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On Foreign Element in the Tantra

The Tantra still remains an enigma to us. Very little work has been done in this domain and very little attempt has been made in the interpretation of its doctrines. But the fact remains that a vast literature has been written on it—a literature which is mostly found in manuscripts. The Tantras can be broadly divided into two classes—orthodox and heterodox. The orthodox Tantras are mainly represented by the Āgamas, the Yamalas and their supplements. The heterodox Tantras are both Buddhist and Brāhmaṇical and are represented by the texts of a number of Tantrik schools like Kulācāra, Vāmācāra, Sahajayāna, Vajrayāna etc. In the present article I will deal with a number of indications contained in the Tantrik literature which definitely points out that mystic practices of foreign origin crept into the heterodox class of Indian Tantras at a very early date.

Mr. H. P. Sastri in his Catalogue of the Palm-Leaf Mss. of the Darbar Library, Nepal (1905, p. lxxix) quotes a very significant stanza from the Kūbijā-tantra which points out that the Kūbijā School of Tantras is probably of foreign origin:

---

1 The Substance of this paper was read at the Anthropological Section of the 6th All-India Oriental Conference held at Patna, December, 1930.
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Gacica tvam bhārate vareśa' dhikaraya sarvataḥ |
Pithopapithakṣetresu kuru sṛṣṭir anekadhā ||

"Go to India to establish yourself in the whole country and make manifold creations in the sacred places of primary and secondary importance."

In another place in the same Tantra the Tantras of this school are said to have originated among the potters, a low class Hindu, and this is why they are said to have belonged to the Kulalikamnaya. It is prescribed there that the Goddess Kubjikā should be worshipped in the house of a potter.

A certain number of Tantrik practices styled Cīnācāras have been much discussed by scholars. The Tura-Tantra adopted by both Hinduism and Buddhism says that the cult of Cīna-Tāra came from the country of Mahā-Cīna. Vasiṣṭha, one of the greatest sages of Brāhmaṇism, is said to have gone to the country of Mahā-Cīna to meet Buddha, who was to be found at that time neither in India nor in Tibet. Vasiṣṭha was initiated there by Buddha to the secret doctrines of Cīnācāra and subsequently came back to India to propagate them. In this Cīnācāra Prof. Sylvain Lévi finds distant echo of the secret societies which existed in China (Le Népal, I, pp. 346f.). On my part while discussing one of the Sadhanas published by Dr. Binayatosh Bhattacharya (no. 127 of the Sādhanamāla) I have tried to establish the identity of Mahā-Cīna-Tārā with Ekajatā, whose cult is said to have been recovered by Siddha Nāgārjuna in Tibet (I. H. Q., vol. VI, pp. 584ff.). The Sādhanas of the Goddess Ekajatā was discovered by him in the country of Bhoṭa (Ārya-Nāgārjunapāḍāiḥ Bhoteṣu uddāntau). The description of Ekajatā is found in six different Sādhanas (123-128). It closely agrees with that of Mahācīnakrama-Tārā as found in Sādhanas 100 and 101. A comparison of these two goddesses show that they are essentially identical, the only difference being in the Bija-mantra; in the case of Cīnakrama-Tārā, it is composed of three letters, and in the case of Ekajatā, it is sometimes composed of 4 and sometimes of 5 letters. Corresponding to these goddesses we find in the Hindu Pantheon Tārā, Ugratārā, Kkajatā, and Mahā-Nilasarasvatī. The dhyānas of these goddesses as found in the Hindu Tantras literally correspond with those found in the Buddhist Sādhanas. In my article already referred to I have also quoted from the Sammohana Tantra found by me in Nepal the following significant passage about the origin of this goddess:
“The Maheśvara said unto Brahmā, hear from me about Mahā Nilasarasvatī with attention. It is through her favour that you will narrate the four Vedas. There is a lake called Cola on the western side of the Meru. The mother, goddess Nīlogratārā was born there... the light issuing from my upper eye fell into the lake Cola and took a blue colour. There was a sage called Akṣobhya, who was Śiva himself in the form of a muni, on the northern side of the Meru. It was he who meditated first on the goddess (?), who was Pārvatī herself reincarnating in Cinadeśa at the time of the great deluge.”

According to this text Nilasarasvatī or Ugratārā was born in a lake called Cola on the western side of the Meru; which was included in the Cinā-deśa. I suggested that Cola is probably to be connected with the common word for lake, kul, kol, which is found with the names of so many lakes to the west and north of the Tien shan that is in the pure Mongolian zone.

There are ample evidences to prove that the zone of heterodox Tantras went far beyond the natural limits of India. Some of the Tantras divide the Tantrik world into three krāntās or regions, Viṣṇukrāntā, Aśvakrāntā and Rathakrāntā. Viṣṇukrāntā comprises the region from the Vindhya to Chaṭṭala (Chittagong), Aśva-krāntā, the region from the Vindhya to Mahācīna including Nepal, and Rathakrāntā from the Vindhya to the great ocean including Kamboj and Java (see Avalon, Principles of the Tantra, vol. II, Introd.).

In the Sammohā Tantra (fol. 7 a-b) we find a similar enumeration of Tantrik zones. The zones are here fixed according to two different Tantrik modes, known as Kādi and Hādi. The countries in which the Kādi mode is in vogue are the following:—


The countries in which the Hādi mode is in vogue are the following:—

Aṅga, Vaiṅga, Kaliṅga, Suviraka, Kāśmira, Kāmboja, Saurāṣṭra, Magadhā, Mahārāṣṭra, Mālava, Nepāla, Kerala, Cola, Cala, Gauḍa, Malaya, Sīṃhala, Voonka (?), Vido (?), Vyonda (?), Karnāṭa, Lāṭa, Māiṭa, Panaṭa, Andhaka, Pulindaka, Hūpa, Kaura, Gandhāra, Vidarbha,
Videha, Bālhika, Barbara, Kekaya, Kośala, Kuntala, Kirāta, Śūrasena, Sevara, (? Sauvitra), Banaṭa, Taṅkaṇa, Koṅkaṇa, Matsya, Madra, Maida, Saindhava, Pārśvākika, Dyorjāla, Yavana, Jala, Jalandhara, Salva (? Šalva), Sindhu.

Two points are noteworthy about the zones described above. A number of countries beyond India are enumerated and described as the centres of Tantrik culture. These are—Bālhika (Balkh), Kirāta (the hill tribes of the Himalayan zone), Bhoṭa (Tibet), Cīna (China), Mahācīna (Mongolia ?), Maida (Media ?), Pārśvākika (? Pārāṣika—Persia), Airāka (Irāk ?), Kamboja, Hūṇa, Yavana, Gandhāra and Nepāla. It is not to be literally believed that Tantrik culture ever spread to all those distant countries. The truth is perhaps that some heterodox schools of Tantras associated themselves with those countries either through tradition or through the community of some mystic beliefs, of which the history is lost to us. We should further note in this connection that even within the limits of India some non-Aryan groups of people like Pulinda, Kirāta, Barbara, Taṅkaṇa, Ābhīra, Kuntala etc. are connected with that particular culture.

Another important point to be noted is that within the limits of India the countries of the outer zone only are enumerated. The Mid-Land (Madhyadeśa), the country of the orthodox Brāhmaṇical culture, is practically excluded except the doubtful reference to Kaura or Kaurava and Kośala which may very well be Southern Kośala. In an article published in the Indian Historical Quarterly (Vol. VI, pp. 98ff.) I have tried to establish that the Mid-Land was the country of the orthodox Tantrik culture of which the 18 Āgamas and their supplements formed the sacred literature. But the countries around it like Kāmarūpa, Kāśmīra, Kaliṅga, Koṅkaṇa, Kāṇci, Kośala etc. were not fit places for its cultivation. The Brahmins of those countries were unfit to be priests according to the orthodox Tantras. So it is evident that in these countries on the outer zone grew later on a sort of Tantrik culture which was of a different inspiration.

The unknown compiler of the Sammoha Tantra does not remain contented by simply enumerating the different countries. He pretends to possess some knowledge of the Tantras current in some of these countries. Thus on fol. 27b while referring to the Tantras of different schools, he says that the country of Cīna possesses 100 primary and 7 subsidiary Tantras (कतम तत्रिः के ते उपतत्रिः
saptā ca), Drāviḍa has 20 primary and 25 subsidiary Tantras, Kerala has 60 subsidiary Tantras and so on.

The sacred centres (pīṭhasthānas) of primary importance, as found in the heterodox Hindu Tantras and the Buddhist Tantras are four in number, Kāmarūpa, Pūrṇagiri, Uḍḍiyāna and Jalandhara. Pūrṇagiri has not yet been definitely identified, but there is no doubt that Uḍḍiyāna corresponds to the Swat valley, of which the people used to make “the acquisition of magical formulæ their occupation” (Watters, On Yuan Chwang, i, p. 225) already in the time of Hiuen Tsang in the beginning of the seventh century A.D. Jālandhara and Kāmrūpa have not changed their names since ancient times. All these three places are situated on the high roads leading to countries outside India—Uḍḍiyāna situated in the valley of the Swat river, easily accessible to the Upper valley of the Indus, has been the meeting place of the peoples of different origin. It is situated on the high road that connects the Upper valley of the Indus with Balkh, Samarcand etc., on the one hand and the Pamirs, Khotan, Kashgar etc. on the other by the valley of the Gilgit. Jālandhara is situated on another highway that connects Tibet with India through the Shipki pass, and Kāmrūpa has to a great extent been the centre of activities of foreign peoples who have been coming down from the Northern and the North-eastern hills since very ancient times. It is probably not without significance that Bhāskaravarman who was the king of Kāmrūpa told a Chinese envoy to India that his forefathers had come to India from the country of Mahācīna and requested him to send a Sanskrit translation of Tao-te-king, the sacred text of Taoism and a portrait of Lao tzu, its founder. In ancient times a land route connected Assam with Western and Southern China through the Patkoi hills and Upper Burma, and this route was generally followed by the invaders and immigrants from the North-East.

II

I will now proceed to deal with particular Tantrik texts that contain direct references to practices of decidedly foreign origin. The Jayadratha Yāmala, which I have elsewhere proved to be a compilation of the 8th century A.D., while discussing the special doctrines of different Tantrik schools, mentions amongst others the practices
of the Lāmās (Lāmūvarga), Śākinīs and Yoginis (Jayadratha
Yāmala, Śaṭka III, folia 187a, 193b). The texts in which these
practices are described are sometimes very obscure. Following is
roughly the substance:—

The special doctrine of the Lāmās is conducive to spiritual success
(siddhi). According to it one should not cultivate the company of
other gods except Śiva (?). The words of the Guru as embodied
in the Tantras may or may not be followed. One should have all
worldly desires and need not follow the strict discipline. He should
not have satisfaction in (current) religious doctrines and practices.
He should think that it is his self that is alone present everywhere
and practise self-control in the company of women. He should
perform religious acts on particular auspicious days according to
the prescribed discipline. He should not be angry even at the
gravest provocation. Such is the practice of the group of
Lāmās.

According to the special doctrine of the Śākinīs the adept should
never divulge the mantras to others. He should practise samādhi
in company of all women, should always meditate on the nūda, take
his meals at night and worship Śiva. He should not violate the
discipline of his sect during the Daksināyana, should practise self-
control by all means, should maintain his own Kula and should
avoid the intermixture of Kulas. He should have himself undis-
turbed with respect to body, speech and mind either in his own Kula
or in that of others. He should have his meals in company of
the Yogins. Those who follow the doctrines of the Śākinīs do not
uselessly kill animals for the sake of sacrifice.

Now who are the Lāmās and Śākinīs, of whom the special prac-
tices are just described? The ġākintis, rākintis, lākintis, śākinīs
and hākinīs are mentioned as the female energies (Śaktis) of the
Tantrik deities respectively called ġāmeśvaranātha, rāmeśvaranātha,
lāmeśvaranātha, kākeśvaranātha, śameśvaranātha, and hāmeśvara-
nātha who together with their sakties, form mystic groups designated
under the mnemonic ḍa ra la ka ṣa ha. The Lord of Lāmā is
here called Lāmeśvara. Lāmā is not the commonly known Tibetan
word Bla-ma meaning 'scholar', but something different. The Lāmās
are mentioned in the Jayadratha Yāmala on two other occasions in
the same context (192a):—

Durlabhā Kāśyapīvargena pañcāṃrtavivardhita /
Rūpikā Cumbikā Lāmā paravṛttātha pālikā //
Anivarta ca...dvesi janmántara-samudbhavä
Vikhyāti raktamādau tu bhrūbhaṅgaḥ kurute tataḥ //
Etastu saṃgamenāiva param siddhim dadanti ca /
Saṃhṛtyārthādaya paścācca punarmarṣayet //
..................ālāpenāpi cumbati
Cumbikā sā'nuvijñeyā yoginibaladarpitā.............
Niśvāsai bhairavaista stu Lāmānāṁ tu vinirdiṣet //

The Lāmās otherwise called Rūpikā and Cumbikā flourish among
the rare group of the Kāśyapīs. Association with them is conducive
to spiritual success. They are called Rūpikā because they assume
different shapes during their intercourse with others. They are called
Cumbikā because they kiss at the very first introduction.

In the Hevajra Tantra (Paṭala III fol. 6a) the Lāmās are referred
to in the company of the ḍākinīs and called Khāṇḍarohā and
Rūpiṇī.

Ḍākinī tu tathā Lāmā Khāṇḍarohā tu Rūpiṇī /

The Lāmās therefore constituted a mystic group of female Tantrik
adepts who had their special practices. The Sammohā Tantra
(fol. 39b) in another place distinctly refers to a Tantrik practice
(vidyā) called Lamayāmnaya i.e. the āmnāya of the Lamas or Lāmās.

The Lāmās are also known from other sources. Waddell in his
Lamaism (p.364) describes in detail a goddess called in Tibetan Lha-mo.
She is also called paldan Lha mo (Skt. Devī or Śrī Devī). She is the
“goddess or the queen of the warring weapons”. She “like her great
prototype the goddess Durgā of Brāhmaṇism is perhaps the most
malignant and powerful of all the demons, and the most dreaded.
She is credited with letting loose the demons of disease and her name
is scarcely ever mentioned and only then with bated breath and
under the title of the great queen. In her pictures she is pictured
as surrounded by flame and riding on a white-faced mule, upon a saddle
of her own son’s skin flayed by herself. She is clad in human skins
and is eating human brains and blood from a skull and she wields
in her right hand a trident rod. She is publicly worshipped for
seven days by the Lāmās of all sects, especially at the end of the 12th
month in connection with the prevention of disease for the incoming
year. And in the cake offered are added amongst other ingredients
the fat of a black goat, blood, wine, dough, and butter and these
are placed in a bowl made from a human skull”. In Western Tibet
Lha-mos and ḍākinīs are represented as beautiful young women but
more often with fearful faces etc., to signify their power "to destroy
demons whom it is their mission to combat." First in rank stands
Lha-mo (Mahākāli), "mother of the gods." She is represented in 15
different forms, but specially as a woman of frightful aspect holding
a club with a dead man's head at its end and a skull for cap.

It the district of Kanaur Buddhists believe in (i) Paldan Lamo,
the supreme goddess equivalent to Mahākāli, (ii) Sai Lamo or the
goddess Devi Bhagavati, (iii) Sai Lamo or Baṭuka Bhairva (The
Punjab Castes and Tribes, I, pp. 82, 83, 91 etc.).

We thus see that in Tibet in modern times the Lāmās who are
certainly the same as the Lamos are conceived as goddesses of the
type of Kāli and worshipped according to rites that can be called
Tantrik. It seems that in more ancient times these Lāmās, like
many other goddesses of the Tantrik pantheon, were female Tantrik
adepts who later on came to be worshipped. It is the practice
of these adepts of Tibetan mysticism that is referred to in the
Tantrik texts mentioned before. That these Lamos were in the
habit of kissing people at their first meeting with them seems to be
a direct reference to the Tibetan mode of greeting by showing the
tongue.

In this connection I may be permitted to make a few suggestions
about the other groups of female adepts of Tantrik mysticism, e.g.,
the lākinis, the ḍākinis, the śākinis. In Western Tibet, the
land of sorcerers and witches, there is a class of sorcerers called
Lha-ka (probably Lha-k'a) or god's mouth-piece (also called Ku T'em
ba). They "are frequently found in Western Tibet and may be
females and in which case the woman may marry without hindrance
to her profession. These wizards are especially resorted to for
relief of pain" (Ibid., pp. 482 ff.). Lākinis seem to have been the
name adopted in the Tantrik literature for these wizards. Similar
types of witches distantly connected with the Dags (the people of
Dāgistan) and Śakas were probably referred to in the Tantras as
ḍākinis and śākinis respectively. Evidence is not wanting to
prove that women still have a great rôle in the spiritual life of diffe-
rent peoples of this zone as well as that of Central Asia and Mongo-
lia.1

1 Mahāmahopādhyāya H. P. Śastri told me one day that the
worship of Lāmādevī is prevalent in some parts of Midnapur. But
I have not been able to collect any other information on it. I am
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I have elsewhere tried to prove that the Tantrik doctrines were usually garbed in a mystic language. In the Buddhist Tantras it is called Sandhābhāṣā or Sandhāvacana. It is sometimes very difficult to penetrate into that language and arrive at the real interpretation of the doctrines.

The Jayadratha Yāmala while describing the special practices of the Lāmās mentions the special language to be used with them. This language is described as monosyllabic (Ekākṣara-samullāpa) and may thus be considered to have belonged to the Sino-Tibetan family as the Lāmās themselves belonged to the Tibetan group of mystics. The Lāmās, according to this language, had 24 different names:—Yogini, Rūpiṇī, Lāmā, Śākini, Nālinī, Khagī, Cult, Bilā, Trikhagagā, Peśini, Dehinī, Jalā, Revati, Bedhanī, Lukī, Paḍabhi, Raktini, Hisā (?), Karoṭhi, Kaluśī, Bhadrā, Dundubhi, Mukharā, and Āturā. We have already seen that the Lāmās were Rūpikā as they were capable of assuming different shapes. Some of the 24 names enumerated are descriptive of such shapes which they could assume.

A number of words belonging to the language of the Lāmās is mentioned in the Jayadratha Yāmala. A comparison of these words with Tibetan and with other allied languages of the Himalayan zone clearly shows that they were culled from some dialect of that family. There are only two difficulties in establishing the identity of these words. As I have to depend on a single manuscript of the text preserved in the Darbar Library of Nepal and as that ms. also is in parts corrupt on account of the negligence of the copyists, I have not always been able to determine the real forms of the words. The words as transcribed in the text always possess a vowel ending though we are told at the outset that the language is a monosyllabic one. We have to remember that the compiler of the text could not always faithfully transcribe the words as they belonged to a foreign tongue. Besides we are not yet in a position to determine the real forms of the words in question as they were in the 8th century A.D., when the text was compiled, also informed that a goddess called Rākini is worshipped at Ghāt-śilā in the Santal Perganās. This goddess may have some connection with our Rākini.
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Our knowledge of the Tibetan dialects of that period is still very limited. A few such words are given below:

**abhivādāna**—bipśa? Tibetan—gdo-bsu—greeting.

**svāgatam**—nāristi, bibi; in the Sammohaka Tantra (28*) Nārīśa is said to be the word for praṇava according to the traditions of some Tantrik schools (urdhvaṁnaye...nārīśa praṇava parikirtita). bibi—bib cf. Tibetan phibs-bsu meaning ‘welcome’.

**mātā**—Lāsabhā = *lasabhf cf. Ma’i tshabs meaning ‘mother’ in Tibetan. Lha as in Lhā-mo means devi. The word, therefore, may be connected with Lha tshabs.

**bhagīṇī**—bhāgīṇī?

**duhitā**—duhīnti?

**svāśrū**—bhiḥ samant

cf. Tib pha, a-pha meaning ‘father’.

**bhṛtṛjyā**—nimi śmi?

**patrī**—gusu naye, there may be three different words here, gu su, naye; for the last two cf. Tib. chuṁ ma and Chinese nīw.

**mātula**—māṛṣya?

**pitā**—pīdimistho?

**napāti**—trimini?

**pitāmaha**—bālusī? for ‘grandfather’ cf. Tib. po-bo, po’o-lags; Sikimese—jojo-o.

**mātāmaha**—pilapite nunoni?

for ‘grandmother’—Tib. mo’o laṭ, a phyi laṭ, Sikimese— a ņogs, a naṭ.

**sura bhakta**—airiṣaṁ?

**pakṣīram**—āpīṣi?

**dadhi**—dī?

**ājya**—limaṁ?

**bhōjana**—dekaram, the real word seems to be *de for which cf. Lepcha, zo, tha, and Magar jeu, Tib. za-ba.

**gūḍha**—duma?

**svāminī**—japam = jāp cf. Tib. zab meaning ‘husbanding’.

**piṭāmi**—barise?

**āgataḥ**—eni re *eni cf. Newar-wone, Tib. ‘on ba etc. meaning ‘to come.’

**gacchāmi**—nigānitesi; the correct form probably was *nigānire which may contain two words ni, ga and the suffix re, cf. Tib. gyo, gyok; Lepcha non; Murmi, nyu etc.

upta bīja—nibinakā, vulg. nilinītigī?

samudra—andhaaśāyō?

prthivī—anānt cf. Sokpa—wonnish.


supta—dveyāśint?

nagarāstriddha—adhenā susurā?

śādhyā—piśitāla?

svabhuja—paśabarā?


hasti—tiśīlā?


aja—āniḍa—anīḍ cf. Tib. —ra, Bhutanese—rah, Magar-rha, Gurungra; gardabha—kharag?

gāva—śrota jabaṅ?

for ‘tiger’ cf. Sokpa—par.

mṛga—śrīra kolo, probably mistake for śība kol?

for Chepang—kosya, Tib. śa ba., Tib. (spoken)-śa-p’o; Ladaki-śa-po.

sarpa—sahini?

vijātayāḥ—kahiśeṣa?

Besides these rapprochements another important fact is to be noted. The few verbs that are mentioned in the list—enire, barire, nigārire etc. end in re. Hodgson in his Comparative Vocabulary of these languages notes that in Limbu the suffix re is usually found with the verbs, cf. pārē—to give, phērē—to come, pirē—to give, tērē—to take away, sērē—to kill etc.

1 For the comparison I have mostly depended on this Vocabulary of Hodgson.
The words belonging to the language of the Lāmas discussed above therefore further corroborate the fact that these yoginis belonged to some Tibetan race and that the compiler of the Hindu and Buddhist Tantras had a real knowledge of their practices. For facilitating intercourse with them a selection of some common words of their language was also made by them. The mystics, both female and male of India, really used to have regular intercourse with those of other contiguous countries in ancient times, and through this intercourse, exchange of ideas and practices were made. It is for that reason that we still find in the Tantras vestiges of mystic doctrines foreign to India.

**THE TEXTS**

I

\[ (\text{fol. t87}\text{a}) \]

\[ \text{चन्द्रिन्न् देरवारसूरी हाल...हालवै...हालवै...} \]

\[ \text{लोके सुचना व विकल्पवांशार्येन।} \]

\[ \text{विषयं शोभपिछलेन निम्ले वि अपशाहनी।} \]

\[ \text{मन्यार्यार्येनं अपसादी सत्ता सर्वं।} \]

\[ \text{ब्राह्मण सम्बंत: पश्चिन भवितपिरामित।} \]

\[ \text{ब्राह्मणसंस्कृत भवितसंस्कृत।} \]

\[ \text{गारीपरं रत्नावनं संयमी विवाह वत्तन।} \]

\[ \text{तिथी निश्चित क्रमं नियमं: परिभूषित।} \]

\[ \text{大厅ऽन्न लामार्स सम्बाहु निवेष।} \]

\[ \text{शोभिवरणो शैव निष्क्रियों को भवित।} \]

\[ \text{प्रेमी समया मोल्ल लामार्सथित।} \]

* From the *Jayadratha Yāmala*, Šaṭaka, III, paper ms. no. 375 of the Nepal Darbar Library. I have printed the text as it is without proposing any emendation.

I The underlined passages are supposed to be the eleven questions to be put to the Yoganis while meeting them in deep dark nights. The language in which they are garbed is characterised as *Paiśāca Sanskrit* i.e. the Sanskrit of the Piśācas. Nothing could be made out of these questions, though their explanation is given in the verses that follow.
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(fol. 189b)

प्रखण्डीर्य चैव मिष्टं कप्यदपशिति।
योणिन्द्र कालकौत्तसं जापका यथू लाभात॥
शेषाहृत्य: योगु यमोऽग्रं यथोऽग्रं मत:॥
मयोऽग्रेः सत्य चत्वरिष्ट: परिकूपितम:॥
तथेऽ ब्रह्म निलचितमि लामा च तत्तीयवां।
पतुतावत्व मील्य चतुर्मै निर्विते सिद्ध:॥
प्रकोणवत्वः अम्भो भक्ताभिः स।
दुर्मोि पदरने प्रत्त वन्तमि सुन्ते।॥
एते प्राक्ष्यायानि पहलो परित्वितः॥
शति कौशलदाडिव यागानि सम्भवं परं॥
एत अणाधुश्चिष्ठ चेतिनेतिस्यैवति।
चदन्दे देवि दुर्बल: प्रधी योगकर्षरशिः॥
तिसी द्वितियांगानि चौरी तीनोिन्नानि।
गतान्तर मणाप्रो गदवी दूषितमः पर:॥
विनिनासा सुनीमासा वराहिः नेनराधकः।
करारानि दशमा सातीयापमि च तथा॥
दुमोखित प्राहमः॥
योगमिनश्रवत्वः शीष्यपालसं दुबद्ध॥
गाठमातितं तथा एकतमो भमामः॥
श्रवकरशमिष्टिर दैशायां सन्तुतं वदेन॥
वौटायमेश्वराय प्रसमधा वरमाने।।
साय भिन्नोमदाभि क्वित्यथा रमेदनि॥
विवाययृ प्रभिति व तत्तीयव विभेदमः॥
प्रविकारणमा लामा परिभंस्किति सुन्ते॥
जन्मेत्वा तु देविष्ट भेदिः परिभीतिः॥
नाभवतमवृक्षो एयनाभावमहोः॥
धर्माय एकोति प्रसमधा वरमाने।॥
प्रवायचक्षयावतु विवृ इतिभविष्य॥
सा नौ मतोन्न सन्ता चाचाप्रियति तत्तुर।।
महाविष्ठि महाबोध गमने ग न नाहाति॥
गला तु मानुषाकं आणुमयाति सम्भवि।
ON FOREIGN ELEMENT IN THE TANTRA

शास्त्रज्ञ वरेण्यविवाही वर्णणः।।
शुरुद्भूत नमार्धदा नमोऽय नमस्या तस्।।
महानालयार्थे यति यती तथा तस्य रूपसः।।
रजाहता तथा कार्य सत्यमानीवर्णम्।।
श्रीति सन्तापद्राच धीरजनाहिनं संसमैि।।
कथितं तथा इवं भुजार्थे भुजार्थः पदः।।
तत्तसुतार्थः इवैव ग्रहणात्मा विकर्षण।।
चर्मधारान विभिन्नति मारिष्य विष्य खुलताः।।
नाथभा श्रीति माता तु मातोऽय मातोऽयः कूलः।।
दशकः दशकिणिर्भाषाः पुष्पमः समवी विन्दः।।
नीलिनिक्षितिः भाषागः पन्नी गुसुमुबः तथा।।
काले मातुः मेयोऽ पित्रिभिवाही पिता तथा।।
विभिन्नित्वं तथा भासा भासुविन्नति विसाच।।
नाथभा विसाचिते दुमानः विनिशोंंनिता।।
पौराणिकी बायोसः पार्वीरायौथमः।।
द्विध विधं निर्मित चास्य देकरं भोजनं तथा।।
इनुगुठूः विसेयो जयसूवाहिति सामिनि।।
विभिन्नितिः विनिशां पितां भास्यं।।
विनिशेण्यी वस्त्रालि सुनवः सुन्नुवादः।।
जातविकी नीलिमिन्नति भासा नीलिमिन्नति तथा।।
चार्मार्थो सुनुरवः भागाती दर्थिविवृत्ताः।।
काले पश्यं देविः सुखपवाली तथा।।
पुष्यं सुसुराक्षः नरशालयाः।।
विभिन्ताः तथा काभा।।
तुसुसालू पुरवाधवा।।
इस्मोगिः तथा पञ्ची दिविला दिविलाः।।
कुक्त जन्त तथा कष्णा।।
मेवोऽयं तथा वस्त्रां जराविवहाः।।
वर्णशः चुहुरः देवी नीलिविवहाः।।
गद्धभी खर्छः मेयोऽ सायः।।
सुरवासा यथा।।
सुतिनिर्माता तथा सन्ता कृतिजीवन विजयं।।
विभिन्ताः बहारीः विवर्णवर्गं आत्मा।।
पररविवर्देशं पदं कैव सहान्वे।।
ON FOREIGN ELEMENT IN THE TANTRA

जत्यपन, भक्ति भक्तियं भक्तियानमभावनम न।
श्रीविष्णु श्रीविष्णु श्रीविष्णु श्रीविष्णु श्रीविष्णु श्रीविष्णु श्रीविष्णु

(Jol. 1910)

कर्तृत्वमश्च चेतां चेतां चेतां चेतां चेतां चेतां चेतां चेतां चेतां चेतां

ग्राम्य बोटः च एतां द्रम्य नामां भष्यं

प्रेतायुगीनां महात्मां निषिद्धमुयुष्यं

सम्बन्धनीयां भौण्ड चच्चासाधारां

लोकों चेतां चेतां चेतां चेतां चेतां चेतां चेतां चेतां चेतां चेतां

गृहाशु महात्मां नमः निषिद्धात्त्व गृहान्तः

नायुक्तिशीलवा देवी दुःस्मु गृहान्तः

समाजीय भौण्ड चेतां चेतां चेतां चेतां चेतां चेतां चेतां

द्रष्टान्तः च चेतां चेतां चेतां चेतां चेतां चेतां

कुम शाक्तिनी दुरेति भण्डां चेतां चेतां चेतां

एकाचरां सम्बन्धवा एवे मातमश्च न।

ADDITIONAL NOTE—While examining some Mss. in the Asiatic Society of Bengal for other studies, I have recently come upon another text concerning the Lāmās. It is found in the Buddhist compendium called Abhidhānottara, preserved in the Government collection (see also H. P. Sastri, Catalogue of the Government Collection of Buddhist Mss., 1917, No. 10759). The Ms. was copied in 1298 A.D. One of the sec-
tions (pañala) is called the Lāmūlakṣaṇa-pañala (fol. 836 ff.). The Lāmās are conceived here as female ascetics of different types. One of the types is described as possessed with well proportioned limbs (sanyāgaṅgāvayava), and round face (mukhān yasyās tu dhīyate parimaṇḍalam). They have long eye-lashes, and are well-dressed (svastra), beautiful and truthful (saunyā, satyavādini). They are faithful to their true religion and brave sisters (saddharmaratā nityān virabhagīnyā). The dharma and karma mudrās are to be used with them. Another type of Lāmās has long lips (lamboṭhī), red grey eyes (rakta-piṅgala-locanā), auspicious looks and are fair like the Campaka flowers (subhagā dhanyā gaurī campaka-sannībhā). They are tall (dīrghā), have fearful faces (karaḷā) and are fond of coloured dresses (vicitra-vasana-priyā). They laugh and play and stand obstructing the route (hasate ramate caiva mārgam ākrāmya tiṣṭhati). The ēśā mudrā is to be used with them.

A third type of Lāmās is red and fair (rakta-gaurū) and has red, grey eyes (rakta-piṅgala-locanā). They have wavy hairs and put on a sort of head-dress (kvāciṇā ca tathā keśā paḷlabandha uire tathā) and they have one wrinkle on their forehead (lalite ḍṛṣyate caiva ekarekhi). They are long necked, and fond of singing. They are particularly restless and save in quarrels (caḷaccittā viśeṣaṇa kalakeṣu ca rakṣate). The ūakti mudrā is to be used with them.

The last type of Lāmās is short statured and is fond of yellow cloths (krasvā sthūla-jaṅghā pitavastra-priyā); they have dark grey eyes (kṛṣṇapiṅgala-locanā) and are dreadfully looking (karaḷavikṛtaṁghorā sthūla syāt sthūlavaktraja | lamboṭhī kṛṣṇavarṇa ca kolārakṣi rūṇa- nāśika ||). They are fond of dancing, have dark colour and are charming (nītya-gandharvavakeṣā meghavarṇa manoharā). The Nāga-mudrā is to be used with them. Such Lāmās are called Heruka-lāmās (Śrī-herukāṇa ca lāmānām etadbhavati lakṣaṇam).

The text further speaks of the dākinīs and the symbolic language to be used with them. I will deal with this symbolic language along with other similar Tantric devices in my next article. During my stay in Nepal I did not succeed in getting any information either about the Lāmos or Lāmodēvi. I am however informed by some Nepalese of Nayakot that there are temples of Lāmo devīs in the interior of Nepal. The Tibetan Bla-mas only are entitled to enter the temples for worshipping them. It is currently believed also that if any body enters the temple he is sure to die.

P. C. Bagchi
Dhorail Inscription of the Reign of Mahmud Shah, Śaka 1455.

I.H.Q., March, 1931
Dhorail Inscription of the Reign of Mahmud
Shah : Śaka 1455

The inscribed stone under notice was discovered by Kumar Sarat Kumar Ray, at the village of Dhorail, in the district of Dinajpur, in course of one of his early tours in North Bengal for investigation and collection of antiquities of old Varendra. It is now being exhibited in the Museum of the Varendra Research Society.

The inscription is cut on a sand-stone slab pointed at the top, measuring 39" high x 15½" broad x 5" thick. The writing covers a space of 25" x 14", and is arranged in 10 lines on one side of the stone. The reverse side is rough. The letters are raised and clear, and vary in size from 1½" to 2". The characters are Bengali. Especially noteworthy are i, c, j, r, s and h which changed from Proto-Bengali to Bengali after the Muslim conquest. Thus, the 5-shaped i of the Bodh Gayā inscription of Aśokacalla of L. S. 51 (Cunningham, Mahā-Bodhi, Pl. xxviii; Ep. Ind., vol. xii, pp. 27 ff. and plates) gains two slanting strokes at the top and the bottom (cf. iti, l. 10), the lower curve of j is extended to the left, and its angular adjunct to the right is lengthened too (cf.—vāja l. 7), the arrow shaped r yields to a triangle with a dot inside (cf. farāsa, l. 9), s acquires its double loops (cf.—daśa, l. 4), and h is present from (cf. mahā, l. 5). C retains its cursive form, m is either looped or non-looped (cf. man, l. 5, and samaye, l. 6), sub-script r is marked by a wedge at the bottom, and visarga by a triangle with a hook at the top (cf. nyātela, l. 6).

To the student of Paleography the inscription is, therefore, of importance as supplying an epigraphic landmark for the fully developed Bengali alphabet. The language is Sanskrit. The orthography calls for no special remark, except that consonants following a super-script r are doubled. The final t between Śrīma and farāsa (l. 9) was first omitted through oversight, but subsequently inserted below fu.

The inscription is dated in the Śāka year fourteen hundred and fifty-five, and refers itself to the reign of Mahāmuda Sāha (Mahmud Shah). It records the construction of a bridge in the spring time of that year by a minister of the king (mahāpātrādhipātra) Phārāsa Khāna (Faras Khan), son of Nṛravāja Khāna (Nurbaj Khan).

The date of the inscription, Śaka 1455 corresponds to A.D. 1533

LII, Q., March, 1931
and A.H. 940, the year following that of the accession of Ghiyasuddin Mahmud Shah to the throne of the kingdom of Gaur. His coins show that he had enjoyed a partial sovereignty from A.H. 933 to A.H. 939, when he succeeded in seizing the entire kingdom by murdering his nephew Ala-ud-din Firoz Shah (Catalogue of the Coins in the Indian Museum, Calcutta, vol. II, p. 179). Mahmud was one of the eighteen sons of Husen Shah, and also the last of the independent Sultans of Bengal. The present record is also worthy of note as a Sanskrit epigraph of a Muhammadan minister of a Muhammadan king. It is the earliest known inscription of Mahmud's reign, and is perhaps the earliest Sanskrit inscription of Bengal of the Muhammadan period. Two more inscriptions of the same reign are known, but they are in Arabic. Both of them are of the Malda district; one records the construction of a mosque in A.H. 941 (J. A. S. E., vol. lxiv, pt. I, p. 226), and the other, that of a gateway in A.H. 943 (Ibid., p. 214).

**Text**

Srī-r-astu,
Śake pañca-pañcā-
śad-adhikacaturddha-
śa-sat =āṅkite madhau
Śri-śrīman-Mahāmudasa-
ha-ñrpatēḥ samaye Nr-
равāja-khāna-putra-ma-
hāpatṛadhīpātra-śrīma-
t-Pharāsa-khānena śaṅkra-
moṇaḥ vinirmmīta itī.

**Translation**

"May you be prosperous!"

"This bridge was caused to be built by the illustrious Pharāsa-Khāna, minister of ministers, son of Nṛravāja-khāna, in the time of the doubly auspicious Mahāmuda Sāha, in the spring, marked by Śaka (year) fourteen hundred increased by fifty-five."

**Niradbandhu Sanyal**
Cultivation in Ancient India

IV Preparation and Application of Manure

“चार्व ग्रामदिन्यः प्रायु कुम्हारैकोलेभे तत:॥
रूटे संबोधा तत् रूटे कला गुणधर्मशः॥
फाल्मुने प्रत्येकारे गते कला निधापेनुं॥
ततो बयनकाले तं पर्यात् सारधिशीलसः॥

बिना खारियु यहाँ बढ़ते न प्रलयापि॥

“In the month of Mūgha, a dung-heap is raised by a spade, dried in the sun and made into smaller balls. In the month of Phālguna, these are placed into holes dug for the purpose, and afterwards scattered on the field at the time of sowing. The paddy-plant only grows without manure, it does not bear fruit.” 107, 108, 109.

The value of manure in cultivation was appreciated in India as early as the time of the Rg-veda. 2 Pārāśara also wants to point out the importance of manure by the sentence:

“बिना खारियु यहाँ बढ़ते न प्रलयापि।”

The ancient Indians did not apparently know the use of chemicals as artificial fertilisers; they have come into use only about hundred years ago. Besides bones, flesh of animals, fish-washings, vegetable and animal products etc., the manure that they primarily used consisted of the excreta of various animals mixed with litter which absorbed the urine and kept the animals clean. Whether they knew the exact chemical composition of the yard-manure is not known, but they certainly appreciated its fertilising property and also its physical effects upon the texture and water-holding power of the soil. It is only a modern discovery that the farm-yard-manure contains all that is necessary for the nutrition of plants, viz., nitrogen, phosphoric acid and potash. Nitrogen compounds are the chief fertilising elements in the manure, but the nitrogen is inevitably


2 Vide Ante.
lost to a certain extent. The loss can be minimised only if the dung-heap is not disturbed; for any disturbance causes rapid fermentation of the liquid portion of the manure, viz., urine, with a consequent increase in the evaporation of ammonia. The direction of Parāśara to keep the dung-heap undisturbed up to the month of Māgha, i.e., for ten months of the year is thus significant. Again, the sentence,—

“रीढे समीय तन सम्बे जला गुणमल्लपिष्म” is also significant, for if any easily fermentable material still remained in the active form, it should be got rid of by drying. This process also reduces ammonia which would otherwise be injurious to the seeds and the tender roots of plants. The direction “सूर्य जला निधापर्यन्” is also very important inasmuch as the manure, as it decomposes under the earth, increases the stock of humus which oxidises and tends to decrease in the open air, so that when the manure is scattered over the field, it is comparatively rich in humus that contributes greatly to the fertility of the soil. Knowledge of manuring at the time was probably a result of extensive practical and not scientific observations.

There are also many other writers who speak of manure. Varāhamihira in the Brhat Saṃhitā says, “To promote inflorescence and fructification, a mixture of one āḍhaka (64 palas) of sesame, 2 āḍhakas of excreta of goats or sheep, one prastha (16 palas) of barely powder, one tūlā of beef thrown into one dōṇa (256 palas) of water and standing over for seven nights should be poured round the roots of the plant” (17, 18). He further prescribes that the seeds before sowing should be treated as follows:—They should be taken up in the palm greased with ghee and thrown into milk; on the following day the seeds should be taken out of the milk with greased fingers and the mass separated into single seeds. This process is to be repeated for 10 successive days. Then, the seeds are to be carefully rubbed with cow-dung and steamed in a vessel containing pork or venison. Then the seeds are to be sown with the above mentioned flesh and lard in a soil where previously sesame was sown and dug up, or trodden down and then sprinkled daily with water mixed with Kṣīra. (19, 20)

“To ensure the growth of Ballaṅga (i.e., sprouting and the growth of luxurious stem and foliage), the seeds should be properly soaked in an infusion of powdered paddy, māṇa (bean), sesame and barley

Brhat Saṃhitā edited by Dr. Kern, chapter 55, p. 304.
mixed with decomposing flesh and then steamed with Haridrā (turmeric). This process will succeed even with Tintiḍi (tamarindus indica). For the Kapiththa (Feronia elephantum) the seeds should be soaked for about 2 minutes (literally, such length of time as it would take one to make a hundred rhythmic claps with the palms (तालमबः)) in a decoction of 8 roots,—Āśphoḷa (Jasmine), Āmalakī (Phyllanthus emblica), Dhava (Grislea tomentosa), Vāsika (Tustica guarderussa), Vētula (calamus rotung), Sūryavallī (Gynandropsis pentaphylla), Śyāna (Echites fructescens) and Atimuktaka (Aganosma caryophyllata) boiled in milk. The seeds then should be dried in the sun. This process should be repeated for 30 days. A circular hole should be dug in the ground, a cubit in diameter and 2 cubits deep, and this should be filled with the milky decoction. When the hole dries up, it should be burnt with fire and then pasted over with ashes mixed with ghee and honey. Three inches of soil should now be thrown in, then the powder of bean, sesame and barley, and then again three inches of soil. Finally washings of fish should be sprinkled and the mud should be beaten and reduced to a thick consistency; then the seeds previously prepared should be placed in the hole under three inches of the soil and fish washings (with fish). This will lead to luxuriant ramification and foliage which will excite wonder."

The Agnipurāṇa² gives the following directions:

"A tree becomes laden with flowers and fruits by manuring the soil with powdered barley, sesameum and the offal matter of a goat mixed together and soaked in washings of beef for seven consecutive nights. A good growth of trees is secured by sprinkling them with the washings of fish". While Khaṇḍa advises the cultivators thus:

"O worthy cultivator, for a vigorous growth of bamboo, give an infusion of powdered paddy to its roots, for the growth of Arum, ash, and for that of cocoanuts, salt.

In the Arthaśāstra it is stated that:

"The seeds of grains are to be exposed to mist and heat (सुगारा-

1 Translation of these verses from the Bhāthsamhitā are taken from Dr. Seal's Positive Sciences of the Hindus.
pāyanam ippam ca) for seven nights; the seeds of Kośī such as Mudga, mūga etc. are treated similarly for 3 nights; the shoots of sugar-cane and the like (kāṇḍabija) are plastered at the cut with the mixture of honey, clarified butter, the fat of hogs and cow-dung, the bulbous roots (kāṇḍa) with honey and clarified butter, cotton-seeds with cow-dung; and water pits at the root of trees are to be burnt and manured with bones and cow-dung at proper seasons. The sprouts of seeds when grown are to be manured with a fresh haul of very small fish and irrigated with the milk of suha (Euphorbia antiquorum)".  

V Collection and Treatment of seeds

About the collection and treatment of seeds. Parāśara says,—

"All kinds of seed should be collected in the month of Māgha or Phālgun. They are then to be well dried in the sun and exposed to dew at night". "The Putikās (small receptacles) are afterwards made and the seeds kept in them". "Different kinds of seed must be kept separate, for mixed seeds are not good". "After the seeds have been placed, in the Putikā must be well closed; grass that may grow out of it must be up-rooted or when the seeds sprout, the field will be full of grass".

VI Construction of Agricultural Implements

Parāśara describes the plough and its accessories thus:

The plough consists essentially of the following 8 parts: Ṣha (the pole of the plough), Yuga (the yoke), Niryo!a (the rod of the plough exclusive of the pole and the share), Niryo!apaśikā (iron plates that fix the share to the Niryo!a). (There are two pairs of Paśikā), Halashānu (a strong piece of wood that is fixed to the Niryo!a at the end opposite to which the plough-share is fixed; this is held by the cultivator while ploughing the field), Aḍḍacalla (the pins of the yoke where the bullocks are tied), Śaula (an extra piece of wood that tightly fixes the Niryo!a to the pole) and Paccanī (goad)".

"Ṣha is 5 cubits long, sthāṇī 2½ cubits, niryo!a 1½ cubits, yuga व्येशयाच्याच् (?), niryo!a-पासिका and aḍḍacalla राधाराधानी (i.e., about 9 inches, taking the breadth of a finger to be approximately ½ inch) and śaula

1 Shyāmā Śāstri’s translation, 2nd ed., p. 141.
2 Kṛṣi Samgrahā, 148-151.
an inch (nearly a cubit). *Pacani* is made of bamboo with iron-top and (शरवादमुखिका गुंगुदिका) about 3 or 4½ feet long, (taking the transverse length of a fist (हृदि) to be approximately 4 inches)."

"Ābāndha (a rod of iron which prevents the *nirvola* from getting out of the pole) must be cyclindrical and (पट्टभुक्त) about one foot long. *Yoktra* (the tie of the yoke) 4 cubits in length, a rope 5 cubits long and *Phāla* (ploughshare) 1 cubit or (पालसात्तिचक्र) 1 cubit and 4 inches, *Paśātā* is नकाल (nearly 7 inches) and looks like a leaf of *Arka* (calotropis gigantea). *Viddhaka* (a big hoeing instrument) has twenty-one spikes and the harrow is 9 cubits long."¹

Besides the plough and its accessories as enumerated by Parāsara, there were also the following agricultural implements:

*Śrīni* (sickle), *Khanittra* (hoe), *Mūsala* (pestle), *Ūdākhala* (mortar), *Śrūpa* (winnowing basket), *Dhānyakṛt* (winnowing fan), *Cālanī* (sieve), *Śthīvi* (granary), *Methi* (the post of the threshing floor round which cattle turn to thresh out the grains), etc.

VII  *Ploughing the Land*

"In order that the crops may have a luxuriant growth", Khana says, "the cultivator should plough the land under the auspices of the asterisms known as, *Śvāti, Uttaraphalagni, Uttarāśāṇā, Uttarabhūḍrapada, Mṛgāśīrā, Mūlā, Puravasā, Puṣyā, Śravāṇā* or *Hastā* and on Fridays, Mondays and Wednesdays," "It is unwise to begin ploughing on the day of the full moon or the new moon. "The land should be ploughed 16 times for radish, half the number of times for cotton, half of that for paddy and none for betel." "The soil for radish must be as soft as cotton and for sugarcane, the soil must be ploughed to dust."

VIII  *Sowing, Planting, Treatment of Plants, etc.*

"Āman paddy, jute, ginger, arum, turmeric, mango, pumpkin, gourd, cucumber etc. are to be sown in the month of *Vaisākha*; and sugarcane, plantain and betel are also to be planted in this month if they have not been planted in *Caitra.*" "The field is manured generally towards the end of *Jyaistha.* In this month *Jyaisthidhik* paddy ripens." "The month of *Āṣāṅga* is the best for planting autumn paddy (i.e., for transplanting the *āman* paddy that

¹  *Loc. cit.*, verses 110-117 and 96, 97.
is sown in *Vaisākha*), and also for planting mango, lichis, coconut, flower plants, betel etc. In this month, *Āus* paddy begins to ripen. “Pepper, tobacco, kalai and kaluttha (dolichos biflorus) are to be sown in *Śrāvaṇa*. Old trees will surely bear fruits if the soil at their roots is turned up in this month and fresh soil dumped there in the month of *Agraḥāyaṇa*. “Turnip, sesamum, mudga (mungo) and pepper are to be sown towards the end of *Bhādra*. In this month, *Āus* paddy fully ripens; and hoeing is done and water drained off from the field (in which *āman* paddy had been sown) leaving just enough for only the roots to be under water.

“In the month of *Āsvina*, the ground must be prepared for the winter crops. *Godhūma* (wheat), mustard, *kalai*, cabbage, potato, radish, beet etc. are to be sown in this month and arrangements made to preserve water in paddy-fields.” “Barley, peas, coriander, water-melon, cucumber and gourd are to be sown in the month of *Kūrtika*. “In *Agraḥāyaṇa*, *āmin* paddy ripens and pumpkin is sown.” “In *Phālugna*, winter crops ripen, and if it rains sufficiently, *Āus* paddy is sown.”

Now-a-days, *Āus* is mostly sown in the month of *Vaisākha*. In *Phālugna*, *Jyaiśhik* paddy is sown. There is usually a scarcity of rain in the months of *Phālugna* and *Caitra*. That is why *Jyaiśhik* paddy requires a marshy land for its growth.

Rotation of crops was known early in India. *Āus* paddy and winter crops are thus sown in the same field by rotation—the former in spring and the latter in Autumn.

“Khaṇā says, “my worthy cultivator, plant radish towards the end of the 3rd season of the year, sow mustard towards the end of Autumn. And if you mind to make money, sow maze in the following month of *Caitra*."

In the Kauṭilya Arthaśāstra (Eng. trans. 2nd ed., pp. 139 f.) the directions are given about sowing.

“*Ṣāli* (a kind of (rice), *vṛsh* (rice), *kodrava* (paspalum scorbiculatum), *tila* (sesamum), *priyaṅgu* (panic seeds), *dāraka* (?) and *varaka* (phaseolus tribolus) are to be sown at the commencement (pūrva- vāpa) of the rainy season. *Mudga* (phaseolus mungo), *mūrga* (ph. radiatus) and *śaibya* (?) are to be sown in the middle of the season. *Kusumbha* (safflower), *masura* (Ervum hirsutum), *kulattha* (dolichos biflorus) *yava* (barley), *godhūma* (wheat) *kalāya* (leguminous seeds), *atasi* (linseed) and *sargapa* (mustard) are to be sown last”.
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The following directions are given in the Bṛhatāṃśhītā (chap. 55) and the Agni-puṛāṇa about the planting of trees:

**Bṛhatāṃśhītā:** “It is best to plant trees at intervals of 20 cubits, next at 16, and 12 cubits interval is the minimum that can be prescribed.” 12.

**Agni-puṛāṇa:** “Trees planted in rows twenty cubits apart should be deemed as the best planted, while those having an intervening space of 16 or 10 cubits between them should be deemed as ranking second best in respect of fruitfulness. Trees should be transplanted 12 times, they should not be planted too close or adjoining each other, in which case, the branches that touch one another should be lopped off with a chopper, as otherwise, they would bear no fruit. Should barrenness be apprehended, the leaves and branches of a tree ought be sprinkled over with a solution of cold water saturated with Viḷaṅgā, clarified butter, pulverised Mudga, Māṣa and Kaluttha pulse. Similarly, a tree sprinkled with cold water and clarified butter becomes laden with abundant fruits and blossoms.

The method of propagation by cuttings and graftings was also known to India from very early times. The following lines from the Bṛhatāṃśhītā (chapter 55) will be illustrative: “Kāṇṭhāl (Jack-fruit tree), Ṇoka, Kadali (plantain), Jambi, Lakua, Dāḍimba, Drūkṣā, Pālibata, Bijapūra (Mātulaṅgā) Atinukta ka—these are the plants to be propagated by means of cuttings besmeared with cow-dung” (4-5). “Better than this method is the method of propagation by graftings. This can be done in two ways,—the cuttings of one plant is either inserted in the root of another plant or on the stem of another plant (सूक्ष्म्कीर्दित्य अथै रोपणस्वमिति) PARA:). Grafts should be smeared with cow-dung. For transplanting (प्रभावं नीला रोपणस्वमिति:) the plants should be smeared from root to the top (आपतिक अविनाशः) with ghee (clarified butter), sesame oil, honey of the krudra variety of bees of the Usīra (Andropogon Laniger or Andropogon Chitaram), the Viḷaṅgā (Embelica ribes) milk and cow-dung”. (6-7) “The most suitable ground for planting is soft soil that has been sown with sesamum indicum and dug up and trodden with sesame in flower”.

Directions for sowing paddy are elaborately given by Parāśara in his Kṛṣi-saṅgraha thus:

“Sowing in the month of Vaiśākha is best, in the month of Jyaiṣṭha is tolerable, Aṣāṭha bad and Śrāvana worst. Transplanting
should best be done in Āśādha. It is bad to do it in Śrāvana and worst in Bhādra.

"After the seeds have been sown, the field is to be harrowed, otherwise the seeds are not distributed uniformly over the field," 169.

"The seeds are of two kinds—one for sowing and the other for planting. Only healthy seeds are used for sowing. Unhealthy seeds are for planting (i.e., the seeds are sown and when they sprout, the shoots are transplanted). Full-grown plants should not be raised; transplanting is to be done while the plants are young. If planting is done in the month of Śrāvana, there must remain one cubit of ground between any two plants; if in Bhādra, ½ cubit, and if in Āśvina, चतुर्दशी (i.e., about 3 inches), (170, 171, 172).

Parāśara says, "पाण्डुलिपि ग्रामिण चेव धानभावर्धिं". We have already said that the seeds are of two kinds. In the case of those for which transplanting is not necessary, the field is ploughed for a second time in the month of Āśādha or Śrāvana, after the seeds grow into plants. This destroys some of them but they subsequently turn into manure and give the rest a healthier growth. "For want of sufficient timely rains, the second ploughing may be done in the month of Bhādra, but in that case, the produce will only be half. If the second ploughing is not done before Āśvina, the prospect of harvest is little." (174). "Planting or the second ploughing should not be done in marshy land neither should manure be given; only the grass is to be cleared out." (175).

"If after planting, the field is not hoed, the crops cannot grow in abundance, nor yield a good harvest. If hoeing is done in the month of Śrāvana or Bhādra, the harvest is doubled thereby, even if grass may again grow. If another hoeing is done in the month of Āśvina, corns grow as plentifully as Māga." (176-178).

"So that the paddy may not get diseased (यंत्र), the water in the field is to be drained off in the month of Bhādra, leaving just enough for only the roots to be under water." (180).

"The fool who does not make arrangements in Āśvina and Kārtika to preserve water should not expect a harvest." (183).
IX Reaping and Storing

"In the month of Pauṣa (after the Puṣya-yātra), the wise cultivator reaps the full harvest and after threshing the corns, measure the grains with Āḍhaka. 1 The measured grains are then stored and are never spent in Pauṣa even erroneously." (217,218).

Khaṇā says: "The corns ripen 30 days after the appearance of flowers and 13 days after the ears bend low." "The corns ripen in the month of Agrahāyaṇa. They should be reaped in Pauṣa, threshed in Māgha and husked in Phālguna."

Conclusion

Thus beginning at the time of the Rg-veda, the science and method of cultivation steadily developed and attained a high stage of perfection by the 4th century B.C. In the Vedic age, agriculture was the general occupation; each family possessed a number of corn-fields in well-marked holdings measured off according to the standard of measurement prevailing in those days. The occupation was then considered noble and each respectable householder was eager to possess a number of cattle and fertile corn-fields. By the time of the Yajurveda, caste-system became fully established and agriculture became the occupation of Vaiṣyās. In the age of the Brāhmaṇas we find that industrial workers were gradually sinking in estimation, yet agriculture being the staple industry of the country went on developing in the Sūtra and the Epic periods. After the disruption of the Maurya empire, the political history of India became full of vicissitudes and under inimical political circumstances, agriculture instead of being a concern of the state and a matter of expert knowledge, was relegated to the lowest strata of population. The wisdom that grew in the course of ages remained buried in literature not easily accessible to the mass. Thus neglected and uncared for, the art of cultivation gradually decayed in India. 2

R. Ganguli

1 Here Āḍhaka is a unit of measure for grains. It is a vessel having a volume of 216 cubic inches.

2 I am thankful to Dr. B. M. Barua of the Calcutta University for many suggestions.
Śilaparikatha

This short treatise by Vasubandhu is found twice in the Tanjur, once in the gi section and a second time in the ńe section of the mdo portion of that collection. It treats of the greater efficacy of śīla than that of dāna.

That it was regarded as an important work, though short, is evident from the presence of a fairly elaborate commentary on it occurring in the same collection. This commentary is by Prakāśakirtti.

Śīla may be explained as moral vows or observances. The śīlas, ten (or sometimes five) in number, had to be observed by all desiring emancipation. The whole of Buddhist ethics is based on these observances.1

It is not possible to ascertain who this Vasubandhu was. If he is the famous Vasubandhu, the Buddhist philosopher, his date will be circa 410-490 A.D. He was the brother of Aśaṅga, the famous teacher of the Yogācāra school of the Mahāyāna. Vasubandhu was the author of a large number of valuable works, some of which are available in Sanskrit and the rest in Chinese and Tibetan translations. The present work is one whose original has so far not yet been traced. There is nothing in this work which can either prove or disprove this identification of the author of this short treatise with the famous Buddhist philosopher of the same name.

As has been mentioned, this work occurs in two sections of the mdo i.e., śūtra portion of the Tanjur (see Cordier's Catalogue du Fonds tibétain, vol. III, pp. 423 and 436). In editing the text both these readings have been compared. The xylograph used is of the Visvabharati Library. We have not tried to give verse-restoration of the Sanskrit original but have given only a prose reconstruction with an English translation.

From the text it would appear that two different metres were used in the original—each had four lines but one had seven syllables and the other nine in each line.

The work contains only eleven verses and the Tibetan transla-

For details see Visuddhimagga, P.T.S., pp. 6-58.
tion is fairly clear except in one or two places. In editing and translating it, the commentary mentioned before has been utilised. In some cases the commentary (Com.) gives a different reading; these readings are noted in the footnotes. Nothing is known about Prakāśakīrtti, the author of this commentary.

**TIBETAN TEXT**

rgya gar skad du | sī la pa ri ka thā |
bod du | tshul khrims kyi gtam |
dkon mchog gsum ia phyag htshal lo |

1
rgya mtsho dañ ni glañ rjes kyi |
khyad par dag ni gan yin pa |
sbyin pa dañ tshul khrims kyi |
khyad par dag ni de yin no |

2
gañ zig dog pañt sems kyis ni |
lo bṛgya1 sbyin pa byin pa pas |
gañ zig ŋin cig2 tshul khrims ni |
bsurū ba de las khyad par hphage |

3
sbyin pa sān pa runams dañ ni |
rigs ŋan dag3 kyañ sbyin4 par byed |
gañ yañ ruñ bas tshul khrims ni |
yoṅs su bsruñ bar mi nus so |

4
sbyin par4 rab tu ḥbyor gyur kyañ |
de ni sbyin bdag chen po min |
tshul khrims rṇzm par dag pa yis |
sbyin bdag chen po yin par bṣad |

5
mgo bo6 bregs paḥam gtsug phud ldan pa7 rgyu |
khrus kyi8 chu yis ral pa khyab par ḥchañ |

---

1 Com. bṛgyar. 2 Com. gsig 3 Com. rṇams. 4 Com. ster bar. 5 Com. pa. 6 Original omits this bo 7 Com. par 8 Com. tshni khrims
sīlāparikātīā

cha lugs sna tshogs dag gis spyod gyur kyiā

gal te tshul khrims med na sgu spyod yin
gal te tshul khrims kyis rgud la don med

jt ltar tshul khrims bla med ldan pañi dri
dam pa mtho ris ḫdi na mi zad ldan
de ltar phreṅ bañi dri ni khyab min ciṅ

de bzin byug pañi dri yaṅ ḫbyuṅ mi ḫyur

ẖdi ni bdag ḫgāh gzān du ḫgro ba bde
grag sdaṅ dgaṅ ziṅ kun gyis bkur pa ste
chos ldan ḫbras bu de de maṅ po mthoṅ
tshul khrims ḫbras bu draṅ sroṅ chen pos gsuṅs


tshul khrims nad pa sman pañi mchog yin ziṅ
mun pañi sgron me ḫam thag la skyabs daṅ
ḥjigs pa bṣruṅ daṅ phoṅs la ne du daṅ
ḥchi bañi ṭhya mtsho mthāṅ med gдушṅs gyur yin

gañ zig ḫdul bañi tshul khrims rnamḥ ḫjīg ṭshe
skrag zugs tshul khrims ldan pa yod ma yin
de baṅ ḫjīg ṭten gzān mthāṅ ṭgal sms kyis
gaṅ zig ḫgro ḫdod des ni tshul khrims bṣruṅs


tshul khrims dri med ma lus ji bzin bzag

ses rab zi bas yid ni yoṅs smin ḫgyur

---

1 Com. gal te tshul khrims med na gyo sgyus spyod
2 Com. pa 3 Com. na le sa
4 Com. ston 5 Com. khyab
6 Com. ḫid 7 Original has tshul khrims mchog la
8 Com. ḫag 9 Com. bṣruṅs
10 Com. du
de bas rga śi' nad hjigs rnam thar pa
gaṅ zic throb ḡdod des ni² tshul khrims sruṅs

Sanskrit Reconstruction

॥ नमो रबवयाय ॥

1

नागरिकयद्वियोऽयेय यदनरत तत्वं दानाश्रोलोरनसम्

2

श्रव्यक्ते जो बहुरात् दानं देहति तत्वाद् यो दिनमये शोलं रचनि स प्रतिविम्यमिते

3

श्रीमिकां: त्वकुलीनाय दानारो दानं देहति न पुन: कविष्ठ विविन्ना शोलं परिपरिनुव्य ग्राह्यगति

4

दानेन सम्बन्धादिपि दानपरिश्रमिन सवयि द्विप्रश्रेष्ठम् दानपरिपरिनुव्ययि नतीर्देशि

5

शिरोसुण्डलेन वा शिरोविश्वासिनेन वा दानजलेन वा वायसगत्तिनेन वा विष्णवबन्धयया बापित वस्की
भवेक यदि शीलेन न खातू

6

गदार गती वा नदीसुपसङ्क्राभी वा बरसत्वा कलेव बापित वा गनी—व्यावृत्त यदि शशा शैवविनिर्वाहः
४

7

चायातुपशीलान्यय: परम्परवर्धन्ययस्याय मायाजनोत्त म व्यथ विकस्तुसिकययोऽययिति न व्यथ विति

8

इह कविष्ठिद्वियोऽयेय मर्गी सुक्ष्मस्म। सर्व येन: प्रतिनिर्देशिणि। धार्मिकता तत्तु वयि यह देखते।
शीलपल्लं तु मद्यसुत्तिना काव्यितम्।

9

शीलं रोपिष्ट: परसौ बैयः। तमसो दीयः। चार्त्य स्याहयस्म। अधि रचयं। निपर्दि वमु:। चन्द्राविसुत्तवागात्
भी:।

10

कविष्ठ विष्णवबन्धवह भारवयाः। न नाधीकर्त्व वतित। कविष्ठ तेन लोकाप्राप्तोऽर्थितिनेन लाभित्यया
शोलं रचनि

1 Original has de bas na śi and Com. has de bas rga ḡchi.
2 Com, la.
Salutation to the Three Precious Gems

1

There is as much difference between gifts and moral observances (śīla) as there is between the sea and the foot-prints of a cow.

2

He who observes the moral observances even for a day is superior to one, who with a pure heart, bestows gifts for a hundred years.

3

Even the butchers and the low-born people, can become donors by making gifts; but one is not able to observe śīla properly.

4

Giving rich gifts one does not become a great giver, but by pure moral observances does one become a great donor.

5

Even after shaving the head, or keeping a crest on the crown (śikhā), or possessing big clotted hair washed with water of ablution, or using various dresses a man is a cheat if he is devoid of śīla.

6

Whether going to the Ganges or to a river, or to the waters of the river Sarasvati or of a well, or teaching Nelesa (?)—all these become fruitless if a man be devoid of śīla.

7

The supreme fragrance of śīla is imperishable even in the uppermost heaven. Even the garlands do not spread such fragrance nor even the pomades.

8

Here there are some persons who desire happiness in the other world. Every one worships happiness and fame. These results in the
case of religious men are seen very often. The results of śīla have, however, been spoken of by the great sage.

9

Śīla is like the best doctor in diseases. It is like the lamp in darkness, the refuge of the distressed, the protection in (times of) fear, like a friend in danger and a boat in this endless ocean of death.

10

There are some persons, who being afraid of the breach of vinaya-śīla do not observe them. There are some others who, desiring in their minds to go to the other end of this world, observe it.

11

With entirely pure śīla and well-kept wisdom and peace the mind becomes mature. So he, who wants liberation from the dread of old age, death, and diseases, should observe śīla.

NOTES

1. I have used ग्लान्ध for glaṅ ṛjēs which literally means imprint of bull.

3. In the second line of this stanza the commentary of Prakāśa-kīrtti uses the word ster for sbyin; but that does not alter the meaning as both the words mean the same thing.

5. This is the first verse with nine syllables in each line and the rest are like this. The second line in the Com. begins as tshul khrims chu yis, which means “water of śīla.” This is not clear and khrus kyi chu yis is a better reading. The last line of this verse in the Commentary reads as gal te tshul khrims med na gyo sgyus spyod. The words gyo sgyus means the same as simply sgyu.

6. In the third line occurs the word ne le bar in the original and na le sa in the Com. What it means I have not been able to ascertain; brten means to adhere or to hold but the Com. has ston for it; ston means to show or to teach. So according to the Com. na le sa indicates some subject, whereas in the original ne le bar may be a place and any such thing.

9. In the first line of this verse we have accepted the reading of the Com. The original reads as follows: tshul khrims mchog la sman pahi mchog yin sīn which means that ‘with best śīla the best results accrue.’ But in consideration of what follows the reading of the Com. seems better.

ANATHNATH BASU

III.Q., MARCH, 1931
Inscriptions of Govindacandra Haricandan in the Fort of Langalaveni

Govinda Haricandan Jagdev was the 21st king of the Boghale dynasty of the Atagada rulers. He ruled his kingdom from Ś. 1683 to 1710 (1716-1788 A.D.). His father Jagannāth or Jagabandhu Haricandan acted as the Viceroy of the Musulman Nawab in the District of Ganjam. Jagabandhu had two sons. The elder Madhusūdan succeeded his father and ruled from 1758 to 1761 A.D. As he died without any son, his younger brother Govindacandra ascended the throne of Atagada. Govindacandra was an able ruler. He made his subjects happy by his good and wise administration and kept his estate unmolested by foreign enemies. It is this king, about whom these inscriptions speak in glowing terms, On the lotus seat of the deity Gopālasvāmi at Lāngalaveni fort, the following inscription is found. It is in one śloka written in Oriya characters and Sanskrit language, and reads thus:—

गीतिन्यासमा शरिष्टदन्ते याती जगदी व धराधिनायः।
नेवािष्ट्वादिति श्रावाय भक्ता निर्जिता प्रकटविचकार॥

[Netra 2 Aṅka 9 śat 6 Candra ॥] As Aṅkānāṁ vāmato gatiḥ is the rule, it must be 1692 (1770 A.D.). Rājā Govindacandra Haricandan had got the idol of the Goddess “Śrīmatī” or Rādhā prepared with great devotion and reverence.]

The inscriptions exist in the mutt of Gopālasvāmi in the fort of Lāngalaveni even now along with the deities of Gopālasvāmi and Śrīmatī. It is said that Govindacandra Haricandan installed the idol of “Śrīmatī” or Rādhā by the side of Gopālasvāmi, and prior to this, the deity Gopālasvāmi alone was worshipped at that place. As this inscription support the tradition, there is no room for doubting the establishment of goddess “Śrīmatī” or Rādhā by Rājā Govindacandra Haricandan Jagadev.

The second inscription written in Oriya characters and language is on the lotus seat of Rādhā-Govinda deity made of stone in the Jagannātha temple of Atagada. It reads thus:—

गीतिन्यासमा शरिष्टदन्ते याती जगदी व धराधिनायः।
[Govinda Haricandana Jagaddeva, Śakābda 1693 (1771 A.D.)]
This shows that it was made by Govindacandra Haricandan Jagadev in the very next year after the first inscription. Hence he was the founder of the two idols Rādhā and Govinda.

The third inscription is inscribed in a circle under the lotus seat on which the deity Dola-Govinda is seated. This inscription is in one śloka written in Oriya characters but Sanskrit language.

The reading is as follows:

चित्र यस्म दीपिका निदानकारमायो पदा
कौमुदी देवीप्रचारिनिदित्तुष्पा वासिस्तु दीनाचलन।
स्वालवर्ष दिनाङकाराय धनाय रामायिन
तथा श्रीवन्मालिनः श्रीमिन्द मोदि-निश्चितः कियान पु

[May this god Govinda bless Śrī Vanamālī Deva, in whose heart sits always Lord Jagannātha, the destroyer of all evils, whose fame has spread from the Himalayas to Cape Comorin, whose sole duty is the maintenance of the Brahmīns and whose work is based on religion.]

On Vasanta Pañcamī and Dolapūrṇimā (holy), the festive occasions of god Jagannātha at the foot of Lāṅgalavēnti, the custom was and even now is that the idol of Dola-Govinda is taken out instead of that of Jagannātha. This image of Dola-Govinda is nicely executed on metal. The exact date of this inscription is not known, but from the genealogy of the ancient royal family of Atagada, it may be said that this king was known by two names, namely, Govinda and Vanamālī. So it may safely be concluded that the third inscription also belongs to the reign of Govindacandra Haricandan and that he was the founder of the image of Dola-Govinda.

As the history of Govindacandra Haricandan of those days will be interesting to the readers, it is given below:

When Govindacandra Haricandan was ruling over Atagada, Nawab Kumbhīla Ānanda Rāj attacked the gates of Jagannāth Prasad of Lāṅgalavēnti fort at Bovrani or Boirani. But the Nawab was repulsed. Thirty of the enemies’ party were imprisoned and beheaded by the order of the Rājā.

In the reign of Madhusūdan Haricandan, Kṛṣṇa Bhuṅja, the Rājā of Gumsoor had captured the Hattiutto mutt of Atagada. To avenge this, Govindacandra sent his large army to attack Bhuṅja after the death of his brother Madhūsudan. This expedition was led by commander Śrīkaraṇ Patnaik. The Atagada army attacked the Bhuṅja Fort of Kakarsali, where the Rājā
was defeated and was compelled to retreat. The victorious army took possession of the Hathiutto mutt and built a new fort named Mandaragad, the walls of which were made of mud (18 x 25 cubits), and made 300 soldiers guard the fort. These soldiers who guarded the newly built fort were granted lands at those places free of taxes and their descendants are enjoying the same till now. Another fortress named Balabahdra Palace was constructed at a place called Biripura. Two years later Kr̄ṣṇa Bhuñja concluded a treaty with the Rājā of Atagada at a village of Kanachai. The successor of Kr̄ṣṇa Bhuñja by name Lakṣmana having been driven out from Gumsoor by his brother Trivikrama took refuge in Atagada.

Govinda Haricandan had powerful allies such as Haribara Narendra of Mohuri, Vināyaka Māndhāta of Nayagarh, Marda Gopāla-deva of Khallikote and Jagaddeva of Tekkali.

Virakesarideva of Orissa, having been captured and imprisoned by Rājārām Paṇḍit Subedar of the Maharattas, died and left Divyasimhadeva, his grandson as his only heir. At that time the Maharattas had been a source of great trouble. Divyasiṃha arrived at the village of Pamlamba via Banapur. Having come to know the pitiable state of the Orissa king, Govinda Haricandan had a fort built at Usta Agency and kept him with his 2000 followers, 5 elephants and 50 horses as his guest for one year. During this time was born his first son Mukundadeva the great Oriya king.

Govinda got back certain conquered territories from Gajapati, Jagannātha Nārāyaṇa Deva, king of Parlakimedi. He then attacked and defeated the Maharattas who attacked the Puri temple and restored Divyasiṃhadeva at his old palace of Bali. The fort of Khurda was also released from the hands of the Maharattas.

Mr. Catsford of the East India Company came to know this fact, and besieged Lāṅgalvenī Fort through Jagannāth Prasad Gate in 1768. A treaty was then concluded between the Rājā of Atagada and the East India Company to the effect that the Rājā of Atagada should pay an annual revenue of Rs. 47,000 to the East India Company. Since then the independence of the Rājā of Atagada came to an end. Some time before the above incident, Colonel Peach waged war against the Rājā of Parlakimedi at Jalumur, and as the Rājā of Parlakimedi was defeated, his estate was taken by the East India Company. In the same year, Resident Catsford went with a large army and attacked and captured the fort of Ganjam.
The Candra Dynasty of Arakan

We know of several Candra dynasties of Bengal, from the accounts of Tāranātha, songs of Mayanāmati and the copper-plate grants of Śrī Candra deva, but nothing of the Candra dynasty of Arakan, except what can be made out from the few coins of Arakan described by Sir A. P. Phayre in his 'Numismata Orientalia'. Recently some interesting accounts have been published of a dynasty of Candra kings of Arakan in the Annual Report for 1925-26 of the Archaeological Survey of India (pp. 146-48). This is the result of a preliminary examination of some inscriptions on a stone-pillar found on the platform of the Sithhaung temple at Mrohaung in Arakan by Forchhammer in the early eighties. For some reasons or other they remained so long undeciphered. Mr. Hirananda Śāstri, the Government Epigraphist for India, who examined them, says that the oldest of the inscriptions is written in characters resembling those of the late Gupta script. The others are in Nāgārī characters. Their major portion is practically obliterated. A preliminary decipherment has been made of the best preserved portion. The following is a summary of its reading as supplied by Mr. Śāstri:

"The first twenty lines are illegible on the impression. Ll. 21-41 give an account of the numerous kings of the Śrī-Dharmarājānuja-vamśa, preceding Ānandacandra, to whose rule the inscription belongs. The kings are stated in order with a period of reign assigned to each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Balacandra reigned for ... ...</td>
<td>10. Niticandra ... ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Devacandra ... 22</td>
<td>11. Mahāvīra Nar ēśvāra ... ... 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Yajñacandra ... 7</td>
<td>12. ... ... 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ..........son of Bhūmicandra ... ?</td>
<td>13. ... ... 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ..........son of Kirticandra ... 24</td>
<td>14. Dharmaśūra ... 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ..........son of Nītīcandra ... 55</td>
<td>15. ... ... 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Dipacandra ... ?</td>
<td>16. Śrī-Dharmavijaya ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Priticandra ... 22</td>
<td>17. Narendra-vijaya, the son of Dharmavijaya 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. ..........candra ... ?</td>
<td>18. Narendra-candra ... 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Anandacandra ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Ll, 41-62 enumerate in detail the numerous benevolent deeds of Anandacandra. He was like Karṇa in charity; like Yudhiṣṭhira
in speaking truth. He resembled Kāma in beauty and in splendour
was like the sun. He built many vihāras and attached to them a
large extent of land, cows and buffaloes. He erected many Buddhist
temples and set up in them beautiful images of copper, etc. He
gave everyday linen cloths to the monks coming from different parts
of the country. He also granted land with servants to fifty Brahmans.
Various dwellings and roads in different parts were constructed for
the use of Ārya-samgha.

"Ll, 63-71 probably state that a subordinate (of Anandacandra)
gave his daughter, a 'gem among women' to Anandacandra, the
king of Tāmrapaṭṭana, together with a dowry of a town called Śrī-
paṭṭana after having constructed in it a tank and a vihāra.

"The inscribed stone does not itself appear to have belonged
originally to the temple, where it is now serving the purpose of a
gate-post at the entrance to the temple. The latter was built by
Minbin, the 12th of the Myauk-u dynasty, who reigned over Arakan
from 1531 to 1533 A.D., while the former is said to have been set up
by Anandacandra, a king of Tāmrapaṭṭana and a descendant, accor-
ding to the chronological table given in the inscription, of Bālacandra
of the Śrī-Dharmarājānuja-vaṁśa. Who this Ānandacandra was
and how that Tāmrapaṭṭana is to be identified still remain to be
worked out; on palæographical grounds alone, the inscription stone
is older than the temple by many centuries. Moreover, the names
mentioned therein are altogether new to us, and it is quite possible
that we are now on the threshold of an important discovery and are
about to resuscitate to life a dynasty of kings, which was in exist-
tence in the mediaeval period, but which has now become extinct.
However, mention may be made of some of the names, probably
of kings, which are also preserved on old coins of Arakan. For this
purpose reference may be made to the coins Nos. 1-12 on plate
II of Phayre's Coins of Arakan. Coin No. 2 has the name Priticandra
above the bull, while coin No. 3 probably has Dharmavijaya and
No. 8, Viracandra. The name on coin No. 9 figured in plate XXXI
of the Catalogue of the Coins in the Indian Museum (Calcutta,
Volume I) should certainly be read as Ntiticandra, although Vincent
Smith read it as Śrī Śivasya or Givasya. The cabinet of the Phayre
Provincial Museum has another coin of the same name stamped on
it, but it is a better specimen, and on palæographical grounds, it
may be older than the coin in the Indian Museum. That is to say, we have two coins both bearing the same name Nāticandra, but belonging to two different periods. There are other coins bearing names not mentioned in the list of kings given in our inscriptions. But the above will suffice at least to allow us to conjecture that the names of kings mentioned in the inscription are no others than those of Arakan. But on the other hand, none of these names can be identified with any of those that are mentioned in the lists of the kings of Arakan as given by the native chroniclers, although there were kings in Arakan with names ending in Candra and Taing-candra. At the same time, Tamrapañcana, the name of the country, over which Ānandacandra was king is not known to chroniclers. Śrīpañcana is equally unknown. Again, Ānandacandra is said to be a descendant of Bālacandra of the Śrī-Dharmarājānuvañśa. One Bālacandra, son of Śrīhañcandra who reigned in Bengal, is known to have extended his power to Tirhut and Kāmarupa at a time when Magadha was ruled by the elder son of king Harṣa. Bālacandra was succeeded by his son Vimalacandra followed by Gopi- candra. During the latter's reign the seat of Government was at Cātiagrama (Citātagong), and the kingdom of Rakhan or Arakan was just to its south."

We shall try to give here some facts and suggestions, with the hope that they may help in editing the inscriptions.

It appears that king Ānandacandra, though a Buddhist, patronised Brāhmaṇas. We find in the Kulaji books of the Varendra Brāhmaṇas of Bengal that king Vallālasena of Bengal sent Brāhmaṇas to Maurāṅga or Maudūṅga and to Rasāṅga or Rabhāṅga (Arakan?):

"Gaudē śatam nṛpatinā pancāsan Madaghe tathā/
Bhōṭe ṣaṣṭih samākhyātāh Maurāṅge ca tathāvidhāh>//
Utkale dvāvinśasī ca Rasāṅge ca tathāvidhāh/
evaṁ sthitir Brāhmaṇāmāṁ sarvacēsa-nivāsināṁ;="
(Varendra-kulapājī)

Again:— "dvi śat = ādhika-pancāśad-Varendraṛṇāṁ dvi-janmanāṁ/
pancāśan Madaghe ṣaṣṭi Bhōṭe ṣaṣṭi Rabhāṅgake//= catvārinśad-Utkale ca Maudūṅge'pi tathā =āṅkakaḥ/ dattā nṛpatinā harṣam Vallālenā mahātmanā="
(Gaudē Brāhmaṇa, p. 88)

Can these be the Brāhmaṇas, to whom Ānandacandra gave away
lands with servants? If so he becomes a contemporary of king Vallālasena in the first half of the twelfth century A.D.

There are names of nineteen kings in the list. If the first and the last are excluded, there remains seventeen only. Of these, the periods of reign of 12 only have been deciphered. They reigned for 187 years, each about 16 years on an average. The remaining five, at this rate, might have reigned 80 years. Or assuming three generations a century, their reign comes to 166 at the highest. So Bālacandra was earlier than Ḍīnandacandra by about 267-353 years. Assuming Ḍīnandacandra to have ascended the throne on 1160 A.D., Bālacandra's reign must have terminated some time between 747-833 A.D. i.e. he reigned some time between the eighth and the ninth century. It is said that in the ninth century the country around Chittagong was conquered by a Buddhist king of Arakan, who erected a pillar at Chittagong (Chittagong District Gazetteer, p. 20). It may be that this pillar was subsequently removed to Mrohaung.

This dynasty of kings is said to be of the Dharmarājānūjavanīśa. Yama is Dharmarāja. Who is his anuja or younger? It may be Citragupta, the mythical forefather of the Kāyasthas, for he is said to be a twin brother of Dharmarāja:—

Vāyuḥ sarvagataḥ srṣṭaḥ Sūryas tejoyoviḍḍhimān /
Dharmarājas tataḥ srṣṭaś Citraguptena saṃyutaḥ /" 

(Garuḍa-Purāṇa, Vaṅgavāsti Edition, 1314 B.S., p. 676)

1 may also mean his another brother Vicitra:—
prayāti Citranagarāṇī Vicitro yatra pārthivāḥ // 

Yamasy = aiv = ānujaḥ. saurir yatra rājyaṇa praśasti ha/ (Ibid., p. 622).

In the Kulaji books of the Kāyasthas of Bengal, we find that Citragupta, Vicitra and Citrasena are three brothers. Of them Citragupta lived in heaven, Vicitra among the Nāgas and Citrasena on earth:

Citragupto gataḥ svarge Vicitro nāga-sannidhau// Citrasenāḥ prthivyāḥ

(Śabda-kalpadruma, see under 'Kāyastha').

Among the many surnames of the Bengal Kāyasthas, 'Candra' is one. So this Candra dynasty of Arakan may be of the Kāyastha caste. If Bālacandra of Bengal be identical with Bālacandra of Arakan, then the Candra dynasty of Bengal was also of the Kāyastha caste.

JOGENDRA CHANDRA GHOSHII
The Administration of the Delhi Empire in the Pre-Mughal Period

Land Revenue

Land revenue formed the principal source of income to the State in the pre-Mughal period. India was then, as is still now, an agricultural country. From a perusal of the contemporary records we find that the demand of the state varied in different times. During this period, the revenue was generally assessed by "guess or computation," and it was Alauddin who first devised the scheme of *jarih* and tried to improve the system of assessment then prevalent in the country, but it appears that his system did not long survive his death. His standard of taxation was extremely exorbitant and it was "equal to half the gross annual produce of the lands, to be levied throughout the kingdom, and to be regularly transmitted to the Exchequer" (Brigg's *Firishta*, vol. I, pp. 346 f.). "Cultivation whether on a small or large scale was to be carried on by measurement at a certain rate for every hiswa" (one twentieth part of a bigha—Elliot, vol. III, p. 182), "and the headmen and Chowdhuris and all other rayyats were placed on the same footing; so that the burden of the strong was not thrown on the weak. He also ordered that what used to be the perquisites of the Chowdhuris should be collected and paid into the treasury, and that grazing fees for each head of cow and buffalo and sheep should also be realized" (De, *Tabaqati Akbari*, pp. 169, 170, Persian text, p. 153). "The scrutiny into the conduct of the ministerial officers and scribes was carried to such an extreme, that they were not able to misappropriate even one *jital*. If any one took anything in addition to his fixed salary, it at once appeared against him in the papers of the patwari (the village accountant) and was immediately exacted from him with the greatest rigour and contumely" (De, *Tabaqati Akbari*, p. 169-170). But as has already been said, Alauddin's system of assessment did not long survive his death. On the accession of Ghiyasuddin Tughlaq to the throne, the old system of assessment by "guess or computation" was revived by that monarch. "In the generosity of his nature, he ordered that the land
revenues of the country should be settled upon just principles, with reference to the produce. The officers of the Exchequer were ordered to assess either by guess or computation, whether upon the reports of informers or the statements of valuers. They were to see that cultivation increased year by year. The Hindus were to be taxed so that they might not be blinded by wealth and so become discontented and rebellious, nor, on the other hand, be so reduced to poverty and destitution as to be unable to pursue their husbandry" (Elliot, vol. III, pp. 230 f.).

"In fixing the revenue of the various territories, he acted with moderation; and did not listen to the words of those who made high offers. If any one forcibly realized from his jagir more than that was fixed, the Sultan objected to, and cancelled, the transaction. If any one deducted any amount from the revenue payable by him, on account of payments to his retainers, and the amount did not reach the latter, he was punished, and the amount was recovered from him" (De, Tabaqati Akbari, pp. 209, 210; Persian text p. 192). Thus from the above writings of Zia Barni and Nizamuddin Ahmed, we get a good account of the principle of taxation, and its working during the reign of Ghiyasuddin Tughlaq.

The demand of the State reached its climax during the reign of Muhammad Tughlaq, when he increased it in the Doab "out of all proportion to the income of the people"—as Zia Barni has described. The same author proceeds on to say that the tax was raised from ten or twenty times which rather seems to us to be an exaggeration. However, that the rate of taxation was extremely exorbitant and that "it operated to the ruin of the country and the decay of the people" is admitted by all historians. Ferishta, who came much later and who derived his materials mainly from the contemporary historians, says, "the duties, levied on the necessaries of life and realised with the utmost rigour, were too great for the power of industry to cope with; the country in consequence, became involved in poverty and distress" (Brigg's Ferishta, vol. I, p. 414). Along with his heavy taxation some abwabs were also levied which was an additional horror to the people (De, Tabaqati Akbari, p. 218; see also in this connection Zia Barni's Tarikhi-Ferozshahi).

After the death of Muhammad Tughlaq and the accession of Feroz Tughlaq to the throne, the storm passed away, and India again showed signs of prosperity and happiness; taxes were levied according to just principles and many illegal exactions (abwabs) were
done away with. The revenue was imposed after a proper enquiry about the condition of the land and the facilities of irrigation provided by the construction of canals for improved agriculture.

Feroz, in his Fatuhati-Ferozshahi says that he abolished twenty three illegal and vexatious taxes. About the steps that Feroz took to suppress these illegal imports, the following quotation may be cited from Ferishta: "It is hereby proclaimed that the small and vexatious taxes, under the denomination of cottwaly, etc., payable to the public servants of Government as perquisites of offices by small traders, licenses from shepherds for the right of pasturage on waste lands belonging to the crown, fees from flower-sellers, fish-mongers, cotton-cleaners, silk-sellers, and cooks, and the precarious and the fluctuating taxes on shop-keepers and vintners, shall henceforth cease throughout the realm; for it is better to relinquish this portion of the revenue than realize it causing so much distress occasioned by the discretionary power that has to be vested on tax-gatherers and officers of authority; nor will any tax hereafter be levied contrary to the written law of the book" (Brigg's Ferishta, vol. I, p. 453).

However, much may be said in support of the benign policy of the sovereigns like Ghiyasuddin Tughlaq and Feroz Tughlaq in regard to revenue matters and their noble aspirations to do good to the peasantry, corruptions could not be totally stamped out of the country and old order of things revived as soon as any one of them had made their exit from the royal stage. Even during their life time oppression of the moqaddams on the one hand and high handedness of the sief-holders on the other, could not be checked properly, because of the fact that very few cases could reach the ears of the sovereign.

**Provincial Administration**

The Delhi empire in the pre-Mughal period was divided into provinces and the number of provinces sometimes increased and sometimes decreased according to the extent of the empire. In the early days of the Muhammadan rule the number of provinces was smaller than those of the reign of Alauddin Khilji or Muhammad Tughlaq when the Muhammadan empire rose to the meridian of its glory. But when the noon-tide splendour of the meridian sun had begun to wane, the number of provinces again decreased.

From the writings of Zia Barni we get references to twelve pro-
vinces of the Delhi Empire at the beginning of the reign of Muham-
mad Tughlaq which are as follows:—(1) Delhi, (2) Gujrat, (3) Malwa,
(4) Deogir, (5) Tilang, (6) Kampila, (7) Dwara Samudra, (8) Ma'bar,
afterwards Muhammad Tughlaq increased the number of provinces
for the better administration of the empire. Shahabuddin, the
author of the Masalik-al-absar, who was a native of Damascus,
and whose source of information on this subject was Sirajuddin
Abul Fath Aumar, ("a lawyer and a native of the province of Oudh,
who had lived long at the court of the Sultan of Delhi"), gives a
list of twenty-three provinces into which the Delhi empire was then
divided. These were as follows:—"(1) Delhi, (2) Deogir, (3) Multan,
(4) Kahran, (Kuhram) (5) Samana, (6) Siwistan, (7) Uch, (8) Hasi,
(Hansi), (9) Sirsuti, (Sirsah) (10) Maabar, (11) Tilank (Telingana),
(12) Gujrat, (13) Badaon, (14) Oudh, (15) Kanauj, (16) Lakhnauti,
(17) Bihar, (18) Karra, (19) Malwa, (20) Lahore, (21) Kulanor, (Gow-
alior), (22) Jajnagar, (23) Tilanj, Darusamand (Telingana (?)) and Dwara-
samudra" (Elliott, vol. III, pp. 574-575). Over each of the provin-
ces there was a Governor who was responsible for its administration
and proper management. This increment of the number of provinces
by Muhammad Tughlaq was, no doubt, judicious and calculated to
ensure better administration in the provinces.

From the above account of Shahabuddin we hear of only one
province of Bengal, namely, Lakhnauti, whereas from the account of
Zia Barni we find that Bengal was divided into three provinces, Lakh-
nauti, Satgaon, and Sonargaon. This fact is also corroborated by Feri-
shita (Brigg's Ferishta, vol. I, p. 423). So, on the whole, we get
twenty-five provinces. The administration of the distant places
like Bengal, the North-Western provinces and the Deccan was
somewhat different from that of the other places. Bengal as we have
just seen, was divided into three provinces with a Governor over each of
them; above these three Governors, there was one Viceroy at their head
to look into the affairs of Bengal as a whole and to supervise the ac-
tions of the provincial Governors. The distant provinces of the Deccan
and the Punjab were similarly administered. From the account of
Shahabuddin which agrees with that of Ferishta (Brigg's Ferishta vol. I,
p. 432), it is seen that the Deccan was divided into four provinces,
namely, Deogir, Malabar, Telingana, and Dwara-Samudra with a
Governor over each; above these four governors there was similarly
one Viceroy with his capital at Deogir as the head of all the provincial
governors of the Deccan. The Punjab was similarly divided into several provinces with a governor over each, but above them a Viceroy with similar powers as stated in the case of Bengal and the Deccan. These small divisions of the three distant places ensured better government in those places, and each provincial governor served as a check upon the other and a sudden combination on their part against the Central Government was rendered difficult.

But so far as the administration of the provinces was concerned, there were some serious defects in the machinery of the government itself. Each of these provinces was, as Mr. Smith described them, "miniature replica of a State". The governors had a very slender tie of allegiance to the Central Government, and all of them were leaders of large armies, recruited and paid by them direct. They generally appointed all their subordinate officers, whose promotion and dismissal as well depended on them alone. In short, in regard to internal affairs of a province, the governor was practically his own master. Provincial revenue was under his control, forts were garrisoned by him and soldiers were under his command. If a governor was ambitious enough he could, on the slightest negligence on the part of the Central Government, cut off every connection from it. Moreover, want of good communication in the absence of steamship or telegraphs only facilitated their projects. Had there been any better means of communication, much of the trouble might have been overcome and timely information and intervention might have nipped in the bud the aggression of these provincial governors. Balban, Alauddin Khilji, Muhammad Tughlaq and Feroz Tughlaq were all, for some time or other, provincial governors and they knew fully well how in such a state of affairs, it was easy for a provincial governor to throw off the mask and aspire to the royal dignity, but still none of them made any attempt whatsoever to bring the provincial governors into a closer and more rigid control of the Central Government and thus lay the foundation of the empire on a stronger basis.

In the provincial head quarters there was a Qazi for the administration of justice to which I have already given reference.¹ There

¹ In the I.H.Q. of June, 1930, p. 270, in speaking of provincial Qazis, I told that there was a Qazi in Bengal and another in the Deccan, but they referred to the Qazis of the Viceroy's courts. Besides the Qazis for Viceroy's courts, there were Qazis in
was also certainly a provincial Dewan without which the management of the revenue was not possible.

**Army**

The governmental organization was on military lines and every official had to be enrolled in the army list. In those rough and stormy days strong and well-disciplined army was of imperative necessity for the stability of every kingdom. The provincial Governors were ambitious, rebellion was rife, and the mode of communication extremely difficult, and in such a state of affairs, the only means to overawe the provincial Governors and to check their disruptive tendencies was the formation of a well-trained and well-disciplined standing army. But in those days the kings generally depended upon the provincial Governors and sief-holders for the supply of troops in times of necessity. This was an extremely cumbersome and irksome process. It revealed the weakness of the central Government in case the Governors or sief-holders could not come forward in time with their levies. Moreover, the provincial Government and sief-holders were well aware of the weakness of such a system, and they might, if they had only the inclination to do it, put the central Government in an utter helpless condition in times of crisis by wilful negligence of the royal mandate.

Even a king like Balban had to depend mainly upon this practice. He had no doubt, a well-drilled and well-organized army and he kept up the efficiency of the army by constant exercise "by leading them out twice every week to hunt for forty or fifty miles round the (capital) city" (Brigg's Ferishta, vol. I, p. 255), but however strong and efficient his army might be, a politician and a statesman like him should have more thoroughly realised the weakness of the above practice and should have taken steps to curb the power of the Governors and sief-holders and thereby remodel the militia on a sound basis.

It was Alauddin who first conceived the idea of organizing the Indian army on a stronger and more solid basis. He was confronted with two great difficulties—firstly, high-handedness and discontent of the great nobles which must be checked, secondly, the frequent incursions of the Mongols on the North-western Frontier which seem—each of the head quarters of the Governors' provinces into which those countries were divided.
ed to threaten the very existence of the Delhi Empire. Now, in order to cope with these difficulties, the most important thing that was necessary was the formation of a strong and well-disciplined standing army under the direct control of the central governments. With this purpose in view, he appointed worthy men to act as commanders and lieutenants and the army was directly recruited by the Ariz-i-Mamalik (muster-master of the kingdom). The pay of the soldiers was fixed and they were paid by the central government in cash from the royal treasury and the corruption was checked by means of the branding system. In this connection Ferishta says: “He (Alauddin) settled the pay of every horseman for himself and his horse. The first class had 234 tankas, the second class 136 and the third class 88 tankas annually, according to the goodness of the horse, and upon a muster, he found his cavalry to consist of 475,000” (Brigg's Ferishta, vol. I, p. 350). The military commanders and lieutenants were also paid in cash and not by grants of lands which had hitherto been the practice under the previous Sultans. The rigidity of the discipline in the army, which he maintained, may be clearly understood from the following words of Alauddin himself—“I am in the habit of stopping one month's pay for three successive years, from every soldier who neglects to appear at muster......” (Brigg's Ferishta, vol. I, p. 352).

After the death of Alauddin, the efficiency of the army was greatly impaired and abuses slowly crept into the military organization. But with the accession of Ghiyasuddin Tughlaq many of the abuses were remedied. In this connection Nizamuddin Ahmed, the author of the Tabaqati Akbari says: “He (Ghiyasuddin Tughlaq) adopted the methods introduced by Sultan Alauddin in respect of the descriptive rolls of the troopers, and the branding of horses and the prices and examination of the latter, and of the maintenance of the retainers” (De, Tabaqati Akbari, p. 210; Persian text, 193).

During the reign of Muhammad Tughlaq the Delhi emperor had at one time, an enormous cavalry numbering 370,000 (Brigg's Ferishta, vol. I, p. 414), but the efficiency of the army was greatly impaired due to his whims and caprices.

During the reign of Feroz Tughlaq the efficiency of the army was maintained through the efforts of Malik Razi, the Deputy-Ariz-i-mamalik. Shams-i-Ashf says: “In the reign of Feroz Shah there was an army of 80,000 and sometimes 90,000 horses, exclusive of slaves. These men remained on service all the year.........In those
days Malik Razi, a very venerable and righteous man, was the Deputy-
Aris and administered the business of the army in a very proper
manner" (Elliot, vol. III, pp. 347 f.).

But however efficient Feroz’s army might have been, he displayed
lack of political foresight and statesmanship, as he again resorted
to the old method of granting fiefs to the nobles and military com-
manders in lieu of cash payment. Herein Feroz laid the germs for
the future dissolution of the Delhi empire by increasing the power
of the nobles at the expense of the central government. After his
retirement from the political arena of Hindusthan, Delhi empire showed
signs of speedy decay, whereas the barons grew richer and more
powerful. As the power of the central government decreased, the
power of these fief-holders increased and, by and by, almost the
whole of Hindusthan was divided into innumerable tribal chieftaincies.
In some places the Farmuli tribe was predominant, at another place
the Lohani tribe, and at others the Serwani tribe and so on.
Waqiati-i-Mushtaqi has given a very graphic picture of the condi-
tion of Hindusthan during the reign of Sikandar Lodi which runs as
follows:—

“One-half of the whole country was assigned in jagir to the Fur-
mulis, and the other half to the other Afghan tribes. At this time
the Lohanis and Farmulis predominated. The chief of the Serwanis
was Azam Humayun and the principal chieftains of the Lodis were
four:—Mahmud Khan who had Kalpi in jagir; Mian Alam,
to whom Etawah and Chandwa were assigned; Mubarak Khan
whose jagir was Lucknow; and Daulat Khan who held Lahore. Among
the Sahu Khails, the chiefs were Husain Khan and Khan Jahan,
both from the same ancestor as Sultan Bahlol, Husain Khan, son
of Feroz Khan, and Qutb Khan Lodi Sahu Khail, who flourished in
the time of Sultan Bahlol.

“The districts of Saran and Champaran were held by Mian Husain,
Oudh, Ambala and Hodhana by Mian Muhammad Kālā Pāhār,
Kanauj by Mian Gadai, Shamsabad, Thaneswar and Shahabad by
Mian Imdad."

“Among the great nobles of Sultan Sikandar’s time was Saif Khan
Acha-Khail. He had 6,000 horse under him, and was the deputy of
Azam Humayun, jagirdar of Karra, who used to buy 2,000 copies of
the Quran every year, had 45,000 horses under his command, and
700 elephants. There were also Daulat Khan-Khani who had
4,000 cavalry, Ali Khan Ushi who had 4,000, and also: Feroz Khan
Serwani who had 6,000. Amongst other nobles, there were 25,000 more distributed. Ahmad Khan also, the son of Jumal Khan Lodi Sarang Khani, when he was appointed to Janupur, had 20,000 cavalry under him" (Elliot, vol. IV, pp. 545, 547 f.).

If we go through the above accounts carefully and at the same time remember how Sikandar had to strive hard to maintain his position, we can realise the pitiable condition of the Delhi empire. The system was unsound at the core and its fall was inevitable and it was only a question of time.

**Kotwal**

The function of a Kotwal in mediæval India was very important inasmuch as public peace, tranquillity and safety of the urban people mainly depended upon him. He was the chief of the city police and was entrusted with the protection of the city against all offences. During the Mughal period, we get a very good picture of the duties and functions of a Kotwal from the Aini-Akbari of Abul-Fazl as well as from Storia-de-Mogor of Manucci. But about the period of which we are speaking only some casual references to his duties may be found here and there in the pages of some of the histories of the period. Briggs in his translation of the Tarikh-i-Ferishta says, "The office of Kotwal embraces the regulation of the town police, and the public market. The Kotwal also regulates the hire of cattle, and provides carriages for the Government and for travellers" (Brigg’s Ferishta, vol. I, p. 288; see also Tabaqati Akbari, p. 158, Persian text, 143).

As his position was that of the Superintendent of Police (De, Tabaqati Akbari, p. 154) there were certainly other officers below him like the Inspectors or sub-Inspectors of the present day, and we find that in the administration of the capital city, Darogha was appointed under him (Tabaqati-Akbari, Persian text, p. 139) but we do not know what were their exact functions.

**Dak-Chauki**

The institution of Dak-Chauki was first inaugurated during the reign of Alaaddin Khilji who "whenever sent an army to any place, arranged a horse dak-chauki (relay) from Delhi to the place of destination and posted at each Karoh a fast runner, who is called Paik in Hindi; and he appointed a scribe at each town or city, on the way, who
reported every day what happened there” (De, Tabaqati-Akbari, p. 183). The above system has been more vividly described by Zia-Barni in the following language:

“It was the practice of the Sultan, when he sent an army on expedition, to establish posts on the road, wherever posts could be maintained, beginning from Tilpat, which was the first stage. At every post relays of horses were stationed and at every half or quarter kos runners were posted and in every town or place where horses were posted, officers and report-writers were appointed. Every day, or every two or three days, news used to come to the Sultan reporting the progress of the army and intelligence of the health of the sovereign was carried to the army. False news was thus prevented from being circulated in the city or in the army. The securing of accurate intelligence from the court on one side and the army on the other was a great public benefit” (Elliot, vol. III, p. 203).

But during the reign of his unworthy successors the services of this valuable department seemed to have been lost to the empire, and again Tughlaq Shah made endeavours to revive this old department established by Alauddin, when during his Deccan expedition he made arrangements that “messengers should come from Delhi, twice a week, by Dak-Chauki, and should bring intelligence of everything being safe.” (De, Tabaqati-i-Akbari, p. 211).

The following description of the Dak-Chauki as was prevalent during the reign of Muhammad Tughlaq has been given by the Moorish traveller, Ibn Batuta—“The barid or post in India is of two kinds. The horse-post is called ulak, and is carried on by means of horses belonging to the Sultan stationed at every four miles. The foot-post is thus arranged. Each mile is divided into three equal parts, called dawak, which signifies one-third of a mile. Among the Indians, mile is called kos. At each third of a mile there is a village well populated; outside of which are three tents, in which are men ready to depart. These men gird up their loins and take in their hands a whip about two-cubits long, tipped with brass bells. When the runner leaves the village, he holds the letter in one hand and in the other the whip with the bells. He runs with all his strength and when the men in the tents hear the sound of the bells they prepare to receive him. When he arrives, one of them takes the letter and sets off with all speed. He keeps on cracking his whip until he reaches the next dawak. Thus, these couriers pro-
ceed until the letter reaches its destination. This kind of post is quicker than the horse-post” (Elliot, vol. III, pp. 587 f.).

The department subsequently fell into disuse and it was revived after a long time by Sikandar Lodi who improved upon the old system and extended its operation to all parts of his kingdom as is evident from the accounts of Ferishta, who says—“He established horse-posts throughout his country and received accounts daily from every military detachment of his army in motion” (Brigg’s Ferishta, vol. I, p. 587). The department seemed to have been utilised both for civil and military purposes and with its help he kept himself in constant touch with all the important parts of the dominion.

Such was the administrative machinery which prevailed in the Delhi empire during the pre-Mughal period. As is apparent from the machinery of government which has been described above, there were some serious defects in the system as well as in its working which not only marred the efficiency of the government, but also exposed it to the worst kinds of casualties leading to the ultimate dismemberment of the empire. They pointed out undoubtedly that the germs of its destruction could be found in the system itself and when the final crash came, although it came from outside; it would have certainly come, even, if no Tamarlane or Babar would have invaded India. By the middle of the 14th century the Delhi empire exhibited unmistakeable signs of decay and destruction; the empire was worn out and it bore the appearance of a spent-bullet deprived of all its strength and vitality. There could not be any further doubt about its fall, and it is rather strange that the end came so late.

The first characteristic defect of the system was that it had no balanced constitution. No political machinery was ever devised to checkmate the whims and caprices of the sovereigns, and, as a matter of fact, they did whatever they liked, without any fear of opposition or hindrance from any duly organized constitutional body. The people could not device or organize any constitutional body as the people of England did to extort any charter or right of liberty and thereby put a stop to the despotic actions. The advisory council which existed, as we have already seen, was no check upon the autocratic action of the sovereign. It was the creation of the king himself and it depended wholly on his mercy for its existence. Had there been any constitutional check upon the despotic actions of the sovereign,
much of the unrest and lawlessness that prevailed during the reigns of Kaikhushru, Kairubad, Mubarak Shah, Tughlaq Shah II etc. on account of their negligence and incompetence, might have been averted and much of the energy of the State which was thus frittered away in unnecessary commotions might have added strength and vitality to the kingdom. The loss of moral prestige which it ultimately suffered owing to the follies and unstatesmanlike actions of Muhammad Tughlaq, which hastened the downfall of the empire, could also have been averted.

The second defect was that there was no proper machinery of government for the administration of the provinces. Each province, as has already been said, was “a miniature replica of a state.” With vast resources at his back, “the provincial governorship often proved a stepping-stone” to the imperial authority, as were the cases with Jalaluddin Khilji, Alauddin Khilji, Ghiyasuddin Tughlaq and Baholol Lodi, but none of them made any attempt to bring the provinces into a closer connection with the central government by putting salutary checks upon their actions. Moreover, the provinces should have been further divided into smaller units, like Sarkars and Parganas, for their better administration as were done in later times.

The third characteristic defect was that there was no attempt to connect the outlying provinces of the empire with the central government by means of roads, bridges, and other facilities of communication. In those days when there was no steamship or telegraphy, the only means by which the central government might keep in touch with the different parts of the empire was by the construction of good roads connecting all the important parts of the empire. But this the pre-Mughal emperors did not do.

Fourthly, in regard to law and justice in rural areas and in smaller places, the people were left to themselves and the government was satisfied only with the collection of revenue. The maintenance of peace and security in those areas were left to the village communities and no officer seemed to have been appointed to look into their actions and thus ensure proper administration and at the same time keep itself in closer touch with the masses. This indifference of the government towards the rural areas, also engendered a corresponding indifference on the part of the people towards the government.

Fifthly, the military character of the government was maintained from the beginning to the end. There was no attempt on the part
of the sovereigns to create a national Government or a homogeneous State and thereby merge the differences of the conqueror and the conquered. As a matter of fact, all the feelings of the conqueror and the conquered were allowed to remain and this "social inequality producing bitterness ended in rebellion." Even Feroz Tughlaq who has been described by the contemporary historians as "full of the milk of human kindness," and who posed himself as the champion of justice and humanity proved no exception.

Sixthly, "the Islamic State fostered luxury among the members of the ruling class. The highest offices in the State were held by Muslims and elevation to positions of honour was generally determined by Royal will and not by merit. The easy acquisition of enormous wealth and participation in the festivities of the court led to great vices, and the Muslims towards the close of the 14th century lost their old vigour and manliness. The early Muslims who served Altamash, Balban and Ala-ud-din were soldier martyrs who cheerfully braved risks for the glory of Islam, but their descendants, who had no inducement to work, degenerated into mediocre, who had neither the ability nor the enthusiasm of their ancestors"(Medieval India, Iswari Prosad, p. 470).

Seventhly, absence of the law of primogeniture was one of the most important causes which undermined the strength, vigour and prestige of the empire and paved the way for its ultimate extinction. In the absence of the law of primogeniture, every son, brother or other near relations of the preceding emperor considered himself to be the best fitted to wear the crown and would not give up his claim before sufficient trial of strength, and it meant chaos, unrest and disorder in the empire with consequent loss of prestige of the royal power. Taking advantage of such internal strife or weakness of the central government, the provincial governors did, as a matter of fact, often raise the standard of rebellion and some of the more ambitious of them even aspired to the throne of Delhi, as for instance, Jalaluddin Khilji, Ghiyasuddin Tughlaq and Bahlol Lodi. Had there been any recognized law of succession, or, in absence of it, had there been any duly authorised constitutional body like the Parliament of England, whose decision might be final in regard to these affairs, much of unnecessary bloodshed and commotion might have been avoided. But in the absence of both of them the country suffered a great deal from so much court intrigue, wars of succession, rebellion, murder of sovereigns, and other heinous
acts that the onward march of the Empire was very often retarded.

Inspite of the defects in the organization of the government or in its works, as described above, the Muslims during the pre-Mughal period brought Northern India for a very long time and the greater part of the Deccan for about half a century under one Imperial unity in place of petty hostile states, hitherto fighting with one another for suzerainty. There was enough of chivalry in the Rajput blood, their patriotism was proverbial and their valour was universally acknowledged, but what was wanting in them was the idea of national union. The Muslim State again taught the Indian people how to become a single power—a power having youthful vigour and a strong militia at its back. The new power imparted a new vigour and freshness to the Indian soil, which has lost much of its strength and power by petty strifes and internecine struggles.

