BENGAL LOST TO SHAH JAHAN OWING TO THE TREACHERY OF ITS GOVERNOR DARAB KHAN.

Though Akbarnagar remained in the possession of Shah Jahan, his hold on the rest of the province of Bengal was soon lost. It was mainly due to persistent faithlessness on the part of Darab Khan. In spite of the warnings received from Akbarnagar, the Bengal viceroy failed to offer any opposition to the rebel chieftains when they confronted him. As they were uncertain of his policy, the rebels laid siege to Jahangirnagar forthwith. Their menacing attitude at last forced Darab Khan to give up his wavering tactics and join them openly against Shah Jahan. But his repeated change of front made the Bengal zamindars suspicious, and they kept Darab Khan under strict surveillance. Their next act was to induce other prominent officers of the province, including Rai Jauhar Mal Das, who had succeeded Mirza Maki (taken ill) as *diwan* (*Baharistan*, p. 313b), and Mirza Salih, the *thanahdar* of Sylhet, to join their ranks.⁹⁷

53. KAMRUP AND ORISSA ALSO LOST.

The news of the final defection of Darab Khan along with his officers was received by Shah Jahan after he had reached Akbarnagar (early in January, 1625). Further depressing news soon arrived regarding the loss of the north-eastern frontier province of Kamrup.

⁹⁶ *Baharistan*, 315a-316a.

⁹⁷ *Iqbalnamah*, 239 (*E. & D.*, VI. 416); *Baharistan*, 320b-321a; *M.U.* (Beveridge), I. 452; *Riyaz* (A. S.), 201; *Gladwin*, 75; *Stewart*, 148; *History of Jahangir*, 384.

Some confusion exists regarding the last phase of Darab Khan's chequered career. According to the *Iqbalnamah* and the *Maasir*, Shah Jahan, after his defeat on the Tons, asked Darab to meet him near the pass of Gurhee, but there is no such suggestion in the *Baharistan*. Moreover, the former work seems to suggest that Darab's plea that he was besieged by the Bengal zamindars was hardly true; but the *Baharistan* and the *Maasir* agree that he was actually held in blockade in Jahangirnagar. Lastly, the news of Darab Khan's final change of front does not appear to have been received by Shah Jahan before he returned to Akbarnagar (as the *Iqbalnamah*, *Riyaz*, *Gladwin*, and *Beni Prasad* all suggest).

Zahid Khan Bokhari, who had been appointed governor there by Shah Jahan, also joined the side of the Emperor with Raja Satrajit of Bhushnah, Raja Lakshmi Narayan of Koch Bihar, and Shaikh Shah Muhammad, son of late Shaikh Kamal. Though Shah Quli Khan, the governor of Orissa, remained personally loyal to the rebel prince, that province too slipped from his hands, as the zamindars in a body shook off their allegiance and submitted to the Emperor.⁹⁸


54. SHAH JAHAN DECIDES TO FINALLY LEAVE FOR THE DECCAN.

All hope of making another effort in Bengal, Bihar, and Orissa having now disappeared, Shah Jahan decided to return by the old route (across *arkar* Madaran, Midnapore, Orissa, and Telingana) to the Deccan, the political complications of which held out better prospects to him.

Great preparations were begun for the impending retreat. The newly-made outpost at Gurhee was evacuated and the *thanahdar*, Kamalu-d din Husain, recalled. The officers who were still faithful were at this time allowed to realise as much of their dues as possible from their own *jagirs*; Darya Khan Rohilla, Shujaat Khan and Mubarak Khan from Ghoraghat, Sulaimanabad, Jahanabad, Tajpur, and Purnea, and Kamalu-d din Husain from the *jagir* which had been conferred on Raja Bhim. While others succeeded in filling their coffers prior to their departure for the Deccan, Mubarak Khan perished in the attempt. A zamindar in his *jagir* suddenly rose in arms, looted all his property, and killed him.

Prior to his final departure from Akbarnagar, Shah Jahan took a drastic step. He ordered Abdullah Khan to hunt down those of his followers who were unwilling to accompany him, and, in one day, about one thousand of them were put to death. Aram Bakhsh, the elder son of Darab Khan, who had long been suspected of complicity with his father, was at last killed by Abdullah Khan, though Shah Jahan had directed that no harm should be done to him. Darab too, some time after, met a similar, though more deserved, fate at the Mahabat Khan.

98 *Baharistan*, 326a.



55. AKBARNAGAR EVACUATED AT LAST (c. EARLY FEB., 1625).

After a stay of twenty-four days (c. January 8 to January 31, 1625), spent mainly in hunting excursions across the Ganges, Shah Jahan left Akbarnagar for the Deccan with all the munitions and baggage deposited there, and with a small following, including (besides those already noted) Wazir Khan, Shah Quli Khan, Sarandaz Bahadur, Rumi Khan, and Shitab Khan. The last one, however, deserted the rebel prince after he had marched three stages from Akbarnagar.⁹⁹

The most interesting and eventful phase of the rebellion of Shah Jahan may now be said to have ended, and the rest of the story, which is but a tale of another desperate and fruitless venture in the Deccan, may here be briefly related.¹⁰⁰

56. REVIEW OF THE DECCAN AFFAIRS DURING SHAH JAHAN'S OPERATIONS IN NORTHERN INDIA, 1624-25.

A retrospect of the Deccan affairs during Shah Jahan's absence of nearly a year and a half in the north seems to be essential to an appreciation of the new move on the part of the rebel prince.

The conclusion of an alliance with Bijapur by Mahabat Khan, about the middle of August, 1624, had greatly disappointed and also enraged Malik Ambar, the powerful minister of Ahmadnagar. To counteract this alliance, he entered into an offensive and defensive treaty with the king of Golconda, and then launched an attack on the state of Bijapur. Adil Shah, the reigning king, was taken unawares and offered only feeble resistance. Malik Ambar plundered the city of Bidar with impunity, and afterwards marched upon Bijapur, the capital city, which was closely besieged. In great distress, the Bijapur king sent a messenger to recall his own minister Mullah Muhammad Lari and his forces from Burhanpur, and also solicited help from the Imperialist officers in the Deccan. When the latter, accompanied by Mullah Muhammad Lari, marched to the relief of the Bijapur king,

⁹⁹ *Baharistan*, 324b, 326a-328a; *Iqbalnamah*, 239-40; *M.U.* (Beveridge), I. 452-53.

¹⁰⁰ The original authorities for this part of Shah Jahan's rebellious career having already been fully utilised by historians, a repetition of the same has been avoided in the present thesis.

Malik Ambar made an earnest appeal to them to desist from interference, but this failed. The combined army on the other hand pressed him so hard that he was soon compelled to raise the siege of Bijapur and retire towards Ahmadnagar, only to be hotly pursued by the enemy.

Reduced to extremity, Malik Ambar resolved to make a supreme effort. So, one day, when the Imperial and the Bijapur forces were lying heedless, impressed with the notion that the Ahmadnagar minister would not fight, he suddenly appeared on the border of their camp, five *kos* from Ahmadnagar. The combined host was totally defeated, the Bijapur minister being killed and the Imperial commander (Iashkar Khan) captured.

Malik Ambar, successful beyond his hopes, immediately laid siege to Ahmadnagar as well as to Bijapur, occupying all the territories as far as the frontiers of the Imperial domain in the Balaghat. He also sent a large force under Yakub Khan against the Imperial headquarters in Burhanpur, while he himself marched upon Sholapur and took it by storm.¹⁰¹

57. ALLIANCE BETWEEN SHAH JAHAN AND MALIK AMBAR OF AHMADNAGAR AGAINST THE MUGHAL EMPEROR.

At this opportune moment Shah Jahan arrived at Dewalgaoon in the Nizam-ul-mulk's territory. Needless to say, he was cordially welcomed by Malik Ambar. The brilliant successes lately won by that Abyssinian adventurer now led Shah Jahan to ally himself with his life-long enemy (against the common foe—the Mughal Emperor). The rebel prince sent his generals, Abdullah Khan and Shah Quli Khan, to aid Malik Ambar's forces engaged in the siege of Burhanpur, and he himself followed them with the rest of his adherents, encamping at Lalbagh.

Three successive assaults were made upon the fortified city in which Shah Jahan and his generals exhibited great gallantry, but the besieged, by dint of numbers and by hard fighting, held them in check, killing many officers and men.

To the intense relief of the Imperialists, news at this moment

101 For details see *Iqbalnamah*, 234-37 (*E. & D.*, VI. 414-16); *Khafi Khan*, I. 348-49; *Gladwin*, 76; *History of Jahangir*, 387-91.

arrived that Prince Parvez and Mahabat Khan had already arrived on the bank of the Narbada, on their way back to Burhanpur. Alarmed at the rapid successes achieved by Malik Ambar, the Mughal Emperor had ordered Prince Parvez, who was in Bihar, to proceed against him without delay. The prince accordingly started for Burhanpur, having given the province of Bengal in *jagir* to Mahabat Khan, who himself was summoned soon after to join the same enterprise.¹⁰²

The intelligence of the approach of his old foes was enough to unnerve Shah Jahan and make him raise the siege of Burhanpur and retire to Rohangarh in the Balaghat.

58. FAILURE OF THE ALLIANCE AND SHAH JAHAN'S RECONCILIATION WITH THE EMPEROR.

Shah Jahan's prospects were utterly ruined. Abdullah Khan, who had so long served him faithfully, now left Shah Jahan, only to be followed by many others. Worn out by the vicissitudes of fortune the rebel prince was seized with a dangerous illness on his way to Rohangarah. This completed his miseries. His proud spirit now entirely broke down, and he wrote a pathetic letter to his father, expressing sorrow and repentance and begging pardon for all his faults.

The Mughal Emperor was shocked at the miserable condition of a son whom he once had loved so dearly. "His tears fell upon the part of Shah Jahan's letter which mentioned guilt; and his crime vanished from memory" (Dow, 72).

In the midst of this returning softness, Jahangir was not altogether void of policy. He wrote an answer with his own hand that if Shah Jahan would send his sons Dara Shikoh and Aurangzib to court and also surrender the fortresses he still held—Rhotas and Asir—he would be pardoned and given the country of the Balaghat as a fief. The terms were all promptly complied with, and a peace was, after all, patched up between father and son at the end of more than three years.¹⁰³

SUDHINDRA NATH BHATTACHARYYA

102 *Iqbalnamah*, 234-44 (*E. & D.*, VI. 418); *Khafi Khan*, I, 349-50; *M.U.* (Beveridge), I. 269; *Gladwin*, 77; *History of Jahangir*, 391-92.

103 *Iqbalnamah*, 244-45, 249, 252 (*E. & D.*, VI. 418-19); *Gladwin*, 77-78; *Stewart*, 148; *History of Jahangir*, 393-95.

Two New Varieties of Old Indian Coins

AVANTI

A




Obverse



Reverse

MATHURA

B



Obverse



Reverse

Two New Varieties of Old Indian Coins

Cunningham was the first to make a thorough and systematic collection of the indigenous coins of ancient and mediæval India and study them closely. In fact, the assignment of indigenous groups of coins to definite localities in northern and central India is usually made by enquirers in this field on the basis of his general statements. Prof. Rapson emphasised the importance of these coins, both from numismatic and historical point of view.¹ Since then, the efforts of Rapson himself and several other scholars have brought to light many interesting and new specimens of these coins. The present paper is devoted to the study of new varieties of such

A.

Avantī—A.E. Sq. Size. 65. Wt. 40·3 grs.

Obverse—Male and female figures standing side by side; the latter holds some thing (? a lotus flower) in her raised right hand and her left hand seems to be grasped by the right hand of her companion; the male figure wears a necklace and has a long plaid of drapery dangling down to the feet between his legs as we find in the well dressed figures in the early Indian monuments like Bharhut; a crescent is just to the right of his head, on the left of which is a *svastika*; there appears to be an indistinct object (? a lotus flower) below the female figure. All these devices are inside a very shallow incuse which covers almost the whole of the coin blank.

1 'The attractions of the Græco-Indian class have apparently diverted the attention of most collectors from a study of the purely native ancient and mediæval coinages. But, there can be no doubt of the great historical importance of these latter.' E. J. Rapson, 'Notes on Indian Coins and Seals,' part i, *JRAS.*, 1900, p. 97.

2 The few types of coins which are noticed in the following lines are in the collection of Mr. Subhendu Singh Roy, M.A., a former student of mine. The provenances of these specimens are not known, as they were acquired from dealers of ancient coins and curios; but they have been assigned to definite localities on the basis of the general observations of Cunningham and V. A. Smith.

Reverse—The so-called Ujjain symbol in low relief, covering almost the whole of the surface—each of the four circles contains inside it a small taurine symbol.

The coin is a very interesting variety of this series. Cunningham was of opinion that the Ujjain coins were invariably round in shape and Besnagar and Eran coins which, from the stylistic point of view, belong to this series, were nearly all square. It must be observed, however, that coins of square as well as round shapes are found in the locality, and Cunningham and Smith notice both these varieties in their accounts. Cunningham's assignment of these coins was slightly modified by Smith who was inclined to ascribe them to Avanti a larger territorial unit, of which Ujjain was the capital city, as they are collected not only from Ujjain and its environs but also from a much wider area. They are almost invariably of copper and are distinguished by the presence of the curious symbol (designated by Cunningham as 'Ujjain and by Rapson as 'Mālava') on one or other of their sides. This symbol, very likely astronomical in character, is however, like the *svastika* not merely central Indian or Indian in its usage, but is to be found in very ancient objects hailing from the far distant corners of the world. The coins, other than punch-marked or cast, from this locality can be classified under three main heads, viz.

(i) The symbols type, in which 'the type is simply made up of a collection of symbols which, at an earlier period, were impressed one at a time by different punches' (Rapson), thus marking an intermediate stage in 'the development of the punch-mark system into the type system' (Rapson);

(ii) The standing figure and animal types in which the obverse side is occupied by a standing figure³ or an animal (bull, rhino or elephant) in company with other devices, such as tree within railing, solar symbol etc. and

3 The standing figure on many of these coins can be definitely identified as Siva; Cunningham in his *CAI.*, pp. 97-98, Pl. X, figs. 1-5, was in some doubt about the identification of this figure, but the attributes in his hand, viz. a staff—not a sun standard as Cunningham describes it, because the solar symbol does not seem to be joined to the staff—in his right and vase in his left and the association of the same figure with bull on the obverse side—Siva and his mount Nandī—definitely disclose his identity. Moreover, the three-headed standing figure on the obverse of fig. 6, carrying the same attributes in his hand tentatively identified by Cunningham as Mahākāla, the tutelary deity of Ujjain, adduces further evidence in support of this identification. So, Cunningham's statement that 'this coin (fig. 6) may be accepted as a single evidence of Brahmanism at Ujjain' should be modified.

(iii) The inscribed types in which there is an elephant on one side and on the other a human hand with the inscription *U-je-ni-ya* below in early Brāhmī characters of the Suṅga period.

Our coin differs from all these known varieties, in so far as its obverse side bears two human figures, a male and a female one, and the symbols which we find in association with them are mere adjuncts. The dress and attitude of the figures remind us of a male and female Yakṣa from Bhilsa (Nos. 190-A and 191-A in the archæological collection of the Gwalior State Museum) who are dressed similarly and represented in the same attitude. One cannot be sure about the identity of these two figures, for definite indications for determining it are lacking. The Ujjain symbol on the reverse is interesting on account of the fact that each of the four orbs contain inside it a taurine symbol; there are other variants of this symbol, in one of which we find the taurine is replaced by the *svastika*. The weight of this coin does not enable us to determine its denomination correctly; because it weighs a little above three grains than the scheduled weight of a quarter *Kārṣāpana*. Its approximate date is the 1st. century B. C., if not a little earlier.

B.

Mathurā—Copper (seems to be a compound metal with a small proportion of silver and brass) round—Hindu Rājā type—actual size-weight 125·5 grains.

Obverse—Three elephants—one facing front, the others to right and left shown side ways; their foreparts only are visible; riders are less distinctly shown above these (cf. Cunningham—*CAI.*, p. 89 and *JRAS.*, 1900, p. 110. figs. 9 and 10—coins of Rāmadatta and Śeṣadatta); faint traces of other symbols on the left top corner.

Reverse—A female figure to right holds an indistinct object (? a lotus flower) in her raised right hand, her left hand rests on hip; it touches the Nāga symbol very clearly visible near her feet; over this is a clearly visible Ujjain symbol of the plain variety; a crescent-like object shown sideways near her left shoulder; half portion of another symbol though partially defaced occupies the whole of the left field of the coin blank; the female figure seems to stand on an indistinct object. Traces of the issuer's name in early Brāhmī characters on the top are visible; of which *ta* and *ma* appear to be legible, the letter to the left of *ta* might have been *u*, but nothing is certain.

The specimen described above belongs to the very interesting group of coins assigned by Cunningham to Mathurā. These are the issues of the Hindu kings of Mathurā some of whose names can be clearly distinguished in many specimens.⁴ Cunningham read the names of Balabhūti, Gomitra, Brahmamitra, Rāmadatta, Puruṣadatta and Virasena. Rapson and Smith added to this list of Hindu princes of Mathurā whose names could be deciphered on their coins the names of Uttamadatta, Śeṣadatta, Bhavadatta, Viṣṇumitra, Kāmadatta, Śivadatta and Śiśucandradatta or—Candrūta. From the manuscript notes of V. A. Smith appended to his *Catalogue of Coins in the Indian Museum* which is now in the collection of the Calcutta University Library we learn that Mr. Burns has a coin of Śivaghōṣa from Mathurā where the reading of the name is beyond doubt. Most of these coins are characterised by the presence of the standing figure with its right hand upraised and its left resting on hip, with the name and title of the issuer on the top on one side⁵ while the other side is usually occupied by one elephant or three elephants as depicted in the present coin, sometimes with riders on them.⁶ Prof. Rapson remarks about the obverse that 'the characteristic type of the kings of Mathurā is a standing figure, which has been supposed to represent the god Kṛṣṇa.' (*Cambridge History of India*, vol. I, p. 526). But it is certainly a female figure as a glance at the coins of this type will prove. Cunningham, Smith, and Rapson in their respective accounts of these coins did not describe it either as male or female; but Pandit Bhagwanlal Indraji definitely describes it as a female figure in his account of the coins of the Satraps and the Hindu Rajas of Mathurā.⁷ The Satraps of Mathurā—

4 Mr. K. P. Jayaswal would ascribe most of these coins to the Bhāraśiva Nāgas; cf. *History of India, 150 A.D. to 350 A.D.*, pp. 12-15.

5 Here described after Rapson as the reverse side.—Cunningham and Smith describe it as the obverse.

6 The three elephants with riders on them are as usual very crudely depicted, cf. the coins of Rāmadatta, Puruṣadatta, and Śeṣadatta reproduced by Cunningham in his *Coins of Ancient India*, pl. VIII, figs. 16 & 17 and Rapson, *JRAS.*, 1900, p. 110, pls. 9 & 10; our specimen is the only one known to me where the elephants can be so very well distinguished; the central rider is distinct but the side ones are less so.

7 *JRAS.*, 1894, p. 553, pl. 10-14. The right and left hands of the female figures in the indigenous coins and their imitations are so very commonly depicted in this attitude that the up-raising of the right hand of the figure in these coins would not justify us in identifying it as Kṛṣṇa shown in the characteristic attitude of uplifting the Govardhana mountain.

especially Hagana and Hagamaṣa issue coins with this characteristic device on one side, the other side being usually occupied by a horse instead of an elephant. Bhagwanlal was inclined to place these Hindu Rajas after the Satraps, suggesting that the former borrowed the type of the latter; but the view of Smith and Rapson that the case was just the reverse seems to be the correct one.

The association of the three elephants with riders on one side with the peculiar symbol⁸ by the side of the female figure on the other would tempt us to attribute it to Rāmadatta; but the legend bearing the issuer's name is so illegible that we refrain from doing so. As noticed in our description of the reverse side, however, portions of the name of Uttamadatta seem to be legible; but this is also extremely uncertain.

The coin seems to be die-struck on a cast blank. Its heavy weight is comparatively rare in this series.

JITENDRA NATH BANERJEA

8 This symbol or variants of it are recognisable in the coins of Rāmadatta Puruṣadatta, Uttamadatta and Soḍāṣa; it has not been noticed by Cunningham, but Smith describes it as a conventional tree; it can be drawn thus



A variant of this symbol occurs on some Kuniṇḍa coins.

Chronology of the Sena Kings of Bengal

(based on astronomical evidences)

There are among the historians many differences of opinion about the date of Lakṣmaṇa Sena, king of Bengal. Some even go so far as to establish the existence of two Lakṣmaṇa Senas. It will be my effort in this paper to find out the time of Lakṣmaṇa Sena with the help of astronomical evidences as far as possible.

In the *Sambandha Tatvārṇava* it is stated that Lakṣmaṇa Sena's grandfather Vijaya Sena was born in Śaka 951 (=A.D. 1029). He died at the old age of ninety in Śaka 1041 (=A.D. 1119). From Nīlakaṇṭha's *Yaśodhara Vaṃśamālā* we learn that Vijaya Sena became king of Gauda in Śaka 994 (=A.D. 1072). He defeated Nānyadeva of Mithilā. It was during the reign of Nānyadeva, that a Sanskrit work was composed by him in Śaka 1019 (=A.D. 1097).¹

Vijaya Sena was also a contemporary of Coragaṅga (A.D. 1076-1147), king of Kaliṅga.

The Barrackpore plate of Vijaya Sena was inscribed in his 31st or 32nd regnal year on the occasion of a lunar eclipse in the month of Vaiśākha. Hence the date of the inscription is A.D. (1072+31 or) 1103.² From astronomical calculations we know that the 1st (2nd, according to the *Brahma-siddhānta* and *Siddhānta-śiromaṇi*) Vaiśākha in this year was the 25th March and on this day there was a total lunar eclipse visible from India. The end of this eclipse was seen at Naihati at about 10-0 P.M. on the night of the 25th March. Very likely, Vijaya Sena's inscription refers to this eclipse. The date of the month has

1 Pischel's *Katalog der Bibliothek der D.M.G.*, II, p. 8.

2 From the 'Kurchinama' of the Dattas of Aṣṭagrāma and other villages in the Mymensingh district we learn that Datta Raja along with others left the company of Vallāla out of disgust for his character to distant places in Śaka 1061 चन्द्रसुशून्यावनिसंख्यशाके बल्लालभीतः खलु दत्तराजः। vide R. C. Chakravarty, *Gauder Itihāsa.*, pt. i, p. 179). This shows clearly that Vijaya's reign could never have extended up to this date.

been read as the 7th of Vaiśākha. R. D. Banerji (*Ep. Ind.*, vol. XV) says that "the last two lines in the plate are so very indistinct that it is impossible even to copy them, at least the dated portion." The date of Lakṣmaṇa Sena's Tapandighi plate was first read as 'Sam 7', then as 'Sam 3' and now as 'Sam 2'. Similarly, the date of this newly discovered Śaktipur plate of Lakṣmaṇa Sena was first read as 'Śrāvaṇa 2' which Dr. Bhattasali now reads as 'Śrāvaṇa 7'. Hence it seems that the date read as the 7th is really the 2nd (or the 1st) of Vaiśākha. Moreover, we should remember that there were no lunar eclipses on or about the 7th of Vaiśākha between A.D. 1040 and A.D. 1200. We therefore cannot agree with the reading of Sam 61 or 62 as suggested by Dr. Bhattasali and Mr. Mazumdar. Prof. Bhandarkar suggests that Sam 61 or 62 might refer to the Caulukya Vikrama era of A.D. 1076. But in Sam 61 or 62 of this era i.e. in A.D. (1076 + 61 or) 1137 or within a few years before or after that date there was no lunar eclipse in the first week of Vaiśākha. Moreover, from what follows it will be evident that Vijaya Sena's reign could not have extended to A.D. 1138. Hence the date read as Sam 31 or 32 by R. D. Banerji seems to be more plausible.

After Vijaya, Vallāla Sena ascended the throne in A.D. 1119. His Naihati plate is dated in his 11th regnal year on the 16th of Vaiśākha on the occasion of a solar eclipse. This date is equivalent to the 9th April of A.D. 1130. On this day occurred a total solar eclipse but non-visible from India. There are several instances of grants being made on the occasion of an eclipse though the same may not have been visible from a particular locality. So this must be the eclipse mentioned in Vallāla's inscription. In Śaka 1091 (= A.D. 1169) Vallāla completed his *Dāna-sāgara*; one year before this in Śaka 1090 (= A.D. 1168) he began composing his *Adbhuta-sāgara*. Owing to his old age he was anxious to instal his son Lakṣmaṇa, who also had grown old, on the throne and this he did that very year (A.D. 1168). Vallāla left instructions to his son Lakṣmaṇa to complete his *Adbhuta-sāgara*. He died in Śaka 1092 (= A.D. 1170). The meaning of what Ānanda Bhaṭṭa states in his *Vallāla-carita* seems to be this: 'When forty plus twenty four (as *māsa* = 12, *māsad-vayam* = 24), or 64 years have elapsed i.e. in the 65th year beginning from Śaka 1028 (= A.D. 1106) Vallāla

with his wife departed from this world.’³ Therefore Vallāla died in Śaka (1028+64 or) 1092 (= A.D. 1170) as stated before.

The statement in the *Adbhuta-sāgara* on the *Saptarṣicāra* that in Śaka 1082 the Saptarṣis had already been in the Viśākhā Nakṣatra for 61 years indicates that this happened in Śaka 1082 (= A.D. 1160) during the reign of Vallāla Sena and not in the very first year of his reign (*bhuja-vasu-dasamītasāke Śrīmad Vallālasenarājyādan.ādiprabhṛti*). This meaning is supported by a passage in the *Toḍarānanda-saṃhitā-saukhya* about the position of the constellation of the Great-Bear according to the *Adbhuta-sāgara* in the Śaka year 1082 (= 1160-61 A.D.) while Vallāla Sena was ruling.’⁴

We know that from Śaka 1082 the *atītarājya-saṃvat* of Govindapāla was started. It seems that Vallāla defeated Govindapāla in Śaka 1082 (= A.D. 1160-61) and to commemorate this event the date Śaka 1082 is mentioned in several places in his *Adbhuta-sāgara*.

The *Tughu Bhārata* states that the very year in which the crown prince Vallāla captured Mithila, a son was born to him in Vikramapura and was named Lakṣmaṇa.⁵ This seems to be Vijaya Sena’s victory over Nānyadeva of Mithila as referred to in his Deopara inscription. Hence Vijaya captured Mithila in A. D. 1106 (= Śaka 1028), the year of the birth of his grandson Lakṣmaṇa Sena. The Mithila Brahmins seem to have perpetuated this date as one from which they were freed from the Buddhist rule after a long time.

That Lakṣmaṇa Sena ascended the throne in Śaka 1090 (= A.D. 1168) as already stated also follows from *Sadukti-karṇāmṛta* written by his officer Vaṣu Dāsa’s son Śrīdhara Dāsa who states there that in Śaka

3 राज्याभिषेकमारभ्य चत्वारिंशत् समा यदा ।
मासद्वयं व्यतीतं च स पञ्चषष्टिहायणः ॥
सहस्रे ऽष्टेविंशत्युते शकाब्दे पृथिवीपतिः ।
स्त्रीभिः सार्द्धं महाभाग उत्पपात दिवं प्रति ॥

4 P. V. Kane, *History of Dharmaśāstra*, vol. 1, pp. 300, 421 quoted by R. C. Mazumdar, in *IHQ.*, VII, pp. 679-689.

5 मिथिले युद्धयात्रायां बल्लालेऽभून् मृतध्वनिः ।
सद्वीं विक्रमपुरे लक्ष्मणो जातवान् असौ ॥

1127 when 37 years (*rasaika-trimśe*; *rasa* = 6, *eka* = 1, *triṃśa* = 30) of Lakṣmaṇa's reign had elapsed, he was writing this book. Hence Lakṣmaṇa ascended the throne in Śaka (1127-37 or) 1090 (= A.D. 1168) and was reigning still in Śaka 1127 (= A.D. 1205/6). Thus Vallāla ruled from A.D. 1119 to 1168 for 50 years. This supports the statement in the *Ain-i-Akbari* that Vallāla ruled for 50 years.

There is an era current in the name of Lakṣmaṇa Sena. An inscription of Śivasimha Deva, Rājā of Tirhut, is dated in Lakṣmaṇa Saṃvat 293 and Śaka year 1321, 'Śrāvāṇa Sudi 7, gurau' (i.e. Thursday). Now Śaka 1321 = A.D. 1399. In this year Caitra Śukla 1 was the 8th March. Śrāvāṇa Śukla 7 being the 125th day of the luni-solar Caitrādi year is equivalent to 10th July, A.D. 1399 and it was also a Thursday. On astronomical calculations we find that Śrāvāṇa Śukla 6 continued till 9.50 July, the previous day. This calculation has also been done by General Cunningham in his *Indian Eras* (p. 78). Hence the beginning of the Lakṣmaṇa Saṃvat is (1399-293 or) A.D. 1106. The (Hijra) San year given in this inscription has been read as 807 (= A.D. 1404). But for the same reason as stated in regard to the figure 7 in Vijaya Sena's inscription, the correct reading should be San 801 equivalent to Sept. 13, 1398 to Sep. 3, 1399. Hence this date is no proof of the existence of the Bengali San, a really mongrel era invented by Akbar or by some one before Akbar (A.D. 1556). From a verse composed by the famous Thākur Vidyāpati (as quoted by Dines Chandra Sen in his *Vaṅgabhāṣā O Sāhitya*, p. 215) we learn that in Lakṣmaṇa Saṃvat 293 and Śaka 1321, Rājā Śiva Siṃha ascended the throne. This is exactly the date of the inscription already quoted. From different inscriptions General Cunningham has shown the same beginning of the era (A.D. 1106). A difference of one or two years is sometimes observed which seems to have arisen from the same cause which makes the beginning of the Vikrama Saṃvat vary from 58 to 56 B.C. at times. From *Minhaj-i-Shiraj* we learn that Rai Lakṣmanīya (Lakṣmaṇa Sena) had been on the throne for eighty years. So Lakṣmaṇa Sena became the Crown Prince in his twentieth year (A.D. 1126) and reigned for eighty years including his period of yuvarājaship till A.D. 1206. This long life of Lakṣmaṇa Sena is supported by the statement of Halāyudha Bhaṭṭa, the spiritual adviser of Lakṣmaṇa Sena, in his *Brāhmaṇ*

sarvasva that in his boyhood he was appointed as the 'Rāja Paṇḍita,' in his youth as the minister and in his advanced age as the Chief Justice (*Dharmādhikārin*) of Lakṣmaṇa's dominion.⁶

The Madhainagar plate of Lakṣmaṇa Sena is dated on the first coronation day on the 27th day of Śrāvāṇa. The 27th day of Śrāvāṇa in A.D. 1168 was the 21st July (according to the *Brahma Siddhānta* and the *Siddhānta Śiromaṇi*). On astronomical calculations we find that a full moon occurred on the 21st July A.D. 1168. Lakṣmaṇa Sena's first coronation, therefore, occurred on the full moon day of Śrāvāṇa in A.D. 1168 during his father's life-time. The Govindapur plate of Lakṣmaṇa Sena is dated '*rājyābhīṣeka-samaye Saṃ 2.*' This seems to support the statement in the *Adbhuta-sāgara* that Vallāla Sena himself was busy with the coronation ceremony of Lakṣmaṇa as Vallāla had grown old. After the death of Vallāla in A.D. 1169/70 Lakṣmaṇa Sena had his second coronation which occurred in year 2 of his reign as stated in the Govindapur plate.

The Tapandighi plate of Lakṣmaṇa Sena is dated in Saṃ. 2, Bhādra dine 28 on the occasion of *Hemāśvaratha-dāna* ceremony. From astronomical calculations we find that the 28th day of Bhādra in A.D. 1169 was the 24th day of August on which day a total solar eclipse non-visible from India occurred. This eclipse has been wrongly recorded in Swami Kannu Pillai's *Indian Ephemeris* in two places as visible from India. This eclipse seems to be the occasion of Lakṣmaṇa Sena's gift. We have the Naihati plate of Vallāla Sena of Saṃ. 11 recording the performance of the *Hemāśvaratha-dāna* ceremony on the occasion of a solar eclipse.

The Sundarban plate of Lakṣmaṇa Sena is dated in Saṃ. 2, Māgha dine 10 equivalent to January 3, A.D. 1170. This was the Pauṣa-pūrṇimā day, on which Śrī Kṛṣṇa's Puṣyābhīṣeka ceremony and the coronation ceremony of several Hindu kings took place. As Lakṣmaṇa

बाल्ये ख्यापितराजपरिडतपदः श्वेतांशुविम्बोज्ज्वल-
च्छतोत्सिक्कमहामहत्तरपदं दत्त्वा नवे यौवने ।
यस्मै यौवन शेषयोग्यमखिलक्षमापालनारायणः
श्रीमल्लक्ष्मणसेनदेवनृपतिर्धर्माधिकारं ददौ ॥—verse 12.

Sena was a devout Vaiṣṇava, this was very likely for him an auspicious day for making a gift.

The Anulia plate of Lakṣmaṇa Sena is dated Sam. 3, Bhādra dine 9, equivalent to August 6, A.D. 1170. It corresponds to Kṛṣṇāṣṭamī or Janmāṣṭamī day in lunar Śrāvāṇa, so it was also an auspicious day for the gift.

The newly discovered Śaktipur plate of Lakṣmaṇa Sena is dated 'Sam. 3, Śrāvāṇa 2' (read by Dr. Bhandarkar) or Sam. 6, Śrāvāṇa 7 (by Dr. Bhattasali), on the occasion of a solar eclipse. On astronomical calculations we find that in Sam. 3 Śrāvāṇa 7 corresponding to July 4, A.D. 1171 there was the possibility of an eclipse occurring. But this eclipse did not occur owing to the true distance of the Sun from the node exceeding the theoretical limit of possibility. Hence the eclipse mentioned in this plate is one of those calculated ones with the possibility of the eclipse occurring. We know that 'the eclipses mentioned in inscriptions are not always observed eclipses but calculated ones.' (*Ep. Ind.*, vol. I, pp. 242-3). Hence the year read as 'Sam. 3' by Dr. Bhandarkar and the day read as 'Śrāvāṇa 7' by Dr. Bhattasali seem to be correct.

Prof. Kielhorn erroneously considered the date of coronation of Lakṣmaṇa Sena and the epoch of the Lakṣmaṇa Samvat to be A.D. 1119. He was of opinion that the conquest of Nadia took place in the eightieth year of his era i.e. in (1119 + 80 or) A.D. 1199 and took Lakṣmaṇa's 'atīta rūjya Samvat 83' occurring in the Janibigha inscription to be (1119 + 83 or) A.D. 1202, that is just after Lakṣmaṇa Sena's rule, and thus he shows that this was after the Mahomedan conquest of Bengal, quoting this inscription in support of his conclusion (A.D. 1119).

Minhaj-i-Shiraj heard in Hijra year 641 (= A.D. 1243 June to 1244 June) from two of Mahammad-i-Bukhtiyar's surviving soldiers Nizamuddin and Samsamuddin at Lakhnauti of Muhammad's raid of Bihar and Bengal when forty years after the raid had elapsed. But 40 years of the Mahomedan calculation is really 39 solar years. Hence the capture of Bihar and 'Nudiah' occurred in A.D. (1243/4-39) or A.D. 1204-5. This is also supported by a verse from Halāyudha Bhaṭṭa that in Saka 1124 (= A.D. 1202/3) the Mahomedans first entered east of

Patna in Behar.⁷ This was one of several of Muhammad-i-Bukhtiyar's incursions into Maner and Bihar previous to his organised attack on Bihar in A.D. 1204 followed by an attack on 'Nudiah' in A.D. 1205. The author of the *Riaz-us-Salatin* says that Lakṣmaṇa Sena fled to Kāmarūpa. This was perhaps falsely reported by the people to mislead Muhammad towards Kāmarūpa, and, in fact, his expedition to Kāmarūpa and thence to Tibet was disastrous. Lakṣmaṇa Sena was hiding somewhere in Bengal, probably in Vikramapura whence he retired to Jagannātha or Puri in Orissa and these whereabouts of Lakṣmaṇa Sena became known to the Mahomedans later on. In the (Kanai-Badasi) Gauhati (Kāmarūpa) rock inscription of Śaka 1127, month Caitra (= A.D. 1206) it is stated that the Turuṣkas first entered Kāmarūpa that year but was completely annihilated.⁸ After the disaster of Kāmarūpa Muhammad was assassinated in A.D. 1206. Hence, Nadia could not have been captured in A.D. 1199 as stated by Prof. Kielhorn.

Minhaj-i-Shiraz says 'Rai Lakṣhmaniya got away towards Sankanat and Bang and there the period of his reign soon came to a termination. His descendants up to this time (about A.D. 1260) are rulers in the country of Bang.'

In A.D. 1206/7 Lakṣmaṇa Sena left for Jagannātha in Orissa and at this date practically ended the Hindu kingdom of Bengal,⁹ and the 'atīta rājya Saṃvat' of Lakṣmaṇa Sena began in memory of the most generous, just and spiritual head of the country (styled 'Khalif' by the Muhammadan writer).

After Lakṣmaṇa Sena Viśvarūpa became king in A.D. 1207 and defied the Muhammadans for a few years more. That this date of Viśvarūpa is correct will be evident from the Sāhitya Pariṣad plate dated 'in his 13th regnal year on the Uttarāyana Saṃkrānti day when the

7 'चतुविंशोत्तरे शाके सहस्रैकशताब्दिके ।

वेहारपाटनात् पूर्वं तुरुष्काः समुपागताः ॥'—

—Umesh Ch. Batabyal in the monthly *Sāhitya* for Phālguna of B.S. 1310.

8 'शाक ११२७। शाके तुरगयुग्मेशे मधुमासत्रयोदशे ।

कामरूपं समागत्य तुरुष्काः क्षयमाययुः ॥'

9 'ये काले लक्ष्मणसेन नीलाचले चले । हिन्दुराज्य शेष हइल यवनेर बले ॥'

—मेलमाला quoted in R. K. Chakravarty's *Gauder Itihāsa*, pt. i, p. 210.

venerable mother witnessed a lunar eclipse.' This date is, therefore, equivalent to (1207+12) or A.D. 1219. In this year 24th December was the Uttarāyaṇa Saṃkrānti day (vide *Brahma Siddhānta* and *Siddhānta Śiromani* and also the first day of Māgha according to the custom in Orissa. A partial lunar eclipse visible from India occurred on the night of 22nd December A.D. 1219 which ended at Vikramapura (Dacca) at about 4.40 A.M. in the night. The grant seems to have been dated the next morning on the 23rd. We should remember here that there are no years between A.D. 1190 and A.D. 1250 except the year A.D. 1219 in which there occurred a lunar eclipse visible from Bengal on or about the Uttarāyaṇa Saṃkrānti day.

There are three inscriptions dated thus: *Śrīmad Lakṣmaṇa Sena devapadānām atītarājya Saṃ*'. In the yearafter the close of the reign of Lakṣmaṇa Sena'. Hence it will presently be seen that these inscriptions are dated after the reign of Lakṣmaṇa Sena i.e. from A.D. 1207. Two of these inscriptions were recorded during the reign of Aśokavalla Deva and are dated in Saṃ 51 and 74 after the expiration of the reign of Lakṣmaṇa Sena. The one of Saṃ 74 is dated 'Vaiśākha Vadi 12, Gurau.' This date is equivalent to (1207+74 or) A.D. 1281. In this year lunar Caitra began on Friday, the 21st March. On astronomical calculation we find that Vaiśākha Vadi 12 in this year was Thursday the 17th April, A.D. 1281. The date of the other inscription viz., Saṃ 51 is therefore equivalent to (1207+51 or) A.D. 1258. The correctness of the dates of these two inscriptions will be evident from another inscription dated in 'Parinirvāṇa year 1813, Kārtika Vadi 1, Budhe,' during the reign of the same king Aśokavalla Deva. The generally accepted date of Buddha's Parinirvāṇa among the Ceylonese and other Buddhists is 545 B.C. So the date in the inscription is equivalent to (1813-546 or) A.D. 1267. In this year lunar Caitra began on Friday, the 25th February. Kārtika Kṛṣṇa 1 is the 22nd day of the luni-solar Caitrādi year. On astronomical calculations we find that Kārtika Purnimā ended on Tuesday the 4.83 October, A.D. 1267. The date is, therefore, equivalent to Wednesday, the 5th October, A.D. 1267. Bhagwan Lal Indraji and Cunningham considered Saṃ 51 and 74 should be counted from the Lakṣmaṇa Saṃvat of A.D. 1106 and equivalent to (1106+51 and 74) or A.D.

1157 and A.D. 1180 and placed the other inscription of the Parinirvāṇa year 1813 between the two dates in about A.D. 1175, and thus they erroneously remarked that this inscription of Parinirvāṇa year 1813 shows the Buddha's death to have occurred in (1813-1175 or) 638 B.C. In reality these three inscriptions will clearly be seen to be dated in A.D. 1258, 1267 and 1281, all during the reign of Aśokavalla Deva.

