

Barcode - 4990010201289

Title - Indian Historical Quarterly vol. 9

Subject - GENERALITIES

Author - Law, Narendra Nath, ed.

Language - english

Pages - 1122

Publication Year - 1933

Creator - Fast DLI Downloader

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

Barcode EAN.UCC-13



4 990010 201289

143157




OFFICE

THE INDIAN HISTORICAL QUARTERLY

EDITED BY
NARENDRA NATH LAW

Vol. IX



CAXTON PUBLICATIONS

RMIC LIBRARY	
Acc No. 143157	
Class No. C	
Date	29.6.87
St. Card	S.D.
Class	Cb.
Cat.	Cb.
Bk. Card.	S
Checked	Cb.

First Published 1933

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. IX, 1933)

ARTICLES

	PAGE
Akbar as a Sun-Worshipper	137
By Dr. Hirananda Sastri, D.Litt.	
An almost contemporary Account of Mahmud's Invasions of India	934
By Prof. Shri Ram Sharma, M.A.	
Architecture of the Taj and its Architect	872
By S. C. Mukherjee	
Avadhāna and Apadhāna	32
By Dr. Edward J. Thomas, M.A., D.Litt.	
Baud Charter of Kanakabhañja	751
By Charu Chandra Das-Gupta, M.A.	
Bhāskara—a forgotten Commentator on the Gītā	663
By B. N. Krishnamurti Sarma, M.A.	
Bodh-Gayā Image Inscription	417
By Dr. B. M. Barua, M.A., D.Litt.	
Bogle's Embassy to Tibet	420
By D. B. Diskalkar, M.A.	
Buddhist Manuscripts at Gilgit	227, 567
By Dr. Nalinaksha Dutt, Ph.D., D.Litt.	
* Caste and Chronology of the Pāla Kings of Bengal	479
By Jogendra Chandra Ghosh	
Cittaviśuddhiprakaraṇam of Āryadeva	705
By Prabhuhai Patel	
Daspalla Copper-plate Agreement	943
By Paudit Binayak Misra	

	PAGE
Date of Karkācārya	923
By G. B. Makoday	
Did Tailapa II defeat a Cedi King?	132
By Prof. V. V. Mirashi, M.A.	
Doctrine of Trirūpa Hetu	503
By Durgacharan Chatterji, M.A.	
Early History of the Gāhaḍavāla Dynasty	951
By Dr. Dharendra Chandra Ganguly, M.A., Ph.D.	
Eastern Cālukyas	491, 736
By Dr. D. C. Ganguly, M.A., Ph.D.	
Epigraphic Notes	208, 273, 957
By Dines Chandra Sircar, M.A.	
First Aryan Colonization of Ceylon	742
By Dr. Md. Shahidullah, M.A., Litt.D.	
Formal Elements in Indian Inscriptions	215
By Dr. O. Stein, Ph.D.	
God Varuṇa	515
By Prof. Dr. A. Berriedale Keith, M.A., D.C.L.	
Mm. Haraprasad Sastri	307
By Dr. Narendra Nath Law, M.A., Ph.D.	
Hetucakranirṇaya	511
By Durgacharan Chatterji, M.A.	
Identification of some Brāhmaṇical Sculptures	161
By Dr. Dharendra Chandra Ganguli, M.A., Ph.D.	
Indo-European 'Kh' in Sanskrit and Avestan	131
By Dr. Muhammad Shahidullah, M.A., Litt.D.	
Influence of Tantra on the Tattvas of Raghunandana	678
By Rajendra Chandra Hazra, M.A.	
Kālidāsa in China	829
By Prof. Louis Finot	
Kārdamaka Kings	37
By Dr. H. C. Raychaudhuri, M.A., Ph.D.	
Kingdom of Kīra	11
By Dr. R. C. Majumdar, M.A., Ph.D.	
King Narasiṃha of Gauḍa and the Study of Mahābhāṣya in Bengal	948
By Jogendra Chandra Ghosh	

	PAGE
Kṛṣṇa and Jarāsandha	854
By Sadasiva L. Katre, M.A.	
§ Literary Reference to Samudragupta	930
By Dr. R. C. Majumdar, M.A., Ph.D.	
Mādhyamikas and the Tathatā	30
By Prof. Louis de la Vallée Poussin, Ph.D.	
Mahā-Pralaya and Last Judgment	18
By Dr. Ānanda K. Coomaraswamy, D.Sc.	
Maināmati Copper-plate of Raṇavaṅkamalla Harikāladeva (1141 Saka)	282
By Dinesh Chandra Bhattacharya, M.A.	
Malik Ambar: A New Life	629
By Sir Jadunath Sarkar, Kt., C.I.E., M.A.	
Mepputtūr Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭatiri	22
By Prof. K. Rama Pisharoti, M.A.	
Monetary System of the Moghul Times	157
By Rev. G. L. Schanzlin, M.A.	
Mubammad Bakhtyar's Expedition to Tibet	49
By Nalinikanta Bhattasali, M.A.	
Nāgavaṃśīs of Cakrakoṭya	92
By Rai Bahadur Hiralal	
Naṭī of Pāṭaliputra	154
By Prof. A. Banerji-Sastri, M.A., D.Phil.	
New Contributions to the Interpretation of the Mahāvamśa	107
By Prof. Wilh. Geiger, Ph.D.	
Note on a newly discovered Taxila Inscription	111
By Harit Krishna Deb, M.A.	
Note on Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja's Caitanya-Caritāmṛta	98
By Dr. S. K. De, M.A., D.Litt.	
Note on the Girdharpur Brāhmī Inscription of the Year 28	145
By Prof. Sten Konow, Ph.D.	
Notes on the Gubhasamāja-Tantra and the Age of the Tantras	1
By Prof. M. Winternitz, Ph.D.	
Notion of Time in Hindu Philosophy	149
By Dr. Sukumar Ranjan Das, M.A., Ph.D.	
On some Tibetan names of the Buddha	46
By Prof. Otto Schrader, Ph.D.	
Origin of the Malpaharias of the Rajmahal Hills	886
By Sasanka Sekhar Sarkar, M.Sc.	
Pāñcarātra and the Upaniṣads	645
By Dr. D. L. De, M.A., Ph.D.	

	PAGE
Phallus Worship in the Veda	103
By Prof. Vidhushekhara Bhattacharya	
Political Significance of the Madhyama and the Udāsīna ...	770
By Dr. Narendra Nath Law, M.A., Ph.D.	
Prachhāra Administration	121
By Dr. Rama Shankar Tripathī, M.A., Ph.D.	
Puṇḍravardhana—its Site	722
By Prokhash Chandra Sen	
Purāṇic Traditions (about earlier homes and migrations of the Indian Āryas)	461, 880
By Narayan Tripathī	
Puṣṭi-mārga of Vallabhācārya	300
By G. H. Bhatt, M.A.	
Remarks on the Fourth Rock Edict of Aśoka	76
By Prof. Jarl Charpentier, Ph.D.	
Rise of Najib-ud-daula	866
By Sir Jadunath Sarkar, M.A., C.I.E.	
Rise of Vijayanagara	521
By Dr. B. A. Saletore, M.A., Ph.D.	
Saivaite Deity Kṣetrapāla	237
By Chintabaran Chakravartī, M.A.	
Samkarṣa-Kāṇḍa --A genuine supplement to the Purvamīmāṃsā Śāstra	290
By V. A. Ramasvami Sastri, M.A.	
Satvant, Sātavata and Nāsalya	88
By Prof. J. Przyluski, Ph.D.	
Some Linguistic Notes	253
By Dr. P. C. Bagchī, M.A., Litt.D.	
Some points Regarding the Origin of the Licchavis of Vaiśālī	439
By Syamacharan Chakravarty, M.A.	
Some Poetical Ideas in the Tamil Work (Kural)	211
By Prof. C.S. Srinivasachari, M.A.	
Some Sanskrit Texts on Painting	898
By V. Raghavan	
Some Technical Terms of Sanskrit Grammar	279
By Kshitish Chandra Chatterjee, M.A.	
Sources of Buddhist Logic	499
By Durgacharan Chatterji, M.A.	
Srīkrṣṇa and the Source of the Bhāgavadgītā	188
By Rai Bahadur Amarnath Ray	

	PAGE
• Study of Ancient Geography	470
By Harihar V. Trivedi, M.A.	
Study of the Twenty Aspects of Śūnyatā	170
By Dr. E. Obermiller, Ph.D.	
Tamil Sangam in a Pāṇḍyan Charter of the early Tenth Century A.D.	63
By Prof. S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar, M.A., Ph.D.	
Tapas	104
By Prof. Vidhushekhara Bhattacharya	
• Theory of Rīti and Guṇa in the Agnipurāṇa	118
By Prakash Chandra Lahiri, M.A.	
• Two Saura Images from the District of 21-Parganas	202
By Kalidas Datta	
• Two types of Subjectivism in Monistic Vedānta	912
By Makhanlal Mukherjee, M.A.	
Vāmana's Theory of Rīti and Guṇa	835
By Prakash Chandra Lahiri, M.A.	
What a Deity Represents?	40
By Dr. B. Bhattacharyya, M.A., Ph.D.	
Who was the Gupta contemporary of the Kadamba king Kākusthavarman?	197
By N. Lakshminarayan Rao	
Yerragudi Copy of Aśoka's Minor Rock Edict	113
By Prof. B. M. Barua, M.A., D.Litt.	

MISCELLANY

Art of Pantomime in Kerala	967
By Prof. C. S. Srinivasachari, M.A.	
Aryadeva	978
By Pandit Vidhushekhara Bhattacharya	
A so-called Convention of the Hindu Drama	981
By Manomohan Ghosh, M.A.	
Commentaries on the Uttararāmacarita	577
By Kshitish Chandra Chatterji, M.A.	
Dāsas of the Karnāṭaka Country	969
By Prof. S. Hanumantha Rao, M.A.	

	PAGE
Dinajpur Pillar Inscription of the Kambojanvaya Gaudipati ... By Jogendra Chandra Ghosh	789
Hindu Theatre By Manomohan Ghosh, M.A.	591
Hindu Theatre By Dr. Ananda K. Coomaraswamy, D.Sc.	594
Hindu Theatre By D. R. Mankad, M.A.	973
Hindu Theatre By V. Raghavan	991
Janamejaya Parīkṣits By Nityadhan Bhattacharya, M.A.	804
Metaphysical Significance of Dharma and Adharma in Jaina Metaphysics By Jagdish Chandra Jain M.A.	793
New Gupta Sculpture By Dr. Dharendra Chandra Ganguly, M.A., Ph.D.	588
Notes on the Ghosūṇḍī Stone Inscription By Jogendra Chandra Ghosh	795
Ohind (Uṇḍ) Inscription By Harit Krishna Deb, M.A.	803
On the Term 'Anusamyāna' By Ananta Kumar Bose, M.A.	810
Origin of Indus Valley Script By Atul K. Sur, M.A.	582
Quotations from the Kāmasūtra By Dr. A. Venkatasubbiah, M.A., Ph.D.	597
Sāukhya and Original Buddhism By Mrs. C. A. F. Rhys Davids, M.A., D.Litt.	585
Scythian Tribal Names in a Machura Epigraph By Harit Krishna Deb, M.A.	800
Seventh All-India Oriental Conference By P. C. Bagchi, M.A., Litt.D.	995
Silver Coin of king Prasannamātra, the grandfather of king Mahā Sudevarāja of Sarabhapur By L. P. Pandeya Sarma	595
Sloka of Bhāsa By Mrs. Malati Sen, M.A.	580
Syntactic Position of a Preposition in Ardhamāgadhi By A. N. Upadhye, M.A.	987

	PAGE
Udayapura-nagara	584
By Dines Chandra Sircar, M.A.	
Vainyagupta Dvādaśāditya	784
By Dr. D. C. Ganguly, M.A., Ph.D.	
Vainyagupta Dvādaśāditya	989
By Dr. R. C. Majumdar, M.A., Ph.D.	
Varāhamihira and Buzūrmehr	984
By A. N. Upadhye, M.A.	
Yerragudi Minor Rock Proclamation	583
By K. P. Jayaswal, M.A.	
 REVIEWS	 598, 814, 1004
 SELECT CONTENTS OF ORIENTAL	
JOURNALS	616, 822, 1031
 BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES	 625

MAP

	FACING PAGE
Line of Muhammad Bakhtyar's March	51

PLATES

	FACING PAGE
Akbar as a Sun-Worshipper	137
An Image from Bodh-Gayā	417
A Silver Coin of the reign of King Prasannamātra	695
Coins of Vainyagupta	788
Daspalla Copper-plate Agreement	943
Kānāibādśī Inscription	49
Mm. Haraprasad Śāstrī	1

	PAGE
Phanendrī Mahāmāyā and Thakinī Vikatā	169
Vaiṣṇavī, Vāsudeva and Kumārī	165
Vīrendrī Ugra Tārā and Sarasvatī	167
The Naṭī of Pāṭaliputra, 300 B.C.	154
The Silhako or Stone Bridge Zillah Kamrup	58
Two Saura Images from the District of 24-Parganas	204
Umā-Maheśvara	588
Yerraguḍi copy of Aśoka's M.R.E. 1.	116

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

(Vol. IX, 1933)

	PAGE
Aiyangar, Prof. Dr. S. Krishnaswami, M.A., Ph.D.	
The Tamil Sangam in a Pāndyan Charter of the early Tenth Century A.D.	63
Bagchi, Dr. P. C., M.A., Lit.D.	
Some Linguistic Notes	253
The Seventh All-India Oriental Conference	995
Banerji-Sastri, Prof. A., M.A., D.Phil.	
The Naṭī of Pāṭaliputra	154
Barua, Dr. B. M., M.A., D.Litt.	
A Bodhi-Gayā Image Inscription	417
The Yerragudi Copy of Aśoka's Minor Rock Edict	113
Bhatt, G. H., M.A.	
The Puṣṭi-mārga of Vallabhaçārya	300
Bhattacharyya, Dr. B., M.A., Ph.D.	
What a Deity Represents?	40
Bhattacharya, Prof. Dinesh Chandra, M.A.	
The Maināmati Copper-plate of Ranavaṅkamalla Harikāladeva (1141 Śaka)	282
Bhattacharya, Nityadhan, M.A.	
Janamejaya Parikṣits	804
Bhattacharya, Vidhushekhara	
The Phallus Worship in the Veda	103
Tapas	104
Āryadeva	978
Śaṅkarāçārya and Dharmakīrti	979
Śaṅkara's Reference to a Buddhist Passage	981
Bhattacharya, Nalinikanta, M.A.	
Muhammad Bakhtyar's Expedition to Tibet	49
Bose, Ananta Kumar, M.A.	
On the Term 'Anusamyāna'	810
Chakravarti, Prof. Chintaharan, M.A.	
The Śaivaite Deity Kṣetrapāla	237
Chakravarty, Syamacharan, M.A.	
Some points Regarding the Origin of the Licchavis of	

	PAGE
Vaiśālī	439
Charpentier, Prof. Dr. Jarl, Ph.D.	
Remarks on the Fourth Rock Edict of Aśoka	76
Chatterjee, Durga Charan, M.A.	
Doctrine of Trirūpa Hetu	503
Hetucakranirṇaya	266, 511
Sources of Buddhist Logic	499
Chatterjee, Kshitish Chandra, M.A.	
Commentaries on the Uttararāmacarita	577
Some Technical Terms of Sanskrit Grammar	279
Coomaraswamy, Dr. Ananda K., D.Sc.	
Hindu Theatre	594
Malāpralaya and Last Judgment	18
Das, Dr. Sukumar Ranjan, M.A., Ph.D.	
Notion of Time in Hindu Philosophy	149
Das Gupta, Chatur Chandra, M.A.	
The Buddhist Charter of Kaṇakabhañja	751
Datta, Kailas,	
Two Saura Images from the District of 24-Parganas	202
De, Dr. D. L., M.A., Ph.D.	
Pāñcarātra and the Upaniṣads	645
De, Dr. S. K., M.A., D.Litt.	
A Note on Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja's Caitanya-Caritāṃpti	98
Deb, Harit Krishna, M.A.	
A Note on a Newly-discovered Taxila Inscription	141
Scythian Tribal Names in a Mathura Epigraph	800
The Ohind (Uṇḍ) Inscription	803
Diskalkar, D. B., M.A.	
Bogle's Embassy to Tibet	420
Dutt, Dr. Nalinaksha, Ph.D., D.Litt.	
The Buddhist Manuscripts at Gilgit	227, 567
Finot, Prof. Louis, Ph.D.	
Kālidasa in China	829
Ganguly, Dr. Dharendra Chandra, M.A., Ph.D.	
Identification of Some Brāhmaṇical Sculptures	161
The Eastern Cālukyas	491, 736
Early History of the Gāhaḍavāla Dynasty	951
A New Gupta Sculpture	588
Vainyagupta Dvādaśāditya	784

	PAGE
Geiger, Dr. Prof. Wilh., Ph.D.	
New Contributions to the Interpretation of the Mahāvamsa ...	107
Ghosh, Jogendra Chandra.	
Caste and Chronology of the Pāla kings of Bengal ...	479
The Dinajpur Pillar Inscription of the Kambojanvaya Gaudipati	789
Notes to the Ghosūṇḍi Stone Inscription	795
King Narasiṃha of Gauda and the Study of Mahābhāṣya in Bengal	948
Ghosh, Manomohan, M.A.	
The Hindu Theatre	551
A so-called Convention of the Hindu Drama	981
Hazra, Rajendra Chandra, M.A.	
Influence of Tantra on the Tattvas of Raghunandana ..	678
Hiralal, Rai Bahadur,	
The Nāgavaṃśīs of Cakrakoṭya	92
Jain, Jagdish Chandra, M.A.	
The Metaphysical Significance of Dharma and Adharma in Jaina Metaphysics	793
Jayaswal, K. P., M.A.	
Yerragudi Minor Rock Proclamation	582
Keith, Prof. Dr. A. Berniedale, M.A., D.C.L.	
The God Varuṇa	515
Katre, Sadasiva L., M.A.	
Kṛṣṇa and Jarāsandha	854
Konow, Prof. Sten, Ph.D.	
A Note on the Girdharpur Brāhmī Inscription of the year 28	145
Lahiri, Prakash Chandra, M.A.	
The Theory of Rīti and Guṇa in the Agnipurāṇa ..	448
Vāmana's Theory of Rīti and Guṇa	835
Law, Dr. Narendra Nath, M.A., Ph.D.	
Am. Dr. Haraprasad Sastri	307
The Political Significance of the Madhyama and the Udāsīna	770
Majumdar, Dr. R. C., M.A., Ph.D.	
The Kingdom of Kīra	11
Literary Reference to Samudragupta	920
Vainyagupta Dvādaśāditya	929
Makodan, G. B.	
The Date of Karkācārya	923

	PAGE
Mankad, D. R., M.A.	
Hindu Theatre	973
Mirashi, Prof. V. V., M.A.	
Did Tailapa II defeat a Cedi King?	132
Misra, Pandit Vinayak	
Dasalla Copper-plate Agreement	943
Mukherjee, Makhanlal, M.A.	
Two Types of Subjectivism in Monistic Vedānta	912
Mukherjee, S. C.	
The Architecture of the Taj and its Architect	872
~ Obermüller, Dr. E., Ph.D.	
A Study of the Twenty Aspects of Sūnyatā	170
Patei, Prahubhai	
Cittaviśuddhiprakāṣaṇam of Āryadeva	705
Pisharoti, Prof. K. Rama, M.A.	
Menuttar Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭatīri	22
√ Poussin, Prof. Louis de la Vallée, Ph.D.	
The Mādhyamikas and the Tathatā	30
Przyluski, Prof. J., Ph.D.	
Satvant, Sātvata and Nāsatya	88
Raghavan, V.	
Hindu Theatre	991
Some Sanskrit Texts on Painting	895
Ray, Amarnath, Rai Bahadur	
Śrīkṛṣṇa and the Source of the Bhagavadgītā	188
Raychaudhuri, Dr. H. C., M.A., Ph.D.	
The Karddamaka Kings	37
Rao, Prof. S. Hanumantha, M.A.	
The Dāsas of the Karnāṭaka Country	969
Rao, N. Lakshminarayan	
Who was the Gupta contemporary of the Kadamba King Kākusthavarman?	197
√ Rhys Davids, Mrs. C.A.F., M.A., D.Litt.	
Sāṅkhya and Original Buddhism	585
Saletore, Dr. B. A., M.A., Ph.D.	
The Rise of Vijayanagara	521
Sarkar, Sir Jadunath, Kt., M.A., C.I.E.	
Malik Ambar: A New Life	629
The Rise of Najib-ud-daula	866
Sarkar, Sasanka Sekhar, M.Sc.	
The Origin of the Malapaharias of the Rajmahal Hills	886

	PAGE
Sarma, B. N. Krishnamurti, M.A. Bhāskara—a forgotten Commentator on the <i>Gītā</i>	663
Sarma, Pandit L. P. Pandeya A Silver coin of King Prasannamātra, the grandfather of king Mahāsudevarāja of Sarabhapur	595
Sastri, Dr. Hirananda, M.A., D.Litt. Akbar as a Sun-worshipper	137
Sastri, V. A. Ramaswami, M.A. The Saṅkarsa-kāṇḍa—A genuine supplement to the Pūrvamīmāṃsā Śāstra	290
Schanzlin, Rev. G. L., M.A. The Monetary System of the Mughal Times	157
Schrader, Prof. Dr. F. Otto, Ph.D. On Some Tibetan Names of the Buddha	46
Sen, Prohash Chandra Puṇḍravardhana—its Site	722
Sen, Mrs. Malati, M.A. A Śloka of Bhāsa	580
Shahidullah, Dr. Muhammad, M.A., Litt.D. Indo-European 'Kh' in Sankrit and Avestan	131
The First Aryan Colonization of Ceylon	742
Sharma, Prof. Shri Ravi, M.A. An almost contemporary Account of Mahmud's Invasions of India	934
Sircar, Dinesh Chandra, M.A. Epigraphic Notes	208, 273, 957
Udayapura-nagara	584
Srinivasachari, Prof. C. S., M.A. Some Political Ideas in the Tamil work (Kuraḷ)	244
The Art of Pantomime in Keraḷa	967
Sur, Atul K., M.A. Origin of Indus Valley Script	582
Thomas, Dr. Edward J., M.A., D.Litt. Avadāna and Apadāna	32
Tripathi, Narayana The Purānic Traditions (about earlier homes and migrations of the Indian Aryas)	461, 880
Tripathi, Dr. Rama Shankar, M.A., Ph.D. The Pratihāra Administration	121
Trivedi, Harihar V., M.A. The Study of Ancient Geography	470

	PAGE
Upadhye, A. N., M.A.	
Varāhamihira and Buzurjmehr	984
Syntactic Position of a Preposition in Ardhamāgadhī ...	987
Venkatasubrah, Dr. A., M.A., Ph.D.	
Quotations from the Kāmasūtra	597
Winternitz, Prof. Dr. M., Ph.D.	
Notes on the Guhyasamāja Tantra and the Age of the Tantras	1

ERRATA

Additional Correction to the Pkt. Verses of the NS. published
in *HIQ.*, vol. VIII, no. 4

(Roman numerals refer to serial nos. of the Pkt. Verses)

- III. Read असूगदो.
XXXIII. „ कमलवणामुअन्धी.
XLI. Insert णहे after चन्दं.
XLVIII. Read अधिकववु.
XLIX. „ वरतणु ते हियअनन्दो.
L. „ उद्धयमाणो.
LXI. Omit हि before विभादि.
LXV. „ -किदावतंसा,
LXIX. „ -समुदिदो, -सुरभिदो and एम सहि मरसो
LXXIV. „ परिशुणमाणो
XCVI. „ कुमुदिजण.
CIII. „ -कुरं वोवेइ

In the Select Glossary read अहमुख=अहोमुख.

Indian Historical Quarterly Vol. IX, No. 1

Page 203 para 5, l. 7 insert *skirt* after the word *short*
„ 204 „ 6, l. 9 „ *of* „ „ „ *that*
„ 274

for


- “1. Mahārāja Mādhavavarman I; his son
2. Madhavavarman II (17th ? year)” in ll. 26-27

Read

- “1. Mahārāja Mādhavavarman I; his son
2. Devavarman; his son
3. Mādhavavarman II (17th ? year)”

**HARAPRASAD
MEMORIAL NUMBER**

DEDICATED
TO THE REVERED MEMORY
OF
MM. DR. HARAPRASAD SASTRI, D. LITT., C.I.E.





**Mahamahopādhyāya Haraprasad Śāstri, M.A., C.I.E., D.LITT.
(1853-1931)**

THE Indian Historical Quarterly

Vol. IX

MARCH, 1933

No 1

Notes on the Gubhasamāja-Tantra and the Age of the Tantras

Among the numerous essays and original works in the field of Sanskrit Literature, for which the name of the late Mahāmahopādhyāya Haraprasāda Śāstrī will always be remembered, his valuable contributions to our knowledge of Buddhist literature in Nepal and Tibet are perhaps the most important. We owe to him some of the most precious discoveries of new texts in recent times. His "Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Government Collection under the care of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol.1, Buddhist Manuscripts" (Calcutta, 1917), is a mine of information on the Buddhist literature of Nepal. In No.18 of this Catalogue (pp.17 ff.) he describes the *Gubhasamāja* which is also called *Tathāgataguhya*. This is a Vaipulya Mahāyāna Sūtra, and the Mahāmahopādhyāya conjectures "that this Vaipulya work is the original *Tathāgata Guhyaka* and that the first book of *Guhya Samāja* and sometimes the second also are called *Tathāgata Guhyaka* only by an analogy". Unfortunately this work has never been published, though there seems to be a MS. of it also in Cambridge.¹ It seems, however, to be identical with the work quoted as *Tathāgataguhya-sūtra* in Śāntideva's *Śikṣāsamuccaya* (ed. Bendall, pp. 7, 126, 158, 242, 274, 316 and 357). This is an entirely different work from the

¹ Haraprasāda Śāstrī refers to Bendall's *Cambridge Catalogue*, which is not accessible to me.

'*Guhyasamāja Tantra* or *Tathāgataguhyaka* which has been edited by Dr. Benoytosh Bhattacharyya as No. LIII of the Gaekwad's Oriental Series (1931).² The passages quoted by Śāntideva are all in prose. They all refer to Mahāyāna ethics. We find here such beautiful passages as the following (p.7):

'In whom does the Will to Enlightenment (*Bodhicitta*) arise, O Lord?' He said: 'In that one, O great King, who has formed the unshaken resolve to obtain it.' He said: 'O Lord, and who has this unshaken resolve?' He said: 'He, O great King, in whom the Great Pity has arisen.' He said: 'In whom, O Lord, has the Great Pity arisen?' He said: 'In him, O great King, who does not desert any living being.' He said: 'In what way, Lord, is no living being deserted?' He said: 'O great King, it is by renouncing one's own welfare.'

In another quotation (p.274) ten things are enumerated, by means of which a Bodhisattva acquires power: "Here, O great King, a Bodhisattva gives up his body and his life, but he does not give up the Good Religion. He bows before all beings, and does not allow his pride to rise. He has patience with the feeble beings and does not put any difficulties in their way. He gives the best, excellent food to the beings who are suffering from hunger. He gives security to those beings who fear. He is full of zeal for the complete healing of the sick. He satisfies the poor with riches. He repairs the shrines of the Tathāgata by lumps of plaster. He brings glad tidings to the beings. He shares his possessions with the poor and the unfortunate. He bears the burden of those who are weary and exhausted."

We shall look in vain for such passages in the *Guhyasamāja Tantra*, now published. Here, too, a chapter (2nd paṭala) is devoted to the question of *Bodhicitta*. It is answered here by abstruse speculations,

2 A MS. of this Tantra text is No. 64 in H. Sāstrī's *Catalogue*, p. 64, described by him as 'the first of the three parts of *Guhyasamāja Tantra*.' A more detailed description has been given by Rajendralala Mitra, *The Sanskrit Buddhist Literature of Nepal*, Calcutta 1882, p. 261 ff. A MS. of the Aparārdha of the *Guhyasamāja* in 15 Paṭalas is mentioned in the *Catalogue of Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Royal Asiatic Society* by E. B. Cowell and J. Eggeling in *JRAS.*, 1876, No. 44.

most mysteriously worded, on the transformation of *Kāya*, *Vāk* and *Citta*, which are neither existent nor non-existent.³ While worship at sanctuaries and reading of sacred books are rejected (p. 142: *caityakarma na kurvīta na ca pustakarūcanam*), the eating of the flesh of elephants, horses, dogs, cows, and even human flesh (*mahāmāṃsa*) is freely recommended (see pp. 26, 117 etc.) and *viñmūtra* is to be used not only for *homa* but also for food (pp. 19, 26, 55, 117, 128 etc.) Sexual intercourse with young Caṇḍāla girls and beautiful women is to be indulged in for the sake of Buddha worship (*Jinapūjāhetoh*) especially in chapters 7 and 8 (but see also pp.19, 31, 32, 94 etc.). In the fifth chapter a Buddha declares that even the most wicked men, murderers, thieves, libertines, and even those who have incestuous intercourse with mothers, sisters, and daughters, may reach perfection in the highest Mahāyāna. And it is said to be 'the teaching of all Buddhas' that the Yogin may kill living beings, tell lies, steal and go to women (chap.16, p.120).

In one passage (chap.5) the Bodhisattvas, when they heard such teaching, became indeed frightened, they trembled and fell down in a swoon. But Lord Sarvatathāgatakāyavāk touched them with the rays issuing from his body after a certain meditation, and they were soon revived, and praised the Lord who had given them a miracle instead of an explanation. In a second passage (chap.9) the scruples of the Bodhisattvas are not removed by a miracle, but by the simile of Space. As in Space (*ākāśa*) all worldly phenomena are equally to be found, thus a life in lust (*rāgacaryā*) is the same as a Bodhisattva life (*bodhisattvacaryā*) and the same as the best life (*agracaryā*).⁴ Magic rites are taught in this Tantra not only for the purpose of becoming a Buddha and for attaining supernatural powers, but also for the sake of killing, destroying, subjugating etc., e.g. in chapters 13, 14 and 15.

Of course, there are also many quite unobjectionable samādhis and mantras taught in our text, but on the whole we find in it the same unsavoury mixture of mysticism, occult pseudo-science, magic, and erotics, as in most of the other Buddhist Tantras. All this is far, far

3 Cf. B. Bhattacharyya, Introduction, p. xix ff.

4 See p. 37, and Bhattacharyya's Introduction, p. xxiv f.

removed from the ethics of Mahāyāna Buddhism, as we find it in the *Tathāgataguhyā-sūtra* quoted by Śāntideva.

Rajendralala Mitra could not find words strong enough in denouncing the immoral character of the *Tathāgata-Guhyaka*. "The great wonder is," he exclaims, "that even a system of religion so pure and so lofty in its aspiration as Buddhism could be made to ally itself with such pestilent dogmas and practices."⁵

Now-a-days we look upon this literature more coolly and are inclined to judge it more mildly. B. Bhattacharyya says that 'the Tantras are not meant for ordinary people', but only for the Yogins 'who have attained some degree of spiritual perfection', and that all the abuses that have been most vehemently poured forth by scholars are due to their not comprehending that the Tantras must not be 'interpreted in the ordinary way without special reference to Yoga and the cultivation of psychological faculties.'⁶

Professor G. Tucci⁷ may be right when he sees in the Tantras "one of the highest expressions of Indian mysticism which may appear to us rather strange in its outward form, chiefly because we do not always understand the symbolical language in which they are written," and it may be my fault, if I cannot find much wisdom in the gibberish of most of the Tantras. Let it be granted that the strange and often filthy language in which the teaching of the Tantras is shrouded, must not be taken literally, but has to be interpreted by the enigmatical *Sandhābhāṣā*⁸ as referring to mysterious 'psychic matters.' But is it not, to say the least, highly dangerous to use such 'mysterious' language?

More important is the question of the date of the *Guhyasamāja Tantra*. Tāranātha⁹ says that Tantrism was handed down by secret

5 *The Sanskrit Buddhist literature of Nepal*, l.c.

6 Introduction, pp. xvii, xxii.

7 *JASB.*, N. S., vol. XXVI, 1930, p. 128.

8 B. Bhattacharyya still speaks of 'Sandhyābhāṣā or the Twilight language,' though Vidhushekhara Bhattacharyya, *IHQ.*, IV, 1928, p. 287ff., has proved that it is Sandhā-bhāṣā, 'intentional speech,' i.e. enigmatical speech in which a secret meaning is intended.

9 *Geschichte des Buddhismus*, p. 201.

means from the time of Asaṅga until that of Dharmakīrti. Tibetan and Chinese traditions relate that the Tantras were brought down by Asaṅga from the Tuṣita-heaven where he learnt the Śāstra from Maitreya. Dr. B. Bhattacharyya¹⁰ tries to prove that Asaṅga is actually connected with the rise of Vajrayāna, and that he may be taken to be the author of the *Guhyasamāja Tantra*.

The only argument, however, which he is able to add to the traditions accepted by him, is that there exists a *Prajñāpāramitā-sādhana* ascribed to Ācārya Asaṅga. But he moves in a circle when he contends that the theory of the five Dhyāni-Buddhas and their Śaktis appears 'for the first time' in the *Guhyasamāja*, and that this Tantra is the earliest, because it introduced this doctrine into Buddhism; that the *Sādhana* of Asaṅga, because it contains the Doctrine of the Dhyāni-Buddhas, must be later than the *Guhyasamāja*; and that the *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa*, which does not mention the Dhyāni-Buddhas in a methodical manner, must be earlier than Asaṅga and the *Guhyasamāja*.¹¹ The *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa* may be an early Mantrayāna work. But there is nothing to prove its existence in the early centuries A.D. The XIVth chapter contains some texts that were translated into Chinese between 702 and 705, but the whole work has been translated into Chinese between 980 and 1000 A.D. Professor J. Przyluski¹² who has made a study of the work thinks that the final redaction, if not the compilation of the work, may have taken place between the 8th and the 10th centuries.

I cannot see that the *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa* which is a ritual work of the Mantrayāna, and describes itself as a *Mahāyāna-Vaipulyasāstra*,

10 *IHQ.*, III, 1927, 736f., *Sādhanamālā*, II, Introd., pp. xxiiiiff., xxviiff. *Guhyasamāja Tantra*, Introd., p. xxxiiff.

11 Dr. Bhattacharyya ascribes Asaṅga to the third century. I think, we must place him, as most scholars are now agreed, in the 4th century. See also the discussions of the Japanese scholars Taiken Kimura, Genmyo Ono, J. Takakusu, and Hakuju Ui in *Indian Studies in Honor of Charles Rockwell Lanman*, 1929, pp. 79ff. According to Professor Ui the dates are: Maitreya-nātha, Asaṅga's teacher, 270-350, Asaṅga, 310-390, Vasubandhu, 320-400. Prof. Takakusu considers these dates too early by 100 years, l.c. p. 102.

12 *BEFEO.*, XXIII, 1923, p. 306.

has much to do with the Vajrayāna work *Guhyasamāja* describing itself as a “Mahāguhya-Tantrarāja.”

It is only on the authority of the late compiler of the *Sādhanamālā* that the *Prajñāpāramitā-Sādhana* is ascribed to Asaṅga. It is not mentioned among the works of Asaṅga elsewhere, and we may at least be allowed to suspect that it was ascribed to the great teacher only in order to enhance its importance.

There is, however, no authority and no tradition at all for ascribing the *Guhyasamāja-Tantra* to Asaṅga. Neither among the works which, in Chinese and Tibetan texts, Asaṅga is said to have received from Maitreya in the Tuṣita-heaven, and which are probably works of a historical teacher Maitreyanātha, nor among the works ascribed to Asaṅga himself, does the name of the *Guhyasamāja* appear.

The language of the *Guhyasamāja*, like that of most Tantras, is much inferior to that of the author of the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra*, whether he be Maitreyanātha or Asaṅga,¹³ who writes very good Sanskrit. Certainly also the teaching of the latter is infinitely superior to that of the *Guhyasamāja-Tantra*. Whoever wrote the verse *Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra*, IX, 16: “As in a broken vessel the reflected image of the moon is not seen, so the image of a Buddha is not seen in wicked beings”, cannot have written the verses quoted above from the *Guhyasamāja*.

There is one passage in the same chapter of the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra* (IX, 46) in which Professor Sylvain Lévi sees an allusion to Tantric ideas.

In the eleven verses (38-48) of the *Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra* the Greatness (*vibhūti*) of the Buddhas is explained, which is immeasurable and unthinkable, and far exceeds that of the Śrāvakas and Pratyekabuddhas. This Greatness can only be obtained by *parāvṛtti*¹⁴ or

13 For the chronology it does not make much difference which of them is the author. The arguments seem to me to be in favour of the authorship of Maitreyanātha, the teacher of Asaṅga.

14 The terms *parāvṛtti* and *āśrayaparāvṛtti* (see also *Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra*, IX, 12-17) occur frequently in the *Laṅkāvatāra*, see, for instance, pp. 43, 62, 81, 98, 108, 232 in the edition of Bunyiu Nanjio, Kyoto 1923. D. T. Suzuki, *Studies in the Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*, London 1930, pp. 98, 100, 108, 152, 179, 184f. generally renders it by ‘revulsion,’ in one place (p. 365), by ‘a sudden awakening

‘turning aside’ of the ordinary ways of thinking about the reality of the world: by *an absolute change of mental habits* as regards the five senses (verse 41), the mind (*manas*, v. 42), the objects of sense and their reception¹⁵ (v. 43), false discrimination (*vikalpa*,¹⁶ v. 44), the basis (*pratiṣṭhā*) of reality (v. 45), sexual union (*maithuna*, v. 46), and the idea of space (*ākāśasaṃjñā*, v. 47).

It is necessary to give the text and translation of verses 45 and 46:

pratiṣṭhāyāḥ parāvṛttau vibhutvaṃ labhyate param/
 apratiṣṭhitanirvāṇam Buddhānām acale pade//
 maithunasya parāvṛttau vibhutvaṃ labhyate param/
 Buddhasaukhyavihāre'tha dārā'saṅkleśadarśane//

“In the turning-aside of the basis of Reality supreme Greatness is obtained, (namely) the ‘Nirvāṇa without basis’¹⁷ in the immovable seat of the Buddhas.

In the turning-aside of sexual union supreme Greatness is obtained, (namely) in the enjoyment (or pleasure-ground) of Buddha-happiness and in looking without impure thoughts at a wife.”

I do not understand how Professor Lévi can see in this last verse an allusion to ‘mystic couples of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas which are of such importance in Tantrism’.¹⁸ It seems to me, we have rather to think of the pleasure enjoyed by a Buddha in Sukhāvātī where women

in the soul.’ In the glossary (p. 418) he explains it by ‘turning-up, turning-over, revulsion,’ S. Lévi translates *parāvṛtti* by ‘Revolution,’ without giving an explanation.

15 On the new word *udgraha*, see S. Lévi in his notes on the verse, (text, p. 41, translation, p. 81).

16 See Suzuki, l.c., p. 438. “In the *Laṅkāvatāra* discrimination stands contrasted to intuitive understanding which goes beyond discrimination (*avikalpa*).”

17 Apratiṣṭhita-Nirvāṇa is the highest kind of Nirvāṇa, which has no ‘basis,’ but abides in the Śūnya. Cf. Lévi, *Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra*, Traduction, p. 21 and note 4 on p. 27; Suzuki, l.c. p. 95; A. B. Keith, *Buddhist Philosophy*, p. 257 f.

18 Keith, l.c. p. 301 follows Lévi, when he says that this “allusion in Asaṅga reveals the existence in Buddhism of Tantric rites, in which the union of the Buddha or Bodhisattva with the personification of wisdom, Prajñāpāramitā, is reproduced on earth as one simple and effective mode of realizing the true identity of the individual with the Buddha.”

and sexual union are unknown.¹⁹ At any rate, the parallelism of the two verses shows that *maithunasya parāvṛttau* can only refer to a discarding of sexual union.

Professor G. Tucci²⁰ also claims a higher age for the Tantras. He points out allusions in the *Tattrasiddhisūtra* by Harivarman (4th cent. A.D.) and in Asaṅga's *Madhyāntānugamaśāstra* (both texts are only known from the Chinese translations) to a school called *na ya siu mo* (Nayasauma). In this he sees a reference to the Saumyas or the Somasiddhāntas whom he identifies with the Kāpālikas (on the authority of two commentaries on the *Prabodhacandrodaya*).

All this is very ingenious, but also doubtful, especially as we know so very little about this sect.²¹ Though no hard and fast line of demarcation can be drawn between *Mahāyānasūtras*, *Dhāraṇīs*, and *Tantras*, they nevertheless belong to three distinct periods of Buddhist literature. The chapters containing *Dhāraṇīs* in the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* and the *Laṅkāvatāra*, have been proved, on other grounds, to be later additions. The *Mahāmāyūrī* which was translated into Chinese as early as in the 4th century A.D., is a *Dhāraṇī*, and cannot be called a 'Tantra' in the proper sense of the word.²² The term 'Tantra' ought to be restricted to the texts connected with Śakti worship. Tantra texts in this sense cannot be proved to have existed before the 7th century, though some of the elements constituting the Tantras may have existed before that time.

Some of these elements, indeed, may be traced as far back as the times of the *Yajurveda*, where we already find the use of mystic syllables and words²³ which play such an important part in the Mantras of Tantric works. Magic also which is one of the elements of Tantra literature, of course, reaches back to the *Atharvaveda*. But there is no line of 'evolution' from *Yajurveda* and *Atharvaveda* to the *Tantras*. Still less is it possible to admit "that the seeds of Tantric Buddhism were already there in the original Buddhism in the form of

19 *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, XXIV, 31.

20 *JASB.*, N. S., Vol. XXVI, 1930, p. 128ff.

21 Cf. Chintaharan Chakravarti in *IHQ.*, VIII., 1932, p. 221ff.

22 G. Tucci (l.c., p. 129) describes it as 'absolutely tantric.'

23 See my *History of Indian Literature*, Vol. I, 185f.

Mudrās, Mantras, Maṇḍalas, Dhāraṇīs, Yoga and *Samādhi* as a means to attain happiness and prosperity in this world".²⁴ *Yoga* and *Samādhi*, it is true, were practised in early Buddhism, but there is nothing in the Tipiṭaka or any early Buddhist document to prove that Gotama or his first disciples had anything to do with *Mudrās, Mantras, Maṇḍalas,* and *Dhāraṇīs*. On the contrary, we read in the very first Sutta of the *Dīghanikāya* (Brahmajāla-Sutta, 21) that Gotama 'holds aloof from such low arts' as palmistry, auguries, sacrificing to Agni, offering oblations from a spoon, snake charming and other kinds of witchcraft and charms.²⁵ It seems, however, that original Mahāyāna-sūtras were often supplanted by Tantras. It is characteristic that the first three chapters of the *Māñjuśrī-mūlakalpa* which calls itself a Mahāyāna-sūtra are called 'Parivartas', like the chapters of Mahāyānasūtras, while the rest of the work is divided in 'Paṭalas'. Thus the *Guhya-samāja*, described as a Vaipulya Mahāyānasūtra,²⁶ is divided in 'Parivartas', while the *Guhya-samāja Tantra* is divided in 'Paṭalas'.

The Mahāmahopādhyāya Haraprasāda Śāstrī may be right when he suggests that the *Guhyasamāja Tantra* was called so 'only by an analogy' to the *Mahāyānasūtra Tathāgataguhyaka*.

It would be worth while to examine this and the Cambridge MS. in order to see whether the passages quoted by Śāntideva are to be found in the work. According to Watters (s. *Śikṣāsamuccaya*, ed. C. Bendall, p. 274, note) the work quoted by Śāntideva corresponds to the Chinese translation of about 1000 A.D. (Nanjio, Nos. 23, 3, 1043) in which the title corresponds to a Tathāgatacintya-guhya-nirdeśa, and which is a Mahāyānasūtra entirely different from the Tantra. K. Watanabe, (*JRAS.*, 1907, p. 664), says that Nanjio No. 1027 corresponds to the *Śrīguhyasamāja Tantrarāja* and adds: "Some parts of the original text which are not fit for publication as Dr. Rajendralala Mitra indicates.....are omitted in the Chinese."

24 B. Bhattacharyya, *Two Vajrayāna Works*, GOS., No. XLIV, Introduction, p. x.

25 See *Dialogues of the Buddha*, translated by T. W. Rhys Davids; *Sacred Books of the Buddhists*, Vol. II, 1899, p. 16 ff.

26 Haraprasāda Śāstrī's *Descriptive Catalogue*, No. 18, see above.

10 *Notes on the Guhyasamāja-Tantra and the 'Age of the Tantras*

It would be very important for the history of Mahāyāna and Tantra literature, if the Sanskrit text of the Vaipulya Mahāyānasūtra *Guhyasamāja* were published, and the different Chinese translations could be compared with it.

M. WINTERNITZ

The Kingdom of Kīra

Kīra is included in the list of countries whose kings waited upon emperor Dharmapāla in the famous imperial assembly at Kanauj.¹ The exact identification of this country has not been very easy, and various suggestions have been made from time to time. Kielhorn, while editing the Khālimpur copperplate of Dharmapāla merely refers to the *Bṛhatsamhitā*, according to which the Kīras belong to the North-East division of India.² Mr. A. K. Maitra, while re-editing the inscription, merely quotes the opinion of Kielhorn.³ Some have even identified the Kīras with the Kashmirians⁴. I have elsewhere⁵ made a passing suggestion about the location of Kīra, and I now proceed to state the grounds on which it was based.

Balādhuri, in his account of the conquests of Muhammad bin Kasim mentions a country named Al-Kiraj.⁶ Leaving Al, as a mere Arabic prefix, Kiraj may be taken as equivalent to Kira, when we remember that even the well known mango (*Āmra* or *amba*) has been referred to by Arabic writers as *Ambaj*.⁷

In *Chachnāma* the name of the place is written as Kurij⁸ and a romantic story is told how Jaisia (Jaisimha), the son of Dāhar, the deceased king of Sindh, was at first given shelter by Drohar, the king of Kurij, but was afterwards driven away by the machinations of Drohar's sister whose immoral proposals he refused to accept. It is related that having learnt of the plot to murder him, Jaisia left Kurij and "journeyed on, till he arrived at Jālandhar in the land of Kashmir."

1 Khālimpur copper-plate, V. 12, *Ep. Ind.*, vol. IV. p. 243.

2 *Ibid.*, p. 246.

3 *Gauḍatekhamālā*, p. 21, f.n.

4 *Ind. Ant.*, vol. XVII, p. 9.

5 Arab Invasion of India (*Journal of Indian History*, vol. X, part I, p. 60).

6 English Translation by Murgotten, p. 223.

7 Elliot, *History of India by its own historians*, vol. I, p. 27.

8 *Chachnāma*, translated by M. K. Ferdunbeg, pp. 181ff.

Thus this country should be placed in the neighbourhood of Jālandhara. Now, two inscriptions from Baijnath⁹ give the name of that place as Kīragrāma, and refer to its ruler as a subordinate vassal of the lord of Jālandhara. Burgess supplies the following note about the place. "Kīragrāma or Baijnath is a small town in the east of the Kangra district about thirty miles east of Kot Kangra, in latitude 32° 3' N. and longitude 76° 41' E. The number of old temples about the village points to its having been in early times a place of some note."

The identification of the name and its proximity to Jālandhar naturally point to Kīragrāma or Baijnath as the capital and its surrounding tracts as the country of the ancient Kīras,¹⁰ referred to by the Arabs as al-Kiraj or al-Kurij. This view is further confirmed by the statement in the Nagpur stone inscription of V.S. 1161 that "the Kīra chief was eloquent beyond measure on account of the proximity of the Sarasvatī."¹¹ It is well known that the river Sarasvatī, which has now completely disappeared, was traditionally placed in the neighbourhood of the region where we have located the Kīras.

So far about the position of the Kīra country. We may now turn to its history.

Leaving aside mere literary references which supply no positive data for history, the earliest historical events of the Kīra country are those known in connection with the Arab conquest of Sind.¹² The account of *Chachnāma*, quoted above, would indicate that Kīra was a powerful country in the beginning of the eighth century A.D. The name of the king is given as Duhar by Balādhuri, and Drohar in *Chachnāma*. That Jaisia (Jaisimha) sought refuge with him, and he agreed to give him shelter against Muhammad bin Kasim, point to his relative strength and importance. But perhaps this very act provoked

⁹ *Ep. Ind.*, vol. I, pp. 97ff. For the topography cf. also *Ep. Ind.*, vol. II, pp. 492-3, *Ann. Rep. Arch. Surv.*, 1905-6, pp. 17ff.

¹⁰ Since the above was written I find Rapson had already made a passing suggestion to this effect in his article on the Kulūtas (*JRAS.*, 1900, p. 540).

¹¹ *Ep. Ind.*, vol. II, p. 194.

¹² R. C. Majumdar, *Arab Invasion of India*, pp. 39-40.

the wrath of the Arab general, for he soon led an army against the Kīras and conquered the country.

The recall and tragic death of Muhammad bin Kasim enabled the Kīras to regain their freedom. But within thirty years the Arab general Junaid reconquered the kingdom. The Arab domination over the Kīra kingdom does not, however, appear to have lasted for a long period. The rise of Kashmir as a great power under Lalitāditya put an effective check against the aggression of the Arabs in the northern Punjab, and the Kīra country must have regained its freedom before the middle of the eighth century A.D. About the beginning of the ninth century A.D. the Kīras were defeated by Dharmapāla and the Kīra king attended the imperial assembly at Kanauj to do homage to the Pāla emperor.¹³

The history of the Kīras about this period may also be gathered from the inscriptions of the kings of Chambā.¹⁴ Two of these refer to Sāhilladeva, the founder of the family, as a 'fresh rain-cloud to extinguish in a moment the mighty blazing fire of the Kīra forces, fanned, as by the wind, by the Lord of Durgara, assisted by the Saumatikas.' Dr. Vogel places the foundation of Chambā town and of the consolidation of the state by Sāhilla towards the middle of the tenth century A.D. He also takes Durgara to be the ancient name for the modern Dugar (Dogrā), the mountainous tract between the Jhelum and the Ravi, or more definitely the ancient Jammu State on the Cīnāb. The Saumatikas cannot be exactly located but must have been a neighbouring tribe.

The hostility between Kīra and Chambā is also reflected in the popular traditions. The *Vaṃśāvalī* of the Chambā Rājas relates that in the reign of Lakṣmīvarman, the grandson of Meruvarman, the Kīras invaded Chambā and killed the Rājā in battle. Vogel places Meruvarman in the commencement of the eighth century.

All these evidences lead to the conclusion that shortly after the Arab menace was over, the Kīras pursued an aggressive campaign against Chambā and the neighbouring states. During the next two

13 *Ep. Ind.*, vol. IV, p. 243.

14 Vogel, *Inscriptions of Chambā* (*Ann. Rep. Arch. Surv.*; 1902-3, pp. 241, 257, 262ff.).

centuries, they were rapidly growing to be the leading power, and made a confederacy with some of the neighbouring hill states. By the middle of the tenth century A.D. the rising power of Chambā had to reckon with this confederacy but evidently with not much success.

The next reference to Kīra in point of time is perhaps to be found in a passage in the Khajuraho inscription of Yaśovarman (verse 43) which has been translated as follows by Kielhorn.¹⁵

“The image of Vaikuṅṭha (which) the ornament of princes, the illustrious king Yaśovarman, who crushed his enemies, has set up (here),—the lord of Bhoṭa obtained it from the Kailāsa, and from him Sāhi, the king of Kīra, received it as a token of friendship; from him afterwards Herambapāla obtained it for a force of elephants and horses, and (Yaśovarman himself) received it from Devapāla, the lord of horses.”

The passage is not indeed free from difficulties. The epithet “Sāhi” which Kielhorn applies to Kīrarāja, may also be taken along with Herambapāla. But perhaps Kielhorn has rightly taken the other meaning, as Herambapāla and his son Devapāla are usually regarded as Gurjjara-Pratīhāra kings of Kanauj, to whom the epithet Sāhi can hardly be applied. For that term undoubtedly refers to the Shāhiya rulers who were at that time ruling over Afghanistan and the Punjab.

If, therefore, we accept Kielhorn’s translation, the epithet Sāhi, applied to Kīrarāja, becomes full of interest. The date of the Kīra king in question can easily be determined. As he was a contemporary of the Pratīhāra king Herambapāla, he must have ruled about the end of the ninth or the beginning of the tenth century A.D. Now Alberuni informs us, that about that very time, the Brahmin vizier of the Turkish Sāhiya kings had usurped the throne and founded the Hindu Sāhi dynasty.¹⁶ Are we to take, therefore, that the founder of the new Sāhi dynasty was originally a king of Kīra and hence the Sāhi ruler was also called Kīra-rāja? This is not a necessary or inevitable inference, but there are two circumstances which prove a close associa-

¹⁵ *Ep. Ind.*, vol. I, p. 122.

¹⁶ *Alberuni*, translated by Sachau, II, p. 13.

tion between the Sāhi rulers and the Kangra district with which Kīra has been identified above.

While discussing the Sāhiya kings, Alberuni deplures the lack of accurate information on this subject, due to the absence of historical spirit among the Hindus. Then he adds: "I have been told that the pedigree of this royal family, written on silk, exists in the fortress Nagarkot".¹⁷ That this fortress was the basis of Sāhi power in the Punjab also follows from the fact, that after Sultan Mahmud had defeated the confederate forces of Ānandapāl in 1008 A.D., he "took up the pursuit of the fugitives and followed them to the fort of Nagarkot which was situated near Kangra on the spur of a hill and was encircled by the river Bangāngā."¹⁸

The engagement between Sultan Mahmud and Ānandapāl took place on or near the bank of the Indus. Nagarkot or Kangra is situated at a great distance from that. The most plausible way of explaining the statement quoted above is to suppose that the defeated forces of Ānandapāl kept up a running fight with a view to save themselves by entering into the fortified city of Nagarkot which was evidently one of the strongest military bases of the kingdom. The facts that the pedigree of the royal dynasty was supposed by Alberuni to have been preserved in Nagarkot (among all places), and that it was regarded as the last refuge of the royal army, easily support the presumption that Nagarkot formed one of the centres of their power and authority. And Nagarkot is only 23 miles west of Baijnath.

The Kīra kingdom survived the downfall of the Sāhiyas, though perhaps under a new dynasty. In the eleventh century A.D. it was defeated successively by Gāṅgeyadeva Kalacuri¹⁹ (c. 1015-1040 A.D.) and his son Karṇa²⁰ (c. 1040-70 A.D.) who attempted to establish a paramount empire in northern India and succeeded to a large extent. The Cālukya king Someśvara I²¹ (Āhavamalla) (c. 1042-1068 A.D.) who defeated Karṇa also includes Kīra among the lists of his conquests.

17 *Alberuni*, II, p. 11.

18 *M. Nazim, Sultan Muhammad*, p. 90.

19 *Ep. Ind.*, vol. XI, p. 143.

20 *Ep. Ind.*, vol. II, p. 15.

21 *Ep. Ind.*, vol. XV, p. 104.

Towards the close of the eleventh century A.D. Kīra had to submit to the Paramāra king Lakṣmadeva of Mālava.²²

The repeated foreign invasions throughout the eleventh century A.D. must have considerably weakened the vitality and resources of the Kīras. Although they aided the rebel Bhoja against Jayasiṃha, the king of Kashmir²³ (1128-49 A.D.), they soon lost their independence and became feudatory to the king of Jālandhara.

The two Baijnath Praśastis, referred to above, introduce us to a line of ten chiefs of Kīragrāma. They also refer to the king of Jālandhara as the overlord of the kingdom. This was undoubtedly true of the time when the inscription was composed, but it does not necessarily follow that all the ten chiefs named in the record were vassals of Jālandhara. In particular it is worthy of note that the eighth chief married a daughter of the king of Jālandhara, and it is by no means usual for an overlord to marry his daughter to a vassal chief.

The date of the inscription is given both in Lokakāla, or Saptarṣi Samvat and the Śaka era. The Śaka date was first read by Cunningham as 726 corresponding with A.D. 804. This reading was adopted by Bühler and all subsequent writers. But this date, as was pointed out by Bühler does not agree with the astronomical details. Vogel has since shown that the correct date is Śaka 1126 corresponding with 1204 A.D.²⁴

If we assume this date to be correct, and allot a reign of 20 years on an average to each generation, we may place the ten chiefs (consisting of nine generations) of Kīragrāma between A.D. 1030 and 1210. It would thus follow that this line of chiefs came into power shortly after the invasions of Sultan Mahmud and the overthrow of the Sāhiya dynasty. If my theory regarding the connection of the Sāhiyas with the Kīra kingdom were held tenable we might regard this new line of chiefs as the successors of the main Sāhiya dynasty in the kingdom of Kīra.

²² *Ep. Ind.*, vol. II, p. 194.

²³ *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, VIII, v. 2767.

²⁴ *Ann. Rep. Arch Surv.*, 1905-6, p. 20.

After the thirteenth century A.D. the Kīra kingdom passes from our view. It has, however, left its legacy partly in the monuments of old, and partly in the aristocratic feelings of its people which even the most abject poverty has failed to crush. The statues of Gaṅgā and Yamunā, and substantial parts of the old temple which they adorned still exist to tell the tale of its forgotten glory. The Rājanakas of Kīragrāma mentioned in the Baijnath Praśasti are perhaps still represented by the Ranes or Rajput Zemindars in the Pargana of Baijnath. To Dr. Stein we owe the following story which illustrates the feelings of this aristocratic body.²⁵

“The Raja of Kapurthala quite lately married a girl from the house of a bitterly poor Rajput of the Gulherian Mian clan, who lives as Zamindar not far from Baijnath. Though the man is so poor that his daughter, the present Rani, used to work for wages in the tea plantations, his countrymen have not yet pardoned him that he contracted the alliance with the Raja.”

R. C. MAJUMDAR

25 *Ep. Ind.*, vol. II, pp. 482-3.

Maha-Pralaya and Last Judgment

Vedic tradition envisages the voyage (*yāna*) of the individual after death as a passing *on* from one plane of being (*loka*) to another; and though there is the possibility of perpetuity (*sthāyitā*) on any given plane until the End of Time (*kalpānta*, *mahā-pralaya*), there is no conception of the possibility of a return to any past state. The later doctrine of reincarnation, in which the possibility of a return to a previous condition is conceived, seems to reflect an edifying tendency of the religious (*bhakti-vāda*) and psychological (*hīnayāna*) extensions, perhaps incorporating popular non-Vedic elements.¹

More exactly, there are two different courses that may be followed: the Angelic (*devayāna*) in the case of the individual whose ship is knowledge, and the Patriarchal (*pitryāna*) in his case whose ship is Works (*karma*) done with a view to reward. In the former case the individual passes by way of the "Sun" and therebeyond to the Supreme Self and the Unground: in the latter, he reaches only the "Moon", and in due course thence returns to a new corporeal state in a subsequent sub-Time (*manvantara*), when the choice of routes again presents itself. What follows here, however, does not take account of this distinction of routes, but rather of the distinction between those who on the one hand are borne on either by Understanding or by Works, being equally Wayfarers, and those on the other hand who having neither understood nor yet wrought, the Last Judgment finds not merely unannihilate but also without merit.

In any case, the final end of voyaging is on the Farther Shore of the Sea of Life (*saṃsāra*). When landing is made there, *Jīvātman* knows itself as *Paramātman*, absolute-space-in-the-heart (*antarhṛdaya ākāśa*) is known as the absolute-space-body (*ākāśa-śarīra*) of Being and Non-Being, and the sea of life is as it were counter-seen (*paryapaśyata*) by the Self as the multiplicity of its own Identity.² Voyaging, we are

1 See my *Yakṣas*, I, p. 14, note 1.

2 *Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa*, VII, 8, 1: *Saṅkarācārya*, *Svātmanirūpaṇa*, 95:

given intimations of that Paradise (*prāṇārāma*, *nandana*), in Union (*sāyujya samādhi*) consummating thought (*dhyāna*), in Ecstasy (*ānanda*) consummating Will (*kāma*), and in the consent (*sāhitya*) of Art (*nirmāṇa*): knowledge, love, and work becoming pure (*asakta*) Act.

But though the possibility of Gradual Enfranchisement (*krama-mukti*) is open to the Voyager,³ there is also the possibility for him whose ship is rudderless, or wrongly steered, to wander on uncharted courses toward an unknown landfall, farther and ever farther from the Quay (*ghāt*): so far and so long that he may not be in sight of Yonder Shore when every hither shore and every vessel is dissolved at the End of Time. So at the End of Time there is a departing of the Freed (*mukta*) and Ego-bound (*māna-baddhaka*). In Christian tradition this is called the Last Judgment.

Save and except the highest Devas, Angels (*ājānaja*), whose being is from Eternity, all beings, be they 'quick or dead', are "judged" at this Last Day. The Self of those who have already achieved a Total (*nirguṇa*) Realisation (*mukti*) is already in conscious identity with the Supreme Identity: and now for those whose Realisation has been 'by degrees' (*krama*) or qualified (*saguṇa*) there ensues the last death of the categorised Ego, a "death" that is absolutely *Mors janua vitae*, an enfranchisement from every possible contingency—the Gates of Heaven are opened to the Jīvātman, now Kṛtātman, "Perfected Self", so that he becomes again (*abhisambhavati*) in his Own Form (*sva-rūpa*), Imageless (*nirābhāsa*), Pure Intelligence (*cit*), and Unalloyed Delight (*pūrṇānanda*).

But for those lost beings who have not in Time achieved even a Partial Realisation, but are still altogether involved in the net of delusion (*moha-kalila*), deeming that the Ego is the Self, for these there can be no present possibility of Enfranchisement at the End of

"On the vast canvas of the Self, the picture of the manifold worlds is painted by the Self itself, and that Supreme Self takes a great delight therein."

3 The concepts *yāna* and *krama-mukti* imply by hypothesis a crossing of the sea of life (*saṃsāra*). If the Upaniṣads also contemplate the possibility of an Immediate Enfranchisement, and consequent Transformation (*abhisambhava* or *parāvṛtti*), the realisation, "I am Brahman," "That art thou" in actual experience, this cutting of the knots of the heart at a single stroke is not our present theme.

Time: having thought, still thinking that to act "for the sake of the Self" (*Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*, II, 4, 5) means nothing but to satisfy every desire of the Ego, by serving the body here and now, living by such an "*Asura Upaniṣad*" as this, these "shall perish", (*Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, VIII, 8). These are the "damned": Their damnation is a self-adjudged and Self-adjudged condemnation to an endless, though not eternal, latency, a relative, though not absolute annihilation: to a Hell below the silent glassy sea of the non-Time (*kalpāntara*) that divides Time from Time, there by Necessity, "God's justice", to await their mortal rebecoming in another Time (*kalpa*), where the possibility of achieving, or not achieving an Immediate or Deferred Enfranchisement will again present itself.

Abhimānatva, then, is "Original Sin". Satan's claim to 'equality with God', his assertion of the independence and self-subsistence of the Ego, is the occasion of his Fall and theirs who follow him. Man's Fall, the same in kind, has been described traditionally as an eating of the Fruit of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil. This Tree is none other than the Tree of Life, planted by the Self itself, by God himself, in the Garden of Life (*prāṇārāma*), as a fair thing and a delight of the eyes, for His and Man's pleasure. But to eat of the Fruit is Mortal Sin (*anṛta*) against the Spirit, "forbidden" to man as individual ego⁴: for "eating" is an assimilation to, and a self-identification with, things "as they are in themselves", not "as they are in God", therefore a taking on of what is nothing in itself, a venom (*viṣa*)⁵ that is Death from the standpoint of Eternal Life, a closing of the Gates of Paradise.

None but the Self can swallow such a venom and yet live, as Śiva

4 It must not be thought that because the man is represented as yielding to the seduction of the woman that a merely carnal fall is implied. Here "man" stands for "Subject," "woman" for "Object" (as *pratīka*, in each case); the Fall is equally a derogation of the Intellect and of the Will.

5 It is impossible not to see a connection of *viṣa* "poison," with *viṣayatā*, objectivity: cf. *Maitrī Upaniṣad*, VI, 31, where vision is said to "feed upon" the *apsaras* (i.e. fascinating possibilities of being) as sense objects (*viṣayān*); also *Nirukta*, V, 15, where *apsaras* is artificially connected with *a-psā*, giving the sense of "forbidden food"; *Bṛhaddevatā*, V, 148 and 149, and *Sarvānukramāṇī*, I, 166, where Mitra-Varuṇa are seduced by the sight of *Urvaśī*.

does when by another image the *dvandva*-bane is produced at the Churning of the Sea of Milk; the wound and signatures of this bane being the blue-black stain on His throat as Nilakanṭha, Viṣakanṭha, Viṣāgnipā, His taking of the Serpent to His breast as *nāga-yajñōpavīta*, and His "addiction" to drugs. That apparent subjection of the Self to the tragedy (*anṛta*, *arta*) of Life, that accepted pain, is the Passion of God and Everyman.⁶

ANANDA K. COOMARASWAMY

6 "That heart which stands apart from pain and woe,
Nor seal nor signature of love can know" (Sanā'I).

Mepputtūr Narāyaṇa Bhaṭṭatiri

Amongst the many distinguished Sanskritists that Kerala has produced, none has risen so high in popular esteem as Mepputtūr Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭatiri. As a poet and *bhakta* his is a household name, while as a grammarian he is well-known among the select circle of *Sāstraic* scholars. It is proposed to notice the life and career of this great poet who is probably the greatest figure among the Kerala Sanskritists since the 15th century.

Bhaṭṭatiri belonged to the family, known as Mepputtūr, Sanskritised as *uparinavagrāma*. This house was on the northern banks of the river Nīla, in Malabar near Tirunāvay. His father was Mātr̥datta, a scholar proficient in *Mīmāṃsā Śāstra*; on the mother's side, he was associated with the famous *Bhaṭṭas* of Payyūr *Bhāṭṭamana*, his mother being the only sister of nine brothers all equally eminent in the *Mīmāṃsā Śāstra*.¹ Thus both on the paternal and maternal side, he inherited high scholarly traditions.

If local traditions are to be believed, it appears that Bhaṭṭatiri was an irresponsible lad in his youth. After the usual Sanskritic education which every *Nampūtiri* had to have in those ancient days, he left his studies and betook himself to a life of ease. At an early age he married a Pisharoti woman,² the niece of the then well-known astronomer-astrologer Tr̥kkaṇḍiyūr Aeyuta Pisharoti.³ Bhaṭṭatiri was so much engrossed in his new-found joy that he became careless in the observance of the daily religious routine. One morning he arose late and rushing out of his wife's house he chanced to step across the sacred plank on which Pisharoti was performing the

1 Vide the writer's paper 'Religion and Philosophy in Kerala' in the *IHQ.*, IV, 4, pp. 702-719.

2 The marriage here mentioned must be the *Sambandham* system of marriage. May this be taken as suggesting that Bhaṭṭatiri was not the eldest son of his father? Otherwise he should have married in his own caste.

3 Vide the writer's paper 'Śāstras: Practical and Theoretical' published in the *Journal of the Mythic Society*, XXI, 3.

Nāḷumpakkomvaikkal.⁴ This was a great breach of manners and Pisharoti, naturally feeling very angry, administered him a severe reproof, in spite of the fact that Bhaṭṭatiri was a brahmin of great social position. The young man was naturally dumb-founded and received the whole censure quietly. When the old man had ended his tirade, he hurried out; but he was not long absent. He returned immediately after his usual morning rites and calmly requested Pisharoti to teach him higher Sanskrit. Struck by his sincerity and evident desire to study, Pisharoti acceded to his request and he began his studies that very day. In an incredibly short time, if tradition is to be believed, he mastered *Kāvya*s and *Nāṭaka*s, *Aṅkāra* and *Vyākaraṇa*, and in these various subjects he soon became recognised as a great scholar.

As a Bhaṭṭatiri, a brahmin of the highest social position, he had to be proficient in Śrauta literature before he could find an honoured place amongst his kinsmen. He therefore requested Pisharoti to teach him that branch of literature also, but Pisharoti objected, for this was a subject that tradition and convention alike prohibited a non-*Dvi*ja from handling. Bhaṭṭatiri was firm, however, in his resolve that he would not have two *Gurus* and forced his teacher to undertake the task, even though he feared divine punishment for this act. Being a good scholar in more than one branch of literature, it was easy for Pisharoti to master and teach this branch of study, and in due course Bhaṭṭatiri was taught the religious texts as well. But what Pisharoti feared did happen, for before long he became a prey to leprosy.⁵ Bhaṭṭatiri was struck with pity and remorse at seeing his Guru suffering and therefore prayed intently to God to cure him by transferring the disease unto himself. In response to the request of Bhaṭṭatiri, Pisharoti became cured as if by a miracle, while his disciple fell a victim to the dire

4 This is supposed to be a very religious practice, and all astrologers in our land daily performed this after their morning rites. The work done is finding the constellation and *tithi* for the day, the calculations being made by means of *covries* spread out on a wooden plank 3 ft. by 2½ ft. This system is gradually dying out.

5 Another tradition will have it that Pisharoti was suffering from rheumatism.

disease. For a cure he resorted to the sacred Kṛṣṇa shrine at Guruvāyūr,⁶ where he spent his time in prayer and fasts and divine service. There he began his famous *Nārāyaṇīyam* and by the time it was finished—it took him a hundred days, as tradition records—he was cured. Such is the story our elders have handed down to us regarding the final studies of Bhaṭṭatiri, and they also would have it that during the progress of the *Nārāyaṇīyam*, the *bhakta* beheld the divine vision of Śrī Kṛṣṇa on more occasions than one.

It may be noted that the traditional story mentioned above is to a certain extent belied by Bhaṭṭatiri's own statement, recorded in his *Prakriyāsarvasvam*, that he had more Gurus than one. It is stated there that he studied *Mīmāṃsā* from his father Māṭṛdatta, *Tarka* from Madhavārya, and *Vyākaraṇa* from Ācyutārya.⁷ The tradition, however, is very strong, and it may contain an element of truth in that he cured his *Guru* during his period of sickness by careful nursing. He himself became afflicted, probably by contagion and was thereafter cured by divine grace.

Now a well-known *bhakta*, his fame as a scholar proficient in almost every branch of Sanskrit literature spread far and wide. He was consequently an honoured guest everywhere and particularly at the courts of king Ravi Varma and Vīrakerala Varma of Cochin and of Devanārāyaṇa of Ambalapuḷa, for these princes were themselves great scholars and actively patronised men of letters. There are many traditions clustering round Bhaṭṭatiri, even though he lived in the modern period. He has left behind him a number of works which can be classified under the three heads of literary, lyrical and *Śāstraic*. Upon these we shall now dwell.

In the field of literature, Bhaṭṭatiri's fame rests upon his *Prabandhams*—*Campus*: *Rājasūya*, *Dūtavākya*, *Subhadrāharana*, *Pāñcālīsvayamvara*, *Niranunāsika*, *Svāhāsudhākara*,⁸ *Nṛgamokṣa*,

6 This shrine has now become very famous throughout India as the centre of the Satyāgraha campaign for the removal of social disabilities.

7 Vide Vol. 106, page (Preface) 3, of the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series. Can the Mūdhava here mentioned be also a Pisharoti?

8 Vide Keith, *History of Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 336-337 where this work is reported to be the result of extempore poetry. The basis of this information is not cited.

Dakṣayāga, *Kaunteyāṣṭaka* and *Vāmanāvatāra*: these ten *Prabandhams* are ascribed to him. In assigning the authorship we are again forced to fall back upon tradition, for there are a number of *Prabandhams*, and many of them speak of a Nārāyaṇa as their author. But since this age produced at least three more Nārāyaṇas⁹—all writers of no mean repute—it becomes difficult to ascertain accurately which Nārāyaṇa wrote which work. Apart from this difficulty, there are a number of anonymous *Prabandhams* which are also fathered upon Bhaṭṭatiri. The question as to which are the *Prabandhams* of Bhaṭṭatiri does not therefore admit of easy solution. The list given above is based upon the best Paṇḍit tradition, and this is bound to be our sole guide so long as critical editions of the numerous *Prabandhams* available are not forthcoming and so long as an elucidation of the Nārāyaṇa-problem in Kerala Sanskrit Literature is not attempted. It is greatly to be regretted that not one of these *Bhaṭṭatiri-Prabandhams* is yet printed in Devanāgarī character.

As I have elsewhere stated,¹⁰ *Prabandhams* owe their existence to the popular demand for greater variety at the hands of the professional actor and the Pāṭhakakkāran. There is a popular view that Bhaṭṭatiri inaugurated this type of literature, but this view does not appear to be quite correct, for we have *Prabandhams* in mixed Malayalam and Sanskrit as early as the 15th century.¹¹ It may possibly be that Bhaṭṭatiri was the first to write an original *Prabandham* in Sanskrit, the earlier ones being but compilations, such as the *Rāmāyaṇam Prabandham* for instance.¹²

We may refer to an interesting tradition associating our author with Iravi Cākyar, a famous professional actor of the period and a protégé of the chief Devanārāyaṇa of Ambalapuḷa. On one occasion

9 Compare, for instance, Nārāyaṇa of *Vivaraṇa* fame, Nārāyaṇa, the author of *Bhāvārthadīpikā* on *Uttarurāmacarita*, and again Nārāyaṇa, the author of *Srīmāheśvarumāhātmya*.

10 Vide the writer's paper on 'Pāṭhakam' published in the *IHQ*. Also 'Kuthu' published in the *Journal of the Mythic Society*, XII, 2, pp. 183-195.

11 Vide *JOR.*, Madras, IV (1930), pp. 142-151.

12 A complete edition of the *Prabandham* is issued from Urakam near Trichur, but it is in Malayalam script and is not critical.

when Bhaṭṭatiri was a guest at this court, this Cākyar was conducting a *Prabandham Kuthu*,¹³ the scene for the day being the disfiguring of Sūrpaṇakhā. After the performance was over, Bhaṭṭatiri asked the actor how he would act the next scene—Sūrpaṇakhā's complaint to Rāvaṇa, for she had lost her nose and therefore could not pronounce nasals and *anunāsikas*. The actor said that the scene could not be effectively acted, but the blame was to be levelled more at the poet than the actor who had simply to act whatever the poet gave him. Bhaṭṭatiri took the cue from the actor, and immediately set about writing a scene for the next day in which he took care to introduce no nasal or nasalised sound, and the scene was acted very successfully. Thus was produced the *Niranunāsika Prabandham*. Thenceforward Bhaṭṭatiri and Iravi Cākyar were close comrades and the scholar's best *Prabandhams* were written for his actor friend.¹⁴

To the ten *Prabandhams* of Bhaṭṭatiri which have been mentioned above, the Paṇḍit world would give a very high place, next only to the works of Kālidāsa and Bhavabhūti. This praise by the Paṇḍits is not indeed excessive, for in these works we have excellent poetry characterised by a natural freshness and never marred by artificial conceits.

Another short work of Bhaṭṭatiri is the *Kocchinagaravarṇana*, a treatise written at the instance of King Vīrakerala Varma (1603-1615). A Devanāgarī edition of this work is available. It is a small prose work, being practically one sentence running to about twenty pages.¹⁵ Another work that may be assigned to him is the *Rāsavilāsakāvyaṃ* which is of considerable merit.

Bhaṭṭatiri is furthermore the author of two religious lyrics—the *Nārāyaṇīyan* and the *Śrīpūḍasaptati*. We have already referred to the circumstances in which the first of these works was produced. Our

13 Vide the writer's paper on 'Kuthu' published in the *QJMS.*, XII, 2, pp. 183-195.

14 Iravi Cākyar, alias Ravinartaka, figures as the author of a small *Kāvya*, *Cāṇakya-kathā*, published in the Calcutta Oriental Series, No. 6. The writer has a manuscript copy of the work.

15 The writer has noticed this work in the paper contributed to the Sixth All-India Conference at Lahore; vide pp. 471-91, vol. I of the Proceedings.

Pandits are of opinion that it is the greatest *stotra* we have. Even when due allowance is made for local patriotism, it may be conceded that it is easily the best religious lyric in Sanskrit. It is a brilliant summary in a thousand verses of the *Śrī Bhāgavata* and is characterised by inimitable poetry infused by the sweet fervour of intense faith and devotion. It is one of the most popular books in our land. Numberless editions have appeared in the vernacular script, with and without commentaries in Malayalam; but a standard edition became available only when it was issued by the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series. The *Nārāyaṇīyam* ranks high as a great religious lyric and is for that reason greatly honoured by us all. In the other lyric which is not so well known, are sung the praises of the Goddess enshrined at Mūkkola, Sanskritised as *Muktisthala*, where Bhaṭṭatiri is said to have died. This is also reported to be poetry of a high order.

Bhaṭṭatiri has in addition made his contribution to the *Śāstras* of *Vyākaraṇa* and *Mīmāṃsā*. From his own statement it is clear that, after studying *Vyākaraṇa* under Acyuta Pisharoti, who is the earliest author available in this *Śāstra* in our land,¹⁶ Bhaṭṭatiri wrote his treatise, *Prakriyāsarrasvam* at the request of his patron, Devanārāyaṇa of Ambalapuḷa. This is a commentary on the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇini, the sūtras being rearranged and commented on to suit the practical point of view, the purpose served being the same as that served by the *Kaumudī* of Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣitar. Bhaṭṭatiri and his contemporary Dikṣitar were worthy compeers in the same field and the treatise of the one is as original in conception and treatment as that of the other. If tradition is to be believed, they heard of each other and compared their works, whereon Bhaṭṭoji gave the palm to Bhaṭṭatiri, but pointed out one defect in the *Sarrasvam*, namely that it did not deal with *Dhātus*. This tradition apart, the success of the work is attested to by the great popularity that the *Sarrasvam* had in Kerala for a long time. True, it lost its popularity some time later and was replaced by the *Kaumudī*;

16 Pisharoti is the author of the *Praveśika*, primarily designed for beginners and particularly for Bhaṭṭatiri himself. This serves all the purposes of a practical manual of grammar and it was very popular in our land so long as the traditional method of Sanskrit study was in vogue

but this was due not to the superiority of the latter, but to its all-India popularity. Bhaṭṭatiri's treatise is now being published in the Tri-vandrum Sanskrit Series and Part I has already come out. It is one of the important contributions in the field of *Vyākaraṇa*.

It has been mentioned that the *Sarvasvam* does not deal with Dhātus. This subject, however, is dealt with in the *Dhātukāvya*¹⁷ which apparently is supplementary to the *Vāsudevavijaya* of Paṭṭatu Vāsudeva and which elucidates over three thousand roots. This *Kāvya* thus forms a real supplement to the *Sarvasvam* and both together complete the whole range of *Vyākaraṇa*.

On his own admission, Bhaṭṭatiri studied *Mīmāṃsā* under his own father and in this *Śāstra*, he has produced a work of no mean merit. He is the author of the *Māna* portion of the *Mānameyodaya*, the *Meya* part being written by another Nārāyaṇa, well-known as Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍita. This is a unique Prakaraṇa work, and it occupies an important place in the scheme of *Mīmāṃsā* studies. In this treatise, an attempt is successfully made to establish the six *Pramāṇas* advocated by the Kumārila school, after refuting the various views on *Pramāṇa* advanced and accepted by the other schools particularly by the Prābhākaras and the Naiyāyikas. The *Mānameyodaya* is referred to as a work of great philosophical importance, in which 'Kumārila epistemology and metaphysics are interestingly summarised'.¹⁸

It may be noted here that Bhaṭṭatiri's scheme was to deal not merely with the *Pramāṇas* but with the *Prameya* as well, as is stated in the second of his opening verses. But since the *Meya* is written by another Nārāyaṇa, the presumption evidently is that Bhaṭṭatiri did not live to finish his work. If this view is tenable, then the *Māna* constitutes the last work of Bhaṭṭatiri.

Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭatiri was undoubtedly the most outstanding figure in the realm of letters during his age and no later scholar has been able to usurp his place. Even today he ranks as the greatest figure. It now remains to notice his date. Following the usual custom

17 Prof. Keith refers to a *Dhātukāvya*, vide page 133 f.n. This work evidently must be different or the information given there is wrong.

18 Vide Keith's *History of Sanskrit Literature*, p. 474.

of Malayali writers of a later date, Bhaṭṭatiri has given us a few *Kali* chronograms in his works. Thus the *Nārāyaṇīyam* he finished on the date expressed in the *Kalirācakam*, *āyurārogyasaukhyam*, which works to about 1587 A.D. Two chronograms are reported to be present in his *Sarvasvam yatnaḥ phalaprasūḥ syād* and *kṛtarāgarasodhya*, and these give us the dates February and March, 1617 A.D., the interval of two months being held to be the period in which he wrote his grammatical master-piece.¹⁹ But this does not appear to be quite acceptable for there is the real difficulty of getting such a work done in two months. There is also the question whether we are justified to take both these as *Kalirācakas*. The first of these alone deserve to be taken thus, and in that case, we have the date 1617 as the date on which he began his *Sarvasvam*. There is also a statement recorded in an astrological treatise which says that Bhaṭṭatiri lived for twice 53 years.²⁰ From the *Kalis* mentioned above, it will be seen that Bhaṭṭatiri must have finished his education and entered upon literary career before 1587 A.D. and his greatest work, *Prakriyāsarvasvam*, he began in 1617. When it is remembered that his first work was the *Nārāyaṇīyam* and that he entered upon higher studies later in life than usual, it may be legitimate to hold that Bhaṭṭatiri was born in the middle of the 16th century, and when to this is added the statement that he lived for 106 years, we have a fair approximation of his date 1550-1656. In his introduction to the edition of *Prakriyāsarvasvam*, the editor says: 'Historians assert that Bhaṭṭapada lived for 106 years from 1560 to 1666 A.D.' We have not been able to find out the basis of this statement, but it agrees fairly with the approximation we have arrived at.

Meppattūr Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭatiri is held to be the last of the many great intellectual giants that Kerala has produced. He is one of our greatest Sanskrit poets as he is also the greatest of our Vaiyākaraṇas. But he is honoured and respected more as the greatest of our *bhaktas*; and in this realm he is treated with as great respect as Śrī Śaṅkara is in the realm of Advaita philosophy.

K. RAMA PISHAROTI

19 Vide TSS., vol. 106, Intro., p. 3. 20 Vide TMS., vol. 3, Intro., p. 19.

(The Mādhyamikas and the Tathatā)

I hope I shall have some day the leisure of stating in detail the position of the Mādhyamikas. Much has been written lately on this problem by Mr. Stecherbatsky, St. Schayer, or Dr. Das Gupta, which does not seem accurate. [43]57

The reader will find here the translation of a few lines of the treatise named *Jewel in hand* or *Gem in hand*,¹ a work of Bhāvaviveka (reading of the Sk. Mss.) or Bhāviveka ('Clear distinction' of the Chinese translators). This Acārya is of opinion that there is not, as wrongly maintained by the Vijñānavādins, a *Tathatā* or *Dharmatā*, "the essential and permanent nature of things". The correct conclusion to be drawn from this negative is that, amongst the Mādhyamikas, Bhāvaviveka-Bhāviveka at least is not a 'monist'. As an orthodox exponent, he definitely considers that Buddhism is alien to every metaphysical interest, being merely a Path leading to final rest by an unconscious and objectless contemplation.

"If it be contended that the *Tathatā*, although it is foreign to words (*abhilāpa*, *vyaśahāravivikta*), is nevertheless a reality (*tatva*): in that case, the expression *Tathatā* refers only to the *Ātman* of the Tīrthikas under an other name. Just as the *Tathatā*, although it is a reality, is nevertheless, from the point of view of exact truth, beyond the concepts of being and not-being, it is the same with *Ātman*. The Tīrthikas think that the *Ātman*, which is real, omnipresent, eternal, agent, enjoyer, is nevertheless foreign to every concept (beyond the pale of conceptions). As it transcends the domain of words, and as it is not the object of the dealing-with-ideas-intellect (*vikalpabuddhi*), it is said to be foreign to concepts. The doctrines of the Tīrthikas say: "The words do not go there, the thought does not realise it; therefore it is named *Ātman*."

"The *Ātman* being such, is it reasonable to assert that "the knowledge (*jñāna*) which takes the *Tathatā* as its object, leads to

1 Nanjio 1287, Taisho 1878, vol. 30, p. 275, Col. 1.

deliverence, while the knowledge which takes the Ātman as its object, does not'-? But what is the difference between the *Tathatā* and the *Ātman*, since both are ineffable and real? It is only by *esprit de parti* (*pakṣagrahaṇa*) that it is so said." To conclude: Bhāvaviveka does not admit this *Tathatā*, which is described both as real and non-existing.²)

LOUIS DE LA VALLEE POUSSIN

² Candrakīrti too condemns the *Tathatā* of the Vijñānavādins, *Ytti*, pp. 176 and 264: "Lest the auditors should be frightened we say that there is a *scarūpa* of the fire"

Avadāna and Apadāna

The division of the Buddhist Scriptures into nine aṅgas is well known. It is mentioned repeatedly in the Pāli Canon itself, and has remained constant throughout the Pāli tradition: *Ekacce moghapurisā dhammaṃ pariyūpunanti, suttam geyyam veyyākaraṇam gātham udānam itivuttakam jātakam abbhutadhammaṃ vedallam* (M. i, 133). The *Mahāvvyutpatti* however has twelve aṅgas, that is, after *udāna* it adds *nidāna* and *avadāna*, and at the end *upadeśa*.¹ Max Müller in his preface to the *Dharmasaṃgraha*, p. iii, speaks of the Hīnayāna as having nine aṅgas and the Mahāyāna twelve. His statement probably rests upon the fact that the *Mahāvvyutpatti* has a list of twelve, but that this list is Mahāyānic is not at all proved. There is much that is Sarvāstivādin in that work. The *Dharmasaṃgraha* itself has more claim to be considered Mahāyānic, yet it gives nine aṅgas, *navāṅgapravacanāni*. The work is attributed in the colophon to Nāgārjuna himself, and the attribution, even if not correct, must have been made by a Mahāyānist.

The list there given (No. 62) is *sūtra, geya, vyākaraṇa, gāthā, udāna, jātaka, vaipulya, abbhutadharma, upadeśa*. It differs from the Pāli (apart from the minor differences mentioned) by omitting *itivr̥ttaka* and adding *upadeśa*. It also, like *Mvyut.*, inverts the order of *vaipulya* (*vedalla*) and *abbhutadharma*. It is quite possible that it is a Hīnayāna list, but it was evidently accepted by a Mahāyāna writer. Even when we come to indisputable Mahāyāna works, we still fail to find twelve aṅgas. The *Lotus*, ch. 2. p. 46, makes Buddha say:

नवाङ्गमेतन्मम शासनं च प्रकाशितं

and a few lines above it specifies these nine:

सूत्राणि भाषामि तथैव गाथा इतिवृत्तकं जातकमद्भुतं च ।

निदान औपम्यशतैश्च चित्रैर्गेयं च भाषामि तथोपदेशान् ॥

1 There are minor variations, *itivuttaka* and *itivr̥ttaka*, *vedalla* and *vaipulya*, which are passed by for the present.

Here are further differences. It retains *itivṛttaka*, but omits *vyākaraṇa* and *udāna*. It makes the list up to nine by adding *nidāna* and *upadeśa*, but has no *avadāna*. *Aupamyasatais ca citraiḥ* is doubtless a poetical equivalent for *vaipulya*, for to a Mahāyānist those works were exactly those 'varied with hundreds of similes'. The *Lotus* is usually reckoned an early Mahāyāna sūtra, but even when we come to a definitely late work, like the *Kāraṇḍavyūha*, there is still no *avadāna*. The list in this work (p. 81) has eleven aṅgas, corresponding with *Mvyut.*, except that it omits *avadāna*. The list recurs later on (p. 86), where there are only ten aṅgas, as it there omits *nidāna* as well.

We are therefore scarcely justified in describing the list of twelve aṅgas as characteristic of Mahāyāna. On the contrary the three aṅgas added to the Pāli list have nothing characteristically Mahāyāna about them. These are *nidāna*, *avadāna*, and *upadeśa*. *Nidāna* is well known in Pāli, though not as a separate aṅga. *Upadeśa* is so little characteristic of Mahāyāna that in the Tibetan collection there is only one item of that name, *Mahāyānopadeśa*, which also occurs as No. 41 in the list of Mahāyāna works in *Mvyut.*- 65. The case of *avadāna* is still more striking. In the Tibetan collection there are eight items expressly called *avadāna*. One of these is the *Avadānaśataka* itself, and seven others are single *avadānas*, four easily recognisable as from the *Divyāvadāna*, both well known Sarvāstivādin works². This means that the bulk, if not all, of the *avadānas* recognised in the Tibetan as canonical are Sarvāstivādin. The later works known as *Avadānamālā* are Mahāyānist and elaborations by individual poets of the material of the *avadānas*, but they are not a part of the *drādaśāṅgadharmapraracanam*.

If the term *vaipulya* were an addition in the list of twelve, there would be a reason for calling this longer list Mahāyānist, but it or the corresponding term *vedalla* occurs in all the lists, and it evidently has some relation to *vedalla*. What relation that it is has never been explained. The terms can easily be derived from *vidala* and *vipula*

² Cf. *Index des Kundsurs*, Nos. 338, 341-7, 356 (St. Petersburg, 1875). Csoma de Koros, *Analyse du Kandjour* (ed. Foer), pp. 284, 285. There are also other *avadānas* there without the name

respectively, and *vaipulya* as a term for the sūtras 'of great extent' is an intelligible description of such sūtras, but it throws no light on the term *vedalla*. The Pāli word appears to have been beyond the comprehension of the commentators, and the hopelessness of the moderns may be seen from the fact that the Pali Text Society's Dictionary ignores Burnouf's derivation from *vidala*, and suggests (1) that the latter part of the word may be a distortion of *ariya*, (2) that the whole word is from 'vedāṅga'. It appears as if the Sanskritisers instead of trying to adapt an unintelligible term substituted for it a term of their own which had a familiar meaning. It has to be borne in mind that both Pāli and Sanskrit rest upon an earlier form of the Canon in some form of Prākṛt, and what the word may have been in that Prākṛt we do not know. As *avadāna* forms a very characteristic portion of the Sarvāstivādin literature, it appears probable that the list of twelve aṅgas (the only list mentioning *avadāna*) is really of Sarvāstivādin origin, and that the shorter Mahāyāna lists reproduce portions of this in various ways.

There is general agreement that the works of the type of the *Divyāvadāna* and *Avadānaśataka* originated with the Sarvāstivādins. Through the labours of Nanjio, Anesaki, S. Lévi and others we now have a clear idea of the structure of the Canon of the Sarvāstivādins and other related schools like the Dharmaguptas. Besides the Vinayas, which like the Pāli Vinaya contain a store of legends, there are the four āgamas corresponding to the first four Pāli Nikāyas, and also containing legends. But the *avadānas* are not a part of the āgamas. They consist of collections of legends taken chiefly from the Vinaya and combined so as to form a particular type of literature, the type in fact which forms the aṅga known as *avadāna*. The fact that it was drawn from canonical sources made it an easy matter to treat it as part of the Canon. The sources of its composition have been shown most fully in the case of the *Divyāvadāna* by S. Lévi.³ He has identified more than two thirds of the legendary part as being from the Vinaya of the Mūla Sarvāstivādins. There is also, as in the case of other *avadānas*, much that has been drawn from the sūtras. It is

³ *Les éléments de formation du Divyāvadāna* in *T'oung Pao*, 1907, p. 105 ff.

necessary to state these details, because the avadāna literature has sometimes been studied without any recognition of the fact that it is literature of a particular type. Windisch has given an excellent analysis of the *Mahāvastu* without once mentioning that it is an avadāna.⁴ This work belongs to another school, the Lokottaravāda, but it shows the same features of composition as the Sarvāstivādin avadānas, and expressly states its source. It does not, as has been asserted, claim to be the Vinaya, but the 'Great Story' of the *Vinaya-piṭaka* according to the text of the Mahāsamghikas, the Lokottaravādins of Madhyadeśa.⁵ Accordingly the compiler or compilers have gone through their Vinaya and collected all they could find which contributed to the *Mahāvastu*, the Great Story of the career of Śākyamuni, and have put it down with all its repetitions and all the sūtras, vyākaraṇas or jātakas from the rest of the Canon which contribute to the story of any of the characters.

All this literature is very different from what we know of the Pāli *Apadāna*. 'Avadāna' says Speyer, "is interchangeable with *Apadāna*". This is doubtless true of the etymology of the words. Whatever the root of the word is, there is little doubt that *ava-* is the Prākṛt form of *ap-*, and that the two words coincide in sense in so far as they mean 'glorious achievement' or 'heroic story'. But this does not make them the same type of literature, any more than a novel is an epic. The only prose apadāna in the Pāli Canon is the *Mahāpadāna-sutta* in the *Dīgha N.*, which gives in a schematic form the careers of the last seven Buddhas, while the collection of Pāli apadānas known as *Apadāna* is a work in verse of a uniform character. Neither of them possesses the features of the Sanskrit Avadānas. There was in the Pāli Canon enough store of legends to have made it easy to produce works similar to the Sanskrit compositions, but this was never

4 *Die Komposition des Mahāvastu* (Abh. k. suchs. Ges. d. Wiss., 27), Leipzig 1909.

5 *Aryamahāsamghikānāṃ lokottaravādināṃ madhyadeśikānāṃ pāṭhena vinayapiṭakasya mahāvastuye ādi. Mahāvastu*, vol. i. 2.

6 This Prakrit origin of the term is another indication of the Sarvāstivādin origin of the avadāna, for it is now recognised that the Sanskrit Canon of this sect was originally Prakrit.

done. Such legends still remain scattered in the *Vinaya* and commentaries of the later commentators. The Sarvāstivādins and related schools remained for centuries in India with a continuous growth, and once the collection of legends in a characteristic form as *avadāna* was begun, the further development was easy, and so we find the Aśoka legend drawn in. In Ceylon, on the other hand, the Theravādin Canon appears to have been earlier recognised as definitely closed. Hence it is that we never find a mention of Aśoka in the Canon. The Theravādins had the Aśokan legends, much as we find them in the *Divyāvadāna*, but they remained in the commentaries. The Sarvāstivādins by their invention of a new literary form and of a method which preserved the appearance of *Buddhavacana* were able to elaborate such legends into an *Aśokāvadāna*. Any legend referring to any period or age could be inserted by the device of introducing Buddha to explain the events recounted of the past or to prophesy about the future destiny of the characters in the legend. It remained *Buddhavacana* owing to the portions of Sutta or Vinaya interwoven into the story.

EDWARD J. THOMAS

The Kārdamaka Kings

In the Kanheri Inscription of the *amātya* Sateraka the queen of Vāsiṣṭhīputra Śrī Sātakarṇi is described as “*Kārdamaka-vaṃśa-prabharā Mahākṣatrapa Ru.....putrī.*” The Mahākṣatrapa Ru.....has been identified with the Great Saka Satrap Rudradāman I who ruled over Malwa, Gujarat and some adjoining territories about the middle of the second century A.D. The term *Kārdamaka-vaṃśa* has, however, not yet been satisfactorily explained. In the *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali (iv. 2) and the *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭilya (ii. 11) we have a similar expression *Kārdamika*. Dr. Bühler thinks it not improbable that *Kārdamaka-rāja* may have been a title of the Western Kṣatrapas apparently derived from a place called Kārdama (*I.A.*, XII. 273). In this connection he refers to a locality called Kardamila known from the *Mahābhārata*, and also to the expression *Kardama-rāja* which occurs in the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* (VI. 200) as the name or title of a Kashmirian prince. The position of Kardamila has not, however, been indicated by him. As to Kardama-rāja mentioned by Kalhana it is to be noted that it is a personal name which need not have any reference to the *Kārdamaka-vaṃśa* which is undoubtedly a dynastic designation, although (as Rapson points out) it is uncertain as to whether it is the designation of the paternal or maternal ancestors of the queen of Vāsiṣṭhīputra Sātakarṇi.

In the *Political History of Ancient India* (third edition, pp. 296, 343) the suggestion has been made that the Kārdamaka family probably derived its name from the river Kardama in Pārasīka or Persia (*Pārasīkeṣu Kardama nāma nadī*—Com. on *Arthaśāstra*, ii. 11). The commentator on the *Arthaśāstra* does not, however, give us any indication as to the particular province of Persia where the river in question is to be located. As the Kārdamakas are ancestors of a Saka princess, possibly the daughter of the Great Satrap Rudradāman I, it is permissible to conjecture that they are to be looked for in one of the two regions of the Persian Empire which were specially associated with the Sakas viz. (1) Sakasthāna or Seistan, the valley of the Helmand, and

(2) the vast plains of the Syr Darya or Jaxartes referred to as 'Para-Sugda' in the Hamadan inscription of Darius. In the opinion of Professor Herzfeld, the editor of the inscription, the fertile valley of the Zarafshan river as far as the banks of the Syr Darya, was included within the old Achæmenian satrapy of Bactria or Balkh. And it is interesting to note that there is actual evidence of the existence of an Indian tradition connecting a line of 'Kārddama' kings with Bālhika or Bāhlika, modern Balkh. The Uttara-Kāṇḍa of the *Rāmāyaṇa* knows a dynasty of kings whose progenitor is called Kārddameya (ch. 100, 19; 102, 20) or Kārddama (100, 29):—

uttīṣṭhottīṣṭha rājarse Kārddameya Mahābala (100. 19)

na santāpastuyā kāryaḥ Kārddameya Mahābala (102. 20)

eraṃ sa rājā puruṣo māsaṃ bhūtvātha Kārddamaḥ (100. 29).

The Kārddamas were closely related to the 'Aila' (lunar) race. They are said to have been descended from a *prajāpati* named *Karddama* (100. 3-7) and ruled over Bālhi or Bālhika:—

śruyate hi purā saumya Karddamasya prajāpateḥ

putro Bāhlīśvaraḥ śrīmānIlo nāma sudhārmikaḥ

This Bāhli (Bālhi) or Bālhika (100.7) lay outside the Madhya-deśa (103. 21) and should, therefore, be distinguished from the place of the same name mentioned in the Ayodhyā-Kāṇḍa (68. 18) as lying to the west (cf. *Pratyānmukho* of verse 13) of the river Ikṣumatī and to the east of Mount Sudāman and *Viṣṇopadaṃ*. The position of this 'Viṣṇupada' in relation to the Vipāsū (Ayodhyā K., 68. 19) or the Beas suggests that it is identical with 'Viṣṇupada-giri' of the Meharauli Iron Pillar inscription of Candrar and, therefore, stood close to Delhi.

Nor is it reasonable to identify the Bālhi of the Uttara-Kāṇḍa with the territory of the Madras in the central Punjab on the strength of some passages of the *Mahābhārata* (Ādi., 113, 3; 125, 21 etc.) because the Madra kings are not styled 'Kārddama,' and the word 'Bālhika' in these passages may very well be a copyist's mistake for Bāhika (cf. the reference in Ādi. 67. 6, to Śalya, king of the Madras, *sa Śalya itī rikhyāto jajñe Bāhika-puṅgavaḥ*). So, too, in the passage '*Darado nāma Bālhikaḥ*', the original reading may have been Bāhika. There is no valid reason for equating the term *Bālhika* with *Bāhika* and *Darada*. If the derivation of the name 'Kārddamaka' from the river

Kārdama in Pārasīka is correct then it stands to reason that the home of the Kārddama or Kārddamaka kings should be identified with Bālhika or Balkh in Irān and not with any territory in India proper.

Thus far we have been dealing with the tradition connecting the Kārddama kings with Bālhika. Have we any tradition about their connection with the Dekkan where the Kanheri inscription has been found? Now, the *Brahmapurāṇa* (IV. 12) connects a son of Prajāpati Kārdama with the *Dakṣiṇā diś*:—

*Dakṣiṇasyām diśi tathā
Kārdamasya Prajāpateḥ
putram Saṅkhapadam nāma
rājānaṃ so'bhyaśecayāt*

The verse cited above undoubtedly points to a period when the Kārddamas were associated with the Dekkan. The names Kārdama and Saṅkhapada are doubtless those of eponymous and legendary heroes, probably wholly mythical. But the Kārddamakas are a historic dynasty and tradition recorded in the Epic and Purāṇic literature undoubtedly points to Balkh and that neighbourhood as their early habitat whence they probably migrated to the south. Tradition, it may be conceded, is not history. But it cannot altogether be ignored in attempting an explanation of the term '*Kārddamaka-raṃśa-prabhavā*.'

H. C. RAYCHAUDHURI

What a Deity Represents

There is a great variety of misconceptions prevalent in modern times with regard to the conception of godhead, not only in Hinduism but also in Buddhism. Most people consider the deity to be nothing more than an idol.

The deities are intimately connected, as all students of the Tantras know, with the Sādhana and Siddhi, and the conception of godhead is an essentially spiritual matter.

The Sādhana, as is well known, is concerned with the procedure for worshipping a particular deity. This consists in sitting in meditation in a quiet place, away from crowds, and there practising Yoga till a state similar to deep sleep is brought about. In this state the ascetic communes with the Infinite Spirit, or the inexhaustible store-house of energy, which is supposed to be the creative spirit which created the world structure. The ascetic by this communion draws forth energy from that inexhaustible store-house of energy and becomes powerful himself. This process of the realisation of the Infinite Spirit is what is called Sādhana, and when this Sādhana is practised for a long time with great devotion the ascetic is able to obtain certain supernormal powers which are called Siddhis, or perfections. These perfections are of many kinds, and include revival of the dead, omniscience, miraculous movements, flying in the air, and so forth. Altogether thirty-two kinds of Siddhis are generally recognized, and when an ascetic obtains several of these supernormal powers he is called a Siddha, or a Supernormal Being. In the Tantras, three different types of Siddhas are enumerated, the High, the Middling, and the Low. The highest type of Siddhas are called the Mahāsiddhas, and they are able to fulfil all their desires as soon as they arise in their minds.

The Tantras are, in fact, Sciences dealing with spiritual matters, and giving directions for a variety of psychic exercises. It therefore stands to reason that the Tantra is a Science or a Vidyā requiring competent preceptors and competent disciples. Like all other Vidyās, the Tantra is not open for all and the sundry, but only for those

who are initiated into the mysteries of the science, and are competent to follow the prescribed practices with zeal and patience. These are the right type of disciples for Tāntric practices or what we call 'Adhikārins'. In almost all Tāntric works long chapters are devoted to the qualifications of Gurus and disciples, and there are also rules for testing their respective competence to give or receive initiation.

The Adhikārin must have a certain equipment before he proceeds to receive his initiation in the Tantras from a preceptor. And, in fact, as the path of the Tantra is exceedingly difficult, the disciple is required to have a great deal more equipment than is necessary for pursuing any other Vidyā known to ancient India. First of all, the neophyte must be patient, enduring, devoted and sincere; he must serve the Guru with whole-hearted devotion. But the most important equipment necessary for him is that he should be proficient in the art of Yoga and Haṭhayoga, without which it is impossible to proceed with any Sādhana worth the name, or with any Tāntric practices.

The process for the realisation of the deity, or even the conception of deities, is very detailed, and is given in an elaborate form in the *Guhyasamāja*, a work of the Tāntric Buddhists, written, probably, in the third century A.D. But before an account or a summary is given of this elaborate process, it is necessary to point out that when the Jīvātman and the Paramātman commingle in the highest state of meditation, the mind sky is filled with innumerable visions and scenes, until at last, like sparks, the individual visualises letters or the germ syllables which gradually assume the shape of deities, first indistinct, then changing into perfect, glorious and living forms, the embodiments of the Infinite.' These beings are known as deities, and, once visualized, the deity never leaves the ascetic, but becomes instrumental in giving the ascetic more and more spiritual powers. This process of visualization is described in several well-known works.

l This has been designated in the *Nityotsava* as Parā Sakti by Nityānanda-nātha who gives the following definition :

यस्यादृष्टो नैव भूमण्डलाद्यो यस्यादाद्यो विद्यते न द्वितीयः ।

यस्याज्ञातं नैव शास्त्रं किमन्यैर्यस्याकारः सा परा शक्तिरेव ॥

नित्योत्सव, प० १.

Below are quoted two verses which state clearly the origin of the deities, and their gradual evolution from the germ syllable. In the *Advayavajrasamgraha* it is said:—

स्फूर्तिश्च देवताकारा निःस्वभावा स्वभावतः ।

यथा यथा भवेत् स्फूर्तिः सा तथा शून्यतात्मिका ॥²

“The manifestations of Sūnya are the forms of deities which are by nature non-existent. Wherever there is manifestation, it must also be Sūnya in essence.”

शून्यताबोधितो बीजं बीजाद्विम्बं प्रजायते ।

विम्बे च न्यासविन्यासौ..... ॥³

“From the right perception of Sūnyatā proceeds the germ syllable, from the germ syllable proceeds the conception of an icon, and from the icon its external representation.”

The equipment necessary for persons competent to worship deities, and the nature of the deities themselves, have already been indicated. It is now necessary to describe in detail from the *Guhyasamāja* the process by which an ascetic is able to visualize the deity. The *Guhyasamāja* calls this process Upāya, or ‘means’, which is recognized as of four kinds: Sevā, Upasādhana, Sādhana and Mahāsādhana. Sevā is again sub-divided into two: namely Sāmānya (ordinary) and Uttama (extraordinary). Of these two, the Sāmānya or the ordinary Sevā consists of four Vajras: first the conception of Sūnyatā; second, its transformation into the form of the germ syllable (Bīja); third, its evolution in the form of the deity; and fourth, the external representation of the deity.⁴ This process has already been explained above.

2 *Advayavajrasamgraha*, G.O.S. edition, No. 49, p. 51.

3 *Ibid.*, p. 50.

4 *Guhyasamāja*, G.O.S. edition, No. 53, pp. 162-3.

चतुर्विधमुपायन्तु बोधिवज्रं च वर्णितम् ।

... ..

सेवाविधानं प्रथमं द्वितीयमुपसाधनम् ।

साधनन्तु तृतीयं वै महासाधनं चतुर्थकम् ॥

In the *Uttama Sevā*, Yoga with its six limbs should be employed. These six limbs are: *Pratyāhāra*, *Dhyāna*, *Prāṇāyāma*, *Dhāraṇā*, *Anusmṛti* and *Samādhi*. *Pratyāhāra* is here explained as the process by which the ten sense-organs are controlled. *Dhyāna* is explained as the conception of the five desired objects through the five *Dhyānī* Buddhas, namely, *Vairocana*, *Ratnasambhava*, *Amitābha*, *Amoghasiddhi* and *Akṣobhya*. This *Dhyāna* is again sub-divided into five kinds: *Vitarka*, *Vicāra*, *Prīti*, *Sukha* and *Ekāgratā*.⁵

Prāṇāyāma is the control of the breathing process by which breath, which is of the nature of the five *Bhūtas* or elements and the five kinds of knowledge, and is like a bright jewel, is drawn from inside and placed as a lump at the tip of the nose, and is meditated upon.⁶

Dhāraṇā is the meditation of one's own Mantra on the heart, and the placing of it on the *Prāṇabindu* after restraining the jewel of the sense-organs. When this is done, *Nimittas* or signs make their appearance. These signs are of five different varieties, and appear

सामान्योत्तमभेदेन सेवा तु द्विविधा भवेत् ॥

... ..
 प्रथमं शून्यताबोधि द्वितीयं बोजसंहतम् ।
 तृतीयं बिम्बनिष्पत्तिश्चतुर्थं न्यासमङ्गरम् ॥

5 *Guhyasamāja*, p. 163.

सेवा षडंगयोगेन कृत्वा साधनमुत्तमम् ।
 साधयेदन्यथा नैव जायते सिद्धिरुत्तमा ॥
 प्रत्याहारस्तथा ध्यानं प्राणायामोऽथ धारणा ।
 अनुस्मृतिः समाधिश्च षडंगो योग उच्यते ॥
 दशानामिन्द्रियाणान्तु स्ववृत्तिस्थानान्तु सर्वतः ।
 प्रत्याहारमिति प्रोक्तमाहारप्रतिपत्तये ॥
 पञ्चकामाः समासेन पञ्चबुद्धप्रयोगतः ।
 कल्पनं ध्यानमुच्येत तद् ध्यानं पञ्चधा भवेत् ॥
 चित्तकं च विचारं च प्रीतिश्चैव सुखं तथा ।
 चित्तस्यैकाग्रता चैव पञ्चैते ध्यानसंग्रहाः ॥

6 *Ibid.*, p. 163.

पञ्चज्ञानमयं श्वासं पञ्चभूतस्वभाधकम् ।
 निश्चार्यं पितृरूपेण नासिकाग्रं तु कल्पयेत् ।
 पञ्चषडं महारणं प्राणायाममिति स्मृतम् ॥



successively. First is the sign of Marīcikā, or mirage, the second is that of smoke, the third of fire-flies; the fourth of light, and the fifth takes the form of a constant light like a cloudless sky.⁷

Anusmṛti is the constant meditation of the object for which the psychic exercise is undertaken, and by this Pratibhāsa or 'revelation' takes place. After commingling the two elements Prajñā and Upāya, the whole objective world should be conceived as contracted in the form of a lump, and this should be meditated upon in the Bimba or circle. By this process the transcendental knowledge is suddenly realised, and it is known as Samādhi.⁸

For the purpose of visualization it is necessary that the process should be continued for six months, and this should be done, according to the *Guhyasamāja*, always while enjoying all kinds of desires. If within six months the visualisation of the deity does not take place, the process should be repeated thrice while following the rules of restraint duly prescribed. Even with this if the deity is not realised, it should be done by the practice of Haṭhayoga. By this Yoga the ascetic attains the knowledge of the deity.⁹

7 *Guhyasamāja*, p. 164.

स्वमन्त्रं हृदये ध्यात्वा प्राणबिन्दुगतं न्यसेत् ।
 निरुध्य चेन्द्रियं रत्नं धारयन् धारणा स्मृतम् ॥
 निरोधवज्रगते चित्ते निमित्तमुक्तायते ।

 प्रथमं मरीचिकाकारं धूञ्जाकारं द्वितीयकम् ॥
 तृतीयं सद्योताकारं चतुर्थं दीपवज्ज्वलम् ।
 पञ्चमन्तु सदालोकं निरञ्जं गगनसञ्चिभम् ॥

8 *Ibid.*, p. 164.

विभाव्य यदनुस्मृत्या तदाकारन्तु संस्मरेत् ।
 अनुस्मृतिरिति ज्ञेया प्रतिभासोऽत्र जायते ॥
 प्रज्ञोपायसमापत्त्या सर्वभावान् समासतः ।
 संहृत्य पियङ्गयोगेन विम्बमध्ये विभावनम् ।
 भवति ज्ञाननिष्पत्तिः समाचिरिति संज्ञितः ॥

9 *Ibid.*, p. 165.

दर्शनं च द्विधा यावत् तावत् परमासभावनम् ।
 सर्वकामोपभोगैस्तु कर्तव्यं सर्वतः सदा ॥

The above incidentally shows what part is played by Rājayoga and Haṭhayoga in the conception of godhead. It shows, also, that the Tantras begin where Yoga ends. Therefore, the worshippers of deities must be first adepts in Yoga before they make an attempt to follow the more advanced science of the Tantras, which, obviously, is not meant for ordinary people. The conception of godhead in Buddhist as well as the Hindu Tantras is thus philosophically most profound.

The individual soul is called the Jīvātman, while the Infinite is known as Paramātman, and when they combine in the state of the highest meditation, an artificial condition brought about by constant practice of Yoga, the deity appears in flashes or in sparks. The nature of the Jīvātman being finite, it is not possible to realise the Infinite in its entirety, that is to say, the result of the mystic experience of the Jīvātman also remains finite. And as the object for which the worshipper sits in meditation is different in different cases, the deity visualized also becomes different. It is the Bhāvanā of the worshipper which is of the nature of a psychic force, which re-acts on the Infinite Energy, giving rise to different manifestations according to the nature of the re-action. The nature of this re-action is of illimitable variety and, therefore, the resultant deity also appears in an infinite variety of forms, and this is the chief reason why we find innumerable gods and goddesses in the pantheons of the Hindus and the Buddhists. The ascetic who visualises a particular deity, generally makes it a rule to describe the deity and the particular process by which this visualisation took place for the benefit of his disciples, so that the latter may realise the deity in the easiest and most efficient manner.

B. BHATTACHARYYA

दर्शनं यदि वयमासुर्यदुक्तं नैव जायते ।
आरभेत त्रिभिर्वारैर्यथोक्तविधिसम्भारैः ॥
दर्शनं तु कृतेऽप्येते साधकस्य न जायते ।
यदा न सिध्यते बोधिहंठयोगेन साधयेत् ।
ज्ञानसिद्धिस्तदा तस्य योगेनैवोपजायते ॥

On some Tibetan names of the Buddha

Every Sanskrit scholar acquainted with Tibetan and the Tibetan mania for etymological translations must have been puzzled by the two most frequent names of the Buddha in that language, viz., *sañs-rgyas* and *bcom-ldan-ñdas*. Are they translations of a Sanskrit compound, such as **सम्यक्संबुद्धः**, or of two uncompounded terms as, e.g. **बुद्धो भगवान्** or, if not, what is their origin? There are, of course, in Tibetan literature explanations for both of them, but I have seen none, either by a Tibetan or by an Indian or Western or Japanese scholar, which completely answers the question as to their Sanskrit original. I therefore venture to offer my own explanation of these terms.

There can be no doubt, to begin with, that either term is indeed, as Tibetan scholars hold, an *abbreviated compound*. The parts of either are also, excepting *sañs*, easily recognisable, but less so is the reason for which they were compounded.

Sañs means, according to three explanations quoted in his *Dictionary* by Sarat Chandra Das, either 'fully awakened [from the slumber of Avidyā]' or 'purified [from all the sins arising from Avidyā]' or 'liberated [from the beginning]'. Now, as there is no other term in Tibetan which could be regarded as a direct translation of the title **बुद्धः** and as it is unthinkable that no direct translation of it should have been attempted, we have first of all to ask whether *sañs.pa* may not actually mean 'awakened' or 'awaked'. That this is so, we learn from Jäschke who (on p. 458a of his *Dictionary*) states that in the *Dzanglun* the word is once connected with *ra.ro.ba.las* 'from intoxication' and another time with *gzim.pa.las* 'from a deep sleep'. Associating herewith, as we can hardly avoid to do, the phrase *ñtshon-rgya.bar. ñgyur.ba* 'to become a Buddha' we arrive at the conclusion that there must have once been in Tibetan by the side of *ñtshan.ba*, *tshanñs* 'to press into, to stuff' and *sañ.ba*, *sañs* 'to do away with, remove, cleanse' (e.g., in *sñun.sañs* 'the disease is removed') a now obsolete present *ñtshan.ba* 'to awaken' or 'to awake' with its still existing perfect *sañs*. The latter in *sañs.rgyas*, then, undoubtedly does mean **बुद्धः**. Why, then, was the Buddha not simply called *sañs.pa*?


Because of the well known pedantic anxiety of the Tibetans to translate with absolute accuracy. The translators here, as elsewhere now and then, had become aware of the insufficiency of a literal translation. An extreme case of this kind is the translation of वातायनेषु in *Buddhacarita*, III 18, by *rlun.brgyod.skar.khun.rnams.su* where the Tibetan word for 'window', viz., *skar.khun* (star-hole) has been added to the literal translation of the Sanskrit वातायनम् (wind-passage), because *rlun.brgyod* has not in Tibetan the conventionally restricted meaning of वातायनम् | *Saṅs.pa* means 'awakened' in quite a general sense, as also 'removed, cleansed, purified', and it lacks the *positive* sense conveyed by the term बुद्धः. Therefore, to make good for this want and coin a technical term recognizable as such in Tibetan, the addition to *saṅs.pa* of *ye.śes.rgyas.pa* or *śes.rab.rgyas.pa* 'wide (perfect) in wisdom (प्रज्ञा)', was deemed necessary, and thus the compound *saṅs.ye.śes.rgyas* was created and further abbreviated in the same way as many other frequently used compounds. The result was that *saṅs.rgyas* practically ceased to be felt as a compound and was freshly compounded with *rdzogs.pa* (a synonym of *rgyas.pa*) and other 'prepositions' in *mñon.par.rdzogs.par.saṅs.rgyas.par.* = अभि-सं-बुद्धः and *yan.day.par.rdzogs.paḥi.saṅs.rgyas* = सम्यक्-सं-बुद्धः.

An altogether analogous case is *bcom.ldan.ḥdas* 'the victoriously consummated' (Schiefner) or 'he who, sated with conquest, has passed beyond' (Sarat Chandra Das). If *bcom* means भगः 'success, victory' (S. Ch. Das), then *bcom.ldan* means of course भगवान्, and the translation of this term alone, and not of a double term of which it was a part, can have been intended. This is also admitted by भगवान् only being given as the Sanskrit equivalent of *bcom.ldan.ḥdas*. For what purpose then, was *ḥdas.[pa]* added? Because *bcom.ldan* by itself does not mean भगवान् but 'victorious, triumphant [over enemies]' and thus, without an additional label, must be understood as an epithet of kings rather than of ascetics. And there can be but little doubt that *ḥdas* is nothing but the remainder of a current expression shortened by composition, viz., of *myan-ḥdas* (being itself a contraction of *mya.nan.las.ḥdas.pa*) 'which is now the usual, non-literal, Tibetan version of निर्वाण (Jäschke), but really means 'one who has passed away from sufferings', i.e., 'attained Nirvāṇa.'

Among the terms which did not require an additional label, because they are clearly an individual designation, is *de.b'zin.g'segs.pa* 'gone (or come) like those (or that one)', the Tibetan equivalent of तथागतः. It is another question whether this Tibetan translation, which follows the usual traditional explanation, is in accordance with the original meaning of the term. I think it is not. To my mind तथागतः in primitive Buddhism was just as little used in the literary sense as it is in non-Buddhist Sanskrit where it is (as early as, and probably earlier than, the *Rgveda-Prātisākhya* synonymous with तथाभूतः, तथागुणः, एवरूपः एवंगतः meaning 'of such qualities (kind, nature, condition).') But as a Buddhist religious term the word had, of course, from the beginning a more definite meaning (comp. तथात्वम्, तथाता of later Buddhism), viz. 'being in such a condition [as is most desirable]' = 'the ideal man, the perfect man.' That this original meaning of तथागतः was still remembered even when it had already been obscured by scholastic sophistry, is shown by several passages in the Nikāyas such as the one of the *Aggañña-Sutta* translated by Mrs. Rhys Davids (though, curiously, with a foot-note explaining तथागतः as 'the thus-come' or 'thus-gone') as follows (*Buddhism*, p. 236): ".....because such names as these, belonging to the Norm (dhamma), or to the Highest; and again, One with the Norm, or the Highest, are tantamount to Tathāgata."

Note.—The author wishes to state that the usual method of transliterating Tibetan, as applied by the editor to the above paper (the manuscript of which has the Tibetan words in the native script), is not the one recommended by him. For the latter (which in his opinion is also preferable to Professor Liebich's recent suggestions on pp. 238 ff. of his *Kṣīrataraṅgiṇī*) he begs to draw attention to his review of Jaschke's *Tibetan Grammar*, new edition, in *Orientalische Literaturzeitung*, 1931, columns 760-762.

F. OTTO SCHRADER



Kannabudhi Inscription

I.H.Q., March, 1933

*By the courtesy of the
Rungpore Sahitya Parishat*

Muhammad Bakhtyar's Expedition to Tibet

In the *Indian Historical Quarterly* for 1927, on page 843, Mahamahopadhyaya Padmanath Bhattacharyya, in the course of a criticism of the second edition of Gait's *History of Assam*, referred to an important rock-inscription. It is situated at a place called Kānāi-badaśī-bāoā, about a mile north-east from the northern bank of the Brahmaputra, opposite the east-end of the town of Gauhati in Assam. It records, both in figures and words that on the 13th of Caitra, in Śaka 1127, the Turks or Turuṣkas were annihilated on reaching Kāmarūpa. The Mahamahopadhyaya says that the date corresponds to the 27th March, 1206 A.D.

The record at that time did not attract the attention it deserves. The Mahamahopadhyaya has re-edited the inscription with a fair illustration in his recent publication *Kāmarūpa-Śāsanāvali* (Inscriptions from Kāmarūpa), Introduction, p. 44. This excellent publication, in which all the inscriptions relating to Kāmarūpa have been brought together, with the texts in Nāgarī characters and with Bengali translations and illustrations, would certainly have attracted the attention of Indologists all over the world, had it been published in English.

Through the courtesy of Mr. K. L. Barua, Minister to the Government of Assam, I obtained a fresh photograph of the Kānāibadaśī inscription. The Mahamahopadhyaya's transcription of the text is perfectly right. I give the text and its translation below.

Śaka 1127

Śāke turagayugmeśe Madhumāsatrayodaśe/

Kāmarūpaṃ samāgātya Turuṣkāḥ kṣayamāyayuh//

Translation:—In Śaka (expressed by) Horse, Two and Iśa (horse=7, Two=2, Iś=11, i.e., 1127) on the 13th of the month of Madhu (i.e. Caitra), the Turuṣkas obtained annihilation on arriving in Kāmarūpa.

The Mahamahopadhyaya has worked out the equivalent of the date as the 27th March, 1206 A.D. The Śaka dates are traditionally reckoned in completed years. So this date would mean, when 1127 years

had been completed and when it was the 13th Caitra of the next year. During this period, the solar year began on the 25th March, according to the Julian Calendar. So the last day of the month Caitra, the 30th Caitra corresponded to the 24th March. Thus the 13th Caitra, 1127 Śāka, corresponds to the 7th March, 1206 A.D.

This record has naturally been taken to refer to the historic disaster that overtook Muhammad Bakhtyar and his aggressive army on their return march from his expedition to Tibet. The date of the disaster can fairly accurately be calculated from the records in the *Tabakat-i-Nasiri*. It expressly states that the disaster happened in 602 H (Raverty, p. 573). The month and date of the event are indicated by the following account of Muhammad's broodings at Devkot, when he reached the place after the disaster. "During the adversity, he would be constantly saying—'Can any calamity have befallen the Sultan-i-Ghazi, that my good fortune hath deserted me!' and such was the case, for at that time the Sultan-i-Ghazi, Muizzuddin Muhammad-i-Sam had attained martyrdom" (Raverty, p. 572). This event happened on the 1st Shaban, 602 H (Raverty, pp. 484-85). This date corresponds to the 13th March, 1206 A.D. by the Julian reckoning. So it was by this date that Muhammad was brooding over his misery at Devkot. The disaster in Kāmarūpa took place immediately before this date and is strangely confirmed by the Kānāibadaśī inscription which says that the event happened on the 7th March, 1206 A.D.

The site of the Kānāibadaśī inscription, practically opposite modern Gauhati, gives rise to the presumption that the encounter between the forces of Kāmarūpa and the retreating Turks took place not far from the place of the record and the victorious party exultingly recorded their victory at the place where their leaders were in waiting. As the topography of Muhammad Bakhtyar's campaign has never been satisfactorily settled and Raverty's comments made confusion worse confounded, it would be useful if we study the text of the *Tabakat-i-Nasiri* afresh. The text, as translated by Raverty, is therefore quoted below with necessary comments.

TEXT

"After Muhammad-i-Bakhtyar possessed himself of that territory (Rai

Lakhmaniāh's) he left the city of Nudiah in desolation and the place which is (now) Lakhnawati he made the seat of Government.....

“After some years had passed away and he had ascertained the state of the different mountain tracts of Turkistan and Tibbat to the eastward of Lakhnawati, the ambition of seizing the country of Turkistan and Tibbat began to torment his brain; and he had an army got ready and about 10,000 horse were organised.....One of the chiefs of the tribes of Kunch and Mej whom they were wont to call Ali, the Mej, fell into the hands of Muhammad-i-Bakhtyar, the Khalj, and at his hands also, the former adopted the Muhammadan faith. He agreed to conduct Muhammad-i-Bakhtyar into those hills and act as guide; and he brought the latter to a place where there is a city, the name of which is Burdhan (kot).” Raverty, p. 559.

COMMENTS

It is necessary to study Rennell's Bengal Atlas, sheet No. V closely in order to ascertain the topography of Muhammad Bakhtyar's route during this expedition.

Raverty has not discussed the starting point of the expedition. Blochmann says:—‘He seems to have set out from Lakhnautī or Devkot’ (*JASB.*, 1875, p. 282). But there is no talk of Devkot yet, which is mentioned as the place where Muhammad took shelter after his discomfiture. The seat of Government was fixed at Lakhnautī and the expedition must be taken to have started from Lakhnautī.

The direction in which the troops proceeded is not mentioned. Rennell's sheet No. V shows a bewildering maze of roads. There is no doubt about the fact that Muhammad had communication from the king of Kāmarūpa on the way to Tibet and was held up and worsted by the forces of Kāmarūpa on his return from Tibet. Also, before starting, Muhammad made inquiries regarding the state of the country *eastwards* of Lakhnautī and not in any other direction. So, when starting from Lakhnautī, his first object was to proceed eastwards and reach Kāmarūpa. The easiest way to do so was to follow the highways that led to the east. A glance at the map will show the routes that were open to Muhammad. Three principal roads can be distinguished. The northernmost one starts from Māldā, reaches Dinājpur via Devkot (Damdamāh) and passes through Rangpur, Kuḍigrām and Dinhāṭṭa to Rāngāmāṭi. The

second more southerly route joins the first route at Kuḍigrām after passing through Niśānpur, Buxyganj, Ghodāghāt and Ulipur. The southernmost route bifurcates from the second route at Niśānpur, passes straight east by Kūñchan to Sibganj where it crosses the Karatoyā and then it goes north to Govindaganj and Bardhankuṭhi and joins the second route a few miles further north.

The narrative of the *Tabakat* expressly states that Ali Mech led the army to a city called Burdhankot. It will be seen later that possibly Ali Mech was not with the army at this stage. Any way, the army came to Bardhankot. Raverty cites some variants of the name from different manuscripts, one of which is Murdhan or Murdhankot. If Murdhan be the correct name of the place to which the army was led, Nek-Marddan, the famous cattle fair in the Dinājpur district at once suggests itself. The place is 37 miles northwest of Dinājpur and 16 miles south-west of Ṭākurgāon, a subdivisional town of the district. From time immemorial, a cattle fair, the biggest in Bengal, is held every year at this place, which, of itself is not of much importance now, having only about 500 inhabitants (*Dinajpur Gazetteer*, p. 139). The persistence of this extraordinary fair at this place is an evidence of its ancient glory. The place is directly north of Lakhnautī and on the high road leading to the north. From Nek-Marddan which is in Mālduār State (about eight miles north-west of Pīrgañj) the road passes north-east-east by Gobinagar, Cālpauni, Lālbāzār and Cooch-Behār to Rāngāmāṭi. Muhammad may have preferred this route to the southern routes in order to avoid crossing a number of rivers near their mouths, where they are the broadest. But the prefix Nek of the name Nek-Marddan is a difficulty hard to reconcile. This route, again is undoubtedly more circuitous than the other three and passed through more jungly and less civilized tracts. A man of common sense is more likely to prefer marching through inhabited tracts with plenty of provisions. The southern routes thus get preference and as a place called Bardhankuṭhi actually stands on the southernmost route, this has naturally to be preferred above all others. It is necessary to recall at this stage what the *Tabakat* says about Burdhankot.

TEXT

“They relate after this manner that in ancient times, Shah Gushtasib returned from the country of Chin and came towards Kamrud and by this route got into Hindustan and founded that city (Burdhankot). A river flows in front of that place, of vast magnitude, the name of which is Begmati; and when it enters the country of Hindustan, they style it, in the Hindu dialect, Samund (ocean); and in magnitude, breadth and depth, it is three times more than the river Gang. To the banks of this river, Muhammad-i-Bakhtyar came and Ali, the Mej, joined the army of Islam.”

COMMENTS

The fact that the text is corrupt was noticed by Raverty himself, as he says in a foot-note:—“The reader cannot fail to notice that considerable discrepancy exists here in our author’s statements respecting this river and bridge.”

Ali Mech is said in the last passage to have conducted the army to Burdhankot, in front of which flowed the large river, three times as big as the Ganges. But in the passage under discussion, Muhammad is said to have arrived at the bank of this big river, where Ali Mech joined him. These two statements are contradictory. Which of these two statements is right? Muhammad certainly did not require a guide in the territory under his immediate occupation. And the region of Bardhankuthi, if not within the territory of Muhammad, cannot have been far beyond it. Thus, the probability is in favour of Ali joining Muhammad on the bank of the great river. Up to Bardhankuthi and even beyond, Muhammad could very well manage for himself.

Bardhankuthi is close to Govindagañj in the present Raigpur district, on the Raigpur-Bogrā border. It is about 20 miles north of Bogrā civil station and 12 miles north of Mahasthāngarh. Govindagañj stands on the left bank of the Karatoyā and Bardhankuthi is about a mile to its east. Govindagañj is prominently marked on Rennell’s sheet No. V on 1° east Calcutta Longitude and Bardhankuthi is also shown close to it, mis-spelt Burgancooty. It is a place of high antiquity and is at present the residence of a Zamindār, whose ancestors during the 16th century A.D. were proprietors of the big zamindārī of Ghodāghāt, comprising—the greater part of the Dinājpur district,

a portion of Raingpur in the south and nearly the whole of the districts of Bogrā and Māldā.' (*Raingpur Gazetteer*, p. 137). The present Dinājpur Rāj Estate was formed out of this big Zamindārī of Ghodāghāt.

The large river in front of Burdhankot which Minhaj calls Begmatī presents some difficulty. It was thrice as broad as the Ganges. This name and description has given rise to an amazing amount of confusion. Raverty (pp. 561-62, f. n.) recognises that this description suits only the great Brahmaputra river. "From what he says about the size, we are led to conclude that this river Begmatī or Bekmatī must be the Brahmaputra; but what part of it is the question to be solved".

Blochmann is of different opinion. He says:—"According to Minhaj, a large river flows in front of (*dar pesh*) the town. This can only refer to Karatoyā, which formed so long the boundary of ancient Muhammadan Bengal and later, of the Koch and the Koch-Hajo dominions. In fact, it was the boundary between Bengal and Kāmarūpa at the time of the Mahābhārata. Though the river in front of Bardhankot is said to have the name of Bagmatī, no other river than the Karatoyā can possibly be meant" (*JASB.*, 1875, pp. 282-283).

Blochmann is generally very acute and correct in his observations. But it is difficult to support him here. He seems to have forgotten altogether that Bardhankuṭhi is on the eastern bank of the Karatoyā, and to reach Bardhankuṭhi, Muhammad would have had to cross this river, three times as broad as the Ganges. And then, having crossed over to the Kāmarūpa side, it would not have been necessary for him to march along its bank for ten days and at last take the help of a bridge to recross it. Rai Ramaprasad Chanda Bahadur, late of the Archaeological Survey, saw this difficulty and in a Bengali article in the now defunct *Journal Sāhitya for Śrāvan*, 1320 B.S. (1918 A.D.) he proposed to identify Burdhan(kot), with Paṇḍravardhana, present Mahāsthāngarh, on the west bank of the Karatoyā. But it has yet to be proved that Paṇḍra-Vardhana was ever called simply Bardhan or Bardhankot, or that the place, which has long been known as Mahāsthān and whose identification with Paṇḍravardhana was so long a difficult problem, retained its name as late as 1200 A.D.

Then the size of the river is a difficulty which cannot be lightly overcome and can hardly be made to fit the Karatoyā.

Karatoyā, as marked on Rennell's map, is an insignificant stream (1783 A.D.). On Vanden Brouke's map (1631 A.D.? *Akbar* by V. A. Smith, p. 473; 1660 A.D.? *Rangpur Gazetteer*, p. 9), Ghodāghāṭ and Sherpur-Murchā are shown on its bank. There, it is a much larger river than on Rennell's, but it is shown to originate from the Brahmaputra and is much thinner in comparison. The silly tradition that at one time, Karatoyā was so large a river that Sherpur-Murchā in the Bogrā district stood on its western bank and *Daškāhaniā*-Sherpur in the Jāmālpur subdivision of the Mymensing district stood on its eastern bank, has found place in many books. The latter place is said to be distinguished as *Daškāhaniā* because ten Kāhans of cowries ($4 \times 20 \times 16 \times 10$ cowries) were charged by the ferryman as his fees for ferrying a man across. The absurd nature of the tradition will be apparent from the fact that the two places are now about 45 miles apart.

From the fact that Karatoyā is still flowing under the ramparts of the old fort at Mahāsthān, it may be inferred that in this region at least, it has not changed its course much. The river is at present a mere dry streamlet but we may judge the greatest width it ever attained by tracing its old banks. And the old banks of the river are distinctly traceable, nearly a mile apart (*Bogra Gazetteer*, p. 9). This agrees very well with its sketch on Vanden Brouke's map. It is very doubtful if this hill-stream ever attained a larger width.

Thus Raverty's assumption that by the description, we cannot think of any other river than the Brahmaputra, which, even on Rennell's map is about five miles wide in places, appears to be right. But Brahmaputra is even now about 14 miles east of Bardhankuṭhī, and on Rennell's map the distance is greater. Then again, Brahmaputra is a well-known name and the only other name by which the river is sometimes designated is Lauhitya. But the *Tabakai* calls it Begmatī or Bekmatī. The variants are Beg-hati, Bakmatī, Bagmatī, Bangmatī, Magmatī, Nangmatī and Nagnatī. When such confusion is found to exist with regard to such a remarkable topographical feature as the great Brahmaputra river, common sense would dictate that there is certainly some corruption of the text here.

The clue to the solution of this difficulty is to be found in the sentence:—“A river flows in front of that place, of vast magnitude, the name of which is Begmati; and when it enters the country of Hindustan, they style it in the Hindi dialect Samund”. This would suggest that at that place of which the author is speaking, the river had not yet entered the country of Hindusthān. That is, the place in front of which the river was flowing was outside Hindusthān. Can this be said of Bardhankuṭhi, only 12 miles north of Mahāsthāngarh? This must be some place in Kāmarūpa, beyond the eastern limit of North Bengal. Two variants of the name Begmatī are remarkable, viz. Baṅmatī and Naṅmatī. This name is practically identical with the name Raṅmatī, if the initial letter be taken to be *re* instead of *be* or *nun*. With the name read as Raṅmātī, before which the Brahmaputra flows even to this day and to which all the roads previously described which lead to Kāmarūpa converge, we at once land upon the solution. The author is speaking of Rāṅgāmāṭī on the gate to Kāmarūpa and of the broad river flowing in its front, without actually naming the river. This emendation at once solves all difficulties. Ali Mech very naturally joins Muhammad here to guide him through Kāmarūpa to Tibet. The broad river actually flows before Rāṅgāmāṭī, and not before Bardhankuṭhi on the eastern bank of the Karatoyā. It is by the northern (right) bank of the Brahmaputra that Muhammad marches towards Kāmarūpa starting from Rāṅgāmāṭī, and not along the right bank of the Karatoyā to Darjeeling or Sikkim, as Blochmann erroneously supposed. All the facts adjust themselves naturally and correctly with the very plausible change of *be* or *nun* into *re*. The text therefore should be emended in the following manner. The emendations and additions are italicised:—

“He agreed to conduct Muhammad-i-Bakhtyar into those hills and act as guide. *Muhammad came to a place where there is a city, the name of which is Burdhan (kot). They relate after this manner that in ancient times, Shah Gushtasib returned from the country of Chin and came towards Kamrud and by that route got into Hindustan and founded that city (Budhankot). Following that route, Muhammad came to a place called Rāṅgāmāṭī, in front of which place flows a river of vast magnitude..... three times more than the river Gang*”.

A look at the map will show the importance of Rāngāmāṭi as guarding the gate of Kāmarupa. The place was of very great strategic importance in old days; but its importance has dwindled down to such an extent that it is not even shown on modern maps. Buchanan, writing about 1809 says:—‘It is said that the extent of the town from east to west was about six miles and that in this space was included 52 markets. The only traces of public buildings are those of a fort and a mosque. Those of the former show no appearance of strength.....The mosque is small and rude’ (Martin’s *Eastern India*, III, p. 472).

TEXT

‘To the banks of this river Muhammad-i-Bakhtyar came and Ali, the Meji joined the army of Islam; and for a period of ten days, he took the army up the river among the mountains until he brought it to a place where, from remote times, they had built a bridge of hewn stone and consisting of upwards of twenty arches. After the army of Islam passed over that bridge he (Muhammad-i-Bakhtyar) installed there, at the head of the bridge, two of his own Amirs, one a Turk slave, and the other a Khalji, with troops, in order to guard it until his return. Then Muhammad-i-Bakhtyar, with the whole of the rest of his forces passed over that bridge; and when the Rao of Kamrud became aware of the passage (over the bridge) by the conquering troops, he despatched trustworthy persons saying:—‘It is not proper at this time to march into the country of Tibbat and it is necessary to return and to make ample preparations, when in the coming year, I who am the Rao of Kamrud agree that I will embody my own forces and will precede the Muhammadan troops and will cause that territory to be acquired.’ Muhammad-i-bakhtyar did not in any way accept this counsel and he turned his face towards the mountains of Tibbat.’

COMMENTS

Raverty’s translation of this portion of the *Tabakat* was probably published about 1875 A.D., because Blochmann could comment on it in his third contribution on the History and Geography of Bengal published in the *JASB* for 1875. Twenty-five years before these publications, an article by Major Hannay appeared in the *JASB* for 1851, No. iv, p. 291, giving an account of a stone bridge, about 8 miles north-west of northern Gauhāṭi, as the town on the northern bank of

the Brahmaputra, opposite modern Gauhāṭi, is called. The bridge was at a place called Silhāko (lit. Stone bridge). My friend Mr. Manoranjan Mukherjee, informs me that the bridge was situated over a hill-stream, about three miles north-west of the Railway station Chutiāpādā, which station, again, is about four miles north of Āmingāon, the terminus station.


A very good illustration of the bridge accompanies Major Hannay's article and a copy of it is reproduced here.

"This bridge," says Major Hannay,—“a remnant of ancient times in Kamrup, is situated about 8 miles north-west of Northern Gowhatty, on the high alley which, no doubt, formed at one time, the principal line of land-communication with ancient Gowhatty (Pragjyotisa) and western Kamrup, and is built across what may have been a former bed of the Bor Naddi, or at one particular season, a branch of the Brahmaputra, appearances now indicating a well-defined water-course, through which, judging from marks at the bridge, a considerable body of water must pass in the rains, and at that season, from native accounts, the waters of the Brahmaputra still find across to it.

The structure is of solid masonry.....There are no arches, the superstructure being a platform, with a slight curve, 110 feet long and eight feet in breadth, composed of slabs of stone six feet nine inches long and ten inches thick, numbering five in the whole breadth resting on an understructure of 16 pillars, three in a row, equally divided by three large solid buttresses; with a half buttress projecting from a circular mass of masonry, forming the abutments at each end of the road, there being in the whole length 21 passages for water.

“.....if we could suppose that the expedition of 1205-6 came in sight of the Brahmaputra at Rangamati, crossed the Manash and marched through Northern Kamrup, the possession of which would oblige the Raja to submit, it is not improbable that this is the stone bridge over which Bactyar Khilji and his Tartar cavalry passed, previous to entering the outworks of the ancient city of Gowhatty (or Pragjyotisha) the bridge being but a short distance from the line of hills bounding Gowhatty on the North N. W. and West, on which are still visible its line of defences extending for many miles on each side from N. W. gate of entrance or pass through the hills.

The Muhammadan general is also said to have been obliged to return from an advanced position (perhaps Chardoar) hearing that the Raja of Kamrup had dismantled the stone bridge on his rear: now, it is quite evident from the marks



THE SIL HAKO or Stone Bridge in ZILLAH KAMRUP

Drawn by Capt. J. C. Fisher, R.E. in 1841. See *Annals of Assam*.

1.11.02., March, 1933

By the courtesy of the
Asiatic Society of Bengal

on the stones of the platform that they had been taken off and replaced somewhat irregularly.”

I have quoted in extenso from Hannay as no other good description of the stone bridge at Śilhāko is available, and Hannay's description is now 81 years old. I learn from Mr. Manoranjan Mukherjee as well as from Mr. K. L. Barua that the bridge collapsed through the terrible earthquake of 1897. Some of the stumps of the pillars and buttresses are still standing. Many of the detached stones were carried away to Barpeta, about 40 miles west of Śilhāko and employed there in building a temple.¹

It is striking, how the strong common sense of a military official got at the truth where scholars like Raverty and Blochmann heaped confusion on confusion. Stone bridges are not as plentiful as blackberries in Bengal and Assam. In fact, no other stone bridge of equal dimensions appears to be known in Bengal or Assam. The one at Śilhāko had 21 openings for the passage of water, while Tabakat speaks of the bridge over which Muhammad passed as having ‘upwards of twenty arches’. Hannay very pertinently suggests Rāṅgāmāṭi as the place where the Muslims struck the Brahmaputra; but yet it did not occur either to Raverty or to Blochmann that this might be the Baṅgmātī or Naṅgmātī of the *Tabakat*. The discovery of the Kānāi-badaśī rock inscription about 12 miles south-east of Śilhāko now makes it almost sure that this must be the stone bridge over which Muhammad passed. But all the same, it is necessary to examine the grounds on which Blochmann and Raverty rejected the identification.

Blochmann takes Muhammad to the vicinity of Darjeeling, following the course of the Tistā and thus could not find his way to accept Hannay's identification. Raverty examines the question at length. Most of his objections either do not arise or are easily answered, once it is recognised that the Muslim army met the Brahmaputra at Rāṅgāmāṭi and then marched forward along the northern bank of the river. The distance from Rāṅgāmāṭi to Śilhāko is about 100 miles and

1 It is very much to be regretted that the Government of Assam did not attempt to restore this priceless monument of antiquity soon after it was shaken by the earthquake. Attempts, I think, should even now be made to restore the monument.

considering the number of rivers to be crossed on the way, it is not unlikely that it took the Muslim army 10 days to cover the distance. Bardhankuṭhi to Rāṅgāmāṭi is about 85 miles and it is also not impossible that the period may refer to the time taken by the army to reach Śilhāko from Bardhankuṭhi.

The encounter with the forces of Kāmarūpa shows that Muhammad did not march in a direction totally different to Gauhāṭi, as Raverty supposes. He must have entered Kāmarūpa to provoke the king of Kāmarūpa so. The Kānāibadaśī inscription clearly says, *kāmarūpaṃ samāgataḥ*, arriving in Kāmarūpa.

We now definitely know that the disaster to the Muslim army took place on the 7th of March, when the norwesters had already begun.

The two arches of the bridge were dismantled with the knowledge that the river was not fordable and that it was difficult to cross it without the bridge. Otherwise, there is no meaning in damaging the bridge.

Raverty has wondered why two such insignificant breaches, of the total length of 13 feet 9 inches should have put the Muslim army into such difficulty. I think it is only fair to credit the king of Kāmarūpa with some sense and to hold that he certainly wanted to make his work of destruction effective. The *Tabakat* says that two of the arches were destroyed; if so, not only were the platforms removed, but the pillars on which the platforms rested must also have been dismantled. And it was certainly no easy task to re-erect those pillars with the help of the exhausted and famished soldiers, the remnant of Muhammad's depleted forces, and get the bridge into working order with a hostile army at the back.

That the Muslim army was allowed to advance so far unmolested might appear strange. It should be remembered that the whole of Hindustan was at the feet of the Muslim invaders by this time and the fate of Bihar and Bengal at the hands of Muhammad must have struck terror into the heart of the king of Kāmarūpa, who was trembling for the safety of his own kingdom. Moreover, if we can judge from the subsequent history of Kāmarūpa and the repeated struggle of its kings with the Muslim invaders, this must have been the time-old military practice of the country. The enemy was allowed to advance even into the heart of the country during the dry season and set on hard with the

onset of the rains. When it was learnt that Muhammad's object was not Kāmarūpa but Tibbat, the king of Kāmarūpa even offered to accompany the Muslim invader into Tibet, if he would again come next year in proper time and with proper equipments. Muhammad did not pay heed to this offer but turned his face towards Tibet and marched forward.

The narrative of the *Tabakat* clearly implies that Muhammad did not advance further eastwards into Kāmarūpa, but turned north from Śilhāko.

It is needless to follow the text of the *Tabakat* any further. The Muslim army marched for 15 days through defiles and passes and on the 16th day reached the open country where there was a fort and fought a fierce battle there from day-break to evening and suffered severe losses. Hearing that a vast number of horsemen had gathered at a city called variously Karpattan, Kararpattan and Karampattan about 15 miles from the fort, and would soon come up to meet the invading forces, Muhammad sought safety in retreat. On the return march, the army found the whole country deserted and suffered untold privations. On reaching the bridge, the Muslims found two of its arches broken. Thereupon, they took shelter in a lofty temple in the neighbourhood. The forces of Kāmarūpa came and began to make a strong bamboo wall round the temple from a distance to shut the Muslim army in, as if in a cage. The Muslims cut through this wall, jumped into the river on a false assurance of a ford having been found and were almost entirely drowned. Muhammad somehow got over, reached Devkā and died of a broken heart. According to another account, he was strangled on his sick bed by one of his own followers.

Muhammad, during the 15 days of his march to Tibet from Śilhāko, over difficult defiles and passes could hardly have covered more than about 50 miles. That is, he possibly crossed the first line of mountains into Bhuṭān. Tibbat was still far off. It is interesting to note that modern maps show a track actually proceeding straight north from the region of Śilhāko and entering Bhuṭān by Raṅgiyā and Tāmbulpur. After crossing the first line of mountains and reaching the valley, we meet with a place called Karu-gompa. This may be the Karpattan or Kararpattan of the *Tabakat*. I know of no work from which the topographical details of this portion of Bhuṭān may be learnt. It would be

interesting to inquire if there is actually a fort on this track, and if Karu-gompa is a walled town. The Muslim army in their panic-stricken condition may have lent ears to many travellers' tales and magnified descriptions of dangers and the actual Karpattan may after all be a small place. Karu-gompa is about 60 miles north from Śilhāko.

It would be interesting to identify the site of the temple in which the Muslim army took shelter. It has to be sought for in the vicinity of Śilhāko. If the disaster overtook the Muslim army on the 7th March, 1206 A.D., it possibly started $16+16+10+10+10=62$ days earlier, or about the first week of January, 1206 A.D.²

NALINIKANTA BHATTASALI

² Mr. K. L. Barua suggests that this may be the Gopeśvar temple five miles up the river spanned by the Śilhāko. It stands on an eminence called Deo Duar (Deva-dvār). A place nearer Śilhāko would seem to be indicated by the narrative. Captain Dalton was of opinion that the temple in question was the great temple at Hajo, seven miles down Śilhāko, and near the place where the river falls into the Brahmaputra. (*JASB.*, 1855, p. 8, footnote). The river spanned by the Śilhāko is called the Puṣpabhadra.

Mr. Barua further suggests that Karam Sathan may be the modern village of Kumrikāṭā, which is quite close to Daranga where the annual Bhūtia fair is held and where Bhutia ponies called locally Tāngnā (Tāngan) are sold.

The Tamil Śāngam in a Pāṇḍyan Charter of the early Tenth Century A.D.

The following passage in Tamil forms part of the genealogical portion of an important copper-plate charter.¹ The passage in full gives a list of Pāṇḍyas who lived and passed away, but who look, from the description given, very much like legendary characters rather than historical ones. The allusions are clear in some cases, while in others they are far from being clear even as legends. But the part that follows begins with the well known point of the Mahābhārata War, and carries the genealogy down to the establishment of the Śāngam in Madura, and there the traditional portion comes to a stop. The actual genealogy starts thereafter with one that bore the name Parāṅkuśa. For the purpose of the present note, we are not concerned with that portion. We set down the text as it occurs on page 454, and its translation as found on page 460 of volume III, part IV of the *South Indian Inscriptions* published in the Archaeological Survey of India Series:—

mārathar malai-kaḷattaviyaḥ pāratattirpaḥaḍoṭṭiyum Vijayanar Vasu śāpanīkiyūm Vendaliyaḥ churam pokkiyūm vaśayil mākkayal puli śilai vaḍavarai neṇṇiyil varaiṇḍun taḍaṇṇūḍām paṇi koṇḍu taḍāhangaḷ pala tiruttiyūm aḍum paśi noy nāḍahaṇṇi ambor chitramuyariyūm talai-ā'angānattirṇannokkamiruvēndaraik kolai vāḷiṇṇalai tumittuk kuraittalaiyin kūṭṭoḷittum mahābhārataṇṇu tamīḷ-paḍuttum Madhurāpurich-chngam vaittum mahārājarūṇṇu sārṇvvaḥmaumarūṇṇu Mahimaṇḍalaṇṇu-Kāttikandapin.

“He who led the elephants in the Bhārata (war) so as to destroy the great charioteers in a hill-battle; he who relieved Vijaya (Arjuna) from the curse of Vasu; he who drove (his enemies) to the forest so that they might be scorched up and destroyed (there) and had the blameless (royal emblems) of the big fish, the tiger and the bow engraved on the top of the Northern Mountain (i.e. the Himālayas); he who, securing the services of huge giants, restored many tanks and relieved the country from disease and pinching hunger; he who with a dreadful sword cut off the heads of two kings that advanced against him in the

1 The larger Sinnamanūr Plates, as they are called.

battles at Chitramuyari and Talaiyālangānam and stopped the dance of their (two) headless trunks and he who had the Mahābhārata translated into Tamil and had established the "Sangam" in the town of Madhura and had ruled the circle of the earth and had passed away."

The first statement has reference to a Pāṇḍya who took part in the Mahābhārata War. The statement actually made here in regard to the Bhārata War is that the Pāṇḍya concerned charged with his corps of elephants in the Bhārata War, so that the Mahārathas (heroes of the chariot) may be suppressed in the field of fighting. The translation made by the Epigraphist leaves a good deal to be desired. The term *malai-kaḷam* is translated as a hill-battle. The compound-word actually is the field in which enemies contend for success. Of course, Mr. Subrahmanya Aiyar adds a footnote. But the translation given there leaves it still *malai-kaḷam* as the field of battle, taking *malai* for hill and making it the place of battle. *Malai* is the Tamil verb "contend" or "fight". *Kaḷam* is the field. "Charging with his elephants, so that the Mahārathas may fall", would mean that the Pāṇḍya led the elephantry to the destruction of the great charioteers of the enemy. The next statement refers to the Pāṇḍya who helped Arjuna to rid himself of the curse of Vasu.²

The next following statement is that he drove the enemy kings into the desert, so that they may be destroyed. This is a general statement, where he is said to have defeated other kings, and drove enemy kings into the desert as the only safety from his pursuit. This is the usual Tamil expression meaning that the enemy could find no freedom from the victor except by fleeing into the desert for protection. The next is a more definite statement. It is the imprinting of the Pāṇḍyan royal emblems of the time on the face of the Himālayas. This is a claim that is often made by Southern kings, all three of them, at various times. The Southern monarch that is said to have carried his arms successfully so far as the Himālayas, must have been overlord of his

² This is, according to the *Mahābhārata*, prince Babhruvāhana, Arjuna's son by the Pāṇḍya princess Citrāngadā, who fought against him and defeated him in the course of Arjuna's peregrination preliminary to the celebration of the horse-sacrifice. The story will be found in chapters 70-82 of the *Āśramadhikā Parva* of the *Mahābhārata* (Kumbhakonam edition).

two colleagues in the South, and if the Pāṇḍya happened to be the overlord, his authority is generally taken to have been acknowledged by the Cola and the Cera, and the emblems of the three together constitute the imperial Pāṇḍyan sign-manual. This is said to have been imprinted on the Himālayas as a sign that the Pāṇḍyan suzerainty had been acknowledged right up to the Himālayas in the north. In historical times a similar claim was made by Jaṭāvarman Sundarapāṇḍya I right up to the banks of the Krishna. His inscription in Poonamallee shows the combined emblem of the three kingdoms similarly. The claim here made is ascribed actually to the Pāṇḍyan hero³ of the *Śilapadhikāram*. A victorious march up to the Himālayas has similarly been claimed by the Pallava Siṃhavarman in his Amarāvati inscription,⁴ and by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Govinda III.⁵ Although we cannot be very definite as to the particular individual who achieved this distinction, having regard to the fact that these rulers were in the habit of appropriating such extraordinary achievements of their ancestors to themselves, the reference here seems to be to the one who made claim to this for the first time. Since the hero of the *Śilapadhikāram* is described as the Pāṇḍyan Neḍuṃśeḷiyan, victor over the Aryan army, it seems likely that this is the person under reference here.

The next following statements deserve careful scrutiny. The first has reference to the vast work of repairs to irrigation tanks carried out by a Pāṇḍyan ruler not with the assistance of human labour but with that of goblins. Of course, the work must have been stupendous and must have been carried out as a measure of famine-prevention. The next following incident is similar in point of character, that is, destroying hunger in the kingdom of the Pāṇḍyas. Apart from poetical language, this could only mean that the particular Pāṇḍya concerned took steps to give relief to his people at a time when they were bound to suffer from hunger owing to the failure of crops in the country as a result of famine. He is said to have got rid of hunger by measures which are not specifically stated, and to have brought this relief work

3 Book XVII, lines 1-5 and the Epilogue to Book XXIII.

4 *SI.*, I, No. 32, ll. 29-39.

5 Sanjan Copper-plates of Amoghavarṣa: *Ep. Ind.*, XVIII, No. 26, V. 23.

of his to a conclusion by raising “a picture that was painted in gold”. This latter part has been coupled with what follows in the Epigraphist’s translation, which makes *Citramuyari* a battlefield like Talai-āḷankānam. But the language used actually is that he got the country rid of a killing-hunger, and raised the golden picture, as if to say that the removal of the hunger was brought to a conclusion by raising this picture.

How could the raising of the golden picture complete, even ceremonially, the removal of hunger? It would be clear even to superficial readers that this item and the previous one, the large scheme of repairs to irrigation tanks are actually measures of famine-relief. If that be so, is there anything like the raising of a golden picture that could be connected with famine-relief measures; whether anything like the raising of a picture is symbolical of what was actually done? It is nothing more than the celebration of the famous festival to Indra, which brings to a fitting conclusion the vast efforts of the ruler to keep famine out of the country, if his own efforts could do so. That festivals to Indra were largely in vogue in India we can presume from the familiarity with which comparisons are drawn to Indradhvaja and other details connected with it in literature. In the *Śilapadhikāraṃ*, one whole book is devoted to this Indra festival, which seems to have come to a close on the full moon of Caitra, the first month of the Tamil year. The self-same festival is referred to in the opening book of the *Maṇimekhalai* as a normal condition of affairs in a Tamil city like *Kārcipattinam*, the Cola capital. That it was not confined to the Tamil country alone, we may presume from the reference to it in the third verse of the fourth *sarga* of the *Raghuramāṣa*, where the ladies of the city with their children came to see the coronation procession of Raghū.⁶ In commenting on this verse, Mallinātha explains what the Indra festival under reference was, and gives us some details as to its celebration. The term *Paruhūtadhraja*, the festival of the raising of which is brought into comparison with the coronation procession of Raghū, is explained by the commentator as the festival celebrated by

king with a view to the timely fall of rain. He gives three *ślokas* in explanation thereof, all of them probably from the *Bhaviṣyottarapurāna*. The first one⁷ defines the flag as having the form of an elephant, raised on four posts, and fixed up standing in front of the city-gate. 'In this manner the inhabitants of the city celebrated the festival of Indra in the rainy season'. In a second verse,⁸ he gives another definition. The Sakradhvaja is four-sided, in the form of a flag, and fixed in front of the royal-gate of the palace. 'This, people call 'the flag of Indra', and brings health and happiness to the people of the city'. Another verse⁹ quoted in the context explains the purpose, and the verse is addressed to Yudhiṣṭhira. Whoever is the king that carries the flag of Indra in festival procession, in his kingdom the clouds pour the amount of rain wished for, without a doubt. Thus it is clear that the raising of this flag connotes a festival to god Indra with a view to an abundance of rainfall at the proper seasons of the year, and the celebration is a festival conducted by kings. This is exactly the description that we find given of the festival in Bk. V of the *Śilapadhikāram*, and the first book of *Maṇimekhalai* as well, in both of which it is explained as taking the flag on which was a representation of the Airāvata, Indra's elephant, from the front of the building in which is placed Kalpavṛkṣa (the wish-giving tree) of Indra with the eight auspicious signs, and taking it round in festive procession. This festival begins with the announcement by the big drum, placed in the hall dedicated to the Vajrāyudha (the thunder-bolt) of Indra, carried on the back of one of the royal elephants, and the festival announced by beat of drum both when it begins and when it closes, in the temple hall where the image of the white-elephant, Airāvata, is housed. It is not explained so fully in the corresponding portion of the *Maṇimekhalai*, but in substance it is the same. It will be seen from

- 7 गजाकारं चतुस्तम्भं पुरद्वारे प्रतिष्ठितम् ।
पौरा कुर्वन्ति शरदि पुरुहूत महोत्सवम् ॥
- 8 चतुरस्रं ध्वजाकारं राजद्वारे प्रतिष्ठितम् ।
आहुः शक्रःत्रजनाम पौरलोके सुखावहम् ॥
- 9 एवं यः कुरुते यान्नामिन्द्रकेतोर्युधिष्ठिर ।
पर्जन्यः कामवर्षी स्यात्तस्य राज्ये न संशयः ॥

this detailed description that the festival was actually a celebration in honour of god Indra with a view to obtaining rain, and all the features associated with the festival are features in close association with Indra and his royal heavenly paraphernalia, his characteristic weapon, the Vajrāyudha, his special mount Airāvata, his special tree Kalpaka and the flag, all of them alike symbolising the coming of Indra, to which the *Maṇimekhalai* adds the statement (I, ll. 5-15) that, in the days when the great festival of Indra was being celebrated in Puhār, the capital of the colas, by special permission of the god, Indra's heaven itself became empty, and all the gods came down to the Cola capital in various forms to witness the great festival.

The point for explaining the passage in the grant consists in this. That the particular Pāṇḍyan under reference undertook active measures to prevent famine as far as human agencies could provide for it, and assured himself of unfailing timely rain, without which all human efforts would have been in vain, by celebrating this traditional festival to bespeak the good offices of the rain-god Indra. The two statements therefore together constitute work that was done in connection with one particular object, and must be so taken in our interpretation of the passage. Then follows a series of three statements. The first is the achievement of a Pāṇḍyan, who won the victory at Talaiālakānam, where, on the field of battle, he cut off the heads of the two other crowned kings like himself, and stopped the dancing of the headless trunks. Without all the poetical embellishments, it simply means the two kings, the Cola and the Cera whoever they were, were killed in the battle. The next statement is the doing of the *Mahābhārata* in Tamil, and the next following statement is the establishment of the Sangam in Madhura. Of course, the passage comes to a close with the statement that, after these great kings and *Sārcabhuvas*, or emperors, had ruled and passed away began another series of rulers. The purpose of the grant in doing this is to indicate that when these rulers of old who lived and passed away so gloriously, another set of rulers of modern times began to rule in succession. This manner of stating it gives indication of a comparatively long interval between the one set and the other.

The really interesting question in respect of this passage is whether we should ascribe each one of these events, or achievements, to

a separate ruler, or whether some of these have to be taken together and ascribed to one and the same ruler. This turns out to be of importance particularly with reference to the last three of them. We have seen already that in respect of irrigation-works, and the celebration of the Indra festival, we would be justified in taking the two together as the work of one and the same ruler. Similarly one may be inclined to take the two incidents connected with the *Mahābhārata* together; but that is hardly called for as the active assistance in the war may be the work of a Pāṇḍya sovereign who might even have fallen in battle, from the way that his part in the war is described. The victory that Arjuna's own son won against his father betokens a comparatively young ruler, and, having regard to the additional fact that Arjuna married the princess in the course of his *Tīrthayātrā* he must have come to the throne later in succession to the other. The next one is a general statement, the defeating of contemporary kings which may be ascribed to one Pāṇḍyan of distinction, and may even be common to several. We have pointed out that the imprinting of the Pāṇḍyan emblem on the Himālayas, whether it is actual or merely poetical, is ascribable to a particular Pāṇḍyan from whom, of course, his successors could have assumed it, as is often the case, without any achievement to substantiate it. Then follows the one distinguished for the famine-works referred to, and then comes the next one, the victor at Talaiālamkānam. The Pāṇḍyan victor at Talaiālamkānam is a famous figure in the so-called Sangam literature of Tamil, and the victory at Talaiālamkānam is itself under reference by a number of poets of the first rank among those regarded as poets of the Sangam. First and foremost there is the Madurai-kāñji of Māngudi Marudan included in the Sangam collection called Pattup-pāṭṭu (*Ten poems*). This poem of 850 lines is in celebration of this Pāṇḍyan whose exploits are described in full, and the purpose of the poem is to draw his attention to the necessity of providing himself for the life to come, having done all that need be done by a sovereign on earth to discharge his duties and make himself famous. Then the great poet Nakkīrar refers to him in some poems ascribed to him. But in one, *Ahanānūru* 36, there is a full and unmistakable reference to the battle, and to the seven enemies whom he had overcome. Their names are enumerated categorically as the Cera,

the Cola, the chief Titiyan, the chief Eḷini, the chief of Erumaiyūr, the chief Irungovenmān, and the chief Porunan. These seven are referred to allusively in the *Madurai-kañji*. Another poet Kurungu-ḷiyūr Kiḷār refers to another achievement of this Pāṇḍya, his taking the Cera 'prince of the elephant-look' prisoner in poem 17 of the *Puranānūru*. In poem 19, the same poet addresses the same sovereign, and the poet refers by name to the Cera prince 'of the elephant-look' in other poems, making him undoubtedly a contemporary with him. Another poet, Kallāḍan addresses this very same Pāṇḍyan in poem 23. There is a similar reference to him mentioning specifically his Cera and Cola enemy in poem 25 of the same work. So then we see that the Pāṇḍyan, who was victor at Talaiālamkānam against the two other enemies and a number of chiefs, their allies, is actually celebrated by poets, whose names undoubtedly figure in the traditional lists of the Sangam as they have come down to us, and whose works are undoubtedly included in the collection known as the Sangam collections. Poem 18 of the *Puranānūru* exhorts this Pāṇḍya to make his territory well provided with irrigation works. Can we, therefore, identify him with the Pāṇḍya who is mentioned in this charter, as having distinguished himself by similar works and celebrating the great Indra festival?

There would be justification for identifying this Pāṇḍyan with the Pāṇḍyan victor at Talaiālamkānam, as poem 19 by the same author refers unmistakably to the battle of Talaiālamkānam, in which he is said to have overcome the seven enemies. Taking the two poems together, it leaves us in no doubt that the poet Kuḍapulaviyanār does celebrate the Pāṇḍyan victor at Talaiālamkānam. His exhortation in regard to the duty of the Pāṇḍyan to make the food supply abundant in the country by providing irrigation works would, therefore, warrant our taking it that, according to the charter under discussion, it was he who took steps to get rid of hunger from his country and celebrated the Indra festival as a fitting completion to his benevolent work. If so, then it amounts to this; that the Pāṇḍyan victor at Talaiālamkānam at some time in his reign, felt the urgent necessity for embarking upon large irrigation works and providing the country with the means for raising an ample supply of food and putting it beyond reach of famine.

We then proceed to the next incidents, the doing of the Mahābhārata in Tamil, and the establishment of the Sangam in Madūra. So far as the doing of the Mahābhārata is concerned, we have definite information regarding three versions of the *Mahābhārata*. The latest is what is popularly known, and in popular use, as the *Mahābhārata* of Villiputtūrar, sometimes spoken of as *Villiputtūr Āḷcār*, supplemented by a comparatively modern writer, Nallā Piḷḷai. This is the complete version of the work we have. The next is a version of which we have not as yet come upon even a complete manuscript, but of which portions are available covering three or four *parvas* from the Udyogaparva. The part available has recently been published, but it is only a part. Even so, it gives us the information in one of the verses included in the published part that the work was composed in the reign of Nandivarman of Tellāru, whom we know as the Nandivarman, grandson of the great Nandivarman, Pallava-Malla of the eighth century. The work therefore is referable to the middle of the ninth century after Christ. The name of the author, however, is Perumḍevanār. This Perumḍevanār has often been mistaken for the Perumḍevanār, whose name figures in the so-called eight Sangam collections, for the eight of which he composed the poems in invocation. This would mean that it was in his time that the collections were actually made, and that it fell to his lot to compose the poems in invocation; and he composed the eight poems for Śiva, Viṣṇu, and Skanda or Subrahmanya, according to occasions, showing a broad-mindedness in matters religious, fairly a general feature of the times. We find the name Perumḍevanār among the list of writers compiled from the Sangam works, and there is at least one poem among the collections by a Perumḍevanār, which probably was in those days a common name. To distinguish, therefore, the particular Perumḍevanār who translated the *Mahābhārata* in Tamil, he is always referred to as the Perumḍevanār who wrote the poem Mahābhārata in Tamil. That is, he is generally distinguished as the author of the Tamil *Mahābhārata*. Quotations from the *Mahābhārata* occur in the classical grammar *Tolkāppiyam* and elsewhere, for purposes of illustration. These have been collected to the extent of about forty verses, and several among these are not found in the part so far published of the *Bhārata* of the more modern Perumḍevanār whose work is distin-

guished by the name *Bhārataveṅbā* indicating the metre of the verses in the poem. It seems clear, therefore, that we have to look for another Perumdevanār who rendered the Mahābhārata in Tamil, and composed the poems in invocation for the eight collections of the so-called Śāngam works in Tamil. Can we refer the rendering of the Mahābhārata in Tamil by this author as under reference in the expression 'the putting into Tamil of the Mahābhārata' in the charter under examination? This will become clearer in the next section where we shall take up for consideration the establishment of the Śāngam in Madura.

According to the traditional account of the Śāngam, that is really the only account that is available so far, there were three such Śāngams. It is by the maintenance of a court of learned men, it is hardly necessary to give these Śāngams any stricter organisation than that as far as our information of them at present goes, that the Pāṇḍyas encouraged the growth of Tamil literature, and made it possible for the comparatively large output of Tamil literature at the period. In the course of the progress of this literature, a famine is said to have supervened and, lasting for the proverbial twelve years, made life in the country impossible. The ruler for the time being, finding it difficult to maintain such a large court at a time of such great distress, dismissed them all by allowing them to scatter themselves elsewhere than in the Pāṇḍya country; during the time of distress, and return immediately that the famine ceased. The famine having lasted perhaps longer than was expected, those that returned were comparatively few, and among them it would appear there was nobody who had cultivated that part of Tamil grammar relating to love, one of the five main sections of Tamil grammar. The Pāṇḍya ruler at the time finding that the court was so denuded of scholars of eminence made a systematic effort to collect the poems, as far as he could arrange it, the best among them with a view to putting them in a permanent form. The eight collections of works generally called by Tamil scholars Śāngam works had been thus made in his time. He was however much exercised about grammar or *Lakṣaṇa Grantha* for one important section, and offered a prize for one that would compile an abbreviated work on that subject. Finding no one came forward to do the work, he did not know what exactly to do, when just under the seat of the god in the great temple at Madura,

a set of copper plates was discovered containing a work on that subject in sixty *sūtras*. This work had necessarily to be commented upon and all the poets who then happened to be at court were asked to comment upon the work. Six such commentaries were presented and were submitted for approval to the dumb child of a Brahman regarded as an *Aratār* of Śkanda or Subrahmanya. Of the six commentaries, the young umpire approved in part of that by a scholar by name Madurai Marudan Iḷanāgan. The commentary of Nakkīrar received far greater approval, and that got, therefore, incorporated with the *Sūtras* and has come down to us. So says tradition in regard to the work known as the *Iṭṭayanār Ahapporuḷ*.

The dumb prodigy that did this miraculous work was the person who collected, probably later in life, the 400 poems on love comprising what is known as the *Ahanānūru*. As we stated in the paragraph above, the work of collection must have begun earlier, and must have led to the discovery relating to the lack of that particular section of Tamil grammar. Whether all the collections were completed then or later we have no indication for certain. But that this collection was made by this Brahman, Rudraśarman, son of the rural celebrity Uppūrikuḍi Kiḷān is clearly stated by the commentator on the work, and it is followed by the further statement that he made it for the Pāṇḍyan Ugraperuvaludi, who must, from the name itself, be regarded as a separate, and, in all probability, the next succeeding ruler to the other mentioned in the preceding paragraphs. That this is so is confirmed by the fact that the poems in invocation for the *Ahanānūru* as well as all the other collections were composed by *the* Perumdevanār who achieved his fame by rendering the Mahābhārata in Tamil. So the rendering of the Mahābhārata in Tamil by this author must have preceded his composing the poems in invocation for the collections. The collections therefore must have been completed at a time subsequent to his achieving the great reputation by doing the Mahābhārata in Tamil.

We thus come to this conclusion as a result of our investigation of the passage in the large Sinnamanūr copper-plate charters issued by the Pāṇḍyan king Rājasimha who had the title Mandara Gaurava, son of Parāntaka Śaḍaiyan (Sans. Jaṭila): the first Pāṇḍyan mentioned

in this passage is the Pāṇḍyan who played an active part in the war of the Mahābhārata. The next one is the prince Babhruvāhana, son of Arjuna himself. Another Pāṇḍyan seems to be under reference, victor over contemporary monarchs, perhaps because he achieved the hegemony in the Tamil land. Then we come to the Pāṇḍyan who imprinted the combined Pāṇḍyan emblem of the three kings, fish, the tiger and the bow, on the Himālayas. This may be the same as the one above, and may be the Pāṇḍyan 'victor over the Aryan army'. Then follows one to whom, as we have arranged it, the following achievements are credited: the great scheme of putting in repairs innumerable irrigation-tanks, thus putting his kingdom beyond reach of hunger and celebrating the achievement by a great festival to Indra. The next achievement of his is the killing of the two contemporary monarchs in battle at Talaiālam-kānam. Then the doing of the Mahābhārata in Tamil. Then the establishment of the Śāngam in Madura. While the passage gives no indication which is manifest, that these were the achievements of a single ruler, we have shown reason why these have to be ascribed to a single monarch on the evidence of the Śāngam works themselves, which must be regarded as contemporary. Thus the Pāṇḍyan victor at Talaiālamkānam seems clearly to stand out as the celebrity who did these things. The person responsible for the drawing up of the charter saw good reason to stop there in his recital of the ancient Pāṇḍyas. We do not know exactly why. He passes on to the more recent dynasty, the reigning ruler of which at the time conferred a charter upon a learned Brahmin.

The charter is datable in the middle of the tenth century A.D., as the Pāṇḍyan donor of the charter seems to be certainly the ruler who was overthrown by the conquering Cola Parāntaka I, A.D. 906-955. We cannot investigate in this paper how many generations backwards from him are actually known to us on the authority of the copper-plate charters, and what interval came between these and the ancient Pāṇḍyas under advertence. We must reserve that investigation to another occasion. But we may state here roughly that the historical Pāṇḍyas known from these charters take us through thirteen generations as the epigraphist has arranged it on his genealogical table, taking us back through four centuries and bringing us to the second half of the

sixth century. We have shown reason for a long interval, an interval of two to three centuries between that and the flourishing period of Pāṇḍya rule¹⁰ and the last Pāṇḍya referred to here must belong to a period in the second or third century of the Christian era.

S. KRISHNASWAMI AIYANGAR

¹⁰ *Beginnings of South Indian History*, pp. 240 ff.

Remarks on the fourth Rock Edict of Aśoka

When trying to establish, according to my humble opinion, the order of publication and the interrelations of the thirteen (fourteen) Rock Edicts of Aśoka¹ I pointed out that the Edicts III and IV are most probably only pieces of one original rescript. This seems to me to be proved by the identical words recurring in III, A-B, and in IV, K (cp. Gīrnār: *Devānaṃpiyo Piyaḍasi rājā evaṃ āha dbūdasavāsābhisitena mayā idaṃ āṅapitaṃ* (III) with *dbūdasavāsābhisitena Devānaṃpiyena Piyaḍasiṇā rājā idaṃ lekḥapitaṃ* (IV). Further in III, D, Aśoka inculcates certain meritorious actions such as *ahiṃsū* and a decent behaviour towards relatives, ascetics and Brahmins, the very absence of which he deplors in IV, A. Because of these reasons I hold it as fairly sure that Rock Edicts III and IV should be read as one.

Now what I intend here is nowise to give any new and startling interpretation of Edict IV simply for the reason that I am not able to do so. I shall, however, try to establish, according to my lights, the meaning of certain expressions within the first three paragraphs of the Edict which still look somewhat dubious. Thus let us begin with quoting these paragraphs from the new edition of the inscriptions by the late lamented Professor Hultzsch; for practical reasons the Gīrnār version is referred to here.

A. *atikātaṃ aṃtaraṃ bahūni vāsa-satāni vadḥito eva² prāṇārambho vihiṃsū ca bhūṭānaṃ nūṭisu asaṃpratipatī brāhmaṇa-sramaṇānaṃ³ asaṃpratipatī.*

B. *ta aja Devānaṃpriyasu Priyaḍasiṇo rājā dhaṃmacaraṇena*

1 Cp. BSOS., VI, 313 ff.

2 K. *vā*; Dh. J. *va*; Sh. M. *vo*.

3 K. *Samaṇa-bambhaṇānaṃ*; Sh. M. *Samaṇa-bramaṇana(m)*; Dh. *Samaṇa-bābhānesu*,

*bherighoso aho dhammaghoso vimānadasaṇā⁴ ca hastidasaṇā⁵ ca aggi-
khaṃdhāni⁶ dasayitpā janaṃ.*

C. *yārise bahūhi vāsasatehi na bhūtapure tārise aja vadhite
Devānaṃpriyasa Priyadasino rāṇo dhammānusastiyā anāraṃbho
prāṇānaṃ avihāsā bhūtānaṃ nātānaṃ saṃpatipatī brāhmaṇa-sama-
ṇānaṃ⁷ saṃpatpatī mūtari pitari⁸ susrusā thairā-susrusā.⁹*

What is first of all apt to attract our attention is the expression *atikātaṃ antaram bahūni vāsasatāni vadhito eva prāṇāraṃbho* etc., i.e. "in times gone by, for many centuries, there has ever been increasing the killing of animals" etc. To this corresponds the *bahūhi vāsasatehi* of C. The phrase *atikrāntam antaram* is not a very rare one; it occurs in the Rock Edicts IV, V, VI, and VIII as well as twice in the Pillar Edict VII at Delhi-Toprā. But why 'for many centuries'? According to my humble opinion this does not simply mean a lump sum intended to express a high but unlimited number of years. Instead of that it means, as I venture to suggest, that for many centuries the Buddhist doctrine (*dhamma*)¹⁰ had been in abeyance; after many hundreds of years, however, through the pious exertions of Aśoka it had again risen to its former height. As, according to the Rummindei inscription, Aśoka thought himself to be well aware of the Buddha's birth-place it might not be too venturesome a suggestion that he also believed the founder of Buddhism to have lived several centuries ago. Thus it comes to this: for several hundreds of years, since the time of the decease of Gautama the Buddha, his doctrine had been in a state of increasing decay until it was again lifted up to its former height by the reforms of Aśoka.¹¹

4 Like Senart and Buehler I am unable to read here anything but *dasāṇā* (Hultzsch has *darsaṇā*).

5 K. *hathini*, Dh. *hathini*; Sh. *astina*; M. *astine*.

6 Sh. *joti-khaṃdhani* (all other versions—except G.—*kaṃdhāni*).

7 Dh. *Samana-bābhaneṣu*.

8 K. *māfa-pitisu*; Sh. M. *mata-pituṣu*; Dh. *māti-pitu-susūsā*.

9 Sh. *vudhanaṃ susruṣa*; M. *vudhrana susruṣa*; Dh. *vudha-susūsā*.

10 Cp. Geiger, *Abhandl. Bayer. Akad. d. Wissenschaften, philol.-hist. Kl.*, XXXI: I, 33ff.

11 In this connection we may also remember that in another passage Aśoka reminds us of the pious kings of yore (Delhi-Toprā VII, B): *Ye atikaṃtaṃ*

Many different interpretations have been put forth of the words *bherighoso aho dhammaghoso* in B.¹² All sorts of more or less ingenious interpretations have been proposed and rejected; the difficulties to be surmounted, however, do not in reality seem very great. First of all we must, of course, interpret *aho* as = *abhūt* as was correctly suggested by Kern,¹³ a suggestion that has been endorsed by most scholars. In spite of the great reverence that we still feel for the work of the immortal Burnouf there can be no doubt at all that his interpretation of *aho* as being an exclamation¹⁴ is essentially a mistake. Thus *bherighoṣo'bhūd dharmaghoṣaḥ* can mean nothing but: "the sound of drums became the announcement of *dharma* (i.e. the doctrine of Buddha)". And here we are reminded of the words of Professor Bhandarkar that "the sound of a drum invariably precedes either a battle, a public announcement, or the exhibition of a scene¹⁵ to the people". The sound of drums thus preceded the proclamation of the Aśokan edicts; and as these contained the maxims of the simple and practical Buddhism taught to laymen such proclamations may well be called a *dharmaghoṣa*. As the first commandment of this Buddhism for laymen is *ahiṃsā*, the non-killing of living beings,

aṃtalaṃ lājāne husu heram icchisu katham jāne dhammavādhiyā vadheyā no cu jāne anulupāyā dhammavādhiyā vadhiṭhā. Thus the exertions of these rulers came to naught, perhaps because their behaviour was rather that of the children of the world, cp. Rock Edict VIII, A (Girnar): *atikātaṃ aṃtaraṃ rājāno* (K. Sh. M. *Devanaṃ(r)iyā*) *vihārayātāṃ āyāsuṣeta magavyā añāni cu etārisāni abhīramakāni ahuṃsu*// Aśoka, however solely went on tours for preaching *dhamma* and thus achieved every sort of success.

12 Authorities dealing with this passage are Lessen *Ind. Alterthumsk.*, II,² 238 n. 3; Wilson, *JRAS.*, XII, 174 ff.; Burnouf, *Lotus*, p. 731; Kern, *Juertelling*, p. 45 ff. (= *IA.*, V, 261); Senart, *I.A.*, X, 84; Buehler, *Ep. Ind.*, II, 467; Hultsch, *JRAS.*, 1911, 785 ff.; 1913, 651 ff.; D. R. Bhandarkar, *I.A.*, XLII, 25; De la Vallée Poussin, *Les Mauryas*, p. 109 ff.; Wickremasinghe, *BSOS.*, VI, 545 f.; Mookerji, *Aśoka*, p. 136.

13 Cp. Johansson, *Shāhbāzgarhi*, I, 32.

14 Quite recently repeated by M. de la Vallée Poussin.

15 This drum is sounded to announce great spectacles or festivals; it is the *chaṇabheri* of which we hear in *Jātaka*, vol. VI, p. 465, 8 ff.: "*atha rājā nagare chaṇabheriṃ carāpetvā sattūhaṃ chaṇaṃ karontu, etcImaṃ atthaṃ pakāseto Satthā āha: āhaññantu sabbaviṇā bheriyo deṇḍimāni cu/ nadantu māgadhā saṃkhā vaggu vadatu dundubhī*//

we may well compare the *bherī* sounded by Aśoka's officials with the *māghātabheri* spoken of in a passage of the *Jātaka*. The king of Kosala, so we are told in the introduction to the *Aṭṭhasaddajātaka* (418; vol. III, p. 428 ff.), in the middle of the night heard a fearful sound; consulting the Master he came to know that he ought not to fear: "na hi, mahārāja, evarūpaṃ bhayānakam arinibbhogasaddaṃ tram ev' eko suni, pubbe pi rājāno evarūpaṃ saddaṃ sutvā brāhmaṇānaṃ kathāṃ gahetvā sabbaśatukkayaññaṃ yañitukāmā paṇḍitānaṃ kathāṃ sutvā yaññaharaṇatthāya gahitasatte cissajjetrā nagare māghātabheriṃ carūpesuṃ."

In the *atītavatthu* the king of Benares also hears some dismal sounds: Brahmins persuade him to prepare an immense sacrifice but a wise and pious man (the Bodhisattva) explains to him the real cause of the sounds, and the king upon hearing his words cancels the sacrifice and commands the *māghātabheri* to be sounded all through the town.¹⁶ It seems to me that the passage in the Edict may perhaps get its most easy explanation by means of this parallel from the *Jātaka*

Curiously enough no scholar so far seems to have noticed the necessity of putting a full stop after *dhammaghoso*. That this must be done will be made obvious by our translation which will follow presently.

We now, however, come to the most crucial passage of the inscription viz., the words: *vimānadasaṇā ca hastidasaṇā ca agikhaṇḍhāni ca añāni ca divyāni rūpāni dasaṇitpā janaṃ*. The construction of the sentence is wholly clear; the main question is, however, in what way to translate the words *vimāna*, *hastin*, and *agniskandha* in this connection, and there the opinions of very prominent scholars differ widely.¹⁷ Thus, to quote only a few examples, Burnouf translated the two first expressions¹⁸ by "des promenades de chars de parade, des

16 Cp. also the *dhammabheri* mentioned in *Jātaka*, IV, 269, 15f: (Rājā)
nagaraṃ gantvā "ito paṭṭhāya sakalapaṭṭharāsino pañcusilāni rakkhantū" ti
dhammabheriṃ carūpesu.

17 Their different opinions are mostly to be found in the literature referred to above.

18 For reasons that will become obvious presently we leave *agniskandha* aside here.

promenades d'éléphants", while Kern has (quite correctly): "apparitions of chariots of the gods, and apparitions of celestial elephants"; about the same suggestions are found in the translations of Buehler and Hultzsch.¹⁹ Senart's translation of *vimāna* by 'reliquaries' is, of course, out of the question. There is, however, no need to continue this enumeration as I shall take it for granted that the translation 'representations of aerial chariots' and 'representations of (celestial) elephants' are as nearly correct as they can possibly be.

The *vimānas*, of course, are celestial chariots, celestial mansions of the *devatās* moving about in the sky and described in the *Vimānavatthu* and cognate texts in the most exuberant expressions. In Jātaka 541 king Nimi, after having visited in the company of Mātali the lurid and terrifying abodes of the denizens of Hell, finally arrives at the *devaloka*. There he sees one *vimāna* after another, with pillars of gold and jewels, surrounded by lotus ponds and trees of paradise, built from gold, crystal, jewel etc. and described in a most fanciful way.²⁰ The representations of these *vimānas* are apparently meant to give an idea of the bliss of the heavenly world, in which men of meritorious *karman* dwelt for periods that might to a human being seem strongly to approach to eternity. As for the (celestial) elephants Professor Bhandarkar²¹ has suggested that the scenes may be representations of the Buddha when in the shape of a white elephant he descended into the womb of his mother. Although this idea was apparently familiar to Aśoka as is proved by the [*su*]rvasveto hasti sarvalokasukhāharo nāma of Girnār and by the *gajatame* of Kālsī²² the suggestion of Professor Bhandarkar is for obvious reasons an impossible one. Professor Hultzsch suggests the elephants of the Mahārājas or Lokapālas which seems far more acceptable. But above all we

19 *JRAS.*, 1911, 788; *CH.*²; I, 7.

20 In the verses describing these *vimānas* there often appears a word *vyamha* 'mansion, palace,' the derivation of which does not seem clear. *Vyamha*, however, is derived from °*vēmha* < °*vesma* < *veśman*, and is simply a metrical form like *vyamhita*: *vimhita*, *vyasanna*: *visanna*.

21 *IA.*, XLII, 26 f.

22 Cf. Kern, *Jaartelling*, p. 44; Buehler, *ZDMG.*, XXXIX, 490; Windisch, *Buddhas Geburt*, p. 6 f.; Hultzsch, *CH.*, I, p. 27 n. 2.

ably to think of the elephant of Indra²³; for Indra, the ruler of the *devatās*, is the most prominent being in the world of bliss, his position being the highest one to which a man might rise according to the belief of Aśoka's subjects.

But if so far we are on fairly safe ground we seem to be getting into deep waters when trying to deal with *agniskandha*. There, if anywhere, the suggestions of the authorities differ very widely. Thus Prinsep;²⁴ quoting *Mahāvamsa*, XII, 34, found here an allusion to the *Aggikkhandhasutta* of the *Āṅguttara Nikāya* (vol. IV, p. 128 ff.). This suggestion was correctly refuted by Burnouf, *Introduction*, p. 628; who pointed out that the word must mean something like 'a mass of fire.' Burnouf himself (*Lotus*, p. 731) translates it by 'feux d'artifice' (fireworks) while Kern and Hultzsch²⁵ preferred to interpret it by 'fiery balls of fire, meteors.' In an earlier publication Hultzsch²⁶ approved of the interpretation of Buehler²⁷ who suggested that 'fire-trees' should be the correct mode of rendering the puzzling word.²⁸ Later on Hultzsch, apparently misled by certain passages in the Pāli Canon, translated it by 'radiant beings of another world', which has later on been altered into the more general expression 'masses of fire'. Professor Bhandarkar again thought that the *agniskandha* might refer to the fiery pit mentioned in the Jātaka 40 (*Khadirāṅgārājātaka*, vol. I, p. 226 ff.), a suggestion which, though by no means plausible in itself, still contains a hint in the true direction as will be seen presently. Finally Professor Thomas pointing

23 *Airāvata*, *Airāvata* (*Ārāvata*). In the Pāli texts there seems to be no trace of his female counterpart *Abhramu*, which is perhaps first mentioned in *Sisup.*, 1,52: *Sulilayālāni na bhartur Abhramor na citram Uccaiḥśravasaḥ padakramam/ānudrutaḥ saṃpūti yena kecalaḥ Balasya śatruḥ praśasaṃso sīghratām* //

24 *JASB.*, VII, 266.

25 *JRAS.*, 1911, 788.

26 *ZDMG.*, XXXVII, 555.

27 *ZDMG.*, XXXVII, 260; *El.*, II, 467.

28 Such a suggestion has to a certain degree been supported by Professor S. K. Aiyangar, *JRAS.*, 1915, 521 ff., who points to the South Indian custom of igniting a tree on the full-moon of Kārttika (the day of Viṣṇu's victory over Bali).

29 *JRAS.*, 1914, 394 ff.

to certain passages in the literature³⁰ arrives at the conclusion that the word must here mean "bonfire". Unfortunately this ingenious suggestion is hardly disputable as it is quite obvious that *agniskandha* must here allude to some supernatural phenomenon.

In order to try to settle this disputed question let us first of all throw a glance at the eschatology of the Aśoka Edicts.

It has repeatedly been pointed out that a central point of the Buddhist doctrine, viz., the idea of *nirvāṇa* is never mentioned in the Edicts of Aśoka.³¹ The historical Buddha undoubtedly preached the doctrine of Nirvāṇa, but only to the initiated; and it would certainly have been somewhat unpractical to preach to the common layman a doctrine which did either mean that the highest bliss consisted in complete annihilation or rather in an eternal existence not to be qualified by any attributes intelligible to the human mind. And it is the typical Buddhism of the layman that is proclaimed in the rescripts of Aśoka. To the layman meritorious actions performed during one or several existences led to a blissful life in Heaven (*svarga*). This is proved by several passages in the Edicts (such as VI, I, Gīrnār):

*yaṃ ca kiṃci parākramāmī ahaṃ kiṃti bhūtānaṃ ānaṃṇaṃ
gaccheyaṃ idha ca nāni sukhāpayāmi paratrā ca svagaṃ ārādhayaṃtu;
IX, K. L. (Gīrnār): ta tu kho mitrena ca suhadayena vā ṇatikenā va
sahāyana va ovāditavyaṃ tamhi tamhi pakaraṇe idaṃ kacuṃ idaṃ
sādha iti iminā saka svagaṃ ārādhetu iti. Kiṃca iminā katavyataraṃ
yathā svagāradhī; Dhaulī Sep. 1. S, U: vipaṭipādayamīne hi etaṃ
nathi svagasa āladhi na lājāladhi.....sampaṭipadyamīne ev etaṃ
svagaṃ ālādhayitha mama ca ānaniyaṃ ehatha.*

Cp. further the passages, Sahasrām, Bairāt G and Brahmagiri-Siddāpura H.³² Nothing more need be said about this here as the idea

30 *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, p. 72f. where *agniskandha* is translated by 'conflagration' but may as well simply mean 'mass of fire.' Cf. also *SBE.*, XXII, 238 (Trisālā dreams of a great fire).

31 Cp. e.g., Hultsch, *CI.*² I, p. liii.

32 i.e. *sahāyena*.

33 The passage is also found in the recently discovered Gavimaṭh inscr. G: *no hi iyaṃ mahateṇeva cakiye pāṭotave khudakca pi pakomamīṇena vipule pi cakiye svage ārādhayitave.* Cp. Professor Turner in *Hyderabad Arch. Series*, No. 10, p. 15 f.

of *svarga* as the ultimate goal of a meritorious existence is wholly clear as far as these inscriptions are concerned.

But if the remuneration of the just and pious man is the attainment of *svarga* then the simple and easy law of retribution—familiar to the adherents of nearly every religion—craves that the wicked and sinful one should get his ample share of tortures and punishments in Hell. It is quite true that Buddhism does not, at least in its developed form, know anything like an eternal Hell—just as little as an eternal Heaven. Time comes when its denizens are again sent back to earth to struggle, if possible with greater success, with the problems of ethics and morality. However, the periods allotted to the existence in various Heavens and Hells are of such an immense duration that to the common man they may well appear to be equal to eternity.

As far as I am aware there is no direct mention of Hell in the Edicts of Aśoka. But there is, on the other side, ample mention of those sins that were sure to land the sinners in the very abyss. First among them stands the killing of animals. There are, within the Buddhist literature, so many horrid descriptions of the tortures awaiting the butcher, the hunter, the fisherman in the other world that no example need be adduced here.³⁴ Aśoka also mentions other serious sins such as discourtesy and disobedience to parents and relatives and discourtesy to Brahmins and ascetics.³⁵ No doubt these heinous crimes would all, according to common belief in the time of Aśoka, lead to an existence in the abode of damnation.

Keeping in mind what has now been said we may perhaps ask ourselves whether this might not throw some light upon the mysterious *agniskandhāḥ* of Rock Edict IV.

34 Cp. e.g. *Jātaka*, VI, 109, 4 ff.; 111, 4 ff. where fowlers are getting their throats split and are scalded in boiling water while butchers are cut in slices etc. Cp. also *Jātaka*, V, 270, 3 ff.

35 Impudent behaviour against Brahmins will be punished in Hell according to *AV.*, V, 19, 3 and other Vedic texts. The terrible fate awaiting the *paribhāsakā samaṇabrāhmaṇānaṃ* is described e.g. in *Jātaka*, V, 266, 23 ff. and in VI, 106, 21 ff.; 108, 23 ff. (where those *ye silavaṃ samaṇaṃ brāhmaṇaṃ ca hiṃsanti roṣenti supāpadhammino* are plunged headlong into a giant blazing iron cauldron).

It seems tolerably clear that the representations of *vimānas* and elephants were meant to afford the spectators a view of the splendours of the celestial world; they were an exhortation to the pious, holding out to their eyes the rejoicings that were in store for them in the Heavens inhabited by the *devatās* and ruled over by Indra. But if such were the case then a contrast to these brilliant things was also wanted, viz., a picture bringing into the minds of the spectators the horrible places of torture whither led the path of the sinner. No exhortation to virtue and piety could be a more effective one.

The Indian hells, however, are mainly abodes of fire; burnt, brazed, boiled in giant cauldrons, torn to pieces with glowing pincers, racked on beds of molten iron, running through caverns where the floor, the walls, and the ceiling are plates of blazing metal are the denizens of these torture-chambers.³⁶ It is quite true that to the Jains—just as to Dante—the deepest pits were a desert of ice and snow pervaded by a most horrid cold; but I know of no correspondence to this amongst the Buddhists. Even *Arīcī*, the very lowest hell, is to them a blazing furnace.³⁷ And I may say that I believe the *agniskandhāḥ* of Aśoka to have been meant as representations of the hellish flames.

Now it is quite true that *agniskandha* does sometimes denote persons or supernatural beings of extreme brilliancy and splendour. It is an old idea that a fiery light emanates from a pious and liberal man;³⁸ we see pictures of the Buddha with flames radiating from his shoulders etc. And such persons are sometimes compared to an *agniskandha*. Professor Hultzsch, in order to support his interpretation of the word, speaks of 'radiant beings of the other world.' To the quotations adduced by Childers Hultzsch himself has added *Mahāvagga* (I, 16, 1; 17, 1; 18, 1) where the four Mahārājas, Sakka, and Brahmā

³⁶ Without giving here any extensive quotations I simply point to the descriptions of the hells given in the Jātakas 530 and 541 and in *Mahāvastu*, I, p. 4 ff.; III, p. 454 ff. Cp. the literature quoted by myself in *Paccekabuddhage-schichten* (1908), p. 11 n. 1.

³⁷ Cp. e.g. *Jātaka*, I, 232, 16 ff.: *sa* (: *aṅgārukāsu*) *khadirāṅgārapuṇṇā sampajjalitā sajotibhūtā Arīcimahāniraya viya khūyittha*.... On the etymology of *Arīcī* cp. Johansson, *Monde Or.*, II, 97 ff.

³⁸ Cp. e.g. *Jānaśruti Pautrāyaṇa* in *Chānd. Up.*, IV, 2, 1 ff.

Sahampati stand in front of the Buddha like huge piles of fire (*seyyathāpi mahantā aggikkhandhā*, s. *mahā aggikkhandho*). To these examples may be added a few other ones such as *Jātaka*, IV, 124, 21: *mayhaṃ dve puttā aggikkhandhā viya jalanti*, "my two sons blaze like masses of fire";³⁹ *Jātaka*, VI, 372, 7f.: *mahā aggikkhandhasadiso Mahosadho paññāya jalati*, "Mahcsadha because of his wit shines brilliantly like a great pile of fire" etc. However in all these passages great persons are only compared to *agniskandhā*; there is no example of the word having exactly the sense attributed to it by the late Professor Hultsch.

In all passages known to me, however, the sense of the word is simply 'a mass, a pile of fire', perhaps even 'a bonfire'. Thus let us take at random some examples from the Pāli texts:

Jātaka, IV, 139, 25ff.:

"*Nāvā taṃ samuddham atikkamitrā parato Aggimālaṃ nāma gatā. So pajjalita-aggikkhandho viya majjhantikasuriyo viya ca obhāsaṃ muñcanto aṭṭhāsi.*" (Like a blazing pile of fire).

Jātaka, V, 269, 13 ff.:

*Ayomayā simbaliyo soḷaṅgulakaṇṭakā
dubhato-m-abhilambanti duggaṃ Vētaraniṃ nadiṃ
Te accimanto tiṭṭhanti aggikkhandhā va ārukā
āditā jātavedena uddhaṃ yojanaṃ uggatā.*

Here the *Sūlmali*-trees growing on both banks of the Vaitarani river are compared to piles of fire.

Jātaka, VI, 330, 6 ff.:

*rūjaṅgaṇe catūsu kaṇṇesu cattāro aggikkhandhā mahāpākārappa-
māṇen' uṭṭhāya jalanti* ("four bonfires").

Cp. further *Mil. P.*, p. 304, 7 (*mahatimahā aggikkhandho*); *Therīg.*, 351 (*amittā vadhakā kāmā aggik(k)handhūpamā dukkhā*); *Samy. Nik.*, II, 85f. (a huge pile of fire consuming even forty wagon-loads of fuel); *Paṭis.*, I, 125; *Dīpav.*, VI, 37 etc.

The simple *khandha*, meaning 'a bulk; the trunk of a tree' is

³⁹ Daśaratha is speaking of Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa.

sometimes used in a sense which does not very much differ from that of *aggikkhandha*. Thus in *Jātaka*, VI, 107, 14f; we hear about the sinners in Hell that

*Sajotibhūtā paṭhavim kamanti
tattehi khandhehi ca poṭhayanti, etc.*

The commentary to the second line runs thus:

“*Khandhehi ca poṭhayanti* ti nirayapālehi anubandhitvā tālappamāṇehi jalita-ayakhandhehi jaṅghāsu paharivā patitā teḥ’eva khandhehi poṭhayanti cuṇṇavicuṇṇaṃ karonti.”

In *Jātaka*, VI, 113, 35 the ‘*khandhā sajotibhūtā*’ are explained in the commentary to be great masses of flaming mountains; literally we can only translate it by ‘bulks flaming with fire’. Further examples could perhaps be adduced but these may be sufficient for our present purpose.

If then *aggikkhandha* means nothing but ‘a mass, a pile of fire’, and if it is even used in at least one passage⁴⁰ of the trees in Hell it may not seem too hazardous to suggest that in the Rock Edict IV it also means ‘piles of fire’ meant to symbolize the tortures to be suffered in the hellish fire-pits.⁴¹

My translation of Rock Edict IV, A-C, would then run as follows:

A. “In times gone by, for many hundreds of years, there had ever been increasing the killing of living beings, the hurting (of living beings), discourtesy to relatives and discourtesy to Brahmins and ascetics.

B. Now, however, because of the observance of the Buddhist doctrine on the part of the Beloved of the gods, the king of auspicious countenance, the sound of drums has become the announcement of the true religion (Buddhism). Showing the people representations of

⁴⁰ *Jātaka*, V, 269, 15.

⁴¹ An old and well known tradition tells us that Aśoka before his conversion was a very cruel ruler, who had amongst other things constructed a ‘Hell’ where people were subjected to the most fiendish tortures (cp. on this ‘Hell’ Senart, *Inscriptions de Piyadasi*, II, 300; *Dirūvadāna*, 374 ff.; *Fa-hien* (Giles, 1923), p. 58 ff.; *Yuan Chwang* (Watters), II, 89; *Tāranātha*, p. 28 ff. etc.). May not the legend of this torture-chamber contain a misrepresented tradition of the spectacles presented by Aśoka to his subjects as described in this Edict?

celestial mansions and of (celestial) elephants, piles of (hell-)fire and other supernatural apparitions,

C. these are now promoted by the Beloved of the gods, the king of auspicious countenance,⁴² through instruction in the Buddhist doctrine, abstention from killing and hurting all living beings, courtesy to relatives, courtesy to Brahmins and ascetics, obedience to mother and father, obedience to the aged such as they had not existed formerly for many a century."

I am well aware that my interpretation is no more than a hypothesis; still I venture to think that it may solve the difficulties of the passage in question in a somewhat easier way than some previous efforts.

JARL CHARPENTIER



⁴² *Devānampriyasa Priyadasino rāño* does not directly rule *anusastiya* but must be taken together with *vaḍhite*.

Sātvant, Sātvata and Nāsatya

Under the title 'The Sātvatas and their Religion' Sir R. G. Bhandarkar wrote: "In the Ādiparvan Vāsudeva addressing the Vṛṣṇis says that Pārtha does not think them who are Sātvatas to be covetous. Vāsudeva is called Sātvata in Ādip. 218, 12; Kṛtavarman in Ādip. 221, 31; Sātyaki in Droṇap. 97, 36; and Janārdana in Udyogap. 70, 7. At the end of chap. 66 of the Bhīṣmaparvan Bhīṣma says: 'This eternal god, mysterious, beneficent and loving should be known as Vāsudeva, and Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas and Sūdras worship him by their devoted actions. At the end of the Dvāpara and the beginning of the Kali age, he was sung or expounded by Saṃkarṣaṇa according to the Sātvata rites (Vidhi).' At the end of chap. 12 of the third book of the *Viṣṇu-Purāṇa* it is stated in the account of the genealogy of the Yādavas and the Vṛṣṇis that Sātvata was the son of Aṃśa, and all his descendants were called after him Sātvatas. The *Bhāgavata* represents the Sātvatas as calling the highest Brahman Bhagavat and Vāsudeva (IX, 9, 49) and having a peculiar mode of worshipping him. It mentions the Sātvatas along with the Andhakas and Vṛṣṇis, which were Yādava tribes (I, 14, 25; III, 1, 29), and calls Vāsudeva Sātvatarṣabha (X, 58, 42; XI, 27, 5). In *Patañjali* (IV, 1, 114) Vāsudeva and Bāladeva are given as derivatives from Vṛṣṇi names in the sense of sons of Vāsudeva and Baladeva.....From all this and such other passages from *Patañjali* it will appear that Sātvata was another name of the Vṛṣṇi race of which Vāsudeva, Saṃkarṣaṇa, and Aniruddha were members, and that the Sātvatas had a religion of their own according to which Vāsudeva was worshipped as the Supreme Being, and thus the account given above from the *Nārāyaṇīya* is amply confirmed (*Vaiṣṇavism, Saivism and Minor Rel. Systems*, § 6).

In *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* (2, 25) Haug had read: *tasmād dhā'py etarhi Bharatāḥ satvanām vittim prayanti turīye haiva saṃgrahitāro vadante*. He translated (p. 128): "thence when now-a-days the Bharatas spoil their enemies (conquered in the battle-field) those

charioteers, who seize the booty say: the fourth part (of the booty is ours) alone." Weber (*Indische Studien*, IX, p. 253) objects to this translation and remarks, by comparing it with the *Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa* (XIII, 5, 4, 21: *ādatta yujñam Kāśīnām Bharataḥ Satvatām iva*), that in *Aitar. Brā.* (2, 25) we have perhaps to read: *Satvatām vittim*. In fact, in *Aitar. Brāh.* (8, 14) Satvant is the name of a people of the South (*ye ke ca Satvatām rājānah*).

This name has also been found by the authors of the *St. Petersburg Dictionary*, Cowell, Max Müller and Weber in the *Kauṣītaki-Upaniṣad*, IV, 1; Macdonell and Keith think that the reading there is not *Satvan-Matsyeṣu*, but *sa-Vaśa-Matsyeṣu* (*Vedic Index*, II, p. 421).

It is probable that Satvant of the *Brāhmaṇas* and Sātvata of the Epic and the Purāṇas are two variants designating the same Southern people and are other names of the Andhaka-Vṛṣṇis.

I have shown elsewhere (*JRAS.*, 1929, p. 273 seq.; *JAHRS.*, IV, p. 49 seq.) that Prākṛt Satakani=Sātiyaputa of the Aśoka's inscription. The Sātiyaputas may be compared with the Setæ described by Pliny immediately after the Andhras and with the tribe of the Satakas or Satakas. In all these names, we find a non-Aryan radical *sata* which appears in modern Muṇḍā languages in the form *sadam*, 'horse', Sātiyaputa=Satakani means 'son of the mythic Horse'. It seems probable that Satvant is formed in a similar way from the radical *saṭ* 'horse' and the Aryan suffix *vant*.

Whitney (*Sanskrit Grammar*, 2nd. ed., § 1233) gives numerous possessive adjectives made by this suffix, from noun-stems of every form, both in the earlier language and in the later. "Instead of the specialized meaning of 'possessing', the more general one of 'like to, resembling' is seen in a number of words, especially in the derivatives from pronominal stems, *māvant*, 'like me' etc. Other examples are *indrasvant*, 'like Indra', *nīḍāvant*, 'nestlike', *nīlāvant*, 'blackish', *unṛvānt*, 'manly', *prṣadvant*, 'speckled', *kṣāitavant*, 'princely'....." Accordingly, *satvant* may have the meaning 'horselike' as it suits the descendants of the mythic Horse.

The researches of M. Dumont about the Aśvamedha have brought to light the procreative power of the mythic Horse. The final rite of this ceremony consecrated a magic union between the Queen and the

sacrificed Horse. The princes born of this union could, therefore, be called 'sons of the Horse'.

The Satakani kings, we know, celebrated the horse-sacrifice. *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa* (XIII, 5, 4, 21) refers to the defeat by Bharata of the Satvants and his taking away the horse which they had kept ready for an *Aśvamedha*. Since the Satakani were considered as descendants of the ancestral Horse, the same may be said of the Satvants and this descent accounts for their name.

The Sātvatas of the Epic and Purāṇas are especially known as adorators of Bhagavat. Vāsudeva is called Sātvata and Sātvatarṣabha. In a recent paper (*Archiv Orientalní*, IV, p. 261 seq.), I have tried to establish that the Andhaka-Vṛṣṇis were of the same stock as Viṣṇu and Vāsudeva. If, as Bhandarkar assumes, Sātvata was another name of the Vṛṣṇi race, we are probably right in considering as equivalents Satvant, Sātvata, Sātiyaputa and Satakani.¹

Sata, Sāta, Sātiya being various forms of a radical synonym of *Aśva*, 'horse', it is now possible to explain Nāsatya which is a Vedic name of the Aśvinau. Nāsatya has no satisfactory etymology in Indo-Aryan. To analyse it into *na+asatya*, *nā* (= *netar*) + *satya*, or *nāsū+tya* is impossible or fanciful. In examining some non-Aryan words like *patana*, *varuṇa*, I have isolated an affix *-na* after the radicals *pata-*, *varu-*. If we put off the same affix, we find in Nāsatya our radical *satya*, 'horse', the form of which is here intermediate between *sat* and *sātiya*. As it would be shocking in Sanskrit to call two great gods *na-satya*, 'non-truth', the lengthening of *ā* may have taken place to improve the meaning. This being admitted, *nāsatya* is to *satya* like *aśvin* to *aśva*. We have two derivatives of two radicals meaning 'horse'. The first (*nāsatya*) is non-Aryan; the second (*aśvin*) is Aryan. We should now answer the question: why were two Vedic gods called at the same time by an Aryan and a non-Aryan name? This problem will be discussed subsequently.

Avestic Nāōnhaidya, equivalent of Nāsatya, is also without etymology. It is the name of a demon (*daēva*). In *Bundahišn* (28, 10)

1. *Sat* being a non-Aryan radical, the variations of quantity *sat*, *sāt* are explicable in words of foreign origin. The same variations appear in modern Muṇḍā languages.

the business of the demon 'is this, that he gives discontent to the creatures' (cf. West, *SBE.*, 5, 128, n. 4; 37, 213, n. 4; Blochet, *RHR.*, 32. 113; Bartholomae, *Altiran. Wörtb.*, s. v.). This feature agrees with our thesis: the *daéva* in Iran, as the *asura* in India, are hostile to Aryan gods and men; hence a connexion between *daévas* and non-Aryan notions.

J. PRZYLUŚKI

The Nāgavamśis of Cakrakotya

I propose to give here a short account of the Nāga dynasty of Bastar, which was quite unknown till the beginning of the current century, when I deciphered a number of inscriptions, for which a strenuous search was made by my friend Rai Bahadur Panda Baijnath, who was then Superintendent of that state, extending north to south from almost the sources of the Mahanadi to the banks of the Godavari, which at places forms the boundary between it and the Nizam's Dominion. It comprises an area of 14000 square miles mostly covered with primeval jungle, described in the latest *Imperial Gazetteer* as one of the most untrodden regions of the Peninsula, where in the deep recesses of the wild forest is the home of the Gond races, one of the aboriginal Dravidian peoples, whose origin is indistinct, a people who still erect rude stone monuments and use stone implements unwitting of the procession of the centuries and the advance of civilization to their borders. Scattered in this forest more than twenty inscriptions were discovered written in beautiful Sanskrit and revealing the existence of a dynasty of kings, who worshipped the Aryan gods and were not less advanced in point of civilization than other well-known dynasties ruling in the centre of Hindustan or in the countries south of the Godavari. These inscriptions give us the names of at least 7 or 8 Nāgavamśī kings, who ruled between 1023 and 1342 A.D. It is therefore clear that the records of many kings, if they left any, are yet to be discovered. In a period of 300 years we might expect about double the number of kings we have come upon. We cannot at present arrange them in a genealogical table, as we do not yet know the relationship which they bore to each other except in three cases. We know their dates from the inscriptions from which we can easily judge where the gaps lie.

The oldest record of the Nāgavamśī kings of Bastar goes back to 1023 A.D. when one Nṛpatibhūṣaṇa¹ was ruling the country then known as Cakrakotya. As part of the king's name has been lost we can not

1 *U. P. Inscriptions* (2nd Edition), p 166.

say for certain, whether this was the proper name of the king or it was one of his titles. After him we find a record² of Jagdekabhūṣaṇa Dhārāvarṣa dated in the year 1060 A.D. The inscription records the construction of a tank at Bārasūra, which was the capital of the Nāgavaṃśis in those days, by Māhārāja Candrāditya, a feudatory chief of Jagdekabhūṣaṇa. Candrāditya claimed descent from the Karikāla family, who held sway over the country watered by the Kaveri. The family traced its origin to the well-known Cola race. These details are interesting and show that Candrāditya was connected with the ancient Colas of the Cuddapah Dist., who probably invaded the Bastar country and left him or his ancestor in charge of the conquered dominion, which the local kings recovered and reduced the Cola Governor to the status of a feudatory. We know from other inscriptions that the Cola king Kulottuṅga, who ascended the throne in 1070 A.D., had once attacked the Bastar country in his youth. It is therefore possible that Candrāditya accompanied him and remained behind as his representative in the country he conquered. Dhārāvarṣa died before 1065 A.D., as the Rājapur copper plate grant shows, leaving a minor son Someśvaradeva, who was apparently ousted by Madhurāntakadeva belonging to a collateral branch, in 1065 A.D. This is a unique record which deserves notice at some length. It records the grant of Rājapur village to one *Meḍipota* or a *Churikāra Meḍipota* and his descendants together with 70 Gadyānaka coins. The purpose of the grant is described as follows:—“Nobody enters the *Churi-prabandha* at the village sacrifice. There is no place for the preceptor of the local Yoginis. For this purpose this village is taken for the benefit of all creatures for showing kindness to them and for performing virtue.” This statement appears to be something like an agreement made by the donee, who gives the reasons for accepting the grant for a purpose, which is clothed in an obscure language. I take it to be a compensation for supplying a victim for human sacrifice. In editing this inscription in the *Epigraphia Indica*³ I have shown how I arrived at this conclusion. It must be remembered that in that part of the country human sacri-

2 O. P. Inscriptions, p. 158.

3 Vol. IX, pp. 174ff.

fices were rampant even a hundred years ago; no body indeed can say that cases of that nature do not occur even now. A careful perusal of Police reports would show that even in these times belief in the efficacy of human sacrifices has not disappeared. In Bastar there is a shrine of Dantēśvarī to whom human sacrifices were offered since she was installed there and the Bhonslas, when they became the overlords of that state, were constrained to keep a guard at the temple in order to prevent human sacrifices.

When the British took over these wild territories they had to appoint an officer to repress that practice. Col. Macpherson of the Madras army, who was appointed to this office wrote in 1852 as follows:—
 “In the worship of the earth goddess the rite is human sacrifice. It is celebrated as a public oblation both at social festivals held periodically and when occasions demand extraordinary propitiation; such as the occurrence of an extraordinary number of deaths by disease or by tigers or should many die in child-birth or should the flocks or herds suffer largely from disease or from wild beasts or should greater crops threaten to fail or the occurrence of any marked calamity to the families of the tribal chiefs.” Madhurāntakadeva’s action in giving a grant for the supply of victims appears to have been as much prompted for the general welfare of the people as his own safety, because he appears to have been a usurper, as we find him later on ousted by Someśvara-deva, the rightful heir, notwithstanding these precautions.

The earliest dated record of Someśvaradeva’s times belongs to the year 1069, but the figures of the date are somewhat doubtful. The other dates which are quite certain are 1095, 1097 & 1109 A.D. It appears that Someśvara was a valorous king who not only displaced Madhurāntaka whom he killed in battle, but crossed the Godavari and burnt Vengi,⁴ which was the name of the country lying between the Godavari and the Kṛṣṇā. He also subjugated Bhadrappattana and Vajra, which I have identified with Bhāndak and Vairāgarh in the Chāndā district. Vairāgarh is referred to in Tamil literature as Vairāgaram, a corruption of Vajrākaram, which means a mine of diamonds. It is well-known that diamond mines existed in Vairāgarh. The Vengi kings were perpetual

4 *JRAS.*, vol. XIII (1852), p. 248 *et. seq.*

enemies of the Cakrakōṭya kings and they were wont to burn each other's towns when opportunity offered itself. Someśvara also claims to have taken possession of six lacs of villages belonging to Kośala or the Chhattisgarh country, but this seems to be an exaggeration. It is possible that he may have raided the neighbouring Kośala country and may have held an indefinite number of villages in his possession, until he was driven out again. This surmise seems to be supported by Jājalladeva's inscription of 1114 A.D., in which it is recorded that he seized in battle one Someśvara after having slain an immense army.⁵ We know from Bārasūra inscription that Someśvara was living in 1109 A.D. and that he had died in 1111 A.D., which is apparent from his mother's inscription⁶ of that year found at Narāyanpāl. Jājalladeva was king of Ratanpur, the capital of the Kośala country and finds a mention among Someśvara's rivals along with the kings of Orissa, Lānji in the Bālāghāṭ District, Lavana in Raipur and 3 others mentioned before, viz., Vengi on the other side of the Godavari and Bhāndak and Vairāgarh in the Chāndā District. Someśvara appears to have been the greatest of his dynasty in the Cakrakōṭya kingdom. His son and successor was Kannaradeva, who is mentioned in his grandmother's inscription of 1111 A.D., where it is plainly said that he ascended the throne on his father Someśvara having gone to heaven.⁷

Of Kannara's deeds nothing is known. There is a big gap after him, as the next inscription in point of time belongs to the year 1218, when Jagdekabhūṣaṇa Narasiṃhadeva was ruling. In that year there was an eclipse of the sun and the month of Jyeṣṭha was intercalary. So a feudatory chief of his made a grant of land to the Brāhmanas and got a record carved on a stone. Another record of a gift during his reign is dated in the year 1224 A.D. That is the sum total of the information available about him. Another name found in an undated record is that of Jayasiṃha of the Nāga family. It is not known whether he was the predecessor or successor of Narasiṃha. Similarly another undated record of what appears to be a second Kannaradeva has been found. A Sati stone of the reign of Hariścandradeva dated in 1324 A.D. is the last

⁵ *C. P. Inscriptions*, p. 160.

⁶ *El.*, vol. I, p. 32 *et seq.*

⁷ *El.*, vol. IX, pp. 311 ff.

record which apparently refers to the Nāgavamśī line of kings. It mentions him as ruling Cakrakotya showing that that name was still in use in the 14th. century.

I will now quote the titles of the Bastar Nāgavamśīs, which go to establish a connection with other Nāgavamśīs ruling elsewhere. In the Narāyanpāl inscription we find Dharavarṣadeva described as "Mahārāja Paramabhaṭṭāraka Parameśvara born of the Nāgavamśa, resplendent with the mass of rays of a thousand hood-jewels, the Lord of Bhogāvati, the best of towns, whose crest was a tiger with a calf, who was of the Kāśyapa *gotra* and who had made his shout of victory universally known and was a glorious ornament among kings." In other inscriptions the name of the family is mentioned as Chindaka, which is a variant of Sindaka or Sinda family, which also claimed to have belonged to the Nāgavamśa and to have been the Lord of Bhogāvati. These were ruling in Yelbarga in the Nizam's dominions. There was another branch ruling in Bāgalkoṭa in the Bijapur district. These branches were distinguished from one another by some variations in their crest or *lāñchana*s and banners or *dhvaj*as, *patākā*s or *ketana*s. The Vyāghra *lāñchana*, (tiger crest) seems to have been common to all, probably because the original ancestor of the dynasty, which received its name after him, was believed to have been brought up by the king of serpents on tiger's milk. The story of their mythical origin relates that the long armed Sinda, a human son of the serpent king Dharanendra was born at Ahicchattrā in the region of the river Sindhu or the Indus and was reared by a tiger. This is recorded in the Bhairanmaṭṭi inscription in the Bāgalkoṭa Tāluka of the Bijapur district in the Bombay Presidency. Parenthetically I may note here that the name of Dharanendra is found in the vulgar form of Dhāru with a similar story in the Jubbulpore district in connection with the descent of another royal family tracing its origin from a snake. We find that the Bāgalkoṭa branch of the Nāgavamśīs owned the tiger crest and Phaniketana or banner of hooded serpents. The Halavur branch of the Vanavāsī tract had the *vyāghra-mṛga-lāñchana* or a crest of a tiger and a deer and the Niladdhvaja or blue banner. In Bastar there were apparently two branches, the main branch having *Savatsa-vyāghra-lāñchana* or a tiger with a calf as their crest, thus depicting probably

the story of their origin in a clearer way. Their banner is not mentioned anywhere. In the second branch in which Madhurāntaka was born the *lāñchana* was *dhanur-vyāghra* or bow and tiger and the banner was *kamala-kadalī* or lotus-flower and plantain leaves. To judge from their titles Paramabhaṭṭāraka Parameśvara Mahārāja, the Bastar branch appears to have been more independent than other branches of this dynasty. If ancient sites of the state be properly explored it is very probable that several other records would be forthcoming, which will throw a good deal of light on the Nāga dynasty.

It appears that the dynasty had democratic institutions. A notification recorded on stone by Māskadevī, a younger sister of Rājabhūṣaṇa Mahārāja proves it. It says:—"In view of the fact that every member of the agricultural classes has been troubled by the King's officers while collecting rents, which have been exacted even before they were due, the elders of the five great assemblies and the agricultural classes in meeting assembled framed the following rules:—That in future those villages which at the time of the coronation of any king may be required to render service shall collect the taxes etc. only from such residents as had been settled long there. They shall be traitors to the king and Māskadevī, who living in Cakrakotya will violate these rules". This sounds like a legislative council ruling.

The Nāgpur country carries the name of Nāga with it and the old Bhogāvati which Bastar kings claimed as their original seat or capital has been traced up in the vicinity of Nāgpur, where the great queen Prabhāvati (Guptā, daughter of the Imperial Gupta king Candragupta II and queen of the Vākāṭaka king Rudrasena II made a grant, in which she mentioned her relationships with the Nāgas, apparently as a matter of pride. Nāgārjuna is said to have hailed from the adjoining portion of the country and to have visited the Nāgaloka, his original home, to deliver lectures to the Nāgas of that place. All this stray information together with the new light which the learned scholar Mr. K. P. Jayaswal has recently thrown on the dark period of Indian History has to be strung together for a connected history of the great Nāga tribe setting all their branches in their proper places in and out of the Central Provinces.

HIRALAL

A note on Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja's Caitanya-Caritāmṛta

It is somewhat strange that the date of composition of this important biography of Caitanya has not yet been settled, for there appears to exist a great deal of difference of opinion on this subject. Dinesh Chandra Sen in his two works on Bengali Language and Literature¹ gives 1615 A.D. as the date of composition of the work. But in the one place he states that the work was completed after seven years' labour, in another, after nine years' labour. On the other hand, Jagadbandhu Bhadra, in the introduction to his *Gaura-pada-taraṅgiṇī*, states that the work was completed in 1503 Śaka (=1581 A.D.). This latter opinion appears to have been accepted by Satish Chandra Ray in the introduction to his edition of the *Pada-kalpataru*,² as well as by Dinesh Chandra Sen again in his *Chaitanya and His Age*³ and in his *Vaisnava Literature of Mediaeval Bengal*.⁴ It appears, however, that the former date is probably the correct one. In some manuscripts of the work a *śloka* is found after the colophon which appears to give an indication of the date of its composition. This verse, however, is not found in all manuscripts, and the printed texts (e.g. Kālnā edition) sometimes omit it. The verse is also missing in some of the Dacca University manuscripts which I have examined.⁵ As it occurs in most of the manuscripts, which contain it, after the colophon, it is probably a scribal addition which was naturally omitted in some of the manuscripts. The authenticity of the verse is therefore not beyond question, but probably it records the traditional date. The verse in most manuscripts runs thus:

*śāke sindhvagni-bānendau jyaiṣṭhe vṛndāvanāntare|
sūryāhe sita-saptamyāṃ grantho'yaṃ pūrṇatāṃ gataḥ||*

1 *History of Bengali Language and Literature*, Calcutta, 1911, p. 487; and *Baṅga Bhāṣā O Sāhitya*, Calcutta, 1334 B. S., p. 319.

2 Pt. V, p. 51.

3 Calcutta, 1922, p. 77.

4 Calcutta, 1917, p. 63.

5 See note at the end of Gauḍīya Mādhyama Maṭha edition, which mentions this fact of omission.

This would give us the date Śaka 1537 (=1615 A.D.) But another reading *śāke'-agni-hindu-bānendau* is also found in other manuscripts of the text, and this would give us the date Śaka 1503 (=1581 A.D.). These two readings, unfortunately, make a difference of 34 years and have probably led to the divergence of opinion regarding the date of the work mentioned above. It seems, however, that the date 1615 A.D. given by the tradition recorded by the first reading of the verse given above is the more probable one. From internal evidence, it appears that the latest work cited in the *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* is Jīva Gosvāmin's *Gopāla-Campū* which is expressly dated as having been completed in Śaka 1514 (=1592 A.D.).⁶ Kṛṣṇadāsa could not therefore have completed his work in 1581, and the only other date given by tradition being 1615 A.D., it has to be accepted in view of this citation of Jīva Gosvāmin's work. The fact that Kṛṣṇadāsa's work explicitly acknowledges its indebtedness to Vṛndāvana-dāsa's *Caitanya-bhāgavata*, while it is in its own turn not mentioned in the list of previous biographies of Caitanya given by Jayānanda and Locanadāsa, would go to support the conclusion that it is one of the latest biographies of Caitanya in Bengali.

Dinesh Chandra Sen gives⁷ a short list of works cited in the *Caitanya-caritāmṛta*, but this list he compiles practically from a similar list given in Jagadbandhu Bhadra's work. It must, however, be pointed out that these and such other lists, which are compiled generally from the printed editions of the text, are often misleading; for the printed editions do not often distinguish between works which are actually cited by name by the author and those from which anonymous quotations are given; and the editors themselves often supply as headings to such quotations the names, by chapter and verse, of the works which the manuscripts of the text very often quote anonymously. As a notable instance, we may refer to verses 5-12 which open Kṛṣṇadāsa's work. These verses are printed in some editions (e.g. the Vaṅgavāsī edition, the Gauḍīya Mādhva Maṭha edition etc.) as quota-

6 The first part bears the date Śaka 1510 (=1588 A.D.); the second part is dated in Śaka 1514 (=1592 A.D.).

7 *Baṅga Bhāṣā O Sāhitya*, p. 320: *History of Bengali Language and Literature*, pp. 481-82 footnote.

tions from Svarūpa Dāmodara, with the superscription *svarūpa-gosvāmi-kāḍacāryam*, although in the Kālnā edition this indication is omitted. The manuscripts of the text which we have consulted in the Dacca University collection and elsewhere do not support this attribution to Svarūpa Dāmodara, and no such superscription as given above is found in the manuscripts. This appears therefore to be a piece of unjustifiable "padding" by zealous editors, of which instances are not infrequent in the printed editions. We give below a full list of the works and authors actually cited by name, as well as those cited or referred to anonymously, prepared from one of the dated manuscripts of the work existing in the Dacca University Library (No. 207, dated Saka 1672).⁸

The following works and authors are actually mentioned by name in the text itself :

Aṣṭādaśa līlā-chandas by Rūpa (Madhya i, 39), Āgama (Ādi ii, 20; iii 83; Madhya ix, 42) or Āgama-sāstra (Antya xix, 25), *Ujjvala-nīla-maṇi* by Rūpa (Madhya i, 38), Upaniṣad (Ādi ii, 12, 24 vii, 108 etc.), *Upa-purāṇa* (Ādi iii, 81), *Karṇāmṛta* or *Kṛṣṇakarṇāmṛta* (Madhya i 120, ii, 77; ix; 305-9; Antya xv, 27), *Kalāpa* (Ādi xvi, 32), *Kāvya-prakāśa* (Antya xiii, 111), *Kūrma-purāṇa* (Madhya i, 117; ix, 201), *Kṛṣṇa-vijaya* by Guṇarāja Khān (Madhya xv, 99), *Korān* (Ādi xvii, 155; Madhya xx, 5), *Gīta-govinda* (Madhya ii, 77; x, 115; Antya xiii, 79; xv, 27, 83; xvii, 6, 62), *Gītā* or *Gītā-sāstra* (Ādi iii, 21; v, 88, 89; vi, 27; vii, 117 etc.), *Gopāla-campū* by Jīva (Madhya i, 44; Antya iv, 230), *Govinda-birudāvalī* by Rūpa (Madhya i, 40), *Caṇḍīdāsa* (Ādi xiii, 42; Madhya ii, 77; x, 115; Antya, xvii, 6), *Caitanya-maṅgala* by Vṛndāvana-Dāsa (Ādi viii, 33-38, 44, 63; xi, 54; xv, 7, 33; xvii, 138, 330; Madhya i, 11 etc.), *Caitanya-stava-kalpa-rkṣa* by Raghunātha-Dāsa (Antya vi, 326; xiv, 72, 119; xvi, 86; xvii, 70; xix, 75), *Jyotiṣa* (Ādi xvii, 103), *Daśama-carita* by Sanātana (Madhya i, 35), *Daśama-tippaṇi* (Madhya i, 35), *Dānakeli-kaumudī* by Rūpa (Madhya i, 39; Antya iv, 226), *Nāṭaka-varṇana* by Rūpa [= *Nāṭaka-candrikā*]

8 In preparing this list Mr. Subodh Chandra Banerjee of the Dacca University Manuscript Library very materially assisted me and I take this opportunity of thanking him for his help.

(Madhya i, 40), Nigama-purāṇa (Madhya xx, 393), Nyāya (Madhya xxv, 50), *Pañjī-tīkā* (Ādi xv, 6; Antya xiv, 10), *Padjūvalī* by Rūpa (Madhya i, 39), *Pātañjala* (Madhya ix, 42; xxv, 51), Purāṇa (Ādi iii, 38, 83 etc.), Bṛhat-sahasra-nāma (Ādi xvii, 90), *Brahma-saṃhitā* (Madhya i, 120; ix, 237, 239, 309, 323), *Brahma-sūtra* (Madhya xxv, 98), *Bhāgavata* (many references), *Bhāgavatāmṛta* by Sanātana (Madhya i, 35), *Bhāgavata-sandarbhā* (Ādi iii, 79; Madhya i, 43; Antya iv, 229), *Bhārata* or *Bhārata-sāstra* [= *Mahābhārata*] (Madhya vi, 97; Ādi iii, 83), *Bhramara-gītā* (Madhya xxiii, 56; Antya xix, 107), *Mathurā-māhātmya* by Rūpa (Madhya i, 40; xxv, 208), *Yoga-sāstra* (Ādi ii, 18), *Rasāmṛta-sindhu* by Rūpa (Madhya i, 38; xix, 133; iv, 223), *Rāyer Nāṭaka-gīti* [= *Jagannātha-vallabha-nāṭaka*] by Rāmānanda Rāya (Madhya ii, 77), *Laghu-bhāgavatāmṛta* by Rūpa (Madhya i, 41), *Lalīta-mādhava* by Rūpa (Madhya i, 38; Antya iv, 225), *Vidyūpaṭi* (Ādi xiii, 42; Madhya ii, 77; x, 115; Antya xv, 27; xvii, 6, 61), *Viṣṇu-purāṇa* (Ādi vii, 117), *Vyāsa-sūtra* (Madhya vi, 133, 138; xxv, 43, 89; also see *Brahma-sūtra*), *Śārīraka-bhāṣya* (Antya, ii, 95), *Sikṣāṣṭaka* (Antya xx, 138, 139), *Ṣaṭsandarbha* (Antya iv, 231), *Sāṃkhya* (Madhya ix, 42; xxv, 49), *Siddhārtha-saṃhitā* (Madhya xx, 223), *Stavāvalī* or *Stava-mālā* (Madhya i, 39), *Hayasīrṣa-pañcarātra* (Madhya xx, 237), *Hari-vaṃśa* (Madhya xxiii, 110), *Haribhakti-vilāsa* by Sanātana (Madhya i, 35).

In addition to some of the works mentioned above, quotations are given in our MS with the actual citation of the following works and authors by name: *Gopī-premāmṛta*, *Gautamīya* (Tantra?), *Caitanya-carita* [= *candrodaya*] *nāṭaka*, Jayadeva, Tantra, *Nārada-pañcarātra* (or only *Pañcarātra*), *Nṛsiṃha-purāṇa*, *Padma-purāṇa* (also *Padmottara-khaṇḍa*), Brahman (taduktam brahmaṇā) *Brahmaṇḍa-purāṇa*, Bharata-muni, *Bhāgavata* (referred to also by Skandhas, e.g. daśame, dvitīye etc.), *Bhāṣya*, *Mamaiva ślokāḥ Rāmānanda-kṛta Gīta*, *Viśva* or *Viśvaprakāśa*, *Sāstra*, *Sāstrajña*, *Śrīdhara-svāmin*, *Śrīmukha-Sikṣā-śloka*, *Śrī-yāmunā-cārya-stotra*, *Śrī-rūpa Gosvāmin* (also *tatkṛta saptam-skandha-vivecana*), *Śrī-sahasra-nāma-stotra*, *Sruti* (also general references as *Veda* and *Vedānta*), *Sāmudraka*, *Siddhānta-tattva-bheda*, *Sindhu* (= *Bhakti-rasāmṛta-sindhu*), *Stuti-śloka*, *Smṛti*, *Haribhakti-sudhodaya*.

Anonymous quotations appear to be given from the following works in addition to most of those mentioned above:

Abhijñāna-śakuntala, Amara-koṣa, Ādi-purāṇa, Uttara-rāma-carita, Ekādaśī-tattva (Ādi ii, 74), Garuḍa-purāṇa, Govinda-līlāmṛta (Kṛṣṇadāsa's own work), Jīva's Tattva-sandarbhā, Lakṣmīdhara's Bhagavan-nāma-kaumudī, Naiṣadhiya, Pāṇini, Bhāvārtha-dīpikā of Śrīdharaśvāmin, Bhāravī's Kirātārjunīya,, Raghuvamśa, Rāmāyaṇa, Svetāśvatara Upaniṣad, Sāhitya-darpaṇa (Antya i, 186), Skanda-purāṇa.

S. K. DE

The Phallus Worship in the Veda

Eminent oriental scholars, both European and their Indian followers, have tried to prove the practice of Phallus Worship in the Veda. The only argument advanced by them in support of it lies in the word *śiśnadeva* used twice in the *Rgveda* (VII, 21, 5; X, 10, 99). I have discussed the question at some length in my *Vedic Interpretation and Tradition*¹ arriving at the conclusion that the word *śiśnadeva* can mean nothing but 'lustful', as it is interpreted traditionally. In the course of my discussion I quoted from Sanskrit literature the following words for comparison: *śiśnodara-parāyaṇa*, *śiśnodara-trp*, and *śiśnodarambhara*, all bearing the only sense 'one addicted to lust and gluttony'. Besides the following words compounded with *-deva* as the last member were also cited from different Vedic works: *mātr-deva*, *pitṛ-deva*, *ācārya-deva*, *atithi-deva*, and *śraddhā-deva*. Certainly these words do not mean a mother-worshipper, a father-worshipper, a teacher-worshipper, a guest-worshipper and a faith-worshipper respectively.

To the above list I can add one more; it is *strī-deva* meaning *kāmuka* 'lustful', as it is evident from the following lines of the *Brahmāṇḍa-purāṇa*, *Uttarakhaṇḍa*, I. 9-11 (as added to the *Adhyātmarāmāyaṇa*, *Nirṇayasāgara* Edition, p. 4):

प्राप्ते कलियुगे घोरे नराः पुण्यविवर्जिताः ।
दुराचाररताः सर्वे सत्यवार्तापराङ्मुखाः ॥
परापवादनिरताः परद्रव्याभिलाषिणः ।
परस्त्रीसक्तमनसः परहिंसापरायणाः ॥
देहात्मदृष्टयो मूढा नास्तिकाः पशुबुद्धयः ।
मातापितृकृतद्वेषाः स्त्रीदेषाः कामकिङ्कराः ॥

VIDHUSHEKHARA BHATTACHARYA

1 Presidential Address in the Vedic Section of the Sixth All-India Oriental Conference, Patna, December, 1930.

Tapas

In the creation legends in the Brāhmaṇas or Upaniṣads there occurs a phrase *sa tapo 'tapyata* (*Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, II, 2-4, 1; *Bṛhadāranyaka Up.*, 1, 2, 6; *Taittirīya Up.*, II, 6, 1 etc.). In the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* (loc. cit.) one reads: *so 'śrāmyat sa tapo' tapyata*. It literally means 'He exerted himself, he performed *tapas*'. My esteemed friend Dr. Winternitz in his *History of Indian Literature*, Calcutta University, 1927, p. 220, translates it thus: 'He tortured himself and mortified himself.' And he adds here the following note: "As the magician must prepare himself for his magic, and the priest must prepare himself for the sacrifice, by means of self torture and mortification, so Prajāpati, too, has to prepare himself in the same way for the great work of creation.....The word *tapas* actually means 'heat,' then 'ascetic fervour,' then 'asceticism itself.' He says further (p. 223): "As the term *tapas* not only means mortification, but also heat, it is possible, in the case of the words 'when they had mortified themselves,' which might also mean 'when they had become heated' to think of 'hatching-heat,' and it is quite possible that there is intentional ambiguity in the Sanskrit words." In another note of the same work he writes: "*Tapas* may here have its original meaning of 'heat' (some 'creative heat' analogous to the heat by which the brood-hen produces life from the egg) or it may mean the 'fervour' of austerity; or, as Deussen thinks, both meanings may be implied in the word."

This explanation seems to be due to too much adherence to the philological aspect of the question utterly ignoring the tradition.

According to it *tapas* in such cases is to be taken in the sense of 'knowledge' (*jñāna*), 'thought' or 'reflection' (*ālocana*). And it is very clear from the *Muṇḍaka Up.*, I, 1, 9: *yasya jñānamayan tapah*, 'whose *tapas* is in essence *jñāna*. And this *jñāna* is nothing but *ālocana* 'thought' or 'reflection'. So writes Śaṅkara in his commentary on the *Taittirīya Up.*, II, 6, 1 that *tapas* here means *jñāna* there being no possibility of other kind of *tapas*, for His desires are already satisfied

(*āptakāma*), and so He cannot perform any austerity. And so the phrase in question means that He reflected upon the creation etc. of the world He is about to make.¹ Śaṅkara writes the same thing also in his commentary on the *Praśna Uṇ.*, 1. 4.²

In the course of a discussion on the meaning of this word, *tapas*, used in the *Parāśara-dharmasaṃhitā*, I. 23, Sāyaṇa Mādhavācārya in his commentary has arrived at the same conclusion saying that *tapas* means *ālocana* 'reflection', the word being derived from the root *tap* which means in such cases 'to reflect' (*tap ālocane*).³

In the *Mahābhārata* in its edition mainly based on South Indian texts by Kṛṣṇamacārya and Vyāsacārya, Bombay, 1907, *Śāntiparvan*, 228, there are various meanings of the word of which the last one is *jñāna*.⁴

1 स आत्मैवकामः संस्तपोऽतप्यत तप इति ज्ञानमुच्यते "यस्य ज्ञानमयं तपः" इति श्रुत्यन्तरात् (मुण्डकोपनिषत् १।१।६।। आसकामत्वाच्चेतरस्यासम्भव एव तपसः। तत् तपोऽतप्यत तप्तवान्। सृज्यमानजगद्गर्चनादिविषयामालोचनामकरोदात्मेत्यर्थः। See Sāyaṇācārya's Commentary on the *Taittirīya Aranyaka*, VII, 2 (Ānandāśrama, 1898, p. 626).

2 प्रजानां स्थावरजङ्गमानां पतिः सन् जन्मान्तरभावितं ज्ञानम्० तपोऽन्वालोच्यदत्तप्यत । अथ तु० ज्ञानमन्वालोच्य० ।

3 यत् तत्रैव (स्कन्दपुराण) उक्तम्—

कोऽसौ मोक्षः कथं केन संसारं प्रतिपन्नवान् ।

इत्यालोचनमर्थज्ञास्तपः संसन्ति पण्डिताः ॥ इति

सोऽन्य एव तपःशब्दः । तप आलोचने इत्यस्माद् धातोस्तदुत्पत्तेः । तत् तपोऽत्र ज्ञानशब्देन संगृहीतम् ।

4 These are the meanings: fast, the religious observance to be performed during the acquirement of the Vedas, any particular practice, acquiring the knowledge of Ātman, the act of giving, austerity, control of senses, etc. Let the text be quoted here:

पक्षमासोपवासादीन् मन्यन्ते वै तपोधनाः ।

वेदव्रतादीनि तप अपरे वेदपारगाः ॥ २

यथानिहितमाचारस्तपः सर्वं व्रतं गताः ।

आत्मविद्याविधानं यत्तपः परिकीर्तितम् ॥ ३

त्यागस्तपस्तथा शान्तिस्तप इन्द्रियनिग्रहः ।

ब्रह्मचर्यं तपः प्रोक्तमादुरेवं द्विजातयः ॥ ४

ज्ञानात्मकं तपःशब्दं ये वदन्ति विनिश्चिताः । १०

Compare here the meaning of the word *aikṣata* used frequently in the creation legends in the principal Upanisads and *Chāndogya*, VI, 2-3, (see the *Concordance to the Principal Upanisads* and *Bhāgavadgītā*) with that of *tapo 'tapyata*, and it will be clear that both of them are used, in fact, in the same sense.

As we have seen, Sāyana Mādhavācārya takes the root *tap* to mean 'reflection' (*ālocana*). But though this meaning of the root is hardly found in any other place, so far as goes my information, we cannot discard it altogether. There must be some origin of it, otherwise he could not write it so boldly.

Be that as it may. Now as the word *tapas* has thus both the senses, austerity and reflection, I think, Roth is quite justified in suggesting that in these cases *tapas* is 'intense abstraction', or 'severe meditation' as Muir would say (See Roth's *Lexicon* and Muir's *Sanskrit Texts*, vol. V, p. 361).

VIDHUSHEKHARA BHATTACHARYA

New Contributions to the Interpretation of the Mahāvamsa

In the following pages, *Mahāvamsa* will mean the whole chronicle, including its more recent continuations generally called *Cūla-vamsa*¹ and not its most ancient part only.

I *Local traditions on Duṭṭha-gāmaṇi in Rohaṇa*

When I was myself travelling in Rohaṇa in the winter of 1926 I was surprised to hear legends and popular traditions everywhere concerning King Duṭṭhagāmaṇi (101-77 B.C.) who is, no doubt, the national hero of the Sinhalese. With the help of these traditions I am now able to describe more accurately the topography of Duṭṭhagāmaṇi's war with his brother Tissa (*Mhvs.*, 24, 32 ff.). Duṭṭhagāmaṇi had his residence in Mahāgāma, Tissa in Dīghavāpi. Regarding the situation of Mahāgāma there is no doubt that it is the modern Māgama in the cultivated area of Tissamahārāma N.E. of Hambantota on the left bank of the Kirinda-oya not far from its mouth. As to Dīghavāpi I conjectured (*Mhvs.*, trsl., p. 8, n. 1) that this was perhaps a name of the Mahakandiyaveva (Kandiyakaṭṭu-veva), about 30 miles SSW. of Batticaloa. This has been verified by what I learned on the spot to my question referring thereto. The Ratemahatmaya at Bibile told me that the name Dīghavāpi is still well known in the country, and it is nothing but Mahakandiyaveva.

Duṭṭhagāmaṇi's dominion was, therefore, the South-Western part of Rohaṇa i.e. the greater part of the present Province Uva together with the Eastern districts of the Southern Province, that of Tissa the North-Eastern Rohaṇa, the district round the Mahakandiyaveva, what is now called the Eastern Province of Ceylon.

In the first war between the two brothers Duṭṭhagāmaṇi was unsuccessful and fled to Mahāgāma, while Tissa retired to Dīghavāpi.

¹ I may be allowed to publish here a few notes to my translation of this important work (Pāli Text Society, *Mhvs.*, 1912; *Cvs.*, I, 1929; II, 1930) which is still the richest source of the knowledge of Ceylon history.

In the second war the elder brother (styled *rājā* in the *Mhvs.*, while Tissa is referred to as *kumāra*) was victorious. There the popular tradition enables us to give an exact description of the scene of war. According to it the locality of the decisive battle was a place named *Yudaganāva*² a little more than a mile NNW. of Buttala. There is a *pansala* on the spot and a *dāgoba*, no doubt erected in commemoration of the historical event. The tradition suits very well to the topographical facts. Buttala is nearly half-way between Mahāgāma and Dīghavāpi, and the boundary of the two dominions was probably not very far from that place. Duṭṭhagāmaṇi must have approached from Mahāgāma along the old high-road passing through Kataragāma and leading from Buttala to Medagāma-Bibile-Alut-nuvara (old Mahiyaṅgaṇa) on the Mahaveli-gaṅga.

After the battle, prince Tissa fled and came to a monastery the name of which is not mentioned in the chronicle. He was pursued by the king. But the priests protected Tissa and helped him in escaping to Dīghavāpi. Local tradition locates the scene of this event at the *Okkampiṭṭiya-vihāra*, situated about 4 miles, as the crow flies, east of Buttala.

Finally according to the tradition (which I heard myself on the spot), Duṭṭhagāmaṇi after his victory stayed for some time at a place where later on the *Timbarkavivihāra* was erected. This tradition, too, is quite true. The monastery lies a mile or so East of Medagama in the jungle.³ Medagama is about 20 miles away from Buttala to North, nearly half-way on the road to Dīghavāpi. It appears that after Tissa's escape Duṭṭhagāmaṇi took a new and strong position nearer to the hostile capital in order to watch the further military operations of his brother and eventually to prevent a new attack. When he saw that Tissa's resistance had definitely broken down, he returned to Mahagāma where afterwards the reconciliation of the two brothers took place.

We do not know, of course, how far such local traditions contain

² The name itself reminds us of the historic event, for *yuda* is the Vedic and Pāli *yuddha*, 'battle.'

³ I visited it on the 10th of February, 1926.

an historical kernel. But they help us at least to understand the text of the *Mahāvamsa* in a more accurate and exhaustive manner.

II *Single words and terms*

There are in my translation of the *Mahāvamsa* some words and terms which are not precisely or even wrongly explained. This may partly be excused for the long distance which separated me (i.e. during my work) from Ceylon and the lack of reliable sources. To my venerated friend Buddhadatta Thera (Aggarama, Ambalangoda) I owe a series of useful suggestions and corrections some of which I may be allowed to publish here with additional notes of my own.

1 *Udakukkhepasīmā*, lit. 'boundary (made) by throwing up water' (*Mhvs.*, 89. 70; 94. 17; 97. 12) is an interesting Buddhist ceremony, insufficiently described by Wijesinha (*Mhvs.*, trsl., p. 312, n.) and by myself (*Crs.*, trsl., II, p. 199, n. 3). According to Buddhadatta a note on the term should run as follows: Ecclesiastic acts must be performed within a sacred boundary (*sīmā*) and they can be performed not only on dry ground but also in water, either in a building erected on piles in a river or lake, as we see so frequently in Ceylon, or even in a boat. If the act takes place in water, the boundary must be fixed in the following manner: After the chapter of the *saṃgha* has assembled, one of the priests takes water in a vessel or a handful of water from the lake or the river. He then throws the water with his hands to the four quarters. The boundary is marked by the furthest points where the water has fallen. When doing so the bhikkhu who throws the water must stand within the *hatthapāsa*, in the immediate vicinity of the chapter.

2 *Catubhāṇavāra* (*Mhvs.*, 98. 24). We are told that king Vijayarājasīha (1739-47) invited the sāmaṇera Saraṇaṅkara and had a commentary on the *Catubhāṇavāra* made by him in the language of Laṅkā (*nimantetrāna tass' eva catubhāṇavāraṇṇanam Laṅkābhāsāya kāretrā*). It is well known that *bhāṇavāra* means a section of holy texts, and that the Tipiṭaka, for the purpose of learning and recital, is divided into a great number (2547) of such sections. But I did not know what by *catubhāṇavāra* is meant. Buddhadatta informs me that

this is a name for the *Maha-pirit-pota*, 'the great Pirit-book', *paritta*, i.e. a collection of holy texts, short hymns or sermons which are publicly recited on certain occasions with a view to warding off the influence of evil spirits. The description of a *Paritta* ceremony is found in my book, *Unter Tropischer Sonne*, p. 28 ff. The *Mahā-pirit-pota* is called *Catubhāṇavāra* because it consists of four such sections. Subsequently I saw that Saraṇaṅkara's commentary on the Paritta-book is even mentioned in L. de Zoysa's *Catalogue of Pāli, Sinhalese, and Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Temple Libraries of Ceylon* (Colombo 1885), p. 6 under the title *Catubhāṇavāra-Atthakathā*, and that it is common in the island. Finally I may point to the fact that the phrase *pirūt satar baṅgar*, the four bhāṇavāras of the *paritta* already occurs in a Sinhalese inscription of the first half of the 10th century (Wickremasinghe. *Epigraphia Zeylanica*, I, p. 48, l. 38). We see from this passage that the *paritta* collections are by no means quite modern as Childers (s.v. *parittā*) has said.

3 *Dhammaghosaka*. In a note on *Mhrs.*, 37, 149 I have suggested that this term (37, 173) means the same as *dhammabhāṇaka* 'preacher of the doctrine'. This is wrong according to Buddhadatta. *Dhammaghosaka* denotes a Bhikkhu who invites people for a sermon proclaiming that such and such a priest will preach on some subject of the *dhamma* on such and such a day at such and such a place. I may add a notice on *dhammakathika* and *dhammabhāṇaka*. Are they synonymous? The first term occurs frequently in Buddhist literature, often in combination with *vinayadhara*, 'one who masters or knows by heart the Vinaya' and *bahussuta*, 'one who has a wide knowledge of tradition'; also with *suttantika*, 'one who is versed in the Suttantas' (cf. Stede, *PTS. Dict.*, s.v. *dhamma*). It must therefore have a general meaning like 'one who is able to converse about subjects of the holy doctrine'. This is quite in concordance with the meaning of *dhammā kathā* or *dhammakathā*, 'ethical discussion, conversation about the Dhamma' (Stede, I. 1) and with that of *dhammaṃ katheti*. On the other hand, *dhammabhāṇaka* does not occur in the older literature. It is entirely missing in Childers' and Stede's Dictionaries, and I have in my own collections the only quotation *Mhrs.*, 37, 173. But we meet terms like *Dīghabhāṇaka*, *Majjhimbhāṇaka*, *Samyuttabhāṇaka*,

Āṅuttarabhāṇaka, *Khuddakabhāṇaka* and *Jātakabhāṇaka*. It appears clearly from *Dīgha Commentary* (ed. PTS., I, 1886, p. 15²⁷) that they denote priests who have learned the *Dīgha*-, *Majjhima-nikāya* etc., who know it by heart, and who are able to recite it from memory.

The same difference of meaning between *kathika* and *bhāṇaka* results from *Milindapañha* (ed. Trenckner, p. 341):

Bhagarato kko, mahārāja, dhammanagare evarūpā janā paṭivasanti: suttantikū venayikū ābhidhammikū dhammakathikū Jātakabhāṇakū Dīghabhāṇakū Majjhimbhāṇakū Saṃyuttabhāṇakū Āṅuttarabhāṇakū Khuddakabhāṇakū sīlasampannā etc.

There are no *dhammabhāṇakū* in this list nor *Jātakakathikū* and so on. In *Mhvs.*, 37, 173, however, *dhammabhāṇaka* is, I believe, simply synonym of *dhammakathika*. But this is a more modern development of meaning influenced by Sinhalese language. Here *baṇa* at present means, accordingly to Buddhadatta, 'a sermon preached in *Sinhalese*' (not a recital of Pāli Texts) so that all laymen understand it. Such a *Baṇa*-preaching lasts two or three hours in the afternoon or first half of the night, sometimes in up-country it lasts for a whole night.

III *Mahāvamsa and the inscriptions*

Finally a short supplement to my article on 'the Trustworthiness of the Mahāvamsa' in the present *Journal*, VI, p. 205 ff. We are told in the *Mahāvamsa* (70, 327 ff.) that when Parakkamabāhu after a long campaign had nearly conquered Rājaraṭṭha, the province of his cousin Gaṭabāhu, the latter in his distress asked the Bhikkhus for intervention, and owing to their admonition Parakkamabāhu indeed stopped the war and returned to his own country Dakkhinadesa. It is then stated in 71. 2-4 that after the end of the hostilities Mānābharāṇa, the ruler of Rohaṇa, tried to enter into an alliance with Gaṭabāhu. But Gaṭabāhu who desired no treaty with him betook himself to the vihāra by name Maṇḍalīgiri. There he had the words 'I have made over Rājaraṭṭha to the king Parakkama', graven on a stone tablet..... The inscription means no doubt: According to the treaty made with him Parakkamabāhu is appointed my successor in Rājaraṭṭha. Maṇḍalīgiri is the present Medirigiriya in the Tamankaduva district. In the

ruins there the inscription of Gajabāhu has not yet come to light. But recently the parallel inscription of Parakkama has been discovered by Paronavitana, the epigraphist (now acting Commissioner) of the Archæological Survey of Ceylon, at an ancient vihāra at Saṅgamuva near Gokarella NE. of Kurunegala i.e. on the ground of old Dakkhinadesa.

“In this document the two princes (Gajabāhu and Parakkamabāhu) seem to treat each other as independent sovereigns of equal status, but Gajabāhu, being the elder of the two and, moreover, the ruler of the capital city of the Island, is given precedence. The treaty itself consists of four clauses by the first of which the two cousins solemnly declare that they would not wage war against each other till the end of their lives. The second clause lays down that the kingdom of the one who will be the first to pass away will become the property of the survivor. We do not know what the third clause was about, as this part of the record is damaged. By the fourth clause, the two princes enter into an offensive and defensive alliance declaring that a king who was an enemy to one of them was an enemy of both.”⁴

Thus again a passage of the *Mahāvamsa* is confirmed and supplemented by an inscription.

WILH. GEIGER

⁴ *Annual Report of the Archæological Survey of Ceylon for 1930-31, May, 1932, p. 5.*

The Yerragudi Copy of Aśoka's Minor Rock Edict

Mr. Dines Chandra Sircar has earned our gratitude by publishing a tentative reading of the Yerragudi Copy of Aśoka's Minor Rock Edict together with a reproduction of a photograph of the same.¹ As he himself has realised, the reading offered by him is far from satisfactory, far, we mean, from indicating the real course of the text of the inscription through the labyrinth created by the scribe. King Aśoka has, in his R.E. XIV, regretted the incompleteness or distortion of some of his inscriptions due partly to error or carelessness on the part of the scribe-engraver (*lipikarāparādha*). If there be any glaring instance of his scribe-engraver's error or carelessness, it is certainly the inscription under discussion. There is hardly any uniform method in the madness of the scribe.

He engraves the first line, as he ought to, from left to right, but continues it in such a manner as to make it appear as two separate lines, here marked as **1** and **1a**. Then he begins to engrave from right to left and continues it in such a fashion as to make the left half of the second line as a continuation of L. **1a**. To indicate this left half of the line it is marked as **2a**.

Like a good man he engraves the third line from left to right, while coming to the fourth line, he proceeds again from right to left, and whimsically stops without completing the line, and that apparently to leave space for the first four letters of L. **5**, engraved from left to right. As might be expected, he engraves the next line from right to left. But here he suddenly halts after engraving ten letters in order to begin the seventh line from the margin on the left. He finds space enough for engraving the six letters of L. **7**, the continuation of which he engraves from the left margin. The continuation of L. **7** is, therefore, marked here as **7a**. Here he creates a further trouble by accommodating four letters of L. **7a**, reading *°dhetave e*, in an intervening space

¹ *IHQ.*, vol. VII, pp. (737) 817 ff.

between L. 7 and L. 6. He does not place these four letters between the *kākapādas* in order to keep them distinct. The four letters are taken to make up a short line, here marked as **7b**. The manner of engraving is such that lines **7**, **7b** and **6** appear to form one line at its full length.

The seventh and eighth lines are engraved both from left to right, while the next line exhibits the scribe's caprice for engraving from right to left. Here again he arbitrarily stops after engraving just twelve letters in order to commence L. 10 from the left margin. The next line, comprising nine letters, as it does, is engraved from left to right and placed below the left extremity of L. 10. A short line marked as **10a**, consisting of six letters engraved from the right margin from right to left leads arbitrarily to L. 11. Like L. 11, the twelfth and thirteenth lines consist each of nine letters and are arranged on the same short scale, L. 13 being engraved from right to left.

The next line, engraved from left to right, does not run to its full length. After L. 15, engraved at full length from left to right, but before coming to L. 16, one has to trace up the course of the text in continuation of L. 11. The continuation proceeds in a number of short lines, here marked as **11a**, **11b**, **11c** and **14a** some of which are engraved from right to left.

The continuation of the text ending in L. 14a is to be traced in L. 15, which proceeds at full length from left to right. Here the scribe tries to satisfy his predilection for writing from right to left in a short line comprising four letters, which is conveniently marked as **16b**.

Like L. 16, the seventeenth, eighteenth, nineteenth, twentieth and twenty-first lines are engraved at full length from left to right, while coming to the concluding line, the scribe finally seeks to satisfy his bias for writing from right to left.

For distinguishing the lines that run from left to right from those that proceed from right to left, in the case of the former the numerals are put before and in the case of the latter these are put after.

The anomaly in the engraving of the inscription might be partly due to the fact that the scribe entrusted with the work was inefficient and careless, and partly due to the fact that he was so much habituated


to writing the Kharoṣṭhī form of writing from right to left that it was very difficult, nay, impossible for him to shake it off even in writing a Brāhmī inscription. The long habit of writing from right to left worked within him by fits and starts, and it could not have operated so virulently if he were not of unsound mind at the time of engraving it or damagingly careless in habits.

The language of the inscription does not materially differ from that of other copies of the Minor Rock Edict. The *l* sound is nowhere substituted for the *r*, and so far as this is concerned, the language shows a tendency to get rid of Māgadhism. But the use of *e* as a nominative singular case-ending for the masculine and neuter stems ending in *a* is patent. In one instance we have *prāna* for *pāna*, *srāga* for *sāga*, and *ārokam* for *ārogyam*. We trace vowel-sandhis in *meyasa* = (*me + asa*), *hiyatha* = (*hi + atha*), and *hathiyārohā* = (*hathi + ārohā*). We have a few peculiar verbal forms in *susutariye* for *susutariye*, and *radhasitā* for *radhitā* or *radhisati*.

The find-spot of the inscription is a place called Yerragudi in the Kurnool District of the Madras Presidency. The copy is incised on the face of the same set of boulders that bear a copy of the fourteen Rock Edicts. The discovery of a copy of M.R.E. along with a whole set of the Rock Edicts in South India and on the same rock is important as upsetting the earlier hypothesis that the Rock Edicts were intended to mark the upper or northern boundaries of Aśoka's empire, and that the Minor Rock Edicts were meant to mark its lower or southern boundaries.

The historical importance of the inscription lies also in the additional matters that it contains. The additional matters give a clear hint as to the method and agents employed for a wide circulation of the message to be proclaimed. The message was officially communicated to the *Rājūkas* who by the beat of drums made it known to the public at large. The elephant-riders, the *kāraṇakas*, the charioteers and the religious teachers were expected to set to work and instruct their resident pupils. The kinsmen were required to talk to the kinsmen, and the neighbours to the neighbours by implication.

The riddle of the enigmatic *vyuthena* 256 remains unsolved. It is, however, decided that it is intended to signify either 256 nights or years. If it signifies nights, we must understand 256 nights spent in



Yerragudi Copy of Asoka's M.R.E.I.
(By kind permission of the Editor, Bhārati, Madras)

I.H.Q., March, 1933.

- 17** -yathā bathiyārohāni kāranakāni yū(g)yacariyāni² bambhanāni
ca nivesayā-
- 18** -tha amtevāsīni yā(ri)sā porānā pakiti iyaṃ sususitaviye
apacāyanā ya vā me ācari-(ṃ) sa va me-
- 19** -yasa yathācāriṇa ācariyasa nātikāni yathārahaṃ nātikesu
pavatitaviye hesā(p)i
- 20** amtevāsīsu iyaṃ yathāraha pavatitaviye yārisā porānā pakiti
yathāraha yathā iyaṃ
- 21** ārokaṃ siyā hevaṃ tūphe ānapayātha nivesayātha ca
amtevās(i)ni hevaṃ de-
tiyapanaā yepinaṃvā- **22**

B. THE TEXT AS MADE OUT

- 1** Devānaṃpiye hevaṃ(āha)[;] **1a** (s)ā(dhi)kāni.....³
- 2** (y)[aṃ] hakaṃ upāsake na tu kho **2a** ekaṃ samvachar[aṃ] (paka)te
- 3** husa[.]Sāti(r)ekaṃ (tu kho) savachare yaṃ mayā saṃghe upayi-
- 4** -te bādha ca me pakate [.] Iminā ca kāle(na) (a)-**5** -misā munisā
devehi te dāni misibhūtā[.]Pakamasa hi⁴ **6** (u)a mahatpaneva sakiye
kha-⁵ **7** -dakena pi pa(rā)- **7a** -(ka)mīnena sakiye vipule svage āra-
- 7b** -dhetave [.]E- **7a** -tāyeva aṭhāya iyaṃ **8** (s)āvane sāvite athā khudaka-
mahadhanū parākaṃevu Aṃ- **9** -tā ca me jānevu ciraṭhitikā ca **10** iyaṃ
pakame hotu [.]vipule pi ca vadhasitā aparadhiyā diyaḍhiy(aṃ)[.]
- 10a** Iyaṃ ca sāvane sā- **11** -(vāp)ite vy[u]thena 200 50 6 [.]
- 12** (Rājū)ke ānāpitaviye **13** bherinā Jānapadaṃ āna- **14** -payisati
Raṭhikānaṃ ca [:] Mātāpitūsu su-⁶ **15** -sitaviye [:]hemea gurūsu
sususitaviye prānesu dayitaviye [.]**11a** Hevaṃ Devānaṃpi- **11b** -yena⁷
yathā De- **11c** -(vānaṃpiye(na) **14a** (sava)tha kathitā hia ca vataviyā
[.] (Naṃ) **16** susuma[:] Dhammagunā pavatitaviyā [.] Hevaṃ tūphe
ānapayātha Devānaṃpiya- **16a** -sa vacanena [.] He- **16b** -vaṃ dāni hi-

2 The reading is kindly suggested by Mr. N. G. Majumdar.

3 The gap may be filled up with the words *adhatiyāni rasāni*; supplied from other copies of M.R.E.

4 Other copies read *Pakamasa hi iyaṃ phalaṃ*.

5 Read *kh[u]*—.

6 Read *su[su]*—.

7 Read *°piyeneva*.

17 -yathā hathiyārohāni kāranakāni yūgyacariyāni baṃbhanāni ca nivesayā- 18 -tha aṃtevāsīni yā(ri)sā porānā pakiti. [.] Iyaṃ sususitaviye [:] Apacāyanā ya vā ācari(ṃ) sa va me- 19 -yasa yathācāriṇa ācariyasa[.] Nātikāni yathārahaṃ nātikesu pavatitaviye [:] hesā (p)i 20 aṃtevāsīsu yathārah [aṃ] pavatitaviye yūrisā porānā pakiti [—]yathārah[aṃ] yathā iyaṃ 21 ārokaṃ siyā [.]Hevaṃ tuphe ānapayātha nivesayātha ca aṃtevāsīni [.]Hevaṃ De- 22 -vānampiye ānapayati [.]

Translation

Thus verily His gifted Majesty saith:—

During (the period comprising) more than two years and a half⁸ since I became a lay worshipper (of Buddhism),⁹ the (first) one year I was not exerting myself (for the cause of the good faith). (Subsequently) when more than a year (passed) since I came in contact with the Buddhist Holy Order¹⁰ I exerted myself strenuously. By this (interval of) time¹¹ men who were unmixed with the gods have now been intermingled. It is not indeed that the man of greater position striving energetically is able to obtain the bliss of paradise in its full magnitude. For this very purpose I have caused this declaration to be declared that the man of lesser position as well as the man of greater position will strive energetically, that the Antās (inhabitants of the allied outlying tracts and principalities),¹² too, will come to know of it,

8 The expression *sātirekāni aḍhatiyāni* or *sādhikāni aḍhatiyāni* signifies 'more than two years and a half and less than three.' Accordingly the Pāli expression *sādhikāni diyaḍḍhasatāni sikkhāpadāni*, occurring in the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* should mean 'more than 150 and less than 200 rules of conduct.' But Buddhaghosa explains it in such a manner as to explain away the force of *sādhikāni*.

9 & 10 These would seem to accord with what Buddhaghosa says regarding the first two stages of Aśoka's conversion. In the first stage he cherished but an ordinary kind of faith (*pothujjanikā saddhā*), a mere personal admirer of an individual monk, while in the second stage his faith became deepened after he had come in contact with the representatives of the Holy Order.

11 Literally, 'by this time.'

12 In the Pāli and general Buddhist sense, the term *aṃtā* or *paccantā* means 'the regions or areas outside the Middle Country.' There are passages, in which the same term denotes the outer zones of a realm or kingdom.

and that this tradition of energetic effort will become ever-lasting, and will greatly increase, at least, one and a half times.

This declaration is caused to be declared in 256¹³ in terms of the time gone by.¹⁴ The message is to be officially communicated to the *Rajjukas* (touring district officers).¹⁵ They shall announce (the same) by the beat of drums to the *Jānapadaṣ* (people of the districts)¹⁶ as well as to the *Rāṣṭrikas* (citizens of the hereditary tribal states)¹⁷: "Proper attention should be paid to the parents,¹⁸ proper attention should likewise be paid to the teachers and preceptors,¹⁹ and tender regard should be entertained for the (different) forms of life".

Here, too, the matter should be stated as stated everywhere by His Gifted Majesty, in the (very) manner thereof: "We shall attend to this. The moral qualities of piety are to be propounded".

Thus announce ye the command by the authority of His Gifted Majesty. Now the matter being such, here set ye the elephant-riders,²⁰ the *Kārunakas*,²¹ the charioteers and the Brahmins (religious

13 & 14 *Vyutha* or *vyuṭha* is the same term as the Skt. *vyuṣṭa* which occurs in the *Arthaśāstra* in the sense of 'an entry or statement of date in terms of the regnal year, month, fortnight and day.' See Barua's *Aśoka Edicts in New Light*, pp. 66 ff.

15 Literally interpreted, *Rājūka* or *Rajjugāhaka amacca* is undoubtedly the designation of land-measuring or land-surveying officers. The *Rajjugāhaka amacca* is indeed represented in the *Kurudhamma Jātaka* as engaged in measuring land and fixing boundaries of allotments or plots of land belonging to different owners or tenants. The external support to such an interpretation may indeed be derived from the *Indika* of Megasthenes mentioning a class of such officials in the service of the Maurya Court. But as represented in Aśokan edicts, R. E. III and P. E. IV, the *Rājūkas* were the high officials in charge of the districts, going from time to time on tours of inspection. They were empowered to discharge the magisterial as well as the judicial functions.


16 & 17 We cannot suggest at present any better way of distinguishing between the *Jānapada* and the *Raṣṭhika*, and both from the *Aṃtā*.

18 Literally, 'mother and father.'

19 The word *guru* is taken here in a collective and comprehensive sense denoting both *ācārya* and *upādhyāya*, both *śikṣā-guru* *dīkṣā-guru*.

20 *Hathiyārohā* is=Pāli *hatthirohā*=Skt. *hastipakāḥ*.

21 *Kāraṇaka* or *kāraṇikā* means in Sanskrit 'a judge,' 'an examiner.' It may also mean 'a scribe or clerk.'



teachers)²² (your) resident pupils to work according to the good old rule.²³

This is to be attended: "That which I have practised as a filial duty, let it be due to the teacher properly behaving as such". The kinsmen should propound the matter to the kinsmen as far as they can. The same should also be propounded as far as possible to the resident pupils according to the good old rule, so that this (noble tradition) will remain unimpaired. Thus instruct ye the resident pupils and keep them engaged.

Thus verily His Gifted Majesty commandeth.

B. M. BARUA

22 The word *brahmana* is interpreted here in a general sense which seems to fit in with the context.

23 *Povāṇā pakiti* is evidently an Aśokan expression for the Pāli *dharmasamantano* or the Skt. *sanātana-dharmah*, or *ṛtīḥ purātanaḥ*.

The Pratihara Administration

The kingdom of Kanauj, whose fortunes had received a rude shock in the confusion following Harṣa's death revived and re-called its power and prosperity during the vigorous rule of the Pratihāras, who held sway over it for about two centuries and a quarter. Mihira Bhoja and Mahendrapāla, the two most powerful monarchs of this dynasty, carried on protracted campaigns, as a result of which their empire grew to enormous dimensions, comprising territories as widely apart as Saurāṣṭra, Magadha, Gorakhpur district, Ujjain, Karnal district (Pehoa), Bundelkhand, and Rajputana. In this paper we wish to deal with the administrative machinery of the Pratihāras. Unfortunately no medieval Kautilya or Megasthenes has left to posterity an account of this system of government, but a few facts may be gleaned from the Pratihāra inscriptions, and we may further supplement them from those of the Gāhadavālas, who, it may be reasonably assumed, must have inherited the traditions and general structure of administration from their predecessors.

At the head of the state was the king, whose office was hereditary. He exercised absolute powers, and except his immediate advisers the people in general had hardly any share in the determination of his policy in peace or war. The inscriptions usually apply to him the epithets *Paramabhaṭṭāraka*, *Mahārājādhirāja*, and *Parameśvara*, which have been taken to imply imperial status. But sometimes to the names of even mighty potentates like Mihira Bhoja are prefixed merely the honorific *Śrīmat* or the unassuming title of *Mahārāja*.² In the Gāhadavāla records the kings are given the appellations of *Īścapati*, *Narapati*, *Gajapati*, *Giripati*, and *Triśaikapati*, (the exact connotation of the last term is obscure).³ Next to the sovereign were the chief

1 *Ep. Ind.*, I, p. 156.

2 *Ibid.*, XVIII, p. 90.

3 *Ibid.*, X, p. 98; XIV, p. 193 etc. These terms perhaps signify lords of various classes of feudatories; but the first three may also stand for the lordship over the three branches of the army. According to the *Si-yu-ki*, however, when there is no paramount monarch the southern, western, northern and eastern

queen (or *paṭṭamaḥiṣī*) and the crown-prince (*yuvarāja* or *Mahārājaputra*); and from the Gāhāḍavāla plates they appear to have been quite important personages being invested with certain 'royal prerogatives' of granting land.⁴ Their grants had, however, to receive the consent of the ruling monarch before they could take effect. Thus, when the *yuvarāja* Jayacandra⁵ and the *Mahārājñī* Gosaladevī⁶ make a grant, they do so with the approval of Vijayacandra and Govindacandra respectively. Sometimes the crown-prince was more closely associated with the government, as was Govindacandra during the life-time of his father, who appears to have been an invalid.

The suzerain was the centre of a number of feudatory chiefs, who helped him in military undertakings, and rendered him personal attendance when required. Such, for instance, were the chieftains named Uṇḍabhāṭa of Siyadoni,⁷ Balavarman and Avanivarman of Saurāṣṭra,⁸ Mathanadeva of Rajorgarh⁹ during the Pratihāra times and Siṅgara Kamalapāla and Vatsarāja¹⁰ under the Gāhāḍavālas. These feudatories are described as having obtained from their overlord the *Pañcamahāśabda*,¹¹ or the *Rājapatti*, i.e. the royal fillet or tiara.¹² The inscriptions bestow on them such subordinate titles as *Mahāsāmantādhipati*, *Samadhigataśaṣamahāśabda*, and *Mahāpratihāra*,¹³ but sometimes they even assumed the bombastic epithet of *Mahārājādhirāja*, as did Mathanadeva, Durbhāṭa and Niṣkalaṅka, which was probably due to varying degrees of dependence.

The powers of these subordinate chiefs must have been considerably restricted, since we learn from certain inscriptions that even their grants were countersigned by provincial representatives of the suzerain. Thus, according to the Una charter, Dhika, who was perhaps such an official under Mahendrapāla, gave his approval to a grant made

parts of Jambudvīpa (India) are respectively supposed to be ruled over by four sovereigns called Gajapati, Chatrapati, Aśvapati, and Nārapati (Beal's Trans., vol. I, p. 13, note).

5 *Ep. Ind.*, II, p. 118.

6 *Ibid.*, V, p. 117.

7 *Ep. Ind.*, I, p. 169.

8 *Ibid.*, IX, p. 1f.

9 *Ibid.*, III, p. 263f.

10 *Ibid.*, IV, p. 130.

11 *Ibid.*, IX, p. 1. See also for an explanation *Ind. Ant.*, IV, pp. 106, 204; XII, p. 95; XIII, p. 134; *Ep. Ind.*, XII, p. 254 etc.

12 *Ibid.*, IV, p. 130.

13 *Ibid.*, p. 169.

by the Mahāsāmanta Avanivarman II Yoga.¹⁴ Again, the Partabgarh inscription represents that it was to the provincial governor of Ujjain, named Mādhava, that Indrarāja, the Cāhamāna feudatory, after having built a temple to the sun-god Indrādityadeva) applied to make an endowment for its upkeep. The record calls Mādhava a 'tantrapāla', and also gives him the titles of *Mahāsāmanta* and *Mahādaṇḍanāyaka*. These governors were assisted in the enforcement of their authority by the military, which were posted at strategic points in the distant provinces. Thus, Maṇḍapikā (Mandu), near Ujjain, was the military headquarters for the southern regions, as we are told that Mahendrapāla II stationed there one Śrī-śarman as his commander-in-chief.¹⁵

Besides, provincial defence was organised by building forts, which were placed in charge of officers called *K o ṭ ṭ a p ā l a* (guardian of fort). Under Bhoja I one such official was Alla. But his father Vaillabhaṭṭa, who was in the service of Rāmadeva, is given the designation of *Maryādādhurya*, or *Dhurodhikārī*, meaning chief of the boundaries. This shows that one of his functions was also to watch that the existing boundaries were not disturbed by foreign encroachments.¹⁶

Another provincial officer whom we know from the Barah copper-plate¹⁷ was the *V y a v a h ā r i n* or controlling officer. He supervised the grants that were made by kings with a view to avoiding their lapse into abeyance. These charters (*śāsana*) were conveyed by an officer called *D ū t a k a*, which literally means 'messenger'.¹⁸ Regarding his duties, Fleet remarks that "the Dūtaka's office was to carry, not the actual charter itself, for delivery into the hands of the grantees, but the king's sanction and order to the local officials, whose duty it was then to have the charter drawn up and delivered".¹⁹

In connection with the village administration we learn of officials designated as *G ā m a g a m i k a*, *M a h a t t a r a*, and

14 *Ep. Ind.*, IX, pp. 2, 6.

15 *Ibid.*, XIV, p. 177f.

16 *Ibid.*, I, pp. 154-159. *Maryādā* may also mean a constitution or regulation-system, especially of corporate bodies; and so *Maryādādhurya* may denote a person responsible for its maintenance. *Durodhikāra*, on the other hand, means only an officer in control, and Dr. L. D. Barnett told me that it may not be a technical term.

17 *Ibid.*, XIX, p. 16; cf. also *Vyavaharaṇa* in *Ep. Ind.*, XI, p. 145.

18 *Ibid.*, V, pp. 209, 213.

19 *Ill.*, vol. III, p. 100, note 3.

Mahattama.²⁰ The first term probably stands for headmen of the villages who were responsible to the government for the maintenance of peace and order within their boundaries. The other two terms have evidently the same political significance, although the terms have comparative and superlative inflexions. *Mahattara* literally means 'one higher in rank'; *Mahattama*, 'one highest in rank'. It seems they were the two classes of elders of villages, who co-operated with the government officials in the management of rural affairs.

This list is further supplemented by the Gāhadavāla records, which it will be noticed, mix together court officials and strictly political functionaries, local or central:

(a) *Mantrin* or minister. He advised the king on matters of moment, but the inscriptions do not give any idea if there was a separate minister for each department.

(b) *Purohita*, or chaplain. He ministered to the spiritual needs of royalty, whom he assisted in the maintenance of the Dharma. He was also the recipient of the royal gifts. The plates often mention the term *Mahāpurohita*, which shows that there was a high-priest in the kingdom.²¹

(c) *Pratihāra*, or door-keeper. The office of the chamberlain has always been a prominent one in the states of ancient India. This official is also mentioned in the records of the Pratihāra kings,²² and in the *Mahābhārata* and the *Kautiliya* he is called 'Dvārapāla' and 'Dauvārika' respectively.

(d) *Senādhipati*, or commander of troops.

(e) *Bhāṇḍāgarika*, or superintendent of stores. He had to see that all necessary articles were kept in readiness and that their distribution was in accordance with the king's orders.

(f) *Akṣapaṭalika*, or keeper of records. Considering the large number of Gāhadavāla grants, his office must have been a very important one. Some inscriptions mention the superior officer called *Mahākṣapaṭalika*.²³

20 *Ep. Ind.*, III, p. 263 (Rajor inscription).

21 See the *Arthasastra* (Transl.), p. 15f. for his duties and qualifications.

22 *Ep. Ind.*, I, p. 206.

23 *Ibid.*, IX, p. 94.

(g) *B h i ṣ a k a*, or the physician. He looked after the health of the king, and was perhaps the head of the public health department.

(h) *N a i m i t t i k a*, or astrologer. He was responsible for forecasting the effects of particular conjunctions of the stars, portents, etc.; it was probably after his reading of the omens that undertakings were embarked upon.

(i) *A n t a ḥ p u r i k a*, or superintendent of the seraglio. As kings not unoften used to have several wives, a special officer was appointed to look after the needs of the harem.

(j) *D ū t a s*, or envoys. These formed a diplomatic corps responsible for maintaining proper relations with foreign powers.

(k) *K ā r y ā d h i k ā r a - p u r u ṣ a s*, or officers in charge of elephants. They were probably charged with the management of elephants, wild or domesticated.

(l) *T u r a g ā d h i k ā r a - p u r u ṣ a s*, or officers in charge of horses. These two sets of functionaries formed a very important part of the state machinery, as its defence and power largely depended upon the efficiency and organisation of the cavalry and elephant forces.

(m) *P a t ṭ a n ā d h i k ā r a - p u r u ṣ a s*, or officers in charge of towns. These may be compared to the 'Nāgarika' of Kauṭilya's *Arthasāstra*, being charged with the administration of cities. From the Siyadoni record it also appears that during Pratihāra times some sort of municipal government was not unknown. For it tells us that the town affairs were managed by an assembly of five called 'Pañcakula', and by a committee of two, appointed from time to time by the town²¹

(n) *Ā k a r ā d h i k ā r a - p u r u ṣ a s*, or officers in charge of mines. They must have been very important officials, as the mines were one of the chief sources of revenue.

(o) *S ṭ h ā n ā d h i k ā r a - p u r u ṣ a s*, or officers of police-stations. They corresponded to modern *Thānādārs*, and were responsible for policing and maintaining law and order.

(p) *G o k u l ā d h i k ā r a - p u r u ṣ a s*, or officers of cattle-stations. As agriculture was the main industry, it was necessary to have a separate officer for cattle in order to rear good breeds etc.

(q) *Kāyasīha* or *Karaṇika* i.e. the scribe. He was apparently the writer of the records.

(r) *Pattalika*.²⁵ This term perhaps denotes the head of *pattala* or Tahsil.

Besides these officers, the Lucknow Museum plate of *Kīrtipāla*, found in the Gorakhpur district of the United Provinces,²⁶ mentions *Dharmādharāṇika*, *Dāivāgārika*, *Mahāsādhānika*, *Aṣṭavargika*, *Mahārthasāsānika*, and *Saṅkha dhārin*. It is, however, difficult to determine exactly the functions of these officials.

Territorial Divisions

For purposes of administration the kingdom was divided into numerous provinces. These provinces were usually called *bhukti*, as the *Kānyakubjabhukti* in the Barah copper-plate,²⁷ or *bhūmi* as the *Gurjarātrā-bhūmi* in the Daulatpura charter,²⁸ or *maṇḍala*, as the *Saurāṣṭra-maṇḍala* in the Una grant.²⁸ According to the Barah copper-plate, however, *maṇḍala* was the next lower unit after *bhukti*, and was not a synonymous term. The provinces were further subdivided into *viṣayas* or districts. Among them we find mention of *Udumbara*³⁰ and *Dindavanaka*.³¹ The term *bhoga* also seems to have been used sometimes in the same sense, as we read of the *Vaṃśapotakabhoga*.³² The headquarters of a district were called *adhiṣṭhāna* or *pattana*.

The next unit in the descending scale was the *agrahāra*, or a modern tahsil. We thus read of the *Valākāgrahāra* in the Barah copper-plate. In the *Gāhadavāla* records, however, the term '*pattala*' is used in the same sense.

Last came the *grāma* or village, which had been the most stable unit of administration in India from time immemorial. Furthermore

25 *Ep. Ind.*, IX, p. 320

27 *Ibid.*, XIX, p. 15.

29 *Ibid.*, III, p. 3.

31 *Ibid.*, V, p. 210.

26 *Ibid.*, VII, No. 10.

28 *Ibid.*, V, p. 210.

30 *Ibid.*, XIX, pp. 15, 17.

32 *Ibid.*, III, p. 263.

in some records the term *pāṭaka* appears;³³ this, according to the lexicographer Hemacandra, denoted one-half of a village.³⁴

Group-life

As some Pratihāra inscriptions show, persons following the same occupation normally formed themselves into corporations for regulating their business. For example, the Gwalior epigraph³⁵ refers to the guild of oil-millers and gardeners, who in their corporate capacity made gifts to a temple. Similarly, the Siyadoni³⁶ and Pehoa³⁷ records mention such traders as potters, distillers of spirituous liquors, sugar-boilers, betel-sellers, and horse-dealers, whose organisation into guilds is proved by their joint action, and by the fact, that they had a foreman or *deśī*. We are told, for instance, that the distillers of liquors were required to give on every cask liquor worth half a *vigrahapāladrumma* to the god Viṣṇu. Or, we may cite the joint agreement of the horse-dealers, whereby they imposed upon themselves and upon their customers certain taxes, the proceeds of which were distributed among the temples and the priests in specified proportions.

Such guilds must have been of benefit to the state, inasmuch as they certainly fostered a law-observing spirit in the interests of the community, and thus facilitated the task of government, besides rendering useful service in organising society and administering justice in internal affairs.³⁸

Fiscal conditions

We may now set forth the evidence regarding the principal sources of revenue, on which depended the stability and strength of the state. The Rajor inscription of the Pratihāra feudatory Mathanadeva mentions numerous dues from a village like the *bhoga* and *mayuta* income, with all customary and not customary, fixed and not fixed receipts; the

33 *Ind. Ant.*, XVIII, p. 135.

34 'Pāṭakastu tadardhe syāt' (see Bochtlingk's edition, p. 179).

35 *Ep. Ind.*, I, p. 161.

36 *Ibid.*, p. 167.

37 *Ibid.*, p. 181.

38 Cf. R. C. Majumdar's *Corporate Life in Ancient India*.

shares of all sorts of grain; the *khatabhikṣa* (cess on threshing floors);³⁹ *prasthaka*; *skandhaka*; and *margaṇaka*.⁴⁰ The meaning of these three terms, however, is not known. Fines for ten offences (*sadaśūparā-dhadaṇḍa*),⁴¹ likewise *aputrikādāna* and *naṣṭibharata* (naṣṭabharata?) were other sources of revenue. Besides these, the state laid claim to treasure-trove and mineral products. The record also mentions the following taxes: three *viṃśopakas* on every sack of agricultural produce brought for sale to the market (*baṭṭadāna*); two *palikas* on every *ghaṭaka-kūpaka* of clarified butter and oil; two *viṃśopakas* per mensem on every shop; fifty leaves on every *chollika* of leaves brought from outside towns.

In addition to these, the Gāhadavāla plates mention the following sources of revenue:

(a) *Bhāga*, or share: this possibly represents a stipulated share, exacted by the actual owner from the farmer who cultivated the land.

(b) *Bhoga*, or enjoyment: probably certain rights that the landlord enjoyed when the land was left fallow. Or, it might refer to the use of waste and taking of grass, etc. from the field, when the cultivator's crops had been removed. Or, is 'bhāga' partial and 'bhoga' complete proprietorship?

(c) *Kara*, or rent proper, payable in cash or kind.

(d) *Hiraṇya*, or gold: a money-tax, levied on profits of trade and manufacture. Or is it that 'Kara' represents dues in kind, and 'Hiraṇya' dues commuted into cash?

(e) *Praraṇikara*: a tax on turnpikes, intended to preserve the peace of the village by discouraging the advent of large numbers of visitors. Sometimes it has also been interpreted as a tax for the upkeep of roads.

(f) *Turuṣka-daṇḍa*: a term difficult to explain. It has been variously interpreted as a tax on aromatic reeds,⁴² or tribute paid to Ghazni by the ruler of Kanauj,⁴³ or a tax imposed on the Hindus to ward

³⁹ See *Ep. Ind.*, II, p. 179, verse, 42. Khalaka appears as a revenue term in *Ind. Ant.*, XVIII, p. 114, l. 55.

⁴⁰ See *Ibid.*, p. 83, l. 20. It may be equivalent to the Hindi 'maṅgana.'

⁴¹ On the 'daśaparādhan' see Jolly's *Hindu Law and Custom* (Eng. Transl., by B. K. Ghosh, 1928, pp. 168-270).

⁴² *JASB.*, LXI, pt. I, p. 113.

⁴³ Vaidya, *UJHL.*, III, p. 211.

off the Moslems.⁴⁴ But, as pointed out by Sten Know,⁴⁵ it might also mean a tax levied on the Moslems, who, according to the *Kamil-ut-Tawarikh*, settled in the Kanauj kingdom in the time of Mahmud-bin-Sabuktigin, and were 'constant in prayer and good words'.⁴⁶ Thus it would be a sort of Hindu counterpart of the Moslem Jizya.

(g) *Jalukara*, or tax on water. This must have been a fruitful source of income as the prosperity of the village largely depended upon irrigation.

(h) *Gokara*: probably a tax on the breeding of cattle just as in the South there was a tax of 'the good bull'. Or, was it charge covering grazing rights?

(i) *Viṣṭyadāna*: this must have been some kind of district tax.

(j) *Yamalikambala*; *Nidhi-nikṣepa* (treasure-trove); *Kuṭaka*; unfortunately the signification of these terms is unknown.

We also learn from inscriptions that there were regular customs-houses, called *Mattadāra*, or *Maṇḍapikā*, where perhaps taxes on sales and manufactures were levied and collected.

Regarding land-settlement the details are meagre to the extreme. All the information that we get is that the village lands were measured by 'Hastas' or 'Nalukas', and they were well demarcated by boundaries.⁴⁷

We are also told in the Gāhaḍavāla plates of the rights possessed by owners of villagers, and granted to donees, viz., water (*jala*); waste-land (*sthala*); iron-mines and salt-mines (*lohalavanakara*); fisheries (*matsyakara*); ravines (*garta*); saline soil (*oṣara*); groves of madhuka (*mahua*) and mango (*madhukāmraavanacaṭikā*); grass and pasture land etc. (*tracyutigocaraparyantaḥ*).

Coins

Lastly, we may enumerate the coins mentioned in the Pratihāra records in connection with donations: Dramma; Pañcīyaka-dramma;

44 Smith, *Early History of India*, p. 400 footnote.

45 *Ep. Ind.*, IX, p. 329.

46 Elliot's *History of India*, II, p. 251. See also *Ep. Ind.*, IX, p. 321.

47 *Ep. Ind.*, V, p. 113.

Vigrahapālīya-dramma; Vighrapāla-satka-dramma; Vighratuṅgiyā-dramma; Ādivarāha-dramma; Varāhakāya-viṃśopaka (?); Vighraha-dramma-visovaka; Kapardaka; Kākinī; and Varāṭaka.⁴⁸

Judging from this comprehensive system of coinage and taxation, it would appear that the fiscal administration was fairly developed, and the government knew how to realise money from the people.

RAMA SHANKAR TRIPATHI

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, I, p. 169.

Indo-European “kh” in Sanskrit and Avestan

It is well-known that I.-E. *skh* is represented in Sanskrit by *ch* and in Avestan by *s*. According to some I.-E. *sk* and *sq*, *sqh*, *sq^w*, *sq^wh* before palatal sonants may also be changed to Skt. *ch*. Av. *s*. But the representation of I.-E. *kh* without the sibilant before it in Skt. and Av. has remained doubtful. I shall try to show here that

I.-E. *kh*, Ar. *śh* = Skt. *ch*, Av. *ś*, Germanic *h*, as opposed to
I.-E. *skh*, Ar. *śśh* = Skt. *ch*, Av. *s*, Germanic *sk*.