"The military system of the Hindus was" also "out of date and old fashioned." They used to depend too much upon elephants, but that elephant was dangerous against well trained cavalry had been proved on many occasions, but still they would cling to this old method of warfare and even bitter experience could not make them change their minds. The Muhammadans, on the other hand, had excellent cavalry which was constantly recruited from beyond the Afghan hills.

Another important thing which the Muhammadans gave to India was better discipline and organization. The caste system of the Hindus worked as a hindrance in the way of their governmental organization. Even at times of national crisis they often refused to make a common cause for their own deliverance by merging the differences of their creeds or clans and thus put forth a concerted action under a common leader. The Muslims, on the other hand, had no caste barrier, and they could offer a united front against their enemies, No artificial barrier divided them in their actions and they stood shoulder to shoulder for their national cause.

JOGINDRA NATH CHOWDHURY
Persian Inscriptions in the Gwalior State

The royal order under notice is engraved in a panel on a stone post. It has been recently discovered at Bhilsa by the Gwalior State Archaeological Department. It is being published, by the courtesy of the said department, from a photograph of the inscription. Bhilsa has been explored by the archaeologists as early as 1874, but this inscription does not appear to have been noticed so far.

Bhilsa is a railway station on the Bombay-Delhi main line of G. I. P. Railway and is 535 miles from Bombay. At present it is a growing town, being the head-quarters of a district of the same name in the Gwalior state.

It is one of the biggest centres of monuments of archaeological and historical interest in the State and the earliest monument discovered so far in the state belongs to Bhilsa.

Bhilsa is famous for its ancient site which lies two miles N. W. of the present town called Bes or Besnagar identified with the Vesenagara, or Caityagiri of the Pali works and the Vidisha of the Puranas, and was once the capital of a great kingdom. The city was of marked importance since many important relics dating between the 3rd century B.C. and the first century A.D. were unearthed from the site and many others are still to be found in its close vicinity. The most important of these are the remains of Buddhist stūpas and shrines at Sanchi and the inscribed Garuda pillar of a Vaishnava Temple at Bes, called Kamb Bapa locally known to the archaeologists as Heliodoros pillar.

Bhilsa first appears in Muhammadan writings as Mahabalistan in Alberuni’s description of India written about 1030 A.D. In 1235 A.D. Bhilsa was attacked and sacked by Altamash, who is

1 See I. H., Q., Vol. III, no. 4.
4 Sanchi lies 5 miles S.W. of this site. It is now included in the Bhopal State.
6 E. M. H., I. 59.
7 Ibid., II, 327 and R. T., 622.
said to have destroyed a great temple here. In 1290 A.D. Ala-ud-din\(^1\) reduced the size of the town. He completely subjugated Malwa. Bhilsa, being on the borders of Malwa, was therefore attached to this province.

The inscription reproduced here\(^2\) is inscribed on a stone-post fixed in the ground in front of the Gandhi Gate in the city wall of the present Bhilsa. The portion of the post above ground is about two feet and the top has been chamfered into a sort of conical shape. The inscribed panel measures $9\frac{3}{8}\times 13\frac{3}{8}$". The inscription consisting of five lines of Persian prose in *Nastaliq* characters contains a royal warrant exempting the *Kolis* (the Hindu weaver class) from *Begar* (forced labour or compulsory service without wages). It does not contain any date, name of a king or any other person, and cannot therefore be assigned to any particular ruler of the Muhammadan period to which it evidently belongs. Locally it is ascribed to the time of Alamgir (Aurangzeb) who ravaged Bhilsa in A.D. 1682,\(^3\) and changed its name into Alamgirpur—a name which did not become popular.

Considering the general intolerance, which Aurangzeb had towards non-Moslems, it appears quite improbable that Aurangzeb Alamgir would have at all extended this concession to the Koli. Be that as it may, on palaeographical grounds and keeping in view the foregoing tradition, I feel inclined to assign it to the later Mughal period preferably to Alamgir II (A.D. 1754-1773), by whose time the Mughal rule has almost declined.

The Koli of Bhilsa enjoy the privilege even to-day hardly knowing of this royal decree.

The *Begar* system continues even now and has been more or less in vogue throughout India. A reference to this system may be traced back to 3,000 B.C. or to the olden days of the Egyptian and Babylonian civilization. The mention of *Begar* is found in tale XVII, chapter I of the *Gulistan*, of Shekh Sade of Shiraz (Persia), written in A.H. 656 (= A.D. 1258). Later on this system is mentioned in most of the Mussalman chronicles. It is therefore probable that this system developed and came to be widely practised during the rule of the Muhammadans though they may not necessarily be the originators.

**Ramsingh Saksena**

---

1 E.M.H., III, 148 and 543.

2 See annexed plate.

3 E.M.H., VIII, 283.
Line 1. From the threshold of Imperial Majesty.
Line 2. And dignity (the fiat is hereby decreed).
Line 3. Kolis (Hindu weaver class) are (henceforward) exempted from Begar (forced labour or compulsory service without wages);
Line 4. None should run counter to it (i.e. attempt to exact Begar from the Kolis).
Line 5.

I. H. Q. March, 1931.
Dāṇḍin’s Conception of the Guṇas

Dāṇḍin is one of the earliest known writers who treat of the Guṇas in connection with the R̥tī, although the term R̥tī itself, standardised by Vāmana, is never employed by him. The professed object of his work¹ is to describe what he calls ‘the body of poetry and the embellishments thereof.’ These embellishments consist of certain external modes of expressions and are covered by the general term Alaṃkāra (which is described as kāvyā-sobhākāra dharma), applicable as much to the technical Guṇas that form the essence of his postulated “ways of speech” (girām mārgāh, which is equivalent to the R̥tī of other writers) as to the so-called alaṃkāras or poetic figures. Whatever enhances poetic beauty (kāvyā-sobhā) is its Alaṃkāra, and in this view Dāṇḍin’s position is not fundamentally different from that of Vāmana who explains the term alaṃkāra broadly as beauty (saundarya) in a non-technical sense.

In the first chapter of his work Dāṇḍin defines and classifies poetry and discusses at some length the special characteristics of the two extreme modes of composition (mārga), viz., the Vaidarbhā and the Gauḍa, explaining the application or otherwise of the ten standard excellences or Guṇas which form all the while the criterion for their distinction, and giving throughout a preferential treatment to the Vaidarbhā. In the beginning of the second chapter he first offers a general definition of alaṃkāra as embellishment per se, and then goes on to remark that in the previous chapter he has spoken of alaṃkriyāh in connection with the classification of the mārgas. The term alaṃkriyāh in this passage has thus a clear reference to the ten standard excellences which he has already dealt

¹ Our references throughout are to the edition of Raṅgācārya, with the commentary of Taruṇavācaspati and the anonymous Hṛdayaṅgamā commentary (Madras, 1910), unless otherwise indicated. The editions of Premacandra Tarkavāgīśa with his own commentary (Calcutta, Śaka 1803), and of Belvalkar and Reddi (with a new Sanskrit commentary and English notes) in the Bombay Sanskrit Series (1920), as well as Belvalkar’s English translation (Poona 1924) have also been consulted. It is rarely that Böhtlingk’s edition has been of use; its text follows generally that of the Calcutta edition.

I.H.Q., MARCH, 1931
with as the essence of the Vaidarbla-mårga. Next, he says that he would now deal with the general (súdhrara) alamkàras, which term obviously refers to the poetic figures that he is proceeding to discuss in the chapter under discussion. Thus, the Guṇas are generally laid down as eka-mårga-gata, pertaining to the excellent diction Vaidarbla, and therefore visisṭa alamkàras, while the so-called poetic figures or alamkàras in the narrow sense are mårga-dvaya-gata or súdhrara, because both the mårgas abound in such decorations as the upamà, rûpaka etc. Taranavācaspati comments on this: sobhākaratvan hi alamkāra-lakṣaṇam, tallakṣaṇa-yogat telpî [śleṣūdayà daśa guṇā api] alamkārāḥ......guṇā alamkārā eva ity acūryāḥ.

From this we are not to understand, with P. V. Kane, that "Dāṇḍin's work......makes no distinction between the Guṇas and the Alamkāras," for while to Dāṇḍin every Guṇa is an Alamkāra, he nowhere states that every Alamkāra is a Guṇa. What is meant is not that the Guṇas and the Alamkāras are identical, but that the embellishments like śleṣa etc., which are technically called Guṇas, form the sine qua non of a diction par excellence, which cannot go without them; whereas the figures of speech or Alamkāras like upamā etc. are not the special characteristics of a specific diction but they may reside in all kinds of diction. From this we may conclude that so far as a good composition is concerned Dāṇḍin makes the Guṇas (but not the poetic figures) its absolute condition, a position approximating that of Vāmana who, however, commits himself to the clear statement that the Guṇas constitute an inseparable attribute of poetry,¹ implying thereby that it can do without Alamkāras or poetic figures. Thus, when the technical excellence and the poetic figure are both termed alamkāra in a non-technical sense, and yet a technical distinction is implied between them as characteristics of a diction, we may well hold that Dāṇḍin as S. K. De remarks² "practically fore-shadows, if he does not theoretically develop the rigid differentiation between the Guṇa and the Alamkāra of the Riti school".

We have seen that Dāṇḍin treats of the Guṇas in connection with his conception of the mårga, which is equivalent to the Riti, and not in relation to rasa (as writers on Rasa and Dhvani theories do), the fundamental importance of which had not yet been recognised in theory. Proceeding to describe the distinctive characteristics of the

1 Kūvyāalamkāra-sūtra-vṛtti, iii, 2, 1-3.
2 Sanskrit Poetics, II, p. 106.
two (among many) extreme ways of speech (mārga or vartman), Daṇḍin lays down:

 śleṣaḥ prasūdah samatā mādhuryam sukumāratā/
arthavyaktir udāratvam ojaḥ-kūnti -samādhayah/
iti vaidarbha-mārgasya prāṇā daśa gunāḥ smṛṭāḥ/
ēṣṭām viparyayāḥ prāyo drāyat gauḍa-vartmanāḥ

It will be well to bear in mind here that Daṇḍin, like his predeces-ors, does not give a general definition of the Guṇa; but he describes it broadly in connection with the doṣas (iv, 1) by the statement that doṣas mar the poetic effect just as the guṇas heighten it. In the verses cited above Daṇḍin mentions ten guṇas, which follow those of Bharata in their number and nomenclature but differ in their content. They are described as the very “life-breath” of the Vaidarbha-mārga. If we accept the term vaidarbha-mārga to be an upalakṣaṇa, standing for a standard good diction, as S. P. Bhattacharyya has suggested, Daṇḍin’s position is that the excellences just mentioned are essential in any good composition. But the Gauḍa-vartman often (prāyāḥ) presents a different aspect, the conception of the Gauḍas about the essentials of a diction being apparently different from that of the Vaidarbhas. Some controversy exists over the meaning of the term viparyaya in this verse. Those who accept Taruṇavācaspati’s interpretation would take it to mean vaiparitya, i.e., opposition or contrariety, while others following the Ṣṛdayāṅganaḥ mean by it anyathāvīva, i.e., difference or divergence. The ten fixed excellences, viz., śleṣa etc., are said to constitute the essential characteristics of the Vaidarbha-mārga, but if it is asked what constitutes the essential characteristics of the Gauḍa-mārga we cannot reasonably answer that the opposites of these excellences (which would really be doṣas or faults) do it; i.e. if “ēṣṭām” in i, 42 is taken to refer to the essentials (prāṇāḥ), then the term viparyaya should mean anyathāvīva instead of vaiparitya.

1 Kāvyādarśa, i, 41-42.
2 [This verse is missing in the Calcutta (Premcandra) and Bombay (Reddi and Belvalkar) editions, as well as in the edition of Böhtlingk. It is also missing in the Tibetan version (J.R.A.S., 1903, p. 349). As this extra verse is found in the Madras edition only, it would not be profitable to deduce any definite conclusion therefrom.—S. K. D.].
3 The Gauḍī Riti in Theory and Practice in the I.H.Q., June, 1927.
The point requires some explanation. If, in this case, *vīpārītya* is interpreted to imply 'the reverse' or 'the opposite', the fundamental characteristics of the Gauḍa-mārga are relegated to the position of something like *dōgas* and would correspond to such *dōgas* as are actually defined as *aritimat* by Bhoja.1 We cannot, however, hold that the Gauḍa-mārga could have been defined as something marked by the opposites of the excellences constituting the Vaidarbha-mārga, for these would be devoid of all charm and would hardly constitute a poetic diction. Dāṇḍin presents to us the type of the Gauḍa-mārga

1 *Sarasvatī-kāṇṭhābharaṇa* (K. M. edition) p. 24. In the enumeration of this set of negative *gūṇa-vīpārītya-dōgas*, besides the technically defined positive *dōgas*, Bhoja was, perhaps, influenced by Vāmana's dictum *gūṇa-vīpārītyatmano dōgah—*i, i, i (where, however, the term *vīpārītya* is rightly taken to mean 'the opposite,' since *dōgas* in Vāmana's theory bear characteristics opposite to those of the *gūṇas*; that is, if the *gūṇas* create poetic charm the *dōgas* destroy it) as well as by the treatment of Dāṇḍin's *vīpārītyas*. Bhoja's *vīpārītyas* mean certainly *vaipārītya*, since each of a set of nine out of twenty-four of his *gūnas* has on principle been shown to have a particular *dōga* corresponding to it; and the *dōgas* which thus arise do not attach themselves to a particular Riti, so that by reason of these *vīpārītyas* the Gauḍī Riti, or for the matter of that, any other Riti does not unnecessarily suffer from deficiency. But while Bhoja was partially influenced by Dāṇḍin in evolving such a set of faults, he does not appear to have followed any fixed tradition. Some of these *gūnas* which have been shown to have a set of corresponding *dōgas* are defined after Vāmana, and some after Dāṇḍin. Besides, Bhoja, on principle, invents a *vīpārītya* of each of the ten *Gūṇas* (excepting Samādhī) of Vāmana or of Dāṇḍin, while Dāṇḍin names or characterises the *vīpārītyas* of only some of them, the other *Gūṇas* being common to both the Mārgas. Bhoja calls the *vīpārītyas* distinct *dōgas*, and as such they are not the characteristics of a particular Riti, whereas Dāṇḍin's *vīpārītyas* are sometimes the characteristics of the Gauḍa-mārga, and he never uses the term *dōga* in their connection, excepting once in i, 69. Thus Bhoja's *vīpārītyas* are negative entities, being always the exact opposites of some corresponding *gūṇas*, whereas Dāṇḍin's *vīpārītyas* are partly the characteristics of his Gauḍa-mārga, and as such, they constitute positive entities.
which is not, really speaking, devoid of charm, nor condemned outright. In spite of his decided partiality for the Vaidarbha and a mild aversion for the Gauḍa manner, we are not convinced that he meant to deprive the latter of the recognition that was its due. S. P. Bhattacharyya has already shewn¹ that even long before the time of Daṇḍin the Gauḍī Rāti had, side by side with the widely accepted Vaidarbhi, an established tradition of its own, which Daṇḍin himself could not ignore.

On the other hand, if viparyaya is taken to mean anyathātva, the utmost we can hold against the Gauḍa-mārga is that its standard of a poetical composition differs from that prevalent in the very widely recognised Vaidarbha; and that in their attempt to attain that standard the propounders of the Gauḍa diction did not mind if they sometimes deviated from the practice prevalent in the other mode.⁹

The controversy about the exact meaning of viparyaya really raises distinctions without much difference, and the ultimate conclusion derivable from the different views is almost the same. Thus, we may distinguish three different views:

1. The Gauḍa-mārga generally presents a different aspect as regards the essentials of a diction. The word esāṁ in this case would refer to the essentials (prāṇāḥ) and viparyaya would mean anyathātva or a different aspect.

2. Far-fetchedness, unevenness etc. which are themselves the opposites of excellences like lucidity (prasāda), evenness (samatā) etc. are sometimes noticed as existing in the Gauḍa-mārga. The word esāṁ in this case would refer to dhṛṣṭādināṁ guṇānāṁ and viparyaya would mean vaiparītya or opposite.

3. The conception of the Gauḍas regarding the excellences of composition generally differs from that of the Vaidarbha,

¹ Loc. cit.

₂ Taruṇavācaspati, who explains viparyaya as ‘opposite’ (i, 42), remarks in connection with i. 88; kāntī-viparyayam atyukti-nāma guṇāṁ gauḍābhimataṁ darśayati. This statement confirms our belief that the Gauḍas could not have taken the viparyayas as positive blemishes since they were supposed to add charm to their composition, and that the Gauḍas had possibly a tradition of their own, which though sometimes different from that of the Vaidarbhas, was equally appreciated by a class of writers and theorists.
This view may be arrived at from the hint given in the *Hṛdayaṅgamā*, where *eṣām* has been taken to refer to *śleśādinām gūṇānām* and *viparyaya* to mean *anyathātva*.

All these interpretations, though seemingly divergent so far as the terms *eṣām* and *viparyaya* are concerned, lead us to some important conclusions on which there appears to be general agreement. No one would perhaps deny that (i) the ideals of composition differ generally in these two types of poetry, i.e., if the Vaidarbhā-kārya demands compactness of structure, clarity of expression, a sense of proportion, evenness of syllable-structure etc., the Gauḍās are satisfied with hyperbole and verbosity, alliteration and bombastic expressions, and such other characteristics. (ii) In order to attain this standard the Gauḍās do not care if they have sometimes to have recourse to *śaithilya*, *vaiṣṇavya* etc. But it must not be understood on that account that looseness, harshness, unevenness of syllable-structure etc., which are deviations from or even opposites of qualities like *śleṣa*, *sukumāratā* and *samatā*, form the inseparable characteristics (*prāṇāh*) of the Gauḍā-mārga, as the excellences like *śleṣa*, *prasūda* etc. are of the Vaidarbhā-mārga. (iii) Far-fetchedness, exaggeration, looseness etc. are looked upon as positive excellences by the Gauḍās, who *sometimes* entertain them in poetry for a particular purpose, viz., the achievement of their standard of poetry which differs fundamentally from that of the Vaidarbhās,—the one emphasising the chaste and classical manner and the other preferring the fervid and the bombastic. That Daṇḍin meant to imply all this will be clear as we proceed with his treatment of the individual Gūṇas, which we now propose to take up in detail.

(1) *Śleṣa*. It is found in a composition which is free from looseness (*śaithilya*), and this looseness consists in the use of *aḷpha prāṇa* syllables, i.e. syllables containing unaspirated letters which require little effort in pronouncing, or more technically the first and third

---

1 The word *prāyas* in i, 41 is important in this connection. The characteristics of these two types of poetry often differ but sometimes they agree. The Gauḍā mārga sometimes presents opposites of and deviations from the excellences prevailing in the Vaidarbhā, but qualities such as *samādhi*, *arthavyakti*, *audārya*, *muddhurya* and *opas* are more or less common to both the mārgas, as we shall see hereafter.
DAṆḌĪN’S CONCEPTION OF THE GUṆĀS

(non-conjunct) letters of each varga, and the semi-vowels and nasals, the rest being mahāprāṇa-syllables. The Vaidarbhās are fond of compactness of syllabic binding (bandha-gaurava), which is illustrated by examples like mūlātī-mūlā laṅghitaṁ bhramaraṁ, where, though soft syllables like mā and la are present, the effect of looseness or saithilya has been removed by the use of mahāprāṇa syllables and conjunct consonants, and as such the passage illustrates the excellence śleṣa. A fondness for alliteration inclines the Gauḍas to accept instead a composition like mūlātīmūlā lolāikalilā, though it contains alpa-prāṇa syllables and consequently involves saithilya. It is, however, not meant that saithilya in itself is a blemish. From the point of view of the Vaidarbhās it may appear so, and Daṇḍin elsewhere says that all soft syllables constitute a blemish of looseness (bandha-saithilya-dogo hi darśitaḥ sarvakomale, i, 69). But to the Gauḍas it is a preferable excellence of diction inasmuch as it gives more scope to alliteration.

(2) PRASĀDA. It is the excellence which conveys a sense which is well-known (prasadādhārtha) and easily comprehended (prasāti-subhaga). Theorists, old and new, define and emphasise this special excellence almost in the same way. Too much strain required to arrive at a meaning spoils the charm of poetry. The illustration given by Daṇḍin is indor indīvara-dviti lakṣṇa lakṣmīnī tani “the moon’s spot resembling the glow of a blue lotus increases its beauty.” Here the words indu, indīvara, lakṣṇa and lakṣṇa are so well-known that the expression conveys its sense without any effort. Here, as elsewhere, Daṇḍin speaks of the characteristics of the Gauḍa-mārga side by side with the excellences attached to the Vaidarbla. The Gauḍas who aim at learned expressions prefer even what is not conventional (nāti-rudha). Since their idea of poetic excellence differs from that of the Vaidarbhās they hold that poets can achieve distinction only when they have mastered etymologies and vocabularies and can use difficult words and round-about expressions, while the Vaidarbhās aim

1 Ayugmā varga-yamagū yaṅakoḻpāsavaḥ samrteḥ, quoted by Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita under Pāṇini, viii, 2, 1. On these technical terms, see Belvanalkar’s notes on Kavyādarā (Bombay edition), pp. 55 f.
2 We do not think that saithilya is exactly the opposite of śleṣa, which is an admixture of alpa-prāṇa and mahāprāṇa syllables. A composition consisting exclusively of mahāprāṇa syllables would constitute the exact opposite of saithilya.
at making their composition lucid and easily intelligible to every reader by the use of well-understood expressions. Here we would like to maintain that the term vyutpanna is not the name of the viparyaya corresponding to the prasāda, but that we follow the Hṛdayaṅgama in interpreting it as vyutpannam iti (ḥetoh), i.e., by reason of its being learned.¹ The example given² of the Gauḍa mode contains difficult expressions, the meanings of which are not clear on the surface. Arjuna generally means the third Pāṇḍava and it is not rūḍha in the sense of 'white': the expressions valakṣāgu (white-rayed, i.e. moon) and anatyarjuna (anati-dhavala) are round-about and unusual.

(3) Samatā. It consists in the absence of unevenness³ in syllabic structure, or rather in the arrangement of letters (varṇa-vinyāsa). There must be an evenness between the beginning and ending of a stanza as regards the arrangement of letters or syllables, i.e. if a passage begins with soft vocables it must end similarly. There are three kinds of such structure (bandha), namely, (i) soft (mṛdu) (ii) harsh (spṛuta) and (iii) temperate or mixed (madhyama), arising from the grouping together of soft, harsh or mixed letters. The examples of samatā consisting of three structures (bandhas) and that of the uneven structure (vaiṣamyā) are given in two verses (i, 48-49). Each half-verse is supposed to consist of the example of a particular bandha, whereas the latter half of the second verse illustrates vaiṣamyā⁴

¹ [This is quite plausible. But in spite of this strict stress on a dubious grammatical construction, there appears also the implication that the viparyaya, as described in i, 42, of Prasāda can perhaps be designated as vyutpanna. Compare, for instance, Śīthila which is a viparyaya of Śleṣa, but which is not expressly designated as such. But this does not affect the general argument and is merely academic so long as viparyaya is not taken to connote a direct opposite or a positive bleinish. The same remark applies also to dīpta below—S. K. D.]

² ... anatyarjunaḥ janma-sadṛkṣāṇka vaḷaḳṣaṇaḥ.

³ On the variant reading samam ṣaṅghaṣu viṣamām (Bombay ed.), see Belvākara’s notes in his edition at pp. 45 f.

⁴ Belvākara and Rangacarya reasonably suggest that to avoid syntactical difficulties these two verses should be taken as separate examples of vaiṣamyā, whereas “the halves are by themselves examples of Samatā.” Thus we should connect the word iti in the beginning of i, 50 with the two previous verses, and not with the latter half of the second verse only.
The Gaudas, we are told, admit such compositions (even though they lack uniformity of syllable structure) for the sake of richness of ideas and alamkāras, which being their specific aim, they do not care whether they find it in an even or and uneven structure. Tarunavacaspati suggests that, even though each half-verse contains an example of samatā, the soft (mrdu) and harsh (sphuta) bandhas are not accepted by the Vaidarbalas, for the soft structure is devoid of distinction and the harsh one of agreeableness, implying thereby that the Gaudas would sometimes like the samatā displayed in soft and harsh structures, and hence they would not have recourse to vaiqamya as a matter of principle. In certain cases, however, they would sacrifice evenness for the sake of artha-джāmbara and alamkāra-джāmbara.¹

(4) Mādhurya. It consists in the establishment of rasa in the word and in the theme⁵ (vāci vastuny api rasa-sthitih, i, 51). S. K. De has already shown⁶ that the term rasa as found in Daṇḍin’s treatment does not involve the technical sense in which it is used by the rasa and dhvani theorists, but should be taken in the non-technical sense of pleasing poetic flavour generally. But in Daṇḍin’s Mādhurya, as S. K. De further points out,⁷ the term rasa seems to bear another distinct technical connotation which is different from that given by the Rasa and Dhvani schools; and this is implied in the special meaning attached by Daṇḍin to the vāg-rama and vastu-rama involved in his Mādhurya, the former consisting of repetition of sounds belonging to the same bruti (brutyanuprāsa) and the latter connoting absence of vulgarity (agṛmyatva). Tarunavacaspati rightly gives them the names of sabda-mādhurya (i, 52) and artha-mādhurya (i, 62) respectively,

¹ [The terms artha-джāmbara and alamkāra-джāmbara should be explained as indicating a partiality for excessive ornamentation and for exaggerated conceptions, which latter cannot be strictly called ornamentation. The akṣara-джāmbara (i.e., sabda-джāmbara), which Bāṇa refers to as a characteristic of the Gaudas, must mean a certain leaning towards verbal bombast, while artha-джāmbara is not exactly verbal bombast: it has also an implication of what may be called ‘mental bombast’.—S. D. D.]

² or sense (artha, i. 62).

³ Sanskrit Poetics, ii, p. 137. fn.

⁴ The Theory of Rasa in Sir Ashutosh Mookerjee Silver Jubilee Volume (Orientalia, vol. III), p. 212, where the subject has been fully treated.
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suggesting thereby a two-fold characteristic of this special excellence. Dāṇḍin himself recognised the two-fold aspect of this particular guṇa, as will be understood from his remark vibhaktam iti mādhuryam in i, 68. It is noteworthy that he has nowhere else made any distinction between a sabda-guṇa and an artha guṇa as Vāmana has done; nor, like Bharata, does he expressly state that he looked upon any guṇa as relating either to sabda or to artha. The standard of distinction between a sabda-guṇa and an artha-guṇa, which the later writers describe as āśrayāśrayi-bhāva and which we find first fully established in Vāmana's work\(^1\) leads us to judge that some of the Guṇas of Bharata and Dāṇḍin belong to sabda, some to artha and others again to both.

The vāg-rasa or sabda-mādhurya is said to consist of what is called brutyamuprāṣa. This is not alliteration consisting of repetition of the same or similar syllables, but it is the name given to the specific grouping of similar sounds\(^2\) (bruti-sāmya) which exists in letters belonging to the same sthīna or place of utterance and effort (e.g., kaṣṭha, tālu, danta, etc.), or homogenous letters to which Pāṇini (i, 1, 9) gives the name savarna and which is defined as tulyāśya-prayatna. The example given in this connection is esa rājā yada lakṣmīn prāptavān brāhmaṇa-priyah, where the use of s and r, v and l, t and d as well as p and b produces brutyamuprāṣa, which, involving an economy of effort in articulation, gives a special pleasure to the Vaidarbhās, who avoid, for fear of incurring monotony, mere vartānuṇuprāṣa or the alliteration consisting of repetition of similar letters.\(^3\) The Gauḍás,

---

\(^{1}\) The Kāmadhenu calls it sabālūrthopāsā-vaśāt......bhedāḥ (p. 84 V. V. Series).

\(^{2}\) S. K. De, Sanskrit Poetics, ii, p. 101, fn. 8. The yamaka is excluded expressly (i, 61) as being not conducive to mādhurya.

\(^{3}\) [The respective effects produced by the two kinds of anuprāṣa are described in i, 52 and i, 55. When within any group of vocables is experienced a similarity of sounds, a juxtaposition of words (padāsatti) exhibiting that kind of similarity apparently produces the specific kind of alliteration called brutyamuprāṣa, which involves an economy of effort due to a restriction to the same sthīna of articulation. The vartānumputti, on the other hand, is contiguity (adūrātā) which awakens latent impressions from the immediately earlier cognition of the same sound produced by the same letters (purvānubhava-sanśkāra-bodhini). Here also there is an economy]
however, are fond of varṇānuprāsa displayed in examples like cāru candraśasāṃ bhūru bimbāṃ paśyaitad ambare | man mano manmathā-
krāntaṃ nirdayaṇi hantum udyatam ||, where the repetition of ca, ba,
ma, and na in the words produce the desired alliteration. Here the
Gauḍas take special care to see that too many syllables do not
intervene the repetition of similar letters (aḍāratā, i, 58), for that
would destroy the immediateness of the effect.

Hemacandra and Māṇḍikyacandra remark that the vāg-rasa (or
the saśda-mādhurya as Tarunavacspati calls it) consists both of
brutyanuprāsa and varṇānuprāsa, and as such it will be clear that
mādhurya, which as a saśda-guna consists of the repetition of sounds
or syllables, is admitted in both the Vaidarbha and Gauḍa modes,
the only difference being that the character of alliteration slightly
differs in the two Mārgas, the one emphasising ēruti and the other
varṇa. Tarunavacspati suggests (i, Co) that the word prāyah in
i, 54 signifies that ērutiyanuprāsa and varṇānuprāsa are both accept-
ed in both the mārga: only in i, 59-60 it has been stated that the
Vaidarbhas do not admit specific kinds of alliteration, like smarākh
khalā, etc., where the alliteration is not accepted on account of its
harsh structure in the first half and on account of its loose structure
in the second half.

Coming to vastu-rasa or artha-mādhurya Daṇḍin appears to im-
ply that since embellishment is the general source of poetic charm
and since all guṇas and alaṃkāras go to embellish poetry, it may
be granted generally that all embellishment imbues the sense with
vastu-rasa or artha-mādhurya; yet what specially does this is the
absence of grāmyatā, in which is also included the idea of abhila-
tvā of later writers, and which belongs both to saśda and to

of effort, but since one and the same letter is repeated the economy
is supposed to decline into a weariness caused by the employment
in the same way of the same organs of articulation,—S. K. D.].

1 [Two kinds of varṇānuprāsa appear to be distinguished in
the two examples (given in i, 57), viz., in metrical feet (pāda) or in
word (pada). They must be of sufficient contiguity to awaken the
impression.—S. K. D.]

2 [It is rather curious that Daṇḍin should bring in the idea
of abhilitvā or indecency in this Guṇa. This apparently shows that
the rasa in this Guṇa is taken not in the technical sense of the Rasa-
theorists, but in the general sense of pleasing poetic effect produced
This *vastu-rasa* or *artha-mādhurya* which can be induced by all embellishment but which is specially marked by the absence of coarseness and vulgarity is accepted both by the Vaidarbhas and by the Gauḍas. Indecorous and vulgar expressions and ideas are rejected by both, for Daṇḍin clearly lays down: *evamādi na bāṃ-
santi mārgayor ubhayor api* (i, 67).

by a certain arrangement of word (*vāc*) or matter (*vastu*). Such pleasing effect in the mind of the Sahādaya is apt to be marred by anything which is *grāmya*. The *grāmya* is not vulgar in the restricted sense, but Daṇḍin brings under its connotation the *aśīla* (both in word and sense, and not in sense alone) which equally disturbs a good and pleasing sense. Bharata appears to comprehend the *aśīla* in an aspect of the fault *bhinārtha*, while Bhāmaha includes it under *dauṭata* (in *bruti* and *artha*) in his first list of general *doğas*. This first list of Bhāmaha's ten *doğas* appears from the context to mention those which concern the inner nature of poetry, for it is dealt with in connection with the classification and general characteristics of poetry; while the second list of another ten *doğas* includes faults which are more or less external. This second list of Bhāmaha is accepted and verbally repeated by Daṇḍin, but he does not mention the first list of ten *doğas*, as well as most of Bharata's original ten *doğas*, which includes the idea of the *aśīla*. In treating the Guṇas taken as essential characteristics of good poetry, Daṇḍin could not very well avoid referring to some of the essential *doğas* (e.g. *nayatva* in *arthavyakti*) although he does not define and distinguish them properly; and in *mādhurya* it was natural for him to bring in the idea of the avoidance of the *aśīla*.—S. K. D.]

1 In i. 63-64 and i, 66-67 two kinds of indecorous expression are distinguished. The proposal in i, 63 is direct and therefore vulgar; in i, 64 it is reached by implication and therefore taken as quite decorous. In i, 66 words are used which, if united together, give rise to a new word in Sanskrit by combination, which conveys a vulgar meaning. In i, 67 the words used, possessing more than one meaning, give rise to an undesirable and indecorous suggestion.

2 Hemacandra and Māṇikyacandra remark that Daṇḍin establishes this definition of *mādhurya* by rejecting the one given by Vāmana (*prthak-padatvam*), since this excellence consists in alliteration (in its verbal aspect) and as such it may as well be present
(5) **Sukumārata.** It consists in the absence of harshness due to the use of mostly soft syllables. But it has been remarked in connection with Śleṣa that the presence of all soft syllables in a composition makes it sīthila, and as such it ceases to be excellent with the Vaidarbhās. What is implied here is that soft syllables must remain mixed up with slightly harsh ones and conjunct consonants, and that the total effect must be a certain elegance. It might be argued that such an admixture is not a distinctive criterion: Sukumārata might have a chance of being confused with Śleṣa. To this Tarkavāgīśa remarks that the admixture of alpa-prāṇa and mahāprāṇa syllables constitutes śleṣa, whereas Sukumārata consists in tenderness as a total effect arising from the admixture of soft (komala) and harsh (paruṇa) letters. Nor should we understand that what is alpaprāṇa is necessarily komala and what is mahāprāṇa, paruṇa. Even unaspirated letters may give rise to harshness by reason of a specific admixture (alpaprāṇasya varṇa-vibhoga-samyoṣa-tvena paruṇatva-sambhavī, p. 69). Similarly aspirated letters too may give rise to komalatva as a total effect under special circumstances. Thus, it is the general effect that forms the criterion of paruṇatva or komalatva syllables. In a sīthila-bandha the syllables are all alpaprāṇa and the general effect is ‘loose’. In śleṣa this looseness is overcome by the presence of mahāprāṇa syllables, appearing side by side with the alpaprāṇa ones and making the general effect compact. In the example mālātiṣṭhama laṅghitasā bhramaraśvih the conjunct consonants shine prominently and seem to make the structure generally compact. But the example maṇḍilīkṛtya varhāṇi etc., (of Sukumārata) consists of an admixture of alpaprāṇa syllables slightly with mahāprāṇa ones, as well as conjunct consonants, but the general effect is not harsh or inelegant. The conjunct consonants do not shine prominently and consequently there is no such touch of cohesiveness or compactness as in the expression:........laṅghitam bhramaraśvih.

Here too Daṇḍin presents the Gauḍa ideal side by side. Whereas the Vaidarbhās accept Sukumārata in which expressions consisting of unharsh vocables generally predominate, the Gauḍas have an eye to a ‘glaring composition’, and consequently they do not

In compound words. But this unhistorical statement ignores the chronological relation between Daṇḍin and Vāmana, and therefore possesses little value.
mind if their poetry involves harsh vocables requiring much strain for pronouncing them. The example given here nyāksena kapitah paksah etc. consists of harsh vocables, but to achieve a glaring or grand effect, as well as an exuberance of alliteration, the Gauḍas do not care if they have to sacrifice the general tenderness of structure so welcomed in the Vaidarbha-mārga. We would like to interpret the words diptam iti as diptam iti (hetoh), following the Hiḍayāṅga-mā's indication with reference to vyūtpanna in i, 46. These terms vyūtpanna, dipta etc. give us some of the standard characteristics which the Gauḍas aim at, and they also serve as an apology for the Gauḍa poet's deviations from some of the guṇas prevailing in the Vaidarbha mode. Such an interpretation will not be out of place here, since Daṇḍin has all along been presenting the fundamental characteristics that distinguish the two types of poetry.

(6) ARTHAVYAKTI. It is the explicitness of sense which consists in the absence of neyatva, that is, in the absence of extraneous matter to be brought over for the completion of the sense. In other words, it is that excellence in which the idea of a passage is quite clear from the words actually used, and no implication is necessary for the completion of the sense. The example given here hariṣodhṛtā dhūḥ etc. (i, 73) contains Arthavyakti since the redness of the ocean has been explicitly stated to be due to the blood of the snakes that were crushed by Hari's claws. The neyatva is illustrated in the next verse where the reader requires an implication to be

1 [They are all the same called viparyaya in i, 42. It does not really matter whether these are the actual names of the viparyayas, or generally describe what is understood by viparyaya in the Gauḍa-mārga, so long as the very likely interpretation which the writer puts on the word viparyaya is accepted.—S. K. D.].

2 Daṇḍin does not recognise neyatva and grāmyatva in his treatment of ten technical doṣas. The Post-dhivani writers enumerate a fault called neyārtha where a secondary (indicated) sense is had recourse to without any established usage (rūḍhi) or special motive (prayojana), one of which is absolutely necessary in Indication. The verse which illustrates neyatva here would be an example of the technical fault nirhetā in the treatment of Post-dhivani writers.

3 This must be distinguished from the technical faults nyāya-virodhi which Daṇḍin deals with in iv, 51-54.
understood as to why the ocean was reddened. The Vaidarbhas and the Gaudas both reject it: _nedvama bahu manyante margavor ubhavor api_ (i, 75), because the sense is not apprehensible where the _sabda-nyaya_ (i.e. the law of the expressive power of the words) has been violated. Thus Arthavyakti as an excellence is admitted in both the margas. It will be clear, therefore, that if there were anything which the Vaidarbhas would reject and which could be recognised as a technical blemish, it would be equally rejected by the Gaudas. In other words, a veritable _doṣa_ the Gaudas would avoid just like the Vaidarbhas.

We must not think that since Danḍin’s Prasāda and Arthavyakti both involve explicitness of sense, these two guṇas should be identical. A distinction, though very subtle, can be made in this respect between these _guṇas_. J. Nobel rightly points out that in Prasāda the sense must not be too unusual, words should be used in their obvious or generally understood senses; whereas in Arthavyakti the connection of ideas must be apprehended from the words actually used, there must not be any expectation (ākāṅkṣā) of further word or words to complete the sense.

(7) _Udārata_. It implies an elevation consisting of the expression of some high merit;² literally, upon the utterance of which (_yasmin ukte_) is suggested (pratīyate) some excellence possessing elevation (_utkargaṁ guṇah kaścit_). The Udārata is said to be present in all the Mārgas.³

In the example given of this excellence (i, 77) is implied the eminence of the king’s liberality (_tyāgasya utkargaḥ_), which is not directly expressed in so many words. It is not clear⁴ what Danḍin

---

1 The _Hṛdayaṁgaṇa_ explains the _sabda-nyaya_ thus: _yuvād artho bhimataś tuvac cha bhida bhavitavyam, sabdasyāpi yuvād arthapratipādana-saktis tuvād arthena bhavitavyam iti sabda-śāstra-nyāyah._


3 ........tena sanāthā sarva-paddhatik (Madras ed.). The other editions read _kāvyā_ in place of _sarva_; yet we can take it that this _guṇa_ is entertained in both types of poetry in the absence of the mention of the corresponding characteristic prevalent in the Gauda-kāvyā.

4 [It does not certainly refer to any elevated way of expression but to some implied high merit or _utkargaṁ dharma_ of the subject-matter described. Thus, it is not equivalent to the _uttānapadatī_ of
really means by this definition. The use of the expression *pratiyate* in the definition reminds us of the *parīyamāna artha* of the Dhvani theorists, but we are not certain if the concept of Dhvani as such was at all recognised so early.

Daṇḍin mentions an alternative definition of *udārata* in deference to the view of "some" (kaic chí), which is "something characterised by commendable or eulogistic epithets" (*ālāghyair vīśeṣaṇāḥ yuktaḥ*) such as *ālāmbuja, krīdā-saras* etc. Tarunavācaspati interprets *ālāghya* as *vaiśīṣṭya-pratīti-kṛt*, i.e., bringing into comprehension its peculiarity or distinctive character, and this is supported apparently by Daṇḍin's examples. But we need not take it in this restricted significance alone.

(8) Ojas. It consists in the super-abundance (*bhūyavatvā*) of compound words, and it appears to be accepted in both the Mārgas. In the Vaidarbya-mārga it is the soul of prose; even in verse this is the sole resort of the Gaudās. It is said to be of manifold variety according as there is a profusion or paucity of heavy (*guru*) or light (*laghu*) syllables or an equal mixture of both. This apparently refers to the prosodic long and short syllables. It is further added that this excellence is met with in compositions like *ākhyāyikā*. But since the fine distinctions between the *kathā* and the *ākhyāyikā* are not favoured by Daṇḍin, we may presume that Ojas of manifold

the *Agni-pūrāṇa* (34,69). It must, however, be distinguished from the poetic figure *udātta* in ii, 300, where the greatness, high merit or prosperity of a personage is directly expressed or described; and in this light the use of the word *pratiyate* in the definition of the *gūṇa* is important. As the illustration shows, Daṇḍin appears to think that the *varṇanā-bhaṅgī* is essential: otherwise, the *udārata* could hardly be an excellence of diction. But it need not mean any technical suggestiveness or *parīyamānata* of the Dhvani-theorists, although the word *pratiyate* is actually used. The alternative definition of the *gūṇa* cited by Daṇḍin speaks of praiseworthy epithets (*ālāghya vīśeṣaṇa*): but this, as the example shows, only refers to *epitheta ornatia* of a distinguishing character, like 'toy-lotus', etc. The pregnancy of meaning implied in the first as well as the second definition must therefore be taken in an extremely narrow sense; and the *udārata* is a *gūṇa* in so far as it depends upon a particular way of description or *varṇanā-bhaṅgī*—S. K. D.]

1 Premcandra interprets in this definite sense,
variety is acceptable as the life of prose (gadyasya jīvitum) in all kinds of prose composition. The employment of compounds was probably meant to add force or energy to the diction.

The Gauḍās, we are told, like long compounds even in metrical composition. The Vaidarbhas, too, use compounds in verses, but whereas the Gauḍās are indiscriminately fond of long compounds, the Vaidarbhas would admit them in verses only when they serve to afford charm without much strain, and do not produce confusion (anākulam). Thus, in brief, Ojas, is particularly a characteristic excellence with the Gauḍa poets, who use it to any degree in any composition, while the Vaidarbhas apply it with greater discretion and with certain restrictions.

(9) Kanti. It is said to predominate in a composition which is agreeable to the whole world on account of its not transgressing the general usage or ordinary possibilities. Briefly, it is the absence of the unnatural. This excellence, we are told, is generally found

1 In the treatment of Ānandavardhana (p. 141) compound words constitute the criterion of saṅghatañā and not of guṇa. The primacy of Rasa having been admitted, Ānanda could not maintain that any amount or variety of compound words might be used in any kind of prose composition. Long and middling compounds may be employed in the ākhyaṭikā, but since the depiction of sentiment, particularly śṛṅgāra, predominates in the kathā, the compounds must be used with an eye to its awakening, and too many long compounds would be detrimental.

2 Ojas and, for the matter of that, long compounds have all along been accepted as the sine qua non of the Gauḍi Riti, and even in the twelfth century Śriharṣa regaled the scholarly Indian with his brilliant and sonorous verses. See S. P. Bhattacharyya, op. cit.

3 Heinnacandra and Māṇikyacandra refer to the view of one Maṅgala along with Vāmana, and remark that they reject Daṇḍin’s definition of Ojas on the ground that long compounds cannot be the special characteristic of Ojas, since this excellence resides in all the three Ritis (whereas long compounds are met with only in the Gauḍī Riti). We must not, however, place much reliance on these remarks of later writers. About Maṅgala we know nothing except what we get in such references: but all the three Ritis of Vāmana do not contain Ojas, for his Pāṇcālt has not been defined as possessing it.
in Vārttā and Varāṇā. The meaning of the term vārttā is not clear; but the Hṛdayaṅgamā explains it as anyonya-kathānam, and varāṇā as prakāṃsa-vacanām. Premacandra Tarkavāgiśa quotes a definition of Vārttā: anāmaya-priyālāpa vartī vārttā ca kathyate, and explains it thus; priyālāpe hi loka-prasiddhiha-vastuvabhidhānam evocitam. He further refers to another explanation of vārttābhidhānayu viz., itihāsa-varāṇānṛṇu i.e., legendary accounts. Bhāmaha uses the term vārttā in cases where vakrokti is absent, and it falls short even of Daṃḍin’s svabhāvokti; it consists of such bald and matter of fact expressions as gato’stam arko bhārindur yānti vāsāya pakṣiṇāh etc. It is rejected by Bhāmaha as an alamkāra, and there is no indication for supposing that it is accepted by Daṃḍin, whose svabhāvokti too involves at least some amount of charm. So far as Daṃḍin’s treatment is concerned, the meaning anāmaya-priyālāpa may well serve our purpose. The Varāṇā may be taken to mean vastu-svarūpa-nirūpāna, but even in that case it would be different from Daṃḍin’s Svabhāvokti.1 It must be noted here that though the illustrations of Kānti given by Daṃḍin are theoretically said to conform to general usage, they are yet tinged with a slight touch of exaggeration; but this is probably necessary for the sake of a certain heightened expression without which a dry svarūpa-varāṇā (such as involved in Bhāmaha’s vārttā) might become an example of Kānti. It is thus a heightened expression in the shape of a slight exaggeration that makes Daṃḍin’s vārttā fundamentally different from that of Bhāmaha.

The Gauḍas2 however, are satisfied with exaggerated ideas transcending ordinary possibilities. These highly exaggerated descriptions are called atyukti, which, Tarunavacaspāti remarks, is not a blemish but an excellence pleasing the Gauḍas. The examples contain indeed highly exaggerated statements, since (i) the dust from the feet of a great man cannot really wash away the sins committed, and (2) to say that the creator created the aerial space as small, because he was mindful of the extensive expansion of the heroine’s

1 Compare the illustrations in i, 87 and ii, 10.

2 We would accept the order of verses as in the text in the Bombay and Calcutta editions (i.e., place i, 91 of the Madras edition immediately after i, 87 and not after i, 50).

3 In i, 88 the Vidagdha is a reference to the Gauḍas, implying a certain love of learned display, as opposed to the general simplicity aimed at by the Vaidarbhās.
breasts is certainly a flattering but an excessive statement. This is not merely a heightened expression, but indicates a preference for the exaggerated and the unnatural. Yet the Gauḍas are said to make much of such descriptions, and this is really due to the difference of ideals aimed at in the two types of poetry.

(10) **SAMĀDHĪ.** It consists in the transference of the qualities of one thing to another. The transference may be manifold, and five different cases are distinguished by Gopendra Tippa Bhūpāla in his commentary on Vāmana iv, 3, 8, viz., abhidheya-sambandha, sūdhāya, samavāya, vaiparītya and kriyā-yoga. But Daṇḍin speaks of three cases: (i) superimposition (adhyāsa) of the action of one object on another. (ii) transference of the original sense of a word, which may not in itself be very pleasing (e.g. spitting, vomiting, etc.), to a secondary sense for the sake of some pleasing effect, and (iii) simultaneous super-imposition of many qualities.

It is worthy of note that since transference is at the root of this particular guṇa, it is very difficult to distinguish it from poetic figures like rūpaka etc. which also are based on similar transference of an object or its functions to another object. As suggested by S. K. De, the distinction may be explained by supposing “that in the guṇa there is a transference only of the qualities or actions of one thing to another while in the alambāra either one dharmin itself is substituted for another, or the new dharma entirely supplants the existing dharma.” “But the process of poetic transference” he goes on, “is essentially a mode of figurative expression, resting finally on labhanā, and Vāmana would (partially) regard Daṇḍin’s definition of the samādhi-guṇa as constituting the figure vakrokti, which, in his opinion, consists in a similar transference based on resemblance”.

This excellence is said to be followed by all poets, by which Daṇḍin probably means that it is accepted in both types of poetry, Vaidarbhā and Gauḍa. But he may also imply that such a mode of figurative expression is the basis of all poetic expression, and no poet (whatever be his ideal of poetry) can do without it.

From the above sketch it will be clear that in spite of Daṇḍin’s professed partiality for the Vaidarbhā-mārga, he gives the Gauḍa its due recognition as a mārga of a different type, which might not have been totally acceptable to himself, but which must have had an established tradition of its own, differing in many respects from the widely preferred Vaidarbhā. To him the Vaidarbhā represents the mode of the standard good kāvyā, but he also accepts Gauḍa
as a Mārga. If the fixed excellences are required to be essential in standard good poetry, the Gauḍa does contain some five or six of them. The samūḍhi and udāratā are accepted in both the Mārgas. The neyatva and grāmyatva as defects of poetry are rejected by both; and as a corollary, both cherish an equal amount of regard for artha-vyakti and artha-mādhurya which consist in the avoidance of these faults. The sabda-mādhurya consisting of alliteration finds a place in both these types—only the ideas about alliteration differ. Hemacandra finds vāg-rasa (or sabda-mādhurya) in śrutiya-nuprāsa and varṇa-nuprāsa which are accepted in Dāṇḍin's opinion, by the Vaidarbhās and the Gauḍas respectively. The ojas is accepted by both, with this difference that it is the sine qua non of the Gauḍa-mārga where it is indiscriminately practised, but the Vaidarbhās use it with some restrictions. Of the three kinds of sam-bauḍhās the Vaidarbhās practise only the mixed or middle type, the other two extreme types, viz., mṛdu and sphuta being practised by the Gauḍas. Hence the latter do not accept vaiṣṇavya on principle, but if it is sometimes found in their composition we are to understand that it is there for the purpose of attaining a different ideal. Similarly, if the Gauḍa deviates from other excellences prescribed for the Vaidarbhā, as the standard good composition, it is done for the achievement of the same purpose, viz., for attaining a different poetic standard, which had independently developed even long before Dāṇḍin expounded his theory.

Judging independently, the treatment of Dāṇḍin's Guṇas does not seem to be quite clear and consistent. Some of his Guṇas are somewhat obscure in their conception or definition. "The definition of udāratā" remarks S. K. De "is rather vague, so also is that of kānti, in both of which Dāṇḍin apparently admits subjective valuations not clearly indicated," The distinction between certain Guṇas is again too subtle (e.g., śloka and sukumāratā, kānti and udāratā). The ten excellences shown above, having been described as the life breath of a standard diction, it is natural to expect that they would all present a positive aspect and should not be defined in negative terms. But in the case of certain Guṇas, viz., artha-vyakti and artha-mādhurya, the fault to be avoided is first characterised, wherefrom the character of the corresponding Guṇa is to be comprehended by implication. Thus, so far as these

Sruti-varṇānaprāśaḥkṛyaḥ vāg-rasah (p. 198, N. S. P. Edn.).
two excellences are concerned they are negatively conceived (while others present a definite positive meaning) and consequently give rise to a lack of uniformity in Daṇḍin’s conception of the Guṇas.

We have already noticed that the splitting up of each Guṇa as relating to śabda or to artha respectively did not, as a theory, develop till the time of Vāmana. For the first time Vāmana offers us such a standard for distinction (viz., āśrayaśrayi-bhāva) which was later on utilised by writers like the author of the Agni-purāṇa, Bhoja and Prakāśavarṣa who added a third variety of Guṇa, namely, the Guṇa appertaining to both the word and the sense. Daṇḍin, like Bharata, is not explicit on this distinction. Now that this standard of distinction came to be definitely established since Vāmana’s time up to the systematic development of the Rasa-dhvani theory, we can apply it to ascertain whether the Guṇas as characterised by Bharata and Daṇḍin can be taken as belonging to the word or to the sense or to both. This procedure leads us to conclude that Daṇḍin’s śleṣa samatā, ojas and sukumārata are prominently what are called śabda-guṇas; his prasāda, artha-vyakti, udāratā, kānti and samādhi belong to artha, whereas his mādhurya has an implication of both śabda and artha. The two-fold aspect which Daṇḍin imparts to his mādhurya is a more direct evidence justifying the conclusion that this is a Guṇa having a double character. Vāmana’s was an original move on this direction, and with the eye of a novel theorist he read a new aspect in the Guṇas of his predecessors from which he shaped a system of his own. What was naively treated in the works of Bharata and Daṇḍin received a systematic development at the hands of this earliest known expounder of the Ritti school, properly so called.\(^1\)

Prakas Chandra Laihri

\(^1\) I am indebted to Dr. S. K. De for helping me in diverse ways in the writing of this article.
Origin of Mādhava-Vidyārāṇya Theory

We have seen¹ that the theory of identity of Mādhavācārya with Vidyārāṇya finds no support in any of the inscriptions, literary works or traditional narratives either of the contemporary period or of even later times down to the end of the 17th century. On the contrary, we find the testimony of the above sources distinctly hostile to the theory. How then did the theory arise and when?

Now the earliest inscriptions relating to Vidyārāṇya are of the reign of Harihara II (1377-1404) and show him to be a spiritual guide of the king, and a few grants of land are recorded to have been made in his presence and by his orders to gods and Brahmans. Thus a copper-plate grant of the Sringeri Mutt of 1384 A.D. says, “By the grace of Vidyārāṇya-muni he acquired the empire of knowledge unattainable by other kings”, (Mysore Arch. Rep., 1916, p. 58). Another copper-plate grant of the same Mutt of 1386 thus praises him: “The learned have come to the conclusion that Vidyārāṇya is the supreme light incarnate......The swan Bukka sports happily near the lotus Bhāratītṛtha......which expands by the rays of the sun Vidyārāṇya” (ibid., 58-9).² This record also refers to his death and the creation of an agrahāra named Vidyārāṇyapura near Sringeri in his memory by Harihara II. But none of them show any connection between him and the building of the capital city of the Vijayanagara empire and in fact in the first of the grants quoted above the capital is called Vijayanagara and not Vidyānagara. Nor is any political importance attached to him in these records. The earliest record on stone that connects him with the capital and Harihararāya is an inscription in the village Guṇṭanur (Chitaldroog Taluk 45, Ep. Carn. XI) of Ś. 1487 Rāktaṅkṣi Māgha śu. 15 Wednesday and lunar eclipse (January 16, 1565 A.D. is the equivalent of the tithi, but it is a Tuesday and no lunar eclipse occurred on the date) of the reign of Acyutarāya which refers to him as the king

² Another record of the same Mutt of 1382 A.D. (ibid., p. 57) tells us that some time after 1356 A.D. king Bukka wrote a letter to Vidyārāṇya who was at Benares asking him to return to Vijayanagara.
seated on the throne in Vidyānagarī built by Hariharamahārāya in the name of Vidyāraṇya-śrīpāda. (see also Challakere 51 of Ś, 1481). The story of Nuniz about the building of the capital by Deoras named after the sage Vydiajuna who directed him to choose the particular spot for the creation of the city is well-known and is of nearly the same period (1535-37). But he is not described as connected with the establishment of Vijayanagara kingdom nor does he appear as a great author in any of the inscriptions or literary works for a long time. The earliest record (which is not clearly spurious like the Kapālapur plates etc. referred to in I.A., 38, p. 89-91) that gives Vidyāraṇya the credit for the establishment of Vijayanagara empire is a copper-plate at Sringeri (E. C. VI Śrṅgeri 13) of Ś, 1574 Nandana Sam. Bhādra Śu. 15, Tuesday lunar eclipse=7th September, 1652 A.D. of the reign of the Kejadi chief Śivappanāyaka. By this time the Vijayanagara kingdom had become extinct. The inscription states that Vidyāraṇyaamuni, the spiritual ancestor of the then pontiff of the Sringeri Mutt, Saccidānandabhāratī had created Vidyānagarī (city) by the favour of god Virūpākṣa and the merit of tapas, and placed Harihara (1) on the throne and that out of gratitude Harihara created two agrahāras Śrṅgapura and Vidyāraṇyaapura for the use of the pontifical seat set up by Śaṅkarācārya at Sringeri and bestowed them on Vidyāraṇya. Vidyāraṇya is also spoken of as Vedabhāṣya-pravartaka (promoter of the commentaries on the Vedas). The writer of the grant evidently tried to glorify Vidyāraṇya and he attributed to Harihara I not only the grant of Śrṅgapura-agrāhāra which was made by him for the use of Bhāratītīrtha (E. C., VI Śrṅgeri), but even the creation of Vidyāraṇyaapura-agrāhāra which was the work of Harihara II and which was done after the death of Vidyāraṇya (see Mys. Arch. Rep., 1916, p. 59) was also attributed to Harihara I. Similarly it is Vidyātīrtha who must be considered as the chief promoter of the Vedic commentaries since he is praised by Sāyaṇa in the opening stanzas of his Vedic commentaries as one whose breath is the Vedas and in the concluding stanzas as a Maheśvara who might be pleased with his interpretation of the Veda.

Of course there were other people who promoted or helped to bring

1 Vijayanagara, "the city of victory", is sometimes called Vidyānagarī, "the city of learning". The first syllable of this word occurs also in the names Vidyātīrtha and Vidyāraṇya.
about the commentaries such as Mādhava, the elder brother of Sāyaṅa, who delegated the work to him, kings Bukka I and Harihara II who ordered the production of the work, and several scholars like Paṇḍari-dikṣita (Mys. Arch. Rep. 1908, p. 14) who might have helped in the interpretation of certain passages of the Vedas. Vidyāraṇya is nowhere praised as having had anything to do with the Vedic commentaries but the inscription attributes to him the credit due to Vidyātīrtha for the promotion of the Vedic commentaries.

But even here Vidyāraṇya is not spoken of as the author of Vedabhāṣya but only as its promoter. But in Vidyāraṇya-kālajñāna composed after the extinction of the Vijayanagara kingdom (circa 1664) and before the compilation of Śivatattvavatnākara (1709) Sāyaṅa and Mādhava are said to be nominal authors of the works named after them while to Vidyāraṇya comes the real credit of composing them. The work Guruvanā of the 18th century A.D. follows this but ascribes to Vidyāraṇya the sole authorship of Vedabhāṣya and the other works in the name of Mādhava and Sāyaṅa are stated to be written by them practically to his dictation.¹ The succession list or Gurupilīge in the Sringeri Mutt also agrees with the above as regards Vedabhāṣya. Another small work containing the praise of Vidyāraṇya and composed in recent times is Vidyāraṇya-śaṅkottara-śatanamāvali which contains the praises of Vidyāraṇya as a great yogin that revived Vijayanagara city, created a shower of gold in Hampe and wrote a commentary on the three Vedas, lord of the Karnāṭaka throne, anointer of Bukka as king, writer of commentaries on all the Upaniṣads and the obtainer of birudas including the cross palankin (Avadhani’s Vidyāraṇya, Telugu work, pp. 180-83).

Thus we can see that from the inspirer of Vedabhāṣya, Vidyāraṇya began to be looked upon as its sole author and all the works of Sāyaṅa and Mādhava were pointed out as written by them under his instructions or composed by him in their name. The creation of the city of Vijayanagara, the establishment of the kingdom of Vijayanagara with the rain of gold obtained by his mystic power and the setting up of Harihara I and of Bukka I on the throne were also attributed to him but he was kept quite distinct from Mādhava.

Once this glorification of Vidyāraṇya began, not only were the

¹ See the Introduction to Guruvanā published in Srirangam Series,
works of Mādhavācārya and his brother Śaṅkaṇācārya fathered upon him (against the internal evidence of the works themselves), but he was also identified with Mādhavācārya, the elder of the brothers. Thus Maṇimaṇjaribhedini, a sanskrit poem of modern times written to extol the Sringeri Mutt and Vidyārāṇya and as a rejoinder to the hostile attacks of the Mādhva sect (the founder of which is called in the work an incarnation of anger and for which belief it quotes Kedārakhaṇḍa) identifies Mādhavācārya with Vidyārāṇya before he became an ascetic. In this work Mādhva is described as a poor man unable to marry on account of his indigence. He prayed to goddess Lākṣmī for wealth and was promised that he would get it in his next birth. This was interpreted to mean sannyāsa, Mādhva took sannyāsa from Bhāratikṛṣṇatīrtha and was named Vidyārāṇya. After becoming a sannyāsin he composed the commentaries on all the Vedas. Before this he had written a treatise on Dharmāśāstra, two vṛttis on all the sūtras, Saṅgatiratnamālā and others not named (vi, 10). The story of the raining of gold and setting up the king (whom it wrongly calls Acyuta (VI, 50 & 53) on the throne of Kārnāṭaka and the building of Vidyānagarī city are next described. Then comes the disputation between Vidyārāṇya and Aksobhyatīrtha, a guru of the Mādhva sect, Vedāntadesika of the Rāmānuja sect acting as arbitrator. Vidyārāṇya is described as victorious. No date is given in the work nor is the genealogy of the author described. The author calls himself a Paramahaṃsa-parivrajakācārya and is named Rāmayogin. Because of the ignorance and confusion displayed in the work as regards king Acyuta whom it calls the founder of the Kārnāṭakarājya, the work seems to have been written long after the Vijayanagar empire came to an end and the author’s attacks on the Mādhva sect tend to show that he was writing at a time when that sect was all-powerful in Kārnāṭaka. It is probable that it was composed at the time of Pūṇbaiya, the Dewan of Mysore State (1799-1812), who was a follower of Mādhva sect.

The confusion of Mādhavācārya with Vidyārāṇya is clearly seen in the work Maṇimaṇjaribhedini; but in his attempt to glorify Vidyārāṇya the writer states that Vedabhāṣya was composed by Mādhavācārya after he became a sannyāsi under the new name Vidyārāṇya, though the other works, namely, Dharmāśāstra, evidently, Parāśārasūtra-vyākhyā etc., are said to have been written by him after sannyāsa; but the statement is directly opposed to the evidence of the vedic commentaries where Śaṅkaṇa appears as the author and the name Vidyā-
rañya does not occur and Mādhava appears as a minister or scholar at the bidding of king Bukka. We must also note that Mādhavācārya is described in the work as one who never entered the married state while he is shown as a performer of sacrifices in the works of his brother and of himself\(^1\), which is only possible in the case of a married man. Further, Agrahārā Bāceyahāllī plates (published in Mys. Arch. Rep. 1915 p. 42) of 1377 refer to Māyaṇa, son of Mādhavācārya. Sivaṭattvaratnākara too describes Mādhava as having several sons and grandsons. Hence the statements made in Maṭi-manjarībhedī are opposed both to the evidence furnished by inscriptions and literary works and even tradition, and the work deserves to be rejected as entirely worthless.

This process of ascribing to Vidyārañya not only the establishment of the Vijayanagara kingdom but the authorship of all the works of Mādhava reaches its culmination in the Ānegondi Bakhire, purporting to be a history of Vijayanagara (Ānegondi) kings, in the possession of the puraḥita of the late Rājā of Ānegondi and noticed in p. 16 of the Telugu work Vidyārañyaclaritramu by Avadhāni. Here Vidyārañya is said to have built the city of Vijayanagara named Vidya-nagara in Ś. 1258 and to have sat on the throne and ruled the kingdom for 26 years and left in Ś. 1284 (1362 A.D.) placing Bukka on the throne and died in the year Yuva. Vidyārañya is described as Mādhavabhaṭṭa before he became an ascetic in Ś. 1244 and as having composed the works Parāśaramādhaviya, Kālamādhaviya, Vidyāmādhaviya, Nidānamādhaviya and a commentary on the three Vedas. Thus Vidyārañya is not only identified with Mādhavācārya, brother of Śaṇaṇa, but also with other Mādhavas, among whom is Vidyāmādhava, son of Nārāyaṇapūjya-pāda of Vasiṣṭhagotra who composed Vidyāmādhaviya (an astronomical work published in the Mysore Oriental Library Series) and also Mādhava, son of Indukara, the author of the medical work Mādhavanidāna of the 16th century A.D. Evidently the Bakhire is a modern production embodying conflicting traditions of doubtful value.

Some of the modern writers and editors have gone one step further still in confusing Vidyārañya with Mādhava, author of Āravadaranasaṅgraha and Mādhavāmātya, author of Tātparyadipikā without even a traditional basis. In the introductory stanzas of the first

\(^1\) Op. cit.
of these viz., Sarvadarśanasaraṅgraha we find it distinctly stated that its author Śāyāna-Mādhava is a Kaustubha jewel to the Milky ocean, Śāyāna and can never be confused with the elder Mādhavācārya, brother of Śāyāna. Nor is there any evidence traditional or literary1 to identify him with Vidyāraṇya. As regards Mādhavāmātya we know from inscriptions that he was the governor of Candragutti and Banavase from 1347 (Ep. Carn. VIII Sorab 375) to 1391 A.D. and that he captured Goa from the Turks. Now Vidyāraṇya was already an ascetic and the head of the Sringeri Mutt in 1377-78 (E.C. VI Koppa 19 & 31) and could not therefore have been governing Candragutti and fighting with the Turks during the period. Further Vidyāraṇya was dead in 1386 A.D. according to the second Sringeri Mutt copper-plate (Mys. Arch. Rep., 1916, pag 59). Mādhavāmātya was of Áṅgirasa-gotra and son of the Brahmin Chāvunda and a staunch Śaiva, being a disciple of the Śaiva priest Kriyāsakti (E.C. VII Shikarpur 281), while Mādhavācārya was of Bāravājagotra and son of Māya and a disciple of Vidyātīrtha and of Bhrāttītīrtha as acknowledged in his works. Further the Śrīgeri Kaḍita and Guruvaṇḍa distinctly describe Mādhavāmātya as distinct from Vidyāraṇya (Mys. Arch. Rep., 1916, p. 58; Guruvaṇḍa, VII, 23). The question has been very ably discussed by Mr. Narasimhachar in his article in the Indian Antiquary for 1916 and he has proved convincingly that Mādhavāmātya is quite different from Vidyāraṇya.

We may also notice here the tradition regarding the Śaṅkarācārya Mat or Kaṇccha Kāmakoṭi pīṭha now located in Kumbakonam, Tanjore District in the south. The earliest work giving an account of its gurus is a Sanskrit poem Puṇyaślokamaṇjarī by Sarvajanasadāśivabodha, 56th pontiff of the mutt (1524 to 1539). Here we are told that the yati Vidyātīrtha, disciple of Candracūḍa, ruled in Kaṇcī mutt for 73 years from 1297 to 1370 and retired to the Himālayas with his disciple Śaṅkarānanda, where he died in 1385 A.D. He is said to have been surrounded and revered by Mādhava, Bukka and Bhrāttītīrtha and to have set up 8 gurus to look after his mutt during the absence of Śaṅkarānanda and himself in the Himālayas.2 No mention is made of Vidyāraṇya. The name given to Vidyātīrtha before he be-

1 The only exception is the commentary Suṣamā of 1720 A.D. to be noticed later in this paper.

2 गीता वालयानुभावार्तिविविधेह्य स्त्रिकलितिः पृष्ठे: ॥ ॥
came a sannyāsin is Sarvajñāvisṇu, son of Śāraṅgapāṇi of Bilvāranya and his guru Candracūḍa is called Gaṅgeśa before sannyāsa. The next work of the mutt regarding the subject is Gururatnamālikā by Sadāśivabrahmendra, co-disciple of Ātmabodhendra (1586 to 1638), 58th pontiff of the mutt. From this we learn that Vidyāttirtha was the teacher of Śayaṇa and Mādhava and was skilled in disпутations. No mention is made of Vidyāranya here also; nor is he identified with Mādhavācārya.

But a later production regarding the gurus of the Kauśi mutt named Suṣamā composed in 1720 as a commentary to the above Gururatnamālikā speaks of Śayaṇa and Mādhava as the composer (kārtṛ) and the reviser (pārīkārtṛ) of Vedabhāṣya and Vidyāttirtha as their guru praised in Vedabhāṣya and in Jaimintyanyāyamālāvistarā respectively. As regards Bhāratīttirtha, it is stated that he was also a disciple of Vidyāttirtha and in his work Vaiyāsikānyāyamālā Vidyāttirtha is invoked in the opening verse. Bhāratīttirtha is represented in Suṣamā also a guru of Mādhava, the order of seniority among his gurus being Jāṅnavittirtha (Gaṅgeśa alias Candracūḍa), Vidyāttirtha and Bhāratīttirtha as stated in the opening stanza of Parāśarāvyākhyā. With regard to Śayaṇa-Mādhava, the author of Sarvadarśana-saṅgraha who invokes Sarvajñāvisṇu in the introductory verses of his work, the commentator (the author of Suṣamā) tries to explain the name Śayaṇa as the name of a family and Śayaṇa-Mādhava as Mādhava born in the family of Śayaṇa. The praise of Śaṅkarānanda by Vidyāranya in Paṇcadaśi and Vivaranāprameyasaṅgraha is explained by saying that Śaṅkarānanda, disciple of Vidyāttirtha, was a senior class-mate and a junior guru of Mādhavācārya who is here identified with Vidyāranya, the chief guru being Vidyāttirtha. It is further stated that Mādhava was given the name Vidyāranya by Śaṅkarānanda and that with eight of his co-disciples including Saċcidānanda he set up eight mutts and himself stopped at the mutt near Virūpākṣeśvara on the banks of the Tungabhadrā to stem the growing tide of the Mādhva religion (see the commentary under stanza 76).

In the next stanza giving the names of the co-disciples of Vidyāranya, viz., Saċcidānanda, Advaita Brahmānanda etc., the commentator tells that one of the disciples of Vidyāttirtha who was placed
In charge of Sringeri mutt was Advaita Brahmānanda alias Ānandātman also called Bhāratītīrtha and quotes a stanza from Bhadāranyakopaniṣāddīpikā of Saṅkarāṇanda in which he praises after Vidyātīrtha, his disciple Advayabrahmānanda calling him also Bhāratīyānanda stating that he lived at Virūpākṣa (Hampe) and set up eight mutts appointing as their heads Mādhava and others to combat the Dvaita religion. We next learn from the commentary Suṣamā that seeing the Sringeri mutt in ruins for 800 years after the 11th guru beginning from Saṅkara, and the Śaiva and Mādhva religions growing powerful, Vidyārāṇya is stated to have defeated Akṣobhya and receiving sannyāsa from Vidyātīrtha and Saṅkarāṇanda, set up his co-disciples Saccidānanda and others in eight places in the Karnāṭaka including Sringeri in newly established mutts and himself stopped at a mutt in Virūpākṣaṃkṣetra (Hampe) where he remained as minister and that he issued bulls with the seal of Vidyāsākara (combined name of Vidyātīrtha and Saṅkarāṇanda) and that king Vīrabukka and the succeeding kings of Vijayanagara, respected in spite of the proximity of the newly set up mutt in their own capital, the pontiffs of Kāñcī mutt as jagadgurus (world teachers) and granted them lands as mentioned in copper-plate śāsanas of Vīra-Narasimha Kṛṣṇarāya etc. in that mutt (see also Venkataraman’s Saṅkarācārya and his successors in Kāñcī).

It will be seen from a study of the above that the early tradition of Kāñcī mutt refers to Mādhavācārya, Śāyaṇa, Bukka and Bhāratītīrtha as disciples of Vidyātīrtha, a fact which is already known to us from the works and inscriptions relating to them. It is to be observed that no mention is made here of Vidyārāṇya or of his mistaken identity with Mādhavācārya. The later tradition of the mutt represented by the commentary Suṣamā of the 18th century tells us that Sringeri mutt was in ruins for a long time until it was revived by Bhāratītīrtha and Vidyārāṇya under the orders of their guru Vidyātīrtha, pontiff of the Kāñcī mutt and of Saṅkarāṇanda and that eight other branch mutts of Kāñcī were also set up with the disciples of Vidyātīrtha presiding over them, including the mutt at Hampe where Vidyārāṇya is said to have resided. But the Kāñcī tradition cannot be relied upon except for contemporary events. It is no doubt true that there is no inscriptive evidence to prove the existence of Sringeri mutt before the 14th century A.D. But the same can be said of the Kāñcī mutt. There is no proof that Vidyātīrtha belonged to the Kāñcī mutt. The Vāgīśvarī Gaṇapati temple
inscription at Sringeri of 1356 A.D. (Mys. Arch. Rep. 1916, p. 56) refers to the visit of king Bukka to Sringeri to pay his respects to Vidyātīrtha and to the gift of some lands for the expenses of his mutt. The other copper-plate grants that eulogise Vidyātīrtha and his intimate relations with Bukka are found to belong to Sringeri or places not far from Sringeri. Neither Kānci nor its neighbourhood has produced so far any inscription on stone or copper relating to Vidyātīrtha. The list of the pontiffs of this mutt prior to Vidyātīrtha given in Punyaālokamañjārī and other records of the mutt appears to contain the names of many of the rulers or ministers of Kashmir taken from Kalhaṇa's Rājatarangini (12th century). It is too much to believe that the pontiffs of the mutt were connected with the rulers of Kashmir or that their influence extended so far off. As for Suśamā, it merely reproduces the mistaken tradition of the identity of Vidyāraṇya with Mādhava and exaggerates the importance of the Kānci mutt at the expense of Sringeri and other mutts in Southern India. Naturally the writer's statements are full of inconsistencies and errors. Thus he tells us in one place that the statement made in some works that Vidyāsaṅkara is the same as Vidyātīrtha praised by Śāyaṇa etc., is quite wrong as Śāyaṇa was not wanting in vocabulary.¹ But elsewhere while trying to attribute to Vidyātīrtha, the connection with the seal of Vidyāsaṅkara found in the Sringeri mutt (in honour of goddess Vidyāsaṅkara, the lingā set up in memory of Vidyātīrtha in the samādhi-temple at Sringeri known as Vidyāsaṅkara temple) he is ready to say that Vidyāsaṅkara, Vidyātīrtha and Vidyānātha are one and the same.² Similarly in trying to identify Vidyāraṇya with the author of Sarvadarśanasaugraḥa he says that the name of the author Śāyaṇa-Mādhava simply means Mādhava born of Śāyaṇa family.³ Now we know that this work

¹ वृद्धोदने विद्याषा सिद्धीवेश्वरस्वामिं विद्यामयरक्षितं शरणाक्षरम् विद्यāतीर्थो शरणागमनं सृजना अस्तवलाद वेदांतप्रकाश श्रीमयासाङ्करकोशम सत्तु वाण्डक्षरसारातिशयायम्

² वृद्धोदने विद्याषा सिद्धीवेश्वरस्वामिं विद्यामयरक्षितं शरणाक्षरम् विद्यातीर्थो शरणागमनं सृजना अस्तवलाद वेदांतप्रकाश श्रीमयासाङ्करकोशम सत्तु वाण्डक्षरसारातिशयायम्

³ प्रभाबिष्टिसिद्धीवेश्वरस्वामिं शरणाक्षरम् सृजना अस्तवलाद वेदांतप्रकाश श्रीमयासाङ्करकोशम सत्तु वाण्डक्षरसारातिशयायम्
was composed very late in the reign of Bukka II as it refers to the work of Jayatirtha (circa 1365-88). How could the author (if he is to be equated with Vidyāraṇya) call himself in his old age by the name he had before sannyāsa and call his guru Vidyātīrtha also in the same way by the name he had before sannyāsa? Neither Mādhavācārya nor Śāyaṇācārya ever refers to Śāyaṇa as a family name in any one of their works. Surely such an important detail could not have been left out by Śāyaṇa in his Alaṅkārasudhānīdhi nor has any writer referred to Mādhavācārya the elder as Śāyaṇa-Mādhava. What were the 8 mutts established by Vidyāraṇya (or Bhāratiṇītīrtha?) under Śaṅkarānanda’s orders and when did they ever acknowledge the Kāṇcī pontiff as their founder? The Kāṇcī mutt has not a single record of the Vijayanagara kings till the reign of Vira Narasiṃha, more than 150 years after the establishment of the kingdom. Moreover, the statement that Vidyāraṇya received sannyāsa from Vidyātīrtha and not from Bhāratiṇītīrtha is opposed to what is given in Maṇiñānjarībhedini. Neither the Sringeri nor Kēḻadi tradition nor Maṇiñānjarībhedini ever refers to any connection between Vidyāraṇya or Vidyātīrtha with Kāṇcī mutt. We may therefore dismiss this later tradition of Kāṇcī mutt as a mere glorification of Vidyāraṇya in such a manner as to bring greater glory to Kāṇcī mutt whose pontiff Vidyātīrtha is represented as his guru.

It is thus clear that in trying to eulogise Vidyāraṇya and his work, political and literary, his admirers naturally gave him the credit for the authorship of some of the best literary works of his period which were composed by Śāyaṇācārya and his elder brother Mādhavācārya. Most of such narratives were composed towards the close of the 17th century. Some of the writers of the 18th and 19th centuries have gone one step further and boldly identified him with Mādhavācārya. Modern editors and writers have in many cases ascribed the writings of other Mādhavas of the period to Vidyāraṇya and identified him with them all,

1 Thus Keḻadināpavijaya by Liṅgaṇa written towards the close of the 18th century and Bhuvanapradipika of 1868 of Rāmakṛṣṇa, both of Mysore State, speak of Mādhavabhaṭṭa or Madhavarya becoming a sannyāsin under the name of Vidyāraṇya.
Arguments for the identification of Vidyāraṇya with Mādhavaśīrga answered

What then are the reasons advanced by scholars in support of the identification assumed between Mādhava and Vidyāraṇya?

(1) In a copper-plate grant (Inam office copper-plate grant noticed in Mys. Arch. Rep. 1908, p. 14) dated 1386 A.D. (Ś. 1308 Kṣaya Sam. Dwitiyāśadha śu 2 Tuesday, Karkatakaasaukiānti day) a grant of lands is recorded to have been made by Harihara II in lieu of a money grant bestowed previously in the year Durmāti by the prince Cikkarāya of Araga to Nārāyaṇa-vājapeyāyājīn, Naraḥari-somayājīn and Paṇḍari-Dikṣita, promoters of the commentary on the four Vedas (Catur-veda-bhāṣya-pravartaka). The new grant is stated to have been made by the king in the presence of Paramahāṃsa-parivrājakāśrya Vidyāraṇya. From this it is argued that "Mādhavaśīrga had a great deal to do with the composition of the commentaries on the Vedas and it is likely that the grant was made at his instance to the above scholars for their co-operation in writing these monumental works. If Vidyāraṇya had been a different person altogether, there would have been no necessity to make the grant in his presence. This inscription makes it quite clear that Mādhavaśīrga was a sannyāsin under the name of Vidyāraṇya in A.D. 1386" (Indian Antiquary, 1916, p. 19).

Unfortunately for the above argument the dating of the grant is irregular as the tithi quoted falls on a Thursday (June 28, 1386 A.D.) and not on Tuesday as stated in the grant and moreover we find that in another copper-plate grant of 1386 (noticed in Mys. Arch. Rep., 1916, p. 59) Vidyāraṇya is said to have died previous to that date, viz., in Ś. 1309 Kṣaya Sam. Jyeshha. ba. 13th Saturday corresponding to May 26, 1386 A.D. (a Saturday if we take the year Kṣaya, Ś. 1308, as correct). Thus the genuineness of the grant is doubtful. Further, the mere mention of a grant made to certain vedic scholars (who might have helped in the interpretation of certain passages and been thus called promoters of the vedic commentaries) in the presence of Vidyāraṇya does not prove that he was the author or promoter of the vedic commentaries. The presence of the guru was availed of to give additional sanctity to the gift made by the king. Moreover the grant recorded in the sāsana was not a new one but merely consisted of a gift of lands in lieu of a grant of money made
previously by a scion of the royal family. There are also sev-
eral other inscriptions (E. C. VI Koppa 19 of 1378 ? E. C. VI Koppa
30 of 1378), in which lands are recorded to have been granted to
certain individuals or temples in the presence of or under the orders
of Vidyāraṇya. In these cases a similar identity or motive should
have to be accepted. It is quite possible that the donees in the
Inam office grant were the disciples of Vidyāraṇya and a grant of
land was made to them in appreciation of their services in the cause
of Vedic learning by the king in the presence of their guru. This
seems to be the most natural interpretation. Anyway there is no
ground for concluding from the evidence of the above grant that
Vidyāraṇya and Mādhavacārya were one and the same person.

2. The second argument used to support the theory of identity
rests upon the evidence of a work on Telugu grammar known as
Ahobalīya by Ahobalapāṇḍita said to be a nephew of a Mādhavacārya.
Now in this work we find a stanza in which Vidyāraṇya is
praised as the author of the Veda-bhāṣya, and Dhātuvaṛṭti, and the
bestower of kingship on Harihara in Vidyāraṇaṇī and master of the
goddesses of learning and of wealth. From this it is concluded that
Mādhavacārya is Vidyāraṇya. (Ind. Ant., 1916, p. 18).

But it has been distinctly stated in the works Vedabhāṣya and
Dhātuvaṛṭti that Śāyaṇa was their author and Mādhavīya was a
name given by him to these works (see also p. 711, vol. VI, I.H.Q.),
Hence on the authority of this stanza it is Śāyaṇa that has to be
identified with Vidyāraṇya. The testimony of the work, however,
has to be rejected as worthless as it belongs to a recent date, and
is based on a legend which glorifies Vidyāraṇya by fathering on him
the achievements and writings of others. Ahobalapāṇḍita was not
a relation of the famous Mādhavacārya, because his work purports
to be a review of Kākanūri Appakavi's Telugu commentary on
grammar called Appakaviyam the date of which is Ś. 1578 (gaja-
saila-sara-sudhākara) or A.D. 1656 and hence could not be a contem-
porary or relation of our Mādhavacārya.¹ His work may have been
composed in about 1700 A.D. and cannot therefore carry any autho-
ry for its statements regarding Vidyāraṇya.

3. Similarly two more works are cited to prove the identity of
Mādhavacārya with Vidyāraṇya, viz, Tithipradīpikā by Nṛsiṃhasūri,

¹ For this information I am indebted to Mr. Jayanti Ramayya
Pantalu.

I.H.Q., MARCH, 1931
svāmī of the Kuḍali Mutt of Ś. 1591 whose guru is named Vidyāraṇya⁰ and there are several gurus of the Āvani Mutt who are called by the name of Vidyāraṇya. It is not possible to determine who this Vidyāraṇya was that composed Pañcadaśī. But nothing however is to be found in the work of Pañcadaśī to support the identity of Vidyāraṇya with Mādhavācārya.

Conclusion

It is now clear that Vidyāraṇya, the ascetic head of Śrṅgerī Mutt, could not be the same person as Mādhavācārya, the minister of Bukka, and the writer of works on Dharmaśāstra and allied subjects. There is not a single inscription or literary work of the period which ever tries to connect the two. The tradition of the Śrṅgerī mutt distinctly shows him to be different from Mādhavācārya. The only narratives or works which seem to point to a connection between the two are of later times which make hopeless confusion between Vidyāraṇya, Mādhavācārya, and Śāyaṇa. Their unreliability is patent from the gross ignorance of the colophons of the works and of the political history of the period displayed in them. Even these do not explicitly state that Vidyāraṇya’s father was Māyaṇa or his brother was Śāyaṇa as is the case with Mādhavācārya. Modern writers have fallen into the same error and try somehow or other to show Vidyāraṇya as the author of all the works of Śāyaṇa, his brother Mādhava and other Mādhavas (one writer has even identified him with Madhvācārya, the founder of the Dvaita school of thought in southern India).⁰ The rejection of the theory of identity between Mādhavācārya and Vidyāraṇya and distinguishing the achievements of the great scholars who wrote under the early Vijayanagar kings, from those of each other would greatly help the proper understanding of the history of the period.

R. Rama Rao

---

1 E.C. VII, Shimoga, 81.
2 See History of India by Prothero and Sattā Candra Vidyābhūṣāṇa.
Early Viṣṇuism and Narayaniya Worship

Our enquiry in the previous articles has indicated¹ that theistic tendencies, bordering on the devout, manifest themselves more or less throughout the whole course of Upaniṣadic speculation; but they emerge in a clear and definite form in some texts of the younger group of major Upaniṣads. This gradual evolution of the theistic sense resulted ultimately in the vivid conception of a personal god; and all the elements of the devotional attitude, which one of these Upaniṣads directly characterises as bhakti, centre round a somewhat inchoate sectarianism, which does not indeed reject the impersonal Ātman but identifies it with new great gods like Rudra-Siva, derived partially from Brāhmaṇism and created partially by popular faith. This presumably indicates a compromise between the high speculation of the Upaniṣads which was never discredited and the popular faiths which now demanded recognition. It is indeed difficult to ascertain whether the beliefs and observances of the Brāhmaṇic and Upaniṣadic religion was a matter of actual practice beyond a restricted circle. They must have, to a certain extent, filtered down to the common people; for their undoubted influence on the comparatively modern developments of Hinduism, as well as upon sects and cults, precludes any hypothesis of their having been the exclusive possession of a particular class or caste. But the common people must have had their peculiar faiths and practices, originating from independent sources and profoundly varied and modified by the cultural ideas of the Non-Aryan people in the Gangetic plain. We have as yet no means to determine the exact nature and extent of the influence which contact with Non-Aryan people exerted on the Aryan world; but it is now generally

¹ See IHQ, vol. vi, 1930, pp. 496ff. In the writing of this article I must renew my grateful acknowledgments to my Professor, Dr. S. K. De, who has taken the trouble not only of supervising and revising it but also of enriching it with some notes of his own. But the opinions expressed in the essay are my own.
recognised that the fusion or absorption of races and cultures, which was apparently going on from Vedic times, must have been a potent factor in determining the general current of Indian thought and belief. The ancient popular records are lost or have not been preserved; but there can be no doubt, as recent research has amply established, that the so-called popular element, as distinguished from the hieratic, must have been a strange fusion of polygenous ideas. In course of time, however, a mutual reaction between the two, the popular and hieratic, was inevitable, and the barrier slowly broke down. An exclusive ritual and a highly philosophical creed had to be relaxed so far, even for their own self-existence, as to adopt deities and countenance practices to which heterodox popular religion inclined; while the mass of the people, having little time or interest in elaborate ritual and philosophical abstraction, allowed their larger religious emotions and sentiments to be recognised and re-interpreted by the intellectual aristocracy, and thereby obtain the stamp of orthodox authority.

Thus, about the time when the formal heresies, which came to a head in Buddhism and Jainism, were assailing the very core of the Śrauta religion, the orthodox ritual and creed were faced with the no less difficult task of remodelling themselves by assimilating and moulding the current beliefs and widespread religious practices of their new environment. These popular faiths, centring round the worship of Rudra-Śiva, Viṣṇu-Nārāyaṇa, or Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva, were strongly marked by a tendency towards devotionalism which must have had a disintegrating and even disruptive effect on the older ceremonial or theosophic religion. All this led, on the one hand, to a practical codification of older tradition and stricter regulation of daily life and conduct in the Śrauta-, Gṛhya-, and Dharma-Sūtras; on the other hand, it resulted in a renewed and systematic philosophical activity, sometimes keeping more faithfully to the old Upaniṣadic spirit (Vedānta), but sometimes starting from a different point and diverging more widely (Sāṃkhya). But all this did not prove enough for preventing an entire reshaping of the older religion. Sectarian popular faiths had been gradually gaining ground, and they must have been more in rapport with ordinary life than the mystic ritual of the priest or the profound specula-
tion of the philosopher. It is true that some of the Upaniṣads, if not the Brāhmaṇas, were in a way popular, or intended for a wider public; but the inherited ritual and creed could be accepted only by the initiated, and generally speaking, they never seemed to have formed the actual faith of the people. The elasticity of orthodox philosophy, however, admitted a whole world of gods as a temporary reality into its idealistic scheme; and the older placid theology, already disturbed by the newer worship of sectaries, had to readjust itself, even for its own prestige and continuance, to the changing order of things. A new (and yet not entirely new) feeling, the spirit of emotional religious devotion or bhakti as it came to be called, was gradually developing round new personal gods or old gods conceived anew as wielding power of love and grace; and this, having already found its way into the heart, had to be justified also in the intellect. All this may not have been accomplished by any deliberate theological attempt, but the result of ultimate compromise is seen not only in the fully developed sectarianism of the Mahābhārata in general, but also in particular in the syncretic theism of the Bhagavadgītā, which cannot be satisfactorily explained as an isolated phenomenon.

If there was a strain, original or developed, of theism in the Upaniṣads, it is only natural that it could in the end easily, if not perfectly, mingle with the best theistic elements of the popular cults. If the one was predominantly reflective and the other essentially emotional, both the theistic streams had their source in the same hopes and longings of the human heart; and this fact could partially reconcile, if not fully obliterate, the incongruities of an alliance between philosophy and devotional faith.

Our sources of information about these old religious movements are, however, scanty and unsatisfactory. The problem of the origin and development of a religious movement is in itself a difficult one, but the difficulty is enhanced in this particular case by a hopeless insufficiency of historical data. Here and there we come across isolated facts or ideas, but the connecting links, sometimes stretching over centuries, have to be supplied by inferences from such meagre premises. We have to depend almost entirely on what is contained in the epic poetry, supplemented to a certain extent, by additional information from inscriptions and doubtful literary sources. It
would be highly interesting indeed if it were possible to trace historically and consecutively the train of ideas whereby a formal or philosophical religion, living by ordinance and dogma, could adapt itself to the freedom and unconventionality of popular beliefs, which in their turn allowed themselves to be renewed and transformed. Apart from the general failure of sober historical material in India, the fact that sectarian religions, handed down by floating and indefinite tradition, were originally the possession of the people dissociated them from the sympathy of the orthodox creed; and

1 These popular faiths could not have been “anti-Brāhmanist” in the sense in which Grierson takes the term (Ind. Ant., 1908, p. 252 and elsewhere); at best we can call them non-Brāhmanist or rather non-orthodox. There could not have been any sense of sharp antithesis, and their easy ultimate “Brāhmanisation” would in itself be a proof of their freedom from any direct antithetical attitude. Even Grierson’s dubious theory of the Kṣatriya origin of one of these cults, if admitted, can hardly be adduced as a proof of its alleged anti-Brāhmanist tendency. There are passages indeed in the Mahābhārata (e.g. xii, 269, 9) which may be taken to indicate that the doctrine of Bhāgavatism was recognised as opposed to the pure teaching of the Vedas, but these probably bear testimony to the non-orthodox and popular character of the faith or its independent origin, and nothing more. It may be conceded that Bhāgavatism was not strictly Brāhmaṇic, and could not have been evolved within the fold of orthodoxy which clung to Vedic rites and Vedic gods. But, as Hopkins (Ethics of India, 1924, p. 172) rightly points out, it was also not anti-Brāhmaṇic, for it did not reject Brāhmaṇic authority and institution, as the Buddhists did. There is no open denunciation of the orthodox religion, but there is, on the other hand, a distinct anxiety for as much reconciliation as possible. The trend of the Bhagavadgītā itself would show this. In the Nārāyaṇiya section also, the orthodoxy of the Nārāyaṇiya or Pañcarātra theology is insisted upon by the legend that the supreme scripture of this religion was uttered by the seven Citraśikhandin sages (Marici, Atri etc.) and Manu Svāyambhuva, and was approved by Nārāyaṇa himself as according well with the four Vedas. There is also the legend of Nārada receiving at Śvetadvīpa the doctrine directly from Nārāyaṇa; while its conservatism is expressed
they received, until they could not be safely ignored, little recognition and justice, even if they swayed the lives of a larger population and had been of greater living force.

One of the most important sectarian movements referred to above is what is known as the cult of Viṣṇu, to which we shall confine our attention in this enquiry. H. Ray Choudhuri is undoubtedly right in characterising Viṣṇuism, in its general acceptation, as a great federation of religions bound together by certain fundamental doctrines; but the earliest and the most important of its many phases is the worship of Viṣṇu as Nārāyaṇa-Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva, which forms the leading motive of the Mahābhārata in general and of the Bhagavadgītā in particular. But it is a long step indeed from the theistic speculation of the Upaniṣads to the full-blooded sectarianism of the great Epic.

Strictly speaking, this cult, as we find it developed in the Epic, is hardly yet known by the special appellation of Vaiṣṇavism, but by its belief in yajña, tapas and other traits of the Śrauta religion. It would be a hasty generalisation also to state that certain characteristic features of the faith, like the Ahimsā doctrine, are proofs (as H. Ray Choudhuri in Early History of the Vaiṣṇava Sect, Calcutta, 1920, p vii, presumes) that “Bhāgavatism, like the religions of Mahāvīra and Buddha, was the expression of a natural reaction from the sacrifice-ridden religion of the Brāhmaṇic period”. The superficial analogy suggested to Buddhism and Jainism (which though heterodox or heretical, can scarcely be described as popular) is misleading for more reasons than one; and Ray Choudhuri seems to have overlooked the fact that there was an intervening Upaniṣadic period in which the formal sacrificial religion of the Brāhmaṇas was being gradually replaced by a more intellectual theosophy, and that within this intellectual theosophy not only theistic but devotional tendencies were developing.


2 The word attaches itself peculiarly and prominently to the cult in the later phase of its history, but probably not so in its earlier; and there is scarcely any evidence of a Vaiṣṇava cult in early times. [The sectarian name Vaiṣṇava as a worshipper of Viṣṇu is to be found nearly at the end in the latest portion of the epic, but that only three times. In Mbh., xviii, 6, 97, for instance, we are told:
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is characterised by various names, not intrinsically connected with each other. This fact can be satisfactorily explained only by the supposition that sources of these names and therefore of the cult itself were many and varied. Although it identifies its deity apparently with the Vedic Viṣṇu, it is seldom directly called Vaiṣṇava; and the Vedic Viṣṇu can hardly be recognised in the deity it worships. It is sometimes called the religion of the Bhāgavatas, the worshippers of Bhagavat, the Lord, the Blessed or the Adorable One,¹ its earliest religious text-book being the Bhagavadgītā.

aṣṭādaśa purāṇāṇām śravaṇād yat phalāṁ bhavet /
tat phalam samavāpnoti vaiṣṇavo nātra samśayaḥ //

The mention of the eighteen purāṇas raises a doubt as to the earliness of the passage. The other two passages occur in the same context and speak of vaiṣṇavaṁ padam (xviii, 6, 98; 6, 103) and vaiṣṇavaṁ yajāḥ (xviii, 6, 98) in the same strain. In some other passages the word is used more in the sense of “relating to or belonging to Viṣṇu” than “worshipping Viṣṇu”. Thus, Duryodhana in one passage (iii, 254, 15-20) is advised to perform a vaiṣṇava yajña or sacrifice to Viṣṇu as a substitute for the Rājasūya. In the same way, Nārāyaṇa as Mahāpuruṣa advises the gods to perform a vaiṣṇava kṛatu (xii, 340, 55). Phrases like vaiṣṇava astra, vaiṣṇava tejas, or vaiṣṇava sthāna are common enough, but they have apparently no sectarian significance.—S. K. D. J.

¹ Grierson (JRAI, 1910, pp. 159-162; “Bhakti-mārga” in ERE, p. 539; also cf. A. Govindācārya Svāmin, JRAI, 1910, pp. 861-62) derives the term bhagavat from root bhaj (to which the sense “to adore” is given) and connects it with bhakti, which is also derived from the same verbal root. The word bhagavat, in his opinion, mean “the Adorable One.” V. V. Sovani (JRAI, 1910, pp. 863 f.) would derive the term (more accurately) from root bhaj, “to divide,” “to share,” but give to it the sense of “the possessor of all merit or quality,” so that the word, in his opinion, could be best translated by the expression “the Perfect.” F. Otto Schrader (JRAI, 1911, p. 194) would prefer the phrase “the Holy One.” Hopkins, after an elaborate review of the Vedic and Epic use of the term, would conclude (JRAI, 1911, pp. 727-38) that it would be best to retain the expression “the Blessed One,” indicating the deity who is blessed with all good attributes and by implication blesses his devotee.
the somewhat mythical Nārāyanīya section (ch. 334-351) of the Śāntiparvan, again, the supreme god is named Nārāyaṇa or Hari, and

From the point of view of the faith itself the etymological discussion is rather futile; for, to the devotee, the word expresses much more than its mere radical or historical meaning, and it is therefore untranslatable. It must be noted that the word is applied in the Epic, as elsewhere, to various gods and demi-gods, to priests, saints, and sages, possessing high merit, especially religious merit, as well as to the Supreme Being. It is also a familiar designation of the Buddha. Sometimes a mere form of polite address ("venerable sir"), the word has also the restricted connotation of reverence to the possessor of attributes, holy or divine; while in the derivative word bhāgavata, its denotation is still more restricted to a particular divinity, whose name obviously (like that of the Buddha) was originally an epithet. Whether the word bhāgavat has a direct connexion to the still earlier bhaga, the name of a Vedic deity, of which there are corresponding words in other Indo-European languages (see Schrader, Reallexicon d. Indo-German. Alterth. 2nd Ed. i, p. 406; JRAS, 1911, p. 194) is extremely doubtful; but it is most likely that the Vedic Bhaga was conceived, as his name would indicate, as the apportioner of good luck or giver of good things—a sense which apparently survives, probably through the radical connexion, in the word bhagavat. There is no justification for Macnicol's opinion (Indian Theism, p. 32) that the Bhagavat "traces his descent from the ancient Sun-god Bhaga, one of the Ādityas" except the accidental similarity of the name due to derivation from the same verbal root. Hopkins (loc. cit.) is perhaps right in suggesting that the word bhaga itself (apart from its being a proper name) means in Vedic "fortune" or "good luck" (root bhaj, to share), so that the original Vedic significance of the word bhagavat would be "one who is fortunate or blessed," without any strong religious implication. [The Vedic 'bhaga' is interpreted in the sense of bhāgatheyā or 'good fortune' in Nirukta ix, 31, (cf. xii, 3; iii, 16 in the sense of sexual enjoyment); and the word is apparently derived from the root bhaj, 'to distribute,' 'to apportion' (i, 7), which is also implied in the name of the deity Bhaga as the distributor or the apportioner. The word subhaga in the sense of 'auspicious' is a common enough epithet of Vedic deities. The root does not occur in the list of 44 roots in Nighañṭa iii, 14, signifying Vedic worship, and it could not have meant 'to adore.' But it is noteworthy that the word is
his unceremonious worship appears to be still bearing traces of the older sacrificial religion. The so-called Nārāyaṇiya system, though connected with Bhagavat and Vāsudeva, is said to have originated from Nārāyaṇa, who is indeed identified here with Hari, Viṣṇu, Hara and Kṛṣṇa (besides other gods), but to whom we have the earliest reference in the Śatapatha-Bṛahmana as Puruṣa-Nārāyaṇa in connexion with the mythical performance of a Pañcarātra sātra or series of sacrifices lasting over five days. Hence this system is sometimes known as the religion of the Nārāyaṇiyas (i.e. followers of Nārāyaṇa), and is also called the Pañca-rātra (or Pāṇca-rātra) system, about the origin and meaning of which term, however, there is considerable uncertainty. The religious system, again, connects itself prominent-ly with Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva, whose name can be split up and traced separately back to Vedic literature, but who, spoken of as Bhagavat, figures as its promulgator in the Bhagavad-gītā, thus lending his name to the worship. His tribal name Sātvata (or less correctly Sāttvata), to which fanciful etymologies are given but which has been taken as conterminous with the family name Vṛṣṇi, occurs in the Śāntiparvan as a synonym of Bhāgavata (as well as of Bhagavat himself) without any ethnic significance. It is also a designation of the religion itself. From the monotheistic character of the faith, moreover, the devotee is called Ekāntin or Ekāntika, and the religion is often designated as Ekānta- (or Ekāntika-) dharma. Each of apparently used in the sense of (sexual) enjoyment in Nirukta iii, 16 in connexion with the word jāra.—S. K. D.]

1 See J.R.A.S., 1911, p. 939, f. n. 1; also Mbh., xii. 342, 771.

2 All the four designations, Bhāgavata, Sātvata, Ekāntin and Pañcarātra occur in the Nārāyaṇiya section (Mbh., xii, 337, 1; xii, 335, 19; xii, 348, 1-4; xii, 235, 25). [The term 'Ekāyana' ('The Way of the One,' or 'Fixing one's thought on one object' = Monotheism) is applied to the system in later Pañcarātra Āgamas (e.g. Padma-tantra, 18): but the word is not found in the Nārāyaṇiya. An Ekāyana doctrine (61. 30) is taught in Mbh., xii, 217, but it appears to be a variation of the Brahma-doctrine (so Niñakaṭha); although Nārāyaṇa (61, 2) is associated with it, it has nothing to do with the Ekānta dharma of the Nārāyaṇiya. In Śri-Praśna Sāṃhitā (quoted in J.R.A.S., 1911, p. 937. n. 1) the word is vaguely used to denote a vedischen possibility a Upanishad, or the crown of all Upaniṣads, of which a whole of later Pañcarātra literature is supposed to be a vast com-
these terms possesses a history behind it, and the ultimate Bhāgavata
religion, as revealed in the Epic, appears to be the final meeting place of many currents of
ideas and sentiments. The original records of the
school are now lost, and how the different currents met is a puzzle;
but an historical examination of the terms, so far as available mater-
ials permit, would form a profitable preliminary to the understanding
of the main lines of the conjectural development of the religious
system and of the bhakti-vāda it expounds.

Viṣṇu possesses a fairly long history, which gives him, as a deity,
different values for mythology, ritualism, philosophy and religion.
Judged by the number of hymns addressed to
him in the Rg-veda, he does not appear to possess
as much importance as his subsequent position
in Indian religious history would indicate. We have only five entire
hymns addressed to him, but in the somewhat puzzling character given
to him by these hymns one can hardly recognise the Viṣṇu who became
the centre of worship of the bhakti religion which goes by his name.¹

mentary. Is it in this sense (i.e. Upaniṣad) that the word is used
in Chāndogya Up., vii, 1, 2, where Nārada gives Sanatkumāra a list
of sāstras he has studied, though he makes it clear that he is a mantra-vit
and not an ātmavit (or Aupaniṣada)? Colebrooke (Essays, i, p. 414,
Madras ed. 1871), however, expresses his legitimate doubt about the
meaning of Ekāyana as a sākha of the Veda. Or, does it really
refer to a traditional early Pañcarātra system, with which Nārada’s
name is associated in the Epic? Different explanations of the word
in Ch. Up. have been suggested, e.g., Nitiśāstra (Śaṅkara), Ethics
(Max Müller) etc.; but none is satisfactory. The word is also used
in Chāndogya Up., vii, 5, 2 (eittam hy evaṁ ekāyanam) apparently in
the same sense as employed in Brhad-Ār. Up., ii, 4, 11 and iv, 5, 12,
viz. ‘the sole object,’ ‘the centre of union,’ ‘the meeting place’; but
this obvious connotation does net help us in fixing its denotation of
a particular sāstra.—S. K. D. J.

¹ The main features of Viṣṇu’s character have already been
fully analysed and discussed by writers on Vedic mythology and
religion, and we need not give detailed references here. Most of the
relevant Rg-vedic texts in original and in translation will be found
conveniently collected together in Muir, Original Sanskrit Texts
(London, 1863), vol. iv, ch. 2, pp. 54-83.
Conceived as a beneficent young giant\(^1\) of unknown parentage,\(^3\) his characteristic attributes are his close association with Indra\(^3\) and his three mystic strides.\(^4\) The first of these attributes naturally resulted in a transference to him of some of the titles and heroic deeds of Indra, as well as giving him even in Rg-vedic times a certain reality and importance among the great gods; but it also tended to obscure his distinctive character. All his greatness, however, was not due to Indra, even if he does shine in Indra’s reflected glory.\(^8\) He has his own definite and famous feat which elicits enthusiastic praise, and this consists of the three mighty strides with which he measures the universe. The first two strides are earthly, discernible to men, but the third, the highest (parama pada) is inscrutable, known only to the wise. In the highest step of the wide-strider, which is also called his highest abode or domain, those devoted to the gods (devayu), as well as the gods themselves, rejoice;\(^6\) it is like an eye

1. **Bṛhadāranyaka, yuva, kumāra, i, 155, 6.**
2. He is not one of the Ādityas in the Rg-veda. But he is already becoming an Āditya in Satapatha Br., xiv, i, 1, 6. It is in the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas that we find him established in this role, his original solar character probably suggesting this new relation.
3. The references are numerous. One entire hymn (i, 155) is devoted to the pair. He is Indra’s worthy or intimate friend (**indra-sya yujyah sakhi** i, 22, 19) and is addressed as friend or colleague by Indra himself in many a hymn, the friendship arising from Viṣṇu’s aid to Indra in his heroic deeds. In his supreme feat of slaying Vītra, Indra implores Viṣṇu to step out more widely (viii, 89, 12; iv, 18, 11; see also i, 156, 5; vi, 20, 2; vi, 69; vii, 99, 4 f.).
4. Referred to in almost every hymn to Viṣṇu.
5. Inspite of one of the hymns (viii, 12, 27) which tells us that it was by Indra’s power that Viṣṇu took his three strides. On the contrary, the myth seems to be established enough that Indra is powerless without Viṣṇu’s mystic aid.
6. Hopkins’ interpretation (**Religions of India**, p. 56 followed by Grierson, **Religion of the Rg-veda**, p. 194 and Ray Chaudhuri, **op. cit.** p. 7) based chiefly on i, 154, that it is the abode of the departed spirits is hardly borne out by the passage itself. The stanza referred
fixed shiningly in heaven, and in it there is a well of mead. Although the origin and etymology of the name Viṣṇu are puzzling, both ancient and modern scholars agree in assigning an original solar character to this deity, his leading attribute of the three strides symbolising the passage of the swiftly moving luminary through the three divisions of the universe (earth, air and heaven), or (a view which is less likely) representing its rise, culmination and setting. Inspite of the fact that Viṣṇu, in one of the hymns (i, 156, 3), is called the ancient germ of śta

to only speaks poetically of the seer’s wish to attain that path or domain (pāthas) of Viṣṇu, where men devoted to the gods rejoice, referring to the parāma pada or the highest step where there is a well of mead, although in the immediately preceding stanza all the three steps are described as unfailing, filled with mead and rejoicing in bliss. There is no reference here or elsewhere to any “realm of departed spirits”. Neither the funeral hymns nor the hymns to the fathers contain any allusion to Viṣṇu. The Rig-veda, x, 15, 3 cited by Hopkins (op. cit., p. 144) does not appear to be conclusive on this point. At least, such frankly uncertain and meagre data should not be made the basis of such generalisation of Viṣṇu’s connexion with the spirits of the dead as Macnicol (op. cit., p. 31) indulges in; nor is there any definite idea of a “sun-home of souls” such as Griswold imagines, Oldenberg (Religion des Veda, p. 232) and Keith (Philosophy and Religion of the Vedas, p. 109, note 6) appear to negative the idea of Viṣṇu’s connexion with the spirits of the dead.

1 Various etymologies are suggested. Besides the orthodox ones of ṛṣi, to pervade (Dhān-pātha, iii, 13), viḥ ṛṣi, to attain (Dh. iii, 18 or ix, 81), ṛṣi to enter (Dh. iv, 130), viḥ ṛṣi to let loose, (Dh. v, 2, or ix, 5), we have also the generally accepted derivation ṛṣi, ‘to be active’ (Böhtlingk and Roth, Macdonell, Keith etc.), or ‘to stimulate’ or ‘inspire’ (Barnett), viḥ śna (akin to śnu) ‘crossing the back of the earth’ (Bloomfield), vi (bird)+affix śna, designating the Sun-bird (Bloch), and vi (fly)+śna (on the analogy of īṣṇu) “the heavenly bird” (Hopkins).

2 With the notable exception of Oldenberg (op. cit. p. 229f.) who thinks that there is no definite trace of solar character in Viṣṇu, that he represents an abstract conception merely as a traverser of wide space, and that nothing concrete corresponds to his three steps,

3 śta here may or may not mean sacrificial order, it probably
(पुर्वम् रिस्या गर्भम्), there is nothing to warrant the view ingeniously maintained by Barnett\(^1\) that this solar interpretation is an after-thought or a subsequent mythologisation, that the Vedic Viṣṇu is not the Sun, and that we must emphasise those passages of the younger Vedas and Brāhmaṇas which present Viṣṇu as the spirit of Brāhmaṇic sacrifice.