We have the Bodhi-Gayā inscription of Buddhasena during the reign of the same King Aśokavalla Deva. This Buddhasena of the Chinda line, therefore, replaced the Cikkoras towards the end of the 13th century.

The Janibigha inscription of Jayasena, son of Buddhasena, lord of Pithi (Magadha), is dated in Saṃ 83 after the expiration of the reign of Lakṣmaṇa Sena i.e. only nine years after the last date and during Aśokavalla's reign. This date is, therefore equivalent to (1207+83 or) A.D. 1290, long after the Mahomedan conquest of Bengal and Bihar. This is quite in accordance with Tāranātha who states that Lava Sena II, Buddhasena and his son Harita Sena ruled after the Senas of Bengal, and they were subordinate to the Turuṣkas or Mahomedans. "Buddhasena, if Tāranātha is to be believed, should, therefore naturally be placed much later than A.D. 1202,"¹⁰ which we have already found to be true.

Hence it will be evident from the above that the Lakṣmaṇa Saṃvat was counted from the date of Lakṣmaṇa's birth in A.D. 1106 when Mithila was freed from the Buddhist rule and that he ascended the throne in A.D. 1168 and reigned till A.D. 1206. Thus Lakṣmaṇa Sena's *atīta rājya saṃvat* began from A.D. 1207. We also see that Kielhorn's epoch of Lakṣmaṇa Saṃvat (A.D. 1119) is incorrect which was really the coronation year of Vallāla Sena and that there were no two Lakṣmaṇa Senas.*

DHIRENDRA NATH MUKHERJI

10 N. G. Majumdar, "Patna Museum Inscription of Jayasena" *IA.*, vol. XLVIII, (1919), p. 47.

* I am grateful to Professor Probodh Ch. Sen and Mr. Jogendra Ch. Ghosh for their valuable suggestions in preparing this paper.

The "Dharmas" of the Buddhists and the "Gunas" of the Sāṃkhyas

Professor Vidhushekhara Bhattacharya has recently devoted a series of lectures to the subject of the **B a s i c C o n c e p t i o n o f B u d d h i s m .**¹ The opinions expressed by him have elicited the following remarks:

Buddhism strikes the historian of religions by two quite extraordinary features. First of all, it places man above god. Man can reach the highest position, far above the position of a god, by his own effort without the intervention of a divine power. The gods abide in heaven, they constitute a divine world (*deva-loka*), but the Super-man, the Buddha, stands far above all worlds, he is *lokottara*. At the same time, this man, who by his own exertion can attain so high a position, is deprived of a Soul. For it is most emphatically and repeatedly stated, that the Soul does not exist, neither the Soul, nor the Self (*ātman*), nor the Ego (*ahaṃkāra*), nor the personality, the individual (*puṅgala*), nor the living being (*jīva*), nor even man (*maṇuṣya*). All these are mere names, names of unreality, imagined phantoms. Man does not exist! Buddhism is *anātma-vāda*, *puṅgala-nairātmya*. Atheism, the denial of God, should not so much strike the Indian scholars as it strikes the European, for the most orthodox system of Indian philosophy, the Mīmāṃsā, is also atheistic (*anīśvara-vāda*). But the denial of the reality of man and at the same time the worship of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas who are men, not gods, is a puzzle to the Indian historian just as it is to the European.

Mr. Vidhushekhara Bhattacharya proposes a very simple solution of the puzzle. According to him Buddha, like all his predecessors, the sages of the Upaniṣads, was willing "to extinguish desire." He does not tell us what desires Buddha strived to extinguish, he says desire in general, all desires, whatsoever they should be (p. 64). Now, what is the object most desired, asks our author and answers, it is

¹ B h a t t a c h a r y a , Vidhushekhara, *The Basic Conception of Buddhism*, 1934 (Calcutta University), 105 pages.

evidently one's own life, the Self (p. 65). "Offer the kingdom of heaven and tell a man that he may accept it, but only on condition, that he shall give up his life. Certainly he would not accept the offer" (*ibid.*).

It is also evident, thinks our author, that by extinguishing the Self all desires will be *eo ipso* completely extinguished. For neither will there be any persons who could desire, nor will there be any objects which could be desired. This the author states in an unambiguous manner, he says, "thus there being neither the subject nor the object there is no room for desire to come forth" (p. 74). A more radical extinction of desire can hardly be imagined!

Such a drastic solution of the puzzle has the merit of simplicity, but I do not think it will find many believers. The author will probably be quite astonished to know that even if his *experimentum crucis* be realized and no subject at all be in existence, this does not at all mean that there will be no objects and no desires. For although there is in Buddhism no subject, there is plenty of objects desired. The objects, like everywhere, are divided in Buddhism, in those that are desired (*upādeya*) and those that are not desired (*heya*). There is a whole class of objects termed "anāsrava-dharma" which are never *heya*. Nirvāṇa is not *heya*, the Path (*mārga*) and its various divisions is not *heya*, but *upādeya*. Notwithstanding the circumstance, that there are seemingly no persons who could desire them, the desired objects exist nevertheless. The desires which Buddha wished to extinguish are *klesas* i.e., "oppressors," bad desires. Buddhism is a doctrine "of defilement and purification" (*sāṃklesa-vyavadāniko dharmah*), a doctrine of defilement by bad desires, and of purification by good desires. In the early history of Buddhism there are some instances, in which the aim of Buddhism has been misunderstood just as Mr. Bhattacharya misunderstands it. There have been some religious men who committed suicide. They thought thus to "pull down the very foundation of desire" (p. 70). But they were condemned by the church, and suicide was declared to be a crime equal to assassination. The author says (p. 74),—"desire, the cessation of which is sought for *naturally* requires for its very being both a subject and an object. Therefore while by *pudgalanairātmya* its subject is denied, it is *dharmanairātmya* that removes its object."

To this we must object first of all that *pudgala-nairātmya* is Hīnayāna and *dharma-nairātmya* is Mahāyāna. Buddhism existed seven centuries without *dharma-nairātmya* at all and continues to exist till now without it in Ceylon and other countries.

The argument of the author gives an eloquent demonstration of the fact that it is impossible to treat such problems as the basic conception of Buddhism in ignoring all results of modern research² and in forgetting the existence of history.

Moreover the argument which to our author seems so strong and so self-evident,—the argument namely that if there is neither subject nor object there can be no desires—is strong only in common life and in realistic systems, it has no strength in an idealistic system.

Thirdly, the argument that “desire naturally requires for its very being both subject and object” is contradictorily opposed to what Buddhism has always preached. It is a “natural” argument only in everyday life, but not in philosophy, still less in Buddhism. The basic conception of Buddhism is perhaps exactly the contrary of what Mr. Bhattacharya thinks it to be. For it is most clearly stated and repeated almost in every Buddhist work “*asti karma, asti phalam kārakas tu nopalabhyate.*” “Action exists, and their results” (i.e., attaining the desirable and avoiding the undesirable) “exist also, but the man who perpetrates these actions does not exist.” That does not mean that he does not exist for the man in the street, but he does not exist in Buddhist philosophy, as well as in all those great European systems of philosophy, which doubted or denied personal identity.

What then exists if man does not exist?

The same text answers “*kārakas tu nopalabhyate.....anyatra*

² The latest productions of European research in the field of *mārga* are, a master-work of Prof. L. de La Vallée Poussin, *La Morale Bouddhique* (Paris, 1927) concerned mainly with Hīnayāna, and Dr. E. Obermiller's *Doctrine of Prajñāpāramitā* (*Acta Orientalia*, XI) concerned exclusively with Mahāyāna. Although the author treats Buddhism mainly as *mārga*, these two very rich sources of information have apparently completely escaped his attention. Dr. E. Obermiller is at present issuing a further work on the same subject, viz. *Analysis of the Abhisamayālaṅkāra* (Calcutta Oriental Series).

dhārma-saṅketāt." The *dhārma*-theory exists. And what is the *dhārma*-theory? It is causality "*tatrāyam dhārma-saṅketo yad uta asmin sati idam bhavati.*" The two central conceptions of Buddhism are *dhārma* and *pratītya-samutpāda*. The *dhārma* is an Element of reality, *pratītya-samutpāda* is the causality inherent in these Elements. The one implies the other, an Element is a c a u s a l l y c o n n e c t e d Element. There are in Buddhism at least three different conceptions of *dhārma* as well as of *pratītya-samutpāda*. (Cf. my Buddhist Logic, I, p. 134.)

It is exceedingly important to realize the full compass and all the implications of the principle that the *dharmas* alone exist, but not the *dhārmīn* and consequently not the man. The overwhelming importance of this principle has escaped the attention of our author. Therefore his work, notwithstanding all its other merits, must be considered as a failure to solve the puzzle of Buddhism. It is clear that we must look for a solution of that puzzle in another direction. We must fully realize the fact that Buddhism always has been not only a religion, but also a system of philosophy. It is *jñānamārga*.

We thus come to the problem of the basic conception of Buddhism as a problem of philosophy. We will look for it not in the emotional or religious field, but in the field of ontology. This philosophic basis of Buddhism however has several times changed. It is Pluralism in Hīnayāna, Monism in Mahāyāna, Relativism in the Mādhyamika and Idealism in the Yogācāra school.

We thus must turn our attention not only to philosophy, but also to history.

When the author posits the problem of a "basic" conception of Buddhism, he apparently seeks after a conception which is never changed and is to be found as the basis of every historical or even modern form of Buddhism.

He therefore indiscriminately wanders through all sources accessible to him which go under the general stamp of some kind of Buddhism, and seeks to extract the general conception lying at their bottom. Historical treatment is quite foreign to him, unless we hold for such treatment the views expressed on pp. 1-10, where we find very interesting considerations on the store of ideas of the Vedic age

out of which Buddhism arose. This want of historical treatment inside Buddhism, this treatment of all Buddhist literature *en bloc*, is a great defect of the otherwise very interesting work.

The want of an historical point of view makes the author recoil in astonishment before three quite contradicting statements. Being glib assertions regarding all existing things, those statements bear the unmistakable stamp of being intended as basic (p. 33). The one says "everything exists" (*sarvam asti*), the other maintains "nothing exists" (*sarvam śūnyam*), the third asserts "mind only exists" (*viññāna-mātram asti*). The author tries to find some solution in patching together these quite contradictory assertions. But he fails. By themselves these views are exclusive of one another, and cannot be reconciled unless treated historically. There is absolutely no hope to develop them out of the principle of desire-extinction. But historically we find that there are three kinds of Buddhism, the one maintaining that "everything exists," the other that "nothing exists" and the third that "all things are mind only."

These are the celebrated "three swingings of the law" as stated by the Tibetan historian, the first, the middle and the last we would tell, the three periods in the development of Buddhist philosophy, the first which arose in ancient Magadha in the sixth century B.C., and still exists in Ceylon and in Burma, the second which arose in the last centuries B.C. in the Andhra country and was given a definite formulation by Nāgārjuna in the second century A.C., and the third which seems to have arisen in the North-west of the same time as the second and was given a definite formulation by Asaṅga of Peshwar in the fourth century A.D.

But how is it that these three quite different basic conceptions are all included in the general pale of Buddhism? Is there or is there not a conception still more basic which could serve as a starting point for all them?

Yes, there is such a conception. The author rightly points to the connection of *anātman* as the basic of all the forms of Buddhism. This is a conception which by itself needs not to be exclusively Buddhistic³

3 Cf. below.

but it is the basic in the sense of a starting point from which the historical development began and which has produced many modifications. Buddhism at the beginning is *anātma-vāda*, the theory of no-Soul or no-Self as the author translates the term. This is the conception from which all the later variety of theories developed and which till now is at the basis of that form of Buddhism which prevails in Ceylon and Burma, but which, according to the method of our author, must be the constant basis of all the forms of Buddhism.

Now what really means "no-Soul" (*anātma*)? And how does it come that "no-Soul" is the common basis of the three conflicting statements, "all exists," "nothing exists," "mind only exists"? It seems very difficult, even quite impossible, "to develop them out of "no-Soul" and still more difficult to identify them with it. Moreover it is not at all true that all Buddhists believe in no-Soul. For it would be very strange if "no-Soul" had become the creed of almost all Asia. If it is not the creed of its mother country India, it is the creed of Tibet, Mongolia, China, Corea and Japan. They have borrowed it from India and if Vedānta be regarded as the fundamental creed of India at present, we have the testimony of Śrīharṣa that Vedānta does not differ in principle from Mādhyamika.⁴ That means that it is also allied to Buddhism. The puzzle is great! The simple solution proposed by Mr. Bhattacharya will not help us.

We must distinguish between Buddhism as a religion and Buddhism as a philosophy.

Tradition, which we have no reason to disbelieve, maintains that Buddha himself had recourse to a double language. To the simple man he preached morality, to the educated men he taught philosophy. Buddhism has conquered the people of India and of almost all Asia by its noble and lofty moral ideals, and not by its no-Soul philosophy.

The religious masses in all Buddhist countries hardly have any idea of professing a no-Soul religion. They probably would be very much astonished if they were told that their religion is a no-Soul religion,

4 Cf. *Khaṇḍana-khaṇḍa-khāḍya*, pp. 19 and 29 (Chowkh.)-*Mādhyamikādi-vāgyavacchārāṇām svarūpāpalāpa na śakyaṭe*.

just as some amateur lady-scholars in Europe are astonished and unwilling to admit that Buddha preached no-Soul.

I therefore think that our author is on the wrong way, if he wishes to solve the puzzle of no-Soul without either making a difference between religion and philosophy or between the different periods of Buddhist philosophy. The principle of no-Soul has an altogether different meaning. Grammatically and logically it can mean either no-Soul or non-Soul.⁵ In the first case the term represents a simple negation (*prasaṅga-pratiśedha*), in the second it is a qualified negation (*pariyudāsa = apoha*) i.e. a negation which contains not alone its negative part, but also its positive counterpart. This positive counterpart is a positive assertion of those things which are the non-Soul.

Our author evidently conceives no-Soul as a simple negation (*prasaṅga-pratiśedha*) whose aim it is to “pull down the very foundation of desire” and to create a condition where there is neither subject nor object.

However on the other view, the *pariyudāsa* view, the term *anātman* means the real existence of all things except the Soul. We now understand the meaning of the first of the three dictums in which the basic conception of Buddhism has been expressed, “all exists.” It means that all elements even the past and the future, the subtle and the visible, all exist, except the Soul.⁶

How are these all really existing things called? They are called *dharmas*. What does the term *dharma* mean? It means “quality.” The qualities exist, but not the substances (*dharmīn*), not the possessors of these qualities, not the *kāraṇa*. The Soul is supposed to be a thinking substance. This substance, according to Buddhism, does not exist, but its supposed qualities, the mental phenomena all really exist. Which are they? They are first of all consciousness, pure consciousness (*viññāna*). Nobody can deny its reality. Next to consciousness nobody can deny will (*cetanā = saṃskārā*). Presentations (*saṃjñā*)

⁵ Cf. Aristotle's distinction between “non est homo justus” and “est homo non-justus.”

⁶ Cf. my *Central Conception of Buddhism*, p. 25.

⁷ The author is very gravely mistaken when he on p. 48 assumes that *citta*

or separate ideas are *dharmas*, nobody can deny their existence. There are finally feelings (*vedanā*), the feelings of pleasure and pain, no one will deny their reality. We thus have a classification of all mental phenomena in four groups (*skandhas*), but there is no-Soul, no thinking substance among them. The author quotes (pp. 63-70) the very eloquent and precise statement of this theory in the Benares sermon by Buddha himself. Buddha goes through all the Elements of body and mind and finds in them only these Elements, but no possessor of the Elements, no Ego, no Soul. This sermon and this quotation should have suggested to the author the right meaning of the term no-Soul, but he seems to have kept past its real import and discovered here the mere repudiation of desire.⁸

in Buddhism can be a synonym of *cetanā*. Synonyms are in Buddhism the three terms *cittam-mano-vijñāna* corresponding to *buddhir, upalabdhir, jñānam* of N. S. I. 1. 15. Both triads are contrasted as synonyms (*anarthāntaram*), the one in Buddhism, the other in Nyāya. In Buddhism they are *vijñāna-skandha*. But *cetanā* is the foremost among *saṃskāras*. It belongs to *saṃskāra-skandha*. Every *dharma* (element) can be envisaged as a *saṃskāra* (force) when it is considered as a cause, but *cetanā* is *saṃskāra* in the narrow sense, it is synonymous with *karma*, the driving force of the Universe. The author is also mistaken when he translates on p. 68 *saṃskāra* as "coefficient of consciousness," for such are only the *saṃskāras* of the *samprayukta* class, but by no means those of the *viprayukta* class. *Saṃskāra* is *sambhūya-kārin* i.e. coöperating force or force simply, since all forces in Buddhism are coöperative. The force $\epsilon\zeta\omicron\chi\eta\upsilon$ is *cetanā* "will." Cf. my Central Conception of Buddhism, pp. 20, 32, 100.

8 By the bye, this classification of all mental phenomena in four groups—feeling, ideas, will and pure sensation—is an extraordinary important feature of all Buddhism. It does the highest credit to the philosophers who established it, it is in the full sense of the term "psychology without a Soul." It corresponds to a quite modern achievement of European Science. It compares most favourably with some modern and old European attempts to arrive at a correct classification of mental phenomena. Such a correct classification is a very important part of psychology and if we take the development of German psychology up to the classification of Brentano, the English ones up to that of B. Russel, and French philosophy up to M. M. Bergson, we will be astonished to see that India possessed some centuries B.C. that classification which European philosophy arrives at only at a very recent date. ...

The main difference is this that the Indian classification distinguishes between pure sensation (*vijñāna-skandha*=*nirvikalpa-pratyakṣa*) and a presentation or concept (*saṃjñā-skandha*=*savikalpa-pratyakṣa*). European science (W.

These are the mental phenomena (*dharma*) as only realities according to the no-Soul theory. What about the physical world? Taking *ātmā* to mean substance,⁹ is there any substance in the physical world? Under the physical world we must understand our body and the external physical objects. Does Matter exist as a substance? No! Matter exists only as sensible qualities (*dharman*), sense-data, not as a substance possessing these qualities. The substance (*pradhāna*) does not exist, but the fundamental tactile qualities—repulsion, attraction, heat and motion (the four *mahābhūtas*) are the only fundamental physical facts which are cognizable. They are all classified as varieties of tactile “qualities” (*spraṣṭavya-dharma*). Besides these fundamental Elements of Matter (*mahābhūta*) there are other tactile Elements, and there are the sense-data, e.g., the visible, auditory, olfactory and gustatory Elements; colour, sound, odour and taste, but no substance, no Matter. Matter is *pradhāna*, this sterile, mute, indefinite, enduring, omnipresent “something” which is supposed to be Matter (*vastu*); it does not exist. On the other hand the *dharman* (mental and physical) exist, they are realities, they are the Elements of the existing world. Existing in the world are only its Elements, mental and physical, sensations and sense-data, but no enduring substances, neither Souls, nor Matter. The terms *dharma* (Element), *sat* (existent), *anitya* (unenduring), *īṣṇa* (point-instant) *saṃskṛta* (causally produced), *pratitya-samutpanna* (dependently appearing) are synonyms. It is particularly remarkable that their meaning extends equally to mental as well as physical entities. They all refer to the ultimate, simplest, minutest, subtlest Elements of existence (*dharma*).

Now what is according to our author the meaning of the term “*dharma*”? It is very important to have a clear answer on this point since, as we have seen, *anātmā* (as *paryudāsa*) simply means the *dharma*-theory (*dharma-sāṅketa*).

James, B. Russel etc.) doubts whether pure sensation (*nirvikalpaka*) can be considered as really existing, as a separate element. The Abhidharma also maintains that it is *samprayukta*, i.e., never appearing alone. But it plays an enormous part in all the history of Indian philosophy appearing there under different names, cf. my *Buddhist Logic*, I, p. 174.

⁹ Cp. Mādḥ. Vṛtti, 437—*ātma-śabdo'yaṃ svabhāva-śabdo-paryāyaḥ*.

Since the author does not attach due importance to this term, he does not dwell upon its definition, but it is clear from his occasional statements on pp. 75-76 that he accepts the interpretations of *dharma* as "thing," as even "thing round us". It is time that this utterly wrong interpretation should be once for all dismissed and forgotten. *Dharma* is exactly the contrary of a thing, a thing is *dharmin*, a *dharma* is the contrary, it is a non-thing, it is a quality, not a substance, it is the negation of a substance.¹⁰ Substance is *dharmin*, but not *dharma*.

• A thing and a thing "round us" first of all means such things as jars and cloths etc. (*ghaṭa-paṭāli*), perhaps also such as cows and horses (*aśva-gaṛāli*). But is consciousness (*viññāna*) a thing? Is it a thing round us? The will (*cetanā*), an idea (*saṃjñā*), a feeling (*vedanā*)—are they things? But they are all *dharmas*. Admitting the jars and cloths, horses and cows can be called thing, is a horse a *dharma*, is the jar a *dharma*? Let it once for all be known that the jar is not a *dharma*, but an assemblage of *dharmas*.

An assemblage of what *dharmas*? First of all, it consists of a patch of colour (*varṇa*), the lines of its figure (*saṃsthāna*), of matter, i.e. the four phenomena of repulsion, cohesion, a certain temperature and nobility. They are all *dharmas* i.e. elements of the imagined complex called a jar. These *dharmas* together constitute the jar, but the jar is not a *dharma*, because it is an assemblage of *dharmas*. The principle that all things are assemblages of *dharmas*, that they themselves are non-*dharmas*, spurious *dharmas*, that only the ultimate Elements of the empirical things possess full reality, but not all these things themselves, is at the root of all Buddhism. It is a fundamental mistake to admit that the jar is a *dharma*. The jar as *dharmin* is an illusion. A man to whom this basic theory of Buddhism is not clear cannot undertake it to solve the fundamental puzzle of Buddhist philo-

10 It is true that a quality being detached from every substance becomes a thing (*vidyamānam dravyam*), *sui generis*, or, more precisely, "something" and this would perhaps be an adequate translation of the term, it is *vastu-mātra*, an indefinite but pure reality, the ultimate, subtlest Element of reality, implying the negation of *samarūpa*, of the relation of substance to quality altogether. But that is a very special standpoint—*yo hi padārtho vidyamānaḥ sa sarvabhārah*, cf. *Mādhi. Vṛtti.*, p. 760. cf. also my *Central Conception* etc., p. 26. n. 1.

sophy. For not working what a *dharma* means, one never will arrive at a right comprehension of two other very important Buddhist terms, viz., the terms *pratītya-samutpāda*, "dependent origination" and *saṃskāra* (= *sambhūya-kāritra*), "co-operative production." *Dharmas* are infra-atomic minutest, very subtle, separate momentary unities of energy,¹¹ which are held together not by inherence in a substance, but by causal laws, laws of dependent origination. "Dependent origination" means origination of *dharmas*. Since every *dharma* (except the three eternal ones) is produced by a combination of several *dharmas* in the preceding moment, it is called *saṃskṛta* i.e. "co-operatively produced." Every *dharma* is *saṃskṛta* as a product and *saṃskāra* as a cause. Without knowing what a *dharma* is, it is quite impossible to have a correct and adequate idea of what *pratītya-samutpāda* and *saṃskāra* are in early Buddhism.

In the later periods the meaning of these three fundamental terms has shifted, but shifted simultaneously in a parallel change. When the meaning of *dharma* in the Mādhyamika school has changed, the meaning of *pratītya-samutpāda* and of *saṃskāra* has also changed. The same happened in the Yogācāra school.

Thus the basic conception of Buddhist philosophy is *anātma*, but *anātma* in the sense of *reality* of all *dharmas* among which no *ātman* is to be found. Buddhism is a system of philosophic Pluralism, *anātma-vāda* means at the beginning the same as *sarvāstivāda*, the reality of all Elements (*dharmas* among which no-Soul and no substance, no things are to be found, it is a pluralistic and realistic psychology without a Soul; *anātma-vāda*, *sarvāsti-vāda*, *dharma-vāda* or *dharma-saṅketa* means the same. It is also synonymous with *pratītya-samutpāda-vāda* or *saṃskāra-vāda*, because every *dharma* can be a *saṃskāra* and is *pratītya-samutpanna*.

We thus can consider the following expressions as synonymous and

¹¹ Since the four *mahā-bhūtas* are not substances but forces (repulsion, attraction, heat and motion) it is clear that the Buddhist atoms cannot be like the atoms of the Vaiśeṣikas, absolutely hard and indivisible particles of matter. The *saṃghāta-paramāṇu* although consisting of 8 parts is not larger or heavier than the simple one, just as a needle will not become heavier if it becomes hot, i.e. if 'atoms' of the element heat are added to it or get intensified in it.

referring to the basic conception of Buddhism: *anātma-vāda* = *dharmavāda* = *dharmatā* = *dharmasanketa* = *pratitya-samutpāda-vāda* = *saṃskāra-vāda* = *saṅghāta-vāda* = *bauddha-matam*.

Whosoever wishes to translate *dharmā* in whatsoever a language must choose a phrase which would imply (i) plurality (*saṅghāta*) and (ii) denial of substance. The term "thing" misses the point because it implies rather the assertion by no means the denial of *dharmā*. Moreover, and this is the main point, it must be applicable to the physical as well as to the mental domain. The term "element" seems to me preferable, although of course it is also not quite free from defects.¹²

Basic ideas of Sāṃkhya and Buddhism compared

We will perhaps better understand the basic ideas of Buddhism if we compare them with the basic ideas of the Sāṃkhya system. The difference between them is great, but there is unquestionably a family likeness. Just as every empirical thing or every living being, according to Sāṃkhya, is an assemblage of minutest infra-atomic Elements, more forces than substances, which are called "qualities" (*guṇa*), just so in Buddhism the empirical things and living beings are assemblages of momentary infra-atomic, very subtle unities or forces, which are also called "qualities" (*dharmas*).

It is a fundamental feature of the Indian mind in general and a firm tradition of all Indian science to be always on the search after invisible, subtlest, infra-atomic, dynamical elements or forces, whose operation produces the visible phenomena of our experience.

What are the so-called "oppressors" or *kleśas*. Are they really oldest Indian science? Are they really "wind, bile and phlegm," as

12 Prof. H. Jacobi has rallied to the translation of the term *dharmā* as an "element of existence," "Seins element," cf. his *Triṃśikā-vijñapti* "übersetzt von Hermann Jacobi (Stuttgart, 1932). Prof. Sylvain Lévi's rendering of *dharmā* as "essence" (cf. *Matériaux Vijñaptimātra*, Paris 1932) is not very much different, it hits the right point, namely that it is *dharmā* as opposed to *dharmā*. Remains it for Frenchmen to decide whether such expressions as "les essences de la cruche" or "les essences de la personnalité" would be found equally convenient phrasing. We want a term that would be equally applicable to the mental as well as to the physical domain and would express plurality.

vāta-pitta-kapha are often translated? These are only conventional names for very subtle infra-atomic three forces whose equipoise produces health.

What are the four "Great Elements" of Matter? Are they really what their names imply: earth, water, fire and air? They are the forces of repulsion, attraction, heat and mobility, each of them some subtlest energy manifested in tactile phenomena.

What are the elements of grammar? There are invisible suffixes, the so-called *krips*, which are active forces forming words.

What are the *dharmā-dharman* or *karma* which is even called *adr̥ṣṭa*? It is an invisible force of our former deeds.

What are the so-called "oppressors" or *kleśas*. Are they really "love, hatred and infatuation," as they usually are translated or are they something quite different? One must consider that the extinction of *kleśas* not only makes a man dispassionate, but converts him into a Buddha, hence it converts phenomenal life into the absolute. The *saṃkleśas* are the 12 *nidānas*¹³ or phenomenal life as contrasted with the absolute and produced by transcendental illusion (*avidyā = mukhyā bhrāntiḥ*). The *kleśas* are therefore transcendental forces creating and controlling phenomenal life (*saṃsāra*).

What are the *guṇas* of the Sāṃkhya system? Are they really 'goodness,' 'passion' and 'darkness' as *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas* are sometimes translated? They are infra-atomic quanta of three different energies whose interplay produces the phenomenal world, both physical and mental.

Now what are the *dharmas* of the Buddhists? As already stated *dharma* means the same as *guṇa* i.e. quality.¹⁴ What is hidden under this designation? There is no mystery, the whole catalogue containing 75 items is presented to you. They first of all are 5 sense-organs, 5 corresponding categories of sense-data and that is all for the physical world. No mysterious Matter! For the mental world there is consciousness as pure consciousness and corresponding to it mental pheno-

13 Cf. *Madhyāntav*, p. 29 ff. (ed. Tucci).

14 This meaning has been established by Dr. B. Seal in his *Positive Sciences of the Hindus*.

mena, ideas, feelings, will and different kinds of emotions or mental forces (*saṃprayukta-saṃskāra*), their list contains 46 items.

There are other forces which are general, neither physical nor mental (*rūpa-citta-viprayukta-saṃskāra*), e.g. the forces of production and destruction applicable to both spheres. They are therefore neither specially mental nor specially physical, but general. Their list contains 14 items. Space (*ākāśa*) is a *dharma*. Time, however, is not a *dharma*. What does it mean that it is not a *dharma*? It means that it does not exist. Duration does not exist. Time is past, present and future. The past does not exist, because it is past. The future does not exist, because it is future. Remains the present moment which alone exists, but it also does not exist separately from the thing existing at that moment. A *dharma* is a separate (*pr̥thag*) thing, a Thing-in-itself (*svalakṣaṇa*). Thus space, as empty space, is a *dharma*, but time is not. The full catalogue of *dharmas* contains 75 items in the Sarvāstivāda school.


They are alone the *dharmas*; there is apparently no mystery, there ought to be no mystery. The mystery comes from the fact that the *dharmas* are physical and mental at the same time just as the *guṇas* of the Sāṃkhīyas, they are the ultimately real. Their synonym is the real (*sat*). The real lying at the bottom of every phenomenon, whether physical or mental, is a *dharma* and this is a mystery! *Sthīramati* says that in Hīnayāna a *dharma* is the ultimate reality (*pariniṣpanna*).¹⁵ *Vasubandhu* recording the controversies which raged in the schools on the problem of the essence of *dharmas*, says that they are something very deep or subtle.¹⁶ They are also infra-atomic, dynamic unities of forces or Elements, whose inter-dependence according to casual laws (*pratītya-samutpāda*) constitutes the illusive objects of our phenomenal life.¹⁷ Sāṃkhīya admits besides the moving *guṇas* a motionless (*niṣkriya*) Soul. This Soul is degraded in Buddhism, it is converted into simple consciousness (*vijñāna*) which is also a *dharma*, an Element having the same sense as all other Elements. In Buddhism as well as in Sāṃkhīya the human personality consists of

15 *Madhyāntav.*, p. 27. (ed. Tucci).

16 *Ab. Kośa*, V. 27.

17 Cf. below, p. 27 (a) n. 3.

The "Dharmas" of the Buddhists and the "Gunas" of the Sāṃkhyaas



an infinite number of point-instants of *guṇas* or *dharmas* which are held together in Sāṃkhya by a pervading Matter (*pradhāna*) and an eternal Soul in Buddhism exclusively by casual laws (*pratītya-samutpāda*).

The individual, according to Sāṃkhya, consists of a Soul enveloped for the time of *saṃsāra* in Matter, which consists of eternally moving minutest elements (*guṇas*) of three different kinds. The process of the Deliverance of the Soul from the embracement of Matter consists in the gradual purification and pacification of the *guṇas* through knowledge. When absolute knowledge is attained, the Soul alone remains in its genuine purity and freedom.

The Buddhist conception of an individual can be imagined as a large circle filled with point-instants of different kinds. Inside the large circle of point-instants united by causality, there is no Soul, but a small island filled with *anāsrava-dharma*, or Elements which are eternally tranquilised, motionless and pure. They never will be sullied by passion and turmoil.

As long as the process of purification from desire goes on, the turmoil of moving Elements gradually subsides and gets pacified. Finally all will become *anāsrava*. Nirvāṇa will be attained.

In both systems, as we have seen, phenomenal life is represented as a bondage and as a beginningless commotion of minutest infra-atomic particles charged with some energy. In both systems the theory of salvation offers many points of similarity. In both systems there is at the bottom of every personal life an element of purity which is concealed and enveloped by the commotion of the impurity of phenomenal life. In both systems this life is regarded as a burden (*duḥkha*) and liberation from it is the aim of the doctrine. In both systems this is expressed in the formula of the "four principles of the saint" (*catvāri āryasatyāni*). Remaining faithful to its pluralistic principles, Buddhism has replaced the pure Soul of the Sāṃkhya by a plurality of pure elements (*anāsrava-dharma*) and by a complete extinction (*nirodha*) of all life in Nirvāṇa. The annexed chart can to a certain degree represent the comparative outlook of both systems very far from being "things," still less the things "round us," as jars, cows and horses etc., and the *dharmas* are something "very deep", some-

thing “inexplicable,”¹⁸ something transcendental, the ultimate reality that can be ascertained by philosophic analysis. They can be characterized just as the *guṇas* of the Sāṃkhyas are characterized in an old document,¹⁹ “their ultimate reality transcends the domain of the sensible; the objects which are contained in the domain of the sensible are Illusion,²⁰ they are quite in one.”

In Mahāyāna “the ultimate reality which transcends the domain of the sensible” is quite different. Mahāyāna is monistic, the ultimate reality is there called “*pariniṣpanna*,” the ultimate or perfect reality. “How is a unity (i.e. Monism) converted into a plurality?” asks Sthiramati²¹ and answers “plurality is mere illusion.”²² Only for those philosophers “who assume that the *dharmas* are ultimate realities, only for them, would it be a contradiction to maintain unity and plurality at the same time. But for those who do not assume the ultimate reality of *dharmas*,²² scripture must not be interpreted in that sense.” It is clear from this passage that Sthiramati opposes Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna as Pluralism and Monism. It is also clear that in Hīnayāna the *dharmas*

18 *draṅ-bar-mi-nus-so = bśud-par-mi-nus-so*, cp. Ab. Kośa, I. 27, M.de La Vallée Poussin's note in his translation and my Central Conception etc., p. 91.

19 *Vyāsa-bhāṣya* quotes this couplet from *Ṣaṣṭitantra*,—

गुणानां परमं रूपं न दृष्टिपथमृच्छति ।

यत्तु दृष्टिपथं प्राप्तं तन्मायेव सुतुच्छकम् ॥

20 Prof. R. Garbe writing in 1892 thought it a great merit on the part of Prof. H. Oldenberg to have established that early Buddhism is realistic. He says “the world of the objects is as real for Buddha as it is real for Kapila” (cp. Introd. to his trans. of Sāṃkhya-tattva-kanmudī, p. 10). This would imply, if taken literally, the reality of objects or things, of jars and cows etc. However these objects are illusions (*śūnya*). Oldenberg had the right impression of the realism of Hīnayāna as compared with the illusionism of Mahāyāna, but the *dharma*-theory was quite unknown to him, he confounded the reality of *dharmas*, i.e. of mere Sense-data with the reality of things (*dharmas*). He did not realize the import of the principle *sarvam asti*, he did not know that it refers to the reality of the 12 *āyatana*s alone, (cp. my Central Conception etc., p. 90) and the 12 *āyatana*s are a classification of Elements alone, not of things. He did not know the difference between *dharma-nairātmya* and *puṅgava-nairātmya*.

21 कथमेकं विचित्रं य cp. *Madhyāntav.*, p. 26.

22 *Ibid.*—योहि (i.e. the Mahāyānist) धर्मावशावम परितिष्यन्नमिच्छति.....

were considered as a plurality of u l t i m a t e realities, as a plurality of *parinīṣpanna* Elements while in Mahāyāna all this plurality is merged into one single monistic ultimate reality which alone is designated by the term *parinīṣpanna* and its synonyms *tathatā*, *bhūtakoti*, *animittatā*, *paramārthatā*, *dharmadhātutā*, *śūnyatā* etc.

A long time since, when comparatively little was known of Buddhism, Professor Hermann Jacobi made an attempt to deduce some basic Buddhist ideas out of the Sāṃkhya system.²³ He compared the *tattvas* of the Sāṃkhyas with the 12 *nidānas* of Buddhism and noticing some points of similarity he thought it possible to deduce the latter out of the former. This attempt, in the form in which it was initially proposed, has been dropped, but it became the starting point of a long discussion in which a number of the leading scholars of Europe participated. It is now more or less generally admitted that the Sāṃkhya system preceded Buddhism in time and constitutes its philosophic basis. It is impossible to speak about the basic ideas of Buddhism without comparing it with Sāṃkhya ideas. According to Prof. R. Pischel²⁴ "theoretical Buddhism reposes entirely on Sāṃkhya Yoga," "it has borrowed from Sāṃkhya-Yoga almost everything." "Buddha has converted into a religion what his teachers had taught before as a philosophy." Prof. H. Oldenberg who at first was unwilling to admit so powerful an influence, accepted later on this opinion in a more moderate form. He thought that "we have ample right to call Sāṃkhya that doctrine which appears as the remote, if not the nearest, background of the fundamental ideas of Buddhism."²⁵ Prof. R. Garbe²⁶ fully rallies to this opinion and lays stress upon the fact that Sāṃkhya preceded Buddhism not in the shape of detached ideas, but as a complete, closed system. He enumerates²⁷ seven points of detail where the similarity seems

23 Der Ursprung des Buddhismus aus dem Sāṃkhya-Yoga, gött. Nachrichten, 1896, pp. 1 ff., continued in a further article "Ueber das Verhältniss der Buddhistischen Philosophie zum Sāṃkhya-Yoga und die Bedeutung der Nidāna, ZDMG., 52, 1 ff.

24 Leben, u. Lehre des Buddha, seconded by Lüders, pp. 22, 62, 65, 67, 69, 75.

25 Die Lehre der upanishaden u. die Anfänge des Buddhismus (1915), p. 318.

26 Die Sāṃkhya Philosophie, 2 (nd) ed. p. 10.

27 Der Mondshein der Sāṃkhya Wahrheit (München, 1892) pp: 9-10.

to him quite convincing. Under point No. 5 we meet here the *anātman* which thus proves to be, in its origin, a Sāṃkhya and not a Buddhist idea. Oldenberg also makes the following remarks:—“When Buddhism repeatedly and constantly laid great stress on the changing and fleeting character of the world process,—the constant change also of feelings, ideas etc. in which no self (*ātman, attā*) is contained,—this changing life lying entirely in the domain of Non-Self,—this was a Sāṃkhya doctrine.” M. E. Senart²⁸ assumed a still greater influence of Sāṃkhya on Buddhism. He however limited it to the practical teaching of the path to Salvation and made Buddhism more dependent on the Yoga than on Sāṃkhya. He maintains that the Yoga shared indeed the speculative doctrines of the Sāṃkhya, but Buddhism could stand very near to Yoga without sharing its philosophy (*tout en divergeant sur les philosophèmes purs*). Senart thought that early Buddhism was not philosophic (*incapable d’im effort de logique suivie et consciente*), but he could not think otherwise since at that time the *dharma*-theory was quite unknown to him and consequently the meaning of *pratitya-samutpāda* and its contrast with the *pariṇāmarāda* of Sāṃkhya could not be understood. Indeed he assumed the identity of these theories. We thus have the authority of Professors Jacobi, Oldenberg, Pischel and Garbe in favour of the opinion that the doctrine of *anātman* was initially a Sāṃkhya idea.²⁹ Later on in the run of centuries it had lost its unorthodox character. Of course the *anātma* doctrine is for them not much more than the fleeting and constantly changing character of feelings, ideas and notions. The *dharma*-theory, in its full extent, was also completely unknown to them and the meaning of

28 *Bouddhisme et Yoga*, in *Revue de l’histoire des religions*, v. 42, 1900, pp. 345 ff.

29 It means in Sāṃkhya just as it means in Buddhism exactly the same, namely “everything except the Soul,” it is a *pratyutāsa*-negation, an affirmation of the reality of the non-soul; whatsoever exists, i.e. changes and lives, belongs to the domain of the non-Soul, “das alles jenes Pliessen ganz und gar im Bereich des Nicht-Selbst verläuft” (Oldenberg, *Buddha*,² pp. 331-332). Of course the Sāṃkhya System assumed a separate lifeless Soul, this Soul being *niṣkriya* was rejected by the Buddhists just as they rejected *ākāśa*, *pradhāna*, time, space and other imagined entities.

dharma as a technical term appeared as a riddle.³⁰ Nor was the *guṇa* theory of Sāṃkhya sufficiently understood, nay even the translation of the terms *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas* remained fluctuating and a series of hypotheses on their meaning and their origin, mythological and foreign, were proposed.³¹ It seemed also a contradiction that the Hindus themselves should Sāṃkhya for an eternalist doctrine (*sāśvata-vāda*). Indeed the Hindus assume that Sāṃkhya is diametrically opposed to Buddhism. They admit the existence of two "radical doctrines" (*ekānta-darśana*) in principle opposed to one another, the one maintaining that "everything is eternal" (*sarvam nityam*),³² the other, on the contrary, asserting that "everything is non-eternal (*sarvam anityam*)",³³ the first is Sāṃkhya, the second is Buddhism. This contradiction disappears when one realizes that the difference refers to the theories of causations adopted by each system. In Sāṃkhya everything is eternal since it represents the manifestation of one eternal Matter; although these manifestations are eternally-changing (*nitya-pariṇāmin*), they are eternally the same in their material cause (*kāraṇa-avasthāyām*).³⁴ In Buddhism there is no eternal Matter, the manifestations are detached (*prthag*) momentary *dharma*s, appearing in functional interdependence upon one another (*pratītya-samutpāda*).³⁵ Thus it is that notwithstand-

30 The first systematic attempt to understand this term was made by Mrs. Magdalene and Wilhem Geiger, in *Pāli Dharma* (Munich, 1921).