Skt. *śākhā*, Modern Pers. *śākh*, Arm. *cakh*, Lith. *śaka*, Old Sl. *sokha*, Goth. *hoha*. I agree with Brugmann that I.-E. form was **khāqwhā* and the Aryan form **śhākhā*. The primitive Indo-Aryan form would be **chākhā*. By Grassmann's Law it will be *śākhā* or *chākā*. Now the word *chākā* (in Bahuvrīhi compounds as *chāka*) is actually found in one of the Barhut inscriptions: *naḍadapāde dhenachako* (*Barhut Inscriptions*, Cal. Uni. publication, page 87). *dhenachako* has been rightly explained by the learned editors as equivalent to Pāli *dhanosākho*, “tim-boughed”.

Ved. *achā*, Av. *aśā* show that the primitive Aryan form was **aśhā*.

Skt. *chāga*, Anglo-Sax. *hecen*, Umbrian *habina*, Old Slav. *koza* show that the I.-E. form was **khoga* with an alternative form **qhoga*.

Skt. *pucha*, Goth. *fauho*, I.-E. *pukho* (I.-E. **puskho* > Av. *pusa*).

This representation of I.-E. *kh* in Av. is similar to that of Ar. *kh* (I.-E. *qh*, *q^wh* palatalized) as Av. *ś*.; e.g. Av. *haśe* (for *haśye*) dative sing. masc. = Skt. *sakhye*; *haśa* instr. sing. = Skt. *sakhyā*; but *hakha* nom. sing. = Skt. *sakhā*. That in such cases Av. *ś* is not derived from older *s* by palatalization is clear from Av. *hisid'yāt* = Skt. *chidyāt*, where *ch* = I.-E. *skh* (cf. Gk. *skhāzo*); Av. *spasyā* = Skt. *paśyāmi*, where *ś* = I.-E. *k* (cf. Lat. *specio*, OHG. *spehon*); Av. *masyo* = Skt. *matsya*.

MUHAMMAD SHAHIDULLAH

Did Tailapa II Defeat a Cedi King ?

In his *Early History of the Deccan* (3rd. ed., p. 139) Sir R. G. Bhandarkar says "Tailapa (the founder of the Later Calukya Dynasty) humbled the king of Cedi." Dr. Fleet also referred to this event¹ but was not inclined to accept it as historical, for he wrote "Some of the later records assert that in addition to subverting the power of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, he overcame the king of Cedi, the Utkalas or the people of Orissa and Nepal and had subjugated the whole of the Kuntala country. The alleged conquest of Nepal is of course an invention of poets; and probably the statements about Cedi, the Colas and Orissa are no more substantial, except in being perhaps based, in the first two cases, on some successful resistance of attempts at invasion". Rai Bahadur Hiralal, however, who has recently written on the history of the Kalacuris of Tripurī² has identified this Cedi king defeated by Tailapa with Yuvarājadeva II of Tripurī.³ This king was closely related to Tailapa for, Bonthādevī, the daughter of Lakṣmaṇarāja and the sister of Yuvarājadeva II was the mother of Tailapa. We must, therefore, suppose that Tailapa waged war on his own maternal uncle.

Neither Dr. Fleet nor Rai Bahadur Hiralal has cited any authority for his statement, but they are evidently relying on the Yewur grant of the reign of Vikramāditya VI to which Dr. Bhandarkar has referred in a footnote. This Yewur Grant is inscribed on a stone tablet "at a shrine of god Basavaṅṅā at the temple of the god Someśvara on the north

1 *The Dynasties of the Kanerese Districts*, 2nd ed. (1896) p. 431 (*Bombay Gazetteer*, I, pt. ii).

2 *ABORI.*, IX, p. 291. Prof. R. D. Banerji also has made a similar statement in his recently published book '*The Haihayas of Tripurī and their Monuments*' p. 14.

3

चेदीयवंशतिलकां लक्ष्मणराजस्य नन्दनां नुत्तशीलाम् ।

बोन्थादेवीं विधिवत्परिशिन्ये विक्रमादित्यः ॥

सुतमिव वसुदेवाद्देवकी वासुदेवं गुहमिव गिरिजामिदं वसुधैकुर्वन्मौलेः ।

अजनयद्य बोन्थादेव्यतस्तैलभूपं विभवविजितशक्रं विक्रमादित्यनाम्नः ॥

side of the village Yewur in the Sorapur Ilakha which is on the eastern frontier of the Kaladgi district". It had not then been carefully edited with a facsimile,⁴ but from a transcription and handcopy supplied to him, Dr. Fleet gave his version in the *Indian Antiquary* (VIII pp. 10 ff.). The genealogical portion of the grant which is in Sanskrit was copied from some earlier copper-plate; so Dr. Fleet utilised, for his version of the grant, the Miraj grant of Jayasimha III dated Śaka 946 (A.D. 1024-5) of which a transcription and an abstract translation had already been published.

The foregoing account of Dr. Fleet's version of the Yewur inscription shows that he had no reliable materials before him when he published it in the *Indian Antiquary*.⁵ In that inscription there occurs the following verse about Tailapa:—

हूणप्राणहरप्रतापदहनो यात्रात्रसन्मारवः
 चैद्यच्छेद्यखिलभ्रमाजयनयव्युत्पन्नवीरोत्कलः ।
 येनात्युग्ररणाप्रदर्शितबलप्राचुर्यशौर्योदयः
 कारागारनिवेशितः कविवृषा यं वर्णयन् घूर्णते ॥

Dr. Fleet translated this verse as follows:—

(Tailapa) who destroyed the life-destroying power of the Hūṇas; who caused the inhabitants of the deserts to tremble at his journeying forth; who eradicated the Caidyas; who subjugated the brave Utkalas by all his patience and victory and administrative talent; by whom any one who possessed an abundance of strength and increase and courage, manifested in the exceedingly fierce van of battle, was cast into prison; and in describing whom (even) the best of poets is driven to his wit's end."⁶ Dr. Fleet thus took the verse as consisting of four compound expressions and two relative clauses, all descriptive of Tailapa. As he himself acknowledged, the translation was not altogether satisfactory. It was, however, this version and translation on which both he and Dr. Bhandarkar relied for their statements in the first editions of their works which were published subsequently.

In 1887 Dr. Fleet published the Kauthem plates of Vikramāditya

⁴ Dr. L. D Barnett has since then edited the inscription in *Ep. Ind.*, XII, pp. 260 ff. He has not, however, discussed or translated the present passage.

⁵ See vol. VIII, pp. 10 ff.

⁶ *Ind. Ant.*, vol. VIII, p. 16.

V of Śaka Samvat 930 with a facsimile.⁷ As he had better materials to work on at this time, he gave a correct version of the above stanza, reading अखिलभ्रमाजयनयव्युत्पन्नधीरुत्पलः in place of वीरोत्कलः and took it to mean—“(Tailapa) by whom Utpala who had destroyed the lives of the Hūṇas and caused the Māravas to tremble at his approach, and had cut off the Caidyas and had perfected his intellect by policy combined with conquest of the whole world was cast into prison.”⁸ This translation, as far as it goes, may be accepted with slight corrections viz. Hūṇa, Mārava and Caidya were kings and not the people of the particular countries. It was thus clear that the description of martial exploits given in this verse refers not to Tailapa but to some king named Utpala who was defeated by Tailapa and cast into prison. As no king of this name was known at the time, Dr. Fleet identified him with Pāñcāla, a Western Ganga prince, whom, according to other inscriptions, Tailapa killed in battle. Apart from this identification it was quite clear that the Caidyas or rather the Caidya king was defeated by Utpala and not by Tailapa. No other inscription of Tailapa or his successors records his defeat of a Cedi king. Still the statement in the works of Dr. Bhandarkar and Dr. Fleet has remained uncorrected till now.

In 1886 an important Sanskrit kāvya, the *Narasāhasānka-carita* of Padmagupta *alias* Parimala was discovered and two years later Prof. Bühler and Dr. Th. Zachariæ published a critical account of it in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Wien Imp. Akademie of Sciences.⁹ From the *Narasāhasānkarita* it was clear that Utpala was the name of the Paramāra king Muñja of Dhārā (called also Vākpatirāja).¹⁰ The above stanza हूणप्राणहर- &c. which occurs in the Kauthem plates of Vikramāditya V, the Miraj plates of Jayasiṃha II and the Yewur inscription of Vikramāditya VI refers, therefore, to Tailapa's victory over and imprisonment of Munja. The *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* of

7 *Ind. Ant.*, vol. XVI, p. 15ff.

8 *Ibid.*, vol. XVI, p. 18.

9 An English translation of the article has appeared in the *Ind. Ant.*, vol. XXXVI, p. 149 (1907).

10 श्रीमदुत्पलराजोऽभूदप्रजोऽस्याग्रणीः सताम् । सगरापत्यदत्ताब्धिपरिखायाः पतिर्भुवः ॥

Merutuṅga tells us that Muñja defeated Tailapa six times. When he crossed the Godāvarī in his seventh expedition against the advice of his minister Rudrāditya, he was defeated and taken prisoner by Tailapa. When he tried to escape from imprisonment, he was made to beg from door to door and hanged on a tree. Bühler accepted the statement of Merutuṅga that Tailapa killed Muñja for it is clearly referred to in two Cālukyan inscriptions but he was inclined to look with suspicion on the other details of the tradition recorded by Merutuṅga. He remarked "The narrative is adorned with so many touching scenes and so many verses which the imprisoned king is said to have composed under different circumstances, that its legendary character is unmistakable".¹¹ Merutuṅga's version is not, however, as suspicious as Bühler thought. We know from an inscription of Muñja that he had a minister named Rudrāditya.¹² That Muñja was a good poet is known from Padmagupta's description of him¹³ as well as from several verses in anthologies ascribed to Muñja, Vākpatirāja or Utpalarāja. The verse in Kauthem and other inscriptions shows that he composed verses in his imprisonment to please Tailapa. The tradition recorded by Merutuṅga seems, therefore, to have had a foundation in fact.

Nor have we any reason to doubt the truth of the description of Muñja's military exploits in that stanza. It is true that Bühler has not referred to them in the critical and fairly exhaustive account of Muñja's conquests,¹⁴ but this was probably because his attention was not directed to it. We must note that the description occurs not in the panegyric of a court poet but in the records of his enemies. Besides we know from another inscription¹⁵ that Muñja defeated Yuvarājadeva II the Cedi king, killed his generals and held his sword on high at Tri-

11 *Ind. Ant.*, XXXVI, p. 170.

12 *Ind. Ant.*, XIV, p. 160.

13 सरस्वतीकल्पलतैककन्दं वन्दामहे वाकपतिराजदेवम् । यस्य प्रसादाद्भयमप्यनन्यकवीन्द्र-
वीर्यो पथि सञ्जयामः । *Navasāhasāṅkacarita*, 1, 7. Also cf. *Ep. Ind.*, I, 1567 f.,

"The Udepur Prasasti of the Kings of Malwa."

14 *Ind. Ant.*, XXXVI, p. 169-70; *Ep. Ind.*, I, 230.

15 युवराजं विजित्याजौ हत्वा तद्वाहिनीपतीन् ।

सद्गुण ऊर्ध्वीकृतो येन त्रिपुर्यां विजिगीषुषा ॥ *Ep. Ind.*, I, p. 235.

purī, the capital of the enemy. His victory over a Hūṇa king also is likely to be a fact. Both his father Sīyaka¹⁶ who preceded and his brother Sindhurāja¹⁷ who succeeded him are known from other records to have waged war on a Hūṇa prince and Muñja also may have done the same. That there was a Hūṇa family reigning in the 10th and 11th centuries is known from other inscriptions. The plates of Avanivarman II Yoga, (Vikrama) Saṃvat 956 mention a Hūṇa king, Jajjapa, who was defeated by Avanivarman.¹⁸ From the Jubbulpur copper-plate of Yaśahkarnadeva¹⁹ we learn that Karṇa of Tripurī (circa 1040-1070 A.D.) married a Hūṇa princess Āvalladevī. The Paramārs were constantly at war with Hūṇa and Cedi princes. The Cedis were on the east and the Hūṇas probably on the west of the kingdom of the Paramārs. Karṇa's marriage with a Hūṇa princess must have, therefore, been dictated by political considerations, as it united two royal families against a common foe. It is more difficult to identify the king of the Maru country who was defeated by Muñja; but he is likely to be Balirāja, the Cāhamāna prince of Naddula in Rajaputana. The Sundha Hill inscription of Cācigadeva²⁰ tells us that Balirāja defeated an army sent by Muñja. Afterwards Muñja may have advanced in person and defeated Balirāja, or his successor.

The foregoing discussion will make it clear that the verse हूणप्राणहरप्रतापदहनो &c. describes the Paramāra king Muñja who was imprisoned and afterwards beheaded by Tailapa. As said above, there is no other record which alludes to Tailapa's victory over a Cedi king. His close relation to Yuvarājadeva II would also make such an invasion improbable in the absence of a definite proof.

V. V. MIRASII

16 अकङ्क्यामकेयूरमनूपुरमखलम् । हूणावरोधवैधव्यदीक्षादानं व्यघस्त यः ।

Narasāhasāṅkacarita XI, 90.

17 अपकर्तुमत्र समयं तवात्तभीर्मनसापि हूणानृपतिने वाञ्छति । इभकुम्भभित्तिदलनोद्यमे हरेर्न कपिः कदाचन सटां विकर्षति ॥


18 *Ep. Ind.*, IX, p. 1.

19 *Ep. Ind.*, II, p. 1.

20 *Ep. Ind.*, IX, p. 71.

तस्माद्धिमाद्रिभवनाथयशोनुहारी श्रीशोभितोऽजनि नृपोऽस्य तनूद्भवोऽथ । गाम्भीय-
धैर्यसदनं बलिराजदेवो यो मुञ्जराजबलभङ्गमचीकरत्तम् ।

Akbar as a Sun-Worshipper



HQ., March, 1933

From a photograph
by Dr. Hirananda Sastri

Akbar as a Sun-Worshipper

Akbar was probably more inclined towards Zoroastrianism than any other religion. It is said that he was taught the peculiar terms, ordinances, rites and ceremonies of this creed and that he was very reverential to the Sun-God. From the twenty-fifth year of his reign (March 1580), we are told, he began to prostrate himself in public before the Sun. The *Ain* (III, p. 393) would show that for Akbar to light a candle meant to commemorate the rising of the Sun and that his maxim was that 'To whomsoever the Sun sets, what other remedy has he but this?' The worship of the Sun is rather more Brahmanical than Zoroastrian. The Hindu worship Him daily by his most sacred *mantra*, the *Gāyatrī*, praying Him for the *bhargas* and for the stimulation or sharpening of the intellect. The 'Sauras' among the Hindus worship this divinity particularly, just as the Saivas worship Śiva and the Vaiṣṇavas, Viṣṇu. It is not impossible that Akbar learnt worshipping the Sun from Rājā Bīrbal who exercised very great influence on him and was himself a great adherent of the cult of the Sun. The evidence available would show that Akbar learnt the *Sūryasahasranāma* from a Jaina teacher of his—the influence which some of the Jaina *munis* exercised on Akbar has already been pointed out (V. Smith's *Akbar the Great Mogul*, pp. 164-5, 237; *Sarasvatī*, 1912, pp. 289 ff.) The list given by Abul Fazal names three Jaina *gurus* for whom the Great Mughal had a very high regard. The *Hīravijaya kāvyam* shows that the stoppage of animal slaughter was due to the teachings of Hīravijaya-Sūrī on whom Akbar had conferred the grand title of *Jagad-guru* or the Preceptor of the world. The *Adīśvara* temple on the holy hill of *Saṣruñjaya* near Palitana in Kathiawār has a long Sanskrit inscription written on its walls which combines the praise of this Jaina monk with that of Akbar and may well be referred to for knowing what the Great Mughal did under the noble influence of the Jaina saints. Vincent Smith has rightly remarked that 'Akbar's action in abstaining almost wholly from eating meat and in issuing stringent prohibitions, resembling those of Aśoka restricting to the narrowest limits the destruction of

life, certainly was taken in obedience to the doctrine of his Jaina teacher'. The following colophon of the commentary on the *Kādambarī* would show that Akbar read the *Sūryasahasranāma* with Bhānucandra whom Hīravijaya Sūrī had left behind after his famous visit to Akbar. Siddhicandra, the joint¹ author of the said commentary and a disciple of Bhānucandra, was another teacher of the Great Mughal.

इति श्रीपादशाहश्रीअकब्बरजलालदीनसूर्यसहस्रनामाध्यापकश्रीशत्रुंजयतीर्थकर-
मोचनाद्यनेकसुकृतविधापकमहोपाध्यायश्रीभानुचन्द्रगणितच्छिष्याष्टोत्तरशतावधानसाधन-
प्रमुदितपादशाहश्रीअकब्बरप्रदत्तपुस्त्युहमापराभिधानमहोपाध्यायश्रीसिद्धिचन्द्रगणिविरचि-
तायां कादम्बरीटीकायामुत्तरखण्डटीका समाप्ता ।

This colophon is practically identical with that of the *Lekhalikhanūpaddhati*, a manuscript copy of which, written in the Vikrama-Samvat 1711, I saw with the Jaina *muni* Śrī-Vicakṣaṇavijaya at Bangalore last year. The difference is that the latter was written in the reign of Jahangir and it attributes the giving of the title *Khush-faham* to the Jaina monk Siddhicandra to Jahangir and not to Akbar, and that it also mentions the conferment of the title 'the second Nādir-i-zamān' on the said monk. This reads as:—

इति महाराजाधिराजपादशाहश्रीअकब्बरजलालदीनसूर्यसहस्रनामाध्यापकश्रीशत्रुंजय-
तीर्थकरविमोचनगोवधनिवर्तनाद्यनेकसुकृतविनिर्मापकमहोपाध्यायश्रीभानुचन्द्रगणिशिष्य-
युगपदष्टोत्तरशतावधानसाधनप्रमुदितपादशाहश्रीअकब्बरजलालदीनपादशाहश्रीजिहांगीर-
नूरुद्दीनप्रदत्तपुस्त्युहमनादिस्जमां द्वितीयाभिधानमहोपाध्यायश्रीसिद्धचन्द्रगणिविरचिता-
लेखलिखनपद्धतिः समाप्ता ।

लिखितोयं विद्यापुरे सं. १७११ वर्षे [११*]

It is interesting to observe here in passing that these references go a long way to prove that Akbar was not *ummi* or illiterate as is very often believed.²

1 The following verse given in the *pūrvā-bhāga* of the *ṭikā* makes Bhānucandra the author:—

श्रीवाचकः संप्रति भानुचन्द्रो अकब्बररत्नापतिदत्तमानः ॥

श्रीशाहिचेतोऽब्जपङ्घितुल्यः श्रीसिद्धिचन्द्रोऽस्ति मदीयशिष्यः । कादम्बरी वृत्तिरयं तदीय-
मनोमुदे तेन मया प्रतन्यते ॥

2 Vincent Smith, for instance, held this belief.

It is rather curious that though the Hindus as Sun-worshippers should have been the teachers of the said *Sahasranāma* yet Akbar selected a Jaina monk and read the eulogy of the Sun with him. Besides, the Jains do not worship the Sun. But it does not matter much. The fact is that Akbar read the *Sahasranāma* or the 1000 names to worship the Sun-God. One would be curious to know the *Sahasranāma* that Akbar the Great learnt. From a collection of ancient manuscripts muni Vicakṣaṇavijaya at Bangalore last year showed me some leaves which gives this eulogy or the *Sahasranāma* in question. He also showed me a diagram (see facsimile published herewith) which bears these one thousand names of the Sun written in circles. The diagram which I reproduce below was, I believe, worshipped by Akbar. I draw this inference from the following words written at the end of the *Sūrya sahasranāma*:—

अमुं श्रीसूर्यसहस्रनामस्तोत्रंप्रत्यहं प्रणमत्पृथ्वीपतिकोटीरकोटिसंघटितपदकमल-
त्रिखण्डाधिपतिदिल्लीपतिपातिसाहिश्रीअकब्बरसाहिजला[ल*]दीनः । प्रत्यहं शृणोति सोपि
प्रतापवान् भवतु ॥

This diagram is written in red colour which does not allow of a good photograph. It gives some pictures also which were apparently worked in by some unprofessional painter who wrote the thousand names and preferred to draw the figures himself and thus preserve the sanctity of the writing. I believe the word *amum* is here used for the *Sahasranāma* itself. The pronoun *adas* is, occasionally, employed to indicate the nearness and in the sense of 'this' or 'here', as in असौ शरभ्यः शरणागतानां (Raghu³ vi, 21) where *asau* means 'one who is to be seen in front' असाविति पुरोवर्तिनो निर्देशः according to Mallinātha. Possibly it is the very *stotra* of the Sun. Otherwise, it must be a copy of it. Both the *stotra*, I mean the *Sahasranāma*, and the diagram are with the said *muni*. The collection which contains both of them has got some interesting works, Sanskrit as well as Prakrit, and is worth being acquired. The belief is that some of the manuscripts preserved in it belonged to the Jaina monks whom Akbar and Jahangir had patronised. Perhaps the good soul of the 'great scholar', the Mahāmahopādhyāya Paṇḍit Haraprasād Śāstrī M.A., C.I.E., will help

in its acquisition and the pick of it will be brought to the notice of scholars ere long.

As the eminent Indian scholar to whose memory this volume is being inscribed was a great discoverer of good manuscripts I consider it quite opportune to announce the discovery of the stotra in this note as a tribute to his memory.

HIRANANDA SASTRI

Note on a Newly-Discovered Taxila Inscription

Kalawān is a site about three miles south-east of Sirkap, in Taxila. Here, under the foundations of a stūpa, the excavations of Sir John Marshall have brought to light a well-preserved Kharoṣṭhī inscription in five lines, incised on a copper-plate with punctured dots in the manner of the Taxila silver-scroll record. Prof. Sten Konow is engaged in editing the inscription in the *Epigraphia Indica*; and he has meanwhile given a preliminary account in *JRAS* (Oct. 1923, pp. 949-965) with a view to elicit a discussion on the various points arising out of the phraseology of its dating. How important the matter is will be evident from the fact that Prof. Konow has felt convinced that his own 'dating of all the Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions of the old series falls to pieces.'¹

The date is expressed thus:—

(Line 1) Saṃvatśaraye 1.100.20.10.4. ajasa śravaṇasa masasa divase
treviśe 20.1.1.1. imena kṣuṇeṇa.....

We may compare the date occurring in the allied silver-scroll record from Taxila:—

(Line 2) Saṃ 1.100.20.10.4.1.1. ayasa aṣaḍasa masasa divase 10.4.1.
iśa divase.....

There can be no doubt that the word *ajasa* in the copper-plate corresponds to the word *ayasa* in the silver-scroll. Nor can it be denied that the year 134 of the one refers to the same era as the year 136 of the other. We must accordingly assume that *ajasa* and *ayasa* are equivalent expressions; so that *aja* and *aya* have to be recognized as two variants of the same word. The question is, what that original word may have been.

Prof. Konow now thinks that *aja* and *aya* are two variants of the proper name 'Azes' known to have been borne by a ruler of this region whose coins have come down to us. His former view was that *ayasa* in

¹ *JRAS.*, p. 952.

the silver-scroll corresponds to Skt. *ādyaśya*, implying an intercalary month Āśāḍha in the year 136. A parallel explanation applied to *ajasa* in the copper-plate would lead us to infer that there was an intercalary month Śrāvaṇa in the year 134 of the same era. Astronomically, such a position is untenable, as the Professor has been informed by Dr. van Wijk who has made a special study of Hindu astronomy. That is the chief reason why Prof. Konow now abandons the old explanation. His other reason is that "it seems hardly likely that Sanskrit *ādya* can appear both as *aya* and as *aja* in two records, which are almost contemporary". But this is not a weighty consideration. In the silver-scroll, Skt. *pratiṣṭhāpita* appears as *pradistavita*, while in the copper-plate Skt. *pratiṣṭhāpayatī* appears as *pra-istaveti*, with the *t* completely elided. Again, the name Takṣaśilā appears in the silver-scroll as *Takṣaśie* (=Skt. *Takṣaśilāyām*), while the name Chaḍaśila, where 'the last component, *śilā*, is evidently the same as in Takṣaśilā',² appears with the *l* intact in the copper-plate (line 2).³ The irregularity of the dialect employed in these epigraphs is well-known; in the Kalawān copper-plate itself, we come across *grahavati* for Skt. *grhapati*, side by side with *gahathuba* for Skt. *grhastūpa*. There is thus no insurmountable phonetic difficulty in tracing both *aja* and *aya* to Skt. *ādya*. On the other hand, although from the phonetic standpoint there can be no objection to the assumption that *aja* might represent the name Aześ, the fact that the name is always rendered as *Aya*, never as *Aja*, on the coins of Aześ raises a strong presumption against the existence of a side-form *Aja*. Moreover, it is hardly possible that the exceptional side-form, even if it existed, should be used here in preference to the form found on the coins of Aześ which must have been current at the time the copper-plate was inscribed. That "the name Aześ was familiar from the numerous 'Aześ' coins in common use" is recognized by Professor Konow.⁴ If the object of the donor or engraver were to imply any reference to an era 'used by Aześ and his successors', nothing could be calculated to

2 *Ibid.*, p. 965.

3 *Ibid.*, p. 950.

4 *Ibid.*, p. 945 f.

impair that object more effectively than the choice of a form of the name Azes not occurring on the numerous Azes' coins in common use.

Under the circumstances, we are obliged to formulate an explanation for *ayasa* and *ajasa* as corresponding to some word qualifying *masasa* (=Skt. *māsasya* in *aṣāḍasa masasa* and in *śravaṇasa masasa*) coming immediately afterwards in the two records. The *māsa* is always in these epigraphs a lunar month. We know that the lunar month has two varieties, from a new moon to the next new moon, or from a full moon to the next full moon. Both varieties are known to early Hindu astronomy, the former being designated *amānta*, the latter *pūrṇimānta*. They are also sometimes called *mukhya* and *gauna*, respectively. Now, the term *mukhya* is synonymous with *ādya*, being derived from *mukha*, which has the same meaning as *ādi*. It is therefore quite reasonable to explain *ajasa masasa* or *ayasa masasa* as Skt. *ādyaśya māsasya*, 'of the *ādya* month', in other words, 'of the *amānta* month',—Śrāvaṇa in one case, Aṣāḍha in the other.

This interpretation is justified in another way. Prof. Konow and Dr. van Wijk have realized that, in several Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions of the Kushān period, the month employed is *pūrṇimānta*. Since the months in these records are not qualified by any term implying that they pertain to the *pūrṇimānta* scheme, we may infer that, where no such term was applied, the people understood the months to be *pūrṇimānta*. If, therefore, the *amānta* month was required to be used, a differential expression would be necessary. And the term *ādya* applied to the month could well denote the difference.

The Kalawān inscription thus shows that the term *ayasa* occurring in the Taxila silver-scroll has no reference to intercalation or to Azes. It is a term indicating that the month employed was *amānta*.

It might be useful to append Prof. Konow's reading of this important record—

(L. 1) Saṃvatsāraye 1 100 20 10 4 ajasa śravaṇasa masasa divase
treviśe 20 1 1 1 imeṇa kṣuṇeṇa Caṃdrabhi uasia

(L. 2) Dhraṃmasa grahavatisa dhita Bhadravalasa bhaya Chadaśilae
śarira praistaveti gahathu—

(L. 3) bami sadha bhraduṇa Naṃdivadhaneṇa grahavatiṇa sadha
putrehi Saṃeṇa Saiteṇa ca dhifūṇa ca

- (L. 4) Dhramae sadha ṣṇuṣaehi Rajae Idrae ya sadha Jivaṇamdiṇa
 Samaputrena ayariena ya sarvasti-
- (L. 5) vaana parigrahe raṭhanikamo puyaita sarvasvatvaṇa⁵ puyae
 nivaṇasa pratiae hotu.

HARIT KRISHNA DEB

A Note on the Girdharpur Brāhmī Inscription of the Year 28

In the *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society*, vol. XVIII, pp. 4 ff., Mr. Jayaswal has published a Brāhmī inscription, found near the Girdharpur mound at Mathurā and dated in the year 28 of the Kanīṣka era, during the reign of the Devaputra Śōhi Huviṣka, and in the *Indian Historical Quarterly*, VIII, pp. 117 ff., Mr. Harit Krishna Deb has made some remarks on this record. The epigraph itself has been known to me for some time, but I have not felt at liberty to make any use of it before a paper which I have prepared for the *Epigraphia Indica* at the request of the Government epigraphist is published.

Since the inscription has now been made known, I should like to make some few remarks, in the hope that the criticism they may elicit can be utilised in my paper in the *Epigraphia*.

Mr. Jayaswal has justly remarked that the Girdharpur inscription reduces the interval between Vāsiṣka and Huviṣka to a few months. Vāsiṣka's latest date is found in a Mathurā inscription¹ of the third month of *hemanta* in the year 28, and the new Huviṣka inscription is dated on the 1st Gorpaiias 28. As stated by Mr. De, the Macedonian Gorpaiias corresponds to August-September. Dr. van Wijk has been good enough to calculate the date according to the system followed in my edition of Kharoṣṭhī inscription, and found that the corresponding Julian date is August 19th, A.D. 155. It is, however, possible, or rather probable, that the epoch of the Kanīṣka era is later than I have assumed in Dr. van Wijk's calculations.

Mr. De, who does not appear to ascribe the Mathurā inscription of the year 28 to Vāsiṣka, speaking of the Sāñci statue epigraph of the 5th day of the first *hemanta*-month of 28 as containing Vāsiṣka's last date, is of opinion that the Sāñci statue, with its date in October or November of Sam 28, is later than the Girdharpur inscription of August 28. That would be so if the Kanīṣka year began with Caitra, but everything speaks against that assumption, and we must evidently

¹ No. 33 in Lueders' List.

reckon with a Kārttikādi year. There is not, therefore, any over-lapping in this case.

Nor can I accept Mr. De's statement that 'our record proves the use of Macedonian month-names in the Mathura region, at least, as early as the reign of Huiṣka.' I shall return to this question below.

The inscription mentions a *puṇyaśālā* and a perpetual gift of 1100 *perāṇas*, and, according to Mr. Jayaswal, 'the officer signing and executing the gift was a nobleman, *Tīkana Prācī*, the son of *Rukamāna*.' *Tīkana* is said to be the Turki title *tigin*, and we should accordingly have to assume that this designation was known and used in India in the second century A.D., the *Tīkana* being, according to Mr. Jayaswal, evidently the governor of Mathurā.

I am unable to accept this ingenious explanation. It cannot be supported by a reference to a Nālandā inscription of the 6th century A.D., or to the use of the supposed Turki title *yaruga* at a still earlier date, it being very doubtful whether *yaruga* is originally a Turki word at all.

What is more important is, however, that the reading *tīkana* is a correction made by Mr. Jayaswal himself. What stands in his plate is *ayaṃ puṇyaśālā prācinī Kanasarukamāna-putreṇa Kharāsalera-patina Vakanapatinā akṣayanūri dinnā*, and it seems necessary to connect the irregular form *prācinī* with *puṇyaśālā*, characterizing the hall as 'eastern', probably in order to distinguish it from another, 'western', hall.

The donor himself is accordingly characterized as *Kanasarukamāna-putra*, *Kharāsalera-pati*, and *Vakanapati*, apparently without mentioning his actual name.

I cannot analyse the first two of these terms. I cannot even decide whether we should translate the first one as 'son of Kanasarukamāna' or as 'the scion of the Kanasarukamas'. *Kharāsalera-pati* must mean 'lord of Kharāsalera', but we do not know any district or tribe of that name. It can hardly have anything to do with *Khara*, the first station on Mahākātyāyana's northward flight from Roruka, before he reached the country of the *Lambākapālas*, i.e. Taghmān.²

² Cf. *Divyāradāna*, pp. 577 ff. and Lueders, *SBAW.*, 1930, pp. 39 ff.

From Lambāka Mahākātyāyana preceeded to Syāniāka, i.e. Chitrāl, and further to Vokkāna, i.e. Wakhān. The form Vokkāna is difficult, on account of its *kk* where we should expect a guttural fricative, but the identification of the name seems to be certain.

Now we know that Wakhān was one of the five principalities of the old Ta-hia country, and that the Kuṣāṇas continued to look on their old home in and near Badakshān as their real stronghold,³ and since we have before us a Kuṣāna inscription, it is tempting to see another form of the name rendered as Vokkāna in the *Divyāvadāna* in our *Vakana*. The two forms would bear the same relationship to each other as *Erān* and *airjana*. If I am right, Kharāsālera must also have been situated in the same neighbourhood.

As stated by Mr. Jayaswal *Vakana* is clearly the same name as *Bakana* in the Mathurā statue inscription published by Messrs. Vogel⁴ and Jayaswal⁵. Also there I would translate *Bakana-pati* as 'lord of Wakhān'. Mr. Jayaswal corrects *Bakana* to *Barkana* and explains *Barkanapatina Hum. . .* as 'by the king (*nṛpati*) of Varka, the *kṣā. . .* of Huma, referring us to the Śaka tribe *Haumararka* mentioned in an Old Persian inscription.⁶

That the donor was not settled in Mathurā but had come to the place from the North-West is, in my opinion, made probable by the use of the Macedonian month-name *Corpiaiōs*. The Macedonian calendar has not formerly been traced in any inscription from India proper. We find Macedonian months mentioned in records from the North-West belonging to the Śaka and the Kaniṣka periods. But even in the border-land the Indian names were commonly used, and during the Parthian period no instance of the use of the Macedonian months is known from Indian inscriptions. It was the Śakas and their heirs

3 Cf. Ohavannes, *Young Pao*, II, viii, p. 1872.

4 *ASI.*, 1911-12, pp. 120 ff.

5 *JBOIS.*, VI, pp. 12 ff.

6 This sounds to me as if we were to say "King Rūpa, ruler of Kāma", instead of 'King of Kāmarūpa'. I shall not, in this place, enter into a discussion of the identity of the *Mahārāja Rājātirāja Devaputra Kuṣāṇam putra Shāhi Yamatākṣama*. The anusvāra in *Kuṣāṇam* seems to be quite distinct. If it is right, the form *Kuṣāṇam putra* is in favour of explaining *Kanusarukamōna* as a gen. pl.

the Kuṣāṇas who stuck to them, in and in the neighbourhood of their old strongholds.

When we now find a Macedonian month mentioned in a Mathurā inscription, it seems to be necessary to draw the inference that it was drafted by a person who came down from the North-West, from the Kuṣāṇa strongholds in the old Ta-hia country. And if I am right in my explanation of the designation *Vakanapati* as meaning 'lord of Wakhān', this conclusion becomes certain.

The Girdharpur record accordingly seems to throw some light on the state of things in the Kuṣāṇa empire in the second century A.D. Nobles and chiefs from the old Kuṣāṇa country occasionally visited Mathurā and endowed various establishments. But it is probable that they also had another mission: to control the administration on behalf of their suzerains, who seem to have spent much of their time beyond the frontiers of India proper. In such circumstances it would not be unlikely that our information about the Kuṣāṇa nobles should be incomplete. We know nothing about Vamataksama. He may have been a successor of Wima Kadphises who never resided in India itself. And there may have been more than one 'unknown' ruler. The unexpected appearance of a suzerain with more high sounding titles than any other Kuṣāṇa, the emperor Kaniska in the Ara inscription, points in that direction.

Our record seems to be due to a chief of Wakhān, who owed allegiance to the Kuṣāṇa over-lord. The disruption of the Kuṣāṇa empire which led to the five hi-house setting up for themselves, and which was an established fact in the first half of the fifth century A.D., had not begun at the time when Huviska began his rule. Though he is not distinguished by the full imperial title, he certainly held a position superior to that of the local ruler of Wakhān, who was probably a hi-hou.

STEN KONOW

Notion of Time in Hindu Philosophy


“What is Time? A mystery, a figment but all powerful! It conditions the exterior world, it is motion married to and mingled with the existence of bodies in space, and with the motion of these. Would there then be no time if there were no motion? No motion if no time? Is Time a function of Space or Space of Time? Or are they identical?” Such must have been the train of thoughts that passed through the mind of early thinkers when they set upon pondering over the notion and function of Time.

Thus the earliest expression of human mind on the notion of Time is a vague pronouncement on the all-powerful character of Time. “Time drives as a horse with seven reins, thousand eyed, unaging; possessing much seed. His wheels are all beings. He brought the beings together and duly encompasses them. Being the father, he becomes the son of them all. Than his, verily, there is no other brilliance that is higher. Time generated yonder sky, Time also these earths. What is and what is to be stands out sent forth by Time. From Time came into being the waters. By Time the sun rises; in Time he goes to rest again. Time generated of old what is and what is to be.”¹ Such vague expressions did, no doubt, lead to more consistent and rational deliberations on the notion of Time. The later Hindu philosophers maintained *Kāla* (Time) as an independently existing Force and they gave the following reasoning:—

“All perceptible things are perceived as moving, changing, coming into existence and passing out of it. They are produced and destroyed. There must be some Force or Power which thus brings them into existence and moves them all. The things themselves cannot do it. There must, therefore, be something which makes this movement, organisation and destruction of things possible. It is this something, this Power or Force, which is *Kāla*. As it moves and changes things it gives rise to in the perceiver the notions, with regard to those things, of past, present and future, of old and new.”² That is to say, it produces all

1 *Atharva-veda*, sūktas, XIX, 53-54.

2 *Vaiśeṣika-sūtra*, Upaskāra and Vivṛti, 11. ii. 6; *Nyāya-vārttika*, 11. i. 36. *Aparasmimn aparaṃ yugoput ciram kṣipram iti kālalingāni.*



those relations which are termed temporal and is in this sense only Time. It must be conceived as a Reality,³ because it cannot be shewn to be dependent for its existence upon anything, rather it is upon Kāla (Time) that all moving and discrete things depend, in so far as they have movements and change. It must be also a Reality which pervades the whole universe, that is to say, has relations with all things that are moving and changing. In fact, it is a Reality which relates things together in regard to their movements and changes, and thus enables a perceiver to speak of some things as old, and of others as young, with reference to one another. Thus Kāla (Time) is a Reality which holds together the sensible universe as it ever moves on in well-regulated and seasoned cycles, and yet maintains that positional order which, for ever, obtains between its various members."⁴

The Hindu philosophers further proceeded to argue that infinite Time is a non-entity objectively considered, being only a construction of the understanding (*buddhi-nirmāṇa*) based on the relation of antecedence and sequence, in which the members of the phenomenal series are intuited to stand to one another. These phenomenal changes as intuited by us in the empirical consciousness fall into a series, which the understanding conceives as order in Time. "The Time-series, then", says Sir B. N. Seal, "is a schema of the understanding for representing the course of evolution. The schema of the understanding supervenes on the phenomenal world as order in Time, and hence in the empirical consciousness the Time-series appears to have an objective reality and to form a continuum. As there is an ultimate and irreducible unit of extensive quantity (*parimāṇa*) in the *Guṇas* or infinitesimal Reals of *Prakṛti*, which are without constituent parts, so the moment may be conceived as the ultimate and irreducible unit of this Time-continuum as represented in the empirical consciousness." A moment, therefore, cannot be thought of as containing any parts standing in the relation of antecedence and sequence. If change is represented by the Time-series, a moment as the unit of Time may be supposed to represent the unit of change. Now all physical change may be reduced to the motion of atoms in space, and we may therefore define the moment as representing the ultimate unit of such change, viz., the (instantaneous) transit of an atom (or rather a *tanmātra*) from one point in space to the next succeeding point. Even an atom has constituent parts (the *tanmātras*),

3 *Vaiśeṣika-sūtra*, 11. ii, 7. *dravyatvanityatve vāyunā cyākkhyāte*.

4 *Pratistapāda*, p. 22.

and hence an atom must take more than one moment to change its position. The motion of that which is absolutely simple and without parts from one point in space to the next must be instantaneous, and conceived as the absolute unit of change (and therefore of time or *kṣana*). If this be held to be an irreducible absolute unit, it will follow that what we represent as the Time-continuum is really discrete. The Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika philosophy asserts the existence of Time (*Kāla*) as extending from the past through the present to the endless futurity before us. Had there been no time we could have no knowledge of it and there would be nothing to account for our time-notions associated with all changes. The Sāṃkhya school did not admit the existence of any real Time; by it the unit of *Kāla* is regarded as the time taken by an atom to traverse its unit of space. It has no existence apart from the atoms and their movements. The appearance of *Kāla* as a separate entity is a creation of our *buddhi* (*buddhi nirmāṇa*) as it represents the order or mode in which the *buddhi* records its perceptions. But *Kāla* in the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika Philosophy is regarded as a substance existing by itself. In accordance with the changes of things it reveals itself as past, present and future.⁵ The Sāṃkhya teachers regard Time as past, present and future inasmuch as they are the modes of the constitution of the thing in its different manifesting stages of evolution (*adhvan*). The Indian astronomers regarded Time as being due to the motion of the planets. These must all be contrasted with the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika conception of *Kāla* which is regarded as an all-pervading partless substance which appears as many in association with the changes related to it.⁶ Time is of one dimension; two moments cannot co-exist; neither does any series of moments exist in reality. Order in Time is nothing but the relation of antecedence and sequence, between the moment that is and the moment that went just before. But only one moment, the present exists. The future and the past have no meaning apart from potential and sublatent phenomena. One kind of transformation to which a thing is subject is that it changes from the potential to the actual, and from the actual to the sublatent. This, the Hindu thinkers called the change of mark (*lakṣaṇapariṇāma*) as

⁵ *Nyāyukāṇḍalī*, pp. 64-66.

⁶ *Nyāyamañjarī*, pp. 136-139.

opposed to the change of quality (*dharmapariṇāma*) and the change due to duration or lapse of time (*arasthāpariṇāma*). The present is the mark of actuality, the future the mark of potentiality, and the past the mark of sub-latency, in a phenomenon. Only one single moment is actual and the whole universe evolves in that one single moment. The rest is but potential or sublatent.⁷ Vijñānabhikṣu points out that this does not amount to a denial of Time. It means that Time has no real (or objective) existence apart from the moment. But the latter is real, being identical with the unit of change in phenomena (*guṇapariṇāmasya kṣaṇatra vacanāt*). But even this is real only for our empirical (relative) consciousness (*vyutthita darśana*), which intuits the relation of antecedence and consequence into the evolving Reals (*guṇas*), in the stage of 'empirical intuition' (*saricārā nirvikalpa-prajñā*). The 'intellectual intuition' (*nirricārā nirvikalpaprajñā*), on the other hand, apprehends the Reals as they are, without the imported empirical relations of Space, Time and Causality.⁸

The Jaina philosophy also held the same view regarding finite and infinite Time, that is, Time measurable and immeasurable. It maintains that Time (*Kāla*) in reality consists of those innumerable particles which never mix with one another, but which help the happening of the modification or accession of new qualities and the change of qualities of the atoms. Time (*Kāla*) does not bring about the changes of qualities, in things, but just as *ākāśa* (ether) helps interpretation and *dharmā* (nature) motion, so also *Kāla* (Time) helps the action of the transformation of new qualities in things. Time perceived as moments, hours, days etc. is called *samaya*. This is the appearance of the unchangeable *Kāla* (Time) in so many forms. *Kāla* (Time) thus not only aids the modification of other things, but also allows its own modifications as moments, hours etc. It is thus a *dravya* (substance), and the moments, hours etc. are its *pariyāyas* (modifications). The unit of *samaya* is the Time required by an atom to traverse a unit of space by a slow movement.⁹

7 Vide *Pātanjalusūtra*, pāda 111, 52.

8 Sir B. N. Seal, *Positive Sciences of the Ancient Hindus*.

9 *Dravyasaṃgrahaṅgīti*, 19-20.

In Buddhism Time is regarded as a subjective element. Time is the concept (*Kālapaññatti*), by which first and foremost mental states are distinguished in internal intuition. It is the *sine qua non* of the succession of mental states.¹⁰ The Buddhist philosophers looked upon Time as only a concept derived from this or that phenomenon, such as (a) states expressed in such phrases as, 'temporal (aspect of) mind', 'temporal aspects of matter'; (b) the phenomenal occurrence expressed by such phrases as 'the past' and 'the future', (c) the phenomenal succession in an organism expressed by 'the time of seed generation' and 'the time of sprouting'; (d) the characteristic marks of phenomena expressed by 'the time of genesis' and 'the time of decay'; (e) the functions of phenomena expressed by 'the time of feeling' and 'the time of cognizing'; (f) functions of being expressed by 'the time of bathing' and 'the time of drinking'; (g) the modes of posture expressed by 'the time of going' and 'the time of stopping'; (h) the revolution of the moon, sun etc. expressed by morning, evening, day and night; or (i) the grouping of days and nights etc. into periods expressed by 'half-month', 'month' etc.¹¹ The Buddhists held that it should be understood that abstract time is a mere concept because it is not existing by its own nature. This is, in short, the notion of Time in ancient Hindu philosophy which held that temporal characteristics are among the most fundamental in the objects of our experience and therefore cannot be defined properly.

SUKUMAR RANJAN DAS

10 Vide *Abhidhammattha-saṅgaha*.

11 *The Expositor*. (Atthasālini). part II, Analysis of Terms, pp. 57-60.

The Nāṭī of Pāṭaliputra

“Not the epic song, but the dance”, says Wundt,¹ “accompanied by a monotonous and often meaningless song, constitutes everywhere the most primitive, and, in spite of the primitiveness, the most highly developed art. Whether as a ritual dance, or as a pure emotional expression of the joy in rhythmic bodily movement, it rules the life of primitive men to such a degree that all other forms of art are subordinate to it.” For primitive man there is no such thing as religion apart from life, for religion covers everything. The dance was, in the beginning, the expression of the whole man, for the whole man was religious. Not a single ancient mystery in which there is no dancing; in fact most people say of the devotees of the Mysteries that ‘they dance them out’. Dancing forms part of the worship. The other intimate association of dancing is with love.² As such, it is older than man. Among insects and among birds dancing is often an essential part of love. Thus dancing was born with religion and love. As Dr. Louis Robinson has pointed out, “the spasmodic jerking of the chimpanzee’s feeble legs is the crude motion out of which the heavenly alchemy of evolution has created the divine movements of Pavlova”. And it has often ended in a series of “immodest and dissolute movements by which the cupidity of the flesh is aroused”.

In earliest Indian literature, Nṛtā is the female dancer typifying both these aspects of ritual and love. Dancing is often referred to in the Ṛgveda (I, 10, 1; 92, 4, etc.) and later (Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa, I, 42).³ Ṛgveda I, 92, 4 makes it clear that the dancer Nṛtū was a Hetaira.⁴

The Nṛtū survives in the Devadāsī in the post-Vedic literature. From the vital function of dancing in love, and its sacred function in religion, the Devadāsī dancing evolved as an art, a profession, an

1 Wundt, *Volkerpsychologie*, 3d. ed. 1911. Bd. i. Teil i, p. 277.

2 Westermarck, *History of Human Marriage*, vol. I, ch. xiii, p. 470.

3 Weber, *Indian Literature*, pp. 196ff.

4 Jolly, *Recht und Sitte*, 48.



The Nāgī of Pāṭaliputra, 300 B.C.

amusement. Dancing, like priesthood, became a profession, and dancers, like priests, formed a caste. The Devadāsī is both a religious and professional dancer. Married to the gods, taught dancing by the Brahmins, they figure in religious ceremonies, their dances representing the life of the god they are married to as well as the emotions of love they experience for him.⁵ Nṛtū's dance, and of the pre-Ārya Śiva, and the reverent dance of the Devadāsī are in India a great symbol, "the clearest image of the *activity* of God, which any art or religion can boast of".⁶

The archæological remains at Mohenjo-Daro have brought to light many a female dancer of 3,000 B.C. The accompanying dancer belongs to 3,00 B.C. It was discovered by Mr. Jackson, late Principal of Patna College, and myself, at the Mauryan level near Patna College, during excavations for the sewers of the University area. It is now exhibited in the Buxar and Pataliputra room in the Patna Museum.

This terra cotta image is about 13 inches in height, 2 inches across the waist and 4 inches across the skirt. For the technique of the face moulding, compare the 'Pataliputra laughing girl' excavated from the Mauryan level at Bulandibagh (Patna) by Dr. Spooner in 1912. For the bare breasts and ballet skirt, the Ṛgveda description of Nṛtū recurs through the ages:

"Adhi peśāṃsi rapate Nṛtūr irāporṇute rakṣa usruva barjaham"
Ṛgveda, I, 92, 4.

Sāyana comments:

"Nṛtūr iva nṛtyantī goṣid iva peśāṃsi rūpanāmatat sarvair-darśanīyāni rūpāni Uṣā adhivapate scātmany adhikaṃ dhārayati rakṣaḥ sarkīyam urahpradeśaṃ aporṇute anāchāditaṃ karoti."

"Like Nṛtū, a dancing girl, carefully putting on her person vestments to attract the eyes of all, bares her breast."

"A good education", Plato declared in the 'Laws', his most mature work, "consists in knowing how to sing and dance well". According to an ancient Chinese maxim—"One may judge of a king by the state of dancing during his reign". The loveliest of Vedic creations,

⁵ Rothfeld, *Women of India*, ch. vii, "The Dancing Girl," 1922.

⁶ Coomaraswamy, *The Dance of Śivā*, 1918.

Uṣas, the Goddess of Dawn, has been compared to Nṛtū, a dancing girl, meeting, us, not only as love, as religion, as art, but as morals. And Nṛtū's successor weaving the maze of the dance in the accompanying terra cotta carries on the glorious tradition from the 3rd millennium to the 3rd century B.C. The Lippsian doctrine of *Einfühlung* or "empathy" places the dancers and the spectators in the self-same cultural plane and even in technical elaboration, old India hardly yields to more modern attainments.

A. BANERJI-SASTRI

The Monetary System of the Moghul Times

The starting point of the modern Indian monetary system is the silver rupee, weighing one *tola*, or 178 grains. It was first coined by Sher Shah during his short rule of the Delhi empire, 1540-45. He also introduced a copper coinage based on the *dām*, a piece weighing about 330 grains, this being the first *systematic* use of that metal for coinage¹ in India.

The *Ain-i-Akbari* contains a very elaborate account of Akbar's coins which were closely modelled after Sher Shah's. The *dām* as described in that place, weighed 5 *tanikas*, which comes to 306.22 grains. It mentions that the *dām* was formerly called *pysah* and also *behooly*. It also gives the divisions of the *dām*:

ādhelāh	1/2 dām
powlāh (pā olā)	1/4 ..
dāmree	1/8 ..

Dām seems to be an Indian word, perhaps in some way connected with *tāmra* copper.¹ The word occurs frequently in the *Ain-i-Akbari*. The revenue of the whole empire, curiously, is not given in rupees, but always in *dāms*. In other places, where accounts are inserted, they are mostly in *dāms*, if smaller amounts. In a few instances the figures given are in three columns, *rupees*, *dāms*, and *chitcels* (1/25 of a *dām*).

The word *pysah* or *paisa* was originally the name of a weight, which, as it seems, had come with the Moghuls from Central Asia. According to Schuyler, Tashkent has the following weights: The *batman* (about 374 lb. avoirdupois) is divided into 64 *tchariks*, of about 5¾ lb., subdivided into 80 *paisas* each, of a little more than one ounce each. The *mishkal* is again one quarter of a *paisa*.

In the early Moghul monetary system there were 40 *dāms* to a rupee. The copper value of the 40 minted *dāms* was about 26 *dāms*,

¹ Prof. M. Collins, formerly of Santiniketan, pointed out to me that *dam* is *damma*, finally derived from the ancient Greek *drachma*.

about $\frac{2}{3}$ of the face value. 40 minted *dāms* would weigh 2 lb. 728 gr. Troy (40×306.22 gr. = 12248.8 gr.). The face value of this amount of copper pieces was one rupee, or one silver *tola*, equal to 179.66 grains of minted silver.

The modern pice pieces of India, the lineal descendant of the quarter *dām* of Akbar's time, weigh 78 grains, making a total of 312 grains for an imaginary or theoretical modern *dām*. But as the modern currency has only 64 of these copper pieces to the rupee (they are really bronze) of course their total weight will equal only the weight of 16 of the old copper *dāms*, making their metal value (if they were pure copper), only as 2:5 to the value of the rupee. The constancy of these Indian copper weights with the exception of Jehangir's temporary increased weights, these 3½ centuries, is a remarkable phenomenon in the history of coinage, only equalled by the constant weight of the silver rupee itself during this long period of time. The change in the relative value of the silver rupee to its copper coins is another important fact.

It would seem that in the two systems, the ancient 1:40 system of Akbar's (really the ratio is 1:160, viz. 1 rupee to 160 quarter *dāms*) time, and the modern ratio of 1:64 of modern pice, we have two diverging streams of numeration, of which the seemingly more modern type is really the older. Or, it may also be possible, that the 1:64 system is borrowed, while the other type may date back to an ancient monetary system based on *Kauris* as sole currency.

The old Bengali system of designating fractional values of the rupee seems a mixture and compromise of both systems.

The modern pice in Bengali numeration is expressed in the following way, 5 times four *kadās*, or five *gaṇḍās*. A *gaṇḍā* is usually considered as an old group figure, a sort of primitive dozen, consisting of four units. This is correct, but it is not the whole story. *Kadā*, whatever the origin of the word may be, in the above cited case means a group of four, for a modern pice is the equivalent of 80 kauris, 5 times four *kadās*, $5 \times 4 \times 4$.

Gaṇḍā clearly in this case cannot mean a simple *gaṇḍā* of four, but must mean a large *gaṇḍā* of $4 \times 4 = 16$. The above instance is taken from an original Bengali manuscript, dated 1209 B.E. or 1802 A.D. (Mitra. *Types of Early Bengali Prose*, Calcutta, 1922).

Two instances are found on the same page, where *cāri kaḍā* is used as the exact equivalent of *gaṇḍā*, and vice versa. If *cāri kaḍā* means 16, then *gaṇḍā* must also mean 16.

This opens up rather interesting vistas into the general monetary systems of older India. First of all the question arises, what unit is meant by the old designation of the figures 1-19 in Bengali accounts, in the pice column? 20 of that unit are equal to an anna, but annas are a rather late innovation, both in accounts, and as an actually existing coin.

Clearly, the present anna in Bengali account stands for the older *dām*, which was the original unit of which the pice, or the *old pai* or, the *powlah* of Akbar's time is the quarter. I am not saying that the anna is the numerical equivalent of the *dām*, because we have seen that there were 40 *dāms*, or 160 quarter *dām* to the rupee, while now the rupee contains only 64 quarter *dāms* or pice. In other words, the present pice has to do the service and be the fictional or nominal equivalent of $2\frac{1}{2}$ of the previous quarter *dāms*. But nevertheless, the modern pice is treated as a fraction of the anna, while at the same time, the way it is written in Bengali accounts, clearly indicates the pice as the highest surviving aggregate of the ancient Kauri system, naming the pice as $5 \times 4 \times 4$ Kauris, a total of 80 Kauris. Thus also the system of weights by which the *dām* of Akbar's time weighed five *tan̄kas*, has had its place in the further development of the system. Somehow the factor *five* enters in the make-up of both modern weights and also in some of the other older monetary systems. 16 *tarr* or *viss* = 80 *cash* make one *fanam* or *gallee*, while 5 *fanams* make one rupee, according to one of the South Indian monetary systems, now obsolete.

A maund is 40 seers. A seer is 80 tolas, while a seer contains four paos, or quarters and each pao splits again into four *chataks*, or 16 *chataks* to the seer. Thus also here the five enters in a factor in the one system, but not in the other. A seer is $5 \times 4 \times 4$ tolas, but a seer is also 4×4 *chatūks*.

In buying straw we find that Kudi (*Gaṇḍā* (twenty fours) is one *Paṇ*, is 80 bundles. 16 *Paṇs* is one *Kāhaṇ* (*Kahāpaṇa* = *Kārsāpaṇa*).

The latter is an ancient unit, for even in Kauris their number

equivalent to one Siki, or four annas, is exactly the same number as the total bundles of straw in a Kāhaṇ, namely 1280.

According to Cunningham quoted by E. H. Walsh, in his *Coinage of Nepal*, the ancient standard of weights for Copper coins in India was a weight also called Paṇ (the old Kārsāpaṇa) of approximately 144 grams, which makes the 178, or 180 grains of the later silver rupee equal to $1\frac{1}{2}$ Paṇ in weight.

How pice was considered in the 17th century we learn from Tavernier. They were worth anywhere from 46 to 56 pice to the rupee, according to the greater or smaller distance from copper mines. An interesting reason for unwillingness or inability of governments to use copper as a monetary standard was its comparative great weight, unhandy in transportation.

A counterpart to this observation of the shrewd French jeweller, is what he tells us about Kauris. Near the seacoast the ordinary standard of eighty to the pice prevailed. Farther inland one could get much less per pice, at Agra only 50, or 55. He also mentions that Kauris were imported to America, 'to serve instead of money'. It would be interesting to know where in America, and how long Kauris were used as small currency? Most likely in the portions of South America near the Caribbian. Prof. A. K. Sarkar in the *IIIQ.*, Dec., 1931, has an excellent article on the *Coins and Weights of Ancient India*. He admits the impossibility of accounting for the discrepancies of the various ancient standards given.

It is the opinion of this writer that the only safe starting point is afforded by the coinage of Muhammadan times, working backward in our investigations from the known and actually existent, to those standards of pre-Muslim times of which in most cases only the lists remain.

Identification of some Brāhmanical Sculptures

It is admitted on all hands that in ancient times the Indian sculptors executed their work in accordance with the rules prescribed by the Sāstras. A thorough knowledge of these canons enables one to determine the real identity of a particular image. The discovery of a large number of sculptures is reported annually in the publications of the Archaeological Department but many of them have not yet been properly identified. I have selected a few of them for study in the following pages. Dr. Spooner reports the discovery of a peculiar stone image in a mound close to Shabkadar, on the Momand frontier, North Western Frontier Provinces. He remarks that¹ "the sculpture represents a goddess with four arms which fact at once invests it with unusual interest, for figures with more than two arms are almost unknown in Gandhāra art. Unfortunately the upper pair of arms are lost, but the lower ones hold a spear and a well defined wheel respectively, while the peculiarly Greek nature of the drapery is a further point of interest."

Mr. V. A. Smith has brought this sculpture in the lime light by illustrating it in his well known *History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon* (first ed. fig. 78). He reiterates in it the remarks of Dr. Spooner, and adds that² "a striking and at present unique illustration of the progressive Indianization of the foreign types is afforded by the recent discovery, near Shabkadar, on the Momand frontier, of a standing headless female figure with four arms, executed more or less in Gandhāra style, with drapery described by Dr. Spooner as being specially Greek in character. The upper arms have been lost; the two lower ones hold respectively a spear and a wheel. The drapery seems to me to be treated in an extremely formal manner, and I think the work is of late date."

I find three out of the four arms of the goddess in perfect condi-

1 ARASI., Frontier Circle, 1908-09, p. 4.

2 Smith, *History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon*, p. 124.

tion and only the upper left arm is broken. The object held by the goddess in her lower left hand is not a spear but a *gadā* (club). Similar object is held by a Viṣṇu image at Kanarak, which is evidently a *gadā*.³ As against Dr. Spooner's remark that the four-armed goddess in Gandhāra sculpture is almost unknown, it may be pointed out that the four-armed god was not unknown to the people of that locality in that age. A large number of Kaniska's coins, discovered in the Punjab and the North-West Frontier Provinces, bear effigy of the four armed Siva.⁴

The image under review holds *cakra* (discus) in the right lower hand and a *padma* (lotus) in the right upper. The lotus is much damaged. Its stem still remains in perfect condition. She carries *gadā* in her left lower hand. The object in the left upper hand cannot be determined as the hand itself has disappeared. It may be suggested that it carried *śaṅkha* (conch-shell). The goddess stands facing front on a lotus capital. Her face and head are badly damaged. She wears a beaded necklace, armlets, and bracelets. The armlets and bracelets are identical with those worn by the female figures of the Andhra and Kushan period. She wears a thick garment which hangs from the waist down to the feet. The upper part of the body is covered with a thin piece of cloth. The lower garment has the conventional drapery like that in the early Gandhāra sculpture. The goddess has the pose and gait of a purely Hellenic sculpture. The image is evidently the work of Gandhāra School and may be assigned to the early part of the 2nd century A.D.

I am inclined to identify the goddess with Vaiṣṇavī, the consort of Viṣṇu. Mr. Gopinath Rao states that Vaiṣṇavī has four arms. She carries *śaṅkha* in her right lower hand, *cakra* in the right upper, *gadā* in the left upper, and *padma* in the left lower hand.⁵ There is a sculpture of Vaiṣṇavī in the Bhārat Kalā Bhavan, Benares, holding *padma* in the right lower, *gadā* in the right upper, *cakra* in the left upper, and *śaṅkha* in the left lower hand. The image under discussion carries in its hands *cakra*, *padma*, *śaṅkha* (?), and *gadā*. Vaiṣṇavī

3 Smith, *op. cit.*, Fig. 142.

4 *Indo-Scythian Coins*, by Cunningham, Pl. XVIII, Nos. 4 and 5.

5 *Elements of Hindu Iconography*, vol. 1, part 11, p. 385.

carries the attributes of Viṣṇu. Our image holds the attributes in the order that is found in the Puruṣottama variety of Viṣṇu.⁶ The goddess holds the *cakra* by the rim. Though it is unusual, it is not uncommon. The Lakṣmanakathi Viṣṇu image also holds the *cakra* by the rim though in a different fashion.⁷

This image of Vaiṣṇavī is the earliest known specimen of its class. It is invested with special interest as it suggests that the cult of Viṣṇu like the cult of Śiva was prevalent in the North Western Frontier of India as early as the 2nd century A.D.

During the year 1905-6 Dr. Bloch discovered a number of stucco figures at the base of the Mainyar maṭha, a little temple at Rājgir, in Bihar.⁸ All of them are interesting both from iconographical and artistic point of view. One of them is a male figure standing to front. He has four arms the fore part of the front two hands being broken. The right lower hand is placed on the shoulder of a male figure and the left lower on the shoulder of a female figure. He wears a *mukuta* (crown), *karnakuṇḍala* (ear-ring), *keyūra* (armlet), *calaya* (bracelets), and a garland made of flowers, which hangs up to the knee. He also wears a tight fitting transparent loin-cloth. A piece of cloth tucked up goes across the middle of his thighs and is tied in a knot to his left. The attending male figure to the left has a *cakra* behind his head. His long hairs are tied in a knot on his head. He wears an ear-ornament, necklace, bracelet and a loin cloth. He has two arms. The right hand holds an uncertain object, and the left one is placed on his thigh. The female figure to the right has also long hairs tied in a knot on the head. She has ornaments like those of the male attendants, and has the additional ornaments of armlet and anklet. Her transparent wearing garment hangs up to her ankles. She has two arms. Her right hand holds an indistinct object. She stands in a *tribhaṅga* pose.

Dr. Bloch identifies the principal image with Bāṇāsura, and remarks that "Kṛṣṇa once had a fight with this demon, because he had refused the hand of his daughter to the divine hero, and it was in this

6 *Agni Purāṇa*, chapt. XLVIII, v. 9.

7 *Iconography of the Buddhist and Brahmanical Sculptures in the Dacca Museum*, Pl. XXXII.

8 *ARASI.*, 1905-06, p. 104.

fight that Bāṇāsura lost two of his hands''.⁹ In the recently published volume of the Archaeological Survey of India,¹⁰ Maulavi M. H. Kuraishi supports Mr. Bloch's view. But at the same time he makes an alternative suggestion and remarks that the image probably represents Śiva.

The identification of the image with Bāṇāsura or Śiva is untenable. Bāṇa had thousand arms, all of which were severed by Kṛṣṇa in battle.¹¹ But the image under discussion has four arms and only the front two are broken, which Dr. Bloch regards as severed.

I am inclined to identify the principal figure as Vāsudeva. Vāsudeva has variety of forms. He is generally represented with four arms carrying *śankha*, *cakra*, *gadā* and *padma*. But sometimes these attributes are represented in human form in order to signify that they have life and force behind them. *Himādri Vratakhanda* narrates that Vāsudeva may hold *padma* in his right upper hand, and the right lower hand may be placed on the head of Gadādevī, a female figure representing *gadā*. The left upper hand holds *śankha*, and the left lower hand is placed on the head of a *cakrapuruṣa*, a male representing *cakra*. *Cakrapuruṣa* holds a *cāmara*. He has a big belly. Gadādevī holds too a *cāmara*. Between the legs of Vāsudeva may be seated the goddess Earth touching his feet with her hands. Vāsudeva should be adorned with *kuṇḍala* (ear-ring), *aṅgada* (bracelet and armlet), *kaustubha* (necklace), loin-cloth, and garland of flowers hanging up to the navel. *Viṣṇumūrtti-paricaya*¹² illustrates an image answering to the above description.

The image under discussion has almost all the characteristics described above though there are differences in detail. The central figure wears a crown, ear-ring, bracelet, armlet, necklace, loin-cloth, garland of flowers hanging up to the knee. The attending figure to the right of the God is evidently Cakradeva who has a *cakra* behind his head. The attending figure to his left is Gadādevī, who holds an uncertain object

9 *ARASI.*, 1905-06, p. 104 & Pl. XL, Fig. 2.

10 Vol. LI, p. 132, Fig. 88.

11 *Yatra yuddham abhūd ghoram Hari-Śaṅkarayor mahān/
Chinnaṁ sahasraṁ bhāhunām yatra Bāṇasya cakriṇā//*

Viṣṇu Purāṇa, ch. XXXII, v. 8, p. 385.

12 *Viṣṇumūrtti-paricaya* by B. B. Kavyatirtha Vidyavinoda.



1 Vaiṣṇavī



2 Vāsudeva



3 Kumārī

*(Reproduced from the Archaeological Survey
Reports, Government of India)*

in her right hand like the Gadādevī illustrated in the *Viṣṇumūrti-pāricaya*. But the position of the attending figures does not answer to the rules laid down in the *Vratakhṇḍa*. According to this authority, as it has been referred to above, Gadādevī should stand to the right of Vāsudeva and the Cakradeva to his left. But this rule regarding the position of these attending figures is not meticulously followed. The Viṣṇu image at Lakṣmanakathi, in the Dacca District, has Gadādevī and Cakrapuruṣa to his left and right respectively.¹³ Hence there can hardly be any doubt that our image is anything else than Vāsudeva.

The image of this type is very rare. It belongs to the early Gupta period. It has high artistic merit. The God is sunk in deep meditation. A transcendental beauty mingled with child-like simplicity is emanating from his face. The artist has finished the modelling with singular felicity.

In the recently published volume of the *Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey*,¹⁴ Mr. R. D. Banerji has made observations on the Brāhmaṇical sculpture, lying in the Chausat Yoginī temple at Bheraghat, near Jubbulpore, Central Provinces. Mr. Cunningham¹⁵ and Dr. Bloch¹⁶ also noticed them before him. A large number of those images have not yet been satisfactorily identified.

(i) One of them is a four-armed goddess which Mr. Banerji designates as a dancing goddess.¹⁷ Though the head and the fore-part of the arms of the deity are missing, it is not altogether divested of interest. Devī is in a dancing mood. She wears a transparent garment which hangs down up to the ankle. There are a *kukkuta* (cock) to her right, carved in the back slab, a little above the pedestal, and a human figure, badly worn out, to her left.

Kukkuta is known as an attendant of Kumāra (Kārttikeya) and his consort Kumārī. *Matsyapurāṇa*¹⁸ narrates that Kumārī should have

¹³ *Iconography of the Buddhist and Brahmanical Sculptures in the Dacca Museum*, Pl. XXXII.

¹⁴ No. 23, 1931.

¹⁵ *ASI.*, vol. IX, pp. 63 ff.

¹⁶ *ARASI.*, Eastern Circle, 1907-08, pp. 16 ff.

¹⁷ *Memoirs of the ASI.*, No. 23, Pl. XXIX, a.

¹⁸ Chapter CCLXI, vs. 27, 28, 5; *Elements of Hindu Iconography*, Pt. 11, p. 387.

attributes, like those of Kumāra. Her vehicle is *Mayūra* (peacock). She wears necklace, armlets and red-cloth. She carries in her hands *sūla* and *kukkuṭa*. Mr. G. N. Rao quotes that Kumārī may have four arms; she carries *śakti* and *kukkuṭa* in two, the other two being in *abhaya* and *varada* pose. Her vehicle is a peacock. The image under review does not show a peacock as her vehicle, but her association with a *kukkuṭa* leads me to identify her with Kumārī.

Mr. R. D. Banerji assigns this sculpture to the Kushan period. But the transparent garment and the unexaggerated hip of the goddess suggest that it is a work of the Gupta period.

(ii) A slab represents a four-armed goddess. All the hands of the goddess are mutilated except the left lower, which carries an indistinct object. The goddess is seated in a *sukhāsana* pose. Her right leg is pendant and is placed on a lotus. Her left leg is drawn in front of her. The goddess wears a crown ear-ornament, necklace, armlets, bracelets, and anklets. There is a swan in front of her, looking to right.

Swan is the vehicle of both Brāhmī and Sarasvatī, the consorts of Brahmā. *Devī*, *Matsya*, and *Agni Purāṇas*¹⁹ narrate that Brāhmī has four faces, four hands, and a swan as her vehicle. *Śāradātilaka-tantra* lays down that Sarasvatī carries *çūṇā*, rosary, pitcher of nectar, and a book in her hands, and she has a swan as her vehicle. Manasā has swan as her vehicle but she must always be associated with snakes. I am inclined to identify the goddess as Sarasvatī. She cannot be Brāhmī as she has only one face. Brāhmī is always described as one having four faces.

(iii) A slab representing a four-armed goddess bears the inscription Virendrī. Three out of her four arms are missing. The right upper hand, which is in perfect condition, holds a *khadga* (sword), the butt of which only now remains. The goddess assumes a fierce look. She wears a head-dress made of skull, *nāgahāra*, (necklace of serpents), armlets, bracelets, and anklets. She is seated in a *sukhāsana* pose. Her left foot is placed on a dead man lying down, and her right leg rests on the back of a lion. There is an emaciated figure seated to her left.

¹⁹ *Devī P.*, chap. 1, vs. 1 and 2, p. 191; *Matsya P.*, Ch. CCLXI, vs. 24 and 25, p. 904; *Agni P.*, Ch. LI, vs. 18 and 19, p. 102.



5 Virendrī Ugra Tārā

*(Reproduced from the Archaeological Survey
Reports, Government of India)*



Sarasvatī

IIIQ., March, 1933

The *Kālikā Purāṇa*²⁰ narrates that Ugra-Tārā has four arms and is swarthy in complexion. She is adorned with garland of skulls in her head and neck. She carries *khadga* in her right upper hand, *cāmara* in the right lower, *kartrī* (dagger) in the left upper, and *kharpara* (bowl or skull) in the left lower. She wears a *jatā* (matted hair) in her head, and her breast is graced with a *nāga-hāra*. Her hip is covered with a tiger's skin. She is fearful in appearance and is engaged in licking a corpse. Her left leg is placed on the chest of a dead human body and her right one rests on the back of a lion.

*Devī Purāṇa*²¹ relates that Bahurūpa is seated on a man. She has two arms, carrying *khadga* and *śūla*. According to the same authority, Vimalā is also seated on a man, carrying in her hands pearl, *akṣasūtra* (rosary) and *kamaṇḍalu* (small water vessel).²²

The image under review has a general agreement with Ugra Tārā as described by the *Kālikā Purāṇa*. Hence I am inclined to identify her as such.

(iv) To the left of the above-mentioned image is a slab representing a four-armed goddess. An inscription on the pedestal designates her as Thakini. The goddess has four arms all of which except the left front are missing. She wears a crown and is seated on a camel.

*Devī Purāṇa*²³ narrates that Vikaṭā has long arms carrying *pāśa* and *daṇḍa*. She has a dreadful appearance and is seated on a camel.

As there is no sign of dreadfulness in the face of this image and as no other goddess is known to have camel as her vehicle, I am inclined to identify the image with Vikaṭā.²⁴

20 *Kālikā P.*, Ch. I.XI. 61-62.

21 *Devī Purāṇa*, Ch. I. vs. 7 and 8.

22 *Ibid.*, vs. 41 and 42.

23 *Ibid.*, vs. 24-31.

24 The inscriptions on the images in the Chausaṭ Yoginī temple are engraved in a careless manner. Some of the images only are inscribed. This suggests that originally it was not the intention of the sculptors to inscribe them. In later times somebody with imperfect knowledge of the Brāhmaṇical iconography seems to have put these labels on them. That the images were erected in pursuance of the rules of iconography already known to us, admits of no doubt. But some of the names assigned to the goddesses are not found in any Sanskrit literature. They are peculiar and are not, after all, Sanskrit. But the identity of the images, bearing these peculiar inscriptions, can be known with the help

(v) A slab to the right of Ugra Tārā is inscribed as Phañdrī. The principal image is a four armed goddess. All the hands of the goddess are broken. The goddess wears a crown, ear-ring, armlets, necklace, waist band, anklets, and garland of flowers. She is seated in a *sukhāsana* pose. Her pendant right leg is placed on a demon lying below and her left leg is drawn in front of her. Over her head is a many-hooded snake. On the pedestal are seated one male and one female figures to the right of the goddess, and a male only to her left, all worshipping her.

I do not find any *dhyāna* answering to the above description. *Kālikā Purāṇa* (ch. LXXVII) states that *Mahāmāyā* came out bursting through the Śivaliṅga. As soon as the Devī sprang up, the split-up Liṅga was converted into three figures Bhairava, Bhairavī, and Heruka. The Devī is very beautiful. Her breasts are well-developed. Her hands are in *varada* and *abhaya* pose. She is seated on a demon.

Mahāmāyā and *Īsvari* are the consorts of Śiva. *Devī Purāṇa* lays down that *jaṭā*, *mukuta*, *candra*, and *sarpa* are the ornaments of *Īsvari*. *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa*²⁵ tells us that *Maheśvari*, who is seated on a bull, has bracelets of serpents. Śiva has serpents as the ornaments of his head. It is a general maxim of the Hindu Śāstras that the female counterpart of every god has the same attributes as the latter.

The image, referred to above, should be identified with *Mahāmāyā*. Though *Kālikā Purāṇa* does not mention the snake as the ornament of the Devī, its association with her is not in any way unusual, she being a consort of Śiva.

The only other goddess which has serpent as her ornaments is *Manasā*. But *Manasā* is never known to have been seated on a demon.

of the rules of iconography. I have identified above some of them. A female counterpart of Gaṇeśa is labelled as *Śrī-Aiṅginī*. Mr. R. D. Banerjee rightly suggests that the image ought to have been described as "Gaṇeśūnī." (*Memoirs; Arch. S.*, I, No. 23, p. 85). An image of *Mahiṣamaridini* is inscribed as *Terambā* (*ibid.*, p. 87). A female counterpart of *Narasimha* and that of *Agni* are labelled respectively as *Siṃha Siṃha* (*ibid.*, p. 90), and *Ehani* (*Ann. Rep. Arch. S. I.*, E. Circle, 1907-9, p. 18). They ought to have been described as *Lakṣmī*, and *Svāhā*. The etymology of the words *Ekadi* of *Ejari*, *Thakini* and *Thakini* are not known.

²⁵ *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa*, *Devī Māhātmya*, Chapter LXXXVIII. v. 15.



7 Phagendri Mahāmāyā

*(Reproduced from the Archaeological Survey
Reports, Government of India)*



6 Thakini Vikāṣa

(vi) A slab represents a seated boar-headed female figure. She has four arms, the forepart of all of which are broken. Her pendant right leg is placed on an animal lying down. Mr. Bloch suggests that the head of the goddess is that of a boar, but the animal is an antelope.²⁶ Mr. R. D. Banerji expresses his doubt about the identification of the animal as an antelope.²⁷ According to Mr. Cunningham the goddess has a cow's head, and the animal on the pedestal is a cow.²⁸ There can be little doubt that the head of the goddess is that of a boar. The animal on the pedestal appears to be a buffalo. The slab contains an inscription which Mr. Bloch reads as 'ekadī, Mr. Cunningham as 'Erurī' or 'Kjarī'²⁹ and Mr. R. D. Banerji as 'Erudī'.³⁰ None of these words is found in the Sanskrit Dictionary. But it is not very difficult to determine the plausible identity of the goddess. *Matsya Purāṇa* narrates that Vārāhī, the consort of Varāha incarnation, should be seated on a buffalo. She should carry *gadā* and *cakra*. *Devī Purāṇa*³² states that Vaivasvatī, the daughter of Sūrya, has a face like that of a boar. She is seated on a buffalo. She should be drinking from a skull. She holds a *daṇḍa* in her hand. There is another female sculpture in the Chausaṭ Yoginī temple which has a boar's head, and which is inscribed as 'Varāhī'. We can therefore reasonably identify the image under discussion with Vaivasvatī.

The inscriptions on the pedestal of the images in the Chausaṭ Yoginī temple, are of the character of those of the 11th century A.D. The images themselves must have been erected previous to that.

To all the images described above are attached great importance specially from the standpoint of iconography. Some are rare and some are the only specimens of their classes. A few of them have high artistic merits.*

DHIRENDRA CHANDRA GANGULI

26 *ARSL*, E. Circle, 1907-8, p. 17, No. 8.

27 *Mem. Arch. S. I.*, No. 23, p. 89 (No. 71); cf. Pl. XXXII, a.

28 *ASL*, vol. IX, p. 68, No. 52.

29 *ARSL*, E. Circle, 1907-8, No. 8, p. 17.

30 *ASL*, vol. IX, No. 52, p. 68.

31 *Mem. Arch. S. I.*, No. 23, No. 74, p. 89.

32 Ch. vs. 30-31.

33 Ch. CCLXI.

* I am indebted to Mr. N. K. Battasali, M.A., for helping me with some valuable suggestions, when writing this paper.

A Study of the Twenty Aspects of Sūnyatā

(Based on Haribhadra's *Abhisamayālaṅkāra-ālokā* and the
Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra)

The present article has for its aim the elucidation of the term *sūnyatā*, as interpreted by the Mādhyamika school of the Buddhists. It forms a part of my Analysis of the 8 principal subjects and the 70 topics of the of the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra* of Maitreya-Asaṅga.* The subject dealt with at present refers to the first chapter of the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra* (*Sarva-ākāra-jñātā-adhikāra*), to its 9th topic,—the action of Accumulation (of the factors for the attainment of Enlightenment by the Bodhisattva; *saṃbhāra-pratipatti*), and more particularly to the Bodhisattva's Accumulation of Wisdom (*jñāna-saṃbhāra*: *Abhisam. Kārikā* I 47a contains only the word *jñānam*). This Accumulation of Wisdom represents the cognition of the principle of *sūnyatā*=Non-substantiality or Relativity—in its various aspects by the Bodhisattva on his Path. The subject, which is only pointed to in the *Kārikā*, by a single word is discussed in detail in the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra-ālokā* of Haribhadra. We quote the corresponding passages of the said work (according to the MS. of Prof. F. Minaev, now in possession of the Public Library at Leningrad), along with its Tibetan translation (Tangyur, MD0. VI, Peking Edition).

The classification into 20 Aspects has been made by Haribhadra (as well as by his predecessors) in accordance with the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra*. The passages of the latter are quoted and translated in the foot-notes, in order to show the full concordance between the texts. For other works as for instance in the *Mādhyānta-vibhāṅga* of Maitreya-Asaṅga, in *Dīnāga's Aṣṭasāhasrikā-piṇḍārīha* etc. we have 16 or 18 aspects

* This Analysis has been undertaken for publication in the *Calcutta Oriental Series*.

of *śūnyatā* as the number usually admitted (cf. *Mahāvīyutpatti* § 37). The last four forms which appear in the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā* are evidently later additions.

As regards the translation of the term *śūnyatā* by 'Relativity', it has been first adopted by Prof. Th. Stcherbatsky in his *Conception of Buddhist Nirvāṇa*. Objections have been raised against this rendering. It is however in any case correct if we take the term from the standpoint of the Mādhyamika school (as in the *Abhis. ālokā*, Haribhadra is a Mādhyamika, since he belongs to the *Yogācāra-Mādhyamika-svātantrikas*). In the Tibetan Commentaries it is especially pointed to the fact that the term *śūnyatā* has the same meaning as *pratītya-samutpāda* which latter term in the Mādhyamika interpretation has the meaning of Relativity. This is most eloquently confirmed by the *śloka* of Nāgārjuna's *Lokāṭīta-stava*:—

यः प्रतोल्यसमुत्पादः शून्यता खैव ते मता ।

भावः स्वतन्त्रो नास्तीति सिंहनादस्तत्रातुलः ॥

"*śūnyatā* means for thee (O Buddha) the principle of Dependent Origination (i.e. Functional Interdependence or Relativity). There are no independent (non-relative) entities.—Such is the unequalled lion's roar!"

The 20 aspects of Relativity are as follows:—

I. *The Subjective Relativity*. We have this aspect in consideration of the dialectical nature¹ of the faculty of vision and the remaining internal faculties.—

[*Abhis.ālokā*, MS. 70 b. 6-8.]

तत्रेयं विंशतिविधा शून्यता । यदुत । आध्यात्मिकानां चक्षुरादीनामकूटस्थाविनाशितां प्रकृतिमुपादायाध्यात्मशून्यता । १ ।

[Tg. MDO. VI. 69b. 1-2] *de-la ston-pa-ñid nam-pa-ñi-śu-ni ḥdi yin te.ḥdi-lta-ste.nañ-gi dños-po² mig-la-sogs-pa-rnams-kyi rañ-béin ther-zug-tu-gnas-pa dan ḥjig-pa-ma-yin-pañi-phyir nañ-ston-pa-ñid-do.*³

1 Lit. The nature (of the internal elements) which is that of being neither eternal nor evanescent (in the ultimate sense). Cf. *Pañc.* quoted in note 3.

2 =*ādhyātmikānām bhāvānām* or *vastūnām*.

3 *Pañc.*, I. 213 b. 5-6.—*de-la nañ-ston-pa-ñid gañ ée-na. nañ-gi chos ées-bya-ha-ni mig dan. rna-ba dan. sna dan. lee dan. lus dan. yid-de. (cakṣuḥ śrotraṃ*

II. *The Objective Relativity.* We have this aspect, considering just the same nature of the external elements, as visible matter, and the rest.

[Abhis.ālokā, MS. 70b. 8-9]

बाह्यानां रूपादीनां तथाप्रकृतिमुपादाय बहिर्धाशून्यता । २ ।

[Tg. MD0. VI. 69b. 2.] *phyiḥi gzugs-la-sogs-pa-rnams-kyi ran-bzin delta-bu-gin-paḥi-phyir phyi-ston-pa-ñid-do.*⁴

III. *The Relativity of both the Subjective and Objective.* We have this aspect, considering just the same nature of the external and internal bases of cognition.—Here the internal bases are constituted by the elements which have the character of sense-faculties. The external are constituted by the elements which have the character of the objects (that correspond to the sense-faculties). (As regards the physical foundations of the sense-faculties),⁵ they are internal elements, inasmuch as they are dominated by consciousness, and external, inasmuch as they are not included in the category of the sense-faculties as such.—(The cognition of) these first 3 aspects of Relativity is associated with the Stage of Action in Faith.⁶)

[Abhis.ālokā, MS. 70b. 10-15.]

आध्यात्मिकबाह्यानामायतनानां तथाप्रकृतिमुपादायाध्यात्मबहिर्धाशून्यता । ३ ।

तत्राध्यात्मिकमायतनं यदिन्द्रियरूपसंगृहीतम् । बाह्यं यद्विषयरूपसंगृहीतम् ।

ghrāṇam śhrā kūyo manaś ca). de-la mi-rtog mi-hjiḡ-paḥi-phyir (antya-arināśīrāt) miḡ miḡ-gis ston-ño....., de rḥi-phyir te-na, deḥi ran-bzin de-gin-paḥi-phyir te. ḥdi-ni nuñ-ston-pa-ñid-do.—Of what kind is the Internal (Subjective) Relativity?—The elements which we call 'internal' are (the faculties of) vision, audition, the olfactory, gustatory, tactile, and that of the intellect. Now, as it is neither eternal, nor evanescent, the faculty of vision is relative (devoid of a real essence of its own), etc. (Similar indications with regard to the other sense-faculties).—Why that? *Because this is their essential nature.*—This is the Internal (Subjective) Relativity.

4 Ibid., 213 b. 6-7.—(The same repeated in regard to the External Relativity—*rūpādīnān*).

5 Sic acc. to Gser. I, 307 a. 2. —*phyi-nañ gñis dbaṅ-poḥi rten-gyis bsdu-paḥi gul lūa*.

6 Sic acc. to Haribhadra. In the Gser. and the Rnam-bśad we have the indication that the first 3 varieties also refer to *sambhāra-mārga*.

आध्यात्मिकब्राह्मं तु यदिन्द्रियाश्रयेण संगृहीतम्⁷ तद्वाध्यात्मिकं चित्तेनोपात्तत्वाद्ब्राह्मं
चानिन्द्रियसंगृहीतत्वात् । तच्च शून्यतात्रयमधिमुक्तिचर्याभूमौ ।

[Tg. MDO. VI. 69b. 2-5] *phyi dan nañ-gi bdag-ñid-can-gyi skye-
mched-rnams-kyi rañ-bz̄in de-lta-bu yin-paḥi-phyir phyi-nañ-ston-pa-
ñid-do. de-la nañ-gi skye-mched-rnams-ni dbaṅ-poḥi rañ-bz̄in-gyis
bsdus-pa gañ-yin-paḥo. phyi-ni yul-gyi rañ-bz̄in-gyis bsdus-pa gañ-yin-
paḥo. phyi-nañ-ni dbaṅ-poḥi rten-gyis bsdus-pa gañ yin-paḥo.*⁸ *de-ni
sems-kyis zin-pa-ñid-kyis-na nañ yin-la dbaṅ-pos ma-bsdus-pa-ñid-kyis
phyi ḥaṅ yin-no. stoṅ-pa-ñid ḥdi gsum-ni mos-pas-spyod-paḥi
sa-la yin-no.*

IV. *The Relativity of (the Transcendental Wisdom cognizing)
Relativity.*

The essence of the Relativity of all the elements of existence is the Transcendental Wisdom which has for its object the Relativity of the internal elements etc. As this Wisdom is itself relative, we speak of “the Relativity of Relativity.” Indeed, “the Relativity of all the elements of existence” is to be understood merely as “the knowledge about the Relativity of all the elements.” In such a sense Relativity is itself relative.”—The cognition of this aspect takes place on the Path of

7 This passage is omitted in the MS. The text is restored acc. to the Tib version and the Gser. q. v.

8 Pañc. 1. 213b. 8 — 214a. 2.—*de-la phyi nañ stoṅ-pa-ñid gañ ḥe-na-
nañ-gi skye-mched drug dan. phyiḥi skye-mched drug dan. ḥdi-dag-ni phyi-
nañ-gi ḥes-bya-ste. de-la mi-rtag mi-ḥjiḡ-paḥi-phyir nañ-gi chos-rnams phyiḥi
chos-rnams kyis stoṅ-ño. de ciḥi-phyir ḥe-na. deḥi rañ-bz̄in de yin-paḥi-phyir-te
phyiḥi chos-rnams nañ-gi chos-rnams-kyis stoṅ-ño. de ciḥi-phyir ḥe-na. deḥi rañ-
bz̄in de yin-paḥi-phyir-te. ḥdi-ni phyi-nañ-stoṅ-pa-ñid ces-byaḥo.*—Of what kind
is the Relativity of both the Subjective and the Objective? We have
the 6 internal and 6 external bases of cognition. So we speak of them
(together) as “the external and the internal.” Now, being neither eternal nor
evanescent, the internal elements are relative with respect to the external. Why
that? *Because this is their essential nature.* The external elements are relative
in regard to the internal. Why that? *Because such is their essential nature.*
This is what we call “the Relativity of both the subjective and the objective
elements”.

9 This interpretation is adopted in the Madhyānta-vibhaṅga (Aga Ed. 3a
—*de yan gañ-gis ji-ltar mthoṅ*), in Diināga’s Aṣṭasāhasrikā-piṇḍārtha (Tg.
MDO. XIV. 333b. 5.), in Triratnadāsa’s commentary on the latter, by Ārya

Training (i.e. the Degree of Highest Mundane Virtues¹⁰) since it is characterized by the removal of the (gross form) of subjective imputation.

[Abhis.ālokā, MS. 70b. 15-71a.3.]

सर्वधर्मशून्यताया अध्यात्मादिशून्यतालम्बनज्ञानस्वभावाया अपि शून्यत्वेन शून्यता-
शून्यता । ४ । सर्वधर्मशून्यताज्ञानमात्रं सर्वधर्मशून्यता । तेन च शून्यता शून्या । तस्या
प्राहकविकल्पप्रहाणात् । इयं प्रयोगमार्गः ।

[Tg. MD0. VI. 69b. 5-7.] *chos-thams-cad-stoñ-pa-ñid-kyis nan-
stoñ-pa-ñid-la-sogs-pa-la dmigs-paḥi śes-paḥi rañ-bźin-gyi stoñ-pa-ñid
kyañ stoñ-pa-ñid yin-paḥi-phyir stoñ-pa-ñid-stoñ-pa-ñid-do. chos thams-
cad stoñ-pa-ñid-du śes-pa-tsam-ñid-ni chos-thams-cad. stoñ-pa-ñid yin-
la. des kyañ stoñ-pa-ñid stoñ-pa-yin te. der ḥdzin-paḥi rnam-par-rtog-pa
spoñ-baḥ-phyir-ro. ḥdi-ni sbyor-baḥi-lam-laḥo.*¹¹

V. *The Great Relativity.* The 10 parts of the horizon are rela-
tive, since each of them is taken in its relation to the others. (Their
Relativity is called the "Great") owing to the all-embracing character
(of the horizon). The cognition of this aspect is associated with the
first Stage of the Bodhisattva. On this Stage we have (the cognition

Vinuktasena, and by Haribhadra. Another interpretation is to be found in the
Mādhyamika-avatāra where the understructure or the foundation of Relativity
is considered to be the principle of Relativity itself. The cognition of it has
for its aim the removal of imputed views as to its being an absolute principle.
(Gser. I. 307 a. 6, b. 4). Cf. *Conc. of Buddh. Nirvāṇa*, p. 49. "Is Relativity
itself relative."

10 See acc. to Gser. and Rnam-bśad. Cf. above.

11 Pañc. I, 214a. 2-3 --*de-la stoñ-pa-ñid-stoñ-pa-ñid gañ śe-na. nu-rtag mi-
ḥūg-paḥi-phyir. chos-rnams-kyi stoñ-pa-ñid gañ-yin-paḥi stoñ-pa-ñid des
stoñ-pa-ñid stoñ-ño. de ciḥi-phyir śe-na. deḥi rañ-bźin de yin-paḥi-phyir-te.
ḥdi-ni stoñ-pa-ñid-stoñ-pa-ñid ces-byaḥo.*—Of what kind is the Relativity of
Relativity? As it is neither eternal nor evanescent, the Relativity of the
elements is devoid of the essence of Relativity (as of something absolute). Why
that? Because such is its essential nature. This is the Relativity of Relativity.
In the Pañc. in all the remaining aspects of śūnyatā the fact of being neither
eternal nor non-eternal (*akūṭastha-avināśitā*) is indicated as the essential
nature of Relativity. Cf. the following paragraphs.

of the Absolute as being) all-pervading.¹² (Every kind of limitation as 'eastern', 'western', and the like is consequently inadmissible from the standpoint of the Ultimate Reality).—

[Adhis.sloka, MS. 71a. 3-5.] दशानां दिशां दिग्भिः शून्यत्वेन महाशून्यता । ५ ।
तासां महासंनिवेशत्वान् । इयं सर्वत्रगतार्थेन प्रथमायां भूमौ ।

[Tg. MDO. VI. 69b. 7.] *phyogs bcu-po-ni phyogs-kyis ston-pa-ñid yin-paḥi-phyir chen-po-ston-pa-ñid-de, de-ruams-ni dbyibs che-ba yin-paḥi-phyir-ro ḥdi-ni kun-tu-ḥgro-baḥi don-gyis sa dan-po-laḥo.*¹³

VI. *The Relativity of the Ultimate Reality.* The latter, that is Nirvāṇa, is devoid of the essence of Nirvāṇa (as of a separate entity),¹⁴ inasmuch as it represents the mere separation (from the phenomenal elements).¹⁵ The cognition of this aspect is associated with the second stage. In the latter we have the cognition of the Absolute as being (Nirvāṇa) "the highest aim"¹⁶ that is to be attained. (This highest aim is cognized as having itself a relative character.¹⁷).

[Abhis.ālokā, MS. 71a. 5-7]

परमार्थस्य निर्वाणस्य निर्वाणार्थरूपशून्यत्वेन परमार्थशून्यता । ६ । तस्य
विसंयोगमात्रत्वान् । इयमप्रार्थेन द्वितीयायाम् ।

[Tg. MDO. VI. 69b. 7-70a. 1.] *don-dam-pa mya-ñan-las-ḥdas-pa-ni mya-ñan-las-ḥdas-paḥi don-gyi ran-bḥzin-gyis ston-pa-ñid yin-paḥi-*

12 Madhyānta-vibhāṅga, Aga Ed. 4a. 3, Mahāyāna-saṃgraha, Tg. MDO. LVI. 34b. 4, "Doctrine of Pr.-pār." p. 53.


13 Pañc., I, 214a. 3-5.—*de-la chen po-ston-pa-ñid gan ḥe-na, mi-rtog mi-ḥjiḡ-paḥi-phyir śar-phyogs-kyis ston.....de ciḥi-phyir ḥe-na, deḥi ran-bḥzin de yin-paḥi-phyir-te, ḥdi-ni chen-po-ston-pa-ñid ces-byaḥo.*—Of what kind is the Great Relativity? Being neither eternal, nor evanescent, the eastern quarter is devoid of a real essence of its own, etc. (Similar indications in regard to all the other points of the horizon). Why that? etc.

14 Cf. Conception of Buddhist Nirvāṇa, p. 27.

15 Abhidharmakośa, I, 6.

16 *parama-artha*. Cf. Abh. kośa-bhāṣya on I. 2.—Madh. vibh. 4 a. 3. Mah. saṃgr. 34 b. 4, "Doctrine of Pr. pār." p. 54

17 Gser. I. 299 b. 6.—*mya-ñan-las-ḥdas-pa meḥog kyan ston-par rtogs-pas-so.*—Although Nirvāṇa is the highest (aim), it is cognized as being relative.



*phyir don-dam-pa-stoñ-pa-ñid-de, de-ni hbral-ba-tsam yin-paḥi-phyir ro. ḥdi-ni mchog-gi don-ñid-kyis-na sa gñis-pa-laḥo.*¹⁸

VII. *The Relativity of conditioned existence.* The 3 Spheres of Existence which are a product of causes and conditions (are relative, inasmuch as the World of Carnal Desire (or of Gross Bodies) etc. are devoid of a separate essence of their own. And, as they have no absolute existence, they are correlative and are possible antidotes of one another. The cognition of this aspect is associated with the third Stage. In the latter we have the cognition of the Absolute as being the homogeneous cause (of Phenomenal Existence). (The latter, as the natural outflow of the Absolute is cognized as being relative.¹⁹).

[Abhis.ālokā, MS. 71a. 7-10.]

संस्कृतस्य त्रैधातुकस्य कामादिधातुशून्यत्वेन संस्कृतशून्यता । ७ । तस्यापारिनिष्यन्न-
स्वभावत्वेन शक्यप्रतिषेधत्वात् । इयं निष्यन्दार्थाप्रित्वेन तृतीयायाम् ।

[Tg. MDO. VI. 70a. 1-2] *ḥdus-byas-pa khamṣ gsum-pa-ni ḥdod-paḥi khamṣ-la-sogs-pa stoñ-pa-ñid yin-paḥi-phyir ḥdus-byas-stoñ-pa-ñid-de. de-ni yoñs-su-ma-grab-paḥi rañ-bñin-ñid-kyis gñen-poḥi phyogs-ñid-du nus-pa-ñid-kyi-phyir-ro.*²⁰

18 Pañc. I, 214 a. 51-6.—*de-la don-dam-pa-ni mya-ñan-las-ḥdas-pa ste, mi-rtag mi-ḥjig-paḥi-phyir mya-ñan-las-ḥdas-pa de-yañ mya-ñan-las-ḥdas-pas stoñ-ño. d ciḥi-phyir ḥe-na. deḥi rañ-bñin de yin-paḥi-phyir te. ḥdi-ni don-dam-pa-stoñ-pa-ñid ces-byaḥo.*—The Absolute Reality (or the highest aim) is Nirvāṇa. Being neither eternal nor evanescent (Cf. the Salutation in the Mūla-mādhya-nika—*anucchadam aśāśvatam...prapañcopa'amam śreem*), this Nirvāṇa is devoid of a real essence of its own. Why that? Because such is its essential nature. This is what we call the Relativity of the ultimate Reality (or of the highest aim).

19 Pañc. I. 214 a. 2.—*deḥi rañ-bñin-can ḥdus-byas ḥkhor-ba...stoñ-par rtogs-pas-so.*

20 Pañc. I. 214 a. 6-8.—*de-la ḥdus-byas stoñ-pa-ñid gañ ḥe-na ḥdus-byas ḥes-bya-ba-ni ḥdod-paḥi khamṣ dañ, gzugs-kyi khamṣ dañ, gzugs-med-paḥi khamṣ te de-la mi-rtag-mi-ḥjig-paḥi-phyir ḥdod-paḥi khamṣ ḥdod-paḥi khamṣ-kyis stoñ-ño...de ciḥi-phyir ḥe-na. deḥi rañ-bñin de yin-paḥi-phyir-te. ḥdi-ni ḥdus-byas-stoñ-pa-ñid ces-byaḥo.*—Of what kind is the Relativity of conditioned existence? Conditioned existence is (included in) *the World of Carnal Desire, the World of Pure Matter, and the Immaterial Sphere.* Being neither eternal, nor evanescent, the World of Carnal Desire is devoid of a real essence of its own, etc. (the same in regard to the Sphere of Pure Matter and Immaterial). Why that? Because

VIII. *The Relativity of the unconditioned.* The unconditioned is that which is beginningless, endless and not liable to change. It is relative, inasmuch as origination etc. (which are denied in) the beginningless and so on, do not exist, being the contradictorily opposed parts, the mere foundation of a name.²¹ The cognition of this aspect is associated with the fourth Stage, in which the Absolute is cognized as the Unique Principle in regard to which there can be no attachment.²²

²³ असंस्कृतस्यानुत्पादस्यानिरोधस्य स्थितेरनन्यथात्वस्य च तेनैव शून्यत्वादसंस्कृत-
शून्यता । ८ । अनुत्पादादीनां प्रज्ञप्तिनिमित्तस्य विरुद्धप्रतियोगिन उत्पादादेरभावात् ।
इयं निष्परिग्रहार्थेन चतुर्थ्याम् ।

[Tg. MDO 7a. 2-4] *hdus-ma-byas skye-ba-med-pa dan hgag-pa-med-pa dan gnas-pa-las gzan-du-hgyur-ba-med-pa-ni de-nid-kyis ston-pa yin-paḥi-phyirhdus-ma-byas-ston-pa-ste. skye-ba-med-pa-la-sogs-pa-rnams-kyi btags-paḥi rgyu-mtshan mi-mthun-paḥi. la skye-ba-la-sogs-pa med-paḥi phyir-ro. hdi-ni yoḥs-su-hdzin-pa-med-paḥi don-gyis-na bzhi-pa-laho.*²⁴

IX. *The Absolute Relativity.* As every limit or end is devoid of a real essence of its own, (we have this aspect of Relativity) as transgressing all limitation. A limit (or end) means a part. Now, between the limits of Eternity and of the Nought there exists absolutely nothing which could draw a boundary between them and thus make them appear such is their essential nature. This is what we call the Relativity of conditioned existence.

21 Gser. I, 308 a. 2.—*zlog-phyogs skye-ba-sogs-kyis dben-pa-ni thu-sñad-kyi rgyu-mtshan-no.*

22 Ibid., 300 a. 2.—*yoḥs-su-hdzin-pa-med-paḥi hdus-ma-byas kyañ ston-par rtogs-pas-so.*—Because the unconditioned which cannot be the object of interest is cognized as being relative.—M. vibh. 4 a. 3., Mah. saṃgr. Tg. MDO., LVI, 34 b. 415.

23 This passage is omitted in the MS. Text restored acc. to Tib. q. v.—

24 Pañc. I. 214 a. 8—b. 2.—*de-la hdus-ma-byas-ston-pa-nid gañ ze-na. hdus-ma-byas zes-byu-ba-ni gañ-la skye-ba-med-pa dan hgag-pa-med-pa dan. gnas-pa-las gzan-du-hgyur-pa-med-pa hdi-ni hdus-ma-byas zes-bya-ste. mi-rtug-mi-hjiḡ-paḥi phyir hdus-ma-byas de-ni hdus-ma-byas-kyis ston-no.*—Of what kind is the Relativity of the unconditioned? The unconditioned is that which neither becomes originated, nor disappears, and does not change its state. As it is neither eternal etc.

as having each its own separate essence. The cognition of this aspect is associated with the fifth Stage, where the Absolute is cognized as including the collective personality,²⁵ (since from the standpoint of Ultimate Reality there can be no limitations whatever).—

[Abhis.ālokā, MS. 71a. 10-14]

अन्तस्यान्तेन शून्यत्वादतीतान्तत्वेनात्यन्तशून्यता । ६ । अन्तो भागस्तत्रोच्छेद-
शाश्वतान्तयोर्मध्ये न तदस्ति किञ्चिद्येन तयोर्भागव्यवच्छेदमात्रत्वेन स्वभावो व्यवस्थाप्यते
इयं संतानाभेदार्थेन पञ्चम्याम् ।

[Tg. MDO. VI. 70a. 4-6.] *mthah ni mthas ston-pa-ñid yin-paḥi-
phyir mthah-las-ḥdas-pa-ñid-kyis-na mthah-las-ḥdas-pa-ston-pa-ñid-do.
mthah ni cha ste de-lo chad-pa dan rtag-paḥi mthah gñis-kyi dbus-na
de-dag-gi cha rnam-par-gcod-paḥi rgyu-mtshan gan-gis deḥi ran-bzin-
du rnam-par-ḥjog-pa de-ni ci-yañ-med-do.ḥdi-ni rgyud-tha-dad-pa-med-
paḥi don-gyis-na lña-pa-lakho.*²⁶

X. *The Relativity of Degree.*²⁷ 'The beginning,' 'the middle,' and 'the end' are ideas that are correlative and have consequently no real essence of their own. They, the beginning etc., are knitted together in the Absolute Essence, and consequently no limitation can be drawn between them. The cognition of this aspect is associated with the sixth Stage where the separate unreality of the defiling and the purifying elements is cognized.²⁸ (There is consequently no differentiation of good and bad, high and low etc.).

25 In such a sense we have to understand *santāna-abhedo*, the non-differentiation of the separate personalities. M. vibh. 4 a. 3-4, M. saṅgr. 34 b. 5, "Doctrine of Pr.-pār." p. 55.

26 Pañc. I. 214 b. 2-3.—*de-la mthah-las-ḥdas-pa-ston-pa-ñid gan ze-na. gan-la mthah mi-dmags-pa de-ni mthah-las-ḥdas-pa ste mi-rtag mi-ḥjig-paḥi phyir. mthah-las-ḥdas-pa mthah-las-ḥdas-pas ston-ño. de ciḥi phyir ze-na. deḥi ran-bzin de yin-paḥi-phyir te ḥdi-ni mthah-las-ston-pa-ñid ces-byaḥo.*—Of what kind is the Absolute (or unlimited) Relativity? That with which no limit can be perceived is called "the Absolute (or unlimited)." Being neither eternal nor evanescent, this "unlimited" is devoid of a real essence of its own, etc.

27 Lit. "Relativity as the negation of the high and low (beginning and end, good and bad, etc.)" Otherwise: the Relativity of that which has neither beginning nor end. (Sic acc. to Pañc.).

28 I.e. that the Absolute, as the unique undifferentiated principle, can be

[Abhis.ālokā, MS. 71a. 14-16.]

आदिमध्यपर्यवसानानां शून्यत्वेनानवरागशून्यता । १० । आद्यादीनां धर्मतानुस्यूत-
त्वेनात्यन्तिकत्वात् । इयं निःक्लेशविशुद्धार्थेन षष्ठ्याम् ।

[Tg. MDO. VI. 70a. 6-7.] *thog-ma dañ dbus dañ tha-ma-rnams-
ni de-rnams-kyis ston-pa-ñid yin-pas thog-ma dañ-tha-ma-med-pa-ston-
pa-ñid de. thog-ma-la-soys-pa-ni chos-ñid-kyi rjes-su-skyes-pa-ñid-kyis*²⁹
*mthañ-ñid sin-tu-med-paḥi-phyir-ro.ḥdi-ni kun-nas-ñon-moñs-pa dañ
rnam-par-dag-pa-ma-yin-paḥi don-gyis-na*³⁰ *drug-pa-laḥo.*³¹

XI. *The Relativity of the points that are not to be rejected.*³² The points that are not to be rejected are to be regarded as relative, since they can be taken only in their relation to rejection which is the same as removing or casting away. Now, rejection etc. which has the character of action is connected with an enunciation of non-rejection.³³ The cognition of this aspect is associated with the seventh Stage in which the undifferentiated character of the Absolute is cognized.³⁴

neither defiling nor purifying. M. vibh. 4 a. 4, M. saṃgr. 34 b. 5, "Doctrine of Pr.-pār." p. 55.

29 The Tangyur text is corrupt: *thog-ma dañ tha-ma-med-pa-ston-pa-ñid-la-soys-paḥi chos-ñid-kyi rjes-su-skyes-pa-ñid-kyis...*

30 Corr. acc. to Mah. saṃgr.—The Tib. version of the Abhis. ālokā has: *ḥdi-ni kun-nas-ñon-moñs-pa-med-pas rnam-par-dag-paḥi don-gyis-na...*

31 Pañc. I. 214 b. 3-5.—*de-la thog-ma-dañ-tha-ma-med-pa-ston-pa-ñid gañ ze-na. gañ-la thog-ma mi-dmigs sin tha-ma gañ mi-dmigs-pa de-la ḥgro-ba mi-dmigs. ḥon-ba gañ mi-dmigs-te. mi-rtay mi-ḥjig-paḥi-phyir* etc.—Of what kind is the Relativity of the beginningless and endless? That, with which a beginning cannot be perceived, and an end likewise does not exist, cannot have a motion hither and thither. (Cf. Salutation to the Mūla-mādḥ.—*anāgamaṃ anirgamam* and Conception of Buddhist Nirvāṇa, p. 69). Being neither eternal, nor evanescent, etc.

32 Acc. to Ratnākaraśānti's *Suddhimatī* (Tg. MDO. IX.) this is the Mahāyānistic Path; acc. to the Commentaries on the *Śatasāhasrikā* and the 3 *Prajñā-pāramitā-sūtras* (of Daṃṣṭrāsena, Tib. Gnod-ḥjoms gñis, Tg. MDO., XIII and XIV) it is the Final Nirvāṇa without residue (*anupadhi-śeṣa-nirvāṇa* = *lhaq-med myaṅ-ḥdas*; Gser. I. 308 a. 5).

33 Gser. I. 308 a. 4-5.—*dor-ba dañ spañs-pa dañ btañ-bu-las bzlog-pa-ni-tha-sñad-kyi rgyu-mtshan-mo.*—The foundation for its name is the fact of being the counterpart of rejecting, removing, or casting away.

34 M. vibh. 4 a. 4, M. saṃgr. 34 b. 5, "Doctrine of Pr.-pār.," pp. 55 and 56.

This unique principle (which is Nirvāṇa, a point that is not to be rejected is thus cognized as being relative.

[Abhis.ālokā, MS. 71b. 1-4.]

अवकिरणोत्सर्गलक्षणस्यावकारस्य विपर्ययेणानवकारस्तस्य तेन शून्यत्वादनवकार-
शून्यता । ११ । अवकिरणदेः क्रियारूपत्वेनानुत्सर्गप्रज्ञप्तिनिमित्तत्वयोगान् । इयमना-
नात्वार्थेन सप्तम्याम् ।

[Tg. MDO. VI. 70a. 7-b. 1.] *bral zin spañ-la yons-su-btan-baḥi*
mtshan-ñid-can-gyi dor-ba-las bzlog-pa-ñid-kyis-na dor-ba-med-pa ste
de-ni des stoñ-pa-ñid yin-paḥi-phyir.dor-ba-med-pa-stoñ-pa-ñid-de
dor-ba-la-sogs-pa-ni bya-baḥi ño-bo-ma-yin-pa-ñid-kyis-na spañs-par
ötags paḥi rgyu-mtshan-du mi-ḥthad-paḥi-phyir-ro.³⁵ ḥdi-ni tha-dad-
pa-med-paḥi don-gyis-na bdun-pa-laḥo.³⁶

XII. *The Relativity of the Ultimate Essence.* This Essence is not something produced by the agency of all the different Saints. It is devoid of a real essence of its own (and consequently relative), since it is impossible for the conditioned and the unconditioned to be changed or unchanged anew into something either eternal or non-eternal.³⁷

[Abhis.ālokā, MS. 71b. 4-6.]

सर्वार्यैरकृता प्रकृतिस्तस्यास्तया शून्यत्वात्प्रकृतिशून्यता । १२ । तस्याः संस्कृता-
संस्कृतविकाराविकारानापत्तेः ।

35 Acc. to the Tib. version: *kiyā-arūpaveṇa avatsarga-prajñāpti-*
nimittatva-ayogāt.

36 Pañc. I. 214 b. 5-6. *-de-la dor-ba-med-pa-stoñ-pa-ñid gañ ze-na. gañ-la*
gañ-gañ dor-ba med-pa-ste. mi-rtog mi-ḥtyg-paḥi-phyir dor-ba-med-pa dor-ba-med-
pas stoñ-ño. de ciḥi-phyir ze-na. deḥi rañ-bžon de yin-paḥi-phyir etc.—Of what
kind is the Relativity of the points that are not to be rejected? (The points that
are not to be rejected) are those in regard to which absolutely nothing is to be
removed. Being neither eternal nor evanescent, the e points that are not to be
rejected are devoid of a real essence of their own. Why that? Because such is
their essential nature.

37 Gser. I. 303 a. 6-b. 1. *-de-ni ye-nas stoñ pas de stoñ-par ḥphugs-pa gañ-gis*
kyañ ma-byas-pas ḥdus-byas ḥgyur-ba dañ ḥdus-ma-byas mi-ḥgyur-bas gnod-par
mi-nus-pa.—Being relative (void) from the outset, it cannot be rendered void by
the Saints. Therefore we have here no opposition of the conditioned that becomes
changed and the unconditioned which is unalterable.

[Tg. MDG. VI. 70b. 1-2.] *hphags-pa thams-cad-kyis ma-mdzad-pa-ni ran-bzin te. de-ni des ston-pahi-phyir ran-bzin-ston-pa-ñid-do. de-la ni hdus-byas dan hdus-ma-byas-kyi rnam-par-hgyar-ba dan rnam-par-mi-hgyur-bahi gnod med-pahi phyir-ro.*³⁸

XIII. *The Relativity of all the Elements of Existence.* Every separate element is devoid of a real essence of its own. Indeed, all the elements, those belonging to the categories of the conditioned as well as the unconditioned, are mutually dependent and have consequently no ultimate existence.³⁹

The cognition of these 2 aspects (XII and XIII) is associated with the eighth Stage. In this Stage we have the cognition of the Absolute as (the unique principle) from which nothing can be removed and to which nothing can be added.)⁴⁰ Moreover, in this Stage (the Bodhisattva cognizes the Absolute as being) the foundation for the 2 kinds of controlling power, viz. that of direct cognition, and that of purifying the Sphere (of future Buddhahood).⁴¹ This Stage is thus characterized by both action and result. (As regards the cognition of the said two aspects of Relativity, they refer to) that appliance⁴² (of the eighth Stage) which represents the full penetration (into the Essence of the Absolute).

[Abhis.ālokā, MS. 71b. 7-11.]

धर्मस्य धर्मेण शून्यत्वात्सर्वधर्मशून्यता । १३ । सर्वधर्माणां संस्कृतासंस्कृतराशेरि-

38 Pañc. I. 214 b. 6-8.—*de-la ran-bzin-ston-pa-ñid gan ze-na. hdus-byas-sam. hdus-ma-byas kyan-ruñ-ste chos-thams-cad-kyi ran-bzin gan-yin-pa de-ni ñan-thos-rnams-kyis ma-byas ran-sañs-rgyas-kyis ma-byas. byañ-chen-rnams-kyis ma-byas. de-bzin-gśegs-pa dgra-bram-pa gan-dag-pa-rtsegs-pahi sañs-rgyas-rnams-kyis ma-byas-te. mi-rtay mi-hjig-pahi-phyir etc.*—Of what kind is the Relativity of the Ultimate Essence? The Essence of all the elements, the conditioned and the unconditioned (Cf. Uttaratantra, Transl. p. 230 and 231), is not produced by the Śrāvakas, the Pratyekabuddhas, the Bodhisattvas, and the Tathāgatas, the Arhats, the Perfect Supreme Buddhas. As it is neither eternal nor evanescent, etc.

39 This passage very pregnantly shows the real meaning of śūnyatā.

40 This refers to *prakṛti-śūnyatā*. M. vibh. 4 a. 4., M. saṃgr. 31 b. 6. Cf. Abhisam. Kār. V. 21.—*nā'pancyam atoh kiñcit prakṣepacyam na kiñ ca na. ...*

41 On *buddha-kṣetra-purīśuddhi* see Chapter IV. M. saṃgr. 31 b. 6, "Doctr. of Pr.-pār.," p. 56.

42 *parīkarmaṇ* = *yoñs-su-shyōñ-ba*. On these appliances cf. below under "the Accumulation of the 10 Stages" (*daśa-bhūmi-saṃbhāra*).

तरेतरापेक्षत्वेन स्वभावापरिनिष्पन्नत्वात् । एतच्च शून्यताद्वयमहीनानाधिकार्येन
निर्विकल्पक्षेत्रपरिशुद्धिवशिताद्वयाश्रयत्वेन चर्याफलभूमित्वात्प्रतिवेधपरिकर्मणाष्टम्याम् ।

[Tg. MDO. VI. 70b. 2-4.] *chos-rnams-ni chos-rnams-kyis ston-pa-ñid yin-paḥi-phyir chos-thams-cad-ston-pa-ñid-de.ḥdus-byas dan ḥdus-ma-byas-kyi chos-kyi tshogs thams-cad-ni phan-tshun bltos-pa-can yin-pas-na ran-bžin yoṅs-su-grub-pa-med-paḥi-phyir-ro.ston-pa-ñid ḥdi gñis-ni ḥgrib-pa dan ḥphel-ba-med-paḥi don dan rnam-par-mi-rtog-pa dan zin yoṅs-su-dag-pa-la dhan-ba gñis-kyi rten-ñid yin-paḥi-phyir ḥbras-buḥi sa-ñid yin-pas⁴³ so-sor-rtog-pa yoṅs-su-sbyon-baḥi dbye-bas sa brgyad-pa-laḥo.⁴⁴*

XIV. *The Relativity of Essence.* Matter and the other (groups of elements) the essences of which are impenetrability etc. are devoid of these essences (as of something that is real in itself). Indeed, the general and the special characteristics (which are put forth as the essences of things) are merely nominal.

[Abhis.ālokā, MS. 71b. 12-14.]

रूपणादिलक्षणस्य रूपादेस्तल्लक्षणशून्यत्वाल्लक्षणशून्यता । १४ । लक्षणव्यवस्थानस्य
सामान्यविशेषप्रज्ञप्तिमात्रत्वात् ।

[Tg. MDO. VI. 70b. 4-5] *gzugs-la-sogs-pa-ni dchi mtshan-ñid gzugs-su-run-ba-la-sogs-pa ston-pa yin-paḥi-phyir ran-gi-mtshan-ñid-ston-pa-ñid-de⁴⁵ mtshan-ñid-du rnam-par-bžag-paḥi spyi dan khyad-par-ni btags-pa-tsam yin-paḥi-phyir-ro.⁴⁶*

XV. *The Relativity of the present, past, and future which cannot be perceived* (all of them at once). If we take the elements relating

⁴³ Sic. acc. to the Tg. Correct: *spyod-pa dan ḥbras-buḥi sa-ñid yin pas.*

⁴⁴ Pañc. I. 214 b. 8—215 a. 5.—*de-la chos-thams-cad-ston-pa-ñid gan ze-na. chos thams-cad ces-bya-ba ni gzugs dan. tshor-ba dan...*(an enumeration of all the *skandhas*, *āyatanas* etc.) —*ḥdus-byas-kyi chos dan. ḥdus-ma-byas-kyi chos te...de-la mi-rtag mi-ḥjig-paḥi-phyir* etc.

⁴⁵ = स्वलक्षणशून्यता ।

⁴⁶ Pañc. I. 215 a. 6-8—*de-la ran-gi-mtshan-ñid-ston-pa-ñid gan ze-na, gzugs-ni ḥjig-paḥi mtshan-ñid.* (= *vināśa-lakṣaṇam rūpam*; Cf. *rūpyate, luhyate, badhyate* etc.)...*tshor-ba-ni myon-baḥi mtshan-ñid* (= *anubhava-lakṣaṇā vedanā*) etc. (Follow the essences of *saṃjñā*, *saṃskāra* and *vijñāna*). *mi-rtag mi-ḥjig-paḥi phyir* etc.

to the past etc. separately, it is impossible to perceive (within each of these categories)⁴⁷ other elements which are dialectically opposed.⁴⁸ Indeed, (time is a property) which can be only nominally attributed to a thing.

The cognition of these 2 aspects of Relativity (XIV and XV) is associated with the ninth Stage, in which (the Bodhisattva cognizes the Absolute) as being the basis of the Power of Transcendental Wisdom.⁴⁹

[Abhis.ālokā, MS. 71b. 14-72a. 1.]

अतीतादीनां धर्माणामतीतादिध्वध्वस्वितरेतरविपर्ययानुपलम्भत्वेनानुपलम्भशून्यता ।

१५ । अध्वनां भावप्रज्ञप्तिमात्रत्वात् । एतच्च शून्यताद्वयं ज्ञानवशिताश्रयत्वेन तथैव नवम्याम् ।

[Tg. MDO. VI. 70b. 5-7.] *hdas-pa-la-sogs-paḥi chos-rnams ni hdas-pa-la-sogs-paḥi dus-rnams-la phan-tshun bzlog-na dmigs-su-med-pa-ñid-kyis-na mi-dmigs-pa-stoñ-pa-ñid-de. dus-rnams-ni dños-po-la btags-pa-tsam-ñid yin-paḥi-phyir-ro.*⁵⁰

XVI. *The Relativity of the (combined elements which have) the essence of a Non-ens.* Such entities do not represent realities by themselves, since they are functionally interdependent. Indeed it is said:—What is an entity beyond its causes?—

[Abhis.ālokā, MS. 72a. 2-4.]

नास्ति सांयोगिकस्य धर्मस्य भावः प्रतीयसमुत्पन्नत्वादिति संयोगस्य तेन शून्यत्वाद-

भावस्वभावशून्यता । १६ । सामग्रीमात्रं भाव इति कृत्वा ।

[Tg. MDO. VI. 70b. 7-8.] *sbyor-ba-las-byuñ-baḥi chos-rnams ni ño-bo-ñid med-pa-yin-te. rten-cuñ-ḥbrel-par-ḥbyuñ-baḥi-phyir-ro. zes-bya*

47 I.e. the elements of the past, the present, and the future, each taken separately.

48 I.e. if we take for instance the elements of the past, we have only the past, if we have those of the present then only the present; it is impossible to perceive past and present together.

49 Madh-vibh. 4 a. 4., M. saṃgr. 34 b. 6. "Doctr. of Pr.-pār.," p. 56.

50 Pañc. 1. 215 a. 8-b. 1. *-de-la mi-dmigs-pa-stoñ-pa-ñid gañ ze-na. gañ-la hdas-pa mi-dmigs-pa dañ. ma-ḥoñs-pa mi-dmigs-pa dañ. de-ltar-byuñ-baḥi gnas mi-dmigs-pa ste. mi-rtag mi-ḥjig-paḥi-phyir* etc.—Of what kind is the Relativity of the non-perceptible?—That, in regard to which neither past, nor future, nor present existence can be perceived, is neither eternal, nor evanescent, etc.

*bas tshogs-pa-ni des ston-pa-ñid-yin-paḥi-phyir dños-po-med-paḥi-
ño-bo-ñid-ston-pa-ñid-de. dños-po-rnams-ni tshogs-pa-tsam-yin-paḥi
phyir-ro.*⁵¹

XVII. *The Relativity of Mundane Existence.* The five groups of elements constituting a mundane individual existence are devoid of a real essence of their own. Indeed "a group of elements" has the meaning of "an assemblage."⁵² But an assemblage cannot be an entity by itself. Therefore it can by no means be the foundation for an existence which bears the essence of the *causa materialis*⁵³ (of Phenomenal Life). The cognition of these two varieties (XVI and XVII) is associated with the tenth Stage, the former being (with the preceding Stage). In the tenth Stage we have the cognition of the Absolute as being the substratum of the controlling power over the Biotic Force.⁵⁴ The latter as exercising its influence over the individual is relative.

[Abhis.ālokā, MS. 72a. 4-8.]

भावस्योपादानस्कन्धलक्षणस्य तेन शून्यत्वाद्भावशून्यता । १७ । राश्यर्थो हि
स्कन्धार्थः । राशिश्चापदार्थत्वान्नोपादानलक्षणस्य भावस्य निमित्तं भवितुमर्हतीति कृत्वा ।
एतच्च शून्यताद्वयं कर्मवशिताश्रयत्वेन पूर्ववदशम्याम् ।

[Tg. MDO. VI. 70b. 8-71a. 2.] *dños-po ñe-bar-len-paḥi phuñ-poḥi
mtshan-ñid-ni des ston-pa-ñid yin-paḥi-phyir dños-po-ston-pa-ñid-
de.spuñs-paḥi don-ni phuñ-poḥi don yin-la.spuñs-pa gañ don-med-pa
yin-paḥi-phyir ñe-bar-len-paḥi mtshan-ñid-can-gyi dños-poḥi rgyu-
mtshan-du hgyur-bar ḥos-pa-ma-yin-paḥi-phyir-ro. ston-pa-ñid gñis-
po ḥdi-dag-ni las-la-dbañ-baḥi rte?-du gyur-pa-ñid-kyis-na sna-ma-
bēin-du sa heu-pa-laḥo.*⁵⁵

51 *Ibid.*, 215 b. 1-3.—*de-la dños-po-med-pa-ño-bo-ñid-ston-pa-ñid gañ ñe-na-
chos thoms-cad rten-ciñ-ḥbrel-par-ḥbyuñ-baḥi-phyir. ḥdus-paḥi ño-bo-ñid med-de
me-rtag me-ḥjig-paḥi phyir. ḥdus-pa ḥdus-pas ston-ño.*—Of what kind is the
Relativity of that which has the essence of a Non-*caus*? As all the elements are
functionally interdependent, a combined existence has no real essence of its own.
Being neither eternal nor evanescent, a combined existence has no real essence, it
is unreal in itself, etc.

52 *rāśi* = *spuñs-pa*. Cf. Abh. kośa I. 20.

53 *upādāna-kāraṇa* = *ner-len-gyi rgyu*.

54 M. saṃgr. 34 b. 6-7. "Doctrine of Pr.-pār." p. 57.

55 Pañc. I. 215 b. 4-5.—*de-la dños-po gañ ñe-na. phuñ-po lña ste. phuñ-po de-*

XVIII. *The Relativity of Non-ens.* That which represents a Non-ens⁵⁶ as Space etc.⁵⁷ which is uncaused and unconditioned is devoid of an essence of its own. Indeed it is merely nominal, being the negation of a (phenomenal) reality, as something obstructing and the like.

[Abhis.ālokā, MS. 72a. 8-10.]

अभावस्यासंस्कृतस्याकाशादेस्तेन शून्यत्वादभावशून्यता । १८ । वस्तुधर्माविरणादिना
तत्प्रज्ञप्तैः ।

[Tg. MDO. VI. 71a. 2-4.] *dños-po-med cin ḥdus-ma-byas-pa nam-mkhab-la-sogs-pa-ni des-ston-pa-ñid yin-paḥi-phyer dños-po-med-pa-ston-pa-ñid-de dños-poḥi chos sgrib-par-byed-pa-la-sogs-pa med-pa-las de brtags-pa yin-paḥi-phyer-ro.*⁵⁸

XIX. *The Relativity of the true Monistic Essence of Existence.*⁵⁹ It is that which (exists from the outset) and is not produced by the Transcendental Wisdom or the intuition of the Saints. Indeed, Transcendental Wisdom and direct intuition make clear the Ultimate Reality. (The latter must therefore be viewed in its relation to the said wisdom and intuition).

[Abhis.ālokā, MS. 72a. 10-12.]

स्वभावस्य शून्यताख्यस्यार्याणां ज्ञानेन दर्शनेन वाकृतत्वात्स्वभावशून्यता । १९ ।
ज्ञानदर्शनस्य यथाभूतार्थद्योतकत्वात् ।

dag kyan phun-po-rnams-kyis ston-bas. de-ltar-na dños-po dños-pas ston-no.—Now, what is mundane existence? It is (constituted by) the 5 groups of elements. But these groups are devoid of a real essence of their own. Therefore mundane existence is relative (devoid of an essence of its own).

56 *abhāva* = *dños-po-med-pa* (not simply: *med-pa*) has here the sense of "the absence of the conditioned, phenomenal, separate reality" (*abhāva* = *vastu ... dños po*). The synonyms of the latter are: *saṃskṛta* = *ḥdus-byas*, *paratantra* = *gñan-dbañ*, etc. It is opposed to *nitya* and *asaṃskṛta* which are the understructure of Relativity in this case.

57 (*ākāśa*) and the two kinds of Extinction (*nirodha*).

58 Pañc. 1. 215 b. 5-6.—*ji-ltar-na dños-po-med-pa dños po-med-pas-ston ze-na. dños-po-med-pa zes-bya-bu-ni. ḥdus-ma-byas-te. ḥdus-ma-byas de yan ḥdus-ma-byas-kyis ston-pas. de-ltar-na dños-po-med-pa dños-po-med-pas ston-ño.*—How is the Non-ens devoid of a real essence of its own? The Non-ens is the unconditioned. But the unconditioned is devoid of a real essence of its own, etc.

59 *śūnyatā* in the sense of the negation of all separate reality.

[Tg. MDO. VI. 71a 4-5.] *rañ-bzin ston-pa-ñid-du grags ni ḥphags-pa-rnams-kyi śes-pa dan mthoñ-bas ma-byas-pa-ñid yin-paḥi phyir rañ-gi-ño-bo-stoñ-pa-ñid-de.śes-pa dan mthoñ-ba-ni yañ-dag-paḥi don ji-ltar-ba-bzin-du gsal-bar-byed-pa-ñid yin-paḥi-phyir-ro.*⁶⁰

XX. *The Relativity of a foreign origin.*⁶¹ The Ultimate Absolute Essence of the elements is everlasting and exists independently from the appearance or the non-appearance of the Buddhas. It is relative being viewed in its (negative) relation to an agent from without. Indeed it is said:—Human effort that is directed upon the Ultimate Monistic Essence will have for its result only a useless foil.

The cognition of these three aspects (XVIII, XIX and XX) is associated with the last Stage i.e. the Stage of the Buddha. In it the Absolute is cognized as the foundation, and thereby are removed the Obscuration of Moral Defilement with its residues and the Obscuration of Ignorance with its residues, and then happens the manifestation of the true nature of the Buddha.⁶²

[Abhis.ālokā, MS. 72a. 13-b3.]

उत्पादाद्वा तथागतानामनुत्पादाद्वा स्थितैवैषा धर्माणां धर्मता । इति परेण कर्त्रा
शून्यत्वात्परभावशून्यता । २० । शून्यताधिष्ठानो हि पुरुषव्यापारो केवलं विघातायेति
कृत्या । एतच्च शून्यतात्रयं यथाक्रमं सवासनकुंशावरणब्रह्मणाश्रयत्वेन सवासनज्ञे यावरण-
प्रहाणाश्रयत्वेन स्वयंभूतार्थेन च बुद्धभूमौ वेदितव्यम् ॥

[Tg. MDO. VI. 71a. 5-8.] *de-bzin-gśeys-pa-rnams ḥbyuñ yañ-ruñ ma-byuñ yañ-ruñ ste chos-rnams-kyi chos-ñid ḥdi-ni ye-gnas-paḥo źes-bya-bas byed-pa-po gzan-gyis stoñ-pa yin-paḥi-phyir gzan-gyi ño-bo-stoñ-*

60 Pañ. I. 215 b. 6.—*rañ-bzin źes-bya-ba-ni ño-bo-ñid ma-nor-ba-ste, de-la stoñ-pa-ñid gañ-yin-pa de-ni śes-pas ma-byas, mthoñ-bas ma-byas-te, ḥdi-ni rañ-bzin-stoñ-pa-ñid-do.*—The Ultimate Essence is the true essence. It is the ultimate principle of Non-substantiality which is not produced by knowledge and is not produced by intuition. This is the Relativity of the Ultimate Monistic Essence. Acc. to Gser. I. 309 b. 6-310 a. 1.—This is not a repetition of *prakṛti-sūnyatā*, being a more detailed form.

61 Or: of the Transcendental Essence.

62 The 4 last aspects of *sūnyatā* are regarded as additions to *abhāva-svabhāva-sūnyatā*. Indeed, the fundamental aspects of Relativity (in the *sūtras*) are 16 in number.

*pa-ñid-de ston-pa-ñid-la brten-paḥi skyes-buḥi bya-ba-ni dub-paḥi hbaḥ-
zig-tu hgyur-baḥi-phyir-ro. ston-pa-ñid gsum-po ḥdi-dag-ni go-rim-
bzin-du ñon-moṅs-paḥi sgrib-pa bag-chags dan-bcas-pa spaṅs-paḥi rten-
ñid yin-paḥi-phyir dan. śes-byaḥi sgrib-pabag-chags dan-bcas-pa spaṅs-
paḥi rten-ñid yin-paḥi-phyir dan ran-byun-ñid yin-paḥi don-gyis-na
saṅs-rgyas-kyi sa-la yin-par śes-par-byaḥo.*

E. OBERMILLER

Śrīkṛṣṇa and the Source of the Bhagavadgīta

The common belief that Śrīkṛṣṇa was the founder of a *bhakti* cult and of the Bhāgavata sect requires examination. That the Bhagavadgītā is the earliest work of the Bhāgavata sect, known to us, might be easily conceded, but that Śrīkṛṣṇa himself was the founder of a *bhakti* cult which teaches that liberation, or the highest good, is attainable by devotion and self-surrender to Bhagavat, incarnated as man, is quite another matter. Such a theory presupposes not only that the doctrine of *avatāra* was as old as the time of Śrīkṛṣṇa, but that Śrīkṛṣṇa actually preached that he was the Supreme Being incarnate as he is made to preach in the Bhagavadgītā (henceforth abbreviated as *Bhg.*).

Let us travel back to the age in which Śrīkṛṣṇa lived and taught. Very probably he lived in the age of the Kurukṣetra battle. The Jain tradition¹ supports the *Mahābhārata* on this point. It makes Śrīkṛṣṇa a cousin and contemporary of Neminātha, the Jain Tīrthaṅkara before Pārśvanātha of the 8th century B.C. It should be borne in mind that the succession of Tīrthaṅkaras was not an unbroken one, and, modern research tends to place the Kurukṣetra battle near about the 12th century B.C. In any case, Śrīkṛṣṇa lived two or three generations before the great sage Yājñavalkya, the compiler of the White Yajurveda, and the outstanding figure in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa and the Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad. The Hymns of the Ṛgveda and the Sāmaveda might have all, or most of them, been composed before Śrīkṛṣṇa's time, and those of the Black Yajurveda were perhaps compiled a little later by Vaiśampāyana, the disciple of Kṛṣṇa Dvāpāyana. Examining the literature which had preceded and immediately followed Śrīkṛṣṇa, one does not find therein any trace of the fully developed *bhakti* or the *avatāra* doctrines, as found in the *Bhg.* The rudimentary *bhakti* of the Vedic hymns to Nature-Gods, and the *bhakti* of the *Gītā* are as poles asunder. The same remark

¹ As recorded in the Jain *Harivaṃśa*. The Buddhist tradition, too, as recorded in the *Ghaṭa Jātaka* makes him the slayer of Kaṃsa. Radhakrishnan says that Ariṣṭanemi (=Neminātha) is mentioned in the Yajurveda. *History of Indian Philosophy*, vol. I, p. 287.

holds true of the Brāhmaṇa doctrine of Prajāpati taking the shapes of the tortoise and the boar for special purposes, and the Gītā doctrine of the Supreme Being incarnating Himself from time to time with a view to protect the faithful and destroy the evil-doers. There is no evidence that Viṣṇu, the Solar God, had attained the position of the Supreme Being in Śrīkṛṣṇa's time and no authority for holding that Śrīkṛṣṇa was the founder of the *avatāra* doctrine or that he preached himself as one. As to his having even founded a *bhakti* cult, minus the doctrine of *avatāra*, there is no evidence either. It might be argued that, since the Bhāgavatas or followers of Śrīkṛṣṇa appear originally to have been outside the pale of Brahmanism, it is possible that Śrīkṛṣṇa adopted the doctrine of *bhakti* from the popular religion prevailing in his days. Such a supposition is negated by the fact that Śrīkṛṣṇa himself does not appear to have been an out-and-out non-Brāhmaṇical teacher. Then, again, much philosophy that grew outside sacrificialism was incorporated in the Upaniṣads, but we find no trace of the *bhakti* doctrine in Upaniṣadic works earlier than the Śvetāśvatara, where *bhakti* is still rudimentary. The Śvetāśvatara was probably compiled near about the time of the Buddha, and the *Bhḡ.* with its more developed *bhakti* doctrine was undoubtedly a much later work.² The theory that Śrīkṛṣṇa propounded the *avatāra* doctrine is, therefore, purely imaginary. Whether theism itself can be traced to him is not also free from doubt.

Indian scholars with the exception of H. C. Raychoudhuri,³ and one or two others, are unwilling to concede that Kṛṣṇa Devakīputra,⁴ mentioned in the *Chāndogya Upa.* as a pupil of Ghora Āṅgīrasa, is identical with the Kṛṣṇa of the *Mahābhārata*, the Gītā and the Purāṇas. The reasons they urge are mainly two: First, the Purāṇas mention Sāndīpani, and sometimes Garga, but not Ghora, as Śrīkṛṣṇa's teacher, and secondly Ghora did not teach his pupil the cardinal

2 To me the *Gītā* appears to have been composed as early as 40 B.C., unless the *Gītā* verses quoted in the *Bodhāyana Gṛhyaśeṣa* and *Pitṛmedha Sūtras* be interpolations.

3 *Early History of the Vaiṣṇava Sect*, pp. 30-37.

4 It should be noted that this Kṛṣṇa overcame 'aśanāyā' and 'pipāsā,' that is, attained Brahma-knowledge.

doctrines of the *Bhg.*, viz., *bhakti*, and *avatāra*-hood. It should be remembered, however, that the *Chāndogya Upa.* was compiled much nearer Śrīkṛṣṇa's time than the Purāṇas, which, as we find them, are all post-Christ works, and one should not be surprised if such late authorities, which attributed all sorts of solar and vegetation myths to Śrīkṛṣṇa, invented mythical *gurus* for him, or omitted the name of one of his teachers. As pointed out by Raychudhuri, some of the things which Ghora taught Śrīkṛṣṇa are also emphasised in the Gītā. The stress on these teachings is equally present in the *Anugītā*.⁵ When one takes into account the great distance of time which separated the date of the composition of the Gītā from Śrīkṛṣṇa, the doctrinal differences are easily explained. In the domain of religion and philosophy, the rearing of a stately edifice upon rather slender foundations is no uncommon happening.

Everybody has noticed that, of all the Upaniṣads, the Kaṭha and the Śvetāśvatara influenced the author of the *Bhg.* most. The Śvetāśvatara appears to have been an instance of a Yoga Upaniṣad crowned, in course of time, with theism, the leaning being towards Śaivism. It is equally likely that the *Bhg.* too, was originally a Yoga Upa.,—which, indeed, it professes to be,—Vaiṣṇavised in course of time. Unlike the Śvetāśvatara, the Gītā probably lost its claim to be reckoned as an Upaniṣad owing to the intrusion into it of doctrines alien to the teachings of the Upaniṣads, viz., the doctrines of *avatāra* and of *bhakti* being the easiest way to liberation.⁶

A hypothesis is put forward here as to the gradual growth of the *Bhg.* into its present shape, which appears to the present writer to be more satisfactory than any other hitherto suggested. That Kṛṣṇa was both a great Kṣatriya warrior and a great religious teacher cannot be doubted. The Yadu clan, to which he belonged, is said to have originally been regarded as a Sūdra one; it obtained recognition as a

6 The *Anugītā* is more appropriately the *Pūrvagītā* for reasons to be stated later on.

6 It is possibly for this reason that the Bhāgavatas came for a time, to be regarded as outside the pale of Brahmanism. But they appear to have been readmitted into its pale, when the excellence of the *Bhagavadgītā* gained for it the position of one of the three 'prasthānas' of the *Vedānta*.

Kṣatriya clan later on. It might be that the very greatness of Kṛṣṇa led to this advance in status. Before his time, Brahmanism had contented itself with sacrificialism, though the better minds among the Aryans had already taken to philosophical speculations which resulted in the formulations of the Upaniṣadic *brahmacāda*. But the Vedic Aryans had conquered a people even more civilised than themselves, as the Mohenjodaro and Harappa finds would show. It may be presumed that this people had its religion and its philosophy too. When the writings in the seals found in the two places are deciphered, and the images found more thoroughly studied, the debt of modern Hinduism to this people will be thoroughly appraised. That image-worship is a legacy left by these Pre-Aryans⁷ is certain. It might be that the Sāṅkhya and the Yoga Systems of philosophy grew among them. R. P. Chanda thinks⁸ that the Yoga was evolved by them. The inter-connection between the two has long been recognised. Whether we accept the common view that Yoga was evolved as the discipline for the realisation of the *tatvas* of the Sāṅkhya, or the opposite view, mentioned in the Maitrī Upaniṣad, that Sāṅkhya metaphysics grew by way of explaining the validity of the Yoga processes,⁹ it appears likely that both the systems had the same provenance.

Some epoch-making achievement in the sphere of religion and philosophy must have given Śrīkṛṣṇa the supreme position he holds in the Indian mind. In the *Bhṡ*. (IV. 1-3), he is made to say that he revived the Yogic tradition. In the *Mahābhārata*¹⁰ (henceforth abbreviated as *Mbh.*), he is called the 'Yogācārya' i.e. the teacher of Yoga. In the same work, and also in the *Gītā* and the Purāṇas, the epithets, 'Yogeśvara', 'Mahāyogin', and others of like import, are found frequently applied to him. In the 'Kṛṣṇ-stavarāja' by Bhīṣma,¹¹ three of the ways in which Kṛṣṇa is saluted are:—

'Sāṅkhyātmane namaḥ', 'Yogātmane namaḥ', and 'Vedāīmane namaḥ'.

7 Even if they were Aryans, they must have been a Non-Vedic branch of the race.

8 See his article in the *Pravāsi*, No. 3 of 1339.

9 See Das Gupta, *History of Indian Philosophy*, vol. 1, pp. 227-8.

10 Mausālaparvan, ch. 3, verse 26, Bāṅgavāsī Edn.

11 *Mahābhārata*, Sāntiparvan, ch. 47.

The Bhāgavata Purāṇa (X. 70) tells us that Śrīkṛṣṇa would sit up early every morning, and merge his soul into the universal soul. The *Mbh.*,¹² similarly tells us that he would sit up in the small hours of the morning and meditate upon Brahman. The tradition, therefore, was that Śrīkṛṣṇa's *yoga* was mixed up with the *brahmacāda* of the Vedānta. Considering all this, the present writer thinks that Śrīkṛṣṇa was the first to harmonise the Sāṃkhya-Yoga with the *brahmacāda* of the Upaniṣads,¹³ a process which we find well worked out in the Kaṭha and the Maitrī Upaniṣads, and which was further developed with the addition of theism in the Śvetāśvatara. The same synthesis is found in the *Bhg.* Considering the fact that Kṛṣṇa lived long before the compilation of the Kaṭha Upa. it is just possible that his Yoga-vedānta synthesis was cruder still.

Such a cruder synthesis is really to be found in a work which we find in sheer disguise in the *Mbh.* It is the first of the three Anugītā books to be found in the Aśvamedhaparvan of the *Mbh.* This book, i.e., the Anugītā proper, exists in a fragmentary form, but its Yoga-vedānta synthesis is undoubtedly older than that of the Kaṭha. The two following books of the Anugītā represent the gradual development of the teaching of the Anugītā proper. Even these appear to contain teaching older than that of the Śvetāśvatara Upa., because theism is not taught therein. In the second book, there is just a mention of the god Nārāyaṇa, to whom animal sacrifices used to be offered in the past, as the universal soul, while in the third, we find Viṣṇu just bidding for the position of the Supreme Being, he is called 'brahmamaya'. It might be noted that in the Kaṭha Upa. Viṣṇu is identified with Brahman.¹⁴

It appears strange to the present writer that the Anugītā books

12 Śāntiparvan, ch. 53, verses 2-3. I am indebted to S. N. Tadpatrikar's 'Kṛṣṇa Problem' for this and the preceding Bhāgavata reference.

13 This synthesis might have an element of pan-theism in it as the verse 'Sarvataḥ pāṇi-pādan tat sarvato 'kṣi-śiromukham,' apparently based upon the Puruṣa-sūkta of the *Rgveda*, occurs at least twice in the Anugītā and once in the *Bhāgavadgītā*. One cannot be sure, however, that the verse was not interpolated into the Anugītā books when they were paraphrased. 'Tad viṣṇoḥ paramaṃ padam,' *Kaṭha Up.* I, 3-9.

should ever have been considered later works than the *Bhg.* Even Telang, who translated them, could not escape the common error and readily accepted the tradition that the Anugītā was a sort of uninspired replica of the *Bhg.* The reasons he urges would not stand scrutiny. The cardinal teachings of the *Bhg.* are not to be found in the Anugītā. The *Bhg.* describes two *niṣṭhās*, the *jñāna-niṣṭhā* and the *karma-niṣṭhā*, and while admitting that both led to the attainment of the *summum bonum*, holds that the *karma-niṣṭhā*, which includes the doctrines of desireless action, *bhakti* and *ācatāra*, is the better way. The Anugītā knows only the *jñāna-niṣṭhā*, but nothing about the *karma-niṣṭhā*. If Kṛṣṇa were merely repeating in the Anugītā the substance of the teachings of the *Bhg.*, how could he be so forgetful as to omit all his cardinal teachings? The silly introduction¹⁵ added to the Anugītā, which was a part of the Aśvamedha-parvan, when the *Bhg.* was interpolated into the Bhīṣma-parvan, the misleading name given to the work (i.e. Anugītā), and a few consequential additions and alterations in the body of the work have served their purpose admirably. That purpose was to pass the new work as embodying Kṛṣṇa's true teachings and to relegate the older works of the Kṛṣṇa Sect to an inferior place. The three books of the Anugītā, as found now, are evidently a paraphrase. The linguistic peculiarities are the same as in the Gītā, but the philosophy is much older. It is possible that the writer who paraphrased the works introduced certain anachronisms, but any unbiassed reader will not fail to observe that to say that the Anugītā is an uninspired repetition of the Gītā teaching is to upset deliberately their real order in time.

To sum up. Kṛṣṇa was the great religious teacher who brought about a Sāṃkhya-Yoga-Vedānta synthesis. The earliest literary records of this synthesis are the Kaṭha, the Maitrī, and the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣads and the three books of the Anugītā. The first book which exists in a fragmentary paraphrase was undoubtedly older than the Kaṭha Upa., and might be a remnant of the Āraṇyaka of the Sāttvatas, spoken of in the Nārāyaṇīya account in the *Mbh.*¹⁶ In course of time

15 It attributes to Arjuna a weak intellect, and to Kṛṣṇa a faulty memory.

16 Śāntiparvan, ch. 348, verse 31.

an abstract philosophy and an abstract deity ceased to give satisfaction to the common people, and there was a thought-movement among them, as a result of which the great teachers of men, who had taught men to lead better lives, and had, even in their own days, been possibly looked upon as supermen, came to be worshipped as incarnations. This thought-movement was possibly a post-Buddha one, and Kṛṣṇa and the Buddha were very likely deified by their respective followers near about the same time. Then, again, Buddhism, and before it, a number of Upaniṣads, had condemned 'karma', and the result was a social revolution in which the flowers of the youth of the country took to sannyāsa. This meant utter emasculation of the race. It was with a view to check this process that the Gītā emphasised the doctrine of desireless action,¹⁷ a doctrine the bare rudiments of which are found in the Iśa Upa. When the doctrines of *bhakti*, *avatāra*, and desireless action were adopted by Kṛṣṇa's followers, they came to be known as the Bhāgavatas (i.e. worshippers of Bhagavat incarnated as man), and the superb structure of the *Bhg.*, with its architectural incongruities, perhaps more apparent than real, reared its head upon the foundations of Śrīkṛṣṇa's Sāṃkhya-Yoga-Vedānta synthesis, as developed by his followers. The greatest of such followers was Arjuna, and it is a matter for gratification that the true relation between Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna is pointed out in the Gītā. It was not because the two won the Kurukṣetra battle, as much by recourse to deceit and chicanery¹⁸ as by bravery, that Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna came to be regarded as the worshipful. They were undoubtedly great warriors, but they were great religious teachers too. Nor could a man, who has been worshipped as the Supreme Being, have been a voluptuary as the Purāṇas depict him. The true meaning of the Purāṇic legends is obscure, and those who take them in their literal and ostensible sense only desecrate the memory of the greatest of India's religious teachers. Nor was

17 This doctrine appears to have considerably influenced Mahāyāna Buddhism.

18 Such deceit could never have been practised by the disciple of Ghora Āṅgīrasa, and the great originator of the Yoga-Vedānta synthesis. It was allowed by the ethical code of the Brāhmaṇical writer of the *Mbh.*, who was at one with modern diplomats in this respect.

Śrīkṛṣṇa a servile adherent of the Brāhmaṇical social scheme as the *Mbh.* depicts him, for we find him declaring that liberation was within the reach of all, not simply through the path of *bhakti*, as a reluctant priesthood would grudgingly concede, but through the path of knowledge and contemplation, Sāṃkhya-Yoga :

Idaṃ dharmam samāsthāya ye'pi syuḥ pāpayonayah/

Striyo vaiśyās tathā sūdrās te'pi yānti parāṃ gatim//¹⁹

The Sāṃkhya-Yoga-Vedānta synthesis of the *Bhg.* has puzzled western scholars. Garbe thought that the Vedāntic passages were subsequently interpolated into what was originally a Sāṃkhya-Yoga work. Belvalkar retorts that to prove such a hypothesis it must be shown that the Kāṭha and the Svetāśvatara upaniṣds had previously suffered from similar interpolations²⁰

This Sāṃkhya-Yoga-Vedānta synthesis finds favour in all Vaiṣṇava literature including the Vaiṣṇava Purāṇas, though their theism was possibly of a later date. Śaṅkara and his early followers fought shy of the Sāṃkhya, but many of Śaṅkara's latterday followers have sought the help of the Sāṃkhya in explaining phenomena. This great synthesis, this harmonising of non-Brāhmaṇical and Bāhmaṇical philosophies could never have been the work of a mean intellect. Considering its universal acceptance by Vaiṣṇavism, old and new, it would be no wild surmise to hold that this synthesis²¹ was the abiding work of the towering intellectual and spiritual genius of Śrīkṛṣṇa himself. We know of no one else to whom this synthesis might justifiably be traced.

It is hoped that the present thesis will induce a fresh study of the

19 *Anugītā*, ch. IV, verse 61. See also *Bhg.*, IV, 32.

20 See Belvalkar's 'The Svetāśvatara Upaniṣad and the Bhagavadgītā and also the chapter on the Bhagavadgītā in his *Basu Mallik Lectures*, Pt. I. The same remarks hold good of the *Maitrī Upa.*, all the three being Kṛṣṇa Yajurveda Upaniṣads.

21 I have not spoken of a Sāṃkhya-Yoga-Vedānta-Mimāṃsā synthesis for the simple reason that in its early stages, as for instance, in Śrīkṛṣṇa's time, Vedānta had not yet washed its hands entirely clean of *Karma* or *Sacrificialism*.

Anugītā books, and stimulate investigation into the nature of Śrīkṛṣṇa's teachings.

[This paper is my tribute of respect to the memory of the late Mahāmahopādhyāya Haraprāsad Śāstrī who, possessing, as he did, the gift of scientific imagination in an eminent degree, was able to light up many a dark corner in the past history of this country.]

AMARNATH RAY

Who was the Gupta contemporary of the Kadamba king Kākusthavarman ?

A verse in the Tālagunda pillar inscription of Kākusthavarman¹ speaks of the matrimonial alliances that this Kadamba king contracted with the Gupta and other royal families. It runs as follows:—

Gupt-ādi-pārthiva-kul-āmburuha-sthalāni
sneh-ādara-praṇaya-sambhrama-kesarāṇi
śrīmanty-aneka-nṛpa-ṣaṭpada-sevitāni
yo = bodhayad = duhitṛ dīdhitibhir = nṛp ārkkaḥ ।

It has been translated thus:—

“This sun of a king by means of his rays—his daughters—caused to expand the splendid lotus-groups, the royal families of the Guptas and others, the filaments of which were attachment, respect, love and reverence (*for him*) and which were cherished by many bees—the kings *who served them*”. Or, in plain words, this king’s daughters were married to the members of the Gupta and other royal households.

In order to ascertain as to who was the Gupta that was the son-in-law of this Kadamba king, it is necessary to determine, first, the date of Kākusthavarman. Several genuine Western Gaṅga grants² tell us that Mādhava, the father of Avinīta (or Mādhava III, as I shall call him hereafter) had taken to wife the sister of a Kadamba Kṛṣṇavarman. There were two kings of this name in the Kadamba family. We have to find out which of them was the brother-in-law of the Gaṅga king Mādhava III. As Mr. K. N. Dikshit has pointed out³ the identity of this “Kṛṣṇavarman can be established from the fact that he is said in all the records which refer to him to have performed the celebrated Aśvamedha sacrifice”. The Kadamba grants attribute

1 *Ep. Ind.*, VIII, pp. 24 ff.

2 Uttanūr plates of Durvinīta (*Mys. A.R.*, 1916), Gummiraḍḍipura plates of Durvinīta, (*Ibid.*, 1912), Keregoḍi-Raṅgūpura plates of Rājamalla II (*Ibid.*, 1919) and Kūḍlūr plates of Mārasimha (*Ibid.*, 1921).

3 *Ep. Ind.*, XIV, p. 166, f.n. 2.

the performance of this sacrifice only to Kṛṣṇavarman I, the second son of Kākusthavarman.⁴ No reasonable doubt can, therefore, be entertained that Kṛṣṇavarman I was the brother-in-law of Mādhava III. What was the date of Mādhava III? Palæography and the date Śaka 380 supplied by the Jaina work *Lokavibhāga* as the 22nd year of the Pallava king Simhavarman II who anointed on the Gaṅga throne Āyyavarman, the father of Mādhava of the Penukoṇḍa Plates (or Mādhava II as he will be called in the sequel) have enabled Dr. Fleet to fix A.D. 475 as the probable date of Mādhava II.⁵ This Mādhava was not the father of Avinīta and consequently not the brother-in-law of Kṛṣṇavarman I; for the Gaṅga charters state clearly that Avinīta's father was Viṣṇugopa, son of Harivarman who was the son of Mādhava I. Mādhava II was the son of Āyyavarman, who was also the son of Mādhava I; and it is not unlikely that Harivarman and Āyyavarman were identical, for, as Rice has pointed out, 'Āyya or Āryya may be intended for an improvement on Ari' the Dravidian form of Hari which is the first part of the name Harivarman.⁶ If this identification is correct, Mādhava II would be a brother of Viṣṇugopa, the grandfather of Avinīta. Otherwise, Harivarman and Āyyavarman will have to be regarded, as has been done by Prof. Dubreuil,⁷ as two different sons of Mādhava I and consequently brothers. In this case Mādhava II would be a cousin of Viṣṇugopa. Thus, Mādhava III would be either a brother's son or a cousin's son of Mādhava II. In either case he would be removed only by one generation from Mādhava II of the Penukoṇḍa Plates. The latter's date being A.D. 475, the period of Mādhava III would be about A.D. 475-500. His brother-in-law and contemporary Kṛṣṇavarman I of the Kadamba dynasty would also have to be relegated to the same time, *viz.*, A.D. 475-500 or thereabout. We arrive at the same result if we

4 Prof. Jouveau-Dubreuil's identification of the Kṛṣṇavarman, the brother-in-law of Mādhava III, with Kṛṣṇavarman II is not tenable as the latter is not known to have performed any horse sacrifice.

5 *JRAS.*, 1915, p. 471 ff.

6 *Ep. Ind.*, XIV, p. 332. Harivarman is actually called Arivarman in the Tanjore Plates (*Ind. Ant.*, VIII, p. 212).

7 *Ancient History of the Deccan*, p. 107.

work backwards from the initial year of the reign of the Kadamba king Harivarman which Mr. K. N. Dikshit has shown to be A.D. 538.⁸ This is a landmark in the Kadamba chronology. Here it is necessary to bear in mind that the verse quoted above states in unmistakable terms that it was Kākusthavarman, not his father Bhagīrathavarman as supposed by Rev. Heras⁹, who gave his daughters in marriage to Gupta and other families and that the marriages were celebrated by him when he was a king and not a prince. Moreover, the Tālagunda inscription which describes the achievements of all the predecessors of Kākustha does not say a word about any family alliance between the Kadambas and the Guptas during the reign of Bhagīrathavarman. It has been shown above that Mādhava III, one of the sons-in-law of Kākusthavarman flourished between *cir.* A.D. 475 and 500. Kākusthavarman must have, therefore, lived till A.D. 475. The marriage of Mādhava III might have taken place in that very year or one or two years later. The marriage of another daughter of Kākusthavarman with the Vākāṭaka king Narendrasena took place in about A.D. 445¹⁰ for the marriage of his grandfather Rudrasena has been shown by Dr. V. A. Smith to have been celebrated in about A.D. 395.¹¹ Since, as stated above, it was in the capacity of a king that Kākusthavarman performed the marriage of his daughters, he must have been on the throne in A.D. 445. Allowing some time for Kākusthavarman to have a daughter of the marriageable age in 445, his accession may be placed in about 435. We may, therefore, conclude that his date was *cir.* A.D. 435 to 475. And the Tālagunda inscription of this king has been assigned by Prof. Rapson to the 5th century A.D.¹²

So the Gupta sovereign that was ruling at this period was Kumāragupta I whose reign lasted from A.D. 414 to 455. He was thus an elder contemporary of Kākusthavarman. But since his father Candragupta II had a fairly long reign of about 35 years, Kumāragupta must have come to the throne at an advanced age. Consequently, he must have been an old man when Kākusthavarman was anointed ruler

8 *Ep. Ind.*, XIV, p. 166.

9 *JBORS.*, XII, p. 460.

10 Dubreuil's *Ancient History of the Deccan*, p. 75.

11 *JRAS.*, 1914, p. 326.

12 *Andhra Coins*, Introduction, p. lv.

of the Kadamba dominions. Hence it is not probable that his wife was a daughter of Kākusthavarman. It is therefore quite reasonable to think that either Skandagupta or Puragupta was the son-in-law of the Kadamba monarch. Whether this marriage was celebrated during the life time of Kumāragupta or afterwards, it is not possible to say at present.

But Rev. Heras is of opinion that Kākusthavarman's daughter was the wife of Kumāragupta, that it was Bhagīrathavarman who gave his grand-daughter in marriage to the Gupta king while his son Kākusthavarman was yet a prince and that the marriage was celebrated in about 391-392 during the reign of Candragupta.¹³ He bases his conclusions on the tradition recorded in a verse in the *Śṛṅgāra-Prakāśa* of Bhoja that Vikramāditya (i.e. Candragupta II) sent his poet Kālidāsa on an embassy to the court of a Kuntala king. This embassy, he says, finds support in a verse in the *Aucityavicāracarcā* of Kṣemendra (wrongly attributed by Rev. Heras to Hemacandra). This Kuntala king he takes to be the Kadamba king Bhagīrathavarman. It may be that the Kadambas were the rulers of Kuntala or a part of it. But there are reasons to think that the Vākāṭakas were also known as the 'lords of Kuntala' in the period with which we are concerned. The work entitled *Bharatacarita* states clearly that the author of the well known Prākṛt poem *Setubandha* was a Kuntaleśa.¹⁴ Bāna tells us in his *Harṣacarita* that this poem was composed by Pravarasena.¹⁵ This Pravarasena has been rightly identified with the Vākāṭaka king Pravarasena II. It thus becomes clear that Pravarasena II was also called Kuntaleśa. And we know that some of the Vākāṭaka kings lay claim to the conquest of Kuntala.¹⁶ It is therefore possible that Kālidāsa might have been sent to the Vākāṭaka court. And as later tradition attributes this work to Kālidāsa, we may suppose that he wrote it for Pravarasena when he was in the Vākāṭaka court as an ambassador. Thus, since the Vākāṭakas were also known as 'lords of Kuntala', granting that the title was a mere boast, as Rev. Heras would have it, it cannot be asserted that it was to a Kadamba king that Kālidāsa was

13 *JBORS.*, XII, pp. 458 ff.

14 *ABOI.*, V, p. 46.

15 *Harṣacarita*, I, verse 14.

16 Ajanta Inscription, *Arch. Sur. of W. India*, IV, pp. 124 ff.

sent by Candragupta II. Moreover the date of Kālidāsa is still an open question. It is not certain whether he was a protégé of the Gupta emperor Candragupta II. Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar is of opinion that Kālidāsa's patron was Yaśodharman of the Mandasor inscription (A.D. 532).¹⁷ In view of these facts, the embassy of Kālidāsa to the court of a Kuntala king cannot help us in drawing any conclusions about the family relations of the Guptas and the Kadambas. As has been pointed out above, the marriage of the Kadamba princess was performed by Kākusthavarman himself during his reign which commenced about A.D. 435, that is to say, long after the death of Candragupta II and Bhagīrathavarman. It is not therefore possible to accept the views of Rev. Heras. Nor can we agree with Mr. Moraes who, while rejecting the supposition that the Gupta son-in-law of Kākustha was Kumāragupta, follows Rev. Heras in holding that "it was Candragupta II who made overtures to Bhagīratha to form a marriage alliance" and thinks that the marriage was celebrated during the latter's reign in 410-11 A.D.¹⁸

N. LAKSHMINARAYAN RAO

¹⁷ *Sir Asutosh Memorial Volume*, pp. 75 ff.

¹⁸ *The Kadamba Kula*, p. 27.

Two Saura Images from the District of 24-Parganas

The low lying wild tracts, on the south of the present district of 24-Parganas, have yielded, after reclamation, numerous antiquarian remains of considerable archæological and artistic merit (vide my Monographs published by the Varendra Research Society). In the present paper I propose to describe, in detail, two stone sculptures, discovered from this area. One of them (Fig. 1) is a Sūrya image, while the other (Fig. 2) is a Navagraha slab. The Sūrya image was found by a villager about ten years ago, together with a Śivaliṅga of black shale, in the course of the excavation of a tank at Kashipore, a village under the Jaynagore P.S. of the Alipore sub-division. When I collected it, the image was broken into two parts from the lower portion of its body. Now it is bound together by wire. The upper part of its right hand as also the side figures are missing.

This sculpture is 2' 5½" high and made of bluish basalt stone. In it the Sun-god is depicted almost in the round with a plain circular halo round the head. He wears a cap-like head-dress, from underneath which curls of hair descend on each shoulder, a short necklace, apparently of beads with a rectangular bar in the centre, plain bracelets, and a long tunic, similar to that of the Sūrya image found in the niche of the Gupta temple of Bhumara.¹ This kind of dress is also seen in the Kushan images² and is evidently the Udīcya (northern) dress, which Varāhamihira assigns to the Sun-god in his *Bṛhat Saṃhitā*. In each of his two hands there is a lotus stalk, rising just above the shoulders and terminating in a bunch of lotuses, unlike a single lotus as depicted in the later images. The waist is tied round by a belt, with two hanging tassels from the stud in the centre. Along the left side there is a sword, kept in position by means of a strap.

In front of the image is the figure of Aruṇa, the charioteer of the Sun-god. Only the upper part of his body is visible. He holds a goad

1 Vide plate XIV, *Memoirs of the Archæological Survey of India*, No. 16.

2 Vide plate XII, *Catalogue of the Museum of Archæology at Sanchi*.

in his right hand and the reins of the Sun-god's horses in his left. Beneath this figure, on the pedestal, is carved the body of the chariot with its wheel as well as seven horses. Below these carvings on either side of the bottom of the pedestal is a human figure in semi-prostrate posture.

Besides the circular halo and the curly hairs, this image of the Sun-god has thick lips, a round face, and long drawn eyes. His body is visible up to the knees, and the posture in which he stands apparently shows that his legs are inside the hollow of the car. The *Bṛhat Saṃhitā* and other Sanskrit books enjoin that the Sun-god is to be represented up to the knees, and it may be the probable reason why his figure is shown in that way. This peculiarity also occurs in the other early Sūrya images.³ On the chariot also, just above the horses, there are three decorative designs with a pointed semi-circular projection on the top and two leaf-like projections on the two sides, resembling the Caitya window of the Gupta period.⁴

So far as I know, only one Sūrya image of this type has hitherto been discovered in Bengal, and assigned, on the grounds of style, to the late Gupta period. It is now in the V.R.S. Museum at Rajshahi, and comes from the Bogra district.⁵ In essential features this image is almost similar to the one described above, but differs in dress. The upper half of its body is bare like the later images and the lower half only is clad in a short, tied round the waist.

The next sculpture, I wish to describe here, is a Navagraha slab, referred to above. About 25 years ago it was unearthed by a cultivator from the ruins of Kaṅkandīghi, in lot no. 26, under the Mathurapore P.S. of the Diamond Harbour sub-division. It is in a very good state of preservation and is made of black clay chlorite stone, the height and length being 1' 7" and 3' 3" respectively. In it the images of the nine planets, as prescribed by the Hindu astrology, with that of Gaṇeśa, are carved in relief. They are standing in a line on a single full blown

3 Vide figure 54, Sarkar's *Mandirer Kathā*, Konārak, Rao's *Iconography*, plate lxxxviii, fig. 2; Cunningham's A. S. vol. V.

4 • Vide plates III, XII, XIV, *Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India*, No. 16.

5 Vide figure 1, V.R.S. Annual Report for 1926-27.

lotus, extending from the foremost figure of Gaṇeśa to that Ketu, the ninth planet, instead of a separate small lotus for every individual figure, as found in the other Navagraha images. Each of the figures has over the head an oval halo with lotus border and a snake-head-like design between them, and wears a sacred thread and a short skirt tied round the waist by a girdle. Their other peculiarities from the left are noted below.

1. Gaṇeśa. Stands in Abhaṅga pose, wears a Jaṭā-mukuṭa, a pair of bracelets of beads, and holds in his right hand a rosary and in his left a battle axe.

2. Ravi (Sun). Stands in Samabhaṅga attitude, wears a Kirīṭa Mukuṭa, a necklace, a pair of bracelets and a Banamālā hanging up to the knees, and holds, as usual, in his either hand a lotus stalk terminating in two lotuses, just above the shoulders.

3. Soma (Moon). Stands in Abhaṅga attitude, wears a Kirīṭa Mukuṭa, a necklace, a pair of bracelets, a pair of armlets and holds a rosary in the right hand and a Kamaṇḍalu in the left.

4. Maṅgala (Mars). Stands in the same pose as the above image, wears a Kirīṭa Mukuṭa and other ornaments like the image of the moon and holds a rosary in the right hand and a spear in the left.

5. Budha (Mercury). Stands in Tribhaṅga attitude with his left leg half bent. Wears a peculiar head-dress and other ornaments as in the above two images and holds with his two hands an arrow. Along the left side is a big bow, placed on his shoulder, extending upto his feet.

6. Br̥haspati (Jupiter). A pot-bellied figure with long beard. Stands in Abhaṅga pose, wears a Jaṭā Mukuṭā and other ornaments like Budha, and holds a rosary in the right hand and a Kamaṇḍalu in the left.

7. Śukra (Venus). Stands in Abhaṅga attitude, wears a Kirīṭa Mukuṭa and other ornaments as in the above images, and holds in his right hand a rosary and in the left a Kamaṇḍalu.

8. Saṅi (Saturn). Stands in a peculiar attitude, owing to his paralytic affection caused by a curse, wears a Kirīṭa Mukuṭa and other




Fig. 1—Sūrya




Fig. 2—Navaṅgaha

IIIQ., March, 1933

ornaments like Śukra, and holds a rosary in his right hand and a staf in his left.

9. Rāhu (Ascending Node). A big mouthed figure having onl. the upper part of a human body. He is seated on a chariot, and wears a head-dress like modern tiara and other ornaments as in the above images, has a pair of big moustaches, and holds with his two hands an unfolded book. He has a small eye on the forehead and a hood of snakes over the Mukuṭa.

10. Ketu (Descending Node). It is a human figure, in Abhaṅgā attitude with the lower part like a serpent tail. Wears a Mukuṭa-like tiara and other ornaments as in the body of Rāhu, has a hood of snake heads over the Mukuṭa, and holds a sword in his right hand and a shield in his left.

Below the lotus, on which the above images of the planets stand, are carved in low relief, the stems and leaves of the lotus plant in scrolls, with the main stem in the centre and the Vāhanas (carriers) of the planets within and below them. Among the Vāhanas, the following are from the left, within the stems and leaves of the lotus plant :

A lion, swan, boar, deer, elephant, jackal, buffalo, fish, vulture, and the following are beneath them : a mouse, horse, ram, peacock, dog, swan, frog, ass, chariot.

Over the halos of the images of the planets there is a border in relief with three decorative designs, one in the centre and two on the two sides, like Makara heads, placed back to back. Upon that on the upper and on a portion of the side edges of the slab are depicted flames of fire.

In most of the Navagraha slabs hitherto discovered, all the images of the planets are found standing side by side, as in this sculpture, though there are a few where they are depicted in seated postures.⁶ Their separate and detached figures are very rare with the exception of the Sungod. The reason may be attributed to the fact that they were not independently worshipped, as even now the Hindus do not worship

6 Vide figure 30, *Mandirer Kathā, Konārak*, p. 56, plate XVIII; *Hand Book to the Sculptures in the Museum of the Baṅgīya Sāhitya Pariṣad*.

them separately under the belief that this may offend the other planets. So far as I know only two detached images of the planets have been discovered uptill now, one of the moon at Mandla⁷ and the other of the Rāhu and Ketu at Chidambaram.⁸

The number of such Navagraha slabs found in Bengal up to the present time is also not very considerable. Only four were discovered before in the North Bengal. They are now preserved in the collection of the Varendra Research Society. From their descriptions, published in the Catalogue of the Museum of the above society, we know that two of them contain figures of Gaṇeśa as in the image from Kaṅkaṅdīghi. This peculiarity is seen in these Bengal sculptures alone, and the probable reason for it may be traced to the fact that Gaṇeśa being believed to be the remover of all obstacles (*vighnāntaka*), his image was placed before those of the nine planets, who are supposed to influence the destinies of mankind.

In the Orissan temples such sculptures are seen, placed on the doorways, as architraves. According to Mr. Monmohan Ganguly the introduction of these images in the temples was invariably meant to ensure prosperity to their founders, and to prevent any evil happening to the temples themselves." In the South Indian temples also such images, carved in slabs, are found within the enclosed Verāndahs, round the central shrine. But how they were placed in the temples of Bengal is not definitely known as there is no old temple in this province with such a sculpture fixed in situ.

These two images and the other sculptures, which have hitherto been found in this part of South Bengal, are all chance finds in stray diggings from many of the old sites lying unexplored here. The most extensive among them are the ruins at Kaṅkaṅdīghi, referred to above in lot no. 26. They cover more than one hundred acres of land and are situated with many brick mounds near the temple of Jaṭār Deul. Besides this Navagraha slab, a colossal Viṣṇu image of black shale, a

7 Vide *Descriptive List of Exhibits in the Archæological Section of the Nagpore Museum*, plate I, fig. 1.

8 Vide Sastri's *South Indian Images of Gods and Goddesses*, pp. 239-41, fig. 145.

9 *Orissa and Her Remains*, p. 185.

beautiful. Sūrya image of bronze, some old potteries, as also other sculptures were unearthed a few years ago from this area. The river Raidighi Gang, which flows along the western side of this tract is also studded with ruins on both banks. Foundations of buildings, built of large bricks, exposed due to river erosion, are still visible there during the ebb tide, about 16 feet below the present bank of the Gang. From these and other numerous antiquities, discovered in its adjoining area¹⁰ it appears that in the pre-Muhammadan age, this place was the centre of culture of this part of the Gangetic delta.

The site is well worthy of trial excavations, which if fruitful, would be likely to throw light on the obscure history of the Sundarbans.

KALIDAS DATTA

¹⁰ Vide my paper on the Antiquities of Khari and Sundarbans. V.R.S. Monographs.

Epigraphic Notes

I.—Genealogy of the Śālaṅkāyanas

While editing the Kolleru (Kollair) grant¹ of the Śālaṅkāyana Mahārāja Nandivarman, son of Caṇḍavarman, Dr. Fleet remarked: "In Sir W. Elliot's fascimiles I have another copper-plate inscription of Vijayanandivarmā and his *Yucamahārāja*, whose name seems to be Vijayatuṅgavarmā or Vijayabuddhavarmā." He appended the following note to the name of the *Yucamahārāja*: "The original (l. 3) has 'Vijayabuṅgavarmassa', and in the margin, a little above the line, there is the character *ddha*, differing not much from *ṅga* as there written, apparently intended to be introduced somewhere in the line as a correction." As we shall presently see, this statement regarding the inscription was found wrong and was subsequently corrected by Dr. Fleet himself. But unfortunately the mistake is perpetuated in later writings on the Śālaṅkāyana genealogy.

En passant, I may draw the attention of readers to the names of these kings generally accepted and used by scholars. The names can hardly be Vijayanandivarman, Vijayabuddhavarman and the like.

Śālaṅkāyana inscriptions are stated to be issued from Śrīvijayaveṅgīpura, Vijayaveṅgīpura or Vijayaveṅgī. The Kadamba grants² are generally issued from Śrīvijayavaijayantī, Śrīvijayatriparvata and Śrīvijayapalāśikā. The Maṭṭepaḍ plates³ of Dāmodaravarman were issued from Vijayakandarapura. We have also references to Śrīvijayakāñcīpura,⁴ Śrīvijayapalakkada⁵ and Śrīvijayadaśanapura⁶ in many of the Pallava inscriptions. There can be no doubt that the names of the places are Veṅgīpura, Kañcīpura, Vaijayantī, Palāśikā etc. and that *Vijaya* or *Śrīvijaya* has been prefixed to them simply for the sake of glorification. I have no doubt that the name of the Śālaṅkāyana Mahārāja of the Kollair grant is similarly Nandivarman,

1 *IA.*, V, pp. 175 ff. (Sanskrit and old Canarese Inscriptions: No. XVIII.).

2 See the Kadamba grants edited by Fleet in *IA.*, vols. VI and VII.

3 *EI.*, XVII, 327 ff.

4 *ibid.*, III, 142 ff.

5 *IA.*, V, 50 ff.

6 *E.I.*, I, 297; *I.A.*, 154 ff.

and not Śrīvijaya- or Vijaya-nandivarman, as is generally taken to be. *Vijaya* and *Śrīvijaya*, in such cases, mean *Vijayayukta* and *Śrīvijaya-yukta* respectively; when prefixed to proper names, they form examples of the *Śākapārthivādi* (*Karmadhāraya*) class of the *Tatpuruṣa* compound. It must also be noted in this connection that in the Kanteru (A) and the Pedavegi plates, the reigning Śālaṅkāyana king is simply called Nandivarman without *Vijaya* prefixed to his name.

To come to our point. The scholar, who first accepted the wrong information of Fleet, seems to be Prof. Dubreuil, the author of the *Ancient History of the Deccan* (Eng. tran., 1920). Before his work was published, a Prākṛit copper-plate inscription of another Śālaṅkāyana *Mahārāja* Devavarman was discovered near Ellore. It was then edited by Dr. Hultsch in *Ep. Ind.*, IX, 56ff. In the *Anc. Hist. Dec.*, Prof. Dubreuil, therefore, speaks of four Śālaṅkāyana monarchs, viz., (1) Devavarman of the Ellore plates; (2) Caṇḍavarman and his son; (3) Nandivarman of the Kollair plates; and (4) Buddhavarman, son of (3) Nandivarman, mentioned in the facsimile referred to by Fleet. As regards Buddhavarman, Dubreuil has quoted the passage of Dr. Fleet and remarked: "This name is probably Buddhavarmā, for in the margin, there is the character 'dha'".⁷ Evidently the Professor commits another mistake when he writes that the letter in the margin is 'dha' and not 'ddha' as is attested by Fleet.

The mistake was next repeated by Mr. K. V. Lakshmana Rao, who edited the two copper-plate grants discovered at Kanteru, one belonging to the Śālaṅkāyana *Mahārāja* Nandivarman and the other to the Śālaṅkāyana *Mahārāja* Skandavarman.⁸ Like Prof. Dubreuil, Lakshmana Rao has quoted the same passage of Fleet and has taken 'Vijaya Buddhavarman' as a king belonging to the Śālaṅkāyana dynasty.⁹ It is to be noted that Fleet hesitatingly proposed an alternative of two names, viz., Tuṅgavarman and Buddhavarman with a

⁷ *AHD.*, Eng. tr., p. 89.

⁸ *JAHRS.*, V, 26 ff.; the plates appear to be originally edited by Mr. Lakshmana Rao in the Journal of the Andhra Academy or the *Andhra-Sāhitya-Parīṣat-Patrikā*, XI, 113 ff.

⁹ *JAHRS.*, V, p. 26.

slight inclination towards the latter; then Dubreuil preferred the name Buddhavarman, and now Lakshmana Rao takes Buddhavarman as an established name in the Śālaṅkāyana genealogy.

Next we come to Mr. Subba Rao, who has edited the Pedavegi copper-plates of the Śālaṅkāyana Mahārāja Nandivarman II.¹⁰ He refers to five inscriptions belonging to the Śālaṅkāyana kings. "Of these a Prākṛt inscription which was discovered by Mr. Elliot remains unpublished; but two kings mentioned in it are known to us as Vijayanandivarman Yuvamahārāja (!!!) and Vijayabuddhavarman. The late Mr. Lakshmana Rao edited in *Andhra Sāhitya Parishat Patrikā*, vol. XI, two Śālaṅkāyana inscriptions discovered in Kanteru near Guntur and these belong to Nandivarman and Skandavarman. Another Śālaṅkāyana inscription discovered in Kollair lake and (sic.) which belongs to Vijaya Nandivarman, eldest son of Caṇḍavarman, was published in *Indian Antiquary*, vol. V by Mr. Elliot (? Fleet.). A Prākṛt inscription discovered at Ellore which belongs to Vijayadevavarman was published in *Epigraphia Indica*, vol. IX."¹¹ By this time everything is complete.

I doubt, whether all the inscriptions, edited by Fleet in his well-known 'Sanskrit and Old-Canarese Inscriptions' series have been carefully read by these scholars. It is however, wrong to say that "a Prakrit inscription which was discovered by Mr. Elliot remains unpublished." It was actually published by Dr. Fleet in *Ind. Ant.*, IX 100ff. (*Sanskrit and Old-Canarese Inscriptions*, No. LXXIV). "This is the grant of Vijayabuddhavarman," he says there, "of which I have spoken at vol. V, p. 175. I now give the text from the original plates which belong to Sir Watter Elliot." Fleet's reading of the first plate of the grant is as follows:—

L. 1.	Siddha	Sirivijayakhandavamma-mahārājassa	samv-
			vachhara.....
L. 2.	Yuvamahārājassa	Bhārattāyaṇa	Pallavā- ...
L. 3.	ṇaṃ	Śirivijayabuddhavamma	devi ...
L. 4.	kūjana vibā (?)	rudevī Kadā	(?) vīya ...

10 *Ibid.*, I, 92 ff.

11 *Ibid.*, p. 93.

No argument is necessary to prove that the inscription belongs to the Pallavas and refers to king Skandavarman and the Crown-prince Buddhavarman, and that it has nothing to do with the Śālaṅkāyanas. Dr. Fleet himself was conscious of what he said before, and remarked: "And Vijayabuddhavarmā is said to be a Pallava, and of the Bhāraṭṭāyanagotra. There is, therefore, no genealogical connection between the Vijayabuddhavarmā of this grant and the Vijayanandivarmā of the Veṅgī grant at vol. V, p. 175, who was of the Śālaṅkāyana gotra."¹²

This inscription has been carefully re-edited by Prof. Hultzsch in *Ep. Ind.*, VIII, 143ff. We give here the text of the first plate as deciphered by Hultzsch along with his translation.

Siddha

L. 1. Siri-vijaya-khandava[m]ma-mahārājassa saṃvachchar-
[ā] . . . [1*]

L. 2. Yuvamahārājassa Bhāraddāyassa Pallavā-

L. 3. ṇaṃ Si[ri]-vijaya-Buddhavammassa devī [Bu]ddhi.

L. 4. kura-janavī Chārudevī Ka[ḍake] vīya . . . [1*]

"Success! The years . . . (of the reign) of the glorious Mahārāja Vijaya-Skandavarman. Chārudevī, the queen of the Yuvamahārāja, the Bhāradvāja, the glorious Vijaya-Buddhavarman (of the family) of the Pallavas, (and) mother of [Buddyaṅ]-kura, (addresses the following order) to the official at Ka[ṭaka]."¹³

There can, then, be no question of a Buddhavarman in the family of the Śālaṅkāyanas. The following kings are so far known, from inscriptions to have belonged to the Śālaṅkāyana dynasty.

1. Ellore Prākṛt grant: (1) Devavarman.
2. Kollair Sanskrit grant: (2) Nandivarman, eldest son of Caṇḍavarman.
3. Kanteru Sanskrit grant A: (1) Nandivarman.
4. „ „ B. A: (1) Skandavarman.

¹² *IA.*, IX, 101.


¹³ *El.*, VIII, 146.

5. Pedavegi Sanskrit grant: (1) Hastivarman
 (2) Nandivarman I, son of
 Hastivarman.
 (3) Caṇḍavarman, son of
 Nandivarman I.
 (4) Nandivarman II, eldest son of
 Caṇḍavarman.

There can be no doubt that the Nandivarman of the Kollair grant is identical with Nandivarman II of the Pedavegi grant, since both of them are described as 'the eldest son of Caṇḍavarman' in the inscriptions. It is, however, not quite clear whether the Nandivarman of the Kanteru grant A. is identical with either of the two Nandivarmans of the Pedavegi grant or he is a third king different from them. Nevertheless, it seems reasonable to identify him with Nandivarman II of the Pedavegi grant. In both the Kanteru and the Pedavegi grants, Nandivarman II is called *Bhagaraccitrarathasvāmi-pādānuudyāto vappabhaṭṭārakapādabhaktaḥ paramabhāgarataś Śālaṅkāyano mahārāja Śrīnandivarmā*. The Kollair grant also has *Bhagaraccitrarathasvāmi-pādānuudyāto vappabhaṭṭārakapādabhakta-paramabhāgarataś Śālaṅkāyano* etc. It is also to be noted that this king has the epithet *paramabhāgarata* in all these three inscriptions, and that no other Śālaṅkāyana king is known to use that epithet. It appears, then, almost certain that the Nandivarman of the Kanteru plates is also, like the king of the same name of the Kollair plates, identical with Nandivarman II of the Pedavegi plates. There is, however, nothing in the inscriptions from which we can determine the precise relationship to which Devavarman and Skandavarman stood to the line of these four kings.

As the Ellore grant is written in Prākṛt, there can hardly be any doubt that king Devavarman ruled before Skandavarman and Nandivarman II, both of whom use Sanskrit in their inscriptions. Devavarman, therefore, should be placed before Hastivarman, who appears to have been succeeded regularly by his son, grandson and great-grandson. Considering the facts that the inscriptions of Nandivarman II are, on palæographic grounds, to be assigned to about the middle of the 5th century A.D. and that he was preceded by three kings of his line, it

seems probable that Skandavarman of the Kanteru grant came after Nandivarman II. We, however, do not know whether Devavarman was the immediate predecessor of Hastivarman and Skandavarman, the immediate successor of Nandivarman II. The genealogical table then stands as the following :



In conclusion it may be pointed out that this Śālaṅkāyana Hastivarman of the Pedavegi plates can hardly be any other than the Vaiṅgeyaka-Hastivarman mentioned in the famous Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudragupta.¹⁴ The main arguments in favour of this assertion are the following :

(1) The Śālaṅkāyana is the only dynasty which can be called Vaiṅgeyaka, as all the grants of the Śālaṅkāyana kings are issued from Veṅgīpura. No other early dynasty is known to have its headquarters at the city of Veṅgī.¹⁵

14 *CI.*, III. No. 1, l. 20; see also *JAHRS.*, I, 93.

15 It may be noted that a Sanskrit grant belonging to the Pallava *Dharmamahārāja* Siṃhavarman (*IA.*, V, 154) refers to Veṅgorāṣṭra. The grant was issued from Srīvijayadaśanapura which has been identified by Venkayya with Darsi in the Nellore District. According to Venkayya and Dubreuil, the Pallavas were, about the time of Siṃhavarman, in possession of parts of the Nellore and the Guntur Districts. It is not impossible that Siṃhavarman's kingdom included the southernmost part of the Veṅgī country. There is, however, as yet no evidence to prove that the Pallavas were ever in possession of the city of Veṅgī. We must also note that even the grandfather of this Siṃhavarman used Sanskrit in his inscription. (cf. Omgodu plates of Skandavarman II, *II.*, XV. 246 ff). It is generally accepted that Sanskrit was introduced in Southern inscriptions about the 4th century A.D. Siṃhavarman, therefore, seems to have come long after the time of Samudragupta.

(2) The Śālaṅkāyanas ruled, according to Dubreuil, 'between 350 and 450 A.D.',¹⁶ and Burnell thought that the Kollair grant of Nandivarman II may be palæographically assigned to about the 4th century A.D.¹⁷ It is then generally accepted that the Śālaṅkāyanas ruled contemporaneously with the early Guptas (320-467 A.D.).

As regards the date proposed by Dubreuil, it may be said that the Śālaṅkāyanas certainly began to rule long before 350 A.D. Dr. H. C. Raychowdhuri¹⁸ has rightly identified the Śālaṅkāyanas with the Salakenoi mentioned in the *Geography of Ptolemy* (about 140 A.D.). Ptolemy says: "Beyond the Maisoloi (cf. Masuli-pattan) are the Salakēnoi near the Arouaia mountains, with the following cities: Benagouron 140° 24'; Kastrā 138° 19' 30'; Magaris 137° 30' 18' 20'."¹⁹ Benagouron, the premier city of the Śālaṅkāyanas appears to me to be a mistake for Bengaouron (Beṅgapura; cf. Veṅgorāṣṭra), which is no other than the well-known Veṅgīpura.

As regards the conjecture of Dr. Burnell, it may be said that, if we compare the characters of the Kollair plates²⁰ with those of the inscriptions of the early Eastern Calukyas²¹ and of the Viṣṇukunḍins,²² it becomes impossible for us to accept such an early date for the Kollair grant. I have no hesitation in asserting that palæography has nothing to say against the ascription of the inscriptions of Nandivarman II to the middle of the 5th century A.D. It is, then, quite possible that his great-grandfather ruled about a century earlier and was a contemporary of Samudragupta (about 330-375 A.D., according to Smith).

(3) Lastly, excepting this Śālaṅkāyana Hastivarman, we do not know of any other king, who ruled at Veṅgī, whose name was Hastivarman and who can be any how placed in the middle of the 4th century A.D. i.e. the time of Samudragupta.

DINES CHANDRA SIRCAR

16 *AHD.*, Eng. tr., p. 89.

17 *South Ind. Pal.* 14 & n. 2; *I.A.*, V, 176.

18 *Pol. Hist. Anc. Ind.*, 3rd. ed., 341 n.

19 *Geog.*, VII, i, 79.

20 *I.A.*, V, 176 Pls.

21 See e.g., Satara plates of Viṣṇuvarddhana I, *I.A.*, XIX, 30; Polamuru plates of Jayasiṃha I, *JAHRS.*, IV, 72.

22 See e.g., the Polamuru plates of Mādhavavarman, who cannot be much earlier than the Eastern Cālukya Jayasiṃha I, *JAHRS.*, VI, 17.

Formal Elements in Indian Inscriptions

The treatment of the formal character of Indian inscriptions is connected with the classification of the inscriptions themselves. A votive inscription cannot be ranked with a historical record, giving the genealogy of a dynasty, the date, the account of all the real or exaggerated exploits of a ruler, the subdued countries and kings, and thus serving as an invaluable source for geography, history etc. Nevertheless, from the point of view of a study of the formal elements in Indian inscriptions, one has to abstract from the historical and non-historical the records which are religious and quasi-religious. To decide the class, to which an inscription belongs, one has to ask whether the inscription has been issued by an official authority or not. Even in those inscriptions, the contents of which are deeds of grant, religious endowments, donations, passages commemorating the erection of a public work, panegyric descriptions of personal events there are also found the essential parts of an official procedure.

The production of such an inscription in the office of a ruler justifies an inquiry into its formal parts. Not only to get an insight into the working of the bureaucratic apparatus of the royal court are these formulas helpful but also they serve as a guide for chronological considerations, when other sources are lacking; the genuineness of such documents can be easily proved, because nowhere else than in these formulas does a forger commit a slip so easily. Finally, there is one point more, more important perhaps from the general view of history and human culture viz., the question, whether the developing of the formal side is an indigenous feature of India, or, whether we have to take into account a foreign influence.

Our starting point, in any case, should be the earliest representatives of the epigraphic literature, the inscriptions of Aśoka, not only from their chronological priority, but also, because of their fulfilling

1 For a classification of Indian inscriptions according to their contents see Fleet, *Imperial Gazetteer of India, the Indian Empire*, II, pp. 50 ff.

the condition required, viz., that they are enunciations of a ruler issued from his chancellery.

The opening formula consists of a statement that the following enunciation, relating to religion,² was caused to be written by the king; the circumstance that the sentence occur only twice in RE I and RE XIV seems to point to the use of a general introductory. While RE III, V, VI, IX begin with: the king speaks thus, the remaining inscriptions lead *medias in res*, in few cases only putting the king in the beginning of the sentence as subject (RE II, IV, VIII, XIII against VII, X, XII). Something like a date we meet in RE III after the opening sentence with *evam āha, dbādasa vāsābhisitena mayā idam āñapitam*; in RE IV at the end of the text we read: *dbādasa vāsābhisitena Devānampriyena Priyudasinā rāñā idam lekhāpitam*.³ From the date of the *mahāmātra*-institution in RE V, Kh. 14, leaving aside the date of the inscription itself, one must conclude that the king wanted only to fix chronologically the development of his religious and moral ideas, as he emphasizes his authorship of the confessions and efforts. So I would be inclined to consider RE I-XIV as of one type except the differences stated in RE XIV by the king himself. As a proof of such a view we may refer to the uniformity of the text and engraving of each of the inscriptions in the same order on the same rock.

A new element is introduced into the separate inscriptions at Dhauli and Jaugaḍa. Dh. S. I. runs as follows: *Devānampiyasa vacanena Tosaliyaṃ mahāmāta nagalariyohālakā ratariya*, while J. begins: *Devānampiye hevaṃ āhā Samāpāyaṃ mahāmātā* etc. The second form, reminding the usual introduction in RE, has surely to be taken in the sense of *vacanena*, according to the order of the king, and with slight difference, due to the government, the same wording is found

2 Hultzsch uses the term "rescript on morality" (*CHI.*, 1, p. 2, n. 2), the word 'rescript,' however, has such a specific meaning that it can hardly be applied to *dhammalipi*: cf. Buehler, *Ep. Ind.*, II, p. 472, n. 23, who has noted the collective sense of *dhammalipi*.

3 From the sentences: *etāya athāya ayaṃ dhammalipi* or *idam likhitā*, or *lekhāpitā*, or *lekhāpitam* (RE., IV, V, VI) it is to be seen, that the drafting is meant, not the engraving. Of. Dh. and J. SE.

in Dh. II and J. II. Further the place is given, the seat of the provincial officers, as in Dh. RE I and J. RE I. Finally, on the Jaugada rock these two separate edicts are clearly distinguished from others and "the separation of these two edicts is more distinctly marked by the accompaniment of the *svastika* symbol at each of the upper corners of the upper inscription, and of the letter *m* at the upper corners of the lower inscription".⁴ The *m* has been explained, in connection with the *svastika*, being a monogram consisting of two Brāhmī *o*, as the final letter of the sacred syllable *om*. One would feel inclined to connect the letter *m* with the marks on the punch-marked coins,⁵ where sometimes two *ms* appear, one on each side of a dotted circle. Whether the latter or the former explanation is correct there is no doubt that these symbols are of an auspicious character, expressed in later inscriptions by word.

The formula: *Devānaṃpiye Piṅgāsi lāja herama āha*, occurring in each PE, repeated not less than ten times in PE VII, cannot be considered as anything else but as giving prominence to the royal view, a self-complacency of an extraordinary kind. While the indication tells us often, when the *dhañmalipi* has been caused to be written, the inscription itself is not dated therewith.⁶ Although the observation, made by Fleet, accepted by Hultzsch,⁷ is correct, according to which the PE VII ends with a date, this date pertains to the composition, not to the publication of the inscription. The Queen's PE Allahabad-Kośam begins with the formula, as known from SE; a little

4 *CI.*, I, p. xiv; according to the Plate opposite p. 116 also the lower inscription shows in the centre of the upper border a *svastika*.

5 See *JBORS.*, V, 1919, pp. 463 ff., Plate III, figs. 74, 96. While the sign is generally explained as the Taurine symbol, e.g. Rapson, *Catalogue of the Coins of the Andhra Dynasty* etc., p. clxxv, 2. Fleet (*JRAS* 1907, pp. 529 ff.) believed it to be "an Indian development of the top of the caduceus—as the herald's staff, the token of a peaceable embassy." The real caduceus is to be seen full-shaped e.g. in Smith's *Catalogue of the Coins in the Indian Museum*, Calcutta, I, 1906, Pl. I, 1 rev.

6 In PE VI (Delhi-Topra 9 f.) the year of the draft is given on the end of the inscription, because in its beginning, line 1, there is a reference to the RE-composition in the 12th year.

7 *CI.*, I, p. 133, n. 6 and p. 137, n. 5.

different is the introduction of the Kauśāmbī PE, where the king, using here as in the former inscription, only one name, namely *Devānampīye*, issues an order: *ānapayati*, and continues by addressing the officers, to whom the order pertains, probably similar to the Sārnāth inscription.

Different again are the introductory words in the Bairāt RE; the king addresses the *saṃgha*, by saluting the clergy and expressing his hopes that the monks are in good health and enjoying pleasant life. Justified as it may be in paying reverence to the holy men,⁸ the same formula is used, *mutatis mutandis*, in addressing the officers, as shown by the inscription at Brahmagiri and Siddāpura: *Suraṇnagiriṭe ayaputasa mahāmātānaṃ ca vacanena Isilasi mahāmātā ārogiyaṃ ratariyā resp. hevaṃ ca ratariyā. Devānampīye ānapayati, resp. Devānampīye hevaṃ āha.*⁹ No doubt, here occur some features, which are found in later inscriptions: the place, from which the record has to be issued corresponds to the later usage of indicating the place, from which the king addresses his officers and issues his order; the officers are honoured by a courteous formula, and the royal order is introduced by *ānapayati*.

This survey, however, would be incomplete without calling attention to another item, of course, of a few inscriptions only: it is the subscription of the writer. In the copies of Brahmagiri, Siddāpura and Jaṭiṅga-Rāmeśvara, the name, Capaḍa, is mentioned in Brāhmī, while his profession, *lipikara*, is written in Kharoṣṭhī.

To sum up: The inscriptions of Aśoka, though not of that secular and official character, as are the inscriptions of other ancient cultures, show some formulas, occurring throughout the later epochs of Indian epigraphic literature. These features are: 1. The introductory words (a) stating the order of the king, preceded by a courteous phrase; (b) giving the place of the officers, to whom the order is addressed, and where it is to be published; (c) re. the province of the officer, who has to convey the order to his subordinates; 2. though no exact date of the inscription is given, some event or the composition is dated in regnal

8 Cf. e.g. *Manu*, II, 127; *Gaut.*, V, 37; *Ap. Dh.*, I, 14, 26ff.

9 Accordingly the beginning of the Jaṭiṅga-Rāmeśvara inscription has to be supplied.

years; 3. auspicious marks on the beginning are used; the writer (engraver) is mentioned at the end of the inscription. Thus we can say that the formal features of Indian inscriptions are to be found *in nuce* in Aśoka's time already.

The Indian Monumentum Ancyranum, the Hathigumphā-inscription of the Kaliṅga king Khāravela, is an autobiographic panegyric, though its contents are very important from a historical point of view. The religious sentiment of the author finds its expression in the opening formula of reverence: *namo arahantānaṃ, namo savasidhānaṃ*. These *namaskāra*-sentences cannot be counted as the *svastika* and the *m*-marks in the inscription of Aśoka or the auspicious formulas, used in later epigraphic records. Nor need the annalistic style in Khāravela's monument deceive us into the assumption of a date; at the same time, the so-called Maurya date, I think, is a misreading and misinterpretation.¹⁰

The earliest Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions, of great importance for the reconstruction of the history and chronology of the first centuries of the Christian era, are mere votive and donors' inscriptions. Though not in all of them, in many, however, there occurs a new feature: an exact date in regnal years, or, according to some specific era, viz. the year, the month, the fortnight (sometimes), the day. For mainly three reasons, viz., the use of Indian month-names in a form not like the specific dialect of the inscription, the use of un-Indian month-names, and the continuous reckoning of the days of the month, the inference is hardly out of place that this new feature is due to some custom introduced into that area.¹¹

Into the second century A.D. lead us some Brāhmī inscriptions, which are characterised by a new style. Among them that of

10 The new edition of the inscription by K. P. Jayaswal and the late R. D. Banerji, *Ep. Ind.*, XX, p. 71ff. reads in the opening line: *ar[ī]haṃtānaṃ*; the passage in l. 16, mentioning the *Muriyakāla*, has been omitted in the translation on p. 89. In the inscription are to be found two symbols at the beginning, namely a *vaddha-maṅgala* and a *svastika*, at the end a tree within a square enclosure or railing, see p. 74.

11 The occurrence of Macedonian month-names seems to support the theory of a borrowing from the Greeks, cf. Konow, *Ull.* II, 1, p. lxxxix f; but see n. 25 below.

Rudradāman deserves special attention.¹² The first word met in his dam-inscription is an auspicious expression: *siddham*. After a "plain statement of events" in the mutilated first three lines, a superficial connection is made by *tad idam sc. tadākaṃ* introducing the quasi-historical part, the history of the dam and the eulogy of the rebuildler, the Mahākṣatrapa Rudradāman. It has to be remarked, that the verbose style is significant in the inscriptions of the later centuries; a style, in which historical events of a secondary importance are exaggerated; but there does not yet appear the m e t r i c a l form, though the poetic eloquence of the future *prākṛiti* is found in its first steps. This second part opens with an exact date according to the year of an era, the month, fortnight and day. A third part of the inscription (l. 16ff.) brings the acknowledgment for the service done by the officer who carried out the work of reconstruction; the writer or engraver is not mentioned. Important is the language, it is S a n s k r i t. This inscription, no doubt, had its origin in the office of the ruler, although it was given shape by a man of letters. That assertion gets its support from the Audhau inscriptions;¹³ here none of the features of the former Junāgaḍh inscription is to be found, except the date. One would infer that it was already a common custom to date the private votive inscriptions, probably in imitation of the official records.

Some peculiarities of the same kind like those in the Junāgaḍh inscription occur in that of the Queen Gotamī Balasirī (*Ep. Ind.*, VIII, p. 60); the auspicious formula, the dating according to the regnal year of her grandson Vasīṭhīputa Siri Puḷumāyi, but giving the season, fortnight and its day, describing the historical career of her son, Gotamīputa Siri Satakaṇi, and finally, the poetical style must be noticed. The caves at Nāsik and Karle have preserved some inscriptions of these two rulers. Gotamīputa Siri Saḍakaṇi issues an order (*ānapayati*) from the victorious camp of his army at Vejayantī to the officer Viṅhupālita at Govadhana.¹⁴ That order was orally

12 *Ep. Ind.*, VIII, pp. 36 ff.

13 *Ep. Ind.*, XVI, pp. 19 ff.

14 *Ibid.*, VIII, p. 71, No. 4. Vaijayantī is Banawāsi in the North Kanara District. occurring in several inscriptions, of. Fleet, *JRAS.*, 1905, 304f. D. R.

(*aviyena*) given, was written down by the officer Śivaguta, kept by the Mahāsāmiya;¹⁵ the deed was delivered in the 18th year, on the first day of the second fortnight of the rainy season; the engraver was Tāpasa. From the same king comes an inscription in Nāsik¹⁶ which offers a plenty of information on the chancellery work. The beginning may be quoted verbally:

*Siddha! Goradhane amacasa Sāmakasa deyo rājāṇito (?) raño
Gotamiputasa Sātakaṇṇisa mahādevīya ca jīvasutāya rājamātuya
vacanena Goradhane [ama] co Sāmako arogavatuvo tato era ca ratavo.
etha.....*

Neither the reading nor the explanation of the word *rājāṇito* is certain though the sense, suggested by Senart, is clear: *rājāṇati* = *rājājñapti* might be the *lectio facilior*.¹⁷ That order of the king and the queen has to be made over to Sāmaka, who is called an *amaca*, as the officer Viṇhupālita of the former record; but one new thing occurs here: the officer has to be wished good health (*arogavatuvo*). Again it is stated that the order was given orally and written down by the *pratihārarākṣin* Loṭa in the 24th year of the king, on the fifth day of the fourth fortnight in the rainy season. The engraver of that record was Sujivin. In line 7 (*Ep. Ind.*, VIII, p. 73, l. 11) occurs the order to register the donation (*nibadhāpetha*), the reading accepted by Senart (*ibid.*, p. 74); in the last line the second date: tenth day of the second fortnight in the summer season of the 24th year is connected with the expression: *nibadho nibadho*. Senart translates: the donation had been made....., without considering that the donation does not need to be dated, if the execution of the royal couple's order by writing the *lekha* and its date is mentioned. Further, his reference in the Karle inscrip-

Bhandarkar believes Benākataka as the place where the king's army was encamped, see *Ind. Ant.*, 47, 1918, p. 152, n. 18.

15 Differing from Senart's interpretation of that term V. S. Bakhle is of opinion that the Mahāsāmiya seems to refer "to the resolution of that body [the corporate assembly of the city] or to that body itself," *JBBRAS.*, N.S., IV, 1928, pp. 64, 72.

16 *Ep. Ind.*, VIII, p. 73, No. 5.

17 Senart, of course, must change also *deyo* into *deyā*; referring to line 11 one would prefer to read *rājāṇato*.

tion No. 19¹⁸ to *Yājñavalkya* (I. 317) is hardly correct. *Nibandha* means in the official language only a register, the verb *nibandha*=to enlist into the register.¹⁹ Perhaps in the inscription the engraver of the cave-inscription repeated by a mistake the note of the registering; otherwise the expression means: the registration has been carried out on (that and that date).....Now, from the two dates, which are separated by about three months' time, that at the end of the inscription is the date of the registration, while the former, though later in time, dates the execution of the *lekha*. Senart suggested that the earlier date, "on which the donation had been pronounced" "was probably added by Sāmaka, because he wanted to state the interval which, owing to delays in transmission, intervened between the resolution of the two royal persons and the execution of their will". In the inscription (l. 6, resp. 11) the king and the queen order the registration; it seems natural that the registration took place at once, while the execution of the plate needed some time; and as the order of registration is expressed in the plural with the local adverb *ettha*, there is no doubt that the registration was carried out in the court, before the deed was executed and handed over to the donees. Schematically this inscription is composed of: 1. The auspicious formula; 2. command for the transmission of the royal order to the provincial officer; 3. formula of salutation; 4. text of the order proper; 5. the writer of the orally given order and the date of the *lekha* execution; 7. name of the engraver; 8. date of the ordered registration. The third inscription²⁰ by the same ruler comes from Karle. The king orders the *amāca* of Māmāda, informing him about the grant of a village as land for the benefit of the monks, to register that donation and the privileges connected with it; the order

18 *Ep. Ind.*, VII, p. 68.

19 Neither the form *nibadha* for *nibandha* and *nibaddha* is probable nor can the latter be something else than 'written,' 'enlist,' a term known also from the *Kautiliya*. *Nibandha* in the sense of endowment, rent etc. is of later times. *Ep. Ind.*, VII, l.c. Senart himself says: 'Hence *nibandha* refers to a distinct official formality which precedes the completion of the grant.....perhaps it was a kind of registration of the royal decision in the archives of the State.'

20 *Ep. Ind.*, VII, p. 64. Senart's rendering (p. 67f.) of line 5, where he reads and takes *niba[m]dhapehi[m]* as 1st person aorist sing. of the causative is quite unintelligible; it is nothing but the second person caus. of the imperative.

was given orally, written down and delivered in (some place?) in the 18th (?) year; the plate was executed by Sivakhadaguta.

Turning to the inscription of Gotamīputa Satakani's son, the Nāsik No. 3,²¹ the following items are found: 1. the auspicious formula; 2. the order of Vasīthīputa Siri Puḷumayi to the officer (*āmaca*) of Govadhana; 3. the statement of the donation; 4. the order of registering; 5. the writer of the order, the *mahāsenāpati* Medhuna; 6. probably the keeping of the record; 7. the delivery of the deed, the date of that delivery; 8. the engraver.²² By these inscriptions we get a fairly good insight into the chancellery work, though there exist some vagueness. It is not clear whether the dating refers to the engraving or the delivery of the deed. Nāsik No. 5 seems to date the writing of the king's order, Nos. 3 and 4 as well as Karle No. 19 the delivery of the deed to the donees, because the fact of engraving is not such an important event as to need a date. Doubtful is the word *lekha*, it seems to refer to the document, made by the *mahāsenāpati* or *pratihārorākṣin*, high courtiers,²³ according to which the (copper?) plate which was handed down to the donees was executed by an engraver of the office. The donees got incised on the cave as a public proof of their rights the copy of the plate (*paṭikā*).²⁴

As far one can judge from the material offered by the inscriptions of the Sātavāhana dynasty, a definite form of the developed formal style is reached, though there existed slight deviations. The scheme seems to be: 1. auspicious formula; 2. the order of the ruler (from any place, generally his camp) to an officer (of a province), sometimes with a courteous sentence; 3. the order stating the grant of land, and the like, ending with the order of registration; 4. the explicit genesis of the deed: orally given order, written down by a high courtier, whose name

21 *Ep. Ind.*, VIII, pp. 65 f.

22 Not of the cave-inscription, but of the 'title-deed[s] to the donees,' as remarked correctly by Senart *Ep. Ind.*, VII, p. 69.

23 In that sense the assertions by D. R. Bhandarkar, *Ind. Ant.*, 48, 1919, p. 80 and n. 4; and by J. Vogel, *Ep. Ind.*, XX, pp. 6 and 32 have to be modified, at least for the earlier period of the Sātavāhana dynasty.

24 Literary *paṭikā* means a cloth, cf. Buehler, *Palaeographie*, p. 88.

is mentioned; 5. the date of the execution of the *lekha* or *paṭikā*, re. the delivery to the donees; 6. the name of the executing artist of the *paṭikā*; (7. the dated note on the executed registration).

An attempt will now be made to connect the development of the formal elements, as treated above, with the general history of India. Between the inscription of Rudradāman and those of the Sātavāhana dynasty there exists some difference in the method of dating, which has been observed already.²⁵ But we can trace a different wording too, viz., the absence of a bureaucratic or formal language in Rudradāman's record which contains a poetic language, while the Sātavāhana inscriptions show an official style; and to a certain extent the records of the Kṣaharēta inscriptions form a transitory stage between the two. It must, however, be conceded, that the inscriptions of Uṣavadāta, the son-in-law of the *kṣatrapa* Nahapāna, do not represent the orders of a ruler; nevertheless, an official position must be attributed to this man. The large donations show at least the commanding power of a rich relative of the ruling father-in-law, to whom he never forgets to refer in the inscriptions and who himself nowhere appears in them. Uṣavadāta was a Śaka, *Ep. Ind.*, VIII (p. 85, No. 14a, 1. 2) and must be considered as a governor, but certainly he acted as a general.²⁶ For, in the Nāsik cave inscription No. 10 (*Ep. Ind.*, VIII, p. 78, 1. 3) he speaks of the *aṃṇāti* of his *bhaṭāraka*, according to which he released the chief of the Uttamabhadras from the siege of the Mālayas, who fled and were made prisoners by the Uttamabhadras. The most interesting inscription of Uṣavadāta is Nāsik No. 12 (*Ep. Ind.*, VIII, p. 82), mentioning the endowment of a large sum, invested in guilds at Govardhana; the investment and the gift of cocoanut trees have been proclaimed (*śrāvita*) and registered in the *nigamasabhā* at the *phalakavara*.²⁷ The inscription offers three dates, the first is the year 42, Vaiśākha month, the second shows the year, month, fortnight and day, the third was perhaps given in the same way. Though the registration is stated as performed

25 Cf. Sten Konow, *Ep. Ind.*, XIV, pp. 140 f.; supra, p. 219; but see Harit Krishna Deb, *IHQ.*, VII (1932), pp. 117 ff.

26 Cf. Rapson, l. c., LVII, CX.

27 Cf. Senart, *Ep. Ind.*, VIII, p. 84.

caritrato, according to custom, the difference in the way of dating and of registration, compared with that of the Sātavāhanas, is obvious.

One point more must be touched, i.e. the appearance of the auspicious formula. The signs of *maṅgala* in Aśoka's Separate Edicts are the first occurrence of such an use in inscriptions; the supposed seven signs in the Sohgaura copper-plate are more likely to be explained in connection with the contents of the plate.²⁸ Auspicious signs can be traced in the Nāsik cave inscriptions, where they serve as distinguishing marks between two inscriptions, of which the former ends and the next begins in the same line.²⁹ The innovation, however, of the Sātavāhana dynasty's inscriptions in Nāsik and Karle is the use of an auspicious word *siddham* in different forms. The question, when this word came into existence,³⁰ can be answered in this way: the word

28 See Fleet, *JRIS.*, 1907, pp. 510 ff.; cf. also for a view connecting the symbols with the punch-marked coins, Durga Prasad, *Observations on the silver punch marked Coins of ancient India and their age*, Benares 1931, pp. 71.

29 Nāsik No. 3, cf. *Ep. Ind.*, VIII, Plate 1, last line, middle of the lower photograph: a *scutika* and some trapezoid sign; in Nāsik No. 5, to be seen in photograph 5, first line.

30 According to rulers:

K ṣ a h a r ā t a. Uṣavadāta: Nāsik No. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14a (?), Karle No. 13.

S ā t a v ā h a n a. Time of Maḍhariputa Svāmī Sakasena: Kaṅheri, Lueders' List No. 1001, 1002.

Gotamiputa Siri Sadakaṇi: Nāsik No. 4, 5.

Vāsiṭhīputa Siri Polumāci: Nāsik No. 1, 2, 3; Karle 19 (?); Myākādōni (*Ep. Ind.*, XIV, p. 155).

Private inscriptions of his time: Nāsik No. 25, Karle 14, 20. Further Nāsik No. 6, 16, 17 (? a *si*; a superscribed *ddha* seems to be visible *Ep. Ind.*, VIII, p. 90 Senart does not read it, while he translates 'Success'), 18, 26, 27. Amarāvati Lueders' List 1248.

Gotamīputa sami Sīriyaṅa Sātakaṇi: Nāsik No. 24; Kaṅheri No. 1024.

A b h i r a. Iśvarasena: Nāsik No. 15 (cf. *Ind. Ant.*, 47, 1918, p. 156).

Later Sātavāhana: Vāsiṭhīputa sami Sīri Caḍasāta ('end of the second or beginning of the third century A.D.') Sten Konow, *ZDMG.*, 62, p. 592).

Gotamīputa Sīriyaṅa Sātakaṇi. Lueders' List No. 1310.

Hāritiputa Viṅhukaḍa Cuṭukulānaṅda Sātākaṇi: *Ind. Ant.*, XIV, 1885, p. 333 (Lueders' List, No. 1186); *Ep. Carn.*, VII, 1, No. 263.

Private inscriptions at A m a r ā v a t i: Lueders' List, No. 1229, 1230.

siddham is found in Brāhmī inscriptions of the Sātavāhana dynasty, of the Kṣharāta and of the Kuṣāṇa, in Nāsik, Karle, Amarāvati and Mathurā. But the home of that use was, no doubt, the Western Cave area, and it must be connected with the development of the official style in the Sātavāhana inscriptions.

O. STEIN

1232, 1233, 1244, 1255, 1262, 1267, 1268, 1271-1274, 1285, 1308; *Ep. Ind.*, XV, p. 266, No. 21; p. 272, No. 49; p. 274, No. 55, 56; p. 275, No. 57.
J a g a y v a p e t a : 1203.

Kuṣā: Luders' List No. 1040, 1041, 1060.

Mahād: „ „ „ 1072, 1073.

Yunnar: „ „ „ 1172.

The Mathurā inscriptions are throughout of private character; the greater part of them is dated between the years 4-95 (the Kāman inscription, Luders' List No. 12 in the 74th year): Luders' List, No. 16, 19, 22a, 27-31, 37, 39, 44, 48, 53, 54, 58, 75, 85, 116, 121, 122, 125m, 125n; of unknown rulers' time 81a, 83; time of Kaniska 21; of Vāsiṣka 149a; of Huvīṣka 35, 42, 60, for 81 cf. Buehler, *Ep. Ind.*, II, p. 206, No. xxxvii and Konow, *Ill.*, II, 1, p. lxxxiii, 163f.; of Vāsudeva 66, 69a. As mentioned above, these inscriptions are entirely private votive inscriptions and the like, where an old custom, borrowed from other places, like the Western Caves, continues. And though there is an inscription of Kumāragupta of the 113th year (*Ep. Ind.*, V, Appendix No. 442), it must be remarked, that already some Mathurā inscriptions show the late stage of the use of *siddha* by abbreviating the word to *sdha* (cf. Luders' List, No. 35, 42, 66, *Ep. Ind.*, II, p. 206, No. xxvi, *Ep. Ind.*, I, p. 287, No. ix, p. 392, No. xxiv). Thus we can say that in the later part of the third century A.D. the use of *siddha* slowly came to an end, and the occurrence in Kumāragupta's inscription is nothing but a survival of the practice of the engravers at Mathurā.

For other instances cf. the quotations by Buehler, *Palaeographie*, p. 87, note 35, further Kaṣheri, Luders' List, Nos. 993, 998, 999, 1060, 1065, 1066, 1012-14, 1020. For the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa inscriptions see Vogel, *Ep. Ind.*, XX, pp. 1 ff, No. C 3, B 1, B 2, B 4, B 5, C 2, C 4, C 5, E, F, G, H, J. No doubt, the custom spread from Amarāvati of the Sātavāhana time to this place. Another proof of that view can be seen in the inscription of the Kadamba king Sivakhaḍavamman in *Ep. Carn.*, VII, 1, No. 264. No official record of the Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions shows the word *siddha*.

The Buddhist Manuscripts at Gilgit

The third manuscript that has been examined by me is, as is the case with the other two manuscripts,¹ written on birch-bark in Cursive Gupta characters of the 6th century A.D. Considering the period it was under earth, it is surprising to find that the glaze of the ink still remains and can be easily revived by a slight wiping with a damp piece of soft cloth.

The title of the Ms.

The title of the book, as given in the last leaf of the Ms., is

सर्वतथागताज्ञान-बोधिसत्त्वभूमिक्रमणम् and
सर्वतथागताधिष्ठान-सत्त्वावलोकन-बुद्धक्षेत्रसन्दर्शनव्यूहम् ।

The second name has been adopted in the Tibetan version, in which the Sanskrit title is given thus (MDO, Kha, 395a):

आर्यसर्वतथागताधिष्ठान-सत्त्वावलोकन-बुद्धक्षेत्रनिर्देशनव्यूहनाम महायानसूत्र and its Tibetan rendering is as follows:

*l*phags. pa.de. bshin. gsegs. pa. thams. cad. kyi. byin. gyis. brlabs-sems. can. la gzig.sñi-saṅs. rgyas.kyi. shin. gi. bkod. pa.kun. tu. ston. pa.shes. bya. ba. theg. pa. chen. poḥ. mdo. (On restoration it would be आर्यसर्वतथागताधिष्ठान-सत्त्वावलोकन-बुद्धक्षेत्रव्यूहसन्दर्शननाम महायानसूत्र ।

Csoma Körösi translates the title thus: "Description of the province of Buddha, on which, for the sake of all beings, all Tathāgatas have bestowed their benedictions" (*As. Recs.*, XX, p. 425).

The Chinese text, which has been taken by Nanjio as a version of this Sūtra, contains only a small fraction of the whole Sūtra, and is entitled Fo-shuo-chuang-yen-wang-to-lo-ni-ching (for Chinese charac-

¹ For the accounts of the previous two mss. see *IHQ.*, VIII, pp. 93-100, 342-350.

In this connection I must thank Mr. Ramchandra Kak, who realises the value of the finds, for taking the necessary care of the mss. and giving me all the facilities to deal with them.

ters, see next page, l. 1), and its Sanskrit form would be **बुद्धभाषितव्यूह-राजधारणीसूत्र**। but in ll. 5-6, the full title of the Sutra is given thus :
i-ch'ieh-ju-lai-so-lu-kuan-ch'a chung-sheng-shih-hsien-fo-ch'a-chung-n-wang-to-lo-ni (For Chinese characters, see next page, ll. 5-6).

Nanjio has reproduced the Sanskrit title as transliterated in Tibetan characters in the xylographs, but the exact restoration from the above Chinese expression should be **सर्वतथागताधिष्ठान-सस्वावलोकन-बुद्धक्षेत्रव्यूह-राजधारणी** !

Its translation in the light of the Chinese rendering would be : "The Dhāraṇī for a beneficent watch over the beings of the excellent Buddha-land, to whom all Tathāgatas vow their protection."

The Chinese and Tibetan versions

The Tibetan translation of this work has been made by Surendrabodhi, Śilendrabodhi, and Jinamitra with the Tibetan monk Ye-shes-de. The translation is as literal as possible and hardly needs any comment.

The Chinese translation of I. tsing, printed in the Taisho edition is equally literal, making allowances of course for the insurmountable difficulties presented by a non-alphabetic language. On a comparison of the Chinese version with our Ms., it appears that the Chinese text contains the essential portion of this Sūtra i.e. the actual *dhāraṇī*, and not the supplementary *dhāraṇīs* and the accounts of their efficacies. Perhaps the Chinese version represents the earliest form of the *Sūtra*, which, in course of time, attained by additions its present form as found in our manuscript and the Tibetan version.² The Chinese text (see l. 2 of the Chinese characters), as restored into Sanskrit begins thus :

² Cf. the beginning of the Sanskrit ms. and the Tibetan text, *infra*, p. 236.

[2] एवं मया श्रुतम् । एकस्मिन् समये भगवान्
पोतलकपर्वते विहरति स्म । सन्ति बहवो [3]
देवमनुष्याः सर्वे महाव्याख्यानधर्मकामाः । [अथ]
दशदिशमवलोक्य बलगुमनोज्ज्वरे [4] अवलो-
कितेश्वरं बोधिसत्त्वं आमन्त्रय मञ्जुश्रीः बोधि-
सत्त्वोऽवाचत् । अस्ति कुलपुत्र (lit. सत्पुरुष)
[5] सर्वतथागताधिष्ठानसत्त्वावलोकन-बुद्धक्षेत्र-
व्यूह[6]राजधारणी नाम सूत्रम् । मया पूर्वं
प्रथमचित्तोत्पादकाले सुकुसुमज्योतिःसन्दर्शतथा-
गतस्यान्तिकात् श्रुतम् । येषां [7] नवतीनां
सत्त्वकोटीनां तद् धर्मं श्रुतं तेषां तथागतज्ञान-
प्रतिलम्भोऽभूत् ।

7 6 5 4 3 2 1
佛說莊嚴王陀羅尼呪經
如是我聞。一時薄伽梵在布怛洛迦山爲諸
人天一切大衆演說法要。遍觀十方以妙音
聲。告觀自在菩薩妙吉祥菩薩言。善男子有
經名一切如來所護觀察衆生示現佛刹莊嚴
王陀羅尼。我昔初發心時。於花光顯現如來
所。與九十俱胝衆生。一聞此法皆得如來智

A comparison of this with the Sanskrit text shows that an addition of a long passage covering 4 leaves has been made after the words विहरति स्म and before दशदिशमवलोक्य. In the Chinese text, there is the first line of the Sūtra as found in Sanskrit, i.e. the name of the place where Buddha was staying but not the names of the Bodhisattvas, gods and other beings that assembled to hear him. It then skips over 4 leaves of the Sanskrit Ms. corresponding to 3 (395-397) leaves of the Tibetan xylograph, and then comes to the 5th leaf of the Sanskrit Ms. corresponding to leaf 398a of the xylograph. The Chinese text henceforth keeps quite close to the Sanskrit original up to leaf 132a, l. 2.

In the Chinese version as also in the Tibetan, the *dhāraṇīs* or *mantrapadas* are not translated but transliterated, and compliment must be paid to the Chinese for the great skill that has been shown in the reproduction of Sanskrit sounds.

The concluding passage of the Chinese version is given below along with its Sanskrit restoration. The last three lines (5-7) are not found in the Sanskrit Ms.

- [1] मरणकाले बुद्धबोधिसत्त्वदशनं भविष्यति ।
 [2] कायमुत्सृज्य सुखावत्यां लोकघातौ पुनस्तपत्ति
 लक्ष्यन्ते । आयुर्गणत्रयसमन्वागतः भविष्यति (lit.
 परिपूरि गमिष्यति) । सर्वेणत्रयः [3] शमिताः सत्त्वाः
 प्रमुदिताः । अस्यां धारणायां भाष्यमाणायां षष्टीनां च
 प्राणिसहस्रानां अनुत्पत्तिकेषु धर्मेषु [4] क्षान्तिप्रति-
 लम्भोऽभूत् सर्वोवरणविनिमुक्तः सर्वाभिप्रायपरिपूर्णाः ।
 [5] एवं खलु लोकज्येष्ठेन भाषितं तत् सूत्रम् । अव-
 लोकितेश्वरः बोधिसत्त्वः मञ्जुश्रीबोधिसत्त्व [6] सर्वो
 महासंघश्च प्रमुदिताः सुप्रतिपन्नाः ॥ [7] बुद्धभाषित-
 व्यूहराजधारणी सूत्रम् ।

7 6 5 4 3 2 1

臨命終時觀佛菩薩。捨身之後必得
 往生極樂世界。壽命色力悉皆具足。一切怨
 讎並生歡喜。說此呪時六萬有情得無生法
 忍。永除諸障所願滿足
 爾時世尊說此經已。觀自在菩薩妙吉祥菩
 薩。一切大眾聞佛所說歡喜奉行
 佛說莊嚴王陀羅尼呪經

The above extract indicates a natural end. In view of the fact that after this a new Dhāraṇī is being recited, it may be easily concluded that the rest of contents of the manuscript is a later addition.

The Tibetan version is a *verbatim* rendering of the whole of the Sanskrit Ms. and hence it is much larger in size than the Chinese. Nanjio has not taken note of this fact in his *Catalogue*.

Date of the Work

The safest data for ascertaining the time of composition of the ms. are the dates of the Tibetan and Chinese translations. The Tibetan translation was made in the ninth century while the Chinese in the seventh (about 701 A.D.). Hence there can be no doubt about the existence of this work in the sixth century or some time before this. Though the Chinese translator had, as his basic text, an original different from the present one, there need not be any doubt about the work belonging to the sixth century A.D., as the script of the present ms. testifies. Again, if it be held that the Chinese translators worked with a Sanskrit original, which is earlier in date than the present one, then its date may be pushed further back, say, by a century, and we may safely conclude that this text was written as early as the 5th century A.D.

*Résumé of the Contents**

Section I—The text opens as usual with an account of Buddha's residence which is here located at Potalaka, the abode of Avalokiteśvara, and his audience consisting of gods, men, bodhisattvas and other beings. There, at the request of all these beings Buddha delivered the Sūtra containing the principal Dhāraṇī.

Section II—What follows after Section I is really superfluous. It is only another dhāraṇī called *Abhayatejam*, delivered by Vajrapāṇi Bodhisattva; the only reason for its inclusion is perhaps that it is also a *Buddhādhiṣṭhāna* and that the merit acquired by learning this *dhāraṇī* is similar to that conferred by that of the previous one.

Section III—After the conclusion of this *dhāraṇī* and followed by an account of a ceremonial, Mañjuśrī appears on the scene and asks why the present sūtra is called *Sarvatathāgatādhiṣṭhāna-sattvāvalokana-buddhakṣetrasandarśana-ryūha* (leaf 134b), and then puts a few other incidental questions, which Buddha answers, by uttering some gāthās.

Section IV—Arya Avalokiteśvara comes with another *dhāraṇī* called *Vyavalokana-prātihārya*; the reason for its inclusion is that it speaks of *sattvādhiṣṭhāna* or *sattvāvalokana* and that by reading and writing this *dhāraṇī* all the merits described before by the Tathāgatas are acquired (*sarvān etān tathāgata-bhāṣitān guṇān pratilabhante*—leaf 139b, l. 4).

Section V—The *Vyavalokana-prātihārya* is followed by three other *dhāraṇīs* with descriptions of their respective rites given by Anopamā Mahāyakṣiṇī, Śaṅkhinī Mahādevī, and Bhīmā Mahādevī. All these are meant to confer benefits, or protect those beings who will read, write or propagate this Sūtra.

Section VI—Lastly comes the section dealing with the merits acquired by studying and propagating the Sūtra, and the suitability of its title.

* For want of space the full summary cannot be published in this number. It will appear in *IHQ.*, IX. 2.—Ed.

Various Points of Interest

Of the various points of interest to which attention should be drawn, the first is the Indian Buddhist system of writing two or more books in one volume with running pagination, and the adoption of that system by the Tibetan translators.

When Sāhityācārya Śivanātha Śāstrī, the learned paṇḍit of H. H. the Maharaja of Kashmir, commenced in collaboration with myself the transcription of this ms., our first impression was that 123 leaves of the ms. had been lost, as the page number began with 124. On a comparison, however, of this Ms. with its Tibetan version, it appeared that the ms. lacked only two leaves, i.e., nos. 122 and 123. From the numbering of the leaves i.e. from 122 and not from 1, it seems that the present ms. was a copy prepared at the instance of a certain upāsaka from another ms. which bore these page-numbers, and that the preceding leaves of this ms. viz. from 1 to 121 were left out as they evidently contained other books. Our ms. represents the last part (leaves 395-426) of the second (kha) volume of the Tibetan Kanjur mDo. This Tibetan bundle contains four sūtras, of which the first is the *Lalitavistara* (1-329), the second *Mañjuśrī-vikrīḍita nāma mahāyāna-sūtra*, the third *Mañjuśrī-vikurvāṇa* and the fourth *Sarva-tathāgatādhiṣṭhāna-sattvāvalokana-Buddha-kṣetra-nirdeśana-vyūha*. On the basis of the division of the volumes as made by the Tibetans and the page-numbering of the present ms., the opinion may be hazarded that the Tibetans adhered to the divisions as made by the Indians, who, as is the practice in writing mss. both among the Indians and the Tibetans, included 3, 4 or more books in one bundle, writing the last words of one book and the first words of another in the same line, leaving a little space between them. It is very likely that the *Lalitavistara*, being very extensive, was not given a place in this volume, and that the original bundle, from which the present ms. was copied, contained the last three books of the vol. *kha* of mDo.

The second point of interest is the name of the donor, Sulivajra, at whose instance this ms. was copied. The name occurs thrice in the ms., every time it being mentioned in the concluding line of the *Dhāraṇī*, by which invocation is made for the protection and well-being

of the donor. The name of the person and, probably, that of his *gotra* are non-Sanskritic, indicating thereby the non-Indian nationality of the donor. It may be that he was a Hūna, about whom we read so much in Kalhaṇa's *Rājataranṅī*. The Dhāraṇī (Ms. 130b; Tib. 402b) is worded thus:⁴

१ नमः सर्वतथागतानां । तद् यथा बुद्धे सुबुद्धे बुद्धमते* । लोके विलोके लोकातिक्रान्ते । सत्त्वा-
 २ ३ ४ ५ ६
 ७ वलोकने सर्वतथागताधिष्ठिते । सर्वाशापरिपूरणे द्युतिन्धरे नरदेवपूजिते † । तथागतज्ञानं तथा-
 ८ ९ १० ११ १२
 १३ गताधिष्ठाने सर्वलोकं सुखीभवतु । पूर्वकर्म क्षपय** । मम [नात्सेहं मारपति शूलिन्नणस्य आर्यदिक
 १४ १५ १६
 १७ महाश्राद्धोपासक शूलिवज्जस्य ††] रक्षा भवतु । सर्वभयेभ्यः तथागताधिष्ठानेन स्वाहा ॥

The third point of interest is that the Dhāraṇīs in the ms. are found transliterated and not translated in the Tibetan and Chinese versions, pointing thereby to the belief current among the Buddhists, both Indian and non-Indian, of the 6th or 7th century A.D. about the efficacy of the mantras by their proper intonation.

Lastly, it is of interest to note the remark occurring in leaf 153a that this Sūtra will become popular in the south and not in the north, east or west, where the people will not give it its due honour and as a result will go to hell. The author of this Sūtra never dreamt that it would gain popularity more in the north than in the south and that an inhabitant of the farthest north would be instrumental in propagating its copy in the 20th century.

The scene of this Sūtra is located at Potalaka as is the case with many other Dhāraṇīs (see, e.g. *Dhāraṇī-Saṅgraha*, ASB. Ms. 1. 11b).

4 This mantra is collated with its Tibetan and Chinese transliterated texts. The devanāgarī figures indicate the numbers given in the Chinese text, and the footnotes show the differences in reading.

* Ms. सुद्धमते ; Chin. omits it. † Ms. सर्वतथागताधिष्ठानाधिष्ठिते

‡ Ms. नरके च पूजिते ** Tib. सर्वकर्म क्षपयतु

†† The Chinese, as restored into Sanskrit, gives मम अमुकस्य स्ववर्णं स्वनाम ; for this Tibetan gives here nothing. The Ms. in another place mentions this name which may be read thus :

नात्सेहं मारपति शूलिन्नणस्य आर्यदिक शूलिवज्जस्य ।

Yuan Chwang refers to this mountain as a place of great sanctity, being the abode of Avalokiteśvara Bodhisattva. He locates it on the east of the Malaya mountain, the scene of the well-known Mahāyāna sūtra, *Laṅkāvatāra*.⁵ It was very near the sea, and a stream of water after a long winding course flowed into the sea from the lake on the Potalaka mountain. The port of India from which people sailed to Ceylon was on its north-east. If we take Dhanuṣkoṭī to be that port, Potalaka should be located somewhere between the Malaya mountains and Dhanuṣkoṭī. In the *Gaṇḍavyūha* (leaf. 28b) occurs the name *Sāgara nāma Laṅkāpatham* and in leaf 27a *Sāgarāmukha*, a place suitable for meditating upon the vastness of the sea. It seems that these forsaken places near the border of the sea and amid the mountains became the haunt of the meditating monks, and many Mahāyāna sūtras came into existence in those places. Watter (II, p. 230) dismisses away the Malaya mountain as a 'poetical creation' but Nundolal Dey gives ample evidence to show that it really existed and constituted the southern part of the Western Ghats (see his *Geographical Dictionary*, p. 132). He further states that one of the summits of these mountains bore the name of Pothigei, the Bettigo of Ptolemy, the abode of Agastya, and was also called Agasti-kūṭa or Poṭiyam, which was the southernmost peak of the Annamalai mountains where the river Tāmra-parṇī has its source (see *Ibid.*, Map.). Can this Poṭiyam be our Potalaka?

The tradition recorded by Tāranātha about the location of Potalaka, the abode of Avalokiteśvara, also points to its existence somewhere in the southernmost corner of India. The upāsaka Sūntivarman⁶ wanted to go to Potala from Śrīdhanakaṭaka caitya,⁷ the identification of which has been placed beyond doubt by the finds at Amarāvati and Nāgārjunikoṇḍa. He had to traverse a long perilous way over uninhabited regions and had to cross

⁵ *Laṅkā.*, p. 1.

⁶ See Schiefner, *Geschichte etc.*, p. 132.

⁷ It is located in Dhanaśrīdvīpa. The Tib. word is *Dha.na.sri.i.glin*, *glin* being usually restored as Sanskrit *dvīpa*. According to S. C. Das's Dictionary, it may also mean "an isolated large monastery." Tāranātha, I think, has used the word *glin* in the sense of a 'monastery'. In that case, *Dha.na.sri.i.glin* would refer to the huge monastic establishment at Amarāvati or Nāgārjunikoṇḍa.

rivers, forests, lakes and so forth. Superstitious as the people must have been at that time, Śāntivarman, for safety while travelling, invoked Tārā, Bhṛkūṭī, Hayagrīva, Ekajātī and lastly Avalokiteśvara all well-known names of gods in the later Buddhist literature to aid him in his tour over the wild uninhabited region. In the account there is no indication that the route lay across the vast sea to an island like Madagascar, where Prof. Tucci⁸ would have us look for the location of the Potalaka, the abode of Avalokiteśvara on the basis of an account of the travels of Buddhagupta. It may be contended that in p. 157 of Tāranātha's *Geschichte* while describing the route of Candragomin from Nālandā to Potala *via* Dhanaśrī-gliṅ (gliṅ = *rihāra* and not *drīpa*), it is said that he travelled in a boat which was wrecked, and that he was saved by the goddess Tārā. This also does not suggest that we are to look for Potala in Madagascar, for it is quite natural that in those days, when the land-routes were generally infested with wild animals and robbers, and when there were the difficulties of crossing rivers and mountains and obtaining food and shelter on the way, it was safer and more comfortable to travel by the river-routes or coastal sea-routes, and that this was preferred by the Indians is amply proved by the *Jātakas* and such other literature. In this case, I think, Candragomin went in a boat along the eastern coast up to Amarāvati and thence to Potala or Potalaka. In view of the fact that the scene of the present work is laid at Potalaka, and the statement that the work will become popular in the south, it behoves us to look for its location somewhere near the southern extremity of India, where it will not be too much to expect that we shall, in no distant future, hear of the discovery of ruins of as great an antiquity and importance as those at Nāgārjunikoṇḍa.

We shall conclude this preliminary note by reconstructing from the Tibetan xylograph the Sanskrit text which was written on the first two leaves of the Ms. nos. 122 and 123 that are lost. It is as follows:

एवं मया श्रुतमेकस्मिन् समये पोटलकवर्षते आर्यावलोकितेश्वरायतने दिव्यमणिरत्नश्रीइन्द्र-
नीलमये पुष्पसंस्तृते देवसिंहासने भगवान् सार्द्धं महता त्रिबुसङ्घेन पञ्चमात्रैर्भिबुशतैः सर्वैर्हृद्भिः
शीशाक्षवैः चेतोवशिताप्राप्तैः सद्गर्मपारंगतैश्च सार्द्धं बोधिसत्त्वैः सर्वैः महाकरुणाज्ञानप्राप्तैः सर्वैः

⁸ See *III Q.*, vol. VII, pp. 695-6.

एकजातिप्रतिबद्धैः द्विजातिभ्यां च त्रिजातिभिर्दशजातिभिर्विंशतिजातिभिस्त्रिंशतिजातिभिः शत-
जातिभिर्वा प्रतिबद्धैः सर्वैः अष्टफलप्राप्तैर्दशभूमिस्थितैः तद् यथा आर्यावलोकितेश्वरेण मंजुश्रिया
विमलकेतुना रत्नश्रिया वज्रकेतुना विमलप्रभेण चन्दनेन अमृतकेतुना एवंप्रमुखं सप्तशतैः बोधि-
सत्त्वैः सार्धं उपासकोपासिकाभिः सर्वैः च व्याकृतैः समाधिप्राप्तैः नानालोकधातुभिः सन्निपतितैः
पञ्चसहस्रैः सर्वैः गन्धर्वशतसहस्रैः पूर्वबुद्धपर्युपासितैः तथागतप्रतिहार्यदृष्टैः सार्धं सर्वाभिः
महायज्ञिणीभिः बोधिसत्त्वज्ञानप्राप्ताभिः व्याकरणप्राप्ताभिरवैवर्तिकाभिः अनौपम्यया विमलप्रभया
च प्रभावत्या भीमश्रिया यज्ञिण्या च एवं प्रमुखाभिरशीत्या महायज्ञिणीभिः । शतक्रतुब्रह्म-
वेश्वरणावृतपद्मविरुद्धकविरुयान्तमणिभद्रदुत्रपूर्णभद्राः एतेश्च लोकपालैः सार्धं निराणोऽभूत् ।

अथ तैः सर्वैः तथागतं सिंहासनं निराणं ज्ञात्वा स्वकस्वकैः कुशलमूलेस्तथागतं दिव्या-
लंकारवल्गुपुष्पमालयभूपविलेपनवाद्यशब्देन मानितः पूजितः शतसहस्रकोटिशः प्रदक्षिणीक्रुत्य
अर्चितश्च । तेन खलु पुनः समयेन भगवान् सर्वसत्त्वमहाकल्याणज्ञानस्थितं नाम समाधि समा-
पन्नोऽभूत् । तेन समाधिधारणबलेन त्रिसाहस्रमहासाहस्रलोकधातवः आभया अवभासिता
अभूवन् । सर्वरूपाणि स्फुटितानि । ये च सत्त्वा जात्यन्धाः चक्षुषा रूपाणि पश्यन्ति स्म । वधिराः
श्रोत्रेण शब्दान् शृण्वन्ति स्म । रोगस्पृष्टा विगतरोगा भवन्ति स्म । नभाश्च वस्त्रावृता बभूवुः ।
उन्मत्ताः स्मृतिं प्रतिलभन्ते स्म । होनकायाः परिपूर्णैर्न्द्रिया बभूवुः । दरिद्रा धनानि प्रति-
लभन्ते स्म । सत्त्वानां यः खलु धनवस्तुभोगविहीन आसीत् स धनवस्तुभोगसम्पन्नोऽभूत् ।
सर्वसत्त्वाः सर्वसुखसमर्पिताः सर्वाशापरिपूर्णा अभूवन् । त्रिसाहस्रमहासाहस्रलोकधातौ ये
केचित् सत्त्वा अनुशासनधर्मश्रवणाय येन भगवान् तेनांजलिं प्रणम्य उपसंक्रान्ताः । ये सत्त्वाः
देवभूताः ते सर्वे देवसुखं संप्रहाय बुद्धानुस्मृतिं कृत्वा धर्मश्रवणाय येन भगवान् तेन उपसंक्रान्ताः ।
ये सत्त्वा मनुष्यभूताः ते च मनुष्यसुखं परित्यज्य धर्मश्रवणकामाय येन भगवांस्तेन उपसंक्रान्ताः ।
ये सत्त्वा नागयज्ञराज्ञसप्रेतपिशाचभूतास्ते बुद्धानुस्मृतिं प्राप्य सर्वसत्त्वेषु मैत्रचित्ता भूत्वा काय-
चित्तसुखं लब्ध्वा धर्मश्रवणाय येन भगवान् तेनोपसंक्रान्ताः । ये सत्त्वा यमलोके अन्धतमिस्रायां
जातास्तेऽपि बुद्धानुभावेन एकज्ञानं स्मृतिं लब्ध्वा परस्परं परिजानन्ति स्म । ते महातमिस्राभ्यः
परिमुक्ता बभूवुः । सर्वे सत्त्वाः परस्परं मैत्रचित्ताः बभूवुः । तेषामुपकलेशाः क्षीणा अभूवन् । तेन
खलु समयेन महापृथिवी षड्विकारं प्रकम्पतं उन्नमति अवनमति स्म । अथ तस्यां पर्षदि
मंजुश्रीकुमारभूतः सन्निराणः सन् बोधिसत्त्वं महासत्त्वमार्यावलोकितेश्वरमेतदवोचत् । कुलपुत्र,
महाबोधिसत्त्वपर्षदि अवभासितायां महापर्षदः पूर्वनिमित्तं परिस्फुटम् । अनेकबोधिसत्त्वकोटि-
नियुतशतसहस्राणां च व्याकरणं प्रकटितम् । धर्ममहावाक्यस्य [Leaf. 124 पूर्वनिमित्तं संदृश्यते ।
कुलपुत्र अनेकानां च बोधिसत्त्वकोटिनियुतशतसहस्राणां सर्वाशापरिपूरिमहाज्ञानप्रतिलम्भो
भविष्यति । तत् कुलपुत्र सत्त्वानां कात्यायमुत्पाद्य हिताय सुखाय यावदनुत्तरस्यां सम्यक्-
संबोधौ प्रतिष्ठापनाय तथागतं पारपृच्छ]

The Śaivaite deity Kṣetrapāla

The deity Kṣetrapāla, which is at present almost transferred to the domain of folk-deities and little known to students of Hindu religion, appears to have at one time occupied a position of no mean importance in the Hindu pantheon. Beside the descriptions of the deity scattered in different Tantras and Purāṇas, we know of treatises which exclusively dealt with the worship of this deity. *The Catalogus Catalogorum* (I. p. 134, III. p. 29) refers to two works, e.g., *Kṣetreśapūjana* and *Kṣetrapālapaddhati* while there is reference to a *Kṣetrapālatantra* in the *Karīndrācārya List* (No. 1141). The names of all these works indicate quite clearly the fact that they pertain to the worship of Kṣetrapāla.

We do not know when and how the deity came to occupy a place in the catholic and ever-expanding pantheon of the Hindus. Presumably evolved out of the tendency of the primitive people that supposed every object, animate and inanimate, to be presided over by a separate spirit or deity, it came to acquire an independent position in the Hindu hierarchy of gods at a comparatively early period. We find it referred to or described not only in some of the original Tantras and Purāṇas, but also in digests and other works some of which go back at least to the sixteenth century.

The exact identity of and the proper position occupied by a deity in Tantra and Purāṇa pantheon is not always easy of determination. The descriptions of a particular deity to be found in different works are seldom elaborate and exhaustive. The same deity, again, is found in different works in different forms and not infrequently discharging different functions. A particular form of a deity is often supposed to be meant for a particular type of worshipper, having a particular end in view and thus arose innumerable forms of the already numberless deities.¹ As a matter of fact, this is the principal idea underlying the

I असंख्या त्रिपुरादेवी असंख्याता च कालिका ।

वागीश्वरी तथासंख्या तथा तद्वत्कुलाकुला ॥

Kularūḍāmaṇi (Notices of Sanskrit Mss., H. P. Sastri, 1, 70).

conception of plurality of deities in India. These general observations apply fully to the deity we are going to describe e.g. Kṣetrapāla as to other deities like Kālī, Tārā, Manasā etc.

Kṣetrapāla appears to be a Saivite deity from the descriptions that are met with in various works. In one place he is definitely called a son of Śiva (śambhu-tanaya)² According to the *Linga Purāṇa*³ Kṣetrapāla is an incarnation of Śiva. It is stated that when even the destruction of the demon Dārūka would not satisfy the wrath of the goddess Kālī, Śiva, for the welfare of the world, assumed the form of a child, suckled her breast and drank off in this manner her indignation. The energy thereby infused into the system made him the protector of the field and he had eight forms.

The *Skandapurāṇa* account differs from the above in some detail. According to it Śiva in his child-form created 64 Kṣetrapālas from his mouth with a view to remove the fear of the gods from Kālī.⁴

The same Purāṇa, elsewhere, gives Kṣetrapāla as the name of one of the liṅga forms of Śiva, worshipped in Prabhāsa and Puruṣottamakṣetra (Puri). This is stated to be the name of one of the eight liṅga forms assumed by Śiva in Puruṣottamakṣetra (*Viṣṇukhaṇḍa-Puruṣottamamāhātmya* IV. 57-9). Phallic forms of Kṣetrapāla under the names of Kālamegha and Kaṅkālabhairava are also represented as being objects of worship in Prabhāsa.⁵

Kṣetrapāla is found to have been identified with Vaṭuka, a Bhairava or emanation of Śiva, in the *Vaṭukabhairavastotra* which is stated to belong to the *Viśvasāratāntra* and which while enumerating one hundred and eight names⁶ of the latter deity gives Kṣetrapāla as one of the names.

2 मूर्ध्नि पिङ्गलकेशम् ऊर्ध्वत्रिलोचनं सम्पाद्य जटाकलापम् ।

दिग्वासं भुजङ्गभूषणमुग्रदंष्ट्रकं क्षेत्रेशं शम्भुतनयं भजे ॥

This *dhyāna* is given in the *Purohitadarpaṇa* under *Vāstupūjā*.

3 *Pūrvabhāga* 106. 22-4.

4 चतुःषष्टिक्षेत्रपालानित्युक्ता सोऽसृजन्मुखात्—*Skandapurāṇa, Kumārikā-Khaṇḍa*, 62, 16.

5 *Prabhāsakhaṇḍa*, chapters 331 and 137 respectively.

6 The hymns giving such lists of names of deities are interesting inasmuch

In spite of these clearly śaivaite characteristics, it is curious, as we shall see hereafter, that in folk conceptions the deity sometimes takes a feminine form and sometimes is given a Vaiṣṇavite appearance. The *Kulārṇava*, however, goes to the extent of saying that Kṣetrapāla is the supreme deity who rules over the whole universe.⁷

The deity is supposed to have a good many forms. According to the *Līngapurāṇa* the number is eight, while according to the lists quoted in the *Vācaspatya* and the *Puraścaryāṇava* the number is 49 and 64 respectively.⁸ One form of the deity is believed to preside over each letter of the alphabet and each of these letters begins one particular name. This close connection of the deity Kṣetrapāla with letters of the alphabet is significant in view of one of the cardinal doctrines of the Tantras according to which letters and sounds occupy a very important position in Tantra theology. Particular regions have also particular forms of the deity beside the 49 presiding over the 49 letters of the alphabet and the *Puraścaryāṇava* mentions 15 such forms.

From the etymology of the name as also from the account of the *Līngapurāṇa*, already cited, protection of the field or rather plots of land appears to have been the main function of the deity.⁹ Hence worship was first of all offered to him in all important rites with a view to safeguard the place of worship and consequently the whole performance. One who takes recourse to a particular plot of land without worshipping Kṣetrapāla is supposed to be oppressed by serious obstacles.¹⁰

as they reveal the under-current of monotheism pervading all the external forms of polytheism. Thus in the list of names of one deity are found not infrequently names of other deities probably seeking thereby to impress on the popular mind the identity of all the different deities.

7 XVII. 99.

8 The *Skanda P.* also gives 61 as the number though the list given by it differs, in respect of some of the names, from the other lists. According to this Purāṇa 25 of this number were given charge of heaven, 25 of the nether world and 11 of the earth (*Kumārikā-Khaṇḍa* ch. 62).

9 It is to be noted that a pastoral character is also attributed to the god Śiva in his popular conception as revealed in the Śivāyana songs in Bengali. The deity was also worshipped for getting various other sorts of objects e.g. freedom from the fear of snakes (*Skanda P. Prabhāsakhaṇḍa*, ch. 181).

10 The need of offering worship to this deity at the beginning of all rites

The deity is conceived of in some quarters as a *dvārapāla* (door-keeper) or rather lord of a quarter. He seems to have presided over either the Western or the Southern direction. According to the *Prayogasāra* as quoted in the *Vācaspatya* worship should be offered to him in the west while according to the *Kulārṇava* (VII. 30) to the south.

The anthropomorphic description of the deity is found to be differently worded in different works but still there are some common Śaivaite characteristics in all these various descriptions.¹¹ He is three-eyed and naked, has serpents as his ornaments, has the mace and the skull in his hands, carries the shining moon. According to the *Kaulāvalī* he has a trident in his hand and is possessed of *ḍamaru* and *khaṭvāṅga*. He is described as being of a mad and strange appearance. His eyes are savage and circular, his teeth and hence the face are fearful though in the *Dākinītantra* he is stated to have a smiling face, his tawny hairs are up-raised. He wears a red piece of cloth. He is not, however, white like the silver mountain (*rajatagirinibha*) as usually Śiva is described to be, but is only whitish in colour or is as black as the collyrium-mountain (*nīlāñjanādrinibha*) or as blue as the sky (*vyomanīla*). According to the *Skanda Purāṇa* (*Kumārikā Khaṇḍa*, 62. 18)¹² Kṣetrapālas have, like Vaṭuka Bhairava, the dog as their *vāhana* (or conveyance). A long mustache is attributed to him in the conception of the deity as worshipped by the women of Bengal.

As regards the offerings to be made to the deity there seem to have been some objects specially favourite to him. According to the *Tantrasāra* a big piece (of flesh) with condiment is the offering specially laid down for him. The *Isānaśiva-gurudvāpaddhati* (pt II, p. 188-9) prescribes for him a special preparation of rice. Śiva in the *Skandapurāṇa* directs that bean mixed with rice is to be the offering made to the Ksetrapālas. In folk rites in Eastern Bengal śaktu (*chāttu* or a particular preparation of barley) is the principal object offered to the deity. Cakes and sweetmeats, kids, 'the first milk of a

is emphasised in *Kulārṇava Tantra* (VII. 32) and *Skanda P.* (*Kumārikā Khaṇḍa* 62. 18-20).

cow or buffalo', 'the first fruits at harvest times' are also offered in different places.¹³

So far we have dealt with accounts of the deity as found mainly in Purāna and Tantra works. But there is another aspect of the deity, not unlikely the more primitive one, though there is scarcely any reference made to it in any old work. This may be called the popular aspect, the aspect familiar to the people in general though little known to scriptures. The deity enjoys immense popularity all over India and is worshipped under different popular names and forms. Khetpāl (Protector of the fields), Khera (the homestead mound), Bhūmiyā (the godling of the land or soil), Zamindar (land-owner), Saim or Sayam (which has been traced to *śyāma* 'black' or *svayambhū* 'self-emanated' in Sanskrit) are the various vernacular names with which the deity is called by the people.¹⁴ As a matter of fact, every village in the Himalayan Districts is stated to have a temple dedicated to this deity.¹⁵

11 The deity is described among other works in the *Dākinītantra* (Vaṅgiya Sāhitya Pariṣat Ms.—fols. 16b, 17a), *Merutantra* (XXXII. 227-8), *Isānaśivagurudevapaddhati* (II. 188-9), *Sāktānandataraṅgiṇī* (XII. 3), *Puraścaryāraṇava*, *Tantrasāra*, *Kulāvalinirṇaya* (p. 33 of Avalon's edition) and *Skanda P.*, *Kumārikā Khaṇḍa* (62. 18, 25).

नीलाञ्जनाद्रिनिभमूर्द्धं पिशङ्गकेशं वृत्तोग्रलोचनमुपात्तगदाकपालम् ।

आशाम्बरं भुजगभूषणमुग्रदंष्ट्रं क्षेत्रेशमद्भुतमहं प्रणमामि देवम् ॥

Sāktānanda, XII. 3 and *Puraścaryāraṇava* (p. 705).

क्षेत्रपालं महाभागं वराभयकराम्भुजम् ।

द्विभुजं श्वेतवर्णाभं स्मेरास्यं रक्तवाससम् ॥—*Dākinītantra*.

12 वलिमपि सोपदंशबृहत्पिण्डेन दद्यात्—*Tantrasāra*.

दध्याज्यमिश्रं शाल्यन्नं सिद्धं कुटुपतण्डुलैः ।

दत्त्वाम्भस्त्रिस्तदन्नार्धात् त्रिः कपालेर्वलिर्ज्ञपेत् ॥—*Isāna*

नेधेयं भवतां राजमाषतण्डुलमिश्रकाः—*Skanda-Kumārikā* 62, 18

माषभक्तं वलिं दद्यात् धानाचूर्णमथापि वा—*Dākinī*.

13 Crooke—*Introduction to Popular Religion and Folklore in Northern India*, pp. 65-6; Atkinson—*Notes on the History of Religion in the Himalaya of the N. W. P., India*, p. 127.

14 Crooke—*loc. cit.*

15 Atkinson—*loc. cit.* The deity is popular in South India as well. Different types of images of Kṣetrapāla of a fearful and awe-inspiring character are there

The cult of Kṣetrapāla is highly popular among the women folk of Bengal. The women of the districts of Farīdpur and Barisal¹⁶ observe the *vrata* of Kṣetra in the month of Agrahāyaṇa on Saturdays and Tuesdays of the black fortnight. It is believed, one is relieved of illness or from fear of tigers by this observance. It is further believed that the performance of the *vrata* in the month of Māgha tends to rouse the wrath of tigers and hence it is performed always in the month of Agrahāyaṇa and never in the month of Māgha. *Chāttu* made of fried paddy and *tila* is specially liked by the deity and partaken of by the ladies observing the *vrata*. Some amount of *chāttu* packed in a piece of cloth is hung at the time of worship from a jujube tree where the deity is supposed to reside. At some places the worship is offered in an open place under a branch of this tree, with two baskets marked with vermilion placed on the ground nearby upside down.

The story runs to say that on a certain occasion a peasant's wife went with some amount of *chāttu* as provision for the day to work in the field taking her husband, suffering from a bad type of leprosy, in a basket. Some part of the *chāttu* was packed in a piece of cloth and kept hanging from a branch of a jujube tree. The god Kṣetrapāla partook of the food and when cleansing the moustache to which portions of the *chāttu* were sticking, powders fell on the body of the leper who had a temporary glimpse of the god who immediately cured him completely. This led to the introduction of the worship of the deity in this world.

Another story says that two drops of blood fell on the ground from Pārvatī who was in her monthly courses. She covered them with two baskets and went to work. On her return she noticed two tigers were born under the baskets. They were very hungry and asked for food. Pārvatī ordered them to find out any food they could within the time that would be taken by her in spinning thread from a very small amount of cotton. They went and finished two villages and a half. Pārvatī was taken by surprise and she struck their

met within many a Śaiva temple. One image of the deity in the Tanjore temple is as old as the 11th century A.D. (*South-Indian Images of Gods and Goddesses*—H Krishna Sastri, p. 159-60).

16 A brief description of the *vrata* as performed in the district of Mymensing was published in the *Sāhitya Pariṣat Patrika*, (vol. IX, p. 112).

hind legs with a stick with a view to cripple them and curtail their mischievous activities. The legs were broken and they could not do as much harm with the remaining two legs. Pārvatī also ordered them to take food only once a week and to take stale, and not fresh, meat by leaving the animal killed to decompose for a week before its meat could be taken. But it was stated that their hunger would be appeased by the annual performance of Kṣetra-vrata by the women.¹⁷

Worship is offered to the deity in Chittagong by members of different communities like the Hindus, Buddhists and Muhammadans. Elaborate folk-rites are also performed there in connection with his worship.¹⁸

In Western Bengal, apparently in some stronghold of Vaiṣṇavism, the deity seems to have been given quite a different setting. Here the deity appears not only in a feminine form but also gives up the Śaivaite connections and thoroughly becomes Vaiṣṇavite.¹⁹ As a matter of fact, the deity is here worshipped as a form of Lakṣmī, consort of Viṣṇu. The link with Kṣetrapāla seems to be perceptible through the name Kṣetra-devī and through the pastoral characteristics. Kṣetra-devī like Kṣetrapāla is also the presiding deity of the field. The story describing the benefit accruing from her worship states how through her grace paddy seeds brought forth golden paddy in a day.²⁰

CHINTAHARAN CHAKRAVARTI

17 The story is interesting inasmuch as it relates a legend embodying the popular belief regarding the origin of the tiger and some of its characteristics.

18 "On the cult of the godling Kṣetrapāla in the District of Chittagong in Eastern Bengal"—R. K. Bhattacharya (*Journal of the Anthropological Society of Bombay*, vol. XIII, pp. 673-80).

19 In Patna also the deity is identified with Viṣṇu and in Oudh a feminine form is ascribed to it. Crooke, *loc. cit.*

20 *Vratadarpana*—Sudev Chandra Chatterji (Kamālini Sahitya Mandir, 1333 B. S.) p. 161-2.

Some Political Ideas in the Tamil Work (Kural)

It is an accepted idea of the Tamils that the 'Sacred *Kural*' of the immortal Tiruvalluvar is the abiding authority on all ethical subjects valued in the Tamil country. The author was, in the words of Dr. G. U. Pope, "undoubtedly one of the great geniuses of the world." According to tradition, he belonged to a lowly caste, but has been the oracle of millions for nearly two thousand years; and in his person, 'the last has indeed become the first'. We have no definite data which will enable us to fix with precision the age of our author. A series of verses, under the name of the 'Garland of Tiruvalluvar' and ascribed to many great Tamil poets, describes the merits and excellences of the poet in an exhaustive manner and an admiring spirit. The circumstances narrated for the composition of this anthology have been interpreted to bear out the suggestion that the poet was a member of the so-called third Saṅgam of Madura and a contemporary of some of the celebrated Saṅgam poets¹, most of whom flourished in the early centuries of the Christian era. Ceylonese tradition speaks of the poet's contemporaneity with Elāla or Elāra who was of the Tamil race and conquered and ruled the island, according to the *Mahāvamsa*, from 145 to 101 B.C.; and it has been suggested that Tiruvalluvar wrote his treatise, possibly as a guide to his friend Elāla or his son, and that the title Valluvar might mean a priest, a nobleman or an officer of state.² In spite of this it is maintained that the distinct references to the work by Śāttanār, the author of *Maṇimekhalai* and Iḷanko-aḍigaḷ, the equally illustrious author of the *Silappadikāram*, both of whom were contemporaries of Seṅguṭṭuvan Cera, who is said to have flourished in the second century after Christ, strengthen the postulation of a very early date for the work which employs the pecu-

1 V. R. R. Dikshitar, *Studies in Tamil Literature and History*, p. 131.

2 *Valluva* may be identified with the Sanskrit term Vallabha; and it all depends on whether the term is the name of a person, a caste or an office, as applied to the poet (*ibid*, p. 130). The date of the work is not yet capable of precise definition.

liar *venba* metre after the *sūtra* style of Sanskrit literature:—say in the first century B.C. or in the first two Christian centuries. The author did not give the work any sort of sectarian tinge but endeavoured, primarily, to be a moralist rather than a religious teacher. Every Hindu sect claims the great poet and interprets his verses so as to support its own peculiar tenets. “The Jainas specially consider him their own; and he has certainly used several of their technical terms. . .”³ Materials are available for claiming him, though not with definiteness, for Buddhism, Śaivism, Vaiṣṇavism and even Christianity. He seems to have been acquainted with different creeds and faiths; and his teaching appeals to every faith and implies an eclectic system of faith and practice, being didactic and non-controversial. “What philosophy he teaches seems to be of the eclectic school as represented by the *Bhagavadgītā*⁴ which can be made to appeal to every faith.”

According to the new school of non-Aryan Tamil scholars that is rising up, there has not been much of indebtedness of the Tamils to the early Aryan culture; and the early Dravidians had, independently of the slightest Aryan or other influence, their own culture and literature. On the other hand, there are not wanting scholars who say that the history of South Indian culture begins, properly speaking, only with the coming of the Aryans to the south. The introduction of Aryan culture into the south was the result, not of conquests, but of a peaceful and gradual process of penetration.

Be this point as it may, it is not open to much opposition that Tiruvalluvar was familiar with Sanskrit literature, and particularly with the literature bearing on the *Arthasāstra* and *Dharmaśāstra*, not to speak of the *Kāmasāstra*. His work deals with the four objects of life, *Dharma*, *Artha*, *Kāma* and *Mokṣa* (*Aṛam*, *Poruḷ*, *Inbam* and *Vīdu*, which are the exact Tamil equivalents of the corresponding Sanskrit terms). The last of these does not lend itself to didactic treatment and has been omitted. *Dharma* (Righteousness) has been treated in all the four stages viz., of student, house-holder, a retired life and that of the hermit, and the whole is supplemented with a chapter on

3 G. U. Pope, *The Sacred Kurral* (1886), Intro. p. v.

4 Barth, *Religions of India*, p. 192.

predestination. The next division of the book relates to life in society which presupposes and implies some sort of governmental organisation. It deals with *Artha* and is termed *Poruṭpāl*.⁵ It covers 70 chapters out of a total of 133 for the whole work. Parimeḷagar, the greatest of the commentators on the work, divides the section into kingship (royalty), elements of sovereignty (the *aṅgas* or limbs of the state), and common duties. The section on kingship covers 25 chapters, and that on Ministers of state in 10 chapters. Five chapters are devoted to the territory of the state, fortifications, royal wealth and forts. Alliance and enmity are detailed in 11 chapters; and the remaining chapters in the division relate to the conduct of ruler and subjects, the carrying on of agriculture and other miscellaneous matters. The seven categories, viz. *svāmin* (sovereign), *amātya* (minister), *suhṛt* (ally), *koṣa* (finance), *rāṣṭra* (territory), *durga* (fortress) and *bala* (army) constitute the doctrine of *Ṣaptāṅga*, the seven limbs (organs) of the body-politic.⁶ From Kauṭilya's description of the attributes of a *janapada*, it is co-extensive both with territory and population which form the physical constituents of the state from the point of view of political thought. Chapter LXXIV, dealing with the land, implies the combination of both people and territory in the treatment of Tiruvalluvar. The king should have, according to the *Kuṛaḷ*, courage, wisdom and energy, a sleepless promptitude, knowledge and strong decision; he should be easy of access and endowed with pleasant speech and pleasing mien. Almost in the same ideas, does Kauṭilya clothe the essential qualities of the *svāmin*. He should have an inviting

5 Translated by Father Beschi into 'rerum proprietates'; by Graul into "de bonis;" 'vom Gute', and by Ariel into 'la fortune.'

The chief translations of the work are those of (1) Beschi (Latin) (cir. 1730 A.D.); (2) F. W. Ellis (1820); (3) W. H. Drew (1852); (4) J. Lazarus (1885); (5) G. U. Pope (1886); (6) V. V. S. Aiyar (1916); and (7) H. A. Popley (1931). There are (1) a German and a Latin rendering by Dr. Graul (1856); (2) French versions by Mm. Ariel, de Dumast, Lamairesse and de Fontainieu.

6 Verse 381 of the *Kuṛaḷ*—tr. of Pope:

"An army, people, wealth, a minister, friends, fort: six things—

Who owns them all, a lion lives amid the kings." cf. *Manu*, VI, 160; *Kauṭilya*, Book VI, 1, Kāmandaka, 1, 18.

(*abhigāmika*) nature; and he should be endowed with *prajñā* (understanding), *utsāha* (energy) and *ātma-sampat* (self-possession). Tiruvaḷḷuvar's description of the king as one who gains treasure, stores it up, defends it and expends it duly for the kingdom's weal, is paralleled by the four-fold functions of the king according to the *Kāmandaka Nītisāra*, which are "to acquire wealth by equitable means, to preserve it, to augment it and then spend it on the deserving." Tiruvaḷḷuvar regards learning as the most essential attribute of the ruler; he deems that the chief wealth of all is that 'acquired by ear-attent', following herein the old maxim, stressed by Kauṭilya that hearing opens the door to right knowledge and to right action. The prescription of Tiruvaḷḷuvar (verse, 447) that

"What power can work his fall,
Who faithful ministers employs,
That thunder out reproaches when he errs",

is supplemented with the lesson that

"To cherish men of mighty soul,
And make them all their own,
Of kingly treasures rare,
As rarest gift is known" (verse 443).

Kauṭilya's enumeration of the qualifications of a ministerial officer (*amātyasampat*) is capable of close comparison with the *Kuraḷ*'s description of ministerial qualities.

The chapter on acting after due consideration and those dealing with the selection of time and place and with the cognisance of power⁷ run almost closely identical with the Kauṭīliyan maxims on many points; and similar parallels with Kauṭilya may be easily found in the succeeding chapters dealing with the selection of ministers and other 'instruments' and their employment. In the 51st chapter, Tiruvaḷḷuvar puts in the very first verse itself an expression which "indicates unmistakable affinity with Kauṭilya's *Artha-sāstra*".⁹ The subject is the

7 The *Kuraḷ*, verse 385, and *Kāmandaka*, 1, 20.

8 Chapters 47, 48, 49 and 50.

9 Dr . S. K. Aiyangar—*Some Contributions of South India to Indian Culture*, ch. VI, p. 126.

selection of ministers by the king; and the verse, as translated by Pope, runs thus:—

“How treats he virtue, wealth and pleasures?

How, when life's at stake, comforts himself?

This four-fold test of man will full assurance make.”

The substance is that a man, before being selected for admission into the body of ministers, should be tested by the four tests of righteousness, wealth, love and fear of life. The last test or *upada* has not been understood rightly, owing to a wrong reading, by the commentator and owing to a lack of knowledge of the original source of inspiration, that source being Book I, Chapter X of the *Arthasāstra*, which goes on to describe the four allurements—religious, monetary, love and that of fear—and advises the king to employ those ministers whose character has been tested under “the three pursuits of life, religion, wealth and love, and under fear.” It may be also well maintained that in the same chapter of the *Kural*, dealing with the selection of ministers, we find a great many points of resemblance to the qualifications that are to be expected of ideal councillors, as set forth by Kauṭilya in the chapter on the creation of ministers.¹⁰ One finds an almost full identity between Tiruvalluvar's maxims regarding the right sceptre (chapter, LV)¹¹ and the several rules by which the righteous monarch should abide, as laid down by Kauṭilya, Manu and others. The *Kural* precept that the king

10 Commenting on this, Dr. S. K. Aiyangar remarks:—“But to any dispassionate reader, the similarity of idea is quite clear, detail for detail, so that there is no reasonable doubt left that the author of the *Kural* had full knowledge of the *Artha-sāstra* and adopted several of its conclusions strangely enough. It is to the credit of Tamil scholarship of an elder age, that this similarity had already been pointed out by a commentator who preceded Parimèl Aḷahar in this work.” (*ibid*, p. 128).

11 Verse 543 viz.,

“Learning and virtue of the sages spring

From the all-controlling sceptre of the king.”

and its complement, verse 560 (ch. LVI),

“Where guardian guardeth not, udder of kine grows dry,

And Brahmans' sacred lore will all forgotten lie.”

can easily get numerous parallel passages in *Kauṭilya*, in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, in *Manu* and other works.

“Should raise the rod with brow severe,
But let it gently fall”

may be read side by side with the maxim of Abul Fazl, the learned minister of Akbar, that the king “ makes wrath the tyrant, pay homage to wisdom, so that blind rage may not get the upper hand and inconsiderateness overstep the proper limits” and “sits on the eminence of propriety, so that those who have gone astray have a way left to return. .”¹² Again, when the Tamil sage urges, in chapter LVII on Absence of Terrorism, the warning:—

“Whom subjects scarce may see,
of harsh forbidding countenance,
His ample wealth shall waste,
blasted by demon’s glance”,

we are naturally inclined to Kauṭilya’s enumeration of the first class of qualities that must mark the true *scāmin*, *viz.*, those attributes which are of an inviting nature (*abhigānika*) and induce people to approach him and follow his lead.

More suggestive is Tiruvalluvar’s treatment of detectives. His lesson that

“One spy must not another see; contrive it so;
And things by three confirmed as truth you know”.

is identical with Kauṭilya’s warning; “ when the information derived from three independent sources is the same, then it shall be held reliable; if the sources differ, the reporters concerned shall be either punished or dismissed.”¹³ His very first notice of spies in whom “along with the Dharmaśāstra, let the king confide as eyes” is synonymous with the aphorism, familiar in the pages of Kauṭilya and Megasthenes, that the ‘reporters’ were in fact ‘the eyes and ears of the executive government.’¹⁴ The Tamil poet mentions spies; disguised as monks and

¹² The *Ain-i-Akbari* tr. by H. Blochmann, vol. I (p. iv of Abul Fazal’s Preface).

¹³ *Kural*, verse 589; and *Kauṭilya*, II, ch. XIII.

¹⁴ Compare with Kāmandaka’s words: “That king, one of whose eyes is *cara* (or spy) is awake even in sleep”. XIII, 29, quoted by V. R. R. Dikshitar.

devotees and stresses on the wisdom of “spying by spies and testing the things they tell by other spies.”

The qualities of *utsāha* (energy) and of *prajñā* (wisdom) which are very necessary to the king, are detailed in four chapters (60-63) in the course of which the Tamil sage teaches that ‘the wealth of mind’ is permanent as contrasted with material wealth and that ‘delay, oblivion, sloth and sleep; these four are pleasure-boat to bear the doomed to ruin’s shore.’ Manly effort is idealised into the lesson, breathing of the spirit of the *Bhagavad Gītā*, that

“Though fate divine should make your labour vain,
Effort its labour’s sure reward will gain.”

(Verse 619).

Hopefulness in difficulties is regarded as an essential royal virtue; and the ruler is enjoined “not to allow sorrow to touch his soul” and ‘to take pain as pleasure’ and “not to meet with troubled mind the sorrows it expects.”

The ideal measure of the qualities of a minister is spread over ten chapters of the *Kuṛaḷ*. Kauṭilya’s description of the fittest person for a ministership as one who was “a native of the country, born of a high family, influential, learned in the arts and sciences; possessed of wisdom and foresight, endowed with a good memory, capable, eloquent, intelligent; possessed of enthusiasm, endurance, dignity and grandeur, pure in character, devotedly attached (to the interests of the state), endowed with a good excellent conduct, strength, health and boldness, devoid of procrastination and fickleness of mind, of a loving nature, and not of a disposition to excite enmity” can well apply to every phase of the minister’s qualifications, according to Tiruvaḷḷuvar, which embrace a knowledge of the means, time and mode of execution, a determined mind, greatness of protecting power, learned wisdom and manly effort and a combination of natural subtlety of mind and power of pondering and firmly resolving (chapter LXIV).

The minister’s power of speech should be such as to hold spell-bound “the listening ear, while those, who have not heard, desire to hear.” (verse 643). It is noteworthy that he is warned against even the least sin and oppression, even though it be to safeguard the so-called interest of the state.

“In pot of clay unburnt he water pours and would retain,
Who seeks by wrong the realm in wealth and safety to
maintain.” (verse 660)¹⁵

The duties of envoys are detailed in chapter LXIX; they lay stress on the qualifications of high birth, knowledge, goodly grace, sound sense, and capacity “to speak right home, prepared for each emergency”, as well as a fearlessness of consequences to himself. This last is indicated in verse 690, which runs thus:—

“Death to the faithful one his embassy may bring:
The envoy gains assured advantage for his king.”

The envoy (Dūta) was evidently deemed to be an important minister; and his description implies that he had to advise with regard to peace and war relations of the state with a control over foreign policy.

The idea that the minister should have a thorough knowledge of the council and should not dread to speak out his mind boldly before it, is conveyed by Tiruvalluvar in the course of two chapters, illustrations of which are embodied in the two following verses, translated:—

“By rule, to dialectic art your mind apply,
That in the council fearless you may make an apt reply.”
(verse 725)

“Though many things they have learned, yet useless are all
To men who cannot well and strongly speak in the council hall.”
(verse 728)

It may not be stretching the idea too far if we should suppose that the Tamil sage expected the ideal minister to check the autocratic tendencies of the king who was bound by the decisions of the *Mantri-pariṣad*, morally, if not constitutionally. The minister was, strictly speaking, to prop up the monarch on the pedestal of righteousness and efficiency, and had to keep true to the maxim—“For if the king

¹⁵ Compare this with Aristotle's dictum that one of the chiefest qualifications required in those who fill the highest offices, should be ‘virtue and justice.’ Also Plato's view, embodied in his *Republic* that members of the philosopher class (rulers) should have fortitude, magnanimity, docility and memory.

could not be kept in check by ministers, is national prosperity possible by such ministers?¹⁶

The attributes of land and people as the essentials of a state are next detailed; and we are straightly told that, in spite of other advantages that it may possess, a land gains nought that is not at peace with its king. The *durga* constituent of the state comprehends different types of fortifications, like water and hill forts, desert and forest forts (verse 742). The revenue receipts of the state should be mainly made up of income accruing to the king in his personal capacity, taxation proper and tribute and booty taken in war (verse 756). The treasury is deemed to be the surest guarantee of internal peace and external security. The army is required to be complete in all its limbs, and well-equipped and drilled, under proper leaders. Above all desiderata there should be the true martial spirit animating all ranks (chapters LXXVII and LXXVIII). The *ally* as a constituent element of the state is treated only in the very general terms of friendship, good and bad, real and unreal. Secret foes are to be guarded against; and indulgence in dicing and gaming, peculiarly royal vices in ancient times, is condemned in forceful terms.

It has been possible, in the course of this brief paper, to indicate only a few salient features of the political ideas embodied in the *Kural*; but enough has been shown to demonstrate the familiarity of the Tamil sage with Sanskrit political literature and to show the comprehensive culture and outlook that marked ancient Tamil learning and scholarship.

C. S. SRINIVASACHARI

Some Linguistic Notes

I

Maṭaci

The curious word *maṭaci* occurs in a passage of the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* (I, 10. 1): *maṭaci-hateṣu Kurusv Āṭikya saha jāyayā Uṣastir ha Cākrāyaṇa ibhya-grāme pradrāṇaka urāsa*. Though the word is of unknown meaning there is no doubt that in this sentence the devastation of the Kuru country caused by the *maṭaci* and the consequent poverty of the village in which Uṣasti Cākrāyaṇa lived are spoken of.

The word has been explained by Śaṅkara in his commentary to the *Chāndogya* as *aṣani*; this explanation is generally accepted, and it is rendered into English as 'hailstone'. Sénart in his translation of the *Chāndogya* while accepting the same meaning 'la grêle (?)' has expressed his doubt about it. Jacob in his *Scraps from the Saddarsana* (*JRAS.*, 1911, p. 510) discussed the different traditional explanations of the word and pointed out for the first time that Ānandagiri in his commentary on the *Bhāṣya* of Śaṅkara offers an alternative explanation of the word as *rakta-varṇāḥ kṣudra-pakṣi-viśeṣāḥ* 'a sort of red-coloured winged creatures'. This is admitted by Amalānanda as the correct meaning of the word in his *Vedānta-kalpataru*, a commentary on *Bhāmātī*. Jacob while accepting this meaning of the word thought that it meant 'locusts'. The word seemed to him to be an importation from 'outside Āryāvarta'. Since this suggestion was made K. B. Pathak took it up and tried to find out the word 'outside Āryāvarta' in the Dravidian world. In a note published by him in the *Indian Antiquary* (XLII, p. 235) he pointed out that the word is a Sanskritised form of 'the well-known Dravidian word *miḍiche*'. The word *miḍiche* is in fact found in Canarese, and it means there 'grasshopper, locust'. Kittel in his *Canarese Dictionary* has compared this word with other Dravidian words for 'locust' e.g. Telugu-*miḍutha*, Malayalam-*viṭṭal* or *vetṭal* and Tamil-*vetṭukkili*. Pathak is of opinion that all these words are derived from a common root *miḍi* 'to hop'. Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar made use of this suggestion

(*Carmichael Lectures*, 1918, p. 28) for establishing his theory of Dravidian influence on the Sanskrit language.

It is difficult to say if the Malayalam and Tamil words are at all related to the Canarese word *midiche*. If the Telugu word *midutha* has at all any connection with the Canarese *midiche* the changes in the vowel and the final consonant have not been explained. On the other hand, the word is found in different Iranian dialects and we have reason to suppose that it was present in the common Indo-Iranian.

Gauthiot in his *Grammaire Sogdienne* (Introduction, p. ii) while discussing the different words for 'locust' in Persian showed that three different names of 'locust' are known in Persian: the one **ma ḡax* (old **ma ḡakha*) is special to the language of Northern Persia i.e. what may be called the Arsacidan language. It is found in the Armenian loan *marax*, Hübschamann—*Pers. St.*, p. 100 and Meillet, *MSL.*, t. 17, p. 245). The second word in Persian is *maig* which belongs to the dialect of the South-West and goes back to old **ma ḡaka* or **ma ḡka*. The third Persian word is *malax* derived from an ancient **ma ḡakha*. *Malax* has been supposed by Gauthiot to be of Sogdien origin as in one of its dialects only ḡ is known to have changed into *l*. Afghan *malax* and Brahui *malakh* go back to the same origin.

All these forms are reducible to ancient **ma ḡaka* or **ma ḡakha* of which there was an old feminine form like **ma ḡaki* or **ma ḡakhi* which in common Indo-Iranian was something like **madak'i*. It is probable that the dental underwent a cerebralisation on Indian soil and gave rise to the form *maṭacī*. The Canarese word therefore seems to be a loan from the Indo-Aryan.

II

Mañjula and Manāzil

The name of Mañjulācārya appears as that of a famous astronomer. Bhāskarācārya who lived in the beginning of the 12th century has not only mentioned his name in connection with the precession of the equinoxes but has also accepted his calculations in that respect. A work of astronomy is attributed to the authorship of Mañjulācārya. The work is called *Laghumānasam* and is as yet unpublished. It was composed in the Śaka year 854 i.e. 931 A.D. A detailed notice of this work will be found in the *Descriptive Cata-*

logue of the Sanskrit Mss. in the Govt. Oriental Mss. Library, Madras (vol. XXIV, 1918, Section on *Jyotiṣa*, pp. 9101-9103, no. 13475). The colophon of the work runs thus:—

Śrī Mañjulācāryakṛtam prabhava-saṃvatsara-kārtika-śukla-paurṇamāsyām prārabdham Laghumānasūkhyam gaṇitam Yallayā-kṛta-sopapattika-vyākhyā-sahitam.

The commentator Yallaya who belonged most probably to the 11th century¹ quotes a verse from earlier authors to testify to the high position of Mañjula amongst astronomers:

*Aryabhaṭa grahagaṇitam golam Dāmodaro vijānāti |
Candrajño Jīṣṇusutassarvam jānāti Mañjulācāryaḥ ||*

“Aryabhaṭa knows the science of the motion of stars, Dāmodara that of the earth, Jīṣṇusuta that of the moon but Mañjula knows all of them”. There is therefore nothing strange in Bhāskara’s accepting him as the greatest authority on the precession of the equinoxes.

Yallaya’s comment on the first śloka of the *Laghumānasam* has a special interest which has not yet been pointed out. The śloka runs thus:

*Prakāśūditavāt khyāto Bhāradvājo dvijottamaḥ |
labdhapūrvam sphūṭopāyam vakṣye ’nyallaghumānasam ||*

1 Prof. J. C. Ray in his Bengali book “Our Astronomers and Astronomy” (p. 23 and p. 95) gives the name as Muñjāla but this seems to be wrong. He mentions two Mss., one from Kaśmīr and the other from Madras. We have consulted a copy of the Madras Ms. where the name is written as Mañjula. Cf. also the *Madras Catalogue*. Mr. N. K. Majumdar (*Journal of Letters*, vol. XIV Calcutta University, *Laghumānasam* of Muñjāla) gives the name under the same form. Prof. Ray gives the name of the commentator of the *Laghumānasam* also wrongly as Mallayācārya. The correct form of the name is Yallayācārya.

The colophon of the commentary speaks of Yallaya as the son of Śrīdhara and the disciple of Sūryaṇārya (*sic.* Sūryācārya, cf. *the Madras Catalogue*, *loc. cit.*, p.9020), the son of Bālāditya. In this catalogue another work of Yallaya—a summary of Sūryadeva’s commentary on the *Āryabhaṭīyam* (*loc. cit.*, p.9020) is mentioned. If Sūryācārya and Sūryadeva be the same person then he lived in the 10-11th century A.D. as the latter is quoted by Bhāskara in the beginning of the 12th century A.D. The time of Yallaya therefore will not be much later than this date.

Yallaya explains it thus:

*prakāśaḥ prasiddhāḥ prakāścāsūrūditya-śceti tadvat khyātaḥ.
loke ādityanāmadheyāḥ puruṣāḥ vidyante. tathāvidhākhyātimannaham.
Brahmaṇāntastimira-saṃhārako-'rko yadvat prasiddhaḥ tadvad-
ahamapi.*

*athanyadarthāntaram. Prakāśam nāma paṭṭanam-uttaradeśeṣu
vidyate. tatrastha-puruṣāstu deśabhāṣayā sūryam Mañjula iti varṇa-
yanti. Mañjulācāryohamityuktam bhavati....Śrīmat Prakāśapaṭṭana-
vāsino deśabhāṣayā sūryam Mañjula iti hi vadanti.*

I believe there is some foundation in the second meaning offered by Yallaya. According to it Prakāśa was the name of a city in Northern countries, "where the people in their native language describes the sun as Mañjula". Yallaya was an astronomer by profession and had direct access to certain traditions about the great teachers of astronomy—traditions which are lost to us. According to this tradition therefore Mañjula was a man of the city of Prakāśa of the Uttaradeśa and his name was a synonym of the sun. This agrees with what we know about the names of some of the great teachers of astronomy like Varāhamihira, Jisṇusuta, Bhāskarācārya, etc. all of which are connected with the names of the sun.

But Mañjula as a name of the sun is unknown to any Indian language. It seems to be a Sanskritisation of the Arabic word *manzil* (plural, *manāzil*) which means a lunar station and thus corresponds to Sanskrit *nakṣatra*. The name of Mañjula was thus probably modelled on a real astronomical term. If it was at all taken to mean sun, as Yallaya wants us to believe, it was through a certain confusion.

III

Hippokoura and Kolhapur

Ptolemy in his *Geography* mentions Hippokoura, the royal city of Beleokouros, on the western coast of India almost midway between Barygaza and Muziris. Barygaza is modern Broach and Muziris, Muzirikuttu of ancient Tamil inscriptions, is modern Cranganore a little to the north of Cochin. Beleokouros is generally supposed to be one of the kings known as Viḷivūyakura from the Audhra coins. The coins

of Viḷivāyakura are exclusively found at Kolhapur and this is why it is believed that the kings of that name belonged to a particular branch of the Andhra kings ruling in the region of modern Kolhapur.

Hippokoura which is said by Ptolemy to have been the capital of Viḷivāyakura has, however, not been properly identified. It is tentatively identified with Kolhapur on account of the fact that it is the find-spot of the coins of Viḷivāyakura. But this identification can be supported with more precise arguments.

The first element of the name Hippokoura, *Hippos*—is a Greek word meaning 'horse'. The second element *-koura* like *goura*, *oura*, *our* etc. which are generally found in the end of the place-names of South India mentioned by Ptolemy has been proved to be an indigenous word meaning 'city' (cf. *Pre-Aryan and Pre-Dravidian in India*).

The name therefore was partly translated and partly transcribed in Greek. It was evidently known to them as 'the city of horse'. The word for horse in the Dravidian languages are the following:

- korā (Gond),
- goḍā (Kui)
- goro (Kurkh)
- gurramu (Telegu)
- kudirei (Tamil)
- kudure (Canarese)
- hulla (Brahui)

All these forms of the word show the possibility of the existence of another form like *kolla* which might have given rise to *kolha* of Kolhapur. It is probably the name of Kolhapur which is referred to as *Kollagiri* in the medieval Tāntrik literature. (cf. for example the *Dākārṇava*, II. P. Sastri, *Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts of A.S.B.*, vol. I, p. 97). *Kollagiri* was supposed to be a *pīthasthāna* in the Tantras, and Kolhapur also has been sacred to the Hindus for its famous temple of Mahālakṣmī.¹ In the same region and not far from Kolhapur

1 In fact Fleet (*Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts* p. 538 and p. 497) says that the more ancient name of Kolhapur was *Kollāpura* and *Kollagiri* which is mentioned in the list of conquests made by the Hoysala King Viṣṇuvardhana (1117-1137 A.D.) was probably a different name of Kolhapur. The more ancient form of the word *Kolha* was therefore *Kolla-Kollu*.

we find mention of another place sacred to the Tantras viz. Karahāṭaka, modern Karhād or Karād (cf. S. Lévi, *Le Catalogue Géographique des Yakṣa*, 44.4., p. 78). It is therefore permissible to think that Hippokoura and Kolhapur are identical as both the names mean the same thing—‘the city of horse.’

Prof. Przyluski in a paper in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1929, pp. 273ff.) has tried to bring out the significance of the names Viḷivāyakura and Sātakarṇi, the titles of the Andhra kings. He has pointed out that *Sāta-* of Sātakarṇi is based on the Austric word for horse *sādām*. I might here point out *en passant* that the word is still preserved in the Hindi vocabulary as *sāro* or *sālo* in the word *sārotarī* which means an *aśvavidyaka* or *ghoṭakacikitsaka*, ‘horse-curer’.

Besides Viḷivā of Viḷivāyakura has been compared with the word Vaḍavā which ordinarily means a ‘sea-horse’. But in the Sanskrit lexicons Vaḍavā is also taken to be a synonym of aśvā or ghoṭakī, the female of an horse. Therefore Viḷivāyakura also may be equated with Hippokura and Kolhapur and it may be asked whether the word Viḷivāyakura primarily was the name of the place and afterwards was used to designate a particular family of the Andhras ruling from that place.

IV

Pil-, *Peḷ-* and Vedic *Pedu*, the words for elephant.

Prof. Sylvain Lévi in a note on Paloura-Dantapura (*Notes Indiennes J. As.*, 1925, pp. 46-57) tried to prove that the two names, Dantapura mentioned in Indian texts, and Paloura mentioned by Ptolemy, are identical because in Dravidian the words *pallu*, *hallu*, *pal* etc. mean ‘tooth’. Prof. Przyluski subsequently discussed the question again (*Bull. Soc. Ling.*, 1926, pp. 218-219; for both the articles see *Pre-Aryan and Pre-Dravidian in India* published by the Calcutta University). As the word is found in different languages of the Austric family too meaning the tusk of an elephant Prof. Przyluski is inclined to trace the word to Austric origin. I do not propose here to decide if the word is Dravidian or Pre-Dravidian but I want to draw the attention of

scholars to the different forms under which it occurs in the Sanskrit vocabulary.

In the Dravidian family of languages the words *pallu*, *pella*, *pell*, *hallu*, *pall* and *pal* mean 'the tusk of elephant.' The word for elephant in Assyrian is *piru*, in Aramean *pil* and in Arab *fil*. They are all supposed to have been derived from the Indian world along with the animal and are apparently connected with the words found in the Dravidian family. Though they mean in the Dravidian languages exclusively 'the tusk' there was a time when it meant also the animal. Kittel in his *Kannadū-English Dictionary* records the following words—*pal-a*, elephant; *pallava*, young of an elephant; *pidi*, a female elephant, *pillakā*, female elephant. Traces of it have been left in old inscriptions and texts. In an inscription of the 11th century of king Bhāskara Ravivarman of Cochin written in Tamil, the word for she-elephant is given as *peḍi* (*Epigraphia Indica*, III, p. 66ff cf. also Kottāyan grant, *Madras Journal*, XIII, I, pp. 182, 142ff.), still called *pidi* 'a female elephant' in modern Tamil. In Dravidian *Pillaiyar* is the name of Ganeśa—the god who has the head of an elephant. Besides *pille* in the Tamil country means a child. It probably originally meant 'the young one of an elephant' (cf. Pāli, *pillaka* which means the young of an animal; for further discussion on it see later).