Even leaving open the question whether there is in the Rg-veda any advanced ritualistic theory which would make such a suggestion plausible, it is difficult to accept Barnett’s contention as applying to Rg-vedic Viṣṇu. It is not enough to explain all the Rg-vedic mythological characteristics and epithets of Viṣṇu and displace the generally accepted theory of solar origin, of which traces persist throughout the history of the deity; but the point is important for understanding the process of Viṣṇu’s elevation in subsequent literature. Following R. G. Bhandarkar\(^2\) the general opinion has been that Viṣṇu’s later popularity and rise in importance were chiefly due to the reverence for the third step, the mysterious highest abode where he dwells. This is probably true, but it cannot be the whole explanation. The passages from the younger Vedas and Brāhmaṇas emphasised by Barnett establish without doubt that in the Brāhmaṇic period, if not in the Rg-vedic times, Viṣṇu was conceived more or less as the embodied spirit of sacrifice, whose inspiring power was an aid to Indra; and that his three steps embracing the earth, air and sky were perhaps expressed symbolically in the common ritual formula bhūr bhuvah svah (earth, air and sky),\(^3\) which apparently refers to the all-pervading power of sacrifice. It is not clear by

refers to cosmic order. This word indicates no connexion with Varuṇa and his Rta, and Keith is undoubtedly right (op. cit., p. 112, note) in stating that Viṣṇu’s connexion with Varuṇa is slight and artificial.

1 Hindu Gods and Heroes (London, 1922), pp. 38f.

2 Vaishnavism, Śaivism and other Minor Religious Systems (Strassburg 1913), pp. 33f.

3 This is Barnett’s explanation; but the ritual formula, which may conceivably refer to the three forms or three abodes of the pre-eminently ritualistic god Agni, need not be directly connected with Viṣṇu. The sacrificers taking three strides in the ritual in imitation of the three strides of Viṣṇu (Śatapatha Br., i, 9, 3, 9-10 and 15) is, however, more significant (Keith, Taitt. Saṃ., i. p. cxxvii).
what train of thought this conception of Viṣṇu as sacrifice was reached in the Brāhmaṇas, but it is clear that by this identification, beginning from the time of the Yajur-Veda, Viṣṇu came to possess an added importance in Brāhmaṇic theory and ritual, even if he was not yet the supreme god nor the god of a devotional faith. He was perhaps already a great god in Rg-vedic times, but this constant identification with sacrifice, as Keith points out,¹ probably increased that greatness and made it permanent and abiding.

Another Rg-vedic attribute, which Viṣṇu shares with Varuṇa and other gods but which must have moulded his character in epic times as a sectarian god, is his good thought or benevolence (sumati), which embraces all mankind and through which he traverses the universe with his wide steps (i, 156, 3; vii, 100, 2). Among the motives variously given for the three strides are mentioned Viṣṇu’s concern for men in distress (iv, 49, 13) and his desire to bestow the earth as dwelling for man (vii, 69, 5-6; vii, 100, 4). It was Viṣṇu who made fast the earth, propped up the lofty sky, enveloped the world in light, and by his three steps maintained the steadfast ordinances; hence he is called the Protector, gopā (1, 22, 18-19; 1, 154, 1-2; vi, 69, 5; vii, 99, 2-4; etc). No doubt, some of these cosmic acts and attributes Viṣṇu possesses in common with other gods; and his mythological alliance with Indra may be partially responsible for his magnanimous and munificent qualities; but benevolence is one of the traits which is unmistakeable and which, surviving in the mythological conception of the Epic, must have helped the process of his later elevation in popular sectarianism.

Whatever may have been the process of his translation and elevation in epic times, there can be no doubt that Viṣṇu, is already a more important deity in Rg-vedic times than the comparative paucity of references in the hymns would seem to indicate.² He comes to figure more prominently and definitely as the persona-

¹ Philosophy and Religion of the Veda, p. 111.
² See Keith, op. cit., p. 109. Although only five entire hymns are addressed to Viṣṇu in the Rg-veda, he is referred to about a little over hundred times; and Rg-veda i, 22, 16f., i, 154-6, vii, 99, i, vii, 100 would, inspite of the usual tendency to henotheism, show that he was not such an insignificant god in the Vedic pantheon as he is
tion of sacrifice in the younger Vedas and Brähmaṇas. In the *Taittiriya-Samhitā* (i, 7, 4) we are told that "Viṣṇu is verily the sacrifice"—a sentiment which is accepted implicitly in the *Maitrāyanī Samhitā* i, 4, 14 and seems to be fairly well established in post-Vedic literature. In the *Vājasaneyi-Samhitā* (ii, 25 and xii, 5), Viṣṇu, presumably as 'yajña' or sacrifice (as commentators explain) is mentioned as dispelling evil-minded enemies, and the three strides are now definitely located in the earth, air and space. One significant passage of the *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa* (i, 9, 3, 9) relates the details of the legend regarding the three steps and furnishes a symbolical meaning to it in terms of the ritual. The miraculous power of Vāmana-Viṣṇu, the Sacrifice, of enlarging himself (in his artifice to defeat the Asuras) to such an extent as to encompass the whole universe, is referred to in another passage of the same Brāhmaṇa (i, 2, 5, 1 f.), which gives perhaps the germs of the later myth of the dwarf incarnation; while yet another passage of the same text (xiv, i, i, 1 f.) contains the legend of a contention among the gods at a sacrificial session, in which Viṣṇu, the Sacrifice itself, comes off victorious and is therefore dubbed "the most excellent (āreṇṭha) of the gods". The sentiment is anticipated often thought to be. His name occurs 59 and 66 times in the Yajur and Atharva-Veda respectively. That he was an old deity even in *Rg-veda* seems probable from the reference to him as ṗūrva.

1 Some of the Brāhmaṇa passages in original and in translation will be found collected together in Muir, *op. cit.*, iv, pp. 107-114.

2 We are told in this passage that Viṣṇu by his strides obtained for the gods all pervading power (*vikrānti*), and that the same pervading power Viṣṇu, as sacrifice, obtains by his strides for the sacrificer. For this reason the sacrificer strides the Viṣṇu strides, referring to the three strides which the sacrificer takes in the ritual in imitation of Viṣṇu himself. Identification with sacrifice also occurs in *Śatapatha Br.*, i, 1, 1, 2; xiv, 1, 1, 6; *Ait. Br.* i, 15; *Taitt. Br.* i, 2, 5, 1, etc. It is noteworthy that 'yajña' or sacrifice is an "incarnation" of Viṣṇu in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* (i, 3, 1 f.).

3 In this passage the three strides are not mentioned. Cf. *Rg-veda*, i, 155, 6 where Viṣṇu's gigantic form (*brhaḥcarīra*) is mentioned. On an explanation of the origin of the myth of the dwarf form, see Keith, *op. cit.*, p. 111, which also refers to the Brāhmaṇa and Samhitā passages relating to the cosmogonic Boar and Fish forms (see Macdonell, *Ve. ite Mythology*, Strassburg 1897, p. 41).
in the *Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa* (i, 1) which calls Viṣṇu, as a ritualistic deity, *paramadeva*, in contradistinction to Agni, who is called *avama deva,* although the same Brāhmaṇa elsewhere (i, 30) gives to Viṣṇu the doubtful compliment of making him the door-keeper of the gods (*devinām dvārapūlah*). A curious legend is also told in the *Satapatha Brāhmaṇa* (xiv, i, 1, 7-10) of the accidental severing of Viṣṇu’s head from his body and of the head being transformed into the Sun—a recollection perhaps of his original solar character.

On the mythological side, as distinguished from the merely ritualistic, the three strides of Viṣṇu become important in the Brāhmaṇas for the part they play in the protection of the world from the Asuras, who are now conceived definitely as evil beings perpetually hostile to the gods. Thus, in the *Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa* (vi, 15) the Asuras having agreed to assign to the gods so much as could be covered by Viṣṇu with three strides, he is said to have appropriated by his famous strides the world, the Vedas and speech.

In the earlier Upaniṣads, Viṣṇu does not figure much; but the

1 This apparently refers to their respective order of invocation in the Soma sacrifice (Agni being invoked first and Viṣṇu last), and not, as Max Müller pointed out, proves anything as to their relative dignity or place in the hierarchy of gods. Keith suggests that the passage may refer to the physical situation of the gods, viz. the celestial Sun and the terrestrial Fire.

2 Quoting *Rg-veda* (i, 156, 4) (*vrajāṁ ca viṣṇuh sakhiśvam āporṇuḥ*), where Viṣṇu with his friends is described as opening the enclosure (of Vṛtra ?).


4 It is important to note, as R. G. Bhandarkar points out (op. cit., p. 34), that not only in the sacrificial ceremony, but also in the ritual of domestic life, specially in the marriage ritual, Viṣṇu came to play a part. Viṣṇu as the protector of the embryo and promoter of conception is already a *Rg-vedic* idea (viii, 36, 9; x, 158).

5 Viṣṇu is mentioned in *Bṛhad-Ār. Up.*, iv, 4, 21 (viṣṇur yonis mukpayatu) in the course of a symbolical description of the sexual rite; but the passage hardly signifies much, unless one supposes that
Kaṭha Upaniṣad, in a well-known passage (i, 3, 9) gives a philosophical significance to Viṣṇu’s parama pada as the end of the path which man traverses, the final goal of existence. With an undoubted reference to the older Rg-vedic myth, the highest step of Viṣṇu is used (as the preceding stanzas show) almost synonymously with the state of Brahma (tattpa), so that Viṣṇu is apparently mentioned here as an empirical manifestation or form of Brahmā. It must be borne in mind that in the Rg-vedic scheme the upper heaven, which is spoken of as the highest step and abode of Viṣṇu, is not his exclusive dwelling, but belongs to all celestial (āgni-sthāna) deities, as well as to the terrestrial Agni and Soma; but when it became peculiar to Viṣṇu as his parama pada, this expression presumably helped in raising the deity to his higher post-Vedic dignity.

It is clear from the brief sketch given above that the Vedic and Brāhmaṇic Viṣṇu has little inner connexion with the Nārāyaṇiya or Bhāgavata religion, which apparently did not owe its origin to Vedic literature, and that early Viṣṇuism, if it ever independently existed, was neither Nārāyaṇa-Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva worship, nor the bhakti-religion which came to be known under the generic name of Vaiṣṇavism. No doubt, Viṣṇu’s benevolence is a characteristic trait, but it has

Viṣṇu here symbolises the source of fertility, in accordance with the Rg-vedic idea of Viṣṇu as the promoter of conception. In Taitt. Up. i, 1, 1 Viṣṇu is apparently nothing more than the wide-striding (viṣṇur urukramah) Vedic deity. Among later Upaniṣads the Mai-trāyaṇi distinctly brings in sectarian ideas and refers to the three aspects of the Supreme Being as Brahmā, Rudra and Viṣṇu (iv, 5; vi, 5). It is not necessary to refer here to the much later neo-Upaniṣads where Viṣṇu figures abundantly as the Supreme Being, for these must have been composed under professedly Vaiṣṇavite influence. Barnett’s statement (JRAS, 1929, p. 129) that the chief doctrines of a Viṣṇuite Church are preserved in Chāndogya Up. iii, 17, 6 is not supported by anything in the text itself, unless of course one presumes the identity of Kṛṣṇa-Devakīputra of this passage with Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa of the epic (which question may now be left out of discussion). Still less are any Viṣṇuite doctrines preserved, as he alleges, in certain parts of the Kaṭha Up.
little direct relation to the idea of a god of grace, which's fundamental to the later faiths; and the cosmic and ritualistic attributes fade away in the later vivid and devout conception of a personal and loveable god. The process whereby the comparatively inferior Vedic Viṣṇu was in post-Vedic literature transformed into the supreme Epic Viṣṇu is not altogether difficult to understand, for the latter still retains some of the characteristics of his earlier prototype; but it is not clear how Viṣṇu, whether Vedic or Brāhmaṇic, could be connected with an entirely new system of theistic devotion for a personal god and identified with Nārāyaṇa or Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva. One may presume that this was due merely to the fortuitous circumstance that Viṣṇu, Nārāyaṇa and Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa were inde-

1 Macnicol's statements (op. cit., p. 39) that Viṣṇu from Vedic times "was recognised as a god of grace" or that he was "too highly personalised a deity" are too hasty generalisations. It is also alleged (op. cit., p. 34) that Viṣṇu "was connected from earliest Vedic times with a work of deliverance for mankind" and that this was one of the elements which inspired the thought of "salvation" and elevated Viṣṇu to the highest place in Indian theistic devotion. But Rg-veda, vi, 49, 13, which is cited in support, only speaks in general terms of Viṣṇu's feat of measuring the universe by his three strides for the good of mankind and praises his bountifulness. The verse cannot be specifically construed as giving any idea of a god of grace connected with the work of deliverance or salvation, but it merely refers, generally, to his benevolence and munificence, of which we have spoken above. If deeds of deliverance were any test, then Indra, more than Viṣṇu, should have claimed more attention. If, in the Brāhmaṇa, Viṣṇu is associated with protection of the world from the Asuras, it must have been due to his alliance with Indra and the Vṛtra-myth or to his new rôle as the personification of sacrifice. Macnicol's further generalisation (p. 30) that the Brāhmaṇa identification of Viṣṇu with sacrifice is an indication that Viṣṇu was "already on his way to his place as the god of the worship of men's hearts" is not only unwarranted but betrays an entire misunderstanding of the Brāhmaṇa notion of sacrifice. See Keith's effective criticism of this point in JRAS, 1915, p. 839.
pendently raised to the supreme dignity and were (despite their
difference as types) as a matter of course equalised by a mysterious
process of religious syncretism. Mutual compromise may be suggest-
ed. But all this cannot be the whole explanation. The connecting links
are unfortunately missing; only surmise but no definite solution of
the problem is possible.

In the obscurity of the early ages it is not easy to discern the
causes which set Viṣṇu apart for this particular rôle and raised him
to the place of eminence which he came to occupy
in post-Vedic religious literature; but from the
account given above the different stages can be
dimly distinguished. When we find that the Brāhmaṇas already
identify Viṣṇu with the sacrifice and exalt him as an excellent deity,
we can guess that he is already on the way of becoming one of the
central figures of the sacrificial religion. This is the first stage: but
how this was accomplished is not clear. There is
no evidence to support Barnett’s thesis that this
was the natural working out of an older hieratic
tradition which regarded Viṣṇu not as a solar
caracter but from the beginning, as the personification of sacrifice.

It appears more plausible, on the other hand, to regard Viṣṇu’s ins-
piring mythological connexion with Indra in the latter’s heroic deeds
as one of the factors working towards this identification with sacrifice,
especially if we bear in mind the Vedic theory of the inspiring power
of sacrifice, which is supposed to strengthen the gods in the perfor-
dance of their divine functions. Indra is declared in mythology to
gain in power by Viṣṇu’s mystic aid, in the same way as Indra is
said in ritual theory to acquire divine energy by the mystic aid of
sacrifice. An original mythological trait, of which an analogy was
found in the ritual dogma, might have led to the ultimate mystical
equalisation; but we must not press the analogy so far as to suppose
with Barnett that in Viṣṇu’s three all-embracing strides was found the
symbol of the power of sacrifice to pervade the three worlds.

At any rate, in one of the younger Upaniṣads we find not only a
confirmation of Viṣṇu’s rising significance in Brāhmaṇical circle, but
also the hint of a temporary philosophical per-
sonification of Viṣṇu as Brahman. In the declara-
tion that the end of man’s long journey, the goal
of wisdom, is the highest place of Viṣṇu, we mark
a further definite stage in the process of Viṣṇu’s elevation.
There is some probability in R. G. Bhandarkar’s suggestion that the obscurity surrounding Viṣṇu’s inscrutable third step helped to give him an association of divine mystery necessary for a supreme god. This sentiment finds expression even in the heightened statement of one hymn (vii, 99, 2) in which the seer declares that Viṣṇu, more than any other god, is beyond mortal comprehension. Viṣṇu’s intimate alliance with the great Indra whose quality he absorbs to himself, and the trait of benevolence in his character must also be emphasised, for here we have a transference to him of the vivid reality of Indra’s character, as well as the Vedic germs of Viṣṇu’s love for man and his exertions on the world’s behalf. To all this must be added the fact that Viṣṇu was originally a sun-god with the sun-god’s tremendous cosmic attributes, as well as his association of light and life and blessedness, especially as a study of comparative religion assures us that this has been a potent factor in elevating some deities of other nations to a place of eminence.

It is not difficult to understand that as Viṣṇu was originally a kindly yet active sun-god, the source of life and light, he was found to be the best possible god to identify with the loveable yet energetic supreme deity of a popular cult. But in this connexion the question naturally arises as to why Viṣṇu, and not the other solar deities, Mitra, Pūṣan, Sūrya and Savitṛ, should be found to possess the enduring theogonic capacity of attracting the special devotion of worshippers and becoming later the centre of a devotional faith. To this question there is no precise solution. Perhaps Mitra, surviving from a much earlier period, had already lost his individuality or merged it in that of Varuṇa, and could not attain the eminence which his Iranian double Mithra did; perhaps Pūṣan, who almost disappears in later Vedic and post-Vedic literature, was too much of an insignificant pastoral god; perhaps Sūrya, symbolising the luminary itself, was too obvious and concrete a

1 Reverence for the wide steps appears especially in Rg-veda, i, 22, 16-21; i, 154.
2 Macnicol, op. cit., pp. 31-32, 34.
deity; but it is somewhat surprising that the golden deity Savitṛ, the stimulator, should be brushed aside in favour of Viṣṇu. The only plausible explanation of the ignoring of Savitṛ appears to be the comparative lack of heroic traditions and legends and a certain want of reality, the presence of which might be demanded in the central figure of a popular cult.

All these conjectures may be hazarded and they may be justly pronounced problematical; but it does not follow that these ideas were not at present all in the history of the transformation of Viṣṇu. They are, however, not sufficient to explain the last step by which a vivid personal god was moulded out of uncertain figures of mythology or speculation. The springs of religious devotion are always obscure, and it is difficult to explain why some gods, more than the others, can specially attract the intimate devotion of his worshippers; but there can be no doubt that obscure sectarian sentiments of love and reverence for a real and personal god had the ultimate influence in affecting the older pantheon and completing the transformation of Viṣṇu, as also Rudra and Prajāpati. It betrays as much willingness on the part of orthodoxy (for Viṣṇu until now was an orthodox deity) to lend its not-insignificant god, as an eagerness on the part of sectarianism to borrow, remodel and identify him with its own loveable gods or demi-gods; and the procedure, even if not deliberate, must have been for mutual benefit. By this process the semi-divine character of popular

---

1 [The Saura sect is an exception difficult to explain. Foreign influence has been conjectured, but the antiquity and indigenous form of the worship cannot be denied. This is perhaps a survival of the ancient worship of a sun-god as a sun-god, conceived also as a symbol of the supreme deity. In the Epic cult Viṣṇu is no longer an obvious sun-god.—S. K. D.]

2 Barth’s suggestion (Religions of India, Eng. Tr., p. 166) of the foisting of a sectarian god (Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa) upon a dummy Viṣṇu, and Hopkins’ view (Religions of India, p. 388) that it was “an attempt to foist upon Vedic believers a sectarian god by identifying the latter with a Vedic divinity,” are really one-sided generalisations. The Brāhmaṇisation of Bhāgavatism, on which Grierson puts so much emphasis, must be understood in the sense that it was the result of a compromise on both sides. If the non-Brāhmaṇic popular cult
heroes and demi-gods of tradition, was on the one hand, enhanced by their identification with an old deity of orthodox mythology and speculation; while on the other hand, the latter became heir to the regard and affection in which the popular heroes and demi-gods were traditionally held. The process is still traceable in a vague way in the Epic,¹ but by what precise train of thought the ultimate identifications were reached will remain uncertain.

The many-sidedness of Viṣṇu's character in the Epic is remarkable, and as a figure of popular devotion he is strangely elusive.

Viṣṇu in the Epic. Mythology and philosophy, superstition and the practice of piety combine to give him ever-changing forms and mystical identifications. But in the midst of the extraordinary variety of deities in the Epic, Viṣṇu's vivid personality cannot be mistaken. In the Epic² Viṣṇu figures pre-eminently as an independent full-blooded supreme deity, or is conceived in the philosophical term of All-Soul, or identified with All-god, as well as with Nārāyaṇa, Vāsudeva or Kṛṣṇa; but he retains through all the multifarious mythical, theological or legendary embellishment a shadow of the older Ṛg-vedic traditions. There is indeed hardly any obvious trace in the Epic of the older views regarding Viṣṇu; but his solar origin is not altogether obliterated. It reappears in his direct identification with the sun³ in some passages, as well as in the many solar epithets was Brähmanised, the Brähmanic religion in its turn was entirely transformed by the popular cult, so that in the end what remained is as much Brähmanic as popular. It is in this character that we find the religion in the Epic.

¹ See Hopkins' *Epic Mythology*, p. 77.

² All the references to relevant epic passages will be found in Hopkins' *op. cit.* sections 143-157; Sørensen, *Index of the Names in the Mahābhārata* (London 1904), as well as in Muir, *op. cit.*, iv, pp. 114 f., 131 f. Detailed references, therefore, are not given here. Our references to the Mahābhārata throughout are to the Calcutta edition (Bangabāsi Press, 1908, with Nilakaṇṭha's commentary), which substantially agrees with the Bombay edition, unless otherwise indicated.

³ This point can hardly be made the ground of the hypothesis of the solar origin of Vaiṣṇavism such as Grierson wants to make out in his article on "The Nārāyaṇiya and the Bhāgavatas," in *Ind. I.H.Q., March, 1931*
he bears and adventures he accomplishes. He is golden-coloured (suvarṇa-varṇa), the shining (rocamāna) sun-bird (suparna), who traverses the sky, or rises like a mare's head (haya-griva, abva-tiras, etc.) from the sea; he is thousand-rayed (sahasrārca), possesses the seven steeds of the sun (saptāsca) and his disc (cakra), having the sun itself for his eye and the diadem of solar glory (kirtim); he is govinda, gōhita, gopati and goptṛ like the sun, and has the bird Garuḍa (who must be traced to a different Ṛg-vedic myth) as his sign (suparṇa-ketu, garuḍa-dhvaaja) and his vehicle; he is tawny-haired (hari-emābhu) and connected with spring-time (mādhava); he is the golden germ (hiranyaga-rbha, vasu-retas); and his three strides (tri-vikrama) encompasses the three worlds. The original mythological subordination and association with Indra is scarcely concealed. The three steps and Viṣṇu's connexions with Vṛtra-myth are expressly stated in the epic story of Indra's fight with the demon Vṛtra in iii, 10, where Viṣṇu promises to aid Indra by entering into his thunderbolt. He is the youngest of the Ādityas, last in birth, we are told, but best in excellence; but even if he is younger than Indra (Upendra) he soon rises above him (Atindra); and Indra's titles and fighting character, passing into this junior Āditya, he typifies prowess and and becomes pre-eminently the lord of hosts (ganaśvara) and the slayer of demons (daityāri). If grandeur is sometimes imparted to his appearance by giving him a terrible form (ghorā tanu), he is conceived as fair, beautiful and lovely, not dark, but white; and his benevolence, love for man and munificence are not forgotten.

But new characteristics and new legends, which we need not catalogue here in detail, gather round Viṣṇu and transform him into a new mythological being, conceived as the supreme personal god. He is no longer a sun-god, nor is the religion of which he is the

Ant., Sept. 1908, as well as in his article "Bhakti-Mārga" in ERE, p. 540. The solar origin of Viṣṇu does not indicate the origin of Vaiṣṇavism as sun-worship. See S. K. De in BSOS, vi (1930).

1 A mythical story of the haya-śiras form is told, with philosophical explanations, in xii, 347, and this form with the horse's head is said to be the primeval (purṇa) form.

2 This in itself would show the implausibility of any suggestion that the epic sectarian faith connected with Viṣṇu is a form of solar worship, or had any original connexion with such worship.
centre connected in any way to sun-worship. He is also not the impersonal Brähmanic principle of sacrifice, although traces of this idea linger in his connexion with sacrifice. Nor again is he the temporary Upaniṣadic embodiment of the metaphysical Brahma, although philosophically his unmanifest and unconditioned being is acknowledged. In spite of the divergent sectarian zeal, which sometimes exalts Brahma and Siva, with whom also he is identified as one of the Trinity, Viṣṇu in the Epic is undoubtedly the dominating and supreme god of a personal faith, either in his own vivid form or as identified with Nārāyaṇa-Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva. The curious syncretism involved in the Indian theory of Incarnation, as well as the convenient philosophical doctrine which believed in one supreme reality but admitted temporary personifications of the same, is responsible for attracting to him old myths attributed to Prajāpati and other gods, and giving him a new, but living, mythological personality. He is soon identified, as the supreme deity, with many other gods, orthodox and sectarian, or with deified beings claiming that honour, especially with Nārāyaṇa, an independent Brähmanic as well as legendary conception, whose titles and attributes are also absorbed. Viṣṇu's four forms (catur-mūrti), four arms (caturbhuja), four lights (caturbhānu), guardianship of the four quarters (caturmahārājika),¹ all seems to be the mythological result of the theological vyūha doctrine of the Pañcarātra worshippers of Nārāyaṇa, which speaks of four successive presentations or emanations (caturvyūha) of the supreme deity, as Vāsudeva (or Kṣetrajña = the pure knowing self), Saṃkarṣaṇa (jiva), Pradyumna (mind) and Aniruddha (self-consciousness),—who are also

1 Cf. the Mahārājas of the Buddhists, who were also Lokapālas.

2 Nārāyaṇa, we are told (xii, 344, 15 f.), remains mystically in the disc of the Sun, and cleansed souls enter the sun-door into him, thence pass into Aniruddha, and thence becoming pure mind go to Pradyumna, thence to Saṃkarṣaṇa and finally into Vāsudeva or Kṣetrajña. This mystical vyūha doctrine, to which we shall return later, plays an important part in the later development of the cult; but its anticipations are to be found in the Epic itself. The doctrine in its philosophical aspect is discussed in the commentaries on Brahma-
mythologically conceived as belonging to the same family! Apart from this, Viṣṇu as the supreme god is also conceived as the supreme philosophical principle, the highest Ātman or Brahman or Puruṣa of philosophical speculation.¹ He is, however, not a mere philosophical abstraction, but a living, powerful and real god, who is the lord and ruler as well as the creator and the destroyer. From our point of view, however, the most interesting points are his absorption of Nārāyaṇa and his identification with Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva, to which we should now turn our enquiry.

(To be continued)

Mrinal Das Gupta

Sūtra, ii, 2, 42. It is to be noted that this theory of vyūhas or emanations is absent in the Bhagavād-gītā, but is developed in the Nārāyaṇīya episode of the Epic.

¹ It is not clear what Hopkins (Religions of India, p. 461) means by the remark that “it is with the philosophical (and not the ritualistic) Viṣṇu that Kṛṣṇa is identified,” unless he has the philosophical Bhagavadgītā especially in view; for, the epic Viṣṇu is more a mythological than a philosophical creation. Philosophy does not appear to have done much for Viṣṇu, philosophy in the epic conception being more an outward accretion than an inward principle. The above remark of Hopkins is also hard to reconcile with another which he makes in his Epic Mythology (p. 203, note), where he says: “Viṣṇu is first a philosopher’s god,” which he further explains by the qualification “i.e., priestly god.” And yet he would not admit “ritualistic” Viṣṇu, who was also presumably “priestly.”
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II

The Nasik cave inscriptions have been studied very carefully by Bühler (A.S.W.I., vol. iv) and Senart (E.I., vol. viii, p. 59 ff.). We shall first of all examine the panegyric of Queen Balaśrī. We have observed before that the first epigraphic record of Gautamiputra at Nasik is dated in the year 18. It is generally believed by scholars that Gautamiputra extended his territories after this date and probably exterminated the Kṣaharātas in that year. I cannot understand exactly what Sir R. G. Bhandarkar meant by conjoint rule. My impression after a study of his Early History of the Deccan is that according to him Pulumāyi was associated with his father even from the start. If this impression is correct, it would appear that Gautamiputra had already conquered all those extensive territories by the 18th year of his reign, as they have been mentioned in the inscription of the 19th year of Pulumāyi (19th year of Gautamiputra, according to those who maintain the theory of conjoint rule). In any case the recounting of the exploits of Gautamiputra in Balaśrī’s inscription was made soon after the conquests of Gautamiputra. But then the style of the language of the inscription leaves the impression that these conquests took place some time ago and was not certainly recent. As a matter of fact, all the translators always use the past tense. This significant fact shows that Pulumāyi and Gautamiputra cannot have ruled together. Again, towards the end of the same inscription, we find that Pulumāyi makes over “the merit of the gift to his father”. This making over of the merit implies that the donee is dead. M. Senart too expresses this view though with much hesitation. Another fact strongly militates against the theory of joint rule, viz., that Queen Balaśrī who so elaborately extols the exploits of her son should fail to date the record in the regnal years of her son even though her son was alive. Besides, it is certainly very astonishing that kings who were supposed to be ruling together should never have been mentioned together. The relevant inscriptions come from the same place and are even found in the same cave. If the
kings were really reigning conjointly; certainly their names would have been mentioned together. Again, the solicitude of Pulumāyi for the maintenance of the ascetics living in the Queen's cave also point to the fact that the latter was ruling alone (E.I., VIII, p. 65).

We may for the present leave the Sātavāhanas alone and turn our attention to Nahapāṇa whose dates, as we have shown, cannot be referred to the Śaka era. When could he have reigned? Here, however, some of the scholars refer his date to the Vikrama era, a suggestion made long ago by Cunningham (vide also Śāstrī, J. R. A. S., 1926, p. 655), while R. D. Banerji suggests that the dates of Nahapāṇa are to be referred to his regnal years. If we refer the dates of Nahapāṇa to the Vikrama era, we find that he must have been ruling about 7 to 12 B.C. But this ascription of the dates of Nahapāṇa to the Vikrama era presents insuperable difficulties which cannot be removed on any hypothesis. The Periplus is our authority for this period. Unfortunately we cannot ascertain the date of the Periplus with precision. McCrindle dates it between A.D. 80 and 89. Kennedy considers it to have been written c. 70 A.D. (J. R. A. S., 1918 p. 112). Schoff originally thought the date of the work to have been 60 A.D., but later on changed his view. But we can find out its terminus ante quem with certainty. The author of the Periplus speaks of contemporary king Malichas, the king of the Nabateans. We know that this kingdom was annexed by Trajan in 106 A.D. to the Roman empire. So the book must have been written before 106 A.D. But the king mentioned seems to be Maliku III who flourished between 39 and 70 A.D. The series of Nabatean inscriptions too abruptly end at about 95 A.D. As a matter of fact, we cannot be far from wrong if we hold that the work was finished before 90 A.D. Now in the Periplus (Art. 41) we find a reference to a king Mambāros (McCrindle) or Nambanus (Schoff). The careful study of Abbe Boyer and other scholars make it certain (vide Journal Asiatique, 1897. Nahapāṇa et l'era Śaka) that Mambāros-Nambanus of the Periplus is to be identified with the great Kṣaharāta satrap Nahapāṇa. So it is apparent that Nahapāṇa was ruling before the Periplus was written. We cannot definitely say when he came to the throne and how long he was on it. All that can legitimately be inferred is that he must have been on the throne some time before 90 A.D. About the territories of Nahapāṇa, the Periplus furnishes us with the particulars that they included
Barygaza, and Minnagar (? Mandasor), near Ujjain. But how far did it extend towards Konkan and Mahāraṣṭra? The surmise of Boyer that the territory next to his was that of Keprobozes, king of Limurike, is probably correct. What the Periplus actually tells us is contained in Art. 50. From Barugaza the coast immediately adjoining stretches from the north directly to the south, and the country is therefore called Dakhinabades (51). Among the marts in the south country there are two of more importance, Paṭhāna, which lies south from Barugaza a distance of twenty days, and Tagara ten days east of Paṭhāna, the greatest city in the country (52). The local marts which occur in order along the coast after Barugaza are Akabarou, Souppara, and Kalliena, a city which was raised to the rank of a regular mart in the time of the elder Saraganes, but after Sandanes became its master its regular trade was put under the severest restrictions; for if Greek vessels, even by accident, entered its ports, a guard was put on board and they were taken to Barugaza (53). After Kalliena other local marts are mentioned. Then follows Naoura and Tundis, the first marts of the Limurike, and after these Mouziris and Nelkunda, the seats of Government. So from this account of the Periplus it would appear that the kingdom of Nahapāṇa stretched for some length below Kalliena (Kalyan). The powerful elder Saraganes and the weak Sandanes may or may not be Sātavāhana. The context and the language of the Greek passage show that they were not contemporary rulers. Now this is exactly the territories of Nahapāṇa, as we find from the place-names in the inscriptions of Uṣavadāta and Ayama. The Nasik region, however, is not included. But from the way in which Paṭhāna and Tagara (? Junnar) has been mentioned in the Periplus it can be inferred that they too lay within Nahapāṇa’s dominions. And this would show the inclusion of N. Mahāraṣṭra within his territories. Thus it is clear that some time before 90 A.D. Nahapāṇa’s territories included those regions which scholars generally place under his sway about the year 45 (Ayama’s Junnar inscription), which they also consider to be the closing year of his reign. This is important and strongly supports our date of Gautamiputra on entirely different grounds. According to our chronological arrangement the defeat of the Kṣaharātās took place in c. 96 A.D. But Nahapāṇa himself might have reigned a few years earlier and closed his reign at about 70 A.D. There is nothing in the Periplus to contradict it, while there is much to be said in favour of this date. I would refer to Kennedy’s article in J. R. A. S., 1918, and to Schoff’s introduction
to his translation of the Periplus. This explains the wear and tear in the coins of Nahapāṇa, both before and after their being restruck by Gautamiputra (noticed by Rev. Scott).

There is an interesting note on Ujjain in the Periplus which throws some light on the vexed history of this period. The Periplus informs (Art 45) that "in the same region eastward is a city called Ozene, formerly the capital wherein the king resided". The context and the language of the Greek passage leave the impression that Ozene was the capital of Nahapāṇa, but who for reasons not known to us transferred it to Minnagar (Mandasor), near Ujjain. About the period described by the Periplus, Ujjain was included in Nahapāṇa’s dominions. Would not this change of his capital from such a famous place to a city comparatively unknown mean that he had lost hold of Ujjain? This is possible and would show that about the time of the Periplus the power of Nahapāṇa was on decline. And this probably was due to the attack of the other line of the Kṣatrapas and of the Sātavāhanas.

That Nahapāṇa was defeated by Gautamiputra seems a priori possible on account of the fact that in the great Joghaltembhi hoard there is not a single coin of any other king after Nahapāṇa. But on other considerations this view seems to be incorrect. We have already given the arguments of Rev. Scott. A careful study of Queen Balaśri’s inscription too confirms this impression. There the great king Gautamiputra is described as "one who destroyed the Śakas, Yavanas and Palhavas; who rooted out the Khañarāta race; who restored the glory of the Sātavāhanas......". Now the main argument in favour of the theory of the defeat of Nahapāṇa by Gautamiputra is based on the fact that in this inscription he is described as having rooted out the Khañarāta race coupled with a doubtful passage in a Nasik inscription (No. 4, E.I., VIII, p. 71) which is translated differently by Bühler and Senart. Bühler took the passage to mean "the field which has been possessed by Ṙṣabhadatta up to the present time", while Senart took the crucial word "Ajakalakiyam" to be the name of the field. The interpretation of Senart is quite plausible. So this inscription cannot definitely be taken to imply that the field came to Gautamiputra’s possession immediately after Ṙṣabhadatta’s. Again, is it not very strange that the name of so great a king as Nahapāṇa (who it is alleged was defeated and killed by Gautamiputra) should not be mentioned in an eulogistic praṇasti? This reticence should have led scholars to conclude
other wise. But it is rather strange that scholars who have built their theories on the strength of the phrase *khakharatavasaniravasesasakarasas*, should have utterly neglected the preceding phrase *sabhyavana palhavanisudanasa*. It is rather unfortunate that we do not know exactly the extent of the dominions of Nahapāṇa. The place-names in the inscriptions of Uṣavadāta and Ayama show that his sway extended over a large territory from Prabhāsa in S. Gujrat, from Broach to Surparaka, the Nasik district, Puṣkara near Ajmer, Ujjain region, Karle and Junnar. This is what we find from the inscriptions. But Prof. Rapson assures us without giving any weighty reason that "Nahapāṇa's territory must have extended much farther north. The place-names in the inscription of Queen Bala-śri seem undoubtedly to indicate the provinces which her son Gautamiputra wrested from the Kṣaharatās, and these included Surāṣṭra (Kathiavar), Kukura (probably some portion of Rajputana), Ākara (East Malwa), and Avanti (West Malwa)." There is nothing whatsoever in the praśasti of Bala-śri which can show that all the provinces mentioned there (unless specifically mentioned as belonging to others) should be taken to mean to have been wrested from the Kṣaharatās. On the other hand, we are told in the praśasti that Gautamiputra destroyed the Śakas, Yavanas and Palhavas. Now should we not seek, in some of these territories which the inscriptions of Uṣavadāta and Ayama indicate to have been in the possession of Nahapāṇa, the names of the territories of the Śakas, Yavanas and Palhavas? Another statement of Prof. Rapson is still more open to criticism. It has been held by scholars that Gautamiputra exterminated the Kṣaharatās and annexed their territories. Prof. Rapson endorses this view, but again he observes: "Even after these provinces had been conquered by the Andhras, the districts still further north may have remained, since Puṣkara in Ajmer, the place of pilgrimage to which Ṛṣabhadatta resorted for consecration (abhiṣeka) after his victory over the Malayas, may be supposed to have lain within the dominions of his lord (bhatṭāraka)." Thus we find that the current hypothesis of complete extermination of the Kṣaharatās is negatived even in the very record which is regarded to prove it. As a matter of fact, such expressions have to be taken in a qualified sense.

In view of these facts we can legitimately hold that Nahapāṇa himself was not defeated by Gautamiputra. He must have been a successor, may be his son in-law Uṣavadāta. In any way the
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interval between his death and the complete defeat of the Kṣaḥaraṁtas is small. The explicit mention of Nahapāṇa as a reigning monarch in the Peripplus does not allow us to formulate any theory which would take him towards the very beginning of the Christian era or even before it.

To close this account of Kṣatrapa and Andhra chronology one more knotty point has to be tackled. Who is really Sātakarṇi, the lord of Daksīṇāpatha, who was twice defeated in fair fight by Rudrādāman and yet was not exterminated by him because of the non-remoteness of their connection.

According to Prof. Rapson and others this Sātakarṇi must be Pulumāyi himself and in support of this view a Kanheri inscription is cited. We quote in extenso Prof. Rapson's remarks: "This inscription is fragmentary, and its exact purport is uncertain. The queen's name is missing, but she is described as 'the queen of Vāsiśṭhi-putra Śrī-Sātakarṇi, descended from the family of Kārdamaka kings. She was almost certainly described as (the daughter) of the Mahākṣatrapa Rudra.' There can be little doubt that the Vāsiśṭhi-putra here mentioned is Pulumāyi, and that the Mahākṣatrapa Rudra is Rudrādāman. This donation was recorded by the minister Sateraka." In the inscription, however, only Mahākṣatrapa- Ru e putrya (h) is found. Bühler thought that the name of the great kṣatrapa was Rudra (Indian Antiquary, 1883, p. 272). This suggestion of Bühler may after all be correct. But the two important inferences that Prof. Rapson makes from the inscription, viz., that the Vāsiśṭhi-putra here mentioned is Pulumāyi, and that the mahākṣatrapa Rudra is Rudrādāman himself is purely conjectural. There is nothing in the record to sustain it and as a matter of fact Prof. Rapson himself confesses the record to be uncertain in purport. Again is it not rather surprising that one should call his son-in-law as being non-remote in connection? As a matter of fact, Sir R. G. Bhandarkār thought that the reading is not correct, and translated the passage as 'remoteness of connection.' His translation has much to commend itself. It is in accordance with Sanskrit idiom and usage. The one singular passage cited in the lexicon of Roth and Bohtlingk is not sufficient to outweigh common construction. But even conceding that the expression means what Bühler understood by it, the premise will not certainly hold the weight of Prof. Rapson's inference. The expression in the Kanheri inscription may stand for Mahākṣatrapa Rudrasīṁha. So here is a difficulty at
the outset. But again there is the difficulty in identifying Vāsiṣṭhiputra Śrī-Sātakarni with Vāsiṣṭhiputra Śrī-Pulumāyi. The metronymic is doubtless the same in both. But in the inscriptions of Pulumāyi nowhere else we have got the form Sātakarni. This is rather strange. Moreover we have to remember that the inscription was set up by the queen with the help of the confidential minister who, it can be conceded, must have known the name of his royal master. The suggestion of Prof. Rapson is not, however, impossible. It will be methodologically wrong to make a statement like that. But if because it might not be impossible, we hold that it is likely, then at this rate we can build any historical edifice we like. The new chronological order proposed by us raises no such difficulty. We cannot, however, in view of the vagueness and meagreness of the data at our disposal definitely say who was the husband of the daughter of the mahākṣatrapa Rudra who is called Vāsiṣṭhiputra Sātakarni in the inscription of his queen. That he is not Śrī Yajña is certain, but from the peculiar way in which their relationship is expressed it is probable that he was in some way connected with Śrī Yajña and may possibly be his brother and connected in his rule. It is tempting, however, to identify him with Vāsiṣṭhiputra Catarapana Sātakarni, of whom we have an inscription at Nanaghat dated in his 13th year. Pandit Bhagavanlal supposed this king to be the father of Gautamiputra Śrī Yajña. But Prof. Rapson is almost certain that this cannot be. He however, observes, "The Pandit was, no doubt, correct in his estimate of the period to which the insessional characters belong; but it is impossible to determine whether this king Vāsiṣṭhiputra Catarapana Sātakarni is a member of a dynasty otherwise unknown...."

Gautamiputra Śrī Yajña seems to be the last great king of the Sātavāhana family. The reverses which he suffered at the hands of the W. Kṣatrapas prove fatal to them and they could not any more recover from the shock fully. His inscriptions are found in Andhra-desa, at China (Cīna), in the Kistna district (year 27), in Māhārāṣṭra, at Nasik (year 7), and at Kanheri (undated and year 16). It is not open to question that he ruled over both Māhārāṣṭra and the Andhra country. It is noteworthy that he issued coins in imitation of the Śakas of Ujjain. This fact, according to Vincent Smith, probably points to his victories over the latter and this inference of Smith is further, strengthened by the fact that his coins are found in Gujrat, Kathiawar, East Malwa, Aparānta, the Central Provinces and the Kṛṣṇa district,
But it should be noted that the large distribution of his coins does not conclusively prove any territorial sovereignty. The find-places of his inscriptions should alone be regarded as the regions over which he certainly held sway.

I should like to notice here one fact which had inadvertently been omitted in course of my discussion. This fact is cited to prove that the dates of Nahapāṇa should be referred to the Śaka era. Dr. H. C. Raichaudhuri sums up the argument thus: "The theory of those who refer Nahapāṇa's dates to the Śaka era, is confirmed by the fact pointed out by Prof. Bhandarkar and others that a Nasik inscription of Nahapāṇa refers to the gold currency of the Kuśāṇas who could not have ruled in India before the first century A.D." This interpretation of the word 'kuśāṇa' occurring in the Nasik inscription is exceedingly doubtful. M. Senart and others deny that the word can mean the Kuśāṇas. And even if it be taken to refer to the Kuśāṇa coinage, it certainly does not affect the date of Nahapāṇa which we have proposed. It is well known that Vima Kadphises issued an extensive gold coinage and if Kaniska's dates be referred to the Śaka era, there can be no difficulty in assigning Nahapāṇa to the period c. 60 A.D.

HARI CHARAN GHOSH
The Lokāyatikas and the Kāpālikas

In old works the Lokāyatikas are mentioned as a sect distinct from the Kāpālikas. Guṇaratna, a fourteenth century commentator, however, identifies the Kāpālikas with the Lokāyatikas. We shall see how these two sects were gradually amalgamated.

The Viṣṇupurāṇa refers to a class of people of ancient origin who were free to live wherever they liked unworried by conventions, pure at heart and blameless in action. Virtue or vice they had none. They lived in an atmosphere of perfect freedom in which man can move without the fear of conventional dogmas of religion and social usage. These people were probably the forefathers of the Lokāyatikas. The vedicists were the unquestioning followers of the vedic injunctions. These two extreme schools of thought flourished side by side, one always opposing the other. Along with these two we find another sect which was neither avowedly religious like the vedicists nor absolutely non-religious like the free men. The followers of this sect observed religious practices not for the purification of the self as a step to Mokṣa but for attaining objects of the senses—enjoyment being their sole end. They were the Śiśnadevas and the Vāmadevas. We cannot say with certainty who these Śiśnadevas or the Vāmadevas originally were. Some maintain that they owe their origin to the barbarous tribes of the non-Aryan group. We can, however, go so far as to say that they did not possess the spirit of the true Aryans. They adopted the religious practices of the vedicists as a means to the realisation of their end—sensualism, which was all that they stood for. The Aryan spirit on the other hand was bold and direct.

The Śiśnadevas were those who worshipped the Phallus. Being
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वषेष्याखातिरिच्छ: सिस्नात्वविविक्तिन:।
गुलाल:कवय: श्रव: सिस्नात्वविविक्तिनः।
प्रांधनं: ग नेशानं: भोजनाध्ययनम:।

Viṣṇupurāṇa, I, 6, 12 & II, 1, 26.
fond of sensual enjoyment alone they had no real faith in the Vedas.\(^1\)
The Chāndogyaopaniṣad mentions a particular form of worship, the Vāmadevavrata, according to which the devotee could enter into sex-relationship with any woman and with any number of them.\(^2\)
He who is initiated into the Vāmadeva Sāman need have no restraint in the matter of sexual intercourse. These Vāmadevavratsins, if not the Śiśnadevas, were probably the forefathers of the Kāpālikas. Sensualism in connection with religious rites was the main characteristic of this school, which later on came to be known as a sect of the Śaivas of the left hand order. Much as their names and practices resemble one another we are not sure if the Śiśnadevas and the worshippers of the Liṅga had any distinct connection with each other. Nor are we quite sure if any such connection actually existed between the Vāmadevas and the Vāmācārins who indulged in sexual pleasure under cover of religion.

There is evidence to show that the non-religionists passed through five distinct stages of development in the course of their evolution. In the initial stage they were pure at heart, blameless in action and free from all conventions, having neither virtue nor vice. In the second stage they developed a spirit of intolerance and opposition accepting the authority of none, yet having no positive problem of their own to solve.\(^3\) The third stage revealed some positive theories—Svabhāva-vāda,\(^4\) recognition of perception as a source of knowledge\(^5\) and the
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1. *Nyāyamañjarī*—

2. *Sammatitarkaparakaraṇa*—

3. *Bhāṭṭa Utpala's com. on Brhatasamhitā, I, 7.*

theory of Dehātmavāda. It was at this stage that they came to be known as the Lokāyatas. In the fourth stage an extreme form of hedonism which was due perhaps to the corruption brought about by their unchartered freedom formed the most important feature of this school. Gross sensual pleasure superseded pure bliss which the Lokāyatikas enjoyed so long. License replaced liberty. It was now that they got the designation of Ārāvaka and preached the gospel of—"Eat, drink and be merry, for to-morrow we may die." From this time forward the non-religionists leaned gradually towards spiritualism. Being severely attacked by the spiritualists, they developed the theory of Dehātmavāda and tried gradually to identify the sense-organs, breath, and the organ of thought as well with the self. At this stage they even accepted inference, though in a restricted sense, as a source of knowledge, and did not deny

1 शरीरालि—शाबदावसे ।
   देह शाबदा—
   श्चतविबिः: काय: पुष्प:—शीतर्णोपङ्क्षमुपतिर्गाद्य: नीताध्यायानाथे ।

2 कान एवैकः पुष्पाचः—नीलक्रष्ट: ।
   वाष्ट्रोपङ्क्ष सुवान जीविता वे स कोन ।

3 Advaitabrahmasiddhi—
   कैचिन्त: कृत्वा निर्ग्रामा सादावमिति श्रामार्गम्।
   सतीनिर्ग्रामार्गम् प्रवर्तिते तत्तद्विधिका:।
   कृत्वा निर्ग्रामा सादावमिति श्रामार्गमिति ।
   विभाविनि प्रवत्तयात् प्राणायामविनि समते।

4 Nyāyamañjara—चुमिचितसात: प्राण: विविषमतमासम्।
   विविषितवर्णप्रतीति विविषितवः पाद्यसोतीति।
   बुद्धायुभमासम् जब्त्तयात्रविनि।
   तव भुस्तुमासम्: प्रामांका: केन नीहुने।
   तत्तत्तमेव: रघुवरसाकामियोधरम्।
   बुद्धमान न तथोदौ प्रामाण्य तत्तदिबिनिः।

Purandara—कौशिकविज्ञानमां वांचेवरीरविन्यास।
   युन कौशिकस्विमां सात्तमद्याकान्नानानसेव न नुअ न तत्तदिबिनिः।

Sarvamatasasangraha—हस्तम् चुर्चितवर्णसंस्करणं साधनाधिकारं प्रत्ययुभमासम् तव वासनाभ्यं भवित प्रयत्नसुसूचिविचित्रम्।
   कौशिकविज्ञानवरीरविन्यासं नृस्तुमामासमिति कुनु: स्वाकार्यविधिकारकमानसमिति।
the existence of Ākāśa or ether as the fifth element. In the fifth stage they came to be at one with the Buddhists and the Jains in opposing the vedicists and got the common designation of Nāstika. At this last stage all anti-vedic schools came under one head—the Lokāyata.

The sect which allowed enjoyment of women for religious purposes introduced gradually the drinking of spirituous liquor and eating of meat, into their religious rites. In course of time the advocates of this school became the worshippers of Rudra, the terrible god, and began to carry one half of a human skull as a cup from which to eat food and drink wine. A garland of skulls formed an invariable decoration of the members of this sect. They used to dance about with a long chain of the bones of the dead flung round their neck and thus assumed a fierce appearance.

The earliest references to the Kāpālins, or the skull-bearers, are to be found in the Maitrāyaṇi Upaniṣad. Here the vedicists use freely such abusive epithets as thieves with regard to them. They are called—‘Taskaras’. This is due, most probably, to the fact that the real purpose of the Kāpālins was not to practise religion but to enjoy sensual pleasure under the mask of religion. They are mentioned here along with the Bārhaspatyas who also are similarly condemned.

Next we meet them as the Śaivas, worshipping Bhairava and Cāmunḍā in their terrific forms wearing a garland of human skulls and requiring human sacrifices and offerings of wine for their propitiation; or as the Buddhists worshipping Buddhakapāla (a

1 Guṇaratna—कृष्ण चावानिकंकनीया चाकां पवन सृष्टिसमकाला: पवनभुजार्क

2 भक्षाये चाने ब्राह्मणकुकुलिन: कापालिक:......ते: भैर न संसेतिस्। प्रकाशसुमाताति तद्भर

3 श्रीता: कापालिका: परे—Siva Purāṇa Vāyavīyasaṁhitā, II, 24. 177.

4 Prabodhacandrodaya, II, 12, 13.—

Vacaśpati Miśra, Govindānanda, Anandagiri, etc.

etc.
Buddhist deity) associated with his sakti, Citrasena, held in close embrace. The figure of Buddhakapāla presents a fierce appearance with three blood-shot-eyes rolling in anger, a distorted face, canine teeth, ornaments made of bones, a garland of severed heads and in an attitude of menacing dance. The hair on his head rises upwards like flames of fire. The god is four-armed. In his hands are shown the Kartti, the Kapāla, the Damaru, and the Khaṭṭāṅga. At this stage we meet another Kapālikā leader named Kapāla-pāda who was a Śūdra by caste and whose followers were all yogins bearing skulls.

The images of the deities are the creation of their devotees, and the devotees imitate their deities as closely as they can. Thus there is a close agreement between the characteristics of the deities and their devotees. The Kapālikas bear skulls as their deities do.

Huen Tsang, Mahendravikrama, Bhavabhūti, Śaṅkara, Kṛṣṇa Miśra, Mādhavācāryya and Ānandagiri, have all left accounts of Kapālikas as a horrible and demoniacal sect feared by all. Being condemned and feared by the villagers, the members of this sect preferred to renounce the world, bear matted hair, use tiger’s skin as garment and bed, besmear their bodies with the ashes of burnt up corpses and live in caves or rocky places. After fasting they

Mattavilāsa—

पेघा सुभ भिष्टलामुखलीस्थितत्वः
शाखा: समाबसलिंग बिजलघुङ्गमः
संगीतस्वलिंगमित्र सौवर्मरः
कीर्तिप्रसन्सतस्वानात्र सर्वायनाः

Śaṅkaravijaya of Mādhava—

शूली विपुल्भु पुरवतेंद्रविकी संहासनानावलरामुः
संहासनेति मद्यपुर्वताः

Igīta確認後を参考: 

Igīta確認後を参考: 此件是説明タブリ: आमरंजनेरतिविद्याधिपी: तपालोभित्वप्रस्तात्वः

Śaṅkaravijaya of Ānandagiri

I.I.Q., MARCH, 1931
drank liquor from the skulls of Brahmans. Their sacrificial fires were fed with the brains of human beings; and the lungs of human victims covered with fresh blood gushing out of the deadly wounds in their throats were the offerings by which they appeased the terrible god Mahābhairava. They practised yoga and were supposed to possess supernatural powers. For example, they could control Harihara and the other great and ancient gods, stop the course of the planets in the heavens, submerge in water the earth with its mountains and cities, and drink up the waters of the oceans in a moment. They had the power to move about in the air. They possessed also the eight siddhis.

The Kāpālikas strive to attain various supernatural powers as their aim is to attain sensuous pleasure. According to some philosophers the state of salvation is no better than that of a piece of inanimate and insensible stone. The Kāpālikas in opposition to this view maintain that a state of salvation in which there is no sense of pleasure should not be aimed at. Exactly the same view is attributed to the Cārvākas by the author of the Naiṣadha Kāvyas. The difference between the Lokāyatikas and the Kāpālikas lies in the means and not in the end. The Kāpālikas suggest some religious rites for attaining pleasure. They hold that pleasure exists in the objects of desire. The founder of the Kāpālika school assures that a devotee having attained salvation, becomes a Śiva and enjoys

1. "विरिक्तदत्तव्रताः वाणूः सूरासंसागराः विपरति वच्चयं ग्यानादेः धर्मिष्ठा गहिरमिष्ठा।
   समसन्धोत्तमः पूर्णिः विद्याय महायोक्त्स कलयं सकलं भूमितयं चाषयं विषवानि तत्॥
   Prabodhacandrodaya, III, 14.

2. "संविषया विषयाः आच्छादिः देवलं विषयाः कामावशोधिति प्राकाशं विषवानि।

3. Prabodhacandrodaya, III, 16:
   देवकारणं शुभं विषयं व विद्यायान्तियोऽस्मात्तिः वैवर्षिकं सुचिकलं सकलं विषवानि तत्।
   परशुः: प्रतिच्छिन्न नित्यत्वाय वाणस्वाभिः कान्तिः कर्मसङ्कुच्चितं विषवानि॥

   सुखोऽनं शङ्कहृदय विशालाय श्रेष्ठाश्रियाः।
   नीतम् तमस्वैव यदा विषय तस्मां न:॥

The man who has prescribed the Śāstras to show the way to salvation as one calculated to make animate beings inanimate and insensible like stones is surely Gotama—the most bovine.
the pleasure arising from the company of excellent beauties like Pārvatī. Their aim is Kāmasādhana—they are the hedonists.¹

Next we come across in the Śrībhāṣya of Rāmānuja a peculiar class of Kāpālikas bearing no Kapāla. Probably as a reaction against the cruelty and ugliness of their own practices, the Kāpālikas, through the influence of the Vedicists became divided into two sections. One section stepped back and brought a more healthy tone to their school. They gave up the horrible and demoniacal aspects of their rituals, and discarded the very Kapāla, from which the term Kāpālika is derived. In Rāmānuja's account we find that a man who knows the essence of the six marks and who is skilful in the use thereof attains the highest bliss by concentrating his mind on the soul as seated on the female organ. These Kāpālikas, according to Rāmānuja, are an anti-vedic sect.² They differed from the skull-bearers only in the means. They still agreed as regards the end, viz., Kāmasādhana.

The other section of the Kāpālikas who did not approve of this retrograde step continued to bear skulls with their horrible and demoniacal practices. But they were no longer called the Kāpālikas. They got by this time a more hated name Kālāmukha or Kālavada. The Kāpālikas lost their Kapālas but continued to hold the old designation. The Kālāmukhas continued to hold the skull but lost their old designation of Kāpālika.³

1 Bṛhaspati Sūtra, II, 6. कापालिककृष्ण कामारथि।

2 Śrībhāṣya, II, 2. 35-38.

चेन दैत्ये वैदिकाः तत्त्वाक्याचार्युपतिकाचार्यं त्रापनकाराय वनेन। दिनिग्निसांन्यैव निश्चितकारकं प्रकरणसाहित्यं। तथा निष्प्रयाधिपतिमथ सूत्रकारस्तुरवर्गादिदुर्गा यथासः। कायासः—

भृविका। वर्णरेषसः परस्परविभाषतः।

भगवानमुमार्गं व्यास विवर्षयस्यस्ति।

कश्चिद् शरणाकाश्च कुसूमाय विश्वामिति।

भर्गो यशोपीतांडुस्तुप्रबंधवतं प्रवर्तेत्।

भार्मवर्तितंदैवत् न भूष वह जायते।

3 Śrībhāṣya, II, 2. 35-38:

तथा कालामुक्ता यथे कापालिकभृतान्वयमकालवदग्नानवनसुरक्रामकालपालवतहि।

धार्मिकबलमेव इति सता इति य सरस्ति। कायाः
We have seen that in the fourth and the fifth stages of development of the Lokāyatikas, the Lokāyatika or non-religionist sect became very licentious. They lost their purity of heart and an anti-vedic attitude became their main characteristic. All oppositionists of the Vedas were known as the Nāstikas, and the Nāstikas were identified with the Lokāyatikas. They were against vedic sacrifices of animals but they lost strength gradually and leaned towards spiritualism.

The new dispensation mentioned by Rāmānuja avoided all cruel and abominable rites. It is, therefore, an anti-vedic sect with sensual pleasure as the end of life. The members of the sect used to meet like the Lokāyatikas once a year at a particular place and to enjoy to their heart’s content all sorts of pleasures without any let or hindrance. Like the Vāmdevavratins of old the Kāpālikas of this stage used to come in sensual contact with any woman irrespective of rank and nearness of kin. The Lokāyatikas who were in their primitive stages pure at heart and blameless in action now became degraded. Thus with the degradation of the Lokāyatikas and the partial purification of the Kāpālikas these two sects were brought almost to the same level and identified themselves with each other. Guṇaratna, the
commentator of the Śaḍdārśanasamuccaya, refers to this identification.¹

In the time of Bṛhaspati of Arthaśāstra fame these two sects were clearly distinct. The Lokāyatikas were Āhetuvācins or Akriyāvādins² the followers of the doctrine of non-causation. According to this doctrine which was propounded by Brahmanāspati or Bṛhaspati, something comes out of nothing—the caused comes out of the uncaused—चत: सद्वाय। This leads to the supposition that the self is Niśkriya, or passive, and therefore remains unaffected by actions, good or bad—नाहि सुक्टदुष्क्रताकर्मणां पहलन विपाकः,³ the universe is self caused and self generated, and there is no retribution of action.

But the Kāpālikas are not so. They are not the Akriyāvādins. They practise religion as a means to an end. According to them Śiva is free from stain and is the supreme agent. No action however repugnant to the moral standard of the world or of the Vedas really clings to Him. The besmearing of His body with the ashes of burnt up corpses together with similar other practices is certainly antivedic. But inspite of this he is free from demerit. On those who have discovered the actual presence of Śiva, the divine spirit, in themselves, the god Śiva confers the power to move in the sky and to have other miraculous powers. According to them Prakṛti is Upādāna kāraṇa and Śiva is Nimitta kāraṇa. This view of the Kāpālikas shows that they were not Āhetuvādins. Religious practices were no end in themselves but merely means. When they gave up Kriyā and became engaged in sensualism they became at one with the Lokāyatikas.

The ugly side of the Kālāmukhas when further developed took a distinct shape and came to be called the Aghoris, the Aghora-panthis or the Kerāris, to whom the human brain was the most delicious morsel and who were considered as Epicurean cannibals. Their predecessors, the skull-bearing Kāpālikas were not apparently as

¹ प्रथम राजकविक्षपति—कापालिका महोज्जवपर योगिनि ब्राह्मणययजाताय वेशं

² नातिक जीवसमिकादिर्विश न मयंन। सत्यस्मातं कर्माद्वयाति।.......

³ वधे ते नदीमपि दिवशं गर्भं संभूत जयासमितिनां भौमानविनां च

2 Śūtrakṛtāṅga—

3 Jātakamālā.
shameless and abominable as these Aghorins. The skull-bearers used to eat flesh and drink wine but always refrained from eating dead carcasses. The Aghorins on the other hand used to take delight in eating dead carcasses and surrounding themselves with filth and foul things of the most ugly and revolting nature.

On the basis of these antivedic practices of the school which is indifferent to Varnāsramadharma and is looked down upon by the members of the Brāhmaṇical schools in all the stages of its career as Śiśnadevas, Kāpālikas, Śaivas, and Aghorins, some are very much inclined to infer that the sect sprang from the uncivilised people of the non-Aryan group.

It was possibly due to the influence of the Buddhists and the Jains that the skull-less Kāpālikas became more and more refined and gave up wine and meat, but still continued in their original habit of sensualism. This sensualism, too, in course of time, either through the influence of the primitive Bauddhas or the Vaiṣṇavas, was purged of its grosser aspect so prevalent among the skull-bearers and took a more refined shape, the end of which was much higher than mere sexual pleasures. The refined body utilised Kāma as a means to some higher end. These people did not care for the temporary and incomplete pleasure mixed with pain as did their predecessors or the Cārvākas. They aimed at the pleasure which is eternal, supreme and pure. These people were the Sahajiyās. They sacrificed Kāma for Prema. They agree with the Lokāyatikas in this that their end is pleasure, that they are antivedics, and that they believe that the material human body is all that should be cared for.¹ They agree with the skull-bearers in this that they employ women for religious purposes. Love for a woman with whom one is not bound by the tie of wedlock is their essential feature. Here

¹
they agree with the Vāmadevas, the Vāmācārins and the Kāpālikas.

The Tāntrikas, who are according to some a very modern sect, came into being as a class probably as the result of an effort to modify the Kāpālika mould of thought. They are perhaps a class of people of the Brāhmanical school who with a view to countering the evils of Kāpālikism sanctioned and adopted the popular doctrines regarding indulgence, paying no heed to Varnārāmanadharma, and were thus able to influence the vedic doctrines to some extent. Thus, although the enjoyment of the senses may be recommended by the Tāntrikas along with the skull-bearers and the non-religionists, the Tāntrikas differ from them in their end. The end of the Kāpālikas and the Lokāyatikas is Kāma or gross sensual pleasures, but the end of Tantrikism is to become Vīra, to attain full control over one’s passions and to attain final liberation of the soul. It accepts Kāma as a means to an end which is much higher than sensual pleasures.

Buddha by his ‘Pañcakāma-guṇa-dīṭṭha-dhammanibbānavāda’ refers almost to the same doctrine. Vātsyāyana of Kāmaśāstra fame also differs from the Lokāyatikas and the Kāpālikas as regards the end. The ultimate aim of his work according to him is to teach the subjugation of senses.

Thus it appears that the Lokāyatikas, the Vāmadevas, the Śīśādevas, the Kāpālikas, the Kālāmunkhas, the Aghorins, the Vāmācārins, the Sahajiyās and the Tāntrikas all walk along the same track with slight differences.

Bright joy of everlasting sunshine was the creed perpetually present before the eyes of the Lokāyatikas. The year to them was a busy round of gay and pleasant festivals. In course of time through the influence of the vedicists who were chiefly pessimists the Lokāyatikas made it a rule to meet only twice a year for enjoying all sorts of pleasures with full freedom without any restrictions whatsoever. The Lokāyatikas being the organisers there was no touch of religion in these festivals. The festivals were known as the spring festival or वसोत्सव and the autumnal festival or कौशिकोत्सव.

1 Ratnāvali of Sriharṣa, Abhijñānaśakuntala etc.
2 Mudrārākṣasa, Kaumudīmahotsava nāṭaka (recently published in the Dakṣiṇabhāratī Sanskrit Series) etc.
In course of time, however, there was a further reduction of their festivals and the entertainment in spring alone survived. In this festival dance and song, flower and the red ochre, swimming and playing contributed to the creation of an atmosphere of gaiety and frivolity from which all sterner laws of sexual ethics were banished for the time being and men and women mixed together indiscriminately. In the next stage the vedicists tried to avail themselves of this festival in their own way. They introduced the worship of Madana and began to call it Madanotsava in which a mere touch of religion was introduced. As soon as the worship of Madana was introduced, the Lokāyatikas, who were the non-religionists, ceased to join this festival. Enjoyment they did want. But freedom was the thing which they loved. They did not like to be circumscribed by any religious feeling. The vedicists in their turn gradually transformed this festival into a religious observance. The Bhaviṣya-purāṇa mentions a like observance in which Śiva and Pārvatī are concerned. Later on the Vaiṣṇavas gave it a new shape and a name. They placed Madanamohana in place of Madana. This is the Dolotsava of the Vaiṣṇavas.

The Lokāyatikas, however, did not join any religious festival but pursued their own course undeterred by all obstacles. They became at one with the Kāpālikas and continued to meet once a year at a place where extreme forms of licentiousness prevailed. This idea of licentiousness, as we have already seen, does not owe its origin to the Lokāyatikas. It was the peculiar possession of the Kāpālikas. Similarly the circles of the Cakras of the Tantrikas, particularly of the lefthand order, and the Maṇḍalas of the Sahajiyās, owe their origin most probably to the annual meetings of the Kāpālikas with whom the Lokāyatikas joined later on. In Guṇaratna's time these annual meetings of the Kāpālikas became the common festivals of both the sects—the Lokāyatikas and the Kāpālikas.

Now let us conclude this topic. We have seen that the Kāpālikas agreed with the Lokāyatikas in anti-vedic practices; they agreed in licentiousness. They had common annual festivals. They gave more importance to प्रवचन than to चतुर्वाह. They were the heretics

Lokāyata—नातुमाय प्रवचन, प्रवचनविवस्त्र प्रमाणम् etc.
Kāpālika—प्रव विवक्षुवत्सन निर्णयवस, Mattavilāsa.
or Pāṇḍya condemned by the orthodox schools,¹ And for these reasons these two schools were identified with each other.

Dakshina Ranjan Shastri

A Short Chronology of Indian Astronomy

The ancient Indian astronomy had for its basis the religious ceremonies of the Hindus. In the early Vedic period each heavenly body represented a Divinity and so the study of Astronomy originated in the doctrine that the Supreme Being had assigned to the heavenly bodies some duties by which they became rulers of the affairs of the world, and that a knowledge of the Divine Will could be had by observing the order of their motions and the recurrence of times and seasons. The Hindus therefore watched with care all the phenomena of the heavens in order to perfect their calendar of festivals, etc. The Vedic sacrificial rites had a close connection with astronomical calculations, and so some amount of astronomical knowledge was obtained in India at the time when the Vedas and the Brāhmaṇas were composed. It is from astronomical premises that scholars like

¹ Brhaspati Sūtra—

Ⅰ, Brhaspati Sūtra—

यदा यात्रायाय तवादश्रया मात्रनिधानस्तुत्रे सबा कायपालेभाषायादात्रे—II, 13.

लोकायतस्स्त्राणाय वः परिष्ठः सविभावाशिष्यादात्रे—II, 12.

कायपालिकाशब्दाम्री विष्णु मयातिन समु—II, 8.

कायपालिकाशब्दाम्री विष्णु—II, 9.

कायपालिकाशब्दाम्री विष्णु मयातिन समु—II, 31.

एवं पाणिक्ष श्रम्यमेव मनंश्यमि न कुर्याम्—II, 35.

कायपालिकाशब्दाम्री विष्णु मयातिन समु। न ब्रह्मचर्यं हितमेतवद्विलोक्यातिन समु।

Garuḍa Purāṇa, Pūrva Khaṇḍa, 98. 17.

कायपालिकाशब्दाम्री विष्णु मयातिन समु। न ब्रह्मचर्यं हितमेतवद्विलोक्यातिन समु।

I.II,Q., MARCH, 1931
Tilak, Dikṣit and Jacobi argue a great antiquity for the Vedic writings.

The Vedic year was twelve months of 30 days each, with an occasional intercalary month, "the thirteenth month fabricated of days and nights, having thirty members." (Atharva-Veda xiii, 3, 8). There is no indication of any definite cycle, the five year cycle having appeared later. The year was also divided into two equal courses or ayanas, a northern course or Uttarāṣāṇa beginning at the winter solstice and a southern course or Dakṣiṇāyana beginning at the summer solstice. In the Rig-Veda two asterisms only are mentioned, viz., Maghā and Phālgunī; but in later Vedic texts (A. V. xix, 7, 1-5) a complete list of the twenty-eight nakṣatras or asterisms is given. The list is headed by Kṛṣṭikās or the Pleiades, which marked the vernal equinox of the Vedic year. Jacobi proved that the Vedic year commenced with the summer solstice. His arguments are based on the following rendering of a verse of the "Frog Hymn":—

"Those leaders of rites observe the institutes of the gods, and disregard not the season of the twelfth month as the year revolves and the rains return, then scorched and heated they obtain freedom."

Dikṣit,1 from a passage of the Brāhmaṇas,2 fixes the age of the Vedas at 3000 B.C. The words "they (the Kṛṣṭikās) do not move from the eastern quarter while the other asterisms do move from the eastern quarter" are taken by him to mean, definitely, that the asterism Kṛṣṭikās (Pleiades), and no other asterism, was on the equator. He writes, "in my opinion the statement conclusively proves that the passage was composed not later than 3000 B.C." In Vedic texts no definite mention is made of the planets, but some oriental scholars hold that the people of the Vedic age5 had knowledge of the planets. Vedic astronomical facts are not accurate as it was not the intention of the Vedic writers to deal with astronomy directly and that it was only when religious rites demanded it, that they referred to astronomical facts.

The earliest formal Hindu astronomical work was the Jyotiṣa Vedāṅga. It is the name of certain works or classes of works, regard-

1 Indian Antiquary, 1895, xxiv, p. 345.
2 Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, II, 1, 2, 2-4.
3 Bhāratīya Jyotiṣa Śāstra by S. B., Dikṣit; Our Astronomy and Astronomers by Jogesh Chandra Roy.
ed as an auxiliary to the Vedas. The Jyotiṣa Vedāṅga is a small metrical treatise containing a statement regarding the place of the winter solstice at some ancient date which gave rise to a good deal of comment and speculation. Its author intended to propound the doctrine of the cycle consisting of five years of 1830 apparent solar days. The year was tropical and began with the white half of the month Māgha and terminated with the dark half of the month Pauṣa (verse 5). The year which is the fifth part of the yuga contains three hundred and sixty-six days, six seasons, two ayanas (the northern and southern progress of the sun), twelve solar months (verse 28); while the sun accomplishes five tropical revolutions, the moon accomplishes sixty-two synodical and sixty seven periodical revolutions and the whole period comprises sixty-one sāvana months of 30 natural days each (verse 31); the yuga begins with the winter solstice at the new moon of Māgha, the new moon taking place in the first point of Śrāvaṇa. This indicates that the Vedāṅga Jyotiṣa was composed in the twelfth century B.C., a conclusion which has also been confirmed by the internal evidence from Bodhāyana Śrauta sūtra. The Vedāṅga Jyotiṣa does not teach much of astronomy and it does not claim to do so. Max Müller remarks in this connection that "the object of this small tract is not to teach astronomy. It has a practical object which is to convey such knowledge of the heavenly bodies as is necessary for fixing the days and hours of the Vedic sacrifice."

Jyotiṣa Vedāṅga is followed by the astronomy of the Jainas. The only work on Jaina astronomy, now available, is Suryaprajñāpti. There is however evidence that two more works on Jaina astronomy were written, one called Candraprajñāpti and the other Bhadrabāhaviya Saṁhitā of Bhadrabāhu. These two works are mainly known from quotations by later astronomers. Jacobi in his preface to the translation of the Kalpaśūtra, remarks that the Bhadrabāhaviya Saṁhitā was mainly an astrological work, Bhadrabāhu was the religious preceptor of Candragupta and died in 293 B.C. Bhadrabāhu also wrote a commentary on Suryaprajñāpti and this is believed to be the first commentary on the work. The exact date of com-

---

1 The text is given in Thibaut's article on Jyotiṣa Vedāṅga (J.A.S.B., 1877); Yājuṣa Jyotiṣa by Dvivedi and Jyotiṣa Vedāṅga by Lala Chotelal.

position of Sūryaprajñāpati is not known. Thibaut says that this book must have been written before the Greeks came to India, as there is no trace of Greek influence in this work. Its authorship is attributed to Mahāvīra. The traditional date of Mahāvīra’s death is 527 B.C., but Jacobi says that Mahāvīra died in 462 B.C. Therefore, it is certain that Sūryaprajanāpati must have been written in about 500 B.C. Weber points out that the doctrine propounded in the Sūryaprajñāpati shows in many points an unmistakable resemblance with that contained in the Jyotiṣa Vedāṅga and it thus became manifest that the astronomical books of the Jainas do not only furnish information about the opinions held by a religious sect, but may, if rightly interrogated, yield valuable material for the general history of Indian ideas. According to the Sūryaprajñāpati, the yuga begins with the summer solstice, at the moment when the moon is full in the beginning of Abhijit and the sun consequently stands at Pusyā. The distinctive doctrine of the Jainas is the assumption of two different suns, two moons and two sets of constellations. In this connection, Colebrooke remarks, "they (the Jainas) conceive the setting and rising of stars and planets to be caused by the mountain Sumeru and suppose three times the period of a planet’s appearance to be requisite for it to pass round Sumeru and return to the place wherefrom it emerges. Accordingly they allot two suns, as many moons, and an equal number of each planet, star and constellation to Jambudvīpa; and imagine that these appear on alternate days, south and north of Meru." This doctrine has been controverted by all later astronomers. Here also the yuga comprises five years of 360 days each, each year in its turn being divided into twelve months of 30 days each; in the Sūryaprajñāpati this kind of year—commonly known as the sāvana year—is called the karma year or ṛtu year. The six days by which this year is shorter than the solar year are called atirātras. The one important point in which Sūryaprajñāpati differs from the statement in the Jyotiṣa Vedāṅga is this that according to the Jyotiṣa Vedāṅga the yuga begins with the winter solstice, at the moment when it is new moon, sun and moon being in conjunction in the beginning of the nakṣatra Dhanisṭhā, while according to the Sūryaprajñāpati the yuga begins with the summer solstice, at the moment when the moon is full in the beginning of Abhijit and the sun conse-

1 Max Müller’s History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature.
quently stands at Puṣyā. In his paper on Sūryaprajñapīti, Thibaut in conclusion draws attention to the striking resemblance which the cosmological and astronomical conceptions of an old Chinese book called Tcheon-Pei (of which a complete translation was published by E. Biot in the Journal Asiatique, 1841, pp. 592-639) bear to the ideas on the same subject as expounded in the Sūryaprajñapīti.

The history of Hindu Astronomy of the period from 500 B.C. (i.e., the approximate date of composition of Sūryaprajñapīti) to 500 A.C. (i.e., the approximate date of Āryabhaṭa’s writing) is generally called the dark age of Hindu Astronomy. Any work written during this period of 1000 years is not available to us. But it is not probable that this period was barren of any astronomical improvement and this science remained in a static condition in this country. References of astronomical knowledge prevailing in this period are found here and there in literary and philosophical works of that period. During this period of 1000 years probably the astronomical Saṃhitās and the older Siddhāntas were composed. Astronomy was stated to be one of the principal accomplishments of the Jaina priest in the Bhagvatī sūtra. The date of the Bhagvatī sūtra is about 300 B.C. It is noteworthy that the knowledge of astronomy is considered necessary for the Jaina priest for exactly the same purpose as it was for the Vedic priest, viz., to find the right time and place for the religious ceremonies. It is also observed by Sānti-candra gaṇa (1595 A.C.) in the preface to his commentary on the Jañānudvipa prajñapīti. The Buddhist monks were at first advised to refrain from the study of astronomy which was condemned as a low art (tiracchāna vijjā) as far as bhikṣus were concerned. Later on Buddha relaxed his opinion and made it a rule of conduct of the bhikṣus living in the woods that they must learn elementary astronomy. The incident which compelled him to change his mind is this: Once upon a time some robbers approached certain bhikṣus living in the forest and asked them, “with what constellation is the moon now in conjunction?” The bhikṣus could give no reply as they were ignorant of astronomy, being forbidden by religious injunction to learn astronomy. This incensed the robbers who beat the bhikṣus and went away. When Buddha came to know of this unfortunate incident, he made the following rule: “They (the bhikṣus living in

1 Bhagavatī-sūtra, 90; Uttarādhyāyana sūtra, xxv, 7, 8, 38.
forests) should learn the stations of the constellations, either in whole or in parts, and they should know the directions of the sky." These instances prove beyond doubt that the science of astronomy was not in a static condition but was progressive during the period of 1000 years from 500 B.C. to 500 A.D. This is the period, therefore, when the astronomical Sāṃhitās and the older Siddhāntas were written. The Jyotiṣa Sāṃhitās are no longer extant, though Dr. Kern was known to have possessed a fragmentary manuscript of Garga Sāṃhitā. They are mainly known from citations by later astronomers. The authors of the two Sāṃhitās, generally mentioned in the writings of later Hindu astronomers, are Parāśara and Garga. The precise period in which they lived is a vexed question. Parāśara’s sayings have been quoted by Varāhamihira in his Bṛhat Saṃhitā and also by his commentator Bhāṭṭotpala. According to the Nirukta, Parāśara was the son of Vasiṣṭha and according to the Mahābhārata and the Viṣṇupurāṇa Parāśara was the grandson of Vasiṣṭha, and Parāśara, was the father of Vyāsa, the compiler of the Mahābhārata. Parāśara, therefore, must have lived just before the Mahābhārata was composed. Dīkṣit and Jacobi from astronomical evidence have fixed the date of the Mahābhārata as 450 B.C. It has, for this reason, been asserted that Parāśara lived about 500 B.C. Garga, the writer of Garga Saṃhitā whose sayings have been cited by Varāhamihira in his Bṛhat saṃhitā is mentioned in the Mahābhārata as a well-known astronomer. The description, which is given in the Mahābhārata of astronomer Garga, leaves no doubt as to the identification of the writer of Garga Saṃhitā with the Garga mentioned in the Mahābhārata. Therefore, Garga also lived about 500 B.C. There is mention of two other Saṃhitās by Devala and Kāśyapa in the Śukrācārādhyāya of Bṛhat Saṃhitā, but these works seem to have been written much later than the Saṃhitās of Parāśara and Garga. Next comes the works on the Siddhāntas. Of the eighteen or twenty ancient astronomical works referred to by ancient Hindu writers, under the name of Siddhāntas, or "Established conclusions" nine are mentioned by Abūl Fazl in the Institutes of Akbar, namely:—(1) Brahma Siddhānta, (2) Śūrya Siddhānta, (3) Soma Siddhānta, (4) Bṛhaspati Siddhānta, (5) Garga Siddhānta, (6) Nārada Siddhānta, (7) Parāśara Siddhānta, (8) Pulastya

2 Gadāparva, 8, 14.  
3 Śalva parva, 38.
Siddhānta and (9) Vasiṣṭha Siddhānta. Other Siddhāntas mentioned are the works of (10) Vyāsa, (11) Atri, (12) Kāṣyapa, (13) Marīci, (14) Manu, (15) Aṅgiras, (16) Lomasa, (17) Pulīṣa, (18) Yavana (19) Bhṛgu and (20) Cyavana. The first is supposed to have been revealed by Brahmā the second by the sun, the third by the moon and the fourth by Brhaspati (Jupiter). All the other texts are supposed to have been composed by mortals, and of these few are now extant, they being principally known from citations of mathematical writers of later date. It is impossible to say with certainty which of the two principal astronomical works, the Brahma Siddhānta or the Sūryasiddhānta (Saurasiddhānta), is the more ancient, though the former is supposed to have been the earlier. Both of these works have undergone revision at different periods. Brahmagupta based his Brāhmaṇa-vasutāsiddhānta (628 A.C.) on a revised edition of Brahmāsiddhānta. Nyāśa, the commentator of the Sūrya Siddhānta, affirms that Brahmagupta’s rules are framed from the Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa, in which the Brahmāsiddhānta is contained. Various other works of the same name are referred to as being anterior to the work of Brahmagupta; such as the Brahma Siddhānta of Śākalya, which is regarded as one of the five systems from which Varāhamihira compiled his Pañcasiddhāntikā. The five Siddhāntas forming Varāhamihira’s Pañcasiddhāntikā are the Paitāmaha (Brāhma), Vasiṣṭha, Romaka, Pulīṣa, and Saura Siddhāntas. Varāhamihira there also states his view as to their order in importance and accuracy, assigning the first place to the Sūrya Siddhānta, placing next the Romaka and Pulīṣa Siddhāntas as about equally correct, and declaring the two remaining works to be greatly inferior to the three mentioned. In no case Varāhamihira has obliterated the characteristic features of the Siddhāntas he had to deal with, and that whatever distinguishes those works from one another in the text of the Pañcasiddhāntikā actually distinguished them also in their original form. The Sūrya Siddhānta of Varāhamihira is the only one of the five Siddhāntas, which has come down to our time, and therefore allows us to compare it with what Varāhamihira tells us about the Sūrya Siddhānta as known to him. A cursory survey of those chapters of the Pañchasiddhāntikā, which treat of the Sūrya Siddhānta, shows at once that the treatise of that name known to Varāhamihira agreed with the modern Sūryasiddhānta in its fundamental features. The methods of the two treatises are essentially
the same and on the other hand, sufficiently different from those of the other Siddhāntas summarised by Varāhamihira, to ensure to the Sūryasiddhānta in its two-fold form a distinct position of its own.¹ Of the Paitāmaha Siddhānta Thibaut says,² “that the Paitāmaha Siddhānta, known to Varāhamihira, represents Hindu astronomy as not yet affected by Greek influences, and thus belongs to the same category as the Jyotiṣa Vedāṅga, the Garga Saṃhitā, the Sūrya-prajñāapti and similar works. From what Varāhamihira says about its contents it might be identified with the Jyotiṣa Vedāṅga.” The Romaka Siddhānta, as the name suggests, must have been an adaptation from some Greek or Roman astronomical work. The author of the Romaka borrowed his fundamental period from the west; the year of the Romaka, down to seconds, is the tropical year of Hipparchus or of Ptolemy who accepted the determination by his great predecessor. Thibaut has proved that there were issued several recasts of the original Romaka Siddhānta epitomised by Varāhamihira.³ It, therefore, continued to be held in esteem which prompted its remodelling in order to make it harmonize with the altered state of opinion. But the Romaka Siddhānta was referred to by Brahmagupta in a decrying spirit and its followers were censured by him. The Pauliśa Siddhānta resembles in many respects the current Siddhāntas of the Hindus. Some European scholars believe that the Pauliśa Siddhānta is an adaptation of some work of Paulus Alexandrinus, Dr. Kern in his preface to the Bhṛhat Saṃhitā says, “We have no right, whatever, to infer that Paulus Alexandrinus and Pauliśa are one and the same, for identity of name is too slender a ground specially when the name happens to be a common one.” Further, the Pauliśa Siddhānta is an astronomical work based on mathematical calculations, whereas the work of Paulus Alexandrinus is mainly an astrological one. Thibaut says that it appears that the Pauliśa Siddhānta was a work following the same general methods as the Sūrya Siddhānta, Āryabhaṭa and all the later astronomers; at any rate it agreed with the great majority of Hindu astronomical works in establishing a mahāyuga which contains an integral number of Sāvana days, etc. and of revolution of the planets.⁴ He further

¹ Thibaut, Introduction to Pañcasiddhāntika, p. xii.
² Ibid., p. xx.
³ Ibid., p. xxv ff.
⁴ Ibid., p. xxxviii.
says that in this work the new knowledge imported from the west was embodied. About the Vasiṣṭha Siddhānta the Pañcasiddhāntikā gives only very scanty information. Varāhamihira places the Vasiṣṭha Siddhānta, together with the Paitāmaha Siddhānta, in the lowest rank of the works whose tenets he reproduces. Thibaut says “that the methods in the Vasiṣṭha Siddhānta are so crude and they so completely omit to distinguish between mean and true astronomical quantities that the Vasiṣṭha Siddhānta can hardly be included within scientific Hindu astronomy.”

The last and the most important period of Hindu astronomy beginning with Āryabhaṭa (b. 476 A.C.) was a real advance in mathematical astronomy. Āryabhaṭa wrote two works on astronomy of which one—Āryabhaṭiya is now available. He based his work on the main principles laid down in the old Sūrya Siddhānta. He was profusely quoted by Brahmagupta and other subsequent astronomers. Āryabhaṭa believed in the diurnal motion of the earth. He was also the first among Hindu astronomers to explain thoroughly the planetary motions by means of epicycles. The father of Indian epicyclic astronomy, as he is called, ascribed to the epicycles, by which motion of a planet was represented, a form varying from the circle to nearly an eclipse. Next came Varāhamihira who lived in the sixth century A.C. He is mainly known as a compiler His astronomical works now in existence are Bhart Saṃhitā and Pañcasiddhāntikā. Bhart Saṃhitā is an astronomical as well as an astrological work and is supposed to be based on some ancient Saṃhitā. Pañcasiddhāntikā belongs to the class of the so-called Karanagranthas i.e. compendious astronomical treatises which do not set forth the theory of the subject at a comparative length as the Siddhāntas do, but merely supply a set of concise and often only approximately correct rules which suffice for the speedy performance of all the more important astronomical calculations. Varāhamihira was the only one among Hindu writers on astronomy who thought it worth while to give an exposition of all the more important forms of astronomical doctrines current at his time and he gave them in

1 P. C. Sen Gupta, Āryabhaṭa—the father of Indian Epicyclic Astronomy, Journal of the Department of Letters, Calcutta University, vol. xviii,

2 Thibaut, Introduction to Pañcasiddhāntikā, p. viii.
the order of importance the five Siddhāntas whose teaching he summarizes are to be arranged. In the Pañcasiddhāntikā Varāhamihira remarks, "when the return of the sun took place in the middle of Asleṣa, the tropic was then correct. It now takes place from Punarvasu". The Vedāṅga Jyotisha made the year begin with the Winter solstice and this was in vogue at the time of Varāhamihira. He introduced a change in the year-beginning and made the 1st of Nakṣatras commence with Aśvini. This modified year-beginning has since then been current in India. Another astronomer was Lalla who was probably a contemporary of Varāhamihira. He wrote Śiṣyadhi- vrddhida, an astronomical work based on the writings of Āryabhaṭa. Though he declares himself to be a disciple of Āryabhaṭa, he did not subscribe to his master's theory of earth's rotation and in its refutation he said, "If the earth is moving at a very rapid speed, why does not an arrow projected upwards fall on the western side of the projection? Why do not the clouds appear to move only towards the west? You cannot say that the earth is moving at a less speed, as it has to complete one revolution round its axis in 24 hours". Almost contemporary with Varāhamihira was an astronomer called Bhāskara. He was not the great astronomer Bhāskarācārya, the writer of Siddhānta Śiromani. This Bhāskara wrote two astronomical works, called Brhat Bhāskariya and Laghu Bhāskariya, based on the teachings of Āryabhaṭa. He took 444 Śaka year for the karaṇa year and must have, therefore, lived about 560 Śaka or about 578 A.C. He was at least anterior to Bhramagupta who censures Āryabhaṭa for some of the omissions in the latter's methods. Prthūḍakasvāmin, the commentator of Bhramagupta, remarks in this connection that Bhramagupta was not just in censuring Āryabhaṭa as it was not his omission, but an omission of his disciples, Bhāskara and others (Bhāskarādīnāṃ bhavatu). The great Bhāskarācārya also mentions some Āryabhaṭa's disciples, namely Prabhākara and others (Āryabhaṭa-śiṣyaḥ Prabhākara-dādayah). This Prabhākara is no other than the above named Bhāskara. The second Bhāskara did not call the first one Bhāskara as that might lead to confusion and therefore gave

1 Lalla took 420 Śaka as his karaṇa year and as such he must have lived within 500 Śaka at the latest. But Dikshit says that Lalla was born in 638 A.C. or 560 Śaka; his argument are not convincing.

2 Vide a paper by Dr. B. B. Datta on the two Bhāskaras, Indian Historical Quarterly, Dec. 1930.
the synonym Prabhākara for Bhāskara. This was also a common practice in Sanskrit works. The next astronomer who came into prominence was Brahmagupta who wrote his famous work, Brāhma-
sphuṭasiddhānta in 550 Saka or 628 A.C., when he was thirty years old. Nṛsiṃha, the commentator of Sūrya Siddhānta, affirms that Brahmagupta’s rules are framed from the Viṣṇudharmottra Purāṇa, in which the Brahmasiddhānta is contained. The above assertion is also confirmed by Pṛthūdakasvāmin, Brahmagupta’s commentator, and Alberūnī. Brāhma-sphuṭasiddhānta was translated into Arabic by Mohammed Ibn Ibrahim Al-Fazari in 773 A.C. and the translation was known by the name of Sindhind. Another work of Brahma-
gupta, a Kāraṇagrāntha of the name of Khaṇḍakhādyaka, was translated into Arabic and goes by the name of Alarkand. It is neces-
sary to mention in this connection that Brahmagupta maintained his karaṇa to be founded on Āryabhaṭa, or at any rate to give results equal to those to be derived from Āryabhaṭa; but it is curious that the dimensions of the epicycles and the positions of the apogees assumed in the Khaṇḍakhādyaka differ, all of them more or less, from those recorded in the Āryabhaṭīya. It is hence probable that the Āryabhaṭa whom Brahmagupta is supposed to have followed is a person entirely different from the famous Āryabhaṭa. He cannot be Āryabhaṭa II, the writer of Mahāsiddhānta, who was much posterior to Brahmagupta. Therefore it is probable that this Ārya-
bhaṭa whom Brahmagupta followed must have been a third Ārya-
bhaṭa anterior to Brahmagupta and posterior to Āryabhaṭa I. Brahmagupta refuted the theory of earth’s rotation of Āryabhaṭa I and put forward as an argument that “if the earth moves a minute in a prāṇa, then whence and in what route does it proceed? If it revolves, then why do not lofty objects fall?” After Brahmagupta there was for some time dearth of eminent astronomers. The next astronomer of importance was Muñjāla living in the beginning of the tenth century A.C. He wrote his Kāraṇagrāntha, Laghu mānasa in 932 A.C. He must have been a very celebrated astronomer as he was mentioned by name and even in some points (specially in his methods of finding the precessional rate) followed by the great astronomer and mathematician Bhāskara. In the Laghu-mānasa Muñjāla states that the annual precession was 59.907 seconds of arc. The next astronomer was Śripati. He also wrote an astro-
logical treatise. His astronomical works are Dhi keto, a Kāraṇagrāntha, and a siddhānta called Siddhāntaśekhara. His exact date is no
yet known, but this much is known that he was anterior to Bhāskarācārya and wrote his Siddhāntaśekhara about 962 Śaka or 1040 A.C. He gave an account of the peculiar doctrine of the Jaina astronomers who assumed two suns, two moons, two sets of stars and planets and the Meru to be of pyramidal shape. Just following Śripati was Bhojarāja, another astronomer not very much known. Dr. Bhaudaji says that Bhojarāja wrote a Kāraṇagrāntha called Rājamrgāṅka, from which it is known that Bhojarāja who was the king of Dhāra, was born in 964 Śaka or 1042 A.C. The next astronomer was Satānanda, who was prominent and popular with the Indian calendar makers. His work, Bhāsvatī based on the Sūryasiddhānta of Varāhamihira is a karaṇa granthā, a compendium, and is made much use of by the calendar makers. Its popularity with them is known by the saying “Bhāsvatī grahaṇe dhanyāh.” Bhāsvatī was written in 1021 Śaka or 1099 A.C. But the most celebrated among Indian astronomers was Bhāskara who lived in the twelfth century A.C., having been born in 1114 A.C. At the age of 36 he wrote his great work, Siddhānta Śiromaṇi, divided into two parts, Golādhyāya and Grahaganitādhyāya. Besides this, he wrote at a much later period a Kāraṇagrāntha called Kāraṇakutūhala, when he was 69 years old. Recently an astronomical work, a short treatise on the corrections of the moon’s place called Bijopanaya has been stated as a distinct astronomical work of Bhāskara. But from a perusal of the contents one may doubt if the work can at all be attributed to Bhāskara. There are passages in the Vāsanābhāṣya of the work which lead to this doubt. If this work is at all written by Bhāskara, it was never meant to be a separate treatise. It must be an appendix to Bhāskara’s Siddhānta Śiromaṇi to which his well known Bijagaṇita and Pāṭigaṇita are also appendices. Pandit Bapudeva Śastri has given a brief account of Bhāskara’s genius in J.A.S.B. of 1893. About Bhāskara Spottiswoode remarks—“That the penetration shown by Bhāskara in his analysis is in the highest degree remarkable; that the formula which he establishes and his method of establishing it, bear more than a mere resemblance to the corresponding process in modern mathematical astronomy; and that the majority of scientific persons will learn with surprise the existence of such a method in the writings of so distant a period and so remote a region.”

In conclusion, a few words are necessary to deal with the question of the foreign influence on Indian astronomy. This is a long disputed
question and has been discussed thread-bare by the oriental scholars. Many scholars tacitly assume a Greek basis for the Hindu scientific astronomy. Thibaut in his Introduction to the Pañca Siddhāntikā has discussed this question at a considerable length and concludes that "the later Siddhāntas fall under one category, all of them, however much they differ in details, representing the modern phase of Hindu astronomy which is completely under the influence of Greek teaching." Alberūnī, Rodest, Weber, Colebrooke, Whitney and various Arab scholars have also dealt with this question from different points of view. The general hypothesis is the dependence of Hindu scientific astronomy on Greek teachings. Various facts have since then been found against this pre-conceived hypothesis and discussed at a great length. But the fundamental belief of the pro-Greek school has not yet been shaken. Some of the Arab writers, especially Al Fazari, the writer of Sind. hind, have expressed the view that the Greek and Hindu mathematicians drew their inspiration from a common source. It is, in this connection, worth while to consider the great Hebrew cabalist (Cabalala, gabbalah) compendium, the Zahar, passages from which have been discussed by Günther; since it is the opinion of many Hebrew scholars that the authors of the Zahar were influenced by Hindu writers, this fact may throw some light upon Hindu originality in astronomy. Bishop Severus Sebokht of Nisibus (c. 650 A.C.) who would naturally have been expected to favour Greek claims, took up a quite contrary position and believed in the original and independent growth of Hindu Spherical astronomy. Since he was almost a contemporary of Brahmagupta, his testimony might have some special significance regarding this question of foreign influence on Indian astronomy. However, the final seal has not yet been put and it will require further researches on this subject to arrive at a conclusive decision regarding this question of Greek influence.

SUKUMAR RANJAN DAS
Tāranātha’s History of Buddhism in India
(Translated from the German version of A. Schiefner)

VII

EVENTS CONTEMPORANEOUS WITH
KING AŚOKA

Before handing over the charge of teaching to the Venerable Kāla,¹ the Venerable Dhitika while dwelling in Kauśāmbī in the land of Mālava and suffering from sickness, imparted various instructions to the four classes of persons.² The bhikṣus of Vaiśālī thought that perfect instruction could not be obtained from an ailing Sthavira, so they did not betake themselves to him, and held that the ten improper measures,³ practised by them, were according to the

¹ Tib. Nag-po, in Bustoñ is found Kahnava, which can be traced back to Kṛṣṇa.
² I.e. monks, nuns, lay disciples and female devotees; cf. Pāli, catasso parisā.—Tr.
³ In the Tibetan text of Vinayakṣudraka the ten improper acts are mentioned thus:

(1) the exclamation of surprise ‘Aho’;
(2) to incite the bhikṣus to frivolities;
(3) to dig with one’s own hand and to let others dig;
(4) to mix and eat the salt consecrated for life whenever needed;
(5) to go away one Yojana or a half, assemble there and eat, alleging it to be a journey;
(6) to eat with two fingers the food which is (so small as) not to be left over;
(7) to sip in intoxicating drink in the manner of a leech and seek excuse on the ground of sickness;
(8) to mix one droma of sweet milk and one droma of sour milk and drink it out of time;
(9) to make a new cushion without patching or mending an old and strong pillow of the size of Sugata-span (?);
(10) to place on the head of a Śramaṇa at the cross roads
Law, the Vinaya and the Doctrines of the Teacher. The Arahant Yaśa and 700 other arahants denounced them and arranged for the second collection of words (i.e. the Second Council) in the Vihāra of Kusumpurī,1 of which king Nandin, who came of the family of the Licchavis, was the patron (dānapati). At the time of determination of the boundaries of the six cities,2 700 arahants, all of whom belonged to the region of Vaiśāli, had obtained the two sanctificatory stages of emancipation and were vastly learned,3 The collection therefore is surely a partial one. As the essentials of this history may be very fully known from the Vinayakṣudraka4 it has not been here described. That this collection took place at the time has been told by Bhaṭaghaṭi and Kṣemendrabhadra. In the Vinaya which is still existing in Tibetan, it is stated that 110 years after the demise of the Teacher the second collection, according to the tradition, took place and that the collection was made suited to one school. In the Vinaya of another school it is seen that the second collection was arranged 210 or 220 years after the demise of the Teacher. In order to ascertain here the right mean, one must take into consideration the fact that in some of the extant Indian historical works the Venerable one round begging bowl, filled with fragrant essence and sweet smelling incense, decorated with flowers, and to invite people to give gold, silver and jewels, telling them that great reward awaits such givers. Cf. Lassen, II, 84, Koppen, Religion des Buddha, p. no. 7.

Cf. Rockhill’s Life of Buddha, pp. 173ff.; for the Pāli version of these ten breaches of the rules of discipline see Dutt’s Early History of the Spread of Buddhism and Buddhist Schools, pp. 226-7; La Vallec Poussin, Le Musdon, N.S., vi (1905); Ind. Ant. 37 (1908); Mahāvamsa (transl.) pp. 19-20.—Tr.

1 In the text Kusma-puri. The name of the Vihāra is different in the Mahāvamsa, see Lassen II, 86. (The name is Vālikārāma—Tr.)

2 It seems that this passage is not quite incorrupt. There were six cities besides Vaiśāli, from which places the Arhats assembled to take up the task of expulsion of bhikṣūs.

3 Schiefner has taken it be the proper name of Bahuṣrutiya School. The Tib. is man-du-thos-pa, meaning ‘vastly learned’. While the Tib. name for the School is man-thos.—Tr.

Dhittaka and the others have been made contemporaries of Aśoka, and that after Sudarśana had passed out of existence and Aśoka died, the second collection was to have taken place. It (this discrepancy) is due to the faulty interpretation of the words of Kṣudrāgama: “When he gave over the teaching to Sudarśana, the elephants (i.e. the great beings) had entirely vanished out of existence, at that time 160 years had passed since the Nirvāṇa, etc. In Sanskrit yadācīt through the power of word-combination can as well mean “at which time” as also “and at the time.”¹ This passage one must have translated as “at which time,” The Guru Paṇḍita said that if it is put as 200 vārs, etc. then a half-year has been calculated as a full-year and it should therefore be taken as 100 years. According to the adjusted⁴ report of Paṇḍita Indradatta, it is said that Upagupta appeared 50 years after the Nirvāṇa of the victorious (One), but 110 years after the Nirvāṇa the hierarchical succession came to an end.⁵ Then while speaking of the appearance of Aśoka, etc. he says obviously that as this is in contradiction with the prophecy and the sources of the adjusted tradition of Āryadeśa, although everything appears to have been properly mentioned, yet it is not credible.

In the east in the land of Aṅga lived a wise and very well-to-do householder, and in his house grew through the power of his deeds a tree from which fell jewel-fruits. As he was without any child, he used to bring offerings continually to the great god Viṣṇu in the form of Kṛṣṇa, in consequence whereof the self-same Kṛṣṇa was born as his son. When he had grown up he became desirous of going out to sea. He then with 500 merchants, taking all equipments of a ship, went to the jewel-land and filled the ship with goods. In this way as he had gone to the sea six times and returned quickly with loaded ship without any difficulty, all regions were filled up with fame of the merchant as being endowed with great merits. At the time when his parents were dead and he had become a faithful devotee of the Venerable Dhittaka many merchants came to him from the far north and requested him to go again

¹ So Tāranātha thinks to be the cause; one notices therefrom how differently he uses from the Sanskrit in Sanskrit. Yadācīt is primarily a Tibetan fabrication.

² Tib. gtaḥ, gyi, sbyor. wa: German: Geschichtsharmonie.—Tr.

³ Tib. gtaḥ, rabs, rdzogs, zin.—Tr.
to the sea. Although at first he declined saying that he would not go as he did not hear of anybody having loaded a ship for the seventh time, but on their persistent request he at last sailed and reached the jewel-island, loaded the ship with treasures and returned home. On an island of the ocean the merchants saw a green grove existing and so they went there to recuperate themselves. But they were caught there by Krauśika Kumārī, the foremost Rākṣast of the Rākṣast family dwelling in the sea. They then took refuge in the Venerable Dhitika. At that time the gods, who were their friends, informed the Venerable Dhitika, who came to the island through supernatural power. The Rākṣast, not being able to endure his glory, ran way, and the merchants returned happily to Jambudvīpa. At this place the merchants supplied the clergy of the four regions for three years with all requisites, and at last entered into the priesthood. They were ordained by the Venerable Dhitika and all of them soon attained the grade of Arhatship. Then on the passing away of Dhitika, the venerable Kṛṣṇa, who belonged to the family of merchants joining the priesthood, took charge of the teaching; he delivered instructions to the four groups, and the acquisition of the four fruits suffered no interruption.

At this time appeared Bhikṣu Vatsa\(^1\) of Kasmira, of Brāhmaṇa caste, very wicked, but learned. He took pleasure at the Ātmaka theory, travelled over all regions, and turned the simple people into his bad teaching and thus raised a little dissension in the saṅgha. Therefore Dhitika collected the clergy of the four regions in Vihāra Puṣkariṇī, a part of the Marū land, the yakṣa Kapila providing them with the necessary sustenance, corrected the errors, and re-iterated the Ānātmaka theory in the assembly of the monks. As three months passed, all the bhikṣus who were earlier converted by the Sthavira Vatsa to the Ātmaka theory, were completely purified, beheld the truth and at last, Sthavira Vatsa himself was converted to the unshakeable teaching.

Far off in the island of Śimhala was the king Āsana-Simhakoṣa (Tib. khri-laden-sen-ge-xl. mtsod—Tr.). Once when he was in an assembly, a merchant of Jambudvīpa made over to him a wooden image of the teacher. As he asked what it was, the merchant recounted to him (the events) beginning from the Teacher up to the Venerable Kṛṣṇa of the dignitaries. Then the king wished to see the Venerable

---

1 Tib. gnas. pa. cf. Wassiljew, Der Buddhismus, p. 62 of the German translation
Krṣṇa as also to hear the excellent teaching and so sent a messenger. When this (messenger) came near the Venerable, the latter set out with a following of five hundred through the air by means of his supernatural power, whereupon the messenger held himself fast to the corner of the holy robe and let himself down on the border of Śimhaladvipa. As he sent the messenger before, the king came to meet him with others. He entered the chief city, where he diffused differently coloured rays of lights, shone forth and showed other wonders. On this island he preached the Law for three months, filled it with vihāras and clergymen, and made many partakers of the four fruits. Although the Teacher formerly had trodden over this island with his feet, the teaching after his death gradually disappeared, the Venerable Krṣṇa, however, greatly spread it afresh. After handing over the teaching to the Venerable Sudarśana, who came of the royal family, he vanished to the country of Kuśavana in the north. Now follows (the story of) Sudarśana.

In the west in the land of Bharukaccha, there was a kṣatriya Darśana, sprung of the Pāṇḍu line. He had extraordinary riches; his son was called Sudarśana. As he grew up, he became possessed of prosperity like that of the gods: he had 50 pleasure-gardens, 50 picked women, each of whom had 5 maid-servants and each of them again had five female playmates. He spent daily 5000 gold paṇas on flowers alone, not to speak of his other riches. Once when he had gone to the pleasure-garden, surrounded by that group, he saw the Ārya Sukāyana going on the way with numerous followers, became exceedingly faithful and bowed before him, and took his seat by his side. When the Ārya had taught him the Law, he obtained on that very seat the grade of an Ārya. When he asked for reception into the clerical order, the Ārya explained to him that that was not possible for one living as a householder, that the circumstances were not suitable and that he should inform his father beforehand. As he requested his father for permission to enter into the priesthood, his father flew into rage and wanted to put him in iron-fetters, but just at that moment he raised himself in the air, displayed the stream of light and showed other wonders. Thus he converted his father, who said: "O son, as you have attained such a high grade of virtue, enter into the priesthood and thereby give me pleasure." After he had entered the priesthood, he delivered the teaching to his father, who then realised the truth. Then he chose Krṣṇa as his Ācārya, and he lived in his company for a long time. Then Krṣṇa died and Mahā-
sudarśana began to discipline the four groups by means of his teaching.

At that time there lived, in the west in the country of Sindhu, a yakṣīṇī Hiṅgalākṣī of great strength and supernatural power. She was spreading epidemics in different regions. She obstructed the way of those who wanted to go away somewhere else. She appeared in a dreadful form, whereupon the people offered her daily a wagon-load of food drawn by six bullocks, one excellent horse, one man and one woman.1 When Sudarśana came to know of this and also of the fact that the time to subdue her had come, he came to his place of residence after he had collected his alms in the city of Sindhu, and ate his food. She took him to be a Śramaṇa who had lost his way. When at last he poured out the water, with which he had washed his bowl in her house, she flew into rage and sent a shower of stone and weapon, which, however on account of his being absorbed in compassionate meditation (maitrībhāvanā—Tr.), he turned into a shower of flowers. Then through the power of the wish of the Venerable, all sides were set on fire and the yakṣīṇī herself was greatly terrified and sought for refuge to the Venerable. He taught her the Law, initiated her into the precepts, and from that time up to the present day no offering of flesh and blood was made to her. Further, Sudarśana knew that later on there would be no subduer, so he converted to the teaching 500 unbelieving Nāgas and Yakṣas. Thereafter the Venerable visited all the towns in the south, provided them with vihāras and monks. On many small islands he established the Buddha’s teaching, and afterwards in Mahācīna and other lands he spread the teaching gradually and led innumerable living beings into bliss, and at last he vanished from existence into the “nirvāṇa-nirvāṇadhātu.”2

It is to be observed that the time of youth of king Aśoka corresponded to the last portion of the life of the Venerable Dhātikā; the time of his sinful way of living with the time of the Venerable Kesā; the time when he became Dharmarāja was the time when the Venerable Sudarśana protected the teaching; when Mahāsudarśana vanished out of existence, King Aśoka also died. From the Vene-

---

1 A similar yakṣa-offering is mentioned in the biography of Śākyamuni, p. 298 (68).
2 As restored from Tibetan. Schiefner renders it by "in dem restlosen Stoffe der Verdienstanhäufung".—Tr.
rable Ananda up to Sudarśana there are wellknown avadānas; their contents Kṣemendrabhadra had collected and described. This series (of teachers) protected the teaching perfectly and their teaching agreed with that of the teacher, the Buddha himself. Thereafter appeared, it is true, many Arhants but they did not perform things which fully agreed with Buddha's teachings. The seventh section, the events contemporaneous with king Aśoka.