31 The *guṇa* theory as the main or central Sāṃkhya doctrine has been fully disclosed by Dr. B. N. Seal in his "Positive Sciences of the Hindus" and by Prof. S. N. Dasgupta in his "Study of Patañjali" (Calcutta, 1920) and other works.

32 Nyāya-sūtra, IV. 1. 29.

33 Ibid., IV. 1. 25.

34 In Sāṃkhya virtually there is no intrinsic difference among things, *sarvam sarvātmakam*, the change of the collocation of atoms only changes potentiality into actuality. Just as in Leibnitz's system every monad is the mirror of the universe, just so in Sāṃkhya every point instant is "identical" with the eternal and ubiquitous whole. Cp. Dasgupta, *The Study of Patañjali*, p. 79.

35 These two opposite and contrasting theories, implying the one as the negation of the other have nevertheless often been identified as long as the *dharma*-theory was not understood. In the Yogācāra system *pratītya-samutpāda* is retained only by name, it has become *pariṇāma-vāda* as is quite clear from the initial passage of the *Triṃśikā*. The Chinese tradition is conscious of the difference and calls it *ālaya-pratītya-samutpāda*, cp. Demioville, in *Materiaux Vijñapti-mātra*, p. 34, but virtually it is *pariṇāma-vāda*.

ing the unmistakable affinity between the *guṇa*-theory and the *dharma*-theory the two systems to which they belong and in which they play the leading part are diametrically opposed to one another, the one being called Evolution (*pariṇāma-vāda*), the other Functional Interdependence (*pratītya-samutpāda-vāda*). Here as always the history of philosophy evolves by contrasts. It is a general rule in the history of philosophy that every new departure starts in opposition to reigning ideas, but at the same time it creates the new on the basis of the old. Causation as Functional Dependence (*pratītya-samutpāda-vāda*) is unquestionably the new departure of Buddhism. It implies the negation of *pariṇāma-vāda*, which is the Sāṃkhya theory of Causation, asserting "identity" (*tādātmya*) between cause and effect. The first is *a-sat-kārya-vāda*, the second is *sat-kārya-vāda*. But the *dharma* theory of the Buddhists seems only to be a far going modification of the *guṇa*-theory of the Sāṃkhya, a modification made necessary by the change in the theory of Causation. The *guṇas* are Elements or qualities which are 'identical' with Matter; the *dharmas* are separate Elements.³⁶ Whatsoever the indirect antecedents of the *guṇa*-theory may have been in the Upaniṣads or in mythology, its definite aim in the Sāṃkhya system is to bridge over the gulf between Mind and Matter. According to this theory a physical phenomenon and a mental one are equally composed out of minutest infra-atomic quanta of three different stuffs or forces, the Intelligence (or nervous) stuff, Energy-stuff and Inertia-stuff. The first is predominant in a mental phenomenon, the last in physical one. In an idea or a feeling, e.g., the nervous stuff is more active, matter or inertia is in abeyance. In a plant or in a stone the last is predominant, the first is in abeyance. Energy is constantly being liberated and absorbed. There is therefore no stability at all, everything is moving and instantaneous (*kṣaṇika*). But although being momentary flashes of instantaneous infra-atomic quanta charged with some energy, the *guṇas* and the phenomena composed by them are said to be ubiquitous and eternal (*vibhu, nitya*). As already stated they are eternal in their causal or potential condition (*kāraṇāvacasthāyām*) as

³⁶ *Sarvam pṛthag, sarvam nānā, na kaścit eko bhāvo vidyate*, cp. N. Sūtra, IV, 1, 34.

absorbed in an eternal, primordial Matter. At that early period of Indian philosophy when the *guṇa*-theory was being philosophically founded, it is more than probable that the atomic structure of Matter must have been discussed.³⁷ It is probable that at that early epoch there was a division of opinion. The Jains and some pre-Vaiśeṣika system joined the Materialists and began to assume indivisible atoms, whereas the Sāṃkhyas and some pre-Buddhist philosophers decided for infinite divisibility. Although later on the Buddhists assume the existence of atoms, they deny their indivisibility. Their atoms are therefore no atoms at all, they are *dharmas* i.e. "qualities" absolute qualities, qualities without any stuff. That the Buddhist atoms cannot be any stuff is a direct consequence from the character of their four fundamental Elements of Matter (*mahā-bhūta*). Although called earth, water, fire and air, it is clearly stated that these are only conventional designations and that the four forces of repulsion, attraction, heat and motion are meant by these terms. V a s u b a n d h u states that only the last of these names is adequate, because the Sanskrit term *sumīraṇa* means both air and motion. Just as B e r k l e y thought that space is presented to us in our sensuous experience of "resistance" to organic movement, just so the Buddhists at an early date defined matter as mainly the phenomenon (resistance of *sapratighatva*). At the early date Buddhism contained already the germs of that Idealism into which it later on developed. At that date Hīnayāna or Sarvāstivāda maintained in general that all realisable ideas must be either concrete data of sense (*bāhya-āyatana*) or concrete data of invalid consciousness (*abhyantara-āyatana*). Substance, whether Spirit or Matter, was denied every separate reality. Both categories, the inward as well as the outward data, were called *dharmas* i.e. non-substances, absolute qualities. This designation evidently also aimed at bridging over the gulf between Matter and Mind, not however by assuming an equal composition, but by assuming their

37 Prof. H. J a c o b i (art. Atomism in ERE.) attaches much importance to the silence of Pāli Suttas and to the denial of atomism by the Vedāntins, Mahāyānists and Sāṃkhyas. But this denial refers to the Vaiśeṣika, eternal atoms and does not refer to those systems who had a dynamic or semi-dynamic theory of Matter. The *tanmātras* are evidently also some kind of atoms or infra-atoms.

parallelism, their equal status.³⁸ This psycho-physical parallelism was indeed quite natural, because according to the Buddhist theory of Causality (*pratītya-samutpāda*) there is a general parallelism between all elements of existence (*asmiṃ sati idaṃ bhavati*). Moreover, in marked opposition to the Sāṃkhya tenet that everything is eternal, because Matter is eternal, the Buddhists maintained that nothing is eternal (*sarvam anityam*), because substance does not exist. Existent are only “qualities,” i.e., realisable data of sensuous experience and of inward consciousness (*dharmas*). Therefore the terms Element (*dharma*) and the term “existent” (*sat*) have become synonyms. Thus although *dharma* is a general term embracing both categories of data, assumes a separation between Mind and Body, but only because it assumes a separation between all Elements in general (*sarvam pṛthag*), there is no identity between them at all, and no inherence (*samavāya*) in whatsoever a substance. The idea which the Buddhists made of an Element as an external *dharma* is most clearly seen from the manner in which they explain the phenomenon of acceleration in a falling body.³⁹ Every body is composed of “atoms” or infra-atomic quanta of four kinds of energy: resistance, attraction, heat and motion. They all are present in every body, in the same proportion, but their intensity (*utkarṣa*) can be different. When a body falls, its quanta of motor energy are intensified. At every moment the falling body is otherwise composed. It is clear from this that the *dharmas* are not “things,” but “elements” of things

Dharma, the basic conception of Buddhism

That the conception of *dharma* is the basic conception of Buddhism is most clearly and pregnantly expressed by the Buddhists themselves in their old *credo*—*Ye dharmā hetuppabharā*..... This formula which professedly contains the shortest statement of the essence and spirit of Buddhism, declares that Buddha discovered the Elements (*dharmā*) of existence, their causal connection (*hetu = pratītya-samut-*

³⁸ This psycho-physical parallelism is called by Vasubandhu, Ab. Kośa, I, 45 तद्विकारविकारित्व ।

³⁹ Cp. A b. K o ś a, II. 46 and my Buddhist Logic, I. 101.

pāda) and a method to suppress their efficiency for ever (*nirodha*). We have seen that *dharma*, *pratītya-samutpāda* and *anātma* are only different expressions of one and the same idea of philosophic pluralism which is also called *skandha-vāda*. This Buddhist *credo* embraces all the three varieties of Buddhism with some difference of implication. Generally the phrase means—Buddha established the Elements (*Ye dharmā*) which are causally produced (*hetu-ppabhavā=pratītya-samutpannā*) and which are extinguished (*nirodha*) in Nirvāṇa. In Hīnayāna it implies that all Elements are inter-related and real. That is the genuine *pratītya-samutpāda*, Pluralism. In the Mādhyamika system it implies that all Elements, being interdependent, cannot be intrinsically real by themselves (*svabhāvena*), they are relatively real (*svabhāvena śūnya*). This is the *śūnyatā-pratītya-samutpāda* or *advaya-vāda*, Monism. In the Yogācāra-system a further implication is added, viz., “all Elements are relative, except one, viz. Pure consciousness (*vijñapti-mātratā*) which is Absolute. This is the *ālaya-pratītya-samutpāda*, Idealism.

As to the intrinsic philosophic value of early Buddhism, in that form in which it was shaped in the school of the Sarvāstivādīs, Professor Stanislav Schayer delivers himself in the following words:—

“This system is by itself a very important subject of scientific, investigation and can be placed on the same level as the great speculative systems of Greece, of the Christian middle ages and of modern Europe.”⁴⁰

This testimony from an authoritative pen which has the right to speak in the name of European philosophy can be supplemented by the opinion of a man who without being a professional philosopher had nevertheless a life long intimacy with Buddhist ideas to the study of which he devoted his life. He thus summarizes the basic idea

40 Stanislav Schayer, *Ausgewählte Kapitel aus der Prasannopadā* (Krakow, 1931), p. XII.

of Buddhism which, we have seen, is the *anātma*-theory, as the pluralistic *dharma*-theory but not *anātma* as extinguishing of desire.

“Buddhism,” says he, “stands alone among the religions of India in ignoring the Soul. The vigour and originality of this new departure are evident from the complete isolation in which Buddhism stands in this respect, from all other religious systems then existing in the world. And the very great difficulty which those European writers who are still steeped in animistic preconceptions find in appreciating or even understanding the doctrine, may help us to realize how difficult it must have been for the origination of it to take so decisive and so far-reaching a step in philosophy and religion at so early a period in the history of human thought.....The doctrine of impermanence of each and every condition, physical or mental; the absence of any abiding principle, any entity, any *sub*-stance, any “Soul” is treated from the numerous points of view from which it can be approached, in as many different Suttas.”⁴¹

We do not at all intend to minimize the importance of Buddhist ethics, of *mārga*, of “extinguishing of desire.” But this ethical doctrine, if deprived from its philosophic or ontological foundation, is more or less similar in many systems. The author himself lays stress upon the fact that its aim is the same as the aim of the sages of the Upaniṣads. The originality of Buddhism consists in its *anātma-vāda*, and *anātma-vāda* is the same as *dharma-vāda*. The other name of *dharma-vāda* theory is *pratītya-samutpāda-vāda*, and that of *pratītya-samutpāda-vāda* is *saṃskāra-vāda*. The terms *dharma*, *pratītya-samutpāda* and *saṃskāra*, if rightly interpreted, bear witness to that powerful effort of the human mind which was produced early in the history of India and has received the name of Buddhism.

Th. STIERBATSKY

41 T. W. Rhys Davids, *Dialogues* v. II, p. 242.

MISCELLANY

The Candragupta of Vāmana's Kāvyaḷaṅkāra-sūtras

The verse, viz.,

सोऽयं संप्रति चन्द्रगुप्ततनयः चन्द्रप्रकाशो युवा

जातो भूपतिराश्रयः कृतधियां दिष्ट्या कृतार्थश्रमः,

quoted by Vāmana in the *Kāvyaḷaṅkāra-sūtras* to illustrate *ojas* has been believed to refer either to the Gupta emperors Candragupta and Samudragupta, and the Buddhist philosopher Vasubandhu, or to the Mauryas Candragupta and Bindusāra, and to Bindusāra's minister Subandhu. In this note what I wish to point out is the striking similarity that exists between this verse and the third stanza of Candra's posthumous Iron pillar inscription at Mehrauli.¹ On comparison of the two we find that

(a) both the verses are in the शार्दूलविक्रीडित metre;

(b) both the verses use the adjective चंद्रप्रकाश in some form or other. The Mehrauli inscription puts the idea in the words समग्रचन्द्र-सदृशीं वक्त्रश्रियं विभ्रता ;

(c) both the verses are in some way connected with Candragupta, and

(d) both the verses are प्रसादगुणयुक्त.

From these agreements, it seems that these two verses are the composition of one and the same poet, and that the Candragupta mentioned by them is one and the same person. The Mehrauli pillar inscription was most probably composed by a poet at the court of Candragupta's son, and so also probably the drama containing the verse quoted by Vāmana. The inscription was written to exalt the father of the patron, and the drama to sing the glories of the patron himself.

DASARATHA SARMA

प्राप्तेन स्वभुजाज्जितं च सुचिरं चैकाधिराज्यं क्षितां
चंद्राह्नेन समग्रचन्द्रसदृशीं वक्त्रश्रियं विभ्रता ।
तेनायं प्रणिधाय भूमिपतिना भावेन विष्णोर्मति
प्रांशुर्विष्णुपदे गिरौ भगवतो विष्णोर्ध्वजः स्थापितः ॥

Origin of the Pratihāra Dynasty (A Reply)

In the previous issue of the *Indian Historical Quarterly* (vol. X, p. 583) Mr. Dasaratha Sarma, while criticising my article on the "Origin of the Pratihāra Dynasty" remarks—"He (D. C. Ganguly) thinks that the terms *Gurjareśvara*, the king of Jurz, etc. do not signify the kings of the Pratihāra dynasty. But as regards this, he would change his opinion on going through the following verse :

*Gauḍenāra-Vaṅgapati-nirjjaya-durvidagdha-sad-Gurjjareśvara-
dig-arggalatāṃ ca yasya / nītvā bhujam vihata-Mālava-rakṣaṇ-ārtham
svāmī tath ānyam opi rājya-cha(pha)lāni bhūktī //* (JA., vol. XII,
p. 160, ll. 39-40).

Herein the term *Gurjareśvara* refers to the Pratihāra king Vatsarāja."

Mr. Sarma would not have invited me to accept his view on the subject had he cared to go through the verse preceding the one he has quoted from the Baroda plate of Karkarāja. It runs—

*Yen aikena ca Gūrjjareśvara-patir ygoddham samabhyudyataḥ
śauryya-prōddhata-kandharō mṛga iva kṣipram diśō grahitaḥ bhūt-
āsaiḥhata-dakṣiṇāpatha-mahāsāmanta-cakra (in) yato rakṣām āpa-
viluṅṭya (nṅhya) māna-vibhavaṃ Śrīvallabhēn ādarāt //*

(Ibid, ll. 33-35)

Here we find one *Gurjareśvara-pati* (master of the lord of Gurjara), and in the next verse, which has been referred to by Mr. Sarma, and which has been mentioned above, we find one *Gurjareśvara* (lord of Gurjara). According to Mr. Sarma, *Gurjareśvara* of the verse is identical with the Pratihāra Vatsarāja. If we are to accept it, we will have to maintain that Vatsarāja or his predecessor had a *pati* or over-lord. But this will not bear any examination. Vatsarāja was evidently the *Gurjareśvarapati*. It will not be difficult to find out the *Gurjareśvara*, who defeated the king of Gauḍa and Vaṅga. I have thoroughly discussed this point in my paper on the "History of the Gurjara Country," to be published in this journal.

D. C. GANGULY

The Kaumudīmahotsava and the Date of Kālidāsa

On going through the *Kaumudīmahotsava*, one finds that it contains a number of passages parallel with those found in the works of Kālidāsa; and the parallelism is so close that borrowing on the side of either Kālidāsa or the authoress of the *Kaumudīmahotsava* cannot be easily denied. Sometimes it is not merely the idea, but also the language, and the metre of the verse that has been taken over and utilized by the borrower in his or her works. As the drama *Kaumudīmahotsava* has been assigned by Mr. K. P. Jayaswal to 340 A. D., and clear evidence of borrowing by one side or the other can, therefore, be of material assistance in determining the date of our greatest poet, I give below some of these parallel passages. These are :—

- (a) अशक्यारम्भप्रवृत्तं तत्रभवन्तं मधुरेश्वरं पश्यामि—
इदं किलाविष्कृतकान्तिविद्भवं तुषारवातातपदर्शनेष्वपि ।
शरीरमुद्यानशिरोषपेलवं तपोवनक्लेशसहं भविष्यति ॥

(*Kaumudīmahotsava*, 1, 23.)

राजा—अहो असाधुदर्शी खलु भगवान् कण्वः
य इमामाश्रमधर्मे नियुङ्क्ते—
इदं किलाव्याजमनोहरं वपु स्तपःकर्म साधयितुं य इच्छति ।
ध्रुवं स नीलोत्पलपत्रधारया शमीलतां छेतुमृषिर्ध्रुवस्यति ॥

(*Abhijñānaśākuntalam*, Jivānanda Vidyāsāgara's edition, p. 17)

Both the authors employ the वंशस्थ metre. The sentences accompanying the verses convey similar ideas, and the resemblance between इदं किलाव्याजमनोहरं वपुः and इदं किलाविष्कृतकान्तिविद्भवं, as well as तपःकर्म and तपोवनक्लेशसहं is, I believe, patent to every reader.

- (b) सूत्रधार :—

एकैश्वर्यस्थितोऽपि प्रणतबहुफले यः स्वयं कृत्तिवासाः
कान्तासंमिश्रदेहोप्यविषयमनसां यः पुरस्ताद् यतीनां ।
अष्टाभिर्यस्य कृत्स्नं जगदपि तनुभिर्विभ्रतो नाभिमानः
सन्मार्गालोकनाय व्यपनयतु स वस्तामसीं वृत्तिमीशः ॥

(*Mālavikāgnimitram*, 1, I., Srīveṅkaṭeśvara edition, p. 1)

- सूत्रधार :—

श्रीमद्वैयाघ्रचर्मास्तररतितले स्थण्डिले संनिषण्णः
कृत्वा पर्यङ्कबन्धं कणामणिकिरणक्षारिणा तक्षकेण ।
नानात्वप्रन्थिमेत्रीं धियमिव विकिरन् दन्तकान्तिच्छलेन
ब्रह्मव्याख्याननिप्रस्तव भवतु तमःकृतये कृत्तिवासाः ॥

(*Kaumudīmahotsava*, 1, 1)

In these opening verses, both the writers employ the *स्रग्धरा* metre, and salute god Siva. He is styled *कृत्तिवासाः* by both, and the closing lines express the same idea. There is no great difference between the meanings of *त्व भवतु तमःकृतये कृत्तिवासाः* and *सन्मार्गालोकनाय व्यपनयतु स वस्तामसीं वृत्तिमीशः* ।

- (c) आशाकेशान्तधूमैरिव गगनतलं व्याप्तमासीत् मोभि-
धूमव्याजेन दीपास्तिमिरमिव मुहुः पीतमेते वमन्ति ।
किञ्चान्यत् प्रस्थितानां प्रियतमवसतिं नक्कमेकाकिनीनां
श्रूयन्ते राजमार्गे कलकलमुखरा मेखलाः सुन्दरीणाम् ॥

(*Kaumudīmahotsava*, 4. 10)

गच्छन्तीनां रमणवसतिं योषितां तत्र नक्क'
रुद्रालोके नरपतिपथे सूचिमेद्यैस्तमोभिः ।
सौदामिन्या कनकनिकषन्निगधया दर्शयोर्वी'
तोयोत्सर्गस्तनितमुखरो मा स्म भूविंक्वास्ताः ॥

(*Meghadūta*, 1. 37)

Here both the writers use slowly moving metres, one employs the majestic *स्रग्धरा*, and the other *मन्दाक्रान्ता*. In the lines underlined above *प्रस्थितानां* = *गच्छन्तीनां*, *प्रियतमवसतिं* = *रमणवसतिं*, *नक्क'* = *नक्क'* and *एका किनीनां* is equal to *योषितां*. The difference in wording has, probably, been brought about by the difference in metres.

- (d) या रात्रिविरहाभिषङ्गविषमादाधीयसी वर्तते
या सा सङ्गमहोत्सवप्रणयिनी क्षिप्रं क्षपा क्षीयते ।
व्यत्यासेन यदि त्वयेदमुभयं धातः कृतं तावता
लब्धाश्वासमुपप्लवेऽपि मिथुनं न त्वामुपकोशति ॥

(*Kaumudīmahotsava*, 5, 25)

अनधि-गतमनोरथस्य पूर्वं शतगुणितेव गता मम तियामा ।
यदि तु तव समागमे तथैव प्रसरति सुभ्रु ! ततः कृती भयेयम् ॥

(*Vikramorvaśī*, Act III, Jivānanda Vidyāsāgara's edition, p, 79)

The metres no doubt differ. But the remarkable similarity between the ideas expressed by the two is evident to every one.

- (e) परिव्राजिका—महदिदमाकारबद्धं तेजः अस्य हि
दर्पणगतमिव सवितुःपटान्तरचितं महानुभावस्य ।
प्रतिबिम्बितमिव प्रतिमुखपतितं प्रतिहन्ति मे दृष्टिम् ॥

(*Kaumudīmahotsava*, 2, 7)

हरदत्तः—

महत्खलु पुरुषाकारबद्धं तेजः ।
द्वारे नियुक्तपुरुषानुमतप्रवेशः
सिंहासनान्तिकचरेण सहोपसर्पन् ।
तेजोभिरस्य विनिवर्तितदृष्टिपातै-
र्वाक्यादृते पुनरिव प्रतिवारितोऽस्मि ॥

(*Mālavikāgnimitram*, 1. 12., Srīveṅkaṭeśvara edition, p. 29)

Here both the परिव्राजिका and हरदत्त are made to use the words आकारबद्धं तेजः । The idea underlying the two verses is the same, but the wording has to differ, because while one verse refers to a picture, the other speaks of the actual presence of the hero.

(f) वीरसेनः—

कालापकर्षं सति भंगुरत्वात्
प्रक्षीणसंस्कारभुवां स्मृतीनाम् ।
स्फुरन्ति मे शैशवचेष्टितानि
जातिस्मरस्येव भवान्तराणि ॥

(*Kaumudīmahotsara*, 4. 12)

राजा.....

रम्याणि वीक्ष्य मधुरांश्च निशम्य शब्दान्
पर्युत्सुको भवति यत् सुखितोऽपि जन्तुः ।
तच्चे तसा स्मरति नूनमबोधपूर्वं
भावस्थिराणि जननान्तरमौहदानि ॥

(*Abhijñānaśākuntalam*, Act. V, Jivānanda Vidyāsāgara's edition, p. 152)

The above well-known verse from the *Abhijñānaśākuntala* finds its counterpart in that quoted from the *Kaumudīmahotsara*. The lines

तच्चे तसा स्मरति नूनमबोधपूर्वं
भावस्थिरानि जननान्तरमौहदानि ।

look like a much improved version of

स्फुरन्ति मे शैशवचेष्टितानि जातिस्मरस्येव भवान्तराणि ।

These passages would most probably suffice to establish the borrowing of ideas, language, and even metre, by either Kālidāsa or the authoress of the *Kaumudīmahotsara*. But even with these before us, we cannot decide offhand the priority or posteriority of these writers. If the priority of the authoress of the

Kaumudīmahotsava is established, we shall have to reject as baseless the tradition that Kālidāsa flourished at the court of Vikramāditya in the first century B. C. If, however, it is the priority of Kālidāsa that is arrived at by the comparison between these and other passages, we shall have to discard the theory of his being a member of the court of Candragupta II. He must be either prior or anterior to 340 A. D. the date of composing the *Kaumudīmahotsava*. He cannot be both.

DASARATHA SARMA

Rīti and Guṇa in the Agni Purāṇa

In an article on "The theory of Rīti and Guṇa in the Agni Purāṇa" in vol. IX, no. 2 of the *IHQ.*, Mr. P. C. Lahiri has made some statements which need examination.

I. The Alaṅkāra section in the *Agni Purāṇa* is a hopelessly loose heaping of all sorts of ideas from this and that writer and does not deserve to be treated seriously as representing any systematic tradition. Dr. De supposes in his *Sanskrit Poetics* that it represents a systematic tradition which stands separate from that of the orthodox Kashmirian writers and which is followed by Bhoja, and Mr. P. C. Lahiri only follows him when he says in a footnote on p. 448 that Bhoja, along with the older Vāgbhaṭa, is influenced by the *Agni Purāṇa*. It is not a Purāṇa compiler of such a nature that hints at new paths in special Śāstras and surely the compiler who borrows from *Tantravārtika*, Bhartṛmitra, Bharata, Daṇḍin and Ānanda, may well borrow from Bhoja, who takes credit for the new Rasa theory propounded by him in his *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*. The truth therefore is that the Alaṅkāra section in the *Agni Purāṇa* is definitely later than Bhoja, from whom, it borrowed not only the Alaṅkāra-Abhimāna idea of Rasa expounded in his *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* and already referred to in his *Sarasvatīkaṅṭhābharaṇa*, V. 1, but also some Śabdālaṅkāras and other ideas.

II. Mr. Lahiri thinks that no prominence has been given to Rasa by the compiler of the Alaṅkāra section of the Purāṇa, and that Rasa "has been very curiously treated as an external element of Kāvya" (pp. 448-49). The Alaṅkāra section of the Purāṇa is spread over eleven chapters, chs. 337 to 347. The first chapter deals with Kāvya and of it, as has been noted by Mr. Lahiri, the Purāṇa says that *Rasa is the life*. Śl. 337/33 places Rasa above Vāgvaidagdhya which can be said to be identical with the concept of Vakrokti as applying generally to poetic expression as such and as a whole. The next chapter deals with drama. The third is completely devoted to Rasa and from this third chapter up to Śloka 17 of the sixth chapter, the subject dealt with is Rasa. For, the fourth which speaks of Rītis and Vṛttis, deals with Buddhyārambha Anubhāvas; the fifth which is called नृत्यादीं अङ्गकर्म निरूपणम् deals with Śarīrārambha Anubhāvas, such as the Alaṅkāras of the Ālambanas in the shape of damsels, the glances etc.; and the first part of the sixth again deals with Rasa. The rest of the sixth, and the seventh treat of Śabdālaṅkāra and are followed by the eighth speaking of Arthālaṅkāra. Chapter 345 describes

Ubhayālaṅkāra, chapter 346, Guṇas and the last chapter (347), Doṣas. This analysis can show how the importance of Rasa is not diminished and how the writer has not left it less prominent. If he does not mention Rasa in the definition of Kāvya, Mammaṭa and Hemacandra also do not mention, as Mr. Lahiri himself points out. The latter two cannot be mistaken as having belittled Rasa. They are the greatest of standard writers who have followed Ānanda and Abhinava. Even the single line in the chapter on Kāvya is important वाग्वैदग्ध्यप्रधानेऽपि रस एवात्र जीवितम् । 33/337.

Again we have in 342/3 :—

रसादिविनियोगोऽथ कथ्यते ह्यभिमानतः ? ।

तमन्तेरण सर्वेषां अपार्थैव स्वतन्त्रता ॥

In the main Rasa chapter (339) it is said :—

लक्ष्मीरिव विना त्यागात् न वाणी भाति नीरसा ।

If it be said that the *Agni Purāṇa* deals at length with Alaṅkāras, Guṇas etc., the reply is that a compilation in order to be a full treatise, touching upon all the subjects of the Śāstras, has to treat of Alaṅkāras, Guṇas etc. Do not Mammaṭa, Hemacandra and Viśvanātha do so ? It is only such treatises like the *Dhva. Ā.* of Ānanda which establishes an original theory like Dhvani that cannot and does not deal with other subjects. Lastly, I have not been able to find any authority in the text of the Alaṅkāra section of the Purāṇa for Mr. Lahiri's statement that Rasa has been treated here very curiously as an external element of Kāvya.

III. On p. 449 Mr. Lahiri says that though the Purāṇa follows Bharata in holding Rīti, Vṛtti and Pravṛtti as Anubhāvas, it differs from Bharata in whom these constitute Vācikābhinaya! He says :—

“The Purāṇa follows the same process in the treatment of the Rītis, the Vṛttis and the Pravṛttis; but accepted though they are as Anubhāvas they do not yet constitute Vācikābhinaya as they do in the treatment of Bharata. They stand for Āhāryābhinaya (342/2)...”

No doubt, Guṇas, Doṣas and Alaṅkāras come under Vācikābhinaya in Bharata but none can understand how along with Rīti, Vṛtti and Pravṛtti also can be said to come under Vācikābhinaya in Bharata. The statement discloses a lack of understanding of the import of Vṛtti and Pravṛtti.¹ To state briefly, Vṛtti is Ceṣṭā

¹ See my article on Vṛttis in *JOR.*, Madras, vol. VI, part. 4; vol. VII, parts 1 and 2.

and Pravṛtti is Veśa. Rīti is Vacana or speech. Says Rājaśekhara, and following him Bhoja also in his *Śr. Pra.* :

तत्र वेषविन्यासक्रमः प्रवृत्तिः, विलासविन्यासक्रमः वृत्तिः, वचनविन्यासक्रमः रीतिः ।

(K. M., p. 9.)

Vṛtti is dramatic action as such and one of its varieties is Bhāratī which however, being speech, is the Vācikābhinaya which is examined from the point of view of various Rītis. Kaiśikī Vṛtti which is the graceful mode of action, Ārabhaṭī which is the violent mode of action and Sāttvatī which is action of mental moods, can never be called Vācikābhinaya. Similarly they can never be called Āhāryābhinaya. It is absurd to call Rīti, Vṛtti and Pravṛtti, Āhārya. Mr. Lahiri says:—“They (Rīti, Vṛtti and Pravṛtti) stand for Āhāryābhinaya (342-2) which has been defined as Buddhyārambha.....” And he adds in the footnote:—“The Āhāryābhinaya of the Purāṇa should be distinguished from that of Bharata where it has been explained as a rule of decoration (*nepathyaḥ vidhi*). The interpretation given in the Purāṇa (342/2) is not permitted by the etymology of the word Āhārya.” The only saving statement here is the last in which the author points out that the etymology of the word makes it difficult for one to accept the Purāṇa’s notion of Āhārya.

Āhārya is invariably Nepathya, dress and make-up. No doubt, it forms a part of Vṛtti, even as Rīti forms a part of Vṛtti. We find the graceful dress included in the definition of the *Kaiśikīvṛtti*—या ऋद्धनेपथ्य etc. In graceful action, graceful dress also is comprehended. Therefore Vṛtti and Pravṛtti are intimately related, as Shakespeare also says, ‘apparel oft proclaims the man.’ As the *Viṣṇudharmottara* says, Pravṛttis are वृत्तीनमाश्रयाः ।² Āhārya which is dress, is Pravṛtti—Veśavinyāsa. These three, Rīti, Vṛtti and Pravṛtti (speech, action and dress) are all Anubhāvas, and are classed as बुद्धयारम्भानुभावाः by Bhoja in chapter XVII of his *Śṛṅgāra Prakāśa*.³ Śingabhūpāla also follows Bhoja and says in his *RAS.*, I, p. 64 :

बुद्धयारम्भास्तथा प्रोक्ताः रीतिवृत्तिप्रवृत्तयः ।

Following Bhoja’s *Śr. Pra.* the Purāṇa also considers the three, Rīti, Vṛtti and Pravṛtti as Buddhyārambhānubhāva :

बोधाय एष व्यापारः ? सु(स) बुद्धयारम्भ इष्यते ।

तस्य भेदाः त्रयः, ते च रीतिवृत्तिप्रवृत्तयः ॥ (339/53, 54.)

² Vide *JOR.*, Madras, vol. VII, part. I, pp. 49-51.

³ pp. 208-236, vol. III, Mad. Ms.; vide also Śāradātaraṅga who follows Bhoja. *Bhā. Pra.*, pp. 11-12.

Mr. Lahiri holds that according to the Purāṇa, all these three Buddhyārambhas are Āhārya. He bases his statement on 342/2:

स्तम्भादिस्सारत्तिको जागारम्भो वाचिक आङ्गिकः ।

शरीरारम्भ आहार्यो बुद्ध्यारम्भप्रवृत्तयः ॥

This verse does not mean that Rīti, Vṛtti and Pravṛtti, which are the three Buddhyārambhas, are Āhārya. How can speech and action be two varieties of dress? One cannot contend that the Purāṇa has a new theory to expound viz., dress means speech and action also. The last part of the verse really means that Pravṛtti, which is one of the Buddhyārambhas, is the Āhāryābhinaya (बुद्ध्यारम्भेषु त्रिषु, या तृतीया प्रवृत्तिरिति, सा आहार्याभिनयः ।). Even such a clumsy text as the *Agni Purāṇa* cannot mistake Āhārya as anything but dress. Therefore neither does Bharata consider Rītis, Vṛttis and Pravṛttis as Vācikābhinaya⁴ nor does the Purāṇa consider all these three as Āhāryābhinaya. Consequently the footnote no. 6 of Mr. Lahiri on p. 449 becomes meaningless and his emendation of 339/54 unnecessary. How can Ālāpa etc. which are twelve kinds of Vāgārambha be Buddhyārambha Anubhāvas? Ālāpa etc. are not varieties of Buddhyārambha. The Buddhyārambhas are, as 339/54 says, Rīti, Vṛtti and Pravṛtti, and these form the subject-matter of the next chapter (chap. 340). In chap. 339, śls. 44-45 begins the treatment of Anubhāvas:

मनो-वाग् बुद्धि-वपुषां स्मृतीच्छाद्वयत्नतः ।

आरम्भ एव विदुषां अनुभाव इति स्मृतः ॥⁵

Śls 46-50 describe मन आरम्भानुभावाः, śls. 51-53 (first half), द्वादश वागारम्भ, śls. 53 (second half), 54 and chap. 340 describe बुद्ध्यारम्भाः and chap. 341, as is said in its first verse, describes शरीरारम्भाः । These are all Anubhāvas and are called Abhinayas. From the point of view of the four kinds of Abhinaya, these are re-distributed and the study of Anubhāvas closes with śl. 2 of chap. 342, after which some general aspects of Rasa are taken up. Vāgārambha is Vācika; Mana-ārambha is Sāttvika (Sattva=manas; अनुपहतं हि मनः सत्त्वमुच्यते says Bhoja in his *Śr. Pra.*, chap. XI); Śarīrārambha is ŀngika and Pravṛtti which is one of the three Buddhyārambhas is Āhārya. What about the other two Buddhyārambhas, Rīti and Vṛtti? Vṛtti pertains

4 It must also be pointed out here that the concept of Rīti is not to be found in Bharata and that it arose much later.

5 See Bhoja. *SKA.* V, Śl. 40, p. 477.

to all action. Its first variety called Bhāratī and the Buddhya-rambha called Rīti are Vācikābhinaya and are to be taken along with the Vāgārambhas, Ālāpa etc. According to the traditional meanings, Ārabhaṭī will be Āngikābhinaya, Sattvatī Vṛtti will be Sāttvikābhinaya and Kaiśikī Vṛtti will be all Abhinaya that is graceful. But to adopt the strict and scientific meanings of these concepts, as explained in the above referred to paper on the Vṛttis in the *JOR.*, Sāttvatī will go with Sāttvikābhinaya and Ārabhaṭī and Kaiśikī will go with all Abhinayas, forceful and graceful respectively.

A word about chapter 340 of the Purāṇa called Rītinirūpaṇa. Correctly speaking, it must be called बुद्धयारम्भनिरूपणम् or रीतिवृत्तिप्रवृत्ति-निरूपणम् ; for, in the foregoing chapter, मनश्चारम्भ and वागारम्भ have been treated and its succeeding chapter (chap. 341) treats of शरीरारम्भ. As it is, it treats of not only Rītis but of Vṛttis also. This is the smallest chapter in the whole section and of its eleven verses, the first four are concerned with Rītis. Then begins a treatment of Vṛttis. Śl. 5 enumerates the four Vṛttis ; śl. 6 defines Bhāratī and up to the first half of śl. 10 we have the varieties of Bhāratī (भारतीभेदाः) described. Then there are two lines, one giving a short definition of Ārabhaṭī and the other abruptly stopping in the midst of the enumeration of the varieties of Ārabhaṭī. There still remains to be treated the fourth variety of Ārabhaṭī, the whole of the Kaiśikī and the Sāttvatī Vṛttis and the whole subject of Pravṛttis. Therefore I think that the text of the chapter as printed, is incomplete.

IV. Mr. Lahiri says that though the Purāṇa holds Rītis, Vṛttis and Pravṛttis as Anubhāvas, the Purāṇa, unlike Bharata's text, "is not explicit on the point whether these call forth Rasa." If the three are Anubhāvas and if Anubhāva is nothing but one of the factors that call forth Rasa, how is the Purāṇa not explicit on the relation between Rīti etc. and Rasa?

V. In para. 2, on p.450, Mr. Lahiri says that in the scheme of the *Agni Purāṇa*, Guṇas stand apart 'as an absolute entity', that they do not go to define Rītis and that the Vāgārambha is not Daṇḍin's गिरां मार्गः .

The whole of the Alaṅkāra Śāstra is included in the Vācikābhinaya section of the *Nāṭya Śāstra* which is one fourth of drama, being the Bhāratī Vṛtti. This Bhāratī Vṛtti is studied and analysed into Lakṣaṇas, Guṇas and Alaṅkāras. Closely akin to these is a composite study of the Bhāratī Vṛtti in terms of Rītis or Mārgas, which was attempted at a later time. Still another study of the Bhāratī Vṛtti is

what Bharata gives us in chapter XXIV as the twelve 'Mārgas'⁶ of the Vācikābhinaya. The expression in the shape of Alāpa, Vilāpa etc. can be examined from the point of view of Lakṣaṇas, Guṇas and Alaṅkāras and of the Rītis of Daṇḍin. There is little difference between the text of a drama and a kāvya. But the Vācikābhinaya portion is often treated as kāvya. All kāvya is drama of the Bhāratī Vṛtti. That वागारम्भ and the realm of गिरां मार्गः are identical and that the Rītis as pointed out in a study of a drama's Vācikābhinaya are identical with the Rītis pointed out in a kāvya will be plain on a perusal of Siṅgabhūpāla's treatment of Rītis in his *RAS*.

The question of what things constitute the differentia of the various Rītis is too big to be taken up here. I have tackled the problem in two papers of mine on the 'History of Guṇas' and 'Rīti and style.' In the third instalment of my paper on Vṛttis in the *JOR.*, VII. 2, I have pointed out some facts which are relevant to this discussion. An analysis of Daṇḍin's Guṇas show the existence in them of such things as Alaṅkāra, Samāsa and metaphorical usage. According to Rudraṭa the Rītis are Samāsa Jātis. Vaidārbhī is the collocation with no compound while the compounded collocation, according to the number of words compounded, produces the Pāñcālī, the Lāṭīya or the Gauḍī. Another line of thought shows us the development of Rītis as Anuprāsa Jātis, varieties of Vṛtṭyanuprāsa. These appear in Bhāmaha, are clearly formulated in Udbhaṭa's *KASS.*, and are called merely Vṛttis by Ānanda. By the time we reach Mammaṭa the three Vṛtṭyanuprāsa Jātis become identical with the three Rītis, viz., Vaidārbhī, Pāñcālī and Gauḍī. This lights up the early history of Rīti and in Daṇḍin's treatment of it we find all these ideas. For, what is Daṇḍin's Samādhi Guṇa, if it is not metaphorical usage? What is Ojas, if it is not the Samāsa on the basis of which Rudraṭa

6

एते मार्गास्तु निर्दिष्टाः यथाभावरसान्विताः ।

काव्यवस्तुषु निर्दिष्टाः द्वादशाभिनयात्मिकाः ॥

आलापश्च प्रलापश्च × × ×

× × × ×

एते मार्गः हि विज्ञेया वाक्याभिनययोजिकाः ॥

N. S., XXIV, 49-57.

Here, if one wants verbal identity in the shape of the word Mārga, one can have it but much value is not attached to this fact that Vilāpa etc. are also called Mārgas. Any way such occurrence of the word Mārga in Bharata is to be noted by one interested in the history of Mārga as it is applied as a synonym of Rīti.

defines the Rītis? Again, what is the first Śābda variety of Daṇḍin's Mādhurya except the sweetness born of Anuprāsa, on the basis of which Śabdālaṅkāra, three Vṛttis are born and which eventually get identified with the three Rītis? (Daṇḍin, I, 51-58). As a matter of fact, the subject of Anuprāsa is dealt with by Daṇḍin only in chapter I as comprehended in his Mādhurya Guṇa of one variety pertaining to Śabda (for, of the other Mādhurya of Agrāmytā, we have the two sub-divisions of Śābda and Ārtha) and not in the chapter on Śabdālaṅkāra, a fact which has misled Mr. K. S. Ramaswamy Sastriar⁷ to say that Anuprāsa Śabdālaṅkāra is absent in Daṇḍin. Even Yamaka is touched here by Daṇḍin but is left out for special treatment in the Śabdālaṅkāra section. And what is this Śābda Mādhurya of Daṇḍin, viz. Anuprāsa except Śabdālaṅkāra? When we come to Vāmana, we have even Rasa coming in as constituting the Guṇa of Kānti of Artha, in the study of Rīti. Therefore it cannot be said simply and naively that some absolute entity called Guṇa, which is quite different from Alaṅkāra etc. defines Rīti in Daṇḍin or that other writers and their definitions of Rītis in other words and other ways differ wholly from Daṇḍin's.