On account of uncertainty of quantity of the medial vowel the word has been preserved under different forms like *pil-*, *pel-*, *pal-*, or with cerebrals like *peḍ-*; with a final vowel it has taken the forms *pil-la*, *pil-lu*, (also *pil-u*), *pel-la*, *pal-a*; *pal-lu* etc. We may therefore expect the word under any of the forms mentioned above.

This word whether Austric or Dravidian plays an important role in Sanskrit vocabulary. It has been preserved in a number of place names. Hiuan Tsang in the middle of the 7th century visited a mountain to the south-west of the capital of Kapiśā (Kafiristan) which he calls *Pi-lo-sho-lo*. This name, he says, was given to the mountain from its presiding genius which had the form of an elephant (cf. Watters, *On Yuan Chwang*, I, p. 129). The name is translated into Chinese as 'elephant-solid' and hence restored by Julien as *Pilusāra*. It is evident that the word *Pilu* was used to mean 'elephant'. It is

possible to discover the same word in a little different form in the name of another place mentioned by the same traveller further to the west on the borderland of India, *Po-lu-shu*. The city which was situated about 100 li to the south-west of Puṣkarāvati is generally identified with modern Palo-dheri (*ibid.*, p. 217). The name has been restored as *Palusā*. It seems that the word *palu* (later *palo*) was used in the sense of 'elephant's tusk'. Such a view is confirmed by two curious Buddhist legends which are associated with this place. Hiuan Tsang relates that to the north of the city there was a tope to mark the spot where the Bodhisattva in his previous birth as prince *Su-ta-na* bade adieu on being sent into exile for having given the elephant of the king, his father, to a Brahmin. The name of the prince is rendered as *Sudāna* but it means according to the Chinese gloss 'having good teeth' (*sudanta*). The *Jātaka* referred to it is the *Vessantara Jātaka*; the name of the prince was Vessantara. The name Sudanta was that of the much prized white elephant which the prince gave away (cf. also Watters, *ibid.*, p. 218). Besides close by the city the Chinese pilgrim noticed a mountain called *Tan-to-lo-ka* with which another legend of Bodhisattva's sacrifice is connected. The name is generally restored as *Danta-loka*. These two legends clearly indicate that the place was somehow connected with a fabulous 'white elephant and its tusk' just in the same way as the mount Pilusāra is said to have been presided over by an elephant-genius. It may not be out of place to point out that in the north-western zone in the region of Pilusāra and Palusā a few other place names also had connection with elephant in some way. The name of Puṣkarāvati has probably been preserved in that of modern Hastnagar 'the city of elephant' with which it is identified. Puṣkara is one of the names of elephant and it is therefore not impossible that in ancient times it really meant the 'City of Elephant', like Hastinapura of the Kurus and Vāraṇāvata of the Pāṇḍavas. It is not without significance that the historians of Alexander mention a king called Astes (Hasti) as ruling over a people called Astacians (Hastikas) living in the region of Puṣkarāvati.

A large number of Nāga legends are still current in the Punjab. Some of the legends relate to nāgas called *Piuli* or *Pili*, *Phal*, *Pael*,

Padoi etc. (See the *Punjab Tribes and Castes*, I, p. 161, 169, 170, 784).

The word is preserved under cognate forms in other connections. Hemacandra in his *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi* (III. 517) mentions a name *Pālakāpya* (*Pālakāpye kareṇubhū*) which the commentator explains as the name of a *hasti-cikitsaka*. That a particular science on the medicine of the elephants had developed and was attributed to the authorship of *Pālakāpya* is known from other sources too (cf. H. P. Sāstri, *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society*, V, 308ff). H. P. Sāstri gives the story of *Pālakāpya* in full. The sage says: "My name is *Pālakāpya*. I take care of the elephants and nourish and cherish them, hence my name is *Pāla*, and the suffix *kāpya* denotes the Gotra in which I was born." (Ibid., p. 311-12). The attempt in the legend to connect the word with the Sanskrit root *Pāla* is a late one. It is possible to discover two elements in this name—*Pāla* and *Kāpya*. *Pāla* is evidently the word for elephant under consideration while the second element *kāpya* is the name of a particular *gotra*. But without raising the deeper question of the origin of the gotras it is possible to analyse the word further. It is derived from the word *kapi* which usually signifies 'a monkey.' But another sense of it is preserved in the Sanskrit texts. In the Sanskrit lexicons (cf. *Śabdakalpadruma* sub. voce) amongst the different synonyms for *gajapippali* we get *karipippali*, *ibhakaṇa*, *kapivallī*, *kapillikā* etc. Here the words *gaja*, *kari*, *ibha* and *kapi* appear to have been used in the same sense. Therefore in the compound *Pālakāpya*, both the words *pāla* and *kapi* had probably the same sense originally.

Besides in such words like *palāda*, *palādana*, *palāpah*, *palāśa*, *pippala* etc. which occur in the Sanskrit vocabulary the same word for elephant viz. *pal-* is discernible. The first two words of the series *palāda* and *palādana* are recorded by the Sanskrit lexicographers (see *Śabdakalpadruma*) as meaning 'a meat-eating *rākṣasa*'. As the second element of the two words *ad-* is 'to eat' the first element *pal* may be taken to have meant 'flesh probably of elephant', the significance of which may be best understood by supposing that elephant was important amongst a certain section of Indian population

and those who killed the elephant were counted amongst the barbarians. *Palāpa* is explained as *hastikapola* where *pal-* is clearly taken in the sense of *hasti*. The word *pippala*, another word for the *ficus religiosa*, occurs under the form *pippapala* in the *Amarakośa*. Amongst its many synonyms is found *gajāśana* probably because the twigs of the peepal tree are a favourite food of the elephant. But one of the Hindi names of the tree is *gajahaṇḍu* and a particular kind of peepal which is called in Hindi *Beliā pippala* is known in Sanskrit as *gajapādapa*. *Pippapala* is explained in the *Amarakośa* as *kuñjarāśana* and *gajabhakṣaka*. The word *palāśa* which is the name of a different kind of tree may have a similar significance. *Aśa* means food and hence *palāśa* means the food of *pal-* i.e. elephant. *Pippala* and *pippapala* might have originated from a reduplicated form of the same word *pal-*.

Moreover another word is found in the Sanskrit lexicons (cf. the *Śabdamañā*)—it is *pillakā* of which the meaning is given as *hastinī*, 'she-elephant'. Though the masculine form of the word does not occur in the Sanskrit dictionaries it was evidently **pillaka*. If the Sanskrit suffix *ka* is omitted we get the word *pilla*, a secondary form of the word *pil-*.

The word also occurs under the form *pīlu* in one of the later Sanskrit lexicons, the *Medinīkośa*, where among its many synonyms is given *matamgaja* i.e. relating to the elephant. The word *pīlupati* or *mahāpīlupati* is sometimes mentioned in the inscriptions as the title of a particular officer. It is generally taken to denote 'the officer in charge of elephants' [*Ep. Ind.*, XII, p. 43; Majumdar, *Inscriptions of Bengal*, p. 186]. In the *Mahāvvyutpatti* the word occurs along with *aśvapati* and *gajapati* and is interpreted as 'chief-treasurer' probably because 'elephant' in the Buddhist literature is supposed to be the best of the seven treasures.

The word *pillaka* which we have just noticed is preserved also in another connection. In the Pāli texts (*Jātaka*, II, 406; *Dictionary*, P.T.S.) the word is used to mean 'the young of an animal'. Amongst the modern dialects Bengali has preserved it in the doublet *chele-pile* to mean 'children'; *chele* from *sāvaka* which originally meant 'the young one of a bird'. Such doublets, primarily, applied

to the animal world, are used as expressions of greater tenderness. (cf. also the use of the expression *kāccā-vāccā* which is used in Bengali in the same sense). It is therefore probable that Bengali *pile*, derived like Pāli *pillaka* from *pilla* or *pil-* originally meant 'the young of an elephant.

In the Ṛg-vedic hymns mention is often made of a mythical steed called *Paidva*. It is so called because it was given to a person called Pedu by the Aśvins. Pedu was a protégé of the Aśvins and they favoured him with a good steed instead of a bad horse which he had. This 'swift, strong, white incomparable and dragon-slaying steed' was the *Paidva*.

The *Paidva* is described as white. [*Ṛc.*, I. 116. 6 *śvetam*; (*Śāyana-śvetavarṇamaśvam*), I.118.9, *śvetam aśvam*; X. 39.10, *śvetam aśvam*.]

The *Paidva* is praiseworthy and invoked by men (cf. *Ṛc.*, I. 116.6 and I. 119.10, *kīrtanyam* which Śāyana explains as *mahi mahat atigambhīram ata eva kīrtanyam sarvaiḥ kīrtanīyam praśasyam*).

The *Paidva* is swift and powerful. [*Ṛc.*, I. 116.6, *vājī* (*Śāyana, vejanavān*); I. 117.9 (also VII. 71.5; *ūhothurāśumaśvam*, I. 118.9, (*Śāyana-johutram alīsayena saṃgrāmeṣu āhvātāram aryo'reḥ śatrorabhibhūtim abhichācukam ugraṃ vīryacattam*) X. 39. 10, *navabhīrvājai-ṇavatīm ca vājinam* i.e. mighty with nine and ninety varied gifts of strength.]

The *Paidva* is loud-neighing (cf. *johutram* in *Ṛc.*, I. 118.9 already explained. *Ac.*, X. 4.4 *aramghuṣo*).

The *Paidva* is invincible in war (cf. I. 119.10 *śaryairabhidyum pṛtānasu duṣṭaram*; I. 117.9, *sahasrasam vājinamapratītam* (strong winner of thousand spoils).

The *Paidva* is impelled by Indra, he is a dragon-slayer like Indra and he is comparable to Indra in prowess (cf. *Ṛc.*, I. 118.9, *indrajūtam ahihanam*; I. 117.9, *ahihanam*; I. 119.10, *Indramiva carṣaṇisaham- Ac.*, X. 4. 10 *Indra mehimayghāyantam-ahim paidvi arandhayat* i.e. Indra and *Paidva* have subdued and tamed the vicious snake (Griffith). In *Ṛc.*, IX. 88. 4, Soma is described as *paidvo na hi tvamahināmnām hantā* i.e. Soma is like *Paidva* in slaying the dragon.

Besides in *Ṛc.*, I. 116.7 and I. 117.6 *Paidva* seems to be the steed

from whose *kārotara* (which means according to Yāska, *Nirukta* III, 23, a *kūpa* or *utsa*—hence the cavity in the head) the Aśvins make flow hundred jars of wine.

It is probably the same *Paidva* who is found as *Petva*, *Pitva* and *Pidva*. *Petva* is twice mentioned in *Atharva Veda* (IV. 4.8; V. 19.2) where reference is made to its *rāja* i.e. strength and swiftness but by that probably its male power is meant, as the spell is for removing lack of virility. In *Ac.*, V, 19.2 *Petva* is said to have overcome a horse. In *Rc.*, VII. 18.17 *Petva* overcomes a female lion. *Petva* is further mentioned in the list of animals offered in the Aśvamedha sacrifice. *Petva* is generally taken to mean a ram or a goat. But a ram or a goat can not possibly be supposed to have overcome a horse or a female lion. *Petva*, *Pitva* and *Pidva* therefore may be taken to mean the same powerful animal as the *Paidva* (for references to these words see the *Vedic Index*, Macdonnell and Keith; *Taitt. Sam.*; V, 5.22; VI, 2.8, 4; *Vāj. Sam.* XXIX. 58.59, XXIV. 32 etc.).

Now which is this steed called *Paidva* described as white, swift and powerful, invincible in war, loud-neighing, able to overcome a horse and a lion and from whose head wine flows? He is said to have been impelled by Indra and is often compared to Indra for his prowess. He is above all a steed. The aforesaid qualities can be only attributed to a steed of the kind of elephant. An elephant of the white colour, powerful, loud-neighing and rutting, goaded by Indra and having the qualities of Indra himself, reminds us of the *Airāvata*, the elephant of Indra in classical mythology. Though I do not propose here to deal with the story of the mythical *Airāvata* I would like to point out in this connection that Indra does not possess any elephant in the Vedic mythology. He is only once (*Rc.*, IV. 16.4) compared to 'a wild elephant with might invested'. So if we are to trace the origin of the *Airāvata* from the Vedic myths we cannot overlook its similarity with the mythical *Paidva*. If it is admitted that the steed *Paidva* was an elephant it is possible to go further into the history of the name.

All the forms *Paidva*, *Pidva*, *Petva* and *Pitva* are reducible to either *Pedu-Pidu* or *Petu-Pitu*. The fluctuation of the vowels *e* and *i* and that of the consonants *d* and *t* show that it was a foreign word that was being transcribed. The foreign word was probably the word

under consideration *pedu* or *pidu*, the indigenous word for elephant. As the cerebralisation had not started in the Indo-Aryan in that period the cerebral was rendered simply by a dental.

In later Vedic period we come across with other words for elephant like the *hasti*, *kari*, etc. But these words are all descriptive and evolved in a period when the Indo-Aryans had become more familiar with the elephant. The account of *Pedu-Paidva* reveals probably their first acquaintance with elephant. The Indo-Aryans had in earlier times greater familiarity with the horse; the superiority of elephant over horse in strength, speed and in other respects inspired them with awe at the first instance and that awe found expressions in coloured stories which gradually took the form of the myth of Paidva.

P. C. BAGCHI

Hetucakranirṇaya

Though there is not a single text of Diinnāga in its original form, the manifold references to him and his school in the works of the Brahmanic as well as Jaina logicians, who were at so much pains to demolish the Buddhist views, enable us to realise at once the importance of the philosophical standpoints of Diinnāga and his followers and the vigour of their criticisms of the non-Buddhist schools. So the history of Mediæval Indian Logic and as a matter of that, the history of Indian Logic in its entirety, cannot be properly studied until the writings of Diinnāga and Dharmakīrtti—the two great figures in the field of Buddhist Logic—remain buried in Tibetan (and in some cases Chinese) translations. It has become imperative upon the students of Indian Logic to exploit the Tibetan sources and attempt reconstruction of the texts from their Tibetan (or Chinese) translations. It may be pointed out in this connection that the faithful Tibetan translations of Sanskrit texts, prepared by Tibetan and Indian scholars in collaboration with each other can be more easily rendered into Sanskrit than into English or any other European language.

The object of this paper is to offer an edition of the Tibetan text of Diinnāga's *Hetucakranirṇaya** with its Sanskrit reconstruction and English translation. The Tibetan text consists of three parts viz., one table of *hetus* and two sets of *kārikās*. It is in the Tanjur Mdo, Ce, fols. 193^b₁—194^b₂ (Narthang edition, Viśvabhāratī copy). It was translated into Tibetan by one Zahor ' scholar called Bodhi-sattva in collaboration with Bhikṣu Dharmāśoka. Though exact identification of Zahor is not known (vide Dr. B. Bhattacharya's Introduction to the *Tattva-saṃgraha*, G. O. Series, Vol. I, pp. 30-31), the Buddhist scholars of that place played an important part in translating Sanskrit texts into Tibetan.

* The name, *Hetucakranirṇaya* has been preferred to *Hetucakrahamaru*, as read in the Xylograph, which seems to be a wrong transliteration. Dr. F. W. Thomas agreeing with Cordier suggests *Hetucakraḍomaru*, but the Tibetan translation of the Sanskrit title unmistakably suggests the original as *Hetucakranirṇaya*. See Randley's *Fragments from Diinnāga*, p. 2, note 1.

Dr. Vidyābhūṣaṇa published (*JASB.*, N. S., III, pp. 627-632) the Tibetan translation of the *Hetucakra* (the table of nine reasons) reproduced from a copy of *Hetucakra nirṇaya* (according to him *Hetucakrahamaru*) which he obtained from Labrang. In his *History of Indian Logic* (p. 299) he has also given some account of the work.

The *Hetucakranirṇaya* is, as the name implies, a tabular representation of the possible forms of inference, based upon the presence, the absence as well as both the presence and the absence of the *hetu* in the *sapakṣa* (similar cases) and the *vipakṣa* (dissimilar cases). The treatise does not undertake to discuss the principles or methods of an inferential argument but only shows the several forms of inference both correct and incorrect, arising from the possible relations of the *hetu* with *sapakṣa* and *vipakṣa*. It may be suggested that Dinnāga after setting forth the principles of inference in treatises like the *Pramāṇasamuccaya*, has prepared the *Hetucakranirṇaya* as an appendix containing a chart of the possible forms of inference.

It is worth noting that the examples of inference are all taken from the *Pramāṇasamuccaya* and the *Nyāyapraveśa* and they continue to be the stock-examples in the later manuals of Buddhist Logic for the illustration of the corresponding forms of inference, valid and invalid.*

* The English translation and the dissertation on the Doctrine of Threefold Hetu and a few incidental notes will be published in the next number.—Ed.

TEXT

I

(1)

sgra ni rtag ste | gzal bya
yin paḥi phyir | namkhaḥ bzin
dañ bum pa bzin no | mthun
paḥi phyogs thams cad la
yod de | dños kyī ma
ñes pa yin par bsad ||

(4)

sgra ni rtag ste | byas
paḥi phyir | namkhaḥ bzin
dañ bum bzin no |
mthun paḥi phyogs la med
mi mthum paḥi phyogs la yod |
ḥgal baḥi gtan tshigs yin
par bsad ||

(7)

sgra ni rtsol ba las mi
byuñ ste | mi rtag paḥi
phyir | glog bzin dañ namkhaḥ
bum pa bzin no | mthun
paḥi phyogs gñis ka mi
mthun paḥi phyogs thams cad
la yod de dños kyīho ||

(2)

sgra ni mi rtag ste | byas paḥi
phyir | bum pa dañ namkhaḥ bzin |
mthun phyogs la yod | mi mthun
phyogs la med | rtags pa yañ
dag yin añ ||

(5)

sgra ni rtag ste | mñan bya yin
paḥi phyir | namkhaḥ bzin | mthun
paḥi phyogs la med mi mthun
paḥi phyogs la med | thun moñ
ma yin paḥi gtan tshigs so ||

(8)

sgra ni mi rtag ste | rtsol
ba las byuñ baḥi phyir | bum
pa glog dañ namkhaḥ bzin |
mthun paḥi phyogs gñis ka mi
mthun paḥi phyogs la med |
yañ dag go ||

(3)

sgra ni rtsol ba las byuñ ste |
mi rtag paḥi phyir | bum pa
dañ glog dañ namkhaḥ bzin | mthun
paḥi phyogs thams cad la yod mi
mthun paḥi phyogs gñis ka dños kyī
med pa yin par bsad ||

(6)

sgra ni rtag ste | rtsol ba las
byuñ baḥi phyir | namkhaḥ bzin
dañ bum pa glog bzin no |
ḥgal baḥi gtan tshigs yin par
bsad ||

(9)

sgra ni rtag ste | lus can la yin
paḥi phyir | namkhaḥ dañ rdul
phran dañ ias dañ bum pa bzin |
mthun paḥi phyogs gñis ka mi
mthun paḥi phyogs la dños gñis
kyīho ||

I

(1)

शब्दो नित्यः प्रमेयत्वात् ।
आकाशवद् घटवच्च ।
सपक्षे [विपक्षे च] सर्वस्मिन् सत्त्वम् ।
अनैकान्तिको [हेतुः] ।

(4)

शब्दो नित्यः कृतकत्वात् ।
आकाशवद् घटवच्च ।
सपक्षेऽसत्त्वं विपक्षे सत्त्वम् ।
विल्लो हेतुः ।

(7)

शब्दोऽप्रयत्नान्तरीयकः ।
अनित्यत्वात् ।
विद्युदाकाशवद् घटवच्च ।
सपक्षे उभयं (सदसत्त्वं)
विपक्षे सर्वस्मिंश्च सत्त्वम् ।

(2)

शब्दोऽनित्यः कृतकत्वात् ।
घटवदाकाशवच्च ।
सपक्षे सत्त्वं विपक्षे चासत्त्वम् ।
हेतुः सम्यक् ।

(5)

शब्दो नित्यः श्रावणत्वात् ।
आकाशवत् [घटवच्च] ।
सपक्षेऽसत्त्वं विपक्षे चासत्त्वम् ।
असाधारणो हेतुः ।

(8)

शब्दोऽनित्यः प्रयत्नत्वात्
घटविद्युदाकाशवच्च ।
सपक्षे उभयं (सदसत्त्वं)
विपक्षेऽसत्त्वम् ।
हेतुः सम्यक् ।

(3)

शब्दः प्रयत्नोऽनित्यत्वात् ।
घटवद् विद्युदाकाशवच्च ।
सपक्षे सर्वस्मिन् सत्त्वं
विपक्षे उभयं सत्त्वमसत्त्वं च ।

(6)

शब्दो नित्यः प्रयत्नत्वात् ।
आकाशवद् घटविद्युद्वच्च ।
विल्लो हेतुः ।

(9)

शब्दो नित्योऽमूर्तत्वात्
आकाशवत् परमाणुवत्
कर्मवद् घटवच्चेति ।
सपक्षे उभयं विपक्षे उभयं
सदसत्त्वम् ।

II

[193^b, 1] rgya gar skad du he tu ca
kra ha ma ru ।

bod skad du gtan tshigs kyi hkhor lo
gtan la dbab pa ॥

[2] ḥjam dpal g'zon nur gyur pa la
phyag ḥtshal lo ।

ḥkhrul paḥi dra ba ḥjoms mdzad paḥi
thams cad mkhyen la phyag [3] ḥtshal nas ।
gtan tshigs tshul gsun po po yi
gtan la dbab pa bśad par bya ॥ 1 ॥

rjes su dpag par bya ba la
yod [4] daṅ med daṅ gñis ka yi ।
yod pa la ni yaṅ dag ste
med daṅ gñis ka ma grub yin ॥ 2 ॥

the tshom gñis te ma grub b'zin
ma [5] grub sbyar ba de b'zin du ।
mthun paḥi phyogs la yod pa daṅ
med pa de b'zin gñis ka daṅ ॥ 3 ॥

mi mthun phyogs la de b'zin no
gsum la rnam pa gsum yin te ।
steṅ ḥog gñis la yaṅ dag go
logs la ḥgal ba gñis yin te ॥ 4 ॥

zur [6] b'zi thun moṅ ma nes yin
dbus na thun moṅ ma yin paḥo ।
g'zal bya byas daṅ mi rtag daṅ
byas daṅ mñan bya rtsol byuṅ daṅ ॥ 5 ॥

mi rtag [194^a, 1] rtsol byuṅ lus can min*
rtag daṅ mi rtag rtsol byuṅ daṅ ।
rtag daṅ rtag daṅ rtag pa daṅ
rtsol byuṅ min daṅ mi rtag rtag ॥ 6 ॥

II

॥ भारतभाषायां हे तु च क्र
ह म रु ॥

भोटभाषायां गूत्न् छिगूस् किय
खोर् लो गूतन ल दव्व् प
[हेतुचक्रनिर्णयः]

मञ्जु श्रीकुमारभूताय नमः ।

सर्वज्ञाय नमस्कृत्य

भ्रान्तिजालविनाशिने ।

रूपत्रयविशिष्टस्य

हेतोर्निर्णय उच्यते ॥ १ ॥

अनुमेये भवेत्सत्त्व-

मसत्त्वमुभयं तथा ।

सत्त्वे सम्यगसत्त्वे स्या-

दसिद्धकस्तथोभये ॥ २ ॥

सन्दिग्ध उभयासिद्धौ

यथासिद्धः प्रयुज्यते ।

सपक्षे च भवेत्सत्त्व-

मसत्त्वमुभयं तथा ॥ ३ ॥

विपक्षेऽपि भवेत्तद्वत्-

त्रयाणां त्रिप्रकारकम् ।

उपर्यधो द्वयोः सम्यग्

द्वौ विरुद्धौ च पार्श्वयोः ॥४॥

मध्येऽसाधारणोऽनैका-

न्तिकः† कोणचतुष्टये ।

प्रमेयकृतकानित्य-

कृतश्रावणयज्ञजाः ॥ ५

अनित्ययज्ञजामूर्त्ता

नित्यानित्यप्रयज्ञजाः ।

नित्यो नित्यश्च नित्यश्चा-

यज्ञजानित्यनित्यकाः । ६ ॥

rtag pa la ni sgrub pa bkod ।
steñ ḥog mi mthun logs dañ sbyar ।
yañ dag gtan tshigs [2] gñis yin no ।
logs dañ mi mthun steñ ḥog sbyar ॥ 7 ॥

ḥgal baḥi gtan tshigs gñis yin no ।
zur baḥi thad dañ snol par sbyar ।
thun moñ ma ñes rnam pa bzi ।
logs gñis thad kar sbyor bas na ॥ 8 ॥

thun moñ ma yin ma ñes [3] paḥo ।
gtan tshigs ḥkhrul ḥkhor rnam dgu yi ।
deḥi rnam pa ḥdi ltar ste ।
nam mkhaḥ bum dañ bum mkhaḥ dañ ॥ 9 ॥

bum pa giog dañ namkhaḥ bzin ।
mkhaḥ dañ bum pa mkhaḥ bum dañ ।
[mkhaḥ dañ bum pa giog dañ bzin ।]
glog dañ namkhaḥ bum bzin dañ ।
bum [4] dañ glog dañ mkhaḥ bzin dañ ॥ 10 ॥

namkhaḥ rdul phran las bum bzin ।
de ni ñes paḥi dbaḥi byas yin ।
the tshom zab paḥi¹ lugs la ni ।
yod dañ med dañ yod med dañ ।
phyogs gcig mthaḥ dag sbyar bas so ।
phyogs chos [5] dgu yis ḥkhor lo ni ॥ 11 ॥

slob dpon phyogs kyī glaḥ pos mdzad
pa rdzogs so ॥
za ho ra mkhas pa bo dhi sa [t]tva dañ
dge slon dha rma a so kas
bsgyur ciñ žus te gtan phab paḥo ।

1 Xylograph reads zu baḥi.

न्यस्ता नित्यादयः साध्याः ॥

ऊर्ध्वार्धो विषमे पार्श्वे

सम्यग्हेतुद्वयं भवेत् ।

ऊर्ध्वार्धो विषमे तिर्यग्

विरुद्धहेतुकद्वयम् ॥७॥

कोणचतुष्टये योज्योऽ-

नैकान्तिकश्चतुर्विधः ।

अनैकान्तोऽसाधारणः

पार्श्वयोर्मध्ययोगतः ॥८॥

हेतुयन्त्रं नवाकारं

तत्प्रकारक ईदृशः ।

नभोघटघटाकाश-

घटविद्युद्वियद्यथा ॥९॥

वियद्घटाकाशघट-

[वियद्घटतडिद्यथा]

विद्युदाकाशघटवद्

घटविद्युद्वियद्यथा ॥१०॥

खाणुकर्मघटा यद्वत् ।

प्रस्तुतं तद्विनिश्चितम्

सदसत्सदसत्त्वेन

सन्देहगहने नये ।

पक्षाश्चैकैकशो युक्ताः

स्याच्चक्रं नवयर्मकम् ॥११॥

आचार्यदिग्नागकृतिः समाप्ता

जहोर पण्डितेन बोधिसत्त्वेन

तथा भिक्षुकेण धर्माशोकेन च

भाषान्तरमारोप्य संशोध्य

च निबद्धा ।



III

rtag dañ mi rtag [6] rtsol byuñ dañ
bar du rtag pa rnam gsum dañ ।
rtsol byuñ min dañ mi rtag rtag
dgu po de ni bsgrub byaḥi chos ॥ 1 ॥

gzal bya byas dañ mi rtag dañ
byas dañ mñan bya rtsol las byuñ ।
mi rtag rtsol byuñ lus¹ can min
dgu [7] po ḥdi ni rtags rnam yin ॥ 2 ॥

dañ po gsum po mthun phyogs la
yod pa gzir b'zag mi mthun la ।
khyab byed gtan med gñis paḥo
bar pa rnam gsum mthun phyogs la ॥ 3

med pa gzir byas mi mthun la
khyab dañ mi [194^b 1] mthun rnam
gñis paḥo ।

hog ma gsum po mthun phyogs la
rnam pa gñis pa gzir byas nas ॥ 4 ॥

mi mthun phyogs la khyab pa dañ
gtan med rnam pa gñis pa yin ।
rim pa b'zin du go bar mdzod
zur b'zi dños kyī ma ñes la ॥ 5 ॥

[2] logs gñis la ni ḥgal rtags te
dbus kyī dbus ni thun moñ min ।
dbus kyī thog mthah yañ dag dgod
blo gros² khyon du ḥkhums par mdzod ॥ 6

III

नित्यानित्यप्रयत्नोत्था
मध्यमत्रिकशाश्र्वताः ।
अयन्नानित्यनित्याश्च
साध्यधर्मा इमे नव ॥१॥

प्रमेयकृतकानित्य-
कृतश्रावणयत्नजाः ।
अनित्ययत्नजामूर्ता
एते हि नव हेतवः ॥२॥

आद्ये त्रिके सपक्षे हि
सत्त्वाश्रयाद्विपक्षके ।
व्याप्त्यभावोभयानि स्यु-
र्मध्ये त्रिके सपक्षके ॥३॥

विपक्षेऽसत्त्वमाश्रित्य
व्याप्त्यभावोभयानि हि ।
आश्रित्योभयरूपं तु
निम्ने त्रिके सपक्षके ॥४॥

भवेद् व्याप्तिरसत्त्वं च
विपक्षे द्विविधं तथा ।
अवगच्छ क्रमेणानं-
कान्तं कोणचतुष्टये ॥५॥

विरुद्धः पार्श्वयोर्हेतु-
रसामान्योऽन्तरान्तरं ।
मध्योर्ध्वाधो भवेत्सम्यग्
बुद्ध्यावगच्छ विस्तरम् ॥ ६ ॥

DURGACHARAN CHATTERJI

1 Xylograph reads *reg bya tor lus can*.

2 Xylograph here adds *bloḥi* which is required neither by the metre nor by the sense.

Epigraphic Notes

II—Genealogy of the Viṣṇukuṇḍins

The history of the Viṣṇukuṇḍins has been touched by scholars like Kielhorn, Hultzsch and Dubreuil. Their views as regards the genealogy and the chronology of the dynasty differ from that of mine. The question of genealogy will be discussed in the present paper and that of chronology in another.

The first known inscription of the Viṣṇukuṇḍins is the Chikkulla plates, edited by Kielhorn in *Ep. Ind.*, IV. 193ff. These plates give us the following line of kings.

- 1 Mahārāja Mādhavavarman ; his son
- 2 Vikramendravarman (I) ; his son
- 3 Mahārāja Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman ; his eldest son
- 4 Mahārāja Vikramendravarman (II) (10th year).

Then come the Rāmatīrtham plates, edited by Hultzsch in *Ep. Ind.*, XII. 133ff. Here we have the following line :

- 1 Mahārāja Mādhavavarman ; his son
- 2 Rājā Vikramendra ; his son
- 3 Rājā Indravarman. (27th year).

There can hardly be any doubt that Rājā Indravarman of the Rāmatīrtham plates is identical with the Mahārāja Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman of the Chikkulla plates.

Next, we have two sets of copper-plate grants belonging to this dynasty, which were found at a place called Ipur in the Tenali taluk of the Guntur District. They were edited by Hultzsch in *Ep. Ind.*, XVII. In the first set of these plates, we have the following line :

- 1 Mahārāja Govindavarman ; his son
- 2 Mahārāja Mādhavavarman (37th year) ; his son
- 3 Maṇcaṇṇabhaṭṭāraka.

Hultzsch, on grounds of palaeography, identified Mādhavavarman of the first set of the Ipur plates with the king of the same name in the Rāmatīrtham and the Chikkulla plates. It can be easily shown that later writers, who have disapproved of this identification as unwarranted, are themselves wrong. The epithets applied to the name of this king, as found in the Chikkulla, Rāma-

tirtham and the Ipur plates (set I), clearly establish the identity. Let us here quote the corresponding passages of the three inscriptions:

1. Chikkula plates : एकादशाश्वमेधावभ्रिता (भृथा) विधौतजगद्वक (त्क लमषस्य
ऋतुसहस्रयाजिनः [ः] सव्वमेधावाप्तसव्वभूतस्वाराज्यस्य बहुसुवर्णापौण्डरीकपुरुषमेधवाजपेय-
यूभ्यषोडशिराजस्यप्राधिराज्य[प्रा]जापत्याद्यनेकत्रिविधपृथुगुस्वरशतसहस्रयाजिनः [: *] ऋतुवरानु-
ष्टात्ताधिष्ठाप्रतिष्ठितपरमेष्ठित्वस्य महाराजस्य सकलजगन्मण्डलविमलगुरुप्रि(पृ)थुन्नितिपतिमकुट-
मदिग[णनि]करावनतराद्युगलस्य माधववर्मणः[*]

2. Rāmatīrtham plates : सकलमहीमण्डलावनतसामन्तमकुटमणिकिरणावलीढ-
चरणयुगो विख्यातयशाः श्रीमन्महाराजमाधववर्मा—तस्योर्जितश्रीविष्णुकुण्डपार्थिवोदितो-
दितान्वयतिलक[समुद्रूतै]कादशाश्वमेधावभृत(थ)विधौतजगत्कलमषऋतुसदस्र[या]जिनः स्नान-
पुण्यादकपावत्राकृताशरसः

3. Ipur plates set I : स्मृतिमतिबलसत्व (त्व) धैर्यवीर्यविनयसंपन्नः सकलमहीमण्डल-
भनुजपतिप्रतिपूजितशासनः त्रिवरनगरभवनगतयुवतिहृदयनन्दनः स्व[न]यबलविजितसकल-
सामन्तातुलबलविनयनयनियमस्वत्व(त्व)[सं]पन्नः सकलजगद्वनिपतिप्रतिपूजितशासनः अग्निष्टोम-
सहस्रयाजी हि[र]ण्यगर्भप्रसूतः) एकादशाश्वमेधावभृतविधूतजगत्कलमषः सुस्ति स्थिरकर्ममहा-
राजश्रीमाधववर्मा

When we remember the fact that no other Viṣṇukunḍin king is as yet known to have performed a single sacrifice of any kind except the one named Mādhavavarman and when we note further the unique numbers—*eleven aśvamedhas* and *thousand agniṣṭomas (kratus)*, testified to by all the above three inscriptions, there remains no doubt as regards the correctness of the identification proposed by Hultzsch.

The second set of the Ipur plates gives us the following line of kings :

- 1 Mahārāja Mādhavavarman (I) ; his son
- 2 Mādhavavarman (II) (17th ? year).¹

As regards Mādhavavarman (II), the issuer of this set of the Ipur plates, Hultzsch says : "As the alphabet of this inscription seems to be of an earlier type than that of the preceding one (*scil.* Ipur plates set I), and as grandsons are frequently named after

1 Hultzsch doubtfully reads the date as year 47. We shall discuss the point in another paper.

their grandfather, I consider it not impossible that Mādhavavarman II was the grandfather of Govindavarman's son Mādhavavarman, who would then have to be designated Mādhavavarman III." A consideration of the evidence of the two sets of the Ipur plates renders this theory untenable. It is to be noted that Mādhavavarman (I), the grandfather of the issuer of the Ipur plates set II, is called in that inscription :

[ए]कादशाश्वमेधावभृथावभूतजगत्कर्म[ष]स्याग्निष्टोमसहस्रयाजिनोनेक
 सामन्तमकुट्टकूमयिखचितचरणयुगलकमलस्य महाराजस्य श्रीमाधववर्मणाः । If this passage be compared with the corresponding passage, quoted above from the Ipur plates set I, there can be no doubt whatsoever about the identity of this Mādhavavarman (I) with the king of the same name of the Ipur plates set I, and also of the Chikkulla and the Rāmatīrtham plates. It is highly improbable that two kings of the same name and dynasty and of the same period performed exactly equal numbers—*eleven* and *thousand*—of great sacrifices, such as the *āsvamedha* and the *agniṣṭoma*. We, therefore, think it perfectly justifiable to take the king named Mādhavavarman as one and the same person, who has been credited with the performance of eleven *āsvamedhas* and thousand *agniṣṭomas* (*kratus*) in all the different Viṣṇukuṇḍin inscriptions.

Moreover, the theory of Hultzsch that Mādhavavarman (whom he is inclined to designate Mādhavavarman III), son of Govindavarman of the Ipur plates (set I), is the grandson of Mādhavavarman II of the Ipur plates (set II), has now been disproved by the discovery of the Polamuru plates, where Mādhavavarman, son of Govindavarman is represented as the grandson of Vikramendra, and not of a king entitled Mādhavavarman.

The Polamuru plates, edited by Subba Rao in the *Journ. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc.*, VI, 17ff., give us the following line of kings.

- 1 Vikramahendra ; his son
- 2 Govindavarman ; his son
- 3 Mahārāja Mādhavavarman (40th ? year)²

² There is only one numerical symbol on the plate. In the *Journ. Andhra Hist. Res. Soc.*, VI, it has been deciphered as 48. As far as I know, there was no method known in ancient India to express a number like 48 by a single numeri-

That this Mādhavavarman of the Polamuru plates can be no other than the famous performer of eleven *āsvamedhas* and thousand *agnistomas* is proved by his significant epithets :—अतुल[ब*]लपरा[क्र]मयशोदानवि-
नय[सं] पन्नो दशशतसकलधरणीतलनरपतिरवसितयिविधदिव्यस्त्रिधरनगरभवनगतपरमयुवतिजनवि-
हरणरतिरन्न (न) न्यनृपतिसाधारणदानमानदयादमधृतिमतिज्ञान्तिकान्तिशोरियो (शौर्यो)-
दार्ढ्यगंभि(भी) द्यप्रभृत्यनेकगुणसंपन्नितरयसमुत्थितभूमण्डलव्यापिविपुलयशोः (शाः) क्रतुसह-
स्रयाजी हिरण्यगर्भप्रसूत(ः) एकादशाश्रमेधावभृथस्नानविगतजगदेनस्कः सर्वभूतपरिरक्षणचुम्बुः
विद्वद्धि(द्दि)जगुरुद्वस्तपस्त्रिजनाश्रयो महाराजः श्रीमाधववर्मा ।

It appears, however, that Mādhavavarman and Govindavarman have respectively been called Janāśraya and Vikramāśraya in this inscription, and it may be argued that they are not identical with the kings of the same names of the Ipur plates (set I). But this doubt is unjustifiable in view of the fact that Mādhavavarman of the Polamuru plates is not only called son of Govindavarman and credited with the performance of eleven *āsvamedhas* and thousand *agnistomas*, but is also called हिरण्यगर्भप्रसूत⁴ and त्रिवरनगरभवनगतपरमयुवतीजनविहरणरति (त्रिवरनगरभवन-
गतयुवतिहृदयनन्दन in the Ipur plates), which epithets we have only in his own Ipur plates (set I). There can therefore be no doubt that the Ipur plate (set I) and the Polamuru plates were issued by one and the same king.

In this connection we must notice the view of some South Indian scholars who have identified Mādhavavarman II of the Ipur plates (set II), with the king of the same name of the Chikkulla and the Rāmatirtham plates, and Vikramahendra of the Palamuru plates with Vikramendravarman II of the Chikkulla plates. We have noted above that only one king of the Viṣṇukunḍin dynasty may be believed to have performed sacrifices and, though there seems to be a little exaggeration in the grant of one of his successors, in all

cal symbol. I have not found a symbol like this elsewhere. It appears to signify the figure 40 (or 70?).


3 In quoting the passage from the Polamuru plates, I have not followed Mr. Subba Rao's transcript. The word दम has been read as धर्म.

4 The meaning of this term will be discussed in another paper.

the inscriptions of the dynasty, that king—Mādhavavarman (I), son of Govindavarman and father of Devavarman and Vikramendrarvarman (I)—has been credited with the performance of eleven *āsvamedhas* and thousand *agniṣṭomas*. As is also noted above, we think it almost impossible that there can be more than one Mādhavavarman, performer of eleven *āsvamedhas* and thousand *agniṣṭomas*, in the same family and the same period. But if we accept the above identifications proposed by some South Indian scholars, we have three Mādhavavarman—I, II and III—all of whom were performers of eleven *āsvamedhas* and thousand *agniṣṭomas*! Moreover, the identification of Mādhavavarman II of the Ipur plates (set II) with his namesake of the Chikkulla and the Rāmatīrtham plates is, in my opinion, next to impossible. In the Chikkulla and the Rāmatīrtham plates we have the significant epithets of the great Mādhavavarman, crediting him with the performance of eleven *āsvamedhas* and thousand *agniṣṭomas*; but these epithets are conspicuous by their absence in the Ipur plates (set II) in connection with the name of Mādhavavarman II. The date, which is not fully legible but which appears to me to be 17, has been read by Hultzsch as the 47th year of the king. Is it possible that a king who performed, among other sacrifices eleven *āsvamedhas* and thousand *agniṣṭomas*, did not perform a single of them before his 47th (if my reading is correct, 17th) year or forgot to refer to such glorious performances in his own inscription? It is also significant that Mādhavavarman II has no royal title in his own Ipur plates (set II). Again, the identification appears utterly untenable when we notice that those significant epithets regarding the performance of eleven *āsvamedhas* and thousand *agniṣṭomas* have been attached in this inscription to the name of his grandfather Mādhavavarman I. We, therefore, hold that there were only two—and not three—Mādhavavarmans in the Viṣṇukuṇḍin family and that the first of them, who was the grandfather of the second, performed a good many sacrifices including eleven *āsvamedhas* and thousand *agniṣṭomas*.

As regards the second identification, nothing needs be said after our identification of Mādhavavarman I, the great performer of sacrifices. But it must be noticed that his name is written in the inscription as Vikramahendra, which appears to be the engraver's mistake for Vikramamahendra. If, of course, we take it as a slip for Vikramendra, the king should be designated Vikramendra I, there being two other Vikramendras in the family.

The following is therefore the genealogical arrangement of the Viṣṇukuṇḍin princes according to our theory.



DINESH CHANDRA SIRCAR

Some Technical Terms of Sanskrit Grammar

Since the dawn of grammatical studies in India, grammarians have noticed the peculiarities of declension in the strong cases and have coined special technical terms to denote them. The term used by Pāṇini is **सर्वधातुक** which has greatly puzzled his commentators. Unable to find any rational explanation of this term, commentators of Pāṇini have generally contented themselves with saying that by the use of this big technical term, which conveys no meaning of itself, Pāṇini intends to hold up to ridicule the needlessly long technical terms of his predecessors. We read in the *Nyāsa on Kāśikā*, I. 1. 42

पूर्वाचार्यैरेवेयं प्रयोजनमन्तरेणापि महती संज्ञा प्रणीता । तस्या इह समाभ्रयसां यत् तत्
तत्कृतस्य शब्दानुशासनस्य दोषवत्त्वसूचनार्थम् । तत् पुनः स्वशास्त्रस्य पुनरुक्ततादोषपरिहारार्थम् ।
यदि हि तद्दोषवद् भवत्येवमस्य प्रणयनं युज्यते नान्यथा ।

‘It is the ancient teachers who coined this long technical term without any necessity whatsoever. The use of that term in this work is to show the defective character of their grammars. And that again for the purpose of showing that the author’s own work is not superfluous, for if the previous works are defective then only the composition of a new treatise on the subject is justified, not otherwise.’

Haradatta in his *Padamañjarī* on the same sūtra says practically the same thing **पूर्वाचार्यानुपालब्धुमेषा संज्ञा**—‘this technical term is for the purpose of rebuking his predecessors.’

Bhaṭṭoji saw the absurdity of this explanation and merely said **महासंज्ञाकरणां पूर्वाचार्यानुरोधात्**—‘The use of this big technical term is simply out of regard for the ancient teachers’. So also the other modern commentators of Pāṇini.

The true explanation is supplied by an anonymous commentator who is quoted with disapproval by Haradatta. He says: **सर्वं नाम तिष्ठत्यस्मिन् इति सर्वनामस्थानम् । नाम प्रातिपदिकम् । सर्वशब्दोऽवयवकार्तृस्त्ववचनः । सर्वावयवयुक्तं यत्र नाम तिष्ठतीत्यर्थस्तेनान्यत्र न्यूनं तिष्ठतीत्यर्थो गम्यते** i.e. that in which the entire word remains (without suffering weakening or reduction in any way) is known as *Sarvanāmasthāna*. *Nāman* means *Prāt'padika* (or the crude form of a word). *Sarva* implies the entirety of parts. The mean-

ing is: where the word remains with all its parts intact, the implication being that in the other *vibhaktis* the word undergoes weakening or reduction.

This explanation has not generally been accepted by grammarians of the Pāṇini School because in the artificial system of Pāṇini the suffixes postulated by older grammarians were discarded in favour of what he considered simpler ones. According to the predecessors of Pāṇini comparatives are formed with *īyans* which is retained in the strong cases but suffers reduction in the weak cases; similarly perfect and present participles are formed with *vans* and *ant* respectively. Pāṇini, however, finding that these full forms occur only in five cases whereas the reduced forms occur in the remaining sixteen cases, postulated the suffixes as *īyas*, *vas*, *at* etc. to secure **लाघव** or brevity and prescribed a *n* as the augment in the strong cases of these stems.

The strictly scientific method has been followed in the Kātantra system which regards the suffixes as *īyans(u)*, *vans(u)*, *śant(ri)* etc. So the technical term *Sarvanāmasthāna* is significant in the treatises of the Kātantra School, which, though preserving the ancient self-explanatory technical terms in most cases, has by a strange irony of fate substituted the meaningless syllable *ghuṭ* (II.1.3) for *Sarvanāmasthāna* in this particular case. This *ghuṭ* is evidently coined after the *suṭ* of Pāṇini.

That the above explanation of **सर्वनामस्थान** is the correct one may also easily be seen by comparing the term with another technical term used by Pāṇini viz., **सर्वधातुक**. The word **सर्वधातुक** as opposed to **आर्धधातुक** means the suffixes in which the root was retained in its entirety. According to the ancient grammarians the vikaraṇas formed a part and parcel of the root, so the terminations before which the vikaraṇa was found were known as **सर्वधातुक** terminations and those before which they were not found were regarded as **आर्धधातुक** i.e. preserving only a portion of the root.

In the *Atharva Prātiśākhya* we find the term **पञ्चपदी** (i. 88, iii.5.59) used for the strong cases and this appears to be earlier than **सर्वनामस्थान** as it merely means 'a collection of five cases' and does not specify the peculiarity of the strong cases, but simply draws attention to the fact that they stand apart from the other cases.

The corresponding term used in the *Jainendra Vyākaraṇa* is घ (1. 1 32) and in the *Mugdhabodha* चि (Rule 82). Sākaṭāyana uses the *pratyāhāra* छट्.

In the *Nirukta* (II.1) Yāska uses निवृत्तिस्थान for the weak cases, but we do not find therein any word for the strong cases.

In this connexion it will be interesting to note another peculiarity of the *Kātantra Vyākaraṇa*. The *Kātantra* generally uses significant terms for the tenses and moods. The only two exceptions are पञ्चमी and सप्तमी. Thus we find there (*Ākhyāta*, I.24-33):

वर्तमाना—लट्,	present	परोक्षा—लिट्,	perfect
सप्तमी—विधिलिङ्,	optative	श्वस्तनी—लुट्,	periphrastic future
पञ्चमी—लोट्,	imperative	आशीः—आशीर्लिङ्,	benedictive
श्वस्तनी—लङ्	imperfect	भविष्यन्ती—लृट्,	future
अद्यतनी—लुङ्,	aorist	क्रियातिपत्ति—लृङ्,	conditional

In the above list we find सप्तमी and पञ्चमी occupying the second and third places—a fact which the commentators of the *Kātantra* have not found it easy to explain. To us, however, the explanation is perfectly simple, it being clear that for some reason or other the terms for these two moods were lost or disliked and since लिङ् occupies the seventh place in Pāṇini's system of लकारs and लोट् the fifth place, सप्तमी and पञ्चमी were substituted for them (1. लट्, 2 लिट्, 3. लुट्, 4 लृट्, 5. लोट् 6. लङ् 7. लिङ् etc. according to the order of the vowels following लृ and leaving लेट् out of consideration as confined to the Vedas).

KSHITISH CHANDRA CHATTERJEE

The Maināmati Copper-plate
of
Raṇavaṅkamalla Harikāladeva (1141 Śaka).

This copper-plate was discovered towards the end of the year 1803 while "digging earth for the repairs of the highway through the Maināmati hills", about 5 miles to the west of the town of Comilla in the district of Tippera. It was sent to the Asiatic Society of Bengal by Mr. Elliot, the then Judge-Magistrate of Tippera. The plate unfortunately has long disappeared from the collection of the Society. The inscription was deciphered 'by the aid of several Paṇḍits' and published by the celebrated orientalist Mr. H. T. Colebrooke in the *Asiatic Researches*, IX (1807), pp. 401-6 with an indifferent engraving, exhibiting a facsimile of the original, which is the only material now available for the record. It was reprinted with the engraving in Colebrooke's *Miscellaneous Essays*, vol. II, pp. 241-6. The exact find-place is not unfortunately indicated by Colebrooke and cannot be determined now. It appears from Rennell's Map (Sheet No. 46, pt. II) that at that time there were two roads passing through the Hills from the village 'Uumtulla' (i.e. Amtali near Comilla), one through the 'Lolmi' hills to Rammoan and the other branching to the N.W. (i.e. by the northernmost range called Maināmati) to the village Mirzapur whence to Burkamta. The mention of the Maināmati hills instead of Lalmai makes it almost certain that the plate was discovered in the latter road somewhere near the Maināmati hills.

This is a single plate engraved on one side only. Colebrooke gives the following description of it: "The plate measures eleven inches in height and nine in breadth. . . . The sides have a gentle curvature and at the top is an abrupt bend allowing room to a figure coarsely delineated and apparently intended to represent a temple" (cf. the description of the Chittagong plate of Dāmodara, *JASB.*, 1874, p. 318). The delineation probably constituted the emblem of the Royal dynasty. The inscription consists of 24 lines and the characters are evidently proto-Bengali. The language is Sanskrit and with the exception of the last three lines where the date of the record is given the entire inscription is in verse. It contains nine stanzas employing six

different metres. As regards *Orthography* the only things noticeable are the spelling of the word Samvat with the ψ in place of m and retention of the final m before the letter t (ll. 4, 7 & 15), before p with which it is joined in 'maṇḍanam=paṇḍitānām' (1.2) and before m in 'anīsam=mānase' (1.3). The avagraha is used in lines 11, 14 and 23.

The inscription opens, rather abruptly, with a laudatory stanza in praise of one 'Hedi-eba', whose son Śrī Dhaḍi-eba is eulogised abundantly in three elegant verses. The latter was a chief minister of a famous king, Raṇavaṅkamalla (v. 5) and held the office of a *Mahāśvanibandhika*, a title which is not met with elsewhere. *Aśvanibandhika* literally means a groom, while Colebrooke takes it to mean 'a general commanding the cavalry'; but a *Mahāśvanibandhika* who happens also to be the 'chief minister' (*amātyaṭilaka*) probably denotes here a civil officer in charge of the Royal Horse, for, there is hardly any reference to military skill in the elaborate panegyrics of this officer. The inscription records a grant of land measuring 20 *Droṇas* in a village named Bejakhanda in favour of a Buddhist Monastery (*Vihāra*) built in the city of Paṭṭikerā (v. 6). From v. 8 it is clear that the gift of land was made not by the sovereign monarch nor by a vassal but expressly by the *Aśvanibandhika*, to whose mouth is put the usual address to the future kings. The writer of the record, one Medinī-eba, makes no secret of the fact (in v. 9) that the inscription is in the nature of a *Praśasti* of a (private) family (of officers) to which probably he himself belonged. The description and the boundaries of the lands are not given in the record which fortunately, unlike other records of Bengal, is very clearly dated in the Śaka year 1141 and the 17th regnal year of King Harikāladeva, Phālguna 26. The wording of the date clearly shows that the actual name of the king was Harikāla and Raṇavaṅkamalla was his *viruda*. Dr. Keilhorn calculated that this date (corresponding to Feb. 19, 1220 A.D.) coincides with the auspicious *tithi pūrṇimā* and according to him "there can hardly be a doubt that the donation recorded in the copper-plate was made on account of the full-moon." (*Ind. Ant.*, XXII, p. 108).

The inscription thus fortunately preserves the name of a monarch of the ancient kingdom of *Paṭṭikerā* who came to the throne in the year 1203-4 A.D. Colebrooke gave a wrong reading of verse 6 and

failed to decipher the important reference to the city of Paṭṭikerā which was first correctly given by Mr. N. K. Bhattasali of the Dacca Museum (*Dacca Review*, 1921-22, p. 142). We have to make a slight improvement in Mr. Bhattasali's reading of the line in question. The metre requires a long syllable in the 3rd letter: so the reading cannot either be 'Durgottaro' or 'Durgottarā' (accompanied by forts), but is clearly *Durgottārā* (excelling a fort). The phrase *Durgottārā-vihārī* may better be taken as one word meaning 'a *vihāra* dedicated to the Goddess Durgottārā i.e. a form of Tārā named in the *Sādhanamālā* as Durgottārīṇī-Tārā'. While correctly making out that the inscription 'appears not to be a grant by the sovereign', Colebrooke was clearly wrong in surmising that it was 'a memorial of the grant recorded by the possessor, who must have been the heir of the grantee and who seems to acknowledge in this place (v. 9) the liberality of the grantor's successors continuing to him.' (*Miscell. Essays*, II, p. 246 note).

The city of Paṭṭikerā remains yet to be identified. If the find-spot of the plate is any clue to its situation, the Maināmati hillock presumably formed a part of this ancient city and the ruins of a temple on the top of this hillock to the west of the Mahārājā's Bungalow may even point to the small monastery mentioned in the plate. The city gave the name to an important *pargaṇā* in the district of Tippera still known as Pāṭikārā or Pāiṭkārā which extends to the same hills, though the hills themselves now fall under a separate *pargaṇā* named Meherkula. In older documents of the 18th century the name of the *pargaṇā* occurs regularly as either 'Pāṭikerā' or 'Pāiṭkerā' leaving no room for any doubt about the identification. The village Bejakhaṇḍa cannot be definitely identified now. The late Mr. Kailas Chandra Sinha (in the *Rājamālā*, pp. 517-18) wrongly read the name as 'Ijakhaṇḍa' and suggested its identification with a village 'Maijkhād' in *pargaṇā* Mahichail, a few miles to the west of the Lalmai hills. There is a village Bejabādi near the foot of the hills on the west of which may be the village referred to in the plate.

The extraordinary nature of the three names of the grantor 'Dhaḍi-eba', his father 'Heḍi-eba' and the writer 'Medinī-eba', all apparently belonging to the same family, deserves more than a passing notice. Though the names have, no doubt, been more or less Sanskritis-

ed in the hands of the writer of the fairly good Sanskrit verses, they clearly preserve their foreign origin in the unique appellative 'eva' or 'eba', found in all the three names, which is entirely unknown in any Indian dialect as far as we know. Colebrooke also noticed that contrary to the rules of the language 'the particle *eva* is subjoined without changing the preceding vowel'. Fortunately he did not disturb the text with proposed emendations and in none of the three names there is any room for any doubt on the reading. We are, therefore, tempted to hazard the conjecture that here we have evidence of a respectable family of Burmese origin which settled and survived in the 13th century A.D. in the district of Tippera. For 'ba' and 'ye-ba' (modified to 'e-va') seem to be the characteristic of Burmese names even now. The inscription may thus be regarded as corroborating in a peculiar manner the intercourse between the kingdom of Paṭṭikerā and Burma as recorded in the Burmese chronicles. The identification of the 'Pateikkara' of Burmese chronicles with Paṭikara of the Tippera district though put forth in the local history of Tippera (*Rājamālā*, pp. 4-6) more than 35 years ago, attracted the serious attention of Burmese scholars only recently (*Report, Arch. Sur. of Burma*, 1923, p. 32). This identification is sufficiently corroborated by the position of the kingdom as given in the Burmese accounts. The vast kingdom of King Anoratha (1044-77 A.D.) of Pagan who 'made a progress through the western portion of his dominions as far as Bengal' (Phayre: *Hist. of Burma*, p. 37), was bounded on the west by the 'foreign' kingdom of Pateikkara (*Report*, 1923, p. 31). The celebrated love romance of the Prince of Pateikkara with the only daughter of king Kyanzittha (1084-1112 A.D.), which forms the subject of one or two poems and is acted on the stage up to now, rests, according to the best authority, 'upon a solid foundation of fact' (*Ibid.*, p. 32). Pateikkara is mentioned in a Burmese inscription of 1184 A.D. (Gerrini, p. 740). The healthy intercourse between the two kingdoms was kept up by the next king Alaungsitthu (1112-87 A.D.) who undoubtedly had as one of his queens a 'Pateikkara' Princess (*Report*, 1922, p. 61: cf. Phayre, p. 40). King Narathu (1187-91 A.D.) who killed this foreign Princess with his own hand, was in his turn murdered by desperados sent by the King of Pateikkara for revenge. The event took place, according to the latest chronology, in 1189 or 1191

A.D. not more than 15 years before Harikāladeva came to the throne. King Harikāla was thus not unlikely the immediate successor of the King of Paṭṭikera who was responsible for the death of Narathu. In this connection we should like to mention the fact that in the whole district of Tippera there are at present about two thousand Buddhists living all in a group of villages near Laksam about 15 miles from Maināmati. Can the presence of this entirely non-Brāhmaṇic religion in Tippera be taken as a faint trace of the Burmese intercourse in the 13th century?

In verse 3 the grantor is described as being proficient in the rites of the famous *Sahaja* cult of later Buddhism and according to our interpretation the verse also preserves the name of his religious teacher Aviraha who must have flourished in Paṭṭikerā.

THE TEXT

- 1 Om¹ Ta^cminn uccair-amalina-kule viśva-vikhyāta-kīrti(r)
vidyā dhāraḥ parama-sukṛ
- 2 ti maṇḍanam = paṇḍitānām (1*) khyātaḥ śrīmān-ajani sa
mahān HEDI-EBĀ-bhidhāno yasya
- 3 svacche vyacārad-anīśam = mānase dharmma-haṃsaḥ || (1*)
Tasmād-abhūd amalakūti-kalā-vitānaḥ ||
- 4 śrīmān amātya-tilako manujāmalenduḥ (1*) dṛṣṭvā śaśī
tamiti ²yam = truṭi-vṛddhi-sāṭhyā-
- 5 llajjā-rujā³ śvayathumān-iva saṃvibhāti || (2*) Avirahāt
sa mahāśvanibandhikaḥ parama-
- 6 tatt(v)a-mahatt(v)am-adhiṣṭhitaḥ (1*) rucira-rītiṣu nītiṣu
gīṣpatiḥ SAHAJA-dharmmasu karṃmasu
- 7 śobhate || (3*) Dāna-dhyāna-mahodadhiḥ pravicalaccittaika-
kārāgṛham = taptāsvāda-tṛṣā-
- 8 mayah kati dayādhāraḥ parapraṇināṃ (1*) Dharmmasyātula-
keli-sadma sukṛti guptaika yo-

1 Expressed by a symbol: C. reads *Srī*.

2 C. reads *Yas=tru*. Read *Samiti* for *tamiti* which is meaningless.

3 C. reads **rujī*.

- 9 gīśvaraḥ soyaṃ śrī-DHADI-EBA eka udabhūd-ānandacandro
 bhuvi || (4*) Yasyaivāśvanibandhi-
 10 koyam-abhavad kṣoṇīndra-cūḍāmaṇes = tasya ŚRĪ-RANAṂ-
 KAMALLA-nṛpater-lilāpi loko
 11 -ttarā (1*) ākrāmadbhir-itastatas-trijagatīṃ yat-tad-yaśobhiḥ
 sitaiḥ prāsāde' pi ni-
 12 je sahasranayano jātāvanīnāmitaḥ⁴ || (5*) Durgottārā-
 vihārī rucira-vira-
 13 citā PAṬṬIKERĀ-nagaryāṃ⁵ yeya(ṃ) dharmmasya kāmam
 mukuṭa-viracanā-prakriyevāti-
 14 bhāti (1*) grāme' syai VEJAKHANDE nija-sarala-hṛdā
 viṃśati-droṇa-bhūmir-dattācandrā-
 15 rkam-āstām-ativimalayaśaḥ śasya-samyak-kṛṣīśca || (6*)
 Yuktam = tad-⁶asya kīrte(r)-
 16 yat sarvvatra bhavati bhṛamāḥ (1*) dattā dakṣiṇa-cittena
 catuṣṣīmeti bhūḥ svayam || (7*) Haṃ
 17 ho bodhata bhāvi-bhūmipatayo yat tāmra-patrāṅkuram
 yuṣmān-aśvanibandhi-
 18 koyam-adhunā kṛtvāñjalim yācate (*) pālyā bhūmir-iyam
 na vā katipaya-droṇe-
 19 na rājya sthitiḥ dhig-dainyam vidhaveva sā vasumatī
 yasyā laghīyān patih || (8*)
 20 Sahaja-guṇa-mahimnā yadyapīyam svabhāvād-ativilasati
 guptā-vaṃśajānām
 21 prasastiḥ (*) vimala-kula-guṇoghāi(r)-gāḍham-ākṛṣyamāṇaḥ
 prakāṣayati-tad-ittham
 22 MEDINI-EBA eṣaḥ || (9*) Śakanṛpater-atitā abdāḥ '1141'
 RANAṂ-
 23 MALLA-ŚRĪ-HARIKĀLA-DEVA-PĀDĀNĀ(M)
 saptadaśa-samvatsare' bhilikhya-
 24 māne yatrāṅkenāpi sam'vvat 17 sūrya-gatyā Phālguna-dine 26'

4 Read *Jāto 'vanī*, C. reads *jātānulināyitūḥ* which makes no sense.

5 C. reads *paṭṭikerānagaryām* (?).

6 C. reads *Yuktas = tad*^o

7 C. reads *Tula-dine 29* and translates "29th of the Sun's being in the balance" (p. 406). Kielhorn has given the correct reading (*I.A.*, XXIV, 1895, No. 227).

TRANSLATION

1 In that high, unsullied family, was born the glorious, great and celebrated (person) named HEDI-EBA, of a world-wide renown, the repository of all learning, highly virtuous and an ornament of the learned—in whose pure mind played Dharma (piety) like a swan in the clear *Mānasa* lake.

2 From him was born the prince of ministers, a spotless moon among men with the collection of her digits formed by his unsullied fame; seeing whom in a contest (for beauty) the Moon in guile of waning and waxing appears dropsical as it were from the malady of shame.

3 That superior officer of the Royal Groom, initiated into the greatness of the Supreme Truth through (the teacher)⁸ AVIRAHĀ, and a veritable Bṛhaspati in the charming courses of Polity, shines in the good practices of the *Sahaja* cult.⁹

4 An ocean of charities and meditation, a prison-house unto the way-ward, an embodiment of relish and desire to the afflicted¹⁰ and how very full of kindness towards other creatures, an unequalled pleasure-house of Piety, virtuous, one great ascetic in the *Guptā* family— such was Śrī Dhadi-eba, who rose up as the one gladdening Moon on the earth.

5 The sportive acts of that crest-jewel of kings, the glorious *Raṇavaṅkamalla*¹¹ (a Hero in bends of battle), whereof he was the Groom of the Royal Horse, were also extra-ordinary, as by reason of his white renown attacking the three worlds here, there and every

8 Avirahāt meaning without desertion i.e. constantly is a bad word: it is better taken as a proper name here.

9 Sahaja-dharmma-sukarmmasu is a single word, or Sahaja-dharmmasu is a separate Vahuvrihi compound:—sahajo dharmma eṣu iti.

10 Colebrooke translates this obscure portion as follows 'yet thirsting to taste by practise of austerity that which alone confines the fleeting thoughts etc.'

11 In the *Wörterbuch* Raṇavaṅkamalla is taken as an incorrect form of raṇaraṅgamalla: raṇavaṅka occurring in two different places in this plate yields a good sense 'bends or crooked turns of battle.'

where, the thousand-eyed God (Indra) even in his own palace came to be brought down to the Earth.

6 Lands measuring 20 *dronas* were given with his own sincere heart in the village Bejakaṇḍa, belonging to the small monastery (*vihāri*) dedicated to the goddess Durgottārā and built handsomely in the City of Puṭṭikerā, which monastery looks very much like the act of setting up a crest for Dharma. Let this very pure act of fame subsist as long as the sun and the moon along with an agriculture rich with harvest.

7 It is only just that his fame travels everywhere. For, this land with 4 boundaries was given by himself with a sincere heart.

8 Know, Oh! ye future princes, what is (written) in this copper-plate. This Royal Groom, now begs of you with folded hands: This land-grant should be respected (by you). Nor does a kingdom rest on a few *dronas* (of land). Fie on such meanness. That country is like a widow, whereof the lord is mean.

9 Though this panygeric of the descendants of the *Guptā*¹² family shines forth through the greatness of their natural virtues yet does this Medinī-eba, attracted greatly by the multitude of the virtues of this pure race, depicts it thus.

The expired years of Saka King 1141, in the 17th (regnal) year of His Excellency Śrī Harikāladeva, Raṇavaṅkamalla: written also in figures Saṃvat 17, 26th day of Phālguna by the sun's motion.

DINESH CHANDRA BHATTACHARYYA

12 In this verse the word *raṇśajām* stands without specification. *Guptā*, therefore, better refers to the actual name of the family and accordingly in verse 4 also we should read the same word *Guptā* making perhaps a better sense.

The Saṃkarṣa Kāṇḍa—A genuine Supplement to the Pūrva-mīmāṃsā Śāstra

I

The *Saṃkarṣa Kāṇḍa*, or the *Saṃkarṣaṇa Kāṇḍa* (henceforth abbreviated as *Sk.*) as it is otherwise known, is traditionally recognised as a Supplement to the *Pūrva-mīmāṃsā Śāstra*. It has all along remained a sealed book to modern scholars. Mr. M. I. Sandal, in the Introduction to his English translation of the *Pūrva-mīmāṃsā Sūtras* (S. B. H. Series, Vol. I, pp. x-xii), says that *Sk.* is a spurious work. He observes:

(In the *Sk.*), there are no adhikaraṇas and the Sūtras are meagre; it is an apocryphal portion of the Mīmāṃsā, most probably palmed off by Khaṇḍa-deva as genuine.....It has a commentary called *Bhāṭṭacandrikā*, by Bhāskara, son of Gambhīra. (i).

All the writers of the Mīmāṃsā have characterised Jaimini's Mīmāṃsā as containing twelve chapters. (ii).

Strange to say that the *Sk.* is not mentioned by Alberuni and Abul Fazal. The latter has given the contents of the twelve chapters of Jaimini's Mīmāṃsā. For these reasons, I am of opinion that the *Sk.* is a spurious work. (iii).

The *Sk.* never found popularity amongst the students of Mīmāṃsā; and was, therefore, very properly consigned to oblivion. We do not find it mentioned in any ancient works prior to Rāmānuja in his *Brahmasūtra-Bhāṣya* or Madhusūdana Sarasvati in his *Prasthānabheda*. (iv).†

The style of the so-called Sūtras does not resemble that of Jaimini; it is so very curt and mutilated that one cannot make out anything without the help of Bhāskara's *Bhāṭṭacandrikā*. There are no adhikaraṇas which are the peculiar characteristics of Jaimini's Mīmāṃsā. (v).

The last sūtra in the fourth pāda of the fourth chapter, which is the 16th chapter in the work, ends with the word (phrase) 'यथा याज्यासंप्रैपः' which has been repeated (twice) and imitated from the final endings in the *Sāṃkhyapravacana* or the *Vedāntasūtras*. (vi).

It is a valuable work in Mīmāṃsā literature and is more in the nature of the *Kalpa Sūtras*. It does not criticize any general principle as is done

† Evidently, Mr. Sandal is misinformed. See the citation from the *Saṃkarṣa Kāṇḍa* by Saṃkara on *Vedānta Sūtras*. III, 3, 13: तदुक्तं संकर्षे—

'नाना वा देवता पृथग्ज्ञानात्' इति ॥

by Jaimini in his *Mīmāṃsā*. The well-known twelve principles have been discussed in the twelve chapters by Jaimini; but, in the (present) work under description, there is a simple description of the post-sacrificial (?) minor ceremonies which really form the subject of the Śrauta part of the *Kalpa Sūtra*. In this view, which I take of the *Sk.*, it cannot be considered a supplement of Jaimini's *Mīmāṃsā*. (vii).

Mr. Sandal's observations contain, no doubt, certain truths, which, if scrutinised, would reveal that some of them are misleading.

The term *Sk.* is generally understood to stand for a clear and comprehensive exposition of Vedic propositions which are found scattered in the various recensions of the Vedas¹ or those supposed to have been lost. Naturally, then, it has no *saṅgati* which relates together the *adhyāyas*, *pādas* and *adhikaraṇas*. It is because of this characteristic that the *Sk.* has come to be regarded as a supplement to the *Dvādaśūlakṣaṇī* completing the twelve chapters of the latter by considering the topics left undiscussed therein. It is also *miscellaneous* in that it is based on both *upadeśa* and *atideśa* as are the *tantra* and the *prasaṅga* of the 11th and 12th chapters. For this reason, we cannot have strict *saṅgati* among topics in this *kāṇḍa*. This feature is therefore no argument against its authenticity. There can be traced, however, some relation (*saṅgati*) between the various parts in this *Kāṇḍa* such as *ākṣepa*, *aparāda* or *prasaṅga*. According to the printed commentary of Bhāskararāya, most of the *pādas* of these four chapters are known by different names indicative of the particular

1 Cf. सम्यक् निःशेषतया स्फुटतया च, कृष्टा आकृष्य विप्रकीर्णवेदवाक्येभ्यः सङ्गृह्य निर्णीयन्त इति संकर्षणव्युत्पत्तिः ॥

2 Bhāskararāya begins his commentary, *Bhāṭṭacandrikā*, thus: एवं द्वादश-भिरध्यायैः प्रकृतिविकृतिभेदेन कतिपयाज्ञवायान् संशोध्य, तैरेव न्यायैरितस्ततो विप्रकीर्णान्वेद-वाक्यार्थान्नैदंपर्येण सम्यक् निष्कृष्य निर्णीतुमेषा चतुरध्यायारभ्यते । अतएव संकर्षे न प्रत्यधिकरणा संगत्यपेक्षा ॥ Appayya Dikṣita, in his *Kalpataru Parimala* (Nirraya Sagar Edn., p. 50) observes: धर्मविचारार्थं द्वादशलक्षणार्थं कृत्वा, तत्रासूत्रितान् कश्चिदध्यायानालक्ष्य, तत्संग्रहार्थं द्वादशलक्षणार्थं संकर्षकाण्डं कृतवतो महर्षिवरस्य जैमिनेः ॥ Elsewhere in the same work, he characterises the *Sk.* thus: द्वादशलक्षणविचारितनानाविषय-न्यायविचारात्मकः तत्परिशिष्टः तन्प्रसंगवदुपदेशातिदेशसाधारण्येन प्रकीर्णकः प्रवर्तितः ॥ (op. cit., p. 838).

themes discussed in them—as can be readily seen from the following tabulation:—

Adhyāya	Pāda	Subject
xiii	4	यूपपादः
xiv	1	इष्टकापादः
”	2	अवदानपादः
”	3	प्रेष ”
”	4	होम ”
xv	1	कालपादः
”	2	अग्नि ”
”	3	ग्रह ”
”	4	आर्षेयपादः वा वरणापादः
xvi	1	हौत्रकाध्याये समाधिपादः
”	2	निगदपादः
”	3	वषट्कारपादः

II

If this feature of the work had been properly understood, Mr. Sandal would not have remarked that in the *Sk.* there are no *adhikaraṇas* and that the *Sūtras* are meagre etc. Mr. Sandal complains that the *Sūtras* are “meagre.” He is evidently under the impression that the *Sūtras* printed in bold type in the edition of the *Bhāṭṭacandrikā* represent the complete *Sūtras* constituting both the *pūrcapakṣa* and the *siddhānta* views in any given *adhikaraṇa*. But, the pity of it is that these are not at all complete *Sūtras* but only the first words of the first *Sūtras* generally in those *adhikaraṇas*. For example,³ in the printed text, we get the *Sūtra* of the first *adhikaraṇa*—‘अनुयजतीति’ but, the full *Sūtra* runs thus—‘अनुयजतीत्यनुवषट्कारश्चोच्यते’ which finally decides that the proposition ‘सोमस्याग्ने व्रीहोत्यनुयजति’ enjoins a new sacrifice to be performed after the Soma Yāga.

Again, Mr. Sandal’s statement that “it (the Saṃkarṣakāṇḍa) is an

3 For other instances see the Appendix at the end of this paper.

apocryphal portion of the Mīmāṃsā, most probably palmed off by Khaṇḍadeva" is clearly wrong. The *Saṃkarsakāṇḍa*, as a prakīrṇaka of the Mīmāṃsā Śāstra, was composed by Jaimini,⁴ the author of the *Dvādaśalakṣaṇī*. It is referred to by Bādarāyaṇa, the author of the *Ādānta Sūtras* and has been commented upon by several great writers of the Mīmāṃsā Śāstra. According to Saṃkara, Rāmānuja and other Bhāṣyakāras, Bādarāyaṇa has cited in his Sūtra—प्रदानवदेव तदुक्तं (iii, 3, 43), the approval of the Siddhānta-view of the adhikaraṇa xiv, 2, 15 of the *Sk.*⁵

On the authority of the *Prapañcahṛdaya*,⁶ it appears that the famous Vṛttikāra Bodhāyana wrote a Vṛtti on the *Sk.* This Vṛttikāra is identified with Upavaṛṣa.⁷ Tradition holds that Śabarāsvāmin's

4 Vide the remarks of Appayya Dikṣita quoted already under f.n. ante. Cf. also. तदिदं (मीमांसाशास्त्रं) विशत्यध्यायनिबद्धं । तत्र षोडशाध्यायनिबद्धं पूर्वभागस्य धर्मविचारपरायणं जैमिनिकृतम् । तदन्यदध्यायचतुष्कमुत्तरमीमांसाशास्त्रमुत्तरकाण्डस्य ब्रह्मविचारपरायणं व्यासकृतम् । *Prapañcahṛdaya*, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, p. 30.

5 Saṃkara explains *Ādānta Sūtra*, iii, 3, 43, as follows:

तस्मात्पृथगेवोपगमनं प्रदानवत्—यथा, 'इन्द्राय राशे पुरोडाशमेकादशकपालम् । इन्द्रायाधिराजाय । इन्द्राय स्वराशे, इत्यस्यां त्रिपुरोडाशिन्यामिष्टौ, 'सर्वेषामभिगमयन्नवद्यत्सङ्घट्टकार' मिति । अतो वचनादिन्द्राभेदाच्च सहप्रदानाशङ्कायां, राजादिगुणभेदाद्याज्यानुवाक्याव्यत्यासविधानाच्च, यथा न्यासमेव देवतापृथक्त्वात्प्रदानपृथक्त्वं भवति । एवं तस्मात्प्रदानेऽपि आध्येयांशपृथक्त्वादाधानपृथक्त्वमित्यर्थः । तदुक्तं संकर्षे—'नाना वा देवता पृथग्ज्ञानात्' इति । तत्रतु, द्रव्यदेवताभेदाद्यागभेदो विद्यते । नैवमिह विद्याभेदोऽस्ति ॥

Rāmānuja in his *Sribhāṣya* explains: प्रदानवदेव, प्रदानवदावर्तनीयमित्यर्थः × ×

× × × तदुक्तं संकर्षणे—'नाना वा देवता पृथग्ज्ञानात्' इति ॥

Srikanṭha has the following explanation:

इन्द्रप्रदानवद्यथा इन्द्राय राशे पुरोडाशमेकादशकपालं..... स्वराशे इति गुणभेदात्पृथक् पुरोडाशप्रदानम् । नाना वा देवता पृथग्ज्ञानादिति संकर्षे तथोक्तत्वात् ।

6 तस्य विशत्यध्यायनिबद्धस्य मीमांसाशास्त्रस्य कृतकोटिनामधेयं भाष्यं बोधायनेन कृतं तद्वन्थशाहुस्यभयादुपेत्य किञ्चित्संक्षिप्तमुपवर्षेण कृतम् ॥

7 My revered Professor Mm. Vidyāvācaspati Prof. S. Kuppasvāmi Śāstrigal in his artical—'Bodhāyana and Dramiḍācārya: Two Old Ādāntins presupposed by Rāmānuja' (III Oriental Conference, Madras) has tried to establish the Bodhāyana-Upavaṛṣa identity. If this identity is acceptable, the Vṛtti known as Kṛtakoti, according to literary sources, belongs to Upavaṛṣa. Hence, the passage from the *Prapañcahṛdaya*

bhāṣya covers also the *Sk.*⁸ Bhavauāsa, one of the famous Vṛttskāras has written a bhāṣya or vṛtti on the *Mīmāṃsā Sūtras*, which is now unfortunately lost to us; and this also covers all the 16 chapters.⁹

Devasvāmin, probably the famous author of the bhāṣya on the *Āśvalāyanaśrautasūtra*, has commented on the 16 chapters of the *Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtras*. His bhāṣya is described in the *Prapañcahṛdaya* as a beautiful summary of the bhāṣya of Upavarṣa,¹⁰ and is the only ancient commentary on this Kāṇḍa, now available in manuscript. Rājacūdāmaṇi Dīkṣita, a reputed author in the *Pūrvamīmāṃsā Śāstra* and other branches of knowledge, has also written a commentary, known as *Saṃkarṣa-nyāyamuktāvali*.¹¹ Lastly, Bhāskararāya has written his *Bhāṭṭacandrikā* on the model of Khaṇḍadeva's *Bhāṭṭadīpikā* on the *Drādaśulakṣaṇī*. All these categorically accept the *Sk.* as genuine.

Now it is to be examined whether Khaṇḍadeva has commented on the *Sk.* If we take the opening verse in the *Bhāṭṭacandrikā* of the *Sk.*

cited above, is to be interpreted in the sense that Bodhāyana who is none other than Upavarṣa wrote a summary of his own Vṛtti and called it *Kṛtakoti*.

8 Contrary to this traditional view, the *Prapañcahṛdaya* holds that Sabarasvāmin has not commented on the *Saṃkarṣa Kāṇḍa* and one *Saṃkarṣa* or *Saṃkarṣaṇa* has written a bhāṣya on it—

पुनः द्विकाण्डे धर्ममीमांसाशास्त्रे पूर्वस्य तन्त्रकाण्डस्याचार्यशबरस्वामिनातिसंक्षेपेण संकर्षकाण्डं द्वितीयमुपेक्ष्य कृतं भाष्यम् । तथा देवताकाण्डस्यैव संकर्षेण (संकर्षणेन—ग. पाठः) ।
Prapañcahṛdaya, p. 39.

9 The *Prapañcahṛdaya* remarks on p. 39, भवदासेनापि कृतं जमिनीयभाष्यं (षोडशाध्यायपरिमितं). *Devasvāmin* also in his bhāṣya on XV. II, 1, says,

अस्मिन्पादे 'अपूर्वात्तथा सोमः' इत्याख्यापादपरिसमाप्तेः भावदासमेव भाष्यमिति ।

10 तदपि (उपवर्षभाष्यमपि) मन्दमतीन्द्रति दुष्प्रतिपादं विस्तीर्णत्वादित्युपेक्ष्य षोडशलक्षण-पूर्वमीमांसाशास्त्रमात्रस्य देवस्वामिना अतिसंक्षिप्तं कृतम्. *Prapañcahṛdaya*, p. 39.

It is Devasvāmin's bhāṣya and not Sabarasvāmin's, which is constantly referred to by Bhāskararāya in his *Bhāṭṭacandrikā*; and references to an ācārya and vṛttikṛt found in Devasvāmin's bhāṣya and the *Bhāṭṭacandrikā*, might be in all probabilities to the famous Vṛttikāra Upavarṣa, who has commented on this Kāṇḍa.

11 This work is noticed by Dr. Hultsch in his *Reports of South Indian Mss.*, vol. II, No. 1489.

प्रणम्य जैमिनिमुनिं खण्डदेवकृताविह ।

अनुग्रहाय मन्दानां संप्रहोऽयं विधीयते ॥

as authentic, then it is clear that Khaṇḍadeva has written a commentary on this Kāṇḍa, a summary of which has been afterwards written by Bhāskararāya. But the concluding verses in the *Bhāṭṭacandrikā*--

खण्डदेवकृतभाट्टदीपिका लक्षणैः कतिपर्यैरसंभृता ।

इत्युदीक्ष्य बुध भास्कराग्निचिद्र-भारती वरिभरांबभूव ताम् ॥

अद्यावधि कृतिरेषा (आ)द्यन्तविहीनेति दीपिकाख्यासीत् ।

षोडशकलाभिरधुना परिपूर्णा भाट्टचन्द्रिकात्वमगात् ॥

give us a different idea, viz. Khaṇḍadeva has *not* commented upon the *Sk.* We have got no tangible evidence as yet to prove Khaṇḍadeva's authorship of any works on this Kāṇḍa.

Mr. Sandal observes that "Bhāskara has dedicated his work in the name of *his masters* and called it *Bhāṭṭacandrikā* after the *Bhāṭṭadīpikā* of his preceptor". That Bhāskara was the disciple of Khaṇḍadeva cannot be accepted. Evidences are available to prove that Khaṇḍadeva, the Mīmāṃsā teacher of Perubhaṭṭa,¹² flourished in the beginning of the 17th century, while Bhāskararāya, son of Gambhīrarāya Dīkṣita lived at a later age. If he were one of the disciples of Khaṇḍadeva, he would have certainly referred to his 'guru' in terms like 'pūjya-pāda' as Śambhubhaṭṭa has done. From Bhāskara's concluding verses already cited, we are able to gather that he was a great admirer of Khaṇḍadeva and his works and as such, wrote his *Candrikā* a commentary on the *Bhāṭṭadīpikā* and a commentary on the *Saṃkarṣa sūtras*.

12 Khaṇḍadeva was the Mīmāṃsā teacher of Perubhaṭṭa, the father of Jagannātha Paṇḍita, and not of Jagannātha Paṇḍita, as Mr. Sandal has observed in his Introduction, p. xi. The second and third verses in the beginning of the *Rasagaṅgādhara* clearly prove this view. The *yacchabda* in the second verse— . . . सर्वविद्याधरो यः goes along with 'tucchabda' in the third verse—

तं वन्दे परुभट्टाख्यं लक्ष्मीकान्तं महागुरुम्'. This Perubhaṭṭa, the husband of Lakṣmī, as Nāgeśa's Commentary notes, is undoubtedly the father of Jagannātha Paṇḍita, the author of the *Rasagaṅgādhara*, the Five Laharīs, the *Bhāminīvilāsa* and other minor works.

13 It is possible that Bhāskararāya, the author of the *Saṃkarṣabhāṭṭacandrikā* is identical with the author of the *Candrikā* or *Candrodaya*, a commentary on

Mr. Sandal's arguments (2), (3), (4), and (5) do not contain sufficient evidences to prove that the *Saṃkarṣa Kāṇḍa* is a spurious work. We have already cited six authors of the *Pūrvamīmāṃsā Śāstra* of whom at least *five* have undoubtedly commented upon this Kāṇḍa—a fact which would well prove its genuineness as a supplement to the *Dvādaśalukṣaṇī*. In the light of these, we cannot accept Mr. Sandal's conclusion which is based on the sole reason that Alberuni, Abul Fazal and Mādhava, the author of the *Sarva-darśana-saṃgraha* have not referred to it.

Mr. Sandal's sixth argument is that "the style of the *Saṃkarṣa Kāṇḍa* is so curt and mutilated that without the help of the Commentary one cannot understand it' etc. All sūtras, as a rule, are curt and are not intelligible without a commentary.¹⁴ As for his opinion that they are *mutilated*, we are afraid that he is not in full possession of the sūtras. We have given in the Appendix some full sūtras which were collected and reconstructed from references.

Mr. Sandal's seventh argument supports our view. The repetition of the phrase यथा याज्यासंप्रैषः at the end of the *Saṃkarṣa Kāṇḍa* clearly shows that the *Saṃkarṣa* closes the *Pūrvamīmāṃsā Śāstra*; for, we do not find any such repetition in the last sūtra of the twelfth chapter. In this respect, Jaimini might have followed some of his predecessors in the field of Mīmāṃsā or some Kalpasūtrakāras. Mr. Sandal's observation that 'Jaimini has either followed the *Sāṃkhya-pravacana-sūtra* or the *Vedāntasūtra*' is baseless.

(1) There is a theory prevalent among scholars that the available *Sāṃkhya-pravacana-sūtras* are not the genuine sūtras of Kapila and they are the productions of Vijñānabhikṣu who flourished during the 14th century. Jaimini could not have any access to these sūtras.

the *Bhāṭṭadīpikā*. It may also be said here that the same Bhāskararāya has composed a minor work on Mīmāṃsā—*Matvarthalukṣaṇāvicāra* and the *Vaidikakośa* in verse, both now preserved in the Tanjore Mahārāja Serfoji Sarasvati Mahal Library.

14 Compare:—

अस्पाक्षरमसन्दिग्धं सारवद्विभक्तमुत्तमम् ।
अस्तोभमनवद्यच्च सूत्रं सूत्रविदो विदुः ॥

(2) In the *Vedāntasūtra* there is the repetition of the word at the end of each *pāda* and *adhyāya* and the whole *sūtra* is repeated at the end of the *Śāstra*. Such a practice is not followed.¹⁵

The *Saṃkarṣa Kāṇḍa* is a valuable work in the *Mīmāṃsā* literature and is more in the nature of the *Kalpasūtras*. Unlike the *Dvādaśalakṣaṇī*, the *Saṃkarṣa Kāṇḍa* has not got any separate principle to enunciate and, therefore, is a miscellaneous supplement. It attempts at a further application of the principles already enunciated in the twelve chapters, to other examples in the Vedas, which may not be otherwise easily intelligible. Even within many *adhyāyas* one and the same principle is enunciated and discussed with reference to different illustrations with a view to widening the application of the rule of interpretation in question to the vast field of the Vedas and other texts of unquestionable authority on the eternal dharma. In this sense it is a *Kalpasūtra* but there is this main difference that the *Mīmāṃsā* enquires whether this particular thing is to be accepted in this particular way, while all *Kalpasūtras* are generally mere compendiums of ritualistic informations found scattered in the various branches or recensions of the Vedas, all of which the Vedic students are not allowed or have no time to study.

III Appendix

The *Sk.* consists of four *adhyāyas*, each *adhyāya* being subdivided into four *pādas*, and each *pāda* again subdivided into a number of *Adhikaraṇas* or *Nyūyas* as follows:—

Adhyāya	Pādas				Total
	1	2	3	4	
XIII	15	18	24	27	84
XIV	41	18	15	30	104
XV	25	36	20	14	95
XVI	13	19	22	10	64

Adhikaraṇas 347

15 According to Devaśvāmin's *bhāṣya* on the *Sk.*, there is repetition of a word or of a phrase at the end of the second chapter (XIVth chapter) of the *Saṃkarṣa*. If this is reliable, this practice of the *Sūtrakāra* does not help us to definitely say whom he has followed.

The following full Sūtras constituting various Adhikaraṇas in the *Sk.* are collected and reconstructed from Appayya Dīkṣita's *Vedānta-kalpataru-parimala* and Vāsudeva Dīkṣita's *Adhvarṇīmāṃsākutūhala-vṛtti*.

(1) Adhyāya XIII. 1.1 अनुयजतीत्यनुवषट्कारः चोद्यते (V.K.P., N.S. Ed. p. 838).

- (2) Adhyāya XIII. 3.2 (1) सह कुम्भीभिरतिक्रामन्नाहेति स्रुकुप्रत्यान्नायः श्रूयते
यथा पलाशस्य मध्यमेन पशुर्न जुहोति (पूर्वपक्षः),
(2) दारुपात्राणि कुम्भीभिर्विकल्प्येरन् एकार्थत्वात्
(आशङ्का),
(3) प्रवृत्तस्य प्रदानस्य पात्रनिधानात् अपनयो यथा
पात्रीवतं पयमिकृतमुत्सृजेत्, (सिद्धान्तः) ।

[AMK, Vṛtti, Vanivilas Edn., Sri Rāngam Madras, p. 398].

- (3) Adh. XIII. 3 (1) तत्र शेषकार्याणि क्रियेरन् पात्रान्यत्वात् (पूर्वपक्षः),
(2) नापनीतेषु श्रुतत्वात् तत् व्याख्यातम् (सिद्धान्तः),

[AMK, Vṛtti, p. 398].

- (4) XIV. 2.2 (1) तत्र देवतानामादेशो न विद्यते अनाम्नात्त्वात् (पूर्वपक्षः),
(2) विद्यते वा अन्यार्थदर्शनेभ्यः (सिद्धान्तः),
(3) आम्नातः प्रयाजेषु देवतादेशः, तस्य प्रतिषेधो वचनमितरेषु
(गुणसूत्राशङ्का),
(4) आम्नातो वैकेषां तद्दर्शयत्यमुष्मा अनुब्रूयामुं यज (गुणसूत्राशङ्का-
निरासः) ।

[AMK, Vṛtti, p. 160].

- (5) XIV. 2.14 (1) तेषां पृथक्कृतानां निरवदानं यथाऽन्येषां हविःपृथक्त्वात्
(पूर्वपक्षः),

- (2) वचनात्सर्वेषां सह अवदीयेत (सिद्धान्तः) ।

[VKP, p. 838].

- (6) XIV. 2.15 (1) तेषां पृथक्प्रदानं अवदानैकत्वात् (पूर्वपक्षः),
(2) नाना वा देवता पृथक्ज्ञानात् (नाना वा पृथक् ज्ञानात् ; नाना वा
देवतापृथक्त्वात्) (सिद्धान्तः),
(3) अन्यार्थप्रदर्शनाच्च (गुणसूत्रम्) ।

[VKP, pp. 838—9].

- (7) XIV. 4.1 (1) देवतासंयोगेन चोद्यमाने प्रदान आहुतिः यथा लोके ।
[AMK, Vṛtti, p. 390].
- (8) XIV. 4.2 (1) अदेवतासंयोगेन चोद्यमानेऽर्थगृहीता यथा भोजनचोदनायां
मनुष्ययोगः।
[AMK, Vṛtti, p. 288].
- (9) XIV. 4.3 (1) सूक्तवाको याज्याप्रस्तराहुतीरिध्मः प्रथम आहुतीनां ह्यते
इत्येतेन व्याख्यातम् (पूर्वपक्षः),
(2) प्रशंसा वा संस्कारः प्रस्तरस्य सञ्ज्ञानात् समिन्धनार्थ इध्मः
(सिद्धान्तः) ।
[AMK, Vṛtti, p. 288].
- (10) XIV. 4.27 (1) ऋताषाट् ऋतधामेति यथार्थविनिष्कर्षोऽर्थपृथक्त्वात् (पूर्वपक्षः),
(2) यथा समान्त्रानं वा (सिद्धान्तः) ।
[AMK, Vṛtti, p. 150].
- (11) XIV. 4.28 (1) षडभिर्जुहोतीति पर्यायवादो यथा सावित्राश्च जुहोति ।
[AMK, Vṛtti, p. 150].
- (12) XVI. 2.1 (1) (...) इत्यालेखनः (पूर्वपक्षः),
(2) प्रकृतित इत्याश्रमरध्यः (सिद्धान्तः) ।
[AMK, Vṛtti, p. 269].
- (13) XVI. 4.10 (1) पशावुत्तमे प्रयाजे स्रुगादापनो न विद्यते संप्रेषितत्वात् (पूर्वपक्षः),
(2) विद्यते वा अन्यकालत्वात् यथा वाज्यासंप्रैषो यथा वज्यासंप्रैषः
(सिद्धान्तः) ।
[AMK, Vṛtti, p. 838].

The Puṣṭi-mārga of Vallabhācārya

The *Puṣṭi-mārga* or the doctrine of grace as taught by Vallabhācārya (1479-1531 A.D.) is one of those branches of knowledge that are undeservedly ignored by the world of scholars. Some writers¹ have also done injustice to Vallabha by explaining the word *Puṣṭi* as eating, drinking and enjoying.

Vallabha's predecessors such as Śaṅkara, Bhāskara etc. have accepted three authorities, generally known as three *Prasthānas*, viz., the *Vedas* including the *Upaniṣads*, the *Gītā* and the *Brahmasūtras*, but Vallabha adds the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* as the fourth authority and remarks that in case of doubts in any of these four authorities one should try to remove them in the light of the succeeding authority.² The *Bhāgavata* thus stands on the same level as that of the *Vedas*; nay, it is the very ripe fruit of the Kalpa-tree in the form of the *Vedas*.³ The reason why Vallabha attaches so much importance to the *Bhāgavata* is, to my mind, the fact that the episode of Kṛṣṇa and the Gopīs is very elaborately treated in it; and it is on the strength of this episode that he tries to preach the doctrine of *Puṣṭi*.

Like his predecessors, Vallabha expresses his own opinion on *karma*, *jñāna* and *bhakti*, which have been regarded as the three well-known paths to liberation and which were practised only by the cultured. He discusses their significance and relative importance. He calls this *bhakti* as *śāstric* or *māryādā bhakti*, to be practised according to the letter of the scriptures and as such not useful for

1 See the article "Vallabhācārya" in *E. R. E.*; "Doctrine of Māyā" in Prof. Jwalaprasad's *Introduction to Indian Philosophy*. The remarkable exception is that of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar's *Vaiṣṇavism*, etc.

2 वेदाः श्रीकृष्णवाक्यानि व्याससूत्राणि चैव हि ।
समाधिभाषा व्यासस्य प्रमाद्यं तद्यत्तुष्टयम् ॥
उत्तरं पूर्वसंदेहघारकं परिकीर्तितम् ।

Vallabha's *तत्त्वदीपनिबन्ध*, Benares Edition, p. 12.

3 निगमकल्पतरुर्गलितं फलम् । भागवत, I. 3.

females and members of the so-called lower classes. He is confronted with the most important question of his times, and also of our times, whether the time-honoured paths of *karma*, *jñāna* and *bhakti* can satisfy the spiritual demand, not of males of the first three classes only but of humanity in general, without any distinction of caste, creed and nationality. Vallabha remarks that the case of the females and Sūdras did not receive proper attention at the hands of his predecessors. He finds that the iron age is so unfavourable to the three paths that they cannot be practised rigidly⁴ and thus, although they were most effective in times gone by, they become out of date. In one of his works,⁵ Vallabha gives a graphic description of his own times—a description which is true even to-day. The atmosphere of the country is thus not at all congenial and does not leave any scope for *karma*, *jñāna* and *bhakti*. At the same time, at all times and in all countries there are souls in all classes that are anxious to be free from the bondage of the world. The prophet of the age is, therefore, required to solve the problem in a satisfactory manner, and wonderfully, Vallabha does not fail to rise to the occasion. He cuts the Gordian knot by introducing the *Puṣṭi-mārga* or the doctrine of grace.

With Vallabha, the three terms, *Brahman*, *Paramātman* and

4 कलौ भक्त्यादिमार्गा हि दुःसाध्या इति मे मतिः ।

विवेकधैर्याभय, 17.

5 म्लेच्छाक्रान्तेषु देशेषु पापैकनिलयेषु च ।
 सत्पीडाव्यग्रलोकेषु कृष्या एव गतिर्मम ॥
 गङ्गादितीर्थवयेषु दुष्टैरेवावृतेष्विह ।
 तिरोहितार्थदेवेषु ॥
 अहङ्कारविमूढेषु सत्सु बापानुवर्तिषु ।
 लाभपूजार्थयत्नेषु ॥
 अपरिज्ञाननष्टेषु मन्त्रेष्वव्रतयोगिषु ।
 तिरोहितार्थदेवेषु ॥
 नानावादविनष्टेषु सर्वकर्मव्रतादिषु ।
 पापवृद्धेकप्रयत्नेषु ॥

कृष्याभय, 2-6.

Bhagavat, are synonymous and refer to Kṛṣṇa, the highest entity.⁶ Those who are not in a position to follow any of the three paths are asked to dedicate everything to Kṛṣṇa and to live on His mercy alone until they enjoy the highest bliss. The conception of *Puṣṭi* is mainly based on the well-known verse of the *Muṇḍakopaniṣad*⁷ that the realisation of God is possible only through His grace.⁸ This idea further appears in many places in the *Gītā* and is nicely illustrated by the episode of Kṛṣṇa and the Gopīs in the *Bhāgavata*. The word *Puṣṭi* is explained in the *Bhāgavata* as the grace of God.⁹ Vallabha himself has explained the word in very clear terms. In one place¹⁰ he says that in the *maryādā mārga*, God allots fruits according to the actions of men, while in the *Puṣṭi-mārga*, He does not take into account the doings of human beings but shows favour to them in the allotment of

6 वेदान्ते च स्मृतौ ब्रह्मलिङ्गं भागवते तथा ।

ब्रह्मेति परमात्मेति भगवानिति श्रूयते ॥

तत्त्वदीपनिबन्ध, p. 11

एको देवो देवकीपुत्र एव । Ibid.

परं ब्रह्म तु कृष्णो हि सच्चिदानन्दकं बृहत् ।

सिद्धान्तमुक्तावली, 3

कृष्णात् परं नास्ति देवं वस्तुतो दोषवर्जितम् ।

अन्तःकरप्रबोध, 1.

7 नात्ममात्मा प्रवचनेन सन्न्यो न मेधया न बहुना श्रुतेन ।

यमेवैव ब्रूयते तेव सन्वस्तस्त्वैव आत्मनि ब्रूयते तन्नं स्वाम् ॥

मुद्रक, III. 2. 3 ; also कठ, I. 2. 22.

8 The idea of grace appears in कठ, I. 2. 20.

तमक्रतुः पर्यति वीतलोको धातुः प्रसादान्महिमान्मात्मनः ।

Cf. श्वेता०, III. 20 ; महानारायण, VIII. 3.

9 योष्वं तदनुग्रहः ।

10 फलदाने कर्मपिबः । कर्मकारणे प्रवत्नापेक्षः । प्रवत्ने कामापेक्षः । कामे प्रवाहापेक्ष इति मर्षादारुणार्थं वेदं चकार । ततो न ब्रह्मस्त्रि दोषगन्धोऽपि । न चानोश्वरत्वम् । मर्षादा-
मार्गत्व तथैव निर्माणात् । यत्रान्यथा स पुष्टिमन्व इति ।

अष्टमाध्याय on ब्र. सू., II. 3. 42.

fruits. In another place¹¹ he distinctly says that in the *maryādā-mārga*, the liberation is possible through *jñāna* and *bhakti*, as laid down in the scriptures, which the aspirant has to try his best to acquire, while in the *puṣṭi-mārga*, nothing except the grace of God is required. The *puṣṭi-mārga* is thus meant for those who are utterly helpless and who are still desirous of getting salvation. When nothing requires to be done in the *puṣṭi-mārga*, except to throw oneself at the feet of God with complete faith in Him, it becomes quite obvious that the doors of the *Puṣṭi-mārga* are open to one and all. No distinction of caste and nationality can be admitted in this school of thought, and this is clearly borne out by the fact that the Gopīs, who were uncultured females born of a low family, surrendered themselves to Kṛṣṇa *in toto* and enjoyed the unique bliss only by force of Kṛṣṇa's grace. Illustrations of this type are also found among the well-known eighty-four disciples of Vallabha. Some of them were, no doubt, females and members of the low class.

It may be argued that the *maryādā-mārga* should be reserved for

11 कृतिसाध्यं साधनं ज्ञानभक्तिरूपं ज्ञानेण बोध्यते । ताभ्यां विहिताभ्यां मुक्तिर्मर्यादा । तद्विहितानामपि स्वरूपबलेन स्वप्राप्यां पुष्टिरुच्यते । तथा च यं जीवं यस्मिन्मार्गेऽङ्गीकृतवान् तं जीवं तत्र प्रवर्तयित्वा तत्फलं ददातीति सर्वं सुस्थम् । अत एव पुष्टिमार्गेऽङ्गीकृतस्य ज्ञानादि-नैरपेक्ष्यं, मर्यादायामङ्गीकृतस्य तदपेक्षितत्वं च युक्तमेवेति भावः ।

अणुभाष्य on ब्र. सू., III. 3. 29.

Cf. (1) मर्यादापुष्टिभेदेन वर्यां द्विधोच्यते । तत्र सहकार्यन्तरविधिस्तु मर्यादापक्षो-च्यते । पुष्टौ तु नान्यापेक्षा ।

अणुभाष्य on ब्र. सू., III. 4. 46.

(2) साधनं विना स्वस्वरूपबलेन कार्यकरणे हि पुष्टिः ।

अणुभाष्य on ब्र. सू., IV. 1. 13.

(3) साधनक्रमेण मोचनेच्छा हि मर्यादामार्गीय मर्यादा । विहितसाधनं विनेव मोचनेच्छा पुष्टिमार्गमर्यादा ।

अणुभाष्य on ब्र. सू., IV. 2. 7.

(4) पुष्टिमार्गेऽनुग्रहैकस्यैव प्रमाद्यमार्गाद्विस्तारः ।

अणुभाष्य on ब्र. सू., IV. 4. 9.

(5) अनुग्रहः पुष्टिमार्गे नियामक इति स्थितिः ।

सिद्धान्तसुकावली, 18.

the males of the first three classes and the *puṣṭi-mārga* for females and lower classes, and thus there will not be encroachment on the field of *maryādā-mārga*. But in reply to this it can be said that the present times are not at all favourable to the paths to be followed by the members of the three higher classes and they, being completely helpless, have to follow the other *mārga* viz. *Puṣṭi*, moreover, when females and Sūdras can achieve their goal by following the *puṣṭi-mārga*, it is thousand times easier for the Brahmins and others to realize God.¹² It is therefore evidently in the interest of humanity to accept the doctrine of *puṣṭi* and live the life in accordance with it.

The next important question is how to translate the idea of *puṣṭi* into action. We are told by Vallabha that the Lord manifested Himself to him on the eleventh day of the bright half of the month of Śrāvaṇa and gave him a message that all people will be free from all kinds of sin by performing the ceremony of *Brahma-Sambandha* which connects an aspirant with Brahman.¹³ This ceremony has to be performed for initiation into the *Puṣṭi-mārga*. The practice that seems to have been introduced by Vallabha on the strength of the divine message is this. Everyone desirous of realizing God but incapable of fulfilling that desire in any other way is asked to approach a spiritual preceptor, who is always engaged in the worship of Kṛṣṇa, who is free from vices and who is a critical student of the *Bhāgavata*.¹⁴ The preceptor first of all gives him a *mantra*¹⁵ which tells him that his

12 For a full discussion of this question see Vallabha's सुबोधिनी on भागवत, II. 1.5.

13 भावशास्थामले पक्ष एकादश्यां महानिशि ।
साक्षाद्भगवता प्रोक्तं तदक्षरश्च उच्यते ॥
ब्रह्मसम्बन्धकरणात् सर्वेषां देहजीवयोः
सर्वदोषनिवृत्तिर्हि ॥

सिद्धान्तरहस्य, 1-2.

14 कृष्णासेवापरं वीक्ष्य दम्भादिरहितं नरम् ।
श्रीभागवततत्त्वज्ञं भजेजिज्ञासुरादरात् ॥

तत्त्वदीपनिबन्ध, p. 414.

15 श्रीकृष्णः शरणां मम । Cf. नवरात, 9.

only guide from that time is Kṛṣṇa. This is generally known as *Sarāṇa mantra*. Afterwards the Guru takes him to an image of Kṛṣṇa, gives him a Tulasī leaf, recites the mantra for initiation,¹⁶ makes him repeat the *mantra* and asks him to put the Tulasī leaf near the feet of the image. This mantra is always kept secret.

It nowhere appears in the published works of Vallabha; but it is always kept by the side of the image. There are some eleven or twelve commentaries on this mantra and the earliest commentary is of Gokulanāthaji, the grandson of Vallabha. Tradition asserts that the *mantra* was no doubt revealed to Vallabha by Kṛṣṇa. The *mantra* clearly shows that everyone entering in the *puṣṭi-mārga* is required to dedicate himself and his belonging to Kṛṣṇa and declare himself to be the most loyal servant of the Lord. It must be clearly borne in mind that the dedication is to Kṛṣṇa and not to any human being, including even the Ācārya.

After this ceremony is over, the man has to pass his time in worshipping the image of Kṛṣṇa, like Gopīs worshipping Kṛṣṇa in old days and in reading or hearing the stories of God.¹⁷ The worship of God is of three kinds viz. with body, with wealth and with mind. The first two kinds are calculated to destroy 'mine and thine', the very backbone of the whole Samsāra, and the last type, looked upon as the highest form of worship, accomplishes the realization of God. The whole life must be the life of an ideal servant of God. He must not mind anything other than the Lord. His is the life of complete self-surrender and devotion. The Lord, on his part, is sure to help such a man, who has renounced everything only for His sake.

In case, the aspirant cannot find a qualified preceptor, he is advised by Vallabha to create an image of God for himself and pass

16 This mantra, otherwise known as आत्मनिवेदनमन्त्र, runs as follows:—

सहस्रपरिवत्सरमितकालजातकृष्णवियोगजनिततापक्लेशानन्दतिरोभावोऽहं भगवते कृष्णाय
देहेन्द्रियप्राद्यान्तःकरणानि तद्धर्माश्च दारागारपुत्रासविसेहापराधि आत्मना सह समर्पयामि
दासोऽहम्, कृष्ण, तवात्मि ।

17

सेवायां वा कथायां वा यस्यासक्तिर्हृदा भवेत् ।

यावज्जीवं तस्य नाशो न क्वापीति मतिर्मम ॥

भक्तिवर्धिनी, 9.

the rest of his life in the worship of that image.¹⁸ Vallabha undoubtedly possessed all the necessary qualifications of a Guru and therefore performed the initiatory rite in all cases. Even now, the practice is that the ceremony of *Brahma-Sambandha* is performed by the descendants of Vallabha, although Vallabha has nowhere said that the ceremony should be performed by his own descendants.

Sometimes a charge of sensualism is levelled against Vallabha and his system. It is not possible to discuss the question in all its aspects within the small compass of this article, but it is sufficient to remark that Vallabha, wherever he gets an opportunity, has made abundantly clear that sensualism has no place in his system. He, in one place,¹⁹ says that God will never enter into the heart of those who are slaves of passion. When dedication of everything to God does not leave scope for man's individualism, it is impossible for him to run any risk on his own account. Some of the descendants of Vallabha have written small works in order to show that passion is most detrimental to spiritual progress.²⁰

It must have been now clear from what has been said above that *Puṣṭi* has nothing to do with eating, drinking and enjoying; and I am sure, those who care to read the works of Vallabha with an unbiassed mind are sure to be struck with wonder at the sublimity of the conception of the *Puṣṭi-mārga*. In fine, I cannot resist the temptation of remarking that some of the burning problems of the present times can be happily solved by giving a proper turn to this doctrine.

G. H. BHATT

18 तदभावे स्वयं वापि मूर्तिं कृत्वा हरेः क्वचित् ।
परिचर्यां सदा कुर्यात् तद्रूपं तत्र च स्थितम् ॥

तत्त्वदीपनिबन्ध, p. 414.

19 विषयाक्रान्तदेहानां नावेशः सर्वथा हरेः ।
संन्यासनिर्णय, 6.

20 दोषेषु प्रथमः कामो विविच्य विनिरूप्यते ।
यस्मिन्नुत्पद्यते तस्य नाशकः सर्वथा मतः ॥

Harirājaji's कामाख्यदोषविवरणम् ।

Harirājaji (born in 1591 A.D.) was the fifth descendant of Vallabha.

Mm. Dr. Haraprasad Sastri

(1853-1931)

As the present number of this journal is dedicated to the memory of the distinguished Indologist, it is the proper occasion for making a survey of his writings along with references to such important biographical details as have a bearing upon his scholarship. As he devoted his whole life to the service of learning, his writings have accumulated through a period of about fifty-five years running to several thousands of pages. Many of them lie scattered in journals and pamphlets accessible at present with much difficulty. An attempt has been made in this paper to reflect within a small compass the distinctive features of his writings, pointing out at the same time the papers where important topics have been treated, and the hints and materials which they can supply for use by future workers on the same or similar lines. It is necessary for a proper appreciation of the writings to remember that many of the opinions expressed or the conclusions reached in them were done by him for the first time, or were correct inspite of the absence of evidences that happened to be acquired subsequently to confirm them.*

I

If we could have transported ourselves in imagination to the Sanskrit Collegiate School of Calcutta in 1866, we would have found in its fifth form a boy of thirteen named Sarat Nath. The transformation of his name into Haraprasad took place about this time in fulfilment of a vow to Hara for his recovery from a serious illness. At the end of one of his earliest articles published in the *Āryadarśana* (73) in 1877, we find him sign-

School &
College
career.

*The references made by the numerical figures are to the serial numbers of Sastriji's publications listed in Appendix I.

The important biographical details not touched in the body of the paper are to be found in Appendix II.

ing as Śrī Śarat. He showed signs of intellectual brilliance from this early stage. As a recognition of his merit he received a double promotion passing the Entrance Examination as a competition scholar in 1871. During his College days, he won many scholarships, and also the Holkar prize by writing a brochure in Bengali called *Bhārata Mahilā* on the ideal of womanhood as set forth in the ancient Sanskrit literature. He was a first class first in the B.A. and the M.A. in Sanskrit, winning the title of Śāstrī that used to be conferred in those days on the student who could acquire the topmost position in the M.A. together with a uniformly brilliant career in the preceding years.

Ancestry.

Haraprasad belonged to a Brāhmaṇa family of Naihati, a place about 24 miles north of Calcutta. The family had been noted for about a hundred years for the teaching of Nyāya to students who used to come to the place for study from far and near. Māṇikya Candra Tarkabhūṣaṇa left Jessore and settled at Naihati about 1760 A.C. He was a very learned man and a great Naiyāyika, vying with the distinguished Jagannātha Tarkapañcānana, whose learning was utilized by Colebrooke in the compilation of the *Vivāda-bhaṅgārṇava*, in his reputation as a scholar. Sir William Jones used to treat with great respect Māṇikya Candra's opinions on cases to which the Hindu law was applicable. Māṇikya Candra's son Śrīnātha Tarkālaṅkāra, and his grandson Rāmakamala Nyāyaratna (Sastriji's father) enjoyed a great reputation for their scholarship in Navyanyāya. Interesting details about his grandfather Śrīnātha and his maternal grandfather Rāmamāṇikya Vidyālaṅkāra a great scholar have been given by Sastriji himself (108) showing how in their lives, plain living and devotion to stern ideals were wedded to a deep learning that had its rewards in none other than the triumphs of learning.

It was his effort to publish the *Bhārata Mahilā* in a prominent Bengali monthly that led to Haraprasad's acquaintance with one, who was to influence his mind very greatly through-

out his life. He was no other than the great Bengali novelist Bankim Chandra, who was an inhabitant of Kāṭālapāḍā near Naihati, the very place where the ancestral home of the young author was situated. Failing to have his essay published in the *Āryadarśana* as the editor wanted its radical alteration, Haraprasad welcomed the good offices offered by Rājakṣṇa Mukhopādhyāya to have it accepted for publication in Bankim Chandra's *Vaṅgadarśana*. It was he who took Haraprasad to Naihati and introduced him to Bankim Chandra. The acquaintance started in this way ripened in course of time into a deep friendship (134, pp. 519-522). The feeling has been thus expressed by Sastriji in his speech on the occasion of the unveiling of Bankim Chandra's bust at the premises of the Vaṅgiya Sāhitya Pariṣad in 1329 B.S. (1922): "He (Bankim Chandra) was my friend, philosopher, and guide during his life-time. I want him now to see from on high that this disciple of his is still attached and devoted to him in the extreme" (170, p. 608). To none other among his senior contemporaries, with whom he had occasion to collaborate in the literary field, has he expressed his obligation in such feeling terms; from which it can well be inferred that his debt to the intellectual influence of Bankim Chandra was the largest. The influence was imbibed in conversations with him at his residence lasting on holidays usually from the afternoon to 9.30 P.M.—a limit that was very rarely overstepped. The topics of these conversations were very various,—history, literature, poetry, prose, drama, and Sanskrit, Bengali, and English languages (133, pp. 563, 564). The papers published in the *Vaṅgadarśana* had to come up to a high standard. The *Bhārata Mahilā* stood this test, and impressed its editor with the literary ability of the young contributor. From this time onwards i.e. from 1876, Bankim Chandra continued uninterruptedly his encouragement to Haraprasad not only during his own editorship of the journal but also during the period it was edited by his elder brother Sanjiva Chandra. Quite a crop of papers numbering more than twenty-five (leaving out the contributions that

The Vaṅgadarśana and Bankim Chandra's influence on Sastriji.

appeared subsequently in a book-form) came into being within the short period of six years (1876-1882) under the warm influence of his advice and sympathy. Haraprasad, as stated by himself (176, pp. 563-565), had but two objects in view at this time, viz. to please the litterateur by his writings and to mature his ability to write. He never looked beyond these to personal name and fame at this stage, and it was for this reason that his contributions were not published over his signatures. The identity of his papers would have ever remained a matter for conjecture, if a pamphlet published in 1916 had not contained a list of the writings that saw the light through the *Vaṅgadarśana*. The cognizance of the list without any contradiction by Sastriji or any member of his family may be taken as indicative of its general accuracy. The contribution of the articles continued even from Lucknow where he remained for a year for teaching Sanskrit in the Canning College.

The four principal subjects that received Sastriji's attention.

The contributions to the *Vaṅgadarśana* touched all the three principal subjects, which along with the search for manuscripts and the preparation of their descriptive catalogues, engaged Sastriji's attention for a longer period and in a larger measure in subsequent years than any other. These three subjects are the Bengali language and literature, Buddhism and its later developments, and criticism of Kālidāsa's poetical works. The preparation of descriptive catalogues of manuscripts was initiated at the request of the veteran orientalist Raja R. L. Mitra who on account of his illness 1878 sought in Sastriji's assistance in connection with the completion of his *Sanskrit Buddhist Literature of Nepal*. He translated 15 abstracts of the larger manuscripts, which have been indicated in the Table of Contents. Thus an early beginning was made of a line of work that was Sastriji's forte. The search for Mss. brought to his notice mines of new information that enabled him to strike out fresh avenues of research for himself, and illumine for the benefit of other scholars and the public at large many a dark and unnoticed region in the domain of historical truths. The light derived

from the manuscripts discovered or handled by him exposed to his view the use of the Bengali language for writing works connected with the later phases of Buddhism in Bengal, and also the greater antiquity of the Bengali language, literature and script than had been supposed. It enabled him to supply new materials that filled up many a gap in the account of Buddhism from the emergence of Mahāyāna to the final absorption of Buddhism by Hinduism specially in Bengal. Finally, as the manuscripts dealt with by him ranged from the Vedic period to the nineteenth century, and covered a large variety of subjects, he was put to the necessity of dwelling, in the Prefaces to the *Descriptive Catalogues* and elsewhere, on the histories of those subjects and the chronology of the various works in addition to marking out the noteworthy points in the contents of the treatises.

The *Vaṅḡadarśana* came into being at a time when the potentialities of the Bengali language as a pliant and efficient instrument of expression were gradually becoming patent. Various forces were being brought to bear upon it by writers of different leanings to give it a shape to their likings. The authors with a bias towards Sanskrit (of whom Rāmāgati Nyāyaratna may be taken as typical) gave the language an undue measure of Sanskrit leaven, while there were others who imported into it so many colloquial words as also those of Arabic, Persian, English and such other foreign extraction that it ran the risk of losing its Bengali character. To the latter category belonged Śyāmācaraṅ Cāṅgulī whose article in the *Calcutta Review* of 1877 (pp. 395-417) stimulated a discussion of the question. Sastriji has always supported in his articles published in 1878 and later the middle course (48, 65). He deprecated on the one hand the use of such Sanskritic Bengali as the following :

Sastriji's contribution to the discussions about the shape to be given to written Bengali.

“পর্তুতাকারতরনবিশিষ্ট প্রসারিত সমুদ্র, প্রবল বজ্রবাত, ঘোরতর
শিলাবৃষ্টি, জীবিতাশাংহারক হৃৎকম্পকারক বজ্রধ্বনি, প্রলয়শঙ্কাসমুদ্ভাবক
ভীতিজনক ভূমিকম্প, প্রধরশিশি-প্রদীপ্ত নিদাঘযথাক্.....অসংখ্য-

ভারকামণ্ডিত তিমিরাবৃত-বিশুদ্ধ গগনমণ্ডল ইত্যাদি ভারতভূমি-সম্বন্ধীয় নৈসর্গিক বস্তু ও নৈসর্গিক ব্যাপার অচিরাগত কোতূহলাক্রান্ত হিন্দুজাতীয়-দিগের অন্তঃকরণ একরূপ ভীত চমৎকৃত ও অভিভূত করিয়া ফেলিল যে, তাহারা প্রভাবশালী প্রকৃত পদার্থসমুদায়কে সচেতন দেবতা জ্ঞান করিয়া সর্বাপেক্ষা তদীয় উপাসনাতেই প্রবৃত্ত থাকিলেন। (65, p. 181).

On the other hand, he condemned such Anglicized Bengali as—

“আমি ল্যাণ্ডোগাড়ীতে ড্রাইভ করিতে করিতে হাওড়া ষ্টেশনে পঁছিয়া বেনারসের জন্ত বুক করিলাম। ফাষ্ট ক্লাশে লোয়ার বার্থ ভেকাণ্ট ছিল না, আপার বার্থে বোডিং শ্বেড্ করিয়া একটু সট্‌আপ্‌ দিবার চেষ্টা করিতেছি, এমন সময়ে হুইসিল দিয়া ট্রেন ষ্টার্ট করিল।” (85, p. 286).

“শিক্ষিবাসী যুবকগণ মহোৎসাহসহকারে এই কথা প্রচার করিয়া সত্যকে লুপ্ত করিবার মধ্যে আনিয়াছেন।”

“সুতরাং যদি পাশ্চাত্য শিক্ষা কিছু অনিষ্ট করিয়া থাকে তাহার জন্ত আমরা নিজ অদৃষ্টকেই ধন্তবাদ দিতে পারি।”

“যে যে ক্ষেত্রে তিনি কার্য্য করিয়াছেন, সেই সকল ক্ষেত্রেই প্রায় তিনি সমসাময়িকগণের বহু পূর্ববর্তী ছিলেন।” (85, p. 285).

The treatment of the subject is very humorous at places (85, pp. 286, 287). Details of these interesting discussions cannot be given here for want of space. Suffice it to say that Sastriji's opinion on the subject was very sound and may indeed be taken to be the theoretical foundation of contemporary Bengali prose.

His opinion about the latitude to be given to Bengali for its development, and about the Bengali grammar.

He came to the conclusion that the language should be light or serious according to the nature of the subject-matter. The first essential of every piece of writing in his judgment is clearness and simplicity. It is unwise to cease borrowings altogether from other languages in times of necessity, as such a course would hamper the development of Bengali. There should not be any objection to the use of foreign words, if the resources of Bengali, Sanskrit or any Indian vernacular, cannot supply the need in the same effective way. A reasonable measure of Sanskritic words may be used, but in any case, the current Bengali words should not be taboo under

the notion that they lessen the dignity of the composition. The terms of ordinary use when properly handled can evolve such forcefulness as cannot be had otherwise in particular cases. The attempt to eliminate the Persian or Arabic words from Bengali is bound to fail, because a very large proportion of them has already been naturalized in the language and because half the population of Bengal, which is Musalman, cannot agree to this elimination (85, p. 286; and 63, p. 76). The question of allowing Bengali the fullest latitude for development led him to raise his voice against the writers of Bengali grammars, of which about 250 had already appeared in 1901. The authors were writing the grammars in imitation of Sanskrit grammars, following at times the nomenclature used in the grammars for the English language (81, and 165, pp. 864-867).

The stress laid above by Sastriji on the clearness and simplicity of the language is found reflected in his own Bengali writings. All his articles dealing with easy or abstruse subjects are characterized by the perspicuity of the language in which they are couched. It was this characteristic of his style that was pointed out by the distinguished Bengali critic Akshay Chandra Sarkar in his *Sādhāraṇī* (14th July, 1881):

“পণ্ডিত হরপ্রসাদ শাস্ত্রীর গত লেখক পাইলে, বাঙ্গালা সাহিত্যের ভরসা আছে, তাহা নিশ্চয় কথা। পূর্বে একবার বলিয়াছি, ইহার লেখা এরূপ পরিষ্কার—পরিষ্কার কেন স্বচ্ছ—যে ভাষার আবরণ আছে বলিয়াই বোধ হয় না। আর, একটি কথা সাধু বা সংস্কৃত অথবা অসাধু বা প্রাকৃত—অতএব এ দুইটির একত্র সংস্থান করা অকর্তব্য এরূপ ফলাবের জ্ঞাতভেদ হরপ্রসাদে নাই। যে যেমন কাজ করিতে পারে, শাস্ত্রী তাহার বর্ণবিভেদ না করিয়া তাহাকে সেই কার্যে নিযুক্ত করেন।”

His pen was plied beyond the limits of historical articles. In his earlier years, he wrote in Bengali on economic topics, such as 'exchange,' 'free trade and protection' 'the reason why the rents are paid,' 'the cultivation of sugar-cane' and so forth, but this line of writing was not pursued in later times. Two sets of Bengali articles—one on the works of the great poet Kālidāsa, and another on Buddhism, would, I think, be

received on all hands as valuable additions to the Bengali literature on serious subjects. The contents of these writings have been dealt with in their proper places in this discourse.

It would be an interesting revelation to many, who knew Sastriji merely as one absorbed in the pursuit of his dry-as-dust subjects attractive to the antiquarian and the historian, to learn that he could also wield a pen of no mean power as a novelist. His mind was keenly sensitive to the inspiration of the Muse of poetry, and he even tried once (see *Kalpanā*, 1880) to write poems as evidenced by a specimen called *Mohini* recently published in a collection of some of his writings. But portions of his prose writings in the *Vālmīkir Jay* (2), *Kāñcanamālā* (4), *Meghadūta* (3), and *Bener Meye* (5) and some passages in his articles on Kālidāsa are replete with poetry. A few specimens may be given by this opportunity :

(a) The following is a passage from the *Vālmīkir Jay* on the fascinating power of the song sung by the R̥bhus at the time of their descent to the earth—

“গানে মুগ্ধ কে নয় ? যখন সামান্ত মনুষ্যগায়ক তান ছাড়িয়া গায়, তখন কে না মুগ্ধ হয় ? তাহা অপেক্ষা যখন অন্তরের উল্লাসে প্রাণ খুলিয়া গিয়া গান বাহির হয়, তখন আরও মধুর হয়, যে গীত বুঝে, সে আরও মুগ্ধ, যে গীতের ভাব বুঝে, সে আরও মুগ্ধ হয়, গীতে যদি শুধু কাণ না ভরিয়া মনও ভরাইতে পারে, তাহা হইলে সে গীতে লোকে উন্মত্ত হয়। আজি ঋতুগণ গায়ক, জন্মভূমিদর্শনে পুলকে পূরিভ হইয়া গাইতেছেন, হৃদয় উল্লাসে ভরিয়া উঠিয়াছে। বশিষ্ঠ, বিশ্বামিত্র ও বায়ীকি শ্রোতা, তাঁহারা শুনিতেন। বুঝিতেন, ভাবগ্রহ করিতেন। কাণ, মন, প্রাণ ভরিয়া উঠিতেছে। বাহির ইন্দ্রিয় কাণে প্রবেশ করিয়াছে। মন ও প্রাণ কাণে উঠিয়াছে। জ্ঞান, চৈতন্য হত। তাঁহারা গায়কে মুগ্ধ, গায়কের ভাবে মুগ্ধ, গানে মুগ্ধ, সুরে মুগ্ধ আর সুরের ভাবে আরও মুগ্ধ।

সুর যত জমিতেছে, কেবল যেন বলিতেছে ভাই ভাই ভাই। ঋতুরা যেন বাহুপ্রসারণ করিয়া স্বাবর, জঙ্গম, ভূচর, খেচর, জলচর সকলকে ডাকিতেছে—এস ভাই ভাই, এস ভাই ভাই, এস ভাই ভাই ভাই—সবাই ভাই। সুর জমিতেছে, যেন আরও ডাকিতেছে, ভাই ভাই

(b) The language of this extract from the *Kāñcanamālā* is as light and playful as the dancing flowers striking one another with their delicate petals under the influence of the fragrant breeze—

“দুইটি ফুল, সমান ফুটিয়াছে, সমান হাসিতেছে, গন্ধে চারিদিক্ আমোদিত করিতেছে। পাশাপাশি ফুটিয়া দেখাইয়া দেখাইয়া গন্ধ ছড়াইতেছে, আর হাসিভরে একবার এ ওর গায়ে পড়িতেছে, একবার ও এর গায়ে পড়িতেছে। একবার এ উহাকে পাপড়ী দিয়া মারিতেছে, ও আবার তাহার শোধ দিতেছে। বাতাস ইহাকে উহার গায়ে ফেলিয়া দিতেছে। বাতাস ণামিলে ও আবার ইহার গায়ে পড়িয়া মারিয়া যাইতেছে। কেমন সুন্দর! একরূপ সমবিকসিত, সমপ্রস্ফুটিত, সম-গন্ধামোদিত, সমান কুসুমদ্বয়ের মিলন কেমন সুন্দর।”

(c) A few lines from the *Meghadūta* bear testimony to the adroit way, in which a charming Sanskrit description from Kālidāsa can be kept equally charming in its Bengali garb—

“শ্যামা—কাল নয়—তপ্তকঙ্কনবর্ণাভা—কাঁচা সোণার মত রঙ। শিখরিদশনা—মল্লিনাথ অর্ধ করিয়াছেন কোটিযুক্তদশনা অর্থাৎ ইঁহরদাতী। টোলের ভট্টাচার্য্য মহাশয়েরা অর্ধ করিতেন, দাড়িষবীজের ত্রায় দশনযুক্ত, যাহার দাঁতগুলি দাড়িম দানার মত। পকবিষাধরোষ্ঠী—পাকা তেলাকুচার মত ছুঁটি ঠোঁট। মধো কামা—কোমরটী সফ। চকিতহরিণীপ্রেক্ষণা—হরিণের চোখ মুখের তুলনায় খুব বড়, পটলচেরা, আর তার উপর চলচল করিতেছে; মানুষের চোখের যে অংশ সাদা, হরিণের সেই টুকু জলের মত, কেমন চল চল করে। তাহার উপর যখন আবার সেই হরিণ ভয় পায়, তখন সেই চলচলে চোখ আরও চলচলে হয়; যক্ষপত্নীর চোখছুঁটি তেমনি।”

(d) The following is a beautiful delineation of the confluence of the Ganges and the Jumna bathed white in moonlight—the latter with its blackish waters looking white, the former with its greyish stream looking doubly white—and the spacious marble palace on the bank also tinged white, casting on the waters its shadow appearing equally white, though a shadow. This was the palace of Purūravas and it was from here that Urvaśī made her final exit to heaven (see 113, p. 249)—

“প্রয়াগে গঙ্গা ও যমুনার সঙ্গম। একদিকে গঙ্গার শাদা জল তোড়ে আসিতেছে, আর একদিকে যমুনার কাল জল বেগে আসিতেছে। যেখানে দুইয়ে মিশিয়াছে, সেখানকার অপূৰ্ণ শোভা কালিদাস একদিন মহাকবির চক্ষে দেখিয়াছিলেন। তিনি তাহার যে বর্ণনা করিয়া গিয়াছেন, তাহা তুলনার অতীত, কিন্তু সে বর্ণনায় আমাদের আজ কাজ নাই। ভাদ্র মাসের ভরা গঙ্গা পাড়ের উপর আসিয়া পড়িয়াছে, ভরা যমুনাও পাড়ের উপর আসিয়া পড়িয়াছে; যেখানে এ দুইএর মিলন হইয়াছে, সেইখানে একটি সাত তলা প্রকাণ্ড শাদা মারবেলের রাজবাড়ী—এমন পালিশ করা যে, দিন রাত যেন চক্-চক্ করিতেছে—ঝক্-ঝক্ করিতেছে। সেই সাত তলা বাড়ীটাই আজ আমাদের বর্ণনার বিষয়। আজ আকাশে মেঘ নাই, পূর্ণিমার রাত্রি। চাঁদ পূর্ব দিক্ হইতে উঠিতেছে আর যেন নির্জলা হুধের মত শাদা আলোয় পৃথিবীকে ডুবাইয়া রাখিয়াছে। ভরা গঙ্গার শাদা জলের উপর হুধ্, ঢালা—যমুনার কাল জলের উপর হুধ্, ঢালা। যমুনার কাল রং ডুবাইয়া দিয়া যেন শাদা রংয়ের ঢেউ উঠিতেছে। মারবেলের বাড়ীর উপর চাঁদের আলো পড়িয়াছে—যেন সব বাড়ীটিকে হুধে নাওয়াইয়া রাখিয়াছে। মারবেলের ছায়া গঙ্গার জলে পড়িয়াছে, ছায়া হইলে কি হয়, সেও যেন শাদা হইয়া গিয়াছে। এইরূপে শাদার উপর শাদা, তার উপর শাদা, এক অপরূপ শাদা রঙের সৃষ্টি হইয়াছে। আর সকলের উপর একটা চক্চকে ঝক্‌ঝকে ভাব সকলেরই মন হরণ করিতেছে।”

(e) The *Bener Meye* (Merchant's Daughter) is a realistic novel presenting a picture of the Buddhist and Hindu community of the 11th century living side by side, and coming into contact with each other in the alternations of conflict and co-operation. Sastriji's intimate knowledge of the manners and customs of the period together with the historicity of some of the principal figures introduced into the fiction has enabled him to create in the mind of the reader a delusion in which he feels as if sensing a real world. The details about the procession of the Buddhists at Saptagrāma, their festivities on the occasion, their monasteries, their beliefs, and mode of worship and sādhanā under the instruction of the Siddhācārya named Lui, the Nālandā University, the Hindu inhabitants of Saptagrāma with their leaders Harivarmadeva and his minister Bhavadeva Bhaṭṭa, their attempts to foil the designs of the

Buddhists to entice the widow into the Buddhist fold with all her properties, the ultimate fight between the Buddhists and the Hindus and the former's defeat, and the way in which the villages acquired through the fight were redistributed, giving an insight into the way in which the Buddhists were ousted or absorbed by the Hindus—all these together with the manner of putting them invest the novel with the marks of a production that can only be the outcome of a vivid historical imagination.

The extract quoted below will give the reader an idea of the way in which he could handle the commonplace incidents with a skill that made them attractive—

“ভোর হইতে না হইতেই তারাপুকুরের মাছ-ধরার সরঞ্জাম সব প্রস্তুত। পুকুরটি যতখানি চওড়া, ততখানি লম্বা। একপানি জাল, জালের সূতাগুলি বহুকাল ধরিয়া গাবানতে এমন শক্ত হইয়াছে যে, মাছের মাথা কি উহা ছিঁড়িয়া পালায়। জালের তলার দিকে ইট ও পাথর বাঁধিয়া দেওয়া হইয়াছে। উপরে গোছা গোছা সোলার ফাতনা ভাসিতেছে। দুই পাড়ের ধারে দুই নৌকায় জেলেরা জালের দড়ি ধরিয়া বসিয়াছে। নৌকা চলিল, সোলার ফাতনা চলিল, জালের দড়ি চলিল, পাড়ের উপর অগণ্য মাছুষ চলিতে লাগিল। বড় বড় মাছ ঘাই দিতে লাগিল, এক একটা মাছ পনের হাত লাফাইয়া উঠিয়া আবার জালের মধ্যে পড়িতে লাগিল। এক একটা ঘাইয়ে জল তোলপাড় হইতে লাগিল। ঘাইয়ে ঢেউগুলি গোল হইয়া ক্রমে বড় হইতে হইতে ডাঙ্গায় আসিয়া পড়িতে লাগিল। ক্রমে জাল তারাপুকুরের মাঝামাঝি পৌঁছিল। তখন সূর্য্যদেবের রাক্ষা কিরণ আসিয়া তারাপুকুরের জল সোনার রঙ করিয়া দিল। কিন্তু এ কি? জাল যে আর টানা যায় না। জালের তলায় এত মাছ পড়িয়াছে যে, দুই নৌকায় জেলেরাই জাল টানিয়া উঠাইতে পারিতেছে না। তখন জালের দড়ি নোল করিয়া দেওয়া হইল। কতকগুলি মাছ ঘাই দিয়া লাফাইয়া জালের পিছনে গিয়া পড়িল। তাহারা যখন লাফায়, তখন বোধ হইতে লাগিল যেন, রূপার মাছ-বৃষ্টি হইতেছে। মাছগুলো রূপার মত সাদা, মাজা রূপার মত চক্চকে, একটার পর আর একটা পড়িতেছে। চক্চকে রূপার রঙের উপর সূর্য্যের সোণালি রঙ পড়িয়া গিয়াছে। সে রঙের মেশামেশিতে এক অপূর্ব শোভা।”

The adoption of Bengali as the medium of instruction in colleges was advocated by him emphatically as early as 1880 in

The adop-
tion of
Bengali as
the medium
of
instruction.

his article (59) in the *Vaṅgadarśana*. Since the thirties of the nineteenth century, it became the settled policy of Government to promote the knowledge of 'European literature and science' among the people of this country through the medium of the English language. The policy was formulated in the light of Lord Macaulay's Minute (1835) which brought to a close the heated controversy between the 'Orientalists' and the 'Anglicists' and led the Government to direct its patronage mainly to the promotion of English education.¹ The advantages of the spread of knowledge of the European literature and sciences are no doubt many, but the harmful effects of the teaching of the various subjects through the medium of a foreign tongue became gradually perceptible. The establishment of the Calcutta University presented the opportunity for a full application of the policy and for a scrutiny of its advantages and disadvantages. The harmful effects were being observed by some interested in the welfare of the country. Among them may be mentioned Rev. J. Long, who expressed in 1860 his opinion on this point in the course of an Address delivered by him at the Family Literary Club, Calcutta: "The study of English should be restricted in most, if not in all the junior classes, to the critical examination and acquisition of the grammar, construction and idiom of that language. It may be argued that by reading history in Urdu, where now it is read in English, you diminish the school-boy's opportunities of familiarizing himself with English; but, *under the present system, the boy learns neither English nor history* In other words we should have a separate department for literature and science, including, under the latter head the Sciences of Mathematics, History, Geography, and Political Economy. We should adopt that medium of communicating knowledge, through which the largest amount of knowledge may be most speedily and accurately acquired. Science is intrinsically the same whether clothed in Arabic, Sanskrit,

¹ Stark, *Vernacular Education in Bengal (1813 to 1912)*, pp. 21-24.

English or Urdu. But why dress her up in disguise? Are the difficulties of arithmetic decreased by the rules of addition and subtraction being explained in a strange and unfamiliar tongue? *The native scholar would learn, and thoroughly too, ten chapters of history and geography in Urdu or in Hindi in the time he would take to make himself intelligently acquainted with the facts recorded in one chapter of an English work.*¹

Twenty years after, the same state of things continued without any remedy, as the following gist of the protest made by Sastriji will show: 'If education be imparted through the mother tongue, it facilitates the work. We are taught, instead, through the difficult language of a people living so far away. It is not easy for a boy to have a fair knowledge of the language, even though labours continued for eight years. If it be conceded that, as English is the official language, it should be learnt by all, there is no reason why it should be necessary for the sixty-six millions of people of this province of Bengal to learn arithmetic, history, and the sciences through English. Why teach English without using the vernacular for explaining its intricacies? Why teach the Śāstras and even Sanskrit through a foreign tongue? The method involves labours out of proportion to the gain. It is not calculated to awaken the student's interest in the subjects taught to him. He tries somehow to pass the examination, after which he unlearns most of what has been crammed into his brain.' (59, pp. 212, 213). It was in 1891 when Sir Gurudas was the Vice-Chancellor of the Calcutta University that Bankim Chandra attempted to secure for Bengali a greater scope for its use in the examinations. Sastriji joined in these efforts along with Sir Asutosh. A motion was tabled by Sir Asutosh at the Senate meeting with this object in view, but the result was very meagre (170, p. 604). It was not until 1910 that Bengali became an independent subject of study in the M.A., but it

¹ *The Third Anniversary Report of the Family Literary Club* (1860), p. 16.

is even now far from what it should be as a medium of instruction in the colleges. Absence of literature on particular subjects of study is pointed out as an obstacle in the way of making it such a medium, but it should be remembered that the University can do much towards fostering the growth of such literature by announcing its intention to select the best vernacular books on particular subjects from among those that might be available after a number of years to be specified by itself. It is necessary to stimulate the development of such literature for the benefit of the people instead of leaving it to be created by the people themselves through their unaided initiative.

Collection of evidences regarding the antiquity of the Bengali script and language.

In the seventies of the last century, none had the idea that the Bengali script and the Bengali language were as old as the evidences, many of which were brought to the notice of scholars by Sastriji, proved them to be. In 1867, Raja Rajendralal was much delighted to find out the manuscript of a work, in Bengali character, called *Setubandha* copied in the 13th century A.C. In 1883 Prof. Bendall brought out the facsimile of half a leaf of the *Hevajratantra* in the Bengali script bearing the date 1198 A.C. But these manuscripts could not take us to the period before the advent of the Musalmans in Bengal. Sastriji was responsible for the discovery of the following eleven Mss. in the Bengali script belonging to times before the Musalman period (90, p. 9):

(1) A Buddhist ms. (which was a commentary on a Kālacakrayāna text) copied in Jessore during the reign of Hari-varmadeva (about the end of the 10th and beginning of the 11th c.).

(2) *Kṣaṇabhaṅgasiddhi* (of the same period).

(3) *Vajrāvalī* of Abhayakaragupta (about the end of the 11th and the beginning of the 12th c.).

(4) *Kālacakrāvātāra* (of the same author) copied 1125 A.C.

(5) *Caryāgīti* (copied at the beginning of the 12th c.).

(6) *Kuṭṭanīmata* of Dāmodaragupta (copied 1172 A.C.).

- (7) *Hevajratātra-ṭīkā* (copied 1198 A.C.).
- (8) *Rāmācarita* of Sandhyākara Nandin (12th c.),
- (9) *Rāmcarita-ṭīkā* (12th c.),
- (10) *Dohākoṣa-pañji* of Advayavajra (12th c.), and
- (11) *Apohasiddhi* of Ratnakīrti (12th c.).

Through the help of the scripts in these mss., specimens of the Bengali alphabet were traced back to the 10th century. The script must have emerged earlier, because Luipā who introduced the Sahaja cult among the Buddhists, flourished, according to Sastriji in the 10th century A.C.¹ (93, p. 44; 21, pp. 15, 16). As he wrote in a language which was essentially Bengali, the Bengali script is necessarily as old as his writings, though of course nothing can be said about the forms of the characters in the absence of specimens. To find out Luipā's date, Sastriji depended upon the fact that he and Dīpaṅkara Śrījñāna composed the Sanskrit work called *Lui Abhisamaya*. As the latter left the Vikramaśīlā monastery in 1038 A.C. at the age of 58 years (i.e. was born in 980 A.C.), Luipā being his elder contemporary has been assigned to the 10th century. Sastriji could not have this conclusion about the date of Luipā confirmed by the evidence of the succession lists of Siddhācāryas available in the monasteries in Nepal (93, p. 47). It is a matter for gratification that his son Dr. Benoytosh Bhattacharyya, the learned general editor of the Gaekwad Oriental Series, has taken up this unfinished work as he has done many of his suggestions, and examined two of these genealogies. His conclusion is that Luipā ought to appear on the list about 669 A.C., assigning an average of 12 years to each succession.²

The evolution of the Bengali script through the various centuries after the advent of the Musalmans into Bengal has

¹ It is mentioned as the 8th century in 86, p. 45, and as the 9th in 21, p. 16.

² *Sādhanamālā*, II, xli-xliii.

been traced by Sastriji through the specimens of the Bengali characters in the following manuscripts (90, pp. 9, 10):—

Subhāṣitasamgraha (12th c.).

Pañcarakṣā (13th c.).

Dharmaratna of Jimūtavāhana (14th c.).

Kṛṣṇakīrtana (14th c.).

Kuṣumāñjaliprakāśa 1st part (15th c.).

Bodhicaryāvatāra (15th c.).

Kāśīdāsa's Mahābhārata, ādiparva (16th c.).

Aṅadarāyavāra (17th c.) and

Juiminibhārata (18th c.).

Sastriji's
contribution to
the
materials
for the
history of
Bengali
literature.

Sastriji's contribution to the materials for the history of Bengali literature, specially in its earlier stages, is valuable. It was he who drew the attention of the public to the extensive Vaiṣṇava literature which had an important bearing not only on the history of the vernacular literature but also on the philology of the Bengali language, and the general history of the province. He himself became aware of the existence of this large literature after his appointment as the Librarian of the Bengal Government Library in 1886 (21, Preface, p. 1). In his dissertation (9) on the subject at the Cumbuliatola Reading Club in 1891, he cited the names of 114 composers of Vaiṣṇava songs, some of whom had to their credit a large number of them ranging up to 458. Moreover, 287 songs were anonymous. A large number of these compositions had been in print, but, as Sastriji points out (21, Preface, p. 1), the Smārta Brāhmaṇas and the Naiyāyikas (who were usually Śāktas) took no notice of them on account of their hateful attitude towards the Vaiṣṇavas, specially the followers of Caitanya. Details about the life and works of the poets were also given in the dissertation. It opened the eyes of the educated to the existence of an extensive literature of which they had been unaware in spite of the fact that many of the works had been printed.

To these Vaiṣṇava works should be added the songs and

other kinds of literature written by the 84 Siddhas in a language that has been shown to be essentially Bengali. The names of their Bengali works have been given in the accounts of the composers of *padas* in the *Bauddha Gān O Dohā* (pp. 21-36).

In the *Vaṅgadarśana* of 1880 (62), he has given within a short compass the history of Bengali literature from Raja Ram-mohan Roy up to the time of publication of the article, tracing the development of both prose and poetry and offering his criticisms on the writings of about twenty prominent authors. In subsequent writings, he has not attempted to write the history of Bengali in a systematic way but occasional glances at the literary productions of a particular period are found in some of his articles along with his opinions about their merits or demerits (cf. 84 and 189).

2

Sastriji had a keen sense for the appreciation of beauty. There are beauties in the arrangement of thoughts, colours and sounds that require no training for their appreciation, but in their higher flights a training is necessary. Sastriji's natural power for this appreciation was sharpened by his intensive study of the Sanskrit poetics without which the delicate beauty of many Sanskrit passages is sure to be missed. He has interpreted in Bengali the beauty in the poetical works of Kālidāsa in a large number of articles (47, 51, 66, 110-121, 123, 125, 126, 128-133, 313) numbering more than twenty, and in his *Meghadūta* (3). Of these, three were written between the years 1878 and 1882, and the rest in 1915-1919, covering more than 200 pages. This cluster of articles along with the *Meghadūta* constitutes a valuable contribution to the Bengali critical literature. His pamphlet on *Mālavikāgnimitra* in English (12) treats of the beauty, plot etc. of the drama. Sastriji also wrote a few English articles on Kālidāsa, and one or two Bengali articles, directed to the elucidation of the date etc. of the great poet and not to the interpretation of the beauty of his writings.

His Bengali articles in appreciation of the beauty in Kālidāsa's works.

After a study of the poetical works of both the world-

Kālidāsa
and
Shakes-
peare,

renowned poets Kālidāsa and Shakespeare, Sastriji at an early age felt inclined to analyse the greatness of each and indicate the spheres in which the one excelled the other. A striking feature of Kālidāsa's writings, says he (47), lies in the fact that in the depiction of characters in his dramas and other poetical works, he has always shown a partiality towards the pretty, the handsome, and the beautiful, unlike Shakespeare who has through his magic pen brought into being a large variety of men and women ranging from the meanest to the noblest, from the satanic to the divine. Kālidāsa has peopled the world of his creation by the self-effacing Auśinari, the fascinating Mālavikā, the exquisite Śakuntalā, the dignified Kaṇva, the outspoken Śārṅgarava, the heroic Raghu, the loving Aja and the conscientious Duṣyanta and such others but we look for in vain in his writings for characters like the grasping Lady Macbeth, the designing Cleopatra, the extortionate Shylock and the revengeful Prospero. In the painting of struggles between conflicting emotions, in the depiction of the deepest sentiments, in the play upon the whole gamut of human feelings and experiences, Shakespeare ranks much higher than Kālidāsa; but Kālidāsa stands supreme in his artistry as a painter of Nature, in his skill in the weaving of the subtle and the delicate into the finest gauze of imagery. The description of the changing landscapes as seen by both Rāma and Sitā from their aerial car on their way back from Laṅkā to Ayodhyā in the 13th canto of the *Raghuvamśa* has scarcely a parallel. The foaming blue ocean with whales spurting water through nostrils, the sandy coast with huge snakes risen out of their watery lairs for airing themselves, the green forests along the sea looking like the rusty rim of a wheel, the hills, rivers, and hermitages lying along the route up to the sacred confluence of the Ganges and the Jumna mingling their grey and blue waters, make up the beautiful panorama, upon which the poet fabricated his verses of unique beauty (47, pp. 36, 37). He has also evinced his skill in the handling of the brush in the portrayal of the seasons. The spring being the strongest in its

appeal to the human emotions, it has been adverted to by the poet in several places in his writings viz., the *Ṛtusamhāra* (VI), *Mālavikā* (III), *Kumāra* (IV), and *Raghu* (IX). It is remarked by Sastriji (110) that the delineation of the season becomes shorter but sweeter in intensity in the order of the poetical pieces named above. In the first and the second, stress has been laid on the beauty of Nature; in the third, the beauty of Nature shares his attention equally with the emotional changes caused by the spring, while in the fourth, these sentiments receive prominence as against the beauty of Nature. In all these descriptions, a keen power of observation of the minute details about men and things is in evidence.

Kālidāsa points out the beautiful features of the heroines in his Kāvya and Nāṭakas through dexterous delineation and skilful presentation. The beauty of Yakṣa's wife in the *Meghadūta*, and of Indumatī in the *Raghu* has been brought out in a masterly way through only a few strokes of the brush, as only one stanza has been sufficient to conjure up before the mind's eye the beautiful likeness of the former, while the latter has been painted in all her completeness through only nineteen qualifying epithets. The beauty of Pārvatī in the *Kumāra*, however, has received a more elaborate treatment, as nineteen stanzas have been used to mirror it (313, pp. 1096, 1097). Of these stanzas to which Sastriji refers, I am quoting two by way of specimen from Ryder's effective rendering:—

As pictures waken to the painter's brush,
 Or lilies open to the morning sun,
 Her perfect beauty answered to the flush
 Of womanhood when childish days were done.
 Suppose a blossom on a leafy spray;
 Suppose a pearl on spotless coral laid;
 Such was the smile, pure radiantly gay,
 That round her red, red lips for ever played.

In Kālidāsa's dramas, the heroine is brought to the view

of the hero and the audience in a charming manner. Mālavikā is brought upon the stage of the theatre hall in the royal palace to exhibit her skill in dancing (110, p. 1098.) Urvaśī chased by a demon had fallen into a swoon. She had not recovered from the effects of the shock, when she was introduced in the play, still quivering (119, p. 1100). Śakuntalā first appears before the audience along with two companions of almost the same age and beauty and engaged in watering the plants. Her tender feeling for the plants as a trait of her tender heart is made manifest through the very first words addressed by her to one of her companions, while the charm of her beauty is shown to advantage by her movements to keep off the bees attracted by the lotuslike loveliness of her face (110, pp. 1101, 1102).

The exposition of the *Meghadūta*.

The exposition of Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta* made by Sastriji is noteworthy. He had been equipping for years through visits to the places mentioned in the poem for getting an insight into the inner meanings, if any, of the passages, and visualizing to himself those localities with all their natural beauty. As an example of the way in which he draws out the inner meaning, the following may be pointed out: The separation of the Yakṣa from his wife caused him an intense pain. He was banished by Kuvera to Rāmagiri, which contained various spots with which the movements of Rāma and Sitā during their banishment were associated. Kālidāsa only hints at these associations. Sastriji points out the implication that the pangs of separation felt by the Yakṣa were meant by Kuvera to be further intensified by the sight of the spots, which reminded him, by way of contrast to his own misery, of the conjugal happiness enjoyed there by Rāma and his consort (3, p. 10).

The chronology of Kālidāsa's works.

At places, the interpretations were too candid in their expositions of the amorous feeling running through the whole poem, to which exceptions were taken by some reviewers on the ground of refined taste. Sastriji revised the work but pointed out that tastes vary in the different epochs, and for that reason, what he had written might not be quite in conso-

nance with the present day conventions, but might not have been offensive to taste in Kālidāsa's time (3, p. iv).

Sastriji has suggested (282) three chronological stages to which Kālidāsa's works can be assigned. These stages can be settled by keeping in view the following principal criteria :

(1) The poet's preference for the beauty of Nature to the beauty of the fair sex; and

(2) the adoption of a theme centering round human, divine, or semi-divine beings.

By following this method, Kālidāsa's works have been arranged in the following chronological order :

I. (1) As the delineation of Nature occupies the greater part of the *Rtusamhāra*, relegating the beauty of women to a minor place in the poem, it is the earliest literary production of Kālidāsa.

(2) In the *Mālavikāgnimitra*, the same preference of the beauty of Nature to that of the fair sex is discernible in such appreciations of Nature's beauty as 'the movement of the tender shoots of flowering plants leaves the dancing girls far behind,' though feminine beauty receives also a considerable measure of attention.

(3) The *Meghadūta* shows that Kālidāsa is as attentive as before to the delineation of Nature. His language is more polished than before, and he turns his eyes far beyond the limits of Malwa, because with the advance of his age, he has acquired knowledge of other lands.

II. (4) The *Vikramorvaśī* marks a change in the components that have hitherto made up the themes of his writings. A divine beauty is introduced as the heroine of the drama. The description of Nature received the same amount of attention as before.

(5) In the *Kumārasambhava*, almost all the figures are divine. As regards the treatment of the beauty of Nature and feminine beauty, the poet's attention is equally divided between them.

III. (6) After treating of things human and then of things

divine, Kālidāsa turns to a mixture of the two, as the former was not regarded as very elevating, while the latter was too high for the ordinary mortals to follow. In Śakuntalā was blended the human and the divine, as she was the daughter of a celestial being brought up on the earth under the care of Kaṇva. In this drama, Nature's beauty is used as a foil to feminine beauty which is thus given a higher position.

(7) The *Raghuvamśa* belongs to the same category as the *Śakuntalā* as far as the blending of the human and the divine is concerned. It treats of the descent of the God-head himself on the earth in human shape. According to Sastriji, this is Kālidāsa's greatest work. "From the fanciful appreciation of Nature in the *Ṛtusamhāra*, the poet rose by steps to the highest conception of God-head and the highest conception of the relation in which man stands to his creator" "He makes his Rāma the embodiment of all perfections that human mind could conceive, but in the background, he keeps his ancestors and his successors who represent not all but one or two qualities in perfection. Dilipa represents the perfection of obedience, Raghu of prowess, Aja of love, Daśaratha of kingly virtues and these usher in Rāma embodying the perfection of all the virtues represented in his ancestors (282, p. 182). The epic character of the *Raghuvamśa* has been defended by Sastriji on the ground that its hero is Rāma, occupying the apex of the pyramid, on one side of which are arranged his virtuous ancestors, and on the other his descendants of declining virtues ending with Agnivarṇa (see 125, pp. 642, 643 and 126). Moreover, the *Raghuvamśa* contains indications which mark it out as the product of a mature mind. The treatment of the points is short but masterly (127).

The treatment of love by Kālidāsa.

Love being the principal material drawn upon by the poets of all lands and all ages occupies a large place in the writings of Kālidāsa. The poet has given us different pictures of love in his various works. From the *Ṛtusamhāra*, which only reminds one of the feelings awakened in the minds of lovers by the various seasons, we find him painting in the *Mālavikā*

the fitful love of a king turning from one beauty to another and achieving its object through intrigue overcoming the obstacles put in its way by jealousy (111, 122, 123, and 12); while in the *Meghadūta* he delineates the love of the pining Yakṣa for his wife left behind in his far off home (3). In both the love is sensuous, but it is deeper in the *Meghadūta*. In the *Vikramorvaśī*, the love of Purūravas for Urvaśī was very deep and its depth became manifest by their separation. The description of his anxious search for the beloved in the garden of Kumāra in the Himalayas lays bare the intensity of his feeling reaching a stage verging on madness (113, 114). The love of Duṣyanta and Śakuntalā is a passion in its first stages, but is found to be purified of its dross through the fire of separation brought about by Duṣyanta's forgetfulness (282, p. 181). The love depicted in the *Raghuvamśa* is very much subdued. Aja's love for Indumatī was very intense as evidenced by his wailings after the latter's sudden decease, but these wailings are much restrained in comparison with those of Purūravas for Urvaśī in the *Vikramorvaśī* and of Rati for Madana in the *Kumāra* (128). This subdued tone pervades the whole of the *Raghuvamśa*. Rāma's lamentations for Sītā in the Daṇḍaka forest could have been given a more lurid colour and a larger space in the epic, but the poet refrains from doing so probably under the idea that this will not fit in with the awe-inspiring character of Rāma and Sītā as the incarnation of the divine. He has therefore taken to the device of merely referring to these wailings through Rāma speaking of them to Sītā on his way back to Ayodhyā from Laṅkā. The reader is thus left to supply much through his imagination with the help of this reflection of the distant reality in Rāma's conversation with Sītā (132, 133).

In the depiction of Pārvatī's love for Śiva in the *Kumāra*, Kālidāsa reaches the highest height that love can reach in human conception. "Love is here an absolutely divine sentiment, and no passion. Pārvatī wants to be united to Śiva, not a union of the flesh but a union of the spirit. Such an idea

of lofty spiritual love is unknown in the literature of any country" (282, p. 181; 112).

Kālidāsa's
home and
age.

Sastriji has written two articles regarding Kālidāsa's home and age (280, 281). In the descriptions of the natural scenery he evinces a partiality towards that of Malwa as indicated by a detour in the route of the Cloud Messenger towards Ujjain. He does not describe any other part of India with such details. The limits of the area within which the poet had his residence can be further narrowed down to Dasapura fifteen miles from the right bank of the Chambal or some place near Dasapura. The temple of Skanda mentioned in the *Meghadūta* has been identified with that of Khanderas (Skr. Skandarāja) on the river Gambhīrā near Dasapura. Among other arguments in support of his view, he states that the flora, fauna and other objects (of which a list has been made by him) mentioned in the *Rtusamhāra* are found nowhere *in toto* except in Malwa.

Many evidences have been adduced by Sastriji in favour of his view that Kālidāsa flourished in the latter half of the period between 404 and 533 A.C.

An interesting statement has been made that the expression 'utsavaśaṅketān' found in the *Raghuvamśa* (iv. 78) may be analysed into UTschang (Chinese name for two provinces of Tibet bordering on China), Bostan, and Khotan (281, p. 36).

3

Sastriji's
activities
re. search
for mss.
and
making
their
catalogues.

The appointment of Sastriji by the Asiatic Society of Bengal in 1891 as the Director for conducting the operations in search of Sanskrit and Vernacular Manuscripts brought him into a field of investigation that has been fruitful of results of far-reaching importance. As already stated, a beginning had already been made in the preparations of the *Descriptive Catalogues of Manuscripts* at the request of Raja R. L. Mitra. But this appointment as Director for the search of Manuscripts after the demise of the Raja put him into contact with rich mines of information, which, on the one hand, supplied him with the materials for establishing his theses in connection with the Bengali language

and script, and enabled him, on the other, to extend further the limits of our knowledge in connection with Buddhism, specially Mahāyāna and its later developments in Bengal. The zeal with which he carried on his work in this sphere is indicated not only by the large number of manuscripts collected under his supervision and described in his *Notices and Catalogues* (the mss. numbering more than 10000) (see 32, 33-41) but also by the fact that he did not hesitate to undertake the arduous journey to Nepal for the fourth time in his 69th year for carrying on his investigation in the Darbar Library. The search for mss. presents such a vast field for work that though many thousands of mss. have been collected by the efforts of scholars in both India and Europe, and Aufrecht's *Catalogus Catalogorum* contains the names of at least forty-thousand mss., only a small fraction of the investigation has been completed, considering the long way that yet remains to be covered. To quote Sastriji's own words (279, p. 62): "In the Darbar Library of Nepal itself there are 16,000 Sanskrit mss., not to mention the entire Kanjur-Tanjur collections of the Tibetans and the entire Chinese Tripiṭaka. Of these 16000 mss., only a thousand, mostly of palm-leaf, have been catalogued, bringing to light a whole literature of different schools of Buddhism and Tantra, some written in old Bengali, old Hindi and other vernaculars of North Eastern India. In the valley of Nepal there are still vast numbers of palm-leaf mss. brought there by fugitive monks and Paṇḍits fleeing before the first onslaught of the fury of the Muhammadan conquest. In the district of Puri, there are thirty-two Śāsanas or villages granted to Brāhmaṇas in perpetuity by the Hindu Rajas of Orissa. In 1908, I went there with Prof. Macdonell, and we calculated that the number of palm-leaf mss. (for all Orissa mss. are written on palm-leaves with a style) in these Śāsanas is nearly two lakhs." It is found from Sastriji's interesting account of the search of Mss. and preparation of their *Catalogues* (279) in India that though Sir William Jones' *Catalogue* of his manuscripts was published in 1807, and H. H.

Wilson's Catalogue of the Mackenzie collection was the first to be published in India in 1928, the Government of India did not include the work within the ambit of its patronage until the time of Lord Lawrence. He took up the suggestion of Paṇḍit Radha Kissen, the priest of Ranjit's court, contained in a letter addressed to the Viceroy emphasizing the need for a systematic search of mss. A grant of Rs. 24000/- was sanctioned by the Government and the work was commenced in right earnest in 1870. With this financial aid, the provincial Governments collected up to 1915 the following totals of mss :—

Bengal 11000, Madras 15000, Bombay 9000, and the United Provinces 8000. (See 279, pp. 59, 60).

It was the indefatigable scholar Brian Hodgson who initiated the collection of Buddhist Mss. in Nepal and gathered much information about Northern Buddhism through his own studies and through the assistance of his Buddhist Munshi Amṛtānanda who was induced to write a book called *Dharmakoṣa Saṃgraha* to explain the form of Buddhism current in Nepal. The manuscripts collected by Hodgson were distributed as follows :—85 bundles containing 144 works to the Asiatic Society of Bengal, 85 to the Royal Asiatic Society, 30 to the India Office Library, 7 to the Bodleian Library and 174 to the Société Asiatique and M. Burnouf, now deposited in the Bibliothèque Nationale. These, together with the Wright collection catalogued by Bendall containing about 172 separate works and the H. P. Sastri collection comprising 125 such works, constitute altogether 250 Buddhist treatises, rejecting copies of the same book and fragments. (See 302, pp. 19, 20, 201, 202). It was at the repeated requests of Hodgson to the Asiatic Society of Bengal to make a descriptive catalogue of the collection in its possession that Raja R. L. Mitra was appointed to do the work with two paṇḍits. When he fell ill in 1878, Sastriji was asked to help him and after a labour of five years, the *Nepalese Buddhist Literature* came out in 1882. Though Sastriji was appointed as the Director for conducting the search for Mss. under the auspices of the

Asiatic Society of Bengal in 1891, he had been preparing the Xth volume of the *Notices of Sanskrit Mss.*, 1st Series, in continuation of R. L. Mitra's labours, which took it up to the IXth (32). The Xth volume commenced to appear in parts from 1890 till its completion in 1892. It was followed by the publication of twelve volumes of *Notices and Descriptive Catalogues* of Sanskrit, Buddhist-Sanskrit, and Vernacular manuscripts till 1931 leaving out of account the Index volume (Xth) of the *Notices*, 1st series, and the *Descriptive Catalogue* of Kāvya Mss. (Vol. VII) now in the press (see 32-41) and of course, the several unpublished volumes of the *Descriptive Catalogue* upon which he spent much labour. All these volumes alone are enough to represent a fairly large amount of labour that can well earn, for the life of a scholar of average capacity for industry, a recognition as useful. But Sastriji was made of a much sterner metal. He could spare both time and energy to pursue his work in other directions in addition to his favourite but arduous task of carrying on the search for Mss. and preparing their descriptions. The Mss. were on various subjects relating to the various periods from the Vedic to the modern, and belonged to the various classes of literature by reason of the differences in the nature of the subject-matter and the language in which it was couched. Sastriji's mental equipment was such as could do justice to an exacting work of this description. The elaborate *Prefaces* to some of his catalogues running even to more than 300 pages present an historical background which helps the reader to view the Mss. on a subject in their right chronological bearings and assess their relative values. The connected accounts of the Sanskrit grammatical literature or the *alaṅkāra* literature in the *Preface* to his *Descriptive Catalogue*, Vol. VI (1931) may be mentioned as two only among several such instances. To Indologists the importance of the details about the several thousands of Mss. furnished by the catalogues cannot be overrated. Delving deep into the contents of manuscripts to bring to light the facts buried in them is comparable in

Some mss.
discovered
and
edited by
Sastriji.

value to the difficult but very useful task of excavation for laying bare the materials that contribute to the knowledge of the past, and illumine the highways and byeways of the bygone periods. Without the careful salvage of these important sources of historical information from the ravages of the white ants and the climate in their obscure places of deposit in the lofts of muddy huts in the villages, or on the shelves of people who kept them on without knowing their utility, the loss to the art of reconstructing the past would have been immense. The reports of tours [42 (a), (b), (c)] for the search of manuscripts submitted to the Asiatic Society of Bengal by Sastriji testify how the large and small collections of Mss. in the villages and towns in several districts of Bengal and some neighbouring areas were ransacked with the result that some very valuable Mss. were acquired for the Society. The *Rāmacarita* by Sandhyākara Nandin written in almost the same script as the Tantra Mss. of the 12th and the 13th century may be mentioned as an example. It was composed before the advent of the Musalmans into Bengal. After his accession to the throne in 1880, the hero of the work Rāmapāla set out to quell the rebel chief of the Kaivarta caste named Bhīma Diboka and drove him out of his territory. The author of the book was the son of Rāmapāla's minister of Peace and War. A portion of the commentary on the treatise was also to hand [42 (a), p. 7]. Both the text and the commentary have been edited by Sastriji. Many other manuscripts, some of which were edited by him subsequently, were procured in the course of the searches conducted by him or made by him personally. They relate to diverse subjects such as tantra, smṛti, astrology, medicine, dhanurveda, dramaturgy, architecture, philosophy, Buddhism etc. Some very interesting among them have already been named in connection with the evolution of the Bengali script. A few more may be added viz. *Bodhicaryāvatāraṅkā* and *Cittavisuddhiprakaraṇa* [see 42 (a), pp. 19, 20], *Dākṛṇava*, *Kīrttilatā* by Vidyāpati, works relating to the Dharma, Manasā, and Maṅgala Caṅḍī cults, a life of Caitanya

by Jayānanda [42, (a), p. 24]. Sastriji makes a special reference to two Mss. of the *R̥gveda*, because many portions of them were copied in the 16th century while those collated by Max Mueller for his edition of the Veda were copied in the 17th and the 18th [42 (b), p. 2]. One of the Mss. acquired at a small town at the northern extremity of Nepal has been pointed out as important by Sastriji in view of the fact that it contains the statement that the great astronomer Varāhamihira lived at Kānyakubja on the Ganges [see 42 (a), p. 2]. The four visits to Nepal to examine and collect originals or copies of Mss. from the Darbar Library and elsewhere within the territory have borne the most important results. It is not possible to name all the important Mss. that have been acquired, studied, and catalogued by him in the two volumes of his *Catalogue of the Palm-leaf and selected Paper Mss. (from Nepal)* which are so rich in manuscript materials. A glance through the volumes can make it patent to the reader that the manuscripts described in them offer a vast field for research, and can be utilised to light up many a dark corner of the past. An idea of the labour involved in the acquisition of Mss. can be made from a passage in one of the Reports which runs thus [42 (b), pp. 1, (2 1906)] :

“Though I have not been able to publish much, I have collected materials for two more volumes of the *Notices of Sanskrit Mss.* and acquired 1572 Mss., and, for the purposes of this acquisition, examined at least ten times as many. I have also examined and acquired a Jaina Bhāṇḍāra with 1335 Mss., for which the Government of India has been pleased to make a special grant of 5000 rupees.” But this arduous work must not be regarded as altogether denuded of hours of elation brought about by successes. Such hour came when Sastriji became triumphant in a difference of opinion between him and Prof. Bendall as to the date of a palm-leaf Ms. of the *Skanda-Purāṇa* in later Gupta character. It was then believed that the *Skanda-Purāṇa* was a myth and existed only in Khaṇḍas and Māhātmyas. “Prof. Bendall,” says Sastriji,

The bearing of the ms. of the *Skanda-Purāṇa* on the antiquity of the *Purāṇa* literature.

"was very unwilling to admit that the Ms. was so old, and we often talked on the subject and I maintained that the Ms. belonged to the 6th century and that the writing resembled that of the Horiuzi Ms. kept in the Horiuzi monastery in Japan where it has been lying since 609 A.D. But Prof. Bendall stoutly maintained that it was written in the 9th century. Finding that we were quarrelling on these facts for several days, Mrs. Bendall one day told us both to bring all the materials on which we held our opinions and to decide the question once for all. She very kindly consented to be our umpire. So one day we three sat on the verandah of the College Library (Nepal) and brought all the Mss., charts, and drawings and began to show them to Mrs. Bendall. Prof. Bendall had a theory that a Ms. is old in the inverse ratio of the mātrās or the top lines of letters. I readily acceded to this theory. It was however found that Bendall's Ms. of the *Pārameśvara-mata-tantra* copied in 859 contained many more mātrās or top lines than the *Śkanda Purāṇa* discovered by me. Prof. Bendall had to admit that the *Śkanda-Purāṇa* was at least 200 years older than the *Pārameśvara-mata-tantra* i.e. the *Śkanda-purāṇa* was written in 659 at the latest. The umpire gave her verdict in my favour. We worked from 11 to 3 o'clock in the afternoon and the verdict was passed and we all came well satisfied with our work. The antiquity of the Purāṇas was set back by several centuries and the discovery of the unique Ms. of the *Śkanda Purāṇa* was regarded as a great event in the history of the Purāṇic literature." (302, pp. 27, 28).

The
Abhi-
samayā-
lankāra.

The account of how the *Abhisamayālamkāra* eluded the search of two scholars like Raja R. L. Mitra and Prof. Bendall for nearly 30 years is interesting. In noticing the Ms. of the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā*, the former could not find that another work was embodied in it, while the latter noticed it but thought it was an introductory work, not realizing that it was according to this small treatise that the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā* had been recast. Prof. Stcherbatsky during his visit to Calcutta in

November 1910 told Sastriji that he had discovered the *Abhisamayālamkāra* five years ago. This had also been discovered by Sastriji at Khatmandu in Nepal in the summer of 1907 independently of Prof. Stcherbatsky [42 (c), p. 5].

Special references to four interesting works found in Nepal have also been made by Sastriji. The first is the *Ādikarmavidhi* on Buddhist rituals by Tatakara Gupta about the 9th century A.C. Tatakara informs us that (1) in his time there were married monks known as Āryas, (2) any one who took refuge in the Tri-ratna was a Buddhist, (3) the castes that made a living by killing animals were not admitted into the Buddhist community unless it was given up and (4) the Buddhists like the Hindus made use of the monosyllabic Tantric formulæ in the performance of every act of their daily life [42 (c), p. 3].

The discovery of four important mss.—*Ādikarmavidhi*.

The second work is entitled *Viśvapradīpa*,—an encyclopædia, of which only one part on music was found in the Nepal Darbar Library, and another part on Jyotiṣa has been described by Eggeling in his *Catalogue of the India Office Library*. The author of the work was Bhuvanānanda who was patronized probably by Sher Shah [42 (c), p. 3].

Viśvapradīpa.

The third treatise is a Sanskrit geographical work called *Ṣaṭpañcāśaddeśvibhāga*. It seems to be part of a Tantra and references are made in it to temples and places of pilgrimage as the landmarks of 56 places including China and Tibet [42 (c), p. 10].

Ṣaṭpañcāśaddeśvibhāga.

Another important Ms. was acquired from Mithilā. It is the *Varṇa(na)ratnākara* of Jyotirīśvara Kaviśekhara cārya who lived in the early part of the 14th century. It is in the Maithila character and its language is Maithili. Apart from its philological importance, its value lies in the fact that it gives descriptions of town, royal court (including officials) etc. in its seven chapters [42 (a), p. 23 and Dr. S. K. Chatterjee's article in the *Proceedings of the Fourth Oriental Conference*, vol. 2].

Varṇa(na)ratnākara.

The appointment of Sastriji to the post for carrying out the scheme for searching the Mss. of bardic chronicles in Rajputana and Gujerat gave a new turn to his activities for

the collection of information about Mss. and their acquisition. Since the initiation of the plan for the collection and publication of the manuscripts of bardic chronicles at the request of Sir George Grierson to Lord Curzon in 1904, four years elapsed in fruitless negotiations until Sastriji was called to take up the work in 1909. He writes in his Report, "I have made three tours in Rajputana visiting some of the capitals and ancient towns therein and in Gujerat. I have submitted four Progress Reports since 1909 to the Society, and I am now submitting a General Report of my work for the last four years. In the first year I visited Jaipur, Jodhpur and Baroda. In the third year, I visited Jaipur, Jodhpur and Bikanir, and in the fourth, I visited Bharatpur, Bundi, Ujjain, Mandasore, Ajmere, Jodhpur and Bilāḍā" [42 (d), p. 2 (1913)]. There are twelve appendices in the Report. The most important of these have been indicated by Sastriji himself: In the 1st Appendix, he answers the question whether the Bhāṭṣ and Cāraṇṣ only are the bards by stating that various castes wrote bardic poetry but the Bhāṭṣ and Cāraṇṣ made their living by writing these chronicles alone. In the 11nd Appendix, he treats of Piṅgal and Ḍiṅgal, the language of bardic poetry, while in the 11rd, he speaks of the rewards and remunerations given to the bards. The 1Vth throws light on the genealogies of the chiefs by comparing Todd's catalogue of the 36 royal races of Rajputana with a newly found genealogical work of the 36 Kṣatriya races. The result of the comparison shows that what Todd calls the Scythic element among the Rajputs does not exist among the Kṣatriyas. A short history of the family of Sardul Singh of Northern Sekhāvati adequately dealt with by Todd is found in the 1Vth Appendix, while the 1Vth gives information about a very interesting sect of flame-worshippers who have kept alive the flame from 1464 A.C. at Bilāḍā in Marwar [See 42 (d), p. 4].

The objects of the visits to the various chiefs in Rajputana and Gujerat were not merely to have access to their libraries to examine the Mss. but also to enlist their active co-operation

in the collection and publication of the chronicles by the Asiatic Society of Bengal as well as on their own account. The sympathetic response made by several chiefs—specially Jodhpur, Jaipur, Baroda, Bikanir, and Bundi, and Thakur Sahib Kesari Singji of Acrol (Jaipur), went a great way towards making a good beginning for a successful prosecution of the difficult work which devolved on Sastriji and the Asiatic Society [see 42 (d), pp. 2, 3 and 42 (e), pp. 2, 6].

The difficulty of the task of collection of the Ms. chronicles lies in the fact that the greater portion of them is still being handed down orally. The written literature is less than a third of the oral. The portion existing in writing is difficult to understand as the bards are bad calligraphists. The area to be explored is also very large as it extends from Delhi to the Kṛṣṇā, and from Behar to the Indus. It is also probable that the chronicles are available beyond these limits. Besides the Bhāṭṣ and Cāraṅs, there are the Bāḍoās who keep the genealogies of all castes and write songs in praise of their clients while the Dhulis or Drummers also write historical songs. A large number of Bhāṭṣ were either forcibly converted to Muhammadanism or embraced Islam of their own accord. They are following their occupation all the same, and singing the praises of the Hindu and Musalman rulers alike [42 (e), pp. 3, 4; 42 (d), p. 10].

The importance of the Bardic chronicles lies not only in the information supplied by them for the reconstruction of the history of Rajputana but also for the mutual checking of the historical materials derived from the Persian, Hindu and other sources. For the ensuring of accuracy in the narration of events relating to Rajputana, or other places that had anything to do with Rajputana, an important source of evidence like the bardic chronicles cannot be ignored or neglected. Sometimes, for the history of Rajputana, the chronicles are the only available and dependable source of information. Sastriji has himself demonstrated the value of these chronicles by his very interesting Bengali article on the light that can be thrown on the reign

of Aurangzeb from the non-Moslem sources (86). As space does not permit me to reproduce all that has been said in the paper, I am giving here the bare outline : Raja Yasovanta Singh of Jodhpur had a prime minister named Muhnot Nayan Singh. The *Khyāt Nayan Singh* (Khyāt=prose history) written by him is looked upon by the Rajputs as an authentic history of the province [86, p. 291; also 42 (d), p. 46]. It has however been found to be dependable up to about 200 years before the time of its composition. Beyond that limit, it shows some discrepancies as compared with the inscriptions. The author also wrote a statistical account of the Rajput States during the middle of the 17th century. It is still found in the archive of the family at Jodhpur.

Within 20 years of the death of Aurangzeb, Raja Abhaya Singh became the Subahdar of Gujerat. A Pokaran Brāhmaṇa who was put in charge of the accounts of the Subah preserved many papers in his residence. They can yield statistical information about a region which formed part of the Mughal Empire.

The two epics *Ajitodaya* and *Abhayodaya* deposited in the library at the Jodhpur Fort can also furnish historical materials. The former relates the attempts of Ajit Singh to thwart the designs of Aurangzeb against him almost the whole of his life. The account of the clever way in which Durgadas Rathor with the help of Mukunda Khīcī disguised as a snake-charmer took away Ajit and his brother surreptitiously from the prison by concealing them in baskets for carrying serpents is very interesting.

The chronicles preserved by the Bhāṭs and Cāraṇs relating to every State in Rajputana contain more or less information about Aurangzeb. Anūp Singh, the chief of Bikanir, was Aurangzeb's general at the time of his invasion of the Deccan. When Adoni in the Bellary District of the Madras Presidency capitulated, the Brāhmaṇas of the place were about to throw the manuscripts in their possession into the river when Anūp Singh made the request to make over the manuscripts to him

instead of destroying them. They acceded to the request. The manuscripts were deposited in the Bikanir Fort, forming the largest collection in Rajputana. He caused a big *smṛti* work called *Anūpa-vilāsa* to be compiled by several paṇḍits while a commentary on the *Śivatāṇḍava Tantra* was written under his auspices. The chronicles relating to Jay Singh, the Maharaja of Jaipur, contain information about Aurangzeb because he was a commander of the Emperor. The *Vaṃśa-bhūskara*, a comprehensive history of the Hāḍā Cauhān family of Bundi, can also yield similar historical materials, as the chief of Bundi of the time was a commander under Aurangzeb. The Sanskrit work *Satruśalyacarita* is a biography of Śatruśalya of the same family. As regards the Rāṇās of Udaipur, Todd takes note of their continual feuds with Aurangzeb, but does not speak of many details of which he was not aware. With the efforts of Mahāmahopādhyāya Śyāmalān, an elaborate history of Udaipur was composed and printed, but its publication was stopped by the reigning Rāṇā. Though it is now kept under lock and key in a small room, portions of the work are found in handwriting or print all over Rajputana. The chronicles relating to the Deoḍās and Solāṅkis of Sirohi, and the *Vacarīkā* about Ratan Singh of Ratlam may also be cited as sources of materials for the Mughal history.

The chronicles current among the Sikhs, the *Povāḍās* recited by the Gandhālīs,—Cāraṇs of Mahārāṣṭra, and the historical accounts available in the monasteries and temples of the Satnāmīs and Vallabhīs persecuted by Aurangzeb, as also the *Rāsās*, *Dhāls*, and *Sijhāis* preserved in the Jain monasteries in Kathiawad, Marwar, Udaipur, Gujerat etc. have also been mentioned as sources of information, but as they fall outside our purview at the present moment, I refrain from giving the details (88).

A very interesting class of Sanskrit works has been pointedly brought to notice by Sastriji viz. the Sanskrit Gazetteer literature. Four such Gazetteers have been found but they are all incomplete. These in chronological order are (1) Vidyāpati's

Bhūparikramā (15th c.); (2) the *Vikramasāgara* written at the request of Vikrama, a member of the Vaijala family holding jagirs near Patna; (3) Jagamohana's *Deśāvalivivṛti* (17th c.) composed with the patronage of Dulāla Vaijala, a descendant of Vikrama Vaijala just mentioned; (4) Rāmakavi's *Pāṇḍava-digvijaya* composed with the patronage of a Raja of Pañcakoṭ (18th c.).

It is found from the contents of the mss. and their dates that for the last four or five hundred years, the Hindus have been trying hard to collect useful information about a large number of places. The number varies in the treatises. In the *Bhūparikramā* it is 65, while in the *Deśāvalivivṛti* and the *Vikramasāgara*, it is 56. The *Deśāvali* is the most interesting in view of the fact that it has discarded the Purāṇic mould in which such works are usually cast e.g. the *Brahmakhaṇḍa* of the *Bhaviṣya Purāṇa*, which is supposed to have been composed by Vyāsadeva at the end of the Dvāpara Yuga though in fact it is so modern that it embodies the story of Vidyā and Sundara at Burdwan, popularized by Bhāratacandra's poem completed in 1753. It is also valuable inasmuch as it contains information about 'trade, commerce, manufacture, agriculture, history, geography etc.' of the localities dealt with, though the holy places receive the greatest attention. The salt trade of Tamluk in the 19th century, the manufacture of cloth at Candrakoṇā and other places in the district of Midnapore, the foundation of Midnapore by Medinikara,—the author of the *Medinikoṣa*, the descriptions of the forts, details about the population of different localities, and descriptions of the articles of trade are some of the topics dwelt on in the treatise. The contents of the other three works are equally interesting but it is not possible to dilate on them here (see 287 pp. 14-25; 16, pp. 130-133).

It was on account of his long experience in connection with the search of Mss., and his knowledge of the various indological subjects that he was requested by the Government to help Prof. Macdonell by his advice and explanations during his

visits in 1908 to temples, museums, libraries, and excavated sites in various places in Northern, Central and Southern India. Also 'the experience of so many years' writes Sastriji in his report [42 (a), p. 2] "has given me some knowledge of where valuable mss. are to be found. . . . Large collections can now be purchased, and several such collections have come to my knowledge. One of these containing 6600 and odd manuscripts was offered to me, but I could not find funds for it. Prof. A. A. Macdonell, however, to whom I showed the Mss. in February, 1908, applied to Lord Curzon as the Chancellor of the Oxford University, and he wired to Maharaja Sir Chander Shamsheer Jung Bahadur Rana, who supplied the necessary funds and requested me to purchase the collection, which he then presented to the Bodleian Library."

I shall close this brief survey of Sastriji's activities in connection with the search of Mss. and the preparation of their descriptive catalogues by inserting here an informing extract from his Preface to the *Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Mss.*, Vol. I (1917): "This is the first of a long series of volumes of a descriptive catalogue of Sanskrit Mss., belonging to the Government collection in the Asiatic Society's rooms—collected since the institution of the search of Sanskrit mss. under the order of Lord Lawrence's Government in 1868. The number of the collection stands at present at 11,264; of these 3156 were collected by my illustrious predecessor Raja Rajendralal Mitra, LL.D., C.I.E., and the rest by my humble self. Besides Sanskrit, it has Mss. in Prākṛt, Hindi, Mārwarī, Marhāṭṭī, Newārī, and Bengali. But these form an insignificant part of the whole. The works relate to various schools, Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism, Tāntrism and other systems of sectarian Hinduism. The various branches of the knowledge of the Hindus are well represented in this collection. Manuscripts are written in various scripts,—Bengali, Devanāgarī, Uḍiyā, Mārwarī, Kāśmīrī, Newārī—both ancient and modern. Some of the ancient Mss. go so far back as the 9th century A.D. There is one unique ms. in the ancient Bengali hand, copied undoubt-


edly in the last years of the 10th century. There are numerous mss. dated in the 11th century. The subsequent sections are well represented..... Besides unique Mss. which open up vast vistas of research in history, religion, and sciences of ancient India, whole literatures are revealed in the collections. For instance, there are numerous works of Vajrayāna, Mantrayāna, Kālacakrayāna to be found here, which throw a flood of light on those later phases of Buddhism which developed out of the Māhāyāna system. But for these works, these phases of the religion would have remained only a name."

4

Sastriji's
contribution in the
field of
Buddhism.

The fourth principal subject that received attention in his investigations and writings is Buddhism. During his visits to Nepal as also in the course of his searches for Mss., he came across treatises in Sanskrit as well as in early Bengali devoted to the Buddhistic themes. In Nepal as also in various places in and outside Bengal, he had numberless opportunities to study Buddhism in its relics and remains or through the explanations of its exponents, Buddhist or otherwise. The Southern Buddhism, known in the 16th century to the Portuguese when they came into contact with Ceylon, Burma, Southern China and the Indian Archipelago, began to be studied after the establishment of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, and its literature became well-known in the 19th century specially through the activities of the Pali Text Society. But the Northern Buddhism did not receive in India and Europe the same amount of attention as the Southern. In the last quarter of the century a wider interest was roused in its literature through the publication of R. L. Mitra's *Nepalese Buddhist Literature* (1882) and Bendall's *Catalogue of the Buddhist Sanskrit Mss. in the University Library, Cambridge* (1883). These two catalogues dealt with the collections of Mss. made by Hodgson and Wright respectively. It became at this time possible to trace the originals of some of the Tibetan translations (about ten thousand) of

Sanskrit works written in India on Buddhism, brought to light by the Hungarian scholar Csoma de Koros. Burnouf, Hodgson, and Vassilief may be mentioned as the principal writers whose labours served first to give an insight into the nature of Northern Buddhism towards the middle of the 19th century. The translation of the *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka* with copious notes by the first named scholar, and the works of the other two viz. *Le Bouddhisme*, and the *Essays* dealing *inter alia* with the literature and religion of Nepal and Tibet are a landmark in the history of the discovery of Northern Buddhism. They were followed by the publication of a number of important texts such as the *Lalitavistara*, *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-Prajñāpāramitā*, *Mahāvastu*, *Divyāvadāna*, *Kāraṇḍavyūha* until Sastriji came in with his *Bṛhat Svayambhū-purāṇa*, of which the first instalment appeared in 1894 and the last in 1900. 'It is the only Purāṇa of the Buddhists, giving the topography of one of the most important places of pilgrimage in Nepal, with all its shrines and monasteries and stūpas' (302, p. 25). His visit to Nepal in 1897 gave him the desired opportunity of identifying the places etc. mentioned in the work and the opportunity was also utilized to some extent for the purpose; but the Darbar Library gradually absorbed all his attention. It came into existence some time after Bendall's visit to Nepal in 1884. The scattered collections of Mss. at Khatmandu were sought to be brought into the library by Sir Bir Samser Jung Rana the Prime Minister. It was at last located in the spacious hall with a clock where it is continuing. Just as on the one hand Sastriji valued his opportunity to utilize this mine of information, so on the other, he regarded it as a good fortune to come into contact with Indrānanda from whom he received much of his information. He was a descendant of Amṛtānanda—the scholar who supplied Hodgson with so much of Buddhist lore. It is stated by Sastriji, 'He gave me light on the history of Buddhism which I found nowhere in printed books and Mss.' (302, p. 30). The value of the Darbar Library of Nepal, as already stated, lies in the fact that when the Buddhists fled a few centuries ago



The
Buddhist
works
edited by
Sastriji :

*Bṛhat
Svayambhū-
purāṇa.*

from Behar and Bengal to be away from the onslaught of the Musalmans, a large number of them took refuge in the Valley sequestered in the Himalayas. It became in this way the repository of very valuable Buddhist treatises brought here by these refugees. The cataloguing of the many manuscripts discovered there constitutes a story that has been told already. The Buddhist manuscripts found there and edited by him as also the use of the materials culled here or from the treatises discovered here for writing on the various topics comprised in Buddhism come within our purview at the present moment. Over and above the *Bṛhat Svayambhū-purāṇa* mentioned above, he edited the following :

*Citta-
viśuddhi-
prakāraṇa.*

(a) The *Cittaviśuddhiprakāraṇa* (see *JASB.*, 1898, pp. 175 ff.). While speaking of the means of spiritual elevation it attaches more importance to the purity of heart as against the external purity and mere form of worship.

*Catuḥ-
śatikā.*

(b) The *Catuḥśatikā* (1914) of Āryadeva. This ms., available incomplete, deals with the removal of viparyāsas, non-eternality of things, non-reality of Ā .an, wrong views, etc.

*Saundara-
nanda.*

(c) The *Saundarananda Kāvya* (1910) of Aśvaghōṣa delineates how Buddha weaned his stepbrother Nanda from a life of enjoyment and led him gradually into a saintly life. "The doctrines" found in it are, according to Sastriji, "those of Northern Buddhism but not yet of Mahāyāna. Buddha speaks to Nanda, 'You have done your duty, you are emancipated, now go and preach and save others',—exactly what the *Mahāvastu* speaks of. It is not Southern Buddhism, for no emphasis is laid on discipline and the regulation of conduct" (302, p. 210).

*Six
Buddhist
Nyāya
Tracts.*

(d) *The Six Buddhist Nyāya Tracts* in Sanskrit (1910) comprise Ratnakirti's three tracts (1) *Apoḥasiddhi*, (2) *Kṣaṇabhāṅgasiddhi* (by affirmative argument) and (3) *Kṣaṇabhāṅgasiddhi* (by negative argument), Paṇḍita Aśoka's two tracts, (4) *Avayavinirākaraṇa* and (5) *Sāmānyadūṣaṇadik-prasāritā*, and (6) Ratnākara Śānti's *Antarvyāptisamarthana*. The theory

that is advocated in the first tract is that a term denotes something positive, differentiating it from all other, and that assertion and negation are simultaneous and not consecutive. The theory of the momentariness of the world is sought to be proved in the second and the third tracts as against that of the Naiyāyikas that momentariness includes three moments of production, duration, and dissolution. A stand is taken in the fourth against the theory of the Nyāya Śāstra, support being given to the position that the whole is but a collection of parts, having no separate existence, and the supposed eternal relation between the whole and the parts is a myth. In the fifth, the Naiyāyika theory of generality as an eternal category of knowledge is opposed, while in the sixth, the attempt is made to prove that though an example cannot be pointed to as a premise in the argument to establish the momentariness of the world, yet it can be proved on the strength of the 'internal inseparable connection' between the thing to be proved and the thing by which it is to be proved.

(e) *The Bauddha Gān O Dchā* (1916) contains the songs (in the Kirtana form) of Siddhācāryas in the vernaculars of Eastern India, mostly in old Bengali. The Sanskrit commentary accompanying the text explains them according to the doctrines of the Sahajiyā cult (35, p. xi).

*Bauddha
Gān
O Dohā.*

(f) *The Advayavajra-saṃgraha* (1927) containing twenty-one tracts and a few verses dealing with the philosophy, rituals and mantras of the Vajrayāna school. And lastly,

*Advayavajra-
Saṃgraha.*

(g) *The Śrīdharmamaṅgala* containing songs in praise of Dharma Ṭhākura's greatness. Dharma Ṭhākura has been shown to be a later form of Dharma of the Buddhist Trinity. We shall have occasion to turn to this point later.

*Śrīdharma-
maṅgala.*

The manuscripts of all these works with the exception of the last were acquired in Nepal. The edition of these treatises drew his attention to the history of Buddhism in India, specially in its Mahāyāna and later phases. His earliest writings that dealt with some aspects of Buddhism came out as early as

1877 in the *Vaṅgadarśana* in the articles 'Two Periods of our Glory' (43) and 'Brāhmaṇas and Śramaṇas' (44). Then we find his contribution (69) to the *Vibhā* in 1887 on the valuable acquisition of the hitherto unrecovered portion (avadānas 1-50) of Kṣemendra's *Bodhisattvāvadānaḥkalpalatā* from Tibet by Sarat Chandra Das. From this time onwards, many papers on various topics relating to Buddhism, or on particular Buddhist relics, appeared in both English and Bengali journals. The largest number of these was published in the *Nārāyaṇa*, a Bengali monthly edited by the great Deśabandhu C. R. Das, at whose special request (170, p. 492) Sastriji commenced contributing papers including those on Buddhism. The subject-matter of these articles has not been given an English garb, though Sastriji has done so in regard to some of his writings. If he had done so in regard to this group of papers, its usefulness would have reached a much wider circle of readers. However, in taking a note of the information or opinion given by him on important topics or aspects of Buddhism, his articles both English and Bengali will be taken into account.

The atmosphere congenial to the rise of Buddhism in Eastern India.

Any one who turns his thought to the history of Buddhism and the emergence of Hinayāna and Mahāyāna will naturally be inclined to ask the question—Whence arose originally the atmosphere congenial to the growth of thoughts, beliefs and practices which constituted Buddhism. The answer given by Sastriji is that it resulted from the impact of the culture of the three civilized tribes Vaṅgas, Vagadhas, and Ceras, mentioned in the *Aitareya Āraṇyaka* as inhabiting Eastern India upon that of the Aryans (145, p. 398). The place where it developed was between the eastern limit of the region occupied by the Aryans and the western limit of the tract of land peopled by the three tribes. The Thāḍus living near Kapilavāstu may be a branch of the Ceras while the Vagadhas may be Magadhas. Be that as it may, the reference to these people by the term 'vayāṃsi' in the *Aitareya Āraṇyaka* (II, 1, 1, 5) points to the fact that they were looked down upon by the Aryans, as betokened by the similar epithets—monkeys,

bears, rākṣasas etc. applied by them to people not held in favour or esteem by them (145, pp. 459-461). The existence of the Vrātyas in Eastern India was another factor that made the region favourable for the origin and development of thoughts and beliefs independent of or opposed to those of the Aryans towards the west.

The Vrātyas were of the Aryan stock but were considered degraded for their unapproved deeds. They could however be taken again into the Aryan fold on equal terms by some purificatory ceremony. The question of the identity of the Vrātyas has been discussed in detail by Sastriji in several places in his writings (16, pp. 1-21; 18; 201; 145, pp. 459 ff.). The Vrātyas who were taken back into the Aryan society as well as those of them not so treated constituted a source for the emanation of ideas not fitting the traditional Aryan groove. It was for these reasons that Magadha was specially suitable for the development of thoughts and religious doctrines of a heterogenous nature, and, in fact, Buddhism had been preceded here by the philosophico-religious speculations of the Jainas, Ājīvikas etc.

Sastriji refers to some current opinions about Buddha and his doctrines e.g. (1) Buddhism stood for a movement, the sole object of which was to prevent the slaughter of animals in the Vedic sacrifices, (2) it was the monistic doctrine of the Upaniṣads in a different garb, (3) it was based on the original Sāṃkhya philosophy, (4) Buddha belonged to the Śaka tribe and therefore it is likely that the religion preached by him came from the Scythians. Regarding the first view cited above, he states that it cannot be shown from the biographies of Buddha such as the *Lalitavistara*, *Mahāvastu*, *Buddhacarita* or any other dependable passage that the prevention of the slaughter of animals was the sole object of Buddhism. The second view is opposed by him on the ground that the doctrine of Śūnyatā, which resembles, to a great extent, Advayavāda of the Upaniṣads, found a place in the philosophy of Buddhism after the Christian era. About the fourth, he states that if the

original Sāṃkhya philosophy be taken as the basis of Buddhism, then his position that Buddhism came from sources unorthodox from the Aryan viewpoint, or was influenced by people non-Aryan in their stock or outlook finds support. As regards the fourth view cited above, he points out that the derivation of the word Śākya from Śaka a kind of Śāla tree as indicated by Aśvaghoṣa is quite acceptable. Trees called Sakiya Śāl are found in the Nepal Terai even now. As the ancestors of Buddha lived in places, surrounded by these trees, they were called Śākya. Hence, the conjecture regarding the Scythian ancestry of Buddha is altogether baseless (see 145 for the treatment of all the points).

The
emergence
of
Mahāyāna.

Sastriji has given a detailed account of the way in which Mahāyāna came into existence (147) and has pointed out the grounds on which it claims a higher position than Hīnayāna (146). In the former article, he states *inter alia* that though Mahāyāna is considered to have been full-fledged with the composition of the *Mādhyamikavṛtti* by Nāgārjuna, the 'rescue of the *Prajñāpāramitāsūtra* from the nether world' by him and the propagation of its doctrines by his disciple Āryadeva, it had an earlier beginning. This is evidenced by the previous existence of the *Mahāyāna-śraddhotpādasūtra*, and also the *Buddhacarita* and *Saundarananda* which are interspersed with Mahāyāna ideas. These had been preceded by some Mahāyāna Sūtras, e.g. the *Lañkāvatāra*. Hence the origin of Mahāyāna is earlier than is usually supposed.

Mahāyāna is the outcome of the dissatisfaction of the younger Buddhist monks at the strict application of the stringent rules of discipline initiated by Buddha. These monks wanted a relaxation of the discipline on ten points. These have been explained by Sastriji in 154. Two of them may be mentioned, such as the storing of some salt in a horn for use at need, and the prohibition of meals after noon. This conflict between the sthaviras and the monks wanting more latitude resulted in the secession of a very large number of bhikṣus who came to be known as the Mahāsāṅghikas. They began

to preach their views with a great zeal and turned *loḥottara-vādins* from the very outset. In other words, they preached the doctrine that Buddha was not an ordinary mortal but a being with uncommon powers. Though he has attained Nirvāṇa, he was immanent in the universe in the form of a subtle influence that is inspiring millions of people to regulate their activities in the light of his teachings (147, p. 946). It was they who commenced setting up images of Buddha for worship (155, p. 206). The *Mahāvastu Avadāna* of the Mahāsāṅghikas refers to the Daśabhūmis and the possibility of the attainment of Buddhahood by the Buddhist sādhakas, but not to Bodhisattvavāda i.e. not resting contented with one's own salvation but working for the salvation of others postponing his own. The *Laṅkāvatāra* contains this teaching in a less developed form but the *Saundarananda* has it full-fledged. The basic doctrines of Mahāyāna are thus found to be gradually growing into their full stature through their early form in the doctrines of the Mahāsāṅghikas (147, pp. 950, 951).

Doctrines
of the
Mahā-
sāṅghikas.

The doctrines of the full-fledged Mahāyāna present in some respects a striking contrast to those of Hinayāna. The Mahāyānist attached no importance to the śīlas as a means of salvation, but they were looked upon by the Hinayānist as important steps to the gradual spiritual uplift of a monk to Arhathood. They strove for *bodhicittotpāda* (the formation of the resolution to attain *Boḍhi*) after taking refuge in the Triratna by uttering the set formula, making a confession of his sins (*pāpadeśanā*), and developing the mental attitude to approve others' meritorious deeds (*puṇyānumodanā*). Then comes the fulfilment of the six *pāramitās*. Incidentally, it is mentioned that the derivation of *pāramitā* is to be sought not in *pāramitā* (i.e. one who has gone over to the other shore, i.e. has attained perfection), but in *paramasya bhāvaḥ = pāramyam = pārami* (in Buddhist Sanskrit) + *tā = pāramitā* i.e. the state of perfection (146, p. 792). The Mahāyānist turned out to be energetic, aggressive, and full of exuberance as

The
doctrines of
Hinayāna
and
Mahāyāna
contrasted.

evidenced by the ideals placed before them for realization. One of the *pāramitās* is *vīrya-pāramitā* i.e. manifesting energy in the highest degree through some act. Their resolutions were not for performing negative virtues such as refraining from some sinful acts but for doing positively and aggressively meritorious deeds, leaving the negative virtues to follow in the train of such deeds. The postponement of one's own salvation to that of others is of a piece with these bold flights of thought for the realization of ideals that relegated the self to the dim background. The doctrine of *karuṇā* finds in Mahāyāna a scope for exercise unknown in Hīnayāna. But of all the means of spiritual uplift, the highest place is given to *jñāna*, which in its supreme stage in *prajñāpāramitā* raises a man to the top-most reaches of spiritual elevation. The principal aim of this *pāramitā* is to enable one to comprehend the *sāmṛta* and *paramārtha* truth. The changing worldly phenomena may be taken as (conventional) truths of the former kind, but from the standpoint of the highest truth, they are mere passing existences as opposed to *paramārtha satya* or *śūnyatā*. The Dhyānas are a means to the attainment of the highest knowledge. They are four in Hīnayāna, but are numberless in Mahāyāna, indicating a tendency to multiply the number, even beyond the possibility of enumeration, discernible also in other spheres of their thoughts and actions. The stages of spiritual progress are four in Hīnayāna but are ten (*daśabodhisattvabhūmi*) in Mahāyāna; the Buddhas in the former are twenty-four excluding Śākyasiṃha and Maitreya the future Buddha, while in the latter they are countless. In their references to the numerical figures and periods of time, the Mahāyānists unlike the Hīnayānists evince a tendency to exaggerations staggering the imagination (146). In regard to the Buddha Nidāna i.e. the rebirths with their various actions leading a Bodhisattva towards Buddhahood, the Mahāyānists in their characteristic way put hundreds of births under one *caryā*, four of which make the whole span viz. *prakṛticaryā*, *praṇidhānacaryā* (comprising five divisions called *praṇidhi*), *anulomacaryā* and *anivarttanacaryā* [in which

the *vyākaraṇa* (prophecy re. Buddhahood) and *anuvyākaraṇa* (prophecy repeating the previous one) are made]. The Hīnayānists, with their own line of thinking, trace these births of the Bodhisattvas previous to the attainment of Buddhahood only from the latter part of the last caryā (156). Another difference between the Hīnayānists and Mahāyānists is found in the fact that Dharma is regarded by the latter as superior to Buddha, and the Triratna is mentioned as Dharma, Buddha and Saṅgha, and not as Buddha, Dharma and Saṅgha as done by the former. The five Dhyānī Buddhas are considered in Mahāyāna the custodians of Buddhism from times immemorial while Buddha Śākyamuni is nothing but a recorder of its doctrines like Vyāsa. This is clearly corroborated by the fact that at Svayambhūkṣetra in Nepal, there are five temples of the five Dhyānī Buddhas around the Svayambhū Caitya and none for Buddha Śākyamuni, whose image stands at some distance on the way leading to the Caitya as a kind of *dvārapāla*. The *vajrācārya* who accompanied Sastriji pointed out to him the image with the explanation as to the value of his services just mentioned (146, p. 795). Another difference between Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna lies in the worship of images of deities in the Mahāyāna, a beginning of which, as already stated, had been made by the Mahāsāṅghikas in the worship of Buddha represented by an image. The last difference between the two yānas is in regard to a philosophical inquiry into the ultimate problems of the universe. The Pāli literature is usually taken to represent Buddha as unwilling to encourage speculations as to these ultimate problems on the ground that they are fruitless so far as the attainment of Nirvāṇa is concerned. In the Mahāyāna works, however, such speculations are found in abundance.

The highest objective of the Buddhists is Nirvāṇa. In Hīnayāna, the aspiration of the Sādhaka is to reach it after effecting his spiritual elevation through self-purification, but in

The nature
of
Nirvāṇa.

Mahāyāna, the fulfilment of this aspiration is not wanted until he brings about the salvation of the other beings of this world. The conception of Nirvāṇa and the process by which the different conceptions have been formed at different times is an interesting study. Sastriji has devoted two or three articles or portions of articles to this subject (see 143, 144, 148). In Hinayāna, the conception of Nirvāṇa, so far as it can be gathered from several passages, is *catuṣkoṭi* *vinirmukta* like that of the Mādhyamikas, though a superficial glance at a passage in the *Mahāparinibbāna Sutta* lends colour to the idea that it is simple 'extinction'. Buddha, when questioned as to the state of a Buddha after *parinibbāna*, replies negatively to all the four queries, which can be put in the language of a Mādhyamika as *bhāva*, *abhāva*, *bhāvābhāva* and *na bhāva nābhāva*. In plain words, *nirvāṇa* cannot be called either 'existence,' or 'non-existence,' 'a combination of the two,' or 'a negation of such combination' (see e.g. *Paṭṭhapāda Sutta*).

Aśvaghoṣa uses the simile of the extinguishment of a lamp in his *Saundarananda* (xvi, 28, 29),¹ to explain the condition after the attainment of *nirvāṇa* but he does not appear to support the negation of existence in the three² ślokas preceding those just mentioned. He explains desire (*trṣṇā*) etc. as the cause of rebirths; hence the annihilation of desire etc. is the way to salvation, in which the *dharma* will be realized. This *dharma* is *sānta* (tranquil) and

- 1 दापो यथा निर्वृत्तिमभ्युपेतो नैवावनिं गच्छति नान्तरिक्षम् ।
दिशं न काञ्चिद् विदिशं न काञ्चित् क्लेशचयात् केवलमिति शान्तिम् ॥
एवं कृती निर्वृत्तिमभ्युपेतो नैवावनिं गच्छति नान्तरिक्षम् ।
दिशं न काञ्चिद् विदिशं न काञ्चित् क्लेशचयात् केवलमिति शान्तिम् ॥
- 2 तज्जन्मनो नैकविधस्य सीम्य तणादयो हेतव इत्यवेत्य ।
तांश्चिन्धि दुःखाद् यदि निर्मुञ्चा कार्यचयः कारणसंचयाच्चि ॥
दुःखचयो हेतुपरिचयाच्च शान्तं शिवं साच्चिकुरुष्व धर्मम् ।
तणाविरागं लयनं निरोधं सनातनं त्राणमहार्यमार्यम् ॥
यस्मिन्न जातिर्न जरा न मृत्युर्न व्याधयो नाप्रियसम्प्रयोगः ।
नेच्छाविपन्नप्रियविप्रयोगः चेभं पदं नैष्ठिकमथ्य तं तत् ॥

śiva (blissful). It is a condition free from birth and death, old age and disease, enmity, disappointment, and the pangs of separation. It is a state well worth one's labours for achievement. Thus it is patent that *Āśvaghoṣa* does not look upon it as the annihilation of existence. On the other hand, it is a state of existence which is beyond all changes discernible in the world of phenomena. *Śūnyatā* This is *śūnyatā* (literally voidness) meaning that it is indescribable by the power of human speech with its many limitations. (143, 302, pp. 212, 213). explained.

The bare *śūnyatā* of *Nāgārjuna* was too dry and tough to appeal to the people, to satisfy the needs of the human mind. *Vijñānavāda.* *Maitreyanātha* therefore started *Vijñānavāda* or *Yogācāra* and wrote *kārikās* or verses in eight chapters in support of his views. The bare *śūnyatā* of the *Mādhyamikas* was replaced by the transcendental stream of consciousness. "All Buddhists believe in the momentary character of all phenomena. There is nothing permanent except *Śūnya* the *Paramārtha*. Now, *Maitreya* said, 'No. There should be consciousness of *śūnya*. But this is impossible in those who believe all things to be momentary, even ideas. But the stream of ideas may be permanent though not the ideas, the acts of consciousness'. The great exponent of this theory was *Asaṅga* in the 4th or 5th century A.D." (302, pp. 465, 466; 88, p. 84). With the close of the 5th century came to an end the period of original thinking among the Buddhists in India. 'After them for three or four centuries more, we hear of many eminent scholars and commentators among them. But these were commentators, digest-makers, exegetists, writers of abridgments and polemical works' (302, pp. 467, 468). From after the time of *Asaṅga*, a gulf of difference separated the *Mādhyamikas* and the *Vijñānavādins*. *Dharmapāla* marked it and requested *Haribhadra* to write a commentary (called *Abhisamayālaṃkāra*) on *Maitreya's* treatise with the object of reconciling the two schools of opinion. The *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* is recognised as an authority by the *Mādhyamikas*.

Mahā-
sukhavāda.

The *Abhisamayālamkārikā* is a synopsis of the *Prajñāpāramitā* made by the Vijñānavādins. The *Āloka* was written to explain the former in the light of the latter with a view to their reconciliation. Thus an effort was made to unite the two wings of Buddhism, but about this time, another school of opinion came into being with its far-reaching consequences. It was the Mahāsukhavāda. According to the followers of this line of thought, *sūnyatā* was not only inexpressible *sat* (existence) and *cit* (consciousness) but also inexpressible *sukha*. This was the opinion of the Vajrayānists and the Sahajayānists (88, pp. 84, 85). The emergence of this school of opinion was, according to Sastriji, influenced by the Magi priests of the people who inhabited the places around the Caspian Sea, and the lakes Van and Aral. In the 7th century, after the devastation of their hearths and homes by the Musalmans, the priests came into India teaching the worship of deities and their consorts in embrace as a symbol of the Mahāsukha in *Sūnyatā*, and the deification of the letters of the alphabet (302, p. 468; 101, p. 15).

The
progress of
Bodhicitta
to the
attainment
of
mahāsukha
is
symbolized
in the
stūpas.

The conception of the element of *mahāsukha* in Nirvāṇa has also been shown to be reflected in the structure of the stūpas. The progress of the *Bodhicitta* from its lowest stage to the highest is symbolized in the structure of the Buddhist stūpas. A stūpa has a short circular pole at its base representing the hell and the world of evil spirits. Then comes a half spherical body symbolizing the world of human beings, whence starts the upward course of the bodhicitta. Next follows a square block representing the dominion of the four Mahārājas, over which stands a pole, on which rest five discs followed again by a pole and another set of discs numbering 13, 16, 21 or 23. Over this there is another pole and a cone surrounded also by discs. The portion from the square block mentioned above to the tip of the cone represents in succession the thirty-three heavens, *Yamaloka*, *Nirmāṇarati-loka* and *Parinirmāṇarctiloka* which is the last *loka* in the Kāmadhātu. Then come Rūpadhātu and Arūpadhātu.

When the Bodhicitta reaches the Arūpadhātu, it is denuded of *kāma* (desires) but retains body and energy. By the application of this energy, further progress is made through *dhyāna*, *prañidhi*, and *samādhi*. This *dhātu* contains four principal *lokas* which are attained by a mastery over four *dhyānas*. In the first of these *dhyānas*, the *citta* retains *vitarka* and *vicāra*; in the second, *vitarka* disappears and *prīti* and *sukha* fill up the mind; in the third, *prīti* disappears and leaves *sukha* alone, while in the fourth, *sukha* also disappears. Then the *citta* wants to cut off its connection with the body. After the severance of this connection, the *citta* sees everything including the solid as infinite space. Then it enquires whether what is felt as *śūnya* has any consciousness. The result of the enquiry is negative and the *citta* now at the apex of the stūpa plunges into the infinite *śūnya* surrounding it on all sides. When the Buddhists could not remain satisfied with the dry and highly metaphysical conception of *śūnyatā*, they added to it infinite *karuṇā* (mercy) for all the sentient beings of the universe. Hence in the Arūpadhātu, the *citta* was face to face not only with the infinite *śūnya* but also with the limitless *karuṇā*. The Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara was about to merge himself in *śūnya*, but *karuṇā*, roused by the lamentations of the suffering millions all round, prevented him from the merger of his self in *śūnya*. He formed the resolution not to attain *nirvāṇa* until a single creature remains to be freed from the worldly miseries. This conception of *karuṇā* mixed with *śūnyatā* proved very heartening to the people at large, though of course, it was difficult for them to realize *śūnyatā*. Hence this term was replaced by *nirātmā*. When the Bodhicitta or the Bodhisattva was at the apex of the stūpa, he was surrounded by *nirātmā* or, by the later transformation of *nirātmā* viz. Nirātmā-Devī. The meaning of the Bodhisattva falling into the embrace of the Devī became thus patent to them, demonstrating that *nirvāṇa* was a mixture of *śūnyatā* (or *nairātmya*), *karuṇā* and *mahāsukha* [143, pp. 139-145; 148, p. 1058; Introduction to N. Vasu's *Modern Buddhism*, (mentioned later as

The
infinity of
Karuṇā.

Intro.), pp. 6, 7]. Thus the ideas associated with the structure of the stūpas indicate also the way in which the conception of *nirvāṇa* gradually underwent changes of a radical type.

Mantra-
yāna.

The introduction of the elements of *karuṇā* and *mahā-sukha* into *nirvāṇa* or *śūnyatā* took place gradually to satisfy the needs of the mind and the heart of the generality of the people of the Buddhist faith unable to understand and relish the conception of *śūnyatā*. It was also to meet their needs that big treatises like the *Prajñāpāramitā* were rendered into short *Dhāraṇīs* to facilitate memorizing with the same religious merit derived from their recitations as the study of the whole treatises. The *Dhāraṇīs* were further shortened into *mantras* of one or two letters for repetition. This short cut to the acquisition of what was believed to be the highest spiritual merit was called *Mantrayāna* (149, pp. 1200, 1201). The *Mahāyāna*, and even the *Mantrayāna* following this tendency, were converted into mere sacraments (*śikṣāpadas*) (see Intro. p. 7, Tatakara Gupta's *Ādikarmaracanā*), thus doing away with the necessity of the many spiritual exertions that had been regarded previously as essential to a man's spiritual progress. The same fate overcame the *Vajrayāna* in Nepal in later times. All these indicated that the people were eager to follow some easy methods to reach the goal which had been looked upon as the reward of arduous efforts (Intro. p. 7).

Tantras

The Tantras, which, as already stated, came from outside India,¹ have as their essence "the worship of Śakti or the Female Energy. The female energy is worshipped in conjunction with the male energy. The union of male and female energy is the essence of Tantra" (Intro. p. 10). According to Sastriji, 'neither did the Buddhists derive their form of Tantra from the Brahmins, nor the Brahmins from the Buddhists.

1 गच्छ त्वं भारते वर्षे अधिकाराय सर्वतः। (from *Kulālikāmnāya* or *Kabjikāmata*—a ms. in later Gupta character)—[101. p. 14].

Both received their Tantras from the same source' (Intro., p. 11). These Tantras are subsumed under the three principal Yānas viz. Vajrayāna, Sahajayāna, and Kālacakrayāna. The first Yāna was chiefly the religion of the middle class people and the married Buddhist clergy, while the second had numerous followers among people below the middle class Buddhists and some among the lower class Brahminists. The third Yāna was followed by the Buddhists of the lowest social stratum and was more a religion of fear than of love (Intro. p. 13).

'The word Kāla means time, death, and destruction. Kālacakra is the wheel of destruction, and Kālacakra-^{Kālacakra}yāna. yāna means the vehicle for protection against the wheel of destruction. Waddell describes this as demonology or devil-worship and so it is. Even Buddha is a demon and in the Asiatic Society's Library there is a book entitled *Buddha-carita* (by Nāthurāma, see 10, p. 7; 150, p. 169) which describes Buddha as demon. . . . Unless Buddha was mentioned in Kālacakrayāna, one would be inclined not to call it Buddhism at all' (Intro., p. 8).

The Vajrayāna was evolved from Mantrayāna by a king of Orissa named Indrabhūti in the eight century. 'It was half ^{Vajrayāna.} mystic, half philosophical and more sensual than the previous forms of Buddhism' (302, p. 469; Intro., p. 6).

The Sahajayāna came into being in the ninth century (?) with the object of making salvation easy (Intro., p. 9). One of ^{Sahajayāna.} the most prominent exponents of the doctrine of this sect was Luipā, a Siddhācārya. The songs composed by some of the traditional 84 Siddhācāryas have already been mentioned in connection with the early Bengali literature. The origin of this sect is lost in obscurity but it has many features similar to those of the Vajrayāna. The belief in the efficacy of the *mantras* is found in both, though in the Vajrayāna the field for their use is much greater than in the Sahajayāna. The position of the Guru (spiritual preceptor) is very high in both; in the Sahajayāna, however, the dependence on the preceptor is

much greater because of the fact that the disciple is absolutely helpless without the preceptor's guidance through the secret and mysterious rites able to lead him to the goal through enjoyments (142, p. 69). The followers of both the Yānas believe in Śūnyatā and Mahāsukha. The prefix *Vajra* in 'Vajrayāna' and 'Vajraguru' means Śūnyatā, and the deities of this yāna are manifestations of Śūnyatā. Their number is also very large. In course of time, the worship of Dakinīs, Yoginīs, Piśācis, Bhairavas etc. took the place of those ranking higher in the pantheon. The Sahajiyās however attached much sanctity to the human body which was looked upon by them as the epitome of the universe, containing the Kāmadhātu, Rūpadhātu, Arūpadhātu etc. (149, p. 1199). It was to the human body that they turned more for effecting their salvation than to the deities. In Vajrayāna, the five Dhyāni Buddhas, representing the five Skandhas, had their consorts, while many other deities had also their Śaktis (149, p. 1202). The element of *Mahāsukha* in Śūnyatā was symbolized in the gods and goddesses in embrace. The Sahajayānists debased it by its symbolization in their own carnal pleasure during worship, because it was their usual mode of worship to identify themselves with the deities immersed in *Mahāsukha* (101, p. 19; 148, pp. 1058, 1060, 1067). The woman taken as the companion in the Sādhanā was regarded as the means of attaining the fourth Śūnya (Viramānanda) called Prabhāsvara. Details about the condition of the Sādhakas reaching Mahāsukha are found in the verses quoted by Sastriji in 148, pp. 1062, 1063. They looked upon the world as śūnya, birth and death as empty dreams, and morality and its opposite as mere names. This belief leading to ethical anarchy produced the evil consequences which proved a very powerful cause for the disappearance of Buddhism in the land of its birth.

It is an enigma that a religion that was remarkable in so many ways,—in mental and ethical discipline, in philosophy, in the advocacy of the principle of self

abnegation in a form unsurpassed in any other religion in the world, in the missionary efforts made by its followers, in the preaching of love and brotherhood, and in the inspiration imparted to the development of the fine arts and architecture, should be well-nigh extinct in the very region where it saw the light. The causes that led to this result are an interesting study. Sastriji has summed up the causes and also given details of the process of absorption of Buddhism by Hinduism. He has also shown how it now subsists in a deceptive form in some places in India retaining its humble existence after its glorious career for centuries.

The causes
of decline
of
Buddhism
in India.

The causes of the disappearance of Buddhism (see 43, 44) are :—

On the side of the Hindus—

(1) Their self-confidence, mutual co operation, and strong faith in their own religion.

(2) The replacement of the sacrifices in a large measure by intellectualism as manifested in Śaṅkara's philosophy and its triumphs, the development of the Nyāya Śāstra and the propagation of its knowledge. Those who were attracted by an appeal to the intellect found much food for thought in the literature written by their co-religionists instead of leaving their faith to resort to the Buddhist literature and religion for their intellectual appeal.

(3) The Purāṇas were recast and new purāṇas came into being to provide sufficient materials to keep chained to Hinduism the faith, heart, and intellect of the masses. These were a counterpoise to the attractive *jātakas* and *avadānas* of the Buddhists.

(4) The emergence of the Bhakti cults.

(5) The alertness of the Brāhmaṇas in the pursuit of their avocation with unabated zeal as opposed to the waning enthusiasm of the Buddhist priests in this direction due to the accumulated wealth of the monasteries to which they belonged. Their wealth increased through the patronage extended to them

by the kings and rich people as also by reason of the fact that unlike the practice among the Hindus, the monasteries became the owners of the properties of those who renounced the world and joined them (95, p. 48).

(6) Diminution of patronage from the kings and householders. As Buddhism began to decline, and Hinduism became its aggressive competitor, the kings turned more towards the latter in the distribution of their patronage (149, p. 1208). The decrease in the number of Buddhist laity also resulted in the difficulty of the Buddhist monks to receive alms. As a monk could not take alms from more than three householders and could not visit the same household within a month for the same purpose, ninety households are necessary to maintain a monk. In former days, the Hindu householders used to give alms to the Buddhist monks freely but in course of time, their attitude is likely to have stiffened against them under the influence of the Brāhmaṇas. A provision in *Sūlapāṇi's Prāyaścittavivēka* prescribing an expiatory rite for the mere sight of a Buddhist monk indicates the influence that was exercised against the monks generally (101, p. 20).

On the side of the Buddhists—

(a) Too much of inattention to worldly affairs brought in its penalty. The maintenance of the progress of a community or its preservation in a healthy condition depends upon many factors, any one of which cannot be neglected long with impunity.

(b) The monasteries became centres of evil influence.

(c) Many of the best people of the Buddhist society went out of the country for the propagation of the religion in other lands, leaving the society at home poor on account of the loss of their services within the country.

(d) The debasement of the religion in some instances to cults that encouraged the worship of *Ḍākinīs*, *Yoginīs* etc. and counted among their votaries a large section of the people.

(e) The prevalence of practices detrimental to the moral health of the society under the sanction of an interpretation of Mahāsukhavāda that could not but produce a baneful effect on human life. Hundreds of books of the type of *Tathāgata-guhyaka* were composed in support of these religious practices, and they with their commentaries and sub-commentaries gave rise to a large literature. The names of some of these books have been given by Sastriji¹ (149, p. 1205).

(f) The Musalman invasion brought about the ruin of the monasteries including the universities of Nālandā, Vikramaśilā, Jagaddala, Odantapurī etc. The monks fled away in thousands to Nepal, Tibet and other places and were also killed in large numbers (149, pp. 1208, 1209).

(g) The decrease in the number of Buddhist Bhikṣus gave the Brāhmaṇas a greater opportunity to work upon the minds of the Buddhists generally in order that they might come into the Hindu fold. The paucity of Bhikṣus brought about a great change in the composition of the Buddhist priesthood. It was the married clergy with families, who were called Āryas, that took the place of the Bhikṣus proper, and began to cater to the religious needs of the Buddhists generally. They commenced attaining the normal status of Bhikṣus through the performance of some sacraments [Intro., pp. 19, 7 (quoting Tatakara Gupta's *Ādikarmaracanā*); 149, pp. 1207, 1208]]. They officiated at the religious ceremonies but at the same time, in addition to their profession of priesthood earned their livelihood through such avocations as those of a mason, painter, sculptor, goldsmith, and carpenter. These artisan priests who were in later times larger in number than the Bhikṣus proper became the religious guides of the people. Their avocations left them little time and desire for the

1 *Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇa Tantra, Cakrasaṃvara Tantra, Caluṣpiṭha Tantra, Uḍḍiśa Tantra, Seḥoddeśa, Paramādibuddhodhṛta Kālacakra, Kālacakra-garbha Tantra, Sarvabuddha-samāyoga Ḍākinijāla-saṃvara Tantra, Hevajratantrarāja, Mahāmudrātilaka, Jñānagarbha, Tattvapradīpa, Vajradāka, Herukābhyudaya, Guhyavajra.*

acquisition of learning, for deep thinking, or for devotion to Dhyāna and other spiritual exercises. They could not be expected to raise the declining Buddhism to a higher position through their endeavours nor could they check its course towards its ruin through the introduction of salutary reforms.

(h) The gradual absorption of Buddhism by Hinduism was facilitated by the state of affairs pointed out above. This process of absorption, and the fact of the existence of Buddhism under the transparent veil of Hinduism form the subject-matter of the following paragraph after next. In some cases, however, ousting has taken place and not absorption. This will also be pointed out *en passant*.

In this conflict between Buddhism and Hinduism for a long period, it was natural that a spirit of rivalry to hold the ground and latterly a spirit of enmity should be generated. That this was a fact can be inferred from many evidences. The expiatory provision found in Śūlapāṇi's *Prāyaścittaviveka* (15th century) against the Buddhists has already been cited (see 150, p. 166). The third Act of the *Prabodhacandrodaya* contains a bitter attack upon the Buddhists while the last portion of the *Svayambhūpurāṇa* (14th century) pours abuses on the Śaiva Yogins who were the worst enemies of Buddhism (150, p. 171). The hostility can be traced back to a much earlier period but it was when the struggle for the very existence of the religion was going on that the bitterness was at its highest. The treatment meted out to the castes, that according to Sastriji, were formed out of the disintegrated Buddhist community is also an index to this hostility, because it has been stated that those that were late in joining the Hindu community were given a low position in the castal hierarchy even to the extent of being untouchable (Intro., pp. 15, 1922). 'The *Śakti-Saṅgama Tantra* a later work declares that the object of that Tantra is to root out Buddhism and establish Brahminism, while the Buddhist Tantras equally denounce Brahminism. The theory was current twenty years ago that the Brahmins derived their Tantras from the Buddhists,

but of late it has been ascertained that neither did the Buddhists derive their form of Tantra from the Brahmins nor the Brahmins from the Buddhists. Both derived these Tantras from the same source' [Intro. (1911), p. 11].

The story of the supersession of works composed by the Buddhists in the several fields of literature viz. grammar, lexicon, prosody, *alamkāra*, *nyāya*, *smṛti*, and *tantra* by rival works written by the Hindus has been told by Sastriji (101). One or two examples may be given to illustrate the point. In the field of grammar, the widely prevalent school of Sanskrit grammar called *Candravyākaraṇa* founded by Candragomin of Varendra in Bengal became extinct owing to its competition with the *Samkṣiptasāra*. The grammatical works of Cāṅgudāsa and Rabhasa Nandin also met with the same fate. Some of the excellent commentaries on Pāṇini by Buddhist grammarians fell into disfavour, the *Siddhāntakaumudī* of Bhaṭṭoji attaining the dominant position. In the domain of logic, the achievements of the Buddhist scholars like Nāgārjuna, Diṅnāga, Dharmakīrti were remarkable; but the competition of their works with those of the Hindu dialecticians ousted them from India. In the field of philosophy, the Hindus tackled it in a different way. The substance of the doctrines argued out in the treatises of the Buddhists was appropriated by the Hindus in such a way as to deprive the former of their speciality. Gauḍapāda and Śaṅkara, for instance, utilized the essence of the Mādhyamika philosophy, which thus lost its excellence.

The process of supersession of Buddhism by Hinduism in the fields of literature and religion.

5

When the Tantras were introduced into India from outside in the 7th or the 8th century, the Buddhists adopted them as also the Śaivas and the Vaiṣṇavas. The Vaiṣṇavas adapted them into the *Pañcarātras* of which, more than 200 are available. The Śaiva Tantras were prevalent in Kashmir and Central India. It was the Buddhist Tantras that were prevalent in Bengal. After the Musalman invasion of Bengal, the com-

position of Tantras by the Buddhists came to a stop. It was the Gauḍīya Śaṅkarācārya who in the fifteenth century wrote many works. He tried to adapt the Buddhist Tantras to their use by the Hindus. It was Triguṇānanda, his disciple Brahmānanda and the latter's disciple Pūrṇānanda who helped in a prominent way the absorption of the Buddhist Tantras by works written by them for use by the Hindus. Their sphere of work was in East Bengal and they composed a large number of treatises. The period for their activities may be located between 1500 and 1600 A.C. Brahmānanda's *Tārārahasya* and Pūrṇānanda's *Tattvacintāmaṇi* are well-known treatises. It was the movement set afoot by these three that Hinduised the Buddhist Tantras. Kṛṣṇānanda Āgamavāgīśa following their example gave many Buddhist deities a location in the Hindu pantheon through his *Tantrasāra*. Two such deities may be mentioned viz. Kṣetrapāla and Mañjuḥṣa (a changed form of Mañjuśrī). The *Āgamakalpalatikā* by a grandson of Kṛṣṇānanda effected the entry of a larger number of Buddhist deities into the Hindu pantheon. Thus the contents of the Buddhist Tantras were utilized by the Hindus in three Tantras, which thus threw out of use their Buddhist rivals. The *smṛti* works of the Hindus utilized also the materials of the Buddhist Tantras and helped, like the Tantras, the absorption of the section of the population, that could not altogether shake off their Buddhist leanings, into the Hindu society. The five Dhyāni Buddhas had five Śaktis. Of the latter, two viz. *Māmakī* and *Pāṇḍarā* together with the *Pañcarakṣā* constituted by *Mahāpratisarā*, *Mahāmāyūrī*, *Mahāsītavati*, *Mahāsāhasrapramardini* and *Mahāmantrānusāriṇī* are worshipped along with Durgā in the great Hindu ceremonial called Durgāpūjā. The *dhyānas* for some of the deities are identical in Buddhism and Hinduism e.g. those for Kṣetrapāla and Kālī. Many of the Buddhist deities whose names commence with the prefix *Vajra* such as *Vajravārāhi*, *Vajrayoginī*, *Vajradhātviśvari* have been adopted by the Hindus as their own. The Trinity of the Buddhists has

undergone the same process. *Buddha* has become the *Jagannātha* of the Hindus—an incarnation of *Viṣṇu*. *Dharma* has become their *Dharma Ṭhākura*. At times, *Dharma* was worshipped by the Buddhists in the form of *stūpa*. In course of time, the five niches in the *stūpa* for holding the five *Dhyāni* Buddhas gave it the appearance of a tortoise. Hence, *Dharma Ṭhākura* is sometimes found in the shape of this animal. When priests of the *Yogī* caste to the exclusion of the *Brāhmaṇas* are found to officiate at the ceremonies of the deity, it should be inferred that the Buddhist character of the deity has been retained, but when it is found that the priests belong to the *Brāhmaṇa* caste, the character of the worship has been Hinduised. *Śaṅgha* has been transformed into *Śaṅkha*, a conchshell i.e. no longer a deity. In a pond at *Mayanā*, an image of *Dharma Ṭhākura* and a conchshell have been discovered. Though Hinduism has assimilated into itself the Buddhist deities, the *bija mantras* are still intact. These *bijas* indicate the borrowings. When the Hindus worship *Śiva* or *Viṣṇu* by uttering the *dhyāna Mantras* commencing with *Dhyāyen nityam, Dhyeyaḥ sadā*, etc., they are following the traditional Hindu mode, but when they worship by identifying themselves with the deities (*ātmānam viṣṇusvarūpaṁ vibhāvya*), they are really proceeding on the line laid down by the Buddhists. When by the repetition of the *bija mantra* in *dhyāna*, the dormant power is roused and lifted through the six mystical centres in the body viz. *liṅgamūla, anāhata, nābhimūla, hṛdaya, kaṅṭha* and *ājñācakra* to the 'thousand-petalled lotus' in the brain, the process is tinged with Buddhistic colour. And lastly, the implicit reverence shown to the *guru* (spiritual preceptor) is a loan made by Hinduism from Buddhism, because the Hindus had been *devabhājus* and the Buddhists *gubhājus* (see 101, pp. 17-19, 254, 142).

Though the absorption of *Dharma Ṭhākura* into Hinduism has been mentioned already, some details about the cult of *Dharma Ṭhākura* should be given here in view of the fact

The
remnants
of
Buddhism
in India.

that it was a discovery made by Sastriji. He came across many places where *Dharma Thākura* was being worshipped. Ghanarāma's *Dharmamaṅgala* was published as early as 1884. Ghanarāma, a resident of the district of Burdwan, wrote his work in 1710 A.C. He was a Brāhmaṇa who used to officiate at the religious ceremonies of the Caṅḍālas. Ghanarāma states that the story of his *Dharmamaṅgala* was derived from the *Hākanda Purāṇa*, and that it was the poet Mayūrabhaṭṭa who first wrote on the subject. Other authors dealing with the topic were Rūparāma, Māṇikacandra Gaṅguli, Rāmacandra and and Khelārāma. Ramāi Paṇḍit was the first great priest of the Dharma cult and the author of the *Paddhati* (liturgy) for the worship of the deity. According to Ghanarāma's statement, *Dharma Thākura* manifested himself during the reign of the son (9th c.) of king Dharma Pāla who, according to Sastriji, may be the second king of the Pāla dynasty of Bengal. The formula of meditation in Māṇika Gaṅguli's work shows that the deity had his origin in Śūnyatā, indicating the association with Buddhism. Dharma created Pārvatī, the Hindu goddess, representative of the primeval power (Ādyā Śakti) while he himself was without a beginning (Anādyā). Pārvatī gave birth to the gods of the Hindu Trinity through the grace of Dharma. He hates the Vedic sacrifices, and punished the sage Mārkaṇḍeya for protesting against this attitude. Reference is made in the *Paddhati* to the respect paid to him in Ceylon. A peculiarity of the offerings made to the deity is that lime often constitutes one of them. They also include pigs and hens. When vows are made for the fulfilment of desires, small pieces of bricks are hung from the ceiling of the room containing the deity, and as soon as the desires are fulfilled, they are taken away. The other deities that are found in the company of Dharma are Śitalā (corresponding to Hāriti) goddess of small-pox, Gaṇeśa, Pañcānanda a form of Mahādeva, Ṣaṣṭhī, the goddess for the welfare of children, Jvarāsura, the demon of fever, and Mahākāla. Some of them are also found at Svayambhūkṣetra in Nepal in connection with

Dharma. The Śakti of Dharma is named Kāminyā. The unfriendly attitude of the priests of the Dharma cult towards the Brāhmanas is evidenced in the poem called Śrī Nirañjaner Uṣmā. The reason for this feeling is of course obvious. It has gone so far as to make the followers of Dharma look upon the Musalman invasion of Bengal as a retribution brought about by *Dharma Ṭhākura* against the Hindus. Dharma assumed the appearance of a Yavana and riding on a horse assumed the name Khodā. All the gods wore *ijāra* (pantaloons) with great delight and assuming the appearance of the Muhammadans or their religious guides and leaders, they destroyed the images and temples at Jājpur, a stronghold of Dharma worship.¹ The various names under which Dharma is worshipped in the different localities is very large e.g. Bākuḍā Rāya, Śitala Siṃha, Buḍā Dharma, Dalu Rāya, Jagat Rāya and so forth, and the people who worship these deities are millions.

Some of the many places where Dharma is worshipped may be mentioned: the village of Sūagāchi near Pāṭuli, Jāmālpur near Mukṣimpāḍā, village Badaoāna on the river Bhallukī, Bodh Mahāla in Orissa, several places in Calcutta e.g. 45, Jaunbazar Street and a temple on Balaram Dey Street (For the above information re. *Dharma Ṭhākura* see 10, 151, 152, 79).

A remnant of Buddhism is still found in the rites and ceremonies of the Hinduised *Sarāki* weavers in many places in the Gaḍhjāt and Killajāt mahals in Orissa, in Mogalvandi and in the Thanas of Puri and Cuttuck as also in Mayurbhanj and in the districts of Burdwan, Birbhum, and Bankura. The

নিরঞ্জন নিরাকার, হৈল্যা তেঁত অবতার, মুখেতে বলেন বসবার ।
 বস্তক দেবতাপণ, সবে হয় একমন, আনন্দেতে পরিল ইয়ার ।
 ব্রহ্মা হইল ম'হানন্দ, বিষ্ণু হইল শে'কাধর, আদ্য হৈল্যা শূলপাণি ।
 গণেশ হইয়া গাজি, কার্তিক হৈল কাঁজি, ককির হইল বত মুনি ।
 ভেজিয়া আপন ভেক, নারদ হৈল্যা শেক, পুন্দর হইল মৌলনা ।
 চন্দ্রপূর্বা আদি বেবে, পদাতিক হয়্যা সবে, সবে বেদি বাজার বাজনা ।

term *Sarāṅki* is a corrupted form of *Śrāvaka*. Buddha occupies an important place in their faith (150, Intro. p. 28).

The foregoing sketch shows within a small compass Sastriji's contributions in connection with the four principal subjects which received a large measure of his attention, and the various directions taken by his mental activities in a period covering fifty-five years. There are other subjects on which he wrote at times e.g. inscriptions, topography, castes, education, Sāṅkhya and Nyāya, and Vaiṣṇavism, but his major contributions were on the four subjects mentioned above, as a glance through Appendix I will show. All this was accomplished simultaneously with the administrative work that devolved on him as a duty in the various positions occupied by him. Appendix II presents a list of these positions, some of which had onerous duties attached to them. Sastriji's life is a brilliant example in which duty was always a pleasure. His zeal for study and for the extension of the bounds of knowledge in the subjects handled by him continued unabated up to the last. In him combined many qualities of head and heart. His exterior may have appeared cold to those who did not come into close contact with him, but in fact, his goodwill and friendship once extended continued warm and steady. I had the opportunity of knowing him personally for several years and working with him on the committees of public institutions. This long acquaintance and collaboration imparted to our relationship a personal touch which was productive of a uniform stream of sympathy and confidence. It is for this reason that his demise has caused in me a feeling of personal loss. The loss is no less to the world of scholarship. It will be difficult to fill up the void that has been created by the extinction of the sum of the rare qualities of head and heart that constituted his personality. It is however a partial compensation that the writings left behind by him will continue to inform, guide, and inspire the people of the present and the future generations. It is also a source of solace to his friends and relatives that the reverence in which his memory

is held by them is shared by a much wider circle of admirers. The following few lines penned by Dr. Ganganatha Jha express the feeling entertained towards him generally.

“ I have always looked upon Mahāmahopādhyāya Paṇḍit Haraprasād Śāstri as one of the principal ‘architects’ of the reputation that has been my meed in this world. It was through his kindness that the Asiatic Society of Bengal accepted my translation of Kumārila’s *Sloḥavārtiḥa* for the *Bibliotheca Indica* which brought me to the notice of the world of Orientalists.

The first time that I saw him was sometime in 1899-1900 at his residence. By that time he had seen some part of my work on Kumārila.

This was the commencement of the life-long relationship which has continued unimpaired all along; and the tie has been so strong that even after his departure, it promises to continue through his talented son.

As regards the Mahāmahopādhyāya’s work it is not necessary to say much. My opinion of it is briefly summed up: He, of all people, has been the real father of Oriental Research in North India.”

APPENDIX I

LIST OF WRITINGS

BENGALI WORKS

1. 120/ B.S. } (1) ভারত মহিলা (The Ladies of Ind). 1st ed. First
(=1880 A.C.) } published in the *Vaṅgadarśana*, 1282.

The booklet in five chapters deals with the condition and ideal of women in the Hindu society as can be ascertained from the ancient Śāstras and other Sanskrit literature.

2. 1288. (2) বাম্বীকির জয় (The Superiority of Vālmiki), 84 pp. A portion was previously published in the *Vaṅgadarśana*, 1287.

Vaśiṣṭha, Viśvāmitra and Vālmiki, the three great figures of the Purāṇic literature have been shown to represent the three forces physical, intellectual and moral. The three sages were striving to bring about the happiness of the world according to their own particular lines of action: Vālmiki came out triumphant ultimately on account of his selfless compassion towards the humanity.

3. 1309. (3) মেঘদূত (*Meghadūta*), v+88 pp. Previously published in the *Vaṅgadarśana*.

In this brochure Sastriji brings out in a charming way the delicate beauties of Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta*. In the Preface to the work, he makes a grateful acknowledgment of the assistance received from one whose name has not been mentioned in compliance with his desire. As it is now a thing of the distant past, the curiosity of the reader may be satisfied by this piece of information that he is Paṇḍit Rajendranath Vidyābhūṣaṇa. Four years later Paṇḍit Vidyābhūṣaṇa also acknowledged his gratitude in the Preface to his work *Kālidāsa O Bhavabhūti* in the following way :

বীহার নামসোদ্যানে কুত্ব চয়ন করিয়া এই প্রবন্ধ লিখিয়াছি, বীহার কাব্যলোচনা-সম্পূর্ণ্যে আমার ভারী মীমস পাবারের চিন্তে কাব্যপ্রিয়তা অধিগ্রাহে, বীহার উপদেশ ব্যতীত 'কালিদাস ও ভবভূতি' কথাটি লিখিতে পারিতাম না, বীহার রূপ আমার জীবনে অপরিপোষ্য, বোধ হয় প্রবন্ধের অকিকিংকরু উপলক্ষি করিয়াই, তিনি, ইহাতে বীহার নাম সংযোগ করিতে দিলেন না। আমি উদ্দেশে বীহার নিকটে কৃতজ্ঞতা প্রকাশ করিতেছি।

4. 1322. (4) কাঞ্চনমালা (*Kāñcanamālā*). Previously published in the *Vaṅgadarśana*, 1289.

Based on a Buddhist legend the novel depicts the single-minded devotion of Kāñcanamālā to her husband Kuṇāla, son of Aśoka, specially during his helpless condition brought about by his step-mother, at whose instance he was deprived of his eye-sight.

5. 1326. (5) বেণের মেয়ে (Merchant's Daughter). Previously published in the *Nārāyaṇa*, 1325 and 1326.

The heroine of the fiction is a merchant's daughter. After the demise of her husband the leaders of the Buddhist community of Saptagrāma and its neighbouring places, where the scene of the fiction is laid, try to convert this widow to Buddhism and thereby appropriate her large properties. The Buddhist chief of Saptagrāma helps this attempt with his men and money. The father of the girl, on the other hand, assisted by the Hindu chief Harivarmadeva and his minister Bhavadeva Bhaṭṭa defeat the purpose of the Buddhist leaders by clever actions directed against their conspiracy to bring the girl under their control. Ultimately, a fight takes place between the two chiefs resulting in the defeat of the Buddhists. Through this novel, Sastriji has painted a picture of the state of things in Bengal in the 11th century A.C. when Buddhism was on the decline and was being gradually absorbed by Hinduism. The episodes found in conjunction with the main plot, such as the sea voyage of the girl's father Vihari Datta to Java, and the descriptions of the Buddhist procession at Saptagrāma, the conference for awarding rewards to learned men and artists both Hindu and Buddhist invited from places far and near, the Nālandā University, etc. are extremely vivid and realistic with the colouring and details that bring up before the mind's eyes a picture of Bengal of the 11th century.

TEXT-BOOKS FOR SCHOOLS

- (a) প্রসাদ-পাঠ (১ম ও ২য় ভাগ) (*Prasāda-Pāṭha*).
 (b) ভারতবর্ষের ইতিহাস (History of India).
 1895. (c) *History of India*.

The history of ancient India did not receive the amount of attention it deserved at the hands of the earlier writers of Indian history like Mill, Elphinstone and Marshman (100, pp. 1, 2). In 1895 Sastriji published, his *History of India* giving a connected account up to the time of Buddha.

BENGALI PAMPHLETS

7. 1923. কলিকাতা মহানগরীতে আহৃত ভারত-হিন্দু-মতাবলম্বী প্রথম মহাধিবেশনে, সভাপতি মহোদয়ের সম্বোধন (Presidential Address delivered at the 1st Session of the All-India Hindu Conference held in Calcutta).

It was translated into English by N. Law.

অধিলভারতীর সংস্কৃতমহাসম্মেলনে (মথুরার অধিবেশনে) সভাপতির অভিভাষণ ।
 (Presidential Address delivered at the All-India Sanskrit Conference held at Mathurā).

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS IN ENGLISH.

9. 1891. (1) *Vernacular Literature of Bengal before the Introduction of English Education*, 16 pp. A lecture delivered at the Cumbuliatola Reading Club.

Information has been collected in this pamphlet about a large volume of literature in Bengali valuable for the history of particular localities as also for the philological data found in it.

10. 1897. (2) *Discovery of Living Buddhism in Bengal*, 31 pp.

In spite of the unfavourable attitude of the Brāhmaṇas towards the Buddhists and their wholesale massacre by the Musalmans, the Buddhists continued to exist in Bengal and Bihar long after the Muhammadan invasion of Eastern India. The religion which counted its votaries in Bengal by millions could not disappear altogether without leaving its impress behind in various forms. In fact, it is still living among the people of the provinces. The widely prevalent worship of Dharma Thākura in different places of Bengal has been shown to be Buddhistic in its origin (see 212).

11. (3) *The Study of Sanskrit*, 16 pp. A paper read at a meeting of the Calcutta University Teachers' Association.

After giving a brief sketch of the development of the Sanskrit language and its large grammatical literature, Sastriji deals with the state of Sanskrit learning in Bengal at the beginning of the 19th century, undergoing a change in the later years after the establishment of the Calcutta Sanskrit College.

12. 1907. (4) *Mālavikāgnimitra*, 17 pp.

This is a review of the plot and characters in Kālidāsa's *Mālavikāgnimitra*.

13. 1916. (5) *The Educative Influence of Sanskrit*, 31 pp. A lecture delivered on the occasion of the laying of the foundation-stone of the Hindu University, Benares.

In this Address delivered at the Benares Hindu University, Sastriji has laid stress on the unbroken continuity of the Sanskrit literature from the commencement of the Vedic period and also on its value as an instrument of education. He has described its voluminous character dealing with a large variety of subjects and has given an account of the literature on the different branches of study: Economics, Science, Fine Arts, History and kindred subjects, Philosophy, Poetry, and Drama.

14. 1917. (6) *Bird's-Eye View of Sanskrit Literature*, 32 pp.

The extent of Sanskrit literature classified under various subjects has been dealt with in this brochure.

15. 1922. (7) *Presidential Address, Sanskrit and Prakrit Section, Second Oriental Conference, Calcutta*, 14 pp.

A brief account of the ancient languages of India and the grammatical speculations connected therewith has been given in the Address and the singular

achievements of the Indian literature in the domains of philosophy, grammar, and poetry have been pointed out.

16. 1923. (8) *Magadhan Literature*, 133 pp.

This is a collection of six Lectures connected with Magadha delivered at the Patna University in 1920-21: (1) The original inhabitants of Magadha, (2) Pāṭaliputra—the intellectual capital of India. (3) Historical lessons from the *Arthasāstra* of Kauṭilya, (4) Vātsyāyana's *Kāmasūtra*, (5) *Vātsyāyana Bhāṣya*, and (6) Bāṇabhaṭṭa and Āryabhaṭa.

17. 1925. (9) *Lokāyata*, 6 pp. Dacca University Bulletin No. 1.

It is an account of the Lokāyata (materialistic) system of thought as found in the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*, *Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccaya* etc.

18. 1926. (10) *Absorption of the Vrātyas*, 9 pp. Dacca University Bulletin No. 6.

The Vrātyas were Aryans. *Vrāta* means a horde. The Vrātyas were at first nomadic Aryan hordes hostile to the Vedic Aryans. The differences in manners and customs between the Aryans and the Vrātyas were many and have been enumerated on the basis of the *Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa* and other Vedic texts. It was by the Vrātyastoma that the Vrātyas could be taken back into the Aryan fold. Those who were not so treated remained lower in status in the eye of the Vedic Aryans. They brought in new energy, and were mainly responsible for many new lines of thought and action in the later Vedic period.

19. 1928. (11) *Sanskrit Culture in Modern India* (Presidential Address, Fifth Oriental Conference, Lahore), 43 pp. Published also in the *Prabuddha Bhārata*, XXX (1929), pp. 66-75, 126-135.

After the systematic commencement of the search of Sanskrit Mss. from the time of Lord Lawrence (1868), many new materials were brought to light. The preservation of Sanskrit and other Mss. helped a good deal the study of ancient Indian culture. It contains an account of the state of Sanskrit studies in the 18th century as also of the same after the introduction of English education among the Pandits. It also points out the results of researches in previous years and also the researches that remained to be made in the various fields of Sanskrit literature.

EDITIONS OF BENGALI TEXTS

20. 1312. (1) *শ্রীধর্মমঙ্গল* (*Śrīdharmamaṅgala* of Māṅik Gāṅgulī). Vaṅgiya Sāhitya Pariṣad Series No. 8. Edited in collaboration with Dr. Dines Chandra Sen.

It is a versified narrative showing the greatness of Dharma Thākura, a Hinduised Buddhist deity.

21. 1223. (2) *বৌদ্ধগান ও দোহা* (*Bauddha Gān O Dohā*), 36+210+105 pp. V. S. Pariṣad Series, No. 55.

It is a collection of songs of Siddhācāryas written in the vernaculars of Eastern India, mostly in old Bengali. The Sanskrit commentary explains them according to the doctrines of the Sahajiyā sect.

22. 1335. (3) কাশীরামদাসের মহাভারত, আদিপর্ব (Mahābhārata of Kāśirāma, ādiparva), xxviii + 248 + xvi pp. V. S. Pariṣad Series, No. 75.

The Ādiparvan of Kāśirāma Dāsa's Bengali Mahābhārata has been edited from a unique Ms. of the 16th century. It differs considerably from the previous editions of the work. In the Introduction, Sastriji has shown that the Sanskrit Mahābhārata had passed through five redactions. He has pointed out the additions and alterations introduced by Kāśirāma in his Bengali version, and has also given a list of words (used by Kāśirāma) which have assumed different forms in the current Bengali.

EDITION OF A MAITHILI TEXT

23. 1331. বিদ্যাপতি প্রণীত কীর্তিলতা (Kīrttilatā of Vidyāpati) vi + xcviii + 48 pp. + English translation 43 pp. Hṛṣikeśa Series No. 9.

This Maithili poem of Vidyāpati in the form of a dialogue between two birds eulogizes the heroic stand made by Kīrtisīṃha, a Tirhut prince against Arslan, the treacherous enemy of his father. With the help of the Sultan of Jaunpur he defeats Arslan. The descriptions of Jaunpur and its markets, the Sultan's court, the march of troops and the fight are very graphic and interesting.

EDITIONS OF SANSKRIT TEXTS

24. 1888-1797. (1) *Bṛhaddharmapurāṇa* (Bibliotheca Indica, No. 120), 589 pp.

It is an edition of the upapurāṇa of that name.

25. 1894-1900. (2) *Bṛhatsvayambhūpurāṇa* (Bibliotheca Indica, No. 133), 502 + 38 pp.

This is a Buddhist Purāṇa presenting details about Svayambhūkṣetra, an important place of Buddhist pilgrimage in Nepal containing many shrines, stūpas, etc.

26. 1904. (3) *Ballālacarita* of Ānandabhaṭṭa (Bibliotheca Indica, No. 164), 125 pp.

This work in twenty-seven chapters gives an account of the time of Ballālasena, king of Bengal. It was written in 1432 A.C. about three hundred years after Ballāla's reign. Some items of information contained in it are corroborated by other evidences.

27. 1910. (4) *Rāmacarita* of Sandhyākara Nandin, ASB. Memoir. Vol. III, No. 1, 56 pp.

The *Ramapalacarita* a poem of the 12th century refers in each stanza to the story of Rāma as also to Rāmapāla, who ruled in Bengal towards the close of the 11th century.

28. 1910. (5) *Six Buddhist Nyāya Tracts* of Rātnakīrti, Paṇḍita Aśoka, and Ratnākaraśānti (Bibliotheca Indica, No. 185), viii + 114 pp.

For details about these six tracts, see pp. 346, 347.

29. 1910. (6) *Saundarananda* (Bibliotheca Indica, No. 192), xxiii + 138 pp.

This poem of Aśvaghoṣa in eighteen cantos was discovered by Sastriji in Nepal. It delineates how Nanda, a half-brother of Buddha, was persuaded by the latter to renounce the world and join the Buddhistic Order as a Bhikṣu in spite of his deep attachment to his wife Sundarī.

30. 1910. (7) *Syainika-śāstra* (a book on hawking). Text and English translation (Bibliotheca Indica, No. 193), iii + 39 + 35 pp.

This is a practical handbook for hunting and hawking in seven chapters written by Rudradeva, a ruler of Kūrmācala or Kumaon.

31. 1914. (8) *Catuṣśatikā* of Āryadeva (ASB. Memoirs, Vol. III, No. 8), 66 pp.

The edited fragments of the work deal with such topics as the removal of misconceptions, non-reality of things, non-reality of Ātman and so forth.

- 31a. 1927. (9) *Aḍvayavajrasaṃgraha* (Gækwad's Oriental Series, No. 40), v + xxxviii + 63 pp.


This is a collection of twenty-one short tracts dealing with the doctrines and rituals of the later phases of Buddhism, particularly the Vajrayāna.

NOTICES OF SANSKRIT MSS.

32. (a) 1890-1892. *Notices of Sanskrit Mss.*, 1st series, Vol. X, 8 + 32 + 16 + 367 pp. (1025 Mss. described).
(b) 1895. *Notices of Sanskrit Mss.*, 1st series, Vol. XI (Indices), 20 + 72 + 23 + 138 + 4 pp.

The previous volumes are by Raja R. L. Mitra.

33. (a) 1898-1900. *Notices of Sanskrit Mss.*, 2nd series, Vol. I, xi + 432 pp. (422 Mss.).
(b) 1898-1904. *Notices of Sanskrit Mss.*, 2nd series, Vol. II, xxii + 238 pp. (266 Mss.).



(c) 1904-1907. *Notices of Sanskrit Mss.*, 2nd series, Vol. III, xxvi + 18 + 253 pp. (366 Mss.).

(d) 1911. *Notices of Sanskrit Mss.*, 2nd series, Vol. IV. xxxvi + ii + 265 pp. (359 Mss.). Total 1413 Mss.

DESCRIPTIVE CATALOGUES OF MSS.

34. 1905. (1) *Catalogue of Palm-leaf and Selected Paper Mss. belonging to the Darbar Library, Nepal*, Vol. I, lxxxii + 32 + 273 + 23 pp. (457 Mss.).

35. 1915. (2) *Do.* Vol. II, xxxv + 271 + 21 pp. (931 Mss.).

36. 1917. (3) *A descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Government Collection under the care of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, Vol. I—Buddhist Manuscripts, ix + 199 pp. (119 Mss.).

37. 1923. (4) *Do.* Vol. II—Vedic Manuscripts, x + 1256 pp. (1726 Mss.).

38. 1925. (6) *Do.* Vol. III—Smṛti Manuscripts, lxxvi + 1066 pp. (1232 Mss.).

39. 1923. (5) *Do.* Vol. IV—History and Geography, vi + 125 pp. (55 Mss.).

40. 1928. (7) *A descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Collections of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, Vol. V—Purāṇa Manuscripts. ccxxvii + 897 pp. (1080 Mss.).

41. 1931. (8) *Do.* Vol. VI—Vyākaraṇa Manuscripts, cccxxxix + 521 pp. (732 Mss.).

Vol. VII—Kāvya Manuscripts (in the Press) (857 Mss.).

Total Mss. described in the seven volumes—5801.

The following volumes of *Descriptive Catalogues of Mss.* have been made ready for the Press :

Vol. VIII	Philosophy	about	1394	Mss.	
.. IX	Tantra	..	1005	..	
.. X	Jyotiṣa	..	500	..	
.. XI	Jaina	..	1500	..	
.. XII	Vernacular	..	500	..	
.. XIII	Miscellaneous	..	700	..	in ing
.. XIV	Addenda, Supple				

Total 5599 ..

Grand Total 14686 Mss.

REPORT ON SEARCH FOR MSS.

42. 1901. (a) *Report on the Search of Sanskrit Manuscripts (1895-1900)*, 25 pp.

1905. (b) *Do.* (1901-1902 to 1905-1906), 18 pp.

At page 23 of this Report, Sastriji refers to a previous one submitted by him. I have not been able to get hold of its copy.

1911. (c) *Do.* (1906-1907 to 1910-1911), 10 pp.

1913. (d) *Preliminary Report on the Operation in Search of Mss. of Bardic Chronicles (1913)*, 52 pp.

(e) *Report of a Tour in Western India in Search of Mss. of Bardic Chronicles*, 6 pp.

Though the pamphlet does not state the year for which it contains the details of the search for Mss., the *Preliminary Report on the Operation* etc. (pp. 1, 2) shows that it is the report for 1909. This *Preliminary Report* (p. 2) refers to the submission of four Progress Reports to the Society since 1909. Only one constituting this item is to hand.

THE VANGADARŚANA

43. 1284. (1) *আগাদের গৌরবের দুই সময় (Two Periods of our Glory)*, pp. 36-46, 75-81.

The article deals with the two periods of great intellectual activity in India viz. 9th to 4th century B.C., and 6th century A.C. to the 9th. The first period relates to Northern India and the second to Southern India generally. The former speaks in detail about the development of the systems of philosophy, law etc. and the latter about the movements carried on by Kumārila, Śaṅkara, etc. resulting in the revival of Hinduism.

44. 1284. (2) *ব্রাহ্মণ ও শ্রমণ (Brāhmaṇas and Śramaṇas)*, pp. 145-152.

The paper deals with the revival of Hinduism and decay of Buddhism. It is a continuation of the previous paper.

45. 1284. (3) *শঙ্করাচার্য্য কি ছিলেন? (Śaṅkarācārya—What was he?)* pp. 241-248.

In this article, it has been stated that the value of Śaṅkara's contribution lies in his Advaita philosophy rather than in his work as a religious reformer.

46. 1284 (4) *বেদ ও বেদব্যাখ্যা (The Vedas and their Interpretation)*, pp. 413-421.

It is a review of Ramānātha Sarasvatī's edition of the *R̥gveda* with Bengali translation, notes, and explanations.

47. 1285. (5) কালিদাস ও শেক্সপীয়ার (Kālidāsa and Shakespeare), pp. 28-41.

The fields in which the two poets excel each other have been pointed out. Kālidāsa has a liking for only the pretty and the beautiful while Shakespeare deals with human characters of all sorts ranging from the noble to the ugly.

48. 1285. (6) বাঙ্গালা ভাষা (The Bengali Language), pp. 77-88.

A middle path between a style of writing with too many Sanskrit words and a style with extremely colloquial words is advocated. He is of opinion that current Bengali words as also borrowings of terms from Arabic etc. which have already got currency should not be interdicted.

49. 1285. (7) সমাজের পরিবর্তন কয় রূপ ? (Changes in Society), pp. 121-129.

50. 1285. (8) একজন বাঙ্গালী গবর্নরের অদ্ভুত বীরত্ব (The strange Conduct of a Bengali Governor), pp. 137-139.

It is a satirical description of the way in which Raja Durlabharāma, a Governor of Orissa during the Musalman rule conducted himself under an attack by the Mahratta raiders.

51. 1285. (9) বঙ্গীয় যুবক ও তিন কবি (The Bengali Youths and the three Poets), pp. 396-410.

The elements appealing to the Bengali youths in the writings of Kālidāsa, Byron, and Bankim Chandra have been discussed here.

52. 1285. (10) মনুষ্য জীবনের উদ্দেশ্য (The Ideal of human Life), pp. 520-527.

In the ideal of human life, the debt to society should find an important place.

53. 1285. (11) এক্সচেঞ্জ (Exchange), pp. 538-549.

54. 1285. (12) তৈল (The Art of Oiling), pp. 549-552.

It is a humorous piece of writing expatiating on the great influence of unctuous words and deeds.

55. 1287. (13) স্বাধীন বাণিজ্য ও রক্ষা-কর (Free-Trade and Protection),

56. 1287. (15) খাজনা কেন দেই ? (Why do we pay rent?), pp. 61-70.

57. 1287. (16) শিক্ষা (Education), pp. 119-124.

The specialization in education should commence after a thorough grounding in general culture.

58. 1287. (17) হৃদয়-উদাস (The yearning Heart), pp. 189-191. It appeared over the pseudonym 'A Monk in Youth.'

It is an expression of the heart's yearning for filling up the void in the human heart. The composition reminds one of Bankim Chandra's *Ekā* in *Kamalākānter Daptar* (1875), p. 10.

59. 1287. (18) কলেজী শিক্ষা (College Education), pp. 211-218.

The evils of education as imparted in the colleges in India have been pointed

out. The system of examination does not develop an appetite for real learning while the medium of instruction being a foreign tongue wastes much time and stunts the intellect.

60. 1287. (19) নূতন খাজনার আইন সম্বন্ধে কলিকাতা রিবিউএর মত (*The Calcutta Review on the Tenancy Bill*), pp. 289-302.
61. 1287. (20) ভট্টাচার্য্য-বিদায় প্রণালী (*The System of paying Honoraria to Pandits*), pp. 369-376.
62. 1287. (21) বর্তমান শতাব্দীর বাঙ্গালা সাহিত্য [The Bengali Literature of the Present (19th) Century.], pp. 489-512.

A note is added at the end by the editor to the effect that it was read by Sastriji at a meeting of the Sāvitrī Library.

63. 1288. (22) নূতন কথা গড়া (*The Coining of New Terms*), pp. 72-77.
- The paper puts forward the view that for the expression of a new idea, the resources of the Bengali language as also of the other Indian vernaculars and Sanskrit should be utilized for supplying the new terms, and if they fail, the foreign tongues should be resorted to.
64. 1288. (23) মাঝে "মজুষ্ক" ও হালের "গাইন করা" (*The unshiny Merit of former days and the shiny Semblance of Merit of the present day*), pp. 124-128.
65. 1288. (24) বাঙ্গালা ভাষার পরিণতি (*The Bengali Language*). Appeared over the pseudonym 'Graduate'.
- The object of the paper is to discuss the principles on which the structure of the Bengali language should be based. He illustrates his opinion by giving specimens of Sanskritic or anglicized Bengali, which should be avoided.
66. 1289. (25) কালিদাসের রঘুবংশ (*The Raghuvamśa*), pp. 42-47.
67. (26) স্বায়ত্ত শাসন (*Self-Government*). [Mentioned in the pamphlet on Sastriji's life].

THE VIBHA

68. 1294. (1) মুসলমানী বাঙ্গালা—সুর্জু উজালবিবির কেচ্ছা (*Musalman Bengali—the Story of Surjju Ujālbibi*), pp. 282-286.
- Surjju Ujāl Bibir Kecchā* or the versified story of a lady called Surjju Ujāl (bright like the sun) is by a Musalman author. The peculiarity of its language lies in the considerable number of Arabic and Persian words used in it. The substance of the story and a specimen of the language appear in the paper.
69. 1294. (2) ভারতের লুপ্ত রত্নোদ্ধার—বোধিসত্ত্বাবদান কল্পলতা (*The Recovery of a lost Indian Jewel—the Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā*), pp. 450-455.

This is an account of the discovery of some incomplete Mss. of the *Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā* of Kṣemendra in Nepal by Hodgson and Wright, and of a complete copy by Sarat Chandra Das in Tibet.

70. 1294. (3) कुशीनगर (Kuşīnagara), pp. 24-33 and 114-117.

The paper contains a description of the various attempts made for the identification of Kuśīnagara where Buddha attained Mahāparinirvāṇa. Carlleyle identified it with Kasai in the district of Gorakhpur.

71. 1295 (4) মুসলমানগণের সংস্কৃত চর্চা (The Study of Sanskrit by the Musalmans), pp. 99-102.

Akbar, Jahāngir, Shāh Jahān and Khasru Parwiz took interest in the study of Sanskrit. The *Rāmāyaṇa*, the *Mahābhārata*, and a number of other works were translated into Persian under the patronage of Akbar. Some works on medicine and astrology had their Persian versions centuries before Akbar's time. Dara Shikuh himself translated into Persian as many as fifty Upaniṣads. Anquetil du Perron, who built the premises at Chinsura in which the Hughly College is situated and who is said to have been the father of the distinguished Kaviwalla Anthony translated some of these into Latin through Dara Shikuh's Persian translation.

THE ARYADARŚANA

72. 1284. যৌবনে সন্ন্যাসী (A Monk in Youth) IV. pp. 86-89.
 73. 1284. প্রকৃত প্রণয় ও বিবাহ (True Love and Marriage). IV, pp. 187-192.
 74. 1284. ইক্ষু (Sugar Cane), IV, pp. 431-436.

THE KALPANA

75. 1287. মোহিনী (খণ্ডকাব্য) (Mohini—a poem).
 76. 1287. স্ত্রী-বিপ্লব (The Dominance of Women).

THE NAVYABHĀRATA

77. 1290. কলিকাতা দুইশত বৎসর পূর্বে (Calcutta 200 years ago), 1 7 pp. 256-261.

It is an interesting account of the three villages Kalikātā, Sūtānuṭī, and Govindapur constituting the city of Calcutta giving details about its inhabitants, topography, influential men, trade and commerce etc.

THE SĀHITYA-PARIṢAT-PATRIKĀ

78. 1304. (1) কাটোয়ার নিকট প্রাপ্ত জৈন-পিত্তল-কলক (A Brass-plate of the Jains found near Katwa), IV, 4, pp. 293-296.

The plate contains representations of nine objects of Jaina worship, including the images of five Arhats. It is known from the small inscription at the foot of the plate that it was put up in the Jaina year 1923=1397 A.C. at a place called Indreśvara which is identified with Baragram near Katwa.

79. 1304. (2) রমাই পণ্ডিতের ধর্মমাঙ্গল (The *Dharmamaṅgala* of Ramāi Paṇḍit), IV, 1, pp. 60-68.

80. 1305. (3) ধোয়ী কবির পবন-দূত (The Pavanadūta of Dhoyi), V, 3, pp. 187-196.

This is a description based on a Ms. of the work.

81. 1308. (4) বাঙ্গালা বাকরণ (The Grammar of the Bengali Language), VIII, 1, pp. 1-7.

Defects usually found in the then current grammars of the Bengali language following the rules of Sanskrit grammars have been pointed out. The discussion in the paper as to whether the Bengali language should be made subservient to Sanskrit attracted the attention of scholars to the topic. The question was discussed by others—some favouring Sastriji's arguments for the development of Bengali on independent lines, and some opposing them.

82. 1317. (5) বৌদ্ধঘণ্টা ও তাম্র-মুকুট (A Bell and the Copper Crown used by the Buddhists), XVII, 2, pp. 129-30.

While exhibiting a bell and a crown brought from Nepal, an account of the *dikṣā* (initiation) ceremony of the Nepalese Buddhist Bānrās who used the bell and the crown was given. This *Dikṣā* comprises five *abhiṣekas* (consecrations) including the *ghoṅṭābhiṣeka* and *mukūṭābhiṣeka*. The initiated get the right to use a bell and a crown on festive occasions.

83. 1321. (6) বঙ্গীয়-সাহিত্য-পরিষদের সভাপতির অভিভাষণ (The Annual Presidential Address, V. S. Pariṣad), XXI, 1, pp. 21-47.

While pointing out the collection of mss. as one of the duties of the Vaṅgiya Sāhitya Pariṣad, the Address relates how the Government of India under Lord Lawrence was persuaded to make a grant for the collection of old manuscripts and allotted it to the Provincial Governments for the necessary action. The activities of the Indian States in this direction have also been described. The Address also deals with the principal topics of several ancient Bengali mss. throwing light on the later phases of Buddhism.

84. 1321. (7) সাহিত্য-সম্মিলনের অষ্টম অধিবেশনের (বর্ধমান) সভাপতির সম্বোধন (The Presidential Address, 8th Session, V. S. Sammilana, Burdwan), XXI, 4, pp. 241-277.

The Address points out 20 contributions of Bengal, giving details of each. They

are : (1) taming and treatment of elephants, (2) variety of religious opinions, (3) silk, (4) linen, (5) theatre, (6) ships and boats, (7) Bauddha Śilabhadra, (8) Śāntideva, a Buddhist writer, (9) Nātha Pantha, (10) Dīpaṅkara Śrījñāna, (11) Jagaddala Mahāvihāra and Vibhūti Candra, (12) Luipāda and his Siddhācāryas, (13) iconography, (14) cultivation of Sanskrit learning, (15) Bṛhaspati, Śrīkara and Śrīnātha, (16) the Nyāya system, (17) Caitanya and his followers, (18) the tantras, (19) the Brāhmaṇas of Bengal and (20) the Kāyasthas and the Rājās (same as 159).

85. 1321. (8) সাহিত্য-সম্মিলনের অষ্টম অধিবেশনের সাহিত্য-শাখায় সভাপতির সঞ্চোধন
(The Presidential Address, Literary Section of the V. S. Sammilana, 8th Session, Burdwan), XXI, 4, pp. 279-288.

While dilating on the position attained by the Bengali literature in various fields, the Address points out the gaps that were yet to be filled up. It also discusses as to what should be the proper mode of assimilating words from other languages and coining new words. It is stated that non-Sanskritic words current in Bengali need not be banished from literature. The language should be allowed to grow on an independent line without being subservient to any other (same as 158).

86. 1321. (9) হিন্দুর মুখে আওরঞ্জিবের কথা (Light on the Reign of Aurangzeb from the Hindu Sources), XXI, 4, pp. 289-296.

It is suggested that Hindu sources can throw a flood of light on the history of the time of Aurangzeb. The historical literature of Rajputana, for instance, dealing with contemporary kings and distinguished families can supply valuable data for the purpose. Several works of this kind in Sanskrit and vernacular have been named as the sources that should be utilized (same as 160).

87. 1322. (10) সঞ্চোধন (The Presidential Address, 21st Annual Meeting, V. S. Pariṣad), XXII, 2, pp. 121-160.

Thirty-three writers of mediæval Bengal have been mentioned along with their personal details, outlines of their activities and specimens of their writings. A large number of words used by them has been quoted to show that these writings are essentially Bengali. This shows that three hundred years before the invasion of Bengal by the Musalmans there was in the country a large literature in Bengali written by the Buddhists.

88. 1323. (11) সঞ্চোধন (The Presidential Address, 22nd Annual Meeting, V. S. Pariṣad), XXIII, 2, pp. 81-94.

The Address deals with the Buddhist Sanskrit literature that developed in Bengal and the neighbouring places from the 9th century A.C. up to the time of the invasion of the province by the Muhammadans. Several Buddhist Tantric texts have been described. Details about some prominent teachers of the Mantrayāna, Vajrayāna, Sahajayāna and Kālacakrayāna schools of Buddhism have also been given as also seventy-six names of Siddhapuruṣas as found in the *Varṇa(na)ratnākara* of Jyotirīvara Kaviśekhara-cārya.

89. 1326. (12) চণ্ডীদাস (Caṇḍīdāsa), XXVI, 2, pp. 75-84.

It has been stated that the followers of the Sahajiyā cult which is a bye-

product of Buddhism in its later phase in Bengal became either Nādhā Nādhis (Vaiṣṇavas) or Bhairava Bhairavis (Śāktas). It is inferred from the lives of the Bengal poets Jayadeva and Caṇḍidāsa that they had been Sahajiyās. The amorous practices sanctioned among the Sahajiyās under a religious belief were replaced among the Vaiṣṇavas by the submergence of the amorous feelings in the amorous happiness of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa. Caṇḍidāsa was at first a devotee of Vāsuli, a deity imported from the Buddhist pantheon. Then he became a Sahajiyā practising the religion with Rāmī, a laundress. Lastly, he turned a Vaiṣṇava expressing his devotion through songs on the love of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa. New light has been thrown on the way in which Caṇḍidāsa met with his death. It is stated in a few songs containing Rāmī's lamentations that Caṇḍidāsa was killed by a Muhammadan king of Gauḍa as the queen became enamoured of the poet on hearing songs sung by him.

90. 1327. (13) বাঙ্গালার পুরাণ অক্ষর (Ancient Bengali Script), XXVII, 1, pp. 1-12.

The evolution of the Bengali scripts from Brāhmī has been explained through the specimens of Bengali characters reproduced in a number of plates containing scripts from mss. and inscriptions ranging from the 11th century A.C.

91. 1328. (14) ব্রহ্মা প্রবন্ধ সম্বন্ধে আলোচনা (Remarks on a Paper on Brāhmā), XXVIII, 3, pp. 118-119.

The reason why the god Brahman has four faces is to be found in the fact that the four kinds of Speech called Vaikhari, Madhyamā, Paśyantī and Sūkṣmā were each produced from one of his four mouths.

92. 1328. (15) মহাদেব (Mahādeva), XXVIII, 3, pp. 145-152.

Mahādeva was originally a god of the Vrātyas or the non-Vedic Aryans roaming about in hordes (see 267).

93. 1329. (16) সভাপতির অভিভাষণ (২৮শ বার্ষিক) (The Presidential Address, 28th Annual Meeting, V. S. Pariṣad), XXIX, 1, pp. 43-53.

The antiquity of the Bengali literature has been pushed back to the 8th century A.C., as it has been shown that Buddhist songs appearing in works known to have been composed about that time were in Bengali. It has been pointed out that even now the songs in old Bengali are recited in the Buddhist monasteries of Nepal, where they have preserved the chronological lists of Siddhācāryas, and their portraits. Doubts have however been expressed about the correctness of the names of the traditional eighty-four Siddhas because many of the names obtained from Java disagree with those mentioned in the *Varṇa(na)ratnākara*.

94. 1329.(17) চণ্ডীদাস (Caṇḍidāsa), XXIX, 4, pp. 127-145.

Boḍu Caṇḍidāsa, the reputed author of the *Śrīkṛṣṇakīrtana*, and Dviija Caṇḍidāsa, the author of the songs on the love of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa are stated in this article to be different persons. It has been shown that the former work based on the story of the *Brahmavaivartapurāṇa* was utilised by Jayadeva in the 12th century A.C. The songs of Dviija Caṇḍidāsa were later, as evidenced by the language. It is also pointed out that as many of the composers of the

Kirtana songs were devotees of the goddess Caṇḍī and called themselves Caṇḍidāsa, it is difficult to fix the identity of the author in question.

95. 1331. (18) হিন্দু ও বৌদ্ধের তফাৎ (The Differences between a Hindu and a Buddhist), XXXI, 2, pp. 45-64.

The various differences between the Hindus and the Buddhists in matters of religion, philosophy, customs, and general culture have been discussed here.

96. 1331. (19) প্যারীচাঁদ মিত্র (Pyāricā d Mitra), XXXI, 4, pp. 157-163.

The paper is an appreciation of the style of writing in Bengali initiated by Pyāricā d Mitra in his monthly in 1854. He used the easy, current language for serious compositions.

97. 1332. (20) আমাদের ইতিহাস (Our History), XXXII, 4, pp. 195-201.

The paper points out that the materials for the history of India are not as meagre as was at first supposed, because valuable historical information can be had from the Sanskrit literature, specially from the works on Smṛti. The starting point for Indian history can be pushed back further and the Purāṇic and other sources utilised for the purpose.

98. 1333. (21) ওরায় ষতীন্দ্রনাথ চৌধুরী (The late Rai Yatindranath Chaudhuri), XXXIII, 1, pp. 45-57.

99. 13333. (22) বুদ্ধদেব কোন ভাষায় বক্তৃতা করিতেন? (The Language in which Buddha used to deliver his Discourses), XXXIII, 2, pp. 91-103.

A specimen of the language prevalent at the time of Buddha is preserved in the short sentence inscribed on the casket found at Piprawa containing Buddha's relics. The peculiar feature of the language is that the letters *t*, *th*, *ḍ*, *ḍh*, *ś*, *ṣ*, *h*, and *ḥ* are not used in it. Rājaśekhara, the author of the *Kāvya-mimāṃsā* informs us that about the same period, Śisunāga of Magadha introduced in his palace a language that did not contain those letters, while Kubinda of Śūrasena also abolished the harsh sounding alphabets from the language similarly introduced by him. It is surmised that Buddha preached his religion in a language that was without these alphabets. As he had to deliver lectures in the various districts, the language adopted by him was such as was intelligible to all. The various languages through which Buddhism was propagated in subsequent times have been enumerated in the paper on the basis of lists in some ancient Buddhist works.

100. 1335. (23) সভাপতির অভিভাষণ (The Presidential Address, 34th Annual Meeting, V. S. Pariṣad), XXXV, 1, 1-7.

Sastriji advocates the view that on the strength of the evidences as furnished by the genealogies in the Purāṇas, Indian History should commence from the time of the Mahābhārata War (1512 B.C.). The gradual development of Indian thought in the domains of polity, religion, grammar, and dramaturgy required a very long time before the final stage could be reached. The history of India can therefore claim a greater antiquity than has hitherto been conceded.

101. 1336. (24) বঙ্গালার বৌদ্ধ সমাজ (The Buddhist Community of Bengal).
The Presidential Address, 35th Annual Meeting, V. S. Parishad,
XXXVI, 1, pp. 1-21.

It is pointed out in the paper that the Buddhists of Bengal have gradually been absorbed into the Hindu Society and their literature in its various branches has either been given a Hindu garb or has been replaced by new productions of the Hindus (same as 168.)

102. 1337. (25) সভাপতির অভিভাষণ (৩৬শ বার্ষিক) (The Presidential Address,
36th Annual Meeting, V. S. Parishad), XXXVII, 2, pp. 61-69.

The Address deals mainly with the work done in the V. S. Parishad in recent years.

103. 1337. (26) চিরঞ্জীব শর্মা (Cirañjīva Śarmā), XXXVII, 3, pp. 134-142.

Information is furnished in the paper about the life of Cirañjīva Śarman, a Bengali scholar of the 17th century, and two of his works, the *Mūdhava Campū* and the *Vidvanmodatarāṅginī*.

104. 1337. (27) কাশীনাথ বিদ্যানিবাস (Kāśīnātha Vidyānivāsa), XXXVII,
4, pp. 175-178.

This is an account of Kāśīnātha Vidyānivāsa, a Bengali grammarian of the 16th century. He was the acknowledged leader of the Bengali scholars of his time and took part in the proceedings of the meetings of Paṇḍits at Delhi for settling some controversial points of the Smṛti Śāstra.

105. 1338. (28) রত্নাকরশান্তি (Ratnākaraśānti), XXXVIII, 1, pp. 1-4.

The article presents an account of the great Buddhist teacher Ratnākaraśānti who was in charge of the Vikramaśilā monastery and had among his pupils Dipaṅkara Śrījñāna, the distinguished figure in the history of Tibetan Buddhism.

106. 1338. (29) ব্রহ্মপতি রায়মুকুট (Brhaspati Rāyamukuta), XXXVIII, 2,
pp. 57-64.

The article recounts the literary activities of Rāyamukuta (the well-known commentator of the *Amarakoṣa*), who flourished during the reigns of Gaṇeśa and his son Jalaluddin, kings of Bengal in the 15th century A.C.

107. 1338. (30) বাণেশ্বর বিদ্যালঙ্কার (Bāṇeśvara Vidyālaṅkāra), XXXVIII, 3,
pp. 135-144.

It contains details about Bāṇeśvara who with ten other scholars compiled the *Vivādārṇavasūtra*, a digest of Hindu Law, at the instance of Warren Hastings. This was translated into Persian and through it into English by Halhed as the *Code of Gentoo Law* (1776).

108. 1338. (31) রামমাণিক্য বিদ্যালঙ্কার (Rāmamaṅikya Vidyālaṅkāra),
XXXVIII, 4, pp. 215-218.

Rāmamaṅikya was a great Naiyāyika of the last century. He was Sastriji's maternal grandfather. Details about his life are found in this article.

109. 1339. (32) পুরুষোত্তমদেব (Puruṣottama Deva), XXXIX, pp. 1-6.

The paper deals with the literary works of the Buddhist scholar Puruṣottama who lived during the reign of Lakṣmaṇa Sena of Bengal. Puruṣottama's *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa* written as a supplement to the well-known Sanskrit lexicon of Amarasimha, has been shown to contain words indicating definite alterations and expansions of the religious views and practices of the people of Bengal.

THE NĀRĀYAṆA

A. Re. Kālidāsa's works

110. 1322. (1) কালিদাসের বসন্তবর্ণন। (The Description of Spring by Kālidāsa), II, 1, pp. 403-418.

It has been shown that the descriptions of the spring season occurring in the *Rtusamhāra*, *Mālavikā*, *Kumārasambhava*, and *Raghuvamśa* are found to be increasingly beautiful in the order of the four works just named. The delineation of feminine beauty has also become more and more charming in the same ascending order.

111. 1323. (2) ইরাবতী, (Irāvati), II, 2, pp. 709-722.

The paper describes how Irāvati, a favourite queen of Agnimitra, came to be gradually set apart from the king's heart through the jealousy of Dhāriṇī the first queen. The charming *Mālavikā* happened to be the instrument through which this change was effected in the king's love for Irāvati.

112. 1323. (3) পার্বতীর প্রণয় (Pārvati's Love), II, 2, pp. 810-824.

Pārvati's deep love for Mahādeva whom she tried to have as her husband through the severest austerities has been delineated in this paper. This love with the least element of selfishness in it has been pointed out as the best form of love described in Kālidāsa's works.

113. 1323. (4) উর্বাশী-বিদায় (The final Parting of Urvaśī), III, 1, 249-255.

It is a description of the pathetic parting of Urvaśī from Purūravas at the expiry of the period of twenty-two years during which she stayed on the earth. Her departure was contingent over the sight of her son.

114. 1324. (5) বিরহে পাগল (Demented through Separation), III, 2, 552-564.

It gives a picture of the extremely perturbed mental condition of Purūravas at the time when Urvaśī accidentally turned into a creeper in Kārttikeya's garden. This condition lasted till the restoration of Urvaśī to her normal state at the accidental touch of the creeper by Purūravas.

115. 1324. (6) কোমলে কঠোর (Sternness in Tenderness), III, 2, 623-628.

The sternness existing in the midst of tenderness has been illustrated in the cases of Bharatamuni cursing Urvaśī and Kaṇva sending away Śakuntalā immediately after his knowledge of her secret marriage with Duṣyanta.

116. 1324. (7) কণ্ঠের কোমল স্নিগ্ধতা (The tender Aspect of Kaṇva's Nature), III, 2, 659-671.

The paper shows how Kaṇva and the inmates of his hermitage viz. Gautamī, Anasūyā, and Priyamvadā were all extremely tender towards Śakuntalā.

117. 1324. (8) কথের কঠোর বৃত্তি (The stern Aspect of Kaṇva's Nature). III, 2, 842-849.

It delineates in detail how Kaṇva and his disciples were stern towards Śakuntalā after her marriage with Duṣyanta and during the disciples' visit to the royal court.

118. 1324. (9) শকুন্তলার মা (The Mother of Śakuntalā), III, 2, 944-949.

The article shows how Menukā, mother of Śakuntalā, marked from heaven with tender care her daughter's career on the earth and gave her protection as soon as she fell into distress.

119. 1324. (10) ছদ্মস্তের ভাঁড় মাধব্য (Mādhavya the Court-Jester of Duṣyanta), IV, 1, pp. 35-43.

The paper details the activities of Mādhavya, the Vidūṣaka in the *Abhijñānaśakuntala* to show that his intelligence was not so sharp as that of Gotama, the Vidūṣaka in the *Mālavikāgnimitra*. Though Mādhavya was sympathetic towards the king checking him in the most sentimental steps taken by him, yet he did not prove so helpful to Duṣyanta as Gotama to Agnimitra in the love affairs.

120. 1324 (11) দুর্কাসার শাপ (The Curse of Durvāsas), IV, 1, pp. 85-90.

In the *Mahābhārata* Duṣyanta repudiates Śakuntalā through fear of public criticism, knowing very well that he married her. Kālidāsa introduces in his play the curse of Durvāsas, causing the king to forget Śakuntalā. This has served to keep unscathed the good name of the king. Moreover the curse brings about punishment of the lovers, who by reason of their passion disregarded duties towards society.

121. 1324. (12) শকুন্তলায় হিন্দুয়ানী (The Influence of Hinduism traceable in the Śakuntalā), IV, 1, pp. 163-170.

Unlike the earlier writings of Kālidāsa, the *Śakuntalā* bears a clearly religious impress. In the *Mālavikāgnimitra*, *Meghadūta*, and the *Vikramorvaṣīya* the poet thought more about the language and the plot than his religious ideal. The *Śakuntalā* has been shown to be permeated by the Brāhmaṇic influence. The play commences with Brāhmaṇas' benedictions which are fulfilled at the end. The delay in the fulfilment is also caused by a Brāhmaṇa's curse.

122. 1324. (13) এক এক রাজার তিন তিন রাণী (Kings with three Queens each), IV, 1, pp. 259-263.

It is pointed out that in the three dramas by Kālidāsa viz. *Mālavikā*, *Vikramorvaṣī*, and *Śakuntalā*, there is a mention of three queens but while in the first named drama all the three appear on the stage, only two do so in the second and only one in the last.

123. 1325. (14) অগ্নিমিত্রের ভাঁড় (Agnimitra's Court-Jester), IV, 1, pp 448-457.

The Vidūṣaka of Agnimitra in the *Mālavikāgnimitra* was smart, cautious, and diplomatic. It was through his cleverness that the king could easily meet and marry Mālavikā.

124. 1325. (15) কুমারসম্ভব—সাত না সতেরো সর্গ ? (The *Kumārasambhava*—has it 7 or 17 cantos?), IV, 2, pp. 523-527.

Sastriji is of opinion that the last ten cantos of the *Kumārasambhava* are not from Kālidāsa's pen because the style of writing and the portrayal of character in them is not like that in the first seven cantos.

125. 1325. (16) রঘুবংশের গাঁথনি (The Structure of the *Raghuvamśa*), IV, 2, pp. 638-643.

A superficial glance through the *Raghuvamśa* may give one the idea that it is a collection of poems on different heroes without any common purpose running through all of them. Sastriji is of opinion that it is an epic and the purpose running through them all is to show that Rāma was the greatest personality in contrast with all the other belonging to the solar dynasty.

126. 1325. (17) রঘুতে নারায়ণ (Nārāyaṇa in the *Raghuvamśa*), IV, 2, pp. 733-739.

In opposition to the view that the *Raghuvamśa* is a mere versified narrative like the Purāṇas, Sastriji points out that it contains the chief characteristic of an epic viz. the depiction of an ideal. This ideal is found in Rāma's character which forms the apex, as it were, of the poem. His ancestors like Raghu and Dilipa possess one particular virtue in a very high degree while his successors are deficient in the possession of virtues. They have all been used as a foil to manifest Rāma's greatness.

127. 1325. (18) রঘু আগে কি কুমার আগে ? (The *Raghu* or the *Kumāra*—Which is earlier?), IV, 2, pp. 820-829.

It has been shown here that the *Raghuvamśa* is a production of Kālidāsa's mature view. Comparing it with the *Kumāra*, it is found that the delineations of scenes and incidents in the *Raghuvamśa* contain signs of a master-hand. They are shorter but more beautiful than those in the other work. The striking similes for which Kālidāsa is famous are found in greater abundance in the *Raghu* than in the *Kumāra*.

128. 1325. (19) অজ-বিলাপ ও রতি-বিলাপ (The Lamentations of Aja and Rati), IV, 2, pp. 913-920.

The lamentations of Aja for Indumati and Rati for Madana in the *Raghu* and the *Kumāra* respectively have been compared, showing that the former is the production of Kālidāsa's mature age.

129. 1325. (20) রঘু-কাব্য বড় কিসে ? (Wherein lies the Excellence of the *Raghuvamśa*?), V, 1, pp. 45-50.

The excellence of the *Raghuvamśa* lies in the variety of descriptions, the delineations of different circumstances giving rise to different *rasas*, the use of perspicuous and appropriate language and musical metres.

130. 1325. (21) রঘুবংশের বাল্যলীলা (Boyhood in the *Raghuvamśa*), V, No. 2, pp. 170-176.

The paper shows how Kālidāsa treats of boyhood in the *Raghuvamśa* in connection with the lives of Raghu and Sudarśana.

131. 1325. (22) রামের ছেলেবেলা (Rāma's Boyhood), V, 1, pp. 323-332.

The object of the paper is to show that the delineation of Rāma's boyhood in the *Raghu* is masterly.

132. 1325. (23) রঘুবংশে প্রেম (Love in the *Raghuvamśa*), V, 1, pp. 409-420.

The love depicted in the *Raghu* is very much subdued but yet deep. The instances cited are found in the devotion of Sudakṣiṇā to Dilīpa, in the feelings expressed by Aja and Indumatī at their first meeting and in the references, made by Rāma in his conversation with Sītā during the aerial journey from Ceylon, to the intensity of love for Sītā felt by him in the places seen by them.

133. 1326. (24) রঘুবংশে প্রেম-বিরহ (The Pangs of Separation in the *Raghuvamśa*), V, 2, pp. 33-36.

The instances of the pangs of separation touched in the *Raghu* are Aja's lamentation for Indumatī after her decease, Rāma's grief for Sītā after her banishment, and Sītā's sorrow at separation from Rāma.

B. Re. Bankim Chandra

134. 1322. (1) বঙ্কিমচন্দ্র কাঁটালপাড়ায় (Bankim Chandra at Kā'tālpādā), I, 1, pp. 513-527.

The article contains Sastriji's reminiscences of Bankim Chandra whom he used to interview at his residence.

135. 1322. (2) বঙ্কিমবাবু ও উত্তর চরিত (Bankim Chandra on the *Uttara-rāmacarita*), I, 1, pp. 609-620.

It is a review of Bankim Chandra's criticism of Bhavabhūti's *Uttaracarita*. The adverse view taken by Bankim regarding Bhavabhūti's delineation of Rāma's character has been shown to be ill-founded.

136. 1325. (3) বঙ্কিমচন্দ্র (Bankim Chandra), IV, 2, pp. 563-570.