VIII

THE EVENTS AT THE TIME OF KING VIGATĀŚOKA

Of the eleven sons of king Aśoka, the most excellent was Kuṇāla, whom a ṛṣi had given this name on account of the similarity which his eyes had with those of the bird (named) Kuṇāla dwelling in the Himalayas. At the time when he had become master of all sciences, Tiṣyarakṣitā, the wife of king Aśoka, fell in love with him and wanted to seduce him artfully. But as he was pure and would not agree to it (her proposals), Tiṣyarakṣitā flew into rage. Later on when King Aśoka was suffering from diarrhoea and vomiting excrements, Tiṣyarakṣitā heard that just the same (illness) had happened to a common man of a mountain-village. She ordered his death, and when the stomach was cut open and examined, it was found out that a many-limbed ugly worm by going up and down caused the diarrhoea and vomiting. This worm did not perish by any medicine except when treated with a white garlic. Thereupon Tiṣyarakṣitā gave the king a white garlic as the remedy. Although the Kṣatriyas cannot eat white garlic, he was however allowed to take2 for healing the sickness, and he soon recovered. At this the king vowed to grant her an excellent (boon). She said that she would ask for it not then but at some other time. Once upon a time in the

2 Burnouf, loc. cit., p. 150.
north west in the Aśmaparānta country lying far off, king Gokarṇa revolted and the king's son Kuṇāla was sent there with an army for his subjugation. When he had subjugated the king, Tiṣyarakṣitā said to Aśoka: "O king, the time to grant me the boon has come now, give me the rulership for seven days." When he had granted her the same, she wrote an order to extract the eyes of Kuṇāla, sealed it with the stolen seal of the king and sent a messenger to Aśmaparānta. Although the king of that place read the letter, he did not dare extract the eyes of Kuṇāla. When however Kuṇāla himself read the letter and became aware of the command of the king as also of the fact that one was ready to extract the eyes, he ordered accordingly the man to take out one eye and place it in his hand. What happened was made known to him before by an Arhat (that it would so come to pass). He had been many times initiated into the teaching which had the doctrine of impermanence as its beginning and which also brought firmness to his mind, as a result thereof, he became a Śrotāpanna as soon as he saw the eye. After dismissing his servant, he took a lyre and wandered through different countries, and at last came to the Elephant controller at Pāṭaliputra. There the elephant gifted with insight recognised him and showed him respects. The men could not recognise him; on the daybreak the elephant guards asked him to play on the lyre. And as he had played the melody Gamaka on the lyre the king came to know from the top of his palace that the voice was similar to the voice of his son; on the morning he had enquiries made and learnt the actual state of things. When he had found out the cause, the king flew into rage, ordered Tiṣyarakṣitā to be locked up and burnt in the Lākṣāna house. But Kuṇāla dissuaded him from it and he declared the true-wish: 'If I who love Tiṣyarakṣitā and my son in equal manner, and have no hatred in my mind, then let the eyes be as before'; and Kuṇāla obtained his eyes better than before. He then entered into the priestly office and obtained the Arhat grade. Therefore the rulership could not devolve on him but his son Vigatāsoka was selected for the rulership. At this time appeared in the kingdom Oḍīviśa, the brāhmaṇa Rāghava having great wealth;

1 In the other recensions of this story, it is known as Takṣaśilā which is restored from Tibetan rdo, hdsog (stone-accumulation).

2 This story of Kuṇāla with slight variations is found also in the Divyāvadāna (27), Aṣokāvadāna and Ivaṭanakalpalata (59).—Tr.
he acknowledged the three treasures (ratnas) as his teaching. He was informed beforehand by a god in a dream that on the following day a bhikṣu would come to his house to beg for alms, and that as his supernatural power was great, he would be able to collect the Venerables of all regions and so he should ask him (to do that). When another morning the Arhant Pṛṇadha came to his house he implored him. He maintained for 3 years the congregation of 80,000 Venerables. The gods being greatly delighted at the teaching let fall down in his house a rain of flowers. He satiated 100,000 bhikṣhus daily up to the end of his life. The eighth section: the events at the time of king Vīgatāśoka.

IX

EVENTS OF THE TIME OF SECOND KĀŚYA PA

After him the Arhant Kāśyapa, who was born in the North, in the land of Gāndhāra, worked for the salvation of living beings through three kinds of religious works. At that time there lived, the son of Vīgatāśoka, Vīrasena, who through the favour of Vaiśravaṇa’s wife, the goddess Lakṣmī, possessed inexhaustible riches without doing even the least harm to living beings. He supported bhikṣus of the four quarters for three years, and offered a hundred kinds of sacrificial requisites to all caityas existing on the face of the earth. At that time in Mathurā, the Brāhmaṇa Yaśa who was very much devoted to the teaching, erected the Vihāra Śāravatī, and maintained 100,000 monks; in that Vihāra the Arhat

1 Tib. dbaḥ. woḥi, sde with it variant dbaṅ-poḥi, sde (Indrasena); is it not a corruption of Vṛṣasena? See Lassen II, 27, the Mañjuśrī- mūlatantra (leaf 323) attributes to him a reign of 70 years, and to his predecessor 76 years.

2 Text: Yaśika (grags-ldan),

3 The river Śāravatī is mentioned in the Divyāvadāna (p. 21) as one of the boundaries of the Madhyama Janapada of the Buddhists;
Slanavasa (Sañavāsika or Śañavāsa) taught the Dhamma to a large number of bhikṣus of all regions gathered there. At that time there lived, in a region of the kingdom of Maruṭa, the son of a merchant, Mahādeva, who had committed the three unpardonable (ānantarya) sins, viz., particide, matricide and murder of an Arhart. Tormented by his conscience he went to Kasmira. After concealing his ways of life he became a bhikṣu. With his sharp intellect he became very learned in the three Piṭakas, felt strong repentance, and practised samādhi in solitude. Thereafter, by the power of Māra, all took him to be an Arhart, and this greatly increased his gain and fame; he them came to Saravatti with a group of bhikṣus; the the bhikṣus recited the Prātimokṣasūtra by turn, and when the turn came to Mahādeva, he said at the end of his recitation that "gods are deluded through ignorance, the path proceeds out of the sound-stream, the sceptics are possessed by others" (wrong views).—this is the teaching of Buddha." When he had taught this, the Venerable ones and the old bhikṣus said that these were not the words of the sūtras; but the majority of the young bhikṣus sided with Mahādeva, and thus there appeared a division. After Mahādeva had explained falsely the sense of many other words of the text and had passed away, the bhikṣu Bhadra, whom men took to be a reincarnation of Māra Pāpya, also succeeded in introducing many contradictions and doubts regarding the sense of the scriptures, and he announced five facts, viz., (1) the answer, (2) ignorance (3) doubt, (4) temptation (5) the restoration of individuality and he gave these out to be the

see S. N. Mazumdar's edition of Cunningham's Geography, p. xliii; Vinaya, Mv., I, p. 197.—Tr.


2 The kingom was probably named after the ruler and he is Maruṇḍ? See Bohtlingk and Roth, Sanskrit Dictionary s. v.

3 In the Abhidharma-mahā-vibhaṅga-sūtra and other works Mahādeva's life is related. Watters has summarised it in his Yuan Chwang, vol. I, pp. 267-9.—Tr.

4 In the Chinese sources Pāṭaliputra is mentioned instead of Kasmira. See Watters, op. cit., p. 268.—Tr.

5 Lha, rnam. ma, rgy. pa, yis, bslus, Lam. ni. sgra, yi, rgyun, las. byun, . The. tsom, can, rnam, gzan, gyis, hjug.—Tr.
teaching of Buddha. Different ways of explaining the word appeared in consequence of the many special opinions, and on account of doubts and misunderstandings the division became manifold, and also on account of the fact, that the teachers of the different sūtras in the language of different regions changed a little the succession of letters and connection of words, and introduced many different long and short word-beginnings.

Although the Arhants and many learned people tried to reconcile this division, the ordinary bhikṣus were overpowered by the Demon and the division did not cease. When Mahādeva and Bhadra died, the bhikṣus came to know their character. After Kaśyapa II had vanished from the present, the Venerable Mahāloma took charge of the land of Mathurā and the Venerable Nandin, the affairs concerning the teaching. The ninth section, the events of the time of Kaśyapa II.

1 See Dutt’s Early History etc., p. 229, for the interpretation of Mahādeva’s five tenets.
MISCELLANY

Yageśvara

In the I.H.Q. of June, 1929, Dr. Venkatasubbiah wrote an article on Yageśvara, a rare word occurring in Pūrṇabhadra’s Pañcatantra. He pointed out that Dr. Hertel was wrong in taking the word in the sense of ‘gold’. He referred also to the fact that the word occurred in the Naiṣadha of Śrīhāra (12. 38), and Mallinatha and Nārāyaṇa took it to mean ‘a crystal phallus of Śiva’.

I wish here to add that the word occurs in Skanda-purāṇa (Maheśvara-khaṇḍa, 11.6 of Kunārikā-khaṇḍa), and there it is used in the sense of a Śivaliṅga made of stone. The word, however, is found there in the form of Jageśvara.

There is no critical edition of Skanda-purāṇa, but it is probable that अविष्कार is a variant for अविष्कर. The form अविष्कर is, in fact, found even in Nārāyaṇa’s commentary (vide the 4th N. S. edition); and in a correct and well written manuscript of the commentary of Jinarāja, preserved in the Bhandarkar Institute, both the forms अविष्कार and अविष्कर are found. It is no doubt difficult to derive the word in its latter form, unless we assume it to be a contraction of अविष्कर, which seems to be another Śivaliṅga mentioned in Skanda-purāṇa (9. 22 of the above-mentioned khaṇḍas).

There is, however, no doubt that Śrīhāra himself wrote अविष्कर. Vidyādhara, the earliest known commentator on Naiṣadha, gives the word in this form. But he explains अविष्कर as a crystal water-deity, and does not say that it is a Śivaliṅga. He contrasts Yageśvara with Nārāyaṇa. The latter, too, he says, is a water-deity (जलदेवता), resorting as he does to the ocean; but he sleeps in the ocean, while Yageśvara ‘keeps awake’ (ज्ञान) as stated in the Naiṣadha verse referred to above.

Cāṇḍūpaṇḍita, the next commentator after Vidyādhara, does

1 Vidyādhara and Cāṇḍūpaṇḍita wrote in the latter half of the 13th century. Their commentaries are still unpublished, but extensive extracts from them have been given in the notes appended to my English translation of Naiṣadha, now in the Press.
not recognise the word वाणिज्य at all; for he construes it as या + जनावर, an interpretation found in Nārāyaṇa also. He connects, however, Yāgeśvara with the natural ocean, from which ‘the ocean of fame’ described in the verse is to be distinguished, and in the case of the ocean, he explains it as वस्त्रयुक्त, who, he says, lives invisible in the ocean. Čaṇḍī is a learned commentator, but his explanation of this word is ambiguous.

Among later commentators, Mallinātha, Jinarāja and Nārāyaṇa rely on some current tradition (प्रविष्टि) and take the word to mean a crystal phallus of Śiva (कण्ठज्ञाति याणिज्य रति प्रविष्टि: ). Skanda-purāṇa, too, as we have seen, refers to Yāgeśvara as a Śivaliṅga, though not made of crystal.

There is another reason which makes the connection between Yāgeśvara and Śiva probable. Śrihariṣa describes Yāgeśvara as living ‘invisible, having entered the waters’ (जग वाणिज्य इत्यं तत्र, वस्त्रयुक्त अज्ञेयस्या कण्ठज्ञाति वाणिज्य: ). It is here important to note that we know of a Śiva idol, which, too, is described as living in the midst of waters. Manikhaka, in his Śrikanṭha-carita 3, 14, refers to the wooden Kapateśvara Śiva and says that he ‘sleeps’ (i.e. lives hidden) in water in Satisaras, which is a name of Kāśmira (3.1).

य स त भगवः कपातेशभवन्य मिन्नालोकवयस्य वपकम: ||

इत्येवः काकमच्छ जल वाणिज्यन्वण्यवयस्य हर्षप्रतिद्वंतयाः ||

From this it is clear that certain forms of Śiva are described as abiding in water, and Śrihariṣa attributes the same characteristic to Yāgeśvara. This lends further support to the belief that Yāgeśvara as described by Śrihariṣa is a form of Śiva. Besides, the fact that the name Yāgeśvara ends in ‘śvara,’ while the deity is described as being of crystal, is an indication that the reference is to a Śivaliṅga. For practically all the names of Śivaliṅgas mentioned in the Puraṇas end in ‘isvara,’ while references to crystal Śivaliṅgas are not rare even in the Kavya literature. A crystal phallus of Śiva is referred to in Daśakumārakarita (1.2), and in Nava-sahasānikakarita (18, 51).

I have here confined myself to the word Yageśvara, but may point out that, in the Naiṣadha verse referred to above, the earlier commentators read विश्व वर्ग for विश्व तर, and make it qualify अज्ञेयस्या.

KRISHNA K. HANDIQUI

1 For details see Rājānaka Jayaratha’s Hararacita-cintāmaṇi, ch. 14.
**Date of the Mudra-raksasa**

While editing a Kannada version of the Mudrārākṣasa, I was strongly impressed that the Sanskrit work should be ascribed to the Gupta period and not to the eighth or the ninth century and that Dr. Jacobi [W. Z. K. M. (1888), pp. 212-6] has wrongly arrived at the year 860 A.D. as the date of composition of the drama. The last verse of the play is as follows:

बाराधीमायुमोक्तसमविधावाः साराधीमायुमोक्तसमविधावाः
वस्त्र राजनविकि प्रवाहपरिक्तै शितिरभूतभावी।
कंभार्कारस्यर्वस्य भूतयमहागुप्ता संपीतिरास्तुःः
व शीतामहाकालिकवर्षसे पराधिनवक्ष्यामुः॥

The variants of the last word in this poem that occur in the manuscripts are Dantivarman, Rantivarman and Avantivarman. Now there are two Avantivarman to be found, one being a contemporary of Harṣa (c. 640) and the other a king of Kashuṇir (855-83 A.D.). Jacobi believes that the latter is the one referred to and that his minister Sura had the play enacted at his court. According to him, the eclipse that is referred to in the play took place on the 2nd December, 860.

This is unsatisfactory for several reasons. For the sake of argument we may equally assert that it is Dantivarman who is alluded to. We have three kings of the name, two of the Rāṣṭrākuṭa lineage and the other a Pallava who succeeded Nandivarman Pallavamalla. The first Rāṣṭrākuṭa Dantivarman (c. 600) was probably a contemporary of Pulakesin II (cf. Ind. Ant., vol. XI). The second Dantivarman or Dantidurga who had the titles of Vairā-muzha, and Khaḍgāvaloka lived in 754 A.D. and conquered Saṇḍubhūpa, the Lord of Kānci (Nandivarman), Kaliṅga, Kośala, Śri Śaila, the Śeṣas, Mālava Lāṭa and Ṭaikika after crossing the rivers such as Mahānadi and Revā (Ind. Ant., vol. XII). The Pallava king Dantivarman was the son of Nandivarman Pallavamalla and seemed to have ruled from 779 to 830 A.D. Between his 21st and 50th year, Rāṣṭrākuṭa Govinda III defeated him and took Kānci.

Any of these kings might with equal propriety be referred to in the drama. But a careful study reveals the fact that the author was a resident of Northern India and knew very well the topographical details of the city of Pāṇāliputra. In all probability he lived in the
city long before it was destroyed. In the drama, the king of Kashmir and that of Malaya are referred to as Mlecchas or barbarians. If we locate Malaya in South India and opine that the drama was enacted before a Dantivarman, or even suppose that Avantivarman of Kashmir is alluded to, it is not conceivable how the author could refer to the country of his patrons as Mleccha-deśa with impunity. Mleccha-deśa was the general term applied to all countries beyond the confines of Āryāvarta—the country between the Himalayas and the Vindhayas. (विष्णुस्वामिनी: राजार्कार्यशास्त्रः) In this drama Śakas, Cīnas, Hūṇas, Pārāśikas, Yavanas, Khaśas, and even Kāśmīras, and Kulūtas are referred to as barbarians. Moreover, among the varieties of Prākt employed in the drama, the Kṣapaṇaka Jīvasiddhi and the Caṇḍālas employ Māgadhī instead of the ordinary Sauraseni. All this cumulative evidence leads us to suppose that the author was a native of the country bounded on the north-east by the Khasia hills, in the south by the Vindhayas and in the west by Kulūta which Yuan Chwang tells us was the country between Jālandhara and the Śatadrū.

Turning now to the time of composition of the drama, we find that at the outset a lunar eclipse takes place. This must have been in Bhādrapada, for the Kaumudi-mahotsava is referred to immediately afterwards. This surely occurred on the day of Āśvayuja-pūrṇimā when Kośagari-vrata is observed and Indra and Laksṇī are worshipped. Soon after this, while Candragupta is taking Cāṇakya to task for having stopped Kaumudi-mahotsava, the attendants sing of Śarad-ṛtu and the wakening of Viṣṇu from his snake-bed i.e. on the occasion of the Utthānadvādaśi or Probodhotsava (Kārtika Śū 12). The estrangement between Cāṇakya and Candragupta is immediately reported to Rākṣasa and on Kārtika, suddhapūrṇimā, Rākṣasa asks the Kṣapaṇaka to name an auspicious day for marching on Kusumapura. Jīvasiddhi says that after sunset the Budha-lagna is auspicious.

The eclipse that according to Jacobi took place on the 2nd December, 360 A.D. is thus not the one that is alluded to, because firstly, it occurs on the full-moon day of the Mārgaśīra month. But, as we have seen, the whole action must have been concluded by the Kārtika Pūrṇimā. Probably Jacobi relies on Dhuṇḍirāja and thinks that nearly two months of inactivity elapsed after the estrangement between Cāṇakya and Candragupta. But Rākṣasa’s words show that as soon as the message from Pāṭaliputra came, immediate efforts were made to march on the city. At the most a delay of three or four days (from utthānadvādaśi to Pūrṇimā) is all that is possible.
Secondly, there was no lunar eclipse at all on the 2nd December, 860 A.D.\(^1\) Viśākhadatta must have 1ad an actual eclipse in his mind, which for the purpose of his drama he presents as imminent, and it must have been generally believed that it was actually going to take place as indicated by the preparations made to observe it with due ceremonies.

The last verse of the Bharatavākyas is assigned in some manuscripts to the actor of the part of Candragupta himself. In that case, it is almost certain that the Candragupta alluded to must have been a king at whose court the drama was acted. The use of the word adhunā\(^2\) supports this idea.

Viśākhadatta was familiar with Kusumapura and probably lived there before it was destroyed by the Ganges. We have the record of at least three such inundations. The latest was probably in 1472 A.D. after which Sher Shah re-built the fortress and the town. This is also referred to in the Jain work Karpūraprakara.

"तीर्थनिरविशेषतः यथाश्रवी कौशिकः पुष्पाश्रयति श्वेताप्ति दुर्लक्षक्ष्यमुपयोगिः।
प्रसन्नविहितं नाम कर्मवियतो न।।
तथा श्रीरूपाकमलप्रकरणात्
(विषाणुप्रकरणः)
तथा श्रीमलोकनिरविशेषतः
विषयकामधिकाराः गला पथात् विकम्बकृतकराष्टी
जाते।
तत् वपरि चतुर्थस्त्रिप्रभावितविशेषतः
समस्याधिकाराः गला पथात् कुशी जाते।"

One thousand and nine hundred and fourteen years after the Nirvāṇa of Mahāvīra, the Ganges once again destroyed Pātaliputra. Before this in about 750 A.D., according to a version of Kang-Juyen, there was another submergence of the city. But the earliest of all seems to be the one at the time of the death of Kalkin which event Jaina accounts place in 472 A.D. The Trilokasāra says

Similarly the Jaina Harivāṇa, Trałówadipikā, Uttarapurāṇa, and the Trilokasāra are all unanimous in placing Kalkin 394 years and five months after Śaka era (My. Ar. Rep., 1928). May we not therefore, be justified in concluding that in the year 472 A.D., Pātaliputra was destroyed by the Ganges. Viśākhadatta must have lived prior to this date and in the days of Candragupta Vikramādiya.

Viśākhadatta himself gives us the clue in a verse (Act IV, 4).

Here the Gupta lineage is compared with that of the gods,
and Malayaketu is referred to as an ordinary king (manuṣya). 
Kalyāṇakula seems to be the same as Śrīkula and in an inscription
of Gupta era 61, the Gupta family is referred to as “शीतराहुतानावमुश्यानः
”, and the Deva is no other than Candragupta himself whose titles
on the coins are (1) Avikrama, (2) Ajītavikrama, (3) Narendracandra
(4) Devarāja, (5) Śṛṅgavikrama, etc. Moreover, the Sakas who are
mentioned in the drama are probably the Western Kṣatrapas whose
line came to an end in 388 A.D. at the hands of Candragupta. It is
unlikely that if no Saka is found after 400 A.D., a writer recording
long after should refer to them. The destruction of Sakas is referred to
by Bṛṇa and in the drama Devicandragupta quoted in the Śṛṅgāra-
ṛpaka. So the drama Mudrārākṣasa must have been written
some time after 388 A.D. and before 415 A.D. the latest date for
Candragupta Vikramāditya. Thus Viṣākhadatta becomes the younger
contemporary of Kālidāsa. Dr. J. J. Modi is of opinion that the
Hūnas were to be found on the Indian borders as early as the
second century A.D. and the argument that Hūnas came to India
only after 475 A.D. is not valid. They became a menace only in
the time of Toramāna and Mihirakula and harassed Skandagupta.
But until then they seem to have been contented with sporadic
expeditions for the purposes of pillage and robbery. The use
of the phrase “सूक्ष्म दशविष्यां” in the Bharatavākya shows that
a sort of guerilla warfare was being carried on and that the Hūnas
were not yet as powerful as they were to become under Toramāna
or Mihirakula.

There is nothing in the internal evidence that militates against
our view. Some of the stanzas that occur in this drama are also to be
found in the Pāñcatantra (षुष्णमां लक्ष्यमां तिमि पारद्रव च etc.) and in Bhartṛhari’s
Nitiśataka (भार्तर्थक नितिधूलु etc.). Of Bhartṛhari’s Satakas only the Śṛṅgāra-
śatakā seems to have been his own composition, the other two
being collections of Subhāgītās, Pāñcatantra or Tantrākhīyikā
cannot be placed later than the middle of the third century A.D.
Perhaps Viṣākhadatta borrowed the verse from Pāñcatantra, or as
is more probable, he introduced into his work some of the floating
literature of his time. So there is no sufficient reason for placing
him after Bhartṛhari.

In the first Act, Cāṇakya says that Induśarman is well-versed
in the science of polity of Auśanasa school. This does not necessarily
mean that this drama is posterior to Śukranīti. Kālidāsa mentions
the Auśanasa-nīti thus:
Kauṭalya in the *Arthaśāstra* criticizes the opinions of his predecessors like *Mānava, Bārhaspatya, Āśvamasa, Pārāśara* and *Ambāya*. Nor is there sufficient justification for placing Viṣākhadatta after Varāhamihira. Kālidāsa knows that the Moon is the friend of Budha and Guru (cf. *Raghunātana*, XIII, 76). The notion that Ketu influences the fortunes of men (according to Ballālasena’s *Abhutasāgaras*) originated with Pulisa or Paulas of Alexandria. Hence we can only conclude that the drama was composed after the third century A.D.

The allusions to the selflessness of the Buddhas or Bodhisattvas and to the story of Śibi show that Buddhism was an honoured religion at this time, though due to the Bṛahmanical revival it was gradually losing ground. The fact that Cāṇjakya sent Induśarman to the court of Malayaketu as a Kṣapaṇaka of the Lekottaravādin school instead of as a Bṛahmin Parivarājaka, shows that the Buddhist monks had been in the habit of conducting political intrigues under the protective cloak of their Āśrama. The nuns in the *Kathāsaritarasāgaras* and in the *Daśakumāramaratita* engage themselves in even more reprehensible acts. It is not surprising that an author with Bṛahmanical leanings like Viṣākhadatta, depicts Jivasiddha as a spy and a betrayer.

Coming to the style, a single glance is enough to show that Viṣākhadatta writes clearly and forcibly as befits the narrative. His style shows none of the elaborate orateness of Maṅgha and Bhavabhatti or Ratnakara or Bharavi. At the same time, since in the first stanza he employs Vakrokti, it is possible that he is later than Bhamaha. Bhamaha must certainly be prior to Bharavi, the arguments about the former being posterior to Daṇḍin or Dharmakirti being manifestly absurd. Bharavi must have been the contemporary of Durvinita (c. 450), Sīnḥavarman or Sīnḥavisṣu of Kanci (Saka 309 or A.D. 458 according to Sīnḥasūri’s *Lokāvitthāga*) and Yuvamanaraja Viṣṇuvardhana. The attempt to place Bharavi between 615 A.D. (accession of Viṣṇuvardhana of the Eastern Cālukyas) and 634 A.D. (the date of the Aihole inscription composed by Raviķirti) would lead us to the ridiculous conclusion that during the space of fifteen years Bharavi became so famous that a Jaina poet of such merit
as Ravikirti classed him with Kālidāsa. Bhāravi must be placed in about 450 A.D. Thus there is nothing contrary to our view that Viśākhadatta might have followed the school of Bhāmaha.

Some minor points might be noticed. Vaṭēśvaradatta is spoken of as merely a Sāmanta, while his son Prthu perhaps obtained the title of Mahārāja (which cannot mean a minister) and Viśākhadatta has the title of neither Sāmanta, nor Kumāra nor Yuvarāja. And the use of the phrase Śrīmadbandhubhṛtya in the Bharatavākya indicates that the members of the family of Viśākhadatta was included among the relatives and servants of Candragupta. Probably Prthu tried to make himself independent during the reign of Samudragupta who deprived him and his son of all their power.

The designation of the offices that occur in the drama like Kālapūraka, dānapūraka, sarvanagarāreśṭhin, durgapūraka, kumāra, adhīrāja, vijayapūraka, etc. also occur in the Basra seals and other contemporary Gupta records as uparikamaḥārāja, mahāpratihārin, mahādayaśāmanyaka, nagaraśreśṭhin, dānapūrōḍhikaraṇa, etc. Viśākhadatta evidently employs the terminology of his own time instead of that of the Arthaśāstra.

Thus having fixed the time of the composition of the play, we shall see if in any year about the beginning of the fifth century A.D. the astronomical conditions mentioned in the play are fulfilled. It has already been indicated that the balance of probability is that Viśākhadatta while writing the play had a definite time-scheme starting with a lunar eclipse on a Bhādrapada full-moon day and ending with the Kārtika full-moon day in accordance with the pūrṇimānta reckoning. The year 397 A.D. satisfies these conditions.¹

Lunar eclipse, Bhādrapada Ś. 15, Monday, 24th August, 397 A.D.
Kaumudimahotsava, Āśvina Ś. 15, Wednesday, 23rd Sept., ³
Prabodhotsava, Kārtika Ś. 12, Monday, 19th October, ³
March on Pāṭaliputra, Kārtika Ś. 15, Thursday, 22nd Oct., ³

On Thursdays travelling is forbidden till 3 P.M. (22 ghaṭikās after sunrise) and because of Paurṇimā and Kṛttikānukṣaṇatra travelling

¹ The year A.D. 388, in which Candragupta destroyed the Śakas, seems also to fit the data:—Bhādrapada Ś. 15 Lunar eclipse on 2nd September; Āśvina, kaumudi mahotsava on October 2nd, Monday; Prabodhotsava on Kārtika 12, Saturday, October 28th; and the full-moon of Kārtika falls on Tuesday, 31 October.
from north to south is also tabooed. It is further enjoined that princes must start in a dvisvabhāvalagna like that of Buddha when engaged in war. Jivasiddhi opines that the Lagna is strong enough to overcome the evil results of nakṣatra, tithi and vāra. Independent of the accepted belief that the drama Devi-candragupta is a work of Viśākhadatta and cannot have been composed prior to 388 A.D., the last date of the Kṣatrapas, we have arrived at the conclusion that Murdārākṣasa must have been composed during the time of Candragupta II, by our process of reasoning. I am not aware of Dr. Sten Konow's arguments for placing Viśākhadatta in the reign of Candragupta, but the facts adduced above serve to show that this theory cannot be dismissed, as Dr. Keith does, as a mere “fantasy.”

S. SRIKANTHA SATRI

Characteristic Features of the Saṭṭaka form of Drama

The word ‘Saṭṭaka' is fairly well-known to students of Sanskrit dramaturgy as the name of a minor form of drama. But the literal and exact sense of the word or its characteristic features are not quite well-known. Originally it seems to have referred to a form of dance.

The word Śaḍīkā is found in a Bharhut inscription where it refers to music or dance. According to Dr. Hoernle it is a somewhat irregularly formed equivalent of the Sanskrit Saṭṭaka applicable to the dancing of the Apsarases.

That dancing formed an essential part in the staging of Saṭṭakas is gathered from statements found in the prologues of the two Saṭṭakas—Karpūramañjari and Rambhāmañjari. The Pāripāṭvika in the first work expressly states that the Saṭṭaka has to be danced. In the second work the expression ‘Oh, the dancers have already begun' has been used to refer to the fact that the play has already begun. This would also be quite clear from a definition

1 Read before the Sixth All-India Oriental Conference at Patna in December, 1930.
3 वस्त्रों बदितथे।
4 पपो प्रमाणानि नन्दे।

I.I.L.Q., MARCH, 1931
of the Saññaka as given in the Bhāvaprakāśana according to which Saññaka is a form of dance.\(^1\)

Uses like सच्चस पातिली, सच्चसहस्त, and शर्मिकृतिहितसद्वक्रमविविधता in the Rambhaṇānjari would seem to point to a kind of metre or rāga as the meaning of the word.

It is not known when the Saññaka as a form of drama—as apart from a kind of music or dance—came to be introduced. Neither we have many surviving specimens of this kind of drama. Earlier works like the Nātyaśāstra of Bharata and the Daśarūpaka of Dhanaṇṭjaya do not mention Saññaka. The section of the Agnipurāṇa (338, 2) dealing with dramaturgy refers to Saññaka but the time of the composition of the Purāṇa is not yet definitely known. And the Karpūramaṇjari of Rājaśekhara seems to be one of the earliest, if not the earliest, available specimen of a Saññaka. But even at the time of Rājaśekhara, Saññaka as a form of drama does not seem to have been widely known and this necessitated a definition of the form in the prologue.\(^2\) It should be noted that the prologue is not found elsewhere to define or explain the form of the drama.

There was a good deal of controversy with regard to the exact nature of Saññaka. According to some it is a type of Toḷaka\(^3\); according to others it is a form of Nāṭikā.\(^4\)

But the greatest amount of controversy appears to have centred round the language of a Saññaka. Thus a characteristic feature of the Saññaka as noted by Viśvanātha in his Sāhityadarpaṇa (and as is the general impression among students of Sanskrit) is the exclusive use of Prākṛt.\(^5\) But this does not seem to have been the case originally or even later on generally. The definition of this form of drama as given by Rājaśekhara in the prologue of his Karpūramaṇjari does not refer to this important feature. Had it required the exclusive use of Prākṛt, the verse that explains it would not have omitted to mention this vital point. On the other hand subsequent

---

1 सच्चस पातिली । सच्चसहस्त । शर्मिकृतिहितसद्वक्रमविविधता (p. 269).
2 But Prof. Sten Konow thinks otherwise. According to him the definition of Saññaka as given in the work itself suggests that the Karpūramaṇjari was not the first composition of its kind.—Karpūramaṇjari (H. O. S.), p. 195.
4 Ibid., p. 244.
5 सच्चस पातिली । सच्चसहस्त । शर्मिकृतिहितसद्वक्रमविविधता (VI.284).
query, why Prākṛt has been used to the exclusion of Sanskrit may be regarded as an indication that Saṭṭakas were composed in Sanskrit as well.

The Bhāvanaprakāśana of Śrādātana, ‘a compendium of all activities of the writers on literary criticism from Bharata down to Kṣemendra in the 11th century’ (as the work is described in the introduction to its edition in the Gaekwad’s Oriental Series) actually refers to people who were definitely of opinion that at least the king in a Saṭṭaka should not speak Prākṛt. In the same breath the view of others according to whom the king should speak Māgadhī or Śauraseni form of Prākṛt is also referred to. It is stated in another place of the same work that a Saṭṭaka should be Prakṛtaprākṛta-naya. But the meaning of the word is not quite clear. It seems to refer to the use of high class Prākṛt alone in a Saṭṭaka. For it is definitely laid down that a Saṭṭaka should be couched in the languages spoken in Śūrasena and Mahārāṣṭra. It may not unlikely also mean that a Saṭṭaka should be mainly—if not exclusively—in Prākṛt, thereby hinting at the possibility of the existence of Saṭṭakas in Sanskrit.

The definition of the Saṭṭaka as given by the author of the Nātyadarpana is extremely obscure. He is expressly of opinion that a Saṭṭaka should be in one language. But it is difficult to make out anything from his statement to the effect that it should neither be in Sanskrit nor in Prākṛt. Does it indicate that Saṭṭakas were originally in spoken dialects which were different alike from Sanskrit and literary Prākṛt?

Whatever might have been the case originally it is clear from the references of Śrādātana that there were Saṭṭakas in which the king

1 न बदंति प्राकृत भाषाणि राजेिति कविष्चित्ता: (p. 269).
2 भाषाम् भौरीस्या वा बदंति राजेिति केवल (loc.cit.).
3 प्रकृतप्राकृतस्य शहस्व नामानि भवेन (p. 244).
4 युरौज्ज्वलपरात् यापाध्यायादिकित्तम (p. 269).
5 विचलन प्रबंधकयादिता यहि क्षाया भविषी।

चन्द्रातिसुधांत्रा स सरस्वी नारिकर्मिन: ||

at least spoke Sanskrit. The silence in Rājaśekhara’s definition as to the language to be used in a Saṭṭaka as also his excuse for using Prākrit instead of Sanskrit would naturally lead one to suspect the existence of Saṭṭakas in Sanskrit.

As a matter of fact we have a work the Rambhāmaṇjarī of the Jain poet Nayacandra (author of the Hammīramalākāvya) which is styled Saṭṭaka and is written in imitation of the Karpūramaṇjarī. The work is partly in Sanskrit. Here the king speaks Sanskrit; the Sūtradhāra speaks Sanskrit and Prākrit. The plot of the work agrees very closely with that of the Karpūramaṇjarī. The use of Sanskrit by our author cannot be supposed to be a fresh adventure as its use in earlier works can be inferred from the statements of Śāradātānaya and Rājaśekhara.

One more notable feature of the work is that it is complete in three yanvanikās or acts whereas according to the consensus of opinion of all authors of works on dramaturgy it should have four.1

It will not be out of place here if an attempt were made to hazard a suggestion to explain this confusion with regard to the exact nature of a Saṭṭaka. Originally it seems to have been—as its name appears to indicate and as has been supposed by scholars like Sten Konow2 and Keith3—a form of popular operatic representation abounding in music and dancing. It was possibly the practice at that time to use in it popular dialects which were neither literary Prākrit nor Sanskrit. This seems to be the significance—as has already been conjectured—of the definition of the Nātyadarpaṇa. When introduced in a Sanskrit garb or even when it was in popular dialects it does not seem to have appealed to the cultured Sanskritist audience. This is probably hinted by the Nātyadarpaṇa when it refers to its comparative unpopularity.4 Rājaśekhara might have made an attempt to restore the

---

1 The work as edited by Paṇḍit Ramcandra Dinānātha Śastri was printed at the Nirmaṇa Sagara Press, Bombay in 1889. Curiously it is styled a nāṭikā on the cover. It deals with the story of king Jāitra-Sīṃha, the Paṅgu, of Benares and Rambhā, the daughter of Madanavarmman of the Kirmir dynasty of Lāṭa (Gujrat). The subject-matter and historical data of the work will be dealt with in detail in a separate paper.
3 Sanskrit Drama, p. 350.
4 पंचरि च जातिमानस्मालिनिमित्ताम् क्रृत्रंगमित्रित्वाय भक्षाधिक वैदिकतालि (p. 215).
popular character of this form of drama by his composition of a Saṭṭaka in literary Prākṛt. It should be noted that Rājaśekhara makes use of high class Prākṛt alone (e.g., Śauraseṇī and Māhārāṣṭri). The preponderance of desī and local element in his work may possibly be due to his desire to make it popular.

Originating, as it did, from so famous and great a poet as Rājaśekhara the Karpūramaṇjarī soon came to occupy the position of an ideal Saṭṭaka. And not only later poets but also rhetoricians did not hesitate to accept it as the type. And some, at least, of the rhetoricians like Viśvanātha appear to have adapted their definitions of this form of drama to the Karpūramaṇjarī.

Chintaharan Chakravarty

On Manimekhalā “the guardian deity of the sea”
(a Cambodian document)

In the last number of the Indian Historical Quarterly, I have drawn attention to Manimekhalā, a goddess of the sea, whose name appears in the Pāli Jātaka and in a celebrated epic of the Tamil literature, associated in both of them, with the same tale—the rescue of a holy man about to be drowned after a shipwreck. I have suggested that this deity belongs to Southern India and that her place of worship may have been Kāñcī or Kāveripaṭṭana. Now I have quite unexpectedly and by mere chance come across another reference to Manimekhalā not in India proper, but in Further India, in that kingdom of Cambodia (Kāmvuja, Kāmboja), where much of old India can still be detected, not only in ancient temples, but also in current life and daily practices.

The Cambodian Rāmāyaṇa has the following episode. Its translation has been prepared through the kindness of Mademoiselle Suzanne Karpeles, the keeper of the King’s library and the secretary of the Buddhist Institute at Phnom-Penh.

“At the settled time, the gods and goddesses went to the meeting place where they used to go every year for the pleasure of dancing. A very powerful god, Varjun by name, having heard that all were already present at the place, dressed himself and went there in order to take part in the dance along with the other gods.

At that time, a goddess of the sea, Manimekhalā, who had also
heard of that meeting, left her abode, holding in her hand a blazing jewel, and went to the place where all had to gather. At the same time, it happened that a king of the Giants, Rāmāsura or Rāma parusa (Paraśu Rāma) by name, very wicked and very powerful, left his heavenly mansion to enjoy a walk. In the course of his walk he perceived from afar the blazing fires of the jewel that Maṇimekhalā tossed in her hand while playing with it. Wishing to take hold of that precious jewel, Rāmāsura proceeded straight to her. The gods who were then dancing fled away and hastened to their home at the sight of the wicked Rāmāsura. Maṇimekhalā, left alone on the spot, hid herself in the clouds, tossing her jewel. The Giant followed on her steps. Seeing him, she behaved as if she would give her jewel up to her foe. But, as he was nearing, she tossed the jewel up, and Rāmāsura dazzling at the blaze, drew back. She stepped further, he pursued her. In a fit of anger, he advanced again in order to catch hold of her, but Maṇimekhalā again escaped the threatening hand. At last, the Giant threw his axe, hoping to kill the mistress of the jewel, but, lo! the axe did not touch her. Rāmāsura exclaimed: 'Mekhalā, will you give me your jewel? If not, you will be killed by my own hands' and he went on pursuing her.

At this moment the god Varjun, a sword in his hand, came to pass along. Rāmāsura then left her aside, and full of anger, addressed the god Varjun with these words: 'Who are you? How are you so bold as to pass along before my eyes? Do you not know that I am the most powerful in the three worlds?' Varjun answered:

Well, rascal, my name is Varjun, well-known in the three worlds. While passing through the air, I did not trample on your head. Why do you get across against me? Why do you want to emulate me? Have you not heard from the gods the extent of my divine power? Well be aware of this, Rāvaṇa himself, with ten heads and twenty arms, yields to myself?

Listening to these harsh words of Varjun, Rāmāsura enraged turned his axe round and began to fight. They exchanged such blows that the earth quaked. At last Rāmāsura succeeded in catching Varjun's feet, and he struck him against mount Meru so hard that Varjun died. The three worlds quaked, the Meru leaned on one side under Rāmāsura's heavy blow.

After that fight, Rāmāsura returned home victorious. As for Maṇimekhalā, she sat back to the sea, where she is still going on acting as a guardian.'
This is the tale from which a ballet has been drawn, still performed at the court of Cambodia. It was given once more, a few months ago at the festival held at Phnom Penh on the opening of the new Buddhist Institute (May 1930); it had been performed a little earlier (December 1929) before the mahārājā of Kapurthala on the occasion of his visit to the royal court of Cambodia. The programme distributed to the guests is as follows:

1. Welcoming dance of the angels.
2. The archangel Vorchun join the angels and dances with them.
3. The goddess of the sea, Mekhālā, holding a blazing stone, enters and dances with others. The archangel Vorchun requests her in vain to give him the stone.
4. The demon Ream-Eysor, dazzled by the blaze of the jewel thrown by Mekhālā, breaks out into a fit of fury, and pursues the angels. He attempts to obtain from the goddess of the sea her wonderful jewel, but to no purpose; he pursues her and engages himself in a fight with the archangel Vorchun who tries to stand in his way.

Now it is clear at once that the compiler of the Cambodian Rāmāyāna was familiar with the same Mañimekhalā, "the guardian of the sea", the owner of a wonderful jewel, who appears both in Pāli and Tamil literature, and that he was, moreover, acquainted with some features of her legend which we could only guess or presuppose from Indian sources. I had in my previous paper dwelt on a passage of the Mahājanakajītaka where the author explains why the goddess neglected for full seven days to inspect the sea; after giving his own explanation, he adds: "some people say (keci vadanti) that she had been attending a meeting of the gods". And again, after becoming conscious of her negligence, Mañimekhalā exclaims: "If Mahājanaka had perished in the sea, I could not hereafter be admitted into the meeting of the gods." What that meeting was is now told expressly in the Cambodian Rāmāyāna: the gods used to meet once a year in a fixed place for the pleasure of dancing. Now, Mañimekhalā's struggle with Paraśu Rāma is not likely to be a spontaneous fancy of the Cambodian epic; it was probably borrowed from some old cycle of Indian legends in which Mañimekhalā was playing the chief part. It is no wonder that legends originating from the South-Eastern coast of India reached Cambodia; there are ample evidences of regular intercourse between this kingdom and the Southern dynasties, the Pallavas and the Colas. I hope I can later trace another evidence of the same kind, but in a converse direction.

Sylvain Lévi
Notes on Dravidian

The r-sounds of Dravidian

I General

The sound \( r \) can, in very general terms, be described as being produced by the vibration of the tip of the tongue raised up to some point between the teeth-ridge and the middle-palate on the mouth-roof. The sounds so produced are of different varieties, depending upon the point of articulation and the amount of vibratory movement involved. So far as the point of articulation is concerned, it may be anywhere between the teeth-ridge and the middle-palate. Vibratory movements of the tongue-tip become impossible when the point of articulation is taken beyond the middle-palate; and they are reduced to a minimum when the tongue-tip is on the teeth-ridge. From the supra-dental region to the mid-palatal area, the tongue-tip retains sufficient elastic power to be set in varying degrees of vibration. The more forward the position of the tongue-tip, the greater is the tendency shown by the sound to assume a fricative character; as the tongue-tip moves more and more backward on the mouth-roof, the vibratory movements become easier, till a particular position is reached beyond which no vibratory movements are possible.

As the tip of the tongue could vary its point of contact on the mouth-roof, one should naturally expect variations in the character of the sounds produced not only among the different dialectal varieties of the same language but also among individual speakers of the same dialect and even among the different enunciations of the same speaker. This is actually the case in Dravidian. Further, the tendency of Dravidian to push up the tongue-tip towards the dome or apex of the mouth-roof (cf. the enunciation of the characteristic 'cerebral' sounds \( t, \dot { d}, \breve { n} \), of Dravidian) has led to the production in Dravidian of as many \( r \) sounds as there are points of articulation from the teeth-ridge up till the mid-palatal region. To adopt the scientific classification of Jespersen, we may say that the Dravidian varieties may be produced anywhere between \( \breve { r} \) and \( \breve { r} \breve { h} \). We need only note the value of southern English \( r \) [\( \dot { l} \), P. A. 'l'] is absent in Dravidian.

See Jespersen's Lehrbuch der Phonetik, pp. 38, 39.
For practical purposes, however, we shall recognise here only three main varieties. These three varieties are represented in Tamil:—

(a) the so-called "light" \( r \) which is post-dental and produced in the region covered by \( \text{SR}^e \) to \( \text{SR}^f \); all the southern dialects possess a distinct symbol for this sound, which symbol is usually equated to its actual phonetic value. The vibratory movements of the tongue-tip are very few here and the muscular tension is very low.

(b) An 'alveolar' \( r \) produced at the position denoted by \( \text{SR}^f \) to \( \text{SR}^e \); this sound has no separate symbol in any of the southern Dravidian speeches. The sound itself exists as such in a fixed form in Tamil only in the consonant groups \( nd^r \) and \( tr^r \) where \( d^r \) and \( t^r \) represent alveolar plosives. In the other dialects the sound crops up only as an impermanent peculiarity in the enunciation of certain speakers or dialectal sub-varieties.

(c) The so-called 'cerebral' or 'cacuminal' or 'hard' \( r \) is produced in the region of \( \text{SR}^e \) to \( \text{SR}^f \) and termed variously in the south by native grammarians as \( \text{bakala}\varphi\gamma\pi\alpha, \text{banjir}\iota, \text{etc}. \) The vibratory movements of the tongue-tip are largest in the production of this variety. Tamil, Telugu and Kannada possess symbols for this sound, but in modern enumeration Tamil alone gives it its true value.

In the production of all these three varieties, the lips remain slightly open, the tongue-tip immediately behind the tip-region is slightly drawn backwards so that the tongue-tip is allowed free play during vibration. The vibratory movements in all cases are in contact with the mouth-roof. These vibratory movements increase in number as the point of articulation proceeds higher and higher on the mouth-roof from \( \text{SR}^f \) to \( \text{SR}^h \). The post-dental \( r \) involves only very few vibratory movements, while the post-alveolar \( r \) is quite distinctly 'rolled' or 'trilled.' Generally speaking, the most forward variety \( \text{SR}^e \) and the most backward \( \text{SR}^h \) are not heard in Dravidian.

The fact that the vibratory movements become easier as the tongue-tip takes up higher and higher positions on the mouth-roof is of particular significance in Dravidian inasmuch as in certain

1 Alveolar \( d' \) in \( nd^r \) is produced at a slightly more forward position than \( t^r \) in \( t^r \). The point of articulation for the voiced alveolar \( d' \) is the region of the fore-gums, while \( t^r \) is produced at the back-gums.

2 What I have termed 'alveolar' \( r \) in a previous article of mine in these columns includes the true as well as the post-dental variety.
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dialects the 'lighter' varieties of \( r \) tend to become rolled \( r \) either in combinative positions or under the influence of mechanical or semantic accent. Indeed, any attempt on the part of a speaker to 'trill' his \( r \) gives rise to the production of \( r \).

II. The description of \( r \) sounds in Tamil Grammars

I have described above the values of the main varieties of \( r \) as they are brought out in present-day enunciation. It would be interesting to consider here the views of old Tamil grammarians with a view to finding out, if possible, the values attached to these sounds in the enunciation of a more ancient period.

The oldest extant Tamil grammar Tolkāppiyam (1st century B.C.?) describes the production of the 'light' \( r \) thus:

Sūtra

"\( \text{Nūṇinā-v-aṇarīy-aṇṇam varuḍa} \)
\( \text{Rakāra łaṅkāram āy iранdum piṟakkum}. \)"

"\( R \) and \( l \) are produced by the tip of the tongue being raised and allowed to rub against the hard palate".

The same grammar describes the 'hard' \( r \) thus:

"\( \text{Aṇari nūṇinā v-aṇṇam oṭ'tra} \)
\( \text{Raṅgā nāṅgāyiraṇdum piṟakkune}. \)"

"\( R \) and \( n \) are produced by the tip of the tongue being raised and made to come in contact with the palate".

It may be observed that the Tolkāppiyam does not describe any other variety. The Namūl, another grammar, which is later than the Tolkāppiyam describes similarly these two varieties only:

'Light' \( r \):

"\( \text{Aṇṇa nūṇinā varuḍa ra la varum}. \)

"\( R \) and \( l \) are produced by the rubbing of the tip of the tongue against the palate".

Minute observation reveals that the symbol for 'light' \( r \) in Tamil is usually given to-day the value of the post-dental only. The Tamil alphabet thus possesses symbols only for the post-dental \( r \) and the 'hard' or post-alveolar \( r \), the purely alveolar variety having been from early times associated in symbol and in sound with the post-alveolar or retroflex \( r \).
'Hard' $r$:—

"Anna nunini nani-yuril ra na varum".

"$R$ and $n$ are produced when the tongue-tip is closely attached to the palate'.

It would be useless to expect in these descriptions the scientific precision such as we are accustomed to in modern phonetic treatises. On an examination of the above definitions of the Tamil grammars the following points deserve to be singled out:—

(1) So far as $r$ is concerned, it is clubbed with the continuative $l$, merely on the ground that the tip of the tongue comes into play against the palate in both cases, $l$ in modern Tamil is distinctly post-alveolar, and 'light' $r$ is post-dental. It could certainly not be that in ancient Tamil the $r$ described here had the same point of articulation as that of modern $l$. $l$ may indeed have been produced in the post-dental or alveolar regions but the definitions themselves do not suggest anything to warrant an inference of this kind. It is possible that the difference in the points of articulation was not considered by the old grammarians to be sufficiently important to be noted, probably because for $r$ and $l$ the points of articulation varied greatly among different speakers and different enunciations were current in an older period.

(2) As for the other $r$ which corresponds in symbol to that representing modern $r$, the old grammarians class it among plosives and define it as being similar in point of production to the alveolar $n$. This view of the Tamil grammarians calls for a few comments. Evidently, the sound referred to here is an alveolar $r$ ($\text{R}r'$), as we see from the fact that it is described as having the same point of production as $n$ and, further, as the classificatory lists show the relationship of this $r$ to $n$, just as dental $t$ is shown to be parallel to dental $n'$. Between the alveolar $r$ and the post-alveolar $r$, the only difference that is easily observable, is the amount of vibration of the tongue-tip. Among individual speakers themselves, the values of the alveolar and the cerebral $r$'s are interchanged to-day. It was therefore probably felt by the grammarians that the symbol standing for modern $r$ need be described only as representing an alveolar sound and that no separate mention need be made of the cerebral.

Yet another factor also should have contributed to the confusion of the alveolar and the cerebral values of $r$ in these definitions. This point has to be considered in close connection with the grammarians' classification of $r$ as an alveolar plosive.
Why did they class \( r \) as an alveolar plosive? Was it because originally it had only the value of alveolar \( t' \) or \( d' \)? Did the sound originally have none of those vibratory movements which we associate with modern \( r \)? In other words, could we consider that the modern value of \( r \) is a later development from \( t' \)? The answer to these questions is unequivocally in the negative when we note (a) that \( t' \) (as we find it in Tamil-Malayalam today) has no distinct individuality of its own and shows itself to be a secondarily derived sound; (b) that phonetically \( t' \) can never give rise to \( r \) under any circumstances; and (c) that the independence and individuality of \( r \) as an ancient Dravidian phoneme with a definite phonetic value and with clear semantic differentiations in those forms, possessing this sound as distinct from forms having 'light' \( r \), are unquestionable as shown by the occurrence of the symbol and the sound (in some instances) in the southern Dravidian dialects.

When once we note that \( r \) is ancient and that \( t' \) has no individuality of its own, the view (expressed by some scholars) that the symbol for \( r \) originally had only the value of a plosive becomes unlikely. Why then have these two sounds been confused in the classification adopted by Tamil grammarians? And why does the symbol for modern Tamil \( r \) stand for \( t' \) or \( d' \) also in those few consonant groups where these alveolars occur?

I have indicated the answer to these questions already in my discussion of the origin of alveolar plosives \( t', d' \) in the I.H.Q. (1929). In a large number of instances, the production of \( t' \) or \( d' \) occurs in close connection with the vibratory 'rolling' of the alveolar or cerebral \( r \), and thereupon the alveolar plosive was associated with \( r \) in symbol and in sound. (Cf. for this association of \( t \) or \( d' \) with \( r \) the Tamil groups \( nd r \) and \( td r \), the latter of which is produced not only when an original \( r \) is involved but also as the result of combinative changes of alveolar \( l \) or \( n \) plus dental \( t \)). Though \( t' \) or \( d' \) was recognised as possessing no separate individuality of its own except largely in connection with alveolar or cerebral \( r \), it was singled out as the first element in the emphatic enunciation of \( r \) (alveolar and cerebral). When the sound \( r \) (alveolar and cerebral) was recognised (especially in accented positions) as being constituted of \( t' \) or \( d' \) and \( r \) (alveolar or cerebral), the symbol originally standing for \( r \) by a natural confusion came to stand for \( t' \) also in the consonant groups like \( t' k \) (\(<l \) or \( n+k \)) and \( t' p \) (\(<l \) or \( n+p \)) where no \( r \) was involved,
The process of association may therefore be represented to have taken the following course:—

1. Alveolar and cerebral r (with trilling) existed as original sounds in Dravidian and were correctly represented by the modern symbol for r; no attempt was made to distinguish these two, because they shared common features in their enunciation.

2. The alveolar plosive element t' or d' was incorporated by these sounds initially, when they were ‘rolled’ particularly under the influence of accent arising from mechanical or semantic causes.

3. This plosive element came to be intimately associated with r which latter was thereupon also classified as a plosive especially because the plosive element underwent changes parallel to those undergone by the other plosives p, t, k and their voiced varieties.

4. Further, the symbol standing for r also came to stand for the single sound t' or d' when it cropped up even in contexts where no original r was involved, i.e., when it cropped up as an assimilative result of the combination of l or n+k or l or n+p, (in which cases no original r was involved).

The mixing-up of the symbols for r and t' or d' and the classification by the Tamil grammarians of r as an alveolar plosive should therefore be traced to the peculiar phonetic value of Tamil alveolar or cerebral r which in accented or certain combinative positions had the value of t' or d' + r.

III Occurrence of the Sounds

(a) In initial positions, no one of the r- sounds is found in native words in the different Dravidian dialects except in Telugu, Tulu, Kui and Gondi where the initially occurring r- is the result of Aphæresis consequent on accent-shifting:—

**Telugu:** rōlu (mortar)—cf. Tamil ural (mortar)
   lō (inside)—cf. nū (inside)
   rāyu (to rub)—cf. orai (to rub)
   etc.

**Tulu:** lam(b) (to wash)—cf. Tam. alambu
   reh(b)u (to dissolve)—cf. Tam. karai
   randu (to crave)—cf. Tam. era-kku
   etc.
Kui: *rūk* (to rub)—cf. southern *or-ai*, etc.
*ris* (to set in position)—cf. southern *irutt* (to place)
*rī* (to burn)—cf. *eri* (to burn)
etc.
etc.

Gōndi: *ragga* (to descend)—cf. Tamil *iraṅgu*;
*sāṅg* (to be open)—cf. Tamil *tur* (to be open)
etc.
etc.

(b) Intervocally, both *r* and *r* occur in Tamil and Malayāḷam
and are given their correct values, e.g., *paravaī* (bird),
*iraṅgu* (to descend), *urai* (to settle, coagulate), etc.

There exist separate symbols for *r* and *r* in Kannada and Telugu
also but the modern value of both these symbols is only a post-dental
*r* (see below for instances).

(c) In final positions, *r* when preceded by a long vowel appears
without any enunciatory vowel in Tamil, e.g., *ūr*, *Īr*, etc., but final
*r* takes always a slight enunciatory vowel, e.g., *kāru* (cloud), *āru*
(essence), etc.

In Malayāḷam, final *r* may also appear alone, e.g., *karar* (rope),
*vaṛar* etc.

No attempt has been made in the above analysis to distinguish
between the alveolar and the post-alveolar varieties both of which have
in this essay been denoted by *r*. As vibratory movements of the
tongue-tip exist in the production of both these sounds, they could
not usually be easily marked off one from the other, but we may
note here that *r* in the Tamil consonant groups *ndr* and *ttr* is alveo-
lar. The post-dental variety is in Tamil represented by a different
symbol and it possesses a distinct individuality of its own, as it
ordinarily fails to undergo any of those changes which *r* (alveolar
and cerebral) appears to have undergone (see below).

Other general features about the occurrence of *r* and *ṛ* may be
noted below:—

1 This difference is easily explained. Post-dental *r* involves
very few vibratory movements and therefore no enunciatory vowel
was recognised; while the larger number of vibratory movements
entailed in the production of the 'hard' *r* naturally brought into pro-
minence a slight vocalic element. Such a vocalic element is also
associated in Dravidian with the enunciation of *p, t, k*, immediately
after explosion.
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(i) $r$ and $r$ are used alternatively in a few instances which denote basically the same meanings:—$karu$, $karu$ (black); $tiruva$, $tirappu$ (opening) etc.

This alternance of $r$ and $r$ in the bases probably points to a period when the different varieties of $r$ alternated with one another and no fixity of sound had arisen; but instances of such alternance are few in the extant word-stock.

(ii) In the large majority of cases, $r$ and $r$ are distinct and separate phonemes in Tamil today, e.g.,

$r$ (post-dental)  $r$ (alveolar or cerebral)
$ir$ (to sit, to exist)  $ir$- (to go down, etc.)
$păr$ (to see)  $păr$ (to fly)
$āṛ$ (nearness)  $āṛ$- (to cut)

etc.  etc.

(iii) In dialectal varieties of Tamil, $r$ and $r$ are freely interchanged. In the colloquial of the Coimbatore district, the sound uniformly used for both $r$'s approximates to $br$ in character, e.g., $ēṟu$ (car) for $ūṛ$, $pērai$ for $pērai$ (roof), $āri$ (to cut) for $ari$, etc.

In the colloquial of Madras city (probably owing to the influence of Telugu, for which vide infra) all $r$'s are given the value of the post-dental $r$ [br], e.g., $para$ for $pāra$ (to fly), $kari$ for $kāri$ (curry) etc.

(iv) We have already referred to the peculiarity in the enunciation of $r$ in the Tamil country, viz., the production of a slight alveolar $t$ before the rolling or vibration of the tongue-tip commences. Its presence can be detected on careful observation. The alveolar plosive $t'$ (or $d'$) is the sound resulting from the tongue-tip forming an initial stoppage; just before the breath-current, necessary for the production of the vibratory movements of the tongue-tip, begins to issue, the tongue-tip will have formed this stoppage and the first force of the current explodes the stoppage and produces alveolar $t$. The alveolar plosive in $ṭr-ṛ-ṛ$ could be heard conspicuously when $r$ is rolled with some stress deliberately. If the $r$ is produced higher up in the mid-palatal region itself, the plosive incorporated may be the cerebral $t$; but usually the alveolar $t$ alone is heard.

(v) Malayālam $r$ is very much more “rolled” than Tamil $r$, e.g., $arivuka$ (to know), $purame$ (besides) etc.

Post-dental $r$ in consonant groups sometimes becomes $r$ in

1 Sanskrit consonant groups formed of voiceless plosives and $r$ are given in Mal. the values of $pr$, $kr$, $ṛ$, e.g., $prākāra$, $krānti$, $ṛāsam$, 
Malayalam e.g., avar (they) + dative ending -k = averku (to them), etc.

Final r of words, sounded as a "chit" (cille-) often becomes r, e.g., kayar (rope), payar (grain), vayar (belly) etc.

R and r occur as separate phonemes as in Tamil (Vide above).

Again, Skt. rv and rn are also pronounced as rv and rn in Malayalam, but ry (as in karya) retains its value in Malayalam.

(vi) Telugu.

The modern dialect observes no distinction between r and r, and uses r throughout in sound. The grammatical dialect or the sādhu bhaṣā which represents an ancient stage of Telugu, shows r and employs a separate symbol for it, e.g., adaru (all), nāru (hundred), āru (six), gūramu (horse), kāri (black), mārri (change). etc.

In some instances where Tamil uses r, even literary Telugu uses the symbol r only:

kāru — kāru (Saltness)

(vii) Kannada keeps fairly close to Tamil in preserving r in the symbols of the literary dialect, but the value given to it in modern spoken Kannada is everywhere that of the post-dental r.

(viii) Tulu and Kōdagu have eliminated r throughout in native words, e.g., är (to grow cool); mār (to change) etc.

There is reason to think that in a large number of Tulu instances this elimination was caused not only by the mere replacement of r by r, but also to the change of r to d or dj in certain positions, e.g., madepu (to forget), āji (six), kudi (term), pide (to be born), māḍe (screen), kaja (stain) etc.

etc., but if the first constituent of the group is voiced, the r is retained griha, brāhmaṇa, etc. R before other plosives voiced or voiceless, generally shows a tendency in Mal. to become r, e.g., varga, markaṇa etc.

It is interesting to note that double r in old Telugu is represented by ry and not rr. This shows how the "rolling" of the sound was recognised as greater in degree when the accent-influenced doubling became necessary. Conversely, when the ancient r combined with other sounds in Telugu Saṃsas, the "rolling; was reduced, and the sound was represented by r, e.g., āru (six) + garu (persons = ārguru, etc.)
(iv) Kui shows r in rare instances like the following, e.g., arpa to hide), vṛṣa (to write) etc. Most of these cases of r appear to be peculiar to Kui, developed from r or ḍ, t, etc.

But in a number of cases r seems to have changed to j, e.g., āji (six), pāṃja (to fly), tōṃja (to appear; cf. tōr cf. Kann.), tija (to turn), etc.

(x) Gōṇḍī speakers very freely interchange r and r: the ancient r seems to have undergone changes, while the new r is developed from t, ḍ, etc:—

bāppor (when), mūr (to close—cf. South mūḍu) etc.

The change of r to s (through an intermediate 'āydam'-like k?) may be postulated in the following instances: ask (to cut, <ark), pesh (to pick, <pirakāk).

r+k (plural ending) has given rise to hk in a few instances like the following:

kūr (horn)—kōhk (horns)

nūr (village)—nāhk (villages) etc.

Compare the production of the minute glottal fricative called āydam in Tamil e.g., kal+ēdu <kahtēdu (the stone is bad), where l+t>h, just as Gōṇḍī r+k>hk.

(xi) The sound represented by the symbol r in Kurukh and Brāhūi grammars as occurring in these dialects, is really the North Indian flapped r.

The influence of the neighbouring Indo-Aryan has levelled down older native r's to r, as illustrated by the following instances:—

Brāhūi parra (wing)—cf. Southern par—(to fly)

Kurukh ara (sawing instrument)—cf. the southern base ar 'to cut.'

IV Combinative Changes

A few of these have already been referred to. Certain others in which r is involved, occur in some of the southern dialects. They are indicated below:—

(i) r changes into ēlūr in the inflexional endings of Tamil nouns with final r, e.g., ār (river), ēlūrai, etc. This change does not appear to be represented in Kannada or Tulu. Malayālam shows the same development as Tamil while Telugu and Gōṇḍī show t or ṭ in similar contexts arising from r, e.g., ēru (river), ṭi, etc.

(ii) R appearing finally in the first constituents of Tamil samāsas changes into ēlūr, e.g., kalīlēru-vāṇai, ēlēru-tanqār, etc.
No similar change is generally observable in the other dialects except Malayālam. Telugu, however, shows a few forms like cillēluka where -ll- is probably from tll.r.

(iii) Final r of certain passive verb-bases becomes tlr in their corresponding transitives and causatives, e.g., mālt'rū (to change) from mar (to become changed) etc.

Traces of these exist in Kannāḍa and Malayālam where the r of the consonant group has been eliminated. Kannāḍa shows the dental t while Malayālam shows the alveolar, e.g., Kannāḍa māttu and Mal. māttu.

(iv) A few derivative nouns from bases with final r show tlr as a development of r, e.g., kutt'ram from kṛṛ, net'tri from ner, etc. Corresponding forms in Kannāḍa show dental tt while Malayālam retains alveolar tt'. There are a few Telugu instances like ulla (to be dried) where t probably goes back to an original alveolar.

(v) In a number of other instances, forms with nd'r appear to be developments from bases with alveolar r or cerebral r, e.g., oru (one), ondru; tūr, tund'ral etc. While Telugu shows no correspondences answering to this particular development, Kannāḍa parallels show nḍ for nd'r (cf. on'du, etc.) and Malayālam forms show n'nt (cf. on'n'nu etc.)

(vi) Certain combinative changes appear to be clearly represented in Tamil; these are the following :

(a) Final r of verb-bases combining with the Past Tense affix t become tlr, e.g., pel'vrān (he obtained) from per (to obtain) etc.

(b) L or n combining with t change into tlr, as in vit'vrān (wīl+ tu), etc. Cf. here the production of -l- when Kui final l of verb bases like sol- (to enter), combine with the dental tense-particle t; probably the intermediate stage represented the alveolar l'. Cf. Winfield's observations on page 75 of his Grammar. Note also the production of -l- in the inflexional endings of Tel "irregular nouns" with final -l, -n and -r.

(c) L or n combining with p or k changes into the alveolar plosive t', as in nal+pu = nalt'pu, nil+ku = nil'ku etc.

L. V. RAMASWAMI AIYAR
Bharatavākya and the Bhagavadajjukam

In view of the recent discussions about the nature of Bharatavākya and Praśasti, the following observations will be found interesting. All the extant dramas have a Bharatavākya, which is generally introduced with expressions like रपेन्म न ते सूर्य; निर्य तरोऽवि. and भव: परं विषयवर्धिः।

But Bhāsa has no such thing. It is true that there occurs a stanza at the end in Bhāsa-dramas, the subject-matter of which is similar to our usual Bharatavākya, but it is a matter of grave doubt whether the stanza was designated by the author as Bharatavākya or as Praśasti. Bharata's Nātyaśāstra or for the matter of that so late a treatise as the Daśarūpaka does not theoretically recognise Bharatavākya; they only know Praśasti. Moreover, the term Bharatavākya devoid of expressions like रपेन्म न ते सूर्य; निर्य तरोऽवि etc., seen within brackets in our present printed copies of Bhāsa, might have been inserted by some later scribe. Yet Bhāsa-dramas do possess this Praśasti. But curiously enough, a prahasana named Bhagavadajjukam, a very refreshing comedy, has neither a Praśasti nor a Bharatavākya, though one of the Mss. mentions a Bharatavākya which is identical with Nāgānanda's Bh.; and which should be for that very reason, rejected, as is done by the editor. The Prahasana ends with a simple and impressive description of sun-set.

The stanza runs thus:

भग नति कि दिनहयासावल्लो

पुरायुमाधव यव सत्सुरजसादायिः।

संस्कृत संस्कृतसिकादक्षम्-

मायाक्षते द्वन्द्वनांभिन्नविभिः॥

It will at once be noticed that the verse is neither a 'nṛpadeva-praśasti,' nor a 'devadvijanṛpatinām praśāmsanām.' This total absence of Bharatavākya or Praśasti is seen in no other extant Sanskrit drama.

1 The title, I think, should be as put by me above and not as printed by Mr. Anujan Achan, for Śāṇḍilya's remark, "Bhagavadajjukāṃ nāma sanvuttaṁ," (p. 87) corroborates my contention.


3 Ed. by Bannerji Śāstrī in Bihar and Orissa Research Journal, and by P. Anujan Achan.

4 Bhag., p. 97.
This deviation from the usual convention is very bold, if deviation it is. Otherwise there can be two possible conjectures for the nature of the verse, viz., either the drama is incomplete (which it is evidently not), or else it was composed at a time when the dramaturgical rules of the extant Bharata-Nāṭyaśāstra were not binding on this author. But Winternitz does not find the latter suggestion very satisfactory. I, however, think it plausible that this small prahasana was written before the time of the present Bharata-Nāṭyaśāstra or at least before it acquired such a Śāstric authority. My reasons for so thinking are these:

(1) The fact is already noted by Winternitz that the prologue to this Prahasana knows a classification of the types of plays considerably different from our present treatise on dramaturgy.

The portion runs thus:


This evidently shows some distinct principle of division as Nāṭaka and Prakaraṇa. They are taken here as the basis of the other ten species, while according to our present theory, they themselves form the first two species. Out of the ten types counted above Sallāpa, Utsṛṣṭikāṅka and Vāra, as main species of drama, are unknown to any of the present theorists. Saṁllāpaka, however, appears as an uparūpaka in the Sāhityadarpaṇa; Utsṛṣṭikāṅka, though nowhere seen in that form, seems to be a variety of Aṅka, which is recognised by all, while Vāra does not appear anywhere in the extant literature.

1 This absence of Praśasti or Bharatavākya lends support to M. Ghosh's suggestion that Praśasti did not form a part of the drama, which formally ended with Kāvyasaṁhāra. Yet Bharata enjoins Praśasti, the absence of which in the present play would uphold the view propounded above. Moreover Kāvyasaṁhāra is technically the conclusion of the plot by showing Varāpti, which also is not done in this drama, thus showing its lose adherence to theory.

2 Bhag., Preface.

3 Bhag., Preface.

4 Ashokanath Bhattacharya seems to think that this passage refers to twelve Rūpakas, (I.H.Q., vol. II, 414). The tradition about twelve Rūpakas is to be seen only in one other place. C. D. Dalal in his Introduction to the Pārthaparākrama gives a list of the
This I think indicates a time when the theory was not finally fixed. The very presence of Sallāpa and Utsṛśṭikānka in the enumeration of the main types, shows that as yet the later main rūpakas and uparūpakas were not properly settled.

(2) The absence of the mention of the author’s name and the play’s title in the prologue, which feature is also shared by Bhāsa-dramas, may also indicate an earlier origin, though I confess that by itself, it would not be sufficient to prove its pre-Bhāsa composition.

(3) Death of Vasantasenā on the stage, which violates the usual theory (though as late and staunch a drama as Nāgānanda betrays the same feature), is a characteristic which is also shared by Bhāsa-dramas.

(4) Vasantasenā at two places, where she recites the Āryās, resorts to Sanskrit without any stage-direction which goes against the conventional practice of all our existing dramas.

(5) Lastly is this omission of Bharatavākyā or Praśasti. I think that all the above features, which militate against Bharata’s rules, taken together may indicate that our play was composed at a time when the present stereo-typed rules of Dramaturgy as enjoined by Bharata and others were not supreme.

I take this opportunity of showing that the play as printed is considerably mutilated. At two places, at least, the printed prose portions show a probable verse form. On page 26 there is a quotation which forms two Pādas of an anuṣṭubh:

नमस्त्रूति वधारे करेतुकङ्गने वानि।

dramatic works of Gujrat. He incidentally points out that as regards the famous Prabandhaśata of Rāmacandra, “the following note is found in an old paper leaf containing notes on mss, ‘रामचन्द्रकर्ता प्रबंधशत प्रावर्तकान्तकारित्वस्य प्राप्तम् १०००,’ from which quotation he inferred that the Prabandhaśata was one single work not 100 different works as hitherto believed. But for our purpose the mention of 12 Rūpakas has a new interest in view of the above passage of the Bh. The same quotation about the Prabandhaśata was pointed out in the Gujratī quarterly Purātattva (vol. II, p. 421), where it was further remarked that Rāmacandra might have developed the 12 Rūpakas mentioned by his Guru Hemacandra in his Kāvyānuśasana. If this Prabandhaśata discussed only these 12 Rūpakas, it must have been a very erudite discussion, as its length is computed at 5000 ślokas.
A FURTHER NOTE ON BHARATAVĀKYA

And on page 90 one whole verse seems to have been printed in prose form:

मंडलदेव हर्माधर्म प्राधिनामसमानति।
न जानिन ब्रम्हस्मीयं द्विप्र आपदितिति॥

I do, however, note that the metrical precision in the above lines is loose, which may be restored by proper textual-collation.

D. R. MANKAD

A Further note on Bharatavākya

Mr. Vibhutinath Jha has set forth his objections against my "Note on Bharatavākya (IHQ, vol. V, pp. 549 ff.) in the form of another note (IHQ, vol. VI, pp. 175 ff.).

But unfortunately his objections betray the unpleasant fact of his failure to catch my point. And the hollowness of the statements of Mr. Jha was laid bare by Mr. Manomohan Ghosh in his paper Bharatavākya (IHQ, vol. VI, pp. 485 f.) which indirectly lends support to my thesis.

Far from citing a passage in any work on dramaturgy having reference to the Bharatavākya, Mr. Jha vaguely proceeds to say that "the earliest works on dramaturgy seem to make reference to.......... Bharatavākya". But we frankly confess our inability to realise how and where such a reference is made. Nor are we able to understand how the question of 'seeming' comes in.

And we may here point to some more authorities, not mentioned in my original paper, who are also found not to have made any reference to the Bharatavākya. Abhinavagupta, the celebrated author of a commentary on the Nātyakāśtra of Bharata does not mention anything like Bharatavākya when commenting on a verse (XIX, 95) of Bharata which tells of the Praśasti. Sāradātanaya (12th-13th cent.) in his Bhāvaprakāśana 'a compendium of all activities of the writers on literary criticism from Bharata down to Kṣemendra' (as it is described in the preface to the work published in the Gaekwad's Oriental series) has no reference to the Bharatavākya. Neither do Rāmacandra, author of the Nātyadarpaṇa or Nāṭjāyaśobhāgana make any mention of it.

This conspiracy of silence may be accounted for by the supposition that the designation Bharatavākya was meant only as a stage-direction
to indicate the way of application of the Praṣasti even on the supposition of its identity with BV which was however a fact at least later on. But even in that case it is not possible for us to say when the term came to be used for the first time.

Mr. Jha has, on the otherhand, made an attempt, influenced by preconceived notions, to show that the Praṣasti (and as a consequence the BV) formed an integral part of the drama. He seeks to point out that a clear connecting link between the drama and the verses under the name of BV has been preserved by expressions like tathā- pūdam astu. But a critical eye will notice that the subject-matter of the verse in question, viz. praising the king, scarcely fits in with the character of a king. It was also pointed out that such expressions are not founded in all works.

The real nature of the application of the verse has been made clear not only by commentators like Pṛthvīdhara and Rāghavabhaṭṭa, but also authors of rhetorical works like Rasārṇavasudhākara. It is however curious that Mr. Jha definitely suspects the accuracy of the the statement of Pṛthvīdhara (p. 176) without adducing any evidence for his doing so, and finds fault with me for having been led away by this old commentator. I plead guilty to his charge, for in these cases, in the absence of any cogent proof to the contrary, we have no other course left than to be guided by the statements of old writers which are based on older tradition.

Mr. Jha is perplexed (p. 177) by the possibility of existence of separate BVs belonging to different parties. But does that possibility involve any inconsistency? If a party and not a poet was responsible for the nāndī or the initial benedictory verse (as is stated in the Sāhityadarpana), I do not see any reason why the same thing will not be true in the case of the concluding benedictory verse as well.

Chintaharan Cīakravartī

A Note on Meherunnisa and Jehangir

According to Dr. Beni Prasad, the chief biographer of the 4th great Mughal emperor, the story of Jehangir's amour with Meherunnisa, later on the celebrated empress Nurjahan, has to be rejected, because while it is found 'nowhere in the earlier half of the seventeenth century,' we find it everywhere in the record of the
subsequent generations. But while reaching this conclusion, Dr. Beni Prasad seems to have lost sight of the fact that the Rajput record, which vouches for its truth, belongs not to the latter, but to the earlier half of the seventeenth century. The Phalodi Khyat which was written when Rājā Sura Singha (1622-31) ruled at Bikaner states explicitly that the emperor had been in love with Nurjehan before her marriage with Sher Afgan. The passage dealing with this question has been translated by Dr. L. P. Tessitori as follows:—

"The emperor Jehangir, when still a prince, had an amour with Nur Mahal, a daughter of Itmad Dola and sister of Asaf Khan. After becoming emperor, he put her husband to death and took her into his harem, and gave her the name of Nur Mahal, and raised her above all the concubines in the harem. (Not only this but he placed the whole empire into her hands and he became her slave)."

Further we might add to this the testimony of Joannes De Laet, whose 'De Imperio Magni Mogalis, sive India vera commentarius. E varijs auctoribus congestus' was first published in 1631 A.D., and cannot therefore be said to belong to the latter half of the century. He writes that Jehangir had been in love with Nurjehan while she was still a maiden during the life-time of Akbar, but as she had been already betrothed to the Turk Sher Afgan, the emperor did not allow Selim to marry the girl, although he (Selim) never lost his love for her.

These two independent sources of testimony,—the one, an extract from a contemporary Rajput record, and the other, the substance of the remarks of a contemporary foreign traveller should, I think, lead one to suspect the existence of such a love-affair even if no other sources of evidence were available. But when we find everyone in the latter half of the seventeenth century repeating this story, and when we take the peculiar circumstances of the case into consideration, the suspicion turns almost into certainty. As for the non-mention of the matter by the court historians of Jehangir and Shahjehan, this can be, as surmised by Dr. Beni Prasad himself, best explained by the fact that 'no court historian would dare to refer to a scandal dishonourable to the whole dynasty'.

DASHARATHA SHARMA
Notes on Asoka Rescripts

ALAM CAPALAM SAMĀDAPAYITAVE.—P. E. I. Capalanaḥ has been taken to mean “fickle (persons)” by Hultsch (Corpus, p. 120) and “the fickle-minded” by Bhandarkar (Asoka, 1925, p. 306). There is, however, nothing in the context to warrant this sense. In the Pali canon we meet with a verb samādapeti in the sense of inducing or urging others to a particular course, in contra-distinction to one’s following it oneself. Thus, in Āṅg. II, pp. 253-256, we have a series of expressions, such as attanā ca pāñātipātī hoti paraṁ ca pāñātipāte samādapeti side by side with attanā ca pāñātipātā paṭivirato hoti paraṁ ca pāñātipātā āramanaṇā samādapeti, and so forth. Buddha himself is known in the canon as a samādapeti, ‘arouser,’ ‘instructor’ of people, and it seems that Asoka had become another such in his own time. The same force is present again in the Pali expression ekace ca attanā deti paraṁ ca samādapeti (DhA., III, p. 17), which means ‘some not only themselves bestow gifts but urge others to do the same’. Wishing others to perform meritorious deeds is an attitude of mind which appeals also to Asoka, as is evident from the general tenour of his Rescripts, e.g., R.E.v: tathāṅca ca me prajā anuvocata (Mansehra). See also the concluding portion of R.E.vi. The idea of para-samādapanā or janasaṁsādapanā is also latent in what is known in Pali literature as “dhammaghosakakamma”, e.g., DhA. III, pp. 81-82 “mahājananām samādapetvā puññāni karomi, uposathadivasesu uposatham samādiyāmi, dānaṁ demi, dhammaṁ suññāmi, Buddharaṭanādhī sadisaṁ ratanaṁ nāma n’atthi tiṇṇan ratananaṁ sakkaṁ karothā ti ughoshento carāmi.” It is interesting to note that Asoka also speaks of ‘dhammaghoso’ in R.E.iv., and when we find that the deeds implied by the Pali quotation, especially those contemplated in the italicised expressions, have also been recommended and, in some cases, actually performed by Asoka himself, it becomes easy to understand the sort of dhammaghosā which was his. Mahājanasaṁsādapanā, if we may be allowed to call it so, was, therefore, one of the sacred tasks Asoka had set for himself. If that is so, then we had better read Alamca palavam samādapayitave instead of combining ca and palavam into capalam as has been done hitherto, and translate the expression “And (my pulisās are) able to urge others (to do it),” viz., to conform to and practise morality.

ETADATIKA.—P. E. VII. 1. 24. Hultsch (Corpus, p. 135, n. 5) equates athā with athāya and refers for comparison to the expres-
sion *etāya athā* in R. E. xii (Girnar), ll. 8-9, where *athā* is dative, and also to a parallel (*bhojanatthā*) in Müller’s Pali Grammar, p. 67. Although in the Asoka Rescripts we come across such separate words as *etāya athāya* (R. E. IV, v, vi, xii, xiii), *etāye athāye* (R. E. iii, iv, v, ix, xiii, etc.), or such *sandhi*-joined expressions as *etāyātthāye* (R. E. xii, Kālsi), *etāyātthāya* (M. R. E. i, Brahmagiri), *etāyātthāye* (R. E. vi, Kālsi), nowhere do we find the *samāsa*-formed word *etadathā* except in the present instance, *vis.*, P. E. vii, l. 24. Of such a *samāsa* form I have met with an exact counterpart in Aṅg. i, p. 198, from which I would quote at some length:

“Kathāsampayogena bhikkhave puggalo veditabbo yadi vā sa-upaniso yadi vā avanapaniso ti.

Anohitasoto bhikkhave anapaniso hoti ohitasoto sa-upaniso hoti. So sa-upaniso samāno abhijānāti ekaṁ dhammaṁ parijānāti ekaṁ dhammaṁ pajahati ekaṁ dhammaṁ sacchikaro ekaṁ dhammaṁ. So abhijānanto ekaṁ dhammaṁ......sammāvimetthi phusati. *Etadathā* bhikkhave kathā *etadathā* mantana *etadathā* upaniśa *etadatham* sotāvadhānaṁ yadīdham anupāda cittassa vimokho.”

And the gloss on the italicised words is as follows:

“Bhikkhave yā esā ‘kathāsampayogena’ ti kathā dassiūta sā *etadathā*, ayaṁ tassā kathāya bhūmi, ayaṁ patiṭṭhā, idam vatthum, yadīdham anupāda cittassa vimokho ti evam sabbadadesu yojanā veditabbā” (Manorathapūrani, Siamese edition), which may be rendered: ‘O bhikkhus, what has been said here in the words “Kathāsampayogena etc.” (of the text) *has this for its root purpose*, namely, complete emancipation of the citta, that is to say, it is the plane, the basis, the ground of that saying.’

It is clear that *etadathā* or *etadatham* of the Aṅguttara passage is an adjective, a compound of *eta* and *atha*, meaning ‘fraught with this intent’, which is not different from the sense ‘for this purpose’ or ‘on this account’, hitherto read into the inscriptive term *etadathā*, taken as dative substantive by Hultzsch, But however justified and acceptable Hultzsch’s interpretation may be, may not the term, on account of its close rapprochement, be derived in the same way as its Pali counterpart ‘etadathā’, being regarded as an adjective qualifying *esa* in “esa kaṭe”? If so, the final ə of of *etadathā* will have to be regarded as due to the usual lengthening of finals in
Topra, as Woolner points out (Asoka Glossary, p. 75, sub voce). The whole expression—\textit{Imaṃ cu dharmānupatipati anupatipajamṣu ti etadathā me esa kaṭe} of P. E. VII, may thus be rendered “By me this has been instilled with this purpose viz, that people might also conform to this consistent practice of Dhamma”. As a matter of fact, we find Asoka extremely anxious for “anulūpā dharmavaḍhi” towards the commencement of P.E. VII, and this was the foundational purpose for which he inaugurated his ‘dhammānusathini’ (to which end he instituted the ‘dhammathaṅabhāni’, which were to bear his moral instructions, and the ‘dhamma-mahāmātā’, who were to give effect to them) and ‘dhammasāvanāni’ (the moral instructions themselves and proclamation thereof), a purpose which could only be fulfilled through ‘dhammāpadāna’ (inculcation of morals, admonition) on his own part and ‘dhammānupatipati’ (conforming to it) on that of the people for whom it was meant.

\textit{Sailendranath Mitra}
REVIEWS


Prof. Rangacharya has set himself to a most arduous and ambitious task. He has designed to write a History of India in nine volumes from the earliest times to the Muhammadan conquest—a programme that, in fact, requires the combined efforts of a number of scholars than of a single individual. Whosoever has worked in the field of Indology knows too well how complex and perplexing is the web of Indian history, but Prof. Rangacharya has the courage, and it seems, the equipment as well to dash through it and work it out single-handed to a complete and successful issue. Even in the first volume, which is under review, he has given evidence of his capacity, more so of his historical outlook; and let us assure him at the very outset that he has begun well.

The present volume purports to give 'a succinct picture of the evolution of India and her races and culture in the ages which preceded the Vedic era', and ends very fittingly with the advent of the Aryans. The whole volume thus provides the background in which the Vedic period of Indian history had its setting. A list of the main headings of its contents would convince the reader of the extensive ground it covers. In the first chapter, our author traces the geographical evolution of India, in course of which he discusses the different geological epochs, and the formation of Indian geographical configuration. This is proved by a general discussion of the various theories about the origin of man and his birth-place which very naturally leads to the subject of the general features of the Eolithic age, the diffusion of Eolithic culture and India's part in it. The third chapter is devoted to a survey of the Paleolithic age and its general characteristics. In this connection the Paleolithic sites in South India and the Dekkan have been examined in detail, and a very interesting comparative study has been made of Paleolithic drawings and paintings. The next two chapters are devoted to the study of the ethnological basis of transition from the Paleolithic to the Neolithic age. In this connection a general account has been given of the
Negritos, Pre-Dravidians and Mundas; and the different theories with regard to the Dravidians have been examined in detail. The Aryan and Dravidian problem has received due attention; the different ethnological groups in relation to the Dekkan and North-India have been carefully studied and the bearings of anthropology on this important problem discussed. The sixth chapter is concerned with a study of the neolithic age in connection with which the author discusses among others the nature of Indian neolithic settlements, neolithic sites in India, the world-unity of neolithic culture, life, art, religion and culture of neolithic time, survivals of neolithic life, neolithic elements in modern culture, and what is more important, he traces the germs of caste-system in the regional communities of neolithic times. The advent of metals forms the subject-matter of the next chapter. With the two concluding chapters which deal with the Indus Valley civilisation and the Aryans respectively, the author launches into what we may now designate as the beginning of the historical period of Indian history. A very succinct picture has been given of the Indus Valley Civilisation, in course of which he has rightly discussed the importance of the Indus Valley finds, the relative antiquity of the Egyptian, Mesopotamian and Indus civilisations, and the ethnology of the Harappa and Mohen-jo-daro people. He has described the archaeological remains, the cities, horses and temples of Harappa and Mohen-jo-daro, their pottery, seals and other minor antiquities, and the religious faith and funeral custom of the people. In the last chapter he discusses almost all the important theories about the Aryan home, and the date of the beginning of Aryan culture; but more important is his discussion of the bearing of the Sindh discoveries on the question.

It is evident that the author has traversed an extensive ground where every step requires more or less cautiously to be laid. The chapters are, therefore, more or less hypothetical in character, and there have cropped up a number of contending theories with regard to each individual matter and problem. Moreover, an almost bewildering mass of materials in the field of geology and pre-historic archaeology, ethnology and anthropology, as well as studies and contributions by different authorities on the subject have been made available in recent years. All these had to be reckoned, studied and analysed in the preparation of this volume which is undoubtedly a difficult task. But Prof. Rangacharya has done it successfully. There is, however, hardly any outstanding original contribution towards
the elucidation of the many knotty problems with which the present volume deals,—the author hardly claims to have any such,—nor does he hazard any new theory with regard to them; he has certainly done well in not adding to the already bewildering number of contending theories. But he has studied all materials and authorities thoroughly, summarised all important findings and theories, and have criticised them whenever required, and, what is most required, has successfully attempted to correlate the results of his almost exhaustive studies of all these findings and materials into a well-connected and well-presented historical narrative.

That this volume has had to be printed in a hurry which, however, is unaccounted for, is evident from a number of typographical errors as well as from traces of hasty composition. But the defects are negligible when the merits are compared. Almost all sources and source-materials have been referred to and discussed, and the bibliography at the end of each chapter is on the whole exhaustive. Prof. Rangacharya has certainly been successful 'to leave in the mind of the reader a picture of what India was before the commencement of the Vedic age of her history.' This volume would be useful to all students and scholars interested in the study of ancient Indian history and culture. We congratulate our author on what he has done, but more for what he is going to do. We shall eagerly await the publication of the future volumes of the series.

Nihar Ranjan Roy


This short monograph is concerned, as its title indicates, with a concise and systematic account of the famous Śrī Mahā-Lakṣmī or Ambābāi temple of the city of Kolhapur. It deals with the traditions and mythological accounts with regard to the temple, the history and general description of the people, its religious importance, its sculptures and decorative embellishments, its architecture, in fact, everything important that is to be said in connection with it. It is thus 'a valuable contribution' as Rev. Heras puts it, 'to the archaeological studies of Southern India'; and certainly facilitates the work of the future historian of the Silharas.
In the first chapter of the Monograph, the author narrates the mythological accounts in connection with the goddess Mahā-Lakṣmī, and gives an explanatory list of temples that were built from time to time round about the famous shrine. The second chapter deals with the history of the building of the temple which is, as usual, shrouded in a cloud of incredible legends and traditions. Relying on the mythological account as given in the Karavīra-Māhātmya, Mr. Kundangar seems to conclude that it was by about the 3rd century B.C. that the original image of the goddess Śrī Mahā-Lakṣmī had been set up for public-worship. This is, however, doubtful to the extreme; for we have hardly any archaeological evidence as to the setting up of any anthropomorphic representation of a divinity for public worship as early as the 3rd century B.C. It is all the more incredible in view of the fact that the very conception of Śrī Mahā-Lakṣmī is a complete one and could not have possibly originated at so early a date. Like most of the brähmanical gods and goddesses Mahā-Lakṣmī must have been a conception of the Purānic pantheon; the story in the Karavīra-Māhātmya reads undoubtedly like a Purānic one, as it refers to the traditional enmity of the Nāga and Garuḍa, as also to the demon Mahiṣāsura. It is evident that the whole story is a later creation of the highly imaginative writers of the Purāṇas. But it is a reasonable hypothesis of the author that the present image of Mahā-Lakṣmī in the Ambābāī temple was set up early in the 13th century from a small temple near Kapila-tirtha. The temple, in fact, was originally built much earlier than the 13th century; and is associated with one Karṇa, a Cālavakya king, as recorded in a spurious inscription (Ind. Ant., XXX, p. 201). Mr. Kundangar seems to hold that Karṇa was a real historical personage and that he was a king of the early Cālavakya dynasty; the temple was, therefore, built by king Karṇa, according to our author, some time in the 7th century A.D. This is again a doubtful assertion; for, apart from the question if Karṇadeva was really a historical personage, or if he really belonged to the early Cālavakya dynasty, the temple, judged by its architectural style and sculptural and decorative embellishments, cannot in any way be dated so early as the 7th century A.D. The architecture of the temple is purely Cālavakya as our author contends, and not Dravidian; but that is hardly any argument for ascribing it to so early a date. In fact, the temple cannot be dated in our opinion earlier than the eleventh century A.D. when a later Cālavakya dynasty
had already wrested Kolhapur from the Rāstrakūṭas (c. 973 A.D.). The architectural style is a local variation of what is ordinarily known as the later Cālukyan styles; the pillars and pilasters, the cornice and parapet mouldings, the ground plan and the general form as well as the sculptures and decorative embellishment and last of all though not the least, the material which is fine grained black stone may favourably be compared with similar elements of contemporary monuments in Western India. Karnaḍevas, then, if he was really a historical personage, should belong to the main or branch line of the later Cālukya dynasty, and be ascribed to a date not earlier than the 11th century A.D. The adjoining temples of Mahā-Kālī and Mahā-Sarasvatī were, however, built not until about two centuries later, i.e., by the beginning of the 13th century A.D. Originally the main temple was undoubtedly a Hindu one dedicated as it had been to Mahā-Lakṣmī, but later vicissitudes had transformed it into a Jain Basadi, so much so that the Jains assert that not only the temple but the image itself originally belonged to them. Mr. Kundangar has, however, shown good grounds to show that such a claim has no historical justification. The third chapter is devoted to a description of the temple, its plan, pillars, parapets, cornices, griezes, sculptures and other architectural and decorative motifs which are themselves proof enough against our author’s contention as to the early dating of the temple. The fourth chapter describes the image of Śrī Mahā-Lakṣmī itself and discusses its iconographic and religious importance.

This small brochure is not without drawbacks, but is nevertheless useful. We may, therefore, safely recommend it to all students of South Indian history and archaeology. But we would like to request our author to be a bit more historical, and exhaustive in his references. He would also do well to follow a systematic and generally accepted method of transliteration, as also to use diacritical marks. To write Śrī Mahā-Lakṣmī, (or Lakṣmī) as Shri Mahā-Lakshmi in a book concerned with historical and archaeological studies is indeed a drawback that cannot and should not be easily overlooked.

Nihar Ranjan Roy

Thanks to the untiring efforts of Indologists extending over a period of more than a century, the rough outline of the history of India is now practically settled from about 600 B.C. to the modern period. But no comprehensive and detailed history of India can really be undertaken unless all the important sources of Indian history are edited and published in convenient form and thus made accessible to the general historian. By publishing the second volume of Mr. K. P. Padmanabha Menon's History of Kerala, the editor has made available much valuable material for the history of Malabar (the ancient Kerala) of the early 18th century. The title would, however, disappoint those who would expect in the work an effort to furnish a connected history of the land. For, as has been pointed out by the reviewers of vol. I, what the late Mr. P. Menon has really done is to reprint with copious notes the English translation of a group of nineteen letters which Visscher, a Dutch missionary, wrote to his friends and relatives in Europe from Malabar. The volume under notice contains eleven letters from IX to XIX.¹

Jacobus Canter Visscher was born in Harlingen in Holland. "From his youth upwards he took delight in reading accounts of travels and was filled by them by a desire to visit distant lands and nations, and to ascertain the truth or falsehood of other writers. This desire grew so irresistible that though not without hope of promotion in his native country, he accepted an appointment from the East India Company".² Visscher arrived in Batavia in 1716. He then served as chaplain at Cochin from 1717 to 1723. In 1725 he went back to Batavia as a "Minister of God's word". Visscher was "induced to write these Memoirs by the desire to relate the various circumstances

¹ Major Heber Drury's English Translation contains eight more letters (XX—XXVII): Letter XX (Nairs), XXI (Chegos and other lower castes), XXII (Account of Tattares, Jogis, etc.), XXIII (Malabar temples), XIV (Superstitions of the Natives), XXV (Feast-days of Malabar, etc.), XXII (Account of peper, turmeric, cardamon and areca of Malabar), XXVI (Description of Cocoa-palm, Malabar cinnamon, sanctity of cows and snakes, etc.): An account of Travancore.

² Extract from the Dutch editor's Dedication, 16th August, 1743.
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of which I have either been an eye witness or which I have heard from trustworthy persons.... My observations will bear only upon the manners and customs of the people, their laws, rites and ceremonies, description of their kingdoms, as well as their origin and their modes of government, and other similar subjects." 1 Visscher published his Memoirs under the title Malabar Letters in Leeuwarden, in Holland in 1743. His work lay in comparative obscurity till a copy of his book "accidentally" fell into the hands Major Heber Drury, when the latter was at Cochin in 1860. He took it to England and had the entire work translated "with the exception of one or two chapters, relating to Java and the Dutch dependencies of the Eastern Archipelago." These were omitted as they had no connections with the Malabar coast. Drury published his English translation in June 1862. 2 In his preface Drury pointed out the existence of numerous valuable Dutch chronicles 3 "though but little known to us, chiefly of course from the fact of their being sealed up in a tongue which few care to acquire in the present day." Many of the Dutch and Portuguese chronicles appear to have been destroyed in Cochin in the first half of the nineteenth century. But many perhaps still remain in "dishonoured obscurity".

The letters of Visscher throw a flood of light on the political, social, religious and economic history of Malabar of the early 18th century, when the Portuguese, the Dutch, the English and the Danes were struggling for controlling the trade with India and the Far-East. In Letter IX he gives an account of the four "royal houses in Malabar, those of Travancore, Cochin, the Zamorin (Calicut) and Colastirio" and their various feudatories. Anyone going through this letter would at once feel that the usefulness of the work would have been greatly enhanced if there had been a map of Malabar in the volume. with the ancient and mediæval names printed in red. Letter X

1 Extract from the author's (Visscher's) preface.
2 Printed by Gantz Brothers, at the Adelphi Press, 21 Rendall's Road, Vepery 1862. Drury's work contains in addition to Visscher's letters an account of Travancore and Fra Bartolomeos travels in that country.
3 Drury advances the theory that persons bearing the name 'Canterfischer' in the Coromandel coast were probably descendants of this Dutch author.
deals with some of the laws and customs of the people of Malabar. The most interesting part of this letter deals with the institution of "laying the property of another in arrest" and trial by ordeals. We are told that "when a Rajah owes money to a Brahmin who can adduce satisfactory proof of the debt, the creditor can demand the money of the Rajah, three distinct times, and if the Rajah still delays payment, the Brahmin brings a rama from a pagoda (temple), when the Rajah may neither eat, sleep or bathe till the dispute is settled and the rama removed" (p. 12). For cases where the king commits an offence compare Manu (VIII, 336) and Kauṭilya’s Arthāśāstra (Mysore ed., 1919, p. 236). “Dubious cases in which no proof could be obtained” were decided by various ordeals. One of these ordeals took place “in a river or tank in which crocodiles are found. The Cayman’s (alligators) pagoda on the river Cranganur close to Paliporte is especially famous for this process. A small heathen temple stands on the bank of a river, in which two crocodiles have for a long time been supplied, their daily food being thrown into the water, so that they were indeed by the bait to remain there. To undergo this ordeal, the accused is compelled, after solemn profession of innocence in presence of the Brahmins and nobles and of a great concourse of people to swim across the river and back, or if he cannot do this he must be dragged through holding on with his hand to a boat. If the crocodile put him under, it is a sign of his guilt, otherwise, he is released as innocent”. It is interesting to note that something like this crocodile ordeal existed until quite recent times amongst the natives of Africa. Letter XI deals among other things with the national assemblies of Malabar which used to act as a check on the “arbitrary power” of the Kerala kings. But unfortunately these were not held very often and used to meet only in emergencies. In giving a list of the sources of the revenue of the Cochin Rajah, Visscher makes the following interesting statement: "No one may wear whisker, except by his (king’s) permission, for which a fine of acknowledgement must be paid, and then a great banquet must be celebrated in honour of those whiskers" (p. 19). Letter XII deals elaborately with the coins prevalent in Malabar such as Moorish Rupees, Hindu Pagodas, Japanese Kobang and Itsobo, European “six dollars, ducatons, Spanish matter and ducats.” Visscher mentions “our Malabar specie” separately. “It has a good deal of variety” but the gold and silver
Fanams and the copper or lead Boeserobben appear to have been the most important. But the most interesting was probably "a kind of money cowries," which was used "not only in Bengal, but also exported in quantities to the West Indies." It may be mentioned that Yuan Chwang (Watters, vol I, p. 178) as early as the middle of the 7th century A.D. notices "cowries" as "media of exchange" in the "commerce" of India. Visscher claims to have seen Muslim coins bearing the "twelve signs at the Zodiac" and "the likeness of a man." Letter XIII deals with the ecclesiastical and temporal grandees in Malabar and the "customary salutations between the higher and lower orders in their daily intercourse" while letter XIV which was written to Visscher's mother gives an account of the "description of the costume, habits, etc of the women of this country." That early marriage was prevalent in Malabar in the 18th century is clear from the following: "A girl is considered marriageable when she has attained her 13th year; and then all the suitors begin to flock around her. As she attains womanhood earlier, so her bloom is proportionately sooner over than our country." The Dutch writer approves and praisies the system of management of the children by the native woman of Malabar and ascribes to this reason "why so few men of dwarfish stature are found in India, whereas they abound in Europe" (p. 34). Letter XV is devoted to an account of the religion and customs of the Topases, a Christian community of Malabar, the greater part of which were "offspring of a great number of enfranchised Portuguese slaves". "They like to class themselves with the Portuguese whom they call our people (Teur nossa genti), though these, owing to their native pride, despise them even more than we do, always styling them Negroes or blacks. The Topases however are not a whit discouraged by this treatment and not only give themselves Portuguese names, but are in the habit of choosing those that belong to the noblest Portuguese and Spanish families. They affect very haughty airs, and teach their children always to address them as "My Lord, my father (Senhor mei pai). The ignorance of the priests of this Christian community would be clear from the following: "One of the Dominican parish priests, a

1 Cf. 'Zodiacal gold mohurs' of the Timurid Jahāṅgīr (1605-27). Stanley Lane Poole, Mediaeval India (Story of the Nations Series), p. 319.
white European, being advanced in years was waited on by our
visitors of the sick, who, knowing no other language, began to con-
verse with him in Dutch. The priest remarked: 'I understand the
Latin you are speaking very well, but I don't know quite well enough
to make answer in it.' Another priest when asked "who first existed,
Christ or the Christians?.............in his simplicity made answer 'the
latter'."

Letter XVI gives a description of the St. Thomas or Syrian
Christians, their origin, early history and religion. Mr. Menon's
note on the Traditions of St. Thomas is useful, for in it the
author has collected most of the arguments for and against the
genuineness of the tradition that the "Apostle St. Thomas landed
at Malankara near Cranganur, founded seven churches and finally
suffered martyrdom at Mylapore near Madras". Commenting on the
apocryphal Acts of Judas Thomas the Apostle, according to which
St. Thomas visited the court of the Indo-Parthian king Gudnaphar
(Gondophranes), Prof. Rapson has remarked: "The legend of St.
Thomas has thus been furnished with an historical setting which is
chronologically possible".1 As there was regular maritime
communication between Barbaricum (on the Indus Delta), in
the empire of Gondophranes and Muziris (Cranganur) in the
first century A.D., there is no inherent imposibility in the
acceptance of the tradition. Another apocryphal work, the
Evangelium Ioannis de obitu Mariae gives the name of Mazdai,
"whom St. Thomas also visited and under whom he suffered
Martyrdom".2 Is it possible that Mazdai was the king of the Mylapore
region? Letter XVII is devoted to an account of the "Roman
Catholic priests in Malabar and their converts among the heathen".
Referring to the Jesuit Archbishop and Bishop in Cochin and its
neighbourhood, who were appointed by the King of Portugal to look
after the Christians "of the Romish persuasion," Visscher remarks:
"they are the craftiest spies of the Portuguese monarch, prying into
the affairs of the company, and imbuing the natives with deep aver-
sion to the Dutch." We are not sure that native patriotism and

2 Schoff, Periplus of the Erythraean Sea, pp. 37, 44, 165
and 205.
narrow sectarianism were not getting the better of him here over his veracity and Christian conscience. Our suspicion finds support when we find Visscher censoring commandant Ketel because he allowed “Romish priests” not only to visit the condemned criminals of their persuasion in Cochin, but even to accompany them to the scaffold”; and praising the present commandant Hertenberg, “who is a man of noble character”, for having “done away with these irregularities.” The following observation of Visscher however is interesting: “Except the St. Thomas’ Christians all those who are converted by the Roman Catholics are either the slave children of Christians, like most of the Topasses or of the lowest sort of Heathens, none being higher than the Chegis. Few Brahmins, Chetoriahs (Kṣatriyas) or Śūdras adopt their religion; indeed, we might suppose that low castes do so generally, in order to escape the contempt in which they are held by nation.” These remarks of the Dutch missionary on the spread of Christianity among the Indian masses are largely true even after the lapse of more than two hundred years. Letters XVIII and XIX are devoted to the “Jews, black and white” and the Moors (Muslims) of Malabar. Visscher clearly indicates the reason why the Moors, the friends of the Zamorin of Calicut “nourish a rooted hatred” towards the Portuguese. The commerce of these coasts had remained with the Moors probably from the time of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas (Balhaavi) of Mānyakhetaka1 (Mānkīr) if not earlier. The arrival of Vasco da Gama in the 15th century threatened this monopoly. “They disputed any share of it being usurped by the newcomers.” The most interesting thing about the Jews and Muslims is however the fact that these non-Hindu communities lived and prospered under the rule of orthodox Hindu rulers for hundreds of years without apparently any serious religious persecution. Attention may be drawn in this connection to the Veraval grant of the Cālukya Arjunadeva (c. 1262-75), king of Kathiawar and Gujarat, which also bears witness to tolerance in religious matters of Hindu monarchs in Mediaeval India. Nobody can fail to be struck by the generous statesmanship of the Hindu States which allowed Muslim communities to thrive and to build and endow mosques in the most sacred cities and places of India for it forms a remarkable contrast to the policy of plunder and desecration practised by the early Turkish conquerors of India. The latter gave up the liberal and tolerant

1 He ruled in the Deccan from c. 753 to 970 A.D.
policy of the Arab conquerors and were thus largely instrumental in introducing into the complicated socio-religious structure of the Indian peoples a problem which remains unsolved even to this day.

In conclusion I beg to add that in addition to a map of Malabar, an introduction giving a short account of Visscher's life, and the previous publications of his letters, and a brief discussion of the history of Malabar and the Far East in the 2nd half of the 17th and the first half of the 18th century would greatly enhance the usefulness of the work.

H. C. Ray

---

1 See my *Dynastic History of Northern India*, vol. I, pp. 22 fn. 2, 94 etc.
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Asia Major, vol. VIII, fasc. i, ii

Siegfried Behrsing—Das Chung-tsi-king des Chinesischen Dirghāgama.—Mr. Behrsing presents here a translation of the Saṅgāti-sūtra of the Dirghāgama as preserved in Chinese versions. Wherever he has found the Pāli text of the Saṅgāti Sutta of the Dīgha Nikāya corresponding to the Chinese version, he has reproduced it, and gave German translation of the portions which do not correspond with the Pāli text. To the translation (24 pages) he has appended exhaustive notes (90 pages) and a comparative table of the technical terms as found in the different versions of the Saṅgāti Sutta, the Mahāvyutpatti and the Pāli texts.

L. D. Barnett—Index to the Section ‘mDo’ of Kanjur Manuscripts in the British Museum. Dr. Barnett has given the Tibetan titles along with their Sanskrit restorations. He has also alphabetically arranged the Sanskrit titles.

Indian Antiquary, January, 1931

R. B. Haldar—Chittor and its Sieges.

C. E. A. W. Oldham—Sidi Ali Shebhi in India, 1554-1556 A.D.

Jogendra Chandra Ghosh—Where was Tarkārī? The note supports the view that the village named Tarkārī mentioned in the Silimpur stone inscription found in the district of Bogra in Bengal was situated in Puṇḍra or Gauḍa and should be identified with the city of the same name mentioned in the Matsya- and the Kūrma-Purāṇas.

Ibid., March, 1931

R. V. Jahagirdar—A Note on the Ten Plays of Bhāsa. Basing his arguments on some internal evidences in the dramas ascribed to Bhāsa, the writer classifies them into several groups. As the Svāpna-vaśavadatta, Pratijnā-yau-gandharvāyana and Pahcarātrā have been found to resemble each other constituting one group and differing from the rest of the plays, the conclusion is drawn that all the plays cannot be the production of one and the same poet.
Lily Dexter Greene.—*Nature Study in the Sanskrit Drama Sakuntalā.*

**Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society,**
vol. vi, nos. 1 and 2

Ganganatha Jha.—*Kumārila and Vedānta.* The points of contact between Kumārila’s Mīmāṃsā and Śaṅkara’s Vedānta in regard to some essentials such as the nature of Ātman, the *sumnum bonum* of life, have been pointed out here.

D. R. Bhandarkar.—*The Antiquity of the Poona District.*

K. B. Pathak.—*On the Date of Śākṭāyana-cintāmāni.* It has been shown here that materials from the Śākṭāyana-cintāmāni of Yakṣavarman were taken by Hemacandra for his grammatical works *Bṛhadavrtti* and *Laghuavrtti* proving that Yakṣavarman was anterior to Hemacandra who lived in the twelfth century A.C.

S. K. Belvalkar.—*An Authentic but Unpublished Work of Śaṅkarācārya.* Attention of scholars has been drawn to the fact that Śaṅkara commented on the whole of the 2nd and the 3rd Ārāṇyakas of the Aitareya Āraṇyaka, and not on the last four chapters of the 2nd Ārāṇyaka (II, 4-7) only as found in the extant editions of the *Aitareya Upaniṣad Bhāṣya.* The point is proved by Sāyana’s statement at the beginning of his commentary on the 2nd Ār. of the *Ait.* Ār. as also by the existence of the commentary of the two Ārāṇyakas in the Mss. deposited in some of the Oriental Libraries in Europe.