The *Agni Purāṇa* borrows its definitions of the Rītis from Bhoja, (chapter XVII, on Anubhāvas, in the *Śr. Pra.*), where Bhoja himself borrows from Rājaśekhara. Later than these, Bahurūpa Miśra, in his commentary on the *Daśarūpaka* (Mad. Ms.) reproduces these definitions of the Rītis with the mention of Bhoja's name. The *Kāvya Mīmāṃsā* says :

1. —यत्—समासवत्, अनुप्रासवत् योगवृत्तिपरम्परागर्भं जगाद सा गौडीया रीतिः । (p.8).

2. —यत्—ईषदसमासं, ईषदनुप्रासं, उपचारगर्भं च जगाद सा पाञ्चाली रीतिः । (p.9).

3. —यत्—स्थानानुप्रासवत्, असमासं, योगवृत्तिगर्भं च जगाद सा वैदर्भी रीतिः । (p.9).

To these three, Bhoja adds the fourth Lāṭiyā which the Purāṇa takes. In the above definitions of the three Rītis, three factors count—Samāsa, Anuprāsa and Yaugika or Aupacārika-prayoga. Of these, Samāsa (of Rudraṭa's Rītis) is the Guṇa of Ojas; Anuprāsa (of the Vṛttis which are finally identified with the three Rītis) is one of the two kinds of शब्दमाधुर्य of Daṇḍin; and Upacāra mentioned by Rājaśekhara is Daṇḍin's Samādhi, metaphorical expression, personification etc. There is however no trace of Yoga Vṛtti as a part of the

⁷ See his Sanskrit Introduction to his edition of Udbhata's *KASS.*, with Tilaka's commentary in the Gaek. series (p. 19).

lakṣaṇa of Rīti in Daṇḍin. Daṇḍin also has said that Vaidarbhī has a kind of Anuprāsa, has something like स्थानानुप्रास ; for it is a discriminate employer of such varieties as श्रुत्यनुप्रास and that it is Gauḍī which loves Anuprāsa as such and Samāsa as such. The Vaidarbhī of Daṇḍin also has little or no compound. This Bhoja follows in the Anubhāva-chapter in his Śr. Pra. (chapter XVII) and the Agni Purāṇa borrows from him when it says that

1. Pāñcālī is उपचारयुता, मृद्री and ह्रस्वविग्रहा,
2. Gauḍīyā is दीर्घविग्रहा and अनवस्थितसन्दर्भा,
3. Vaidarbhī is उपचारैर्न बहुभिः युता or उपचारविवर्जिता, नातिकोमलसन्दर्भा and मुक्कविग्रहा, and
4. Lāṭīyā is अनतिभूयउपचारता, स्फुटसन्दर्भा and नातिविग्रहा (Śls. 2-4).

Bhoja's definitions are as follows :

1. यत् अनतिदीर्घसमासं, अनतिस्फुटबन्धं, उपचारवृत्तिमत्, पादानुप्रासप्रायं, योगरूढिमत् वचः सा पाञ्चाली ।
2. यत् अतिदीर्घसमासं, परिस्फुटबन्धं, नात्युपचारवृत्तिमत्, पादानुप्रासयोगि, योगरूढिपरम्परागर्भं वचः, सा गौडीया ।
3. यत् असमस्तं, अतिसुकुमारबन्धं, अनुपचारवृत्तिमत्, स्थानानुप्रासयोगि, योगवृत्तिमत् वचः, सा वैदर्भी ।
4. यत् ईषत्समस्तं, अनतिसुकुमारबन्धं, नात्युपचारवत्, लाटीयानुप्रासयोगि, रूढिमद् वचः, सा लाटीया ।

(Mad. Ms., chapter XVII, vol. III, pp. 212-6).

The word Vighraha in the Agni Purāṇa stands for Samāsa ; for, it is for a Samasta word that we give Vighraha.

Thus the characteristics which are given in the definitions of Rītis in Rājaśekhara, Bhoja and the Agni Purāṇa are not wholly unrelated to Guṇas and these Guṇas themselves are not absolute entities standing apart. The Upacāra is Daṇḍin's Samādhi and the feature of Vighraha or Samāsa comes under Daṇḍin's Ojas. Therefore it cannot be held that "the Rītis in the Purāṇa have not been distinguished from one another by the presence or absence of certain poetic excellences (Guṇas)."

On p. 452, Mr. Lahiri feels some difficulty in the reading of the definition of the Lāṭīyā, both in the article and in the footnote no. 11. The confusing line referred to is—

परित्यक्ताऽभिभूयोऽपि रूपचारैरुदाहता ।

It must be thus connected :

परित्यक्तातिभूयोभिरुपचारैरुदाहता ।

and it means that the Lāṭiyā does not have too much of metaphorical expressions.

VI. (a) Coming to Mr. Lahiri's exposition of the text of the Purāṇa on Vṛtti, he chooses a reading 'क्रियासविषमा' and translates it as "keeping strict accordance with the action of the drama." First, the reading is not available in the text or in the footnote and secondly, it is not known how क्रियासविषमा means what he has given as its import. The text has क्रियास्वविषमा and can be taken as क्रियासु अविषमा but this is not good. Mr. Lahiri chooses on p. 453 reading क्रियासु नियमः, given in the footnote of the text, and this is better. It makes some sense; for Vṛttis are the various Niyamas of Kriyā, the various methods of action, the different departments of dramatic action. मया काव्यक्रियाहेतोः प्रक्षिप्ताः द्रुहिणाज्ञया—says Bharata of Vṛttis in the Vṛttivikalpādhyāya.

(b) Mr. Lahiri says, "It is curious that the term Rīti has been used in connection with the Bhāratī which has been mentioned as a variety of Vṛtti." Now, the clumsiness of the Alankāra section in the Purāṇa is matched only by that of the Ānandāśrama edn. of the Purāṇa. It is not unlikely that the word रीति is a mistake for वृत्तिः. Besides this point, there are other mistakes in the Purāṇa's definition of the Bhāratī :

वाक्प्रधाना नरप्राया स्त्रीयुक्ता प्राकृतोक्ता (क)।
भरतेन प्रणीतत्वात् भारती रीतिरुच्यते ॥ 340/6

According to Bharata the Bhāratī is वाक्प्रधान and नरप्राय and as others have further explained it, it is also भरतप्रणीत. So far the Agni Purāṇa is correct. But according to Bharata and all other writers, Bhāratī is only Sanskrit speech, speech of the Uttama Pātras and of male Pātras only. The Agni Purāṇa is wrong in calling Bhāratī प्राकृत and स्त्रीयुक्त. It is not Bhāratī that is स्त्रीयुक्ता but it is Kaiśikī. Says Bharata—

या वाक्प्रधाना पुरुषप्रयोज्या स्त्रीवर्जिता संस्कृतवाक्ययुक्ता ।
स्वनामधेयैः भरतैः प्रयुक्ता सा भारती नाम भवेत्तु वृत्तिः ॥

(N. S., XXII. 25).

Surely Bhāratī Vṛtti, being speech, is the realm of Rīti which is Vāgvinyāsakrama but this cannot justify the careless remark that calls भारती a रीति .

The Agni Purāṇa mentions four Āngas of the Bhāratī but gives only three, viz. वीथी, प्रहसनं and प्रस्तावना. Bharata gives the four Āngas as प्ररोचना, आमुखं, वीथी and प्रहसनम् and if we can give the

credit to even the *Agni Purāṇa* to have gone so far critically as to include प्रोचना and आमुखं under the one head of प्रस्तावना, it should have consistently given the Aṅgas as three.

Bharata gives the thirteen Aṅgas of Vīthī thus in the Daśarupakā-dhyāya—उद्घात्यकं, अवगलितं, अवस्यन्दितं, असत्प्रलापः, प्रपञ्चः, नालिका, वाक्केलिः, अधिबलं, छलं, व्याहारः, मृदवं, त्रिगतं and गरडम्.

The Purāṇa gives them thus :

उद्घात(ल्य)कं, लपितं or लगितं which is a mistake for अवगलितं, असत्प्रलापः (4th in Bharata), वाक्श्रेणी (a synonym of Bharata's प्रपञ्चः), नालिका, विपणं (this makes no sense), व्याहारः, त्रिमतं (त्रिगतं, 12th in Bharata), छलं, अवस्कन्दितं (अवस्यन्दितं, the 2nd in Bharata), गरडं and मृदवम्. Thus only twelve are seen. Vākkeli and Adhibala of Bharata are missing and in the place of the two we have a Vipāṇa and if we can take उचितं as one, we have the thirteenth also in the bit— त्रयोदशमथोचितम्. But what does उचितं mean?

(c) On p. 453 Mr. Lahiri speaks of Bharata and his followers giving us a Vṛtti assigned to the Śṛṅgāra Rasa called कौशिकी. This name is incorrect. The name of the Vṛtti is given everywhere as कैशिकी and if a corrupt text should read कौशिकी, does Mr. Lahiri propose to retain that name and make thereby a new theory of Vṛtti ?

VII. Guṇas : (a) *Agni Purāṇa* (346/5 and 6) enumerates the Śabda Guṇas :

श्लेषो लालित्यगाम्भीर्ये सौकुमार्यमुदारता ।

सत्येव यौगिकी चेति गुणाः शब्दस्य सप्तधा ॥

Mr. Lahiri takes सती and यौगिकी as the sixth and the seventh Guṇas. But he also notes that while defining these, the text omits both and has Ojas defined instead. In the footnotes of the printed text of the Purāṇa we have another reading of the third Pāda, viz. रुडिश्च यौगिकी. I think the second line can thus be emended :

योजश्च यौगिकी शक्तिः गुणाः शब्दस्य सप्तधा ।

and the Yoga Śakti is the characteristic referred to by the Purāṇa, Bhoja and Rājaśekhara in their definitions of Rītis. The definition of यौगिकशक्तिगुण must then be taken as left out and this is one more instance of the careless way in which the section has been compiled. The Purāṇa speaks of exactly six Artha Guṇas, and six Ubhaya Guṇas only and in view of these two facts, I think that it really meant only six Śabda Guṇas, those that have been defined by it. If so, we retain Ojas and the text has

to be emended in another way, omitting यौगिकी शक्ति altogether. In the place of सप्तधा, we must have had षट् स्मृताः or some such expression.

(b) The Purāṇa defines Gāmbhīrya as उत्तानशब्दक and Mr. Lahiri takes it as meaning “high sounding and bombastic” words. Uttāna is evidently wrong here. Further, it does not mean “high sounding and bombastic.” It is the exact opposite of गाम्भीर्यं which is depth. Uttāna is गाध ; it means turned up, open and plain and as such approaches Prasāda and Arthavyakti. As the opposite of गाम्भीर्यं, it cannot go with it. The same quality, उत्तानपदता occurs in the definition of Audārya also. Therefore I think that the text must be अनुत्तानशब्दक. The text as printed reads :

विशिष्टलक्षणोक्ते खलेख्यमुत्तानशब्दकम् ।

and it must thus be corrected

विशिष्टलक्षणोक्ते खलेख्यनुत्तानशब्दकम् ।

Now उक्ते खलेखि reads better and makes sense better than उक्ते खलेख्यम्. अनुत्तानशब्दम् will mean in consonance with गाम्भीर्यं, containing deep and hidden import.

Another point in the definition of Gāmbhīrya is the Agni Purāṇa's equation of it with सुशब्दता and this Mr. Lahiri fails to note. The text says :

गाम्भीर्यं कथमन्त्यार्याः तदेवान्येषु शब्दताम् । Sl. 8.

The bit तदेवान्येषु शब्दतां is a mistake for तदेवान्ये सुशब्दतां . Suśabdatā or Suśabdyā is as old as Bhāmaha, but it is in Bhoja that we first hear of it as a Guṇa. Neither the Śabda nor the Artha Suśabdatā of Bhoja has anything to do with the Gāmbhīrya of the Agni Purāṇa.

(c) The Artha Guṇa सामयिकत्वम् : The Purāṇa defines it (in Sl. 17) as Artha Vyutpatti. It may mean such cases as—

अवेक्ष्य धातोर्गमनार्थमर्थवित् चकार नाम्ना रघुमात्मसम्भवम् । RV., III.

क्षतात् किल लायत इत्युदग्रः क्षलस्य शब्दो भुवनेषु रुढः । RV., II.

यथा प्रहादनाच्चन्द्रः प्रतापात् तपनो यथा ।

तथैव सोऽभूदन्वर्थः राजा प्रकृतिरजनात् ॥ RV., IV.

But one must prefer to take it as the reverse of the Doṣa असामयिक dealt with in Agni Purāṇa (347/10 and 11). सामयिक is समयादच्युत and this Asāmayika doṣa is identical with the Pada doṣa रुढिच्युत of Bhoja. रुढेरच्युत is the Artha Guṇa Sāmayika of the Purāṇa.

(d) The Ubhaya Guṇa यथासंख्य. It is thus defined in 346/21:

यथासंख्यमनुदेशः सामान्यमतिदिश्यते ।

and Mr. Lahiri explains it as “the extended and universal application (*sāmānyātideśa*) of an undefined statement (*anuddēśa*)”! The author has not made any attempt to understand this Guṇa. Anybody must at once be reminded here of the *alaṅkāra yathāsaṅkhyā*, which had a chequered career ever since Bhāmaha. Bhāmaha (II, 88) gives it as otherwise called Saṅkhyāna and says that it is also an Alaṅkāra according to some. Daṇḍin in II. 273 gives a third name for it, क्रमः. Most of the later Alaṅkārikas recognise it. Kuntaka alone rejects it. And it is this Yathāsaṅkhyālaṅkāra that *Agni Purāṇa* makes into an Ubhaya Guṇa, though as an Ubhaya Guṇa it means nothing. That it is identical with the Alaṅkāra Yathāsaṅkhyā, Saṅkhyāna or Krama is beyond doubt. Mr. Lahiri fails to note that the definition as printed, यथासंख्यमनुदेशः, is an error for यथासंख्यमनुदेशः. Anuddēśa is अनु-उद्देश or क्रमिक उद्देश, enumeration in the same order. It is the same as Bhāmaha’s क्रमशोऽनुनिर्देशः (II. 89) and Daṇḍin’s अनुदेशो यथाक्रमम् (II. 273). Bhoja’s Ubhayālaṅkāra Krama which comprehends all varieties of Krama includes this Yathāsaṅkhyā also. This is no wonder in the Purāṇa which makes Guṇas of Alaṅkāras and Alaṅkāras of Guṇas and such concepts like Aucitya also. The Purāṇa definition of it viz. यथासंख्यं अनुदेशः (or अनुदेशः but never अनुदेशः) follows Pāṇini I. 3. 10: यथासंख्यमनुदेशः समानाम्. If we take Mr. Lahiri’s interpretation of the सामान्य-अतिदेश as extended application, we make no sense and we do not know what aspect of Yathāsaṅkhyā is referred to. I may suggest that the text as printed सामान्यमतिदिश्यते is incorrect and that it can be corrected into सामान्येनानुदिश्यते which will correspond to समानामनुदेशः ।

(e) The precedent made in the *Agni Purāṇa* for making a Guṇa of Pāka is to be found in Bhoja who makes it the शब्दगुण called प्रौढिः ।

उक्तेः प्रौढः परीनाकः प्रोच्यते प्रौढिसंज्ञया । SKA., I. 77.

—योऽयं आभ्यासिको नालिकेरपाकः, मृद्वीकापाकः इत्यादिः वाक्यपरिपाकः सा प्रौढिरुच्यते । SKA., p 61.

(f) The Ubhaya-guṇa Rāga in the same Rāga as mentioned by Bhoja in SKA., V in connection with varieties of love. (See pp. 609-610). The *Agni Purāṇa* is extremely careless and uncritical when it makes it a Guṇa.

(g) Mr. Lahiri’s interpretation of Vaiśeṣika guṇa (346/29) given on p. 459 is highly imaginative. No doubt 346/25 is very vague but

Vaiśeṣika guṇa means only those Doṣas which according to the principle of Aucitya are not Doṣas in certain cases, as Mr. Lahiri remarks on p. 455. Of these Doṣa-Guṇas Daṇḍin speaks but it is however Bhoja who constituted them into a special class called Vaiśeṣika Guṇas. These are dealt with by the Purāṇa at the end of the chapter on Doṣas where it is easy to deal with them. Prakāśavarṣa and the *Agni Purāṇa* follow Bhoja who borrows from Daṇḍin.

VIII. Regarding the footnote on p. 459 explaining the terms सामान्य and विशेष mentioned by the *Agni Purāṇa* in 338/4-5: This applies to all definitions. The two are given as the two aspects of Lakṣaṇa or definition as such. In connection with drama or dramatic representation, the Purāṇa first mentions twentyseven kinds, Rūpakas and Uparūpakas. Underlying the characteristics that distinguish each of these (Viśeṣas) there lies the unity of the Sāmānya lakṣaṇa of Nāṭya as such, for all of them are dramatic representation. They possess in common—तैलोक्यानुकरणं, त्रिवर्गसाधनत्वं, रसभावादिः, अभिनयाः, पूर्वज्ञः. Taking the five Sandhis and the Arthaprakṛtis and Avasthās that go to form the Sandhis, these three, viz. Sandhi, Arthaprakṛti and Avasthā, are common to all varieties of drama but particular varieties lack one or more of these. These differences constitute Viśeṣa lakṣaṇa and therefore the Viśeṣas are not things which occupy a “specific part of the drama,” as Mr. Lahiri thinks.

V. RAGHAVAN

Mahārāja Caṇḍavarman of the Komarti plates

Hultzsch, while editing the Komarti plates of *Mahārāja Caṇḍavarman* in *Ep. Ind.*, IV, 142 ff., was inclined to identify that king with the Śālaṅkāyana Mahārāja Caṇḍavarman, father of Nandivarman II. Kielhorn, who dealt with the Śālaṅkāyana inscriptions in his 'List of North Indian inscriptions' obviously, was of the same opinion.¹ Prof. Dubruil was silent about the suggestion of Hultzsch, when he discussed the Komarti grant.² But Sewell (*Hist. Ins. S. Ind.*, p. 18) and Jayaswal (*Hist. Ind.*, pp. 127-28) have now accepted the old identification proposed by Hultzsch.

Regarding the Komarti plates, Hultzsch says that "a connection may be established with the plates (i.e. the Kollair plates) of the Śālaṅkāyana *Mahārāja Vijayanandivarman*, who, (1) like Caṇḍavarman, professes to have been 'devoted to the feet of the lord, (his) father' (*bappabhaṭṭāraka-pāda-bhakta*) and who (2) was the eldest son of *Mahārāja Caṇḍavarman*. The close resemblance between the alphabets of the plates of Vijayanandivarman and of the Komarti plates suggests that Caṇḍavarman, the father of Vijayanandivarman, may have been identical with the *Mahārāja Caṇḍavarman* who issued the Komarti plates."

I agree with Hultzsch that the characters of the Komarti plates resemble closely those of the plates of Nandivarman II Śālaṅkāyana, and that, therefore, "the two Caṇḍavarmans must have belonged to the same period." But it is difficult to go beyond that. There are some serious points against the identification of the issuer of the Komarti plates with the Śālaṅkāyana *Mahārāja Caṇḍavarman*.

The Komarti plates were found near Narasannapeṭa in the Ganjam District. The grant was issued from विजयसिंहपुर, which has been identified with the modern Siṅgupuram between Chicacole and Narasannapeṭa. On the other hand, *all* the known Śālaṅkāyana grants were issued from Veṅgīpura, which has been identified with Peddavegi near Ellore in the West Godavari District, and which appears to have been the chief city of the Śālaṅkāyanas as early as the time of Ptolemy.

It must be noted that Caṇḍavarman of the Komarti grant calls himself कलिङ्गाधिपति (lord of Kaliṅga) ; but no Śālaṅkāyana *Mahārāja*

1. See his 'List of Northern Inscriptions', No. 686.

2. *Anc. Hist. Dec.*, Eng. tr., p. 94.

so far known claims mastery over the Kalinga country. The issuers of *all* the Śālaṅkāyana grants invariably call themselves शालङ्कायन and भगवच्चित्तरथस्वामिपादानुध्यात i.e. meditating at the feet of lord Citrarathasvāmī, who must have been the family-deity of the Śālaṅkāyanas. It must also be noticed that both these distinctive epithets are conspicuous by their absence in the Komarti grant.

Besides, the phraseology of the Komarti grant seems to be different from that of the known Śālaṅkāyana inscriptions. Two points at least deserve notice in this connection. First, the king of the Komarti grant calls himself श्रीमहाराजा(ज)चण्डवर्मा, while *all* the issuers of the Śālaṅkāyana grants invariably call themselves महाराजश्री- so-and-so. Secondly, the phrase आसहस्रांशुशितारकाप्रतिष्ठ used as an adjective of अग्रहार, and the idea conveyed by it, are unknown to the phraseology of the known Śālaṅkāyana inscriptions, which, we should note, are marked by a remarkable similarity of language among themselves.

Such being the case, we must take the issuer of the Komarti plates as belonging to a separate dynasty, until further evidence is forthcoming.³ It seems probable that the dynasty to which Caṇḍavarman of the Komarti grant belongs ruled over the Kalinga country (or the major part of it) with its capital at Siṃhapura, when the Śālaṅkāyanas ruled over the country to the west of Kalinga with their capital at Veṅgīpura. The country of the Śālaṅkāyanas was the heart of what is called the Andhradeśa in Sanskrit literature. In the inscriptions of the Eastern Cālukyas, it has been designated वेङ्गीमण्डल, वेङ्गीराष्ट्र, वेङ्गीमही and the like. Probably the country was called "the Veṅgī kingdom" even in the Śālaṅkāyana period.

Another king of the dynasty of Siṃhapura seems to have been the issuer of the Brihatprostha grant (issued from विजयसीहपुर i. e. सिंहपुर), edited by Hultzsch in *Ep. Ind.*, XII, 4 ff. The name of the king who issued this grant has been taken to be Umavarman. According to Hultzsch, "both the alphabet and the phraseology of the grant closely resemble those of the Komarti plates of the Mahārāja Caṇḍavarman. This king may have belonged to the same family as the Mahārājomavarman.....For both kings issued their edict from Siṃhapura or Sihapura and bore the-epithets 'lord of Kalinga' and 'devoted to the feet of (his) father.'"⁴

3 Prof. Dubrenil rightly separates the two dynasties. *Ibid.*, pp. 89 and 95.

4 *Ep. Ind.*, XII. p. 4. Hultzsch is not quite accurate in the last point.

Caṇḍavarman is called बप्पभङ्गारकपादभङ्ग while Umavarman is called बप्पपादभङ्ग

The characters of the Komarti grant closely resemble those of another inscription, the Chicacole grant of the Nanda king Prabhañjanavarman.⁵ The two phraseological peculiarities of the Komarti grant noticed above are present in the Chicacole grant. We may therefore agree with Hultzsch when he says, "the phraseology of the grant resembles that of the copperplate grants of the Gaṅgas of Kalinga, but still much more closely with that of the Chicacole plates of Nandaprabhañjanavarman. Another point in which the last mentioned plates agree with the Komarti plates is that in both of them the title *Kaliṅg-ādhipati* i.e. 'lord (of the country) of Kalinga' is applied to the reigning prince. There remains a third point which proves that Candavarman and Nandaprabhañjanavarman must have belonged to the same dynasty. An examination of the original seal of the Chicacole plates, which Mr. Thurston, Superintendent of the Madras Museum, kindly sent me at my request, revealed the fact that the legend on the seal is *Pi[tr-bhakta]*, just as on the seal of the Komarti plates."⁶ The Chicacole grant was, however, not issued from Siṃhapura, or Siḥapura but from विजयसारपल्लिकावासक, "the residence or palace (or camp?) at the victorious Sārapallikā". It is not clear whether सारपल्लिका was the permanent capital of the Nanda कलिङ्गाधिपति Prabhañjanavarman; but the explicit mention of the term वासक (residence, dwelling) probably suggests that it was not.

On palæographic grounds, these kings should be assigned to about the time of Nandivarman II Śālaṅkāyana i. e. about the 5th century A. D.⁷ It is, therefore, impossible to agree with the late Prof. R. D. Banerji when he writes, "we do not know anything of the history of Kalinga and Orissa after the fall of the dynasty of Khāravela (2nd century B. C. according to the Professor) till the rise of the Śailodbhavas in the 7th century A. D."⁸

It is difficult to determine whether this line of the kings of Kalinga was ruling at the time of the southern expedition of

in the inscriptions. An inscription discovered at Tekkali seems to have been issued by this king. It has been (badly) edited in *Journ. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc.*, VI, p. 53.

⁵ *Ind. Ant.*, XIII, 48 f.; for reference to the Nanda or Nandodbhava dynasty in Kalinga, see the Talmul plates, *JBORS.*, XIV, 90.

⁶ *Ep. Ind.*, IV, 143.

⁷ Prof. Dubreuil places them a little later. *Loc. cit.*

⁸ *History of Orissa*, I, ch. VIII, Kalinga and Orissa in the Scythian and Gupta periods, p. 109.

Samudragupta (c. 350 A.D.) It is, however, interesting to note that the Allahabad pillar inscription does not refer to any king of Kalinga nor of Simhapura and Sārapallikā. The states mentioned there, that may be conjecturally assigned to the Kalinga region, are Kurāla, Koṭṭura, Piṣṭapura, Eraṇḍapalla, Avamukta and Devarāṣṭra. Of these Piṣṭapura has been definitely identified with Piṭhāpuram in the Godavari District. That it was the seat of a government in the beginning of the 7th century A.D., is proved by the passage पिष्टं पिष्टपुरं येन in the Aihole inscription of Pulakeśin II.⁹ It is interesting that we have got an inscription of a कलिङ्गाधिपतिर्मागधकुलालङ्करीष्णुर्वामिष्टि-पुत्रा महाराजश्रीशक्तिवर्मा, who granted from Piṣṭapura the village of Rākaluva in the Kalingaviṣaya.¹⁰ Rākaluva has been identified with Ragolu, the find-spot of the copper-plates, near Chicacole in the Ganjam District. The characters of the inscription seem to resemble those of the Veṅgī and Simhapura inscriptions and may, therefore, be assigned to about the 5th century A.D. But the phraseology is remarkably different from that of the inscriptions of the Simhapura line. It may be conjectured, therefore, that Śaktivarman belonged to a separate dynasty, that of Piṣṭapura, which was probably supplanted by the Cālukyas in the beginning of the 7th century A.D.

It is interesting that Śaktivarman is said to have been born of a Māgadha family. Māgadha is a mixed caste sprung from Vaiśya father and Kṣatriya mother (Manu, X, 11 & 17.) The epithet कलिङ्गाधिपति seems to suggest that the claim of कलिङ्गाधिपतित्व of one of the two lines of Piṣṭapura and Simhapura was, at one time, challenged by the other.

The names of the other states mentioned above cannot be satisfactorily identified. We do not know whether Eraṇḍapalla of the Allahabad pillar inscription has anything to do with the Sārapallikā of the Chicacole grant. It, however, does not appear quite unreasonable to think that after the downfall of the Ceta dynasty, to which the great Khāravela belonged, Kalinga became split up into a number of petty principalities and that that state continued as late as the time of Samudragupta's invasion. The history of Kalinga in about the 5th century A.D. was possibly marked by the rivalry between the royal lines of Piṣṭapura and Simhapura for the supreme authority over Kalinga. The line of Simhapura was possibly overthrown by the Gaṅgas in about the beginning of the 6th century

9 *Ep. Ind.*, VI, 4 ff.

10 *Ibid.*, XII, 1 ff.

A.D. Curiously enough we find a line of kings with names ending in वर्मन् ruling over parts of Eastern and Northern Bengal in the 10th and 11th centuries A.D. The ancestors of these "Varmans"—as they style themselves in their inscriptions—are said to have once occupied Simhapura. Cf. वर्माणोऽतिगभीरनाम दधतः श्लाघ्यौ भुजौ विभ्रतो मेजुः सिंहपुरं गुहामिव मृगेन्द्राणां हरेर्बान्धवाः ; Belāva grant of Bhojavarman¹¹ (middle of the 11th century A. D.) son of Sāmalavarman, grandson of Jātavarman and great-grandson of Vajravarman. The Bengal Varmans trace their descent from Svayambhū through Yadu ; evidently they claim connection with the Yādavas (cf. हरेर्बान्धवाः in the passage quoted above). Whatever that claim may mean, it may be presumed that the Varmans, when they were displaced from Simhapura (by the Eastern Gaṅgas?), marched towards the east and carved out a principality somewhere in South or South-east Bengal. They appear to have supplanted the Candra dynasty of East Bengal, possibly after it was shaken by the defeat of "Govindacandra of Vaṅgāladeśa" by that Indian Napoleon; Rājendra Coḷa I Gaṅgāikonda, in about 1023 A.D.¹²

DINES CHANDRA SIRCAR

11 *Ibid.*, XII, 37 ff.

12 The Kalinga Varmans seem to have originally come from the kingdom of Sang-ho-pu-lo (Simhapura) placed by Yuan Chwang in the Punjab. See also the Lakkhamandal inscription (*Ep. Ind.*, I, 12).

The Four Ways and the Four Fruits in Pāli Buddhism

In the Pāli Piṭakās are to be found various words which are manifestly important: *dhamma*, *magga*, *nibbāna*, *arahān* (the moral law, the way, nirvāṇa, and the person who is worthy) to mention only a very few. But these four are sufficient briefly to delineate the teaching which was at the root of early Buddhism.

Now early Buddhism falls roughly into two divisions: (1) Sākya, or the oral teaching of Gotama and his co-founders. This, because it was oral, has not come down to us intact; (2) monastic Buddhism, or the views and tenets of the monks who lived two or three centuries after Gotama's death. These are the monks who "edited" the texts as we have them to-day, collecting the material for the stringing together of the Founder's reputed discourses from "repeaters." These "repeated" to the "editors" all that they could remember of the tradition handed down to them orally.

One of the differences between these two forms of Buddhism lies in the different value that each ascribed to the terms mentioned above. For the Founder *dhamma* was much like Kant's "moral law within the breast," the inner guide and monitor; for the monk it became an externalised body of doctrine. For the Founder *magga* was very probably the Way for becoming (*bhava*), for becoming greater, nobler, better during many life-spans to come; for the monk it was merely the eightfold Way (or Path) of eight fitnesses. For the Founder *nibbāna* was a cathartic process, a cleansing from the fires of passion, hatred and illusion; for the monk it was a waning of the self of man. When we come to the term *arahān*, it is not easy to say what it meant for the Founder and his fellow workers. But as it is closely connected with the subject of this paper, I may be allowed to consider it at some length.

The term *arahān*, like these other terms, has had a long history. In the *Rg-Veda* it is sometimes applied to the god Agni; while in the *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa* the term appears to be an honorific title bestowed upon some high official, important on account of his worldly status. In Jaina literature the epithet is given exclusively to the revealer of the religion. Turning to Pāli literature we do not find the *arahān* emerging

just as a *ṛṣi*, a recluse; nor as a person with magic powers (*iddhi*) such as the six heretical leaders (*Vin.* II. 210) and Kassapa (*Vin.* I. 25 ff.) are recorded to have claimed to possess; nor yet as a person addicted to the performance of physical austerities. For these interpretations of *araham* were rejected. What we do find is that the available documentary material shows the *araham* already emerged as a man or woman who has won perfection here and now; and arahanship as a highly desirable state to be won here and now. Arahanship so regarded is the offspring of monastic Buddhism with its dread of renewed becomings. Thus nearly every description of *araham* is in terms of finite achievement. The notion of consummation was contracted to something that man might conceive and name in this rebirth.

So rapidly, apparently, did the term *araham* come to mean the finished product that we do not know what it had meant for Gotama. But a great Teacher would not have seen perfection as realisable under physical conditions: he would have thought of man growing up to perfection as he ran on and fared on, his thought, word and deed becoming finer and purer in each new rebirth. It is apparent that the notion of winning perfection here and now cuts across this larger view. The ideal becomes one which only the few can grasp.

Under monastic Buddhism this goal of arahanship, of perfection to be won here and now, was the goal held up to every zealous bhikkhu (monk) and bhikkhunī (nun). According to the thought of the time, those who attained the end desired were able to do so because the whole trend of their lives and characters had been set in this direction during more or fewer becomings (*i.e.*, lives), according to their different destinies. There may have been some whose destiny it might not necessarily have been ever to attain arahanship: these like Devadattā, might have been incurable, *atekiccha* (*Vin.* II. 202; *A.* III. 402, etc.). Again there were many disciples who were not able to achieve arahanship in this life.

Nevertheless the majority of those who had entered the Order was reckoned to be on an upward way, sufficiently advanced to merit a designation conveying spiritual achievement. These who have progressed well are not ranked merely as non-arahans (*i.e.*, as "not saints" or as "not men perfected") but are brought under one of

three headings which, with the arahans as the fourth heading, are together classified into a fourfold group. Of this the arahan is naturally the highest member. This group consists of those people who were on what is known as the "Four Ways"; and within the Buddhist interpretation of the Indian belief in a chain of rebirths (*samsāra*) this group has some importance.

When each of the four ways (*maggā*) had been fully mastered, it was said to yield a fruit (*phala*). The fruit of one way was not immediate attainment to the next way; but was the gaining of definite subsequent conditions (fully stated in the texts, *see below* p. 789). These conditions had to be spent before entrance to the next way, if this was destined, could take place. Strictly speaking, the last way and the last way only was the Way to arahanship.

The person who is on the first Way (*sotāpattimaggā*), the Way of stream-attainment, is called *sotāpanna*, a stream-winner, a stream-attainer, or a stream-entrant. He who is in the second Way (*sakadāgāmiṃmaggā*), the Way of Once-returning, is called a *sakadāgāmin*, an once-returner. He who is on the third Way (*anāgāmiṃmaggā*), the Way of No-return, is called an *anāgāmin*, a non-returner. He who is on the fourth and highest Way (*arahattamaggā*), the Way of Arahanship, is, when he has reaped the fruit of this Way, an arahan. The fruit of this Way is also the goal of the good life and the highest and sweetest fruit in the life of a recluse. But when it has been gained, then the task is done, for the arahan has nothing further to do.

At some time, we do not know exactly when, *the* Way became divided into this group of the four Ways. These represent stages of the Way, and have nothing to do with the other classification of the Way into eight component parts. But because the one Way was, or came to be, the Way to arahanship, these four Ways are also in a sense Ways to arahanship. Yet they are nowhere called by this name in the Pāli Canon. Moreover there exist, so far as I know, only a few Vibhaṅga passages (*Vbh.* 322 ff; 335) where the generic term "the four Ways" is used. Ordinarily each one is referred to specifically. It is most suggestive to find that in the *Saṅgīti-Suttanta*, although the four limbs of stream-attainment, the four limbs of the stream-attainer and the four fruits of samānhood (which are identical with the

fruits of the four Ways) are named, the four Ways themselves are not catalogued. They are indeed doubly absent. In the first place there is no heading called the "Four Ways." In the second place, under the heading the "fruits of samāṇaship" the fruits are said not to be those of the Ways—the way of stream-attainment and so on—but are said to be those of stream-attainment and so on, the word *magga* not appearing. This omission of the four Ways from among the Fours of the *Saṅgīti Suttanta* is as remarkable as the omission from among its Eights of the Way (or Path) as eightfold. Here the eight "fitnesses" or "rightnesses" (*sammatta*) are catalogued. And that is all.

This suggests that at the time when this Suttanta was written down the Four Ways had not been established as a group, and the sub-division of the Way into stages (each one of which was called *magga*), or into eight component parts (*aṅga*) was not as yet very important. But since *bhava*, becoming, which as I have suggested was originally implicit in the Way, came to be connected with recurring experience of Ill and was hence a thing to be dreaded, the teaching on the Ways appears to have been used as a tool—not for holding out the hope of a number of subsequent rebirths, but for holding out the hope of greatly reducing the number of rebirths to this world, with the possibility of not returning to it again. Thus as time went on it is probable that the Ways came to receive more emphasis than the fruits. The *Dhammasaṅgani*, for example, has sections on each of the four Ways (277-364), but not on the fruits. I think it possible that the notion of the four fruits preceded that of the four Ways; that there were perhaps originally only three fruits corresponding to the various aspects of renewed becomings, which were thought of as going on after life here had ceased; that the fruit of arahanship was a later accretion added when the finite concept, that of man perfected with nothing more to do, ousted the concept of an infinite becoming; and that the division of the Way into four parts was also a later device made to balance the four fruits.

The term "stream-winning" especially appears to belong to an earlier date than do the other terms in this group. It represents a facet of a notion which was of the essence of Sākya, for it suggests a perpetual flowing along to join the greater, as rivers flow to join the

ocean. This ocean of *samsāra* (rebirths) had originally been regarded as a thing full of the promise of infinite opportunities for progress. Later it came to be regarded with dread, as a process to be stopped at the cost of life renewed and renewable. Then it will have been that *sotāpatti* was dethroned from its sovereignty over becoming and was relegated to the lowest place in the fourfold Way; and then too, that the conception of the four Ways was probably crystallised into formulæ. Such formulæ were wanted in order to hold out to as many as possible, besides those who were arahans, the consolation of the cessation of lives. It was in order that the majority should be able to look forward to ultimate enlightenment and, more particularly, to returning here once only or not at all, in either case ultimately waning utterly, that the conception of the Four Ways was put forward.

Before going on to a discussion of other points concerning the Ways and the Fruits, it will be as well to quote the passage which perhaps occurs most frequently, and which shows how the characteristics and destinies of those on the four Ways were formulated. It clearly shows a cathartic process, arahanship not being possible until all the moral faults and obstructions which are to be got rid of by progressing along the lower Ways, are truly eliminated as these Ways are mastered. This quotation is taken from the *Dīgha-Nikāya* (I. 156; III. 107, 132) or Collection of Long Discourses, but it occurs also in other Nikāyas:—

“A bhikkhu by the complete destruction of the three fetters (delusions of the self, doubt, trust in the efficacy of good works) is a stream-winner, one who cannot be reborn in any state of woe, assured, bound for enlightenment. A bhikkhu by the complete destruction of the three fetters and by reducing to a minimum passion, hatred and delusion is a once-returner, who by returning once to this world shall make an end of ill. A bhikkhu by the complete destruction of the five fetters (the above three with sensuality and ill-will added) which pertain to this world is one who takes birth spontaneously¹ in the Pure Abode, there to wane utterly, thence never to return. A bhikkhu by the destruction of the āsavas (of desire for sense-pleasures, for re-

¹ Transl. by Mrs. Rhys Davids in *Indian Religion and Survival* p. 64, as “just ‘happening’, not of parents.”

birth, of ignorance and of false views) comes here and now to realise for himself that emancipation of heart and mind which is arahanship, and continues to abide therein."

It will be observed that there is no indication of what the bourn or destiny of an arahān might be.

In the *Aṅguttara* (I. 233) this process of spiritual development is made dependent on training in those rules which together are said to combine to make the threefold training: the higher morality, the higher thought and the higher insight. Again "pondering with method" is stated to be a possible means of rising not only from stream-attainment but from being merely a virtuous bhikkhu, to arahanship (*S.* III. 168 ff.). Pondering with method means concentrating upon the five grasping groups (or groups of fuel for existence) as being, among other things, full of desire and pain, impermanent, empty and not of the self.

Thus there is a continuity between the Ways. Having fared along one and shed the wrong states which pertain to it, a disciple may pass on to another. This occurrence may be spread over more than one rebirth. For example, Dīghāvu, a lay-disciple, was called a stream-winner in this life, and after he had died Gotama is reputed to have said that Dīghāvu would not return from that world where he was reborn. (*S.* V. 344 ff.). On the other hand we hear of disciples who became stream-winners in this life and who shortly afterwards became arahāns—also in this life. In such cases it is probable that attainment in this life to the two intervening ways was not thought to be omitted. For otherwise full purification could not be entailed. Again it is said that two boys (*Ps. Breth.* pp. 10, 61) realised the four ways in succession in the very act of having their curls cut off. Such rapidity of realisation is suggestive of preparation in previous rebirths, a person achieving the utmost in this becoming because his or her destiny "was fully ripe" for this.