This paper contains many interesting details about Bankim Chandra throwing light on the way in which Sastriji's contact with the great novelist inspired him in his writings.

C. Miscellaneous

137. 1322 (1) রাধামাধবোদয় (Rādhāmādhavodaya), II, 1, pp. 31-43, and
& II, 1, pp. 638-648.
1323.

It is a Bengali epic written in the 19th century by Raghunandana Gosvāmin of Māḍo in the district of Burdwan. It deals with the love of Rādhā and Mādhava. It has been highly spoken of by Sastriji.

138. 1323. (2) তীর্থ-ভ্রমণ (Visits to holy Places), II, 2, pp. 1025-1035 :
and pp. 1138-1145.

It is an appreciation of an interesting book written by Yadunātha Sarvādhikāri on his travels on foot from Khānākul to Hurdwar. The details given in it about the many places visited by him are full and vivid.

139. 1323. (3) **দুর্গাপূজা** (The Worship of Durgā), II, 2, pp. 1174-1179.

It is a faithful picture of the four days during which the worship of Durgā is performed in the Bengali house-holds in the autumn every year. The devotion with which it is carried on has been made manifest in the description.

140. 1324. (4) **মেদিনীপুর পরিষদে সভাপতির বক্তা** (The Presidential Address delivered at the Midnapore Pariṣad), III, 2, pp. 731-740.

It deals with the prosperous condition of Tāmralipti as also its decline in regard to trade and commerce described in the *Daśāvalivivṛti* and gives an account of Midnapore and some of its literary men.

141. 1322. (5) **দুর্গোৎসবে নব-পত্রিকা** (The Nava-Patrikā in the Worship of Durgā), I, 2, pp. 1449-1462.

Plants and twigs of plants nine in number are constituted into a bundle and given in a rough way the shape of a deity. This is called Navapatrikā (lit. nine plants). Each of the plants or twigs (*rambhā, kacvī, haridrā, jayantī, bilva, dādimba, aśoka* and *māna*) represents a deity, whose worship forms an integral part of the worship of Durgā in autumn.

D. Re. Buddhism

142. 1321. (1) **বৌদ্ধ কাহাকে বলে ও তাঁহার গুরু কে ?** (Who is a Buddhist and who is his preceptor?), I, 1, pp. 57-70.

After explaining that in later times any one who took refuge in the Buddhist Trinity by uttering a set formula was a Buddhist, he shows how the reverence for the guru or the spiritual preceptor was found in gradually increasing degrees in Hīnayāna, Mahāyāna, Vajrayāna, and Sahajayāna.

143. 1321. (2) **নির্বাণ** (Nirvāṇa), I, 1, pp. 133-145.

At first sight, the Nirvāṇa as conceived in the Pāli literature i.e. in the Hīnayāna looks like extinction but Aśvaghōṣa explains it as a peaceful condition. Nāgārjuna argues that it is beyond our comprehension (*catuṣkoṭivinirmukta Sūnyatā*). The different parts of the stūpa have been explained as symbolising the progress of bodhicitta towards Sūnyatā. The introduction of the conception of Karuṇā in later times has also been pointed out.

144. 1321. (3) **নির্বাণ কয় রকম ?** (What are the forms of Nirvāṇa?), I, I, pp. 244-248.

The paper explains the two forms of nirvāṇa viz. *sopādīśeṣa* and *nirupādīśeṣa*.

145. 1321. (4) **কোথা হইতে আসিল ?** (Whence has it come?), I, 1, pp. 389-398; 459-467.

It has been shown here that the tribes who lived in Eastern India were not

like the Aryans in their thought and mode of living. It was they who paved the way for the reception of a system of thought and belief like Buddhism.

146. 1322. (5) হীনযান ও মহাযান (Hinayāna and Mahāyāna), I, 2, pp. 786-796.

The points of difference between the two yānas have been explained in this article.

147. 1322. (6) মহাযান কোথা হইতে আসিল? (Mahāyāna—whence has it emerged?), I, 2, pp. 945-953.

It was the Mahāsāṅghikas who were the predecessors of the Mahāyānists. They seceded from the Elders or the Theravādins as they could not come to an agreement on several points regarding discipline.

148. 1322. (7) সহজযান (Sahajayāna), I, 2, pp. 1056-1067.

The development of Sahajayāna from the doctrine of Mahāsukha in Nirvāṇa has been explained, and the tenets of the yāna have been pointed out from the writings of some of the Siddhācāryas.

149. 1322. (8) বৌদ্ধধর্মের অধঃপাত (The Downfall of Buddhism), I, 2, pp. 1199-1209.

The article enumerates and expatiates on the causes that led to the downfall of Buddhism in India.

150. 1322. (9) বৌদ্ধধর্ম কোথায় গেল? (Buddhism—Where has it disappeared?), II, 1, pp. 165-172.

The remnants of Buddhism traceable in Bengal after the Musalman invasion at different times from the 13th century to the present day have been treated in this article.

151. 1322. (10) এখনও একটু আছে (A Little is still left), II, 1, pp. 276-287.

The details about the Dharma cult as found in the different places in Bengal are found in this paper.

152. 1322. (11) উড়িষ্যার জঙ্গলে (In the Jungles of Orissa), II, 1, pp. 533-543.

The remnants of Buddhism as traceable in some places in Orissa at present and also as existent in the past few centuries in Orissa form the subject-matter of this paper.

153. 1323. (12) জাতক ও অবদান (The Jātakas and Avadānas), II, 2, pp. 927-934.

After pointing out the differences between the Jātakas and Avadānas, Sastriji speaks about several avadānas, and specially about Rai Bahadur Sarat Chandra Das's valuable discovery of the first 49 avadānas of the *Bodhisattvāvadāna-kalpalatā* by Kṣemendra.

154. 1323. (13) দলানলি (Schism). II, 2, pp. 1236--1243.

Sastriji explains the 10 points of the schism between the Theravādins and the Mahāsāṅghikas. They related to the strict discipline of the Buddhist Saṅgha against which the Mahāsāṅghikas raised their protest.

155. 1323. (14) মহাসাঙ্ঘিক মত (The Doctrines of the Mahāsāṅghikas), III, 1, pp. 204-208.

The paper explains how the Mahāsāṅghikas became *lokottaravādins* in their conception of Buddha, attached less importance to *vinaya* and the greatest importance to *prajñā*, and set up images of Buddha for worship.

156. 1323. (15) থেরবাদ ও মহাসাঙ্ঘিক (Theravāda and Mahāsāṅghika), III, 1, pp. 333-338.

It treats of the differences between the Theravādins and the Mahāsāṅghikas in their conceptions of the *Buddha-nidānas* (actions in the previous births that led a being to Buddhahood).

157. 1324. (16) মানুষ ও রাজা (The People and the King), III, 1, pp. 403-408.

The article gives details about the origin of man and king as given in the *Mahāvastu* and the *Aggaññasutta* of the *Dīgha Nikāya*.

THE PRAVASI

158. 1322. (1) বাঙ্গালী ভাষা ও সাহিত্যের গতি (The Tendencies of the Bengali Language and Literature), XV, 1, pp. 116-122 (same as 85).

159. 1322. (2) বাঙ্গালার প্রাচীন গৌরব (The Glories of ancient Bengal), XV, 1, pp. 157-173 (same as 84).

160. 1322. (3) হিন্দুর মুখে আরজেবের কথা (Light on the Reign of Aurangzeb from the Hindu Sources), XV, 1, pp. 291-296 (same as 86).

161. 1327. (4) লাইব্রেরী (Libraries), XX, 1, pp. 309-314.

It is a lecture delivered on the occasion of the opening of a public library. It gives details of various libraries in and outside India and dilates on the value of the institution as a means of diffusion of knowledge.

162. 1329. (5) কান্তকবি রাজনীকান্ত (সমালোচনা) (The Mellifluous Poet Rajanikānta—a review), XXII, 1, pp. 735-738.

163. 1333. (6) বৃহত্তর ভারত-পরিষদে আশীর্বাদ-পত্র (A message of good-will to the Greater India Society), XXVI, 2, pp. 314.

164. 1336. (7) কালিদাসের অভিধান (A Lexicon attributed to Kālidāsa), XXIX, 2, pp. 473-476.

In the Madras Government Oriental Library there is a Ms. entitled *Nānārthaśabdaratna* with a commentary called *Taralā* by Nicula. It has been described in the colophon as compiled by Kālidāsa. Sastriji is of opinion from internal evidences that the author may be the great poet Kālidāsa.

165. 1337. (8) অভিধান (Lexicology), XXX, 1, pp. 862-867.

It is a review of the *Calantikā*, a dictionary of Bengali words. It contains *inter alia* a discussion on some grammatical rules governing Bengali.

THE BHĀRATAVARṢA

166. 1333. (1) ঋষির মেয়ে (সমালোচনা) (Ascetic's Daughter—a review), XIV, 1, pp. 945-948.

167. 1333. (2) ঈকৃষ্ণ (সমালোচনা) (Śrīkṛṣṇa—a review), XIV, 1, pp. 328-330.

168. 1336. (3) বাঙ্গালার বৌদ্ধ সমাজ (The Buddhist Community of Bengal), XVII, 2, pp. 207-222, (same as 101).

THE MONTHLY VASUMATI

169. 1329. (1) নাট্যকলা (Dramaturgy), I, 1, pp. 137-140. (contd.).

170. 1329. (2) বঙ্কিমচন্দ্র (Bankim Chandra), I, 1, pp. 417-422; 604-608.

171. 1332. (3) বাঙ্গালা সাহিত্যে চিত্তরঞ্জন (Cittaranjana and the Bengali Literature, IV, 1, pp. 489-494.

172. 1333. (4) গুরুদাস-স্মৃতি (Reminiscences of Sir Gurudas), V, 2, pp. 291-294; 336-341.

173. 1334. (5) জহিন্সী (Jhinsi—a village near Mussoorie), VI, 2, pp. 54-57.

174. 1336. (6) কামন্দকীয় নীতিসার (The Kāmandakīya Nitisāra—a review), VIII, 2, pp. 634-636.

175. 1338. (7) "এস এস বঁধু এস আধ আঁচরে বস" ('Come, Darling, sit on half of my scarf'), X, 2, pp. 369-377.

It constitutes an effusion of Rādhā's love for Kṛṣṇa.

176. 1338. (8) ভবভূতি (Bhavabhūti), X, 2, pp. 549-556 ; 717-724

It contains a general discussion about Bhavabhūti and two of his dramas on Rāma and an analysis of one of them viz. the *Uttararāmacarita* with special references to its beauty.

177. 1338. (9) মহামহোপাধ্যায় মহাকবি মুরারদান (Mahāmahopādhyāya Murārdāna—the great poet of Rajputana), X, 2, pp. 881-884.

THE ANNUAL VASUMATI

178. 1333. (1) পাঁচ ছেলের গল্প (A Tale of Five Boys), pp. 4-7.
 179. 1334. (2) ক্যানোগী টিবা (Byānogi Tibbā—a place near Mussoorie), pp. 277-281.

THE PAÑCAPUṢPA

180. 1336. (1) ভারতের নাট্যশাস্ত্র (Bharata's Nāṭyaśāstra), II, pp. 262-267.
 181. 1337. (2) ভারতমল্লিক (Bharata Mallika), III, pp. 650-651.
 It is an account of Bharata Mallika (of Bengal) who wrote many works including commentaries on the *Mugdhabodha*, *Amarakośa*, *Bhaṭṭikāvya* etc.
 182. 1339. (3) সিংহল-দ্বীপ (The Island of Siṃhala), V, pp. 625-631.

THE RAṄGAPURA-SAHITYA-PARIṢAT-PATRIKA

183. 1321. রঙ্গপুর-সাহিত্য-পরিষদের চিত্রশালার ষারোদ্ঘাটন উপলক্ষে সভাপতির অভিভাষণ (The Presidential Address delivered at the Ceremony for the Opening of the Rangpur Museum), pp. 17-22.

THE BHARATI

184. 1326. স্বর্গীয় অক্ষয়চন্দ্র সরকার (The late Akṣayacandra Sarkar), vol. 46, pp. 417-424.

THE ĀGAMANI

185. 1326. নায়নের দুর্গোৎসব (The Worship of Durgā by a Brāhmaṇa), I, pp. 6-18.

This is a short story in which the annual worship of Durgā by a Brāhmaṇa was about to be discontinued in the family for want of funds after the Brāhmaṇa's decease. The Brāhmaṇa's son, only nine years old, managed however to get over the difficulty through his resourcefulness prompted by his extraordinary devotion.

THE UDBODHANA

186. 1324. বঙ্গ বৌদ্ধধর্ম (Buddhism in Bengal), XIX, pp. 345-355.

The paper relates how in ancient times Buddhism spread widely in Bengal and became deep-rooted in the province. It also explains the ways in which some Buddhist cults and institutions were absorbed into Hinduism.

THE SAHITYA

187. 1300. (1) কবি কৃষ্ণরাম (The Poet Kṛṣṇarāma), IV, 2, pp. 111-119.

Bhāratacandra, the author of the *Vidyāsundara*, borrowed the plot of his poem from Kṛṣṇarāma, son of Bhagavatidāsa of village Nimita near Calcutta.

188. 1326. (2) রামেন্দ্র বাবু (Rāmendrasundara), pp. 297-304 [Also published in the Hrishikesh Series No. I (1327), pp. 1-10].

THE MĀNASI

189. 1321. (1) কলিকাতা-সাহিত্য-সম্মিলনের অভ্যর্থনা সমিতির সভাপতির অভিভাষণ (The Address delivered by Sastriji as the President of the Reception Committee, Literary Conference, Calcutta), VI, 1, pp. 331-369.

The Address gives an historical account of 24-Parganas and Calcutta, and treats of the literary men of both these places. Next, it dwells on diverse topics such as the trade and commerce of Tamuk, and the colonizing and missionary activities of the people of Bengal.

190. 1321. (2) ঐ অভিভাষণের পরিশিষ্ট (Supplement to the foregoing Address), VI, 1, pp. 710-712.

THE MĀNASI O MARMAVĀNI

191. 1327. (1) অর্ধেন্দু-কথা (Reminiscences about Ardhendu), XII, 2, pp. 210-213.

192. 1331. (2) রাধানগর সাহিত্য-সম্মিলনে সভাপতির অভিভাষণ (The Presidential Address delivered at the Literary Conference, Rādhānagar), XVI, 2, pp. 217-228.

It traces the history of Khanakul Krishnanagar in the district of Hughly, gives an account of its literary men including Kaṇāda Tarkavāgīsa, Nārāyaṇa Vandyopādhyāya Thākura, Yadunātha Sarvādhikāri, and Rammohun Roy.

193. 1333. (3) বঙ্গীয়-সাহিত্য-পরিষদে শোক-সভা (Condolence Meeting at the Vaṅgiya Sāhitya Pariṣad), XVIII, 1, pp. 532-535 (same as 98).

THE NĀCAGHARA

194. 1331. অর্ধেন্দু-স্মৃতি (Reminiscences about Ardhendu). Two instalments.

THE SUVARNAVANIK-SAMĀCĀRA

195. 1331. (1) দেবেন্দ্রবিজয় বসুর কথা (Reminiscences about the late Devendravigaya Vasu), VIII, pp. 230, 231.
196. 1334. (2) অধরলাল সেন (The late Adharlal Sen), XII, p. 27.

VIJAYA

197. 1322. (1) অষ্টম বঙ্গীয়-সাহিত্য-সম্মিলনের সভাপতির অভিভাষণ (The Presidential Address, V. S. Sammilana, 8th Session), III, pp. 57-88 (same as 84).
198. 1322. (2) সাহিত্য-শাখার সভাপতি মহোদয়ের সম্বোধন (The Presidential Address, literary Section of the V. S. Sammilana, 8th Session), III, pp. 3-11 (same as 85).

THE PRACI

199. 1330. (1) ডাকা ও খনা (Dāka and Khanā), I, 1, pp. 141-144.

The popular Bengali verses containing wise sayings attributed to Dāka and Khanā are shown to have been composed after the Muhammadan conquest. The Buddhist deities Heruka and Vajravarāhī together are called Dāka in Nepal, but the sayings have nothing in them to evince their connection with Buddhism. The language of the verses and their subject rather indicate that Dāka belonged to East Bengal. Khanā describes herself as the wife of Mihira, son of Varāha, but the internal evidences show that she could not have been a daughter-in-law of the ancient astrologer Varāha of Avanti. She belonged rather to Bengal at a much later period.

200. 1330. (2) বিদ্যাপতি (Vidyāpati), I, 1, pp. 208-218.

Vidyāpati, the celebrated Maithila author of the 14th century, is generally regarded as a Vaiṣṇava poet and all his poems are taken to refer to the love of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa. It is contended in this paper that Vidyāpati was really a Śaiva, and his poems deal with love in general, having no particular connection with Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa.

201. 1330. (3) ব্রাত্য (Vrātyas), I, 1, pp. 527-532 [similar to 10 and 16, Lec. (1)].

THE PRAVARTAKA

202. 1330. পালবংশের রাজত্বকালে বাঙ্গালার অবস্থা (The Condition of Bengal during the Pāla Period), pp. 582-589.

The article deals with the condition of Buddhism and the indications of the revival of Brāhmaṇism in Bengal during the Pāla period and gives an account of the Nāthas.

NAVAYUGA

203. 1332. কয়টি তারিখ (নৈহাটী-সাহিত্য-সম্মিলনের ইতিহাস শাখায় পঠিত) (Some important Dates). pp. 1097-1099. Read at the Historical Section, V. S. Sammilana, Naihati.

It treats of Raja Gaṇeśa's conquest of a portion of Bengal in 1401 A.C. as known from the *Bālyalīlāsūtra*, the date of Śivasimha's (Vidyāpati's patron) accession to the throne in 1405 A.C., and the victory of Gaṇeśa (of Tirhut) over Arslan (see *Kīrttilatā*).

JOURNAL OF THE ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BENGAL

204. Pr., 1890. (1) *The Account of a Bengali Brahmin who obtained a high position in the Sinhalese Buddhist hierarchy in the 11th Century A.D.*, pp. 125-127.

A collection of 107 Sanskrit ślokas entitled *Bhaktiśataka* was published in Ceylonese character. The author Rāmacandra calls himself a *Kṣitisa* and a Buddhist. In the colophon again the author is described as a Brāhmaṇa (*bhūsa*), a master of the Buddhist scriptures (*Bauddhāgamacaḥravartin*), a teacher, and an inhabitant of Gauḍa. In the Sinhalese commentary by Sumaṅgala on the *Bhaktiśataka* the home of Rāmacandra is located in Varendra in the Rāḍha Maṅḍala of Gauḍa. The commentator further informs us that the author was made *Bauddhāgamacaḥravartin* by Rājā Parākramabāhu of Ceylon (who lived in the 11th century A.C.). It is inferred from some of the verses that Rāmacandra was persecuted for his Buddhist faith. As a voluntary exile in Ceylon, he was favourably received by the ruler.

205. Pr., 1890. (2) *A short Account of an old Gun recently dug up at False Point*, pp. 166-168.

A portion of the inscription on the gun, written in a character intermediate between the modern Bengali and old Kuṭila could be deciphered. It shows that a Hindu chief named Jayadhvaja Siṃha obtained this gun from a Yavana. The date appearing in the inscription, though not clear, has been suggested to be about 1525 A.C.

206. Pr., 1890. (3) *A Map of ancient Āryāvarta prepared by Nagendra Nath Vasu*, p. 204.

The route taken by the cloud messenger as described in Kālidāsa's *Meghadūta* has been shown in the map.

207. Pr., 1892. (4) *Notes on the Banks of the Hughli in 1495*, pp. 193-197.

Vipradāsa's work on the goddess Manasā dated (Śaka year 1417) 1495 A.C. contains an interesting account of the voyage of Cānd Saodāgar. His small fleet passed by many places situated on the banks of the Hughli. Accounts of these places as found in the ms. have been given in this paper.

208. J. 1893. (5) *On a new Find of old Nepalese Manuscripts*, pp. 245-255.

Twelve Sanskrit Mss. have been described in the paper. They include a Ms. of the *Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā* of Prajñākara and a complete Ms. of the *Cāndra Vyākaraṇa*. Some of the Mss. are copies of well-known works but are valuable for their ancient date.

209. Pr., 1893. (6) *Reminiscences of Sea-voyage in ancient Bengali Literature*, pp. 20-24.

The paper deals with accounts of sea-voyage found in five Bengali poems written between 1495 and 1595 A.C. One of them is called *Bāiś Kavir Manasā Maṅgal* in honour of the goddess Manasā compiled from the works of twenty-two poets.

210. Pr., 1893. (7) *Note on an inscribed Gun in the Armoury of the Nawab of Murshidabad*, pp. 24-26.

The inscription contains the name of Mahārājā Kṣṇacandra Rāya of Nadia. Jayadhvaja Siṃha previously mentioned in 206 is identified with an Ahom prince of Assam and the Yavana, from whom the prince obtained a gun, is no other than Mir Jumla, the Commander-in-Chief of Aurangzeb.

211. Pr., 1894. (8) *Ancient Bengali Literature under Muhammadan Patronage*, pp. 118-122.

This is a note on the Bengali versions of the *Mahābhārata* by Parameśvara Kavindra and Śrikaraṇa Nandin. The former translated Jaimini's *Mahābhārata* under the patronage of Parāgol Khān, a general of Husain Shāh at Chittagong, and the latter added portions to the translation under Parāgols' son, Chuṭi Khān.

212. Pr., 1894. (9) *Discovery of the Remnants of Buddhism in Bengal*, pp. 135-138.

The worship of Dharma Thākura prevailing in Western and Southern Bengal has been shown to have belonged to a Buddhist cult. Nine reasons have been advanced in support of this conclusion. Dharmarāja, though popularly known to be a form of Śiva, is in fact a name of Buddha, and the word Dharma or Saddharma refers to Buddhism, Dharma being one of the three objects of special devotion with the Buddhists. The Mantras used in the worship refer to Buddha and the annual Dharma-festival coincides with the birth-day of Buddha. The priests of Dharma Thākura are not usually Brāhmaṇas and unlike the temples of the Hindu deities the Dharma-temples face either the east or the south.

213. J. 1895. (10) *Buddhism in Bengal since the Muhammadan Conquest*, pp. 55-61.

Remnants of Buddhism were traceable even after the Muhammadan conquest in the provinces of Eastern India. Some Buddhist deities like Dharma and Kṣetrapāla are still being worshipped in Bengal in a Hinduised form.

214. J., 1895. (11) *Śrīdharmamaṅgala, a distant Echo of the Lalitavistara*, pp. 65-68.

The *Dharmamaṅgala* is a book for use by the Dharma-worshippers at their annual festival falling on the birth day of Buddha. In spite of many points of differences between the story of Lāu-sena in the *Dharmamaṅgala* and that of Buddha in the *Lalitavistara*, the two accounts resemble each other materially.

215. J., 1895. (12) *Note of Viṣṇupur circular Cards*, pp. 284, 285.

The paper contains a description of the game played with the help of 120 pieces of cards divided into 10 groups named after the ten incarnations of Viṣṇu. The play is said to have been invented by the Malla Kings of Viṣṇupur, Bengal.

216. Pr., 1896. (13) *A second Set of Viṣṇupur circular Cards*, pp. 2, 3.

The game played with forty-eight cards classified into twelve groups has been explained. One of the groups contains the figure of a Malla King. Some of the designs in the cards are identical with those on the Viṣṇupur circular cards.

217. Pr., 1896. (14) *The Discovery of Vidhiviveka, a unique Manuscript at Puri*, pp. 130, 131.

The note contains the notice of a ms. of Maṇḍana's *Vidhiviveka* on which Vācaspati has written a commentary called *Nyāyakaṅikā*.

218. J., 1897. (15) *Notes on Palm-leaf manuscripts in the Library of H. E. the Maharaja of Nepal*, pp. 310-316.

Of the several Mss. mentioned in the paper, two are very interesting. The *Yavanajātaka* (the Greek system of casting a horoscope) is described in its post-colophon note to be a work first translated into Sanskrit by Yavaneśvara from his own language, and then rendered into 4000 *Indravajrā* verses by Sphurjīdhvaja. The copy of the *Vimalaprabhā*, a commentary on the *Kālacakraṅtantrāja* is another valuable Ms. It is stated in the colophon that the commentary was written by Kamalavara in 1818 of the Nirvāṇa era (1175 A.C.) and was copied by two Bengalis.

219. Pr., 1897. (16) *Some ancient Burmese inscribed Pottery*, pp. 164, 165.

It contains a description of three bricks found in Burma, one with the representation of five figures of Buddha in *Bhūmiśparśa mudrā*, and the other two with the well-known Buddhist formula *Ye dharmā* etc. inscribed in a character prevalent in Eastern India during the Pāla period. As the cut of the faces of Buddha appears to be Indian, it is surmised that the bricks were taken away from India by the Burmese pilgrims.

220. J., 1898. (17) *The Discovery of a Work by Āryadeva in Sanskrit*, pp. 175-184.

Almost the whole of a small work ascertained later on to be *Cittavisuddhi-prakaraṇa* appears in the paper. It assigns a high position to the purity of heart for spiritual elevation, to the exclusion of the external purity.

221. Pr., 1898. (18) *India in Lakṣmaṇa Sena's Time from a rare Manuscript written in his Court*, pp. 190-192.

Dhoyi's *Pavanadūta* (then unpublished) describes places lying on the route to be taken by Pavana (Wind) while coming from Southern India to Bengal. These places have been identified as far as possible.

222. Pr., 1899. (19) *On a Manuscript of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñā-pāramitā written in Nālandā and discovered in Nepal*, pp. 39, 40.

The Ms. is interesting as it was copied at Nālandā in the 6th year of the reign of Mahipāla in the 11th century.

223. Pr., 1900. (20) *On a Turquoise Gaṇeśa*, pp. 69, 70.

While exhibiting a Turquoise, Sastriji identified the figure carved on it with Gaṇeśa having four faces and in company with a Śakti riding on a lion. An explanation of these peculiar features of Gaṇeśa was given by him on the basis of Rāghava Bhaṭṭa's commentary on the *Saradātīlaka*.

224. Pr., 1900. (21) *On the Manuscript of a Work on the Biography of one of the Pāla Kings of Magadha, Rāma Pāla (the Rāmacarita by Sandhyākara Nandin)*, pp. 70-73.

The paper contains a short account of Rāmapāla's reign on the basis of the first canto of Sandhyākara Nandin's *Rāmacarita*, written in verses with two meanings, one applicable to the hero of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the other to Rāmapāla.

225. Pr., 1900. (22) *On a Manuscript of Kulālikāmnāya, a Tantric Work in Gupta Characters of the 7th Century*, pp. 76, 77.

This is a description of the external appearance of a very old Ms., of the *Kulālikāmnāya* which is a part of a large work on Tantra entitled *Kubjikāmata*. It shows that all Tantras cannot be regarded as recent works.

226. Pr., 1900. (23) *On a Supplement of the Celebrated Lexicon*

Amarakoṣa by a Buddhist Author in very ancient Bengali Character, pp. 79, 80.

It has been shown from the fragment of a Ms. containing only four leaves of Puruṣottama's *Triḅāṇḁāśeṣa* that this work which forms a supplement to the well-known Sanskrit lexicon of Amarasimha contains words marking an expansion of vocabulary connected with Buddhism. The subject received a fuller treatment subsequently in the *Sāhitya Pariṣat Patrikā*, 1339, No. 1 (109) after the publication of the *Triḅāṇḁāśeṣa*.

227. Pr., 1900. (24) *Antiquities of the Tantras and the Introduction of Tantric Rites in Buddhism*, pp. 100-102.

The article describes three Tantric Mss., *Laṅkāvatāra* (not the well-known Buddhistic work of that name), *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā* and *Kulālikāmnāya*, written in Gupta character, proving the existence of Tantric works in the 5th century A.C. The later identification of Dharma of the Buddhist Trinity with Prajñā has been taken to have introduced Śakti worship in Buddhism, culminating in the development of a form of Tantricism.

228. Pr., 1901. (25) *On the Authenticity of the two newly discovered Manuscripts of the Vallāla-carita by Ānanda Bhaṭṭa, and their Importance in tracing the history of the caste-system in Bengal*, pp. 74, 75.

Ānanda Bhaṭṭa's work on Ballālasena, the king of Bengal, is based on three previous works of different authors. Written in 1432, about three hundred years after Ballāla's time, the work supplies information corroborated by other evidences.

229. Pr., 1901. (26) *A Note on the Existence of the Magii (Median Priesthood) in India at the present Day*, pp. 75-77.

It has been stated on the strength of a statement in Ānanda Bhaṭṭa's *Ballāla-carita* that the Brāhmaṇas known as Śakadvīpī or Śākaladvīpī are the descendants of the ancient Magii who came from Persia in two batches. Those who came earlier are called Śakadvīpī, and those who came after the Indo-Scythians and had established their capital at Śākala in the Punjab are called Śākaladvīpīs.

230. J., 1902. (27) *Bābhan*, pp. 61, 62.

The Bābhans or the Bhūmihāraḁas of Bihar and Benares, who claim to be Brāhmaṇas, are surmised to have been such originally but were subsequently converted to Buddhism.

231. J., 1902. (28) *Dhelāi Caṇḁī, a form of tree-worship*, pp. 1-3.

The paper was read at a meeting of the Asiatic Society of Bengal on the 3rd May, 1899. Though it was printed for the *JASB.*, 1902, it was kept back from publication, as the author wanted to make some additions. The article names some places in the district of 24-Parganas, where some date trees, believed as representing Caṇḁī, were worshipped with clods of earth thrown towards them. The deity thus propitiated, was believed to exercise a paci-

fyng influence over crying children. A few years after, the change was noticed that sweets were offered to the trees instead of clods of earth and the influence of the deity was believed to cover a wider field.

- 232.** Pr., 1902. (29). *On the Organisation of Caste by Ballāla Sena*, pp. 3-7.

The paper reproduces the details contained in the chapters of the *Ballālacarita* dealing with Ballāla's activities in connection with the reorganisation of castes in Bengal.

- 233.** Pr., 1902. (30) *Four Inscriptions of Mahāśiva Gupta and Mahābhava Gupta, of Kalinga and Kośala*, p. 89.

- 234.** Pr., 1902. (31) *The Identification of Rāmagiri, the starting Point of the Cloud in the Cloud-Messenger of Kālidāsa with Rāmgad hill in the Sirguja State*, pp. 90, 91.

- 235.** Pr., 1903. (32) *Obituary Notice of the Late Professor E. B. Cowell*, p. 52.

- 236.** Pr., 1904. (33) *Scientific Attainments of Dr. Ramkrishna Gopal Bhandarkar*, p. 30.

- 237.** J., 1905. (34) *History of Nyāya-śāstra from Japanese sources*, pp. 177-180.

The paper contains a bibliography of the Buddhist Nyāya system as known in China and Japan. As there is nothing in the *Nyāyasūtra* corresponding to the 'Nine Reasons' and 'Fourteen Fallacies' attributed by the Chinese sources to Soe-mok or Akṣapāda, it is conjectured that the *Nyāyasūtra* as we find it is a later production. It is also stated that the *Sūtra* as also its *Bhāṣya* by Vātsyāyana came into being after the emergence of the Mahāyāna school of Buddhism.

- 238.** J., 1905. (35) *An Examination of the Nyāyasūtras*, pp. 245-250.

Arguments have been adduced in this paper to show that the *Nyāyasūtra* is not the work of a single author. It has several irreconcilable passages. Moreover, one portion of the *Sūtra* deals with logic in three separate sections while the other with philosophy. Each of these two portions again has not come from the same hand, as can be inferred from the internal evidences. The original *sūtras* of Akṣapāda underwent changes at the hands of the Buddhists, and Mirok (Maitreyanātha) is actually credited in China with the introduction of the *Sūtras* relating to yoga into the Nyāya system.

- 239.** J., 1905. (36) *Some Notes on the Dates of Subandhu and Diñnāga*, pp. 253-255.

Subandhu, the author of the *Vāsavadatta* and Diñnāga, the great Buddhist writer are assigned to the beginning of the 5th century A.C.

240. J., 1908. (37) *A Kharoṣṭhī Copper-plate Inscription from Taxila or Takṣaśilā*, pp. 363-365.

A line in Kharoṣṭhī characters first read by Cunningham has been revised in the note.

241. J., 1909. (38) *A new Manuscript of the Buddhacarita*, pp. 47-49.

A lacuna of 11 ślokaś occurring in Cowell's edition of the *Buddhacarita* has been supplied from a Ms. of the work found in Nepal.

242. J., 1909. (39) *The Recovery of a lost epic by Aśvaghoṣa*, pp. 165, 166.

This is an account of the way in which Sastriji discovered the Ms. of the *Saundarananda* of Aśvaghoṣa.

243. J., 1909. (40) *The Origin of the Indian Drama*, pp. 351-361.

The paper discusses the tradition about the origin of the dramatic performance as recorded in Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra*. It also delineates the contents of the work together with his remarks on its language and author.

244. J., 1910. (41) *Causes of the Dismemberment of the Maurya Empire*, pp. 259-262.

It is stated in the paper that the Brāhmaṇa subjects of Aśoka were much displeased at the Emperor's activities in favour of Buddhism. It was this that prompted them to lend their whole-hearted support to Puṣyamitra, who wrested the throne from a descendant of Aśoka.

245. J., 1910. (42) *Refutation of Max Mueller's Theory of the Renaissance of Sanskrit Literature in the 4th century A.D., after a lull of seven centuries from the time of the rise of Buddhism*, pp. 305-310.

A large number of Sanskrit works written between the 4th century B.C. and the 4th century A.C. has been cited in the paper to refute Max Müller's theory that the Sanskrit language fell into disuse during the period.

246. J., 1910. (43) *The Bhāṣāpariccheda*, pp. 311-314.

It has been ascertained from the family chronicles of Bengali Brāhmaṇas and some other Mss. that Viśvanātha Nyāyapañcānana, the author of the *Bhāṣāpariccheda* lived in the first half of the 17th century. He was the son of Kāśīnātha Vidyānivāsa and grandson and great-grandson of Ratnākara Vidyāvācaspati and Narahari Viśārada respectively.

247. J., 1910. (44) *Discovery of Abhisamayālamkāra by Maitreya-nātha*, pp. 425-427.

Though Maitreya-nātha's *Abhisamayālamkāra* is usually found as an annex to the Ms. of the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, yet it is a separate

work. The reason for subjoining it to the *Pañcaviṃśati* lies in the fact that the *Pañca*° has been recast in the light of the exposition of the Buddhist doctrine and philosophy as contained in the treatise.

248. J., 1911. (45) *Notes on the newly found Manuscript of the Catuśśatikā by Āryadeva*, pp. 431-436.

The notes contain a description of the contents of the *Catuśśatika* as found in a manuscript-fragment of the work.

249. J., 1912. (46) *The Bardic Chronicles*, pp. 145-147.

As a specimen of the Bardic lays current in Rajputana a stanza has been quoted in this note with the story explaining the same.

250. J., 1912. (47) *Who were the Śuṅgas?* pp. 287, 288.

From an analysis of the Gotra connections, the Śuṅgas have been identified with a class of Brāhmaṇas professing the Sāmaveda. The Śuṅgas had connection with Bharadvāja through the father's side and with Viśvāmitra through the mother's side.

251. J., 1912. (48) *A note on Bhaṭṭi*, p. 289.

It has been pointed out that Bhaṭṭi appears in the colophon of a manuscript of the *Bhaṭṭikāvya* to have been an inhabitant of Balabhī.

252. J., 1912. (49) *Remarks on M. M. Chakravarti's Paper on Bhaṭṭa Bhavadeva of Bengal*, pp. 347, 348.

The arrival of learned Brāhmaṇas in Bengal at the invitation of Ādisūra in the 8th century was a fact. It is also pointed out that Bhavadeva mentioned in Jivadevācārya's *Bhakti-bhāgavatamahākāvya* cannot be identified with the Bengali author of the same name, who built the temple at Bhuvaneśvara.

253. J., 1912. (50) *Theories to explain the Origin of the Visen Family of Majhawali*, pp. 373-377.

The paper deals with all the theories advanced to explain the origin of the Visen family of Oudh, and suggests that Viśvasena, a Kṣatriya king of Benares ruling three or four centuries before Buddha may have been the founder of the family. Originally the Visens had the surname Sena which was replaced by Malla in later times.

254. J., 1914. (51) *Relics of the Worship of Mud-Turtles (Trionychidæ) in India and Burma*, pp. 134-136.

Some instances of the use of Mud-turtles in worship and iconography in Northern India have been enumerated, including the practice of Dharma-worship in Bengal where the Dharma of the Buddhist triad is represented by a tortoise. An explanation of this icon is found in the fact that as Dharma was first represented by a stūpa or mound which in later times took the shape of a tortoise on account of the provision of five Dhyāni Buddhas, the Dharma-worshipper took Dharma to be a tortoise-shaped deity.

255. Pr., 1919. (52) *Obituary Notice of Dr. Hoernle*, pp. ccxxxi-ccxxxii.

256. Pr., 1920. (53) *Annual Address* (1919, ASB.), pp. xxi to xxvii.

This presidential address delivered at the annual meeting of the Society contains an account of the progress of Oriental Studies in connection with the discovery of archaeological monuments, publication of ancient works, collection of old manuscripts and establishment of Oriental Associations.

257. Pr., 1921. (54) *Annual Address* (1920, ASB.), pp. xviii-xxv.

It has been suggested on the strength of an interpretation of the Vrātya hymns of the *Atharvaveda* that Śiva was originally a god of the Vrātyas and these Vrātyas formed a group of non-Vedic Aryans who roamed about in hordes (vrātas) outside the region inhabited by the Vedic Āryans.

258. Pr., 1926. (55) *Lord Curzon 1859-1925*, (Obituary Notice), pp. clx-clxi.

259. Pr., 1926. (56) *Sir R. G. Bhandarkar 1837-1925*, (..), pp. clxv-clxvi.

260. Pr., 1927. (57) *Manomohan Ganguli 1880-1926*, (..), pp. clxiy-clxv.

261. Pr., 1927. (58) *Sir Alfred Woodley Croft 1841-1925*, (..), pp. clxxi-clxxii.

262. Pr., 1928. (59) *F. E. Pargiter 1852-1927* (Obituary Notice), pp. clxiv-clxv.

263. J., 1929. (60) *R̥gveda in the making*, pp. 307-309.

The paper deals with the arrangement of the hymns of the *R̥gveda* as indicated in the *Aitareya Āraṇyaka*, and shows how the division into Maṇḍalas generally follows the order mentioned in the *Āraṇyaka*. It has been stated on the basis of a passage in the *Kāmasūtra* that the Aṣṭaka division of the *R̥gveda* is later as it was introduced by the Brāhmaṇas of Pañcāla some time before Buddha.

MEMOIR, ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BENGAL

264. 1924. (61) *A Note on 'A Working Model of the Origin of the Ganges in a Temple in Ganjam,'* VIII, No. 4, pp. 255, 256.

Pr., 1912, p. cxxxiv.

Important manuscripts copied in the 12th century A.C. were exhibited by Sastriji at a meeting of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. One of them was a Ms. of the *Pañcaviṃśati-Śatasāhasrikā-ratnasañcayagāthā* which was translated into Chinese in 981 A.C. Another was a complete code of Hindu law by Govindarāja, the well-known commentator of Manu.

Pr., 1912, p. cxxxiii.

A genealogical tree of the Rāthor family and a photograph of Shihoji, the founder of the family, were exhibited.

THE CALCUTTA REVIEW

- 265.** 1898. (1) *The Diary of Govinda Dāsa*, CVI, pp. 79-96 and 372-383.

The article is an analysis of the contents of *Gobindadāser Kaḍacā*, a Bengali work of the early 16th century. Govindadāsa who accompanied Caitanya to the various places of pilgrimage wrote this *Kaḍacā* or diary describing the places visited by him. The account commences with the description of Caitanya's home, companions, and routine of work, and gives details of his journey from Bengal to the sacred places in Southern India.

- 266.** 1898. (2) *Topography of Govinda Dāsa's Diary*, CVII, pp. 172-184.

Some places mentioned in the *Diary* have been identified and their details given.

- 267.** 1903. (3) *Sanskrit Learning in India*, CXVII, pp. 106-110.

Beginning with a brief account of the vast literature in Sanskrit touching almost every branch of study, Sastriji dilates on the usefulness and the superior method of teaching of the Calcutta Sanskrit College, the only institution in Bengal where the benefits of the University can be had without being deprived of the advantages of the indigenous Ṭol training.

- 268.** 1917. (4) *Bengali Buddhist Literature*, pp. 390-407.

The paper deals with the contents of the Dharmamaṅgala literature and the *Bauddha Gāna O Dohā* (21). Cf. 87.

- 269.** 1930. (5) *A Study of the Mahāvastu* (a review), pp. 439-443.

THE DACCA REVIEW

- 270.** 1914. (1) বঙ্গীয় সাহিত্যসম্মিলন (৭ম অধিবেশন, কলিকাতা), অভ্যর্থনা সমিতির সভাপতির অভিভাষণ, পৃ: ১৬০—১৬১. (same as 188).

- 271.** 1915. (2) *The Dramas of Bhāsa*, pp. 301-310.

It gives descriptions of the plots of thirteen dramas of Bhāsa.

- 272.** 1921. (3) *The Buddhists in Bengal*, pp. 91-104.

The main thesis of the paper is to show that the Buddhist community and Buddhism in Bengal were gradually absorbed by the Hindu Society and Hinduism. The communities which at present labour under some social dis-

advantages were originally Buddhists. The Buddhists were the influential classes in the province and therefore the brunt of the Muhammadan invasion had to be borne by them. After the disruption of their community, they had to be content with a disadvantageous position in the society of their adoption. The worship of Dharma Ṭhākura and the Vaiṣṇava orders of the Sahajiyās and Nāḍhā-Nāḍhis had a Buddhist origin.

THE INDIAN ANTIQUARY

273. 1912. (1) *Dakshini Pandits at Benares*, pp. 7-13.

This is an account of the literary and other activities of a few Brāhmaṇa families who came from Southern India and attained a great influence at Benares through their scholarship. Seven such families have been named in the paper. Details about Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa, Śaṅkara Bhaṭṭa, Vidyānidhi Kavindra, Gāgā Bhaṭṭa, Nāgojī Bhaṭṭa and Vaidyanātha Pāyaguṇḍe are found in the article.

274. 1912. (2) *On the Date of Subandhu*, pp. 15, 16.

In a letter, Sastriji further substantiates his own view as against Hoernle by stating that he has found the name Subandhu and not Vasubandhu in several Mss. of Vāmana's work.

275. 1913. (3) *Sāntideva*, 1913, pp. 49-52.

The available details about the life of Sāntideva, the author of the *Bodhicaryāvatāra* and other works, are found in the article. He has been identified with Bhuauku, a Siddhācārya, who composed songs in a language which was essentially Bengali.

276. 1913. (4) *King Candra of the Meherauli Iron Pillar Inscription*, pp. 217-219.

King Candra of this inscription in which he is credited with victories in Bengal and Punjab had been identified by V. Smith with Candragupta II. This paper identifies Candra with Candravarman, the lord of Puṣkarāṇa in Western India mentioned in the Śuśunia Rock Inscription. V. Smith accepted this view in the third edition of his *Early History of India* (p. 90).

THE EPIGRAPHIA INDICA

277. 1913-14. (1) *Mandasore Inscription of the time of Naravarman*.
The Mālava year 461, XII, No. 35, pp. 315-321.

By a comparison of the genealogies of Naravarman and Candravarman found in this inscription and the Śuśunia Rock Inscription respectively, these two kings have been ascertained as brothers. It has also been pointed out that Candravarman is identical with Candra of the Meherauli Iron Pillar Inscription, and the latter cannot be identified with Candragupta II.

278. 1915-16. (2) *Śuśunia Rock Inscription of Candravarman*, vol. XIII, p. 133.

It is a short record in Sanskrit inscribed on the Śuśunia hill in the district of Bankura in Bengal. Its historical importance has been pointed out in 276 and 277.

JOURNAL OF THE BIHAR AND ORISSA RESEARCH SOCIETY

278. 1915. (1) *Search for Sanskrit Manuscripts*, pp. 57-65.

It is an interesting account of the search for manuscripts from its beginning in India. It takes note of what has been achieved in the field not only in the various provinces of British India but also in the Indian States.

280. 1915. (2) *Kālidāsa—his Home*, pp. 197-212.

Arguments have been adduced in the article to show that Kālidāsa was an inhabitant of Malwa and was born in the town of Daśapura or near about 15 miles from the right bank of the Chambal.

281. 1916. (3) *Kālidāsa—his Age*, pp. 31-44.

Evidences have been given in the paper to prove that Kālidāsa flourished in the latter half of the period between 404 and 533 A.C.

282. 1916. (4) *Kālidāsa,—Chronology of his Works and his Learning*, pp. 179-189.

According to Sastriji, the works were written by Kālidāsa in the following chronological order: *Rtusamhāra*, *Mālavikā*, *Meghadūta*, *Vikramorvaśī*, *Kumāra*, *Sakuntalā*, and *Raghu*.

283. 1916. (5) *Reply to B. C. Mazumdar's Note on 'Kālidāsa—his Age,'* pp. 391-392.

284. 1916. (6) *Seven Copper-plate Records of Land Grants from Dhenkanal*, pp. 395-427.

The paper deals with five grants made by the Sulki family (one by Raṇastambha, one by Kulastambha and three by Jayastamba), the sixth grant by a queen named Tribhuvana Mahādevī, and the seventh by a ruler called Jayasimha. The original home of the donee of the first grant of Jayastambha is Kolāñca, a name identical with that of the place whence the forefathers of the Rāḍhiya Brāhmaṇas are said to have come at the invitation of Ādiśūra.

285. 1917. (7) *Tezpur Rock Inscription*, pp. 508-514.

The inscription records the settlement of a dispute for tolls between the local Zemindars, the boatmen, and the people who towed the boats. Its importance lies in the fact that it provides a definite date for a line of kings of Prāgjyotiṣa mentioned in the plates. The record shows that the Gupta era was used in Tezpur in the 9th century A.C., and that the Pañcakula Brāhmaṇas were even then influential as far east as Assam.

286. 1917. (8) *Puṃsavana Ceremony*, pp. 557-559.

The ceremony is performed in the beginning of the third month after conception to get a male child. Sastriji has given a description of the sacrament as observed in different ways by the followers of the Sāma-, Rg-, and Yajur-Vedas.

287. 1918. (9) *Gazetteer Literature in Sanskrit*, pp. 14-25.

It is an account of some Sanskrit works including Jagamohana's *Desāvaliṅgī* and Rāmakavi's *Pāṇḍavadigvijaya*, describing various places and furnishing information about their area, population, trade and commerce etc.

288. 1918. (10) *Tekkali Inscriptions of Madhyamarāja, the son of Petavyāloparāja*, pp. 162-167.

This copper-plate containing names of kings believed to belong to the Sailodbhava family of Koṅgaḍa in Kalinga is assigned to the 11th century.

289. 1918. (11) *Grant of Raṅastambhaḍeva*, pp. 168-171.

Raṅastambha of the Sulki family issued this grant from the Sulki head-quarters Kodālaka. The land granted belonged to a village called Jārā in the district of Jārā in the Rāḍha Maṅḍala. The paper points out that there is a village called Jārā on the border between the districts of Hughly and Midnapur, both belonging to Rāḍha. There are even now in Midnapur influential cultivators who call themselves Sulki tracing their origin to a place called Kedālaka.

290. 1918. (12) *Khaṇḍadeuli Inscriptions of Raṅabhañja Deva*, pp. 172-177.

This grant executed by Raṅabhañja Deva on the occasion of the birth of his grandson contains a genealogy of the Bhañja dynasty of Mayurbhanj. The accurate decipherment of words in this inscription has served to correct the misreadings of other Bhañja inscriptions.

291. 1919. (13) *Literary History of the Pāla period*, pp. 171-182.

The account has been divided into four sections: (1) Sanskrit Brāhmaṇic Literature, (2) Sanskrit Buddhist Literature, (3) Vernacular Buddhist Literature, and (4) Preachers of Buddhism.

292. 1919. (14) *Śiśunāga Statue*, pp. 552-563.

The Śiśunāgas of Magadha are identified with the Vrātyas, because the dress of the statues is like that prescribed for the Vrātyas in the *Kātyāyana-Śrautasūtra*.

293. 1919. } (15) *Contributions of Bengal to Hindu Civilization*, 1819,
1920. } pp. 307-324, 492-510; and 1920, pp. 54-68 (same as 84).

294. 1920. (16) *Two eternal Cities in the Province of Bihar and Orissa*, pp. 23-49.

The first part of the paper is an account of the activities of distinguished personages connected with the city of Pāṭaliputra (Cf. *Magadhan Literature, Lecture II—The Seven Great Writers*). The second portion contains a description of Tosali, identified with the Dhauli of the present day. It was a prosperous city in ancient times.

1920. (17) *Two Copper-plates from the States of Bonai*, pp. 236-245.

- (1) Grant of Vinītatūṅgadeva.
(2) Grant of Udayavarāha.

- 296.** 1921. (18) *Caturaṅgam* (A four-handed game of Chess played with dice), pp. 62-77.

Satarañja is the Arabic form of *Caturaṅga*. The double chess now in vogue all over the world is a development of the quadruple form of *Caturaṅga*. The double chess went from India to Persia, Arabia, and other countries. An account of the four-handed game has been given from Raghunandana's *Tithitattva* and translated into English.

- 297.** 1922. (19) *Chronology of the Nyāya System*, pp. 13-28.

The Nyāya system of Gautama developed, according to Sastriji, in two different ways. The Brāhmaṇas fostered it both as an art of controversy and as a system of theistic philosophy, while the Buddhists and the Jainas only as the science of Logic. The chronology of the Nyāya system has been traced from the time of the *Nyāyasūtra* which is said to have been compiled in the 3rd century A.C. to the time of Udayana who wrote his works at the beginning of the 11th century.

- 298.** 1923. (20) *Chronology of the Sāṃkhya Literature*, pp. 151-162.

While dealing with the chronology of the Sāṃkhya Literature from the time of Kapila downwards, a description of a work called *Kapilasūtraṭṭi* has been given. This is a commentary on 22 Sūtras regarded as the root of the entire Sāṃkhya system.

- 298.** 1928. (21) *The Mahā-purāṇas*, pp. 323-340.

In this address delivered at the Annual General Meeting of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society, the contents of the 18 Mahāpurāṇas have been discussed in a general way.

THE BHANDARKAR COMMEMORATION VOLUME

- 300.** 1917. *Bombay in the eleventh Century*, pp. 249-254.

In the *Ḍākārṇava*, a Tantric work of the 12th century A.C., mention is made of a goddess called Mumbanī along with many other goddesses, each of whom bore a name derived from that of the place in which her temple was situated. Sastriji identifies Mumbanī with Mumbā-devī, whose shrine now stands on the Malabar Hills in the city of Bombay, to which this is the earliest indirect reference.

THE BUDDHISTIC STUDIES

- 301.** 1931. *Chips from a Buddhist Workshop*, pp. 818-858.

The article deals with the following topics: (1) Buddhists under persecution, (2) the position of Vasumitra, (3) the *Mahāvastu* and Vasumitra, (4) origin of the split, (5) the *Laṅkāvatāra*, a new tradition, (6) *Bodhisattva-piṭaka*, (7) the development of the yānas, (8) the three kāyas.

THE INDIAN HISTORICAL QUARTERLY

302. 1925. (1) *The Northern Buddhism* (in three instalments). I, pp. 18-30; 201-213; 464-472.

This is an account of the origin and development of Northern Buddhism through its various phases.

303. 1925. (2) *Bhadrayāna*, I, pp. 769-771.

The special doctrine of this Buddhist school is, as has been put by Sastriji, "non-duality mixed with Karuṇā accompanied with supreme knowledge and supreme means of salvation." The Guru is regarded by the followers of this school as all the Buddhas put together. The doctrine was introduced by one Dharmapāda and then preached by Bhāde or Bhādrapāda who wrote a few Bengali songs. The only available treatise of the school is by Kuddālapāda, a disciple of Bhāde.

304. 1926. (3) *A Copper-plate Grant of Viśvarūpa Sena of Bengal*, II, pp. 77-86.

The plate throws much light on the later history of the Sena Dynasty in Bengal. It has been edited here with some improvements upon previous readings of the inscription.

305. 1927. (4) *The Malla Era of Viṣṇupur*, III, pp. 180-181.

It has been ascertained from a date given in the colophon of a ms. that the initial year of the Malla Era current in Viṣṇupur in the district of Bankura in Bengal is 694 A.C. The era was introduced by the founder of the Malla dynasty of Viṣṇupur.

306. 1930. (5) *Chāndogya-mantrabhāṣya, a Pre-Sāyaṇa Commentary on select Vedic Mantras* (a review), pp. 782-785.

THE JOURNAL OF THE BUDDHIST TEXT AND RESEARCH SOCIETY

307. 1893. (1) *English Translation of 'Bhaktiśataka'* with Sanskrit Text, I, 2, pp. 21-43.

308. 1894. (2) *A short Note on the Mahāyāna and Hinayāna Schools*, II, 2, pp. 6-11.

The Note is an English translation of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* dealing with the differences between the Hinayāna and the Mahāyāna schools of Buddhism.

309. 1894. (3) *Notes on the Svayambhūpurāṇa*, II, 2, pp. 33-37.

The *Svayambhūpurāṇa* is a Buddhist work of not more than 250 years. It was written in glorification of the Svayambhūkṣetra, a holy place for the Buddhists in Nepal. The work gives *inter alia* interesting descriptions of Nepal and China.

310. 1894. (4) *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*, chapter xviii (translation). *The Evolution of Sūnyatā*, II, 3, pp. 10-15.
311. 1894. (5) *The Relation of Bengali to Pāli and Sanskrit. Which is more Intimate?* II, 3, pp. iii-v.
According to Sastriji the relation of Bengali to Pāli is more intimate than that of Bengali to Sanskrit.
- 311a. *A Note on the Sūnyatā Philosophy of the Northern Buddhists*, II, 3, pp. v, vi.

KEGAN PAUL TRENCH AND TRUEBNER'S JOURNAL

312. *Superstitions prevalent in the Sunderbans* (referred to at p. 13 of the pamphlet entitled 'Mm. Haraprasad Sastri,' 1916, Hare Press, Calcutta).

ADDITIONS TO THE LIST

313. 1322. কালিদাসের মেয়ে দেখান (Kālidāsa's Manner of Introduction of the Heroines). *The Nārāyaṇa*, 1, 2, pp. 1096-1104.
314. সীতার স্বপ্ন (Sītā's Dream). *Ibid.*, 1, 2, pp. 1153-1159.
315. 1339. ভারতবর্ষের ধর্মের ইতিহাস (Notes on the Development of Religion in India). *The Vaṅgaśrī*, 1, 1, pp. 4-9.
316. *Report on the Bodh-Gaya Temple* written in collaboration with Mr. Justice Sarada Charan Mitra.
The Commission was appointed by the Government to report on certain points, regarding which information was needed to decide whether the management the Bodh-Gayā Temple should continue in the hands of the Hindu Mahānta.
317. An unpublished article বাঙ্গলা শকুন্তলার জুবিলি (A paper read on the occasion of the 50th performance of the *Sakuntalā* in Bengali).
References are made to the following papers written by Mm. H. P. Sastri in

THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE A.S.B.

1902. pp. 3-7. Re. *The Kaivartas driving away the Pālas*.
1904. p. 38. *Evidences of Slave-Trade in the Mughal Empire*.
1912. p. cxxiv. *A Biography of Śāntideva, the author of the Bodhicaryāvatāra*.

APPENDIX II

1853. 6th December. Birth.
1876. Passed the M.A. examination.
1880. Selected as a Commissioner of the Naihati Municipality of which he became the Chairman subsequently.
1883. Appointed as a lecturer in the Calcutta Sanskrit College and also as an Assistant Translator to the Government of Bengal.
1885. Elected as a member of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. Became also a member of the Philological Committee and was put in charge of the publications belonging to the Bibliotheca Indica.
1886. Appointed as the Librarian of the Bengal Government Library. Held this post up to 1894.
1888. Nominated as a Fellow of the Senate of the Calcutta University and a member of the Calcutta Central Text-Book Committee.
1891. Appointed as the Director of the operations in search of mss. by the Asiatic Society of Bengal.
1895. Selected as the Secretary of the Buddhist Text and Research Society, Calcutta.
1897. First visit to Nepal.
1898. Decorated with the title of 'Mahāmahopādhyāya.'
- 1898-99. Second visit to Nepal with Prof. Bendall.
1900. Appointed as the Principal of the Calcutta Sanskrit College.
1903. Worked as a member of the Commission appointed by the Government of Bengal to report on the Bodh-Gaya Temple.
1907. Third visit to Nepal.
1908. Retired from the Principalship of the Calcutta Sanskrit College. Made a tour of many places in Northern and Central India in company with Prof. Macdonell.
1909. Commissioned by the Asiatic Society of Bengal on behalf of the Government of India to report on the Bardic mss. in Rajputana.
1911. The title of C.I.E. was conferred on him.
1913. Elected as the President of the Vaṅgiya Sāhitya Pariṣad. He continued in this office altogether for 12 years.

1914. Presided over the 8th session of the All-Bengal Literary Conference at Burdwan and over the Literary Section of the Conference.
1918. Presided over the Midnapore Literary Conference.
- 1919-20.
& President of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.
- 1920-21.
1921. Elected as an Honorary Member of the Royal Asiatic Society, London. Appointed as the Professor in charge of the Sanskrit and Bengali department of the Dacca University.
1922. Fourth visit to Nepal. Honoured by the Vaṅgiya Sāhitya Pariṣad at a meeting organised by it for the purpose. Presided over the meeting of the All-India Hindu Sabha at Calcutta. Presided over the section of Sanskrit and Prakrit Literature of the 2nd Oriental Conference held at Calcutta.
1924. Presided over the 15th session of the All-Bengal Literary Conference at Radhanagar, the birth-place of the great social reformer Raja Rammohan Roy.
1927. The title of D. Lit. was conferred on him by the Dacca University.
1928. Presided over the 5th session of the Oriental Conference held at Lahore.
1930. Elected as the president of the Greater India Society. He held this office for two years.
1931. A function was held under the auspices of the Vaṅgiya Sāhitya Pariṣad to present to him, on his attainment of the 75th year, the first volume of the *Haraprasād Saṃvardhana Lekhamālā* (edited by Dr. S. K. Chatterjee and the present writer) and the unpublished articles meant for its second volume (published in 1932) as a token of its members' homage to the savant.
1931. 17th November (Tuesday). Decease.

My thanks are due to Mr. Naliniranjan Pandit Sahitya-bandhu and Mr. Chintaharan Chakravarty, M.A., whose *Jivanīpañji* (Biographical Table) and *Lekhapañji* (List of writings) in the *Saṃvardhana-Lekhamālā* (V.S. Pariṣad Series, No. 80, 2 vols.) edited by Dr. S. K. Chatterjee and the present writer in honour of Mm. H. P. Sastri have facilitated the collection of materials for the two Appendices.



An Image from Bodh Gayā

THE Indian Historical Quarterly

Vol. IX

JUNE, 1933

No 2

A Bodh-Gayā Image Inscription

The inscription, dealt with here for the first time, is incised on the pedestal of a figure of the Buddha representing the stage of effort prior to his attainment of Buddhahood. The inscription consists of four lines, the first of which is nearly intact and the last has almost completely disappeared with the peeling off of stone from the inscribed surface. The two intermediate lines, too, have been materially damaged in parts apparently for the same reason. The possibility of restoration of the missing letters and words is far remote until a counterpart of the inscription is somehow discovered on the pedestal of another figure of the same description. The figure is evidently carved in the red sand-stone of Mathurā, and the inscription is written in that form of Brāhmī characters that goes to connect it with the large number of Jaina and Buddhist image inscriptions that are incised during the reign of the Kuṣāṇa rulers, Kaṇiṣka, Huviṣka, Vāsiṣka and Vāsudeva, and it may be that chronologically it is somewhat posterior to them.

Its language, like that of the Mathurā inscriptions of the Kuṣāṇa age, is not quite Sanskrit in the sense that it does not entirely keep clear of Prākṛt elements, such as those which linger in the words *bodhisatva-
paṭimā sīharathā*, *°upāsikāye*, *sahāyētīye* and *pūjāye*.

It is dated in Saṃvat 64 of a then current era, the identity of which is still a matter of dispute. If its reference is to the Śaka era, its date must be set down as A.D. 142 (78 + 64); if to the Gupta, the date is

A.D. 384. So long as the contemplated era remains uncertain,¹ the main guide to chronology is bound to be an argument from the general development of Indian iconography, palæography and official language. Such an argument may enable the historian to assign safely the inscribed figure to the 2nd or the 3rd century A.D. The lower limit of its date may be fixed with the help of Fahien's account of Bodh-Gayā. This Chinese pilgrim visited Bodh-Gayā in the beginning of the 5th century A.D. He noticed a novel feature in the development of the artistic life of Bodh-Gayā, in that he could see a few figures of the Buddha installed in the then existing sanctuaries,—the earlier sanctuaries that were chiefly the erections of Kuraṅgī, the elderly queen of King Kauśikiputra Indrāgnimitra. The figure of the Buddha was out of the question at about the close of the 1st century B.C., when Kuraṅgī set up the old stone-railing around the original Bo-tree, the little Diamond-throne temple, the old Jewel-walk shrine, etc. at Bodh-Gayā. The inscribed image under notice must be one of the figures seen by Fahien on the sacred site of Bodh-Gayā at the time of his visit. The epigraph also attests that two such images were installed, both of which were *sīharathū*, each resting, probably as it did, on the back of a pair of lions, as is the case with some of the Bodhisattva figures in the sculptures of Amarāvati.

The incompleteness of the text of the inscription will always be regretted for the simple reason that it refers to some other works of merit, the nature of which can no longer be ascertained. It is interesting, however, to observe that the shrine in which the two Bodhisattva figures were installed is described in the inscription as *amātyadhura-vihāra*. *Dhura* is a Buddhist technical term and means 'way'. There are two kinds of *dhuras*: *ganthadhura* (way of study) and *vipassanū-dhura* (way of meditation) open to the followers of the Buddha. It may be that the shrine containing the two figures was a sort of chamber for study or meditation which was erected by a royal minister. The figures are described as *śailikū-bodhisattva-paṭimā*, the

1 Some of the local scholars suggest the Kalachuri as the probable era. This era commenced in A.D. 249.

stone images of the Bodhisattva. The text given here is based partly on the remnant of the lingering inscription on the pedestal of the image in the Indian Museum and largely on the photograph published by Cunningham of the colossal figure and of the inscribed pedestal in his *Mahābodhi*, pl. XXV.

TEXT

- L. 1 Mahārājasya Tr(i)kamalasya¹ sa[m] 60 4 (gri) (3) (di) 5
 ?? sya pū(r)vva² bh(i)kṣu - vinaya(dharas)ya vihārasya
 sadhevihārī vitā³.....kṣu.....
- L. 2 Amātya-dhura-vihāre svakena samartha ś????(ś)ailikā bodhi-
 satva-paṭimā sīharathā pratisthāpayati 2 [.] Upāsikāye
 arthadha(r)ma-sahāyetiye dhat?..... ? kṣu.....ye sarvvā.....
- L. 3(ś)ahāyatā dharmā-kathikena ??tā [-] Imenā kuśalamūlena
 mātāpitrñā[m] pūjāye bhavatu upādḥ?.....jāye.....
- L. 4ye ? vva.....[.]

Translation

- L. 1 Just prior to Saṃvat 64, the third month of the hot season and
 the fifth day of (the reign of) the great ruler Trikamala, the
 fellow-monk.....residing in the monastery of a Vinayadhara
 Bhikṣu (a monk conversant with the Vinaya discipline).....
- L. 2 set up by his own means two lion-supported stone-images of
 the Bodhisattva (the Buddha still in the stage of effort) in the
 monastic chamber (for study or meditation) erected by (a
 royal) minister. By a Buddhist female lay worshipper who was
 the helper of the cause to the advantage of the efficacious doctrine
 (*arthadharmaśahāyetrī*).....
- L. 3 a work of merit has been done by a preacher of Buddhism with
 the help.....Let (the merit) arising from this root of good
 serve for the honour of mother and father (and for the benefit of
 the preceptor.....and progeny).....
- L. 4

B. M. BARUA

1 Cunningham reads *Tukamāta*^o or Lüders, *Trīkamata*.

2 The intended spelling may be *pūrvvāyām*.

3 The intended spelling may be *sārdhavihārī vinā*.

Bogle's Embassy to Tibet

Until 1624 no European set foot in Tibet. On 30th March of the year Antonio De Andrade, a Portuguese missionary working in the Jesuit Mission at Agra proceeded to Tsaparang in Tibet where he stayed for some days and created an interest in the mind of the king of the place about his mission. The next year again he went to the same place and was so successful in his work that a church was founded there with the help of the king himself. Owing to his influence with the king he soon began to rise in public estimation and to play a part in political affairs. Some time before 1630 he returned to India and was appointed Provincial of the Company of Jesus at Goa where he died on 19th March 1634. The mission at Tsaparang also soon ceased to exist.¹ References are found of some more Christian missionaries who visited the country often on their way to China and India, and a Dutchman named Van der Putte, who was a learned man and a good observer, is said to have resided at Lhasa for several years before he went to China. But in subsequent years the Tibetan Government very carefully guarded the passes of the Himalayas and did not allow strangers to go freely through them.²

The British connection with Tibet is said to have begun thus: In 1772 Deb Judhur, the Chief of Bhutan, and a vassal of the Tibetans, overran Sikkim, descended into the plains of Bengal, attacked Cooch-Bihar and carried off the Rājā as a prisoner. The people of Cooch-Bihar applied to Warren Hastings, the then Governor of Bengal, for assistance. He immediately despatched a battalion of sepoy's under Jones, defeated and drove the invaders back and even seized their own country. The Bhutanese thereupon appealed to the Tashi Lāmā of Tibet to intercede for them with the Governor of Bengal. The Lāmā wrote to Warren Hastings a letter, (received on 29th March 1774), expressing regret for the aggressions of his vassal and requested him to cease hostilities against him and invited him to friendship. Warren Hastings restored Bhutan and concluded a treaty with that king in April 1774. He

1 Dr. L. D. Barnett, *JII.*, vol. II, p. 241.

2 *Historians' History of the World*, vol. XXIV, p. 505.

wrote to the Lāmā in reply proposing a general treaty of amity and commerce between Bengal and Tibet and obtained a passport for a European to proceed to Tibet for the negotiation of the treaty.³ He selected Mr. George Bogle, a servant of the Company, well known for his intelligence, assiduity and exactness in affairs and gave him the following instructions dated May 13, 1774:

“I desire you will proceed to Lhasa The design of your mission is to open a mutual and equal communication of trade between the inhabitants of Bhutan (Tibet) and Bengal, and you will be guided by your own judgment in using such means of negotiations as may be most likely to effect this purpose. You will take with you samples for a trial of such articles of commerce as may be sent from this country And you will diligently inform yourself of the manufactures, productions, goods, introduced by the intercourse with other countries, which are to be procured in Bhutan.”⁴

Mr. Bogle, accordingly, set out from Calcutta with Mr. Hamilton as his assistant in the middle of May 1774. He went through Bhutan by way of Tassisuden in the middle of October and on 23rd of the month reached Phari Jong at the head of the Chumbi Valley. Here he was received by two Lāmā officers and on 26th he arrived at Paridrong on the frontier of Tibet. On 12th November he arrived at Desherepgay near Chamuaning, north of the Tsanpo river where he had an interview with the Lāmā and delivered to him a letter and a necklace of pearls from Warren Hastings. He stayed at this place for some days, made enquiries about the trade of Tibet as directed by Warren Hastings and sent to him a Memorandum on the trade of Tibet (vide pp. 425-9) along with his letter dated 5th December 1774 (see p. 424, letter No. 1) from this place. How carefully he had studied within a short time at his disposal the economic advantages that might result from the intercourse of trade between India and Tibet can be seen also from his other Memorandum on the money and merchandise of Tibet (see p. 430-1, letter No. 3)⁵

Bogle soon became very friendly with the Tashi Lāmā who treated

3 Sir Francis Younghusband, *India and Tibet*, pp. 4-7.

4 Markham's *Mission of Bogle*, p. 6.

5 See also S. C. Sarkar's article 'Notes on the Intercourse of Bengal with the Northern countries' in the *Proceedings of the Meeting of Ind. Hist. Rec. Comm.*; vol. XIII, p. 99.

him in the most intimate manner and assured him that his heart was well disposed towards the English. But the real object of Bogle's mission to open a channel of commerce between Tibet and Bengal could not bear any fruit. The Tashi Lāmā, though convinced of the mutual advantages and well disposed towards the English, had no power to decide the point. At his request two deputies of the Regent of Lhasa came to see Bogle but they were averse to the proposal of allowing trade to be carried on between the two countries and put forth some excuse or other. Once they said that the Tibetans were afraid to go to Bengal on account of the heat. Another time they said that they could not do anything without the permission of the Chinese. The Tibetan authorities did not like Mr. Bogle to go to Lhasa and made him resolve to go back to Bengal. At his farewell interview the Tashi Lāmā said to Bogle: "I wish the Governor will not at present send an Englishman. You know what difficulties I had about your coming into the country and how I had to struggle with the jealousy of the Regent and the people at Lhasa. Even now they are uneasy at my having kept you so long. I would wish that the Governor would rather send a Hindu."⁶ The Lāmā handed over Bogle a letter to be given to Warren Hastings containing a request about the grant of a land to him on the banks of the Ganges on which he might build a Buddhist temple and a resthouse for the people of his country who may visit Calcutta for purposes of trade.

Bogle returned to Calcutta in June 1775. It can be seen that he was not completely successful in his mission. In fact his master Warren Hastings also could not have expected any very striking result from the first communication. It was inevitable that Bogle should be viewed with suspicion and that the Tibetans should not, all at once, throw off their country freely open to trade.⁷ One great advantage of the mission, however, was that Bogle could secure the sympathies at least of the Tashi Lāmā towards the British who maintained a correspondence with him. A friendly mission was subsequently sent to Calcutta by the Tashi Lāmā which was received with hospitality. Warren Hastings procured a plot of land on the bank of the Hooghly branch of the Ganges

⁶ Younghusband *India and Tibet*, p. 23.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

opposite to Calcutta and fulfilled the wishes of the Tashi Lāmā by building a Buddhist temple there for him.⁸ In 1779 Warren Hastings decided to send Bogle himself again to Tibet. But unfortunately the mission could not be undertaken. The reason was this: The Chinese Emperor learning that the Tashi Lāmā had established a correspondance with the English Government entertained suspicions about him and ordered him to see him at his capital. The Tashi Lāmā accordingly went to China where he died a mysterious death in 1780. Some said that Lāmā's servant, at the instigation of the Emperor of China, put poison into his food, while others spread different reports.⁹ But from the letter of the chief minister of Lāmā himself dated 28th October, 1781 sent to the Governor-General and published below (see pp. 433-6, letter No. 4) it is seen that Lāmā's death was due to small-pox! The letter states that upon the invitation of the Emperor of China to see him the Tashi Lāmā set out from his place on 5th April 1779 and met the Emperor on 29th March 1780 at a place called Seur Potaulah. Both the Emperor and the Lāmā stayed there for one month and then proceeded to Peking, the Imperial capital. But to Lāmā the water and air of China proved adverse. Irruptions of small-pox came forth and the Lāmā retired from this perishable world on 4th July 1780.¹⁰ Subsequently Bogle himself died in Calcutta on 3rd April 1781.

An account of Bogle's mission to Tibet has been published by Markham in which some of Bogle's letters on the subject are published. Below are published five letters which have hitherto escaped publication. The first three are preserved in the Records of the Government of India at Calcutta. Their copies were very kindly supplied to me by Mr. Abdul Ali, the Keeper of the Records. The last two letters are preserved in the Historical Museum at Satara in the Bombay Presidency. They were found in the collection of Lord Macartney purchased by the late Rao Bahadur D. B. Parasnis from an auctioneer in London.

8 *Bengal Past and Present*, vol. XXVI, pt. II, p. 195.

9 *Bengal Political Consultations* dated October 1792. Paper forwarded by the Resident at Benares—received 15th September 1792.

10 In the *Bengal Past and Present*, vol. XXVI, p. 195 and in Young-husband's *India and Tibet*, p. 26 the date of the death of the Tashi Lāmā is given as 12th November 1780. It seems to be wrong in the light of this letter.

No. 1

To

The Hon'ble Warren Hastings,
President and Governor &ca &ca

Hon'ble Sir,

I had the honor to advise you of my arrival on the frontier of Thibet in a short address of the 26th of October. I left Paridrong next day accompanied by some of Teshoo Lama's servants and arrived here on the 12th ultimo.

The Lama received your letter and presents very graciously and I have every reason to be satisfied with his reception.

Having represented to him your desire of opening a free intercourse of trade between the inhabitants of Bengal and this country he has given me assurances of his ready endeavours to bring it about; but as he intends in a few days to return to Teshoo Loombo his capital, where he will have an opportunity of consulting with the merchants, he delays coming to any determination at present. In the meantime he has written to Lahassa on the subject, from which he expects the arrival of some officers to congratulate him on his return.

Teshoo Lama's character and abilities, his having discovered and placed the present Delay Lama in the chair at Potalo, his being favored by the Emperor of China, and his having obtained from him the appointment of Gesub Rambackay, the present chief, give him great influence. The seat of government, however, is at Lahassa. The Emperor of China is paramount sovereign and is represented by two Chinese officers who are changed every three years. These men are to report to their Court the state of the country but I am told seldom interfere in the management of it, which during Delay Lama's minority is entrusted to Gesub and four ministers. Teshoo Lama has a number of villages and monasteries belonging to him which are scattered over Thibet and intermix with those of the Delay Lama. To attempt to explain the nature of a Government where so many different interests are blended together would oblige me to enter into details, which, as my imperfect knowledge of the country might hardly justify, I at present would rather wish to avoid.

I take the liberty of enclosing a memorandum of the trade of Thibet and have the honor to be

Hon'ble Sir &ca,
George Bogle

Desherepgay,
near Chamuaning
the 5th December 1774.

MEMORANDUM BY MR. BOGLE ON THE TRADE OF THIBET*Of the trade and productions of Thibet*

The foreign trade of Thibet is very considerable. Being mountainous, naturally barren, and but thinly peopled, it requires large supplies from other countries and its valuable productions furnish it with the means of procuring them. It yields gold, musk, cowtails, wool and salt; coarse woollen cloth and narrow serge are almost its only manufactures. It produces no iron, nor fruit, nor spices; the nature of the soil and of the climate prevents the culture of silk, rice, and tobacco, of all which articles there is a great consumption; but the wants of the country will best appear from an account of its trade. In this sketch, however, I propose only to give the outlines, which I will beg leave afterwards to fill up and correct.

Its foreign merchants

The genius of this Government, like that of most of the ancient kingdoms in Hindostan, is favorable to commerce; no duties are levied on goods, and trade is protected and free from exactions. Many foreign merchants, encouraged by these indulgences, or allured by the prospect of gain, have settled in Thibet.

Cashmirians

The natives of Cashmire, who, like the Jews in Europe, or the Armenians in the Turkish Empire, scatter themselves over the Eastern Kingdoms of Asia and carry on an extensive traffic (*Sic*) between the distant parts of it, have formed establishments at Lahassa and all the principal towns in this country. Their agents, stationed on the coast of Coromandel, in Bengal, Benares, Nephaul (*Sic*) and Cashmire, furnish them with the commodities of these different countries, which they dispose of in Thibet or forward to their associates at Seling, a town on the borders of China.

Facquiers

The Gossienes, the trading pilgrims of India, resort hither in great numbers. Their humble deportment and holy character heightened by the merit of distant pilgrimages, their accounts of unknown countries and remote regions, and above all their professions of high veneration for the Lamas, procure them not only a ready admittance but great favors; though clad in the garb of poverty there are many of them possessed of considerable wealth; their trade is confined chiefly to articles of great value and small bulk. It is carried on without noise or ostentation, and often by paths unfrequented by other merchants.

Tartars

The Calmacks, who with their wives and families annually repair in numerous tribes to pay their devotions at the Lama's shrines, bring their camels loaded with fur and their Siberian goods.

Inhabitants of Bootan and Assam

The Bootecas and the other inhabitants of the mountains, which form the southern frontier of Thibet, are enabled by their situation to supply it as well with the commodities of Bengal as the productions of their own States.

The people of Assam furnish it with the coarse manufactures of their kingdom.

Chineze

The Chineze, to whose empire this country is subject, have established themselves in great numbers at the capital, and by introducing the curious manufactures and merchandize of China, are engaged in an extended and lucrative commerce; and thus Lahassa, being at the same time the seat of Government and the place of the Dalai Lama's residence, is the resort of strangers and the centre of communication between distant parts of the world.

Its trade with China

The most considerable branch of commerce is with China; it is carried on by the natives of that kingdom, and by the Cashmirians and the Lama's agents who proceed to Seling, and sometimes even to Peking. The imports are coarse tea, of which the consumption is immense; flowered and brocaded sattins of various kinds, pelong, handkerchiefs, silk thread, furs, porcelain cups, glass, snuff boxes, knives and other cutlery, talents of silver, and some tobacco. The returns are made in gold, pearls, coral, chanks, broadcloth, and a trifling quantity of Bengal cloths.

With Siberia

The productions of Siberia are imported chiefly by the Calmacks, or by the way of Seling. They consist of furs, red and black bulgar hides, cow-tails, some dromedaries, bastard pearls and silver, and are bartered for broadcloth, coral and amber beads, spices and gold.

With Cashmire

The Cashmirians naturally engross the trade with their country. It is not considerable. The imports are chiefly sugar, dried raisins and other fruits the exports are goats, wool and gold. The imports from Assam are spices and timber, muggadooties, and other coarse manufactures of silk and linen.

With the Debe Rajah's Kingdom

The native productions of the Debe Rajah's country brought into Thibet are rice, wrought iron, coarse woollen cloth, and some munjeck, which are exchanged for tea and other Chinese commodities, rock salt, wool, sheep skins and narrow frizes for their home consumption.

With Nephaul

The productions imported from Nephaul are chiefly iron and rice; but as these two countries have been the principal channels of communication between Bengal and Thibet, it is necessary to give a more particular account of them.

Ancient commercial state of Nepaul

While Nepaul was divided among the different States of Catmaund, Pattan, Badgaund and Goorka, and remained under the Government of Rejahs independent of each other's authority, every encouragement was given to trade. A very moderate duty was levied on goods; the country, populous and well cultivated, easily furnished the means of transporting them, and the merchants, free from spoil or exactions, settled in Nepaul and contributed to enrich it at the same time that they improved their own fortunes. Some disputes arose among these petty Chiefs.

Conquest of it by Goorka

They went to war, and Perti Narrain, the Rajah of Goorka, was called in to take part in the quarrel; having subdued the enemy, he turned his arms against his allies; and partly by treachery, partly by the exertion of superior abilities, has after a war of twentyfive years, made himself master of the whole of the country and united it under one Government.

Effect of this revolution

But although the wealth of Nepaul furnished Goorka with the means by which he rose, he neglected to cherish the source from whence it flowed. Mistrustful of subjects disaffected to his Government he entertained a number of troops on regular pay. He disciplined them; he furnished them with firearms; he formed an artillery and left nothing undone to render himself formidable; the stated revenue of countries where a standing army had hitherto been unknown was unequal to those extraordinary expences, and Goorka, among other expedients, had recourse to imposing high duties on trade in order to defray them. The merchants, subject to heavy and arbitrary fines upon the most frivolous pretence, or obliged to purchase the protection of a tyranical Government by presents scarce less oppressive, quitted a country where they could no longer enjoy that freedom and security which is the life of commerce. The Gossienes, who had formerly very extensive establishments in Nepaul, having incurred Goorka's resentment by the assistance which they afforded his adversaries, were driven out of the kingdom; and many of the most wealthy inhabitants, being stripped of their possessions or exposed to the exactions of a conqueror, likewise deserted it. Two Cashmirian houses only remain, and the Rajah, afraid of their also abandoning him, obliges them to give security for the return of such agents as they have occasion to send without the boundaries of his dominions.

Trade with Bengal through the Debe Rajah's country

The trade between Bengal and Thibet through the Debe Rajah's country used formerly to be engrossed wholly by the Booteas. Two of the Cashmirian houses however who fled from Nepaul, being unwilling to forego the gainful

commerce in which they had hitherto been concerned, settled at Lahassa, and having obtained permission from the Debe Rajah to transport their goods through his territories established agents in Bengal; but as they are prohibited from trading in broadcloth and some other considerable articles. and as their traffic is carried on to no great extent, and all other merchants are excluded, it by no means compensates the loss which Bengal has sustained by the interruption of its commerce through Nephaul.

Through Morung

The commodities of Bengal used also to be conveyed into Thibet through Morung and a province adjoining to it, which is subject to Lahassa and governed by a Chief styled Deuro Jung. The facquiers when expelled from Nephaul generally frequented this road, but being esteemed unhealthy it was not adopted by any creditable merchants. Goorka, however, having extended his conquests over the first of these countries, and having lately invaded the other, all intercourse is at present interrupted.

By way of Banaris

Besides these different communications, there is a road leading from Banaris and Mirzapoor, through the Mustang country and the hills to the northward of Bulwang Sing's territories, which are subject to the Rajahs who still preserve their independence. The more valuable sorts of Bengal goods are sometimes imported into Thibet by this channel. But although the merchants travel in perfect security and receive every assistance from these petty chiefs, the length of the way, the difficulty of the road, through a mountainous and in several places uninhabited country, and the intermediate profits upon the goods, render it far from eligible. Of late years it has become more frequented on account of its being almost the only means of communication.

Nature of this trade

The principal articles of merchandize between Bengal and Thibet are broadcloth, attar, skins, neel (indigo), pearls, coral, amber, and other beads chank, spices, tobacco, sugar, Malda striped sattins, and a few white cloths, chiefly coarse; the returns are made in gold dust, musk and cowtails.

Of the money of Thibet

A knowledge of the current species and of the proportional value of money in a country is of capital importance towards understanding the nature of its trade, but the intricacy of the subject and the variety of circumstances requisite in forming a just notion of it oblige me at present to mention it only briefly. There are no mints in Thibet. Payments are made in talents of China and Tartary in small bulses of gold dust or in the coin of the former Rajahs of Catmaund and Pattan, which is the established species of the kingdom. The

circulation of their rupees, which were of a base standard, proved very beneficial to these Chiefs, and Goorka, as soon as he had firmly established his authority in Nephaul, endeavoured to introduce his coin into Thibet. For this purpose he sent a deputation to Lahassa with a large sum of rupees struck in his name, and desired the sanction of Government to circulate them through the country. The merchants aware of Goorka's ill-faith, refused to accept them, and the Government returned him this artful answer,—We are willing to receive your coin, provided that you take back all the money of Nephaul which is now in circulation. This condition was neither for Goorka's interest, nor in his power to comply with. Nothing since has been done in this important affair. The old specie continues to pass; but the channel by which it was introduced having been long stopped up, it has rose greatly above its former value, as well in proportion to the talents of silver as to the gold dust.

No. 2**BENGAL SECRET CONSULTATIONS**

9 May 1775 (pp. 2177-2179)

The Governor General having received the following Letter from Mr. George Bogle he lays it before the Board.

To

THE HON'BLE WARREN HASTINGS,

President and Governor, &c., &c., &c.

Hon'ble Sir,

Having received no Letters from Calcutta for several Months past, and having had no Accounts of the Dispatches I did myself the Honor to send you of the 5th December having reached Beyhar, I have declined addressing you from the Belief that my Letters would not arrive safe, and this Consideration will I hope serve to justify the Shortness of the present Trouble.

I have continued to receive repeated Marks of the Lama's Favor, and at his Desire have remained thus long at Terhoo Loembo. I propose in a few days to take Leave of him and begin my Journey towards Bengal; in Company with the Gossisne who was formerly sent by him to Calcutta; and a Priest who is to attend me to Tasserudden and second me with the Deb Rajah.

I have at present only to request that you would be pleased as a Mark of Attention to the Lama, to give Orders to the Custom Masters at Moorshedabad and Houghley to pass our Boats without Duty, and in Case you have sent me any Commands subsequent to your Letter of the 10th August, that you would be so good as order a Copy of them, together with such further Instructions as you may think proper to favor me with, to be sent to the Care of Lieut.

Williams, to whom I shall give such Directions, as may insure their safe Arrival with me at Tasserudden.

Teeshooloombo, the 28th March, 1775.

I have the Honour to be &c.

GEORGE BOGLE.

The Governor General proposes to direct Mr. Bogle to settle the Terms of a free Trade with the Rajah of Tassaruden and if necessary even to yield the Tribute annually paid by the Bootan Caravan which comes annually to Rungpore which he (the Governor General) is informed by Mr. Du Casel amounted in the year 1178 to 2105 Narainny Rupees which is no Object compared with the Advantages that may be derived to the Company by opening a new Channel of Trade which may be particularly advantageous to the Sale of Broad Cloth and Coral, the two principal Imports from Europe.

The Proposition being agreed to Resolved that the Governor General do authorise Mr. Bogle to conclude a Treaty with the Rajah upon the above Conditions.

No. 3

TO

THE HON'BLE WARREN HASTINGS,

Governor-General, &ca., &ca., &ca.

Fort William.

Hon'ble Sir,

I have already laid before you a report of my late mission into Thibet as it was impossible, at the time of my appointment, to foresee any probable expenses,¹¹ in countries hitherto unknown, and on a business entirely new, no fixed allowance was made for them. They were left to be defrayed by me as the circumstances should require, and I was ordered to give in an account of them on my return, which I have now the honour to submit to you.

Except the charge of servant's wages, they consist chiefly of presents; the other expenses of my journey being very inconsiderable. For according to the practice in Bootan and Thibet, accommodations of all sorts were provided for me on the road. During my stay in the first of these countries, I had a house allotted for my residence, and provisions supplied me by the Government.

¹¹ The paper accompanying this letter and giving the expenses is not found.

While I remained with Tesho Lama I lived in his palace, and every necessary was provided for me by his orders.

A sense of this hospitality, a regard to the character of the nation I represented, and above all the desire of forming a connection and good understanding with people hitherto strangers to the Company, and of facilitating my negotiations as to trade, rendered presents on my part necessary. These I have charged; and at the same time have given credit for such gold dust &c. as I received in return. But I have taken no notice of some pieces of silk, blankets, and Tanyan Horses, as they were of little value and rather entailed upon me an expense. Neither have I charged such of my own effects as I gave away; or other expenses merely personal.

I have only to add, that as you were pleased to prohibit me, and Mr. Hamilton who accompanied me, from engaging in trade, these charges were incurred only on the public service upon which I was deputed.

I take the liberty of troubling you with these particulars for the information of the Hon'ble Board. The circumstantial manner in which the accompanying accounts are stated precludes, I imagine, the necessity of any further explanation, and will serve to point out the propriety or impropriety of the disbursements.

Calcutta, the 11th December, 1775.

I have the honour to be,
Hon'ble Sir,

Your most obedient humble servant
GEORGE BOGLE.

*MEMORANDUM¹² BY MR. BOGLE ON THE MONEY AND
MERCHANDISE OF TIBET*

April 19, 1779 (*Home Department O. C. No. 3*).

The only specie current in Thibet is the coin of the former Rajahs of Nepaul, called Indermillees. They are of a base quality, much worn; but none having been imported since Goorkha's conquest of Nepaul, they have rose to an exorbitant value. The bullion is brought from China in lumps of silver called Dozahs, which, I believe, are of a standard superior to the currency of Bengal yet when weighed against Indermillees they were not equal to them in value by ten per cent. A Dozah which weighed 340 or 350 Indermillees was

¹² Bogle's letter of which this memorandum was an accompaniment is not found.

purchased with 320, 310, and even 300 Indermillees. The Sicca Rupees of Bengal carried by Gosaines into Thibet, were valued at 2 Indermillees to a Sicca Rupee. A Balsa of gold dust called a Gastong and weighing $9 \frac{1}{3}$ Inderms, was valued from 120 to 130 Indermillees. Thus the value of this coin, when compared with silver or with gold dust, is not fixed. The rate in the market during my stay in Thibet was daily rising. It may be difficult to reconcile the high value of the fact to assign the cause would be rather (torn) than useful.

The broad cloth of two colours is esteemed before any other. There was none at market; the colours next prized are red, yellow, blue. The prices of these and other usual articles of trade were as follows:

Broad cloth coarse	12 Tank (sic.) per yard	80 Inderms
Chank male	each	6 to 10 „
Cloves	per seer of 60 sica wt.	54 „
Nutmegs	5 or 6	1 „
Malda striped cloth (mushroos)	ppss (sic.)	40 „
Otter skins	per score	70 to 80 „
Coral middling size	per Sicca wt.	15 to 18 „
„ very large beads	Twice its weight in gold dust.	

Cutlery, hardware, glass and many other European commodities, not being staple articles, it is impossible to ascertain the price. Small quantities are sometimes brought into Thibet by the Gossaines which are much esteemed.

Amber beads, pearls and diamonds. The price of them depends entirely on their size and goodness. The first is an article of common consumption and ready sale. The two last being purchased by the people of high rank, or by the Chineze, the price is high, but the sale slow and uncertain.

It may be necessary to remark that the scarcity of Bengal and European goods while I was in Thibet no doubt served to enhance their value.

The returns from Thibet are made chiefly in gold dust, musk and cowtails.

The price of gold dust I have already mentioned. Musk is generally bought in bags with a considerable portion of skin adhering to them. The price is from one half to three fourths its weight in Indermillees. The superfluous skin is from a sixth to a fourth of its weight, and if the musk is fresh it loses by evaporation about a fourth part.

Cow tails, white, are from two to four Indermillees each.

The charges on transporting goods from Bengal to Thibet I estimate as follows:

One maund from Rungpore to Buxiduar	4 Inderms
from Buxiduar to Binjipore	12 „
from Ringe to Paridsong	4 „
from Paridsong to Lahassa or Teshoo Loombo	4 „

No. 4

*From Raja Punjin Irrtinee Roomoo Thung Chaunjoo Thoosoo, or chief minister of Tasoo Lumoo to the Governor General.*¹³

Recd. Feb. 12th 1782.

To the Fountain of Benefits abounding in Excellencies, Ornament of the chief Seat of power and of Greatness, shedding splendour on the Leaders of Europe, Repository of Valor and Magnanimity, exalted in Enterprize, high in Dignity the Governor Immaud u'dowlah¹⁴—may his Fortitude and his Existence be perpetuated by the bounty of Almighty God. Some time before this the Khankaum of China called unto him the Lord of his Votaries the Luminary of the World Maha Gooroo Sahib, with earnest solicitations and on the seventeenth of the month Rubbaa i.e. sauni A. H. 1193¹⁵ the Lama, according to agreement, directed his steps towards the Region of China.

And when he passed his sacred foot forth from this Land, the Khankaum despatched forward to receive him Leaders of high Distinction and he caused to be prepared and kept in readiness, cattle to transport his Baggage, and Conveyances and Tents and necessaries of every Denomination and There is a Soobah and they call that Land *Seur potaullah* and on the 22nd of the month Rubbaa i.e. sauni in the year of the Hijira 1194.¹⁶ Maha Gooroo Sahib and the Khankaum of China met each other in that Soobah, in joy and satisfaction:—and they continued there for the space of one month—and then they proceeded on from thence to the City of Pickeen—that is to say—the royal City—where is the exalted Throne of the Emperour—and in that City they remained for six months.

And in those Days the Khankaum of mighty power, in the abundance of his faith and his love for the Truth, exhibited unbounded proofs of Obedience and Submission and paid the Duties of Reverence and Respect.

And the Maha Gooroo on whom be the continued blessing of the Almighty instructed many of the sages of China, and of the sages of *Kitmauk*, and (not mentioned in Pooruna Geer Goosaini's relation). He caused their Heads to be shaven and received them into the number of the Obedient—and he conferred innumerable Blessings on the inhabitants of that Land,—and they received Joy and Happiness from his presence.

And down to this time the Maha Gooroo was well in Health; but the water and air of China proved adverse—and was pernicious (to him) as the pestilential

13 No. 1, 389 of the Macartney collection in the Satara Museum.

14 i.e. Warren Hastings.

15 i.e. 5 April 1779 A.D.

16 i.e. 29 March 1780.

and hot Blast to a cold and frozen Body and the Maladies and the Distempers which were produced were many and various.

And at this time such was the will of God, Irruptions of the small-pox came forth and our earnest Endeavours, and the application of numerous Remedies availed nothing—for the predominating star of our happiness was reversed and obscured—and the Shadow of our protector was withdrawn, and we were excluded from his presence—and the only Remedies which remained were Resignation and Submission. The measure of his Existence was filled up—and the Lip of the Cup of Life was overflowed—and he retired from this perishable world to the everlasting Mansions on the first Day of the Month Rujjub, in the year of the Hijira 1194.¹⁷ And to us it was as if the Heavens had been precipitated on our heads—as if the splendid and glorious Day had been converted into utter Darkness.

The Multitude lifted up on all sides the Voice of Sorrow and Lamentation—but what availed it—for Fortune, treacherous and deceitful had determined against us.

And we all bent down on the knee of funeral affliction and performed the holy obsequies, such as were due—and We now supplicate with an united Voice the return of the hour of Transmigration—that the Bodies may be speedily exchanged, and our departed Lama again be restored to our sight. This is our only Object—our sole Employment—may almighty God who listeneth to the Supplications of his Servants, accept our prayers.

And after the Death of the Lama, the gracious Conduct of the Khankaum was still the same—or rather, his royal favour was greater than before—in so much that it might be said, Maha Gooroo Sahib was still living—such was the Excess of his Bounty.

And when the funeral Solemnities were concluded We received our Dismission—and the Emperor caused Supplies of food and of raiment, and necessaries of every sort to be prepared—and he ordered people to be stationed at the different stages—to convey the Corps of the deceased Lama from One to the other.

And when we turned our faces from the Land of China, he caused Carriages to be given to my followers—and he appointed two Amceral Omraus to attend the sacred Remains of the Lama; for its protection—And on the 21st Day of the month Shuvvaul in the year of the Hijira 1196¹⁸ in the Morning I arrived at the place of my abode in safety.

17 i.e. 4 July 1780 A.D. The date 12 November 1780 given for his death in *Bengal Past and Present*, vol. XXVI, p. 195 seems to be wrong.

18 i.e. 10 October 1781.

He was a Bengalee by birth and was sent by the Tashi Lāmā as the first

And a Tomb had been prepared before our arrival for the Body of the departed Lama—and we deposited his Remains therein—and we presented the necessary offerings—and distributed alms, to promote the Transmigration—and we are unremitting in our Supplications that he may speedily appear again on the face of the Earth—may they be accepted.

Poorun Geer Goosaini arrived here in the year 1193 after the Departure of the Lama (towards China).—And two Letters and nine Strings of pearls, without blemish and perfect in their form (form)—and among them One String of large pearl, of great brightness and purity and two Chaplets of Coral, which you sent as a Gift, arrived safe.

And your satisfactory Letters and that which you wrote concerning the village of the Raja and the Remission of all Matters relating thereto, to do honor to me—the whole as there written, was in those Days submitted to the inspection of Maha Gooroo Sahib, and the Joy which he expressed on reading these things was exceeding great.

And the friendly Letter and the two Rosaries of pearl and Coral, one of them intermixd pearl and Coral and the other Coral alone which in the Abundance of your kindness and favor you sent as a Gift to me, arrived in an happy hour, and was the case of much satisfaction.

And regarding your Refusal to receive the Value of the nine Strings of pearls and of the two Chaplets of Coral directing on the contrary, that they should be presented as a Gift,—as the pearls were of great Beauty and of exceeding high price, and for as much as your friendship to Maha Gooroo Sahib was evident and apparent—in consideration of these things I could not presume to take them.

I formerly wrote to you requesting that with the Value of the unwrought Gold which I sent to you certain pearls and Coral might be purchased and that the price of the pearls and the Coral might be balanced by the produce thereof—and if it should be deficient for that purpose that you would inform me of that deficiency—so that I might write to you and transmit that which was wanting—and if on the contrary there should be a surplus remaining out of the value of the Gold, that other pearls and other Coral of the first Quantity might be purchased therewith.

And I have moreover strong hope and firm Expectation that as you formerly showed kindness and attention to the Application respecting the village of the Raja, so in regard to the certain portion of Land and the Mahasol thereon, that favour has been shown,—I presume to repeat the Request, that corresponding to the Application of Maha Gooroo Sahib you will show kindness appertaining thereto and furthermore, that you will grant a Plot of Land

Buddhist priest of the monastery built for the Lāmā on the opposite side of Calcutta. Cf. *Bengal Past and Present*, vol. XXVI, p. 197.

in the noble City of Calcutta on the Bank of the River—concerning this affair I spoke fully and particularly to the Gossaini Poorum Geer' and he will make known to you the whole thereof and you will comply with my Request.

And I have communicated other Matters and other Things to the Faithful Poorun Geer by whom you will be informed of them—In compliance with his Wishes you will permit him to remain under the Shadow of your protection and favor him with such mark of your kindness as may enable him to pass his Days in returning thanks for your bounty and goodness.

You must persist in sending to me constant Information of your Health, that the Garden of pleasure and satisfaction may continue to flourish.

To trouble you more would exceed that which is right.

May your happiness and prosperity remain firm and unshaken. Written on the first Day of the month Zehijeh A.H. 1195 corresponding to the 28th October 1781.¹⁹

Sent by Poorum Geer as a Gift

a piece of Khanduck,
a Dehleek of unwrought Gold,
Two pieces of China Silver
six pieces of China Silk.

Let it be accepted.

No. 5

*From Soobun Chumboo to Mr. George Bogle*²⁰

Received February 12th 1782.

To him of the high and exalted asylum! the Eminent of the Dwelling of the only God! The Repository of the Benefits of Power! The genuine Conferrer of Favors! Mr. George Bogle—be his Prosperity without End!

Your wellwisher, Soobun Chumboo, having set Forth his Humility and Submission—and Confessed his Weakness and Inability—in the Language of Absence, makes known to your Understanding,—Illumined as the Sun.—that the State of these Parts is according to the Divine Will, and to the Ordination of him who is without end, and in his Hands,—in the Hands of an Almighty Protector, and that your Safety, and your Health, are the daily subjects of my Supplications.

¹⁹ The christian date 28th October 1781 really corresponds to 10th Jilkad of A.H. 1195; while the first day of Jliheja (Zehijeh) corresponds to 18th November 1781.

²⁰ No. 1, 441 of the Macartney collection in the Satara Museum. The contents of this and the preceding letter are almost same.

It has not remained unknown to your enlightened Mind,—That the Letters, and the String of Pearls, which are Intermixed with Coral, and formed into a Chaplet, and which in the Excess of your kindness and your Favor you were pleased to send me as a Gift, and to Confer it upon me, Arrived safe.

Truly, it may be said, That I beheld you in your own Person! For such was my exceeding great Joy and Satisfaction thereat—That I know not, in what Language to explain it.

The Khullefah Bungwaun, that is to say, Maha Gooroo Sahib, on the seventeenth Day²¹ of the Month Rubaau Sauni, directed the Reins of his Intentions from Tasso Lumboo toward the Land of China.

And the various Inhabitants of the Environs and the Places round about, of Shobah, and of Khumbah, those who Sojourn in Tents, and those who live in Cities,—came and were Received according to their Degrees, and their Stations,—and the Chief Princes of the Kingdom and the Pillars of the State, and the Mighty Men, and the great Leaders, came Forth, to meet and to guard him on the high Road—And they were waiting his Arrival with eager Expectation. And they obtained admission to the honors of audience in Crowds,—Crowd after Crowd—and they presented their Gifts and their offerings without Number. And the Lama laid the hand of Intercession on the heads of the Guilty, and made them Joyful,—And after this manner the Multitude Followed him the whole day.

Thus he travailed on—through the Journeys and the Stages—and in the Soobah Seur Potaullah which is a place exceeding delightful, he saw the Khankaum of China, and they met together in Joy, and Satisfaction—and he remained with the Khankaum of China, for the Space of one Month.—And the Khankaum prepared Entertainments of various Sorts, and made Feasts after divers manners.

And during this Time the Goosaini Poorun Geer made known those things, concerning the Land of Europe, which your Tongue had taught him,—all of them he made known.—And the Lama exerted great Endeavours, and proved his Friendship and solicited therein—and hereafter the Chaunkeah Lama, may his Felicity be eternal, will write, and send an answer, concerning these Things.—For we Exerted ourselves to Fulfil your Wishes, from our Hearts, and From our Souls.

Let not this your well-wisher pass out from your friendly Mind, and when Time shall be convenient, send unto Me, the Gold Brocade, and the large Coral, for the purchase whereof, I formerly sent by the Goosaini, to your respected Presence Thirty Tolah of Virgin Gold—Buy them and send them unto me. And if aught should remain unpaid, Inform me thereof by your Pen, that

21 i.e. 5 April 1779 A.D. as shown in the preceding letter.

I may pay it: For doing so you will favor me. Safety and Peace be with you, for truly my Heart is with you always—Written on the first Day of the Month —Tehijeh in the year of the Hijra 1195 corresponding to the 28th October A.D. 1781.

As a present—A piece of Khanduk and a piece of Cocheen, which is Silk of China, and Four Tolah and a half of unwrought Gold, which after the manner of this Land is Called Kytoo. Let it be accepted.

D. B. DISKALKAR

Some points Regarding the Origin of the Licchavis of Vaisālī

Various conjectures have been made by different scholars about the original home of the Licchavis of Vaisālī. The question which puzzles the readers of Indian History is whether the Licchavis were the same as the Vedic Aryans or a different stock of people. It is said that they had some affinity with the Tibetan people. In Tibet there was the custom of exposing the dead for being devoured by wild animals. This custom was in vogue among the Licchavis also as is found in Beal's *Romantic Legend of Śākya Buddha*, derived from Chinese sources. The legend relates how the Licchavis "exposed corpses of men to be devoured by the birds, collected and piled up the white bones of dead persons, burnt corpses and preserved the bones in heaps, buried there, left them on the ground and also hanged them from trees" (*Corpus Ins. Ind.*, vol. III, p. 136). Thus they disposed of their dead sometimes by burial, sometimes by cremation and sometimes by leaving them on the ground.

Discoveries made at pre-historic cemeteries in other parts of India give evidence of the various ways of disposing of the dead. The description given in the legend does not refer to any particular custom exclusively adhered to by the Licchavis. It describes the various possible methods which they might have adopted for the disposal of dead bodies. Hence many alternative processes have been mentioned. The Vedic Hindus also appear to have adopted those methods before the custom of burning the dead on funeral pyres was introduced among them. There is a passage in the *Atharva Veda* describing in a similar way various procedures of disposing the dead (*Atharva*, 18-2-34). *Āpastamba* also has a similar passage. So this custom of exposing the dead to be devoured by animals does never prove that the Licchavis came from Tibet or from any other country where this custom prevailed. The recent discoveries at Mohenjo-daro and Harappā have proved that the Vedic Aryans were not the only inhabitants of ancient India. The Licchavis were probably one of the many tribes occupying a

portion of the foot of the Himālaya in modern Tirhoot, having many customs and usages in common with other peoples around them.

It is further argued that the judicial procedure of Vaiśālī as related in the *Aṭṭhakathā* being substantially similar the procedure now found at Lhasa, the origin of the Licchavis is to be traced somewhere in Tibet. After the propagation of Buddhism in Tibet frequent intercourse with India enabled the people of the forbidden land to imbibe Hindu ideas and customs. So it is not unlikely that the Tibetans themselves got their judicial system from India. That the Licchavis were not the same as the Nisibis, the Persian subjects of king Darius, has sufficiently been proved by Dr. B. C. Law (*Some Kṣatriya Tribes etc.*, p. 29).

The next question which requires careful consideration is whether the Licchavis were originally Aryan by birth or some Non-Aryan tribe subsequently engrafted upon the Aryan Stock for reason of their political ascendancy. The term Licchavi does not appear to be a pure Sanskrit word, though Buddhaghosa has derived it from *Licchavi* or *Līnacchavi* (*ibid.*, p. 20). The Licchavis have not found a place in the Sūtras of Pāṇini, though he has made mention of many other Kṣatriya tribes of ancient India. They were certainly a very prominent people either during the life-time of the great grammarian or before him. The term *Licchavis* as such has no place in the Purāṇas. Manu has included them in the Vrātya class. In the Bālakāṇḍa of the *Rāmāyaṇa* the sage Viśvāmitra in his journey to the city of Janaka has pointed out to Rāma the city of Viśālā (Chap. 45, v. 10). The king of Viśālā, according to it, was Sumati, an Ikṣāku king. So at the time of the writer of this portion of the *Rāmāyaṇa* Vaiśālī and Mithilā were two independent principalities having two different scions of Kṣatriya races ruling over them. The *Viṣṇupurāṇa* also makes the rulers of Vaiśālī Kṣatriyas, descendant of the Solar race. The *Mahābhārata* makes mention of the Mallas (Sabhā P., XXX, 5). Even the Bhargas who had probably a very small principality in the mountainous region of the Himālayas have been enumerated in the epic along with other border tribes such as the Kirātas and the Gāndhāras (Bhīṣma P., IX). Thus unimportant hill tribes who were probably the neighbours of the Licchavis have been mentioned, though they have been ignored. The reason is obvious. According to the Mahāparinibbāna Sutta, Ajātaśatru, king of

Magadha, made up his mind to destroy the oligarchical government of the Licchavis. He succeeded in gaining his object with the help of his Brahmin minister Vassakāra. So when Viśvāmitra pointed out to Rāma the city of Viśūlā, the Licchavis had lost all political importance. They were then either subjects to some neighbouring Kṣatriya king or had been driven to the further north. Ajātaśatru is called 'Vedehiputto' in the Mahāparinibbāna Sutta. The *Divyāvadāna* speaks of him as 'Vaidehīputra' (Cowell, p. 55). His mother is also said to be a princess of Kośala. Another Buddhistic account makes Triśalā the mother of Ajātaśatru. The Jainas make the same lady the mother of Mahāvīra. So out of these conflicting accounts no history can be built up. Moreover no authentic account can be had about the exact relationship between the Videhas and the Licchavis. From the scanty account that may be obtained from the Jaina and the Buddhistic works, it may be surmised that the Videhas and the Licchavis were united into one confederacy, but originally they were different people. In the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* Janaka is called a Vaideha. The origin of the word is found in the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*. Janaka was a pure Vedic Aryan prince. The non-Vedic form of Caitya worship, as found at ancient Vaiśālī during the life-time of the Buddha, could not find place in the capital of Janaka, the convener of that famous Vedic religious congress (*Vājasaneyā*, Chap. V).

The Buddha passed through Pāṭaligrāma just before his Supreme Enlightenment and saw a city being built there. His prediction regarding the future greatness of the city was fulfilled inasmuch as it subsequently became the capital of the Maurya empire (*Mps.*, I, 28). Viśvāmitra of the *Rāmāyaṇa* referred to above has mentioned Rājagṛha as the capital of Magadha and named many other cities around it. But he has omitted the name of Pāṭalīputra though he comes to the very spot where the city was afterwards built. The Licchavis in all probability had lost their political ascendancy before the construction of the city of Pāṭalīputra and had come under the sway of the neighbouring Kṣatriya chiefs of Kośala and Videha mentioned in the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

There is some force in the contention that the Licchavis were not the same as the Videhas. The *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* makes the Videhas a thoroughly Aryan people. The story of Māthava, the

Videha king carrying Agni Vaiśvānara to the east of Sadānirā as related therein, clearly proves how the Videhas got the right of performing Vedic sacrifices. It is for this that they have got such a prominent place both in the Vedic and the post-Vedic literature. The Licchavis have almost been ignored in the Brāhmanical literature probably because of their non-Aryan origin. Though subdued by Ajātaśatru, they were not totally exterminated. In later years, probably after the destruction of the Maurya Empire, they began to gather strength and rose to power before the ascendancy of the Imperial Guptas. Candra Gupta I married Kumāra Devī, a Licchavi princess, and the issue of that marriage, the illustrious Samudra Gupta, took pride in calling himself a *Licchavi Dauhitra*. The very word *Licchavayah* inscribed on the reverse of the coin issued by the same monarch clearly proves that here the Licchavis only, and not any other tribe, is meant. In Jaina works, Mahāvīra, the founder of Jainism, has been called a Vaidelāputra. Ajātaśatru as referred to above has got the same designation. If these conflicting accounts have any historical value at all, it is this that they were connected with the Videha clan but not with the Licchavis who were a different people. Abhaya, the son of Bimbisāra by Ambapālī, a courtesan, was a *Licchavi dauhitra*. Ajātaśatru had a hatred for him and also for the Licchavis whose haughtiness he crushed and whose power he destroyed. After their defeat, they probably fled to the further north and established a kingdom in Nepal. In Sanskrit literature of the subsequent period Viśālā has been made the same as Videha. In the *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa* Videha and Tīrabhukti have been made synonymous with each other. Tīrabhukti was a familiar name with the Hindu kings of Bengal in later times. It is now identified with modern Tirhoot. Viśālā is said to be the same as modern Besāḍ on the Gandak in the district of Muzaffarpur in the Tirhoot Division. Mithilā, the Videha capital, seems to be the same as Janakpur in the territory of the king of Nepal.

The *Mahāvastu* makes Mithilā the capital of Videha as distinct from Vaiśālī of the Licchavis (Senart, vol. I, p. 287). Much stress has been laid on the word *Vāsistha* which is a name applied to the Licchavis by the Buddha. It is said that the Kṣatriyas were sometimes addressed by the name of their priest and adopted their *gotra*

after his name. So the designation *Vāsiṣṭha* indicates that they were Kṣatriyas having the ascetic Vasiṣṭha as their priest. One ascetic Vasiṣṭha is said to have had his hermitage in the territory of the Mallas (Senart, vol. II, p. 164). Śākyasiṃha in introducing himself to the ascetic says that he belongs to Ādityagotra, but refrains from making any reference to his priest. Ananda who was a cousin of Siddhārtha has been named as Vaidehamuni (*ibid.*, vol. III, p. 49). The Mahāparinibbāna Sutta refers to the Mallas of Kusināra also as Vāsetṭhas (Tr. by Rhys Davids, p. 121). It will be going too far to surmise that all the hill-tribes had the ascetic Vasiṣṭha as their priest. It is difficult to draw any conclusion from these stray words so long as their full significance is not clear. The designation *Vāsiṣṭha* here may imply those who had regard for, or who were followers of, Vasiṣṭha (Pāṇini, 4, 3, 95) but not necessarily those who had Vasiṣṭha as their priest. The *Mahāvastu* omits the name of Vaiśālī in its enumeration of the places where a Bodhisattva may appear for attaining Buddhahood, and maintains that "the people who are religious and are worshippers of the Brāhmaṇas and Sramaṇas can expect to have him incarnate among them". The *Lalita Vistara* regards Vaiśālī as a place unfit for the birth of a Bodhisattva inasmuch as "the Licchavis were not respectful to their elders, had no religious duty to perform, were not the disciples of any teacher, and had no faith in any religion." This seems to be one of the reasons why the *Mahāvastu* does not mention their name at all. Evidence is not wanting to show that they were hardy mountaineers, rough and insolent in their behaviour, having fondness for fine dress and luxury only. They appear to be same as the Asuras of the *Chāndogya* (9-7) who cared for good dress and external beauty only and not the next world or anything beyond this phenomenal existence. In Rockhill's *Life of the Buddha* (p. 62) it is stated that the people of Vaiśālī has a law that a daughter born in the first district could marry only in the first district, not in the second nor in the third and no marriage was to be contracted outside Vaiśālī. The rules restricting marriage clearly indicates that the Licchavis considered themselves different from other neighbouring tribes and tried to preserve the integrity of their race by regulating their marriage laws. Perhaps the Brāhmanical rules of marriage were not yet introduced among them. It



is difficult to trace the exact nature of the faith prevalent among them. In the *Mahāparinibbāna Sutta* the Buddha is represented as visiting many *Cetiya*s at Vaiśālī. One of the *Caitya*s is meant according to Buddhaghosa for Yakṣa worship. The *Mahāvastu* speaks of several *Cetiya*s being made over to the Buddha by the Licchavis as the Lord by his supernatural power freed the Vajjian capital from epidemic diseases caused by the evil influence of the Yakṣas who lived in the Himalayas. The Yakṣas appear to be non-Aryan evil spirits. The *Kena Upaniṣad* represents a Yakṣa as a being having supernatural power, causing astonishment even to the gods. But he is said to be quite different from the Aryan Brahmā whom the gods worshipped in the form of Umā or Haimavatī. The *Mahābhārata* (Vanaparva, Chap. 161, vs. 4, 5) makes Bhīmasena fight with the Yakṣas, the servants of Kuvera, guarding a lotus pond in the Himalayan region. The Vedic Aryan Kṣatriyas did not certainly worship the Yakṣas. It is probably owing to the absence of any religion based on philosophy and reason that Jainism and Buddhism found favour with the Licchavis so soon. It is said in the *Ācārāṅgasūtra* (Jacobi, *SBE.*) that the venerable ascetic Mahāvīra's parents were worshippers of Pārśva, and followers of the Śramaṇas. It is probable that Mahāvīra developed his own faith out of the religion that was prevalent among his kinsmen. The denial of God, death by fasting and other severe practices approved by him have no counter-part in the religion of the Vedic Aryans. The Jñātrikas to whose clan Mahāvīra belonged was included in the Vajjian confederacy of Vaiśālī. The only conclusion which can reasonably be made from this is that these people occupying the region at the foot of the Himalayas were of non-Aryan birth, having their own religion and customs. They were afterwards aryanised and were dubbed as Kṣatriyas.

It is contended that the Licchavis were the Vrātyas according to the code of Manu (X, 22). The compiler of the Law Book forgot the true tradition of the *Vedas* and the *Brāhmaṇas* regarding the Vrātyas and was influenced simply by the ideas of his own time. Vrātya, according to the *Atharva Veda*, meant magnanimous, he was a favourite of the gods, a source of energy to the *Brāhmaṇas* and the Kṣatriyas alike. He was moreover a superior god; wherever he went, the gods and the whole

world followed him.....He walked like a king. Among the Vrātyas there were some who were virtuous and respected by all (Sāyana on *Atharva Veda*, 15th Kāṇḍa). Moreover Vrātya was the Supreme Being endowed with all the qualities of Brahmā (*Praśna Upa.*, 2, 11). Śaṅkarācārya says that Brahmā is Vrātya because like the latter he is above all purifying ceremonies. He is not in any way inferior to any being. This peculiar position of the Vrātya is inexplicable. The *Tāṇḍya Mahābrāhmaṇa* does not give him such an exalted position. When the gods went to heaven their followers were lowered for living in Vrātya. Those who lived in Vrātya became inferior as they did not practise the controlling of passions, neither cultivated land nor took to commerce. (*Tāṇḍya*, 17th Chap.). Here *Vrātya* may indicate either a place allotted to a certain class of people or a certain condition of life. The Vrātyas were divided into various ranks on account of their different customs. The *Vrātyastoma* brought them all to the same rank. Kātyāyana in his *Śrautasūtra* makes mention of four kinds of Vrātyastoma to be performed by the four classes of the Vrātyas (22, 123). He also tells us how the converted Vrātyas who entered the Brāhmaṇic fold, had to cut off all connection with their former life and to hand over their wealth to those of their companies who still followed the old mode of life thereby transferring to them their former impurities. The Vrātyas, according to the same *Brāhmaṇa*, were the enemy of Brāhmaṇa priests, and forcibly took away food from them. In short, they did every thing contrary to Vedic customs. They were therefore unfit for Vedic sacrifices. They were never included in any of the Vedic castes. The institute of Manu gives the stamp of a Vrātya to a Brāhmaṇa or a Kṣatriya or a Vaiśya unless he performed the initiation ceremony at a certain prescribed age. According to the *Manu*, the Mongolian hordes and the Bactrians, who held sway over northern India, were originally Kṣatriyas and became Vrātyas or fallen for neglecting Vedic rites. In this way the Śakas, the Yavanas, the Cīnas and even the Kirātas were brought under the category of the Kṣatriyas. But they became *Vṛṣala* or fallen for ignoring Vedic customs and laws. When non-Aryan tribes began to pour in and obtained political ascendancy in Northern India, a new interpretation of the term *Vrātya* was felt necessary. Vrātya, who was a superior being in the *Veda*, became unfit for Vedic rites

in the *Brāhmaṇas*. But Kātyāyana, as mentioned before, gives him bows, arrows, dresses, chariots and other paraphernalia befitting a true Kṣatriya when he enters the Aryan fold after performing Vrātyastoma. In this way he got the exalted position of a fighting race and was recognised as a Kṣatriya. After the death of Puṣyamitra, there was probably no paramount power in India for checking the inroads of the barbarian hordes through its northern gate. When they occupied different parts of Āryāvarta and obtained political power they could no longer be looked down upon as *Mlecchas* or 'impure' by the Vedic Aryans. So they were aryanised and made Kṣatriyas. The term *Kṣatriya* was applied to one who would protect people from danger. (*Raghu*, Canto II, 53). It was afterwards applied to any ruling race who had the capacity of protecting people from internal and external dangers. The term *Vrātya* was probably applied to these ruling races, who, either by some Vedic ceremony or in course of time, when their true origin had been totally forgotten, came to be regarded as Kṣatriyas. The Licchavis were also Kṣatriyas in this sense. "They were a free wild set, very handsome and full of life. They dressed well, were good archers and drove fast carriages, but they were wanton, insolent and utterly irreligious". (Watters, *Yuan Chwang*, vol. II, p. 79). This picture of the Licchavis tallies well with that of the Vrātyas quoted above. The description of the Sākyas as left by Buddhistic writers reminds one of a Kṣatriya race as depicted in the Sanskrit epics. But one will search in vain for such an idea of the Licchavis of Vaiśālī. When the Law Book of Manu was compiled, probably in the second century B.C., their real origin was forgotten. They could not be designated Kṣatriyas as they did not observe Vedic rites and customs, nor could they be termed non-Aryans as they had considerable wealth and power. So they were termed as Vrātyas i.e. Brahmins were ready to accept them provided they underwent some sort of penance. Time is a great leveller. So, these Licchavis, who were hardy mountaineers, came to be recognised as true Kṣatriyas and Samudra Gupta took pride in calling himself a '*Licchavi dauhitra*'.

There is another point for consideration. In the Mahāparinibbāna Sutta it is stated that when the Buddha attained final emancipation, the Licchavis of Vaiśālī claimed a portion

of the remains of his sacred body. They sent a messenger to the Mallas of Kuśīnārā demanding a portion of the relics of the Exalted One as they belonged to the same Kṣatriya caste. On receiving the news of the demise of the Exalted one, Ajātaśatru, the king of Magadha, said: "The Lord is a Kṣatriya and so am I. I, therefore, deserve a share of the relics." In this way, six other independent tribes ruling over different principalities at the foot of the Himalayas claimed shares of the relics on the ground of being of the same caste with the Lord. It may be argued that because these tribes demanded relics of the Buddha claiming Kṣatriya origin for themselves, and because the king of Magadha even did exactly the same thing, they may all be regarded as Kṣatriyas.

Even the Kirātas, who were not allowed to live within the boundary of Aryan settlements during the time of Harṣavardhana (*Ratnāvalī*, Second Act, 3) were called Kṣatriyas in the code of Manu. Whatever may be the exact category to which these people belonged, it is at least clear that they were not of the same rank as the Kurus, the Pañcālas or the Videhas who possessed a high Vedic culture. The culture of the Upaniṣads received a great impetus at the hands of the Vedic Kṣatriyas whose long list can be found in the *Chāndogya* and other Upaniṣads. There is not a single Kṣatriya king like Janaka or Ajātaśatru of the Upaniṣads among the so-called Kṣatriya nobles who vied with one another for the remains of the Buddha's body. The Vedic Kṣatriyas were not famous for fine dresses or ornaments. A Licchavi noble claimed Kṣatriya origin on account of his wealth and power.

From the above it is apparent that the Licchavis were self-styled and not real Kṣatriyas. They were called so either through courtesy or on account of the fear they had inspired in the minds of their neighbours by their political ascendancy.

The Theory of Rīti and Guṇa in the Agnipurāṇa

The author of the Alaṅkāra portion of the Agnipurāṇa¹ is the earliest of a class of writers² who stand apart from the orthodox and beaten paths of Sanskrit poetics but who acknowledge, both in form and matter, the inevitable influence³ of some of their predecessors belonging to one or other of the earlier schools of speculation.

His definition of *Kāvya*, *kāvyaṃ sphuradalaṅkāraṃ guṇavad doṣavarjitam* (337/7) uncritically mentions some of the established elements of poetry.⁴ The definition merely lays down that figures of speech (Alaṅkāra) must be conspicuously present in it, the poetic excellences (Guṇas) must be there but it must be free from the poetic flaws (Doṣas). The other elements, namely, *Dhvani*, *Rasa* and *Rīti* have not been mentioned in this definition of poetry, but the writer has treated of them elsewhere in his scheme. *Rasa* has been mentioned in connection with the *mahākāvya* (a special variety of poetry) as well as in reference to the drama. Although *Rasa* has been described as the life (*jīvita*) of a *Kāvya* (337/33), yet no prominence has been given to this element in the detailed treatment. On the contrary,

1 Our references are throughout to the edition of the *Agnipurāṇa* in the Anandāśrama series, 1900.

2 Kuntaka, Bhoja and Prakāśavarṣa are the three other writers here referred to. *Rasārṇavālaṅkāra*, a work of the last named writer, was published (in vol. V. no. 1 of the *IIIQ.*) by Pandit V. Venkatarama Śarma. Its value and the question of its affiliation were discussed by S. K. De in *IIIQ.*, vol. V, no. 4 p. 770.

3 For similarities between the treatments of Bhāmaha and the *Agnipurāṇa* see P. V. Kane's *History of the Alaṅkāra Literature*; for *Agnipurāṇa* and Bhoja, see S. K. De's *Sanskrit Poetics*, vol. II, p. 262, and *JRAS.*, 1923, pp. 537f.

4 Bhoja (i,2) and the older Vāgbhaṭa (i,2) are influenced by the *Agnipurāṇa* on this point: the former adding *Rasa* and the latter mentioning also *Rīti* in their respective definitions. It is also remarkable that the post-Dhvani writers Mammaṭa and Hemacandra name exactly the three elements mentioned in the *Purāṇa*'s definition although the conception of poetry of these later writers had undergone a thorough change by the teachings of the Dhvani school.

it has been very cursorily treated as an external element of Kāvya. Similarly the Rīti has been once mentioned along with Vṛtti, Pravṛtti, Bhāva, Rasa and Guṇa in connection with Mahākāvya (337/31-32), and has again been treated in fuller detail in connection with the drama (Ch. 340) where the Rīti, Vṛtti and Pravṛtti constitute special cases of Anubhāva. We know that Bharata's Guṇas, Doṣas and Alaṃkāras constitute Vācīkābhīnaya or Anubhāva which calls forth Rasa. The Purāṇa follows the same process in the treatment of the Rītis, the Vṛttis and the Pravṛttis: but accepted though they are as Anubhāvas⁵ they do not yet constitute Vācīkābhīnaya as they do in the treatment of Bharata. They stand for Āhārya Abhinaya (342/2) which has been defined as *buddhyārambha* or intellectual effort which helps the comprehension of the art of dramatic speech (*Vācīyukti* = *Vāgārambha*, 339/51).— The expression *Vāgvidyāsampratijñāne* (in the matter of understanding the art of speech 340/1) is a more direct evidence justifying our interpretation that the Rītis etc. help the proper understanding⁵ of *Ālāpa Pralāpa* etc. (339/51-53), which are special cases of *Vāgārambha* (339/49) or *Vāgvidyā* (340/1) or the art of dramatic speech.

5 The Anubhāva has been generally defined as *manovāg-buddhirapuṣām ārambhaḥ* (339/44-45) implying (i) external manifestations due to peculiar mental action (*Manu ārambha* 339/46) (ii) mode of dramatic speech (*Vācīyukti*—*Vāgārambha* 339/51) (iii) intellectual effort giving rise to the striking mode of dramatic speech (*buddhyārambha* 339/54) and (iv) physical movements of the actor (*rapuārambha* 341/1), which represent respectively (i) the *Sāttvika* (ii) the *Vācika* (iii) the *Āhārya* and (iv) the *Jūgika Abhinayas* (342/2). The *Āhārya Abhinaya* of the Purāṇa should be distinguished from that of Bharata where it has been explained as the rule of decoration (*nepathyājo vidhiḥ*). The interpretation given in the Purāṇa (342/2) is not permitted by the etymology of the word *āhārya*.

6 The reading in the first two lines of verse 54 (ch. 339) seems to be corrupt. Maintaining the reading, it is difficult to connect the word *bodhāya* with *vāgārambha* (verse 49) with which it should bear, from the context, clear relationship. Should the reading be *esām bodhāya vāgārambha itīṣyate*, so that *esām* may refer to the different varieties *ālāpa* etc. of *buddhyārambha*? This reading appears to be in conformity with what the author has said in 339/44-45 and 342/2.

But while the Purāṇakāra's Rīti, Vṛtti and Pravṛtti all ultimately go to constitute the Anubhāva, the writer, unlike, Bharata, is not explicit upon the point whether these call forth Rasa. Of course the manner and context⁷, in which the treatment of Vibhāvas and Anubhāvas has been brought in, apparently show that these are factors in the realisation of Rasa. But the Purāṇakāra does not explain the process of this realisation, nor does he clearly discuss the relation between the Rītis and Rasa.

The Rīti here has no relation with the Guṇa which has been treated afterwards as an absolute entity. The Rītis constitute such poetic factors as help the proper understanding of *Vāgārambha* or mode of dramatic speech which must be differentiated from the mode of poetic speech (*girāṃ mārga*) of Daṇḍin. But this theoretic distinction is more apparent than real; for the fundamentals of poetry and of the drama have not been very sharply kept apart. The Rasas as well as the Rītis appear to have been equally associated with poetry and drama. And as a matter of fact, all the elements, namely, Vṛtti, Pravṛtti, Bhāva, Rīti, Guṇa and Rasa, have been mentioned as belonging to Mahākāvya also (337/31-32). Moreover, the treatment of Alamkāras which have been defined as *Kāvyaśobhākara dharmāḥ* (342/17) commences at the middle of a chapter that deals with dramatic representation (*Abhinaya*) etc. All this tends to show that the Purāṇakāra did not observe a theoretical distinction between the fundamentals of poetry and drama—the characteristics of both having been dealt in a more or less confused and uncritical way without any sharp line of demarcation. This lack of consistency was perhaps due to a merely eclectic and uncritical attempt to make a compilation of previous speculations, both orthodox and unorthodox.

The Purāṇa mentions four Rītis, namely, Pāñcālī, Gaudī, Vaidarbhī and Lāṭī, the last being added to Vāmana's enumeration of three Rītis. The use of expressions like *gaṇḍadeśīyā* and *lāṭajā* (340/1) clearly indicates that the writer, like Vāmana, held the same view, namely, that the names of Rītis were derived from the names

7 In 339/35 it has been remarked that poets should deal with Rasas and Bhāvas in poetry, and immediately after that, the Vibhāvas and Anubhāvas have been defined and discussed in detail.

of the countries in which they were specially favoured. We have already seen that the Rītis in the Purāṇa have not been distinguished from one another by the presence or absence of certain poetic excellences (*Guṇas*): but they have been classified according to (1) the absence or presence in varying degrees of compound words⁸, (2) the exuberance or paucity of metaphorical expressions and (3) variations in the degrees of softness, if present. Thus the Pāñcālī must be soft in diction (*mṛdvī*), endowed with metaphorical expressions (*upacāra-yutā*) and must contain short compounds (*hrasva-vidrahā*). The Gauḍiyā, on the other hand, contains long compounds (*dīrghavidrahā*) and is of uncertain import (*anavasthita-sandarbhā*).⁹ The Vaidarbhī must be absolutely free from compound words (*muktavidrahā*) and the composition should not be too soft (*nātikomala-sandarbhā*); it should usually be devoid of metaphorical expressions and even when these are present

8 Rudraṭa is the first writer to bring in the consideration of compound words in connection with the Rīti. He mentions four Rītis of which Vaidarbhī does not contain compounds, while varying degrees of compound words are found in Pāñcālī, Lāṭiyā and Gauḍiyā. It is to be noted that Rudraṭa makes no mention of the Guṇas.

9 Literally 'where the composition is of an unsettled nature' it may also mean 'where a regular connection is lacking.' It is not fully clear what expressions like *anavasthitasandarbhā* or *sphuṭa-sandarbhā* really mean or what this uncertainty or clarity is due to. The uncertainty may be the effect of either playing upon words in the form of intonation, pun or paranomasia or, if strictly applied to the drama, it may be due to what we call 'dramatic irony' where the poet aims at presenting some fact beyond what is actually understood from the words used by the speaker. Here the *sandarbhā* (composition or speech) is *anavasthita* (unsettled or uncertain) because it produces one effect upon the person spoken to and another upon the audience. But the difficulty of explaining the expression, as referring to 'dramatic irony', is that this latter is not limited to any particular Rīti, e.g. Gauḍī (and for the matter of that to any mode of dramatic speech), as belonging to a particular country, but it is a special case of dramatic technique which may occur in any drama of any country. If, on the other hand, these expressions (*anavasthita-sandarbhā* and *sphuṭa-sandarbhā*) are explained in connection with poetry in general, the latter expression may bring in the idea of a clarity of sense, such as is involved in Daṇḍin's *Prasāda* and *Arthavyakti Guṇas*, while the former may stand for the reverse of that. But, then, should clarity of sense be present only in Lāṭī and in no other Rīti? And why should Gauḍiyā be marked by a veritable defect?

there must not be too many of them.¹⁰ And lastly, in Lāṭīyā the compound words must not shine too prominently (*nāti-visphuravīgrahā*), and the composition should be clear and easily understandable (*sphuṭa sandarbhā*) and there should be a long series of metaphorical expressions.¹¹

As of Rītis so of the Vṛttis the Purāṇa gives no general definition, but the characteristic feature of the Vṛtti has been described as *Kriyāsaviṣamā* (keeping in strict accordance with the action of the drama).¹² No sharp distinction has been drawn between the Rīti and the Vṛtti. It is curious that the term Rīti has been used in connection with the Bhāratī which has been mentioned as a variety of Vṛtti. It is all the more amazing that not a word has been employed to define, describe or explain Pravṛtti, which has been mentioned as a division of *buddhyārambha* like Rīti and Vṛtti in 339/54.

Judging the Purāṇa's Rītis as they are, it would appear that they are not themselves the intellectual efforts (*buddhyārambha*) of the actor, but their inclusion under the *buddhyārambha* variety of Anubhāva may be justified in the sense that they are the external manifestations of the intellectual skill of the writer. One who is versed in these may understand the art of the dramatic speech, since, the function of the Rītis has been explicitly mentioned as helping the understanding of that art (*vāg-vidyā-sampratijñāne*). Now, although the Rītis here stand somewhat like means to an end, yet it is probably implied that dramatic speech itself is restricted to some or all of these Rītis: in other words, the different varieties of dramatic speech (*vāgārambha*), like *ālāpa*, *pralāpa* etc., find their expressions in short or long compounds, soft or hard syllables and metaphorical expressions which form the basis of the Rītis. If one, with a knowledge of the Rītis which consist of nothing

10 The reading appears to be corrupt. Our interpretation has been based upon taking the first *upacāraih* as *upacārair lakṣitā*.

11 The reading is a little obscure. Retaining it as it is, it would mean 'having once been free from metaphors the composition is again marked by too many of them.' It is even difficult to suggest a better reading in the absence of the treatment of any other writer following the Purāṇa's teachings regarding the Rītis.

12 It appears that the Rīti depends for its effect on words and the Vṛtti on action.

but the absence or presence of compound words and metaphorical expressions, is entitled to the proper understanding of the dramatic speech, the only conclusion possible is that the Rītis form a part and parcel of the different varieties of dramatic speech, even if they are not identical with them. In brief, the Rītis, as treated in the *Agnipurāṇa*, may be taken to mean the particular mode of diction in which the dramatic characters speak. But the Purāṇakāra's treatment of the Rītis, along with Vṛttis and Pravṛttis in connection with the drama, stands unique in the history of Sanskrit poetics and dramaturgy, and in spite of explaining them in connection with drama, their application in poetry in general can hardly be objected to.

As for the classification of the Vṛttis, he follows partly the principle in Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra* (Ch. XX, Kāvya-mūlā Text) with this difference that the Vṛttis here have not been assigned to any particular Rasa. Bharata, and following him other writers of dramaturgy, assign the *Kausikī Vṛtti* to Śṛṅgāra, Hūsyā and Karuṇa. The Purāṇa's description of Vṛttis as *Kriyāsaviśama* (or *Kriyāsu niyamah* = that which guides the action of the drama) appears to imply that they depend for their effect upon the action of the drama, and not upon the words or style thereof, and it is here that the Vṛttis are distinguished from the Rītis. Thus the Purāṇa's loose use of the term Rīti in connection with the Bhāratī may somehow be justified on the ground that, unlike the other Vṛttis, this particular Vṛtti depends for its effect mainly on words (*vāk-pradhānā*) and not on action.

Coming to the Guṇas, the Purāṇakāra remarks at the very outset that poetry, without Guṇas cannot be charming, even if it is endowed with Alamkāras (346/1), a remark which would lead the reader for a moment to believe that the writer apparently assigns a more important place to the Guṇas than to the Alamkāras like his predecessors of the Rīti school. But his definition of *Guṇa* as 'that which imparts a great charm to poetry (*yaḥ kāvyē mahatīm chāyām anuḡṛhṇāti*) is not fundamentally different from that of *Alamkāra* as 'attributes that beautify poetry' (*kāvya-sobhākarā dharmāḥ*). The latter definition is borrowed *verbatim* from Daṇḍin, but taking the two definitions together it is not clear whether the Guṇas constitute a more important element than the Alamkāras in the treatment of the Purāṇakāra. As regards this dis-

inction between the Guṇa and the Alaṅkāra, the Purāṇakāra does not seem to have availed himself of the more clear-cut treatment of Vāmana and Daṇḍin. As a matter of fact the fundamental distinction between Guṇas and Alaṅkāras is not at all apparent in his treatment, and he has incorporated in some of his Alaṅkāras, such characteristics as have been associated with Guṇas by other writers.¹³

The relation between Guṇas and Doṣas in the Purāṇa appear to be the same as what is found in the treatment of other writers. The Doṣa has been described as *udvega-janako doṣaḥ sabhyānām* i.e. Doṣa creates a sense of aversion in the readers,—which is evidently the result of its destroying the poetic effect which the Guṇa serves to heighten. Thus the Purāṇakāra's position is not at all different from that of Vāmana, in whose opinion the Doṣas bear characteristics opposite to those of the Guṇas and *vice versa*. If so, it may be argued that there is no necessity of mentioning the Guṇas separately meaning thereby that the Guṇas should be understood by implication from the Doṣas.* To this the Purāṇakāra replies that Guṇas like Śleṣa, and Doṣas like Gūḍhārtha have been clearly distinguished (*guṇāḥ śleṣādayo doṣā gūḍhārthādyāḥ pṛthak-kṛtāḥ* 46/2), by which he perhaps suggests that it is not to be understood that Śleṣa and such other Guṇas are always the exact opposites of Doṣas like Gūḍhārtha etc., but that the Guṇas as a class ought to be distinguished from the Doṣas as such. The distinction consists in this that the effect of the one upon poetry and consequently upon the reader will be quite opposite to that of the other. The simple fact deducible therefrom will be that the Guṇas adorn poetry and please the reader, while the Doṣas mar the poetic effect and produce, a sense of aversion

13 He borrows the definition of Daṇḍin's Samādhiguṇa word for word, but treats it in connection with Lakṣaṇā which comes in the process of dealing with Abhivyakti as one of the *śabdārthālaṅkāras*. Daṇḍin's Samādhi 'is a mode of poetic transference resting finally on Lakṣaṇā.' But Lakṣaṇā itself is treated by the Post-dhvani writers like Mammaṭa neither under the Guṇas nor under the Alaṅkāras, but separately as a particular mode of comprehension of the meanings of words and expressions.

* *na ca vācyaṃ guṇo doṣābhāva eva bhaviṣyati/
guṇāḥ śleṣādayo doṣā gūḍhārthādyāḥ pṛthak kṛtāḥ//*
The reading in the printed text is evidently corrupt.

in the reader's mind. It seems, therefore, that the Purāṇakāra's view is exactly on a par with that of all earlier theorists.

The Purāṇakāra's classification of the Guṇas is somewhat remarkable. Neither Bharata nor Daṇḍin gave us any classification of the Guṇas. It was Vāmana who for the first time classified each of the Guṇas in two-fold aspect, according as it belonged to the word or to the sense, thus doubling the number of the traditional Guṇas. But the Purāṇakāra deviates from that traditional number and nomenclature, and in addition to Vāmana's classification he, for the first time, evolves a third set of Guṇas belonging to the word as well as to the sense. Some later writers also, like Bhoja and Prakāśavarṣa, enumerate three sets of Guṇas, but they differ from the Purāṇakāra's classification in this that the third set which they enumerate is not restricted to those Guṇas that belong both to the word and to the sense, but it deals with Doṣas which have ceased to be such on account of their not marring the poetic effect. It is remarkable that even in the treatment of this third set of Guṇas, these later writers are influenced by the Purāṇakāra and partially by Daṇḍin, who towards the end of their chapters on Doṣas deal with a class of Doṣas which is not considered as destroying the effects of poetry under particular circumstances. The Purāṇakāra classifies the Guṇas first under two heads, viz., Sāmānya and Vaiśeṣika. The Sāmānya has further been classified into (1) *śabdaguṇa* (2) *arthaguṇa* and (3) *ubhaya-guṇa* (that belongs to Śabda and Artha). The Śabda Guṇas are seven in number viz: Śleṣa, Lālitya, Gāmbhīrya, Saukumārya, Udāratā, Satī and Yaugikī. Of these, the last two are not found in the list of definitions, but they are replaced by Ojas, thus making the total number of Śabda-guṇas really six.

I. Śleṣa It is defined to be a particular arrangement of words which produces a coalescence or cohesiveness in the structure (*Śuśliṣṭa-sanniveśatvam śabdānām*). Although it has not been made clear what this cohesiveness is due to, yet it may be generally assumed that this Guṇa of the Purāṇa incorporates in it characteristics of Vāmana's Śabda-guṇa Ojas which again appears to correspond partly to Daṇḍin's Śleṣa.

II. Lālitya. It is said to exist where the letters are already com-

bined in the words by grammatical *guṇa*, *ādeśa* etc., and there is hardly any necessity of further euphonic combinations.¹⁴

III. Gāmbhīrya. It is characterised as existing in that composition in which the words are high-sounding or bombastic (*uttānaśabdaka*) and the subject to be described (*lekhyā*) is possessed of a distinctive peculiarity (*viśiṣṭa-lakṣaṇollekha*).

IV. Sukumāratā. It consists in word composed mostly of unharsh syllables. It ought to be noted that this definition bears proof of the Purāṇakāra's close borrowing from Daṇḍin, and therefore it may be explained in the light of the latter's Guṇa of the same name.

V. Audārya. It consists of exaltedness of expressions by means of praiseworthy epithets. This corresponds to Daṇḍin's second Udāra.

VI. Ojas. It consists in the superbundance of compound words, and it forms the life-breath of metrical and other compositions. As in some of the previous instances, the definition of this Guṇa is not the Purāṇakāra's own but derived from Daṇḍin.¹⁵

The Arthaguṇas are enumerated as six in number, and they have been thus classified:

I. Mādhurya. It consists in maintaining tranquil forbearance and calmness of appearance under the influence of anger and malice.¹⁶

14 It is not known what the author really means. If the changes due to the grammatical *guṇa ādeśa* etc. be accepted, it is difficult to see why rules of euphonic combinations, if applicable, should be debarred from being used. Does this Guṇa bear any idea of the negation of Kaṣṭatva Doṣa (347-10) which consists in inconvenience of pronunciation due, for instance to bad *sandhi*? In that case Lālitya would exist in compositions where *sandhi* is permissible only where it is absolutely necessary. (e.g. where the syllables combine into a single word or where the combination takes place between the root and its prefix). Or where, it, being optional, does not give rise to the Kaṣṭatva doṣa. It would appear, therefore, that in the *Uttaracarita*, VI/19, *Vīro rusaḥ kimayam aityuta darpa eva*, the Sandhi in *aiti* (*ā-eti*) is absolutely necessary, but the word structure is such as to create a difficulty in utterance if *aiti* is further combined with *uta*.

15 For *padgādi* an alternative reading *padgādi* has been suggested in the foot-note to the Anandāśrāma edition of the *Purāṇa*.

16 The construction of the verse (*krodherṣyākāra-gāmbhīryam mādhuryam dhairyagāhitā*) is peculiar. The seventh case-ending appears to have been dropped

II. Samvidhāna. It exists where there is effort (*parikaraḥ*) to gain a wished-for object (*apekṣita-siddhaye*).

III. Komalatā. It is characterised as a special arrangement of words (*sanniveśaviśiṣṭatā*) which is free from harshness and inelegance (*kāṭhinyādi-nirmukta*) and which does not at the same time give rise to laxity (*tiraskṛtyaiva mṛdutā(ṃ) bhāti*). It is difficult to see what this definition exactly means. As it is, it appears to stand midway between the two extreme structures of composition, harsh and loose.

IV. Udāratā. It exists where the exact inner significance (*āśayasyūti-sauṣṭhavam*) is very easily comprehended (literally, falls to one's comprehension at even a superficial attempt = *lakṣyate sthūla-lakṣatva-pravṛtteḥ*).¹⁷

V. Praudhi. It is said to consist in mature logical reasonings (*praudhā yuktayo hetugarbhinyah*) that help the completion (*nirvāhasyopapūlikāḥ*) of the subject of discourse.¹⁸

VI. Sāmāyikatva. It consists in the comprehension of the meanings of matters in hand and those independent of it by means of establishing a relationship between them, either internally or externally.

The Ubhayaguṇa again has been classified under six different heads as follows:

I. Prasāda. It consists in the use of words of which the meanings are too well-known (*suprasiddhārtha-padatū*).

II. Saubhāgya. It implies, like Daṇḍin's Udāratā, an elevation consisting of the expression of some high merit (*utkarṣavān guṇaḥ kaścit*). It is evident that in his attempt to follow Daṇḍin's definition, our author has lost all sense of consistency; and the mention of *udāratā* in

between *krodherśyū* and *ākāra-gāmbhīrya*. Bhoja, in his definition of Arthamādhurya appears to make the construction clear (*krodhādāv apy ativratū* p. 64, Kāvya-mālā Text.)

17 Panchanan Tarkaratna (ed. Vaṅgavāsī Press, Calcutta) rightly reads *lakṣyatva*.

18 The reading *pratihataṃ* is corrupt. Panchanan Tarkaratna (*op. cit.*) reads *abhiprāyaṃ prati yataḥ*, which appears to be preferable.

this connection raises a doubt whether this Guṇa is to be named Saubhāgya or we are to understand that the Guṇa Uḍāratā has a three-fold characteristic according as it belongs to the *śabda*, to the *artha* or to both.

III. Yathāsamkhyā. It is the extended and universal (*sāmānya*) application (*atideśa*) of an undefined statement (*anuddēśa*).

IV. Prāśastya. It consists in describing in appropriate time even horrible objects in unharsh (i.e., agreeable) words and expressions. It may partially approximate to Vāmana's Arthaguṇa Saukumārya, where inauspicious statements like *mṛtam* are avoided by the use of some agreeable expressions like *yaśaḥśeṣam gatam* etc.

V. Pāka.¹⁹ Maturity which implies the highest stage of perfection of a poetic composition. It has got four distinct varieties of which two only, viz., *mṛdvīkā-pāka* and *nārikelapāka* have been mentioned or defined. The *mṛdvīkā-pāka* is said to exist where a particular composition is sweet both at the beginning and at the end.

VI. Rāga.²⁰ It is a particular quality used with a view to attain (the beauty of) poetry.

From the above it will be evident that the author's treatment of the Guṇas, as of all other poetic elements, is rather vague, unsystematic, eclectic and uncritical. It is really a matter of surprise that in spite of having before him such developed schemes of Guṇa and Rīti as enunciated by the adherents of the Rīti school, he did not avail himself pro-

19 The naturally vague and unsystematic treatment of the author makes it difficult to grasp what this maturity is due to. He includes Pāka under the Guṇas, but Rājasekhara, who has given a very interesting history of the earlier views on Pāka, means by it *sauśabdya* or general excellence of language; and in one of the views that he cites the scope of Pāka is given as very wide, inasmuch as it forms the basis on which the different poetic elements like Guṇa, Alaṃkāra and Rīti as well as the process of the exact choice of words according to their sense (*śabdārtha-grathana-krama*) stand. For a connected history of Pāka the reader is referred to *Sanskrit Poetics* (vol. II, p. 300), where its author has given a brief treatment of this poetic factor.

20 This definition is extremely vague. This is the characteristic of all the different elements of poetry. Broad characteristics are attributed to the general terms like Guṇas and Alaṃkāras but the individual Guṇa ought to show in what particular way it helps to accomplish poetical objects.

perly of their system, nor did he attempt to improve upon them. Should we understand with some scholars that the *Agnipurāṇa* was the first treatise to supply crude materials to the writers of the different schools of *Alaṅkāra Śāstra*, each of whom might have developed his own system in his own way? But his lavish borrowings, either in letter or in spirit, in a regularly unsystematic way from all the earlier works on poetics and dramaturgy exclude that possibility. A work which is claimed as the source of an important branch of knowledge should possess an individual tone and a system of its own, however crude and undeveloped its treatment and ideas might be; and it is impossible to believe that such a store-house of heterogenous and conflicting views could have formed the starting point of a technical *Śāstra*.

The classification of the *Guṇas*, again, in this work is somewhat vague. For instance, the work has not clearly explained the distinction between the *Sāmānya* and *Vaiśeṣika*²¹ sets of *Guṇas*. The definitions that have been given of individual *Guṇas* do not give us any light, but leave the reader to judge for himself the differentia of these two sets of *Guṇas*. The *Sāmānya* *guṇa* has been defined as *sarvasādhāraṇībhūtaḥ* (that which belongs to all), implying perhaps that the different varieties of *Sāmānya* *Guṇa* e.g. *śabda-gata*, *artha-gata* and *ubhaya-gata*, which are being characterised here, may be practised by all classes of writers. But with regard to the *Vaiśeṣika* *Guṇa* the author has got nothing to say except giving a general definition which runs as *vaiśeṣikaḥ parijñeyo yaḥ svalakṣaṇa-gocaraḥ*. It probably means that these excellences are based upon the particular (*viśeṣa*) characteristic of an individual author, and must be defined in terms of his own peculiar ideas (*sva-lakṣaṇa-gocaraḥ*); for what lies in the power of a particular individual cannot be brought under the scope of hard-and-fast rules.

21 The terms *Sāmānya* and *Viśeṣa* he uses also in connection with the drama (338/4-5). The *Sāmānya* embraces all the general characteristics of a drama, viz. *Rasa* with all its accessories, *Abhinaya*, *Aṅka* etc., which are found scattered all over the drama (*sāmānyam sarva-viṣayam . . . sarvatraivopasarpaṇat* 338/5-6); while *viśeṣa* appears to be applied in connection with the *Nāndī*, the *Arthapra-kṛtis* (like *blīja*, *vinḍu* etc.), which occupy any specific part of the drama.

Amongst the Guṇas enumerated and defined by the Purāṇakāra, we have seen that some follow closely the treatment of either Daṇḍin or Vāmana, and as such they have to be interpreted in the light of their treatment; while the rest of the Guṇas must either have been borrowed from sources unknown to us, or characterised by the author himself. Even if the latter be taken to be his original contribution, the isolated borrowings in which he has evidently lost the spirit of the earlier sources make his position still worse. If he has borrowed, he has done it uncritically; if he has at all made original contributions he has proved a failure. Most of the definitions are unintelligible; they leave the reader to guess what they mean. No illustrations have been given to help the reader in understanding their characteristics. The character of the Artha-guṇas have not been distinctly kept apart from that of the Śabda-guṇas or of the ubhaya-guṇas. Thus the question of arrangement (of words or letters) has crept even into the treatment of Artha-guṇas. Two of his Śabda-guṇas, namely Satī and Yaugikī, are given only in name; they have been neither defined nor characterised. Ojas has stealthily crept into the definitions of the Śabda-guṇas, although it is not mentioned in the general list of enumeration of the Guṇas. Nothing more need be added to prove that if the author is systematic in anything it is in inconsistency. To explain this inconsistency we have only to admit that the Alankāra section in the *Āgnipurāṇa* "is chiefly a compilation by a writer who was himself no theorist, but who wanted to collect together and present a workable epitome conforming in essentials to the teachings of no particular orthodox school", for no truer statement appears to have been ever made in connexion with this work.

PRAKAS CHANDRA LAHIRI

* I must acknowledge my deep obligations to my Professor Dr. S. K. De who guided these investigations and very kindly looked over the first as well as the final draft of this article.

The Purānic Traditions

(about earlier homes and migrations of the Indian Āryas)

The Indians of today have been ethnically divided into seven main physical types,¹ viz. I. the Turko-Irānian (represented by the Baloch, Brāhūi and Afghans of Baluchistan and N.W.F. Province); II. the Indo-Aryan (occupying the Punjab, Rajputana and Kāsmīr and having as its characteristic members the Rajputs, Khatris and Jats:; III. the Scytho-Dravidian (comprising the Marāthā Brāhmans, the Kunbis and the Coorgs of Western India); IV. the Aryo-Dravidian or Hindustānī (found in the U.P., in parts of Rajputana and in Bihar); V. the Mongolo-Dravidian or Bengali type (of Lower Bengal and Orissa²); VI. the Mongoloid type (of the Himalayas, Nepal, Assam and Burma); and VII. the Dravidian type (extending from Ceylon to the valley of the Ganges and pervading Madras, Hyderabad, the Central Provinces, most of Central India and Chotanagpur). Of these seven types the Dravidian alone is taken to be indigenous, or at least to be the earliest inhabitants of India. The Indo-Aryan, the Mongoloid and the Turko-Irānian types are considered as of foreign origin. The Aryo-Dravidian, the Mongolo-Dravidian and the Scytho-Dravidian are composite types formed by crossing with the Dravidians. "The dominant influence in the formation of these types was the physical seclusion of India, involving the consequence that the various invaders brought few women with them and took the women of the country to wife. To this rule the first wave of Indo-Aryan formed the sole exception."³ This theory supposes that "the ancestors of the Indo-Aryans came into India from the north-west" and that "after the first swarm of Indo-Aryans had occupied the Punjab, a second wave of Aryan speaking people, the remote ancestors

1 See *Imperial Gazetteer of India*, 1909, I, pp. 283-348.

2 If "remarkable aptitude for clerical pursuits" is the distinguishing index of this "most distinctive type" (cf. *ibid.*, p. 294), then "the bulk of the population of Orissa" can hardly be said to come under the category of the Mongolo-Dravidian or Bengali type.

3 *Ibid.*, pp. 347-48.

of the Aryo-Dravidians of to-day, impelled by some ethnic upheaval, or driven forward by the change of climate in Central Asia, made their way into India through Gilgit and Chitral and established themselves in the plains of the Ganges and Jumna, the sacred Middle land (*Mādhyadeśa*) of post-Vedic tradition".⁴ This theory precludes the possibility of any friendly or peaceful migrations, and postulates not only one invasion from the North-West but even a double invasion and holds that "the inhabitants of the Midland represents the latest stage of Indo-Aryan immigration"⁵ and that "the latest invaders probably entered the Punjab like a wedge into the heart of the country already occupied by the first immigrants forcing the latter outwards in three directions to the East, to the South and to the West."⁶

Side by side with this ethnological division there is the linguistic division.⁷ The modern vernaculars of India have been broadly divided into three groups, viz. 1. Indo-Aryan vernaculars, 2. Dravidian languages and 3. the Muṇḍā languages. The Indo-Aryan vernaculars⁸ consist of (A) language of the Midland (Western Hindī); (B) Intermediate languages (Rājasthānī, the Pāhārī languages, Gujarātī, Punjābī and Eastern Hindī); (C) Outer languages (I. North Western group,—Kāśmirī, Kohistānī, Lahudā and Sindhī; II. Southern language—Marātī; and III. Eastern group—Bihārī, Oriyā, Bengali and Assamese). The Dravidian languages have been divided into four groups viz. (1) Drāvīḍa group consisting of Tamil, Malayālam, Kanares, Kodagu, Tulu, Toda, Kota, Kurukh and Malto; (2) Intermediate languages—Gond etc.; (3) Andhra group consisting of Teluga, Kandh and Kolāmi, and (4) Brāhūī language. The Muṇḍā languages, which consist of Kerwārī, Kūrkū, Kharijā Juāng, Savara and Godabea, "are among⁹ those which have been the longest spoken in India and may with great probability, claim to be aboriginal". "The principal¹⁰ home of the Muṇḍā languages is Chotanagpur; speakers are further found in the adjoining districts of Bengal, Orissa, Madras and the Central Pro-

4 *Imp. Gaz. of I.*, 1909, 1,

6 *Ibid.*, p. 358.

8 *Ibid.*, p. 364.

10 *Ibid.*, p. 383.

5 *Ibid.*, p. 358.

7 *Ibid.*, pp. 349-401.

9 *Ibid.*, p. 382.

vinces with an outlying colony far to the west of Mahadeo hills, north of Berar.”

The theory of Aryan entry into India in two streams from the North-West has been characterised by Pargiter as ‘improbable in itself’, and ‘wholly¹¹ unnecessary according to the tradition’. He however¹² identifies (1) the Aryans with the Purānic Aīlas or Kṣatriyas of the lunar race, (2) the Dravidians with the Mānava or solar race Kṣatriyas, and (3) the Saudyumna stock (Utkalas, Gayas etc.) with the Muṇḍā race, and its branch the Monkmer folk in the East. In his opinion¹³ “tradition or myth thus directly indicates that the Aīlas (or Aryans) entered India from the Mid-Himalayan region”. “They (mythical tales)¹⁴ certainly suggest that Purūravas’s origin was in that north region, and this agrees with and explains the fact that that region, the countries in and beyond the middle of the Himalayas, has always been the sacred land of the Indians”.

One may however regretfully differ from this eminent scholar in these identifications and assertions. True it is that the region—countries in and beyond the middle of the Himalayas—has always been of ancient sacred memories, but it is not at all so on account of its early association with Ilā or earlier Aīlas who were comparatively of later origin and were less important personalities from the religious point of view. The region is held in high esteem¹⁵ owing to its very old association with the Hindu Triad Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva, and also with other high gods and holy sages. Badarikāśrama,¹⁶ the place of Eternal Brahmā, contains the sacred hermitage of Nara, and Nārāyaṇa, the prophet-representative¹⁷ of Nārāyaṇa of the Arctic region (or of Viṣṇu of Mid-Siberia) who first introduced¹⁸ into India, the Viṣṇu cult of the North, the Bhāgavata dharma, Pitṛ worship in the

11 *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*, pp. 296-97.

12 *Ibid.*, p. 295.

13 *Ibid.*, p. 299.

14 *Ibid.*, p. 298.

15 *Mbh.*, Udy., III, Śānti, 192, 8-25.

16 *Ibid.*, III, 4.

17 Cf. *Mbh.*, Śānti, 334, 8-12, 28-34; 335, 2-15; 336, 19-60; 338-340; 343-346; 348.

18 Cf. *Mbh.*, Śānti, 334, 8-12, 28-34; 335, 2-15; 336, 19-60; 338-340; 343-346, 348.

tarpaṇa form and many other important religious rites. The Mount Kailāsa is the permanent favourite abode of Śiva and Pārvatī, the place of Kuvera, the lord over the Yakṣas and Gandharvas.¹⁹ The mid-Himalayan region is the birth-place of Umā and of the sacred²⁰ river Gaṅgā and has been sanctified by the severe austerities of holy sages. Just on its Northern border lies the much coveted Paraloka,²¹ the earthly Paradise, the land of Bliss and Peace, where only the good and virtuous people dwell, and beyond it lie the most sacred Brahmaloḥa and other Lokas (see below). It is for all such reasons that the North was considered²² in ancient India as 'the best (direction) in all respects' where man 'gets free from sin and attains *Mukti* (salvation)'.

The earlier association of the Āryas with the countries beyond the middle of the Himalayas—Ilā's final settlement in the Ilāvṛta country, Purūravas's special attachment to the Gandharva and trans-Himalayan countries, Nahuṣa's officiating appointment to the post of the Indra and his final²³ expulsion, his brother Rāji's supremacy over the Indra, his sons' forcible²⁴ occupation of the Deva countries and the manner of their final destruction—all these clearly suggest the expansion and out-flow of the Āryas through the North into the countries beyond and not *vice versa*.

Besides, the Āryas themselves have been described from the very beginning as a cross race of mixed origin. Ilā's consort Buddha was the illegitimate son of Soma, the emperor over the Brāhmaṇas²⁵ of the North, by Tārā, an abducted lady of the Āngiras clan. Ilā herself was of doubtful origin (see below). There was no formal or regular marriage between her and Buddha, and the caste of their offspring, Purūravā, was determined as Kṣatriya²⁶ by his *karma*, duty or conduct. Pargiter does not say whether the Āryas were a cross race. From the Purāṇic descrip-

19 *Mbh.*, Udy., III, 5-6, 11. 20.

20 *Ibid.*, 8-9. 17.

21 *Mbh.*, Śānti, 192, 8-25.

22 *Mbh.*, Udy., III, 27, 1, Cf. Śānti, 192, 21-22.

23 Cf. *Mbh.*, Van., 181, 30-43, Adi., 75, 26-29 & Śānti, 342, 44-51. Udy., 11-17.

24 *Vā.*, 92, 75-99; *Br.*, 11, 3-26; *Hvś.*, I 28. *Mt.* 24, 35-49. *Bhṛ.*, IX 17, 12-16.

25 *Mbh.*, Udy., III, 8. *Mt.*, 8. 2-3; II, 63; 23, 10-11. *Hvś.* I 25, 20; 46, 7-9; 4, 2. *Hvś.* III. 37, 5. *Vā.* 70, 3; 90, 19. *Viṣ.* IV 6. 5.

26 Cf. *Br.*, 108, 69-70.

tion the Ailas appear more to have been an 'Aryo-Mongoloid' race, but there is no such ethnic division. In any case, Pargiter's identification of the Aryans with the Ailas makes the whole equal to a small part.

Pargiter's identification of the Kṣatriyas of the solar race with the Dravidians, rests on a very slippery ground. Of course, the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* (see below) suggests that the progenitor of the solar race, the Kṣatriyas of Ayodhyā, came from the Draviḍadeśa, but the traditions unanimously trace the purest Ārya blood, purest in descent in this clan of Kṣatriyas and that is why "in the genealogical accounts the post of honour in being described first is always given to the solar or Mānava race".

Similarly the identification of the Saudyumna stock (Utkalas, Gayas etc.) with the Muṇḍā race is hardly probable unless by Muṇḍās are understood such tribes of Śavaras, Dāsas, Matsyas, and possibly the Nāgas of Kadru origin, as had, by virtue of their ancient Vedic culture and pure conduct, long been accepted into pure Aryan fold and had since been merged beyond recognition (c.f. the statement that Sudyumna's sons, Utkala, Gaya etc. were much devoted to the Dharma (*Paramadhārmikāḥ*),²⁷ very powerful, energetic and devoted²⁸ to Yajña). In that case the Uḍras, particularly the *Venāṭiā Oḍas* may be equated with the *Vainateya Garuḍas*,²⁹ but the suggested identification of the Utkalas etc. with the Muṇḍās is, on the whole, highly problematical.

The *Manu Samhitā* declares all the Indians, whether 'Aryan' 'Dravidian' or 'Muṇḍā' as coming of one single stock. The *Mahābhārata* quotes Manu's versions as authority above doubt and controversy, and explains further that originally³⁰ there was only one race called the Brāhmaṇas which in course of time was divided into four sects (*jāti*) or castes, viz. Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya, Vaiśya, and Śūdra, by following different conduct or occupation (*karma*), and thereby

27 *Vā.*, 85, 18; *Bhāg.*, IX, 1. 40; *Hvs.*, 1, 10, 18.

28 *Mkd.*, II, 15.

29 Compare the statement of *Mbh.*, 101, 5-6 about the *karma* (conduct,) and caste of the Garuḍas with that of *Manu.*, X, 43-44 regarding the Oḍras or Auḍra-Draviḍas; Cf. also *Mbh.*, Anu., 35, 17-28.

30 *Mbh.*, Śānti, 188, 10-17; Cf. *Adi.* 75, 13-14.

developing distinct temperaments (*guṇa*) and colours. The race of Brāhmaṇas first sprang from the One Brahma, and from the Brāhmaṇas were born³¹ gradually the three other Varnas or castes (*jāti*), the Kṣatriya, the Vaiśya and the Śūdra. They are all related to the Brāhmaṇas by family or blood ties. All other castes except these three are mixed³² races, produced by irregular or unauthorised unions between the pairs of these four castes in ascending or descending order (*Anuloma* or *Pratiloma* process), or, by a series of further complicated cross. Non-observance of time-honoured family customs and neglect of sacred duties, inspite of the regular or orderly unions, gave rise also to several new castes including the Vrātya. The Dravidians (*Dravidas*) were Vrātya Kṣatriyas³³ i.e. of pure Kṣatriya origin, but were reduced³⁴ to the status of Śūdra for the negligence of their sacred duties.

The Niṣādas were born³⁵ of the combination of Brāhmaṇa males with Śūdra females. It is unanimously held that the race first came into being or received distinct recognition³⁶ just after King Vena's death, was divided into numerous tribes in course of time by further crosses, known under the common designation of the Mlecchas, and grew in number in the Tretā age.³⁷ They were³⁸ of charcoal colour, red eyes, black or curly hair and were a short statured but very strong people. From the very beginning they were treated as a degraded race owing to their peculiar constitution and conduct and were con-

31 *Mbh.*, Śānti, 60, 42-47; Cf. *Manu.*, IX. 320-21; *Mbh.*, Śānti, 56, 23-26.

32 *Ibid.*, 296, 7-9; Cf. *Manu.*, X; *Mbh.*, Anu, 48 & 49.

33 *Manu.*, X, 20-22.

34 *Ibid.*, X, 43-44; *Mbh.*, Anu., 33, 21-22; 35, 17-18.

35 *Manu.*, X; *Mbh.*, Anu., 48, 12 says that Niṣādas were born of the union of Śūdras with Kṣatriya females.

36 *Mt.*, 10, 7-8; *Bd.*, 68; 122-126; *Hrs.*, I, 5, 16-20; *Bhg.*, IV, 14, 41-46; *Mbh.*, Śānti, 59, 95-97; *Br.*, 4, 44-47; *Viṣ.*, I, 13, 30-37; *Vā.*, 62, 120-125.

37 *Mbh.*, Śānti, 207, 42-45; *Mt.* 4, 54 says that Prācetasā Dakṣa created several tribes of Mlecchas.

38 *Mbh.*, Śānti, 59, 95-97; *Br.*, 4, 44, *Viṣ.*, I, 13, 34; *Vā.*, 62, 121-22; *Mt.*; 10, 8, 123; *Hrs.*, I, 5, 17. According to the *Bhg.*, IV, 14, 41-46 they were of short stature; colour, crow-black; nose-end depressed; brow broad at both sides; eyes red; and hair of copper colour. They still live in hills and forests.

signed to the Vindhya region. From their description they appear to correspond to the present day 'Dravidian type' of the ethnic division in whose "typical"³⁹ specimens, the stature is short or below mean; the complexion very dark, approaching black; hair plentiful, with an occasional tendency to curl, eyes dark, head long, nose very broad, sometimes depressed at the root, but not so as to make the face appear flat. This race, the most primitive of the Indian types, occupies the oldest geological formation in India, the medley of forest clad ranges, terraced plateaux and undulating plains which stretches, roughly speaking, from the Vindhya to Cape Comorin." Assuming that Niṣāda-Mlecchas and the Dravidians are the same, one finds a substantial difference of opinion between the ancient Indian authorities and the modern scholars as to the origin and habitat of this race. The former definitely call it a mixed race of Brāhmaṇa or Ārya origin, some members or tribes of which, attained at certain periods the highest Vedic culture and introduced into India some new forms of Vedic rites, particularly of the Pitṛ worship of the South (see Varāha tradition below). The latter declare it to be 'the most primitive' on the ground that⁴⁰ "taking them as we find them now, it may safely be said that their present geographical distribution, the marked uniformity of physical characters among the more primitive members of the group, their animistic religion, their distinctive languages, their stone monuments, and their retention of a primitive system of totemism justify us in regarding them as the earliest inhabitants of India of whom we have any knowledge."

To a layman ignorant of how far the present ethnic distinctions are free from the cumulative effects of factors such as the total prohibition of intermarriage or social exclusion, particular habitat, environment, climate, food, conduct, habit etc., the unanimous statement of the Indian authorities would appear to be more convincing. The primitive system of totemism is not confined to the Dravidian Muṇḍā alone; it continues as well in the shape of lower animals, birds, lizards, snakes, and even trees, side by

³⁹ *Imperial Gazetteer of India*, vol. I, p. 296.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 299.

side with the more refined human *gotra* system, even among some 'Aryan' tribes including the high class Brāhmaṇa; and the popular tradition has it that the primitive system was first introduced during the Dakṣa-Rudra war. During the latter phase of the Devāsura war when the Asuras were compelled to live⁴¹ in the jungles and hills, most probably in close association and intimacy with the Muṇḍās, the latter apparently borrowed and adopted the Asura custom of stone monuments, which has its echo in *samādhis*, *stūpas*, and possibly in temples of the Āryas. Their forcible total expulsion from the pale of Aryan culture, apparently after the conclusion of the Devāsura war, and their secluded life and habits may account for their distinctive languages, and, continuing in the original 'animistic religion' of the ancient Indian mass. Rai Bahadur S. C. Rai in his paper,⁴² *A possible ethnic basis for the Sanskritic element in the Muṇḍā language*, has shown that in the Muṇḍāri vocabulary there is "the existence of a large Sanskritic element..... And it is quite remarkable that even a number of Muṇḍāri words of primary importance denoting things and actions which even the most primitive people cannot do without, look like pure Sanskrit words, or clear variations of such words". This clearly suggests at least the linguistic origin of the Muṇḍās from the Aryan stock.

The Purāṇas, however, make mention of numerous Mleccha tribes living in Indonesia, or Australasia (see below) and it is just possible that during the age of Asura supremacy when the great Indian empire extended far outside (or when India proper came under the subjugation of the Asuras of the now-submerged Pātāla continent), free maritime intercourse and the then political situation had led several migrations of these Mleccha people to and from India, resulting in their manners, customs, language and religion greatly influenced by the out-side contact.

The Purāṇas are rather silent and do not make any explicit statement about any outside home of the original Indian Brāhmaṇas or Āryas. All references in the matter point to India itself as the land of their origin and development. The specific mention of

41 Cf. *Vā.*, 97, 111-124; *Mat.*, 47, 50, 76-77, 89; 131, 5; 137, 7.

42 *JBORS.*, IX, pp. 376-393

the Brahmāvartta⁴³ (the land lying between the rivers Sarasvatī and Dṛṣadvatī) as the land of good custom (*sadācāra*), or, of its adjoining countries, the Brahmarsideśa (Kurukṣetra, Matsya, Pañcāla and Sūrasena)⁴⁴ from the Brāhmaṇas of which places, the people of the whole world should learn their respective conduct (*caritra*), indicates the ideal state of Brāhmanical culture those parts once attained, and not that they were the cradle land of Aryan immigrants from outside (compare *Mbh.*, Karna, 45, 14-16, saying that eternal *dharma* is also known in many other countries such as Aṅga, Magadha, Kaliṅga etc.).

At the same time the Purāṇas do record some traditions which unmistakably suggest immigrations to India from out-side; but those migrations, not hostile in many cases, were not confined either to the North West or the North (Mid-Himalayan region) alone. Almost all the directions of India had witnessed such migrations from outside, although at different periods. The immigrants sometimes brought with them new faiths, different forms of worship, but they along with their distinct culture had long been absorbed beyond recognition, in the main body of the Indian Āryas. The current and the accepted theory is that it is these out-side immigrants from the North-West or the North whose descendants now constitute Aryan population of India, but if this out-side immigration theory is to be accepted at all, then it must be said with some degree of certainty that the probabilities of immigrations from the South, East and South-East are not less, if not more strong, than from the former two directions. In this article I propose to deal with a few such Purānic traditions as clearly suggest migrations from the opposite directions viz. the South, East or the South-East.

(To be continued).

NARAYANA TRIPATHI

The Study of Ancient Geography*

Agni-Purāna

Geographical materials, embodied in the Purāṇas, are not so meagre as those of history. The ancient Aryans belonged to a nomadic race and some of their wandering tribes did not definitely settle down till a very late period. Even in the Purāṇic age some of them travelled from place to place, being induced by the only aim of seeing the world.¹ In course of their wanderings they passed through different countries, crossing various mountains and rivers. In those days India had established commercial intercourse with foreign lands,² and the growth of international trade necessitated a wide and accurate geographical knowledge.³ Consequently her ancient inhabitants must have stored much valuable geographical materials in some treatises, now lost to us, or at least much information was orally handed down to succeeding generations, and ultimately embodied in the Purāṇas.

In the *Indian Antiquary* (XIV, pp. 319 ff.) Dr. Burgess suggested that lists of geographical names contained in the *Purāṇas*, *Itihāsas*, *Smṛtis* and other available sources of information should be prepared "as a means to the better elucidation of the ancient geography of India". He also gives the specimen of an alphabetical list of such names. Following his suggestion, Fleet, in a subsequent issue of the same Journal,⁴ gives a list of topographical names contained in the *Bṛhat Saṃhitā* of Varāhamihira. After him J. E. Abbott gave a list of such names contained in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*.⁵ After this, no further attempt was made in this direction.

In the following pages I propose to give an alphabetical list of topographical names as embodied in the *Agni Purāṇa*. All the various

*I must express my deep obligations to Dr. N. N. Law, the editor of this Journal not only for his valuable suggestions but also for the troubles that he has taken in revising this article.

1 *Mārkaṇḍeya P.*, 58. 7; 58. 15.

2 N. C. Bandyopadhyaya, *Economic Life and Progress in Anc. India*, 1, p. 32.

3 *Ibid.*, pp. 294, 295.

4 *IA.*, XXII, p. 169.

5 *Ibid.*, XXIII, pp. 1-6.

readings have been put in the foot-notes. The text used by me is published by the Venkatesvara Press, Bombay; the figures of references are to its chapter and verse, indicated thus LIV. 14; LVI. 4. etc.

[Abbreviations used:—Bhā.=Bhāratavarṣa; Pl.=Plakṣa; Pu.=Puṣkara; Kr.=Krauñca; J.=Jambū; Śāl=Śālmala; D.=Dvīpa; Mt.=mountain; other abbreviations such as N.=North and S.=South are easily intelligible.]

The Topographical information contained in the Agni-Purāna:

A

- Aṅga—A country in the S.E. of Bhā. LIV. 14.
- Anutaptā—A river in the Pl. D., LVI. 4.
- Andhakāraka⁶—A mt. in Kr. D., LVI. 13.
- Andhra—A country and people in the S. of Bhā. LV. 6.
- Abhīśāha—A country in the N.E. of Bhā. LV. 20.
- Abhrā⁷—A river in Kuśa-D., LVI. 11.
- Amṛta—A river in Pl. D., LVI. 4.
- Ambaṣṭha—A country in the S.W. of Bhā. LV. 16.
- Aśmaka—A country in the S. of Bhā. LV. 15.
- Aśvamukha⁸—A country in the N.W. of Bhā. LV. 18.

I

- Ikṣu-samudra—(i) A sea surrounding Pl. D., LIV. 6.
- (ii) A river in Śāka-D., LVI. 17.

6 The reading is Andha(thā)kāraka. This may be taken as Andhakāraka or Atha+kāraka.

7 The reading is Vidyūtabhrā. This cannot be taken as one name because in that case the number of the rivers in Kuśa-D. would not count seven as it has been found in all other cases.

8 A country commonly receives its appellation from its people. For example, the compounded word *Mahānāsa* (with a long nose), by which a country was known, indicates that there lived a kind of people who were famous for their long noses. The words *Aśvamukha* and *Mahākeśa* are of similar types. The Sakas, Sūtas, Videhas and Māgadhas also have imparted their appellations to the countries where they resided. Such terms are included in the lists of countries in the Purāna and therefore, in all such cases, they are described as countries. Whether such countries have borrowed their names from the people residing there is a subject left for further investigation.

Indra-Dvīpa—One of the nine parts of Bhā. LV. 4.

Ilāvṛta—One of the Varṣas; it is the middle portion of J.D.,
LIV. 12; LV. I.

U

Unnata—A mt. in Śāl. D., LVI. 6.

Ṛ

Ṛkṣa—One of the Kulācalas of J.D., LV. 7.

Ṛṣikulyā—A river in Bhā. LV. 10.

K

Kakudmat—A mt. in Śāl. D., LVI. 7.

Kaṅka (or Krauñca)—A mt. in Śāl. D., LVI. 7.

Katāha—One of the nine parts of Bhā. LV. 5.

Kamboja—A country in the S. of Bhā. LV. 15

Karṇāta—A country in the S. of Bhā. LV. 15.

Kaliṅga—A country in the S.E. of Bhā. LV. 14.

Kaśerumat—One of the nine parts of Bhā. LV. 4.

Kāmbhoja—A country in the S.W. of Bhā. LV. 16.

Kāraka (?)—A mt. in Kr. D., LVI. 13.

Kāverī—A river in Bhā. LV. 9; LV. 10.

Kāśī—A country in the E. of Bhā. LV. 13.

Kāśmīra—A country in the N.E. of Bhā. LV. 20.

Kimpuruṣa—One of the Varṣas; it is a part of J. D. and is to the
south of Ilāvṛtavarṣa, LIV. 12; LV. 2.

Kirāta—A people to the E. of Bhā. LV. 6.

Kunti—A country in the middle region of Bhā. LV. 12.

Kumārī—A river in Śāka-D., LVI. 17.

Kumuda—A mt. in Śāl. D., LVI. 6.

Kumudvatī—A river in Kr. D., LVI. 14.

Kuru—(i) One of the Varṣas; it is to the north of Meru mt., LIV.
12; LV. 3;

(ii) A country in the middle region of Bhā. LV. 12.

Kuśa—One of the seven Dvīpas; it is surrounded by Sarpissamudra,
LIV. 5; LVI. 8.

Kuśésaya—A mt. in Kuśa-D., LVI. 10.

Kṛṣṇavenī—A river in Bhā. LV. 9.

Ketumāla—One of the Varṣas; it is to the W. of Meru mt., LIV. 13; LV. 3.

Ketumālā—A river in Bhā. LV. 12.

Kolāta—A country in the N.E. of Bhā. LV. 13.

Kramu—A river in Pl. D., LVI. 4.

Krauñca (i) One of the seven Dvīpas; it is surrounded by Dadhi-samudra, LIV. 5; LVI. 12.

(ii) A mt. in Kr. D., LVI. 13.

Kh

Khasa—A country in the N.W. of Bhā. LV. 18.

Khyāti—A river in Kr. D., LVI. 15.

G

Gabhastimat—One of the nine parts of Bhā. LV. 4.

Gabhastī—A river in Śāka-D., LVI. 17.

Gāndhāra—A country in the N. of Bhā. LV. 19.

Godāvarī—A river in Bhā. LV. 9.

Gomatī—A river in Bhā. LV. 9.

Gomeda—A mt. in Pl. D., LVI. 3.

Gaurī—A river in Kr. D., LVI. 14.

Gh

Ghana—A country in the S. of Bhā. LV. 15.

C

Candra—A mt. in Pl. D., LVI. 3.

Candrabhāgā—A river in Bhā. LV. 10.

Candrā—A river in Śāl. D., LVI. 7.

Cedi—A country in the E. of Bhā. LV. 13.

J

Jambū Dvīpā—One of the seven Dvīpas; it is surrounded by Lavaṇasamudra, LIV. 5; LIV. 11.

Jala-samudra—One of the seven oceans; it surrounds Pu. D., LIV. 6; LVI. 20.

Jīmūta—A country in the S. of Bhā. LV. 15.

T

Ṭaṅkaṇa—A country in the N.E. of Bhā. LV. 20.

T

Tāpī—A river in Bhā. LV. 9.

Tāmraparṇī—A river in Bhā. LV. 10

Tāmravarṇa—One of the nine parts of Bhā. LV. 4.

Turaṣka—A country in the N.W. of Bhā. LV. 18.

Trigarta—A country in the N.E. of Bhā. LV. 20.

Tridivā—A river in Pl. D., LVI. 4.

D

Dakṣiṇāpatha—The southern region of Bhā. LV. 15.

Dadhisamudra—A sea surrounding Kr. D., LIV. 6.

Divāvṛta—A mt. in Kr. D., LVI. 14.

Dugḍhasamudra—A sea surrounding Śāka-D., LIV. 6.

Dundubhi—(i) A mt. in Pl. D., LVI. 3.

(ii) A mt. in Kr. D., LVI. 14.

Dyutimat—A mt. in Kuśa-D., LVI. 10.

Draviḍa—A country in the S.W. of Bhā. LV. 14.

Droṇa—A mt. in Śāl. D., LVI. 6.

Dh

Dhūtapāpā—A river in Kuśa-D., LVI. 11.

Dhenukā—A river in Śāka-D., LVI. 17.

N

Nayarāṣṭra—A country in the S. of Bhā. LV. 15.

Narmadā—A river in Bhā. LV. 8.

Nalinī—A river in Śāka-D., LVI. 17.

Navarāṣṭra—The same as Nayarāṣṭra.

Nāgadvīpa—One of the nine parts of Bhā. LV. 5.

Nābhi—One of the Varṣas, LIV. 12.

Nārada—A mt. in Pl. D., LVI. 3.

Nāstika—A country and people in the W. of Bhā. LV. 17.

Niṣadha—(i) A mt. to the S. of Meru, LIV. 9;

(ii) A country in the W. of Bhā. LV. 17.

Nīla—(i) A mt. to the N. of Meru, LIV. 10.

(ii) A country in the N.E. of Bhā. LV. 20.

P

Pañcama⁹—A mt. in Kr. D., LVI. 14. (?)

Paṭaccara—A country in the middle-region of Bhā. LV. 12.

Payāśvinī—A river in Bhā. LV. 10.

Payoṣṇī—A river in Bhā. LV. 9.

Pavitrā—A river in Kuśa-D., LVI. 11.

Pāñcāla—A country in the middle region of Bhā. LV. 12.

Pādma—A country in the east of Bhā. LV. 13.

Puṇḍarīkavat—A mt. in Kr. D., LVI. 14.

Puṇḍarīkā—A river in Kr. D., LVI. 15.

Puṇḍra—A country in the S.E. of Bhā. LV. 14.

Pulinda—A country in the S.E. of Bhā. LV. 15

Puṣkara—One of the seven Dvīpas; it is surrounded by the sea of sweet water, LIV. 5; LVI. 20.

Puṣpavat—A mt. in Kuśa-D., LVI. 10.

Plakṣa—One of the seven Dvīpas; it is surrounded by Ikṣusamudra, LIV. 5; LIV. 10; LVI. 1.

B

Bāhlīka—A country in the N. of Bhā. LV. 19.

Brahmaputra—A country in N.E. of Bhā. LV. 20.

Bh

Bhadrāśva—One of the Varṣas; it is to the E. of Meru, LIV. 12; LV. 1.

⁹ It is doubtful whether the word *Pañcama* means 'the fifth', or it is the name of a mountain. But here it is taken as a mountain because otherwise the list of the seven mts. will not be complete.

Bhārata—One of the Varṣas; it is to the S. of Meru, LV. 2; LV. 4.
 Bhīmarathī—A river in Bhā. LV. 9.

M

Mattagaṅgā—A river in Bhā. LV. 10.
 Matsya—A country in the middle region of Bhā. LV. 12.
 Madra—A country in the N. of Bhā. LV. 19.
 Madhyadeśa—The middle region of Bhā. LV. 11, 12.
 Manojavā—A river in Kr. D., LVI. 14.
 Mandara—A mt. in Kuśa-D., LVI. 10.
 Malaya—A mt. in Bhā. LV. 7.
 Mahākeśa—A country in the N.W. of Bhā. LV. 18.
 Mahānadī—A river in Bhā. LV. 9.
 Mahānāsa—A country in the N.W. of Bhā. LV. 18.
 Mahiṣa—A mt. in Śāl-D., LVI. 6.
 Mahī—A river in Kuśa-D., LVI. 11.
 Mahendra—A mt. in Bhā. LV. 7.
 Māgadha—A country in the E. of Bhā. LV. 13.
 Māṇḍavya—A country in the N.W. of Bhā. LV. 18.
 Māthura—A country in the W. of Bhā. LV. 17.
 Mūlaka—A country in the S.E. of Bhā. LV. 14.
 Mūlika—A country in the N.W. of Bhā LV. 18.
 Meru—A mt. in J. D., LIV. 7; LV. 2.
 Mleccha—A country in the W. and N. of Bhā. LV. 17; LV. 19.

Y

Yavana—A country and people to the W. of Bhā. LV. 6; LV. 17.
 Yonitoyā—A river in Śāl-D., LVI. 7.
 Yaudheya—A country in the middle region of Bhā. LV. 12.

R

Ramya. (Ramyaka)—One of the Varṣas; it is to the N.W. of
 Meru, LIV. 12; LV. 3.
 Rātri—A river in Kr. D., LVI. 14.

L

Lampāka (Lambaka)—A country in the N. of Bhā. LV. 19.
 Lavana—One of the seven seas; it surrounds the J. D., LIV. 6.

Lāṭa—A country in the S.W. of Bhā. LV. 16.

Lokāloka—A mt. beyond the Svādūdaka-samudra which surrounds the Pu. D., LVI. 21.

V

Vaṅga—A country in the S.E. of Bhā. LV. 14.

Varadā—A river in Bhā. LV. 8.

Vāmana—A mt. in Kr. D., LVI. 13.

Vāruṇa—One of the parts of Bhā. LV. 5.

Vitrṣṇā—A river in Śāl-D., LVI. 7.

Vidarbha—A country in the S.E. of Bhā. LV. 14.

Vidarbhā—A river in Bhā. LV. 11.

Videha—A country in the E. of Bhā. LV. 13.

Vidyut—A river in Kuśa-D., LVI. 11.

Vidruma—A mt. in Kuśa-D., LVI. 10.

Vidhṛti—A river in Śāl-D., LV. 8.

Vindhya—A mt. in Bhā. LV. 8; LV. 14.

Vipāsā—A river in Pl. D., LVI. 4.

Vimocanī—A river in Śāl-D., LVI. 7.

Vedasṁṛti—A river in Bhā. LV. 8.

Venukā—A river in Śāka-D., LVI. 17.

Vaibhrāja—A mt. in Pl. D., LVI. 3.

S

Saka—A country in the S.W. of Bhā. LV. 16.

Satadrū—A river in Bhā. LV. 11.

Śāka—One of the seven Dvīpas; it is surrounded by Dugdha-samudra, LIV. 5; LVI. 15.

Sālmala—One of the seven Dvīpas; it is surrounded by Surā-samudra, LIV. 5; LVI. 5.

Sikhī—A river in Pl. D., LVI. 4.

Śivā—(i) A river in Bhā. LV. 8;

(ii) A river in Kuśa-D., LVI. 11.

Suktimat—A mt. in Bhā. LV. 7.

Suklā—A river in Śāl-D., LVI. 7.

Sūrasena—A country in the middle region of Bhā. LV. 12.

Sringin—A mt. to the N. of Meru, LIV. 10.

Śveta—A mt. to the N. of Meru, LIV. 10.

S

Sandhyā—A river in Kr. D., LVI. 14.

Sanmati—A river in Kuśa-D., LVI. 11.

Sarayū—A river in Bhā. LV. 9.

Sarasvatī—A river in Bhā. LV. 10.

Sahya—A mt. in Bhā. LV. 7.

Sarpissamudra—One of the seven Seas; it surrounds the Kuśa-D.,
LIV. 6.

Siṃhala—One of the nine parts of Bhā. LV. 5.

Sukṛtā—A river in Pl. D., LVI. 4.

Sukumārī—A river in Śāka-D., LVI. 17.

Sumanas—A mt. in Pl. D., LVI. 3.

Surasā—A river in Bhā. LV. 8.

Surāsamudra—One of the seven Seas; it surrounds Śāl-D.,
LIV. 6.

Sūta—A country in the E. of Bhā. LV. 13.

Saindhava—A country in the W. of Bhā. LV. 17.

Somaka—A mt. in Pl. D.; LVI. 3.

Stananāga—A country in the N. of Bhā. LV. 19.

Strīmukha—A country in the S.W. of Bhā. LV. 16.

Strīrājya—A country in the W. of Bhā. LV. 17.

H

Hari—A mt. in Kuśa-D., LVI. 10.

Harivaṛṣa—One of the Varsas; it is to the S.W. of Meru, LIV. 12.

Himavat—A mt. to the S. of Meru, LIV. 9.

Himācala—A mt. in the N. of Bhā. LV. 19.

Hiraṇmaya (Hiraṇvat)—One of the Varsas; it is to the S.E. of
Meru, LV. 1; LIV. 12.

Hemakūṭa—A mt. to the S. of Meru, LIV. 9.

Hemaśaila—A mt. in Kuśa-D., LVI. 10.

Caste and Chronology of the Pāla kings of Bengal

The caste and the chronology of the Pāla kings are two of the vexed questions of the history of Bengal. In this paper we shall try to throw some new light on them.

Our sources of information are :

1. The colophon of the commentary of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñā-pāramitā* by Haribhadra. It was written in the reign of Dharmapāla. He is spoken of as *Rājabhaṭ-ādi-raṃśa-patita*¹ i.e. descended from a family of which Rājabhaṭa was the first.

2. The Kamauli copper-plate grant of Vaidyadeva,² which speaks of Vighrahapāla III as *raṃśe mihirasya jātavān* i.e. born in the race of the sun.

3. The comments on the verse 4, chap. I of the *Rāmacarita* by Sandhyākaranandī.³ Dharmapāla is here described as *samudru-kula-dīpa* i.e. the light of the race of the ocean.

4. The comments on verse 17 of the same chapter and book, which say :—

*Śrī-paṭiḥ pārthivo yo nābhiḥ Kṣatriyas = tasmāt sambhūtaḥ vidhir =
iv-eti śleṣ-opamā | utra śrī-pater = Vāsudevasya nābhito = 'rayavād
= udbhūtaḥ | śeṣaṃ sugamaṃ | ubhayatr = āpi samaṃ | |*

i.e. both Rāmacandra and Rāmapāla were of the Kṣatriya race.

5. The *Vyāsa-purāṇa* of Siṃhagiri embedded in the *Ballālacarita*. In this the Pālas have been described as the worst of the Kṣatriyas.⁴

6. Tāranātha (1608 A.D.) says that Gopāla was born at Puṇḍra-
vardhana of a beautiful Kṣatriya young woman who was in liaison with
a tree god.⁵

1 R. D. Banerji's *Bāṅglār Itihās*, vol. 1., p. 140 n.

2 *Ep. Ind.*, vol. 11, p. 350.

3 *Rāma-carita*, p. 20.

4 *Ibid.*, p. 4.

5 Schiefner's *Geschichte des Buddhismus in Indien*; p. 195, quoted in *I.H.Q.*, vol. VIII, p. 530-31.

7. A Bengal poet named Ghanarāma in the *Kāṇurpālā* of his book named *Dharmamaṅgala* says:—

ধাৰ্মিক ধৰণীতলে ধৰ্মপাল ৰাজা ।
 প্ৰিয় পুত্ৰ প্ৰায় পালে পৃথিবীৰ ৰাজা ॥
 অপুত্ৰক মহাৰাজা অথিলে প্ৰকাশ ।
 বিশেষ ভ্ৰাম্ভণ বিষ্ণু বৈষ্ণৱেৰ দাস ॥
 পূৰ্বাপৰ পালে ৰাজা এই গৌড়পুৰী ।
 ধৰ্মশীলা ৰাণী তাৰ বনভা হুন্দৰী ॥
 বনবাসে তখন আছিল সেই সতী ।
 তাৰ সঙ্গে সমুদ্ৰ সন্তোগ কৈল ৰতি ॥
 গৌড়পতি তোমাৰ জনম নিলা হয় ।

i.e. Dharmapāla, the king of Gauḍa was without a child. His queen Vallabhā while in exile was enjoyed by the ocean and thus the lord of Gauḍa (Devapāla) was born.

To these we shall add a new piece of evidence, which we have recently come across in a *Campū-kāvya* called the *Udayasundarī-kathā*. Author of this is one Soḍḍhala, a Gujarat-poet of the eleventh century, A.D. He says that Dharmapāla, the lord of Northern India (*Uttarāpatha-svāmī*) and of the family of Māndhātā (*Māndhātṛ-vaṃśa*) was besieged in a fort by a Śilāditya of the Valabhi dynasty and was obliged to capitulate.*

Now let us see if we can come to a definite conclusion from these seemingly discrepant versions.

Mm. H. P. Sastri has in his introduction to the *Rāmācarita* (pp. 2-4) discussed all the above points excepting Nos. 4 & 6. He has translated *Rājabhāṭ-ādi-vaṃśa-patita* as 'descendant of a military officer of some king'. Others, however, have taken Rājabhāṭa to be a proper name, which seems preferable. They identify him with Rājabhāṭa, whom the Chinese traveller Seng-chi found ruling in Samatāṭa in the latter half of the seventh century. According to this view Rājabhāṭa must have been the first king of his line and the founder of the dynasty,

* "kathāncana baliyasā saptāṅga-samagreṇ = Uttarāpatha svāmīnā Māndhātṛ-vaṃśa-prabhavena bhūbhṛtā Dharmapālena saha vighraho = dirghatām = avāpa".—*Udayasundarī-kathā* (Gaekwad's Oriental Series), p. 4.

as the word *ādi* indicates. Considering his time, i.e., the latter part of the seventh century, he cannot be far removed from Dharmapāla. 'The Khalimpur plate' of Dharmapāla supplies us with the names of three of his ancestors, viz., Gopāla, his father; Vapyāta, his grandfather; and Dayitaviṣṇu, his great-grandfather. We do not find any Rājabhāta among these names. Of these Dayitaviṣṇu far from being a king was not even a military man, as has been pointed out by Mm. H. P. Sastri.⁸ His son Vapyāta is said to have 'become famous as the destroyer of adversaries'. We are inclined to think that he, by his successful military career, became a feudatory king of Samatāta. The word *Śrī* put before Vapyāta and Gopāla and not before Dayitaviṣṇu also goes to support our supposition that Vapyāta was the first king of the line. We have already shown that according to the statement of Haribhadra, Rājabhāta was the first king. If our surmise is correct Rājabhāta becomes identical with Vapyāta. We think that Vapyāta is a contracted form of Vappa- or Vappi-bhāta. He might also have been called Rājabhāta after he became a king. In the Chāṭsu inscription of Bālāditya⁹ Śaṅkaragana is said to have conquered Bhāta, the lord of Gauḍa '*Bhātaṃ jivā Gauḍa-kṣitipam.*' Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar who edited the inscription identifies Bhāta with Śūrapāla, while Dr. R. C. Majumdar thinks that Bhāta meant 'fighter' and by it Dharmapāla was referred to.¹⁰ Both, however, agree in identifying this Bhāta with a Pāla king. Can it be that it (Bhāta) was the dynastic name of the Pālas? In fact nowhere in their inscriptions they called themselves Pālas. It was in the charter of Vaidyadeva that they were for the first time called *Pāla-kula*. This identification, however, does not help us in determining the caste of the Pālas, nor does it go against taking them as Kṣatriyas.

Some again proceeding a little further identify Rājabhāta of Haribhadra and Rājabhāta of Seng-chi with Rājarāja or Rājarājabhāta,

7 *Ep. Ind.*, vol. IV, p. 247.

8 *Rāma-carita*, p. 2.

9 *Ep. Ind.*, vol. XII, p. 12.

10 *Jour. of Letters*, vol. X, p. 41n.

son of Devakhaḍga of the Khaḍga dynasty of Bengal.¹¹ There are certain difficulties in this identification. This Rājaraja or Rājarajabhaṭa was not the first king of this line. How again can Dayitaviṣṇu, who is not a king, be included in this line of kings? Devakhaḍga is identified by some with Devavarmā, the king of Eastern India mentioned by the Chinese traveller Hwui Lun. If there is any truth in this identification, we find that the surnames of Khaḍga and Varmā are interchangeable. Varmā is a well-known surname of the Kṣatriyas. According to the *Śaṅkha-smṛti* a surname of a Kṣatriya should be indicative of strength 'balānritam'. Both Khaḍga and Varmā are the accessories of war, so they are suitable surnames of a Kṣatriya. From this we may surmise that the Pālas were Kṣatriyas. But again they are also the surnames of Brāhmaṇas and Kāyasthas, i.e. the Nāgara Brāhmaṇas of Gujarāt and the Kāyasthas of Bengal.¹³ Viśvakhaḍga is a Brāhmaṇa donee of the Tippera copper-plate grant of Lokanātha,¹² who flourished about this time.

Mm. Sastri has thrown out a 'conjecture'¹⁴ that Dayitaviṣṇu might have descended from the family of Mahārāja Mātṛviṣṇu mentioned in the Iran stone boar inscription. But as besides Dayitaviṣṇu, there is no name in the Pāla dynasty which ends with *viṣṇu*, he surmises that it indicates illegitimacy, for the Viṣṇus of Iran were Brāhmaṇas. This conjecture has no basis. We need not run to Iran stone boar or pillar¹⁵ for a Brāhmaṇa with the name-ending *Viṣṇu*. Prabhāvarīṣaviṣṇu is one of the Brāhmaṇa donees of the charter of Lokanātha adverted to above. Guṇa-viṣṇu is the well-known author of the *Chāndogya-mantra-bhāṣya*. Besides there is Kopiviṣṇu, the *Mahā-sāndhi-vigraḥika* of Viśvarūpasena.¹⁶ All of them are of Bengal. We, of course, do not know the caste of the last one. Viṣṇu is now-a-days found exclusively among the Kāyasthas of Bengal.

11 *JASB.*, 1923, p. 378.

12 *Ep. Ind.*, vol. XV, p. 303, l. 37.

13 *Kāyastha-Samāj*, 1331 B.S., p. 238.

14 *Rāma-carita*, p. 6.

15 *Gupta Inscr.*, pp. 89 and 159.

16 *Beng. Inscr.*, (Varendra Res. Soc.), vol. III, p. 139.

We do not understand how the fact of giving up the name-ending or the surname of Viṣṇu by the Pālas after Dayitaviṣṇu at all indicates their illegitimacy. The history of India bears ample evidence to show that Brāhmaṇas taking up the Kṣatriya profession assumed Kṣatriya surnames and were merged into the Kṣatriya caste. By and by mythological genealogies from the sun or the moon were invented for them. But for this reason nobody ever called them illegitimate. Take, for instance, the case of Mayūraśarman, the founder of the Kadamba dynasty. He and his descendants assumed the Kṣatriya surname of Varman. The Pallavas although claimed descent from Aśvatthāman, a Brāhmaṇa, used the Kṣatriya surname, Varman. The Cauhāns of Broach claimed to be of Vatsa gotra.¹⁷ They used the Brāhmaṇa surname Dāma for some generations and then gave it up and assumed Bhaṭa or Vaddha. The Cauhān prince Sāmanta is spoken of distinctly as a Vipra i.e. Brāhmaṇa of the Vatsa gotra in the Bijoliā inscription (*JASB.*, vol. LV, pt. i, p. 41). Their Brāhmaṇa origin is hinted at even in a later work like *Prthvīrāja-viāya* (V. 20):—

asiḥ snāt-otthito yasya Gaṅgā-sāgara-saṅgame/
ciraṃ Gauḍa-rasa-(ā?) śuddha brāhmaṇatāṃ yayau//

The verse is in double *entendre*. The sword of Durlabharāja lost its lustre by being tarnished with the blood of the Gauḍas (*Gauḍa-rasa*), but it regained it by being washed in the confluence of the Ganges with the sea. In the case of Durlabharāja himself it is said that he had been degraded or fallen from his brahmanhood by drinking wine (*gauḍa-rasa*) but regained it by bathing in the holy waters of the *Gaṅgā-sāgara-saṅgama*. In the *Hammira-mahā-kāvya* (I, 27.) also Vāsudeva is called a Dīkṣita, which is *distinctly* a Brāhmaṇa surname, as has been pointed by Prof. Bhandarkar (*I.A.*, vol. XI., p. 26 n). Brāhmaṇas with the surname of *Dāma* are found in many inscriptions. Śāśvatadāma of the Vatsa gotra is a donee in the Nidhanpur charter of Bhāskaravarman.¹⁸

17 *Ep. Ind.*, vol. XII, p. 197.

18 *Ep. Ind.*, vol. XIX, p. 125.

Both Sastri and Banerjee seem to have laid undue stress on the tradition that the Pālas had descended from the sea. Although Sastri noticed the disagreement between the statement of the *Rāmacarita* and *Dharmamaṅgala*, still he opined that the Bengal tradition was embodied in the latter.¹⁹ According to the latter only Devapāla was the son of the ocean-god, while according to the former his father Dharmapāla was the *samudra-kula-dīpa*. Banerjee has gone further. He has rushed to the conclusion that 'the forefather of this line of kings came from the sea and in the absence of a plausible account of their ancestry became known as the children of the sea-god.'²⁰ Ghanarāma was an author of much later date. He wrote his book in 1713 A.D.²¹ He was a poet and not a historian. He might have confused tradition of *sagara-varṇṣa* into *sāgara-varṇṣa* and wrote as his poetic fancy led him. His facts are also not reliable. He says that Dharmapāla was without a son (*apūtraka*), but we know that Dharmapāla had, besides Devapāla, another son named Tribhuvanapāla. Again he says Vallabhā was the mother of Devapāla but we know her name was Raṅṅādevī. No serious student of history should therefore place any importance in his version. In all probability he has confounded the Dharmapāla of Daṇḍabhukti of the Tirumalai inscription of Rājendra Coḷa (*Ep. Ind.*, vol. IX, pp. 229-33) with the Dharmapāla of the Pāla dynasty.

Mr. Prabhas Chandra Sen has pointed out²² that in the *Rāmacarita*, Pālas have been called not only *samudra-kula-dīpa*, but also as Kṣatriyas. He interprets that *samudra-kula* means *sūrya-kula* or solar race to which Samudra belonged. In support of his interpretation he has quoted from the *Rāmāyaṇa* (Laṅkā-kāṇḍa, Sarga XIX, vs. 30-31) to show that the Samudra has been called *jñāti* or agnate kinsman of Rāmacandra, who also belonged to the solar race.

We quite agree with Mr. P. C. Sen in his interpretation. In fact we find in the *Brahma-purāṇa* (chap. VIII, vs. 59-60) that the king Sagara obtained a boon from god Nārāyaṇa that Sagara will get Samudra

19 *Rāma-carita*, p. 2.

20 *The Pālas of Bengal* by R. D. Banerji, Chap. I, Intro.

21 *Hist. of Beng. Lang. and Lit.* by D. C. Sen, p. 371.

22 *Kāyastha-Samāji*, 1336 B.S., p. 185.

as his son. Samudra was henceforth called Sāgara i.e. the son of Sagara. It is clear from the charter of Vaidyadeva that the Pālas were at that time known as of the solar race. The author of the *Rāmacarita* was a little later than Vaidyadeva. So he must have known the accepted version of the pedigree of the dynasty of his hero. It cannot therefore be believed that of all persons Sandhyākaranandī, a son of a high official of Rāmapāla, should deviate from the current version, and assign a *nondescript* pedigree. We call it *nondescript* because there is no epic or paurānic version to the effect that Samudra propagated a family. On the other hand, *Sagara-vaṃśa* is well-known. So it would be quite reasonable to think that by *Samudra-kula* he meant *Sūrya-kula* i.e. the family to which Samudra belonged. Again Sāgara is one of the 108 names of Sūrya.²³ According to this also, *samudra-kula* may mean *sūrya-kula*.

It is not only that the Pālas of Bengal are said to be of the *Sagara-vaṃśa*, but others also claimed the same pedigree. A feudatory of the early Cola Aditya Karikāla is said to have belonged to the Sagara Virāṭa dynasty.²⁴ In the Tamil portion of the record Virāṭa has been put as Ilāḍa. Dr. Krishnaswami Aiyangar thinks²⁵ that this Ilāḍa is no other than Rāḍha, a division of Bengal and that the connection with Sagara would refer the individual perhaps to a family of Bengal. We do not know how far Dr. Aiyangar is right in his assumption. It appears that there was a country called Virāṭa probably in Southern India, for we find that Hoysala Viṣṇuwardhana captured the fort of Virāṭanagara.²⁶

Tāranātha says that Gopāla was born of a beautiful Kṣatriya woman by a tree-god. It need not be told that this is a pure and simple myth. But we think that giving currency to such a legend was dictated by a policy of state. Gopāla was not a member of the royal

23 *Mahābhārata*, III, 152.

24 *South. Ind. Ep. Rep.* for 1906-7, Sec. 65, pp. 87-88.

25 *Jour. of Ind. Hist.*, vol. IV, p. 330.

26 *Inscr. at Sravaṇa-Beḷagoḷa*, No. 138; *Ep. Car.*, vol. IV, Ng. 70. King Virāṭa's capital is identified with Pānungal or Hānungal in Dharwar (Rice's *Mysore and Coorg*, p. 2). There is also a Birat in Rangpur Dist. of Bengal. (*An. Rep. Sur. Ind.* for 1925-26, p. 113, and Glazier's Rangpur, p. 8). It is not in Rāḍha, but in Gauḍa or Puṇḍravardhana. It contains ancient remains,

family of Bengal nor in any way connected with it. He might have been elected by some influential persons of the State, but it is not unlikely that there existed an opposite faction which did not favour it. With a view perhaps to inspire awe into the minds of the people and thereby suppress disaffection, it was thought expedient to circulate the story that the king was no ordinary mortal but the son of a god and is protected by him. A similar instance can be found in the history of Kashmir. Durlabhavardhana reigned in the earlier part of the 7th c. Like Gopāla he was not of the blood-royal, and is said to be the son of the mythical Karkoṭaka Nāga. To attribute supernatural powers to the king was a well-known policy of state even in the time of Kauṭilya.²⁷ An illustration of this policy in later times will be found in the epithet of *Siddharāja* or *Siddha-cakravartin* applied to Cālukya Jayasimha of Gujarat. This was necessary in the case of Jayasimha as his 'succession to the throne was attended with struggle and intrigue.'²⁸

We shall now discuss the new piece of evidence supplied by the Gujarat poet Sodḍhala. According to him Dharmapāla was defeated by Silāditya of the Valabhi dynasty. Now this Dharmapāla has been described as Uttarāpatha-svāmī and of the *Māndhātṛ-vaṃśa*. What other Dharmapāla known to history can be styled as the lord of the Northern India and is at the same time a contemporary with any one of the Silādityas than the Dharmapāla of the Pāla dynasty of Bengal? In his Khalimpur charter we find that he made the kings of Kuru, Yadu, Yavana, Avanti, Gāndhāra, Kīra, Bhoja, Matsya and Madra, that is all the principal kings of the Northern India to agree to the selection of Cakrāyudha to the throne of Kanauj. After this, is there left any vestige of doubt that he was the person meant? Now let us see whether he was a contemporary with any one of the Silādityas of Valabhi. We shall presently see that Dharmapāla reigned in the latter half of the eighth century. The last king of the Valabhi dynasty is Silāditya VII. His only known date is 766 A.D.²⁹ So

²⁷ Kauṭilya's *Artha-Sāstra*, Bk. IV, Chap. V.

²⁸ *Bomb. Gazz.*, vol. I, Pt. I, pp. 171-74.

²⁹ *Gupta Inscr.*, p. 173.

Dharmapāla was at least a contemporary with this Silāditya. So far, therefore, there is no improbability in Sodḍhala's statement.

Let us now examine the other statement of Sodḍhala, calling Dharmapāla of the *Māndhātṛ-vaṃśa*. Both Vaidyadeva and Sandhyā-karanandī were connected with the Pāla dynasty. One was a feudatory of Kumārapāla and the other a son of the *Śāndhivigrahika* of Madanapāla. So their statement might have been vitiated with partiality, but no such charge can be laid against Sodḍhala. His statement must have been based on some record or on tradition which has been handed down from the time of Dharmapāla. In point of time his evidence is next to Haribhadra's. We can have no objection in accepting his evidence as independent and trustworthy. It may be argued that if the Pālas are of the *Māndhātṛ* lineage why their *prasasti-kāras* are silent about it? No, they are not silent. In verse 11 of the Khalimpur charter of Dharmapāla himself, his army has been compared to that of Māndhātā and his opponent Indrāyudha to Mahendra. This allusion may be unintelligible now, when all tradition is lost, but in Dharmapāla's time, people found no difficulty to understand it. There is no doubt that they did not avail of every opportunity to proclaim their Kṣatriya origin and epic lineage, like their Hindu compeers. The reason is not far to seek. They were Buddhists and were not, therefore anxious to parade their Kṣatriya origin in their *prasastis* every time.

We have seen that all but one evidence go to prove the Kṣatriya origin of the Pālas. That one again is not against their being Kṣatriyas. Even the account of Tāranātha shows that they were Kṣatriyas at least from the mother's side. The fact of being of the *Māndhātṛ-vaṃśa* does not run counter to their being also of the *Sagara-vaṃśa*, as Māndhātā belonged to the solar race and Sagara was a descendant of Māndhātā. Their claim to Kṣatriyahood was as good as that of the many ruling dynasties of their time. This is proved by their matrimonial connections with the recognised Kṣatriya dynasties such as the Rāṣtrakūṭas and the Cedis.

It is not unlikely that the Pālas were originally Brāhmanas but were merged into the Kṣatriya caste by taking up the Kṣatriya profession, like the Kadambas, Guhilots and others. And when they

became kings, an epic lineage was found for them like so many royal dynasties of the mediæval India. If their claim to Kṣatriyahood is not disputed, we do not quite see why the claim of the Pālas should be questioned. Their claim is at least as early as that of Dharmapāla, and that it found ready recognition is proved by his marriage with a Rāṣtrakūṭa princess.

Chronology

Now we shall take up the other controversial question, the chronology of the Pālas. Sodḍhala says that Dharmapāla came into conflict with a Śilāditya of the Valabhi dynasty. We have no direct evidence to corroborate it. But considering the fact that he brought so many kings under his influence, got presents from the kings of Northern India, and his army penetrated as far as the Gokarnatīrtha,²⁹ it is not at all improbable that he led his conquering expedition to Gujarat also. Besides, among his dependants we find the Lāṭas.³⁰ He also granted land to the Lāṭa Brāhmaṇas.³¹ These clearly prove his connection with Gujarat. This statement of Sodḍhala supplies us with a data for ascertaining the time of Dharmapāla approximately. The Khalimpur charter of Dharmapāla was issued in the thirty second year of his reign. We find in it reference to his defeating Indrāyudha, the king of Kanauj, and also of placing Cakrāyudha on the throne of Kanauj. So Dharmapāla must have done all these on or before the 32nd year of his reign. According to the Jaina *Harivaṃśa* Indrāyudha was reigning in 783 A.D. His defeat, therefore, cannot be earlier than this date. Even assuming that this took place in 783 A.D. and in the 32nd year of Dharmapāla, he could not have ascended the throne earlier than 752 A.D. The last king of the Valabhi dynasty was Śilāditya VII. His only known date, we have seen, is 766 A.D. He could not have survived later than 770 A.D. According to the Hindu account preserved by Alberuni the fall of Valabhi was due to an Arab naval expedition from

³⁰ *Ind. Ant.*, vol. XXI, pp. 254-57.

³¹ *Ibid.*

Mansura. This is supposed to have taken place some time between 750 and 770 A.D.³² Dharmapāla could not, therefore, have begun his reign later than 770 A.D. Thus we get two dates, the earliest and the latest, viz., 752 and 770 A.D. within which must lie the first year of the reign of Dharmapāla. Let us see if we can fix a date nearer to the actual date of Dharmapāla's accession to the throne. We know from the Bodh-Gayā inscription³³ of the 26th year of reign of Dharmapāla that the fifth *tithi* of the dark fortnight of the month of Bhādra of that year fell on a Saturday. According to the above calculation his 26th year must be between 777 and 795 A.D. By consulting Swamikkannu Pillai's *Indian Chronology* we find that the years 786, 789 and 793 A.D. satisfy the above conditions. Now according to this the initial years of the reign of Dharmapāla must be one of the three years—761, 764 and 768 A.D. Of these the earliest, viz., 761 A.D. seems more probable. It would not be reasonable to think that immediately on ascending the throne he was in a position to embark on such a big conquering expedition as to overrun the whole of Northern India and some portion of the Deccan. He must have taken some time to make necessary preparations for such an extensive undertaking and also to consolidate his power in his neighbouring kingdoms such as Gauda, Kāmarūpa and other countries which, according to Tāranātha, he conquered. Dr. Shahidullah has also arrived at this date but from a different data (*IHQ.*, vol. VII, p. 536).

The date of Kumārapāla can similarly be fixed approximately. The Kamauli grant of Vaidyadeva of Kāmarūpa was made at the *viśuvati* (*saṃkrānti*) in *Vaiśākha* on *Ekādaśī*. It was entered on the 1st of *Vaiśākha* in the 4th regnal year. We can assume with pretty certainty that Kumārapāla reigned some time in the first half of the 12th century. Now only three years viz., 1119, 1123 and 1142 A.D. satisfy the above conditions. Of these only the first two seem to be more probable. It is a common practice with a feudatory chief to use the regnal year of his overlord. So this 4th year must be taken to be that of

³² *Ep. Ind.*, vol. IV, p. 243.

³³ *Bomb. Gazr.*, vol. 1, Pt. I, p. 95.

Kumārapāla. This must have fallen in 1119 or 1123 A.D., and he must have commenced his reign in 1116 or 1120 A.D. If the fourth year of his reign fell in 1142 A.D. the initial year of his reign would be 1139 A.D. We know that Kumārapāla ruled at least 4 years. His successor Gopāla's reigning period is not known. But his successor Madanapāla ruled at least 19 years.³⁵ We also know that Govindapāla began his reign in 1161 A.D.³⁶ But even eliminating the reigning period of Gopāla III, Madanapāla must have ruled up to $(1139 + 4 + 19) = 1162$ A.D. So Kumārapāla could not have ascended the throne later than 1120 A.D. Dr. R. C. Majumdar has also arrived at this date by a different calculation.³⁷

Monomohan Chakravarti has shown that king Nayapāla might have ascended the throne between 1030 and 1033 A.D.³⁸ Now we hope it would not be very difficult to draw up an approximate chronology of the Pāla kings of Bengal with these three points almost fixed and the known reigning periods of these kings.

JOGENDRA CHANDRA GHOSH

³⁴ *Proc. Beng. As. Soc.*, 1884, p. 80.

³⁵ *Arch. Surv. of Ind.*, vol. III, p. 125.

³⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁷ *JASB.*, N.S. XVIII, p. 6.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 1900, pp. 192-3.

The Eastern Oalukyas

IV

*Viṣṇuwardhana III, Samastabhuvanāśraya, Tribhuvanāṅkuśa,
and Viṣamasiddhi (A.D. 709-746)*

Viṣṇuwardhana assumed the titles of Samastabhuvanāśraya, Tribhuvanāṅkuśa and Viṣamasiddhi. Six inscriptions of his reign have been discovered.

(i) *The Ganapavaram plates.*¹

A number of plates was found in the village of Ganapavaram, in the Bhimavaram tāluka of the Kistna District. It records the grant of two 'nivartanas' of land, in the village of Ariyēru, in the Attili-*viṣaya*, to Nūri-śarman, son of Nanni-śarman, a resident of Padminyagrahāra. The grant was executed by Nissaramiṇyi who was also the executor of the grant of Maṅgi-Yuvarāja I.

(ii) *The Pasapubarṛu plates.*²

The Pasapubarṛu inscription states that some lands in the village of Pasapubarṛu, in the Gudrahāra-*viṣaya*, were granted to Keśavaśarman of Parandūr. The grant was executed by Vijayamahādevī, the chief queen of Viṣṇuwardhana III.

(iii) *The Setapadu inscription.*³

An inscription was found at Setapadu in the Guntur tāluka. It registers a gift of land at Velalūru by a certain Kannoba. It was issued in the 33rd year of the reign of Sarvalokāśraya Śrī-Viṣṇuwardhana-Mahārāja. The King may be identified with either Viṣṇuwardhana III or Viṣṇuwardhana IV, both of whom enjoyed a fairly long reign.

*Continued from page 780 vol. VIII.

1 *SE.*, 1925, p. 76.

2 *Ibid.*, 1917, p. 116.

3 *Ibid.*, 1917, p. 116.

(iv) The Peravali inscription.⁴

An inscription was brought to light in the village of Peravali. It states that the King Viṣṇuwardhana granted the village of Māvīṅṭhipalli, in the Ve(ṅgi)nāṇḍu-*viṣaya* to Vīraśarman, a resident of the village Peruvāli. Peruvāli is identical with the village Peravali where the record was found.

(v) The Musinikuṇḍa plates, Saka 684.⁵

The Musinikuṇḍa plates register the grant of the village Musinikuṇḍa, in Tonka-Nāṭavādi-*viṣaya*, to the Jaina temple Naḍumbi-*vasti* at Bijavāḍa (built by?) Ayyana-Mahādevī, queen of Kubja-Viṣṇuwardhana-Mahārāja. The executor of the grant was the queen herself. The inscription was issued by Viṣṇuwardhana-Mahārāja, son of Maṅgi-Yuvarāja, in Saka 684=762 A.D. The inscription offers some difficult problems for solution. The date falls in the latter part of the reign of Viṣṇuwardhana III's son, Vijayāditya I. This leads to the supposition that though Viṣṇuwardhana abdicated his throne in favour of his son in the middle of the 8th century A.D., he carried on his public works even up to the 7th decade of the same century. As the executor of the grant was the queen of Kubja Viṣṇuwardhana and as the inscription contains the seal of the latter, it may be suggested that the present record is a renewal of an old one, issued during the reign of Viṣṇuwardhana I.

Of the localities, Bijavāḍa is evidently the modern Bejwada. Nāṭavādi corresponds to the modern Nandigama, in the Kistna District.⁶

(vi) The Jaḷayūru plates.⁷

A number of plates was discovered in the Kistna District of Jaḷayūru, in the Plolanāṇḍu-*viṣaya*, granted by Pṛthivīpothī, the beloved daughter of Maghinduvarāja, on the occasion of a Saṃkrānti, in the year twenty three of the reign of Viṣṇuwardhana-Mahārāja, son

⁴ *Ibid.*, 1915, p. 90.

⁶ *SE.*, 1924, p. 117.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 1917, p. 116.

⁷ *RI.*, vol. XVIII, p. 58.

of Vijayasiddhi to a Brāhmaṇa resident of Kommara. The land was bounded on the east by the Eliyeṟu river, on the west by Kākaṇḍivāḍa.

Dr. Hultsch suggests that Maḡhinduvarāja is the same as Mahendravarman, the Pallava king of Kāñcī.⁸ I think the name is a corruption of Maṅgi-Yuvarāja who might have been identical with the son of Kokilivarma Anivārīta. Of the localities, Ploṇāṇḍu-ṽiṣaya is the same as Prolnandu or Prolunandu which corresponds to southwestern part of the Godavari District, comprising the Ramachandrapuram, Cocanada, Peddapuram tālukas and the Divisions of Tuni Pithapuram.⁹ Jaḷayuru is the modern Jalluru in the Pithapuram Division. Eliyeṟu is the modern Eleru river flowing through Pithapuram. Kākaṇḍivāḍa may represent the modern Cocanada. Kommara is the modern village of the same name in the Ellore tāluḷa of the Kistna District.

During the latter part of the reign of Viṣṇuvardhana, Prthivīvyāghra, the chief of the Niṣāḍas, invaded the southern part of Eastern Cālukya dominion. Just about this time Udayacandra, the lord of the city of Vilvala and a general of Nandivarman II, the Pallava King of Kāñcī, was carrying on military excursions in order to rescue his master from the hands of the invading Dramila prince.¹⁰ He killed the Pallava Citramāya and defeated the hostile armies on the battle fields of Nimba (vana), Cūtavana, Saṅkaragrāma, Nellūr, Nelveli, and Śūrāvaṟundūr.¹¹ Nellūr is evidently the modern Nellore, the headquarters of the District of the name in the Madras Presidency. The northern portion of this District was under the sway of the Eastern Cālukyas. Udayacandra next encountered the above-mentioned Niṣāḍa chief who had already occupied a portion of Viṣṇuvardhana's kingdom. The Niṣāḍa chief sustained a heavy defeat and was forced to surrender the Cālukya territory. The portion which was occupied by him is said to have been annexed into the Pallava domi-

8 *Ibid.*

9 *Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society*, vol. I, p. 87.

10 *SI.*, vol. II, p. 372.

11 *Ibid.*

nion. The Udayendiram plates of Nandivarman state¹² that Udayācandra, in the northern region, pursued the Niṣāda chief, called Pṛthivivyāghra, who desiring to become very powerful, was running after the horses of the 'Aśvamedha', "defeated (him) drove (him) out of the viṣaya of Viṣnurāja, (which) he subjected to the Pallava". Here Viṣnurāja is identical with Viṣnuvardhana III. He was a contemporary of the Pallava Nandivarman II who was vanquished by the Western Cālukya Vikramāditya II (A.D. 733-746). It is very difficult to identify the particular portion of the Eastern Cālukya territory, which was subjugated by the Pallavas. The Eastern Cālukyas held sway over the northern part of the Nellore District for a long time.

Vijayamahādevī was the chief queen of Viṣnuvardhana III, who gave birth to his son Vijayāditya I. Viṣnuvardhana III, who lived at least up to 762 A.D., seems to have entrusted the charge of his kingdom to his son Vijayāditya in A.D. 746. He enjoyed his kingdom for 37 years.¹³

Vijayāditya I, Bhaṭṭāraka, Tribhuvanānkuśa, Vijayasiddhi, and Vikramarāma (A.D. 746-774)

Vijayāditya assumed the titles of Tribhuvanānkuśa, Vijayasiddhi, and Vikramarāma.¹⁴ Three inscriptions of his reign are known to us.

(i) *The Sakarambu inscription.*¹⁵

The Sakarambu inscription records the grant of the village of Sakarambu, in Vilānāṇḍa (i.e. Velanāṇḍu) to a Brāhmaṇa named Devaśarman, a resident of Kārāmceḍu.

(ii) *The Gommatūru inscription.*¹⁶

The Gommatūru inscription registers that Vijayāditya granted the

12 *SII.*, vol. II, pp. 368, 372. . . . Uttarasyām api diśi Pṛthivivyāghrābhidhā(na)-Niṣādapatim prabalāyamānam Aśvamedhaturāṅgamānusāriṇam āpatantam anusṛtya vijitya Viṣnurāja-viṣayāt Pallavasātakṛtya etc. etc.

13 *SII.*, vol. I, p. 58.

14 *EI.*, vol. IV, p. 119; *SE.*, 1917, p. 116.

15 *SE.*, 1917, p. 116.

16 *Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society*, vol. V, Part I, pp. 51ff.

village of Gommatūru, in the Gudrahāra-*viṣaya*, to Mādliava-śarman, a Brāhmaṇa, resident of Vargiparu. The executor was Bhurama.

(iii) *The Dinakādu inscription.*¹⁷

The Dinakādu inscription states that Vijayāditya made a gift of some lands, in the village of Dinakādu in the Prakunora-*viṣaya*, to Mādhuva, a resident of Vargiparu.

Vijayāditya's reign witnessed a great political change in the Deccan. Kīrtivarman II, the last of the Imperial Cālukya rulers of Badami, was overthrown by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Dantidurga shortly before 753 A.D. A powerful Rāṣṭrakūṭa sovereignty was established in the Deccan, which maintained its supremacy up to the third quarter of the 10th century A.D. These Rāṣṭrakūṭas, as we will see below, were political rivals of the Eastern Cālukyas, and were a source of constant trouble to them.

Almost all the inscriptions assign Vijayāditya a reign of eighteen years.¹⁸ Two of them, however, state that he ruled for nineteen years.¹⁹ He closed his reign in 764 A.D., and was succeeded by his son Viṣṇuwardhana.

Viṣṇuwardhana IV, Viṣṇurāja (A.D. 764-799)

Viṣṇuwardhana was also known as Viṣṇurāja. The fall of the Western Cālukyas of Badami had a terrible repercussion on the Cālukyas of Veṅgi. The Rāṣṭrakūṭa Dantidurga warred with the rulers of Kāñcī, Kerala, Coḷa, Pāṇḍya, and the kings Śrīharsa and Vajraṭa.²⁰ He was succeeded by Kṛṣṇa I, who became jealous of the prosperity of the Eastern Cālukyas. Shortly before 769 A.D., Kṛṣṇa despatched the Yuvarāja Govinda II for the conquest of Veṅgi, which was then under the sovereignty of Viṣṇuwardhana IV. The Cālukyas could not withstand the onslaught of the formidable Rāṣṭrakūṭa army. Viṣṇuwardhana surrendered his treasury to Govinda II, and acknowledged his authority. The Alas plates²¹ of Yuvarāja Govinda II state that in Śaka 692=769 A.D., Govinda from the camp of the victorious army

17 *Ibid.*, p. 56.

18 *SI.*, vol. 1, p. 58.

19 *SE.*, 1914, p. 84; 1912, p. 84.

20 *EL.*, vol. VI., p. 212.

21 *Ibid.*, p. 213.

that invaded Veṅgi-maṇḍala, when the lord of Veṅgi was humbled by the cession of (his) treasury, forces and his own country, granted a village (in the modern Kolhapur State). The camp was located at the confluence of the Kṛṣṇavernā and the Musī.²²

At the death of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛṣṇa I, a civil war broke out between his two sons Govinda II and Dhruva over the succession. The younger Dhruva gained the upper hand and seized the throne for himself.²³ Govinda thus being overthrown called upon the aid of the kings of Mālava, Kāñcī, Gaṅga and Veṅgi, who readily offered their services. The king of Veṅgi, referred to, was evidently Viṣṇuwardhana IV. The allied army attacked Dhruva on behalf of Govinda II, but was severely routed. The Paithan plates²⁴ of Govinda III, dated Śaka 716=794 A.D., report that "although that brother (Govinda II) of his had fetched in large numbers those hostile kings even, the ruler of Mālava and others, who were joined by the lord of Kāñcī, Gaṅga, and the king of Veṅgi, his (i.e. Dhruvarāja's) mind underwent no change in regard to him, when afterwards he (Dhruvarāja) had possessed himself of his ruby ornaments and his store of gold. When even after his (i.e. Dhruvarāja's) conciliatory overtures Vallabha (Govindarāja) did not make peace, then (Dhruvarāja) speedily defeated him in a battle offered by the brother, and he afterwards drove away the eastern and northern opponents, and obtained the whole sovereignty".²⁵

The king of Veṅgi referred to above was evidently Viṣṇuwardhana IV. The other kings seem to have been the Pratihāra Vatsarāja, the Western Gaṅga Śivamāra II (776-815 A.D.), and the Pallava Dantivarman (about A.D. 779-830),²⁶ who were rulers of Mālava, Mysore, and Kāñcī respectively.

After this reverse, Govinda II retired from political life, leaving his allies in the lurch. Dhruva then turned his arms against his brother's confederates. Viṣṇuwardhana seems to have submitted to his authority

22 Govindarājo Yuvarājah Veṅgimaṇḍaloparyyāyātavijayaskandhāvāre kośadaṇḍātmabhūmisamarpaṇenānate Veṅgiṣe Kṛṣṇavernā-Mu (sī) saṅgame sabhogo dattaḥ/*El.*, vol. VI, p. 211.

23 *Bom. Gaz.*, vol. I, pt. II, p. 393.

24 *El.*, vol. III, p. 104.

25 *El.*, vol. III, p. 107. •

and assisted him in the war against the Western Gaṅga chief. The combined forces of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and the Cālukyas being reinforced by the Haihayas fell upon Śivamāra II. The allied army was temporarily held back by the Gaṅga king who achieved some initial victories. An inscription²⁷ of Śivamāra's reign reports that the king earned distinction by vanquishing the Vallabha army (supported by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa, Cālukya, Haihaya and other brave leaders) which had encamped at the village named Muḍugundur. He also conquered the cavalry of Dhora which had spread over all quarters. Dhora was evidently the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Dhruvarāja and the Cālukyas were the Eastern Cālukyas. Śivamāra eventually sustained a heavy loss and fell a captive in the hands of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas.²⁸

Dhruvarāja was succeeded by Govinda III shortly before 784 A.D.²⁹ Govinda, in the early years of his reign, followed a policy of conciliation. He released the Gaṅga Śivamāra and reinstated him on his throne.³⁰ Viṣṇuvardhana also acknowledged his hegemony and placed him at his service. Govinda laid the foundation of the city of Māṅyakheta, the modern Malkhed about 90 miles south-east from Sholapur, Bombay Presidency and transferred his capital there. He requisitioned the service of the king of Veṅgi, who seems to have been Viṣṇuvardhana IV, for the construction of the above city. Viṣṇuvardhana responded to the call of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king and fulfilled the task entrusted to him. An inscription³¹ from the Nelamaṅgala tāluka, dated A.D. 802, of Govinda III's reign, states that "at half a word by the mouth of the letter bearer, the Veṅgi king, wherever he was, constantly performed his service without intermission by his own wish, and built for him an outer wall, lofty as the sky, of marvellous splendour, with the constellations around its head like a garland of pearls". This statement is sup-

26 *The Pallavas*, by Dubreuil, p. 75.

27 *EC.*, vol. IX, p. 41.

28 *Rom. Gaz.*, vol. I, pt. 11, p. 393.

29 *Ibid.*, p. 394.

30 *EC.*, vol. IX, YD. 60.

31 Lekhāhāra-mukhoditarddha-vacasā yatrā Veṅgiśvaro nityaṃ kiṅkaravad vyadhād aviratam . . . rmma savam ātmeccayā/bāhyā! (?)—vṛtir asya yena racitā vyomāvalagnā rucam citram mauktika-mālikām iva dhṛtām mūrddha(n)i svatārāganaiḥ // *EC.*, vol. IX, NL. 61, p. 52; cf. *An. Rep. My. Arch.*, 1927, p. 116.

ported by the Radhanpur grant³² of Govinda III, dated Saka 730=808 A.D. The city, the outer wall of which was built by the Veṅgi king, seems to have referred to Māṅyakheta, which was built during the reign of Govinda III. Govinda III's inscriptions, noticed above, make it clear that the Eastern Cālukya king held the position of a subordinate chief of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas during the latter part of the 8th century A.D.

Viṣṇuvaradhana seems to have married a Haihaya princess by whom he had a son named Nṛparudra.³³ Besides this he had two other sons Vijayāditya and Bhīma-salukki. Almost all the inscriptions assign him a reign of thirty-six years³⁴ except one, which allots him thirty-three years' reign.³⁵ He closed his reign in A.D. 799, and was succeeded by his son Vijayāditya.

D. C. GANGULI

³² *IA.*, vol. VI. p. 71.

³³ Narendramṛgarājasya bhrātā Haihayavaṃśajah ājñaptir asya dharmasya Nṛparudra nṛpottamaḥ/*SII.*, vol. I, p. 34.

³⁴ *SII.*, vol. I, p. 46.

³⁵ *SE.*, 1917, p. 121.

Sources of Buddhist Logic

(From the traditional point of view)

As the Brāhmaṇas are anxious to trace every doctrine to the Vedas or the Śruti, so the Buddhists try to affiliate every tenet of theirs, however late, to some *Buddha-vacana*, or *Āgama* as they usually call it. While introducing the problem of *Pramāṇas* Kamalaśīla in the *Tattvasaṃgrahapañjikā* (=TSP), the elaborate commentary on the *Tattvasaṃgraha* (=TS) of Śāntirakṣita, (cf. Barnett, *JRAS.*, 1927, p. 852) refers to some statements ascribed to Buddha, as the nucleus of Buddhist Logic. In order to emphasise the rational attitude of Buddhism, he incidentally quotes a statement of Buddha in which he exhorts his followers to examine his words thoroughly before accepting them as does an expert with a piece of gold by heating, filing and testing on a touchstone.¹ Though this attempt to connect the origin of Logic or *Pramāṇa-śāstra* with Buddha has but little chance of being accepted as historical truth, it exhibits the philosophical ingenuity of the scholiast.

Pratyakṣa (or perception) in the Brāhmaṇical system is ordinarily divided into two : (i) *nirvikalpa* and (ii) *savikalpa*. But the Buddhists reject the second and accept the first, though with them it means something entirely different from what it does with the Brāhmaṇas. On this point we have a *Buddhavacana*² as quoted by

1 *tāpācchedācca nikaṣāt suvarṇam iva paṇḍitaiḥ/parikṣya bhikṣavo grāhyaṃ madvaco na tu gauravāt* //TSP., p. 12, also TS., *Kārikā*, 3588.

2 *cakṣurvijñānasaṅgī nīlam vijānāti na tu nīlam iti*. TSP., p. 12.

A person in association with the visual consciousness cognizes the blue, as blue but not that it is blue. This *Buddhavacana* or *Āgama* is also quoted by Candrakīrti in his *Prasannapadā*, the renowned commentary on the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* of Nāgārjuna, Bib. *Buddhica*, p. 74, ll. 8-9. Prof. Poussin in footnote 6 in the same page has doubted the correctness of the reading of the Ms. *nīlamitīti cāgamasya*, and has emended the text as *nīlam iti cāgamasya*. But as a matter of fact Prof. Poussin's emendation is unnecessary and the reading of the Ms. is all right and has also the support of the Tibetan translation. It is to be noted that one *iti* will not convey the intended sense at all. The first *iti* is connected with *nīlam*, and the second *iti* separates the whole *Āgama* from the subsequent expressions, and thus the antithesis.

Kamalaśīla, which says that one with visual cognition (*cakṣur vijñāna*) can perceive the unique character of a thing (*nīlam vijñāti—nirvikalpañāna*) but not its common character (*nīlam iti vijñāti—savikalpañāna*), the former corresponding roughly to an acquaintance with an object while the latter to a descriptive knowledge about it.³

With regard to *Anumāna* (or inference) we also have, on the authority of Kamalaśīla, a statement of Buddha, that the *liṅga* (or the mark) inseparably connected with the *sādhya* (*probandum*), if definitely ascertained (*vinīścita*), is the cause of inferential knowledge.⁴ This is illustrated in the well-known Buddhist doctrine that all that has the character of being effected (*samudayadharmaka*) has also the character of being destroyed (*nirodhadharmaka*). Here we have a statement of concomitance (*vyāpti*) between the *probans*, the character of being produced (*hetu—samudayadharmakatvam*) and the *probandum*, the character of being destroyed (*sādhya—nirodhadharmakatvam*). Though there is no direct mention of the thesis or the conclusion (*pakṣa*), it is evident from the statement of *vyāpti* which is implicitly contained in it⁵.

between *nīlam* and *nīlam iti* is brought out without the least ambiguity. *nīlam vijñāti* means 'cognises blue as blue'; hence the cognition is strictly in correspondence with the external or the externalised object, i.e. the cognition is *nirvikalpa*. And '*nīlam iti vijñāti*' means '(cognises) that it is blue'; the cognition in this case involves an association of the object cognised with name, class, and the like, which are of a universal character (*kalpanā*) i.e. the cognition is *savikalpaka*.

From the above discussion it will be clear that the last inverted commas in the reading of the *Āgama* in the *TSP.*, p. 12. l. 22 should be placed after *iti* and not after *nīlam*, as has been printed. Again Prof. Poussin has emended °*vijñānasaṅgī* to °*vijñānasamaṅgī*. This is also unnecessary nor has it the support of the Tibetan translation.

The *Āgama* which Prof. Poussin has traced to the *Abhidharma*, and the *Nyāyabindu-pūrvapakṣasamkṣepa* is also found in the *Pramāṇasamuccaya-vṛtti* (Tib.) with the variant noted by him, as a quotation from the *Abhidharma-chos mñon pa las kyan mig gi rnam par shes pa dan ldan pas sñon po shes kyi sñon poñi sñam du ni ma yin no* (Mdo. Ce. 14-a 2; Narthang.)

3 *Indian Philosophy* by Dr. Radhakrishnan in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 14th ed. Vol. 12.

4 *sāddhyārthāvinābhūtaṃ liṅgaṃ vinīścitaṃ sadanumānañānasya kāraṇam, tacca yat kiṃcit bhikṣavaḥ samudayadharmakaṃ sarvaṃ tan* (printed as *sarvatra*) *nirodhadharmakam iti*. *TSP.*, p. 12.

5 According to Dharmakīrti *pakṣa* need not be explicitly stated in a syllogistic argument (see *Nyāyabindu*, III, 36-37 and the *Ṭikā* thereon).

The above example illustrates, as suggested by Kamalaśīla, the *svabhāva hetu* which is one of the three types of *hetus* of the Buddhist logicians—(i) *svabhāva*, (ii) *kārya*, and (iii) *anupalabdhi*—these being the three principal relations in which the *probans* (*hetu*) may be connected with the *probandum* (*sādhyā*).

Kārya hetu is illustrated in the following examples summed up in a verse :

- (i) It is fiery because it has smoke.
- (ii) There is water because there are cranes.
- (iii) He is Bodhisattva because he has auspicious signs.

With reference to *anupalabdhi-hetu*, Kamalaśīla attributes another statement to Buddha which objects to the validity of a conclusion from mere negation. Buddha is said to be admonishing his followers thus : "O Bhikṣus, let not an individual (*pudgalaḥ*) try to prove the soul (*pudgalaṃ*), nor let him seek proofs in support of it'. It is I or some body like myself who can prove the soul." According to the Buddhist logicians,⁶ negation of objects not entering the zone of cognition owing to impediments in respect of time, space, and nature, is a source of problematic knowledge, as it is excluded both from perception and inference. A cause (*kāraṇa*) or a fact of wider extension (*vyāpaka*) being absent will make the effect or the subordinate fact (*vyāpya*) absent. Inasmuch as the knowledge of an object is neither the cause nor a fact of wider extent with reference to the object, the absence of the knowledge of an object does not prove the non-existence of the object. Therefore the negation of the im-

6 *kāryākhyam api—*

dhūmena jñāyate vahniḥ salilaṃ ca balākayā.

nimittair jñāyate gotraṃ bodhisattvasya dhīmatuḥ. TSP., p. 13.

Quoted in the *Subhāṣitasamgraha* ed. by Bendall 14-13 and traced in the *Gaṇḍavyūhasūtra*.

Compare :—*anukampā priyākhyānaṃ dhīratā muktahastatū.*

gambhīrasandhinirmokṣo liṅgānyetāni dhīmatām.

tatra prathamena ślokena pañca bodhisattvaliṅgāni darśayati.

Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra. ed. by Sylvain Lévi, p. 175.

7 *mā bhikṣavaḥ pudgalaḥ pudgalaṃ pramiṇoṭu. pudgale vā pramāṇam udgrhṇātu. kṣaṇyate hi bhikṣavaḥ pudgalaḥ pudgalaṃ pramiṇvan. ahaṃ vā pudgalaṃ pramiṇuyāṃ vo vā syān mādrśaḥ. TSP. p. 13.*

8 *Nyāyabindu, II, 48-49.*

perceptible (*adrśyānupalabdhi*) cannot prove anything, but gives rise to doubt.

So from mere non-apprehension of the soul (*pudgala*) no definite conclusion as to its existence or otherwise can be made. The above statement ascribed to Buddha, therefore, seeks to establish that *anupalabdhi* to be a valid source of knowledge (*pramāṇa*) should be *drśyānupalabdhi* (i.e. non-perception of what is capable of being perceived) and not mere *adrśyānupalabdhi* (non-perception of the imperceptible).

In conclusion it may be observed that genuine doubt may be expressed as to the statements or *āgamas* being fathered upon Buddha; nevertheless they may be taken as laying the foundation-stone of the edifice of the Buddhist logic, which became in subsequent times a structure of great splendour and beauty.

DURGACHARAN CHATTERJI

The Doctrine of TrirūpaHetu

The formulation of the doctrine of *Trirūpa Hetu*, i.e., with threefold characteristic is generally ascribed to Dignāga but the researches of Prof. Tucci in *Pre-Dignāga Buddhist Logic* have proved that some predecessor of Dignāga (probably Vasubandhu) was aware of it.¹ It is also to be noted that *Prasastapāda* very clearly lays down the threefold condition of a valid *hetu* and quotes a *kārikā*² which seems to be sufficiently old and authoritative as it was regarded worth quoting by so eminent a scholar like him.

In the *Nyāyasūtra* there is no reference to any such characteristic of the *hetu*. But it mentions that both *hetu* and *dr̥ṣṭānta* may be based on *sādharmya* and *vaidharmya* (*udāharaṇasādharmyāt sādhyasādhanam hetuḥ. tathā vaidharmyāt. sādhyasādharmyāt tadāharmabhāvī dr̥ṣṭānta udāharaṇam tad viparyayād vā viparītam. Nyāyasūtra, I. I. 34 37*). The doctrine of the threefold characteristic of the *hetu*, is but a direct corollary of *sādharmya* and *vaidharmya hetu* as would clearly appear from the explanation of Vātsyāyana (vide *Nyāya Bhāṣya* on the above sūtras) though he has not mentioned *trairūpya* in so many words. It is, however, interesting to note that Uddyotakara and following him many other Brāhmaṇic logicians have read fivefold characteristic (1. *pakṣasattva*, 2. *sapakṣasattva*, 3. *vipakṣā-*

1 *Pre-Dignāga Buddhist Texts on Logic* (G.O.S.), p. XIX.

2 *yad anumeyena sambaddham prasiddham ca tadanvite tadabhāve ca nāstyeva talliṅgam anumāpakam. viparītam ato yat syād ekena dvitayena vā. viruddhāsiddhasandigdham alliṅgam kāśyapo 'bravīt.*

Prasastapāda-Bhāṣya (Vizianagram Sanskrit Series), p. 200.

That which is connected with the *anumeya* (i.e. *pakṣa*) and is known to exist in what possesses the *anumeya* (i.e. *sapakṣa = sādhyadharmasāmānyena samāno'rthah sapakṣah, Nyāyapraveśu, §5*) and always absent in what does not possess *anumeya* (i.e. *vipakṣa = vipakṣo yatra sādhyam nāsti, Nyāyapraveśu §6*) is the *liṅga* (*hetu*) which makes inference possible. That which is different from this in one or a pair of these characteristics is not a valid *liṅga* (*hetu*), it being either *viruddha* (contradictory), *asiddha* (unreal) or *saṃdigdha* (doubtful).

sattva, 4. *abādhitatva* and 5. *asatpratipakṣatva*) of a *hetu* in the *Nyāyasūtra* 1. 1. 5.

The three conditions of a valid *hetu* have been stated in the *Nyāyapraveśa* (vol. I. §3) as follows :—

hetus trirūpaḥ kimpunas trairūpyaṃ pakṣadharmattvaṃ sapakṣe sattvaṃ vipakṣe cāsattvamiti.

In order to avoid ambiguity and attain preciseness Dharmakīrti has put them thus :

trairūpyaṃ punar liṅgasyānumeyasattvam eva. sapakṣa eva sattvam. asapakṣe cāsattvam eva niścitam. ((Nyāyabindu 11-6-7)

Dharmottara in his commentary on the above observes that the word *niścita* which occurs in the enumeration of the third characteristic of *hetu* should also be read in the first as well as the second. By this he means that the *hetu* is not a *hetu* of the type which, by its inherent capacity, is capable of causing inferential cognition (*na योग्यतया लिङ्गं परोक्षज्ञानस्याऽनिमित्तम्*) as a seed produces sprout. No conclusion is possible if the *hetu* is not known. We do not infer the existence of fire from smoke which is not observed by us. Thus the *hetu* of an inference is sharply distinguished from such *hetu* (cause), which by its mere presence, produces an effect. In other words smoke is not the *hetu* in the sense in which the seed is the *hetu* of the sprout (*yathā bijam aṅkurasya*) Thus the *hetu* of an inference (*anumāna*) is different from the *hetu* of the production of anything (*kīraka hetu*).

Dharmottara has also discussed the propriety of the position of *eva* in the above-mentioned conditions. If the first would have been stated as *anumeva eva sattvam*, then an *asūdhāraṇa hetu* might have passed for a valid one (see *Hetucakra*, No. 5).

The second condition is to be read as *sapakṣa eva sattvaṃ niścitam iti (dvitīyaṃ rūpaṃ)*.

Significance of *niścita* has been already pointed out. The position of *eva* after *sapakṣa* points out that a valid *hetu* should be present in *sapakṣa* alone and never in *vipakṣa* and thus excludes the fallacies of *sūdhāraṇa anaikāntika* (see *Hetucakra* Table, Nos. 1, 3, 7 and 9). If *eva* were put after *sattvam* it would have meant that a valid *hetu* would be only present and by no means absent in the *sapakṣa*. In that case *prayatnajatva* which is a valid *hetu* for proving *śabdo' nityaḥ* (sound is non-eternal), becomes an impossibility.

The third condition (*asapakṣe cāsattvam eva niścitam*) is quite explicit. *eva* being put after *asattvam* it is to be understood that

there should always be the absence of the *hetu* from *vipakṣa* and thus it invalidates an inference like *śabdah prayatnajaḥ anityatvāt* (sound is produced after an effort because it is not eternal) in which *anityatva* is partly existent in the *vipakṣa*.

Let us take an example of valid inference and see how the three conditions are fulfilled, which will enable to us understand clearly what *pakṣa*,³ *sapakṣa* and *vipakṣa* mean. The following is the form of a fully expressed inference :

Sound is non-eternal,
Because it is a product.
All that is a product is non-eternal,
Like an earthen pot.
(or) All that is eternal is a non-product
Like space.

Here we infer the non-eternity of sound from its being a product, which is, therefore, the *hetu* in this particular inference. Now the *hetu*, the quality of being a product, is present in sound which is called the *pakṣa*, and thus it fulfils the first condition.

The second characteristic of the *hetu* is, as we have said above, that it must be present in the *sapakṣa*. *sapakṣa* has been defined as what is analogous to *pakṣa* or subject on the ground of its possessing in generality the attribute to be proved (*sādhyadharmasāmānya*) of the *pakṣa*. In the above argument, an earthen pot, which is analogous to sound on the ground of its possessing the attribute of non-eternity, is *sapakṣa*.⁴

The third condition is that the *hetu* must be absent from the *vipakṣa*. The *vipakṣa* is heterogeneous to the *pakṣa* and stands in contrast with *sapakṣa* on the ground of its being different (*tato'nyah*) from, or contradictory (*tadviruddhaḥ*) to, or implying negation (*tadabhāvah*) of *sapakṣa*.⁵

3 *Pakṣa* has got two different meanings in Indian Logic. Sometimes it is used in the sense of the whole proposition to be proved, e.g. *sound is eternal* and sometimes in the sense of the subject of the proposition to be proved (i.e. the minor term) e.g. *Sound* in the proposition, '*Sound is eternal*.' When a *hetu* is said to be present in the *pakṣa* it is used in the latter sense.

Cf. *jñātavye pakṣadharmatve pakṣo dharmyabhidhiyate
vyūptikāle bhaveddharmah sādhyasiddhau punardvayam.*

Ratnākara-vatārikā (Commentary on the *Pramāṇanayatattvāloka-lampkāra*, Jaina Yaśovijaya Series), Chap. III, p. 9.

4 See *Nyāyabindu* II. 9.

5 *Ibid.*, II. 10

In the instance stated above, space (*ākāśa*) is *vipakṣa* because it is eternal, i.e. it is opposite to what is non-eternal which is *sapakṣa*.

Thus we find the *hetu*, the quality of being a product, has satisfied the three conditions necessary to make the inference 'sound is non-eternal' valid

The Jaina logicians object to the doctrine of the threefold character of a *hetu* and aver that one characteristic i.e. *anyathānupapatti* is alone sufficient to make the *hetu* a valid one, and also if this characteristic be wanting, the *hetu* cannot be valid in spite of the threefold characteristic.⁶

Let us take a syllogism like this :

garbhastho maitratanaḥ syāmaḥ. (Maitra's son that is
in the womb (of his mother) is dark-complexioned)
maitratanaḥ tvāt. (Because he is a son of Maitra).
sampratipannamaitratanaḥ tvāt. (Like the present sons of
Maitra).

Here the *hetu*, *maitratanaḥ*, the fact of being a Maitra's son is (i) present in the *pakṣa*, *garbhastho maitratanaḥ* (Maitra's son in the womb). It is also (ii) present in the *sapakṣa*, and (iii) absent in the *vipakṣa*. Though the *hetu* has fulfilled three conditions, the conclusion is obviously wrong.

On the contrary, there are cases of valid *anumāna*, where *hetu* possesses only one or two conditions and not three as the Buddhist logicians would insist.

The following is an example of correct inference from a *hetu* having one characteristic i.e. *pakṣadharmatva*.

bhāvābhāvau kathamcitsadātmakau
kathamcidupalabhyatvāt.

Now there cannot be anything outside *bhāva* and *abhāva* as these two exhaust the world of knowledge (*pramāṇa*) and consequently there is no *sapakṣa* or *vipakṣa*.

Again, there are cases of correct inference, though the *hetu*

⁶ *nānyathānupapannatvaṃ yatra tatra trayeṇa kim*
anyathānupapannatvaṃ yatra tatra trayeṇa kim.

Tattvasaṃgraha(=TS.) *Kārikā*, 1369.

If there is *anyathānupapannatva*, what is the good of a *hetu* having a threefold character? If again *anyathānupapannatva* wanting no good will come out of a thesis in spite of a *hetu* with threefold characteristic.

cf. *Nyāyadīpikā*, *Sanātana Jainagranthamālā*, no. 10, p. 31ff.

fulfils only two conditions and not three e.g. *nūcandraḥ śaśī candra-
tvenāpadiṣṭatvūt* (Śaśī is not non-Candra because it is known as
Candra). Here *loṣṭrūdi* (a piece of stone and the like) is *vaidharmya
dṛṣṭānta*, or *vipakṣa*, but there is no *sapakṣa*.

Nevertheless the inference is valid. Similarly there are instances
in which there is no *vipakṣa* e.g. *ātmaghatādayaḥ kathamcidasa tū-
tmānāḥ kathamcidanupalabhyamānatvūt kharaviṣūṇavat*.

There being the absence of *vipakṣa*, the *hetu* does not fulfil the
vipakṣāsattva condition.

Thus we find that even in the absence of the threefold characteris-
tic of the *hetu*, correct inference has been possible. So by both
anvaya and *vyatireka* (positive and negative arguments) it is proved
that the doctrine of the threefold characteristic of the *hetu* is a faulty
one, and the only characteristic of a valid *hetu* is *anyathānupapatti*,
as advocated by us, the Jainas. To this objection the Buddhists
reply : Let *anyathānupapatti* or *avinābhūva* i.e. concomitant relation
between the attribute to be proved or the predicate of the thesis
(*sādhyadharmā*) and the reason (*hetu*) be the only characteristic of
the *hetu*. But where is this characteristic of the *hetu* to be ascertained ?
There are three possible cases i.e. (i) in the *sādhyadharmā* in general,
(ii) in the *sādhyadharmīn* or (iii) in the *dṛṣṭāntādharmīn*. Let the
avinābhūvitva characteristic be ascertained in general (*sāmānyena*)
in the predicate of the thesis (*sādhyadharmā*). But this is not
plausible, for unless the concomitant relation between *hetu* (middle
term) and *sādhyadharmā* (major term) is ascertained in respect of a
particular *dharmīn* (minor term), *anyathānupapatti* alone cannot
establish a proposition ; as for example, *cākṣuṣatva* (visibility) is the
hetu of *anityatva* (non-eternity) and they are inseparably related
(*avinābhūta*, *anyathānupapanna*) ; but this is absolutely useless when
we are to establish the *anityatva* (non-eternity) of *śabda* (sound).
Although *cākṣuṣatva* is in general (*sāmānyena*) an invariable associate
(*anyathānupapattilakṣaṇa*) of *anityatva*, it is by itself absolutely useless
in this particular case, because *cākṣuṣatva* is not an attribute of *śabda*
and therefore does not prove its *anityatva*.⁷ If to avoid this

7 *sāmānyena gate tasminnevaṃ cet sādhyadharmīni
hetoḥ sattvaṃ prakāśyeta na vipakṣitasiddhibhūk.
tadyathā cākṣuṣatvasya nāśenāvvyabhicāritā
sāmānyena gatā tacca dhanau tasya na sādhanam.*

difficulty the relation of the *hetu* with the *dharmin* is regarded as a necessary condition, the threefold characteristic of the *hetu* is admitted. *anyathānupapatti* of a *hetu* is useless unless its *anvaya* i.e. *sapakṣasattva* (existence in the similar cases) and *vyatireka* i.e. *vipakṣāsattva* (non-existence in the dissimilar cases). relations are pointed out. So in that case we have the threefold characteristic in full. If it be said that there is the presence of the *hetu* in the *sādhyadharmīn*, this also will not enable us to solve the difficulty, for in that case it would be tantamount to the acceptance of the *trairūpya* doctrine.⁸ From the *anyathānupapatti* we get *anvaya* and *vyatireka*, which in other words are *sapakṣasattva* and *vipakṣāsattva* respectively. Again, by the presence of the *hetu* in the *sādhyadharmīn*, we get *pakṣasattva*.

Let the *anyathānupapatti* of the *hetu* be determined in the *sādhyadharmīn*. To this the Buddhists reply :

If the above alternative be accepted the use of the *hetu* becomes needless. The *sādhyā* is proved (*siddha*) by the same *pramāṇa* as proves the *hetu* inseparably connected with the *sādhyā* and determined in the *sādhyadharmīn*.⁹ If again the *sādhyā* is not proved, the *hetu* also is not proved, for the *hetu* according to Jainas is inseparably connected with the *sādhyā* and is ascertained as such in the *sādhyadharmīn* ; and if the *sādhyā* is not proved, the *hetu* which is to be ascertained in the *sādhyadharmīn* is not also proved. It may be said that the *sādhyā* is proved by some different *pramāṇa*. But in that case what is the use of the *hetu* ? The *hetu* is requisitioned for proving the *sādhyā*. If the *sādhyā* be already proved, the *hetu*, becomes useless.

Again, if the *sādhyā* be proved by the *hetu*, there will be the fallacy of *anyonyāśraya* (*petitio principii*). The proof of the *sādhyā* is to depend on that of the *hetu*, as the *hetu* is intended for proving the *sādhyā*. The proof of the *hetu*, in its turn, is to depend on that of the *sādhyā*, as the *hetu* is invariably connected with the *sādhyā*. So the fallacy of *anyonyāśraya* is inevitable.

8 *tasya dharmīni sabbhāvah khyāpyate cet tathā sati
saiva trirūpatāyātā bhavatām api darśane.*

TS., Kārika, 1383.

9 *evam tarhi yata eva pramāṇāddhetuḥ sādhyāvinabhūtaḥ sādhyadharmīni
siddhas tata eva sādhyam api siddham iti vyartho hetuḥ TSP., p. 409.*

Let us take the third alternative, viz. the *anyathānupapatti* is to be determined in the *dṛṣṭānta*. If the *anyathānupapatti* of the *hetu* be determined in the *dṛṣṭāntadharmīn* independent of *sādhyadharmīn*, there will be no knowledge of *vyūpti*, and hence the *sādhyā* cannot be proved by the *hetu*.

Thus it follows that in none of the three ways in which we can take the *anyathānupapatti* characteristic of a *hetu*, it is faultless. So we must reject the theory of the Jaina logicians that it is sufficient if a valid *hetu* possesses one characteristic i.e. *anyathānupapatti* only and not three. It has been contended that in spite of satisfying the threefold condition of a *hetu*, it cannot lead to a correct inference. But this objection is futile. In the syllogism "The son of Maitra that is in the mother's womb is dark-complexioned, because he is a son of Maitra like other sons of Maitra." The *hetu* does not in fact possess the threefold characteristic, as it has been erroneously maintained. That Maitra's son will be other than dark complexioned cannot be refuted on any reasonable ground. So the condition of *vipakṣāsattva* is not satisfied. The *hetu* is fallacious and is technically known as *sandigdhdhavyatireka*. We can without violence to logical canons imagine a Maitra's son to be other than dark-complexioned (*āyāmī*), the dark complexion being due to such causes as particular diet, religious merit etc. and there is no warrant to suppose that these causes are absent. So the above example of a fallacious inference with a *hetu* of threefold character is untenable, for actually the *hetu* in question does not possess the three necessary characteristics. The other examples that have been stated with a view to proving that there are cases of correct inference with *hetus* which do not fulfil the three conditions, but on the contrary fulfil one or two only, can be made to show on closer analysis that their *hetus* really admit of three conditions. Thus the Buddhists answer all the charges of the Jaina logicians and prove to the hilt that a valid *hetu* must have three characteristics.

So if there be a *hetu* which possesses only one or two characteristics but lacks all the three, it will be defective and will invalidate the conclusion. Dignāga in his *Pramāṇasamuccaya* gives illustrations of these kinds of defective *hetu*.

Sound is eternal (*nitya*)

Because it is a product (*kṛtaka*).

Here the *hetu*, *kṛtakatva* has only *pakṣadharmatva*, but neither *sapakṣāsattva*, for *kṛtakatva*, the attribute of being a product, does

not reside in the *sapakṣa*, eternal things, as no eternal thing (*nitya*) is a product (*kṛtaka*) nor *vipakṣasattva* for the absence of eternity is not followed by the absence of the attribute of being a product. Similarly the inference of the eternity of sound from the *hetu mūrttatva* (corporeality) or *aprameyatva* (unknowability) is wrong, as in the first case, the *hetu, mūrttatva* has only *sapakṣasattva* and in the second case, the *hetu, aprameyatva* has only *vipakṣāsattva*. Again if the *hetu* has only two characteristics, it will be equally fallacious. Sound cannot be proved non eternal (*anitya*), by the *hetu* incorporeality (*amūrttatva*), as it has not the *vipakṣāsattva* character. Dignāga sums up all these cases of wrong *hetu* in the following *kārikā*¹⁰ in his *Pramāṇasamuccaya* :

*kṛtakatvūddhanir nityo mūrttatvād aprameyatāḥ
amūrttaśrūvaṇatvūbhyām anityaścūkṣuṣatvataḥ.*

DURGACHIARAN CHATTERJI

10 Quoted in the *TSP.*, p. 404.

The above corresponds with the following couplet of the *Pramāṇasamuccaya* in Tibetan translation :

byas phyir sgra ni rtag pa dañ
lus can phyir gzal min phyir.
lus min phyir dañ mñan bya las
mi rtag mig gis gzun byaḥi phyir.

tshad ma kun btus pa, (Chap. II), Mdo, Ce. 5a, 5.

See A note on the *Pramāṇasamuccaya* by D. C. Chatterji, *ABORI*, 1930, p. 196.

Hetucakranirṇaya

TRANSLATION*

II

In the Indian language

HETUCAKRAHAMARU

In the Tibetan language

gtan tshigs kyi hkhor lo gtan la dbab pa

Obeisance to Mañjuśrīkumārabhūta.

1. After obeisance to the Omniscient (Buddha) who is the destroyer of the snares of ignorance, the determination of *hetu* with threefold characteristic is pointed out.

2-3a-b. There will be the presence, the absence as well as both the presence and the absence (i. e. presence in some part, while absence in another) of the *hetu* in the *anumeya* (that which is to be proved—*probandum*). If there be the presence of the *hetu*, the conclusion will be correct, while the absence thereof will make it invalid. If there be both the presence and the absence (of the *hetu* in the *anumeya*) the conclusion will be doubtful just like an invalid one.

3c-d—4a-b. There will be the presence, the absence as well as both (of the *hetu*) in the *sapakṣa* (that which is analogous to the *pakṣa*—*anumeya* or the object of inference). And similarly in the *vipakṣa* (that which is opposed to the *pakṣa*) there will be the presence, the absence, as well as both the presence and the absence of the *hetu*. So there will be three classes of the threefold *hetu* (i. e. nine varieties in all).

4c-d—5a-b. The *hetus* at the top and the bottom (in the middle of the *hetucakra* or the Table of *hetus*, i.e. Nos. 2 and 8) are valid, while those on the two sides (in the middle of the *hetucakra*, i.e. Nos. 4 and 6) are contradictory. The *hetu* is uncommon (*asūdhāraṇa*) in the centre (i.e. No. 5) and (the *hetus*) in the four corners (i.e. Nos. 1, 3, 7 and 9) are common (*sūdhāraṇa*).

* For the translation of the *cakra* (1), see *Hetucakra—The Wheel of Reasons in the History of Indian Logic*, p. 299. Note that in No. 5 “*sound is non-eternal*” is to be corrected to “*sound is eternal*.”

5c-d—6a. (The *hetus* in the several divisions of the *cakra* are respectively as follows):

(1)	(2)	(3)
<i>prameya</i> (knowable)	<i>kr̥taka</i> (effected)	<i>anitya</i> (non-eternal)
(4)	(5)	(6)
<i>kr̥ta</i> (effected)	<i>śrāvāṇa</i> (audible)	<i>yatnaja</i> (made by efforts)
(7)	(8)	(9)
<i>anitya</i> (non-eternal)	<i>yatnaja</i> (made by efforts)	<i>amūrta</i> (incorporeal)

6b-7a.

(1)	(2)	(3)
<i>nitya</i> (eternal)	<i>anitya</i> (non-eternal)	<i>prayatnaja</i> (made by efforts)
(4)	(5)	(6)
<i>nitya</i> (eternal)	<i>nitya</i> (eternal)	<i>nitya</i> (eternal)
(7)	(8)	(9)
<i>ayatnaja</i> (not made by efforts)	<i>anitya</i> (non-eternal)	<i>nitya</i> (eternal)

These (nine) beginning with the *nitya* are put (in the *cakra* as *sūdhya*s) (those that are to be proved).

7b-8a. There are two valid *hetus* in the middle at the top and the bottom (i.e. in Nos. 2 and 8 of the *cakra*), and two contradictory *hetus* in the middle at the top and the bottom (i.e. in Nos. 4 and 6 of the *cakra*).

8b-9a. There are four uncertain (*anaikāntika*) *hetus* in the four corners (i.e. in Nos. 1, 3, 7 and 9 of the *cakra*). And the *hetu* is uncertain and uncommon (*anaikānta osādhāraṇa*) in the centre (i.e. in No. 5 of the *cakra*) obtained by the cross connection of the four corners.

9b c. The table of nine *hetus* is what has been now described.

9d-11a. (The *dṛṣṭāntus* or examples in the table are as follows:)

(1)	(2)	(3)
<i>nabhoghaṭavat</i> (like the space and the pitcher)	<i>ghaṭākāśavat</i> (like the pitcher and the space)	<i>ghaṭavidyudvīyavat</i> (like the pitcher the lightning, and the space)

(4)	(5)	(6)
<i>viyadghatavat</i> (like the space and the pitcher)	<i>akāśaghatavat</i> (like the space and the pitcher)	<i>viyadghatataḍidvat</i> (like the space, the pitcher and the lightning).
(7)	(8)	(9)
<i>vidyudākāśaghatavat</i> (like the lightning, the space, and the pitcher)	<i>ghatavidyudviyadvat</i> (like the pitcher, the lightning, and the space)	<i>akāśāṅkarmavat</i> (like the space, atom and action)

116f. What was taken up (for discussion) has thus been determined. With regard to the problem (of the *hetu*) which is very difficult owing to doubts, there is the *caḥra* consisting of nine cases based upon the presence, the absence and both the presence and the absence (of the *hetu*).

Here ends the treatise of Ācārya Diṅnāga.

The work is translated (into Tibetan) and given the present form by Paṇḍita Bodhisattva of Jahor and Bhikṣu Dharmāśoka.

III

I.

(1)	(2)	(3)
<i>nitya</i> (eternal)	<i>anitya</i> (non-eternal)	<i>prayatnaja</i> (made by efforts).
(4)	(5)	(6)
<i>nitya</i> (eternal)	<i>nitya</i> (eternal)	<i>nitya</i> (eternal).
(7)	(8)	(9)
<i>ay.tnaja</i> (not made by efforts)	<i>anitya</i> (non-eternal)	<i>nitya</i> (eternal).

These nine are the *sādhya-dharmas* (attributes to be proved of the subject).

2.

(1)	(2)	(3)
<i>prameya</i> (knowable)	<i>kṛtaka</i> (effected)	<i>anitya</i> (non-eternal)
(4)	(5)	(6)
<i>kṛta</i> (effected)	<i>śrāvya</i> (audible)	<i>ratnaja</i> (made by efforts)

(7)	(8)	(9)
<i>anītya</i> (non-eternal)	<i>yatnaja</i> (made by efforts)	<i>amūrta</i> (incorporeal)

These nine are the *hetus*.

3-5a-b. In the first three (i.e. in Nos. 1, 2 and 3 of the *cakra*) there is the presence of the *hetu* in the *sapakṣa*, whereas there are the presence, the absence as well as both the presence and the absence of the *hetu* in the *vipakṣa*. In the middle three (i.e. in Nos. 4, 5 and 6 of the *cakra*) is the absence of the *hetu* in the *sapakṣa*, whereas there are the presence, the absence as well as both the presence and the absence of the *hetu* in the *vipakṣa*. In the last three (i.e. in Nos. 7, 8 and 9 of the *cakra*) there is both the presence and the absence of the *hetu* in the *sapakṣa* whereas there are the presence, the absence as well as both the presence and the absence of the *hetu* in the *vipakṣa*.

5c-d-6.—Note that the *hetu* is uncertain (*anaikānta*) in the four corners (i.e. Nos. 1, 3, 7 and 9 of the *cakra*), contradictory (*viruddha*) on the two sides (i.e. in Nos. 4 and 5 of the *cakra*), uncommon (*asāmānya* = *asādhāraṇa*) in the centre (i.e. in No. 5 of the *cakra*) and valid in the middle both at the top and the bottom (i.e. in Nos. 2 and 8 of the *cakra*). Determine the further details by (the exercise of your) intelligence.

DURGACHARAN CHATTERJI

The God Varuṇa

Professor Przyluski has of late opened up an interesting field of conjecture in his endeavours to find Austro-Asiatic origin for a number of words in Sanskrit. The task is, unfortunately, a very difficult one, largely because of the deplorably late character of most of the evidence for Austro-Asiatic forms. We are compelled to rely on modern words which have to be conjecturally referred to an original which must be asserted to have existed in extremely early times, in order that in Sanskrit it should be a loan word. There is, of course, nothing unsound in the theory. All that is necessary is to remember the grave difficulties of demonstration, and accordingly to weigh carefully each instance which is suggested before coming to any decision.

The question can be illustrated very conveniently in the recent attempt¹ made to explain Varuṇa as god of the sea. The first point in the derivation now proposed for Varuṇa starts from Sanskrit *bharu*, 'sea', a word of great rarity and late authentication, and Pāli (also Sanskrit) *maru*, 'desert'. With these are compared Malay *baroh*, 'low-lying country', 'seashore', 'sea'. It is then suggested that the Sanskrit *maryādā*, which is usually classed with Latin *mare* and other words of Indo-European origin denoting 'sea', is to be explained as akin to *maru*. We are assured that vowel permutations are common in the Austro-Asiatic languages. It must, however, be observed that the connection of *maryādā* with the Indo-European word for 'sea' is not disproved by the suggestion² that the *mare* type is confined to the north-western Indo-European dialect. We cannot overlook the Greek *Amphimareos*, which seems to contain the same root. We have also a Sanskrit *māra*, 'sea', which is so far as is yet known only preserved in lexicographical literature.³ Moreover, even if *maryādā* is not connected with *mare*, there is the alternative etymology from Indo-European *mer-*, 'glimmer', the root idea being 'boundary' as the meaning 'sea' can

1 *JRAS.*, 1933, pp. 613-22.

2 Meillet, *Les Dialects indo-européens*, p. 22.

3 *Uṇādi*, ii. 25.

easily enough be thence derived. Similarly we cannot dismiss *maru*, desert, as necessarily non-Indo-European; we have an obviously possible source in *mel-*, 'crush', if we hold that *maru* first denotes 'sand'.⁴

If we ignore these difficulties, then our attention is invited first to the Semitic *baḥr* which means 'sea' in Arabic, 'stretch of water' in Guèze, (Classic Ethiopian), and is comparable with Amharic *baraha*, 'desert'. Nöldeke ascribes the primitive meaning of 'depression', and Father P. Jouön suggests that there is connection with *bharu* in Sanskrit and Pāli. In Sumerian again we find the root *bar*, to which Delitzsch gives the meaning 'on the outside', 'outside', 'free space', 'desert'. We may therefore, it is suggested, postulate a Palæo-Asiatic radical *bar*, which must have originally designated what lay outside of groupings of human beings, and consequently uncultivated land, seashore, the sea itself. In Sumerian, it is admitted, the root does not modify the initial and retains a rather general sense. In Austro-Asiatic languages the radical assumes different shapes, and such and such a word is specialised in a particular sense. To the Austro-Asiatic languages accordingly are ascribed the loan words in Semitic and Indo-Aryan. This is inevitable, because the obvious suggestion of borrowing by Semitic from Sumerian is really precluded as plausible by the meaning of Sumerian *bar*. It never appears to denote the sea, and it may most certainly be doubted if it has anything whatever to do with the Austro-Asiatic root proposed. Equally the Semitic terms seem best left aside, and explained as derived from the basal sense of 'depression', wholly unconnected with the idea of being outside the groupings of human beings.

We are left therefore with the grave doubt whether any early Sanskrit word can be traced to Austro-Asiatic origin, for, if we decline thus to explain *maryādā*, it is admitted that *maru* and *bharu* are not Vedic. As regards the former word we are in no wise obliged to believe that it is in any way connected with *bharu*, and we may therefore concentrate on *bharu* which, of course, is well known from its occurrence in Bharukaccha. Now Professor Przyluski holds that the non-Aryan tribes peopling the Indus delta and the neighbouring regions believed

⁴ Walde, *Vergl. Woerterbuch*, ii. 234.

that beneath the sea lay the realm of the king of the waters, and that king was revered as a great god. The evidence for this hypothesis is given as follows. (1) In the various recensions of the *Rāmāyaṇa* the description of the western regions ends with the mountain Asta, the sun-setting, where is erected the palace of Varuṇa.⁵ (2) In the Geographical catalogue of the Yakṣas in the *Mahāmāyūrī*⁶ we have *Bharuko Bharukaccheṣu*. This normally means that among the people of Bharukaccha there is the Yakṣa Bharuka, but a Chinese translator renders Bharuka as 'god of the water', which suggests Varuṇa. (3) In the Pāli *Jātaka*⁷ a king Bharu reigns in the Bharu country, and his realm is ultimately engulfed in the ocean. (4) In the *Divyāvadāna* we have the legend not of the destruction of Bharukaccha, but of its foundation by one of the ministers of the king of Rauruka, who had escaped when the capital was destroyed. Rauruka, as Professor Lüders⁸ has shown, is not to be sought for in Turkestan, but in the country of the Sindhu-Sauvīras, the region of the lower Indus. Bharu being a non-Aryan name, the legend is probably non-Aryan, and we find in the *Mahābhārata*⁹ references to the Śūdras of Bharukaccha as bringing presents to Yudhiṣṭhira, suggesting that we are dealing with a world extraneous to the Brāhmanic civilisation.

These pieces of evidence seem wholly defective to establish the existence of a great god to whom Buddhist tradition ascribed a realm at the bottom of the waters, while the compilers of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, who held that gods necessarily dwelt on mountains, enthroned this extraneous Varuṇa on the sunset mountain. Neither the *Jātaka* nor the *Divyāvadāna* has anything about a great god, and even the catalogue of Yakṣas, who are not great gods, has nothing about a Yakṣa at the bottom of the ocean.¹⁰ And there is not the slightest reason to suppose that the *Rāmāyaṇa* knew anything of such an extraneous god, who did not exist so far as can be

5 S. Lévi, *JA.*, 1918, i, 122.

6 S. Lévi, *JA.*, 1915, i, 35 ff.

7 ii. 169 ff.

8 *Weitere Beiträge zur Geschichte und Geographie von Ostturkestan*, pp. 45 ff.

9 ii, 1830, ed. Bombay; *marukarcha* is the Calcutta variant, *m* and *bh* being constantly confused in MSS.

10 The Chinese rendering no doubt merely refers to the notorious connection of Yakṣas and water; see A. Coomaraswamy, *Yakṣas*, pt. II (1931).

proved in the Buddhist tradition. The only evidence as to the identification of a Bharu (not necessarily that of Bharukaccha) with a god has nothing to do with Varuṇa. The word *bharu* in the *Unādi*, i. 7 is explained by Ujjvaladatta, who takes the root as *bhr̥*, as meaning *svāmī*, the *Siddhāntakūmudī* adds *Hariś ca*, the *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa* holds that Bharu denotes also Śiva, and it is the view of Mahādeva that the mysterious *Bharvoś caraṇāmbujadvayam* in Bāṇa's *Kādambarī* refers to Hari and Hara. The value of these late views is dubious, but at least they are clearly proved to have existed.

But on the basis of his belief in the identification on a non-Aryan god of the sea (*baru/bharu*) with Varuṇa, Professor Przyluski is led to suggest that the Vedic god himself is to be explained as regards name by *baru*. The *-na* is not simple, but we are referred to the case of the word *patana*, 'city', 'capital' (rather *pattana*), which is to be traced back to a Palæo-Asiatic root, by the aid of an Assyrian form *bitanu*. Hence we have an ancient root, *bar*, enlarged to *bara* in Sumerian and *baru* in Austro-Asiatic, whence by adding the suffix *-na* we obtain Baruna which is not far from Varuṇa.

Now in the Mitanni king's version of his treaty with Subbiluliuma, the Hittite king, there occurs the name of a god Aruna, while the Hittite version has Uruwana, and Professor Kretschmer¹¹ has suggested that the original is Aruna in Hittite which means the sea, while Uruwana is a popular etymology of Aruna, as also is Varuṇa, the proto-Indians having borrowed a god of the sea from Western Asia. This view is rejected by Professor Przyluski, who prefers to trace Aruna, Varuṇa and Uruwana to an Austro-Asiatic Baruna. There is an obvious difficulty in assigning Varuṇa to this origin when in later Sanskrit we find *bharu*. Nor is it removed by the example adduced, namely the fact that, while we have in the *Atharva-veda kambala* which is referred to an Austro-Asiatic root *bala* with prefix *ka-* we find in the earlier *R̥g-veda* the form *vāra*, 'hair', 'horse hair', showing that the ancient loans are those that depart most from

¹¹ WZKM., xxxiii, 1 ff. It is odd, if Aruna is the Hittite form, that it should not appear in the Hittite version. Why should the Hittite King fail to reproduce the name properly? The obvious answer is that the god was Varuṇa, not Aruna, and there was no Hittite god Aruna.

the Austro-Asiatic models. In all probability, whatever the origin of *kambala*, *vāra* can be referred to an Indo-European root, and the example disappears. It is in fact very difficult to accept the principle involved, and certainly it must be reinforced by clear instances before we can contemplate adopting it as a working hypothesis.

Further, it is impossible to accept with satisfaction the attempt to explain Aruna and Varuṇa from the fact that in certain Austro-Asiatic languages the initial undergoes complete reduction as in Bahnar *ār*, 'marsh'. That initial sounds are often lost in the course of the history of language is one thing, that in the 14th century B.C. we can have derived from Austro-Asiatic speeches Aruna side by side with Varuṇa is a hypothesis wholly implausible. To render it reasonable to accept, very strong evidence would be necessary and none is forthcoming. As for Uruwana M. Benveniste, we are informed, is able to prove that *-uwa-* and *-u-* are equivalent in Hittite, while the variation in Mattiwaza's name as Mattiuza shows definitely that *-wa-* and *-u-* can be interchanged. We have therefore no ground for denying that the Uruwana is simply Varuṇa, and not a popular etymology, especially as no such etymology is obvious.¹²

It is difficult also to understand exactly how it is supposed that Varuṇa came to the Aryans. "Nothing forbids us to affirm that a section of the Aryans always remained faithful to the Austro-Asiatic Varuṇa, god of the sea". But we have not the slightest evidence that there ever existed an Austro-Asiatic Varuṇa, god of the sea, and, as I have elsewhere pointed out,¹³ we have no evidence of a Hittite god Aruna, as the ocean. The whole fabric of the views of Professors Kretschmer and Przyluski seems to be built up on the fact that two foreign versions of Varuṇa are rather inaccurate. The identification of Varuṇa with Ouranos involves far less difficulty than does this mass of hypotheses, especially if we adopt the view that Ouranos is to be derived from *ueru-*,¹⁴ but, apart from that, the nature of Varuṇa in

12 Keith, *Dr. Modi Memorial Volume*, p. 93.

13 *Ibid.*

14 Walde, i. 281. Alternatively we may refer the term to the base seen in Sanskrit *vāri*, 'water,' Avestan *vār*, 'rain,' and other terms in Walde, i, 268, 269; L.H. Gray, *Iran. Rel.*, p. 26.

the *R̥g-veda*¹⁵ is such as to render his subsequent close connection with the sea far from unnatural, rendering it quite unnecessary to derive that aspect of his character from a god of the sea, whether Hittite or Austro-Asiatic, whose existence is purely a construction. If and when we have any independent evidence of the existence of such deities, then only would it be necessary to consider whether there is any likelihood of contamination in the nature of Varuṇa.

It may be added that it is unnecessary and improbable to explain *marianni* in the Mitanni treaty by reference to the hypothetical Austro-Asiatic *mari*. The current view, which accepts in *anni* a Mitanni final¹⁶ added to a base connected with Vedic *marya*, 'young man', is far more plausible than the idea that the term *marianni* designates the people of the borders, of the desert and the vicinity of the sea.

A. BERRIEDALE KEITH

¹⁵ Keith, *Religion and Philosophy of the Veda*, i-100 ff; cf. Hopkins, *Epic Mythology*, pp. 119-20.

¹⁶ There is a clear case of such a contamination in *Mitraśśil Arunaśśil* in the Mitanni version of the treaty.

The Rise of Vijayanagara*

III

Now we shall turn our attention to another quarter where we shall indeed find more valuable support for maintaining the view that Harihara I raised himself to the position of a king in 1336 or in 1340 A.D., or according to some, certainly in the year 1343 A.D.

The first of these three views relates to the famous story of the foundation of Vijayanagara in the year 1336 A.D. by Harihara I with the aid of Vidyāranya. I do not intend to dwell on this topic here since I have reserved it for its proper place.⁴⁰

I shall take the second view viz., that Harihara was indeed independent in 1340 A.D. The inscription which gives us this information is from Nelamaṅgala. It runs thus:—“Svasti Śrī Kāliyugada Varus(h)a Saṃ 4442 yuda—1263 Vikrama Saṃvatsarada Āsvayija Śu. 10 Ma. Śrī Mahāmaṅdaleśvaram Arirāya vibhāḍa Bhāsege-tappuvarāyaragaṅḍa Catus-samudrādhipati Śrī Vīra Hariyappa Voḷeyaru pṛthvirājyaṅgeyuvalli Śrīmanu Mahāsāmantādhipati Nara-loka-gaṅḍa Mayileya-Nāyakaru Kukalanāḍanu āḷutīralu Śrīmanu Mahā-kukkalanāḍa—liyahonnu—illegible”.⁴¹

The third view relating to the establishment of the kingdom of Vijayanagara in the year 1343 A.D. is based on the following epigraph:—“If Śāradā were for all times to take the Earth as a leaf on which to write, with a twig from the cup of the gods as a pen, and the ocean as a cup of black water (or ink), dark as the blue mountains, even so she would not exceed the sum of the qualities, Iśa. . . .”

“(On the date specified i.e. 1343 A.D.) when the Mahārājādhirāja, Rājapameśvara, Vīra Pratāpa Hariharamahārāya was ruling the kingdom—a dweller at his lotus feet Bhāyaṅga, son of Padmanābha of the Soma-vaṃśa, established in Hiriya-gaṅḍasi-thaḷa, the village of

* Continued from vol. VIII, No. 4. p. 774.

⁴⁰ It is inserted in Chapter III of the writer's forthcoming book entitled *Social and Political Life in the Vijayanagara Empire*. Heras in his *Beginnings of Vijayanagara History* has also examined this question.

⁴¹ *EC.*, IX, N1, 19, p. 61 (Text).

Maṅgasamudra, and repairing the Hiriya Ghaṇḍasi agrahāra at the southern sluice of that tank, for the safety of the channel brought to the old tank, set up the god Hanumanta in front of him, and created a śāsana".⁴²

I intend to examine the direct evidence given to us in these two epigraphs in terms of contemporary events and the position which Harihara occupied in Hoysala history. We shall begin with the inscription from Nelamaṅgala dated 1340 A.D. The titles given to Harihara are "Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara, Arirāya-vibhāḍa, Bhāsege-tappuva-rāyara-gaṇḍa, Catus-samudrādhipati, Śrī Vīra Hariyappa Oḍeyāru". The phrase used in connection with him is "Pṛthvī-rājyaṅgeyuvalli".

There is nothing either in the titles or in the phrase used to suggest that Harihara was an independent ruler in 1340 A.D.

One admits that some of these titles,—“Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara, Arirāya-vibhāḍa, Bhāsege-tappuva-rāyara-gaṇḍa”, were used by Harihara himself, and by his successors, although like him they were careful enough to modify the last title relating to the lordship over the seas. But the fact of Harihara having assumed these titles in 1340 A.D., cannot be taken to mean that he was necessarily independent. The first title of “Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara” is in itself not of much value because it was a Hoysala title,⁴³ and was held by many provincial governors in the Hoysala times. The other two titles “Arirāya-vibhāḍa” (destroyer of hostile kings) and “Bhāsegetappuva-rāyara-gaṇḍa (champion over those kings who break their word) need an explanation. Supposing that Harihara assumed independence in 1336 A.D., and that these were the titles which denoted his royal rank, we have evidence to prove a feudatory calling himself by one of these titles. He was Vīra Māji Hiriya-Pemmanāyaka, who styles himself a “Mahānāyakācārya” and “Bhāsege-tappuva-rāyara-gaṇḍa”.⁴⁴ It is incredible that if Harihara I had really become an independent ruler in 1336 A.D. or 1340 A.D. he would ever have allowed a feudatory under him to call himself by the very same title which Harihara pre-

42 *EC.*, V, pt. 1, Ak., 159, p. 181.

43 *Fleet, Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts*, p. 65. (1st Ed.).

44 *EC.*, IX, Dv. 3, p. 74. Cf. Nāgayya who calls himself “Bhāsege-tappuva-Leṅkara-gaṇḍa” in about 1305 A.D., *EC.*, III, Md. 83, p. 155 (Text).

fixed to his own name. What Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya the Great permitted in the instance of a petty Coḷa representative, Harihara would never have allowed in the case of a Mahānāyakācārya, especially when we realize the fact that the empire of Vijayanagara had just come into being under the guidance of the eldest son of Saṅgama. Therefore, neither the 'birudu' of 'Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara' nor that of 'Bhāsege-tappuva-rūyara-gaṇḍa' can be taken to mean that Harihara was independent. The last title *Catus-samudrādhipati* (Master of the Four Oceans) can be interpreted to mean that he was indeed a king. But on a closer examination even this 'birudu' fails to carry conviction with it. In all likelihood it was a title which Harihara may have received at the hands of Vīra Ballāḷa III for some act of bravery about which we know nothing for the present. This supposition is strengthened by the fact that Harihara was engaged in unifying the western and eastern sea-boards of the Hoysala empire, as is evident by his activities in Bārakūru, Honnāvūru, Bādāmi, and by his having placed his younger brother, Kampa, probably with the sanction of his royal master Ballāḷa III, in charge of the Udayagiri district guarding the eastern coast. If he was really an independent monarch in 1340 A.D., nothing prevented him and his successors from appending that 'birudu' which suggests his influence over the northern, western, eastern and southern oceans, in the subsequent years. But this title which appears in the grant of a private person in 1340 A.D., does not figure in the royal grant of Harihara in 1346 A.D. For in that year he calls himself as one who has "conquered the Earth from the eastern to the western oceans."⁴⁵ And ten years later (1356 A.D.) Bukka I is called in a grant by Mallinātha-Oḍeyar, who, as a general over the Vijayanagara forces, must certainly have been intimate with the proper royal titles, master only of the Eastern and Western oceans.⁴⁶ Again in 1360 A.D. Bukka is given the same title, and not the 'birudu' of 'Catus-samudrādhipati'.⁴⁷ The reason why the 'birudu' of 'Catus-samudrādhipati' was not used by the founders from the year 1346 till 1360 A.D. is that the conquest of the southern ocean i.e. of the

45 *EC.*, VI, Sg. 1, p. 92.

46 *Rice, My. Inscr.*, p. 2.

47 *EC.*, III, Hn. 19, p. 8.

southern Sultanate of Madura which bordered on the southern ocean, was not effected till 1360 A.D.; and, therefore, neither Harihara I nor Bukka I prefixed that title to their names. Therefore, this 'birudu' inserted in the grant of 1340 A.D. gives us no clue to the independent position of Harihara in that year. We can only assume that it must have been bestowed on him in recognition of some act of valour, since we know that he was indeed the 'Strong Man' of the times.

We now proceed to examine the phrase used in connection with him "Śrī Vīra Hariyappa Oḍeyaru pṛthvī-rājyaṅgeyuvalli" (while Vīra Harihara was ruling the kingdom of the world). This phrase likewise is insufficient to prove that he was an independent ruler in 1340 A.D. The technical phrase used to denote sovereignty from the times of the later Cālukyas, as the accompanying table will show, was, as Mr. Rice rightly says, "Sukha-saṅkathāvinodadinda" (in the enjoyment of peace and pleasant (or profitable) conversation, especially it would appear, stories relating to benefactions for charity or religious merit).⁴⁸ This phrase has been interpreted by Mr. Rice thus—"While ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom", "as conveying the idea probably intended to be expressed".⁴⁹ It is true that in the early times of Karnāṭaka history, as Dr. Fleet observes,⁵⁰ the phrase 'Pṛithvī-rājyaṅgeyuvalli, conveyed the idea of sovereignty, and that it was superseded by the more elaborate "Vijaya-rājyam-uttar-ottar-ābhi-ṽiddhi-pravardhamānaṃ-ā-candra-ārka-tārāmbaram-sale (or salut-tum-ire)", "The victorious reign augmenting with perpetual increase, being current, so as to endure as long as the moon and sun and stars may last." But this also was exchanged in the Vijayanagara times for the still more high-sounding phrase which began with the usual 'birudus' of the monarchs, spoke of the Aṅga, Vaṅga, Kaliṅga and other kings, addressed the Vijayanagara ruler in terms of respect, and ended with the assertion that the latter satisfied the desires of the needy from Himācala to Setu.⁵¹ This may be considered to be the typical manner

48 Rice, *Mysore and Coorg*, pp. 167-8.

49 Rice, *Mysore Ins.*, p. 2 note: *EC.*, IX, Dv. 32. p. 41, gives the meaning in clear terms.

50 Fleet, *Dyn. Kan. Dist.*, p. 429; Fleet quoted in *QJMS.*, II, p. 64.

51 *EC.*, XII, Ck. 10, p. 73.

in which sovereignty is denoted in the royal grants of Vijayanagara. But the frequent use of the phrase 'pr̥thvī-rājyaṅgeyuvalli' in the Vijayanagara age may be explained by saying that it signified the subordinate status of provincial governors;⁵² that in the instances where it occurs in connection with the rulers, it denoted the instability of the times as in the reign of Ballāḷa III or in those of Śadāśiva; that it mostly occurs in the vīragals and in grants made by private persons and sometimes by nobles; and that whenever it was used in the Vijayanagara times it was invariably qualified by the imperial titles 'Rājādhirāja', 'Rājapameśvara', or 'Mahārājādhirāja' which augmented considerably the meaning of the words 'while ruling the kingdom of the word'. These considerations may, therefore, enable us to understand that in 1340 A.D. its inclusion in an inscription may not necessarily be interpreted to mean the independent position of Harihara.