S. K. Hodivala.—*Parsi Viceroy and Governors of Kathiawar.*

F. B. Tyabji.—*Social Life in 1804 and 1929 amongst Muslims in Bombay.*

K. G. Kundangar.—*Development of the Kannada Drama.*

**Journal of Indian History,** vol IX, pt. iii, Dec. 1930

Abdul Aziz.—*History of the Reign of Shāh Jahān* (Book II, Ch. II). This chapter treats of the Mughal Army. The writer, following Abūl Fazl’s classification of the army, divides this chapter into the following sub-sections:

I. *Manṣabdārs* and their followers corresponding to the cavalry of the present day. In this sub-section, the writer gives in detail the qualifications for the post of a Manṣabdār and his duties.

I.H.Q., March, 1931
II *Ahadis* were a special class of horsemen appointed to guard the Emperor’s person, they possessed qualifications higher than those of Manşabdârs.

III Piâdagân, though usually translated by ‘Infantry’, includes also (i) Bundûqchîs (Matchlock-bearers), (ii) Darbârs (Porters); (iii) Khidmatiya; (iv) Mewras (couriers); (v) Shamsheerbâz (experts in feats of arms); (vi) wrestlers; (vii) Chelas (slaves); (viii) Kahârs (letter-bearers) and Dâkhite (foot-soldiers).

The writer gives also an account of the artillery of Humâyun, Akbar and others and completes his paper by giving an “estimate of the total strength of the Army”.

H. N. SInha—*The Genesis of the Din-i-Ilahi*. Mr. Sinha prefaces his article by a reference to the dominant note in the awakening of India in the 16th century, viz., Love and Liberalism. He also gives a survey of the then political condition of India. He regards the faith—Din-i-Ilahi—as the outcome of Akbar’s eclecticism; he gives an outline of Akbar’s lineage and environment, dwells on Sufism, Vaishnavism, and the Mahdavi and Roshni movements. He has shown clearly how Akbar was influenced, or rather, allowed himself to be influenced by the contemporaneous religious and political events, and constituted out of many faiths the Divine Faith (Din-i-Ilahi). It contains an accurate study of the character of Akbar and the causes of his greatness.

S. S. Surya Narayana Sastri—*Buddhist Logic in the Maṇimekhalai*. The object of this paper is to refute the contention that the account of Buddhist logic given in the 29th chapter of the *Maṇimekhalai* is posterior to Diinnåga. The writer gives a translation of the relevant portion of the *Maṇimekhalai* up to the account of the fallacies and gives his reasons for attributing an early date to the composition of the *Maṇimekhalai*.

C. S. Srinivasachari—*The Historical Material in the Private Diary of Ananda Ranga Pillai* (1736-1761). The following topics are treated in this paper:—Events after the battle of Ambur—The victors at Pondicherry—English occupation of San Thome—Chanda Sahib’s expedition to Tanjore—Operation at Tanjore—The coming of Nasir Jang into the Carnatic and the retreat of Chanda Sahib—First encounter with Nasir Jang.

L. V. Ramaswami Aiyar.—Dravidic Forms for ‘Betel leaf.’

T. R. Chintamani.—Amarakhaṇḍana of Śrī Harṣa. This short Sanskrit text covering only eleven pages of the Journal is a criticism of the well-known lexicon of Amarasiṃha. Its importance lies in the fact that a number of authors and works hitherto unknown has been quoted here. This Harṣa was, as has been inferred by Mr. Chintamani from a piece of internal evidence, a son of Pārthasārathī Miśra, and therefore should not be identified either with the author of the Raināvalī, or with that of the Naigadhīyacarita.

D. T. Tattacharya Siromani.—Śānta—the Ninth Rasa. The discussion centres round the controversy in the works of Poetics as to the propriety of the acceptance of Śānta rasa as a separate poetic sentiment.

S. Suryanarayana Sastri.—The Chinese Suvargasaptati and the Mātharavṛtta. Suvargasaptati is the Sanskrit equivalent of the Chinese name of Paramārtha’s Chinese translation of the Śāṅkhyakārikā and its commentary. As the Gauḍapāda bhasya and the Mātharavṛtta, two Sanskrit commentaries on the Śāṅkhyakārikā have various points of resemblance to Paramārtha’s translation, some sort of relation among the three works is naturally sought to be established. The Mātharavṛtta, having a closer affinity with the Chinese work, is taken by some scholars to be the original commentary. The writer of this article, however, points out some fundamental differences between Māṭhara and Paramārtha regarding both their doctrines and expositions, as shows that Paramārtha agrees more with Gauḍapāda than with Māṭhara. In some places, Paramārtha is fuller and clearer than either of the two Sanskrit commentators.

N. Ayyaswami Sastri.—Madhyamārthasaṅgraha of Bhācaviveka. The short Sanskrit treatise containing 11 anustamba stanzas “on the nature of the Double Truth as accepted in the Madhyamika system of Buddhist Philosophy” has been restored from the Tibetan version and translated into English.

A. Padmanabhaya.—Ancient Bhṛgus. The writer amplifies in this first instalment of his article the theme that the Dravidas, Asuras and Bhṛgus are identical. “The amplified equation will be Asura-
Bṛghu- Dravida- Pelasgian- Phrygian- Hittite- Phœnician Greek- Etruscan- Latin- Frank."

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society,
January, 1931

O. G. von Wesendonk—The Kālavāda and the Zervanite System.
The speculations as to time as prevalent in ancient India, Iran, Mesopotamia and the Hellenistic world have been compared in this paper. It has been shown that the Indian conception of Kāla has very little in common with the Zervanite theology of Iran, the former being a well-founded philosophical doctrine and the latter a religious dogma associated with various myths and legends.

Review of Philosophy and Religion,
vol. II, No. 1

B. N. Krishnamurti Sarma—New Light on the Gauḍapāda-kārikās.
The opinion that the kārikās of Gauḍapāda on the Māṇḍūkyya Upaniṣad have been mistakenly taken as part of the original Upaniṣad, by Madhvācārya is opposed by the writer on the ground of the reasonableness of Madhva’s view, which was shared by many prominent writers of old.

Vivsabharati Quarterly,
vol. 8, pts. I & II

Vidhushekara Bhattacharya—Mahāyāna Viṃsaka of Nāgarjuna.
This is a short Mahāyāna treatise representing the views of both the Viṃśānavādins and the Mādhyamikas with a particular stress on the idealistic theory. The Sanskrit original of the kārikās, which is no longer extant, has been reconstructed from the available Tibetan and Chinese translations. An introduction and English translation with notes, as also the Tibetan and the Chinese versions are given here.

Amulya Charan Sen—Schools and Sects in Jain Literature.
Fig. 1
Clustered Capitals
From - Torana Pillar, Bharhut

J.H.O., June,
Origin of the Bell-Capital

In his note on the origin of the Lotus Capital (I.H.Q., VI, pp. 373-375 & pl.) Dr. Ananda K. Coomaraswamy states the case for the Indian origin and symbolism of the lower member of the Mauryan Capital and its derivation from the Lotus symbol, which he traces in the Vedic literature. Similar views have been held for the last half a century. They derive their plausibility from the resemblance of the bell capital to the calyx of a flower reversed, to which also its supposed Persian prototype has much similarity. Of 'the drooping foliations of the Capitals,' Dr. Rajendralala Mitra wrote as early as 1875 that, 'to an Indian they appear very like the pendant filaments of the lotus after the petals have been removed from the receptacle, or the reverted petals of a lotus bud,—forms which are peculiarly ornamental and beautiful, and which have been employed in India as ornaments in a variety of ways and in different places.' That was why he did not admit the supposed similarities between the Aśoka and the Assyrian (?) pillars to be conclusive. It is noteworthy that his conjecture involves only the decorative theme of the capital and not its solid shape, which have been confused in recent mystic interpretations of the motif. The distinction seems to have been maintained by Mr. Purna Chandra Moo-

kerjee\(^1\) who described the 'bell-shaped' Rumindei capital as exhibiting 'the usual festoons in the face of the big cyma,' the last-named moulding being translated by him as "Padma."

Dr. Coomaraswamy's interpretation of the capital as the mystic lotus support is founded firstly, upon the occurrence of certain lotus supports in the chamfer reliefs of the Bharhut rails, secondly, on the morphological affinities between the Mauryan capitals and the said lotus supports, and thirdly, on the significance attached to the lotus symbol in the Vedic literature. We proceed to discuss these in the following paragraphs.

I

The Lotus Symbol in the Bharhut Reliefs

That the Indians attached some sort of mystic significance to the lotus is implied by certain legends according to which the flower is said to have sprung up at the feet of Siddhārtha when he walked seven steps after his birth.\(^2\) The flower is also represented on the soles of a Buddha image at Sārnāth,\(^3\) dating from the Kuśāṇa period. The design of a lotus springing up from another in the chamfer reliefs of the Bharhut rails, recalls the representation of the Śrāvasti miracle in Gupta art. From the absence of differentiating emblems on figures of Indra, Agni and Brahmā in the coins and monuments of the Śuṅga period, it would appear that the iconography of Śrī usually appearing on a lotus was probably of non-Brāhmaṇical origin.\(^4\) The representation of 'Sīrinā Devatā' on the Bharhut rails without the flower indicates that this mark of Śrī was not rigidly adhered to. That she was not the only deity associated with the flower is proved by the figure of the girl with a lyre, standing upon it, on one of the

---

3 Sahni,—*op. cit.*, p. 38, B (a) 6.
4 Ramaprasad Chanda,—*Mūrti-O-Mandir*, pp. 4-5. Coomaraswamy,—*History of Indian and Indonesian Art*, p. 31; *Eastern Art*, vol. I, no. 3, pp. 175-89 and plates.
pillars (unpublished). The man and the woman riders, appearing on lotus-supports on either side of a medallion, and again at other places carrying the Garuḍaṇḍikaṇas without that appendage, taken together, denote that the lotus seat or pedestal was not an invariable attribute of divine figures in Śūṅga art. Following is the list of figures on the lotus-supports in the chamfer reliefs of the Bharhut rails:

1. Anthropomorphic figures:—The man and the woman on horseback: the man with hands in an attitude of adoration and the woman grasping a branch of the mango tree, disposed in pairs to the right and left of the same medallion (Mithuna); women raising a hand to grasp a flower or a necklace hanging from a flower placed above; or holding a ball-like object or a flywhisk in the uplifted hand; the other hand descending to the girdle or pointing to the breasts, or holding lotuses.

2. Beasts:—Winged horses and elephants.

3. Birds:—Swans craning their neck: peacocks with expanded plumes: the parrot pecking at the mango.

4. Flowers:—Two lotuses, one springing from the other.

If the lotus supports of Bharhut had been meant to represent pillars like the Mauryan and Śūṅga ‘Śilāstambhas,’ we should expect to find all the foregoing figures on contemporary columns. This is, however, not the case. The custom of setting up anthropomorphic figures on the top of columns did not, in fact, begin till a much later date. A tripartite lion in the Bharhut reliefs, supporting an anthropomorphic figure of which only the feet survive, is to be explained as a carrier (vāhana). And if not of totemistic origin, the birds and animals on the lotus supports must have been designed with decorative intent on the lines of the Śrīs and the Mithunas in which the lotus may have an iconographic significance. The elephant on the lotus is probably derived from the ‘Abhīṣeka’ type of Śrī, wherein its decorative significance is obvious. The swan found on the vase and lotus (Bhadraghaṭa) medallions of Bharhut and also in the ‘Abhīṣeka’ type of Śrī, as represented in the Orissa caves, have no more import than its association with the lotus pool. The lotus in the hands of some of the figures need not necessarily have been an icono-
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1 Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Report (henceforth abbreviated as A.S.I.R.) for 1925-26, p. 151, pl. lvii, fig. (a).
2 Cf. व्यक्ति संस्कारसूत्रम् निविधया निलिमः। Meghadūta, 11, 3.
graphical attribute. The significance of the flower being thus proved to be indeterminate and the decorative character of some of the figures on the lotus supports being obvious, the latter cannot be held to represent the supposed symbolic Mauryan bell-capitals carrying animal figures.

II

The Morphology of the Lotus Supports and the Bell Capitals

The morphological similitudes between the lotus supports of Bharhut and the campaniform capitals of the Mauryan pillars suggested by Dr. Coomaraswamy can be hardly reconciled to facts, The fillet moulding in the lowermost part of the Gutiva, Rumindei and Allahabad capitals, as well as the cable and the bead and reel mouldings below the Basarh, Sankissa and Nandangarh capitals cannot be derived from the lotus supports. In shape as well as in the form of the petals, the bulb-shaped lotuses of the chamfer reliefs of Bharhut do not resemble the campaniform

1 Smith,—The Jaina Stūpa and other Antiquities of Mathura, pp. 12-13, plate VI. Herringham,—Ajanta Frescoes, plate II, fig. 3; plate XI, fig. 13; plate XIV, fig. 16; plate XVII.

Cf. चन्द्रो लोकश्रवणम्।

नोता चित्विरसिलम् पादुकोत्तरी च।

धार्मिकी च व्यवहारान्त यथा नीप पद्द्यम्॥

Meghadūta, II, 2.

O. M. Dalton,—The Treasure of the Oxus, 2nd edition, gold plaques, nos. 49, 74, 89, 92, 93. Plates XIV, XV, no. 103, pp. 26 27, plate XVI.

2 Mookerjee,—op. cit., plate XVI, fig. 2.

3 Id., Plate XVI, fig. 3.

4 Fergusson,—History of Indian and Eastern Architecture (London, 1876), fig. 3, p. 53.

5 Dr. Ludwig Bachhofer,—Early Indian Sculpture (Paris, 1929), vcl. I, pl. III.

6 Id., pl. VIII.

7 Id., pl. IV,
capitals with their characteristic ornamentation. In the lion capitals of Sārnāth\(^1\) and Rāmpurva,\(^2\) the transition between the bell and the abacus is partly effected by the undecorated torus, which has its precedent in the Achaemenian pillar-base and cannot be derived from the stamens of the lotus. In the Sāñchi, Sañkissa and Rāmpurva (bull)\(^3\) capitals its place is taken by a corded torus or cable moulding, the history of the ornament going back to much earlier times and having nothing to do with the said stamens. Its occurrence below the Basarh, Sañkissa and Nandangarh capitals cannot be otherwise explained. That the corded torus does not represent the stamens of the lotus is demonstrated by the simultaneous appearance of the two forms on the lotus capitals of the ‘torana’ of Bharhut (Fig. 1), the former intervening between the bell and the lotus-shaped abacus, and the latter falling on the shoulder of the bell, respectively. The fillet appearing above the torus in the Sāñchi, Sārnāth and Rāmpurva (lion) capitals has no counterpart in the lotus growing in nature or as represented in the chamfer reliefs of Bharhut. No resemblance can be imagined between the thalamus of the lotus and the square abaci of the Basarh lion capital, the Mathura elephant capital of the reign of Huviśka,\(^4\) the ‘Makara’\(^5\) and ‘Kalpavrṣkṣa’\(^6\) capitals of Besnagar and the lotus capitals of the Garuḍa poles\(^7\) in the Bharhut reliefs, as well as the abaci of the Garuḍa\(^8\) and the fan-palm capitals of Besnagar,\(^9\) which are square above, and round and octagonal, respectively, below.

The other type of lotus supports occurring in two instances in the Bharhut reliefs, not described by Dr. Coomaraswamy, comprise a cup-shaped flower with petals rising upwards and supporting an
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1 Bachhofer,—*Early Indian Sculpture*, vol. I, pl. V.
2 Chanda,—‘The Beginnings of Art in Eastern India,’ (*Memoirs of the A.S.I.* no. 30, pl. II(b).
3 *Id.*, pl. III(a).
4 Cunningham, *A.S.R.*, vol. III, p. 20, pl. V.
5 *Id.*, vol. X, pp. 42-43, pl. XIV.; *A. S. I. R.*, 1913-14, pp. 189-90, pl. LIV, figs. (a) and (b).
7 Cunningham,—*The Stūpas of Bharhut*, pl. xxxii, figs. 5 and 6; *A.S.I.R.*, 1925-26, pl. lviii,
8 *A. S. I. R.*, 1913-14, p. 188, pl. lxx (a) and lxxii.
abacus decorated with beads, or with beads and the cable moulding (Figs. 2 & 3). The juxtaposition of these ornaments with the lotus owes its inspiration to the artists' familiarity with the lotus capital which appears twice on the Garuda-dhvajas and twice on isolated columns supporting the elephant as well as on structural pillars in the pseudo-architecture of the Bharhut reliefs. The dissimilarity between the bell capital and the second type of lotus support is too obvious to need further comment.

III

The Vedic Lotus Symbol

Before postulating a connection between the Vedic lotus symbol and the bell-capitals, of which our earliest specimens come from the Mauryan 'silāstambhas', it is necessary to ascertain whether the said symbol can have any bearing on the significance of the pillars. Dr. Rajendralala Mitra was of opinion that the Mauryan pillars "were used as mere monuments erected singly in distant places to bear only inscriptions". The presence of stūpas and temples in the vicinity of some of the columns led Fergusson to surmise their association with religious edifices. This was rightly contested by Dr. Mitra who pointed out that "the Tirhut pillars, which are still in situ, have no mound or ruin of any kind in their close proximity to bear out this supposition." Fergusson, nevertheless, appears to have guessed the religious significance of the pillars. In the Aśokāvadāna of the Divyāvadāna, the memorial monuments erected by Aśoka on the sacred sites of Buddhist history are described as 'cīhna's or emblems. The Rumiūdei pillar inscription, in enumerating the erection of a pillar on the birthplace of Buddha as one of the royal acts of Aśoka, indicates that the columns are included among the 'cīhna's. But the Sāñchi column, standing at a place not connected with the personal history of Buddha, proves

1 Cunningham,—Mahābodhi, pl. III.
2 Mitra,—op. cit, p. 15 and footnote.
3 Fergusson,—op. cit., p. 55.
4 Cowell & Neil,—Divyāvadāna, p 389 and footnote.
that all of these columns are not commemorative in character. Its capital has the same design as that of the Sārnāth column. The symbolic character of the lions which crown the latter has been long recognised.

In my paper on Mauryan Art, I attempted a chronology of the Mauryan bell capitals on morphological grounds, and this has been since corroborated by Prof. Chanda on the strength of certain passages in the edicts of Aśoka mentioning columns standing at the time of their promulgation. This implies that not all of these columns did appertain to Buddhism. That one at least belonged to another cult is shown by the pillar of Lauriya-Ārārāj, which had been crowned with a Garuḍa capital. Prof. Chanda is thus justified in concluding that these columns are animal standards intended for worship, the crowning animals being emblems of different gods. As the carrier system does not appear in a standardised form in the Bharhut reliefs dating a century after Aśoka, the interpretation of the animals' figures as symbols of divine beings with whom they came to be associated later in Brāhmaṇical mythology as suggested by him, is however open to question. Nevertheless, the association of Garuḍa with Viṣṇu in the second century B.C. is established by the inscription mentioning Vāsudeva on the Heliodorus column. The capitals of the Sāṇchi and Sārnāth columns (B.C. 242-31) were evidently caused to be designed by Aśoka when he had already become a Buddhist, as fitting emblems for the founder of his religion, on the analogy of animal-crowned pillars already existing at that date.

In its portable form, the animal standard is represented by two Garuḍa dvajas carried by two riding figures on the Bharhut reliefs.

1 Sahni, op. cit., p. 16.
3 Chanda,—The Beginnings of Art in Eastern India (Memoirs of the A.S.I., No. 30), pp. 31-33.
4 In the Mbh., I, 3, Airāvata, the Nāga king, appears as a Bull of extraordinary size, whose excreta is Amṛta. It is ridden by a man of uncommon stature. Also Agni appears as a Horse with Indra as rider.
5 In Jaina iconography Garuḍa is a Yakṣa having the Boar as its mount. It is also the mount of the Yakṣa Tumburu and of the Yakṣīṇi Cakreśvari.—Puran Chand Nahar, Jaina Mūrtiattver Samśkripa Vivaran, a paper read at the Radhanagar Vaṇgiya Sāhitya Sammilan (Sam. 1331), pp. 6, 5, 8.
The Garuḍa pole appears on the obverse of a rectangular copper coin of the second century B.C. (Nahar Collection, Calcutta) with the legend 'Māzo' on the right top corner of the field and 'Senapatisa Nitahāsō' on the reverse; as well as on certain types of Gupta coins.\(^1\) A standard surmounted by a crouching bull facing left, appears on the coins of Narendrāditya.\(^2\) Similar standards are known to have featured in the religion of the Indus Valley civilisation. A three-sided prism of faience discovered at Mohenjodaro\(^3\) shows a procession of four men carrying as many standards of different types. One of these is crowned by a featherlike emblem, while another is surmounted by the figure of a bull facing right and standing on a horizontal member supported on a rod. It is significant that the bull, the elephant and the tree represented on the Indus Valley seals appear also on the Mauryan and Śuṅga pillars. So it is probable that some connection might have existed between the cults of the animal-standard in the Indus Valley culture and the Mauryan and Śuṅga pillar cults as suggested by Prof. Chanda.\(^4\) The Vedic lotus symbol cannot possibly have any bearing on these cult objects.\(^5\) It


Samudra Gupta—
\{ Standard type... pp. I-5, pls. i, ii (1-5).

Candra Gupta II. — Archer " ... pp. 6-7, pl. iv (1-7).

Kumar Gupta I.—
\{ Archer " ... pp. 61-67, pl. xii (1-12).

Pratāpā " ... p. 87, pl. xv (15) (15-18).

Skanda Gupta—
\{ Archer " ... pp. 114-19, pls. xix, xx (1 2).
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\(^2\) *Id.*, p. 149, pl. xxiv, no. 4.

\(^3\) *A.S.I.R.*, for 1925-26, p. 87, pl. xlv, fig. 22.


\(^5\) The use of the *yātra* emblem on one of the chariot standards mentioned in the Mahābhārata (see Appendix) apparently controverts this view. It should be borne in mind, however, that the above standards, emblems of power and victory, are mostly connected with
Fig. 2
Lotus-support, Bharhut, Pillar No. 41 (8) a
Indian Museum

Fig. 3
Lotus-support, Bharhut, Pillar No. 5 (17) b
Indian Museum

I. H. Q., June, 1931.
is, therefore, unwarranted to assume that the campaniform capital of these animal pillars represents the Lotus of the Vedic ritual.

IV

The Composite Mauryan Capital

The composite Mauryan capital from Pāṭaliputra, a recent discovery made by Mr. Ramlal Sinha of Bankipore, which I am permitted to announce, affords light on the origin and significance of the Bell capital (Fig. 4). It is now only 1'2" high, polished and made of buff coloured Chunar sandstone. Its lower portion has disappeared and the carvings survive only in part. It is said to have been originally discovered in course of some diggings at Lohanipur, but was found lying near a Bania's shop, not far off Govind Mitra Road, Moradpur. Its abacus, 5 1/4" high, has the form of a lotus with its petals turned downwards, the stamens being represented on its upper edge, at the foot of the moulding at the top (ht. 1"). This type of lotus-shaped abacus is found on the clustered capitals of the 'Torana' pillars of Bharhut (Fig. 1). Below the abacus is a bead and reel moulding which cannot be derived from the stamens of the lotus. The bell proper, now only 6 1/4" high, differs from the standard Mauryan type in having flat ribs decorated with the spiral and several leaf patterns, disposed between the arrises, so that each arris appears between a pair of ribs decorated with the same ornament. Another polished Mauryan bell with ribs decorated in much the same manner has been discovered by Mr. Hargreaves at Sārnāth (Fig. 5). 1

kings or men of the ruling caste and that the yūpa standard in the Epic is compared to the yūpa of the Rājasīya rite, a royal ceremony. Both the yūpa and the standard entail the use of a pole or post, and in that Rāmāyana I, 14, 22-27, the worship of yūpas having gold decorations, with garments, flowers and scents is described (cf. Indradhvaṇa in the Appendix). Evidently because of their sharing such a common feature the two could combine happily. Similar conditions do not appear in the case of a Vedic lotus symbol. There is no hint of a parallel feature in the standards of the Mahābhārata so far as I am aware.

The morphological differences between the lotus shaped abacus and the lower member of the composite capital indicates that the architects of the Mauryan school recognised the difference between the lotus form and the form of the lower member, to which most modern archaeologists give the name 'bell' in consideration of its solid shape. *This composite capital with its upper member designed on the model of a lotus, controverts the theory of the lotus origin of its lower member and reduces the application of the term 'lotus' thereto to an absurdity.*

The difference between the lotus shaped abacus and the lower member is further accentuated by the emblishment of the so-called bell, the form and decorative theme of which have no resemblance to a lotus, and which by its divergence from the standard design clearly shows that to the Mauryan architects the capital was merely a decorative and architectural element.

*The Significance of the Bell-Capital*

An analysis of the various uses of the capital in early Indian architecture confirms the above conclusion regarding its significance. In the Mauryan śilāstambhas it happens to be carved on the same block of stone as the crowning animals, so that it is not a true capital and its purpose is only decorative. Its peculiar shape conveys the impression of carrying down the superincumbent weight instead of propping it up from below. Nor can its crowning animals conveniently accommodate the beams of the superstructure. The capital is, therefore, ill-suited to structural purposes. If it were employed at all in the hypostyle hall at Kumrahr and the palaces of Aśoka at Pātaliputra described by Fa Hien,¹ we do not know what devices had been adopted by the architect to remedy its defects. The architects of the subsequent times tried to appropriate it to structural purposes (i) by placing on its top a rectangular animal capital

¹ Legge,—*Travels of Fa Hien*, p. 77.
surmounted by a cubical block,⁴ an impost⁵ or a volute capital⁶ on which to place the beams (Northern India); (ii) by adding short props, curved or perpendicular, rising from its shoulder to the corners of the rectangular capital above (Sāñchi)⁷; and by supplementing it with a double capital having an upper row of volutes (Bharhut).⁸ They also created an altogether new order by enclosing the corded torus above the bell in a rectangular frame, the vertical lines of which create the impression of effectively supporting the abacus comprising tiers of projecting slabs and the crowning figure sculptures (Western India).⁹ None of these devices have any mystic significance, so that none is necessarily implied in the campaniform lower member which serves in a purely architectural capacity.

Various monuments may be cited to show that like the Mauryan architects who had designed the above mentioned capitals from Sārnāth and Pātaliputra, those of post-Mauryan times were fully alive to the decorative significance of the bell capital. The undecorated capitals of the baluster pillars of the ‘Torana’ of Bharhut,⁷ of those in the reliefs of Sāñchi ‘Toranas’⁸ and in the Nasik⁹ and Kanheri¹⁰ caves are instances in which the campaniform member has
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2 Id., pls. xliii, xlv and xlv (fig. 1); Cunningham,—The Stūpa of Bharhut, pl. x.
4 K. de B. Cordrington,—Ancient India, p. 32, fig. 10 C, p. 34; Bacchofer,—Early Indian Sculpture, vol. I, pl. 59 (right).
5 Cunningham,—The Stūpa of Bharhut, pls. xxx, fig. 3 & xxxi.
6 Bacchofer,—op. cit., vol. ii, pls. 66, 69, 70.
7 Cunningham,—A. S. R., vol. v, pl. xlvii.
8 Bacchofer,—op. cit., vol. 1, pls. 49, 50, etc.
9 Fergusson & Burgess,—Cave Temples of India, pls. xxii, xxiii (figs. 3 and 4).
10 Id., p. 350, fig. 62.
been treated as an abstract shape and divested of all ornament according to necessity. The type is noted also at Amarāvatī. In the pilasters of the Pitalkhora Vihāra cave and the Kankali Tila pillars, the solid shape of the capital has been modified according to exigencies of design or limitations of the quarry. The fluted capitals of the Caitya cave at Karle indicate that the decoration of the capital could be intelligently subdued in subordination to the entire design.

The Lotus capitals of the 'Torana' pillars of Bharhut (Fig. 1) illustrate the invention of new themes of decoration, though the scheme is still vertical. Some of the lotus capitals of the Bharhut reliefs, on the other hand, are set off with lotus petals and festoons in two parallel rows, which shows that the scheme of decoration was already changing from the vertical to the horizontal during the second century B.C. In the Kṣatrāpa Kuśāna pillars of Mathura, in those of the Amarāvatī reliefs and in the pilasters of the Ananta Gumpha and the Pitalkhora Vihāra cave, the new scheme of decoration appears perfected by the division of the surface into parallel horizontally disposed zones, and by the introduction of diverse new motifs of ornament, including the acanthus leaf.

VI

The Problem of Origin

Except for the Indus Valley standards described above, our knowledge of the morphological character of the pre-Mauryan animal

1 A. S. I. R. for 1908-09, pl. xxxix, figs. (c) and (e).
2 Fergusson & Burgess,—op. cit., pp. 244-45, pl. xvi.
3 Smith,—op. cit., pls. xliii, xlv, xlv.
4 Fergusson & Burgess,—op. cit., p. 234, pl. xii, fig. 1.
5 Smith,—op. cit., pls. xlv, xlvii (1), li (fig. 2).
6 A. S. I. R. for 1905-06, pl. xlvi, figs. 1-3; for 1908-09, pl. xxix, fig. (d). Fergusson,—Tree and Serpent Worship, pl. lxxxix, no 3, pl. lxxviii, fig. 2. Codrington,—op. cit., p. 37, fig. 12/C; pl. 25, fig. (b).
7 Mitra,—op. cit., vol. ii, pl. xxiv.
standard is derived from references in the Mahābhārata, etc, so that it cannot be taken for granted that the Mauryan and Śuṅga animal standards, monumental or otherwise, do accurately preserve the pre-Mauryan forms. No bell or lotus capital appears on the Indus Valley standard. None are mentioned in connection with the chariot standards of the Mahābhārata. Nor can any be recognized on the Garuḍa and Bull standards of the Gupta coins, and this is all the more remarkable, as the capital was fairly popular with the Gupta architects, appearing, as it did, also on the Dhvaja stambhas of the period. On the other hand the square abacus of the Basarh capital has its parallel in the horizontal member of the Indus Valley standard. This type of abacus is ill-suited to its place on the top of the campaniform capital of the Mauryan columns which finally appear with the circular form. So that it is doubtful whether the said capital had any place in the original pre-Mauryan standard. The above consideration lead to the conclusion that the campaniform capital was an intrusive element and its adoption was but an incident in the long history of the animal standards.

Poles and standards of wood, bamboo and metals are known to have featured in the battles and the religious observances of the Indian peoples from ancient times. In translating such cult objects into lithic and monumental forms, the architect must have felt the necessity of adding appropriate decorative features, and there was nothing to hinder him from borrowing the themes from foreign sources. But such borrowings must be substantiated.

1 The type persists in the square abaci mentioned above.
2 For battle standards, etc., see Appendix. Their forms could have been hardly monumental.

The Marhia pole of the Khonds, with its crowning elephant, which featured in human sacrifices, and the Marhai poles of the Ahirs (C.P. & Berar), one with peacock’s feathers (probably representing a peacock) and another with a white cock tied to the top as well as a pole crowned by a clay image of a parrot, which are worshipped with ceremonial dances, are some modern examples.

The Diffusionist Theory

For the diffusionist theory it is claimed that the chain of evidence for the Persian origin of the Mauryan campaniform capital is complete. In its latest form,¹ the theory rests upon the resemblances between the shape and decoration of the Mauryan capital and the Achaemenian pillar base² as it occurs at Susa and Persepolis, supported by a mass of historical facts.

The Assyrian Origin

None of the above are accounted for in Dr. Bhandarkar’s thesis³ that the features of the Mauryan column ‘such as the bell shaped capital, smooth unfluted shafts and lustrous polish are all adopted from the Assyrians, but directly, and not through the Persians.’ In fact except for Dr. Rajendralala Mitra’s statement that “the drooping foliations of the capitals . . . certainly belong in common both to the Aśoka and the Assyrian pillars,”⁴ a statement not supported by citation of specimens, there is nothing to support Dr. Bhandarkar’s thesis on the Assyrian origin of the Bell Capital. The whole trend of Dr. Mitra’s argument is to refute an imaginary thesis of Assyrian influence on early Indian architecture. But beyond making anthropological speculations as to the Vedic Asuras being the Assyrians Dr. Bhandarkar neither adduces evidence nor cites parallel features from Assyrian architecture, such as might have led him to this conclusion.

The Persian Origin

The affinities of form and technique noticeable between Mauryan and Achaemenian architecture have to be considered, first, in the

background of the cultural relations existing between India and her western neighbours during the 4th and 3rd centuries B.C. Perrot and Chipiez were of opinion that the said affinities were due to the migration of Persian forms into India during the Achaemenian occupation of the Indus Valley. A scaraboid of steatite, ‘exhibiting a winged stag, in the cutting of which the drill has been freely used,’ and which recalls similar works of Achaemenian art, has been found in the pre-Hellenistic strata of the Bhir mound at Taxila. More evidence of the same character may be expected from further excavations of the Bhir mound and the ruins of other cities of the Punjab and the Indus Valley raided by Alexander. The Indian punch-marked silver coinage struck on the Persian standard perhaps represented the Achaemenian coinage for India. But the penetration of Achaemenian art beyond the Punjab at this period has yet to be proved. So that references to pre-existing stone columns in the edicts of Aśoka cannot be interpreted as denoting their existence ‘much earlier than the reign of Aśoka or the Mauryan period’, though some of them may be assigned to the two preceding reigns.

India and the Hellenistic Orient

On the other hand, under the Mauryan empire, there existed considerable facilities for a more intimate cultural intercourse between India and the West. Parapanisadai, Aria, Arachosia and Gedrosia came to be included in the Mauryan empire as the result of Candragupta’s treaty ‘jus communis’ with Seleucus. During the third century B.C., the caravan route from India reached Seleukeia

3 *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. VI, 1927, p. 402 ; *Cambridge History of India*, vol. I, 1922, pp. 319-44.
4 Codrington,—*op. cit.*, p. 18.
on the Tigris via Candahar, Persepolis and Susa, while another, 'an old main road' ran via Candahar, Herat, Hecatompilos, Ecbatana, Seleukeia, and was joined by the Taxila-Cabul-Bactria road'. Taxila was then the seat of Mauryan province and communicated with Pādaliputra by a great highway. The Aramaic inscription of Taxila\(^1\) which refers twice to 'mārāna Priyadārs' is accounted for by the above relations with the old Achæmenian provinces. The Indian sea-borne trade was carried to Seleukeia along the Persian gulf and up the Tigris and also to Egypt through Arabian intermediaries. The opening up of these trade routes appears to have resulted in arousing and increasing interest in India and in the Hellenistic world about each other, Candragupta is said to have been accustomed to offer sacrifices upon Alexander's altars on the Hyphasis in Hellenic fashion.\(^2\) A few drugs were also sent by him to Seleucus.\(^3\) The Rock Edict XIII of his grandson Aśoka betrays his knowledge of the Greeks.\(^4\) From the Rock Edict II we learn that Aśoka, who evidently felt drawn to the Hellenistic world, arranged for the medical treatment of men and cattle in the dominions of Antiochus Theos and his neighbours.\(^5\) His description of himself as 'Priyadārśa' the beloved of the gods, recalls the deification of kings prevailing amongst the successors of Alexander the Great in the Orient. The world that he claims to have conquered by 'Dharma' was mainly the Hellenistic world\(^6\) and he seems to have been inspired by Alexander's vision of Eurausian empire\(^7\) based on a union of hearts (homonoia) and a joint Commonwealth of Macedonians and Persians, no less than by Achæmenian imperialism. His appointment of Tuṣaspha, a Yavana (Persian?) to the governorship of an imperial


\(^3\) *Cambridge History of India*, vol. I, 1922, p. 431.


\(^5\) *Id.*, pp. 2-4.

\(^6\) *Id.*, pp. 66-70.

\(^7\) Tarn, *op. cit.*, pp. 69ff.
Fig. 4
A composite Mauryan Capital (height 1'2'') From Pataliputra.

(With kind permission of Swami Aryakananda, of the
Ramkrishna Ashram, Bankipore.)

Fig. 5
Mauryan Capital, Sarnath
(Fragment)
province,\(^1\) has numerous parallels in the history of Alexander,\(^2\) whose policy in this respect was imitated by Antigonus I and the Seleucids,\(^3\) though but sparingly. Like the Macedonian Conqueror who stood in the magnificently appointed tent of Darius and wondered, "this, as it would seem, is to be a king!"\(^4\), both Candragupta and Aśoka appear to have been impressed by the dignity and splendour of Achaemenian imperialism as indicated by the Persian ceremonies prevailing in the Court of the former\(^5\) and by the forms of the edicts of the latter resembling those of Darius.

**Achaemenian art and Indian Antiquities of the Mauryan Period**

The said affinities have to be considered, secondly, in relation to the history of Indian art and architecture of this period, which reflects the results of the above cultural intercourse in diverse ways. An authentic case of the importation of Achaemenian objects of art into India is recorded in 326 B.C. It is stated by Quintus Curtius, Diodorus and Arrian that Alexander's presents to the king of Taxila included many vessels of gold and silver and a vast quantity of Babylonian and Persian embroideries from the store-house of the old Persian kings.\(^6\) The upper strata of the Bhir mound (4th or 3rd century B.C.) at Taxila has yielded 'a scaraboid of Chalcedony'\(^7\) graved mainly with the drill in the Achaemenian fashion', which is 'probably of Persian provenance' (depth 2' below surface). A few minor antiquities found in the same strata reflect the influence of Achaemenian art. Among these are four bangles\(^8\) of thin beaten gold shaped on a core of
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3 Tarn, op. cit., pp. 110-11.
7 A. S. I. R., part I, 1920-21, pp. 17 18, 20, pl. XVII, fig. 1.
8 Id., p. 20, pl. XVII, fig. 27.
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shellac with their ends terminating in lions' heads (depth 9" below surface), which recall Achaemenian gold armlets from Susa and in the 'Treasure of the Oxus'. Of special interest is a fragment of pottery from the side of a vase,2 decorated with the conventional leaf design (Fig. 6)...... ....eministic of the capitals of the well-known Asoka pillars (depth 1'3" below surface sq.25 x 51). Another vase from the same mound 'shaped like a modern martban', is 'stamped round the shoulder with bead and reel mouldings and bands of floral patterning', among which is the ring of leaves enclosed between festoons (cf. the Quasi-Ionic Capital of Pātaliputra) of Persian design.8

From Sārnāth, about 800 miles S. E. from Taxila as the crow flies, comes a polished sandstone head wearing a crenellated crown which recalls the one on the figure of Darius above the Behistun inscription.6 The Tytler statues from Patna6 have on their hands coiled armlets decorated spirally and terminating in dragons' heads which recall Achaemenian ornaments.7 Their waist-cloth, which is worn without the usual Indian 'kaccha' is reminiscent of the Persian garb8 and also recalls Alexander's experiments with the Persian dress. All these point to the source from which the Mauryan architect was likely to borrow his themes.

Mauryan Architecture

The Mauryan architect would appear to have been indebted to Medo-Persian sources, too, for certain architectural features from as early as the reign of Candragupta. The latter's palace at Pātaliputra comprised halls, their gilded pillars being adorned with golden vines and silver birds. Fragmentary remains of golden vines have

1 O. M. Dalton, op. cit., p. xiv, fig. 1 ; p. xv, fig. 2 ; p. xvii, fig. 3 ; and pp. 32-39 with plates.
2 A. S. I. R., part I, 1920-21, p. 20, plate XVI, fig. 1.
3 A. S. I. R., 1924-25, p. 48, pl. viii, fig. (d).
5 Dalton,—op. cit., p. 1, fig. 40.
6 Chanda,—The Beginnings of Art in Eastern India (Memoirs of A. S. I., No. 30), p. 34, pl. iv.
7 Dalton,—op. cit., nos. 118, 138, pl. xvii, no. 132, plate xx.
8 Id., p. xlvi, fig. 28.
been discovered in the excavations of Kumrahr at Patna. Polybius (x, 27, 9-10) mentions a temple at Aena which was surrounded by porticoes having entirely gilt columns. The golden vines of the pillars 'recall the one overshadowing the royal couch of Darius', a gift of the Lydian Pythias and the product probably of some Ionian workshop. The halls of Sandracottus may be compared in descriptions with those of Ecbatana, which were constructed of cedar and cypress and sheathed in silver and gold. "Neither Memnonian Susa with all its costly splendour", says Aelian, "nor Ecbatana with all its magnificence can vie (with them), for methinks only the well known vanity of the Persians could prompt such a comparison."

From consideration of the bull capitals of the columns in the portico of the Sanctuary at Delos, Perrot and Chipiez arrived at the conclusion that "drawings of the oriental buildings eulogised by the companions of the Macedonian may have existed and were handed about in the days of the Ptolemies and the Seleucidae." This is borne out by the fact that the tablets dating from as late as the reigns of Antiochus the Great, Seleucus Philopater, etc. found by Loftus at Warka are sealed with rings engraved with Persepolitan subjects. A similar ring engraved with the Persepolitan bull capital (addorsed) which 'should probably be assigned to the 5th century B.C.', has been obtained at Rawalpindi. The fragment from the side of terracotta vase from Taxila, described above, which is decorated with arries and festoons in the manner of the Persian pillar base and the Mauryan capital, points to the eastward migration of Persepolitan designs, in the same manner, during the 4th and 3rd centuries B.C. The restored ground plan of the hypostyle hall at Kumrahr shows the distribution of pillars in square bays according to the Persian design. Its pillars had been set up ten cubits apart from centre to

3 Id., pp. 26-27.
4 McCrindle,—Ancient India as described in Classical Literature, pp. 147-48.
5 Perrot and Chipiez,—op. cit., pp. 56-57.
6 Dalton,—op. cit., pp. xlvi, 29; No. 106, fig. 55, pl. xvi.
centre measured by the Indian cubit of 18", whereas in Darius' Hall of hundred columns they are 21' or nearly ten cubits apart measured by the Persian unit of 25,1/3". A mason's mark at the bottom of one of these pillars which has luckily escaped destruction from the conflagration which devastated the building, strongly resembles a similar mark from Persepolis. Dr. Spooner's explorations of the site disclosed the existence of an elevated platform (of earthwork) resembling that at Persepolis. Further excavation only can show whether the mounds at Kumrahr actually contain ruins corresponding in their relative positions to the complex of structure at Persepolis.

The silicious varnish appearing on the Mauryan monuments, for which Mr. K. P. Jayaswal advocates a prehistoric origin on the evidence of a polished neolith,¹ had been applied to the Behistun rock inscription, "apparently to give a finish and durability to the writing.........to give a clear outline to each letter, and to protect the surface against the elements" (Rawlinson).

Evidence is, therefore, not wanting to show not only the migration of Achaemenian arts including Persepolitan designs to India during the Mauryan period, but also the popularity of plans of Persepolitan buildings and characteristic Persian techniques in the capital city of the empire. The Persepolitan capitals of some of the pillars in the Yusufzai reliefs and of Gandharan pillars of masonry work as the Surkh Minar and the Minar Chakri² denote that motifs of Achaemenian architecture continued to be a persistent source of inspiration to the Indian architect long after the downfall of that dynasty.

**The Campaniform Moulding in Persia**

Thirdly, the antecedents of the campaniform moulding are well-known in Persia and render it impossible that the Indian bell capital could have originated elsewhere. So far, no moulding corresponding to it is known to have been discovered in Mesopotamia or the Indus Valley. A short ring of pendant leaves terminating in a festooned border, bulging in outline, and distributed over Western Asia and Mesopotamia with marked local differences, appears to have inspired

2 Cunningham,—A. S. R., vol. v, pp. 185-89, pl. xlv; Fergusson,—History of Indian and Eastern Architecture, 1876, p. 56.
the design of the lower member of the second order of Persian capitals. But the Persian base, though decorated with petals disposed between festoons like the said member, differs from it in its characteristic shape and in the design of its petals, consisting in each case of a sharp ridge or arris enclosed between the usual festoons. It is held to be an indigenous product of Persia, suggested to the architect by the rude stone block the rustic constructor was driven to employ, so as to save the wooden post of his humble house from coming in contact with the damp earth. The form maintains a physiognomy which is neither Assyrian nor Egyptian nor yet Greek. Nowhere else are the component parts exactly adjusted as these, and above all, turned in the direction we find them here. The decorative theme, the solid shape to which it is applied, every feature is original.

The Mauryan Capital and the Persian Base Compared

The Mauryan bell has the same type of petals as the Persian base, the resemblance extending to the short leaves occurring between the festoons at their lower end. It differs mainly in not having a ring of leaves falling on its shoulder, the enrichment being obviously considered unnecessary at a height whence it could not be grasped by the eye. The Śuṅga architect, who must have been aware of the transposition of the Persian pillar base to the top of the Mauryan column, obviously lacked the judgment which made the Mauryan architect eliminate the ring of leaves and revert to the original Persian design, e.g., on the capital of the Heliodoros column. Another difference is in the higher accentuation of the curves of its outline, which it owes to its decorative function on the top of a pillar carrying no superincumbent weight. Its broader festoons and the bold execution of its petals must have been intended to throw the whole design into relief in the blazing Indian light, by inviting shadows in the hollows between the arrises and festoons. The resemblances between the Indian and the Persian mouldings, therefore, conclusively establish the indebtedness of Mauryan art to the Achaemenian. The divergences are only due to the fresh and living inspiration of Mauryan art, which deliberately adapted the Persian motif to Indian climate and purpose.

2 Ibid., pp. 88-90, 118-19.
Finally, the Hellenistic treatment of some of the sculptures crowning the Mauryan columns constitutes a sort of birth mark for the capital themselves. For, as denoted by the fragmentary handle\(^1\) of the above-mentioned vase from Taxila (depth 1'3" below surface, sq. 25 x 51'), which is decorated with the head of Alexander the Great in the lion's skin (Fig. 7) and also by the laurel wreath represented below the mural crown on the Sārnāth head, the traditions of Hellenistic and Achaemenian arts had been migrating to India, during the Mauryan epoch, in the same current\(^2\) along trade routes which started from Hellenistic cities as Ephesus, Antioch and Seleukeia on the Tigris and passed through Susa, Ecbatana and Persepolis to India.

Evidence for the presence of Hellenistic influences in the art of the Ganges Valley at this period is afforded by two terracotta heads from Sārnāth\(^3\) and Basarh\(^4\) respectively, of distinctively Greek appearance. But in view of Nearchus' statement that 'the Indians quickly learnt to make Greek articles such as the scrapers and oil-flasks used by athletes,'\(^5\) it may not be warranted to trace such minor works of art to actual Græco-Bactrian artists. Two terracotta heads representing smiling children with quaint head-gears, done in a realistic manner, from Patna\(^6\) and Basarh\(^7\) evidently belong to the same class. The laurel wreath and rams' horns which decorate the Mauryan heads discovered by Mr. Hargreaves at Sārnāth (1914-15) are also Greek motifs. The chief contribution of Hellenistic art in the formation of that of the Mauryan lay in the 'advanced power of visualizing;' must have been acquired through the study of western plastic works by the Mauryan artists (Bachhofer). To such study is due the plurifaciality attempted in the sculptures. The animal figures of Mauryan art convey a sense of internal structure of bones and muscles, which is unmistakably Hellenistic. This applies also to the figures on the abacus of the
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1 A.S.I.R., pt. I, 1920-21, p. 20, pl. xvi, fig. 2.
2 Elliot Smith, —Human History, pp. 474-80.
6 A.S.I.R., pt. I, 1917-18, p. 27, pl. xvi, fig. 2.
7 Id., 1913-14, p. 182, no. 791, pl. xliii, fig. (h).
Sārnāth capital,¹ which appear sloping off into the background without casting strong shadows so that their style can hardly be taken as 'purely Indian,' as supposed by Dr. Vincent Smith.² Dr. Bachhofer points out Hellenistic influences in the treatment of certain details of form, viz., the cheekbones, moustaches and the deeply imbedded eyes of the lions. The comparative freedom in the rendering of the manes of the Sārnāth lions as compared to the totally schematic and conventional representation of the same feature in the Sāñchi and Rāmpurvā lions is also significant. The most convincing proof of Hellenistic treatment is the entasis characterising the shaft of the Sāñchi column,³ a distinctive feature of Greek architecture. A sandstone capital carved in low relief with the acanthus leaf is stated to have been discovered at Bankipore.⁴

Hellenistic tradition, affected no doubt later Achaemenian works as indicated by the Susa frieze of lions; but the Mauryan lions differ from the Persian in their comparatively restrained naturalism, and in the suave treatment of their surface, which denote a fresh Hellenistic inspiration at work. On the other hand, a certain lifelessness is common to them and the Mauryan lions generally have their manes rendered in schematic and conventional manner. Again, the sense of volume and linear composition of the Sāñchi and Sārnāth capitals may be considered to be Indian traits. As the ratios of these columns differ from those of the Greek orders, they would seem to constitute an independent order by themselves. The variations noticeable in the said ratios and in the arrangements of the mouldings of the capitals imply that the 'style' cannot have 'taken centuries before it was brought to the state of perfection in which we find it at the time of Aśoka,' as maintained by Dr. Rajendralala. The conclusion is irresistible that Mauryan art and architecture represent a fusion of the Persian, Hellenistic and Indian traditions which

¹ Bachhofer, — *op. cit.*, vol. 1, pp. 6-7, 12-13, pl. 6.
³ Cunningham,— *The Bhilsa Topes of Buddhist Monuments of Central India*, pp. 193-95.
dates from the 4th and 3rd centuries B.C. I have elsewhere tried to show that this original synthesis took place in the Gangetic plains.¹ Hence, if no monuments like the above have been as yet discovered on Bactrian soil,² it does not necessarily follow that Hellenistic influences had not been independently operating on the origins of the Mauryan art in the Ganges Valley. The latter, indeed, do not appear to have been virile enough to stamp out the Persian and Indian forms flourishing by their side. Their simultaneous presence in the same art and architecture is, nevertheless, indicative of their correlation. Therefore, the undoubtedly Indian elements being left out of account, if the Hellenistic touches in Mauryan art are admitted to be imported features,³ the same admission has to be made for the campaniform capital, due regard being had to the cultural relations existing between India and Persia at the time, to the Achaemenian influence generally noticeable in the Indian arts and architecture of those days, as well as the close affinities between the capital and the Persian base, the latter being a characteristic product of Persia (549-330 B.C.).

The Theory of Collateral Origin

When in 1875 the theory of the lotus origin of the bell capital was first formulated by Dr. Rajendralala Mitra, he simply rejected the supposed similitudes between the so called Asokan and Assyrian capitals as inconclusive in character. Since then our knowledge of Mauryan art and architecture has been considerably enriched by various archaeological discoveries and the resemblances between the Persian and Mauryan forms are obviously too close to be ignored. Hence, while claiming a non-Iranian origin for the bell capital, traceable to the Vedic lotus symbol, Dr. Coomaraswamy has tried to explain away the said resemblances as due to their collateral origin.⁴ According to him the two forms are cognate, ‘parallel derivatives from older forms current in Western Asia’; Northern India having

² Bhandarkar,—op. cit., p. 214.
³ Cf. A. W. Lawrence,—Later Greek Sculpture and its Influence on East & West, pp. 77-79.
Fig. 6
Fragment from the side of a Terracotta vase (ht. 7")
From TACHA

Fig. 7
Fragment of the handle of a Terracotta vase (ht. 5 1/2")
showing Alexander's head in horn's skin
From TACHA
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long formed a part of the Western Asiatic Culture complex': or 'common inheritances from an Ancient Eastern Culture that extended from the Mediterranean to the Ganges Valley............which may well have had a continuous history extending upwards from the stone age.' The moulding being thus admitted to be of W. Asiatic origin, the learned critic only arbitrarily rejects the data for its Achaemenian derivation and antedates its diffusion to India on totally inadequate grounds.

The above theories of the independent and collateral origins of the bell-capital are apparently supported on the plea of continuity of tradition in art. It is maintained rightly by Dr. Coomaraswamy that the whole group of motifs of Western-Asiatic aspect appearing in early Indian art need not be supposed to have been introduced by Asoka's Persian craftsmen en bloc. Indeed, it is not improbable that these motifs were introduced in Indian art at different points of time and through different agencies. Hence the converse proposition that the whole group of the said motifs is derived from a common Eastern culture once distributed over India and Western Asia is equally open to objection. Consequently, each case of similitude between Indian, Persian and Western Asiatic motifs has to be considered individually and by itself, as well as in relation to the entire group of such motifs.

The survival of wooden forms and techniques in early Indian architecture certainly points to the existence of a contemporary or older wooden architecture. But until specimens have been discovered it is premature to maintain that it resembled Mauryan and Śunga architecture in every detail. Strictly speaking, archaeology is neither in a position to define what was the state of pre-Mauryan arts, nor to enumerate the exact repertory of their decorative themes. The previous existence of decorated wooden rails, deduced by Prof. Chanda¹ from the ancient Indian Tree and Stūpa cults, is rendered doubtful by the absence of ornament on the earliest railings of stone construction,² such as the monolithic rail of Sārnāth,³ the ground balustrades of the Great Stūpa of Sānchi,⁴ as well as those surrounding the open court or hall no. 36 at Sārnāth, which have come down in some frag-

¹ Chanda,—'The Beginnings of Art in Eastern India,' Memoirs of the A. S. I., No. 30, pp. 3-8.
³ Sahni,—op. cit., p. 3.
⁴ Sir John Marshall,—A Guide to Sānchi, p. 34, Plates I & II.
ments bearing inscriptions in characters of the second century B.C.\(^1\) In these circumstances Dr. Coomaraswamy’s assumption that “the bell-capital must have been a common element of the craftsman’s repertory under the Nandas as in the time of Aśoka,” is hardly justified.

**APPENDIX**

*Standards in the Mahābhārata and Their Significance*

The standards described in the Mahābhārata are distinctive, and are chiefly of the war chariots (III. 173, 37; VI. 19, 27; VII. 105, 1-29 etc.)\(^2\); they are also mentioned in connection with the battle elephants (VIII. 22, 14-15; 77. 8; 81. 14, 34 etc.) and the horsemen\(^4\) (VIII. 19, 45 etc.). In the war chariots, the standard consisted of a pole hoisted on the “upastha” part of the vehicles, crowned by an emblem or emblems of gold, silver, or inlaid work. Lower down were hung bells, garlands and flags of variegated colours, also bearing various emblems.

The standard was set up in position on the chariot on the eve of a battle (IV. 31, 18-22; 37, 25-26; 46, 1-7; V. 47, 102; 111, 3-5; VII. 2, 25 etc.), or of a journey (II. 24, 21-26; V. 82, 20). As in

\(1\) Sahni,—*op. cit.*, pp. 3, 21c-12, 214 15, Nos. D/a 13-20, 39.


\(3\) Fergusson,—*Tree and Serpent Worship*, pls. xxxiii, xxxiv, xxxviii, and xl.; Sahni,—*Sarnath Museum Catalogue*, pl. v.; Hamid, Kak and Chanda,—*Sanchi Museum Catalogue*, 1922, pl. x.; Coomaraswamy,—*Indian and Indonesian Art*, pls. viii, xiii, fig. 48, xvi, fig. 54; O. M. Dalton,—*The Treasure of the Oxus*, 1926, pp. 52-53, pl. xxviii, figs. 199-200; Herringham,—*Ajanta Frescoes*, pl. xviii.

\(4\) The riders carrying the *Garuḍā-dhvajas* on the Bharhut rails are examples. For ordinary standards, see Coomaraswamy,—*op. cit.*, pls. xii, fig. 42 and xix, fig. 70; Cunningham,—*Mahābodhi*, pl. viii, 3.
the Ṛg-veda (VII. 85, 2; X. 103, 11), it was a part of the warfare to pierce or cut down the enemy standards. It is interesting to note that the Kauṭṭhemi grant of Vikramādiṭya V of the Śaka Samvat 930 (A.D. 1008-9), mentions 'raṇastambhas' set up by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Kakka III which were cut asunder in battle by the Western Calukya king Taila II.

The following are some of the standards:

I. Of gods and goddesses:

Vaijayanta (= Indra), of bamboo (?) with golden decorations and of the colour of the blue lotus (III. 42. 8). Bull (= Śiva, VIII. 34. 41).
Cock (= Skanda, III, 228. 32). Peacock's feathers (= Durgā, IV, 6. 14). The hoisting of the Indradhvaja (I. 63. 17-29) constituted an important cult stated to have originated in the kingdom of Cedi. According to the Mahābhārata it consisted in planting a bamboo pole on the ground for the celebration of Indra's worship. The next day.............it was decked with golden cloth, scents and garlands and various ornaments.

2 Mahābhārata, IV. 57. 39; 58. 59, 78; 61. 31; 64. 6-7; VI. 54. 25, 62; 80. 13-15; 93. 39; 96, 75; 120. 23, 50; VII. 14. 41, 52; 92. 31, 37, 64; 97. 30; 107. 31; 108. 9; 123. 16, 32-33; 125. 21, 70; 146. 56; 156. 82, 157; 162. 18; 168. 5, 22; 169. 6, 40; 170. 14; 189. 18-21; 192, 14; 201, 42; VIII. 15. 38; 16. 7, 12; 20, 8; 21. 18; 22. 15; 24. 40; 25. 68, 21; 30. 22; 48. 27; 53. 7; 56. 35-36; 61. 20, 45-46, 51, 55; 77. 65; 78. 21, 22; 79. 71, 77, 78; 81. 5; 82, 12, 18; 89. 25-26. 64; 91. 33-38; IX. 10. 31; 12. 56-58; 16. 38-39, 63; 17. 61; 21, 21; 28. 53-54, etc.
4 Cf. Matsya Purāṇa, 133, 61.
5 This feature may be noted in connection with the yūpā worship described in the Rāmāyaṇa (see ante). Possibly herein we have a clue to the significance of the rosettes, palmettes, honeysuckles etc., carved on the abaci of the capitals of the Mauryan Lats, unless they were of purely decorative character. The worship of pillars with garlands is represented on some bas-reliefs of the Stūpa II at Śānci (Fergusson, Tree and Serpent Worship, Pl. XLIII) and some railing pillars at Sārnāth (Sahni, Sārnāth Museum Catalogue, Pl. VI1). Garlands are carved on certain fragmentary shafts of pillars, of late Mauryan date, from Sārnāth (A. S. I. R., 1914-15, pl. lxviii, nos. 16, 21). Cf. Bas-reliefs on the gateways and corner pillars of the Mahābodhi rails; also A. S. I. R., 1914-15, pl. lxvii, nos. 11, 12, and Mudrārākṣasa, act III, para 3.
and the god came himself, accepting the worship thus offered, in the form of a swan.' Kings celebrating this festival were said to secure happiness, prosperity and victory for their kingdoms. The celebration took place in the autumn and the Viṣṇu Purāṇa V. 10-13 seems to show its connection with the harvest festival.¹ In the Kālikā Purāṇa the pole is a trunk of the Arjuna, Aśvakarṇa, Priyaka, Dhava, Audumbara, Deodar or the Sal tree, selected by the priest with elaborate ceremonies, and set up by the king, properly coloured, clothed and embellished with bells, flywhisks, gems, garlands, flowers, scents, etc.² According to the Matsya Purāṇa it is an evil omen to dream of the Śakradhvaja falling down (242. 9). Dreams about embracing the same dhvaja foretells victory in quarrels, at dice and in battle (242. 24-25).

II. With effigies of gods and other emblems: Dharma, Māruta, Śakra and the Aśvins (= 5 sons of Dṛupad) by her five consorts, respectively, said to be descended from the above gods, VII, 23, 85). The Sacrificial Post (=Saumadatti, VII, 105, 22-24, compared to the post erected in the Rājasāya ceremony). Kamanḍalu (=Drona, IV, 55, 45). Altar (=Drona, IV, 57, 2; 58, 3-4, VI, 17, 24-25). Fire (=King of Kaliṅga, VI, 17, 35). The Moon with planets and two drums (=Yudhiṣṭhira, VII, 23, 81-82). Malaya (=Pândya, VII, 20, 20). Plough (=Śalya, king of the Madras, VII, 105, 18-20).

III. With trees: Palm and the sun and stars (=Bhistva, IV, 55, 6-60; VI, 16, 23; 17, 18; 46, 50). Palm (=Baladeva, IX, 37, 20 XVI 3, 6). Karṇikāra (=Abhimanyu, VI, 47, 7-8).


Elephant's rope (= Karna, IV, 55, 54-55; VII, 2, 25; 105, 12-13; VIII, 12, 17; 56, 87-88; 86, 5; 87, 87-93). Bull (= King of Magadha VI, 17, 28; Gautama, VII, 105, 14-16). Lion (= Uttara, IV, 37, 25-26, 46, 2; 67, 13; Bhima, VII, 23, 80; Satyaki, VII, 112, 57-58). Lion's tail (= Aśvatthāmā, VI, 17, 21; VII, 105, 10-12). Boar (= Jayadratha, king of the Sindhus, VI, 17, 30; 93, 39; VII, 105, 20-21). Monkey¹ (= Arjuna, I, 227, 1-17; III, 151, 15-18; VI, 46, 3-6; 53, 4, 5, 27; 66, 28; 67, 13; V, 47, 102; 53, 13; 55, 7-12; 137, 5-6; 141, 3-5; VI, 50, 43-44; 71, 24; monkey with lion's tail, VII, 88, 26; 100, 36; 105, 8-10; VIII, 40, 14; 46, 51-55; flags with bells, the sun, the moon and stars, 53, 7-9; 76, 27; 87, 88; 93; IX, 4, 16; 62, 12).³ Jackals (= Alāyudha, VII, 177, 19).

Various beliefs relating to the Standard: The standard appears to have been regarded as an auspicious emblem (V, 85, 18; XIV, 70, 15, etc.).³ Bhīṣma refuses to fight at the sight of an inauspicious standard (VI, 108, 79). The falling down of standards forebodes evil unto the Bharatas (II, 80, 24). The imminent death of kings is prognosticated when the standards tremble and give off smoke and when crows perch on them (VI, 3, 42-45). The trembling of the standards when Karna goes out to battle is evidently an evil omen (VIII, 37, 8).⁴

Some of the chariots and standards are stated to have been gifts from the gods or else made by the celestial craftsman, e.g. the chariot of Vasu and the Indradhvaja worshipped by him (I, 63, 13-29); of Arjuna (I, 227, 1-17, etc.); of Jarāsandha (II, 24, 11ff.), and the standards of Skanda (III, 228, 32), and Krṣṇa (X, 13, 4-5). On the termination of the battle of Kurukṣetra, Arjuna's chariot is mysteriously consumed by flames and the Monkey with the standard disappears (IX, 62, 12). The chariot of Krṣṇa vanishes when the doom of the Yādavas is imminent. The standards of Krṣṇa and Baladeva are also removed by the Apsaras at that time (XVI, 3, 5-6).

² Matsya Purāṇa, ch. 281-82, describes the 'Aśvaratha' and 'Hastiratha' rites in which the dedication of chariots having the lion and the Garuḍa standards is enjoined for propitiating Divākara and Mādhava respectively. Cf. Legge, Travels of Fa-Hien, pp. 18-19, 79.
³ Cf. Rāmāyana, II, 6, 13; 7, 3.
⁴ Cf. Matsya Purāṇa, 230, 3; 243, 11-12.
Arjuna’s standard is the most powerful of all and Yudhīṣṭhīra is considered the stronger for its possession (V, 53. 13; 137. 5-6; VI, 19-29). The circumambulation of the chariot and the standard (I, 227. 17; IV, 46, 6, etc.) recalls the similar worship of the Buddhist Stūpas. The Palī and the Garuḍa standards were worshipped by Baladeva and Krishna respectively (XVI, 3. 6). The latter, about to perform a journey in the char of Jarāsandha, reflects on Garuḍa which appears at once with the Spirits that dwell in the standard and takes its usual place on the flagstaff (II, 24. 22-23). Arjuna will not fight under the standard of Uttara; but by pursuing the magical rites formulated by Viśvakarman invokes the Monkey and propitiates the Firegod, who at once bids the Spirits to their place on the standard (IV. 46, 3-6). The Monkey appears on the flagstaff, only to disappear with the spirits after the battle is over (IV, 67, 13). The standard urges Arjuna on to war (V, 47, 102). The Monkey with its host of Spirits, gaping and of fierce mien, setting up terrific roars, is time and again described as overawing the enemies.1 The standard emblems of Kaṇa and Arjuna combat each other when their owners engage in battle (VIII. 87, 87-93). The legend associating Hanumat with the Monkey standard is rather unskilfully woven into the context and might be a later accretion (III, 151, 15-18).

The standards mentioned in the Mahābhārata are thus not only associated in some cases with the cults of Śiva, Skanda and Durgā, with tree worship and the harvest festival, but also appear independently with a characteristic body of beliefs, which point to the prevalence of their independent worship as some period of antiquity.

The inclusion of the Vyāpa or sacrificial post (compared in the text to that of the Rājasūya ceremony, among the standard emblems, the occurrence of the Dhvaja in the Ṛg-veda in the sense of banners used in battle as stated above, as well as the mythical association of some of the chariots and standards with Vedic gods, viz., Indra and Agni, indicate that the Vedic people might have been a factor in the diffusion or the elaboration of the trait. Further, its minor importance in the

1 Fa Hien records a legend about how the lion on the Sāṅkāśya pillar once frightened the Brahminical opponents of the Buddhists by giving a great roar.—Legge, *Travels of Fa Hien*, pp. 50-51. The function of the Spirits is clearly defined in the *Mahābhīrata*, v. 141.4.
ORIGIN OF THE BELL-CAPITAL

Rg-veda as denoted by the small number of references, considered together with its existence in the Indus Valley culture, would make it appear that the Vedic people had imbibed the trait from among their neighbours.\(^1\) The animal standards mentioned in the Mahābhārata, not subordinated to other cults, are best explained as ultimately derived from an older culture, surviving in a modified form, in that of the Kuru-Pańcāla country.

It is noteworthy that the distribution of the early Indian monumental pillars considerably overlies that of the chariot standards of the Great Epic and a connection between them may be reasonably postulated. This conclusion is strengthened by the fact that during the Gupta period when the ‘Dhvaja-stambha’\(^2\) had been long in the services of Buddhism, Jainism and Brahminism, something of the old significance of the standards appears to persist in the custom of recording ‘Praśastis’ of kings who had won fame and victory in arms,

---

1 For standards used by the princes of the Sindhu and the Madra kingdoms of the Epic which lay in the zone of the Indus Valley culture, see ante. Though domesticated, the elephatn does not appear on the few Indus Valley standards, so far known. On the other hand, the domestication of the animal is noted only in later Vedic literature. See Cambridge History of India, vol. I, 1922, pp. 106-137; Macdonell & Keith,—Vedic Index, 1912, vol. I, ‘Nāga’, p. 440; vol. II, ‘Hastin’, p. 501. But the people of the Gangetic plains must have been acquainted with the animal from much earlier times. A rock painting depicting the elephant at Mirzapore and a terracotta elephant and rider toy discovered at Bhita in the Allahabad District, dateable at the circa 8th century B.C., are noteworthy in this connection. See, Mitra,—Prehistoric India, plate facing p. 154; and A.S.I.R., 1911-12, pp. 71-72, no. 1, pl. xxii, fig. 1. The accredited origin of the Indra-dhvaja in the Cedi country shows how the worship of new ‘dhvajas’ had been springing up.

The palm and the Kārṇīkāra standards of the Mahābhārata and the palm and the Kalpa Vṛksa capitals of Pawaia and Besnagar offer interesting parallels to the prehistoric tree ensigns and the nome emblems of Egypt, the XXth and XXIst nomes being represented by the Palm tree. Moret,—The Nile and Egyptian Civilisation, pp. 40-59.

2 The Eran pillar of Buddhagupta is described as “Dhvajastambha janarddanasya” in line 9 of the record on the shaft.—no. 19 of Fleet,—C.I.I., vol. III.
on the shafts of the pillars, e.g., the Allahabad pillar of Samudra Gupta,\(^1\) the Bhitari pillar of Skanda Gupta, the Eran pillar of Budha Gupta, the Meherauli pillar of Candra, the Mandasor Lion pillars of Yasodharman and the Phaladpur pillar.\(^2\) The lines nos. 29-30 of the Allahabad pillar inscription and no. 9 of the Mandasor pillar inscription leave no room for doubt that the pillars were intended as emblems of victory gained in war.

It is the standards mentioned in the Epic, therefore, and not the Vedic Lotus symbol nor the Lotus supports of Bharhut, that can throw any light on the morphology and significance of the 'Dhvajastambhas'. So far our knowledge goes, the lotus is not mentioned in connection with any of the above standards. Due regard being had to the case for the migration of the campaniform moulding from Persia to India, the probability lies, therefore, that the said moulding was not of Indian origin and was taken over for enhancing the decorative effect of the dhvajas and the structural pillars which had all been assuming liti and monumental forms with the rise of early Indian art and architecture. The morphological and functional divergences of the moulding from the Achæmenian design, as well as the many variations in form and decoration that appear during its long history as an element of ancient Indian architecture, are explained as due to the natural modification of a trait in course of diffusion.\(^*\)

\textit{Achyuta Kumar Mitra}

---

1 It was originally a Mauryan pillar, but was re-used for incising inscription.

2 Fleet, -\textit{op. cit.}, nos. 1, 13, 19, 32, 33, 34 and 57.

* I am indebted to Mr. Bajra Kumar Bhattacherjee, M. Sc. for his kind help in preparing this appendix and to Prof. Panchanan Mitra, M.A., Ph.D. of the University of Calcutta and Dr. Provash Chandra Basu M. Sc., M.B. of the Bose Institute for many useful suggestions. My thanks are also due to Mr. Matimohan Gupta for the drawings accompanying this paper.
Topography in the Purāṇas

_Veṇkaṭācala_

In the Caitanya Caritāmṛta (ii. 9) it is said that Caitanya after visiting Purī crossed the river Godāvari, passed through various tirthas, and subsequently, arrived at Veṇkaṭācala. Veṇkaṭācala appears to have been a very sacred place; it is worth while, therefore, to see what information the Skanda Purāṇa furnishes us with, regarding the location of that tīrtha. The first canto of the second volume (Viṣṇu Khanda) of the Skanda Purāṇa describes the māhātmya of Veṇkaṭācala. The identification of the hill, however, is not very difficult if the inaccuracies which have crept into the passages concerned are eliminated, but considerable difficulties seem to lie in the task of reconciling the present position of Veṇkaṭācala with the position given in our Purāṇa. Thus in ii, i, i, 43-44, 46 is given the topographical details of Veṇkaṭācala as follows:—

_Hastiśailāduttarataḥ pañcayojanamātrataḥ,_
_Suvarṇamukhari nāma nadināṁ pravarā nadi, 43_
_Tasyā evottare tīre Kamalākhyāṃ sarovaraḥ,_
_Tattire Bhagavānāste Śūkasya varado Hariḥ. 44_
_Kamalākhyā sarasa uttare kānanottame,_
_Kroṣadvayārdhamātre tu haricanadana-sobhite,_
_Śrīveṇkaṭācalo nāma Vāsudevālayo mahān. 46_

Here it is said that there is a śaila called Hastiśaila, on the north of which is a river called Suvarṇamukhari. On the north of that river is a sarovara called Kamala, on the north of which stands Śrī Veṇkaṭācala, seven yojanas in length and one yojana in height. That Veṇkaṭācala lay on the north of Kamala sarovara, on the south of which the river Suvarṇamukhari was flowing is made further clear in ii. 19 where it is said that one Raṅgadāsa, wishing to visit Veṇkaṭācala from Pāṇḍya country, arrived on the bank of the river Suvarṇamukhari where he bathed. He then crossed it (19) and came to the sacred Kamala sarovara where he again bathed and performed pūjās. He crossed it (20-21) and gradually advanced towards Veṇkaṭācala. All these clearly show that
Veṅkaṭācala was situated on the north of Kamala sarovara, by the south of which flowed the river Suvarṇamukhari, keeping Hastiśaila on the south.

Hastiśaila is perhaps still to be found in modern Kālahasti, a small range of hills, an off-shoot of the Nagari hills, spreading from Kālahasti on the north to Candragiri on the south-west in the North Arcot district (Ep. Ind., vol. I, p. 368; vol. III, pp. 116, 240) of the Madras Presidency. On the north of this range of hills from Kāla-hasti to Candragiri still flows a river called Svarṇamukhi, which is undoubtedly the river Suvarṇamukhari of our Purāṇa (ii, i, 113). It can, therefore, be said that the Purānic Hastiśaila and Suvarṇamukhari are occupying the same position with regard to each other as they possibly occupied at the time of the Purāṇa. The river Suvarṇamukhari rising from the Velikond range (southern spurs) of the Madras Presidency flows in a north-eastern direction and falls into the Bay of Bengal. But somewhere at a place on the north of the modern Kāla-hasti railway station of the M., & S. M Ry., it bifurcates and one branch flows first southwards by the western side of the Kāla-hasti railway station and then takes a south-western course by the northern side of the off-shoots of the Nagari Hills. Thus we see that the river Suvarṇamukhari or Svarṇamukhi flows by the north of Hastiśaila as stated in the Purāṇa.

But there are some inaccuracies regarding the course of the river. In ii. 1, 22, 33-4 of the Skanda Purāṇa it is said that Agastya Āśrama was on the bank of the river Suvarṇamukhari. Again in ii. 1, 33, 18 & 31 it is stated that the river originating from Agastya-Śaila falls in Dākṣiṇāsāgara. Dākṣiṇāsāgara refers to the Bay of Bengal as has been found in many cases, and so the river Suvarṇamukhari falls in the Bay of Bengal. The other statements of the Purāṇa, however, are highly improbable. There were many Agastya-Āśramas, but if it was the Āśrama of the Nasik division of the Bombay Presidency, it is not possible that the river Suvarṇamukhari flowed as the far as Bombay Presidency to meet the Agastya Āśrama. The river in question does not reach the western part of the North Arcot district, not to speak of the far western part of the Bombay Presidency. Agastya-Āśrama may also probably be the Agastya-Śaila, wherefrom the river originated as stated above. But Agastya-Śaila is the Agastya-kūṭa mountain of the Tinnevelly district in the Madras Presidency. But this is also highly improbable for the river Suvarṇa-
mukhari does not flow even beyond the Madras Presidency. These inaccuracies, which have crept into the Purāṇa, either through textual corruption or on account of the ignorance of the compilers, must be eliminated in order to find out the true position of the river. A similar mistake occurs again in ii, 1, 30, 24 where it is said that Bharadvāja-Āśrama was on the bank of Suvarṇamukhari. Evidently the river could not have flowed northwards up to Prayāg where the Āśrama was situated (Rāmāyaṇa, Ayodhyā k., ch. 54). Again in ii, 1, 34, 25f. it is said that the river Suvarṇamukhari after its confluence with the river Veṇā flowed northwards with great force by the side of many tīrthas, through many dense forests and through the Udakhala country, until its confluence with the river Vyagrapadā after which it flowed towards Vṛśabhācala. There are various Veṇās but taking it to be the river Kṛṣṇā which is nearest to Suvarṇamukhi, no such confluence can be found. The river (Suvarṇamukhi) has not even joined the various southern branches of the river Penner which flows on the immediate north of it, not to speak of the far more northern river Kṛṣṇā and also the river Kālindī, with which a confluence of the river Suvarṇamukhari is also described (ch. 25). These are some of the inaccuracies which must be eliminated to find out the real course of the river. It is impossible to think of a river, which flowed through Tinnevelly, Nāsik and Madras and at the same time extended up to the United Provinces to meet the river Yamuna.

So the statement of the Purāṇa that Suvarṇamukhari flows by the north of Kālahasti is a geographical fact. It is said that on the north of the river Suvarṇamukhari was a sarovara called Kamala sarovara. About 3 miles to the north of the Suvarṇamukhari there is a town called Tirpadi or Tirpati or Tripati in the district of North-Arcot, 72 miles north-west of Madras, and at a short distance from the Renigunta Railway station of the M. & S. M. Ry. Between Tripati and the river Suvarṇamukhi there are still about 32 ponds and large tanks, the most famous of which is Svāmi puṣkariṇī. It is therefore probable that one of these ponds was called Kamala in those days. It is said that on the north of that Sarovara lay Veṅkaṭācala. On the east of Tripati at a distance of about six miles there stands a range of mountains called Tirumala giri consisting of seven ranges, running from north to south and the northern range is called Veṅkaṭagiri. The Padma
Pûrâṇa (Uttarā kh., ch. 90) also mentions Veṇaṅkṣa hill, but it gives no topographical details. Veṇaṅkṣa-giri is also called Šeṣācâla in the Pûrâṇas and nowadays it is also known as Šeṣādri (Ep. Ind., vol. III, p. 240). In the Skanda Pûrâṇa (ii. 1, 7, 51 f.) it is said that there are many ōṁthas in Veṇaṅkṣa-câla such as Akâsagaṅgâ, Pâpanâśana, Kumâradhârikâ, Pâṇḍava ōṁttha. The ōṁthas are all to be found more or less near the Veṇaṅkṣa-giri i.e. the first (north) range of the Tirumali hill, although Akâsagaṅgâ and Kumâradhârikâ are now called Viradgaṅgâ and Kumâravârikâ. On the top of the Veṇaṅkṣa-giri there is the celebrated image of Nârâyana called Veṇaṅkṣa-gîvara or Bâlâji Viśvanâth. It was also visited by Caitanya (Cai. Caritâ. ii. 1) so it can be safely established that the first (northern) range of the Tirumali hill which is still called Veṇaṅkṣa-giri is the Veṇaṅkṣa-câla of our Pûrâṇa situated on the north of Kamala sarovara. On the south of this hill is the river Svarânaṅkâhi (Suvârânaṅkâhi), flowing by the northern side of Kâla-hasti. So we see that the position of Veṇaṅkṣa-câla as described in the Pûrâṇa exactly coincides with the present position of the same hill; on the north of Veṇaṅkṣa-câla therefore flowed the river Penner which was known in ancient times as the river Pinâkini (Sewell’s Arch. Surv. of S. India, vol. 1, pp. 123, 129). That in ancient times it occupied the very same position is corroborated by the following description of the journey of Arjuna from Indraprastha to Veṇaṅkṣa-câla (Skandapurâna, ii. i. 29): Arjuna first arrived at the river Bhâgirathi, and then pursuing a course along her bank gradually passed through Gaṅgâdvâra, Prayâg and Kâśikâ, and arrived at the Dakṣînasâgara (39-40). He gradually advanced and by crossing on his way the famous river Mahânadî he came to the sacred place Purusottama and thence to Śimhâcâla (41). Afterwards he came to the bank of the river Godâvari, crossed it and after seeing the river Malâpahâ on his way, arrived at the bank of the river Krâṣṇâ-Veṇî (42-44). He then came to Śriparvata (45). After passing that Parvata he crossed the river Pinâkini and arrived at Veṇaṅkṣa-câla, the abode of Nârâyana. After alighting from the highest peak of Veṇaṅkṣa-giri, he advanced towards the river Suvârânaṅkâhi (48).

This survey of the position of Veṇaṅkṣa-câla from the north exactly coincides with the position of the same as surveyed from the south by the route of pilgrimage of Raṅgadâsa. Arjuna, it seems, started from Indraprastha i.e., modern Delhi and came to Gaṅgâdvâra i.e., Mâyâpuri,
which included Hardwar (Mbh., Vana, 84). The Kur-P. also says (ii, 42) that Gaṅgādvāra and Haridvāra are identical. The Vāmana (4&34) and Liṅga Purāṇas also seem to testify to this (e.g. i, 100). So from Haridvāra, Arjuna pursued a course along the banks of the Ganges and came to Prayāg i.e., Allahabad and then came to Kāśikā i.e., Benares. From Kāśikā it is said that he arrived at a place close to Dakṣiṇasāgara, i.e. the the Bay of Bengal.¹ Travelling southwards from that corner of India Arjuna crossed the river Mahānadi and came to Puruṣottama Kṣetra i.e. Puri.² From Puri he came to Sinhācala, a place (hill) which still now bears that ancient name.³ To come to Venūkaṭācāla from Sinhācala, he had to cross the river Godāvari. Then it is said that he crossed one river Malāpahā and then the river Krṣṇā-Veṇī. Krṣṇā-Veṇī, must be the river Krṣṇā itself, which flows by the south of Godāvari, and as such it must have intervened Arjuna’s way. It appears therefore that the river Malāpahā lay between Godāvari and Krṣṇā. It is probable that the river Muner which meets Krṣṇā at Kondapalli is the same as Malāpahā. It should be noticed that from Bezwada to the Sea, Krṣṇā becomes wider and wider, and so perhaps Arjuna had to abandon the coastal route and go further up the river Krṣṇā to cross it which he could not do without crossing the river Muner which lies between Godāvari and Krṣṇā. After crossing the river Muner or Malāpahā, he crossed the river Krṣṇā- Veṇī i.e. Krṣṇā, and then came to Śrīparvata and subsequently to the river Pinākinī. The river Pinākinī is the river Penner on the south of which Nellore is situated. Śrīparvata therefore might be a mountain on the north of Penner and south of Krṣṇā. On the immediate south side of the river Krṣṇā there is a Śāila called Śrī Śāila in the Kārnāl Country in the Balaghāt ceded districts (De, Dict., p. 193). This Śrīśāila is also called Śrīparvata and Parwattam. Caitanya visited that hill (Ca-Ca, ii. 9). It was perhaps a sacred place and it is but natural that Arjuna would visit that hill, and more so because the parvata lay almost on his way to Venūkaṭācāla from the river Krṣṇā. Thus he passed through the Śrīparvata and then crossed the river Pinākinī or Penner. After

¹ Dakṣina Prayāga means the Trivenī on the north of Hugli in Bengal (Br-Dharma-P, i, 6; A.S.B., vol. VI, 1910, p. 613).
² For a detailed topographical description of Puri, see Indian Historical Quarterly, Dec. 1929, p. 659.
³ A railway station of the B. N. Ry, some five miles to the north of Waltair, also bears this name.
that he arrived at Venkatacalca which as shown above was on the south of the river Pinäkinī. It thus clearly follows that the topographical records contained in the description of Arjuna's pilgrimage evince a fairly good geographical knowledge of the compilers of the Skandapurāṇa.

We have further evidences regarding the corroboration of the present position of Venkatacalca. In chapter 79 of the tenth canto of the Bhāgavata-purāṇa, is described a journey of Baladeva. It is said that Baladeva first arrived on the bank of the river Kauśikī and then went to that Sarovara wherefrom the river Sarayu has sprung. He then travelled along the banks of Sarayu and subsequently arrived at Prayāg. There he visited the Pulahā Āśrama. From that place he continued his journey, bathing on his way in the rivers Gomatti, Gandakī, Vipāśa and Śoṇa, till he arrived at Gayā where he performed Pitr worship. From Gayā he came to Gaṅgā Sāgara Saṅgama, whence he travelled southward and reached the Mahendra Parvata. From Mahendra Parvata he respectively passed through the rivers Saptaparva, Veṇā, Pampa and Bhimarathī and then arrived at Śrīśaila. Travelling south from Śrīśaila he arrived at Venkatagiri.

The river Kauśikī is perhaps the river Kuśi or Kauśaki mentioned in the Rāmāyaṇa (Ādi, 34) and also in Var. P. (140). All the Purāṇas agree that the river has taken its rise from the Himalayas and so probably had a course through the United Provinces. It can be supposed therefore that the river Kauśikī of Baladeva was the river Kośi, which now flows through the Rāmpur state of the United Provinces. So from the Kośi river of Rāmpur, Baladeva started and arrived at the Sarovara, wherefrom the river Sarayu originates. The river rises in the mountain of Kumaun, but the traditional belief is that the river issues from the Mānasā Sarovara (Mbh., Anuśā., 155). So it seems that Baladeva went straight north from the river Kośi and arrived at the Mānasā Sarovara. From that lake he followed a course along the bank of Sarayu or Gogrā as it is called nowadays, and then came to Prayāg i.e., modern Allahabad. It is said that there he visited Pulahāśrama. The Var. P. says (143) that Pulahāśrama and Śalagrāma are one and the same place. According to Pad. P. (Pātāla, kh. 78) and Bhāg. P. (v. 7) Śalagrāma is placed near the source of the river Gandak where rṣi Pulaha performed asceticism. It is not reasonable to think that Baladeva travelled northwards as far as the slopes of the Himalayas from Prayāg and
then again descended southwards to bathe in the river Gomati which was his next halting station from the Pulahāśrama. The inclusion of Pulahāśrama in the list is therefore a textual corruption which should be eliminated. So it stands that from Allahabad, Baladeva marched along the northern bank of the river Ganges, and then reached probably Bhitri where the river Gomati joins the Ganges, and crossed it after bathing there. From that place he continued his march for Gaṇḍakī, Gaṇḍakī is the present river Gaṇḍak which joins the Ganges flowing from the north, at Sonepur in the district of Muzaffarpur in Bihar. And so when it is said that Baladeva bathed in that river, it follows that after crossing the river Gomati near Bhitri he journeyed through Ballia and Saran and then came to Sonepur, which seems to be the shortest way from Gomati to Gaṇḍak. Probably, at Sonepur, Baladeva bathed in the river Gaṇḍak. It is said that he also bathed at Vipāśā. Vipāśā or the Beas or the Hyphasis of the Greeks is in the Punjab. This inclusion of Vipāśā in the list is therefore essentially a textual corruption like the Pulahāśrama which is placed near Allahabad. So if we omit Vipāśā from the list it stands that Baladeva after bathing in the river Gaṇḍak, bathed at Śoṇa, which was regarded as a sacred river and then marched straight east to Gayā. From Gayā he went to Gaṅgā Sāgara Saṅgama, which probably meant a place somewhere near the confluence of the Ganges with the sea, like Arjuna’s Daksīna Saṅgara. So from Gayā, Baladeva probably marched southwest and arrived somewhere near the mouth of the Ganges in the Bay of Bengal and then followed a coastal route and reached the Mahendra Parvata. Mahendra Parvata was used by the ancient Indians as a sort of generic term denoting the whole range of hills extending from Orissa to the district of Madura. It probably meant the hill of Kaliṅga (see Rāghuvaṃsa, vi, 54) and the Uttara-Naiṣadha-carita (canto XII, 24) also supports it. However, Baladeva arrived at Kaliṅga and then came to Sapta Godāvari. It was a place of pilgrimage and is mentioned often in the Purāṇas (‘ad., Svarga, 19). According to the Rājatarāṅgiṇī, (bk. viii, s. 34449, Dr. Stein’s trans., vol. ii, p. 271) it meant the modern Dowlaishwerani 6 miles to the south of Rajahmundry. We have seen Baladeva following a coastal route and so it is but natural that he would come to the mouth of Godāvari, and cross it at Sapta Godāvari or Dowlaishwerani as it was considered a sacred place. After crossing the river Godāvari, it would have been the easiest route for Baladeva to cross
the river Kṛṣṇā and come directly to Śrīśaila which was to the immediate south of the river. But we have seen that Arjuna, after crossing the river Godāvari, avoided a strictly coastal route and so was entangled in the crossing of the river Malāpahā or the river Mener, before he could cross the river Kṛṣṇā. Baladeva also avoided a coastal route after crossing the river Godāvari and came across the rivers Veṇā, Pampā, Bhīmarathi before he could reach Śrīśaila. It appears therefore that Baladeva was entangled in a South-western route instead of following a strictly southern route. There are many Veṇās, one is Veṇī, a branch of the Kṛṣṇā itself (Padma, Uttara, 74) which rises in the Western Ghats. But it is impossible to think that Baladeva went as far as the Western Ghats to cross it in view of the fact that there are other Veṇās which lay near him.

There is another river called Veṇā or Veṇvā or Veṇī-gauṇā which is identified with the river Wain-Gauṅā of Central Provinces, being a tributary of the river Godavari (Mbh., Vana, 85; Padma, Ādi, 3). It rises from the Vindhyāpada range. But we have seen that Baladeva arrived at the mouth of the Godāvari and probably crossed it. So no longer perhaps it was possible for him to retrace his steps north-west up to the northern border of the Hyderabad State to meet the river Wain-Gauṅā. Veṇā of Baladeva was therefore the Kṛṣṇā itself. Pampā has still retained that ancient name being a tributary of the river Tuṅgabhadrā. It flows by the side of Kampli in the district of Bellary (Bom. Gaz., vol. I, pt. II, p. 369). The river Bhīmarathi is the river Bhīmā of the Hyderabad State which joins Kṛṣṇā near about the Kistna railway station of the G. I. P. Ry. But it appears that the rivers are not placed in proper setting so far as their geographical position is concerned. For once Baladeva crosses the Veṇā, i.e., Kṛṣṇā and Pampā, than he comes to the Bellary district and then again reverts northwards as far as Kistnā to cross Bhīmā in the Hyderabad State, seems improbable specially in view of the fact that after crossing the river Pampā his aim was to go to Śrīśaila. The rivers might therefore be placed in this order, Bhīmarathi, Veṇā and Pampā. So it appears very certain that after crossing the river Godāvari, Baladeva instead of following a strictly southern route journeyed westward through the Hyderabad State and arrived at the confluence of the rivers Bhīmā and Kṛṣṇā or Veṇā. Then he continued his march in a south-western direction through the Madras Presidency, by crossing the river Tuṅgabhadrā, which of course is not mentioned, and perhaps by the western side of the
Anagundi hills. This took him to the Bellary district, and he was thus face to face with the river Pampā in order to go to Śrīśaila. Naturally, therefore, Baladeva crossed the river Pampā and probably took a direct eastern course which took him to Śrīśaila standing, as we have pointed out, on the south of the river Kṛṣṇā. Thus we see that Baladeva was entangled in a very round about course, only because he abandoned the coastal route. It is said that from Śrīśaila he arrived at Veṅkaṭagiri and so from Śrīśaila Baladeva took a direct southern route and arrived at the first (northern) range of the Tirumalagiri which is called Veṅkaṭagiri. It thus clearly follows that the topographical records contained in this description of the journey of Baladeva, with the exception of some few textual corruptions, and the literary evidences adduced in this paper to locate Veṅkaṭācala from Hardwar on the one hand and Pāṇḍya on the other evince the fairly good geographical knowledge of the Hindus regarding the upper and middle portion of India.

SASHI BHUDAN CHAUDHURI

Dvaidhībhāva in the Kauṭiliya

When a king takes to dvaidhībhāva, he enters into sandhi with one hostile power, and proceeds to meet another. The sandhi may be a hīna-sandhi, i.e., by which the hostilities are ended; it may also be an alliance which takes place before any war is waged between the king and the enemy. The hīna-sandhi is humiliating to the weaker party proposing the peace. But if the king be powerful and be attacked by two enemies simultaneously, he can defeat one of them causing him to enter into a humiliating hīna-sandhi, and turn his energies against the other enemy. The mere cessation of hostilities on one side, be it through hīna-sandhi or an alliance, is a source of of relief and the removal of a handicap in his operations against the other hostile power. The alliance however may be of such a form that the enemy is won over not merely to stop his hostile activities but to render positive help by giving him army and bearing losses of various descriptions. All this assistance may be rendered in exchange for a material gain present or future. The ways in which this alliance may take place and the means by which one party may take advantage
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over the other party, and such other topics, will now be dealt with. The sambhūyayāna mentioned by K. has resemblance to an aspect of dvaidhibhāva. In the former, a sandhi precedes the joining of the combination by a king invited to do so on terms settled by him and the convener of the combination. In the latter also, sandhi takes place between the king and the dvitiyā prakṛti (the second rājaprakṛti i.e., a king in the zone next to the kingdom of the king who makes the sandhi); this sovereign in the first zone is, according to the Kauṭūliya, a ‘natural enemy’ of the former, and hence one of the features distinguishing dvaidhibhāva from sambhūyayāna is the presence of at least two hostile kings attacking a third king, while in sambhūyayāna, there may be only one enemy, and the king making the combination enters into an alliance with another king who need not necessarily be an enemy. In sambhūyayāna again, active help of the party to the sandhi is in the forefront, while in dvaidhibhāva, the cessation of hostility between a king and one of his enemies is most wanted, no matter whether or not the latter actively co-operates with him in facing the onrush of the other enemy.

Some of the advantages, one or more of which can be had by a sovereign, who wants to have recourse to dvaidhibhava, from a sandhi with a neighbouring king as mentioned already, are: The king entering into the sandhi will be prevented thereby from attacking the sovereign’s kingdom from the rear; will resist an invader from the rear; will not join the other enemy of the sovereign; the strength of the sovereign will be doubled by the sandhi; the transport of supplies and the receipt of help will be facilitated, while those of the enemy will be obstructed; the party to the sandhi will overcome the various obstacles on the way; will guard, with his own army, the army of the sovereign while marching from one fort to another or through forests; will facilitate the conclusion of a treaty of peace with the enemy in case anything unexpected and detrimental to the interest of the sovereign comes to pass; or will, at the conclusion of the operations when he has received his share in the gain, or his remuneration for the labours undergone by him, speak well of the sovereign and thereby enlist in his favour the confidence of other neighbouring kings.9

1 For the definition, see K., XV. ch. 1, p. 430.
2 K., VII. ch. 7. I have here followed the text of the Kauṭūliya as settled in the Trivandrum edition. The explanations of Mm. T.
If, however, the sovereign, wanting to have dvaidhībhāva, has any reason for suspecting that a sandhi, by which an army can be had for money, or money in exchange for an army, will work better with a king than his personal co-operation, he should have recourse to same.

In this connexion, the Kauṭiliya speaks of sama-sandhi, viṣama-sandhi and ati-sandhi. When a king superior in power (jyāyas) gets a consideration that is deserved by one who is equal to or inferior in power to the sovereign taking to dvaidhībhāva, it is called viṣama-sandhi. It is also viṣama-sandhi when a king equal in power to the aforesaid sovereign gets the share deserved by a superior or an inferior power, as also when an inferior power happens to receive a remuneration or a share in the gain proper for a king of equal or superior strength. The sandhi is called sama when the remuneration or the share in the gain allotted to a party to the sandhi is commensurate with his status as a power. When a party to the sandhi gets an advantage in his remuneration or share in the gain, not noticed by the other party to the alliance, it is called ati-sandhi.

A king of inferior strength intending to adopt dvaidhībhāva can offer different shares in the gains or different remunerations to the parties to the alliance according to their status, and also according to the circumstances in which each of them may happen to be at the moment. He can, for instance, offer a sovereign of superior power a consideration deserved only by one of equal power for entering into the sandhi, if the sovereign of superior power be in calamities, too much addicated to hunting, drinking, etc. jeopardising his health and life, and has acquired such wealth as has created enemies and for these reasons weaker than what he should be normally.

If, on the other hand, the king of inferior strength finds that he is almost sure to have the expected gain, and that for recuperating his lost power and increasing his influence or for protecting the rear of his kingdom, a sandhi with a king of superior strength is needed with the offer of a viṣiṣṭa (special) consideration i.e., more than sama (commensurate with the power of the party invited into the alliance), he should do so.

Ganapati Sastri have thrown much light on the intricacies involved in the inter-state relations contemplated in the text,
The king of inferior strength should offer a king of superior power, for entering into a sandhi, a consideration less than what is commensurate with the latter's power if it be found, on the one hand, that he is in calamities and his subjects have grown disaffected and disloyal, while, on the other, the king himself is well-circumstanced so far as fortresses and friendly kings are concerned, will have to march only a short distance to fight the enemy, and is sure to have complete victory over him.

In the sets of circumstances described above, the party to the sandhi to whom terms are offered being an amitra, he can accept them if he thinks them advantageous, or reject them carrying on the hostility (vikrameta) if he thinks otherwise, and at the same time, be powerful enough to do so.

A king taking to dvaidhibhāva should offer a remuneration or share in the gain proportionate to the power of a king of equal status, when he finds that the latter is able to cope with the army of the enemy or that of the ally of the enemy, or with the enemy's troops recruited from among wild tribes, and is well acquainted with the topography of the region which is difficult to negotiate, and through which the army will have to pass or upon which the fight is likely to take place, or can guard the rear of his kingdom during his absence.

When a king finds that in adopting dvaidhibhāva, he has to enter into a sandhi with another king of equal power, who is in calamities and whose subjects have grown disaffected, then he can offer a remuneration or a share in the gain less than what would have been otherwise commensurate with his status.

If, however, the king having recourse to dvaidhibhāva be himself in calamities and with subjects grown disloyal but has to increase his military strength to avert the present danger, which cannot be accomplished without the help of an ally, then he should offer a special remuneration or a share in the gain to a king of a status equal to his to utilize his co-operation.

In the three cases mentioned above, the offers of the king should be accepted by the other parties who are of course amitras, if he be found to be well-meaning; otherwise, the hostile actions may be continued (vikrameta) if strength permits.
An offer of a special gain may be made by a superior king adopting dvaidhbīhāva to an inferior king to attract him into a sandhi with him with the ostensible object of facing the former's enemy. There may be a sinister motive on the part of the king of superior strength to bring to book the inimical king of inferior power by crushing him after defeating his enemy or by realizing from him what he has given away as consideration after the victory over the enemy is achieved. The Kauṭiliya cautions the king of inferior rank against such a contingency, and asks him to continue his hostile operations (vikrameta) as an amitra if he finds himself strong enough to do him harm and at the same time feels that the sinister motive is at the back of the offer made to him. Otherwise he may accept the terms. Other alternatives open to him in the former case are either to join the powerful king's enemy against whom the preparations are being made or to send to the powerful king in return for the consideration only the portion of the army that is recalcitrant or is composed of men captured or obtained from an enemy and therefore unsubmissive.

A king of superior power taking to dvaidhbīhāva can offer to a king of inferior strength a remuneration or a share in the gain commensurate with the latter's status as a power, if the former be in calamities and his subjects be recalcitrant.

If a king of superior power adopting dvaidhbīhāva finds that the king of inferior strength whom he wants to enter into a sandhi with him is in calamities and has to deal with recalcitrant subjects, he can offer the latter a remuneration less than what his rank deserves.

The kings in the last two cases, amitras as they are, were advised to continue their hostile operations (vikrameta), if they find themselves strong enough to do so. Otherwise, the offers are to be accepted.

There may be occasions when it is advisable for a well-meaning and peace-loving superior king to accept a share in the gain (offered by a hīna king) less than his position demands. Such occasions are: (1) When the superior king, whose subjects are not disloyal and who is not addicted to drinking, etc., wishes to involve his enemy (who also happens to be the enemy of the hīna offerer), engaged in ill-commenced works, in further losses of men and money, (2) when he wishes to send away the recalcitrant portion of his army, (3) when he wishes to bring to his side the recalcitrant portion of the army of his
enemy, (4) when he wishes to cause trouble to his *pidaniya* (oppressible) and *ucchedaniya* (exterminable) enemy with the help of the *hina* offerer.

There may also be occasions when irrespective of the relative positions of the king taking to dvaidhibhāva and the king to whom offer is made by the former to enter into a sandhi with him, the latter may demand a very large remuneration or share in the gain for the help rendered. One or more of the reasons that actuate the latter to demand a very large consideration or to enter into the alliance are: (1) the offerer is in calamities with his subjects grown disloyal, and therefore this is the opportunity for ruining him, (2) the well-commenced works of the offerer sure to be crowned with success can be destroyed, (3) the latter can be attacked within his kingdom or during march towards the enemy, when the king accepting the offer comes near unsuspected, and (4) there is the chance of having a large gain from the offerer’s enemy (*yātavya*) to be attacked immediately. The offering party is also advised to accede to the aforesaid demand to have a very large consideration for the military help in view of (1) the protection of his army from annihilation, (2) the prospect of destroying the impregnable fortress of the enemy, and crushing the forces sent to the enemy by his ally for his assistance as also the enemy’s forces composed of wild tribes, (3) the chance of the loss and expenditure that will have to be borne by the party to the sandhi on account of the long distance to be traversed and the long time that will be required for the various purposes, (4) the acquisition of the help of the *yātavya* (the enemy against whom he is now about to march) after he is subdued, enabling the offering king to bring to book the party who is demanding such a large consideration for rendering him assistance, and (5) the prospect of capturing the troops of the enemy with the help of the party to the sandhi.¹

¹ For the passages relating to the sandhi in dvaidhibhāva followed by vikrama, see *K.*, VII, ch. 7. Here vikrama is not the component of dvaidhibhāva called vigraha; it is the vikrama (i.e., prakāśa-yuddha, kūṭa-yuddha, or tuṣṇīnyuddha) of the party invited to help the king taking to dvaidhibhāva. It should be borne in mind that the party so invited is an amitra who carries on the hostility if he does not accept the terms of an alliance. (See also *K.*, VII, ch. 6, pp. 280, 283).
Bodhisattva Prātimokṣa Sūtra

Prātimokṣa-sūtra of the Hinayānists

The Prātimokṣa-sūtra forms the keystone of the disciplinary literature of the Buddhists. It is fortunate that not only the Pātimokkhasutta of the Theravādins in Pali but also the Prātimokṣa-sūtra of the Sarvāstivādins in Sanskrit are available for study. The latter has been discovered by the Pelliot mission in the ruins of Doudour-āquor at Koutcha, and edited and published by Monsieur É. Huber in the Journal Asiatique (1913) along with a French translation of Kumārajiva's Chinese version of the work. This has been supplemented by Prof. La Vallée Poussin and Herr E. Waldschmidt. Prof. Poussin has published a fragment of the Prātimokṣa manuscript and the Sanskrit "Kāmavācā" belonging to the Stein Collection, as also a fragment of the Sanskrit Bhikṣuṇī Karmavacana (Oxford Sanskrit Ms. 1442) in collaboration with Miss C.M. Ridding, while Mr. Waldschmidt has brought out with ample philological and comparative notes the Bhikṣuṇi-Prātimokṣa and Bhikṣuṇī-Vibhaṅga of the Sarvāstivādins from the fragmentary manuscripts discovered and collected by the Prussian Turfan-expedition. The manuscripts of the Bhikṣuṇi-Prātimokṣa were found in Qyzil and Sangim, while those of the Bhikṣuṇi-Vibhaṅga were traced in the collection of paper manuscripts at Murtoq. The Chinese and Tibetan sources have also furnished us with ample materials for an exhaustive study of the Prātimokṣa-sūtra, and therefore, of the Vinaya of the various Hinayānic schools. Waldschmidt has fully utilised the Chinese and Tibetan versions of the Bhikṣuṇi-Prātimokṣa and Bhikṣuṇi-Vibhaṅga in his work mentioned above. The editions of the Prātimokṣa-sūtras have greatly advanced our knowledge inasmuch as they have thrown light on the question of the probable form and language of the original Prātimokṣa-sūtra of the 4th or 3rd century B.C., and have thus served to suggest a solution of the knotty problem as to the language of the original Tripiṭaka.  

1 JRAS., 1913, p. 843 ff: Nouveaux fragments de la collection Stein.

Prätimokṣa-sūtra of the Mahāyānists

Though our knowledge of the Hinayānic Prätimokṣa-sūtras has made a fair progress, we are yet in the dark about the Prätimokṣa-sūtra of the Mahāyānists. It is only through the citations made by Śāntideva in his Śikṣāsamuccaya and Bodhicaryāvatāra that we are aware of the existence of a Bodhisattva-Prätimokṣa-sūtra. Very likely it is this Sūtra that corresponds to the Chinese Sūtra no. 1500 (Pu-sa-chieh-pen) of the Taishō edition of the Chinese Tripitaka (vol. xxiv) which treats of Pārājikā and such other offences falling within the scope of a Prätimokṣa-sūtra. The only other Mahāyānic book that can be treated as a Prätimokṣa-sūtra is the Chinese Brahma-jāla Sūtra, of which we have a French translation (Le code du Mahāyāna en Chine) by De Groot.¹

At the Library of the Cambridge University, there is a manuscript entitled Bodhisattva Prätimokṣa Sūtra in the collection made by Bendall from Nepal. Through the courtesy of Dr. E. J. Thomas I have been able to take a photograph of the manuscript. It contains only ten leaves with six lines in each page. The size of the leaves is 10 inches by 2 inches. The right-hand end of almost every leaf is so much damaged that the last word of almost each line is either lost or illegible. In the appended edition I have supplied the words as far as possible in the light of their Chinese translations where available as also of their context, and the manner of wording usual in the Buddhist Sanskrit texts.

In line 1 of the last leaf (obverse side) of the ms., we find "Iti Bodhisattva-Prätimokṣa," (see the attached plate) showing that the writer wanted to call the work a Bodhisattva Prätimokṣa Sūtra. Whatever may be the writer's intention, it is evident from the contents that the present manuscript has very little to do with the Bodhisattva Prätimokṣa Sūtra cited in the works of Śāntideva.

The Present Manuscript

This manuscript is divided into two parts, of which the first is intended to serve as a manual for the initiation of devotees, lay or recluse, into the Mahāyānic rules of discipline, and the second is a dissertation on the āpattis (offences) and anāpattis (non-offences) of a

¹ For further particulars, see my Aspects of Mahāyāna Buddhism etc., pp. 293-5.
Bodhisattva. The whole manuscript is really a compilation of extracts from different works, two of which evidently are the Bodhisattvabhūmi and the Upāliparipṛcchāsūtra. The citations from the Bodhisattvabhūmi appear in the first part and have been marked in the appended text. The Upāliparipṛcchāsūtra commences from leaf 5 (reverse side—see the attached plate). Judging by the contents, the first part should be called a Karmavākyā, corresponding to the Kammavācam of the Burmese and Ceylonese Buddhists, and not a Prātimokṣa Śūtra, the second part being a supplement to it. The first part corresponds roughly to the first chapter (Ordination service) of the Kammavācam, detailing the formalities through which a candidate is to pass to undertake the discipline of a Bodhisattva. In the Bodhicaryāvatāra we have an account of the ceremony of initiation of a Bodhisattva but it is written not in the characteristic form and style of a manual of initiation—the form and style in which the present ms. is written. It is in this manuscript that we for the first time come across the formal requests and announcements necessary for the initiation of a devotee into the Mahāyānic rules of discipline, and I think, this is the earliest book of its kind so far discovered.

Probable age of the Ms.

The ms. is written, as will be seen from the attached plates, in Raṃā character, a very old script prevalent in Nepal about the 11th or 12th century A.D. Prof. Bendall has rendered easy our task of fixing the dates of Nepalese manuscripts by furnishing us with the tables of letters and numerals from dated mss. of various times from the 9th to the 18th century A.D.1 If the present manuscript be placed by the side of this table, it will be apparent that its letters and numerals are similar to those of the Cambridge University Library Mss. Nos. Add. 1693 and 1686, both of which have been dated by Bendall to be 1165 A.D. Of the letters, the following may be particularly mentioned as bearing the closest resemblance to those of Ms. No. 1686:—e, ja, tha, dha, sa, sa and sa. Of the numerals, 2, 3, 4, 8 and 9 are exactly similar to those of Ms. No. Add. 1693, and 5 and 6 to those of Ms. No. Add. 1644. The date of the former ms., according to Bendall, is 1165 A.D. and that of the latter is 1139 A.D. Hence, we shall not be wide of the mark if we put the date of the present manuscript as

1 Bendall, Catalogue of the Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts. I,11, Q., June, 1931
the 12th century A.D. and its composition, say, about a century or two earlier, i.e., about the 10th or 11th century A.D.

The Ceremony of Initiation in Some of the Late Works

The ceremony of initiation is described incidentally not only in the Bodhicaryāvatāra but also in two other late works, viz., the Advayavajrasaṅgraha and the Kriyāsaṅgrahapañjikā.