But in drawing up the scheme of the four Ways it was the majority, the less highly developed and cultivated that early monastic Buddhism had in mind. If these could not attain arahanship in this rebirth, they might at least gain one of the lower fruits. But here we are faced with a difficulty. For as Buddhism developed the winning of arahanship became tied down to the here and now. It is to my

mind not easy to reconcile to this concept the concept of the Way of No-return as a stage on the way to this same arahanship. [For if, after a person has left this earth, he is not to return to it, if he is to pass utterly away in the realm where he is reborn after his bodily death here, how can he become an arahan as that is ordinarily conceived by the texts, with their insistence on *ditṭhe va dhamme* (here and now, lit.:, in these very seen conditions)? The Way of No-return in fact appears as a cutting short of the development implied by the four-Ways-group, which hence presents a curious anomaly. For the gulf between the non-returner and the arahan is physically unbridgeable, and therefore the inclusion of the third Way is out of place if it is thought that the attainment of arahanship here and now is the ideal of those on the Way of No-return.

Yet theoretically it must have been held to be possible for a non-returner to reap the fruit of arahanship. Or was it that the arahanship thus thought of did not fulfil the "here and now" condition? It is true that in the Piṭakas there is nothing approaching a decisive record of a person who was declared to be first a non-returner in this life and then an arahan, also in this life. But it is true that the Commentaries on the *Theragāthā* and the *Therīgāthā* speak of some of these unusual people, of one Thera and of four Therīs, that having been established in the fruition of no-return, they not long afterwards attained arahanship, and in this life.²

If for some reason the present moment, or as we should say "opportunity," could not be exploited so as to gain arahanship, it was perhaps because not enough effort had been put forth. In the *Majjhima* (I. 436) it is said that the attempt to get rid of the five Fetters which belong to this world, their elimination being considered necessary for non-return—may end either in the extirpation of the āsavas, which is virtually the same as arahanship, or in the destruction of the five Fetters and a state of non-return. Thus the effort to achieve non-return may overreach itself, and end in arahanship; or it may accomplish exactly that which it set out to do. But the disciple who

2 We do not know on whose authority these bold assertions were made.

put forth the effort has not won both states, but the one or the other. Indeed in this passage the two appear to be mutually exclusive.

Again, this alternative result may depend upon the presence or absence of any substrate for existence. In the *Sutta-Nipāta* (p. 140) is a phrase which has been much repeated in the Suttas. It says, "For a bhikkhu who is zealous, ardent, the self established you may expect one of two fruits: either *aññā* (perfected knowledge) here and now, or if his stuff of existence be not wholly spent, the condition of a non-returner."

At first sight it looks as if the presence of a remainder of the stuff of existence (*sa-upādisesa*) or the absence of it (*anupādisesa*) were meant to denote alternative consummations. But this is not so. Either the bhikkhu has *aññā*, which would mean that he has no substrate remaining, or he has not quite achieved *aññā* (here). The *Dhammapada Commentary* (II. 163) distinguishes two forms of *parinibbāna*, utter waning out. It says that *parinibbāna* means there is a substrate remaining after the attainment of arahanship by the destruction of the *kilesas*; and there is no substrate remaining after the destruction of the *khandhas*. The *Itivuttaka* (p. 38) and the *Sutta-Nipāta Commentary* (I. 350) identify these two conditions (*sa-upādisesa* and *anupādisesa*) with the nibbāna-state (*nibbāna-dhātu*). Nothing spatial is meant by this: it is defined (S. V. 8) as destruction of passion, hatred, delusion and the *āsavas*.

These considerations show, not the irreconcilability of *anupādisesa* (called *aññā* in the *Sutta-Nipāta* passage) and *sa-upādisesa*, but the existence of a close connection between them. But when it came to be thought that arahanship was to be won here and now, logically the third Way should have been eliminated from the group of the four Ways; for it suggests an alternative achievement to arahanship, so long as insistence is laid on gaining this in the present rebirth. But the third Way was not eliminated. Yet something very like it appears to have been attempted in an *Ānguttara* passage (IV. 378). It is said of all those on the three lower Ways that when they have done their time here they are with a substrate remaining, but will not be reborn in any state of woe. The arahān is not mentioned in this passage: neither is *anupādisesa*. Does this joint exclusion of the arahān and *anupādisesa* intend to imply that this state was the monopoly of the arahān?

There is not so much perplexity about the state of a *sakadāgāmin* as there is about the *anāgāmin* after he has deceased from this body. It is clearly stated, in both the Commentaries on the *Majjhīma* and on the *Puggalapaññatti*, that he is to return once to this earth and to spend the intervening time in the deva world.

One point in this passage of the *Majjhīma Commentary* calls for some notice. It is concerned with the meaning which it intends to ascribe to the term *magga*, way. For this passage says that the once-returner "having here made to become the Way of once-returning, wanes utterly here.....or making to become the Way here....." It is open to question, I think, whether the Way here means the way of once-returning as it is explicitly called the first time it is mentioned; and whether it is called simply *magga* in subsequent allusions to it for the sake of brevity (which is not however as a rule a virtue of the Commentator); or, whether the one sole Way is intended. Either interpretation would be possible. Once-returning might be as easily entailed by cultivation of the Way itself as by cultivation of the Way of Once-returning. For the latter was a part or stage of the former. It is said that whoever is blessed with the ariyan eightfold Way is a stream-winner (S. V. 347). And the once-returner although at a higher stage on the Way than was the stream-winner was not on a different way, for there was not a second one by which a disciple could progress. This mention of the (one) Way may have been due to a lingering memory of the earlier teaching which became "left-in" in the Commentary. At all events nothing can now fortunately alter the fact that, in this Commentary, the Way is called by its simplest designation, *magga*.

And I think that there are good grounds for the hypothesis that by *magga* the *Majjhīma Commentary* means the way, and nothing less. The Way was for making to become, and later, meant going to nibbāna; and these were the aims of those on the fourfold Way. In addition various Commentaries (M.A. I.162; S. I. 196) call *sota*, stream, a name for the Way. Again, in the *Dīgha* and *Saṃyutta Commentaries* (D.A. I. 313=S.A. II.73) *sotāpanna* is defined as "having attained the stream of the Way."

Descriptions of those who are on the four Ways are descriptions of

those who are progressing on the Way shown by Gotama to all his disciples and followers. Declarations of knowledge pertaining to these Ways are manifestations of the extent to which the training has been variously fulfilled, or of the different states to which it will conduce while it is being fulfilled to a greater or less degree. So far we have found that the greater or lesser amount of destruction of the fetters is the criterion for measuring those on the four Ways. Another, and possibly late, means of discrimination is also used (*S. V. 375*). This includes, besides elimination of the Fetters, four endowments: faith in the Buddha, in Dhamma, in the Saṅgha, and joyousness and swift-ness in insight. The first three of these remain constant, being ascribed to those on each of the four Ways, while their other achievements vary with their progress. But in other passages (*D. II. 93; III. 227=S. II. 69*), possibly earlier, the first three of these endowments with the possession of virtues dear to the Ariyans (instead of joyousness and swift-ness in insight) are called the four possessions of the stream-winner only, and not of those on all the four Ways.

There are records that others besides those who had entered the Orders became arahans. It is therefore only to be expected that others also were capable of entering the lower Ways.

Gotama is recorded to have said that the most backward bhikkhu is a stream-winner (*Vin. III. 10=D. II. 155*). Of women he is reputed to have said that they might become (*bhaddha*) those to realise the fruits of the first three Ways and arahanship if they would go forth from home into homelessness (*Vin. III. 254*). This last clause seems to be in contradiction of the view that lay-people may be stream-winners, and looks like a piece of later editing. For it is highly probable that Gotama would not have tried to discriminate between a lay-man and a lay-woman in the matter of stream-entrance. He is reputed to have told the Sākya lady Kāḷgodhā that she had won the fruits of stream-attainment and that that was a gain for her; and there are various records of laymen who are said to have won this state. Thus Dhammadinna affirmed that he had the four limbs of the stream-winner intact. Moreover Gotama is recorded to have instructed Mahānāma that these four limbs are to be used by one lay-disciple who is a stream-winner to comfort another who needs their assurance because he is ill (*S. IV. 408 ff.*).

Again, he is recorded to have declared that any white-frocked house man who observes the first five *sīlas*, and who is possessed of the four endowments of the stream-winner may declare the Self by the self (*attanā va attānan*) by uttering the formula of stream-attainment.

These *attā* couples of sayings which occur especially in the *Āṅguttara*: may declare the Self by the self (A. III. 211), the Self upbraids the self (A. I. 57), the self conceals the Self (A. I. 149), are redolent of the old Upaniṣadic outlook, and are a priceless indication of the bond which was then held to exist between the Highest Self and the individual self, the lesser being able by its own nature to declare its share in the nature of the All and its union with it. These couples are a fragment of original Sākya, and belong to a time before *nibbāna* as a waning of the self of man had intervened as a natural corollary of the growth of the *anattā* doctrine.

There is a very interesting passage in the *Āṅguttara* (III. 351) which states that various classes of devas who possess perfect faith in the Buddha, in Dhamma, in the Saṅgha and who have the virtues dear to the Ariyans, are stream-winners. Such devas include the Four Firmament Devas, the Devas of the Thirty, of Tusita, those who delight in creating and those who have power over the creations of others. The devas of Brahmā's company are not mentioned, for they were, so it is thought, non-returners. Neither are the devas "beyond that" (*tatuttariṃ*) included.

We turn now to those who may become once-returners and non-returners. In all the canonical records which I have come across of women who are said to be on one or other of these Ways, they are only said to be so after they have left this earth. The same is not true for men. For there are at least three passages all in the *Saṃyutta*, where a man is called an *anāgāmin* while he is alive. A Brahmin belonging to the independent class of Brahmās (*paccekabrahmā*), of which we have no traditional knowledge, was asked by some bhikkhus on his appearance to them after he had passed hence, "Were you not called *anāgāmin* by the Lord?" But if he had been so called, we do not know whether he won this title before or after he had left this world.

In the *Āṅguttara* (II. 159) it is said that if both the once-returner

and the non-returner have here and now attained to the realm of neither-perception nor non-perception, deceasing hence they will pass to the company of the devas who have attained this realm. But the once-returner will come back to this state of things because he has not destroyed the Fetters which pertain to this world. In another passage (A. I. 63 f.) the sole difference between a non-returner and a once-returner is that the former "having attained to a certain calm freedom of mind dwells therein."

There is a puzzling passage in the Lohicca Suttanta of the *Dīgha*. Here Gotama is made to say that if any samāna or brāhmaṇa were to put obstacles in the way of those clansmen who have won distinction in Dhamma and the discipline, as for example the fruit of stream-winning or the fruit of one or other of the Ways, he would be putting obstacles in the way of those who are making embryos fit for devas (*dibbā gabbhā*) ripe for rebirth in becomings fit for devas. This curious little passage appears to mean that attainment to any of the four Ways might lead to rebirth among the devas. Or does it actually mean this? Had it meant literally this, would it not have said *devesu*, among the devas? Is the use of *dibba* meant to imply that one might be merely deva-like, without necessarily joining their company? I do not think so. I think that before *arahatta* (arahanship) came to be identified with *nibbāna*, and before that came to mean the waning of the self, and not merely of *rāga*, *dosa* and *moha*, (passion, hatred and illusion), the arahan was regarded as having some bourn beyond, when this life was over; and that before *nirodha*, making to cease, came to assume prime importance, the arahan was allowed to fit in with the essentially Indian belief in the running on and faring on of beings. This was *saṃsāra*, whose "beginning and end are alike unthinkable." Who is more worthy than the arahan for the bliss of the deva-realms? Who is more worthy for a myriad opportunities for self-betterment? He was as certainly fit for these as he was for cessation.

I. B. HORNER.

Some References pertaining to Agriculture in Jaina Literature

This is an attempt to point out a few references relating to agriculture noticed by me while going through some of the Jaina works.¹

To begin with, *Sthānāṅga*² in its 4th *uddeśaka* of the 4th *sthāna* deals with the four types of *kṛṣi*: (1) *rāpita*, (2) *parirāpita*, (3) *nindita* and (4) *parinindita*, the actual quotation being as follows:—

“चउव्विहा किसी पणत्ता, तंजहा - वाविया, परिवाविया, णिंदिया, परिणिंदिया ।”
(सू० ३५५)³

In *Upāsakadasāo*, the 7th *aṅga*, we come across the life of Ānanda, one of the ten *upāsakas* of Śramaṇa Bhagavān Mahāvīra, who “limits himself in his possession of landed property to five hundred ploughs and land at the rate of 100 *nirartanas* for each plough (नियत्तणसइएणं हलेण) and renounces the possession of any other landed property.”⁴

According to Paṇḍit Becharadas this is a type of the plough which, as its very name implies, has an efficiency of ploughing ground 100 sq. *nirartanas* in measure. Hearnle, however, takes this as a measure of land.⁵

Furthermore, we find this Mahāśrāvaka, vowing that he will only keep 500 carts for foreign traffic and 500 carts for home-use to bring grass, corn etc. from fields.⁶

In the narration of the life of this Ānanda, we notice a passage wherein Indrabhūti Gautama, the 1st Gaṇadhara of Lord Mahāvīra,

1 I have not found references from Jaina literature incorporated by Mr. Radharamana Gangopadhyaya in his interesting work “Some materials for the study of Agriculture and Agriculturists in Ancient India.”

2 This is the 3rd *aṅga* out of the 12, all of which form a part and parcel of the Jaina canon. It is divided into 10 chapters called *sthānas* some of which have *uddeśakas* as their subdivisions. This work along with Śrī Abhayadeva Sūri's commentary has been published in two parts by the Āgamodaya Samiti.

3 Abhayadeva Sūri explains this as under:—

“कृषिः—ग्रान्यार्थं क्षेत्रकरणम्, ‘वाविय’ति सकृद् ग्रान्यवपनवती, ‘परिवाविय’ति द्विस्त्रिंशो उत्पाद्य स्थानान्तरारोपणतः परिवपनवती शालिकृषिवत्, ‘णिंदिय’ति एकदा विजातीयवृक्षाद्यपनयनेन शोधिता निन्दिता, ‘परिणिंदिय’ति द्विस्त्रिंशो वृक्षादिशोधनेनेति.”

4 See Dr. Hearnle's edition of *Upāsakadasāo* (Bibl. Indica), p. 14.

5 *Ibid.*, p. 80.

6 *Ibid.*, p. 14.

is described as walking जुगंतरपरिलोयणाए दिट्ठीए . The word *yuga* (Pr. *juga*) signifies in Buddhistic literature the measure of a plough.⁷ In Jaina literature, it is generally interpreted as the yoke of a cart⁸ or a length of four cubits.⁹

In the description of *piśāca* given in this *āṅga* (II), we come across the following words connected with agriculture:—

Gokilañja, sūlibhasella, sukhakattara, phāla and *hala kuddāla*.

The *Praśnavyākaraṇa* mentions *maiya* in *saṃvaradvāra* and *laṅgala* in *āśravadvāra*. In *Daśavaikālika* (VII, 28) too, we find *naṅgala*¹⁰ and *maiya*. The word *sīra* meaning a plough is used by Haribhadra Sūri in his work named *Samśārādāvānala-stuti* (v. I).¹¹

The *Bṛhatkalpasūtra* informs us about two kinds of fields viz., *setu* (setu)¹² and *ketu* (ketu), the former watered by means of a well etc., and the latter depending upon rain, for its being watered.

As regards implements of agriculture, Śrī Akalaṅka's *Tattvārtharājavārttika*¹³, a commentary on Umāsvāti's *Tattvārthādhigamasūtra* supplies us with names of three of them: (1) *hala*, (2) *kuliśa* and (3) *dantālika*.

In *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi* (III, v. 554 ff.) we find certain terms pertaining to agriculture as can be seen from the following quotation:—

“कुटुम्भी कर्षकः क्षेत्री हली कृषिककर्षकौ ।

कृषोवलोऽपि, जित्या तु हलिः सोरस्तु लाङ्गलम् ॥ ५५४ ॥

गोदारणं हलमीषसीते तद्दण्डपद्धती ।

निरीषे कुटकं, फाले कृषकः कुशिकः फलम् ॥ ५३५ ॥

7 The figurative use of this word in philosophy clearly indicates its popularity.

8 See Śrī Haribhadra Sūri's Comm. to *Daśavaikālika* (V, 1, 3). In *Abhidhānarājendra* (vol. IV, p. 1574) we find the following line:—

“युगमात्रया शरीरप्रमाणाया शकटोर्ध्वसंस्थितया दृष्ट्या”

9 Vide the comm. on *Pravacanasāroddhāra* (103rd dvāra), where it is said

“युगं—युपं चतुर्हस्तप्रमाणां तत्प्रमाणां भूमि निरीक्षत.”

10 See *Jambūdvīpaprajñapti* (Sū. 42).

11 This hymn is composed in *samasamśkrta* i.e. to say its language can be looked upon as Sanskrit-and-Prakrit as well.

12 See *Rājapraśnīya*, p. 2.

13 This seems to have been composed not later than the 9th century.

दात्रं लवित्रं, तन्मुष्टौ वण्टो मत्स्यं समीकृतौ ।
 गोदारणं तु कुहलः खनित्रं त्ववदारणम् ॥ ५५६ ॥
 प्रतोदस्तु प्रवयणं प्राजनं तोत्रतोदने ।
 योत्रं तु योक्त्रमाबन्धः, कोटिशो लोष्ट्रभेदनः ॥ ५५७ ॥
 मेधिर्मेधिः खलेवाली खले गोबन्धदारु यत् ।”

According to *Prajñāpanāsūtra* (I, 36) and the *bhāṣya*¹⁴ of *Tattvārthadhigamasūtra* (III, 15, p. 265) the agriculturists are designated as *Āryas* and not as *Mlecchas*, the two groups in which all human beings are classified by the Jaina philosophers. The *Āryas* have been further divided into six classes according to their (1) *kṣetra*, (2) *jāti*, (3) *kula*, (4) *karma*, (5) *śilpa* and (6) *bhāṣā*. Agriculturists are included in the class styled as *karmārya*. It may not be amiss to state that the *śilpāryas* are here spoken of as *alpasāvadya* and *agarhitājīva*, perhaps implying thereby that they are preferred to the *karmāryas*.

The *Tattvārtharājarārttika* (pp. 142-143) has:—

“कर्मर्यास्त्रेधा—सावद्यकर्मर्या अल्पसावद्यकर्मर्या असावद्यकर्मर्याश्चेति । सावद्य-
 कर्मर्याः षोढा असि-मसि-कृषि विद्या-शिल्प-वणिकर्मभेदान् । . . . अल्पसावद्यकर्मर्याश्च
 श्रावकाः . . . असावद्यकर्मर्याः संयताः”

The land where are born the *Tīrthāṅkaras*, the *Cakravartins*, the *Vāsuderas*, the *Pratīvāsuderas* and the *Balarāmas*, is designated in Jainism as *karmabhūmi*. This is also defined as one where we find people at some time or other resorting to *asi*¹⁵, *masi* and *kṛṣi* for their livelihood.¹⁶ This will suggest the place which is assigned to agriculture in the Jaina field.

14 This has been edited by me along with Siddhasena Gaṇi's commentary and is published in two parts by Sheth D.L.P. Jaina Pustakoddhāra Fund Series.

15 For an interpretation of this word occurring in the *Ṛg-veda* see *IHQ.*, vol. VIII, p. 366.

16 Śrī Siddhasena Sūri, while commenting upon *Pravacanasāroddhāra* has observed as follows:—

“कर्म—कृषिवाणिज्यादि मोक्षानुष्ठानं वा तत्प्रधाना भूमयः कर्मभूमयः”
 (pt. II, p. 311).

In the *Akarmabhūmis* and the *Karmabhūmis*, too, especially, in the time of the *Kulakaras*, ploughing seems to be unessential, since all sorts of desires of mankind are practically gratified by the *kalpavṛkṣas* which grow of their own accord. Can this be interpreted to mean that at least in some periods of time and in some places, the ground was exceedingly fertile?

For the sake of people's livelihood, ploughing was established along with grass-gathering, wood-carrying and trade by Lord Ṛṣabha before he renounced the world. Some people were later on persuaded by his son Bharata to give it up. This incident¹⁷ is described by Śrī Hemacandra Sūri, the famous poligrapher in *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣa-carita*, which is translated into English¹⁸ as under:—

“Then Bharata summoned the laymen and made this announcement: ‘You must take your food daily in my house. Ploughing etc. must not be done. Moreover, daily you must devote your attention to study of the scriptures, acquiring new knowledge. When you come into my presence after you have eaten, you must recite: ‘You are conquered. Fear grows. Therefore, do not kill. Do not kill (*mā hana*)’.”¹⁹

Amongst the 15 *karmādānas* (the 15 ways of living to be avoided) enumerated in the *Upāsakadaśāṅga* (p. 20), *sphoṭakarma*,²⁰ too, is included. This shows that a Jaina ought to refrain from an occupation involving breaking of ground by means of spades, ploughs etc.

HIRALAL R. KAPADIA

17 This is also referred to by Śrī Amaraçandra Sūri in his work *Padmānanda Mahākāvya* which is based upon *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣa-carita*. See pp. 415-416 of my edition (G. O. Series, vol. LVIII).

18 See G. O. Series (vol. LI. p. 343).

19 This indirectly furnishes us with a Jaina view about the origin of the *Brāhmaṇas*.

20 “स्फोटकर्म कुहालहलादिभिर्भूमिदारणेन जीवनम्”—Abhayadeva's Comm.

Identity of Vidyāraṇya and Mādhavācārya

A short note by Mr. Markandeya Sarma appeared in vol. VIII, no. 3 of this *Quarterly* apparently as a reply to my argument disproving the identity of Vidyāraṇya with Mādhavācārya. As he has raised objection only to a few points dealt with by me I waited to see if the question would be discussed more fully by other writers before sending a reply.¹

The main objections raised by me to the theory of identity of Vidyāraṇya, the head of the Śringeri Matt, with Mādhavācārya, brother of Sāyaṇa and author of various works like *Parāsāra-smṛti-vyākhyā*, are briefly as follows:—

1. The literary tradition at Śringeri as recorded in the works *Vidyāraṇyakāvalajñāna* and *Gururamaṣa*, which give a fairly full biographical account of Vidyāraṇya, has recorded that Vidyāraṇya was distinct from the ministers Mādhava and Sāyaṇa.

2. The encyclopaedic work *Śivatattvaratnākara*, compiled in 1708 by the chief of Keḷadi kingdom in which Śringeri is situated, gives the name Śivadharma to Vidyāraṇya before he assumed *sannyāsa* and makes him a different personage from Mādhavācārya.

3. Against this positive evidence there is not a single inscription proving the identity.

4. Nor do the references to Mādhava in the works of Mādhava and Sāyaṇa indicate such an identity but, on the contrary, are opposed to it.

5. Above all these, the great difference between the lives of these two great men as depicted in inscriptions² and literature, the one (Vidyāraṇya) an ascetic and the head of the Śringeri Matt and the spiritual guru of the Vijayanagar kings and the other (Mādhavācārya) a householder and performer of sacrifices and a minister obeying the orders of Vijayanagar king Bukka. Other arguments will be set forth here to prove the difference between the two personages.

How does Mr. Sarma meet these objections? The absence of reference to Vidyāraṇya in the works of Sāyaṇa and contemporary

1 An article entitled 'The Mādhava-Vidyāraṇya theory' by M.A. Doraiswamy Iyengar has appeared in the *Journal of Indian History*, vol. XII, part ii.

2 Hampe Inscription dated S. 1332, *SII.*, IV, p. 60.

inscriptions is explained away by the principle that it is not customary for a sannyāsī to be referred to by his name in the pre-sannyāsa stage. But this principle applies only to the sannyāsī himself and not to others. There is no authority preventing a younger brother (like Sāyaṇa in the case of Mādhavācārya) or a nephew (Sāyaṇa-Mādhava) or a sister's son (Lakṣmīdhara) referring to such a change in the status of Mādhavācārya either in the literary works or inscriptions which were composed after he became a sannyāsī.

Another argument put forth by Mr. Sarma in support of his theory is that Mādhavācārya adopted the name Vidyāraṇya at a subsequent stage of his life, perhaps years later. In other words, Mādhavācārya was a householder and afterwards assumed the yellow robe. Now it must be asked in all seriousness when this change took place. It cannot have taken place before the great works of himself and his brother Sāyaṇa were composed as they contain introductory verses and colophons describing him as a householder, a minister of Bukka and performer of sacrifices (in which animals are killed, ascetics being forbidden to injure living beings under any account). So the change can only have occurred after all these works were written. Of Mādhavācārya's works, *Parāśarasṃṛti-bhāṣya*, *Vyārahāramādhava*, and *Kālanirṇaya* were composed in the reign of Bukka I (1356-1377). The introductory verses of *Jaiminīya-nyāyamālā-vistara* show that it was begun by him in the reign of Bukka I, but a stanza occurring in the colophon at the end of the work वेदानां स्थितिकृत्पुराहरिहरः has a pun which seems to indicate that it was completed in the reign of Harihara, viz., Harihara II, son of Bukka I. Even if this verse is rejected as inconclusive (not occurring in some mss.), there are references to Mādhava in certain works of Sāyaṇa which were composed in the reign of Harihara II according to their introductory verses and colophons. The *Atharvaveda-bhāṣya*, *Taittirīyāranyaka-bhāṣya* and *Yajñatantra-sudhānidhi* belong to this series. It has been shown by me (see *IHQ.*, vol. VI, no. 4, p. 710) that the bhāṣyas on the Vedas were all composed by one individual although he might have received assistance in various ways from others.³ Mr.

3 One of the introductory verses in *Yajñatantra-sudhānidhi* unmistakably supports my contention. After making the Tulābhāra gift Sāyaṇa was praised

Sarma would give the credit of their composition to Mādhavācārya according to his interpretation of the word *Mādhavīya* although Sāyana himself says in his *Dhātuvṛtti*: तेन मायण पुत्रेण सायणेन मनीषिणा । आह्वयया माधवीयेयं धातुवृत्तिर्विरच्यते । (*Dhātuvṛtti*, vol. I, part i, Oriental Library edition, Mysore, p. 2).

Under the above assumption of Mr. Sarma, Mādhava must have written part of his *Vedabhāṣyas* in the reign of Harihara II. If we take Sāyana as their author, still we find no reference in *Atharvavedabhāṣya* etc. to Mādhava having become a sannyāsī even in the beginning of the reign of Harihara II. On the contrary, in the *Yajñatantrasudhānidhi* of Sāyana (composed in the reign of Harihara II) his brother Mādhava is described still as ममाकतूनामाहर्तामाधवार्यः सहोदरः (*JA.*, 1916, p. 2). From these it follows that Mādhavācārya could only have become a sannyāsī some time during the reign of Harihara II (1377-1404) and that there could have been no Vidyāraṇya in the time of Bukka I, if the identity is accepted.

But it is now known that Vidyāraṇya was already a sannyāsī and the head of the Śringerī Matt in 1375 A.D. in the reign of Bukka I according to a stone inscription at Kudupu, S. Canara District, dated Ś. 1297, Rākṣasa Kār śul Gu corresponding to Oct. 25, 1375 a Thursday (*Mad. Ep. Rep.*, 1929, No. 460). Further the Śringerī Kadita purporting to be a copy of a copperplate inscription dated 1380 refers to Vidyāraṇya having returned from Benares and assumed the charge of the Śringerī Matt in the reign of Bukka I (*Mys. Arch. Rep.*, 1916, p. 57). This would be irreconcilable with Mādhava-Vidyāraṇya identity theory for the reason stated above.

There is another argument against the belief that Mādhavācārya became a sannyāsī after he wrote his works. In the works *Parāśarasmitībhāṣya*, and *Kālanirṇaya*, Mādhavācārya praises as his gurus Vidyātīrtha and Bhāratīrtha and in his latest work *Jaiminīya-nyāyamālā-vistara* he says that he became great by the grace of Bhāratīrtha. It is thus certain that Bhāratīrtha was the immediate guru of Mādhava. But the works *Vicaraṇopameyasamgraha*, *Anubhūti-prakāśa* etc. which

thus: adhitās sakalā vedas te ca drṣṭārtha-gauravāḥ tatpraṇītena tad-bhāṣya-pradīpena prathiyasā (*Tanjore Mss. Catalogue*, vol. V, p. 2168).

are accepted as the compositions of Vidyāraṇya contain invocatory verses addressed to Vidyātīrtha and Śaṅkarānanda and make no reference to Bhāratīrtha. Such a procedure would be difficult to explain if Vidyāraṇya was the same as Mādhavācārya, especially as we know that Bhāratīrtha was a sannyāsī and pontiff or Śrīṅgeri Matt at this time. Moreover, the work *Vidyāraṇyakālañjāna* tells us that it was composed by Bhāratīkṛṣṇa under the orders of Vidyāraṇya “भारती कृष्ण यतिना नृपाणामावलि स्तया । आख्यातोऽग्रन्यरूपेण विद्यारण्यस्य चाज्ञया” (p. 232 of Ms. A. 47, Mysore Oriental Library). The Śrīṅgeri copperplate inscription of 1386 and the introductory stanzas of the Śrīṅgeri kaṭita of 1380 would also clearly indicate that Bhāratīrtha was either a disciple or junior to Vidyāraṇya who apparently was absent either at Benares or elsewhere at the time of the Śrīṅgeri stone inscription in 1346 (See *Mys. Arch. Rep.*, 1916, pp. 56-58 and also p. 713 of *IHQ.*, vol. VI, no. 4.). A later work *Puruṣārthaprabodha* by Brahmānandasarasvatī tells us that the subjects dealt with therein are not found in earlier works written by Śaṅkara, Vidyāśaṅkara, Vidyāraṇya and Bhāratīrtha (p. 4929. Sanskrit B, part I, vol. IV of Triennial Catalogue of Oriental Mss. Library, Madras). The evidence of the above inscriptions etc. seems to be incompatible with the theory that Mādhavācārya became Vidyāraṇya.

But more than this, tradition is unanimously hostile to the theory of Mādhavācārya having retired from the post of the minister of Bukka I and become the head of the Śrīṅgeri Matt under the name Vidyāraṇya. They all depict Vidyāraṇya before he became a sannyāsī to have been a poor Brahmin unable to marry (according to *Maṇimañjarībhedinī*, and *Guruvamśakāvyaṃ*) or having too many children (according to *Śivatattvaratnākara*). Not one of them refers to his having been a brother of Sāyana or a minister of Bukka, or a performer of sacrifices like the famous Mādhavācārya. Further, they are all unanimous in declaring that Vidyāraṇya was already a famous sannyāsī at the time of the foundation of the Vijayanagar empire in 1336. In fact, they attribute to the ascetic Vidyāraṇya and the Śrīṅgeri Matt the glory of having raised Harihara I to the throne and built its capital (named after the sage). Thus according to all the above traditional biographies and the spurious copperplates and the literary references, quoted by me (see *IHQ.*,

December 1930 and March 1931) Vidyāraṇya is quite a different personage from Mādhavācārya even if he became a sannyāsī later. Hence those who accept the belief that the famous Mādhavācārya assumed sannyāsa in his later life (i.e., after composing his works and serving as the minister of Bukka I) will have to reject the testimony of the above tradition and are not entitled to claim for Vidyāraṇya the credit of having helped Harihara I to the throne of Vijayanagar or having taken part in building its capital. They can only claim for him ministership under Bukka I for a few years and the composition of a few works which are clearly those of Mādhavācārya and the headship of the Śringeri Matt from about 1375 to 1386 and the authorship also of a few philosophical works definitely assignable to Vidyāraṇya. The advocates of the theory of the identity of Mādhava with Vidyāraṇya, however, usually credit Vidyāraṇya with both the political glory of the Vidyāraṇya of tradition and the literary glory of Mādhavācārya.

But, as it has been shown above, such an identity is incompatible with the evidence before us. Now what, after all, is the authority cited for such an identification?

Mr. Sarma has named about three or four works as disclosing an identity of authorship between Mādhavācārya and Vidyāraṇya. But to presume an identity of persons from the compositions supposed to belong to them is very unsafe in the case of great men holding a high position in popular estimation in India like Śaṅkarācārya, Kālidāsa etc. In the case of such personages, the composition of numerous works which were evidently not theirs is foisted on to their name and if by careful research we come across the real authors of the books and identify such authors with the famous personages to whom they are generally attributed (by popular imagination), there will be terrible confusion in history. Taking Vidyāraṇya himself we find, in some editions of *Devaparādhasotra* that the work belongs to Śaṅkarācārya but other writers attribute its authorship to Vidyāraṇya. Similarly *Vākya-sudhā* is attributed by some to Bhāratīrtha and by others to Śaṅkarācārya (see Tanjore Mss. Library Catalogue edited by P. P. Sastri, vol. XII, p. 5447).

Similarly some editions of *Tātparyadīpikā*, commentary on *Sūtasamhitā*, and also some later works referring to it (see *IA.*, 1916,

p. 17; Triennial Catalogue of Oriental Mss. Madras, 1919-22, vol. IV, part I, Sanskrit B, p. 4919 where a work *Kriyākramadyotikā* by Sadyojātācārya is mentioned) attribute to Vidyāraṇya the composition of *Tātparyadīpikā* (see also p. 76 of *Ācārabhūṣaṇa* by Triyambaka Oka). There are also some scholars who maintain that Mādhavamantrī is identical with Vidyāraṇya (*QJMS.*, vol. VII, no. 3, p. 222) in spite of the inscriptions which show him as the governor of Goa in 1391, years after Vidyāraṇya had become the head of the Śringeri Matt and died (see *JBBAS.*, vol. IV, pp. 115-116; *Mys. Arch. Rep.*, 1916, p. 59). Now shall we on the above bases identify Vidyāraṇya with Mādhavamantrī and Śaṅkarācārya?

Similarly the introductory verses and colophons of several compositions like the *Vedabhāṣya* clearly prove that Sāyaṇa was their author but have been ascribed to Vidyāraṇya by some.⁴ Even the works of other distinct personalities like *Sarvadarśana-saṃgraha* of Sāyaṇa-Mādhava, *Vaiyāsikanyāyamālā* by Bhāratīrtha and *Vidyāmādhaviya* by Vidyāmādhava of Vaśiṣṭha-gotra, son of Nātāyaṇapūjyapāda (Mādhavācārya belonged to Bhāradvājagotra and was the son of Māyaṇa) have been claimed by some to be works of Vidyāraṇya. If as Mr. Sarma has done in the case of the work *Jīvanmuktī-viveka* of Mādhava we are to assume the identity of Mādhava with Vidyāraṇya on the basis of one or two Mss. and the statement of one or two recent writers that Vidyāraṇya was its author, we shall also have to identify Vidyāraṇya with all the several personages named above. Hence we have to reject the testimony of colophons which were influenced by later tradition.

Let us now examine the three works which in the opinion of Mr. Sarma would definitely prove the identity of Vidyāraṇya with Mādhavācārya. The first of these is Caṇḍapa's *Prayogaratanmālā* of the time of Vīra Bhupati, son of Yuva Bukka and grandson of Harihara II. Of this prince Vīra Bhupati we have an inscription dated 1386 (*EC.*, XI, Molakalmuru 31) and another dated Ś 1322 (see *Mad. Ep. Rep.*, 1913, p. 75) and we may therefore take him as a later contemporary of Vidyā-

⁴ See p. xxiv of the Preface to the *Descriptive Catalogue of the Sanskrit Mss. of Tanjore Library*, vol. III.

raṇya. In the introductory verses of this work Vidyāraṇya is praised as वेदार्थ विशदी कर्त्तवेद वेदांग पारगः। But this epithet is too general and could be applied to any one of the numerous scholars of the time who were engaged in the vedic studies and does not necessarily indicate Vidyāraṇya's identity with Mādhavācārya to whom Mr. Sarma ascribes the composition of the well-known *Vedabhāṣya*. It has been shown already from Sāyaṇa's work *Yajñatantra-udhānidhi* that Sāyaṇa and not Mādhava was its author. But Mādhava was also a scholar versed in the interpretation of the Vedas. So also were Vidyātīrtha and Bhāratī-tīrtha whom Caṇḍapa has praised in another work *Āścalāyana-sandhyābhāṣya* as commentators on the Vedas.

श्रीभारतीतीर्थमुनिविद्यातीर्थमुनीश्वरौ ।

नमामि भाष्यकर्त्तारौ त्रयीमयमहार्णवा ॥

(Madras Oriental Mss. Library: Triennial Catalogue 1919-22, vol. IV, part I, Sanskrit A, p. 4215). Similarly Mādhavamantṛi calls himself in his *Tātparyā-dīpikā* as वेदशास्त्रप्रतिष्ठातृ । There is therefore nothing to prevent Vidyāraṇya from being praised as वेदार्थविशदीकर्त्ता वेदवेदाङ्गपारगः without being identified either with Mādhava or Sāyaṇa. Moreover another epithet सांख्ययोगरहस्यज्ञ is applied in the introductory verses of the same work of Caṇḍapa to Vidyāraṇya. Now neither Sāyaṇa nor his brother Mādhava has written any work showing an intimate knowledge of the subjects of Sāṅkhya and Yoga. Hence the argument based on Caṇḍapa's work cannot be accepted as proving the identity of Vidyāraṇya with Mādhavācārya.

The next two works cited by Mr. Sarma as proving the above identity are Mitramiśra's *Vīramitrodaya* and Nṛsiṃha's *Prayogapārijāta* to which he assigns the dates 16th century and 1360-1435 A.D. respectively. They refer to Vidyāraṇya as the author of certain passages found in the *Parāśarasmr̥ti-vyākhyā* and *Kālanirṇaya* of Mādhava. We have seen already that such identity of authorship is no proof for the identity of the personages identified unless supported by other reliable evidences. Moreover the works cited belong to a very much later date. Mitramiśra, author of *Vīramitrodaya*, lived in the court of Vīrasimha who murdered Abul Fazal and his literary activity has been ascribed to a period between 1610 and 1640 A.D. (Kane's *History of Dharmaśāstra*, p. 446) viz., about 250 years after the reign of King Bukka I, the patron

of Mādhava. Nṛsiṃha's *Prayogapārijāta* apparently belongs to the beginning of the 16th century A.D. as it refers to works like *Kriyāsūtra* (p. 1181, Mysore edition of *Prayogapārijāta*. Probable date: earlier than 1600), *Smṛticintāmaṇi* (by Gaṅgāditya, p. 107 assigned to about 1450-1500 A.D. by Kane, *ibid.*, p. 669), and *Muhūrtasaṃgraha* (pp. 489-567, Mysore edition earlier than 1650 A.D., see Kane, *ibid.*, p. 607). Any way the date given by Mr. Sarma viz., 1360-1435 is too early for *Prayoga-pārijāta* and seems to be based on the date of a Ms. of the work found in the Bikanir Library Catalogue edited by Rajendra Prasad. Now in p. 439 of the above Catalogue the date Saṃvat 1495 is given for the Ms. and taking the year as Vikrama Saṃvat the equivalent date was computed as 1439 and as the Ms. itself was dated so early the original work was ascribed to a period 80 years earlier i.e. 1360. But it is now ascertained that the details of the date of the Ms. are Saṃvat 1495 Śrīmukha sam. Śrāv. ba 3, Saturday. This year coincides not with Vikrama Saṃvat 1495 but with Śaka Saṃvat 1495 and the details of the date correspond to Saturday August 15, 1573.⁵

Hence the date of the composition of *Prayoga-pārijāta* cannot be ascribed on the basis of the above to such an early period. Moreover the works *Prayoga-ratna* and *Nirṇaya-sindhu* which frequently quote from the *Prayoga-pārijāta* never allude to Mādhavācārya as being identical with Vidyāraṇya. Hence it is most probable that the reference to Vidyāraṇya in place of Mādhavācārya is due to the copyist. Any way the identity is claimed in a work dated probably about 150 years later than the Mādhava's work referred to.

Now what after all we can gather from the above works is that the Vidyāraṇya legend which attributes to him the authorship of certain compositions of Mādhavācārya, had already begun in the 2nd or 3rd quarter of 16th century. There is not only lack of evidence to support the identity of persons claimed but there is reliable evidence of about the same time hostile to such an identity. For the Chronicle of Nuniz, dated between 1535 and 1537 in the reign of Acyuta itself based on some work accepted as authoritative at the time, tells us that

5 I am indebted to the Bikanir Durbar for this information.

Vidyāraṇya was already an ascetic long before the foundation of the city of Vijayanagar. Further, we have two stone inscriptions in Chitaldrug District of 1538 and 1559 (*EC.*, XI Chitaldrug 45 and Challakere 54) which speak of Vidyānagari caused by Harihararāya (Harihara I) to be built in the name of Vidyāraṇya. But Mādhavācārya could not have been a sannyāsī, as was shown before, in the reign of Harihara I in 1336. Hence since we have more definite data of about the same time as the two works quoted by Mr. Sarma, opposed to the identity of Mādhavācārya with Vidyāraṇya the arguments advanced in favour of the identity cannot be accepted.

Moreover the traditional narratives of the Śringeri Matt viz., *Vidyāraṇyakāvajñāna* (c. 1600 A.D.) and *Gururamaṇṣa* (c. 1720 A.D.) also ascribe to Vidyāraṇya the composition of the works of Sāyana and Mādhava but treat them as separate persons. Thus in verse 44 of chapter IV of *Gururamaṇṣa* we learn that Vidyāraṇya wrote certain works at the request of the ministers Sāyana and Mādhava and published them in their name.