From qualifying phrases given in the tabular statement (see Appendix) it will be clear that Hoysala tradition had already sanctioned the use of the phrase 'Sukha-saṅkathā-vinodadiṃ' instead of 'Pr̥thvī-rājyam-geyuvalli' which was associated with kings as well as viceroys in the Vijayanagara times. An examination of the political events of 1340 A.D. will make it clear that the inclusion of the latter phrase in a grant of that year gives us no definite data to assume that Harihara was an independent ruler in 1340 A.D.

We now turn to the other inscription from Arasiyakere which, as noted above, gives Harihara I the title of 'Mahārājādhirāja', in 1343 A.D.⁵³ I admit that this is the best direct evidence we have of Harihara as an independent ruler in 1343 A.D. after the elimination of the following considerations against it:—To start with, this epigraph, as Mr. Rice remarks, "opens with an ultra-hyperbolic verse in praise of Śiva."⁵⁴ True, it is a grave defect of the eastern mind to be ultra-hyperbolic on very many occasions; but it may be observed that Harihara, who was, content with the modest title of 'Vīra Hariappa Oḍeya', would not have given vent to his imagination by falling into

52 *EC.*, IX, Cp. 150, pp. 164; 336; *EC.*, VII, Sh. 70, p. 72 etc.

53 *EC.*, V, AR. 159, O.C.

54 *EC.*, V, Intro., p. XXVIII.

an ultra-hyperbolic vein only in the year 1343 A.D., when neither before that date nor after it we have any evidence of his having allowed a subject of his to call him by the imperial titles of 'Mahārājādhirāja Rājaprameśvara'.

Moreover, it may be noted that this is a private grant and that it has not the weight of a royal pronouncement. If Harihara really assumed royal dignity in 1343 A.D., his own grant of 1346 A.D., which we shall presently cite, would have made known to us the fact of his having been called a 'Mahārājādhirāja.'

Further, neither the beginning nor the end of the above grants is in conformity with the acknowledged Vijayanagara practice. There is neither the salutation to the Boar at the beginning nor the Kannada *śiṅga* manual 'Śrī Vīrūpākṣa' at the end. Therefore, the value of this inscription is diminished because of its exaggeration and its private nature. Any assertion as regards the royal position of Harihara I based on this inscription is consequently untenable.

If we have no substantial evidence till the year 1343 A.D. to maintain that Harihara had become independent, the next question to be asked is—when did he really become king?

The answer to this question lies in a proper analysis of the political situation in the first half of the fourteenth century in southern India, and in understanding the position which Harihara occupied in Hoysala history. We shall begin with the latter, and we shall see what and where he was between 1300 and 1340 A.D. The supposition that the sons of Saṅgama were officers under the Hoysala government is well founded. Kumāra Kampana, according to the local chronicles of Madura, was a 'door-keeper' of Vīra Ballāḷa III.⁵⁵ Under what circumstances he was transferred to Madura is a point that remains to be seen. As regards Harihara, the following may be observed:—

In 1309 A.D. Harihara seems to have already occupied the highest position in the Hoysala kingdom. For under the name of Devappa

⁵⁵ Satyanātha Iyer, *The Nāyaks of Madura*, p. 3. We may suppose that there was some such high dignitary called the 'door-keeper.' Cf. *Arthasāstra*, Bk. II, ch. X, p. 81, note 6 (Shama Sastri's ed.). Taluvachitta-viṭṭhappa is called one of the ministers at the gate of the great minister Vallappa in 1341 A.D. *EC.*, X, Mr. 82, p. 175; see also *EC.*, XII, Tm. 1, p. 2.

Hariappa he was placed as the Sarvādhikāri over the Haḍavalike-nāḍu.⁵⁶ We admit that the identification of Devappa Hariappa with Hariappa Oḍeya will, for the present, be only a conjecture; but we may be permitted to assume that this was the same person who later exchanged his name 'Devappa' for the more fitting 'Vīra' by dint of hard work as a minister for peace and war. Sarvādhikāri, it may be incidentally noted, was a title of the greatest consequence in Hoysala history.⁵⁷

We shall presently see that this 'Devappa' would justify the other title which he probably had—that of 'the Strong Man' of Lakkaṇṇa—by his warlike activities directed towards the western and north-western portions of the Hoysala Empire. In fact, it was he who brought the western seaboard under the control of Ballāḷa III. This is proved, according to some, by his having built a fort at Bārakūru in Tuḷuva in 1336 A.D.⁵⁸ In 1340 A.D. he was placed over Kukkalānāḍu. We infer this from the titles given to him (Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara, Arirāyavibhāḍa, Bhāsege-Tappuva-rāyara-gaṇḍa, Catus-Samudrādhipati),⁵⁹ and from the history of this little principality. In about 1330 A.D. Kukkalānāḍu was under (Mayīleya nāyaka), Jāleyan-nāyaka, a feudatory of Ballāḷa III.⁶⁰ In 1336 A.D. he is called Chenneya-nāyaka.⁶¹ In 1339 A.D. Koṭeya-nāyaka's son Mayīleya-nāyaka Chenneya-nāyaka's son Koṭeya-nāyaka was under Ballāḷa III.⁶² In 1340 A.D. Mayīleya-nāyaka's younger brother Chenneya-nāyaka, also called in the same inscription Mayīleya-nāyaka Chenneya-nāyaka, was the feudatory of Ballāḷa III. The date of this inscription is "Śakābda 1262 neya Vikrama Saṃvat-

56 *EC.*, VII, Sh. 19, p. 13. Another Harihara is Aḍḍāyada Harihara Daṇṇāyaka in 1235 A.D. *EC.*, III, Md. 121, p. 53. The younger brothers of one Harihara Śiva Daṇṇāyaka are mentioned in 1279 A.D. *EC.*, III, Tn. 84, p. 83. The ruler of Kundaur was Harihara in 1297 (?) A.D. *EC.*, IX, Cg. 59, 12 (Text).

57 *My. Arch. Report.*, 1914-5, p. 52.

58 Sturrock, *S. Canara Manual*, I, p. 53. *op. cit.*

59 *EC.*, IX, Nl. 19. *op. cit.* The last named title "Lord of the Four Oceans" was evidently bestowed on Harihara by Ballāḷa on account of his work in the maritime districts.

60 *EC.*, IX, Nl. 12, p. 32.

61 *EC.*, IX, Nl. 9, p. 32.

62 *EC.*, IX, Bn. 110, p. 22.

63 *EC.*, IX, Bn. 117. p. 23. He is called also "Koḍiya-nāyaka".

sarada Kārtika Śu-5-ralu⁶⁴ (= November, Friday 24, 1340 A.D.)⁶⁵ This ruler Mayileya-nāyaka appears in the same year, according to Mr. Rice, under Hariappa Oḍeyar. The inscription which supplies us with this information is effaced, and it presents some difficulties as regards its date. "Kaliyugada varusam 4442 yeda—1263 Vikrama Saṃvatsarada—ṇa Saṃvatsarada Āsvayuja Śu. 10 Ma". If we agree with Mr. Rice, we may place this in "August, Thursday, 3rd, 1340 A.D."⁶⁶ or in 1341 A.D. It is certain that Mayileya-nāyaka was under Harihara. Kukulanāḍu which had been under the Hoysalas, and Mayileya-nāyaka Chenneya-Nāyaka, who had acknowledged the suzerainty of Ballāla III in 1340 A.D., would not have tamely surrendered to "the rising power" of a new chief like Harihara if the latter were an enemy of Ballāla III, especially when that Hoysala monarch was still powerful to command an army that could meet the Turks in a battle in 1342 A.D. Therefore, it may be concluded that Mayileya-nāyaka Chenneya-nāyaka willingly acquiesced in the government of Harihara because the latter was the governor placed over Kukulanāḍu by Vīra Ballāla III. Nominally over this area, Harihara was really concentrating his attention on the important question of subjugating Bādāmi, where in the same year (1340 A.D.) he built a fort.⁶⁷ In 1342 A.D. he solved the entire problem of the control of the western coast by bringing under his sway the Muhammadan chief named Jamāl-ud-dīn of Honnāvūru.⁶⁸ Thus from 1309 A.D. till 1342 A.D. his activities only confirm that he was indeed the 'Strong man' not only of Lakkhaṇṇa⁶⁹ but of the times as well.

Inscriptional evidence warrants our assumption that the Hoysalas ruled till the year 1346 A.D. Now, the supposition is that during the reign of the last two Ballālas,—Vīra Ballāla III, and Ballāla IV, Hariappa, who had so faithfully served his sovereigns, would not have deliberately thrown his weight on the side of the great enemies of the

64 *EC.*, IX, Bn. III. OC. Text, p. 40.

65 Swamikannu, *Indian Ephemeris*, IV, p. 283.

66 Swamikannu, *Indian Ephemeris.*, IV. p. 283; but it may also correspond to February, Monday, 26, 1341, *Ibid.*, p. 284.

67 *IA.*, X, p. 63. Heras, *The Beginnings*, p. 68.

68 *Ibn-Batuta, Travels.*, (Defremery-Sanguinetti) IV, p. 63; Heras, *Ibid.*

69 It is impossible to find out who this Lakkhaṇṇa was.

Hoysalas, the Muhammadans, by creating another kingdom within the limits of the Hoysala Empire. All the evidence brought forward by the supporters of the theory that the Vijayanagara Empire was established between 1336 A.D. and 1340 A.D. being highly unsatisfactory, we fall back on the guess with which Mr. Kṛṣṇa Śāstrī concludes the introduction to the first of the series of his articles. "In fact there is strong reason to believe that till A.D. 1346 by which time Ballāla had died, there was no attempt made by Harihara and his brothers to declare their independence."⁷⁰ The Rev. Heras says the same—"The fact is that the year 1346 A.D. witnessed the end of the Hoysala dynasty,"⁷¹ but in his next statement he is indefinite as to when Harihara appointed Bukka as his *yuva-rāja*. "And it was perhaps on this occasion (i.e., in the year 1346) that Harihara I appointed Bukka his *Yuva-rāja*. We say, perhaps, for the inscription referring to this event is of the year 1378, when Bukka himself was already on the throne after his brother Harihara's death."

While arguing against the unwarranted conclusions of Mr. Kṛṣṇa Śāstrī, the Rev. Heras proves conclusively the identity of interests between Harihara and Vīra Ballāla III⁷², and opines that "in the same year (i.e., 1346 A.D. "the year of Ballāla IV's death"), most likely after the death of Ballāla IV, the authority of Harihara was acknowledged in the same Tāluka (of Bangalore), according to an inscription at Harihara Hobli".⁷³ While the Rev. Heras has thus decidedly added to our knowledge of those dark days of the early Vijayanagara history, and has advanced on the suppositions of Mr. Kṛṣṇa Śāstrī, especially in pointing out the importance of the year 1346 A.D. in South Indian history, yet he has not finally declared whether the Empire of Vijayanagara was founded in 1346 A.D. or earlier. This is evident from the hesitation with which he speaks of Harihara's having made Bukka his *yuva-rāja* in 1346 A.D., from the assertion which he has made in the earlier part of his book that there was a city called Vijayanagara in the Hoysala times,⁷⁴ and finally from the

⁷⁰ *ASR.*, 1907-8, op. cit.

⁷¹ Heras, *The Beginnings etc.*, p. 110. See Dr. Venkaṭa Ramaṇayya, *Kampili and Vijayanagara*, p. 32.

⁷² Heras, *The Beginnings etc.*, p. 68.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 104.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 42.

statement, which we have already seen, that Harihara I was enthroned by Ballāla III as the latter's own Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara between the years 1330 and 1340 A.D. at Vijayanagara.⁷⁵ While the question of raising Harihara to the status of a Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara in the north by Ballāla III, between 1330 and 1340 A.D., is not at all denied, the assertion that there was a city named Vijayanagara between these two dates is a point which one is not prepared to admit. For, if there was a city called Vijayanagara between 1330 and 1340 A.D., the significance of the name of the capital, and of the assumption of the status of a sovereign by Harihara only in 1346 A.D., are not easily understood. There cannot be a doubt that the kingdom which soon came to be known as the Empire of Vijayanagara, was founded in the year 1346 A.D.

We resume the thread of our analysis of the political situation in the Karnāṭaka. Ballāla IV ruled, as we have noted, till 1346 A.D. And we assume that he died issueless, and that, as the Rev. Heras would have it, Harihara was acknowledged king in the Bangalore region. Over and above his personal qualifications, Harihara had the supreme consolation of realizing that three of his brothers were doing more for the country than any one else in the Karnāṭaka. All these brothers, Harihara, Bukka, Mārappa and Kampana were indeed conjointly responsible for the rejuvenation of Hindu life in southern India, although the leading line was in the hands of Harihara. While he was busy safeguarding the western and north-western parts of the Hoysala Empire, his brother Mārappa was equally active in acquiring a kingdom in the West. This we infer from an inscription of 1346 A.D. which records that Mārappa "from Kallāsa acquired a kingdom in the west", and defeating the Kadamba king in a great battle, proceeded to the temple of Śiva at Gokarna.⁷⁶ This little point of Mārappa's having acquired a kingdom in the West from Kallāsa, which, if I may say so, was perhaps Kalāśa, deserves a passing remark. The Rev. Heras has identified the ruler of Kallāsa with the Piṇḍya Deva of Ucchaṅgi.⁷⁷ I think that the phrase 'Kingdom in the West' may refer to the Sindas.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 67.

⁷⁶ *EC.*, VIII, Sb. 375, p. 66.

⁷⁷ Heras, *The Beginnings etc.*, p. 77.

In the unexplored region of Karnāṭaka history, the Sindas have played a small but significant part. In 1245 A.D. the Sinda king called Harabara Devarasa had made Kallise his capital.⁷⁸ I suppose that this Kallise of Harabara Devarasa and the Kallasa of Mārappa are the same. This would mean the end of the Sinda family on the one hand, and of the Kadamba dynasty on the other. The year when Mārappa cleared the land of these two ancient royal houses, it must be remembered, was 1346 A.D.

Meanwhile in the same year, Mārappa's younger brother Kampana, had proved the mettle he had in him by winning the lordship of the Eastern Seas. Thus in an inscription of 1346 A.D. he is styled the "Lord of the Eastern and Western Seas."⁷⁹ The fact of our not knowing for the present all the details of how he came to acquire the control over the Eastern Coast is no justification for our rejecting the evidence of the above inscription, which proves that in 1346 A.D. Kampana was doing for the sake of the country on the eastern coast, what his brothers were doing on the western and northern coasts.

We are ignorant as to what Bukka was doing in the same year (1346 A.D.); but there cannot be a doubt that that shrewd son of Saṅgama was laying deep plans for an effective campaign against the Muhammadan Sultanate of the South.

However that may be, the year 1346 A.D. saw the united activities of the brothers for a common end—the liberation of the country from foreign domination. This great fact is commemorated in two ways:—

- (a) By a joint pilgrimage which all the brothers undertook to the famous Maṭha at Srīṅgeri in 1346 A.D.; and
- (b) By a definite statement made in an inscription, engraved under royal command, dated in the year (1347 A.D.) to the effect that the capital Hastinī was "protected by the king Harihara together with his brothers",⁸⁰ among whom Muddappa, probably because he was not alive, does not figure.

⁷⁸ *EO.*, VII, Hl. 54, p. 171, Intro. p. 36.

⁷⁹ Butterworth and Venugopal Chetty, *Inscriptions in the Nellore District*, II, pp. 789-90.

⁸⁰ *EO.*, VIII, Sb. 375, p. 66.

To the evidence of these inscriptions we may add two other epigraphs which also speak of the joint rule of Harihara and Bukka. These are dated 1346 A.D. and 1346-8 A.D.⁸¹ But the inscription which gives us the clue to the exact date of the foundation of the Vijayanagara Empire is that which records the joint pilgrimage of Harihara and his brothers to Śṛṅgeri in 1346 A.D. It says that "Harihara having conquered the earth from the eastern to the western ocean, in order to celebrate the festival of his victory", along with Kampana Oḍeyar, Bukkaṇṇa Oḍeyar, Mārappa Oḍeyar, Muddappa Oḍeyar, son-in-law Ballappa Dannāyaka, Kumāra Sovanṇa Oḍeyar, and others made to Bhārati Tīrtha Śrīpāda, his disciples, and forty Brahmins residing at Śṛṅgeri, a grant on a stone Śāsana of nine villages belonging to Kelanāḍu in Sāntaligenāḍu in the customary manner. This inscription is dated in "Jayābhyudaya Śaka-varuṣa 1268 neya Pārthiva Saṃvatsarada Phālguṇa Bahula Guruvāradandu"⁸² (=A.D. 1346, March 9, Thursday.)⁸³ The inscription which suggests to us the death of Ballāla IV and which records the grant of Jīnganṇa is dated in the cyclic year Vyaya. Vyayasamvatsarada Vaiśākha Śu. I Betyavāradalu,⁸⁴ which corresponds with (A.D. 1346) April 23, Sunday.⁸⁵ There is one point, however, which requires an explanation: if the grant recording the charity of Jīnganṇa is in April 1346 A.D., and is, therefore, later than that testifying the pilgrimage of Harihara and his brothers to Śṛṅgeri, then, why is it that no mention is made in the former about the new ruler Harihara and his brothers who had already assumed the dignity of independent rulers in March 1346 A.D.? The answer is implied in the phrase in the inscription that informs us about the famous pilgrimage to Śṛṅgeri.

This phrase, which deserves an examination, is the following—Harihara "having conquered the earth from the eastern to the western ocean, in order to celebrate the festival of his victory, made an excellent

81 *MC.*, IX, Bn. 59, p. 12; *EC.*, IX, Do. 50, p. 80 respectively.

82 *EC.*, VI, Sg. 1. p. 347 (Text).

83 Swamikannu Pillai, *The Indian Ephemeris*, IV, p. 294.

84 *EC.*, IX, Bn. 120 O. C. p. 44 (Text).

85 Swamikannu Pillai, *Ibid.*

grant.” The Rev. Heras comments on the above in this manner:—
“This conquest is called conquest and victory in a broad sense. A real victory and conquest supposes an enemy, and this enemy is always mentioned in the inscriptions of those days: the Turukas, the Colas, the Pāṇdyas, the Teluṅgas, the lords of Kuntala, Śaṅka of Koṅkan, etc. Now since the enemy is not mentioned on this occasion, it is evident that the enemy did not exist, a fact which is confirmed by the absence of records proving the conquest of the Southern portion of the Peninsula from the eastern to the western ocean. This phrase is therefore a stereotyped expression meaning that Harihara obtained the sovereignty over the earth from the eastern to the western ocean.”⁸⁶ The propensity of the Hindu monarch to prefix grandiloquent titles to their names is not denied; but what is worth while to know is whether Harihara and his brothers had any valid reason to make public the festival of their *victory* over imaginary enemies. The enemies, I believe, against whom Harihara scored a victory were the great nobles of the Hoysala Court, some of whom, as we have already described, were associated with Vīra Ballāla III himself in governing the country. To the list of these ministers, the Bhīma Rāyas, the Kaṭhora Haras, and the rest, must be added the names of Vīra Māji Hiriya Pemmanāyaka and the others, all of whom, if it came only to a question of birth and loyal service, could put forth as solid claims for the Hoysala throne as Harihara himself. It is this uncertainty which hung in the air—whether Harihara together with his brother was to succeed to the Hoysala throne or one of the great nobles of the Hoysala Court,—and the inadvisability of openly avowing the rivals of the Court as enemies, an act of indiscretion that might have brought untold misery to the rising state, that account for the absence of the names of the rulers in the grant of Jinggaṇṇa of April 1343 A.D. Since none possessed the right for the throne which Harihara could put forward, both by virtue of his own prowess and by that of his brothers, on the death of Vīra Virūpākṣa Ballāla in 1346 A.D., the people acknowledged the sovereignty of Harihara, the eldest son of Saṅgama, over the whole of Karṇāṭaka.


B. A. SALETORE

⁸⁶ Heras, *The Beginnings*, pp. 105-106.

(APPENDIX)

Age	Dynasty	Ruler	Qualifying Phrases	Reference
972 A.D.	Gaṅga	Satyavākya varma	“sukha-saṅkathā-vinodadol pṛthvī- rājyaṅgeyutham ire”	E.C., IV, Ng. 51, p. 365 (Text)
1028 A.D. (?)	W. Cālukya	Jagadekamalla	“ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom”	E.C., XI, Cd. 64, p. 15 (Transl.)
1037 A.D.	do	do	“vijaya-rājyam-uttar-ottara” etc., (“Victorious kingdom extend- ing on all sides, etc.”)	E.C., XI, Dv. 126, p. 74
do	Nolamba	Immaḍi Nolamba Pallava (under Jagadekamalla)	“ruling with the treasures (or mines) and under-ground stores, and 1000 forces, the kingdom in peace and wisdom”	do
1040 A.D.	W. Cālukya	Jagadekamalla	“victorious kingdom extending on all sides etc. ruling the kingdom of the earth in peace and wisdom”	E.C., XII, Si. 40, p. 95
1045 A.D.	do	Tribhuvanamalla	“victorious kingdom extending on all sides etc.”	E.C., XI, Dv. 143, p. 77
do	Pāṇḍya	Vijayāditya Deva	“ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom”	do

Age	Dynasty	Ruler	Qualifying Phrases	Reference
1062 A.D.	W. Cālukya	Tribhuvanamalla	"victorious kingdom extending etc."	E.C., XI, Dv. 143, p. 77
do	Pāṇḍya	Vijayāditya-Deva (under Tribhuvanamalla)	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	do
1066 A.D.	do	Vijayāditya Deva (under the W.C. Trailokyamalla)	do	E.C., XI, Dv. 11, p. 27
1067 A.D.	W. Cālukya	Traīlokyamalla Deva	do	E.C., XI, Cd. 47, p. 12
	do	Viṣṇuvardhana (son of Trailokyamalla)	"duṣṭa-nigraha viśiṣṭa-pratipālanadimālu" (putting down the evil and upholding the good etc.)	do
1074 A.D.	do	Bhuvanaikamalla Deva	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., VIII, Sb. 299, p. 52
1084 A.D.	do	Vinayāditya	do	E.C., V, Pt. I., Ak. 6, p. 114
1087 A.D.	do	Jagadekamalla	do	E.C., XI, Cl. 21, p. 99
do	Noḷamba	Malla Deva (under Jagadekamalla)	do	do
1090 A.D.(?)	W. Cālukya	Tribhuvanamalla Deva	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., VI, Kp. 43, p. 83
1093 A.D.	do	The Mahāmaṇḍalesvara	do	E.C., XI, Hk. 3, p. 115
1100 A.D.	do	Baṅcharasa Deva (under Tribhuvanamalla Perumāṇḍi Deva)	do	E.C., XI, Mk. 41 pp. 96-97
1106 A.D.	W. Cālukya	Tribhuvanamalla	"victorious kingdom, was extending, etc."	E.C., XI, Dv. 139, p. 77
do	Pāṇḍya	Pāṇḍya-Deva, under the W.C. Tribhuvanamalla	"ruling the kingdom in peace and wisdom"	do
1109 A.D.	W. Cālukya	Tribhuvanamalla	"putting down the evil and upholding all ruling in peace"	E.C., XI, Dv. 12, p. 27
		Bammaresa (under Tribhuvanamalla)	do	do



Age	Dynasty	Ruler	Qualifying Phrases	Reference
1111 A.D. do	W. Cālukya Pāṇḍya	Tribhuvanamalla Pāṇḍya Deva (under the W.C. monarch) Tribhuvanamalla	'victorious kingdom extending etc.' "ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom" "victorious kingdom extending etc."	E.C., XI, Jl. 9, p. 85 E.C., XI, Jl. 9, p. 85
1124 A.D.	W. Cālukya	Rāya Pāṇḍya Deva (under the W.C. Tribhuvana- malla)	"ruling the kingdom in peace and wisdom"	E.C., XI, Dv. 122, p. 73 E.C., XI, Dv. 122, p. 73
1124 A.D.(?)	W. Cālukya	Jagadekamalla	"victorious kingdom was extend- ing on all sides etc."	E.C., XI, Cd. 13, p. 5
do	Pāṇḍya	Vijaya Pāṇḍya Deva (under Jagadekamalla)	"putting down the evil and uphold- ing the good etc." "ruling the kingdom in peace wisdom"	do
1128 A.D. do	W. Cālukya Pāṇḍya	Trailokyamalla Vīra Pāṇḍya Iruṅḡo'a Deva (under Trailokya- malla)	"ruling the kingdom of the earth" "ruling the kingdom in peace and wisdom"	E.C., XI, Si. 7, p. 89 do
1135 A.D.(?)	W Cālukya	Tribhuvanamalla	"victorious kingdom was extend- ing etc."	E.C., II, no. 384, p. 165
1136 A.D.	do	Bhūvallabha Perumāṇaḍi	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., VI, Kd. 35, p. 7
do	Hoysala	Viṣṇuwardhana	do	do
1143 A.D. do	W. Cālukya ?	Jagadekamalla Senāpati Daṇḍanātha (under Jagadekamalla) Jagadekamalla	do do do	E.C., XI, Dv. 85, p. 67
(?)1145 A.D.	do	do	"victorious kingdom extending etc."	E.C., XI, Dv. 168, p. 82
1145 A.D. (?)	Pāṇḍya	Jagadekamalla Vīra Pāṇḍya (under the W. C. Jagadekamalla)	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., XI, Do. 168 p. 82 do

Age	Dynasty	Ruler	Qualifying Phrases	Reference
1146 A.D.	W. Cālukya	Jagadekamalla Permmā- nāḍi Rāya	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., XII, Cr. 29, p. 80
1149 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., XII, Cr. 40, p. 85
do	Hoysala	Hoysala Dēva under Jaga- dekamalla	do	E.C., XII, Cr. 18, p. 76
1149 A.D.	W. Cālukya	Jagadekamalla	"victorious kingdom was extending"	E.C., VII, Ci. 39, p. 185
do	Pāṇḍya	Vīra Pāṇḍya (under him)	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	do
1150 A.D.	W. Cālukya	Jagadekamalla	"victorious kingdom was extend- ing. etc.," and "ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., XII, Pg. 43, p. 121
1152 A.D.	do	Jagadekamalla (Permmā- nāḍi)	"putting down the evil and up holding the good etc."	E.C., V, Pl. Ak. 52, p. 129
do	Pāṇḍya	Tribhuvanamalla Deva (under Jagadekamalla)	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	do
1161 A.D.	W. Cālukya	Tribhuvanamalla (Perm- mānāḍi)	do	E.C., XII, Ck. 32 p. 81
1167 A.D.	W. Cālukya	Cālukya Cakravarti	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., XII, Si. 23, p. 91
do	Cola (?)	Malli Deva Cola mahā- rāya	do	do
1172 A.D. (?)	W. Cālukya	Jagadekamalla Permmā- nāḍi Deva	do	E.C., XII, Ck. 11, p. 73
1181 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., XII, Ck. 13, p. 74
do	Hoysala	Ballāla Deva (under him)	do	do
1187 A.D.	W. Cālukya	Jagadekamalla Permmānāḍi	do	E.C., XII, Ck. 14, p. 74
1188 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., XII, Ck. 20, p. 76

Age	Dynasty	Ruler	Qualifying Phrases	Reference
1187 A.D.	W. Cālukya	Tribhuvanamalla Deva	"putting down the evil and up- holding the good, ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., XI, Cd. 33, p. 10
do	Pāṇḍya	Vijaya Pāṇḍya Deva (under the W. C. monarch)		
do	?	The Mahāsāmantādhi- pati Kāmeya Nāyaka (under Vijaya Pāṇḍya Deva)		
1194 A.D.	W. Cālukya	Jagadekamalla Permmā- naḍi	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., XII, Ck. 16, p. 75
do	Hoysala	Ballāla Deva (under him)	"putting down the evil and up- holding the good, ruling the kingdom in peace and wisdom"	do
1199 A.D.	W. Cālukya	Tribhuvanamalla Deva		
do	Pāṇḍya	Vijaya Pāṇḍya (under the W. Cālukya monarch)	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	do
1200 A.D. (?)	W. Cālukya	Jagadekamalla Permmā- naḍi	"putting down the evil and up- holding the good" "was ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., XII, Ck. 35, p. 82
	Hoysala	Vīra Gaṅga Hoysaṇa Deva (under the W. Cālukya monarch)	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	do
1130 A.D.	Sinda	Ekkala Devarasa		E.C., VIII, Sb. 7, p. 2
		(Kāmeya Nāyaka)	(Vijaya Pāṇḍya Deva)	

Age	Dynasty	Ruler	Qualifying Phrases	Reference
1132 A.D.	Sinda	Ekkala Devarasa	“ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom”	E.C., VIII, Sb. 147, p. 21
1166 A.D.	Pāṇḍya	Vijaya Pāṇḍya	do	E.C., XI, Cd. 72, p. 16
1160 A.D. (?)	Kaḷacuruya	Bijjala Deva	do	E.C., VIII, Sb. 346, p. 61
do	Kadamba	Soyi Deva (under Bijjala)	do	do
1072 A.D.	Pallava- Noḷamba	Trailokyamalla Noḷamba- Pallava Jayasimha.	do	E.C., XI, Mk. 28, p. 94
1172 A.D.	Kaḷacuruya	Rāyamurāri Soyī Deva	do	E.C., VIII, Sb. 389, p. 69
1181 A.D.	do	Ahavamalla's great viceroy Keśimayya	do	E.C., VII, Sk. 144, p. 107
1256 A.D.	Cola	Iruṅgoḷa Co'amahāraya	do	E.C., XII, Si. 11, p. 90
1248 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., XII, P'g. 50, p. 121
1262 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., XII, Si. 34, p. 94
1277 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., XII, Si. 32, p. 93
1060 A.D.	Hoysala	Vinayāditya	do	E.C., V, Ak. 186, p. 186
1101 (?) A.D.	do	Viṣṇu [Ballāla I ?]	do	E.C., V, Ak. 34, p. 122
1113 (?) A.D.	do	Viṣṇuvardhana	do	E.C., V, Hn. 149, p. 39
1120 A.D.	do	do	“putting down the evil and up holding the good, ruling in peace and wisdom”	E.C., XII, Tp. 58, p. 54
do	do	do	“prthvī-rājyaṅgeyuttiralu”	E.C., III, Ng. 77, p. 340 (Text)
do	do	do	“ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom”	E.C., IV, Ng. 103, p. 404 (Text)
1124 A.D.	do	do	“prthvī-rājyaṅgeyuttire”	E.C., III, Ng. 193, p. 377 (Text)
1121 A.D.	do	do	“ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom”	E.C., V, Bl. 147, p. 94

Age	Dynasty	Ruler	Qualifying Phrases	Reference
1123 A.D.	Hoysala	Viṣṇuwardhana	"victorious kingdom extending on all sides etc."	E.C., II, No. 132, p. 59 Text
do	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., V, Hn. 102, p. 30
1125 A.D.	do	do	"duṣṭa-nigraha Śiṣṭa-pratipālanā-geydu-rakṣisuttam Dorasamu-drada-nele-viḍinoḷ-sukha-saṅ-kathā-viṇodidemrajyageyuttam-ire"	E.C., IV, Ng. 28, p. 335 (Text)
do	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom."	E.C., V, Ak. 53, p. 129
1126 A.D.	do	do	"ēka-cchatra- chāyīm-Sukha - rājay - aṅgeyuttire" (ruling the happy kingdom of Gaṅgavādi under the shadow of his sole umbrella)	E.C., III, Sv. 34, p. 45 (Text)
1128 A.D.	do	do	"duṣṭa-nigraha-śiṣṭa-pratipālanā-geydu - tanna - eka - cchatra-cchāye-naḷdutta- Yādava-puradom-sukha-saṅkathā-vinodadim-prthvi-rājayāṅgeyuttam-mire"	E.C., III, My. 16, p. 10 (Text)
1130 A.D.	do	do	"putting down the evil and up holding the good, ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., V, Ak. 41, p. 124
1130 A.D.	Hoysala	Vira Gaṅga (Viṣṇuwardhana).	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., XII, Tp. 104. p. 63.
1130 A.D.(?)	do	do	do	E.C., V, Hn. 85, p. 27.
1131 A.D.	do	do	duṣṭa-nigraha-śiṣṭa-pratipālanā-dim sukha-saṅkathā-vinodadim-prithvi-vāry aṅgeyuttamire"	E.C., III, Md. 29, p. 132. (Text).

Age	Dynasty	Ruler	Qualifying Phrases	Reference
1131 A.D.	Hoysala	Vira Gaṅga (Viṣṇuvar- dhana).	“vijayarājyam-uttarottarābhi- vṛddhi” etc. “victorious kingdom extending” etc.	E.C., II, no. 143, P. 75. (Text)
1134 A.D.	do	do	“putting down the evil and uphold- ing the good.” “ruling the king- dom in peace and wisdom”	E.C., XII, Gb. 34, p. 24
1135 A.D.	do	do	“ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom”	E.C., V, Hn. 89, p. 28.
1136 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., V, Ak. 32, p. 121
”	do	do	“pṛthvī-rājyaṅgeyuttam-ire”	E.C., III, Tn. 129, p. 309 (Text); E.C., V, Bn. 17, p. 49.
1137 A.D. (?)	do	Vira Gaṅga Hoysala Deva	“ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom”	E.C., XII, Ck. 12, p. 73
”	do	do	do	E.C., V, Ak. 144, p. 177
1138 A.D. (?)	do	Viṣṇuvardhana	do	E.C., XII, Tp. 63, p. 56
1139 A.D.	do	[Narasimha (Viṣṇu ?)] Viṣṇuvardhana	“putting down the evil and uphold- ing the good”. “ruling the king- dom of the world in peace and wisdom”.	E.C., V, Ak. 105, p. 155
”	do	do	“ruling in peace and wisdom the kingdom which was extending on all sides.”	E.C., V, Hn. 114, p. 32
1140 A.D.	do	do	“ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom”	E.C., XII, Gb. 13, p. 20
”	do	do	do	E.C., V, Ak. 58, p. 132
1139 A.D.	do	Narasimha I (?)	do	E.C., V, Ak. 17, p. 117
1143 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., V, Ak. 55, p. 130
1144 A.D.	do	do	“pṛthvī-rājyaṅgeyuttam-iralu”	E.C., III, Md. 22, p. 129

Age	Dynasty	Ruler	Qualifying Phrases	Reference
1154 A.D. (?)	Hoysala	Narasimha I (?)	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., V, Bl. 168, p. 99
1155 A.D.	do	do	"putting down the evil and upholding the good" and "ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., V, Hn. 87, p. 16
1083 A.D.	do	(Vinayādityā) Tribhuvanamalla Hoysala Deva	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., V, Ak. 194, p. 187
1117 A.D.	do	Viṣṇuwardhana	"the victorious kingdom was extending on all sides" etc.	E.C., III, Ml. 31, p. 177
1132 A.D.	do	Ballāla	'suka-saṅkathā-vinodadinda prithvī-rājyaṃ-geyuttam-ire"	E.C., IV, Kr. 56, p. 303 Text.
1142 A.D. (?)	do	do	do	E.C., V, Ak. 110, p. 160
1148 A.D.	do	do	"putting down the evil and upholding the good" and "ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., VI, Kd. 34, p. 7
1149 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., V, Hn. 65, p. 19
1154 A.D.	do	Hoysala Ballāla Deva	do	E.C., V, Ak. 157, p. 180
1158 A.D.	do	Narasimha	do	E.C., V, Ak. 145, p. 178
1169 A.D.	do	Hoysala Ballāla Deva	do	E.C., V, Ak. 1, p. 112
1177 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., V, Ak. 62, p. 135
1177 A.D.	do	Viṣṇuwardhana Hoysala Deva	do	E.C., V, Bl. 116, p. 74
1177 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., V, Bl. 58, p. 58
"	W. Cālukya	Tribhuvanamalla Deva	"victorious kingdom was extending on all sides" etc.	E.C., V, Bl. 116, p. 76
1142 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., V, Ak. 110, p. 160

Age	Dynasty	Ruler	Qualifying Phrases	Reference
1164 A.D.	Hoysala	Narasimha I	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., V, Ak. 68, p. 136
do	do	do	do	E.C., XII, Tp. 32, p. 47
1166 A.D.	do	do	"putting down the evil and upholding the good" and "ruling the kingdom in peace and wisdom"	E.C., VI, Rd. 51, p. 11
do (?)	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., V, Hd. 179, p. 41
1167 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., V, He. 177, p. 103
do	do	do	do	E.C., X, Bp. 8, p. 136
1169 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., XII, Tp. 91, p. 60
do	do	Buveyya-Nāyaka, governor or under Narasimha I	do	do
1170 A.D.	do	Narasimha I	do	E.C., VI, Kd. 30, p. 6
do	do	do	"putting down the evil and upholding the good" and "ruling the kingdom in the enjoyment of peace and wisdom"	E.C., V, Bn. 56, p. 15
do	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., V, Hn. 153, p. 40
1171 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., IV, Kr. 53, p. 302
1172 A.D.	do	do	do	Text
1173 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., XII, Tp. 38, p. 48
1155 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., V, Hn. 154, p. 40
1157 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., V, Hn. 69, p. 21
1157 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., XIII, Kg. I, p. 32
1157 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., V, Ak. 835, p. 173
1159 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., V, Ak. 141, p. 175
do	do	do	do	E.C., V, Ak. 119, p. 165

Age	Dynasty	Ruler	Qualifying Phrases	Reference
1159 A.D. (?)	Hoysala	Narasimha I	"duṣṭa-nigraha-śiṣṭa-pratipālana-pūrvakam-sukha-saṅkathā-vinoda-dinda-rājyaḡeyuttam-ire"	E.C., II, No. 345, p. 147 (Text)
do	do	do	prthvī-rājyaḡeyuttam-iralu"	E.C., III, Md. 24, p. 130
1160 A.D. (?)	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., V, Hn. 72, p. 23
do	do	do	"duṣṭa-nigraha-śiṣṭa-pratipālana-mādi-sukasaṅkathā-vinodadim-prthvī-rājyaḡeyuttam-iralu"	E.C., III, Sr. 74, p. 77
1161 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., V, Bl. 193, p. 106
1162 A.D.	do	do	"putting down the evil and upholding the good" and "ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., XII, Tm. 12, p. 18
do	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., XII, Tp. 61, p. 75
do	do	do	do	E.C., V, Ak. 142, p. 146
1163 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., V, Ak. 172, p. 182
1173 A.D.	Hoysala	Narasimha I	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., V, Bk. 25, p. 53
1173 A.D.	do	Ballāla Deva (II)	do	E.C., V, Ak. 71, p. 138
1174 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., V, Cn. 146, p. 189
do	do	do	do	E.C., V, Ak. 69, p. 137
do	do	do	do	E.C., V, Ak. 139, p. 174, (Text)
do	do	do	do	E.C., IV, Hn. 20, p. 233
1177 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., XII, Ck. 36, p. 83
do	do	do	do	E.C., V, Bn. 86, p. 67

Age	Dynasty	Ruler	Qualifying Phrases	Reference
1178 A.D.	Hoysala	Ballala Deva (II)	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., V, Hn. 55, p. 16 Text
1179 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., IV, Ng. 15, p. 328
1181 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., V, Cn. 161, p. 196
			"ruling the southern territory in peace and wisdom, punishing the evil and upholding the good".	E.C., II, No. 327, p. 16, Text
1182 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., V, Cn. 153, p. 112
1183 A.D.	do	[Narasimha ?] Ballala II	do	E.C., V, Bl. 137, p. 91
1184 A.D.	do	do	"putting down the evil and upholding the good" and "ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom".	E.C., V, Ak. 88, p. 146
1184 A.D.	do	The Great Minister Goparasa under Ballala Deva II	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., VII, Sk. 145, p. 107
1185 A.D. (?)	do	Ballala II	do	E.C., V, Bl. 119, p. 78
1185 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., VI, Cm. 78, p. 45
do	do	do	do	E.C., V, Ak. 127, p. 170
do	do	do	do	E.C., V, Ak. 61, p. 133
1186 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., V, Bb. 175, p. 101
1186 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., V, Ak. 39, p. 123
1187 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., XII, Ck. 9, p. 72
1188 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., V, Ak. 22, p. 119
1189 A.D.	do	Vira Ballala Deva	"putting down the evil and upholding the good" and "ruling the kingdom of the earth"	E.C., V, Ak. 57, p. 132

Age	Dynasty	Ruler	Qualifying Phrases	Reference
1189 A.D.	Hoysala	Ballāla Deva II	"putting down the evil and upholding the good" and "ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., V, Ak. 90, p. 147
1189 A.D. (?)	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., V, Ak. 48, p. 126
1190 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., V, Ng, 93, p. 394 (Text)
1190 A.D. (?)	do	(U)-Mā-Devi, queen of Ballāla II in Dorasa-mudra	do	E.C., V, Ak. 85, p. 145
1191 A.D.	do	Ballāla II	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., V, Bl. 188, p. 165
1191 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., V, Ak. 35, p. 122
1193 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the Earth"	E.C., XII, 1p. 31, p. 47
do	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., VI, Cm. 39, p. 39
1194 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., V, Ak. 193, p. 187
do	do	do	do	E.C., V, Ak. 5, p. p. 114
1195 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the whole earth in peace and wisdom, punishing the wicked and upholding the good"	E.C., II, No. 335, p. 143
do	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., V, Ak. 150, p. 179
1196 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., V, Ak. 178, p. 183
1197 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., V, Ak. 23, p. 120
1197 A.D. (?)	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., V, Ak. 4, p. 113

Age	Dynasty	Ruler	Qualifying Phrases	Reference
1198 A.D.	Hoysala	Ballāla II	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., V, Bl. 77, p. 64
1199 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., V, Ak. 103, p. 154
1200 A.D.	do	do	sukha-saṅkathā-vinodadinda-Prṭhvī-rājyaṅgeyuttire"	E.C., IV, Kr. 44, p. 300 (Text)
1200 A.D. (?)	do	do	do	E.C., IV, Ch. 204, p. 69 (Text)
1200 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., V, Ak. 38, p. 122
1200 A.D. (?)	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., V, Hn. 139, p. 39
1202 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., XII, Tp. 128, p. 67
1203 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., VI, Kd. 36, p. 8
1205 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., XII, Tp. 43, p. 50
1209 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., V, Ak. 59, p. 133
?	do	do	do	E.C., V, Ak. 40, p. 123
1211 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., V, Hn. 31, p. 10
1213 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., V, Ak. 46, p. 125
1214 A.D. (?)	do	do	do	E.C., V, Ak. 146, p. 178
1214 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., XII, Tp. 48, p. 52
1214 A.D. (?)	do	do	do	E.C., XI, Cd. 79, p. 18
		Narasimha Deva		
		do	"putting down the evil and upholding the good" and "ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	
1215 A.D. (?)	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., III, Ck. 17, p. 75
1215 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., V, Ak. 180, p. 184
1218 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., IV, Ng. 29, p. 338 (Text)

Age	Dynasty	Ruler	Qualifying Phrases	Reference
1220 A.D.	Hoysala	Narasimha Deva	"putting down the evil and upholding the good" and "ruling the kingdom in peace".	E.C., V, Ak. 77, p. 140
do	do	Ballala (II)	"putting down the evil and upholding the good" and "ruling the kingdom of the world in peace".	E.C., V, Ak. 77, p. 140
do	do	Narasimha II	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., V, Bl. 113, p. 74
1224 A.D.	do	do	"victorious kingdom was extending on all sides" etc.	E.C., XI, Dv. 25, p. 35
1234 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom,"	E.C., XII, Gb. 40, p. 25
1225 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., IV, kr. 77, p. 317
1226 A.D.	do	do	"putting down the evil and upholding the good" and "ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., XII, Gb. 11, p. 18
do	do	Narasimha Dannāyaka (under Narasimha II)	do	E.C., XII, Gb. 11, p. 18
1227 A.D.(?)	do	Narasimha II	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., V, Ak. 152, p. 174
1227 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., V, Bl. 151, p. 96
do	do	do	do	E.C., V, Ak. 50, p. 128
1228 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the earth"	E.C., XII, Tp. 54, p. 53
1229 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom,"	E.C., XII, Tp. 42, p. 50
1232 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., XII, Ck. 27, p. 79
do	do	Chatteya Nāyaka (under Narasimha II)	"ruling the kingdom in peace"	do

Age	Dynasty	Ruler	Qualifying Phrases	Reference
1233 AD.	Hoysala	Narasimha II	"putting down the evil and upholding the good;" and "ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom".	E.C., XII, Gb. 45, p. 15
1234 AD.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., V, Ak. 82, p. 143,
1229 AD.	do	Someśvara Deva	do	E.C., IV, Ng. 98, p. 399 (Text).
1235 AD.	do	Vīra Someśvara	do	E.C., XI, Jl. 33, p. 88
do	do	Narasiṅga Nāyaka and Mallaya Nāyaka (governors under Someśvara)	do	do
1236 AD.	do	Hoyasaṅga Sovi Deva	do	E.C., XI, Dv. 129, p. 75
1237 AD.	do	Someśvara Deva	do	E.C., XII, Tp. 21, J. 45
1237 AD.	do	do	do	E.C., XI, Hk. 131, p. 136
1240 AD.	do	do	do	E.C., XI, Hk. 121, p. 133
1241 AD.	do	do	do	E.C., VI, Kd. 83, p. 15
1246 AD.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the earth"	E.C., XII, Tp. 23, p. 46
1255 AD.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., V, Ak. 108, p. 157
1269 AD.	do	Narasimha III	do	E.C., XII, Tm. 19, p. 19
1296 A.D.	Hoysala	Narasimha III	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., XII, Tm. 49, p. 19
do	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., IX, Db. 3, p. 63
1287 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., VII, Sh. 63, p. 24
do	do	Janneya Daṇḍāyaka, under Narasiṅha III	do	do

Age	Dynasty	Ruler	Qualifying Phrases	Reference
1256 A.D.	Hoysala	Narasimha III	"ruling the kingdom of the earth"	E.C., XII, Tp. 28, p. 46
1265 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., XII, Tp. 22, p. 45
do	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., VI, Cm. 89, p. 47
1266 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., V, Hn. 101, p. 30
1267 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., IX, Db. 31, p. 67
1270 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., IV, Ng. 48, p. 322 (Text)
1273 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., IV, Ch. 131, p. 49 (Text)
do	do	Mallanna and Mañchayya, (governors under Nara- simha III)	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace"	do
1274 A.D.	do	Narasimha III.	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., V, Bl. 150, p. 96
1276 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., Hn. 49, p. 110
1275 A.D.	do	do	"putting down the evil and up- holding the good" and "ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., VI, Kd. 143, p. 27
1276 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., V, Cn. 269, p. 238
1277 A.D.	do	Hoysala Narasimha III	do	E.C., IX, Rn. 72, p. 129
1278 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., VI, Tk. 80, p. 120
1281 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., V, Bl. 155, p. 97
1282 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., III, Nj. 184, p. 374
1284 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., V, Ak. 9, p. 113
1284 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., VI, Cm. 117 119, P. 52

Age	Dynasty	Ruler	Qualifying Phrases	Reference
1286 A.D.	Hoysala	Hoysala Narasimha III	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., XI, Cd. 12, p. 4
1286 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., XI, Cd. 32, p. 9
1286 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., XII, Tp. 123. 65
1220 A.D.	do	Narasimha I	do	E.C., XI, Hk. 58, p. 122
1228 A.D.	do	Ballāla Dēva	do	E.C., IV, Hk. 104, p. 130
1297 A.D.	do	Ballāla III	do	E.C., V, Ak. 120, p. 166
1287 A.D.	do	Rāmanātha	"putting down the evil and up- holding the good" and "ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., XII, Tm. 17, p. 6, Tm. 28, p. 9
1291 A.D.	Hoysala	Vīra Ballāla III	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., III, Nj. 103, p. 147 (Text)
1292 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., VI, Cm. 36. p. 38
do	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., III, Nj. 92, p. 345 (Text)
1295 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., IV, Ch. 65, p. 2 (Text)
do	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., IV, Ch. 44, p. 15 (Text)
1297 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., III, Nj. 185, p. 374 (Text)
1299 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., IX, Kn. 76, p. 130
1307 A.D.	do	Vīra Ballāla along with the great minister Māḍigi Deva Daṇṇāyaka	do	E.C., XI, Hk. 136, p. 137
1309 A.D.	do	Hoysala Ballāla III	do	E.C., VII, Sh. 19, p. 13

Age	Dynasty	Ruler	Qualifying Phrases	Reference
1310 A.D.	Hoysala	Ballāla III along with the great minister Mādagi Deva and the great minister Aḷiya Māchāya Daṇṇāyaka	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., XI. Cd. 1, p. 1
do	do	Ballāla III	do	E.C., V, Hn. 51, 51, P. 14
1312 A.D. (?)	do	Vīra Ballāla III	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., III, Nj. 71, p. 338 (Text)
1314 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., V, Hn. 164, p. 40
do	do	do	do	E.C., V, Hn. 181, p. 41; Hn. 182, p. 42
1315 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., IX, Ma. 15, p. 53
1316 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., IX, Kn. 6, p. 121
1317 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., IX, Ma. 59, p. 58
do	do	do	do	E.C., IV, Ch. 116, p. 16
1318 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace"	E.C., XII, Ck. 4, p. 71
do	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., IV. Ch. 143, p. 94 (Text)
1319 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., XII, Mi. 28, p. 107
1325 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., XII, Tp. 24, p. 46
1328 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., IX, Db. 12, p. 63; Db. 18, p. 64
1328 A.D. (?)	do	do	do	E.C., XII, Tm. 55, p. 15
do	do	Ballāla Deva and together with Bhīma Rāya and other champions by his side	do	E.C., XI, Cd. 4, p. 3

Age	Dynasty	Ruler	Qualifying Phrases	Reference
1328 A.D.	Hoysala	Ballāla III	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., IX, Dv. 1, p. 74
do	do	do	do	E.C., IX, Dv. 60, p. 81
1300 A.D. (?)	do	do	"putting down the evil and upholding the good" and "ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., XII, Tp. 127, p. 67
1330 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., V, Ak. 66, p. 135
1318 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., IX, Cp. 72, p. 146
1331 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., IX, Cp. 71, p. 145
1307 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., IX, Cp. 76, p. 146
1313 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., IX, Cp. 184, p. 169
1331 A.D.	do	Ballāla together with the great minister Rāmeya Daṇṇāyaka	do	E.C., XII, Gb. 30, p. 22
do	do	Ballāla together with the great minister Kāmeya (Rāmeya ?) Daṇṇāyaka	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace"	E.C., V, Ak. 31, p. 121
1332 A.D.	do	Ballāla III	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., III, Nj. 65 p. 336
1333 A.D. (?)	do	do	do	E.C., XII, Tp. 83, p. 59
1333 A.D.	do	Ballāla's minister Aliya Mācheya's son Gaṅgi-deva Daṇṇāyaka	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., X, Gd. 16, p. 214
1336 A.D.	do	Ballāla III	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., IX, Cp. 168, p. 167
1336 A.D. (?)	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., V Ak. 67, p. 136

Age	Dynasty	Ruler	Qualifying Phrases	Reference
1338 A.D.	Hoysala	Hiriya Ballappa Daṅ- ṅāyaka (under Ballāla)	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., XI, Cd. 6, p. 3
1338 A.D.	do	Ballāla III	do	E.C., V, Ak. 183, p. 185
1339 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., IX, Bn. 117, p. 23
1340 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., IX, Bn. 31, p. 9.
do	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., IX, Bn. 111, p. 22
1341 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., XII, Si. 10, p. 89
1342 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., IX, Bn. 129, p. 24
1343 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., IX, Bn. 41, p. 10
1337 A.D.	do	Mahāsāmantādhipati Holake Bomina Nāyaka from Nidugal	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., XII, Si. 8, p. 19
1347 A.D.	do	Hariappa Oḍeyar (Hari- hara I)	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., IX, Bn. 97, p. 19
1348 A.D.	Vijayanagara	Hariappa Oḍeyar Buk- kaṅṅa Oḍeyar	do	E.C., IX, Dv. 50, p. 80
1368 A.D.	do	do	"ruling a secure kingdom"	E.C., IX, Bn. 139, p. 26
1351 A.D.	do	Bukkaṅṅa Oḍeyar	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., IX, Kn. 49, p. 125
1354 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the empire of the world"	E.C., XII, Pg. 74, p. 129
1355 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., XI, Cd. 2, p. 2
do	do	General Mallinātha Oḍeyar (under Bukka)	do	do
1359 A.D.	do	Bukka	"ruling a peaceful kingdom"	E.C., VI, Mg. 25, p. 63
1360 A.D. (?)	do	do	do	E.C., XI, Dv. 120, p. 73
1362 A.D.	do	Kampana (son of Bukka) under Bukka	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., X, Ct. 95, p. 262

Age	Dynasty	Ruler	Qualifying Phrases	Reference
do	do	Mallapa Oḍeyar (under Bukka)	do	E.C., IX, An. 82, p. 118
1367 A.D.	do	Bukka	do	E.C., IX, Db. 39, p. 68
1368 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., IV, Ch. 113, p. 43
1369 A.D.	do	do	“ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom”	E.C., VI, Kp. 6, p. 77
do	do	do	“ruling the kingdom of the world”	E.C., IX, Cp. 150, p. 164
1369 A.D. (?)	do	Kampana Oḍeyar	do	E.C., IV, Yl. 64, p. 85, (Text)
1371 A.D.	do	Bukka	“ruling the kingdom of the world”	E.C., VIII, Sb. 17, p. 41
1371 A.D.	Vijayanagara	Bukka Rāya	“ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom”	E.C., VI, Mg. 87, p. 74
do	do	do	“ruling the kingdom of the world”	E.C., X, Cb. 63, p. 209
1372 A.D.	do	Chikka Kampana (II)	do	E.C., IV, Gn. 32, p. 104 (Text)
1374 A.D.	do	Kampana Oḍeyar (II)	do	E.C., IX, Ht. 157, p. 109
do	do	Bukka Oḍeyar	do	E.C., III, Ml. 23, p. 175
do	do	do	do	E.C., IX, Nl. 53, p. 38
1375 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., IX, Dv. 13, p. 74
do	do	Jammaṇṇa Oḍeyar, son of Kampana Oḍeyar	do	E.C., X, Ct. 94, p. 262
1377 A.D.	do	Yduagiri Virūpākṣa, son of Bukka	“ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom”	E.C., VIII, Tl. 28, P. 169; Tl. 125, p. 187
1378 A.D.	do	Yadugiri Virūpākṣa	do	E.C., VI, Kp. 30, p. 81
1380 A.D.	do	Vira Hariappa Oḍeyar	“ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom”	E.C., VI, Mg. 58, p. 70

Age	Dynasty	Ruler	Qualifying Phrases	Reference
1388 A.D.	do	Bukka (Rājādhirāja)	"ruling a peaceful kingdom"	E.C., X, Gd. 6, p. 212
do	do	do	"ruling the earth"	E.C., X, Bp. 17, p. 138
1377 A.D.	do	Harihara Mahārāya	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., VII, Sk. 35, p. 40
1379 A.D.	do	Harihara	"ruling the kingdom"	E.C., VIII, Sb. 196, p. 31
1379 A.D.	Vijayanagara	Harihara	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., VII, Hl. 84, p. 175
do	do	Chikka Rāya, son of Harihara	do	do
1378 A.D.	do	Hariappa Oḍeyar	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., X, Sd. 112, p. 196
do	do	do	do	E.C., X, Ct. 68, p. 256
1380 A.D.	do	Harihara	"ruling a secure kingdom"	E.C., XII, Kg. 43, p. 40
do	do	do	"ruling a kingdom"	E.C., IV, Ch. 44, p. 21 (Text)
do	do	do	do	E.C., VIII, Sb. 152, p. 22
1382 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., III, Ml. 21, p. 173
1384 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., X, Kl. 67, p. 18
do	do	do	"ruling a secure kingdom in peace and wisdom"	E.C., VIII, Fl. 147, p. 192
1386 A.D.	do	Immaḍi Harihara Rāya, son of Harihara	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., X, Sp. 12, p. 273
1387 A.D.	do	Harihara	"being the kingdom of the ruler of the world"	E.C., XI, Hk. 127, p. 135
1388 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., III, v.l. 20 p. 172
1390 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., X, Kl. 105, p. 32
1392 A.D.	do	do	"was on the heroic throne of the empire"	E.C., X, Bg. 15, p. 233

Age	Dynasty	Ruler	Qualifying Phrases	Reference
1393 A.D.	?	Narana-Deva Odeyar	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., IX, Kn. 100, p. 134
1394 A.D.	Vijayanagara	Harihara	do	E.C., III, In. 64, p. 279 (Text)
1395 A.D.	do	Harihara and the great minister Gundapa	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., IX, Cp. 37, p. 140
do	do	Danṇāyaka Harihara	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., VIII, Sb. 103, p. 15
do	do	do	do	E.C., X, Sp. 54, p. 279 do
do	do	Immaḍi Bukka, under Harihara	do	E.C., VIII, Tl. 8, p. 164
1396 A.D.	do	Harihara	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., V, Hn. 7, p. 242
do	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world [in connection with Bukka]"	E.C., X, Kl. 248, p. 69
1397 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., V, Bl. 3, p. 49.
do (?)	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., IX, Db. 66a, p. 71
1406 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., VIII, Tl. 9, p. 164; Tl. 130, p. 189
1404 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., X, Kl. 73, p. 19
do	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., VIII, Tl. 31, p. 163
1401 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., VI, Kp. 35, p. 82
1400 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., VI, Kp. 52, p. 86
1403 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., IV, Ch. 45, p. 15 (Text)

Age	Dynasty	Ruler	Qualifying Phrases	Reference
1403 A.D.	Vijayanagara	Harihara	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., X, Ct. 86, p. 260
1404 A.D.	do	Virūpākṣa	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., VIII, Tl. 13, p. 165; Tl. 133, p. 190
1405 A.D.	do	Bukka (?)	do	E.C., VI, Tl. 12, p. 165; Tl. 126, p. 187
1406 A.D.	do	Bukka	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., III, Md. 28, p. 131
1415 A.D.	do	Harihara (?)	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., VII, Sh. 31, p. 16
1442 A.D.	do	Harihara (?)	do	E.C., XI, Hr. 14, p. 106
1407 A.D.	do	Deva Rāya	do	E.C., VIII, Tl. 122, p. 187
do	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., XII, Si, 101, p. 102
do (?)	do	do	do	E.C., X, Ct. 39, p. 250
1408 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., X, Mb. 175, p. 118; E.C., IX, Bn. 122, p. 23
1408 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., VIII, Sb. 261, p. 41
1409 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., VII, Sh. 70, p. 27
1412 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., VIII, Sb. 467, p. 78
1413 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., X, Ct. 81, p. 257
1414 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., IV, Cp. 148, p. 164
1416 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., IX, Cp. 169, p. 168; E.C., X, Mb. 7, p. 72
do	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., VII, Sk. 252, p. 142
1417 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., X, Ke. 83, p. 23

Age	Dynasty	Ruler	Qualifying Phrases	Reference
1417 A.D.	Vijayanagara	Deva Rāya]	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., VIII, Tl. 148, P. 193
1419 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., VII, Sk. 37, P. 40
1422 A.D.	do	Vijaya Rāya, son of Pratāpa Deva Rāya	do	E.C., VI, Mg. 46, P. 68
1424 A.D.	do	Deva Rāya	do	E.C., VII, Sk. 93, P. 60
1429 A.D.	do	" son of Vijaya Deva Rāya [?]	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., VIII, Sb. 565, P. 90
1412 A.D.	do	Deva Rāya	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., IX, An. 1, P. 111
1418 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., IX, An. 4, P. 111
1430 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., VII, Sk. 40, P. 47
1431 A.D.	do	Pratāpa Deva Rāya	do	E.C., VII, Sp. 70, P. 27
1432 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., IX, Cp. 149, P. 164
1431 A.D.	do	Deva Rāya	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., IX, Bn. 127, P. 24
1432 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., VIII, Tl. 23, P. 167
do	do	do	"ruling a peaceful kingdom"	E.C., V, Cn. 241, P. 226
1436 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., VIII, Sb. 490, P. 82
1437 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., IX, Cp. 147, P. 164
1448 A.D.	do	Mallikārjuna	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., VIII, Sb. 473, P. 79
1458 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., III, Sr. 29, P. 82
1468 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., III, Sr. 139, P. 111
				E.C., X, Mb. 21, P. 75

Age	Dynasty	Ruler	Qualifying Phrases	Reference
1468 A.D.	Vijayanagara	Virūpākṣa	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., VIII, Tl. 143, p. 191
1470 A.D. (?)	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., X, Mb. 253, p. 130
1472 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., VIII, Sa. 60, p. 103
do	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., X, Bp. 10, p. 1354
1478 A.D.	do	do	"ruling a peaceful kingdom"	E.C., V, Cn. 153, p. 195
1486 A.D. (?)	do (Sāluva)	Narasiṅga	"ruling the earth"	E.C., XII, Tm. 54, p. 15
1487 A.D.	?	Chikka Timma Nṛpa (over Niḍugal)	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., XII, Pg. 54, p. 12
1493 A.D.	Vijayanagara (Sāluva)	Immaḍi Narasiṅga	"ruling a peaceful kingdom"	E.C., VI, Mg. 50, p. 69
1495 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., X, Kl. 24, p. 8
1496 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., X, Kl. 1, p. 1
1499 A.D.	do (Tuluva)	Narasaṅga Nāyaka under Immaḍi Narasiṅga Rāya	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., IX, Cp. 52, p. 143
1513 A.D. (?)	?	Narasiṅha Voḍeyar	do	E.C., IX, Kr. 56, p. 127
1510 A.D.	Vijayanagara (Tuluva)	Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., X, Gd. 28, p. 216
1511 A.D.	do	do	"seated on the jewel-throne in Vijayanagara, shone with sur- prising fame"	E.C., XI, Hk. 94, p. 128
1514 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., V, Ag. 86, p. 261
1516 A.D.	Vijayanagara	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., VI, Mg. 39, p. 67
do	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., IX, Ma. 68, p. 59
1518 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., XI, Hr. 108, p. 131
				E.C. V, Mb. 19, p. 75

Age	Dynasty	Ruler	Qualifying Phrases	Reference
1520 A.D.	Vijayanagara	Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., VI, Mg. 27, p. 64
1521 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., IV, TN, 42, p. 221
1523 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., IV, Ch. 99, p. 38 Text.
1524 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., VI, Mg. 62, p. 70
1525 A.D.	do	do	"when (with usual and various titles) the great king-whom the Aṅga, Vaṅga, Kaliṅga and other kings served, addressing him with such word as 'Look on us, great King! Victory! Long life!' seated on the jewel throne in Vijayanagara, Kṛṣṇa Rāya, imitating by his policy Nṛga and the other kings, and satisfying the desire of the needy from the eastern to the western mountains and from Himācala to Setu"	E.C., XII, Cp. 10, p. 73
1526 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., XI, Jl. 41, p. 58
1527 A.D.	do	Virupākṣa Deva Rāya (?)	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., X, Mb. 97, p. 100
1530 A.D.	do	Acyuta Deva Rāya	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., XI, Dv. 28, p. 38

Age	Dynasty	Ruler	Qualifying Phrases	Reference
1530 A.D.	Vijayanagara	Acyuta Deva Rāya	"by the Aṅga, Vaṅga, Kaliṅga and other foreign kings is he thus unceasingly addressed— 'Victory ! Long Life! Supreme is this king Acyuta, established on the jewel throne, dwelling in Vijayanagara, rejoicing in the fullness of fame, excelling Nṛga, Nala, Nahuṣa and others kings, the home of unequalled valour and generosity"	E.C., IX, Db. 30, p. 66
do	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., V, Cn. 187, p. 206
1531 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., XI, Dv. 31, p. 40
1532 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the earth"	E.C., X, Ct. 60, p. 254
1533 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., IX, Nl. 31, p. 34
do	do	do	vide E.C., IX, Db. 30, p. 66 cited above	E.C., X, Ct. 55, p. 254 ; E.C., X, Bg. 25, p. 234 E.C., XII, Pg. 95, p. 129
1534 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., XI, Hr. 17, p. 118
1535 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., IX, Cp. 50, p. 142
do	do	do	"ruling the kingdom in peace"	E.C., XII, Ck. 5, p. 71
do	do	do	"ruling the peaceful kingdom"	E.C., XII, Ck. 44, p. 87
1537 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., V, Aḱ. 167, p. 182
do	do	do	do	E.C., X, Bg. 4, p. 231

Age	Dynasty	Ruler	Qualifying Phrases	Reference
1538 A.D.	Vijayanagara	Acyuta Deva Rāya	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., XI, Jl. 3, p. 84
1539 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., X, Ct. 87, p. 260
1540 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., X, Kl. 114, p. 44
1540 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., X, Bg. 37, p. 237
1540 A.D. (?)	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace"	E.C., VI, Cm. 80, p. 45
1542 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., XI, Hk. 62, p. 122;
1540 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., XI, Hk. 111, p. 131
1544 A.D.	do	Sadāsiva	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., XII, Mi. 65, p. 111
1547 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., X, Mb. 4, p. 72
1550 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., XII, Tp. 6, p. 43
1552 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., VI, Mg, 40, p. 67
1554 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., X, Mb. 4, p. 72
			do	E.C., XII, Tp. 6, p. 43
			do	E.C., VI, Mg, 40, p. 67
			"ruling the empire of the world"	E.C., XII, Mi. 78, p. 112; Pg. 39, p. 121
				E.C., XI, Hr. 22, p. 107; E.C., IX, Bn. 30, p. 9
1555 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., XI, Hk. 116, p. 132
1556 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., XII, Pg. 40, p. 121
1546 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., XI, Hk. 110, p. 131
1548 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the earth"	E.C., XII, Tp. 129, p. 68

Age	Dynasty	Ruler	Qualifying Phrases	Reference
1554 A.D.	Vijayanagara	Sadāsiva	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., XI, Dv. 22, p. 30
1555 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the earth"	E.C., VI, Mg. 60, p. 70
do	do	do	do	E.C., XIII, Ck. 6, p. 71
1556 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., XII, Si. 31, p. 93
1560 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the empire of the world"	E.C., XII, Tm. 4, p. 2
1562 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., XI, Dv. 30, p. 40
1551 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., XI, Jl. 24, p. 87
1553 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the earth in peace"	E.C., XI, Cl. 9, p. 99
1556 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., XI, Mk. 3, p. 90
1557 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., XI, Mk. 1, p. 90
158 A.D.	Vijaynagara	Sadāsiva	"ruling the kingdom of world"	E.C., XI, Cl. 47, p. 103
159 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., XI, Hk. 21, p. 118
1562 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., XI, Uk. 2, p. 90
1568 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., XI, Hk. 6, p. 116
1562 A.D.	do	Rāma Rāya	"ruling the empire"	Hk. 7, p. 116
1565 A.D.	(Karnāṭaka)	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., XII, Tm. 44, p. 11
1569 A.D.	do	Tirumala	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., VII, Ci. 62, p. 189
1571 A.L.	do	do	"with all titles" duly praised with folded hands by the Kambhoja Bhoja Kaliuga Karahātu and other kings who had received the rank of door-keepers with such expressions as 'victory !	E.C., XII, Mi. 10, p. 105 E.C., Tm. 1, p. 2

Age	Dynasty	Ruler	Qualifying Phrases	Reference
1573 A.D.	do	Raṅga Deva	Long Life! "ascending the golden throne of Karnāṭaka, the king Tirumala Mahārāja rules the whole world, Manu by his policy, victorious by the might of his arm".	E.C., XII, Ck. 8, p. 71
1575 A.D.	do	Raṅga Rāya	"ruling the kingdom of the earth in peace and wisdom"	E.C., X, Ct. 65, p. 256
1577 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the empire of the world". do	E.C., XII, Mi. 37, p. 108
1578 A.D.	Vijayanagara	Tirumala Deva	"ruling the empire of the world"	E.C., X, Mr. 57, p. 168
1589 A.D.	do	Veṅkaṭpati	"ruling the whole world"	E.C., XII, Ck., 39, p. 85
1592 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the empire of the world in peace"	E.C., XI, Hr. 6, p. 105
1593 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the earth"	E.C., XII, Mi. 21, p. 106
1609 A.D.	do	do	do	E.C., XI, Si. 1, p. 88
do	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., VI, Mq. 63, p. 71
1612 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the empire"	E.C., XII, Si. 84, p. 100
1622 A.D.	do	Rāma Rāya (?)	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., III, Tn. 62, p. 234, (Text)
1636 A.D. (?)	do	Veṅkaṭpati (?)	do	E.C., XII, Tm. 60 p. 15
1636 A.D.	do	Veṅkaṭpati	do	E.C., XIII, Ck. 19, p. 76

Age	Dynasty	Ruler	Qualifying Phrases	Reference
1639 A.D.	Vijayanagara	Veūkaṭpati	"ruling the earth with the valours of Pṛtha's son (Arjuna) and devoted to the promotion of merit"	E.C., III, Ng. 193, p. 378, (Text)
1640 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world"	E.C., X, Sd. 31, p. 183
1645 A.D.	do	Raṅga Rāya	"putting down the evil and upholding the good" daily attaining the obeisance with devotion of the kings of various countries, etc.	E.C., X, MI. 60, p. 93
1659 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the empire of the world"	E.C., V, Bl. 196, p. 107
1662 A.D.	do	do	"ruling the kingdom of the world in peace and wisdom"	E.C., V, Ag. 83, p. 266

The Buddhist Manuscripts at Gilgit

In the previous issue (*IHQ.*, IX. I, pp. 227-236), an account has been given of the third manuscript entitled *Sarvatathāgatasattvā-valokana-buddhakṣetra-saṅdurśanavyūha*.

The first two leaves of this Ms. are lost, and so in the previous issue they were restored into Sanskrit from Tibetan. The object of this paper is to offer a translation of the text contained in the two leaves lost and summarise the contents of the remaining portion of the manuscript.

(Summary)

Thus have I heard. Once Bhagavā was dwelling on the Potalaka mountain in the abode of Ārya Avalokiteśvara and was seated on a bejewelled throne strewn with flowers with 500 bhikṣus, who were all arhats, free from āsravas, having full control over their minds and mastered the good Law, with 700 bodhisattvas, who were endowed with great compassion and knowledge and who were to become Buddhas after one, two or (at the most) one hundred births, all of them, were in the possession of eight fruits and established in the ten *bhūmis* (stages of spiritual progress), the prominent among them were Avalokiteśvara, Mañjuśrī, Vimalaketu, Ratnaśrī, Vajraketu, Vimalaprabhā, Candana, etc., with 5000 male and female lay-devotees, all of whom had been predicted (to become Buddhas), were meditators, and assembled from the various lokadhātus; with 100,000 Gandharvas who had previously served the Buddhas and witnessed the miracles performed by them; and with the 80 Mahāyaksīnīs, who had obtained the Bodhisattva knowledge, and had been predicted to become Buddhas without the chance of retrogression, the foremost among them being Anopamā, Vimalaprabhā, Prabhāvatī, and Bhīmaśrī. Knowing that Buddha had taken his seat on the throne, all those (assembled) worshipped him in accordance with the meritorious power of each, with divine clothes, ornaments, flowers, garlands, incense, unguent and music, and then circumambulated him innumerable times. Then Buddha entered into a meditation called the *Sarvasattva-mahākaruṇā-jñāna-sthita*. By the

power of this *samādhi*, light shone forth in all the *trisāhasra-mahāsāhasra* worlds. Everything became visible, the born blind began to see objects, the deaf heard sounds, the diseased were freed of their diseases, the naked were covered with clothes, the insane got back sanity, the physical defects of the defective were removed, the poor became rich, and beings, who were without wealth and property, became endowed with them, in short, all beings became happy and all their hopes were fulfilled. All beings whether of *Dccaloka* or *Manuṣyaloka*, sacrificing their own enjoyments, approached Buddha for hearing the religious discourse; even the Nāgas, Yakṣas, Piśācas, by remembering Buddha, became friendly to all beings and approached Buddha for hearing the discourse. By the power of Buddha, those beings who were ever in darkness in the Yamaloka got back their memory for one moment and came to know each other; they became friendly when they were rescued from the pitch dark state and freed from their troubles. At that time, the earth quaked six times. In that assembly was seated Mañjuśrīkumārabhūta. He said this to Avalokiteśvara: “O Kulaputra, the premonitory signs of the great assembly are visible, innumerable Bodhisattvas have received predictions (about their attainment of Buddhahood), and similar signs of a great discourse are also visible. Countless Bodhisattvas are to obtain knowledge which will fulfil all their hopes. Out of compassion to them, for their good, and for establishing them in (the path leading to) the highest *sambodhi*, O Kulaputra, request the Tathāgata (to deliver the discourse). In future, there will be beings who will commit sins, be poor and destitute, possess discoloured bodies, suffer from old age and disease and have limited enjoyments. They will be unrestrained in the use of the senses, possessed of short life and poor intellect, and subject to attachment, hatred and delusion. It is for them, that you, O Kulaputra, should solicit the Tathāgata for delivering a discourse, and by doing so, you will be conferring lasting benefit and happiness on beings, saving them from evils, diseases and sins, and helping them in the fulfilment of their wishes including the attainment of the highest *nirvāṇa*. At this, Ārya Avalokiteśvara looked around in ten directions, remembered the countless Tathāgatas, and after due salutations, said: “There will be, in future, O Bhagavan,

beings afflicted by old age, disease, misery and death; (they will be) poor and short-lived, unrestrained in the use of the senses, given to fighting among themselves on account of mutual jealousy and ill-feeling, depriving one another of their wealth and property, finding pleasure in frivolous amusements, labouring under the misconception that things of the world are good and permanent. These beings will be born in the various lower spheres of existence including hells, and it is for their welfare, for their rescue from evils and fulfilment of desires including the attainment of the Tathāgata-knowledge that I pray you, O Bhagavan, to deliver a discourse. To you there is nothing unknown and unheard; many are the monks and nuns, male and female lay-devotees, denizens of heavens and other spheres, who are wise, and worshipped the previous Buddhas; they have assembled here to listen to your discourse. Let them not be disappointed. Then all those assembled endorsed in one voice the request of Avalokiteśvara. When Bhagavān was thus requested thrice, he looked around the ten corners of the world, and with a ringing sweet musical voice addressed Avalokiteśvara as follows: "There is, O Kulaputra, a Samādhi (meditation) called *Sarva-tathāgatādhiṣṭhāna-sattvāvalokana-buddha-kṣetrasundarśana-vyūha*, which I heard, after I had obtained the first *Bodhicitta*, from the Tathāgata Sukusumajyoti-sandarśa, and the moment it was heard, it was practised by innumerable beings, resulting in 90 koṭis of them attaining the Tathāgata knowledge, and the rest including myself hearing the prediction (*vyākaraṇa*) as to the attainment of Buddhahood. And I now remember through my Tathāgata-knowledge that 30,000 Tathāgatas delivered this discourse for the benefit of beings, and in every case, yourself and Mañjuśrī were the supplicants. The assembly of Bodhisattvas and lay-devotees, similar to the one present here, evinced their veneration (to this text), and thereby again, countless being heard the prediction as to their attainment of Buddhahood in future and gained mastery over many Bodhisattva-meditations. All their desires were fulfilled. They became free from all diseases. Their merits matured, and their hindrances were removed. They obtained pleasing, lovely bodies, and their treasuries and store-houses were filled with wealth and corns. They were respectfully treated by the kings, ministers, and the beings in general. They became

possessed of wisdom and the power of recollection, and developed faith in Buddha, Dharma, and Saṅgha. They were blessed in every way, viz., with long life, noble birth, strong physique. They had not to suffer separation from the dear ones. Such will be the fruits of those who will worship this Text (*dharmaparyāya*) with flowers, incense, scents, garlands, unguents, flags and festoons, uttering *namo Buddhāya*, and praise it, remember it, deliver it or have it delivered, write it or have it written, or respectfully listen to its delivery by a Dharmabhāṅaka. In this life, they will derive all the benefits mentioned above, viz., beautiful and healthy physique, wisdom and intelligence, honour from kings, ministers and the people generally, and wealth and property. Their breath will give out sandal scent and their eyes will be like the blue lotus. By day and night they will visualize Buddhas and Bodhisattvas, and all their hindrances (to emancipation) will be removed. They will be protected by the gods, and at the time of death, they will see the Bodhisattva. Their minds will be undistracted and free from envy. After death, they will be reborn in the Sukhāvātī lokadhātu. All of them have been predicted to become Buddhas, and one need not have any doubt about same. If any one commits this treatise to memory, write it or have it written with due veneration, all his mental and physical troubles, be they regarding their physique, property, intelligence, dear ones, kingdom, disease, food, or dress, will cease through the power of this Samādhi. But he should confess (*pratideśana*) all the sins that he might have committed during this and previous lives, develop firm faith in Buddha, Dharma, and Saṅgha. By doing so, he will be absolved from all sins and he will have ample wealth and will never be born in any evil sphere of existence. Such is the merit of this Samādhi. The immense benefits can be derived by listening to, committing to memory or writing the *Dhāraṇī-mantrapadas*. On the delivery of this discourse the earth quaked six times and there was on the Tathāgata a shower of flowers, cloth etc. Then what are the *Mantrapadas*? They are:

नमः सर्वथागतानाम् । तद् यथा बुद्धे सुबुद्धे बुद्धमते* । लोके विलोके लोकातिक्रान्ते । सत्त्वा-

* Ms. सुद्धमते ; Chin. omits it.

वलोकने सर्वतथागताधिष्ठितेः सर्वाशापरिपूरणे द्युतिन्वरे नरेवपूजितेः तथागतज्ञाने तथा-
गताधिष्ठाने सर्वलोकं सुखीभवतु । पूर्वकर्म क्षपय** । मम [नात्सेहं मारपति शूलन्निवास्य आर्यदिक
महाभाद्रोपासक शूलिवज्रस्य] रक्षा भवतु । सर्वभयेभ्यः तथागताधिष्ठानेन स्वाहा ॥

These *Mantrapadas* were uttered by 30,000 Tathāgatas and I am also doing the same for the benefit and protection of all beings, for the checking of all diseases, and for the future appearance of these beings in *Buddhakṣetras*."

If anyone be anxious to know how to acquire the merits enumerated by the Tathāgata, he is advised to develop loving and compassionate mind and get rid of envy, pride, deceit and anger; then with concentrated mind he is to worship Buddha and cogitate over the merits of the Tathāgatas, perform 108 *japas*, and offer one flower to every Tathāgata. That will make him prosperous and he will see the Tathāgata even in dream and at the time of his death. He will be reborn in the *Sukhāvātī* heaven, and there he will be endowed with long life, strength and beauty and all his hopes will be fulfilled. On the utterance of this *Dhāraṇī*, 60,000 beings obtained insight into the non-origination of all things, had their hindrances removed and their hopes were fulfilled.

II

Then *Vajrapāṇi*, looking around the ten corners, said: "There is, O *Bhagavān*, the *Dhāraṇī* called the *Abhayateja*, which I heard from the *Abhayavyūharāja* Tathāgata. Whoever hears this *Dhāraṇī*, all his afflictions disappear; I wish to impart this *Dhāraṇī* to those who recites, or listen to (the previously stated *sūtra*), or those who worship or remember it." The Mantra is as follows:

नमः सर्वबुद्धानां* सर्वबोधिसत्वानामर्हतानाम् † । तद् यथा । ओम् वज्रधर वज्रकाय
वज्रबल वज्रतेज । हुं हुं वज्रपाणि तथागताज्ञां पालय । स्मर प्रतिज्ञाम् । सर्वव्याधिं
सर्वपापाणि नामय । देहि मे यथेप्सितं वरम् । मम [नात्सेहं मारपति शूलन्निवास्य आर्यदिक

† Ms. सर्वतथागताधिष्ठानाधिष्ठिते

‡ Ms. नरके च पूजिते

* Tib. तथागतानां

** Tib. सर्वकर्म क्षपयतु

‡ Ms. ०मर्हन्तानाम्

शुलिवज्रस्य] यं यमेवाभियाचाम तं तमेव समृध्यतु । हे हे तुरु तुरु* आगच्छागच्छ । मा विलम्ब ।
दर्शय वज्रकायम् । दर्शय वज्रकायम् । बुद्धाधिष्ठानेन स्वाहा ॥

On the utterance of this mantra the earth moved, all the Yakṣas, Rākṣasas, gods and men praised him. Then Vajrapāṇi dilated on the merits acquired by the utterance of this mantra. If anyone wishes to have wealth and property, kingdom, Vidyādhara-hood, long life and strength, he is to set up an image of Vajradhara of sandal-wood, adorned with all the ornaments and with a face bursting into a *attāṭṭa* laugh. Then he is to worship it with certain rituals (the details are passed over here). After this Vajrapāṇi is again praised and nobody entertains any doubt about the efficacy of the mantras.

III

Then Mañjuśrī asked: “Why O Bhagavan, this Samādhi is called *Sarvataṭhāgatādhiṣṭhāna-sattvāvalokana-buddhakṣetra-sandarśana-vyūha*.” Bhagavān said: “Because it leads to the attainment of the Tathāgata practices (*adhiṣṭhāna*) constituting all the *Samādhis* and *Dhāraṇī-mukhas* resorted to by the Bodhisattvas, to the knowledge of beings’ thoughts (lit. contraction and expansion of mind and mental powers), to the development of, in the minds of gods and other beings, faith in Buddha, Dharma and Saṅgha. It dissuades beings from committing evils, removes their envy, hatred etc. and establishes them in the path to Bodhi. These beings become faithful and will never have any suffering. It is for this reason, O Kulaputra, this is called *Sarvataṭhāgatādhiṣṭhāna* etc., by hearing which one becomes a non-retreating (*avaivartika*) Bodhisattva.” Then, it is asked, why the readers, writers or hearers of this *Sūtra* are predicted about their attainment of Buddhahood. What must be their merits, what are the difficult tasks accomplished by them? In reply Bhagavān said: “By listening to, writing and preaching this *Sūtra*, one acquires merit far more than that accumulated by the completion of the *pāramitās*. To remember, write,.....this sūtra is also a very difficult task,

* Ms. रु रु

† Ms. does not repeat it.

because people are given to evil deeds, worldly enjoyments of eating, drinking etc., subject to desire, anger and so forth, surrounded by evil friends. They suffer and repent only at the time of death when the whole world appears to them as a cemetery. They lack faith and desire for good actions. They have not seen the Tathāgatas nor they are aware of the prediction about their future attainment of Buddhahood. It is very difficult for such persons to worship,..... this *sūtra* and its preacher.” Then all those assembled said: “We shall, O Bhagavan, honour those who will preach, or listen to, this *sūtra*, and shall propagate it so that it may endure long.” Bhagavān endorsed their wish but warned them that for honouring and propagating the *sūtra* and for furnishing the *sūtra*-preachers with their necessities, they will have to stand with abuses, beating etc. and so for that reason, they must be careless about the sufferings of their body and mind.”

Then Bhagavān uttered the following verses:

शृणुत कुलपुत्र अप्रमत्त
 मो पश्चकाले परिताप्यु भेष्यतः ।
 बुद्धस्य उत्पाद्यु कदाचि लभ्यते
 कल्पेन कोटीभि शतैः सहस्रैः ॥
 गुणाश्च शृण्वत्यभिभ्रह्धेत
 न दुर्लभा तेषु समाधि भेष्यति ।
 कल्पेन कोटी यथा गङ्गावालिका
 यो दानु दद्या द्विपदोत्तमेषु ॥ :
 धनं च धान्यं तथा वस्त्रभूषणं
 गन्धं च माल्यं विलेपनं च ।
 यश्चैव सूत्रं अभिभ्रह्धित्वा
 भ्रुणोय वाचेय लिखापयेत ।
 न तस्य पुण्यस्य प्रमाणु विद्यते
 ता चाप्रमाणं सूगतेन देशितम् ॥
 रण्यं च सेवेत सदाप्रमत्तो
 ध्यानं च ध्यायेतु सदान्यचित्तः ।
 दानं च दद्या प्रियपुत्रधीतरा
 हस्तौ च परित्यजेत यथैव ॥
 सूत्रस्य धारेति कश्चि अयं
 ततो पुण्या विशिद्धु प्राप्तु यते ।

अर्थस्य दाता वरसूत्रमेतत्
 सर्वस्यापाय सदावर्जितस्य ॥
 धनस्य धान्यस्य च दायको ह्ययं
 गुणाश्च सर्वेपि न तस्य दुर्लभ ।
 आयुर्बल वीर्यं न तस्य दुर्लभं
 धारेति सूत्रं य इमं विशुद्धम् ॥
 द्रक्षन्ति बुद्धं अमिताभुनायकं
 मयापि स व्याकृतु बुद्ध बोधौ ।
 न तस्य पापं पि कदाचि विद्यते
 सुखावर्ती द्रक्ष्यति लोकघातुं ॥
 यं चापि तस्य सद कर्म भेष्यति
 सर्वज्ञयं यास्यति चित्तनीदे ।
 कायस्य शूले तथ शीर्षतापे
 न तस्य जातु विनिपातो भेष्यति ॥
 सांष्टिकाश्चापि गुणां स लस्यते
 सर्वं यथा चित्तितु प्रार्थितं च ।
 तस्माभि तेभिषद् भिक्षुभिष्णुणी
 उपासकोपासिका राजाभिषदाः ॥
 इदं च सूत्रं सद धारितव्यं
 संत्करु नित्यं च कर्तव्यधारके ।

गन्धैश्च माल्यैश्च विलेपनैश्च
 सत्कः कृत्वा च लिखापयेत् ॥
 गुरु गौरवं कृत्वा च धर्मभाणके
 यथा नरेन्द्रस्य तथागतस्य ।
 मा पश्चकाले जरव्याधिपीडिता
 अनेक आयाससहस्रव्याकुला ॥
 नरकेषु तिर्यञ्च परिभ्रमणा
 शण्डश्च पण्डाश्च जुगुप्सनीयाः ।
 य जात्यन्धभूता कुण्ठाश्च गन्धिन
 स जास्यते नीचकुलेषु स्त्रीषु ॥
 ईर्ष्यालुकस्य सद पापचारिण
 क्रोधाभिभूतस्य च मत्सरिण्य ।
 बुद्धेषु धर्मेषु करित्व गौरवं

इमेषु जातीषु प्रपतते सौ ॥
 तत्रैव दुःखानि च वेदमाना
 मा पश्चकाले परिताप्यु भेष्यतः ।
 तस्मात्तैर्हि सद पूजितस्य
 यश्चैव धारेत् प्रकाशयेत् ॥
 यश्चैव परिभाषणु तस्य कुर्वते
 जुगुप्सना ताडन बन्धनश्च ।
 मयैव च तेन परिभाषणकृता
 मयैव सत्करु करित्वा धारके ॥
 तस्मात्तैर्हि सद धर्मभाणके
 यश्चैव धारेत् लिखेत वाचये ।
 सत्कुरु तैश्च सद नित्यु कुर्या
 क्षिधाश्च वाचां मधुरा भवेत् ॥*

IV

Ārya Avalokiteśvara then saluted Bhagavān and said, "I remember the *Dhāraṇī* called *Vyavalokana-prātihārya*, which I heard from the Jñānaketuprabhākara Tathāgata. Memorising, hearing and preaching of this *Dhāraṇī* bear all the fruits mentioned by you. All the wishes of a being are fulfilled, the hindrances due to his *karma* are destroyed, he obtains *samādhi* and becomes free from disease and visualises Buddhas and Bodhisattvas. Then at the request of Bhagavān, he utters the *mantrapadas*, after which he gives a detailed account of the ceremony of worshipping images and the merits acquired thereby.

V

Then comes Anopamā Mahāyakṣiṇī, who saluted Bhagavān and said, "I acquired a *mantra* while dwelling at Ghosilārāma in Kauśābī. I know the inner mind (*hṛdayam*) of all Vidyādharas and that I want to communicate it to you for the benefit of all beings." Then she utters the *mantrapadas*, followed by a detailed account of a ceremony of worshipping the *Tathāgata-pratimā*, and the merits acquired thereby.

* Ms. folio 137b-138a (a tentative reading).

After this appears Śaṅkhiṇī Mahādevī, who utters a *mantrapada*,—this mantra is addressed to herself and is meant for the protection of Tathāgata's religion and the dharma-preachers and listeners. It is followed by a short account of the ceremonies of an image-worship.

In the same way Bhīmā Mahādevī utters a mantra addressed to herself followed by an account of the ceremony of an image-worship.

VI

Then follows an interlocution between Avalokiteśvara and Bhagavān about the merits of reading, writing, remembering, preaching and worshipping the *Sūtra*. The merits, as usual, are said to be unsurpassable by anything else and the beings are therefore instructed to worship it in some form or other.

Then it is said that this *dharmaparyāya* will spread in the south (Dakṣiṇāpatha) and not in the north, east and west where the people are not so religious and given to wordly pleasures.

Again the merits are expatiated upon and Bhagavān winds it up by the following gāthās :

गृह्णाहि आनन्द इमं समाधिं
या भाषिता पूर्वभवेषु नायकैः ।
यश्चैव त्रैधातुकदानु दद्या
सप्तान् रत्नान् च पूरयित्वा ॥
बुद्धेषु धर्मेषु सदाप्रमत्तः
यश्चैव सूत्रस्य धरेति कश्ची
अयं ततो बहुतरु पुण्यु भेष्यते ॥
यश्चैव बुद्धस्याभिभ्रष्टित्वा
विहार कारापयि चैत्तिकानि ।
इमस्य सूत्रस्याभिपूजयित्वा
उपमापि तस्य न स भोन्ति दानम् ॥
यश्चापि एकं ज्ञापयेत् पुष्पं
वस्त्रं च माल्यं च विलेपनं तथा ।
यश्चापि कार्षापणु दानु दद्या
इमस्य सूत्रस्य च पूजनार्थं ।

जनित्वा बोधाय च मैत्रचित्ते
अयं ततो बहुतरु पुण्यु प्राप्नुया ॥
यश्चापि सत्त्वेषु इमं समाधिं
प्रकाशये देशयि बोधिसत्त्वः ।
प्रतिपादये बोधिमनुत्तरे तथा ।
उपमानि पुण्यापि न तस्य भोति ॥
तस्मापि सूत्रं इमु धारयेत्
लिखेत् वाचेत् तथा प्रकाशये ।
इमं च श्रुत्वा तथ आनुशांसा
कृत्वा मैत्रं तथ सर्वसत्त्वैः ॥
मा पश्चकाले परिताप्यु भेष्यथ
उपपद्यमानं नरकेषु प्रेतयो ।
जरण्याधिमृत्यु परिताप्यु पीडित
स मृत्युकाले भयभीतमानसो ।
अभीक्ष्ण उश्वासन उश्चन्तः

मुखे मुखं प्रेक्ष्यति बालबुद्धिः ॥
 कोऽस्माभिः श्राणां भवते परायण
 यस्माभिः पूज्यं न कृतं तथागते ।
 बौद्धं च धार्म्यं च तथ सांधिकं च
 हरिष्य नेष्ये यमलोकि दारुणे ।
 न तस्य श्राणां सद कश्चि भेष्यति
 न पुत्रदारं न च मित्रबान्धवं ॥
 न चापि राष्ट्रं न च हास्यलास्यं
 धनं न धान्यं न च वस्त्रभूषणाः ॥

सर्वं जहित्वा पुनरपि दुःखदारुणा
 अनुभेष्यते बालु तथापि दारुणो ।
 को बालबुद्धी न जने प्रसादं
 इमु दुःखु इमु अनुशंसा ॥¹
 तस्माच्च तैर्हि सद भिक्षुभिक्षुणी
 उपासकोपासिका राजभिसदा ।
 इमं च सूत्रं सद धारितव्यं
 सत्कर नित्यं च कर्तव्यधारके ॥

Then Ānanda appears and promises to commit this *Sūtra* to memory and Bhagavān emphasises on the necessity of remembering and propagating *Sūtra*. On the delivery of the *sūtra*, minds of 60,000 beings obtained emancipation from *āsravas*, 700 Bodhisattvas attained Bodhisattva-samādhi and 500 were predicted to be able to visit the Buddha-kṣetras and 90,000 were freed of their *kleśas*.

Then on enquiry Ānanda learns that the title of the *Sūtra* is to be *Sarvatathāgatajñāna-bodhisattvabhūmikramaṇam* or *Sarvatathāgatādhiṣṭhāna-sattvāvalokana-buddhakṣetrasandarśanavyūha*.

NALINAKSIIA DUTT

1 Ms. fol. 154a-155a (a tentative reading).

MISCELLANY

Commentaries on the *Uttararāmacarita*

Mr. P. V. Kane in the Introduction to his excellent edition of the *Uttararāmacarita* writes:

“There is a third commentary by Rāmachandrabudhendra, who seems to have been an inhabitant of Benares. This was printed in Telugu and Grantha characters. On comparing it with the commentary in Vidyāsagara's edition, we found to our surprise that the two agree word for word excepting a few verses at the beginning of the commentary which are not found in the latter edition. This has caused us a great deal of perplexity. Isvarachandra not only omits the verses but also does not say definitely whether the Sanskrit commentary is his own composition or another's. There are no introductory verses on the commentary contained in his edition of 1782. On the title page in English we read the words ‘edited with notes and explanation by Isvarachandra Vidyāsāgara.’ These words lead one to think that the learned author claims the commentary as his own. On the other hand, the absence of introductory verses and the omission to say definitely that the commentary is his make it highly probable, if not certain, that the commentary is not his and that he simply included it in his edition without acknowledging his debt to Rāmachandrabudhendra. We advance this view with great diffidence. There is a certain very modern ring about this commentary (e.g., भद्रं तस्य सुमानुषस्येति सर्वेषु पुस्तकेषु पाठो दृश्यते स च न सम्यग् लगति इति मत्वा तस्येत्यत्र प्रेम इति पदं परिवर्तितम् । pp. XX, XXI).

Mr. C. Śaṅkararāma Śāstrī in his preface to the Bālamānorama series edition of the *Uttararāmacarita*, writing on the 15th March 1932, says:

“Mr. P. V. Kane has proved that this commentary is the same as the one in Vidyāsāgara's edition so that Isvarachandra Vidyāsāgara's claims, if any, to the authorship of the commentary are unfounded.”

The charge of plagiarism brought against Isvarachandra Vidyāsāgara, one of the greatest scholars Bengal has ever produced, has in fact, no basis. In the first place Isvarachandra in his Bengali preface to his edition of the *Uttararāmacarita* fully acknowledges his indebtedness to Premacānd Tarkavāgīśa and Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa. As the preface is written in Bengali and therefore not within the reach of non-Bengali scholars, we are giving a translation of the relevant passage:

“For the convenience of teachers and students difficult passages have been explained. In this I have been greatly helped by the short commentary of my

revered teacher Premacānd Tarkavāgīśa. Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa, the son of Raṅga-nātha Dīkṣita of Benares had composed a commentary on the *Uttaracarita* entitled *Apekṣitarvākyāna* in Śaṃvat 1686. There is a manuscript of this commentary in the Calcutta Sanskrit College. Nārāyaṇa's commentary is very terse, many difficult passages have been altogether skipped, and of those passages which have been explained the explanations offered are not always satisfactory. Still I have undoubtedly received great help from that commentary. I have only explained those passages which are difficult in my opinion."

This clearly shows that far from tacitly appropriating what belongs to others Vidyāsāgara has most unequivocally acknowledged his debt to his predecessors. I wish I could say the same of modern scholars who make use of the commentaries of Iśvaracandra Vidyāsāgara and Premacānd Tarkavāgīśa and show their indebtedness by throwing mud on the venerable scholars.

That the commentary on the *Uttararāmacaritam* attributed to Rāmacandrabudhendra could not have been his composition needs hardly to be stated. In the first place Rāmacandrabudhendra was not an inhabitant of Benares. In the introduction to his commentary on the *Subhāṣitatriṣatī* and *Campūrāmāyaṇa*, he says श्रीमांस्त्रैलिङ्गदेशे स जयति.....

रामचन्द्रो बुवेन्द्रः ।

In the second place, Rāmacandra was not the man to explain anything briefly. He distinctly says in the introduction to his commentaries on the *Subhāṣitatriṣatī* and *Campūrāmāyaṇa* :

व्याकुर्वन्ति निश्चद्गौरवभयाच्चैव स्फुटं युक्तिभि-

र्ये तेऽध्येतृजनप्रतारणपराः का नेपुणी वा ततः ।

वेखर्यां वदसां कवीशद्दयं प्रख्यापयन्नन्वय-

द्वारैवाहमिहाखिलं प्रविवृणोम्युक्तिप्रजोजम्भितम् ॥

Thirdly, the entire absence of all rhetorical discussions also clearly shows that it cannot have been the work of Rāmacandra-budhendra.

Fourthly, the sledge-hammer way in which Rāmacandra deals with his predecessor is conspicuous by its absence in this commentary.

Fifthly as Mr. Kane has himself pointed out passage like :

अत्र लिपिकरप्रमादवशात् वृत्तशब्दस्थाने वृत्तानुशब्द आपतित इति प्रतीयते, एतदर्थमेव मूले वृत्तशब्दो निवेशितः । वृत्तान्तोऽन्तरित इति पुंस्त्ववान् पाठस्तु नपुंसकप्रयोगस्य शासन-विरुद्धत्वात् तत्परिहारायोपात्त इति प्रतिभाति (पृ: २३) ।

सगरस्यासमञ्जस्तु असमञ्जादथांशुमान् ।

दिलीपोऽंशुमतः पुत्रो दिलीपस्य भगीरथः ॥

इति रामायणदर्शनात् पितुः प्रपितामहान् इति पाठो न सङ्गच्छत इति पितुः इत्यत्र पुरा इति पदं विनिवेशितम् (पृ: २५) । किमस्या न प्रेयो यदि परमसङ्गस्तु विरहः इति चतुर्थेव पुस्तकेषु पाठो दृश्यते स तु सङ्गच्छत इति मत्वा पाठान्तरं परिकल्पितम् (पृ: ३६) भद्रं तस्य etc. (quoted by M. Kane) । अद्विरतविनोदव्यतिकरैः इति सार्वत्रिकः पाठः स तु न सङ्गच्छत इति मत्वा पाठान्तरं कल्पितम् (पृ: १२६) । प्रवृत्तेति सार्वत्रिकः पाठः स च न समीचीन इति पाठान्तरं परिकल्पितम् (पृ: १४५) etc. clearly indicate the very recent character of the commentary.

Lastly, some of the passages occurring in the first act of the *Uttararāmacarita* are found in the earlier portions of the *Campū-rāmāyana* also and one cannot fail to be struck by the different ways in which they have been explained in the two commentaries.

The above considerations make it abundantly clear that Rāmacandrabudhendra could not have been the author of the commentary printed in Iśvaracandra Vidyāsāgara's edition of the *Uttararāmacarita*, that Vidyāsāgara himself composed the commentary and that he fully availed himself of the works of two of his predecessors viz. Premacānd Tarkavāgīśa and Nārāyaṇa Dīkṣita. It will also appear from the passages quoted above that wherever Vidyāsāgara had occasion to emend the text he explicitly stated it.

It is surprising that the two following ślokaḥ printed in Devanāgarī characters in Vidyāsāgara's edition of the *Uttararāmacarita* never attracted the attention of his fault-finders.

वाराणसीनियतवासपवित्रमूर्तेः श्रीरङ्गनाथविदुषो विहिताध्वरस्य ।

श्रीबालकृष्ण इति यः प्रथितस्तनूजस्तस्याग्रजेन रुचिरा विवृतिर्व्यघ्रायि ॥

श्रुतुगजरसचन्द्रे विक्रमार्कस्य शाके गतवति शुभमासे कार्तिके शुक्लपक्षे ।

प्रतिपदि परिपूर्णाकारि जिज्ञासुतुष्यै विवृतिरियमुमेशाधिष्ठितायां नगर्याम् ॥

It is clear from the last verse that the commentary was composed in Samvat 1686 (i.e. 1629 A.C.) so that this is the earliest commentary on the *Uttararāmacarita* known to us.

The absence of introductory verses in Vidyāsāgara's commentary is explained by the fact that he was merely preparing an annotated edition for college students and did not feel called upon to follow the traditional methods.

A Śloka of Bhāsa

Though Bhāsa's dramas have been carefully edited by Mm. Gaṇapatī Śāstrī and other scholars, there are still many passages which are obscure. To one such passage, we wish to draw the attention of the readers. The 22nd śloka of the 1st Act of the *Pratimā-nāṭaka* runs as follows:—

ताते धनुर्न मयि सत्यमवेक्षमाणे
मुञ्चानि मातरि शरं स्वधनं हरन्त्याम् ।
दोषेषु बाह्यमनुजं भरतं हनानि
किं रोपणाय रुचितं त्रिषु पातकेषु ॥

Mm. Gaṇapatī Śāstrī explains the first line in these words:

मयि विषयभूते स्वविधेयं मामवलम्ब्येत्यर्थः, सत्यम् स्वप्रतिश्रुतभरताभिषेकानन्यथाभावम्,
अवेक्षमाणे प्रतीक्षमाणे, ताते विषये तातं प्रतीत्यर्थः, धनुः न चापप्रयोगकथैव नास्ति ।

Woolner and Sarup translate: "Shall I bend my bow on my sire if he keeps not troth with me" while Paranjape renders it in this way: "The bow is not certainly to be used against the father, who is maintaining his faithfulness to his pledge (in not giving me the kingdom)"; Mm. Gaṇapatī Śāstrī seems to have merely had recourse to the well-known dictum of the *Mahābhāṣya* अस्तिभवन्तीपरः प्रथमपुरुषेऽप्रयुज्यमानोऽप्यस्ति while Woolner and Sarup seem to construe धनुः with नमयेयम् understood according to Vāmana's dictum लिङ्गाध्याहारौ ५।१।१४. Vāmana's example is:

मा भवन्तमनलः पवनो वा वारणो मदकलः परशुर्वा ।
वाहिनी जलभरः कुलिशं वा स्वस्ति तेऽस्तु लतया सह वृक्ष ॥

where अनलः is to be construed with घाक्षीत्, पवनः with भाङ्क्षीत् etc. Similarly in *Śiṣupālaradhā*, IV. 35:

वनस्पतिस्कन्धनिषण्णबालप्रवालहस्ताः प्रमदा इवात्र ।
पुष्पेक्ष्णैर्लम्बितलोचकैर्वा मधुव्रतव्रातवृत्तैर्व्रतत्यः ॥

Mallinātha construes व्रतत्यः प्रमदा इव with लस्यन्ते understood on the strength of Vāmana's dictum. An extreme instance of such क्रियाध्याहार is given in the *Mahābhāṣya* I.1.45 (Ed. Kielhorn, vol. I. p. 111, I. 23) प्रविश पिण्डीम् where प्रविश is to be construed with गृहम् and पिण्डीम् with भक्षय understood. Of course, as Vāmana points out, these are possible only in the case of very well-known things.

So far as construction is concerned, both Gaṇapati Śāstrī and Woolner and Sarup are justified, but the meaning suggested by them does not suit the context.

The present śloka is addressed by Rāma to Lakṣmaṇa who had become furious and was insisting on removing all obstacles with the help of the bow. Rāma shows Lakṣmaṇa the utter unreasonableness of his anger by this śloka. He says: There are three persons who were chiefly concerned in the matter—Daśaratha, Kaikeyī and Bharata. Daśaratha was merely keeping his plighted troth, Kaikeyī claiming what rightfully belonged to her and Bharata had absolutely nothing to do with the affair. Hence he says:

Shall I bend my bow towards my father who is simply observing his plighted troth, shall I discharge an arrow at my mother who is (merely) taking her own wealth, shall I slay my younger brother, Bharata, who is free from all guilt? Of these three crimes, which will you, irritable by nature, prefer?"

It is therefore clear that the words न मयि are out of place in the first line. All through the drama it has been emphasised again and again that Daśaratha was not at all to blame for what happened, for the kingdom had been promised to Kaikeyī at the time of her marriage. In the 2nd¹ and 3rd verses Kaikeyī and Bharata are exculpated as Daśaratha is in the first verse. Bharata is particularly called दोषेषु बाह्यम् because he was staying far away and could not have any part in what was going on in his father's capital.

All these considerations would show that नमयि is the correct reading. Following the dictum अपि माषं मषं कुर्याच्छन्दोभङ्गे त्यजेद्गिरम् the poet has used नमयि for नमयै Imp. 1st. sing. of the causative Ātm. of नम्. This also fits in with the imperative in मुञ्चानि and हनानि and renders अघ्याहार unnecessary. Slight variations of the normal form for the sake of metre are of too frequent occurrence in the Trivandrum plays to cause us any uneasiness in the present instance.

MALATI SEN

1 Woolner and Sarup translate the second verse: "Shall I let fly an arrow at my mother if she take my wealth"—a meaning which the words cannot bear,

Origin of Indus Valley Script

It is well-known that most of the scripts of North India are derived from the ancient Indian Brāhmī script. But the origin of the Brāhmī itself had for a long time been a matter of controversy. It was seriously contended that it had a Semetic origin. Modern studies, however, have led to the general acceptance of the indigenous origin of the Brāhmī. In fact, this has been conclusively proved both by Dr. Pran Nath in his paper on "The Scripts on the Indus Valley Seals" (*IHQ.*, VII, 4) and by Mr. Langdon, in his paper on the script used on the seals discovered from the chalcolithic sites of Mohenjo-daro and Harappā in the Indus Valley (*Mohenjo-daro*, vol. II, p. 424). The characters on these seals represent the earliest Indian script discovered up to now. Many of the signs show a striking resemblance to the signs found on the early Sumerian seals. A connecting link between the Indus Valley script and the Brāhmī script, however, was lacking. But this lacuna in our knowledge has been filled by the discovery of Pandit Lochan Prasad Pandeya of Bilaspur, in July last, of a cave inscription at Vikramkhole in Sambalpur. According to Mr. Jayaswal the character in the inscription belongs to a period intermediary between the script of Mohenjo-daro and Brāhmī. Some letters still retain their original or secondary Mohenjo-daro forms and some have already assumed the Brāhmī or the proto-Brāhmī forms. This conclusively proves that the Brāhmī script originated in India. But the problem seems to be complicated by a recent announcement made by Professor Paul Pelliot in the *Academie des Inscriptions et Belles Letters* about the momentous discovery of M. Guillaume, who has shown 130 examples of the 'most striking resemblances' between the Indus Valley and the Eastern Island scripts.

ATUL K. SR

Yerragudi Minor Rock Proclamation

Asoka scholars have to thank the Editor of the *Indian Historical Quarterly* for making this new recension of the M.R.P. available to them through his valued Journal (VII, 737; IX, 112). The reading, in the main, has been ably fixed (*IHQ.*, IX, 112). But it will take time to come to a definiteness about the additional matter found in the Yerragudi edition. This can be attained when scholars have examined actual impressions. The plate published by the *Bhāratī* and the *IHQ.* is good enough,¹ but doubtful points will be solved from estampages.

At present I may point out one or two matters connected with the inscription. I think, the record proves that Brāhmī was boustrophedonic, a fact already suspected from other pieces of evidence.

The reading of the second word in l. 13 is *Jānapada*, not *Jānapadam* as proposed at pp. 116-118, which does not make any difference in the meaning. Its singular use is remarkable; while the Rājukas were to order the *Rāthikāni* (plural), they in the general empire were to direct their order to the institution *Jānapada* (singular).

I do not think that the order is addressed to elephant-drivers and charioteers. That portion of the record requires further study. On the present material I would read the passage in line 17 as '*hatthiyārohāni kāranakāni yūgyācariyāni baṃbhanānī*' and take it as referring to three classes of Brahmins—the rich (those who ride on elephants), the government officials, and those who are engaged as Teachers. What has been read as *yūgya*^o is meaningless, as charioteers. No emperor will give directions about charioteers and mahāūts in particular and through an inscription. The attention paid is to the Brāhmaṇas and their pupils (*aṃteṅvāsīni*).

K. P. JAYASWAL

¹ See now also *ASR.*, 1928-29, 161; pl. LXII, which has come out since the above note was set up in type. This plate is much better than the *Bhāratī* plate.

Udayapura-nagara

There is reference to Udayapura-nagara in the inscription dated in the 28th year of Muhammad Shah, edited by me in the June 1931 issue of this Journal (vol. VII. pp. 410ff.) I could not identify it; but, the language of the 'Khatolā Bundelī' of Damoh, I suggested, was probably to be found somewhere in the Damoh, region. The town was situated in the Mālava subāh of the Mughals.

After going through that paper of mine, Mr. R. S. Saksena, Superintendent of Archæology of the Gwalior State, has written me saying, "Udayapur Nagar of the inscription is, in all probability, Udayapur town of the Gwalior State. It may also be safely assigned to the Damoh region of the Linguistic Survey, as the border of the State near Udayapur joins with that of the Saugar District (C.P.) in which Damoh is situated. Udayapur is a place of great antiquity dating back to the 10th or the 11th century A.D. and has still numerous ruins bearing Hindu and Moslem inscriptions."¹

I also now think that Udayapura-nagara of the inscription should be identified with the town of the same name in Scindia's territory. It is now a decayed town in the Bhilsa District of the Gwalior State, 4 miles by road from the Bareth Railway Station on the G.I.P. Railway, and "possessing important and interesting archæological monuments." In his article in the *Indian Antiquary*, vol. LV. pp. 4ff. Mr. Saksena has spoken of "inscriptions on pieces of red sand-stone with raised letters" discovered at Udayapura. The epigraph, I had to deal with, is also a relieve and not an inscription, and is also on red sand-stone.

DINES CHANDRA SIRCAR

¹ For a detailed account of Udayapura, see *Report of the Arch. Surv. of India*, vol. VII, p. 68 and vol. X, p. 69; *IA.*, LV, p. 4; *IHQ.*, vol. III, p. 715.

Sāṅkhya and Original Buddhism

(A comment on Kalipada Bhattacharya's recent article)

(I have read with mixed feelings the article on 'Some Problems of Sāṅkhya Philosophy and Literature' in the September issue, 1932, of this Journal. I cannot claim to speak as an old student of Sāṅkhya, else I might be questioning the imputing to the shadowy if doubtlessly historical figure of Kapila anything amounting to a 'system' and a 'philosophy', which emerged much later.) It is where the Founder of the *Sākyan* new teaching, which very long after came to take shape as what is now called Buddhism, is held up as teaching a philosophy, and a philosophy of four fundamental principles, in accordance with similar principles of Sāṅkhya philosophy, that I find the writer wrong.

I am not saying, that monastic scholastic Buddhism did not frame those so-called four truths, or that later scholastic Sāṅkhya, with a category of four points about *heya* and *hāna*, may not have suggested the late Buddhist four about *dukkha*. I would only contend that, as a feature in the First Utterance of Benares, the four are a pretty obvious gloss (as Deussen saw), and that, as fundamentals in what was not a philosophy, but the mandate of a great world-religion, they are impossible and entirely out of place. That mandate showed forth the man, the *puruṣa*, as the creator of his own salvation by the right choice of his will, in his quest for the Highest, the *paramārtha*. Here we have a revelation to man of a More in him:—in his nature, his life, his destiny. In the four truths, we are mainly concerned with a Less in the man:—with ill as his nature and life, unless he makes his nature wilt by cutting out desire, or will, the very source of the hope in what lies before him. /

Throughout the Pāli Suttas we can see creeping up the influence of the early Sāṅkhyan teaching; not of any 'system', but of a teaching which saw in the composite human being not just *nāma-rūpa*: the man with a shape or body, but the man as having both body *and* a set of mind-ways, distinguishable from the very man. The man is not denied in that teaching; far from it:—'*puruṣo'sti*', it maintains, and for very excellent

and unanswerable reasons, given, as Mr. Bhattacharya will know very well, in the Sūtras. But he had an inner procedure as systematic as was that of the body. / And it was this procedure that captivated the early Śākyan Saṅgha, probably even during the day of the first Śākyan teachers. Is it not clear enough in the Second Utterance, warning men not to confuse the very *puruṣa* or self with body or mind? This more-in-analysis of the man we see recognized in early Suttas of Pāli as one of two strengths (*balāni*) in the man: *paṭisaṅkhānaṃ*, or discriminating thought, and *bhāvanā*, or 'making-become', which was for the Śākyan world what Yoga became for the Brahman world.

But in all this there is no philosophy, as we understand the word. There never was a philosophic system of Buddhism till a thousand years after the day of the Founder. Nor for that matter was there any philosophic system in the Upaniṣads. These were religious utterances, *mantras*, aspirations. It is only we who try to read any system into them. Why can we not let them stand in their true value for what they really were? When will Europe cease to talk in this way, and Indian writers no less? When is the Śākyamuni to be made no more to pose as a philosopher, as a pundit, full of wise and wordy discourse, of categories and ideas about men? There is no hope for India having a vision of him as he really was, till we banish from our eyes any imagining of him as prosing on about *skandhas* and the ills of life. A man was he in close touch with the unseen, with men in the unseen worthy to 'inspire' him, as we say—to will and word him with a message to this man and that woman, a message of a new amplitude in life, a new vista, a new joy in the mighty Becoming, the making-become that lay before him, before her. (Verily are you That, but That you must make-become in you. There is here no actual Being, else is the religion of India absurd, irrational; there is only potential Being. There is becoming; a long 'Way'. Therein walk, 'attaining to happiness by happiness'.)

And we shall not begin to understand him and his message as long as we take the many scriptures about him and his work at their face-value—at the value the compilers and then the revisers, the editors, have come to hold these in, in their later day. Hardly any writer

on Buddhism as yet is historically critical in dealing with Pāli literature. Many will assign one whole work as later than another work, but who yet digs into any one work to find what a palimpsest that one work is:—a history in itself? Mr. Bhattacharya, who shows some historical discernment in feeling after a gradual growth in Śāṅkhya, has nothing of the kind when referring to Pāli works. He sees Śāṅkhya, for instance, as pre-Buddhistic, because “Śāṅkhya as a system of philosophy occurs in the *Lalitavistara*”. This is as much as to say, that because a certain teaching (a ‘system’) is known to the poet of a late Buddhist work, it therefore was known to the first Buddhist teaching of at least 1000 years earlier! I am not saying this is the only evidence adduced; I say it is no evidence and should not have been mentioned, so worthless is it.

We live so remote from the day of the birth of a world-religion, that we, the after-men, have tended to mess up its original nature in wrappings and superstructures of ideas, in ‘scriptures’, in exegesis. I do not lose sight of the piety and devotion ever at work on these, but I do see the original plant all but buried, of the Man bringing a message to Man to come up higher and behold a broader, brighter view about himself. And that will not have been said in list, formula or category, much less in a system of philosophical fundamentals.

C. A. F. RHYS DAVIDS

A New Gupta Sculpture

It is stated that the national art of India rose to a high state of excellence during the Gupta period. The sculpture under review, which is now lying uncared for under a banyan tree in a bye-lane at Benares, bears an eloquent testimony to that. It is 2 ft. 6 in. high and 1 ft. 6 in. broad and it represents 'Umā and Maheśvara'. 'Umā-Maheśvara' images are generally the products of the mediaeval age. They are of two varieties viz. Kalyānasundara or Vaivāhika, and Umāliṅgana. Kalyānasundara image represents the marriage ceremony of Umā with Maheśvara, and are again depicted in two forms. Umā sometimes stands just in front of Maheśvara¹, and occasionally on his left.² Umāliṅgana images were made more or less in accordance with the canons given in the *Matsya Purāṇa*³ viz. Umā should be embracing Maheśvara seating on his left thigh. Maheśvara should be touching her breast with one of his left hands. A certain Purāṇa lays down that one of Maheśvara's left hands should be placed on the breast of Umā, and one of his right should sportively touch the chin of the goddess⁴.

The image under discussion does not belong to any of the two classes referred to above. It neither demonstrates the wedding ceremony of Umā with Maheśvara, nor does it represent their amorous display. Its style and language are quite different from the mediaeval sculptures of this type. Maheśvara is with four hands. The right upper hand is holding the chin of Umā, and the right lower hand is holding the head of a man. One of the left hands is holding a *triśūla* and the other is placed on the left shoulder of Umā. There are a hooded-snake, and an animal above on the left of Maheśvara. A bull is standing below to the right of the god. Umā is holding an uncertain object with her left hand.

1 *Descriptive Catalogue of Sculptures in the Vaṅgīya Sāhitya Pāriṣat*, Plate XVI; *Catalogue of the Varendra Research Society*, p. 9, c (d) i.

2 *Iconography of Budh. and Br. Sculptures in the Dacca Museum*, Plate XLVIII b.

3 *Matsya Purāṇa*, Ch. CCLX, Vs. 11, 12.

4 *Icon. Dacca Museum. Pl. XLIX.*



Umā-Maheśvara

IHQ., June, 1933.

The sculpture is a masterpiece of art. Maheśvara is deeply absorbed in the beauty of his consort, and observes, as if, the very inner recess of her heart. Divine pleasure emanating from the realisation of that beauty manifests itself in his calm and serene face. There is no thrill. Thrill yields to the dispassionate love,—the love transcendental. Maheśvara's joy knows no bound. He feels that his heart is too small to contain it. Hence he desires that all the living creatures should enjoy this beatitude in association with him. This is the law of Nature. One's joy is exalted by the exhibition of the object of his love before the world. Maheśvara is now under the influence of the same law. Exuberance of his feeling makes him eager to show the world the beautiful face of his consort—the face implanted in his bosom. He extends his right hand and raises her face by holding her chin so that every part of it may be seen by all. The hand in its extended position is cleverly executed. The bent at the elbow is characterised by soft delineation. Maheśvara has to incline a little to the left in order to enable his hand to reach the chin of his consort. In consequence, there is a little fold in the skin of the left part of the abdomen, and the right hip has become more pronounced. The weight of his whole body now rests on his left leg and makes it stiff. The abdominal muscle is faithfully treated.

Umā surrenders herself to Maheśvara. The position of her face is at his command. Maheśvara raises it a little, and she follows the action of his and without the least restraint. So her face rests on a little uncomfortable position. Umā puts up with that evidently to satisfy her beloved. Maheśvara's action arouses in her a sense of delicacy. Her look is innocent. The treatment of her facial muscle is so nicely finished that one finds in it the association of purity, tenderness and loveliness. There is softness all through her body. The palm of her left hand is carefully bent.

The feeling of the living creatures, evoked at the demonstration by Maheśvara, focuses through the bull below. The bull is a wonderful creation of the artist. It turns its neck upwards and observes the action of its master with great eagerness. There is tension in the muscles and

engorgement in the veins of its body due to exuberance of feeling. The chisel of the artist has achieved great success in making the bull emotional. The whole scene after all is a realistic one. Its beauty lies in the general ordering of the parts in relation to the whole and in the moulding. The members are playing their rôles individually, but their actions collectively lend air to the whole scene.

Both Mahésvara and Umā wear transparent garments, which is a strong characteristic associated with the Gupta images. The language of this sculpture is that of the Śiva image in the Deogarh temple.⁶ These characteristics together with its general features point out that it belongs to the Gupta period.⁷

DHIRENDRA CHANDRA GANGULY

6 Smith, *Fine Art*, Pl. XXXIV.

7 Rai Bahadur Rama Prasad Chanda also thinks that the image belongs to the Gupta period.

The Hindu Theatre

We have read carefully Mr. D. R. Mankad's interesting paper on the Hindu Theatre published in *IHQ*. (vol. VIII, 1932, No. 3). It is a proof of the writer's extensive study and painstaking research. By starting discussion on a subject which has so long been neglected Mr. Mankad has earned the gratitude of those who may be interested in the history of ancient Hindu Theatre. It is therefore with an apology that we shall discuss below our disagreement with some of the views expressed in the aforesaid article.

Mr. Mankad considers the Raṅgapīṭha (Rp.) and the Raṅgaśīrṣa (Rś.) as two different parts of the theatre. We may think that the following facts will go against such a view:

(1) In chapter I of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* (NŚ) Brahman asks the gods to guard the different parts of the theatre where the latter take up their position (C. 84-98; Gr. 81-95; GOS. 83-97).¹ In this connexion no Rś. is mentioned while Rp. is mentioned thrice. The pillars even are noticed by the gods, so the omission of Rś. is significant.

(2) In course of giving the measurement of the different parts of the play-house Rś. only has been mentioned (C. II. 34-36; Gr. 36-38; GOS. 36-38). This omission also makes us suspicious about the separate existence of the Rś. and Rp.

(3) The passages giving direction for the earth-work in the Rś. of a *Vikṛṣṭa* hall (C. II. 70-74; Gr. 72-76; GOS. 72-76) may also be said to give reasons for locating the Rś. and Rp. in the same part of the theatre. For Rś. twice mentioned in this connexion has once Rp. as its variant² in one manuscript (*vide* variants in all the three texts).

(4) In case of the *Tryasra* type of the theatre no Rś. has been mentioned (C. II. 102-104; Gr. 104-106; GOS. 105-107) and Rś. mentioned in case of the *Caturasra-avara* type of the theatre has Rp. as its

1 C., Gr. and GOS., indicate respectively the editions of the NŚ. published in Chowkhamba-Benares, Paris-Lyon (Ed. Grosset) and Gaekwad Oriental Series.

2 The *variant* here and in the passage mentioned in (4) possibly shows that some students of the NŚ. in early times considered the Rś. and Rp. as synonymous. Though one cannot be sure on this point, this explanation seems to get support from (1) and (2) above.

variant in one manuscript (C. II. 87-101; Gr. 90-104; GOS. 90-104, see variants of Gr. and GOS.).

From the points mentioned above it is perhaps clear that the terms Rp. and Rś. are synonymous and as such relate to the *same part* of the theatre and not to *two different parts* as Mr. Mankad has supposed. And on taking such a view one feels no difficulty in understanding the description of the performance of the *Ratnāvalī* as given by Dāmodara-gupta (A.C. 779-813). The curtain mentioned by Dāmodara and a host of dramatists did not exist as Mr. Mankad has supposed (*IHQ.*, 1932. pp. 494-495) between Rś. and Rp. but between the stage (Rp. or Rś.) and the tiring room (*Nepathya-grha*). The exact position of the curtain was evidently in the two doors leading from the tiring room into the stage (C. II. 70; Gr. 72; GOS. 72). This view will very clearly explain the following passage from the *NS*:—

ध्रुवायां संप्रवृत्तायां पटे चेवापकर्षिते ।

कार्यः प्रवेशः पात्राणां नानार्थरससम्भवः ॥

(v. 1 संप्रयुक्तायां in C.) C. and Gr. XIII 3

“After the *dhruvā* song has begun and the curtain has been drawn aside, the actors who are the source of *rasas* of various imports should enter (the stage)”.

The curtain mentioned here is not the drop-curtain of the modern theatre. For, expressions like *pravīśya-apaṭi-kṣepeṇa* which are common enough in Sanskrit plays will not allow us to take the word *apaṭi* in the above extract in any sense other than that of the curtain hung in the two doors of the tiring room (*nepathya-grha*). Prof. Keith's view on this point seems to be in complete agreement with ours (*vide Skt. Drama*, p. 359).

In all these three types of theatre the players of musical instruments occupy a place in R. between two doors.




fig. 1.




fig. 2.




fig. 3

Explanatory

- Fig. 1. *Vikṛṣṭamadhya* hall
 = 64 × 32 Sq. cubits.
 Its N. (*Nepathya-gṛha*)
 = 16 × 8 Sq. cubits.
 „ R. (*Raṅgaṇīṭha*)
 = 16 × 8 Sq. cubits.
 „ M. (*Mattavāraṇī*)
 = 8 × 8 Sq. cubits.
- Fig. 2. *Caturśā-avara* hall
 = 32 × 32 Sq. cubits.
 Its N.
 = 32 × 4 Sq. cubits.
 „ R.
 = 16 × 4 Sq. cubits.
 „ M.
 8 × 8 Sq. cubits.
 „ D.
 = a door with a curtain
- Fig. 3. *Tryaśra* hall
 = 16 × 3 Sq. cubits.

No measurements of its different parts have been given in the NŚ.

Mr. Mankad had to depend on the available text of the *Abhinava-bhāratī* to a considerable extent. This text is at times hopelessly corrupt and as such should be used with great caution. For example, in connexion with passages giving measurement of the *Vikṛṣṭa-madhya* type of the theatre (C. II, 36; Gr. 37; GOS. 36-37) this text explains *catuṣṣaṣṭī-karān* as *catuṣṣaṣṭīrhasta-dairghād-vistārāt-ca* or 'sixty-four cubits in length as well as in breadth' (ED. GOS. p. 57). But such an interpretation would make the theatre one of a *caturāśra-madhya* type.

Thus we see that it will be safer to rely more on the text of the NŚ. than on its available commentary. And following *only* the former we have three types of the theatre as shown in diagrams given below.

Diagrams and Explanatory Remarks

In these diagrams we have not tried to locate the pillars and the

outer doors. For, the passages of the *NŚ.* giving their location are not clear. The *Abhinavabhāratī* on this point is also not of much help. Those who may be interested in any possible interpretation of the *NŚ.* on these points, may study the diagrams in Mr. Mankad's article with profit. We have, however, tried to locate the place occupied by the players of musical instruments according to the *NŚ.* (XIV. 2 of C. and Gr.).

MANOMOHAN GHOSH

Hindu Theatre

Mr. Mankad's discussion of the architecture of the Hindu theatre, *JHQ.*, VIII, 3, is the best that has yet appeared. But he would have had less difficulty with some of the terms listed in his Appendix II had he consulted not only Acharya's *Dictionary*, but also my comments thereon in *JAOS.*, vol. 48, pp. 250-278, my articles on 'Early Indian Architecture,' in *Eastern Art*, vols. II and III, and the references to architectural terms occurring in the *Mahācamṣa* and *Cūlavamṣa*, which have been so carefully indexed by Professor Geiger in vol. I of his translation of the latter text. Here I will only say that *nirvyūha*, practically equivalent to *bhūmi* and *tala*, means 'storey'; *vedikā* is usually 'a railing', not a pedestal or base; *gavākṣa* is the ordinary 'curved window' of Indian architecture, the so-called 'caitya-window', the whole of which is compared to an 'ox-eye'; *nāgadanta* is almost invariably 'a peg', for hanging things on, Abhinava proves that 'bracket' may also be meant. *Śālabhañjikā* has been fully explained by Professor Vogtlin. 'The woman and tree or śālabhañjikā in Indian literature and art', in *Acta Orientalia*, vol. VII. Cf. my *Yakṣas*, II, p. 11.

As for the curtain, of course, there were two curtains, neither of them a drop curtain, but one over each doorway leading from the *nepathya* on to and from the stage, just as in the Chinese theatre even today, where anyone who cares may see the actor enter 'with a toss of the curtain'.

ANANDA K. COOMARASWAMY



A Silver Coin of the reign of
King Prasannamātra

**A silver coin of king Prasannamātra, the grandfather of king
Mahā Sudevarāja of Śarabhapur**

The silver-coin of king Prasannamātra, having the *legend in box-headed characters* is the first of its kind yet discovered in India.

It was found at Salhepāli on the bank of the Māndha river a tributary of the Mahānadi. Salhepāli is a village in the Raigarh State, C.P. A gold-dust-washer (sonjhara) woman came across it while washing earth and sand for gold-dust near the deserted old village-site by the river.

The coin is round and bears inscription and carving on one side only. The other side is blank. The legend as deciphered by me reads *Śrī Prasannamātra*.

It is in the box-headed characters. It is surmounted by a bust, on one side of which there is a figure of a discus and on the other that of a conch, while at the bottom of the legend, there is a top portion of what appears to be a mace. The coin is of silver but there is a faint polish of gold all over.

Prasannamātra was the grandfather of Mahā Sudevarāja and Mahā Pravararāja whose copper charters written in the box-headed characters have been found in the Sārangarh State and the Raipur district respectively. All the charters of Mahā Sudevarāja and those of his uncle Mahājayarāja were issued from Śarabhapur. Rajendralal Mitra surmised that Śarabhapur was the old name of the Sambalpur town, the head-quarters of the district of the same name now in Orissa and formerly in the Chattisgarh division in C.P. Rai Bahadur Hiralal, suggested that it was a new name imposed on Śrīpur, the capital of the later Gupta or Somavaṃśī kings of Mahā Kosala, in commemoration of the capture of Śrīpur by king Mahā Sudevarāja or his father. But we have no inscriptional evidence to such a victory won by Sudevarāja or his father. I think the Śarabhapur kings were the vassals of the Somavaṃśī kings of Śrīpur and assisted them in military expeditions (see my paper in the Proceedings of the Lahore Session of the All-India Oriental Conference).



The bust referred to above may represent *Lakṣmī* or *Garuḍa*. Mr. Allan of the British Museum is in favour of identifying the figure as *Garuḍa*. The Śarabhapur kings were apparently Vaiṣṇavas *Parama Bhāgarat* and so were their overlords Mahāśiva Tīvararāja and Harṣa Guptā kings of Mahā Kosala. The seal of one of the copper charters of Mahāśiva Tīvararāja (Baloda Plates) is thus described by Dr. Hultzsch:—“A circular seal it bears in relief on a deep counter sunk surface, across the centre a legend in two lines; at the bottom a floral device and at the top a figure of *Garuḍa* facing the front, with a *cakra* (discus) on his proper right and *śaṅkha* (conch) on his proper left.”

Our present coin may safely be accepted as one struck on the model of the above described seal by the *Śarabhapur kings who were feudatories* under the Śrīpur Somavaṃśīs the sovereign-lord of Kosala, as one of them Mahāśiva Tīvararāja is styled in the seal referred to above. The charters and seals of Mahāśiva Tīvararāja are also in the box-headed characters as those found in case of our coin.

The date of Tīvararāja has not yet been ascertained, so also are dates of kings of Śarabhapur. According to some scholars, the box-headed characters were in use between the 5th and 6th centuries A.D.

L. P. PANDEYA

Quotations from the Kāmasūtra

Considering the importance of Vātsyāyana's *Kāmasūtra*, citations from that work in other books may be said to be rare, and those from the introductory and concluding portions to be rarer still. It is therefore of interest to find that Ānandagiri (or Ānandajñāna) has quoted from the same work (1.3. 49-51) the following six stanzas (some of them with readings different from those in the printed editions) and a short prose sentence in his commentary on Sureśvara's *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad-bhāṣya-vārtika*, 1. 4: 409 (p. 514):

1. kiṃ syūt paratīety āśāṅkū kārye yasmin na jāyate/
na cārthaghaṇaṃ sukhaṃ ceti śiṣṭās tasmīn vyavasthitāḥ//
2. trivarga-sādhakam yat syūd dvayor vaikasya sādhakam/
kāryam tad api kurvīta na caikārtham dvi-bādhakam//
3. dharmam artham ca kāmam ca pratyaṅgam lokam eva ca/
paśyann etasya tattvajñō na ca rāgāt pravartate//
4. evam artham ca kāmam ca dharmam cāpy ācaran narah/
ihāmutra ca niśālyam atyantam sukham aśnute//
5. tad etat kuśalo vidvān dharmārthāv avalokayan/
nātirāgātmakeḥ kāmī prayuñjānaḥ prasidhyati//
6. adhikāra-vaśād uktā ye cātrācāra-varjitāḥ/
tad-anantaram atraiva te prayatnān nivāritāḥ//
7. teṣāṃ samavāye pūrvaḥ pūrvo garīyān/

Of these, nos. 1, 2, 4 are found on p. 26 (I. 3. 50, 51, 45) of the Benares edition (published in the Chowkhamba Sanskrit Book Depot in 1912) of the *Kāmasūtra*; nos. 3, 5, 6 on pp. 380-1 (VII, 2, 53, 59, 54), and no. 7 on p. 15 (I.2.14). In the Bombay edition printed at the Nirṇayasāgara Press in 1891-2, they are found on pp. 26, 25; 370-371; and 15 respectively.

Both the editions read *śiṣṭās tatra vyavasthitāḥ* in 1d; *dvayor ekasya vā punaḥ* and *na tv ekartham dvi-bādhakam* in 2d; *dharmam copācaran narah* in 4b; and *ye citrā rāga-vardhanāḥ* in 6b. In 7, the Bombay edition reads *eṣāṃ samavāye* while the Benares edition has the same reading as Ānandagiri.

REVIEWS

THE MAHĀBHĀRATA, Southern Recension, *Virāṭa Parvan*, vol. VI edited by P. P. S. Śāstrī and published by V. Ramaswamy Sastrulu & Sons, Madras

The principle enunciated with regard to the edition of the Mahābhārata undertaken by the Bhandarkar Research Institute under the able editorship of Dr. Utgikar which is bound to hold the field for a long time to come was to publish the texts common to the two Recensions, northern and southern. This means that the additions in both the recensions will not be included in that edition. Prof. P. P. S. Śāstrī, who has undertaken the editing of the Southern Recension of the Mahābhārata, does not accept the principle adopted by the Bhandarkar Institute and makes out a case that the Southern Recension, though bulkier of the two, is the more genuine and authoritative. His main argument is that at least from the Javanese version of the Mahābhārata which could not be later than 996 A.D., the Southern Recension is accepted by a long line of authors and their works. It would be interesting to know the divergences between the two Recensions. While the Northern Recension fixes the number of chapters as 67 with 2050 stanzas, the Southern Recension as proved by the *Anukramaṇikādhyāya* of the *Ādiparvan* gives out the same number of chapters but with 3500 stanzas. But the Grantha edition published in Tanjore (1895) divides the whole *Virāṭa Parvan* into 76 chapters. Though the editor of the present edition has been mainly following the Tanjore Grantha edition he prefers the scheme of 67 chapters to 76. In this direction he furnishes us with a concordance enabling us to see the divergences among the three published editions of the Mahābhārata in respect of the chapters. Though the editor has divided his edition into 67 chapters still he claims 3500 stanzas on the whole. The principal text edited comes to 3283 stanzas, and the additional stanzas of the text, 217, are made up by the inclusion of what has been regarded as the *adhikapāṭha* (interpolations). In his brief introduction Prof. Śāstrīar notes seven main differences between the two recensions.

It is worth while to repeat them briefly here. The first chapters of Northern Recension are spread over the first two chapters of Southern Recension. In the Northern Recension besides a special chapter on *Durgāstava*, the chapters 50 and 65 of the Southern Recension are omitted, as well as the first 25 stanzas of chapter 62 and a portion of chapter 66.

In this edition as many as seven manuscripts including the one that belongs to His Highness the Mahārājā of Travancore have been consulted. As the last manuscript was received after the printing of the text, the editor has added an appendix containing the more important additions for the information of scholars.

V. R. R. DIKSHITAR

THE MAHABHARATA (Southern Recension) *Udyogaparvan*, vol. VII edited by Prof. P. P. S. Śāstri and published by Messrs. V. Ramaswamy Sastrulu & Sons, Madras.

We are glad to note that the *Virāṭaparvan* has been followed by *Udyogaparvan* in such a short time, though the latter is one among the longest of the Parvans. This quick succession of volumes bespeaks of the untiring efforts on the part of both the editor and the publishers. In the edition of the volume under notice, as many as eight manuscripts have been consulted of which two are in Malayalam script belonging to His Highness the Mahārājā of Travancore. Undoubtedly the value of this edition is much enhanced by the consultation of the Malayalam manuscripts, a characteristic feature of which is that they are the least tampered by the hand of the redactor or the scribe.

As in the case of the *Sabhāparvan* the editor follows in this volume the *Griantha* edition of 1895 while he divides the *Parvan* into 186 chapters exactly in the manner prescribed in the *Anukramanikādhyāya* of the *Ādiparvan*. Though both the recensions, southern and northern, agree as to the total number of chapters of this *parvan* as 186, yet the editor remarks that no single manuscript which he has consulted adopts that division of 186 chapters. Consequently one has to look for divergences in the texts and deviations in the scheme of chapters as a whole.

While such deviations are pointed out in the body of the text, the divergences are indicated by a concordance to the three standard editions of the *Mahābhārata*—the Poona edition, the Kumbakonam edition and the Southern Recension. This concordance is very useful as it enables us to judge the divergences between the different editions.

In the *Udyogaparvan* which is mainly concerned with preparations for the ensuing great war at Kurukṣetra, there is a sub-section entitled *Sanatsujātaparvan*. This *parvan* occupies chapters 40-45 in the present edition. Here the sage Sanatsujāta instructs Dhṛtarāṣṭra, father of the Kauravas, on the importance of *Brahmavidyā* and the realisation of the Supreme Being by freeing oneself from the trammels of *saṃsāra*, the cycle of births and deaths, by the practice of *dharma* and especially of *brahmacarya*. The great philosopher Śaṅkara who was attracted to this section wrote a valuable commentary on it entitled the *Sanatsujātīya-bhāṣya*. But there are two views as to the genuineness of the 44th chapter. Though a manuscript in the Tanjore Library makes out a *bhāṣya* of Śaṅkara to this chapter, yet Prof. Śāstrī is of opinion that it is the hand of the scribe at work who passed it off in the colophon as the *bhāṣya* of Śaṅkara and that it is not therefore genuine. In fact, Prof. Śāstrī wants us to believe that Śaṅkara did not write a commentary on this chapter. Without committing ourselves to one view or the other, it seems advisable to search for more manuscripts of the *bhāṣya* and compare them with regard to this particular view.

In this edition again the editor draws our attention to certain changes in the titles of the subsections so as to be in conformity with the *parvasaṅgrahādhyāya* of the *Ādiṣarvan*. The titles introduced are *Vyāsābhigamanaparvan* (chapters 46-64) for *Yānasandhiparvan* of the published texts, *Vicādaparvan* (chapters 127-137) for *Bhagavadgāyāparvan* and *Bhīṣmābhīṣecanaparvan* for *Sainyaniryāṇaparvan* (chapters 141-145). 'It will be observed' says the editor, "that the proper sequence is for *Bhīṣmābhīṣecanaparvan* to follow the *Sainyaniryāṇaparvan* and not to precede it." It would have been more interesting, and perhaps more fruitful, if the editor of this *parvan* had consulted the commentary on this *parvan* by Sarvajña Nārāyaṇa, the author of the *Manvārtharṭti*, a commentary on Manu's law-code, of a date

not later than the latter half of the 14th century. In his learned introduction to the *Laws of Manu* (S.B.E., vol. XXV) George Bühler has drawn our attention to the fact that the commentaries by Nārāyaṇa on the *Udyogaparvan*, on the *Svargārohaṇaparvan* and on the *Sanatsujātīya* are still extant (*Ibid.*, p. cxxx). This edition, like the other volumes, is well printed and neatly got up, and deserves to adorn the bookshelf of every lover of ancient Indian literature.

V. R. R. DIKSHITAR

MAHARANA PRATAP, by Sri Ram Sharma with a foreword by A.C. Woolner. Pp. ix+151+iv. D. A. V. College Historical Monographs, No. 1. Lahore 1932.

In the annals of Mediaeval India, Pratap Singh, the Lion of Mewar, has always been a name to conjure with. But hitherto there has been no authentic biography of this great king. In the present work the author, who is Professor of History in the D. A. V. College, Lahore, has undertaken to remove this want. As his list of original authorities, classified under eight heads (Mss., published works, modern collections, inscriptions, paintings, coins, modern works and works of reference) shows, he has tried to make an exhaustive study of the sources bearing on the history of the hero of Mewar. Beginning with the Introduction the work extends to 10 chapters (11 including the bibliography) of which the first gives a brief sketch of the early history of Mewar and the rest deals with successive episodes of the hero's career. The author throughout makes an honest attempt to discover truth by weighing different lines of evidence and to separate the kernel of fact from the husk of tradition. Frequently he seeks to bring out in his descriptions the springs of human action. His style is also lucid, if not picturesque. He devotes a whole chapter, aptly enough, to the campaign of Haldighāt. His plan of battle would have gained in weight if it had been accompanied by topographical details. Perhaps it will come to most readers as a surprise to learn that this historical battle was all but gained by the chivalry of Mewar. The author takes this oppor-

tunity to correct Tod's mistaken statement that Prince Salim was the leader of the Imperial forces in the bloody fight. The author's concluding estimate of Pratap's character is well worth study. In his hands Pratap comes out not as a knight-errant fighting single-handed against heavy odds but as an able and skilful general who formed coalition after coalition to check the Mughal invasions, and above all inaugurated the system of warfare which is wrongly attributed to the inventive genius of Sivaji. It is interesting to note in this connection that the author finds fault with Mm. G. S. Ojha's estimate of Pratap in his well-known *Hindī History of Rajputana* as savouring of an attempt to deify the hero. A couple of maps and a number of illustrations add to the usefulness of the present work. On the other hand, the total absence of diacritical marks in the printing of proper names is regrettable. The list of errata again is far from exhaustive (compare *hallow* for *halo* p. 7, *Jarret* for *Jarrett* p. 26 n; *difecat* for *defeat* p. 46).

We hope this first number of D. A. V. College Historical Monographs will be followed at no distant date by other useful publications in the same series.

U. N. GHOSHAL

MAHARANA KUMBHA by Haribilas Sarda. Second edition. Pp. xxvi+235. Ajmere 1932.

Mr. Harbilas Sarda has already won a reputation among those who are interested in the past history of India by his previous publications on the antiquities of Rajputana. In the present book the qualities characterising his former works are again brought clearly before our eyes. The author displays the same knack of reproducing the ancient tales, the same burning desire to correct the one-sided accounts of the Persian historians, the same passionate pride in the achievements of the Hindu people. It is idle to expect from him the critical acumen which seeks to extract truth from the bewildering maze of traditional and other evidence or attempts to analyse human motives or to paint the lights and shades of the historical characters.

To the general reader the most interesting portion of the book would seem to consist of the concluding pages (200-4) where the author puts to himself the question, why even such a great king as Kumbha "failed to restore Rajput supremacy in Upper India and free Western India (*sic*) from the tyranny and oppression of the Afghan (*sic*) adventurers". His answer is contained in one statement, namely, the lack of political foresight which comes only from full national consciousness.

Among the useful features of the present book may be mentioned the long bibliography at its beginning, and the exhaustive account of Mahārāṇā Kumbha's monuments and literary accomplishments (Chs. XIII and XIV) as well as the complete list of Kumbha's inscriptions (Ch. XV). But its scholarly value is much discounted by the preponderance of bardic tales, the occasional deviations from historical facts (cf. pp. 54-55), not to speak of its extremely loose system of transliteration.

U. N. GHOSHAL

JASAIHARACARIU—Karanja Jain Series, No. I. Edited by Dr. P. V. Vaidya, M.A., D.LITT. Published by Karanja Jain Publication Society, Karanja, Berār.

A hearty welcome is due to this new Series of Jain Publications, the Karanja Jain Series or Ambadas Chaware Digambar Jain Granthamālā, which owes its origin to the generous munificence of Seth Gopal Ambadas Chaware who has introduced the Series to perpetuate the memory of his father. It is to be regretted, however, that owing to the absence of well-organised and concerted action, a host of similar attempts emanating from private munificence has unfortunately failed though as yet only a small fraction of the vast and valuable literature of the Jainas has seen the light of day. We hope and believe Mr. Chaware would look to the permanence of his laudable enterprise by the creation of endowments and trusts.

Thanks to the labours of various scholars, a number of works in Apabhraṃśa have, of late, been critically edited and published. The importance of these works in the linguistic history of the different

Indo-Aryan Vernaculars is inestimable. And we are glad that one more work has been added to this list by the publication of the volume under review.

The theme of the work—stories of several births of Prince Yaśodhara—is highly popular, at least among the Jainas. The learned editor has, in his Introduction, given an account of about thirty works in Sanskrit, Prākṛt, and the Vernaculars dealing with this theme; and he assures his readers that the list is not exhaustive.

The edition is based on four Mss., variant readings from which have been noted in the form of foot-notes. There are one or two points to which the attention of the learned editor should be drawn. The glossary of words unfortunately does not refer to the place of occurrence of the words and thus loses much of its utility and importance. The absence of any note, in the Introduction, on the language of the work is keenly felt, for the importance of the work lies, as the editor has also incidentally mentioned, not as much in the subject-matter as in the language in which it is composed.

CHINTALARAN CHAKRAVARTI

KAMARŪPA ŚĀSANĀVALI, by Padmanath Bhattacharya, M.A., with an Introduction on the royal dynasties of Kāmarūpa. Pages 10+47+215 and 16 plates. (Published by the Rangpur Sahitya Parisat). Rs. 6. [In Bengali].

This work, by reason of the high degree of erudition and care bestowed on it by the editor, will long remain indispensable to students of North Indian history during the Hindu age. It is not merely that the editor has reconstructed the Hindu history of that province with the latest information available; but he has also thrown light on a variety of other subjects and obscure points in ancient Indian epigraphy and administration in consequence of which his book rises out of the narrow bounds of a provincial history and takes rank with indispensable works of reference on the Hindu age of India. This fact only adds a keen edge to our regret that its Bengali garb will limit its usefulness to those who know that tongue and script; for

we feel that those to whom this work will remain a sealed book for this linguistic difficulty will be real losers in their pursuit of Hindu history.

We may cite here some instances of the latter. The editor has discovered the correct meanings of many technical terms used in Sanskrit land-grants on which the standard lexicons throw no light and former Orientalists have been in the dark.

(1) Page 33. *Bhūmichhidra* means 'land unfit for cultivation' (and not *fit*, as Bühler wrongly took it). This I can parallel from many Persian land-grants of Muslim India in which *zamin-i-uftādah* (i.e., waste land) is gifted away,—either because it was considered unjust to take away anyone's cultivated land for being granted to another, or (more probably) because the minister (*dutak*) who got the grant sanctioned by the king told him that the land proposed to be alienated was lying waste and yielding no gain to the State.

(2) Pp. 43 and 201. *Pañca-mahā-śabda* explained.

(3) The sign \int is not a form of *Om* but *āñji*, the Tantrik interpretation of which is given on pp. 56-66 and 202.

(4) P. 72. *Sahasra* is measure of corn and not a coin.

(5) P. 107. *Apakṛṣṭa bhūmi* means 'land set aside' (in modern usage, *khārij zamin*).

Among the many interesting and highly useful pieces of information of a general character may be mentioned the editor's identification of many of the trees and plants whose archaic names occur in these inscriptions, his speculation about the use of the *āryā* and *rasanta tilaka* metres (p. 171), the rejection of the tradition of Brāhmaṇa migration from Kanauj (p. 9), the division of Brāhmaṇas into *gotras* (septs), etc. The learned editor has conclusively proved that the Dharmapāla of the Kāmarūpa inscriptions was not his namesake of Bengal and that the Pāla dynasty of Assam had no connection with the Pāla kings of Bengal. He has shown remarkable acumen in demonstrating that the supposed lost copper-plate of Dharmapāla is identical with the Sualkuchi grant of Ratnapāla (p. 209), and that the proper sequence of the Bhāskara-varma plates has been hitherto misunderstood (pp. 19, 21, 206).

All the ten inscriptions extant have been here reproduced in facsimile, thus enabling the reader to study their palæography and readings for himself. One novel feature is the printing of the text as corrected by the editor in the body of the book, while relegating the corrupt readings of the original to the footnotes. This method, though unorthodox in Indology, will prove very helpful to the student. By the way, the prevalence of the Maināvati legend and song in Mārāthi might have been noticed.

We cannot conclude this notice without remarking that the editor's scholarship is only equalled by his fairness to previous workers in the same field and his personal modesty. He never hesitates to correct himself; he recognises that continual supersession is the law of research. We are deeply touched by Pandit Padmanath's reverence for his *guru*, Mm. Haraprasād Śāstrī, the *doyen* of Indologists, so recently taken away from us.

The volume has been printed by the editor at his own cost, no small proof of devotion to learning on the part of a retired college lecturer who has never burnt incense before Saraswatī's sister and rival and has not, in consequence, been blessed by the latter deity.

JADUNATH SARKAR

INDIAN LITERATURE IN CHINA AND THE FAR EAST
by Prabhat Kumar Mukherji. Greater India Society Series.
iv + 334 + 18 pp.

During the last few decades, so much of addition has been made to our store of information relating to the Chinese Buddhist literature that it is well-nigh impossible for an average reader to take stock of them without the help of a suitable handbook. The present work has removed this desideratum, for which we thank the author and the G. I. Society. Thirteen years ago, Mr. G. K. Nariman sprang an agreeable surprise upon us by bringing together in his *Literary History of Sanskrit Buddhism* the results of the valuable researches of the European orientalisks relating mainly to the Buddhist-Sanskrit literature. Mr. Mukherji has caused a similar surprise by putting

together the yields of investigations relating to the Buddhist-Chinese literature. Nanjio's monumental work, unsurpassed even now, brought to light for the first time the wonderful zeal, perseverance of the Indian and Serindian Buddhist monks and roused the curiosity of many a scholar and incited them to dive deep into a literature preserved in a most difficult monosyllabic tongue. Overcoming all obstacles a few scholars have studied sections of this literature and made additions to our knowledge, the latest being that of Dr. P. C. Bagchi. Most of the writings of these scholars are scattered in journals and books. Mr. Mukherji's object is to bring them together within a small compass and present them in a readable form. This arduous task has been accomplished very creditably. We hope his labours will be amply rewarded by the wide circulation of the book. He has enlivened the dry-as-dust historical researches by the life sketches of the most important personalities in the history of Buddhist literature like Aśvaghoṣa, Nāgārjuna, Kumārajīva and Paramārtha, and has enhanced the value of the work by presenting the gist of some of the rare treatises like the *Sūtra of the 42 Sections*, *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa* and the *Viśeṣacintā*. As the work is replete with useful information, it is not possible to point out all its best features. We can therefore mention here only the particularly valuable topics dealt with in the book. They are,—biographies of distinguished translators; the Āgama literature in China; Chinese translations of the Pāli works, viz., *Milindapañha*, *Samantapāsādikā* and the *Visuddhimagga*; old Chinese Catalogues of Buddhist texts; and the method adopted by the Chinese for the transliteration of Dhāraṇīs. He has incidentally spoken of the Vinayas of the various schools, the growth of Mahāyāna, and the introduction of Tāntrism into China. To marshal these numerous facts does credit to the author indeed but there have been here and there a few omissions. One expects, for instance, that, while he speaks of the Chinese *Brahmajāla Sūtra* and the *Abhidharmakośa*, he could also refer to De Groot's translation of the *Sūtra* and La Vallée Poussin's epoch-making work on the *Kośa*, but he does not do so.

A perusal of the book reveals that it was more the Serindian than the Central Indian monks who were responsible for the composition of the greater portion of these Buddhist Chinese works. It is

quite natural that it should be so far the Indians who settled in Central Asia and propagated Indian culture, became better linguists and felt at home in both the Chinese and the Indian languages. Of all the regions in India, Kashmir, I think, has contributed the most to this literature and the recent finds of mss. at Gilgit prove definitely the existence of an influential Buddhist community in the north-western part of Kashmir. Mr. Mukherji should be thanked for bringing out this book which helps one to have easily a comprehensive idea of the Buddhist literature (based on Indian originals) that developed in some countries of the Far East. We wish that the author and the Secretary of the Greater India Society had made better arrangements for proof-reading, as the errors that have crept into the work should have been removed by the bestowal of greater care and attention.

N. DUTT

THE CATUḤSATAKA OF ARYADEVA, pt. ii (Sanskrit and Tibetan texts with copious extracts from the commentary of Candrakīrti) reconstructed and edited by Vidhushekhara Bhattacharya, xxiv + 308 pp. Visvabharati Studies, No. 2.

MAHAYANAVIMŚAKA OF NĀGARJUNA (Reconstructed Sanskrit text, with the Tibetan and Chinese version and an English translation) edited by Vidhushekhara Bhattacharya, 44 pp. Visvabharati Studies, No. 1.

NAIRĀTMYAPARIPRĀCĪHĀ (the original and restored Sanskrit text with its Tibetan version) edited by Sujit Kumar Mukhopadhyaya, 22 pp. Visvabharati Studies, No. 4.

These three publications, two of which have already appeared in the *Visvabharati Quarterly*, testify to the great strides made by Indian scholars within recent years in the critical edition and translation of Sanskrit texts, and to their capacity for reconstructing the texts from Tibetan. The third book *Nairātmyapariprācā*, of which the original Sanskrit text has been published by Prof. Sylvain Lévi, offers us an excellent opportunity of judging how far correctly the restoration of a

Sanskrit text from a Tibetan version can be made. The editor Mr. S. K. Mukhopadhyaya does not appear to be at home with the phraseology of Buddhist Sanskrit works. In restoration, this equipment is essential, and it is advisable that no one without it should try his hand at restoring the Sanskrit texts from Tibetan. Mr. Mukhopadhyaya would have done well if he had put down his text as translation and not as restoration from a Tibetan original.

As regards the contents of the treatise, its object is to convince a non-Buddhist of the non-existence of *Jivātman* by establishing that there is nothing but *Śūnyatā* and that the empirical existence is not real and is therefore called *saṃvṛti*. It further points out the way to develop *Bodhicitta* and the means of attaining Nirvāṇa through *prajñāpāramitā*.

The restoration of the *Mahāyānaviṃśaka* is free from the defects of the kind mentioned above. The object of this text is similar to the previous one, viz., to establish the non-existence, or rather, the unreal appearance of the things of the world. A lack of the proper comprehension of this truth is the cause of our sufferings. It speaks of the *pratītyasamutpāda* as the means to the realisation of the Truth. Mr. Bhattacharya stumbles at the expression *cittamātra*, and following perhaps Mr. Yamaguchi is constrained to say that this book "represents the views of both the Vijñānavādins and Śūnyavādaius". (See p. 9) He refers us to the *Mādhyamikarṣṭi* (p. 276) where Nāgārjuna speaks of the Vijñānavādins. It is a well-known fact that Nāgārjuna scoffs at the Vijñānavādins for their *cittamātra* or *vijñānamātra*, and even at p. 276, he speaks of them in the same terms as he does of the Hīnayānists, viz., that on account of the weak intellects of his disciples, Buddha had to have recourse to many expedients for imparting his real teachings, and that *Vijñānavāda* was one of these expedients. In the face of such statements it is not at all fair to attribute to Nāgārjuna the idealism of *Vijñānavāda*. The editor has added copious notes to the small text. The English translation may well be regarded as an improvement on the one offered by Yamaguchi in the *Eastern Buddhist*, IV (1926), pp. 56-72, 167-176.

The edition of the *Catuhśataka* of Āryadeva by Mr. Bhattacharya is a distinct improvement on the two editions of the text published pre-

viously by the late Mm. H. P. Sastri, and Dr. P. L. Vaidya. We have here the last nine chapters of the great work of Āryadeva, replete with Sanskrit notes and comments, reconstructed in many places from the Tibetan versions. The editor has taken much pains to point out the defects in the restoration and the French translation of Dr. Vaidya, but has at times been overcritical, e.g., in insisting that Tib. *mdzah ba* should be restored as *sueha* and not as *rāga* or that *mi-mthum* should be *pratikula* and not *ananukula*.

In the Introduction he furnishes us with the information from the Tibetan version of Candrakīrti's commentary that Āryadeva was a native of Sīhala, and came to Southern India after renunciation (*tato dakṣiṇadikparamparayāgatya*). In view of the facts that there is no mention of Jambudvīpa, and that the direction of Southern India with reference to Ceylon should be *uttaradik*, is it not justifiable to look for Āryadeva's home somewhere in Northern India? We learn from the *Mahāvamśa* that Sīhabāhu ruled over the territory known as Sīhala, after which his people were called the Sīhalas, and Ceylon got its name Sīhaladvīpa. It is very likely that Āryadeva belonged to Sīhala of Bengal and not Ceylon. We hope evidences will be forthcoming to that effect.

We are anxiously awaiting the publication of the first seven chapters of the book announced in the Preface, as that will be a new contribution to our store of knowledge about Mahāyāna Buddhism.

N. DUTT

SCHOOLS AND SECTS IN JAINA LITERATURE by Amulya Chandra Sen. Visvabharati Studies No. 3. 47 pp. Price Rs. 4/-.

The object of this brochure is to offer an account of doctrines and practices of the non-Jaina sects as found in the Jaina Canon. Though a small treatise, one feels refreshed to go through it, because one does not find in it as in the previous book too numerous quotations from other works or too much of reliance on others to the well-nigh exclusion of the author's own independent opinion. In the Introduction he collects the

passages from the Jaina sources, which reveals the attitude of the orthodox Jainas towards the non-Jaina religious and philosophical schools. He has taken an impartial attitude towards the Ājīvikas and has also some good words to say for them on the strength of the Jaina Canon, e.g. the Ājīvikas practised "severe austerities, fierce austerities, abstention from ghee and other delicacies, and indifference to pleasant and unpleasant food." The account of Mañkhali Gosāla in the Jaina scriptures can well bear a comparison with that of Devadatta in the Buddhist Tripitaka. The author traces in the Jaina literature references to the names of some Brāhmaṇic schools, or doctrines, viz., Sāṃkhya and Yoga, Śāśvatavāda and the Vedāntic doctrines of the Upaniṣads, and the Ātmasasthavāda. He then takes up the *Tajjirataccharīravāda*, and in this connection, he summarises the conversation that king Pāyāsi had with the ascetic Keśī. Though he mentions the *Dīgha Nikāya* in the Bibliography, it is rather strange that he does not write a word about the Buddhist criticism of the doctrine *taṃ jīvaṃ taṃ sarīraṃ aññaṃ jīvaṃ aññaṃ sarīraṃ*. The references to *Nāstikavāda*, and the doctrines of the various Buddhist schools are indeed interesting. He has explained lucidly the Jaina classification of the various schools of thought under four heads: Kriyāvāda, Akriyāvāda, Ajñānavāda and Vinayavāda. Here again one can notice the author's omission to refer to Buddha's attitude towards the Kiriya- and the Akiriya-vādins. Following Rhys Davids' lead, he has fallen into the error of looking upon the *Brahmajālasutta* as summarising the 62 non-Buddhistic views (see my paper in the *IIIQ.*, and the *Mahabodhi* 1933). In part III he speaks of some ascetic practices many of which are found mentioned in the Pāli works. The practices do not indicate the existence of separate religious sects as implied in the chapter. They are merely practices restored to by the ascetics of the different orders,—Jaina, Buddhist or Brāhmaṇic. The concluding section treats of the schisms in the Jaina church, and the Jaina criticisms of non-Jaina doctrines. The book is full of valuable information and is a welcome addition to the literature on Jainism.

THE HISTORICAL INSCRIPTIONS OF SOUTHERN INDIA (COLLECTED TILL 1923) AND OUTLINES OF POLITICAL HISTORY, by Robert Sewell, edited for the Madras University by S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar, M.A., HON. PH.D., Madras, 1932.

The book intends to give the chronology of the South Indian History from 250 B.C. to 1876 A.D. It is, in plan, similar to Duff's Chronology, and is evidently a valuable hand-book to the Research students in Indian History. The editor, who is a well known scholar in this particular branch of study, has endeavoured to make improvements on it in the light of the modern researches. The book is not, however, free from errors. The statement that "Khāravēla compelled the Śuīga king Puṣyamitra to make peace" (p. 12) is too wide.

It is erroneous to say that "the Cālukya Maṅgaleśa defeated in 609 A.D. Buddharāja, the Kaḷacuri ruler of Cedi, in the Mahākośala country of Central India." (p. 22). The Mahākūṭa Pillar inscription, dated 602 A.D. (I.A., XIX, 7.), records the defeat of Buddharāja at the hands of Maṅgaleśa. Hence Buddharāja must have suffered that reverse before that date. Buddharāja was the ruler of Malwa, Northern Gujarat, and Lāṭa. Nothing is known about his connection with Mahākośala.

The editor has made an attempt to identify the countries mentioned in the Tirumallai Rock inscription (p. 65). His suggestion leading to the identification of Māsūnideśa with the modern Bastar State does not seem to be at all convincing. The country may be identified with Masulipatam, in the Kistna District, Madras. In the opinion of the editor, Mahīpāla, referred to in the above inscription, is not a proper name, but means only a king who ruled over Oṭṭa or Orissa. The fact that Rājendra Cola's conquest over Oḍra viṣaya is mentioned elsewhere in the same inscription goes against that assumption. Mahīpāla was evidently the Pāla king of the same name, who was a contemporary of Rājendra Cola.

If Indraratha is to be taken as identical with Indravarman of Kalinga, as has been suggested by the editor, Ādinagara should better be identified with Nagara, the ancient capital of Kalinga, the modern Nagarukatakam adjacent to Mukhalingam, 20 miles from Parlakimedi, in the Ganjam District,

Elaborate information regarding the political achievements of the Hoysalas of Dorasamudra is given. But an important event is not mentioned. Sometimes between 1094 and 1100 A.D., the Hoysalas revolted in order to throw off their allegiance to the Cālukyas of Kalyāṇī. Vikramāditya VI despatched an army at the head of the Paramāra Jagaddeva, king of Mālava, to keep the Hoysalas under control. Dorasamudra was besieged by the Cālukyas and the Paramāras. But Ballāle, Viṣṇuvardhana, and Udayāditya, the sons of Eṛeyaṅga, successfully defended their capital, and repulsed the invaders (*EC.*, VI, Pl. No. 45; II, revised edition, No. 349; Jainad ins.).

The errors, referred to, which have probably found their place through inadvertance, however, do not lessen the usefulness of the work, which will render valuable aid to the students of Indian History.

D. C. GANGULY

JAINISM IN NORTH INDIA (800 B.C.-A.C. 526) by Chimanlal Shah. Longmans, Green & Co. 1932. xxiv+292 pp., with 24 illustrations and 2 Maps.....Price £2-2-0.

We greatly appreciate Mr. Shah's efforts to present us with a picture of the career of Jainism in Northern India from the time of the earliest record relating to same up to the 6th century A.C. The book is full of references to the original sources testifying to the writer's industry in the handling of the varied materials composing the account. The author discusses first the thorny question of the antiquity of Jainism and the date of Pārśva. Like other writers on Jainism, he depends here on Jacobi who adduces as one of his principal evidences the mention of *Cātuyāmasaṃvara* in the *Dīgha Nikāya*. This particular piece of evidence, I am afraid, is not very safe for drawing any conclusion. In the first place the date of compilation of the *Dīgha Nikāya* is uncertain. Assuming with Jacobi that it refers to events of the 6th or the 5th century B.C., and that *Cātuyāmasaṃvara* was known to the compiler of the *Sāmañña-phalasutta*, one may still question why he mentions always Nigaṇṭha Nāṭaputta and not Pārśva by name and makes only a passing

reference to the four rules of discipline. It is clear from the Nikāyas that Nigaṇṭha Nāṭaputta was the Jaina Tīrthaṅkara known to the compilers of the Nikāyas, and the practice of nudity among his followers was not also unknown at the time. Nigaṇṭha Nāṭaputta is invariably identified by scholars with Mahāvīra, and in the passage relied on by Jacobi the expression *Cātuyāmasaṃvara* is put in the mouth of Nigaṇṭha Nāṭaputta. Besides this, the interpretation of *Cātuyāma*, as made in the passage, does not express its actual meaning nor has Buddhaghosa clarified it. So what we contend is that Pārśva may have been the original founder of Jainism but this *Cātuyāmasaṃvara* of the *Sīmaññaphala sutta* cannot be used as an evidence for proving the antiquity of Pārśva. Throughout the book it is evident that the author has taken up his pen not as a judge sifting evidences but as an advocate upholding the cause of Jainism, and in places where he found his position weak he quotes a string of names of scholars, most of whom in their turn very likely rely for their knowledge of Jainism on the works of Nahar, Jaini or Stevenson. We wish he had given us in further details the Jaina traditions about Pārśva as this would have convinced us better than trying to merely stating that “three of the greatest writers on *Indian Philosophy* Drs. Belvalkar, Dasgupta and Radhakrishnan—and historians and scholars like Charpentier, Guerinot, Mazumdar, Frazer, Elliot, Poussin and others hold that the Nigranthas existed previous to Mahāvīra”. The most original and by far the best chapter in the book is the one on ‘Mahāvīra and his Times’, covering 65 pages. In it he has given within a short compass the tradition of the growth of the Jaina church, and the essentials of the Jaina doctrine and discipline. Like others, he has been hard upon the Ājīvikas and so upon Dr. Barua for having put in a few good words for this sect, so much caluminatèd in the Jaina and Buddhist works. The fact that the Ājīvikas were recognised as a religious sect in the Jaina and Buddhist literatures, and were found worthy of receiving donations from kings should have received a careful consideration, and the opinions of Hoernle and other European scholars should not have carried him away.

In the next three chapters, the object of the author is to show how

far Jainism enjoyed the patronage of kings and clans of northern India. There are in them many illuminating statements though one must take with caution such remarks as that Cāṅakya was the son of a devout Jaina (p. 131); Aśoka had Jaina leanings in his early life (p. 143); and King Nanda was a Jaina (p. 128). What mars these chapters is the author's love for quotations from other works, and a tendency to digress into the knotty problems of historical names, dates, and dynasties, leaving aside the main theme, e.g., in the 4th chapter he could without, speaking of the historical and chronological bearings of the Hāthigumphā inscription, trace the career of Jainism in Kaliṅgadeśa. The last two chapters, in which he has collected all the information relating to Jainism, derivable from the Mathurā inscriptions and those of the Gupta period, are interesting and valuable. The seventh chapter on the Jaina literature of the north, though a story retold, has its own charms, and we appreciate the author's capacity to put bare facts in an attractive form. The last chapter on Jaina art in northern India is no less interesting but one does not feel satisfied with the scanty details. The author has appended to the work a comprehensive bibliography which would be very useful to any one desiring to have a firsthand acquaintance with the source books. In spite of the material resources of the Jaina community, it is rather strange that the Jaina literature and religion have not received its due attention from the students of Indology—a fact pointed out by Mr. Shah as well as Rev. Heras. The main reason, I think, is the lack of adequate number of organizations to have all the important Jaina texts critically edited and translated into English.

Though we have been constrained to point out a few blemishes, we cannot but praise the author for his excellent work and commend it to the reading public as a reliable history of Jainism. This attempt to present a connected history of Jainism in northern India is the first of its kind and we hope the author will carry on his researches and present us with a similar volume on the history of Jainism in Southern India.

Select Contents of Oriental Journals

Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, vol. VII, pt. i

OTTO STEIN.—*Græco-Indian Notes :*

(1) *Pramnai*. The writer opposes in this Note Barnett's statement that the *Pramnai* mentioned by Strabo as distinct from the Brāhmaṇas signifies the Prājñas, who were so called for their adherence to *prajñā* or intellect. From a comparison of the word *Pramnai* in Strabo with the Greek equivalent for 'Śramaṇa', the writer inclines to the view that *Pramnai* is a corruption of *Sramnai* representing 'Śramaṇa'.

(2) *Kampana*. From the different uses of the word *Kampana* both in literature and inscriptions, it has been surmised that its two meanings viz. 'administrative unity' and 'chief command' have evolved from a common source though independently.

AMARNATH RAY.—*Yogakṣema*. The words Yoga and Kṣema are explained as 'attaining the unattained' and 'maintaining the same' by commentators including Śaṅkarācārya. The writer of this note suggests a new interpretation expounding the expression as *yogesa kṣemaḥ* (what is good among gains) which would thus mean *niḥśreyasa* or the 'summum bonum'.

Half-Yearly Journal of the Mysore University, vol. VI, No. 1

K. SRIPAD RAO.—*On some Stone Implements from South India—II*. The writer describes a few stone implements discovered in Southern India. They have a close resemblance to those belonging to the Mauserian industry of the Continent of Europe. It has been suggested that they mark a culture similar to the Mauserian, though not of the same age.

Indian Antiquary, January, 1933

B. A. SALETORRE.—*Dynastic Continuity in Vijayanagara History*.

DASHARATHA SHARMA.—*Gleanings from Sanskrit Literature*. Extracts

have been made from the works of Vācaspati Miśra (9th century A.C.) to show that they contain facts of social and administrative importance, throwing light on a dark period of Indian History.

Ibid., February, 1933

ANAND KOUL.—*Kashmiri Riddles.*

BISHESHWAR NATH REU.—*Rāo Candrasen, a forgotten Hero of Rājputānā.* It is an account of the career of Rāo Candrasen. Preceding Mahārānā Pratāp by about ten years, Candrasen sacrificed everything to protect the independence of his state against Akbar's attacks and lived a wandering life in the mountains.

V. V. MIRASHI.—*Historical Data in Rājashkhara's Viddhaśālabhañ-jikā.* The play commemorates the victory of the Kalacuri king Yuvarājadeva over the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Buddiḡa Amoghavarṣa III, the son-in-law of Yuvarāja.

Ibid., March, 1933

BISHESHWAR NATH REU.—*Jalor Inscription of the Time of Paramāra Viśala, dated V.S. 1174.* The inscription supplies for the first time the genealogy of the Paramāras who ruled over Jalor.

RICHARD C. TEMPLE.—*Bangal and the City of Bangala.* The writer assert that the site of Varthama's 'City of Bengala' must have been Satgaon on an old bed of the Hugli river.

K. P. JAYASWAL.—*The Vikramkhol Inscription (Sambalpur District).* This is an examination of the inscription leading the writer to conclude that it may be assigned to *circa* 1500 B.C.

Ibid., April, 1933

E. H. JOHNSTON.—*The Gaṇḍīstotra.* The Sanskrit text of this work was recovered by Baron A. Von Stael-Holstein from a transcription in Chinese characters in 1913 (Bibl. B. xv). In this paper Mr. J. has made some emendations in the readings and added an English translation of the text. The text was translated by Fa-T'ien, a monk of Nālandā (10th century A.D.). It was intended for ceremonial recitation. Mr. J. disagrees with the Baron as regards the author-

ship of the *Stotra*, and is not prepared to believe that Aśvaghoṣa of the *Buddhacarita* fame could be its author.

Ibid., May, 1933

- E. H. JOHNSTON.—*Random Notes on the Trivandrum Plays*. The writer inclines to the view that some at least of the Thirteen dramas published from Trivandrum are genuine Bhāsa-plays.

Ibid., June, 1933

- V. V. MIRASHI.—*Historical Data in Padmagupta's Navasahasānkarita*. In this play Padmagupta describes in a romantic setting some incidents in the life of his patron, Sindhurāja.
- E. H. JOHNSTON.—*Random Notes on Trivandrum Plays*. The meanings of some words occurring in the plays attributed to Bhāsa have been determined, and their current interpretations criticised.

Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society, March-June, 1933

- K. P. JAYASWAL.—*History of India, c. 150 A.D. to 350 A.D.* The paper deals with the Nāga-Vakāṭaka Imperial Period dividing it into four parts: (i) India under the Nāga Dynasty (c. 150 A.D.-284 A.D.). (ii) The Vakāṭakas (248 A.D.-550 A.D.). (iii) Magadha (31 B.C. to 340 A.D.) and the Gupta India at 350 A.D. (iv) Southern India (150 A.D.-350 A.D.) and unification of the North and the South.
- J. F. W. JAMES.—*The Skirts of Nanda Devī*.
- A. C. BANERJI.—*Pāli Plates of Govindacandra of Kanauj, 1171 V. S.* The inscription recording the grant of the village of Pāli is the earliest grant of Govindacandradeva as king.

Journal of the Department of Letters (Calcutta University), vol. XXIII, 1933.

- JITENDRA NATH BANERJEA.—*Pratimā-lakṣaṇam*. The Sanskrit text of a work named *Pratimā-lakṣaṇa* is edited here for the first time with English translation, notes, and appendices. It treats of the measurement of Buddhistic images.

MANOMOHAN GHOSH.—*Mahārāṣṭrī, a later Phase of Śāurasenī.* The writer wants to show that the principal Prākṛt dealt with by the writers of the Western school of Indian grammarians and generally identified with Mahārāṣṭrī is really a later phase of Śāurasenī. It is also argued that the so-called Mahārāṣṭrī Prākṛt has nothing to do with the country of Mahārāṣṭra, and that it is Śāurasenī,—only a slightly more developed than the dialect of that name found in the old dramas posterior to Aśvaghoṣa.

GOPAL HALDAR.—*A Skeleton Grammar of the Noakhali Dialect of Bengali.*

Journal of Oriental Research, vol. VI, pt. iv (Oct.-Dec. 1932).

K. A. NILAKANTHA SASTRI.—*The Takua-pa (Siam) Tamil Inscription.*

S. S. SURYANARAYAN SASTRI.—*Vācaspati's Criticism of the Sphoṭavāda.*

The paper explains the doctrine of Sphoṭa together with its full criticism as made by Vācaspati Miśra in his *Tattvabindu* and in the *Devatādhikaraṇa* of his *Bhāmatī*. The advocates of the doctrine maintain that the letters of a word are only the manifestations of the Sphoṭa, a mysterious entity already in existence. Each letter by itself cannot express a sense. The difficulties inherent in this assumption of the existence of the entity within the word have been pointed out by Vācaspati.

T. G. ARAVAMUTHAN.—*The Madurai Chronicles and the Tamil Academies.*

K. A. SUBRAMANYA AIYAR.—*Some more Nyāyas.* Ten 'popular maxims' (Nyūyas) not included in Jacob's well-known compilation *Laukikanyāyāñjali* have been explained here.

V. RAGHAVAN.—*The Vṛttis.* This continued paper deals with the concept of Vṛtti as found in the works of Sanskrit poetics explaining its meaning and nature with the help of the exposition in the *Abhinavabhāratī*, the commentary on Bharata's *Nāṭya-sāstra*.

P. S. SUBRAHMANYA SASTRI.—*History of Grammatical Theories in Tamil and their Relation to the Grammatical Literature in Sanskrit.*

C. SIVARAMAMURTI.—*Painting and allied Arts as revealed in Bāṇas Works.*

Ibid., vol. VII, pt. i (Jan.-March 1933).

- K. A. NILAKANTHA SASTRI.—*The Kodumbālūr Inscription of Vikramakeśari.*
- T. R. CHINTAMANI.—*Some Minor Works of Śrī Citsukhācārya: Adhikaraṇasaṅgati.* Citsukha is known to have commented upon the *Brahmasūtra-bhāṣya* of Śaṅkara. The present treatise *Brahmasūtrādhikaraṇasaṅgati* together with the *Adhikaraṇamañjarī* already edited in the Journal may have been intended as an appendix to the commentary on the *Bhāṣya*.
- C. V. KUMARASWAMI SASTRIAR.—*Rājasekhara—the Dramatist.* Facts have been put forward to show that Rājasekhara lived between 850 and 920 A.C. It has been argued that Kṣemeśvara who is known to be a contemporary of Rājasekhara cannot refer in his drama *Caṇḍakauśika* to Mahīpāla of Bengal who reigned between 974 and 1026 A. C. So Mahīpāla mentioned by Kṣemeśvara cannot but be the king of Kanauj of that name.
- V. RAGHAVAN.—*The Vṛttis.* The paper in this instalment, shows the position of Vṛttis in relation to Rasas and types of dramas and heros.
- P. S. VEDACHALA IYER.—*The Sources of Tolakāppīyam.* The *Tolakāppīyam*, the most ancient grammatical work in Tamil has been shown to have drawn upon a few Tamil and Sanskrit works named in the article.
- C. SIVARAMAMURTI.—*Painting and allied Arts as revealed in Bāṇa's Works.*
- N. AIYASWAMI SASTRI.—*Extracts from Jayānanda's Commentary.* This commentary on the *Madhyamakāvātāra* (chap. vi) is being retranslated into Sanskrit from the Tibetan Version.

Journal of the United Provinces Historical Society, vol. VI, pt. i (Jany., 1933)

- PRAYAG DAYAL.—*Raja Newal Rai of Oudh.* Raja Newal Rai was the Prime Minister of Nawab Mansur Ali Khan Sufdarjang of Oudh. He also served as the Commander-in-Chief of the Nawab's forces and was slain in 1750 A.C. in the battle with Ahmad Khan Bangash.

S. N. DAS GUPTA.—*An Attempt at Genealogy of the Paramāras of Malwa.*

NANDALAL CHATTERJI.—*The Mission of Messrs Amyatt and Hay to Mir Qasim (1763).*

ASHIRAVADI LAL SRIVASTAVA.—*Early Life of Nawab Saadat Khan.*

Journal of Urusvati Himalayan Research Institute, vol. III

N. D. MIRONOV.—*The Prajñāpāramitāhṛdayasūtra as an Inscription.*
A slab of stone containing the shorter text of the *Prajñāpāramitāhṛdayasūtra* inscribed on its four sides has been found by V. Panov in Inner Mongolia. The inscription has been described and analysed in this paper and the text compared with that preserved in the Horiuji Manuscript edited in the *Ancient Palm-leaves* by Max Müller.

Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society, vol. XXIII, No. 2 (Oct., 1932).

N. SUBHA RAO.—*Two Centuries of Wodeyar Rule in Mysore (1565-1761).*

K. NARAYANASWAMI IYER.—*Śrīvidyā.* The paper deals with the Tāntric form of Śakti worship leading to salvation.

A. S. THIYAGARAJU.—*Sumeru-Dravidan Affinities.* It has been shown that the Sumerian roots had cognates or derivatives in the Dravidian languages.

S. SRIKANTHA SASTRI.—*Gautamīputra, Rudradāman and Kanīṣka.* The dates of Gautamīputra and Puṣyamāvi have been assigned respectively to the first and second quarters of the 2nd century A.C. and Puṣyamāvi, Rudradāman and Kanīṣka have been made contemporaries.

ibid., vol. XXIII, No. 3 (Jan., 1933).

A. AIYAPPAU.—*Rock-cut Cave-tombs of Feroke, S. Malabar.*

S. K. GOVINDASWAMI.—*A Chapter of Kadamba History from Tamil Literature.*

K. NARAYANASWAMI IYER.—*Śrīvidyā (concluded).*

S. SRIKANTAYA.—*Heavenly Mansions of the Hindus.*

Review of Philosophy and Religion, March, 1933

MRS. C. A. F. RHYNS DAVIDS.—*Buddhism and Religion.* The contention of the writer is that Man is ever seeking to have, to be, to get a More, the Most being inconceivable and unattainable. "In Buddhism", she says, "we have the More enjoined upon the man to an extent not surpassed in any religion".

Sāhitya Parisat Patrikā, vol. XXXIX, no. iii.

RADHAGOVINDA BASAK.—*Newly discovered old Copper-plate of Paharpur.* It discusses the important features of the record from the standpoint of the social, geographical and political history of Bengal and is accompanied by a Bengali translation and a decipherment of the text of the record in which an attempt is made to correct the readings as given by Mr. K. N. Dikshit in several cases (*Ep. Ind.*, XX, 59ff).

BRAJENDRANATH BANERJI.—*History of Newspapers and Periodicals of Bengal (1835-57).* This third instalment of the paper brings down the history to 1853.

MANINDRAMOHAN BASU.—*Newly discovered Manuscripts containing the Padas of the Śrīkṛṣṇakīrtana.* Herein is published the text of the earlier one of these manuscripts about 150 years old, which contains 16 songs of Caṇḍīdāsa of which 10 are found in the *Śrīkṛṣṇakīrtana* as published by the Vaṅgīya Sāhitya Parisad on the basis of a single MS.

KAMINIKUMAR KARA RAYA.—*Account of Siraṇī and other Rites performed in Muhammadan Families of Mymensingh (Eastern Bengal).*

Ibid., vol. XXXIX, no. iv.

BRAJENDRANATH BANERJI.—*History of Newspapers and Periodicals of Bengal (1835-57).*

CHINTAHARAN CHAKRAVARTI.—*Version of Sanskrit Works in Bengali.* It gives an account of the earlier attempts made for popularising the contents of the different branches of Sanskrit literature through

translations, adaptations and exegetic works in Bengali as well as in various other vernaculars of India. Incidental reference has been made to a few works not included in Long's Descriptive Catalogue of Bengali Books printed during the first half of the 19th century.

JATINDRAMOHAN BHATTACHARYA.—*Earliest Grammar of the English Language written in Bengali.* It gives a detailed description of the *Inglis Darpan* of Ramachandra printed in 1816 at the Hindusthānī Press of Lalbazar, Calcutta.

Tirumalai Sri Venkatesvara, vol. I, No. 5 (Dec. 1932).

V. SANKARA AIYAR.—*Śabdāsāmrajyacakravartin or Pāṇini Ācārya.* The writer dilates upon the greatness of Pāṇini as a grammarian of unsurpassable excellence and points out the ingenious devices introduced in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* to secure brevity of expression.

C. DORAI SWAMI IYENGER.—*Hinduism as followed by the Viśiṣṭādvaitins.*

A. VAIKUNTRAM PANDIT.—*Lord Kṛṣṇa: Statesman, Politician, Philosopher, Artist and Religious Preacher.*

A. PADMANABHIA.—*Early Dravidian Races.* Continued.

P. V. JAGADISA IYER.—*Places of Antiquarian Interest in South India.* Continued.

K. K. KRISHNAMACHARYA.—(1) *A Note on Kumāradāsa and Jānakīharana.*

M. DORASWAMAYYA.—(2) *A Reply.* The two writers differ in their opinions as to the date of Kumāradāsa on the strength of the evidence presented by the archaic style of the poet's *Jānakīharana* as also by the parallelism between this poem and Māgha's *Śīsupālavadha*. Māgha is considered to be earlier than Kumāradāsa by Mr. Krishnamacharya.

Ibid., vol. I, No. 9 (April 1933).

M. RAMAKRISHNA KAVI.—*Vidyādharmacakravartin I.* The paper deals with a Sanskrit prose Ms. called *Gadya-karṇāmṛta* by Kālakalabha or Sukala Vidyādharmacakravartin who wrote under the patronage of Vīranarasimha (13th century A.C.), a Hoysala king of Dora-

·samudra. The historical information supplied by the work is that Vīranaraśimha had to proceed from his capital to South India to help the Cola king Rājarāja who had been taken as captive by a Kāḍava king to Sendamaṅgalam.

M. DORASWAMAYYA.—*Vidyādharaśakravartin II.* This Vidyādhara living in the court of the Hoysala king Bhallāla III (1300—) composed a poem entitled *Rukmiṇīkalyāṇa* and commented upon the *Virūpākṣapañcāśikā*, *Kāvyaṅprakāśa*, *Alaṅkārasarrasra* and *Daśaślokī*. The *Rukmiṇīkalyāṇa* of which a transcript is preserved in the Govt. Oriental Mss. Library, Madras, supplies in its Introduction interesting details about the Hoysala kings from Bhallāla II to Bhallāla III.

Bibliographical Notes

- Indian Culture through the Ages*, vol. II (Public Life and Political Institutions) by S. V. Venkateswara. Madras, 1932.
- An Introduction to Buddhist Esoterism* by Benoytosh Bhattacharyya. London, 1932.
- Ācaśī kasūtra* (pt. ii) with the Nirukti of Bhadrabāhusvāmin and the commentary of Malayagirisūri. Bombay, 1932.
- Āṅguttaranikāya*, vol. II: The Book of the Fours translated by F. L. Woodward. Pali Text Society Translation Series. London, 1933.
- Antagaḍa-dasāo and Anuttaravacaiya-dasāo* edited with notes and glossary by P. L. Vaidya. Poona, 1932.
- Dhyanāloka of Ānandarardhana* (with Locana of Abhinavagupta along with Kaumudī of Uttuṅodaya, Upalocana of Kuppusvāmī Śāstrī) edited by S. Kuppusvami Sastri and T. R. Chintamani. Fasc. I. Madras, 1932.
- History of Indian Philosophy*, vol. VII, pt. i: Mysticism in Māhārāṣṭra by R. D. Ranade. Poona, 1933.
- Philosophy of Hindu Sādhanā* by N. K. Brahma. London, 1932.
- Brahmasūtra* with the Vedānta-Pārijātasaurabha of Nimbārkācārya and the Vedāntakaustubha of Śrīnivāsācārya, Kashi Sanskrit Series, Benares, 1932.
- Bu-ston—History of Buddhism* (Choshbyung), pt. ii translated from the Tibetan by E. Obermiller. Heidelberg, 1933.
- Ancient Monuments of Kashmir* by Ram Chandra Kak. London, 1933.
- Studies in Indian Antiquities* by Hemchandra Raychaudhuri. Calcutta, 1932.
- Aśoka* by D. R. Bhandarkar. Calcutta, 1932.
- Incomparable India: Tradition, Superstition, Truth* by Robert J. Blackham. London, 1933.
- Kundamālā of Dinnāga* edited with a Sanskrit commentary by Jay Chand Sastri, and translated into English with notes by Vedavyasa and S. D. Bhanot. Lahore, 1932.
- Ratnāvalī of Harṣa* (with French translation) by M. Lehot. Paris, 1933.
- Saṅkarapādabhūṣaṇa* (on Śaṅkara's Vedānta) by Raghunātha Parvata edited with a commentary by Sankar Sastri Marulkar and Digambar Sastri Kasikar, pt. i. Poona, 1932.

- Priyañkaraṅpakathā of Munirāja and Upasargaharastotra of Bhadrabāhu Svāmin* edited by H. R. Kapadia. Bombay, 1932.
- Ajñāna* by G. R. Malkani, R. Dass and T. R. V. Murti. Calcutta Oriental Series. Calcutta, 1933.
- Kapiṣṭhala-Kaṭhasamhitā*: A text of the Black Yajurveda edited by Raghuvira. Lahore, 1932.
- Mahākarmaribhaṅga* edited with a French translation by Sylvain Lévi. Paris, 1932.
- Paramārthasāra* with the commentary of Rāghavānanda. Benares, 1932.
- Nirayāvaliyog* (the last five upāṅgas of the Jaina Canon) edited with notes and glossary by P. L. Vaidya. Poona, 1932.
- Le bouddhisme* by Przyluski. Paris, 1933.
- Śabdaratnasamanvayakoṣa* by king Sāhji edited by Vitthalram Lalluram Sastri. Gaekwad's Oriental Series. Baroda, 1932.
- A descriptive Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Tanjore Mahārāja Serfoji's Sarasvatī Mahal Library* by P. P. S. Sastri. vol. XIV, Uttaramīmāṃsā and Avaidika. Srirangam, 1932.
- Sthavirāvalīcarita* (Parīśiṣṭaparvan of the Triṣaṣṭīśalākāpuruṣacarita) by Hemacandra edited by H. Jacobi (2nd ed). Bibliotheca Indica. Calcutta, 1933.
- L'illuminé. La légende du Bouddha of L. Suali* transl. by P. E. Dumont. Paris, 1933.
- Buddhist Remains in Andhra, and Andhra History (225-610 A.D.)* by K. S. Subrahmanya. Madras, 1932.
- Chāndogya and Kauṣītakī Brāhmaṇopaniṣads*, Text and English Transl. with notes in English from the commentaries of Śaṅkarācārya and the gloss of Anandagiri, edited by Roer, Mitra and Cowell. Madras, 1932.
- Buddhist Cave Temples of India* by R. S. Wanchope. Calcutta, 1932.
- Comparative Philology of Indo-Aryan Languages* by R. V. Jahagirdar. Poona, 1932.
- Harivaṃśa of Bharānanda* (Bengali Text) edited with comments by Satis Chandra Ray. Dacca University. Dacca, 1932.
- Die Buddhistische Spätantike in Mittelasien*, vol. 7 (concluding volume) by Albert von Le Coq. Berlin, 1933.
- Brahmasūtra Śaṅkarabhāṣya* (Catuḥ-sūtrī only) with nine commentaries including Bhāmatī, Pañcapādikā and some others published for the first time edited by Ananta Krishna Sastri. Calcutta Sanskrit Series. Calcutta, 1933.
- Kingship through the Ages* by P. S. Ramakrishna Ayyar. Ernakulam, 1933.

- History of Kāmarūpa*, vol. I by Kanak Lal Barua. Shillong, 1933.
- Selections from the Peshwa Daftar* :
- No. 26 Tarabai and Sambhaji ;
- No. 27 Balajirao Peshwa and Events in the North (Supplementary) 1742-1761
- No. 28 Peshwa Balaji—Karnatak Affairs, 1740-1761
- No. 29 Affairs of Northern India—Peshwa Madhavrao I, 1761-1772
- edited by G. S. Sardesai. Govt. Central Press. Bombay, 1933.
- Fall of the Mughal Empire*, vol. I (1739-1754) by Jadunath Sarkar. Calcutta, 1932.
- Studies in Aurangzeb's Reign* by Jadunath Sarkar. Calcutta, 1932.
- Sphuṭārthā Abhidharmakośavyākhyā of Yaśomitra* (Sanskrit text romanised) pt. I edited by U. Wegihara. Yokohama, 1933.
- Vedic Mysticism* (Vedic Text with English Translation) by Raghu Vira. Lahore, 1933.
- The Philosophy of Yoga* by Elizabeth Sharpe, London, 1933.
- A History of Pāli Literature*, vols. I & II by Bimala Churn Law. London, 1933.
- Matiriaux pour l'étude du système Vijñaptimātra* by Sylvain Lévi. Des Hautes Études. Paris, 1933.
- Saddhamma-ppakāsini* (commentary on *Paṭisambhidā Magga*), pt. I edited by C. V. Joshi. Pali Text Society. London, 1933.
- Paṇcasūdanī* (commentary on *Majjhimanikāya*), pt. III edited by J. B. Horner. P.T.S. London, 1933.
- Book of Gradual Sayings* (*Āṅguttaranikāya* translated into English) vol. II by F. L. Woodward. P.T.S. London, 1933.
- Philosophy of Yoga* by E. Bragdon. London, 1933.
- Inni dell' Atharvaveda* translated into Italian with Introduction and Notes by Papesso. Bologna, 1933.
- Shivaji the Great*, vol. I by Bal Krishna. Bombay, 1932.
- Maharana Pratap* by Sri Ram Sharma. Lahore, 1932.
- Maharana Kumbha* by Harbilas Sarda, Ajmere, 1932.
- Origin and Development of Religion in Vedic Literature* by P. S. Deshmukh. London, 1933.
- Die Idee der Schöpfung in der vedischen Literatur* by Carl Anders Scharbau. Stuttgart, 1932.
- Sin and Salvation in early Ṛgveda* by T. N. Siqueira. Mödling, 1933.
- Seals of Ancient Indian Style found at Ur* by C. J. Gadd. London, 1933.

Aryan Vestiges in the Near East of the Second Millenary B.C. by N. D. Mironov. Ariana, 1933.

Indian Women and Art in Life by Kanaiyalal H. Vakil. Bombay, 1933.

Essays on Mogul Art by W. E. Gladstone Solomon. London, 1933.

Etudes D'Orientalisme vols. I, II published by Musée Guimet. Paris, 1932.

Die crsten fünf Āhnikas des Mahābhāṣya: translation and explanation (German) by V. Trapp. Leipzig, 1933.

Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques published by l'Institut Belge des Hautes Etudes Chinoises. Brussels, 1932.

Indo-Tibetica by Giuseppe Tucci. Reale Accademia D'Italia. Rome, 1932.

Triṃśikāvijñapti of Vasubandhu (with the Bhāṣya of Ācārya Sthīramati) translated into German by Hermann Jacobi. Stuttgart, 1932.

Syādvādamañjarī of Malliṣeṇa (with the *Anyayogavyavacchedadvā-triṃśikā* of Hemacandra) edited by A. B. Dhruva. Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series. Poona, 1933.

Nayakumāracarīu of Puṣpadanta (Apabhraṃśa Jain Work of 10th century) edited with notes by Hiralal Jain. Karanja, 1933.

India and Java pt. I (History) by Bijanraj Chatterjee. Second Edition. Calcutta, 1933.

Alexanders Kampf gegen Poros by Bernhard Breloer. Stuttgart, 1933.

Sāṅkhyakārikā (studied in the light of its Chinese Version) by M. Takakusu. Rendered from French into English by S. S. Suryanarayana Sastri. Madras, 1933.

Indexes to the Selections from the Peshwas' Daftar, Nos. 1-25 compiled by G. S. Sardesai. Government Central Press. Bombay, 1933.

Canons of Orissan Architecture by Nirmal Kumar Bose. Calcutta, 1933.

Kālakācāryakathā (Svetāmbara Jain hagiographical work)—text, history, legends and miniature paintings by W. Norman Brown. Smithsonian Institution. Washington, 1933.

History of the Rāṣtrakūṭas (Rāṭhōḍas) by Bisheswar Nath Reu. Jodhpur, 1933.

THE Indian Historical Quarterly

Vol. IX

SEPTEMBER, 1933

No. 3

Malik Ambar : A New Life

Introduction

The sources for the history of Malik Ambar, the famous regent of the Ahmadnagar kingdom (c. 1604-1626), hitherto known are *Tārīkh-i-Fīrishtah*, *Tazkirat-ul-muluk*, *Māsiri-i-Rahimi*, and *Tuzuk-i-Jahāngiri*. Of these the first two stop about 1609, the third shortly after, and the fourth is much too brief. But a detailed contemporary account of Malik Ambar, from the unfriendly pen of an Ādil Shahi partisan, is preserved in Fuzuni Astarābādi's *Fatuhāt-i-Ādil Shāhi*, composed in 1640-1643. British Museum Add. 27, 251 is the only ms. of this work known to exist, while Or. 1390 of the same library is a shortened version of it. I present here a translation of the relevant portions of the former of these two mss. with the folio numbers of the originals within square brackets.

It must be observed that Fuzuni evidently wrote without complete official records before him. Hence, he has made many palpable mistakes, especially about the Maratha names and certain events which are correctly known from the more authentic and earlier official histories of Jahāngir and Shāh Jahān. His account of the Bhātvasi campaign (1624) however, is, the fullest and most satisfactory known to us. For Bijapur affairs and the Ādil Shāhi policy and point of view, he is our best guide for the thirty years following the end of Fīrishtah's history (1609-1639).

Early career of Ambar

[267a] Ambar-jiu was a slave purchased by Khwājah Baghdādi, named Mir Qāsim. Having purchased him in Baghdād, he sold him at Ahmadnagar to Mirak Dabir, better known as Changiz Khān. It is well-known that Mirak Dabir had a thousand purchased slaves, and Ambar-jiu was one of them. When decline overtook the Nizāmshāhi dynasty, Ambar-jiu served this man and that and was content with a small subsistence.

When the Mughal army became triumphant over the kingdoms of Khandesh, Berar and Daulatabad, Ambar entered the service of Ibrahim 'Adil Shah, and for some time held a position under him which was not even the rank of a favoured slave of medium grade. As the disruption of the Nizāmshāhi State daily increased, Abhang Khān Habshī, turning hostile to Bahādur Nizām Shāh, the middle grandson of Burhān Nizām Shāh, became an object of envy to the [other] Abyssinians; Ambar went to Abhang Khān, exerted himself well, and rose to the rank of a commander of 150 horse. In the attack on Ahmadnagar he was a follower of Abhang Khān, [267b] and fought very well. At this time one day, with the help of the troops of the fort, he entered the walls of Ahmadnagar¹ and seemed to be on the point of capturing it. Just then Prince Dāniyāl and Khān-i-Khānān came to Ahmadnagar, and laid siege to that lofty fort. The nobles and soldiers of the Deccan became dispersed, and the country was thrown into disorder. Ambar-jiu with a party frequently roved on the frontiers, punished the highwaymen and thieves, raided on every side, and laid his hands [upon the places,] so that the robbers of that country were hard pressed; they elected to follow him, and [thus] nearly two to three thousand Bedars and leading men of that country gathered under his banners, and he after defeating many refractory men became the master of six elephants and many horses and equipment.

¹ Abhang Khān [misspelt Ātik Kh. in Khān Kh. *Biblio. Indica* ed, iii. 251 et seq], who had set up a puppet Nizām Shāh named Miran Shah 'Ali was induced by Chand Bibī to join her. He cut his way through the Mughal lines and entered Ahmadnagar fort in the night of 21 December 1595. [Full details in *Burhān-i-Māsir*, my Ms. iii. 1430-1434, and more briefly in *Firishtah*, litho, ii. 160].

When, after the conquest of Ahmadnagar [fort], the Mughals engaged in occupying that kingdom, Ambar obstructed many of them and slew and plundered them, being everywhere victorious, till his army grew 7,000 strong and many of the sons of the Nizāmshāhi nobles joined him. In this way he gained control [over the Government] and his affairs daily prospered.

Career of Rāju

At this time there lived a man named Rājah, who was the chief personal servant [*khawās*] of S'ādat Khān². This S'ādat Khān was a slave of [268*a*] Nizām Shāh. When ruin seized the Nizāmshāhi dynasty, S'ādat Khān for five or six years roamed through the hills and places difficult of access, became the owner of some famous forts, used frequently to bar the path of the Mughals, and carry off their elephants and horses. In this way he had acquired much property. The Mughal soldiers used to call him Rāju, and so he became popularly known as Rāju. At this time S'ādat Khān conceived the design of visiting Khān-i-Khānān. As Rāju was trusted by him, he entrusted his all to him and went to interview Khān-i-Khānān. But during this interval, Abhang Khān Habshi enticed Rāju with an offer of peerage and wrote to him, "Fortune has made you a great man. Bring the country into your own possession, and become great. S'ādat Khān was [only] a slave of Nizām Shāh. As he has turned traitor to Nizām Shāh and gone over to the Mughals, do you act bravely, because the reward of fidelity to salt is greatness. Guard carefully the territory and forts now in your hands, and try to increase them."

Rāju acted as suggested by Abhang Khān, and gathered a thousand troopers under him. From one side Ambar-jiu and from the other Rāju engaged in devastating the country of the Mughals; often attacking the Mughals by surprise they slew and plundered them. Day by day the troops and wealth of the two increased. For seven or eight years they thus went on injuring the Mughal army. At last the Mughals made peace with Ambar and kept him friendly by means of promises and assurances. His army now numbered 9,000 troopers.

2 S'ādat Khan—His history is given in *Burhān-i-Māsir*, iii. 1409 et seq.

When he saw the Mughals at peace with him and his kingdom spacious and fertile, he wished to get himself recognised as a vassal of the Emperor Akbar. Sending a man he secured a safe-conduct from Khān-i-Khānān and saw him. Khān-i-Khānān welcomed him with honour, embraced him, and gladdened him with an audience of the Emperor Akbar³. Returning from that place, Ambar caused the territory in his possession to be cultivated and reassured the peasants, and the peasants in a few days came to enjoy ease.

But Rāju with 7 or 8 thousand horse frequently attacked the Mughal troops from different sides and plundered them; the country in the possession of the Mughals [269 a] was desolated. At last Prince Dāniyāl sent a man with a letter to Rāju challenging him to an open and stand-up fight. Rāju declined. At last the Prince had no help but to make an agreement with him that he [Rāju] should let the country be cultivated, the revenue being shared in equal halves [269 b] between the two parties. So, two collectors were stationed in each village, one on behalf of Rāju and one on that of the Mughals, dividing the revenue collected.

But the *qasha* of Patan was not included in this treaty; it was extremely well populated and prosperous and inhabited by rich traders. Rāju sent his men there and demanded a loan of 30,000 *hun* from them, but they, emboldened by the support of Mughal troops, refused. When Rāju's men returned disappointed and reported to him the reply of the traders, Rāju arrived from a distance of ten *gāri* [about 80 miles], laid siege to Patan, captured all the traders, took from them 3 or 4 lakhs of *hun*, and returned to his original station. Thereafter wherever his men went they returned after gaining their object. Finally his troops left him on account of his bad behaviour and violation of the honour [*i.e.* women] of the people, and went to Ambar-jiu, who honourably welcomed them, gave robes of honour, salary, and jagir to each according to his status, and made them his devoted servants by his good treatment.

³ Ambar's interview with Akbar is not mentioned in any history of that monarch, and appears to me to be a mere legend.

Ambar sets up a king

Then Ambar sent an army into Rāju's country, laid siege to the fort which contained the treasure of S'adat Khān, and captured it in a short time. He searched for a prince of the Nizāmshāhi dynasty, to place over his head as master, [270 a] so that the populace might agree to obey him. The son's son of old Burhān Shāh, named Shāh 'Alī, who was confined in fort Bijapur, one day disappeared. Evidently 'Adil Shāh had deliberately set him free, as a stroke of policy. He went to fort Parenda and was living there. Malik Ambar repeatedly sent him letters inviting him, but he had no trust in Ambar, nor in his word. When a long time had passed in this way, Ambar took oaths and vows, gave the prince the royal umbrella, brought him out of the fort, and treated him with every kind of respect and honour in the manner of sovereigns. From this act, a new splendour appeared in the kingdom and the State, and many rebels again became obedient to him. Rāju, too, took an assurance of safety from Nizām Shāh, presented three elephants, nine horses and other gifts and 40,000 *han* as his *peshkash*, and served standing behind Nizām Shāh like a *khawās* with a napkin in his hand, for some days. Thereafter with the king's leave he went back to his place, and his troops leaving him came to Nizām Shāh, [270 b] and complained against him. Ambar, regarding this event as a good opportunity, seduced Rāju's troops from his side by money force and friendly overtures. When Rāju learnt that his troops had turned away from him and the garrisons of his forts too would soon go over to the side of the king and surrender their forts, he took new assurances of safety and came to the royal presence. Ambar seized and imprisoned him, and escheated to the State all his horses, elephants and other property.

Then he posted an army on the frontier of the Mughals. Although the Mughals talked of friendship and peace with Ambar, they were at heart planning to ruin him, because he had got in his hands a [Nizām Shāhi] prince, cherished other designs in his mind, and had assembled a countless force and formed connections with the slaves of 'Adil Shāh and was aspiring to supremacy. But Ambar behaved to the populace with justice, kept the soldiers and cultivators pleased with himself, and breathed friendship towards Khān-i-Khānān.

Ambar courts 'Adil Shāh's support

He sent many petitions to 'Adil Shāh, who was inclined to please him and set himself to cherish him [271 a] because of Ambar's bravery and the battles he had fought with the Mughals. Every desire that Ambar had was fulfilled, even to the extent of his sending a man and asking for the fort of Qandahar, which had belonged to Nizām Shāh in olden times but had fallen into the hands of 'Adil Shāh's troops, during the revolution caused by the Mughals, saying, "It is my design to fight the Mughal troops so long as life remains in this body. It may be that through Your Majesty's daily increasing fortune I shall expel the Mughals from the Deccan. But I have no place where I can deposit my children with composure of mind before engaging the enemy. It would not be far from your royal grace to grant me the fort of Qandahar, which your officers have captured again after the olden times."

'Adil Shāh granted the prayer, and gave him that fort. When Ambar got possession of Qandahar, a new splendour and strength was gained by him, and his power daily increased. When Emperor Jahāngir recalled Khān-i-Khānān in displeasure, Ambar seized the opportunity, sent a force, captured the fort of Āntur, and put all its Mughal garrison to the sword. This feat [271 b] made him the bolder in slaying Mughals. He planned to enter 'Adil Shāh's service and fight the Mughals day and night. He sent a man begging that 'Adil Shāh would accept his son, named Fath Khān, as his slave and marry him to one of the children of his slaves. 'Adil Shāh gave the daughter of Yāqut Khān in marriage to Ambar's son 'Aziz Malik, better known as Fath Khān. This Yāqut Khān was an officer enjoying the highest confidence of the king, who gave the bride's dowry out of his own treasury. . . . Twenty thousand *han* was spent in fireworks. The celebrations lasted for forty days. . . . On 5th February, 1609, Ambar's son started with the *doli* (litter) of his bride towards Junnar, which was then the capital of Nizām Shāh.

Jahāngir after his accession placed the Deccan in charge of Khān-i-Khānān. Ambar daily ascended higher on the steps of prosperity and power and asserted his superiority over the rulers of the

neighbourhood. On the one hand, he professed cordiality towards Khān-i-Khānān and behaved in a friendly manner to the Mughal army. On the other side, he acted like a servant to Ibrahim 'Ādil Shāh. But all this was a mere show and intended for deception. It was the desire of Ambar-jiu that, as the Mughal troops used to come repeatedly to Balaghat and ravage Daulatabad and its dependencies, and the Maratha troops used to [273 a] enter Berar and Khandesh and desolate the country, and this had happened again and again and the peasants had been mostly ruined, they should gain repose for a few days. The nobles of the house of Nizām Shāh, each of whom considered himself as the equal of Ambar, nay even higher, and who were jealous of him, were on the watch to overthrow him and preferred discord to co-operation with him.

Khān-i-Khānān Abdur Rahim Khān's campaigns

At this time Jahāngir succeeded Akbar on the throne of Delhi. The Commander-in-Chief [Khān-i-Khānān] first reduced the rebels of Khandesh and Berar and gave an army to his son Mirza Irij. [273b] Jahāngir's intention was that the entire Deccan should be conquered by the Mughals in this way. When that was not accomplished, he in anger recalled Khān-i-Khānān.

After he had reached the imperial Court, he was again sent to the Deccan, on promising to conquer the Deccan up to Setpur [Setubandh] and Rameshwar. He arrived on the bank of the Narmada with an immense force and unheard-of-before pomp. [274a]. After a week's halt there, he crossed the Narmada, took over charge from Prince Parviz, and engaged in his work as *subahdar* of the Deccan. Reinforcements frequently reached him, such as Rājah Mān Singh, Amir-ul-umara Sharif Khān, Asaf Khān.....besides Hindu Afghan and other nobles of Khandesh.

With this host Khān-i-Khānān set out for the conquest of the Deccan, and Nizām Shāh too ordered the nobles of the Deccan to follow guerilla tactics in their customary manner, act as a door-guarding force, and close the path of food supplies to the Mughals. It was done. The Maratha troops day and night engaged in roving round the Mughal camp [274b.] The Mughal troops were so hard pressed that they

agreed to escape with their lives, because all night guns, muskets and rockets were fired on them and night-attacks were delivered. Six months passed in this distress and from hunger and famine no strength was left in any man or beast. The Nawab [Khān-i-Khānān] made them rove around the Nizām Shāhi kingdom and himself shared their hardship. He wished to pass the rainy season even in thus campaigning.

[275a] The nobles wrote to Jahāngir that Khān-i-Khānān was in collusion with Ambar-jiu, who used to pay him one-third of the revenue of the Nizām Shāhi kingdom.....

Jahāngir conferred the *subahdari* of the Deccan on Irij Khān with the title of Shāh Nawāz Khān and sent him there. Shāh Nawāz arrived from Agra on the bank of the Narmada.

[275b] Thence he advanced to his father and saw the prince; took leave of the prince and proceeded on to the conquest of the Deccan, arriving at Jālna. Hearing this alarming news, Ambar-jiu and Nizām Shāh summoned their army chiefs, appointed Ikhlas Khān as commander-in-chief, and sent him off with Jādu Rao, Adam Khān, Atash Khān, Mahaldar Khān, Bābājiu Kante, Bhonslé,⁴ Udajiram, Pesh-rau Khān and other nobles of the Deccan and of the Maratha race under him. These sat down before the Mughal army. Shāh Nawāz Khān, on his side, held a consultation with his officers and followed their advice. But the Nizām Shāhi nobles were always

4 The text has simply *Bhonslé* without the proper name, but a marginal addition gives *Shahji*. This I believe is incorrect, because the absolutely contemporary *Tuzuk-i-Jahāngiri* does not mention *Shahji* among the Maratha deserters from the Nizām Shāhi army; and indeed his name does not occur even once in this book or in its continuation in the *Iqbalnamah*. When Fuzuni wrote, in 1640, *Shahji* was by far the most important *Bhonslé* chief under Bijapur and our author (a newcomer from Persia) unsuspectingly placed him among the Maratha leaders of 1614. He makes a similar confusion on folio 350b, where he says that in 1636 "Bābāji Kāté had set up a boy as Nizām Shāh in the fort of Junnar and collected a vast army; Khān-i-Daurān, appointed by Shāh Jahān, took that fort from him and he [Bābāji] went away in order to enter the service of 'Adil Shāh.'"

Here there are three gross mistakes in one sentence. The king-maker in 1636 was *Shahji Bhonslé* and not *Bābāji Kāté* who had died before 1616, [*Vide Tuzuk*, Sayyid Ahmad's ed. i. 197, misspelt as *Bābu Rāi Kāyeth*.] The fort where the king-maker was forced to capitulate was *Mahuli* and not *Junnar*, and the successful Mughal general was named *Khān-i-Zamān* and not *Khān-i-Daurān*. [*Vide Abdul Hamid's Padishahnamah*, I.B. 225-230.]

discontented with Ambar-jiu, and in this campaign many of them turned away from him, [276a] put their commander Ikhlas Khān under surveillance, and sent a petition to Nizām Shāh, to this purport, "Hail, King of the Deccan Ambar-jiu is a brother like us. Leave the work of regency and premiership to anyone whom the army may desire. He too [i.e. Ambar] should be employed in the service of the Court like us."

They also wrote letters to Prince Parviz and Khān-i-Khānān and by the advice of Shāh Nawāz Khān demanded safe-assurances. The prince gave the assurance and appointed everyone of them to a *mansab*, giving them salary and *jāgir*⁵.

On seeing this, Ambar appealed to 'Ādil Shāh to send Mullā Bābā, better known as Mullā Muhammad Lāri, as envoy to recall the mutinous soldiers to their duty. [276b] Ibrahim 'Ādil Shāh agreed and sent Mullā Muhammad with many nobles and troops to Khirki, to see and advise Malik Ambar. After consultation it was agreed that Mullā Muhammad should go and conciliate the mutineers. The Mullā placed his army and camp under Muhammad Āmin surnamed Mustafa Khān, his son-in-law and nephew [lit., what 'Āli was to the Prophet.]

[277a] Mullā Muhammad Lāri came to the Deccani army and saw its affairs in confusion. After some discussion, the Habshi nobles placed him also under surveillance.

Mirzā Irij used to treat Mullā Muhammad very respectfully and designate him in his letters as uncle (*'ammu-jiu*). Ambar, accusing the Mullā of collusion with the Mughals, induced 'Ādil Shāh to

⁵ Nizām Shāhi deserters to the Mughals.—*Tuzuk*, i. 153 and 197, gives the following account of them:—A number of leading *sardārs* and a body of *bargis*, displeased with Ambar, came and saw Shāh Nawāz Khān [the son and vanguard-leader of Khān-i-Khānān, 'Abdur Rahim Khān] who enlisted them.....They were Ādam Khān, Habshi, Yaqut Khan, as well as the *bargis* Jādu Rāi and Bābu Kāte (or Kāyeth), Udārām Brāhman. With their help Shāh Nawāz Khān defeated Ambar and sacked his capital Khirki in 1614. But after the defeat of Ambar, they through the allurements of 'Ādil Shāh and the deception of Ambar gave up Mughal service. Ambar lured Ādam Khan into his hands and finally killed him. Bābu Rāi and Udārām fled to Bijapur, where they were refused shelter. In a few days Bābu Rāi died through the treachery of one of his kinsmen (lit., acquaintances). Udārām re-entered Mughal service (1616).

recall him. On his return to Court, he fell under 'Adil Shāh's displeasure [277b] and was deprived of his *jāgirs* for two years, as Ibrahim was bent upon humouring Ambar.

The Mughals defeat Ambar, 1614

The Habshi nobles daily urged Shāh Nawāz Khān to attack Ambar. Prince Parviz did not send him the promised reinforcements, and Khān-i-Khānan only shilly-shallied and wasted his time without doing anything or giving a definite answer; so [the Mughal troops] said, "Khān-i-Khānan is giving us up to slaughter." As Mughal reinforcements delayed in coming, while Ambar's army daily arrived and fought while fleeing, it became necessary for Shāh Nawāz Khān to encounter Malik Ambar⁶. With the Habshi nobles and the Mughal army he marched to the bank of the river of Patan. Every day Ambar's nobles used to come and fight like *bargis* [278a] and great battles took place. Spies reported to the Mughal general that Ambar himself was coming with 40,000 horse, while the Mughal fighting force did not amount to 10,000.

[278b] The Mughals took post in a village encircled by the river of Patan, with a deep ditch in front, behind which they planted their artillery. Next day Ambar appeared. His squadron of youths [*bachgān* i.e., pages], ten thousand Habshis, of the age of 17 or 18, mounted on Persian horses, charged from the front of Ambar. They were caught by the deep ditch and could [279a] neither advance nor retreat, being huddled together as if they had been chained. In this position they were mown down by the Mughal artillery, like leaves of trees under a destroying wind.....

6 Shāh Nawāz Khān defeats Ambar.—With the newly arrived Nizam Shahi deserters, Shāh Nawāz Khān marched from Bālāpur against Ambar. On the way he encountered and dispersed a Deccani detachment under Mahaldār, Dānish, Dilāwwar, Bijli, Firuz and some other sardars and moved towards Ambar's encampment. Ambar advanced to the encounter, only 5 or 6 *kos* intervening between the two armies. The battle was fought on Sunday 25th Bahman. Ambar was defeated and fled away under cover of the darkness of night. The Mughals after pursuing him for 2 or 3 *kos* had to give it up through exhaustion. They next burnt Khirki and returned by the Rohankheda pass. [*Tuzuk*, i. 153-154.]

The right and left wings of Ambar fled away of themselves, due to their dissension with him. The Mughals then advanced to the attack, slaying many of his slaves.

A great defeat and flight fell on Ambar's army. They were pursued for nearly one *farsakh* and their property plundered. So many elephants horses and other kinds of property fell into the hands of the Mughal troops that they became rich.. ..

[279b] Shāh Nawāz Khān fired and totally desolated the country from the bank of Patan to Khirki. The houses of Ambar were not allowed to be ravaged, but in the city of Khirki the devastation went beyond all limits. Ambar took refuge in Daulatabad fort.

[280a] Peace was now made on condition of the Deccani Sultans paying 12 lakhs of *hun* to the prince, the nobles and Shāh Nawāz Khān. The Mughal generals retired to their stations.

Shāh Jahān's campaign in the Deccan.

[282a] Khān-i-Khānān, in concert with Khurram, in order to bring that prince to the Deccan [and kill Khusrau], sent a man to Ambar-jiu telling him to totally ravage all the country from the bank of the Narmada to the frontier of the Nizām Shāhi kingdom. Ambar-jiu sent Mahaldār Khān with 20,000 horse [282b], who ravaged Khandesh and Berar and expelled the Mughal officers from their outposts. Khān-i-Khānān repeatedly wrote to the Emperor that unless a prince was sent to the Deccan the situation could not be saved. Jahāngir, pleased with Khurram's speedy termination of the campaign against the Rana,.....[283a] ordered Khurram to the Deccan. That prince declined as he was not in composure of mind about Khusrau who was detained in Court. Six months passed in these discussions. At last the Emperor agreed to all the demands of Khurram.

[283b] Khurram came to Burhānpur. Negotiations were opened with Ambar-jiu, who made peace [284a] by restoring all the Mughal *thānahs* (outposts).

[284b-286] Shāh Jahān rebelled, Parviz was sent to the Deccan.

Adil Shāh quarrels with Ambar, 1624

[287a] At this time 'Adil Shāh was extremely displeased on account of Ambarjiu's bad behaviour and inordinate pride and insolence. Parviz, before marching away to Allahabad, sought the friendship of 'Adil Shāh with many gifts. 'Adil Shāh took this opportunity and sent his confidential [288a] envoy Mullā Muhammad Iāri to Prince Parviz, at Nalcha, a dependency of Mandu. The prince highly honoured him, halted three days there for his sake, and placed all the Mughal nobles [of the Deccan army] under his orders,—such as Khwajah Abul Hasan *alias* Lashkar Khān, Sipahdār Khān, Maghrur Khān, Jānsipār Khān, Mirzā Minuchihr, daughter's son to Khān-i-Khānan, Shaikh Nasrullah, Muhammad Husain Khalf,⁷ Mirak Husain Khāfi, and other Habshi and Maratha commanders, [288b] who had deserted from Ambar to the Mughal side, such as Mahaldar Khān, Jādu Rao, Adam Khān, Shāhjiu Bhonslé, Bābājiu Kānté. This body used to say, "Where can Ambar flee away from us? We shall bring him away mounted on a *kalka* [male buffalo],"—which was an expression describing the greatest disgrace that can be inflicted on a man in the Deccan.

Prince Parviz, after despatching this army towards the Deccan, himself started for Allahabad. On hearing this alarming news, the mind of Ambar-jiu was greatly perturbed, and he wrote repeated letters to 'Adil Shāh begging him to recall Mullā Muhammad as there was a settled peace between 'Adil Shāh and himself. But Ibrahim did not at all agree. So, Ambar had no other remedy left to him. He led an army against Golconda and realised the fixed tribute from its sovereign. Turning back thence, he set out to ravage Nauras [-pur]. 'Adil Shāh returned from Nauras to Bijapur, in order to take advantage of the auspicious fact that whenever an enemy had attacked Bijapur city the 'Adil Shāhis had always gained the victory. Ambar halted for a few days at Nauras and sought to make peace, but without success. An epidemic broke out among the horses of his army, and in one night

⁷ *Khalf* looks like a title. But the reading of f. 291b may justify a re-arrangement of the words here, so as to make the passage mean 'Md. Husain the son (*khalf*) of Shaikh Nasrullah.'

[289a] five hundred of his horses died. Just then it was reported that Mullā Muhammad Lāri with the Mughal troops had arrived.

Bhatvadi campaign, 1624

Ambar marched away towards his own dominions. 'Adil Shāh sent a large force under Ikhlās Khān Habshi on the heels of Ambar, with Ankas Khān, Ambar Khān ['Adil Shāhi], Farhād Khān, Khairāt Khān, Yāqut Khān Sharza, and Randaulah Khān,—so that this army [advanced] from the front and Mullā Muhammad from behind. 'Ambar seeing himself surrounded by the tempest of calamity, left the road and with a few soldiers entered the strong fort of Bhatvadi, and gave repose to his soldiers. By [letting out] the water of the lake of Bhatvadi, he barred the path before the Mughal army; the abundance of mud and mire weakened the Mughal army, and though his own men were fewer, his heart remained confident in reliance upon God.

When Ambar fled into a nook, the Mughal army under Mullā Muhammad arrived near Bijapur. 'Adil Shāh sent special robes of honour to Ikhlās Khān Habshi and two or three other nobles. At this the Mughal peers became very much dissatisfied. Though Mullā Muhammad wrote to 'Adil Shāh [to honour the Mughal generals similarly], he did not show this favour. This was the beginning of the alienation of the Mughal troops.

In short, Ambar fled away and the armies of the three kings came up pursuing him.

[289b] The rainy season invested the ground with the mantle of water; the excess of mud and rain weakened both the armies. Scarcity of food reached an extreme point in the camps of the Mughals and 'Adil Shāh. For two or three nights together the quadrupeds did not get any fodder; what could the men get? Things came to such a pass that strength for movement was not left in the bodies of men or beasts. At Mullā Muhammad's request, 'Adil Shāh sent treasure and provisions, but the convoy after arriving near the frontier durst not proceed further in fear of Ambar's troops. At this time, as in the Mughal army the soldiers did not get their pay and there was no food, many went over to Ambar-jiu, who welcomed, honoured and fed them and took them into his service. At the report of this good treatment by Malik Ambar,

many Mughal and 'Adil Shāhi soldiers fled away at night to him and were cherished there, till it even happened that once a detachment of Ambar's troops, ten thousand horsemen strong, issued from their post, delivered a night attack on the Mughal camp, and [290a] came back to their place in the morning. This occurred repeatedly. Terror of Ambar's army seized the hearts of his enemies' troops, they spent their nights without sleep and their days without repose. Matters at last came to such a pass, that when Mullā Muhammad ordered any officer to go out and escort the treasure and provisions, nobody would agree to it in terror. At last he sent Muhammad Amin Mustafa Khān on this task, in spite of the latter's warning that it was inexpedient to weaken himself by sending away this general from his camp at that time, though personally he had no objection to going out. Mustafa left the camp with the household cavalry (*Khūsa khel*), went where the treasure and provisions were, and brought them a few marches towards the camp.

[290b] Ambar's strength daily increased and that of the Mughals decreased, till at last he gave up night attacks and began to wage battles by day. On many days, coming from one side he would plunder and slay a party and go back. As only two or three *kos* separated the rival camps, this side attacked that or that side this. At last Ambar planted his own tent and the Nizām Shāhi royal standard (*nah-gazi*) in front of the Mughal army with great pomp and demonstration. The Mughal army was labouring under several difficulties from which Ambar's men were free: famine and hunger, disunion, two hearts, two languages, excess of rain,—these ruined them.

Battle of Bhatvadi⁸

One day, when all felt crushed, Mullā Muhammad was in the tent of Sipāhdār Khān and complained against certain men. Sipāhdār

⁸ Bhatvadi.—According to the Marathi *Jedhe Shukavali*, the battle took place in October 1624. M'utamad Khan in *Iqbalnāmah*, pp. 236-237 thus describes the battle:—One day, while the imperialists were negligent and thought that he would not fight that day, Ambar appeared on the edge of their camp. Some [of his troops] sallied forth with the *barji* design, but fled away on seeing a superior force. Then fighting ensued between 'Adil Shāh's troops and Ambar. By chance, Mullā Md. Lāri, the commander of the 'Adil Shāhi

Khān replied, "Nawāb! We are soldiers, we do not fear fighting or retreat. I do not find the condition of this army at all good. It is only two or three *kos* from here to Ahmadnagar. Come with us, so that we may go to that lofty fort." Mullā Muhammad replied, "Certain things have made me believe that I shall have to go to the city of martyrs (i.e., of men slain in battle.)"

[291a] Then was set up the Adil Shāhi standard (*nah-gazl*) and a man sent by Ikhlās Khān came to call Mullā Muhammad. Although Sipāhdār Khān dissuaded him, he did not listen but went to Ikhlās Khān. Sipāhdār Khān at that moment started for Ahmadnagar like a brave soldier. When Mullā Muhammad arrived near Ikhlās Khān he found the army scattered and broken and every man left to his own fate. [The enemy] having drawn their swords were slaying and plundering vast numbers.

At this time Ikhlās Khān sent Yāqut Khān Sharza to Ambar to demand safe assurances. Mullā Muhammad told Ikhlās Khān, "You have summoned me in order that we might fight the enemy, and now you are asking us to capitulate!" Ikhlās Khān retorted, "You have ruined the State of our sovereign, and you do not now consent even to our asking for assurances of safety!" At this speech Mullā Muhammad, becoming weary of the world (*ba-kūr-i-khud dar mānda shuda*), forbade any one to follow him [into the battle]. But three or four men among his near ones took the road with him. Some troopers came up from behind Mullā Muhammad and slew that experienced minister. It was not learnt to what tribe these men belonged; but every one formed his own guess. Some said that the deed was done at the instigation of Ikhlās Khān.

army, was slain, and his fall destroyed the union and order of the Bijapur troops. Jādu Rāi and Udārām, without fighting, fled away. A great defeat fell on the army, through the shameful conduct of the Deccanis. Ikhlās Khān and others, 25 commanders of 'Adil Shāh, were taken prisoner. Out of them Farhād Khān was slain by order of Ambar. Among the imperialists, Lashkar Khān, Mirza Minuchihir and 'Aqidat Khān were captured. Khanjar Khān rapidly betook himself to Ahmadnagar. Others who escaped fled, some to Bir, some to Burhānpur, and some to Ahmadnagar.

Md. Hādi's *Takmila* (Sayyid Ahmad's ed., 392) gives almost the same account but in a more correct form.

[291b] A great disgrace fell upon the armies of the three [allied] kings. The army commanders were as follows: in the Mughal force under Mullā Muhammad Lāri were Khwajah Abul Hasan surnamed Lashkar Khān, Sipāhdār Khān, Jānsipār Khān, Maghrur Khān, 'Aqidat Khān, 'Ali Khān Niāzi, Mirzā Minuchihr, Mirzā Mirak Husain Khāfi, Muhammad Husain Khalf, Shaikh Nasrullah, etc.; among the nobles who had deserted Nizām Shāh for the Mughals and whom Parviz had sent to assist his Mughal detachment, were Jādu Rao Atish Khān, Mahaldār Khān, Adam Khān, Bābājiu Kāté, Shāhjiu Bhonslé; among the 'Adil Shāhi nobles under Ikhlās Khān were [besides] Ikhlās Khān, 'Ambar Khān, Yāqut Khān Sharza, Khairāt Khān, Farhād Khān, Randaula Khān, Aikas Khān, Peshjang Khān, Khudawand Khān, Rustam Rao, Amin Rao, Dilāwar Khān, and Hamid Khān; these men used often to speak of Ambar in terms of ridicule, and yet in a short time some of them were slain, some taken prisoner, some put to flight.

Many of these high grāndees were taken prisoner. It is called the battle of Bhatvadi.

[292a] Malik Ambar, swollen to greatness by this victory, from an ant into a snake, and enriched with wealth exceeding the treasures of Corah, and troops numerous beyond imagination,—laid siege to Sholāpur. When he brought the 'Malik Maidan' gun there, the garrison capitulated [on 15 June, 1625].

[292b] Two years after this Ambar died.

JADUNATH SARKAR

Pāñcarātra and the Upaniṣads

Broadly speaking, three different stages may be traced in the development of the philosophy of Pāñcarātra, coincident with three different stages in its historic career. Of the first stage, in its twofold aspect—historic and philosophic—we have very little information. During this phase, monotheistic religion called Bhāgavata or Pāñcarātra¹ was founded by Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva, belonging to the Sātvata sept of the Outland Yādava tribe (Grierson's *Nārāyaṇī and the Bhāgavatas*, p. 3; Bhandarkar's *Report on the Search for Sanskrit Manuscripts*, pp. 72-74; Grierson's *Monotheistic Religion of Ancient India*, p. 6). Vāsudeva called the object of his worship Bhagavat. He taught that the Supreme Being was eternal, infinite, and full of grace, and that salvation consisted in a life of perpetual bliss near the Lord. Before the fourth century B.C., the founder of this religion, as in the case of Buddhism and Jainism, was deified, and under his patronymic of Vāsudeva became identified with Bhagavat (see *ERE.*, II, pp. 540-41; Garbe's *Philosophy of Ancient India*, pp. 18, 83-85). During this phase in its career, Pāñcarātra entered into an alliance with ancient Sāṃkhya-Yoga, quite in keeping with the manifest tendency of India to combine religion with philosophy (Garbe's *Bhagavad-Gītā*, p. 28). This period was also marked by the absorption of the cult of Nārāyaṇa into the church of Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva (*ERE.*, II, p. 541). During the second stage, about the third century B.C., Pāñcarātra came into contact with Brahmaism of the Midland (*IA.*, 1908, p. 257). The life and death struggle between the Brahmans and the Buddhists was the immediate cause of this fusion (Garbe's *Bhagavad-Gītā*, p. 35). In their warfare against the Buddhists, the Brahmans won over the Bhāgavatas as their allies. Once thus brought in touch with Brahmaism, Bhāgavatism became a cult of Brahmaised anti-Brahmaists (Grierson's *Nārāyaṇīya and the Bhāgavatas*, p. 7.). The *Bhagavad-Gītā* bears witness to the compromise thus arrived at between Brahmaism and Bhāgvatism. The

1 In a wider or generic sense Pāñcarātra and Bhāgavata are treated as equivalent terms, but strictly speaking, they are different (for separate identities, see Bāṇa's *Huṣa-carita*, transl., VIII, p. 236).

syncretic character of the *Bhagavad-Gītā*, to a great extent, justifies the remark of Hopkins that it is a Kṛṣṇaite version of a Viṣṇuite poem (see Hopkins, *Religions of India*, p. 389). In it, Vāsudeva, the founder of Bhāgavatism, was identified with Viṣṇu (XI, 24, XI, 30), and Kṛṣṇa, the personal name of Vāsudeva, was given admission into the circle of Brahmanical gods as an incarnation of Viṣṇu. Thus the outcome of the rapprochement was the identification of Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva with Viṣṇu, and the confession by Brahmaism of the religious orthodoxy of Bhāgavatism (Grierson's *Monotheistic Religion of Ancient India*, p. 8). One of the effects of the identification was that the object of worship became farther removed from devotees. So a craving was necessarily felt by the latter for a personal object of adoration. The Bhāgavata doctors had, therefore, to supply some connecting link between the worshipper and the worshipped. At this stage, two things² were resorted to; one was the theory of Vyūhas or conditioned spirit (*Mbh.*, XII, 340-36-40); and the other was the doctrine of incarnations (*Mbh.*, XII, 340-73-87, 99-100). The Nārāyaṇīya section of the Śānti-Parva of the *Mahābhārata* (XII, 335-352) is the oldest religious literature of these semi-Brahmaised Bhāgavatas. During the third phase, Pāñcarātra transformed itself into Viṣṇuism (Radhakrishnan, *Indian Philosophy*, I, p. 489). This period synchronises with the rise of some of the earliest Saṃhitās, which, in the matter of practice, constitute the Kalpasūtras, as it were, of the Vaiṣṇavas. This period was characterised by the rise of the cult of Śrī or Lakṣmī, who typifies the activity of Viṣṇu or Vāsudeva in finite existence. At this stage, Viṣṇu is the usual designation of the Supreme, although Viṣṇu and Vāsudeva were treated as identical (see *CII.*, III, pp. 56 ff., 269 ff., etc.). Epigraphic records of the imperial Guptas, show the growing popularity of Avatāras, in preference to Vyūhas (see *CII.*, III, pp. 56 ff., 158 ff., etc.). This is also one of the characteristic signs of the transformation of Bhāgavatism into Viṣṇuism.

² It is difficult to say whether the doctrine of Vyūhas was native to the Pāñcarātras. Patañjali's Sūtra on Pāṇini (VI. 3. 6) probably refers to the said doctrine. Dr. Bhandarkar doubts it (*Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism*, p. 13). The principle of Avatāra, however, underlies primitive Aryan thought. (J. Hertel's *Die Sonne und Mitra*, pp. 69 and 79); but it cannot be determined with certainty whether the Pāñcarātra in its inception fell back upon that doctrine.

During this time, there was further augmentation of schemas or devices. God, at this stage, has assumed five forms, viz : , Para, Vyūha, Vibhava, Antaryāmin, and Arcā, for the purpose of meditation, more than for anything else (see *Viṣvaṁsena Saṁhitā*, pp. 122 ff.; *Ahīrbudhnya Saṁhitā*, X, 2 ff., etc.).

The Pāñcarātra, as stated above, entered into an alliance with Brahmaism of the Midland during the second stage in its evolution. This alliance was mutually beneficial. One dominant characteristic of Brahmaism is that it has always exercised a sort of magnetic influence upon all the neighbouring religions; naturally and necessarily would it therefore exercise a far greater influence upon a religion that had chance to come under its sway. Once thus brought in touch with Brahmaism of the Midland, Pāñcarātra became a cult of Brahmaised anti-Brahmaists (*Nārāyaṇīya and the Bhāgaratas*, p. 7). Thus, on the one side, Brahmaism asserted its usual supremacy over Pāñcarātra, and, on the other, the Pāñcarātras³ found a life's opportunity, as it were, to recover their lost ground, since the alliance enabled them to borrow some doctrines from the Upaniṣads, thus placing them in a position to claim orthodoxy for their religion, so long put under the ban of heterodoxy⁴ (see Radhakrishnan's *Indian Philosophy*, I, p. 489). Despite this plagiarism, it must be said to the credit of the Pāñcarātras that they maintained the essentially theistic character of their religion. During the final phase of its evolution the Pāñcarātra, as indicated above, was more and more suffused with pantheistic tenets into Viṣṇuism.

We shall now consider the sources from which the Pāñcarātras are likely to have derived their doctrines, during those two stages in their career.

3 It is difficult to say whether the Pāñcarātra system was in close relations with a branch of Upaniṣadic thought from the beginning.

4 The assertion is subject to modification as we do not know anything definitely about the incipient stage of Pāñcarātra. This view may be accepted if we place absolute reliance upon Śaṅkara's comment (see *Brahma-Sūtra*, II, 2. 42-45). Be it noted, however, that Śaṅkara's criticism of the Pāñcarātra cannot be regarded as final (for defence of the Pāñcarātra, see Yāmunācārya's *Āgamaprāmāṇya*, pp. 50-71).

We should remember that the Midland at this period (i.e. the period when the alliance was effected between the Brāhmaṇas and the Bhāgavatas) was passing through a great fermentation, both intellectual and religious. Sacerdotalism of the Brāhmaṇas gave place to the meditation of the seers of the Upaniṣads. The Upaniṣads mark an advance upon the Saṃhitā mythology, Brāhmaṇa hair-splitting and even Āraṇyaka theology, though all these stages are to be met with here. Broadly speaking, we can say that this period (circa 300 B.C.; see *IA.*, 1908, p. 257) synchronises with the rise of some of the post-Buddhistic Upaniṣads, which easily lend themselves to theistic interpretation. We cannot say with any definiteness whether the Pāñcarātras confined themselves wholly to the contemporary Upaniṣads, in the matter of borrowing. Rather it appears more probable that they borrowed not only from the contemporary, but also from the pre-existing, Upaniṣads according to their suitability. Thus, practically speaking, the Upaniṣads are the sources from which they drew most of their doctrines.

The Upaniṣads are not the systematic treatises of a single hand, but are rather collations or compilations of floating monologues, dialogues or anecdotes. Unlike the sophisticism of Ancient Greece, they are essentially the outpourings or poetic deliverances of philosophically tempered minds in the face of the facts of life. It is clear that the Upaniṣads had no set theory of philosophy or dogmatic scheme of theology to propound. They teach a variety of doctrines and are to be regarded as guesses at truth. It will not be far from truth to say that all the later religio-philosophic systems of the country are rooted in the Upaniṣads (see Bloomfield's *Religion of the Veda*, p. 51).

Under the circumstances the proper and feasible course open to us is not to rely upon the absolute claims of the exponents of the Upaniṣads such as Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja, etc., but to determine their meaning independently.

The central idea running through the early Upaniṣads is the equation of Ātman,⁵ the inmost essence in man, with Brahman, the

⁵ In the pre-Upaniṣadic Vedic literature the word 'ātman' was used to denote, on the one hand, the ultimate essence of the universe, and, on the other,

ultimate essence of the universe (*Br.*, IV, 4.5, 22, 25, I.4.6; *Ait.*, V. 3; *Muṇḍaka*, II.2.5; *Ś.* 1.16; *Tait.*, 1.5, etc.). The Upaniṣads are emphatic in their declaration that the two are one and the same. There is Ātman not in man alone but in all objects of the universe, the sun, the moon, the world; and Brahman is this Ātman (*Br.*, V. 5.2; *Muṇḍaka*, II. 1.10; *Chāndogya*, III. 13.7; *Tait.*, II. 8, III. 10, etc.). But what is the nature of the reality, be it Brahman or Ātman? It is indefinable. Mere negative statements are all that can be asserted of the central reality, which ex hypothesi is incapable of qualification, determination and diversity implied in descriptive attribution. Although no logical demonstration of the ultimate reality is possible, yet intellectual necessity requires us to give some descriptions of it, however fragmentary or partial they may be. This is what is attempted in the Upaniṣads. Several visible objects of nature and psychological principles were tried, but none could render satisfaction to the ideal thus raised. Yājñavalkya said: "He, the Ātman, is not this, nor this (*neti neti*), is inconceivable, for he cannot be conceived, unchangeable, for he is not changed, untouched, for nothing touches him; unfettered, he is not pained nor suffers harm" (*Br.*, IV. 5.15; for negative definitions, see *Br.* III. 7.3, III. 9.26; *Kaṭha* III. 15; *Br.*, IV. 2.4, IV. 4.22). The attempt to define the ultimate reality is doomed to disappointment on account of the inherent incapacity of intellect to grasp the whole. Intellect, with its symbols and shibboleths, creeds and conventions, is not by itself adequate to the grasp of the real (see *Tait.*, II. 4; *Kena*, II. 3; *Muṇḍaka*, II. 1; *Kaṭha*, 1.3.10 etc.). The *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad* (3.7) gives us an analysis of consciousness, which also leads to the same negative definition. Intellect works with the categories of time, space and cause; but the real is beyond these, although it is the basis or ground of finite actualities (*Muṇḍaka*, 1.1; *Chāndogya*, III. 13.7). Our intellectual categories can give us description of the empirical universe under the forms of time, space and the vital breath in man. Later on in the Upaniṣads Brahman is generally used in the former sense, while the word ātman is reserved to denote the inmost essence in man (see Garbe's *Philosophy of Ancient India*, p. 9; Bloomfield's *Religion of the Veda*, pp. 271-74; *American Journal of Philology*, XVI, p. 421; also Macdonell's *History of Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 218 fl.).

cause. But the self-existent Brahman is independent of time, space and cause. Though including space, he is not spatial, though including time, he is not temporal, though containing a causally-bound system of nature, he cannot be reduced to causal relations (*Kaṭha*, II. 14; *Bṛ.* IV. 4.15, IV. 4.16, 17, III. 8.7, IV, 2.4; *Chāndogya*, III. 14.3, etc.). Therefore intellect must confess itself to be bankrupt when ultimate questions arise. An ultimate reality can never be made into an objective representation (*Bṛ.*, II. 4.13, III. 4.2, III. 7.23, III. 8.11, etc.),—a fact which has been clearly illustrated by Kant. “What I must presuppose in order to know an object,” says Kant, “I cannot know as an object.” It is the explanation of all else, though it itself remains unexplained. (If we carefully go through the conversation between Indra and Prajāpati in *Chāndogya* (VIII.7-12), we find that Prajāpati was trying to emphasize the identity of the self which is unaffected by changes of experience. He was anxious to point out that, while the self was not exclusive of conscious states, it was not the conscious states, a fact which has been well shown by Dr. McTaggart. “What does it (self) include? Everything of which it is conscious. What does it exclude? Equally everything of which it is conscious” (*Studies in Hegelian Cosmology*, 2nd ed. p. 23). We are obliged to accept the reality of a universal consciousness which ever accompanies the contents of consciousness and persists even when there are no contents (see *Bṛ.* IV. 3.6, IV. 4.3, etc.). Although it cannot be subjected to empirical investigation, yet its reality cannot be denied. *Taittirīya* (II.1) says Brahman is existence, consciousness and infinity. He is self-caused (*Isā* VIII: svayambhū). *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* (V.1) characterises Brahman as a positive reality: “Full is that, full is this.” Thus it is quite clear that Brahman is not a negative indeterminate principle, although logically indemonstrable.

According to the Upaniṣads there is a higher power which enables us to grasp this central spiritual reality. By knowledge one becomes Brahman (*Bṛ.*, IV. 2.25; *Muṇḍaka*, III. 2.9; *Kauṣītaki*, i. 4; *Praśna*, IV. 10; *Sve.*, 1.7). But this knowledge is not to be understood in the sense of intellectual acumen or dialectical subtlety; it is the intuition of the mystics (*Bṛ.*, IV. 3.32). It is inarticulate (cf. Inge, *Plotinus*,

II, p. 140. We cannot give any formal exposition of this intuition (see *Br.*, III. 9.26, IV. 4.22, IV. 5.15; *Kaṭha*, III. 15; *Praśna*, IV. 10, *Chāndogya*, VII. 24.1 etc.). It is only when thought becomes perfected in intuition that we catch the vision of the real (see *Br.*, III. 5.1, IV. 4.21). We have to pass beyond thought, beyond the clash of oppositions, beyond antinomies that confront us when we work with categories of abstract thinking, if we are to reach the real where man's existence and divine being coincide. By intuitive realisation the unheard becomes heard (*Br.*, II. 4.5; *Chāndogya*, VI. 13). The problems raised by intellect solve themselves the moment we transcend reasoning and start to live the religious life (*Muṇḍaka*, III. 1.8). Thus intuition is a magic talisman or soul-sense which transfigures the existence of men into a new reality (*Br.*, IV. 3.22; *Kauṣītaki*, III. 1, etc.).

Some passages of the Upaniṣads (e.g., *Kaṭha*, II. 23; *Muṇḍaka*, III. 2.3; *Śvetāśvatara*, 1.6) also foreshadow the doctrine of grace (*prasāda*) which enables us to catch the vision of the real.

After having discussed the philosophy of the Upaniṣads in a nutshell, let us proceed to find out the doctrines of the Pāñcarātra in the passages of the Upaniṣads.

Let us sum up the essential dogmas of the Pāñcarātra and see how far we can trace them to the sayings of the Upaniṣads:

1. Transcendent and immanent character of the Deity (*Pādma*, I. VI. 41-43; *Ahir.*, II. 26 fl.; *Lakṣmī*, XIII. 18 fl., etc.).
2. God—endowed with non-natural Guṇas (i.e., *jñāna*, *aiśvarya*, *śakti*, etc.), but free from prakṛtic Guṇas (*Pādma*, I. V. 33-34; *Lakṣmī* II. 8-9; *Mbh.*, XII. 347.18, 348.13, etc.).
3. Various powers ascribed to Him, such as Creation, Preservation, Destruction, Anugraha and Nigraha (*Ahir.*, XIV. 14 fl.; *Pādma*, I. 2.9 fl.; *Lakṣmī* XIII. 21 fl.).
4. God—the efficient and the material cause of the universe (*Mbh.*, XII. 13537; *Ahir.*, XXX. 3-4; *Viṣṇutilaka*, I. 23 fl.).
5. God—All-pervading (*Pādma*, I. 6.23, 24-29; *Viṣṇu* I, 23 fl., II. 5-7; *Mbh.*, XII. 13746-47).

6. Brahman—the Ruler and Overlord of all things (*Lakṣmī* II. 2-10, II. 13 fl.; *Pādma*, 1. 5. 30-34; *Ahir*, II. 45-53).
7. He—the Inner Controller and Witness of all (*Mbh.*, XII. 352. 2-4; *Ahir.*, II. 45-53, LIX. 34-36; *Lakṣmī*, II. 13 fl.).
8. Various Forms attributed to Him, such as Para, Vyūha, Vibhava, Antaryāmin and Arcā (*Ahir.*, XI. 62 fl.; *Viṣvaksena*, p. 122; *Mbh.*, XII. 13528, XII. 340. 36-40, 73-87, 99-100).
9. Emanation of all things from Him (*Pādma*, 1. 2. 8 fl., 1. V. 33; *Lakṣmī*, II. 13).
10. The Ultimate Source (e.g. Brahman)—inexhaustible (*Pādma*, I. 2. 7-12, I. V. 29-34, 1. 2. 21).
11. Recognition of the existence of the Three Categories, viz., Soul, Matter, and God (*Viṣṇutilaka* II. 34; cf. *Ahir.*, XLV. 34, XVIII. 13).
12. Individual soul—a part of the Deity (*Lakṣmī* VI. 36).
13. It is atomic (*Viṣvaksena*, p. 13; *Viṣṇutilaka*, II. 28, *Ahir.*, VI. 27).
14. It is eternal, imperishable (*Viṣṇutilaka*, II. 33, 29-31, 1.107).
15. Release consists in union with the Lord (*Pādma* 1.4.15 fl., 1.6.24, 1.6. 51-52; *Ahir.*, XIII. 11, etc.).
16. Release—possible only through the grace or Anugrahasakti of God (*Mbh.*, XII. 13621, 12768; *Ahir.*, XIV. 25-35).
17. Embodied or mundane state of the Jīva due to the Nigraha Śakti of God (*Ahir.*, XIV. 25-35).
18. Theory of creation (*Mbh.*, XII. 12934; *Lakṣmī* II. 19 fl.; *Ahir*, XXXVIII. 10 ff.).
19. Creation—the sport (*līlā*) of God (*Paramatattvanirṇaya-prakāśa Samhitā*, 1.1.4; *Ahir.*, XXX. 12-13; *Mbh.*, XII. 13602-13762).
20. Distinction between Pure and Non-pure creation (*Ahir.*, XXXVIII. 10 ff. LIX. 34-36).
21. Derivation of the Gross Creation from a Cosmic Egg (*Ahir.*, XXX. 5-11; *Pādma*, I. 5. 19-21; cf. *Lakṣmī* V. 74; *Viṣvaksena*, p. 64).

22. Distinction between empirical and non-empirical time (*Ahir.*, LIII. 10-11).

After having indicated the cardinal doctrines of the Pāñcarātra, let us now quote parallel passages from the Upaniṣads⁶ to explain how far the latter can be viewed as supplying a basis for the philosophy of the Pāñcarātra system: In so doing we shall confine ourselves solely to the classical Upaniṣads for the chronology of which we rely entirely upon Max Müller (i.e. the earliest of them prior to 600 B.C., and the latest *circa* 300 B.C.).

1. "The Paramātmā has two natures, Prakṛti and Vikṛti. Prakṛti is the synthesis of Sattva and other Guṇas; Vikṛti is Puruṣa, called Paramātmā" (*Pādma*, 1.6. 41-43; also see the *Mbh.*, XII. 339. 3-4).

"Brahman resides in all the Tattvas and is the Soul of them; He is also above all the Tattvas" (*Ahir.*, II. 26 fl.).

Kaṭha V. 9. "As the one fire has entered the world
And becomes corresponding in form to every form,
So the one Inner Soul (Ātman) of all things
Is corresponding in form to every form, and
yet is outside."

Kaṭha V. 10. "As the one wind has entered the world
And becomes corresponding in form to every form,
So the one Inner Soul of all things
Is corresponding in form to every form, and
yet outside."

Īśā 5. "It moves. It moves not
It is far, and It is near.
It is within all this,
And it is outside of all this." (cf. *Bhg. G.*,
13.15a.b.d.).

2. "Brahman is devoid of past and future.....the source of all beings.....boundless, beyond the Guṇas, with

⁶ In the citation of passages from the Thirteen Principal Upaniṣads we have used Dr. Hume's translation of the same.

Guṇas, the giver of all desires" (*Pādma*, 1.V. 33-34). "He is called Mahāvibhūti,.....the Supreme abode of six qualities similar to the ocean of immortality (*amṛta*), waveless, shining" (*Lakṣmī* II. 8-9).

"The one God, hidden in all things

.....

.....

Śvetāśvatara, The witness, the sole thinker, devoid of qualities
VI. 11 and 17 (nirguṇa),

.....

He who is the maker of all, the all-knower,
self-sourced,
Intelligent, the author of time, possessor of
qualities, omniscient,

Is the ruler of Primary Matter (*pradhāna*) and of the spirit (*kṣetra-jña*), the Lord of qualities (*guṇa*),

The cause of transmigration (*saṃsāra*) and of liberation (*mokṣa*), of continuance and of bondage."

3. "The Will of God, though of innumerable forms, manifests in five principal ways, to wit, the Śaktis called Creation, Preservation and Destruction of the universe, and Nigraha (obstruction or obscuration) and Anugraha (furtherance or favouring) of the soul" (*Ahīr.*, XIV. 14 fl.; also see *Pādma*, 1.2.9 fl.; *Lakṣmī*, XIII. 21 fl.).

"..... he (Bhṛgu) understood that Brahma is bliss (*ānanda*). For truly, indeed, beings here are born from bliss, on deceasing they enter into bliss."

(*Taittirīya*, III. 6).

"This one, truly, indeed, causes him whom he wishes to lead up from these worlds, to perform good action. This one, also, indeed, causes him whom he wishes to lead downward, to perform bad action."

(*Kauṣītakī*, III. 8).

4. "Before creation the Lord, having nothing to play with (*līlopakaraṇa*), could find no satisfaction (*na ratiṃ labhe*).

He, consequently, made Himself manifold (*ātmānaṃ bahū akalpayat*; see *Ahīr.*, XXX. 3-4).

“On the contrary, my dear, in the beginning this world was just Being, one only, without a second. It bethought itself: ‘Would that I were many! Let me procreate myself!’” (*Chāndogya*, VI. 2. 2-3; cf. *Maitrī*, II. 6).

“As a spider emits and draws in (its thread),
As herbs arise on the earth,
As the hairs of the head and body, from a living
person,
So from the Imperishable arises everything here.”
(*Muṇḍaka*, 1.1.7).

5. “The wise say: Bhagavat is the Highest Soul (*paramātman*) and pervades the Jagat (*jaganmaya*), as butter in cream, as oil in sesame seeds, and as sweetness in guḍa” (*Pādma* 1.6.27; also see 1. VI. 24-29).

“Just as fire is one, but glares everything; just as the sun is one, but is the universal source of heat; just as air is one, but is the source of all waters; so the Puruṣa is one, void of constituents, having for His form the universe (*Mbh.*, XII. 13746-47).

“As oil in sesame seeds, as butter in cream,
As water in river-beds, and as fire in the
friction-sticks,
.....
.....

The Soul (Atman), which pervades all things
As butter is contained in the cream,
.....
.....

This is Brahma, the highest mystic teaching”
(*Śvetāśvatara*, 1.15, 16).

“He entered in here, even to the fingernail-tips, as a razor would be hidden in a razor-case, or fire in fire-holder.”

(*Br.*, 1.4.7; *Kauṣītakī*, IV. 20).

“It is.....as a lump of salt cast in water would dissolve right into the water;” (*Br.*, II. 4.12).

6. "Brahman is the Ruler,.....the source of all beings,
the Supreme Puruṣa,.....the giver of all desires."

(*Pādma*, I.5. 29-34).

"Verily, this Soul is the overlord of all things, the King of all things. As all the spokes are held together in the hub and felly of a wheel, just so in this Soul all things, all gods, all worlds, all breathing things, all selves are held together."

(*Br.*, II. 5.15; also see *Śre.*, VI. 16).

7. "Though divested of body, He dwells in everybody—not touched by the acts accomplished by these bodies. He is the Inner Soul. He is the all-seeing witness dwelling within all embodied creatures and engaged in marking their acts."

(*Mbh.*, XII. 350-2-4).

"He who, dwells in the earth, yet is other than the earth, whom the earth does not know, whose body the earth is, who controls the earth from within—He is your Soul, the Inner Controller, the Immortal.....

He is your Soul, the Inner Controller, the Immortal."

(*Br.*, III. 7. 3-23; cf. *Subāl. Up.*, VII. 1).

8. "Whatever forms the Deity assumes, He does so by His own power."

(*Mbh.*, XII. 13528; also see *Mbh.*, XII, 340. 36-40;

73-87, 99-100).

"The Lord Himself extracted, as the purest essence of the sole divine Śāstra, the system (tantra) called Pāñcarātra describing Him as Para, Vyūha, Vibhava, Antaryāmin, etc., and being recognisable by having liberation as its sole result."

(*Ahir.*, XI. 62 fl., also see *Viṣvaksena*, p. 122: *mama prakūrāḥ pañceti prāhur vedānta-pāragāḥ*).

"The Inner Soul (antarātman) of all things, the
One Controller,

Who makes His one form manifold—

The wise who perceive Him as standing in oneself

They, and no others, have eternal happiness."

(*Katha*, V. 12).

“More minute than the minute, in the midst of
confusion

The Creator of all, of manifold forms,

The One embracer of the universe—

By knowing Him as kindly (Śiva) one attains peace
for ever.”

(*Śvetāśvatara*, IV. 14).

“Him who is without beginning and without end,
in the midst of confusion,

The Creator of all, of manifold form,

The One embracer of the universe—

By knowing God (deva) one is released from all
fetters.”

(*Śvetāśvatara*, V. 13).

9. “From Vāsudeva came all created things”

(*Pādma*, 1.2.8 f.).

“Vāsudeva is the source of all beings.”

(*Pādma*, 1. V. 33).

“Its root is above, its branches below—

This eternal fig-tree!

That (root) indeed is the Pure. That is Brahma.

That indeed is called the Immortal.

On it all the worlds do rest,

And no one soever goes beyond it.”

(*Kaṭha*, VI. 1; cf. *Bhg.G.*, IV. 1-3).

10. “Brahman is changeless,.....tranquil,.....capable of
evolving (the world), unchangeable,.....the source of all
beings.....eternal, without waves, without disturbance,
boundless,.....the giver of all desires.”

(*Pādma*, I.V. 29-34).

“Om!

The you is fulness; fulness, this.

From fulness, fulness doth proceed.

Withdrawing fulness's fulness off,

W'en fulness then itself remains.”

(*Bṛ.*, V. I, see also *Atharva Veda*, X. 3.29).

11. "There is a triad here: Brahman, Jīva (soul), and Jagat."
(*Viṣṇutilaka*, II. 34).

"This has been sung as the supreme Brahma.
In it there is a triad. It is the firm support, the
Imperishable.

By knowing what is therein, Brahma-knowers
Become merged in Brahma, intent thereon, liberted
from the womb.

(*Śvetāśvata*, I.7, also see I.12).

12. Individual soul is a part of the Deity or a contraction
of Lakṣmī, as the Goddess herself calls it in *Lakṣmī Tantra*,
VI. 36: *pramūtā cetanaḥ prokto mat-saṃkocaḥ sa ucyate.*

"This whole world is pervaded
With beings that are parts of Him."

(*Śvetāśvata*, IV. 10).

13. "The Jīva's size is atomic; its characteristic is the union of
knowledge and bliss; it is of the dimension of *trasareṇu* (mote)
and shining with millions of rays."

(*Viṣṇakṣena*, p. 13; see also *Ahir.*, VI. 26;
Viṣṇutilaka, II. 28).

"This living (self) is to be known as a part
Of the hundredth part of the point of a hair
And yet it partakes of infinity."

(*Śvetāśvata*, V. 9, also V. 8; cf. *Bhg. Pu.*,
VI. 16.18; X. 87. 2-6).

14. "The jewel called Kaustubha is Jīva; it is a mass of cons-
ciousness, free from disease. It is without beginning or end.
It always lives in Brahman."

(*Viṣṇutilaka*, II. 29-31).

"No birth, no death for Jīva, O Caturānana."

(*Viṣṇutilaka*, II. 33: no 'tpattir na mrtistasya
Jīvasya, Caturānana).

7 svarūpam anumātram syāj jñānānandaikalaksanam/
trasareṇu-pramāṇāste raśmi-koṭi-vibhāsitāḥ //,

“Just as Brahman is eternal, even so is the individual
soul.

(*Viṣṇutilaka*, I.107).

“The wise one (i.e. the soul, the ātman, the self) is
not born, nor dies.

This one has not come from anywhere, has no
become anyone.

Unborn, constant, eternal, primeval, this one

Is not slain when the body is slain.

If the slayer think to slay.

If the slain think himself slain,

Both these understand not.

This one slays not, nor is slain.”

(*Kaṭha*, II. 18.19; cf. also *Bhḡ.G.*, II. 19, 20 and

Bhḡ.Pu., VIII.7. 19-20).

15. “The summum bonum (hitam atyantam) of men is the absolute discontinuance of the succession of sorrows, and the eternal happiness implied in it, which is tantamount to the attainment of one’s real nature, that is, the nature of God” (bhagavan-mayatā).

(*Ahir.*, XIII. 9-11).

“As I live (viharāmi), just so live the liberated souls.”

(*Pādma* 1.4. 15 fl.).

“When a seer sees the brilliant

Maker, Lord, Person, the Brahma-source,

Then, being a knower, shaking off good and evil,

Stainless, he attains supreme identity (paramam
sāmayam upaiti) with Him.”

(*Muṇḍaka*, III. I. 3).

16. “That man only can see Him, on whom He has shown His grace or prasāda.”

(*Mbh.*, XII. 12768).

“The transmission of obscuration (tirodhānaparamparā) has no beginning, but it may have an end, so far as the individual is concerned, by the breaking in of the power of

divine grace (anugrahasakti-pāta) resembling a shower of compassion coming down upon him who has been beheld by God.”

(*Ahir.*, XIV. 25 fl.).

“This Soul (ātman) is not to be attained by
instruction,
Nor by intellect, nor by much learning.
He is to be obtained only by the one whom He
chooses;
To such a one that soul (ātman) reveals His own
person.”

(*Kaṭha*, II. 23; see also *Muṇḍaka*, II.2. 3; *Śv.*, I. 6).

17. “At the beginning God obstructs the souls by obscuring or contracting their form (ākāra), power (aiśvarya), and knowledge (vijñāna), the result being the three taints (mala) of the soul, to wit (1) atomicity, (2) impotence, and (3) ignorance.”

(*Ahir.*, XIV. 16-20).

“This one, indeed, causes him whom He wishes to lead downward, to perform bad action.”

(*Kauṣītakī*, III. 8).

18. “What is called His making (unmeṣa), like moonrise on the ocean, that is I, Nārāyaṇī Śakti, of the nature of desire to create. What is called the winking (nimeṣa) of the Param-ātmā, during annihilation, that am I, Nārāyaṇī Śakti known as susuptā, desirous of sleeping.”

(*Lakṣmī*, II. 19 fl.).

“This Brahma, verily, shines when fire blazes; likewise this dies when it blazes not. Its brilliance (tejas) goes to the sun; its vital breath (prāṇa), into the wind (vāyu).....
..... All these divinities, verily, having entered into wind, perish not when they die in the wind; therefrom indeed they come forth again.”

(*Kauṣītakī*, II.12; also see II.13).

19. "So the Highest Lord, though all of His wishes are ever fulfilled, could experience, by means of the being created by Himself, the flavour of playing" (līlā-rasa).

Ahir., XXX. 12-13).

"Puruṣa in His fourfold manifestation sports as He wishes."

(*Mbh.*, XII. 13762).

"With the one unborn female, red, white and black,
Who produces many creatures like herself,
There lies the one unborn male taking his delight.
Another unborn male leaves her with whom he has
had his delight."

(*Ścc.*, IV. 5; cf. *Viṣṇu Pa.*, VI.7. 69-71).

20. "The Lord, in order to play, created the world once more: first (pūrvam) the names and forms, then (punah) Prakṛti consisting of the three Guṇas, called Māyā, with whom He began to enjoy." (*Ahir.*, XXXVII. 10 fl.; also see *Ahir.*, LIX. 34-36, where one quarter of God which alone has become this world is naturally identified with Aniruddha, the Inner Ruler (antaryāmin) of all beings, who pervades that which has food and that which has no food, namely, animate and inanimate nature).

"His greatness is of such extent,

Yet Puruṣa is greater still.

All beings are one fourth of him;

Three fourths, the immortal in the sky."

(*Chāndogya*, III.12. 6; also see *Rg-veda*, X.90. 3).

21. "He (Lord), consequently, made Himself manifold by creating Pradhāna and Puruṣa and then from the former, with the help of His Śakti in the form of time, the Mahat, the Ahaṁkāra, etc., down to the gross elements. Out of these He then formed the Cosmic Egg" (*Ahir.*, XXX. 5-11).

"In the beginning this world was merely non-being. It was existent. It developed. It turned into an egg. It lay

for the period of a year. It was split asunder. One of the two eggshell-parts became silver, one gold.”

(*Chāndogya*, III.19. I, see also 2).

22. “Gross is called the time possessing the lava (one-sixth of a second), etc.; subtle the one determining the Tattvas; while that which pervades the activity of the Vyūhas is styled Highest Time.”

(*Ahir.*, LIII. 10-11).

“Now, it has elsewhere been said: ‘Food, verily, is the source of this whole world; and time, of food. The sun is the source of time.’ The form thereof is the year, which is composed of the moments and other durations of time, and which consists of twelve months.....Among these (asterisms) each month of Ātman (viewed as the year) includes nine quarters according to the corresponding course (of the sun through the asterisms). On account of the subtlety (of time) this (course of the sun) is the proof, for only in this way is time proved.....However, the thing to be proved (e.g. time) may come to be proved from the fact of its containing parts (e.g. moments, etc.), to the cognisance of the thing itself.

.....

.....For thus has it been said:—

From Time flow forth created things.

From Time, too, they advance to growth

In Time, too, they do disappear.

Time is form and formless too.”

(*Maitrī*, VI. 14).

A close study of the above parallelisms will show how far we are justified in regarding the Upaniṣads as the sources of Pāñcarātra philosophy, during the second and third stages of its existence. The resemblances between the Pāñcarātra and Upaniṣadic doctrines, during the two above-mentioned phases in the evolution of Pāñcarātra philosophy, are so striking and fundamental that they cannot but lead to the conclusion we have already arrived at.

Bhāskara—a forgotten Commentator on the *Gītā*¹

The *Bhagavad Gītā*, ranking as it does, among the three Prasthānas of the Vedānta, has been vested with great authority by all eminent system-builders of India. Its chief claim to authority lay in its synthetic character; and it very soon came to be raised to the rank of an *Upaniṣad*. No wonder, therefore, that a commentary on the *Gītā* came to be regarded as the *sine qua non* of any reputed founder of a new system of philosophy. It was comparatively easier to write an original commentary on the *Gītā* adumbrating a new philosophy of life and world-view than on the *Upaniṣads* or the *Sūtras* of Bādarāyaṇa. Hence, it became an established procedure for all Ācāryas to start their philosophical career with a commentary on the *Gītā*.

The earliest extant commentary on the *Gītā* is by Saṅkara. But, Saṅkara was by no means a pioneer in the field. There were several earlier commentaries on the *Gītā*. In the beginning of his commentary on the *Gītā*, Saṅkara speaks of certain very prolix commentators who elaborately explained each word, sentence and argument of the *Gītā* but whose numerous self-contradictions only tended to confuse the readers.² He also draws attention to the varying interpretations offered by them in regard to particular verses of the *Gītā*:—

अत्र केचिदाहुः (II, 11) ; अत्र केचित् पण्डितमन्या वदन्ति (II, 21) ; केचित्तु अर्जुनस्य प्रभार्थमन्यथा कल्पयित्वा वर्णयन्ति (III, 1) ; अयं श्लोकोऽन्यथा व्याख्यातः केचित्.....(IV, 18) ; अत्र केचिदाहुः (IV, 24) ; अन्ये तु वर्णयन्ति (XVIII, 6).

Saṅkara, in his turn, was criticised by other commentators who immediately succeeded him. There is evidence to believe that Bhāskara

¹ This article was originally contributed to the H. P. Sastri Mem. number of the *I.H.Q.*

² तदर्थाविष्कारणाय अनेकेर्द्विद्वत्पदपदार्थवाक्यवाक्यार्थन्यायमप्यत्यन्तविरुद्धानेकार्थत्वेन लीकिकैर्गुणमाणमुपलभ्याहं विवेकतोऽर्थनिर्धारणार्थं संक्षेपतो विवरणं करिष्यामि—Saṅkara, *Gītā Bhāṣya* (Introduction).

was one such critic of Śaṅkara though not, as we shall see, strictly a successor of Śaṅkara. Certain evidences, to be set forth presently, enable us to state that in his commentary Bhāskara called into question the interpretations of Śaṅkara.

Bhāskara is a well-known personality in Vedāntic literature. His commentary on the *Vedānta Sūtras* is still extant from which we learn that he was a powerful critic of Śaṅkara. At the very outset of his *Bhāṣya*, Bhāskara complains against the misleading interpretations of Śaṅkara :—

सूत्राभिप्रायसंबृत्या स्वाभिप्रायप्रकाशनात् ।

व्याख्यातं यैरिदं शास्त्रं व्याख्येयं तन्निवृत्तये ॥³

Bhāskara is, all the same, greatly indebted to Śaṅkara whose style and interpretations he flagrantly imitates.

Bhāskara felt himself justified in writing a commentary on the *Gītā* wherein he reviewed Śaṅkara's interpretations. The existence of a commentary on the *Gītā* by Bhāskara is practically unknown to modern writers on Indian philosophy and on the *Gītā*. It is proposed in the following pages to indicate such literary evidences as point to the existence of a *Gītā-Bhāṣya* by Bhāskara.⁴

And before so doing, a few words should be said about the relation between Śaṅkara and Bhāskara as commentators on the *Gītā* and about Bhāskara's view of the practical philosophy of the *Gītā*. The identity of Bhāskara, the commentator on the *Vedānta Sūtras*, with the forgotten commentator of that name on the *Gītā* is happily confirmed by the agreement of views between the two in respect of the place of

3 Bhāskara, *Brahmasūtra Bhāṣya*, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, 1915, verse 2.

4

नायिनः शलभायन्ते भास्करज्ञस्करायते ।

यस्य तच्चिन् प्राणनाथे यतीन्द्रे भक्तिरस्तु मे ॥

The above verse found at the end of certain Dvaita Commentaries on the *Gītā* would also seem to presuppose vaguely the existence of a commentary on the *Gītā* by Bhāskara. This verse given on p. 943 of the Ananda Press Edn. (Madras, 1911), of the *Gītā* with 3 *Bhāṣyas*, is not a composition of either Madhva or Jayatīrtha and as such has no place in either of them. Considering its invective rhetoric it should have been omitted by the Editors.

Karma in the philosophical life of the aspirant. Bhāskara, the author of the *Brahma-sūtra-bhāṣya*, is an exponent of what is called the **ज्ञानकर्म-समुच्चयवाद**—or the view that *karma* and *jñāna* are both necessary for liberation and that at the highest stage of spiritual discipline both *karma* and *jñāna* are equally important. Bhāskara declares:—

यथा शास्त्रान्नियकर्मसमुच्चितादात्मज्ञानादविद्याकामकर्मलक्षणबंधनिवृत्तिः तथा
‘यज्ञादिश्रुतेरश्रवत्’इत्यत्र दर्शयिष्यामः⁵ ॥

अत्र हि ज्ञानकर्मसमुच्चयान्मोक्षप्राप्तिः सूत्रकारस्याभिप्रेता⁶ ॥

The same view is attributed to Bhāskara in the authoritative Dvaita works: the *Sannyāyaratnāvalī*—a classical commentary on Madhva’s *Anuśyākhyaṇa*, by his direct disciple Padmanābha Tīrtha and the *Nayacandrikā*, another commentary on the *Anuśyākhyaṇa*, by Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍitācārya (c. 1350):—

यच्च भास्करेणाभ्युपगतं मुक्तिसाधनं न केवलं कर्म न केवलं च ज्ञानं ; किन्तूभयमेव
तदिति, तदप्यनुपपन्नम्⁷ । भास्कराद्यभ्युपगतं ज्ञानकर्मसमुच्चयं दूषयति⁸ ।

Now, the *Gītā* itself seems to lean to some view closely allied to the **ज्ञानकर्मसमुच्चयवाद** । Bhāskara would, therefore, have welcomed the opportunity of enlisting the support of the *Gītā* for his doctrine and most naturally would have written a commentary on the work showing to the world how the *Gītā* itself espoused his cause. Śaṅkara, in the opening section of his commentary on the second chapter of the *Gītā*, repudiates an interpretation of the *Gītā* offered by ‘some’ (केचिन्) from the standpoint of **ज्ञानकर्मसमुच्चय** । It is an obvious reference to Bhāskara’s line of interpretation:—

अत्र केचिदाहुः—सर्वकर्मसन्नयासपूर्वकादात्मज्ञाननिष्ठामात्रादेव केवलात् कैवल्यं न
प्राप्यत एव । किं तर्हि ? अग्निहोत्रादिश्रौतस्मार्तकर्मसहिताज्ज्ञानात्कैवल्यप्राप्तिरिति
सर्वासु गीतासु निश्चितोऽर्थः इति । ज्ञापकं चाहुरस्यार्थस्य × × × ×
× × × × × तदसत् × × × × × तस्माद्गीता-

5 Bhāskara, *Brahmasūtra Bhāṣya*, p. 21, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, 1915.

6 *Ibid.*, p. 2.

7 *Sannyāyaratnāvalī*, III, 3, p. 106 (Printed, Dharvar).

8 *Nayacandrikā*, II, p. 49 (Printed, Dharvar).

शास्त्रे केवलादेव तत्त्वज्ञानान्मोक्षप्राप्तिः ; न कर्मसमुच्चितादिति निश्चितोऽर्थः ।
यथा चायमर्थः तथा प्रकरणशो विभज्य तत्र तत्र दर्शयिष्यामः⁹ ।

The interrelation between Śaṅkara and Bhāskara is peculiarly interesting. Though Bhāskara appears in his *Bhāṣya* in the rôle of a relentless critic of Śaṅkara and rejects his interpretations of particular sūtras on many occasions (cf. i, 1, 19; i, 2, 12; ii, 1, 14; ii, 2, 29; iii, 2, 3; iii, 2, 41; iii, 3, 30; iii, 4, 26; iv, 3, 13), he is in perfect agreement with Śaṅkara on many other occasions and his *Bhāṣya* looks almost like a summary of Śaṅkara's. His style and very often the expressions used by him clearly betray the fact that he is simply reproducing Śaṅkara's renderings with slight changes. [Bhāskara and Śaṅkara on iii, 4, 40; iii, 4, 50; iv, 2, 19; i, 1, 1-2, 3, 4, 5; i, 2, 11. etc.] This shows that Bhāskara wrote his commentary on the sūtras after Śaṅkara had written his. But this does not necessarily mean that Bhāskara is no more than a successor of Śaṅkara. We have already seen that Śaṅkara was very probably repudiating Bhāskara in his commentary on the *Gītā*. My point is that in the absence of any information regarding a commentator earlier than Śaṅkara on the *Gītā*, who could have interpreted the *Gītā* from the standpoint of **ज्ञानकर्मसमुच्चय**, it would not be wide of the mark to assume that Bhāskara was the commentator. Attention may be drawn in this connection to the fact that the names of Piśāca and Rantideva mentioned by Deśika do not help us much as we cannot assert that any of these two writers held the doctrine of **ज्ञानकर्मसमुच्चय** । We are obliged therefore to fall back on Bhāskara alone as the commentator who would satisfy our requirements. The passages criticising Śaṅkara extracted by Jayatīrtha (to be set forth anon) from Bhāskara's commentary on the *Gītā* might as well have been later additions by Bhāskara in a spirit of retaliation and retort.

Vācaspati Miśra who wrote one of his works in 886 A.D. quotes from the *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* of Bhāskara in various places in

9 Śaṅkara, *Gītā Bhāṣya*, (II, 10), pp. 44-45, *Bhagavad Gītā* with the commentaries of Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja and Madhva and the glosses of Vedānta Deśika and Jayatīrtha, Ananda Press, Madras, 1911. Page references hereafter are to this Edn.

his *Bhāmatī* for adverse comment. He also exposes the untenability of the criticisms urged by Bhāskara against his Master:—

(1) येषु प्रधानं पूर्वपक्षयित्वा अनेन सूत्रेण (१, ३, १०) परमात्मैवाक्षरमिति सिद्धान्तयन्ति, तैरम्बरान्तधृतेरित्यनेन कथं प्रधानं निराक्रियत इति वाच्यम् । अथ नाधिकरणत्वमात्रं धृतिरपि तु प्रशासनाधिकरणता × × × तस्माद्यत्किंचिदेतत् ॥

(2) ये पुनरन्तर्यामिव्यापारायाः पूलोत्पादनाया नित्यत्वं सर्वसाधारणमिति मन्यमाना भाष्यकारीयमधिकरणं दूषयांबभूवुः । तेभ्यो व्यावहारिक्यामीशित्रीशितव्य-विभागव्यवस्थायामिति भाष्यं व्याचक्षीत (iii, 2, 41) with this cf. the following in Bhāskara :—केचित्पुनरन्तर्यामिव्यापारो न्योगः स पूलहेतुरिति मन्यन्ते—तदयुक्तम् । तद्व्यापारस्य नित्यत्वात्—सर्वप्राणिसाधारण्याच्च × × × ।

Bhāskara's interpretation of III, 3, 29:—

यदि पुण्यमपि निवर्तते, किमर्था गतिरित्याशंक्योच्यते । गतेरर्थवत्त्वमुभयथा । दुष्कृतनिवृत्त्या सुकृतनिवृत्त्या चोभाभ्याम् प्रकाराभ्याम् । यदि पुण्यमनुवर्तते, तत्फलमनुभूयावृत्तिः, स्यात् । ततश्च 'एतेन मार्गेण प्रतिपद्यमाना इमं मानवमावर्तं नावर्तन्त' इत्यनावृत्तिश्रुतेर्विरोधः स्यात् । अनेन पथा गतस्यानावृत्तिः, 'अणुः पन्था विततः पुराणः तेनैति ब्रह्मवित्तेजसः पुण्यकृच्च' इति विद्याकर्माक्षिप्ता गतिर्विशिष्टदेशप्राप्तये युज्यते¹⁰ ।

is faithfully quoted and dismissed as misplaced by Vācaspati Miśra:—

ये तु “यदि पुण्यमपि निवर्तते, किमर्था तर्हि गतिरित्याशंक्य सूत्रमवतारयन्ति । “गतेरर्थवत्त्वमुभयथा, दुष्कृतनिवृत्त्या सुकृतनिवृत्त्या च । यदि पुनः पुण्यमनुवर्तते, ब्रह्मलोकगतस्यापीह पुण्यफलोपभोगायावृत्तिः स्यात् ; तथाच एतेन प्रतिपद्यमानगत्यनावृत्तिश्रुतिविरोधः । तस्माद्दुष्कृतस्येव, सुकृतस्यापि प्रक्षयः इति” तैः पुनरनाशंकनीयमेवाशंकितम्¹¹ ;

The two passages placed side by side would clearly show that the *Bhāmatī* is quoting from *Bhāskara*. And the author of the *Kalpataru* expressly states:¹² भास्करमतमाह—ये त्विति ॥

From the foregoing citations it will be clear that Bhāskara is much earlier than Vācaspati Miśra whose *Nyāyasūci-nibandha* was written sixty-six years after the demise of Śaṅkara in 886 A.D.

10 Bhāskara, *BSB.*, p. 186.

11 *Bhāmatī* (III, 3, 29), pp. 812-813. Nirnayasar ed., 1917.

12 *Kalpa-taru*, (Nirnayasar ed., 1917), p. 312.

Assuming that there was an interval of at least 50 years between Bhāskara and the author of the *Bhāmatī*, it comes very nearly to an admission of the close proximity of Bhāskara to Śaṅkara. From this to the actual contemporaneity of the two it will not be a far cry. The contemporaneity of the two is implied in the following passage of the *Mañimanījarī*, a Dvaita work of circa 1330:—

कर्णोऽप्यथत्त सिद्धान्ती भाष्यं तच्छ्रुत्वा त्वान्मनात् ।

भास्करः कर्कशंस्तर्कदुर्भाष्यं तदखंडयत् ॥ (vi, 49).

It is quite possible therefore that Śaṅkara himself made an implied reference to the views of Bhāskara in his commentary on the *Utkrāntigatyadhikaraṇa* (ii, 3, 29) of the *Brahmasūtras* where the question of the size (*parimāna*) of the Ātman is discussed. This question is a very interesting one in Indian philosophy,—different schools holding different views on it. Śaṅkara holds the Ātman to be a *vibhu* in size and explains away the texts which declare him to be '*anu*' as statements made from the standpoint of the '*upādhis*' or of the innate inscrutability of the self. In introducing Śaṅkara's comments on ii, 3, 29, the *Ratnaprabhā* remarks that the Master here is criticising the view of one class of Pūrvapakṣins (Ekadeśin) who hold that the individual self (Jīva) is *anu* while the Universal Self, i.e., the Jīva in his noumenal state is *vibhu*:—

तत्रात्माणुत्वविभुत्वश्रुतीनां विरोधादप्रामाण्यप्राप्तावणुत्वं जीवस्य, विभुत्वमीश्वरस्य

इत्यविरोध इत्येकदेशिपक्षो दर्शितः । तं दूषयन्सिद्धान्तसूत्रं व्याचष्टे ॥ (रत्नप्रभा)

Curiously enough, this is the view of Bhāskara as expressed in his *Bhāṣya*:—

“स्वयं तवदात्मा मुक्तः सर्वगतः । अणुत्वमौपाधिकं संसारावस्थायामुत्क्रान्तिगति-
सामर्थ्यादिभ्युपगतम् ।” (iv, 4, 15): “संसारावस्थायामणुरात्मा । न तु तदेवास्य निजं रूपम्”
(ii 3, 29). The above references show that Śaṅkara was acquainted with the views of Bhāskara who must be admitted to have been a close contemporary of his in view of the interval of about half a century that may be claimed reasonably to have intervened between Vācaspati and his predecessor Bhāskara.

Coming to the *Gītā*, we have already seen Śaṅkara's criticism of the *ज्ञानकर्मसमुच्चयवाद* set up by Bhāskara. Bhāskara himself would appear

to have questioned the relevance of Śaṅkara's introduction to the *Gītā-Bhāṣya* as well as the correctness of his interpretation of III, 4, as will be clear from the extracts from Jayatīrtha's *Prameyadīpikā*.

Some idea of the contents of Bhāskara's commentary on the *Gītā* could be gathered from the few references to it preserved in the magnificent works of Vedānta Deśika and Jayatīrtha, the two commentators of the Viśiṣṭādvaita and Dvaita schools. No manuscript of the work has so far been brought to light.¹³

Vedānta Deśika, unfortunately, does not quote from the work of Bhāskara but refers to his philosophical views in such a manner as to imply that he wrote a commentary on the *Gītā*.

Bhāskara's Satyopādhi-Vāda

In his commentary on *Gītā*, II, 12, Bhāskara seems to have opined that the difference among Individual selves mutually and their distinction from the Supreme Self, alluded to by Śrī Kṛṣṇa is not innate but is the result of certain extraneous conditions (उपाधि). Śaṅkara, too, holds the same view. But there is a slight difference between Śaṅkara and Bhāskara in so far as the former looked upon these 'conditions' themselves as unreal (मिथ्योपाधि)¹⁴ whereas the latter treated them as real (सत्योपाधि). Rāmānuja rejects the attempt to explain away the plurality (of selves) referred to by the Lord from the standpoint of 'सत्योपाधिकृतभेदवाद' of Bhāskara as futile¹⁵:—

औपाधिकात्मभेदवादे ह्यात्मभेदस्यातात्त्रिकत्वेन, तत्त्वोपदेशसमये भेदनिर्देशो न संगच्छते¹⁶ which Deśika clarifies as a refutation of Bhāskara's view:— भास्करमते भेदस्य सत्योपाधिप्रयुक्तत्वाद्भेदनिर्देश उपपद्यत इति शंकायां, तत्रापि सामान्यत उक्तं दूषणमपरिहार्यमित्याह—औपाधिकेति¹⁷ ।

13 There is a rumour going about that a Ms. of Bhāskara's Comm. exists somewhere in Kashmir. Will any scholar take the trouble of ascertaining the truth of this?

14 Cf. सर्वविकल्पासहत्वेन, निष्वाभूतस्यैव उपाधिः निष्वाभेदप्रयोजकत्वस्य प्रागेवोपपादितत्वात्—*Advaitasiddhi*, p. 281, Sri Vidyā Press Edn., Kumbakonam.

15 Rāmānuja, like Madhva, maintains that difference (भेद) among the individuals mutually and from the Supreme is real and innate—not caused by upādhis: भनवदुक्तात्मभेदः स्वाभाविकः इति सुतिरष्याह—*GB.*, p. 52.

16 Rāmānuja, *GB.*, (II, 12), p. 52.

17 *Tātparyacandrikā* of Vedānta Deśika, *Ibid.*

Deśika further adds that the *śruti* quoted by Rāmānuja in support of his view that difference between the Individual selves and the Supreme Being is innate and ineradicable is specially directed against Bhāskara's view and only secondarily against Śaṅkara:—

यद्वा, भास्करपक्षदूषणायैव श्रुतिरुपात्ता । ततश्च कैमुत्येन शंकरपक्षोऽपि दूषितः¹⁸ ॥

Elsewhere, Deśika writes referring to Bhāskara:—

एवं शंकरपक्षोक्तं दोषं भास्करादिपक्षेऽप्यतिदिशति (XIII.).

Concluding his comments on *Gītā*. XVIII, 66, Deśika mentions a number of early Bhāṣyas on the *Gītā* among which is found one by Bhāskara:—

एवमन्येष्वपि भूतेषु भविष्यत्सु च श्रीमद्गीताभाष्येषु भगवद्यामुनार्यभाष्यकारमतानुसारेण दिङ्मोहः प्रशमयितव्यः । पिशाच-रन्तिदेव-गुप्त-शंकर-यादवप्रकाश-भास्कर-नारायणार्य-यज्ञस्वामिप्रभृतिभिः स्वं स्वं मतमास्थितैः परःशतैर्भाष्यकृद्भिः अस्मत्सिद्धान्ततीर्थकरैश्चाविगीतपरिगृहीतोऽयमत्र सारार्थः¹⁹ × × × × × × .

There is also a reference to Bhāskara's commentary on the *Gītā* much earlier than the time of Vedānta Deśika. Abhinavagupta, the great protagonist of the Pratyabhijñā System of Śaivism in Kashmir and veteran *Āṅkārika* of the 10th and 11th centuries A.D., whose commentary on the *Gītā* (referred to by Deśika) is fortunately extant and available in print, refers to Bhāskara's commentary on the *Gītā* in terms of high admiration:—

अत्र चाध्याये (i.e., Chap. 18) यद्वशिष्टमवलोकनं वक्तव्यमस्ति, तत् प्राक्तनैरेव तत्रभवद्भट्टभास्करादिभिः वितत्य विमृष्टमिति, किमस्माकं तद्द्वैतार्थप्रकाशनमात्रप्रतिज्ञानिर्वाहणसाराणां पुनरुक्तप्रदर्शनप्रयासेन²⁰ ॥

Jayatīrtha on Bhāskara

Jayatīrtha is one of the ablest of the classical commentators that Sanskrit philosophical literature has produced. His commentary on the *Gītā Bhāṣya* of Madhva embodies certain very valuable references to

18 *Tātparyacandrīkā*, *Ibid.*

19 *Ibid.*, p. 952.

20 *Gītārthasaṅgraha* of Abhinavagupta published with 5 other commentaries of the Advaita School, Nirnaya Sagar Press, 1912, pp. 675-676.

and quotations from the commentaries of Saṅkara, Bhāskara etc., which throw a flood of light on the interrelation between the commentaries of Saṅkara and Bhāskara.²¹ Without the least exaggeration, we can assert that Jayatīrtha gives us a very deep insight into Bhāskara's interpretation of the *Gītā* and that what little we could hope to gather about this forgotten commentator on the *Gītā* is entirely through him.

At the outset, Jayatīrtha indicates how Bhāskara questions the propriety of Saṅkara's introducing the *Gītā Bhāṣya* with an account of the Avatāra of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and its aims. It may be observed here that both Saṅkara and Rāmānuja preface their commentaries on the *Gītā* with an account of the Avatāra of Śrī Kṛṣṇa; while Madhva opens with an account of the incarnation of the Lord as Vyāsa and his services to humanity by means of the Sūtras and the *Mahābhārata* in which is included the *Gītā*: तत्र च वासुदेवार्जुनसंवादरूपां सर्वभारतार्थसंग्रहां महाभारतपरिजातमधुभूतां गीतामुपनिबबन्ध ॥ To open commentaries on the *Gītā* with an account of some Avatāra closely connected with the work, would thus appear to have been an orthodox convention which the three great Ācāryas obeyed. But Bhāskara was a radical, and cared little for these conventions. He believed, it seems, that a good commentator's business was to indicate the introductory requisites (अनुबन्ध) or preliminaries of the work before him and then proceed to comment on the passages without needlessly beating about the bush. Bhāskara seems to have held that a Sāstra work such as the *Gītā* did not call for any high flown half-poetic²² half-mythic description of the Avatāra of Śrī Kṛṣṇa which Saṅkara lavished on it. Bhāskara, therefore, sternly reproved Saṅkara for his blessed irrelevance. Jayatīrtha reproduces Bhāskara's criticism thus:—

एतेन एतदपि प्रत्युक्तं यदाह भास्करः 'शास्त्रप्रयोजनाभिधाने प्रस्तुते, अवतार-

21 For an illustration of the obvious value of Jayatīrtha's gloss on the *Gītā Bhāṣya* of Madhva for purposes of critical and comparative textual research, see the present writer's paper on 'Saṅkara's Authorship of the *Gītā Bhāṣya*,' *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, Poona, vol. XIV, parts i and ii, pp. 55-76.

22 Witness दैवव्यां वसुदेवादंशिनं कृष्णः किल संबभूव—the phrase च'शिनं कृष्णः , reads poetic enough.

प्रयोजनाभिधानमसंगतम्' इति ॥ Jayatīrtha is aware that the criticism which Bhāskara urged against Śaṅkara would apply to Madhva also; hence his anxiety to state and refute the opinion of Bhāskara. Thanks to Jayatīrtha, we are now in a position to state that Bhāskara's commentary on the *Gītā* opened without any account of any Avatāra connected with the *Gītā*.