In the Kudrśīninghātana, a section of the Advayavajrasaṅgraha recently edited by Mm. H. P. Śāstrī, there is a reference to the ceremony of Posaṭha (Uposatha) performed by a lay-devotee. It is exactly similar to the practice still current among the Hinayāna Buddhists in Chittagong, Burma and Ceylon. On some Uposatha days, a lay-devotee, after taking Trikaraṇa, takes the vow of observing eight of the ten śīlas for one day or more.1 Usually a lay-devotee of the Hinayāna school is required to observe only five śīlas. The Advayavajrasaṅgraha2 also prescribes the same3 for Gṛhapati Bodhisattvas. To this it, however, adds the mantric rituals which included among other things not only a reference to the practice of Maitrī (Love), Karuṇā (Compassion), Muditā (Joy), and Upekṣā (Indifference), but also to Pāpadeśānā, Anumodanā and Bodhicitta.4 It is this additional ritual that gives a Mahāyānic or Mahāyāna-Tantric garb to the Hinayānic ceremony.

In the Kriyāsaṅgrahapañjikā (A. S. B. ms.) there are not only directions for the selection of building sites for monasteries, etc. but also an account of the duties of the Ācārya and the Upādhyāya towards their disciple and vice versa, and of the formalities for receiving a candidate into the clerical order. Mm. H. P. Śāstrī has facilitated our work by reproducing in full in his Catalogue of Buddhist Manuscripts (pp. 123-6) the passage containing the rules of ordination. The passage may be summarised as follows:—

Pravrajyā and Upasampadā ordinations are to be given by an Ācārya and an Upādhyāya. The bhikṣus did not know how to confer

---

1 Advayavajrasaṅgraha, p. 4.
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid.—गुरुत्वालोचितत्वस्य रक्षायेदारस्तः प्राध्यापिसात्त ब्रह्मचारिनां ज्ञातिसम्बलास्तः सुषणावान्तः प्रहलिसाधवास्तः व पञ्चमः विलः।
4 Ibid.
an ordination, so they enquired of Buddha, who gave the following directions:—

(i) The candidate should be first questioned as to whether he had any of the disqualifications debarring him from reception into the Buddhist Order.

(ii) If he is found fit, he is to be imparted the Upāsakasamāvaras (disciplines meant for lay-devotees), viz., Tīrharāṇagamana and five Śīkkāpadas.

(iii) He is then to choose his Acārya and Upādhyāya.

(iv) Next he is shaved (leaving a tuft of hair) and asked whether he is still resolute to retire from household life.

(v) He is then given a new name after the school (nikāya) to which he belongs and made to take again the Tīrharāṇas in his new name.

(vi) He is now to take the vow of observing the ten Śīkkāpadas.

(vii) He then takes the robe, bowl and the student's waterpot by uttering suitable mantras. And

(viii) Lastly he promises to observe the Upasathas and attain the five groups of acquirements, viz., śīla, samādhi, prajñā, vimukti, and vimuktijñānamārjana.1

Mr. H. P. Sāstri is of opinion that this was the form of ordination followed by the Mahāyānists,2 his supposition being based on the fact that the manuscript belongs to one of the last developed schools of Mahāyāna. The ceremony summarised above is, in fact, Hinayānic without any indication which would give it a Mahāyānic tinge except that a Mahāyānic school has adopted it as its own. The absence of mention of 'Sarvabuddhas' and 'Bodhisattvas', not to speak of the high sounding promises and aspirations of a Bodhisattva, leads us to the belief that the work may have belonged to the later Mahāyānic period, but the rules of initiation given in it are taken in toto from some Hinayānic book of rituals, probably a Sanskrit Karmavākyā.3

1 For the meaning of these terms, see Visuddhimagga, p. 234; Milinda, p. 98; Mādhyamikavṛtti, p. 433.
2 H. P. Sāstri, op. cit., p. 126.
3 Cf. Bhikṣu-nikāmakavacana, a fragment of which has been published by Miss M. Ridding and L. de la Vallée Poussin, for the Pali Kammavācam, see J.R.A.S., vol. VII (Ns.), pp. 1f.
In the manuscript of the *Kriyāsaṅgraha* (leaf 36b = *Paññikāsaṅgraha*, leaf 198b) preserved in the Bibliotheque Nationale, there is a passage containing a description of *Samvaragrayaṇa* written in the same style as that in the present manuscript. It runs as follows:

एवं विनाशितकारपूषामिः सर्वतथागतानि संपूर्ण आत्मानं निरालम्यते। आत्मानं सर्वबुद्धिभिधितस्यानि निर्माण्यात्माम्। सर्वं सर्वका द्रात्यि भविष्यन्ति मा महाकारणिका नाथा महासमयसिद्धिः श्रेोम्येत्।

तः कुशलमूर्ति सर्वसंसारसाहित्य कर्मणयम्। अनेन कुशलमूर्ति सर्वसंसारः सर्व-लोककर्मक्षोतिकारविपरिवर्तितिविगता भवति। सर्वलोकस्वरूपसम्पत्तिसमस्मितिनात्र सहनं सौत्रेण सौश्रुष्णेन शुद्धता भगवती भवति नरोत्तमः।

अनेन च चाहै कुशले�ण कर्मणा भवेयं गुड्डो, न च विशेष ठोके दश्यं धर्मि सजानो हिताय, न चौहेग सत्साचा बहुदृढ़पीड़ितान्। भित्तात्तुर्वायं सत्सात्रत्वोऽयों परिषाखेत्॥ इति बोधिनिषिद्धम्। ुद्दार्याियम् परमेण बोधिनिषिद्धात्तमम्॥ इति संवरद्रहणम्॥

(Translation: After worshipping all Tathāgatas in twenty different ways, one should offer himself up, saying “I dedicate myself to all Buddhas and Bodhisattvas. Accept me always and for all times, O Merciful Lords, and give me the Mahāsamaya-siddhi (lit. perfection in the great doctrine).*

He should wish that the merits thus acquired be shared by all beings, and thereby may all beings be free from their calamities, worldly or transcendental, and be possessed of prosperity, worldly or transcendental, and may they, easily and happily, become Buddhas, the Blessed Ones, the best of men.

By this good action may I become a Buddha, and soon preach the doctrine for the benefit of the world, and rescue beings from their many sufferings. Thus he should always direct his merits to the incomparable highest knowledge. This is called the ‘Development of Bodhicitta’. This is acquiring ‘Bodhisattva-discipline’.

This passage is preceded by a formulaic ending with the remark इति पापेरणा and is followed by a description of the ceremony with the ending इति चारणिविवेचः:

1 It is a part of the *Paññikāsaṅgraha*, commencing at leaf 163.
2 There is a Tibetan text called *Mahāsamayasastra*, for details of which see Wassiliew, *Der Buddhismus*, p. 176.
In this description, the rituals for Sanvarga-grahaṇa occur in the following order:—

(1) Pañcadesana,
(2) Pūjana and Vandana,
(3) Pariṇāmanā,
(4) Bodhicitta-totpāda and
(5) Ācārya-bhiṣeka.

In the Bodhicaryāvatāra also, Śāntideva treats of the formalities to be undergone by a Bodhisattva for initiation. As they have been dealt with at length in my book, Aspects of Mahāyāna Buddhism (pp. 302-5), I shall mention here only the rites composing the ceremony:

(1) Vandana and Pūjana (worshipping Buddhas and Caityas);
(2) Śaraṇagamana (taking refuge in Buddha, Dharma and Saṅgha),
(3) Anumodanā or Puṇyānumodanā (expressions of sincere approval of others' good deeds),
(4) Adhyena or Vācanā (entreating Buddha to be the guide of all beings ignorant as they are),
(5) Pariṇāmanā (offering up one's merits to all beings for the sake of bodhi)¹ and then
(6) Bodhicittotpāda (development of Bodhicitta),

First Part of the Ms,

The contents of the first part, in short, are as follows:—An adept approaches a qualified Bodhisattva, and entreats him in set words for initiation into the disciplinary rules of a Bodhisattva. Then he confesses his sins (pratideśanā) formally and takes refuge in the Triratna by uttering the Triśaraṇa formulae. He now develops Bodhicitta, and transfers (pariṇāmanā) the merits so far acquired by the above rites to all beings of the world and takes the vow of looking upon all beings as his very near kith and kin. He then formally chooses (ācārya-bhiṣeka) his Ācārya who presents him to all the Buddhas and the Bodhisattvas and announces before them that so and so has been ordained by him called so and so.

¹ Cf. Śūtrālaṅkāra, p. 147: तिपासास्बोचे सब धर्माप्रकृतियमामि वाता भक्ति
मे जान तंबोषायति प्रतिसिद्धानुमोदनायेवहा विषय
It adds that if an adept cannot find a qualified Bodhisattva to give him the initiation, he should present himself before the image—of a Tathāgata and declare his intention. He should then proceed with the ceremonies described above.

From this account it is apparent that the present manuscript served only as a manual of ordination, containing as it does, the formulæ for the rites mentioned in the Mahāyāna works noticed before. The rites mentioned above are arranged thus:

1. Yācanā (entreating a Bodhisattva for initiation),
2. Pāpadeśanā,
3. Śaraṇagamanan,
4. Pariṃpanan,
5. Bodhicittotpāda,
6. Ācāryābhīṣeka, and

The Second Part of the Ms.

The second part, as stated above, is made up of extracts from the Upāliparipṛcchāsūtra, from which citations are found in the Mūdhyamikavṛttī, Śikṣāsamuccaya and Bodhicaryāvatāra.

In leaf 5b, line 5, it is stated that Upāli had some doubts in his mind regarding the Vinaya of the Mahāyānists and wanted to have them removed by the Teacher. His request to Buddha “vyākarotu tathāgato vinayaviniscayam” leads us to identify the work with the Chinese translation Yin-p'o-li-kwui or Fo-shuo-ch'i-tsin-phi-ni-kin restored by Nanjio as Vinayaviniscaya Upāli Paripṛcchā [Nanjio, nos. 23 (24) & 36].¹ These two Chinese translations correspond to the Sūtra no. 325 [no. 310 (24)] of the Taishō edition of the Chinese Tripitaka, vol. XII, pp. 37-42—Fo-shui-chūeh-ting-phi-ni-kīng. On a comparison of the Sanskrit text as given in the present manuscript with the Chinese translation (Taishō ed., XII, no. 325), we notice that it corresponds to the Chinese translation not from the beginning but from page 39, sec. iii, line 15 up to page 40, sec. iii, line 16, including the inquiry of Mañjuśrīkumārabhūta. This comparison reveals that the present ms. gives only extracts from the Upāliparipṛcchāsūtra and not the

¹ Cf. Tib. Vinayaviniscaya Upāliparipṛcchānāma (f. 220-243) of the Narthang edition of Kañjur (Ratnakūta section), vol. XXIV.
whole of it. The original was larger and contained a versified portion, from which quotations are found in the Mādhyamikavr̥tti (pp. 53, 121, 155, 191, 234, 256, 408). The last portion (Taisho ed., vol. XII, p. 41, sec. 2 to p. 42, sec. 3) of the Chinese version clearly shows that there were many verses in the original Sūtra towards its end. The quotations given in the Mādhyamikavr̥tti from the Sūtra are authentic because the Sanskrit verses agree with those of the Chinese, e.g., in page 155, the verse: Iha sāsani suramāṇiye etc. agrees literally with its Chinese version (p. 42, sec. i, last line & fol.).

Now, if we take into consideration the quotations found in the Śikṣāsamuccaya and the Bodhicaryāvatāra, we cannot have any room for doubt as to our manuscript presenting us only with extracts from the original Upāla paripṛcchāsūtra. In three places, the Śikṣāsamuccaya has quoted the Sūtra. Two (pp. 164, 178) of the three passages appear in the present manuscript. On comparison it becomes evident that in the Śikṣāsamuccaya there is an attempt to put the quotations in an abridged form. The passage cited on pp. 168-9 of the Śikṣāsamuccaya when compared with its Chinese version (p. 38, sec. iii, ll. 4 ff.) shows also that the quotation is given in a very concise form; so also is the citation at p. 178.

The main object of the second part of the manuscript is to point out the two standpoints, from which the disciplinary rules were viewed by the Hinayānists and the Mahāyānists. In short, the pith of the disciplinary rules of the Mahāyānists lay in service to all beings, while that of the Hinayānists was self-purification. This has been clearly brought out in the second portion of the manuscript, where we find the following comparisons:

1. That which is meritorious for a Bodhisattva is demeritorious for a Śrāvaka, and vice versa: To wit, a Bodhisattva desires for repeated births in order to be able to render service to all beings while a Śrāvaka cannot even for a moment cherish thoughts for rebirths.

2. The aim of a Bodhisattva is to work for the good of other beings ( साधुस्य विषय) but this is not necessary for a Śrāvaka ( विषयथा विषय).

* Cf. Bodhicaryāvatāra, p. 139.
2 See text, leaf 7a, l. 5 f.n.
3 For further elucidation, see my Aspects of Mahāyāna Buddhism, etc., ch. V.
3. If a Bodhisattva, after committing an offence, strives for a while to develop and maintain the Bodhicitta (= sarvajñatācitta), he can absolve himself from the offence (स्वपरिहार विषय) but this is not possible for a Śrāvaka (विषयविराग विषय), for the latter should always be on the alert to get rid of kleśas (afflictions) like a man whose headdress is burning.

4. A Bodhisattva may partake of worldly enjoyments but he should at the same time maintain the Bodhicitta, and try to get rid of his kleśas (afflictions) by undergoing many births and not one (दुरालोकविराग विषय). A Śrāvaka, however, should acquire all the kusalanīlas (merit-roots) and be always vigilant like the man with a burning headdress (सावधान विषय).

5. If a Bodhisattva be guilty of actions done through rāga (attachment) and dveṣa (hatred), he is exonerated from sin in regard to those done through rāga but not in regard to those done through dveṣa, because rāga makes him attached to his fellow beings (सम्बन्धवस्तुवस्तु वस्तुं) while dveṣa makes him dissociated (संस्वर्त्तीतः सम्बन्धवस्तुवस्तु वस्तुं) from them, for a Śrāvaka, however, offences committed either through rāga or through dveṣa are equally blamable.

The Third Part of the Ms.

We are at present unable to give any particulars about the third part of the manuscript as there are only a few lines of it on the last leaf. From these few lines, it is however clear that the writer wanted to explain here the Bodhicitta, Dharmanairātmya, etc. by commenting upon some texts. It is rather striking that in the manuscript of the Kriyāsaṅgraha belonging to the Bibliothèque Nationale, there appears also a dissertation on Śunya as similar to Ākāśa and so forth just after the ceremony of Saṃvaragrahāna. Other scholars will, I hope, take up this clue in future and complete the work by tracing the missing pages at least its contents.¹

¹ A photoprint of the leaf where the comment is found is attached hereto.
The passages within brackets [ ] have been supplied by me as the ms. is either broken or illegible at these places.

The passage, marked a-d (see leaf 2b), occurs almost verbatim in the Bodhisattvabhūmi (edition of Wogihara—Tokyo 1930), pp. 152-3, where it is preceded by a detailed explanation of the three Sila-skandhas, which, in short, are as follows:

(i) संबंधित: are all those disciplinary (Pratimokṣa) rules given in the seven (?) nikāyas and meant for the Bodhisattvas; they are to be practised by monks and nuns, male and female novices and lay-devotees.

(ii) कुशलपरम्पराविधीकोश: are all those good deeds performed by a Bodhisattva, physically or verbally, for attaining the highest wisdom (mahābodhi) after taking the sīlasāmparas (disciplines). To wit: a Bodhisattva after being well-established in sīlas, applies himself to study and contemplation, meditation (शमन: विचार कार्यतालय: समाधि:—Bodhic., p. 287) and insight (विषयन:—वग्नभूतस्वमित्तत्त्वपरिक्षणत्वभवन प्रक्ष—Ibid.) and finds pleasure in loneliness; shows respects to his guru in time and so forth.

(iii) सत्यचतुर्विषयिकोश:—These sīlas or good deeds are of eleven kinds, as follows:

   (1) rendering friendly help (saḥāyībhāvah) to beings in their various useful works;

   (2) rendering friendly help to beings suffering from disease and so forth;

   (3) giving just admonition to persons through religious discourses, or discourses on ways and means in their mundane or supramundane objects;
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(4) not only remaining grateful to a benefactor but also giving him a suitable return;

(5) protecting persons from various causes of fear, e.g., lions, tigers, kings, thieves, fire, etc.

(6) consoling persons suffering on account of loss of property or relatives;

(7) offering justly (यास्वपतिः) all the necessary means of livelihood to persons who have been deprived of them;

(8) correcting a body of persons by means of proper gifts and religious discourses (सम्मिविनिधवदन्तो धम्मेष्य गुरविक्रिया)

(9) pleasing others by conversations, exchange of greetings, timely visits, acceptance of others' invitations to food and drink, joining, if invited, the people's worldly celebrations, in short, to avoid all actions which might displease others and to gladden them by one's own qualities;

(10) subduing, fatiguing, punishing and exiling people in order to turn them from evil to good actions by making patent to them things manifest or unmanifest and by good and tender inner will;

(11) frightening people from evils and establishing them in Buddha's doctrine by showing them hells through supernatural power and thereby causing astonishment.

1 B. Bh., p. 152 reads:—सत्यस्य कृतसंविधानस्य विध्यस्य प्रशिक्षणस्य वाक्यात्—

2 Cf. Bodhic., p. 72:—प्रेमप्राप्त्विनिष्ठविविक्षात्स्यथा। कृतस्यविलिति काव्य-बिहिती।

3 B. Bh., p. 153:—बोधाय इत्यंत्येहस्य भोजितस्यस्य एव पादयो।
वासनिकातः बोधिसत्त्वं शीलस्य वरसमात्रतनामकाः श्रीमायातुम्।

तवजीवस्य-नुपरोचन मुक्तः यदुकम्प्यता त्र्युं चौतुःचनि।

त्रिशेषाम्बेश्यं पक्ष-[

[5] 

gुर्जरकेशः छत्रव द्वारकानित्यागस्युपस्थानं पुज्याम् भगवतां महा-

भूमिप्रविधानं। चौये बोधिसत्त्वानं सामीची छत्रवा तेषां गुणानुशरोक्रय

[6] 

षानरसं चेत्त्रप्रासां संजनयं नोरेष्यानुमण्डलेनोकु तकु न्तनेन वा स्थितवा 

न्यायान्यप्रार्थियम्। संस्कृतव ग्रहस्य पुरस्त्रयेवं स्याण्डनीयः। अभु-

[1] 


deaf 2a प्रणवं में कुलपुज्यायुमन भद्रत्तेन वा बोधिसत्त्वशीलस्य वरसमात्रतनामिति।

तन्नं पक्षां स्मृतिमुक्तस्थायं चित्तप्रसादेवेवातुः भूमित्य। न चरस्वेदानी 

मेल्योर्याम्बेदेयस्य स्वकर्त्तस्य महापुरुषानिष्ठानस्य प्राक्षमिक्यप्यत्तिः।

[3] 

मेवार्थमन्तु[विज] चिन्तनया तूणीं भवित्यम्। तेन पुनर्नवेशेन बोधिसत्त्वेन 

सव तथा अवन्धियो बोधिसत्त्वोदविखितेन चेनसा स्थितेन वा निषेधेन वा 

[4] 

एवं स्याण्डनीयः। श्रुण्य त्वभेदायामन कुलपुज्यायुमनः भद्रत्तेन वा।

1 P. Bh., p. 153।—प्राणप्रेमान कुत्वा यथा तत्वाद्य कुलपुज्यान्यानं।

2 Ibid. भग्नाकां।

3 Ibid. श्रुतां नैव समवायां।

4 महाभूमि evidently refers to the last of the ten bhūmis. Other names of this bhūmi are:—प्रस्तविन्यास, निविर्गामन, तथागदाम्यूष, बुद्धभूमि, त्रिभुवन-भूमि।

5 B. Bh., p. 153। adds here महाभूमाम् प्राणप्रेमानं।

6 Ibid. adds परिश्रमं वा वस्त्रं वा शरीरं वर्णितं वस्त्रं तुस्य विश्रो बोधिसत्त्वो नैवे।

7 B. Bh., p. 153। हपुफ्त।

8 Ibid. वेदायिन्।

9 Ms. ब्राह्मणं।

10 B. Bh., p. 153। पुनः नाम कुलपुज्य भक्तिमातारतिः वा।
बोधिसत्त्वोऽसि वोधो व छुटप्रणिपालि [5]। तेन अभिमति वृत्तर्गावयं। स

पुनर्हतति एवं स्वाध[पकीः] [5] वृत्तर्गावयं छुट्युरुस्युक्यम्। भदृच्छति वा बोधिसत्त्वोऽसि वोधो छुटप्रणिपालि [5]। भदृच्छति काल सम्बर्हाण बोधिसत्त्वोऽसि [6]

श्वाहा(पकीः) सर्वबोधिसत्त्वोऽसि संवर्हाणी छुट्युरुस्युक्यमः। सर्ववर्हाणी छुट्युरुस्युक्यमः। श्वाहा। यथोऽथ क्षणिनः यथैव [1]

Leaf 2b श्रिष्टादानि | यक्षीलक्ष्मीनागतानि बोधिसत्त्वानि भविष्यति यानि च श्रिष्टादानि। यक्षीलक्ष्मीदृश्येको दशस्य विद्येय प्रथुप्रणाणानि बोधिसत्त्वानि [2]

वानि च श्रिष्टादानि। येः] च श्रिष्टादानेव येः श्रीसुवीरनि: सर्वबोधिसत्त्वानि: श्रिष्टिवन्ति:। अनावरता: सर्वबोधिसत्त्वानि: श्रिष्टिवन्ते। प्रथु(व्यक्ति: सर्वबोधिसत्त्वानि: [3] सत्या: श्रिष्टिन्ते। तेन प्रतिगुहामीति प्रतिगुहामिति।

समन्वयरज्जुः । । तेन प्रतिगुहामीति प्रतिगुहामिति।]

[सत्या:। स]मन्वयरज्जुः चार्यन्वयस्यमेव प्रभावमात्र विरूपितावर्गावर्गाकथानिः।

1 B. Bh., p. 153 omits b-c.

2 B. Bh., p. 154 here has the following few lines: पूव सिद्धाँतिवार्षिकमि तेन शिक्षो बोधिसत्त्वोऽसि वर्गावर्ग:। तेन च समावयस्यमेव बोधिसत्त्वे वाक्यतं विद्येय प्रतिगुहामिति।

3 For almost a verbatim correspondence of certain portions of this passage, see Śīkṣāsamuccaya, p. 170.
These few lines, omitted in the B. Bh., speak of the mode of confession (pāpadeśanā) adopted by the Bodhisattvas. See my Aspects of Mahāyāna Buddhism etc., pp. 304-5; Bodhic., p. 154; Śikṣā,. op. 160ff.; 168-9; Svayambhū P., pp. 116-8.

3 Ms. निष्णवाजा ।

4 For a parallel passage, see Kriyāsaṅgraha-Paññikā, an extract from which is given in Mm. H. P. Sastri's Catalogue of Buddhist Manuscripts, p. 123.

5 Here we find the formula for Trīśaraṇaṃgaṇama of the Bodhisattvas. Cf. Bodhicaryāvatāra, p. 58:

हुष्ठं गच्छामि वर्षां वाच्याबोधिसात्त्वां ।
वर्षम् गच्छामि वर्षां बोधिसात्त्वानां तथा ॥
I am indebted to Mr. D. A. Dharmacarya for helping me in the decipherment of the first three leaves, before I received Mr. Wogihara’s edition of the Bodhisattvaabhūmi.

2 After Triśaṇaraṇagamana, a Bodhisattva utters this formula for developing Bodhicitta. The commentator of the Bodhic. (p. 4) remarks that the Sūtraśāstraśāmadhyamakāra precedes Bodhiśadvipasya.

The Bodhicitta consists in the candidate’s taking the vow that he will attain bodhi not so much to save himself as to save the worldly beings from their worldly miseries and lead them ultimately to Buddhahood. See Bodhic., ch. 1; Śikṣā., pp. 5ff. Cf. Bodhic., p. 14:

बहुतःबहृत्याति मम जान्महे भीतोपयो हि सर्वेऽपि बोधिचित्तः

3 By Pariṇāmanā a Bodhisattva transfers the merits acquired by him to all living beings; he should wish it from his inmost heart and not by words alone. See Bodhic., p. 79, quoting Vajradhvacūrastūtra and Śikṣā., pp. 29f. सबस्याद्यत: परिब्रह्मणि न सबस्याद्यत:। तत्ततायिनिः परिब्रह्माणि। हृद्धित: ५०। प्रकाशित: ५०। etc.
BODHISATTVA-PRĀTIMOKṢA-SŪTRĀM

अपरायणे भौत नाना शरणं लभन्ते परायणे भौतो भवेयम्। सर्वसंस्कृत्य

[4] भवार्यौनीतिमार्गे भं सर्वमथातुपपरिवर्गिण
परिवर्गवेयं। अनाभ्यगताना्रास्वेयं॥ चित्रिप ॥

[5] सोहमेवनामा पर[न्यु]प्य पादित्वोपौधितोज्जनस्वाहाय यथा माता-

[6] भिनंभगिणीआत्रुदुहिजन्तमत्तम्भासतिसाइनस्वाहायं वध्वं तथा प्रवन्धामि।

प्रतिग्रहं च यथायथर्थे यथार्थं यथार्थानं कुशलमुूच समारोपयामः

इति: प्रकृति युक्तिकिङ दृश्यं नात्मकमिः शीलं रक्षित्वामिः श्र्य[मि]

Lent 4a संपादित्वामिः बीङ्गमार्जम ध्यानं समापत्तिः ग्रास्या ज्ञावाम्य उपाय-

cौशल्यां वा पश्चिमल्य नन्तृ सर्वसत्तानामार्वाय हिन्यामुखाय।

[2]

[उल]रां च समस्यंसमेदिमार्जम तेषा महाभूमिप्रवदिनां बोधिसत्तानां

1 Ms. खानसः।
2 Cf. Bodhic, p. 72: i.e. ज्ञाति पर्यासः (op. cit).

One of the essential conditions for becoming a Bodhisattva is that he must not distinguish himself or his relatives from the other worldly beings, i.e. he must think himself as one with all the beings of the world. Just as one takes care of the various limbs of his body and do not distinguish the limbs from the body, so also a Bodhisattva must look upon all the beings as parts and parcels of his body and hence any of their sufferings is his suffering. See Bodhic., pp. 326 ff.; Śīkaśa, p. 19.: सेतु तथा नं नं समस्यंसमेदिमार्जम तेषा ज्ञाति पर्यासः सव्यसस्त्वेनु ज्ञानं महाभूमिप्रवदिनां बोधिसत्तानां
3 Ms. यथाजायां।
4 Ms. व्यक्तिविभागः।

5 The formula of Parināmanā ends here. In the Kriyāsaṅgraha (see Intro.) it will be observed that this is one of the many declarations necessary for developing Bodhicitta.
महाकालिकाण्यां महायाने सामिचीमत्मकाण्यां। अनु[प्रस्तु] बोधिसत्त्वोऽर्थे
बोधिसत्त्व इति माति: प्रतिमात्यायो धारयत्।।

नतत्त्वाचयायो तत्स्तः: प्रतिमावः। पुरातने दशमु विचु [वु]द्वयोऽधि-
स्तवां मिचनां मिचनां स्थितां यांपाणाः: पात्रयोपितल सामिस्वै नञ्च एवसमारे-
वायुण्यम्। गृहीतमनवेरवनाया बोधिसत्त्व[न म]मैरवनात्लो बोधिसत्त्व-
न्योऽनिष्ठकान राति निषिद्धा बोधिसत्त्वशीर्षसंवरस्थापम्। सोहमेरवनाया

बोधिसत्त्वः अत्मानं साक्षिमूृं प्रज[नन]ृं । । ।

परमाथमनं विपरोशापापम दशक सर्वसतस्तवां विपरोशकुट्टीत्ता दश

Leaf 4b दिशृवन्नातवर्णान्तपोक्तातुष्य[रोमाण्। अ]सिमन बोधिसत्त्वशीर्षसंवरस्थापम्।.

स्मारद्वैम्।। निरवशः।।

एवः पुनः शीतसंवरस्माद्वनकमसामाथ्य्यत्वं धर्मं स्वतं खल्वेष्य यदृ

[2]

वर्णसु निशृवन्नात[पर्यन्तपोक्त] बाणाणु पत्थरागाणां मिचनां मिचनां स्थितां यापाणां

महामृत्युशिकाणां च बोधिसत्तवां कुरु प्राणमिनां प्राणदुनविन येन तपस्येः।।

1 Here we find the formula for त्रायाण्यानुविधं। Cf. Kriyāsaigraha

(Bibl. Nat. ms.), leaf 44.

2 From here, the B. Bk., (pp. 154-5) again corresponds up to

समाधान समाप्तिः in the next page.

3 Omitted in B. Bk., p. 154.

4 Omitted in B. Bk., p. 154.

5 B. Bk., p. 154: प्रायःस्यां।
[3]a b
भवति एवर्नाम्म शोभिषत्त्व शोभिषत्त्वस्यानिकात्। शोभिषत्त्वशोभिषत्त्वसमार्गित: समाक्षोऽधि:।

[4] c
एवं तत्वत् परत: समवादन[विधिन:।]

[5] d
यद्बं तु युग्मवस्त्र: पुज्यते न तत्त्वं स्यात् ततो शोभिषत्त्व:\

[6] e
तथागतप्रतिमाय: पुजत: खयमनि शोभिषत्त्वशेष[ुस्वर:।]समार्गित: बच्चनीयम्।

एवं च करणीयम्। एषांमुस्तरास्त्रं क्रत्र्य द्वायुद विद्यतीतानागतप्रतिवश्यानानो [6]

दुर्भारां भगवतिं महाभूमि[श्रवणं:।] च शोभिषत्त्वां सामीच्छो क्रत्र्य द्विष्टिं जातुमूलवर्त्तं प्रविष्टां नाशकाने च इत्य श्यादचनीयम्। अहमेवनामाः

Leaf 5a दशसु दिखु [सर्वं]कायता महाभूमिप्रविष्टां शोभिषत्त्वां विज्ञापयामि।

तत्परत: सर्वानि शोभिषत्त्वशिष्याश्रापतिनि सत्वं च शोभिषत्त्वशेषलं समाद[वेय]।

[2] f
यन्द्रहरिलित्वाति पृथ्ववश: 4 यात्र शोभिषत्त्वो शोभिषत्त्व शीति। मामिति:

प्रमणित बुद्ध। भगवत्तो शोभिषत्त्वां धारणयन्तिति विग्रह्यः। क K ॥ ॥

1 B. Bh., p. 155 drops this line a-b.
2 Correspondence with the B. Bh., p. 155 ends here.
3 The directions given in the following few lines are intended for one who cannot find a suitable Bodhisattva preceptor to give him formal initiation into the disciplinary conduct of a Bodhisattva.
4 See before leaf 2b line 1 up to मामिति: प्रमणित: in leaf 4a l. 3.
[विनयविनिष्क्रय उपालिपरिश्रुच्या *]

[3] नमो बुधाय। तेन खुदु पुनः समयेनायुपमातुपरिष्क्रमः प्रतिसंबधनात्

[4] युक्तं येन भगवानसंतोस्तत्तांभक्ष्यात्। युक्तं। भगवनसुपरिष्क्रमः प्रतिसंबधनात्

[5] भगवानसंतत्तांभक्ष्यात् । इह भगवनसुपरिष्क्रमः प्रतिसंबधनात्

[6] प्रभृतिष्क्रमः परिष्क्रमः प्रतिसंबधनात् । भगवानसंतत्तांभक्ष्यात्।

* This heading has been supplied by me; it is not given in the ms. See the attached plate.

1 Ms. फ्रि for फ्रिा 2 Ms. खोंबल 3 Ms. खित्रा
[5] बिनविनिष्कर्यं परिपूज्यायिति। ततौ साधू भगवन् व्याकरौतु तथागतोऽ

[6] बिनविनिष्कर्यं विस्तारण महती बिनविनिष्कर्यं सङ्गमित[ता] वोधिसत्त्वपरिनः

एवमुक्ते भगवानायुक्तमुयाक्षेमेतवोवचः। तस्मात्तः वमुपाले अत्यन्वेष

Leaf 6a प्रयोगेनान्यायाशेषेन आवक्यानिकानां [शिर्षा]परिशङ्ख्यं वद। अत्यन्वेष

प्रयोगेनान्यायाशेषेन महायानसंस्थितानां शिर्षापरिशङ्ख्यं वद। ततः

[2] कस्माद्वेतो:। अन्यो हुष्पाले आवक्षः[शा]निकानां प्रयोगेन्‌[न्यो]सङ्क्षेपः। अन्यो

महायानसंस्थितानां बोधिसत्त्वानां प्रयोगेन्‌[न्यो]सङ्क्षेपः। तत्रोपले या आवक्‌

[3] यानिकिष्ठ परिशुद्धशील्यम् सा महायानिकिष्ठ बोधिसत्त्वपरिशुद्धशील्यम्

[4] परमदृशःशील्यम्। या महायानसंस्थितस्य बोधिसत्त्वम्‌[सत्त्वम्‌] परिशुद्धशील्यम्‌

सा आवक्यानिकिष्ठापरिशुद्धशील्यम्‌ परमदृशःशील्यम्। ततौ कस्माद्वेतो:। इहोपाले

[5] आवक्यानिकिष्ठम्[कुचिंशे]धि भवोपपरिनः। इव आवक्‌

यानिकिष्ठ परिशुद्धशील्यम्‌ सा महायानिकिष्ठ बोधिसत्त्वपरिशुद्धशील्यम्

[6] परमदृशः[शी]शील्यम्। कलामोपले महायानसंस्थितस्य बोधिसत्त्वम्‌ परिशुद्धम्‌

Leaf 6b शील्यम्‌। आवक्यानिकिष्ठापरिशुद्धशील्यम्‌ परमदृशःशील्यम्। इहोपाले

महायाने संप्रस्थितं बोधिसत्त्वो महायानसंप्रस्थितं येवौ। कलाम्‌ भवोपपरिनः

[2] परिशुद्धम्‌ अपरिशुद्धविविचारानि‌[सन्धिमानसः। इव महायानसंस्थितस्य

1 Ms. भ्रमायतः 2 Ms. भवोपपरिनः
बोधिसत्त्वस्य परियुद्धशीलता सा आवक्या-निर्णयः परियुद्धशीलता परम- 
दो:शीलयक्ष्मा।

[3] 
तस्माताहि [ल्मुषा]ऽऽ सातरक्षा शिश्ना महायातसप्रवस्थितानां बोधिसस्तवानां बद। निरतुरक्षा शिश्ना आवक्यानिन्दानां बद। लिपपथिरां शिश्नां महायातसप्रवस्थितानां बोधिसस्तवानां बद। निपरिहारां शिश्नां आवक्यानिन्दानां बद। दूरात्मविष्ट्व शिश्नां महायातसप्रवस्थितानां बोधिसस्तवानां बद। साबदानां शिश्नां आवक्यानिन्दानां बद।

कथं चौपाले सातरक्षा शिश्ना महायातसप्रवस्थितानां बोधिसस्तवानां [6]

[निरतुरक्षा शिश्ना आवक्यानिन्दानां। खोपाले महायातसप्रवस्थितेन बोधिसस्तवेन परस्तवानं परियुद्धानं हितमुन्नवित्तमं न दुन: आवक्य[सातरक्षा]।

[1] 
Lent 7a अनेनोपाले पद्यायेण सातरक्षा शिश्ना महायातसप्रवस्थितानां बोधिसस्तवानां निरतु- 
रक्षा शिश्ना आवक्यानिन्दानाम्।

[2] 
कथं चौपाले सुपरिहारां शिश्ना महायातसप्रवस्थितानां बोधिसस्तवानां निष- 
क्ष्मं चौपाले महायातसप्रवस्थितेन बोधिसस्तवेन बोधिसस्तवानां निषे: 

[3] 
सचेन पूर्वस समस्यामेव आपत्तिमाप्यवेत महायातकारे। सवर्णविष्नाचित्तेनाविरहितो

1 Cf. Śūtrālaṅkāra, p. 130: सातरक्षा परियुद्धशीलता इत्या परियुद्धशीलता।
2 Ms. omits it.
3 The passage marked a - b is cited in the Śikṣāsamuccaya, p. 178.
4 Śikṣā, p. 178: कालसमथे throughout.
[4] बिहृतपर्यंतः। एवं महावानसूर्विभिः सचेतनम-भ्याससमये आपत्तिमाध्ये साधारणे सवर्ज्जनानितर्तेनाभिरहितो विहृतपर्यंतः। 

[5] [विहृत]पर्यंतः। एवं महावानसूर्विभिः सचेतनम-शीलस्तथः। सचेतनसाधाराने आपत्तिमाध्ये रात्रिः। पुरिमण्ये सवर्ज्जनानितर्तेनाभिरहितो 

[6] [विहृत]पर्यंतः। एवं महावानसूर्विभिः सचेतनम-शीलस्तथः। सचेतन 

Leaf 7b रात्रिः: पुरिमण्ये आपत्तिमाध्ये रात्रिः। मध्यममाये सवर्ज्जनानितर्तेनाभिरहितो विहृतपर्यंतः। एवं महावानसूर्विभिः सचेतनम-शीलस्तथः। 

[2] सचेतन साधारणे आपत्तिमाध्ये रात्रिः। पुरिमण्ये सवर्ज्जनानितर्तेनाभिरहितो विहृतपर्यंतः। एवं महावानसूर्विभिः सचेतनम-शीलस्तथः। 

[3] सचेतन साधारणे आपत्तिमाध्ये रात्रिः। पुरिमण्ये सवर्ज्जनानितर्तेनाभिरहितो विहृतपर्यंतः। एवं महावानसूर्विभिः सचेतनम-शीलस्तथः। 

[4] नामधुर्कुलयुप्त्यदनुपालकम्। नातिविविधतम्। 

[5] नामधुर्कुलयुप्त्यदनुपालकम्। नातिविविधतम्। 

[6] नामधुर्कुलयुप्त्यदनुपालकम्। नातिविविधतम्। 

1 Śīkā, p. 178 abridges the remaining few lines by saying एवं चामे चामे विधकम्। 

2 Śīkā, p. 173: नातिविविधतम्। 

3 Omitted in Śīkā, p. 173. 

4 Śīkā, p. 173: सचेतनसूर्विभिः। 

5 Śīkā, p. 178: आवक्ष्यम्। 

6 Here ends the citation of the Śīkā, p. 178. 

7 Ms. बिलां 

8 Ms. परिनिर्वाणः.
कथं चोपाले दूरातुभिश्च शिश्ना महायानसंप्रस्थितानं बोधिसत्त्वानं

Leaf 8a सावदानं शिश्ना आवकयानिकानाम्। इहोपाले महायानसंप्रस्थितानं बोधिसत्त्वानं
गुणानविवाक्षाासमानं कर्पणं पञ्चमं कामगुणं। क्रिडत्वा रमित्वा परिद्रायं
[2] वित्त कोऽपितं नोतुसृजति। [अपयुपाले म]हायानसंप्रस्थितस्य बोधिसत्त्वस्य
शिश्ना वेदित्वन। तत् कसमढ़तो। भविष्यत्युपाले स काठं स समयो
[3] यन्त्रमहायानं संप्रस्थितो बोधिसर्वस्वते सुपरिगुहितेन ख्यातान्तर
गतोधि सम्बंधौं शंखरिष्यते। अपि च महायानसंप्रस्थितेन बोधिसत्त्वेन
[4] [२५४] भवे सम्बंधौं: क्षणितव्या।। अनुसूर्यैं बोधिसत्त्वानं
कुशं। भवं गत्यं।। निर्पुष्कुटागृहेन च आवकयानिकेनादी[प-]
[5] [२५२] रस्येलोपेन हि तत्मूलाकोडि अवोपपतिंतत्वादितव्य।। एवमुपाले
[6] दूरातुभिश्च महायानसंप्रस्थितानं बोधिसत्त्वानं सावदानं शिश्ना
आवकयानिकानाम्।।

तस्मादात्मज्जपम् सातारां सप्तिहारं दूरातुभिश्च शिश्नं

Leaf 8b महायानसंप्रस्थितानं बोधिसत्त्वानं [वद। निपु]हर्षा निपरिहारं
सावदानं शिश्नं आवकयानिकानं वद।। तत् कसमढ़तो। महासंभारा
बोधिसत्त्वानंप्रेरणसंवेष्येन कर्पणं संगाःपितं सात्तरितम्।। इव चोपालेत्थे-

1 Ms. परिद्रायं
2 Ms. तस्य श्रव्यं
3 Ms. नोतुसृजति
[3] वर्षा¹ समस्थनः² तथा[गतः सम्य]कुसम्बुद्ध महायानसंप्रस्थितानां बोधिसत्त्वानां
नैकालतनिवेदनकां कथयितं नैकालविरागकां कथयितं नैकालस्वेग-
[4] कथां [कथ]यितं। अधि तु क्षतु पुनः प्रीलिकाः प्रामोदकाः प्रतीत्यपुत्राराधणां
सम्प्रदयकां कथयितं।³ गम्बोरामसंहितां सूक्ष्मां निः[कोक्तुकां]
कथयितं। निःपर्योर्थानां कथयितं। अस्क्रामनावरणां शून्यताकां
कथयितं। त इमा कथां शुव्वादभिर्गतः संप्राप्ता न परिबिक्ताने
बोधिसम्भारः विरुपयितिः।

अथ शायुपाल्यात्: भगवन्तेतद्विचेतं। या इमा भगवानापत्तयः

[1] Leaf 9a काथ्याद्राग[संयुक्ता: काथ्यन्] द्वेष[संयुक्ता: काथ्यनमोहसंयुक्ता]:। तत्र ज्ञतमा
भगवन् महायानसंप्रस्थितस्य बोधिसत्त्वस्य गुह्तरा भाषातः।⁴ कि:

[2] रागसंप्रदयकाः उत्तराये द्वेषसंयुक्ताः: उत्तराये मोहसंप्रदयकाः:। एवमुक्ते
भगवानायुपमन्त्रपालिकेतद्विचेतने। सचेदुपाले⁵ महायानसंप्रस्थितो

1 Ms. वर्षा 2 Ms. समस्थनः
3 Cf. the corresponding Hinayānic expression in Vinaya, 1, p. 15; Dīgha Nikāya, 1, p. 141; द्राक्षर्यो शीलक्षर्यो समक्षर्यो कामानामाधीनविवेकारं
संस्कृतेऽनैगैस्मे भाष्यितसम्बन्धेः। इत्य वा दुरान्ं सायुक्तानिका चक्स्यन्ता सं
पक्तेऽति, तुहं समुहं निरोधं मग्गं।
4 Śīkṣā, p. 164: का पुन्नर्वी द्वैपापिः। समाह्यतस्तस्य तत्त्रादः। सचेदुपाले etc.
5 The portion marked a-b appears in the Śīkṣā, p. 164 with the
undernoted variant readings.
 boon of the Maithil text, which is difficult to understand.

1. *Sikṣa*., p. 164—वास्तविकरणा रागप्रतिलेखयुक्ता।

2. *Ibid.* कुष्ठ। पृ ॥ हृष।

3. *Ibid.* संगुणका। तव कुष्ठ हैतोः। योऽवेष हृषं उपाले।

4. I was feeling tempted to read it as *dandha* as opposed to *kuṣṭra,* but as the Chinese translation supports the reading *bandha,* I have retained it.

5. बातुः अ य may supply the sense here.

6. Ms. अ मुलार्कायः।

7. Ms. अ य।

8. *Sikṣa*., p. 164 omits the portion marked \( b \cdot c \) by putting प।
Here ends this book, and another commences. The scribe wrote only on one side of this leaf and then probably found out that it was a different book altogether. A photoprint of the leaf is attached hereto. I am giving below the reading as far as it has been possible for me to read, hoping that it will give clue to some other manuscript.

\[1\]

Ms. Prinlick

I.H.Q., June, 1931
[5] कारणं। तेषामेवमादी[...]असेविद्यमानक्षिवाच्छण्टत्वात्। एवं तावदात्मा-
क्रोधाभावं न विश्वसं प्रागेव ताहस्वभावं चिन्तस्तित। अतः स्वभावविगतं
[6]
[...]तेन स्वभावं चितं भवतीयाहं। स्वन्यात्मात्वायतनभाष्माभास्तितं
भवति॥ स्वभावविचितं भवति॥[.........].

Nalinaksha Dutt
The First Saka of Citoḍ

Tradition informs us that Citoḍ, the mediæval capital of the Rajput principality of Mevāḍ, was sacked by its Moslem enemies 'three and a half times.' In 1567, the Mughal Emperor Akbar captured this stronghold after a brief investment which was accompanied by circumstances unhappily not experienced for the first time in the life of this citadel. While its brave defenders died fighting against the enemy, their women and children immolated themselves into the fire, in accordance with the age-long custom of jukhar, to save themselves from dishonour. A still worse fate awaited those that survived, for, Akbar ordered a general massacre of those that were left. This incident is the traditional 'third sākā' of Citoḍ. Prior to this, in 1534-35, Bāhādur Shāh, Sultān of Guzrat, had also taken possession of the same fort, after a heroic resistance on the part of its defenders and the inevitable holocaust of men, women as well as children, which is therefore known as the 'second sākā.' Just a year before this, in the winter of 1533-34, the same Sultān had attacked the place which had, however, saved itself at the cost of some of its most prominent heroes, so that Rajputs came to look upon this as the half 'sākā.' Exactly 130 years before this incident, again, it had undergone the experience of another blockade and its concomitant slaughter of fighters and non-fighters at the hands of Sultān 'Alāuddin Khiljī. This, being the first occasion when the Moslems were victorious over Citoḍ, is regarded as the 'first Sākā.'

Around the history of the first Moslem conquest of Citoḍ has developed in course of centuries a mass of romance which till quite recent times was looked upon as sober history. Quite recently, Rai Bahadur Pandit Gaurisankar Ojha of the Rajputana Museum, Ajmere, has tried to examine critically and unravel the truth underlying the traditions. Two other writers, Messrs. Haldar and

1 Col. Tod gives a slightly different version.
2 Udayapur Rāiya Kā Itihāsa in Hindi by Mahāmahopādhyāya Rai Bahadur Gaurisankar Hirachand Ojha.
3 Indian Antiquary, 1929 and 1930.
Qanungo has followed in the footsteps of that eminent scholar and lent—the former fully and the latter partly—their support to his findings. But the matter cannot be said to have been settled beyond all doubt as the divergence in the views of Messrs. Ojha and Qanungo shows. Besides, an examination of the whole episode with reference to the original sources makes it clear that even in matters in which the above writers agree, they have not followed the earliest evidence faithfully.

Our earliest information of the incident is furnished by two Moslem writers—Amīr Khusrau and Ziyāuddin Barānī. The former, 'the greatest of all the poets of India who had written in Persian,' died in 1325 A.D. Two of his works, so far as they are known now, supply information on the subject—the *Khasainul Futuh* (also known as *Tārikh-i-Ālā*) written after 1310 A.D., and the *Ashikā* (otherwise known as *Dewal Rānī*), written apparently after 1318 A.D. Ziyāuddin Barānī finished his *Tārikh-i-Firuz-Shāhī* about 1357 A.D. Both of them were contemporary writers, and what is more, Amīr Khusrau accompanied 'Ālāuddin Khilji in the expedition concerned, while Ziyāuddin Barānī, in the course of his narrative, says, 'the events and affairs of the reign of Jalāluddin (Khilji) and from that period until the end of the work, all occurred under his own eyes and observation.' The accounts given by these two writers must therefore be accorded the foremost place of consideration in any attempt to reconstruct the history of this episode.

It is rather unfortunate that from the point of view of the Rajputs, the other and more important party in this affair, no account has so far been unearthed that can be placed in the same category with the above. The earliest Hindu version of the incident is that which can be gathered from the Kumbhalgaḍh Praśasti of 1460 A.D. that

1 Vide the Bengali monthly magazine, *Prabūsa, Phālgun*, 1337 B.S.
2 For a correct translation of the relevant parts of this work see the *Journal of Indian History*, December, 1929, pp. 369-373. Elliot's rendering is extremely misleading. Elliot, *History of India*, vol. III, pp. 67, 68.
3 Ibid. Also, Elliot, *History of India*, vol. III, p. 550.
4 Elliot, *History of India*, vol. III, p. 265. Also, *JASB*, vol. XXXIX.
5 Ibid., p. 135.
6 (page 3). This is still unpublished. I secured a copy of it through
is more than 150 years later. But, besides being the earliest Hindu reference, it deserves our serious consideration due to the fact that it was written at the instance of Rāṇā Kumbhā of Mevāḍ (1433-69) in whose time a careful investigation into the records of the state seems to have been made with a view to rectify the current inaccuracies in the early chronology of the family to which this prince himself belonged.

There are of course references to the same event in other and later works—such as the Padumāvat, the Āin-i-Akbari, the Tārikh-i-Firishta, the Khyāta of Muḥaṇote Neṭsi, the Rājapraśasti and the Annals of Rājasthāna. But it is admitted on all hands that these later records are based, more or less, upon traditions current in the time of the respective authors, and that, in the interval of 240 years, as in the case of the Padumāvat, and more, in that of others, popular imagination tampered considerably with the original account, so much so indeed, that, truth has been thrown far into the shade. In spite of this defect, no one will deny that there is a kernel of fact in these later accounts, and the problem, therefore, is, how much of these latter we are to rely upon as authentic. Obviously, we cannot accept any portion of the later stories as historical if it is not corroborated directly or indirectly by the evidence furnished by the contemporary writers such as Amir Khusrau and Ziyāuddin Baranī, or the earliest Hindu record on the episode, viz., the Kumbhalgaḍḍh Praśasti.

The vast difference between later tradition and early history will be evident to all, if a comparison be made between the version of the incident as contained in the Annals of Rājasthāna and that of the same as gathered from the epigraphic records which are contemporary, or nearly so, of the event they deal with. Fortunately, since Col. Tod wrote nearly a century ago, Indian epigraphy has made considerable progress and it is no longer possible to fall into the errors to which Tod was misled by the uncritical annals on which

the courtesy of Pandit Ram Karna of Jodhpur. The relevant verses
are also quoted in the footnotes at pages 180, 81 of Ojha's Udayapur Rājya Kā Itihāsa.

1 Written in 1540 A.D. 2 About 1590 A.D.
3 About 1612 A.D. 4 C. 1650 A.D.
5 Composed about 1675 A.D. 6 1829-32 A.D.
he relied. Nobody will now maintain with Tod that Lakṣmaṇasimha, a minor, was the Rāṇā of Mevāḍ, and Bhīmasimha his uncle, regent, at the time when 'Alāūddīn Khilji attacked Citoḍ. It has now been definitely established with the help of inscriptions, supported by records earlier than the annals on which Tod relied that Samarasiṃha (1273¹-1302²) died leaving the state to his son Ratnasimha in whose reign the invasion of 'Alāūddīn took place.

Even the circumstances that induced 'Alāūddīn to undertake the Citoḍ expedition have been misrepresented in the later records. Traditions current in Tod's time and even as early as the middle of the sixteenth century³ attribute it to 'Alāūddīn's desire to secure Padminī, reports of whose extraordinary beauty had reached the ears of the Sultān. But, it should be noted that the contemporary writers like Amir Khusrau and Ziyāuddīn Barānī do not refer to any such consideration as having at all influenced the determination of 'Alāūddīn. It is possible to argue that argumentum ex silentio is no conclusive proof. There is, however, independent evidence to show that other and contradictory causes prompted 'Alāūddīn to undertake the expedition. Ziyāuddīn Barānī mentions that some time in 1297 A.D., the Sultān urged on by his ambition of world conquest sought the advice of his Kotwāl when the latter replied that the conquest of Hindusthan, 'of such places as Ranthambhor, Citoḍ, Canderi, Malwa, Dhar, and Ujjain' ought to receive attention before all others.⁴ It is clear that the idea of the conquest of Citoḍ had been formed more than five years before the expedition took place, and, as we know from the inscriptions, at a time when Samarasiṃha, father of Ratnasimha, was ruling over the principality. This precludes the possibility of the Padmini episode as having effected 'Alāūddīn's determination which is stated by this contemporary writer to have been actuated solely by his overwhelming ambition.

The Sultān did not sleep over his scheme of conquest. By the year 1302, the whole of North India, except Mevāḍ acknowledged

1 Cirwā Inscription of Guhila Samarasiṃha, Vienna Oriental Journal, 1907.
3 The Padumāvat and the Āin-i-Akbari.
the supremacy of the Sultān and that state itself was surrounded by a ring of states subject to his authority when one by one Malwa, Canderi, Marwar, Guzrat, Jaior, Nagor etc. had been conquered. The Sultān was now casting his ambitious looks upon the virgin lands of South India. Here, it must have been apparent to him that before his army could be sent to that quarter, Mevāḍ, which had so long defied attacks, must be crushed lest it afforded to others the example of defiance and created troubles in the rear of his army. Accordingly, in 1303, 'Alāuddin, says Firishta,1 'sent an army by way of Bengal to reduce Warungole while he himself marched towards Chittoor.'

Moreover, the rulers of Mevāḍ seem to have furnished him with causes of grievance. While the Rajput states were crumbling before 'Alāuddin's attacks, refugees from them as well as other refractory subjects sought shelter at Citoḍ which still remained independent. Thus, a tradition preserved by the bards of Rajputana mentions that after the capture of Ranthambhor by 'Alāuddin, the son of the Hindu Rājā of that place fled for protection to Mevāḍ.2

Thus ambition was primarily responsible for the expedition. It is possible that political necessity and the desire of crushing a party which gave shelter to his enemies might also have induced 'Alāuddin to make up his determination.

Having thus resolved on the conquest of Citoḍ, the Sultān started with his army from Delhi on January 28, 1303, and after some time reached 'the confines of Citoḍ'. The imperial pavilion was pitched up in that territory between the two rivers, probably the Berach and

2 Māhārāṇāyaṇa-prakāśa, pp. 14, 15. The collector and editor of these old bardic poems regarding the rulers of Mevāḍ is unwilling to accept the accuracy of the information contained in the piece referred to. But there is no reason to discredit it. On one occasion in reply to 'Alāuddin Khilji's question, what gratitude would he evince if the King should command his wounds to be immediately healed to a rebel Mughal who had been captured after the fall of Ranthambhor, the Sultān was told, 'I will put you to death and raise the son of Hammir Deo to the throne'. This shows that Hammir Deo's son was still alive and apparently had taken shelter somewhere, most likely at Citoḍ according to the tradition. JIH., 1929, p. 365 n.
the Gambhiri. The fort itself stood on the further side of the latter river. It is clear that the rivers presented no obstacles to the invading army, for, Amir Khusrau clearly indicates that both of them were 'fordable'—it being the end of the winter. 'Alauddin now sent 'the two wings of the army which were ordered to pitch their tents on the two sides of the fort.'

The first plan of the Sultan was clearly to overpower the defence and wrest the place by direct attack. This policy was persisted in for two months without success. 'For two months' says Amir Khusrau, who accompanied the expedition, 'the flood of the swords went up to the waist of the hill but could not rise any higher.' The strength of the fort and the gallant defence offered by the garrison evoked the praise of this eye-witness of the incident. 'Wonderful was the fort which even hailstones were unable to strike'. Allowing one month for the march of the army from Delhi to Citoj and two months for the unsuccessful direct assault, we may assume that the first stage of the operations was over by the end of April, 1303.

The failure of the direct attack led 'Alauddin to revise his policy and adopt a new plan which consisted in a regular investment of the place. Catapults were raised so that stones and other missiles might be thrown at the besieged. No detailed account of the progress of the siege during the last four months is, however, given in the Khaizainul Futuh. Amir Khusrau after referring to the construction of the catapults says abruptly that on August 26, 1303, the Sultan accompanied by the author 'went into the fort'. 'It was the rainy season when the white cloud of the ruler of land and sea appeared on the summit of this high hill. The Rai struck with the lightning of the Emperor's wrath and burnt from hand to foot, sprang out of the stone gate; he threw himself into the water and flew towards the imperial pavilion, thus protecting himself from the lightning of the sword'.

1 The quotations, except where otherwise stated, are all taken from the Khaizainul Futuh, for which see the Journal of Indian History, 1929, pp. 369ff.

2 Sir H. Elliot puts it as 'the Rai fled, but afterwards surrendered himself, and was secured against the lightning of the scimitar'. The original has been entirely misunderstood. Ojha, having followed the inaccurate translation by Elliot, has fallen into a great blunder as is shown later on. Messrs. Haldar and Qanungo have only reiterated Ojha's mistake.
On the day the Rai sought refuge in the red canopy from fear of the swords, the great Emperor was still crimson with rage. But though the Rai was a rebel', 'royal mercy' was conferred upon him. 'The storm of the emperor's wrath vented itself against the other rebels. He ordered that wherever a Hindu was found, he was to be cut down like dry grass. Owing to this stern order, thirty thousand Hindus were slain in one day.'

Although the name of the Rāya who surrendered to 'Alāuddin is not mentioned by Amir Khusrau, it will be clear from what follows that he was none other than the ruling prince Ratnasimha. The *Khasainul Futuh* clearly indicates that the person who surrendered was the Rāya or ruler of Citoq who had been defending himself against 'Alāuddin. Now, all our relevant authorities agree in saying that the hostilities commenced when Ratnasimha was the ruling prince and that they continued till the time of Lakṣmaṇasimha who maintained the defence of the fort after Ratnasimha. Apparently, therefore, the person who surrendered must have been either of these two princes. But since the Kumbhalgarhī Prasasti distinctly states that Lakṣmaṇasimha died along with seven of his sons at the hands of the Moslems, it must have been the latter who tendered his submission to 'Alāuddin Khilji. Curiously enough, while the above inscription applies the clause 'departed for heaven' to indicate the termination of Lakṣmaṇasimha's career, regarding Ratnasimha the same authority uses the phrase 'tasmin gate,' which should therefore be understood in the literal sense of 'after he had gone' and not 'after he had died.'

I Ojha has translated the words 'tasmin gate' as 'after he had died,' and Haidar and Qanungo have accepted his translation. Although in inscriptions the verb 'gam' is sometimes used in the sense of 'to die,' yet, under the circumstances mentioned above, it must be taken to have been used in the literal sense. Ojha seems to have been misled by the incorrect translation of the *Khasainul Futuh* by Elliot. Qanungo, following Ojha, opines that the Rāya who fled (?) was Ajayasiṃha, who alone of the several sons of Lakṣmaṇasimha is said to have escaped the sack of Citoq, and, supports his contention by saying that Amir Khusrau must have committed a mistake. But are we justified in finding fault with the evidence of the contemporary writer in the absence of other stronger
But here we are faced with a great difficulty. In Amir Khusrau's version of the story, the Rāya (who, as we have just seen, was Ratnasimha) surrendered, after the Sultān had 'appeared on the summit of the hill,' that is to say, after the fort had been practically won. But, the inscription of 1460 clearly indicates that even after the departure of Ratnasimha, Laksmanaṣimha maintained the defence and that he died fighting against the Moslems; after which, presumably the fort was captured. Thus the chronology of the events that took place in Citoḍ might appear to be differently given in the two records. There is however no real difficulty in reconciling the two versions.

We must remember that Amir Khusrau wrote his Khasainul Futuh at least seven years (if not more) after the incident and it is only reasonable to infer that when he wrote he did so from his memory. It is very likely, therefore, that though all the facts are there, yet, writing from his memory, he failed to observe the exact chronological sequence of the events. Hence, the surrender of Ratnasimha which really took place during the course of the siege is inadvertently put as having taken place after the capture of the fort itself. That although a contemporary writer, such mistakes were not only possible but actually committed by him will be clear from a comparison between the account of the conquest of Citoḍ as given in the Khasainul Futuh and that in his other work, namely, the Dewal Rānī or the Ashikā. In the latter work¹ the author says, 'the Emperor did not waste much time; the fort was reduced in two months,' whereas in the former we are told that it took him at least six months to capture the fort.²

Besides, there is evidence in the Khasainul Futuh itself to show that there was a confusion of chronology in Amir Khusrau's mind. The Rāya is said to have 'flown' 'towards the imperial pavilion,' after 'springing out of the stone-gate'. The reference to the imperial pavilion clearly points to the camp from which Alāuddin was directing the blockade. Again, we are also told that the Rāya himself was pardoned, reasons ³ As pointed above, the Rāya who surrendered was the person who led the hostilities against the Sultān.

¹ Journal of Indian History, 1929, p. 372, l.n. 2; Elliot, History of India, vol. 111, p. 550.

² The Sultān started on his expedition on Monday, the 8th Jamādussānī, 702 A.H. (January 28, 1303) and captured it on Monday, 11 Muharram, 703 A. H. (August 26, 1303).
but the other rebels, 'thirty thousand in number' (who must have been the Rāya's followers), were ordered to be put to the sword. To accept this version of the story is to be drawn into the rather illogical conclusion, viz., that the arch-culprit secured pardon but the rank and file of his followers were punished.1

On the above considerations, it is clear that we must rearrange the chronology of the expedition as it is recounted in the Khasainul Futuh. Otherwise, we cannot possibly explain the inconsistencies of Amīr Khusrāw himself and reconcile the Hindu version of the story with that of the Moslem.

The most probable account of the operations would therefore be as follows. When attacks had failed, 'Alāuddīn, by the end of April 1303, ordered the place to be put under blockade. Catapults were accordingly raised. This new development dismayed Ratnasimha, the ruling prince, and coming 'out of the stone-gate', he 'flew towards the Imperial pavilion' and surrendered himself to the Sultān. This of course meant submission of that Rajput prince and, consequently, a cessation of hostilities. That there was a temporary cessation of hostilities is also indicated by Amīr Khusrāw. After describing the futile attacks of the first two months, the author says: 'Nevertheless......the fort......would have bowed to the ground at the strokes of the Maghrabi stones. But Jesus from Baitul Ma'nmār sent the good news of the building of Mohammad's faith; consequently, the stones....... remained intact.'

The learned translator of the above piece explains it as follows:

'Though the attack sword in hand had failed, it still lay in 'Alāuddīn's power to knock down the fort with his Maghrabis. But he refrained from the step owing to a spiritual message that the building would turn Muslim later'.

This truce following upon the surrender of Ratnasimha no doubt implies the commencement of negotiations for a lasting peace. What the terms, dictated by 'Alāuddīn to his erstwhile foe, were, contemporary evidence does not, it must be admitted, tell us distinctly. But

---

1 As will be shown later, what really took place seems to have been this. The garrison continued to withstand Alāuddīn even after the surrender of Ratnasimha. Hence the Sultān's anger was aroused and he passed a general order for their slaughter after the capture of the place.
the inscription of 1460 A.D. throws an interesting clue which has been entirely overlooked by Ojha (and, following him, Haldar and Qanungo). While mentioning that after Ratnasimha had departed (surrendered), Lakṣmanasingha of the Khumāna family maintained the citadal, the inscription relates the reason, namely that 'considerate men do not abandon family honour when it is forsaken by cowards'.1 Clearly enough, therefore, Ratnasimha had done something for which one of his successors on the throne of Mevād could find no better epithet than 'coward' to be applied to him. Besides, he is said to have distinctly thrown away the 'family prestige' which was held so dear by the Rajputs. No doubt his surrender to the enemy earned him a notoriety, but the very strong epithets used indicate that he had done something much more heinous than mere surrender to the enemy in face of great difficulties.

Here the question necessarily suggests itself, is it possible to find out from our records any idea of the nefarious action which brought upon him this lasting opprobrium? I think it is possible to do so. The Tūrikh-i-Firishtā says2 :

"After the Rājā had been in jail for some time, it came to the Emperor’s ears that among the Rājā’s women there was one Padmīnī, a woman of fine stature, with dark eyes and moonlike face, and adorned with all the accomplishments of beauty. The Emperor sent the Rājā a message that his release would depend on his presenting her (to the Sultān). The Rājā consented and sent messengers.......But the Rājā’s relatives were shocked at the message. They reproached him severely and wished to mix a little poison in some food and send it to him; he would take it and withdraw into the world of the dead without becoming notorious for his dishonour".

Neither does Firishtā’s account stand alone; for a critical examination of the Khasainul Futuh shows that there is a distinct echo of the siege of Citoḍ, after the surrender of Ratnasimha, being


2 For a corrected translation of the piece in question, see J.I.H., 1929, p. 372 f. n.
persisted in on account of a woman, possibly Padmini. Amīr Khusrau observes:

"The army of Solomon dealt strokes, like those of David, on the fort that reminded them of Seba".

Here 'Alāuddīn is compared with Solomon and his attack on Citoḍ, with Solomon's attempt on Seba. Going further on, Amīr Khusrau compares himself with the bird 'hudhud' which formed one of the vast retinue of Solomon.

This analogy, coming as it does from the pen of Amīr Khusrau, the most learned of the Indian poets, must be taken to be pregnant with significance for a clear appreciation of which the reference should be closely followed.

The story relates how Solomon, son of David, set out in an expedition accompanied by a vast retinue including soldiers, animals and birds of which 'hudhud' was one. While he was encamped near a desert, he missed the 'hudhud' and declared that he would punish it severely unless the bird could explain his absence satisfactorily. 'Hudhud' appeared immediately and informed that he brought in the news of the land of Seba and its queen Balquis who worshipped the Sun. Solomon at once sent 'hudhud' with a letter asking Balquis to submit to himself. She assembled her advisers and sent an envoy with presents to Solomon who, however, declared that he would not be satisfied with anything else than the personal submission of Balquis.

The analogy between 'Alāuddīn's operations against Citoḍ and Solomon's expedition against the land of Seba would be justifiable only if Balquis of Seba had a prototype in Citoḍ. Apparently, therefore, Amīr Khusrau implies that 'Alāuddīn insisted on the surrender of a woman, possibly Padmini, of the ruling family at

1 Here it is necessary to remember what Elliot writes about the mode of composition of the book in question. 'The style in which it is composed is, for the most part, difficult as the whole is constructed of a series of fanciful analogies... But we can forgive that for the solid information we are occasionally able to extract from it.' Elliot, History of India, vol. III, pp. 67, 68.

2 Hughes, Dictionary of Islam, sub voce Solomon, pp. 651 ff.

3 Amīr Khusrau's comparison of himself with the bird 'hudhud' apparently took, in the later romantic accounts, the shape of Hirāman Tota.
Citoḍ. What, it may be asked, was the real desire behind this demand for the surrender of Padmîn? Was it due to the lustful desire of 'Alâuddîn or anything else? No definite answers are possible. But the balance of the evidence at our disposal would seem to attribute this demand to a political motive. We have seen already that the expedition was launched with the object of bringing Mevâd under the subjection of Delhi and that, in origin, it had nothing to do with 'Alâuddîn's desire to secure Padmîn. From this point of view, the Sultân's purpose was virtually achieved when Ratnasîngha submitted to him. But at this stage the situation was again clouded by 'Alâuddîn who brought in the question of Padmîn in the course of the negotiations with that Rajput prince. It is possible that thereby 'Alâuddîn aimed at humiliating this arrogant Rajput state which had so long defied the Sultân of Delhi.¹

Whatever may have been the motive, it is almost sure that 'Alâuddîn's demand which was forwarded to the besieged through Ratnasîngha, now a prisoner in the Sultân's hands, was refused by the latter. Thereupon the truce came to an end and hostilities were resumed.

Meanwhile, 'Lâksmanasîngha of the Khumâna family' had succeeded or been raised to the throne of the baleagured city after the withdrawal of Ratnasîngha.² The new ruler continued to uphold the

¹ An examination of Akbar's relationship with the Rajput princes shows that this Mughal Emperor insisted upon the Rajput families which accepted submission to his authority sending a bride to the imperial harem. Did 'Alâuddîn anticipate Akbar's policy?

² Kumbhalgaḍha Praśasti, verse, 177; vide op. cit., p. 180 n. 2. Ojha is unwilling to accept the view that Lâksmaṇasîngha was raised to the throne. But the epithet 'Nîpa' applied to him in the Praśasti in question on several occasions leaves no room for doubt (Indian Historical Quarterly, 1928). Besides Ojha's chronology is open to serious objections on other considerations as well. It is admitted that Citoḍ fell into Moslem hands in 1303 and continued to be ruled by officers on behalf of the Sultâns of Delhi for about 25 years. But what happened to the freedom-loving Guhilotes who had fled to the Aravallis and taken shelter there to save themselves from subjection to the Moslem power? Tradition tells us that they continued to defy the Moslem power under their leaders
‘family prestige’ and defy the renewed Moslem attacks. But all in vain. Along with seven of his sons, he died in the conflict and 'Alāuddin captured the citadel. There can be no room for doubt that the stubbornness of the defence, after the negotiations for peace had fallen through, infuriated the Sultān. This circumstance alone enables us to understand why, while ‘royal mercy did not allow any hot wind to blow upon’ Ratnasiniha, ‘all the storm of the Emperor’s wrath vented itself against the other rebels,’ so that, ‘he ordered that wherever a Hindu was found he was to be cut down like dry grass,’ and, ‘owing to this stern order thirty thousand Hindus were slain in one day.

From what has been said above it will be clear that the causes of the expedition were ambition and political necessity. The operations which continued for more than six months passed through three distinct stages. The first stage was one of direct attack which was persisted in for two months, but failed to achieve the object. The intermediate stage consisted of preparation for siege followed by the surrender of Ratnasiniha, the ruling prince, and negotiations for a permanent peace. This also failed owing to the Rajputs in the garrison not accepting the ignominious term of surrendering a princess of the royal family. The last stage of renewed attack culminated in the defeat of the defenders and the consequent occupation of the fort by 'Alāuddin.

A comparison of the above account with what we gather from the later records affords an interesting study.

Thus, in the Padumāvat, the cause of the expedition is said to be the lustful demand for Padmīnī by 'Alāuddin. The first stage of the attack continued for eight years. During the intermediate period, Ratnasiniha is said to have been captured by the Moslems through a stratagem and his release was made conditional upon the surrender of Padmīnī which, of course, was refused. 'Alāuddin marched off with his prisoner to Delhi from which place he was rescued by a Ajayasiniha, son of Lakṣmānasiniha, and his nephew Hammīra. This is the most logical account we have and there is no reason to discredit it. Ojha’s view would lead to the conclusion that there was an interregnum in the Mevād gadi after Lakṣmānasiniha’s death. But is it possible that people who were fighting for their independence were without any leader? Whoever that leader might have been was no doubt the lawful ruler of the clan.
counter-ruse adopted by the Rajputs only to die shortly at the hands of a personal enemy. 'Alāuddīn renewed his attack on Citoḍ which was immediately captured.

In the Āin-i-Akbarī the cause is the same as in the Padumāvat. The first stage of futile attacks was followed by the capture of Ratnasīṃha as well as his rescue by the Rajputs as before. A further period of war followed till the fort was captured. No idea of the time spent in three stages of the expedition is given.¹

Firishtā does not explicitly state the reason but conveys the idea that the expedition was undertaken in pursuance with 'Alāuddīn's idea of conquest. After six months the fort is said to have been captured and Ratnasīṃha taken prisoner. In the following year, the Rajput prince whose release was made conditional upon the surrender of Padminī, was rescued by a stratagem.²

In the Annals of Rājasthāna, Padminī's beauty is said to have aroused the passion of 'Alāuddīn so that he invested the fort but to no effect. Thereupon, he played a stratagem and captured Bhīmasīṃha, the husband of Padminī and regent at Citoḍ on behalf of his nephew, the minor ruler Lakṣmansīṃha. The period of negotiations followed and the Rajputs rescued their leader by a counter stratagem. 'Alāuddīn pursued the Rajput prince and again invested Citoḍ and after Lakṣmansīṃha and his twelve sons had died in the conflict the fort was captured.

Subimal Chandra Datta

¹ A comparison of the Āin-i-Akbarī version with the Padumāvat will make clear that the former was indebted immensely to the latter. In fact, Abul Fazal's reference to 'ancient chroniclers' from whom he took the story probably points to the same conclusion, Āin-i-Akbarī, vol. II, p. 269.

² Firishtā seems to have followed Amir Khusrau in his account.
Maṇḍana, Suresvara and Bhavabhuti: the Problem of their Identity

In Canto VII of the Saṅkara-digvijaya of pseudo-Mādhava it is recorded that the famous Maṇḍanamiśra had a second name Viśvarūpa and yet a third “vulgar” name Umbeka and after his conversion by Saṅkara came to be known as Suresvara. This tradition has been generally accepted by modern scholars who have been freely exchanging the two names Maṇḍana and Suresvara for a long time past. Credit is due to Prof. Hiriyanna of Mysore who disputed the identity for the first time in the J.R.A.S., 1923 (pp. 259-263), almost simultaneously, it seems, with Dr. Jha’s declaration that “there are no reasons for disputing its historical foundation” (Intr. to Bhāvanāviveka, pt. II, 1923). Prof. Hiriyanna notes three points of doctrinal divergence between the two great thinkers. Before we discuss them it is necessary to ascertain the authorship of one important work on the Vedānta, viz., the Brahmāsiddhi which has not yet seen the light inspite of the assurances of Prof. Kuppuswami Sastri (Proc. of the 3rd Orien. Conf. at Madras, p. 480). While eagerly awaiting the publication of this important work, we may be pardoned for offering the following notes on the external evidence regarding its authorship. It is well known that after his conversion by Saṅkara, Suresvara wrote a number of works on the Vedānta—the five Vārtikas and the Naṭkarmyasa-siddhi; but the Brahmāsiddhi is not one of them (Saṅkara-digvijaya, XIII. 63). On the other hand, Citsukhamuni, who quotes Suresvara and Maṇḍana separately (vide Citsukhi, Comy., Nirn. ed., pp. 9, 112 & 340 for Suresvarācārya, and pp. 155, 164ff. for Maṇḍanamiśra), ascribes the Brahmāsiddhi to Maṇḍanamiśra (p. 140). In his commentary on the Nyāyamakaranda there are frequent references to Maṇḍanamiśra or the Brahmāsiddhi-kāra (pp. 35, 52, 74-5, 225, 290, etc.) but none to Suresvara. Vidhiviveka is professedly a work of Maṇḍana, and Vācaspatimīśra in his commentary thereon refers to the Brahmāsiddhi as apparently a work of the same sampradāya (pp. 80, 281) and it is known that Vācaspati wrote a commentary on the Brahmāsiddhi. It can, therefore, be safely concluded that Maṇḍana and not Suresvara was the author of the Brahmāsiddhi.

I.H.Q., JUNE, 1931
(i) The first point of difference between Mañḍana and Sureśvara noted by Prof. Hiriyanna is that according to Mañḍana āśraya (seat) of avidyā is the Jiva (cf. Nyāyamakaranda, p. 312 "Brahmasiddhikārama-matam utthāpayati" : also Citsukhi, pp. 361-2 (comy.)—"mañḍana-mīśroktim anuvadatī") ; while according to Sureśvara and most other followers of Śaṅkara, it is Brahma itself (Naśikarmyasiddhi, pp. 157-162). Prof. Hiriyanna is, however, wrong in his second point. For, avidyā-nivṛtti, according to Mañḍana also, is identical with Brahma itself. Thus in the Siddhānta-leśa-saṅgraha (chap. IV) we read—"keyam avidyā-nivṛtthiḥ, brahmaiveti Brahmasyadhi-kārāḥ". In the Citsukhi (p. 381) there is the actual quotation of the Brahmasiddhi ("vidyaiśa vādvaśā śāntā tadastamaya ucyaete") which identifies avidyā-nivṛtti with Brahma-jñāna. Either way, it is not according to Mañḍana an abhāva and Prof. Hiriyanna is misled by quite a modern work on the point.

(ii) The second point of difference, therefore, is that Sureśvara maintains immediate knowledge of Brahma acquired directly through verbal statements (śabdasya aparokṣa-jñāna-janakataḥ : cf. Naśikarmyasiddhi, chap. III, p. 280). Among the opponents of the theory, the commentator on the Citsukhi (p. 32) expressly mentions "Mañḍana-mīśra-prabhṛtayah", whose theory is explained by the analogy of ratnattvādhigama (upadesāsahitam pratyakṣam eva sākṣātārahe tu na kevalahṣabdādah). We have given additional references on these two points to show that Prof. Hiriyanna is substantially correct when he opposes the current view about Mañḍana's identity. Two other points of difference are noted below.

(iii) Śaṅkara and his host of followers generally favours Ekajīva-vāda. In the Citsukhi (p. 375) this theory is discussed with reference to a passage of the Iśasiddhi-kāra (‘Brahmaiva svāvidyāt saṁsarati sva-vidyāya ca vimucyaet’, p. 363 ; ‘iti ekavidyāpakṣe na kaścit doṣāḥ’ p. 375 ; cf. Vivaraṇa-pramavasaṅgraha, p. 225). The original source of the theory is, however, clearly indicated in the Siddhānta-leśa-saṅgraha (Viz. ed., p. 20) where both Śaṅkara and Sureśvara are quoted (‘Brahmaiva svāvidyāyā &c. iti Bṛhadārṇyaka-bhāṣye pratipādanat, rājasūnoḥ smṛtiprāptau vyādhabhāvo nivartate | tathaivaṃ atmano ’ājasya tattvam asyādī-vaṅkataḥ iti Vārtikokteṣ ca’). Against this universally accepted theory stands the Nārāyaṇavāda which is expressly identified with the names Mañḍana and Vācaspati (Citsukhi, p. 380 : Comy. ‘Mañḍanamiśra-Vācaspatimiśra-matāvalambināḥ’). This
vāda has been partly quoted in the *Vivaraṇa-prameya-saṅgraha* (p. 224) under the name of Brahmāsiddhi-kāraḥ.

(iv) A set of Vedānta thinkers does not accept jīvanmukti. In the *Siddhānta-leśa-saṅgraha* (p. 107), the theory is found to be opposed by Sarvajñātma-guravaḥ i.e. Suresvara himself. As a matter of fact Suresvara disproves the existence of avidyāleśa (the cause of jīvanmukti) in the *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi* (chap. IV, p. 216 ‘avidyāyāḥ pradhvastattvam na kiñcid avaśīyate’). Against this sadyomukti of Suresvara, the existence of avidyāleśa and jīvanmukti of Maṇḍanaṃsiṇa stands in bold opposition. For, in the Citsukhi-tīkā (p. 385) the explanation of avidyāleśa as a saṃskāra on the analogy of ‘the continuity of fear etc. even after the snake is gone’ is regarded as peculiar to Maṇḍanaṃsiṇa. This very analogy is referred to in the *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi* (chap. IV, verse 60) as “aparah sāṃpradāyikah”. This is therefore a decisive point to show that Maṇḍana is not only different from Suresvara but belongs to an (earlier) school of the Advaita Vedānta other than that of Saṅkara.

This differentiation of Maṇḍana and Suresvara happily derives ‘orthodox’ support from the recently published *Guruvanāsaka-hāvyāṇa* (Srirangam Ed.) where Saṅkara met both Maṇḍana (Canto II, v. 47) and Viśvarūpa (Ib., vv. 50-60). Though the work was written only 3 or 4 generations ago its authenticity is greatly ensured by its being written under the auspices of the Sringeri Mutt and by the fact that the succession list of *Gurus* of the Sringeri Mutt given in this work substantially agrees with that given in a Tantrik work named *Gadyavallāri* written in 1435 Śaka (*Notices of Sans. Mss.*—R. L. Mitra, No. 2261).

The publication of the *Bhāvanāviveka*, a recognised work of Maṇḍana “renders another part of the tradition untenable, viz., the identity of Umbeka and Maṇḍana” (cf. Prof. K. Śāstrī : Proc. 3rd Or. Con., pp. 480-81). Umbeka in several places notes different readings in the text of Maṇḍana (cf. pp. 17, 28, 63, 77, 81 and 82) and attempts alternative interpretations of single passages (pp. 7 and 18). In one place he clearly disagrees with Maṇḍana (p. 92 ‘ato na vidmaḥ katham audāsinyavyacchedaḥ karoter artha iti’) and in another he adds an argument of his own in support of Maṇḍana and shows a peculiar humility in doing so by the interesting remark ‘tad āṣṭāṃ tāvad idaṃ bālabhaṣītaṃ’ (p. 110). So, clearly, Umbeka was not identical with Maṇḍana.
A second tradition makes Umbeka one of the four pupils of Kumārila recorded in the following couplet—

‘Umbekah kārikāṃ vetti tantraṃ vetti Prabhākaraḥ
dVāmanas tūbhayaṃ vetti na kiṃcidapi Revaṇaḥ’

In one reading the third name is Maṇḍana who quotes Kumārila but seems to have little regard for him (Dr. Jha: Intr. to the Bhāvanāviveka, pt. II. p. 2). Thus Maṇḍana is found to criticise adversely a view of Kumārila without mentioning the latter’s name in the Bhāvanāviveka (pp. 22-23, cf. Tantravārtika, p. 351). On the strength of a single passage in the Śīstradīpika (on II. i. i) Maṇḍana had been credited with the authorship of a commentary on the Tantravārtika. But the assumption proves to be wrong, as the passage refers to the Bhāvanāviveka (pp. 80-81). Umbeka’s pupilage under Kumārila is amply supported by other evidences. His lost commentary on the Ślokavārtika is cited by Bhaṭṭa Rāmakṛṣṇa on the Śīstradīpika several times. In the comy. on the Bhāvanāviveka also Kumārila is referred to as Bhaṭṭapāda (pp. 42, 75 and 92) and in one place Umbeka actually mentions him as his Guru (p. 43, cf. Tantravārtika, p. 351). Umbeka, therefore, on his own admission claims Kumārila as one of his teachers and this raises the question of his identity with Bhavabhūti. For, the late Mr. S. P. Pandit first announced the discovery of a Ms. of the Mālatīmādhava, ascribing the play to ‘a pupil of Bhaṭṭa Kumārila’ (Act III) and again to one ‘Umbekācārya, a pupil of Kumārilasvāmin’ (Act VI), though Bhavabhūti is also named as the author at the end. The authenticity of this unique Ms. is definitely supported by the independent evidence of a passage in the Citsukhī (J.A.S.B., 1918, p. 243). The comy. there clearly identified Umbeka with Bhavabhūti. But the identity though subsequently accepted by a large number of scholars is so unexpected that it is still generally regarded with suspicion. In the passage of the Citsukhī under discussion (p. 265) the great exponent of the Advaita school seeks to refute the logician’s definition of ‘verbal’ testimony (viz. āptavākyam) as wrongly extending to purely literary works of a (philosophical) authority (āpta), if there be any, and as a typical instance mentions Bhavabhūti’s literary works, in a manner meant clearly to convince even his opponents. Bhavabhūti’s credentials as a philosophical scholar must, therefore, have been of sufficient celebrity and value to be almost universally recognised even in Citsukha’s times (middle of the 13th cent. A. D.). Citsukha’s citation of a rare passage from Umbeka, i.e., Bhavabhūti himself in his rôle
as a philosopher lends a peculiar grace to his argument instead of contradicting it. It is clear from Citsukha's manner of quoting Bhavabhūti that he has to be identified with a philosophical scholar of repute, hence, it would be unsound to question his veracity without any positive evidence to the contrary. One scholar had contended (Modern Rev., May, 1924, p. 587) that Bhavabhūti betrays sympathy for Buddhism. This is hardly true. For, Kamandaki is deliberately assigned to the rôle of a negotiator of marriage—a most un-Buddhistic function for a Buddhist nun and is found to quote a passage in favour of courtship before marriage (gītās cāyam artho 'ṅgirasā 'yasyāṁ maṇascakṣusāṁ anubandhas tasyāṁ ṛddhiḥ, Act II). Similarly, the duty of warning a young husband with original quotations from the Kāmasūtra (Act VIII) is deliberately given to Kamandaki's assistant Buddhakṣitā, a really Buddhist name. So, Bhavabhūti's feelings towards Buddhism cannot be mistaken.

Bhavabhūti was proud of his attainments and has left in the Mālatimādhava, a magnificent bravado ('ye nāma kecit &c.') that earned for him a place among the few 'arrogant' (uddhata) poets of India (Rasārtavaśudhākara p. 268). The same spirit of pride and arrogance is also found in a passage of Umbeka's comy. to the Ślokavārtika (preserved by Bhaṭṭa Rāmakṛṣṇa on Śastrādipikā, Tarkapāda, Chowkh. Ed. p. 82 'idam tu vārtikakārīyaṁ dūṣaṇaṁ samarthanaṁ ca sarvam evāluna-viśrṇaṁ &c," where after a most scathing criticism of the Bṛgyaśa and the Vārtikakāra, his own teacher, he proudly concludes by reciting 'guror apy avaliptasya kāryākāryam ajānataḥ/ utpatha-pratipannasya parityāgo vidhiyate ṭa.'

III

The remaining factor of the tradition, viz., the identity of Umbeka (i.e. Bhavabhūti) and Viśvarūpa (i.e. Sureśvara) seems to have been left out of consideration by all scholars as apparently baseless. The publication of a commentary by Viśvarūpa on the Yājñavoikhyasamhitā (Triv. Sans. Series), which seems to have escaped the attention of scholars, raises and answers this question in a most remarkable way. It appears from the learned introduction of the late Dr. Ganapati Sastri that quite a literature grew up over this commentary of Viśvarūpa named Bālakṛtā, which was first commented upon by one Yatiśvara Vedatman, the sub-comy. being called the Vibhāvanā. This latter also came to be adorned with another sub-comy. (Yativyākhyā-ṭikā—as
the passage of the Vacanamālā seems to mean: Dr. Sastri gives a
different meaning—the Tikā being that on the original Bālakiṃḍā).
The second comy, on the Bālakṛīḍā was the Amṛtasyandini by
Somayājin and yet a third was named Vacanamālā whose author is
unknown. Dr. Sastri procured fragments of the last named work and
another which he thinks to be same as the Vibhāvanā. The
Vibhāvanā “salutes the original author Viśvarūpa” in these words :
“Yatprasādād ayaṃ loko dhāma-mārga-sthitāh sukhiḥ
Bhavabhūti-Suresākhyam Viśvarūpaṃ praṇamya taṃ t”

This means that the world is happy in the right path of virtue
through the grace of Viśvarūpa, whose other names are Bhavabhūti and
Sureśa, i.e., Sureśvara. The identity of the poet with the giant scholar
Sureśvara is, once more, so unexpected that Dr. Sastri does not even
suspect that the poet Bhavabhūti is meant here as it cannot but be,
and attempts an impossible explanation of the word put before
the name Sureśvara, indicating the devotion of the author towards
Śiva’ (p. iii). The ‘name’ (ākhyā) of Viśvarūpa was not certainly
‘Bhavabhūtisureśa’ but Bhavabhūti and Sureśa. This is the third
independent evidence bearing on the question of the identity of the
poet Bhavabhūti definitely supporting the two previous ones discussed
before (i.e. the Mālatī, Ms, and the comy. on Citsukhī). The Bālakṛīḍā
bears in several respects the affinity of the author with Bhavabhūti.
It is replete with quotations from Vedic texts, indicating his predilec-
tion towards the Veda as is also in evidence in the dramas. Bhava-
bhūti’s Vedic scholarship is mainly responsible for that unique scene
at the beginning of Act IV of the Uttararacarita where he attempts what
must have been a bold challenge to the Brāhmaṇic aristocracy of his
days by justifying in the language of ritual the taking of beef (by
Vasiṣṭha). Similarly, the Bālakṛīḍā alone among the host of Smṛti
writers, seeks to justify govadha (cow-killing) in Srauta rites even
though expressly prohibited in the Smṛti. Part of this interesting
passage is given below for ready reference (Bālakṛīḍā, vol. I, pp. 25-
26):—‘na khulu smṛti-viruddhāṃ śrutiyaṃ sam api ādriyaṁāṃ dṛṣṭyaṁ
tathā hi govadham nānumanyante śrutiyaṃ sam api tadvidhaḥ
maivaḥ, na khulu śiṣṭānāṃ kvacit smṛti-virodhahāḥ śrutiyaṃ
rthān anusāṣṭhānāṃ dṛṣṭham-alpiyasām api ā....smaṛto ‘pi govadho
styargyam arhayet prathamaṃ gavaḥ’ He repeats his opinion again
in this connection on p. 115 below while commenting on the well-
known line ‘asvantaṁ lokavidviṣṭaṁ &c.’ thus “lokavidviṣṭaṁ
sarvañānabhyupagataṁ govadhadhīti kecit. Tat tv ayuktam, vidhā-
nānarthakyaṭ &c.” Under Yājñ. I. 178 ‘Prāṇātyaye tathā śraddhe &c,’ the comment of Viśvarūpa is almost in the very words of Bhavabhūti: “Dvijaḥ kāmyamānātvād dvijakāmyā atithipūjā, tayopanītaḥ Mahokesādī bhakṣayato na doṣaḥ” (vol. I p. 126). It should be noted in this connection that the standard commentary Mitākṣarā and all later Śānti works entirely differ in their interpretation here as in many other places. The commentary of Viśvarūpa is therefore of the greatest value as preserving a tradition on the Yājñavalkya-smṛti quite different from the existing one.

In his commentary on the Yatidharma-prakaraṇa of the Prāyaścitādhyāya Viśvarūpa indulges in philosophical speculations of a remarkable nature. There are quotations from previous writers one of which is traced to the Gauḍapāda-kārikās (‘yathāikasmin etc,’ p. 53). The other two quotations we are unable to trace (pp. 44 and 54 of vol. II). He proves himself yet free from the influence of Śāṅkara. We would refer to only one of his original passages (pp. 67-68 of vol. II) where he attempts a most curious compromise between the Mimāṃsā and the Vedānta by reading into a well-known passage of the Śabara-bhāṣya (codanā hi bhūtaṁ &c,) the necessary authority of the Veda in Ātmajnāna also against all ‘orthodox’ Mimāṃsā scholars. None of his speculations seem to have survived in later literature. The name of the commentary seems to suggest that it was written in his early life in a youthful but immature stage, proof of which is lying broadcast in his entire work. The following references found in this work to certain localities may furnish some clue to his own native place: (i) ‘grāmāyatīyako vaisvadevika iti Mālavānāṃ prasiddhah’ p. 117 of vol. I, (ii) ‘khaṇjiṣṭākhyo dirghapuccah āśvadēsa-prasiddhah 1b. p. 122, (iii) grājanaṁ palaṇḍu-saḍaśam udvadēsa-prasiddham’ p. 123. These references do not conflict with the tradition recorded in the Guruvaṃśakāvyya that the historic debate of Śāṅkara and Viśvarūpa took place at Magadha (Canto II, vv. 43 & 50). This again does not conflict with the life history of the poet Bhavabhūti who was in the court of King Yāsuvardhana according to the Rājatarangīṇī. Yāsuvardhana’s dominions included at least Western Magadha and in one of the inscriptions of the Pāla period (the Ghosrawa inscr. of the reign of Devapāla: II. 9-10) there is a reference to a Yāsuvardhanapura in Magadha, which must have been named after this monarch. Bhavabhūti’s actual connection with Eastern India is also evident from an interesting reference in the Uttaracarita which seems to have escaped the notice of scholars. In Act IV King Janaka
is stated to have left Mithila grieved by Sītā’s exile and spent some years in practising penances in the hermitage of Candradvīpa. (Tathāsya katipaye saṁvatsaraṁ Candradvīpa-tapovane tapastapyamānasya). Bhavabhūti was only slightly removed from the time of It-sing and there is no evidence that there was any place of that name elsewhere in India other than Candradvīpa (mentioned by It-sing) in Eastern Bengal. Candradvīpa must have been at that time a celebrated seat for Brāhmaṇic culture also to be selected by Bhavabhūti for Janaka’s penance.

A reconstruction of the history of Bhavabhūti’s life is now necessary in view of these numerous identifications. It would appear, on the strength of the Śaṅkara-vijaya and the Guruvāṃśa-kāvya, rejecting the Maṇḍana element in the former, that Viśvarūpa was the real name of this giant scholar and Umbeka was either his ‘vulgar’ name (‘lokair abhīhitasya’) or was assumed in his rôle as a Mīmāṃśaka. Both these names, however, represent only the earlier part of his extraordinary career as the name Bālakṛṣṇa and exclamation like ‘āstāṁ bālabhāṣitaṁ’ would indicate. Bhavabhūti was the name assumed in his poetic achievements and this is supported by a well-known tradition that the name was given him after a happy use of the word ‘bhavabhūti’ in a verse composed by him just as in the case of Ghaṭakarpara. His conversion by Śaṅkara and taking Sannyāsa under the name of Sureśvara are well-known in history. According to the Guruvāṃśa-kāvya it was this Viśvarūpa and not Maṇḍana whom the goddess Sarasvatī cursed by Durvāśa wooed after assuming a human form under the name of Ubhayabhārati. The commentary on the Kāvya cites this tradition under II, 46 and refers to a work named Śaṅkarābhhyudaya for authority. One would be tempted to cite in support of this tradition the well-known verse in the Uttararacarita where the poet states that the goddess Sarasvatī attends him like a slave (yaṁ brahmāṇam iyaṁ devi Vāg vaśyevānuvartate’). The life-history of the great Maṇḍana becomes now almost an absolute blank; he is described in the Śaṅkara-vijaya of pseudo-Ānandagiri as the sister’s husband of Kumārila (‘madbhaginībhartā’—Jib. Ed., p. 181). The problem of chronology involved in these identifications deserves to be treated in a separate paper.

Dinesh Chandra Bhattacharvyya
Some Notes on Skanda-Karttikeya

The earliest mention of Skanda is found in the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* (शांतदशयाय तमस्कारं दर्शिति भगवान् सन्तानुभार्मा स्वानं दर्शि भाषयने सं स्वानं दर्शि भाषयने) where Sanatkumāra is identified with Skanda. In the Brahmanic literature *Sanatkumāra* is a philosopher and is regarded as the son of Dharma and Ahiṃsā or of Brahman. In the Pitā literature *Sanatkumāra* is the Brahman himself.\(^1\) In the *Dīgha Nikāya* *Sanatkumāra* is said to have uttered the verse which means that though the kṣatriyas take precedence among all those that trust in lineage, he that is perfect in wisdom takes precedence over all.\(^2\) This hints that Sanatkumāra preferred wisdom to martial spirit. Sanatkumāra of the *Upaniṣad* is also a philosopher and teacher of Nārada.

But who was the Upaniṣadic Skanda? Two answers are possible, viz., (i) this Skanda was either a philosopher deified or a divine being, or (ii) he was, according to the earliest Upaniṣads, the divine warrior. The writer of the *Chāndogya* might have identified the philosopher Sanatkumāra with the divine philosopher Skanda in order to increase the greatness of the former, if the latter had been a great “philosopher” god of that age. But Skanda as such is nowhere found in the early literature, on the other hand, he was characterised as the “warrior” god.\(^3\) In the post-vedic literature and in the plastic representations, Skanda is depicted as a religious teacher. The *Mahābhārata*\(^4\) ascribes to him the exposition of a *Dharma-rahasya* and in a few passages\(^5\) calls him Sanatkumāra—the son of Brahman. The Purānic references of this kind are many. Even a plastic corroboration of it is found in a relief at Ellora where Skanda is represented as “Śivadevasya deśikam,” the teacher of Śiva (see the Āgamas).\(^6\) But all these philosophic touches in the character of Skanda seem to be only secondary. In the Epics, the Purāṇas and later works, Skanda as
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the warrior god is given prominence. Hence, we may say that the philosophic touches given to his character in the later literature were secondary while the militaristic features of his character were primary, and that Skanda of the Chândogya was not a "philosopher" god. The identification of Skanda with Sanatkumāra therefore remains unexplained.

If in that early age Skanda was conceived as the "general" of the gods, then the reason why Sanatkumāra was identified with Skanda becomes somewhat explicable. In the Upaniṣads we find many kṣatriya chiefs teaching the secret knowledge of the Upaniṣads to the Brāhmaṇic sages. Thus in the Brhadāraṇyaka, the kṣatriya king Janaka-Vaideha teaches a Brāhmaṇa named Āśvatarāśvi Budhila, and another king Ajātaśatru destroys the pride of the Brāhmaṇa Bālāki. In the Brhadāraṇyaka and the Chândogya a kṣatriya king Pravahaṇa Jaivali is described as teaching the Brāhmaṇas the doctrine of transmigration and rebirth. In the Chândogya, again, Āśvapati Kaikēya, a kṣatriya king, is seen to teach the doctrine of the universal soul to the five brāhmaṇas. In the Kaśitaki another kṣatriya, Citra by name, teaches Śvetaketu, the son of Gautama. From all these facts it is not improbable to conclude that Sanatkumāra, whatever might have been his caste and function, was identified with a divine kṣatriya chief, furnishing another illustration to show kṣatriya influences in the formulation of the fundamental Upaniṣadic doctrines. Even if the kṣatriya references in the Upaniṣads be due to the brāhmaṇic policy of drawing kṣatriya sympathy,¹ our explanation stands good. Our evidences regarding the Upaniṣadic Skanda being the "warrior" god may not be conclusive, but the balance of probabilities seems to favour our suggestion. There is no special reason why this Skanda should be identified with the "warrior" god.²

Let us now take into consideration the circumstances that ushered in the conception of a divine general. Kings and generals of heaven are only prototypes of earthly kings and generals. In the Ṛg-vedic times the king was the general par excellence. The Senāni, the leader of the army, who appears in a few hymns of the Ṛg-veda, was a general appointed by the king to lead an expedition of too little impor-

1 See Keith, Religion and Philosophy of the Veda, p. 495.
2 See Keith, op. cit., p. 493.
tance to require his own intervention. But with the growth of complexities the functions of the king and the general were being clearly distinguished and in the great Epic we read of generals being in charge of the king's army. A similar process went on in regard to the conception of heaven. In the Ṛg-vedic times Indra, the king of gods, was the war-god of the Aryans. But slowly like the terrestrial king, he lost the position of being pre-eminently the Aryan war-god and in the Epics and the Purāṇas, came to be distinguished as Devarāja. So the necessity of a general was felt and the conception of Skanda was ushered in. Now as on the earth the functions of the king and the general were separated before the times of the Mahābhārata, it is only natural that the necessity for the conception of a divine general was felt at about that time. In the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa the wife of Indra, indicating thereby that Indra still held the army. The Mahābhārata gives the story which says that Indra rescued Devasenā from the hand of a demon and subsequently gave her to Skanda in marriage. The story signifies the transference of generalship from Indra to Skanda. It seems not quite improbable, that the conception of the general god first arose among the kṣatriyas as early as the period of the Chāndogya Upaniṣad. This accounts for the absence of the name of the god from the Saṃhitās and Brāhmaṇas. The Brāhmaṇas at first did not accept the innovation and went on with their own "general" Indra. Later on, probably with the increase of Kṣatriya influence, the conception of Skanda as the general obtained recognition in the Epics and the Purāṇas.

The next reference to Skanda is found in the Gitā and in the commentary of Pātañjali. In the Gitā Vāsudeva declares himself as वेणानीनांस्य स्व कर्त: (he was Skanda among the generals). It is evident that Skanda had become by this time a figure of emulations. He was of as much celebrity among the warriors as Viṣṇu was among the Ādityas and Śaṅkara among the Rudras. So it seems that he was holding his military position among the people from a time previous to the composition of the Gitā. The date of its

1 Cambridge History of India, vol. I, p. 95.
2 Vedic Mythology, p. 62.
3 III, 22, 7.
4 Vanapravā, 221 and 222.
5 X, 24.
6 Bhagavad Gitā, X, 21 ; X, 23.
composition is yet unsettled, some\(^1\) ascribing to it a period earlier than the 4th century B.C. and others\(^2\) a date in the 3rd century B.C. or even later. Whatever may be the correct date it is clear that Skanda was conceived as the divine general long before Vāsudeva sang his divine song.

Patañjali writes\(^3\) ऋषिवाणशी चापित्वा। शापस्य हृदयपाते तदनं न निपायति। वि: संकी विषार्द पायित। विं कार्तर्कम् सीधे प्रिंस्यांर्यांसिंखिताः; प्रक्षापता जगवायां न सात। यात्रेस्त: समुपति पुनाश्रयांर्यांनिमायति। This clearly suggests that images of Skanda and Viśākha were very popular and were showed in public in Patañjali’s time and some people used to earn their livelihood by this profession. Bhūradvīpa grhyā sūtra iii, 9 also mentions Skanda.

Taking all these evidences from the Upaniṣad, the Gītā, Patañjali’s commentary, etc. into consideration, it may be stated that the conception of Skanda came into existence before the invasion of Alexander.

Curiously enough the great general of heaven is often connected with infants and infant diseases. He is the lord of many uncouth figures who regulate the life of the infants. The Vanaparva of the Mahābhārata associates Skanda with fierce पारिवर्त, कुलरक्षा and जनाषा who destroy ever the foetus.\(^4\) In this Parva\(^5\) also Skanda orders the Mātrgaṇa belonging to his retinue to take under their care life of those people who are within sixteen years of age. This tradition is echoed in the Suśruta In the Uttara Tantra of the Suśruta II, which is assigned to the 2nd century A.D., Skanda is described as the "divine general, the husband of Devasenā and the destroyer of the enemy of Devasenā".\(^6\) But the divine general of the Suśruta is also connected with infant diseases.\(^7\) So striking is the similarity between the Mahābhārata and the Suśruta in this respect that the name of the nine grahas of whom Skanda is the lord in the Suśruta\(^8\) are the same as the Pārigadas of Skanda in the Mahābhārata.\(^9\)
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In course of the excavation of some mounds at Mathurā a stone-slab was found on the obverse of which is a goat-headed deity curved in relief labelled ‘Bhagavā Nemeso’ in Brāhmi characters of the Saka-kushana period; to the right are three standing female figures and a male child.\(^1\) It has been suggested by Bühler\(^2\) that the relief bears the legend described in the Kalpasūtra of the fetus of Mahāvīra from Brāhmaṇī Devānandā to Kṣatriyānt Triśalā by Harinegami. So the word Nemeso is nothing but a variant of Harinegami of the Kalpasūtra, Naigameśi of the Nemināṭhacarita and Negamesa of the Brāhmaṇical sūtra literature. That he is none but the divine general Skanda may be inferred from the fact that Harinegami of the Kalpasūtra is not only the transferer of the fetus but also the divine commander of infantry.\(^3\) Skanda of the Mahābhārata\(^4\) like Harinegami of the relief is goat-headed (chāgamukha). The Epic also has Naigameya as a title of Skanda. So it seems in all probabilities that Nemeso of the Mathurā relief is only another variant of Naigameya of the Epic i.e., is another name of Skanda. This Mathurā inscription is dated by European scholars\(^5\) from about the beginning of the Christian era or earlier. Skanda’s connection with the infants may be taken back still earlier. In the Pūrāṇāravīṣṭha-sūtra\(^6\) it is said in connection with the Medhājanana and Āyusya ceremonies that “Kumāra attacks the boy newly born”. The Mahāsena of the Mānavagṛhya sūtra who with others is referred to as the remover of possession by evil spirits is none but Skanda.\(^7\) These facts combine to show that Skanda-Kārttikeya’s connection with infant diseases and other malevolent spirits was established before the Christian era. The process how the great general of heaven came to be associated with such evil things is not far to seek. Rudra in the Rg-veda was believed to cause diseases. He is invoked to keep all free from illness\(^8\) and he is prayed not to afflict children with diseases.\(^9\) In the subsequent literature Rudra became predominantly
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Śiva and he was slowly being raised to the position of the supreme God. A god was therefore sought out and Skanda the divine general whose another name was Kumāra and who was the son of Rudra was thought to be the fittest one to be given the charge of the infants (Kumāras) and diseases. It should be noted that in the Saṃhitās and the Sūtras Rudra is called Dhūrta which is also a title of Skanda in the Atharva-veda Pārīṣṭa, XX.

It may be argued that Skanda, Kumāra, Mahāsenā and Viśākha were different gods originally. Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar thinks that Skanda, Kumāra, Viśākha and Mahāsenā were in older days names of four different gods. His conclusion is based on (1) Patañjali’s reference to both Skanda and Viśākha at the same time, (2) mention of the names of Skanda, Kumāra, Viśākha and Māhasena in the Huviska coins each with a figure corresponding to the names and (3) Amarasimha’s mention of only one of the former four names in each of the four lines of his two verses concerning Kārttikeya. Prof. Bhandarkar’s arguments, however, do not seem to be conclusive. Mahāsenā seems originally to have been only an attribute of the Senāni Skanda. Kumāra might have been originally a different god. But in that case also there is no evidence to show that he was a separate god till the time of the Huviska coins. The coins, as will be shown later on, have been wrongly interpreted.

In the Epics, Skanda and Kumāra are identical. The earliest reference to Kumāra is found in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, where Kumāra is called the ninth form of Agni as well as the son of Agni Gṛhapati. Skanda also was the son of Agni and he was in a very early age identified with Sanatkumāra who is some times called simply Kumāra. It seems that through these connections Skanda and Kumāra became identified with one another at a time earlier than that of the Huviska coins. The Suśruta, a book almost contemporaneous with the Kushans of the Kaniśka line, describes Skanda and Kumāra as the same deity. The Huviska coins, in fact, do not contain four figures of four different deities. One coin contains two figures and three names, and another coin has three

1 Ms. i, 8, 5; Āś vi, 2, 3; Hōs. iii, 18.
2 Carmichael Lectures, 1921, pp. 22-23.
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4 VI, 1, 3, 18.
5 Šabda Kalpadruma, sv., Sanatkumāra.
6 Uttara Tantra, xxxvii, I.
figures and four names. So it is clear that the die-engravers have not given as many figures as there are names. In both the coins only one of the figures seems to have a halo and other figures represent only attendant deities, which are female figures. So with all our diffidence in numismatic knowledge we cannot accept Prof. Bhandarkar's opinion. As for three or four names we may quote Sir. R. G. Bhandarkar who taking Mahāsena to be an attribute of Skanda says “looking to the fact that there are two names of a Buddha on the coins, the above three may have been the names of one single deity. While the figures on the coins are doubtful, the names in the Amarakośa seem to be only accidental. As for Viśākha, however, there is not the slightest clue to show that he was made one with Skanda in times earlier than that of the Mahābhārata. Patañjali differentiates between the images of the two deities. Suṣruta identifies Skandāpsmāra with Viśākha and extols him as the friend of Skanda. The Rāmāyana mentions भारतेय, referring thereby to Skanda and Viśākha. Sir R. G. Bhandarkar adds that "the Mahābhārata story of Viśākha's having arisen from the right side of Skanda is indicative of the tendency of making two gods as one". These all tend to show that Skanda and Viśākha were two different gods from the time of Patañjali to that of the Epics. It should be noted, however, that the evidence from Patañjali is not quite decisive and the absence of Viśākha's name as a deity in early or late literature is quite significant.

In the Epics and the Purāṇas the parentage of Skanda-Kārttikeya is attributed either to Rudra and Pārvati or to Agni and Gaṅgā or Svāhā. In the Epics he is connected with Rudra and Agni. In the Vedic literature Agni figures largely as the typical leader of the vanguard of army. A special army-fire—Senāgni—is mentioned in some of the later Sanskrit works. We have already seen that the Śatapatha calls Kumāra as the son of Agni-Grhapati. On the other hand, the Mānavagṛhya Sūtra, referred to before, connects Skanda with Śiva and Śaivite gods. In later litera-
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ture, including the Epics, Skanda’s connection with Rudra-Siva is the most predominant. It seems, therefore, that the war god Kumāra is in reality one of the manifestations of Agni-Rudra-Siva. Agni and Rudra were often identified with each other in the Vedic texts.¹ In the Epic also Agni is called Rudragarbha² and Śiva.³ Owing to this identification from the earliest times Skanda was connected sometimes with Agni and other times with Rudra. It seems that the former connection was the earliest.