सायणीयमिति माधवीयमित्यादराद्यतिवरोर्यित आभ्यां ।

वेदशास्त्रगृहीतस्सकलास्ताः साधु संव्यधित तद्द्वयनाम्ना ॥

This would show that great as Vidyāraṇya was as the pontiff of the Śringeri Matt from about 1375 to 1386 and the author of some works on Advaita Philosophy like *Pañcadaśī*, *Vicaraṇaprameyasamgraha*, *Anubhūti-prakāśa* etc., tradition glorified him still more by adding on the literary and political achievements of his contemporaries to his name. This seems to have been already commenced by the time of Kṛṣṇarāya (1509-1529). On the one hand, Vidyāraṇya was credited with having placed Harihara I and Bukka I on the throne and having acted as their minister and founded their capital. On the other hand, Vidyāraṇya began to be looked as the author of all the important works of the time. We do not know what political part Vidyāraṇya played before he became the pontiff of Śringeri Matt and when he was merely a sannyāsī and the disciple of Vidyātīrtha. After he became the head of Śringeri Matt he seems to have been greatly respected by Harihara II and his officials. Thus a copperplate of Harihara II dated 1384 describes a grant of land to the disciples of Vidyāraṇya-śrīpāda by King Harihara II. The grant speaks of Harihara II as by the grace

of Vidyāraṇya having acquired the empire of knowledge unattainable by other kings (*Mys. Arch. Rep.*, 1916, p. 58). Another inscription of 1378 (*EC.*, VI, Koppa 30) describes a grant of land having been made to a temple by Prince Virupaṇṇa by orders of Vidyāraṇya-śrīpāda. But later tradition ascribed to him the political glory of Vidyātīrtha and Bhāratīrtha and Vidyātīrtha was highly respected by Harihara I as is proved by the Śṛṅgeri stone inscription of 1346 (*EC.*, VI, Śṛṅgeri I) and was held in great respect by Bukka I also who is described in a copperplate (*EC.*, IV, Yedatore 46) as विद्यातीर्थ मुनेः कृपांबुधिश शीभोगवतारः। Similarly Bhāratīrtha is spoken of as the lotus near which sports the swan Bukka (Śṛṅgeri copperplate of 1386, *Mys. Arch. Rep.*, 1916, p. 59). Later tradition in glorifying Vidyāraṇya attributed to him the achievements of his predecessors in the Śṛṅgeri Matt. This was all the more easy as the names Vidyātīrtha and Vidyāraṇya are very much alike both beginning with Vidyā, and Bhāratī is similar in meaning to Vidyā. Similarly the authorship of numerous compositions of his contemporaries was attributed to Vidyāraṇya. As a large number of the works of the time was written by Mādhavācārya or written by Sāyaṇa and called Mādhaviya (a term which in the absence of a critical study of colophons was wrongly interpreted as meaning the work of Mādhava) it was only natural that these works formed the bulk of the compositions attributed to Vidyāraṇya and hence some of the later writers confused him with Mādhavācārya and added the high political status of Mādhavācārya (and of Sāyaṇa) who are spoken of in their works as ministers of Bukka I and Harihara II to the glory of Vidyāraṇya. Even the achievements of Mādhavamantrin, both literary and political, were attributed by a few writers to Vidyāraṇya and he was wrongly identified both with Mādhavācārya and Mādhavamantrin. But even in the past well-informed scholars like the compilers of the *Vidyāraṇyakālavṛṇāna* and *Guruvamśa* knew to distinguish Vidyāraṇya from Mādhava and Sāyaṇa etc. as also from Vidyātīrtha and Bhāratīrtha though they attributed to him the achievements of those distinguished contemporaries.

Professor J. P. Minayeff

(*The Russian Indologist*)

1840-90

Prefatory Note by Professor Th. Stcherbatsky.

[The study of Sanskrit began in Russia in the early forties of the last century. The first teacher was Prof. K. K o s s o w i t c h who is known by his book *Inscriptiones Palaco-persicae Achaemenidarum*. He was succeeded by Prof. J. P. M i n a y e f f. He was not only a first class Pāli and Sanskrit scholar to whom science is indebted for many valuable editions of texts and works on the history and geography of India, but he also was a great traveller and an authority in historical geography of the countries lying between India and the Russian Empire. He visited India three times and only a premature death stopped his preparations for a fourth long journey to India through Afganistan—a journey which if realized would have lasted four years. Under the cover of a rigid scholarship with a rather sceptical, sarcastic turn of mind, J. P. Minayeff concealed a warm heart which was deeply concerned with the past, present and future destinies of India as well as with the destinies of his own country. His ideas on this subject he expressed in a celebrated address delivered at an annual meeting of the senate students of the University of St. Petersburg (now Leningrad). He then spoke on “The study of India in Russian Universities.” He emphasized the importance of knowing not only the past but also the present condition of that great country. The present biographical sketch and the complete list of his works have been compiled by his niece Miss Alexandra Schneider.]

“The wisdom and science of the Indian philosophers, now as before, ought to be contemplated as the salt of the Indian earth.”

“For a Russian scholar, as in old times, so still more now, the East cannot be only a dead, abstract object of his scientific inquiries.

“He can in accordance with his personal inclinations and scientific disposition take a particular interest in the old Indian languages, in the study of MSS, where the first rays of light of Aryan religious consciousness finds its expression, or concentrate his attention on the investigations of the archaic forms of social development, as much as the memory of it is reflected in the old works of ancient literature— all these studies have undisputably a high scientific value, but the study of ancient India ought not to screen from us the scientific and practical importance of the living phenomena of contemporary India.”

These were the words uttered by Prof. Minayeff in his address on "The study of India in Russian Universities."

Half a century has passed since Prof. Minayeff paid his visit to India, but the diaries of his travels remain until now full of lively interest.

We give here a short sketch of his life and a list of his works.

Prof. M. was a scholar in the true sense of the word, deeply devoted to scientific investigations and researches. He was born in a remote country (Tambof) of Central Russia in 1840 and studied with fervent zeal in the Oriental Faculty of the University of St. Petersburg from 1858-1862.

Goaded by his irresistible desire to know the history of civilisation of the East he studied the Oriental Languages: Chinese with Prof. Vassilieff and Sanskrit with Prof. C. Kossovitch. After having taken his degree of M.A., Prof. M. went abroad for six years, first to Germany, where he studied the Science of Languages under the guidance of the famous indologists: Prof. Bopp, Steinthal (Compar. mythology), Weber and Benfey. Then he worked independently with the MSS. at the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris and the British Museum in London. On his return he was admitted to the Professorate of the St. Petersburg University (1869) and began his lectures, which he continued during twenty years till 1889.

His chief subjects were:

1. The General Science of Languages.
2. The Comparative Grammar (Lectures to the students of the Historico-philological Faculty).
3. Sanskrit Literature and Sanskrit Grammar (delivered for the most part in the Oriental Faculty).

Sometimes he delivered special lectures:

- (a) On ancient Indian Literature.
- (b) On Aryan Mythology. Creeds of the ancient Hindus.
- (c) Shamanism, etc.

At one of the annual festivities of the University (1884), the theme for his public discourse was "The study of India in Russian Universities."

All the lectures of Prof. M. were worked out with the greatest care. MSS. of these are deposited in the Archives of the Academy of Sciences (Leningrad).

Some of his disciples are well known orientalists to-day and the most renowned of them are the distinguished scholars, Prof. Th. Stcherbatsky, Ph.D., and S. Oldenburg.

Deeply interested in the problems of Buddhism M. followed in his investigations three principal directions: the linguistic and philological, the historico-geographical and the historical.

His first published work was the edition and translation of "Prātimokṣa-Sūtra," the Buddhist code of laws of conduct (1869), a work that took him to the primary sources of Buddhism.

His second work was the "Pāli Grammar" presented for Ph. D. degree. It has an introduction of 40 pages where M. develops his views about the Pāli and Sanskrit languages. This grammar was highly appreciated by the scientific world and was translated into French and English, although M. gave it the modest title of "A Sketch." Not satisfied with the study of Buddhism and old India through books and MSS. he was able after many efforts to undertake in the years 1874 and 1875 the long desired and well planned journey to the East. It was the first time that an eminent scholar, an indologist, knowing Pāli, Sanskrit and some Vernaculars, undertook the journey from Russia to India in order to study Buddhism in the land of its origin. He reached Ceylon and not paying attention to the heat of the tropical climate, and absorbed in his investigations, he went all over the country, visited monasteries, and their schools, had conversations with the monks, visited stūpas, temples and ruins, taking their measurements, etc., copied inscriptions, and searched for MSS.

He went all over the south coast of the island, spent some time at Candy concentrating his attention on local customs, noted the devil dancers at the Sinhalese festivals, visited the hunters Veddas in the mountains and jungles, trying to determine to which group their language belonged.

The English officials received the Russian traveller with respectful attention. They provided him with letters of introduction for further facilities in his travels through the country.

On the 1st January 1875 he landed at Bombay and from there he passed to Bihar, the Nepal border and Almora.

He observed the mutual relations of Englishmen and Hindus and entered into lasting correspondence with many of the persons whom he met.

The two years spent in Ceylon and India gave Prof. M. a thorough knowledge of the country, and its people, and that gave him a sound footing in his future writings about India. During his travels he contributed a series of articles to the Russian journals and magazines (some illustrated); after his return home, as an immediate result of his travels, he published

1. *Sketches of Ceylon and India*. From a Russian traveller's note-book. Two volumes.

2. *Indian tales*. A volume containing 47 tales and 25 legends collected at Kumaon where Prof. M. spent three months. At the time it was the first attempt to collect the ethnographical materials of this province. The singers of Almora reminded him of the narrators of the Russian folklore (bylins) and he considered the question about their Aryan origin and their migration to other countries.

The second time Prof. M. went to India only for four months, in the year 1880 from 1st February to 2nd July. Landing at Bombay he crossed over the Nizam's territory and visited the independent states of North India. He stopped at Lahore, Golkonda, Delhi and Hyderabad, visited the monuments of Ellora and the caves of Ajanta.

This time he was attracted not only by historico-archæological India, but also by contemporary living India. Those were the years of the Anglo-Afghan war when Russia advanced into Middle Asia and the political questions were very acute. He observed the relations between the English and the Hindus and made forecasts that are quite prophetic,—specially about the changes that time might bring about in their relations and the likelihood of an Anglo-Russian war.

Prof. M. studied specially the English system of Government, the forms of land owning, the licence tax, the ancient crafts of India found even now in the streets (Punjab), the different forms of schools and systems of education.

Prof. M. returned by way of Egypt—Constantinople. After his

return he wrote a series of political articles in newspapers (see List of Prof. M.'s published works). But the essential scientifico-historical materials of this journey *viz.*, "Impressions on the way round North-west India," "The caves of Ellora" and "The diary" are still in mss. but quite ready for print, but unfortunately remain yet unpublished.

The sudden change from a hot climate to the cold North affected his health. He began to suffer from illness but continued his scientific work with undiminished energy.

Prof. M. was one of the best connoisseurs of the historical geography of Middle Asia, deeply interested, as he was, in the fortunes of its peoples and countries. Studying the subject from different points of view he published

- (a) A Description of the Countries on the upper Amu-Daria,
- (b) Old India. Remarks upon Aphanasius Nikitin's "Travel beyond the three seas."
- (c) A complete translation with commentaries of Marco Polo's travels.

In 1886 M. visited India for the third time. As a competent judge of the land and people he was deputed by the Russian War office to accompany two Russian officers invited by the Indian Government to assist at the manoeuvres of the Anglo-Indian troops.

He stayed in India only for a short time and immediately after the manoeuvres went to Burma, where the war with England had just come to an end, but the hostilities had not yet ceased and the dacoits still roved about in North Burma.

M. crossed Rangoon where at that time martial law was declared, and along the Irrawady went to Mandalay. The town was in an awful state of disturbance. The dacoits were put to death. Their bodies were exhibited for show. The best houses were occupied by English soldiers. The people resigned themselves to their fate, but were hostile to the annexation.

M. touched the problems of British Imperialism and surveyed how rapidly and by what means the English Government succeeded in transforming oriental cities with their original customs into European ones.

During four days Prof. M. examined the libraries of Tsi-bao and in Hlot Dow. A great many MSS. had been plundered and destroyed,

but he had no time to make a complete list, and the English Government had no scholar at hand, who was able to do the work.

He returned home *via* Calcutta, visited Darjeeling, and came into touch with some Tibetans. The diary of this journey is of absorbing interest, but it has also not yet been published.

Once more at home he planned a fourth journey by land through Afghanistan to India, a journey that would have lasted four years, but this plan was never realised.

Having visited the two countries of ancient Buddhism, Ceylon and Burma, enriched with firsthand information Prof. M. wrote his first volume of Buddhism (1888) and began to work at the second one, printing at the same time different Pāli and Sanskrit texts.

The rapidly increasing illness (consumption) brought his valuable life to a premature end. He died on the 1st June 1880, 49 years old, leaving many of his works unfinished.

Truly human life is too short to carry out the complex programme he had worked out for himself, considering the rigid demands he put to his work.

ALEXANDRA SCHNEIDER

APPENDIX

COMPLETE LIST OF PROFESSOR J. P. MINAYEFF'S PUBLISHED WORKS

(1869—1910)

Abbreviations :

B.A.S.R.	Bulletin de l'Académie des Sciences de Russie.
Ch.R.	Christian Reader—a monthly periodical.
E. R.	East Review (Vostochnoye Obozrenie)—a periodical.
E.M.	Europe Messenger (Viestnik of Europe)—a monthly periodical.
G.	Golos—a daily paper.
J.M.P.I.	Journal of the Ministry of Public Instruction.
J.P.T.S.	Journal of the Pāli Text Society.
M.A.	Mélanges Asiatiques de l'Académie des Sciences de Russie.
M.I.R.G.S.	Memoirs (Izvestia) of the Imperial Russian Geographical Society.
M.Ph.F.	Memoirs (Zapiski) of the Philological Faculty of the St. Petersburg University.
M.O.S.I.R.A.S.	Memoirs (Zapiski) of the Oriental Section of the Imperial Russian Archæological Society.
N.M.	North Messenger (Sieverny Viestnic)—a daily paper.
N.V.	Novoe Vremya—a daily paper.
P.N.	Petersburg News (Peterburgskia Vedomosty)—a daily paper.
R.R.	Russkaya Retch—a daily paper.

- | <i>Year</i> | <i>Titles of Works</i> |
|-------------|---|
| 1869 | Prātimokṣa Sūtra, Buddhistic Service-book published and translated. St. Petersburg 1869. <i>BASR.</i> , vol. XVI. Appendix No. 1. (Dissertation for the degree of M.A.). lii+64 pp. |
| ,, | The Pāli-Metric Vuttodaya. <i>MA.</i> , vol. VI, pp. 195-225. |
| 70 | New facts concerning the connection of Ancient India with the West. <i>JMPI.</i> , vol. 150, August, pp. 225-39. |
| 71 | Buddhistische Fragmente. <i>MA.</i> , vol. VI, pp. 577-99. |
| ,, | Buddha's Birth Stories. Several Tales. <i>JMPI.</i> , vol. 153. November, pp. 87-133. |
| 72 | Pāli Grammar. A Phonetic and Morphological sketch of the Pāli Language. St. Petersburg, (for Ph.D. degree), 140. pp. |
| ,, | A few words on the Buddhistic Jātakas. <i>JMPI.</i> , vol. 162, June, pp. 185-224. |
| 74 | Grammaire Pālie. Esquisse d'une phonétique et d'une morphologie de la langue Pālie, traduite du russe par St. Guyard. Paris E. Leroux, 1874, xliv+96. pp. |
| ,, | Review of V. P. Vasilieff's work <i>Religions of the East</i> . Confucianism, Buddhism and Daoism. St. Petersburg 1873. <i>JMPI.</i> , vol. 172, March, pp. 127-48. |
| ,, | Indian Tales. <i>JMPI.</i> , vol. 176, November, pp. 68-104. |
| 75 | The Isle of Lions. Letters from Ceylon. <i>EM.</i> , February and March. |
| ,, | In Nepal. From a traveller's note book. <i>EM.</i> , September. |
| ,, | The position of the English power in Asia. On the occasion of Mr. Venioukoff's book: <i>English Sovereignty in Asia</i> . St. Petersburg 1875. <i>NV.</i> , No. 302, 20th November. |
| 76 | Indian Tales and Legends collected at Kumaon, 1875. <i>MPhF.</i> , vol. II, part 1. |
| ,, | Indian Tales. <i>JMPI.</i> , vol. 183, February, pp. 368-403, vol. 184, April pp. 314-40, vol. 185, May. pp. 62-97. |
| ,, | Review of Mr. Venioukoff's book: <i>A short sketch on the English dominions in Asia</i> . <i>JMPI.</i> , vol. 185, May, pp. 157-61. |
| ,, | Curunegalle and the Silver Monastery. From a journey across Ceylon. "The Bee" Nos. 45, 46, 47, 49, with illustrations. |

- | <i>Year</i> | <i>Titles of Works</i> |
|-------------|--|
| ,, | The Singers of Almora. From a traveller's note book. <i>EM.</i> , No. 7. |
| ,, | In Bihara. From a journey across India. <i>JMPI.</i> , vol. 138, November, pp. 1-19. |
| ,, | Brahmanists. From a journey across India. <i>JMPI.</i> , vol. 138, December, pp. 194-236. |
| 76 | <i>Reviews of Books:</i> |
| | Domenico Pezzi: Introduction à l'étude de la science du langage. Traduit de l'italien sur le texte entièrement refondu par l'auteur par N. Nourisson, Paris 1876. |
| | Abel Hovelague. La Linguistique, Paris, 1876. |
| | H. A. Manitius. Die Sprachen Welt in ihrem geschichtlich literarischen Entwicklungsgange zur Humanität, bearbeitet von H. A. Manitius, Leipzig 1876. <i>JMPI.</i> , vol. 188, December, pp. 309-14. |
| 77 | Fr. Micloschich. Ueber die Mundarten und die Wanderungen der Zigeuner Europas, I—VI. Wien., 1872-76. |
| | Beitrage zur Kenntniss der Zigeuner Mundarten. Wien. I. II. 1874, III. 1876, <i>JMPI.</i> , vol. 190, March, pp. 190-4. |
| ,, | Domenico Pezzi. Glottologia aria recentissima. <i>JMPI.</i> , vol. 190, March, pp. 194-5. |
| ,, | M. Venioukoff. Russia and the East. Collection of geographical and political articles. St. Petersburg V, 1877. <i>NM.</i> , No. 195, 12th November. |
| ,, | An opinion on Mr. Venioukoff's proposition to write a description of the countries situated on the upper Oxus. <i>MIRGS.</i> , vol. XIII, pp. 34-35. |
| 78 | Ceylon and India. From a Russian traveller's note book 2 parts, 1878, (Z. F. Panteloeff), part I, 284 pp., part II, 233 pp. |
| ,, | Nepal and its Story. Review of the book: History of Nepal, translated from the parbatya by Munshi Shew Shunker Singh and Pandit Shri Gumanand. With an introductory sketch of the country and people by the editor Daniel Wright, M.A., M.D., late Surgeon Major N. M. S. Indian Medical Service |

Year

Titles of Works

- and residency Surgeon at Kathmandu, Cambridge 1877.
JMPL., vol. 195, January, pp. 61-85.
- „ Englishmen in Baluchistan A. W. Hughes. The country of Baluchistan. *NM.*, 2nd January.
- „ An Englishman on his way to India. A Ride through Islam: being a journey through Persia and Afghanistan to India, via Meshed, Herat and Kandahar by Hippisley Cuntliffe Marsh, captain of the 18th Bengal Cavalry, London 1877, *NM.*
- 78 From Kuldsha across Tian Shan to Lob Nor, Journey of N. M. Prjevalsky. Published by the Russian Geographical Society. St. Petersburg, 1878. *NM.*, 21st January.
- „ Informations on the Jainas and Buddhists. *JMPL.*, vol. 195, February, pp. 241-76.
- „ The North and the North West frontier of India. Paper read at a meeting of the Ethnographical Section of the Russian Geographical Society. *MIRGS.*, 106 pp.
- „ Reports on the alarming news on the North West frontier of India. *NM.*, 22nd January.
- „ State of affairs at Baluchistan. *G.*, No. 162, 13th June.
- „ The despatching of the Sepoys to Europe. *G.*, No. 163, 14th June.
- „ Indian views on India, as an answer to the book: "Indian views on England" by Nagendra Nath Ghose. *G.*, No. 166. 17th June.
- „ Russians in India. *G.*, No. 194, 15th July.
- „ The glorious exploits of Englishmen in India. *G.*, No. 242, 2nd September.
- „ England and Afghanistan. *G.*, No. 280, 10th October.
- „ The Russians in Afghanistan in the XVIIth century. *PN.*, No. 284.
- „ The Afghan question and Russian politics. *G.*, No. 289, 19th October.
- „ Afghanistan and the roads leading to it. *G.*, No. 291, 21st October.
- „ The Anglo-Afghan war. *G.*, No. 316, 15th November.

- | <i>Year</i> | <i>Titles of Works</i> |
|-------------|---|
| 78 | The military forces of England and Afghanistan. <i>G.</i> , No. 317, 16th November. |
| ,, | Notes on my work: Informations on the countries of the upper Amu Daria <i>MIRGS.</i> , pp. 16-20. |
| ,, | From Peshauer to Kaboul. <i>G.</i> , No. 323, 4th December. |
| ,, | Description of the countries on the upper Amu Daria. St. Petersburg. |
| ,, | The community of Buddhist monks. <i>JMPL.</i> , vol. 201, pp. 1-35. |
| ,, | Mahāsupinajātaka in the article of A. N. Veselovsky: "A discourse on the twelve dreams of Shahaischi." <i>BSR.</i> , vol. 34, pp. 28-34. |
| ,, | Shir Ali and his relations to England. <i>RR.</i> , Nos. 4, 5. |
| ,, | The consequences of Shir Ali's death for Russian influence in Central Asia. <i>NV.</i> , No. 1071, 21st May. |
| ,, | The Afghan war. <i>G.</i> , No. 268, 28th September. |
| ,, | Englishmen in Turkomania. <i>G.</i> , No. 269, 29th September. |
| ,, | Englishmen in Afghanistan. <i>G.</i> , No. 291, 21st October. |
| ,, | The future of Afghanistan. <i>G.</i> , No. 297, 27th October. |
| ,, | The Afghan difficulties. <i>G.</i> , No. 311, 10th November. |
| 80 | The most important works of Sanskrit Literature (A Sketch), in the Universal History edited by V. Korsh. Part I. |
| ,, | Review on Zagarelli's book: Mingrelian sketches. Two parts. Part I: Mingrelian texts with translation and explanation, collected and published by A. A. Zagarelli. Part II: Essay on the phonetics of the Mingrelian language. <i>JMPL.</i> , vol. 212, November, pp. 225-31. |
| 81 | Old India. Remarks upon Athanasias Nikitin's "Travel beyond the three Seas." St. Petersburg. B. C. Balasheff printer. 174 pp. |
| ,, | Old India. Remarks upon Athanasias Nikitin's "Travel beyond the three Seas." <i>JMPL.</i> , vol. 215, June, pp. 165-241, vol. 216, July, pp. 1-58. |
| ,, | British interest and Russian intrigues in Afghanistan. Concerning the book: Recollection of the Kabul campaign, 1879-1888, by J. Duke, <i>NV.</i> , No. 2684, 19th August. |
| ,, | New informations on the Kiaphires. Review of the work: |

Year

Titles of Works

- Tribes of the Hindoo Koosh, by Major J. Biddulph, Calcutta 1880. *JMPI.*, vol. 221, May, pp. 139-57.
- 82 New Studies on Buddhism. Review of the series: The sacred Books of the East translated by various oriental scholars and edited by F. Max Müller, vols. 1, X, XI, Oxford, 1879-81. *JMPI.*, vol. 222, July 1882, pp. 102-18, vol. 223, October 1882, pp. 402-11, vol. 225, January, 1883, pp. 138-64.
- ,, The Indian textiles and the policy of England. Concerning this subject, *ER.*, No. 6.
- ,, Russia and Anglo-Indian interests. *ER.*, Nos. 6, 7.
- ,, The Collision of French and English commercial interests in Egypt, China and India. *ER.*, No. 15.
- ,, Review of the books: (1) *The Hindoos as they are* by Shib Chandra Bose, Calcutta 1881, and (2) *Sketches from Nepal* by the late M. A. Oldfield. *ER.*, Nos. 17, 18.
- ,, Phonetic researches by Melville Bell. 1. English visible speech for the Million by M. Bell, London; 2. Sounds and their relations by M. Bell, London 1882. *JMPI.*, vol. 222, August, pp. 350-55.
- 83 Russian embassy to Kaboul. Journey of the Russian Embassy across Afghanistan and Bucharica in the year 1878-79. From the diary of Dr. Yavorsky, member of the legacy. *NV.*, No. 2374, 7th October.
- ,, A Russian Artist in the Himalayas. *Reiseskizzen aus Indien von Herrn und Frau Wereshagin.* *NV.*, No. 2393, 26th October.
- ,, Pāli Grammar. A Phonetic and Morphological Sketch of the Pāli Language, with an Introductory Essay on its form and character, 1872. Translated from Russian into French by M. Stanislas Guyard. Rendered into English from the French, and re-arranged with some modifications and additions for the use of English students by Chas Geo Adams. British Burma. 92+3 pp.
- ,, Tribal life in modern India, being a Review of the works: 1. Sir Alfred C. Lyall, *Asiatic Studies, Religious and Social,*

- | <i>Year</i> | <i>Titles of Works</i> |
|-------------|--|
| | London 1882. 2. C. L. Tupper, Punjab. Customary Law, Calcutta 1881, <i>JMPI.</i> , vol. 226, March, pp. 164-80. |
| 83 | Historical importance of the valley of Amu-Daria. Paper read at the Ethnographical section of the Russian Geographical Society. <i>MIRGS.</i> , I, p. 52. |
| „ | Land owning in modern India, being a Review of the book: B. H. Baden Powell. A Manual of the land revenue systems and land tenures of British India, Calcutta 1882. <i>JMPI.</i> , vol. 230, November, pp. 135-52. |
| „ | New found meaning of the Buddhist legends. Review of the book: R. Seidel, Das Evangelium von Yesu in seinen Verhältnissen zu Buddha-Sage und Buddha-Lehre, Leipzig, 1882. <i>Ch.R.</i> , I, pp. 732-53. |
| „ | New Self-government of India. <i>NV.</i> , No. 2469, 12th January. |
| „ | An unnoticed discovery (concerning Lessar). <i>NV.</i> , No. 2476, 19th January. |
| „ | Tibet as described by Prjevalsky. The third journey of N. M. Prjevalsky. From Zaisan through Hami to Tibet and up the Yellow river. <i>NV.</i> , No. 2594, 20th May. |
| „ | A Subsidy to the Emir of Afghanistan. <i>NV.</i> , No. 2649, 15th July. |
| „ | A new book on Turkmania. N. N. Grodekoff. The war in Turkmania. The campaign of Scobelev in the year 1880-81, vol. I, St. Petersburg 1883. <i>NV.</i> , No. 2713, 17th September. |
| „ | Did the prophet conquer? <i>NV.</i> , No. 2773, 16th November. |
| „ | Neutrality in the Tonkin question. <i>NV.</i> , No. 2777, 20th November. |
| „ | The Turan culture. Review of G. N. Potanin's book: Sketches of North-west Mongolia, St. Petersburg, vol. IV. <i>NV.</i> , No. 2793, 6th December. |
| „ | The Science of languages (linguistics). Lectures delivered to the students of the St. Petersburg University during the school semester of the year 1882-3, 309 pp. |
| „ | Comparative linguistics. Lectures delivered at the St. Petersburg University during the school semester of the year 1882-3. |

- | <i>Year</i> | <i>Titles of Works</i> |
|-------------|---|
| 84 | The study of India in Russian Universities. An address delivered on the 8th February 1884 at the solemn yearly meeting of the St. Petersburg's University, 20 pp. |
| ,, | Review of John Barsoukoff's book: The great Russian missionary Innocent of Siberia, metropolitan of Moscow and Kolonna. <i>JMPI.</i> , vol. 235, September, pp. 219-27. |
| ,, | Russian intentions about India in old times. On the book published by Mr. D. Kobeko: The tsar Alexis Michailovitch's instructions to Mahmet Jsup Kassimoff, sent in the year 1675 to the Great Mohol. <i>JMPI.</i> , vol. 235, October, pp. 349-59. |
| ,, | The Afghan frontier. <i>NI.</i> , No. 3046, 18th August. |
| 85 | The Science of languages. A course of lectures in the years 1884-5. The edition is reviewed by the Professor himself. |
| ,, | The Cha-kesa-dhātu-vaṃsa. <i>JPTS.</i> , pp. 5-16. |
| ,, | The Sandesa-kathā. <i>JPTS.</i> , 1885, pp. 16-28. |
| ,, | On the Pamir, from the Russian version of Prof. Minayeff. By W. E. Gowan. <i>Proceedings of the As. Soc. of Bengal</i> , 1885, pp. 108-17. |
| 86 | Anāgata-vaṃsa. <i>JPTS.</i> , pp. 33-53. |
| ,, | Gandha-vaṃsa. <i>JPTS.</i> , pp. 54-80. |
| 87 | Buddhism, Studies and materials. St. Petersburg. vol. I, part 1, 280 pp; part 2, pp. 159, <i>MPhF.</i> |
| ,, | The Buddhistic creed. <i>MOSIRAS.</i> , vol. I, part 3, pp. 203-7. |
| ,, | The Buddhistic prayers. <i>MOSIRAS.</i> , vol. II, part 1, pp. 125-36, vol. IV, part 1, pp. 233-40. |
| ,, | Englishmen in Burma. <i>EM.</i> , November, pp. 153-91. |
| ,, | Simāvivāda-vinicchaya-kathā. <i>JPTS.</i> , pp. 17-34. |
| 88 | The Quest of Gold. Review of the work of Captain John Unkovsky: The Embassy to the Tsungar Khan Taidji Zevan Raktan in the years 1721-24. Documents published by N. Y. Veselovsky with preface and notes. <i>JMPI.</i> , vol. 257, May, pp. 237-49. |
| ,, | The apology of Lamahood. Review of the work of A. Pozdneeff: The state of the Buddhist monasteries and the life of |

- | <i>Year</i> | <i>Titles of Works</i> |
|-------------|--|
| | the monks in Mongolia. St. Petersburg. <i>JMPI.</i> , vol. 257, June, pp. 234-48. |
| 88 | Review on J. A. Legge's "Records of Buddhistic Kingdoms by Fa-hien." <i>JMPI.</i> , pp. 310-17. |
| ,, | N. M. Prjevalsky. Obituary notice. <i>JMPI.</i> , vol. 260, November, p. 49. |
| ,, | A new Journal of phonetics. <i>JMPI.</i> , vol. 260, December, pp. 284-86. <i>MIRGS.</i> , vol. XXIV, 3, pp. 231ff. |
| ,, | On Mr. A. M. Pozdneeff's answer. <i>JMPI.</i> , vol. 260, December, pp. 323-6. |
| ,, | Pāṇini, I. 4. 79. <i>MOSIRAS.</i> , vol. II, p. 275. |
| ,, | Chandragomin. <i>MOSIRAS.</i> , vol. II, pp. 276-7. |
| ,, | The general linguistic ABC, projected by the Imp. Academie of Sciences. Paper read at the Oriental section of the RAS., and the Ethnographical section of the RGS., the 9 March 1889. |
| ,, | Forgotten way to China. Reviews of works: N. M. Prjevalsky. The fourth journey to Central Asia. From Kiahta to the sources of the Yellow River. Exploration of the northern borderland of Tibet and the way through Lob-Nor to the basin of Tarim. <i>JMPI.</i> , vol. 264, July, pp. 168-189. |
| 89 | Śiṣyalekha, being a Letter to the Disciple by Chandragomin. <i>MOSIRAS.</i> , vol. IV, pp. 29-52. |
| ,, | Bodhicaryāvatāra. Salvation according to the teaching of the later Buddhists. <i>MOSIRAS.</i> , vol. IV, pp. 153-228. |
| ,, | Petavatthu. <i>JPTS.</i> , pp. 1-199. |
| ,, | Kathāvatthupparakaraṇa-aṭṭhakathā. <i>JPTS.</i> , pp. 213-22. |
| 90 | Sāntideva's Bodhicaryāvatāra edited by J. P. Minayeff. St. Petersburg. 2nd Posthumous edition with a preface by S. Oldenburg. (Rus. I. Ac. of Sciences). |
| 91 | Materials and notes on Buddhism, from the writings of the late J. P. Minayeff, edited by S. Oldenburg: |
| ,, | —Translations from Petavatthu. <i>MOSIRAS.</i> , vol. V, pp. 207-221. |
| ,, | —Translations from Petavatthu. <i>MOSIRAS.</i> , vol. VI, pp. 332-4. |

Year

Titles of Works

- 91—The Kamaon Songs and some other national literary works collected in Kamaon. *MOSIRAS.*, vol. V, pp. 290-300.
- „ Some unedited Jātakas of the Pāli Canon. “Zivaya Starina”—a periodical, vol. III, pp. 161-4, vol. IV, pp. 118-21.
- „ Popular dramatic Representations during the Choly Feast at Almora. *MOSIRAS.*, vol. V, p. 290.
- „ Posthumous work: The Journey of Marco Polo. Translated from the text of old French. Published by the Russian Geographical Society. Edited by V. V. Bartold, 355 pp.
- 93 Indian Songs on the new Income tax from the writings of the late Prof. Minayeff. *MOSIRAS.*, vol. VIII, p. 144.
- „ A Sanskrit Newāri Dictionary from the writings of the late J. P. Minayeff prepared for print by Aug. Conrady. *ZDMG.*, vol. 47, pp. 539-73.
- 94 Recherches sur le Bouddhisme par J. P. Minayeff, traduit du russe par R. M. Assier de Pompignan, Paris, E. Leroux, editeur. Avant propos d'Emile Sénart. 317 pp.
- 95 The Kamaon Songs, from the writings of the late J. P. Minayeff, edited by S. Oldenburg. *MOSIRAS.*, vol. IX, pp. 276-78.
- 96 I. Materials and notes on Buddhism. II. Materials on the Eschatology. *MOSIRAS.*, vol. VI, p. 511.
- „ I. On the legend of Kaśyapa. II. On Maitreya. III. On Kalpas. IV. The legend on king Mahāprajāda. *MOSIRAS.*, vol. IX, pp. 207-21.
- 97 Translations from the Suttanipāta and Mahāvagga (Vinaya). *MOSIRAS.*, vol. X, pp. 93-104, from the writings of the late J. P. Minayeff, edited by S. Oldenburg.
- 1910 Mahāvvyutpatti edited by the late J. P. Minayeff. Second edition with an Index prepared for print by N. D. Mironoff, *Bibliotheca Buddhica*, XIII.

A catalogue of the numerous MSS. collected by the late J. P. Minayeff in India, Ceylon and Burma, has been compiled and edited in 1918 by N. D. Mironoff.

REVIEWS

EXPLORATIONS IN SIND, by Mr. N. G. Majumdar M.A., Assistant Superintendent, Archæological Survey of India. Memoirs of the Archæological Survey of India, No. 48 (Delhi, 1934).

The epoch-making discoveries at Mohenjo-daro have pushed back the antiquity of civilisation in India to at least the fourth millennium B.C. and have revealed a new type of culture which is akin, in many respects, to the Sumerian. The Indus civilisation has now taken its place along with that of Egypt, Persia, Mesopotamia and Crete, and India, nay the whole world, is anxiously watching the further progress of exploration in this region.

The volume before us is an important supplement to the discoveries of Mohenjo-daro. One of the first problems raised by these discoveries was to determine the extent of the spread of this civilisation. For this purpose it was necessary to make a systematic exploration of Baluchistan and Sind. An archæological survey was carried on in Baluchistan, first by Mr. Hargreaves in 1925-26, and then by Sir Aurel Stein in 1926-27, and 1927-28. The results of these explorations have been published in three memoirs of the Archæological Department (Nos. 35, 37 and 43). They prove conclusively that the Indus Civilisation was diffused over a wide area in Baluchistan and flourished side by side with allied cultures.

Similar exploration was carried on in Sind by Mr. N. G. Majumdar in 1927-28, 1929-30, and 1930-31 and the volume under review is a report of this exploratory survey.

The report is written in the form of an official diary, giving a short account of the places visited by the author, the exploration carried on there and the results achieved by it. It is a plain unvarnished scientific account of tedious operations written in an easy and graceful style which reflects great credit upon the author. The sites visited were numerous and only a few of them have yielded important finds. But with the true spirit of a scientific explorer the author has placed before us the net result of his exploration and survey, both in its positive and negative aspects.

On the whole, the exploratory survey has been fully justified by the splendid results achieved therefrom. Clear remains of chalcolithic civilisation, such as we find in Mohenjo-daro, have been discovered in Jhukar, Tharro Hill, Amri, Chāñhu-daro, Lohunyo-daro, Lakhiyo, Ghazi Shāh, Tando Rahim Khan, Pokhran, Kohraṣ Buthi and other places. Although very striking discoveries have not been made in any of these sites, the general result obtained is an important one. It is now proved beyond all doubt that the zone of chalcolithic civilisation extended almost up to the Arabian Sea. To be more precise, the area in Sind over which this culture spread may be described as a triangle with its apex at Limo Junejo in the north and having as its base the line connecting Tharro Hill near Gūjo in the east with Orangi and Amilano in the west. The explorations of Sir Aurel Stein enable us to proceed still further and link up this area with the zone of chalcolithic civilisation in Baluchistan. We are thus now in a position to say that the splendid civilisation of which remains have been found at Mohenjo-daro extended over a wide area comprising a large part of Sind and Baluchistan. This, by itself, is a great step forward in the study of this mighty civilisation and should form the basis of further research and exploration. Unfortunately the Government of India has stopped further research in this direction and it is rumoured that a band of wealthy foreigners would shortly take up the work. It would be a matter of sincere regret if a great country like India cannot even do the necessary spade work in unravelling her most ancient civilisation and allows herself to be exploited by foreigners even in this cultural sphere. For, under the new rules framed by the Government of India, the foreigners would be entitled to take away such a portion of the archæological finds as would be commensurate with the money spent by them. It is humiliating to think that in this enlightened age India would be a willing partner in a transaction by which she would permanently lose a large number of the priceless relics of her past. Even the Egyptian Government has stopped this practice by which formerly Egyptian antiquities filled all the noted museums of Europe. The public opinion of India should be roused to this imminent danger and our legislators should exert their utmost to prevent this catastrophe. Mr. N. G. Majumdar's report makes it clear that capable Indians are

not wanting to take up this work and the Government of India must be persuaded to resume the operations which have been stopped for some time.

In spite of the length of this review, I cannot conclude without reference to one particular matter which the explorations in Sind have brought to the forefront. It is the importance of a systematic and scientific study of pre-historic pottery, which has hitherto received but scanty attention in this country. The most important finds in the explorations undertaken by Mr. Majumdar are various kinds of wheel-made pottery and he has written very valuable notes on them. His description and classification of the ceramic remains form the most brilliant part of the report. By means of this classification he has tried to ascertain the relative antiquities of the different sites. The results, though encouraging, cannot be regarded as conclusive until more data are systematically collected. But he has opened up a line of research which is sure to yield important results. On the whole we sincerely congratulate Mr. Majumdar on the valuable work he has done and the excellent report he has written.

R. C. M.

RANJIT SINGH, by Narendra Krishna Sinha, M.A. Calcutta University Press, Calcutta, 1933.

This well-written monograph represents the fruit of three years' work done by the author as a Prebendary Raychand student of the Calcutta University with revisions suggested by Sir Jadunath Sarkar. As the author explains in his preface, he has treated the biographical details of his hero's career very lightly and has concentrated his attention on the Sikh ruler's relations with the Afghans on the one hand and with contemporary Indian States and the Company on the other. These studies are followed by short but informing chapters on the civil and military administration of Ranjit Singh, while the concluding chapter discusses the significance of Ranjit Singh's career and the causes of his failure. The value of the work is enhanced by a critical survey of the sources, a map and an index.

The author is himself painfully aware that he has not been able to avail himself fully of all the original sources and has partially to depend upon traveller's accounts and similar secondhand authorities. His work nevertheless is a real contribution to the subject with which he deals. His penetrating analysis of human motives often enables him to find out the truth from distinct and conflicting accounts of events, while his discriminating criticism helps him rightly to assess the success and failure of his hero. The author's criticism of Ranjit Singh's military system in the light of the proved defects of the later military system of the Marhattas is of special interest, while his concluding estimate of the great Sikh's rule appears to be as near the truth as possible.

U. N. GHOSHAL

THE MAUKHARIS by Edward A. Pires, M.A. *Studies in Indian History* (Indian Historical Research Institute) No. 10.

Among the minor dynasties that rose to importance after the downfall of the Gupta Empire, the Maukharis occupy a prominent place. But their history has not yet secured the attention which it deserves. Congratulations are due to Rev. Dr. Heras, the enthusiastic Director of the Indian Historical Research Institute and the author, Mr. Edward A. Pires for the publication of the present monograph.