Bhāskara's Theogony

Interesting light is thrown by Jayatīrtha on Bhāskara's theological views. In his commentary on *Gītā*, II, 54, Jayatīrtha cites the queer interpretation of the term केशव propounded by Bhāskara. The reference is not to the term केशव in II, 54 but to the one that occurs later, i.e., XI, 35, as Jayatīrtha himself clearly states:—

‘कश्च अश्च ईशश्च केशाः ब्रह्मविष्णुमहेश्वराः ; ते यस्य अवयवभूताः स केशवः परमात्मा' इति भास्करो 'निरुक्तवान् एतच्छ्रुत्वा वचनं केशवस्य' (x, 35) इत्यत्र । तदसदिति भावेनाह²³ ॥

This shows that Bhāskara's theological views were certainly original and sometimes radically so. Bhāskara believed in a transcendental Deity, of which the three gods of the popular Hindu trinity were parts or lesser manifestations. In other words, Bhāskara (though an Advaitin in essence) was not prepared to identify his Brahman with either Śiva or Viṣṇu as the Śaivādvaitins or Vaiṣṇavādvaitins would like to do; nor even with Viṣṇu as Rāmānuja, Madhva and Vallabha have done. In this respect, Bhāskara seems to have entertained views similar to—though not quite the same as—those of Vijñāna Bhikṣu and vaguely anticipated a doctrine of the theosophic movement of our times. Possibly, we could describe Bhāskara as a non-sectarian so far as his theogony is concerned.

Lastly, Jayatīrtha draws attention to the confused interpretation and altered reading adopted by Bhāskara for the hemistich (VI, 7):—

जितात्मनः प्रशान्तस्य परमात्मा समाहितः ।

²³ Jayatīrtha, p. 156. The reference also shows that Bhāskara's commentary on the *Gītā* covered the eleventh chapter and possibly the rest of the *Gītā* too indeed. So it appears from Abhinavagupta and Deśika's remarks.

The above is the reading in the vulgate text of the *Gītā*. But Bhāskara seems to have read instead:— जितात्मनः प्रशान्तस्य परात्मसु समा मतिः and introduced a very strained interpretation of the text.

Jayatīrtha says:—अत्र भास्करोऽन्वयमपश्यन्, 'परमात्मा समाहित' इति संप्रदायागं पाठं विसृज्य, 'परात्मसु समा मति' रिति पाठान्तरं प्रकल्प्य, समा मतिरितित्वावर्त्य सप्तम्या अर्थमुक्त्वा, पूर्वपाठे अन्वयाभाव इत्यवादीत् । तदनेनापहस्तितं भवति²⁴ ॥

Bhāskara seems to have confronted difficulties in this verse by rejecting the traditional reading and adopting a novel one. The full text of the *Gītā* runs:—

जितात्मनः प्रशान्तस्य परमात्मा समाहितः ।

शीतोष्णसुखदुःखेषु तथा मानावमानयोः ॥

Bhāskara's rendering with his own revised reading would read²⁵:— Equanimity of mind in regard to other selves (comes) to him who is contented and has conquered the senses; balanced outlook (comes also) to him amidst (the opposites of) cold and heat, pleasure and pain as well as esteem and spite.

Bhāskara's insurmountable difficulty seems to have been to find out a proper agreement for the two locatives in the second half—which in Śaṅkara's interpretation too (with which presumably Bhāskara was dissatisfied) is not suitably made out. Madhva offers an easier solution:—

प्रशान्तस्य जितात्मनः शीतोष्णसुखदुःखेषु तथा मानावमानयोः परमात्मा समाहितः
(भवति).

Contemporaneity of Śaṅkara and Bhāskara

Bhāskara appears throughout in Jayatīrtha's commentary as a critic of Śaṅkara. But this does not necessarily mean that Bhāskara was later than Śaṅkara. We have already seen how Śaṅkara, at the very outset of his commentary on the second chapter of the *Gītā*, repudiates the

24 Jayatīrtha, p. 375.

25 The *anvaya* according to Bhāskara would be: जितात्मनः प्रशान्तस्य परात्मसु समा मतिः (जायते) ; (तस्यैव जितात्मनः प्रशान्तस्य) शीतोष्णसुखदुःखेषु तथा मानावमानयोः समा मतिः (भवति) । It will be seen that on this interpretation the phrase समा मतिः would have to be repeated in the second half.

ज्ञानकर्मसमुच्चयवाद of Bhāskara—as a commentator on the *Gītā*. Putting these two facts together, the conclusion is irresistible that both Śaṅkara and Bhāskara were very close contemporaries. Abhinavagupta's reference to Bhāskara as an ancient and authoritative commentator on the *Gītā* makes it necessary for us to date Bhāskara a century or two earlier and this agrees very well indeed with the date proposed by us. Śaṅkara is at present assigned by sober historical criticism to the 8th century A.D. We can, therefore, confidently place Bhāskara also, in the same period.

Now for the clues given by Jayatīrtha. An interesting question is raised (by the commentators on the *Gītā*) if non-participation in *karman* entails sin, Śaṅkara answers it in the negative :

न तावन्नित्यानामकरणादभावादेव भावरूपस्य प्रत्यवायस्य उत्पत्तिः कल्प-
यितुं शक्या, 'कथमसतः सजायेत' इति असतः सज्जन्मासंभवश्रुतेः²⁶ ॥

Śaṅkara's reasoning that a *non-being* of the nature of कर्माकरण (not doing) could not produce, as its effect, a *being* of the nature of sin (प्रत्यवाय) because the *Śruti* negates such a possibility, is overthrown by Bhāskara. Jayatīrtha indicates Śaṅkara's position and Bhāskara's criticism thereon and finally rejects both :—

शंकरस्तु, अकरणमसन्न सन्तं प्रत्यवायं जनयति, 'कथमसतः सजायेते'ति
श्रुतेरित्यवादीत् । तत् भास्करः प्रत्यषेधीत्—द्रव्यविषया श्रुतिः ; गुणस्तु असतोऽपि
जायत इति । उभावपि स्थूलदृश्यान्²⁷ ॥ Jayatīrtha incidentally indicates

what Bhāskara's answer was to the difficulty raised by Śaṅkara. This further helps us to state that Bhāskara interpreted the well-known *Śruti* in the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* as applying to substance only and not to attributes also.

It appears from Jayatīrtha's note on the line यो बुद्धेः परतस्तु सः (III, 42), that Bhāskara interpreted it to mean काम²⁸ even as Rāmānuja has done. Śaṅkara renders it in terms of the individual soul. Madhva interprets the term सः as the Supreme Being.

26 Śaṅkara's *Gītā Bhāṣya* (III, 1 Introd.) p. 190. Jayatīrtha discusses the question only under III, 4; whereas the opinion attributed to Śaṅkara occurs actually in the introductory part of the latter's commentary on III, 1.

27 Jayatīrtha (III, 4), p. 190.

28 भास्करस्तु, कामोऽपीत्यत इत्याह । तदतीव महत् । p. 257.

Further light is thrown by Jayatīrtha on the practical philosophy of the *Gītā* as understood by Bhāskara. The exact import and scope of the famous declaration of the Lord summing up the entire Philosophy of Action:—

कर्मण्येवाधिकारस्ते मा फलेषु कदाचन ।
मा कर्मफलहेतुर्भूः मा ते संगोऽस्त्वकर्मणि ॥

are matters of keen and lively controversy among the Bhāṣyakāras. We are not concerned here with Śaṅkara's interpretation of the verse. Jayatīrtha, in the course of his comments, refers to Bhāskara's interpretation in order to contrast it with that of Madhva and exhibit its soundness as against that of Bhāskara. Now, Bhāskara seems to have understood *Gītā*, II, 47, to proclaim that the law of dispassionate performance of actions (निष्कामकर्म) refers only to those obligatory and occasional rites enjoined by the Śāstra for persons of different social status; and that the verse and what is more, the golden rule of dispassionate performance of karma, has absolutely no reference to certain rites specially resorted to by persons desirous of achieving a special object²⁹: (काम्यकर्म) such as the performance of jyotiṣṭoma sacrifices etc. Madhva takes the widest view of this *śloka* and holds that every variety of karma, *nitya*, *naimittika* or *aicchika*, is capable of disinterested performance. That Bhāskara counts the performance of नित्य and नैमित्तिककर्म alone in a dispassionate manner to be conducive to Liberation and ignores, or more precisely, rejects acts like ज्योतिष्टोम is already clear from an extract from him quoted before.

Attention has already been drawn to Bhāskara's doctrine that Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva are only lesser manifestations of the Supreme Being. Bhāskara would, very naturally, have looked upon Śrī Kṛṣṇa himself (an Avatāra of Viṣṇu) as a lesser manifestation or part (अवयव) of the Supreme Brahman. Now, in commenting on *Gītā* XIII, 12, an identical view is attributed by Śaṅkara to a predecessor of his. The

28 भास्करस्त्वाह—‘नित्यनैमित्तिकान्येव कर्माणि निष्कामतया कर्तव्यानि नतु ज्योतिष्टोमादीनि कर्माधिकारि विहितानि, तेषां निष्कामतया करणे प्रमाणाभावात्.’ Jayatīrtha (II, 47), pp. 139-40.

29 Bhāskara, *BSB.*, p. 24.

hemistich अनादिमत्परं ब्रह्म न सत्तन्नासदुच्यते (XIII. 12), is interesting for a variety of interpretations given by commentators to the first half: अनादिमत्परं ब्रह्म and the whole point centres round this half. The point at issue here is the proper resolution of the term अनादिमत्परं(ब्रह्म). Is it to be split into अनादिमत् and परं or अनादि and मत्परं? Śaṅkara adopts the former and severely criticises an earlier commentator who offered an interpretation with अनादि and मत्परं as the two terms. This earlier rendering was to this effect: मत्परम्- अहं वासुदेवाख्या परा शक्तिर्यस्येति which could have been offered only by one holding the view that Vāsudeva (i.e. the speaker, Kṛṣṇa) was not wholly identical with the Brahman but was simply a part, power or emanation of it. The Bahuvrīhi Samāsa, on such a view, would clearly require the subordination of the two terms मत् and परं to an extraneous object. From what we have seen of Bhāskara, we can safely press his identity with the commentator³¹ credited by Śaṅkara with the queer interpretation 'अहं वासुदेवाख्या परा शक्तिर्यस्य तत्'. We have seen that Bhāskara was loath to recognise Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva as identical with the Supreme Brahman and was firmly of opinion that the three gods of the Hindu Trinity were but inferior manifestations, *avayavas*, or powers, parts or emanations of the Infinite Being which alone he called Brahman—a view which is sharply assailed by Madhva and Jayatīrtha. It is interesting to note that Jayatīrtha, in controverting the earlier interpretation of मत्परं offered by the Pūrvapakṣin—predecessor of Śaṅkara, brings forward an argument which could only be urged against one who does not subscribe to the equation of Vāsudeva-Viṣṇu with the Para Brahman: केचिदनादीति मत्परमिति च पदं विच्छिद्य, अहं वासुदेवाख्या परा शक्तिर्यस्य तन्मत्परमिति व्याचक्षते, तदसत्, अर्थासंभवात् । नहि ब्रह्मेति वासुदेवेति कश्चिद्भेदः ॥

This shows that Jayatīrtha understood this earlier commentator to have made an invidious distinction between Vāsudeva (Viṣṇu or Kṛṣṇa)

31 None of the commentators on Śaṅkara are disposed to lift the veil and reveal the identity of this commentator on the Gītā. Even Deśika and Jayatīrtha are unfortunately silent. Certain unpublished glosses on Jayatīrtha's commentary may be expected to throw some light. They are not at present accessible to me for reference. Abhinavagupta, too, is silent on XIII, 12.

and Para Brahman. Hence his anxiety to demolish such a mischievous interpretation. Our present knowledge of Pre-Śaṅkarite commentators on the *Gītā* does not disclose any one other than Bhāskara who could answer to this requirement. There is every probability, therefore, in Bhāskara's having been the identical commentator who made the 'mischievous' and invidious distinction between Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva and the Para Brahman in XIII, 12; which distinction Jayatirtha felt bound to overthrow, and in which case it would be easy to show that Śaṅkara used Bhāskara's commentary on the *Gītā* and was really refuting his interpretation of मत्परं (XIII, 12). This would not, however, necessarily make Bhāskara a predecessor of Śaṅkara. Conclusive evidences have already been furnished to show that Bhāskara was an unsparing critic of Śaṅkara and that he actually subjected the latter's commentary on the *Gītā* to close criticism. The balance of evidence thus inclines to the view that Bhāskara was a very close contemporary of Śaṅkara.

It is hoped that some of the textual evidences exhibited in the foregoing pages would give scholars and critics interested in restoring the forgotten literary and philosophical celebrities of ancient India to their rightful places, some concrete idea of Bhāskara's forgotten commentary on the *Gītā* and the robust personality of its author.

B. N. KRISHNAMURTI SARMA

Influence of Tantra on the Tattvas of Raghunandana

Introduction

A comparison of the later *Smṛti Nibandhas* with the earlier *Samhitās* reveals a change not only of style and spirit but also of contents. The *Samhitās* such as those of Manu and Yājñavalkya deal with topics many of which disappear in the *Nibandhas*; for example, the long list of multifarious duties of the *snātaka* is missing; the four stages of life are neglected; the five great sacrifices (*pañca-mahāyajña*) have lost their importance; and so on. On the other hand, more attention is paid to the details of rites connected with the social and domestic life of the people. Apart from other minor changes, numerous new festivals have been introduced and a good number of sections deals with the methods of worship of Paurāṇic gods which are not traceable in the *Samhitās* and which have thrown the Vedic sacrificial rites into the background.

A careful study of the *Nibandhas*—so far as it concerns those of the Bengal School—brings to light four prominent factors which have contributed to their growth and development, viz., (i) the *Purāṇas*, (ii) the *Tantra* and sectarian religious works, (iii) Maithila *Smṛti* works, and (iv) local customs and usages. Here we shall deal with *Tantras* only and see how far they have influenced the conduct of the people and thereby moulded the form of the *Nibandhas*.

We are not concerned here with the origin of the *Tantra*. It might have originally been “the pseudo-scientific productions of theologians, in which the practice and theory of Yoga and doctrines of the monist (*advaita*) philosophy are seen mingled with the most extravagant symbolism and occultism,”¹ or “fundamentally an unlimited array of magic rites drawn from the practice of the most ignorant and superstitious classes,”² or an importation from outside, most probably with the Magi priests of the Scythians, as Mm. Hara Prasāda Śāstrī holds,³ or

1 Winternitz, *History of Indian Literature*, vol. 1, p. 606.

2 Farquhar, *Outline of the Religious Literature of India*, p. 200.

3 H. P. Śāstrī's Introduction (p. 10) to N. Basu's *Modern Buddhism*.

derived from the non-Vedic Aryan ideas imbedded in the *Atharvan Samhitā*; or even it may be connected with the recently unearthed Indus civilisation. But one cannot deny their great antiquity. The evidence of the *Ahīrbudhnyā-samhitā*, the *Pañcatantra*⁴ (edited by F. Kielhorn, i, v. 70), the *Duśakumāracarita* (Nirṇaya Sāgara Press edition, II, p. 81, *mudrā-tantra-mantra-dhyānādibhiḥ*), the *Bhāgarata Purāṇa*,⁵ the *Mālatī-mādhava*, the testimony of the Tibetan historian Tāranātha,⁶ the early neo-Vaiṣṇava Upaniṣads like the *Nṛsiṃhatāpanīya*⁷ and the occurrence of works from 609 A.D. onward⁸ prove the existence of the Tantras in the sixth century A.D. at the latest.

A perusal of the early Kashmirian Śaiva Āgama and Pañcarātra Vaiṣṇava works reveals the fact that roughly from the 8th or 9th century A.D. they began to be greatly influenced by Tāntric ideas and practices many of which they incorporated in themselves. This influence pre-supposes the great popularity of the cult and consequently its wide-spread character. The *Ahīrbudhnyā-samhitā* which is replete with Tāntrism hails from Kashmir. Other *Pañcarātra Samhitās* also originated from the North between the 5th and the 9th centuries, though they circulated in the south from the eleventh century onward.⁹ The *Tantrasāra*¹⁰ quotes a few stanzas, which are in their turn found quoted by a Tāntric writer Vidyādharaçārya from Jāvāla (apparently the Smṛti writer), concerning the choice of spiritual preceptor.¹¹ These stanzas

4 Dated not later than 557 A.D. (vide Keith, *Sanskrit Literature*, p. 488; Winternitz, *op. cit.*, I, p. 589, fn. 3; Schrader, *Introduction to the Pañcarātra*, pp. 96 ff.). It is replete with Tāntric ideas and practices and contains mysterious significance of the letters of the alphabet, *mantra*, *yantra* and sorcery.

5 Winternitz, *Indian Lit.*, I, p. 605, fn. 1.

6 Farquhar, *Outline*, p. 210.

7 They are Viṣṇuite in character and describe *mantras* and *yantras* showing Tāntric influence. They were commented upon by Gaudapāda about 750 A.D. Cf. Farquhar, *Outline*, pp. 188-9.

8 A Ms. of the *Kubjikāmata-tantra* dates from the 7th century, a Ms. of the *Paramēśvara-tantra* is dated 858 A.D. and a Ms. of the *Mahākaula-jñāna-vinirṇaya* is quite as old. Cf. Farquhar, *Outline*, p. 99.

9 Farquhar, *Outline*, p. 182; Schrader, *Introduction*, pp. 17 ff.

10 Edited by Pañca Śikha Bhaṭṭācārya.

11 “मध्यदेश-कुह्लोज-लाट-कोङ्कनसम्भवाः । अन्तर्वेदि प्रतिष्ठाना आवन्त्याश्च गुरुत्तमाः ॥
गौडाः शाखाः सुराश्चैव मागधाः केरलास्तथा । कोशलाश्च दशार्णाश्च गुरवः सप्त मध्यमाः ॥
कर्णाट-नर्मदा-रेवा-कच्छास्तीरोङ्गवास्तथा । कालिन्दाश्च कलम्बाश्च काम्बोजाश्चाथमा मताः ॥”

show that the Tāntric cult was at one time widely spread. The Purāṇas also exhibit traces of Tāntric influence, proving the great popularity of the cult. In the *Brahma P.*,¹² the Āgama is mentioned along with the Veda, Vedāṅga, Purāṇa etc., meaning thereby a literature—most probably the Tantra—for the word is used to mean the Veda as well as the Tantra. In XLIV. 9-10, a king Indradyumna is said to have consulted the Tantras along with other works to learn the method of worshipping Hari.¹³ The worship of the Sun (Sūryārghya-dāna)¹⁴ is done in a Saura-padma having filaments and eight petals, nyāsas and mudrās being frequently performed. Śiva also is worshipped with Tāntric mantras.¹⁵ The method of the daily worship of Nārāyaṇa after bath is also Tāntric.¹⁶ Ch. LXI also gives a detailed description of the worship of Nārāyaṇa according to the purely Tāntric method. The Tāntric conception of Śakti is also there. She is the mother not only of the Universe, but also of Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Maheśa.¹⁷ Every god has his Śakti. The Vaiṣṇavī Śakti is described as plunging the whole world in Māyā and as being worshipped under the names of Āryā, Durgā, Ambikā, Bhadrakālī, etc. with wine, meat and other edible things.¹⁸ Other characteristics of the Tāntric cult,

12 Vaṅgavāsī edition, XXVI, 7.—पुराणागमवक्तारं वेदवेदाङ्गपारगम् । Also cf. मुने वेदांश्च शास्त्राणि पुराणागमभारतम् । भूतं भव्यं भविष्यं च सर्वं जानामि वाङ्मयम् ॥ XXVI. 18.

13 तस्मैयं मतिस्तुष्ट्या सर्वयोगेश्वरं हरिम् । कथमारार्घयिष्यामि भुक्तिमुक्तिप्रदं प्रभुम् ॥ विचार्य सर्वशास्त्राणि तन्त्रागमविस्तरम् । इतिहासपुराणानि वेदाङ्गानि च सर्वशः ॥

14 *Brahma-Purāṇa*, Ch. XXVIII.

15 *Ibid.*, XLI, 1 ff.

16 *Ibid.*, LX, 35-40.

ज्ञानकाले विशेषेण चोपस्थाय जले शुचिः । स्मरेन्नारायणं ध्यायेद्धस्ते काये च विन्यसेत् ॥ ओङ्कारञ्च नकारञ्च अङ्गुष्ठे हस्तयोर्न्यसेत् । शेषैर्हस्ततलं यावत्तर्जन्यादिषु विन्यसेत् ॥ ओङ्कारं वामपादे तु नकारं दक्षिणे न्यसेत् । राकारं नाभिदेशे तु यकारं वामबाहुके । नाकारं दक्षिणे न्यस्य यकारं मुद्धि विन्यसेत् ॥ अधश्चोर्ध्वञ्च हृदये पार्श्वतः पृष्ठतोऽग्रतः । ध्यात्वा नारायणं पश्चादारभेत् कत्रच बुधः ॥ &c. &c.

17 *Ibid.*, Ch. CXXXI. 47.

ब्रह्म-विष्णु-महेशानां शक्तिर्माता त्रयीमयी ।

18 *Ibid.*, Ch. CLXXXI. 48-52.

such as the allowance made to women and Sūdras as regards initiation and worship, the nerve and lotus theory, etc. are not hard to discover.¹⁹ The *Garuḍa* and the *Agni Purāṇas* show very distinctly the influence of the Śākta teaching given in the Āgamas, Tantras, and Saṃhitās. The *Brahmāṇḍa P.* is Tāntric in character. The *Līṅga P.*, like the Tantras, contains a long discourse on the mystic meaning of the syllable *Om* and of the letters of the alphabet, while the *Kūrma* (पूर्वभाग, XII) names a number of Tantras besides propagating the worship of Śakti under various names.²⁰ There may arise doubt about the antiquity of the portions containing Tāntric ideas because later additions are traceable in the Purāṇas.²¹ Some, however, of these Purāṇa passages are cited in fairly early works like those of Raghunandana, and Gopāla-bhaṭṭa's *Hari-bhakti-vilāsa*, thus testifying to the wide influence of Tāntric ideas at a fairly early date.

The causes of this spread and popularity of the cult are as follows. First, there is the tradition that the Vedas were meant for the people of the Kṛta-yuga, Smṛtis for those of Tretā, Purāṇas for the Dvāpara, and in the Kali age Tantras are the only means.²² Moreover, Tantrism has been vitally connected with Śaktism which inculcates the propitiation of the dreadful aspects of nature and in which the weakness of the human mind finds a natural resting place. The importance which the Tantras give to the female sex, whose company is sometimes needed in worship, is supported by the erotic instincts of human nature. The

19 *Brahma-Purāṇa*, Ch. XXVIII; XLI; CX. &c.

20 Farquhar, *Outline*, pp. 195 ff.

21 *Vide* Wilson, *Works*, III, p. 18, where he says that the temple of Konāraka mentioned in the *Brahma Purāṇa* was not built until 1241 A.D. Also cf. Farquhar, *Outline*, p. 270, wherein he assigns a similar age to the many passages containing references to Utkala.

22 कृते ऋत्युक्त आचारस्य तायां स्मृतिसम्भवः ।

द्वापरे तु पुराणोक्तं कलावागमकेवलम् ॥

Kulārṇava-tantra.

Also cf. आगमोक्तविधानेन कलौ देवान् यजेत् सुधीः ।

न हि देवाः प्रसीदन्ति कलौ चान्यविधानतः ॥

Viṣṇu-yāmala and *Tārā-pradīpa.*

विना आगममार्गेण कलौ नास्ति गतिः प्रिये ।

Mahānirvāṇa-tantra (Ed. by Kṛṣṇa Gopāla Bhakta).

mystic processes and magic power attainable through them are presented as really attractive. The Tāntric cult, thus appealing to the popular psychology, attained a rapid propagation. Decadent Buddhism also helped the process. With the decline of Buddhism, the Mahāyāna school began to assimilate within itself doctrines regarding Tāntric magic circles, mantras etc. and crowned this assimilation by the adoption of the theory of Kālacakra. But the excesses of Tāntrism inevitably resulted in a severe unpopularity of the faith. Bengal, which was at one time largely converted into Buddhism, became the most notorious place for questionable Tāntric practices. But such a condition was not allowed to linger long. Hinduism re-asserted itself during the rule of the Sena kings in the beginning of the 12th century A.D. and dealt a death-blow to the rival faith. Some Tantras such as “the *Sakti-saigama-tantra*, a later work, declare that the object of the Tantra is to root out Buddhism and establish Hinduism while the Buddhist Tantras equally denounce Brāhmaṇism”,²³ and though some Tāntric works might have been written to re-establish Hinduism (cf. *Mahāriśvasāra-tantra*), we must not attach too much importance to them and conclude that conversion to Hinduism was carried on in a proselytising spirit. It is probable that the process of assimilation was to a great extent a natural one. The Mahāyānists adopted Sanskrit as the language of their scriptures, took to the worship of images, and accepted Śraddhā and Bhakti as religious factors, while the Hindus imbibed the doctrine of *Ahiṃsā* and such gods as the Dharma-ṭhākura. Thus the distance between the two religions growing lesser, Buddhism which was in a decadent stage succumbed to the fresh vigour of revived Hinduism. Through this assimilation Tāntrism, which had spread more rapidly among the Buddhists than among Brāhmaṇists and which had got a firmer footing in the former, was confirmed in its position and attained greater vogue. But the main feature of this confirmation was that the revival of older Smārta rites and older spirit of thought proved a corrective against Tāntric practices.

The greater popularity of the cult served as a stronger incentive

to writing scriptures. Consequently, from the eleventh century onward there was a notable increase of literary activity among the Tāntriks. A good number of Mss. can be safely dated about the 11th century A.D.²⁴ There is also an improvement in the general form of the works, for the Tāntriks remained no longer satisfied with putting down the rituals only but incorporated Smṛti topics in their works, obviously for the guidance of the followers of the cult. The *Mahānirvāṇa-tantra*²⁵ gives a detailed list of such topics dealt with in it. Such lists can be gathered from other Tantras also. What great authority these injunctions attained in course of time even among the Smārta scholars, not to speak of the common run of people, we shall see below.

The Tattvas of Raghunandana

It is significant remark that the science of law (*Vyavahāra-śāstra*) like grammar (*Vyākaraṇat*) is based on usage (*ācāra*).²⁶ This remark holds good in all climes and ages. No jurist or law-giver has ever been guided solely by his own *a priori* speculations. His business is not so much to create laws as to adapt them to the needs and

24 H. P. Śāstrī, *A Cat. of Palm-leaf and Selected Paper Mss. belonging to the Durbar Library, Nepal*, Calcutta I. 1905; II. 1915.

25 Cf. “दीक्षां पूजां जपं होमं पुरश्चरणात्तर्पणम् ।
 व्रतोद्वाहौ पुंसवनं सीमन्तोन्नयनन्तथा ॥
 जातकर्म तथा नामचूडाकरणमेव च ।
 मृतक्रियां पितृश्राद्धं कुर्यादागमसम्मतम् ॥
 तीर्थश्राद्धं वृषोत्सर्गं शारदोत्सवमेव च ।
 यात्रां गृहप्रवेशञ्च नववस्त्रादिधारणम् ॥
 वापी-कूप-सडागानां संस्कारं तिथिकर्म च ।
 गृहारम्भप्रतिष्ठाञ्च देवानां स्थापनं तथा ॥
 दिवाकृत्यं निशाकृत्यं पर्वकृत्यं तथैव च ।
 ऋतुमासवर्षकृत्यं नित्यं नैमित्तिकञ्च यत् ॥
 कर्तव्यं यदकर्तव्यं त्याज्यं प्राज्ञं च यद्भवेत् ।
 मयोक्तेन विधानेन तत्सर्वं साधयेन्नरः ॥”

Mahānirvāṇa-tantra, p. 112.

26 *Vyavahāra-mayūkha* (Ed. by Mandlik) p. 56.

circumstances. This is true with Raghunandana also. It would seem therefore that when, even from a careless perusal of the works of Raghunandana, the reader discovers the many remarkable traces of Tāntric influence in almost all kinds of injunctions—religious, social, personal or political—he can safely picture in his mind the society in which Raghunandana lived.

The Tattvas of Raghunandana²⁷ convince us that the Tantras exerted the maximum of influence in his time on the religious aspect of Hindu ideas and practices. The conception of Śakti is accepted and the origin of the universe is explained through this conception. The goddess Durgā²⁸ is worshipped under various names, such as, Caṇḍikā, Ṣaṣṭhī, Maṅgalacaṇḍī, Durgā, Śyāmā, Vindhyavāsini etc. There are also other Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava gods who are worshipped with equal devotion. The method of worship, in a great majority of cases and specially in the case of Śākta deities, is highly coloured by Tāntric rites and practices, but in no case the purely Tāntric method is recommended. The Purānas and sectarian scriptures are mainly drawn upon to show the correct way of worshipping the sectarian gods. Even as regards Śākta deities, the main outline of worship is Purānic to which Tantras add finishing touches.

The mediums of worship are usually the *Śalagrāma*²⁹ (the sacred stone), *Paṭa* (image),—*Yantras* (diagrams) and *Maṇḍalas* (circles) being of secondary importance. In the *Prācaraṇotsava-yātrā* a circle

27 We have used the following editions of the works of Raghunandana:—

(i) *Smṛti-tattva* in two volumes comprising the 28 tattvas, edited by Jivānanda Vidyāsāgara.

(ii) *Durgāpūjā-tattva*, Ed. by Satīśa Candra Siddhāntabhūṣaṇa from the Sanskrit Sahitya Parisat, Calcutta. (It is to be noted that the *Durgāpūjā-prayoga-tattva* which is one of the two sections of the *Durgāpūjā-tattva* is the same work as the *Śrīdurgārcana-paddhati* occurring at the end of the *Smṛti-tattva*; 11.

(iii) *Yātrā-tattva*, Ed. by Dvārikā Nātha Nyāyaśāstrī from the Sanskrit Sahitya Parisat, Calcutta.

28 Farquhar, *Outline*, pp. 149-150 and 199.

29 बालग्रामे घटे जले वा.....पूजयेत् । *Yātrā-tattva*, p. 36.

30 भद्रकालीं पटे कृत्वा तुम्बु सम्पूजयेद् द्विजः । *Smṛti-tattva*, I, p. 86.

containing the figure of a lotus with eight petals painted with powders of five hues³² is to be drawn. In the *Puṣya-snānotsava* Raghunandana prescribes the drawing of a Maṇḍala called the Sarvatobhadra before the deity and the placing of the auspicious 'ādihāra' in it.³³ It should be noted that the Sarvatobhadra-maṇḍala is originally Tāntric and is used at the time of initiation and worship of deities. The *Phalgūtsava-yātrā-prayoga* includes, among other operations, the drawing of a triangle (*trikoṇa-maṇḍala*)³⁴ in which a washed basin for *arghya* (*dhautārghya-pātra*) is placed in order to throw on it *dūrvā*, *tuṇḍula*, *candana* and *gandha* with the citation of such Tāntric mantras as 'मं वह्निमण्डलाय दशकलात्मने नमः', 'अं अर्कमण्डलाय द्वादशकलात्मने नमः', etc. In the ceremony of entrance into a newly built house, a maṇḍala coloured with five hues, viz., yellow, white, red, black and green, is to be drawn and the *Śāradātilaka Tantra*³⁵ is quoted to support this custom. In case of inability for depicting a maṇḍala the gods might be worshipped in front of a *Śālagrāma-Śilā*.³⁶ In the *Ekāśītipada-rāstu-yāga*, which is well described in the *Matsya P.*³⁷ ten straight lines are to be drawn from south to north and ten from east to west crossing the former, the whole figure resembling greatly a Yantra of the Tāntrikas. Different deities are to be worshipped in the 81 rectangles thus formed. Two stanzas are quoted from the *Rudra-*

31 पेटेषु प्रतिमायां वा घटे मङ्गलचण्डिकाम् । *Ibid.*, I, p. 41.

चामरव्यजनवीज्यमानं प्रतिकृतिप्रयं । *Yātrā-tattva*, p. 41.

पूजाधारमाह गौतमीयतन्त्रम्—

शालग्रामे मणौ यन्त्रे मण्डले प्रतिमासु च ।

नित्यं पूजा हरेः कार्या न तु केवलभूतले ॥ *Smṛti-tattva*, II, p. 62.

32 पञ्चवर्णरजोभिरष्टदलपद्मसमन्वितं मण्डलं निर्माय..... *Yātrā-tattva*, p. 84.

33 ततो देवस्य पुरतः सर्वतोभद्रमण्डलमालिख्य तन्मध्ये भद्रमाधारं स्थापयेत् ।

Ibid., p. 86.

34 *Ibid.*, p. 95.

35 तथा च शारदायाम्—'उक्तानामपि देवानां पदान्यापूर्य पञ्चभिः ।

रजोभिस्तैर्यथोक्तैः पायसान्नैर्दलैर्हरेत् ॥' *Smṛti-tattva*, II, p. 416.

36 मण्डलकरणासामध्ये शालग्रामसमीपे सर्वे पूजाः । *Ibid.*, II, p. 416.

87 Edited by the Vaṅgavāsī Office, Calcutta, pp. 878 ff.

yāmala Tantra which name the different lines.³⁸ In the *Graha-yajña* different kinds of maṇḍalas, representing different planets, are worshipped.³⁹ In the *Śrī-rāmanaramī-crata*, which is celebrated on the eighth day of the bright half of the month of Caitra and which is to be accomplished after the directions of the *Agastya Saṃhitā*, a Yantra with six angles is to be drawn and in it *hṛdaya*, *śiras*, *śikhā*, *kavāca*, *netra*, and *astra* are to be worshipped with the mantras **रं हृदयाय नमः**, **रीं शिरसे स्वाहा**, **रूं शिखायै वषट्**, **रैं कवचाय हं**, **रौं नेत्राभ्यां वौषट्**, and **रः अस्त्राय फट्**⁴⁰.

It is obvious from the above that *yantras* and *maṇḍalas* form mediums of worship in the great majority of cases but they are said to be of secondary importance, primary importance being attached to image (*pratimā*). In the *Deva-pratiṣṭhā-tattva*⁴¹ Raghunandana discusses the different materials for the construction of images of various deities, quoting passages from the Purāṇas and the Tantras.⁴² A newly constructed image is first to be infused with life (*prāṇa-pratiṣṭhā*) to confer divinity on it. During this *Prāṇa-pratiṣṭhā*, which, as Raghunandana rightly observes, is fully described in the Purāṇas, the opera-

38 रुद्रयामले तासां नामानि—

“शान्ता यशोमती कान्ता विशाला प्राणवाहिनी । शुचि सुमनसा नन्दा सुभद्रा
सुरथा तथा ॥ हिरण्या सुव्रता लक्ष्मीर्विभूतिर्विमला प्रिया ।

जया कला विशोका च इडा संज्ञा दशोत्तरा ॥” *Smṛti-tattva*, II, p. 420.

39 कृतेषु मण्डलकेषु वर्तुलादिग्रहरूपेषु पूज्या इति शेषः । तथा च शान्तिदीपिकायाम्—
‘वर्तूलो भास्करः कार्यो ह्यद्वन्द्वो निशःकरः । अङ्गारकस्त्रिकोणस्तु बुधश्चापाकृतिस्तथा ॥
पद्माकृतिर्गुरुः कार्यश्चतुष्कोणस्तु भार्गवः । सर्पाकृतिः शनिः कार्यो राहुस्तु मकराकृतिः ॥
खड्गाकृतिस्तथा केतुः कार्यो मण्डलपूजने ॥” मण्डलकरणासामर्थ्ये वेदिकामाह

Ibid., I, p. 946.

40 *Ibid.*, I, p. 61.

41 *Ibid.*, II, p. 502-13.

42 गौतमीयतन्त्रे—“काश्मरी ज्ञानदा प्रोक्ता स्वर्णाजापि विमुक्तिदा । तेजोदा वारुजा
चैव रैत्तिकी शत्रुनाशिनी ॥ ताम्री धर्मविबुद्धिञ्च करोति बहुसौख्यदा । मृद्वैव मृगमयी प्रोक्ता
प्रतिमा शुभलक्षणा ॥ भोगदा मोक्षदा सा तु प्रतिमा कथिता तव ॥” *Ibid.*, II, pp. 502-3.

tions laid down in the *Mahākapilapañcarātra*⁴³ are to be performed in addition to the Purāṇic ones. Of the different *Nyāsas* prescribed by the said work *tattva-nyāsa* is concerned with Viṣṇu only (*tattva-nyāsa tu Viṣṇu-riṣayaka eva*). For the authority of these *Nyāsas*, Raghunandana refers to the *Śāradā-tīlaka* and the *Krama-dīpikā*. The mantra for *Prāṇa-pratiṣṭhā* may be Purāṇic or Tāntric. The former⁴⁴ is derived from the *Kālikā-purāṇa*, a Śākta work. It is natural therefore that it should bear traces of Tāntric influence and, as a matter of fact, such mystic terms as ह्रं, कट् etc. form its component parts. For the Tāntric mantra, the *Śāradā-tīlaka*⁴⁵ is drawn upon. It is a combina-

43 महाकपिलपञ्चरात्रोक्तकर्म च कर्तव्यं, तद् यथा

“सपुष्पं सकुशं पाणिं न्यसेद् देवस्य मस्तके । पञ्चवारं जपेन्मूलमष्टोत्तरशतोत्तरम् ॥ ततो मूलेन मूर्धादिपीठान्तं संस्पृशेदिति । तत्त्वन्यासं लिपिन्यासं मन्त्रन्यासञ्च विन्यसेत् ॥ पूजाञ्च महतीं कुर्यात् स्त्रतन्त्रोक्तां यथाविधि । प्राणप्रतिष्ठामन्त्रेण प्राणस्थापनमाचरेत् ॥” लिपिन्यासः मातृकान्यासः । उक्तञ्च । “जरादौ सर्वमन्त्राणां विन्यासेन लिपिं विना । कृतं तन्निष्फलं विद्यात् तस्मात् पूर्वं लिपिं न्यसेत् ॥”

कादिमतेऽपि—“मातृकायाः षडङ्गञ्च मातृकान्यासमेव च । सर्वासां प्रथमं कृत्वा पश्चात्तन्त्रो- दितं न्यसेत् ॥” एतद्वचनाच्च पूर्वं मातृकान्यासः पश्चात्तत्त्वन्यासः । क्रमदीपिकायामप्येवं क्रमः । मन्त्रन्यासश्च तत्तन्मन्त्रोक्तपदवर्णान्यासः । *Smṛti-tattva*, II, pp. 505-6.

44 *Ibid.*, II, p. 666. Also cf. *Durgāpūjā-tattva*, pp. 10-11.

45 प्राणप्रतिष्ठामन्त्रस्तु शारदात्रयोविंशतिपट्लोक्तः । यथा—“पाशाङ्कुशपुटाशक्तिर्वाणी बिन्दुविभूषिता । याद्याः सप्तसकारान्ता व्योमसत्येन्दुसंयुताः ॥ तदन्ते हंसमन्त्रः स्यात्ततोऽ- मुष्यपदं वदेत् । प्राणा इति वदेत् पश्चादिह प्राणास्ततः परम् ॥ अमुष्यजीव इह स्थितस्ततोऽ- मुष्यपदं वदेत् । सर्वेन्द्रियाण्यमुष्यान्ते वाङ्मनश्चक्षुरन्ततः ॥ श्रोत्रघ्राणपदे प्राणा इहागत्य सुखं चिरम् । तिष्ठन्त्यग्निवधूरन्ते प्राणमन्त्रोऽयमीरितः ॥ प्रत्यमुष्यपदात् पूर्वं पाशाद्यानि नियोजयेत् । प्रयोगेषु समाख्यातः प्राणमन्त्रो मनोषिभिः ॥”

To this Raghunandana adds elucidating notes:—

पाशाङ्कुशपुटाशक्तिरित्यनेन प्रथमं पाशबीजं आं ततः शक्तिबीजं ह्रीं ततोऽङ्कुशबीजं क्रौं वाणी यकारो बिन्दुविभूषितः, तेन यं, याद्याः सप्तसकारान्ता उद्धृतयकारानुवादेन सप्त न तु तन्निजं बीजं पूर्वं, पृथगुद्धारस्तु वर्णसप्तानामपि सबिन्दुताख्यापनाय, अन्यत्राप्यङ्कुश-वायुनलावनी वरुणाबीजान्युक्तानि, अत्र वायुबीजस्यैकत्वं बीजत्वेन सर्वेषां सबिन्दुत्वं व्यक्तं, राघवमहोऽप्येवम्, अन्यस्तु वाणीबिन्दुविभूषिता इत्युक्ता नादबिन्दुविभूषिता इति व्याख्याने याद्या इत्यस्य विशेषणं वदति, व्योम हकारः सत्य ओकारः इन्दुर्विन्दुः, तेन होम्, अतएव पाशाङ्कुशान्तरित- शक्तिमनोः पुरस्तादुच्चार्य यादिवसुवर्णगुणं सहस्रमिति प्रपञ्चसारोऽप्याह । गुणमित्यनेन

tion of different *bijas* such as the *pāśabīja* (ॐ), *śaktibīja* (ह्रीं), *aṅkuśabīja* क्रौं etc. and other mystic syllables यं रं लं वं शं षं ह्रीं हं सः with the addition of clauses अमुष्य प्राणा इह प्राणा अमुष्य जीव इह स्थितः etc. During the recital of this mantra, the cheeks of the image are to be touched with the right hand according to the direction of the *Kālikā-purāna*.⁴⁶ Among other operations to be observed during the erection of an image, the bathing of the image is to be performed according to the *Hayasīrṣā-pañcarātra*.⁴⁷ The work of erection is completed by worshipping the image with 16, 10 or 5 *upacāras* mainly after the manner of the Tāntrikas. But in case one fails to worship the image even for a single day, the directions of the *Mahākapila-pañcarātra*⁴⁸ are to be followed. In case of negligence for over a month the rites of *Samprokṣaṇa* and *Prāṇa-pratiṣṭhā* are to be performed again. Though this work of erection has obviously been influenced a great deal by Tānttric rites and practices, restrictions of caste and sex are yet to be observed. Only the twice-born are entitled to do the work. Women and Sūdras are not even allowed to touch the image.⁴⁹

In the *Yātrā-tattra* which deals with the twelve principal festivals of Viṣṇu which are to be performed one in each month and which are observed with great pomp and dignity in many places, particularly at the temple of Jagannātha at Puri, we find a detailed account of the rites and mantras to be employed in these festivals.

A study of them shows that both Purāṇas and Tantras contribute to the completion of the form of worship we find in Raghunandana's works. The *Bhūtāpasāraṇa* and *Bhūtaśuddhi*, which may be done in the

होमिति पद्मपादावाच्यैर्व्याख्यातम्, अग्निवधुः स्वाहा, तेनायं मन्त्रः—ॐ ह्रीं क्रौं यं रं लं वं शं षं ह्रीं हं सः अमुष्य प्राणा इह प्राणाः । आमित्यादि अमुष्य जीव इह स्थितः । आमित्यादि अमुष्य सर्वेन्द्रियाणि । आमित्यादि अमुष्य वाक्मनश्चक्षुःश्रोत्रघ्राणप्राणा इहागत्य सुखं चिरं तिष्ठन्तु स्वाहा । *Smṛti-tattra*, II, pp. 505-7.

46 Ibid., II, p. 507. *Durgāpūjā-tattra*, p. 10.

47 *Smṛti-tattra*, II, p. 507.

48 Ibid., II, pp. 511-2.

49 श्रीश्यामनुपमीतानां शूद्रानाम् जनेधर । स्वर्गाने नाधिकारोऽस्ति विष्णोर्वा वा शङ्करेऽपिवा ॥”

Purāṇic fashion also, are often conducted in the purely Tāntric method. The mystic number 108 influences the number of pitchers to be filled with water by which Govinda is to be bathed. In the *Prāraṇotsava-yātrā* a pitcher with seven pieces of cloth upon it is to be placed in a maṇḍala containing the painted figure of an eight-petaled lotus. The ten Dik-pālas are to be invoked and there should be offering of *māṣa* and rice in those parts of the maṇḍala which are representative of the directions over which the respective gods preside. Outside the maṇḍala Kṣetra-pāla, Gaṇādhīpa, Caṇḍa and Pracāṇḍa are to be similarly invoked and offered *māṣa* and rice in the directions as above. In the *Phalgūtsava-yātrā* all the rites mentioned above are to be performed. The *Sūtikā-ṣaṣṭhī-pūjā*⁵⁰ consists of Ṣoḍaśa-mātrkā-pūja,⁵¹ Bhūta-śuddhi, Aṅganyāsa, Yoginī-dākinī-rākṣasī-jāta-hārīnī-bālaghātīnī-ghorā-pīṣitāsanā-vasudeva-devakī-yaśodā-nandapūja etc. and the ceremonies also are replete with Tāntric rites. The *Vāstuyāga-tattva* prescribes the drawing of Yantras and Maṇḍalas in which the gods originating from Vāstu (*Vāstu-sambharāḥ*) and the drawing of a lotus (*padmaka*) having eight petals and filaments (अष्टपत्रं सर्गिकम्) and 8 or 12 letters placed therein, form parts of the daily worship of the Śālagrāmaśilā.⁵² The methods of worship of the Śākta goddesses such as Maṅgala-caṇḍikā, Durgā etc. are highly Tāntric. The worship of Maṅgala-caṇḍikā⁵³ consists of—

Mental representation of the personal attributes of the deity after the description of the *Kālikā-Purāṇa*⁵⁴; the offer of pādya etc. with the formula ओं ह्रीं मङ्गलचण्डिकायै नमः; the sacrifice of he-goats (the method of which is as follows:—The sacrificer should face towards the north and the goat towards the east. He should look at the goat with the spell

50 *Smṛti-tattva*, II, pp. 471 ff. Also cf. *Ibid.*, I, pp. 648 ff.

51 The 16 Mātrkāś are गौरी पद्मा शची मेधा सावित्री विजया जया ।
देवसेना स्वधा स्वाहा मातरो लोकमातरः ॥ शान्तिः पुष्टिर्धृतिस्तुष्टिरात्मदेवतया सह ।
आदौ विनायकः पूज्योऽन्ते च कुजदेवता ॥ *Ibid.*, I, p. 649.

52 *Ibid.*, I, p. 398. Can we not trace Tāntric influence in the name Cakra for the Śālagrāmaśilā?

53 *Ibid.*, II, pp. 466 ff. Also cf. *Ibid.*, I, p. 41

54 *Ibid.*, II, p. 466.

ओम् अस्त्राय फट्, purify it with a Vedic mantra, and sprinkle it after whispering the Tāntric spell “हिलि हिलि किलि किलि वदुरूपधरायै हुं हुंस्फे स्फे इमं पशुं प्रदर्शय स्वर्गं नियोजय मुक्तिं कुरु कुरु स्वाहा” into its ears. He should worship it with flowers, sandal paste etc. and cite the mantra ‘द्वाग त्वं वलिरूपेण मम भाग्यादुपस्थितःetc.’ and mentally identifying the object of sacrifice with Śiva, should place flowers on its head citing the spell ‘ऐं ह्रीं श्रीं’. Then water is to be offered with the mantra ‘तत् सदय अमुकगोत्रोऽमुकदेवशर्मा अभीष्टफलकामो ह्रीं चण्डिकायै इमं द्वागपशुं घातयिष्ये।’ Thus honouring the he-goat, the sword (*khadga*) is to be worshipped. It should be contemplated in the manner described in the stanzas ‘कृष्णां पिनाकपाणिञ्च कालरात्रिस्वरूपिणाम्। उग्रं रक्तास्यनयनं रक्तमाल्यानुलेपनम् ॥ रक्ताम्बरधरञ्चैव पाशहस्तं कुटुम्बिनम्। पिबमानञ्च रुधिरं भुञ्जानं क्रव्यसंहितम् ॥’, consecrated with the formula ‘रसना त्वं चण्डिकायाः सुरलोकप्रसाधकः’, honoured with pādya etc. with the spell अं ह्रीं खड्गाय नमः, worshipped with flowers and taken up with the spell ‘अं ह्रीं फट्’ to sever the victim,; the offer of blood and meat to the goddess saying ‘ऐं ह्रीं श्रीं कौशिकि रुत्रेण आप्यायताम्’ and of the severed head with a burning wick on it; prayer to the goddess to accept the *vali*; painting a *tilaka*-mark on the forehead of the worshipper with the blood on the sword citing ‘यं यं स्पृशामि पादेन यं यं पश्यामि चक्षुरा। स स मे वक्ष्यतां यानु यदि शक्रसमो भवेत् ॥’ and the hypnotic spell ‘ओम् ऐं ह्रीं श्रीं क्लिन्ने मदद्रवे स्वाहा ; the dedication of *Japa*.

From the account of the rituals, it is apparent that the Tāntric rites predominate overwhelmingly over the Purānic ones. Not only the Tāntric mantras are used at every step but the belief in the magic power of the materials of worship has been utilised by the Brāhmanists from the Tantras. Similar also is the case with *Durgāpūjā* which is one of the most important Pujās in Bengal. It is dealt with in Raghunandana’s *Durgāpūjā-tattva* in two sections (i) *Durgāpūjā-pramāṇa-tattva* and (ii) *Durgāpūjāprayoga-tattva*.⁵⁵ The main outline of the worship is supplied by the *Kālikā-purāṇa*, the *Devī-P.*, the *Bhaviṣya-P.* and the *Matsya-Sūcta-mahātānta*, a host of other works and authors⁵⁶ such as the *Agni-P.*, *Kālotara*, *Kriyāsāra*, *Garākṣa-*

55 For the topics dealt with in the latter cf. the Sanskrit Sahitya Parisat edition, introduction, pp. 52-3.

56 Vide *Durgāpūjā-tattva*, Introduction, pp. 45-50, for a list of quoted authors and works.

tantra, Vidyāpati's *Durgābhakti-taraṅgiṇī*, *Nandikeśvara-P.*, *Narasimha-P.*, *Piṅgalū-tantra*, *Prapañca-sāra*, *Brahma-P.*, *Brahmaṇḍa-Purāṇa*, *Mahākapila-pañcarātra*, *Amarasimha*, *Kāla-mādharīya*, *Kāṭhakagṛhya*, *Yāmala*, *Vaśiṣṭha-pañcarātra*, *Vaśiṣṭha-saṃhitā*, *Śāradā-tilaka*, *Śiva-rahasya*, *Saurāgama* etc. being quoted to supplement or modify the directions contained in the first four works mentioned above. The *Vārāhī-tantra*⁵⁷ is quoted to show the method and result of reading the *Caṇḍī-stava* of the *Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa* during the worship; the *Prapañcasāra*⁵⁸ is cited for the enumeration of the upacāras, and the *Yāmala*,⁵⁹ *Kālottara*,⁶⁰ and *Piṅgalū-tantra*⁶¹ for details regarding the construction of the Homa-Kuṇḍa. The *Śāradā-tilaka*,⁶² *Yāmala*⁶³ and the *Trailokyasāra*⁶⁴ are drawn upon to show the method of construction of a *Yoni* to the *Kuṇḍa*. This *Yoni* resembles the female organ and therefore must be of Tāntric origin. Many of the mantras and rites and practices are derived from the Tāntrikas. The Tāntric spell 'ह्रीं ओं दुर्गायै नमः' is used during *arghya-sthāpana* etc. The mystic syllable ऐं forms part of the formula⁶⁵ for *Bodhana* and the branch of a *Bilva* tree is cut off with the citation of the spell 'ओं छिन्धि छिन्धि फट् फट् हुं फट् स्वाहा'. The *Navapatrikā-pūjā* requires spells like 'ह्रीं ओं कदलीस्थायै ब्रह्मायै नमः।' The consecration of the image (प्राणप्रतिष्ठा), the sacrifice of animals and the purification of the elements (भूतशुद्धि) are, as we have seen above, performed according to the purely Tāntric method. During the great bath (महास्नान) of the goddess, the formula⁶⁶

57 *Smṛti-tattva*, I, pp. 69 and 71.

58 प्रपञ्चसारे—“अर्घ्यपाद्याचमन-मधुपर्काचमनान्यपि ।

गन्धादयो नवेद्यान्ता उपचारा दश क्रमात् ॥

गन्धादिका नवेद्यान्ता पूजा पञ्चोपचारिका ॥”

Durgāpūjā-tattva p. 14.

59 & 60 *Durgāpūjā-tattva*, p. 39

61 *Ibid.*, p. 39.

62, 63 & 64 *Ibid.*, p. 40.

65 ओं ऐं रावणस्य वधार्थं रामस्यानुग्रहाय च । अकाले ब्रह्मणा बोधो देव्यास्त्वाय कृतः

पुरा ॥ अहमप्याश्विने षष्ठ्यां सायाह्ने बोधयाम्यतः ॥ *Ibid.*, p. 50.

66 *Ibid.*, p. 13.

‘नारायण्यै विग्रहे चण्डिकायै श्रीमहि तन्न चण्डी प्रचोदयात्’ which is the Tāntric Gāyatrī of Durgā, is to be cited. The *Āvaraṇa-pūjā*⁶⁷ consists of the worship of the goddesses Jayantī, Ugra-candā, Ugra-damṣṭrā, Maṅgalā, and the Catuḥṣaṣṭimātr and Aṣṭa-mātr groups with appropriate Tāntric mantras such as ‘ह्रीं ओं जयन्ते नमः’ etc. The different limbs of the goddess and her throne are to be worshipped with Tantric formulas.⁶⁸ Flowers are to be offered in a lotus⁶⁹ drawn in front of the goddess with the mantra ‘ओं दक्षयज्ञविनाशिन्यै महाघोरायै योगिनीकोटिपरिवृतायै भद्रकाल्यै ह्रीं ओं दुर्गायै नमः।’ The *माषभक्तवलिदान*⁷⁰ also requires Tāntric mantras. The pādya, arghya etc. are offered with the dhenumudrā after citing the syllable वं (वमिति धेनुमुद्रया अमृतीकृत्य ... &c) and the goddess is worshipped on the daśamī-tithi with flowers taken up with the saṃhāra-mudhā.⁷¹ The custom of feeding virgin girls (कुमारी भोजन)⁷² during the mahā-ṣṭamī and mahānavamī-pūjā is due to Tāntric influence, for, it is the Tantras that attach too much importance to the female sex and inculcate their worship as a means of attaining salvation. Even the worship of Kārtika, Gaṇeśa, Lakṣmī and Sarasvatī betrays influence of Tāntric ideas. The Purāṇas contain no trace of their worship with Durgā. This custom perhaps owes its origin to the *Kalīvilāsa-tantra* (18th Pāṭala) wherein the Devī asks Mahādeva:

देव देव महादेव संसारार्णवतारक ।
 पृच्छाम्येकं महाभाग कृपया कथय प्रभो ॥
 ध्यानञ्च कार्तिकेयस्य तथा मन्त्रं जगतुपते ।
 ध्यानञ्च विजयादेव्या जयादेव्या वद प्रभो ॥

67 *Durgāpūjā-tattva*, pp. 61-62.68 *Ibid.*, p. 62.69 *Ibid.*, p. 62. ततो देव्याः पुरतः पद्मं निर्माय प्रागादिवलेषु कर्णिकायां जले वा एतत् पाद्यं ... &c.70 *Ibid.*, p. 65.71 *Ibid.*, p. 67.72 *Ibid.*, p. 65.73 Vide *Durgāpūjā-tattva*, Introduction, pp. 13-15 and pp. 41-43.

मयूरवाहनं तस्य गणेशस्य च मूर्धिकम् ।
 शरत्कालीनमर्दिन्याः पूजनञ्च कथं प्रभो ॥
 कालिकायाः पुराणेषु तथा देवीमते प्रभो ।
 पूजनं कार्तिकादीनां न च कुत्रापि दृश्यते ॥

and in answer to this Mahādeva says,

‘गणेश- कार्तिकस्यापि मयूरमूर्धिकस्य च ।
 जयाया विजयादेव्याः सरस्वत्यास्तथैव च ॥
 कमलायास्तथा पूजा शिवस्य ब्रह्मणस्तथा ।
 सावित्री-पूजनं कृत्वा स च सिद्धीश्वरो भवेत् ॥

* * * * *

पञ्चदेवं प्रपूज्यादौ पश्चान्महिषमर्दिनीम् ।
 ततस्तु कार्तिकादीनां पूजाञ्च यत्ततश्चरेत् ॥
 ततस्तु पत्रिकापूजा देवीपुराणसम्मता ।
 सारात्सारं महेशानि चतुर्वर्णेषु सम्मतम् ॥

In the worship of Sarasvatī⁷⁴, she is to be meditated upon in the manner described in the *Śāradā-tilaka*, but flowers, like Bandhujīva and Droṇa, which are not recommended by the *Matsya-sūkta*, are never to be offered. In the worship of Śrīpuruṣottama (i.e. Nārāyaṇa), अङ्गन्यास and करन्यास are to be performed with the syllables of the sectarian mantra ‘ओं नारायणाय नमः’ ।⁷⁵ Moreover, a maṇḍala, with the figure of a lotus having eight petals and filaments, is to be drawn and after putting down the eight syllables of the above mantra in the figure after the manner of the Tāntrikas, Nārāyaṇa is to be worshipped in it. In the *Śivarātri-vrata*, removal of impediments (विघ्ननिःसारण), blocking of all the directions (दिग्बन्धन), purification of elements (भूतशुद्धि) and control of breath (प्राणायाम) are to be performed after the manner of the Tāntrikas and the Liṅga to be washed with milk along with the mantra ‘हौं ईशानाय नमः’ during the first quarter of the night. During the second quarter, it is to be washed with curd with the mantra ‘हौं अघोराय नमः’, during the third with clarified butter with the mantra ‘हौं वामदेवाय नमः’, and during the fourth with honey with the mantra ‘हौं सद्योजाताय नमः’ । In the

74 *Smṛti-tattva*, I, p. 34.

75 *Ibid.*, II, pp. 568-9.

section called the पार्थिवशिवलिङ्गपूजाविधि the *Rudrayāmala*⁷⁶ is quoted to explain the custom of turning one's face towards the north when one sits down to worship. The pañcamukha-rudrākṣa which represents the five-faced Śiva is to be worn after the muttering of the spell 'ॐ हूं नमः' and the saṃhāra-mudrā is to be performed during Visarjana.

Even the worship of the five Smārta deities—Gaṇeśa, Viṣṇu, Śiva, Śūrya and Devī—which is done according to the Purāṇas, has not escaped Tāntric influence. For example, the dhenu-mudrā, with the utterance of the syllable 'vaṃ', is used to impart imperishability to pādya etc. and the conch-shell is worshipped at the end according to the directions of such Tantras as the *Mantra-tantra-prakāśa*.⁷⁷

The worship of almost every deity includes the muttering (*japa*) of the Bīja-mantra. The rules of counting, in different ways, the number of mutterings of Śakti and Viṣṇu-mantra on fingers, of placing the right hand on the chest, of covering the body with a piece of cloth and so on, are all borrowed from Tāntric works such as the *Puraścaraṇa-candrikā*, the *Mantra-tantra-prakāśa* and the *Mantra-koṣa*.⁷⁸ The *Pañcarātra* is quoted to show that if anybody mutters his Bīja-mantra deliriously with his hands not properly cleansed, his body bare and his head covered, his muttering becomes fruitless.⁷⁹

Tantras exert their influence not only on the form of worship but even in case of mistake or breach of continuity committed by the worshipper he has to purify himself through Tāntric process. For example, if a worshipper rises from his seat during worship through

76. अत्र हेतुमाह रुद्रयामले—'न प्राचीमवतः शम्भोर्नोदीचीं शक्तिस्स्थिताम् । न प्रतीचीं यतः पृष्ठमतो दत्तं समाचरेत् ॥' *Smṛti-tattva*, I, p. 128.

77 *Ibid.*, I, p. 417; *Ibid.*, II, p. 76.

78 *Ibid.*, II, pp. 74-75.

79 पञ्चरात्रे—

अपवित्रकरो नग्नः शिरसि प्रावृत्तोऽपि वा ।

प्रलपन् प्रजपेद् यावत्तावन्निष्फलमुच्यते ॥ *Ibid.*, I, 415.

mental distraction or idleness, he has to perform the Ṣaḍaṅga-nyāsa.⁸⁰

As regards the choice of flowers to be used in worship, Raghunandana quotes the *Śāradā-tīlaka*⁸¹ which states that a wise man should reject those flowers which are anyhow made impure. The *Matsya-sūkta* also is quoted to show that suffering in hell befalls the man who uses, in worship, flowers plucked after the midday ablution. The *Yoginī-tantra*⁸² is quoted to show what requisites of worship never acquire staleness. On other occasions also, Tantras are freely drawn upon. For example, during the worship of the goddess Lakṣmī the ringing of bells (*ghaṅṭā-rādana*) is prohibited according to the direction of the *Yoginī-tantra*.⁸³

From the above analysis of the different kinds of worship we find that Tantras add not only to the number of deities but also to the complication and mystic nature of their worship. The Ṣaṭcakra⁸⁴ theory is accepted and the worshipper feels it essential to rouse the Kuṇḍalinī-Śakti residing in the Mūlādhāra-cakra. The nyāsas and mudrās are freely used for the purpose. They must have created in the people such a deep impression of their magic power that they are

80 तन्त्रान्तरे—विज्ञेयदशवालस्याज्जपहोमार्चनान्तरा । उत्तिष्ठति तदा न्यासं षडङ्गं
विन्यसेत्ततः ॥ *Smṛti-tattva*, I, 415.

81 *Ibid.*, I, p. 401. Also cf. *Ibid.*, II, p. 67, where the *Matsya-sūkta* is quoted for the same purpose.

82. त्रिलवत्रञ्च माध्यञ्च तमालामञ्जुकोदलम् । कङ्कारं तुलसी चैव पद्मञ्च मुनिपुष्पकम् ।
एतत् पर्युषितं न स्याद् यच्चान्यत् कलिकात्मकम् ॥ *Ibid.*, p. 411.

83 *Ibid.*, I, p. 137

84 The six Cakras are:—

- (i) Mūlādhāra, of four petals which is the seat of the Kuṇḍalinīśakti and is situated between the base of the sexual organ and the anus.
- (ii) Svādhiṣṭhāna, of six petals, between the base of the sexual organ and the navel.
- (iii) Maṇipūra, of ten petals at the navel.
- (iv) Anāhata, of twelve petals in the breast.
- (v) Viśuddha, of sixteen petals at the neck.
- (vi) Ājñā of two petals at the brow; and above all there is the Sahasrāra of hundred petals.

employed in Vedic rites also. For example, akṣara-nyāsa⁸⁵ and kara-nyāsa⁸⁶ form parts of the Vaidikī Sandhyā; and in Homa during the Vṛṣotsarga the laddle is to be held with the śaṅkha-mudrā after the manner described in the line 'पञ्चाङ्गलान् बहिस्त्यक्त्वा धारयेच्छङ्खमुद्रया ।'⁸⁷ Even outside the field of worship, Tāntric rites are felt unavoidable for the sake of self-purification. In 'pretatarpaṇa' a kind of mudrā (मुद्रा अङ्गुष्ठतर्ज्जन्यात्मकयोगरूपा.....etc.⁸⁸) is needed for तिलग्रहण । A Brāhmaṇa is to perform the 'prāṇāhuti-mudrā' before beginning to eat.⁸⁹ But it is a happy thing that none of the foul practices, for which the Tāntric cult is notorious, has been allowed to creep into the Brāhmaṇic form of worship. The theory of Kāla-cakra is totally rejected; and of the 'pañca-ma-kāra' meat is allowed to be used only in certain Śākta worships, such as the Rājasī Durgā-pūjā.⁹⁰ Wine is looked down upon in such a way that Raghunandana forbids the use of even its substitutes.⁹¹

From the fact that Raghunandana had to write a separate Tattva on Tāntric Dikṣā, we can infer that this mode of Dikṣā must have been widely recognised in his time. At the beginning of the *Dikṣā-tattva*⁹² he says "In the *Śāradā-tilaka* etc. a great multitude of subsidiary acts in a Dikṣā have been shown but most of these have now become obsolete. An abridgment, therefore, is made of Dikṣā".⁹³ In accordance with the Tantras, the Dikṣā consists of the following parts:—

85 *Smṛti-tattva* I, p. 389.

86 *Ibid.*, I, p. 390.

87 *Ibid.*, II, p. 546 and I, p. 872.

88 *Ibid.*, II, p. 314.

89 *Ibid.*, I, p. 434.

प्राणाहुतिमुद्रामाह शौनकः—'तर्जनीमध्यमाङ्गुष्ठैर्लला प्राणाहुतिर्भवेत् । मध्यमानामिकाङ्गुष्ठैरपाने जुहुयात्ततः ॥ कनिष्ठानामिकाङ्गुष्ठैर्व्याने च जुहुयाद्भुविः । तर्जनीन्तु बहिस्कृत्वा उदाने जुहुयात्ततः ॥ समाने सर्वहस्तेन समुदायाहुतिर्भवेत् ॥'

90 *Ibid.*, II, p. 445 and I, p. 84. *Durgāpūjā-tattva*, p. 30.

91 अतो मद्यप्रतिनिधिदानमप्ययुक्तम् *Smṛti-tattva*, I, p. 84.

92 *Ibid.*, I, pp. 784-7; II, pp. 645-59.

93 धारदातिलकाद्येषु बहुलाङ्गप्रदर्शनात् । इदानीमननुष्ठानाद्दीक्षा संक्षिप्य लिख्यते ॥

Choice of proper time and place for initiation; characteristics of preceptors (who are to be versed in the Āgamas) and pupils; duties of the pupil (viz: summoning the preceptor and his worship); duties of the preceptor (such as the offer of sāmānyārghya; worship of dvāra-devatā; entrance into the maṇḍapa; aversion of the disturbing elements; worship of the seat; purification of hands; purification of the elements; control of breath; performance of the different kinds of nyāsas and the ten sacraments⁹⁴ of the mantra; placing of arghya; worship; and initiation into the Bījamantra⁹⁵; restrictions in the case of women and Sūdras.

There are also other minor functions to which we need not refer. One striking omission made by Raghunandana is that he does not refer to the Tāntric mode of examining the nature (i.e. *siddha*, *susiddha* etc.) of the mantra imparted to the disciple. In laying down the rules numerous works⁹⁶ are repeatedly drawn upon, the quotations from Tantras being much more frequent and all the rules following the directions of Tantras.

The extreme popularity of the Tāntric cult is expressed not only by the religious rites and observances but also by the inclusion of some of the Tāntric acts in the daily duties of the Brāhmaṇas. Early in the morning before leaving the bed, the spiritual preceptor, who is identified with the 'iṣṭa-devatā,' is to be remembered as seated on a

94 They are 'janana', 'jivana', 'tādāna', 'bodhana', 'abhiṣeka', 'vimalīkaraṇa', 'āpyāyana', 'tarpaṇa', 'dīpaṇa' and 'gopana'.

95 Regarding the character of the mantra, the *Bhuvaneśvarī-pārijāta* is quoted:—भुवनेश्वरीपारिजातेऽपि—मायाबीजसमायुक्तः क्षिप्रं सिद्धिप्रदो भवेत् ।..... &c. *Smṛti-tattva.*, I, p. 786.

96 These are:—

Prayoga-sāra (quoted twice), *Agastya-saṃhitā*, *Mahākāpila-pañcarātra* (quoted four times), *Tantrāntara*, *Nṛsiṃha-tāpanīya*, *Śāradā-tilaka* (quoted five times), *Mantra-tantra-prakāśa*, *Homa-mūla*, *Nāradiya*, *Piṅgalā-tantra*, *Vīra-tantra*, *Ratnāvalī*, *Kālottara*, *Dīpikā*, *Jñāna-mālā*, *Tattva-sāgara*, *Sāra-saṅgraha*, *Yoginī-tantra* (quoted twice), *Yama*, *Vyāsa*, *Padma-purāṇa*, *Pūjā-pradīpa*, *Baudhāyana*, *Nārasimha*, *Devī-purāṇa*, *Dāna-sūtra*, *Dakṣiṇāmūrti-saṃhitā*, *Matsya-Purāṇa*, *Vasiṣṭha-saṃhitā*, *Ṣaḍunnaya-mahātāntra*, *Kṛcchra-Śāstra*, *Mantra-prakāśa*, *Saiva*, and *Udyoga-parvan*. *Ibid.*, II, pp. 645-59.

Also, *Tattva-sāra*, *Kārma-purāṇa*, *Bhuvaneśvarī-pārijāta*, *Homasvarottara*, *Mantra-muktāvalī*, *Nṛsiṃhakalpa* and *Rāmārcana-candrikā*....*Ibid.*, I, pp. 784-7.

white lotus in the head and homage is to be paid to him.⁹⁷ Namaskriyā to Sivās (female jackals), after their howling is heard, forms one of the duties to be done during the first half of the first Yāma of a day just after the manner of Śāktas.⁹⁸ After bath a Hindu is to paint sectarian tilaka-marks⁹⁹ on different parts of his body.

The social life of the people appears to have been equally influenced by Tantras. The Smṛti topics included in the Tantras exert a firm hold upon Smṛti-writers like Raghunandana, who, in his *Udvāha-tatva*, *Jyotistatva*, *Prāyaścitta-tatva* etc. frequently quotes the opinions of Tāntric authors with a decided partiality for them. In connection with the auspicious and inauspicious names of brides, the *Matsya-sūkta-mahātantra* is quoted to show that if any person marries a girl of the same name as that of his mother, he has to perform the Cāndrāyana-vrata for atonement.¹⁰⁰ From the same work the stanzas “गङ्गा च यमुना चैव गोमती च सरस्वती । नदीध्वासां नाम वृद्धे मालती तुलसी अपि ॥ रेवती चाश्विनभेषु रोहिणी शुभदा भवेत् ॥”¹⁰¹ are cited as exceptions to Manu’s

97 “प्रातःशिरसि शुक्लाब्जे द्विनेत्रं द्विभुजं गुहम् । प्रसन्नवदनं शान्तं स्मरेत्तन्नामपूर्वकम् ॥ नमोऽस्तु गुरवे तस्मा इष्टदेवस्वरूपिणे । यस्य वाक्यामृतं हन्ति विषं संसारसंज्ञकम् ॥” इति पठेत् । *Smṛti-tatva*, I, p. 336.

Note that the custom of raising the preceptor to such a high position by identifying him with the ‘iṣṭadevatā’ and of remembering him before leaving bed is due to Tāntric influence.

98 कालिकापुराणम्—“यः शिवाविरुतं श्रुत्वा शिवदूर्तिं शुभप्रदाम् । प्रणमेत् साधको भूत्वा तस्य कामाः करे स्थिताः ॥” *Ibid.*, I, pp. 345-6.

99 “The belief in the magic power of diagrams (i.e. Yantras of Tāntriks) lead to the use of sect-marks. These are lines, curves, circles, spots and designs which are painted or smeared on the brow and other parts of the body, in order to place the person under the protection of these powerful instruments and the divinities they represent.....” Farquhar, *Outline*, p. 202.

Also cf. Moor’s table of sect-marks, *Hindu Pantheon*.

100 मतस्यसूक्तमहातन्त्रे—“मातुर्यन्नाम गुह्यं स्यात् सुप्रसिद्धमथापि वा । तन्नास्ती या भवेत् कन्या सातृनास्ती प्रवर्जते ॥ प्रमादाद् यदि गृहीयात् प्रायश्चित्तं समाचरेत् । ततश्चान्द्रायणं कृत्वा तां कन्यां परिवर्जयेत् ॥” *Smṛti-tatva*, II, pp. 114-5.

101 *Ibid.*, I, p. 612.

नोद्धेत् कपिलां कन्यां नाधिकङ्गीं न रोगिणीम् । नालोमिकां नातिलोत्रां न वाचालां न पिङ्गलाम् ।
नर्तवृत्तनदीपान्त्रीं नान्त्यपर्वतनामिकाम् । न पद्महिप्रेष्यनार्त्रीं न च भीषणनामिकाम् ॥

The same work is again quoted to show that girls of the same pravāras as those of the bridegrooms, and daughters of pupils and of spiritual preceptors cannot be married.¹⁰² The marriage of two sons or two daughters on the same day is forbidden by the same work.¹⁰³ An extract¹⁰⁴ is drawn here from a Tantra work called the *Yuddha-jayārṇava* prescribing rules for the choice of proper 'ganas' (deva, nara and rākṣasa) and 'rāsīs' of brides and bridegrooms of the four castes. These rules are still in vogue in our country. In connection with the proper time and method of 'dvirāgamana' of a newly married girl, a stanza from the *Matsya-sūkta*¹⁰⁵ is quoted. Besides these, other Tāntic works such as the *Svarodayo*, *Vidyādhari-vilāsa* etc. also are frequently quoted for opinions. Among the quotations made by Raghunandana in his *Prāyaścitta-tatva*, there is one from the *Matsya-tantra*¹⁰⁶ which ordains that if anybody abandons his grown up and virtuous wife, his sister or his mother through anger, he should perform the Ṛṣi-cāndrāyana and then allow them to live with him. Other quotations

102 *Smṛti-tatva*, II, p. 119.

103 *Ibid.*, II, 120. मत्स्यसूक्तमहातन्त्रेऽपि—“एकस्मिन् दिवसे चैव सोदराणां तथैव च । युग्ममुद्वाहिकं वर्ज्यं कन्यादानद्वयं तथा ॥”

104 युद्धजयार्णवे—“देवा जयन्ति युद्धेन सर्वथा नात्र संशयः । रत्नसां मानुषाणाञ्च संप्रामे निश्चयां मृतिः ॥ कर्किमीनालयो विप्राः क्षत्राः सिंहतुला हयाः । वेश्या युग्माजकुम्भाल्याः शूद्राः वृषमृगाङ्गनाः ॥ सर्वाः परिणयेद् विप्रः क्षत्रियो नवभागभवेत् । षडाश्रयो भवेद् वायस्तिष्ठः शूद्र प्रकोतिताः ॥ वर्णाश्रेष्ठा च या नारी हीनवर्णाश्च यः पुमान् । महत्यपि कुले जाता नासौ भर्तारि रज्यते ॥” *Ibid.*, I, p. 615.

Karki = Karkāṭa, Āli = Vṛścika. Yugma = Mithuna, Aja = Meṣa. and Aṅganā = Kanyā.

105 भुक्ता पित्रगृहे कन्या भुङ्क्ते स्वामिगृहे यदि । दौर्भाग्यं जायते तस्याः शपन्ति कृलनायिकाः ॥ *Ibid.*, I, p. 616.

106 त्यागानन्तरसंग्रहे मत्स्यतन्त्रम्—

“क्रोधाद् यदि त्यजेद् भाव्यां मातरं भगिनीमपि ।

प्राजापत्यव्रतं कुर्यात् सर्ववर्णेष्वयं विधिः ॥” *Ibid.*, I, p. 554.

occur from the *Śāradā-tilaka*, *Nigama*, *Matsya-sūkta* etc. Discussing the question whether a man in 'aśauca' is permitted to worship deities, Raghunandana quotes the *Mantra-muktāvalī* and the *Mahārṇava-tantrāntara*.¹⁰⁷ Such importance and predominance as are enjoyed by the Tantras over Smṛti works are certainly due to the diffusion of Tāntric ideas and their wide-spread influence.

Regarding minor matters in worship, their authority is sought as unavoidable.¹⁰⁸ The name 'Prajāpati' for the fire for Homa in Vāstu-yāga is established by a quotation from the *Matsya-sūkta*.¹⁰⁹ The *Mantra-tantraprakāśa* is quoted to prohibit the uttering of the word 'Svāhā' doubly in Homa.¹¹⁰ In the 'Dūrvā-homa' three twigs of Dūrvā are to be taken in accordance with the *Śāradā-tilaka*.¹¹¹ Even the definitions of 'अतिदेश'¹¹² and of 'धर्म' and 'अधर्म'¹¹³ are derived from

107 अथ सूतकिनः पूजां वक्ष्याम्यागमचोदिताम् । स्नात्वा नित्यञ्च निर्वर्त्य मानस्या क्रियया तु वै ॥ बाह्यपूजाक्रमेणैव ध्यानयोगेन पूजयेत् ॥' नित्यञ्चाशुचिकर्तव्यं प्रेततर्पणादि ।

मन्त्रमुक्तावल्याम्—“जपो देवार्चनाविधिः कार्यो दीक्षान्वितैर्नरैः । नास्ति पापं यतस्तेषां सूतकं वा यतात्मनाम् ॥”

तत्र रामार्चनचन्द्रिकाष्टमहार्णवतन्त्रान्तरेऽपि—

“अशुचिर्वा शुचिर्वापि गच्छंस्तिष्ठन् स्वपन्नपि ।

मन्त्रैकशरणो विद्वान् मनसैव सदाभ्यसेत् ॥”

Smṛti-tattva, II, pp. 277-8.

108 *Ibid.*, I, p. 416 (*Puraścaraṇa-candrikā*; p. 417 (*Viṣṇu-yāmala* and *Skandayāmala*). *Ibid.*, II, p. 58 (*Yoginī-tantra*); 59 (*Mantra-nirṇaya*, *Śāradā-tilaka*, *Prapañca-sūtra*, *Matsya-sūkta*).

109 *Ibid.*, II, p. 419.

“प्रतिष्ठायां लोहितश्च वास्तुयागे प्रजापतिः । जलाशय-प्रतिष्ठायां वरुणः समुदाहृतः ॥”

110 *Ibid.*, I, p. 876; II, p. 549.

111 दूर्वाहोमे दूर्वात्रयं ग्राह्यम् । सारदातिलके होमद्रव्यपरिमाणे दूर्वात्रयसमुद्दिष्टमिति दर्शनात् । *Ibid.*, I, p. 947.

112 अतिदेशस्तूक्तस्तन्त्ररत्ने—

“प्रकृतात् कर्मणो यस्मात्तत्समानेषु कर्मसु ।

धर्मोऽतिदिश्यते येन सोऽतिदेश इति स्मृतः ॥”

Ibid., I, p. 804.

113 अथ 'विदितक्रियया साध्यो धर्मः पुंसो गुणो मतः । प्रतिषिद्धक्रियासाध्यः सगुणोऽधर्म उच्यते ॥' इति तान्त्रिकैरभिहितम् । *Ibid.*, I, p. 818.

the Tantras. The opinions of Tantras are sometimes sought even in Śrāddha, a Vedic rite. Regarding Āma-Śrāddha the *Yoginī-tantra* has “निरग्नोरामभादे तु अन्नं न क्षालयेत् क्वचित् । वृद्धौ तु क्षालयेदन्नं संग्रामे ग्रहणेषु च ॥”¹¹⁴ and in connection with the proper time of Navānna-Śrāddha the *Rudra-yāmala* is quoted.¹¹⁵ Besides these, numerous other quotations in various connections occur in Raghunandana’s works. For example, the *matsya-sūkta* and the *Indra-yāmala* are quoted in connection with Ambuvāci¹¹⁶, the *Prayogasāra* regarding the use of ‘Śrī’ before the name of a spiritual preceptor,¹¹⁷ the *Matsya-sūkta* regarding the auspiciousness of songs or ‘Ulu, Ulu’ sound made by women on certain occasions¹¹⁸ as well as regarding the choice of persons fit to receive the priestly fee¹¹⁹, the *Śāradā-tilaka* regarding the measurement of a cubit¹²⁰ and so on. This shows how the Tantras are widely studied and regarded as authoritative by Smṛti-writers.

When the teachings of Tantras have thus made their way into all aspects and conditions of life, the magic aspect of the Tāntric rites and ceremonies cannot be lost sight of. The belief in the magic power of Tāntric rites, mantras, Yantras, Maṇḍalas and Cakras which are used by them to avert evils, to foretell the future etc., is so deep-rooted that they are considered to be of unfailing application and consequently their use has found its way into Smṛti-works. To ensure the preservation of crops, Raghunandana quotes in his *Jyotistatva* an extract¹²¹ of the *Devī-Purāṇa* given in the *Dāna-ratnā-*

114 *Smṛti-tattva*, I, p. 228.

115 *Ibid.*, I, p. 260.

‘प्रावृट्काले समायाते रौद्रं श्रुत्वा गते रवौ । नाडीवेधसमायोगे जलयोगं वदाम्यहम् ॥’ इति

स्वयामलाच्च ।

116 *Ibid.*, I, p. 814.

117 *Ibid.*, I, p. 919.

118 *Ibid.*, I, p. 886.

119 *Ibid.*, I, p. 503. Also cf. *Ibid.*, II, p. 58 and p. 631, where the *Yoginī-tantra* is quoted and p. 617 where the *Śāradā-tilaka* is drawn upon. &c., &c.

120 *Ibid.*, I, pp. 498-99.

121 लिखित्वा लक्ष्मणेनापि मन्त्रं शस्येषु बन्धयेत् । न व्याधिकोटहिंसायां भयं तत्र भवेत् क्वचित् ॥ सिद्धिः प्रचलतरङ्गतरलितमृदुसमीरयावनोद्देशे श्रीमद्रामभद्रपादाः कुशलिनः समुद्रतटे नानाशतसहस्राक्षरायां मध्ये खरनखरपञ्चोर्द्धलाङ्गुलं पवनसुतं वायुवेगं परकक्षप्रमथनं श्रीमदनु-

kara, which states that if a particular mantra ending in 'घ्रां घ्रीं घ्रों श्रीरामाय नमः' is written with 'alaktaka' and tied to the crops, no apprehension of loss from disease, insects or ferocious animals then exists. In the section dealing with agriculture Raghunandana quotes the *Scarodaya*¹²² to describe the method of drawing three kinds of 'Cakras' viz:—the Lāngala-cakra, the Bijopti-cakra and the Vṛṣabha-cakra in order to foresee the output through agriculture in a particular year. There are descriptions of two more cakras, viz:—the Chatra-cakra and the Siṃhāsana-cakra, by which a king can foresee the happiness or misery in store for himself or his kingdom. The quotations which contain these descriptions prescribe that in case a king finds his planets unfavourably disposed, he must propitiate them according to the directions given in the *Yāmala-tantra*.¹²³ In the section of the 'Jātaka-cakra', two extracts are quoted—one from the *Yuddha-jayārṇava* and the other from the *Scarodaya*—to show the method of foretelling future success and failure of a newborn child.¹²⁴ The good or evil effects accruing from a marriage are known through a process called 'Vedha' in a Cakra, drawn in a particular fashion much after the manner of the Tāntrikas. To give a somewhat detailed description of the process, Raghunandana quotes a few stanzas from the *Scarodaya*.¹²⁵ Once he describes a Cakra called the Sarvato-bhadra, used in calculations by adepts in the science of astronomy (ज्योतिःशास्त्रविशारदः) which has some similarity, as regards description and placing of letters, with the Sarvatobhadra-maṇḍala of the Tāntrikas and which may have been derived from it. Even during the

मन्तमाज्ञापयन्ति—अमुकस्याखण्डज्ञेने वाताभोऽम्भोगान्धीस्तीपाण्डरमुण्डीधूली शृङ्गारतरुपा
कृपराङ्गताफडिङ्गा एलावानरा गरुडा इमडुकमहिषादिरोगं खण्डयत क्षणमपि विलम्बं माचरत
विलम्बं कारयत तदा युष्मान् शतखडं कारयामीति । घ्रां घ्रीं घ्रों श्रीरामाय नमः ॥

Ibid., I, pp. 689-90.

122 *Ibid.*, I, pp. 684-85.

123 *Ibid.*, I, pp. 733-35.

124 *Ibid.*, I, pp. 642-43. Also cf. p. 603, where a passage from the *Brahmā-yāmala* is quoted to show the method of describing a Cakra called the Bālādi-cakra.

125 *Ibid.*, I, p. 613.

Śrāddha ceremony, a maṇḍala is to be described with ashes or water so that food placed in it may not be forcibly eaten up by Rākṣasas.¹²⁶

The popular belief in the magic power of Tāntric rites and practices enables the Tantras to receive recognition even by the courts of justice. Tāntric methods are adopted for the detection of criminals through supernatural power. In the fire ordeal¹²⁷ eight circles are to be drawn and Agni is to be worshipped in one of the circles with 'raktapuṣpa' 'akṣata', 'gandha' etc. and by the 'āvāhana-mantra'. Varuṇa, Vāyu, Yama, Indra, Kuvera, Soma and Sūrya are to be similarly worshipped in successive order in the remaining circles. There should be a ninth circle wherein all gods (*sarvederatāḥ*) are to be worshipped. This custom of worshipping gods in circles, obviously to confer on them some supernatural power to detect crimes, is certainly due to Tāntric influence. The *dharmā-divya*¹²⁸ (i.e. ordeal by lot) contains a great deal of Tāntric operations. The pictures of 'Dharma' and Adharma' are inspired with life (*prāṇa-pratiṣṭhā*) in a Tāntric fashion after the direction of the *Śāradā-tilaka*. The spells¹²⁹ for the purpose are purely Tāntric. The same process, with some variation in the mantra, is followed in the case of the portrait of Adharma also. Then the pictures are worshipped with white and black flowers respectively and placed in two lumps of mud. These lumps are kept in a pitcher from which the accused takes out one. If the lump thus taken out contains the picture of Dharma, the accused is proved innocent, otherwise he is deemed guilty.

From the above we understand how greatly the Tantras contribute to the growth of social and religious ideas but their most important contribution lies in the infusion, though in a limited way, of the idea of cosmopolitanism, which forms one of the best aspects of the Tāntric cult. The orthodox conservative ideas of Brāhmanism encouraged

126 *Ibid.*, I, p. 217.

ततो मण्डलं कृत्वा तान्त्रादिपात्रं पातयेत्...मण्डलाकरणे दोषमाह स्मृतिः "अथ मण्डलैर्हीनं राक्षसैर्भुज्यते बलात् ॥"

127 *Ibid.*, II, p. 598.

128 *Ibid.*, II, p. 609.

129 These have been fully described above.

class and caste distinctions and proved an obstacle to the spread of the idea of equality. Little concession was granted to women and Sūdras and they were never allowed to enjoy the full privileges of a religious life. It is the Tantras that, for the first time, bring about a change in their position. The Brāhmanites recognise, as we have seen above, the Tāntric form of initiation which is open to all, the only restriction being that women and Sūdras are not to utter the 'praṇava'. They are sometimes allowed to worship their favourite deities themselves. For example, in his *Srī-Durgārcanapaddhati* Raghunandana allows the Sūdras to worship the goddess Durgā with the substitution of the word 'namaḥ' for the Praṇava and the Vyāhṛti in the mantras.¹³⁰ They are also allowed to perform, themselves or through substitutes, the Graha-yajña which is a Smārta rite.¹³¹ Similar also is the case with Śiva-pūjā¹³² etc. For this improvement in their position, at least Hindu women and the Sūdras should ever remain indebted to the Tantras.

RAJENDRA CHANDRA HAZRA

130 *Smṛti-tattva*, II, p. 662.

.....शूद्रस्तु प्रणवव्याहृतिस्थाने नम इत्युच्चार्य पूजयेत् ।

131 *Ibid.*, I, p. 943.

अत्र शूद्रस्याप्यधिकारः । स्मार्तं शूद्रः समाचरेदिति वचनात् । अस्य स्मार्तत्वेन प्रतिनिधि-
नापि आरम्भः कार्यः ।

132 *Ibid.*, I, p. 128.

“शूद्रः कर्माणि यो नित्यं स्वीयानि कुरुते प्रिये ।
तस्याहमर्चां गृह्णामि चन्द्रखण्डविभूषिते ॥”

तथा—

“नमोऽन्तेन शिवेनैव स्त्रीणां पूजा विधीयते ॥”

एवकारेण प्रणवनिवृत्तिः । एवं शूद्रस्यापि । तथा नृसिंहतापनीये—“सावित्रीं प्रणवं
यजुर्लक्ष्मीं स्त्रीशूद्रयोर्नेच्छन्ति &c”

Cittavisúddhiprakaranam

OF

ĀRYADEVA*

This treatise was brought to light by the late Mahāmaho-pādhyāya Haraprasad Sastri.¹ Ever since that publication, no one has taken any serious notice of it, excepting that some scholars² have used it for the purpose of reference. The original ms. of the work is of palm leaves in old Nevari script. As it is very defective, its transcription and the printed text based on it are not free from mistakes. In the original ms. the first leaf is missing, the obverse side of the seventh leaf is totally illegible and many pādas, phrases or words are too defaced to be deciphered with any certainty.

The fact that these handicaps could be overcome to a great extent with the help of the Tibetan versions of the work, prompted me to undertake the task of preparing a critical edition of it. There are two Tibetan translations of this work, the first³ of which has been referred to by Bendall,⁴ and the second,⁵ which has a different title and is attributed to a different author,⁶ has been traced by me in the course of editing the first work. A further comparison of the present work with some other texts on the same or similar subjects, supplied me

* The work is in Press and will shortly be published from the Visvabharati.

1 *JASB.*, 1898, pp. 175 ff.

2 Bendall: *SS.*, p. 37; *JRAS.*, 1900, p. 41. Poussin: *Muséon*, 1900, p. 240; *BCP.*, p. 368; Nariman: *History of Skt. Buddhism*, p. 94; Kimura: *Origin of Mahāyāna Buddhism*, p. 166, and others.

3 *Cittāraṇaviśodhananāmaprakaraṇam* (*Sems.kyi.sguib.pa.rnam.par.sbyon.ba.ḥes.byu.ba'i.rab.tu.byed.pa*). See T. Rgyud, Gi, fols. 121b.3-127a.8 (Cordier: vol. II, p. 136); Narthang edition, fols. 118a.5-124b.2.

4 *SS.*, p. 37, footnote.

5 *Cittaratnaviśodhanam* (*Sems.rin.po.che.sbyon.bar.byed.par.ḥes.byu.ba*). See T. Rgyud, Yu, fols. 216a.2-222b.3 (Cordier: Vol. III, p. 232); Narthang edition, fols. 215a.6-222a.5.

6 *Rgyal.ba.lndra.b'u.tis.mdzad.pa*; See Tib. T. Dkar. Chag, fol. 104a.6.

with some more useful materials to work upon. A number of verses [or their parts which are exactly the same as or similar to those⁷ in this treatise, have been of great help in the correction of wrong readings and the selection of the right ones from among a number of them.

There is no title in the Sanskrit ms. of this work⁸. In *SS.* where some of the verses of this treatise are cited, the title is given as *Cittaviśuddhiprakaraṇam*⁹. The first Tibetan translation (*CAV*), both in transliteration and translation, calls it *Cittūvaraṇa- viśodhananūmaprakaraṇam*. The second translation names it *Cittaratnaviśodhanam*. In the printed text I have adopted the title supplied by *SS.* because the title of the work should naturally be *Cittaviśuddhiprakaraṇam*, as the theme of the treatise as indicated by its last verse¹⁰ is *Cittaviśuddhi* and *prakaraṇam*, as will be shown later on, is the class to which it can be allotted.

The work is generally attributed to Āryadeva. *CV.*¹ states in its colophon *kṛtir iyaṃ Āryadevapādānam iti*. *CV.*² supports it with a similar statement viz. *Cittaviśuddhiprakaraṇe Āryadevapūdair apy uktam*. *CAV.*, too, in its beginning as well as its end, supports this view.¹¹

There is also some external evidence to show that this treatise was written by Āryadeva and none else. *Cittaviśuddhi*, according to Vajrayāna, is one of the *kramas* 'stages' which are essential to the path that leads to the realization of *Sambodhi*¹² 'complete enlightenment.' *Pañcakrama*¹³, a treatise dealing with

7 See App. III to the printed text.

8 Later on in the *Cat. NDL.*, p. 249 the editor seems to have accepted the title given in *SS.*, p. 37.

9 One does not know how Dr. Bhattacharyya names the work differently at different places. See *Buddhist Iconography*, pp. xxiv, 1; *SM.*, II, p. cxxxiv; *Annals of B. R. Institute*, Poona, part X, p. 17.

10 *Cittaviśuddhim ādhāya yan mayopārjitam sukham/
cittaviśuddhim ādhāya tenāstu sukhito janaḥ//*

11 It respectively runs: *Slob.dpon.chen.po.'phugs. pa.lhas.mdzad.pa.bžugs so/ (Mahācāryāryadevasya kṛtir viharati sma), Slob.dpon.a.'rya.de.bas.mdzad.pa.rjogs.so// (Ācāryāryadevasya kṛtiḥ samāptā).*

12 *BD.*, p. 3.

13 *Memoirs de la Faculté des Letters de Gand*, fasc. 16. Cf. *Actes du dixième congress international des orientalistes*, 1894, pp. 139 ff.

these stages, devotes a whole chapter to it¹⁴. The *Ṭippaṇī* on this chapter states that Ācārya Śākyamitra, the redactor and the commentator of the text, has made some additions to it. These additions again are said to be the summary of a work, viz. *Anuttarasamḍhi* of Āryadeva, which also is reported to have been known as *Cittaviśuddhikrama*.¹⁵ In my opinion this Āryadeva and his *Cittaviśuddhikrama* alias *Anuttarasamḍhi* have some relation to the author and the work under discussion. The existence of a work called *Cittaratneviśodhanakrama*¹⁶ does support the view that the *Cittaviśuddhiprakaraṇam* alias *Cittaratnaviśodhanam* should have been related to some *krama*.

Moreover, there are two other treatises, *Svādhiṣṭhānakrama-prabheda*¹⁷ and *Abhisambodhikramopadeśa* (*bdag. byin. gyis. brlab. pa'i. rim. pa. rnam.par. dbye ba* and *mñon. par. byañ. chub. pa'i. rim. pa'i. man. ñag* respectively),¹⁸ attributed to Āryadeva, which in spite of the similiarity of their titles to those of some chapters in *PK.*, are not identical with them. They, too, like the work under discussion, deal with the same subject-matter dealt with in *PK.* Further the redactor of the Narthang edition of Tib. T. includes these three works in a volume which is mainly comprised of treatises dealing with *PK.* This, in my belief, is a sufficient evidence to put them down as belonging to the *PK.* literature. All of these treatises, though available as independent works, are, in fact, not so. Each of them taken as a separate unit, does not do full justice to all the aspects of Vajrayāna. They are really, as indicated by one (*CVP.*) of them, more like chapters than complete independent works. They complement each other when taken as a whole. This, I think, is sufficiently convincing an evidence in support of the assumption

14 *PK.*, p. 27 ff.

15 *PK.*, p. viii, footnote 2: *Ācārya Śākyamitraḥ te ātmāno bāhuścutyaṃ prakṛtayan prakṛtiprabhedaprakāśakam Anuttarasamḍhināmakam grantham kṛtvā ārye Pañcakrame prakṣiptavān.* See *PK.*, p. xii, footnote 1. Again at the end of the chapter III: *Anuttarasamḍhir iti aparānāma Cittaviśuddhikrama.* See *PK.*, p. xii, footnote 6. A verse from the latter is cited in *BD.*, p. 28 as that of the former.

16 Cordier, II, p. 243 no. 31.

17 *Cat. NDL.*, p. 65 and *Cat. Cal.*, p. 110.

18 Cordier, II, p. 136.

of the existence of a hypothetical work written by Āryadeva similar to *PK*.

As regards the identification of this Āryadeva, it can unhesitatingly be said that he is not the same as one, who is well-known as the author of *Catvāś-sataka*, *Śataśāstra*, *Akṣaraśataka* etc.¹⁹, though HPS,²⁰ Poussin²¹, Bendall²², Kimura²³, Nariman²⁴, and others²⁵ seem to have once believed him to be so, while Bhattacharyya²⁶, Vaidya²⁷, and later on Poussin²⁸ also doubted this identification.

When the tenets of Vajrayāna were current in Bengal there was a writer of this name. He is supposed to have been known under two or three other names²⁹. Many Sanskrit as well as Bengali treatises on the then Vajrayāna are attributed to him.³⁰ In my opinion this Āryadeva is identical with the author of *Cittaprakaraṇa*³¹, *Svādhiṣṭhānaprabheda*³² and *Anuttarasamḍhi* referred to above and is the one referred to in some other works.³³ of the same school.

The second translation (*CRV*.) as stated above³⁴, attributes the work to Rājā Indrabhūtipāda. He was both a patron and a writer of the Vajrayāna school, and was known as Mahārājā-dhirāja³⁵, Mahācārya, Oḍḍiyanasiddha, Avadhūta etc.³⁶ Besides in his two Sanskrit works, available at present, he is reported to have written a good many other treatises³⁷, big and small.

19 See Tib. T. Tsha, Cordier, III, pp. 296 ff.

20 *JASB.*, 1898, p. 175.

21 *BCP.*, p. 368, footnote; Muséon, 1900, p. 240.

22 *SS.*, p. 37

23 *The Origin of Mahāyāna Buddhism*, p. 166.

24 *History of Skt. Buddhism*, p. 94.

25 Keith: *Buddhist Philosophy*, p. 229; Abhyankara, *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*, GOHS, Poona, p. 510.

26 *SM.*, II, p. cxxxiv.

27 *Études sur Aryadeva*, p. 61.

28 *Buddhisme*, p. 383.

29 *BD.*, p. 30 (intro.).

30 *BD.*, app. p. 14.

31 *Cat. NDL.*, p. 249.

32 *Ibid.*, p. 65 and *Cat. Cal.*, p. 110.

33 *BD.*, p. 3; *Catupīṭhāloka in Cat. NDL.*, p. 13; *SS.*, p. 57.

34 See footnote 6.

35 *Cat. NDL.*, p. 56.

36 *TVW.*, p. xii.

37 *BD.*, pp. 14 ff. (App.).

Unfortunately they are known only through their Tibetan versions. He is supposed to have lived about the fourth quarter of the seventh century A.D.³⁸

As regards the date of this Āryadeva there is very little evidence. Some of the verses of the work occur in other works of settled dates but that, too, does not throw any light on the point, as these verses occur in the texts themselves without any indication that they are quoted from some other work. We have already seen that Āryadeva was the predecessor of Śākyamitra who summarised the *Anuttarasamḍhi* of the former.³⁹ Now this Śākyamitra was a disciple of Śākyaprabha,⁴⁰ who was a contemporary of Gopāla of the Pāla dynasty of Bengal.⁴¹ This fact gives us some data to presume that this Āryadeva was somewhat earlier than the beginning of the eighth century A.C.

Thus Āryadeva lived during a period in which Nāgārjuna⁴², the disciple of Rāhulabhadra⁴³ (Sāraha); Indrabhūtipāda, the king of Orissa⁴⁴; Lakṣmiṃkarā, the learned sister of the latter⁴⁵ and other *siddhas* upheld the banner of Vajrayāna. A comparison of their works shows that the ideal and the path to realise it, which they advocated, were identical in essence. The facts (1) that the chapters bearing similar titles⁴⁶ and containing similar treatment of the subject are attributed to both Nāgārjuna and Āryadeva, (2) that the Tibetan translators committed a mistake in attributing one and the same work to both Āryadeva and Indrabhūti, and (3) that the occurrence of similar and identical verses⁴⁷ in different works of all of them, can be accounted for by their being contemporaries and having similar mission.

From the Tibetan translations, the Indian translator of *CAV.* being Jūnākara, nothing is known about his date,

38 *SM.*, p. XLII.

39 See footnote 15.

40 *Tāranātha* (Schiefer), pp. 211, 213.

41 *Ibid.*

42 See *SM.*, II, p XLV.

43 *The life of Nāgārjuna from Tibetan and Chinese sources*, p. 7.

44 *SM.*, II, p. li.

45 *Ibid.*, liv.

46 Cf. *CVP.*, and works mentioned in footnotes 17 and 18 with chapters 3, 4 and 5 in *PK.*

47 See Index III to this work.

life and career, except that he had translated also some other works from Sanskrit into Tibetan.⁴⁸ The author of one of them, viz. *Gaṇacakravidhi* is Ācārya Dombiheruka who is supposed to have lived in the latter part of the eighth century A.C.⁴⁹ We can deduce from it that the first translation was accomplished after that period.

The Tibetan interpreter of this translation was Jayaśīla (*Tshul. khrims. rgyal. ba.*). If he is the same person as the one who was deputed to India by the Tibetan king Chañ. Chub in search of a great Ācārya for Tibet,⁵⁰ it may be said that the translation was made in the eleventh century A.C. For the person whom Jayaśīla took with him to Tibet was Mahāprabhu Dīpaṅkara Śrijñāna⁵¹ (980—1053),⁵² who was a contemporary of king Nayapāla of Magadha.⁵³

The second translation was made by Upādhyāya Dīpaṅkara Śrijñāna. It is decidedly a later one than the former, as is indicated at the end of the colophon in *CRV*.⁵⁴ It has many discrepancies as regards its fidelity to both the spirit and the words of the Sanskrit text. Coming to the identification of its translator, Dīpaṅkara Śrijñāna, it is not at all certain whether he is identical with the great Dīpaṅkara *alias* Atīśa or not. If they are so, it will be difficult to account for the difference of the titles of the two translations, and the names of the authors of the original work. It has already been shown that the interpreter of *CAV*. and this Atīśa were contemporaries as well as acquainted with each other. Now, if Upādhyāya Dīpaṅkara and Atīśa-Dīpaṅkara were one and the same person, it becomes hardly believable that a work, which is not of much importance, was translated twice during the same period.

Hence, one is naturally led to believe that there might have been two persons living at different times but having the same name Dīpaṅkara. HPS. also in one of his writings⁵⁵ resorts to

48 *BD.*, p. 34 (App.).

49 *SM.*, II, p. lxii.

50 *ITU.*, p. 69.

51 *Indian Pandits in the Land of Snow*, pp. 30, 31.

52 *SM.*, II, lxii.

53 See footnote 51.

54 *btan.la.'phab.pa'o.* It is written at the end of later translations only.

55 *Intro. BD.*, p. 22.

such a conjecture. Moreover, the different epithets⁵⁶ attached to the name Dipaṅkara and the fact that works of various sorts are attributed to him, would also support the existence of more than one person of that name.

The name of the Tibetan interpreter of the second translation is not clear. The colophon in *CRV*. and the index volume⁵⁷ of the Tanjur give his name as *khu. ston. dños. grub*. It may literally mean Rasaśāstrasiddha but that is not quite convincing. The first syllable *khu* might also be the name of a place. According to Cordier⁵⁸ the Tibetan words mean 'le maitre de khu' (the master of Khu) but he also suggests the following correction that they should be changed into '*grus. gyañ druñ*' meaning Sanātanavīrya. However, if the syllable *khu* is changed into *Bu*, the meaning becomes clearer, because we do find such a name as Bu. Ston⁵⁹ among the Tibetan literateurs. One does not know the exact date of this interpreter viz. Bu. Ston, or Khu. Ston or whatever his name may have been, but one thing is certain that he must have existed between the eleventh and the fourteenth century A. C. when the present edition of the Tibetan T. in which this translation (*CAV*.) is available, was accomplished.⁶⁰

Mahāyāna Buddhism in its later stage was split up into two sections, Pāramitānaya and Mantranaya.⁶¹ The latter was subsequently divided into many branches⁶² and had new elements introduced into it by several reputed Ācāryas.⁶³ One cannot say with any certainty to which of these many schools our work belonged. Of course the word Mahāyāna is frequently met with in the text, but that, too, is to be taken to imply some later school wherein the ideas expressed in this text were advocated. The fact that the person, known as an ideal one in our text

56 *BD.*, App. SV.

57 *Tib. T. Dkar. Chag.* fol. 104a. 6.

58 *Cat. T.*, III, p. 232.

59 The famous historian of Tibet and the redactor of *Tib. Tripiṭaka*.

60 See *Hinduism and Buddhism* by Eliot, vol. III, p. 380.

61 *AS.*, p. 14.

62 *Les Chants Mystiques* by Shahidulla, p. 16; *Cakrasambhāratāntra* (Tantra-texts), p. xxxii; *Lamaism* by Waddell, p. 152.

63 Viz. Sāraha, Indrabhūti, Dombihērka, Dipaṅkara etc. see *SM.*, II, intr. s.v.

is called the *yogī*, gives a suggestion that the writer of the text might have been under the influence of the Yogatantrayāna school of the Vajrayānists.

Evidently the writers of the Vajrayāna had for their philosophical ground the Mādhyamika⁶⁴ and the Yogācāra⁶⁵ schools of Buddhist metaphysics. According to the latter *citta* is all in all.⁶⁶ Ordinary laymen and misguided *bhikṣus* of the Vajrayāna period misunderstood this *citta*. They identified it with the ordinary mind of our daily experience, deified it as a mythological personality, and tried to please it⁶⁷ by directing their conduct of life accordingly. In fact, this mind was the *Bodhicitta* which in its deified form identified itself with the *Cittavajra*⁶⁸ and *Bodhivajra*. It was this *citta* which was to be worshipped and was to be taken as the only way for the fulfilment of one's purpose⁶⁹ there being no other source of real happiness.⁷⁰ But in

64 na saṃsāraṃ na nirvāṇam manyante tattvadarśinaḥ//
CVP., v.24.

grāhyagrāhakanirmuktaṃ bhāvayed jñānamātrakam/
tato viśvaṃ cittamātram grāhyagrāhakavarjitam/
SM., p. 73.

65 cittameva mahābijaṃ bhavanirvāṇayor api/
BD., p. 33.

66 yānānaṃ nāsti vai niṣṭhā yāvac cittam pravartate/
AS., p. 22.

67 tathā tathā pravarteta yathā na kṣubhyaite manaḥ/
saṃkṣubdhe cittaratne tu siddhir naiva kadācana//
PS., p. 24.

68 See the following verse of *Cittavajrastava* (Tib. T. Bstod. Tshogs. fol. a. 3) where instead of *Cittavajra* *Bodhicitta* is addressed to.
gaṅ.giś.sems.byuñ-dra.ba.ni/ sems. ñid. kyi.ni. bsal. mdzad.de/
sems. kyi. rmoṅs.pa. sel. ba. yi/ raṅ.sems. de.la.phyag. 'tshal.lo//

69 See *Guhyasamāja*, GOS, LIII, pp. 14, 17A. ff.

70 See *Bodhicittavivaraṇam*, Tib. T. Rgyud, Gi, fol. 44a.4:
raṅ.dan-gṣan.don. bsgrub. don. du/ srid.na.thabs.gṣaṅ yod.na.yiñ/
byaṅ. chub. sems. ni. ma.gtogs.pa/ saṅs.rgyas.kyis sñar.thabs.ma.gzigs//

71 Bodhicittād ṛte nānyat saukhyam asti tridhātuke/
Bodhicittamayam saukhyam sarvasaukhyaprasarṇam//
JS., p. 83;

labdhvā Bodhidvayam ete bhavād uttrastamānasāḥ/
bhavaṅty āyukṣayāt tuṣṭāḥ prāptanirvāṇasaṃjñinaḥ//

Abhisamayālaṅkāraloka, GOS., p. 120.

course of time degeneration strengthened its hold and the mind was always understood in an epicurean way.

We have seen that the mind is treated by the Mahāyānists as the pivot of all metaphysical speculations and ethical conduct of life. A purified mind brings salvation, while a deluded mind leads one to the abysmal depth of damnation. The maxim, *mana eva manusyūṇāṃ kāraṇam bandha-mokṣayoḥ*, is really true both morally and philosophically. We cannot be conscious of our knowledge of both the apparent and the inherent nature of things, without a passport to traverse the portals of epistemological labyrinth. This passing, without a mind, cannot be expected to be functioning. Hence the mind is unavoidable in the proper functioning of abstruse metaphysical speculations. Again, this mind is the reservoir of all human feelings of pain and pleasure, evil and good, or the willing of right and wrong. Hence the ethico-psychological codes intended to guide the volitional as well as emotional aspects of human life, cannot stand apart from the mind.

This is the reason why all the teachers have emphasised the purity of mind. On account of this unavoidable necessity of *cittaviśuddhi*, our writer has taken up the work of explaining its significance, process and result. His treatment of the thesis, though it deviated from the traditional way of uncompromising renunciation and austerity, is in accordance with the social and religious conditions of that time.

Being free from all attachment this mind shines out in its true colours. It is pure from the beginning (*ūdiśu.lldham*), free from all impurities (*anāvīlam*) and enlightened by nature (*prakṛti prabhāsvaram*).

The following verses will be interesting in this connection,

*astam gate candramasīva nūnam
nīrendavah samharaṇam prayānti |
cittam hi tadvat sahaje [ni] line
nāśrāntyamī sarvavikalpadoṣūḥ ||*

BD., p. 48.

*cittam eva hi saṃsāre rāgādikleṣavūsitam |
tadeva tair vinirmuktaṃ bhavānta iti kathyate ||
Tattvasaṃgrahaṇīkā, GOS., p. 184.*

This *citta* as *Bodhicitta*, is defined as follows :—

*sarvabhāvavigataṃ skandhadhātuvāyatanagrāhyagrāhakavarjitam
dharmanairūtīnyasamatayā svacittam ādyanutpannam śūnyatābhāvam.*⁷²

*alakṣaṇam anutpādam asaṃskṛtam avūṇmayam,
ākāśam bodhicittam ca bolhir advayalakṣaṇā.*⁷³

Thus *Bodhicitta* in its metaphysical aspect comes nearer to the *citta* 'mind' or 'consciousness of the Yogācāra idealism. The only difference lies in our approach of awareness to them. The Yogācāra *citta* is conceived purely in a speculative and dialectical way by the intellectual. While the *Bodhicitta* is an ideal mental disposition which could be achieved, step by step, through human efforts, directed by the codes of Mahāyāna ethics and inspired by the best of the motives, viz., of *Maitri* (Love) and *Karuṇā* (compassion). The Yogācāra mind is apprehended through a most subtle synthesis of one's awareness of the supreme and the dynamic force of the cosmos changing at every fraction of a moment, yet preserving its inherent continuity. It is difficult to conceive its existence beyond the symbolic world of words and ideas. On the contrary *Bodhicitta*, through a supernatural concept, is not altogether beyond the sphere of one's awareness. It is an ideal state of realization of a saintly personality, who, as an accomplished Bodhisattva, through his *prañidhānas* (vows), undertakes the arduous task of unburdening the universe of the miseries of the *Saṃsāra*.

Everybody, according to Mahāyāna Buddhism, is eligible for this state of perfect bliss. The Bodhisattvahood, it is believed, lies dormant under the pressure of *vāsanā* and *karma*, in all human beings, and a right sort of an endeavour (*sādhanā*) to be free from these *vāsanā* and *karma*, awakens it from its slumber. Many writers of Vajrayāna openly declared that this Bodhisattvahood *alias* Buddhatvam can be realized within a single life-time.⁷⁴

A picture of the Vajrayānist, who could reach this ideal state of perfection, could be noticed in the following two verses. They are:

72 *Guhyasamāja*, GOS, LIII, p. 12; *Bodhicittavivaraṇam* beginning see footnote 70.

73 *Op. cit.* verse 45; see *BCP.*, p. 421.

74 *CVP.*, vs. 84, 85; *VT.*, p. 101.

*nirvikāro nirāsaṅgo niṣkāṅkṣo gatakalmaśaḥ,
ādyantakalpanāmukto vyomavad bhāvayed budhaḥ. 75
samāropavinirmuktaḥ samādihau susamāhitaḥ,
sarvadā paramānandī sambodhiṃ bhāvayed budhaḥ. 76*

If, with a view to keep himself in harmony with the mystical and esoteric aspect of his fold, he had to take to some chanting of *mantras* etc., he used to resort only to those *mantras*, *sūdhānas* and *dhāraṇīs*, which brought him all the more nearer to his ideals. Nothing is right or wrong for him at that stage of progress, yet he always feels inclined to perform the right action. The verse which correctly expresses that inclination, runs thus :

*śubhāśubhaṃ yady api niśvabhāvakaṃ
tathāpi kuryāt śubhaṃ eva nāśubhaṃ,
jalendubimbopamalokasamvṛtau
sukhaṃ priyaṃ dhukhaṃ aśram apriyaṃ. 77*

Here it will be interesting to cite some of the Prañidhāna-verses which record the declaration of his motives for reaching this stage of Bliss. Two⁷⁸ of them are as follows :

*utpādayāmi varabodhicittaṃ
nimantrayāmy ahaṃ sarvasattvān,
iṣṭāṃ carisye varabodhicārikāṃ
buddho bhaveyaṃ jagato hitāya. 79
anena cūhaṃ kuśalena karmaṇa
bhaveya buddho na cireṇa loke,
deśeya dharmāṃ jagato hitāya
moceya sattvān bahuduhkhaḥpīditān. 80*

These *siddhas*, who reach this stage of perfection, are on the last step of the staircase which leads to *Nirvāṇa*. They, it is said, halt there for aeons and aeons in the expectation of a day when the whole of the universe will be able to be free from

75 *TVW.*, p. 16.

76 *AS.*, p. 10.

77 *AS.*, p. 3

78 For other specimens of these prañidhānas see *SM.*, pp. 3, 57, 67, 503 etc. See also the third *parivarta* viz. *prañidhāna* in *Bodhicittotpādasūtra* of Vasubandhu, Nanjio, no. 1218, which is being edited by me.

79 *AS.*, p. 6; *SM.*, pp. 29, 106.

80 *AS.*, p. 9.

the chain of *pratītyasamutpāda*. This is an advancement from the position of Arhatship which was the *summum bonum* for the *saṅgha* both during the life-time of the Buddha and the days after him.

Here one may naturally be inquisitive to know how could the original sayings of the Buddha be reconciled with such new interpretations of the *Dharma*. It is evident from some of the original dialogues of the Buddha himself that, he preached the Law differently to different people. The social, the moral and the intellectual status of the disciple was considered to be a factor to be reckoned with in deciding the nature of instructions to be imparted. The whole mass of preaching was never meant to be an end in itself. To make all the human beings free from their miserable plight of the *saṃsāra*, was the main purpose of the Buddha and all his disciples after him. This gave rise to all those various interpretations of his teachings, which went on getting changed in different circumstances. Thus the ideal of the Mahāyānist Bodhisattva-hood was given a prominence which superseded the position and honour which the ideal of Arhatship once enjoyed. Some of the verses cited below will speak for themselves in this connection. They are :

asti khalviti nilādi [jagad iti jaḍīyase]
 bhāvagrāhagrahāveśagambhīranayabhīrave.⁸¹
 vijñānamātram evedaṃ citraṃ jagad udāhṛtam,
 grāhyagrāhakabhedenā rahitam mandamedhase.⁸²
 grāhyagrāhakanirmuktaṃ vijñānaṃ paramārthasat,
 yogācāramatāmbhodhipāragair iti gīyate.
 neṣṭaṃ tad api dhīrāṇāṃ vijñānaṃ paramārthakaṃ,
 ekānekaśvabhāvena viyogād gaganābjavat.⁸³
 cittamātraṃ jagat sarvam iti yā deśanā muneh,
 uttrāsaparihārārthaṃ bālānāṃ sā na tattvataḥ.
 deśanā lokanāthānāṃ sattvāśayavaśānugā,
 bhidyante bahudhā loke upāyair bahudhā punaḥ.

81 AS., p. 14. SS., p. 14.

82 SS., p. 15.

83 *Ibid.*, *Jñānasāra* of Aryadeva (Tib. T. Mdo, Tsha, fol. 29a.5-31a.3)
 vs. 26-27.

gambhīrottānabhedena kvacic cobhayalakṣaṇā,
 bhinnā hi deśanābhinnā śunyatādvayalakṣaṇā.⁸⁴
 tāpāc chedāc ca nikaṣāt suvarṇam iva paṇḍitaiḥ,
 parīkṣya bhikṣavo grāhyaṃ mad vaco na tu gauravāt.⁸⁵
 mamety aham iti proktaṃ yathā kāryavaśāj jinaih,
 tathā kāryavaśāt proktāḥ skandhāyatanadhātavaḥ.⁸⁶
 āturyātari bhaiṣajyaṃ yadvad bhiṣak prayacchate,
 cittamātraṃ tathā buddhaḥ sattvānāṃ deśayanti vai.⁸⁷

A proper combination of *Prajñā* (wisdom) and *Upāya* (means) was, according to Vajrayāna, a royal road to the achievement of this ideal. *Prajñā* is the knowledge of things as devoid of all *prapañca*,⁸⁸ and *upāya* is full of compassion by nature.⁸⁹ Both of them are equally important in the complete realization of the ideal. Through *upāya*, one enters into the sphere of *Prajñā*, (the highest wisdom), and it is through the [latter] that one finds out the *upāya*. Both, so to say, go hand in hand on the way to Nirvāṇa. They are inseparable like the lamp and the light. It will not be out of place if we cite the following passages which throw some light on this point. They are :

prajñārahita upāyo bandhaḥ, upāyarahitā prajñā bandhaḥ ;
 prajñāśahita upāyo mokṣaḥ, upāyaśahitā prajñā mokṣaḥ.⁹⁰ idāniṃ
 vicāryate. prajñayā kevalayā kiṃ buddhatvaṃ syāt. naced upāya-
 mātrenaṅpi. uccyate cedam. na prajñākevalamātreṇa buddhatvaṃ
 napy upāyamātreṇa etc.⁹¹

84 *Bodhicittavivarāṇam*, Vs. 26, 97, 98; see *SS.*, p. 20; *Sarvadarśanasam-
 graha*, GOHS., Poona, p. 44.

85 *Tattvasamgrahaprajñikā*, GOS., XXX, p. 12; see v. 31 of *Jñānasāra* men-
 tioned in footnote 84.

86 *Yuktiśaṣṭikā* (Tib. T. Mdo, Tsa, fol. 22b.2--25a.7), v. 34; see *BCP.*,
 p. 376.

87 *SS.*, p. 20.

88 *sarvadharmāniḥprapañcāvubodho hi prajñā*, *SS.*, p. 25.

89 *upāyaḥ karuṇāmūlam*, *JS.*, p. 88; *upāyah. . . karuṇāsvabhāva*, *Cat.
 NDL.*, p. 65.

90 *tādātmyaṃ cānayoḥ sadgurūpadeśataḥ pradīpālokayor iva*, *AS.*, p. 2.

91 *Āryavimalakīrtinirdéśa* in *AS.*, p. 2.

92 *PS.*, in *Advayavivarāṇa* of Padmavajra as cited in *SS.*, p. 32; *Cat. Cal.*,
 p. 113.

So *Prajñā*⁹³ and *Upāya*⁹⁴ when proportionately assimilated⁹⁵ lead to *Mahāsukha*⁹⁶ gradually through the four stages of, Ānandas viz., *ānanda*, *paramānanda*, *sahajānanda* and *viramānanda*⁹⁷.

The doctrine of the *upāya* and its logical outcome are very interesting. The origin of the tendency of indulgence in non-austere activities for a higher purpose which could be traced to some of the very old sūtras of the Mahāyānists, is due to this doctrine. As the instruction that was to be imparted, was to be like a prescription of a masterphysician who changes it according to the temperament and the requirement of the patient, so even the rigid rules of penance and the profound teaching of *śūnyatā* had to be modified in the light of circumstances.⁹⁸ Moreover the idea that the motive is the only criterion by which merits or demerits of an action should be judged, is visible in many Mahāyāna sūtras. The sins that a person committed with a noble end in view, did not contaminate his character. *Upāli-paripṛcchā*⁹⁹ states that there cannot be any danger in a sin if it is committed with an altruistic motive. The *Ratnameghasūtra*¹⁰⁰ is reported to be much more liberal as it allows even the slaying of a person who may be on the point of committing some of the *ānantarya* sins.¹⁰¹ *Upāyakaṣṭhasūtra*¹⁰² cites an example of a *māṇavaka*, Jyoti by name, reported to have been ready even to break his vow of *brahmacarya* which he faultlessly observed for something like forty-two thousand years. Even trickery and falsehood were permitted if that could serve the purpose of a greater good of a greater number¹⁰³. Thus nothing should be left

93 See *PS.*, p. 4; *parāmarṣaṇayogena prajñātattvaṃ niḥsvabhāvātā/
jñānājñeyacibhāyena prajñātattvaṃ taducyate//*

94 See *Ibid.*, p. 5; *SS.*, p. 32:

*upānayaṭyabhimatam yan naukevānukūlataḥ/
sadānukūlayogena saivopāyaḥ prakīrtitaḥ//*

95 See *PS.*, p. 5:

*ubhayor melanaṃ yac ca salīlakṣīrayor iva/
advayākārayogena prajñopāyaḥ sa ucyate//*

96 *Advayasiddhi* in *SM.*, II, p. LXII.

97 *AS.*, p. 32; Cf. *BD.*, pp. 16, 18, 27; *SS.*, p. 51.

98 *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, see Notes 580-82 to chapter V of *Bodhisattva Doctrine* in *Buddhist Skt. Literature*.

99 *SS.*, p. 164.

100 *SS.*, p. 168.

101 See Notes to the present work No. 11

102 *SS.*, p. 165.

103 *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, pp. 72. ff., 101 ff.

undone to realise the purpose which is above 'means'.¹⁰⁴ This liberalism could be justified on the ground that it is not the action of killing which spreads the contamination of the evil but the existence of the *māra* in the *citta* which even without the action itself is sinful.¹⁰⁵ This spirit of liberalism of the Mahāyānists is depicted in *Upāyakaṣṣāyāsūtra*¹⁰⁶ and in the *Outlines of Mahāyāna Buddhism* by Suzuki.¹⁰⁷

This, in short, is the brighter side of the Vajrayāna tenets. The spirit of mysticism runs through both the contemplative and the active sides of the system. All ceremonies and formulas inculcated against a background of a higher type of philosophical thinking, were written in a language which was symbolic.¹⁰⁸ The words which, in an ordinary sense, would have meant one thing, were, in fact, meant to convey something else. The Ācāryas of the system were required not to unfold the secrets of their knowledge to anybody and everybody. Everyone before he entered their fold, was to be put to a severe test of examination. This tradition could not be preserved intact, both in its spirit and form, with the decline of Buddhism. Hence began the miscarriage and misunderstanding of the symbolic secrets of the Vajrayāna. These ceremonies and formulas being taken at their face value, became the source of all evils that crept into the system. The ordinary people took life quite frivolously as if they lived in the world of the Hedonists and Epicureans. The system which one day was based on the most psychological and logical process of thinking and willing, thus became in time a cause of unspeakable degeneration of the whole social order of that time.

The treatise begins with an invocation to Lord Padmanarteśvara. From the very beginning it is noticed that the key-note of all the arguments employed by the writer is that, one with a pure mind (*aduṣṭacitta*), good intention, (*śubhāśaya*) and proper means (*upāyas*), has no burden either of sin (*pāpa*) or of bondage (*bandhana*). In order to support the above view he, in the text itself, has adopted the first verse of *Dhammapada*¹⁰⁹ describing the influence of the

104 C.P., 33.

105 BCP., IX, 11.

106 SS., p. 167.

107 Op. cit., p. 71.

108 See the remarks of Dr. Bagchi in *Indian Historical Quarterly*, vol. VI pp. 577 ff.

109 *manahpūrvāṅgamā dharmā manahśreṣṭhā manojavāh |*
manasā hi prasannena bhāṣate vā kuroti vā | |

mind owing to the purity and impurity of which, we have good and evil consequences. The deciding factor, with regard to the determination of *pāpa* and *puṇya*, is one's disposition of mind (*āśaya*).¹¹⁰ Therefore there is no sin for one whose mind is pure.

He proceeds to say that one should not be shocked at the outward features of the means advocated in the system. As a washerman makes a dirty cloth clean with some matter which itself is dirty,¹¹¹ as a man infected with poison is sometimes cured of it by poison itself¹¹² or as some water accidentally gone into one's ears is taken out by the help of some additional water itself,¹¹³ so, the writer wants to assert, one can get rid of *rāga* and *kāma* by those *rāgas* and *kāmas* themselves, which become the cause of bondage only when they are resorted to by the foolish, but not by the wise in whose case they are actually the cause of emancipation.¹¹⁴

Taking his stand on the Yogācāra system, he says there is nothing but *citta* (mind). This *citta* is naturally from the very beginning pure (*ādiśuddha*) and free from all sorts of false notions (*vikalpas*). The different colours, by which this mind seems to be apparently impressed, are not originally its own. The mind is like a marble stone which seems to be coloured by the colour of other things, influenced by the superfluous colours of the imagination.¹¹⁵

He eulogises the greatness of Mahāyāna and deprecates the texts of Hīnayāna. His attack on Hindu rites and ceremonials is very aggressive and uncompromising. He denounces the practice of renunciation, austerity, bathing in the holy rivers etc.

Some of the Tantric rites, such as the worship of women without any discrimination as regards their beauty, kinship or caste the use of meat and wine by a *yogin*, are mentioned and advocated unhesitatingly. He advises everybody to resort to

110 *tasmād āśayamūlā hi pāpapuṇyavyavasthitih*, CVP., 16 a-b.

111 *na doṣo 'duṣṭacetasām* CVP., 13d;
nāpattiḥ śubhacetasām CVP., 16 d.

112 *yathaiva rajako vastraṃ malenaiva tu nirmalam* CVP., 38 a-b.

113 *viśākrānto yathā kaścid viṣṇaiva tu nīrviṣaḥ* CVP., 36 e-d.

114 *karṇāj jalaṃ jalenaiva*, CVP., 37a.

115 *durvijñaiḥ sevitaḥ kāmaḥ kāmo bhavati bandhanam/
sa eva sevito vijñaiḥ kāmo mokṣaprasādhakaḥ*// CVP., 42.

116 *yathaiva sphaṭikaḥ svacchaḥ pararāgeṇa rajyate/
tathaiva cittaratnaṃ tu kalpanārāgarāñjitam*// CVP., 27.

mantravāda only. The view on the point, held by the author, can be summed up in the following words culled here from the very work under discussion.

prajñopāyasamāyogūc (49^c) *cittanirmalakāraṇāt* (29^d) :

siddhāntī nirvikalpo'sau (79^o) *mantrī sarvaṃ samācāret* (226^d) //

In conclusion he eulogises the greatness of the *guru*, without whose favour no secret meaning of the system can be realised and consequently one cannot attain success.

Thus ends one of the most important text of the Mantrayānists probably of the Yogatantrayāna school of the Vajrayāna. The author has, with a number of examples, references and similes, put forward his thesis on the *cittaviśuddhi* very boldly. The central conception around which he weaves the web of his arguments, is in no way remarkably different from that of his contemporaries. The peculiarity of his treatment of the subject is that he does not go out of the sphere of everyday experience to find out his examples of the concrete word.¹¹⁷

PRABHUBHAI PATEL

117 The following abbreviations are used in the present monograph:

App :—Appendix.

AS :—*Adyarajrasaṅgraha*, GOS.

BCI :—*Bodhicaryāvatārapañjikā*, Bibliotheca Indica.

BD :—*Bauddha Gāna O Dohā*, Calcutta.

Cat. NDI.—*Catalogue of the Nepal Darbar Library*, Vol. II.

Cat. Cal.—*Catalogue of the Asiatic Society*, Calcutta.

CAV.—*Cittāvarṇaviśodhananāmaprakraṇa*.

CVV.—*Cittaratnaviśodhana*.

CVP.—*Cittaviśuddhiprakraṇa*.

CVP.—The work under discussion.

GOHS.—*Government Oriental Series*, Poona.

GOS.—*Gaekwad Oriental Series*, Baroda.

ITU.—*Indian Teachers in Tibetan Universities*, by P. Bose.

JASB.—*Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*.

JRAS.—*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, London.

PK.—*Pañcakramā*.

PS.—*Prajñopāyavinīścayaśiddhi*, GOS.

SM.—*Sādhanamālā*, GOS.

SS.—*Subhāṣitasamgraha*, ed. Bendall.

SS.—*Sikṣāsamuccaya*, ed. Bendall.

T.—Tanjur.

Tib.—Tibetan.

TIV.—*Two Vajrayāna Works*, GOS.

VT.—*Vajradākatantra* in *Cat. Cal.*

Punḍravardhana—its Site

The vast ruins of the ancient fort at Mahāsthān, generally known as Mahāsthān Gaḍ, and the numerous mounds of historical interest that surround it to a great distance towards the south, north and west, have, in recent years, attracted the attention of the students of ancient history. It was Mr. Cunningham who first tried to establish the identity of the site of Mahāsthān and its environs with the city of Punḍravardhana, once the famous capital of Punḍra or Varendrī. Mahāsthān Gaḍ appears to have been the only fortified city on the western bank of the river Karatoyā at a time when that river formed the boundary line between the kingdoms of Varendrī and Kāmarūpa. It is Mahāsthān Gaḍ again, at the foot of which lies the sacred bathing place called Śilādvīpa Ghāṭ (the stone-island bathing place), in popular parlance known as 'Śilā Devī's Ghāṭ,' where even now thousands of pilgrims, relying upon the *Karatoyā Māhatmya* of the *Uttara Pauṇḍra Khaṇḍa*, congregate to acquire merit by bathing in the sacred waters on the occasion of the Nārāyaṇī-yoga. In the present article, we propose to give a short description of Mahāsthān and its environs as also to ascertain its antiquity, and identity with the city of Punḍravardhana.

Account of the Site

Mahāsthān Gaḍ is situated about seven miles north of the town of Bogra. It appears to be the ruins of a huge fort and consists of a great mound of earth intermixed with old bricks and stones. The actual area covered by it is about 500 ft. long and 4000 ft. broad. Even in these days it is in some places about 14 cubits high. The sacred river Karatoyā, which is probably the same as the Sadānīrā of Vedic fame, used formerly to flow just by the foot of its eastern wall, but now it has receded a few yards to the east. The three other sides of the mound are encircled by trenches of considerable width and depth, the trench on the northern side being known as 'Kālidahasāgar', the northern half of the western side as 'Gīlātalākhāl' and the southern

half of the western and southern sides as 'Bārāṇasikhāl'. The mound is now approached, from the junction of the Rangpur and Shibganj roads at the south-eastern corner, by brick-built stairs which are evidently of comparatively modern erection. The ancient approach must have been from the west. An opening on the western wall of the fort is known as 'Tāmra-dvār' (copper-gate). Outside this gate is a high place known as Paraśurām's Sabhābāṭī (the court of Paraśurām). Ascending the mound from the junction of the Rangpur-Shibganj road by the above-mentioned staircase, one can see, on the left-hand side on the fort-wall, one small brick-built tomb called 'Hari Pāl's tomb'. Ascending a little further, one reaches a compound, in front of which, stands a walled shrine known as that of 'Mir Saiyat Sultan Muhammad Mahi-Shoar Balkhi', and on the left side, a mosque of middle size on which is attached a piece of stone containing an inscription in Persian which may be translated as follows:—

(1) "By the name of God the merciful and the compassionate. There is no God but God and Muhammad is his apostle.

(2) The candle, the mosque, the mehrab and the mimber (pulpit), Abu Bakr, Umar, Osman and Haidar.

(3) In the path of God and with a heart towards God, this beautiful, attractive and well-furnished place of prayer, this mosque has been constructed by Khodādil.

(4) Well finished in the year 1130 Hizra (1713 A.D.).

(5) In the seventh year of the reign of Feruk Shiar on the day of Id.

The door of the shrine was on both sides supported by two upright stones, although not *in situ* present. On each of these are inscribed in ancient Bengali character the words 'Śrī Narasiṃha Dāśasya'. On the left-hand side, just outside the door, still lies a large 'Gaurī Paṭṭa' (the holy stone seat of Śiva) almost half-buried in the ground. The shrine is maintained by the Pirpal estate, granted by a Firman (royal order) of an emperor of Delhi. This having been lost, the grant was recognised and confirmed in the year 1096 Hizra (1686 A.D.) by a *Sanad* of the then Governor of Dacca.

Near the Shah Sultan's place, there are:

(1) *Khodāpāthar Dhāp*, upon which lies a large stone-block with

an ornamental figure of a lotus. By excavating a portion of the mound, a number of stone-blocks has been discovered, on one of which are engraved three images of the Buddha¹, .

(ii) *Maikhali Dhāp*, near which outside the wall was found,

(iii) a broken stone-inscription in Sanskrit describing the achievements of a certain Nandī family²,

(iv) Paraśurām's palace,

(v) a large masonry structure known as *Jiyat Kuṇḍu* (the life-resuscitating well), wherein an ornamented ancient stone-pillar has been found,

(vi) *Narasiṅgh's Dhāp*, and

(vii) *Vairāgīr bhītā*.

The Gaḍ itself is traditionally known as the fort of Paraśurāma, the sixth incarnation of Viṣṇu. In the *Uttara Puṇḍrakhaṇḍa*³ it is stated that Bhārgava Paraśurāma set up in this place one crore of Silās (Sivaliṅga stones) and hence it is called 'Siladvīp' (stone-island). There is still an opening on the eastern wall of the fort, which leads to a place on the western bank of the Karatoyā known as 'Siladvīper ghaṭ'.

In the pamphlet named *Sultan Balkhi*⁴ we find a story that Shah Sultan, a religious mendicant, came to Mahāsthān Gaḍ near Hisyū Svandvīp in the time of Shayestū Khān for the spread of Islam. He begged from Paraśurāma, the king of Mahāsthān

1 This stone slab is now deposited at the Museum of the Varendra Research Society.

2 This stone inscription is now in the Museum of the V. R. Society. It appears to be of the 9th or 10th century.

3 *Uttara Puṇḍrakhaṇḍa* is said to be a portion of the *Skanda Purāṇa*. It was first published in the Bengali year 1298 by Paṇḍit Rāj. Candra Nyāya-Pañcānan of Bogra town. It was published by me as an appendix to the second part of my *Bagudār Itihās*. Smārta Raghunandan, a contemporary of Śrī Caitanya Deva (1485 A.D.—1533 A.D.) who lived in the 15th century A.D. quoted in his *Tithitattva* and Vācaspati Miśra in his *Kriyācintāmaṇi śloka*s from the *Uttara Puṇḍrakhaṇḍa*, with respect to Nārāyaṇīyoga. Sūlapāṇi also quoted śloka's from this book in his *Samvatsara Pradīp*.

4 The author Abdul Mazid Khandkar says in his *Sultan Balkhi* that his book is but a Bengali translation of an original Persian work and that he finished the translation in the Bengali year 1288.

Gaḍ, as much ground as would be covered by the cow-hide in his possession. The king granted his request, but as the mendicant began to say his prayer on the piece of hide, it began to expand. Paraśurāma being afraid called to his aid king Balarām Roy of Handial, Rājā Rāmkrṣṇa of Gokul, Māurājā and Rāmdayāl Goswāmī with their forces. They responded to the call and a great battle ensued, in which Paraśurāma with his allies was defeated. He was then put to death by Shah Sultan, but his sister, the beautiful Silā Devī, whom the Sultan now claimed as his prize, killed him with her 'Kaṅkaṅ', a kind of ornament, and sacrificed her life in the Karatoyā.

A few silver coins were discovered on the mound bearing the name of Muhammad Shah. Three of these coins are dated A.H. 852 (A.D. 1448), A.H. 858 (A.D. 1454) and A.H. 862 (1458 A.D.). On one of these the name of the mint-town Mahmudabad appears.⁵ A silver coin of Samasuddin Ileyas Shah (A.D. 1839-58) as published by Thomas in his *Initial Coinage of Bengal* was also found at Mahāsthān Gaḍ in 1874 A.D.⁶

Outside the fort, on the western bank of the Karatoyā, stands a big mound known as 'Govinda's Dhāp'. Here in the river is found a number of stone-blocks, some having beautiful ornamental works on them. On removing earth from the eastern side of the mound a stone-wall of about 150 ft. in length by 4 ft. in height was brought to light. This stone wall was washed away by the great North Bengal flood in 1329 B.S.

To the south of Mahāsthān there is a village named Gokul. This village appears to be identical with Gopa-grha of the Mahāsthān stone inscription. Here there are mounds, of which two are important, viz.

'Lakhindarer merh' (Lakhindar's temple) 45 ft. high, which may be identified with Aśoka Stūpa near Punḍravardhana as described by the Chinese traveller Yuan Chwang; and

'Netāi dhopāni's pāt', which is probably the place where 'four Buddhas sat and walked up and down', according to the Chinese traveller.

⁵ Hunter's *Statistical Account of Bogra District*, p. 196.

⁶ Beveridge's *Antiquities of Bogra*, p. 95.

Other mounds and places of interest are:

(1) Skanda-dhāp situated on the western bank of the Karatoyā. This mound may be identified with the temple of Kārtikeyā mentioned in the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* and 'Skandanagar' of the *Rāmacarita*.

(2) The village Palāśbādī, full of ancient bricks and tanks. It may be identified with 'Palāśavṛnda' of the Damodarapur copper-plates.

(3) The village Rāmasahar. Here are ruins of a mansion.

(4) The village Haripur with numerous mounds.

(5) Śṛṅgīnāth's dhāp and some other mounds in the village Rajakapura.

(6) Yogīr bhavan, about five miles west of Mahāsthān. Here is an establishment of the Nātha Sannyāsis.

(7) The village Arorā. Here is a big mound known as Śālvan Rājā's residence.

(8) The village Antabala (western portion of village Sharalpur). Here is a mound known as Balai's dhāp and Kānai's dhāp. From Balai's dhāp a gold-plated bronze image of Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī of about the fifth century A.D. has been recently discovered. An account of the same has been published by Mr. N. G. Majumdar in the *Modern Review*. Another bronze image of a Bodhisattva from a place near Mahāsthān is now in the museum of the V.R.S., Rajshahi.

(9) Maṅgalnāth's dhāp, about 30 ft. high, in Teghar.

In 1862 A.D. a number of old coins was discovered within an underground building in village Bāmanpādā. Two of them were sent by Mr. Beveridge to the Asiatic Society of Bengal. The margin of the obverse side of one of these coins contained the words 'Śrī Mahendra Sīmā', and the other side the words 'Candra Gupta' (*vide* Cunningham's *Archaeological Survey Report*, vol. XV, p. 117).

Then there are the villages Vihār and Bhāshoā Vihār. The latter may be identified with Po-shi-po vihāra mentioned by Yuan Chwang. The village Vihār was the abode of the famous Aniruddha Bhaṭṭa, the spiritual guide of king Ballāla Sena Deva.

In fact, the whole of Mahāsthān Gaḍ is a vast mound and is surrounded on the north, south and west up to a distance of about 4 miles by innumerable ruins of all descriptions.

Identification

We shall now try to identify Mahāsthān and its environs with the ancient city of Puṇḍravardhana. But before we do so, it is necessary to give some idea about Puṇḍra proper and Puṇḍravardhana Bhukti. In the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* the Puṇḍras have been described as emanating from the accursed descendants of Viśvāmitra.⁷ In the *Viṣṇu-purāṇa*, *Mahābhārata*, and *Harivaṃśa*, five sons, Aṅga, Vaṅga, Kaliṅga, Puṇḍra and Suhma are spoken of as having been begotten by the sage Mamateya Dīrghatamas in the womb of the wife of king Bali, and each of them as having established kingdoms after their respective names.⁸ The fact that in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, Udamaya Ātreya is described as performing the installation ceremony of Aṅga⁹ clearly indicates that his brother Puṇḍra also belonged to the Vedic age. In the *Rāmāyaṇa*, Puṇḍra is mentioned as one of the eastern kingdoms¹⁰. In Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* (4.2.52) occur the names Aṅga, Vaṅga, Suhma and Puṇḍra. The word Puṇḍra finds mention also in the *Bṛhat-Saṃhitā* (XIV), *Garuḍapurāṇa*, (LIII. 13; LXVIII. 17-18), *Vāyupurāṇa* (XCIX. 38. 5), *Bhāg. Purāṇa* (X. 66) and the *Nāṭya Śāstra* of Bharata (III, 12), as well as in the code of Manu (X. 40-44) and the *Arthaśāstra* (II. 11) of Kauṭilya.

From a stone-inscription discovered in village Silimpur in the Bogra district, one can say that Puṇḍra and Varendrī are synonymous¹¹ Cf. *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa*. In a copper-plate inscription of Govinda Śuvarṇa-

7 अन्तान् वः प्रजा भचीष्टेति त एतेऽन्धाः पुच्छाः श्वराः पुलिन्दा मूर्तिवा इत्युदन्धा बह्वी भवन्ति
वैश्वामित्रा दसूनां भूयिष्ठाः— *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, 7. 18.

8 ...तस्मात् बलिः यस्य क्षेत्रे दीर्घतमसा अङ्ग-वङ्ग-कलिङ्ग-सुङ्ग-पुच्छाख्यं बालियं चतुर्षु अजन्मत ।
Viṣṇu P., 5. 18.

“अङ्ग-वङ्ग-कलिङ्गश्च पुच्छुः सुङ्गश्च ते सुतो. 1”

तेषां देशाः समाख्याताः स्वनामकथिता ॥”

(*Mahābhārata*, चादिपर्व—१००।५०)

9 *Harivaṃśa*, 31, 33-35. *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, 36. 6.

10 मागधांश्च महायामान् पुच्छां स्त्वङ्गांस्तथैव च— *Rāmāyaṇa*, किष्किन्धाकाण्ड ४०।२३.

11 तत्प्रसूतश्च पुच्छेषु सकटीव्यवधानवान् । वरेन्द्रीमण्डलयामो बालग्राम इति श्रुतः ।
Silimpur stone inscription.

varṣa of the Rāṣṭrakuṭa dynasty bearing the date 855 of the Śaka era, there is mention of the grant of village Lohagrām to Keśava Dīkṣit of the Kauśika gotra, hailing from Punḍravardhana.¹²

In Jaina *Kalpusūtra*, Godāsa, a disciple of Bhadrabāhu, classified the Jainas of the eastern part of India into four branches, one of which was *Punḍravardhanīya*. There is mention of Punḍravardhana in *Devi Bhāgavata*,¹³ *Padma*,¹⁴ *Matsya*,¹⁵ *Skanda*,¹⁶ *Mārkaṇḍeya*,¹⁷ and *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇas* as also in the *Jñānārṇava Tantra*¹⁸ as quoted in the *Tantrasāra*.

In the *Aśokāvadāna* the story is told how several Ajivikas living in Punḍravardhana were killed under the orders of king Aśoka.¹⁹

The word 'Punḍravardhana' is used both for the city (Punḍravardhanapura or Punḍravardhananagara) as well as the province (Punḍravardhanabhukti). The Chinese pilgrim Yuan Chwang appears to have also used the word in both these senses in his book *Si-Yu-Ki*. In the *Sumāgadhāvadāna* (*Avadāna Kalpalatā* of the 11th century A.D.) Buddha, it is said, travelled from Jetavana Vihāra in Śrāvastīnagara to Punḍravardhananagara.²⁰ In *Koṭikarṇāvadāna* (*Divyāvadāna*) Punḍravardhananagara is described as situated in the east.²¹ In the *Rāmācarita*, Sandhyākara Nandī writes: "Varendrīmaṇḍala forms the best part of the world, of which Punḍravardhanapura occupies the crown-jewel. It is a sacred place where many highly learned Brahmins live."²² Kalhana has described Jayāpīḍa, the king of Kashmir, as

12 *IA.*, XII, 251.

13 *Devībhāgavata*, 9. 30.

14 विपाशायां विपापश्च पाटलं पुच्छवर्धने । *Padma P.*, 51.

15 विपाशायामघोराञ्चौ पाटला पुच्छवर्धने । *Matsya P.*, 13.

16 *Skanda P.*, 29.

17 *Mārkaṇḍeya P.*, 58, 13.

18 नेपाञ्च तथा पीठं तथा वै पीच्छवर्धने । *Tantrasāra*, Ch. I.

19 इद्दा च राज्ञा रवितेजाभिहितम् पुच्छवर्धने सर्वे आजीवकाः प्रघातयिष्याः ॥

Aśokāvadāna.

20 *Avadānakalpalatā*, 93 pallava.

21 पूर्वेषोपालि पुच्छवर्धनं नाम नगरम् । *Divyāvadāna*.

22 वसुधाशिरोवरेन्द्रीमखलचुडामणिः कुलख्यानम् ।

श्रीपीच्छवर्धनपुरप्रतिपदः पृथ्वीः वडवट्टः ॥ *Rāmācarita*.

having entered in disguise the city of Puṇḍravardhana, the residence of the king of Gaud and governed at the time by king Jayanta, and as having taken shelter in a magnificent temple of Skanda.²³ From these it is evident that Puṇḍravardhanapura or Puṇḍravardhananagara was the capital of the kingdom of Gaud and Varendrī.

The word Puṇḍravardhanabhukti signified the lands under the direct control of the central government in the city itself. The jurisdiction of such direct control was not necessarily always confined to Puṇḍra or Varendrī proper but extended at times to other parts of Bengal. Kumāra Gupta I (443-444 A.D.), Buddha Gupta and Bhānu Gupta (533-534) A.D. made grants by copper-plates (generally known as Dāmodarpur copper-plates) of lands in Koṭivarsa Viṣaya, a sub-division of Puṇḍravardhanabhukti (*Et.*, XV, 3). Similar copper-plate grants of lands in Koṭivarsa Viṣaya were made by Mahīpāla Deva I and Madanapāla Deva. Dharmapāla Deva and Lakṣṇasena Deva likewise made grants of lands situated respectively in Mahantaparakūṣa Viṣaya, and Varendrī, all within the jurisdiction of Puṇḍravardhanabhukti as well as within Puṇḍra proper, whereas Keśavasena Deva and Viśvarūpasena Deva made gifts of lands in Vaṅga and Vijayasena granted lands in Khari Viṣaya in Samatāta within the jurisdiction of the Puṇḍravardhanabhukti.

Much speculations have of late gathered round the question as to the actual site of the city of Puṇḍravardhana, although, to all accounts, it once occupied a very glorious position in Varendrī. It appears that there was no such difference of opinion up to the 15th century A.D., so we find the following ślokas in the Sanskrit work, the *Uttara Puṇḍra-Khaṇḍa*, written sometime between the 12th and 15th centuries A.D.:—

स्कन्दगोविन्दयोर्मध्ये भूमिः संस्कृतवेदिका ॥ १७

+ + + + + +

23 गौडराजाश्रयं गुप्तं जयन्ताख्येन भूमिजा।

प्रविवेश क्रमेणैव नगरं पुष्पवर्द्धनम् ॥ ४२१

तस्मिन् सीराश्वरम्बाभिः प्रीतः पीरविभूतिभिः ।

लास्यं स द्रष्टुमविशत् कार्त्तिकेयनिकेतनम् ॥ ४२२ *Rājataranṅinī*, chap. 4.

आद्यं भुवो भवनलक्ष सपादविप्रैः स्कन्दादिविष्णुबलभद्रशिवादिदेवैः ।

अध्युषितं करजलाम्बुविधूतपापं श्री पुण्ड्रवर्द्धनपुरं शिरसा नमामि ॥२४

+ + + + +

करतोया नदीतीरे देवपूजापरायणः । विप्रभोजनमात्रेण अश्वमेधफलं लभेत् ॥ ५२

विशेषः पौण्ड्रनगरे कोटिकोटिगुणं भवेत् ॥ ५३

+ + + +

स्कन्दगोविन्दयोर्मध्ये गुप्ता वाराणसी पुरी । तत्रारोहणमात्रेण नरो नारायणो भवेत् ॥५६

पञ्चक्रोशमिदं क्षेत्रं समन्तात् परिकीर्तितं । तदन्तर्गतमेतत्तु क्रोशमात्रं महेश्वरि ॥

अतिगुह्यतमं क्षेत्रं यत्रास्ते भार्गवो मुनिः ॥ ५७

x x x x -

तस्मात् सकलजगतां श्रीमहास्थानमेतत् ॥ ५६

स्नानाद् यत्र निहन्ति पापनिचयं श्रीपानितोया नदी

यस्यां संस्थितमनुष्यादिसकलं प्राप्नोति पाषाणताम् ।

देवस्तारक मारकोऽपि नितरां ज्ञानं ददात्यद्भुतम्

कौप्यं यत् पय एव तैलविपुलं पौण्ड्रं पुरं पातु वः ॥ ६०

“The place between the shrines of Skanda and Govinda contains a holy altar. I bow down my head in reverence to this place called Śrī Puṇḍravardhanapura which is the foremost place on earth and which has been sanctified by the waters of the Karatoyā and which is inhabited by Sapādalakṣa Brahmins and in which are situated the temples of Skanda, Viṣṇu (Govinda), Balabhadra, Śiva and other gods. By feeding Brahmins on the bank of the Karatoyā one acquires merit equal to that acquired by the performance of Aśvamedha sacrifice. The merit increases manifold, when one does so where the river flows by the city of Puṇḍranagar.”

“The city of Benares is hidden in the place between the temples of Skanda and Govinda by coming where man becomes Nārāyaṇa. This city covers an area of 10 miles around, of which the place extending over two miles where Paraśurāma lives, is the most hidden. This portion is called Śrī Mahāsthāna, the great place of the world. May the city of Puṇḍrapura save you from sins—the city where the god Skanda bestows wonderful knowledge and by whose side flows the river

Karatoyā, by ablution wherein one is purged of his sins and by remaining where man's bones become stones.'"²⁴

From the above it will be seen that the city of Puṇḍravardhanapura or Puṇḍravardhananagara or Puṇḍrapura or Puṇḍranagara, otherwise known as Mahāsthāna is situated on the banks of the Karatoyā and is confined to the space of one *krośa* (2 miles) between the shrines of Skanda and Govinda. And on the basis of the above ślokas it may also be said that the city of Puṇḍravardhana was located in Mahāsthān Gaḍ and its surroundings in the district of Bogra.

Kalhana and Sandhyākaranandī have referred to the magnificent temple of Skanda in the city of Puṇḍravardhana. If Mahāsthān Gaḍ with its adjoining area be taken to be the site of the old city of Puṇḍravardhana we may trace the famous temple of Skanda in the ruins of a temple ascribed to god Skanda and situated in village Bāghopārā, a mile and a half to the south of the Mahāsthān Gaḍ.

Sandhyākara has referred to a family of Nandīs, to which he himself belonged, as being very famous and inhabiting the city of Puṇḍravardhana. Recently part of a stone-inscription has been discovered from the ruins of Mahāsthān Gaḍ containing a genealogy of the well-known Nandī family. The character used in the inscription indicates its date to be the 9th century A.D. i.e. about the time of Nārāyaṇapāla Deva. In *Tabaqat-i-Nasiri* we are told how Bakhtiyar Khilji in the course of his ill-fated invasion of Tibet arrived at a town named Vardhan; thence he proceeded northwards for ten days till he reached a point where he crossed a great river with the aid of a stone-bridge and entered Kāmarūpa.²⁵ In the *Yoginī Tantra*²⁶ the Karatoyā has been described as forming the western boundary of Kāmarūpa.²⁷ According to T'ang Shu also the Ka-lo-tu, i.e. Karatoyā lies between Puṇḍravardhana and Kāmarūpa. Excepting Mahās-

24 *Karatoyā-māhātmya* published as Appendix 1 to Monograph II of the Varendra Research Society.

25 Raverty's Translation of *Tabaqat-i-Nasiri*.

26करतोयात्, पश्चिमे। *Yoginī Tantra*.

27 "[According to T'sang-shu] the river Ka-lo-lu (lies) between that country (Puṇḍravardhana) and Kāmarūpa" (Thomas Watters' *Travels of Yuan-Chwang*, pp. 186-27). See *IHQ.*, IX, i.

thān Gaḍ no other site can be traced to be an ancient city on the western bank of the Karatoyā. It will thus be not unreasonable to identify the town of Vardhan mentioned in the *Tabaqat-i-Nasiri* with Mahāsthān Gaḍ and its surroundings. The word 'Vardhana' may be taken to be an abbreviation of the word Puṇḍravardhana.

The ruins at Mahāsthān Gaḍ and its surroundings answer also to the description of Puṇḍravardhanapura as given by Yuan Chwang. Mr. Cunningham identifies Kie-chu-koh-khi-lo with Kajaṅgala, some 18 miles to the south of Rajmahal which was formerly known as the district of Kankjol.²⁸ The traveller then must have crossed the Ganges somewhere near Rajmahal. In the words of Cunningham "the city (Puṇḍravardhana) the pilgrim places at about 600 li or 100 miles to the east of the Ganges near Rajmahal. Now this description corresponds exactly with the relative position of Rajmahal and Mahāsthān, the latter being just 100 miles to the east of the former."

According to the traveller the city was 30 li or about 5 miles round. According to Cunningham's measurement the actual area covered by the Mahāsthān Gaḍ proper was only 4500 ft. long and 3000 ft. broad. If the distance between the sites of the two temples of the gods Skanda and Govinda (still locally traceable) outside the Gaḍ be added to the area of the Gaḍ itself, the description of the Chinese traveller would exactly correspond to facts. Cunningham too had this in mind when he said that Mahāsthān Gaḍ with its suburbs must have formed the old city of Puṇḍravardhana. The Po-chi-po (vā-shi-vā) Saṅghārāma mentioned in the accounts of the Chinese traveller evidently has reference to the vast ruins still to be seen at village Vāsuāvihāra²⁹ situated about 3 miles and a half away to the west of Mahāsthān Gaḍ. The huge brick mound about 45 ft. high locally known as Merh (*Mandir*) in village Gokul, appears to correspond to the stūpa of king Aśoka referred to by the Chinese traveller. Similarly one feels inclined to identify the site of the Vihāra of Avalokiteśvara Bodhisattva with an elevated place in village Vihāra about 3 miles to the west of Mahāsthān Gaḍ and occupying

²⁸ Cunningham's *ASR.*, vol. XV, p. 110.

²⁹ In the Boundary Commissioner's list, it appears as 'Bhasoā Bihār,' the local name is 'Bhasoā Char' (*vide Jurisdiction List of Bogra*).

an area of 700' × 600'. The place where the past four Buddhas walked for exercise and sat down may also be identified with the high mound known as Netaī Dhopāni's Pāṭ in village Gokul, or Maṅgalnāth's Dhāp in the village Teghar near Behar.

Yuan-Chwang had to travel about 150 miles to the east from Punḍravardhana before he reached the capital of Kāmarūpa. The site of the ancient capital of Kāmarūpa is also at a distance of about 150 miles to the north-east of Mahāsthān Gaḍ.

In the Damodarpur copper-plate inscriptions dated 124 and 129 Gupta Era, the court (*adhikaraṇa*) of the Provincial Governor (*uparika*) of Punḍravardhanabhukti is described as situated in a place known as Palāsavrnda. It may be identified with the village named Palāsabādī, full of ruins, lying contiguously to the south-west of Mahāsthān Gaḍ.

Recently a very important inscription has been discovered here, which has clearly established the identity of Mahāsthāngaḍ with Punḍranagar or Punḍravardhananagar. This has not yet been published but Dr. Bhandarkar, who is editing it, remarks: "This inscription conveys an order of some ruler of the Maurya period to a Mahāmātra stationed in Punḍranagar (Punḍanagalate), asking him to adopt certain measures with a view to relieve the distress of the Samvaṅgīyās, caused apparently by famine. The language of the record is Prākṛt of the same type as that of the Pillar edicts of Aśoka, and the characters are Brāhmī, undoubtedly of the same period. It establishes the identity of Punḍranagar with Mahāsthān in Bogra district, and is the earliest inscription so far discovered in Bengal. The use of a form of 'Māgadhī' which was the court language of the Maurya period shows further that Bengal, at any rate North Bengal, must have been included in the Maurya dominions (Proceedings of the ASB., 2nd January, 1933). Mr. K. P. Jayaswal published a short note on this inscription in May number (1933) of the *Modern Review*. There he remarked as follows: "There is no doubt that the inscription is a genuine Maurya record. In fine lettering it is engraved on a white red stone, similar to many pieces discovered in the Pāṭaliputra excavations. Its importance, which has not yet been pointed out, consists in the fact that it is the first secular administrative Maurya record, Aśoka inscriptions being all religious. In a store-

house, grain had been stored and probably cash also, which was ordered to be lent. It seems to have been a time of distress. The seat of government was at Puṇḍranagar and there seems to have been [Mahā]mātrās for the government of the Sa(ṃ)vaṅgīyās. The record is a striking confirmation of the tradition of the Jaina literature that a prolonged famine visited North India for twelve years in the reign of Candragupta Maurya, which led to the migration of Jain ascetics to the South. Lastly, the *Arthasūtra* of Kauṭilya is confirmed by the Mahāsthān inscription. Kauṭilya includes Vaṅga within the rules of his manual, which shows that Vaṅga was a part of the Maurya empire."

In the year 1928-29, the Archaeological Department excavated the mounds at Govinda Dhāp and Vairāgī Bhiṭā and sunk certain trial pits with the result that architectural and sculptural remains have been unearthed. The architectural remains of two large temples in the Vairāgī's Bhiṭā have been thus described by Mr. K. N. Dikshit:—"The earlier temple measures 98 ft. from east to west and 42 ft. from north to south. No other details of the temple survived except the basement of the plinth on the north and east. The second temple was constructed over the earlier temple in the 11th century A.D." Another temple has been discovered in the southern part of the rains and a solid square platform to the east of the temple, which may also be placed in the same period. But the most imposing structure is the huge temple at the Govinda mound. The excavated structures may be relegated to the four periods of construction commencing from the late Gupta to the Mahomedan occupation.

Cunningham discovered here one Jain statue, the pedestal of a large figure of the Varāha avatār, half the man's head in blue stone of life size and two of bronze figures of Gaṇeśa and Garuḍa. During the excavation of 1928-29, a figure on a fragmentary pot-herd, a terracotta tiger mouth, a terracotta yakṣa plaque, a lost Caṇḍī image (from Govinda Bhiṭā) and a terracotta female figure and many other relics have been found. All the figures are fine examples of artistic effort and creative genius. The first one shows a man discharging arrows from a chariot towards wild animals which are flying in fear. The lost Caṇḍī is a stone image and is understood from the presence

of the feet of the image on the fully blossomed lotus pedestal and of a lotus-marked right hand in the Varada-mudrā. Above the pedestal, on the right side of the image we find the figure of Kārtikeya, on whose right side near about the right foot is a small peacock and on the left side near the feet a couchant lion. On the left side of the image is the figure of a mouse; on the two sides of the main image are two plantain trees. Under the pedestal we find two half-kneeling figures with their hands in *añjalimudrā* and between them a figure of *Makara* (alligator).

Now that the identification of Puṇḍranagar or Puṇḍravardhananagar with Mahāsthāngaḍ is firmly established, we know for certain that during the Maurya period Mahāsthāngaḍ was a seat of a Mahāmātrā of the Maurya empire. From Dāmodarpur copper-plates we further know that it was a provincial capital of the Gupta empire and there is strong evidence to show that king Śaśāṅka and the Pāla empire of Gauḍa also had their capital here.

PROBHASII CHANDRA SEN

The Eastern Oālukyas*

IV

Vijayāditya II. Narendra-mṛgarāja (799-843 A.D.).

Vijayāditya bore the titles of Narendra-mṛgarāja, Cālukyārjuna and Tribhuvanāmkuśa. Three inscriptions of his reign have been discovered.

(i) *The Korroparru Inscription.*¹

It records the grant of the village of Korroparru to a number of Brāhmanas who were residents of Penpaṇḍuru, Vālūceri, Poḍeṅgu, Krovaśiri, Urpuṭūru, Kārañceḍu, Vaṅgiparru, Cānturu, Kīājam, and Rāyūru. The boundaries of the village granted were the villages of Atuguparru, Vānaparu, Vāṅdrūpedayū and Gaṇiyyarābu (?). The record was executed by Nṛpa Rudra. Korroparru was probably situated in the Kaṅḍeruvāḍi-ṛiṣaya.

(ii) *The Ederu Inscription.*²

The plates containing the inscription were discovered in the village of Ederu in the Nuzividu Zamindari of the Kistna District. Its object is to record that some lands, in the village of Va(ṅḍ)rupite(y)u in the Kaṅḍeruvāḍi visaya, were granted to a Brāhmaṇa resident of Minamini. The lands granted were bounded on the east by Korraparru; on the west by Ramāti; on the north by Reṅḍuvati (and ?) Bolareṅḍuvaṭi.

(iii) *The Tāṅḍivada Inscription.*³

It registers the grant of the village of Tāṅḍivada, in Konūru-nāṅḍu-ṛiṣaya to a Brāhmaṇa resident of Vaṅgiparu.

After his accession to the throne, Vijayāditya engaged his attention for the elevation of the political status of his family, which was

* Continued from p. 498, IX, vol. no. 2.

1 *SII.*, vol. I, p. 35, *I.A.*, vol. XX, p. 417.

2 *EL.*, vol. V, p. 118.

3 *SE.*, vol. 1917, no. 5 of Appendix A.

reduced to a very humiliating position during the reign of his father. He was averse to acknowledge the abject subordination of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and to serve them at their biddings. In the early years of the 9th century A.D. Govinda III was busy in fighting with the powerful chiefs of the north. This gave Vijayāditya an opportunity to materialise his object. He openly revolted against the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and seems to have thrown off his allegiance to them. Simultaneously with the rising of the Cālukyas, the Gaṅga Śivamāra II, who had of late been released by Govinda III from the captivity, declared hostility against the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. But sometimes before A.D. 808 Govinda III defeated him and cast him again into prison.⁴ He was subsequently released and reinstated in his former position. Since that time the western Gaṅgas remained in alliance with the Rāṣṭrakūṭas for some years.⁵ Shortly afterwards, Govinda III requisitioned the service of the Gaṅga chief for the subjugation of the hostile king of Veṅgi. A war broke out between the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and the Gaṅgas on one side and the Cālukyas on the other. It prolonged unceasingly for twelve years. Vijayāditya's position was much weakened by the alienation of his brother Bhīma-Sālukki (Cālukya) from him, who joined the opposite camp. Govinda III, having conquered Mālava, Kośala, and Dāhala, burst upon the Eastern Cālukya kingdom with the Gaṅga forces. Vijayāditya was signally defeated and was overthrown by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king, who then established Bhīma-Sālukki on the throne of Veṅgi.⁶ The Sanjan copper plates of Amoghavarṣa state that⁷ Govinda III, having finished his war with Dharma and Cakrāyudha, directed his attention to the conquest of the neighbouring countries. He acquired Mālava along with Kośala, Veṅgi, Dāhala and Oḍraka, and made his servants enjoy them. The servant, who enjoyed the kingdom of Veṅgi, was in all probability Bhīma-Sālukki.

After this discomfiture, Vijayāditya however did not lose all hope of success. He continued the struggle and made persistent attempt to

4 *IA.*, vol. VI. p. 70.

5 *EC.*, vol. IX, Introduction p. 4 ff.

6 *SE.*, 1912, p. 84; 1918, p. 131.

7 Sa Kośala Kaliṅga Ve(ṃ)gi Dāhal Audraka(ā)n Mālavāṃ vilabhya nijasevakaiḥ svayambhujadvikramaḥ II V, 24.; *EI.*, vol. XVIII, p. 245.

regain his throne. His indomitable courage and unflagging perseverance eventually won for him a brilliant success. Govinda III died in A.D. 814 leaving behind him his young son Amoghavarṣa I to succeed him on the throne. Vijayāditya availed himself of this opportunity and made an onslaught on Bhīma-Sālukki. Bhīma-Sālukki obtained adequate succour from the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and their subordinate, the southern Gaṅgas, better known as the Western Gaṅgas, to fight against his enemies. But this time the victory embraced Vijayāditya, who readily seized the throne of Veṅgi by overthrowing Bhīma-Sālukki. The Rāṣṭrakūṭa empire, as has been referred to above, was then under the care of a young king. This awakened in Vijayāditya a strong desire for the destruction of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa sovereignty in the Deccan. He with redoubled vigour fell upon the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kingdom and gave battle to Amoghavarṣa. Amoghavarṣa sustained a heavy reverse and was forced to surrender his sovereignty to the Cālukya king. The Cālukya army now overran the whole of the Deccan and made a victorious march till they reached the city of Stamba which they plundered and devastated. This city is to be identified with the modern Cambay in Gujrat. The Guntur plates⁸ of Vijayāditya III state that Vijayāditya II fought twelve years with the generals of Vallabhendra (i.e. the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king) and having defeated his own younger brother Bhīma-Sālukki, took possession of the Veṅgi-Maṇḍala from him". An inscription of Cālukya Bhīma I reports that⁹ "Vijayāditya destroyed together with the southern-Gaṅga (Dakṣiṇa-Gaṅga) force a certain Bhīma-Salki." The Masulipatan plates¹⁰ of Vijayāditya III relates that Vijayāditya II was a fire of destruction to the Gaṅga family. The Masulipatan grant¹¹ of Cālukya-Bhīma I designates Vijayāditya II as the destroyer of the party, (which supported) the southern Gaṅga. A grant of Amma I¹² registers the fact that "Vijayāditya II having fought 108 battles, in which he acquired power by his arm, with the armies of the Gaṅgas and Raṭṭas (i.e. Rāṣṭrakūṭas) for twelve years, by day and by night, sword in hand, by means of polity and valour,—built

8 *SE.*, 1912, p. 84.

9 *SE.*, 1918, p. 131.

10 *EI.*, vol. V, p. 125.

11 *SE.*, 194, p. 84.

12 *SII.*, vol. I, p. 39.

the same number (i.e. 108) of large temples of Śiva. A grant of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Indra III¹³ reports that sometimes during the reign of Amoghavarṣa I, the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kingdom was conquered by the Cālukyas who devastated the city of Stamba.”

The undisputed supremacy of the Eastern Cālukyas over the Deccan did not last for a long time. Amoghavarṣa I soon recouped his strength and attacked the Cālukyas. He was re-inforced by the armies sent by his relation, the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Karkarāja of Gujarat. All his strenuous endeavours eventually proved successful. He drove the Cālukyas out of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kingdom and won over them a decisive battle at Viṅgaballi, which I am inclined to identify with the modern Binginapalli on the Munyera river, in the Nellore District. A grant¹⁴ of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Indra III, dated Ś. 836=914 A.D., records that “this prince i.e. Amoghavarṣa I, possessed of fortitude, on raising again the glory of Raṭṭa kingdom, drowned in the ocean of the Cālukyas, became (i.e. assumed the epithet of) Vīranārāyaṇa just as (Viṣṇu), again (defeating the earth, drowned in the ocean, became Vīranārāyaṇa (i.e. the heroic Nārāyaṇa). Having by means of punishment, put down obnoxious persons, he destroyed the fiery Cālukyas, (his) enemies, who had completely devastated (the city of) Stamba, just as a (gardener), after removing the thorns by means of a stick, burns chick-peas, the stalks of which have been plucked out with the roots.” The same inscription describes him as the comet of destruction to the plantain tree (viz.) the high family of the Cālukyas”. The Cambay plates¹⁵ of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Govinda IV, dated 852-930 A.D. state that from Jagattuṅga was born Amoghavarṣa of unparalleled strength, by whom Yama, who was pleased (with him), was gratified at Viṅgavalli with unprecedented morsels of cakes (which were) the Cālukyas (and by whom) that pure fame, which could find no scope in the inside, outside and upper side of the universe, was as it were stored up in the reservoir or lake called Jagattuṅga-Sindhu under the pretext of water.” An inscription¹⁶ reports that “Karkarāja vanquished the tributary Rāṣṭrakūṭas who, after they had voluntarily

13 *El.*, vol. IX, p. 36

14 *El.*, vol. IX, pp. 35, 39.

15 *El.*, vol. VII, pp. 37, 38, 43.

16 *IA.*, vol. XIV, p. 201.

promised obedience, dared to rebel with a powerful army and speedily placed Amoghavarṣa I on his throne." This seems to have referred to the part played by Karkarāja in restoring the Rāṣṭrakūṭa empire for Amoghavarṣa from the grip of the Cālukyas. A Rāṣṭrakūṭa grant¹⁷ informs that Amoghavarṣa was worshipped by the lord of Veṅgi and others. The war between the Rāṣṭrakūṭa and the Cālukyas seems to have subsequently been brought to a close by a treaty in accordance with which a Rāṣṭrakūṭa princess was married to Vijayāditya's son Viṣṇuwardhana.¹⁸ Vijayāditya, after the conquest of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa empire, seems to have made an attempt to invade the Pratihāras of Kanauj. Pratihāra Nāgabhaṭa II was at that time on the throne of Kanauj where he ruled till 833 A.D. The Cālukya army under Vijayāditya encountered a strong resistance from the Pratihāras and sustained a heavy loss. The Gwalior Prasasti of Bhoja¹⁹ reports that kings of Andhra, Sindhu, Vidarbha and Kaliṅga succumbed to his youthful energy as moths do unto fire. It means to say that the above mentioned hostile kings, having been attracted by the magnificence of the Pratihāra kingdom, fell upon it for the appropriation but was annihilated by the powerful armies of Nāgabhaṭa II, just as the moths being attracted by the glow of the fire fly into it only to be burnt to death. The Andhra king mentioned above was in all probability Vijayāditya II.

Vijayāditya came into conflict with a Nāga chief. This Nāga chief seems to have been a remote predecessor of the Nāga dynasty ruling in the Bastar State in the 11th and 12th century A.D.²⁰

Vijayāditya deserves credit for exalting the position of his family in the imperial rank. By his marvellous military skill he once brought the Rāṣṭrakūṭa empire under his heels, at a time when the latter rose to the highest pitch of its glory. In order to vindicate his independent authority, he assumed the epithet of Paramabhaṭṭāraka Mahārūjādhirāja Parameśvara. He is glorified as the lord of Veṅgi.²¹

Vijayāditya also won reputation for his extensive architectural

17 *IA.*, vol. XII, p. 219.

18 *SE.*, 1909, p. 108.

19 *EI.*, vol. XVIII, p. 108.

20 *SE.*, 109, p. 101.

21 *SII.*, vol. I, p. 41.

works. He is said to have built 108 temples, called Narendreśvara, in order to get rid of the sin which he incurred by killing men in 108 battles.²² He is variously stated by the inscriptions of his successors to have ruled for 40, 41, 44 and 48 years. Mr. Ellet has accepted the middle one viz. 44 years according to which the king closed his reign in 843 A.D. He was succeeded by his son Viṣṇuwardhana.

Viṣṇuwardhana V, (A.D. 843-844)

Viṣṇuwardhana was also known as Kāli-Viṣṇuwardhana and Kāli-Bittarasa. He assumed the epithets of Sarvalokāśraya and Viṣama-siddhi. Three inscriptions of his reign have been discovered.

(i) *The Pṛthivīpallavapaṭṭana inscription.*²³

It records that the inhabitants of the city of Pṛthivīpallavapaṭṭana made a grant of land during the reign of Viṣṇuwardhana. The grant seems to have referred to a king of the Karnāṭa country and to have mentioned Kāñcī and Rāmeśvara.

(ii) *The Permajīli inscription.*²⁴

It records the grant of some lands in the Pagunavaraviṣaya. The executor of the grant was Jayarupa.

(iii) *The Raṇḍuvalli inscription.*²⁵

It registers the grant of the village Raṇḍuvalli in the Gudrahāra-viṣaya to a Brāhmaṇa named Bhāvaśarman.

Viṣṇuwardhana's reign was uneventful. As has been stated above, he married Śilamahādevī, the daughter of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king. Śilamahādevī gave birth to a son Vijayāditya. He had other sons whose names were Ayyaparāja, Vikramāditya I, and Yuddhamalla I. Ayyaparāja was older than Vijayāditya and Vikramāditya. Viṣṇuwardhana ruled only for a short period of eighteen months. An inscription assigns him a reign of twenty months. He was succeeded by Vijayāditya in 844 A.D.

DHIRENDRA CHANDRA GANGULY

22 *SE.*, 1909, p. 108; *SII.*, vol. I, p. 41.

24 *IA.*, vol. XIII, p. 186.

23 *IA.*, vol. XX, p. 12.

25 *SE.*, 1914, p. 85.

The first Aryan Colonization of Ceylon

Dr. Wilhelm Geiger has tried to prove that Ceylon was colonized by the Aryans from the North-Western India who introduced a north-western dialect of India into it.¹ Recently Dr. S. K. Chatterji has tried to uphold the views of Dr. Geiger.² In this article I propose to examine the legend and the language of Ceylon to find out the original home of the Sinhalese people, from the standpoint of philology and not ethnology.

The Legend

The old chronicles of Ceylon, the *Dīpavaṃsa* (composed between 350 and 400 A.C.) and the *Mahāvāṃsa*, both note the legend of Vijaya and his seven hundred followers who colonized Ceylon. The narration in the *Dīpavaṃsa* is brief, whereas that in the *Mahāvāṃsa* is somewhat detailed. The substance of the legend as found in the former is as follows:—The king of Vaṅga had a daughter, Susimā by name. She had a son called Sīhabāhu, and a daughter called Sīvalī by a lion (*Siha*). At the age of sixteen Sīhabāhu departed from his paternal cave and built a most excellent town called Sīhapura in the Lāḷa kingdom and began to reign there. He had thirty-two sons, of whom the eldest was Vijaya. Being angry at the bad conduct of Vijaya, the king banished him and his attendants, wives, children, relations, maid-servants, manservants and hired workmen from the kingdom. They were placed on board ships and the ships sailed away on the sea. The ship containing the children was helplessly driven to an island called Naggadīpa. The ship containing the women was helplessly driven to an island called Mahilāraṭṭha. The ship containing the men sailed on in the sea; but losing her way and her bearings it reached at last the port of Suppārā. There Vijaya and his followers committed barbarous deeds and as a consequence they were compelled to seek their safety by leaving the

1 *Litteratur und Sprache der Singhalesen*, pp. 90-93, vide also *IHQ.*, vol. II, 1ff.

2 *The Origin and Development of Bengali Language*, pp. 72, 73, fn.

place. Then they stopped at Bharukaccha for three months and there also they exasperated the inhabitants and were again compelled to take shelter on board their ship. The ship sailing over the sea was driven away by the violence of the wind and lost their bearings and thus they arrived at Laṅkādīpa. Tambapaṇṇi was the first town in the island where they set their foot. Vijaya landed on Laṅkādīpa at the time when the Buddha attained *parinibbāna*.³

The substance of the narration given by the *Mahāvamsa* is as follows:—There was a Vaṅga king in the Vaṅga city in the Vaṅga country. He had married a daughter of the king of Kaliṅga. The issue of the union was a daughter. Being extremely passionate he left home and joined a caravan going to Magadha. A lion attacked the caravan in a forest in Lāḷa kingdom. She fell a willing victim to the lion, who, however, took her to his cave and cohabited with her. So she had a son called Sīhabāhu and a daughter called Sīhasīvalī by the lion. At the age of sixteen the boy carried his mother and his sister from the cave and came to a border village. At that time there was stationed the maternal uncle's son of the princess, who was the general of the army of the king of Vaṅga. He took them to Vaṅga city and married the princess. Now the lion searching for his wife and children began to ravage the bordering villages. The king declared a handsome reward for killing the lion. Sīhabāhu killed him and came to the city with the head. It was the seventh day from the death of the Vaṅga king. He was without a son. The ministers, therefore, offered the throne to Sīhabāhu. But he bestowed the kingdom on the husband of his mother and went to his native place with Sīhasīvalī. He built Sīhapura in the Lāḷa kingdom and reigned there making Sīhasīvalī his queen. He had thirty-two sons by her, of whom Vijaya was the eldest. Vijaya was very wicked and the king put him and his seven hundred followers on board ships and cast them adrift in the sea. He did the same with their wives and children. They reached different islands and lived there. The island which the children reached is called Naggadīpa. The island which the women reached is called Mahilādīpa. Vijaya reached Suppāraka port with his men; but

³ *Dīpavamsa* IX, 1-31.

being afraid of the inhabitants on account of the violence of his followers he again embarked on the ship. He landed in Laṅkā at a reign called Tambapaṇṇi on the day when Buddha lay in *nibbāna* between two Sāla trees.⁴

There is no doubt that the *Mahāvamsa* is later in composition than the *Dīpavamsa*. But this does not mean that the *Mahāvamsa* has borrowed its material from the *Dīpavamsa* and that the materials not found in the *Dīpavamsa* are later accretions in the *Mahāvamsa*. In fact both Geiger and Oldenberg are agreed that both the Chronicles have drawn from the same source either directly or indirectly.⁵ Hence we are justified in combining the two narrations which will give us the following common information. Sīhabāhu was the grandson (daughter's son) of a king of Vaṅga. He established an independant kingdom in Lāḷa with Sīhapura as its capital. Vijaya was the eldest son of Sīhabāhu. He being expelled from home embarked on a ship with his large followers and sailed for unknown lands. They first reached Naggadīpa, then Mahilādīpa and then Suppāraka port. From there they went to Bharukaccha. From Bharukaccha they sailed again and reached Ceylon where they settled. The date was the date of the death of Buddha.

Bharukaccha and Suppāraka are well-known places in ancient India. Bharukaccha is undoubtedly identified with Barugaza of Greek writers, the modern Bharoch or Broach at the mouth of the Narbada in the west coast of India. Suppāraka, in Sanskrit Sūrpāraka, in Greek Soupara (Ptolemy) and Souppara (Periplus) is the modern Sopara, 33 miles to the north from Bombay. I take Mahilādīpa to represent the Maldive, where still a language akin to Sinhalese is spoken. Naggadīpa is evidently the same as Nāgadvīpa which is the ancient name for the Jaffna Island. The identification of Lāḷa is much disputed. But from the narration of the *Mahāvamsa* it is clear that its position was between Vaṅga and Magadha. To identify it with Lariké of the Greek writers and Lāṭa of ancient India, part of the modern Gujrat, would land us into many absurdities. It is almost impossible to think of a marriage

4 *Mahāvamsa* transl. by P.T.S., 1912.

5 *Dīpavamsa*, Intro. p. 7; *Dīpavamsa* and *Mahāvamsa* transl. by E.M. Coomaraswamy, Colombo, 1908, p. 14.

relationship between two petty kingdoms on the west and east coasts of India at that time. Then again the order of the places during the voyage cannot be consistent with this view. We, therefore, find no justification to set aside the clear indication of its site by the *Mahāvamsa*. I would take Iāḷa to mean Rāḍha, Rāḍhā of Sanskrit inscriptions and classics, Lāḍha of the Jaina Prākṛt works, Lāḍa of the Tirumalai Inscription of Rājendra Coḷa and Rāl of the *Tabaqat-i-Nasiri*, i.e. the part of western Bengal including the districts of Hugli, Howrah, Burdwan, Midnapur, Birbhum, and Bankura and part of the districts of Manbhum and Santal Parganas.⁶ About the name of Iāṭa for ancient Gujrat I should like to indulge in a theory here. From the legend we have seen that Vijaya and his followers from Iāḷa remained for some time in Suppāraka and Bharukaccha. Some of his followers must have remained there as settlers. It is possible that it was they who gave the name of their old country to this region, which later on came to bear the name of Iāṭa, perhaps a later corruption of Iāḷa.

That Sīhapura (Sanskrit Simhapura) was a town in Eastern India is proved from many inscriptions. King Kīrtti Niśsaṅka Malla of Ceylon (1189-1198 A.C.) says in his inscription that he was the son of Srī Jaya Gopa of the dynasty of the Cakravartins of Kaliṅga, then ruling at Simhapura, who were descended from the race of King Vijaya.⁷ That there was a Sīhapura or Simhapura in Kaliṅga

6 "Dr. E. Müller observed: "Lassen (*Ind. Alterth.* vol. II, p. 105) identifies Iāḷa with Iāṭa (Greek Larike—Gujarāt). The whole context of the *Mahāv.* however shows that this cannot be meant. King Niśsaṅka Malla, a prince of Kaliṅga, who has left many inscriptions in different parts of Ceylon, was born in a city called Simhapura, which he maintains the same as Simhapura where Vijaya was born. If so, Iāḷa was part of the latter kingdom, Kalinga, a not unlikely place to suppose the Aryan conquerors of Ceylon to have started from. This seems to be the opinion of Burnouf (*Recherches sur la Géographie Ancienne de Ceylan*, p. 61), as he identifies Iāḷa with Rāḍha....."la partie basse du Bengale actuel, qui s'étend sur la rive droite de la riviere Hougli, et comprend les districts de Tamoulouk et de Midnapour". This country then must have been thoroughly Aryan at so remote a time as the 5th century B.C. at the latest, for not only is the Sinhalese language Sanskrit, but the vast majority of the higher castes of the Sinhalese have unmistakably the Aryan type of faces, and, as for lower castes, they do not look like Dravidians, but resemble the Veddas."—*I.A.*, XI, p. 198 f.n.

7 *A.C.*, No. 148 and *Ep. Z.*, I, p. 132.

is seen also from the Komarti plates of Mahārāja Caṇḍavarman, the ruler of Kalinga,⁸ and the Bṛhatproṣṭha plate of Umāvarman, the ruler of Kalinga.⁹ In the Belabo Copperplate of Bhojavarman Deva, the original seat of the Varmans has been mentioned as "Siṃhapura like the cave of the lion."¹⁰ In the Ragolu plate of Śaktivarman, the ruler of Kalinga calls himself the jewel of the Magadha race (Maga[dha] Kulālaṅkarīṣṇu. Is it the correct reading? In the Inscription of Vijayanandivarman, eldest son of king Caṇḍavarman, he designates himself as *parama bhāgavataś Śālaṅkāyano*).¹¹ The *Mahāraṃśa* (Ch. 59, V. 29) states that the queen of Vijayabāhu I (1054-1109) was a princess of Kalinga and that three of her relations came to Ceylon from Siṃhapura (vers. 46). Hultzsch identifies Siṃhapura of Caṇḍavarman with Siṅgapuram between Chicacole and Narasamapetā.¹² It seems that the Siṃhapura of Vijaya must have been in Rādha, which later on, for sometime at least, formed a part of the kingdom of Kalinga. It may also be supposed that the race of Vijaya migrated from their original seat of government and founded a new capital in Kalinga with the old name. We should remember that the great grand-mother of Vijaya was a Kalinga princess and his grand-mother was afterwards married to a Kalinga prince, her cousin according to legends.¹³

The narration that Vijaya sailed to Ceylon from Suppāraka or Bharukaccha cannot justify the theory that the first Aryan settlers were inhabitants of that part of India. The order of the places clearly shows that Vijaya must have sailed from the eastern coast of India, perhaps from the port of Tāmalitti. At first they had no idea of settling down in Ceylon. They roved about for sometime like pirates. Hence they settled in Ceylon from Bharukaccha or Suppāraka and not

8 *EL.*, IV, p. 143

9 *EL.*, XII, p. 5.

10 *EL.*, XII, p. 39.

11 *IL.*, I, 176.

12 *EL.*, IV, p. 143.

13 I cannot accept the identification of Siṃhapura with Synghaya on the Gandak river (according to Turnour) or with Sihor in Kathiwar (according to Barnett) or with Singur in the district of Hugli (according to Mr. Nundo Lal Dey) for want of sufficient reasons, though this latter identification is not impossible. There is no evidence for an ancient Siṃhapura in Gujarat or in the west coast of India.

directly from Lāḷa (Bengal). It may be that they were ship-wrecked in Ceylon and were compelled to settle there.

It may be held with Dr. Barnett¹⁴ that Ceylon was colonized by men both from Bengal and Gujrat and the legend is an attempt to combine the two traditions. By an examination of the Sinhalese language in its historical development, we shall presently see that Sinhalese shows unmistakable affinity with the oldest phase of Bengali. This, of course, does not mean that the people from Gujrat never settled in Ceylon. What I mean is that the *first Aryan settlers* were from Bengal who introduced their language in the island.

The Language

Fortunately for us Sinhalese is represented in a series of inscriptions dating from the 2nd century B.C. If we compare Sinhalese with the language of the inscriptions of Aśoka, we are at once struck by its resemblance to the most distinguishing feature of the language of his eastern inscriptions. I shall take here the inscriptions of Aśoka at Girnar as representing the western dialect and those at Dhauri as representing the eastern dialect.

sanskrit	Western Aśokan.	Eastern Aśokan	Old Sinhalese	Modern Sinhalese
Nom. Sing. } Mas. Neut. }	-o, -ni (neut.)	-e	-e, -i	-ā -a (neut.)
Loc. Sing.	-amhi	-asi	{ -ahi, -ihi- hi, -ä	-ehi, -e
Dat. Sing. } (Sanskrit <i>arthāya</i>) }	-athāya	-aṭhāye	×	-ṭa
1st. pers. pl.	×	aphe	apa, üp	api
2nd. pers. pl.	×	tuphe	×	topi
Present participle <i>māna</i>	māna	mina	min	min
tiṣṭh- (√sthā)	tiṣṭ-	ciṭh-	siṭ-	√hiṭ-, √siṭ,
[bhava—(√bhū)	bhava-, ho-	ho-	we-	ve-]
[bhūta-	bhūta-	hūta	wä, wū	vu]
kṛta-	kata-	kaṭa	kaḷa	kaḷa-
kṛtvā	×	kaṭu	koṭu, kaṭu	koṭa-
mṛta-	mata-	maṭa (Kalsi inscr.)	maḷa	maḷa

Sanskrit	Western Aśokan	Eastern Aśokan	Old Sinhalese	Modern Sinhalese
mṛga	maga-	miga	×	muva (*mia)
mayūra	mora	majūla	×	miyuru
trayas	ti, trī	tiṃni	tini	tun, tuṇa
dvādaśa	dbādasu	duvāḷasa, duvāḷasa (Kalsi inser.)	doḷusa	doḷosa
vṛkṣa- kṣudraka	vracha-, vacha- chudaka	lukha-, vacha- khudaka	ruk cudi	ruk kuḍa, kudu
paśyati	pasati	dakhati	√dak	√dāk--
idaṃ	idaṃ	imaṃ	×	mū, meyā
sthavira-	thaira-	mahālaka-, vuḍha-	mahālaka	mahalu
[r	r	l	r	r]
[ṛ	ṛ	n	ṛ	ṛ]
[sy, sy	ṣ	s	ś	s, h]
[jñ	ñ	n	ry, ṇ	ṇ]
[ny	ñ	ṇu	×	ṇ[
[ṇy	mñ	ṇn	ṇ	ṇ]
[kṣ	ch	kh	k, s	k, s, h]

From the above table it will be seen that though generally agreeing with the Eastern dialect, Sinhalese in some instances (shown by square brackets) differs from it. Notably in place of eastern *l*, *n* Sinhalese agrees with the western *r*, *ṛ*. This is rather in favour of my supposition that the first Aryan colonization was from Rādha or western Bengal. In that dialect as also in standard Bengali, Assamese and Oriya, the Old Indo-Aryan *r* is never replaced by *l*. The *ṛ* sound has still been preserved in some sub-dialects of Manbhum, Santhal Parganas and the south-western parts of Midnapur, forming parts of the old Rādha country. It is also current in Oriya. There is another sound, *ḷ*, which is found in Sinhalese. Though this is wanting in the inscriptions of Jagauda and Dhauli, it is found in some other eastern inscriptions like Radhiā (Lauriya Ararāj), Mathiā (Lauriya Nandagarh). It is also preserved in the Kharia Thār dialect of Manbhum and in modern Oriya. Old Sinhalese also agreed in another point with an eastern dialect though not with the language of the eastern Inscriptions of Aśoka. We find in Vessagiri cave inscriptions (*Ep. Z.*, I, p. 18 ff.) of the 2nd century B.C. and the Ritigala inscriptions (*Ep. Z.*, I, p. 139 ff.) of the first century B.C. the preservation of old *ś*, and also *ś* as

a result of old conjunct sounds *-sya*, *-ṣya*, as well as in place of old *s*, as in the words, *diśa*, *Śirā*, *Ṣonutarā*, *teraśa*, *Tiśa* (Sanskrit *Tiṣya*), *Puśa* (Sanskrit *Puṣya*), *saghaśa* (Sanskrit *saṅghasya*), *Ṣonaśa*, *Mahā-śudaśane*, *Ṣumanaha* etc. The *ś* sound is the characteristic of the old Māgadhī and the Māgadhī of the Sanskrit dramatists. It is also found in some old seals found in Magadha as *Ṣaṃdiraḍhaśa*, *Agapalaśa*.¹⁵ This *ś* sound is still prevalent in Bengali. Modern Bengali represents old *kṣ* by *kh*, *ch* as in *pākhā* (Skt. *pakṣa*), *khur* (Skt. *kṣura*), but *māchi* (Skt. *makṣikā*), *churi* (Skt. *kṣurikā*). Similarly Sinhalese represents *kṣ* by *k* (*kh*) and *s*, *h* (<*ch*) as *dakuṇu* (Skt. *dakṣiṇa*), *bik* (Skt. *bhikṣa*), *uk* (Skt. *ikṣu*), but *kus*, *kis* (old Sinh. *kusa*, Skt. *kukṣi*), *das* (Skt. *dakṣa*), old Sinh. *māssā* (Skt. *makṣikā*).

Modern Sinhalese builds the Nom. pl. with *-o*, *-u* which are derived from *ahu* according to W. Geiger.¹⁶ This *ahu* is also the Nom. plural suffix in Māgadhī according to Prakrit grammarians.

Old Sinhalese *jhita* 'daughter' (*Ep. Z.*, I, p. 17) is an interesting word. It is cognate with Bengali, *jhi*, Assamese *jhit* (pr. *zi*) and Oriya *jhia*. The palatalization from *dhītā* (Sanskrit *duhitā*) is thus very ancient.

Modern Sinh. *ginī* may be compared to Beng. *āgun*, Mid. Beng. *āguni*.

Sinh. *sāla*, *selu* is akin to Beng. *śālik* (Skt. *śarikā*). We may compare also Sinh. *dā*, Beng. *dā* (Skt. *dātra*), Sinh. *wāli*, Beng. *bāli* (Skt. *vālukā*), Sinh. *māṭi*, Beng. *māṭi* (Skt. *mṛttikā*), Sinh. *imbul*, Beng. *śimul* (Skt. *śālmali*), Sinh. *ukunā*, Beng. *ukun* (Skt. *utkuṇa*?)

Modern Sinhalese *niti*, 'always' cannot be derived from Pāli or Prakrit *nicca*. It corresponds to Bengali *niti*. Both the words go to an eastern form *nitiya* (Sanskrit *nitya*) (cf. Aśoka Girnar *ekacā*, but Dhauri and Jagauda *ekatiyā* < *ekatyāh*).

Dr. W. Geiger is certainly wrong in his method to compare Sinhalese with the western Indian languages, Marathi, Gujrati and Sindhi as to the preservation of *y* and *v* and come to the conclusion that

15 R. O. Franke, *Pali und Sanskrit*, p. 98.

16 *Litteratur und Sprache der Singhalesen*, p. 57.

Sinhalese belongs to the western Group.¹⁷ These two sounds were preserved in the eastern as well as the western dialect of the inscriptions of Aśoka and we may presume that they were also found in the old Rādha dialect, though changed later on. It is only scientific to hold that Sinhalese is to be derived from an old Rādha dialect of the sixth century B.C., the characteristics of which we can gather by the help of linguistic methods. I do not deny, however, that Sinhalese was influenced later on by Pāli, the sacred language of the people, and by Gujrati, the language of the later immigrants. The early relationship of Ceylon with the Tamil people has also something to do with the development of the Sinhalese language.

Conclusion

Thus we find from an examination of the legend and the language of Ceylon that it was first colonized by Aryans from Bengal and that their language is the parent of the Sinhalese language inspite of much development owing to later accretions to the language.

MD. SHAHIDULLAH

¹⁷ *Litteratur* etc., pp. 92, 93.

The Baud Charter of Kanakabhanja

This inscription was edited for the first time by Mr. R. C. Majumdar.¹ Later Prof. R. D. Banerji studied these copper-plates and came to the conclusion that these plates had 'been forged in recent times to serve a particular purpose unknown to us, by some clever forgerer'.² Das Gupta,³ Hira Lal⁴ and Ray⁵ refer to this inscription as giving the genealogical history of a line of Bhañja rulers who were the overlords of Baud. Prof. Banerji did not consider this inscription as giving the history of a new line of Bhañja rulers in his posthumous work;⁶ and adhered to his own opinion. As there are many inaccuracies in the introduction, text and translation prepared by Mr. Majumdar,⁸ I re-edit this inscription here.

This charter was in the possession of a Khond peasant of Baud; but how, when and whence it came to his possession cannot be ascertained. Mr. Majumdar writes, 'When the peasant was induced to sell this document to the Naib Tahsildar of Sonpur, all that could be ascertained was that the plates had been long in his possession and that he was under the delusion that he could get a clue to some buried wealth if only he could decipher the inscription.'⁹

The charter is incised on three plates of copper, each measuring $8\frac{1}{4}'' \times 4\frac{1}{4}''$. These plates are suspended by a copper-ring of $3\frac{1}{4}''$ diameter which, passing through the circular holes which are cut through the plates in the middle of the upper edge, is closed by a lump of copper, which, according to Mr. Majumdar, is 'shaped like the bud of a lotus'.¹⁰ The first plate is inscribed on one side only, while the second and the third plates are inscribed on both sides. In each of the sides, except the inner and outer sides of Plate

1 *JBORS.*, II, pp. 356-74.

2 *JBORS.*, March, 1928, p. i-xiii.

3 *ABORI.*, XII, Pt. III, pp. 231-45.

4 *El.*, XVIII, p. 286.

5 *DIUNI.*, p. 432-3.

6 *HO.*, pp. 161-90.

7 *JBORS.*, March, 1928, p. i-xiii.

8 *Ibid.*, II, pp. 356-74.

9 *Ibid.*, p. 356.

10 *Ibid.*, p. 356.

III where we get 11 and 2 lines respectively, there are 10 lines. Thus the inscription consists of 43 lines. The letters on all the sides of the plates, except the letters of the outer side of Plate III which roughly measure $\frac{3}{8}$ "', generally measure $\frac{2}{8}$ "' with the occasional exception of some letters on these sides which measure either a little larger or a little smaller. On an average, there are 24 letters in each line of these plates, the lowest number of letters being 12 in l.43 and the highest number being 29 in l.41. There are a few symbols and symbolic representations of some words in this inscription. It begins with 'Om' which is represented by the symbol which we meet, according to the opinion of Mr. Majumdar, with 'in the charters of the Trikaṅga Guptas',¹¹ and it also ends with the symbolic representation of 'Om' engraved in the reverse order. There is also perhaps a symbolic representation in l. 1 between 'mu' and 'ni' of the joined words 'munir-āsīt'. It is very difficult to say what this symbol represents; perhaps it represents some flowers. There is also another symbol representing some unknown meaning between the stop-lines after 'ti' and before 'ti' in l.42. There is also an eye-like figure between 'a' in 'arthapati' in l.21 and 'dva' of 'vidvānu' of l. 22. Whether this figure is the representation of any symbol or not is very difficult to say.

The language of the inscription is Sanskrit and is full of mistakes, due to poor education of the scribe. The inscription consists of 4 different styles of composition viz., verses in Anuṣṭubha metre (ll.1-16; 23-24; 26-27; 30-41), poetic prose (ll.16-20), mixed verse and prose (ll.20-23) and prose (ll.24-26; 27-30; 42-43).

The alphabet of this charter is, in all probability, of the eleventh century A.D. I have made a thorough inquiry into the palæography of this charter and have detected the following varieties of letters.

Among the vowels 'a' has two varieties—the earlier one resembling partially the letter 'a' in Bühler's table XII ('a' in 'anekārāma' l. 9) and the latter one closely resembling the present Bengali 'a' ('a' in 'arthapati' l.21). The initial form of 'ā' is not found in this charter but six varieties of its medial form are found ('ā' in 'kāś-yapo' l. 1; 'nāma' l.1,; 'sthānaṃ' l.3,; '-pāntha' l.8,; 'sṛṣṭyā' l.17; 'grāmiya' l. 20). There is only one variety of the initial form of 'i' ('i' in 'imāni' l. 40); but there are five varieties of its medial form ('i'

11 *Ibid.*, p. 357.

12 *STIP.*, Tafel IV, VIII, 1.

in 'svasti' l. 1 ; 'sam̐bhi' (?) l.2 ; 'rājabhiḥ' l. 36 ; 'pitṛbhiḥ' l. 38 ; 'āpnoti' l. 39), There is no initial form of 'i', but there are six varieties of its medial form ('i' in 'śrī' l.1 ; pṛthivī' l. 7 ; 'kīrtiḥ' l.11 ; 'hasti' l. 20 ; 'grāmiya' l.20 ; 'tṛtiye' bde' l.40). There are two varieties of the initial form of 'u' which are practically of the same age, one of them ('u' in 'ubhaya' l.25) resembling one letter in Bühler's table XIII, the other one also of similar morphology ('u' in 'uttarasyā' l.29) ; there are nine varieties of its medial form ('u' in 'muni' l.1 ; 'suddhānvaye' l.2 ; 'sakuvan' (?) l.5 ; 'kathāsu' l.12 ; 'ripu' l.15 ; 'pura' l.25 ; 'sihipura' l.25 ; dharmapurā' l.25 ; Māhara-pura' l.27). There is no initial form of 'ū' but there are four varieties of its medial form ('ū' in 'babhūvuḥ' ll.2-3 ; '-bhūd-' l. 7 ; '-bhūva-' l. 13 ; '-bhūt-' l.13). There is no initial form of 'ṛ' but there are three varieties of its medial form ('ṛ' in 'sṛgata' l. 9 ; 'nr̥pa' l. 14 ; 'sṛṣṭyā' l. 17). There is one variety of the initial form of 'e' which, in all probability, stands between the letter 'e' in Tafel V, XVII. 7 and XVIII. 7 of Bühler's table XIV so far as the evolution of the letters is concerned ('e' in 'evam-asya', l. 30) and there are altogether four varieties of its medial form closely resembling the modern Bengali form ('e' in 'vase' l. 1 ; 'dehika' l. 5 ; 'veṇḍake' l. 25 ; 'haraṇe' l. 34). There is no initial form of 'ai' but there are three varieties of its medial form ('ai' in 'jari' l. 3 ; 'nikhātaika' l. 15 ; 'guṇaiḥ' l. 21 ; 'śāsanikaiḥ' l. 30). There is no initial form of 'o' ; but there are eight varieties of the medial form of 'o' ('o' in 'kāśyapo' l. 1 ; 'vansoyama' l. 2 ; 'klo' l. 2 ; 'pañco—' l. 3 ; 'dhava'o' l. 8 ; '-nyatho-' l. 8 ; '-bhañjo-' l. 11 ; 'dakṣo' l. 12). There is no initial form of 'au' but there are two varieties of its medial form, the earlier being 'au' in 'pāṭākau' l. 25 and the other in 'vaude-' ll. 4-5.

As regards the palæography of consonants, there occur two types of 'ka' and 'kha' viz., the proto-Nāgarī ('ka' in 'sakuvan' (?) l. 5) ; (and 'kha' in 'sam̐khelata' l. 14) and the proto-Bengali types ('ka' in 'kāśyapo' l. 1 ; and 'kha' in '-khoda-' l. 5). In 'ga' we have three different forms viz., the proto-Nāgarī ('ga' in 'vinirgata' l. 20), the proto-Oriya ('g' in 'gajendrāṇaṃ' l. 4) and the proto-Bengali types ('ga' in 'sṛgata' l. 9). The proto-Bengali type here holds the supreme position as we find no less than 4 slightly different varieties of 'ga' of this type ('-vargeṣu' l. 10 ; 'gotraḥ' l. 21 ; 'dvijegra-ṇiḥ' ll. 22-23 , 'grāmaṃ' l. 29), while the proto-Nāgarī and the proto-

Oriya types are represented by each of these letters. There is one form of 'ga' in this charter, the like of which we cannot find out elsewhere ('ga' in 'grāma-' ll. 27-28). In 'ca' we find only one type viz., the proto-Nāgarī, only the left horizontal stroke of the modern, Nāgarī 'ca' being absent ('ca' in 'Cuḍāmaṇi' l. 13). In 'ja' we have two types prevalent viz., the proto-Nāgarī ('ja' in 'dvijegraṇḥ' l. 22) and the proto-Bengali types ('ja' in 'bhūbhujah' l. 3). In 'ṭa' we find the prevalence of one type only viz., the proto-Nāgarī type ('ṭa' in 'bhāṭṭena' l. 4). In 'ḍa' we find the prevalence of the proto-Bengali type only ('ḍa' in 'soḍasyaiva' l. 6). In 'ṇa' we have the prevalence of the proto-Oriya type only ('ṇa' in 'gajendrāṇām' l. 4). There are three types of 'ta' viz., the North-Indian which is the earliest ('ta' in 'mahātapāḥ' l. 1), the proto-Nāgarī ('ta' in 'saṃkhelata' l. 14). In the letter 'ta' of the word 'saṃkhelata' we have a very interesting specimen of a North-Indian alphabet changing into the proto-Nāgarī type because traces of the parabolic line at the lower part of it are still found in this letter with the addition of the curved stroke in the left joining the right vertical line which is the main characteristic of the proto-Nāgarī alphabet. For this reason I wish to give prior evolution to this letter than the letter 'ta' in 'matra' l. 5 and the proto-Bengali type ('ta' in 'pṛthivīpatih' l. 7). There are two types of 'tha' viz., the early form ('tha' in 'tithim' l. 26) and the proto-Bengali form which is closely evolved from the earlier form ('tha' in 'tathā' l. 3; 'yasaserthine' l. 4—these two letters must be taken to belong to the proto-Bengali type on account of the absence of the down horizontal line below the vertical line which joins the horizontal line on the left, the presence of which would have made these letters belonging to the proto-Oriya type). There are two types of 'da' viz., the proto-Nāgarī ('da' in 'Baudeśvarādayah' ll. 4-5) and the proto-Bengali types ('da' in 'dehika' l. 5). There is only one type of 'dha' viz., the North-Indian or Early type ('dha' in 'dhanadam' l. 18). There are three types of 'na' viz., the North-Indian ('na' in 'yasaserthine' l. 4), the proto-Nāgarī ('na' in 'munirāsit' l. 1) and the proto-Bengali types ('na' in 'madanam' ll. 18-19). Regarding the palæography of 'pa', the late Prof. R. D. Banerji wrote, 'The Nāgarī duct of the writing of the Baud plates is more evident in the case of 'pa'.¹⁵' This opinion of the late Professor is not correct and I have

¹⁵ JBORS., March, 1928, p. xiii.

come to the conclusion, after a very close study of the palæography of this alphabet, that the proto-Oriya style of writing holds the more important place than the proto-Nāgarī style of writing. There are only three variations of the proto-Nāgarī type ('pa' in 'pṛthivīpatiḥ' l.7 ; 'tatputro' l.12 ; '-putro' l.14) and no less than ten variations of the proto-Oriya type ('pa' in 'kāśyapo' l. 1 ; 'mahātapāḥ' l.1 ; 'purā' l. 2 ; 'pañcōttaram' l.3 ; 'pañca' l.4 ; 'pāntha' l. 8 ; 'klipta' l.11 ; 'nṛpa-' l.4 ; 'tatputro-' l.22 ; 'santapta-', l. 11). 'Pha' is written only in the proto-Bengali form ('pha' in 'prapāphalaḥ' l.10). The letter 'bha' has been written in two styles viz. the proto-Nāgarī ('bha' in 'bhūmiḥ' l.28—it is very difficult to account for the presence of the horizontal line on the right besides the usual horizontal line in 'bhūmiḥ' l. 28. With its absence and the presence of the right little horizontal line, it would have looked exactly like the modern Nāgarī 'bha') and the proto-Bengali type ('bha' in 'bhañja-' l.2—a cursory comparison of this form of 'bha' with the modern Bengali 'bha' may lead us to conclude that there is no point of similarity between these two forms ; but if we examine these two types very carefully, we can certainly conclude that morphologically these two types are very similar). There is the proto-Nāgarī form of 'ma' viz., ('ma' in 'nāma' l.1) and another form for which it is difficult to give any name ('ma' in 'paścimāsyāṇi' l.28). 'Ya' is written in the proto-Nāgarī type only ('ya' in 'vaṃsoyam-' l.2). 'Ra' is written in two styles viz. the proto-Nāgarī ('ra' in 'munirāsīt' l.1) and the proto-Bengali types ('ra' in 'sura-' l.20). The proto-Nāgarī form of writing is prevalent in 'la' ('la' in 'kila'). There is only one form of 'śa' present ('śa' in 'śrī' l.7). It is conspicuous that we do not find any proto-Nāgarī 'śa' in this charter but only the proto-Bengali ('śa' in 'yeṣāṇi' l.4) and the proto-Oriya ('śa' in 'śreṣṭhā' l.2). In 'sa' we find the prevalence of the proto-Bengali type ('sa' in 'munirāsīt' l.1) and other two forms of 'sa' for which it is difficult to give any name ('sa' in 'paścimāsyāṇi' l.28 ; 'disau' l.28). There are 4 different varieties of 'ha' ('ha' in 'mahātapāḥ' l.1 ; 'dehika' l.5 ; 'samūḥaṇi' l.20 ; 'hastī' l.20).

Thus we can have a comprehensive idea of the palæography of this charter. In it we find 4 different varieties of writing viz. North-Indian or Early, proto-Nāgarī, proto-Bengali and proto-Oriya. Among all these varieties, the proto-Nāgarī occupies the first place so far as frequency is concerned and next in order of frequency come proto-Bengali, proto Oriya and North-Indian or Early, the first being the most frequent. Thus we can conclude that the feature of the

palæography of this charter is the proto-Nāgarī duct of writing with the great frequency of the proto-Bengali and the little frequency of the North-Indian and the proto-Oriya scripts.

With the question of palæography arise two important questions regarding this charter viz., (1) genuineness of this charter and (2) its date. Let us deal with these two problems one by one. Majumdar,¹⁶ Hiralal,¹⁷ Das Gupta¹⁸ and Roy¹⁹ believe this charter as genuine while Banerji²⁰ held it to be spurious. My object in this paper is to show that this charter is genuine. The main reasons of Prof. R. D. Banerji are as follows :

- (1) 'The king's name is followed by several lines of meaningless adjectives'.
- (2) 'Immediately after the king's name come the details of the land granted, a feature almost unparalleled among Bhañja grants'.
- (3) 'There is no mention of the officers concerned.'
- (4) 'There is no mention of the details of the two villages granted'.
- (5) According to him the rulers who are mentioned in the Baud Charter of Kanakabhañja cannot be earlier than the rulers mentioned in the Antirigram Plates of Yaśobhañja and Jayabhañja. Then he compares the palæography of the Baud Charter of Kanakabhañja with that of the Antirigram Plates of Yaśobhañja and Jayabhañja and concludes that the former is earlier than the latter two, and therefore is to be rejected on account of the fact mentioned just at the beginning of this point.²¹

Firstly, we are to remember that this inscription gives the genealogical history of one Bhañja dynasty, which is different from other three Bhañja dynasties viz., (1) Ādi-Bhañjas of Khijjiṅga-Koṭṭa. (2) Earlier Bhañjas of Khiñjali-Maṇḍala and (3) Later Bhañjas of Khiñjali²² ; and so it is not unusual that the method of the drafting of the Baud Charter should be different from those of other Bhañja dynasties.

Secondly, there is no inconsistency in the drafting of this charter. We get an account of (1.1) Kāśyapa from whom this line

16 *JBORS.*, II, pp. 356-74

17 *EL.*, XVIII, p. 292.

18 *ABORI.*, XII, pt. III, pp. 240-41.

19 *DHNI.*

20 *JBORS.*, 1928, March, pp. i-xiii.

21 *Ibid.*

was originated, (ll.2-5) of the former rulers of this dynasty, [(ll.5-7) the meaning is obscure on account of bad engraving,] (ll.7-11) of Solanabhañja, (ll.11-13), of Durjayabhañja, (ll. 13-20) of Kanakabhañja, the ruling monarch, (ll.20-24) of the genealogy of the donee, (ll.24-25) of the raṇaka, (ll.26-27) of the gift of land, (ll.27-30) of the boundary of the land gifted, (ll.33-39) of the imprecatory verses from the *Mahābhārata*, (l. 40) of the regnal year of the ruling king, and (l.42) of the name of the scribe. Thus there is consistency so far as the drafting of this charter is concerned.

Thirdly, the king's name is not followed by meaningless adjectives. If these adjectives are meaningless, then such meaningless adjectives are found in many charters, genuineness of which is not questioned.

Lastly, Prof. R. D. Banerji does not give any argument for the tacit assumption that the Baud Charter could not be earlier than the Antirigram Plates of Yaśobhañja²³ and Jayabhañja.²⁴ Regarding the palæography of the Antirigram Plates of Yaśobhañja, Rao Bahadur Hira Lal writes, 'the plates exhibit prominently the Oriya style of writing, the chief characteristic of which is the rounding of the straight or angular portions into curve. The form of 'ka' gets transformed into क, a 'kha' into क, a 'ga' into ग and so on. These are really Oriya characters'.²⁵ Regarding the palæography of the Antirigram Plates of Jayabhañja, Mr. Tarini Charan Rath writes: 'the characters used are a highly specialised form of the old Northern Nāgarī type. They deserve special notice, in as much as they very closely resemble the Oriya characters. On the whole, I think, it can be said that the characters of the inscription are the prototypes of the modern Oriya characters.'²⁶ Prof. R. D. Banerji writes that 'in the Antirigram Plates of Yaśobhañja and Jayabhañja we find the first introduction of the current script in Orissan epigraphy, a point which has been duly recorded by Mr. Hira Lal'.²⁷ But it will be shown now that the views of these three scholars are not final. In the Antirigram Plates of Yaśobhañja, the initial forms of 'a, ā, u' and the medial forms of 'ā, i, u, ū, ṛ, ai, o and au' are found; while in the Antirigram Plates of Jayabhañja, the initial forms of 'a, i, u' and the medial forms of 'ā' and 'i' are used. In 'a' we find the use of the proto-Bengali type

22 *ABORI.*, XII, pt. iii, pp. 231-45.

23 *EL.*, XVIII, pp. 298f.

25 *EL.*, XVIII, p. 298f.

27 *JBORS.*, March, 1928, p. XI.

24 *EL.*, XIX, p. 43

26 *Ibid.*, XIX, p. 43.

(‘a’ in ‘ananta’ l.26 I; ‘anyāṁśca’ l.19 II).²⁸ In ā we find the prevalence of the proto-Bengali type (‘ā’ in ‘āsīt’ l.3 I). In ‘u’ we find the proto-Bengali type prevalent (‘u’ in ‘ubhau’ l.33 I; ‘u(t)-kīrṇa’ l.13-14 II). In ‘e’ the proto-Bengali type is prevalent (‘e’ in ‘etasmāt’ l.6 I). Among the consonants ṅa, cha, jha, ṅa, ṭha, ḍha, ba, ya, in the Antirigram Plates of Yaśobhañja and jha, ḍha, ba in the Antirigram Plates of Jayabhañja are not found. We have the proto-Bengali (‘ka’ in ‘karmodyata’ l.14 I; ‘hastodakam’ l.18 II; ‘kha’ in ‘khiñjalī’ l.15 I; ‘khyātaḥ’ l.2 II; ‘ga’ in ‘guṇa’ l.2 I; ‘kuaṅga’ l.7 II; ‘gha’ in ‘vyāghātaṃ’ l.41 I; ‘poghāta’ l.35 II; ‘ja’ in ‘rāja’ l.1 I; ‘jātā’ l.2 II; ‘ṭa’ in ‘saviṭapāraṇāya’ l.20 I; ‘cheṭa’ l.12 II; ‘ḍa’ in ‘voḍā’ l.18 I; ‘gaḍa’ l.11 II; ‘ta’ in ‘saṃyuta’ l.1 II; ‘tha’ in ‘pratyarthī’ l.8 I; ‘pārthivāra’ l.19 II; ‘dha’ in ‘deśādhipati’ l.16 I; ‘na’ in ‘nija’ l.1 I; ‘catsunu’ l.3 II; ‘pha’ in ‘phala’ l.30 I; ‘phala’ l.27 II; ‘bha’ in ‘bhujā’ l.1 I; ‘bāyabhañja’ l.4 II; ‘ma’ in ‘kiityoutame’ II; ‘mahito’ l.9 I; ‘ya’ in ‘ripujayaḥ’ l.2 I; ‘velāyām’ l.11 II; ‘ra’ in ‘rāja’ l.7 I; ‘la’ in ‘tulyaḥ’ l.2 I; ‘loka’ l.1 II; ‘va’ in ‘vīrārī’ l.1 I; ‘śa’ in ‘śeṣa’ l.19 II; ‘śa...’ l.11; ‘sa’ in ‘āsīt’ l.1 I; ‘saṅgha’ l.1 II), the proto-Oriya (‘kha’ in ‘likhitāmitī’ l.37 II; ‘ga’ in ‘guṇa’ l.1 II; ‘na’ in ‘l.20 I, ‘vīryena’ l.2 II; ‘dha’ in ‘rājādhirāja’ l.1 I; ‘pa’ in ‘ripujayaḥ’ l.2 II; ‘śa’ in ‘śeṣa’ l.1 I; ‘śrī’ l.3 II), the proto-Nāgarī (‘ka’ in ‘loka’ l.1 II; ‘ṭha’ in ‘jāṭhināga’, l.21 II; ‘da’ in ‘hr̥daya’ l.2 I; ‘sadā’ l.2 II; ‘pa’ in ‘vyāpāra’ l.11 II; ‘ra’ in ‘rājādhirāja’ l.1 I; ‘tare’ l.1 II; ‘va’ in ‘bhuvī’ l.6 I; ‘nivāsini’ l.2 II), the North-Indian or Early (‘ca’ in ‘cetasāḥ’ l.3 I; ‘ca’ l.13 II; ‘cha’ in ‘prayacchati’ l.36 II; ‘ta’ in ‘vijita’ l.1 I; ‘dha’ in ‘Madhyadinīya’ l.26 I; ‘dharmo’ l.2 II; ‘ha’ in ‘praharaṇa’ l.5 I; ‘hariḥ’ l.3 II)

Thus we see that the theories of Banerji, Hira Lal and Rath cannot be accepted. Among the numerals we find only one viz., ‘3’ in l.30 I. which has a very remarkable resemblance with one ‘3’ found in a ms. whose date is 1049 A.D.²⁹ This numeral is very important so far as the date of this inscription is concerned because this shows that it cannot possibly be dated earlier than the eleventh century A.D.

A comparison of the palaeography of the Baud Charter of Kanakabhañja with those of the Antirigram Plates of Yaśobhañja and Jayabhañja shows that in the former the proto-Nāgarī and in the

²⁸ I refers to the Antirigram Plates of Yaśobhañja and II to the Antirigram Plates of Jayabhañja.

²⁹ *STIP.*, Tafel IX, XX. 3.

latter the proto-Bengali types of letters are pre-eminent ; and as the proto-Nāgarī is undoubtedly of an earlier evolution than the proto-Bengali, the Baud Charter of Kanakabhañja should be placed earlier than the Antirigram Plates of Yaśobhañja and Jayabhañja. Now in order to fix the date of the Baud Charter of Kanakabhañja, we should first ascertain the dates of the other two charters. The Antirigram Plates of Yaśobhañja and Jayabhañja are of the same age because these two princes are brothers and Jayabhañja succeeded his brother Yaśobhañja to the throne. Now in the Antirigram Plates, Yaśobhañja is called 'Jagadekamallavijayī.' The late Prof. R. D. Banerji held that this ruler was no other than 'the Mehara chief Jagamalla, a feudatory of the Cālukya king Blima II of Gujarat of v. S. 1264 = A.D. 1207³⁰ ; but I think that he is none but Jagadekamalla II of the Cālukya dynasty of Kalyāṇi (1139-1149 A. D.) Thus Yaśobhañja, in all probability, lived between 1139-1149 A.D.³¹ Hence the Baud Charter of Kanakabhañja, which should be placed before the Antirigram Plates of Yaśobhañja, is to be ascribed to the second half of the 11th century A. D.

This inscription records the grant of a plot of land,—bounded on the east by the village of Māharapura, on the south and the west by the village of Kopāsimyā and on the north by the river Tela,—to Harivaṃśa, the son of Dhanapati who is the son of Arthapati of the Pāraśāra-gotra and of the 'Triārṣeya'-pravara, who belongs to the village of Hastī in Madhyadeśa,—by Kanakabhañja, the son of Durjayabhañja who is the son of Solanabhañja, in his 3rd regnal year.

The Charter is inscribed by Viṣṇu.

The late Prof. R. D. Banerji had given the genealogical lists of three Bhañja groups of rulers in his book,³² omitting the genealogical table as found in the Baud Charter of Kanakabhañja because he takes it to be spurious. As I have already said, it should be taken as genuine giving the genealogical list of a Bhañja dynasty. Further, the genealogical table of the 2nd group as prepared by Banerji³³ is not quite correct. A comparative study of my table (see below) with that of Banerji will show the difference. For my arguments I do not like to dilate here but I wish to refer to one of my previous communications³⁴ where I have stated arguments³⁵

30 *HO.*, I, pp. 185-86.

32 *HO.*, p. 188.

34 *ABORI.*, XII, pt. iii, pp. 231-45.

31 *ABORI.*, XII, pt. iii, pp. 231-45.


33 *Ibid.*

35 *Ibid.*, pp. 233-38.

Among the place-names, Bāhulāveṇḍaka, Jamarāpura, Sihapura, Māharapura, Kopāsīmīyā, Hastigrāma, Dharmapura, Madhyadeśa and the river Tela are mentioned in this inscription. The river Tela has been rightly identified with 'the river Tel which forms the natural boundary line between the states of Baud and Sonpur'³⁶; Madhyadeśa, with the tract of land between Bengal and Orissa. Other places are still unidentified.

GENEALOGICAL TABLES OF BHIAÑJA DYNASTIES.

I, ĀDI-BHAÑJAS OF KHIJJINGA-KOṬṬA



II. EARLIER BHAÑJAS OF KHIÑJALI-MANḌALA.

(1) Śilābhañja-Aṅgati

(2) Śatrubhañja [(1) (Sonpur R. *EI.*, XI, pp. 98-101; (2) Kumurakela R. *JBORS.*, II, pp. 429-35; (3) Tekkali R. *HO.*, p. 165.]

(3) Raṇabhañja [(1) Singhara R. *JBORS.*, VI, p. 483; (2) Tasapaikera R. *JBORS.*, II, pp. 173 f.; (3) Dasapalla R. *ABORI.*, pp. 134-41 *JBORS.*, VI, pp. 269 f.; (4) Baud R. *EI.*, XII, pp. 326 f.; (5) Baud R. *EI.*, XII, pp. 323-25; (6) Newly discovered R. *HO.*, pp. 169-70; (7) Newly discovered Baud R. *HO.*, p. 170; (8) Unpublished Baud R. *HO.*, pp. 171-72].

(4) Netṛbhañja *alias* Kalyā-
nakalasa

[(1) Ganzam R. *EI.*, XII, p. 295; (2) Ganzam R. *EI.*, XVIII, p. 293; (3) Ghumsur R. *HO.*, p. 174; *JASB.*, 1837, p. 669; (4) Aśaka R. *HO.*, p. 177; (5) Aśaka R. *HO.*, p. 177]

(5) Digbhañja

(6) Śilābhañja

(7) Vidyādharabhañja
alias Amoghaka-
lasa *alias* Dharmaka-
lasa.

[(1) Ganzam R. *EI.*, XII, pp. 296-98; (2) Orissa R. *JASB.*, LVI, p. 159; *EI.*, IX, pp. 275f; *ASM.*, vol. I, pp. 149-66; (3) Aśaka R. *HO.*, p. 177]

(8) Netṛbhañja *alias*
Kalyānakalasa.

[(1) Dasapalla R. *JBORS.*, VI, pp. 276 f.]

III. BHAÑJAS OF BAUD.

- (1) Solaṇabhañja
 |
 (2) Darjayabhañja
 |
 (3) Kanakabhañja
 [(1) Baud R. *JBORS.*,
 II, pp. 367 f.]

IV. LATER BHAÑJAS OF KHIÑJALI

- (1) Devabhañja
 |
 (2) Rāyabhañja
 |
 (3) Virabhañja
 |
 (4) Rāyabhañja II
 |
 —————
 |
 (5) Yaśobhañja
 [(1) Antirigram R. *EL.*,
 XVIII, 298 f.]
 |
 (6) Jayabhañja
 [(1) Antirigram R. *EL.*, XIX, 43]
 |
 (7) Virabhañja II

TEXT.

PLATE I (Inner side)

1. Om̐ (in symbol) svasti srī-kāśyapo³⁹ nāma mu (a symbol)
 nīr = asin = mahā-tapāḥ tad-vanse⁴⁰ —
2. Bhañja-vanso = yama⁴¹ = smina⁴² suddhānvaye⁴³ purā | ya
 sa supo sambhi⁴⁴ śreṣṭhā—⁴⁵·va—
3. bhūvuḥ⁴⁶ kila bhūbhejaḥ | yair = ddattaṃ sāsanaṃ⁴⁷ pañca-
 sthānaṃ pañcottaraṃ tathā | sa—
4. taṃ⁴⁸ pañca-gajendraṇām dharmā—⁴⁹ yassaser = thine ||⁵⁰
 bhaṭṭena mā(rjji)tā y(e)sāṃ manye Bau—

39 Read srī-kāśyapo—

40 Read tad-vanśe.

41 Read Bhañja-vanśo'yam.

42 Read asmin.

43 Read suddhānvaye.

44 As the meaning of the portion 'ya.....sambhi' is not at all intelligible, this portion should be omitted.

45 Read śreṣṭhāḥ.

46 Read bhūbhujāḥ.

47 Read sāsanaṃ.

48 Read śutaṃ.

49 Insert one 'ya' after 'dharmā.' According to Mr. B. C. Majumdar "the very metre requires an additional letter and this letter I suggest to be 'ya'." (*JBORS.*, II, 1916, p. 368, n. 1).

50 Read yaśase'rthine.

5. desvarādayaḥ | vandhanāya tu bharkhoda matra (???) ma sakuvan | dehikapyurakha—
6. ṇḍīmo bhaṭṭenokto baṇig-dadau | ṣoḍasyaiva tu kapyarakhaṇḍe | karpasya pa—
7. ttane ||⁵¹ śrīmāna-⁵² Solana-bhañjo = bhūd-vanse = smin⁵³ pṛthivī-patiḥ | prāsādapra—
8. sarad-dhāma-dhavalokṛta-maṇḍalah |⁵⁴ pratimagvān-nadanya-tlo-pānthapātheya-taṇḍu—
9. laḥ | anekārāma-saṃ (ccha) nna-cchayā-chhādita-⁵⁵ bhūtalah | nikhātāneka-saṃgata—
10. jala-vyatha-prapāphalah | yāga-pata-⁵⁶ vargeṣu samarpya sakalam yayau |

PLATE II (Inner side)

11. dik-klipta-kīrtiḥ santapta-tapo vārāṇasīm prati | śrīmān =⁵⁷ Durjaya-bhañjo—
12. bhūt-⁵⁸ tat-putro raṇa-durjayaḥ | pa(?)nyāvarāṇe dakṣo dakṣo dānakathāsu | ya
13. (va) bhūva maṇḍalesānā⁵⁹ c(u)ḍāmaṇi = rivā = paraḥ | śrīmāna⁶⁰ Kanaka-bhañjobhūt⁶¹ ta—
14. t-putro-nṛpa-sattamaḥ | caṇḍa-dorddaṇḍa-saṃkhelata-khadga-saṃkhelata-khadga-maṇḍala-paṇḍitaḥ | ra—
15. ṇa-vyoma-ripu-stoma nāsa⁶² ca rasmi-khaṇḍitaḥ | Parepanthi-⁶³ nikhātaika-vi—
16. dyāyāma-ti-paṇḍitaṃ⁶⁴ | dorddaṇḍa-caṇḍa-dorddaṇḍa sarāsāreka-khaṇḍitaḥ⁶⁵ | maṣi—
17. vadhaḥ⁶⁶ | srṣṭyā visva⁶⁷ sṛjaṃ | vikrameṇa viṣ(ṇ)uṃ raudreṇa rudraṃ | sauryeṇa sunā⁶⁸

51 The portion from 'vandhanāya' in I, 5 to 'pattane' in II, 6-7 is unintelligible and cannot be translated.

52 Read śrīmān—

53 Read Solana-bhañjo 'bhūd-vanśe' smin.

54 Read prāsāda-dhāma-prasarāt dhavali-kṛta-maṇḍalah

55 Read chāyā-cchādita—

56 Read yogyā-pātra

57 Read śrīmān—

58 Read-bhañjo 'bhūt—

59 Read maṇḍalesānam.

60 Read śrīmān.

61 Read Kanakabhañjo 'bhūt—

62 Read nāśe.

63 Rear Paripanthi.

64 Read paṇḍitaḥ.

65 The portion 'sarāsāreka-khaṇḍitaḥ' is unintelligible and cannot therefore be translated.

66 Read maṣi-vadhaḥ.

67 Read visva—

68 Read suna—

18. siraṃ || Saumyena somaṃ | Valena maruta | Vibhavana
dhanadaṃ || kāntyā mada—
19. naṃ | kshāntyā⁶⁹ dharāṃ sthamnā⁷⁰ Jaladhiṃ dhāmnā
maṇiṃ | dhiyā dhiṣaṇaṃ | sa tu
20. layati nikhila-sura-samūhaṃ | Madhyadesa-vinirggata hasti-
grāmīya⁷¹-pā

PLATE II (Outer side)

21. rāsara sagotraḥ⁷² triyārṣeyaḥ pravaro guṇaiḥ⁷³ | Arthapati-
nāma dvi—
22. jo = bhūta⁷⁴ sādhu-sattamaḥ⁷⁵ tat-putro = bhuta⁷⁶ Dhana
pati vidvān sādhu⁷⁷ dvije⁷⁸ gra—

69 There is a letter between 'ntyā' of 'kṣāntyā' and 'dha' of 'dharām' which cannot be deciphered. If we leave this word, the meaning is not at all obscured. Mr. B. C. Majumdar writes: 'It seems that between 'kṣāntyā' and 'dharā' there is a compound letter, but I think that the letter 'dha' was twice unsuccessfully attempted and then the letter was left as an erased one.' *JBORS.*, 11, 1916, p. 369. n. 7).

70 Read sthāmnā.

71 Read madhyadesa-vinirggata-hasti-grāmīya—. There is a stroke between the medial form of 'ya' in 'madhya' and the medial form of 'e' in 'deśa' which is, I think, not meant for any medial form. The elongated horizontal stroke of the medial form of 'i' is not found in 'hasti.' Most probably this is a mistake made by the scribe.

72 Read pārasara sagotraḥ. The form 'tra' is not quite distinct but we must have 'tra' here as the meaning is quite evident.

73 This line to indicate a stop seems to be misplaced; it should have been put after 'pravaro' as 'guṇaiḥ' has to be constructed with the succeeding words.

74 Read 'dvijo'bhūt.'

75 Insert a line to indicate a stop.

76 Read tatputro'bhūt. The scribe has originally written 'tatputo' but later on he finds that it ought to be 'tatputro.' Therefore he places a stroke which joins the lower end of the curve.

77 A line to indicate a stop is to be placed either after 'sādhu' or after 'dvijegraṇiḥ.' If we place the line after 'sādhu,' then the term 'dvijegraṇiḥ' becomes identical with 'Harivaṃśaḥ'; but if we place this line after 'dvijegraṇiḥ,' the term 'dvijegraṇiḥ' becomes identical with 'Dhanapati.' I suggest that this line is better to be placed after 'dvijegraṇiḥ,' because the meaning which this term signifies can be had from the term 'dvija(va)rottamaḥ' which is identical with 'Harivaṃśaḥ.' Thus this line should be placed after 'dvijegraṇiḥ.'

78 Read dvijā—

23. ṅiḥ Harivamsaḥ tat-sutaḥ sādhu cha | sā⁷⁰ vadānyo dānas-tavya | ṣa⁸⁰ vidvān dvija—(va)⁸¹
24. rottamaḥ | Śa (samyak)⁸² vrāhmaṇāy = āsmai-kṣa-dhipendraḥ pradattavān | vāhu—
25. lāveṇḍake Jamarāpura-Sihipura-ubhaya-pāṭākau Dharmmapurā⁸⁴ raṇā—
26. kaṃ⁸⁶ sāsitaṃ⁸⁵ | catuḥ-sīmā paricchinnam yasaḥ⁸⁰ puṇya-vivṛddhaye | Tithim puṇya—
27. tamām' prāpya yathāśāstra-vidhānataḥ | Pūrvvasyām = asya sīmā Māharapura -- (grā)
28. ma-bhūmiḥ pāṣāṇa-paricchedaḥ | Dakṣiṇa-pascimāsyām disau⁸⁷ Kopāsimyā—
29. grāmaṃ⁸⁸ bhūmiḥ pāṣāṇaḥ paricchinnāḥ⁸⁹ | Uttarasyā⁹⁰ disi⁹¹ Tela-nadī-pari—
30. cchedaḥ Evam—asya catuḥ-sīmān⁹² sāsanikaiḥ⁹³ kṛta⁹⁴ | sa-jala-stha—

70 Read sa.

80 Read sa.

81 The last word in line 23 looks like 'da'; but it is certainly to be taken as 'va,' because if we take this to be 'va,' then the meaning becomes quite clear. The little gap between the upper and the lower horizontal strokes, which is certainly due to the misengraving of the letter 'va' by the scribe, makes it look like 'da'; but as I have stated just now, it is nothing but 'va.'

82 Mr. B. C. Majumdar has read this as a certain 'sa'; but this certainly does not look like 'sa' which we find in this charter. Some interesting notice may be made regarding the morphology of this 'sa'. The scribe is ordered to 'engrave' 'sa samyak.' He engraved 'sa' and then, in a hurry, he, forgetting that he should have to inscribe another 'sa', was going to inscribe 'mya.' He inscribed 'ma' and when he was going to add 'ya' to this, he suddenly saw that he had not inscribed 'sa' of 'samyak.' So he added a horizontal stroke on the left side in the lower part joining the circular part of the engraved 'ma.' Thus morphologically it looks like 'sa.'

83 The letter between 'ra' and 'bhi' of Dharmmapura (?) bhi in l. 25 cannot be deciphered.

84 Read raṇākena.

85 Read sāsitaṃ.

86 Read yasaḥ.

87 Read pascimayoḥ diśoḥ.

88 Read grāma—

89 Read pāṣāṇa-paricchinnā.

90 Read uttarasyām.

91 Read diśi.

92 Read sīmāḥ.

93 There is a word between 'n' of 'sīmān' and 'sa' of 'sāsanikaiḥ' in l. 30 which cannot be deciphered.

94 Read kṛtaḥ—

PLATE, III (Inner side)

31. la-matsya⁹⁵ ca savvo = sadrava vaji⁹⁶ madhuk = āmra-
vane (?) c = aika nuktasu
32. tat-samaṃ | Pha (?) pradātavya vārṣikasya suddhyae | Rājñaṃ
sāsanikair =
33. naiva nānyat kiñcid = iti-sthitiḥ || ya⁹⁷ ye bhūpā⁹⁸ bhavi-
syanti pālanā—
34. ya stha (te) ra = yam⁹⁹ Nyāyato haraṇe doṣa sravaṇān =
muni¹⁰⁰ vākyataḥ | mā bhuda
35. phala sa (ka) va¹⁰¹ parādatte = ti pārthivāḥ | svadattāt
phalamā = dhikyaṃ paradattā ca.¹⁰²
36. pālāne | Vahubhi = vvasudhā¹⁰³ dattā rājabhiḥ sagarā-di-
bhiḥ | yasya yasya yadā bhūmiḥ
37. tasya tasya tadā phalaṃ | svadattāṃ paradattāṃ vā yo
hareta vasudharāṃ¹⁰⁴ sa viṣṭhāyāṃ
38. kṛmīr = bhutyā¹⁰⁵ pitrbhiḥ saha pacyate | mekāṃ svallame
= kaṃ ca.¹⁰⁶ bhūme = rapya = rddhama—
39. ūgulāṃ¹⁰⁷ haraṇ = narakamā = pnoti | yāvadā (bhu) ta¹⁰⁸.
samplava¹⁰⁹ Śrīmat¹¹⁰ = Kanakabhañjasya varṇa
40. kā varaṇādhiṇaḥ | Rāṣṭrasyā = sya tṛtiye = vde¹¹¹ likhitaṃ
tāmra-śāsanam¹¹² || Jmanāṇa (?)
41. śāstrāṇi¹¹³ pa na¹¹⁴ kṣiti¹¹⁵ hareta¹¹⁶ pito¹¹⁷ =
garddabhakas = tasya mā(tā) syāta¹¹⁸ sūkarī¹¹⁹ = ti

95 Read matsyaḥ.

96 Read savvopadrava-varjji'oh--

97 Read ye.

98 Read bhūpāḥ.

99 Read sthite—

100 Read munih-

101 Read samkavaḥ-

102 The word should evidently be 'nu' and not 'ca'.

103 Read bahubhir-vasudhā.

104 Read vasudharāṃ.

105 Read bhūtvā

106 Read Gāmekāṃ svarṇam-ekaṃ-ca.

107 Read ūgulāḥ.

108 Read bhūta.

109 Read bhūta.

110 Read śrīmat--

111 Read tṛtiye-vde.

112 Read śāsanāṃ.

113 Read śāstrāṇi.

114 The letters between 'pa' and 'na' and between 'ra' and 'kṣi' of 'kṣiti' are undecipherable.

115 Read kṣitiṃ.

116 Read hareḥ.

117 Read pita.

118 Read syāt.

119 Read sūkarī.

PLATE III (Outer side).

42. Traya tālānuśāsanam mut'ṭṭṭamiti : o || li
 43. khitam Vi(śṭṭṭ)¹²⁰ ni nāsna¹²¹ nipuṇeniti¹²² ||

Translation.

(L. 1) Om (in symbol). Adoration. There was a sage named Kāśyapa the illustrious who had performed great austerities. In his family (L. 2) (was) this Bhaṅja family. In olden times in this pure dynasty (many) illustrious¹²³ (L. 3) kings were born by whom were given decrees (consisting of) pañcasthāna, pañcottara and (L. 4) five hundred best elephants for piety and fame to the man who asked for them,¹²⁴ (L. 7). In this family was born the illustrious ruler Solanabhāṅja, (L. 8) whose maṇḍala was made white by the extension of the buildings (within the compound) of the royal palace, who gave rice and other necessary things for travelling to the wayfarers, who came from every road (L. 9), whose territory was full of many pleasure-gardens and protected by (artificial) shades, who dug many (L. 10) (tanks or channels which served the purpose of prapā¹²⁵ for water), (L. 11) whose fame had spread in (all) directions, who had performed severe austerities. (He) retired to Bārāṇasī, (L. 10) entrusting all to the competent ministers

(L. 11-13) There was born his son, the illustrious Durjaya-bhaṅja,¹²⁶ (who was) invincible in battle, expert in fighting, skilful in charity and speech, the jewel, as it were, of the crowns of all the rulers of the maṇḍala. There was his son, the illustrious Kanakabhāṅja, (L. 14) the best of the kings, (who was) fierce, mighty, whose sword was unsheathed, who was a scholar par excellence in the maṇḍala, (L. 15) who had scattered the rays of the sky of the battle by destroying all enemies, who was a great expert in the art of subduing enemies,¹²⁷ (L. 16) (who was) the destroyer of the black (i.e., impurity). (L. 17) In creation (he was) like the creator of the

120 Read Viṣṇuṇā.

121 Read nāṇā.

122 Read nipuṇene-ti.

123 The portion 'ya.....saṃbhu' is unintelligible and cannot be translated.

124 The portion 'bhaṭṭena.....pattane' is unintelligible and cannot be translated.

125 Prapā means a shed, from where water is given to the travellers.

126 The word pā(?)ṇyāva is unintelligible.

127 See JBORS., II, p. 327. n. 4.

universe, in power (he was) like Viṣṇu, in fierceness (he was) like Rudra, in prowess (he was) like Śunāsira, (L. 18) in amiableness (he was) like Soma, in strength (he was) like Maruta, in wealth (he was) like Dhanada, in physical grace (he was) like Madana, (L. 19) in patience (he was) like the earth, in vigour (he was) like the sun, in intellect (he was) like Dhiṣaṇa. (L. 20) So he can be favourably compared with the whole body of suras or gods.

There was in the village of Hasti in Madhyadeśa (L. 21) a Brāhmaṇa named Arthapati, the best of pious men, belonging to the Pārāśara gotra and Tryārseya-pravara. (L. 22) There was born his son named Dhanapati (who was) learned, pious and foremost among the Brāhmaṇas. (L. 23) His son Harivaṃśa was honest and he was generous, pious and best of the Brāhmaṇas. (L. 24) The king gave this Brahmin (this plot of land (described later on) properly (i.e. according to Śāstric rites). (L. 25) Both of the pāṭākas Jamarāpura and Sihipura in Vāhulaveṇḍaka were governed by a raṇāka (who lived in) Dharmmapura. (L. 26) With the object of increasing fame and piety (the gift was made of the land) well-bounded on four sides finding (i.e., on) (L. 27) a very auspicious tithi according to the Śāstric rites. Its eastern boundary is the village of Māharapura and (L. 28) there is a stone to demarcate the boundary. On the southern and western directions (L. 29) there is the land of the village of Kopāsimyā demarcated by stones. It is bounded on the north by the river Tela. (L. 30) Thus the four ends of this (plot of land) are recorded by a grant.

(The enjoyment this plot of land) (will be) over water, land and (L. 31) fish and (this plot of land) will be free from all undue exactions. (L. 33) Those who will be kings (of this kingdom) (in future) should respect this grant, for it is wrong to make resumption hearing what the sages has enjoined. (Then follows the usual imprecatory verses from mā in l.34 to samplava in l.39 which, being very familiar, need not be translated here). (L.40) In the third regnal year (of Kanakabhañja) (this) copper-plate is inscribed. (L.41) His father is a donkey (and) mother a sow who dispossesses the donee violating the sacred laws.

(L. 42) Engraved is the charter which has three folds (i.e., three plates). (L. 43) It is engraved by one named Viṣṇu (who is) skilful in the (i.e. this) art.

List of abbreviations

- ABORI.*—Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.
ASM.—Archæological Survey of Mayurbhañja, By N. N. Basu.
DHNI.—Dynastic History of Northern India, Early Mediæval Period, vol. I, By Dr. H. C. Roy.
EI.—Epigraphia Indica.
HO. History of Orissa, vol. I, By R. D. Banerji.
JASB.—Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.
JBORS.—Journal of the Bihar & Orissa Research Society.
R.—Record.
STIP.—Siebzehn Tafeln zur Indischen Palæographie von G. Bühler.

CHARU CHANDRA DASGUPTA

The Political Significance of the Madhyama and the Udāsīna

The terms *Madhyama* and *Udāsīna* found in old Sanskrit political literature signify two of the twelve States that were usually regarded as the components of a *Maṇḍala*¹ (Circle of States). According to the *Kautilīya* (VI, 2, Mysore, 2nd.ed., p. 261), the sovereign whose territory is contiguous to those of both the *Vijigīṣu* and the *Ari*, and whose strength is greater than the individual power of the *vijigīṣu* and the *ari* but less than the combined strength of these two is called *Madhyama*.² The *Udāsīna*, according to the same text, is the sovereign, whose territory is beyond those of the *Vijigīṣu*, *Ari* and *Madhyama*, and who is stronger than the *Madhyama* taken singly, but weaker than the *Vijigīṣu*, *Ari*, and *Madhyama* combined.³ These two descriptions of the *Madhyama* and the *Udāsīna* draw our attention to two characteristics of the States viz. their location and their strength. The *Madhyama* is a State situated near those of the *Vijigīṣu* and the *Ari* while the *Udāsīna*'s territory is more distant. In regard to the relative strength of the four powers mentioned above, the *Madhyama* is inferior in strength to the *Udāsīna* but is superior to the *Ari* or the *Vijigīṣu*, while the *Udāsīna* is stronger than the *Madhyama*, and for the matter of that, the strongest power in the *Maṇḍala*. It should be mentioned in

The concep-
tion of the
Madhyama
and the
Udāsīna in
the *Kaūṭi-
līya*.

1 The scheme of the *Maṇḍala* is usually taken to consist of the *Vijigīṣu* (Central State) and his *Ari* (enemy) with eight more kings (exclusive of the *Udāsīna* and the *Madhyama*) who may help either the *Vijigīṣu* or the *Ari* according to their locations in the *Maṇḍala* or other circumstances. See the present writer's *Inter-state Relations in Ancient India*.

2 अरिविजिगीष्वोर्भूम्यन्तरः संहतासंहतयोरनुग्रहे समर्थो निग्रहे चासंहतयोर्मध्यमः ।

3 अरिविजिगीषुमध्यानां बहिः प्रकृतिभ्यो बलवत्तरः संहतानामरिविजिगीषुमध्यमानामनुग्रहे समर्थो निग्रहे चासंहतानामुदासीनः ।

passing that every conflict between a particular State and its enemy did not necessarily draw the Madhyama and the Udāsīna of his Maṇḍala into the vortex. The existence of such powerful States (with special nomenclature and superior powers up to a limit) within the Maṇḍala was thought to be necessary for the purpose of facilitating discussion or consideration about the line of action to be adopted, should there exist such powerful States that have or are likely to take sides in the conflict.⁴

It is noticed that some scholars of the present day as also a few authors of Sanskrit works of the mediæval period have been misled by the ordinary meanings of the terms 'madhyama' and 'udāsīna' without taking note of their technical sense. Madhyama has been taken as mediatory and udāsīna as neutral. One of the reasons why the mediæval authors fell into the errors was very likely their scanty acquaintance with the ancient Sanskrit literature on *Dandanīti* which they were not under the necessity to consult on account of their detachment from the duty of guiding sovereigns in their inter-state dealings. Nīlakaṇṭha, the writer of the commentary on the *Mahābhārata*, for instance, takes the term 'madhyama' in the sense of 'well-wisher of the Vijigīṣu and the Ari,'⁵ while Nanda Paṇḍita (17th century), a commentator on the *Viṣṇusmṛti* interprets it as a State located between the territories of the Ari and the Vijigīṣu.⁶ Sarvajñanārāyaṇa, the writer of a commentary on the *Manusmṛti*, again, has no clear conception about the meaning of the

Misconception about the terms.

4 That the Madhyama and the Udāsīna may not at all exist in a particular Maṇḍala is clear from a passage in the *Kautiliya* itself, which runs thus: मध्यमोदासीनयोरभावे गुणातिशयेनारिप्रकृतीः साधयेत् ।
K., XIII, 4, p. 408.

5 *Bhāradīpikā* on *Mahābhārata*, XV, 7, 1: उदासीनादभ्यो मध्यमो-
द्वयपीडाकाङ्क्षी ।

6 *Vaijayanīti* on *Viṣṇusmṛti*, III, 38 मध्यमः शत्रुविजिगीषुमध्य-
वर्ती नृपः ।

term 'udāsīna,' because sometimes he takes it as neutral⁷ and sometimes lays emphasis on its being the strongest power.⁸

I have already shown by quoting descriptions of the Madhyama and the Udāsīna from the *Kautilīya* that interpretations like those put upon the terms by Nilakaṅṭha, Nanda Paṇḍita and Sarvajñanārāyaṇa cannot be accepted as correct. The delineations of the activities of the Vijigīṣu in his relation to the Madhyama and the Udāsīna in the *Kautilīya* confirm the meanings of the words as given in the said descriptions of the Madhyama and the Udāsīna and point to the erroneous nature of other interpretations. Many authors and commentators of the ancient and mediæval periods have also given the correct meanings in their treatment of the Madhyama and the Udāsīna though, as stated already, a few have failed to pick up the correct sense.

The terms 'Madhyama' and 'Udāsīna' are found in use in the *Mahābhārata* for indicating the two members of a Maṇḍala, though their exact nature is not ascertainable from the context. Nārada enquiring of Yudhiṣṭhira about the welfare of his kingdom asks whether he pays proper attention to the activities of the Mitra, Śatru and Udāsīna. He also asks whether Yudhiṣṭhira resorts to Sandhi and Vighraha at the right moments and deals properly with the Madhyama and the Udāsīna:

The refer-
ence to Ma-
dhyama
and Udā-
sīna in the
*Mahā-
bhārata*.

मित्रोदासीनशत्रूणां कश्चिद् वेत्सि विकीर्षितम् ।

कश्चित् सन्धिं यथाकालं विग्रहं चोपसेवसे ॥ *Mbh.*, II, 5, 28.

कश्चिद्भृत्तिमुदासीने मध्यमे चानुमन्यसे । *Mbh.*, II, 5, 29.

The use of the term 'Udāsīna' in the first verse in connection with the Mitra and the Śatru as also its repetition in the third verse in connection with the Madhyama points to the conclusion that in the former setting, the term signifies the

⁷ On *Manu*, VII, 158: उदासीन उभयप्रकाररहितः ।

⁸ On *Manu*, VII, 155: उदासीनः सर्वतो बाह्यः स तु सर्वानिवोत्थापयितुं

neutral attitude of a sovereign in contrast to that of a Mitra or a Śatru, while in the latter it has a special signification like that of the term 'Madhyama.'

The terms 'Madhyama' and 'Udāsīna' have also been used in the *Mahābhārata* (Āśramavāsika Parvan) where Dhṛtarāṣṭra instructs Yudhiṣṭhira in the science of polity. Yudhiṣṭhira is directed to be conversant with the details of the Maṇḍala of himself and his enemy, and ascertain the activities of the Udāsīna and the Madhyama.

मण्डलानि च बुध्येथाः परेषामात्मनस्तथा ।

उदासीनगुणानाञ्च मध्यस्थानाञ्च भारत ॥ (*Mbh.*, XV, 7,7)

The particular mention of these two States in the second line though they are included in the maṇḍala referred to in the first shows the political importance attached to them.

Though the *Manusmṛti* contains several references to the Madhyama and the Udāsīna, the text does not define clearly the term Madhyama though of course the earlier commentators on Manu have correctly interpreted the word. The śloka containing both the terms runs thus:

मध्यमस्य प्रचारश्च विजिगीषोश्च चेष्टितम् ।

उदासीनप्रचारश्च शत्रोश्चैव प्रयत्नतः ॥ *Manu*, VII, 155

While commenting on the śloka, all the important commentators have explained Madhyama and Udāsīna in accordance with their interpretations as found in the *Kautilīya*. Medhātithi, Kullūka and Rāghavānanda have described the two sovereigns by a reference to their political strength. According to each of these commentators, the strength of the Madhyama is such that the prudent course of action for him is to help the Vijigīṣu and his enemy if they be allied, though he is able to defeat them when not allied. In other words, the strength of the Madhyama is greater than that of the Vijigīṣu and the Ari taken singly but less than their combined resources. The Udāsīna is described to possess such political strength as cannot enable him to take any attitude other than friendly towards the

The correct descriptions of the Madhyama and the Udāsīna in the *Manusmṛti* and its commentaries.

Correct interpretation by Medhātithi, Kullūka and Rāghavānanda.

three kings Madhyama, Vijigīṣu and his enemy when they are united but can lead him to success in his contests with each of them separately.⁹

Sarvajñānārāyaṇa, sometimes incorrect.

Kullūka points out further that the territory of the Madhyama is situated contiguous to those of both the Vijigīṣu and his enemy (अरिविजिगीष्वोभूम्यन्तरः) while Rāghavānanda locates the Madhyama between the dominions of the Ari and the Vijigīṣu. Sarvajñānārāyaṇa is the only commentator who has attached a peculiar meaning to the term Madhyama. He thinks that the Madhyama, though of small resources, possesses an advantage in the situation of his dominion between those of the Ari and the Vijigīṣu, and for this reason can attack any one of them by combining with the other.¹⁰ Here the assumption that the Madhyama is a sovereign of small resources is unwarranted. This commentator, however, gives a correct interpretation of the Udāsīna on the line of the *Kautilīya* both in regard to his location and strength. He says that the Udāsīna's territory is situated beyond those of the Vijigīṣu, Ari, and Madhyama and that the Udāsīna excels each of them in strength.¹¹

9 मध्यमोऽनयोररिविजिगीष्वोरसंहतयोर्निग्रहसमर्थो न संहतयोः ; उदासीनो-
रिविजिगीषुमध्यानामसंहतानां निग्रहसमर्थो न तु संहतानाम् । Medhātithi.

अरिविजिगीष्वोर्यो भूम्यन्तरः संहतयोरनुग्रहे समर्थो निग्रहे चासंहतयोः स
मध्यमः ।

अरिविजिगीषुमध्यमानां संहतानामनुग्रहे समर्थो निग्रहे चासंहतानां समर्थ
उदासीनः । Kullūka.

मध्यमोऽरिविजिगीष्वोर्मध्यभूमिगतः संस्तयोः संहतयोर्निग्रहेऽसमर्थोऽसंहतयो-
र्निग्रहे समर्थः ।

उदासीनस्त्वरिविजिगीषुमध्यमानामसंहतानां निग्रहे समर्थः संहतानामसमर्थः ।
Rāghavānanda.

10 अरिविजिगीषुमध्यवर्ती क्षुद्रोऽपि मध्यमोऽन्यतरप्रवेशेनान्यतरं बाधत इति
प्रतिसन्धेयः । Sarvajñānārāyaṇa.

Nanda Paṇḍita while commenting on *Viṣṇusmṛti*, III, 38 also interprets Madhyama as शत्रुविजिगीषुमध्यवर्ती नृपः ।

A śloka in the *Manusmṛti* enumerates the qualities of the Udāsīna. This enumeration is not helpful for our purpose as it does not assist us in forming an idea about his special features. He is described as possessed of "gentlemanliness, knowledge of men, prowess, compassionate disposition and constant liberality."¹² Kullūka comments in this connection that with the help of the Udāsīna endowed with these qualities, the Vijigīṣu should fight with his enemy, showing thereby that the Udāsīna was not regarded as neutral.¹³ Sarvajñanārāyaṇa however looks upon the qualities mentioned in the śloka as essential to the maintenance of neutrality.¹⁴

Manu's colourless definition of the Udāsīna.

Manu states in another śloka¹⁵ that the immediate neighbour as well as his ally should be regarded as enemies, and the immediate neighbour of the enemy should be taken as a friend (of the Vijigīṣu), while the State situated beyond the territories of the Ari and the Vijigīṣu should be known as Udāsīna. Here the Udāsīna has been mentioned as तयोः परम् (beyond these two, viz., the Ari and the Mitra). The word *para* has been explained by Rāghavānanda as दहिर्भूमौ वर्तमानम्

Udāsīna's location according to Manu.

11 उदासीनः सर्वतो बाह्यः सर्वानिवोत्थापयितुं शक्तः ।

Sarvajñanārāyaṇa and his close follower Rāmacandra have explained similarly the words Madhyama and Udāsīna in connection with *Manu*, VII, 156: अरिविजिगीष्वोर्मध्यस्थः क्षुद्रो मध्यमः । उदासीनः सर्वेभ्यः परतरः ।

12 आर्यता पुरुषज्ञानं शौर्यं कर्णवेदिता ।

स्थौललज्जं च सततमुदासीनगुणोदयः ॥ *Manu*, VII, 211.

13 एवंविधमुदासीनमाश्रित्योक्तलक्षणेनारिणा सह योद्धव्यम् । Kullūka on *Manu*, VII, 211.

14 एतेषु सन्स्वेवोदासीनता सम्भवति । अन्यथा कस्याप्यरिः कस्यापि मित्रमित्यवश्यं स्यात् । Sarvajñanārāyaṇa on *Manu* VII, 211.

15 अतन्तमरिं त्रिद्यादरिमेविनमेव च ।

अगेरनन्तरं मित्रमुदासीनं तयोः परम् ॥ *Manu*, VII, 158.

Sarva-
jñānārā-
yaṇa's con-
fusion con-
tinues.

(i.e. situated outside). Rāghavānanda quotes a verse from Yājñavalkya (I, 343 — अरिर्मित्रमुदासीनोऽनन्तरस्तपत्रः परः) where also *para* has been used in the sense of outside. Nandana also paraphrases *para* as बहिःस्थित. Medhātithi and Kullūka are silent about the meaning of the term in the śloka. But strangely enough Sarvajñānārāyaṇa, who has correctly interpreted the meaning of the Udāsīna in two other ślokas (*Manu*, VII, 155 and 156) as pointed out already, explains it here as 'different from an enemy and a friend' (उभयप्रकार-रहितः), *para* being taken in the sense of 'different' (अन्य).

A śloka
attributed
to Manu is
in complete
agreement
with the
the descrip-
tion in the
Kautilīya.

While commenting on *Manu*, VII, 158, Nandana quotes a śloka which is mentioned by him as immediately following *Manu*, VII, 158. This contains definitions of both the Madhyama and the Udāsīna. Nandana's commentary on this śloka as printed in V. N. Mandlik's edition of the *Manu-smṛti* (p. 832) is palpably corrupt. It reads thus:

उदासीनस्य लक्षणशेषमुत्तरत्र श्लोके वक्ष्यते—

विप्रकृष्टेऽध्वन्यधत्त (विकृष्टेऽध्वन्यनायत्तः) उदासीनो बलान्धितः ।

विजिगीषुर्मण्डलार्थो (अखिलो मण्डलार्थस्तु) यस्मिन् ज्ञेयः स मध्यमः ॥¹⁶

The purport of this śloka is that the Udāsīna is a powerful sovereign situated far from those of the Ari and the Mitra of the Vijigīṣu, while the Madhyama is also an important sovereign possessing a dominating influence in the Mandala. This śloka with a smaller number of inaccuracies is also found in the textual portion in Mandlik's edition of the *Manusmṛti*.¹⁷ To it there is affixed no commentary, showing that none of the commentators except Nandana took any notice of the śloka, which however has been correctly quoted and clearly explained by Mitra Miśra in his *Vīramitrodaya*, Rājanītiprakāśa (p. 320) without any express mention of the source. He defines

Mitra
Miśra's
correct
interpre-
tation of
the Madh-
yama.

16 The correct text put within brackets is found in the *Vīramitrodaya*, Rājanītiprakāśa, p. 230.

17 *Manu*, Mandlik's ed., p. 832.

Madhyama as a sovereign capable of defeating each of the Ari and the Vijigīṣu when not in alliance:

मध्यमोऽरिविजिगीष्वोरसंहतयोर्निग्रहे समर्थः । तदुक्तम् —

“अखिलो मण्डलार्थस्तु यस्मिन् ह्येयः स मध्यमः” ।

अखिलः अर्थाद्विजिगीषुयातव्ययोः मण्डलार्थः मण्डलप्रयोजनं यस्मिन् ह्येयः स मध्यमः ।

In fact, Madhyama being a powerful sovereign had to be approached by the weak kings for help. The *Viṣṇudharmottara* has actually laid down that either the Udāsīna or the Madhyama should be resorted to for safety when ‘the course of action’ called *saṁśraya* is adopted:

उदासीने मध्यमे वा संश्रयात् संश्रयः स्मृतः ।

(*Viṣṇudharmottara*, ch. 150 Venkateshwar Press ed. p. 282).

Kālidāsa also refers in his *Raghuvamśa*, XIII, 7 to this dependence of the weak kings on the Madhyama.

नृपा इवोपप्लविनः परेभ्यो धर्मोत्तरं मध्यममाश्रयन्ते ।

While defining the Udāsīna as a sovereign capable of defeating each of the Ari, Vijigīṣu, and Madhyama fighting singly, Mitra Miśra quotes the verse found in Mandlik’s edition of the *Manusmṛti* and explains it by stating that the Udāsīna is situated far from the Ari and the Mitra and is a very powerful king not controllable by any one of the three kings Ari, Vijigīṣu, and Madhyama.

उदासीनः अरिविजिगीषुमध्यमानामसंहतानां निग्रहसमर्थः । तदुक्तं

“विकृष्टेऽध्वन्यनायत्त उदासीनो बलान्वितः ।”

विकृष्टेऽध्वनि अरिमित्रापेक्षया विप्रकृष्टे स्थले । अनायत्तः त्रयाणाम-
प्यनधीनः । *Vīramitrodāya*, Rājanītiprakāśa, p. 320.

The definitions of the Madhyama and the Udāsīna contained in the śloka quoted above agree with those in the *Kautilīya*. This śloka, though not touched by Medhātīhi and Kullūka, has thus been explained by Nandana and mentioned by him as appertaining to Manu’s Law-Code while it has been cited by Mitra Miśra as authoritative. It is now patent that Manu and most of his commentators regarded Madhyama as a

The conception of the Madhyama’s greater strength in the *Viṣṇudharmottara* and the *Raghuvamśa*.

Mitra Miśra’s correct interpretation of the Udāsīna.

sovereign of medium strength and Udāsīna as the strongest power in the Maṇḍala.

The *Kāma-
ndakīya*
follows the
Kauṭīlya.

The *Kāmandakīya Nitīsāra* which is at times more explicit than the *Kauṭīlya* describes as follows the Madhyama and the Udāsīna :

अरेश्च विजिगीषोश्च मध्यमो भूम्यनन्तरः ।

अनुग्रहे संहतयोर्व्यस्तयोर्निग्रहे प्रभुः ॥

मण्डलाद्बहिरेतेषामुदासीनो बलाधिकः ।

अनुग्रहे संहतानां व्यस्तानाञ्च वधे प्रभुः ॥ *Kāmand.*, VIII, 18, 19

[The sovereign, whose dominion lies contiguous to those of both the Ari and the Vijigīṣu is termed Madhyama. (His strength is such that) he can assume only a friendly attitude towards the Ari and the Vijigīṣu when they are united, and can be hostile to them when they are disunited.

Beyond the Maṇḍala of these kings lies the territory of the Udāsīna, who is the most powerful of them all, viz., Ari, Vijigīṣu and Madhyama. He has to be friendly to those kings when they are united but is able to defeat any one of them separately.]

Saṅkarā-
rya ex-
plains Mad-
hyama as
the state
of medium
strength
and the
Udāsīna,
as the
strongest
power
in the
Maṇḍala.

The commentator Saṅkarārya states that the Madhyama situated as it is at an intermediate point of the compass (विदिक्) becomes the immediate neighbour of both the Ari and the Vijigīṣu and as such, he is a natural enemy of both of them. But being of a different kind (on account of his greater strength), he has been named differently.¹⁸ Saṅkarārya says further that the Madhyama possesses much power but the Udāsīna is more powerful than the Madhyama. There is no power more powerful than the Udāsīna within the Maṇḍala.

मध्यमो बलवान् । तस्मादपि यो बलवत्तरः स उदासीनसंज्ञः ।

तस्मादुदासीनान् परतोऽधिकतरो नास्ति ।

(Saṅkarārya on *Kāmandakīya*, VIII, 19).

18 अरिविजिगीष्वोर्भूम्यनन्तर इति स्थाननिर्देशः । तस्य विदिग्भाग-
माश्रित्य स्थितत्वात् । स च तयोर्भूम्यनन्तरत्वाच्चन्द्रुरपि भिन्नलक्षणत्वात् मध्यम-
संज्ञो भवति । *Kāmandakīya*, VIII, 18, Trivandrum ed., p. 107.

Thus according to the *Kāmandakīya*, the Madhyama is the sovereign of the medium State and the Udāsīna that of the Super-State in the Maṇḍala.

The *Kāmandakīya* has also given details of the means to be adopted for checking the progress of the Madhyama and the Udāsīna, if they in the exuberance of their power intend to push on conquests of territories.¹⁹ They cannot, therefore, be by their nature either neutral or intermediary.

The descriptions of the Madhyama and the Udāsīna as found in the *Agnipurāṇa* and the *Viṣṇudharmottara* are almost identical with those of the *Kāmandakīya* already quoted.²⁰ In this *Parāṇa* as also in the *Viṣṇudharmottara*, the Madhyama is sometimes called Madhyastha, a term used once in the *Mahābhārata*.

Agreement of the *Agnipurāṇa* and the *Viṣṇudharmottara* with the *Kāmandakīya*.

The text of the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* deals only with the location of the Udāsīna. It has not referred at all to the

- 19 चलेच्चेदूर्जितबलो मध्यमो विजिगीषया ।
एकीभूयारिणा तिष्ठेदशक्तः सन्धिना नमेत् ॥
उदासीने विचलति सर्वे मण्डलिनः सह ।
सङ्घर्मेण तिष्ठेयुः सन्नमेयुरशक्तयः ॥ *Kāmand.* VIII, 55, 56.

- 20 निग्रहानुग्रहे शक्तो मध्यस्थः परिकीर्तितः ॥
निग्रहानुग्रहे शक्तः सर्वेषामपि यो भवेत् ।
उदासीनः स कथितो बलवान् पृथिवीपतिः ॥ *Agnipurāṇa*, 233, 18, 19.
अंशश्च विजिगीषोश्च मध्यमो भूम्यनन्तरः ॥
अनुग्रहे संहतयोर्निग्रहे व्यस्तयोः प्रभुः ।
मण्डलाद्बहिर्गतेषामुदासीनो बलाधिकः ॥
अनुग्रहे संहतानां व्यस्तानाञ्च वयं प्रभुः । *Ibid.*, 240, 3-5.
जिगीषो. शत्रुयुक्तस्य वियुक्तस्य तथा द्विज ।
निग्रहानुग्रहे शक्तो मध्यस्थः परिकीर्तितः ॥
निग्रहानुग्रहे शक्तः सर्वेषामपि यो भवेत् ।

उदासीनः स कथितो बलवान् पृथिवीपतिः ॥ *Viṣṇudharmottara*, Venkateshwar Press ed., p. 281.

शत्रुयुक्तस्य in the first verse of the quotation from the *Viṣṇudharmottara* appears in the Venkateshwar Press edition as शत्रुयुक्तस्य which is apparently a mistake for शत्रुयुक्तस्य found in the *Vīramitrodaya*, Rājānitprakāśa, p. 321.

Yājñavalkya points out the location of the Udāsīna only.

Madhyama, nor has it described fully the nature of the Udāsīna. It states that the Ari is the immediate neighbour of the Vijigīṣu, the Mitra stands next to Ari, while the Udāsīna occupies the territory beyond that of Mitra.

अरिमित्रमुदासीनोऽनन्तरस्तत्परः परः ।²¹

Yājñavalkya, I, 343.

The *Nītimayūkha* of Nīlakaṇṭha follows Yājñavalkya in regard to the location of the Udāsīna :

प्राकृतोदासीनो द्वयन्तरदेशाधिपतिः ।

“The Udāsīna is the sovereign of a State situated beyond the two other States”. Here the use of the word Prākṛta affixed to *Udāsīna* is important inasmuch as it shows that the term Udāsīna has two meanings, one being of general application in the sense of indifferent and the other of special political import.

The *Nītimayūkha* follows Yājñavalkya.

In his *Nītivākyāmṛta*, Somadevasūri (10th century A.C.) is correct in his position as to the nature of the Madhyama and the Udāsīna so far as their political strength is concerned. He however is in error when he says that these two sovereigns though more powerful than any other in the Maṇḍala remain neutral for some reason or other when another sovereign within the Maṇḍala is out for conquest.²² That this position of Somadeva is not tenable is apparent from what has been stated already. Further, according to him, both the Madhyama and the Udāsīna are equally neutral, a position which is not reasonable at all.

Somadeva's *Nītivākyāmṛta*,

The *Amarakośa* (Kṣettriyavarga, verse 10) mentions only the term Udāsīna, explaining it as परतरः ‘the more dist-

21 While explaining this verse, some commentators have made a confusion in the conception of the Maṇḍala. This is however not the subject of investigation at present.

22 अगतः पृष्ठतः कोणे वा सन्निकृष्टं वा मण्डले स्थितो मध्यमादीनां विगृहीतानां निगृहे संहितानामनुगृहे समर्थोऽपि केनचित् कारणेन अन्यस्मिन् भूपतौ विजिगीषमाणे य उदास्ते स उदासीनः ।

उदासीनवदनियतमण्डलोऽपरभूम्यपेक्षया समधिकबलोऽपि कुतश्चित् कारणात् अन्यस्मिन् भूपतौ विजिगीषमाणे यो मध्यस्थभावमवलम्बते स मध्यस्थः ।

Nītivākyāmṛta, *Sāṅganyasamuddeśa*.

ant'. Thus it deals with only one characteristic of the Udāsīna, viz., its location. The term *para* has been used in the same sense both by Manu and Yājñavalkya in connection with the explanation of the term Udāsīna.²³ Kṣīrasvāmin, Sarvānanda and Bharatamallika have correctly indicated the location of the Udāsīna in their commentaries on the *Amarakośa*, while Sarvananda has also referred to the Udāsīna's superior strength. But all of them add erroneously that as the Udāsīna is situated far beyond the territory of the Vijigīṣu, the former is neither helpful nor harmful to the latter.²⁴

The *Kalpudrakośa* recently published in the Gaekwad's Oriental Series mentions only the location of the Madhyama and the Udāsīna and does not differ from Manu, Kauṭilya and Kāmandaka on this point.²⁵

As regards the etymology of the term Udāsīna, Kṣīrasvāmin and Bharatamallika have given important hints in their commentaries on the *Amarakośa* (Kṣātriyavarga, verse 10). They state that the Udāsīna is so called because he is as if were seated on a height (ऊर्ध्वमासीन इवोदासीनः). In fact, in view of the superior strength of the Udāsīna, he can well be regarded as seated on a height among the members of the Maṇḍala.

As the result of our investigation we find that the descriptions of the Madhyama and the Udāsīna as given in the

23 *Manu*, VII, 158: उदासीनं तयोः परम् ।

Yājñavalkya, I, 343: अरिर्मित्रमुदासीनोऽनन्तरस्तत्परः परः ।

24 Kṣīrasvāmin: स्वशत्रुमित्रभूमिभ्यो बाह्योऽतएव तदस्थः ।

Sarvānanda: अरिविजिगीषुमध्यमानां बहिर्भूतोऽत्यन्तव्यवहितो बलाधिकोऽप्युपकारापकारौ न करोति स उदासीनः ।

Bharatamallika: विजिगीषोः शत्रुमित्रभूमितो व्यवहितः । व्यवहितत्वादेव नोपकारी नाप्यपकारी ।

25 अग्रेष्व विजिगीषोश्च मध्यमो भूम्यनन्तरः । *Kalpudrakośa*, p. 99, verse 96.

तस्याप्यनन्तरो मित्रमुदासीनस्ततः परम् । *Ibid.*, p. 99, verse 95.

Kautilīya and referred to at the beginning of this paper are corroborated by many other Sanskrit texts. It has also been shown how some of the writers have misunderstood the meanings of the terms. I turn next to show, from the portions of the *Kautilīya* other than the one in which the definitions of the terms have been given, that both the *Madhyama* and the *Udāsīna* do, as a matter of fact, enter into conflict with the other kings of the *Maṇḍala* when occasion needs it, and it is erroneous to think that the *Madhyama* is always mediatory, and the *Udāsīna* neutral.

A king wishing to march against an enemy has for instance been directed in the *Kautilīya* to be cautious, if the *Madhyama*, or the *Udāsīna* is inimically disposed towards him.²⁶ Again, it has been enjoined that if, at any time, the *Madhyama* tries to bring under sway a friend of the *Vijigīṣu*, the latter should save him by combining with other kings and by inciting the members of the *Maṇḍala* against him by pointing out that the *Madhyama* was growing dangerously powerful intending to destroy all of them, and therefore they should all combine for his downfall.²⁷ This and many other references (some of which are given below) to the activities of the *Madhyama* as described in the *Kautilīya* prove that

26 मध्यम उदासीनो वा प्रतिकर्तव्य ... इति शनैर्यायात् । K., X, 2.

The passage in the Mysore edition of the text (2nd ed., p. 365) has been wrongly divided and the English translation by its editor himself is full of mistakes (Translation, 3rd ed., p. 393). For correct interpretation, see the *Nagacandrikā* (Lahore 1924), p. 171, as also Ganapati Sastri's commentary on the *Arthasāstra* (Trivandrum 1925), vol. III, p. 109.

27 See K., Trivandrum edition, vol. II, p. 395: मध्यमश्चेद्विजिगीषोः मित्रं मित्रभात्रि लिप्सेत मित्रस्यात्मनश्च मित्रायुत्थाप्य मध्यमाच्च मित्राणि भेदयित्वा मित्रं त्रायेत् । मण्डलं वा प्रोत्साहयेत्—अतिप्रवृद्धोऽयं सर्वेषां नो विनाशाय अभ्युत्थितः सम्भूयास्य यात्रां विह्वाम ।

Here also the Mysore text and its English translation are not accurate as I have already pointed out in my articles on the English translation of the *Kautilīya*. (*J.H.Q.*, vol. VII, p. 408 and vol. VIII, p. 213).

the Madhyama was possessed of great political strength but had nothing to do with intermediation:

(A) *K.*, VII, 8, p. 288: मध्यमश्चेदनुगृहीतो विगुणः स्यात् । If the Madhyama becomes inimical after he has received help.

(B) *K.*, VIII, 8, p. 318: तच्चैन्मण्डलमनुगृहीयान्मध्यमावप्रहेणात्मानमुपवृंहयेत् । If the Maṇḍala helps him, he (Vijigīṣu) should augment his power by putting down the Madhyama.

(C) एवमभ्युच्चितो मध्यममवगृहीयात् । Thus gaining in strength he (Vijigīṣu) should put down the Madhyama king.

(D) उच्छेदनीयं वाऽस्य मित्रं मध्यमो लिप्सेत कर्शितमेतं त्रायेत मध्यमवृद्धिभयात् । If the Madhyama attacks a false friend of the Vijigīṣu, the latter though allowing the Madhyama to weaken the strength of that false friend should help him ultimately lest the Madhyama becomes too powerful.

Similarly, the supposed neutrality of the Udāsīna is not in consonance with many passages pointing to his conflict with the other sovereigns of the Maṇḍala. Some of these passages are :

(A) *K.*, VII, 15, p. 309: नदेभिः कारणं: [दुर्गम्] आश्रयेत्—पार्ष्णिग्राहासारं मध्यममुदासीनं वा प्रतिषादयिष्यामि । For these reasons, one should take shelter (in a fort)—if one thinks that he could thereby have the Pārṣṇigrāhāsāra, the Madhyama or the Udāsīna on his side.

(B) *K.*, VII, 18, 319: उदासीनं वा मध्यमो लिप्सेत । If the Madhyama wishes to bring the Udāsīna under his sway.

(C) उदासीनश्चेन्मध्यमं लिप्सेत । If the Udāsīna wishes to bring the Madhyama under his sway.

(D) *K.*, XIII, 4, p. 408: एवं विजिगीषुरमित्रभूमिं लब्ध्वा मध्यमं लिप्सेत । तत्सिद्धौ उदासीनम् । Having thus acquired the territory of the enemy, the Vijigīṣu should try to bring under sway the Madhyama, and if successful, also the Udāsīna.

MISCELLANY

Vainyagupta Dvādasāditya.

Only a few years ago, a copper-plate, discovered in the village of Gunaighar, 18 miles to the north of the town of Comilla, Bengal, brought to light the name of a king known as Vainyagupta.¹ Vainyagupta's name ought to have been known to the scholars long before the discovery of that copper-plate. But failure on the part of the numismatists to read correctly some coins clearly bearing his name is responsible for this ignorance.


The representations of three gold coins are given in Plate XXIII, numbered 6, 7, and 8 in Mr. Allan's *Catalogue of the Coins of the Gupta Dynasties*. Their weights are 144.5, 148.0, 147.7 grains respectively. They are exactly similar in type to the archer type of Candragupta II, and Kumāragupta I.² They may be described as follows:—

Reverse—Goddess Lakṣmī seated on lotus, holding fillet in the extended right hand; left hand rests on her hip; she wears ear-rings, neck-lace, and armlets.

The legend is *Śrī-Dvādasāditya*.

Obverse—King standing to left, nimbate, wearing close-fitting garment, ear-rings, neck-lace, and pointed shoes; left hand holding a bow, the right hand holding an arrow, the head of which rests on the ground. Garuda standard bound with fillet is on the left. Between the feet is the letter *bhā*.

Beneath the left arm are two letters



Mr. Allan reads the first letter as *ca*, and the second as *ndra*,³ and remarks that⁴ “the name beneath the king's arm on the obverse is *Candra*, undoubtedly for Candragupta, while the reverse legend is not *Śrī-Vikramah* or *Śrī-Vikramāditya*, but *Śrī-Dvādasāditya* (Smith,

1 *IIIQ.*, 1930, vol. VI, p. 45.

2 Allan's *Gupta Coins*, pl. VI & XII.

3 *Ibid.*, p. 144.

4 *Ibid.*, Introduction, pp. lii-liv.

JR.AS., 1889, p. 82; *I. M. Catalogue*, I, pp. 106-7). This reading has already been suggested by Rapson (*Num. Chron.*, 1891, p. 57), but he hesitates to accept it definitely. There can be no doubt then as already suggested by Rapson (*ibid.*), that, these coins do not belong to Candragupta, but to a later ruler whom we may call Candragupta III Dvādaśāditya. Rapson doubts that the name is really Candra (*ibid.*). The *ca* is certainly like *ra*, but what appears to be vowel marks above it is the usual crescent; on no. 588 it is difficult to say whether the second akṣara is *tya* or *ndra*, but it is clearly *ndra* on Nos. 589 and 590, and there is no reason to doubt the reading 'Candra.'

But close examination reveals that the first letter is *vai*. The mark, which Mr. Allan takes as crescent, is very likely the secondary vowel *ai* of *va*. The second letter on all the three coins are neither *tya* nor *ndra* but clearly *nya*.⁵ There cannot be any shadow of doubt that the word is Vainya, and the coins belong to the king Vainyagupta. The critical study of these coins help us to arrive at the following conclusions:—

- (a) Vainyagupta belonged to the imperial Gupta dynasty of Magadha.
- (b) He was an independent sovereign, and was very powerful (cf. weight of the coins).
- (c) His title was Dvādaśāditya.
- (d) He was a devotee of Viṣṇu.
- (e) There was no king of the name of Candragupta III.

The Gunaighar inscription, referred to above, furnishes us with some more valuable informations regarding Vainyagupta. The fact that he is associated in this record with the title mahārāja does not in any way indicate that he was a local ruler. Though the Mankuwar stone image inscription,⁶ dated G.E. 129, designates Kumāragupta I as mahārāja, there is no doubt that he was an independent monarch. The Dāmodarpur inscription⁷ of the same year calls him a mahārājādhirāja.

5 Cf. *ndra* of Candragupta II, Allan's *Gupta Coins*, pl. vii.

6 *Ill.*, p. 47.

7 *Fl.*, vol. XV, p. 134.



The evidence of the coins, however, fixes up the status of Vainyagupta as a powerful king.

The object of the Gunaighar inscription is to record that mahārāja Vainyagupta, a devotee of Mahādeva, from his victorious camp at Kṛipura, granted, at the request of mahārāja Rudradatta, a subordinate of the king, some lands in the village of Kantedadaka, situated in the Uttaramaṇḍala, for the maintenance of a Buddhist vihāra. The lands granted were bounded on one side by the village of Guṇikāgrahāra. The royal order was communicated to the Kumārāmātyas, Revajjasvāmī, Bhāmaha, and Vatsabhojika by the Mahāpratibāra-Mahāpilupati-Pañcādhikaraṇoparika-Purapāla-Uparikamahārāja Śrī Mahāsāmanta-Vijayasena. The inscription was written by Naradatta, the minister in charge of peace and war. The record is dated (G.E.) 188 = A.D. 507.

Of the localities, mentioned above, Guṇikāgrahāra is identical with Gunaighar where the plate was discovered. It was situated in ancient Samatata which was subjugated by Samudragupta.

It is known from the Dāmodarpur copper-plates⁸ that Uparikamahārājas ruled the Puṇḍravardhana Bhukti as viceroys of the imperial Guptas of Magadha, and the Kumārāmātyas were in charge of the Viṣayas under them. It is very likely that the Uparikamahārāja Vijayasena also held the post of a viceroy of a Bhukti, in Uttaramaṇḍala, in Samatata under Vainyagupta, and had a number of Kumārāmātyas to serve him as Viṣayapatis. The Eran stone pillar inscription⁹ of Budhagupta states that Mahārāja Suraśmicandra, a subordinate of the king (*bhūpati*) Budhagupta was the ruler of the country between the Kālindī and Narmadā. His subordinate was again Mahārāja Mātrviṣṇu. The relation between Rudradatta and Vijayasena of the Gunaighar inscription appears to have been similar to that of Suraśmicandra and Mātrviṣṇu.

Now it will not be difficult to determine Vainyagupta's position in the imperial rank of the Guptas of Magadha. The chronology of the imperial Guptas of Magadha after Kumāragupta I is somewhat complex. The last known date of this king is G.E. 129 = A.D. 448-449.¹⁰

⁸ *El.*, vol. XV, pp. 113 ff.

⁹ *CH.*, p. 89.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 45; *El.*, vol. XV, p. 133.

He appears to have been succeeded by his eldest son Puragupta. After Puragupta his brother Skandagupta occupied the throne of Magadha about 455 A.D., and closed his reign subsequent to 466-467 A.D. The Bhitari seal¹¹ records that Kumāragupta I was followed by Puragupta, Narasiṃhagupta, and Kumāragupta (II) in succession. It is known from the Sarnāth inscription that Kumāragupta (II) was ruling in 473-474 A.D.¹² It appears that after the conclusion of the reign of Skandagupta the throne of Magadha was occupied by Narasiṃhagupta, and Kumāragupta II in succession.¹³ The dates of the records of Budhagupta's reign range from 476-477 A.D. to 496 A.D.¹⁴ Budha-

11 *JASB.*, 1889, pp. 84-105.


12 *ASI.*, 1914-15.

13 Mr. Pannalal thinks that Kumāragupta I was followed by Skandagupta, Puragupta, Narasiṃhagupta, Kumāragupta, and Budhagupta (*Hindusthan Review*, January, 1918; for other views see *JASB.*, 1921, p. 249 ff.). This view is supported by Mr. Smith (*EHI.*, p. 329). If this theory is to be supported, all the three kings Puragupta, Narasiṃhagupta, and Kumāragupta II are to be accommodated within the space of seven years (468-476 A.D.). But nothing militates against taking Puragupta as the ruler preceding Skandagupta. The Allahabad inscription (*CHI.*, p. 11) states that Samudragupta was selected by his father Candragupta I as his successor from among his brothers. The Bihar stone pillar inscription (*CHI.*, p. 51) tells us that Candragupta II was accepted by his father as his successor. The Junāgaḍh rock inscription records that Skandagupta after the death of his father bowed down his enemies—his fame reached the countries of the Mlecchas—the goddess of fortune selected him as her husband—having discarded all other sons of the king (*CHI.*, p. 62). Close comparison of all these statements makes it clear that Skandagupta got the throne through his own prowess and not through natural course. Mleccha trouble after all did not stand in his way to peaceful succession, if he were at all the lawful successor to the throne. The fact seems to have been that in the latter part of the reign of Kumāragupta I the western boundary of the Gupta empire was invaded by the Mlecchas and other tribes. Kumāragupta sent his son Skandagupta with an army to check the progress of the invaders. But before the enemies were brought under control, the king died leaving his throne to his eldest son Puragupta (son of the mahādevī). Skandagupta after repulsing the invaders proceeded towards the capital, and having overthrown his brother with the armies at his command, captured the throne. He closed his reign after 466-467 A.D., and appears to have had no male issue. If the situation is viewed in the above light the statement of the Junāgaḍh rock inscription is reconciled in every respect.

14 *ASI.*, 1914-15; *Gupta Coins*, p. 153.

gupta seems to have succeeded to the throne of Kumāragupta II, though the nature of his connection with the latter is not yet known. Mr. Jayaswal¹⁵ tells us that according to *Mañjuśrī Mūlakalpa* "after the death of Budhagupta two kings in the Gupta line were crowned, one in Magadha and another in Bengal" (Gauḍa). But the Dāmodarpur copper-plates¹⁶ prove that Gauḍa was ruled by the viceroys (Uparikamahārājas) of the imperial Guptas from the time of Kumāragupta I down to 433-434 A.D. It is apparent from the Gunaighar copper-plate that the administration of Samatāṭa was conducted through a viceroy (Uparikamahārājas) in 506-507 A.D. In this circumstance it appears that even after the death of Budhagupta Bengal continued to be ruled by the viceroys of the imperial Guptas of Magadha. As the coins definitely connect Vainyagupta with the imperial Guptas it can be accepted without reasonable doubt that he ascended the throne of Magadha after Budhagupta, and ruled Bengal through his viceroys. He seems to have been followed by Bhānugupta, who was ruling in 510-511 A.D.¹⁷ The above discussion leads us to draw the genealogy of the successors of Kumāragupta I in the following line:—

Kumāragupta I (417-449 A.D.)




The Gunaighar inscription states that Vainyagupta was a devotee of Mahādevā. But the coins, on the other hand, prove that the king was a follower of Viṣṇu. This suggests that Vainyagupta, though became greatly attached to the Śaiva faith, did not altogether forsake the creed of his family. He was after all a tolerant monarch as we find him giving donations for the maintenance of a Buddhist vihāra.

D. C. GANGULI

15 *Modern Review*, August, 1933, p. 139.

16 *Et.*, vol. XV, pp. 114-115.

17 *OH.*, p. 91.



Coins of Vainyagupta

(Enlarged from coins Nos. 7 & 8, Pl. XXIII, Allan's *Gupta Coins*).

The Dinajpur Pillar Inscription of the Kambojanvaya Gaudipati

This inscription of three lines engraved on the foot of a pillar was found among the ruins of Bāngal or Bānagar. It is now in a garden of the Dinajpur Rāj. Westmacott deciphered and published this with a translation of Rajendralal Mitra in the *Indian Antiquary*, vol. I, pp. 127-28. The reading and the translation are given below:—

1. *Durvvār-āri-varuthinī-pramuthane dāne ca Vidyādharaiḥ
sānandaṃ divi*
2. *Yasya mārggaṇa-guṇa-grāma-graho gīyate Kāmbojānvaya-
jena Gauḍa-pati*
3. *nā ten-endu-mauler-ayaṃ prasādo nirmāyi Kuñjaraghatā-
varṣeṇa bhū-bhūṣaṇaḥ||*

“By him, whose ability in subduing the forces of his irresistible enemies, and liberality in appreciating the merits of his suitors, are sung by the Vidyādharas in celestial spheres, by that sovereign of Gauḍa, by him who is descended from the Kāmbojan line. This temple, the beauty of the earth, was erected for the selencephalous (Shiva) in the year 888.”¹

There was a controversy over this interpretation, between Rajendralal and R. G. Bhandarkar. The chief point of contention was the interpretation of the word ‘*Kuñjaraghatāvarṣeṇa*.’ Bhandarkar questioned the authority for construing this word to mean ‘888’ of some era. Mr. Ramaprasad Chanda and R. D. Banerjee subsequently supported Rajendralal. They have taken 888 to be the Śaka era equivalent to 966 A.D. and made the *Kāmbojānvayaja Gauḍapati* to be the contemporary of Vīrahapāla II., and his son Mahīpāla I. Further they have built upon it the theory that this *Gauḍapati* was the intruder (*anadhikṛta*) of the phrase ‘*anadhikṛta-cilupta*’ in verse 12 of the Bāngal grant of Mahīpāla I. They replied mainly on palæography. Even accepting the interpretation as correct, it is difficult to accept this as a Śaka era. For we have no evidence of the Śaka era having been used in Bengal before the Sena kings. Mahīpāla I himself used the Vikrama Samvat in his Sāranāth inscription. We find that the latter

¹ *Ind. Ant.*, vol. I, p. 127.

era has been used also in a Bodh-Gayā inscription of the time of Govindapāladeva.

Dr. R. C. Majumdar, it seems, has taken the more reasonable view. He holds that Kuñjaraghaṭā-varṣa was the name of the *Gauḍapati*. We shall presently see that this is corroborated by epigraphic evidence also. The sixth verse of the Deopara inscription of Vijayasena reads as below:—

*Yasmin saṅgare catvare paṭur aṭat tūryy-opahṇata-
driṣad-varyge yena kṛpāṇa-kāla-bhujagaḥ khelāyitalaḥ
pāṇinā
dvaidhī-bhūta-ripakṣa-Kuñjaraghaṭā-visliṣṭa-kumbha-
sthalī-muktā-sthūla-varāṭikā-parikarair-vvṛjōptam tad-ady-
āpy-abhūt ||6||*

Mr. N. G. Majumdar has translated it as follows:—

“In the field (lit. court-yard) of battle when his enemies, invited by the shrill-sounding drums, used to appear, he would by his hand play with the sword resembling the serpent of death. That place is still strewn over with myriads of pearls (which are like) big cowries (emanated) from the cleft of frontal globes of the scattered elephants of his opponents.”²

The second line of the above verse seems to be in the double entendre, having a pun on the word *Kuñjaraghaṭā*. We take this word to be a part of the name *Kuñjaraghaṭā-varṣa* which has been put for the whole. We wish to put the following second interpretation to it:—

“The alienated *Kuñjaraghaṭā* (varṣa) was encircled with multitude of strong cords (like an elephant), whose pearl has been reft open from his frontal globes (and thus rendered furious). This (incident is still fresh in the memory of people, as if) happened only to-day.”