Skanda is often associated in the Epics with “mothers”. He is called mātrnandana. Of him it is written that he was worshipped by Indra along with the “mothers”.⁴ The mothers suckled him.⁵ The gods sent the “mothers” of the universe to kill him.⁶ The gods and terrible dwellers of heaven attended him with the “mothers”.⁷ Of the Parivāra devatās to be set up in a svayampradāhāna temple of Subrahmana, Kumāra Tantra prescribes Saptamātṛkā as one.⁸ This idea of mothers as connected with Skanda seems to come from latter’s connection with Agni. In the Vedic literature Agni is called Mātarisvan meaning thereby as the Ṛg-veda poets meant “he who is found in his mother or growing in his mothers”.⁹ Most probably the idea of “growing in mothers” was in course of time transferred from the father Agni to the son Skanda. But who these “mothers” were and how their worship came in vogue is a question yet unsolved, though it is a fact that the “mother” worship was amalgamated with Skanda worship. Images of “mothers” are mentioned by Varāha Mihira¹⁰ who says that the images of “mothers” should be made Svanāma-devānurūpa-kṛta-cihna. In the Dravidian religion, however, there is prevalent the worship of seven mothers and one brother. When we read the suggestion of Dr. Keith¹¹ that there is little evidence or probability of mother worship as Aryan or Indo-European the question naturally arises whether the “mother” worship has to do anything for its origin with the
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Dravidian religion or not. If Mr. Arbman\(^1\) is right in establishing the connection of “mother”-worship with the Vedic Rudra, then it should be noted that Skanda’s connection with “mothers” might have come through that channel.

Then there is the Kṛttikā question so inseparably connected with Skanda-Kārttikeya. All of the three names Kārttikeya, Viśākha and Bāhuleya connect Skanda with the stars. In the Mahābhārata\(^2\) there is a passage which clearly establishes the connection of Skanda with Kṛttikā and other stars. The name Bāhuleya is derived from Bahulā which means Kṛttikā. The name Viśākha also must have some connection with the Viśākhā or Viśākha nakṣatra.

In the Epic\(^3\) Skanda is attended by followers like Unmātha, Pramātha, Subhrāja, 俱āla, Jīhvā, Jyotis, Dahati, Dahana, etc., all of whom suggest fever and fire. It seems that star-worship was mixed up with Skanda-worship. Kṛttikā from an early time was connected with Agni. Kālidāsa speaks of it as ग्रिमिख्रा।मिष्टान्तार्धामागम।\(^4\). The Mahābhārata\(^5\) calls it Agnidaivata, Varāhamihira\(^6\) calls it as Āgneya and Viśākha as Indragnidaivata. Through the common relation of Skanda and Kṛttikā with Agni, the Kṛttikās were most probably connected with Skanda while the idea of Mātariśvan as connected with Agni gave them the mothership of Skanda. Prof. Hopkins\(^7\) justly remarks that Kārttikeya is a very composite god and we have seen how Kārttikeya is related to Agni, Rudra, the “mothers” and the stars.

From the study of the above evidences it seems probable that the sectarian Skanda-Kārttikeya-worship was well established in our country before the 4th century A.D. There are unmistakable sectarian traces in the great Epic. In it Kārttikeya is given a very high position. When he was born, the gods were frightened by his prowess and asked Indra, their king, to kill the boy. But Indra replied that this boy could kill even the creator of the world in battle.\(^8\) Even once Indra, the king of Heaven, took refuge under
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Skanda with folded hands. Sometimes even the Virāj form of Vāsudeva is transferred to Kārttikeya. Even a separate world—the Skandaloka—which a devotee of Kārttikeya is expected to attain is spoken of. In the Anuśāsanaparva there is a particular religious canon which is ascribed to Skanda, and Hopkins finds therein that even Kṛṣṇa and Hari are spoken of as servants of Skanda. It is probable that the sectarian worship of Skanda became popular at that time. The Epic testimony of the tendency towards Kārttikeya worship seems to be supported by numismatic evidences. Many Yaudheyas coins contain a six-headed god on it and the mutilated inscriptions on them seem to read as follows: ॥ "स्वामि ब्रह्माण्डेयम्" . The real meaning of the name Brahmanyadeva is suggested to be the name of the Yaudheyas king to which, as Rapson thinks, the type of six-headed god (Sadānana, Brahmanyā or Kārttikeya) also alludes. There is another coin of the same type which contains the figure of the six-headed god with the transcription कुमारः . Smith suggests 'Kumāra' to be a chief, different from "Brahmanyadeva." It may be the case; but here also the name Kumāra refers to Kārttikeya. These numismatic evidences show that the Yaudheyas worshipped Kārttikeya in six-headed form. As to the date of these coins Smith remarks that "the big rude pieces of the chief who calls himself Svāmi Brahmanyā Yaudheyas" may be assigned to the 2nd century A.D. So Skanda-worship may go as far back as the 2nd century A.D. and the traces of its subsequent growth are left in the Mahābhārata as shown above, in many later Tantras and in some of the Cālukya inscriptions (5th and 6th century A.D.).
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Kulasekhara of Kerala

Kerāla has come to occupy an important place in the field of oriental research. She gave to the world a number of dramas of an apparently new dramatic technique, which led to the postulation of the Bhāsa theory, and though this theory has now been generally discarded, this has no doubt ushered in a large amount of original papers on the subject of what may be correctly called the Kerāla-nāṭaka-cakra. Her Sanskrit theatre is a subject of absorbing interest, for here alone are found in living form the ancient Sanskrit stage and the indigenous type of acting.\(^1\) No less important is the script in which the so-called Bhāsa's dramas are preserved, and a careful study of the same is ushering in new problems of Prākr̥tī study.\(^2\) These dramas do not exhaust her wonderful manuscript wealth: other works equally important are being discovered and announced. Again, she has made her own contribution to the make-up of the wonderful Sanskrit literature: her numerous works and her brilliant authors form an altogether untrodden field for research. And the history of her Sanskrit literature has yet to be written.\(^3\) My study of the subject has suggested a few interesting problems of literary history, such for instance as the problems of Kulaśekhara, of Vāsudeva,\(^4\) of Līlāśuka and Nārāyaṇa. There are indeed a number of other problems; but these appear to me to be the most important as much on account of their intrinsic confusion as on account of their extrinsic importance. A study of these problems is interest-
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ing not merely from the literary, but also from the historical point of view. No systematic attempt has yet been made to tackle any of these problems comprehensively and this has led to the postulation of a number of theories, more or less contradictory, regarding Kerala history and chronology. It is proposed to consider in the course of this paper in some detail one of these problems, viz., the problem of Kulaśekhara, which is the oldest and the most important.

Kerala knows many Kulaśekharas, about half a dozen in number so far as we now know. There is first and foremost the Vaiśnave devotee, the author of the Mukundamāla. There is another Kulaśekhara who figures as the dramatist, the author of the two dramas, Dhanañjaya and Sañvarañja. A third Kulaśekhara greets us as the patron of Vāsudeva, the author of the Yamaka-Kāvyā, Yudhiṣṭhira-Vijaya, a fourth as the patron of Prabhākara and a fifth again as the patron of Lilāśuka. A sixth Kulaśekhara also is met with as the founder of the temple at Trikkulaśekharapuraṇam, a suburb at Cranganore, from which is founded an era, the Kulaśekhara Era. One document at least is available dated in this era. All these Kulaśekharas were kings of Kerala, though there are some divergent views on this subject also. Another fact about them that we may accept is that all these Kulaśekharas could be taken to have lived before the 10th century. For the rest we are faced with a serious blank. We do not, for instance, know how many Kulaśekharas there actually were, when they lived and what exactly each one did. Some work has indeed been done regarding the author of the Mukundamāla and so also of the dramas, but the results achieved do not

1 Vide the last paragraph in my paper on "Rāmakathā—a study"; also 'Kerala Cultural Antiquities' published in the Madras Presidency College Magazine, December, 1928.
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5 Vide Early History of Vaiśnivism by Prof. S. K. Ayyangar, Lecture II.
6 Vide Mm. T. G. Śastrī's Introduction to the Dramas.
show that the final word has yet been said on the subject. I feel that the conclusions arrived at by the scholars who have worked on this topic have been vitiated to a certain extent by the fact that they were concerned with one Kulaśekhara at a time and were trying to introduce an imaginary interpretation. And secondly they were strangers to the local traditions. These two facts have taken away much of the value of their speculations.¹ In this paper it is my object to show that the date of Kulśekharas is yet an open question, which deserves to be reconsidered.

One Kulaśekhara figures as the author of the sweet devotional lyric, the Mukundamāla. Regarding its authorship, there can indeed be no two opinions, for the last verse explicitly says who its author was:

yasya priyau śrutidharau kavilokavirau
mitre dvijanmavapāraśavavabhūtām /
tenāmbujākṣacaranāmbuajasatpadena
rājñā kṛtā kṛtir iyam Kulaśekharēṇa //

The Tamil scholars identify this Kulaśekhara with the Kulaśekhara Alvar; for both are Vaiṣṇavites and have sung songs of devotion and both hail from royal families, Cera or Keraḷa. It is not indeed inconceivable that the same poet sang songs both in Sanskrit and Tamil, only it is not usually the case, especially in old days. Again there has been a lot of confusion between the terms Cera, and Keraḷa. True it was that at one time the two terms might have been used as denoting the same country, for Keraḷa formed a part of the Cera Kingdom. But it was not always the case, and we know that Keraḷa is never correctly called the Cera after the 8th century. Consequently, when a poet says that he hailed from the Cera royal family, it need not necessarily mean that he was a Malayali. In other words, no convincing evidence has so far been adduced to prove the identity of the Kulaśekhara Alvar and the author of the devotional lyric.² From the lyric itself we get the information that he was a king

¹ There is confusion in the consideration of the subject by Dr. S. K. Ayyangar, see his Early History of Vaiṣṇavism, p. 41.
² The following is a summary of Mr. M. R. R. Ayyangar’s view of this subject, kindly furnished me by my colleague Mr. Ramanuja Achariar: ‘From his own words we gather that Kulaśekhara Alvar was a Cera king (early half of the 8th century A.D.) ruling over Kon-
named Kulaśekhara, and if we may accept one of its earliest commen-
tators, Rāghavānanda, we can also come to the conclusion that he was a
king of Kerala. This work does not give us any further information
of a historical character. It is, however, clear that the sweetness of
the devotional fervour running through it and the high temporal
position of the author gave the work a phenomenal popularity, and
the Vaiśnāvites still look upon this work as a very sacred book.
One more legitimate inference the work yields and that is that Sans-
krit studies were very popular in Kerala at that time and that our
land even then produced two distinguished poets who the poet-king
thought were well known enough to be remembered by the posterity,
even if he did not mention them by name. So far we can naturally
inter, but anything over and above this gets within the realm of
speculation.¹

¹ The concluding verse we have quoted above offers a number
of interesting variant readings. Instead of Ravi lokavirau, we have
also Ravi lokavirau and Naralokavirau. Of these two readings the
latter does not yield any sense, except that both were very honoured
in the world. The first of these does convey a specific meaning: it
may be taken to mean that ‘leaders of Ravi-loka’ and Ravi-loka is
identified with the territory round Trippunittura in the Cochin State.
In other words, the acceptance of this reading would yield the idea
that the Bhakta king was holding his court at this town. In the
absence of any information regarding the kingdom, such an inter-
pretation cannot be accepted for the time being. We would accept
the reading given above, which means the ‘leaders of the world
of poetry’ and this is quite suited to the context. For the king was
mentioning them as his friends so that he might ensure some respect
for his work. Though we have no means of definitely deciding who
these poets were, the statement is a clear indication of the fact that
at the king’s court there were two eminent poets, association with
whom was in itself, the king believed, a sufficient hall-mark of poetic
merit. This also yields the suggestion that Sanskrit studies were
then very popular in Kerala. Unfortunately there is no means of
deciding which is the correct reading, and any inference based mainly
upon an interpretation of the verse must necessarily be tentative,
Coming to the work itself, one is forced to the conclusion that it does not come to the high literary standard that a pious progeny has always been assigning to it. It must be conceded that the work is pervaded by a natural simplicity and an intense devotion which are possibly unrivalled. These two qualities, by themselves, cannot give it the high position that has been accorded to it by the South Indian Vaiśnавites. What then is the reason that has given it this high position? The spiritual and temporal position of the author may be one reason. Possibly this Kulaśekhara, we incline to think, was the first royal convert to the Vaiśnavaite faith and the first South Indian to write a religious lyric in Sanskrit. Such a view may go a long way to explain the great popularity of the work and the position it occupies in religious literature. It is interesting to note that the Mukundamāla is more popular among the Vaiśnavaite Tamils than among others, probably because in it may be discerned the seeds of that qualified monism which it was given to Śrī Rāmānuja to expound. In other words, unless it is supported by other evidence. In the second para also there is difference in the reading: some read as 'padmasaravabhitūm.' Evidently this reading does not give any sound sense. Another variant is 'pārśava Caravabhitūm.' This is quite good. As per reading we have accepted, the term, Pārśava means warrior, one of the many varieties of Ambalavasis, and this would suggest that the king had two friends, one a brahmin and the other a warrior. One difficulty may be raised against this interpretation, the interpretation of the term Śrutidharau. A warrior is not allowed to study the Vedas, and as such he could not be termed such. In answer we have only to say that we may either assume that at that time there was not the taboo or accept a .addButton to this expression: Śruti may be understood in the sense of the Vedas and it could also be taken to mean music. The Brahmin friend of the king was well-versed in Vedas while the warrior friend, in music. The acceptance of this reading would raise one more question: Have Ambalavasis such a high antiquity? This appears to be a serious objection, but if we may take our stand on tradition, we may accept a sufficiently high antiquity for them, because our traditions make the Yamaka poet, Vasudevā, a Nambiar, another sect of Ambalavasis. It will be clear from what has been said that whatever readings we may accept, this last verse does not give anything historical,

1 Vide verses 39, 40 and 43 of the Mukundamāla.
this work formed the sacred text in Sanskrit on which to propound a new school of thought. If this view has any semblance to correctness or acceptation, the author of the Mukundamālā is the first of the Vaiṣṇavite Perumāls who actively patronised the Vaiṣṇavite faith to check Buddhism and Jainism in Kerala. This assertion of the orthodox religion on the part of the Emperor led the Buddhists to mobilise their forces, which in its turn led to the blooming forth of the genius of Prabhākara and the elaboration of the Guru school of Mīmāṃsā. This view necessarily makes us put the author of the Mukundamālā to the period anterior to Prabhākara.

The traditions of our religious history have preserved for us two dates, as expressed in the Kali chronogram, Vaiṣṇasthāṇam samrakṣyam and Cittacalanan. The former of these which works out about the close of the 4th century is reported to be the date of Melattol Agnihotri, the staunch supporter of the Vedic cult, and the Kalivākya itself suggests that even then the Vedic religion stood in need of protection. In other words, Buddhism silently advancing over the time honoured Vedic religion, came to be perceptibly felt as its serious rival towards the close of the fourth century. The second Kalivācaka which works out to about the middle of the 6th century, records the destruction of the premier temple at Payyannūr dedicated to Varāhamūrti. The destruction, our traditions narrate, was the result of a religious schism, and it led to the dispersal of the orthodox brahmins from that stronghold to the southern banks of Cūrṇikā, the modern Periyar or Alwaye river, where in due course were born the great pillars of Vedic religion and Hindu philosophy, Prabhākara Bhaṭṭa and Śrī Śaṅkarācārya. Our traditions will have it that the fundamental cause which brought about this calamity was the introduction of foreigners, but they are not very clear who these foreigners were and where they were introduced. In the absence of anything definite, I incline to believe that they are the foreigners to our religion and their introduction is to our centres of worship. In other words, the whole quarrel might have resulted in the introduction of Buddhists into the temple or religious service. In the light of the preceding chronogram such an interpretation does not seem

to be implausible. The silent spread of Buddhism and the popular appeal it always made to the masses gave it a great impetus so that by about the middle of the sixth century, it got a crowning victory, when it brought about a cleavage in the orthodox fold. From this period, till about the time of the Vaiṣṇavite Kulaśekhara, Hinduism appears to have been in eclipse. As a matter of fact Hinduism got its first victory only just before the time of Prabhākara, who, as we shall show later, may be assigned to the early half of the 8th century. The intensive spread of Buddhism led the orthodox party to invite from outside a number of scholars, six in number, to fight their Buddhistic antagonists. All these were Bhāṭṭas and this is an indication that they were the disciples of Kumārila Bhaṭṭa. The result of their work was to wean gradually the masses from falling away from the brāhmaṇic fold. These scholars met the Buddhists in argument and defeated them during the time of a Kulaśekhara. And their most eminent disciple was the famous Prabhākara. In other words, this Kulaśekhara appears to have been the first royal convert back to Hinduism and the first to actively espouse the Hindu cause. It is worth while to point out that Prabhākara was a Vaiṣṇavite, and it is possible that his patron also was a Vaiṣṇavite. This probably was then the most popular cult, thanks to the popularity given to it through the work of the Alvars. As a result of the conversion of the Perumal and his ardent partiality for Vaiṣṇavite Hinduism, his new faith, this Perumal lavished his patronage on Prabhākara and his school and at the same time founded at least one temple, the Śrī Kulaśekhara temple in a suburb of Cranganore. In other words, a consideration of the religious traditions of the period leads one to the legitimate conclusion that the new cult underwent three distinct stages: the first was the transference of the Emperor's sympathy from Buddhism to Hinduism, by converting him into an ardent Vaiṣṇavite; the second, the popularisation of the cult and the founding of the numerous Vaiṣṇavite temples, the earliest of such temples being apparently the shrine of 'Trikulaśekharapuram'; and the last but not the least, the founding of the mutt at Kumblam for the study of the Vedas and Śāstras. The first President of this mutt was Prabhākara who acclaims a Kulaśekhara as his patron; and when we know that Prabhākara precedes Śaṅkara and is not far separated from him, we are safe when we say that our Kulaśekhara must have lived during
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the closing decades of the 7th century and the first half of the eighth century. This date is also borne out by the fact that some time at this period there were come into the land some Buddhists from China: in case we assign this period to the Kulaśekhara, these pilgrims may be identified with It-sing and Huien Tsang. In other words, we shall not be wrong if we assume that with the close of the 7th century there began a revival of Vedic studies under the lead of the newly introduced Vaiṣṇavite cult which in its turn led before long to the complete overthrow of the Buddhistic cult, thanks to the founding of numerous Viṣṇu temples and the famous Mutt at Kumblam for the study of the Mimāṁsā Śāstra. The author of the Mukundamālā, we believe, was the father of the revival of Hinduism. He was the first king to write the devotional lyric in Sanskrit and to actively espouse the Hindu cause, and probably the first to build a number of Viṣṇu temples and to found the Mimāṁsīc Mutt at Kumblam under the presidency of Prabhākara for the furtherance of the exegetical ritualistic studies.

Prabhākara is one of the most elusive figures in the whole range of Sanskrit literature. Scholars who have tried to fix his date are sharply divided into two camps, some assigning him to the pre-Kumārila period and others to the post-Kumārila period. Our traditions are unanimous in maintaining that Prabhākara was the disciple of the six Bhaṭṭas invited in Kerala to check the advance of Buddhism. These Bhaṭṭas were the disciples of Kumārila, and these were the first founders of the Kumārila system of Mimāṁsīc philosophy, one eminent follower of which school was Śaktibhadra, the author of Cudāmani, and contemporary of Śri Śāṅkara. If our traditions may be believed one more direct disciple of Kumārila lived to be the direct disciple of Śri Śāṅkara, I mean Maṇḍana Mīra, the later Suresvara. A reconciliation of these is not impossible, if we suppose that Kumārila lived to a long age and that Maṇḍana was the last of his disciples. This is a very fairly feasible position and it explains also why Prabhākara could expound a new system. In other words, Prabhākara was able to expound the new creed, because even Kumārila and his first batch of students had not yet been able to establish their new view. That one is the disciple of another does not necessarily mean that the disciple must be younger; thus Padmapada and Suresvara and Śaktibhadra are necessarily older than Śāṅkara himself. It is, therefore, quite possible that Prabhākara and Kumārila
were almost of the same age, and both of them died before Śaṅkara must have come up to the arena. Not only that, if we may attach any weight to the remarks of Śaṅkara, it is also reasonable to suppose that Kumārila must have died before Prabhākara, because Śrī Śaṅkara is more wroth with Prabhākara than with Kumārila. He is unsparing so far as Prabhākara is concerned, probably because he was as good as his contemporary and also hailed from the same gramam. The date of Śrī Śaṅkara has been fixed with a fair degree of certainty at the close of the 8th century and that means we may assign Prabhākara to the opening years of the same century. Kumārila might have passed away about the middle of the period and Maṇḍana, a latter day disciple, could have lived to become the disciple of Śaṅkara and to live even after him, especially because the latter had but a short span of life. The same view is further borne out by the fact that Śaktibhadra, a disciple of Śaṅkara, was a follower of Kumārila and this means that he must also have been connected with the original Bhaṭṭas who came and introduced the Mīmāṃsā philosophy into Keraḷa. If he had come after Prabhākara, we would naturally expect to find him following the tenet of Prabhākara. I would therefore believe that Śaktibhadra was the last of the disciples of the Bhaṭṭas, while Prabhākara belonged to the first batch. In other words, Prabhākara was an older contemporary of Śaṅkara, and this view again suggests the middle of 8th century as the date of Prabhākara.

Now to sum up: the Vaiṣṇavite Perumal of Keraḷa, the author of the Mukundaṃalā was the first to assert himself against the rise of Buddhism: he espoused the Vaiṣṇavite cult, composed a sweet lyric, built Vaiṣṇavite temples and patronised the revival of Sanskrit studies in the land which led to the discovery of the genius of Prabhākara and this Perumal must have graced the throne in the early decades of the 8th century.

Now we shall proceed to the consideration of the other Kula-
śekhara. Vāsudeva mentions a Kulaśekhara as his patron, and traditions make Lilāsuka a contemporary of Kulaśekhara. The date of Lilāsuka can with some of certainty be fixed, for our traditions make him the contemporary of Śrī Śaṅkara and the successor of Sureśvara on the pontifical throne at Tekke Madham at Trichur. In other words, he may be assigned to the latter half of the 8th and the first half of the 9th century. The opening words of his Kārṇāmṛtam suggest that he was the disciple of Vāsudeva: compare
The second pada has a śleṣa and here one may find a veiled reference to Vāsudeva, from whom Līlāśuka learnt his worldly lore. Śikṣāguru refers to the teachers who taught him worldly lore; and so the Guru referred to in the first Pāda must be the spiritual Guru. If such an interpretation may be accepted, it would mean that Vāsudeva and Līlāśuka stand in the relation of Guru and disciple and this would suggest that the Kulaśekhara who is the patron of Vāsudeva and Līlāśuka are one and the same and that this Kulaśekhara must have lived in the middle of the 8th century so that Līlāśuka may continue to live in the beginning of the 9th century. And be it noted that this Kulaśekhara cannot come down to the eighties of this century for at the time of the birth of the seer, the king of the country was Rāja Rāja, as mentioned in the Śaṅkarācārya-caritaṃ, and during the heyday of his greatness the king was Rājaśekhara, a great poet and dramatist. This would mean that the patron of Vāsudeva and Līlāśuka must be put down to the middle of the seventh century.

It would be interesting to inquire if the patron of Vāsudeva and the author of the Mukundamālā could be identical. The necessary inter-relation between the various authors we have mentioned makes this identification rather difficult. That would again suggest that the country was ruled by the same king for more than half a century, a thing that is very improbable. We would therefore keep the author and the patron of Mukundamālā separate, assigning the earlier to the earlier, and the latter to the middle, decades of the century. There is also one more argument which necessitates such an assumption, as we shall presently show.

We have tried to locate five Kulaśekharas and these have resolved themselves into two monarchs. We shall now proceed to locate the dramatist Kulaśekhara. He has been the subject of a lot of discussion and various dates have been assigned to him, ranging from the 10th to the 12th century. The 10th century-and-after view was first suggested by the late lamented Mm. G. Śāstri, and this view has been amply supported by the acceptance of same by Prof. Keith. In the light of the internal evidence furnished by the works themselves, this date cannot be accepted, and, not only
that, Mm. Śāstri’s date has no conclusive arguments to support it except his fondness for his own Bhāṣa theory.

From the Prologue of Kulaśekhara’s dramas it will be found that the poets then familiar and popular in Kerala were Śudraka, Kālidāsa, Harṣa and Daṇḍin, while the poets Bhāṣa, Bhavabhūti and Śaktibhadra were unknown to him. The absence of reference to Bhāṣa is inexcusable if his works were known to him, and these works were popular on our stage. The absence of reference to Bhavabhūti gives us the latest limit to this author, all the more so because there was some sort of intellectual intercourse between the North and South of India after the time of the great seer. In view of the reference to Daṇḍin and Harṣa, the absence of reference to Bhavabhūti gives us the latest limit to the date of the dramatist Kulaśekhara. Similarly the absence of all reference to Śaktibhadra gives us the earliest limit. Śaktibhadra claims that he was the first South Indian to write a Sanskrit drama, and his drama, Cudāmanī, has been very popular on our stage. If Kulaśekhara lived after the time of Śaktibhadra, surely he should have referred to the first Sanskrit dramatist of Kerala—a dramatist not the least important even when we regard him from the purely æsthetic point of view. This absence of reference to him can therefore mean only one thing, namely, that Kulaśekhara lived before the fame of Śaktibhadra became well known. It is also very strange that Śaktibhadra should have claimed himself to be the first S. Indian dramatist, if Kulaśekhara lived before him. Himself a Malayali, he could not have said that, if when he wrote his drama, the dramas of Kulaśekhara were popular. The only possible method of reconciling the two positions would be to assume that the two dramatists were contemporaries, Kulaśekhara the older and Śaktibhadra the younger. And they may have written their dramas almost at the same time. Possibly Śaktibhadra, being deficient of his own merits, did not care to announce his work—that had to be done by the great Saṅkara. We know that Śaktibhadra lived to be a disciple of Saṅkara and that gives us his date. And since during the time of Saṅkara the sovereigns were Rāja Rāja and Rājaśekhara, Kulaśekhara must be anterior to him. In other words, we assign the dramatist Kulaśekhara to the middle of the 8th century and he must have lived before 788 A.D. As regards the argument that the dramatist Kulaśekhara’s contemporary quotes from Daśarūpaka, the answer is that it is a myth invented by Mm. G. Śāstri to support his Bhāṣa theory.
Now that we have to assign the dramatist to the middle of the 8th century, it is but reasonable to identify him with the patron of Vāsudeva. And as for the identification of this Kulaśekhara with the author of the Mukundamālā, it will be seen that the style of the two writers presents an insurmountable difficulty in the way. There is absolutely nothing in common between the natural simplicity of the lyric and the chaste elegance of the dramas. The two reveal two distinct hands.

The discipline that we have introduced into the problem of the Kulaśekharas from the traditional and the literary points of view resolves the six Kulaśekharas into two: the author of devotional lyric and the dramatist, who come one after another with or without an interregnum, but more or less close upon one another. Both were devout Vaiṣṇavites and both tried to give an impetus to the Hindu revival which, springing from the greatest Bhaktayogin of Kulaśekhara and passing through the hands of the Karmayogin of Prabhākara, reached its climax in the hands of Śrī Śaṅkarācārya, the greatest Jñānayogin that the world has ever produced.

Enough has been said in the course of the paper to show this was a century of great literary revival. Both the Kulaśekharas were great patrons of literature. The regal munificence of the former was enjoyed by the Bhaṭṭas and Prabhākara, while at the court of the latter lived Sūmāgiri, Vāsudeva and Lilāśuka. Besides the royal protégés, there were at least two great poets: Lākṣmi-dāsa and Śaktibhadra. And the latter days of the century ushered in the great master-mind of India, the venerable Śaṅkara and his disciples. It would thus be seen that the 8th century is a great century for us, so far as the development of Sanskrit literature is concerned.

K. Rama Pisharoti
A Sūrya Icon from a Daśāvatara Temple, Pagan

The Nāt-hlaung Kyaung is a Viṣṇu temple, in fact, the only ancient Brahmanical temple that is still now extant in Burma. It is a Viṣṇu temple which enshrines in the niches of its walls as well as in those of the central square obelisk images of the different incarnations of Viṣṇu, and of Viṣṇu himself. The principal deity of the temple, an image of Viṣṇu seated on his vāhana Garuḍa, is placed in the main sanctum formed by a large deep niche in the middle of the east face of the central obelisk which supports the crowning nikhara of the temple. In plan the Nāt-hlaung temple is a square raised on a plinth about five feet high above the ground. Like all similar temples of Pagan, the interior of the square is occupied by the usual perambulatory corridor running all round a central huge square masonry structure on the three faces of which were originally figures of Viṣṇu standing in niches each adorned with slender pilasters. These figures are all very badly damaged. On the side facing east there is the sanctum wherein was placed the main deity referred to above, and which found its way sometime in the last quarter of the nineteenth century to the Berlin Museum. On the outer walls of the square basement there were on all sides arched niches each of which originally contained one stone sculpture. Some of these sculptures cannot now be traced; others that are still in situ are more or less badly damaged. Of the outer sculptures representing the ten avatāras of Viṣṇu, seven only remain; “three of the four niches on the east side are empty, the sculptures having apparently been removed from there and destroyed by iconoclasts; the figures that remain bear visible traces of wilful disfiguration.” Of these seven images that remain, six have been identified as six avatāras of Viṣṇu, namely, Varāhāvatāra, Narasiṁhāvatāra, Rāmāvatāra,

1 For an elaborate study of the Nāt-hlaung temple and its gods, see my paper on the subject to be shortly published in the Indian Antiquary, 1931.
Parasurāmāvatāra, Vāmanāvatāra and Kalki-avatāra. The seventh image which is one of the best preserved images of the Nāth-hlaung Kyaung has not yet yielded to any definite identification. An attempt is, therefore, made here to ascertain its identity.

It would surprise anybody at the first instance to know that it is not an image of Viṣṇu, nor any of his different avatāras. It is sheltered in the niche close to the entrance, just to the proper left. The image can easily be described, but it is better to quote Mon. Charles Duroiselle, Superintendent, Archaeological Survey, Burma, who sought to identify it in one of his very valuable and interesting Annual Reports (A. R., A. S. I., 1912-13). “It is standing on a lotus flower from which two other smaller ones spring; the arms are placed close to the body bent upward at the elbows, and each hand holds a lotus-bud on a level with the shoulders; it wears a crown; the distended earlobes hang down and touch the shoulder under the weight of large ear ornaments. It has bracelets, armlets and anklets; the lower garment is tucked up and reaches as far as the knees, lines showing folds are visible.” Mon. Duroiselle was not able to identify it, but he added, “the number of the niches would lead one to suppose that this also represents one of Viṣṇu’s avatāras; but it has none of the distinctive attributes of any of these.” And precisely for this reason it is not any of the avatāras of Viṣṇu, nor is Viṣṇu himself. In all likelihood it is an image of Sūrya of the South Indian variety. The position of the two hands as well as the lotus-buds held in one line with the shoulder are significant; no less significant is the number of the hands, namely two, and the strictly erect attitude of standing. All these are features that are particularly noticeable in the South Indian variety of the Sūrya icon. The high boots covering the two legs and feet, and the horse-drawn chariot with Üṣā and Pratyūṣa shooting arrows on the two sides of Sūrya are, no doubt, missing from the present example; but this need not surprise us in the least, for

I See my forthcoming paper, “The Nāth-hlaung Temple and its Gods” in the Ind. Ant, 1931. We have besides these six avatāras, a seventh one, namely, an image of Buddhāvatāra which is enshrined not in one of the outer niches but inside the temple in one of the two small niches over the two capitals on the two sides of the main sanctum. It can, therefore, safely be assumed that the three niches that are now empty must have once sheltered images of the Matsya, Kūrma, and Kṛṣṇa avatāras of Viṣṇu.
FIG. 1
The Nat-hlaung Kyaung, Pagan
(East face)

FIG. 2
Sūrya standing in a niche of the Nat-hlaung temple
these are exactly the features that we miss in the South Indian variety of the Sūrya icon. And when we compare our present icon with a Sūrya image from South India, the iconographic affinities seem to be so striking that it is simply impossible to exclude the possibility of its being designated as Sūrya image. It is surprising, one must admit, to find a Sūrya icon where we would very naturally seek for an *avatāra* of Viṣṇu. But the fact can easily be reconciled if we would only care to bear in mind the very intimate relation of Viṣṇu with the Vedic Sūrya. For, there in the Vedas, he is never a supreme God, but is on the contrary always identified with the Sun, and is said to have stridden over the seven regions and to have covered the whole universe by means of his three steps, a story in which the germ of the later *Trivikrama* incarnation story is so often traced. The idea underlying this solar explanation is obviously incorporated in the *dhyāna* idola: "*dhyeya-ssadi savitṛ-maṇḍala-mahāyavartī Narāyaṇa-sarasijūnasannivṛtah keyūravān makara-kuṇḍalavān kirūṭi hārī hiraṇmayavapur dhyātāśaṅkha-caukraḥ" wherein Viṣṇu as Narāyaṇa is described as residing in the orb of the Sun. The idea that Viṣṇu is the Sun appears still to be maintained in the worship of the Sun as Sūrya-Narāyaṇa". We can, therefore, safely identify the present image as Sūrya whose presence in a Daśāvatāra temple, though uncommon, is not altogether an impossible proposition.

**Niharranjan Ray**

---

1 Cf. plates LXXXVI, XCVI (fig. 2) and XCVI (fig. 2) in G. Rao's Elements of Hindu Iconography, vol. I, part II.

Vilvamangalam Svāmiyārs

One of the most intricate problems confronting the students of early Keraḷa History is the absence of a settled chronology for many of her rulers and men of letters. Keraḷa is said to have had more than one Kulaśekhara, Kājarāja, Kotai Ravi and Bhāskara Ravi among her sovereigns, and more than one Vāsudeva, Śaṅkara, Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍita and Vilvamaṅgalam Svāmiyār among her talented scholars, writers and saints. In the absence of definite historical data, it is very difficult to assign a work or event to a particular writer and to fix his date. In the elucidation and solution of these problems, adequate attention has to be paid to traditions. An attempt therefore may be made here to utilise the available literary and traditional evidences, and to see whether there were not more than one devout soul called Vilvamaṅgalam Svāmiyār, whose saintly personality has been connected with many important temples of Keraḷa, and whose devotional fervour has found lasting expression in many literary compositions.

According to Mr. Uḷḷūr S. Parameśvara Ayyar, there is only one Vilvamaṅgalam Svāmiyār and he is known as Śri Kṛṣṇa Līlāśuka and Kodaṅḍamaṅgalam. A native of Conjevaram or of one of the villages of Andhradeśa, who had resided for long in Keraḷa, he is considered by Mr. Ayyar as the author of the Puruṣakāram, Gopīkābhīraka and other works, besides the well-known Śri Kṛṣṇa Karṇāṇṭam. He is stated to have lived about the end of the 12th century or the beginning of the 13th century A.C. He, therefore, concludes he could not have been a friend of Mānaveda Rāja of Calicut, who introduced the devotional form of entertainment known as Kṛṣṇāṭam Kaḷi in the 17th century A.C.,¹ and that the tradition which makes them contemporaries has to be rejected.

The question of the date and identity of the Vilvamaṅgalam Svāmiyārs is, in itself, of considerable interest and importance, and

¹ So far as the writer is aware, this view, expressed by him about five years ago, has not since been revised. See his article ‘Agastya Bhaṭṭa,’ in the Sadguru (Malayāḷam monthly), vol. III, pp. 479-81.
deserves careful consideration by students of cultural history and especially, of the history of literature, religion and philosophy, not merely because of the intrinsic value of their productions, but also because of the salutary influence exerted by them on subsequent generations. As considerable difference of opinion is possible with regard to the above position of Mr. Parameśvara Ayyar, it is proposed to examine some aspects of the question, with a view to provoke further discussion and ultimately to arrive at the truth.

_Vilvamaṅgalam Svāmiyār I_ (Lilāśuka)

We will first try to fix, as roughly as possible, the date of Śrī Kṛṣṇa Lilāśuka. We get a clue to his date from the fact that, in a commentary of his on one of the works of Śrī Śaṅkarācārya, he admits that his tutor is Padmapādācārya, himself a disciple of the Ācārya-svāmin.¹ As the age of the great Advaitin philosopher is generally held to be from 788 to 820 A.C., Lilāśuka may be considered to have flourished in the early half of the 9th century A.C. This fact also well fits in with Kerala tradition. For, Sureśvarācārya, and Padmapādācārya, the disciples of Śrī Śaṅkara, are the traditional founders of the Naṭuvile Maṭhom and the Tekka Maṭhom, two of the _Sannyāsī Maṭhoms_ which exist at Trichur. The heads of the former institution claim continuity of spiritual succession from _Vilvamaṅgalam Svāmiyār_ also, and, in view of the fact that no other mutt in Kerala claims him or his namesakes, whatever be their dates, we are naturally led to infer that the tradition which assigns all the _Vilvamaṅgalam Svāmiyārs_ to the Naṭuvile Maṭhom may be accepted as genuine. It may also be stated that it is on account of this fact that members of this institution even now retain the coveted privilege of performing _Pūṣpāṭali_ (worship with offerings of flowers) to God Padma-nābhasvāmin at Trivandrum, to whom, according to tradition, it was _Vilvamaṅgalam Svāmiyār_ who offered _Nivedīya_, for the first time. Besides these, as both the _Maṭhoms_ are situated very close to each other, it would have been very easy for Lilāśuka, a _Sannyāsin_ of one _Maṭhom_ (Naṭuvile Maṭhom), to have become a literary disciple also of Padmapādācārya, the president of the neighbouring _Maṭhom_.

¹ For this reference, I am indebted to Prof. K. R. Pisharoṭi.
Vilvamaṅgalam Svāmiyār II

The question now arises: Is this Lalāśuka identical with the Vilvamaṅgalasvāmin, who is acknowledged to be the author of the grammatical treatise, Puruṣakāram? The internal evidence provided by this work itself helps us to suggest an answer. Reference is made therein to the Vyākaraṇa of the 12th century A.C. Mādhavācārya, who was the chief minister of the founders of the Vijayanagara kingdom, and who flourished in the 14th century A.C., refers in his Dhatuvṛtti to the Puruṣakāram as an important and authoritative work on the subject. From this it will be clear that the Puruṣakāram was composed roughly after the first half of the 12th and before the 14th century A.C. (1150-1300 A.C.).

If we follow tradition, we may arrive at the date of this Vilvamaṅgalasvāmin, a little more approximately. According to local tradition, there was a Vilvamaṅgalam Svāmiyār, who was a contemporary of Talakkuḷattūr Bhaṭṭatiri, the greatest astrologer of Kerala, whom he is said to have consulted with regard to some predictions. The date of Bhaṭṭatiri, probably that of his death, is preserved by the Kali cryptogram ‘Rakṣeit Govindamarkka’ which works out to about 1238 A.C. Besides this, there are some Kali chronograms relating to the founding of certain temples by the Svāmiyār, which lead us to the same conclusion.1 We believe that this Vilvamaṅgalam Svāmiyār and the author of the Puruṣakāram may well be identified and assigned to the 13th century A.C.

Vilvamaṅgalam Svāmiyār III

From what has been said above, it will be noted that the evidence of tradition agrees more or less with that of literature in that there

1 I am not prepared to hold that this Svāmiyār alone is the “Vilvamaṅgalam Svāmiyār” who is connected with many of the temples of Kerala. It was a practice with the earlier generations of tradition-makers to ascribe the founding of most of the pagodas of Kerala, large or small, important or unimportant, to a Vilvamaṅgalam Svāmiyār, irrespective of their actual age, so as to assign to these institutions a long-standing pedigree and to enhance their sanctity and prestige by their association with such a devout saint, just as we find many of the forts scattered in different parts of Kerala attributed to an eponymous Ceramaṇ Perumāl, the hero of popular tradition.
were more than one Vilvamaṅgalam Svāmiyār, and that they belonged to different ages. We do not see why, then, we should discredit the traditional view that there were, at least, three of these Sannyāsins, and that one of them, the last, met Mānaveda Rājā of Calicut, the author of the Kṛṣṇāṭṭam Kali,¹ who flourished in the 17th century A.C. Of course, some may be sceptic about the possibility of the Svāmiyār being able to vouchsafe to the pious prince a vision of God Kṛṣṇa, and they need not credit that part of the story. A reference to the known events of the period would show that such a meeting between the saint and the prince is not improbable. For, Mānaveda, the author of the Kṛṣṇāṭṭam Kali, completed the work about 1657 A.C. as seen from the Kāli chronogram Grāhyāstutīngāthakai, which occurs in its last verse.² He was a devout recluse, and while he was the Erlāpāḍ Rājā or heir-apparent, his uncle, the Zamorin Mānavigraman Ṣaktan Tampurān, wagged his wars in Cochin, occupied the northern part of it and resided at Trichur, where he died only in 1658 A.C. It would have been thus very easy for Prince Mānaveda to form an acquaintance with Vilvamaṅgalam Svāmiyār, a Sannyāsin of the Naṭuvile Maṇṭhom, even at Trichur. And it is to be believed, it was after his meeting with the Svāmiyār and his vision of the god that he resolved to write the poem. Thus the anecdote might really have had some basis in fact.

It has been stated that this Vilvamaṅgalam Svāmiyār has written a Sanskrit work called the Kēralācārādipikā,³ at the request of one of the Rājās of Cirakkal (Kōlāttirī) in North Malabar. But this work, or rather the first part of it, viz., Kērala Kṣetra Māhātmyam, which has been published last year, seems to be a

---

¹ Believed to be an adaptation of the now defunct Aṣṭapati-

² sphāyadbhaktibhareṇa nunnamanasā Śrī Mānavedābhidhaka

³ kṣoṇīndreṇa kṛtā nirākṛtakaligrāhyā stutir gāthakaiḥ/
lakṣmīvallabhā “Kṛṣṇagītī” riti vikhyātā tavāṅraghād
eśū puṣkaralocanaḥ bhajatām puṇātā tu mokṣaśrīyam.//

(Kṛṣṇāṭṭam, Svargārohaṇam, V. 32).

This shows that the work was completed on the 1, 736, 612th
day of Kali (or 20th Dhanu 829 M.E.).

³ This work has been recently published by the Jñāna Sāgaram
Book Depot, Trichur, 1929.
spurious production of the early half of the 19th century, and can hardly be attributed to the Svāmiyār. Yet, the tradition that he is connected with the Rājā’s court in his earlier years (?) might after all turn out to be true.¹ We are, however, unfortunately, not in a position to say which are the works that may rightly be attributed to him.

*The Author of the Śrī Kṛṣṇa Kārnāṃrtam*

Having fixed with some approximation to certainty the dates of the three Vilvamaṅgalam Svāmiyārs, we may proceed to examine whether we can assign to each of them any of the other works attributed by Mr. Paramēśwara Ayyar to the Paramahāṃsa of that name, who flourished about the beginning of the 13th century A.C. The Śrī Kṛṣṇa Kārnāṃrtam, the most popular of the devotional pieces of lyrical composition attributed to the Vilvamaṅgalam Svāmiyār is written by a Lilāśuka as seen from the concluding verse of its first Sarga.² This Lilāśuka is identified with Vilvamaṅgalam Svāmiyār by Śāraṅgadhara in his Paddhati, written in the 14th century A.C.³ That this Lilāśuka alias Vilvamaṅgalam Svāmiyār lived prior to the 14th century is also shown by the Madhurā Vijayam of Gaṅgādevi, which was produced in the same century. Gaṅgādevi was the wife of the Vijayanagara prince, Vīra Kampana, and was one of the literary gems of his father’s court. In her Madhurā Vijayam,⁴ after paying her due homage to Vālmiki,

¹ Cf. Kavi Sārvabhauman Vaḷḷatol Nārāyaṇa Menon’s Introduction to ‘Kaustubham’, No. 7 of Rāma Varma Granthāvali, issued from the Cīrakkal Palace, 1926.

² Īśānadeva caraṇābharaṇena nīvit-
Dāmodarasthirayaśastavai.ōlgamena/
Lilāśukena racitam tava deva Kṛṣṇa
Kārnāṃrtam vahatu kalpaśatāntare ’pi.
(Sarga 1, verse 110).

³ He quotes some passages from the Śrī Kṛṣṇa Kārnāṃrtam, and then acknowledges his indebtedness thus “iti Vilvamangalam Śrī caraṇānām.”

Mandāramaṇjarīsyandimakarandarasābdhayah/
Kasyanāhădayanāy alan Kārnāṃrtakaver girah?
Vyāsa, Kālidāsa, Bhaṭṭa Bāpa, Bhāravi and Daṇḍin, who lived many centuries previous to her, she recalls the names of later poets like the Karpāmrtakavi (Lilāsuka), Tikkaya, Agastyā, Gaṅgādhara and Viśvanātha. The poet that is first mentioned after the Karpāmrtakavi is Tikkaya, who may be identified with the distinguished Tikkaṇṭa Somayāji who graced the court of the Telugu-Coḍa chief, Māṁnasiddhi, about the end of the 13th century A.C. Agastyā was the uncle of Viśvanātha, both of whom were courtiers of the Kākatya king Pratāparudra of Warangal (1267-1323 A.C.), while Gaṅgādhara was the father of Viśvanātha. It would thus be seen that Lilāsuka comes after Daṇḍin and before Tikkaya, say, between the 8th and the 13th century A.C. This, by itself, is not however, a sufficient ground for identifying him with the second of the Vīlvaṁgaḷaṁ Svaṁiyārs.

In this connection, it has to be pointed out that it is unlikely that all three Samnyāsins had the name Lilāsuka, there is also no evidence to show that it was a common title and if we turn to the evidence which the Śri Kṛṣṇa Karpāmṛtam itself affords with regard to the cult of its author, it would appear that he was originally a Śaivite.1 His conversion to the Vaishnavite cult was quite possible in an age of religious revival, when the disciples of Śrī Śaṅkarācārya himself founded the mutts at Trichur, dedicated to God Viṣṇu in his manifestation of Pārthasarathi and Nārasiṁha. I, therefore, incline to the view that the Śri Kṛṣṇa Karpāmṛtam may be assigned to Lilāsuka, the first Vīlvaṁgaḷaṁ Svaṁiyār, who lived in the ninth century A.C.

1 Tikkayasya kaveh śuktiḥ Kaumudīyakalāḥidheḥ/
Satṛṣṇaḥ kavibhiḥ svairam cakoraṁ iva sevyate//
Catussaptatikāvyoktivayktavaidūṣyasampade/
Agastyāya jagaty asmin sprḥayet ko na kovidaiḥ ?
Stumas tam aparam Vyāsaṁ Gaṅgādharamahākaviṁ/
Nāṭakachadmanā āṛṣṭāṁ yas caṅre Bhāratīṁ kathāṁ//
Ciraṁ sa vijayai bhūyād Viśvanāṭhakaviśvarah/
Yasya prasādāt sārvajñyaṁ labhante mādṛśeṣv api//
Śaivā vayaṁ na khalu tatra vicāraṇyaṁ
Pancākiṣarjapapara nitarāṁ tathāpi/
Ceto madhyam atasyakusumāvabhasam
Smerānanaṁ smarati Gopavadhūkīśoram//
Sarga II, verse 24.
The Author of the Gopikābhīṣekam

The position with regard to the Gopikābhīṣekam is, however, a little more difficult. This work constitutes Svāmiyar’s portion of the Prakīt poem Śrī Cinha Kāvya. The latter comprises 12 sargas, of which eight were composed by “Vilvamaṅgalasvāmin”, the Svāmiyar himself, and the rest by Durgaprasād Yati, a Kashmirian Brāhmaṇ who was on a pilgrimage to Rāmesvaram and who had become his disciple. Gopikābhīṣekam speaks of the holy deeds of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, the verses being dexterously chosen as illustrations of the Sūtras of Traivikrama’s Prākīt Grammar. One notable feature of the poem is that the Prākīt word “Siri” (Sanskrit: Śrī) occurs in the last stanza of every sarga. At once a devotional piece of composition and a grammatical treatise, it may, for a prima facie reason, be assigned to the author of the Puruṣakāram; for, it has to be noted that all the three Sannyāsins called Vilvamaṅgalam are traditionally believed to have been steeped in their devotion to God Kṛṣṇa who appeared to them at their behest.

The birth-place of the Svāmiyarś

Another question of importance relates to the birth-place of the Vilvamaṅgalam Svāmiyarś. Mr. Paramesvara Ayyar is disposed to think that Līlāśuka was a native of Conjeveram or of some neighbouring place in the Telugu country, and that he immigrated into Keraḷa, where he settled down. No one would envy our friends of the Āndhradeśa for her having been gifted with such a pious poetic soul, the intensity of whose devotion broke forth in raptures on being privileged to see with their mortal eyes God in his manifestation of Bālagopāla; i.e., if, indeed, they were Telugu brāhmaṇas. But, as it is, we do not know why, in the absence of reliable evidence of their Telugu extraction or connection, it should be suggested that they were non-Malayālis. It has to be admitted that there is nothing in Keraḷa tradition which supports it; in fact, the traditions of the Sannyāsi Maṭhoms are against it. Few instances of the grant of Sannyāsam to non-Nambūtiris and most of all, to Paradeśi brāhmaṇas have been recorded. According to the immemorial custom, Sannyāsi succession in these mutts has been confined to members of some sections of the Nambūtiris of particular Grāmams, consisting of the purest descendants of the early brāhmaṇa
settlers. This is a fact which could easily be known by one who has studied the traditions and practices of these institutions. In the face of these facts, it would seem rather strange that a Parishad (outside) brähmaṇa should have been allowed to become a Sanyāsīn of the Maṭhām.

There are also some ancient traditions, which show that one of the Vilvamaṅgalam Svāmiyārs was originally known as Mangalam Nambutiri.¹ This connects him with the Sabhā Yogam at Trkaṅṭāmaṭilakam and with the places adjacent to Cranganur. While he was a distinguished alumnī of the Sabhā Maṭhām at Trkaṅṭāmaṭilakam, he is stated to have become an ascetic, the turn in his life being taken when he was persuaded by his lady-love to exhibit the same constancy of purpose in his devotion to God and to concentrate his energies for the attainment of a higher object, viz., Mokṣa. The incident is said to have occurred at Kākkatturutti near Trkaṅṭāmaṭilakam, on a stormy night, when he braved the dangers of the flood and forded the narrow sheet of backwater lying between Cettwāi and Cranganur, all for the sake of meeting the damsel who was, till then, the object of his profound veneration. The fact that the Sabhā Yogam was then very powerful, and was in a position to chastise the wayward youth for his wanderings suggests for the anecdote an earlier period than the 13th century, by which time the Sabhā Yogam appears to have lost much of its power and influence, if not already driven by adverse circumstances to seek fresh asylums at Trichur and Tirunāvāya. It would seem, therefore, that the tradition noticed above might, with some justification, be referred to the first of these Pūjvapādas known as Vilvamaṅgalam, the rather fanciful title of Līlāśuka being, probably, assumed by him subsequently.

It will be seen from the above that we are, to some extent, justified, on the basis of the available evidence, to assume, for tentative purposes, that there were more than one Vilvamaṅgalam Svāmiyār, that the first of these, known as Līlāśuka, was a contemporary of Padmapāḍācārya, a direct disciple of Śri Śaṅkarācārya, that the second, the accredited author of the Puruṣakāram, lived about the 13th century A.C.; and that the last, if there was one such, was the contemporary of Mānaveda Rājā of Calicut, and might have lived in the 17th century, as held by Keralā tradition. The first Sanyāsīn pro-

¹ It is not known whether this is a contraction for Kodaṇḍa-
maṅgalam or Vilvamaṅgalam or Villumaṅgalam.

L.H.Q., JUNE, 1931
bably composed the *Śri Kṛṣṇa Karṇāṇṟṟṟṟam*; the second might have produced also the *Gopikābhīṣekam*, while there are available, at present, few works that can definitely be attributed to the last. Nothing final can now be said as to the place of birth of each of them, though local traditions seem to be against the view that they are non-Malayāḷis. In any case, there is no gainsaying the fact that they spent the winter of their life amidst Malayāḷis, and have won for themselves a permanent place in the hearts of the pious Malayāḷis.

Whether they be natives of Keraḷa or of the Eastern coast, it has to be admitted also that their activities, literary and religious, contributed, to a great extent, towards the fulfilment of the object of the *Sannyāsī Maḷkōṇu* over which they presided, viz., the affording of ample facilities for “spiritual instruction, the acquisition of spiritual knowledge to promote the Hindu religion and to represent to the laity the true nature of God, according to the Hindu religion.” Well may these great and venerable Vaiśṇava saints be entitled to adoration at the hands of the people of Keraḷa, and in as full a measure as the great Kulaśekhara Āḻvar aroused the spiritual fervour and commanded the homage of non-Malayāḷis, and yet, has been undoubtedly acknowledged to be one of the greatest souls Keraḷa ever produced.

A. Govinda Warīyar
Early Viṣṇuism and Nārāyaṇiyā Worship

Before taking up the question of Viṣṇu’s relation to Nārāyaṇa we propose to describe briefly the general character of early Viṣṇuism in the Epic. It must be noted at the outset that Viṣṇuism as a sectarian doctrine is not found in an isolated and definite form in the Epic, as we find, for instance, the Nārāyaṇiyā worship; but it pervades the whole Epic in an imperceptible and elusive manner. The difficulty is also enhanced by the rather elastic epic attitude which indiscriminately identifies its sectarian gods, who not only absorb one another’s deeds and attributes but also the characteristic theological conceptions and traits of worship. Viṣṇu is, in turn, identified with Śiva, Brahmā and a host of other deities, and the identification, though sometimes formal, helps to obliterate the distinctive sectarian worship which pertains to the deity. In xii, 349, 64-69, five current systems are mentioned, viz., Sāṃkhya, Yoga, Pañcarātra, Vedāraṇyaka (=Vedāh) and Pāṣupata; but in all these systems Viṣṇu is declared to be the niṣṭhā or the chief object of worship. In another passage (xii, 338, 4) where the god is addressed as Pañcamahākalpa, the commentator gives the names of five sects, viz., Saura, Sākta, Gāṇeśa, Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava. These passages really furnish a clue to the understanding of Epic Viṣṇuism in general. It may be regarded as the general name given to the all-inclusive and dominating sectarianism of the Epic, appearing in an ever-shifting and somewhat colourless form. In the huge conglomeration of adventure, legend, myth, history, and superstition and of complex bodies of custom, sentiment, belief and philosophy, this Viṣṇuism is fully blended and cannot be separated as such. It is only when it is directly identified, for instance, with the Nārāyaṇiya or Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva worship that it becomes full-blooded and distinctive; but the connexion is hardly organic and helps us very little in understanding the character of Viṣṇuism itself.

The Viṣṇuite, as a sect or as indicating a definite form of worship, hardly exists in the Epic, and the term Vaiṣṇava, in the sense of sectarian worshipper of Viṣṇu is never used in the work, except at the end where by way of addendum, the benefits of reciting or listening to the narratives are detailed for an obviously pious purpose. There is no Viṣṇuite or Vaiṣṇava: as a matter of fact, all in the Epic are Viṣṇuites or Vaiṣṇavas.

At the same time Viṣṇu is not merely a dummy god for the sustaining of a colourless religion or for the hoisting of varied sectarian beliefs of a more or less definite character. That he has a vivid personality which makes him stand out of the extraordinary variety of deities has already been made clear; and that he is the supreme deity, the all-god, is acknowledged throughout in the Epic.

Viṣṇu is practically the personal embodiment of the complex mass of epic beliefs, both orthodox and popular, and as such, he has a real personality. Hopkins is right in stating that the ultimate emphasis is not on trinity, nor on multifariousness, but on unity; and Viṣṇu is the vivid personification of that unity. He is therefore the supreme externalisation of the philosophical as well as the religious idea of the unity of the godhead; he is also the supreme unifying fact of divergent and bizzare epic faiths and beliefs. He is the summit of its theological conception, to whom alone (whether in his own person ... in diverse forms) not only the knowledge and activity of the worshipper but also his highest sentiment of religious devotion called bhakti, should be directed. Conceived in the most vivid terms of personality, he is the centre of gravity towards which the bhakti conception of the epic religion moves with its complex theological

1 Religions of India, p. 413.

2 The philosophical shape which was given to Viṣṇuism, when it came in the hands of the philosophers, is as indefinite as its purely religious or theological aspect; for Hopkins has very ably shown in his Great Epic that the philosophical views of the Epic represent every shade of opinion from Vedic theism to Upaniṣadic monism as well as various forms of early philosophical speculations, stylistically generally in the Epic as Sāṃkhya-Yoga. Viṣṇu as a god was naturally interpreted according to these philosophical views, old and new.
ideas of a personal god and his grace. Though the doctrines of the faith, unless definitely shaped in Kṛṣṇaism or Nārāyaṇism, are often philosophically incongruous and incoherent, its foundation is a true religious feeling, broad-based on the fancies and instincts as well as on the simple hopes and yearnings of large masses. Viṣṇu-ism must be described in terms of this large and mystic religious feeling of loving worship in an epic setting. To identify itself with gods and godly heroes was therefore easy; but its confused appearance is not an accident but an essence of its being. It is monotheism, but monotheism in which the worship is directed to the "one god of various forms" (viii, 33, 49).

The characterisation of this religious feeling of bhakti takes a more tangible form in the definite aspects of epic Viṣṇuism, known as the Nārāyaṇiya and the Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva worship. The list of Viṣṇu's thousand names (xiii, 149) would itself indicate his Protean character: but in the Epic his principal incarnation is Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva.

The idea of "bhakti" in the Epic. It is here that Viṣṇuism takes a distinct shape. But it may be worth while to indicate here briefly the general conception of bhakti in the Epic, without any reference to its particular developments, although it must be admitted that the fundamental conception is the same throughout. The epic use of the term bhakti has been analysed very ably by Hopkins\(^1\) in its general as well as in its religious sense. It is clear that bhakti is not always monotheistic; for, though directed chiefly to one god, it is often found accompanied by a similar feeling for other gods, and each god is the object of bhakti as need arises. But "other gods" are really conceived as forms of the one god, and in this sense the attitude is monotheistic. When directed towards the one god, it is the devotion directed solely towards him as the special object of worship. When the question is formally put to Saṅjaya, "What is this bhakti you bear towards Janārdaya?" his reply is interesting (v, 69, 4):

\[\text{mayāṁ na seve, bhadraṁ te, na vythādharman ācare /}\\ \text{śuddha-bhāvaṁ gato bhaktyā śāstrād vedmi Janārdaya. //}\]

This reply lays stress on the renouncing of delusive attachments and wrong practices, and prescribes purity of heart and study of scriptures which would give knowledge of god. Although exclusive

\(^1\) JRAS, 1911, pp. 727 f.
concentration, moral purity and knowledge or belief are admitted as preliminary to bhakti, they are not identical with it; the reply really evades the question. The conception of bhakti throughout, whether directed towards a god, or to a woman, or to the king, connotes deep personal affection, typified by the love of a wife for her husband, and is the word interchangeable with priti, bhāva, rāga or sneha as term of fervent and endearing love. It is an emotional and ethical passion, rather than an impersonal intellectual conviction adduced by mere knowledge. The deity is conceived as the beloved, and the worship is essentially loving and intimate adoration (pūjā). As such, bhakti borders upon sense-devotion and leans perceptibly towards the erotic passion. It is usually of the pure sort, and implies a kind of erotic mysticism, which conceives religious longings in terms of earthly passion,—a quasi-amorous attitude of self-surrender to the person or image of the beloved deity, such as characterise not a little of that Christian literature for which the song of Solomon—"I am my Beloved’s and my Beloved is mine" is the sacred archetype.

The idea of prasāda and prapatti in "bhakti".

But its too ardent tendency has the danger of lapsing into sensuousness or sensual passion, such as is apparent in some of the mediæval expressions of this emotion. The feeling results in an exclusive concentration and complete surrender of self; the bhakta acknowledges himself as prapanna (suppliant or submissive), and resorts to his god as the only refuge (śaraṇa) for divine grace (prasāda), without which he can never work out his salvation alone. There is no direct exposition of the trine of grace (prasāda) and surrender (prapatti) in the Epic, but the ideas are fully acknowledged as involved in an attitude of bhakti. These religious conceptions find full expression in the worship of Nārāyaṇa and Kṛṣṇa, who are completely identified with Viṣṇu, and to this we now turn our attention.

Nārāyaṇa is not such an ancient god as Viṣṇu, having been mentioned for the first time in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa and in a dubious section of the Taṅtirīya-Āraṇyaka; but his origin and early history are somewhat obscure. He appears to have been originally a deity of a different kind. Two ancient traditions about him seem to exist. The first, recorded in a Brāhmaṇa fairly early, gives us in ritual language a mysterious and elusive figure, apparently identified with the Ṛgvedic Puruṣa or Cosmic Man as the symbol of creation by sacrifice; and
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the second, recorded in the Epic, gives us a hint (and nothing more) of his character as a legendary saint, divine or deified, although here also he is regarded as a purva-deva or ancient god.

The earliest reference¹ to Nārāyaṇa in a highly mystical passage in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa (xii. 3.4) calls him Puruṣa-Nārāyaṇa, who, under the instructions of Prajāpati, the impersonal cosmic principle in Brāhmaṇa literature, places in a pantheistic mood all the world and all the gods in his own self and his own self in all the worlds and all the gods, thus becoming, by the power of sacrifice, the Universe itself. In a subsequent passage in the same Brāhmaṇa (xiii, 6, 1, 1) we are told that Puruṣa-Nārāyaṇa in his desire to surpass all things performed a pāṇca-rātra satra or a series of sacrifice lasting over five nights, and became omnipresent and supreme by a sacrifice. The sacrifice is designated puruṣa-medha or immolation of the Puruṣa,² and apparently refers to the tremendous symbolical sacrifice, described in the famous Puruṣa-hymn of the Rg-veda (x, 90) as consisting of the mystical immolation of the cosmic Man for the purpose of creation³; for, a little later, another passage (xlii, 6, 2, 12) of the Brāhmaṇa refers distinctly to the Rgvedic hymn (x, 90) with an apparent allusion to a tradition that Nārāyaṇa was the author of the hymn, which came to be known as his litany.

The Puruṣa-Nārāyaṇa tradition of the Brāhmaṇa appears to survive in the strange account given of Nārāyaṇa in the Mahābhārata (xii. 338, 4) where he is praised by Nārada in a long prose hymn as the Puruṣa, Mahāpuruṣa and Puruṣottama,⁴ as well as by the epithet Pāṇcarātra. In Mbh. xii, 350, 5 (cf. also xii, 207, 5, 9-10), the nature of Nārāyaṇa, who is of course equated with Viṣṇu and Kṛṣṇa, is

¹ In Maitreyaṇi-Sāṁhitā (ii, 9) Nārāyaṇa is mentioned as Viṣṇu and Keśava, but this passage, also naming some later deities, has been regarded as an obvious interpolation.

² And not human sacrifice, as Muir, op. cit. p. 25, explains.

³ In Śatapatha Br. (xiii, 7, 1, 1) the self-existent Brahma is represented as sacrificing himself (ātmānaḥ hutoḥ) in a similar manner.

⁴ These epithets as well as Uttama Puruṣa (xii, 335) are common enough for Nārāyaṇa (or Viṣṇu or Kṛṣṇa) in the Epic. It is also possible that the preponderatingly Śaṅkhya-Yoga theology
described by the all-pervading, all-generating and eternal characteristics of the supreme and one Puruṣa or Puruṣottama, with whom he is directly identified as the Primeval Man (xii, 350, 14), and as bearing par excellence the name of Mahāpuruṣa (xii, 350, 9). Indeed in the Epic the identity of Viṣṇu-Nārāyaṇa as the Puruṣa or Mahāpuruṣa is in general an acknowledged fact. In the vision which Nārāyaṇa vouchsafes to Nārada (as the Bhagavat does to Arjuna) Nārāyaṇa⁴ is described (xii, 339, 6f), after the Rgvedic hymn, as having a thousand heads, thousand eyes, a thousand arms and feet as well as a hundred (xii, 43: xii, 335) or even a thousand (xiii, 149) names, with the addition that he is golden coloured—a phrase which is Vedic but which some of the Upaniṣads⁵ apply to the description of the supreme Puruṣa who shines beyond darkness. The Puruṣa-sūkta of the Rg-veda itself is referred to in the Nārāyaṇīya, xii, 350, 5, and its undisputed authority is cited in maintaining the thesis that although many puruṣas are acknowledged in Śaṅkhyā-Yoga, there is only one puruṣa who is the sole source (yoni) of all puruṣas. Is it possible that this early identification of Nārāyaṇa with the Primeval Man lingers behind the puzzling ety-

of this (Nārāyaṇīya) section of the Epic suggested the epithet Puruṣa, cf., for instance, Mbh. xii, 340, 28-29. But Puruṣa is conceived here more as an active principle connected with creation, as well as with preservation and destruction. On Buddha as Mahāpuruṣa, see Senart, Essai sur la légende du Bouddha, pp. 87f., p. 123 and Carpenter, Theism in Mediaeval India (Hibbert Lectures), 1921, p. 45. In the account of creation given by Manu (i, 11), Brahmā is called the Puruṣa. This may be due to the common connexion with the notion of creation, but it is not unusual for Brahmā or Prajāpati to absorb the function of the supreme god, characterised generally as Puruṣa. Cf. Viṣṇu-Puruṣa, i, 2, 45f. So also Rudra-Siva is called the Puruṣa in Śvetāsvatara Upan., iii, 14 (quoting the Puruṣa-hymn). The Puruṣa idea appears to have been well established in the post-Brāhmaṇic literature and applied indiscriminately to all the great gods.

1 Like Viṣṇu, for instance, in v, iii, 7.

2 Chāndogya Up. i. 6, 6; Śvetāsvatara, iii, 8 and 14 etc. The Śvetāsvatara passage is obviously imitated in xii, 340, 57. The puruṣa is a hackneyed enough expression in the Upaniṣads to designate the Supreme Self, and we have also the symbols Puruṣa-in-the-sun; Puruṣa-in-the-right-eye, etc.
mology of the name itself which literally signifies ‘man’, as also behind that of his mysterious double Nara.

1 [The invention of the name appears to us to be somewhat similar to the eponymous process. Barnett explains (op. cit., p. 76) that Nara in the word Nārāyaṇa is a proper name, and that Nārāyaṇa signifies “a man of the Nara family” (Nārāyaṇa in his view having been originally a divine or deified saint); but this explanation is partial, and connects itself with the second tradition about Nārāyaṇa mentioned above, to which alone Barnett would give importance to the exclusion of the first, and apparently earlier, Brāhmanic tradition of Puruṣa-Nārāyaṇa. But Nārāyaṇa’s inseparable twin Nara raises a difficulty. Apparently Nara is also “a man of the Nara family,” being Nārāyaṇa’s double; but it is strange that of the twins one should be called by the gotra-name Nara and the other by the derivative name Nārāyaṇa. But Barnett is undoubtedly justified in rejecting the somewhat artificial etymology of the name (referred to by R. G. Bhandarkar, section 32) which would derive the word Nārāyaṇa from nārāḥ (waters) and ayana (going), “one who has the waters as his resting place”, connecting the conception with that of primeval waters; or from narāḥ (men) and ayana (goal or resting place), “one who is the goal or resting place of men.” (Naras are also spirits as well as gods of heroic prowess in the Epic. The conception of primeval waters goes back to the Rg-veda and is traceable in the Epic and Purāṇa conception of Nārāyaṇa; but the interpretations appear to be later concoctions of misconceived etymology. Both the derivations, however, appear to be accepted in the Epic. In iii, 189, 3 (also in iii, 271, 42) it is said that Nārāyaṇa is so called because in days of yore he named the waters nārāḥ and made them his resting place (ayana); in xii, 341, 39-40 (= Manu-Samhitā, i, 10) the same derivation of the name is given with the addition that the waters bore that name because they were the offspring of nara (āpo nārā iī ākāti āpo vai nara-sūnavah!)! It is not clear if nara in the phrase nara-sūnavah is a proper name or simply means ‘man,’ but it is clear that Nārāyaṇa here declares himself to be “the resting place or goal of man” (nārāṇam ayanam khyātam aham ekah sanātanaḥ).—S.K.D.]

2 [Nara, except as identified with Arjuna, appears to possess no direct activity or importance, but only remains as a mysterious shadow of Nārāyaṇa. His origin and association cannot be traced in the earlier train of ideas; but R. G. Bhandarkar gives the some-
It is not until we come to the fourth *praṇāthaka* of the *Taittirīya-Āraṇyaka* (x, i, 6) that we find again the mention of Nārāyaṇa\(^1\); but this section, which is also known as the *Mahā-Nārāyaṇa Upāniṣad* and which refers to many late sectarian deities, is described as a *khila* or supplement, and is therefore presumably a later addition.\(^2\) It is not surprising, therefore, that the mention of Nārāyaṇa is made here in connexion with Vāsudeva and Viṣṇu apparently as three phases of the same Supreme Being (*Nārāyaṇāya* *vidmahe*, *Vāsudevāya* *dākimahi*, *tanno Viṣṇuḥ praacyayāt*).

In the *Mahābhārata*\(^3\) (as well as in the *Purāṇas*) the identification of Nārāyaṇa as the supreme god (*deva-devah sanātanaḥ*) with Viṣṇu and Vāsudeva (and as a corollary, with every other great god) is complete. It may be suggested that the early identification of Viṣṇu with sacrifice and Nārāyaṇa's symbolic connexion with sacrifice had something to do with their ultimate equalisation; for it is significant that Viṣṇu as the essence of sacrifice is still worshipped under the name of Yajña-what artificial explanation (*op. cit.* sec. 34) that the origin of the idea of Nara and Nārāyaṇa is to be sought in the Upāniṣadic parable of two birds dwelling in the same tree, one looking on, and the other actively engaged in eating the fruit thereof. The connexion suggested is hardly convincing, and the description of Nara as actively eating the fruit does not apply. The association of deities in pair, or the tradition of legendary twins is ancient. Is it too fanciful to presume that the original Brāhmaṇa conception of Puruṣa-Nārāyaṇa was for some mysterious reasons split up, according to this ancient tradition of pairing deities, into Nara (=Puruṣa), and Nārāyaṇa (also =Puruṣa) who is an afterthought or an obvious derivative therefrom? Does not the tradition refer to a duplication into Nara and Nārāyaṇa (*sattvam ēkam dvidhā kṛtam*, see *Mbh.*, v, 49, 21), the quadruplication being the result of an obviously later addition?—S.K.D.]


2 Keith (*JRAS*, 1908, p. 171, fn.) thinks, however, that the date of the passage can hardly be later than the 3rd century B.C.

3 Hopkins, *Epic Mythology*, p. 206. The phrase quoted is taken from a reference to Nārāyaṇa in i, 67, 90 (BORI, ed. Poona 1930) = i, 67, 151 (Bombay ed.). It also occurs in xii, 336, 24 and 29 etc. Also *deva-devah purātanaḥ* in xii, 336, 12 etc.
(Sacrifice) Nārāyaṇa. Mythological accounts in the Epic connect Nārāyaṇa with creation and with the ancient conception of primeval waters. He is still called Puruṣa, Mahāpuruṣa, Uttama-puruṣa, or and Puruṣottama, and probably from this connexion Viṣṇu derives his well-known epithet of Uttama-Puruṣa or Puruṣottama.

It is in this character as the supreme deity and as identified with Viṣṇu and Vāsudeva that Nārāyaṇa appears as the originator of a devotional religion (which however appears to have have had a tradition independent of Viṣṇuism or Vāsudevism) in the somewhat confused and mythical account of the Nārāyaṇiya episode of the twelfth book of the Mahābhārata.

We shall consider the details of the Nārāyaṇiya theology of Ekānta-dharma and its independent character hereafter; but what concerns us most at present is the tradition, which appears to survive here, of the early character of Nārāyaṇa himself. The tale relates (xii, 334) that the one original form of Nārāyaṇa took birth in the Kṛta age in the quadruple form of Nara, Nārāyaṇa, Hari and Kṛṣṇa as the four sons of Dharma or Righteousness.

1 Nārāyaṇa’s connexion with sacrifice (yajña) is indicated in the epithets given to him throughout the Nārāyaṇiya section, such as yajña, mahāyajña, yajñapati, yajña-kṛdaya etc. (xii, 338, 4; xii, 339, 10 etc.); and it is significant that he is also called Parama-yajñika by Nārada. Yajña is also the name of an avatāra of Viṣṇu-Nārāyaṇa in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa list of incarnations (i, 3, 1 f.).

2 See the story of the Bṛj and the Nyagrodha tree in Mbh. iii, 188, 89. The primeval waters were regarded from Rg-vedic times as the original seat of the generating power of the universe.

3 What appears more or less as a title or description in the Epic becomes a definite manifestation (prādurbhāva or avatāra) in the Purāṇas. Thus Puruṣa is given as a prādurbhāva in the list of 22 Avatāras in the Bhāgavata-Purāṇa (i, 3, 1 f) where Nara and Nārāyaṇa are also Avatāras.

4 xii, 334-351 (Bombay Edition). An analysis of the episode is given by Grierson in Ind. Ant., Sept. 1908, p. 263 f. and by R. G. Bhandarkar, op. cit. sec. 4-5. Also in Sørensen, Index, pp. 512-16.

5 In vii, 200, 57 also we are to’d that Nārāyaṇa for the purpose of action (kārpārmam) took birth as the son of Dharma and performed austerities. The birth from Dharma is also referred to in xii, 342, 106-7, 127; xii, 347, 1; xii, 343, 51; xii, 344, 20. In some of the Purāṇas Ahīṃsā is said to be the mother.
The first two, Nara and Nārāyaṇa, took up their abode in the hermitage of Badarī and practised penances there.¹ They were still there when the ever inquisitive Nārada came to visit them; but Hari and Kṛṣṇa who dwelt there formerly were no longer present at the time of Nārada’s visit. To Nārada’s question as to whom they could be worshipping when they themselves were the supreme deities, Nārāyaṇa informed his amazed enquirer that he was worshipping his own original form (prakṛti), the all-pervading and eternal, which embraced both the existent and the non-existent. After this philosophical conversation, Nārada made up his mind, with Nārāyaṇa’s permission, to go and see the original form of Nārāyaṇa; and by means of mystical Yoga-powers he soared into the sky and reached the summit of Mount Meru from which place he obtained in the northwest direction a Pīṣgah-sight of the mythical godland and abode of Nārāyaṇa, the mysterious Śvetadvīpa;² surrounded by the Milk ocean.

There can be no doubt about the extremely mythical character of this account, but it is possible that this strange story preserves even in its mythical garb an ancient tradition about Nārāyaṇa and the Nārāyaṇiya sect. Although indistinguishable from the supreme deity, there is a hint that both Nara and Nārāyaṇa were originally ancient saints of legend. While the description rṣi (sage) is common (e.g. xii, 339, 100; xii, 343, 10 and xii, 346, 7-8; v, 96, 14; v, 97, 2; iii, 47, 11), they

¹ This performance of austerities at Badarī (at Gandhamādana in v, 96, 15) by Nara and Nārāyaṇa is also referred to in other places, e.g., in iii, 40, 1; iii, 141, 23 (Gandhamādana is also mentioned), iii, 156, 10 etc., and seems to be an established tradition. See also v, 11, 4, where it is said that in the hermitage of Badarī, Nārāyaṇa, Kṛṣṇa and Brahmā reside. In i, 70, 29 the hermitage is described as gaurgaya uposobhitam; in iii, 145, 40 as bhāgiraṣthatyupasobhitam.

² Attempts at a geographical localisation of the place, as Barnett rightly emphasises (op. cit., p. 84, note), have been wholly misdirected. The question gained importance from the hypothesis, put forward by some scholars, of points of contact between Christianity and early bhakti religion; the so-called “white-landers” in their opinion, representing a Christian community, probably Nestorian, in the north. This is not the place to discuss the question in detail; but the theory of early Christain influence from the north, with which we are immediately concerned, may now be taken to have been discredited.
are expressly mentioned in xii, 335, 6, and xii, 343, 34, as purāṇau ṛṣī or ancient sages, performing austerities. The epithet also occurs in iii, 47, 10; vi, 65, 11; viii, 87, 74, where Nara and Nārāyaṇa are not only great ancient sages (purāṇau ṛṣi-sattamaṇu), but are also the prototypes of the close epic association of Arjuna and Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa respectively. Again, in iii, 12, 46, Janārdana (= Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa) is said to have addressed Arjuna and declared that “thou art Nara and I am Nārāyaṇa-Hari, and we, the two sages (ṛṣī) Nara-Nārāyaṇa, have come to this world at the proper time.” The same sentiment is repeated in the rather long digression in the Nārāyaṇiya (vii, 341, 37) on the etymology of the various names of the supreme deity of the cult. Indeed, this idea of Arjuna and Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa as incarnations of Nara and Nārāyaṇa respectively (inspite of the many declarations that Arjuna is also an apāda of Indra) appears to be fairly well established in the epic; but the tradition also is important that originally Nara and Nārāyaṇa were ancient sages, just as Arjuna and Vāsudeva were considered as human incarnations. Their traditional deification is also expressed by the description that Nara and Nārāyaṇa were ‘tradi-

1 The epic Nara and Nārāyaṇa, as well as Hari and Kṛṣṇa, occur also as the sublimated forms of Lokapālas (see Hopkins, Epic Mythology, p. 152, f.n.).

2 Also in i, 67, 110; i, 218, 5; iii, 86, 6; vi, 23, 26 etc. Tadpatrikar (B.O.R. Institute Annals, x, p. 331) computes 26 references to this combined identification in the Epic, and rightly reminds us that the joint-worship of Vāsudeva and Arjuna is referred to in Pāṇini, iv, 3, 93. With regard to Arjuna’s godhead, which is proclaimed to him in iii, 41, 35 and 43; iii, 47, 7f., Hopkins remarks (Great Epic of India, New Haven, 1930, p. 184): “Arjuna is a form of Viṣṇu. He is taught this with wonder and great amaze in the sixth book. But our amazement at his amazement is still greater, for this doctrine, apparently so new to him, was revealed to him long before, in the third book, and on that earlier occasion he appeared fully to appreciate the fact that he was divine and identical with Kṛṣṇa, which facts in the sixth book he has totally forgotten.” [It seems that Arjuna’s godhead and identification with Nara was an afterthought (the 26 references are comparatively much too little) arising out of his friendship with Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva who was perhaps long ago identified with Nārāyaṇa. The way in which this godhead is protested would also indicate its comparatively recent origin.—S. K. D.]
tionally two old gods"¹ (nara-nārāyaṇaṇa devau pūrva-devāvīti śrutih, v, 49, 19; also v, 49, 5f.).

It is also curious that this tradition of Nārāyaṇa as an ancient sage vaguely allies itself with the earlier recorded Puruṣa-conception of Nārāyaṇa by means of the other tradition mentioned above, which alleges that he was the ṛṣi or sage who composed the Puruṣa-sūktā of Rg-veda, x, 90.

This composite origin of the epic Nārāyaṇa is interesting as affording a striking instance of the moulding of a personal god out of ancient figures of myth and legend. On the one hand, we have the euhemeristic view which indicates that Nārāyaṇa was originally a divine or deified saint; on the other hand, the old symbolical-ritualistic idea of Puruṣa-Nārāyaṇa, connected with creation, contributes to make the conception complete. But in whatever way we trace the obscure origin and history of Nārāyaṇa, it is clear that in the Epic the equation Viṣṇu = Nārāyaṇa = Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa—the supreme deity is fully established. A precise solution of the equation is not possible, but it may be suggested that, on the one hand, Nārāyaṇa’s Brāhmaṇic connexion with sacrifice as Puruṣa-Nārāyaṇa probably helped his equalisation with Viṣṇu,

¹ [In this interesting passage (as well as in v, 96) warlike attributes are also ascribed to them so that their incarnations as Arjuna and Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa may not be unfitness. Brahmā informs Brhaspati (v, 49) that the ascetics (tāpasu) Nara and Nārāyaṇa exist for the destruction of Āsuras (asūrāṇāṁ vināśaya) and that they are repeatedly born in times of war. The story of the obtaining of the Nārāyaṇa-weapon (vii, 195f.) is based on this legend. The phrase pūrva-deva occurs in i, 224, 3: nara-nārāyaṇau yau taur pūrva-devau vibhāvasau/ samprāptau mānuṣe loke (i.e. Arjuna and Vāsudeva) kāryārtham hi divaukasāṁ// in i, 228, 18: vāsudevārjunāvetau....../ nara-nārāyaṇaṁ taur pūrva-devau divī bruta//; in viii, 10, 41 (pūrva-devau mahātmānau = A and V) etc. In viii, 200, 58f. Nārāyaṇa is said to have performed austerities for 66,000 years, and then for twice that period at the Himavat. He thus became Brahma (brahma-bhūtaḥ), beheld the supreme deity Śiva, to whom he recited a hymn and obtained boons. From the austerities, we are told, was born a great sage, Nara, who was equal to Nārāyaṇa himself and who is none other than Arjuna.

In iii, 41, 35, Arjuna himself is called pūrva-deva.—S.K.D.]
the Brāhmaṇic personation of Sacrifice; while on the other hand, the the tradition of his euhemeristic origin probably made it easy to approximate him to Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa, in whose legendary history also an euhemeristic element must be admitted.

On the origin of the name Pañcarātra given to the devotional religion of the Nārāyaṇīya, the suggestion is tempting that it connects itself with the pañcarātra sattrā, lasting over five days, which the mythical Puruṣa-Nārāyaṇa is reported in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa (xiii, 6, 1) to have performed for obtaining exclusive supremacy; but it must be admitted that there is no direct evidence to support this connexion. In the Epic we are told (xii, 339, 110 f.) that the Pañcarātras only intensified the cult introduced by Nārada, which must be the doctrine explained by Nārāyaṇa to him; and in this view the Pañca-

1 The system is called Pañcarātra and its followers Pañcarātrin or Pañcarātriṇa, but sometimes both the system and followers are known as Pañcarātra. In the Epic, the word, usually in the form Pañcarātra, is almost exclusively used for the system or doctrine (xii, 218, 11; 335, 25; 339, 111; 349, 1; 349, 64; 349, 68; 349, 72).

2 The other statement that the Pañcarātras derive their doctrine from the sun need not seriously affect this tradition. The same thing is also said of the Bhāgavatas. The statement, however, is qualified in the Epic itself by the other statements that the sun, in the form of Sūrya or Vivaśvat, was, like Nārada, only one of the many recipients and communicators of the religion, but that it came ultimately from Nārāyaṇa himself. This view about the sun being the recipient of the religion may have come in after Viṣṇu, originally a Vedic solar god, was accepted in the cult as the supreme deity, or it may have been due to the influence of the Saura sects or solar cults, whose independent existence is mentioned in the Epic. The complex Epic sectarianism was elastic enough, and did not disdain conscious or unconscious contamination, for even Śiva becomes a form of Viṣṇu or Nārāyaṇa and plays a part in the mythology of the Nārāyaṇas or Pañcarātras. That the intrusion of solar myths does not prove that the religion itself was originally or at any time a form of sun-worship has already been emphasised by us above.
rātras would be identical with the Nārāyaṇyās or Ekāntins. In the list of names which Nārada utters in praise of Nārāyaṇa (xii, 338, 4), the latter is called inter alia Pañcarātra.¹

But the origin as well as the precise meaning of the term is really obscure. Various strange etymologies² have been suggested; but they are not only instances of misplaced etymological ingenuity but are also obviously late concoctions to explain the actually obscure or forgotten origin of the name. F. Otto Schrader, who has made a special study of the later Pañcarātra Āgamas, mentions³ what he thinks to be a more reliable explanation (though given in the apocryphal Nārada-Pañcarātra) that the expression Pañcarātra refers to the five (pañca) principal topics or kinds of knowledge (rūtra)⁴ treated in the system or the texts, viz., reality (tattva), liberation (mukti), devotion (bhakti), yoga (yāgika) and the objects of sense (vaiṣayika), although none of the accepted texts of the school strictly conforms to this ideal division. But the explanation, though less fanciful, is obviously a suitable afterthought. Schrader, on the other hand, seems to support our suggestion that the term is to be ulti-

¹ Nilakanṭha explains the phrase as “one who is attainable by the scriptures of the Pañcarātras (pañcarātra-gama-gamya). On the epithet pañca-kāla-kāryapāya employed in this connexion see S. K. De, J.R.A.S., 1921, p. 415 who maintains that Pañca-kāla = Pañcarātra as the designation of the cult.

² Such as: (i) the night (rūtra) = obscuration of five (pañca) great śāstras, viz., Yoga, Sāmkhya, Buddhism, Ārhat and Kāpāla or Pāśupata, (ii) the śāstra which puts to death (pañcatva) other śāstras, just as the sun makes the night (rātri) die, (iii) the system of cooking = destroying (pañc, from root pae, to cook) the night (rātri) = ignorance, (iv) the system which takes its name from the five sacraments (branding etc.) or five daily observances (abhigamana etc.). See A. Govindacarya Svamin in J.R.A.S., 1911, p. 940; Schrader, Introduction to Pañcarātra, Adyar (Madras), 1916, pp. 22, 24.


⁴ The word rūtra (or more correctly rātri) here, as Schrader explains, which originally meant ‘night’, came by some mysterious train of thought (or is it because the doctrine was thought to be esoteric and secret?) to mean both a cardinal doctrine of the system and a chapter or work dealing with the doctrine.
mately connected with the passage in the *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa* (xiii, 6, 1) where the word *pañcarātra* occurs with reference to Puruṣa-Nārāyaṇa’s continuous sacrifice for five days. 1

This would also explain the epic connexion or synonymity between the Pañcarātras and the Nārāyaṇīya Ekāntins, as well as the name Pañcarāтриka given to Nārāyaṇa himself in the Epic and the Purāṇas. But Schrader would like to give a more doctrinal trend to the interpretation by connecting it with the theory of “Manifestation,” and suggesting (chiefly on the authority of *Ahirbudhṇya Sāṁhitā*) that “the sect took its name from its central dogma, which was the Pañcarātra sattra of Nārāyaṇa interpreted philosophically as the fivefold manifestation of God by means of His Para, Vyūha, Vibhava, Antaryāmin and Arcā forms.” This suggestion accords well with the doctrines that prevailed in the later development of the school, 2 but unfortunately we possess no early texts to confirm it.

Who were the Ekāntins or Pañcarātras, and what was the character of their theology, said to have been promulgated by Nārāyaṇa himself as an expression of a bhakti-religion? Even if their origin which is lost in obscurity may have been different, it is clear that the equation Pañcarātra = Ekāntin is established without question in the Epic. 3

Whether these names are conterminous with Sātvata and Bhāgavata we need not discuss at present; but there are passages mainly at the end of the Nārāyaṇīya section (xii, 348, 29 and 34) which say twice that the religion is followed by the Sātvata, and another which says that Uparicara-vasu, Nārāyaṇa’s early devotee, followed the Sātvata rule (xii, 335, 19); while the term Bhāgavat and direct reference


2 The Vyūha doctrine, however, is old and is found in the Nārāyaṇīya.

3 The connexion with Kāpileya or the epic Sāmkhya-Yoga doctrine and the declaration that Pañcaśikha was a teacher of the Pañcarātra system (xii, 218, 11) only emphasise the close alliance of the two systems on the philosophical side, and nothing more. The so-called Sāmkhya-Yoga or the Pañcaśikha scheme, as set forth in the Epic, has little inner connexion with the Nārāyaṇīya faith; on the contrary, they are contrasted in many points, inspite of mutual contamination.
apparently to the *Bhagavadgītā* are also not absent in the account. The original records or scriptures, consisting of "a hundred thousand excellent ślokas" of the Ekāntins or Pañcarātras, referred to in xii, 335, 27 f. and in xii, 339, 110 f., if they ever existed, are not available. Our knowledge of the cult is derived chiefly from the Epic, but the Epic account is greatly overlaid with mythical, legendary and adventitious theosophical matters. There is also the possibility of this account being a somewhat later "Brāhmaṇised" version of an originally independent popular faith. It is difficult to disentangle the pristine form of the cult from these embellishments, but it is highly probable that the cult in its origin was non-Vedic, and that the form in which it is set forth in the Nārāyaṇiya would indicate that, compared with the more or less systematic doctrine of the *Bhagavadgītā*, it represents a less developed and less coherent form of the religion, which has not yet emerged from its mythical and legendary surroundings. The teachings of the two texts, however independently they may have originated, ultimately formed, as emphasised in the Epic itself, the doctrine of one religious body (xii, 346, 11; xii, 348, 8 and 53); but they possibly belonged to different sections of the same church, or perhaps represented an earlier and a later tradition respectively of one popular religious movement, diverging in many particulars but agreeing at least in one essential.

*To be continued*

Mrinal Das Gupta
MISCELLANY

“Ganga” in Ceylon and India

In connection with the definition of “the boundary marks” of waterlogged waste lands, pertaining to the right of entrance of the “Āśrama-Vihāra” dedicated to Ārya Avalokiteśvara,” the recently discovered Gunaighar Grant of Vainyagupta refers to the Ha-(?) cātagama. The words “paścimena Ha-(?)-cātagama” signify that the river Ha-(?)-cāta formed the western boundary. The editor, Mr. Bhattacharya, renders it by “stream” and points out that this sense is still conveyed by the word “gang” (gāṅ?) in Eastern Bengal.

I may note that it is not the only epigraphical instance of Gaṅgā meaning a stream. The inscription of Vainyagupta is dated 188 G. E. (current). 2 In the Partabgarh Inscription of Mahendrapala II who belonged to the Pratihāra Dynasty, 3 we find that at least seven grants to different deities by several personages are consolidated in one record. 4 All of these, however, are “in favour of the shrine attached to the monastery of Hariśīvarā.” The Partabgarh Inscription bears the date 1003, 5 i.e. 946 A. C. The notable point for our present purpose occurs in the eleventh line of this inscription. The words “Kā-(hiṁ)kyāṁ Gaṅgāyāṁ snāvā” cannot but mean “having bathed in the “Kā(hiṁ)ki” or “Kā(hiṁ) ki” river.

The average North Indian, however, means by the “Gaṅgā” the particular river Ganges which waters his homeland. The Bengali Hindu however alters his interpretation when the Gaṅgā enters his own province. To him the Ganges at Benares, for example, is certainly the Sacred River, but he usually attaches no great sanctity to the Padmā in Eastern Bengal. The Hughli, or the Bhāgirathi is the Gaṅgā, so far as he is concerned. But the Ādigāṅgā which waters

1 I.H.Q., March, 1930, pp. 53-56.
2 The editor accepts the views of Mr. Pathak who takes it to be equivalent to 506 A.C. (p. 47).
3 E. I., XIV, pp. 182-184.
4 There is a similar instance in the Vasiṣṭha Temple inscription on Mount Abu (I. A., II, p. 256).
5 E. I., p. 184, 1, 13.
a part of Calcutta is also believed at least locally, to possess a high degree of sanctity. The word means "the earlier Ganges."

This North Indian interpretation can also be supported by epigraphic passages. The verse of Yasodharman's Mandasor Inscription\(^1\) runs as follows:—

Ā Lauhityopakaṇṭha tālavanagahanopatyaśaṅkād ā Mahendrād
Ā Gaṅgāśāśīṣṭaśasās tuhinaśikharināṁ paścināṁ ā payodeḥ /
Sāmantair yasya bāhudraviṇahṛtamadaṁ pādaṁ ānāmabhū
Cuḍāratnāṁśurājivyatikaraśabāla bhūmibhāgaṁ kriyante /

The Gaṅgā in this verse refers unmistakably to the particular river. In the Untikavatika Grant of Abhimanyu who belonged to that Raṣṭrakūṭa House, which did not use the Garuḍa, but had the Lion with open jaws and a protruding tongue as their crest,\(^2\) we find another verse which runs as follows:—

yasyāṁyabhūmipatibhir vvijita (bh) imanair-
ucchrayivamśanihitāṁ svayaśahpatākā/
dṛṣṭā ciraṁ pratidināṁ nanu dṛṣyate ca
gāṅgeva punyasalīla purataṁ pravṛddhāṁ/\(^3\)

The "yasya" refers to the grandfather of the reigning king Abhimanyu. The Gaṅgā here again undoubtedly stands for the river of Northern India. The inscription is assigned "on palaeographical grounds to approximately the seventh century a.d."

In the Hindol Plate of Paramabhaṭṭaraka Mahārājaḥdhiraja Paramesvara Śri Subhākaradeva,\(^4\) we find "Gaṅgetijotāraddhasrotasā" etc.\(^4\) in connection with the definition of the boundaries of the grāma called Noḍdilo which was conveyed to the use of Vaidyanāthabhaṭṭaraka.\(^6\) Pandit Binayka Misra has recently edited that inscription. Pandit Misra is of opinion that Noḍdilo is "distinctly identical with the village Naṇḍelo now lying in the Hindol State". The

---

2 *E. I.*, VIII, p. 165 and 166. The lion, as shown in the plate facing p. 164, is indistinct. Indraji however took it to be such in 1883 a.d. (*J.R.A.S.*, vol. XVI, p. 90).
3 The last visarga is wrong.
4 *J.B.O.R.S.*, March 1930, pp. 77 to 80.
5 L. 49. 6: Ll. 18 to 21.
modern principality lies to the north of the Mahānādī and the town of Hindol lies close to the south-eastern border of Angul between the Mahānādī and the Brāhmaṇī rivers. The village of Nōḍīlō therefore does not seem to have been situated anywhere near the sacred river of Northern India. The stream is very probably a local one. Orissa is a "massif-block", and it is not probable that the course of the Gaṅgā stretched so far south, only a thousand years back.

Several rivers in Ceylon have "gaṅgā" (pronounced gaṅgā) as parts of their names. One of these is the Kelānigaṅgā (pronounced Kelvgdagāṅgā) about eighty-four miles long, from its source to its mouth. It takes its name from the district of Kelāniyā by which it flows, and gains its importance from its proximity to the modern seat of government, Colombo. There is a local tradition that the Buddha came to the town of Kelāniyā where a large stūpa dedicated to him exists to this day. A certain sanctity is associated with this river, because the Buddha is supposed to have bathed in it. The Kālugagaṅgā is another river which flows through the Western Province. It meets the sea where the town of Kālutārā (commonly pronounced Kālcūrā), which gives it its name, stands. The Gingaṅgā which waters the Southern Province, takes its rise from the Goongala Range, and after a course of fifty-nine miles meets the sea close to the modern port of Galle. The Nilwalagaṅgā which comes from Urubokka mountain, situated about four miles to the south-east of Dehiyāya, the Walawegaṅgā which joins the sea at Ambalanota, the Māgamagaṅgā and the Kataragāmagaṅgā which lie to the east of the Walawe are the other notable rivers of the Southern Province. The Mahāwaligaṅgā is the longest of the rivers of the island. It meets the Ambangaṅgā which rises close to Mātale, and flows by the town bearing the historic name of Nālandā.

It divides itself into two streams the Kurugalagaṅgā and the Virugalagaṅgā, when it enters into the Eastern Province. No sanctity is attributed to the waters of the Mahāwaligaṅgā. The Menikgaṅgā which is about eighty-one miles long, has for its source the Namunu-kulā Range. Its mouth lies to the east of Hambantota.

It is evident from the above that "gaṅgā" in Ceylon means a river.¹

¹ Kālidāsa, uses Gaṅgā in the sense of the sacred river in many passages. See Raghuvamśa, canto XIII, verses 9, 10 and 57; canto IV, verses 32 and 36.
It is not my purpose to come to any definite conclusion here, beyond pointing out that North Indian epigraphical instances from the period beginning with the fourth, and ending in the tenth century A.C. favour both the interpretations of the word "Gaṅgā", and that another evidence of the intimate cultural contact of Simhalese Ceylon with North India lies in the geographical use of that word in this Island.

J. C. De

An early supporter of Shivaji

Kānhoji Jēdhē, deshmukh of Bhor, in the Puna district, came over to Shivaji's side during the latter's contest with Āfzal Khān (1659) and with his own contingent fought the Maratha king's battles right manfully in various places for many years afterwards.¹ The chronology (shakāvalī) kept by this family is one of the most valuable sources of early Maratha history. Their home is the village of Kāri some ten miles from the town of Bhor, in the territory of the Sachiv one of the sardārs of the Puna district. During a visit to the place in January 1930, I discovered the following farman of Muhammad Ādil Shāh, sultan of Bijapur, issued to Kānhoji Jēdhē on 7th Jamādi-us-sāni 1054 A.H. (= 1st August 1644).

Kāri is situated in the heart of the Māval country. This tract was in one sense a frontier district of the Nizām-Shāhi kingdom of Ahmādnagar. When that dynasty was extinguished, it passed into the hands of Ādil Shāh of Bijapur (about 1636), but it was long before the new sovereign's authority was fully recognised there. The Jēdhēs had been originally retainers of Randaula Khān, and continued to find in him their master and protector after the district came under Ādil Shāh's sway. At first the new sovereign gave the sief of the Jēdhēs to a Muhammadan female (of Kāliān?), but on appeal the Jēdhēs got it back, evidently through the mediation of Randaula Khan (about 1637-8).

From Randaula's service they were transferred to the contingent of Shāhji Bhonslé, who was a lifelong friend of Randaula.

¹ See Jēdhē Chronology as tr. by me in Shivaji Souvenir, ed. by Sardesai (1927), pp. 1—44.
The present farmān is of great importance as throwing contemporary light on the activities of Dādāji Kond-dev and giving the exact dates of the Maratha acquisition of Kondāna (Singh-garh) and Shāhji's rupture with Bijapur.

**TEXT OF THE FARMAN**

فرمان همايون شرف [ صدر يانت پنام کانهوچی نا یک جبههی ] 

اژ شهروسته اربع اربع کوزن شاهچی بورنسله از مردردان 
درگاه زالا جاه کمالیه ر دادخی کران دیو متعلق ار که در طرف کنداله 
است - جهت دفع و رفع کردا . ر آور ] بقیع دوی آردن آن زایمت عزت و 
رصف دستگه شجاعت و شهامت اشتباه عمله ای [ امثال ] رالا قران 
لاهی المراحم رالا حسان سمجه الاهی رالایان زبده القدایل رالایان 
کهندرچی ر باجی کوهیریان را با زرائی عظام تعمیم عمروشی شه است - بايه که 
ار [ موه ] اشخار خود نزد مشار الهمه امد از استمرار مشرا الهمه دادخی 
ووند دیو مذکور و متعلقان آن جزاء خروار رو کوشمال داده نیست و رابود سازه - 
آن زایمت را بقیع رتصرف در آردن که باعث سرافرازی آرست - نا داند .

تصرفاً را نفع التاريخ هفتم شهر جمادی الثاني سنهٔ ١٠٥٤

بسم اعلى

پرورانگی حضور اشرف اندس

**Translation**

This auspicious rescript [ is issued in the name of Kānhoji Nāyak Jêdhê ], in the Shaku san 1044. As Shāhji Bhonslē has become one

1. The paper has cracked in some places, but the missing words can be easily supplied. They are enclosed within square brackets.

2. تاکید داند.
of the enemies [lit., rejected, reprobad ] of this august Court, and Dādāji Kond-dev, his supreme agent, is [campaigning] in the region of Kondāna,—therefore, for the purpose of putting a stop to [his] activity and gaining possession of that country, [long titles] Khandoji and Bāji Khopā have been appointed to accompany [our] grand nobles. It is proper that he [i.e., Kānhoji Jēdhē, also with] his contingent (ākshām) should go to the aforesaid persons, and with their co-operation [lit., advice] punish and reduce to nothing the said Dādāji Kond-dev and the associates of that base fellow [lit., eater of unclean food],—and bring that region into possession,—so that it may result in his [=Jēdhē’s] being exalted. Know it to be urgent. Written on 7th Jamādi-us-sān, year 1054.

In the name of the Most High.¹

Parwānah of his honoured and sacred Majesty.

JADUNATHI SARKAR

---

¹ May be an error for “In the name of ‘Āli,”—whose name was cut on the seals of the Bijapur sultans.
The "Webbed finger" of Buddha

Discussing this subject in I.H.Q. for December 1930, Mr. Banerjea defends the view of Foucher, that the jālalakkhaṇa originally referred to lines on the palms of the hands and soles of the feet, and that through the misinterpretation of a technical device of the sculptors (intended to prevent the fractures of the fingers of stone images), it later came to be regarded as implying a webbing or membrane connecting the digits. There is much to be said for this view, but against it may be cited the facts (1) that the palms and soles of the Buddha, as Mahāpuruṣa, were said to have been marked with a cakka, and are so represented in very many sculptures of an early date, and it is not likely that another lakkhaṇa referred to other lines in the same places, and (2) as pointed out by Stutterheim, in a discussion on the problem in Acta Orientalia, VII, 232 ff., (overlooked by Mr. Banerjea), the word ḫala is employed by Kālidāsa in the Sakuntalā, with unmistakable reference to the thin lines of rosy light which may be seen between the fingers when they are in contact, and the hand is held up against the light. These two objections make it very difficult to accept the Foucher-Banerjea interpretation in toto.

My solution would be to accept the definite statement of Buddhaghosa, that the jālalakkhaṇa did not refer to a webbing between the figures (and Mr. Banerjea is probably right in saying that Buddhaghosa deliberately begins with this statement, having in view the already existing images with this physical peculiarity indicated), but that the fingers were "of one measure" (ekappamāṇa) "like the latticed window made by carpenter" (vaddhakena-yojitasāla-vātapaṇa), in other words, that the fingers were straight and regularly formed; another lakkhaṇa tells us that they were long.

Buddhaghosa's reliability has already been demonstrated in so many cases once considered unintelligible or mistaken (e.g. in the matters of the hatthi-nakhakaṇḍaṇā, or that of the officiating of the king's eldest son as Pariṇāyaka, where his interpretations have been

Incidentally, it may be noted, that the "hand" described by Kālidāsa is evidently the padmakūśa hasta of the works on Abhinaya, and that this padmakūśa hand would certainly have been employed by the actor at this point in playing the part.

I.H.Q., JUNE, 1931
shown to be correct. In the present case, his explanation gains plausibility from the fact of its correspondence with the usage of jāla in the Śakuntalā; in the simile of the window we meet with the same idea of lines of light seen between parallel opaque bands, fingers or wooden rods as the case may be. The jāla, then, does not imply “webbing” or any abnormality, but simply a perfection of form demonstrated by the appearance of the reddish lines of light that may be seen between the parallel fingers when the hand is held up to the light. But observe that such lines are only in fact regularly disposed (like the spaces between window bars) and evidently seen when the fingers are regular (ekappamāṇā) as well as delicate and long (which other lakkhaṇas require); if the joints are swollen, there will be places where the fingers are too closely pressed together to allow of the passage of any light at all, and other spaces where the fingers are not quite in contact, and only clear daylight can be seen between the fingers. Hence the jālalakkhaṇa implies after all nothing but a perfection of form of the fingers, such as might be looked for in the hand of the Mahāpuruṣa. If, as seems probable, a later misinterpretation arose, originating in the sculptor’s device, this is only a parallel to what happened in the case of upāśa-rīsa which originally meant “destined to wear a royal turban”, and later came to be regarded (perhaps also by misinterpretation of images) as “having a cranial protuberance”. It is not altogether surprising that a later age should have thus interpreted as miraculous abnormalities what had once been simple and intelligible matters; for the tendency to develop the miraculous elements in the Buddha legend is a well-recognised one in the corresponding literature.

Thus, I am on the side of Foucher and Banerjea as to the fact of misinterpretation based on the sculptor’s device; but on the side of Stutterheim as to the original meaning of the word jāla as used in the lakkhaṇa lists.

Ananda Coomaraswamy
A few Evidences on the Age of the Kathavatthu

(i) Tradition

We have to depend mainly on the Ceylonese tradition for ascertaining the time of composition of the Kathavatthu, one of the seven treatises of the Abhidhamma Piṭaka. The tradition\(^1\) tells us that the controversies embodied in the K. V. took place at the Third Buddhist Council, convened in the 17th regnal year of king Aśoka. The compilation of the book too, was, it is said, made at the same time by the Thera Moggaliputta Tissa, and was included in the Canon among the seven Abhidhamma treatises. Buddhaghosa in discussing the authority of the K. V. makes a statement in his Atthasālinī\(^3\) to the effect that Buddha himself laid down the table of contents (mātikā) of the K. V., and while doing it he foresaw that more than 218 years after his demise (mama parinibbānato atthārasavassādhikānaṁ dvinnampassasatānaṁ matthake) Tissa, son of Moggali, being seated in the midst of one thousand bhikkhus, would elaborate the K. V. to the extent of the Dīgha Nikāya, bringing together 500 orthodox and 500 heterodox suttas. The tradition further informs us that Moggaliputta Tissa persuaded king Aśoka to despatch Buddhist Missions after the conclusion of the Council.\(^3\) This statement refers, therefore, to a time when the

---

1 Mahāvaṃsa, (P.T.S. edition), ch. V, p. 55; also Mahābodhi-
vaṃsa, p. 110.


3 The Mahābodhiṇḍa (p. 113) corroborates this tradition and further tells us that soon after the close of the Third Buddhist Council under the presidency of Moggaliputta Tissa it was found necessary to select those places in the border countries (paccantimesu janapadesu) where the teachings of the Master, if promulgated, were expected to endure long. Tissa, accordingly, selected nine centres to each of which he despatched a leading member of the order to establish the doctrine. The monks who were entrusted with the task were:—Majjhantika for Kasmirā and Gandhāra; Mahādeva for Mahiṃsakamaṇḍala; Rakkhita for Vanavāsi; Yonakadhammarakkhita for the Aparāntaka; Mahādhammarakkhita for the Mahāraṭṭha; Mahārakkhita for the country of the Yonakas; the therā Majjhīma
Buddhist Missions were not yet organised under any royal patronage for the dissemination of the truths of Buddhism in regions outside the Middle Country.

(ii) Geographical extent of Buddhism

Here we shall try to examine whether the above traditional account can be corroborated by any internal evidence. In Book I, the 3rd point of controversy is that there was no holy life among the gods (N’atthi devesu brahmacariyavāso’ti). In course of the controversy the opponent of the orthodox school maintains that among the gods there is no Buddhist mode of holy life, the form of life which is regarded holy by the Buddhist recluses, because it is not till then introduced among the inhabitants, godly or otherwise, in the regions outside the limit of the Middle Country, i.e., in the ‘Paccantima-janapadas’. He contends that as yet there can be no initiation or Pabbajjā, in places lying beyond the geographical limits of the Middle Country (Majjhima-janapada), referring thereby to the godly inhabitants of Uttarakuṇḍi and the Mlechas of other places. From this it is evident that Buddhist missionary work was restricted up till the time of the K.V. within the territorial limits of the Middle Country, i.e., to say Buddhism was not yet propagated in India outside the Middle Country as defined in Buddhist literature.

(iii) Attempts to check Schism

The fact of the disruption of the Buddhist Church into various schools also affords some evidence for ascertaining the time of composition of the K.V. According to the commentator of the K.V. the Buddhist Order in India had been, in course of the 2nd century after Buddha’s demise, divided into 18 schools. This is confirmed by both the Ceylonese chronicles, the Dipavamsa1 and for the regions lying near the Himalayas; and Soṇa and Uttara for the Suvaṇṇabhūmi. Not long after Tissa found in Mahinda, the son of Aṣoka, a young and worthy disciple capable of carrying the doctrine to Laṅkā. It is interesting to note how each of these theras succeeded to turn the minds of the people in their respective localities and convert them into Buddhism.

1 Dipavamsa, ch. V.
the Mahāvamsa.¹ Prof. Rhys Davids² has discussed this matter at some length and is inclined to believe that the number of schools was not eighteen but six or seven on the ground that the Kathāvatthu Cy. and the inscriptions on Buddhist topes as well as the records of Yuan Chwang furnish us with six or seven names. We cannot dismiss the traditional account as to the number of Buddhist schools prevalent in the 2nd century after Buddha's demise as unreliable on the ground that the K. V. and the Buddhist topes noted above are lacking in mentioning the names of the 18 schools, as it is not a sufficient proof of the non-existence of those schools. It is not strange that Yuan Chwang while giving an account of the 7th century a.C. should state the names of a few Buddhist schools, because the different schools which arose in the course of the 2nd century after Buddha's demise might afterwards have been either swallowed up, one by the other, or some of them disappeared being unable to withstand the opposition from rival schools. So in the absence of any better evidence to prove the contrary, we cannot disbelieve the traditional account of the Ceylonese chronicles. Here our point, however, is to show that though scholars may not agree as to the number of schools, there is no doubt that the Buddhist Church was divided into a few schools during the period under consideration.