The author fully admits the difficulties of his task arising mainly from the paucity of authentic records. He has, nevertheless, fulfilled his task with ability and success. He has not been content with giving a reconstruction of the political history of the Maukhari dynasties, but he has tried to throw light upon the state of literature and art, of administration and social life under their rule. His work is based on a thorough study of the documents concerned and it gains added interest from the fact that its author had the opportunity of examining some of the monuments on the spot.

On a few points it is permissible to differ from the author's views. He plausibly fixes (p. 20ff.) the date of Kṣatrarvarman Maukhari (mentioned by Bāna in a long list of historical allusions) to be "sometime before Candragupta I" and he cautiously suggests the connection of

Mayūrasarman of the recently found Candrāvalli inscription with Kṣatrarvarman's murder. He is on much less sure ground when he not only follows (p. 25ff.) Mr. K. P. Jayaswal in identifying Candrasena of the *Kaumudīmahotsava* drama with Candragupta I, but takes Sundaravarman and Kalyāṇavarman of the drama to belong to the Maukhari line.

Following the authority of Mr. Aravamuthan, the author chooses (p. 79ff.) to identify the Sulikas of the Harāhā inscription of Išānavarman with the Colas and he connects the Maukhari's victory over them with the alleged invasions of Northern India by Karikāla Cola. This account, however, is admittedly based on the vague and very late authority of the *Kalingattupparanī* and other works.

The author's statement (pp. 129-30) that Pūrṇavarman of Magadha was a Maukhari is admittedly a mere conjecture. Still more so is the statement that Pūrṇavarman was "in all probability" a younger brother of Grahavarman, the brother-in-law of Harṣavardhana. His further attempt (pp. 131-2) to identify this Pūrṇavarman with the king of that name mentioned in the four oldest Sanskrit inscriptions from Java may be regarded as the most conspicuous illustration of the absurdity of the method of drawing far-reaching conclusions from similarity of names. As is well-known, these inscriptions have been assigned on palaeographical grounds to the middle of the fifth century A.D., being closely connected not only with Mūlavarman's inscriptions from Eastern Borneo but also with the *Grantha*-script of the ancient Pallava inscriptions.

Equally unconvincing is the attempt (pp. 136-7) to annex Yaśovarman of Kanauj to the line of the Maukharis. The author, however, is on solid ground when he rejects (p. 144) Dr. Hirananda Sastri's attribution of the Nālanda inscription of Yaśovarman to Yaśodharman, the conqueror of Mihiragula.

In the chapters on administration, religion and social life the author has had to spin out the meagre data at his disposal. It is unfortunate that he should have been tempted to attach the same weight to the evidence of the *Kaumudīmahotsava* drama as that of the contemporary inscriptions. Some of his statements in this connection are open to criticism: e.g. that the power of legislation was vested in the

king (p. 169), nor is it possible to follow the author's simple explanation of *Rājāmātya* and *Kumārāmātya* as King's and Prince's minister respectively.

In the chapter on Archaeology, the author passes in review nearly all the ancient Maukhari sites; but owing to the paucity and fragmentary character of the relics the result is sadly disappointing. It is interesting to note that the author believes with Dr. A. Banerji-Sastri that the facade of Lomasā Rṣi cave, bearing the inscription of the Maukhari Anantavarman, was the work of the Jaina Khāravela. Still more interesting is his observation (p. 198) that flat carvings are a characteristic feature of the Maukhari architecture. This point ought to have been illustrated by a survey of all the extant examples.

The Bibliographical list at the beginning of the work would have been more useful, if the actual numbers of the Journals mentioned had been quoted. It is again unfortunate that while room has been found for out-of-date works like J. C. Dutt's translation of the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* and Turnour's translation of the *Mahāvamsa* and even for a Matriculation text-book, no mention is made of a work like *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa*. The diacritical marks are lamentably inadequate and sometimes misleading or positively wrong, (the most conspicuous example being the repeated reference to the 'Gauḍavāho'). The precise genealogy as well as chronology in the synchronistic table of Maukhari kings and their contemporaries (opp. p. 156) are not warranted by facts. The expression 'ancient Pāli characters' (p. 189) for *Brāhmī* cannot but be regarded as unfortunate. Though the work has been enriched by a map and a number of illustrations, its value would have been enhanced by the inclusion of a list of Maukhari inscriptions with a summary of their contents.

U. N. GHOSHAL.

HISTORY OF THE PARAMARA DYNASTY, By D. C. Ganguly, M.A., Ph.D. (Lond.). Dacca University Bulletin No. XVII. pp. iv+387.

This monograph which won for its author the Degree of Doctorate of Philosophy of the London University is one of the most thorough dynastic histories published in recent years. The author has made an exhaustive study of all the available sources consisting not only of inscriptions and monuments but also of a not inconsiderable number of historical *Kāvya*s, and he has skilfully utilised this material to produce a precise and authentic account of the dynasties with which he deals. In the course of this task he has been led to throw light upon the history of numerous contemporary dynasties with which the vigorous and aggressive Paramāra kings came into contact, such as the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and the Cālukyas of the Deccan, the Caulukyas of Gujarat, the Cāhamānas of Śākambharī, the Pratibāras of Malwa and afterwards of Kanauj and the Kalacuris of Cedi. The author has not been content to give us a merely political history, but he has very properly added notices on the state of administration, literature, art, religion and social life under the brilliant rule of the dynasty whose history he describes.

Of the many interesting points developed by the author, a few may be noticed. On the authority of the oldest extant records of the Paramāras, the Harsola plates of Śīyaka II, he holds (pp. 7-8) that the Paramāras were a branch of the imperial Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty of the Deccan. In this he only follows the authority of the joint editors of the inscriptions concerned (*Epigraphia Indica* XIX, no. 39). He also follows the authority of Dr. R. C. Majumdar (*Cal. Univ. Journal of the Department of Letters*, vol. X, no. 1) in making out the line of Nāgabhaṭa I to have ruled in Malwa, previous to their occupation of Kanauj. But the author makes a distinct contribution by suggesting (p. 18) on plausible grounds that Upendra (Kṛṣṇarāja) was established in Malwa by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Govinda III after the latter's conquest of the country from the Pratihāra Nāgabhaṭa II.

The author's reconstruction (pp. 75-6) of the political history of Sindhurāja on the basis of the veiled allusions in Padmagupta's *Narāśahasāṅkacarita* is a very successful piece of work. To the next ruler after Sindhurāja, the great Bhoja, the author aptly devotes a whole

chapter, in which he fully describes the military successes of his hero and the tragic close of his reign.

In the chapter on art and culture, the author has with his usual industry brought together a considerable mass of data from the contemporary records, but unfortunately no attempt has been made to interpret them, much less to explain the sequence of their development in time and place. We are thus left with bare mention of administrative divisions like groups of villages (p. 237), of denominations of coins like the *Rūpaka* and the *Ardharūpaka* (p. 243), of lists of officials like the *Mahāsādhanika* and the *Dandapāśika* (p. 244). Of the branches of revenue, we have (p. 246) only the English translations, and not the technical designations, while the uncautious statement that the total income of the Paramāra kings of Malwa was probably 1800,000 gold coins, is made on the authority of an admittedly doubtful passage of the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*. Under the head of religion similarly, we have lists of gods and goddesses worshipped by the people (p. 247) and of popular festivals (p. 249), but no attempt is made to throw light upon their significance.

The style of the present work is usually readable, but the author has an occasional tendency of being rhetorical (cf. p. 85). We have noticed a few slips such as 'took his birth' (p. 1), 'fell in the hand of' (pp. 126), 'made raid over' (p. 200), 'exhaustible' (p. 256), 'source of material' (p. 345). Equally unfortunate is the author's reference to the 'Bhupal Agency of Central India' (p. 18). It is again odd to find the Father of Indian Archaeology designated as Mr. Cunningham (cf. p. 14n and p. 27).

A bibliography of original and secondary sources, a list of inscriptions of connected dynasties, another list of the Paramāra dynasty arranged in chronological order and a genealogical table add to the usefulness of the present work. But its value would have been enhanced by the inclusion of a map and of a number of illustrations of the ancient monuments of the Paramāras.

U. N. GHOSHAL.

A DESCRIPTIVE CATALOGUE OF SANSKRIT MANUSCRIPTS IN THE COLLECTIONS OF THE ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BENGAL by Mm. Dr. Haraprasad Sāstri, with a Foreword by Johan van Manen and an Introduction by Chintaharan Chakravarti. Asiatic Society of Bengal. Calcutta 1934.

We welcome this posthumous publication of the late Mahāmahopādhyāya Haraprasad Sāstri. This forms a part of the huge work done in the field of the study of manuscripts by this great scholar who devoted the best part of his life and energy to the investigation, and preparation of descriptive catalogues of Sanskrit Manuscripts, saving from oblivion many little-known but highly important old texts. Only two-thirds of the work (pp. 1-448) could be finally revised and seen through the press by the author, the remaining portions being entrusted to Mr. Chintaharan Chakravarti who has added two Indices of works and authors as also a short but useful Introduction indicating the noteworthy features of the contents of the volume. The work contains details of about two dozen very old Mss. and of about sixty Mss. almost unknown up till now. Mr. Chakravarti has *inter alia* put together in his Introduction some interesting information regarding the social history of India gathered from the Mss. The list of rulers and zemindars mentioned in the volume as patrons of literature and authors of books are of interest to students of history. Mr. Chakravarti has made an attempt in some cases in his Introduction and indices to supplement the information given in the body of the book, making it up-to-date as far as practicable.

We have every hope that Mr. Chakravarti who was closely associated with the late Mahāmahopādhyāya in his later life will be able to do justice also to the volumes of catalogues of manuscripts in the Asiatic Society of Bengal yet to be published.

D. B.



Select Contents of Oriental Journals

Acta Orientalia, vol. XIII, pars I

F. W. THOMAS.—*Some Notes on the Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Chinese Turkestan.*

Ibid., vol. XIII, pars II

HENRICH IUDERS.—*Vedisch heṣant, heṣa, heṣas.*

WATER RUBEA.—*Materialismus im Leben des alten Indien.*

H. HERAS.—*The Royal Portraits of Mahābalipuram.*

Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute,
vol. XV, parts iii-iv.

A. S. ALTEKAR.—*Ideals, Merits and Defects of Ancient Indian Educational System.*

M. WINTERNITZ.—*The Critical Edition of the Mahābhārata: Ādiparva.*

R. GANGULI.—*Famine in Ancient India.* It has been argued that the belief that ancient India was subject to recurrent famines is not true. From the time of the *Ryveda* down to the end of the Gupta period no famine of a serious nature occurred in India. A famine table has been appended to the article showing the dates and the localities where famines occurred between 917 and 1900 A.C.
between 917 and 1900 A.C.

A. N. UPADHYE.—*Darśanasāra of Devasena.* This is a critical edition of a small Jain text of 51 gāthās.

P. V. BAPAT.—*Unidentified Sources of the Vimuttimaggā.* A Chinese text, the name of which has been rendered into Pāli Vimuttimaggā, and a Tibetan version of which has been recently discovered, is regarded by the writer as a work of Indian origin. It was written in India by Upatissa and not in Ceylon. Upatissa has given a nomenclature of worms living in the various parts of the human body and also an account of the development of a child in the womb week by week. This has been very probably taken from an Indian medical work. The Chinese translations of the worms to-

of the worms together with their English renderings of the nomenclature as also a description of the foetus are found in the present paper.

RAJENDRA CHANDRA HAZRA.—*Influence of Tantra on the Smṛtinibandhas.*

A. C. WOOLNER.—*The Date of the Kundamālā.* As the story of Rāma in the *Kundamālā* indicates that the drama was written later than the *Uttaracarita* (7th century), and as Bhoja (11th century) quotes passages from the same in his *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, the date of the work can be placed between the 7th and the 11th century.

P. K. GODE.—*Notes on Indian Chronology.*

(1) A Manuscript of *Bhārata-sāstra-grantha* and Identification of its Author Lakṣmīdhara, and his Date (3rd quarter of the 16th century).

(2) Reference to *Durghaṭavṛtti* in Cāritravardhana's Commentary on the *Raghuvamśa*.

(3) Date of *Samvatsarādiphala-kalpalatā* of Somadaivajña A.D. 1642.

(4) A Manuscript of *Tithiratna* by Somadaivajña.

(5) A Commentary on the *Kumārasambhava* by Jinasamudrasūri and its probable Date (last quarter of the 15th century).

(6) Date of *Haridāsamīśra*, author of commentaries on the *Raghuvamśa* and the *Kumārasambhava* (middle of the 15th century).

Buddhiprakāśa, vol. 82, no. I

(Gujarati Quarterly)

HIMANSUVIJAYA.—*Two Jain architectural works.* The author describes two Jain architectural works, hitherto unknown. They are (1) Vatthusārapayaraṇaṃ and (2) Pratiṣṭhāsāra. The first work is described in its colophon, as composed in V. S. 1372, by one Pheru, the son of Candā of the Ghaṅghakalāśa family and resident of Kaunapura. The second work is composed by one Vasunandī, who seems to be earlier than Hemacandra. The first work is written in Prākṛt, the second in Sanskrit.

Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, vol. VII, part. 3

- A. K. COOMARASWAMY.—*Kha and other Words denoting "Zero" in connection with the Metaphysics of Space.* Dr. C. shows by references to early Sanskrit texts that the Hindu mathematicians selected many of their technical terms from among the expressions which were used originally in a purely metaphysical context.
- T. BURROW.—*Iranian Words in the Kharoṣṭhi Documents from Chinese Turkestan.* The following words are discussed: *ajhate* (of high rank); *gumni* (treasure store); *dramga* (a taxation department); *Maravara* (councillor (?)); *dars* (load); *trusga* (dry); *Sitiyammi* (land); *thavamnaga* (carpet); *Noksari* (new year); *Spasa* (to spy, to keep watch); *denuga* (religion (?)); *nacira* (wild animals, game); *Sada* (pleased); *stora* (horse); *Hinajha* (title of a King of Khotan).

Calcutta Oriental Journal, vol. II, no. 2 (November, 1934)

- PRABHAT CHANDRA CHAKRAVARTI.—*Śaktivāda and Śāktaism.*
- K. R. PISHAROTI.—*Vāstuvidyā.* This is a treatise on architecture translated into English with notes and diagrams.
- SESHAGIRI RAO.—*Suprabhātam.* It has been shown here that the term 'Suprabhātam,' which appears to be a modern translation of the English expression 'good morning,' is quite old in Sanskrit literature.

Ibid., vol. II, no. 3 (December, 1934)

- PRABHAT CHANDRA CHAKRAVARTI.—*Śakti-vāda and Śāktaism.*
- KSHITIS CHANDRA CHATTERJI.—*Popular Etymology.*

Indian Culture, vol. I, no. 2 (October, 1934)

- M. WINTERNITZ.—*The Jains in the History of Indian Literature.*
- C. L. FABRI.—*The Ancient Hungarian Script and the Brāhmī Characters.*
A striking similarity of the Hungarian Notch signs to those of the Asokan script is pointed out in this paper.
- S. K. DE.—*Caitanya-worship as a Cult.*

GIRIJA PRASANNA MAJUMDAR.—*Dress and Other Personal Requisites in Ancient India.* The styles of dresses in ancient India, the evolution of garments, the art of washing and dying clothes, the materials used for dresses,—these are the subjects discussed in the paper, together with descriptions of the ancient head-dresses, umbrella and footwear.

NALININATH DAS-GUPTA.—*The Buddhist Vihāras of Bengal.*

HARIHAR V. TRIVEDI.—*The Geography of Kauṭilya.*

DURGACHARAN CHATTERJI.—*Sources of Knowledge in Buddhist Logic.*

Journal of the Annamalai University,

vol. III, no. 1 (April, 1934)

R. RAMANUJACHARI.—*Vedānta on Freedom and Moral Responsibility.*

This instalment of the paper deals with the Vedānta view of freedom and moral responsibility as interpreted by Śaṅkara, Vallabha and Śrīkaṇṭha.

T. B. NAYAR.—*Three South Indian Metal Images.* The author describes three metal images representing Śiva (Kirātārjunamūrti), Pārvatī and Arjuna—all belonging to a Śaivaite shrine at Tiruveṭakaḷam in South India. The images form a sculptural representation of the story of Arjuna's penance resulting in his acquisition of the Pāśupata weapon from Śiva who appeared first in the guise of a hunter (Kirāta).

M. O. THOMAS —*Literature, Learning and Libraries in Ancient India.*

The opinion is expressed that unlike learning and literature, libraries were not in a flourishing condition in ancient India. The libraries attached to the educational institutions were not of any considerable size. It was only in the Muslim period that libraries commenced to be of large sizes.

B. N. KRISHNAMURTI SARMA.—*The Madhva-Vidyāśaṅkara Meeting—*

A Fiction. Śaṅkara who was, according to the *Madhvarijaya* of Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍitācārya, defeated by Madhva in a wordy warfare, is generally identified with Vidyāśaṅkara Tīrtha, an Ācārya of the Śrīgeri Maṭh in the 14th century. The paper shows that the identification is wrong.

V. A. RAMASWAMI SASTRI.—*Jagannātha Paṇḍita*. The merits of the poems of the celebrated author Jagannātha Paṇḍita of the 17th century have been discussed in this instalment.

Journal of the Assam Research Society,
vol. II, no. 3 (October, 1934)

AMARNATH RAY.—*Date of the Bhāgavata Purāna*. The writer assigns the date of composition of the *Bhāgavata Purāna* to a period between 550 and 650 A.C.

Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society,
vol. XX, pt. ii (June, 1934)

A. S. ALTEKAR.—*Yajñopavīta or "the Sacred Thread."* Yajñopavīta was originally worn on sacred occasions like sacrifices. It was then a piece of deer-skin used for covering the upper part of the body. It was later on replaced by the upper garment of cotton, which has now been symbolised by 'threads,' preserving the earlier tradition by stringing to them a small piece of deer-skin.

II. P. PANDEYA SARMA.—*Kosalānanda Kāvya*. This is an account of the *Kosalānanda-kāvya*, an historical poem in Sanskrit by Gaṅgādharma Miśra dealing with the Chauhan rulers of Patna cum Sambalpur kingdoms.

A. C. BANERJI.—*Baudh undated Grant of Raṇabhañjadeva*. The inscription has been edited here.

A. C. BANERJI.—*So-called Tribal Coinages of Northern India*. Dealing at the outset with the history of the Arjunāyanas and eleven other tribes whose coins have so far been found, the paper gives an account of those coins, describing their types, legends, etc.

DASARATHA SARMA.—*A Contemporary Record of Śivāji's Birth*. A horoscope drawn during the lifetime of Śivāji records that he was born on Friday, the third of the dark fortnight of the month of Phālguna in Saṃvat 1686 (= A.C. 1628).

Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society,
vol. X, nos. 1&2

K. G. KUNDANGAR.—*Kolhapur Copper-plate Grant of Akālavarsadeva*. The inscription recording the grant of a village in the year

Ś. 882 (960 A.C.) by Akālavarsadeva of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa dynasty has been edited and translated into English.

Journal of Indian History, vol. XIII, pt. 2 (August, 1934)

- M. V. UNAKAR.—*Meteorology in the Ṛgveda.*
- M. GOVINDA PAI.—*The Genealogy and the Chronology of the Early Kadambas of Vanavasi.*
- V. R. RAMACHADRA DIKSHITAR.—*Daśabandham.* *Daśabandha* is a legal expression found in the *Arthaśāstra* and the *Smṛtis* in connection with some offences punishable with fines. *Daśabandha* refers to the one-tenth of the sum forming subject-matter of the suit. In the South Indian inscriptions of the Mediæval period, the term occurs in the sense of a tax or an allowance of land or revenue as compensation for excavating a tank.
- B. V. RAMANUJAM.—*Divyasūricaritam.* *Divyasūricarita* is a poem in Sanskrit dealing with the lives of the Vaiṣṇava Ācāryas, and is important for the history of Vaiṣṇavism. It is argued in the paper that the author Gauḍavāhana Paṇḍita cannot be earlier than the first half of the 16th century A.C. as generally supposed.
- C. S. K. RAO SAHIB.—*Akbar's Regulation System; when did it end?*
- ABDUL AZIZ.—*The Imperial Treasury of the Greater Mughals.*

**Journal and Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal,
XXIX, no. 4, 1933.**

- II. K. DEB.—*St. Thomas and a Kushān king.* Mr. Deb prefers Vogel's reading *Mastāna*, on the torso found at Mathura said to be a statue of Kanishka, to Dr. B. Bhattacharya's reading *Caṣṭana*, and traces the name in the Ethiopic version of the Acts of St. Thomas.

—*Suṣa in Sanskrit Literature.* Mr. Deb has found the word *Suṣa* in an astronomical statement in the *Matsya Purāṇa* and compares with it a similar statement found by him in Varāhamihira's *Pañcasiddhāntikā*; from this he draws the inference that the king of Magadha, usually called Śiśunāka, who reigned circa 700 B.C. was in all probability a Suṣinak, that is, a prince from Suṣā (*Biblical—Shushan*).

A. K. MITRA.—*The Mauryan Lāts or Dhvaja stambhas: Do they constitute an independent Order?*—Mr. M. contends that some of the Aśokan pillars might have been existing before Aśoka as they were used to be set up for the habitation of spirits, etc.

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, October, 1934

DINESH CHANDRA SIRCAR.—*Epigraphic Notes:—*

(1) Hiraṇyagarbha. The writer points out that the term Hiraṇyagarbha in expressions like *Hiraṇyagarbha-prasūta* refers to ceremonial of that name, in which the celebrant had to enter into a golden kuṇḍa which was afterwards given away. When taken out of that 'golden womb', he was thought to be born of Hiraṇyagarbha.

(2) Genealogy of the 'Ānanda Kings of Guntur.' According to the writer, Dāmodaravarman of the Ānanda family was a successor of Attivarman and not a predecessor as has been supposed by Hultzsch.

JAIDEVA SINGH.—*Some Problems in connexion with the Nyāya Theory of Perception.*

Philosophical Quarterly, vol, X, no. iii (October, 1934)

H. N. RAGHAVENDRACHAR.—*The Place of God in Advaita.*

P. P. S. SASTRI.— Do.

A. C. MUKHERJI.— Do.

INDEX

- Abdul Latif, letters compiled by, 461f.
 Abdullah Khan, Commander, 676f., 684f., 687f., 690f., 694, 696ff., 709f., 712ff.
 Abdur Rahim, Khan Khanan, 677f.
 Abdus Salam, officer, 702
 Abhidhānacintāmaṇi, terms of agriculture in, 798f.
 Abhidharmakośa, 238
 Abhidharmakośa-bhāṣya, 239
 Abhijit, 332f.
 Abhinavabhārati, Nāṭyaśāstra and, 161-3
 Abhinavagupta, commentator, 161-3, 351ff., 352fn.
 Abhisamayālamkāra-ālokā, Nirvāṇa according to, 349
 Abū Zaid, account of Jury given by, 621
 Abul Fazal, letters of, 456, 461, 465
 Abul Hassan, Secretary to the Governors of Orissa, letters compiled by, 465f.
 Acyutaśiva, teacher, 166
 Adab-i-Alamgiri, historical information in, 459-60
 Adbhuta-sāgara, work of Vallāla Sena, 729f.
 Aditi, goddess, 412f., 418, 423, 430
 Adil Khan, admiral, 693; made king of Bijapur, 700
 Adil Shah, king of Bijapur, 720f.
 Adityasena, Gauḍa scribe engaged by, 572
 Advaita-prakāśa, Caitanya legend narrated in, 302fn.
 Agathocleia, Indo-Greek ruler, 518
 Agni Purāṇa, Riti and Guṇa in, 767-79
 Agriculture, 288-300; references in Jaina literature to, 797ff. See Ancient India.
 Ahmad Shah Abdali, 628, 634; invasion of India by, 625ff.
 Ahmed Beg Khan, governor of Orissa, 681f., 684; defeat of, 687f.
 Aizad Bakhsh Rasa, letters compiled by, 463
 Ajit Singh of Jodhpur, letters of, 454
 Akbar, Aurangzeb's letter to, 457
 Akbar, 453; letters of, 456, 459, 460; record of correspondence during reign of, 456, 461
 Akbariyya Kālidāsa, 479
 Alakhana, king of Gurjara, 617
 Alankāra Śāstra, 771
 Alauddin Islam Khan, governor of Bengal, 678
 Al Bilāduri, account of Jury given by, 623
 Al Idrisi, account of Indian kings given by, 622-3
 Al Mas'ūdī, account of Jury given by, 621-2
 Alexander, coins of, 71, 77ff.
 Ali Khan Neyazi, 693
 Amadit-ul-Malik, Aurangzeb's letter to, 457
 Ambela Expedition, events leading to, 26-36
 Amir Khan Pindari, 26
 Amma I, grants of, 98-99
 Ammarāja, Malayapundi grant of, 94
 Amoghavarṣa, Sañjan copperplate of, 615; Nilgunda inscr. of, 618
 Amoghavarṣa I, Rāṣṭrakūṭas under, 91, (Cālukya) Vijayāditya's conflict with, 93f.
 Amoghavarṣa II, 51, 53
 Anāhita, Iranian goddess, 407f, 421, 423
 Ananda, Jaina Upāsaka, 797
 Anandin, commentator, 307
 Ananta Bhaṭṭa, author of Campū Bhārata, 112; whether Karnāṭaka domicile of, 112ff.
 Anat, Semitic goddess, 411
 Ancient Geography, studies in, 642-64
 Ancient India, agriculture in, 288ff. agricultural lands and labour in,

- 201-2 ; communal cultivation in, 291-2 ; condition of husbandmen in, 289-91 ; famine in, 294-5 ; fertility of soil in, 292-3 ; flood and inundations in, 293-4 ; irrigation work in, 291 ; rainfall in, 295-9 ; Persian and Greek coins and their imitations in, 67-81 ; preservation of grains in, 300 ; Roman coins in, 69f. ; sources of danger to crops in, 292 ; trade routes of, 69
- Ancient Indian coins, two new varieties of, 723-7
- Antialcidas, Indo-Greek king, 515
- Anulia plate, date of, 733
- Apyā (Durgā), goddess, 430
- Appayya Dīkṣita, *Tattvasūddhi* referred to by, 577ff.
- Aram Bakhsh, son of Darab Khan, 692f., 719
- Architecture, Indian, 358ff. ; Mauryan, 360ff. ; Persian, 359ff.
- Arjvi, goddess, 407f. ; river, 418
- Arhat, 211, 219, 225ff., 246, 249ff.
- Arrakan, Shah Jahan's alliance with king of, 693-4
- Arśi speech, 590f.
- Artemis, goddess, 407ff., 422, 424
- Arthasāstra, city-divinities alluded to in, 509 fn. ; rain-gauge mentioned in, 297fn.
- Artists, guild of, 573
- Ārya Āsvagupta, arhat, 554
- Āryadeva, birth place of, 368ff. ; home of, 137-42
- Ārya Pārśva, arhat, 551
- Āryas, (Indian) homes and migrations of, 121-4
- Asaf Khan, vizir, 676, 686
- Asaṅga, Buddhist teacher, 741
- Āśoka, Nālandā vihāra founded by, 557
- Āśokavalla Deva, inscrs. during reign of, 735f.
- Aspasioi, people, 515-6
- Assaji, Buddhist monk, 62f.
- Astakenoi, people, 516
- Astronomical Kali Age, beginning of, 587 ff.
- Ātmavāda. See *Brahmavāda*.
- Āuka, son of Dhanika, 615
- Aurangzeb, 458-60, 462-68 ; letters of, 454
- Marhatta campaigns of, 469 ; religious grants of, 465
- Avalokitavrata, 217, 234, 237
- Avantī coins, 724-5 ; specimen of, 723-4
- Avatāras, 23-24
- Avidyā = vāsanā, 4
- Aya Mal Jaipuri, letters compiled by, 559
- Ayodhyā, mentioned in Bengal inscrs., 324, 324fn., 327fn.
- Bahadur Khan, Zamindar of Hijli, 678
- Bahar-i-Sukham, historical information in, 460
- Bahar Khan, admiral, 693
- Baharistan-i-Ghaibi, work of Mirza Nathan, 672f.
- Bairam Beg, commander, 677f., 704 ; appointed jagirdar of Burdwan, 684 ; made governor of Bihar, 696 ; death of, 705
- Bālāditya, son of Bhaṭṭarāja, 619
- Balarāma, Dionysos identified with, 288
- Baudh plates of Raṇabhañjadva (year 58), 473-7 ; geographical names mentioned in, 474-5 ;
- Bāūka, Jodhpur inscr. of, 341ff.
- Bell Capital, note on origin of, 125-36, 358-67
- Benagourn of Ptolemy, Veṅgi identified with, 159
- Bengal, chronology of Sena kings of, 728-36 ; scribes of, 571 ; Shah Jahan's administrative arrangements in, 692-3
- Bhadra, Buddhist monk, 552
- Bhadrā, second queen of Haricandra, 342
- Bhadrayaśas, a coin-type adopted by, 511
- Bhakti-bhāva-pradīpa, work of Jayagopāla-dāsa, 316f
- Bhāmatī, date of composition of, 348
- Bhānukara, contemporary of Sher Shah, 483

- Bhāratitīrtha**, guru of Mādhava, 803f., 810
- Bhartṛhari**, supposed commentator on *Mīmāṃsā Sūtras*, 452fn.
- Bhartṛmitra**, *Vṛttikāra*, 451-2
- Bhāskara** (different from Vedāntin Bhāskara), son of Divākara and pupil of Śrikanṭha Bhaṭṭa, 351ff.
- Bhāskarācārya**, critic of Śaṅkara, 348; works of, 348ff.
- Bhatṛpaṭṭa**, Guhila king, 614f.
- Bhaṭṭa**, son of Guhila, 618f., 620
- Bhava-dāsa**, *Vṛttikāra*, 449f.
- Bhāvaprakāśana**, *Mahānāṭaka* referred to in, 493
- Bhīmaśukla**, king of Benares, 566
- Bhir mound**, coins found at, 71ff.
- Bhoja**, author of *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*, 767, 769, 773f; Barab and Daulatpur copperplates of, 155; Daulatpur inscr. of, 338; Gwalior praśasti of, 341; *Kāmasūtra* in, 12-13; King, 505; Pratihāra king, 614, 617, 620
- Bhojadeva**, king of Dhārā, 567, 569
- Bhojavarmadeva**, Belava copperplate of, 371f.
- Bhumajaka**, Buddhist monk, 62f.
- Bibliographical Notes**, 204-10, 400-403
- Bilochpur**, battle of, 675-6
- Bodhāyana**, *Vṛttikāra*, 433f.
- Bodhisattva**, 214, 220, 243ff.
- Bombay**, E. I. Company takes possession of, 523
- Brahmadatta**, king of Kāśī, 539 fn.
- Brāhmaloka**, Raivata's journey to, 546
- Brahman**, Buddhist conception of, 277ff.; *Vijñāna* identical with, 2, 8f.
- Brāhmaṇas**, age of, 533-40; astronomical references in, 533-8
- Brāhmaṇa period** (earliest), determination of solstices and equinoxes at, 536-7
- Brāhmaṇa-sarvasva**, work of Halāyudha, 731f.
- Brahmanism**, relation between early Buddhism and, 274-87
- Brahmasūtras**, Upaniṣadic divergences synthesised in, 11
- Brahmasūtra-bhāṣya**, work of Bhāskarācārya, 348
- Brahmavāda**, = *Ātmavāda*, = *Vijñānavāda*, 2
- Brahmavādins**, 8ff.
- Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad-bhāṣyā**, authorship of, 356 fn.
- Bṛhatkalpasūtra**, two kinds of fields mentioned in, 798
- British rule**, relations between civil and military authorities in early days of, 523-32
- Buddha**, 219ff., 238, 245ff.; date of parinirvāṇa of, 735f.; Devadatta's attitude towards, 61f.; Jaina criticism of, 61f.; no-soul theory of, 742ff.
- Buddha (mitrā)**, donor, 576
- Buddhadeva**, Vaibhāṣika teacher, 558f.
- Buddhahood**, state of, 212, 244ff.
- Buddha-Indra**, dual divinity, 521
- Buddhasena**, Bodh-Gayā inscr. of, 796; Tāranātha's information about, 736
- Buddhism**, anattā doctrine in, 742ff., 795; 'arahan' according to, 785ff.; aspects of, 742ff.; basic ideas of, 742ff.; basic ideas of Sāṃkhya compared with those of, 748ff.; central conceptions of, 740; classification of mental phenomena in, 744fn., 745; conception of self in, 283ff.; decadence of, 286ff.; Dharma as basic conception of, 758ff.; 'Dharma' theory according to, 743ff.; doctrine of desire in, 737ff.; features of, 737ff.; 'mahābhūtas' according to, 747 fn.; periods in development of, 741; philosophic basis of, 740ff.; reasons for birth and growth of, 282-3; Tāranātha's History of, 551-9; Vedānta compared with, 1f.
- Buddhism (Early)**, forms of, 785ff.; relation between Brahmanism and, 274 ff.; Buddhism (Pāli), four Ways and four Fruits in, 785-96
- Buddhists**, Dharma of, 749ff.
- Buddhist Saṅgha**, 275, 281
- Buddhist texts**, Kucheian translation of, 585f.

- Bukka I, king of Vijayanagar, 801ff.
 Caitanya, as an author, 301-20; early Gosvāmins inspired by, 307 ff.; education of, 301f.; Keśava Bhaṭṭa Kāśmīrī's disputation with, 302f.; organisation of followers of, 305-7; writings of, 307ff.; verses ascribed to, 311ff.
 Caitanya-caritāmṛta, Sanskrit verses ascribed to Caitanya in, 313f.
 Caitanya-dāsa, commentator, 315
 Cakrapāṇi Kavi, brother of Hari Kavi, 479
 Cālukyas (Eastern), 90-99
 Cālukya-Bhīma I, 96-8; six inscriptions of, 96ff.
 Campā, agriculture in, 288f.
 Campū Bhārata, domicile of author of, 112-115
 Campū style, origin of, 112ff.
 Caṇḍakinnara Jātaka, 346f.
 Candanapāla, king, 558
 Caṇḍavarman, king, 780ff.
 Caṇḍavarman, successor of Saktivarman, 158; Komara plates of, 369f.
 Candellas, 618f.
 Candrāditya, Pallava king, 369
 Candragupta II, Sāhasāṅka as appellation of, 48f.
 Candragupta Vikramāditya, Govinda (Rāṣṭrakūṭa) compared to, 48-53
 Carnatic Records, historical information in, 464; remission of salt tax mentioned in, 464
 Catustava, work of Nāgārjuna, 82-89
 Chabbaggiyas, 60, 62ff.; centres of, 63
 Chahar Chaman-i-Brahman, importance of, 462
 Charles II, transfer of Bombay to the Company by, 523
 Chatsu inscr., 618ff.
 Chicacole grant, identification of Sārapallikā in, 782f.
 China, Kālidāsa in, 566-70
 Citta, Buddhist explanation of, 4ff.
 Coins, from Avanti, 724f.; from Mathurā, 725-7; manufacture of, 68f.
 Coinage (Indian), origin of, 67ff., coinage type, 'Apollo: Tripod,' 513f.; Apollodotus, 512ff.; 'Elephant: Bull,' 512f.; (Indo-Greek), 509-22; 'Nike,' 514-5; Pilei of Dioscuri, 515; Zeus with thunderbolt, 521
 Col. Carnac, Shah Alam II defeated by, 625
 Copperplate grant from Sundarban, 321-31, iconographic and æsthetic significance of, 322
 Dabok inscr., 615
 Dāmodara Miśra, redactor of Mahānāṭaka, 494, 505f.
 Danaides, legend of, 419
 Dāndā, Gauḍa Kāyastha, 572
 Dantidurga, Rāṣṭrakūṭa king, 615
 Darab Khan, Viceroy of Bengal, 686, 692, 692 fn., 703f., 707, 715, 717, 719; treachery of, 718
 Darya Khan, general, victory of, 687ff.
 Darya Khan Rohilla (Sher Khan Fathjang), commandant, 697ff.
 Daśavaikālika, terms of agriculture mentioned in, 798
 Daśavatāra temple inscr., 615
 Dastur-ul-Amal-i-Agahi, importance of, 459
 Datta Rāja, 728 fn.
 Dawar Bakhsh, son of Khusrau, 676
 D. D'souza, Portuguese chieftain, 703, 707
 Deopārā inscr. of Vijayasena, 571
 Devadatta, five special rules pressed by, 61f.
 Devendrabuddhi, 226
 Dhammadinna, disciple of Buddha, 794
 Dhammasaṅgani, four ways discussed in, 788
 Dhanika, son of Guhila, 615
 Dhārāvarṣa, chief of Mount Abu, 154
 Dharma, basic conception of Buddhism, 758 ff.
 Dharmas (of Buddhists) and Guṇas (of Sāṃkhyas), 737-60
 Dharmatrāta, Udānavarga, compiled by 559, Vaibhāṣika teacher, 559
 Dharmika, brāhmaṇa, 559
 Dhīmān, son of Vitpāla, 571
 Dhruvasāminī, 49 f.

- Dhvaja-stambhas, 125 ff., 360 ff.
 Dīgha-nikāya, Tevijja Sutta of, 281;
 'composition of Suttas of, 281 f.
 Dionysos (god), Balarāma identified
 with, 288
 Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna, Jayaśīla's con-
 temporaneity with, 89
 Dravidic 'Water,' 37-47.
 Durgasiṃha, Pañcatantra version of,
 104-5.
 Durrānis, 261, 265 ff; British attitude
 towards, 624-41
 Dūtāṅgada, work of Subhaṭa, 494 ff.,
 495 fn.
 Dvāravati, Kṛṣṇa's capital. location
 of, 541-50
 Dwārakā 542 ff.
 Dyaus, Indian god, 428
 East India Company, 624
 East India, popular goddesses of, 17-18;
 Theriomorphism in, 22-23.
 Ekavyavahārikas, 235 f.
 Empirical reality, recognition of, 580 f.
 Euthydemus I, territory of, 518
 Eyre Coote, appointed by the Company,
 524; theory of military indepen-
 dence enunciated by, 524-6
 Faiyaz-ul-Qawanin, historical informa-
 tion in, 460
 Faizi, letters of, 461
 Faramin-i-Muhammad Shahi-o-Ba'za-i-
 Shahan-i-Salf, importance of, 465
 Feringhi pirates, 679
 Fojdar, Deputy Governor of Malwa,
 466; letters collected by, 466-7
 Fou-Nan, genealogy of kings of, 145
 Gabbhini-Sutta, Sohgaura copperplate
 and Mahāsthān inscr. interpreted
 with evidence from, 57ff.
 Gāhaḍavālas, 327
 Gandhāra, figure of Vajrapāṇi at, 521
 Gandhāra relief (in Indian Museum),
 344ff.
 Gandharva Siṃha, donor, 116ff.
 Gandhāṭa, father of Raṇabhañjadeva,
 473
 Gaṅgādāsa, grammarian, 301
 Gaṅgas, 340, 584; Vijayāditya's
 victory over, 93f.
 Gauḍa scribes, 572f.
 Ghosaka, Buddhist teacher, 554, 559
 Girinagara, same as Raivataka, 54
 Girnār hills, antiquity of, 548ff.
 Gitā, Kashmirian commentary on, 353
 Gitā commentaries, 348-57
 Gokarṇa Kṣetra, sacred place in North
 Kanara, 115
 Gopal Jadun, commandant, 699
 Gopāla-caritra (or Premāmṛta), author-
 ship of, 314-15
 Goparūya, king, 368f.
 Govinda (Rāṣṭrakūṭa), Candragupta
 Vikramāditya compared to, 48-53
 Govindapur plate, 732
 Govindānanda, author of Ratnaprabhā,
 480; successors of, 480-81
 Guhila II, son of Harṣarāja, 618, 620
 Guhila Bhatṛpaṭṭa, 339
 Guhila family, 339, 342
 Guhilas, 614f.
 Guṇas (of Sāṃkhyas), Dharmas (of
 Buddhists) and, 737-60
 Gurjaras, history of, 613-23
 Gurjara-Pratihāra, 337ff., 582ff.
 Gurjareśvara, meaning of, 583
 Haft Anjiman, importance of, 467-9
 Halāyudha Bhaṭṭa, spiritual adviser
 of Lakṣmaṇa Sena, 731ff.
 Hārāvali, 479; verses from, 484-5
 Haribhadra Sūri, plough mentioned
 by, 798; Nirvāṇa according to, 214,
 223
 Haricandra, king, 559; Pratihāras
 descended from, 342f.
 Harihara I, king, 804, 809f.
 Harihara II, son of Bukka I, 802f.,
 809f.
 Hariścandra, brāhmaṇa ancestor of
 Pratihāras, 584
 Harivaṃśa, Dvāravati in, 546ff.;
 genealogy of Saurāṣṭra kings accord-
 ing to, 546
 Harṣarāja, son of Saṃkaragaṇa, 614,
 616ff.
 Hastivarman, contemporary of Samu-
 dra Gupta, 158
 Hinayānists, 124f., 224ff.; essence of
 Nirvāṇa according to, 216f.