We identify this *Kuñjaraghaṭā* with the *Kāmbojānvayaja Gauḍapati* of the Dinajpur pillar inscription.

Let us see what new information, this interpretation yields. *Dvaidhībhāva* means ‘sowing dissension, causing the separation of allies.’ Again *dvaidhībhūto* is interpreted as ‘being separated or disunited? We think that he was a feudatory of Gauda, under some

Pāla king. Sāmantasena by sowing dissension most probably estranged him from his allegiance to his overlord, the Pāla king. His object in doing so was perhaps first to weaken the strength of Kuñjaraghaṭāvarṣa and then to destroy him. Who was this Pāla king from whom he was alienated? Let us try to ascertain the approximate time of Kuñjaraghaṭāvarṣa. He was a contemporary of Sāmantasena, whose grandson Vijayasena, identified with Vijayarāja,³ was a feudatory of Rāmapāla. So he was a contemporary of Rāmapāla. His grandfather, Sāmantasena, therefore, becomes a contemporary of Rāmapāla's grandfather and father, viz., Nayapāla and Vighrapāla III. Again Vijayasena is said to have imprisoned Rāghava and Nānya. The former is identified with Rāghava (c. 1156 A.D.), a son of Coḍagaṅga of Kalinga and the latter with Nānyadeva (1097 A.D.), the king of Mithilā. Allowing 25 years to a generation, Sāmantasena is earlier than Vijayasena by 50 years. The former therefore must have lived in the latter half of the eleventh century A.D. He can in no way be made a contemporary of Vighrapāla II or his son Mahīpāla I. He was at best a contemporary of Nayapāla, III. Consequently Kuñjaraghaṭāvarṣa was also a contemporary of Vighrapāla III. Nayapāla was a strong king and it is unlikely that his feudatory dared to declare independence in his time. Both Kuñjaraghaṭāvarṣa and Sāmantasena must have taken advantage of the weak rule of Vighrapāla III. This defeat of Kuñjaraghaṭāvarṣa at the hands of Sāmantasena in Gauḍa must have laid the foundation of the Sena influence there. Vijayasena is said to have first become powerful in Varendra, although they were the residents of Rāḍha.

If our interpretation of the verse, as pointed out above, is accepted as correct, there is no room for interpreting *Kuñjaraghaṭāvarṣa* as 'Śaka 888' or identifying him with the *anadhikṛta* i.e. usurper who had deprived Mahīpāla of his paternal kingdom. If the former was really the lord of the Gauḍa empire displacing Mahīpāla, it is difficult to accept that he would have simply styled himself as *Gauḍapati*. His panegyrists must have in that case honoured him with all royal titles of the Pālas.

JOGENDRA CHANDRA GHOSH

³ Dr. Raichaudhuri's *Stud. Ind. Antiq.*, p. 158.

The Metaphysical Significance of Dharma and Adharma in Jaina Metaphysics

According to the metaphysics of the Jainas the whole universe is divided into two categories, viz. *Jīvāstikāya* (soul) and *Ajīvāstikāya* (matter). The latter is further divided into *Dharmāstikāya* (or *dharma*), *Adharmāstikāya* (or *adharma*), *Ākāstikāya* and *Kāla*.

In Indian philosophy the words *dharma* and *adharma* are generally used in the ethical sense of merit and demerit. It is said that *Adr̥ṣṭa* or *dharma* and *adharma*, is an unseen principle which causes the upward movement of fire, the sideward blowing of wind, the conjunction and disjunction of atoms and the contact of self with mind.¹ In Jainism *dharma* and *adharma* denote quite a different and peculiar meaning. It is said that both are non-physical and eternal substances which pervade the whole universe. *Dharma* is said to be the medium of motion which assists the soul and matter in their movements, just as water helps the movement of a moving fish. Similarly *adharmāstikāya* is regarded as the medium of rest of the soul and matter, just as shadow is of a traveller in his rest.

Both the substances are considered as indirect, external and passive causes. In other words, it is held by the Jaina thinkers that *dharma* and *adharma* do not compel anything to move or not to move but simply help it in the above functions.

Taking in view the above metaphysical meaning of *dharma* and *adharma*, the modern Jaina scholars try to render a scientific colouring to the above doctrine. According to them, the very fact that the universe is a system by itself governed by inherent laws, and it is a cosmos and not a chaos, implies the existence of *dharma* and *adharma*.² The latter is compared with law of Newton's gravitation,³ and sometimes viewed as the cosmic principle answering somewhat to Leibniz's

1 *Kaṇāda sūtras*, v. 2. 13.

2 A. Chakravarti · *A Philosophical Introduction to Pañcāstikāya*, p. xxvii.

3 *Ibid.*, p. 96.

pre-established harmony;⁴ while the former is said as an all-pervading, non-atomic medium, circulating internally as a perfect fluid and possessing a tremendous velocity comparable to that of light.⁵ Both *dharma* and *adharma* are described in terms that they are applicable to the modern conception of ether.

This is what we know about the metaphysical sense of *dharma* and *adharma*, explaining motion and rest, found for the first time in Umāsvāti's *Tattvārthādhigama sūtras*, and its scientific interpretations offered by the modern scholars. Now let us see what the Jaina Canons of the Śvetāmbaras say about it. In the *Bhagavati*, questioned by his disciple Gotama, Mahāvīra replies: "O Gotama, there are many words which are synonymous with *dharmāstikāya*. For instance, *dharma*, *dharmāstikāya*, *prāṇātīpāta-viramaṇa*, *mṛṣāvāda-viramaṇa*, etc. are all identical in meaning. Similarly, the words *adharma*, *adharmāstikāya*, *prāṇātīpāta*, *mṛṣāvāda*, etc. are equivalents of *adharmāstikāya*."⁶ Abhayadeva, a famous commentator on the canonical literature, explains both the terms *dharma* and *adharma* taking them to mean merit and demerit, as well as the mediums of motion and rest respectively.⁷ It appears from it that Abhayadeva was aware of the two different meanings of the words, but not being satisfied, he simply mentioned both of them, and could not reconcile between the two.

Further, we come across a great logician, Siddhasenadivākara. From a verse in his *Niścaya dvātriṃśikā* it seems that Siddhasena did not feel any necessity for admitting *dharma* and *adharma* into the sphere of the Jaina metaphysics. He says that it is due to *prayoga* (motion imparted by another object) and *visrasā* (motion imparted by itself) that an object moves or is at rest.⁸ Thus Siddhasena appears to

4 Dr. B. N. Seal: *Positive Sciences of the ancient Hindus*, vide *Dravya-saṃgraha*, S. B. J., pp. i, ix.

5 C. R. Jain : *Key of Knowledge*, p. 760.

6 *Bhagavati*, 20. 2, pp. 775-776, Agamodaya, *Jaina Sāhitya Saṃśodhaka*, 3. 1, p. 41.

7 *Ibid.*

8

प्रयोग विस्रसाकमे तदभाव स्थिति स्या ।

लोकानुभावज्ञानः किं धर्माधर्मयोः फलम् ॥

Niścayadvātriṃśikā, 24, *Jaina Sāhitya Saṃśodhaka*, 3. 1, p. 39.

mean that when the purpose of movement and rest of an object is explained by *prayoga* and *visrasā*, it is unnecessary to accept *dharma* and *adharma* for the same functions.

From the above, it seems that there might have been a Jaina tradition which did not believe in the metaphysical sense of *dharma* and *adharma*.⁹ From the works of Pūjyapāda and Akalaṅka it is very clear that they too are conscious of the peculiar doctrine of *dharma* and the *adharma* in the above senses. They have tried their best to establish the doctrine saying finally that it must be accepted as it is the speech of the omniscient one (*Sarvajña*).¹⁰

To conclude, the earlier tradition of the Jainas seems to take *dharma* and *adharma* in their ethical senses and their use as metaphysical substance seems to be a later development and is first propounded by Umāsvāti. Thus Jacobi's statement appears to be right when he says that in primitive speculation the words *dharma* and *adharma* had their natural meaning and denoted subtle fluids which cause merit and demerit.¹¹

JAGDISH CHANDRA JAIN

9 Of. also *Saṅkara Bhāṣya*, 2. 2. 33, *Anandagiri Tīkā*, p. 592 *Anandāśrama granthamālā*.

Here the *dharma* and *adharma* of the Jainas are taken in the meaning of merit and demerit.

10 *Sarvārthasiddhi*, p. 163; *Rājavārtika*, pp. 212-214.

11 *S. B. E.*, vol. XLVI, p. xxxiv.

Notes on the Ghosūṇḍī Stone Inscription

Three fragments of the above inscription have been published in the November issue of the *Indian Antiquary*, 1932, by Mr. R. R. Haldar of the Rajputana Museum, Ajmer, with a note by Mr. E. H. Johnston. As the object of his note is to 'initiate discussion,' we make no apology to offer the following suggestions:—

The biggest of the three fragments containing three lines was first imperfectly transcribed by Kaviraj Shyamal Das in the *JASB.*, LVI, i, pp. 74 ff. It was later on published by Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar in the *Memoir* No. 4 of the *Arch. Surv. of India*, in 1920. He not only gave an improved reading but also discussed its importance from the palæographic, linguistic and religious points of view. He for the first time pointed out that the language of the inscription is Sanskrit, and not a 'mixed dialect' as had been held by Prof. Lüders. Agreeing with Bühler, however, he assigned it to the period between B.C. 350 and 250. It was published for the third time by Mr. K. P. Jayaswal in the *Epigraphia Indica*, XVI, p. 25, with plate. He brought down the date to 200-150 B.C. basing his conclusion on the Khāravēla inscription (165 B.C.) Much credit is due to Mr. Haldar for fitting in with the biggest one the two other smaller fragments, containing one line each, and publishing the connected reading under discussion.¹ It is strange that Mr. Haldar makes no mention of Prof. Bhandarkar, who not only discovered the bigger of the two smaller fragments, found on the boundary stone between Ghosūṇḍī and Bassī, but published a reading of the same with his note in the *Memoir* referred to above. The Professor rightly guessed that it formed a part of the biggest one. He did not, however, try to piece them together. After this piece had been transferred to the Udaipur Museum, Rai Bahadur Gaurisankar Ojha was the

1 L. 1.—[ta] na Gājāyanena Pārāsariputreṇa Sa....ṇa Sarvatātena
śrāmedha—

L. 2. yā) jñā Bhagava(d)bhyāṃ Śaṅkaraṇa-Vāsudevābhyāṃ Sar-
veśvarā [bhyāṃ]—

L. 3.—bhyāṃ pūjā-śilā-prākāro Nārāyaṇa-vāṅe kṛ(ritāḥ)—

first to suggest that it referred to the first line of the biggest fragment (*ASRI.*, 1926-27, p. 204).

The interpretation of the compound word *pūjā-silā-prākāra* in the third line as 'a stone-wall for worship' does not seem to us to be a very happy one. We think that *pūjā* is connected with *silā* by *saṁāsa*, and not with *silā-prākāra*, so the interpretation should be 'a rampart (*prākāra*) for the stone object of worship (*pūjā-silā*).' The *pūjā-silā* here probably refers to *Śālagrāma-silā*, a sacred stone typical of Viṣṇu, as the Liṅga is of the god Śiva. These *Śālagrāma-silās* are now-a-days very common objects of worship in India and there is a considerable literature on the *Śālagrāmas* and their worship. Mention of it is found in the *Mahābhārata*, III, 8102. Amongst the varieties of them mentioned in the Purāṇas, we find that one variety is called Saṁkarṣaṇa and another Vāsudeva (*Agni-Purāṇa*, XLVI). So it seems that the *pūjā-silās* here were the *Śālagrāma-silās* representing Saṁkarṣaṇa and Vāsudeva. The wall was constructed round their place of worship, which was in the Nārāyaṇa-compound.

Mr. Johnston has shown that the word *Sarveśvara* is 'specially associated with the worship of Kṛṣṇa'. This is not the whole fact. The word is found applied to other deities as well. For we find in the *Vāyu-purāṇa* (XXIV, 52) Viṣṇu addressing Brahmā as *Sarveśa*. Again in the thousand names of Śiva in the *Jñāna-saṁhitā* (LXX, 18) of the *Śiva-purāṇa* occurs *Sarveśvara*. So *Sarveśvara* should well be taken here in its literal sense, i.e., 'Lord of all'. He further says that 'Sarva is well-authenticated as a name of Kṛṣṇa'. This is more than we know. He has not quoted any authority. We on the other hand find that Sarva or its other form Sarva is the well-known name of Śiva. The name Sarva as a name of Rudra or Śiva occurs in the *Sata-Rudriya* of the *Taittirīya-saṁhitā* and the *Vājasaneyya-saṁhitā*. Sarva or Sarva also occurs as a name of Śiva in the *Amarakoṣa*, but not of Viṣṇu. They may also mean Viṣṇu, but that is rather of uncommon use.

Mr. Johnston's attempt at connecting Gājāyana of this inscription with the Andhra kings, on the analogy of some names beginning with *Gaja* etc., is far-fetched. He says that Gājāyana as a patronymic is unknown. We do not agree with him. We need not despair

if we do not find this name in the few published texts on the Gotras and Pravaras. Has not Baudhāyana said in the *Śrauta-sūtra* that *gotrāṇām tu sahasrāṇi prayutāny-arbudāni ca*, i.e., there are hundreds and thousands of *gotra* names. Again, these are not without variant readings. So Gājāyana is probably corrupted into Gādāyana or Godāyana found in the text books on the Gotras and Pravaras. The word Gājāyana by its very formation clearly indicates, as has already been pointed out by Mr. Jayaswal a Brāhmaṇical name. If Gājāyana is a Brāhmaṇical patronymic, he cannot belong to the Andhra dynasty, who always used Brāhmaṇical metronymics, but never patronymics.

If the king was a Brāhmaṇa, to which dynasty did he belong? As he has been assigned to circa 200 B.C., the conclusion is irresistible that he was a Śuṅga. But there was no such king as Sarvatāta, or Sarvatrāta as suggested by Mr. Johnston, in that dynasty. This objection can, however, be obviated by saying that it is not the name but the epithet of a king. *Tāta* may mean 'venerable,' 'respectable' or 'father.' Sarvatāta would, therefore, mean 'respected of all' or 'father of all,' i.e., a king or 'lord.' As it appears from the facsimile, the reading *Sarratāta* is preferable to *Sarratrāta*. The name of the king in the inscription under discussion has well-nigh been lost. Only the first letter *sa* and the last letter *ṇa* or *ṇā* remain.

The Śuṅga dynasty is so called after the *gotra* name, Śuṅga. It is a *gotra* under the Bharadvāja Family. Śuṅga can, however, go by its *group* name of Bhāradvāja. Baudhāyana after naming the *gotras* of this group says—*ity=ete Bhāradvājāḥ*, i.e., 'these are the Bhāradvājas'. In some Purāṇas Śuṅga has been read as Tuṅga. Although there is no *gotra* of the name of Tuṅga, there are *gotras* called Tuṅḍa in the Gautama Family and Tuṅgāyani in the Kata group of the Viśvāmītra Family. As they have no similarity in sound with Gājāyane, they can have no possible connection with the Śuṅga or the Tuṅga *gotra*. As such this king could not have belonged to the Śuṅga dynasty.

If this king was not of the Śuṅga dynasty, in what other Brāhmaṇa dynasty can he be placed? It naturally reminds us of the Kāṇva or Kāṇvāyana dynasty, another Brāhmaṇa dynasty, which, according to the Purāṇas, immediately succeeded the Śuṅgas. Now, this Kāṇva or

Kāṇvāyana has no similarity in sound with Gājāyana. There are several *gotras* which are similar in sound to Kāṇva or Kāṇvāyana, but they are all individual *gotras*. Among them it is only Kāṇva which is a group name also. It belongs to the Āṅgīrasa *gaṇa*. The only name similar to Gājāyana in this group is Gādāyana with its variant Godāyana. It is found only in the *Matsya-purāṇa* list of the Kāṇvas. Now this Gādāyana or Godāyana might be a scribe's mistake, or a Prākṛta form, or a variant, of Gājāyana, which has found place in the *Matsya-purāṇa*. We have already said that *gotra* name under a group sometimes goes by its group name. Bauḥāyana after naming all the *gotras* under this group says: *īty-etc Kaṇvāḥ*, i.e. 'these are the Kāṇvas'. So the Brāhmaṇa rulers of the Gājāyana *gotra* could have been known by the group name of Kāṇva or Kāṇvāyana.

If the king of the present inscription belonged to the Kāṇva dynasty, what was his name? We have already seen that his name has well-nigh been lost in the *lacuna*. Let us see if the remaining letters, namely, *sa* in the beginning and *ṇa* or *ṇā* in the end can help us in restoring the lost name. According to the Purāṇas, only four kings of the Kāṇva dynasty reigned, viz., Vāsudeva, Bhūmimitra, Nārāyaṇa and Śuśarman or Sudharman. The last name suits here excellently. The name in the inscription was in the instrumental singular. So the missing word between *Pārāśarī-putreṇa* and *Sarvatōtena* was most probably *Suśarmaṇā* or *Sudharmaṇā*. The only discrepancy is in the first syllable *su*. The subscript sign *u* might have been lost somehow.

Mr. Johnston at first limited the possible authorship of the inscription to the Greek kings of the Punjab, the Śuṅgas or the Āndhra dynasty, and then eliminated the Greek kings by saying that 'it seems improbable that any Greek king should have celebrated an *Aśramedha*.' We do not know how far he is correct in his supposition. Prof. Bhandarkar during his excavations at Besnagar discovered a *yajñaśālā* or sacrificial hall and near it found a seal bearing the following inscription:—

L. 1. *Ṭimītra-dātṛisya [su]—ho(tā)* ❀

I. 2. *p(o) tā-mamtra-sajana [? ṇ]*

On this he made the following interesting remarks:—“The meaning of this legend as just remarked, is not quite clear, but

the words *hotā*, *potā* and *mantra*, which are technical to sacrificial literature, indicate that the sealing is really connected with the *yajñasālā*. And the import of the legend appears to be: 'Of the donor Timitra accompanied by the Hotā, Potā, Hymn-kinsmen and.....' Timitra doubtless is the name of an individual, and seems to be the Sanskritised form of the Greek Demetrius. And it appears that this Greek personage called Demetrius was the *dātā* or *yajamāna* who instituted the sacrifice. The performance of a Brāhmanic sacrifice by a Greek is not a thing that needs surprise us, because we know that many Greeks like other foreign people, such as Śakas and Palhavas, became Buddhists and Hindus. Nay, at Vidiśā itself, as evidenced from an inscription incised on the Khām Bābā pillar, we have an instance of a Greek ambassador Heliadora (Heliodoros) calling himself a *Bhāgavata* or a devotee of Vāsudeva." (ASRI., 1914-15, pp. 77-78).

It may be argued that this inscription cannot belong to the last of the Kāṇvas. It has been assigned to 200-150 B.C. by experts, while the last of the Kāṇvas could not have reigned earlier than the latter half of the first century B.C. We have already said that Bühler and Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar assigned it to a period between B.C. 350 and 250. Mr. Jayaswal brought it down to 200-150 B.C., basing his conclusion on the Khāravela inscription (165 B.C.) And this view has been endorsed by Mr. Johnston. We do not know if a script of Eastern India is a sure standard for assigning the date to a Central Indian script. If there is thus a difference of view among the palæographers in regard to the date of this inscription, it is quite possible to bring it down by another hundred years or so.

If our suggestions are accepted, this inscription will prove to be a very important one. It supplies not only the first epigraphic record of the real existence of the Kāṇva dynasty, but also of the very early worship of the *Śālagrāma-śilā*. We learn from it also that the Kāṇvas like the Śuṅgas performed *Aśvamedha* sacrifice. Further, it proves that the Bhāgavatism found favour not only with the foreigners such as the Śakas, Yavanas etc. but also with the Vedic Aryans of the royal family like the Kāṇvas, from an early period.

Soythian Tribal Names in a Mathura Epigraph

In the *IHQ.*, viii, pp. 117 ff., I pointed out that the Macedonian month-name Gorpiaeus occurs (as *Gurppiya*) in the date-portion of a Mathura Brāhmī inscription pertaining to the reign of Huiṣka. Prof. Sten Konow, dealing with the record in the *IHQ.*, ix, pp. 145 ff., accepts my identification.

I inferred that Vāsiṣka's reign at Sāñci had not terminated when Huiṣka's reign at Mathura began, because the Mathura epigraph* dated in the year 28—month Gorpiaeus—day 1, is earlier than the Sāñci inscription of Vāsiṣka, dated in the year 28—season hemanta—month 1—day 5. Prof. Sten Konow does not admit this inference and says: "That would be so if the Kanīṣka year began with Caitra, but everything speaks against that assumption, and we must evidently reckon with Kārttikādi years." We hope, in his edition of the record, he will adduce his reasons for thinking that the years are Kārttikādi. So far I am not convinced that the years pertaining to the dated Kuṣāna epigraphs are "Kanīṣka years" in the sense that they were connected in any way with the commencement of Kanīṣka's reign†; nor do I think that the years contemplated began either with Caitra or with Kārttika.

I stated that our inscription proves the use of Macedonian month-names in the Mathura region at least as early as the reign of Huiṣka. Professor Konow takes exception to the statement and observes: "That the donor was not settled in Mathura but had come to the place from the North-West is, in my opinion, made probable by the use of the Macedonian month-name Gorpaios. The Macedonian calendar was not traced before this in any inscription from India proper. We find Macedonian months in records from the North-West belonging to

* I am inclined to think that, at the time this epigraph was engraved, Huiṣka had not yet attained undisputed supremacy: his titles are still confined to *devaputra* and *sāhi*. The record betrays the psychology of a partisan, the merit of the donation being assigned to Huiṣka and "to those of whom the *devaputra* (Huiṣka) is beloved," pointing to the existence of a group or party specially attached to him.

† My own view is that the years belong to the 2nd century of the Vikrama era; the year 28 of our epigraph being equivalent to 128 Vikrama.

the Saka and the Kanishka periods.....” The Professor here leaves out of account the copper-plate found imbedded within a stūpa at Sui-Vihār, near Bahawalpur (71° 34' E.—29° 18' N.), dated in the reign of Kanishka, in the year 11—month Daisios—day 18. He further says: “When we now find a Macedonian month mentioned in a Mathura inscription, it seems to be necessary to draw the inference that it was drafted by a person who came down from the North-West, from the Kusāṇa strongholds in the old Ta-hia country. And if I am right in my explanation of the designation *Vakanapati* as meaning ‘lord of Wakhan’, this conclusion becomes certain.” I entirely endorse this explanation of *Vakanapati* as ‘lord of Wakhan’: indeed, that is the view I have long held myself regarding the title *Bakanapati* in the other inscription from the Mathura (Māt) statue-house.¹ I also infer from this circumstance that both inscriptions proceed from persons belonging primarily to Wakhan. But I do not see how it is possible to contest the fact that a Macedonian month-name is actually found in a Mathura inscription of the time of Huvishka: the fact is proved as soon as the identity of Gurppiya with Gorpiaeus is established. When, further, we consider that the inscription is not in the Kharoṣṭhī script, nor in a North-Western dialect (like the Lion-capital inscriptions), we have to recognise that the writer was accommodating himself to local conditions and would hardly have thought of using a Macedonian month-name in an inscription at Mathura if such a name were unfamiliar to the locality.

The donor calls himself *prācinīkanasarukamānaputra*, *kharāsalerapati* and *vakanapati*. Professor Konow analyses the first compound as *prācinī-Kanasarukamānaputra*. I prefer to read it as *Prācinīkana-Sarukamāna-putra*. If *putra* meant ‘son’ and *Prācinī-Kanasarukamāna* represented the individual name of the donor’s father, the donor’s own individual name would assuredly have been mentioned. But we find instead that he is characterised further, but only as *Kharāsalerapati* and *Vakanapati* apparently, ‘lord of *Kharāsalera*’ and ‘lord of *Vakana*’, without specification of his personal name. We must

¹ Wakhan was known to Chinese as *Hiu-mi*, which may perhaps be connected with *Huma*.....in the Māt inscription.

accordingly render putra as 'scion' and must see in *Prācinīkana-Sarukamāna* some clan-name, race-name or tribe-name.²

For such an explanation, fortunately, we are not without external data. Strabo, in a well-known passage, enumerates various "Scythian" tribes—*Asioi*, *Pasianoī*, *Tokharoi*, *Sarakauloi*—as taking part in the overthrow of Greek rule in Bactria. And it seems to me that two of these tribes—*Pasianoī* and *Sarakauloi*—are alluded to in our *Prācinīkana-Sarukamāna*. According to Trogus, the Scythian tribes *Asiani*, and *Saraucae* (apparently variants of *Asioi* and *Sarakauloi*) occupied Bactria and Sogdiana. And the same writer later on adds some "Scythian matters"; namely that the *Asiani* became kings of the *Tochari* (apparently, the *Tokharoi* of Strabo) and ruined the *Saraucae*. But the *Saraucae* were evidently not wholly annihilated: they are referred to by Ptolemy as *Sagaraukai*. We may take it that they were hard hit by the *Asioi-Tokharoi* combination; and they may well have coalesced with the *Pasianoī* and formed a *Pasiano-Saraucae* stock to which the donor of our record belonged.³

HART KRISHNA DEB

² Cf. *Kuṣāna-putra* in the Māt inscription.

³ It is possible that the name *Sarukamāna* is connected with the name *Darganames* given by Ptolemy to a river said to enter the Paropanisadai country from Bactria. I am tempted to ask if the name *Prācinīkana* has anything to do with the name *Parachinar*, a town in Kurram (about 70° E.—34° N.); and if *Kharasalera* is any way related to *Kuramsar*, the name of a pass south of Wakhan, or to the name *Kurram* itself.

The passages in Strabo and Trogus are discussed by Cunningham in his *Coins of the Tochari &c.*, Num-Chron., vol. IX, Third series, 268; f. also by Konow in his *Corp. Inscr. Indic.*, vol. II, part I, pp. xxi-xxii.

The Ohind (Uṇḍ) Inscription

Of this short record, found at Ohind (Uṇḍ) in the Peshawar District (identified with ancient Udabhāṇḍa) 15 miles above Attock we do not possess the original ; but there are two transcripts, one published in *JASB.*, 1854, p. 705, pl. V, the other published in *ASI.*, vol. V, 1875, p. 58, pl. XVI, No. 2.

Prof. Sten Konow has edited the inscription in his *Corpus* of Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions (Pl. XXXII, 2), where the reading adopted is—

Line 1—Saṃ 20. 20. 20. 1 chetrasa mahasa divase aṭhami di 4. 4. iśa kshunami sa[vi]ranakha.....

Line 2—purvashade

Prof. Konow, who was the first to read *purvashade* in line 2¹, states that, in place of *sa[vi]ra*^o, the old Plate showed *sakhara*. The first akṣara seems to me, however, to be not *sa*, but *do* ; compare *do* in *Theudorena* (*Corpus*, Pl. I, No. 1). And the third akṣara may be read as *ta* which is often indistinguishable from *ra* in Kharoṣṭhī. Instead of *sa[vi]ranakha* ..., therefore, we may read *dokhatanakha* The occurrence of the word *purvashade* i.e. 'in (*nakṣatra*) Pūrvāṣādhā' at the commencement of line 2 shows that the details of the dating had not been completely enumerated in line 1 but were being continued in line 2. We may compare the dating of an inscription of about the same period and the same region (Zeda): *saṃ 10. 1 Ashadāsa maṣasa di 20 utaraphagune*. There, we observe that the *nakṣatra* (Uttaraphālgunī) is added after an enumeration of the year, the month and the day. Here, we would hardly hazard a mere conjecture if we read—

Line 1—Saṃ 20. 20. 20. 1. Chetrasa mahasa divase aṭhami 4. 4. iśa kshunami dokhatanakha[tre]

Line 2—purvashade

The restoration of the akṣara [tre] after ^o*nakha* in line 1 suits the context admirably, ^o*nakha[tre] purvashade* signifying 'in the *nakṣatra* Pūrvāṣādhā'.

But what could *dokhata* signify ? It is clearly connected with *nakha[tre] purvashade* and would most probably be an additional characterisation of the *nakṣatra* Pūrvāṣādhā. I propose to identify

1 Dr. van Wijk confirms the propriety of the reading. He has calculated that the *nakṣatra* Pūrvāṣādhā would well correspond to the other details in the dating, viz. 8th Caitra in a *pūrṇimānta* scheme.

dokhata with Gk. *Tokso tes* the name of the constellation Sagittarius to which the *nakṣatra* Pūrvāṣāḍhā belongs. That the names of the Hindu constellations (*rāśi*): Meṣa, Vṛṣa, Mithuna etc. are translations of the Greek names *Krios*, *Taurus*, *Didumos* etc. is well-known. And we have a list of alternative designations—*Kriya*, *Tāvuri*, *Jituma* etc. in the *Bṛhajjātaka* of Varāhamihira, all being attempted transliterations of the Greek names. Transliteration would normally precede translation. We should not be surprised to find a transliteration of Gk. *Tokso tes* as *dokhata* in an inscription of the Kuṣāna period². The psychology of transliteration is illustrated in the words *stratega* Gk. *Strategos*, *Kaisara*—*Lat. Cæsar*, and in many words pertaining to astrology like *horā*, *panaphara*, *āpoklima* etc.

HARIT KRISHNA DEB

Janamejaya Parīkṣits

The name Janamejaya (also read simply as Janmejaya) seems to be one of the common names in the ancient genealogical lists. There were, it is said, some eighty Janamejayas (*Mat. P.* 273, 71-3). The *Mahābhārata* also speaks of eighty Janamejayas as present in the Yama-sabhā (II, 8, 23). Scanning the different genealogical lines of ancient India, we come across one Janamejaya as a king of the Nīpas, another as a Pāñcāla prince who fought and fell in the Great War and probably a contemporary of Yudhiṣṭhira, and a third a king of the mountaineers. Besides these, there are three different Janamejayas in the Paurava line. Sørensen refers to ten Janamejayas in his *Index to the Mahābhārata*.

We are concerned in this article with the Janamejayas of the Paurava line. In this line, there are three Janamejayas: (1) Janamejaya I, the son and successor of Puru, (2) Janamejaya II, the son of Parīkṣit I and grandson of Kuru; and (3) Janamejaya III, the son of Parīkṣit II and grandson of Abhimanyu.

² The Hindus appear to have borrowed from the Greeks the *rāśi*-system, primarily for purposes of astrology. It was later on introduced also into their astronomy.

Nothing in detail is known about Janamejaya I, excepting the fact that he was defeated by the great Ikṣvāku king, Māndhātā, who was a great conqueror and a Cakravartin. Māndhātā is counted among the sixteen great kings (षोडश-राजिक) of the past. Janamejaya I being his contemporary should be counted as an ancient king.

The next two Janamejayas are a matter of much confusion among the scholars, nay, among the Purāṇists even. Janamejaya II was the son of Parīkṣit I. He slaughtered a young son of Gārgya and consequently incurred the great sin of killing a brāhmin. In order to atone for the sin, he performed the horse-sacrifice with the help of Indrota Śaunaka. "Yayāti's chariot, which had belonged to Puru and his descendants, passed from that Janamejaya to Uparicara Vasu Caidya". The *Harivaṃśa* (ch. 30) says—

कुरोः पुत्रस्य राजेन्द्र राज्ञः पारीक्षितस्य ह ।
जगाम स रथो नाशं शापाद् गार्ग्यस्य धीमतः ॥
गार्ग्यस्य हि सुतं बालं स राजा जनमेजयः ।
वाक्छूरं हिंसयामास ब्रह्महत्यामवाप सः ॥
स लोहगन्धी राजर्षिः परिधावन्नितस्ततः ।
पौरजानपदैस्त्यक्तो न लेभे शर्म कर्हिचित् ॥
ततः स दुःखसन्तप्तो नालभेत् संविदं क्वचित् ।
इन्द्रोत्तं शौनकं राजन् शरणं प्रत्यपद्यत ॥
याजयामास चेन्द्रोत्तः शौनको जनमेजयम् ।
अश्वमेधेन राजानं पावनार्थं द्विजोत्तमः ॥

This statement is found also in the *Brahma Purāṇa* (12, 6-16) and the *Vāyu Purāṇa* (11, 31, 18-27). The *Mahābhārata* gives the same statement in a different form (XII, ch. 150-152—Bhīṣma's speech to Yudhiṣṭhira) and thus cannot, by any means, refer to Janamejaya III, the grandson of Abhimanyu. The *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa* speaks of one Indrota Śaunaka performing the sacrifice of Janamejaya and so also does the *Sāṃkhyāyana Śrauta Sūtra* (XVI, 8, 27). But the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* mentions Tura Kāvaseya as a priest of Janamejaya *Parīkṣita* (VIII, 21-23). The *Bhāgavata* makes a confusion here between Janamejaya I and Janamejaya II, and speaks of Tura Kāvaseya as the priest of Janamejaya III. That this is an error will be clearly

found from the following. "Further, 'old Kavaṣa' was drowned at the battle (*Rv.* VII, 18, 12). Now, a ṛṣi named Tura Kūvaṣeya inaugurated Janamejaya Pārīkṣita (i.e. Saṃbaraṇa's great-grand-son) with mahābhiseka, and his father was Kavaṣa, who might well have been contemporary with Saṃbaraṇa (*Ait. Brā.* II, 3, 9). There need be no hesitation in identifying these two Kavaṣas, for 'old Kavaṣa' was on the side opposite to Sudāsa, i.e., on Saṃbaraṇa's side, and Kavaṣa's son inaugurated Saṃbaraṇa's great-grand-son" (*Anc. Hist. Traditions*, p. 12 and *JRAS.*, 1910, p. 50). Weber makes no distinction between the Janamejayas. But by referring to the absolution of Janamejaya from the guilt of Brahmahatyā by performing the horse-sacrifice with the help of Indrota Śaunaka, he virtually makes Janamejaya II the son of Parīkṣit I. He is further of opinion that the well-known question क परीक्षिता गताः in the *Bṛhadāraṇyakōpaniṣad* refers to the sons of Parīkṣit I (*Hist. of Ind. Lit.*, pp. 125-26).

Janamejaya III—the son of Parīkṣit II and grandson of Abhimanyu—came to the throne after his father's death through snake-bite. Out of revenge he performed the great snake-sacrifice at Taxila. It was here that the Great Epic was publicly recited for the first time. The snake-sacrifice and the recital of the *Mahābhārata* made Taxila a holy place and a centre of learning for the next few centuries until the place was over-run by the Persians in the 5th Century B.C.

What this snake-sacrifice was, we do not know. "This is narrated in a ridiculously fabulous form, yet there is one feature noteworthy in it, viz., that the Punjab kingdoms, which constituted so strong a bulwark in the Great War, have all disappeared; the Nāga Takṣaka reigned over the Punjab, and came into direct conflict with Arjuna's grand-son and great-grand-son who reigned on the Jumna. If one may hazard a conjecture on such a flimsy story, it is that the Nāgas had risen to power during the interval of weakness which followed the great battle and had conquered the kingdoms of the Punjab" (*JRAS.*, 1908, p. 336) and that Janamejaya III, with his centre at Taxila, extirpated and subdued them wholly.

Whatever this might be, we, however, come across a similar rākṣasa-satra as performed by the sage Parāśara for a similar cause (*Mbh.*, I, 181; *Viṣṇu P.*, 1, 1, 17-20).

Another fact that makes the confusion between Janamejaya II and Janamejaya III worse confounded is the names that appear in connection with one or both of them. Some Purāṇas, e.g. the *Viṣṇu*, say that both Janamejaya II and III had three brothers, viz., Śrutasena, Ugrasena and Bhīmasena; this, as will be seen later on, is a clear confusion of names. The *Harivaṃśa* mentions them as brothers of Janamejaya II and not of III. The *Matsya* and the *Vāyu* use singular number while speaking of Janamejaya III, which shows that the latter had no brother. The *Mahābhārata* in one place (I, 3. 1) attributes those brothers to Janamejaya III; but in chs. 94 and 95 of the *Ādiparva*, which deal exclusively with the genealogical lists, we get a different version. Ch. 94 descends down to Śāntanu and while speaking of Janamejaya II, son of Parīkṣit I, it ascribes as many as six brothers to Janamejaya II; while, on the other hand, in ch. 95, it uses singular number in connection with Janamejaya III. This singular number from the lips of a contemporary speaker, addressed to the person concerned, is a strong proof that Janamejaya III had no brother. Besides, we see that Janamejaya III was coronated while yet a child.

“ततो नृपे तक्षक-तेजसा हते प्रयुज्य सर्वाः परलोकसत्क्रियाः ।
 शुचिर्द्विजो राजपुरोहितस्तदा तथैव ते तस्य नृपस्य मन्त्रिणः ॥
 नृपं शिशुं तस्य सुतं प्रचक्रिरे समेत्य सर्वे पुरवासिनो जनाः ।
 नृपं यमाहुस्तममित्रघातिनं कुरुप्रवीरं जनमेजयं जनाः ॥”
 (I, 44, 3-6)

“बाल एवाभिषिक्तस्त्वं सर्वभूतानुपालकः ।”
 (I, 49, 18)

Thus we see that according to the *Mahābhārata* (excepting one passage in ch. 3) Janamejaya III had no brother.

Mr. Pargiter makes these Śrutasena, Ugrasena and Bhīmasena all sons of Janamejaya II. “His (Parīkṣit I’s) son,” he says, “was Janamejaya II, and his sons were Śrutasena, Ugrasena and Bhīmasena. Then the account drops them, passes to Jahnu and gives his descendants who formed the Paurava line. Śrutasena, Ugrasena and Bhīmasena are not described as kings, and the fact that their line stops

and the account passes on to Jahnū's son—Suratha as king, shows that Janamejaya's branch lost sovereignty which then vested in Suratha. The cause of this is explained by a story told earlier in the genealogy. Janamejaya II injured Ṛṣi Gārgya's son and was cursed by Gārgya; he was abandoned by his people and was in great affliction; he sought help from Ṛṣi Indrota Daivāpa Śaunaka who purified him with a horse-sacrifice (*Vāyu*, 93, 21-26; *Iśrahmāṇḍa*, III, 68, 20-26; *Hariraṃśa*, 30, 1608-1613; *Brahma*, 12, 9-15; *Linga*, I, 66, 71-77; *Mahābhārata*, XII, 150-152). He did not, however, recover his sovereignty, and his three sons passed into oblivion." (*Anc. Hist. Trad.*, p. 114). "Viṣ. and Gar. (unless its reading be amended) make Janamejaya's three sons his brothers. *Bhāg.* says Parīkṣit I had no offspring. *Ag.* follows *Hc. Mbh.*, I, 3, 661-2 and *Bhāg.*, IX, 22, 35 confuse this Janamejaya II with the later Parīkṣit's son Janamejaya III, who reigned after the Bhārata War. *Varāha* (193, 1-5) also confuses them" (*Ibid.*, footnote).

I give here for the convenience of the readers, the names of contemporary kings of the three Janamejayas in the Yādava, Ayodhyā and Videha lines, as given in the synchronistic list of Mr. Pargiter in his *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*.

SYNCHRONISTIC LIST OF THE THREE JANAMEJAYAS.

Serial No. from the beginning of the line	Pauravas	Yādavas	Ayodhyā	Videha
8	Janame- jaya I	Kṛṣṇu (2nd from Yayāti)	Ardra, father of Yuvanāśva I (5th from Kākutstha)	Udāvasu (2nd from Mithi Janaka)
74	Janame- jaya II	Vṛṣṇi (23rd from Andhaka)	Ahinagu (8th from Kūśa)	Supārśva
95	Abhimanyu (who fell in the battle.)	Sāmba, son of Śrī Kṛṣṇa	Bṛhatkṣaya, son of Bṛhadbala who fell in the battle	Kṛtakṣaya (Here occurred the Bhārata War).
97	Janame- jaya III	Vajra, who surviv- ed the destruction at Prabhāsa and was installed by Arjuna, or Prati- bāhu, his son,	Vatsavṛddha (grandson of Bṛhadbala)	

Dr. H. C. Roy Choudhuri confuses the two Janamejayas (II and III) into one, as he has done with their fathers—the two Parīkṣits (I and II). With a view to establishing the fact that there were only one Parīkṣit and one Janamejaya—his son, Dr. Roy Choudhuri loses sight of many facts and arguments. We, however, know that there were three distinct Janamejayas in the Paurava line—two of them sons of Parīkṣits; and the name Parīkṣit Janamejaya does not always refer to the post-war one. The coincidence of the names of the father and the son in the same line is, however, curious. Mr. Pargiter says—“There is nothing improbable in such duplication, and it is less than has occurred in the dynasties of other countries” (*Anc. Hist. Trad.*, p. 133).

NETTYADHAN BHATTACHARYA

On the Term 'Anusamyāna'

We come across the term 'anusamyāna' in the rock inscriptions¹ of Aśoka. But this word is not found in any Sanskrit lexicon or dictionary.² So the Aśokan scholars have ascribed different meanings to this word. Dr. Senart translated it by the word 'assembly.' But his view was subsequently thought to be incorrect, and Dr. Kern, and after him, Dr. Bühler took the term to mean 'on tour inspection.' This view holds good among the scholars up till now, it being assailed only in 1918 by Mr. K. P. Jayaswal, who substituted the word 'transfer' for 'tour.'³ Though the view of Mr. Jayaswal was adopted by Dr. Vincent A. Smith,⁴ yet that has now been discarded by most of the scholars.⁵

Before proceeding further we should quote⁶ the passages where the term 'anusamyāna' occurs from the edicts of Aśoka :

- (A) 1. Devānampīyo Piyadasi rājā evaṃ āha dhādasa-vāsā-
bhisitena mayā idaṃ āñapitaṃ.
2. sarvata vijite mama yutā ca rājūke ca prādesike ca
pañcasu pañcasu vāsesu anusaṃ-
yānaṃ niyātu⁷ etāyeva athāya imāya dhammānusastīya
yathā⁸.....
- (B) 21.etāye ca aṭhāye hakaṃ.....mate pañcasu
pañcasu vase-
22. su nikhāmayisāmi e akhakhase acamaṇḍe sakhinālambe
hosati etaṃ aṭhaṃ jānitu.....tathā

1 R.E. III; Sep. R.E. I. .

2 Vide *ASIA R.*, 1913-14, p. iii. But Monier Williams gives the meaning of anu+saṃ+√yā. In this connexion see the notes on the word given by Dr. Mookerji in his *Asoka* (p. 125. f. n. 3), and Dr. Bhandarkar in his *Asoka* (2nd. edn. pp. 278-79).

3 *JBORS.*, 1918, p. 37.

4 Smith's *Aśoka*, 3rd edn., pp. 163-64.

5 e.g. Dr. Mookerji, Dr. Hultzsch, Dr. H. C. Raichaudhury.

6 The passages are quoted from Hultzsch's *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, vol. I. (Aśoka Inscriptions).

7 Other versions read 'nikhamantu' or 'nikamatu'. or 'nikhamāvū'.

8 The passage is quoted from the Girnar text of R.E. III.

23. kalaṃti atha mama ānusathīti. Ujenite pi ca Kumāle
etāye va aṭhāye nikhāmayisa.....
24. hedisameva vagaṃ no ca atikāmayīsati tiṃni vasāni
hemeva Takhasilate pi adā a.....
25. te mahāmātā nikhamisaṃti anusayānaṃ tadā ahāpayitu
ataṃe kaṃmaṃ etaṃ pi jānisaṃti
26. taṃ pi tathā kalaṃti atha lājine anusathīti.⁹
- (C) 10.etāye ca aṭhāye iyaṃ likhitā lipī eṇā mahāmātā
nagalaka sasvataṃ samayaṃ etaṃ yujeyu ti eṇa munisā-
naṃ a.....ne paliki.....ye.
11. paṃcasu paṃcasu vasesu anusayānaṃ nikhāmayisāmi
mahāmātaṃ acaṃḍaṃ aphaḷusaṃ ta.....pi kumāle
vi.....ta.....mayi.....lāte.....
12.vacanika ada anusayānaṃ nikhamisaṃti ataṃe
kaṃmaṃ.....yitu taṃ pi tathā kalaṃti athā.....¹⁰

Now though the meaning 'on tour of inspection' is warranted by a host of authorities, it is doubtful whether this meaning is really applicable in the above passages. If it were so, the form 'anusamyānāya (e)' ought to have been used instead of 'anusamyānaṃ'.¹¹ But the fact is, the form 'anusamyānaṃ' has been used everywhere in the inscriptions without a single exception. This shows that the word was never originally used in the above passages in the sense of 'on tour of inspection'. But even supposing that 'anusamyānaṃ' is the correct form, (assuming also that the word means 'on tour of inspection'), it is difficult to understand why such round-about way of expression as 'anusamyānaṃ nikhamantu' was adopted in Rock Edict III instead of the simple 'anusamyantu,' which alone could have conveyed the meaning 'should proceed on tour of inspection.'

In my opinion the word 'anusamyāna' means 'a court-house or a citadel'; this meaning is justified by the etymology of the word itself.

9 Sep. R.E. I. (Dhauḷi version).

10 Sep. R.E. I. (Jauguḍa version).

11 'Tumarthācca bhāvavacanāt.' We say 'paridarśanāya gacchati,' and never 'paridarśanaṃ gacchati.'

'Anusamyāna' is to be derived from *anu+sam+√yā* with the suffix 'anaṭ' in the sense 'anusamyāyate asmin iti anusamyānaṃ.'¹² *Anu+sam+√yā* means to guard¹³ or to go (here and there, about) for the purpose of inspection,¹⁴ so that 'anusamyānaṃ' would mean the place where men keep guard or the place where one goes for the purpose of inspection, and this would be either a court-house or a citadēḥ. This agrees well with the fact that 'gatyartha-dhātu's with their meanings unchanged have for their object something definite and physical (in which case the object takes second 'vibhakti').¹⁵

This meaning is supported by the legend of the Basarh seal No. 800 discovered by the late Dr. Spooner in 1913.¹⁶ I read the legend¹⁷ as follows:—

'Vesāli anusamyāna-kaṭakāre'

'(The seal of) the mat-maker¹⁸ of the anusamyāna (or the court-house) of Vesāli.'

A large number of persons would come everyday to the court-house on various business, so that to provide them with seats mats would be necessary. The above meaning is in conformity with the nature of the remains excavated at Basarh.¹⁹ The legend as read above resembles those of seals No. 69A and 200 from Basarh in its character,²⁰ so that we can neither say that it is a unique seal, nor that it is altogether different from thousand others hitherto excavated.

12 cf. 'Bhūyate asmin iti bhavanam'; cf. 'Samsalana' in Sarnath Pillar Edict.

13 Vide Monier Williams' *Sans. Dict.* s.v. 'anusamyā.' Sten Konow quotes: *Rām.*, II. 79. 13:

'Rakṣiṇāścānusamyāntu pathi durgavicārakāḥ.' Here it seems that 'anusamyāntu' has been used in the sense of 'to walk up and down (as guard)'.
14 Mookerji's *Asoka* (p. 125. f.n. 3.); Bhandarkar's *Asoka* (pp. 178-79. f.n.).

15 cf. Nagaraṃ gacchati, or as Dr. Bhandarkar gives (op. cit)—sabhāṃ niṣkrāntaḥ. When the meaning is changed the object optionally takes another vibhakti, e.g. Mathurāya gacchati. Vide 'vā gatyarthakarmani ceṣṭāyām.'

16 *ASLAR.*, 1913-14, pp. 111-114.

17 Other scholars read differently:—(1) 'Vesāli anusamyānaka ṭakāre', (2) 'vāsā 30 anusamyānakāle kaṭe'; (3) 'anusamyāna-kaṭakāre.'

18 cf. *Kaṭakṛt* in Monier Williams' *Sans. Dict.*

19 *ASLAR.*, 1913-14, pp. 111-14; the excavation-spot is still called 'rājā Bisāl-kū gaḍ' by the people of the locality.

20 *Ibid.*

We can now easily understand why Aśoka asked the Yutas, the Rājukas and the Prādesīkas to preach the 'dhamma,' when they would go to the 'anusamyāna' every five years; for, 'anusamyāna' was the place where people gathered in large number for various purposes, so that it was just the place where ethical teachings could be imparted with substantial success.²¹

ANANTA KUMAR BOSE

²¹ cf. the significance of inscribing edicts in places of pilgrimage, in religious 'samsarāṇa', on trade-routes, near mining areas etc.

REVIEWS

MYSORE GAZETTEER, vol. II (Historical), Parts I-IV. New edition, Bangalore 1930.

It is more than half a century ago that the first edition of the *Mysore Gazetteer* appeared from the pen of that veteran worker in the field of Mysore antiquities, Lewis Rice. A second edition of this important publication was brought out by the same author in 1897. In the sumptuous volumes before us which are quite worthy of one of the premier States of India the work of the earlier author has been revised and brought up-to-date. The enormously enlarged scope of the new *Gazetteer* may be judged from the fact that while the historical and administrative sections of the original edition comprised only a little over 300 pages, the four parts under notice forming only the historical section of the new edition extend to more than 3,000 pages. It is evidently impossible in the course of a short book-review to do justice to all portions of this comprehensive work. But it is possible to give a short analysis of its contents together with some notes on its general character.

Part I (pp. 1-460) forms a kind of General Introduction to the subject. In a series of chapters it deals with the sources and periods of Mysore history, the Pre-history and Proto-history of Mysore, Archæology (comprising Epigraphy and Numismatics which last is, strangely enough, treated as an independent topic), sculpture and painting (the former comprising an early and a mediæval period with separate notices of Buddhist, Brahmanical and Jaina specimens), architecture (under the two divisions 'Civil' and 'Military'), other arts, manuscripts and lastly literature (divided into Sanskrit, Prākṛt, Kannada, Telugu, Tamil, Persian and 'Hindustani').

Part II (pp. 461-1414) has for its subject the early period and traces the history 'from the earliest times to the Vijayanagar Kingdom.' In part III (pp. 1415-2423) dealing with the mediæval period the history is continued "from the foundation of the Vijayanagar Kingdom to the destruction of Vijayanagar by Tipu Sultan in 1776 A.D.

The modern period from 1565 A.D. to the "present time" is treated in part IV (pp. 2424-3206), its earlier portion evidently overlapping the latter part of the preceding volume.

Such being the contents of the work it is only possible for us here to notice a few points by way of criticism. One of the aims of a good Gazetteer should be to condense the largest stock of accurate and up-to-date information on the subject in the shortest available space. Judged by this test the present edition of the *Mysore Gazetteer* falls short of the requirement. It is e.g. inexplicable why the author chooses to weary the reader with a general history of the Nandas, Mauryas, Pallavas, Cālukyas, Colas and even the Suṅgas and Kaṅvas where only a slight account of the part played by the Mysore territory in their history would have sufficed. Still more provoking are the author's tiresome quotations of long extracts from well-known and easily available printed works of the type of Vincent Smith's *Early History of India*. The author's detailed narrative of the events of Mysore history in recent times would have been more appropriate in a series of Annual Administrative Reports than in a work professing to be a Gazetteer.

Another defect of the present work is its want of proportion which is illustrated by the fact that while the author devotes a short and very inadequate chapter to Epigraphy (wherein palæography is not treated at all), he has a disproportionately long chapter on Numismatics. The author's repeated references to 'Sir' Vincent Smith and 'Sir' John Fleet, not to speak of his reference to Dr. "Barnet" and others, leave a very unfortunate impression on the mind of the reader. Equally unfortunate are the author's account of the Śaiśunāgas (pp. 462-63), his reference to the era of Buddha in Aśoka's edicts (p. 48), and his ascription of the Śaka era to Kanīṣka (pp. 494 ff). The author's habit of quoting a number of different views side by side is often bewildering to the reader.

While such are the defects of the present work, acknowledgement must be made of its merits. Interspersed with the political history are interesting sketches of social and economic conditions of the country at different periods. Another good feature of the work is its series of genealogical tables like those of the Gaṅgas, the Colas and the successive dynasties of Vijayanagar. There are also a few good maps, the

earliest going back to c. 450 B.C. The value of the work is enhanced by a series of Appendices (consisting of genealogical tables of the Mahānāgas of Mysore, the succession lists of Emperors of Madras, as well as Dewans and British Residents in the Mysore State, some historical documents etc.), a Bibliography, a "Roll of Honour," and an Index.

U. N. GHOSHAL

1. KALPADRUKOŚA OF KEŚAVA, vol. II (Index). Gaekwad's Oriental Series, vol. LX (Baroda, 1932).

2. ŚABDARATNASAMANVAYAKOŚA OF KING SAHAJI OF TANJORE, Gaekwad's Oriental Series, vol. LIX, (Baroda, 1932).

These two works which we owe to the indefatigable Editor of Gaekwad's Oriental Series form a welcome addition to the growing literature of Sanskrit *Kośas*. The *Kalpadrukośa* was edited for the first time by the late lamented Paṇḍit Rāmāvatāra Śarmā in 1928. Now we are presented with a complete word-index of this valuable lexicon extending over 282 pages. It is bound to be of great help to students of Sanskrit.

The *Śabdaratnasamanvaya* is a late *Kośa* work which is attributed on plausible grounds to the second prince of the Maratha House of Tanjore (1684-1712). It begins with an English Foreword by the General Editor. This is followed by a Sanskrit *Prastāvanā* by the Editor in course of which certain remarkable instances of borrowing or adaptation by the author from the well-known *Kośas* of Medinikara and Śrīdharasena are pointed out. The *Śabdaratnasamanvaya* indeed is a work of the same (*anekārtha*) class as those last mentioned. The edition which is based on three Mss. (two of these being complete) appears to have been well done. The value of the work is enhanced by a good index of words at the end.

U. N. GHOSHAL

Kālidāsa's MĀLAVIKĀGNIMITRA : Samāślokī Gujarātī Translation with a Gujarātī Commentary, named Mananikā by Prof. B. K. Thakore.

Those who know Prof. Thakore's comparative study of the four recensions of the *Śakuntalā* in his remarkably original paper,¹ need not be assured about his capabilities for this new venture. The author has studied all the available materials, and handles it with judgment and freedom. He has collated S. P. Paṇḍit's edition of the play (1889), with Tullberg's (1840) and Bollensen's (1879), and also used the Calcutta and Madras editions, and Tawney's English version. And in deciding on the reading, which in this play are not free from doubt in over a hundred passages, he decides according to the context in almost every case, and reaches conclusions conservative in the main, but in 6 or 7 places as original as they are felicitous.

It is the general opinion that this play is the great poet's first essay in drama. Prof. Thakore demurs. He shows that this play is superior to the *Vikramorvaśī* both in stage effect and in the author's handling of technique, and holds it probable that while it was staged before *Vikramorvaśī*, it might have been written after that lyrical drama. It was certainly written off rather hastily, and its wanting in the finish shows that it was never revised afterwards.

H. H. Wilson's suspicion that it might be the work of a lesser dramatist of a later age, finds little countenance to-day in the world of scholars. Prof. Thakore admits, as already stated, that it is the least polished amongst Kālidāsa's writings, but fully accepts the general view that it is also one of the great poet's works. But for this conclusion he relies not so much on style, idiom, phrasing and other similarities between this and Kālidāsa's other works, as on the ethos and mentality revealed in the play as a whole. A brief and accurate survey of the history of the religious, ethical and social re-construction which started in Northern India, on the impact of Buddhism and especially after Aśoka's mighty efforts to make it predominant in his empire, is attempted by the learned author in his commentary, and passing in rapid review the established facts from the time of the

1 The text of the *Śakuntalā*,

Suṅgas to the beginning of the Gupta Empire, when the re-construction crystallised into the final form of Purāṇic Hinduism, the conclusion is presented that in Kālidāsa's writings we have the most poetical expression of this Gupta age and its mentality. The labours of devoted scholars are steadily bringing us nearer to the day when we shall be able to assign almost every Sanskrit classic to its generation, if not to its decade, and to the part of India to which its author belonged. Then only shall we be able to view Sanskrit literature, as all literature needs to be viewed, in relation to its time and place. Prof. Thakore's is a worthy attempt in this direction, leading the way. And in the interest of his argument, he brings together whatever scattered rays might be helpful, from such works as the *Arthasāstra*, the *Kāmandakīya*, the *Kāmasāstra*, and Bhāsa's plays.

Who were the Suṅgas? A veteran scholar like H. P. Sastri first thought it not improbable that they might be immigrants from Persia. Then when he looked into the evidences which showed their Gotra to have been very ancient and to have produced eminent śrotriyas of the *Sāma Veda*, his doubt was gone. But Prof. Thakore argues that they were of such standing as Sāmavedins from before the time of Pāṇini, is no proof that they were not originally of Persian descent. Racial exclusiveness the most ancient Aryans developed very slowly. Untouchability and cognate ideas are the distinctive marks of Purāṇic Hinduism. That the three Vedas became four, admitting to an equality the *Atharva Veda* of the so-called Vrātyas, is a conclusive evidence that the original liberal attitude gave way very slowly, indeed, to one of increasing rigidity. As we go backwards from the Purāṇic Age, its ideas of exclusive rigidity become less and less applicable: it becomes more and more unhistorical to apply them. The final *Mitra* in every Suṅga name is one mark at any rate of alien origin, however remote. And no satisfactory derivation or meaning from purely Sanskrit or Vedic sources has so far been assigned either to Suṅga, or to Baimbika, which occurs in this play as a synonym.

Almost all writers on the play have followed H. H. Wilson in holding one of the major characters, the Parivrājikā, to be a Buddhist. Our author believes that in her, Kālidāsa has given us a Brahman

lady ascetic, and points out that while the play lends sufficient support to his view, it lends none whatever to the accepted belief. He shows how such Brahman Parivrājikās must have been common in Kālidāsa's day and for some time later. He also cites the *Kaumudīmahotsava*, a play by an authoress in all probability later than Kālidāsa, the Parivrājikā in which is indisputably a Brahman lady.

King Agnimitra is represented in the play as having conquered Vidarbha. And merely on the authority of the play, historians have without exception accepted this as an event which actually took place. It is on this point that, in my humble judgment, Prof. Thakore's originality is to be seen at its best. His grave caveat might be put into three propositions:

- (1) There is no evidence to show that in the second century B.C. Vidarbha was a kingdom: indeed, what little we do know goes to show that it was mainly a land of gaṇa-rule, or under the sway of aristocratic republics.
- (2) Agnimitra's contemporaries were Khāravela to the east of Vidarbha, and the Śātakarṇi to the west of it: the first certainly was much stronger than Agnimitra and in touch with some of the Vidarbha gaṇas, as his inscription shows. The second, we have no reason to suppose, was much weaker than Agnimitra. Neither can he be visualised as looking on unconcerned while a power from the north of the Vindhya pounced upon the land between them.
- (3) The *Nāṭyaśāstra* allowed the dramatist great latitude in inventing incidents and altering not only historical events but even material facts in "sacred history" in order to give a marvelous (*adbhuta*) ending to his plot. Bhāsa's *Pañcarātra* and Bhavabhūti's *Mahāvīracarita* are good illustrations in this direction. The entire Series of Sanskrit plays are seen drawing their plots from the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata*, each author altering the story of the epic as suited him best.

Prof. Thakore concludes that until we have independent evidence to vouch for it, we must look upon this incident in the play

as a piece of pure invention by the playwright, in order to give sufficient dignity and elevation to his plot and characters.

This work of Prof. Thakore deserves careful attention of scholars although it happens to be written in Gujarātī. I need say nothing here of its high merits as Gujarātī literature. Prof. Thakore has long been in the very forefront of the best Gujarātī poets and the best writers of chaste Gujarātī prose. One can only hope that he will find time to follow up his Gujarātī translations of the *Sakuntalā* and *Mālavikāgnimitra* by one of *Vikramorvaśī* also.

D. R. MANKAD

SAHITYA-RATNAKARA edited by T. R. Chintamani, M.A.
Pp. XIX + 126, Madras 1932.

This is a Sanskrit *Mahākāvya* in 16 cantos by Yajñanārāyaṇa Dikṣita. It deals with the exploits of a historical personage, Raghunāth Nāyaka (c. 17th century) the king of Tanjore. As is usual with the works of this kind it mixes much fancy with sober historical facts, but in spite of this, critical students of history may glean from here good materials for the contemporary history of Tanjore. This is the main interest of the work but as a poem too it is not unworthy of praise. In spite of his defects the poet at times rises to a real poetic level (e.g. in *śls.* 66-77 of canto III).

So much about the value of the work. We thank the editor for making it available for the public in such a form. But we regret to say that at times he seems to have done his work rather negligently. For example, a word *gumbha* appears thrice in canto I (17, 40, 42), but well-known Sanskrit dictionaries like that of Apte and Monier-Williams do not register such a word. From the context of the passages in which the word occurs it appears that it is only a misspelt form of *gumpha*. We may however hope that instances of such carelessness are not many, and the editor may be complimented on his work.

MANOMOHAN GHOSH

INDIAN WOMEN AND ART IN LIFE by Kanhaiyalal H. Vakil. Pp. VIII+24 (with six illustrations) D. V. Taraporevala Sons & Co., Bombay 1933.

In this brochure the author addresses the Indian womanhood and draws their attention to the duty regarding the cultivation of various arts. In this connection he states what he considers to be the chief needs of the hour in giving a healthy turn to the newly awakened art-consciousness among the people of this country. Some of his suggestions, viz., the need of interprovincial contacts and attention to local environments, are valuable while as regards others one may not be in complete agreement with him. For example, his rather disparaging treatment of the 'revivalist school' of Indian art does not seem to be based on adequate acquaintance with facts. Indeed some excesses have been committed in the wake of the 'revival' but the significance of the movement for the history of modern Indian art can scarcely be disputed. Leaving aside such points Mr. Vakil's pamphlet may be said to serve a useful purpose in advancing the cause of art in this country.

MANOMOHAN GHOSH

TREASURE-HOUSE OF THE LIVING RELIGIONS by Robert Ernest Hume, M.A., Ph.D. Charles Scribner's Sons., London 1933.

The book under review is a valuable collection of pronouncements bearing on all the important phases of religious thought and life from the sacred text-books of the eleven living religions of the world. It is divided into three parts. Part I relates to Faith in the Perfect God; Part II refers to Man and His Perfecting; and Part III centres round Man and His Social Relations. The excellence of the work lies in the fact that it distilled or juxtaposed the quintessences of the great religions of the world. The author's translations are marked by clearness, simplicity and lucidity. A close study of the parallelisms will unmistakably point to the fundamental unity among the various religions of the world. The author has rendered signal service to the growing spirit of fellowship which aims at transcending all geographical boundaries and parochial outlooks, and strives to get at the essential unity among human beings.

D. L. DE

Select Contents of Oriental Journals

Acta Orientalia, vol. xii, pars 1

STEN KONOW.—*The Arapaçana Alphabet and the Śakas.*

The mystic letters of the alphabet found in certain Buddhist texts are known by the expression *Arapaçana*, because the first five letters happen to be *a*, *ra*, *pa ca* and *na*. The compound Brāhmī letter *ysa* is found in this alphabet. It has been inferred that the Arapaçana and therefore the letter *ysa* were invented in Eastern Turkestan.

F. W. THOMAS.—*Some Notes on the Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Chinese Turkestan.*

The discussion in the paper centres round the following: (1) Kuthacābira; (2) Kuthala; (3) The Twelve-Animal Cycle in Kharoṣṭhī; (4) Relations with Khotan: (a) Hostilities and post-bellum arrangements, (b) Envoys, messages etc., (c) Refugees etc., (d) Merchandise, etc.; (5) The Supiyas; (6) Ogu, etc.; (7) The Buddhist Saṅgha in Shan-shan; (8) Private and semi-official letters; (9) **Camkura.**

Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, vol. XIV, pts. iii-iv

AMARNATH RAY.—*The Viṣṇusvāmin Riddle.*

The writer has put forward arguments to prove that Viṣṇusvāmin, ordinarily regarded as the founder of a Rudra sect of the Vaiṣṇavas, was really a teacher of a branch of the Śaṅkara-Vedānta School with Vaiṣṇavite leanings adopting Nṛsiṃha worship. The Nṛsiṃha cult seems to have mixed up Tantric rituals with Advaita Vedānta and helped the development of the erotic emotionalism of the Bengal School of Vaiṣṇavism. It is inferred by the writer that Vidyāśaṅkara and Sarvajñaviṣṇu, the gurus of Sāyaṇa and Mādhava respectively, are no other than Viṣṇusvāmin. Caitanya's guru and paramaguru are said to have belonged to the Viṣṇusvāmin sect.

B. N. KRISHNAMURTI SARMA.—*The Date of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa.*

The date of the *Bhāgavata* has been assigned by some to the 13th

century A.C. on the supposition that the *Purāṇa* was composed by Bopadeva. This theory has already been exploded on the ground that Bopadeva's *Harilīlā* contains statements indicating the prior existence of the *Purāṇa*. It has been shown here on the strength of textual evidences that the *Bhāgavata* has been mentioned and quoted by authors living in the 6th, 7th and 10th centuries. Hence it must have been composed, in any case, prior to the 6th century.

SAKUNTALA RAO.—*Suttee.*

The history of the custom of self-immolation by a wife after the death of her husband has been traced. Sanskrit texts have been cited to prove that the custom was non-existent in the early Hindu society. The *Madhābhārata* however records two instances of *Suttee* and the Greek historians testify to the prevalence of the practice in India. The practice was eulogised in the Dharma-sūtras compiled between the 5th and the 9th century A.C. though during this period authors were not wanting to condemn it. The annals of Kashmir and some inscriptions from Southern India show that in some cases *anumarāṇa* was practised not only by wives, but also by concubines, slaves of the household and other dear relatives of the deceased. A similar custom of self-immolation called *harakiri* prevails in Japan. It is inferred from this fact that the custom had its origin in Central Asia.

S. SRIKANTHA SASTRI.—*The Two Bhāgavatas.*

The writer wants to prove that the *Devī-Bhāgavata*, which, in his opinion, can be assigned to the 6th century A.C. is slightly earlier than the *Śrīmad-Bhāgavata*.

V. RAGHAVAN.—*The Sāndhivigrahika criticised by Śrī-Vidyācakra-vartin.*

The *Sāndhivigrahika* whose opinions are criticised in the *Brhatṭīkā* of Vidyācakra-vartin has been identified in the article as Viśvanātha, the author of the *Sāhityādarpaṇa*. Both the authors, according to the writer, belonged to the 14th century.

-*The Laghutīkā on the Kāvya-prakāśa.*

It has been pointed out that besides the two commentaries, the *Brhatṭīkā* or *Sampradāyaprakāśinī* on the *Kāvya-prakāśa*, and the

Sañjivini on the *Alamkārasarvasva*, Vidyādhara first wrote a short commentary on the *Kāvya prakāśa* and named it *Laghutīkā* which he has mentioned in his *Bṛhatīkā*.

The Bharatasamgraha of Vidyācakra-vartin.

Evidences have been adduced from Vidyācakra-vartin's *Bṛhatīkā* as well as his unpublished *Sañjivini* that he was the author of another work called *Bharatasamgraha* dealing with dramaturgy.

—The Rasaratnakosa, the Nāṭakaratanakosa and the Saṃgītarāja.

The writer is of opinion that the *Rasaratnakosa* and the *Nāṭakaratanakosa* supposed to have been independent works formed really sections of a big volume called *Saṃgītarāja* by Rāṇā Kumbha, the author of the *Rasikapriyā*, a commentary on the *Gītāgorinda*.

A. N. UPADHYE.—A Note on *Nisidhi* (*Nisīdiyā* of *Khāravela* Inscription).

The word *nisidhi* found in various Jain inscriptions has been explained to indicate a structure built on a spot where a particular saint breathes his last or his relics are buried. The derivation has been traced to the root *sad* (to sit) with *ni*, conveying the idea of a seat. So the expression *arahata-nisīdiya* in the *Khāravela* inscription indicates the monumental structure on the spot within the cremation ground where an Arhat was cremated.

H. R. KAPADIYA.—References to the *Bauddhas* and their Philosophy in *Umāsvāti's Tatvārthabhāṣya* and *Siddhasena Gaṇi's Commentary* to it.

SRIDHARA SASTRI PATHAK.—धर्मशास्त्रव्याख्यानमालायां त्रौणि व्याख्यानानि
(Three Lectures on Scriptural Texts).

Indian Antiquary, July, 1933

K. P. JAYASWAL.—Places and Peoples in *Aśoka's Inscriptions*.

NALINI NATH DAS GUPTA.—On the Reign of *Kṛṣṇa II*, the *Rāṣṭrakūṭa*.

Ibid., September, 1933

HIRALAL.—The Extent and Capital of *Dakṣiṇa Kośala*.

Dakṣiṇa Kośala at the time of *Yuan Chwang's* visit comprised an area lying between 85° and 78° E, covering some 81,000 square

miles, the present Raipur and Bilaspur districts forming the central portion. It is suggested that either Sirpur or Bhandak was the capital, the latter possessing a greater claim to this recognition.

K. P. JAYASWAL.—*Proclamation of Aśoka as a Buddhist and his Jambudvīpa.*

Aśoka's statement in the Rūpanāth Series of Proclamation that he has 'mingled the gods with men in Jambudvīpa' has been given the interpretation that an ideal epoch was brought about by the emperor through the spread of Buddhism not only in Bhāratavarṣa but also in Jambudvīpa which included countries beyond India. The reference to the 'gods mingling with men' is also found in the Purāṇa and Dharmasūtra literature to convey the idea of the inauguration of a morally ideal epoch.

A. VENKATASUBBIAH.—*Mean Saṃkrāntis.*

V. R. RAMACHANDRA DIKSHITAR.—*The Lunar Cult in India.*

It has been shown that like the sun, the moon also enjoyed the independent status of a deity in ancient times. The worship of the moon can be traced back to the Vedic period. The lunar cult was known to the early Tamils and temples were dedicated to the god.

Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society,

vol. viii, pt. i (July 1933)

GOVINDA PAI.—*Genealogy and Chronology of the Pallavas.*

A. SUBBARAYA CHETTY.—*New Light on Tipu Sultan.*

That Tipu Sultan was not fanatical but cosmopolitan in his religious views is the theme of the article.

M. RAMA RAO.—*Epigraphical Notes.*

Twenty extracts from the inscriptions of the Kākatiyas have been given here and their importance indicated.

R. SUBBA RAO.—*The History of the Eastern Gaṅgas of Kalinga.*

Journal of the Bihar Orissa Research Society,

July-September, 1933.

PAURE-DAVAND.—*Mithra Cult.*

The antiquity of the cult of Mithra has been discussed here showing its influence spread far and wide.

J. F. JAMES.—*The Skirts of Nanda Devī.*

K. P. JAYASWAL.—*Appendix to the History of India, 150 A.D. to 350 A.D.*

The first portion of the Appendix D deals with the 'Bhīṭā Excavations' and 'the Hindu War on the Kushans'. The coins and other relics as also the numerous missiles found in the rooms and alleys in two strata of the site excavated show that there were two military operations against the town of Bhīṭā at different periods necessitating the hurried evacuations of the houses. The first attack is inferred to have taken place in the Bhāraśiva period in the 2nd century A.C. and the second in the early Gupta Period. The second portion of the paper treats of the 'Vākāṭaka Seals at Bhīṭā'.

Appendix E puts together passages from the Paikuli Sassanian Inscription (293-4 A.C.) having bearing on India. They show that for 20 years (272 to 292) the Kushans got the protection of the Sassanian king and assumed the position of a vassal.

In the next Appendix a scrutiny of the titles of some Gupta kings as found in the Riddhapur Plates of Prabhāvatī Guptā and the Allahabad Pillar inscription of Samudra Gupta shows that Prabhāvatī, a grand-daughter of Samudra Gupta married to a Vākāṭaka king, did not recognise the political superiority of the Gupta rulers. This points to the hostility of the Vākāṭakas towards the Guptas, the former refusing to acknowledge any Gupta ruler before Candragupta II as a Mahārājādhirāja.

The appendix G is on Further India and Insulindia, 150 A.D.-350 A.D. It discusses the nature of the relation that existed between India and the settlements of the Indians in the countries outside India.

SARAT CHANDRA ROY.—*Report on Anthropological Work in 1931-32; Some Interesting Aspects of Orissan Ethnology.*

P. C. CHAUDHURY.—*Ajapura of Skanda Gupta, and the Area round Bihar.*

Ajapura mentioned in Skanda Gupta's inscription has been identified with the village Ajaipur in the Bihar sub-division of the district of Patna and its importance as a place deserving further investigation has been pointed out.

Journal of Oriental Research, vol. vii, pt. ii (April-June, 1933)

V. RAGHAVAN.—*The Vṛttis.*

This continued paper dealing with the concept of Vṛtti as found in the works of Sanskrit poetics is concerned in this instalment with their number which the various authors regard as different.

P. S. SUBRAHMANYA SASTRI.—*History of Grammatical Theories in Tamil.*

C. SIVARAMAMURTI.—*Kālidāsa and Painting.*

What idea of Art Kālidāsa had and how far this branch of learning had progressed in his time have been shown in this paper.

Ibid., vol. vii, pt. iii (July-September, 1933)

K. A. NILAKANTHA SASTRI.—*Rājendra's Expedition to the Ganges.*

It is known from the Turuvālaṅgādu plates that Rājendra Cola wanted to achieve by the strength of his arms the feats of Bhagīratha who sanctified his country with the waters of the Ganges. After a victorious marching over thirteen places he is said to have brought down the holy waters from northern India and poured them into a tank. Scholars differ in their views on the nature of the achievement. The writer of this article is of opinion that it refers to *digvijaya*. The raid covered a vast area up to the banks of the Ganges across the Baster State, and some parts of the Central Provinces, Western Bengal, and Bihar.

T. N. RAMACHANDRAN.—*The Royal Artist, Mahendravarman I.*
Continued.

N. AIYASWAMI.—*Extracts from Jayānanda's Commentary.*

The Tibetan version of portions of Jayānanda's commentary on the *Madhyamakāratāra* has been published here with its Sanskrit restoration made by Mr. Aiyaswami.

P. S. SUBRAHMANYA SASTRI.—*History of Grammatical Theories in Tamil.*

V. RAGHAVAN.—*A Note on the Name Daśarūpaka.*

Different varieties of dramas with their distinctive features form the subject-matter of this note.

T. R. CHINTAMANI.—*Some Minor Works of Śrī Citsukhācārya.*

The third and the fourth chapters of the Sanskrit text of Citsukha's *Adhikaraṇasaṅgati*, a treatise connected with the *Brahmasūtra* have been edited in this instalment of the paper.

Journal and Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal,

vol. XXVII, no. 2

P. C. BASU.—*The Social and Religious Ceremonies of the Cākmas.*B. K. CHATTERJEE.—*The Social and Religious Institutions of the Khairas.*HARIT KRISHNA DEB.—*The Hindu Calender and the Earlier Siddhāntas.*A. BANERJI-SASTRI.—*Dhenkānāl Grants of Raṇastambha and Jayastambha.*

These two inscriptions recording land-grants by two kings Raṇastambha and Jayastambha are in Sanskrit written in a character belonging to the period 9th-10th century A.C. The second grant supplies several new informations about the Suklivamṣa already known from the inscriptions published previously.

Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society, vol. xxiv, No. 1 (July, 1933)G. V. BUDHAKAR.—*Is the Advaita of Śaṅkara Buddhism in Disguise?*

The writer attempts to prove that Śaṅkara is not indebted to the Vijñānavada and Śūnyavāda of Buddhism for the conception of his Advaita philosophy but has drawn upon the more ancient Advaita literature.

K. NARAYANASWAMI IYAR.—*Śrīvidyā.*

The paper deals with a Tantric form of Śakti Worship.

M. V. KRISHNA RAO.—*Jainism in Gangaradi.***Tirumalai Sri Venkatesvara, vol. i, No. 10 (May, 1933)**P. V. JAGADISA IYER.—*Some Coḷa Kings.*

It is an outline of the events in the reigns of twelve Coḷa kings from Rājendra Coḷa I to Rājendra III, covering the period between 1013 and 1268 A.C.

V. VENKATARAMA SASTRI.—*Janāśrayī Chandoriciti.*

This is an edition of the second chapter of the *Chandoriciti*, a Sanskrit work on prosody.

THE Indian Historical Quarterly

Vol. IX

DECEMBER, 1933

No. 4

Kālidāsa in China

For many centuries, China received from India a large stock of Buddhist texts in Sanskrit. Very few of them are now extant in China proper (i.e. outside Turkestan); as for the remains pertaining to the Brāhmanical literature, they are next to none. It is this extreme scarcity which lends some interest to a single palm-leaf, which is a part of a manuscript preserved in a Buddhist monastery of the Che-kiang province,¹ and which contains references to the legendary life of Kālidāsa, with quotations from his poems.

The history of this manuscript goes back to forty years ago, when Dr. A. O. Franke, entreated by his teacher Franz Kielhorn to search for any Indian manuscripts which might have survived in China, succeeded in detecting one, in 1893. The following year, he wrote to Kielhorn:

“The only old MS., which has yet been found, is in a small dilapidated Buddhist monastery, in the mountainous wilds of T’ien t’ai shan, in the province of Che-kiang, about 125 English miles south-west of the port of Ning-po, where it was seen by Dr. Edkins about thirty years ago. Last autumn I set out to have a look at the

1 Tidings have recently reached me to the effect that the library of the monastery was burnt down and the books destroyed. This rumour needs confirmation.

MS. myself, and I am sending you now a few results of my expedition. I have photographed a portion of the MS., which consists of twenty palm-leaves, and is evidently incomplete, and have copied other parts; and what I am sending are photographs of both sides of the first and second leaves, and tracing of the concluding lines on page 24, as well as of the writing of a leaf, which is not numbered.”²

After a close examination of the materials sent to him, Kielhorn concluded that the bulk of the MS. was formed by a Buddhist poem entitled *Paramārthasevā*, by Śrī Puṇḍarīka.³ As for the leaf not numbered, which he designated as D, he wrote:—

“The writing of D differs little from the ordinary Nāgarī, and may be described as that particular variety of the Nāgarī alphabet, which was current in parts of Bengal about the XIIIth century A.D.Of D I do not know what to make and will only point out that it gives us the initial verses of Kālidāsa’s three Mahākāvya, the Kumārasambhava, Meghadūta and Raghuvamśa.”

In 1914, Prof. Henri Maspero, in the course of an archaeological tour in China, met again with this MS. and brought with him a partial photograph of it, which he was so kind to put at my disposal. So far as I can see, the bundle of leaves which was showed to Maspero, although undoubtedly the same which was seen by Franke, had received in the interval an important addition. According to the photographs, it contains now, besides the *Paramārthasevā* and the leaf D, two other manuscripts or parts: 1° an anonymous treatise on the initiation of the pupil, entitled *Hevajrasekaprakriyā*; 2° a collection of small Tāntrik rituals by Lūyī, Sāśvatavajra etc.

I hope to give before long a detailed account of these works; at present I confine myself to the isolated leaf concerning Kālidāsa. Of this one side was reproduced by Franke as well as by Maspero, wherefrom it may be inferred that the other side is blank. It contains five lines; the first and the last are mutilated at both ends; several

² *JRAS.*, 1894, p. 836.

³ The paper of Kielhorn appeared in the *Academy*, 16th June 1894, and was afterwards reprinted in *J.R.A.S.*, 1894, pp. 836-838, but without the transcriptions which were appended to the former edition.

letters also disappeared on the fringes of the central hole. The leaf was slightly damaged since it had been copied by Franke. The writing is, according to the description of Kielhorn, a Bengali Nāgarī, which cannot be prior to the XIIIth century. Here is the literal copy of the manuscript:

× × रुचि ब्राह्मण । मूर्ख राज श्रीश्रीभोजदेवसभा । मूर्ख उशंटर ॥ उमया सहितो
रुद्रः शंकर सह विष्णुना । टंकारशूलपाणि × × × (२) न्तु शिवः सव्वदा ॥
शरस्वती । कालीचेटी । कालिदाशः ॥ शरस्वती । अस्ति कश्चित् वाक्विशेषः ॥
अस्त्युत्तरस्यां दिशि । देवता(३)त्मा हिमालयो नाम नगाधिराजः । पूर्वापरौ
तोयनि × × गाह्य स्थित पृथिव्यारिव मानदण्डः ॥ कुमारः ॥ कश्चित् कान्ताविरह-
गुरुणा (४) × अधिकारप्रमत्तः सापेनास्तंगमितमहिमा वर्ष भोगेन भर्तुः । यक्षश्चक्रे
जनकतनयास्नानपुन्योदकेषु श्लिग्धच्छायातरुषु वसती रामगि (४) × × × × × दूतः ॥
वागर्थाविव संपृक्तौ वागर्थप्रतिपत्तये । जगतः पितरौ वंदे पार्वतीपरमेश्वरौ ॥ रघुः ॥
त्रयका × × × × ×

We subjoin hereafter a transcription, in which are added between square brackets our own restorations, and in italic letters the syllables read by Kielhorn and now missing. We have put in notes the various readings of the former edition, except those which are distinctly contradicted by the manuscript.

[Vara]ruci vrāhmaṇa| mūrkhā rāja Śrīśrī-Bhojadevasabhā| mūrkhā
uśaṃṭara||

Umayā sahito Rudraḥ Saṃkara[h] saha Viṣṇunā|
ṭaṃkārasūlapāṇiś ca rakṣa(2)ntu Śivaḥ sarvadā||
Sarasvatī|Kālicetī⁴|Kālidāśaḥ||Sarasvatī| asti kaścit vākviśeṣaḥ||
Kālidāśaḥ||

asty uttarasyām 'diśi devatā(3)tmā Himālayo nāma
nagādhirājah|
pūrvvāparau toyani[dhī va]gāhya sthita pṛthivyār
iva⁵ mānadaṇḍaḥ||
Kumāraḥ||

4 Kielhorn: Kāli de(?)vi(?).

5 K. pṛthivyor iva.

kaścit kāntāviraḥaguruṇā(4)[sv]ādhikārapramattaḥ
 sāpenāstaṃgamitamahimā varṣam bhogena bharttuḥ|
 yakṣas cakre Janakatanayāsuṇānapunyodakeṣu
 śnigdhaçchūyātaruṣu vasatīm Rāmagi(ḥ)ryāśrameṣu||
 [Megha]dūtaḥ||

vāgarthāv iva saṃprkṭau vāgarthapratipattaye|
 jagataḥ pitarau vande Pārsvatīparameśvarau||
 Raghuḥ||

traya kāvyaḥ|| vi, śa, ṣa⁶ traya (?) kāvyaṃ||

This odd text might be translated as follows :

The Brahman Vararuci. The blockhead. The court of King
 Bhojadeva. The blockhead: Uśaṃṭara.

May Rudra with Umā, Saṃkara with Viṣṇu, and Śiva, who holds
 the sounding spear, protect us always!

Sarasvatī. Servant of Kālī. Kālidāsa. Sarasvatī is a variety of
 Vāc. Kālidāsa.

Asty uttarasyām etc. Kumāra.

Kaścit kāntā etc. Meghadūta.

Vāgarthāv iva etc. Raghu.

These three are the best three poems.

One cannot but wonder at the uncommon incorrectness of that
 piece: confusion of sibilants and nasals (Sarasvatī, Kālidāsa, sāpena,
 śnigdha, punya), wavering sandhi (Saṃkara saha, vākviśeṣa, sthita
 pṛthivyār iva), all these blunders give the impression of an exercise
 written by a beginner.

Excepting the four verses quoted, the definition 'Sarasvatī
 vākviśeṣaḥ' evidently borrowed from some vocabulary, and the last
 words 'traya kāvyaḥ viśeṣa trayakāvyam', which look like an attempt,
 and a very unfortunate one, at a critical appreciation (for 'trīṇi
 kāvyāni, viśeṣakāvyatrayam?'), — names and words are thrown one after

the other in a quite unconnected way: the Brahman Vararuci, the court of King Bhoja, the blockhead, Uśaṃṭara, Sarasvatī, Kālidāsa. It would be impossible to discern the link which connects these terms, if perchance the missing thread were not supplied by the legendary life of Kālidāsa, preserved in the *History of Buddhism* of Tāranātha.⁷

Here is a summary of the tale.

The Brahman Vararuci was an honoured guest of the king of Benares, Bhīmaśukla, who wished to give him his daughter Vāśantī in marriage. But the princess, deeming herself superior in learning to the Brahman, did not care for his alliance. Vararuci, eager to have his revenge, formed the project to manage the marriage of the proud girl with a blockhead. While walking in the country, he saw a Māgadhan cow-herd, who, while sitting astraddle on a branch, was cutting with an axe the very branch which he sat on. Satisfied with the stupidity of the fellow, he took him to his own house and had him bathed, anointed and clothed in the garb of a Brāhmanic paṇḍit. Thereupon he went to the palace and said to the king: "May it please Your Majesty to invite my teacher, who is a hundred times more learned than myself."

The king having assented, Vararuci brought along the cow-herd, having duly instructed him to salute with the words 'Om svasti!', but to remain silent whenever he was questioned. On being led before the king, the blockhead said: 'Uśaṃṭara!'⁸ All wondered; but Vararuci hastened to explain that it was an abridged formula of blessing:

Umayā sahito Rudraḥ Saṃkarasahito Viṣṇuḥ
ṭaṃkārasūlapāṇiś ca rakṣantu Śivaḥ sarvadā.

Vāśantī asked the would-be paṇḍit several questions upon the words of this stanza, but he kept silent. "Why should my learned teacher answer a woman?", Vararuci interposed. Thereupon he left the court and journeyed to the South. The blockhead married the princess, and having practised an earnest devotion to Kālī, he became before long, by the favour of the goddess, gifted with the highest attainments and was henceforth called Kālidāsa.

⁷ Tāranātha, *Geschichte des Buddhismus*, p. 76.

⁸ Apparently instead of 'Om svasti!', which he had forgotten.

It may be seen by this summary 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.

It follows 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*. I have failed to find out in this last work the tale of Vararuci and Kālidāsa the cow-herd; perhaps some of our readers will be able to point out the Sanskrit version of the story told by Tāranātha.

LOUIS FINOT

Vāmana's Theory of Rīti and Guṇa

Vāmana is the earliest known writer who gives us general definitions of the terms Guṇa and Rīti. His treatment of the Guṇa is inseparably associated with that of the Rīti which is defined as 'a special arrangement of words (*viśiṣṭā padaracanā*) and described as the 'soul of poetry' (*ātmā kāvyasya*). The speciality consists in the harmonious unification of some standard fixed excellences which are technically called *guṇas* and which have been generally defined as 'those elements of poetry that serve to embellish it' (*kāvyaśobhāyāḥ kartāro dharmāḥ*). Thus, in order to endow poetry with a 'soul' Vāmana insists upon imparting a speciality to word-arrangement which speciality is effected chiefly by the harmonious blending of the technical embellishments called *guṇas*. And these *guṇas* unlike the poetic figures (i.e. *alaṅkāra* in the restricted sense) constitute inseparable attribute of poetry since they go to make up the Rīti which is the essence of poetic composition. Without them the composition is devoid of any "vaiśiṣṭya" and consequently becomes 'soul-less.'¹

1 [So much about the soul, which term however must be taken as denoting, strictly, an analogy: but it is not clear what Vāmana means by "*kāvya-śarīra*". What Vāmana actually says on this point (*vṛtti* on i, 1, 1) is that the word 'kāvyā' in his opinion applies to word (*śabda*) and sense (*artha*) adorned with Guṇa and Alaṅkāra; but he adds that it is employed in a secondary sense (*bhaktiyā*) to word and sense. By *kāvya-śarīra* he elsewhere (*vṛtti*, i, 3, 10) means *itivṛtta*, apparently applying the word to the actual contents of poetry. But the first chapter of his work is designated *śarīra* and he again uses the word *śarīra* in his *vṛtti* on i, 2, 6, where he says that this word must be understood after the sentence of the *sūtra* (*rītir ātmā kāvyasya*), probably meaning thereby (as explained also by his commentator Gopendra Tripurahara) that the *kāvya* consisting of *śabda* and *artha* (cf. *vṛtti* on i, 1, 1) is the *śarīra* of which the *ātmā* is *Rīti*. And yet he would regard (as the Dhvani theorists rightly point out) the Guṇa as the essence of Rīti and Doṣa as the properties of *śabda* and *artha*. Thus Vāmana's quest after the soul of poetry is somewhat illusive, and his apprehension of the essence of poetry is, as the Dhvanikāra criticises, external and somewhat vague; for he would still view the whole matter from the point of external form. Jagannātha (*Rasa-gaṅgādhara*, p. 55) appears to realise this difficultly.]—S.K.D.

It will thus be seen that Vāmana logically and more systematically develops the crude teachings of Daṇḍin in establishing a very intimate, nay, inseparable relationship between the two poetic elements namely Rīti and Guṇa and verily like his predecessor he classifies the *rītis* on the basis of the *guṇas* all of which should be present in a particular *rīti* or some of them may be absent in another. But while Daṇḍin discussed at some length the prominent characteristics of only two clearly distinguishable types of *rīti* e.g. the Gaudī and the Vaidarbhī, Vāmana enumerates them as three and only three adding Pāñcālī to the former's enumeration—and he has not in mind any other *rīti* which he has not explicitly mentioned. Thus, from the very outset, one would mark in Vāmana an attempt to be more clear and outspoken—which in itself is a decided advance made upon Daṇḍin. His Vaidarbhī is like Daṇḍin's endowed with all the technical excellences (*samagraḡuṇopetā*), his Gaudī contains Ojas and Kānti while his Pāñcālī is marked by the presence of two other *guṇas* namely Mādhurya and Saukumārya. And of these three *rītis* Vāmana assigns the highest place to the Vaidarbhī inasmuch as it unites in itself all the poetic excellences that serve to make poetry fully relishable by imparting to it the maximum amount of speciality or *vaiśiṣṭya*. The other two varieties have been relegated to an inferior quality in this sense that they lack in one or other aspect of poetic excellence—the Gaudī 'losing itself often in bombast' and the Pāñcālī in 'prolixity.'

Though not free from the undeveloped character which is natural to the treatment of an early theorist, Vāmana's scheme of poetry bears a great importance in the history of Sanskrit poetics. It was he to whom for the first time occurred the idea of the deeper significance of poetry although it was, as the Dhvanikāra puts it, *asphuṭa sphurita*—only darkly discerned. No doubt the subjective aspect of poetry did not engage attention till the advent of the Dhvani-theorists (and even then not to its full extent), and the oft-used word 'soul' must be taken merely as an illuminating metaphor. Vāmana is still concerned with the mere externals of poetry but there can be no doubt that he made a great advance upon the treatment of his predecessors. On the other hand, his influence on the later conception of poetry is patent and undeniable. In the first place, his original search for the essence of poetry was

effectively appropriated by the Rasa-dhvani theorists and the Dhvani-kāra and Anandavardhana acknowledged this. They however considered Vāmana's attempt to be an external analysis of poetry and in this they were right² from their own point of view. But the fact remains that Vāmana showed the way to, if not actually accomplished a deeper analysis of, the facts of poetry. Secondly, it was Vāmana, who following perhaps the tradition prevailing in his Rīti school clearly analysed for the first time the different elements of poetry considering some of them to be essential and others non-essential.

Bearing in mind the limitation that Vāmana's scheme is more or less formal, we must note that unlike his predecessors Vāmana insisted upon a clear-cut distinction between the Guṇa and the Alaṅkāra. Among his immediate predecessors Bhāmaha does not appear to observe any theoretical distinction between these two elements while Daṇḍin observes the distinction in so far as the one may constitute the essential

2 [There is one fundamental point in which the Dhvani theorists differed from Vāmana viz., that while Vāmana considered the *guṇa* and *doṣa* to be properties of *śabda* and *artha* the Dhvani theorists regarded them as the *dharma* of the unexpressed sense which takes the form of *rasa-dhvani*. In this they, no doubt, mark an advance upon the merely formal analysis, and from their own point of view they could characterise Vāmana's scheme as inadequate. But even their own scheme was, in a sense, as formal as Vāmana's. When they insisted upon *dhvani* or suggestion as the essence of poetry they no doubt went a step further and clearly realised that there was something in poetry beyond what is merely expressed, and this unexpressed sense is the most essential. When this unexpressed element is a mood or feeling they thought it to be the most desirable, in deference to their preference of sentimental poetry. But this mood or sentiment they considered to be nothing more than a relishable condition of aesthetic pleasure in the reader's mind, produced by the effect of the poet's representation. They clearly realised no doubt this aesthetic fact, but they still measured the essence of poetry by its effect, and presented external means for producing it. They never considered poetry as a production of the poet's mind, as an externalisation of an internal aesthetic fact, conceived and shaped by the poetic imagination and irreducible as a separate aesthetic fact to a cut-and-dried scheme prescribed by poetics. No doubt externalisation is an important fact, and as such deserves the attention of the theorists, for the poet must express his conception through the external medium. But the internal poetic *idea* as an aesthetic fact cannot be ignored, and the analysis of this process of poetic creation is as important as an analysis of the process of externalisation.]

—S.K.D.

characteristics of a specific diction and the other may exist in all kinds of diction.

We have seen that Daṇḍin offers a general definition of *Alaṃkāra* as embellishment *per se*, and in this view he influences Vāmana to whom poetry is charming by reason of its *Alaṃkāra* which term is employed by Vāmana in the general sense of poetic beauty (*saundarya*).³ If it is asked how does this *saundarya* arise, Vāmana would reply that it arises from the avoidance and utilisation respectively of the technical poetic faults (*doṣas*) on the one hand and the technical poetic excellences (*guṇas*) and figures of poetry (*alaṃkāras*) on the other. The poetic figures like *upamā*, *rūpaka* etc., for which the term *alaṃkāra* is used in a narrow sense are employed in poetry; in so far as they help the realisation of poetic beauty or *Alaṃkāra* in the wider sense by which alone poetry is acceptable. Thus Vāmana gives a definite and clear shape to the position of Daṇḍin who describes the term *alaṃkāra* generally as *kāvya śobhākara dharmā*, which terms may be equally applied to the *guṇa* as well as to the technical *alaṃkāra* or poetic figures. The only difference in Daṇḍin's opinion lies in the supposition that the *guṇas* are essentially important in the best mode or *mārga* whereas the *alaṃkāras* may exist in any *mārga*; or as Vāmana puts it, the *guṇas* are permanent or essential (*nitya*) and the *alaṃkāras* are variable or non-essential (*anitya*) characteristics of poetry. All this naturally prepares us for Vāmana's teaching in the beginning of the third chapter, where the *guṇas* are defined generally as those elements which go to embellish poetic beauty (*kāvya śobhāyāḥ kartāro dharmāḥ*) while the *alaṃkāras* like *upamā*, *yamaka* etc. are said to heighten the beauty thus produced (*tad-atīśaya-hetavas tvalaṃkārah*). And hence the *guṇas* are taken as inseparable attributes of poetry and consequently the *alaṃkāras* which are not absolutely indispensable for the production of the charm of poetry but may serve to heighten it when produced, are relegated to a subordinate position as an element of poetry. The analogy which later writers found between the *guṇas* and qualities of energy, sweetness, residing inseparably as virtues of the human soul as well as the analogy between the *alaṃkāras* or poetic figures and

3 It should be noted that this *saundarya* Vāmana never attempts to define or describe but merely considers the means by which it can be attained.

ornaments on the human body (which embellish indirectly through the sound and sense the underlying soul of sentiment but not invariably) seems to have been explained by Vāmana in the two illustrative verses cited under iii, 1, 2. But it must be clearly understood from Vāmana's treatment that he would regard both the *guṇa* and the *alaṃkāra* (although in different degrees) as the properties of *śabda* and *artha*.

As the means of arriving at poetic beauty, in Vāmana's opinion, is the avoidance of *doṣas* and the utilisation of *guṇas* and *alaṃkāras*, Vāmana, like his predecessors, lays down clearly at the outset that poetry must be free from all blemishes or *doṣas*. The *doṣas* are generally defined as "*guṇa-viparyayātmano doṣāḥ*": they are those elements of which the characteristics are opposite to those of the *guṇas* i.e. if the *guṇas* produce the charm of poetry the *doṣas* destroy it. They are classified under four heads according as they belong to a word (*pada*) and its sense (*padārtha*) or to the sentence (*vākya*) and its sense (*vāk्यārtha*). These are again conceived under two different aspects (*vṛtti* on ii, 2, 24) viz., (1) *sthūla doṣas* which are *doṣas* by themselves, and (2) *sūkṣma doṣas* which are such only in reference to particular *guṇas*.⁴ Bearing in mind Vāmana's definition of *doṣa* as the opposite of the *guṇa* as an element, the first of these sets of *doṣas* would mean those general defects which mar poetic beauty in general just in the same way as the *guṇas* create it. The *sūkṣma doṣas*, on the other hand, would correspond to those *viparyayas* of Daṇḍin which may be considered as 'opposites' and are marked by characteristics which are exactly contrary to those of the corresponding *guṇas*. Thus *śaithilya* which is a characteristic of the excellence *Prasāda* would become a veritable contrary *doṣa* to the *guṇa ojas*, if it is not used along with that *guṇa*. Similarly all the other *śabdaguṇas* excepting *Samādhi* and two of the

4 This classification is not expressly discussed. Vāmana only states at the end of his treatment of *doṣas* that he shall mention *sūkṣma doṣas* in connection with his consideration of the *guṇas* (*ye tvanye śabdārthar—doṣāḥ sūkṣmās te guṇa-vivecane vakṣyante*). From this Gopendra Tippa Bhupala remarks that the *doṣas* treated in ii, 1 are to be known as *sthūla*: *asminnadhikaraṇe lakṣaṇīyā doṣāḥ. . . . sthūlā ityavagantavam* (com. on ii, 1, 3). Vāmana also speaks of *upamā-doṣas* as a separate class of *doṣas* following perhaps Daṇḍin's earlier mention of such *doṣas*.

arthaguṇas, namely, Prasāda and Samatā, have been shown to possess some corresponding *sūkṣma* or *viparyaya doṣas*, although the names of the *viparyayas* are not clearly mentioned. Thus Vāmana, unlike Bharata and Daṇḍin, would apparently employ the term *viparyaya* as 'opposite' in connection with both sets of *doṣas*; and in thus clearly enunciating and enumerating these technical and *viparyaya* sets of *doṣas* he anticipated and influenced later writers like Bhoja and Prakāśavarṣa.

Informations are lacking as to how far exactly the Rīti and Guṇa theories may be traced back in the history of poetics. Bharata's *guṇas*, which are the same as those of Daṇḍin in name and number, were treated in connection with the drama and in such phrases of Bharata as *kāvya-guṇa* or *guṇāḥ kāvyeṣu kīrtitāḥ* we may explain the word *kāvya* as the *drśya* variety of poetry (i.e. drama), since Bharata's *guṇas*, like his *doṣas* and *alamkāras* constitute the *vācikābhinaya* or *anubhāva*. But at the same time it would not be unreasonable to assume that even in Bharata's time the *kāvya-guṇa* must have been known although he himself speaks of it as *nāṭyāśraya* just as the *alamkāras* and the *lakṣaṇas* are spoken of in the same connexion. The theory of Rīti does not naturally find any place in Bharata's treatment where the *guṇa* is discussed as an absolute entity. So far as our present knowledge goes Daṇḍin is the first to enumerate and discuss the *Guṇa* in connection with the Rīti. Vāmana, in support of the definition of each of his Rītis, cites a verse each from some unknown source where the Rītis are found to have been defined, amongst other characteristics, in terms of the *guṇas* and which was later on appropriated by Bhoja in his definitions of the different Rītis both in sense and in expression. Then again in the chapter dealing with *śabda-guṇas* he cites a series of verses which correspond to his own definitions of the *śabda-guṇas*. It is evident from these *saṃgraha* or *parikara ślokas* as well as from what is said above that the Rīti and Guṇa theories had a long history behind it even before Vāmana came into the field, and that he was following a tradition prevailing in the school to which he belonged. These works are lost. If they had existed they would have shown us the theory in the making.

Although Vāmana theoretically follows his predecessors Bharata and

Daṇḍin in the number and nomenclature of his *guṇas*, yet he practically doubles the number by splitting up each of the *guṇas* as relating to the *śabda* or to the *artha*. The distinction between the *śabda-guṇa* and the *artha-guṇa*, the *śabda-doṣa* and the *artha-doṣa* and the *śabdā-lamkāra* and the *arthālamkāra* as standardised by Vāmana, was accepted and developed by later writers till the Rasadhvani theorists like Mammata and Viśvanātha criticised the inadequacy or uselessness of such a distinction especially in the case of the *guṇas*. It is not known whether the distinction between the *śabda-guṇa* and the *artha-guṇa* was at all known to Bharata and Daṇḍin, but if we examine these *guṇas* as they are defined in the light of this criterion we may assume that most of the *guṇas* of Bharata and Daṇḍin are of the nature of either the *śabda-guṇa* or the *artha-guṇa* although no such clear distinction is made by them. It is worthy of note here that Vāmana does not quote any verse in support of the definition of his *artha-guṇas*, as he does in the case of his *śabda-guṇas*. Hence, in the absence of any previous work dealing with such an analysis of each *guṇa*, we are inclined to conclude that Vāmana was the first to evolve this two-fold division of each of the *guṇas*. His insight read a new meaning in the *guṇas* of his predecessors as a result of which he analysed this *guṇa* concept, formed a new theory of classification and consequently influenced the later writers, some of whom evolved even a third set of *guṇas* belonging at once both to the *śabda* and the *artha*.

Vāmana's scheme of *guṇas* has thus been elaborately treated under two heads as a *śabda-guṇa* and an *artha-guṇa* respectively:—

I. OJAS:—(i) *gāḍha-bandhatra* or compactness of word-structure, by which is meant perhaps the cohesiveness due to the frequent use of conjunct consonants specially of the letters of the same *varga* or of any other letter conjoined with *ra* or *ya*. In the example *vilulita-makarandā mañjarīr nartayanti*, Vāmana apparently thinks, there is compactness of structure due to the conjunction of consonants like *n* and *d*, *n* and *t*, *r* and *n* etc., and consequently it contains Ojas which is not present in the example that follows, viz., *vilulita-madhuhārā mañjarīr lolayanti* where the conjunct consonants

noted above are lacking. There are indeed two conjunct consonants in this latter illustration: but they are apparently taken to have created a looseness in the structure which is the characteristic of another *guṇa* viz., Prasāda. Vāmana does not give any details, but his compactness of structure is probably due to the avoidance of loose syllables or more likely by their appearance along with comparatively harsh ones, producing, as a total effect, a cohesiveness in the structure. It is probably through this consideration that S. K. De has taken Vāmana's *śabdaguṇa* (O)jas to correspond to Daṇḍin's Śleṣa.

(ii) *arthasya prauḍhiḥ* or boldness in the expression of ideas, which has been explained in the *vṛtti* in five different ways. These are (1) *Piṇḍārthe vākya-vacanam* i.e. the use of a series of words instead of a single word e.g. *nayanasaṃuttham jyotir atreḥ* instead of *candra*; (2) *Vākyaṛthe padābhidhā* or the use of a single word in order to convey the meaning of a sentence e.g. the word *nimīṣati* instead of using *divyeyam na bhavati kintu mānuṣi* from the convention that gods never wink; (3) *Vyāsa* or analytic expression of ideas by a diffuseness in which several sentences are employed to denote a single idea e.g. the illustrative verse *ayam nānākāro* etc., consists of as many as five sentences used to denote a single idea, namely happiness and sorrow revolve according to the dictates of destiny; (4) *Samāsa* or synthetic expression of ideas by a brevity in which the meanings of several sentences are incorporated in a single sentence, e.g. the illustrative verse, *te himālayam* etc., where we have a single sentence in place of the following several sentences: they took leave of Himālaya—they saw Śiva—they reported their success to him—they were dismissed by Śiva—they flew away to the skies; (5) *asya (arthasya) sābhiprāyatvam* i.e. where qualifying ideas are added with a special purpose or significance. The *Kāmadhenu* explains the word *sābhiprāyatvam* as *padāntara-prayogam antareṇa tad-artha-pratyāyana-prāgalbhyam*. In the example given *so'yaṃ samprapti* etc. (the young son of Candragupta, bright as the moon, has, by good luck, succeeded in his labour and become the support of the learned) the expression 'support of the learned' (*āśrayaḥ kṛta-dhiyām*) has been added with the special purpose of indicating the fact that the prince had Vasubandhu (or Subhandhu) as his counsellor. Similarly the example 'on the loosening of the hair of the lady'

(*vigalitabandhe keśahaste*) who possess beautiful hair (*sukeśyāḥ*), the qualifying phrase has been inserted with a special significance.⁵

I. PRASĀDA:—(i) *śaiṭhilyam* or looseness of structure. Anticipating the objection that this constitutes a veritable *doṣa* since it is the negation of the *guṇa* Ojas, Vāmana replies that Prasāda as a *śabda guṇa* is an excellence only when it appears along with ojas (*guṇaḥ samplavāt*) and not by itself (*śuddhas tu doṣa eva*). Again, if it is asked how can these contradictory attributes appear together, Vāmana would appeal to the common experience of persons who enjoy pleasure and pain simultaneously when they witness an exhibition full of pathos. Hemacandra and Māṇikyacandra, however, would reject such an appeal remarking in accordance with the views of the post-dhvani theorists that the audience derive only pleasure and not pain from such exhibitions. Vāmana adds that in such cases of combination of the two excellences there is sometimes equality between the two and sometimes superiority of the one to the other (*sāmyotkarṣau*).

(ii) *arthavaimalyam* or clearness of meaning, arising from the mention of what is absolutely necessary (*prayojaka-mātra-pada-parigraha*).

5 Govinda explains the word *sābhiprāyatvam* as *prakṛtārtho-pa-yuktatvam* i.e., suitability to the subject-matter in hand remarks that the qualifying adjectives *mahaujasaḥ* (highly vigours), *mānadhanāḥ* (rich in self-respect), etc. in the verse

mahaujaso mānadhanā dhanārecitāḥ
dhanurbhṛtaḥ saṃyati labdhakīrtayaḥ |
nasamhatās tasya nabhinna-vṛttayaḥ
priyāṇi vāñchantyasūbhiḥ samīhitum || (Kirāta, 1, 18)

go to support the statement in the last line of the verse viz., they tried to do good to him even at the cost of their own lives. Other commentators of the *Kāvya-prakāśa* are inclined to explain the word *asya* in the *vṛtti* as referring to *śabda*; but the difficulty is that the context in Vāmana does not permit us to interpret the word *asya* in this way. It should, on the other hand, refer to *artha*. Māṇikyacandra (p. 194) seems to be of opinion that the *abhiprāya* or special significance belongs primarily to the words of the speaker, and that when it is said that this is an excellence belonging to the sense we are to understand that this is merely a secondary or analogical usage. It appears that these commentators are anxious to approximate this aspect of Vāmana's *artha-guṇa Ojas* to the poetic figure Parikara of later writers, which has been defined by Ruyyaka as *viśeṣaṇa sābhiprāyaṭvam*.

In *savarṇā kanyakā* etc. ('a maiden of the same caste endowed with beauty and budding youth') the qualifying adjectives are not superfluous. In the case of the illustration of the *viparyaya-doṣu* that immediately follows viz., *upāstāṃ hasto me* etc. (let my hand approach the girdle zone of beautiful gems), the mention of girdle zone only is what is necessary and the epithet of 'beautiful gems' is superfluous. The *Kāmadhenu* hints at an objection that this *arthaguṇa* prasāda is unnecessary for it might be included in the fifth variety of the *arthapraudhi* where particular words are not used without a special significance. But the two types are clearly distinguishable, for in the one some words are absolutely necessary in order that the passage might fit in with the context instead of being meaningless; in the other, they bear a special significance without which, however, the composition would not be defective. Vāmana's *artha-vaimalya* is really the excellent literary quality which avoids superfluity.

III. SLEṢA :—(i) *Masṛṇatvam* or smoothness, resulting from such a close proximity or coalescence of several words that they all appear to constitute a single whole. Although the definition is generally intelligible, it is difficult to understand why of the illustrations given some in the opinion of Vāmana contain Śleṣa and others do not. Should we be led, by the hints given in the *Kāmadhenu*, to understand that in the defective examples *sūtraṃ brāhmaṇa uraḥsthale* and *taḍitkalilam ākāśam*, the characteristic namely *ekavad-bhāsamānatā* is lacking due to the difficulties of smooth pronunciation, and also that in the defective example *bhramari-valgugītayaḥ* the effect of smoothness has been spoilt by reason of the use of the word *valgu* instead of *mañju*? Even then we are inclined to ask on what standard the effect of smoothness is to be judged except by the rather uncertain and variable standard of individual appreciation?

(ii) *Ghaṭanā* or commingling or congruity of ideas. *Ghaṭanā* has been explained by Vāmana as *krama-kauṭilyā-nulbanatvopapatti-yogaḥ* (effecting congruity between incongruous ideas by means of a crooked or clever procedure) which Rāmasiṃha⁶ interprets as *kramena kauṭilyenā-nulbanatayā upapattiyā yojanam arthasya śleṣaḥ* etc.....

⁶ *Sarasvatikanṭhābharana* (K.M. edition), p. 63.

*aghaṭamānasyeva vākyaṛthasya buddhi-cāturyeṇa ghaṭanā iti vākyaṛ-
thah* (the meaning implied is a clever bringing about of congruity
between apparently incongruous ideas). In the illustration given by
Vāmana there is *ghaṭanā* or congruity of ideas, since the hero cleverly
manages to please two heroines simultaneously which is otherwise a
difficult task. Abhinavagupta, in his attempt to approximate Bharata's
Śleṣa to Vāmana's, takes the same verse as an illustration and remarks:—
*atra manorathātīto 'py ekakānta-nāyikā-yugala-hṛdaya-grahaṇa-lakṣa-
ṇārthah.....asambhavanāspadam na bhavati; tena kuṭilo'pi ayam
kramo na hṛdaye ulbanatram bhajate majjati hṛdaye yataḥ sarvasyeti.*⁷

IV. SAMATA:—(i) *mārgābhedaḥ*, *yena mārgeṇopakramas tasyā-
tyāgaḥ* or homogeneity of diction from the beginning to the end.
The blemish⁸ which arises from a disregard of this excellence is illus-
trated by the verse *Prasīda caṇḍi tyaja manyam aṅjasū* etc., where
the verse begins in the active voice but ends in the passive (*trayā
luptavilāsam āsyate*). The *Kāmadhenu* explains *mārgābheda* as *ādi-
madhyāvasāneṣvaika-rūpyam*, uniformity throughout in the beginning,
the middle and the end.

(ii) *avaiṣamyam* or (1) *prakramābhedaḥ*, i.e. non-relinquish-
ment of proper sequence of ideas. (2) *sugamatram* i.e. ease
of comprehension. The illustrative verse *cyuta-sumanasaḥ kundālḥ
puṣpodgameṣū alasā drumāl malayamarutaḥ sarpantīme* etc., being a
description of *ṛtu-sandhi* (the period when the winter has just
ended and the spring has just set in) the mention of *malaya-marut*,
which belongs exclusively to the spring, has given rise to some in-
consistency. This inconsistency, however, can be avoided if we replace
the reading in the second foot by *manasi ca giram badhnantīme kiranti
na kokilāḥ* (the cuckoos have prepared their melodies but have not
yet poured them in), which clearly indicates the end of winter and

7 (Probably *ghaṭanā* may suggest, from the definition, "the fitness or pro-
priety arising out of a judicious balance (neither more nor less) of order and
irregularity of ideas. The difficulty is with regard to the word *anulbanā* which
means "not excessive, neither more nor less" but it may also mean "not
manifest"). S. K. D.

8 This so-called *sūkṣma-doṣa* corresponds to the blemish namely *prakrama-
bhaṅga* of later writers.

the beginning of spring. We may note here that Daṇḍin's definition of Samatā, even though partially equivalent to that of Vāmana, refers only to the uniformity of syllabic structure, whereas Vāmana's definition of Samatā as a *śabda-guṇa* refers to the uniformity of diction and as an *artha-guṇa* it insists upon a proper sequence of ideas. Hemacandra and Māṇikyacandra⁷ attribute to Vāmana's school a strange remark that in their opinion the uniformity of syllabic structure as defined by Daṇḍin can be included in the Vṛttis and as such Daṇḍin's Samatā is not a special *guṇa*. Hence the necessity of a new definition of this *guṇa* by Vāmana. But we must not forget that the Vṛttis are not separately mentioned by Vāmana, nor does Daṇḍin take them into account. Vāmana's Samatā would appear to be akin to Daṇḍin's; but the latter speaks only of the symmetry of structure, while the former includes symmetry of structure of diction and of ideas in this *guṇa*. Vāmana's Samatā may thus be taken to have been directly developed from Daṇḍin's.

V. SAMĀDHI:—(i) *ūrohāvarohakramah*, which has been explained in two ways. In the first place it means symmetry due to the orderly sequence of ascent or descent. This occurs when there is a gradual rise from the feeble to the vigorous diction, or a gradual decline from the vigorous to the feeble i.e. an alternating graduation of the soft and the forcible diction. Or, secondly it may occur when the wording is such that the heightening effect of the vigorous diction is toned down by a judicious sprinkling of softening words and *vice-versa*.

It may be objected that this Samādhi cannot be a separate excellence by itself because the ascent and descent are nothing more than the excellences of Ojas and Prasāda. Vāmana denies this and points out that it is not absolutely and universally true that in Ojas there is ascent or in Prasāda there is descent. The Ojas and Prasāda are often interwoven and exist like the two currents of a single river. Vāmana, however, would accept the position if it is conceded that the ascent and descent occur in a certain heightened stage (*tivrāvasthā*) of Ojas and Prasāda because in this case the ascent and descent depend upon *other circumstances and not merely on Ojas and Prasāda*. Hence, there can be no

objection to accepting Samādhi as a separate excellence on the basis of ascent and descent, it being understood that the ascent and descent depend upon the excellence which do not consist in them. In other words, ascent and descent are not the essential but accidental or specific characteristics of Ojas and Prasāda, whenever these two excellences attain a special heightened stage the ascent and descent may occur in some of their parts. It must also be understood that the ascent and descent do not refer to the way or tone of reading.

(ii) *artha-dr̥ṣṭiḥ*, or the excellence which leads to a concentration of the mind for the proper comprehension of the meaning. From this point of view Vāmana classifies the *artha* or the meaning broadly into two classes namely:—(1) *ayoni* or absolutely original and (2) *anyacchāyā-yoni* or borrowed from some other source. The two varieties of *artha* have been illustrated respectively in the verses:—

(1) *āsvapehi mama śīdhubhājanāt*

yāvad agradaśanair na duśyase|

candra maddaśanamaṇḍalāṅkitah

kham na yāsyasi hi rohiṇībhayāt||

(2) *mā bhaiḥ śaśānka mama śīdhuni nāsti rūhuḥ*

khe rohiṇī vasati kūtara kiṃ vibheṣi|

prāyo vidagdha-vaṇitā-nava-saṅgameṣu

pumsām manaḥ pracalatīti kim atra citram||

Here the second verse has no doubt been put in a more charming way, but the idea has been borrowed from the first, and hence it is *anyacchāyā-yoni*. In the first, the moon has been asked to go away lest bearing the marks of teeth of the speaker he should have reasonable grounds of apprehensions from Rohiṇī, his legitimate wife. In the second, the moon has been asked to come down to the speaker dispelling all his fears from Rāhu and Rohiṇī. But when the moon did not come down in spite of her entreaties the speaker ascribed his shirking to the fact that men get nervous in the company of clever ladies.

The *artha* is further classified into (1) *vyakta* or explicit and (2) *sūkṣma* or the subtle, of which the latter is again of two kinds, namely (a) *bhāvya* or that which is comprehended by a little thought and (b) *vāsāniya* or that which is more abstruse and is comprehended only by deep thought.

VI. MADHURYA :—(i) *l'ṛthak-padatva*, or distinctness of words arising from the exclusion of long compounds (*samāsa-dairghya-nivṛtti-param*). The example, which Vāmana cites of the *viparyaya* of this excellence contains a long compound. Herein we find a contrast between the views of Daṇḍin and Vāmana. In the former, the profusion of compound words which are supposed to add force and energy to the diction, constitutes a special excellence namely Ojas: it is extolled as the very soul of prose (*gadyasya jīvitam*), but in the latter it is a clear *doṣa* which should be avoided. But we cannot reconcile this view of Vāmana's about the avoidance of long compounds with his characterisation of the Gaudīyā Rīti (i. 2, 12) which is supposed to abound in long compounds and high sounding words: and the verse *dordandāñcīta-candra-śekhara-dhanur* etc., which is given as illustrating the Gaudīyā-Rīti, actually contains a series of long compounds. It is possible, therefore, that, although, Vāmana does not explicitly speak of compound words in connection with his *śabda-guṇa* Ojas, these are implied in his conception of the compactness of structure which is more likely the effect of long compounds¹⁰ than of certain conjunct consonants as has been hitherto suggested.

(ii) *Ukti-vaicitrya* or strikingness of utterance by which is meant perhaps a statement in an impressive but periphrastic manner in order to give a special charm to the expression. In the illustration given of this excellence *rasarad amṛtam kaḥ sandehaḥ* etc. the whole verse wants to say that the lips of the heroine excel all standards of comparison: but this has been expressed in an indirect and charming way.¹¹

VII. SAUKUMARYA :—(i) *ajarathatva* or freedom from the harshness which generally arises from the use of *parusa*¹² or harsh

10 S. P. Bhattacharyya, The Gauḍi Riti in theory and practice in *I.H.Q.*, June 1927, p. 380.

11 [This *ukti-vaicitrya* must not be taken in the specific technical sense in which Kuntaka takes it as an element of his *rakrokti*, nor in the sense of *vaicitrya* which Mammaṭa (*vṛtti* on viii, 2 also on x, i) finds in poetic figures].—S. K. D.

12 As for the *parusa* and *komala* syllables see my article on Daṇḍin's conception of the Guṇas in *I.H.Q.* March 1931,

syllables and conjunct consonants. Here Vāmana does not differ essentially from Daṇḍin who, however, defines this excellence as that which for the most part has no harsh syllables.

(ii) *apāruṣyam* or avoidance of statements that convey disagreeable or inauspicious ideas e.g. the use of *yasaḥ-śeṣam gatam* instead of *mṛtam*, or of *devatādvitīyam* in place of *ekākinam*. This agreeableness of sense is also implied in Bharata in the *guṇa* of the same name.

VIII. UDĀRATĀ:—(i) *bandhasya vikaṭatram* or a certain liveliness of the composition in which the words seem as if they are dancing (*yasmin sati nṛtyantīva padāni*). In other words it is *līlāyāmānātra*, which enlivens the composition with a peculiar swing of words.

(ii) *agrāmyatram* or delicacy due to the avoidance of vulgarity. In the example given *tram evam-saundaryā* etc., the union of lovers has been delicately hinted at; but the example of the corresponding *viparyaya* is extremely vulgar¹³ in expression. It is to be noted here that like Daṇḍin's *Arthavyakti* and *Artha-mādhurya*, Vāmana's *Saukumārya* and *Udāratā* (*artha*) have been negatively conceived, and thus they give rise to a lack of uniformity in Vāmana's conception and treatment of the *guṇas*.

IX. ARTHAVYAKTI:—(i) *arthavyakti-hetutram* or explicitness of words whereby the meaning is easily comprehended (*jhaṭityartha-pratipatti-hetutra*). The later writers do not enumerate *Arthavyakti* as a separate *guṇa* including it under *Prasāda*.¹⁴

(ii) *vastu-svabhāva-sphuṭatva* or explicitness of ideas which makes the nature of things clear. This corresponds more or less to Daṇḍin's poetic figure *Svabhāvvyakti*, as has been already shown by S. K. De. For this reason it is regarded later not as a *guṇa* but as an *alamkāra*.

13 For Daṇḍin's views on *uśīla* and *grāmya* the reader is referred to S. K. De's notes on my article on Daṇḍin *op cit*.

14 There is absolutely no cogency in the remarks of Māṇikyacandra and Hemacandra that the following of Vāmana's views saw no distinction between *Prasāda* and *Arthavyakti*.

X. KĀNTI:—(i) *aujvalyam* or richness (of words) without which the composition is stale and a reflection of conventional things (*yad abhāve purānacchāyetyuyate*). The quality consists in the avoidance of the commonplace which a true literary instinct always obeys. The *Kāmadhenu* too remarks that this *guṇa* would mean the use of more polished and elegant words instead of ordinarily used ones, e.g. *kisalaya* for *patra* and so on. In the illustration given by Vāmana the use of the words *kurangi*, *stavakita* and *ālī* perhaps produce *aujvalya* in the composition which would have been flat if more commonplace words like *hariṇī*, *samīha* etc. were used. This excellence would approach very nearly to some aspects of Kuntaka's *vakrokti*.

(ii) *dīpta-rasatva* or conspicuous presence of the Rasa. Abhinavagupta explains *dīpta-rasatva* as *vibhāvādānām dīptatvam iti yāvat*. In other words, the excitants which bring out the emotional elements of a poem are vividly represented by this excellence. Vāmana's illustrative verse *préyān sāyam apākṛtaḥ*¹⁵ etc., vividly depicts the emotional situation and would, in accordance with the views of later theorists, be *sarasa* poetry.

Now that we have studied all the *guṇas* of Vāmana, belonging both to *śabda* and *artha*, we are in a position to judge the intrinsic value of his treatment. We have seen that Vāmana reads a new meaning in the *guṇas* of his predecessors especially in the light of the standard of distinction, evolved by him between a *śabda-guṇa* and an *artha-guṇa*. This standard—as we have also seen—is *āśrayāśrayibhāva* i.e. a *guṇa* is to be called a *śabda-guṇa* or an *artha-guṇa* according as it belongs to the *śabda* or to the *artha*. But it must be said that the distinction is not always definite. It is difficult to see, for instance, why the clearness of meaning (*artha-vaimalya*) in *artha-guṇa Prasāda* which depends upon the mention of what is absolutely necessary (*prayojaka-mātra-pada-parigraha*) should be taken as a distinguishing characteristic of an *artha-guṇa* when it is a characteristic which strictly belongs to a *śabda-guṇa*. Similarly the *artha-guṇa Saukumārya* and the first four varieties of *arthapraudhi* raise a question as to whether they are related really to the sense or to the word. It is also not

15 This well-known verse is also found in the *Advya-prakāśa*, ch. IV

convincing that Samādhi and Arthavyakti should be taken as *śabda-guṇas* in spite of the fact that even in this aspect of theirs the question of *artha* is involved. On the other hand, we have the clear and unambiguous definitions of the two kinds of Sreṣa, Samatā, Mādhurya and Sukumāratā in each of which the twofold character of the *guṇas* has been distinctly preserved. It is true that *śabda* and *artha* cannot be strictly kept apart, like body and soul, and that we are to apply the designation in accordance with the prominence of the one or the other in each aspect of the *guṇas*. But if there is to be a standard of distinction there must be a uniformity in the principle of its application, the lack of which proves the defective nature of the scheme, as well as of the standard itself.

It may also be argued that in as much as the Rīti of which the Guṇa forms the essence has been defined as *pada-racanā*, what is the use of enumerating *artha-guṇas*? We must not forget that the *guṇas* serve to impart a special charm to the word-structure; and so far as that is concerned, it does not matter whether the *guṇas* belong to the word or to the sense, provided that the one does not go without the other. In the case of a particular *artha-guṇa* we are to understand that the *guṇa* serves to impart a speciality to that word-structure to whose sense the particular *guṇa* belongs; or perhaps, it embellishes the sense primarily and directly and the word-structure only secondarily and indirectly. Thus, so long as a formal view of poetry and consequently of its elements is taken, it is really immaterial whether the *guṇa* embellishes the word or its sense; if it adorns the word it can also adorn its sense through association. In the treatment of the Dhvani-theorists the *guṇas* only go to help the awakening of Rasa; they belong neither to the word nor to its sense. They are then primarily the properties of Rasa, and only secondarily of *śabda* and *artha*.

It appears that Vāmana's scheme of the *guṇas* is no less artificial than that of his predecessors Bharata and Daṇḍin. The distinction between one *guṇa* and another is not always convincing nor is the definition of a *guṇa* or a *doṣa* always clear. The characteristics are often not exclusive, and therefore not distinguishing. When Vāmana expounds the *sūtras* with expressions like *yasmin sati nṛtyantīva padāni* or *yasmin sati bahūny api padānyekavad bhāsante* it is difficult to

follow what is really meant. They are rather vague explanations of the particular sūtras.¹⁶ May not the property of *ekavad-bhāsa-mānatā* be also present in Ojas? Do not the examples given under the *śabda-guṇa Prasāda* also contain *līlāyamānatā*, the characteristic particularly spoken of as belonging to *Udāratā*?¹⁷ The illustrations do not help us always in marking the characteristics which differentiate one *guṇa* from the other, and sometimes the same verse is cited as illustration in connection with several *guṇas*.¹⁸ The four characteristics of *arthapraudhi* in Ojas might also be taken as forms of the strikingness of expression which is given as a characteristics of *arthaguṇa Mādhurya*. *Sugamatva* or ease of comprehension as an alternative explanation of *avaiṣamya* in the *artha-guṇa Samatā* might be comprehended in the *artha-guṇa Samādhi*. In presence of this latter *guṇa* there was no need perhaps of the *śabdaguṇa Arthavyakti* when both aim at comprehending the meaning, although his *Samādhi* itself, as S. K. De remarks, "is hardly an excellence." In *śabdaguṇa Samādhi* the expression *ārohāvarohakrama* receives more explanations than one; yet it is not fully clear what constitutes the *viśeṣa*, the *nimitta* of *ārohāvaroha*, the *tivrāvasthā* of Ojas, as well as the *guṇa Samādhi* itself. Vāmana's attempt to justify the *śabdaguṇa Prasāda* clearly indicates, as S. K. De has already pointed out "that Vāmana himself was perhaps conscious of the defective nature of some of his definitions".

But the importance of Vāmana's theory does not consist in the detailed treatment of his individual *guṇas*. His general doctrine of the Rīti and Guṇa has been criticised as too crude and formal an explanation of the charm of poetry, and the defective and unprofitable

16 Or should we understand that the very attempt of an early theoriser like Vāmana to express himself in all possible ways has a particular merit of its own and as such it deserves our commendation?

17 The examples of *śabda-guṇa Prasāda* are all composed in the same metre (Harinī). It is also to be considered if the Guṇas have any relation to particular metres. We should note here the views of one class of theorists who are of opinion that special metres are exclusively meant for particular Guṇas. (Mānikyacandra's *Saṅketā*, p. 195).

18 The verse *asty uttarasyām diśi devatātmā* has been taken to serve as the illustration of as many as four *śabda-guṇas* namely *Śleṣa*, *Mādhurya*, *Arthavyakti* and *Saukumārya*.

character of his scheme has been commented upon. But it was Vāmana, who first emphasised the importance of diction in poetry, which sharply separates literary works from philosophical or technical writings, and thereby suggested a line of enquiry into the essence of poetic charm. Even if the 'beauty' (*kāvya-śobhā*), which he sets forth as the ultimate test of poetry, is supposed to be capable of realisation by a carefully worked out diction, he was the first to emphasise the proper disposition of word and sense and enquire into the flaws and excellences of expression, the facts of externalisation being, in his opinion, an important factor in every consideration of poetry. But since he conceived poetry from a decidedly formal point of view, his system and treatment had to go through the adverse criticism of the Dhvani and Post-dhvani theorists, who analysed the Rīti system and modified it in their more developed conception of poetry.¹⁹

PRAKAS CHANDRA LAHIRI

19 I must acknowledge my great obligations to my teacher Dr. S. K. De under whom these investigations were carried out. He has added some casual notes which have been enclosed within brackets in the foot notes.

Kṛṣṇa and Jarāsandha*

II

There are numerous stray references to Jarāsandha in many passages of the *Mahābhārata*. He is said to be an incarnation of demon Vipracitti.³² It appears that he was present in Draupadī's Svayaṃvara³³ as also in the Svayaṃvara³⁴ of the daughter of Citrāṅgada, a Kalinga king. In the latter Svayaṃvara, Duryōdhana eloped with the bride and Karṇa defended him and vanquished Jarāsandha. Jarāsandha, now grown old, was pleased at Karṇa's valour and gave him the town Mālinī by way of appreciation. In a passage³⁵ which occurs only in the Southern recension, Kṛṣṇa is said to have vanquished Jarāsandha on the bank of the river Sarasvatī. This interpolated

* Continued from p. 508 of vol. VIII, 3 (Sept, 1932).

32 I. 68. 4. विप्रचित्तिरिति ख्यातो य आसीद्दानवर्षभः ।
जरासन्ध इति ख्यातः स आसीन्मनुजर्षभः ॥

33 I. 201. 23ff. Dhṛṣṭadyumna says to Draupadī:—

शिशुपालश्च विक्रान्तो जरासन्धस्तथैव च ।
एते चान्ये च बहवो नानाजनपदेश्वराः ॥
त्वदर्थमागता भद्रे क्षत्रियाः प्रथिता भुवि ।

Much importance, however, cannot be attached to the list of princes given here, since it includes not only contemporary chiefs (e.g. दुर्योधन, कर्ण, शकुनि, विराट, पौण्ड्रक वासुदेव, भगदत्त, शल्य, भूरिश्रवस, सङ्कर्षण, वासुदेव, सात्यकि, कृतवर्मन्, जयद्रथ, शिशुपाल, जरासन्ध etc. etc.) but also such fabulous kings as औशीनर शिबि (whose stories are narrated in the Vanaparva by Mārkaṇḍeya to Yudhiṣṭhira as events of remote past) and even प्रद्युम्न (Kṛṣṇa's son) and अनिरुद्ध (Kṛṣṇa's grandson).

34 XII. 4-5, where Nārada, after the Mahābhārata war, narrates to Yudhiṣṭhira Karṇa's valour in the Svayaṃvara.

35 II. 54. 33, Bhīṣma describing Kṛṣṇa's achievements to Yudhiṣṭhira says:—

.....भगवान्वासवानुजः ।
ततः पार्थिवमायान्तं सहितं सवराजभिः ।
सरस्वत्यां जरासन्धमजयत्युरुषोत्तमः ॥

This chapter along with some preceding and following ones occurs only in the Southern recension of the *Mahābhārata*.

passage seems to bear Purānic spirit and goes against the statements of the portions common to all recensions. In some places it is said that Jarāsandha was slain by Kṛṣṇa. This point will be dealt with later on. Jarāsandha, on learning of Kāṁsa's death at the hands of Kṛṣṇa, is said³⁶ to have furiously hurled his mace at Mathurā to fall at the place subsequently known as Gadāvasāna. Further³⁷ he is said to have hurled his mace at Balarāma who baffled it with his Sthūnākarna missile which together with the mace fell down on the earth destroying Jarā (the Rākṣasī who had united the two halves of Jarāsandha). Kṛṣṇa says that it was due to the loss of this mace of Jarāsandha that Bhīma was later on able to kill him. Further³⁸ Jarāsandha's daughter is said to have been married to Sahadeva, the youngest Pāṇḍava.

The passages on which the above account of Jarāsandha is based are in a few places obscure³⁹ and contradictory;⁴⁰ and supernatural forces are, as usual, active to some extent. Yet we can get therefrom a fair glimpse of Jarāsandha, his achievements and his relations with Kṛṣṇa. While the descriptions of his origin, his being an incarnation of demon Vipracitti and the boon granted to him by Śiva call for a belief in the supernatural, Jarāsandha's supreme strength and equipments, regarded with awe even by his mightiest adversaries, are pre-eminently conspicuous and may be accepted as such on all hands. He seems to have subdued practically all mighty kings of India. Even such kings (e.g. Bhagadatta) as were quite friendly with his adversaries had at least openly to pay homage to him. His valour attracted even the mighty relatives

36 II. 19. 22ff.

37 VII. 182. 2ff, where Kṛṣṇa shows to Arjuna the advantages of the destruction of Jarāsandha and other powerful adversaries before the war.

38 XV. I. 24 and XV. 27. 13.

39 E.g., II. 14. 18. पुरुषोत्तमविज्ञातो योऽसौ चेदिषु दुर्मतिः etc. where the construction is a bit involved and it is not clear whether the reference is to Śiśupāla or to a different Cedi king called Puruṣottama.

40 E.g., 11. 14. 43 अथ हंस इति ख्यातः कञ्चिदासीन्महान्पुः ।

रामेण स हतस्तत्र संग्रामेऽष्टादशावरे ॥

says that Hamsa was killed by Balarāma. But further 11. 14. 46

तथा तु ङिविकं भुत्वा हंसः परपुरञ्जयः ।

प्रपेदे यमुनामेव सौऽपि तस्यां न्यमजत ॥

says that Hamsa drowned himself in the Yamunā out of grief.

(e.g. Bhīṣmaka) of his avowed foes (e.g. Kṛṣṇa). Practically the whole country fell under his sway as is clear enough from the confessions of Kṛṣṇa and Yudhiṣṭhira as also from several other references.⁴¹ The description of his confinement of a number of kings perhaps means² that such kings as did not readily agree to pay homage to him were taken captive and confined by him in his capital. The idea of his proposed sacrifice of the kings to Śiva was perhaps invented later on to magnify Kṛṣṇa's achievement in having Jarāsandha slain by Bhīma and rescuing the kings. The idea seems to be based on Jarāsandha's excessive devotion to Śiva which, as also his hospitality to guests and partiality for Brāhmaṇas, may be accepted as facts.

His relation with Kaṁsa and alliance with Śiśupāla, Pauṇḍraka Vāsudeva etc. also seem to be facts. But with all that his seems to be the supreme strength. Testimony is borne to this by the fact that while Kṛṣṇa could himself kill Kaṁsa, Śiśupāla etc., he and his party could not face Jarāsandha openly on the battle-field when he came to avenge Kaṁsa's death but had to go from Mathurā to Dvārakā for safety. Again Śiśupāla and Pauṇḍraka Vāsudeva, strengthened by their alliance with Jarāsandha, could do whatever they liked and felt no scruple in offending Kṛṣṇa a number of times.⁴³ Kṛṣṇa had to tolerate all these offences and perhaps his alleged pardon of Śiśupāla's hundred offences was rather meant to avoid danger from Jarāsandha than to fulfil his alleged promise⁴⁴ to Śiśupāla's mother. For it may not

41 E.g., V. 51. 38 ff. Dhṛtarāṣṭra to Sañjaya says:

कृत्स्नं यं पृथिवी देवी जरासन्धेन धीमता ।
मागधेन्द्रेण बलिना वशे कृत्वा प्रतापिता ॥
भीष्मप्रतापास्फुरवो नयेनान्धकवृष्णायः ।
यज्ञ तस्य वशं जग्मुः केवलं दैवमेव तत् ॥

42 The *Bhāgavata Purāna* agrees with this view. Vide X. 70. 24—

ये च दिग्विजये तस्य संनतिं न ययुर्नृपाः ।
प्रसङ्गं रुद्धास्तेनासन्नयुते द्वे गिरिव्रजे ॥

43 Vide II. 14. 10 ff, II. 14. 19 ff, II. 68. 15 ff (where Kṛṣṇa enumerates a number of Śiśupāla's offences and concludes

जरासन्धं समाभित्य कृतवान् विप्रियाणि मे ।
तानि सर्वाणि संख्यातुं तं शक्नोमि नराधिपाः ॥)

44 II. 66 and 68.

be a sheer accident that the term of the promise ended with Jarāsandha's death. How Śiśupāla and Pauṇḍraka Vāsudeva lost their real strength with Jarāsandha's death is clear from the fact that immediately after, Śiśupāla was slain⁴⁵ by Kṛṣṇa in an open fight with little effort and Pauṇḍraka Vāsudeva was subdued⁴⁶ by Bhīma during the course of his *Digvijaya*.

The defeat of Kṛṣṇa and his people at the hands of Jarāsandha is an affair of outstanding importance. Kṛṣṇa confesses his incompetence in resisting Jarāsandha's forces that compelled him and his people to leave their birth-place Mathurā and to shift to distant Dvārakā. The case seems to be still worse. It appears that Kṛṣṇa was actually defeated and taken captive by Jarāsandha and was afterwards released with humiliation. Not only does Śiśupāla, Kṛṣṇa's adversary, refer⁴⁷ to this event but also Vaiśampāyana, whose excessive devotion to Kṛṣṇa cannot be questioned, being noticeable everywhere⁴⁸ in the *Mahābhārata*, mentions⁴⁹ it in his narration to Janamejaya. The ब्राह्मी आज्ञा (command of Brahmadeva) referred to in 11. 22. 44-45 cursing Jarāsandha to be slain by someone other than Kṛṣṇa and the Yādavas, perhaps only hints at Kṛṣṇa's incompetence to kill Jarāsandha.

The Jarāsandha episode sheds light on one more important point in the life of Kṛṣṇa which is rarely mentioned in the *Mahābhārata* and seems to mark the primitive stage in the development of his character. The defeat of Jarāsandha, which formerly was an impossible task

45. II. 70.

46. II. 31. 22 ff. where a couplet (interpolated?) also says—

इदानीं वृष्णिवीरेण न योत्स्यामीति पौरुडकः ।

कृष्णस्य भुजसंत्रासात्करमाशु ददौ नृपः ॥

47. II. 65. 1 ff. स मे बहुमतो राजा जरासन्धो महाबलः ।

योऽनेन युद्धं नेयेषः दासोऽयमिति संयुगे ॥ etc.

48. E.g., I. 62. 36; I. 64. 141 ff. etc.

49. II. 23. 32 ff. ततः श्रुत्वा जरासन्धो माधवेन हतं युधि ।

शूरसेनाधिपं चक्रे कंसपुत्रं तदा नृप ॥

स सैन्यं महदुत्थाप्य वासुदेवं प्रगृह्य च ।

अभ्यपिब्रूत्सुतं तत्र सुताया जनमेजय ॥

for Kṛṣṇa in spite of his political skill and the huge and strong Yādava forces commanded by him, became possible to him with the aid of the Pāṇḍavas. Of course, all the tactics that enabled Bhīma to kill Jarāsandha must be attributed to Kṛṣṇa and it cannot be denied that the Pāṇḍavas were almost always dependent on Kṛṣṇa for their political and spiritual guidance. Still the fact that Kṛṣṇa's tactics could bear no fruit previously shows that most of the success in the achievement is to be attributed to the physical strength of Bhīma who is said to have previously killed Hidimba, Baka and several other demons. With Jarāsandha's death Kṛṣṇa and the Yādavas were not only relieved of an old enemy but the way was made clear to Kṛṣṇa to gain subsequently an unquestionable supremacy. Hence, at least in the primitive stage, Kṛṣṇa and the Yādavas seem to have considerably depended for their welfare and progress on the strength of the Pāṇḍavas. It is interesting to note here that while the entire *Mahābhārata* abounds in passages like त्वया नाथेन गोविन्द नाथवन्तो वयं (=पाण्डवाः) सदा etc., it is in the Jarāsandha episode that we meet with a rare passage like पाण्डवैश्चापि सततं नाथवन्तो वयं (=कृष्णादियादवाः) नृप (II. 14.67).

It is not possible to decide from the *Mahābhārata* when exactly Kṛṣṇa and his people migrated to Dvārakā. The migration, however, must have taken place before the first meeting of Kṛṣṇa and the Pāṇḍavas that took place in Draupadī's Svayamvara. Kṛṣṇa, after the Svayamvara, had accompanied⁵⁰ the Pāṇḍavas to Hastināpura and thence he is said⁵¹ to have returned to Dvārakā and not to Mathurā. The connection, however, of the Yādavas with Mathurā does not seem to have completely ceased, for Kṛṣṇa is said⁵² to have presented to the Pāṇḍavas a number of cows from Mathurā after the marriage of Arjuna and Subhadrā.

Now as to the way in which Jarāsandha was killed, it is quite clear

- 50 I. 226. 18 ff. पाण्डवाश्चैव कृष्णाश्च विदुरश्च महामतिः ।
आदाय द्रौपदीं कृष्णां कुन्तीं चैव यशस्विनीम् ॥
सविहारं सुखं जग्मुर्नगरं नागसाहयम् ।
- 51 I. 227. 109. तान्निवेश्य ततो वीरः सह रामेणां कौरवान् ।
ययौ द्वारवतीं राजम्पाण्डवानुमते तदा ॥
- 52 I. 247. 39. सहस्रं प्रददौ कृष्णो गवामयुतमेव च ।
श्रीमान्माथुरदेश्यानां दोग्धीणां पुरयवचसाम् ॥

that his enemies had recourse to most unfair means. The way in which Kṛṣṇa, Bhīma and Arjuna enter into his palace in the garb of Snātaka Brāhmaṇas, take advantage of his liberality to Brāhmaṇas and guests, and commence the fight in the midnight, perhaps with a view to deprive him of all aid from outside, goes unmistakably to show their unfairness on their part. Śiśupāla speaking to Bhīma most upspringly 'deprecates'⁵³ this act of Kṛṣṇa and the Pāṇḍavas, Śiśupāla's view can not be rejected merely because it comes from an enemy of Kṛṣṇa, since Kṛṣṇa himself says⁵⁴ to Yudhiṣṭhira that, it being impossible even for the collected force of gods and demons to vanquish Jarāsandha in an open fight, recourse to tactics (involving, of course, unfair dealings) is necessary for killing him. Further it appears that Jarāsandha at this time had grown very old as is clear from the description⁵⁵ given by Nārada as one "overpowered with old age" at a much earlier date, i.e., when he was vanquished by Karna. Hence Jarāsandha at the time of his slaughter must have been considerably advanced in age and was consequently not equally matched with Bhīma, a growing giant, in a single encounter. Thus the unfairness of the means employed in killing him is established by various evidences.

53 II. 65. 1 ff. स मे बहुमतो राजा जरासन्धो महाबलः ।
योऽनेन युद्धं नेयेष दासोऽयमिति संयुगे ॥
केचवेन कृतं कर्म जरासन्धवधे तदा ।
भीमसेनार्जुनाभ्यां च कस्तत्साध्विति मन्यते ॥
अद्वारेण प्रविष्टेन ह्यग्ना ब्रह्मवादिना ।
दृष्टः प्रभावः कृष्णेन जरासन्धस्य भूपतेः ॥
येन धर्मात्मनात्मानं ब्रह्मण्यमभिजानता ।
प्रेषितं पाद्यमस्मै तदातुमग्रे दुरात्मने ॥
भुज्यतामिति तेनोक्ताः कृष्णभीमघनञ्जयाः ।
जरासन्धेन कौरव्य कृष्णेन विकृतं कृतम् ॥
यद्ययं जगतः कर्ता यथैतं मूर्खं मन्यसे ।
कस्माच्च ब्राह्मणं सम्यगात्मानमवगच्छति ॥

54 II. 20. 2 ff. न शक्योऽसौ रथो जेतुं सर्वैरपि सुरासुरैः ।
प्राणयुद्धेन(?) जेतव्यः स इत्युपलभामहे ॥
मयि नीतिर्बलं भीमे रक्षिता चावयोजयः ॥

55 XII. 5. 4. . . . विभेदं सन्धिं देहस्य जरया श्लेषितस्य हि ।

At several places in the *Mahābhārata*, Kṛṣṇa himself is said to have slain Jarāsandha. Śiśupāla,⁵⁶ Vidūra⁵⁷ and Kṛṣṇa himself⁵⁸ seem to say so. Their words, however, do not seem to be meant literally, as their own words at other places⁵⁹ attribute the deed to Bhīma. What is meant seems to be that Kṛṣṇa was the main spiritual force in having Jarāsandha slain by Bhīma which, of course, is an accepted fact. Again Śiśupāla's words in II. 67. 11 (वासवप्रतिमो येन=कर्णेन जरासन्धोऽतिदुर्जयः । विजितो बाहुयुद्धेन देहमेदं च लम्बितः ॥) cannot be taken⁶⁰ to mean that Karna killed Jarāsandha. The words देहमेदं च लम्बितः simply mean that Karna seriously wounded Jarāsandha which meaning is quite in agreement with the account "विमेद सन्धिं देहस्य" in XII. 4-5.

The fragments on which the above account of Jarāsandha is based thus give us a fair idea of Jarāsandha, the man and his achievements. The importance of Jarāsandha is also borne out by the fact that later on it was found necessary to make him an incarnation of demon Vipracitti when Kṛṣṇa etc. became incarnations of God Viṣṇu etc. Again, Kṛṣṇa is here several times defeated in battles, is incompetent to vanquish the enemy, is perhaps taken captive and subsequently released with humiliation. He is forced to leave his birth-place and to shift to a distant quarter for safety. Later, perhaps with a revengeful spirit or deliberately with a view to having his way cleared to establish his own unquestionable supremacy,⁶¹ he takes advantage of the occasion of

- 56 II. 40. 23 योऽयं वृष्णिकुले जातो राजानं हतवान्पुरा ।
जरासन्धं महात्मानमन्यायेन दुरात्मवान् ॥
- 57 V. 130. 62. (कृष्णेन) जरासन्धश्च वक्रश्च शिशुपालश्च वीर्यवान् ।
बाणश्च निहतः सङ्घे राजानश्च निपदिताः ॥
- 58 VII. 181. 42 जरासन्धश्चेदिराजो महात्मा महाबाहुश्चैकलव्यो निपादः ।
एकैकशो निहताः सच एते योगंस्तैस्त्वैस्त्वद्धितार्थं मयेव ॥
- 59 E.g., VII. 182. 15 (Kṛṣṇa to Arjuna—). . . .
विनाभूतः स गदया जरासन्धो महामृधे ।
निहतो भीमसेनेन पश्यतस्ते घनञ्जय ॥

60 As taken by Sorensen in his 'Index to the Names in the Mahābhārata,' of course with some hesitation.

61 It must be mentioned that these suppositions, though logical, are not supported by substantial evidence.

Yudhiṣṭhira's Rājasūya and has the foe slain by the Pāṇḍavas in an unfair, if not fraudulent, manner, of course representing that thereby he was exerting himself not in his own interest but in that of the Pāṇḍavas. Thus all these events, as described in the *Mahābhārata*, exhibit Kṛṣṇa, not as Supreme God, but as one possessing all human tendencies and weaknesses, notwithstanding the authors' occasional attempts to identify him with Supreme God.

In this connection a brief comparison of the account of Jarāsandha in the *Mahābhārata* with the corresponding accounts in the Purāṇas and the *Harivaṃśa* is not without its own interest. The *Harivaṃśa* (II. 34 ff.), the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* (V. 22-26), the *Brahma Purāṇa* (195-199),⁶² the *Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa* (103-13),⁶³ the *Bhāgavata* (X. 50 ff.) and the *Padma Purāṇa* (VI. 273 ff.) deal at length with the hostilities between Kṛṣṇa and Jarāsandha; while the *Bhāgavata* (X. 70-73) and the *Padma Purāṇa* (VI. 279) further give the story of killing Jarāsandha by Bhīma. Although the latter account in the two Purāṇas differs only slightly⁶⁴ from the corresponding account in the *Mahābhārata*, the former has undergone a radical change in the Purāṇas.

62 The portions of the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* and the *Brahma Purāṇa* mentioned here are entirely identical.

63 This Purāṇa makes only a passing reference to Kṛṣṇa's overpowering Jarāsandha and killing Kālayavana prior to his removal to Dvārakā— viz.,
विजित्य च जरासन्धं निहत्य यवनं तथा

64 The *Padma Purāṇa* says that Kṛṣṇa had Jarāsandha slain by Bhīma at the request of the Yādavas who were tormented by Jarāsandha and makes absolutely no reference to Yudhiṣṭhira's Rājasūya. It further says that Jarāsandha used to kill one of the imprisoned chiefs on every कृष्णचतुर्दशी and to offer an oblation of the victim's blood to Bhairava. The *Bhāgavata* says that Kṛṣṇa was approached by a Messenger from the imprisoned kings with an appeal for their rescue and was advised by Uddhava to have Jarāsandha tactfully killed by Bhīma in a Brāhmaṇa's garb. Keeping Uddhava's advice in mind, Kṛṣṇa, after giving his consent to Yudhiṣṭhira's performance of the Rājasūya, takes Bhīma and Arjuna to Jarāsandha's Girivraja. The three arrive there at the guest hour (अतिथ्यवेलायां) and Jarāsandha, when begged for, agrees to have dual with Bhīma. He gives Bhīma a big mace and the dual lasts for twenty-seven days, resulting in Bhīma's success effected by Kṛṣṇa who asks the rescued kings to devote themselves to him (Kṛṣṇa) with all their heart.

Enraged at the death of Kāṁsa, his son-in-law, in the hands of Kṛṣṇa, Jarāsandha besieges Mathurā with a huge army⁶⁵ which includes not only Śiśupāla, Paṇḍraka, Bhīṣmaka, Rukmin, Bhagadatta, Salya and others, but also Karṇa, Śakuni, Duryodhana etc. Kṛṣṇa, i.e. Viṣṇu born on the earth, is highly pleased at getting this unique opportunity of relieving the earth of her burden, one of the primary objects of his incarnation. In one place⁶⁶ he is also said to have decided to spare Jarāsandha and to destroy only his forces with a view to encourage him to repeat his attacks with replenished forces, thus to give Kṛṣṇa further opportunities for भूभारहरण. With little or no following, Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma encounter Jarāsandha's forces and play havoc on them. At the sudden growth of a desire in their mind their primeval weapons and furnished chariots descend⁶⁷ to them. The mere sight of the two divine sons of Vasudeva spreads consternation among Jarāsandha's forces which consequently suffer from severe defeat and immense loss of lives. Balarāma in a single encounter completely vanquishes Jarāsandha and is, when about to slay him, prevailed upon⁶⁸ to

65 The strength of the army appears differently as twenty (*Harivaṁśu*, II. 23, *Brahma Purāṇa* 195, *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, V. 22 and *Bhāgavata* X. 50) and several thousand (*Padma Purāṇa*, VI. 273) Akṣauhīṇis.

66 *Bhāgavata*, X. 50. 6 ff. चिन्तयामास भगवान् हरिः कारयमानुषः । तद्देशकालानुगुणं
स्वावतारप्रयोजनम् ॥ हनिष्यामि बलं ह्येतद्भुवि भारं समाहितम् । . मगधस्तु न हन्तव्यो भूयः
कर्ता बलोद्भवम् ॥ एतदर्थोऽवतारोऽयं भूभारहरणाय मे । . etc.

67 The *Harivaṁśu* mentions only the weapons, viz., the plough ह्यवर्त and the club सौनन्द for Balarāma and the bow शार्ङ्ग and the mace कौमोदकी for Kṛṣṇa; the *Brahma* and the *Viṣṇu Purāṇas* mention the plough (not named) and the club सुनन्द for Balarāma and the चक्र, the bow शार्ङ्ग, two inexhaustible quivers and the mace कौमोदकी for Kṛṣṇa; the *Padma Purāṇa* and the *Bhāgavata* respectively mention one and two furnished chariots along with दिव्यायुधः (not named) etc.

68 By a voice from the heaven declaring that Jarāsandha would be slain by his pre-destined slayer according to the *Harivaṁśu*; by Kṛṣṇa's request appealing to Balarāma's sense of compassion according to the *Padma Purāṇa*; and by Kṛṣṇa's dissuasion with a view to accomplishing some purpose (कार्यचिकीर्षया, possibly referring to getting other chances for भूभारहरण) according to the *Bhāgavata*.

spare him. Jarāsandha, extremely humiliated⁶⁹, withdraws and the Yādavas triumphantly enter Mathurā.

Jarāsandha's subsequent seventeen invasions on Mathurā are mentioned and two or three are described in detail. Once, advised by Vikadru and Vasudeva (although they hold Kṛṣṇa to be supremely divine and competent enough to destroy Jarāsandha and his forces) to handle the situation diplomatically, Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma, with a view to save the citizens of Mathurā, repair to the south and, at Paraśurāma's advice, take shelter on the safe Gomanta mountain. Jarāsandha with his forces chases them there and, at Śiśupāla's suggestion, sets fire to the mountain. Kṛṣṇa, as he jumps down along with Balarāma, presses the mountain with his feet thus cooling the fire by causing all the stones to ooze.⁷⁰ The description of the ensuing fight is entirely the same as before purporting to an easy success to Kṛṣṇa and an utter disaster and miserable humiliation to Jarāsandha.

Kṛṣṇa's shifting to Dvārakā, too, has undergone much change in the Purāṇas. Kālayavana, a very powerful enemy, marches⁷¹ against Mathurā and Kṛṣṇa, apprehending a simultaneous attack from Jarāsandha, decides to shift to Dvārakā with all his people with a view to save them from disaster. Accordingly they shift⁷² to the newly-built and strongly-fortified city of Dvārakā on the sea-coast. Kṛṣṇa then makes Kālayavana chase him into a cave where Mucakunda by the fire

69 The *Bhāgavata* actually makes him start for the penance-grove though later his allied kings dissuade him from turning an ascetic.

70 The above account is according to the *Harivaṃśa*. The *Bhāgavata* gives a similar description of Jarāsandha's last invasion, after Kālayavana's destruction, when Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma repair to Pravarṣaṇa mountain and escape unnoticed when the mountain is set on fire by Jarāsandha.

71 According to the *Harivaṃśa* and the *Padma Purāṇa*, Kālayavana, enraged at hearing of Kṛṣṇa's superior valour in fighting with Jarāsandha, comes to aid Jarāsandha at his request. The *Bhāgavata*, the *Brahma* and the *Viṣṇu Purāṇas* do not mention any alliance between Kālayavana and Jarāsandha but say that Kālayavana came to fight with the Yādavas who, as he was informed by Nārada, were very powerful and able to kill him.

72 The *Bhāgavata* and the *Padma Purāṇas* say that Kṛṣṇa by means of his mysterious yogic powers transferred them from Mathurā to Dvārakā when they were sleeping.

of his mere glance burns Kālayavana to ashes. Kṛṣṇa then comes back to Mathurā to remove the Yādavas' wealth to Dvārakā and, as usual, vanquishes Jarāsandha who invades Mathurā for the last time and finally withdraws in sheer disappointment. Later on, too, Jarāsandha was completely defeated by Balarāma and his Yādava forces during his attempt to secure for Śiśupāla Rukmiṇī with whom Kṛṣṇa elopes in the Svayaṃvara.

Thus it will appear that in the Purāṇas defeat, failure and humiliation have been totally transferred from Kṛṣṇa and the Yādavas to Jarāsandha and his forces. Jarāsandha's forces have become considerably more numerous perhaps with a view to give Kṛṣṇa more credit for the achievement. The idea of the incompetence of the Yādavas to face by themselves Jarāsandha and his forces has not disappeared,⁷³ but this too has been retained with a view, it seems, to magnify Kṛṣṇa's leadership of the Yādavas. The original fact of Kṛṣṇa's defeat, confinement etc. by Jarāsandha has totally disappeared. Kṛṣṇa is presented here throughout in supremely divine colours and consequently defeat or failure cannot be here associated with him. The idea of his being an incarnation of Supreme God Viṣṇu never fails and even Jarāsandha is made⁷⁴ later on to believe in the idea. It is therefore quite natural to find here Kṛṣṇa sportively or by his mere presence defeating Jarāsandha and destroying his immense forces and sparing him personally either out of mercy or due to his regard for Brahmadeva's imprecation or for some purpose of his own.

The fact of Kṛṣṇa's emergent shifting to Dvārakā is still retained, though entirely in a different spirit. Jarāsandha alone is no more capable of being the cause of such an emergency, and a more dangerous enemy comes forth to assist him intentionally or unintentionally. Kālayavana who is practically absent in the *Mahābhārata* seems to be an essentially Purāṇic creation. He has been granted safety from Mathurā people by God Śiva,⁷⁵ and Kṛṣṇa, out of regard for Śiva, gets

73 Vide the *Harivaṃśa*, II. 36, 37 etc., the *Brahma Purāṇa*, 195. 11-12 etc.

74 *Harivaṃśa*, II. 48 etc.

75 *Ibid.*, II. 52 etc.

Kālayavana tactfully killed by somebody else. Although Kṛṣṇa himself is absolutely secure from all such enemies, he decides to shift to Dvārakā with the only aim of saving the Mathurā people from disaster. Further, divine and mysterious powers are present with him through and through, e.g. when he frightens the ocean to subside and give him site for building the new city or when he transfers the Mathurā people, while asleep, to Dvārakā in a single night. Thus his shifting to Dvārakā is not represented as due to any fear for himself.

Thus it will be clear that, in the narration of the Jarāsandha episode, while the Mahābhārata presents Kṛṣṇa in essentially human colours, the Purāṇas present him in pure divine colours.⁷⁶

SADASHIVA L. KATRE

⁷⁶ The following editions of the Purāṇa have been used: *Harivaṃśa*, *Viṣṇu*, *Brahma* and *Brahmavaivarta* Purāṇas (Vyaṅkaṭeśvara Press Editions); *Bhāgavata* (Gaṇapata Krishṇāji Edition); and *Padma Purāṇa* (Anandāśrama Edition).

The Rise of Najib-ud-daula*

(From Br. Mus. Pers. ms. 24,410)

[5a] During the government of 'Ali Muhammad Khān (Ruhela of Aonla and Bangarh) a Yusufzai Ruhela of the 'Umr Khel section, named Najib Khān, arrived at Aonla on foot, and entered his service. He was a man of ability, though utterly illiterate. But he had very great cleverness along with good fortune. In a short time, he acquired a horse, and in the course of one year, he became a jamadar, and collected horses, tents and the materials requisite for a jamadar. At the time when, owing to the attack of Safdar Jang and the Marathas, the Afghans took refuge in the forest on the skirt of the Kumaun hills, one entrenchment on behalf of Sadullah Khān was placed in charge of Najib Khān, and he had five hundred men under him. In the fights, he used to withdraw his eyes from his own trenches and go to reinforce every point where the [5b] Marathas attacked in strength, join the defenders and perform feats, so that after peace had been made between Safdar Jang and the Afghans, Sadullah Khān gave the command of one thousand men to Najib Khān. The wife of Najib Khān died, leaving one son named Zazita Khān. Dundi Khān, who was the chief officer (*mukhtar*) of the house of Sadullah Khān and a greater *sardar* among the Afghans, and the master of territory and troops, married his daughter to Najib Khān and (so) the rank of Najib Khān became higher (than before). The mahals on the bank of the Ganges, in the possession of Dundi Khān, such as Chandpur, Nagina, Sherkot, Pinjor, etc., were placed in charge of Najib Khān as estates (*amli jaidad*) for the support of his troops. He established firm administration in these mahals, [6a] crossed the Ganges twice or thrice, entered the mahals of the Emperor appertaining to Saharanpur and Bara and planted his own possession there. When letters and pressing requests came from that party, he would return to his own mahals, till the time when,

* Najib-ud-daulah proved himself the greatest general and politician of India during the 14 years (1757-1770) that he guided the government of Delhi, having been regent and virtual director of the Empire during the ten years following the battle of Panipat. The British Museum contains a unique ms. of his Persian *life*, written one year after his death, by Sayyid Nuruddin Hasan Khān.

by God's will, a quarrel broke out between Safdar Jang wazir and [Emperor] Ahmad Shah (May 1753).

The matter passed into fighting, and Imad-ul-mulk, Mir Bakhshi, son of Ghaziuddin Khān Firuz Jang II, undertook the responsibility of conducting this war and expelling Safdar Jang from the service of the Emperor. A narration of it would form another and a long book and has been already told in many other places. So, I come to my own [6b] subject. In this war, Imad-mulk summoned the Ruhela sardars by means of imperial letters, and Hafiz Rahmat Khān, Dundi Khān and Mulla Sardar assembled and took counsel. Safdar Jang repeatedly wrote to the Afghan sardars, saying, "Beware, if one of you turns towards the Emperor, you ought to bear me and (my) son in mind. This time I shall uproot you and destroy you." As the Afghans in the past had suffered severe chastisement from the hand of Safdar Jang and spent a long time in the hills and jungles, in desolation and ruin, they did not venture to help the Emperor and the Turani party, but spent the time in talk and play. From the Emperor's side Jalaluddin Khān, better known as Mir Musalman, had been sent to call the Afghans, and some *ulema* had been sent [7a] with him, to instigate the Afghans to come by means of religious propositions (*masla*). When these men went to the Ruhela sardars and on behalf of the Emperor conveyed to them messages of hope and fear and offered grants of land in perpetuity, Hafiz Rahmat replied, "We have taken oaths of alliance to Safdar Jang also. Breach of agreement is a very bad thing." Then Maulavi Nazar Muhammad, who was the leading scholar (of the age), answered to the Afghans, "You belong to the community of Muslims; the Emperor,—obedience to whom is a duty according to Canon Law,—has summoned you, and is engaging in a war with a man who is a rebel and a heretic, and the Turani (Irani) people are to be confronted. In such a state of things, I wonder at your religious spirit, that abandoning such a divinely given Government, you do not [7b] agree to subserve the Faith and the world, through fear of Safdar Jang! If you triumph, every one of you will become the master of a vast territory, and besides that the Emperor will give you cash, in support of which offer these trusted officers of the Emperor are present. If you are slain, you would attain to martyrdom. To be slain by the hand

of the enemy of the Faith in the service of the Emperor of the times is the best of all dignities. If you are Musalmans, agree to this. (Otherwise, there would be reason to doubt your faith." The Afghan sardars, becoming thoughtful, told the aforesaid Maulavi that they would summon their teachers (*akhund*) who would reply for them. Then Najib Khān who was present inside the *majlis* (conference chamber) whispered to Maulavi Nazar Muhammad, "Take me (with you). I join you with one thousand men." [8a] Then the Maulavi cried out aloud, "God's grace and mercy be on you!" Hafiz asked, "What is the matter?" The Maulavi replied, "This (true) Musalman has agreed;" all turned their eyes towards Najib Khān, who spoke, "Yes, I agree, and gird up my loins in the faith of Muhammad." The Maulavi said, "Rise. If you are a man, remain constant to this promise." He issued from the assembly and took Najib Khān by the hand. Dundi Khān asked, "Maulavi Sahib, whither are you taking this man?" He replied, "I am carrying him towards Paradise, and I leave you all in the path to Hell." The Afghans laughed and remained silent. The students who knew [8b] Pushtu cried out "Marhaba! Marhaba!" Najib Khān came out, sat down under a tree, settled with the agents of the Emperor the question of his mansab and jagir, and demanded a title and other honours. They agreed to all, and started (with him) the next day. Most of the smaller jamadars who (had hitherto been) with Najib Khān, left the service of Dundi Khān and Hafiz, and followed him to the number of nearly eight thousand Ruhela infantry and 2,000 horse.

The day he reached Shah Jahanabad, the Mir Bakhshi Imad-ul-mulk, took him to see the Emperor, and secured for him the title of Najib-ud-daulah and a 5-hazari mansab. They encamped in the entrenched camping ground on the bank of the river below Nawab Bahadur's house. While Najib Khān was still on the way, Suraj Mal Jat used often to tell Safdar Jang, [9a] "You ought to send an army by rapid marches to intercept these (Afghan) troops on the way so that their business may be finished. Otherwise, when they join, the people of the city would be strengthened." (Safdar Jang) sometimes sent Mughalia troops and sometimes Jat *bargirs* (light raiders), but the work was not accomplished, and these Afghans entered the capital.

The day after the arrival of the Afghans, Ismail Khān, the chela of Safdar Jang, having run a mine under the bastion of the city-wall known as the Nila Burj, after 20 days of labour, fired it, and all the army of Safdar Jang and the Jat with the Gosain (Rajendra Giri), who led the vanguard, delivered an assault; and as much of the bastion [9b] as was under the ground, with the soil around it, to the extent of 20 pucca zira (yards) was blown up; the portion that was above ground was cracked at some places but did not fall down, it remained standing as before. Only the battlements of the wall fell down. The mansabdars' men at the foot of the wall were blown up into the air and many were buried under the earth and stones; so that two hundred Walashahi soldiers, who were in charge of the trenches were killed. A great tumult arose. From the imperial *sangar* (redoubt),—where Imad-ul-mulk himself was standing close to the artillery, a severe fire was opened with guns and rockets. From the other side too large cannon were fired, and [10a] once the troopers of Safdar Jang arrived near the *sangar*, and the men there turned their faces to flight. The Badakhshi soldiers of Imad-ul-mulk, issued from the *sangar*, and fell upon the attacking party. Of the Emperor's followers, Hafiz Bakhtawar Khān, eunuch, the superintendent of the Emperor's (Diwan-i-) Khas, came on foot and caused the guns to be charged by the men of the Emperor's own guard and fired them. The (enemy), who had applied great force there, could not do anything owing to the exertions of this man. Ismail Khān, sallied out of the fort of Firuz Shah which was in his possession, arrived near the foot of the city-wall, and promised large sums to his troops, but found no good path for entering. Just the Aqibat Mahmud Khān, [10b] the tutor of the wazir Imad-ul-mulk,¹ with Shah Budhan jamadar, came to the wall, removed some doors from the houses of Qamruddin Khān's mansion,—pushing back his men (who were objecting) with his own hands, fixed the doors in the place of the fallen battlements, and began to fire muskets (from the shelter of these). From the bank of the river Jamuna, five thousand Jat troopers—all of them Turki sawars and barqandazes, delivered one charge; the defenders fled away, abandoning their guns,

1 Imad became wazir on 1 June 1754 and was Bakhshi at this time.

and took refuge in the fort. Najib-ud-daulah came out to oppose the Jats; the Ruhelas with their knives dug a way through the entrenchment and advanced. Arriving near the Jat troopers, [11a] they slew many with their muskets; many fled away with their flags.

Najibuddaulah himself set out on foot, with armour on his breast, a shield on his wrist, and a stick in his hand, and ran up with his men, till he reached the (attacking) horsemen, attacked them with sword, matchlock and spear and flung them from their horses on the ground. A musket ball hit the bracium (*bazu*) of Najib and that hand became useless, but his heart remained set on the work, till at last the enemy troopers fled away. As soon as they turned their backs, Imad-ul-mulk issued from the *sangar*, and charged with all the troops. Ismail Khān too fled away, and [11b] Safdar Jang and Suraj Mal (with) all went back to their own encampment. The fort of Firuz Shah was evacuated, and the entire old Delhi which Safdar Jang had seized was released. Imad-ul-mulk, beating the music of rejoicing, entered the *sangar*. The Emperor kept sending to Imad-ul-mulk every minute words of praise, sacred relics, food and dress (of his own).

In short, this war continued for four months more, and every day crowds of Ruhelas came from the further side of the Ganges, till 7 or 8 thousand horse and foot assembled under Najibuddaulah and did many great deeds in this war. In the last battle, which was fought between Ballamgarh [12a] and Faridabad (29 September 1753), Najibuddaulah displayed perfect bravery and he accompanied Imad-ul-mulk; but the subsistence-money that came from the Emperor's Government, was distributed to some other sardars, like Bahadur Khān Baluch, (Jeta) Gujar and the newly recruited Mughals. After this matter had ended in peace, owing to the hostility of Khān-i-Khānan and the Emperor towards Imad-ul-mulk, no pay came from the imperial Government, and the Ruhelas pressed Imad hard. In the camp of Ballamgarh, there was a discussion between Najib-ud-daulah and Imad-ul-mulk. The latter requested, "You take an oath to me that you would not take [12b] any step opposed to alliance with me and that you would join me in whatever I desire to do." Najib swore on the Quran that he would side with Imad in every matter. Imad, after much disputation, secured the faujdari of Saharanpur for Najib, gave

him the Emperor's leave to depart, and kept one of his brothers named Sultan Khān with himself as his servant.

One year passed in this way. Najib-ud-daulah went to Saharanpur, organised the administration well, and equipped and collected his army. When Imad-ul-mulk, having placed Alamgir II on the throne (2 June 1754) and taken the [13a] wazirship himself, summoned Najib, he came with his troops. News had come that Safdar Jang was raising an army in Lucknow, intending to come to this side. Imad took counsel with Najib on this affair. Najib said, "If you order me and give me a *sanad* for the subah-dari of Oudh in my name, I can accomplish this undertaking and establish my rule over the province of Oudh." But this plan remained in abeyance. Najib daily grew more powerful on the strength of his troops. Imad-ul-mulk felt inwardly, "This man is an Afghan. He has acquired great strength." Those who wanted to overthrow him (Imad) were of the same way of thinking, especially the Emperor Alamgir, who used to correspond with [13b] Najib, and tempted him with the hope of regent-ship to separate himself from Imad-ul-mulk. Although hostility was born in the heart, outward friendship was maintained. One day Najib-ud-daulah, at the halting place of Shaikh-pura Barnawa, in the journey of Imad to Lahore, came to the door of the audience hall of Imad, where there was strict watchfulness. Many Ruhelas displayed force and wished to enter in a large body. The darogha of the audience tent forbade it. Najib grew angry; he seized with his hand the throat of Md. Murid Khān, the darogha of the audience, forced him to sit down on the ground, and said, "The wazir has not ordered this sort of treatment for me. He knows my dignity. But you rascally people pay no regard to rank." He went [14a] inside with many men and sat down in anger.² Imad overlooked it that time, but mischief-makers impressed on him, "This man does not obey you." The relation between them became strained day by day, till near the end of the year 1756 reports came of the impending invasion of Delhi by Ahmad Shah Abdali.

JADUNATH SARKAR

2 There was one altercation between Imad and Najib on 4 April 1755, but the incident described in the text was the one that took place on 26 December 1755. [*Tārikh-i-Alamgir Sani*, Br. Mus. ms. ff. 45b and 65a.]

The Architecture of the Taj and its Architect

The art and architecture of the Taj are at once so grand and sublime that a visitor often feels inclined to know who conceived and wrought such a marvel. There is a theory current among various scholars that the Taj was designed by an Italian, named Jeronimo Veroneo, or at least that he had some hand in the construction of the edifice. Mr. Keene, an authority on the early Mughal Period and also Mr. Smith seemed to have supported the theory on the basis of a statement made by Father Sebastian Manrique, who came on an apostolic mission to India in A.D. 1640.¹ Keene's reasons in favour of the theory are mainly historical whereas Rev. Hosten² and Smith³ contend both from the historical and art points of view. Profs. Fergusson and 'Saladin also suggest that the 'Peitra-dura' decoration which has been lavishly employed in the Taj buildings is foreign in origin, and mention the name of Austin de Bordeaux as having superintended the inlay work there. All these views require in the first place a thorough examination, which again should be supplemented by other evidences to arrive at a most tenable conclusion.

First, the historical evidences which have been given by Keene and supported by Rev. Hosten in favour of the theory will now be taken up for scrutiny. He and all others who support the Italian theory have based their arguments mainly on the statement made by Father Manrique in his *Itinerario*, of which chapters 57-67 are devoted to an account of the cities of Agra and Lahore and of the Court of the Great Mughals. The good Father's words in describing the Taj as translated by Keene are: "The architect was a Venetian named Jerogimo Veroneo who came to India with the ships of the Portuguese, and who died in the city of Lahore before my arrival. To him gave the Emperor Khurram great salaries but he was supposed to have profited

1 "Chapel of Padre Santos in Agra" by Rev. Father Symphorium in the *Transactions of the Archaeological Society of Agra*, Jan.-June, 1878.

2 "Who planned the Taj?", *Journ. and Proc. of ASB.*, vol. VI, 1910, p. 281.

3 *History of Fine Arts in India and Ceylon*, 2nd ed., pp. 184 f.

so little by them that when he died F. Joseph de Castro found them much less than he had expected." Then follows an account of how Veroneo got the commission from the Emperor and the estimates and plans were prepared.

With the exception of this stray mention of Veroneo as the alleged architect of the Taj, Father Manrique does not enlighten his readers on the antecedents of this great architect. Father Hosten, who has given an elaborate account of Father Manrique's tour in the East in his article, does not give details about the career or training of Veroneo. But Peter Mundy informs us that he received visits from Jeronimo Veroneo on January 3rd of 1630-31.⁴ He also speaks of him as a Venetian goldsmith in Shah-Jahan's pay together with others in 1632-33.⁵

We then learn from Peter Mundy that Veroneo was a goldsmith in the service of the Mughal Emperor about the time the Taj was under construction. Although Veroneo was known to Peter Mundy personally he did not mention that he had any hand in designing the Taj. Had Veroneo framed the original design of the Taj and been the chief architect during the preliminary stages of construction as suggested by Smith,⁶ Peter Mundy must have recorded that fact in his *Itinerario*. But on the other hand, the definite assertion that the profession of Veroneo was that of a goldsmith weakens the validity of Father Manrique's statement.

Notwithstanding the fact that Father Manrique was a man of mark and great piety, it must be admitted that he recorded the story as told by Father Joseph de Castro who was the executor to this unknown Italian. On an analysis, it will be seen how far Father de Castro is consistent when he says that Shah-Jahan paid him large salaries but "he was supposed to have profited so little by them." It can hardly be believed that a man in charge of so elaborate and stupendous a construction as that of the Taj could save "much less than he (Father de Castro) had expected," unless it is definitely known that he was

4 *Travels of Peter Mundy in Asia* edited by R. C. Temple, p. 65.

5 *Ibid.*, p. 208.

6 *History of Fine Arts in India and Ceylon* by V. A. Smith, 2nd Edition, pp. 184-85.

extravagant. However, to meet this objection, Smith suggests that he must have spent a large sum of money as ransom to release certain members of the Portuguese Mission who were imprisoned after the siege of Hooghly by Shah-Jahan.⁷ But the man who ransomed the Portuguese prisoners was one Hieronimo Veroneo, a compatriot of N. Manucci and hence cannot be the same person who is alleged to have designed the Taj. So it appears that there is a great deal of inconsistency in the accounts left by Father Manrique.⁸ It has been recorded by him that Veroneo died at Lahore some time before his arrival (say in March 1641).⁹ Smith suggests that his body might have been removed to Agra for burial. In Padre Santos' Chapel close to Hensing's tomb, there is a tomb of one Jeronimo Veroneo¹⁰ who died at Lahore. Although there is nothing on record to show that his body was removed to Agra, it is quite possible (in consideration of the date of his demise as given in the tomb inscription) that this Veroneo may be the person who is alleged to have designed the Taj. Father Hosten favours the suggestion that "Veroneo should have been buried at Agra though he died at Lahore." It is perfectly reasonable to suppose that he who has designed the Taj should at least find a resting place within the precincts of that city, if not within the Taj enclosure. But if the Mughal Court, or his co-religionists could do him the honour of a burial at Agra, the City of the Taj, it could be expected that they would inscribe a line to the effect that 'here lies Jeronimo Veroneo, the master architect of the Taj.' But the present inscription "Aqui jaz Ieronimo (or Jeronimo) Veroneo falleceo¹¹ en Lahore 2d' Agosto de 1640"¹² on the tomb, though partly corroborates Father Manrique's statement, does not mention his connection with the Taj. When the

7 Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 185.

8 *Storia do Mogor*, vol. I, p. 183.

9 *Transactions of the Archaeological Society of Agra*, 1878, p. xi.

10 In transliterating the name from Spanish into English, Keene has used 'G' instead of 'J' but the tomb inscription shows 'J'.

11 The Portuguese word 'fallecedo' not 'falleceo' as given in the tomb inscription in the past part. of the corresponding verb 'fallecer' (that is, to die).

12 *List of Christian tombs and monuments in the U.P.*, E. A. H. Blunt, pp. 41-42.

epitaph on Colonel Hessing's tomb,¹³ which is very close to Veroneo's, mentions the important events of his life, what objection could there have been to record in stone that he had really been the architect of the Taj? I accept, for the sake of argument, the allegation that the Indian historians of the Mughal period did not like to associate the name of Veroneo with the design of the Taj in contemporary records; but then what could have been the reason that prevented Father de Castro or members of the different Christian missions at Agra from inscribing a line that Veroneo designed the Taj? It is thus seen that the inscriptional evidence as well as a considered analysis of Father Manrique's statement strongly militates against the theory of the Italian origin of the Taj.

A number of Persian historians of the Mughal period has left an elaborate account of the Mausoleum and most of them have given a list of names of the artisans employed and the semi-precious stones used in the construction of the edifice. The *Tārīkh-i-Tājmahāl*¹⁴ in the possession of the Khadims¹⁵ or the hereditary custodians of the Mausoleum, from which Syed Muhammad Latif has drawn his conclusions, mentions the names of the following artisans:—

(1) "The chief architect was Ustád Isá called the nakshá-nawis or the plan-drawer."

(2) "Imánat Khán of Shiráz" writer of Quránic inscriptions.

(3) "Ismáil Khán, the architect of the dome, resident of Rúm (Asiatic Turkey)". Prof. J. N. Sarker has obtained those very names from the *Diwán-i-Afridi*¹⁶ belonging to the Khuda-Baksh Library. He mentions Master (Ustád) Isá as the chief mason or architect. In Prof. Sarker's list, the name of one mason, that is, of Ustád Isá has been mentioned; so the implication is that he is the architect, there being in olden days no marked distinction between the trades of a mason and an architect.

13 Blunt, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

14 *Agra, historical and narrative*, Syed Muhammad Latif, p. 116.

15 One of the descendants of Isa Khan is supposed to be in possession of an original 17th century drawing. A copy of that original drawing is said to have been preserved in the Archaeological Museum at the Taj gateway.

16 "Who built the Taj Mahal?" in the *Anecdotes of Aurangazib and other historical Essays*, Prof. J. N. Sarker, p. 148.

The supporters of the Italian theory seem to have placed undue reliance on a translation by Col. Anderson from an original manuscript on the Taj, the author of which is not known.¹⁷ His list of artisans employed includes "a Christian, inhabitant of Rome, a rare plan-drawer and artist on ₹ 1,000/- a month" and also another "Christian artisan who went by the name of Muḥammád. Shárif on ₹ 500/- per month"; but on other important points, this list corresponds with the one given by Latif. The name of Md. Sharif has been mentioned in Latif's list, who, as the name suggests, was a Mussalman and son of Ustád Isá. Col. Anderson fails to give the name of the Christian plan-drawer from Rome who was employed on the Taj. This omission may be due either to a faulty manuscript or to the fact that the Persian word "Rúm" or Rúmí¹⁸ has been carelessly transliterated into 'Rome' and then the word 'Christian' has been conjecturally inserted to convey a connected idea. The *Bádsháh Námah* definitely mentions that the artists came from different quarters of His Majesty's dominion, that is, they were all Asiatics.¹⁹ The Calcutta Imperial Library manuscript on the Taj is in perfect accord with the *Bádsháh Námah* and mentions Shiraz, Samarkand, Baghdaḍ as the native towns of the artisans employed.²⁰ Thus it leaves no room for doubt that the principal workers were all Asiatics and that the name of Ustád Isá stands conspicuous among them as the architect of the Taj.

After examining the historical evidences in favour of the Italian origin it now remains to determine from the art point of view if such a theory is tenable. The romance of the Taj lies in its conception, as a whole, of sublime grandeur and purity of form and details. The Capitol and the St. Peter at Rome are nothing like the Taj in conception, although they are the masterpieces of renaissance art in Italy. The Taj is purely oriental in conception as suggested by the grouping of the subordinate masses in relation to the primary mass and also in the lay-out of the subsidiary buildings. The remark made

17 *Calcutta Review*, vol. LVII, 1873, p. 237.

18 The Persian word Rúmí means an inhabitant of Rúm.

19 *Bádsháh Námah* by Mulla Abdul Hamid Lahori, vol. II, p. 323.

20 "The Taj and its Designer" in *The 19th Century and after* by E. B. Havell.

by Saladin²¹ that such a perfect symmetry in the lay-out or design of the Taj suggests the hand of a European architect is based on a misconception of the evolution of the Mughal style in India. The history of the Mughal architecture in India begins with the yet unexplored palace of Babar at Chhábágh, but the nucleus of its origin must be sought somewhere beyond India in the verdant plains of Persia and Turkestan. The next land-mark in the history of its development is the little mosque built by Humayun in 937 A.H. situated in the village of Kanchpura. Although the plan differs a little from its prototypes at Ispahan, Shiraz, and Samarkand (probably on account of the varying climatic conditions), the main features remain exactly the same. So far, scarcely a Hindu feature is to be observed in the Mughal style. But on the accession of Akbar, or more precisely, a decade after, a cosmopolitan spirit prevailed and the indigenous art of India was assimilated into it, not of course with any loss of individuality or potency; but the result of this happy fusion is the homogeneously developed Mughal style. The buildings at Fatehpur Sikri and the early works at the Agra Fort clearly show this stage in the evolution. Then comes the age of further refinement in decoration, incised, raised or painted, and the yet undeveloped peitra-dura decorations at Sikandar; colour and gold-work on the walls and ceilings of Itmád-ud-Dauláh belong to this period. Up to the reign of Jehangir, building stone chiefly used was red sand-stone, a material hard and stratified which did not lend itself to an elaborate creeper pattern peitra-dura. But in the reign of Shah-Jahan, the art of decoration received a further impetus, because of the fact that he built chiefly in marble, which being granulous and rather soft was more adaptable to fine chiselling for (the grooves of) the inlay as well as for other delicate carvings. Thus the art of Peitra-dura was prevalent in India during the early years of Mughal rule or even earlier.²² So it is far from truth to say that this art is of foreign origin

21 M. Saladin, *Manuel d' Art Musulman*, tome i, p. 575:

'Le Tadj n'est que le centre de la composition.....On voit donc que, par l'ampleur de la composition et par la symétrie, ce plan est presque de conception classique'. *Ibid.*, p. 571: 'Il semble que la main d'un architecte européen a tracé les symétries exactes et les profils, peut-être trop régulier de ce monument . . .'

22 *Indian Architecture* by E. B. Havell, p. 33.

although it might have developed simultaneously in two different countries. Apart from the technique, the floral design of peitra-dura adopted at the Taj is absolutely Persian of good taste, and is exactly similar to the border decoration of the miniature Mughal paintings. On the basis of these facts it seems that the claims of Austin de Bordeaux as having superintended the Taj inlay work are spurious; and Sir George Birdwood is perfectly right in saying that the magnificent peitra-dura is 'strictly Indian of the Mughal period.'

Another point in the make up of a style is its constructive feature. Havell in his *Indian Architecture* has very ably shown that the general principle of construction is Saracenic although the Indian builders might have improved upon it in various ways. The dome, for example, has been built on the principle of stalactite pendentive much like those on the buildings of Ispahan and Shiraz but the superiority of Indian masons lies in the better handling of constructive details in expressing their ideas of beauty. The domes with the Persian builders, not perhaps excluding the one on the tomb of Humayun, are something unshapely, bulbous, and disproportionately stilted; but the profile of the Taj dome is exquisitely delicate and graceful, expressing appropriately the feminine characteristics.

Now let us examine the principal features of the Italian or Florentine domes of this or an earlier period. The dome over the Florence Cathedral by Brunneleschi or the one over St. Peter, Rome, has been built on the Roman method of simple pendentive system but not on a stalactite basis. Then again the pendentive system itself is altogether oriental in origin.²³ "It was", as Mr. Choisy says, "invented and perfected in the East." The stalactite and occasionally the arched modes of pendentive were the favourite devices with the Persians, whereas the Romans and later on the renaissance builders used to fill in the curvilinear space (formed by the super-imposition of a circle over a square) by means of a plain piece of gradually projecting masonry called the simple pendentive, which when decorated took a fan-shaped form.

If Veroneo was an architect (a fact which is contrary to the account

²³ *History of Architecture on a Comparative Method*, B. Fletcher, p. 195.

given by Peter Mundy), he must have been conversant only with the European style of architecture prevalent at that time in Italy. The supporters of the Italian theory have nothing more to say about his further training (in Mughal or Persian style), but that he was given the commission for executing the work. We fail to imagine how far it is possible for an architect, however proficient he may be in a particular style, to handle so admirably an alien art as to produce a wonder in architecture. It is often said that one who can design in a particular style can adapt himself to any other but only it requires a thorough study of the local conditions—particularly of the constructive details, peculiar ornaments and religious symbols. Veroneo had no such opportunity. Even accepting that he had, it is doubtful that an adventurer of his stamp could have shown such a marked originality in contrast with the work of other artists who were then at the Mughal court.

Thus the Italian theory of the origin of the Taj which hinges upon the only statement of Father Sebastian Manrique (whose information again is second-hand) cannot be maintained against the historical evidences, direct or indirect, obtained so far. Peter Mundy's definite assertion that Veroneo was a goldsmith in Shah Jahan's service, combined with the inscriptional evidence precludes all possibility of the Italian theory being correct. The Persian historians unanimously assigned the work to Ustád Isá and the *Básháh Námah* in particular suggests that all artists employed on the Mausoleum belong to His Majesty's dominion. In addition to these it has been shown from architectural considerations that the workmanship of the Mausoleum is entirely Asiatic, particularly Indo-Persian of the highest order of excellence.

S. C. MUKHERJEE

The Purānic Traditions

(about earlier homes and migrations of the Indian Āryas)*

II

Satya Yuga or the Age of Instinct⁴⁵

The Purānas trace the creation of the human beings to the earliest period of the Satya Yuga. In this Yuga different seasons appeared and the climate was temperate and pleasant. Man did not require any house to live in, nor had he any fixed place of residence. He lived on the mountains, on the banks of rivers, lakes or by the sea-shores. His wants were few and could be easily met with. Instinct and not reason was the propelling force. The fine faculties and the power of distinction were not then developed. He used to live on a sort of juice extracted from the earth, and was very happy, content, strong and innocent. He did not know right or wrong, friend or foe, gain or loss etc. In short he was a simple child of nature. The Varnāśrama system did not exist; nor was any one then considered as mixed or low born. This age lasted for 400 *deva* years and the transition period to the succeeding Tretā Yuga was 400 *deva* years.

Tretā Yuga or the Age of struggle and invention

Changes, climatic and otherwise, in Nature accompanied with constant physical changes of the Earth brought about gradual evolution in the nature of Man. His environments changed and the Satya Yuga conditions gradually disappeared. The transitional period saw the formation of cloud and fall of rain producing different kinds of trees, plants and herbs. Man now began to live in trees and gather his food therefrom. The female's power of productivity developed. She brought forth more children and population increased. By and by,

* Contd. from p. 469 of vol. IX, 2 (June, 1933).

45 Cf. *Vā.*, 8; *Bd.*, 8; *Mkd.*, 49; *Viṣ.*, I, 6; *Vā.*, 61, 159-163.

avarice, i.e. sense of possession developed leading to forcible occupation of trees and honey. This avaricious possession, accompanied with periods of drought brought about partial or wholesale destruction of trees at places. When trees became scarce people felt variations in temperature (heat and cold) and experienced various kinds of sensations. Thus oppressed by winds, chill and heat, the homeless nomadic man first began to make wrappers for the body out of leaves, and then to build abodes on hills, deserts or river-banks. The first home built was on the model of trees and branches and this gave rise to the *Sālā*. Thus solving the question of protection from exposure, man thought about his livelihood and discovering different seasonal trees and plants, lived happily for a time. But avarice and anger again took possession of him and the strongest seized the river-banks hills, plains, trees and plants, and thereby brought about serious disorder.⁴⁶ This caused men to live in communities and villages, and most probably the *Gotra* system of grouping originated at this stage. Each community consisted of four classes of men arranged according to strength and character, viz. (1) strong persons (2) less strong ones living on gifts of the former (3) still less strong living on their own work and (4) the weak ones living on service. All the different members were inter-dependent. But this group system far from improving matters made the situation worse. Individual struggle gave place to mass warfare, and, as a result, all the trees were cut down. Then the headmen of the groups began to think, discovered seeds of different cultivable plants and herbs, and asked their followers to grow them in the fields. Thus began the Art of Cultivation.⁴⁷ By and by, several laws were formulated for the prevention of disputes and quarrels among the people. Those members who were strong enough to take charge of and protect others were appointed as protectors of the society and were called the *Kṣattriyas*. Some members, who living under such protection were fearless, truthful, and spiritually advanced, were called the *Brāhmaṇas*. The less powerful ones who were cruel by habit and were previously engaged in constant

46 Cf. also *Mbh.*, *Sānti*, 59, 14-22; 122, 18-23.

47 *Bd.*, 8, 154; *Va.*, 8, 160; *Mkd.*, 49, 74.

violent deeds against the people at large, for their own selfish ends, were allotted the task of obtaining food and other necessities of life for the general public and were called the Vaiśyas; and those who by nature were unsettled, weak and spiritless were made to serve the other three classes and were called the Sūdras. People at first did not accept these laws and began to quarrel among themselves. This led to re-enactment of those laws in a modified form. Government and engagement in warfare were prescribed as the duty for a Kṣatriya. For a Brāhmaṇa, collecting of dues and gifts for the protectors of the society (*yājana*), teaching and accepting gifts for his own maintenance; for a Vaiśya, cattle-rearing trade and cultivation; and for a Sūdra, architecture and service were prescribed as respective duties. After the introduction of these Varnas or caste-system, the four *Āśramas*, stages of life, were established by and by. But these institutions could not still be popular and continued to receive indifferent or cold reception till the birth and rise into power of some different species of mankind called the Devas, the Pitṛs, the Ṛṣis and the Mānavas in the middle of the first Tretā Age.

The whole human race was originally one and apparently flourished in the polar regions (see below), but with the increase of population accompanied with scarcity of food leading to keen struggle for existence, different groups moved in different directions, settled in different parts of the globe, cultivated different habits and conduct of life under different conditions or environments, and thereby acquired different temperament, colour and physical constitution, and were finally divided into four broad groups or races called the Asuras, the Devas, the Pitṛs and the Mānavas. A rough knowledge of the ancient or Purāṇic geographical division of the earth, particularly of the Jambudvīpa is necessary in order to understand clearly in which part of the globe which race thrived or attained distinction.

The Purāṇas divide the earth mainly into seven dvīpas, viz. Jambu, Plakṣa, Śālmaḷa, Kūsa, Krauñca, Śāka and Puṣkara. This division covers almost the entire land portion of the Northern Hemisphere including North America. Of these the Jambudvīpa roughly corresponds to Asia and contains more detailed description for the purpose of identification.

Division of the Jambudvīpa or Asia

The Meru range is conceived to be the navel⁴⁸ or middle of the earth, to have sprung from the navel of Svayambhū⁴⁹ Brahmā, to be the birth place of the four-headed Brahmā.⁵⁰ To the east of this range⁵¹ or plateau is the Bhadrāsva Varṣa and to the west the Ketumāla Varṣa. A particular mountain in the middle of the Meru plateau⁵² is called the Meru Mount or Sumeru or Mahā-Meru Mountain which lies in the middle of the Ilāvṛta Varṣa. To the south of the Ilāvṛta⁵⁶ lie in consecutive order Hari Varṣa, Kimpuruṣa Varṣa *alias* Hemakūṭa Varṣa with Niṣadha and Hemakūṭa mountains, and Bhārata Varṣa *alias* Haimavata Varṣa with Himālaya mountains. To the north of Ilāvṛta⁵⁷ lie in order Ramyaka *alias* Nilavarṣa, Hiraṇmaya Varṣa *alias* Sveta Varṣa and Śṛṅgavāna⁵⁸ *alias* Kuru Varṣa. Ilāvṛta is the middle⁵⁹ of these countries and the Mount Meru is in the middle of Ilāvṛta. The approximate rough location of these different divisions may be taken as follows:—Bhārata Varṣa (India); Kimpuruṣa Varṣa (Southern Tibet); Hari Varṣa (Northern Tibet); Ilāvṛta Varṣa (western Mongolia; Eastern Kirgitz); Meru *alias* Sumeru *alias* Mahāmeru mountain (Alta mountains); Ramyaka Varṣa (Southern Siberia around the lake Balkas and Western Manchuria); Hiraṇmaya Varṣa (Mid-Siberia); Uttara Kuru Varṣa (Northern Siberia); Bhadrāsva Varṣa (China and Eastern Manchuria); Ketumāla Varṣa (Kirgitz, Turkestan and Persia).

48 *Bd.*, 35, 41, 50; *Vā.*, 34, 37, 46; *Viṣ.*, II, 2, 7, 9, 37; *Br.*, 18, 13, 15, 45.

49 *Vā.*, 34, 16; *Bd.*, 35, 16; *Mat.*, 113, 14.

50 Cf. *Bd.*, 35, 46; *Vā.*, 34, 42-44.

51 *Bd.*, 35, 60-61; *Vā.*, 34, 56; *Mat.*, 113, 44, 37-38; *Br.*, 18, 29, 45; *Viṣ.*, II, 2, 23; *Mkd.*, 54, 14.

52 *Mat.*, 113, 19, 30, 39; *Viṣ.*, II, 2, 9, 13, 14-15; *Br.*, 18, 45; *Mkd.*, 54; 13-14; *Mbh.*, Bhīṣm. 6, 13.

56-7. *Vā.*, 34, 28-31; *Bd.*, 35, 30-32; *Viṣ.*, II, 2, 10-13, 23; *Br.*, 18, 15-19; *Mat.*, 113, 28-31; *Mkd.*, 59-60; *Mbh.*, Bhīṣm. 6, 4-9.

58 *Mat.*, 113, 31 calls it Śṛṅga-Śāka.

59 *Vā.*, 34, 22, 31, 33; *Bd.*, 35, 34, 36; *Mat.*, 113, 19-20, 30, 39; *Viṣ.*, II, 2, 14-15, 7, 23; *Br.*, 18, 20, 29; *Mkd.*, 54, 13-14; 60, 7, 10-11; *Mbh.*, Bhīṣm. 6, 10.

The Meru mountain contained the abode⁶⁰ of the four-headed Brahmā with camp residences of almost all powerful devas. In Bhadrāsva the deva population predominated with their capital at Amarāvati *alias* Devadhāni⁶¹ (apparently on the bank of the river Amur). Of these nine Varṣas, the Bhārata Varṣa is called the land of action and the eight other Varṣas are called earthly heavens (*Bhauma Svargas*).⁶²

Besides this Varṣa division, Asia or the Jambudvīpa has also seven Loka divisions i.e. divisions according to the predominating characteristics of the people inhabiting particular tracts, and these are (1) Bhūḥ (2) Bhuvah (3) Svah (4) Jana (5) Mahah (6) Tapaḥ and (7) Satya. Apart from their spiritual counterpart or abstract location the physical or geographical identification of these Lokas may be taken as roughly corresponding to:—Bhūḥ (India); Bhuvah (Ketumāḷa Varṣa i.e. Western Turkestan, Persia, and possibly Northern Afghanistan); Svah Loka (Kimpuruṣa Varṣa, Hari Varṣa, Ilāvṛta Varṣa and Bhadrāsva Varṣa: the present Chinese Empire); Jana Loka (Southern Siberia); Mahah Loka (Eastern Siberia and Manchuria); Tapaḥ Loka (Mid-Siberia, Hiraṇmaya Varṣa) and Satya Loka *alias* Brahma Loka (Northern Siberia, Arctic Zone including the Greenland and the Purānic Svetadvīpa).⁶³ This Svetadvīpa was a hot island situated in the northern⁶⁴ side of the Kṣīrodadhi (Arctic Ocean) in the north western direction from the Sumeru mountain and at a very great distance from it. In the remote past this island was peopled by a very strong race of Ṛsis or Brāhmaṇas of moonlight white colour, practising

60 *Bd.*, 35, 59, 74-77; *Vā.*, 34, 68-70; *Viṣ.*, II, 2, 29; *Br.*, 18, 36-37; *Mkd.*, 54, 18.

61 According to *Bhāg.*, V, 21, 8.

62 *Bhāg.*, V, 17, 10; *Viṣ.*, II, 2, 48; cf. *Br.*, 18 36-37; *Mkd.*, 55, 16, 21-23; 57, 60-63; *Vā.*, 34, 93-97; 45, 42; *Bd.*, 48, 44-46.

63 For the location of these Loka divisions I have relied mostly on "Loka-tattva" published by Mr. Amiya Kumar Chakravarti in the Caitra 1337 issue of the *Bhāratavarṣa*.

At one time Hiraṇmaya Varṣa (Mid-Siberia), the abode of (Āditya) Viṣṇu, the representative of Nārāyaṇa *alias* Svayambhū Brahmā was being known as Sveta Varṣa, the Svetadvīpa being then called Satya Loka, Puṣkara-dvīpa or Brahma Loka, the abode of the latter.

64 *Mbh.*, *Sānti*, 335, 7-15; 336, 27-30, 32, 35-52; 1; 340, 45, 91-93.

severe austerities, under the kind rule and patronage of Svayambhū Bramhā *alias* Nārāyaṇa *alias* Aśvaśirāḥ (see below) who had for the time being his residence there. The Viṣṇu worship and a particular form of Pitṛ worship owe their origin to this people.

These Lokas are situated in consecutive order and are contiguous to each other like several pieces of an umbrella.⁶⁵

N. TRIPATHI

(To be continued)

⁶⁵ *Vā.*, 50; 75-80; 49, 147-153; *Bd.*, 53, 158-64; 55, 21-28.

The Origin of the Malpaharias

of the Rajmahal Hills

The Malpaharias of the Rajmahal Hills considered from the stand-points of culture and language, may be regarded as an offshoot of the Maler tribe, which dwell in the same topographical area.¹ The two groups of people are also found to be closely allied as regards their physical characters.² In the present paper it is proposed to examine the existing documents throwing light on the origin of the Malpaharias.

These documents comprise a few official records and notes etc. and accounts of some ethnologists. In Lt. Shaw's note "On the inhabitants of the hills near Rajmahal", which is one of our earliest documents (1795)³ neither of the tribes are specially mentioned. 'My information', he writes, 'relates to the inhabitants of the hills in the three *tuppahs* of Mudjeway, Ghurry, and Mannuary. The first is to the south-west of Rajmahal extending as far as Sicrigully, the second is thence in westerly direction as far as Shawhabad, and the third lies to the south of Ghurry from whose people those of the borders of Bheerbhoom and south-east of Rajmahal differ in many respects.' It is interesting to find him note the ethnic differences between the above topographical areas. Unfortunately he does not specify the different groups of people who are thus distinguished from one another. He simply says, "The *tuppahs* of Mudban, Pyer, Chitoleah, Barcope, Putsandaw, Jumneo, Hurnahpore, Dumsai, Kuneallah and others have customs also peculiar to themselves." The earliest specific mention of these two tribes occurs in the minutes of the Government of Bengal, Judicial Department (Criminal) of the

1 Buchanan,—*Eastern India*, II (London, 1838), p. 126; Hunter,—*Annals of Rural Bengal* (London, 1868), p. 221; Dalton,—*Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal* (Calcutta, 1872), p. 273; Risley,—*Tribes and Castes of Bengal*, II (Calcutta, 1892), p. 54; Roy,—*Oraons* (Ranchi, 1915), p. 11.

2 Mahalanobis,—*Analysis of Race Mixture in Bengal*, JASB., XXIII, (1927), p. 317.

3 Shaw,—*Asiatic Researches*, IV, p. 45.

17th July, 1823 by H. C. Sutherland, the then Joint Magistrate of Monghyr.⁴ Col. Sherwill, in a paper published in 1852 speaks of only two distinct tribes occupying the Rajmahal Hills. The one he calls the Male and the other the Santals. He too like Lt. Shaw, does not particularise the mountaineers to be the Malers but his further details go to prove it. He writes:—"The hills are inhabited by two distinct races, the mountaineers or a race living on the summits of the hills and who are with exceptions never found residing in the valleys, and the Santals who reside in the valleys."⁵ This account of Sherwill appears to be faulty as the Malpaharias are mentioned in Sutherland's report in 1823 and in 1838 Dr. Buchanan gave a short history of the tribe. Dalton and Risley wrote much later, the former in 1872 and the latter in 1892. The latest account of the Malers, under the heading "The Saoria Paharias of the Rajmahal Hills" was published by Mr. Bainbridge in 1907. Bainbridge's geographical boundaries are more isolating and complete.

A word regarding the character of the Malpaharia tribe is necessary here for understanding the official documents published herewith by kind permission of the Keeper, Imperial Records. In bringing this tribe under the British control, the Government was much perplexed with the heavy loss of army and money. The sloping hills with the paharia huts concealed underneath the tall forest trees and thick shrubs were not easy of access to the military forces. About their turbulent nature Col. Sherwill writes: "From the days of the Muhammadan kings to 1764 A.D. these hill people were scourge and terror of the neighbouring districts from whose inhabitants they levied black mail and when that could not be obtained, armed bands fully equipped with powerful bamboo bows and poisoned arrows, descended from the hill, murdered all who opposed their progress; they pillaged the country far and near, carrying away grain, salt, tobacco, money, cattle and goats or indeed anything they could

4 *Govt. of Bengal, Consultation*, dated 17th July 1823. Report by Mr. H. D. Sutherland.

5 Col. Sherwill, *A Tour through the Rajmahal Hills*, *JASB.*, 1852, XX, pp. 544-545.

lay their hands upon and retreating to their jungle fastnesses, where no one dares to follow them, defied their victims.”⁶

To suppress the ravages of these hill people on the plains the Government deputed Brooke in charge of a company in 1772, but we do not get sufficient information regarding his encounters with these people. He was succeeded by Capt. Browne. On the 17th of April, 1777, Capt. Browne led a company into the Paharia territories. First a surprise attack was made under the leadership of Capt. Browne himself into the Pooreah Buddha Hill whereby six people were killed and fifteen were made prisoners. Capt. Browne led a portion of the force in capturing the Pooreah Buddha Hill while two other parties under two other officers went to the neighbouring territories. A small village near by Pooreah Buddha of which the name is not on record was raided by Bryce where two were killed and ten were made prisoners. Cunningham who was in charge of the third party captured the village on the Soora Hills where three were killed and twenty were made prisoners. Apart from these surprise attacks Capt. Browne ordered the villages with all its houses and granaries to be burnt down. We read in the Journal that 16 such villages were burnt by Capt. Browne, but there is no evidence of any man being burnt alive, which is extremely doubtful in view of these surprise attacks. Of the 16 villages the name of one hill, Kootny Pahar, about 4 miles distant from Pooreah Buddha, is only mentioned. Nothing more is mentioned about the captives who numbered at least two scores and five.

Capt. Augustus Cleaveland was appointed the collector of Bhagalpur after Capt. Browne, and under him the Paharias were finally subjugated. Cleaveland was appointed in 1779 and within the span of one year by tact and kind treatment he did what his predecessors had failed to do. In the early part of 1780 he submitted to the Government a report that 47 hill chiefs had very gladly accepted the British rule and he devised a new scheme for raising a small force of hill archers by the latter part of 1780. The Government accepted the proposal and by the end of 1780 a force of hill archers was raised under the name of “Bhagalpur Hill-rangers.”

⁶ Sherwill, *loc. cit.*

The following account taken from Rev. J. Long's *Selections from the unpublished Records of the Government of India* App. E, p. 565 published in 1869, shows in detail Cleaveland's scheme in raising a corps of hill archers.

“The following conditions were embodied in:—

1st.—That a corps of archers should be embodied from the hill people to be placed under the authority of the Collector and employed in the Bhagalpur district only.

2nd.—That each Manjhi or chief of a hill men estimated at 400 should furnish one or more men to the corps as might be required.

3rd.—That to every 50 of the corps a chief should be appointed; that the enemies of the Government should be considered the enemies of the hill people and it should be the duty of the corps to reduce all refractory hill chiefs and ghutwals.

4th.—That each chief of a division should receive the monthly pay of Rs. 5/- each, common man that of Rs. 3/- and each chief supplying a common man for corps the monthly allowance of Rs. 2/- subject to such regulations as might be thought necessary in case of misbehaviours.

Cleaveland died in 1784. He could not see his scheme fully mature but he extended his operations to Belputtah *Tuppah*, and Sultanabad, which were transferred from the districts of Birbhoom and Murshidabad to the district of Bhagalpur so that he can exercise his influence over the Paharias there also.

It will be seen that chief causes which led to the divisions of these two tribes were purely political. Capt. Browne tried to enforce in 1778 some laws which were fully strengthened by Cleaveland in 1783. In 1778, Capt. Browne suggested to the Government the following:—
“That jageers of land on skirts of the hills should be given to the old invalid sepoys on condition of their settling there, whereby additional protection against the incursions of the mountaineers would be afforded and also that pecuniary allowance would be made to the Sirdars of the four principal divisions of the hills bordering on the high road, on consideration of their furnishing people to protect the public dawks through their respective divisions. The expenses of this were estimated at the annual sum of Rs. 1,000.” *Vide Long, op. cit., p. 563.*

As a result of this we find in 1785 the Governor-General in Council approving the regulations issued for relieving the invalid sepoy and native officers by granting waste lands in Bhagalpur. The Government further asked for regular information about the expenses which may be incurred on account of the invalid corps and about the progress which may be made in the cultivation of the lands granted.

We must mention here that when Capt. Browne was in charge of the district no army was raised from the hill people; it was raised by Cleaveland in 1780 and Capt. Browne held his office up to 1778. But we have seen before that during Capt. Browne's raids in Paharia villages some captives were made and unless we attribute the adjective 'old invalid sepoy' to them we cannot explain the term properly.

Further, we got accounts of only one raid in the Paharia villages; Capt. Browne was appointed for a period of six years (1772-1778) and it is possible that there were more than one such raids.

Cleaveland's laws were strictly enforced. He gained a certain amount of control over the hill people and his laws proved more appealing than any one else's. By this time the Sardars, the Manjhis, and the Naibs were getting monthly stipends and, as Hunter said, "honorific" dresses like a red turban with a metal monogram of the British Government for Sardars.

The old invalid sepoy whose loyalty was a matter of doubt during Capt. Browne's office became submissive to the British Government during Cleaveland's office. Further, even during Browne's office the captives were certainly more or less injured and they could be regarded as old invalids more than those who retired from the corps of the hill-archers under Cleaveland. Capt. Browne had power to do anything and every thing with his captives and it was a more fortunate proposal to a captive to make him settle on the grant of lands than to put his shoulder in the galleys or undergo the severe trials of a jail prisoner.

We come to Cleaveland's laws now. To quote from Risley (*op cit.*, pp. 55-56):—"In 1783, the year before his death Mr. Cleaveland proposed that the Malers should be given extensive grants of waste lands at the foot of the hill on the following terms:—

(1) Every Sardar was to have a rent free jagir or service tenure, in perpetuity, of from 100 to 800 bighas of land.

(2) Any Male of lower rank than a chief might be allowed any quantity of land, rent free for ten years, it being liable to subsequent assessment at equitable rates.

(3) In order to secure that the foregoing provisions should really come into operation, Mr. Cleaveland suggested that all Sardars and Manjhis holding pension from the Government should forfeit pensions unless they settled in the plains within twelve months."

The most instrumental method of subjugating these hill people was the conferring of "honorific" titles as Sardar etc. and the payment of monthly pensions. Capt. Browne in 1778 placed the scheme before the Government and in 1783 Cleaveland carried it into practice. Then the army of the hill rangers was raised by some monthly remuneration to the sepoys and also to the Sardars who supplied them.

The people, who settled down in the plains, were treated as an outcaste. Those who remained on the hills did very rarely come down and so all communications between the two were stopped. The former formed a body of their own and this led to the subsequent divergence of the two groups. Apart from the geographical evidence, which we will discuss later, there is another evidence which goes to support our theory.

Hastings Memorial

We meet for the first time in the year 1823 in Mr. Sutherland's report the two distinct names Mālē and Mālpāhāriā. The period within which we do not meet with any such distinction is from 1778 to 1823 or 1819 as referred to by Sutherland.⁷ After ten years of working of Capt. Browne's scheme in 1778, in 1788 we meet with a testimony from these hill people in support of the highly efficient power of organization of Governor Warren Hastings (1772-1785) which was perhaps demanded from all parts of India to support him against his impeachment by Burke in London. The signatories of this were altogether 47 hill men. Of these 11 were Sardars known in the body of the letter as Mangy Chiefs and 36 Manjhis known similarly as second Mangy Chiefs. It is to be remembered that immediately after Cleaveland joined the

⁷ Risely, *loc. cit.*, pp. 55-56.

office, he submitted to the Government in 1780 an account of 47 hill chiefs accepting the authority of the British Government. The signatories in all come from only 8 hills. The following is the true copy of the Memorial submitted to Warren Hastings and one of the most important of the three letters discovered from the manuscripts.

“We, the inhabitants of the Hills in the Jungleterry in the Chakla of Rajmahal and Boglepoor, have learnt that the inhabitants of the district of Boglepoor have written in praise of Mr. Hastings, whereof why should not we, who are praising Mr. Hastings, write also and not remain silent. We therefore represent that we formerly lived in the Hills like the beasts of the forests and during the Government of Mr. Hastings became like other men and the qualities and honour of men were instilled into us. Formerly our means of subsistence were no other than those of plunder and rapine and we existed with the greatest difficulty, but now by the wise conduct of that gentleman we live at ease and like others are happy and satisfied with the company, as this ease and civilization which has produced respect to us among mankind has been the effect of Mr. Hastings’ conduct and management. We have never experienced other than kindness nor have any of us heard of any opposition from him on this account. We are pleased with Mr. Hastings. (There are 47 signatories to the Address).

Some Historical Documents

Thus the Hastings Memorial shows no distinction and we see clearly that the people come from both Rajmahal and Bhagalpur.

There is further proof in support of our view in the Preamble to Regulation I of 1796 issued by the Government. Even in this we do not meet with any name of the Malpaharias. The preamble reads as follows:—

“The hills situated to the south and west of Rajmahal and other parts of the district of Bhagalpur are inhabited by a distinct race of people, entirely differing in manners and customs, and who, as far as can be traced, never acknowledged the authority of the native Government.”

“Being destitute of manufactures and but little acquainted with agriculture they subsisted principally by plunder and their incursions

into the low country which were attended by every species of cruelty had almost desolated the districts in which they had existed."

Capt. Browne's laws were instrumental in bringing the Paharia population down in the plains and it was strengthened by Cleaveland who in order to enforce his hill system transferred some of the divisions within his jurisdiction of Bhagalpur. He even once encroached upon the Murshidabad district. During all these operations there is no mention of any people called the Malpaharias.

Probable date of separation of the two tribes

The separation of the Mālpāhāriās from the original stock of the Mālers has been, we think, brought about the beginning of Capt. Browne's hill system. Capt. Browne began his hill system in the year 1778 and the first reference to the two distinct tribes in printed paper is found in 1823 in Sutherland's report. This distinction between the two tribes, it seems, has been brought about during the period from 1778 to 1823 or 1819 i.e. 45 or 41 years.

Geographical boundaries

Lt. Shaw's boundary lines are difficult to locate. He has picked up a *tuppah* from Pakur subdivision, another from Rajmahal, and a third from Godda and the hills he has named are located round about an area of several hundreds of miles on all the four corners. Some of these hills are at present inhabited by the Malers and some of them, I think, were also occupied by these people when Lt. Shaw wrote—because they are situated so far northern in the inner recesses of the hills that no foreign influence has as yet entered therein. Among these Chitoleah located in the Rajmahal Subdivision can be very safely named, while Barcope and Putsandaw in Godda subdivision stand next in order.

Dalton's account has a clear cut division but it is applicable more to the Rajmahal country than to its inhabitants. He describes the boundary lines thus: "The Rajmahal Hill country extends from the banks of the Ganges at Sakrigali in Latitude 25° 15' and Longitude 87° 3' to the Brahmani River and the boundary of the Birbhoom district, a distance of seven miles. To the south of the Brahmani the hills continue to the River Dwarka as the Ramgarh of the Birbhoom district." (*op. cit.*, p. 263).

R. B. Bainbridge, gives in the *ASB. Memoirs*, (IV, p. 43) the following description of the boundary lines of the Saorias (Mālers):

“South of the Saoria tract runs the Bansloi River a roaring torrent in the rains and in the dry season, a sandy bed with here and there a glistening pool to mark its course.”

Mr. E. S. Hoernle, the then Deputy Commissioner of Santal Perganas wrote to me: “As regards grouping by area, it is, I believe, roughly true to say that the Sauria country lies north of a line drawn from Godda to Pakur, that is to say, it includes the whole hill country of the Rajmahal subdivision and the northern area with the hills of Pakur and Godda.”⁸

The inconsistencies in the geographical landmarks of the above three authorities are very great. We find that with the chronology of dates the boundary line is gradually receding northwards. Geographical location of the hill names is exceedingly difficult. The names of the hills where Capt. Browne led his raids in the year 1777 cannot now be traced.

Dalton's geographical boundaries are extensive. We shall see immediately that his geographical account is also corroborated by the older records when the boundary lines of the Maler country were far more southern. The greater part of the river Dwarka is now within Birbhum. The Brahmani flows through the Dumka subdivision. The River Bansloi which forms the southern limit of Mr. Bainbridge's geographical boundary is northern while Mr. Hoernle's boundary line from Pakur to Godda is further northern. We thus find that the southern boundary line is gradually receding northwards. This is due to the widespread migration of the Malpaharias and the depopulation of the Malers in these areas due to their isolating habits in the hill blocks, where dearth of food and drink was eating away the vitals of this tribe.

Sutherland states in his Report: “As his (Cleaveand's) system extended, he found hill men further south and applied for and obtained

⁸ I must thank Mr. Hoernle for the kind assistance rendered by him in my investigations.

the transfer of the pergunnahs of Ambar (Pakur) and Sultanabad (Maheshpur) from the Murshidabad district.”

This Pakur is located about 13 miles north of the river Bansloi while Maheshpur is situated on the southern bank of the river. Thus we find the existence of the Malers even to the south of the River Bansloi. Risley⁹ also referred to this transfer of the two above named places but he does not mention the authority of his statement. Towards the border line of Santal Perganas and the district of Birbhoom there is at present an estate known as Belputtah which lies about 40 miles south-west of Maheshpur and to the south of Dalton's Brahmani River. Both in the Sutherland Report and in Risley we find that this *tuppah* was then occupied by the hill people. We find in the former report:—

“On extending his system to their hills he (Cleaveland) heard of hill men further south and applied for the transfer of the Belputtah Tuppah from Birbhoom to Bhagalpur that he might apply his policy to the hill race there. He died soon after making this proposal but it was revised by one of his successors Mr. Tombelle and sanctioned by Government in 1795.”¹⁰

In the same report we find that the Government was forced to pass some special laws in order to maintain the peace and order in Belputtah, which happened to be unruly because of the advent of the hill population in the plains. We quote the first law from the Sutherland Report.

“Special rules in respect to Belputtah”

Firstly.—That no special laws enacted on account of the general hill population be extended or allowed to apply to the inhabitants of the Pergunnah Belputtah, who are usually called hill people, such individuals being considered amenable to the general laws of the country.¹¹

Then we find that Belputtah was also settled by the Malers. The extensive boundary lines up to Belputtah Tuppah i.e. south-west of Dumka thus far surpass the boundary lines of Dalton and other authorities.

9 Risley, *loc cit.*, p. 54.

10 Sutherland, *loc cit.*, p. 119.

11 Sutherland, *loc cit.*, p. 33.

We cannot but discuss here some inconsistencies in Sutherland's report. He writes: "When, in 1780, Mr. Cleaveland began his hill system, the jurisdiction of Bhagalpore comprised no part of the Rajmahal Hills, then or now inhabited by the Malpaharias. He was brought in contact with the Malers only and it is to them alone that his descriptions of past independence and oppression by the people of the plains apply. The acquisition of Sultanabad brought the Malpaharias under Mr. Cleaveland but it is plain that he was never brought in actual contact with them; or at all events, never recognized the difference. The vernacular term Paharia was never used in correspondence of those days and the "highlanders", hill men" or "hill race" are treated as a single homogeneous tribe up to 1819."¹²

Regarding the first part of the report we find that the Collector of Bhagalpur was placed in the sole charge of the administration of both Bhagalpur and Rajmahal and we must remember here that Cleaveland transferred Pakur and Maheshpur on the east and Belputtah on the south-west to the district of Bhagalpur. Surely then, the border line of the then Bhagalpur district passed close by those places otherwise the administration was not possible. Further, we have seen that Hastings Memorial (p. 9) begins with, "We the inhabitants in the Jungleterry in the Chukla of Rajmahal and Boglepoor etc." Besides this fact, the Rajmahal Hills proper were never occupied by the Malpaharias, as it is not even now found, save and except by a few families of immigrants.

The intervention of the Malpaharias in the Sutherland's report has been, I suppose, because of the ignorance of the proper place of the then Malpaharias. It might be that the Malpaharias had already sprung up. Taking it for granted that the Malpaharias and the Malers were living side by side at Maheshpur we do not find any reason of the Malpaharias only, slipping off altogether; of course, Mr. Sutherland writes that Cleaveland did not actually come in contact with any one of them. This seems to be doubtful before the evidence of Belputtah lying so far south-west of Maheshpur and Dumka. We do not think that Cleaveland crossed unwinkingly such an enormous area at present

12 Sutherland, *op. cit.*, p. 119.

inhabited by about 37000 Malpaharias and went to Belputtah to preach his hill system there only.

At present we find few Malers residing in the Dumka sub-division. We cannot but admit then, that the hill population which had been then occupying the hills of Belputtah and others near by came down and adopted some means of sustenance on the Government stipends and grants of lands. The final process was necessarily the transformation of the Malers to Malpaharias as shown in this paper.

SASANKA SARKAR



Some Sanskrit Texts on Painting

Painting formed a part of ancient Indian culture as much as Saṃgīta and Nāṭya did. Like Music and Dance, Painting also left its impress upon the Sanskrit literature which we propose to show in this paper.

I. *Vaṛṇaka* or *Praticchanda*

Artists first draw a rough sketch and then produce their pictures. This rough sketch seems to have been called in Sanskrit as *vaṛṇaka* and *hastalekha*. Describing the beauty of the city of Pāṭaliputra, Dāmodaragupta says in his *Kuṭṭanīmata* that that city was the model plan or first sketch done by Viśvakarman to show his skill to Brahman who asked him about the construction of the three worlds.

त्रिभुवनपुरनिष्पादनकौशलमिव पृच्छतो विरिञ्चस्य ।

दर्शयितुं निजशिल्पं वर्णकमिव विश्वकर्मणा विहितम् ॥ Sl. 117.

The commentator, Tanusukha Rama Sarma Tripathi, says here:—

वर्णकमनुकरणार्थं मूलभूतं चित्रकं । उक्तं च, 'रूपातिशयकर्तृणां प्रतिच्छन्दो हि कारणम्' इति ।...शिल्पं च आलेख्यं, लेखं, दारुकर्म, चितिकर्म, पाषाणकर्म, रौप्यकर्म, देवकर्म, चित्रकर्म इति भेदैरष्टविधम् ।

From this, we know that the model or sketch called *vaṛṇaka* is also called *praticchanda* and that according to some work, Śilpa is divided into eight kinds.

II. *Hastalekha*

This *vaṛṇaka* or *praticchanda* is also called *hastalekha*. Śrī Harṣa calls it so in his *Naiṣadha*. In a more effective turn of a similar imagery, Śrī Harṣa says that before Brahman created Damayantī, he produced as rough sketches for practice Rambhā, Urvasī and other celestial damsels:

पुराकृतिः स्त्रैणमिमां विधातुं अभूद्विधातुः किल हस्तलेखः ।

येयं भवद्भाविपुरन्ध्रसृष्टिः सास्यै यशः तज्जयजं प्रदातुम् ॥ *Naiṣ.*, VII, 15.

Nārāyaṇa's commentary on this verse says that *hastalekha* is a rough sketch prepared by the artist for practice before he creates his beautiful work of art.

हस्तलेखः प्रथमोऽभ्यासोऽभूत् । अन्योऽपि शिल्पी प्रथमं हस्तलेखाः कृत्वा
पश्चात्सुन्दरं वस्तु निर्माति । उत्तरशिल्पापेक्षया हस्तलेखस्यातिहीनत्वात् ।

It is natural that in literary criticism painting should play a large part. Poetry is the supreme art which like Nature appeals to all the senses. The appeal in poetry to the ear is related to the art of music. The appeal in poetry to the eye is related to the art of painting. Fine miniature painting with each figure in the composition very clear (the *Artha-vyakti-guṇa* of Vāmana in poetry and the *Rūpa-bheda-guṇas* in the six *Guṇas* of a picture) has been pointed out by critics as a prominent feature of Sanskrit poetry. The art of literary criticism in explaining the beauties of poetry naturally adopts the metaphors of painting. (Cf. Plutarch, *On the Reading of Poets*).

III. Light and Shade

A poet is acquainted with all arts, crafts and lores, say Bharata and Bhāmaha. The truth of this is borne out by the writing of such poets as Kālidāsa and Bāna. In the section on Kavi-śikṣā, the Ālaṅkārikas point out certain specific cases of the poets' acquaintance with many arts and lores. Kṣemendra in his *Kavikaṇṭhābharana* says that proficiency in painting is seen in Vyāsa, the poet of the *Mahābhārata*. This is a very valuable reference showing us the feature called 'light and shade' which on flat surface shows heights and depths. This verse ascribed to Vyāsa is given anonymously by Hemacandra in his *Kāvya-lamkāra-viveka* in the same context.

अतथ्यान्यपि तथ्यानि दर्शयन्ति विचक्षणाः ।

समनिम्नोन्नतानीव चित्रकर्मविदो जनाः ॥

About this same 'light and shade' and showing of 'depths and heights', Bhoja quotes anonymously another Anuṣṭubh in chapter IX in his *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* (Ms., Madras Govt. Oriental Mss. Library):

यत्र निम्नोन्नतं चित्रे स्वरूपं पर्वतादिभिः ।

न तत्र प्रतिघातादि कार्यं तद्वत् प्रवर्तते ॥

This also is used as a simile by Kālidāsa while describing the beauty of Pārvatī when youth bloomed on her body. Her body in girlhood was like an unfinished picture which when worked out with the fine brush, attained the waken state as it were from the sleeping or blind state (*Kumārasambhava*, I, 32):

उन्मीलितं तूलिकयेव चित्रं × × ×
वपुर्विभक्तं नवयौवनेन ॥

The word विभक्तं here is important. It means the effect of light and shade; and this is given as one of the necessary good qualities of a picture in the *Viṣṇudharmottara*:

स्थान (नं) प्रमाणं भूलंबो मधुरत्वं विभक्तता ।

Aspects of Poetry in terms of Picture

Vāmana, among other Alaṅkārikas, was a keen student of pictures and his *Kāvyaḷaṅkāra-sūtras* and *Vṛtti* describe some aspects of poetry in terms of picture. With much insight, Vāmana says that the essence of poetry is style (रीतिरात्मा काव्यस्य) and compares this Rīti to the linear beauty, the lines of a picture. एतासु तिसषु रेखास्त्रिव चित्रं काव्यं प्रतिष्ठितं । As style is the soul of poetry so are lines that of picture. On seeing this remark of Vāmana we are reminded of the *Viṣṇudharmottara* which says that the masters praise the lines.

Vāmana again returns to the same metaphor of which he seems to be very fond and says in his *Kāvyaḷaṅkārasūtra-vṛtti*, III, 1.

यथा विच्छिद्यते रेखा चतुरं चित्रपण्डितैः ।

तथैव वागपि प्राज्ञैः समस्तगुणगुम्फिता ॥

Another reference to painting in Vāmana speaks of colour. The *Viṣṇudharmottara*, after saying that the masters praise the lines, remarks that some others praise 'colour' (वर्णाढ्यमितरे जनाः).

Vāmana says that 'aujjvalya' is that quality of the colouring of a picture which makes the picture always look new and fresh. 'Aujjvalya' is brilliancy which ensures the life of a picture. Otherwise the picture fades and looks very old. This quality is borrowed by him

in poetry and he says that poetry looks brilliant and preserves that brilliancy by the quality of 'kānti' in the words chosen.

औज्ज्वल्यं कान्तिः । *Ibid.*, III, 1.25.

बन्धस्य उज्ज्वलत्वं नाम यत्, असौ कान्तिरिति ; तदभावे पुराणच्छायेत्युच्यते

औज्ज्वल्यं कान्तिरित्माहुर्गुणं गुणविशारदाः ।

पुराणचित्रस्थानीयं तेन बन्ध्यं कवेर्वचः ॥ *Ibid.*, III, 1.

A similar idea of an old picture is visualised by Rājasekhara, the dramatist, in a fine description of Nature in the fading evening twilight and approaching darkness in the prologue to his drama, *Bāla-bhārata* or *Pracaṇḍa-pāṇḍava*. He compares Nature at dusk to an old picture dulled by smoke :

किञ्च स्तोकतमःकलापकलनाश्यामायमानं मनाक्

धूमश्यामपुराणचित्ररचनारूपं जगज्जायते ।

Vāmana in his *Kāvya-lamkāra-sūtra* (I. iii. 30-31) compares drama to picture and calls drama as literature par excellence, because of its likeness to a picture.

सन्दर्भेषु दशरूपकं नाटकादि श्रेयः । तद्विचित्रं चित्रपटवत् विशेषसाकल्यात् ।

Bhaṭṭa Tauta, as has been quoted by his pupil, Abhinava, in his *Abhinavabhāratī*, says that Rasa-realisation or emotional response is easily and excellently got only from a drama, for *abhinanya* or acting makes the thing live before us in drama. That is, there poetry attains the visual state when one can realise through the eye what one can only imagine otherwise. It is because of this quality that drama is called picture by Vāmana,—a series of pictures seen before our eyes. It is because of this quality also that drama is called Rūpa (अवस्थानु-कृतिर्नाट्यं रूपं दृश्यतयोच्यते) । रूपकं तद् भवेद् रूपं दृश्यत्वात् प्रेक्षकरिदम् ।
—(भावप्रकाश)

Vāmana briefly compares Rīti, the essence of poetry to lines (*rekhā*) which are the essence of pictures. This sūtra is quoted and further explained by Ratneśvara in his commentary on Bhoja's *Sarasvatī-kaṇṭhābharana* :

यथा चित्रस्य लेखा उत्तुङ्गप्रत्यङ्गलावण्योन्मीलनक्षमा, तथा रीतिरिति द्वितीये विस्तरः ।

Rājānaka Kuntaka, another great Ālaṅkārika, in chapter III of his *Vakrokti-jīvita* says while speaking of the poet's beautiful speech :

मनीषफलकोल्लेखवर्णच्छायाश्रियः पृथक् । चित्रस्येव मनीहारि कर्तुः किमपि कौशलम् ॥

The stamp of beauty on a poet's utterance is totally different from the materials of poetry, viz., the words and thoughts. It is the result purely of the great powers of the poet, constituting his genius. This is like the beauty of a picture which is born of the genius of the artist and is separate from the plank or wall on which the picture is painted or the colours employed. Kuntaka here refers to two surfaces, wall and plank, to the rules for lines, anatomy etc. given in the *Citrasūtras*, to the colours and to the 'chāyā' or 'kānti' or 'aujvalya' of which Vāmana spoke. The following is Kuntaka's Vṛtti on the Kārikā given above.

फलकमालेख्याधारभूता भित्तिः, उल्लेखः चित्रसूत्रप्रमाणोपपन्नं रेखाविन्यासमात्रं वर्णा रञ्जकद्रव्यविशेषाः, छाया कान्तिः । तदिदमत्र तात्पर्यं—यथा चित्रस्य किमपि फलकाद्युपकरणकलापव्यतिरेकि सकलप्रकृतपदार्थजीवितायमानं चित्रकरकौशलं पृथक्त्वेन मुख्यतयोद्भासेत ।— *Ibid.*, p. 154.

What must be noted here is not only the 'chāyā,' 'kānti' or 'aujvalya,' but the mention by Kuntaka of the stamp of the genius of the painter which shows itself distinctly above all other features.

The art of Painting is based on the art of Nāṭya

A perusal of the sections on painting in the *Viṣṇudharmottara*, in Bhoja's *Samarāṅgaṇa-sūtradhāra* etc. will show how *citra* is based by the canonists on Nāṭya. The authors of these texts find it possible to treat of *citra* only after treating of Nāṭya. For *Citra* is only one scene of Nāṭya and Nāṭya a succession of *Citras*. The *Viṣṇudharmottara* says that *Citra* is as much the art of imitation (*anukaraṇa*) as Nāṭya. The poses, the hands of dance called Nṛtyahastas, the *Rasa-dṛṣṭis*—these are studied elaborately in Nāṭya and this study is absolutely necessary for, and is fully utilized in, painting. Says the *Vi. Dhā*—

विना तु नृत्तशास्त्रेण चित्रसूत्रं सुदुर्विदम् ।

यथा नृत्ते तथा चित्रे त्रैलोक्यानुकृतिः स्मृता ।

दृश्यश्च तथा भावा अङ्गोपाङ्गानि सर्वशः ॥

कराश्च ये महानृत्ते पूर्वोक्ता नृपसत्तम ।
न एव चित्रे विज्ञेया नृत्तं चित्रं परं मतम् ॥

The application of the Rasa theory to Citra

It follows from the above-mentioned fact that Citra is based on Nāṭya, that the critics of old applied the Rasa theory of Nāṭya and Kāvya to Citra as well. As a matter of fact the Rasa theory applies to all arts. So it is that, while speaking of the kinds of pictures in the section on Painting in his *Abhilāṣitārthacintāmaṇi* (Mysore ed.), king Someśvara speaks of one type of picture called Bhāva-citra.

शृंगारादिरसो यत्र दर्शनादेव गम्यते । भावचित्रं तदाख्यातं चित्रकौतुककारकम् ॥

Jayadeva, author of the *Candrāloka* and his commentator, Payagunda Vaidyanātha, apply the Rasa theory to Citra.

काव्ये नाट्ये च कार्ये च विभावाद्यैर्विभावितः ।

आस्वाद्यमानैकतनुः स्थायी भावा रसः स्मृतः ॥ *Candrāloka*, VI. 3.

The application of the Dhvani theory to Citra

The application of the Rasa theory of drama and poetry to picture means that in pictures also Rasas are to be depicted by conditions which rouse them viz., the objects of emotions, the excitements of emotions, the effects of emotions and the minor emotions which can be called fleeting feelings and which are accessory to the major emotional mood. This means the application of the Dhvani theory also to Citra. It certainly means so. For, in an artistic presentation, it is the suggestion that forms the very life of that artistic expression. This can also be proved by taking the Canons given by the *Viṣṇudharmottara* for depicting things like evening etc. A persual of the verses in chapter 24, which show, how mountains, sky, earth etc. must be depicted, will prove the truth of this statement. The subjects, e.g., gamblers should be suggested by depicting them as bereft of their upper cloth. उत्तरीयविहीनांश्च द्रुयतासक्तान्प्रदर्शयेत् । A high way must be suggested by portraying a caravan of camels etc. carrying articles of transport (युक्तं सभारैरुष्ट्राद्यैः मार्गं सार्थं प्रदर्शयेत्). The night must be suggested by drawing a thief walking stealthily, by an abhisārikā hurrying to meet her lover in her trysting

place and so forth. Rather it is in picture that this principle of Dhvani, which, according to modern English critics, is "symbolism" in poetry, applies excellently. For here, in picture, there is no scope for the word which can name the subject depicted. In poetry, it is a fault to give anything by its name. To call Rasas by their names, which will never rouse up those Rasas, is a flaw of poetry, called the स्वपदवाच्यत्वं of Rasas. Thus the title of a picture forms a very little part of it. If one does not avoid this flaw, his poem comes to the state of that picture which can be known only by its title or that frame which has the title of the picture within.

Texts on Painting

Coming to the texts on Citra, the work that must be considered first is the *Citrasūtra* mentioned by Kuntaka and Dāmodaragupta and others. The section on Citra in the *Viṣṇudharmottara* is called Citra-sūtra but it is not in sūtra style. Mr. Ramakrishna Kavi mentions in his introduction to the *Sivatattvaratnākara* that there are *Citrasūtras* of Sarasvatī and others. I know of a *Silpa* work called the *Sārasvatā-oirakarmasāstra* in the Tanjore Sarasvatī Mahal Library which I think is the *Citrasūtra* of Sarasvatī. It is not in Sūtra style but is written in Anuṣṭubh. The word 'Sūtra' occurring in 'Citrasūtra' does not mean that it is composed in the style of Pāṇini's grammatical rules. Probably the word 'sūtra' means simply śāstra. Among the texts of Citra Śāstra in Sanskrit which are now available, the *Viṣṇudharmottara*, the *Abhilaṣitārtha-cintāmaṇi* of the Cālukyan king Someśvara, the *Samarāṅgaṇa-sūtradhāra* of king Bhoja, the *Silparatna* of Śrīkumāra and the *Sivatattvaratnākara* of king Vāsava are available in print. Of these, the *Viṣṇudharmottara* and the *Silparatna* are the only two texts that have been translated into English and studied to some extent by scholars engaged in the study of painting. The former has been translated by Dr. Stella Kramrisch, and has also been recently discussed by Dr. A. K. Coomaraswamy, who was carrying on a study of the names of the types of pictures given in the text. Coming to the four kinds of pictures given in the *Viṣṇudharmottara*, सत्य, वैणिक, नागर and मिश्र I am of opinion that none of the first three kinds has been correctly or adequately explained by Dr. Coomaraswamy.

Vaiṇika can never be explained by taking stand on *Vīṇā* which may mean 'lyre' and thus can, in due course, lead one to 'the lyrical.' Similarly *Nāgara* cannot be explained by Vātsyāyana's *Nāgaraka*. Even the Nagara style met with in architecture does not help us in this connection. *Satya* cannot be interpreted as a Sāttvika picture. One can as well derive it from Sat and say it is the picture of the Upaniṣadic Brahman. My impression on reading the *Viṣṇudharmottara* is that even to its author the exact import of these names was not clear. The text seems to have been written after a cut in the flow of tradition of the artists who were using these words as Paribhāṣās. Otherwise one would not, in differentiating types of pictures on the basis of prominent and noteworthy features, mix with these such trifling features as the oblong or square nature of the frame, as the author of the *Vi. Dha.* does. The names *Vaiṇika*, *Nāgara* etc. remind me of similar Paribhāṣās of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, viz., *Jarjara*, *Kaiśikī* etc. which even in Bharata's text are explained very unsatisfactorily with the aid of grammar and verbal resemblances.

It must also be noted in this connection that none of the other works dealing with the types of pictures, speak of these four kinds mentioned in the *Vi. Dha.* The *Abhilaṣitārthacintāmaṇi* give five varieties of picture: विद्ध, अविद्ध, भावचित्र, रसचित्र and धूलीचित्र. Of these the 'Bhāva Citra' stands by itself and is of the greatest importance. It has been explained above that 'Bhāva Citra' is the picture depicting emotion. The 'Rasa Citra' and 'Dhūli Citra' go together. The 'Dhūli Citra' is the Tamil 'Kolam,' done with white flour on the floor and in front of our houses. In the month of Mārgaśīrṣa, Tamil girls vie with each other in the villages to draw the biggest and the most intricate 'Kolams' in front of their houses and then decorate these 'Kolams' at various points with pumpkin flowers. On more festive occasions, in the houses, temples and Tambalams (i.e. brass plates used in our houses) for Nīrājana, these 'Kolams' are done with various coloured powders. These Citras are naturally short-lived. So it is that Śrī Kumāra calls them 'Kṣaṇika.' Since these are drawn more especially on floor, Nārada calls this variety of Citra as 'Bhauma' i.e. 'of the floor.' Śrī Kumāra describes them thus:

एतान्यनलवर्णानि चूर्णयित्वा पृथक् पृथक् ।

(ए) तैश्चूर्णैः स्थण्डिले रम्ये क्षणिकानि विलेपयेत् ॥

धूलीचित्रमिदं ख्यातं चित्रकारैः पुरातनैः ।

Silparatna, XXXVI, śls. 144, 145.

'Rasa Citra' is another variety of 'Kolam.' One must not be misled by the word *Rasa* in 'Rasa Citra' and take it with 'Bhāva Citra.' The word *Rasa* here means *drava* or coloured solution. The *Abhi. Cint.* thus defines it : सद्रवै वर्णकैः लेख्यं रसचित्रं विचक्षणैः ।

This kind of 'Kolam' is also drawn in some Tamil houses. White flour-solution and red Kavi-solution are employed, and are called in Tamil as Mavukkalam and Kavikkalam. The former is drawn in waving lines. Thus 'Rasa Citra' is also a kind of 'Kolam.' While *cūrṇa* or powder is employed in 'Dhūli Citra,' *drava* or solution is employed in 'Rasa Citra.'¹ Therefore it is held by Śrī Kumāra that like 'Dhūli Citra' and Citra (i.e. Sculpture) etc. the 'Rasa Citra' also is not for the walls.

सुधा धवलिते भित्तौ नैव कुर्यादिदं सुधीः ।

रसचित्रं तथा धूलीचित्रं चित्रमिति त्रिधा ॥ *Ibid.*, śl. 143.

Thus Painting and half-visible reliefs, Citrābhāsa and Ardha Citra are the two that are done on walls. These facts are not taken into consideration by Dr. A. K. Coomaraswamy. Consequently, he connects² the Vainika of the *Viṣṇudharmottara* with the 'Rasa Citra' of Śrī Kumāra and says that both are identical. Surely *Rasa* also means emotion and emotion is associated with *Vinā* from which is derived by him the Vainika type. But when one sees the clear definition of *Rasa Citra* given by Someśvara from whom Śrī Kumāra borrows his knowledge, one will be rest assured of the fact that *Rasa Citra* is another kind of 'Kolam,' related to the Dhūli Citra, the word 'Rasa' here meaning *drava*.

1 The Makara and other coloured designs drawn on the cheeks and busts of damsels according to the Kāvya belong also to this category of 'Rasa Citra.'

2 *Ashutosh Mukerjee Commemoration Volume*, Part, I, p. 50.

The Viddha and Aviddha types of pictures of Someśvara stand together. They are thus described by Someśvara:—

सादृश्यं लिख्यते यत्तु दर्पणे प्रतिबिम्बवत् ।
 तच्चित्रं विद्धमित्याहुर्विश्वकर्मादयो बुधाः ॥
 आकस्मिके लिखामीति यदा तूद्दिश्य लिख्यते ।
 आकारमात्रसंपत्त्वे तदविद्धमिति स्मृतम् ॥

Viddha is thus a perfect portrait-like realistic picture, looking verily like a reflection of the thing in a mirror. The description is also borrowed by Śrī Kumāra in his *Silparatna*. Someśvara's definition of Bhāva Citra, is reproduced *verbatim* and that of Viddha with a slight change by Śrī Kumāra. The text as printed in the Triv. edn. is somewhat corrupt and I give it here with my emendations.

सादृश्यं लिख्यते यत्तु दर्पणे प्रतिबिम्बवत् ।
 तच्चित्र (विद्ध) मिति विख्यातं—नालमाकारमात्रकम् ॥

The definition of the Viddha stops with the third foot and the fourth foot describes another picture called Nāla. What is Nāla? It is the Aviddha of Someśvara. Both Nāla and Aviddha are described as 'Ākāramātraka.' Aviddha is something like a Memory-sketch drawn by an artist giving only just those few lines which are enough to show the likeness of the object portrayed (*ākāramātrasampatti*). Now I am disposed to think that the Satya of the *Viṣṇudharmottara* is the Viddha of Someśvara. Satya and Viddha are two names of realistic pictures with complete Sādrśya.³

The texts which have not yet been regularly studied are the *Abhilaṣitārthacintāmaṇi* of Someśvara (which is the source for Bāsava and Śrī Kumāra), the *Sumarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra* of Bhoja and the *Śivatattvaratnākara*. Above I have dealt with one noteworthy section

3 Sādrśya which stands for Realism and is the one feature which emphasises the fact that Painting is also an 'Imitation-Art', is mentioned often in the *Viṣṇudharmottara* as one of the excellences of Pictures which the artist must try to secure.

एषः सुसदृशं कार्यं सर्वेषामविशेषतः

चित्रे सादृश्यकरणां प्रधानं परिकीर्तितम् ॥ VI. Dha., chap. 42.

in the *Abhi. Cint.* on the types of pictures. The *Samarāṅgaṇa-sūtradhāra*, which is a work dealing with a variety of subjects like architecture, arms etc. devotes some attention to painting. It speaks much of the Nāṭya Sthānakas, Nṛttahastas, Rasadṛṣṭis etc. an understanding of which is necessary for painting. The text of this work published in the Gaekwad's Series being corrupt is difficult of interpretation. It is noteworthy that this text connects eleven Rasas with pictures: the well-known nine Rasas, which only are given by the *Vi. Dhā.*, the Preyas introduced by Rudraṭa and the eleventh, Ahampratyaya,⁸ introduced by Bhoja himself. (See *Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra*, ch. 82, śls. 1-3).

Now I propose to notice the contents of two works treating of painting which are still in Ms. form. The *Sārasvatācitrakarmasāstra* is a Ms. on Citra available in the Tanjore Library (Burnell 11076). It is on Citra and not on painting alone. Citra, as is known from the *Silparatna* does not mean picture alone. It means exactly what the Tamil word 'Bomai' means. It means Citra, sculpture or complete figures in stone, metal etc., Ardhacitra, 'half-visible reliefs on the walls,' and Citrābhāsa, 'semblance of a Citra' viz. the mono-dimensional drawing on a flat surface like wall, plank, cloth etc. It is sculpture etc. which are Citra *par excellence*. This classification is also given by the *Sārasvatācitrāsāstra*. It means first Citra, Ardhacitra and Citrābhāsa,—Citra in धातु, दारु, शिला, रत्न and लौह and Citrābhāsa on wall or plank of wood. Then it speaks of Māna of man and women and these go up to chapter X. It then takes up the Māna of Mūrtis. In the 39th chapter, it speaks of मृत्लेपन, smearing the walls with mud and of गुकलेपन, smearing the walls with *cunam*. The 40th chapter deals with Varna Samskāra. From such works as this we learn that painting and iconography and sculpture came to be related and that the canons for the latter two were also the canons for painting

8 I owe the reconstruction of the eleventh Rasa as *Ahampratyaya*, 'the sense of I' to my Professor Mm. S. Kuppaswamy Sastriar. It is sanctioned by the *Sarasvatikanṭhābharaṇa* of Bhoja where two Rasas Udātta and Uddhata are given in the place of this one Rasa of 'Ego' which forms the basic of those two.

—a fact which we realise also on seeing the rather modern paintings on the walls of almost all the South Indian temples.

Another work, of the *Śilpa Śāstra*, which treats of painting and is not available in print is the *Nāradaśilpa* which I propose to examine now. A Ms. of this work is available in the Adyar Library, Adyar, Madras. Two chapters of this work are devoted to painting, one to the architecture of Citra Śālā, 'Art gallery', and another to painting itself. We all know that besides the houses and temples, a place called the Citra Śālā in the palaces of kings contained pictures. We hear of this Citra Śālā of the king's palace in the *Mālavikāgnimitra* of Kālidāsa. But the hall for pictures and its architecture are nowhere else described in works of Śilpa except in the *Nāradaśilpa*. From this work which describes only the public Citra Śālā of the city, we also come to know that in ancient India, apart from the Art gallery in the palaces, there were also public Art galleries in the city. The *Naiṣadha*, X. 35 and *Kādambarī* mention public Art galleries of the city.

Chapter 66 of the *Nāradaśilpa* is called चित्रशालालक्षणकथन and it describes the nature of Citra Śālā. The work is written in a very difficult, affected archaic prose style and consequently very few sentences are clear enough to be quoted here. Nārada quotes an earlier authority, Uśinara, according to whom the Citra Śālā must be in the centre of the city, in a place like the meeting of four streets or in the middle of the Rāja Vīthī, 'king's highway.' The building may be of the shape of a Mardala, (a kind of drum) or Māṇḍalika (circular) or mace-like (*dāṇḍī-kākṛtika*). It has many doors, main and smaller entrances (*dvāropadvāraka*). It may have one or many faces. The courts within must be each in two parts (*dvidvibhāgāṅgaṇa*). This perhaps means that one half on the side of the wall is to be enclosed for pictures and the other half for the floating spectators. There are inner halls, pials to rest on and stairs leading to the upper storey. The pillars may be 32, or 16 in number. One hall for pictures runs across and there is one in the centre. The one in the centre seems to be in a very raised place with steps leading to it. In the front or on the eastern side there is a 'special hall' (*Vaiśeṣika Śālā*). The whole building shall have windows, and beautiful canopies and shall be, in all other ways variously decorated. Again Nārada says that the Citra Śālā must have

many pials and many seats on all sides with Upa-Sālās or minor halls resembling out-houses. The building is like a Mandapa, with dome and kalāśa at the top. It is not that the same hall must have all these details but one may adopt some and another some others. Certain Citra Sālās, for instance, have stairs on all sides and have the halls for picture only in the upstairs. The Citra Sālā has a great mirror within and glass chandeliers. Sometimes the front of the building is beautified by constructing it like a small Gopura. In such halls pictures done in various brilliant colours, of Devas, Gandharvas, Kinnaras, men in sport, persons possessing greatness and of importance are exhibited.

Chapter 71 of the *Nāradaśilpa* is devoted to the decoration of painting चित्रालंकृतिरचनाविधिकथन. Pictures are not only for the joy of the gods and the presiding deities of the buildings, the Vāstunāthas, but are also for beauty according to Uśinara. Nārada gives a new kind of classification of pictures, not found in other works, and it is from the point of view of the places where the pictures are drawn. Thus he says that pictures are of three kinds—of the floor, of the wall, and of the top, i.e. ceiling (भौम, कुड्यक and ऊर्ध्वक). These again are classified from another standpoint into two kinds, permanent and temporary (शाश्वतक and तात्कालिक). The latter is the Bhauma i.e. the picture of the floor; Kolam, the Dhūli Citra and Raśa Citra of Someśvara belong to this class. Nārada says that this variety is drawn in front of the house, on the door-step, on the pials and everywhere in the house on the floor. Birds, snakes, elephants, horses etc. can thus be drawn. These themes are still drawn in our houses.

The pictures on the walls—Kudyaka, or, on the top—ūrdhvaka, are of Devas, Gandharvas, Yakṣas, sages, great monarchs, animals, wrestlers, warriors etc. Nārada says that the pillar-tops and sides of the pillars can also be decorated with painting.

The two good features of all pictures are given by Nārada as fine lines and observation of anatomy rules, अविषमरेखा and अविरुद्धसूत्रापात. He gives rich decoration as another good feature and here we are reminded of the *Vi. Dha.* which says:— स्त्रियो भूषणमिच्छन्ति.

According to place, says Nārada, the appropriate jātis of beings, Daiva, Gāndharva, Yākṣa, Kainnara, Vaidyādhara and Mānuṣa, must be chosen. Nārada speaks also of animals and birds in various postures

as themes to be drawn in the eastern or southern sides. He says that, before painting, Sudhā must be applied to the walls and if the ground is plank or wood in the cases of beams and pillars, it must be smeared with some herbal juice to make it durable. The Citras on wood and metal which refer to carved images etc. and to which the name *citra* applies pre-eminently, are also mentioned by Nārada along with the references to painting or carving, on umbrellas, handles of chowries, swords etc.

The *Siva-tattva-ratnākara* need not be specially treated, for it contains nothing original. In a way, it is also unnecessary to treat of the *Silparatna*⁵ for that work also borrows from the work of Someśvara.

V. RAGHAVAN

5 The chapter on 'Citrakṣaṇa' in this work published in the T.S.S. was surveyed in an article by Mr. K. P. Jayaswal in the *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society*. Subsequently, a translation of the text with some introductory remarks from the pen of Dr. A. K. Coomaraswamy, appeared in the first part of the *Ashutosh Mukherjee Commemoration Volume* (pp. 49-61).

Two Types of Subjectivism in Monistic Vedānta

According to the absolute monism of Saṅkara, the Absolute or Brahman is the ground or substratum of all that appears and is experienced to be real; and is itself of the nature of experience (*anubhava*). The main problem of Vedānta, as for all systems of philosophy, is the relation that exists between the individual experience and the Absolute experience. If the individual experience is identical with the Absolute experience, then there is no room for illusion and error. If the individual experience is only a part of the total experience of the Absolute, then also error or illusion is to be regarded as partially true. If the individual experience is merely subjectivistic and has no reality as distinct from the Absolute experience either as independent of it or even as its segment (if in any way a segment or part of the Absolute can be conceived), then the whole of the individual experiences of this universe have to be regarded as altogether illusory.

We shall here discuss two sub-divisions of the Vedāntic theory of the illusoriness or rather the subjective character of the individual experience and shall attempt to point out the difference that exists between them.

Two such positions of subjectivism have been advocated in monistic Vedānta—one is '*dr̥ṣṭir-eva sṛṣṭiḥ*' (creation as identical with cognition), and the other is '*dr̥ṣṭi-samasamayā sṛṣṭiḥ*' (creation as contemporaneous with cognition). And we are shown how from a transcendental viewpoint these subjective experiences are transcended in intuitive experience of the Absolute.

We shall begin by explaining the implication of the intuitive experience revealed in the existence of particular objects in the light of two different intuitive experiences expounded and upheld by the authors of the *Tattvasūddhi* and the *Nyāyasūdhā*, so that it will be easier to follow ultimately the two nicely distinguished theories of subjectivism that these two intuitive standpoints involve.

It will not be out of place here to point out that though in the *Siddhāntaleśa-saṃgraha* the topic of these two subjective standpoints is dealt with separately from the topic of the two intuitive standpoints,

yet from a study of the *Siddhānta-muktāvalī* of Prakāśānanda where he elaborately criticises the latter type of subjectivism (viz. *dr̥ṣṭi-sama-samayā sṛṣṭiḥ*) from his own standpoint (viz. *dr̥ṣṭir-eva sṛṣṭiḥ*), it will not appear as a new philosophic venture when we associate the two types of subjectivism with two kinds of intuitive experiences relating to the existence of a particular object, say an earthen jug (*san ghataḥ*).*

So the question is what ultimately is the nature of being that is to be ascribed to the jug for instance (*san ghataḥ*), consistently with the monistic position as realised in intuitive experiences of seers e.g. *ekamevādvitīyam*. You can say either that the particularity and experience of a perceptual fact (*cākṣuṣatvādyanubhava*) is an illusion, which means that it is all a logical and metaphysical construction of the intuitive experience; this is the view of Tattvaśuddhikāra. Or, you can admit the particularity and experience of the perceptual fact as a case of determinate cognition grounded directly on the determined existence of Brahman, for, according to this view, the existence of the jug is the determined existence of Brahman; it has no separate, not even illusory, existence of its own. This means that the particularity of the jug etc. is a psychological or epistemological construction of the intuitive experience; this is the view of Nyāyasudhākāra. But both the views agree about the intuitive experience of particular objects and aver that in all the varied experiences of objects, the common element, that is, the vital link through them all, is the Being-in-essence (*sattā-sāmānya*), which is identical with the ultimate reality; and so transcendently speaking the experience of perception is not in any opposition to the intuitive experience of seers embodied in the Sruti texts like *ekamevādvitīyam*, declaring the oneness and entirety of the Reality.

But still the question will pursue us—even so, the Being-in-essence

* e. g. compare the topic beginning with—‘pratīṣamākālinam sattvaṃ jagataḥ iti ko'rthah’ etc. where occur almost all the arguments that we meet with in connection with the position of Tattvaśuddhikāra which is evidently aimed against that of Nyāyasudhākāra who accepts determinate knowledge which the former repudiates: while both deny the existence of object as independent of the knowing of it (*ajñāta-jñāpakatva*)—the common ground of all subjectivism.

Vide *Siddhānta-muktāvalī*, Venis's edition, pp. 40 ff. Also the commentary thereon in Jivānanda's edition.

must be conceived to be different from the jug as determined in extension and intension, that is, the jug as a concept realised in a particular form of existence, for, otherwise everything would be equivalent to every other thing in point of the productive or purposive activity, which is absurd. So we are faced with the question, what sort of a difference is it? Is the difference real; or, is it factual, merely the appearance? Even if it is factual, is it false or true in its implication?

The author of the *Tattva-sūddhi* holds that the particular existence of the jug etc. are superimpositions on the Being-in-essence (*sattā-sāmānya*). 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. As in the case of illusion, the ground of the illusion, the 'this', is apprehended in perception, the functioning of the senses being absorbed by it, while the silver is falsely perceived as being superimposed on it; similarly all perception only takes in the bare Being-in-essence on which alone it is active, while the various differences, i.e. determinations in existence are falsely perceived. As such we have as facts of experience, 'the jug is' and not the 'isness' merely, which would have been the case but for the illusory superimposition.¹

But it may be urged how can you say that the perception of the relation of difference is false, when like the illusory experience, there is no sublation at a later moment? The answer is that even if there is no experience of sublation, the existences of the jug etc. in their relation of difference are incapable of being perceived just as an object existing at too remote a distance and time is inherently incapable of being perceived, the constituents of perception being absent.²

1 *Siddhāntaleśa*, p. 266-7.

“तथा सति सत् सदित्येव प्रत्यक्षं स्यात्, न तु 'षटः सत्' इत्यादि प्रत्यक्षमिन्द्रियान्धव्यतिरेकानुविधायीति चेत्, न। यथा भ्रमेषु इदमंशस्याधिष्ठानस्य प्रत्यक्षेण ग्रहणम्, इन्द्रियान्धव्यतिरेकयोः तत्रैव उपक्षयः, रजतांशस्य त्वारोपितस्य भ्रान्त्या प्रतिभासः; तथा सर्वत्र सन्मात्रस्य प्रत्यक्षेण ग्रहणम्, तत्रैव इन्द्रियव्यापारः। षटादिभेदवस्तुप्रतिभासो भ्रान्त्या इत्यभ्युपगमात्।”

2 *Ibid.*, p. 267.

“ननु तद्वदिह वाचाऽर्थात् तथाऽभ्युपगम एव निर्मलः इति चेत्, न। वाचाऽर्थनेऽपि देवकालव्यवहितवस्तुवद् षटादिभेदवस्तुनः प्रत्यक्षायोर्व्यत्ययेव तत्र मूलत्वात्।”

To explain. After the functioning of the senses, the jug is perceived as being different from all else. In our experience of the relational difference with the jug as the substantive, i.e. in the case of perceiving A as different from B, the two terms of the relation must be co-existent as objects of perception, and when one term is absent as object, there can be no perception, as exemplified in the case of a particular relation of conjunction (*saṃyoga*). And as the difference with the substantive as a term can only be perceived along with another term to which it is related, as for instance the difference with the jug as substantive which involves the other term 'not-jug'; and since it is impossible that all the objects connoted by the term 'not-jug' will co-exist in the same moment, the difference with the jug as substantive is incapable of being validly perceived, and as such it is a case of erroneous perception.³

It may be urged that let the counter-term in the knowledge of difference, requiring as it does memory-impression, be a case of memory-construction; and yet the total experience may be one of perceptual cognition, as in the case of recognition, e.g. "This is the same Ganges" (*seyaṃ gaṅgā*).⁴

But this is no argument. For you admit that the relation of difference is cognised only if the counter-term is presented in its specific character constituting its individuality. As such there being no previous cognition of all the different, distant, absent entities which comprise the counter-term of the relation, there can have been no memory-impression; and without impression no case of memory is possible, for, "memory depends on reproduction from a basis that is

3 *Siddhāntaleśa*, Commentary, p 268.

ससम्बन्धिकपदार्थप्रत्यक्षे यावत्सम्बन्धविषयकत्वस्य यावत्सम्बन्धिप्रत्यक्षजन्यतायाश्च संयोगादिप्रत्यक्षे क्लृप्तत्वात् भेदप्रत्यक्षेऽपि यावत्प्रतियोगिविषयकत्वं यावत्प्रतियोगिप्रत्यक्षजन्यत्वं च वाच्यम् । भेदप्रत्यक्षस्यापि ससम्बन्धिकपदार्थप्रत्यक्षत्वात् । तथा च यावन्तः प्रतियोगिनः तावतां प्रतियोगिनां प्रत्यक्षासम्भवेन क्लृप्तसामग्र्यभावात् न भेदः प्रत्यक्षप्रमाणीय इति तस्य भ्रान्तिमात्रसिद्धत्वं युक्तम् ।

4 *Ibid.*, p. 268.

भेदज्ञानं प्रतियोगिभ्यो संस्कारापेक्षया स्मृतिरूपमस्तु प्रत्यभिज्ञानमिव तत्ताये इति चेत् ।

present.”⁵ Hence an experience of the type “smṛtapaṭādi-bheda-viśiṣṭo ghaṭaḥ” to which you would ultimately reduce it is impossible.

It may again be urged—why must a perceptual cognition alone generate an impression, the inferential cognition of the type—“The golden mountain is a counter-term of difference, being an entity,” (*kanakācalo bheda-pratīyogī vastutvāt*) may, as well generate it. But this is surely a case of *petitio principii*; for without the cognition of difference the inference itself is impossible. The knowledge of inference itself involves a perceptual cognition of the difference among the terms of the inference, and a knowledge of identity of the terms of the inference even though illusory, would preclude the knowledge of inference.⁶

Hence the act of perception taking in only the indeterminate Being-in-essence serves only to emphasise the unitoriness of the Reality. But it may be finally objected that the Being-in-essence which is self-revealed, meaning thereby that no special act of perception is needed for its being experienced, is as much incapable of being perceived. The answer is that the Being-in-essence even though self-revealed is veiled, and the functioning of the senses is required to generate the psychosis in the intellect for the removal of the veil.⁷

So this position denies that there can be any valid determinate perception; all valid perceptions are indeterminate; and the determinations are not inherent in the constitution of the reality, but are illusory

5 *Siddhāntaleśa*, Commentary, p. 268.

भेदज्ञाने हि प्रतियोगिनां प्रतियोगितावच्छेदकरूपेष्वैव भानं पदैरूप्यते । तेन रूपेण सकल-प्रतियोगिगोचरपूड्रानुभवासम्भवेन संस्कारासम्भवात् असन्निकृष्टप्रतियोग्यं स्मृतिरूपत्वमपि न सम्भवति ।

6 *Ibid.*, Commentary, p. 269.

न च कनकाचलो भेदप्रतियोगी वस्तुत्वात् इति भेदे प्रतियोगिवेशिष्टगोचरानुमित्या तत्-संस्कारसम्भवः । भेदज्ञानं विना अनुमित्यभावेन आत्माभयापत्तेः । पक्षसाध्यहेतुपक्षताद्य-भेदभ्रमे सति सिद्धसाधनादिना अनुमानाऽप्रवृत्त्या तदभेदज्ञानविघटनीयस्य तद्भेदज्ञानस्य अपेक्षितत्वात् ।

7 *Ibid.*, Commentary, p. 267.

तस्य (सन्मात्रस्य) स्वप्रकाशत्वेऽपि आवृतत्वात् आवरणनिवर्तकवृत्त्युत्पत्तये इन्द्रिया-पेक्षेतिभावः ।

superimpositions on it. All predication, according to this view, proceeds on the basis of false ascription and accordingly the relation of co-existence of subject and predicate is a case of equally false superimposition which can find logical expression in a negative judgment. The false judgment, "it is a snake" is typical of all judgments, which when corrected, can be negatively expressed in the proposition—"It is not a snake." This has been expressed in Vedāntic terminology as a case of co-existence through negation (*vādhāyām sāmānādhikaranyam*). The relation of substantive and adjective, then, is based on false assumption and has neither foundation in reality, nor justification in logic. This means that the predicate or the determination is always being sublated by the reality (which alone is the true perceptual fact) every moment of our experience; and every case of perception is an affirmation of a whole which is always transcending and negating the determining factors in the perception.

This position may be characterised as *sattādvaividhya-vāda*, admitting as it does the existence of appearance (*prātibhāsika-sattā*) and the absolute existence (*pāramārthika-sattā*). These two existences are not mutually exclusive, for it requires two terms of the same value to set up a contradiction, and so there is no giving away of the monistic position.

The intuitional grasp of reality expressed in this *sattādvaividhya-vāda* involves in itself a kind of subjectivism which is expressed in the theory, *dr̥ṣṭir-eva sṛṣṭiḥ*. For when the objects as we see them attain the status of dream-objects, this form of subjectivism necessarily follows. According to this view all creation is a moment of cognition. The so-called object has no existence outside and apart from the cognising consciousness (*sākṣi-caitanya*), which evolves and organises the sense-data under the influence of creative illusion immanent in it. As the commentator Kṛṣṇānanda explains it—"The pure consciousness when illusorily identified with the manifold of sense becomes, as determined in a single moment, its creation." (*dr̥śyaprapañca-tādātmyāpannam jñānasvarūpam eva prapañcasya ādyakṣaṇā-vacchinnaṃ sat tasya sṛṣṭir ityucyate*). This implies that the particular objects being superimposed on the subject are directly cognised by the cognising consciousness (*sākṣi-caitanya*), even as in the case of other illusory perceptions.

As pointed out already, this whole position is advocated among familiar authors by Prakāśānanda, the author of the *Siddhāntamuktāvalī* who says, "Nor is the view of a two-fold existence contradictory of a three-fold existence; for while ancient teachers (e.g. Sarvajña Muni and others) did not abandon the position that the existence of a dual order of things is dependent on the perception of it, they taught a third kind of existence (the so-called practical) to satisfy the deluded vulgar. For although the essence of the world is percipii, there is no contradiction in maintaining the practical as a third kind of existence, if attention is to be had to these intermediate differences (*sc.* between the waking and dreaming states) which the unphilosophic are persuaded of" (Venis's translation).⁸

On the other hand, the author of the *Nyāyasūdhā*, (who again was the preceptor of the famous Citsukhācārya, and wrote another work called *Jñānasiddhi*)⁹ holds that even if the relation of difference is admitted to be a perceptual fact; there is no giving away of the monistic position. The jug etc., according to this view, has not even the existence of appearance, it has existence only as related to the existence-in-essence of Brahman. The existence of the jug etc. is the existence-in-essence of Brahman¹⁰ as Brahman is the ultimate ground or material cause of all objects. In the perceptual fact, *san ghataḥ*, the cognition of the co-existence with the jug as substantive and the existence-in-essence as adjective is really a case of visual perception, though the relation itself is secondary (*gauna*) from the ultimate viewpoint.

Here a point may arise that with similar reasoning, you will have

8 *Siddhāntamuktāvalī*, p. 28.

"न च त्रिविधसत्ताऽभ्युपगमविरोधः, सर्वस्य द्वैतस्य प्रातीतिकसत्त्वम् अपरित्यज्य त
भ्रान्तसन्तोषमात्रस्य कृतत्वात्, प्रातीतिकसत्त्वेऽपि प्रपञ्चस्य भ्रान्तबुद्धिसिद्धौ अवान्तरवैषम्यम्
आश्रित्य व्यावहारिकसत्त्वाभिधानाऽविरोधात् ।"

9 Vide Commentary on *Pratyaktattva-pradīpikā*, p. 393.

आराध्यपादाः स्वगुरवो ज्ञानसिद्धिकाराः, तत्प्रतीतं वेदान्तप्रकरणं न्यायसुधा ।

10 *Siddhāntaleśa*, Commentary, p. 270.

वदादेः सत्त्वप्रतिभासः अविद्यानसत्तासम्बन्धविवक्षक एव ।

to admit that as the 'isness' (*sattā*) relates itself to the ground of all experience, so in the case of the perception of 'a blue jug' (*nīlo ghaṭaḥ*), the blue as a predicate of the jug will also relate itself to the ground of all experience and thus your Brahman ceases to be formless. This is answered by saying that in the aspects of determination in name and form, i.e. individuation, the relation of co-existence through negation holds and not a substantive-adjective relation. Apart from such aspects of individuation, the perception is a determinate perception and the substantive-adjective relation holds true.

This view therefore truly represents the rigorous *ekasattārāda*, admitting as it does only the absolute existence. It must not, however, be urged that if even the existence of appearance is not admitted in the manifold objects other than the absolute existence of Brahman, why admit the illusory existence of silver arising in the mother-of-pearl other than the real piece of silver not immediately connected. It is because that which is not immediately connected and present is incapable of being perceived that we have to admit it.¹¹

This intuitional view, also, involves in itself another kind of subjectivism, or *dr̥ṣṭīśr̥ṣṭi-vāda*, which is expressed as *dr̥ṣṭisamasamayā śr̥ṣṭih*. For when objects are realised directly in a noumenal status and are identified with reality, another kind of appearance, and therefore of subjectivism, is the result. Every perception is not a mistaken perception, an illusion, as the former theory of subjectivism, viz. *dr̥ṣṭireva śr̥ṣṭih*, would have it. It is an appearance no doubt, but not necessarily an illusory appearance. The appearance is there owing to the instrumentality and interference of nescience in the thing itself.

According to this view of subjectivism, then, the thing being 'mere appearance' referring to the mind, always belongs to the mind. But that does not necessarily imply that it owes its existence to the mind; on the other hand it owes its existence directly to the absolute existence.

11 *Siddhāntaleśa*, p. 308.

न च ब्रह्मतत्त्वात्परमाधिकसत्ताऽतिरेकेण प्रपञ्चे सत्त्वाभासानुपगमे व्यवहितसत्त्वरजतातिरेकेण युक्तौ रज्ज्वाभासोत्पत्तिः किमर्थम् उपेयते इति वाच्यम् । व्यवहितसत्त्व असत्त्वसत्त्वस्य अपरोक्षसम्भवात् तन्निष्ठायाव तदुपगमात् ।

Epistemologically, this is a near approach to the position of Berkeley who holds that there is no object outside of and other than the sense-data that a mind perceives, but since we ourselves cannot create these objective ideas, they are impressed upon us by the Infinite Spirit from outside. While the former view of subjectivism, viz. *dr̥ṣṭir-eva sṛṣṭih*, almost runs square with the Fichtean view of subjectivism, according to which 'the mind projects the purely subjective modification of consciousness into space, or makes objects of them.' So the object not only belongs to the mind, but owes its existence to the mind.

To put it in the Advaita phraseology, this second type of subjectivism, viz. *dr̥ṣṭi-samasamayā sṛṣṭih*, affirms that though the so-called external objects, being modalised states of consciousness are not different from the psychosis of the intellect, yet being different from the *kūṭasthacaitanya*, i.e., the pure eternal intelligence, a subject-object relation arises due to the exercise of the potency of nescience (*arthānām vṛttijñānānatiriktatvepi kūṭasthajñānātiriktatvāt draṣṭṛdr̥ṣyabhedaḥ avidyopasthāpakaḥ sidhyati*).

This implies not only that the objects have no *ajñātajñāpakatva* i.e. they do not refer to things-in-themselves which are unknowable, but also that the fusion of the subject and the object in the affirmation of the existence-in-essence is a fact of perception. The essence of object is not a class-concept (*jāti*), from where spring all the difficulties that the former position sets its face against, but as Bosanquet puts it,—“it is the spirit of a living world and can only be an eternal truth as such a spirit; and though a partial given existence does not determine it, yet it is only in existence—the full complement of existence—that it can be fully revealed” (*Contemporary Philosophy*, p. 81).

How then, it may be asked, can an act of perception be possible at all? For without the object being previously given how can it said to be known or apprehended at all? Thus the fundamental condition, in the Advaita view of perception, viz. the establishment of identity (of existence) between the object and the subject i.e. the object-consciousness (*viṣaya-caitanya*) and the subject-consciousness (*pramāṭṛ-caitanya*) through a psychosis of the intellect, seems to be wanting. This difficulty cannot arise from the *sṛṣṭi-dr̥ṣṭi-vāda* point of view, which admitting that the existence of the object is independent of the

specific relation involved in its being known, can very well take the object as given.

But this cannot be said of the *dr̥ṣṭi-sr̥ṣṭi-vāda*, even of the type we are considering. What it wants to emphasise is that even from the intuitional standpoint every case of perception cannot be interpreted as illusory, unless it is specifically so. That is how it clearly distinguishes itself from the *dr̥ṣṭi-sr̥ṣṭi-vāda* of the former type, which with rigorous logical justification, interprets every case of ordinary perception as illusory. But what does a fact of perception imply? What is really meant by saying, for example, "I perceive the trailing crisp of cloud." Of course, the I or perceiver as subject in relation to the object—"the cloud." But this is on the psychological level. Before that, does not that fact of perception imply the merging of the "Mine" in the "This" in an indistinguishable fact-stuff; for the moment—I am the cloud. This sense of totality or wholeness of existence is on a par with the absolute existence except for the fact of the relatedness which materialises in an act of perception from the psychological point of view. But in the moment of experience, it transcends that sense of relatedness which is lost in the diffused mass of feeling and rises equal to intuition, where truly there is no acquisition of the new. And it does not matter if it is not knowledge, but a bare awareness, the act itself without any sense of activity. We may, say, then, that every act of perception transcends the immediacy; but does not transcend experience, rather affirms the transcendent experience which is the Absolute. So the ultimate monistic position remains unassailable.

Now of these two attitudes which one can be preferred? To answer this, we shall have to look into the difficulties that have been noted in the first attitude and to see if they can stand to reason. It would not be hard to find out that the difficulties are really meant for the Naiyāyikas (the Realists) rather than for the second position, and that for the simple reason that the former hold that a determinate perceptual knowledge (*viśiṣṭa-jñāna*) presupposes the simple knowledge of the predicate (*viśeṣaṇa*) as its condition and as such this determinate perceptual knowledge suffers from all the incongruities that have been urged against it by the author of the *Tattvaśuddhi*. But according to the Vedāntic position a determinate perceptual knowledge results from

the presentation of the object through the sense-contact to the subject. This being so, it does not presuppose the knowledge of the predicate (*viśeṣana*) and is not open to the various difficulties connected with the position of the Realists. We therefore prefer the intuitional attitude of the author of the *Nyāyasūdhā* with its implication of the subjectivism of *dr̥ṣṭi-samasamayāsr̥ṣṭh* as being the more satisfactory from the psychological standpoint.

So we conclude that the true idealist has no case to fight against the subjectivist, if he will not cut down the universe into the "real world," which is a construction of "his felt self." "It is an inconsistent construction and it also in the last reason depends on my present feeling." (Bradley). According to the monistic Idealist, the ideal ground and the real ground are the same; the individual ego and the universal ego are identical. So from the absolute standpoint the individual experience is always being transcended and realised in the universal experience. It is only because the idealist tends to cut down the universe as a whole to a particular construction of it by the individual that he has to beware of the pitfall of subjectivism. As Bosanquet beautifully puts it, "Nature comes through mind and could come no otherwise; but this is not to say that nature is not a great positive experience, in which minds are carried out of themselves, and made the vehicle of a spirit, which they do not individually create and confer, but from which collectively they receive instruction and inspiration." (*Contemporary Philosophy*, p. 62).

MAKHANLAL MUKHERJI

The Date of Karkācārya

eminent scholars have from time to time made attempts to determine the dates of portions of Vedic literature on the basis of astronomical facts. Amongst these, however, to Shanker Balkrishna Dixit alone, the distinguished author of the *History of Indian Astronomy* (in Marathi), belongs the credit of fixing one of the most important milestones in the chronology of Vedic literature, namely, the date of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa at 3000 B.C. on the basis of the passage एतान् ह वै कृत्तिकाः प्राच्ये दिशे न च्यवन्ते occurring in it. B. G. Tilak subsequently came into the field with his startling theories as to the antiquity of the Vedas which caused a great stir in the world of Vedic scholarship, when his *Orion* made its appearance. Following the same methods as were employed by S. B. Dixit and B. G. Tilak, now comes another scholar who has attempted to explain with consistency all the verses of the *Vedāṅga Jyotiṣa*. Vidyābhūṣaṇa Pandit Dinanath Sastri of the Vedic Research Association of Indore is a highly respected figure amongst Indian astronomers. His researches are confined to Hindi. In this paper it is our object to present in English one of his research works on the date of Karkācārya, a commentator on Kātyāyana's *Śrauta-sūtras*.

The point, at which the apparent path of the sun intersects the equator, is called the equinox. This point or equinox, as it is called, is not stationary. It always moves backwards and completes its revolution through the Nakṣatras in approximately 26,000 years, so that, it takes nearly 995 years to traverse one Nakṣatra.

Kātyāyana gives the method of *Prācīdik-sādhana*, that is, of determining the east as follows:— समे शंकुं निखाय शंकुसम्मिताया रज्ज्वा मंडलं परिलिख्य यत्र लेखयोः शंकुप्रच्छाया निपतति तत्र शंकुं निहन्ति सा प्राची ॥

Kātyāyana-Śulhasūtra, 2.

(With a cord equal in length to a śaṅku, describe a circle. Then, in the first part of the day, mark the point where the shadow of the śaṅku touches the circle. This would be the western point. Similarly, mark the eastern point in the second part. And, then join these two points by a straight line. Now, on the equinoctial day, on which the shadow

of the śaṅku will exactly coincide with this line, it indicates the due east and the due west).

While commenting upon this *Sūtra*, Karkācārya writes:--

आदित्योदयो हि प्राच्युपलक्षणम् । न च तामन्तरेणोदयः शक्यते साधयितुम् । अत-
स्तच्छायोपन्यस्ता दिग् ग्रहणार्थम् । ननु चादित्यश्चित्रास्वात्यंतरालेऽन्यत्र वान्यत्रोदेति ।
तत्रानेकाहःसाध्ये कर्मणि प्राची न लभ्यते । दक्षिणायने तु चित्रां यावदादित्य उपसर्पति ।
उदगयने स्वातिमेति । विषुवतीये त्वहनि चित्रास्वात्योर्मध्य एवोदयः अतस्तन्मध्ये
शंकुगतैव छाया भवति ।

(The sun alone is the indicator of the east. He does not rise except in the east. Hence his shadow is indispensable in determining the east. As a matter of fact, the sun rises anywhere between Citrā and Svātī. Due east cannot, therefore, be ascertained on account of these numerous days. While moving towards the Citrā he is in the Dakṣiṇāyana. In the Uttarāyana he moves towards the Svātī. On the equinoctial day he is exactly between Citrā and Svātī. Hence his shadow coincides with the straight line marked by the śaṅku on that day).

Now it is to be noted that there are only two equinoctial points at intervals of six months; one of these points is called *Vasanta-sampāta* or *Vernal Equinox* and the other *Śarat-sampāta* or the *Autumnal Equinox*. When the sun, in its course to the south, comes to this equinoctial point, *Śarat-sampāta* occurs on that day. Similarly, when after six months, he arrives at the other equinoctial point, in its course to the north, *Vasanta-sampāta* falls on that day.

Here a question may arise, "Which Sampāta or equinoctial point is meant? *Śarat* or *Vasanta*?" We think, there is absolutely no room for doubt, in the statement made by Karkācārya. He is quite explicit.

दक्षिणायने तु चित्रां यावदादित्य उपसर्पति clearly shows that, at the time, he was writing, the sun was in the Dakṣiṇāyana and in Citrā. This is further corroborated by the remark उदगयने [स्वातिमेति – the sun moves towards Svātī in the Uttarāyana. Again, he says that the equinoctial day occurs exactly between Citrā and Svātī.

This Viṣuvan or equinoctial day cannot be any other than the *Vasanta-sampāta*, as the sun is distinctly stated to be moving towards the north.

We thus find that, at the time when Karkācārya lived, the *Vasanta-sampāta* occurred half way between Citrā and Svātī. But to-day, it occurs in *Uttara Bhādrapada*; so that, there is a clear difference of about 15 nakṣatras.

We have seen that the *Vasanta-sampāta* takes about 995 years to traverse one Nakṣatra. It necessarily follows, therefore, that it must have taken, at least, about 15,000 years to traverse about 15 Nakṣatras, referred to in the preceding paragraph. And because the same phenomenon had also occurred 26,000 years ago, from now, as it recurs again and again, after a lapse of every 26,000 years, we can fix only the lowest limit of antiquity. To what cycle exactly, the work relates, must be determined by referring to other evidences.

Since, there is, absolutely, no mention of Nakṣatras, in the original *Sulbasūtra* of Katyāyana, it cannot be claimed that the date, at which we have arrived, refer to it and not to the time of Karkācārya. For, Karkācārya is only explaining the passage in the original by describing the astronomical positions concerned, existing in his own time. Moreover, it is to be noted that Karkācārya was a commentator and not an astronomer. The way, therefore, in which he refers to this astronomical phenomenon obviously indicates that it was a matter of common knowledge.

The date we have arrived at is also confirmed by another statement of the same commentator. The benedictory verse of the *Sulbasūtra* runs as follows:—

स जयत्युदयेनेषां चतुस्र्ष्वपि दिक्षु निवस्तां नृणाम् ।

मेरोः प्रतिदिनमन्यामाशां विदधाति यः प्राचीम् ॥

May the sun, who, by his rise, daily shows the east, as also other directions (thereby), to people living in all the four quarters of the north pole, be victorious.

Now, it is a well-known fact in astronomy that the sun can rise on the north pole only on the day of the Summer or the Vernal equinox or *Vasanta sampāta*; and he rises only once in a year. He sheds light on the region of the north pole continuously for six months after which he sets. Although there is no explicit mention of *Vasanta-sampāta*, the clause प्रतिदिनमन्यामाशां विदधाति यः (सूर्यः)प्राचीम् unmistakably points to it. As

otherwise, on *Sarat-sampāta* or *Autumnal equinoctial* day, he only begins to set never to rise until after six months, enveloping the region into a continuous night of darkness, during the period. The *Vasanta-sampāta*, as we have already pointed out above, occurred on the middle point of *Citrā* and *Svātī*. Karkācārya has repeated the fact in several places. Here is one more instance of it. While commenting on the *Sulba-sūtra* he states again अषि चाभियुक्तोपदेशश्चित्रास्वात्योरन्तरालं प्राचीति which means that when the sun rises on the middle point of *Citrā* and *Svātī*, he then points to the due east.

All these various statements of Karkācārya establish beyond doubt the fact that at his time *Vasanta-sampāta* occurred only between *Citrā* and *Svātī*; or in other words, its distance from the Zodiac, in the time of Karkācārya was 0. But to-day it is 202°-0-0. And since a distance of one degree takes 71.6622° years, it follows that the distance of 202.0° must have taken 14536 years by actual calculation. Or, if we take *Svātī* which has moved 208.2 since the time of Karkācārya, it gives us 14565 years according to the same calculation, thus striking a difference of only 29 years.

This conclusion is also supported by other evidences. An annual sacrifice known as *Gavāmayana* used to be performed in ancient times. The author of the *Kātyāyana-Srautasūtras* says that, although the eighth day of the dark half of the month of *Māgha* was the true date for the commencement of this sacrifice, there is sufficient evidence to prove that this sacrifice, namely, *Gavāmayanam* could be commenced on other days also, such as *phālgunī-purnimā*, *caitri-purnimā* or *māghī-purnimā*. This sacrifice was coextensive with the solar year. The lunar year is deficient by 12 days which are added on to it to bring it up to the solar year. As, for instance, if the sacrifice is commenced on the twelfth day of the bright half of the month of *Māgha*, it requires to be completed on the eighth day of the dark half of the month of *Phālguna*. "In view of this difference between the solar year and the lunar year," says the author of the *Srautasūtras*, "the Vedas have laid down in the case of this sacrifice that it should be commenced just four days before the *Purnimā*." The author of the said *Sūtra*, further explains that although the above statement appears to be general, it is in fact, not so; it only applies to the *Purnimā* of *Caitra*, *Māgha* and *Phālguna*. It does not at

all apply to any other Pūrṇimā. In support of this statement, he also says लोकप्रत्ययात् अर्थवादाच्च (कात्यायनश्रौतसूत्र १३ । १ । ६, १०) which means that "the current belief among the people is such and there are other reasons too." While explaining these "other reasons," Karkācārya, the commentator of the *Srautasūtra* writes:—

अर्थवादश्च भवति । तानुत्तिष्ठत ओषधयो वनस्पतयोऽनूत्तिष्ठन्ति । तान्दीक्षितानुत्तिष्ठत ओषधिबनस्पतीनां प्ररोहो भवति । तच्चैवमुपपद्यते तथा तर्ह्यपोभिनन्दमाना अवभृथमभ्यवयन्ति । एतदप्येवमेव घटते वनस्पतिप्ररोहोऽपामभिर्नदनं चैत्रोद्देश एव भवति । तस्मान्माघीचतुरहविशेषणम् ।

It means: When the sacrificers rise from their sacrifice they require for the concluding bath abundance of water and various kinds of medicinal plants. For, the concluding bath or the *avabhṛthasñāna* is done with thousands of showers mixed with fresh herbs. These facilities are available to the sacrificers during the period from Caitrī Pūrṇimā to four days short of Maghī Pūrṇimā and not that of Pausa. For, this plenitude of fresh water and herbs is only available to those who finish their sacrifice by Caitra.

It is clear from the statement of Karkācārya that in his time this abundance of fresh water and herbs could be had up to Caitra which unmistakably points to the Sarat-sampāta or autumnal equinox taking place in Caitra, as these phenomena occur only at the end of the rainy season or in the beginning of autumn.

We thus find that in the time of Karkācārya the autumnal phenomena of nature took place in Caitra. It follows, therefore, that the spring occurred in Āśvina. Generally it is seen that wheat ripens in spring. If, therefore, it could be established that wheat ripened in the month of Āśvina in the days of Karkācārya, our conclusions will be further strengthened.

The Śrāvaṇī ceremony is enjoined to be performed on the Pūrṇimā of Śrāvaṇa when medicinal herbs sprout. The growth of rice is almost simultaneous with other plants. We thus see that rice used to grow when this institution of Śrāvaṇī came into existence. Rice was, of course, upripe at the time. According to the rule regarding *havirdravya* that the seasonal corn alone is to be offered in a sacrifice, raw rice was swallowed at the time. Karkācārya while commenting on अक्षतधाना

अखादन्तः प्राभियुः (पारस्कर गृह्यसूत्र २-१०-२५) remarks यवानां धाना अखण्डयन्तः प्राभियुः which means that raw rice should be swallowed without masticulation.

The meaning of the word 'akṣata' is given in the Kośas and the Sūtras as rice. The herbs, too, ripen about the same time as rice. This is just as it should be. But when the wheat ripens, the herbs are not to be found. But we have already shown above that in the days of Karkācārya, raw wheat used to be swallowed on the occasion of Srāvaṇī. And since Karkācārya refers to wheat being swallowed without masticulation, it can only mean that the wheat was raw. And this could be possible only at the time of its harvest. All these facts, therefore, clearly point to the conclusion that the harvests of wheat and rice had interchanged their places in respect of season. And as raw wheat was available in the month of Srāvaṇa it is but natural to suppose that it ripened in the month of Āśvina.

From the evidence furnished by Karkācārya in his commentary on the *Srautasūtras* of Kātyāyana that the autumn occurred in the month of Caitra and from the fact recorded in his commentary of the *Pāraskara-Gṛahya-sūtras* that the spring took place in the month of Āśvina, it is proved that the spring equinox took place in the month of Āśvina in the time of that commentator. It follows, therefore, that the spring equinox has now receded about seven months back to Uttara-bhādrāpadā, since the date of Karkācārya. And since the twelve signs of the zodiac very nearly coincide with the twelve months of the year, it may be said that the said equinox has receded about seven signs of the zodiac or rāsis as they are termed in Hindu astronomy. The equinoctial point takes about 2166 years to traverse one sign. It follows, therefore, that it must have taken, at least, about fifteen thousand years to cover the distance of seven signs of the zodiac as pointed out above. It may, therefore, be concluded that the commentator of the *Katyāyāna-Srautasūtra* lived about fifteen thousand years ago.

But this is a rough calculation. Let us be more exact. The equinoctial point is, at the present date, in the second division of the Uttara-bhādrāpadā. But it was between Citrā and Svātī in the time of Karkācārya. It may be said to have receded, therefore, about fifteen Nakṣatras and a quarter. And since it takes 956 years to traverse one

Nakṣatra, it must have taken 14579 years to traverse the distance of fifteen Nakṣatras and a quarter.

Although the theory, so far as it goes, appears to be sound enough to warrant serious consideration at the hands of the scholars, it is, nevertheless, open to some objections which we propose to consider in another paper.

G. B. MAKODAY

Literary Reference to Samudragupta

It is a well-known fact that the Sanskrit work *Pañcatantra* was the source of hundreds of similar works found scattered all over the world in different languages. An allied group of works, based on *Pañcatantra*, is found in the Far East, in Javanese, Balinese, Siamese and Laotian languages. These books are known as *Tantri* (*var.* *Tantrai*, *Tantai*, *Tantaiya* etc.). A feature which distinguishes this group is its introduction. Instead of the familiar story of Viṣṇuśarman reciting the text for the edification of his royal pupils, we find here something entirely different. It is said that a king resolved to marry a young damsel every day and asked his chief minister to provide a regular supply of young accomplished girls of noble family. The minister, unable to bring his master to senses, agreed, and for some time continued to supply every day a beautiful girl whom the king married with great pomp and ceremony, only to discard her the next day for a new one. At last the minister exhausted his resources. The day on which the last girl in his stock was supplied he did not return home, but lay down in a deserted place without food. He had an accomplished daughter, *Tantri* by name, who found him out, and having ascertained the cause of his sadness, offered herself to be married to the king with a view to stop this mad practice. The minister had to yield to his daughter's importunities and next day the marriage took place with usual pomp. When the royal pair retired at night, and the king appeared to be asleep, the queen told a story to the waiting maid, in order, as she said, to drive away sleep from her. She took care to describe the various ramifications of the story which, of course, she could not hope to finish in one night. The king who was really awake was so much enchanted with the story, that in order to hear the rest, he refrained from marrying a new queen until the tale was finished.

This setting of the *Pañcatantra* text undoubtedly reminds us of the *Thousand and One Nights*. But the details about the king show that the introductory story was undoubtedly derived from India.

Of the Far Eastern group of *Pañcatantra* texts, I have been able to consult the full text only of *Tantrī Kūmanduka*, a Javanese text,

edited with a Dutch Translation by Dr. C. Hooykaas and published in Bibliotheca Javanica series. I translate below the paragraph of the text bearing upon the royal hero of the introductory chapter.

“In old times there was a king who traced his genealogy to the family of Samudragupta (*Ana ngusana Sang Prabhu, ika pwa Kularungsa Samudraguptaparampara*). He had many fore-fathers but of those between the founder of the royal family and the king himself I will say nothing. By his bravery he protected the world. It is said of the king that he was the greatest among those whose words were law (*Ājñāsiddhi*). His name was Mahārāja Eśvaryapāla and his capital was Pāṭaliputra-nagara in Jambudīpa, in Śrī Lāratāṇḍa. This land lay to the South of the Himālaya and the rivers Gaṅgā and Yamunā flowed through it. In Madhyadeśa (and in the centre of the territory between them)¹ lay the rich city of Pāṭaliputra of which the praise is now sung.”

The next paragraph gives a grandiloquent picture of the king. He possessed all the sixty-four arts (*kalā*), the four oceans formed the limits of his empire; he had no rivals, all the other kings bowed down to him in fear etc. etc.

Now, although no historical importance attaches to the introduction which merely serves as a setting of the text, the name of Samudragupta, the fore-father of the king of Pāṭaliputra, undoubtedly indicates that the name and fame of Samudragupta was still a living tradition in India when the original Sanskrit text was composed. This is specially important in view of the fact that no reference to the great emperor has yet been found in any literary work of India.

In conclusion, I shall briefly refer to two other points of a speculative nature which arise out of the above discussion. First, the unique nature of the introductory episode, and its resemblance to that of the Arabian story book *Thousand and One Nights*. This indicates that a version of *Pañcatantra* served as the basis of the Arabian text.

Secondly, the name of the king Eśvaryapāla is undoubtedly Aśvaryapāla. As the Pāla kings were better known than others in the Far East, in connection with the spread of Mahāyāna Buddhism, it might have

1 Dr. Hooykas' translation is given within brackets. He takes 'Madhyanyāna deśa' as land between the two rivers.

a reference to one of them. A son of Rāmapāla is called Vittapāla² which is an exact equivalent of Aiśvaryapāla. We have no positive evidence that Vittapāla ever ascended the throne, but he may be identical with one of the two sons of Rāmapāla who actually did so. Apart from this, it is clear from Tāranātha's account that in later ages tradition knew of many more Pāla kings than are known from inscriptions. As the king in *Tantrī-Kāmandaka* is at best a traditional one, there is no inherent improbability in the assumption that he was regarded as a Pāla king.

If such an assumption be permitted, the reference to Samudragupta as the ancestor of a Pāla king becomes interesting. In *Rāmacarita*, Dharmapāla is referred to as *Samudra-kula-dīpa* i.e. born in the family of Samudra. This has been taken to mean that the Pālas were descended from the sea, which, of course, is meaningless. In the light of *Tantrī-Kāmandaka*, we may take *Samudra-kula* as family of Samudragupta, and it would then appear that by the eleventh century A.D. the tradition of the descent of the Pāla kings from Samudragupta had already grown up.

Of course this tradition cannot be regarded as a historical truth. But we may easily explain its origin. The reign of the later Guptas ended almost when that of the Pālas began. So, in a later period, people might draw up a connected genealogy of the imperial Guptas, the later Guptas and the Pālas, who reigned in Magadha in almost unbroken succession. It may be mentioned that *Tantrī Kāmandaka* refers to a king Mahārāja Śrī Viṣṇugupta of Kauśāmbī, and this name was borne by the last, but one, of the later Gupta kings of Magadha. Further, Aiśvaryapāla is described as belonging to the Ikṣvāku family. According to the Kamauli grant, the Pālas are descended from the sun. Mr. R. D. Banerji discarded this view on account of its difference from *Rāmacarita* which assigns Rāmapāla to Samudra-family. But

2 *Rāmacarita*, II. 36. In his *Bāṅglār Itihāsa*, p. 291, Mr. R. D. Banerji says that Vittapāla was an officer of Rāmapāla; but he evidently ignores the word 'sūnor.' It is presumably this son who valiantly fought with Hari and whom Mr. Banerji identifies with Rājyapāla (*Ibid*).

here, too, the *Tantrī-Kūmandaka* offers a probable solution of the discrepancy, by referring the origin of the family to Samudragupta and making him a descendant of Ikṣvāku.

Before I close, I should say that it would be risky to deduce historical truth from these statements, which can only help us in explaining the traditions about the origin of the Pālas which grew up in later ages.

R. C. MAJUMDAR

An almost Contemporary Account of Mahmud's Invasions of India

Mahmud's invasions of India have always attracted the attention of Indian historians. Unfortunately, however, not many contemporary accounts of it have come down to us. For a long time students of history were content to depend upon Firishta's history and Utbi's *Kitab-ul Yamini*. Utbi's account, however, is very meagre and lacks details whereas Firishta's distance from his subject-matter does not lend much authority to his work. The publication of the Persian text of a part of the *Zainul Akhbar of Girdizi* edited by Professor Muhammad Nazim in 1928 made available an account of Mahmud's invasions of India written at the most in 1052 A.D., i.e. within twenty two years of Mahmud's death. Its account of Mahmud's invasions of India therefore deserves the foremost place among original authorities on Mahmud's reign and as such it is sure to interest students of Indian History. In the following pages an attempt has been made at providing the readers of Indian history with a translation of Girdizi's Persian account. I have not added many footnotes to the translation as I intend to follow it up by a translation of Utbi's *Kitab-ul-Yamini* when it would be possible to compare these two contemporary histories and evaluate them. The account given by Girdizi runs thus:

When Mahmud became Amir of Khurasan, the Caliph of Baghdad gave him the title of Yamin-ul-Daulat and Amin-ul-Millit.¹

In 390 A.H. (1000 A.D.) Mahmud left for India from Ghazni and conquered many forts.²

On 5th Ramazan 391 A.H. (August 28, 1001 A.D.) Mahmud reached Herat and left for Ghazni. He left Ghazni for India and encamped at Peshawar. He had ten thousand soldiers with him. Jaipal, king of India with twelve thousand horse, 30000 foot and 300 elephants came out to oppose him. Both the armies were drawn up in battle array. Soon the battle began. God gave victory to the Muslims. Mahmud was victorious. Jaipal was defeated. Many infidels were killed. The Muslims

1 Girdizi, p. 62.

2 *Ibid.*, 63.

killed 5000 Hindus in that battle, and Jaipal was made prisoner. Fifteen of his sons and brothers also fell into their hands. A good deal of booty was taken. It is said that the necklace that Jaipal was wearing was valued at 180000 Dinars. Similarly other Hindu chiefs who were taken prisoners were found wearing valuable ornaments round their necks. This victory was gained on Friday, 8th Muharram 392 A.H. (27th Nov. 1001 A.D.).

From here Mahmud marched on Waihind. This country was also ravaged. When spring came, Mahmud returned to Ghazni.³

When Mahmud returned to Ghazni (from Sistan in 393 A.H. ; 1003, 1004 A.D.), he decided to attack Bhatia. He marched by way of Walihtan (Sibbi) and Hissar and reached Bhatinda. Here a battle raged for three days. Bajrao formed his troops in battle line and sent them against Mahmud. He himself left for the bank of river Sasana. When Mahmud learnt this, he sent some of his men in pursuit in order to capture Bajrao and his companions. When Bajrao learnt of the pursuit, he left his main body and killed himself. Mahmud's soldiers took his head and captured all his companions and brought them before Mahmud who was overjoyed. By his orders all of them were killed. Two hundred and eighty elephants fell into his hands.⁴

In 396 A.H. (1006 A.D.) Mahmud decided to make a surprise attack on Multan. He was afraid that if he marched by the direct route, Daud would get to know of it and make preparations to oppose him. He chose therefore a roundabout way to Multan. Anand Pal, son of Jaipal, contested his progress. Mahmud directed his army to attack Anand Pal's territories. Many men were taken prisoners and many were killed, the country was ravaged.⁵

Anand Pal ran away to the mountains of Kashmir, Mahmud reached Multan. He besieged it for a week till the garrison sued for peace. They agreed to pay 20000 Dinars in two instalments every year. Mahmud now returned to Ghazni.

3 Girdizi, pp. 65, 66. Dr. Nazim (*Life and Times of Sultan Mahmud of Ghazni*, p. 67) has stated on the authority of Girdizi that 15 sons and grandsons of Jaipal were captured. The text has sons and brothers.

4 *Ibid.*, pp. 66, 67; Bhatia is probably Bhatinda. This expedition was undertaken early in 1003 A.D.

5 *Ibid.*, pp. 67, 68.

When Mahmud was free from his struggle against Ilak Khan (defeated in January, 1008), he heard that Shokpal, grandson of Jaipal, who had fallen into the hands of Abuali at Nishapur and been converted to Islam, had abjured his religion. Mahmud turned towards him and captured him in the hills of Kashnod. He undertook to pay 400000 Dinars. He was entrusted to Hakin Khazan and imprisoned. He died in prison.⁶

From here Mahmud left for India. In 399 A.H. (1008-1009 A.D.) he fought against Anand Pal and defeated him. Thirty elephants were taken and a large number of prisoners was made.⁷ From here Mahmud marched on to Bhim Nagar and besieged it. For three days the siege continued. Mahmud then succeeded in entering the fort with some of his companions. Gold, silver and diamonds that had been accumulated since the days of Bhim Pando in this fort fell into his hands. Booty beyond counting fell into Mahmud's hands. Mahmud now returned to Ghazni. A throne of gold and silver was built. The booty was displayed at Ghazni for people to stare at.⁸

From Ghazni in 400 A.H. (1010 A.D.) he left for Multan. The territory left unconquered last time was conquered now. Many Carmathians there were captured, some were slain, others mutilated, and made to suffer otherwise so that all of them died. Daud was also captured and taken to Ghazni and sent to Ghork where he died.⁹

In 402 A.H. (1012 A.D.). Mahmud left Ghazni for Thanesar. When Trilocanpal, emperor of India, heard this, he sent messengers and offered 50 elephants if Mahmud would not march on Thanesar. Mahmud paid no heed to his words. When his armies reached the Camp of Ram, his men disputed his path. From their protected places, they attacked the Muslims, many of whom were killed.

When Mahmud reached Thanesar, he found the city deserted. Whatever fell into the hands of his men was destroyed. Many of the

6 Girdizi, p. 69. Dr. Nazim (p. 98) places the rebellion of Sukhpal in the Salt Range in the Punjab and converts Kashnod into the Salt Range. Kashmir would be a nearer guess. There is nothing improbable in Sukhpal being captured.

7 *Ibid.*, p. 69.

8 *Ibid.*, pp. 69, 70. Bhim Nagar is Nagar Kot of Firishta near Kangra.

9 *Ibid.*, p. 70.

idols were broken. Jogar om (which was the most famous idol in that Mecca of the Hindus)¹⁰ was carried away to Ghazni and placed at the Durgah. People flocked to see it.¹¹

In the year 404 A.H. (1014 A.D.) Mahmud decided to take Nanda. When Baro Jaipal, king of India, learnt about it, he sent tried veterans to the fort in order to guard the fort and himself left for the passes in Kashmir. When Mahmud reached the place it was invested thoroughly. When the besieged felt helpless, they asked for peace and surrendered the fort. Mahmud with some of his men entered the fort and took away the valuables and arms that were in the fort. Mahmud left Mir Saragh in charge of the fort and himself left for the pass in Kashmir where Baro Jaipal was hiding. When he heard of the enemy's approach, Baro Jaipal ran away from there as well. Mahmud so arranged matters that the forts in the pass were taken and pillaged. His army captured a good deal of property and large number of men. Many Hindus accepted Islam. The same year he issued orders that in the place conquered, mosques be raised and Hindus be converted to Islam by men appointed for the purpose. Mahmud himself returned to Ghazni. This victory was secured in the year 405 A.H. (1015 A.D.)¹²

When the year 407 A.H. (1016 A.D.) began, Mahmud decided to attack Kashmir. From Ghazni he set out for Kashmir. When he reached the pass, winter set in. Beyond the pass was the fort of Lohkot (Loharin) strong as of iron. It was invested. When the siege was turning to be successful, the severity of winter and the snow helped the garrison which was reinforced by the arrival of fresh troops, from Kashmir. Mahmud sought safety in retirement. He returned to Ghazni in the spring.¹³

In the beginning of the year 409 A.H. (1018 A.D.) Mahmud decided to attack Kanauj, a very populous and prosperous country. Crossing seven waters, Mahmud reached the frontiers of the kingdom, when Bakorah, the warden of the marches, sent a messenger and submitted. From here he advanced to Baranunder (Buland Shahr) Hardat himself fled and left his tribesmen to guard the fort. But Mahmud's

10 Girdizi, p. 70.

12 *Ibid.*, p. 72.

11 *Ibid.*, pp. 70, 71.

13 *Ibid.*, pp. 72, 73.

armies broke their defences and overpowered them. They bought back themselves by paying 1000000/- and thirty elephants.

From here Mahmud advanced to Mahaban (near Muttra) on the Jumna then under Kala Chand. When he heard of Mahmud's advance, he selected his best elephant, mounted it and tried to cross the river. Mahmud learnt of his attempt at escape and ordered his men to watch the roads. In despair Kala Chand killed himself. Mahaban was taken, 165 elephants and a booty beyond imagination fell into Mahmud's hands. From here Mahmud advanced on Muttra, a very great city of the Hindus, sacred as the birth place of Kṛṣṇa son of Vāsudeva. Here is a great Hindu temple. When Mahmud reached Muttra no one opposed him. He ordered his men to spread over the whole kingdom, destroy all idols or burn them and take possession of all property. From the temples, treasures and property beyond counting fell into Mahmud's hands. One sapphire weighed 450 *mithgals*. No one had ever seen such a stone. Gold and silver idols beyond estimate were taken. One gold idol was ordered to be broken and 98300 *mithgals* of gold was found therein. In this way much property and many stones were captured.

From here Mahmud advanced to Kanauj where the Rai was captured. Mahmud now set out for Ghazni. In the way a peerless elephant of Chand Rai of Kanauj which Mahmud had heard of and sought for in vain fell into his hands. It had run away from Chand Rai's ranks and with the Mahaot was now captured. Mahmud named it Khudadad (God's gift).

When Mahmud reached Ghazni, the booty was valued at 2000000 Dinars, 53000 slaves and 350 elephants.¹⁴

In the month of Tir in the year 410 A.H. (1019 A.D.) Mahmud decided to advance against Nanda. He had killed Rajpal. He had decided to join Trilocanpal and make him victorious and bring back his armies to his own kingdom. When he heard the news of Mahmud's advance Jaipal crossed the Ganges towards Bari. Mahmud also crossed the river and defeated all the Hindu armies. Jaipal ran away with some Hindus and did not dispute Mahmud's path who now decided to attack the city

¹⁴ Gird'zi, pp. 74, 76.

of Bari. They found it deserted. All the temples were burnt. They carried away every thing they could lay their hands on. From here, he decided to march towards Nanda's country. After crossing many rivers, Mahmud reached his frontiers. Nanda had heard of the advance of the army of Islam. He had gathered together a good many arms and a large army. It is said his army consisted of 36000 cavalry, 145000 foot, 650 elephants. This should give some idea of his resources. When Mahmud approached his armies, he disposed of his troops in battle array, divided it into the usual sections for the battle. He encamped taking cover to protect himself. He then sent a messenger to Nanda asking him to become a Muslim and save himself from all harm and distress. Nanda returned reply that he had nothing to say to Mahmud except on the battlefield. He heard that Mahmud ascended a height in order to get a view of Nanda's army. He saw a world of tents, encampments and besides immoveable horsemen, foot soldiers and elephants. He left distressed. He prayed to God to grant him victory. When the night fell, God struck fear into Nanda's heart. He left camp and ran away. When Mahmud sent a messenger next day he found Nanda's camp deserted, they had left all their arms and taken away their horses and elephants. The messenger returned and informed Mahmud who left his place of refuge and went towards the enemy's camp and found it deserted. Mahmud thanked God and ordered the camp of Nanda to be looted. A good deal of property of all kinds was thus destroyed.

From here victorious Mahmud set out towards Ghazni. On their way back a forest fell in their way. The army entered it, 580 elephants of Nanda fell into their hands which they captured and brought to the Muslim camp.

Then they brought the news that there are two strongly fortified passes Nur and Qirat. Here the inhabitants are Kafir and idolatrous. Mahmud resolved to attack them. He ordered that a large number of artisans such as blacksmiths, masons and stone-cutters should accompany the troops so that they might level up the roads, cut down the trees and break stones. When the army reached there, it was resolved to attack Qirat first. Qirat is a pleasant place and its inhabitants worship the lion. Its climate is cold and fruits abound. When the Shah of Qirat got the news he advanced to meet them, submitted and sought

protection. Mahmud accepted his submission and spared his territories. When the Shah of Qirat became Muslim and many of the inhabitants of Qirat as well accepted Islam. The inhabitants of Nur, however, refused to comply with Mahmud's demands. Mahmud ordered Hajib Ali to proceed to Nur and conquer it. A fort was built here. Mir Alf was appointed Kotwal of the fort. He was ordered to put Islam round their neck by sword. Islam now made its appearance in their country. This was in 411 A.H. (1020 A.D.).¹⁵

When the year 412 A.H. (1021 A.D.) began, Mahmud decided to attack Kashmir. The fort of Loharkot was invested. A month was spent here. As the fort was very strong, it could not be taken. When it was not taken, Mahmud came out of the great pass and went towards Lahore and Takeshar and spread his armies. When the spring came, Mahmud went back to Ghazni.¹⁶

When the year 413 A.H. (1022 A.D.) began, Mahmud decided to attack Nanda's territory. When the fort of Gwalior was reached, it was invested. It was, however, a very strong fort and Mahmud failed to take it. He remained investing it for four days and nights. The commander of the fort then sent a messenger and sought for peace. He surrendered 35 elephants. The army of Mahmud now retreated from here and advanced towards Kaliñjar which was under Nanda. Nanda was himself in the fort with his near relatives and his officers. Mahmud ordered that the fort be surrounded on all sides. Many plans were thought of. But the fort was so situated that no man could scale its heights. It was not even possible to attack the fort by cutting down stones at its base. No plan was possible. Some days were passed in this fashion. Nanda, however, felt uncomfortable in the fort as all roads had been closed to him. He sent messengers and offered to pay the Jizya, Hudya, and 300 elephants. This was agreed to. Nanda gladly sent 300 elephants and drove them out of the fort without Mahacots. Mahmud ordered his men who came with the pack of elephants, and mounted them. The garrison was very much surprised at this daring of Mahmud's soldiers. Nanda was a poet. He wrote a verse in Hindi and sent it to Mahmud. Mahmud had this recited to the Hindu, Persian and

¹⁵ Girdizi, pp. 76, 79.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 79.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 79, 80.

Turk poets. Every one liked the verse and declared that it was not possible to write more elegant or more high flown lines. Mahmud therefore had an order drawn up conferring on Nanda 15 forts in return for the verse that Nanda had composed in his honour. Besides he sent many presents, women, jewels and dresses. Nanda also sent a good deal in return. Mahmud returned to Ghazni from there.

When winter came, as usual, Mahmud went towards India in order to gain religious merit. Some one said, "On the sea shore there is a great city Somnath by name. Hindus regard it with the same respect which the Muslims reserve for Mecca. There are gold and silver idols in the temple. The idol Manat, which the prophet had removed from Ka'aba, had reached this place *via* Aden. They had brought it. In the treasury of that temple they have placed precious stones and a good deal of property. But the way thereto is very dangerous."

When Mahmud heard this he planned to go to that city and destroy the idols. From Hindustan he now set his forces towards Somnath. When he approached the city and was seen by the Brāhmanas and Sramanas, they all busied themselves in worshipping their idols. The Chief Officer of the city left it and taking his family and men with him sailed down the river in a boat seeking refuge on an island where he remained encamped as long as the Muslim army remained surrounding the city. When the Muslim army approached the city, they besieged it and began to attack it. Before many days had passed a breach was effected, Mahmud's army entered the city, and began to kill. Many Hindus were killed. Mahmud asked the Muazzan to go to the camp and announce the time of prayers when all the idols were broken, burnt or otherwise destroyed. The stone idol of Manat was taken out from its foundation in the ground and broken into small pieces. Some of these were taken to Ghazni on camels where they are still found under the steps of the Mosque. There was some treasure under the idols. All that treasure was taken. A large amount of property was thus got—silver idols, other jewels, and treasure of various kinds.

Mahmud now returned. For Parm Dev, Badshah of the Hindus, stood in his way disputing his path. Mahmud decided therefore to leave the right road back to Ghazni for fear lest this great victory of his should turn into defeat (results of this great victory be thrown away). He

left by way of Mansura towards Multan. His soldiers suffered many hardships partly on account of want of water and partly on account of the Jats of Sindh and on other grounds. Many of the soldiers of Islam lost their lives in the way. At last Multan was sighted and from there Mahmud marched on to Ghazni.¹⁸

Mahmud had been greatly enraged at the conduct of the Jats of Multan and Bhatias of Sainon on account of their molesting his armies when he was returning from Somnath. He wanted to take vengeance on them for their conduct and punish them. Hence in the year 418 A.H. (1027 A.D.), he collected his armies for the twelfth time and set out towards Multan. When he reached the city, he ordered 1400 strong boats to be built. They were fitted with three iron spikes each, strong and sharp, one at the bow and one each on the sides. They were so strong and sharp that they were capable of piercing, wrecking, and destroying whatever they struck against. One thousand and four hundred boats were set afloat on the river. Every boat seated 20 well equipped soldiers with bows, arrows, spears and shields. When the Jats heard of Mahmud's approach, they carried their families to far off Islands. They took up arms, equipped 4000, and according to some accounts, 800 boats. Every boat contained many well armed men. They set off to attack the enemy. When they came opposite the Muslim army, the Muslim shot arrows at them, the firemen threw rockets. When the Muslim boats came near the boats of the Jats, the spikes struck the Jat boats. In this way the Jat boats were either wrecked, drowned or damaged. On the banks of the river, horsemen, foot soldiers and elephants had been placed. When any Jat appeared on the banks, he was again thrown in. The Muslim army marched on the banks of the river, till they sighted the camp of the refugee families. They were robbed. A good deal of booty was obtained. From there the Muslim army left with flying colours for Ghazni.

SRI RAM SHARMA

Handwritten text in Odia script on a copper plate, likely a historical agreement or legal document. The text is densely packed and spans approximately 15 lines. The characters are in a traditional Odia script, and the plate shows signs of age and wear.

Daspalla Copper-Plate Agreement

Daspalla Copper-Plate Agreement*

The inscription in the sub-joined plate which measures 8.3" x 5.9" consists of 14 lines. This is enclosed on four sides by engraved borders. The top border as well as the right border are formed by simple lines. But the other two borders have embellishments. At the end of this inscription the representation of a peacock, which is the family emblem of the Bhñja rulers, is engraved.

Though the inscription is not much old, it is very interesting from the linguistic point of view. Again it definitely connects the present ruling family of Baud with the Bhañja rulers of old epigraphic records.

The scripts used in this record resemble the modern Oriya alphabet. But the archaic form of one Oriya script is noticeable. The script *t* is in the way of formation of its modern Oriya shape. Its horizontal bar has been curved. But unlike the modern Oriya *t*, its lower end of the right limb has not been extended so much as to join with the left end of the horizontal stroke (cf. *ta* in *putra*, *tumbhe* and *mehanuta* in ll. 2, 3 and 5 respectively). Again there is hardly any distinction between the form of *ta* and that of *tra* (cf. *tra* in *putra* and *ta* in *tumbhe* in ll. 2 and 3 respectively). Besides there are some forms of scripts, now known in Orissa as *Karañi akṣara* or the scripts used by the writers of official records (cf. *da* in *dina* in l. 6 and *ka* in *eka* in l. 3).

As regards orthography, the following points that are not found in the modern Oriya writing, call for special notice.

(1) The vowels *r̥* and *l̥* are used for *ru* and *lu* (cf. *ādyar̥* written for *ādyaru* in l. 3; *del̥*, written for *delu* in l. 3). This is due to the fact that the vowels *r̥* and *l̥* are pronounced in Oriya as *ru* and *lu* respectively.

(2) A peculiar phonetic assimilation is represented by *Lokaṃnātha*, written for *Eokanātha* in l. 10.

*I acknowledge my indebtedness to the present Ruling Chief of Daspalla State, who has kindly lent me this document for publication.

(3) The letters *ś*, *ṣ* and *s* are used arbitrarily (cf. *satṛ* and *ṣatṛ*, both written for *śatru* in l. 7; *puruṣānakramare* written for *puruṣānukramare* in l. 8). It is worth mentioning that their sounds in Oriya are not distinguishable from each other.

(4) The letter *j* has been used instead of *y* (cf. *jementa* in l. 4 and *je* in l. 7 written instead of modern Oriya *yemanta* and *ye*). This is due to the fact that the initial *y* of the words is pronounced in Oriya as *j*. The modern phonetic assimilation of the Oriya language is also represented by *jementa* corresponding to Bengali *yemana*.

(5) The words *rajā* (l. 1) and *māhārājā* (l. 4) written for *rājā* and *māhārājā* are also worth noticing. When the Sanskrit words, having two *ā*-sounds successively are adopted into Oriya, their first *ā*-sounds change into *a*-sound in many cases (cf. Or. *kapā* > Sk. *kārpāsa*, Or. *asādha* > Sk. *āṣādha*). But if the sound of *ha* succeeds that of *ā* or the sound of *hā* succeeds that of *a* in a word, the sound of *ha* becomes that of *hā* in the former case and the sound of *hā* becomes that of *ha* in the latter one (cf. Or. *sāhāsa* > Sk. *sāhas*; Or. *pāhāna* > Sk. *pradhāna*). This is why the Sanskrit *mahā* has been written as *māhā*.

The language of the document is not different from the modern Oriya. The foreign words, such as *kabolapatra* (l. 2), *sarakāra* (l. 4) and *mehanata* (l. 5), are still in use in Oriya. But the phrase *ekā pṛthivī kalāi* (l. 4) is not now in use in the common parlance of Orissa; its modern equivalent is *ekā pṛthivī kalu* (we make our states one and the same unit). The final *i* of *kalāi* is derived from the Sanskrit *hi* conveying the emphasis. As for illustration *tu se kathā kahucu* (you are uttering that word) and *tu sei kathā kahucu* (you are uttering that very word) can be cited here. But now this *i* is never used after a verb; such use is found in the ancient Oriya literature.

The singular inflectional termination of the accusative case is *e* in Oriya. It does not euphonicly combine with the final vowels (except *a* and *ā*) of the words to which it is added (cf. *se kathā kahilā*¹ or *se kathe kahile*;² *se hāti delā*³ or *se hātie delā*⁴). Hence the above expression is not wrong nor unintelligible.

1 He uttered words
3 He gave elephant.

2 He uttered some words.
4 He gave an elephant.

The text begins with the date of execution of the document. It contains *samasta* 62 *añka* and 1193 *sāla*. The former year is perhaps the regnal year of Trivikrama Deo. The latter *sāla* year is nothing but the Amlee year.

In Orissa the Amlee new year's day falls on the 12th day of the bright fortnight of the month of *Bhādra*. But as the document was executed on the 25th day of *Mīna* (*Caitra* the last month of the Amlee year according to the Bengal system of reckoning), its corresponding English date will be one and the same according to all systems of reckoning the Amlee year. It, therefore, corresponds to 9th April 1787 A.D. .

Trivikrama Deo Bhañjarajā issued this document, acknowledging the help, rendered by his nephew Mukunda Bhañja, the ruler of Das-palla. The latter prevailed upon Dāsaji, the Nawab under (the Mahratta) Mādhoji's Government, to secure the release of the former from confinement.⁵ In consequence Trivikrama Deo kept himself, his state and his posterity under indebtedness to the Rāja family of Daspalla, which is a branch of the Baud Bhañja family.

The title Bhañja is not now used by the rulers of Baud. This fact led Mr. B. C. Mazumdar to hold that the present Rāja family of Baud is not the off-shoot of the Bhañja family of old epigraphic records.⁶ He connected therefore the former family with the solar dynasty to which Yogeśvara Devavarmar of the epigraphic record belonged.

Trivikrama Deo, named in this plate, is the elder brother of the great-great-great-grandfather of Nārāyan Prasād Deo, the present Ruling Chief of Baud. As he has explicitly called himself Bhañjarajā in the present record, there is the reason to believe the version of the family annals that the present ruling house of Baud is the scion of the old Bhañja family.

At the end of the text there occurs the numeral 5. It perhaps signifies five gods.

⁵ The confinement of the Rāja of Baud by the Mahrattas is revealed by the accounts of early European travellers.

⁶ *JBORS.*, vol. II, p. 366.

TEXT

- L. 1. Samasta 62 aṅka (,) sna⁷ 1193 śāla⁸// mina⁹ di 25
ne/ Bauda rajā Śrī Trivikrama Deo Bha-
- L.,,2. ṅjarajāṅkara// Dasapalā¹⁰ Śrī Mukunda Bhaṅja
puturārajāṅku/ delā kabolapatra/
- L. 3. E nimante kabolapatra lekhidel¹¹/ Ājadina ādyar¹²
tumbha āmbhara ekā gha-
- L. 4. re ekā pṛthivie kalāi/ Tumbhe jementa¹³ Modhoji¹⁴
māhārājāṅka¹⁵ Sar-
- L. 5. kāraṅ¹⁶ °Śrī Nabāba Śrī Dāsaji¹⁷ sābebaṅka
hajuru mehanata kari dharāṭhār¹⁸ chaḍāi
- L. 6. āmbha(ṅku)mulakaku nela/ Ājadina ādyar¹⁹
tumbha bicāraru bāhāra nohu// Tu-
- L. 7. mbhara je²⁰ mitra se āmbhara mitra/ Tumbhara je²¹
satṛ²² se āmbhara satṛ²³/ Ehi-
- L. 8. ṛpe²⁴ prīti²⁵ kari puruśānukramare²⁶ nebā/
Baḍamulo²⁷ ghāṭaṭhār²⁸ jete²⁹ ghā-
- L. 9. ṭa ethire rāhādārire birodha na karibu/ Ete kathāre
anya bicā-
- L. 10. rile Śrī Jaganātha-māhāprabhuṅka³⁰ Śrī Lokanātha-
māhāprabhuṅka³¹ carane a-
- L. 11. parādhi³² hebu/ Āpaṅāra sukṛta jete³³ sabu hāribu//
Purbāpurba-
- L. 12. ṛ³⁴ °Raghoji māhārājāṅka³⁵ dinar³⁶ tumbha
āmbha Padmatolū-ghāṭi sandi³⁷ śimā³⁸

7 ⁷ sana	8 sāla	9 mina
10 Dasapalā	11 lekhidelu	12 ādyaru
13 yemanta	14 Mādhoji	15 Mahārāja
16 sarakāraru	17 Dāsaji	18 dharāṭhāru
19 ādyaru	20 ye	21 ye
22 śatru	23 śatru	24 ehirūpe
25 prīti	26 puruśānukramare	27 baḍamūla
28 ghāṭaṭhāru	29 yete.	
30 Jagannātha-mahāprabhuṅka	31 Lokanātha-mahāprabhuṅka.	
32 Aparādhi	... yete	34 pūrbāpūrbaru
35 Mahārājāṅka	36 Dīnaru	37 sandhi 38 śimā

L. 13. jāhāra³⁹ je⁴⁰ thiba sehiṭhār⁴¹
sehirpe⁴² cālibā/ E kabolap-

L. 14 tra Śrī Trivikrama Deo Bhañjarajānkara pramāṇa 5.

TRANSLATION

On the 25th day of Mīna in the Amlee year 1193 and the regnal year 62. This agreement, executed by Śrī Trivikrama Deo Bhañjarajā, the ruler of Baud, is made over to his nephew Śrī Mukunda Bhañja, the ruler of Daspalla.

Whereas you (Mukunda Bhañja) prevailed upon Śrī Dāsaji, the Nawab under the Government of Mahārājā Śrī Mādhoji for my return to the state from confinement, I (Trivikrama Deo) do hereby (acknowledge your help and) promise that the family and the state of mine as well as those of yours should be (considered) as one and the same. I will never act contrary to your counsel from today. I bind myself and my posterity for the perpetuity of friendly relation with you and your posterity that I will treat your friend and foe as those of mine. I will not quarrel for the right over the ferries at places lying beyond the Badamula ferry places. In case of breach of these promises, I will be accused (of sin) at the feet of the gods Jagannātha and Lokanātha and lose all my merits. Our respective possessions of the boundary line at Padmatalā pass as fixed in the past and in the days of Mahārājā Raghuji will continue (unchanged). This agreement is admitted by Trivikrama Deo Bhañjarājā.

BINAYAK MISRA

39 yāhāra
41 sehiṭhāru

40 ye
42 sehirūpe

King Narasiṃha of Gauḍa *and the Study of the Mahābhāṣya in Bengal*

In the *Padmapurāṇa*, Uttarakhaṇḍa, ch. 185 a story has been told in exaltation of the virtues (*māhātmya*) attaching to the XVth chapter of the *Gītā*. It is stated therein that there was a king named Kṛpāṇa Narasiṃha in Gauḍa (*Gauḍeṣu bhūpatiḥ*). After describing his prowess and wealth of horses and elephants it has been abruptly said that “*punarujjalpayāṃcukre Mahābhāṣyaṃ Phaṇīśvaraḥ*” i.e. Phaṇīśvara re-established the *Mahābhāṣya*, (the famous commentary on the *Pāṇini* by Patañjali) by refuting the arguments of the adversaries. It is not clear what relation this incident had with the main object of the story i.e. the *māhātmya*, nor is it apparent in what way Phaṇīśvara is related to the king Narasiṃha. Probably Phaṇīśvara wrote some commentary on the *Mahābhāṣya*, re-establishing its superiority over the other commentaries on the *Pāṇini*, under the patronage of this king. However incoherent the statement may seem here, it lends some reality to the story itself, to the extent that there was a king in Gauḍa named Narasiṃha and that one Phaṇīśvara re-established the study of the *Mahābhāṣya* in Gauḍa. If the story was a wholesale creation of the imagination, as many of the stories of this type are, there was no necessity of mentioning this incident of the *Mahābhāṣya*.

Now let us see if there is any evidence to show that such a king lived in Gauḍa at any time. We do not know of any well-known king of Gauḍa by the name of Kṛpāṇa Narasiṃha or Narasiṃha. If any such king really existed he must have been a petty potentate, who reigned in some part of Gauḍa, *Gauḍeṣu* being taken to imply ‘in some part of Gauḍa.’ We are indebted to Mr. Prabhas Chandra Sen for the information of the existence of a place called *Narasiṃher dhāp* i.e. the mound of Narasiṃha in Mahāsthān, in the district of Bogra, Bengal (*IHQ.*, vol. IX, p. 724). Mahāsthān with its environs is identified as Puṇḍra-wardhana, the ancient capital of Gauḍa. This Narasiṃha might be the same as Kṛpāṇa Narasiṃha, king of Gauḍa. The mound most probably represents the ruins of his palace. The prefix *Kṛpāṇa* to the name of Narasiṃha is perhaps an epithet for his skill in manipulating sword.

Now let us look to the other point, viz. the re-establishment of the study of the *Mahābhāṣya* in Gauda. The verb *punar-ujjalpayāmcakre* indicate that it had been discontinued, so an attempt at least had been made to revive it. It is doubtful if the attempt was successful. In fact, we find that other systems of Grammar though driven from their countries of origin found asylum in Bengal, but we find no trace of the study of the *Mahābhāṣya* in Bengal except in a single instance. It is on record in the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* (I. 176 & IA., vol. IV, p. 107) and *Vākya-padīya* of Bhartṛhari (Kāṇḍa, ii, stanzas 484-90) that the *Mahābhāṣya* was not only ousted from Bengal but from the other provinces of India also. It is said that king Abhimanyu of Kasmir could not get one authentic manuscript of it throughout India. Bhartṛhari revived the study of the *Mahābhāṣya* in the seventh century. There is a saying that wicked Amarasimha destroyed all copies of the *Bhāṣya*. The Buddhists although accepted the *Pāṇini*, ignored the *Mahābhāṣya*. This produced the Buddhist commentaries the *Kāśikā*, the *Nyāsa* of Jinendrabuddhi and others (*Preface to the Survey of the Manuscript Literature on Sanskrit Grammar* etc. by H. P. Sastri, p. xxiv). Mr. Dineshchandra Bhattacharyya says that the *Nyāsa* was extensively studied in North Bengal from a long time past till the first decade of the nineteenth century (*Sir Asutosh Mookerjee Silver Jubilee Volumes, III, pt. i, p. 189*). Bengal has produced many grammars and grammarians. Among the former now lost *Bhāgavṛtti* is one. It is only known by copious quotations from it by later grammarians. Mr. Bhattacharyya thinks that the author belonged to Bengal. Quotations from the *Bhāgavṛtti* are exclusively found in the books of the Bengal authors, except a few second-hand quotations in the *Mādhaviya* and a solitary one in the *Padamañjarī* of Haradatta (*ibid.*, p. 199).

The authorship of the *Bhāgavṛtti* has been attributed to Bhartṛhari by Srishchandra Chakravarti in his Introduction to the edition of the *Bhāṣāvṛtti*. Mm. H. P. Sastri and Mr. Bhattacharyya did not agree with him. Mr. Khitishchandra Chatterji has conclusively shown that Bhartṛhari could not have been the author of the book. He has also found out the name of the author in a quotation in Śrīpatidatta's *Kātantra-pariśiṣṭa* (I. 142). The author of the *Bhāgavṛtti* was one

Vimalamati (*IHQ.*, vol. VII, pp. 413-18). Mr. Bhattacharyya says that "the work was evidently meant to be a rival of the *Kāśikā*, whose interpretation it has sought to question almost at every step." He further says that a study of its attacks on the *Kāśikā* leads him to believe that the author enlisted himself as a staunch follower of the *Mahābhāṣya*, for the objections are mostly on the score of *anārṣatva* or *bhāṣā-virūddhatva* (*Sir A. M. Silver Jubilee Volumes*, III, pt. i, pp. 189-9). Mr. Chatterji says that the author has sometimes a fling at the *Nyāsa-kāra* also (*IHQ.*, vol. VII, p. 416). Of the host of grammarians produced by Bengal the author of the *Bhāgavṛtti* seems to be the solitary figure who was an out and out supporter of the *Mahābhāṣya*. This tempt us to identify him with Phaṇīśvara of the *Padma-purāṇa*. His object in writing the *Bhāgavṛtti* appears to have been to oust the *Kāśikā* and its commentary, the *Nyāsa*, from the field of North Bengal and re-establish the study of the *Mahābhāṣya*. The words *punar ujjalpayāṃcakre* have, therefore, been very aptly used in the *Padma-purāṇa* in this connection. The author's strong support of the *Mahābhāṣya* might have obtained for him the epithet of Phaṇīśvara, for the *Mahābhāṣya* is also known as the *Phaṇi-bhāṣya*. In a manuscript of the *Padma-purāṇa* in the Govardhana Maṭha, Puri, we found the reading 'Muṇīśvara' in place of 'Phaṇīśvara'. Probably Vimalamati, the author, was a Jaina and known as Muni Vimalamati. In that case we can understand why he has been called Muṇīśvara.

Mr. Khitishchandra Chatterji has assigned *Bhāgavṛtti* to a period between 850 to 1050 A.D. So if our supposition is correct, this king Narasiṃha must have flourished sometime between the ninth and the eleventh century. He was, therefore, in all probability a feudatory of the Pālas.

JOGENDRA CHANDRA GHOSH

Early History of the Gāhadavāla Dynasty

Kanauj played an important part in the history of ancient India. About half a century after the death of Harṣavardhana, Yaśovarman occupied its throne. The Pratihāras ruled there from the early years of the 9th century A.D. till the first quarter of the 11th century. After the fall of the Pratihāras, a Rāṣtrakūṭa dynasty under king Candra established there its suzerainty.¹ Candra was followed by Vighrahapāla, Bhuvanapāla, Gopāla, and Madanapāla. The Set-Mahet inscription² of Madanapāla's reign is dated V.E. 1176=A.D. 1118. It describes Madanapāla's predecessor Gopāla as the ruler of Gādhipura i.e. Kanauj. Gopāla must have been ruling in Kanauj sometimes before 1090 A.D. In the latter part of the 11th century A.D. the Gāhadavālas are found to have established their sway over Kanauj. The earliest known inscription of this dynasty is dated 1090 A.D.³ The Basahi plate,⁴ dated 1104 A.D., states that "in the lineage named Gāhadavāla there was a victorious king, son of Mahiyala, named Candradeva, who, when on the death of king Bhoja and Karna the world became troubled, came to the rescue, and became king and established his capital at Kanauj." Karna, referred to, was evidently the Kalacuri Karna, king of Tripurī, who ruled from 1041 A.D. to 1072 A.D. Suggestion has been made that Bhoja, mentioned above, was the Pratihāra king of the same name.⁵ But the Pratihāra Bhoja closed his reign before 892 A.D. after which his successors ruled in Kanauj for more than one-hundred and twenty-five years.⁶ Hence Bhoja of the Basahi plate, whose death was responsible for the break

1 *JASB.*, vol. XXI, 1925, p. 103.


2 *IA.*, vol. XVII, p. 63.

3 *EI.*, vol. IX, p. 302.

4 *IA.*, vol. XIV, p. 103. *yāte śrī-Bhoja-bhūpe vivu(bu)dha-vara-vadhā-
netra sīmātithitvaṃ Śrī-Karṇṇe kīrtti-śeṣam gatavati ca nṛpe kṣmātyaye jāya-
māne/ bhāritāraṃ yaṃ va(dha)ritrī tri-diva-vibhū-nibhaṃ pṛīti-yogād upetā
trātā viśvāsa-pūrvvaṃ samabhavad iha sa kṣamā-patiś Candradevaḥ//*

5 *IHQ.*, vol. V, pp. 89, 90.

6 *J. Dep. Let.*, vol. X, p. 55.



out of anarchy in Northern India in the latter part of the 11th century, cannot be identical with the Pratihāra king of the same name. He appears to have been the Paramāra Bhoja, who closed his reign shortly before 1055 A.D.⁷

No scholar has hitherto made any attempt to determine the nature of the trouble, referred to by the Basahi plate, that agitated the greater part of Northern India during this period. The most powerful among kings who flourished in the latter part of the 11th century were the Paramāra Lakṣmadeva, Kalacuri Yaśaḥkarṇa, Candella Kīrtivarman, Cālukya Karṇa, Pāla Rāmapāla, and the Cālukya Vikramāditya VI. Evidences are not available to prove that Northern India along with Kanauj fell a prey to disorder as the result of the plundering expedition launched by any of these kings. But if the contemporary records are carefully examined the cause of this catastrophe can be determined with tolerable certainty.

Ibrāhīm, the son of Mas'ūd, and the grandson of the great conqueror Mahmūd, ascended the throne of Ghazni in 1095 A.D. and ruled his kingdom until 1099 A.D. In the year 1075 A.D. he appointed his son Mahmūd governor of his Indian possession.⁸ Mahmūd, on behalf of his father, launched an expedition against Hindusthan. The great Persian poet Salmān was a contemporary both of Sultan Ibrāhīm and his son Mahmūd. He died in 520 A.H. = A.D. 1126. He gives a somewhat detailed description of the prince Mahmūd's invasion of Hindusthan. He tells us that⁹ the prince besieged the fort of Agra, and defeated there the Amir Jaipāl. The prince received loads of red gold, and files of male elephants from the kings of all quarters. In order to protect the elephants, he made a stable at Kanauj, and appointed Cānd Rai to take charge of them. After that, in course of military expeditions, he destroyed a thousand idol temples, and his elephants trampled over more than a hundred strongholds. He marched his army to Ujjain, and the king of Malwa fled away for his life. Kālañjar next fell to his sword. The

⁷ Author's *History of the Paramāra Dynasty*, pp. 82ff.

⁸ *Cambridge History of India*, vol. III, p. 84.

⁹ *Elliot's History of India*, vol. IV, p. 524.

same authority tells us that, during this period, Kanauj was the capital of Hind, which, as it appears from the above report, fell to the sword of the Moslem.

Salmān's statement makes it clear that the United Provinces, Malwa, Bundelkhand and all other intermediate territories were greatly affected by the invasion of Mahmūd. The date of this invasion can approximately be determined within the narrow limit of a few years. The Paramāra Lakṣmadeva, the son of Udayāditya, occupied the throne of Malwa between 1086 and 1094 A.D.¹⁰ He is said to have repulsed an attack of the Turuṣkas.¹¹ It will be admitted on all hands that during the latter part of the 11th century A.D. Malwa was not invaded by any other Moslem army save one. That was led by Mahmūd as has been stated above. Hence there can be little doubt that Mahmūd's adversary in Malwa was Lakṣmadeva. Evidently then Mahmūd's invasion against India took place between the years 1086 and 1094 A.D. the extreme limits of the reign period of Lakṣmadeva. This is the period when the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Gopāla lost the throne of Kanauj, and the Gāhāḍavālas took possession of it. The earliest known date of Candradeva, the founder of the Gāhāḍavāla dynasty, is 1090 A.D.¹² Hence, he can almost with certainty be identified with Cānd Rai, an officer of Mahmūd, referred to by Salmān. The Gāhāḍavāla Candradeva's predecessors were not royal personages. It appears that Candradeva accepted a service under Mahmūd and helped him in his invasion against Hindusthan. When the power of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Gopāla was completely shattered by the Moslem, Cānd Rai was engaged by the Moslem general as his stable-keeper at Kanauj. Shortly afterwards when the Moslem army withdrew to the Punjab leaving Northern India into a state of chaos and disorder, Candradeva, as we are told, taking advantage of the trouble that perturbed the whole world i.e. Northern India, wielded the sovereignty of that imperial city.

The Basahi plate inscription gives us to understand that the death of Bhoja and Karṇa resulted into anarchy in Northern India. If this

10 Author's *History of the Paramāra Dynasty*, pp. 142, 158.

11 *EI.*, vol. II, p. 188.

12 *Ibid.*, vol. IX, p. 302.

troublesome state of things is considered to have been created by the invasion of Mahmūd, as has been suggested above, it will have to maintain that Bhoja and Karna were instrumental in checking the onrush of the Moslems into the heart of India. Both Bhoja and Karna died in the third quarter of the 11th century A.D. Their disappearance from the political arena emboldened the Moslems to launch once more plundering expeditions against India. A short review of the Hindu-Moslem war in India during the middle of the 11th century A.D. will throw more light on the subject under review.

Firishta tells us that "in 435 A.H. = 1043 A.D. the Raja of Dehly, in conjunction with other Rajas, retook Hansy, Thanesar, and other dependencies from the governors to whom Modood had entrusted them. The Hindus from thence marched towards the fort of Nagarkote, which they besieged for four months.....The success of the Raja of Dehly gave such confidence to the Indian chiefs of the Punjab, and other places that though before this time, like foxes they durst hardly creep from their holes, for fear of the Mussulman arms, yet now they put on the aspect of lion, and openly set their masters at defiance."¹³

The most notable among kings, who were contemporaries of the Raja of Delhi, mentioned above, were the Kalacuri Karna, the Paramāra Bhoja, the Cālukya Someśvara, the Cāhamāna Anahila, and the Caulukya Bhīma. The Udepur prasasti of Udayāditya states that the Paramāra Bhoja defeated the Turuṣkas by means of his mercenaries.¹⁴ Malwa is not known to have been ever invaded by the Moslems during this period. Hence it seems likely that Bhoja sent his mercenaries somewhere outside his kingdom in order to fight with the Moslems. The Cālukya Someśvara, king of the Deccan, who ruled from 1042 to 1069 A.D., is said to have defeated the Turuṣkas.¹⁵ He certainly waged an aggressive war against the Moslems. Moslems never led any expedition to the south of the Narmada till the time of Alā-ud-dīn Khilji. The Sundha hill inscription tells us that the Cāhamāna Anahila, who was a contemporary of both the Paramāra

¹³ Brigg's *Firishta*, vol. I, p. 118.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, vol. I, p. 235.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

Bhoja and the Caulukya Bhīma, defeated the Tūruṣkās.¹⁶ Now, it seems almost certain that the Rajas, referred to by Firishta, who helped the king of Delhi in his aggressive war against the Moslems, were Someśvara, Bhoja, Anahila, and others. Though the Kalacuri inscriptions do not tell us anything about Karṇa's conflict with the Moslems, it does not seem quite unlikely that he also sent his armies to the Punjab to help the cause of the Raja of Delhi. Bhoja, and Karṇa, as has been noticed above, were well known for their strong military force. The death of these two veteran leaders put the Moslems on their mettle, who then cast their eyes on the rich plains of India. We have just seen how successfully they carried on their marauding excursions through the heart of this country. The force of the statement of the Basahi plate can only be maintained if the things are viewed in the above light.

A brief survey of the above discussion points out that in 1043 A.D. the Moslems suffered a terrible defeat at the hand of the Raja of Delhi, Paramāra Bhoja, Kalacuri Karṇa, and other Hindu chiefs. So long Bhoja and Karṇa were alive the Moslems did not dare raise their arms against India. Bhoja's death about 1055 A.D. greatly weakened the strength of the Indians, and the death of Karṇa in 1072 entirely broke down the barriers against the onrush of the Moslems. Sometime between 1086 and 1094 A.D. the Moslems under their leader, prince Mahmūd, launched an expedition against the Indian princes, and plundered Agra, Kanauj, Malwa, and Bundelkhand. Candradeva, a military adventurer, joined the Moslems in order to make his fortune. At the outset he accepted the service of the stable-keeper under Mahmūd at Kanauj. But immediately after the departure of the Moslem army, he forcibly occupied the vacant throne of Kanauj, and made himself master of the country.

In almost all the Gāhadavāla records a kind of tax named *turuṣka-danḍa* is referred to as a source of revenue of the Gāhadavāla kings.¹⁷ The word has been variously interpreted by the scholars. Dr. Smith

16 *Ibid.*, vol. IX, p. 72.

17 Cf. Candravati plate of Candradeva, dated 1090 A.D. *Et.*, vol. IX, p. 302, and others.

Mādhavavarman I died at a very old age. The date of the Polamuru grant of this king seems to be year 40 or—if K. V. Lakshmana Rao is right—year 48. It is likely that elder children of Mādhavavarman I died some time before their father's death. In view of the fact that Devavarman, in the Ipur plates (set II) of his son Mādhavavarman II, has the only epithet क्षत्रियावस्कन्दप्रवर्तिताप्रतिमविख्यातपराक्रम, which can by no means suggest his accession to the throne, it appears that this son of Mādhavavarman I did not rule, but predeceased his father. Now we are to determine whether Mādhavavarman I was succeeded by his son Vikramendravarman I or his grandson Mādhavavarman II.

According to the Ipur plates (set I), Mādhavavarman I granted the village of Bilembali in the Guddādiviṣaya to Agniśarman, a Brahmin of the Vatsagotra. In the Ipur plates (set II), we notice the grant of a village—the name of which seems to me to be Murotukalikī—by Mādhavavarman II to two Brahmins named Agniśarman and Indraśarman. It may be that Agniśarman of the first set is identical with his name-sake, who was one of the two recipients of the second set of the Ipur plates. In view of the above fact and also the fact that Devavarman predeceased his father and was probably an elder brother of Vikramendravarman I, it may be stated that Mādhavavarman II succeeded Mādhavavarman I on the throne. The date of his Ipur plates (set II) has been read by Hultzsch as [40] 7 i.e. 47; but he says: "The first figure of the year in the date portion is injured and uncertain."² The symbol in question, however, seems to be 10, and consequently the date may be read as year 17.

Mādhavavarman II was possibly succeeded by his uncle Vikramendravarman I, who must have been considerably aged at the time of his accession. We have as yet no copper-plate grant issued by this king. The duration of his rule cannot be determined. But if we grant a reign period of about 25 years to each of the Viṣṇukunḍin kings, a consideration of the regnal dates of the known kings of the family seems to suggest not a very long reign-period for this king. "His reign was probably short" (Dubreuil, *Anc. Hist. Dec.*, 91). The succession from

Vikramendravarman I to Vikramendravarman II is regular. All these king have royal titles in the inscriptions. We, however, cannot be definite as regards the number of Viṣṇukunḍin kings that ruled before Vikramahendra and after Vikramendravarman II.

Date

We have, now, to consider the time of the Viṣṇukunḍin kings. The Polamuru plates of Mādhavavarman I record the grant of the village of Pulobūru in the Guddavādiviṣaya by the king in his 40th (or 48th) year as an *Agrahāra* to Śivaśarman, a scholar of the Taittirīya school belonging to the Gautamagotra, resident of Kunṛūra in Karmarāṣṭra, son of Dāmaśarman and grandson of Rudraśarman. Next, we are to notice the contents of the Polamuru plates (*Ep. Ind.*, XIX, p. 254) of the Eastern Cālukya king Jayasiṃha I, who began to rule from 633 A.D. These plates record the gift of the village of Pulobūmra in the Guddavādiviṣaya in the 5th year of the king's reign to Rudraśarman, a scholar of the Taittirīya school belonging to the Gautama gotra, resident of Asanapurasthāna, son of Śivaśarman and grandson of Dāmaśarman. There can be no doubt that Pulobūru of the former inscription is identical with the Pulobūmra of the latter and that the village is to be identified with the modern Polamuru (the find-spot of both the inscriptions), near the Anaparti Railway Station in the East Godavari District. There can also be no doubt that Śivaśarman, (son of Dāmaśarman), the recipient of the grant of Mādhavavarman I, was the father of Rudraśarman, (son of Śivaśarman and grandson of Dāmaśarman), the recipient of the grant of Jayasiṃha I. In the latter grant, Rudraśarman is expressly called *Purvāgrahārika*, "the former owner of the *Agrahāra*." Now, how many years intervened between the date of the first grant and that of the second, that is to say, between the 40th (or 48th) year of Mādhavavarman I and the 5th year of Jayasiṃha I?

In considering this question, we are to note the following points. *Agrahāras* were generally granted to Brahmīns, when they returned from the *Gurukula* after finishing studies, in order to help them in settling themselves as *gṛhasthas*. It may, therefore, be conjectured that Śivaśarman received Polamuru at about the age of 25, when king Mādhavavarman I was in the 40th (48th) year of his reign. The king

therefore was old at the time of granting this *Agrahāra* to the Brāhman youth. Sivaśarman, however, died before the date of the grant of Jayasiṃha I. The epithet *Purvāgrahārika* applied to the name of his son in Jayasiṃha I's grant, possibly goes to show that Rudraśarman, as successor of his father, enjoyed the *Agrahāra* for some time before the 5th year of Jayasiṃha I i.e. c. 637-8 A.D. The most interesting point in this connection, however, is that Rudraśarman in Jayasiṃha I's grant is called "resident of the town of Asanapura." He is expected to have resided at Kunṛūra in Karma-rāṣṭra, the original place of his father, or at Polamuru, the *Agrahāra* granted to his father by king Mādhavavarman I. When we remember this change of residence and when we further see that Jayasiṃha I at the time of the execution of the Polamuru grant was in a camp (*riyaya-skandhāvāra*). We may infer that in the early years of his reign, Jayasiṃha I led an expedition to the Viṣṇukunḍin country and encamped in the Guddavādiviṣaya, somewhere near Polamuru; that constant fights were going on between the forces of the Cālukyas and those of the Viṣṇukunḍins; and that Rudraśarman, the *Agrahārika* of Polamuru, had to flee to the town of Asanapura in this troubled period, but came back after a year or two, when Jayasiṃha I was for the time being master of the whole of the Guddavādiviṣaya or a considerable part thereof.³ Considering all these points I think it not impossible that the difference between the time of the two Polamuru grants was about half a century.⁴ Then the 40th (or 48th) year of Mādhavavarman I may be: 637 A.D. (date of Jayasiṃha I's grant) *minus* 50, that is, 587 A.D.

3 The mastery of two different powers over two different parts of one district does not seem to be impossible. The Candra (cf. the Rampal grant of Śricandra; *Inscr. Beng.*, III, no. 1) and Varman (cf. *Ibid.*, no. 3, the Belava grant of Bhojavarman) kings of south-eastern Bengal granted lands in the Puṇḍravardhanabhukti. But it seems to me impossible that the Candras and Varmans were ever masters of the Koṭivarṣa or Dinajpur region of the Puṇḍravardhanabhukti. I therefore think that, in the age of the later Pālas, the *bhukti* of Puṇḍravardhana was divided between the kings of Gauḍa and the kings of south-eastern Bengal.

4 Mr. Subba Rao suggests that the period may be about 40 years. This suggestion however seems to be invalidated by another suggestion of his. He

Mādhavarman I, therefore, seems to have ruled from about the end of the first half to about the end of the second half of the 6th century A.D. The approximate chronology of the Viṣṇukunḍin kings; then, may be taken as follows:

1. Rise of the Viṣṇukunḍin power in the 5th century A.D.
2. Vikramahendra circa 500-520 A.D.
3. Govindavarman ,, 520-535 ,,
4. Mādhavarman I ,, 535-585 A.D.⁵
5. Mādhavarman II ,, 585-615 ,,
6. Vikramendravarman I ,, 615-625 ,,
7. Indra[bhaṭṭāraka]varman ,, 625-655 ,,
8. Vikramendravarman II ,, 655-670 A.D.⁶
9. End of the dynasty somewhere in the 8th century A.D.

takes *Hastikośa* and *Virakośa*, who were the executors of the grant of Jayasimha I, as personal names. But we must notice that the executors of the grant of Mādhavarman I were also *Hastikośa* and *Virakośa*. If we think that these two persons were officers in charge of the Guddavādiviṣaya under Mādhavarman I and also under Jayasimha I, the intervening period between the dates of the grants of the two kings should possibly be shorter than 40 years. We must also note in this connection that there were a *Hastikośa* and a *Virakośa* in the Tālupākaviṣaya, who were ordered by Prthivimūla, the king of the Godavari plates (*JBBRAS.*, XVI, 144ff.) to protect an agrahāra in the same *viṣaya*. Fleet, the editor of the Godavari plates, may be right when he says: "I do not know of any other mention of these two officials, who evidently kept the purses and made disbursements on account of respectively the establishment of elephants and heroes who were to be rewarded for deeds of valour." The epithet *Mahāmātrayodha* applied to *Hastikośavirakośa* in the Polamuru grant of Mādhavarman I seems to show that they were *Mahāmātras* of the Military Department. It may also be that the epithet *mahāmātra* goes with *hastikośa* and *yodha* with *virakośa*. The word *mahāmātra*, according to *Medinī*, means *hastikādhipa* (the Head of the elephant-drivers or riders; cf. vulgo. māhut); the word *yodha* generally means 'a soldier.'

5 Mādhavarman I married a Vākāṭaka princess. His date may not, therefore, be far removed from the glorious age of the Vākāṭakas, viz., the 5th century A.D. Smith places this relative of the Vākāṭakas in about 500 A.D. (*JRAS.*, 1914, p. 139). If Mādhavarman I ascended the throne about 535, his 40th year falls in 574 or 575 A.D. The Polamuru grant refers to a lunar eclipse in the *Phālgunī-paurṇamāsī*, which may therefore be either that of the 21st Feb., 574 or that of the 11th Feb., 575 A.D.

6 According to Kielhorn, the Chikkulla plates should be palæographically assigned to the 7th or the 8th century A.D.

The period assigned to Indravarman, viz., circa 625-655 A.D., is, I think, supported by some views expressed by Fleet in *JBBRAS.*, XVI, p. 116. While editing the Godavari plates of Pṛthivīmūla, Fleet said: "The Adhirāja Indra at whose request the grant was made, is mentioned as having fought in company with other chiefs who united to overthrow a certain Indrabhaṭṭāraka. Taking into consideration the locality (*scil.* the Godavari District) from which this grant comes, and its approximate period as indicated by the palaeographical standard of the characters and the use of numerical symbols in the date, there can be no doubt that Indrabhaṭṭāraka is the Eastern Cālukya of that name, the younger brother of Jayasiṃha I." According to many of the Eastern Cālukya grants, however, this Indrabhaṭṭāraka did not reign at all, though some grants assign a reign-period of 7 days to him. It is, therefore, highly improbable that Indrabhaṭṭāraka of the Godavari grant of Pṛthivīmūla was identical with the Eastern Cālukya of that name. Prof. Dubreuil is almost right in identifying Indrabhaṭṭāraka of the Godavari plates with the Viṣṇukunḍin king Indravarman or Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman.

Fleet further remarked: "And the figurative expression that the Adhirāja Indra mounted upon the elephant *Supratika* of the north-east quarter, overthrew the elephant Kumuda of the south-east or southern quarter, shows that this attack upon the Eastern Cālukyas was made from the north-east of their kingdom of Veṅgī. It is possible that this Adhirāja Indra is identical with the Gaṅga Mahārāja Indrarmā of Kaliṅganagara of whom I have two unpublished inscriptions of about the same period with the present grant." The inscriptions of the Gaṅga king Indravarman referred to by Fleet are dated in the 128th and 146th year of the Gaṅga era, which 'seems to have commenced in A.D. 496.' The above Gaṅga inscriptions were, therefore, issued in c. 624 and 642 A.D. Consequently the Gaṅga king Indravarman was a contemporary of the Viṣṇukunḍin Indravarman (c. 625-655 A.D.). As regards the possession of Veṅgī by the Eastern Cālukyas in the middle of the 7th century, I may say that there is no conclusive proof of that. From the Aihole inscription (*Ep. Ind.*, VI. 4ff.) we learn that Pulakeśin II reduced the strong fortress of Piṣṭapura, which is the

modern Piṭṭāpuram in the Godavari District near the sea-coast, about 80 miles to the north-east of Peddavegi; and he caused the leader of the Pallavas to shelter himself behind the ramparts of Kāñcī, modern Conjeeveram, about 40 miles to the south-west of Madras. Fleet says: "Probably during the campaign which included the conquest of Piṭṭapuram and which must have taken place at this time (*scil.* A.D. 616 or 617), the Veṅgī country was made a part of the Cālukya dominions; and the reference to the Pallavas, immediately after the mention of Piṣṭapura, has been understood as indicating that it was from their possession that Veṅgī was taken."⁸ After the publication of the Viṣṇukunḍin copper-plate grants, the theory of the Pallava occupation of Veṅgī in the beginning of the 7th century A.D. may be tacitly given up. Since Leṇḍlūra—for some time the residence (*rāsaka*) of a Viṣṇukunḍin king has been undisputedly identified with Leṇḍalūru, a village on the ruins of the ancient city of Veṅgī, 5 miles north-east of Ellore in the West Godavari District, it is certain that the Veṅgī country passed from the hands of the Sālaṅkāyanas to the hands of the Viṣṇukunḍins.

The theory now generally accepted is that Veṅgī was conquered by Pulakeśin II during his campaign in the south-eastern region. There is, as I have already said, no conclusive proof in support of this theory. In the records of the early Eastern Cālukya kings, there is no reference to the occupation of Veṅgī at all. The first use of the word Veṅgī is in the inscriptions of the time of Amma I (918-925), which call Vijayāditya II (c. 794-842 A.D.) Veṅgīśa, and in the inscriptions of the time of Cālukya Bhīma II (934-945), which contain the first explicit statement that the territory over which Kubja Viṣṇuwardhana and his successors ruled was the Veṅgī country (*Ind. Ant.*, XX, 94). Both Amma I and Cālukya Bhīma II reigned in the 10th century A.D.; their evidence as to the Cālukya occupation of Veṅgī in the 7th century can, therefore, be reasonably doubted. The fact seems to be that the Viṣṇukunḍins of Veṅgī, from the time of the Cālukya possession of Piṣṭapura, became weaker and weaker, and part by part their kingdom was gradually annexed to the waxing empire of the Eastern Cālukyas. The formal annexation seems to have been completed long before the

⁸ *Ind. Ant.*, XX, 94f.

10th century A.D., i.e., the time of Amma I and Cālukya Bhīma II, when the Eastern Cālukyas claimed that they were masters of Veṅgī at the very beginning of their history. There appears, therefore, no strong ground against the theory that the Viṣṇukunḍins, though shorn of their past glory, were ruling for some time at Veṅgī contemporaneously with the Eastern Cālukyas, who ruled first probably from Piṣṭapura, next from Veṅgī and then from Rājamahendri.

We have to notice two other points before we conclude this note. Smith in his *Early Hist. India* (4th ed. p. 441) says: "In the east he (*scil.* Pulakeśin II) made himself master of Veṅgī, between the Krishnā and the Godāvari, and established his brother Kubja Viṣṇuwardhana there as Viceroy in A.D. 611, with his capital at the stronghold of Piṣṭapura, now Piṭhāpuram in the Godavari District." Smith here, professes to rely on the Kopparam plates of Pulakeśin II, edited by Lakshmana Rao in *Ann. Bhand. Res. Inst.*, IV, 43ff. These plates which are full of textual mistakes record the grant of some lands in the Karmarāṣṭra (northern part of the Nellore and southern part of the Guntur District) by one Pṛthivī-Dubarāja in the presence of Pulakeśin II. The grant is dated in the प्रवर्द्धमानविजयराज्यसरवसर 21. Hultzsch, while editing the plates in *Ep. Ind.*, XVIII., has shown that the inscription belongs to the 21st year of Pulakeśin II i.e. to about A.D. 629-30 and that Pṛthivī-Dubarāja is to be identified with his younger brother, Kubja-Viṣṇuwardhana who is styled पृथिवीवल्लभविष्णुवर्द्धनयुवराज in the Satara grant (*Ind. Ant.*, XIX, 309). 'Dubarāja' is a Dravidian तद्व of Sanskrit युवराज (cf. अकलङ्कतुवराय=अकलंकयुवराज in the Amber inscr., *Ep. Ind.*, IV, 180; and तुवराशन=युवराज in the Kasakudi inscr., *SII.*, II. No. 73). Lakshmana Rao, however, thinks that Duvarāja of this inscription is to be identified with Dhruvarāja of the Goa plates, and that the year 21 falls in A.D. 611. But even if we accept 611 A.D. to be the date when Pulakeśin invaded Karmarāṣṭra, and defeated the Viṣṇukunḍin king, does it follow that Pulakeśin II conquered the whole of the kingdom of the Viṣṇukunḍins? Does the defeat of a king always lead to the loss of his entire territory? Pulakeśin II is known to have defeated the Pallava king, penetrated through the whole of the Pallava country and crossed the Kaveri; but was the Pallava power weakened? Again, in 642 A.D., the Pallava king

Narasimhavarman defeated and killed Pulakeśin II and took Vātāpi, the Cālukya capital; but did the Cālukya power permanently collapse? Did not the Cālukya power exist even during the period of the Rāṣṭrakuṭa usurpation?

To commemorate even the temporary occupation of a part of a country, Indian kings used to grant there lands to Brahmans; and generally this kind of grants was acknowledged by other kings. It may, therefore, be not altogether impossible that Pulakeśin II penetrated as far as the Karmarūṣṭra, where the reigning Viṣṇukunḍin king was defeated, and Pulakeśin I felt himself justified in granting lands in the district, of which he thought himself to be the master for the time being at least. (Cf. "It is doubtless this campaign that led to there being so many inscriptions referring themselves to the reign of Vikramāditya VI at Drākshārām and other places in the Telugu country outside the ordinary limits of the Western Cālukya kingdom." *Bomb. Gaz.*, I, i. 453). If these suggestions be accepted, there is then no difficulty as regards the discovery of Cālukya grants giving lands in places, which were originally under the Viṣṇukunḍins. It is reasonable to suppose that the Viṣṇukunḍin country gradually, not long after the time of Pulakeśin II, merged into the Eastern Cālukya empire, and that gradually the Viṣṇukunḍins lost all their territories excepting the small district round their capital city of Veṅgī. The existence of Viṣṇukunḍin rule in Veṅgī in the 7th century may be compared with that of the Kadamba rule at Vaijayantī even in the glorious days of the great Cālukyas of Bādāmi.

Findspot of Plates

The next point is regarding the find-spot of the Rāmatirtham plates of the Viṣṇukunḍin king Indravarman. The plates were found at a place near Vizianagram in the Vizagapatam District of the Madras Presidency. They record the grant of a village in the Pḷakirāṣṭra, which was evidently situated in the Vizagapatam District (Dubreuil, *Anc. Hist. Dec.*, 91). On the evidence of the Rāmatirtham plates, it has been suggested by scholars that the Vizianagram region was included in the

9 Vide *Bomb. Gaz.*, I, ii, 380 f.

Viṣṇukuṇḍin kingdom, that is to say, the Viṣṇukuṇḍin boundary extended as far as the borders of the Ganjam District. In view of the fact that there was the royal house of Piṣṭapura, the houses of the Varmanas of Kaliṅga and also of the Gaṅgas whose era probably started from 496 A.D., permanent occupation of the Vizianagram region by the Viṣṇukuṇḍins is highly improbable. The truth might have been that in retaliation to the raids of Pulakeśin II and Jayasiṃha I, Indravarman invaded the Cālukya country and penetrated as far as the Pḷakirāṣṭra, where he made grants of land, as did Pulakeśin II in Karmarāṣṭra, Jayasiṃha I in Guddavādi and Gudrahāra, and Vikramāditya VI in the Telugu country. The Pḷakirāṣṭra or the Vizagapatam District was very likely under the Eastern Cālukyas as early as the 18th year of Viṣṇuvardhana I. His Cipurupalle plates, dated in that year, were found in the Vizagapatam District, and they evidently refer to the Pḷakiviṣaya, doubtfully read by Burnell and Fleet as Pukiviṣaya. This Pḷakiviṣaya is, I think, identical with the Pḷakirāṣṭra of the Rāmatirtham plates of Indravarman.

We have seen that the Godavari grant of Prthivīmūla refers to a coalition of kings against Indrabhaṭṭāarakavarman, who has been identified with the Viṣṇukuṇḍin king of that name. When Indravarman Viṣṇukuṇḍin defeated the Eastern Cālukya forces and penetrated far into their territory, Jayasiṃha I, who was the Eastern Cālukya contemporary of Indravarman, formed an alliance with several other kings, one of whom was Adhirāja Indra, identified by Fleet with the Gaṅga king Indravarman. The combined forces of these allied kings defeated the Viṣṇukuṇḍin king and drove him back to his own country.

DINES CHANDRA SIRCAR

MISCELLANY

The Art of Pantomime in Kerala

The Government of His Highness, the Maharaja of Travancore, took on hand recently the work of an exposition of *Kathākālī* (the art of pantomime) in Kerala. The main feature of this ancient art is a highly specialised variety of hand poses (*mudrās*) and of gestures of the body and the limbs. A short descriptive account of the *Kathākālī* with an explanatory note on the gestures and on the subtle devices employed for the expression of the various emotions, together with an account of the training of the actor was recently prepared by Mr. R. V. Poduval, the Travancore State Archæologist; and the attention of the Congress of Orientalists, held at Leyden in September 1931, was drawn to it. A chart of diagrams illustrating the principal *Mudrās*, as gathered from the *Bharata-Nāṭyaśāstra*, the *Hastalakṣaṇapradīpikā*, the Tamil classic *Śilappadhikāram* and the *Abhinayadarpaṇa*, has since been made while the interpretation of the *Mudrās* is said to be nearing completion.

Dancing was cultivated as a fine art by the ancient Tamils; and much information regarding it is available in the *Śilappadhikāram* from which we know that the people were familiar with two kinds of plays, Aryan and Tamil. The former represented mythological episodes; while the Tamil plays were either in praise of gods or kings and their achievements, or represented love scenes. The actress threw her body and limbs into "every graceful attitude which the most flexible form was capable of exhibiting." Tamil art distinguished between dancing and *abhinaya*; and the latter is defined to be the making of signs and gestures indicating the meaning of the song, without any accompaniments behind.¹

The *Kathākālī* is an important form of the dramatic art in Kerala. According to a well-known writer, they are musical plays, the music being sung to the accompaniment of drums and cymbals by singers in

¹ Note on ll. 12-25 of Canto III, p. 64, V. Swaminatha Iyer's Edition (1892.).

the back-ground, while the actors themselves never speak and merely act the dialogic sections called *padams* as they are sung by the singers behind. The *ślokas* or the verses proper differ from the *padams* and describe the progress of the story. The *Kathākālī* is a dumb show, and there is an elaborate system of *mudrās* which have to be learnt by those who have to train themselves to be actors. Only those who know these *mudrās* can fully appreciate the acting; and the actors have to undergo a special and rigorous course of physical training (*kaccha kettal*), to facilitate the control of the various muscles of the face and the body while acting. There is absolutely no scenery required. There are scenic divisions. The stage is under a small cocoanut-thatch canopy. In spite of its primitive accessories, it has been deemed by some that in the *Kathākālī*, the acting has reached its acme of perfection. Mr. Menon remarks "what with the exposition of the science of *mudrās*, the facial expression of the emotions, the quaint though conventional dresses of the actors, the music and the free gait, the *Kathākālīs* attract good audiences."²

Mr. K. R. Pisharoti describes the various phases of the Kerala Theatre in the newly started *Annamalai University Journal*.³ He would give it a comparatively recent origin (the latter half of the 17th century) evolved out of a feud between the Zamorin of Calicut and the chief of Kottarakkara.

The continuity of acting by gesture from ancient times in the Tamil land has been and is very popular: and the art underlying the *Kathākālī* is probably much older than its present form.

C. S. SRINIVASACHARI

² *The Progress of Cochin*, pp. 342-3 edited by T. K. Krishna Menon (1932).

³ *AUJ.*, vol. I, part I, pp. 105-10.

The Dasas of the Karnāṭaka Country

(14th to 19th Century A.D.)

Śrī Madhvācārya¹ was the founder of one of the three important schools of philosophical thought in South India. He lived in the 13th century and his place of birth was near Mangalore on the west coast of the Madras Presidency. The Canarese speaking people of Madras, Mysore, Hyderabad and Bombay form the main adherents of this school. Śrī Madhva made extensive tours in South India and the Deccan and converted several scholars to his faith. The Deccan Hindu kings of the 13th century seem to have bestowed their patronage on this new faith. Its main tenets were: (1) Belief in a Personal God, who is all good and free from evil, (2) Belief in the importance of the Guru or the preceptor—who alone can make it possible for an individual to obtain God-vision and who is the only means of obtaining the grace of Hari, which leads to God-vision or *Bimba-aparokṣa* and (3) A disinterested life of devotion and service to Hari or God.

The extant works of Śrī Madhva are all in Sanskrit. It is not possible to state with certainty if he used the vernacular as his medium of expression to popularise his teachings in order to appeal to the masses. The *Dvādaśa* stotras in praise of his favourite deity, Śrī Kṛṣṇa, illustrate the ecstasy, emotion and divine forgetfulness indicated in verse after verse of this intimate appeal.

Some of the followers of Śrī Madhva were great scholars. They wrote scholarly commentaries on the works of their master, Śrī Madhva. The most brilliant of these scholars was Jaya Tīrtha, who lived in the 14th century at Malkhed, now in the Nizam's Dominions.

There were others whose appeal was not restricted to the intelligent few but who roused the fervour of the masses by embodying their doctrines in popular songs. These songs were composed in praise of God and the gurus—Śrī Madhva and his followers. Complete surrender to the will of God was the ideal that they kept in view and they des-

¹ See my article on Śrī Mādhvācārya in the *Journal of the Madras University*, vol. 1, no. 1 and vol. 2, no. 1.

cribed themselves as Dāsas or the slaves of God. They esteemed good life more than scholarship and observance of ritual. A life of devotion, humility and austerity was considered to be more pleasing to God than the possession of book knowledge and observance of the outer paraphernalia of elaborate worship. They lived in groups acknowledging the importance of a guru, who is to initiate his disciples into the secrets of knowledge by proper observance of the Bhāgavata dharmas and the rules of conduct that devotees of God are expected to follow. The disciple must be fit to receive instruction leading to god-vision. He receives a *nom-de-plume* from his master and is asked to compose songs in praise of God. From the 14th century downwards to the present day, there are groups of Dāsas, scattered over the Canarese country—who are the followers of Śrī Madhva—whose songs have given solace to thousands of people and have helped them in their life and made them try to be a little better than they were.

Their lives, their songs and their effect on common men and women, in their daily joys and sorrows are not widely known outside the community of Śrī Madhva.

One of the disciples of Śrī Madhva, Narahari Tīrtha, by name, is said to have been the founder of the Dāsa Kūṭa or the group of Dāsas. He was a minister of one of the Gaṅga kings of Kalinga (1276 A.D.?) who migrated to Vijayanagara and whose remains were entombed at Anegundi, in the Nizam's Dominions, near the famous ruins of Hampi or Vijayanagara, about the year 1331 A.D. His *nom-de-plume* was Raghupati Tilaka.

For about a hundred years after Narahari Tīrtha, there is a gap in the history of the Dāsa Kūṭa. The displacement of the Hindu kingdoms of the Deccan by the kingdom of the Bahmanis caused a lull in the activities of the new faith. The rise of the Advaita scholar, Vidyāraṇya and the state patronage that he obtained at the court of the First Dynasty of Vijayanagara, was another cause of this silence. Disputations used to take place between the two schools of thought and each side used to claim the victory. Akṣobhya Tīrtha, another direct disciple of Śrī Madhva, and Jaya Tīrtha, who was the disciple of Akṣobhya, played important parts in these disputes.

The period of the second dynasty of Vijayanagara was a period

of state patronage to the religion of Śrī Madhva. Mulbagal, now in Mysore, was one of the provincial capitals of Vijayanagara. It was also a seat of one of the monasteries of Śrī Madhva. Śrī Pada Rāya was the head of this monastery, in the latter half of the 15th century. Saluva Nārasimha, the Vijayanagara king, extended his patronage to him. His *nom-de-plume* was Raṅga Viṭṭala. His songs are simple and melodious.

The disciple of Śrī Pada Rāya was the Great Vyāsa Rāya (1446 to 1539 A.D.).³ He was the ecclesiastical adviser of Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya, the great South Indian emperor of the 16th century. For a short period, he was actually crowned king and coins were issued in his honour.⁴ He was a great scholar and author of three Sanskrit works, viz. *Tarka-tāṇḍava*, *Nyāyāmṛta* and *Tātparyacandrikā*. He must have suggested the idea to Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya to construct the most beautiful structure at Hampi—the temple of Viṭṭala. The influence of the Madhva religion spread over Bengal and led to the rise of the movement of Caitanya. His *nom-de-plume* was Kṛṣṇa and he composed a number of songs.

Three of his disciples took a prominent part in the popularisation of the teachings of Śrī Madhva. They were Purandara Dāsa, Kanaka Dāsa and Vādirāja. Purandara Dāsa (1491-1564 A.D.) is the greatest of the lyric poets of the Karnāṭaka. His songs are very popular in the Karnāṭaka country. There is a stone Maṇḍapa or hall on the banks of the river Tuṅgabhadra at Hampi, where an annual festival is held in memory of Purandara Dāsa.

Kanaka Dāsa belonged to one of the despised castes. But yet, his devotion to God was so intense that he was acknowledged as an ideal devotee and was held in equal honour with the other Dāsas.

Vādirāja was another great scholar, who was the author of several Sanskrit works. He translated into Canarese, one of the Sanskrit works of Śrī Madhva, a condensed version of the *Mahābhārata*. He also composed several Canarese songs.

The sixteenth century was the era of ascendancy for the Madhva

³ See *The Life of Sri Vyāsarāja* by B. Venkoba Rao (M. S. Rao & Co., Bangalore), 1926.

⁴ See *Journal of Indian History*, vol. VII, 1928. p. 34. (Madras).

faith. The political condition of the Tuṅgabhadrā Doab, immediately after the battle of Ṭālikoṭā was not favourable for any activity. Several monks and scholars migrated to Penukoṇḍa, the new capital of Vijayanagara. But the Dāsas continued to live in the village, giving spiritual solace to the people and continuing the traditions of their masters. Purandara Dāsa is said to have left 4 sons, whose names are remembered by their songs. The next important Dāsa, is Vijaya Dāsa, (1687-1755 A.D.). He was born in the Nizam's Dominions. His songs contain the essence of all the teachings of Śrī Madhva.

His successor was Bhaganna Dāsa (1722-1762), who lived in the Samasthan of Gadwal, one of the vassal states of the Nizam. He had 2 brothers, Temmanna and Mohanna, who were also composers of songs.

The most important successor of Bhaganna was Jagannātha Dāsa (1728-1809 A.D.). His great work is the *Harikathāmṛtasāra*, an authoritative treatise on the religion of Śrī Madhva. His *nom-de-plume* was Jagannātha Viṭṭala.

Jagannātha Dāsa had a number of disciples. Dasappa, whose *nom-de-plume* was Śrīda Viṭṭala (1820 A.D.), and Yogīndra of Lingsugur in the Nizam's Dominions, whose *nom-de-plume* was Prāṇeśa Viṭṭala (1822 A.D.) were the most prominent.

The followers of these Dāsas are yet living in the Canarese country, and keep alive the tradition of their masters.⁵

S. HANUMANTHA RAO

⁵ For further details of the Dāsas, see the *History of the Dāsa Kūṭa* by H. G. Bengeri of Kollegal.

Hindu Theatre

Mr. Manomohan Ghosh thinks (*IHQ.*, IX, 1933, p. 591 ff.) that Raṅgapīṭha and Raṅgaśīrṣa were not two distinct parts of the Indian Theatre, as I said in my paper on 'Hindu Theatre' (*IHQ.*, VIII, 1932, No. 3), but were synonymous terms. In spite of reading the second Adhyāya again from this point of view, I am afraid I cannot see eye to eye with Mr. Ghosh.

It is true that the figures given by me in my paper are more in accordance with Abhinava, but I think that in the present condition of the text of *NS.*, Abh. is our only guide for interpreting it. Of course, there cannot be two opinions about the text of Abh. as printed in GOS. being extremely confused and inaccurate, but it is not impossible to arrive at some satisfactory text at many places. To say that the text is corrupt and therefore one should never rely upon it, is like shirking the responsibility of reconstructing it. The very portion which Mr. Ghosh has quoted as hopeless and absurd is open to easy reconstruction. The text as printed reads thus: catuṣṣaṣṭīrhastadairghyādvistārācca. Mr. Ghosh stops here and calls such a remark absurd. But read further: catuṣṣaṣṭīrhastadairghyādvistārācca. dvātriṃśatkaraṃ kṣetraṃ gr̥hītvā madhye sūtraṃ vistāreṇa dadyāt. Now, take out the full stop after -cca and we have a perfectly sensible text as follows: catuṣṣaṣṭīrhastadairghyādvistārācca dvātriṃśatkaraṃ ksetraṃ etc., which would, then, mean 'a field, 64 cubits in length and 32 cubits in width'. Thus we should not discard the text of Abh. too lightly.

The *NS.* itself is very vague about the details of the theatre and I admit that it has no clear instruction about RP and RS: but there are one or two points which show that even the writer of *NS.* considered them as two separate portions.

(1) *NS.* II, 104 runs thus:

samunnataṃ samam caiva raṅgaśīrṣaṃ tu kārayet/
vikṛṣṭe tūnnataṃ kāryaṃ caturasre samam tathā//

This means that RS should be higher in the vikṛṣṭa type and of the same level in the caturasra type. But in comparison with which

particular portion of the theatre was it higher or of the same level? If RP and RS meant the same portion, this must refer to the auditorium, which would be clearly absurd. A stage on the same level as the auditorium would never be thought of. And Abh. answers the question thus: samunnatamiti raṅgapīṭhāpekṣayā, which seems to be the only possible interpretation. It will be seen that the variant raṅgapīṭha, here, will not alter the position.

(2) *NS.* II, 71 is thus:

raṅgapīṭham tataḥ kāryam vidhidṛṣṭena karmanā/
raṅgaśīrṣam tu kartavyam ṣaḍdārukasamanvitam//

Here apparently two distinct parts are meant: and there is no other variant at both these places.

These two points should show almost definitely that RS and RP were different portions of the theatre. There are some other indications pointing to the same conclusion.

(1) The terms RP and RS are suggestive of a conception of the whole theatre regarded as a human body.¹ In the body in the form of the theatre, RP will be the back and RS will be the head. Abh. has actually expressed this:..... nāṭyamandapaśya uttānasuptayada-
vasthitasya raṅgapīṭhamukhyam tadastahastam śīrah (*NS.*, GOS, vol. I, p. 57). This very terminology (RP and RS) presupposes this distinction.

(2) That Abh. considered these two as distinct parts of the theatre is fully borne out. On p. 62 he explains their construction separately. (note particularly raṅgapīṭhe kartavye raṅgaśīrastāvadāha.....). Again in explaining caturasra type he takes them as two distinct parts (p. 66, read from tatra madhyamakṣatakacatuske.....raṅgaśīrah kuryāt, ll. 12-17 of the Comm.). Further while explaining the position of the curtain incidentally, he very clearly mentions them as two distinct parts (p. 212, tatra yavanikā raṅgapīṭhatachirasormadhye).

(3) A separate RS is indicated by another consideration also.

1 It was on this understanding that I called Mr. Raghavan's view about RS more plausible, in note 1 in my paper. But if we take RS to be 8×8 sq. cubits, the area of 12×8 sq. cubits on each side of RS, will remain unexplained.

Examine the diagrams given by Mr. Ghosh. In his Fig. I, RP will be 24' x 12' (I give these measurements in feet, so that it can be easily grasped by the modern readers). Out of this breadth of 12', some portion, say about 4' broad, will be required for the musicians with their instruments. Then the remaining area only 8' wide will become too small for the free movements required on a stage. And when this will be the condition on the biggest type of the theatre, it will be simply absurd in the caturasra type. There, the width of the RP will be 6', out of which the musicians will take away 3' to 4' and there will remain an area hardly 3' wide, an area practically useless for all stage purposes. In fact, what we call 'deep scenes' to-day and which would occupy the fullest width of the theatre, were not infrequently introduced in a Sanskrit drama.² Such 'deep scenes' would certainly require an area at least 12' to 15' wide. Thus a portion, other than RP (which was 12' wide on the biggest type), was required for the musicians to sit; and this was mostly the use of RS.

Another difficulty would arise from the figures given by Mr. Ghosh. In his Fig. II, nepathyagra measures 32 x 4 sq. cubits i.e. 48 x 6 sq. feet. A strip 6' wide and 48' long would be, to say the least, very unusual for such purposes.


Over and above the omission of RS in Mr. Ghosh's plans, his figures differ from mine in one very important respect. According to his plan, the auditorium will cover $\frac{3}{4}$ area of the whole theatre and the stage and tiring room together will cover the remaining $\frac{1}{4}$. According to my plans, the auditorium will cover one half and the other half will be covered by the stage and the tiring room together. In this connection, I must say that Mr. Ghosh's plans are definitely better from the standpoint of the distribution of space. That the stage and tiring room should take up an area as big as the auditorium itself would go against the ordinary rules of architectural distribution of

² *Mālarikāgnimitram* of Kālidāsa has ten persons present on the stage in its last act, over and above the attendants, who must have been two to three in number. Thus this scene will have about 13 persons present on the stage. This will naturally cover an area at least 12 to 15 feet in width. And scenes having 9 or 10 characters were very often introduced in Sanskrit dramas

space. I would, therefore, myself like to adopt Mr. Ghosh's plans, of course, adding RS thereto, which even then, would leave a fairly big area for the auditorium. But I am afraid, neither the original text of NS nor the commentary of Abhinava supports such a view. That Abh. does not support this view is clear enough (p. 57). NS., on the other hand, may seem to support it. I, therefore, reproduce the text in question :

catuṣṣaṣṭīkarān kṛtvā dvidhā bhūtān punas tataḥ/
 pṛṣṭhato yo bhaved bhāgo dvidhā bhūṭasya tasya tu//
 samam ardhavibhāgena raṅgaśīrṣam prakalpayet/
 (v.l. tasyāpy ardhārdhabhāgena, and tasyārdhena vibhāgena)
 paścime'tha vibhāge tu nepathyagrhamādiśet//

The meaning of the first two lines is unequivocal. Take a field 64 cubits in length, divide it into two equal parts of 32×32 sq. cubits each. Then, out of the back field of 32×32 sq. cubits make two equal divisions of 32×16 sq. cubits each. Now the figure will be as under :



According to the first half of the third line above, one of the two portions—*c* and *b*—is to be divided into two (which one is not mentioned in the NS.). Mr. Ghosh divides *c* into two equal portions of 32×8 sq. cubits each and calls one the Nepathyagrha and the other the RP. I divide *b* into two equal parts of 32×8 sq. cubits each and call one the RP and the other the RS and reserve *c* the back portion of 32×16 sq. cubits for Nepathyagrha. Unfortunately the text quoted above is not at all explicit about this, and I think that both the interpretations are possible. I however prefer mine, for I believe that (1) RP and RS were two separate portions of the theatre, (2) Nepathyagrha, which, according to Mr. Ghosh's interpretation, will have a width of

6' in the Caturasra type, would be very unusual, and (3) the *NS.* text noted above does not go against my interpretation, while 'pāscima' in the last line above may even go against Mr. Ghosh's interpretation.

The measurements of Caturasrāvara type as given by Mr. Ghosh also go against mine. However, as Mr. Ghosh has not given his reasons for differing from my note 7 in my paper, I do not wish to discuss that point now.³

There were some unfortunate omissions in my paper as printed in *IIIQ.*, VIII, 1932. I note them here for the benefit of those who are interested in the paper.

(1) P. 489, l. 3. Read after 'wall.....Two more, four cubits distant from them.'

(2) In Fig. I, numbers showing places of the musicians have been left out. Readers may kindly fill them up in the light of note no. 12. of my paper.

(3) In Fig. II, there are five rows of columns. They form three sets, but the distinction between these sets has not been properly shown on account of the reduced size of the figures. The first set has ten columns, second has six and the third has eight. They may be distinguished as follows.

First set (ten columns):—1st row: 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th; 3rd row: 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th; 4th row: 3rd and 4th.

Second set (six columns):—1st row: 1st and last; 3rd row: 1st and last; 4th row: 2nd and 5th.

Third set (eight columns):—2nd row: all (2nd and 3rd doubtful); 4th row: 1st and last; 5th row: both.

D. R. MANKAD

3 I take this opportunity of expressing my gratitude to Dr. Coomaraswamy for suggesting other sources from where I could have acquired better information about some of the words listed in my paper. My only excuse is the handicap under which I work at a place like Karachi, where there is nothing like an Oriental Library. I would, however, be satisfied if my paper has been of some service to the students.

Āryadeva

In the Introduction to my edition of *Catuhśataka* of Āryadeva (p. xiv) I have written from the Tibetan version of Candrakīrti's commentary on that work that Āryadeva was born in the *island* of Sīhala and came to Southern India after his denunciation (*de nas lho phyogs kyī brgyud ltar hoñs te=tato dakṣiṇadikparamparayāgatya*). On this my friend, Dr. N. Dutt in the course of reviewing the book in *IHQ*, 1933, p. 660, writes as follows: "In view of the facts that there is no mention of Jambudvīpa, and that the direction of Southern India with reference to Ceylon should be *uttaradik*, is it not justifiable to look for Āryadeva's home somewhere in Northern India?".....He hopes "evidences will be forthcoming to that effect."

It will be seen that the line under discussion is written by Candrakīrti who was a Northerner being at Nālandā; and with reference to Northern India both Ceylon and the Deccan are in the Southern direction (*dakṣiṇa dik*). So Candrakīrti naturally writes that Āryadeva, a native of Ceylon, came to India following the Southern direction. On the other hand, it is to be noted that according to the interpretation Dr. Dutt seeks to establish there would have been the use of *gatvā* (Tib. *soñ ste*) 'having gone,' and not *āgatya* (Tib. *goñs te*) 'having come,' as actually we have in the above line of Candrakīrti's commentary. For, it goes without saying that the movement of a man from Ceylon towards India, with reference to Ceylon, is *gamana* 'going,' and not *āgamana* 'coming,' or in other words, that movement is *forward*, and not backward.

Again, Dr. Dutt writes (p. 610): "We learn from the *Mahāvamsa* that Sīhabāhu ruled over the territory known as Sīhala, after which his people were called the Sīhalas, and Ceylon got its name Sīhaladīpa." In fact, in the *Mahāvamsa* (PTS) there is no mention of any 'territory known as Sīhalā' " The fact is (vi. 34-35) that Sīhabāhu went to the land of his birth (*Jātibhūmi*) and built there a city which was called Sīhapura. (See also viii. 6). There is nothing to identify *Sīhapura* with *Sīhala*, as Dr. Dutt appears to have done. As the king Sīhabāhu captured or killed the Sīha, 'lion', he was called Sīhala, and owing to their relation to him his followers in Laṅkā were also called Sīhala

(vii. 47). Therefore, the above statement of Dr. Dutt can hardly be maintained.

The main point to be considered here is that as regards the birth place of Āryadeva Candrakīrtti mentions *Siṃhaladvīpa* (*Sing lahi glii*) and not simply *Siṃhala* or *Sīhala*. I have quoted the passage¹ in Tibetan with its reconstructed Sanskrit. So there being *Siṃhaladvīpa* and not mere *Siṃhala* or *Sīhala*, the question raised by him does not arise at all, for certainly he would not locate *Siṃhaladvīpa* in Bengal.

VIDHUSHEKHARA BHATTACHARYA

Śaṅkarācārya and Dharmakīrtti

I had an occasion for writing (*IHQ*, 1930, Vol. VI, p. 169) that the great Śaṅkarācārya can in no way be earlier than Dinnāga whose *Alambanaparīkṣā*, 6, is quoted by the former in his commentary on the *Brahmasūtras*, II. 2. 28. The following few words will clearly show that Śaṅkarācārya cannot be assigned a date also before Dharmakīrtti (c. 635-650), the author of the *Pramāṇarārttika*, the *Pramāṇaviniścaya*, etc. on the similar ground mentioned below.

On the same commentary and on the same sūtra (II. 2. 28) Śaṅkarācārya writes:

api ca sahopalambhaniyamād abhedo viṣaya vijñāyor āpatati.

Here *sahopalambhaniyamād abhedo* is literally taken by the commentator undoubtedly from the following kārikā of Dharmakīrtti, which is well-known in Sanskrit works:

sahopalambhaniyamād abhedo nīlataddhiyoḥ/

bhedaś ca bhrāntavijñānair dr̥ṣyetendāv ivādvaye//

In explaining the above line of Śaṅkarācārya Vācaspatimiśra naturally quotes this kārikā in his *Bhāmatī*.

1 I take this opportunity for supplying the following words to be inserted after *khruis* in the first line, p. xiv, fn. 1 which were unfortunately omitted owing to oversight: *pa sing lahi glii gi rgyal poḥi sras.*

This kārikā is often quoted in Brāhmanical works.¹ But there is a point to be noted here. The two halves of the kārikā are not of the one and the same Kārikā, nor are they in the same work, but they are taken from two different Kārikās in two different works of Dharmakīrti the first half being in the *Pramāṇaviniścaya* (Tib. Mdo, Ce, fol. 274a, l. 7 of the Narthang edition), and the second half in the *Pramāṇavārttika* (Tib. Mdo, Ce, fol. 239b, l. 1 of the same edition), as identified by Prof. Poussin.²

That the two halves of the kārikā under discussion belong to two different kārikās is known also from the following quotation by the author of the *Vivaraṇaprameyasāṅgraha*, Vizianagaram Sanskrit Series, Benares, 1893, p. 75, introducing it with the words, *nanv itthaṃ vijñānavādī manyate*:

sahopalambhaniyamād abhedo nīlataddhiyoḥ/
anyac cet samvidō nīlam na tad bhāseta samvidi//

Here follows another kārikā.

It is to be mentioned that in the *Pramāṇaviniścaya* in its Tibetan version the second half (*anyac cet*°) is not found after the first half, there being some prose lines. This, however, demands further investigation.

In conclusion, it may further be noted that as regards the reading of the line *bhedas ca*° there is *bhrāntirijñānaih*, but according to the Tibetan version we are to read here *bhāntā*° (rnam ses 'khrul bas). This seems to me to be a better reading.

VIDHUSHEKHARA BILATFACHARYA

1-2 Poussin: *Le Bouddhisme d'après les sources brahmaniques* in *Le Muséon*, 1901, pp. 181-182; Vidyābhūṣaṇa: *A History of Indian Logic*, Calcutta, 1921, p. 306-309.

Śaṅkara's Reference to a Buddhist Passage

In vol. VI, p. 141 of the *IHQ.*, I referred to a Buddhist passage quoted in Śaṅkara's commentary on the *Brahmasūtras*, II. 2. 24, which I could not trace back to its source.

Here is another Buddhist passage, and so far as my information goes, it has also not yet been traced. It is cited by Śaṅkara in his commentary on the *Brahmasūtras*, II. 2. 22:

apī ca vaināśikāḥ kalpayanti buddhibodhyaṃ trayād anyat saṃskṛtaṃ kṣaṇikam ceti.

Undoubtedly here the italicized portion is one half of a *kārikā*, there being only one syllable (presumably *tat*) left out at the end.

The word *traya* in the *kārikā* refers to *pratisaṅkhyānirodha*, *apratisaṅkhyānirodha*, and *ākāśa*.

VIDHUSHEKHARA BHATTACHARYA

A so-called Convention of the Hindu Drama

A very common belief among the students of the Sanskrit literature is that the *Bharata-Nāṭyaśāstra* (*NŚ.*) never permitted death-scenes on the stage. For example, Mm. Gaṇapati Śāstrī held such a belief and considered that *Bhāsa* must be anterior to the *NŚ.*, because the dramatist did not care for the rule prohibiting a death-scene (*Pratimā-nāṭaka*, Trivandrum ed. p. xxxii). And probably strengthened by such a belief Prof. A. B. Keith generalised that the Indian tradition forbade tragedy (*Sanskrit Drama*, pp. 280, 345). But a study of the text of the *NŚ.* shows that the above belief is erroneous.

In the very first chapter of the *NŚ.* Brahman in course of his describing the nature of a Drama says that in it there are, among other things, *kvacid hāsyam kvacid yuddham kvacid kāmah kvacid v a d h a ḥ* (105)¹ [lit. sometimes laughter, sometimes battle,² sometimes sensual pleasure, sometimes *slaughter*].

1 References are to the Chowkhamba ed. of the *NŚ.*

2 It may be mentioned in this connexion that there is also a similar belief about the prohibition of battle-scene in the *NŚ.* But this is also erroneous, vide *NŚ.* XX. 74, 84, 86, 90, 101 and XI. 84-85.

And the *NS.*, in course of enumerating the *Vyābhicārī-bhāvas*, describes death which is one of these *bhāvas* and at the same time gives explicit directions about depicting the same on the stage. The relevant passages are as follows: *maraṇaṃ nāma vyādhiṃ abhigātaṃ ca... ..stayaṃ idānīm abhinaya-viśeṣaṃ vakṣyāmi.....*(VII. 85). [Death is either from disease or from accident.....I shall now speak of representing these two kinds of death on the stage.] The *NS.* in this matter goes into details and gives special directions for depicting death from various kinds of accidents such as wounds from weapons, poisoning and snake-bite (VII. 85-89). In addition to this, more detailed directions about representing death on the stage have been given in the chapter XXVI (96-107) of the *NS.*

This error seems to have originated thus: In the early days of Sanskritic studies the only available work which gave information about the Indian Drama was the *Sāhitya-darpaṇa (SD.)*, which was edited with a translation in 1851 in the Bibliotheca Indica series. The *SD.* prohibited death-scene in a *Nāṭaka* (only one of the ten kinds of *Rūpakas*). And scholars, relying on it, wrongly ascribed to the *NS.* a rule which nowhere existed except on a misunderstanding of the *SD.* Thus arose the belief that the *NS.* did not permit death-scenes on the stage in any kind of play.³ If we turn to chapter XX of the *NS.*, we find the following three couplets, enumerating objects which may or may not be presented in an *Aṅka* of a *Nāṭaka*, and prescribing that in no part of a *Nāṭaka* and *Prakarāṇa* (only two among ten kinds of *Rūpakas*) there should be any killing where the famous hero is present.

क्रोधप्रसादशोकाः शापोत्सर्गोऽथ विद्रवोद्वाहौ ।

अद्भुतसंश्रयदर्शनमङ्कप्रत्यक्षजानि स्युः ॥२०॥

3 The belief arose probably due to a wrong extension of the meaning of 'Nāṭaka' to all kinds of Dramas. One of the great early orientalists, H. H. Wilson, who though not the earliest writer on the Indian Drama, mentioned death as one of the objects of dramatic representation, but very curiously opined that the absence of tragic catastrophe in the Hindu Drama was not merely an unconscious omission and such catastrophe was prohibited by a positive rule, and the death of either the hero or the heroine was never to be announced (Vide *Collected Works of H. H. Wilson*, vol. XI, London, 1871, pp. xxvi, lvi).

युद्धं राज्यभ्रंशो मरणं नगररोधनञ्चैव ।
 अप्रत्यक्षकृतानि प्रवेशकैः संविधेयानि ॥२१॥
 अङ्कप्रवेशके वा प्रकरणमाश्रित्य नाटकं (के) वापि ।
 न वधस्तस्य स्याद् यत्र तु नायकः ख्यातः ॥२२॥

[Anger, favour, bereavement, curse, giving away (gifts), flight, marriage and seeing omens may be directly represented in an *Añka*. But objects such as a battle, death, a siege of a city and the loss of a kingdom should not be made directly visible (in an *Añka*). These are to be placed in *Praveśaka* (and *Viṣkambhaka*) etc. Whether in the *Añka* or *Praveśaka* of a *Nāṭaka* or *Prakarana*, no killing should take place where the well-known hero is present].⁴

It appears that Dhanañjaya whose is the next available work on the subject does not take notice of the above rules of the *NS*. For he completely forbids in a *Nāṭaka* the death of the hero as well as all those acts which have been permitted by the *NS*, in a qualified manner (*Daśarūpa*, ed. Haas, p. 93), but he permits like the *NS* death-scene in the kind of *Rūpaka* called *Ihāmṛga*, (*ibid*, pp. 104-105; *NS*. XX. 84). Despite its difference with the *NS* in details the *Daśarūpa* has substantial agreement with the traditional first authority on the Indian Drama. For none of these two works makes a wholesale prohibition of the death-scene on the stage.

The contention of Gaṇapati Śāstrī which is otherwise open to objection stands, however, in a modified form. For the *Bālacarita* and the *Urubhaṅga* not being *Nāṭakas* do not clash with the *NS* while the *Pratimā* being a play of that kind clearly violates its rule.

MANOMOHAN GHOSE

4 Prof. Lindanau in his *Bhāsa-studien* (p. 34) has discovered a contradiction between the couplets quoted above and XI. 84-85 of the *NS*. And Prof. Keith also has endorsed this opinion, (*Skt. Drama*, p. 292, fn. 2). It may be hoped that after a more careful study of the two passages they will modify their views.

Varāhamihira and Buzūrmehr

It is learnt from *Ferishta* that *Pañcatantra* was sent by the king of India to Khusraw Nūshīrwān (531-578 A.C.), king of Persia, with a chess-board, when it was rendered into Pahlvi by Buzūrmehr, his vizier (Brigg's *Ferishta*, vol. I, pp. 149-50, quoted in *Hindu Superiority*, p. 221). Maxmüller, however, notes a tradition slightly different from the above: the king of Persia, Khusraw Nūshīrwān, sent his physician, Barzoi, to India in order to translate the fables of *Pañcatantra* from Sanskrit into Pahlvi (*India: what can it teach us?*, p. 93). It remains doubtful whether Buzūrmehr or Barzoi rendered *Pañcatantra* into Pahlvi. Bhau Daji accepts the latter as the translator and further surmises that the name Barzoi is, in all likelihood, the same as Vararuci. This surmise of his presupposes that early medical writings etc. were in Prākṛta at that time, and one conversant with Prākṛtas alone would be able to translate the *Pañcatantra* into Pahlvi (Bhau Daji's *Literary Remains*, p. 46). Prof. M. T. Patawardhan, possibly accepting the tradition as recorded by Ferishta that it was Buzūrmehr who rendered *Pañcatantra* into Pahlvi, ingeniously suggests that this Buzūrmehr might be the same as Varāhamihira in view of the tradition that Buzūrmehr had lived in India (Patawardhan, *Umarakhayāmacya Rubāyā*, notes, p. 3).

It is proposed in this note to put together some of the important facts from Varāhamihira's life and see whether Buzūrmehr (also spelt mihr) and Varāhamihira can be identical from the phonetic similarity in their names, from the traditions of their visits to foreign countries and from other circumstances.

The name of Varāhamihira is of household familiarity to the students of the history of Indian astronomy. Like those of many Indian authors the details about his personal life are shrouded in mystery. From his *Bṛhat-jātaka* it is learnt that he was a native of Avantī; the name of his father was Adityadāsa; and he got a boon from Savitr, the Sun, in the town of Kapitthaka.

From the starting point of astronomical calculation adopted in his *Pañca-siddhāntika-karaṇa* it is clear that he must have composed his work later than Śaka 427 or 505 A.C. From the facts that he refers

to Āryabhaṭa (Śaka 419 or 497 A.C.), that he chose 427 Śaka as the starting point of calculation rather than Śaka 438 which was equally convenient, and that there is a tradition that Varāhamihira died in Śaka 509 or 587 A.C., it appears that he was born some time about Śaka 412 or 490 A.C. and perhaps died at a mature age of about 97. He wrote works on all the three branches of astronomy.

There is a tradition of his having visited some foreign, especially *yavana* countries. It is a tradition like various other Indian traditions and as such some scholars have easily brushed it aside as worthless or unauthentic. Some disown this tradition with a sentimental touch lest the acceptance thereof might lead to Varāhamihira's indebtedness to foreign sources for astronomical information. But still the tradition needs careful investigation.¹

His father's name was Ādityadāsa; he got a boon from Savitr; he pays obeisance to the Sun in the beginning of his works and he has in his name the word *mihira*—these facts taken together indicate that the Sun might have been his family deity; or as an astronomer he worshipped the Sun, the eminent luminary. Though the word *mihira* might imply some foreign influence still the form is not an impossibility in Prakrits, and it can be found current even in Sanskrit. The Vedic word *mitra* is there: by anaptyxis we can have *mitira*—*mihira* on the analogy of *kātara*—*kāhala*. In view of the Persian and Avestan prototype of that word the claim of foreign influence is plausible but not a necessity. The other part of his name also needs some comment. Though not without a precedent—we have names of old authors such as Kouṇapadānta, Kauṭilya, Piśuna and Ghoṭamukha—the word *varāha* (a hog) in a personal name is not quite palatable. Thus it is not impossible that the author's name might have some foreign tinge, confirming the tradition that he was in a foreign country for some time.

I am inclined to suggest that *varāha* is a corruption of *br̥hat* from the root *br̥h.*, a secondary root from *vr̥dh.* (cp. *vr̥ddha*, *br̥hat*). In view of the rules of phonetic corruption the most natural change of *br̥hat* would be *baraha*, then *varāha*. (cp. Hindi Baḍā and Europeans

¹ For the details about Varāhamihira, see *Bhāratiya Jyotiḥśāstra* by S. B. Dixit p. 210; and Thibaut; *Astronomie, Astrologie und Mathematik*, p. 56.

would spell it *Barhā*). Thus I wish to suggest that the name of this famous astronomical author might have been Br̥hanmitra, and perhaps in early age he had a chance of spending some years in a foreign country where he was called Varāhamihira or some such akin name.

The presence of Br̥hat in the titles of two of his works might not be accidental; he might be indicating his own name there. *Br̥hat-jātaka* may be in contrast to his *Laghu-jātaka*, but it must be remembered that there is no *Laghu-saṃhitā* as against his *Br̥hat-saṃhitā*, a title like *Garga-saṃhitā* etc.

If the original name of Varāhamihira, as surmised above, was Br̥hanmitra, there is every possibility of his being identical with Buzūrmehr. The second part of the name, *mehr*, is practically identical with *mihira*; the first part, Buzūrj, literally means great; and it can as well be equated with Br̥hat in view of the Avestic root *barz* (Sk. *vr̥dh* and then *br̥ha*).² Thus there is some phonetic identity between the two names.

The tradition says that Varāhamihira visited some foreign country, possibly Persia. It was there that he might have been known as Buzūrmehr, the more easy pronouncable form of which is Varāhamihira. This identity explains Varāhamihira's visit to a foreign country and Buzūrmehr's stay in India.

The life of Varāhamihira is put between 490-587 A.D.; and these dates quite agree with the reign of Khusraw Nūshīrwān (531-578 A.C.) with whose court Buzūrmehr is associated. This Persian king, Khusraw Nūshīrwān, was, like Akbar, a ruler of eclectic religious inclinations. He was a great lover and patron of learning; he had received seven Greek Neo-platonist philosophers at his court; and many Greek and Sanskrit works were translated into Pahlvi at his instance.³ It is not at all improbable that he had received a learned astronomer like Varāhamihira at his court and made him stay there for some years.

A. N. UPADHYE

² Taraporewala, *Selections from Avesta and Old Persian*, part I, p. 65.

³ Browne, *A Literary History of Persia*, vol. I, pp. 166-67.

Syntactic Position of a Preposition in Ardhamāgadhī

That the Prakrit dialects, especially those forming the primary group such as Ardhamāgadhī and Pāli, have preserved many elements inherited from the Vedic Sanskrit and for which there are no counterparts in classical Sanskrit, is already noticed by orientalists.¹ Even in Vedic Sanskrit certain phonetic peculiarities are designated as Prakritisms. (Macdonell: *Vedic Grammar*, pp. 33 and 39). After Aśvaghoṣa and Kālidāsa who gave Prakrit a place in their dramas, Prakrit language became merely a transvocalisation of Sanskrit; and the genuine Prakrit style, excepting in the case of a few Jaina authors who tried to stick up to the style of their sacred canon, was completely lost. With later authors Prakrit style became a mechanical imitation of classical Sanskrit. Though the Prakrits are very much influenced by classical Sanskrit, many features which have a counterpart in Vedic Sanskrit alone are preserved therein.

In classical Sanskrit adverbial prepositions, as distinguished from the adnominal ones which are used as *karma-pravacanīya*, immediately precede the verb; while in Vedic Sanskrit an amount of liberty is seen with regard to the position of prepositions in relation to the verb. Sometimes they are separated from the verb by one or more words: *ud uttamam mamugdhi no*, *R.* I, 25, 21; *ā asya vajram adhi sūnau jaghāna*, *R.*, I, 32, 7; *saṃ karmāra ivādhama*¹, *R.*, X, 72, 2. Sometimes the preposition comes after the verb: *jayema saṃ yudhi spṛdhaḥ*, I, 8, 3; *indro gā avṛṇod āpa*, VIII, 63, 3. (Macdonell: *Vedic Grammar*, p. 415).

This liberty about the relative position of the preposition and the verb is noticed in some of the Ardhamāgadhī passages from the Jaina Canon, though in majority of cases the preposition immediately precedes the verb:—

- i. *ai bhumiṃ na gacchejjā*, 'he should not go beyond the ground (allotted for him).' (*Dasa-veyāliya*, V, i, 24).

¹ Pischel: *Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen*, §6; Geiger: *Pāli Literatur und Sprache*, §§78 and 81.

- ii. *taya saṃ va jahāi se rayam*, 'he leaves off sin as (a snake its) slough.' (*Sūyagaḍam*, I, 2, 2, 1).
- iii. *abhi nūmakaḍehi mucchie*, 'deluded by deceitful acts.' (*Sūyagaḍam*, I, 2, 1, 7).
- iv. *asantim karissāmi pūum*, 'I shall thoroughly explain the unrest (of the wicked).' (*Sūyagaḍam*, I, 13, 1).

I hope some Pāli scholars will shed some light on this topic indicating whether any such illustrations are met with in the Pāli canon of Buddhism.

A. N. UPADHYE

Vainyagupta Dvādasāditya

Dr. D. C. Ganguly has made a very important contribution to our knowledge of the Gupta period, in the last number of this journal, by identifying the coins of Vainyagupta. He seems to be quite right in his reading of the coin-legend as 'Vainya' instead of 'Candra' as Allan read it, and there should be no hesitation in attributing these coins to Vainyagupta who is known to us from the Gunaighar copper plate.

It is, however, difficult to support all the conclusions which Dr. Ganguly has drawn from his study of the coins, specially the most important proposition he has laid down, viz., that "Vainyagupta belonged to the imperial Gupta dynasty of Magadha" (p. 785) and "that he ascended the throne of Magadha after Budhagupta, and ruled Bengal through his viceroys" (p. 788).

In the first place, Dr. Ganguly's discussion about the successors of Kumāragupta is vitiated by the assumption that the last known date of Kumāragupta is G.E. 129. V. A. Smith read the date G.E. 136 on his silver coins; this reading has been accepted by Allan (p. cxxxviii) and no ground has been shown to discredit it. Dr. Ganguly's view that Puragupta ruled from 129 G.E. to 136 G.E. when Skandagupta ascended the throne, cannot, therefore, be accepted.

As a matter of fact, the coins do not, in my opinion, really indicate that Vainyagupta was a Gupta emperor of Magadha, any more than Prakāśāditya and Ghatotkacagupta, whose coins belong approximately to the same period and possess the same characteristics. The inscription of Vainyagupta, taken along with the coins, seems to show that he set up as an independent ruler in Samatata, 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.

In two papers published in the *Indian Antiquary* (1918, pp. 161-167) and *JASB.* (1921, pp. 249-255) I discussed the question of the successors of Kumāragupta. In these papers I suggested that after the death of Kumāragupta I there was a struggle for succession among several rival

claimants to the throne, and "although Skandagupta was apparently successful for the time being, it is clear that the embers of the family dissension were not finally extinguished." The new discoveries about Vainyagupta seem to strengthen this hypothesis and I would regard him as representing one of the rival parties which ultimately carved an independent kingdom in Eastern Bengal.

In this connection I would like to say a few words about the criticism of my view by Dr. H. C. Raychaudhuri, who has discussed this problem in his *Political History of Ancient India* (2nd edition, pp. 355-357). Dr. Raychaudhuri rightly refers to my view at the beginning as a 'suggestion', but he winds up his criticism by saying that the evidence on which I relied "does not necessarily imply that there was a struggle between the sons of Kumāra." Of course it does not; for if it did, then my hypothesis would have been a historical fact, and not merely a suggestion.

But let us analyse the criticism of Dr. Raychaudhuri a little more closely, as it has a bearing upon important historical facts. Dr. Raychaudhuri remarks "Dr. Majumdar says that the omission of the name of the mother of Skandagupta in the Bihar stone pillar and Bhitari inscriptions indicates that she was not a Mahādevī and Skanda was not the rightful heir."

I am afraid, this is not a correct version of my argument. What I pointed out was that in the two inscriptions of Skandagupta, reference is made in the genealogical portion to all the Mahādevīs (chief queens) of his predecessors except his own mother. Then I observed, "The omission of the Mahādevī of Kumāragupta I, the mother of the reigning king, in striking contrast with the mention of the other Mahādevīs of earlier kings cannot but be looked upon as significant." I hope it will be admitted that this is something more than a mere *argumentum ex silentio* as Dr. Raychaudhuri puts it.

The illustrations quoted by Dr. Raychaudhuri to prove that sometimes non-Mahādevīs were mentioned in inscriptions and that sometimes names of mothers of kings are omitted seems to be beside the point. The crucial question is, is there another instance, where, in a formal genealogy, the previous queens or Mahādevīs are mentioned but not the queen-mother of the reigning king?

Dr. Raychaudhuri says that in the Banskhera and Madhuban copper-plates, the name of Yaśomatī as Harṣa's mother is not mentioned. But as Yaśomatī is mentioned as the mother of Rājyavardhana, and then Harṣa is said to be his younger brother it is not a real case of omission.

On the whole, I maintain that the available evidence tends to support the view that there was a struggle for empire after Kumāragupta I and that while no serious flaw has yet been pointed out, the new discoveries strongly support the hypothesis I originally laid down in the papers quoted above.

R. C. MAJUMDAR

Hindu Theatre

Commenting on an article of Mr. Mankad on Hindu Theatre (*IHQ.*, VIII, 3) Mr. Manomohan Ghosh says in *IHQ.*, IX, 2 (pp. 591-4) that there did not exist two different parts of the stage called Raṅga Śirṣa and Raṅga Pīṭha. He cites four texts of Bharata himself to prove that one and the same part of the stage was referred to by the two different names. Mr. Ghosh proposes to rely solely on the text of Bharata, setting aside the rather corrupt text of the *Abhinava Bhāratī*.

If *Abhinava Bhāratī* confuses, I think, the text of Bharata, with the various readings, confuses us as much. The text is not explicit on many points. The two names Raṅga Pīṭha and Raṅga Śirṣa are often used without any express statement that the two terms denote the same place. Nor are we able to see the reason why the same place was known by two different names. Let us first take the aid of the valuable commentary of Abhinava which, I think, cannot be set aside, even for the present, as Mr. Ghosh does. At least to one who wants to consult Abhinava also, it is plain that Raṅga Pīṭha and Raṅga Śirṣa are two different places.

1. On p. 57 (Gaek. edn.) Abhinava says that the Raṅga Śīrṣa is the place where the actors remain *i.e.*, after make-up and before taking part in action. Such a place can never be the place where the drama is enacted. A separate place for enacting drama is therefore necessary.

2. On p. 63 Abhinava says that the Raṅga Śīrṣa is to be constructed for the purpose of the actors taking rest, for keeping those who are to appear and for the sake of beauty. If Raṅga Śīrṣa is for such purposes, there must be another place for showing the acting of the drama and that place is the Raṅga Pīṭha.

3. It is clear from the following passage that Abhinava held the two as different.

“रङ्गपीठस्य यदुपरि शिरोरूपमित्यर्थः । तथा च रङ्गपीठापेक्षया रङ्गशिरः उन्नतं वक्ष्यते।” (p. 69, Gaek. edn)

4. The passage in the text of the Nāṭya Śāstra itself to which Abhinava refers in the above quoted passage is

समुन्नतं समं चैव रङ्गशीर्षं तु कारयेत् ।
विकृष्टे तून्नतं कार्यं चतुरस्रे समं तथा ॥ (II., 101.)

The commentary says: समुन्नतमिति-रङ्गपीठापेक्षया । (p. 70.)

5. On the same page Abhinava gives the following Avatārikā to NS., II. 102—

अथ रङ्गपीठरङ्गशिरसोः वक्तव्यशेषं निरूपयति—अष्टहस्तं त्विति ।

Coming to the text of Bharata himself, we notice that chap. II is devoted to a regular description of the theatre and in chap. I, there is mention of various parts of the theatre in connection with the description of the deities which protect the several parts of the house. In 1,85 (Gaek. edn.) a Vedikā is mentioned, and Sūlā-halls and numerous other adjacent structures are also referred to by the words सर्ववेश्मसु and द्वारशाला (Śls. 86-87). Where are these two to be located? Chap. II does not speak of any such halls. The Vedikā is, however, mentioned twice in chap. II also, in śls. 102 and 103. What is this Vedikā? It must surely mean a raised place. This, I think, is identical with the Raṅga Śīrṣa and if it is so, we have it mentioned even in chap. I, as a place different from Raṅga Pīṭha which is also mentioned there. The Vedikā is presided over by God Fire

(I, 85) and the Raṅga Pīṭha by Brahmā himself—(I. 94). On pp. 57 and 59 Abhinava explains the Raṅga Śīrṣa as a raised portion which will resemble the head of a person lying down on his back. If we imagine the whole Prēkṣāgrha (house) as a man lying down on his back, the audience hall will be the portion below his waist; the Raṅga Pīṭha will be his chest and the Raṅga Śīrṣa will be his head (Śīrṣa) and here was Pūjā and Bali done during the Purva Raṅga; hence its other name is Veditā.

Nṣ., II. 36-37 first give 64 Hastas, then a halving of this portion, a second halving of hind-half of the two, and then a third dividing of one of these two halves into two halves. In II. 20, the other measurement of 32 Hastas is supplied. First we get two halves 32×32 ; the hind-half is divided into two parts of 16×32 H. I take the front-half of these two measuring 16×32 as the portion asked to be again halved into two parts, 8×32 . In the front portion 8×32 , there are to be two squares of 8 H. at both ends as Mattavāraṇīs and between the two Mattavāraṇīs is the portion 8×16 which is the Raṅga Pīṭha. In the second bit measuring 8×32 , the Raṅga Śīrṣa is constructed in the very centre measuring 8×8 , leaving on both sides two spaces of 8×12 H. Thus the Raṅga Śīrṣa will rise just at the centre, at the back, of the Raṅga Pīṭha looking like its head. The portion at the back of these two, measuring 16×32 , is the Greenroom. The front half 32×32 is the audience hall. This is how I understand the text of Bharata and how Miss Ketkar also has explained in a very elaborate Marathi exposition of hers of the *Nāṭya Śāstra* of Bharata. Mr. Ghosh has not got two places called Raṅga Śīrṣa and Raṅga Pīṭha and he assigns more space to the audience hall. He also reduces considerably the space of the Greenroom. This view of mine was expressed in an article on 'Theatre-Architecture in Ancient India' in the Nov-Dec., 1931 issue of the *Trivenī*, Madras, along with a diagram of the Vikrṣṭa type. Mr. Mankad, in a footnote to his article on 'Hindu Theatre' refers to it. His interpretation of Bharata's text agrees with mine, except in the dimension of the Raṅga Śīrṣa. I hold it to be an eight Hastas square whereas he gives it as the whole space of 8×32 . He says regarding my view of the Raṅga Śīrṣa that though it is highly plausible,

it is not borne out by the text. When texts are vague, meagre and bewildering, we have got to use our imagination. If my view is plausible, I think, it can be accepted. Abhinava has said on p. 57 that the Raṅga Śirṣa is eight Hastas. He has not said whether it is length or breadth. On p. 58, the Raṅga Pīṭha is described as 8×16; and as distinguished from the broader Raṅga Pīṭha, the Raṅga Śirṣa as likened to a *Śirṣa* or 'head' and therefore I took the Raṅga Śirṣa as an eight Hastas square. It was not possible to reconcile the metaphor of Śirṣa and the markedness of the place and the measurement, 8×32.

Regarding the curtain also with which Dr. A. K. Coomaraswamy's note on Mr. Mankad's article on Hindu Theatre deals, Abhinava has got to say something definite. In this connection also he mentions the Śirṣa and the Pīṭha separately and informs us that between these two was hanging a curtain. There was not only an entrance by *Apaṭikṣepa*, 'with a toss of the curtain', but there seems to have been a **यवनिका-अपसरण**, removal of the curtain also. For says Abhinava on p. 212 (Gaek. edn.).

“तत्र यवनिका रङ्गपीठतच्छिरसोर्मध्ये । तस्या अन्तरागतैः प्रयोक्तृभिर्नटैः
प्राधान्यात् यदि वा वैणिकादिभिरेव प्रयोक्तृभिः प्रयोज्यानि प्रत्याहारादीनि ; गीतकपिण्ड्या
दीनि तु यवनिकायामपसरितायां ।

The Seventh All-India Oriental Conference

The Seventh All-India Oriental Conference had its sessions in Baroda on the 27th, 28th and the 29th December last, under the auspices of His Highness the Gaekwad. Most of the delegates reached Baroda by the 26th and were received by the volunteers at the station. Those who wanted to be accommodated in European style were taken to the Guest House and were lodged either in the Guest House itself or in any of the many camps which had been fitted in the Guest House compound while those who wanted to be lodged in Indian style were taken either to the Damajirao Dharamsala or the Raopura Camp. On the part of the State there was no lack of care and the volunteers placed by the Reception Committee in these centres were all attention to the delegates. Most of these volunteers were college students and their conduct, their modesty, their anxiety to be of service to the delegates, their patience though sometimes unreasonably taxed have still left an indelible mark on the sweet memories of Baroda. Prominent members of the Reception Committee like Mr. Satyavrata Mukherji took pains to visit the camps from time to time and enquire if everything was all right. The energetic local Secretary Dr. Benoytosh Bhattacharya though under the pressure of an overwhelming burden of work and telegrams and enquiries from innumerable quarters managed to cope with his work unruffled.

The inaugural function which took place on the 27th December in the afternoon was magnificent. At 4-45 p.m. Mr. Jayaswal, the President was received at the gates of the Nayamandir by the members of the Reception Committee and conducted to the dias; at 5 p.m. His Highness the Maharaja Gaekwad and Her Highness the Maharani Saheba entered the Hall to open the Conference. After the presentation of the members of the Executive Committee of the Conference to His Highness, he rose amidst loud applause and addressed the Conference.

The address of His Highness, as is characteristic of him, was illuminating and what is more important humane in its tone. It is a matter of common knowledge that within his territory in a short span of time the Gaekwad has done wonders. In education, without making the fruitless attempt at beginning from the top he has begun from the

bottom. It does not matter if his State does not as yet possess a University, because the work which is of greater importance namely educating the masses is being done by him. He has understood that materials are first of all to be made ready before a University can flourish and that if the source remains dry it would be idle to try to keep the stream flowing. He has thus always felt for the man in the street and even when welcoming a large number of specialists in Indian antiquities, he did not forget to warn them that they had duties to perform to their less intellectual and less fortunate brethren. "The research scholar", he said, "is as much a member of society as any other, and has his own duty as a citizen of the time and place to which he belongs." This is why, he continued, "I have always kept the interest of the masses in the very forefront of my administration. I have made education compulsory in my State, so that all may obtain facilities to educate themselves and go out into the world equipped by developing their faculties to the fullest extent possible." But he feels for the antiquarian none the less. "When the student finds his patient labours rewarded and sees a remote past yield up some of its secrets for the first time, he feels the joys of a discoverer; this also I can appreciate to some extent."

Not only does he share this joy with the research worker but he is also acquainted with the right spirit in which the research work should be carried on and many of us will surely do well in remembering the advice he gave us in his address—"Original research adds to our stock of facts and ideas but every one of the new ideas it puts forth must be well digested, every one of the new facts it claims to discover must be scientifically authenticated. Mere novelty in speculation and mere boldness in assertion avail merely to start a controversial flutter here and there. I repeat, let us always cling to high standards. And here, if I may, I wish to say a word of warning to our Universities, young as well as old: your theses the world of scholars will judge, not by their bulk, novelty or number, but solely by the qualities of ripe judgment, critical acumen and scientific method"

After His Highness had declared the Conference open, the President Mr. K. P. Jayaswal delivered his Address. Mr. Jayaswal not only reviewed the salient features of the work done by scholars in

recent years but also as a veteran orientalist uttered words of encouragement to the young workers in the field and held out high hopes for them. He found possibilities of the discovery of the so-called "Indus Civilisation" in the Western Coast line of Kathiawad on the authority of the Mahābhārata in the sands of Rajputana and in certain sites in the Central Provinces. He believed that the area of the flood referred to in the *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa* was certainly the continuous land from Mesopotamia to Rajputana and strongly supported the discovery of Mr. Karandikar "that there is a positive statement in the Purāṇas that the Narmada valley was not affected by the Flood" and that "here we may find evidence of a civilisation which may vie with that of the Nile valley in antiquity." Besides these, Mr. Jayaswal gave us some of his latest expert observations e.g. his reading of the name of *Candragutta* on the Sohgaura plate for the first time, the discovery of a gold plaque in the possession of Mr. Jalan containing plastic representations of *Hara-Gauri* which according to him is one of the remnants of the Nanda Palace called *Su-Gāṅgeya*. We came to know for the first time from him that the Buddhist *Caryāpadas* written by the Siddhas were all composed at Nālandā and Vikramaśilā and that their language, so long wrongly believed to be old Bengali, was no other than old Eastern Hindi. We were further assured by him that the *Vijñaptimātratā-siddhi* "a text which had been lost to the country for centuries and which was the basis of Śaṅkara's system" has been restored into Sanskrit by Rev. Sāṅkrtyāyana. These are some of the interesting features of his illuminating address and though they may give the start to "controversial flutter here and there", they are no doubt suggestive indications of new lines of research in the ancient history of India.

The sectional meetings had their sitting on the 28th and the 29th. His Highness attended in person some of these meetings and even took part in the discussions in some of them. He listened with attention to the Presidential Address of the Anthropology Section, delivered by Rai Bahadur Sarat Ch. Ray of Ranchi on the *Problem of Caste*. The sections of Fine Arts and Gujerati were most largely attended. It was a pleasure to find that the vernacular section which was the most poorly attended in the previous Conferences had such a big audience in Baroda. It surely indicates the genuine interest the

people have been taking there in the development of the Gujarati vernacular.

It must not be understood that the Conference was solely an intellectual affair. The social side was amply looked after. On the first night there were representative Classical dances; exquisite vocal and instrumental music, as well as Garba Dances in which local girl students gave a demonstration of the national dance before the delegates and members. On the third day of the Conference, the Sanskrit play *Mālvikāgnimitra* was staged by the local actors. On the three evenings, lectures were organised by the Conference on "The Indus Valley Civilisation," "Ancient Indian Painting" and "The Indian Art and Civilisation in Central Asia." These lectures proved highly interesting. His Highness gave a party to the delegates at the Luxmi Vilas Palace. The Akhda sports were specially arranged for the delegates. Besides these, the delegates enjoyed a good deal of sight-seeing, the Zaverkhana, the Art Gallery, the Museum, and the Baroda Central Library—all of these deserved close attention and yielded much delight. In short the Conference was a success in more ways than one.

P. C. BAGCHI

A list of papers received by the Secretary for the various sections of the Conference is given below:

I SANSKRIT AND VEDIC SECTION

- Atreya, B. L.—*Probable date of Composition of Yogavāsishtha.*
 Bhattacharya, Bhabatosh—*Pre-Raghuandana Digests of Bengal and Bihar.*
 Bhattacharya, Prof. Shivaprasad—*Mahānātaka Problem, a clue to its solution.*
 —*Asābhāsa in Alaukāra Literature—the true and the false in Art.*
 Chengalvarayan, Pandit N.—*Some clues to the identity of Acārya Daṇḍin as a Tamilian.*
 Chintamani, T. R.—*Fragments of Hārita-Dharmasūtra.*
 Divanji, P. C.—*Date and Place of Origin of Yogavāsishtha.*
 Kumhan Raja, Dr. C.—*Time-analysis in Sākuntala.*
 Mankad, D. R.—*Some important Sanskrit manuscripts.*
 Pantulu, N. K. Venkatesam—*Contribution of the Karṇāṭaka families to Sanskrit Literature in the Tamil Country.*
 Sakharpekar, S. G.—*Evolution of Śaivāgamas.*
 Sastri, K. S. Ramaswami Siromani—*King Pravarasena and Kālidāsa, the two authors of Setubandha.*

Sharma, Dr. H. D.—*Some Hindu poets enjoying the patronage of Muslim rulers.*
Shastri, Madhusudan Koul—*Manuscripts from Gilgit.*

Smṛtitirtha, Mm. Kamalakrishna—*History of the Publication of some Smṛti-nibandhas in Bengal.*

Thakore, Prof. B. K.—*Mālavikāgnimitra—a study.*

Yajnik, Dr. R. K.—*Gujarati Comedy of Art, a comparative study.*

II PHILOLOGY AND GRAMMAR SECTION

Chatterji, Dr. Suniti Kumar—*Polyglottism in Ancient India.*

Chaturvedi S. P.—*Homogeneity of letters in the Pāṇinian System.*

Choudhuri, Professor Nagendra N.—*A note on Pāli, Prākṛta and Apabhraṃśa.*

Varma, Dr. Siddheswar—*Studies in Burushaskī Dialectology.*

III ANTHROPOLOGY, ETHNOLOGY AND MYTHOLOGY SECTION

Buch, Prof. M. A.—*Hindu theory of Property.*

Chengalvarayan, Pandit N.—*Marriage and Marriage customs of the Ancient Tamils.*

Choudhuri Prof. Nagendra N.—*Home of Tāntricism.*

Dutta, Kalikinkar—*Original records about the Santhal Insurrection of 1861.*

Davar, Firoze Cowasji—*Some interesting forms of Divination.*

Dikshitar, V. R. Ramachandra—*South India in the Rāmāyaṇa.*

Ghosh, Dr. Ekendranath—*Human body according to the Garbhopaniṣad.*

Ghosh, Rai Saheb Manoranjan—*Different ethnic types as studied from ancient Indian Art.*

—*Serpent-worship in Ancient India.*

Kalelkar, N. G.—*Distribution of Wealth in Ancient India.*

Kapadia, Prof. H. R.—*Women in Jainism.*

Saletore, Dr. B. A.—*Paraśurāma in History and Legend.*

Samasastri, Dr. R.—*Women's rights in the Smṛtis.*

Sastri, K. S. Ramaswami—*Coronation mystery in the Rāmāyaṇa.*

Subba Rao, R.—*The 'Sugalis.'*

IV PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION SECTION

Bhalerao, S. G.—*A little stock-taking in the Oriental Philosophy.*

Bhatt, Prof. G. H.—*Viṣṇusṛāmin and Vallabhācārya.*

Bhattacharya, Vidhusekhara—*Evolution of Viṣṇūvarāda.*

Majumdar, S. V.—*Hindu System of Morality.*

Modi, Dr. P. M.—*Meaning of Smṛti in the Smṛtipāda of Brahmasūtras.*

—*Pre-Sāṅkara mutilation of the text of Brahmasūtras.*

—*A note on the system of the four Orders of Life.*

—*The Triad of the three Dyads in the Gītā.*

Prabhu, R. K.—*Arctic background of the Conceptions of Māyā, Sat, Asat, Puruṣa, Prakṛti, etc.*

—*Origins of the Bhakti cult.*

Ramakantacharya, G.—*Srī Saṅkara's place in Hinduism.*

Sakharpekar, S. G.—*Āgamic Viraśaivism.*

Sen, Prof. Kshitimohan—*Conception of Sūnya and Sahaja.*

Upadhye, A. N.—*Leśya doctrine.*

V HISTORY AND CHRONOLOGY SECTION

Chatterji, Dr. Suniti Kumar.—*Khāravela.*

Ganguly, D. C.—*Early history of the Gāhaḍavālas.*

Ghosh, Rai Saheb Manoranjan—*Forts of Ancient India.*

Heras, Rev. H.—*Mayuraśarman, the founder of the Kadamba Dynasty, and the Pallavas of Kāñcī.*

Majumdar, Dr. R. G.—*Early Hindu Colonization in Malay Peninsula.*

Mirashi, Prof. V. V.—*Date of Tivarodeva.*

Reu, Bisweswarnath—*Capture of Baroda by Maharaja Abhayasingh of Marwar.*

Sharma, Shri Ram—*A little-utilized source of Mughal History.*

Subba Rao, R.—*The initial year of the little-known Eastern Ganga Era.*

—*Administrative History of the reign of Anantavarma Codagaṅga Deva.*

VI ARCHÆOLOGY, EPIGRAPHY AND NUMISMATICS SECTION

Acharya, G. V.—*History of Coinage in Gujarat.*

Altekar, Dr. A. S.—*A new gold-coin of Bappā Rāval.*

Chakraborty, Dr. S. K.—*The Seleucidan Emperors, their coins and coin-imitations in Ancient India.*

Dikshit, K. N.—*A note on certain copper-plates found at Gaonri in Narwhal Estate near Ujjain.*

Gadre, A. S.—*Ondūru grant of Mallikārjuna of Vijayanagar; 1456 A.D.*

—*Virdi copper-plate grant of Kharagraha.*

Ghosh, Rai Saheb Manoranjan—*Wooden palisade excavated at Pātuliputra.*

—*A study of early Indian Terracottas.*

Modi, R. C.—*A fragment of the Kīrtistambha inscription of Siddharāja Jayasimha.*

Ojha, Mm. Gaurisankar H.—*Ahāda grant of the Caulukya King Bhīmadeva II of Gujarat, Sam. 1263.*

Subba Rao, R.—*Two new copper-plate inscriptions of Vijayāditya.*

VII FINE ARTS, ARCHITECTURE AND ICONOGRAPHY SECTION

Bhattacharyya, Dr. Benoytosh—*Iconography of Heruka.*

Ghosh, Rai Saheb Manoranjan—*A study of Tibetan paintings of the Patna Museum.*

Joshi, K. N.—*Ancient Stone-tubs at Dwarka.*

Ramachandran, T. N.—*The Cakravarti relief from Jagayyapeta.*

Samasastry, Dr. R.—*Significance of Temple Architecture.*

Sanyal, Nirodbandhu—*The proposed identification of the 'Mother and Child' images as Sadyojāta.*

Saraswati, Sarasi Kumar—*Mahālakṣmī.*

Telang, M. R.—*Ancient Sanskrit works on Indian Music and its present practice.*

VIII AVESTA AND IRANIAN SECTION

Pantulu, N. K. Venkatesam—*Zend Avesta and Atharva Veda.*

Patel, Dr. Manilal—*Language of the Gāthās and its relation with that of the Younger Avesta.*

Pour-e-Davoud, Agha—*Buddhism in the Iranian Literature and History.*

IX ARABIC AND PERSIAN SECTION

Akhtar, Kazi Ahmed Mian—*Sadi's visit to Somanātha.*

Bharucha, Prof. N. N.—*The controversy of 'Shakh-i-Nabot.'*

Ziauddin, M.—*Contents of the 'Tuhfatul-Hind'.*

X MARATHI SECTION

Dandekar, Prof. V. P.—*Where Marathi meets Gujarati.*

Sagarkar, Bhalchandra V.—*तत्त्वविज्ञान*

XI HINDI SECTION

Gautam, V. P.—*Life of Thākur Jagmohan Sinha, a renowned poet of Hindi.*

Krishna Sewak—*Mādhavānala-Kāmakandalā.*

Rania, Prof. D. N.—*A dissertation on Hindi Grammar.*

XII URDU SECTION

Akhtar, Kazi Ahmed Mian—*The Art of Waraquat during the Abbaside period.*

Ansari, Nazim M. U.—*Vowel-signs in Urdu and Urdu curriculum.*

XIII GUJARATI SECTION

Oza, S. S.—*Medieval writers of Gujarat.*

Pandya, M. G.—*वर्तमान कालना विज्ञानीसनी शोध अने भूत कालना प्राचीन ऋषिसुनिअनी शोध*

Sandesara, B. J.—*Use of Vṛttas (syllabic metres) by old Gujarati poets.*

Shastri, Keshavram K.—*Medieval Gujarati.*

Vaidya, C. V.—*Gujarati in relation to Marathi.*

PANDIT PARIṢAT

Apte, V. G.—*शङ्करपादभूषणम्*

Ganderao, H.—संस्कृतभाषाजीर्णोद्धार

Krishnamacharya, Embar—प्रमाणा-सामान्य-सङ्ख्या-विचारः

Shastri, Amritlal—अद्वैतात्मदर्शनसमीक्षा

Trivedi, G. G.—पाणिनीयसूत्रे देशविभागः

OTHER PAPERS

Belvalkar, Dr. S. K.—*Dr̥ṣṭāntas in the Brahmasūtras.*

Bhatt, Chunilal B.—प्राचीन आर्योंनी केडवणीनां बीज

Bhattacharyya, Dr. B.—*Eight Mediaeval images in the Collection of Prince Pratapsingh Gaekwad.*

Bhattasali, N. K.—*Location of Kṛṣṇa's Dvāravatī.*

Birdy, Jal Pestonji—*The Origin and Early history of the family of the Gaikwads of Baroda.*

Chakladar, Haran Chandra—*Religion and customs of a Fisher-caste on the East Coast of India.*

Diskalkar, D. B.—*Maratha Vakils with the British at Bombay, Calcutta and Madras in the 18th century.*

Gandhi, Pandit Lalchandra B.—गुजरातनो प्राचीन मन्त्रिवंश

Ganguli, S.—*A golden image of Tārā.*

Gauri Shankar—*Kapphiṇūbhyaḍeṣa, an unpublished Buddhist Mahākāvya.*

Ghosh, N. N.—*Early history of Kausāmbi, as it is available from literary, numismatic and archaeological sources.*

Gyani, R. S.—*Non-Mughal mints of Shah Alam II.*

Iyer, Prof. K. A. Subramania—*Kundamōlā Uttararāmacarita.*

Kane, P. V.—*Gotra and Pravara in Vedic Literature.*

Katara, Sant Lal—*Maulharis.*

Majumdar, Manjulal R.—नीतिशास्त्रना गुजरातो ग्रन्थो

—*Two illustrated Manuscripts of Vilvamaṅgala's 'Bālagopāta Stuti' and the third of 'Daśamaskandha representing Gujarat School of Painting.*

—*Significance of Nārī Kuñjara pictures.*

Mehta, Jayantilal M.—प्राचीन राजशासन

Mishra, Umesha—*The annihilation of Karman—the only means to achieve Mokṣa, as interpreted by Padmapādūcārya.*

Mistri, Manilal Mulchand—हिन्दुमां सूर्यपूजा अने मोडेरातुं सूर्यमन्दिर

Modi, Jagjivan Dayalji—*A Sanskrit drama of the Seventeenth century.*

Padhye, Keshav Appa—*Buddhism as depicted or represented in Ancient (Hindu) Sanskrit dramas.*

Pantulu, N. K. Venkatesam—*Saṅkara and his philosophy in the epics, the purāṇas and other literary works.*

Paramasivan, S.—*Science in the service of Archaeology.*

Sankalia, H. D.—*Mahāyāna Buddhism in the Bombay Presidency.*

- Sāṅkṛtyāyana, Rv. Rāhula—*Tibetan Chronology.*
— *Buddhism in Tibet.*
- Sarkar, Kshitish Chandra—*A preliminary note of the newly discovered Kurkihar finds.*
- Sarup, Dr. Lakshman—*Date of Durgācārya.*
— *Date of Skandasvāmin.*
- Shah Dr. T. L.—*Can Khāruvela and Puṣyamitra ever be contemporaries?*
- Sharma, L. P. Paundeya—*Similarity of the Cave-Men's Art in India and America.*
- Shastri, Girijasankar Pandit—**योगाभ्यासस्य आवश्यकता**
- Shastri, Dr. Hirananda—*Aesthetic aspect of the Indian Seals of the Early Mediaeval period.*
- Shastri, Pandit Girijasankar—**समुद्रयातुः संबन्धवहाय्यता**
- Shoostary, S. A. M.—*Music.*
— *Advent of Rāgas and subsequently of Dhorpads.*
- Shuja. F. M.—*Development of Persian music during Pre-Islamic age.*
- Shrigondekar, Gajanan K.—*The Vaidyanātha and Nakuleśvara of Karan in the Baroda State.*
- Srinivasachariar, Professor C. S.—*Further Light on the 'Pañca-Mahāśabda.*
- Upadhyaya, Pandit Manisankar V.—**वेदानामपौरुषेयत्वम्**
- Upadhyaya, S. C.—*Authorship and date of Paumacariya, the oldest extant epic, in the Jaina Mahārāṣṭrī language.*
- Vadnerkar, V. V.—*Architecture in Ancient India.*
— *Town-planning in Ancient India.*
- Vaidya, Rao Bahadur C. V.—*The Vedic deity of Vaiśvānara explained.*
— *Early Indian History with correct dates found in Skanda Purāṇa.*

REVIEWS

AJÑĀNA by G. R. Malkani, R. Das, T. R. V. Murti. Calcutta Oriental Series, No. 26. London: Luzac & Co. 1933.

The three authors of this work have undertaken to discuss the subject of ajñāna by each writing an essay on the subject quite independently of one another. They recognise it as a most important philosophical idēa, on the proper interpretation of which the understanding of the Vedāntic system mainly depends, and by Vedānta they mean Advaita.

As the subject is set forth from the point of view of "orthodox Vedāntic thought," one would have expected that the authors would have started with at least a nucleus of what is considered orthodox; but we are left to draw our own conclusions as to whether they are merely re-stating an old position or going beyond the orthodox attitude. Mr. Malkani says that the fact of ignorance (*avidyā* and *ajñāna* are used indifferently) is the fundamental postulate of every philosophical system. Whether he is correct in saddling all systems with this postulate does not here concern us. All that matters is his own definition of ajñāna, which is "the erroneous knowledge of reality." After a brief consideration of the reality of matter he concludes that "we misperceive the real when we perceive it as something extended in space and time and as determined by the law of causality—in other words, when we perceive it as matter." But evidently only materialism interprets the real as matter, and if that is all that he has to oppose then he has an easy task. He appears to be shutting his eyes to the fact that the really important opponents of Advaita cannot be disposed of in this way.

But even as it is, Mr. Malkani does not profess to have proved the non-existence of matter. He only maintains that the Vedāntic thesis is quite plausible, and hence that "the problem of cosmic ajñāna or erroneous perception of reality has to be faced." Surely, if it is presented as a mere plausibility we are not compelled to face it. For Advaita it is not merely plausible but an inevitable principle, and Mr.

Malkani might quite well have started at once with his real problem, the apparent contradiction involved in saying "there is Brahman, the absolute reality; and there is also ajñāna, or misperception of that reality." He tackles it by discussing the instance of the snake and the rope. It would be unfair to try and summarise his whole argument. His main conclusion is that there can be no explanation of ajñāna. "It is itself the ultimate explanation of the world-appearance as well as of itself. The illusory is inexplicable; and because it is self-contradictory, it presents no real problem to thought."

Is this a re-statement of orthodox doctrine or an advance on it? Mr. Malkani does not say, but he goes on to take ajñāna in the sense of "simple ignorance or non-knowledge", and discusses several interesting psychological problems--how we can be conscious of being ignorant, and in what sense we are ignorant while asleep. It must be left to the Advaitists to say whether this is mere padding or whether these psychological puzzles have any bearing on the question of cosmic ajñāna.

Mr. Das starts more directly from the same standpoint. The world is a false appearance. "In fact there is no world, although we happen to see one." Unlike Mr. Malkani he holds the theory of different grades or kinds of reality, so that all objects are real in their proper grade. But he does not attempt to show that this is orthodox, and he comes back to the view that although Advaita philosophy cannot deny that there is some appearance, yet it insists that "the appearance is mere appearance and, in fact, is not there at all." What then becomes of grades of reality?

This appears to be much like Mr. Malkani's conclusion, but Mr. Das introduces a new consideration, that Advaitism is not primarily interested in giving a theory of the universe. It is essentially a doctrine of freedom. Still, knowledge pure and simple is the means of realising it, and he goes on to draw the ultimate consequences. "By no amount of logical thinking about the facts of experience can you ever come to the conclusion which denies all facts. The nature of ultimate reality is revealed by scripture and accepted on faith." He even finds that "the theory of ajñāna, which must needs deny all objectivity and appearance, cannot be verified in experience or validated by thought." But philosophy for Advaitism "is not the last word in the matter of truth." This

lies in intuition, in "a spiritual illumination in which all objective appearance will finally and totally disappear." The theory of ajñāna is said merely to sum up in a more pronounced form the contradictions that are found in other philosophical theories.

Mr. T. R. V. Murti, who writes the third essay, so far from holding that ajñāna is a fundamental postulate, thinks that an enquiry about it is in any case barren, and that a less fruitful topic for investigation can hardly be chosen. That is surely a strange view to be held by an expounder of Advaita, but perhaps it is not to be taken very seriously; for he goes on to give us an essay as long as both the other two. He even states that he is not out to establish a pre-conceived theory, but he does as a fact refer to his authorities much more than his colleagues, and gives exact references, which are most valuable for studying the problem historically. He goes systematically through the subject, and without being so trenchant as Mr. Das finds like him that the crowning phase of Vedānta does not lie in the results of discursive thought. There must be "a method, a discipline, to achieve freedom by abolishing the differences 'that' and 'what' so vital to discursive thought."

Although this lies beyond the actual subject of the book, the introduction of these wider questions was no doubt inevitable. When we ask what is the net result of these discussions on ignorance we find it difficult to sum up. The authors have not even agreed on a definition of the subject of their inquiry. For Mr. Murti ignorance "should be identified with belief, with a state preceding, but terminated by, any conscious employment of reasons." Is belief terminated by any conscious employment of reason? He does not define belief. Anyone knows that belief may be belief in the real, and that it is not identical with "erroneous knowledge." Nor does he make matters clearer by saying that "ignorance has been defined as the cause of illusions." This is scarcely a definition. And yet there is here probably mere carelessness of expression and not a divergence in principle from his colleagues, for when we get seventy pages further on we find him speaking of "wrong knowledge or belief." But it does show that the authors have not agreed on a minimum of common terminology.

In their joint statement the authors say that they have not communicated their views to one another during their writing in order to avoid

unnecessary controversy and to approach the subject with a dispassionate mind. They confess that they are not in complete agreement, and evidently three independent expositions cannot produce agreement. Let us hope that when they see one another in print they will be able to tell us whether they are agreed on essentials or whether they still find irreconcilable differences. Nevertheless, whatever drawbacks there may be in their method of exposition, it also has the advantage of expressing their views in a way that will stimulate thought in their readers. They have given clear and intelligible accounts of one school of Vedānta, and have shown that it is also a living modern system still capable of dealing skilfully and vigorously with the problems of human thought.

E. J. THOMAS

PURUṢA-SUKTA OR RĠVEDIC HYMN TO THE SUPERPERSONAL SELF, Text with commentary in English, and Introduction, 'No caste in true Hinduism'. By Dvijadas Datta, M.A., A.R.A.C. (Comilla, Bengal 1933).

The difficulties in the interpretation of the Rġveda are now much more clearly recognized than they were fifty years ago. Many, especially Indian scholars, were beguiled by the bland self-assurance of Max Müller into accepting a mode of interpretation that has found opponents at almost every point, at least outside England. Later scholars are much more cautious. The most recent translator of the Rġveda into German, Prof. Geldner, said, "There lies an almost impenetrable veil over the political and social relationships of ancient India, over the personal connexions of the poets, and over the old store of legends. There is also the predilection of many of the poets for a deliberate veiling of the thought and for complicated metaphors of the artificial poetic language, so that here too it may be said that we see but through a glass darkly."

Hence we must recognize that every new attempt at re-interpreting the hymns deserves examination. The venerable author of the present work has undertaken to set the *Puruṣasūkta* in a new light. But he

also has another purpose—to forge a weapon against the theory of caste as held in modern India. The first question is a purely historical one: what is the true and original meaning of the *Puruṣa-sūkta*? The hymn contains striking imagery, and we have no right to assume that the images were to be understood literally. But what is the literal meaning. We are told that the Puruṣa is everything, ‘this all’ (*idam sarvam*), and that ‘with the Puruṣa as oblation the Gods spread out the sacrifice’ (*puruṣeṇa hariṣū devā yajñam atanvata*). Then, according to the same symbolism, the Gods divided the Puruṣa.

When they divided the Puruṣa,
 Into how many parts did they arrange him?
 What was his mouth? What were his two arms?
 What are his thighs and feet called?

The Brāhmaṇa was his mouth,
 The Rājanya was made his two arms,
 The Vaiśya (was made) his two thighs;
 From his feet the Śūdra was born.

These are the two verses (11 and 12) that form the kernel of the author’s thesis. He declares that they are spurious. There is nothing strange in this supposition. He shows that the doctrine of *suttee* once found in the R̥gveda is not really there. We also know that there are many hymns that end with one or two verses in a different metre. These look like later additions, especially as some of the verses are repeated in different places. Still, this does not prove that they do not belong to the R̥gveda period, although they may not be due to the same poet. But what do we mean by spurious—something added by a brother sage, or something inserted at a later period and merely pretending to be ancient. This is not sufficiently discussed by the author.

Evidently these two verses stand on a different footing from additional verses at the end of a hymn. They form part of the context, and it is not so easy to prove that they are not genuine. The author also sees, it is not enough for his purpose to show that they are spurious. It might still be that the hymn as a whole is a creation hymn or “a

speculation on the *modus operandi* of creation." But that, although it is the view of Sāyana and modern scholars, is what the author denies. He says, truly enough, that we must place ourselves in the shoes of the seers of the Ṛgveda, who had to express themselves in the form of an impressive metaphor, instead of the usual shadowy abstract and general terms of to-day. But the question still remains whether the seers were intending merely to preach an abstract truth about the superpersonal Self, or whether they were setting forth, even metaphorically, a doctrine of creation. We appear to need a careful examination of all other related passages of the Ṛgveda in order to determine a matter not of doctrine, but of fact.

The author's main purpose raises a question for India to answer. For the West it is difficult to know even what caste means, but sympathetic thinkers are beginning to see that a conception cannot be rejected merely because it is not western. They can even see that there are classes of individuals of fundamentally different types of character, which no amount of education and training will efface. What they find a difficulty is the doctrine that these differences go back to the beginning of things, or that by means of birth etc. the differences can be infallibly determined.

Here are problems that face modern India, and one question has been raised by the author in a very distinct way. Does the very earliest Scripture really teach caste? It needed asking owing to the inveterate human tendency to read new doctrines into old utterances. The sincerity and high purpose of the author claim for it a careful and respectful hearing.

E. J. THOMAS

DIE IDEE DER SCHOPFUNG IN DER VEDISCHEN LITERATUR Veröffentlichungen des orientalischen Seminars der Universität Tübingen, fünftes Heft, von Carl Anders Scharbau Verlag von W. Kohlhammer, Stuttgart. 1932, pp. X+175.

The author has attempted in this work a systematic and exhaustive

treatment of the idea of creation in the Vedic literature. The numerous Vedic passages on the idea of creation have been divided into separate categories so far as possible. The number of quotations is very large, but not a single original passage has been given. The reader has to rely on the author's translation of these passages unless he consents to compare a score of original texts for every page of the book. Evidently the author was not much concerned with the accurate interpretation of the passages and yet he seems to be quite confident of the correctness of the interpretation he has given to them, for there is hardly a question mark in the whole book to qualify his translations. What the book has thus lost in quality he has tried to make up for by quantity, by multiplying the number of passages.

In the first part the author briefly discusses a few methodological principles. About the Vedic theory of perception he concludes that the ideal of Vedic perception is direct and intuitive vision. He hits high above the mark perhaps when he says that the personality of every god is always apparent in the Vedic literature, but he rightly asserts that in the Brāhmaṇa period it was completely blurred through the influence of impersonal magic. The author proposes to harmonise the two distinct, and different fundamental ideas of creation and emanation, both of which are met with side by side in the Vedic texts, through the higher synthesis of a phenomenological interpretation of emanation as a form of revelation. In other words, emanation is nothing different from creation but is the original phenomenon, the form of revelation of all the creation. In discussing the problem of creation out of nothing the author incidentally mentions that the supposed Biblical theory of creation out of nothing is based on insufficient ground. He points out that the only Biblical passage which countenances such a theory is to be found in the apocryphal text 2. Maccabaeans, 7, 28 where it is said, "God made this out of non-existing things (ex ouk ónton epóiesen)." But even for this passage there is a significant variant: ouk ex ónton (=not out of existing things).

In the second part the author exclusively deals with the Vedic passages which in his opinion are pertinent to the problem of creation. At first he shows that the original substance was considered to be the vital principle as *semper creator*, its function being *creatio continua* and

then proceeds to discuss the various elements which have been actually described as the original substance, e.g. earth, water, air and ether. More interesting and ingenious is the discussion on time, which the author, sharply differing from Oldenberg and Schrader, considers to be a metaphysical reality and not a mere logical abstraction as in modern philosophy: time is not only an objective substance but also the creator (or the creative vital principle) according to the Vedic authors. After discussing in the same way *prāṇa* and *manas* the author tries to establish the transcendental character of the substance and remarks that the classical polemics against the non-existent (ch. op. VI. 2. 1-3) are superfluous. He insists that in Vedic cosmogonical terminology 'at the beginning' signifies nothing but *in principio* and creation means continuous creation. The author naïvely seeks a grammatical support for the latter theory in the use of present tense in the passages concerned. In the later Vedic period the idea of emanation is predominant as is clear from the use of the root *srj-*, but the author rightly points out that positive will is always combined with it which renders it amenable to a higher synthesis with creation. In the following chapters the author successively discusses creation as deed, creation as sacrifice, problem of logos (*vāc*), problem of idea, creation as magic, creation and man, relation between God and the world and identity of God, the creator, with God of good. In all these chapters the author has tried to establish his point with the help of a bewildering mass of passages, each of which admits of at least several interpretations.

The book certainly repays perusal—at least for the sake of materials collected in it. But in laying down the book from hand the reader cannot but think that the author himself is far from convinced of all the things he wanted to prove. The mass of materials he has brought to bear on every point has not been able to demonstrate what was not clear in his own mind. There is still room for a more sober work on the same subject.

BANGALA PRACIN PUTHIR VIVARAN (vol. III, Pt. III).
Compiled by Taraprasanna Bhattacharya with an introduction by
Chintaharan Chakravarti, Kāvya-tīrtha, M.A. Baṅgiya Sāhitya Pariṣad
Calcutta 1933. Pp. vi+178.

This is a descriptive catalogue of a collection of two hundred old Bengali Manuscripts deposited in the Baṅgiya Sāhitya Pariṣad. In some cases at least the descriptions are quite exhaustive and record the distinctive features of the works described. It is, however, to be regretted that the Mss. have been arranged according to the order of accession and not according to the subject. Thus accounts of the Mss. of the same subject or even of the same work are scattered throughout the book creating a good deal of difficulty. This difficulty has, however, been considerably removed from the part under review by the introduction of Prof. Chakravarti, which, *inter alia*, draws pointed attention to the special features of the more important of the works in each of the five subjects under which the Mss. in the present part can be classified. The descriptive index, which give the names of works and their authors as also of the places where some of the Mss. are recorded to have been copied, will be helpful to students of general history. It is to be regretted that the work of compilation and publication of the catalogue of such a valuable collection is making a slow progress for want of sufficient funds.

N. DURR

SELECTIONS FROM THE PESHWA DAFTAR, vol. VI, Ram-
raja's Struggle for Power; vol. VII, Early Activities of Shahu and
Balaji Vishvanath 1707-1720; vol. VIII, Shahu in his Private Life;
vol. IX, Baji Rao and his Family, 1720-1740; vol. X, Early Strife
between Baji Rao and the Nizam; vol. XI, Shahu's relations with
Sambhaji of Kolhapur; vol. XII, the Dabhades and the Conquest of
Gujarat; vol. XIII, Baji Rao's entry into Malwa and Bundelkhand.
—Edited by G. S. Sardesai. (Pp. 591-1217). Government Central
Press, Bombay.

The scope and importance of this valuable series are quite well-

known to the readers of this Quarterly. The students of Maratha History will ever remain grateful to the Government of Bombay and Mr. G. S. Sardesai for making contemporary records of such undoubted value available in print. For many of us a document written in *modi* script is as unintelligible as an ancient inscription of Egypt written in hieroglyphics. None the less, the publication of these interesting selections should not be made an excuse for closing the Poona Archives to the inquisitive students for all time to come. No selection, however exhaustive, can altogether exclude the necessity of a fresh examination of the original manuscripts. We are confident that the Government of Bombay will henceforth steadfastly hold their enlightened policy of confidence and trust; genuine investigators have a reverence for historical records and they do not make any political use of their knowledge.

The eight volumes under review add immensely to our knowledge of the topics they deal with and necessitate a careful and in many cases complete revision of current estimates and opinion in their light. We have hitherto been accustomed to treat Ramraja as an innocent victim of the Peshwa's ambition and a hapless sacrifice to the political convenience of Tara Bai. But the letters and reports published in vol. VI of this series make it absolutely clear that, inexperienced and unwise though the prince undoubtedly was, he certainly did not lack ambition and was fully conscious of the importance of his new position. He made no secret of his attitude towards the Peshwa and Tara Bai and the papers published by Mr. G. S. Sardesai leave no doubt that if Ramraja had his way the Peshwa would receive no better treatment at his hands. The prince was hopelessly unwise and his inexperience and foolish choice of confidants contributed not a little to the failure of his own schemes. Suddenly called upon to steer the helm of a great and expanding empire and anxious to monopolise all power and patronage of the state, Ramraja tried to play one minister against another, but even in low cunning he was no match for the Peshwa; his intrigues were no secret to the Brahmin minister, his spies and diplomatic agents. As early as 1750 Purandare, himself a politician of no mean ability, brought the king's dubious ways to the Peshwa's notice. His letter runs as follows:—"The king does not care to secure the good graces of Tara Bai. He has asked the Sachiv not to hand over to you the

fort of Sinhgad. He is not straight and fair in his dealings. He tries to upset all your friends as his enemies." Ramraja wanted to negotiate a mountain stream in full flood, was caught in its whirlpool and inevitably drowned. We may pity him but he got what he asked for.

The second and the fortieth letters in vol. VII dispose of a very old popular myth about the drowning of Balaji Vishwanath's brother Tanoji by the cruel Abyssinian rulers of Janjira. The industry of the late Mr. V. K. Rajwade discovered a serious flaw in the story that had obtained a long and wide currency. He conclusively proved that Tanoji was alive in 1706 and Balaji must have left Shivardhan much earlier to improve his fortune and worldly prospects. The letter, now brought to light, leaves no doubt that Tanoji Vishwanath was in Shahu's employment in 1708 and by that time Balaji had already come to considerable prominence. Document No. 40 explains satisfactorily how the story, so long accepted on meagre or no evidence, first originated. One Sambhaji Pant, an agent of Balaji Vishwanath, was sewn into a sack and cast into the sea, a method of execution by no means rare in those unenlightened days, by the Sidis of Tanjira. This was regarded, and rightly so, as a personal wrong by the Peshwa and later on the story went round that Balaji left his ancestral home because his kith and kin were cruelly done to death by the unspeakable Abyssinian. The very first letter of this volume illustrates the dark side of Balaji's character; the founder of the hereditary Peshwa family, it appears, was not above falling foul of a near relative on account of a foal, and Shahu had to administer a mild reprimand for his grasping habits. It does not appear that this early rebuke had any lasting effect.

The spelling of Balājī's name in his seals deserves our notice. It is variously spelt as Bālājī Visvan[ātha], Bālājī Viśvanāth and Bālājī Viśvanāth, the legend on the seal also varies a good deal. From a Jamānpatra or deed of surety, dated 23-2-1711 (No. 10, pp. 6-7) the editor concludes that "This shews that Rajputs from the north accepted Shahu's service." But I am not sure that the Rajput officer mentioned in this document was an outsider. Some Rajputs undoubtedly settled in the Deccan by this time and reference to Rajput claims is again made in document No. 39, pp. 26-27.

Every student of Maratha history is familiar with the story of *Khandyā*, Shahu's favourite dog. The king conferred on the faithful hound the rank of a noble man and had him decently buried after his death. Shahu was evidently a lover of dogs and several letters in vol. VIII show how keen he was in securing good pups from his nobles and courtiers. Did he try to improve the breed? We do not know. A dog fancier need not be a dog breeder as well. But Shahu's interests were not confined to dogs alone. Once he asked his officers to get from Srinagar some musk-deer, wild cattle (or was it yak as the editor suggests?) and a mythical bird called *puma*. It appears that an agent of the Srinagar court was stationed at Satara and he politely pointed out that no living eye had ever lighted on a *puma* in the flesh although they had all heard about it. The habitat of this curious bird was entirely unknown but according to popular report the bird visited the hills near Srinagar every four or five years and left some stray feathers as the sole evidence of its migration and indeed of its existence. The agent promised to get musk-deer and wild cattle for the Chatrapati during the cold season for the beasts were sure to succumb to the effects of the journey during the hot months. Shahu was a keen sportsman and revelled in hunting, hawking and fishing. Fine thread for his rod was imported in maunds from Burhanpur and like the sportsmen of England he insisted on preserving forests for the sake of game though Maharashtra was luckily spared the rigorous and the barbarous game-laws of the West. It will be a mistake to suppose that this volume is without any political interest. The King's hunting excursions and his pilgrimage to holy places of Maharashtra caused no little inconvenience to the poor people of the countryside. Even a grandee of the Pratinidhi's rank could not escape humiliation from the arrogance of the king's illegitimate sons. Reference is found to an early visit of Kanhoji Angria to the Court of Satara and it was from him that the Chatrapati received his supply of wax candles, rose-water, musk and tobacco. The Peshwa was bitterly jealous of Raghuji Bhonsla's rising influence at the court and used the agency of such holymen as Brahmendra Swami and Narayan Dikshit Patankar to retain the favour of the sovereign and his queens.

The English merchants of Bombay found a good customer in the

Peshwa Baji Rao I. In 1734 (No. 9, p. 7, vol. IX) his agent wrote to him that carpets and broadcloth were going cheap at Bombay. In another letter the Peshwa was informed that Mr. Sullivan had some good chandeliers and gold watches for sale. Reference is also made to a telescope but the writer adds that he had no opportunity of looking through it. "If one looks at the sky through this tube," he observes, "during day time everything in the sky becomes visible." The most interesting letters in this volume are perhaps those referring to Mastani. Unfortunately one letter lacks the name of the writer or it would be possible to ascertain wherefrom this lovely enchantress came to the Peshwa. Chimnaji Appa and Balaji, the Peshwa's eldest son, did their best to rescue Baji Rao from the baneful influence of his Muhammadan mistress. Chimnaji was genuinely shocked when his distinguished brother at an unguarded moment demanded a supply of chickens from a village headman. But Chimnaji and Balaji's interference probably did more than anything else to perpetuate the Peshwa's infatuation for Mastani and to strengthen her hold over the valiant warrior. Shahu's observations on this matter show what an excellent judge of human character he was. The king urged the relatives to let the Peshwa and his mistress well alone and let time cool down the ardour of his illicit passion. We read a good deal about Radha Bai in this volume. She was a good and affectionate mother and would not permit Baji Rao to have an interview with the wily Nizam and suggested that the absence of Anand Rau Somvansi and Sambhu Sing Jadhavrao would serve as a plausible excuse. She wanted to take little Sadashiv, (who commanded the Maratha host at Panipat in 1761) with her in her pilgrimage to Benares, and in one letter asks Chimnaji, her devoted son, to send toys and playthings for the children. She hastened to appease one of her sons-in-law when the latter went on a hunger strike. This homely side of her character cannot but touch us and offers a pleasant relief to the disgusting story of court intrigue and personal jealousy. Baji Rao never hesitated to despoil his fellow nobles, as some letters in this volume amply illustrate, but none the less, his prowess and achievements earned him the general approbation of his people. Brahmendra Swami (No. 22, p. 15) triumphantly exclaims: "Shivaji had forty thousand horsemen with him, but did he ever face the Mughals

in a pitched battle? You have done so! Is it not as if God has conferred on you trifling success (or ordinary fame)!"

Baji Rao was anxious to conciliate the Nizam but that was not to be. Conflicting interests inevitably led to an armed contest and the young general dictated his own terms to his hoary headed adversary. The humiliation of Palkhed, however, did not put a stop to the Nizam's intrigues and he tried his best to cause dissension in the Maratha ranks and to undermine the Peshwa's influence. "This phase of the Nizam's policy is vividly illustrated in the copious and informing letters of Ganesh Ballal," published in the 10th volume of the *Selections*. The documents in the succeeding three volumes throw fresh light on the conflict between Shahu and his cousin of Kolhapur, the ruinous rivalry between the hereditary Peshwa and the hereditary Senapati that culminated in the fatal field of Dubhoi, and the Maratha penetration of Malwa and Bundelkhand under the leadership of the first Baji Rao. It is not possible to notice every important document within the limited space at my disposal, suffice it to say that they are by no means few and will amply repay a careful perusal.

The English notes, I regret to find, are not only inadequate but sometimes misleading. I need not cite more than one instance here. The following note has been appended to Letter No. 58, p. 37, vol. IX.—"Pilaji Jadhav sends some medicinal oils to the Peshwa." The reference is to "dukrachiñ va vaghachiñ va morachiñ va asvalichiñ va [va]ḍ vaghlachiñ tele" and the proper rendering is neither medicinal nor medicated oil but the fat of pigs, tigers, peacocks, bears and flying foxes. The fat of these animals is supposed to have medicinal properties and Pilaji says that he had no fat of bear and flying fox but it could be obtained from Santaji Mankar. On his way from Berar Pilaji had a tiger killed and its fat extracted. The substance of a historical document, if it is at all supplied, should be strictly accurate, or it should be omitted altogether. As it is, the notes in English are either redundant or useless.

These old records will be of considerable use to the student of Marathi language as well, as in some cases the words are reproduced in their obsolete archaic forms and sometimes the spelling strictly follows the dialectic variations. Thus *rag* instead of *vagh* in one of Shahu's

letters (No. 29, p. 21, vol. VIII) reminds one of East Bengal dialect with which Marathi bears a striking resemblance. All students of Maratha history over India will anxiously await future volumes of this series.

SURENDRA NATH SEN

HISTORY OF VILLAGE COMMUNITIES IN WESTERN INDIA by A. S. Altekar. University of Bombay Economic Series No. V. Oxford University Press, 1929. Pp. iv + xv + 144.

In spite of the well-known works of Henry Maine, Baden Powell, Radhakumud Mookerji and R. C. Majumdar in the field it cannot be denied that there is still ample scope for a work of the kind attempted by Mr. Altekar. For the researches of the first two authors were confined more or less to the British period, and Drs. Mookerji and Majumdar take us only to the beginning of the Muhammadan period, their subject of enquiry being moreover, much wider. Mr. Altekar on the other hand has tried to delineate the history of the village communities in Western India from the earliest times to the present age. Evidently, the author has not attempted a scholarly work of any kind. Neither can he be charged of being hyper-critical. The book is pleasant reading and would have eminently served the purpose of a school text-book but for the mass of mistakes and inaccuracies present in almost every part of it.

The author starts with the assumption that the village communities in Western India were not of Dravidian origin and takes Baden-Powell to task for suggesting that the Aryans took the idea of villages from the Dravidians. But what is more natural than to suggest that the nomadic Aryan barbarians learnt that art of settled life from their Dravidian predecessors? The author is moreover quite unaware of the fact that *grāma* in the Vedic literature often signifies a band of wanderers, sometimes forming a clan. Favoured by the scantiness of Vedic data the author has been able to draw up a picture of the Vedic village community conforming to his own ideal, specially as he has

wisely desisted from trying to find the exact significance of such terms as *sabhā* and *saṃiti* he calmly attributes to them exactly those meanings which commend themselves most to our enthusiastic and patriotic countrymen. From the non-occurrence of those terms in the Brāhmaṇas the author draws the conclusion that these institutions were non-existent in the Brāhmaṇa period. The *Jātakas*, according to him, faithfully depict the India of the seventh century B.C., and the *Smṛtis* do but register the existing institutions of the country. In short, the *Samhitās*, the *Brāhmaṇas*, the *Jātakas* and the *Smṛtis*,—all have been given the status of Gazetteers,—and that again Gazetteers of Western India. A resolute attempt has been made to pick out authorities specifically bearing on Western India. How could the Westerner Vijñāneśvara, for instance, could have 'satisfactorily' explained the various technical terms unless the laws laid down by the Northerner Yājñavalkya were also current in Western India? On the whole, the portions dealing with the modern period, mainly based on the Gazetteers, are least unsatisfactory; but here too the author shows his deplorable tendency to postulate for one period what existed at another.

Yet the book is decidedly stimulating and thought provoking. Re-writing in a more critical spirit it would supply a real need.

AITIHĀSIKA

MADHYANTAVIBHĀGASŪTRABHĀṢYATĪKA OF STHIRAMATI, being a sub-commentary on Vasubandhu's Bhāṣya on the *Madhyāntaribhāgasūtra* of Maitreyanātha, part I, edited by Vidhushekhara Bhattacharya of the Viśvabhāratī, Santiniketan, and Giuseppe Tucci of the Royal Academy of Italy. Calcutta Oriental Series No. 24.

The publication of this text is to be regarded as an event of exclusive importance in the process of investigation of the Buddhist Mahāyānist literature in general, and particularly, of that part of it which includes the works of the great masters of the Yogācāra Vijñānavāda system.

Acārya Sthiramati, one of the four chief pupils of Vasubandhu,¹ is

1 The other three are: Dignāga, Vimuktasena (Ārya), and Guṇaprabha. Cf. my transl. of Bu-ston's History, vol. II, p. 147, and Prof. Th. Stcherbatsky, *Buddhist Logic*, vol. I, p. 82.

the author of several important treatises which represent for the greater part commentaries and sub-commentaries on the works of his Guru. In the Tangyur MDO we have, besides the sub-commentary on the *Madhyānta-vibhāga*, the Tibetan translation of the following works of Sthiramati:—

1. *Kāśyapa-parivarta-ṭikā*,²
2. *Sūtrālaṅkāra-vṛtti-bhāṣya*,³ a detailed sub-commentary on Vasubandhu's *Sūtrālaṅkāra-vṛtti* (edited by Lévi).
3. *Trīṃśikā-bhāṣya*,⁴ the Sanskrit text of which has been discovered, published, and translated by Prof. Sylvain Lévi.
4. *Pañca-skandha-prakaraṇa-raibhāṣya*.⁵

Moreover, a sub-commentary on the *Abhidharmakośa*,⁶ is likewise attributed to Sthiramati and, according to Tibetan sources,⁷ he is also said to have composed a commentary on the *Mūla-mādhyamika-kārikās* of Nāgārjuna.

The text which forms the subject of the present review, the *Madhyānta-vibhāga-bhāṣya-ṭikā* is undoubtedly one of the most important works of Sthiramati, as it comments upon a treatise which belongs to the fundamental exegesis of the Yogācāra school.⁸ The *Madhyānta-vibhāga* (or *vibhāṅga*), one of the so-called five treatises of Maitreya⁹ and the *Bhāṣya* on it by Vasubandhu, contain an exposition of the main teachings of the Yogācāra system, the teachings which in the canonical literature find their expression in the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra*.¹⁰

In Sthiramati's *ṭikā* we find a thorough-going analysis and explanation of many subjects of the greatest interest and importance. So we have, in the commentary on the second Kārikā, a detailed discussion

2 Tangyur, MDO., XXXVII (ji), fol. 244-350 of the Peking Edition.

3 Tg. MDO., XLVI (mi) and XLVII (tsi).

4 Tg. MDO., LVIII (si), fol. 170-201.

5 Tg. MDO., LIX (hi), fol. 1-67.

6 Tg. MDO., CXXIX and CXXX.

7 Cf. Tson-kha-pa's *Segs-bśad-sñin-po*, Tsan Edition (vol. XIV-pia of Tson-kha-pa's works).

8 Cf. my "Doctrine of Prajñā-pāramitā as exposed in the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra* of Maitreya and its Commentaries," *Acta Orientalia*, vol. XI, p. 97, Bu-ston, transl. vol. 1, pp. 53, 54 and my Introduction to the translation of the *Uttaratantra*, AO., IX, p. 87.

9 Tib. Byams-chos-sde-lña.

10 Cf. "Doctrine of Pr.-pār.," pp. 96, 97; Introduction to *Uttaratantra* p. 86.

concerning "the real cognition of the unreal objects" (*abhūta-parikalpa*) which is characterized as the essence and the source of the whole process of Phenomenal Life, the bare reality free from the differentiation into subject and object (*grāhya-grāhakatva-rahitaṃ vastu-mātram*). This is one of the main tenets of the idealistic Yogācāra system: every Phenomenal Life is a process of constructive thought.¹¹ This constructive thought really exists (*asti dravyataḥ, asti svabhāvataḥ*)—*cogito, ergo sum!*¹² This constructive thought is the factor which conditions the representation of subject and object (though it is devoid of both the latter as two different substances) and through this becomes the cause of the worldly turmoil. "It includes the mind (*citta*) and the mental phenomena (*cakṣta* or *caitā-sika*) which relate to the past, the future, and the present, represent cause and effect, relate to the three spheres of existence, have their final issue in Nirvāṇa, and proceed in accordance with the stream of Phenomenal Life."¹³

At the same time this constructive thought includes the Absolute Reality (*tathatā=śūnyatā=paramārtha* etc.),—the principle of non-differentiation into subject and object, i.e. the unique spiritual principle.¹⁴ This principle cannot be perceived, since it is screened by the incorrect thought-construction.¹⁵

This theory of a really existing mental activity or consciousness which constructs its objects (the latter being unreal as independent entities)¹⁶ is considered to be the middle way (*madhyamā pratipad*), the antidote against the extremities (*anta*) of imputed Realism (*samāropa*) and Nihilism (*apurāda*).¹⁷ The latter is rejected by the admis-

11 Compare this theory of *abhūta-parikalpa* with the teaching about the *ayoniśo manuskāra* as contained in the Uttaratantra. Transl. pp. 133 sqq. and 187 sqq.

12 Cf. Prof. Th. Stcherbatsky, *Buddhist Logic*, vol. I, p. 12.

13 Op. cit., p. 12, line 10 sqq. अतीतानागतवर्तमाना देतुफलभूतास्त्रैधातुका अनादिका-
लिका निर्वाणपर्यवसानाः संसारानुद्भावितावैतसिका निर्विशेषिणा भूतपरिकल्पः ।

14 Op. cit., p. 10, line 22. शुन्यता हि विशुद्धालम्बना । सा च यास्ययाहकरहितता ।
सा चा भूतपरिकल्पे विद्यते ।

15 Op. cit., p. 10, line 25,—अभूतपरिकल्पावृत्तत्वात् गृह्यते ।

16 Ibid., line 15,—विज्ञानादङ्गिर्न रूपादि गृह्यते स्वप्नादिवत् ।

17 Tib. *sgro-ḥdogs* for *samāropa* and *skur-ḥdels* for *apurāda*. These two extremities are likewise designated as *śāsvata-vāda*—Eternalism and *uccheda-vāda*—Annihilationism.

sion of the constructing mind as a reality in itself (*svalakṣaṇa*, *vastu*, *dravya-sat*), and of the Absolute Reality. Imputed Realism is put an end to by the non-admission of the separate reality of subject and object (*grāhya-grāhaka*).¹⁸

Further on¹⁹ we have a short characteristic of the eight forms of consciousness admitted by the Yogācāra school, viz. the store-consciousness (*ālaya-vijñāna*) containing the seeds of all elements of existence, the 'defiled intellect' (*kliṣṭa-manas*) which constructs the representation of the Ego,²⁰ and of the six forms of consciousness corresponding to the sense-faculties (*pravṛtti-vijñāna*).

The next most important subject is the differentiation of the three aspects of reality which, as we know, is one of the most pregnant features of the Yogācāra system.²¹ The constructing mind, "the real cognition of the unreal objects" (*abhūta-parikalpa*) in all its forms and modifications (according to the Yogācāras all the active elements of existence are nothing but such modifications) represents the causally dependent aspect (*paratantra-lakṣaṇa*) of existence²² inasmuch as it is a product of causes and conditions and does not become originated by itself.²³ The same, as it appears to the ordinary individual as differentiated into subject and object, is the Imputed Aspect (*parikalpita-lakṣaṇa*).²⁴ Finally, the principle of non-differentiation or the unique spiritual principle is to be viewed as the Absolute Aspect (*pariniṣpanna-lakṣaṇa*).²⁵

The causally dependent aspect of existence (*paratantra-lakṣaṇa* = *abhūta-parikalpa*) is further on characterized as representing the mind and its phenomena (*citta-caittāḥ*), as relating to all the three spheres of

18 Op. cit. p. 13.

19 Ibid., p. 15.

20 This appears to be similar to the *ahaṃkāra* of the Sāṃkhya. Cf. also Gauḍapāda, Kār II, 16 and Śaṅkara thereon: अहं करोमि मन सुखदुःखे इत्येवंलक्षणम् । etc. .

21 Op. cit., p. 19 (on Kār. I, 6 sqq.).

22 Compare Sūtrālaṅkāra, XI, 40.—अभूतपरिकल्पो हि परतन्त्रस्य लक्षणम् । and Triṃśikā, Kār. 21.—परमतन्त्रस्वभावस्तु विकल्पः प्रत्ययोद्भवः ।

23 Op. cit., p. 20, lines 3, 4.—अभूतपरिकल्पः परतन्त्रस्वभाव इति । परैर्हेतुप्रत्ययैस्तन्नातं न तु स्वयं भवतीति परतन्त्रः । Cf. "Doctrine of Pr.-pār.", p. 94.

24 Ibid., lines 9, 10.—स एव याज्ञयाहक रूपेण स्वात्मन्यविद्यमानेन प्रख्यानात् परिकल्पितः ।

25 Op. cit., p. 20, lines 10, 11.—स एव च याज्ञयाहकरहिततया परिनिष्पन्नः । Compare Sthiramati, on Triṃśikā, 22—परिकल्पितेन स्वभावेन परतन्त्रस्य सदा रहितता परिनिष्पन्नः ।

existence.²⁶ Very important is the analysis of the twelve-membered formula of Dependent Origination (*dvādaśūṅga-pratītya-samutpāda*) and of the three varieties of 'defilement' (*saṃkleśa*), i.e. of the component parts of the process of Phenomenal Life²⁷ which are spoken of as arising all of them from thought-construction, from the mind and its phenomena.²⁸

Special attention is to be paid to the comment on the Kārikā I. 17 and the following, devoted to the synonyms (*paryōya*) of the Absolute (*tathatā*, *bhūta-koṭi*, *dharma-dhātu* etc.), as it contains the explanations of all these terms in a clear, short, and precise form. In close connection with this subject we have here the teaching about the Fundamental Element of the Absolute²⁹ as mingled with defiling elements (with the ordinary living beings) and as free from all the occasional stains (*āgantuka-mala*), e.g., as it is with the Buddha.³⁰ It is the same theory which, in a more detailed and poetical form, is contained in the *Uttaratantra*.³¹

The last section of the part published is devoted to the exposition of the sixteen aspects of *sūnyatā*. It must be noted that the interpretation of these sixteen aspects in the *Madhyānta-vibhāga*, and in the commentaries thereon by Vasubandhu and Sthiramati differs considerably from the explanations of the same which we find in the commentaries of Ārya Vimuktasena and Haribhadra on the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra*. The latter two *ācāryas* are Mādhyamikas; they explain the aspects of *sūnyatā* from the relativistic standpoint peculiar to the Mādhyamika school. In the *Madhyāntavibhāga* and its commentaries the said aspects are taken from the idealistic point of view. This explanation is contained likewise in Asaṅga's *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha* in Dignāga's *Prajñāpāramitā-artha-saṃgraha*,³² and in Triratnadāsa's Commentary on the latter work.

26 Madh. vibh., Kār. I, 9.—अभूतपरिकल्प्य चित्तचैतान्निधातुकाः । Cf. above.

27 Op. cit., p. 34, lines 21, 22, 24.—क्लेशसंक्लेशोऽविद्यादृष्योपादानानोति ... कर्मसंक्लेशः संस्कारा भवस्य ।.....जन्मसंक्लेशः शेषाण्यज्ञानोति । (Cf. Bu-ston, Transl. vol. I. note 56 (pp. 141, 142.)

28 Op. cit., p. 37, line 8.—एष सर्वः संक्लेशोऽभूतपरिकल्पात् प्रवर्तत इति ।

29 *tathatā* is to be understood here in the sense of *gotra=dhātu*.

30 Madh.-vibh., Kār. I, 17.—संक्लिष्टा च विशुद्धा च समला विमला च सा ।

अध्यातुकनकाकाशशुद्धिवच्छुद्धिरिष्यते ॥

31 Compare *Uttaratantra*, Kār. I, 23 (Transl. p. 148) sqq.; II, 3 (Transl. p. 242) etc.

32 Cf. "Doctrine of Pr.-pār," pp. 5, 6.

As concerns the authorship of the *Madhyānta-vibhāga-kārikās*, two passages of Sthiramati's commentary contain, according to my opinion, a strong evidence against the hypothesis of Professors H. Ui and G. Tucci, according to whom Maitreya (or Maitreyanātha) was a historical person.—Indeed, on p. 3, line 13 we read: "He (Ārya Maitreya) is separated (from the attainment of Buddhahood) only by one birth (*eka-jāti-pratibaddha*); accordingly, he has attained the highest culmination of the Bodhisattva's supernatural faculties (*abhijñā*),³³ power of memory (*dhāraṇī*), degrees of intense penetration (*pratisamvid*),³⁴ states of transic meditation (*samādhi*),³⁵ controlling powers (*rasitā*), degrees of steadfastness (*kṣānti*), and degrees of liberation (*vimokṣa*),³⁶ and has removed the Obscuration (*āvaraṇa*) on all the stages of Bodhisattva perfection."³⁷ Further on we have: "To a Bodhisattva who (like Ārya Maitreya) abides on the tenth Stage),³⁸ all the things cognizable in all their forms appear as clearly as a myrobalan fruit on the palm of one's hand; the Bodhisattva (at that time) is similar to one whose eyes are covered by a very fine veil (which is to disappear completely after the attainment of Buddhahood)."³⁹

It is thus clearly said that Maitreya is the Bodhisattva abiding in the tenth Stage;⁴⁰ he is evidently viewed as the future Buddha, the Ajitanātha, the successor to the religious realm of the Buddha Śākyamuni. It seems in the highest degree improbable that such a position could have been assigned to one of the Buddhist *ācāryas*, however celebrated he might have been. This we can add to the arguments advanced by Professor de La Vallée Poussin in his Introduction

33 Tib. *mñon-par-śes-pa* (or *mñon-śes*). M. Vyutp. §14.

34 Tib. *so-so-yañ-day-par-rig-pa*. *Ibid.*, §13.

35 Tib. *tiñ-ñe-ḥdzin*. *Ibid.*, §21.

36 Tib. *rnam-par-thar-pa* or *rnam-thar* (8). *Ibid.*, §70.

37 Op. cit.—स चैकजातिप्रतिबद्ध इति सर्वबोधिसत्त्वभिन्नाधारणीप्रतिबद्धिस्तुमाधिवशिताद्यानिविमो-
क्षाणां परमं पारंगतः सर्वासु बोधिसत्त्वभूमिषु निःशेषेण प्रज्ञोन्नावरतः। (the changes in the text are
ours).

38 *dharmameghā* = *chos-kyi sprin*. Cf. "Doctrine of Pr. pār.," pp. 43, 57, *Uttaratantra*, Transl. p. 117, note 5 (quotation from Nāgārjuna's *Ratnāvalī*), and Bu-ston, Transl. vol. I, p. 130 sqq.

39 Op. cit., p. 5, line 14 sqq.—एवं सति बोधिसत्त्वस्य दशम्यां भूमीं प्रतिष्ठितस्य सर्वाकारं
ज्ञेयवस्तुकरतलस्यमिवामलकं तन्म'शुकवाच्यादितलोचनस्यैवाभासमायाति। Cf. "Doctrine of Pr.-
pār.," 44, note 3.

40 Cf. Bu-ston, Transl. vol. II, p. 141 (quot. from *Citta-mātra-alamkāra*).

to the translation of the *Abhidharmakośa*⁴¹ and to our own remarks on the subject in the Introduction to the translation of the *Uttaratantra*.⁴²

So much as concerns the contents of Sthiramati's Commentary. The learned editors may be congratulated on the publication of this exceedingly important work. The edition of such a text on the basis of a single defective MS. and of the Tibetan translation must be regarded as a task of the greatest difficulty, and its high merit cannot be sufficiently appreciated. The notes, besides the Tibetan text of the parts reconstructed, contain numerous quotations and references of the greatest value.

We must however remark that the reconstruction of the missing parts of the MS. with the help of the Tibetan translation contains many considerable mistakes; it could have been made with more precision. It must be noted that the rules according to which the Tibetan Lotsavas translated the Buddhist treatises from the Sanskrit were very strict. A definite Tibetan equivalent was given to each of the current Sanskrit technical terms and expressions, and the violation of the rules prescribed was severely punished.⁴³ Indeed, we can notice a complete uniformity in the rendering of all the technical terms etc. in all the Tibetan translations of the Kangyur and the Tangyur. It seems that the learned editors have not paid due attention to this fact. In many passages the technical terms have been confounded and are not restored correctly. We may point out here some of such reconstructed passages:—

Page 3, note 5.—तदर्थविनिश्चये for *dehi don rnam-par-dbye-bar*. We ought to have here तदर्थविभागाय °विनिश्चये would have been *rnam-par-nes-par*.

Ibid, note 15.—स चैकजन्मना प्रतिबद्ध इति सर्वबोधिसत्त्वाभिज्ञाधारणीप्रतिसंवित्समापत्ति-
बधिताज्ञान्तिविमुक्तीनां परमं पारंगतः etc. Read: स (२) चैकजातिप्रतिबद्ध इति
सर्वबोधिसत्त्वाभिज्ञाधारणीप्रतिसंवित्समाधिबधिताज्ञान्तिविमोक्षाणां etc. In the
Tib. we have *tin-ñe-hdzin* which is always the equivalent of
समाधि whereas समापत्ति is rendered in all the Tib. transla-
tions *sñoms-par-hjug-pa*; and *rnam-par-thar-pa* is the
equivalent of विमोक्ष and not of विमुक्ति; the latter is always

41 P. xxvi.

42 P. 92 sqq.

43 Cf. Bu-ston, Transl. vol. II, p. 197.

44 This is the technical term (Tib. *skye-ba gcig-gis thogs-pa*). Cf. M. Vyutp., §90. 1.

translated by *rnam-par-grol-ba*. In this passage the 8 *vimokṣas* or Degrees of Liberation from materiality (Tib. *rnam-par-thar-pa brgyad*; M. Vyutp. § 70) are evidently meant.

Ibid, note 18.— तस्माच्छ्रुत्वाचार्यवसुबन्धुस्तस्य etc. In strict accordance with the Tib. *slob-dpañ btsun-pa dByig-gñen* we ought to have: *०त्वाचार्यभदन्तवसुबन्धुस्तस्य* etc.

Page 4, note 20.— येऽपि धर्मानुसारिणस्ते etc. The Tib. has here *chos-la-rton-pa. rton-pa* is the equivalent of प्रतिसरणा as we have it in the case of the four *pratisaraṇas* mentioned in the M. Vyutp⁴⁵ and one of which, viz. the *dharmā-pratisaraṇa* is certainly meant here. Read therefore: धर्मप्रतिसारिणस्ते etc. धर्मानुसारिणः is always translated by *chos-la rjes-su-ḥbrañ-ba*, as we have it in numerous texts.

Ibid.— जाते च निश्चये etc. The whole sentence must be completely changed. Read: ⁴⁶ (१) निश्चयश्चेदुत्पद्यते स प्रणेनृत्क्त्वबोधप्रभावितो भवति । न केवलमागममात्र प्रभावितस्तार्किकाणाम् । The Tib. *rab-tu-phye-ba* is the equivalent of प्रभावित as we have it, for instance, in the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra-ālokā* and elsewhere, and not of प्रविचय, the latter being rendered by *rab-tu-rnam-par-ḥbyed-pa*. Very strange is the reconstruction of *zad-do*, which generally stands for केवल, मात्र and the like, by अपचीयते

Ibid. note 26.— दुर्गतिभ्यो भवाच्च रक्षणं । Read: दुर्गतिभ्यो भवाच्च त्राणं । This will be undoubtedly the correct reading, corresponding to the Tib. *skyob-pa* which is the equivalent of त्राण, whereas रक्षण is always rendered by *sruñ-ba*. Moreover, as we have here the explanation of the so-called 'etymology' of (शास्त्र⁴⁷), it is clear that there can be here no other reading except त्राण.

Ibid.— क्लेशान्नुप्रहाणान्दुर्गतानां भवादक्षणाच्च for *ñon-moñs-paḥi dgra ḥchos-pa dan ñan-ḥgroḥi srid-pa⁴⁸ las skyob-pas*. *ḥchos-pa* is the equivalent of शासन⁴⁹ and not of प्रहाण. Compare the Kārikā quoted below, which is from Vasubandhu's *Vyākhyāyukti*.⁵⁰ With regard to *rakṣana* we have the same remark as in the preceding case. Read therefore: क्लेशान्नुप्रहाणान्दुर्गतिभवाच्च त्राणात् शास्त्रलक्षणात् ।

45 Ibid., §74.

46 Or निश्चयश्चायते (*ñes-par shyēs-na*).

47 Cf. Mādḥ. vṛtti, p. 3 and Bu-ston, Transl. vol. I, p. 42.

48 This is the correct reading, and not *sred-pa*, as we have it in the notes. *sred-pa* is the equivalent of *trṣṇā*.

49 = शास्त्र as the first member of शास्त्र + च .

50 Tg. MDO. LVIII. 143a. 4-6. Quoted Mādḥ. vṛtti, p. 3. Cf. Bu-ston, Transl. vol. I, p. 42.

Page 5, note 41.—शास्त्रप्रणेतुस्तत्त्वावबोधसंपदं निदेशं. The infinitive does not seem to be necessary here. The Tib. has *bstan-pa* which most probably must have been निदेशः; for the infinitive we should have had *bstan-par* or *bstan-paḥi-phyir*. Read therefore: *स्तत्त्वावबोधसंपन्नदेशः*.

Ibid., note 45.—तत्रार्यमेत्रेयाधिष्ठानाद्धर्मेण परम्परया etc. The Tib. has here *chos-kyi⁵¹ rgyun-gyis*. This is the equivalent of धर्मस्रोतः which is the name of a state of transic meditation, peculiar to the Path of the Bodhisattva, beginning with its initial Stages. The sense is that Asaṅga, through the blessing of Maitreya and by the force of the Dharmasrotah-samādhi which he is said to have attained,⁵² has cognized the meaning of the *sūtra*. Read therefore: *तत्रार्यमेत्रेयाधिष्ठानाद्धर्मस्रोतसा* etc.

Page 6, note 63.—नान्यत्र सन्तीत्येते etc. The Tib. has *gzan-du ma-yin-no*, evidently simply: नान्यथान सन्ति would have required *med-do* and not *ma-yin-no*.

Page 8, note 77.—येनालम्बनेन चित्तविमुक्तिर्भवति तत्त्वतोऽवगन्तव्यम्। One ought to read the end of the sentence: तत्त्वमित्यवगन्तव्यम्। This will fully agree with the Tib.: *de-ni de-kho-na yin-par khoṅ-du-chul-par-byaho*, and is much clearer: the object (of the Saint's concentration) owing to which the liberation of the mind is attained, is to be known as the Absolute Truth (*tattva=paramārtha, tathatā-pariniṣpanna* etc.⁵³ *yin-par* very often stands for इति of the original. (Cf. my Tib.-Sansk. Index to *Nyāyabindu*, p. 122).

Ibid., note 79.—फलादि संतानगतं ज्ञेयं (sic!!) for *rgyun-du-ḥzugs-paḥi ḥbras-bu-la-sogs-pa śes-par-byaho*. *rgyun-du-ḥzugs-paḥi ḥbras-bu* is the equivalent of स्रोतश्चापत्तिफलं a well-known term—"the Result (or the fruit) of Entering the Stream." Read therefore: स्रोतश्चापत्तिफलादि ज्ञेयम्।

Ibid. सह शैलेण भावकादीनां Read: सशिष्यभावकादीनां Sic in accordance with the Tib. *slob-ma* which is the equivalent of शिष्य and not of शैल. The latter is always rendered by *slob-pa*.

Page 9, note 88.—भावाभावधर्ममोहाद् for *yod-pa dan med-paḥi chos-la rmoṅs-nas*.

51 Sic. instead of *chos-kyis rgyun-gyis*.

52 Cf. Bu-ston, Transl. vol. II, pp. 141, 142 and *Sūtrālamkāra*, XIV. 3.

53 Acc. to the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra* "the Absolute Truth is the object (*ālambana*) of the pure knowledge of a Saint (*ārya*); being mediated upon and intuited, it is conducive to the removal of the Obscurations."

The reading: सदसद्धर्ममोहाद् seems more suitable here.

Page 12, note 127.—ग्राह्यग्राहकभावरहितता । रहितता etc. etc. The Tib. has *bral dben-pa-ñid*. It is therefore quite incomprehensible why we should have रहितता twice. *dben-pa-ñid* is the equivalent of विविक्तता⁵⁴ The *cheda* must be dropped.

Ibid, note 196.—सम्यगनुपश्यति for Tib. *yan-dag-par-rjes-su-mthoñ*. The correct form must be: समनुपश्यति as we have it always in the *Prajñā-pāramitā-sūtra*, and in the *Bodhisattva-bhūmi*, p. 47 where we have the same sentence.

Ibid., note 16.—सम्यग्यथावत्प्रजानाति for Tib. *yan-dag-pa ji-lta-ba-bzin du rab-tu-śes-so*. Read:⁵⁵ यथाभूयं प्रजानाति as we have it always in the *Prajñā-pāramitā*⁵⁶ and in the *Bodhisattva-bhūmi*, p. 47.

Ibid.—द्वयं न विद्यत इति दर्शनाद् Tib. *gñis-po med-par mthoñ-baḥi-phyir*. It would be better to read simply: द्वयाभावदर्शनाद्.

Page 13, note 148.—द्वयविरहितमेवेति ज्ञापनार्थं Tib. *gñis dan-bral-ba-ñid-du-śes*. The correct reading seems to be द्वयविरहितत्वज्ञापनार्थम्, there being no separate equivalent for इति.

Page 15, note 162.—न तत्स्वभावो विद्यते In connection with the preceding one ought to read: न तु तत्स्वभावं (ज्ञापयति) ।

Ibid, note 163.—प्रधानं हि विज्ञानं ग्राह्यं । Tib. *gtso-bor-ni rnam-par-śes-pa gzun-ño*. One ought better read प्रधानं हि विज्ञानं गृह्यते।⁵⁷ The reading ग्राह्य in this place is unsuitable, since it could be mistaken in the sense that consciousness विज्ञान is an object (ग्राह्य).

Ibid., note 166.—कुशलाकुशलाध्याकृतधर्मवासनाभूतोऽस्ति etc. Read: वासनापरिष्कृतोऽस्ति or वासनापरिष्कामितोऽस्ति Tib. *bag-chags lgyur-baḥi*.⁵⁸

Page 17, note 184.—योगिनस्त्वशुभमनसिकारादिभावनया Tib. *mi-sdug-pa yid-la-byed-pa-la-sogs-pa goms-pas-ni.....goms-pa* is the equivalent of अभ्यास⁵⁹ and not of भावना which is *sgom-pa* or *bsgom-pa*. Read therefore मनसिकाराद्यभ्यासेन or मनसिकाराद्यभ्यासात्.

54 It can be also रहितता (Cf. my Index, p. 88), but since we have here two different Tib. terms one after the other, it is evident that the original must have likewise contained two different words.

55 In the Tib. *yan-dag-pa* for भूत and *ji-lta-ba-bzin-du* for यथा.

56 Cf. *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*, ed. Rājendralāla Mitra, pp. 256, 257 sqq.

57 Cf. my Tib.-Sansk. Index to *Nyāyabindu*, p. 116.

58 Cf. *Abhisamayālaṅkāra-ālokā*, Gaekvad Oriental Series, p. 277.

59 Cf. Index to *Nyāyabindu* (Tib.-Sansk.), p. 10, and *Abhisamayālaṅkāra*, Kār. I. 71 and IV. 38—द्वयं न विद्यत इति दर्शनाद् = *mthoñ dan goms-paḥi lam-dag-la*.

- Page 26, note 309.—प्रहीणपञ्चदशाभासा . The Tib. has *kham s bco-liar snai-ba spans-pa rnam-s-ni*. Read therefore: प्रहीणपञ्चदशात्वाभासा.⁶⁰
- Page 29, note 361.—एवं चित्ताद्याधिपत्याद्विज्ञानमालम्बनान्तरं भजते । The Tib. has *sems-pa-la-soys-paḥi dban-gis*. *sems-pa* is always the equivalent of चेतना, whereas चित्त is rendered by *sems*. One must therefore read: चेतनाद्याधिपत्याद् or चेतनादिवशाद्. The latter seems to be the better reading.
- Ibid., note 364.—The addition तनि in क्लेशकर्मजन्मानि seems to be quite superfluous. Read: क्लेशकर्मजन्मसंक्लेशाः .
- Page 33, note 444.—गच्छतीति जगत् Tib. *ḥgro-bar-hyed-pas-na ḥgro-ba-stc*. We should expect here instead of गच्छति a word nearer in sound to जगत् . Read therefore: जगातीति जगत् .
- Page 35, note 474.—इदानोमुपपादुकाधिकारं कृत्वा Tib. *brdzus-te-skye-baḥi dban-du-mt zad-de*. Read simply: इदानोमुपपादुकानधिकृत्य.
- Page 40, note 541.—धर्मान्तरप्रयत्नप्रयोजनादनवस्था Tib. *chos gzan btsal-dgos-pas*. *btsal* is an equivalent of *mrg*—to seek⁶¹ and not of प्रयत्न which is *ḥbad-pa* or *rtsol-ba*.⁶² Read therefore धर्मान्तरमागंयाप्रयोजनाद् or simply धर्मान्तरमृग्यत्वाद्.⁶³
- Ibid., note 550.—निःस्वभावस्वरूपलक्षणा. The Tib. has *dnos-po-med-paḥi-ño-bo-ñid-kyi mtshan-ñid* which is evidently अभावस्वभावलक्षणा. Compare: *dnos-po-med-paḥi-ño-bo-ñid ston-pa-ñid* = अभावस्वभाव-शून्यता.
- Page 41, note 554.—भिन्नशब्दकीर्तनं for *sgra tha-dad-par grags-te*. Better: भिन्नशब्दप्रसिद्धिः⁶⁴ ; कीर्तन should have required the transitive form *sgrogs* or *bsgrags*.⁶⁵

60 Cf. Abhidharmakośa, I. 31.—आरूप्यान्ना मनोधर्ममनोविज्ञानधातवः ।

In the Immaterial Sphere (*ā-rūpya-dhātu*) 15 component elements of the individual (*dhātavaḥ*) of the 18 do not exist. There remain only: (a) the intellect (*manas*), (b) the psychical elements (*dharma*), and (c) mental consciousness (*mano-vijñāna*).

61 Cf. Index to Nyāyahindu (Tib.-Sanskrit), p. 105.

62 Ibid., p. 106.

63 *dogs-pa* may simply stand for the past. part. Cf. Ind. to Nyāyab. (Tib.-Sanskrit), p. 34.—*brjad-dgos* = *vaktarṇa*.

64 Ibid., p. 11. *grags-pa* can also be *pratitih*.

65 Cf. Abhis-alaukāra, Kār. IV. 3.

Ibid, note 571.—निमित्तविरोध इति । The Tib. has here: *mtshan-ma ḥgog pa*. Read therefore निमित्तनिरोध, “ just as in the above line.

Page 44, note 600.—भोजनशून्यता बाह्यैरिति । Tib. *phyi-rol-gyi-rnams-so*. Better: भोजनशून्यता बाह्यानामिति ।

Ibid.—तेषु विषयवस्तूनि भुजन्त इति भोजन । Tib. *de-dag-la⁶⁷ gul-gyi dños-por bzah-bar-bya-ba*. Read: तेषु विषयभावेन भोज्या इति भोजनं ।

Page 50, note 693.—स्वभूमिमलैः क्लिष्टः । तत्प्रतिपन्नत्वात् न निकृष्टः । (sic!!) The Tib. has: (*rañ-gi*) *sahj dñi-ma-rnams-kyis ñon-moñs-kyi. deḥi gñen-pohi-phyir. ḥog-mas-ni ma-yin-no*. Read: स्वभूमिमलैः क्लिष्टः । न त्वघ्नैः i.e. अघ्नमभूमिकैः । तत्प्रतिपन्नत्वात् ।

Page 51, note 710.—उपभोक्तृणां संदेहापकरणार्थं etc. उपभोक्तृणां is put for *som-ñi-za-ba-rnams-kyi* (sic!!). The latter⁶⁸ must be विप्रतिपन्नानां,⁶⁹ संशयितानां, or सदिग्धानां “of those who are doubting.”

E. OBERMILLER

66 *ḥgog-pa* is always the equivalent of निरोध, whereas विरोध is translated by *ḥgal-ba*.

67 In such cases the locative must not always be expected to stand in the original.

68 *som-ñi-za-ba* is a synonym of *the-tshom-za-ba* and *yid-gñis-za-ba*. For the latter two expressions cf. my Index to Nyāyabindu (Tib.-Sanskrit.), pp. 49 and 120.

69 In Haribhadra's *Abhisamayālamkāra-ālokā* न विप्रतिपत्तिः कार्यं is usually translated v *som-ñir-mi-byaḥo*.

Select Contents of Oriental Journals

Calcutta Oriental Journal, vol. 1, no. 1 (October, 1933).

KSHITIS CHANDRA CHATTERJI.—*Pāṇini as a Poet.* Pāṇini's name is traditionally associated with a poem called *Jāmbavatīvijaya* or *Pātālavijaya*. A few verses in the works of anthology are also attributed to Pāṇini. Several literary works also mention this great grammarian as a poet. All these facts have been thoroughly discussed in the paper. It has been shown however that the *Jāmbavatīvijaya*, though containing some grammatical peculiarities indicating that they have come from the pen of a grammarian, cannot be the work of the great Pāṇini, as in that case, the peculiarities would have been looked upon by the later grammarians as correct without reference to any other authority. The author of the *Jāmbavatīvijaya* has been assigned to a date near about the ninth century A.C. The other verses ascribed to Pāṇini have been shown to be the composition of a rhetorician with a bias more towards rhetoric than towards grammar.

KOKILESWAR SASTRI.—*The World in Śaṅkara-Vedānta.* Passages have been quoted here indicating that Śaṅkara has not denied the reality or the existence of the world, as, according to him, it is the world in which Brahma manifests itself. Brahma not only exists outside the universe, but is also in it. The universe is not different from Brahma.

MALATI SEN.—*Some Notes on the Tricandrum Plays.* Suggestions have been made for new interpretations of a few words occurring in the *Madhyama Vyāyoga* of Bhāsa, sometimes on the basis of altered readings fitting in better with the context.

PRABODH CHANDRA BAGCHI.—*A Note on the Word Parāvṛtti.* The word *parāvṛtti* found in several places of the *Sūtrālaṅkāra* of Aśaṅga has been translated by Lévi as 'revolution'. Winternitz has rendered the term as 'turning aside, discarding'. The author of this note however cites passages from different texts such as the *Vijñapti-mātratāsiddhi* and the *Laṅkāvatāra* to prove that *parāvṛtti* means

'transformation for a higher purpose' which amounts to a mental revolution. The *parāvṛtti* of *Maithuna* mentioned in the *Sūtrālaṅkāra*, therefore, implies the enjoyment of the bliss issuing from that act and not the abnegation of same as suggested by Winternitz. According to this interpretation, mystic couples regarded as a distinctive feature of Tantrism and the later phases of Buddhism were also prevalent in the Mahāyāna Buddhism of Asaṅga's time,

Ibid., vol. I, no. 2 (November, 1933).

KOKILESWAR SASTRI.—*The World in Śaṅkara-Vedānta*. In this instalment, the writer concludes by saying that to Śaṅkara the world is the expression of Brahma and cannot be separated from the same.

KSHITIS CHANDRA CHATTERJI.—*The Mugdhabodha System of Grammar*. How far Vopadeva, the author of the *Mugdhabodhavyākaraṇa*, is indebted to his predecessors has been discussed.

MALATI SEN.—*Some Literary Anecdotes*. Several anecdotes regarding literary men found in different texts have been given here.

PRABODH CHANDRA BAGCHI.—*Some Technical Terms of the Tantras*. That symbolical words that cannot be taken in their literal sense are found in Tantric literature has been shown here. The expression Candra-Sūrya has been cited as an instance. It means the two *nāḍīs* called *idā* and *piṅgalā* supposed by the mystics to exist within the human body.

Ibid., vol. I, no. 3 (December, 1933).

KSHITIS CHANDRA CHATTERJI.—*Caitanya and the Paṇḍit*. There is an anecdote in the *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* that several poetical blemishes were pointed out by Caitanya in a single stanza composed by a distinguished egotistic Paṇḍit. The nature of the blemishes has been discussed here.

KSHITIS CHANDRA CHATTERJI.—*The Anubandhas of Pāṇini*. The *anubandha* is a letter or letters added by grammarians to the root, augment, suffix etc. to show that certain grammatical operations are to

take place in connection with them. Such *anubandhas* as have been used by Pāṇini are enumerated in the paper with a mention, in each case, of the purpose served by the *anubandha*.

KOKILESWAR SASTRI.—*Brahman in Saṅkara-Vedānta*.

MALATI SEN.—*The Muse of Mallinātha*. Several verses composed by Mallinātha, and found scattered in different works have been collected and their poetic beauty pointed out in the article.

Indian Antiquary, October, 1933.

A. VENKATASUBBIAH.—*The Māṇḍūkyaopaniṣad and Gauḍapāda*. The followers of the Advaita school of Vedānta generally think that only the twelve prose sentences in the first section of the *Māṇḍūkya* constitute the original Upaniṣad, and that all the 215 Kārikas distributed among the four sections of the work including those mixed with the prose sentences of the first section have been written by Gauḍapāda. Scholars belonging to the Madhva school however hold the view that the Kārikās of the last three sections only can be attributed to Gauḍapāda. The object of the paper is to controvert these two opinions and to show that Gauḍapāda was the author of the whole work, even of the prose portion, and that this was the view held by Saṅkara.

Ibid., November, 1933.

V. V. MIRASHI.—*Further Light on Rāmagupta*. There is a verse in the *Kāvyamīmāṃsā* contrasting one Kārtikeya's glorious exploits in the Himalayas with Śarmagupta's ignominious defeat at the same place where he had to surrender queen Dhruvasvāminī to the victor. Śarmagupta is another name of Rāmagupta, the elder brother of Candragupta II, and Kārtikeya is believed by some to be no other than Kumāragupta of the same family. The writer of this paper however identifies Kārtikeya with Mahīpāla I of the Gurjara Pratihāra dynasty of Kanauj and is inclined to think that the incident took place either near the Jalandhar doab or near Jalalabad. The adversary who humbled down Rāmagupta was the Kuṣāṇa king referred to as Daivaputra-Sāhi-Sāhānusāhī in the Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudragupta.

F. OTTO SCHRADER.—*A Critical Study of the Isopanishad.*

GIUSEPPE PICCOLI.—*A Comparison between Signs of the 'Indus Script' and Signs in the Corpus Inscriptionum Etruscarum.* It has been shown here that certain signs in the ancient script discovered at Mohenjo-daro and Harappā are identical with those found on some Etruscan utensils and monumental remains.

Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, vol. 9, Nos. 1 and 2

CHARLES FAWCETT.—*Rāma Kāmāti and the East India Company.* This is an account of the career of Rāma Kāmāti, who in the last quarter of the 17th century helped the East India Company in Bombay and rose to position and power; but fifty years later, he had to undergo a trial by the Governor for high treason. His tragic fall has been compared to that of Cardinal Wolsey in England.

MUKUNDA V. UNAKAR.—*Meteorology in the R̥gveda.* Meteorological interpretations have been given to the functions and characteristics of the deities mentioned in the *R̥gveda* and inferences have been drawn regarding the climatic conditions during the Vedic period.

D. R. MANKAD.—*Some Peculiarities of the Sorāthi Dialect.*

Journal of Indian History, vol. XII, 1, (April, 1933).

STEN KONOW.—*Notes on Indo-Scythian Chronology.*

ABDUL AZIZ.—*History of the Reign of Shāh Jahān.* This instalment of the paper deals with the precious stones owned by the Mughal emperors and others of the same period.

H. HERAS.—*A Portuguese Inscription of the Goa Governor Dom Joao de Castro.* The inscription records a victory of the Governor of Goa over Mahmud Shāh III of Gujerat in the middle of the 16th century.

BISHESHWARNATH REU.—*Maharaja Ajit Singh of Marwar.* Evidences have been adduced to show that the murder of Ajit Singh was brought about by the Emperor Muhammad Shāh with the help of Savāi Rājā Jaya-Singh of Jaipur. He was not, as some believe, stabbed by his son Bakhat Singh.

C. S. SRINIVASACHARI.—*The Historical Material in the Private Diary of Ananda Ranga Pillai (1736-1761).*

Journal of Oriental Research, vol. vii, pt. iv (October-December, 1933).

T. N. RAMACHANDRAN.—*The Royal Artist Mahendravarman I.* The activities of the Pallava king Mahendravarman I, the author of the drama *Mattavilāsa*, in the domain of art and literature, form the subject-matter of this paper.

C. SIVARAMAMURTI.—*Śrī Harṣa's Observations on Painting with special Reference to the Naiṣadhīyacarita.*

S. R. BALASUBRAHMANYAM AND K. VENKATARANGA RAJU.—*Nārttāmalai and its Temples.* The paper describes how cert^l in ancient temples of Nārttāmalai, a village in the Pudukotah State, came into existence.

V. RAGHAVAN.—*Nāṭyadharmī and Lokadharmī.* Nāṭya-dharmī and Loka-dharmī in Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra* mean characteristics pertaining to the stage and to the world respectively. Nāṭya-dharmī refers to the elements of idealism such as the poetic language, music, and the devices having their basis on art and imagination. Lokadharmī on the other hand points to the elements of realism such as the prosaic speech, and the realistic representations of things and actions like eating, dressing etc.

P. S. SUBRAHMANYA SASTRI.—*History of Grammatical Theories in Tamil.*

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, October, 1933).

SRI RAM SHARMA.—*Tarikh-i-Muhammad Arif Qandahari.* The paper deals with the contents of a fragment of ms. containing an account of Akbar's reign written by Muhammad Arif, a companion of Bairam.

A. BERRIEDALE KEITH.—*The Origins of the Aryan Gods.* According to Prof. Rudolph Otto, the Vedic deities owe their origin to the primitive man's fear for demonic powers in general, independent of particular phenomena of Nature such as the sun, sky, wind and so forth. It was only at a later period that the source of his terror

was located in the natural phenomena. Prof. Keith opposes the view and shows by references to instances connected with Viṣṇu and others that the theory is not satisfactory and involves large assumptions.

M. B. EMENEAU.—*An Interpolation in some Mss. of the Brhatkathāmañjarī.* The edition of Kṣemendra's *Brhatkathāmañjarī* contains an appendix of 78 ślokas believed to have been the twenty-fourth story of the *Ītālapañcaviṃśatī*. Internal evidences have been discussed to show that the appendix, which has been re-edited here in the light of some new mss., did not at all form part of Kṣemendra's work.

Philosophical Quarterly, vol. IX, No. iii (October, 1933)

T. R. V. MURTI.—*Nāgārjuna's Refutation of Motion and Rest.*

K. A. KRISHNASWAMY IYER.—*The System of Rāmānuja.* The main doctrines advocated by Rāmānuja together with their possible criticisms have been presented in the paper.

AMARNATH RAY.—*Social Changes and the Brahmasūtra.* The writer points out four groups of sūtras in the *Brahmasūtra*, which he thinks, are not very relevant to the subject-matter of the work, and are therefore later additions. The first group (sūtras I, 3, 34-38) denies the right to the Sūdras to attain Brahma-knowledge. The next two groups (III, 4, 18-24 and III, 4, 47-50) are meant to extol the no-action theory. The last group (III, 4, 28-31) discusses the purity of food and untouchability. The revival of Brāhmanism in the Gupta period with the consequent social changes has prompted the interpolation of the first and the last group of the sūtras, while the 'No-action' theory of the Buddhists which left a great impress on the mind of the people was responsible for the addition of the other two groups.

AKSHAY KUMAR BANERJEA.—*Brahmasūtra and Adhyāsarāda.* By a comparison of a few sūtras of Bādarāyaṇa with some portion of the Bhāṣya of Saṅkara, the writer comes to the conclusion that the author of the sūtras does not at all teach the Adhyāsa theory which Saṅkara has demonstrated to be the teachings of Vedānta.

VIOLET PARANJOTI.—*Proofs of the Soul in Tamil Śaiva Sidhānta.*

Quarterly Journal of Mythic Society, vol. XXIV, no. 2 (October, 1933)

N. SUBBA RAO.—*Two Centuries of Wodeyar Rule in Mysore (1565-1761).*

M. V. KRISHNA RAO.—*Jainism in Gangavadi.*

K. NARAYANASWAMI IYAR.—*Śrīvidyā.* The paper dealing with the Śrīvidyā system of Tantric worship describes in this instalment the particular rite called Śrīcakra.

K. RAGHAVACHARYULU.—*Vijjikā.* Some verses attributed to Vijjikā are found in the works of Sanskrit anthology. Rājasekhara mentions a distinguished poetess Vijayānkā, who made her name in the Vaidarbha style of writing and lived in Karnāṭa after Kālidāsa. The Nerur and Kochreni plates of Vijayamahādevī or Vijaya-bhaṭṭārakā show that she was the queen of Candrāditya, brother of Vikramāditya I of the Western Cālukyan dynasty. Whether Vijjikā can be identified with Vijayānkā or Vijayamahādevī is a question that requires further investigation.

G. V. BUDHAKAR.—*Is the Advaita of Śaṅkara Buddhism in Disguise?* The writer continues his attempt to prove that Śaṅkara is not indebted to the Vijñānavāda and Sūnyavāda of Buddhism for his conception of the Advaita doctrine but has drawn upon the more ancient Advaita literature.

Sahitya Parisat Patrika vol. vol. XL, no. 1.

CHINTALARAN CHAKRAVARTI.—*Sun-worship in Bengal and a new Story about the Sun.* (বঙ্গ সূর্যপূজা ও সূর্যের নূতন পাচালী). The paper describes a folk-rite relating to the sun as practised by girls in Faridpur (Eastern Bengal) in the month of Māgha. It records *inter alia* the text of a romantic story, probably unknown to the Purānas, sung on this occasion. This story refers to the love-affairs of the deity.

SATISH CHANDRA BHATTACHARYA.—*Māghavrata in the district of Sylhet* (ঐহট্টে মাঘব্রত). It gives a description of the details of the rite (described in the previous paper) as practised in the district of Sylhet. There is no reference, however, to the romantic story here.

SUKUMAR SEN.—*Śrīkhaṇḍa Community of the Vaiṣṇavas and Caṇḍīdāsa* (শ্রীখণ্ডের সম্প্রদায় ও চণ্ডীদাস). Giving an account of the Vaiṣṇava poets of Śrīkhaṇḍa the paper shows how poems attributed to them in old anthological works of the Vaiṣṇavas of Bengal are in the present days passing under the name of Caṇḍīdāsa.

CHINTAHARAN CHAKRAVARTI.—*A Deed recording the Mortgage of the Śālagrāma symbol of Viṣṇu.* (শালগ্রাম বন্ধকের দলিল). This deed of 1096 B.S. (1690 A.D.) records how two Śālagrāma symbols of Viṣṇu were mortgaged for the sum of rupees two only on condition that the religious merit resulting from the worship of the deity would accrue to the lender.

MANINDRAMOHAN BOSE.—*Newly discovered Manuscript of the Songs of Vaḍu Caṇḍīdāsa.* (বড়ু চণ্ডীদাসের পদের নবাবিষ্কৃত পুথি). It gives the text of twelve of these songs with variants as found in the *Śrīkṛṣṇa-kīrtana*. C.C.

Ibid., vol. XL, no. 2.

YOGESH CHANDRA ROY.—*Territorial Divisions of Old Bengal* (বঙ্গের প্রাচীন বিভাগ). Besides giving the names of the different divisions of Old Bengal, the paper contains historical and philological discussions regarding the interpretation of Subhāṅkara's maxims and terms of land-measurement prevalent in the different parts of the country.

BIBHUTI BHUSAN DATTA.—*Mallikārjuna Sūri, an Astronomer of Old Bengal* (বাঙ্গালী প্রাচীন জ্যোতিষী মল্লিকার্জুন সূরি). The article gives an account of Mallikārjuna referring to his time, works and views. C.C.

Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik, Band 9, Heft 1, 1982.

TH. ZACHARIAE.—*Zitate aus buddhistischen Sanskrit-werken.* The author points out a number of quotations from Buddhist Sanskrit works like *Buddhacarita*, *Saundarananda*, *Jātakamūtā* etc. which are extremely rare excepting in the case of those commentators who were inhabitants of Bengal and were perhaps themselves Buddhists.

- O. G. WESENDONK.—*Zur Frage der Herkunft Zarathustras*. The author tries to show that throughout history the relation between Eastern and Western Iran was uninterrupted, and hence the conclusion that Z. might well have been born in the West and yet preached in the East.
- S. K. CHATTERJI.—*Two new Indo-Aryan Etymologies*. The author derives NIA. *cāwal* (rice) and its variants from the Austric root * *cam* and connects Bengali *puṛ* with Gr. *pūr*, OHG. *fuir* etc.
- MAX WALLESER.—*Zur Morphologie des Sanskrit*. The author tries to give a glottogonical explanation of the ending of loc. sg. masc. neuter.
- A. F. THYAGARAJA.—*English loan-words in modern Telegu*. The author deals with some English words like *road*, *rail* etc. which in his opinion reveal the “linguistic tendencies” and “the essential features of the genius” of Telugu. The tenth and the last word on his list is *receipt* which in his opinion has given rise to Tel. *rasīdu*.
- BATAKRISHNA GHOSH.—*Vyāsa-smṛti* (2). The first part of the *Vyāsa-smṛti*, reconstructed from quotations, was published by the author in the Geiger Commemoration Volume; here the remaining part of this lost Smṛti is published. B.G.

Ibid., Band 9, Heft 2, 1933.

- L. ALSDORF.—*Die Pratyayas, Ein Beitrag zur indischen Mathematik*. The author gives a very detailed and painstaking treatment of the Indian metrical theory of Pratyayas in the light of mathematics. B.G.

ADDENDUM to *IHQ.*, IX, 911 :

Some Sanskrit Texts on Painting

An article of mine of this name appeared in the *IHQ.*, vol. IX, no. 4, pp. 898-911. I want to make the following corrections and additions.

P. 899, l. 25: For *Kāvya-lāṅkāraviveka* read *Kāvya-nuśāsana-vyākhyā-lāṅkāracūḍāmaṇi*. The reference is to p. 7 K.M. edn.

P. 899, ll. 29-30: For Bhoja's *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* read Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadīya*, II. 292.

P. 900, l. 26: Insert रेखां प्रशंसन्त्याचार्याः । after "the masters praise lines."

P. 901, l. 19: Insert Gæk. edn. pp. 288 and 292 after *Abhinava-bhāratī*.

P. 903, l. 1: Read मया for महा in महानृत्ते ।

P. 901: Vāmana's comparison of drama to picture in his *KAS.* and *Vr.*, I. iii, 30-31 and my explanation of it given in the article receive further light from the dramatic theory expounded by the commentator on Bharata, Śaṅkuka, viz., the theory of Citra-turaga, the picture of a horse. Śaṅkuka explains the nature of the cognition and experience of a dramatic performance as similar to our seeing a representation in picture of a horse in action. The dramaturgic texts call this Citra-turaga-nyāya. (Vide *Abhinava-bhāratī*, Gæk. edn., pp. 275-902.)

The following gāthā is quoted in alāṅkāra works, Bhoja's *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* and Mammaṭa's *Kāvya-prakāśa* (chap. X). In the appreciation of a picture, this gāthā speaks of Saukumārya, Vartanacchāyā and Rekhā. The Skt. chāyā of the gāthā is given below: —

अन्यत् सौकुमार्यमन्यैव च कापि वर्तनच्छाया ।

श्यामा सामान्यप्रजापतेः रेखैव च न भवति ॥

A beautiful lady is here described in the language of painting.

P. 902: Painting as based on Nāṭya.

The relation between Citra (Rūpa) and Nāṭya (Rūpa or Rūpaka) and the principle of Anukāra underlying both are well brought out in a verse of Śrī Harṣa having Śleṣa alāṅkāra between the two.

चित्रतत्तदनुकार्यविभ्रमाधाय्यनेकविधरूपरूपकं ।

वीक्ष्य यं बहु ध्रुवञ्शरो जरावातकी विधिरकल्प शिल्पिराट् ॥ *Nai.* XVIII. 12.

P. 903, l. 14: Insert the following text of Pāyaguṇḍa Vaidya-nātha's commentary after *Candrāloka*, VI, 3:

“कार्यपदेन चित्रग्रहणं ; द्वितीयचः सर्वसमुच्चायकः । कार्यपदेन नृत्यादि गृह्यत इति व्याख्यानं तु पुनरुक्तिग्रस्तं । तथा च काव्यनाटकश्रवणेन नाट्यचित्रप्रेक्षणेन विभावादिधोद्वारा रसप्रतीतिः काव्यनाटकनाट्यचित्रस्थत्वं बोध्यं तस्य ॥ (p. 84, N. S. edn.)

I am not able to find one more text even where 'kārya' is used to mean 'citra'.

P. 903, 1. 18: Read *excitants* (uddīpana vibhāva) for *excitements*.

Pp. 903-4: Citra and the Dhvani theory of the ālaṃkārika's. If Dhvani applies to Citra also, what does Ānandavardhana (and his followers after him) mean by comparing to and calling 'Citra' the third-rate poetic composition specialising in mere dexterity of figures and verbal ornamentations? I think, the word 'citra' is used here in its lower connotation. Words like poetry, civilisation etc. have always got a lower and reproachful significance also. Ānanda says in the third chapter of his *Dhvanyāloka* (p. 220):

“ततोऽन्यत् रसभावादितात्पर्यरहितं व्यङ्ग्यार्थविशेषप्रकाशनशक्तिशून्यं च काव्यं केवल-
वाच्यवाचकवैचित्र्यमात्राश्रयेणोपनिबद्धं आलेख्यप्रख्यं यदाभासते, तच्चित्रम् ।”

Abhinava opines similarly in his commentary, *Locana*, on the *Dhva. Ā*. He says that the third-rate poetry is merely striking and productive of wonder and hence it is called 'citra'; Abhinava calls painting as 'merely an art', *kalāmātra*. (p. 34). These two writers, the greatest of our literary critics, considered poetry as superior to the art of painting which, they thought, was bereft of rich suggestion of emotions. There is a strange echo of this view from Hazlitt who says: “When artists or connoisseurs talk on stilts about the poetry of painting, they show that they know little about poetry and have little love of the art. *Painting gives the object itself: Poetry suggests what exists out of it, in any manner connected with it.*”

P. 904, 1. 26: For *Vāsava* read *Basava*.

P. 905, last line: Insert after 'Coomaraswamy' “*JAOS.*, vol. 52, no. 1., March 1932.”

P. 906. 11. 11-12: For *Kavi*, *Māvukkolaṃ* and *Kāvikkolaṃ* read *Kāvi*, *Māvukkolaṃ* and *Kāvikkolaṃ*.

P. 906: In the contribution in the *Asutosh Mukherjee Commemoration Volume* (part 1, p. 50), it is said in my article, Dr. Coomaraswamy equates the Rasa Citra with the Vainika of the *Vi. dha*. In a subsequent contribution in the *JAOS.*, (March 1932), he equates the same Rasa Citra with the Nāgara of the *Vi. dha*.! (p. 16. footnote 6).

P. 907, 1. 25: For *Bāsava* read *Basava*.

P. 908. 1. 17: For *Bomai* read *Bomma*.

1. 19-20: Delete the word 'the monodimensional.'


1. 22: For *means* read *mentions*.

1. 27: For शुक्र read सुधा ।

P. 909: Read *Dāṇḍikākṛtika* for *Dāṇḍikākṛtika*.

P. 910: Read सूत्रपात for सूत्रपात, and *Kuḍyaka* for *Kudyaka*.

V. RAGHAVAN



INDEX

- Abdur Rahim Khān, campaigns of, 635ff.
- Abhang Khān Habshi, 630ff.
- Abhaya, son of Bimbisāra, 442.
- Abhayadeva, commentator, 793.
- Abhimanyu, king of Kasmir, 949.
- Abhinavabhāratī, work of Abhinava, 901, 991ff.
- Abhinavagupta, commentator, 670, 674.
- Abhilaṣitārthacintāmaṇi, five varieties of pictures in, 905ff.
- Adharma, metaphysical significance of, 792ff.
- Adharmāstikāya, Jaina conception of, 792 ff.
- Adhirāja Indra, 962, 966.
- Adityadāsa, father of Varāhamihira, 984f.
- Agnimitra, king, 819.
- Agnipurāṇa, classification of Guṇas in, 455ff; definition of poetry in, 448f; Madhyama and Udāsīna described in, 779; theory of Rīti and Guṇa in, 448-60; treatment of Rītis and Vṛttis in, 450-4; relation between Guṇas and Doṣas in, 454-5; topographical information in, 471-8.
- Agniśarman, 958.
- Ahārya Abhinaya, definition of, 449.
- Ajātaśatru, Licchavi government destroyed by, 440f.
- Ājivikas, 611.
- Ākarādhikārapuruṣa, function of, 125.
- Akbar, animal slaughter stopped by, 137f; sun worshipped by, 137ff.
- Akbar, coins of, 157.
- Akṣapaṭalika, function of, 124.
- Akṣobhya Tirtha, disciple of Madhva, 970.
- Alaṅkāra, Daṇḍin's definition of, 836f.
- Alaungsitthu, Burmese king, 285.
- Amarakośa, Udāsīna explained in, 780f.
- Amarasimha, 949.
- Ambar, early career of, 630-1; king set up by, 633; defeat of, 638f.
- Ambar-jiu, slave, 630ff.
- Amma I, king, 963f.
- Amoghavarṣa, son of Govinda III, 738f.
- Ānandagiri (or Ānandajñāna), commentator, 597.
- Anandpal, son of Jaipal, 935; defeat of, 15.
- Ancient India, disposal of dead bodies in, 439-40.
- Aniruddha Bhaṭṭa, abode of, 726.
- Anoratha, Burmese king, 285.
- Antahpurika, function of, 125.
- Anubhāva, definition of, 449fn.
- Anugītā, teachings of, 192f.
- Anusamyāna, notes on, 810-13.
- Apadāna, Avadāna and, 32-6.
- Arasiyakere inscr., title used for Harahara I in, 525.
- Ārdhadhātuka, grammatical meaning of, 280.
- Ardhamāgadhi, preposition in, 987-8.
- Arhatship, 716f.
- Ari, 770.
- Artha-śāstra, Kuṣaḥ shows parallel ideas with, 247ff.
- Aruṇa, god, 518; Varuṇa connected with, 518 ff.
- Āryabhaṭa, Varāhamihira refers to, 984 f.
- Āryadeva, Cittaviśuddhiprakaraṇa of, 705-21; date of, 709 f.; home of, 610, 972-3, 978 f.
- Āryas, Purāṇic traditions about earlier homes of, 461-469.
- Asaṅga, date of, 5 fn; Guhyasamāja ascribed to, 5; Prajñāpāramitā-sādhana introduced by, 5.
- Asoka, heaven and hell in Edicts of, 80ff.; references in Buddhist literature to 36; remarks on R. E. IV of, 76-87.

- Asoka insers., 'Anusamyāna' in, 810-13; formulas in, 215-9.
- Aṣṭavargika, official, 126.
- Aṣṭasāhasrikā-piṇḍārtha etc., aspects of Sūnyatā in, 170.
- Atiśa, Buddhist writer, 710.
- Ātman, size (parimāṇa) of. 668; (of Tirthikas) compared with Tathatā (of Buddhism), 30 f.; Upaniṣadic doctrine of, 648 ff.; Yājñavalkya's definition of, 649.
- Avadānas, Apadāna and, 32-6; Sarvāstivādin works, 34; nature and types of, 34f.
- Avalladevī, Hūṇa princess, Karṇa's marriage with, 136.
- Avalokiteśvara, dhāraṇī delivered by, 231.
- Avatāra, doctrine of, 188 ff.
- Aziz Malik (better known as Fath Khān), son of Malik Ambar, 634.
- Babhruvāhana, Arjuna's son by Pāṇḍyan princess, 64 fn, 74.
- Bīdarāyaṇa, 293 ff.; Upavarṣa identified with, 293 fn.
- Bāhli (or Bālhika), location of, 38; connection of Kārddamaka kings with, 38 f.
- Baijnath Prasastis, kings of Kira mentioned in, 16.
- Bajrao, death of, 935.
- Balādhuri, Al-Kiraj mentioned by, 11.
- Bālāditya, Chāṭsu inscr. of, 481.
- Ballāla IV, king, 528ff.
- Baro Jaipal, king, 937.
- Basāhi plate, contents of, 951ff.
- Bastar, human sacrifice in Dantośvari shrine at, 94; Nāgavaṃśī kings of, 92ff.
- Baud, Bhañja rulers of, 751.
- Baud Charter, date of, 758-9; description of, 751-2; genealogical list of Bhañja rulers in, 759-62; object of, 759; place-names in, 760; text of, 762-7.
- Begmati, variant of Brahmaputra river, 55.
- Bengal, Buddhist commentaries in, 949; study of Mahābhāṣya in, 948-50.
- Bhaganua Disa, successor of Vijaya Dūsa, 972.
- Bhagavat, five forms of, 647.
- Bhāgavata, authority of, 300; same as Pāñcarātra, 645fn.
- Bhāgavatas, 194f.
- Bhāgavṛtti, date of, 949f.
- Bhagirathavarman, father of Kākusthavarman, 199ff.
- Bhāmatī, Bhāskara quoted in, 666ff.
- Bhāṇḍāgārika, function of, 124.
- Bhañja dynasties, genealogical tables of, 760ff.
- Bhānucandra, Jain monk in Akbar's court, 138.
- Dharata, poetic theories of, 840f.
- Bharatamallika, location of Udāsina in commentary of, 781.
- Bhartṛhari, writer, 949.
- Bharu, king, 517f.
- Bharukaccha, sea-port town, 517f.; 743ff.
- Bhāsa, emendation of a śloka of, 580 f.
- Bhāskara, commentator of Gītā, 663-7; Jayatīrtha on, 670-72; relation between Śaṅkara and, 663 ff.; Śaṅkara's contemporaneity with, 673ff.; 'Satyopādi-vāda' of, 669-70; theological views of, 672-3; Vācaspati Miśra, posterior to, 667 f.
- Bhāskararāya, author of Bhāṭṭacandrikā, 294 f.
- Bhāskarācārya, 254 f.
- Bhaṭṭa, meaning of, 481.
- Bhaṭṭa Tauta, teacher of Abhinava, 901.
- Bhāvaviveka-Bhāvivēka, his view on Tathatā, 30 f.
- Bibliographical Notes, 625-8.
- Bhīmasūkla, Kālidāsa's association with, 839. *
- Bhiṣak, function of, 125.
- Bhoja, death of, 955; Gwalior Prasasti of, 740; Kālidāsa's legendary association with, 831ff.;

- poetic theories of, 840; Pratihāra king, 951 ff.
- Bodh-Gayā, Bodhisattva images at, 418f.
- Bodh-Gayā Image inscription, 417-9.
- Bodhicitta, 2f., 712ff.; definition of, 714.
- Bodhisattvahood, 714, 716.
- Bogle, account of his mission to Tibet, 420 ff.
- Brahma-Sambandha, ceremony of, 304-6.
- Brahmaism, Pāñcarātra and, 647.
- Brāhmaṇical gods, Tāntric practices in worship of, 684.
- Brahmaputra, river, 54ff.; its variants, 55; Muhammad Bakhtyar's march by bank of, 56.
- Brāhmī inscriptions, style in, 219-20.
- Bṛhanmitra, original name of Varāhamihira, 986.
- Bukka I, titles used by, 523 f., 531.
- Buddha, Tibetan names of, 46-8.
- Buddharāja, ruler of Malwa, 612.
- Buddhavarman, text of the grant of, 210 f.; not mentioned in Śālaṅkāyana inscra., 211 f.
- Buddhism, growth of philosophic system in, 585 ff.; no Tāntric rituals in (early), 8 f.; Sāṅkhya influence in 585 f.; Tāntricism in, 682 f.
- Buddhist-Chinese literature, 607 f.
- Buddhist Logic, sources of, 499-502.
- Buddhist Manuscript at Gilgit, 227-36; Chinese and Tibetan versions of, 228-30; date of, 230; interesting points noted in, 232-5; résumé of contents of, 231; title of, 227f.; text of, 235-6.
- Buddhist passage, Śaṅkara's reference to, 981.
- Buddhist Scriptures, divisions of, 32f.
- Budhagupta, 786 ff., 989.
- Burdhankot, Muhammad Bakhtyar at, 52f; location of, 53 ff.
- Buzūrijmehr, Varāhamihira and, 984-6.
- Cāhamāna Anahila, king, 954 f.
- Caitanya-caritāmṛta, author of, 98 ff.; date of, 98-9; works and authors mentioned in, 99-102.
- Cakrakotya, Nāgavaṃśis of, 92.7.
- Cakras, description of, 702 f.
- Cālukyas (Eastern), 736-41.
- Cālukya Bhima II, king, 963 f.
- Caṇḍavarman, Śālaṅkāyana king, 209ff.
- Candra kings, 960 fn.
- Candradeva, king, 951, 953, 956.
- Candrāditya, feudatory chief, 93.
- Candragomin, travels from Nālanda to Potala by, 235.
- Candrakīrtti, commentator, 972 f.
- Caryāpadas, Buddhist treatises, 997.
- Catubhāṇavāra, explanation of, 109 f.
- Ceylon, first Aryan colonization of, 742-50.
- Chambās, hostilities of Kiras against, 13 f.
- Chāndogya Upaniṣad, date of, 190.
- Changiz Khān, 630.
- Chausaṭ Yoginī temple, inscribed images in, 165 ff., 167 fn.; date of, 169.
- China, Kālidāsa's story in, 829-34.
- Cittavisuddhiprakaraṇa of Aryadeva, 705 ff.
- Citra, application of Rasa and Dhvani theories to, 903 f.
- Coins and weights, Bengali system of, 158 ff.
- Cola Parāntaka I, 74.
- Daivāṅārika, official, 126.
- Dām, Indian coin, 157ff.
- Dāmodarpur copper-plates, Uparikamahārājas and Kumārāmātyas in, 786.
- Dancing, 967; antiquity of, 154-6.
- Daṇḍin, poetic theories of, 836ff.
- Dāniyāl, prince, 630.
- Dantidurga, Rāṣṭrakūṭa king, 495.
- Dasappa, 'disciple of Jagannātha Dāsa, 972.
- Daśarūpa, dramatic rules in, 983.
- Dāsas, followers of Śrī Madhvācārya, 970 ff.
- Dasapalla copper-plate agreement, 943-7; author of, 945; date of, 945; text and translation of, 946-7.
- Dayitaviṣṇu, forefather of Pāla kings, 481 ff.
- Deccan, Shāh Jahān's campaign in, 639.

- Deity, conception of, 40 ff.; process of visualization of, 42 ff.
- Devadāsī, female dancer, 154-5.
- Devakhaḍga, Devavarmā identified with, 482.
- Devkoṭ, Muhammad Bakhtyar's death at, 61.
- Devasvāmin, commentator, 294.
- Devavarman, Śālaṅkāyana king, 209 ff.
- Dhammaghosaka, explanation of, 110.
- Dhanañjaya, Daśarūpa of, 983.
- Dharaṇendra, serpent king, 96.
- Dhāraṇis, Tantras differ from, 8.
- Dhāraṇi-mantrapadas, 570.
- Dharma, metaphysical significance of, 792 ff.
- Dharmādhikaraṇika, official, 126.
- Dharmakīrtti, Śaṅkarācārya and, 973.
- Dharmapāla, king of Gauḍa, 480 ff; details about, 486 f.; Kīras defeated by, 13; three ancestors of, 481.
- Dharmāstikāya, Jain conception of, 792 ff.
- Dharma-ṭhākura, god, 682.
- Dharmottara, commentator, 504.
- Dhruva, son of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛṣṇa I, 496 f.
- Dhurodhikārī, official, 123.
- Dhyānī Buddhas, names of, 43.
- Dīghavāpi, Tissa's residence in, 107.
- Dīkṣā, functions in, 696-7.
- Dinakādu inscr., object of, 495.
- Diṅnāga, Buddhist logician, 266, 979.
- Dīpaṅkara Śrījñāna, king Nayapāla contemporary of, 710f.
- Dīpavaṃsa, legend of Vijaya in, 742-3; sources of, 744.
- Dombiheruka, author of Gaṇacakra-vidhi, 710.
- Doṣas, blemishes of poetry, 839ff.
- Dūtaka, function of, 123.
- Duṭṭhagāmaṇi in Rohaṇa, local traditions about, 107-9.
- Durgāpūjā, Tāntric rites in, 690ff.
- Durgara, modern Dugar (Dogrā) identified with, 13.
- Durjayabhañja, father of Kanakabhañja, 759, 767.
- Dvārakā, Kṛṣṇa's shifting to, 863ff.
- Eastern Cālukyas, 491-98, 962ff.
- Ederu inscr., 736.
- Ekāśitipada-vāstu-yāga, Tāntric influence in, 685 f.
- Elephant, Dravidian words for, 258-65.
- Eśvāryapāla, Javanese Pañcatantra refers to, 931 f.
- Father Sebastian Manrique, 872 ff.
- Fatuhāt-i-'Ādil Shāhi, work of Fuzuni Astarābādi, 629.
- Ferishta, account of Hindu-moslem war in, 954; Pañcatantra mentioned in, 984.
- Gāhaḍavāla dynasty, early history of, 951-6.
- Gāhaḍavāla records, officials mentioned in, 124-6; sources of revenue mentioned in, 128-9; 'turuṣkadaṇḍa' in, 955 f.
- Gajabāhu, cousin of Parakkamabāhu, 111 f.
- Gāmagamika, official, 123.
- Gammatūru inscr., object of, 494-5.
- Ganapavaram plates, object of, 491.
- Gārgya, sage, 808.
- Gauḍa, king Narasiṃha of, 948-50.
- Gauḍipati, Dinajpur Pillar inscr. of, 789-791.
- Gavāmayana, kind of sacrifice, 926 f.
- Ghanarāna, wrong account of Pālas given by, 484.
- Ghora Āngirasa, teacher of Kṛṣṇa Devakīputra, 189 f., 194 fn.
- Ghosūṇḍi stone inscr., notes on, 795-9.
- Gilgit, Buddhist Ms. at, 227-236, 567-76.
- Gitā, Brāhmanism and, 190-1; commentaries on, 663 ff.; date of, 189 fn.; growth of, 190-1; nature of contents of, 615 f.; source of, 188-96; Upaniṣadic influence in, 190.
- Girdharpur Brāhmī inscr. (year 28), importance of, 148; note on, 145.8.
- Gokulādhikārapuruṣa, function of, 125.
- Gopāla, king, 481, 485 ff., 951.
- Govinda II, son of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kṛṣṇa I, 496 f., 737 f.; successor of Dhruvarāja, 497 f.

- Govinda IV**, Cambay plates of, 739.
- Guhyasamāja**, age of Tantras and, 1-10; **Asaṅga's** authorship of, 5; **bodhi-citta** in, 2 f.; date of, 5; deity-worship described in, 42-4.
- Gunaighar** inscr., information about **Vainyagupta** in, 785 f.
- Guṇas**, **Bharata's** theory of, 840 f.; embellishments of poetry, 835 ff; two divisions of, 841 ff; **Vāmana's** theory of, 835-52.
- Guptas (Imperial)**, chronology of, 786-8.
- Gupta sculpture**, 588-90.
- Haraprasād Śāstri**, 307-416; principal subjects that received attention of, 310-11; Bengali articles by, 323-330; Bengali works of, 372-73; search for Mss. conducted by, 330-44; contribution to Bengali literature and grammar by, 311-14, 320 ff.; contribution to history of later Buddhism by, 344ff.; list of writings of, 372-416.
- Haribhadra**, **Śūnyatā** as classified by, 170.
- Harihara I**, attainments of, 521 ff., 531ff.; foundation of **Vijayanagara** by, 521 ff.; titles of, 522 ff.
- Harivaṁśa**, son of **Dhanapati**, 759, 768.
- Harivarman**, **Kadamba** king, date of, 199.
- Hastalekha**, meaning of, 898.
- Hastivarman**, **Śālikāyana** king, 209 ff.; identification of, 213 f.
- Hāthigumphā** inscriptions, features of, 219.
- Hetu**, essential conditions of, 504 ff.; types of, 501.
- Hetucakranirṇaya (Translation)**, 511-14; aim of, 267; **Tibetan** text and **Sanskrit** reconstruction of, 268-72; work of **Diṅnāga**, 266-72.
- Hindu Drama**, convention of, 981-83.
- Hinduism**, **Pre-Aryan** elements in, 191; **Tāntricism** in, 682 f.
- Hindu Philosophy**, notion of time in, 149-53.
- Hindu Theatre**, 973-7, 991-4; architecture of, 591-594; architectural terms connected with, 594; three types of, 593.
- Hippokoura**, capital of **Viḷivāyakura**, 256 ff.; identification of **Kolhapur** with, 256-8; meaning of, 257.
- Hiravijaya-Sūri**, **Jaina** monk, 137 f.
- Huviṣka**, 145, 148, 800; interval between **Vāsiṣka** and, 145 f.
- Ibrahim 'Adil Shahi**, 629 ff., 640 f.; grandson of **Mahmud**, 952.
- India**, **Aryan** migration to, 463 f.; origin of **Aryans** and **non-Aryans** in, 465ff.; **Firishta's** account of **Hindu-Moslem** war in, 954; **Mahmud's** invasions of, 934-42; **Mughal** architecture in, 877.
- Indian inscriptions**, auspicious formula in, 225-6.
- Indians**, ethnological and linguistic divisions of, 461 ff.
- Indrabhūtipāda**, king of **Orissa**, 709.
- Indra festival**, references to, 66 ff.
- Indraśarman**, 958.
- Indravarman**, 962, 966; **Rāmatīrtham** plates of, 965 f.
- Indrota Daivāpa Śaunaka**, sage, 808.
- Indus Valley script**, origin of, 582.
- Inscriptions**, formal elements in, 215-26.
- Inscriptions:**
- Aśoka** insers., 215-19;
 - Bajjnath** insers., 16;
 - Brāhmī** insers., 219 f.;
 - Chāṭsu** inser. of **Bālāditya**, 481;
 - Ellore** copperplate, 209, 211;
 - Gaṇapavaram** plates 491;
 - Gāhaḍavāla** records, 121ff., 124-6, 128-9;
 - Girdharpur Brāhmī** inser., 145-8;
 - Hāthigumphā** inser., 219;
 - Kānāibadśi** insers., 50 ff.;
 - Khajuraho** inser., 14;
 - Khālimpur** copperplate, 11;
 - Kharoṣṭhī** insers., 219;
 - Kolleru** grant, 208, 211;
 - Konteru** copperplates, 209, 211;
 - Maināmati** copperplate, 282-9;
 - Mathurā** inser., 148, 225 fn.
 - Minor Rock Edict**, 115 ff.;

- Musinikuṇḍa plates of Viṣṇuwardhana, 492;
 Nāeika inscra., 220 ff.;
 Pasapubaṛṇu plates of Viṣṇuwardhana, 491;
 Pedavegi copperplates, 210 f.;
 Peravaii inscription of Viṣṇuwardhana, 492;
 Pratihāra inscra., 121 ff.;
 Rajapur copperplate, 93;
 Rock Edict IV, 76-87;
 Rudradāman inscra., 224 f.;
 Rummindei inscra., 77;
 Sātavāhana inscra., 223 f.;
 Selapadu inscription 491;
 Uṣavadāta inscra., 224;
 Yewur grant, 134 f.;
 Jagannātha Dāsa, successor of Bhaganna, 972.
 Jaina Metaphysics, Dharma and Adharma in, 792-4.
 Jaina schools, four divisions of, 611.
 Jaipāl, 932; Mahmud's defeat of, 934-5, 938.
 Jājalladeva, king of Ratanpur, 95.
 Jaḷayūru plates, object of, 492-3; location of place-names in, 493.
 Jambudvīpa, 972 f.; Purāṇic division of, 883 f.
 Janaka, Aryan prince, 441.
 Janamejayas (three), synchronistic list of 808-9.
 Janamejaya Parikṣits, 804-9.
 Jaṭavarman Sundarapāṇḍya I, 65.
 Jayasimha I, king, 960, 966.
 Jayaśīla, translator, 710.
 Jayatīrtha, commentator, 669 ff.
 Jayāpīḍa, king, 729.
 Jeronimo Veroneo, supposed architect of Taj, 872 ff.
 Jivātman, 19, 45.
 Kākusthavarman, Kadamba king, 197-207.
 Kālayavana, death of, 863, 865.
 Kālidāsa, his embassy to Kuntala's court, 200 f.; legend about, 831 ff.
 Kālikā-Purāṇa, method of sacrificing he-goats in, 689-90.
 Kalpadrukośa, location of Madhyama and Udāsina in, 781.
 Kamalaśīla, reference to Buddhavacana in commentary of, 499 ff.
 Kāmandakīya, Madhyama and Udāsina described in, 778 ff.
 Kāmarūpa, Muhammad Bakhtyar's fight at, 50 f; Pāla kings of, 605.
 Kāmasūtra, quotations from, 597.
 Kanauj, Mahmud's invasion of, 937f.
 Kanaka Dāsa, disciple of Vyāsa Rāya, 971.
 Kānāibaḍaśī inscra., 50 ff.
 Kanakabhañja, Baud Charter of, 751-69.
 Kangra, Kira identified with, 14 ff.
 Kaṇṣka, 800 f.
 Kannaradeva, son of king Someśvara, 95.
 Kāṇva, dynasty, 798 f.
 Kapitthaka, town, 984.
 Karaṇika, function of, 126.
 Kārddamaka kings, 37-9; ancestral home of, 37 ff.
 Karkācārya, date of, 923-9; determination of east according to, 924.
 Karṇa, king of Tripurī, 951, 954 ff; son of Gāṅgeyadeva Kalacuri, 15; death of, 955.
 Karṇāṭaka Country, Dāsas of, 969-72.
 Kāryādihikārapuruṣa, function of, 125.
 Kāsikā, 949 f.
 Kathākālī, Tamil work, 967 f.
 Kātyāyana, determination of east according to, 923 f.
 Kauṭīliya, Conception of Madhyama and Udāsina in, 770 ff.
 Kāvya, defined by Dhvani and post-Dhvani writers, 448 f.; soul of, 835, 835 fn.
 Kāyastha, function of, 126.
 Kerala, art of Pantomime in, 967-8.
 Kh (Indo-European) in Sanskrit and Avestan, 131.
 Khajuraho inscription, Kiras mentioned in, 14.
 Khālimpur copperplate, Kiras mentioned in, 11.
 Khaṇḍadeva, Mimāṃsā teacher, 294-5.
 Khān-i-Khānān, official title, 630 ff.

- Kharavela**, Agnimitra contemporary of, 819.
- Kharoṣṭhi inscriptions**, characteristics of, 219.
- Kira**, Baijnath Praśastis mention kings of, 16; Balādhuri refers to 11; early history of, 12ff.; hostilities of Chambār against, 13; identification of Kīragrāma or Baijnath in Kangra with, 12; Khajuraho inscription refers to, 14; Khalimpur copperplate refers to, 11, 14; kingdom of, 11-17; connection of Sāhiyas with, 15 f.
- Kirtivarman II**, Cālukya ruler, 495.
- Kirtti Niśsaṅka Malla**, king of Ceylon, 745, 745 fn.
- Kollāpura (or Koḷḷagiri)**, ancient name of Kolhapur, 257 fn.
- Koṭṭapāla**, function of, 123.
- Korroparru inscription**, 736.
- Kullūka**, Madhyama and Udāsīna interpreted by, 773 ff.
- Kumāra Devī**, Licchavi princess, 442.
- Kumāragupta**, 989 f.; contemporary of Kākusthavarman, 199 ff.
- Kumāra Kaṁpaṇa**, 526.
- Kumarāmātyas**, 786.
- Kumārāpāla**, date of, 489 f.
- Kumbha**, Mahārāṣṭra, 602 f.
- Kuṣa!** (Tamil work), political ideas in, 244-52.
- Kuraṅgi**, queen of Indrāgnimitra, 418.
- Kṛṣṇa I**, Rāṣṭrakūṭa king, 496; civil war after death of, 496.
- Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja**, note on Caitanya-caritāmṛta of, 98-102.
- Kṛṣṇa Devakīputra**, Kṛṣṇa of Mahābhārata not identical with, 189 f.
- Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya**, South Indian emperor, 971.
- Kṛṣṇavarman**, Kadamba king, 197 f.
- Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva**, 645f.
- Kṣatriyas**, Brāhmaṇas merged into, 483; non-Aryans designated as, 440 ff.
- Kṣetrapāla**, anthropomorphic description of, 240; descriptions of, 238 f.; offerings for, 240 f.; popular names and forms of, 241-42; Saivite deity, 237-43; worship of, 242-43.
- Kṣetradevī**, presiding deity of field, 243.
- Kṣīrasvāmin**, 781; conception of Udāsīna in commentary of, 781.
- Laghumānasam**, work of Mañjulācārya, 254 f.
- Lakhnauti**, Muhammad Bakhtyar's governmental seat at, 51.
- Lakṣmādeva**, king of Mālava, 16; son of Udayāditya, 953.
- Lakṣmi**, cult of, 646.
- Lakṣmīṅkarā**, female Vajrayāna writer, 709.
- Lāḷa**, kingdom, 742 ff.; identification of, 744f.
- Lāṭa**, locality of, 744 f.
- Lalitāditya**, Kashmir under, 13.
- Lalitavistara**, Sāṅkhya mentioned in, 587; Vaiśālī described in, 443.
- Laṅkā**, island, 972.
- Laṅkādīpa**, island, 743 f.
- Last Judgment**, Mahāpralaya and, 18-21
- Licchavis of Vaiśālī**, Buddha's relics claimed by, 446-7; Buddhist account of, 441; disposal of dead bodies among, 439-40; early references to, 440 ff; matrimonial connection of Guptas with, 442; Mahāvīra's connection with, 444; non-Aryan elements among, 441 ff.; origin of, 439-47.
- Madanapāla**, king, 490.
- Mādhava II**, son of Āryavarman, 198.
- Mādhava III**, father of Avinīta, 197; date of, 198 ff.
- Mādhavavarman I**, date of, 961 fn.; Polamuru plates of, 959, 961 fn.; Viṣṇukunḍin king, 273 ff., 957 ff.
- Mādhavavarman II**, Viṣṇukunḍin king, 274 ff.; Ipur plates of, 957 f.
- Mādhavavarman III**, Viṣṇukunḍin king, 275 ff.
- Madhva**, 670 ff.
- Madhvācārya**, 969 ff.; followers of, 969ff.; main teachings of, 969.
- Madhyama**, political significance of, 770-83.
- Mādhyamikas**, Vajrayāna influenced by, 712 f.

- Mādhyamikas and Tathatū, 30-31.
 Madhyānta-vibhaṅga, aspects of
 Sūnyatā in, 170.
 Magadha, Vainyagupta's rule in, 939.
 Maghinduvarāja, identification of,
 492-3.
 Mahābhārata,, Northern and Southern
 recensions of, 598 f.; reference to
 Madhyama and Udāsīna in, 772 ff.
 Mahābhārata in Tamil, 71 ff.; three
 versions of, 71.
 Mahābhārata War, Pāṇḍyan kings
 playing part in, 64 f.
 Mahābhāṣya, study of, 948 ff.
 Mahāmāyā (goddess), origin and des-
 cription of, 168.
 Mahāparinibbāna Sutta, account of
 Licchavis in, 440-1, 446-7.
 Mahāpralaya and Last Judgment,
 18-21.
 Mahārthaśūsanika official, 126.
 Mahāsādhanikā official, 126.
 Mahāsthān, ancient capital, 948.
 Mahāsthān Gaḍ, antiquity and descrip-
 tion of of, 722-6; Puṇḍravardhana
 identified with, 727-35.
 Mahāsthān Gaḍ inscr., Bhandarkar and
 Jayaswal's remarks on, 733 f.
 Mahattama, official, 123.
 Mahattara, official, 123.
 Mahāvamsa, inscriptions confirm auth-
 enticity of, 111 f.; interpretation
 of, 107-12; legend of Vijaya in,
 743-4; sources of, 744.
 Mahāvastu, Licchavis mentioned in,
 444.
 Mahāvīra, 444.
 Mahāyāna, Kālacakra theory adopted
 by, 682; later phases of, 711 ff.
 Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra, comparison of
 Guhyasamāja and, 6 ff.
 Mahilādīpa, island, 743 f.
 Mahilāraṭṭha, island, 742.
 Mahipāla, king, 612.
 Mahipāla I, 789, 791.
 Mahmud, account of invasions of,
 934 ff.; invasion of India by,
 952 f.
 Maināmāti copperplate, contents of,
 283; date of, 283-4; description of,
 282-3; identification of places men-
 tioned in, 284-6; text of, 286-7;
 translation of, 288-9.
 Mālavikāgnimitra, 998.
 Mālers, hill tribe, 886 ff.
 Malik Ambar: a new life, 629-44.
 Malpaharias, British control over,
 888 ff.; historical documents regard-
 ing, 892 f.; geographical boundaries
 of, 893-5; origin of, 886-97.
 Malwa, Moslem invasion of, 952 ff.
 Manasā, goddess, 168.
 Maṇḍala, 770 fn.; medium of worship,
 685 f.
 Mañjula, Arabic 'manāzil' connected
 with, 254-56.
 Mañjulācārya, astronomer, 254 f.
 Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa, Mantrayāna work,
 5.
 Mantranaya, section of Mahāyāna,
 711 ff.
 Mantrin, function of, 124.
 Manu, Udāsīna defined and located by,
 775f.
 Manusmṛti, Madhyama and Udāsīna
 described in, 773 f., 775.
 Maryādādhurya, official, 123.
 Māskadevī, sister of king Rājabhūṣaṇa
 97.
 Mathurā epigraph, peculiarities of,
 225 fn.; reasons for use of Macedo-
 nian month-name in, 148; Scythian
 tribal names in, 800-02.
 Mathurā inscr., 225 f.
 Medhātithi, Madhyama and Udāsīna
 interpreted by, 773.
 Mepputtūr Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭatiri, life
 and works of, 22-29.
 Meru, 883 f.
 Mihira Bhoja, Pratihāra king, 121.
 Minor Rock Edict (Yerraguḍi copy),
 find-spot of, 115; importance of, 115f.
 language of, 115; text of, 116-8;
 translation of, 118-20; method of
 engraving employed in, 113 ff.;
 Mirak Dabir, or Changiz Khān, 630.
 Mitra Miśra, Madhyama and Udāsīna
 interpreted by, 776 ff.

- Mughal Times, Monetary system of, 157-60.
- Muhammad Bakhtyar, death of, 61; Tibetan expedition of, 50 ff.
- Mukunda Bhañja, ruler of Daspalla, 945 ff.
- Multan, Mahmud's invasion of Jats of, 942.
- Muṇḍas, origin of, 465.
- Muñja, king of Dhārā, 134; his fight with Tailapa and other kings, 135-6.
- Musinikuṇḍa plates (S. 684), object of, 492.
- Muttra, Mahmud's invasion of, 938.
- Nāgaloka, original home of Nāgārjuna, 97.
- Nāgārjuna, disciple of Rāhulabhadra, 709; home of, 97.
- Nagarkot, same as Kangra, 15.
- Nāgavaṁśīs, 92 ff; democratic institutions of, 97.
- Nāgavaṁśīs at Bastar, titles of, 96 f.
- Naggadīpa, island, 742 f., 744.
- Naimittikas, function of, 125.
- Najib-ud-daula, rise of, 866-71.
- Nanda, Mahmud's attack on, 340 f., 937-9.
- Nandana, reference to Udāsīna in commentary of, 776.
- Nandivarman, Kolleru (Kollair) grant of, 208 ff.
- Nārada, pictures according to, 910-11.
- Narahari Tirtha, disciple of Madhva, 970.
- Narasimha, king, 948 ff.
- Nāradaśilpa, work on painting, 909 f.
- Narathu, Burmese king, 285.
- Nārāyaṇa, 680.
- Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa, commentator, 578 f.
- Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍitācārya, commentator, 665.
- Narendrasena, Vākāṭaka king, 199.
- Nāsalya, Satvant, Sātvata and, 88-91.
- Nāsik inscriptions, peculiarities of, 220 ff.
- Naṭaci, linguistic notes on, 253 f.
- Naṭi of Pāṭaliputra, 154-6.
- Nāṭya, art of painting based on, 902-3.
- Nāṭyasāstra, 993; battle-scene in, 981 fn.; death-scenes in, 981 ff.; description of teatro in, 973 ff.
- Navagraha images, peculiarities and description of, 203 ff.
- Nayapāla, king, 490.
- Nelamaṅgala inscr., titles and phrases used for Harihara I in, 522 ff.
- Neminātha, Jain teacher, 188.
- Nepathyagrha, measurement of, 975 ff.
- Nibandhas, antiquity of, 678 ff.; meaning of, 221 f.
- Nigaṇṭha Nāṭaputta, 613 ff.
- Nirvāṇa, stages leading to, 715 f.
- Niṣādas, origin and description of, 466 f.
- Nītivākyāmṛta, Madhyama and Udāsīna described in, 780.
- Nṛtū, female dancer, 154ff.
- Nur, Mahmud's invasion of, 940.
- Nyāsa, work of Jinendrabuddhi; 919f.
- Nyāyaśuddhi, 912ff.
- Nyāyasudhā, 918, 922.
- Ohind (Uṇḍ) inscr., 803-4.
- Ojas (poetic excellence), 841-3.
- Okkampitiya-vihāra, Tissa obtained shelter at, 108.
- Oriental Conference (seventh), 995-1003; list of papers submitted in, (998-1003).
- Oriental Journals, select contents of, 616-24, 822-8; 1031-9.
- Pada Rāya, head of a monastery, 971.
- Padmanābha Tīrtha, commentator, 665.
- Padmapurāṇa, Kṛpāṇa Narasiṃha mentioned in, 948.
- Paidva, mythical steed, qualities of, 263-4; elephant compared with, 264-5.
- Painting, Sanskrit texts on, 898-911.
- Pāla kings, Javanese Pañcatantra refers to, 931 ff.
- Pālas, chronology of, 488-90.
- Pālas of Bengal, caste and chronology of, 479-90; tradition about origin of, 484 ff.
- Palusā, origin of name and location of, 260 f.

- Pañcamahāśabda, 122.
- Pāñcarātra, Upaniṣadas containing essential dogmas of, 651 ff.
- Pañcatantra, Pehlvi renderings of, 984.
- Pāṇḍyan kings, achievements of, 74; political supremacy of, 64-5; famine relief measures of, 65 f., 72 f.
- Pāṇḍyan charter of early tenth century A. D., Tamil Saṅgam in, 63-75.
- Pantomime, art of, 667; description of, 967 f.; main features of, 967.
- Parachinar, town, 802 fn.
- Parakkamabāhu, king of Ceylon, 111f.
- Paramātman, 45.
- Pāramitānaya of Mahāyāna, 711 f.
- Parīkṣits, 805 f.
- Perimeḷagar, commentator of Poruṭpāl, 246.
- Parivrājikā, as depicted by Kālidāsa, 818 f.
- Pārśva, 613 f.
- Pasapubarṇu plates, object of, 491.
- Pāṭaligrāma, Buddha's prediction about 441.
- Pāṭaliputra, Naṭi of, 154-6.
- Pattalika, function of, 126.
- Pattanādhikārapuruṣa, function of, 125.
- Paṭṭikerā, place-name, 284 ff.; Buddhist monastery at, 283, 289.
- Peravali inscr., object of, 492.
- Permajili inscr., object of, 741.
- Perumdevanār, author of Tamil Mahābhārata, 71.
- Phalgūtsava-yātrā-prayoga, Tantric method of worship in, 685.
- Phaṇiśvara, commentator, 948.
- Picture, poetry in terms of, 900-02.
- Piṣṭapura, fortress, 962 ff.
- Plakirāṣṭra, modern Vizagapatam district, 966.
- Poruṭpāla, part of Kuṣaḷ, 246; political ideas in, 246 f.
- Pulakesin II, king, 963 ff.; Koppuram plates of, 964.
- Puṇḍravardhana, Ajivikas at, 728; Cunningham's observations on, 722, 732, 734; division of, 960 in; literary and inscriptional referen-
- ces to, 727ff; Nandī family of, 731; Yuan Chwang's description of, 732; Buddha's journey to, 728; King Jayāpīḍa at, 728-9; ancient finds at, 734-5; Aśoka Stūpa near, 725; mounds and places of interest at, 726; site of, 722-35.
- Puragupta, 989.
- Purāṇas, division of earth in, 882; division of Jambudvīpa in, 883-5; Tāntric influence in, 680 ff.
- Purandara Dāsa, disciple of Vyāsa Rāya, 971 f.
- Purāṇic Traditions, 880-85.
- Purohita, function of, 124.
- Puṣṭi-mārga of Vallabhācārya, 300-306; doctrine of, 301 ff.
- Puṣya-snānotsava, Tantric method adopted in, 685.
- Phallus worship, reference in Veda to, 103.
- Prabhāvatī Guptā, daughter of Candragupta II, 97.
- Prajñā, doctrine of, 717 f.
- Prajñāpāramitā-sādhanā, Asaṅga's introduction of, 5 f.
- Prakāśa, city, 256.
- Prakāśānanda, author of Siddhānta-muktāvalī, 918.
- Prasanamātra, silver coin of, 595-6.
- Pratapsingh, Mahārājā 601.
- Pratihāra Administration, 121-30; coins used in, 129-30; feudatory chiefs in, 122-3; guilds and corporations in, 127; fiscal conditions in, 127-9; village administration in, 123-4; territorial divisions in, 126-7;
- Pratihāras, 951.
- Pratimā-nūṭaku, emendation of a śloka of, 580 f.
- Prāvaraṇotsava-yātrā, Tantric method of worship in, 684 f.
- Prṭhivipallavapaṭṭana inscr., object of, 741.
- Prṭhivivyāghra, chief of Niśādas, 493.
- Qirat, Mahmud's invasion of, 939 f.
- Raḍha, country, 746.
- Raghumandana, Śri Caitanya contem-


- porary of 724fn.; influence of Tantra on works of, 678-704.
- Raghuvamśa, conception of Madhyama in, 777.
- Rāghavānanda, Madhyama and Udāsīna interpreted by, 773f.
- Rājabhāṭa, identification of, 481f.
- Rājacūḍāmaṇi Dikṣita, author of Saṃkarṣa-nyāyamuktāvali, 294.
- Rājā Indrabhūtipāda, writer, 708.
- Rājānaka Kuntaka, 902.
- Rājapaṭṭi, 122.
- Rājapur copper-plate grant, contents of, 93.
- Rājaśekhara, idea of picture in drama of, 901.
- Rājasimha, Pāṇḍyan king, 73f.
- Rāju, slave, 631; career of, 631ff.
- Rajmahal Hills, Malpaharias of, 886ff.
- Rāmacandrabudhendra, commentator, 577.
- Rāmacarita, Dharmapāla mentioned in, 932.
- Rāmānuja, 'upādhis' according to, 669fn., 671.
- Rāmatirtham plates, 965f.
- Raṇavaṅkamalla Harikāladeva, date of, 286; Maināmati copper-plate of, 282-9.
- Raṇḍuvalli inscr., object of, 741.
- Rāṅgāmāṭi, identification of 56f., 59f.; Muhammad Bakhtyar's route through, 52.
- Raṅgapiṭha, 591f., 973ff., 991ff.; position of, 976.
- Raṅgaśirṣa, 591f., 973ff., 991ff.; position of, 976.
- Rāṣṭrakūṭa Govinda III, 65.
- Rāṣṭrakūṭas, 495ff., 951.
- Rauruka, country of, 517.
- Reviews:
- Ajñāna, 1004-7;
- Bāṅgālā Prācin Puthir Vivaraṇ (vol. III, pt. III), 1012;
- Catuṣśataka of Aryadeva, pt. II, 608ff.
- Die Idee der schöpfung in der Vedischen Literatur, 1009-1011;
- Historical inscriptions of Southern India (collected till 1923) and outline of political history, 612-3;
- History of village communities in Western India, 1018-19;
- Indian literature in China and the Far East, 606-8;
- Indian women and Art in life, 821;
- Jainism in North India, 613-15;
- Jasaharacariu, 603-4;
- Kalpद्रुकोśa of Keśava, vol. II, 816;
- Kāmarūpa Śāsanāvali, 604-6;
- Mahābhārata, vols. VI-VII, 598-601.
- Mahārāṇā Kumbha, 602-3;
- Mahārāṇā Pratap, 601-2;
- Madhyāntavibhāgasūtrabhāṣyaṭikā of Sthiramati, 1019-1930.
- Mahāyānaviṃśaka of Nāgārjuna, 608-10.
- Mālavikāgnimitra, 817-20;
- Mysore Gazetteer, vol. II, 414-16;
- Nairātmyapariprechā 860, ff.
- Puruṣa-sūkta or Rg-vedic hymn to the super-personal Self, 1007-9;
- Sabdaratnasamanvayakośa of king Sāhaji of Tanjore, 816;
- Sāhitya-Ratnākara, 820;
- Schools and sects in Jaina literature, 610-11.
- Selections from the Peshwa Daftar (vol. VI), 1012-1018.
- Treasure-house of the Living Religions, 821.
- Rīti, Vāmana's theory of, 835-53.
- Rock Edict IV, remarks on, 76-87; 'agikhaṇḍha' in 84; 'hastin' in, 79f.; 'vimāna' in, 80ff., translation of, 86-7.
- Rudraśarman, 959f., author of Tamil Saṅgam, 73.
- Rudradāman, inscriptions of style in, 224f.
- Rummindei inscr., Buddha's birth-place mentioned in, 77.
- Saṅkarārya, Madhyama and Udāsīna described by, 778.
- Sāṅkhya, Original Buddhism and, 585ff.

- Saṅkhadhārin, official, 126.
 Śāntivarman, tour of, 234-5.
 Sarabhapur, kings of, 595.
 Śārasvatacitra-karmasāstra, unpublished work on painting, 908.
 Sarasvatī, Tantric influence in worship of, 693.
 Sarva, name, of Śiva, 796.
 Sārvadhātuka, grammatical meaning of, 279 f.
 Sarvajñanārāyaṇa, Madhyama and Udāsīna interpreted by, 774 ff.
 Sarvanāmasthāna, grammatical meaning of, 279 f.
 Sarvānanda, location of Udāsīna in commentary of, 781
 Sarvatathāgatasattvāvalokanabuddhakṣetrasandarśanavyūha, summary of, 567 ff.
 Sātakarṇi, Agnimitra contemporary of, 819.
 Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, flood referred to in, 997.
 Sātavāhana inscriptions, scheme in, 223-4; list of rulers in, 225 fn.
 Sātiyaputas, 89.
 Satvant, meaning of, 88-91.
 Sātvata meaning of, 88-91.
 Satya Yuga, Purāṇic account of, 880.
 Saumaṭikas, Kashmir tribe, 13.
 Sāhi, king of Kīra, 14; probable founder of Sāhi dynasty, 14 f.
 Sāhilladeva, Chambā founded by, 13.
 Sāhitya-darpaṇa, dramaturgy in, 982.
 Sāhiyā kings, Alberuni's account of, 15; connection of Kīras with, 15 f.
 Sakarambu inscr., object of, 494.
 Sakti, conception of, 684.
 Sākyamitra, disciple of Sākyaprabha, 709.
 Śālagrāma-śilā, worship of, 664 f., 796, 799
 Śālaṅkāyanas, date of, 214; genealogy of, 208 ff.
 Solmān, Persian poet, 952 f.
 Saluva Narasiṃha, Vijayanagara king 971.
 Saṅkarsakāṇḍa, authenticity of, 290 ff.; supplement to Pūrva-
 mimāṃsā Śāstra, 290-99; themes of, 292, 297.
 Sampāta, equinoctial point, two kinds of, 924 ff.
 Samudragupta, literary reference to, 930-3; relation of Licchavis with, 442.
 Sanatsujātaparvan, Śaṅkara's commentary on, 600.
 Sandhābhāṣā, meaning of, 4.
 Saṅgama, father of Harihara I, 533.
 Śaṅkara, 195; relation between Bhāskara and, 663 f.; subjectivism in philosophy of, 912 ff.
 Śaṅkarācārya, date of, 979.
 Sculptures (Brāhmanical), identification of, 161-9.
 Set-Mahet inscr., date of, 951; Gopāla mentioned in, 951.
 Setapadu inscr., object of, 491.
 Shāh Ali, 633 f.
 Shāh Jahān, Deccan campaign of, 639,
 Shāh Nawāz Khān, Ambar defeated by, 638 f.
 Sher Shah, coins of, 157.
 Siddhāntaleśa-saṅgraha, subjectivism in, 912 f.
 Siddhānta-muktāvalī, subjectivism in, 913.
 Siddhasenadivākara, logician, 793 f.
 Siddhicandra, disciple of Bhānucandra, 138.
 Śihabāhu, king, 742 f., 744, 972.
 Śihala, territory, 972 f.
 Śihapura, town, 742 ff., 972 f.; mentioned in inscriptions, 745 f.; Mahāvamsa account of Śihabāhu in, 972 f.
 Śikṣāsamuccaya, work of Śāntideva, 1 f., Tathāgataguhyā-sūtra quoted in, 1 f.
 Śilāditya, 486 f.
 Śilamahādevī, wife of Viṣṇuwardhana V, 741.
 Śilparatna, work on painting, 904 ff.
 Śiṃhala, island, 972 f.
 Śiṃhavarman, Pallava king, 65; date of, 213 fn.
 Śiṃhavarman II, Pallava king, 198.
 Sind, Arab conquest of, 12-13.

- Sinhalese, affinity of both eastern and western Indian dialects with, 747ff; Gujarati influence in, 750; Pāli influence in, 750.
- Sinhalese people, original home of, 742 ff.
- Siśupāla, Jarāsandha's alliance with, 856.
- Sivaśarman, 959 f.
- Sivali, daughter of Susimā, 742 f.
- Skandagupta, 989 f.
- Skandavarman, Śālaṅkāyana king, 209 ff.
- Smārta deities, Tāntric influence in, worship of, 694.
- Soddhala, Gujarat poet, 480; information about Dharmapāla supplied by, 486-7.
- Sokpal, grandson of Jaipal, 936.
- Somadevasūri, commentator, 780.
- Someśvara I, Cālukya king, 15, 94f., 954.
- Someśvara, types of pictures according to, 907.
- Somnath temple, Mahmud's invasion of, 941.
- Srāvaṇī ceremony, 927 f.
- Srī Kṛṣṇa, avatāra, 671 ff.; Bhakti cult and, 188 ff.; Avatāra doctrine and, 189; contributions to Indian thoughts by, 191 ff.; Sāṃkhya-Yoga-Vedānta synthesis of, 191 ff.; thoughts and events in days of, 188-9.
- Srīpuruṣottama, worship of, 693f.
- Sthānādhikārapuruṣa, function of, 125.
- Subjectivism, 912 ff.
- Sudevarāja, king, 595 f.
- Sulivajra, Buddhist donor, 232 f.
- Sultan Mahmud, Ānandapāl defeated by, 15.
- Sun, diagram bearing thousand names of, facing 137, 139; worshipped by Akbar, 137-40
- Suṅga gotra, 797 f.
- Suṅgas, 818.
- Śūnyatā, meaning of, 171; twenty aspects of, 170-87.
- Suppāraka, port, 743 f., 746 ff.
- Suraśmicandra, subordinate king, 786.
- Sūrya image, features of, 202 ff.
- Susimā, mother of Sihabāhu, 742.
- Sūtikā-ṣaṣṭhī-pūjā, Tāntric rites in, 689.
- Svetadvīpa, island, 884,
- Tailapa II, no defeat of Cedi king by, 132-6.
- Taj, achitecture and architect of, 872-9; actual artisans of, 875; supposed Italian architect of, 872 ff.
- Tāmalitti, port, 746.
- Tambapaṇṇi, 743.
- Tamil Saṅgam, compilation of, 72-3.
- Tāṇḍivāḍa inser, 736.
- Tantras, age of, 1-10; Nibandhas influenced by, 678ff.; social and religious life influenced by, 698 ff.
- Tantri, daughter of a minister, 930.
- Tantri-Kāmandaka, Gupta and Pāla kings mentioned in, 932-3.
- Tāntric cult, spread and popularity of, 681-3.
- Tapas, philological and traditional meaning of, 104-6.
- Tārīkh-i-Tājmāhala, 875 ff.
- Tathāgataguhya, see Guhyasamāja Tantra, 1 ff.
- Tathatā, Mādhyamikas and, 30-31.
- Tattvas of Raghunandana, influence of Tantra on, 678-704.
- Tattvasūddhi, 912 ff.
- Taxila, snake-sacrifice at, 806.
- Taxila inser., note on, 141-4.
- Taxila silver-scroll, interpretation of 'ayas' in, 141 ff.
- Tibet, Bogle's Embassy to, 420-38; foreign trade of, 425ff.; British connection with, 420 ff; Hindu ideas and customs in, 440; Muhammad Bakhtyar's expedition to, 49-62.
- Timbaruka-vihāra, erected by Duṭṭhagāmaṇi, 107.
- Time Buddhist explanation of, 153. Hindu conception of, 149-52; Jaina philosopher's view on, 152.
- Tirthikas, Ātman of, 30f.
- Tiruvalluvar, author of Kuṛal, 244f., 247.
- Tissa, brother of Duṭṭhagāmaṇi, 107.
- Tivararāja, charters and seals of, 596.
- Trilocaupal, emperor, 936. 938.


- Trirūpa Hetu, doctrine of, 503-10 ;
Jaina logicians' objection to, 506ff.
Trivikrama Deo, Bhañja king, 945ff.
Tretā Yuga, Purāṇic account of, 880-82
Turagādhikārapuruṣa, function of, 125.
Tura Kāvaseya, sage, 806.
Turuṣkas, 953 f.
Udakukkhepasīmā, explanation of,
109.
Udāsīna, political significance of, 770-83.
Udayacandra, military excursions of,
493 f.
Udayāditya, Udepur praśasti of, 954.
Udayapura-nagara, identification of,
584.
Ugra Tārā, characteristics and identi-
fication of, 166-7.
Umā-Maheśvara, images of, 588 ;
Gupta sculpture of, 588 ff.
Umāsvāti, Jain teacher, 794.
Upaniṣads, central idea of, 648 f. ;
Pāñcarātra and, 645-62 ; resem-
blances between Pāñcarātra and,
651-62 ; Pāñcarātra philosophy
derived from, 652.
Uparika-mahārājas, 786.
Upāya, doctrine of, 718 f.
Uṣavadāta, inscriptions of, 224.
Ustād Iśa, chief architect of Taj, 875,
879.
Uttararāmacarita, commentaries on ;
577-9.
Vācaspati Miśra, Bhāskara quoted by,
666 f. ; Dharmakīrtti quoted by,
979 f.
Vādirāja, disciple of Vyāsa Rāya, 971.
Vainyagupta Dvādaśāditya, 784-8,
989-91.
Vaiśālī, Licchavis of, 439-47 ; Lalita-
vistara account of, 443.
Vaiśampāyana, disciple of Kṛṣṇa
Dvaipāyana, 188.
Vaiṣṇavism, Sāṃkhya-Yoga-Vedānta
synthesis in, 195.
Vaivasvatī (goddess), description of,
165.
Vaijayantī, location of, 220 fn.
Vajrapāṇi Bodhisattva, dhāraṇi deli-
vered by, 231.
Vajrayāna, 712, 714 ff. ; Cittaviśuddhi
according to, 706 ff.
Vallabhā, queen, 480.
Vallabhācārya, Puṣṭimārga of, 300-6.
Vāmana, 835 ff. ; Dhvanikāras differ
from, 837 fn.
Vamatakṣanā, successor of Wima
Kadphises, 148.
Vapyaṭa, grandfather of Dharmapāla,
481 ; Rājabhāṭa identified with,
481.
Varāhamihira, 984 ff.
Vararuci, Kālidāsa's association with,
831 ff.
Varman kings, 960 fn.
Varṇaka, meaning of, 898.
Varuṇa, god, 515-20 ; arguments refut-
ing Hittite or Austro-Asiatic origin
of, 518-20 ; Buddhist and Brāhma-
ṇical traditions about, 517-8 ; de-
rivation of, 515 f. ; non-Aryan sea-
god identified by Przyluski with
518ff. ;
Vāsantī, Kālidāsa's association with,
833 f.
Vāsīṣka, 800.
Vāstuyāgatattva, Tāntric rites in, 689.
Vāsudeva, Parabrahman distinguish-
ed from, 676-7.
Veda, Phallus worship in, 103.
Vedānta, theory of illusoriness in,
912 ff.
Vedānta (monistic), two types of sub-
jectivism in, 912-22.
Vedānta Deśika, commentator, 669 f.
Vedikā, 992 f.
Veṅgī, country, 962 ff.
Vidyādhara-cārya, Tāntric writer, 679.
Vidyāranya, Advaita scholar, 970.
Vigrahapāla II, 789, 791.
Vijaya, son of Śīhabāhu, 742 ff.
Vijayabāhu I, king of Ceylon, 746.
Vijaya Dāsa, religious teacher, 972.
Vijayāditya I, son of Viṣṇuwardhana
III, 494, 741 ; inscriptions during
reign of, 494-5.
Vijayāditya II, king, 736 ff, 963 ;
inscriptions during reign of, 736 f. ;
title cf, 736.

- Vijayamahādevī, chief queen of Viṣṇu-
vardhana III, 491, 494.
- Vijayanagara, rise of, 521-66; table
showing age, dynasty and qualify-
ing phrases of rulers of, 534-66.
- Vijayanandīvarman, prince, 746.
- Vijigīṣu, 770.
- Vijñāna Bhikṣu, 672.
- Vijñaptimātratā-siddhi, 997.
- Vikaṭā image, attributes and identi-
fication of, 167.
- Vikramahendra, king, 957.
- Viṣvāyākura, Hippokoura and Kolha-
pur, equated with, 257-8.
- Vimalamati, author of Bhāgavṛtti,
949f.
- Vira Ballāla III, King, 523 ff.
- Viṣṇudharmottara, conception of Ma-
dhyama in, 777; work on painting,
904ff.
- Viṣṇuism, Pāñcarātra and, 646.
- Viṣṇukundins, chronology of, 957ff;
date of, 959ff.; genealogy of,
273-8.
- Viṣṇuwardhana III, inscriptions during
reign of, 491-3.
- Viṣṇuwardhana IV, son of Vijayāditya
I, 495ff.
- Viṣṇuwardhana V, 741ff.; epithets of,
741; inscriptions during reign of,
741.
- Vrātya, earlier references to, 444ff.
- Vrātyas, Licchavis regarded as, 440,
445ff.
- Vyāsa Rāya, disciple of Pada Rāya,
971.
- Vyavahārin, function of, 126.
- Vyavalokana-prātihārya Dhāraṇī,
574.
- Vyūhas, doctrine of, 646 fn.
- Yājñavalkya, Śrikrṣṇa prior to,
188.
- Yājñavalkyasmṛti, Udāsīna located in,
779.
- Yallaya, commentator of Laghu-
mānasam, 255ff.; date of, 255fn.
- Yāna (after death), nature and classi-
fication of, 18ff.
- Yantras, medium of worship, 685f.
- Yaśobhañja, king, 759.
- Yaśomatī, mother of Rājyavardhana,
891.
- Yaśovarman, king, 951; Kiras in
Khajuraho inscr. of, 14.
- Yātrā-tattva, Purānic and Tāntric in-
fluence in, 688.
- Yerraguḍi Minor Rock proclamation,
'Jānapada' and 'Yūgyācariyāni'
in, 583.
- Yewur Grant, Tailapa's victory over
Muñja mentioned in, 134f.
- Yoga, deity-worship related with, 45,
interrelation between Sāṃkhya
and, 191.
- Yogācāras, citta according to, 712, 714,
720f.
- Yogīndra, disciple of Jagannātha Dāsa,
972.





905/IND



143157