- Hinduism, Daśavatāras in, 23-24;
Pre-Aryan elements in, 25
Hṛdayaśiva, disciple of Sadāśiva, 166
Hughes, Admiral, 525
Humayun, letters of, 461
Ibn Khurdadba, account of Indian
kings given by, 621
Ibrahim Khan Fathjang, viceroy in
Bengal, 678, 681, 687f., defeat and
death of, 688, 690 fn., 694 fn.; Shah
Jahan opposed at Akbarnagar by,
684-86, submission of, 691f.
Ibrāhim Khān Gārdi, 259, 266; death
of, 262ff., 270 fn.; Ruhelas attacked
by, 260-61
Ihkam-i-Alamgiri, historical informa-
tion in, 459
Inayat Khan, letters compiled by, 460
Inayat Ullah, letters compiled by,
457ff.
India, religious literature of, 274f.
India and Iran, garments of, 423-26 ;
Great Goddess in, 405-30; symbolical
representations of, 423ff.
Indian architecture, Coomaraswamy
on diffusionist hypothesis regarding,
358ff.
Indian coinage, origin of, 67ff.
Indian Culture, Pre-Aryan elements
in, 14-25
Indian hymnology, 148
Indian Museum, Gandhāra relief
in, 344-47
Indian Scripts, origin of, 24
Indo-China, literati of, 146; Indian
epic-themes and Śaiva Siddhānta
in, 146-47; South Indian place-names
in, 144-45; Tantrism in, 146f.
Indo-Chinese kings, Pallava titles
of, 145
Indo-Chinese social life, some Dravi-
dian features in, 143-47
Indo-European languages, 590f.
Indo-Greek coin-types, 509-22
Indra III, father of Govinda IV, 51
Indrabhūti Gautama, disciple of Mahā-
vira, 797f.
Indradhruva, brāhmaṇa, 558
Indravyākaraṇa, grammar, 558
Insha-i-Hamid-ud-Din, historical in-
formation in, 466-67
Insha-i-Jan Muhammad, letters com-
piled by, 465
Insha-i-Jan Zārbakhsh, historical
information in, 464
Inshai Abdul Latif, importance
of, 461-62
Inshai-Faizi, importance of, 461
Inshai Farsi, importance of, 464
Inshai-Ibrahim, importance of, 462
Inshai-Inayat Ullah, historical infor-
mation in, 462
Inshai-i-Nami, importance of, 461
Inshai-i-Roshan Kalam Bhupat,
importance of, 462-63
Inshai Usafi, importance of, 461
Itibar Khan, commandant, 676
Itimad Khan, 691, 695, 702
Jadda, Gauḍa Kāyastha, 572
Jahangir, 674ff.; correspondence
during reign of, 456, 461f.; letters
of, 454, 456, 460; Shah Jahan's
letter to, 465; Shah Jahan's recon-
ciliation with, 722
Jahangir Quli Khan, Governor, 697
Jai Singh, chief of Jaipur, 710
Jaina astronomy, yuga in, 332ff.; sam-
vatsaras in, 333ff.; seasons in,
335f.
Jaina calendar, 332-36
Jaina hymns and magic squares, note
on, 148-53
Jaina literature, references to agri-
culture in, 797-800
Jainism, hymnology in, 148
Jaipur, official letters of Mughal period
at, 454
Jaithamul, letters written by, 463
James Stuart, Major-General, his
attitude towards the Government,
526-27; arrest and dismissal of, 527
Jam-yañ-shad-pa, analysis of theories
concerning Nirvāṇa in commentary
of, 221-33; literature consulted in,
233f.
Jan Libæner, Dutchman, 680:n.
Jarāsandha, 542ff.
Jassa Singh, Sikh chief, 638f.

- Jātaka stories, stūpas commemorating incidents of, 345fn.**
- .Jaṭi, householder, 554**
- Java, primitive dances and plays in, 144**
- Jayapāla, Gauḍa Kāyastha, 572**
- Jayasena, date of Janibigha inscr. of, 736**
- Jayaśīla, date of, 89**
- Jayabhañjadeva, land grant of, 475**
- Jayatīrtha, 350**
- Jayavarman, king of Camboja, 146f.; date of, 160**
- Jiva Gosvāmin, author of Bhakti-sandarbhā, 314**
- Jonagarh, Muslim conquest of, 464**
- Junāgaḍ = Girinagar**
- Jurz (Gurjara), 620ff.**
- Kakka, ruler of Vallamaṇḍala, 339f.**
- Kakkuka, Ghatiyala inscr. of, 341f.**
- Kakūḍ: kakubb: *kakub, notes on, 560f.**
- Kāla, relationship between Zervān and, 426ff.**
- Kālī, goddess, 429; connected with Aditi, 130**
- Kālidāsa, date of, 763ff.; traditional account of, 566ff.**
- Kalimat-i-Aurangzeb, importance of, 457**
- Kalimat-i-Taibat, historical information in, 457-58**
- Kaliṅga, fall of, 782f.; Siṃhapura of, 368ff.**
- Kāmahāyānikan, philosophical treatise of Buddhists, 146**
- Kāmarūpa, Muhammad-i-Bukhtiyar's attack on, 734**
- Kāmasūtra, quotations by Bhoja from, 12-13**
- Kanauj, 340, 342f.**
- Kaniṣka, king of Jalandhara, 551f., 954; Kosam inscr. of, 575-76**
- Karhad plate, 618**
- Karkarāja, 617; Baroda plate of, 616f.**
- Karnama-i-Jaithamul, historical information in, 463**
- Kārṣāpaṇa, 67**
- Kāshirāj Shivdev, secretary of Sujā-**
- ud-daulah, 258f.; account of third battle of Pānipat recorded by, 259-73**
- Kāśyapa: Kaśśapa: kacchapa, notes, on, 561-63**
- Kaula rites, 488ff.**
- Kaumudimahotsava, date of Kālidāsa and, 763-66**
- Kauṇḍapa, Vidyāranya praised by, 806f.**
- Kauṇḍinya Jaya Varman, king of Fou-Nan, 144**
- Kauśasthali. See Dvāravatī.**
- Kauśītaki Brāhmaṇa, astronomical references in, 534ff.**
- Kavikarṇapūra, commentator, 307**
- Kāvya-lāṅkāra-sūtras, mention of Candragupta in, 761**
- Kāyasthas (Bengali), employed by Kośala Guptas, 572; social position of, 573-74**
- Kāya-traya-avatāra-mukha, Nirvāṇa according to, 220-21**
- Keśava Bhaṭṭa Kāśmiri, scholar and commentator, 302ff.**
- Khatut-i-Shivaji, historical information in, 463**
- Khidmat-purast Khan, adopted son of Wazir Khan, 689, 697, 699, 706**
- Khwajah Daud, 684, 704, 710**
- Khwajah Ibrahim, 684, 704, 710**
- Khwajah Idrak, Chamberlain, 686 f.**
- Khwand Amir, historian, letters compiled by, 461**
- Kiṭāgiri, 63**
- Kollabhigaṇḍa Vijayāditya IV, 99**
- Komarti plates, Mahārāja Candavarman of, 780-84**
- Kośala Guptas, Bengali Kāyasthas employed by, 572**
- Kosam (ancient Kauśāmbi), Bodhisattva image at, 575**
- Kosam inscr. of Kaniṣka, 575 f.**
- Kṛṣṇa, capital of, 541 ff.**
- Kṛṣṇa, teacher, 558**
- Kṛṣṇa II, son of Amoghavarṣa, 97**
- Kṛṣṇa III, Karhad plate of, 618**
- Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja, 311, 315**
- Kṛṣṇakarṇāmṛta, authorship of commentary of, 315**

- Kṛṣṇakinkara-dāsa**, 316
Kṛṣṇarāja, son of Auka, 615f.
Kṛtakoṭi, author, 433 f.
Kṛttivāsa Ojhā, Bengali poet, 496, 507
Kṣitipāla, king, 337
Kucha, early history of, 588
Kuchean or Western Arsi, 585-92
Kuḍuhāra, identical with Guḍivāḍa, 159
Kulārṇava, doctrines in, 489-90, 491
Kulika, brāhmaṇa, 554 f.
Kumārajīva, Buddhist scholar, 588
Kumārila Bhaṭṭa, Upavaśa praised by, 431 ff., 436 fn.
Kuṇḍalavanavihāra, monastery in Kashmir, 552
Kunwar Pahar Singh, son of Raja Bir Singh Deo Bundela, 700, 710, 712 f.
Kuvana, monastery in Jalandhara, 552
Kyat, coin current in Burma, 143
Laghu Bhārata, date of Lakṣmaṇa Sena's birth mentioned in, 130
Lakṣāśva, king, 554 f.
Lakṣmaṇa Samvat, beginning of, 731, 733, 736
Lakṣmaṇasena, 326; date of, 728 ff.; date of Anulia plate of, 733; date of Madhainagar, Govindapur, and Sundarban plates of, 732; date of Tapandighi plate of, 729, 732; date of Saktipur plate of, 729, 733; Madhainagar copperplate of, 338
Lakṣmidhara, poet, 479f.
Laotian, version of Pañcatantra, 105
Legs-bsad-gser-phren, work of Tsonkha-pa, 212; analysis of theories concerning Nirvāṇa according to, 214-21
Liaka Kusul-ka, satrap, 515
Liṅga and yoni, cult of, 20f.
Liṅga cult, older than Mohenjo-daro, 21; focus of, 21-2; in Brāhmaṇism, 22
Li-yen, Buddhist monk, 588f.
Lohitaka, Buddhist monk, 62f.
Lokāyatikas, Nirvāṇa according to, 237
Lord Cornwallis, Timur Shah's correspondence with, 635
Lord Macartney, Governor, 525 ff.
Lord Wellesley, foreign policy enforced by, 639 ff.
Lotus, symbolic significance of, 127 ff.
Lotus capitals, divergences between Bell capitals and, 135-36; origin of, 365 ff.
Madhainagar plate, 338; date of, 732
Mādhavācārya, identity of Vidyāranya and, 401-10
Mādhavamantri, Governor of Goa, 806, 810
Madhyadeśa, extent of, 475
Mādhyamikā, place-name, 518
Mādhyamikas, 216f., 219 ff.
Maḍommaṇapāla, Sāmantarāja, 324, 326, 326 fn., 327 fn., 329
Māgadha, caste-name, 783
Magic squares, diagrams of, 150, 151, 153
Mahabat Khan, general, 675 ff., 707-9, 713, 720, 722
Mahābhadanta, designation, 552
Mahābhārata, information regarding location of Dwārakā in, 542 ff.
Mahādeva, Buddhist monk, 552, 556
Mahādeva, Gauḍa Kāyastha, 572
Mahāmāṇḍalika, Śaiva worshipper, 325, 326 fn., 329
Mahānāma, Gotama's instruction to, 794
Mahānāṭaka, chronology and text of, 493-98; views regarding origin of, 498-501
Mahānāṭaka Problem, 493-508
Mahāpadma, 552
'Mahārāja' in inscriptions, 154ff.
Mahārāṇaka Vāsudeva Śarmaṇ, donee, 324, 330
Mahāsamaya, Mahāyāna text, 558
Mahāsthān, Brāhmī inscr. of, 57-66
Mahāvīra, bhikṣu, 558
Mahāyāna, beginning of propagation of, 554-57
Mahdhoji Sindhia, 636
Mahendrapāla, Pratihāra king, 618

- Mahipāla**, 618f., 620
'Maisoloi' of Ptolamy, Masulipatam identified with, 159
Maitrāyaṇī Upaniṣad, summer solstice according to, 540
Majmua az Bias, importance of, 465
Malabar, birth-place of Saṅkara, 146
Malava, Pratihāra kings of, 342-43
Malaya Peninsula, traces of Indian religions and philosophy in, 146-47
Malhar Bhat, grant from Aurangzeb received by, 465
Malik Ambar, minister of Ahmadnagar, 720ff.; alliance between Shahjahan and, 721-22
Malik Husain, nephew of Ihtamam Khan, 693
Mallapadeva, Piṭhapuram inscr. of, 94f.
Mānadeva Sūri, works of, 150, 150fn.
Maṇḍana, 578fn., 581
Maṇimañjarī, 349
Man Singh, Zamindar of Bengal, 685
Manoel Tavares, Portuguese chieftain, 687, 690, 703, 707
Maṅgi, Nolamba king, 93f.
Marathas, 263ff.; debacle of, 264-65; plundered and captured by Shāh's troops, 265-69
Mārkaṇḍeya Purāna, topographical information contained in, 642ff.
Masum Khan, son and successor of Musa Khan, 678-79, 687, 697, 707
Mathanadeva, vassal king, 154, 338f., 619
Mathurā, Yādavas migrated from, 542ff.
Mathurā coins, 725-27; specimen of, 725-26
Maudgalyāyana, 557
Manes, coins of, 515 fn.
Mauryan architecture, 360ff.
Mehrauli pillar inscr., similarity of verse in Vāmana's Kāvyaḷaṅkāra-sūtras with third stanza of, 761
Menandar, Greek king, 511f.; coin-types of, 518
Meng Khamaung, king of Arrakan, 694fn.
Mettiya, Buddhist monk, 62f.
Miguel Rodrigues, Portuguese Governor, 679, 683
Mihira Bhoja, king of Kanauj, 339f.
Minayeff, J. P., 811ff.; biographical sketch of, 811-16; list of works of, 816-26
Minhaj-i-Shiraj, information about Lakṣmaṇa Sena in, 731, 733f.
Mir Jafar, 624, 628
Mir Shams, admiral, 687f., 690, 697, 707
Mir Sufi, tutor, 707
Mir Qasim, 624, 628
Mirza Afrasiyab, son of Darab Khan, 707, 717
Mirza Akbar Shah, 637 ff.
Mirza Bagi, bakhsi, 685, 693
Mirza Hidayetulla, officer, 693
Mirza Mulki, diwan, 693
Mirza Nathan, 673, 683fn., 691, 698
Mirza Rustam, governor of Allahabad, 675, 681, 699, 701, 703
Mirza Rustam Dandahari, commandant, 696f., 701
Mirza Salih, son of Mirza Shahi, 684, 693
Mirza Yusuf, commander, 689
Mitramiśra, author of Viramitrodaya, 807
Mi-yar-ul-Adrak, importance of, 465
Moggallāna, disciple of Buddha, 280
Mohammad Salih Kambhu, letters compiled by, 460
Mohammad Usaf, letters compiled by, 461
Mohanadāsa, meaning of 'mahānāṭaka' according to, 499fn., 506 fn.
Mohenjo-daro, Liṅga cult older than, 21
Mother Goddess, cult of, 405ff.; original Indian conception of, 14f.; origin and development of conception of, 414ff.; Sumerian origins of, 16; various forms of, 412
Mount Meros, location of, 293fn.
Mubarak Khan, death of, 719
Mudgaragomin Siddhapati, brāhmaṇa, 556f.

- Mughal emperors, historical importance of letters of, 470ff.
- Mughal History (1526—1707), unexplored source of, 453-72
- Muhammad Salih, Bakhshi, 695, 717
- Muhammad Taqi, governor of Orissa, 682
- Mujmut-i-Munshiat, historical information in, 464
- Mukhlis Khan, diwan of Bihar, 691
- Mukhtar Beg Nawazish Khan, governor of Kashmir, 463
- Mūla-Dwārakā, 546
- Multan, antiquity of, 513f.
- Mullah Muhammad Lari, minister of Bijapur, 700, 720; death of, 721
- Mumtaz Mahal, queen, 713, 715
- Munshiat Tabrezi, importance of, 462
- Munshi Candar Bhan, letters compiled by, 462
- Munshi Har Karn, letters compiled by, 456
- Murad Bakhsh, birth of, 715
- Musa Khan, Zamindar of Bengal, 678, 690
- Muslim Rulers, poets enjoying patronage of, 478ff.
- Muttra, Hindu temple at, 465
- Nāgabhaṭa II, Vatsarūya's successor, 339f., 616, 620
- Nāga Loka (or Indian Archipelago), division and description of, 121f.
- Nāgārjuna, Buddhist teacher, 247, 741; Nālandā Vihāra expanded by, 557
- Najib-ud-daulah, 260, 262, 268f.; Sindhia's corps overthrown by, 263
- Nālandā, enlargement and foundation of, 557; Sāriputra born at, 556f.
- Naniaa, Goddess, 407; cult of, 408ff.
- Nanda, king, 552
- Nandimitra, arhat, 554
- Nānyadeva, king of Mithila, Vijaya Sena's victory over, 728, 730
- Naraka land, division and description of, 123-24
- Nārāyaṇapāla, king of Gauḍa, 618
- Nārāyaṇa Sarasvatī, poet, 480-81
- Nārāyaṇatīrtha, author of Bālabodhini, 480
- Nārodha, date of inscr. of, 165; Vyomaśiva mentioned in, 165-66; monastery of, 166
- Nashir Khan, commandant, 697, 714
- Nāṭyadarpaṇa, 163
- Nāṭyaśāstra, Abhinavabhāratī and, 161-63, date of, 161
- Navadvīpa, centre of learning, 301f., 311
- Nawab Mohammad Ali Hassan Khan, letters compiled by, 460
- Nigar Nama Munshi Malik Zada, importance of, 463
- Nilgunda inscr. 618
- Nirvāṇa, 211ff.; attributes of, 10fn.; conception of, 214ff.; 235ff.; definition of, 230ff.; Hinayānic view of, 214-18, 224-28; Mādhyamika view of, 219-21, 231-32; Mahāyānic theories about, 239ff.; Prāsaṅgika view of, 232-33; Yogācāra view of, 218-19, 229-30
- Niśśanka Malla, king, 368
- Nityānanda, successor of Caitanya, 304
- No Badah-i-Munir, historical information in, 460
- Nolambas, Vijayāditya's victory over, 92-93
- Nṛsiṃha, author of Prayogapārijāta, 807 f.
- Nuniz, chronicle of, 808f.
- Nur Jahan, 674f.; letters of, 454
- Nur Mohammad, letters compiled by, 461
- Nuskha-i-Aish Afza, importance of, 465
- Nyāyasāra, Sarvajña's authorship of, 163-65
- Nyāyasudhā, ekasattā-vāda of, 581
- Orissa, informations for detailed history of, 465f.; Mughal demand of land revenue from, 466; occupied by Shah Jahan, 681-82
- Oudh, overrun by Darya Khan, 697
- Padyāvalī, 311; Sikṣāṣṭaka as mentioned in, 312-13

- Pālas, 324ff., 327 fn.
Pāli literature, Brahman in, 277f.
Pallavas, Vijayāditya's victory over, 92
Pampā, Kanarese poet, 95
Pañca Siddhānta, beginning of Maghā according to, 540
Pañcatantra, comparisons of versions of, 107ff.; four versions of, 104ff.; languages of, 107; Vasubhāga's version of, 104ff.
Pāṇḍavas, 544; probable date of, 533, 539f.
Paṇḍuka, Buddhist monk, 62f.
Pānipat (1761), Afghan victory at, 626; battle of, 258-73; debacle of Maratha army in, 264-65; death of Ibrahim Khān Gardi in, 269-73; Marathas plundered and captured in, 265-69
Pāṇini, relation between Rkprātiśākhya and, 665ff.
Paricchedi, family name, 99
Parvez, 674ff., 700ff.
Pa-s-su-wei, priestly order of Indonesia, 146
Pātāla, division and description of, 122-23
Patañjali, 667f.; Upavaṛṣa posterior to, 434-35
Pedù = elephant, notes on, 563-65
Periplus of Erythræan Sea, 512
Persian architecture, 359f.
Persian letters for historical information, 453, 455; two classes of, 455-56
Peukolaos, coins of, 511 fn.
Philip Aridæus, coins of, 71
Piśāca, Gītā commentator, 355
Piṣṭapura, capital of Kalinga, 158; royal families of, 783f.
Porus, Alexander's victory over, 515
Prabhākaravardhana, 614
Prabhañjanavarman, Chicacole grant of, 782
Prabhāsa, situation of, 544
Prajñāpanāsūtra, agriculturists designated as Āryas in, 799
Pramāṇas, Upavaṛṣa's definition of, 438-39
Pramāṇa-vārttika, 215, 233
Pramāṇa-vārttika-alamkāra, work of Prajñākaragupta, 225
Prašnavyākaraṇa, terms of agriculture mentioned in, 798
Prasannamātr, king, 101
Pratāpa, Rohtasgaḍh Rock-inscription of, 327
Pratāpadhavala, ruler of Jāpila, 327, 327fn.
Pratihāra, meaning of, 341
Pratihāra dynasty; origin of, 337-43, 582-84, 762; three branches of, 342f.
Pratihāras, 613
Pratyekabuddhas, 214, 223, 231, 232, 245
Pravarasena, emperor, 155
Prayogapārijāta, work of Nṛsimha, 807f.
Prayogaratnamālā, work of Caṇḍapa, 806f.
Premāmṛta-rasāyana śloka, text of, 317ff.
Pulakeśi Janāśraya, Nausari grant of, 337f.
Pulakeśin II, 614
Punabbasu, Buddhist monk, 62f.
Puragupta I, brother of Skandagupta, 156
Purāṇic Traditions (about earlier Homes and Migrations of Indian Āryas), 121-24
Purāsā, queen, 619
Puruṣārthaprabodha, work of Brahmānanda Sarasvatī, 804
Puri, Caitanya's arrival at, 304
Puruṣottam Dev, Zamindar of Orissa, 682
Pūrva-Khāṭikā, place-name, 324f.
Pūrva Mīmāṃsā Sūtras, Old Vṛttikāras on, 431-52
Puṣyagupta, 'Sudarśana' built by, 299
Qandahar, fort of, 674
Rāghava-Caitanya, poet, 480-81
Raghunath Rao, British correspondence with, 632
Rāhula, brāhmaṇa, events of time of, 558-59
Rāhulabhadra, Nālandā Vihāra enlarged by, 557


- Raivataka Yātrā, 545
 Raja Bhim, Rajput general, 687f., 691, 695, 697, 699, 709; death of, 711
 Raja Bir Singh Deo Bundela, 710
 Rājagaha, capital city, 63
 Raja Gaj Singh, chief of Jodhpur, 705, 710
 Rājamalla, Gaṅga king, 93
 Raja Satrajit, chief of Bhushnah, 717
 Rājatarāṅgiṇī, 617; poets of Avantivarman's reign mentioned in, 353
 Rajjā, queen of Guhila, 618
 Rajor inscr., 337 f.
 Rājukas, meaning of, 291
 Rāma dramas, utilised in Mahānāṭaka, 493ff.
 Rāmajitpaṇḍita, author of Nibandhanavanita, 479f.
 Rāmakaṅṭha, commentator, 353f., 354fn.
 Rāmānuja, Bodhāyana presupposed by, 433f.
 Raṇabhañjadeva, Baudh Plates of (year 58), 473-77
 Raṇipadra, (now called Rānoda or Nāroda), 166
 Rasikajivana, some verses from, 483-85
 Rāṣṭrakūṭas, 341, 343, 583f.; Vijayāditya's victory over, 92ff.
 Rāṣṭrakūṭa Karka, Baroda plate of, 339
 Raṭṭavā, queen, 619
 Ravi Gupta, Nirvāṇa according to, 225fn.
 Reviews:
 Abhinaya-darpaṇa of Nandikeśvara, 377-8; Beginnings of Vijayanagara History, 176-7; Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit manuscripts in the collection of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, 835; Early history of Kāmarūpa, 593-602; Explorations in Sind, 827-9; History of North-Eastern India, 381-2; History of the Paramāra dynasty, 833-4; Indo-Aryan Literature and Culture (Origins), 179-80; Indo-Tibetica, 382-91; Jivani-koṣa, vol. I, 374-5; Kāvya prakāśa, (Ullāsas I—III) 376-7; Meghasandēśa of Kālidāsa, 379; Mughal Kingship and Nobility, 602-3; Nayakumāracarīu of Puṣpadanta, 603-4; Ranjit Singh, 829-30; Sri Haṃsadūta of Rūpa Gosvāmin, 380-81; Śrīmad-Bhagavad-Gītā, 375-6; Studia Indo-Iranica, 184-92; Age of the Imperial Guptas, 192-6; Dynastic History of Northern India, 173-5; Headquarters of Reality, 177-9; Maukharis, 830-32; Spotasiddhi of Acārya Maṇḍanamīśra, 175-6; Use of the Cases in Vedic Prose, 167-73; Vedic Studies, vol. I, 181-4. Ṛg-veda, 'kakūḍ and kakūbh,' 'kaśyapa, kaśśapa and kacchapa,' and 'pedū' in, 560-65
 Rhotas, fort of, 696
 Riaz-us Salatin, information about Lakṣmaṇa Sena in, 734
 Rin-chen-sgron-me (=Ratnapradīpa), Commentary of Jam-yan-shad-pa, 212; structure of, 221 ff.; problem of Nirvāṇa discussed in, 223 ff.
 Riyaz-ul-Wadad, importance of, 463
 Ṛkprātisākhya, Pāṇini and, 665-70
 Roy Sing, Sikh chief, 637 ff.
 Rudra, cult of, 19-20.
 Rudra Datta, Gauḍa Kāyastha, 572
 Rudra Varman, successor of Jaya Varman, 144
 Ruhelas, Ibrahim Khān, 262, 263; Gardi's attack upon, 260-61
 Rumi Khan, commander, 689 fn., 710 f., 714
 Rūpa Gosvāmin, immediate disciple of Caitanya, 307, 308 fn., 309, 311 f.
 Ruqqi'at-i-Abul Fazal, importance of, 461
 Ruqqi'at Hakim Abul Fateh Gilani, importance of, 461
 Ruqqi'at-i-Alamgiri, importance of, 458-9
 Ruqqi'at-i-Baidil, historical information in, 462
 Ruqqi'at-Hassam, historical information in, 465-C
 Ruqqi'at-i-Khwaja Hasan, importance of, 464


- Ruqqi'at-i-Nawazish Khan**, historical information in, 463
- Ruqqi'at-Shah Abbas II**, importance of, 462
- Ruqqat-i-Inayat Khan Rasikh**, importance of, 460
- Ruquaim-i-Karaim**, importance of, 458
- Sabarasvāmin**, Upavarṣa's views referred to by, 431ff.
- Sadāśiva**, successor of Acyutaśiva, 166
- Sadāsib Rao Bhāu**, 259, 264ff; Abdali Wazir attacked by, 261-2; death of, 272-3
- Sadat Ali**, 638
- Sadukti-Karṇāmṛta**, work of Śrīdhara Dāsa, 730-31
- Sāhasa Malla**, king, 364f.
- Sāhasānka** (or Vikramāditya), Candragupta II known as, 48f.; Govinda IV known as, 51-53
- Sāhityadarpaṇa**, Mahānāṭaka referred to in, 493, 496
- Sahu**, Aurangzeb's scheme objected by, 457
- Saiva Siddhānta**, 147
- Saivism**, 143
- Sākalya**, author, 666ff.
- Sākta system**, 487ff.
- Śakti**, Goddess, 487
- Saktipur Plate**, 729, 733
- Saktivarman**, ruler of Piṣṭapura, 158, 783
- Sālānkāyanas**, 780ff.; note on, 159-60; origin of, 160
- Salātana Gosvāmin**, disciple of Caitaya, 308, 308 fn., 309
- Sāmantasena**, 338f.
- Sambandha Tattvārṇava**, Vijaya Sena's date mentioned in, 728
- Samkaragaṇa**, son of Kṛṣṇarāja, 616, 620
- Samkaravarman**, king of Kashmir, 617
- Samkarṣaṇa**, 288
- Sāṃkhya**, Buddhism, compared with, 748ff.
- Sāṃkhya system**, Guṇas of, 749ff.
- Samudragupta**, 158
- Saṅgha**, schism in, 551ff.
- Saṅgīti Suttanta**, Four Ways omitted in, 788
- Sañjan copper-plate**, 115
- Sañjaya**, teacher, 280
- Sañjayin**, bhikṣu, 551
- Saṅkarācārya**, 348f., 805; *Gītā-Bhāṣya* and other commentaries of, 350f., 355ff.; Upavarṣa anterior to, 431
- Saṅkarapati**, brāhmaṇa, 556f.
- Sarabhapura kings**, genealogy of, 101
- Sārādātanaya**, author of *Bhāvaprakāśana*, 493
- Sārīputra**, caitya of, 557
- Sariputta**, disciple of Buddha, 280
- Sārṅadhara**, writer, 507
- Sārṅadharapaddhati**, 506
- Sarvajña**, Nyāyasāra written by, 163; religion followed by, 164-5
- Sarvatobhadra**, older than Abhinavagupta's comm., 353
- Sassudevā**, meaning of, 156-7
- Satapatha Brāhmaṇa**, astronomical references in, 536f.
- Saurāṣṭra**, Yādavas settled in, 544
- Sautrāntikas**, 217f., 224ff.; Āgamas of, 551; Nirvāṇa according to, 217f.
- Sāvaṭa**, Pratihāra king, 619
- Savagiyas** (of Mahāsthān inscr.) identified with Buddhist Chabbaggiyas, 60ff.
- Sāvatti**, 63; Gotama consulted by Brahmans at, 283fn.
- Sāyaṇa**, commentator, 801ff.
- Sayyed Ashraf Khan**, letters compiled by, 458
- Sayyid Mohammad Zayi Chughtai**, Mughal officer, letters compiled by, 464
- Sayyid Mubarak**, commandant, 696
- Sayyid Muhammad**, adventurer, 716
- Sayyid Muzaffar**, commandant, 696, 702
- Sayyid Nurullah**, commander, 688
- Sayyid Sharfuddin**, astrologer, 711
- Solok Kak Thom**, inscription found at, 146
- Selim Shah**, 633
- Sena family**, 339
- Senas**, 325ff.
- Shah Abbas**, Persian king, 674
- Shāh Ahmad Abdāli**, 258ff.
- Shah Alam II**, 625ff., 635f.

- Shah Jahan, career of 678-722; daily routine of 458; letters of, 454, 462, 464; Jahangir's letter to, 465; rebellion of, 671ff.; reverses suffered by, 675-8; revolt of, 674-5. See Bengal.
- Shah Pasand Khan, 259f., 263
- Shahriyar, brother of Shah Jahan, 674f.
- Shah Quli Khan, governor of Bihar and Orissa, 714f., 717, 719, 721
- Shaikh Nur Qutb Alam, saint, Shah Jahan's respect shown to, 691
- Sher Khan, Afghan Chief, 678
- Sher Khwajah, commandant, 710; death of, 711
- Shitab Khan, officer in charge of Gour, 714ff.
- Shivaji, letters of, 463; letters of Mughal authorities to, 467
- Shujaat Khan, commandant, 710
- Shujā-ud-daulah, Nawab of Oudh, 258ff., 625ff.
- Sibai (=sibis), people, 516
- Siddha, meaning of, 146
- Sihabāhu, king, 370, 373
- Sihapura. See Simhapura.
- Sikhs, 638ff.
- Simhala, Chinese rendering of, 140; merchant's son, 140
- Simhaladvīpa, wrongly rendered into Tibetan for Simhapura, 138
- Simhapura, Aryadeva's birth-place, 138ff.; Chinese rendering of, 140; find-spot of Komarti plates, 780 ff.; location of, 139; note on, 368-73; royal families of, 783f.
- Simba-Sudarśana, arhat, 557
- Siri Devī, daughter of Dhatarat̥tha, 13 f.
- Sir John Shore, Allahabad ceded by, 638; Zeman Shah's correspondence with, 639
- Siśnadeva, meaning of, 156
- Siva, prototype of, 18 ff.
- Sivaliṅga, 21 f.
- Sivasimha Deva, date of inscr. of, 731
- Sivaskandavarman, Pallava king, 159 f.
- Siyaka II, feudatory, 154
- Skandagupta, usurpation of throne by, 156
- Sohgaura copperplate, 54-56; text and translation of, 54.
- Spandavivṛti; work of Rāmakaṅṭha, 353 f., 354 fn.
- Sphuṭārthā, commentary of Yaśomitra, 215
- Śrāvakas, 214, 223, 231, 232, 245 ff.
- Śravaṇa Belgola inscr., Gaṅga Satyavākya Koṅgunivarman mentioned in, 340
- Śrī, goddess, 17
- Śrī, Hari Kavi, author of Subhāṣitahārāvalī, 478ff.; poets mentioned by, 479 f.
- Śriharṣa, Vedānta allied to Buddhism according to, 742
- Śrīlābha, Buddhist teacher, 558 f.
- Śrīpur Plate, Damaged, 100-103.
- Śrī Sahara, time of, 559
- Sthānāṅga, types of Kṛṣi mentioned in, 797
- Sthavira, Sautrāntika teacher, 551
- Sthiramati, citta and vijñāna explained by, 9 fn.
- Subhadrā, abduction of, 545
- Subhāṣitahārāvalī, work of Śrī Hari Kavi, 478 ff.
- Subhāṣitavali, work of Vallabhadeva, 312
- Subhasundara, work of, 150-51
- Subjectivism, Tattvaśuddhi and, 577-81
- Sudarśana, tank, 549
- Sūdra, name of Brahmans, 551
- Sūkṣmaśiva, native of Gauḍa, 572
- Sulaiman, account of Jurz given by, 620-21
- Sūlapāṇī, scribe of Bengal, 571, 573
- Sumerians, cultural history of, 16 fn.
- Sundarānanda, 316 fn.
- Sundarban, 732; dated copperplate grant from, 321-31; historic importance of, 321; Buddhist monument in, 321, 325
- Sutta-Nipāta, brāhmaṇadhammika-sutta of, 283 fn.
- Sutta-prabhāsa; Nirvāṇa explained in, 221

- Swat Valley, thunder-cult at, 521-2
 Sydney Cotton, British Officer, 27
 Syed Ahmad Shah, 26ff
 Takka, identical with Thakka, modern Punjab, 617
 Tāmraśāṭīyas, Nirvāṇa according to, 237, 237 fn.
 Tantrasāra, work of Kṛṣṇānanda, 487f.
 Tantra rites, ideals of, 486-92
 Tantras, 486 ff.
 Tantri, version of Pañcatantra, 105
 Tāntric texts, religious practices according to, 487 ff.
 Tapandighi plate, 729, 732
 Tāranātha, account of Gauda-Magadha sculpture given by, 571; Buddhist history of, 551-9; counterpart of Kālidāsa's story told by, 566
 Tarkajvālā, Nirvāṇa explained in, 216-7, 234, 236
 Tathatā, 216; characteristic forms of, 217, 236
 Tattvārthādhigamasūtra-bhāṣya, agriculturists designated as Āryas in, 799
 Tattvārtharājavārttika, commentary of Śrī Akalaṅka, agricultural implements mentioned in, 798 f.
 Tattvaśuddhi and Subjectivism, 577-81
 Taxila, coin-types discovered at, 515, 518 ff.
 Thākura Pethada, Gauda Kāyastha, 572
 Theriomorphism, 22f.
 Thunder-cult, 521-2
 Tibetan tradition, Nirvāṇa according to, 211-57
 Tilokasundari, Queen of Vijayabāhu I, 369
 Timur Shah, 634 ff.
 Trilingual Inscription—Bengali, Maithili, Persian (1734 A. D.), 116-20; importance of, 116-7
 Tri-Piṭaka, brāhmaṇa according to, 279f.
 Tripiṭakas, 554 ff.
 Tokharians, 587 f.
 Tsou-kha-pa; analysis of theories concerning Nirvāṇa in commentary of, 214-21; literature consulted by, 233 f.
 Udayana, later than Vyomaśiva, 165
 Udīcya, country, 617
 Ujjayanta, same as Raivataka, 548
 Umavarman, king, 781; lord of Kalinga, 370 : Bṛhatproṣṭha grant of, 371 f.
 Uṇḍabhaṭa, 618
 Upaniṣads, debt of Buddhism to, 1; Brahmavāda in, 2ff.; systems of thoughts in, 11
 Upāsakadasāo, nivartanas mentioned in, 797
 Upavaṛsa, Vṛttikāra, 431 ff.; date of, 434-36; personality of, 433-4; views of, 437-48
 Uttaratantra, Nirvāṇa according to, 256
 Uttaratantra-vyākhyā, Nirvāṇa according to, 249
 Vācaspati, author of Bhāmatī, 348 f.. 578 fn., 581
 Vaibhaṣikas, 21ff., 24ff. leading works of, 559; Nirvāṇa according to, 16ff.
 Vainyagupta Dvādaśāditya, 154-6
 Vaiṣṇavas, Pañcatattvas of, 488
 Vajrapāṇi, figure of, 521-2
 Vākāṭakas, 158
 Vallāla-carita, work of Ananda Bhaṭṭa, 729f.
 Vallāla Sena, 729ff; date of Naihati plate of, 729 732; death of, 732
 Vāmana, author of Kāvyaḷaṅkāra-sūtras 761
 Vansittart, 628
 Varaguṇa Mārañjadaiyan (Pāṇḍya), king of Madura, 92
 Vararuci, traditional account of, 566ff.
 Varmans, early history of, 784
 Vāsanā-avidyā, 4
 Vāsavi Ṭikā, work of Vasugupta, 354f.
 Vāsini, goddess, 17
 Vasubhāga, Pañcatantra of, 104-111
 Vāsudeva, Caitanya's first meeting with 302fn.
 Vasugupta, commentator, 354
 Vasumitra, Buddhist teacher, 552, 554

- Vatsarāja, king of Malwa, 339f., 615f, 762
Veda, Phallus worship in, 156-7
Vedānta, Buddhism compared with, 1ff.
Vedāntadeśika, Gītā commentators mentioned by, 355
Vedica, 560-65
Veṅgi, 159
Vernal equinox, position of, 537ff.; Weber and Prey's interpretation of, 538f.
Viduh, Brāhmaṇa, 554
Vidyāmādhava, son of Nārāyaṇapūjyapāda, 806
Vidyānagarī, city, 809
Vidyāpati Ṭhakkura, Vaiṣṇava poet, 494-6
Vidyāranya, Mādhavācārya's identity with, 801ff.
Vidyāranyakālajñāna, work of Bhārati-krṣṇa, 804
Vidyātīrtha, guru of Mādhava, 803f., 809f.
Vijayadevavarman, father of Hastivarman, 159; date of, 160
Vijayāditya III, 90ff.; four inscriptions of, 90; military campaigns of, 91ff.
Vijayāditya IV (Kollabhiṅga), 99
Vijayālaya, Coḷa king, 92
Vijayanandivarman, son of Candrarvarman, 158-9, 780
Vijayapāla, king, 337f.
Vijayasena, date of Barrackpore plate of, 728f.; Deopārā inscr. of, 571, 573; grandfather of Lakṣmaṇa Sena, 728
Vijñāna, synonymous with Brahman, 2, distinction between jñāna and, 2fn.; Buddhist explanation of, 4ff.
Vijñānamātratā, Vijñaptimātratā, 6ff.
Vijñānavāda, evolution of, 1-11
Vijñānavādins, 7ff.; Nirvāṇa according to, 229f.
Vijñaptimātratā, theory of, 6ff.
Vikramāditya, king, 494 fn., 568f.
Vikramārjunavijaya, work of Pampā, 619
Vira Bhupati, grandson of Harihara II, 806
Viramitrodaya, work of Mitramiśra, 807
Virasena, king, 552
Virasiṃha, king, 807
Viṣṇuśarman, Pañcatantra of, 107ff.
Viśukalpa, king, 559
Viśvambhara, another name of Caitanya, 302f.
Viśvanātha, author of Sāhityadarpaṇa, 493
Viśvarūpasena, son of Lakṣmaṇasena, 324; date of coronation of, 734-6; date of Sāhitya Pariṣad plate of, 734f.
Vitpāla, Gauḍa-Magadha school of sculpture founded by, 571
Vopadeva Paṇḍita, 480-81
Vṛndāvana-dāsa, Caitanya's proficiency in Grammar mentioned by, 301fn., 303, 311
Vyomavatī commentary, on Prasastapada-bhāṣya, 165, 576
Vyomaśiva, author of Vyomavatī, 165-6, 576
Warren Hastings, 526, 526fn.
'Water', Dravidic bases for, 39-40; words conveying various senses of, 40ff.
Wazir Ali, 633
Wazir Khan, commandant, 689, 695, 699f., 702, 704f., 714, 716f.
World, relative permanence of, 579
Yādavaprakāśa, teacher of Rāmānuja, 354
Yajjā, queen, 616
Yaśodhara Vaṃśamātā, work of Nilakaṇṭha, 728
Yaśovarman, Candella king, 618
Yogācāras, 22ff.; Nirvāṇa according to, 219-21
Yogin, brāhmaṇa, 559
Yue-chis, people, 588
Zahid Khan Bokhari, governor of Kamrup, 719
Zeman Shah, 636f.
Zervān, Iranian deity, 426ff.





The first issue of the journal appeared in 1925 and for nearly four decades, it served the savants, scholars and students of Indian history becoming an indispensable tool in their research. This mine was unfortunately abandoned without being fully exploited with the publication of two issues in 1963.

The Quarterly dealt mainly with Archaeology, Art and Architecture, Religion and Philosophy Epics and Puranas, Epigraphy and Numismatics, Grammar and Linguistics, History of India and the world, Law, Polity and Administration, Literature, Science, Social and Economic Institutions and so on. In short it is a journal no student of Indology can afford to miss.

Rs. 450 (each volume)