This fact is corroborated by Aśoka's Schism Pillar Edict engraved in his 21st regnal year. The task of the K. V. being mainly to state the various theses put forward by the leading opponents of the Theravāda School, and to refute each of them from the view-point of the latter, it is evident that its purpose in view was indirectly the same as that of the Schism Pillar Edict of king Aśoka, viz., to put an end to the disruptive elements which threatened the orthodox school at that time. In view of the common object of the two writings, the P. E. and the K. V., it may be said that they were productions of about the same period.

(iv) Traces of Mahāyānic Influence

There are, no doubt, in the K. V. a few topics (e.g., iv, 1, 7; xviii, 1-4; xx, 2; xxi, 4-6; xxii, 1-3, etc.), which prove that

² Buddhism, pp. 195ff.
some of the early Mahāyānic doctrines were known to the compiler. This, however, should not lead us to put the date back, because long before the growth of Mahāyāna, the Mahāyānic ideas and doctrines were already current among some of the early Buddhists, especially, the Mahāsāṅghikas and their offshoots.

Thus an examination of some of the materials of the K. V. and the Aśokan edicts shows that the compilation of the K. V. was made, at least in part, somewhere in the reign of king Aśoka.

Dwijendra Lal Barua

The Age of the Viṣṇu Purāṇa

The evidence of the Maṇimekalai

V. A. Smith has examined the views of Wilson, Pargiter and others about the age of the Purāṇas in general and the Viṣṇu Purāṇa in particular.¹ He has shown that independent testimony assigns a much higher antiquity to the Purāṇas, which is earlier than the 4th century B.C.

Independent proof of the existence of the Viṣṇu Purāṇa in the early centuries of the Christian era is supplied to us by the Tamil classic the Maṇimekalai, the composition of which is generally assigned to the second century after Christ.² In a discourse at the assemblage of Vaṇji with teachers of different persuasions, Maṇimekalai was addressed in turn by the Vedāntin, the Śaivavādin, Brahmavādin, Viṣṇuvādin, the Ājīvaka teacher, the Nirgrantha, the Sāmkhya philosopher, the Vaiṣēśika expounder, and lastly by the Bhūtavādin. In this content we come across a line in which ‘one versed in the Vaiṣṇava Purāṇa’ (Kadālvanan Purāṇamodinan, Ibid., II, 98-99) is mentioned.

Traditionally the Bhāgavata, the Nārada, the Garuḍa and the Viṣṇu are regarded as Vaiṣṇava Purāṇas. It seems to me that the reference here is only to the Viṣṇu Purāṇa. The expression Kadālvanan is an epithet of Viṣṇu, meaning literally ‘the

¹ See Early History of India, 4th edition, pp. 22-23.
² See author's Studies in Tamil Literature and History, pp. 73-76.
god having the colour of the sea'. It may be pointed out in passing that the word Viṣṇu is foreign to the Śaṅgam literature, and whenever that God is mentioned, the epithets employed are Tirumāl, Kaṭalavarpā, etc. Therefore it is reasonable to assume that the term here stands for Viṣṇu and the whole phrase for the Viṣṇu Purāṇa. It points to the practice in vogue in the ancient Tamil land when the traditional Purāṇas, considered to be the fifth Veda, were read and expounded. For a Purāṇa to be read and expounded it must have been popular for a considerable time. As the Maṇimekalai is a composition of the second century A.D., it can be reasonably assumed that the major portion of the Viṣṇu Purāṇa existed perhaps in its present form from the commencement of the Christian era at the latest.

V. R. RAMACHANDRA DIKSHITAK

More on Maṇimekhalā

I

Siam

On my request H. R. H. Prince Damrong of Siam, whose work in the field of archaeology ought to be known by every scholar interested in Buddhism, had an inquiry made in Siam about the goddess Maṇimekhalā. Here is the important note he compiled, as it reads in its original English form. It will be seen that, as it could be expected, Siam and Cambodia agree perfectly well on this subject; Cambodian Buddhism has been for several centuries under the predominant influence of Siam.

"Maṇimekhalā" is known to the Siamese both through the Pāli Jātakas and the indigenous literature.

In the Mahājanaka Jātaka (Mahānipāta) and Saṅkha Jātaka (Dasanipāta) she is represented as the goddess of the sea appointed by the gods to rescue good men who may be shipwrecked.

The Siamese Rāmāyaṇa, composed anew in the reign of king Rama I (1783-1809 A.D.), says that Maṇimekhalā is the goddess of

---

1 "Maṇimekhalā" is also shortened in usage into "Mekhalā".

2 Archaeological finds show that the story of Rāmāyaṇa must have come to Siam not less than five hundred years ago.
the sea and lives in a place studded with gems, and relates a story about her which may be summarised as follows:—

Once at the advent of the rainy season, the gods and goddesses were dancing together. At the time a Yakṣa named Rāmāsūr, armed with axe and bow and living in the clouds, passed by where they were dancing. When he saw Maṇimekhalā’s gem, he wished to have it and chased her. Mekhalā eluded him after dazzling his eyes by directing the rays of her gem into them and leaving him grope in the dark, and mocked at him. Rāmāsūr got enraged and threw his axe at her. But it was averted from her by the supernatural power possessed by the gem. Meanwhile Arjuna who lived upon the Cakravāla mountain came flying between Mekhalā and Rāmāsūr. Rāmāsūr got enraged, saying Arjuna crossed his path, and killed him by dashing him against the Sumeru mountain. Sumeru was thus made to lean on one side and Śiva had it set upright by Sugriva.

The Siamese Rāmāyaṇa also helps us to identify Rāmāsūr and Arjuna mentioned above by narrating other incidents of their lives, namely, (1) Rāmāsūr fought with Rāma when the latter was returning home after marrying Śītā. Rāmāsūr was defeated and forced to surrender his bow. (2) While Daśakaṇṭha (Rāvaṇa) was staying with Rṣi Goputra as the latter’s pupil, Arjuna had a quarrel with him. So Arjuna carried Daśakaṇṭha off as prisoner and flew around exhibiting his victim’s helplessness before the world, but released him later on at the request of Goputra. So, in his book On the sources of the Siamese Rāmāyaṇa, H. M. the late king, Rāma VI. identified Rāmāsūr with Rāma Paraśu (Paraśurāma of the Purāṇas) and Arjuna with Arjuna-Kārtavirya, a king of the Haihayas, who was slain by Paraśurāma, and explained that the Siamese call Paraśurāma an “asūra” by confusing the word “nyakṣa” (meaning “low,” an epithet given to Paraśurāma because, although a Brahmin, he was irate and fierce) with the word “yakṣa.” Thus the episode in the Siamese Rāmāyaṇa summarised above, appears to be a fusion of a story from the Jātakas and the Purāṇas.

There is, however, a tradition current among the people even now that Mekhalā creates lightning by swinging her gem about and that Rāmāsūr creates thunder with his roars and the thunder-stroke by hurling his axe. This gives rise to the theory that Mekhalā and Rāmāsūr are merely lightning and thunder personified. The history of the word “Arjuna” as the designation conferred on men holding a particular office of state, serves to explain why there is an Arjuna
associated with the deities of thunder and lightning. Formerly the designation was Phya Deba Varajun. Later it was changed into Phya Deba Prajun and then again into Phya Deba Arjun. Thus it will be seen that there has been a confusion between "Arjuna" (Pāli "Ajjuna") and Pajjuna (Skt. "Parjanya, god of rain) after they have been transplanted in a foreign country. Probably Mekhalā, Rāmāsūr and Arjuna are old Siamese deities connected with the rain who formerly had Siamese names but were renamed when the Siamese were converted to Buddhism and came under Indian influence. Failing to meet any Indian tradition that explains the phenomena of rain in the same terms as the folklore of Siam, the aim in renaming would have been restricted to equating the old Siamese deities of the rain with gods or heroes of India bearing some amount of resemblance to the former. It must have been thus that the story of Mekhalā of the Siamese Rāmāyaṇa has come to look like a piece of patch work.

The close relationship between Mekhalā, Rāmāsūr and Arjuna and the rain is made further clear by these three personages forming the characters of the "Ra-bam." The Siamese ballet called "Ra-bam" is an ancient form of entertainment at which, ten men on one side and ten women on the other, dance to the accompaniment of music. Formerly it must have been a society diversion like the balls and dances of Europe. Afterwards it became the practice to employ professionals to dance at night when there are religious rites. Since in Siam agriculture forms the chief occupation of the people, religious rites are performed before the rainy season in order to ensure good rain-fall and the story of Mekhalā and Rāmāsūr has been adapted to the dances usual in these rites.

Mons. Nicolas, who has given a summary of the Maṇimekhalā episode (Rāmāsūra and Maṇimekhalā; Arjuna's death; Mount Meru set upright again; Bali's perjury) in his complete analysis of the Siamese Rāmāyaṇa (Extrême-Asie, Saigon, no. 19, Jan. 1928, p. 301), has also collected in Siam some pictures of Mekhalā which will be shortly published in Revue des Arts Asiatiques, Paris.

II

Ceylon and Burma

Mr. S. Paranavitana, Epigraphical Assistant to the Archaeological Commissioner, Ceylon, who had contributed a very important paper,
Mahāyānism in Ceylon, to the Ceylon Journal of Science II, 1, December 1928, has lately published in the Ceylon Literary Register, third series, 1, 1, January 1931, a short, but substantial paper on the goddess, Maṇimekhalā (p. 37-38), which he has kindly sent me. He notices there two references to Maṇimekhalā that escaped me: one is found in the Rājāvalīya, a Sinhalese historical work of the 17th century (Mr. Ananda Coomaraswamy, Boston Museum, has also drawn my attention in a private letter to the same reference). It is told there how Vihāradevi, the mother of the Sinhalese national hero Duṭṭhagāmini, was offered by her father as a sacrifice to appease the wrath of the sea-gods, and how she was safely brought by the goddess Maṇimekhalā across the sea to Māgama where she found her future husband."

"The other reference is contained in a non-canonical Pāli work entitled Chakṣadātuvaṃsa. This book, in its present form, is of no distant date; but there is reason to believe that the legends it contains are very old. Most probably they are of South-Indian origin, for one of the six stūpas (referred to) is said to have been founded by Tamil (Damila) merchants." So far Mr. Paranavitana; but the editor of this booklet, Prof. Minayeff says expressly (Journ. Pāli Text Soc. 1885) that this Chakṣa "is a work by a modern Burmese author, of unknown name and date"; the two mss. used by the editor were Burmese. The Chakṣa relates how Buddha gave over to six of his disciples Anuruddha, Sobhita, Padumuttara, Guṇasāgara, Nānapaṇḍita, and Revata six hair-relics which they brought to Southern lands and had them enshrined in six stūpas. One of those was erected by Maṇimekhalā. Here is a translation of the chapter (JPTS., pp. 10-11) concerning this stūpa:

"There is a place on the sea-shore, all covered with Asoka-trees, and the western side of this is surrounded by a glen. Seeing this, all these (six) holy men reflected: Well, how shall we find in such a place a person to look after the relic? Then the venerable Padumuttara said to the other five holy men: 'I shall look for a maintainer of the relic.' He formed a resolution with the following stanza relating to Buddha's virtues:

'If you, the first in all the worlds, have been an ascetic in order to save the beings, let my prayer be successful through your power! May I find today a donor for a thūpa of the hair of the Jina!'

While he was praying in these words, a guardian of the sea, Maṇimekhalā by name, daughter of a god, appeared owing to Buddha's
power, with all her ornaments, surrounded by many attendants. She came out of the sea in a perceivable form. And the theras told her: 'It is fitting, o lay female-devotee, to have a thūpa built for the relic. If you are able, then be the maintainer of the relic of the 'bull among the men, the incomparable one'! Then she thought: 'I belong to the female sex; how can I obtain knowledge of the plannning of the thūpa? He said: If you, O lay-female-devotee, can give wages to the neighbouring people, they will quickly build a cetiya. 'All right,' she said, and in disguise she went thither, and she gave wages and had a cetiya erected. Those people made on this spot a dagoba eighty feet deep. The daughter of the god then made a heap of the jewels collected from various places by her supernatural power; and then she brought from the Vepulla mountain one block of jewel, shining like a lamp and similar to the jewel of a Cakkavatti, and placed it within the relic chamber made of jewels, putting the relic-casket on the top of the jewel. While it was being placed, the earth quaked, lightenings flashed out of season, and there was a pleasant rainfall. All gods cheered. Manimekhalā, having paid her homage to Bhagavā's relic, had the cetiya closed. After closing it, the cetiya being completed, she uttered the following stanza expressing her wish:

May the dagoba of the Jīna endure five hundred years,
Through your power, may beings know the place of No-death!

Having spoken thus, Maṇimekhalā set and erected the thūpa of the hair. Then the goddess, bowing to the feet of the Arahantas, with a pious mind went away and entered her own palace.

III

French Indo-China

A French lady, Madame Marcel Pascalis, living at Hanoi (Tong-king), has prepared a paper on Maṇimekhalā, specially in Indochinese lore, in which she has collected some more information about the goddess; she has secured a Cambodian drawing, representing Maṇimekhalā as well as a photograph of Maṇimekhalā's dance. The paper will appear next autumn in Revue des Arts Asiatiques.

All these new documents go to show that Maṇimekhalā's own domain is, as I had stated in my first paper, "that region of the ocean which extends from Cape Comorin to the marvellous El Dorado of the Far East". While the Tamil country, Ceylon, Burma, Siam,
and Cambodia affords so many evidences of her long notoriety there, nothing has come as yet to be found concerning her beyond this zone of earth and water. My dear P. C. Bagchi, whom I have to thank for translating, and so well, my first paper from the French original, has pointed out to me an interesting counter-proof. The Mahāvastu, which was certainly compiled in the Northern part of India, has a tale of a shipwreck (III, 353-356) where are found several features appearing also in the Pāli jātakas I have quoted. A samudra-devatā here also comes to the rescue of the Bodhisattva and his fellow-merchants about to be drowned; she repents that she has so long neglected her duty of watching over the sea (mayaṃ pramattavīhārā in the prose redaction, p. 355, l. 1; mamedar na viditaṃ pramattāye, 365, l. 5); but the sea-deity remains anonymous. The compiler is writing beyond the pale of the goddess Maṇimekhalā.

SYLVAIN LEVI

Maṇimekhala

In the folk-lore of Ceylon the Sea-goddess is called Mūdu Maṇimekhalāva. A ballad relates "that Devel Devi was born in the Vaḍiga land whence he sailed for Ceylon with followers of many races in seven ships laden with various things, especially bangles. The ships being wrecked they drifted about for seven days; then a stone raft was made which carried them swiftly to Ceylon, aided by the sea-goddess Mūdu Maṇimekhalāva and the four guardian gods". Another ballad narrates that when Anāīga escaped in the form of a bee, Śiva with his third eye in the centre of his forehead burned Umā to ashes, which he threw into the ocean, repented and ordered the goddess of the sea Mūdu Maṇimekhalāva to restore her. She feigned inability; and to punish her Śiva drank up the sea. Again he bade her restore Umā. She promised to obey if he would again fill the ocean which he did. She then created an image of Umā which he rejected. At length she took the ashes of Umā which she had kept in a vase, shaped them into a figure of Umā upon a banana leaf and brought it to life. Thus Umā was restored to Śiva".1

ARTHUR A. PEREIRA

Derivation of Pāli

Though the texts of the Buddhist Canon known as “Pāli” have been fully studied and utilised for purposes of history, it is somewhat worthy of note that the meaning of the word ‘Pāli’ is not yet clear and its derivation is obscure. Recently Dr. Thomas makes the observation in regard to the subject, “let us have some evidence one way or the other, and we shall be all the better able to do justice to the other matters in this important essay,” commenting on a theory of interpretation proposed by Dr. Walleser.¹

The term as it is ordinarily understood is “Pāli,” and means a ‘series,’ ‘row’ or ‘line.’² Based on this general meaning Childers gives in his Dictionary the rendering of the word as a “series of texts.” Where “Pāli-bhāṣā” is mentioned, it is taken by him to mean “the language of the (Buddhist) sacred texts” and not as “Pāli language.” Thus a language known as “Pāli” is not so far recognised.

Dr. Walleser going against accepted authority points out that there was a language known as “Pāli” which he says belonged to Magadha from where it was taken to Ceylon. He derives the word in an indirect way from Pāṭali or Pāṭaligrāma where “the bhikkhus assembled soon after the death of Buddha.”³ “Pāli” is, according to him, the language of Pāṭaliputra. He finds further that the meaning of the word “Pāli” as given by Childers has to be rejected as “there is a spelling in Ceylon Mss. with cerebral ], which makes the derivation highly improbable.”⁴

The question to be answered is, what is the original word—“Pāli or Pāli.” The current view is that “Pāli” is more closely allied to the “Prākṛt” of Ceylon but the discovery by Dr. Walleser of “Pāli”

---

¹ Indian Historical Quarterly, Dec., 1928, pp. 773 ff.
² It has also the meaning “dyke” (ditch, pit or cave). Vide Prof. Macdonell’s Dictionary under “Pāli”.
³ This along with a few other points raised by Dr. Walleser has been questioned by Dr. Thomas.
⁴ The sense of “line” or “row” is not precluded however merely by the fact of the word being “Pāli” instead of “Pāli”, for “Pāli” persisted in the Malayāḷam language in the sense of “line” or “row”, e.g., kidnakkail pāli (pāli=rows or compartments of a kidnaka—bed),
in some Ceylon Mss. raises the presumption that this may be the original term. It is worthy of note that the cerebral  in commonly met with only in the Dravidian languages of South India; and it is therefore not very surprising to find the form “Pāḷi” as a variant of “Pāḷi” only in Ceylon. It appears in Tamil in another form “Pāḷi,” which in the old Tamil lexicon, the Piṅgalandi Nighaṇṭu is rendered as “munivar vāsam” (dwelling place of munis). It may be also equated with the word “paḷḷi” one of the synonyms given in the Nighaṇṭu itself, which is met with in expressions like “paḷḷi-arai” (bed-chamber), “paḷḷi-koṇḍa Perumāl” (the deity in the recumbent

Instances are quite common where  is used in Dravidian languages for  which is found only in Tamil. A few examples may here be given:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tamil-Malayālam</th>
<th>Kannada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Puḷa (river)</td>
<td>hule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paḷaya (old)</td>
<td>haḷaya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eḷu (seven)</td>
<td>eḷu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maḷai (rain)</td>
<td>maḷe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pāḷu (waste)</td>
<td>haḷu.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interchange of  and  in Tamil may be found in examples like:

Cola—Cola.           | Ilam or Ilam—Ceylon.
Tamil—Tamil.          | paḷam or paḷam—fruit.
pugaḷ or pugaḷ—fame.  | keḷ or keḷ—hear.
pavaḷam or pavaḷam—coral. | uṇundu or uṇundu—pulse,

Instances where cerebral  appears in South Indian vernaculars for  in Sanskrit may be noted in the following, among others:

kāla becomes kāḷa—dark.
phala  ,  paḷa or paḷa—fruit.
kalabha  ,  kaḷapa (old Tamil)—young elephant.
dhavala  ,  tavaḷa ( do. )—white.
valaya  ,  vaḷai—bangle or ring.
pravaḷa  ,  pavaḷa or pavaḷa—coral.
sthala  ,  taḷa or daḷa—place.
khila  ,  kiḷai—branch.
sthāli  ,  tāḷi—pot.
DEKIVATION OF PĀLI

posture) and in the “pālī” (mosque) of the Mussalmans (particularly the Moplahs of Malabar) in South India.¹

It is interesting to find that the word “Pāli” occurs in the early Brāhmī inscriptions of South India,² written in characters similar to those found in the Brāhmī inscriptions of Ceylon, assigned by Bühler to at least the 3rd century B.C. These inscriptions are met with either on the natural walls of caves or on the rocky beds found in them. No other meaning of the word “Pāli” seems possible in these cases than “residence of munis” (monks) or “beds for them to rest on.” “Pāli” would therefore mean a cave, and this interpretation does not militate against the meaning “dyke” given to the term “Pāli” by Macdonell. The conclusion seems warranted that the name “Pāli” may have been derived from the South and originally used to denote the language met with in these caves or the beds in them. “Pāli” is probably only a variant of the South Indian forms “Pāli,” “Pāli” or “Pālī.”³

It is hoped that this short note may answer the query raised by Dr. E. J. Thomas, “what does the spelling with cerebral prove?” It will also indicate that the spelling “Pāli” may have been the original one, as found in the early Prākrit of South India and Ceylon. The meaning here given might set at rest also any necessity for a theory of a possible confusion of the word “Pāli” with “Pāli” meaning line, as conceived by Dr. Thomas in his note.

S. V. VISWANATHA

¹ In these cases “pālī” either means “bed for lying on” or a “place for prayers”.

² The word “pālī” occurs thrice in these inscriptions and has perhaps to be distinguished from “kāvi” and “lena” which are other words met with in them to denote a “cavern”. One point of difference between the caves in Ceylon and those in South India is that in the latter are found beds, while the former do not contain any. Perhaps this fact may lead to the conclusion that “pālī” meant “a cave with a bed in it”.

³ The original and better form of the word would appear to be “Pāli”.
Problems of the Natyasastra

I read with interest Mr. M. Ghose's note on "Problems of the Nāṭyaśāstra" in the issue of March, 1930 (vol. 6, No. 1) of this Journal. I wish to put forward a doubt in accepting his views. He upholds that (i) "the Nāṭyaśāstra legend about the origin of Nāṭya is palpably a badly made table fitted to the text in a still worse manner, (ii) the word Bharata meaning nāṭa has not been derived from any person of the same name and an enquiry seems to point to a reverse process, (iii) the disappearance of the Naṭasūtras of Śilālin and Kṛṣāśva was probably due to socio-political circumstances of the age that followed Pāṇini, and (iv) Śilālin and Kṛṣāśva were the earliest known writers of any Nāṭyaśāstra or the text book for the nāṭas."

Though in Pāṇini (iv, 3, 110 and 111) we find mention of the Naṭasūtras or text-books for nāṭas, ascribed to Śilālin and Kṛṣāśva, the mere mention of the term nāṭa does not lead us to any conclusion, because Pāṇini, in his exhaustive works, is silent as to the definite significance of the term nāṭa, nor any effective evidence as to the existence of drama in his time is found. We are, therefore, according to Dr. Keith's opinion, "in no position to establish the meaning of the term nāṭa", as it might have existed then. In like manner, the mere mention of the 'curious' names, without any external support, is far from being sufficient to prove their authorship of the Nāṭyaśāstra. Mr. R. N. Sāstrī, in this connection, remarks:—

"Pāṇini, in his works, has not made any intentional or avowed attempt to reflect the whole human society and its institutions as they existed in his days or were known to him. But he has made occasional observations only in course of the relevancy, rather under the necessity warranted by his subject. Therefore, even his silence about Bharata's śāstra, or, for the matter of that, the mention of the Naṭasūtras of the two particular teachers made by the way, can hardly count or be adduced as a cogent reason to prove or disprove anything in connection with the tradition that Bharata was the first writer on dramaturgy."

His third argument seems to make a reasonable justification for the disappearance of the alleged Naṭasūtras of Śilālin and Kṛṣāśva. "Should we wonder then", the writer remarks, "if under these circumstances Nāṭyaśātras of Śilālin and Kṛṣāśva did, owing to a sheer disuse for a long time, go out of existence at a time when the earliest version of
the Nāṭyaśāstra was made. To justify this "disuse for a long time" Mr. Ghose suggests that after Śilālin and Kṛśāva (whom he places about a century earlier than Pāṇini?) there came the reign of the Maurya emperors who deliberately made their best attempts to disparage such performances. Kauṭilya, as is clear from his Arthaśāstra, was deadly against encouraging nāṭas and similar people, and often called them as "objects of constant suspicion on the part of the statesmen, who exploited them as spies and tolerated them as ugly tools". This is true, no doubt; but the Arthaśāstra was written specially for a prince, and we find, therein, no record of the attitude with which it was received by the people in general; nor, in any of the extant contemporary works, do we find anything regarding the feelings with which the Arthaśāstra was looked upon by the public; and to think, therefore, that the disparagement of dramatic and parallel performances was "a natural outcome of Kauṭilya's writings", can be said to be no more than mere conjecture. On the other hand, it may be tentatively suggested that Kauṭilya, being averse to such performances, might have made deliberate efforts to suppress them. Thus it seems plausible that the drama, in some form or other, might have attracted people in general, so much so that it began to horrify Kauṭilya, a wise minister, who looked upon it as an impediment to enforce stability to his patron's reign. This is sufficient to show that it had attained—not only a definite form, but also a universal appreciation in those times.

The drama seems to have existed even in Buddha's time. The Lalitavistara also refers to this art.

Āśvaghoṣa's dramatic fragments are enough to bear testimony, not only to its mere existence, but also to its wide-spread popularity; so much so that with a view to promote Buddhism and to bring down the Brāhmaṇical sway, he betook himself to the measure of writing dramas. The use of Sanskrit, as opposed to Prākrit, in his dramas is sufficient to warrant an establishment of its definite form in his time, for Āśvaghoṣa himself, being a strong Buddhist, would never have thought of deliberately introducing Sanskrit. The Buddhists always encouraged the use of vernaculars, as opposed to Sanskrit, for a universal appreciation of their religion and ideas. But Āśvaghoṣa had to write his dramas in Sanskrit to gain popularity. This was the stage achieved by the drama in the time of Kanishka. All these

---

1 See Sanskrit Drama by Dr. A. B. Keith, pp. 43, 44.
arguments are sufficient to enable us to trace a continuous and constant development of the drama in the Mauryan times and thereafter. Mr. Ghose has a kind of support from the terms such as nacca, dassana and pekkhā; their mention strengthens his conclusion that the primitive Buddhists were averse to arts like naccagīvatavādītāni. No drama, therefore, in his opinion, seems to have existed then. But as Dr. Keith has already shown, this argument is far from being sound. "We see, however," he says, "that the objection of the sacred Canon to monks engaging in the amusement of watching these shows, whatever their nature, was gradually overcome, and it is an important fact that the earliest dramas known to us by fragments are the Buddhist dramas of Aśvaghōsa." Moreover, the very mention of such terms leads us to decide that the drama was extant in that age (for other arguments, see Keith's Sanskrit Drama). Furthermore, we may say that the Buddhists of that time did not form the entire society, i.e., there were people who took interest in the drama.

Mr. Ghose takes it to be a well-known fact "that the nāṭas who belonged to the Śūdra-class were to the orthodox society a much despised people." Those people, who appreciated this art, are, in the main, according to his views, responsible for having made the untrustworthy legend which makes Bharata the eponymous hero of the drama. Bharata was a famous legendary name, and it made the business of the legend-maker easier. This seems to have been deliberately done, in his opinion, to give it an air of antiquity.

But this argument is not sound. If the appreciation of dramatic performances is mainly to be ascribed to the heterodox society, the orthodox people of that time would have raised strong objections with a view to bring down the attempts of those who wanted to glorify it to the level of the Vedas (e.g. Nāṭyaveda). The opinion of the Dharmasūtras and the Dharmasāstras, if recorded at all which Mr. Ghose does not do, may be proved to have gained ground in a different time far from that in which the Nāṭyaśāstra originated. The strong oppositions of the primitive Buddhists and Jains are sufficient to testify the attributions of its origin to the orthodox religious society; and, therefore, the legend seems not to have been deliberately made to promote its level as the heterodox people could not have had any connection with it.

The plausible view, with regard to the contradictory opinions found in the Buddhist books, is this. In the beginning the Buddhists seem to have raised strong objections against it, but as it began to
invoke wide appreciation and attract the attention of the entire society, the Buddhists betook themselves to write dramas with a view to propagate their religion. Thus Aśvaghoṣa’s plays make their appearance.

In the Śāriputraprakārana of Aśvaghoṣa we find a remarkable peculiarity; its close accordance with the rules of the Nāṭyaśāstra in all the points, rarely to be found in any other of the extant dramas, leads us to decide that the rules, as given in the Nāṭyaśāstra, must have been definitely established in his time. The upper limit that can be allowed to the Nāṭyaśāstra is the second century B.C. This is sufficient to show that the drama might have obtained definite form and the necessity for its rules might have been felt then. This gave rise to the appearance of the Nāṭyaśāstra, and thus a due limit to the precedence of the drama should be at least a century, or even two, before the time when the Nāṭyaśāstra was written. Thus also we can trace its existence in the Mauryan and Kusāna times, and thus no break in the continuity of its existence seems reasonable. There is not the slightest possibility, then, to see “the disuse for a long time,” as Mr. Ghose observes.

I hesitate to believe with Dr. Keith that the drama must have come into being so late as in the second century B.C. or about that time. I am convinced that the age of the origin of drama should go earlier by at least a century, or even two, than this time. Thus it receives a striking accordance with the Mauryan times, and there are sufficient positive proofs of its existence then. Since then we are able to trace a continuous developments in its performances, and no explicit mention of the influence of Kautilya’s writings is recorded, Śilālin and Kṛśāsva might have been the ancient writers of some Naṭasūtras, but as no such writings have reached us, besides their mere mention, and as any definite information regarding their authorship is lacking, they are, to us, no more than mythical names. Consequently we are left to no other alternative but to attribute the origin of the drama to Bharata. The Nāṭyaśāstra is, of course, of a later origin, but the legend seems to have gained ground since earlier times.
On a Few Technical Terms in the "Hindu Revenue System"

In the course of his review of my Contributions to the History of the Hindu Revenue System in the January number of the J.R.A.S., (pp. 165-166), Dr. L. D. Barnett, while expressing his general appreciation of the work, has thought fit to differ from my interpretation of a number of technical terms and a couple of passages from the classical authors. In view of the difficulty of the subject it seems desirable to consider these criticisms with some care.

I

Uparikara

The two terms udraṅga and uparikara signifying as many distinct kinds of revenue are found side by side in scores of Ancient Indian land-grants, but they have hitherto baffled any satisfactory explanation. In my work under notice I had suggested for them the meanings 'tax on permanent and temporary tenants respectively.' Dr. Barnett disagrees with these explanations, but overlooks the three-fold argument which I adduced (H.R.S., pp. 210-211) in favour of the same. He identifies uparikara, curiously enough, with the Tamil melvūram, i.e., 'the Crown's share of [the] produce' while he is unaccountably silent about the meaning of udraṅga. Admitting it to have the merit of novelty, Dr. Barnett's explanation of uparikara may be shown to be wrong on the following grounds:

(1) The Ancient Indian land-grants have other and distinct terms to signify 'the Crown's share of the produce.' The most common of these are bhūgabhogakara and hiraṇya, which I have shown in my work to mean the king's share of the produce in kind and in cash respectively. Very often the bhūgabhogakara and hiraṇya are included with the udraṅga and uparikara in the list of privileges assigned to the donees by the authors of the grants (cf. H.R.S., pp. 218, 235, 238, 240-241, etc.).

(2) A grant of Balavarman (one of the old kings of Assam who has been approximately assigned to 990 A.C.) couples the officers charged with collection of the uparikara and those charged with the ukhṛetana impost in a list of oppressors who are forbidden to enter the donated land. Two grants of Ratnapāla (1010-1050 A.C.?) and one of Indrapāla (1060 A.C. ?)—both of whom belong likewise to the old
royal dynasties of Assam—similarly include the uparikara and the vikhetana in a list of ‘oppressions’ from which the land in question is to be exempted (H.R.S., pp. 247-248). Other instances of the same kind mentioned in these three records are concerned with the royal princes and favourites, the persons fastening elephants and mooring boats (evidently in the State service), the officers charged with tracking thieves and the arrest of criminals. Evidently, then, the uparikara was not a regular item of revenue like “the Crown’s share of the produce,” but was an irregular tax which bore harshly upon the cultivators.

II

Setu

Dr. Barnett writes, “His [Ghoshal’s] rendering of setu as ‘gardens and fields owned by the king’ seems unlikely: may not setu rather be a sort of water-rate levied in payment for the use of reservoirs?” This statement is unsatisfactory for more reasons than one. In the first place it is not a fact that setu as such was ‘rendered’ by me into the ‘gardens and fields owned by the king’. What I wrote with reference to this term in the passage to which Dr. Barnett refers (H. R. S., p. 108) was as follows. “It is called embanked reservoir which is defined [by Kautilya] as consisting of flower-gardens, fruit-gardens, vegetable-gardens, rice-fields and fields producing other crops. Evidently the term was used in a technical sense to indicate the gardens and fields owned by the king”. It will be seen that my ‘rendering’ of the term is in precise accordance with the definition as given in the Arthashastra itself. Dr. Barnett has forgotten to notice the difference between the ordinary and the technical sense of setu in the Arthashastra. Coming to Dr. Barnett’s own rendering of setu, we have to observe that it is contradicted not only by the definition of Kautilya to which reference has been made above, but also by his use of a distinct revenue-term udahabhūga for “the water-rate levied in payment for the use of reservoirs” (see H. R. S., pp. 31, 33, 290).

III

Bhūmicchidranyāya

Yādavapракāśa’s definition of bhūmicchidra as kṣayayogaya bhūḥ has hitherto been held to prove that the clause bhūmicchidranyāya
of the Ancient Indian land-grants implied the gift of the full right of ownership such as is acquired by a person making barren land cultivable for the first time (Cf. Bühler, *Ep. Ind.*, vol. I, p. 74; Jolly, *Recht und Sitte*, p. 90). In dealing with the latter term, I followed this current explanation which I held best to suit the sense. Dr. Barnett now suggests a fundamentally different interpretation making it mean 'with reservation of the king's right to eject [the tenants] at his will'. This would make the grantees holding lands according to the *bhūmicchidranyāya* not proprietors but merely tenants-at-will. Dr. Barnett's explanation may be shown to be unsound on the following grounds:

(1) Neither the definition in Yādavaprabha's *Vaijayanti* nor the *Bhūmicchidra-vidhāna* section of the *Arthāśāstra* tends 'naturally' to prove the correctness of Dr. Barnett's rendering. The former gives only the general meaning of *bhūmicchidra*, but fails to throw any light upon the significance of the maxim relating thereto. The latter, while doubtless describing "the royal conversion of forests and wildernesses into grazing grounds, retreats for Brāhmaṇas, royal parks and the like", contains nothing to show that the Brāhmaṇas or the occupiers of grazing grounds *e.g.* were liable to ejection at the king's will. The true meaning of the maxim can be found out by comparing (as Bühler and Jolly have done) Yādavaprabha's definition with the rules and maxims of the *Smṛtis* relating to the right of the first clearer, and the seizure of unclaimed property.

(2) The clause *bhūmicchidranyāya* is attached to the endowments granted by kings and ruling chiefs in favour of Brāhmaṇas, temples and the like. Very often these grants contain another clause, viz. that they are to last as long as the sun and the moon shall endure, with the most solemn appeals of the donor to later kings to respect the gift. Frequently such appeals are fortified by quotations from the *Mahābhārata* (the so-called "imprecatory verses"), of which the following may serve as specimens:—"Whoever confiscates land that has been given, whether by himself or another, incurs the guilt of the slayer of a hundred thousand cows. The giver of land enjoys happiness in heaven for sixty thousand years, but the confis- cator (of a grant) and he who assents (to an act of confiscation) shall dwell for the same number of years in hell" (Fleet, *Gupta Inscriptions*, p. 242). Indeed the *Smṛtis* again and again set forth the sinfulness of resuming the gifts to Brāhmaṇas. A unique example of a land-grant
made to Brāhmaṇas in effect on the conditions of loyalty and good
cconduct is the Chammak grant of the Vākāṭaka Pravarasena II (H.R.S.,
p. 195), but even there the donor is careful to include the clause
that the king will not be guilty of theft in the event of his resuming
the grant for violation of the conditions by the donees.

IV

The question of ownership of the soil

Dr. Barnett with genuine pleasure claims to have found in me
a whole-hearted supporter of his long-cherished view that “in ancient
India the Crown owned the land”. In doing this he has done scant
justice to myself. Not only did I expressly mention in the Preface
my intention of reserving a full consideration of this difficult question
for my forthcoming Calcutta University Readership Lectures, but
I also indicated in the body of my present work whenever the
topic came up for mention, the limitations with which the
doctrine of the ownership of the king could be accepted. (See
H.R.S., pp. 169-170, 192, 226). Thus in connexion with Megasthenes’
statement about the royal ownership of all lands, after indicating
the evidence for and against it, I wrote the following words (Ibid.,
p. 170). “On the whole we are inclined to think that the comprehen-
sive statement of Megasthenes was a rash generalisation from certain
tendencies of development of the land-tenures that had already
begun to manifest themselves”.¹

V

The land-revenue passages in Strabo and Diodorus

Megasthenes’ account of the land-revenue conditions in Maurya
India, which is given in connexion with his description of the
caste of husbandmen, has come down to us principally in two parallel
versions, those of Strabo and Diodorus. The first of these versions,
according to the very recent rendering of Monahan (Early History of
Bengal, p. 142) whom I followed in my work, stands thus: “The whole

¹ Dr. Barnett’s opinion on the point under notice is on a par with
his characterization of a printing-mistake (duly corrected in the
list of additions and corrections in my work) as “very unhappy”.
of the land is the property of the king, and the husbandmen till it on condition of receiving one-fourth of the produce.” Dr. Barnett confidently asserts this to be an “ancient blunder,” and proposes to correct the last clause as follows: “they till it on condition of paying one-fourth of the produce as rent.” Unfortunately for Dr. Barnett’s self-complacency his version is at complete variance with that of other recent scholars whose rendering agrees with that of Monahan. We may instance Bernhard Breloer, the author of an interesting series of Kautalya-studies, who translates the clause as follows: “Als Lohn bearbeiten Sie es um den vierten Teil der Fürchte” (Kautalya-Studien, I, p. 52). In the most up-to-date and authoritative English version of Strabo’s Geography in the Loeb Classical Library series, the passage in question is translated as follows (Ibid., vol. VII, p. 69): “The whole of the country is of royal ownership and the farmers cultivate it for a rental in addition to paying a fourth part of the produce.” Here we have a fresh alternative translation which agrees only in part with Dr. Barnett’s version. But in the footnote to the above the translator writes, “Perhaps the more natural interpretation of the Greek would be ‘the farmers cultivate it for wages on condition of receiving a fourth part of the produce’, whether ‘wages’ and ‘fourth part’ are appositional, or ‘on condition of’ means, as it might, ‘in addition to’. But Diodorus Siculus says, ‘The rentals of the country they pay to the king...but apart from the rental they pay a fourth part into the royal treasury.” Here we have the important admission that the translation in the foot-note (which, it will be observed, agrees completely with Monahan’s version) is the more natural one, while that given in the text (which, as before observed, partly supports Dr. Barnett’s rendering) is wholly due to the assimilation of the corresponding passage of Diodorus. In any case it follows from the above quotations that the extract of Strabo is capable of being translated in a variety of ways. Till the meaning of this extract is clearly established by discussion among competent scholars, it is obviously premature to hold with Dr. Barnett that Monahan’s version is “absolutely wrong.”

With regard to the corresponding extract from Diodorus, Dr. Barnett comments as follows, “Diodorus is also misunderstood by Messrs. Monahan and Ghoshal; the true meaning is very skilfully explained by Dr. Breloer in his Grundeigentum in Indien, a work which throws some valuable light on the subject.” Now this criticism is no doubt justified with regard to Monahan’s writing. But it is altogether contrary to the truth in my own case, for I not only
quoted but commented on Breloer's improved translation in the context just mentioned (H. R. S., pp. 168-169) immediately after giving the version of Monahan. Comment is superfluous.

VI

Śūla, kṣāra, kalyāṇadhana

The first two terms occur in the Arthaśāstra as technical titles for as many items of revenue. In the Hindu Revenue System (pp. 274ff. and p. 90) reasons were shown for translating the first as 'produce of the king's farms' and as 'sugar' respectively. Dr. Barnett declares his dissatisfaction with these interpretations, but as he neither gives his reasons nor suggests any alternative explanation, it is impossible to meet his objections. For the present it will be sufficient to state in my favour that 'śūla' is defined in the Arthaśāstra itself as comprising all kinds of crops that are brought in by the stādhyakra, an officer whose functions practically make him equivalent to the royal steward (for references see H. R. S., pp. 29-32). The rendering of kṣāra as 'sugar' is supported by the explanation of Ganapati Sastri (kṣiraḥ guḍavikrayi) and J. J. Meyer's translation 'Zucker.' As to the term kalyāṇadhana which occurs in the land-grants of the Haihayas of Cedi and the Paramāras of Malwa, I left its meaning unexplained for want of evidence. Dr. Barnett now suggests for it the meaning 'marriage-tax', but his argument which is based 'on the analogy of the South-Indian inscriptions' is too vague to be depended upon.

U. N. Ghoshal

The English Translation of the Kauṭiliya

The publication of the third edition of Dr. R. Shamashastry's English translation of the Kauṭiliya Arthaśāstra is an index to the great demand of the reading public for an acquaintance with the contents of one of the most important documents brought to light in recent years. The existence of this demand as well as the importance of the document itself makes the task of the translator all the more onerous, because the creeping in of errors can mislead thousands of readers. It becomes specially regrettable, if the blemishes be of such
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a nature as could have been avoided by the application of a little more energy and labour. When the translation first came out in the Mysore Review (1906-1908) and in the Indian Antiquary (1909-1910) in instalments, and was published in book-form in 1915, the scholars appreciated the industry with which the pioneering work was done by the learned translator, removing many great difficulties which could have been encountered by any one who would have attempted to understand the text unaided. The readers in their eagerness to have a translation in their hand were then ready to make a large allowance for the inaccuracies that could not be removed. A perusal of Dr. S.’s prefaces to the 1st and 2nd editions of the translation shows that he was well aware of the existence of inaccuracies and obscurities which he could not remove but which he had a mind to eliminate by consulting the available commentaries discovered since the publication of the 1st edition of the translation. When the 3rd edition of the translation came out in 1929, Dr. T. Ganapati Shastri’s illuminating Sanskrit exegesis written with the aid of three old commentaries was available. Moreover, since 1909 when the text of the Kauṭiliya was first published, scholars began to apply their minds to the interpretation of the text and bring out books and dissertations treating of the various aspects of the subject-matter of the treatise. In all these publications, light has been thrown on many passages which had been misinterpreted in the translation. Dr. S. does not appear to have taken the pains to avail himself of the results of the labours of these scholars. He has even ignored suggestions for correction made for instance by Dr. Ganapati Sastri in his Preface (p. 2) to the first Part of his edition of the Kauṭiliya. Says he, “I obtained a copy of it (Dr. Shamasastry’s English translation) in order to see whether it would be of any use to my edition. But it seemed to me that many passages were not correctly translated. For example:

मयोद्वारे शाक्षेपदार्थायांनमात्रः य एवममात्यांनें वाचविन्।
बाधिनार्थिकामार्तीर्धि वा रक्षित्र प्रस्तावमात्मामिति:। (I. 7)

After giving general instruction in regard to some of the duties of Kings, Kauṭalya mentions in the above passage the supreme duty of making Ācāryas and Ministers a barrier, as it were, of the Kings. The meaning of the passage is that a King should appoint, as a barrier, either Ācāryas or Ministers who would boldly and effectively check him whenever he shows inclination to stray away from the path of righteousness. Here, Kauṭalya gives expression to a noble
conception of Government, the *sumnum bonum* of the subjects, namely, a King, though he has control over all his subjects, should appoint certain persons who would keep him under control. Mr. Shama Sastri has taken the passage in quite a different sense. He renders it thus: 'those teachers and ministers who keep him from falling a prey to dangers, and who, by striking the hours of the day as determined by measuring shadows warn him of his careless proceedings even in secret shall invariably be respected'. I do not see how this meaning was made out. If the word मूर्त्ति is taken as meaning 'respect' in Sanskrit as it does colloquially in Tamil, Telugu, and Canarese, those who study the *Arthaśāstra* will not grasp the real meaning and perceive the noble conception of Ācārya Kautilya."

There are many such blemishes in the translation, some of which will be pointed out in this note. There are such errors as have not only vitiated detached passages, but have rendered useless whole chapters. Such errors could have been avoided, if, as already stated, Dr. S. had undergone the necessary labours of making his translation correct by taking due note of the light that could be forthcoming on many portions of the *Arthaśāstra* from the writings of scholars who are engaged in the investigations regarding the *Kauṭiliya* and the ancient Hindu administrative system.

I take up the Seventh Book in view of its importance as the portion of the treatise where inter-state relations have been dealt with. Sometimes, the misinterpretation of a term which occurs several times in one or more chapters has led to the repetition of the errors vitiating whole passages and sometimes whole chapters. I shall now point out some of these errors in the order of the chapters of the VIIth Book:

Bk. VII, 1. At page 263 (text, 2nd ed.), K. points out only the most important conditions that should influence the decision of a sovereign in the adoption of one or more of the six courses of actions, viz., sandhi, vigraha, āsana, yāna, saṃśraya, and dvaidhi-bhāva. Dr. S. has translated the passages enumerating these chief conditions in such a way as to mislead an unwary reader into thinking that each condition is the only determining factor in regard to the connected course of action. For instance, he has translated *abhyucchayamāno vigrahīyāt* into 'whoever is superior in power shall wage war.' The emphasis laid on the
term 'whoever' leads one to have the impression that whenever a sovereign acquires power, he must wage war with a weak sovereign to bring him under submission whether there be any cause for conflict with him or not. That such an impression is wrong can well be seen by a reference to such passages as hino'pi vigṛha-yāt (one should enter into hostility even if he be inferior in strength —K., p. 269), hino 'py abhiyāyāt (one, though inferior in strength, should march against the enemy—K., p. 270) and also by such passages as "........jyāyān api sandhiyeta"(........even a strong king should enter into a sandhi—K., p. 269), "........jyāyān api sam-ārayeta" (.........even a strong king should take to sanāraya—K., p. 270). It is much to be regretted that Mr. V. A. Smith in his Early History of India (4th ed., pp. 146, 147) bases his conclusions regarding inter-state relations of the time of Candragupta Maurya on the misleading translations of passages like the one cited above without caring to draw correct inferences after taking into account the combined effect of all the passages in the Kautilya bearing on the points.1

VII, 2, p. 267. Chidreṣu praharet has been translated as "he may murder the enemy when opportunity affords itself." Here the utilisation of the opportunity need not necessarily be murder.

VII, 3, p. 268. 'Guṇābhīniniveśa' in the heading of the chapter cannot be taken to mean 'character,' It means the adoption of the Guṇas or courses of action.

VII, 4, p. 272. In the first paragraph of the Ch., K. explains the variants of Āsana viz. sthāna, āsana and upekṣyā. Āsana is usually resorted to in cases of equality of strength between two conflicting sovereigns. But it may happen that though the two sovereigns approximate to each other in strength, one may be slightly inferior or superior to the other. In the case of such slight inferiority, the form of āsana is called sthāna, while in the other case it is called upekṣyā. K. has guṇaikadeśe sthānam. Here guṇaikadeśa means that the requisite circumstances demanding a resort to the particular guṇa (āsana) exist partially. In such circumstances, the form of āsana to be adopted is called sthāna. Dr. S. translates the passage as "keeping quiet, maintaining a particular kind of policy, is

stāna." Here I think, it has been contemplated by Dr. S. that guṇa refers to a course of action other than āsana which is not the case.

VII, 4, p. 273. The translation of the last passage in the paragraph delineating the circumstances in which vigṛhyāsana is to be resorted to has been made as follows by Dr. S.: "Since no friend would neglect the opportunity of acquiring a fertile land and a prosperous friend like myself...." The situation contemplated in the passage has been misunderstood. The meaning conveyed by it may be put thus: when the enemy is about to march with all his forces to take away from another enemy a fertile region easily acquirable, slighting the existence of the king who is being advised to adopt vigṛhyāsana, then the latter should take to that course of action.

VII, 5, p. 278. The passage kṛtārthā jvāyaso (which should be kṛtārthāj jvāyaso) gūḍhah sāpadeśam apasṛjet should not be made a part of the paragraph in prose, but should be tagged on to the following verses. This misplacement of the verse is also found in Dr. Jolly's edition, but has been rectified in the Trivandrum edition. I think, the misunderstanding of the meaning of the passages is responsible for this error. Dr. S.'s translation is: (p. 307) 'when the desired end is achieved, the inferior king will quietly retire after the satisfaction of his superior. Till his discharge, the good conduct of an ally of usually bad character should be closely scrutinised'. The passage forms part of the suggestion meant for a king who responds to a call for combination. He should be careful in regard to certain points at the time of the division of the spoils and acquisitions after a successful completion of the operations. The passage in question mentions one such point, viz., if the king, who has called him, be of superior strength and shows symptoms of an inclination to deal unfairly with him at this stage, the latter should come away from him secretly (gūḍhah) on some pretext or other (sāpadeśam); should the former be just in his dealings (āucirvṛttāt tu), the latter may wait up to the last to have his share of gains finally made over to him.

VII, 6, p. 280. Sandhi has been translated by the word 'peace' not only here, but also in a large number of other passages wherever the
term occurs. In the K., however, the term has been used in two senses viz., (i) alliance which may not have any connection with war and (ii) treaty of peace after the settlement of a conflict. Hence the use of the word 'peace' without any regard to the distinctions in the implications of the word sandhi in the particular cases has given rise to many inappropriate interpretations. In the passage which, for instance, enumerates the four features of the activities in regard to sandhis (text p. 280) such as akṛtacikīrṣā, kṛtasleṣaṇa, the term sandhi has been translated as 'peace.' But this sandhi may be an alliance concluded at a time when there is no necessity to enter into any treaty of peace to avert a disturbance of same. Moreover akṛtacikīrṣā has been translated as 'with no specific end.' The translation should be 'desire to form a new (akṛta) agreement.' The translation of the expression kṛtasleṣaṇanam should be 'strengthening the agreement already made' instead of 'peace with binding terms.' In regard to the translation of the next terms kṛtavidūṣaṇam and apaśīra-kriyā as 'the breaking of peace' and 'restoration of peace' respectively, the use of the word 'peace' is inappropriate, because in the former case it is unduly restricted to the treaties of peace only, while in the latter, the use of the term 'peace' is out of place in view of the fact that relations with court-officials and servants are involved.

In chapter X, the heading Bhūmisandhi has been translated as 'agreement of peace for the acquisition of land,' Here the use of the word 'agreement' only would have sufficed, as otherwise the impression is created that the sandhi has something to do with war in all cases. In the translation of Bk, VII, ch. 7, paragraph 3, the passage 'when the kings of superior, equal or inferior power make peace with the conqueror' is extrememly misleading, because the use of the term 'conqueror' for vijīgu creates the impression as if the sovereign in question has conquered a king of superior, equal or inferior strength and that a treaty of peace is being concluded. As a matter of fact only the question of alliance for strengthening the position of the king (vijīgu) in difficulty is being treated and therefore the uses of both the words 'conqueror' and 'peace' are inappropriate. Vijīgu literally means a sovereign 'bent on conquest'. But as this desire for conquest was not peculiar to any particular king, the word should be translated by some term of colourless signification. I have used the expression
central sovereign or state' for the purpose, because we find in the
Kauṭiliya that the sovereign with reference to whom a particular
piece of advice is being given, or with reference to whom a
Maṇḍala (circle of states) is being taken into account in a particu-
lar context is looked upon as the vijigita (see Inter-state Rela-
tions in Ancient India, 1920, pp. 2, 3).

VII, 7. In the second paragraph of the translation (p. 312), the
reference to 'the enemy suing peace' is out of place, because in
the circumstances contemplated, there is no enemy suing for
peace. Hence the application of the terms 'even peace' and
'uneven peace' is also wide of the mark.

VII, 7 (transl., p. 314). In the paragraph, two classes of circumstanc-
es have been contemplated in the K. But the translation does
not take note of these two classes of circumstances, interpreting
the whole paragraph as speaking of one class of circumstances
only. In the first portion of the paragraph, mention is made
of the situations in which the king who has been asked by
another king to help the latter is advised by K. to demand
a large consideration for the help to be rendered without
any reference to his position as a hīna, sama, or jyāyas king. In
the second portion, the king who is in need of help is advised
by K. to accede to the demand for a large consideration men-
tioned above in the detailed circumstances. The mixing up of
the two classes of circumstances in the translation has created
a confusion. Moreover, the passage 'one though frequently
getting immense (subsidy) from an assailable enemy of equal,
inferior, or superior power, sends demands to him again and again'
is meaningless. The word bhāya in two places in the text has
been taken by Dr. S., to signify 'frequently' and 'again and
again', while it means here 'large'.

The beginning of the next paragraph in the translation (p. 314)
yields no cogent meaning, because it speaks of an inferior king
trying to keep a superior power under him as an assailable enemy,
though there is nothing in the passage to show that the superior
king has become really inferior in strength on account of his

1 See my article on Dvaidhibāva in this number of the I. H.Q.,
pp. 257, 258.
difficulties. I think the text upon which this translation is based is defective and should be as that adopted by Dr. Ganapati Sastri. The first word in the passage should be jyāyān and not jyāyāmsam. The reference to the sending of a 'proposal of peace to another' is also without any support of the text. The passage on the basis of the correction would mean that an offer of a special gain may be made by a king of superior strength adopting dvaiddhibhāva to a king of inferior power to attract him into a sandhi with him with the ostensible object of facing the former's enemy (yātavyāpadēśa). There may be a sinister motive on the part of the king of superior strength to bring to book the inimical king of inferior power by crushing him after defeating his enemy, or realising from him what he has given away as consideration after the victory over the enemy is achieved.

VII, 8, p. 285. In the first paragraph of the translation (p. 315), paropakāra has been translated by the word misery, while the reference is to reminding a king helping the enemy of the fact that the king is really helping his own enemy (paropakāra) and not advancing his own interest at all. It is not clear from the last portion of the sentence in the translation whether the disunion that takes place is between the king making the offer of wealth and one of the allies of the invader, or, between the invader and one of his allies. The latter meaning is the one supported by the text.

For the reading svārabdham vā yātrāsiddham vighātayitukāmah in the second paragraph of the text, the Trivandrum edition has svārabdhaśyaṃ vā yātrāyaṃ siddhim vighātayitukāmah which yields a good meaning, viz., 'with a view to frustrate the success in his well-commenced march', instead of Dr. Ś.'s translation 'to frustrate the latter in the attempt of achieving large profit from well-begun undertakings'. The variant reading of siddhim for siddham in footnote 2 in Dr. S.'s text suggests a partial improvement of the reading. But it has not been accepted in the body of the text.

At p. 316 of the translation, sambandhāvekṣī (expecting to have a matrimonial connection) has not at all been translated.

The translation constituting the third paragraph of p. 316 is obscure. The situation contemplated is as follows: If a king
who has entered into an alliance with another king (marching against a yātavya) wants to recede from the alliance either to help the yātavya, or to refrain from increasing the strength of the other king who may attack him (parābhīyogāc chaṅkamānaḥ) after the operations are ended successfully, he can demand an immediate payment of his dues, or can demand a larger sum as his remuneration, which will serve to put a financial pressure upon the subjects (prakṛtikarśana), or invite other parties (mitrāmitra) to alliances with the king to rescind their agreements following the example.

In the paragraph after next, the translation of Sākyārambhi is faulty.

**Text**

Sākyārambhin

**S.‘s Translation.**

Whoever undertakes tolerable work is the beginner of possible work.

**Suggested Transl.**

One who is engaged in an operation, the completion of which is within the limits of his ability.

In the same paragraph, the translation ‘without losing anything in the form of favour’ is not at all faithful to the text (alpenāpy anugraheṇa kāryam sādhayati). The translation should be ‘accomplishes his work even with small help’.

The circumstances delineated in the next passage have been misunderstood by Dr. S.

**Text**

tayor ekapurusanugrahe yo mitraṁ mitrataram va 'nugṛhnāti so 'tisandhatte,

**Dr. S.’s Transl.**

Of the two, conqueror and his enemy, both of whom may happen to have a friend in the same person, he who helps a true or truer friend over-reaches the other.

**Suggested Transl.**

Of the two kings, each helping another king, one an enemy (but now an ally) and the other a friend, the king who happens to render assistance to the friend becomes a gainer; and of the two kings, each helping another king, one friendly and the other friendly in a special degree, the king who assists the king friendly to him in a special degree (mitratara) becomes a greater gainer.
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destroy a large mass of effete persons, whose slaughter brings about the destruction of the entire army of their master. Not so, says Kauṭilya, a large number of effete persons is better, inasmuch as they can be employed to do other kinds of works in the camp: to serve the soldiers in the battle fields, and to terrify the enemy by its number. It is also possible to infuse spirit and enthusiasm in the timid by means of discipline and training."

VII, 13. In order to bring out the various factors that should be taken into consideration in deciding whether an attack upon the rear of an enemy should be made, two sets of three kings have been supposed and in each set one king is out for an attack upon another and a third king in each set is to attack the rear of the king out on the invasion. These rear invaders have been taken to be neighbours and therefore natural enemies, but they are for the time being in alliance for mutual benefit. The object of the chapter is the comparison of advantages derived from the rear attacks upon the kings who in their turn are invading their enemies. These advantages may not always be palpable and hence in the choice of the state against which the hostile operations are to be directed, one has more chances of acquisition of gain than the other.

In the first paragraph of the translation (p. 329) the term samhātya has been rendered by the word 'simultaneously' which does not bring out the real meaning. The Vijjīga (central state) and the Arī (enemy) have been taken to be in alliance and hence the word samhāya has been used. In the later portion of the paragraph, the passage 'has to put down the rear only after doing away with one's frontal enemy already attacked' misinterprets the situation. The vidhīlin form ucchindāyāt in the text here as well as in the next paragraph has been taken to convey the sense of vidhī (for which 'has to put down' has been used), while it should be taken in the sense of sambhūvanā. The use of 'only' is out of place. The situation contemplated is this: If there be two kings, one strong and the other weak, and if both are out on expedition against their respective enemies, then of the two kings who are enemies (of the invading kings) in alliance in the rear, the one who attacks the strong king becomes the gainer, because the strong king after defeating his enemy in front would have grown stronger, and consequently could have brought about
the ruin of his rear enemy, if he had not been thwarted during his expedition against the frontal enemy; while the other rear enemy who attacks the weak king during his operation against the enemy in front does not make any gain, because left to himself, these operations alone would have weakened him further, leaving in him no desire to make an attack upon the rear enemy.

As a variant reading to labhālabha in the text, alabdhālabha has been put in the foot-note by Dr. S. But as a matter of fact he has translated the latter word because of its appropriateness for which it should have been adopted in the text itself.

Cakra in the second paragraph of the text has been translated as the 'circle of states', while it means 'army'.

Transl. p. 330. The renderings of calāmitra and sthitāmitra are rather unhappy. They have been translated as 'wandering enemy' and 'entrenched enemy'. Enemies with or without forts are meant.

The terms mūlahara, tādātvika and kadarya have been explained in the K., Bk. II, ch. 9, p. 69. They are explained as (i) spend-thrift in regard to patrimony (ii) squandering wealth soon after acquisition, and (ii) accumulating wealth by oppressing the officials and relations. But Dr. S. does not take any note of these explanations. He has translated the terms as 'extravagant, living from hand to mouth and niggardly'.

Dr. S.'s translation of the next passage, viz., 'the same reasons hold good in the case of those who have marched against their own friends' is likely to create the impression that a king used to attack his friends' territory, though the friendship continued. That this was not the case will be evident from what has been said by K. in connection with the mitrābhāvin, ucchedaniya or karśaniya mitras in Bk. VII, ch. 18. The next paragraph in the translation should also be taken with the limitation mentioned above.

At p. 302 of the text, in the last paragraph, mitra has been put instead of anītra in codharator yo mitrodāthāriṇah. In the 1st edition of the Kautūlīya the right term appeared in the list of corrections. But in the 2nd edition the incorrect word has crept in. The translation (p. 331) has become self-contradictory, because it has been stated that 'he who attacks the rear of the former (referring to the friend = mitra) gains more advantages' which is just the reverse of what is meant.

In the second paragraph of the translation at p. 331 alabdhālabhā-
vagamane has been rendered as 'to enforce the payment of what is not due to them', which is altogether wide of the mark. The correct rendering is 'in the case of returning unsuccessful.'

The sentence in the text (p. 303) beginning with yasya vā yātavyaḥ up to īśatīr vigrāhāpakārāsamanarthah syāt is related to the previous sentence, because it describes a situation alternative to the preceding one. It has no connection with the succeeding sentence to which it has been tagged. The resulting meaning as understood by Dr. S. and evidenced in his translation is very much confused. Two sets of circumstances contemplated in the two sentences are: (i) Of the two Pāṛṣṇigrāhas of two other kings out on invasion against their respective enemies, the pāṛṣṇigrāha of the king whose enemy is able to cause him much harm becomes a gainer as compared with the other pāṛṣṇigrāha who does not have this advantage. (ii) Of the two pāṛṣṇigrāhas themselves, the one who possesses a larger and more efficient army, and is fighting with a fort as his base of operations (sthitaśatruḥ) or has his kingdom situated on either side of that of the king attacked (pāṛśvasthāyin) and is therefore near the yātavya (i.e. the yātavya of the king whose territory is invaded from the rear) becomes a gainer. The advantages enjoyed by a pāṛśvasthāyin rear-invader is that being near the aforesaid yātavya, he can easily combine with him and can make a raid upon the capital of the king whose rear has been attacked. The second set of circumstances described above has a direct bearing upon the pāṛṣṇigrāhas themselves, while in the preceding sets of circumstances, the kings attacked constituted the principal subject-matter for consideration.

In the succeeding sloka (p. 303) sāmantāt should be sāmantāh a variant which has been relegated by Dr. S. to the foot-note. This word has been left untranslated. Though the text mentions three classes of pāṛṣṇigrāhas, viz., sāmantā, pṛśhatovarga and pratīvesa, Dr. S. has tried to make up these three by the second and the third, taking the latter to constitute two classes, one being on each side of the king attacked, though as a matter of fact they constitute only one class.

The misleading translation of the term udāśina as already pointed out has been repeated here (transl. p. 331).

Dr. S. translates pāṛṣṇigrāhaḥbhiyānayos tu mantrayudhāhudd abhyuccayāḥ as follows: Of attacks from the rear and front, that
which affords opportunities of carrying on a treacherous fight (mantrayuddha) is preferable. The translation ought to be 'In rear as well as frontal attack Mantrayuddha brings about increase of strength.' In the text the next two sentences have been put within inverted commas as the opinion of the Ācaryas. The opinion should, however, include the sentence referred to above. This sentence makes a statement in support of which the next two sentences put forward the reasons.

VII, 13, p.304. Dr. S.'s translation of the second paragraph is incorrect. It should be as follows: 'When in war, the expenditure in men and money is apparently the same, the king who first of all engages the recalcitrant portion of his army in the fight by which its destruction takes place, and next, i.e., when the likely source of internal trouble viz. the recalcitrant portion of his army is destroyed, utilises the submissive portion of his army in the fight, he becomes a gainer (as compared with the king who does not do so).

The next sentence also is wrong. It seems that he has taken dūsyabala and vaṣyabala of the text for 'frontal enemy' and 'rear enemy'.

The translation of the śloka that comes next is utterly wrong. It runs thus: 'when an enemy in the rear and in the front, and an assailable enemy to be marched against happen together, then the conqueror should adopt the following policy'.

It should be: 'when the Vijigīṣu happens to be in the position of either the rear-invader (pāśpigrāha), or the invader (abhiyoktr), or the king invaded (jātavya), he should thus conduct the operations (naitram etat samācaret). The misconception about Vijigīṣu is, I think, responsible for the mistranslation. Vijigīṣu should not be translated as conqueror. I prefer the expression 'central king' (or the central state), because he (or it) forms the central point with reference to which deliberations are carried on in the particular context. Here the fact that the Vijigīṣu can be supposed in the positions of the rear-invader etc. corroborates this view.

Dr. S. misses the real point in the first verse of the following śloka upon which the meaning of the śloka depends. His translation is this: 'The rear enemy would usually lead the conqueror's frontal enemy to attack the conqueror's friend'. The correct rendering would be: The Netr (here the vijigīṣu) should attack the rear of the enemy who invades the friend (of the vijigīṣu).
Transl., p. 332. The word 'them' in the first line of the translation of the śloka commencing with ākrandenaḥḥiṣṭihānaḥ refers to Ākranda and Pāṇagráhābhāsārin mentioned in the latter portion of the translation of the previous śloka, but as a matter of fact advice has been given in the text to check Pāṇagráhā (and not Pāṇagráhāsāra) by Ākranda.

The śloka commencing with mitraṇa is meant for the king attacked (abhinyukta or yātavya); hence, the use of the word 'he,' which stands for the conqueror in the translations of the preceding ślokas, also implies 'conqueror’ in this śloka and is therefore inappropriate. Instead of 'he should with his friends' help hold his rear-enemy at bay' the translation should be 'the king attacked (abhinyukta) should cause his friend (mitra) to attack the rear of his enemy.' The translation of the next portion of the śloka is also wrong. In the place of ‘with the help of his friend’s friend he should prevent his rear-enemy attacking the Ākranda (his rear ally),’ the rendering should be 'the king attacked (abhinyukta) should prevent the Ākranda (here the rear-ally of the invader) from obstructing the rear-invader (of the invader) with the help of his (yātavya’s) mitra-mitra'.

The next verse evam maṇḍalam ātmārtham vijigisur nivehastet has been translated by Dr. S. as ‘thus the conqueror should, through the aid of his friends, bring the circle of States under his own sway.’ The question of ‘bringing under sway' does not arise in this context. Only the utilisation of the services of the kings of the Maṇḍala is the subject dealt with in the text.

VII, 13, p. 305. In the last śloka but one of the chapter, the translation of the last verse is defective. It should be ‘killing (the enemies) secretly under the guise of their friend' and not 'having again and again destroyed the strength of his enemies, he should keep his counsels concealed, being friendly with his friends.'

VII, 14, p. 305, last 2 lines. Dr. S. translates "Then the recipients of salaries from two States, exhibiting the acquisition of large profits (to the leader) may satirize the kings, saying, “you are all very well combined.” The rendering should be: ‘The ubhaya-vetanas (i.e. spies drawing salary from the attacked king but ostensibly in the pay of the minor allies of the enemy) should condemn the action of the allies by saying ‘you have been outwitted
(by the leader)". Atisandhā in the text means that a secret gain has been made by the leader at the cost of the allies. The word atisandhāna or the verb ati—sam—dhā has been used in this sense in various places in the Kautūliya.

VII, 14. At p. 306, l. 1 the word duṣṭa in the sentence duṣṭeśu sandhīṃ duṣqayet should not be translated as 'wicked' having regard to the context. The reference is to the alienation of the allies from their leader by the suggestion made above that they have been outwitted.

Purvānyatarābhāve, kanyādānayauvanābhyaṃ and kṛtasandhihīnam at p. 306 should be rectified. The existence of these expressions in the text has vitiated the translation. The right forms would be purvān uttarābhāve, kanyādāna-yaṇapānābhyaṃ and kṛtasandhir hīnam (see Trivandrum edition).

VII, 15. The heading of this chapter has been written as 'Measures Conducive to Peace with a Strong and Provoked Enemy; and the Attitude of a Conquered Enemy.' The Sanskrit heading is 'balavatā vigyāhyopaśodhahetavah dandaśopanatavṛttam ca', the meaning of which has not been faithfully reflected in the English heading. The first part of the heading should be rendered as 'the reasons for shutting oneself (in a fort) while waging war with a powerful enemy.' This meaning finds support in the contents of the chapter. As regards the second portion of the heading, 'dandaśopanata' cannot properly be rendered by 'a conquered enemy,' because conquered enemy, as the Kautūliya itself will show, is not always a dandaśopanata. I have used the expression 'self-submitter' for the purpose (Inter-state Relations, pt. I, pp. 61 f.).

The translation (p. 336) of tulyadurgāṇāṃ nicayāpasārato viśegah [of two or more forts of similar advantages, the superiority lies in the one from which the supply of necessaries of life (nicaya) can be maintained, and which affords a means of escape (apasāra)] is wrong, because the right significance of tulyadurgāṇāḥ and apasāra has been missed. Dr. S.'s translation runs thus: 'When there are many forts, difference should be sought in their affording facility for the collection of stores and supplies'.

VII, 16. The heading of this chapter is dandaśopanāviśṛttam which has been rendered as 'the attitude of a conquered king'. This obliterator
tes the distinction between daṇḍopānayin and daṇḍopanata, the
latter being treated in the previous chapter under the heading 'the
attitude of a conquered enemy'. In fact the position of the daṇḍopa-
ṇayin is just the reverse of daṇḍopanata who is under the domina-
tion of the other. I have styled him 'dominator' in my Inter-state
Relations, pt. I. The palpable mistake of putting this wrong heading
should not have been repeated through all the three editions of the
translation. The impression that the chapter is dealing with
the 'conquered king' has given rise to mistaken translations in
several places.

The opening paragraph reflects the confusion of ideas as to
the difference between the dominator and the self-submitter. Dr.
S. writes: 'In view of causing financial trouble to his protector,
a powerful vassal king, desirous of making conquests, may under
the permission of his protector, march on countries.......
. The
rendering should be 'when a powerful king (i.e. the dominator)
intends to subdue one who, after making a promise (to pay),
causes anxiety in regard to the payment of the money, he should
march.......
'.

Dr. S. in his translation speaks of 'a powerful vassal king'
who goes out to make conquest with the permission of his
protector intending to subdue other kings by the application
of sāma, dāna, bheda and daṇḍa. 'This is absurd because the
dominator is the central figure in the chapter and his relation
to the weak king is explained in it. The dominator is to apply
sāma, dāna, etc. in regard to the weak king according to the
particular circumstances of each case. The misunderstanding of
the basic object of the chapter has vitiated it altogether.

VII, 16, p. 311. The sentence which begins with evam utsāhavato
has been made to end after sthāpayet, but as a matter of fact it
should be linked up with the next line which should come to a
stop after bhūmyupakāriṇah. The translation (p. 339) speaks
of the reinstatement of kings by the 'powerful vassal king', while
in fact it deals with the question as to how the dominator
will utilise the services of the self-submitters of various descrip-
tions.

The last paragraph at p. 311 of the text which has been
continued to the next page describes six kinds of helping kings,
the first set of three kings rendering their help to the dominator
directly, and the second set of three giving their assistance indirectly by causing harm to the dominator's enemy. In view of this fact the text (p. 312) yad amitrām āśūram ṝopakaroti tud ubhayato-bhoga as well as its translation (p. 339) 'whoever helps also his enemy and his enemy's allies is a friend affording enjoyment to both sides' is incorrect and self-contradictory in its meaning. The correct reading is yad amitrām āśūram cāpaharoti (see Trivandrum ed.), of which the translation would be 'he who harms the enemy as well as the enemy's ally is one who helps in two ways......'.

In the rendering (p. 340) of the last sentence of the text (p. 312) pareṇānadhivāsyayā svayam eva bhartāram upagrāhayet, the word pareṇā remains untranslated, while the rest of the sentence has been translated wrongly. The translation runs thus: (he should provide) 'his own protector with an uninhabitable piece of land'. As the advice contained in the whole paragraph is meant for the dāṇḍopanāyin and not for the dāṇḍopanāta, the translation has become the reverse of the actual meaning which is '(the dāṇḍopanāyin) should conciliate (the dāṇḍopanāta) by giving the (former) holder (i.e., the dāṇḍopanāta) himself a piece of land which cannot be occupied except by him'.

The first word (teṣām) of the next paragraph refers to the various descriptions of the dāṇḍopanātas mentioned in the preceding lines and the nominative of the sentence is evidently the dāṇḍopanāyin and not the vassal king desirous of making conquests as pointed out by Dr. S. This wrong impression pervades the whole paragraph and has vitiated its correct import. The last three lines of the paragraph cannot appropriately be taken to refer to what should be done by a 'vassal king' 'to the protector' (dāṇḍopanāyin). On the other hand, they speak of the line of action to be taken by the dāṇḍopanāyin towards the dāṇḍopanāta. The sentence (p. 313) evam asya dāṇḍopanatāḥ putrāaurān anuvartante [thus (i.e. by the line of action mentioned in the preceding lines) the dāṇḍopanātas will follow loyally his (dāṇḍopanāyin's) sons and grandsons] explains the situation.

In view of the errors shown above the translation of the whole chapter should be re-written.

VII, 18. The opening sentence of the chapter should be madhyamasya ātmā trīyā pāṇcamī ca prakṛti prakṛtayāḥ (Trivandrum ed.)
instead of madhyamasyātmatṛtyā pañcamī ca prakṛti prakṛtyayaḥ, as otherwise the use of the word prakṛtyayaḥ in bahuvacama would not be justified as there will be only two prakṛtis viz., ātmatṛtyaḥ and pañcamī.

The translation which has been based on the wrong text is therefore incorrect. Here in the first two sentences of the chapter a grouping of certain States has been made with reference to the dealings of the king under our consideration, viz., the Vijigīṣu (the central king or state) with the madhyama. The madhyama (medium power) and the third and the fifth states from him are prakṛtis, i.e., natural friends, while the second, fourth and the sixth states from the same are vikṛtis, i.e., natural enemies.

The situation contemplated in the next two sentences of the first paragraph of the chapter has been misunderstood.

It is stated in the text that if the Madhyama be friendly to both the sets of kings (prakṛtis and vikṛtis), the Central State should be friendly to him. Should the Madhyama show no leaning to any of these two sets of kings, the Central State should take the side of his own prakṛtis (i.e., friends). But Dr. S. translates (p. 344) the last sentence thus: 'If he does not favour them, the conqueror should be friendly with those states.' Here 'those states' evidently refer to both prakṛtis and vikṛtis, while the text speaks only of the prakṛtis, implying thereby the prakṛtis with reference to the Vijigīṣu (cf. vijīṣur mitraṁ mitramitraṁ va 'śya prakṛtyayaḥ — K., VI, 2, p. 261).

VII, 18 (transl. p. 344). The first sentence of the second paragraph of the translation should be "if the Madhyama wants to bring under sway a really friendly king (mitrabhāvin mitra) of the sovereign of the 'Central State', the latter should save him", instead of "if the Madhyama king is desirous of securing the friendship of the conqueror's would-be friend,......the conqueror should preserve his own friend" as translated by Dr. S.

VII, 18 (transl. p. 346). The rendering of the term udāśina by neutral is, as already pointed out, extremely misleading. A reader who does not consult the text will be puzzled to find that a 'neutral' king is coming into conflict inspite of his 'neutrality.' The udāśina, as a matter of fact, has a technical signification attached to it in the Kauṭiliya as also the term madhyama which
has been translated by Dr. S. as mediatory (transl. 290). The name mediatory would *prima facie* convey the impression that the sovereign so called mediates between two other kings, but according to the description of the Madhyama found in the text, the name has a reference to the amount of strength possessed by a sovereign situated in the neighbourhood. The name Udäsīna has also a similar implication as to the amount of strength of the sovereign so called. The Madhyama is situated within the first zone of both the Vijigīṣu and the Ari (arivijigīṣvora bhūmya[n]tarāḥ.—vi, 2, p. 261) and is therefore within the zone of enmity to each of them. The text (vi, 2, p. 261) lays down that the Madhyama is capable of subduing each of the Ari and Vijigīṣu when they are not combined, but can help them whether they are combined or not i.e. when they are allied, he is able only to help them and not to subdue them. It follows from this that the strength of the Madhyama is greater than that of either the Ari or the Vijigīṣu, but less than the combined strength of the two powers.

The Udäsīna (ut = ैर्ध्वम असिन) i.e. seated on a height) is the strongest power supposed to exist within the first zone of the 'Central State.' It is stated in the text (vi, 2, p. 261) that besides Ari, Vijigīṣu and Madhyama, there is another sovereign capable of subduing each of them when they are combined, but can help them whether they are combind or not i.e., when they are allied, he is able only to help them and cannot subdue them. The inference should therefore be that the strength of the Udäsina is greater than that of the Madhyama and necessarily much greater than that of either the Ari or the Vijigīṣu taken separately, but less than the combined strength of the three taken together.

VII, 18, p. 320. The translation of the verse *nopa[k]urya[v]at amitra[]m v[a] ga[ched yad atikarṣitam* has been made as follows: 'The conqueror should never help his friend when the latter is more and more deteriorating.' It should however be: 'The Vijigīṣu should not help one (referring to mitra mentioned in the second verse) who, much reduced in strength (atikarṣita), goes over to the enemy (amitraṃ gacchet).

There is also a defect in the translation of the following sloka. The words *calam mitram* should be rendered as 'an unstable friend' instead of as 'a wandering friend (i.e. a nomadic king).'

*Nivesya pūrvaṃ tatānyāṃ daṇḍanugrahahetunā* : as been tran-
An Inscription dated in the reign of Emperor
Muhammad Shah

There is a stone (1008, ) inscribed with Devanāgarī characters, in the gallery of the Indian Museum, Calcutta. It is marked “Not Read”. From the label attached thereto it appears that neither the provenance of the inscription nor the name of the donor is known. The language seems to be a Sanskritised form of the “Khaṭolā Bandelī of Damoh,” illustrated in the Linguistic Survey of India, IX, pt. I, p. 464. The epigraph was probably discovered in the Damoh region.
The inscription records the erection of a funeral pillar in honour of a private individual. Its importance lies in its form of dating. It is dated not only in both the Vikrama and the Śaka eras, but also in the “gati-varṣa” (current regnal year) of the Emperor Muhammad Shah, the Mughal emperor of Delhi, who ruled from 1719-1748 A.D. Another interesting thing is that it contains more than one instance of that philological fact, about which M. Sylvain Lévi has said, “les deux lettres ‘ṣa’ et ‘kha’ s’emploient constamment l’une pour l’autre, et les théoriciens posent en principe leur identité absolue dans les jeux de mots.” (Le Népal, II. p. 145).

The inscription contains fourteen lines, which we read as follows:

1. Sidhī (II) Śrī-Gaṇeśā namaḥ | Śrī-Sarasvatī
2. namaḥ (I) Dhṛttesvara-nāma (?) saṃvatsare Śrī
3. Vikramādiptyarājye Saṃvat 1803 (, ) Sā-
4. ke 1668 Śrī-sūrya utrāyane vasa-
5. tī * * Śrī Pāttisāhi Mahāmamadā Sāhī-gativarṣa
6. 28 vaisāṣamāse krasnapakṣe trayodasi 13 caudravāsare
7. vadi nemahā uttipakaraje (?) nijābāgamadhye Udeyapura-
8. nagre Subha asthine (II) Suve Mālava * * -nivāsabāva-
9. li isthittichari (?) Vaisyavarane paramadharmaṁa Śrī-Cauh Capantha
10. Raiji-laghubhrāta Jasavanta Rājī (I) Tinanai nivahāir—Mira
11. Śrī-Cauḥ-Capantha Raiji (, ) tasya putra Śrī-Cauḥ Amanata Rāi-
12. ji tasya putra Ciḥ (?) Śrī-Cauḥ-Varajora Sūngha (I) Dighayu-
13. rastu
14. leṣaka (II) Sūbham bhavatu mangalaṁ (II)

Translation

“Success. Adoration to Śrī-Gaṇeśa, Adoration to Śrī Sarasvatī. In the year 1803 according to the era founded in the reign of Śrī-Vikramādiṭya, in Śāka 1668, when the illustrious Sun is in the Utta-
raṇa (Northern course), in the current year 28 of the illustrious emperor Mahāmamadā Sāha, in the thirteenth 13 lunar day of the black fortnight of the month of Vaisākha......in an auspicious place in (their) own garden at the town of Udeyapura. Jasavanta Rājī, the younger brother of Śrī Cauḍhuri (?) Capantha Rājī, a very pious man of the Vaisya sect,......who is an inhabitant of the Malava Suvā,
(These) three perform (it)—Mira Śrī Caudhuri Capamta Rājī, his son Śrī Caudhuri Amānata Rājī, (and) his son Śrī Caudhuri Varajora Simha. May the writer live long. Let it be auspicious and prosperous.

The scribe (is) Caânduvâ Simghamana.

NOTES

1. Muhammad Shah (1719-48) is the Mughal emperor of Delhi. The 28th year of his reign was 1719 + 27 = 1746 A.D. The Vikrama and Šaka years referred to in the inscription (1803 V.E.−57 = 1746 A.D.; 1668 Š.E.+78 = 1746 A.D.) also give the same date.

2. Udayapura-nagara appears to be an unimportant town in Mâlava.

3. The omission of the word ‘Śrī’ before the name of Jasavamta shows that he was dead. We have left this word untranslated except in two places for the sake of avoiding awkwardness.

DINESH CHANDRA SIRCAR

“Caândasutânam” in the Nanaghât Cave Inscription

In the Nanaghât Cave Inscription No. I, edited by G. Bühler in the Archaeological Survey of Western India, vol. V, the passage “Namo Saâmkasana-Vâsudevânam caândasutânam mahimâvatânah cátumnâm ca lokapâlânah Yama-Varuâna-Kuvera-Vâsavana” (line 1) has been translated as “Adoration to Saâmkarsana and Vâsudeva, the descendants of the Moon, who are endowed with majesty, and to the four guardians of the world, Yama, Varuâna, Kuvera and Vâsava.”

Bühler translates “Caândasutânam” as the descendants of Caânda and takes it as an epithet of “Saâmkasana-Vâsudeva.” I, however, differ from him on the following grounds:

The vowel-mark in “s,” the third letter of the word “caândasutânam,” is distinctly “ū,” and there is hardly any instance of Sanskrit long “ū” being changed into short “u” in Prakrit. Then the next letter, of which the lower part is lost, seems to me to be “rā” and not “ta.” The word therefore is “Candasûrânam,” (= candrasûryayoh) and the epithet “mahimâvatânah” then suits it excellently.

DINESH CHANDRA SIRCAR
The Bhāgavṛtti

The name Bhāgavṛtti occurs fairly frequently in commentaries on grammar and lexicons but we know practically next to nothing about the work and its author. The late Prof. Sris Chandra Chakravarti in his highly erudite introduction to the कार्यावधीसर्वस्थितिका inclines to the view that Bhartṛhari is the author of the Bhāgavṛtti. Prof. Chakravarti writes:—

‘It-sing in a part of his book makes चर्चा the author of a commentary on प्राचीन. He calls it “peï-na” which is surmised by the Japanese translator (Mr. J. Takakusu) to be the Veda-वṛtti or वेड़ावर्णित. Now this “peï-na” is probably the भाषाविद्या which is a commentary on the चार्चावादी’ (pp. 13-14). In a foot-note Prof. Chakravarti asks: “May not the Vedavṛtti as well be a corruption of the word विद्वान्तित or विद्वान्तित i.e., भाषाविद्या ?” This argument need not be seriously considered. By turning and twisting the vowels and consonants in a word we can prove anything, but that is not scientific.

Prof. Chakravarti’s second argument is that Bhartṛhari is mentioned as the author of the Bhāgavṛtti in several grammatical treatises. He says:—“As to its authorship the following statement is found in the तत्त्वादिप by नैवेदिकार्थेन on the Sūtra VIII, 3, 21, viz.,—भार्तरक्षिणा चासन निवात्यांत्योऽसिः। तथा च भागवतिधिका प्रदुर्दाःचर्चासमपवस्तिः तथा एकं तत्त्वादिपतिः। वामनोपि लोकपिन्नानादार्चर्चासमपवस्तिः।—सर्वदेव says in his दुःखार्चार्य on the Sūtra VIII, 3, 37—उदयान उद्धार दुःख भवतीति भार्तरक्षिणा भागवतिधिका चोऽतुस। यहिँ भार्तरक्षिणाः, the author of the भाषाकृष्णतिधिति, a commentary on the भाषाविद्या by पुरुषोमात्रेन, remarks in the end of his book—भाषाविद्या भार्तरक्षिणा निवात्यांत्योऽसिः भाषाकृष्णतिधिति।”

Prof. Chakravarti evidently thought that the three passages quoted above pointed to the same conclusion, but the fact is just the reverse. In the quotation from नैवेदिकार्थेन who certainly was most intimately acquainted with the भाषाविद्या, तथाच means ‘similarly’, so the passage contains the views of three grammarians, viz., भाषाकृष्णतिधिका, भार्तरक्षिणा and भाषाविद्या. In the second passage quoted तसदेव distinctly says—‘it has been said by Bhartṛhari as also the author of the भाषाविद्या’
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(. भगवर्ण भागवतिलकर शौचम् ). As regards the statement of राधाकृपा, it is clear that भगवर्ण confuses भागवति with भरि. As a matter of fact the author of the Bhāgavṛtti was quite distinct from Bhartṛhari as in numerous passages in commentaries on grammar the opinions of both have been quoted side by side.

In a learned preface to the Descriptive Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Collections of the Asiatic Society of Bengal (vol. VI), Mm. Haraprasāda Śāstrī does not offer any suggestion of his own but contents himself with showing the unreliable character of the facts and arguments put forward by Mr. Chakravartī. Says Mm. Sastri: "No reliance can be placed on any historical statements of Srṣṭidharācārya as he belongs to the 17th century and to North Bengal. In this very quotation he confounds Bhṛṭṭi and Bhartṛhari, for Srīdharaśena was the patron of Bhṛṭti the poet, and not of Bhartṛhari the grammarian".

I shall now try to glean some information about the author of the Bhāgavṛtti and his approximate date from the references to the work I have come across in the course of my studies in Sanskrit grammar.

Though भागवति and भागवतिलक are pretty frequently referred to in Sanskrit grammatical literature, in only one passage have I found the name of the author mentioned. In his Kātantra-Pariśiṣṭa (1. 142), Śrīpatidatta says: दत्तोक्तः दिवीर्कः, चौलमोकार्थः। वर्गीय दिव्य दिव्यिते दिलितम् तथा योगकलिकाब्यांदिकः दिवीकः पाठः। तथाच भागवतिलका विचलविचारापि नियातितः।

It would appear from the above extract that Vimalamati is the author of the Bhāgavṛtti. One Viṇalamati is mentioned by Eggeling as the author of a commentary on the Candravyākaraṇa, Trilocanadāsa in his Kātantra-vṛttipāṇīcaka on Kātantra, Samāsapāda I, quotes the following verse from Vimalamati:

विमलमतिः निर्विशेष निलिते गुरुसुप्रचारे।
समासानि तदेव व्याकरणसूत्रानिर्देश स।

In our present state of knowledge it is difficult to say whether all these three Vimalamatis refer to one and the same person or not.
That the Bhāgavṛtti was not among the early लघु on Pāṇini would be clear from the following remarks of Śrīpati (Ibid., II, 16): भागवतेऽक्तात् बान्धव कथेन वस्तूः पमेश्वरे। न तत्तत्तामाम् कथात् श्रेष्ठे च दशस्थैः i.e., the author of the Bhāgavṛtti holds that the dictum is applicable to the Vedas alone; but that is not the view of the early Vṛttikāras nor of Candra. The early Vṛttikāras refer, of course, to Kuṇi, Jayāditya, Vāmana and others.

That the author of the भागवति could not have been Bharatṛhari is evident from the following:

[प्रद्विषणम् प्रतियुनम्] भक्तिरसमततिसदावरथे भागवतयत्नसङ्गधतसः। चतु चल्य 
समानादोवासयथम्।—Goyicandra on Saṁkṣiptasāra, I. 328.

[परमनादेहसममुनादस्वभृत्यसन्धति कथे परीबाराय] सत्यम् प्रतिपदिक्षासुवृजितिकुष च 
[१।११।१।११] श्रवण शुम्धमयस्रवयोगन न हृदये। भक्तिरिष्य त्वसः—य: प्रतिपदिक्षाय सदारी 
न अवतित तदाय श्रुतिभोज, प्रक्षेपर्दिति। चतु च हिद्रुपाली बुद्धिय ज्ञातिति॥ 
तत् च पूवतपदिक्षाय: 
समाचे च पूवतपदिक्षाय: तत् कायमिक ज्ञातिति न देशक्षेत्रमिति भागवतिक्षेत्रसः।—Stradeva 
on Paribhāṣā, 4.

गततःदात्येश तत्त्व भागवति:। गतविष्यकादासाह्याय तत्त्व भक्तिः। चतु चल्य:।—Durghaṭavṛtti on 
इरसमेतताद्रस्य तत्त्व वजयम्।

उपराम उद्धाम तत्वेव सत्तैति भक्तिरिष्य भागवतित्रोक्षम् (Ibid., VII. 3, 31).

That it was posterior to the Kāśikā is clear from the fact that it discusses quotations from भाष as also the fact that in many cases it seems to controvert the views of the Kāśikā.

Thus—

“भाषीद्विवेदसाहित्यविषयोपदलासेव श्राविः” तत्त्व माति: [१०।१५] अवर्धितारोगिण: 
ब्राह्मण:—Ujjvaladatta on उपायदि २। १०४।

चतुः प्रतिष्ण्याः ज्ञातिपतिप्रज्ञोपिति माति: [२।२१।२।२१]। तथाते विद्यार्चवयस्रवयस्रवयस्रवय 
तत्त्व प्रायों तत्त्व भागवतिः: (दूर्वन्ति: उपन कोमलरतिक्षेत्रमिति ७। २। ३०)। भाषायी जिज्ञासुया! तत्त्व पुढ़ला तत्त्व 
भागवतिः:—Goyicandra on Saṁkṣiptasāra, 1097.

चतुः प्रायों भाषी: [१।१।२६] भागवति:—पुरातनसमवस्त्रितासात्तिति पुरातीन्द्विनाशिति ज प्रायों 
पार्थिविति। गतापुस्तिकाय रूत्व: प्राचीन न तेषाय न वर्गो ज्ञातिति।—Stradeva on Pari-

भाषायी विषय प्राचीनाद्विनाशिति ज्ञातिः। चतुः प्रायों: (भाषायी: ५। १। १३२)।
Commenting on Pāṇini VI. I, 9 the Kāśīkā remarks अन्वयसाधिकोष्येऽ। ज्ञुविशिष्टे। कोणचै। On this the Padamaṅjari remarks: भागविद्यार्थकार—पूवंशें "बालीः" "बालयसः" दिति वधानि प्रवेद्याय भाषाविद्यार्थकोष्येऽ—तिष्ठत तायेः साहित्यिति धातुप्रज्ञातिति, नरारावनिति भाषा:। चन्द्रायणणयमः तु न विनिमिति प्रयोजनमुद्रमः, तत्वोत्तराधमविति सब
भवतीति भाषाविद्यार्थकाराः लक्ष्ये, तेनाय भविष्यमेव विशेषचै।

भागविद्यार्थ: पुनः दान—धीरेषुप्रद्वचनेन प्रकाशे यथयेव सतानादायकः भवतः। इश्वराय यथये।
इश्वरः यत्सिद्धेन कवयतीश्च। बाचः शरीरसाधनसिद्धवनारिवः: कर्मचित्त वाच्यमः।—( पुरुषोकार
on दैव cxxxii). Here the last sentence seems to be a hit at Jayāditya
who explains वपालालम् as बाचा शरीरसाधनम्.

Sometimes it has a fling at the Nyāsakāra also. Cf. कर्म वदभवेन अस्वदिग्निकोणेऽम्: दिति वाचकः। तथा अनेककर्म नास्यान्वितति बाचः। ** ** भागविद्यार्थ: "अनेकेश्चाः" दिति जैविन्द्राश्चमः। वाल्मुक्तः एवस्यांशः।" दिति। Durghaṭavṛtti, II, 2, 6.

विनिता नैच्छः, भागविद्यार्थ लिखिते ( पदस्त्री vol. I, p. 251. I. 2).

Instances could be multiplied to any extent to show that on many important points of grammar the Bhāgavṛtti differed from the Kāśīkā. It would appear also that it followed the Bhāṣya much more closely than Jayāditya or Vāmana.

वाल्मेकार [ द्विधिश्चिनीयौ विधिति ] विनितमुद्रमः, भागविद्यार्थः त चन्द्रायणणम् एवम् (Goyicandra on Saṅkṣiptasāra II. 1709).

वाल्मेकारार्थीदिष्टार्थस्यनिःस्थितम्, शाब्दवादिग्रामकोषि च विनिती हास्ये, भाष्यसमालस्यमार्थार्थस्य विनितमुद्रमः। (Ibid., Taddhitaipāda, 47).

भाषाविद्याश्रये द्रव्याधिकारीः च वर्तमाने एव को न तु खूपे अभवतः, वत्सः पदविः अभवितमुद्रिति भाषाविद्यार्थी महतः। (Ibid. Kārakapāda, 177).

Bhāgavṛtti’s view on बाचक विनितमुद्रितम् एवः [ करति २७। ३१] has been quoted or referred to by all subsequent commentators. Unlike most grammarians the author of the Bhāgavṛtti takes the bull by the horns and pronounces the form बाचक in the line incorrect. He suggests the emendation जाते for बाचक. Vide Jumaranandī and Goyicandra on Saṅkṣiptasāra; 504.

Bhāgavṛtti often discusses the peculiar forms occurring in the Bhāṭṭi-
kāvyā. Cf. Bhāgavṛtti, 4. 1, 178. कर्म प्राप्त नैसायिनी अर्थविज्ञानसत्तमः। वायूमशीरेरे...
THE BHĀGAVṛTTI

One important point on which the Bhāgavṛtti appears to differ from most grammarians is that according to it a transitive root can be conjugated in the Bhāṣā. Says Goyicandra (Kṛdantapāda, 180): “वाक्यमत नवार्थिति कार्यप्रदीर्घोऽविनिमेति मयाधृति तथा;” Say “तव तदानीहि द्वितीयमिति वितीयाः।”

It similarly Rāmatarkavāgīśa on Mudhobodha 308: “सद्दश कृपावति मयां यो तत्त्वति मयाधृति।”

Its views on मतिसंवर्यमयाय्य अष्ट matrix have not generally been followed by later grammarians. Strictly following the Bhāṣya it restricts तत्त्वति मयाधृति in the case of these roots to the तुव्यमयाय्य अष्ट matrix holds that such uses as “तम ताति मयाधृति राष्ट्रमनिमाति तेन तमां मयाधृति तत्त्वति मयाधृति” are wrong. The तम ताति मयाधृति तत्त्वति मयाधृति राष्ट्रमनिमाति तेन तमां मयाधृति तत्त्वति मयाधृति—Bhāgavṛtti, 3, 2, 188. On Jumaranandin’s line “तम ताति मयाधृति तत्त्वति मयाधृति” suggests a middle course in his Padamañjarī on 2, 2, 12 and says: “तम ताति मयाधृति तत्त्वति मयाधृति तत्त्वति मयाधृति”

Goyicandra remarks: “तवतिर्यायमयाय्य अष्ट तवातिर्यायमयाय्य अष्ट तवातिर्यायमयाय्य अष्ट तवातिर्यायमयाय्य अष्ट”

The word तवतिर्याय मयाधृति तवतिर्याय मयाधृति तवतिर्याय मयाधृति तवतिर्याय मयाधृति (Kārapāda 177). Haradatta (following Kayita) steers a middle course in his Padamañjarī on 2, 2, 12 and says: “तम ताति मयाधृति तत्त्वति मयाधृति तत्त्वति मयाधृति”

Sripatidatta in his Kātantrapariśiṣṭa taking strong exception to the view of the Bhāgavṛtti holds there can be no तत्त्वति मयाधृति. The author of the ग्रहयाण simply extends the तत्त्वति मयाधृति to all cases saying तत्त्वति मयाधृति. This appears to be the view of all later grammarians.
It would appear that the name Bhāgavṛtti had its origin in the fact that it divided the चट्टाणो of Pāṇini into two parts—the first part dealing with classical Sanskrit (भा) and the second with Vedic Sanskrit (वद्य). Cf. Goytandra on Saṅśiptasāra II. 1729—केदराभस्व बद्वलोके विजयातिनि भाषात्मकतत्त्वसिद्धान्तम्, चतुर्व भाषासारो भाषाविद्वाद्वादासारा भाषावस्थितिम् शिलितम्, and on I, 190 चतुर्व वाक्याधिक वस्त्रविजयाय वस्त्रादिक शिलितम्, and on I, 190 चतुर्व वाक्याधिक वस्त्रविजयाय वस्त्रादिक शिलितम्, and on I, 190 चतुर्व वाक्याधिक वस्त्रविजयाय वस्त्रादिक शिलितम्.

As regards the date of the Bhāgavṛttikāra it is difficult to be very definite until further data are forthcoming. But since the Bhāgavṛttikāra quotes or refers to Kālidāsa, Bhāṭṭi, Bhāravi, Kāśikā, Nyāsa and Māgha and has been referred to by Kramadīstāvar (in his rule कलि वीर वैग भाषा: (वारकपाद, 101) and Maitreya Rakṣita, we shall not be very far wrong if we put him between A.D. 850 and 1050.

Kshitis Chandra Chatterji

The Authorship of the Anunyāsa

Prof. Sriscandra Chakravarti in the introduction to his edition of the Kāśikāvivaraṇapāṇcikā remarks: “Some say that this तत्त्वविद्य is probably identical with the चट्टाण or बालीविद्य.” This opinion is clearly untenable. From quotations in various works on grammar, we can easily make out that the Tantrapradipa by Maitreya Rakṣita is quite a different work from the Anunyāsa. The following extract from Stradeva's Paribhāṣāvṛtti (Benares edition, p. 79) settles the question of the authorship of the Anunyāsa:

एतेका वाचा भ्रुमेलेक्योः भाषातिको विद्योः। तत्त्वविद्य शवमस्युः न ज्ञातार्थक छन्दहन्तः—प्रतिधिसूचनायां शत क्ष्टम:। एरवं श्रवः। पुंचि संभावां च श्वायष ध्रति च च ध्रति। भाषेयः—पुंचि च। एरवं श्रवः। पुंचि संभावां च श्वायष ध्रति च च ध्रति। भाषेयः—पुंचि च। एरवं श्रवः। पुंचि संभावां च श्वायष ध्रति च च ध्रति। भाषेयः—पुंचि च।

From the above it is clear that श्रव (often referred to in commentaries as श्रविष्टि) is the author of the Anunyāsa. In the Durghaṭa-
vṛtti (3, 3, 58) we read: 

1 “इन्द्र” धरि कर्त्ताविकसरणोऽचापो 

शास्त्राः। उभये। “कर्त्ताविकसरणोऽचापो” धरि इन्द्र शास्त्राः। उभये। “कर्त्ताविकसरणोऽचापो” धरि इन्द्र शास्त्राः। उभये। “कर्त्ताविकसरणोऽचापो” धरि इन्द्र शास्त्राः। उभये। “कर्त्ताविकसरणोऽचापो” धरि इन्द्र शास्त्राः। उभये। “कर्त्ताविकसरणोऽचापो” धरि इन्द्र शास्त्राः। उभये। “कर्त्ताविकसरणोऽचापो” धरि इन्द्र शास्त्राः।

तत् तत् शास्त्राः। उभये। “कर्त्ताविकसरणोऽचापो” धरि इन्द्र शास्त्राः। उभये। “कर्त्ताविकसरणोऽचापो” धरि इन्द्र शास्त्राः। उभये। “कर्त्ताविकसरणोऽचापो” धरि इन्द्र शास्त्राः। उभये। “कर्त्ताविकसरणोऽचापो” धरि इन्द्र शास्त्राः। उभये। “कर्त्ताविकसरणोऽचापो” धरि इन्द्र शास्त्राः। उभये। “कर्त्ताविकसरणोऽचापो” धरि इन्द्र शास्त्राः।

तत् तत् शास्त्राः। उभये। “कर्त्ताविकसरणोऽचापो” धरि इन्द्र शास्त्राः। उभये। “कर्त्ताविकसरणोऽचापो” धरि इन्द्र शास्त्राः। उभये। “कर्त्ताविकसरणोऽचापो” धरि इन्द्र शास्त्राः। उभये। “कर्त्ताविकसरणोऽचापो” धरि इन्द्र शास्त्राः। उभये। “कर्त्ताविकसरणोऽचापो” धरि इन्द्र शास्त्राः।

तत् तत् शास्त्राः। उभये। “कर्त्ताविकसरणोऽचापो” धरि इन्द्र शास्त्राः। उभये। “कर्त्ताविकसरणोऽचापो” धरि इन्द्र शास्त्राः। उभये। “कर्त्ताविकसरणोऽचापो” धरि इन्द्र शास्त्राः। उभये। “कर्त्ताविकसरणोऽचापो” धरि इन्द्र शास्त्राः। उभये। “कर्त्ताविकसरणोऽचापो” धरि इन्द्र शास्त्राः।

क्षीतिष्ठ चन्द्रक चकट्टी

—

1 The reference is evidently to the introductory verse of the काषिकां 

which runs thus:

इन्द्र शास्त्र तत्त्व धार्मिकानामार्थाय अधिक

विद्वानसूर तत्त्वं जिगं सारंसंवेदः।
REVIEWS

THE HISTORY OF RÄJPUTĀNĀ (in Hindi)—(Fasciculus 111), by Mahāmahopādhyāya, Rai Bahadur Gaurishankar Hirāchānd Ojhā, (pp. 737-1136).

The present fasciculus continues the history of the state of Udayapur or Mevār for nearly 300 years—from about the third quarter of the sixteenth century to that of the nineteenth. It begins with an account of the reign of the celebrated Rāṇā Pratāp and closes with that of Mahārāṇa Sajjanaśīma who was still ruling when this fasciculus went for publication.

As in the case of the earlier ones, the author has made use of all possible materials in the preparation of this volume. The careful student comparing the contents of the earlier volumes with those in the present one will, however, notice that whereas in the former ones references to inscriptions loom large in the eyes, in the present volume literary evidence has been laid much more in debt. Historical (?) poems like Rājaviḷās, Bhimaviḷās, Rājapraśasti, Mahākāvyā, Amarasīmabhīṣeka Kāvyā etc. or later works written on the authority of such compositions like the Vamśabhāskar and the Viravinda etc. will be found referred to at almost every page in the present volume. The reason is not far to seek. As we enter into the history of Rājputānā of the sixteenth century—we seem to enter into a new world. Dr. Tessitori has shown that the Rājput princes when they came in contact with the Mughal emperors sought to imitate them in every possible way and especially in their patronage of historical literature. But unlike the historical works written under the patronage of the Mughal emperors, those written under the auspices of the Rājput princes were very crude in their form and matter. Their value as historical evidence has been very carefully examined by that distinguished scholar, and those who are interested in Rājasthāni literature as a source of Rājput history must go through the most illuminating articles contributed by him to the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. The fact is that no one, who is not conversant with the western scientific method, can be expected to extract the truth out of this mixture of fact and fancy. It is easy for a student who has an idea of how European scholars have dealt, for example, with the traditions relating to early Roman history.
contained in the pages of Polybius or Livy, to appreciate the amount of credence to be put upon the Rājasthānī literature professing to be historical in character.

The present writer has his own views regarding the value to be attached to the Rājasthānī literature and it is quite permissible to differ from him in this matter. If therefore any person may disagree here and there with him, it is because there is the fundamental difference in the outlook of their respective estimation of the Rājasthānī literature as a source of history. To take an example out of many, in his account of the early history of Rānā Pratāp the author has given preference to Rājput tradition over the evidence of the contemporary Moslem records.

One could not expect—and the author, it is hoped, did not also entertain the idea that the views expressed in this work would be universally accepted. To do so is to lose sight of the scientific character of historical studies. Leaving, therefore, questions of difference of opinion aside every person going through the volumes on the history of Mevār will agree that here is a really monumental work second only to Tod’s famous Annals and Antiquities of Rājasthān.

SUBIMAL CHANDRA DATTA


Recent discoveries in Mesopotamia and India have made it clear that the essential elements of “civilisation” were already in being in the fourth millennium B.C.; upon these foundations of the modern world all else has been elaboration rather than discovery. These beginnings are to be connected with the first great development of agriculture, and antedate that of organised empires and warfare. The present work is an initial synthesis, arguing that the Persian Gulf culture (a term practically equivalent to “Early Asiatic”) survives recognizably, with further evolution, in the later Indian, Greek and Hebrew civilisations. Above all in the Indian not as the result of later influences but as a tendency inherited from a common source or closely related sources the authoress regards it as certain that the Mesopotamian and the Indus Valley cultures were both of Elamite origin. The ultimate debt of existing civilisations to the
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period and it is not improbable that much of the doctrines and philosophy of Mahāyāna Buddhism was contributed by the Southern Indian thinkers. So the information collected in this book about the religious thinkers and their productions is very valuable for the religious history of India.

The fourth chapter is devoted to an examination of the life and times of the author of the Tirukkural (1st or 2nd century B.C.), which abounds in Niti maxims similar to those found in the Hitopadēsa, Kāmandakīya Nītisāra, Kauṭaliya Arthaśāstra, etc. Mr. Dikshitar analyses this treatise under the three heads: dharma (arṇam), artha (porul) and kāma (imbam) and shows by citations from Sanskrit Niti works that the Tamil conception of Muppāl (Trivarga) was not different from that of Aryan India, whence it percolated into Tamil India at a very early date.

So far the author of the present work has been cautious in drawing his conclusions, but when he comes to the chapters on the "Administrative Institutions" and the "Art of War," his patriotic instinct seems to dominate his critical sense, the scanty materials scattered here and there in one or two Sangam works, supplemented by materials collected from some of the later Tamil works and inscriptions he infers the existence of "a wonderful system of polity, having very much in common with the North Indian polity, though in some respects strikingly original" (p. 177).

In the last chapter the author treats of "Social Life in Tamil Land." The information about life in towns and villages is scanty, but it has been partially recompensed by the interesting and well-written sections on marriage and marriage customs, dancing, music, amusements, festivals and superstitions.

We quite appreciate the remark of the author that it is not an easy task to present a complete picture of the ancient Tamil society within the small compass of 50 pages. The task undertaken by him viz., to present us with not only a social picture of the ancient Tamils but also a fairly comprehensive picture of their political institutions, religious and literary activities is really onerous. He has enlivened the book by biographical accounts of the personages who have contributed to the culture which makes Drāviḍa what it is today. The value of the work has been much enhanced by the accounts of the Sangam works, their probable dates and the nature of the historical materials that can be found in them.

N. D.

The Bihar and Orissa Research Society has done considerable service by undertaking the gradual publication of those portions of the Buchanan Mss. which relate to the districts of Bihar. The Journals of Francis Buchanan kept during the survey of the districts of Patna and Gaya in 1811-12, and the district of Shahbad in 1812-13 were published by the Society in 1925 and 1926 respectively. These volumes were enriched by valuable editorial introductions and notes by two well-known scholars—the Patna report being edited by Mr. V. H. Jackson and the Shahbad report being edited by Mr. C.E.A.W. Oldham. The volume under notice is not the Journal, but the Report of the survey of the Purnea district made in 1809-10. The Journal kept by Buchanan during the survey appears to have been lost, which enhances the value of the Report. In the Buchanan Mss, the Journals are quite distinct from the Reports on the corresponding districts. Buchanan used to keep a daily journal, not intended for publication, recording the information which he received and his own observations on the day’s march. The matter recorded in the Journal together with a large amount of supplementary information was at the end of the survey of each district rearranged and put under the appropriate sections for publication as a Report. The Reports are therefore carefully finished works following in their arrangement the actual order of Buchanan’s instructions.

When in January 1807 the Court of Directors selected Dr. Francis Buchanan to carry out a “statistical survey” of the Bengal presidency, their choice fell upon a person who was eminently qualified for that kind of work. Dr. Buchanan came to India in 1794 as a surgeon on the Bengal establishment. From the first, the scientific turn of his mind inclined him towards Botanical and Zoological enquiries. He was sent on a mission to the Court of Ava in course of which he acquired knowledge of the plants of the Andamans, Pegu and Ava. On his return he was stationed at Luckipore, where he wrote a description of the fishes of the Brahmaputra. He was then sent by the Board of Trade at Calcutta to Chittagong and its neighbourhood to conduct investigations. In 1800, after the conquest of Mysore, Lord Wellesley selected Buchanan to make investigations which were to extend “throughout the dominions of the present Raja of Mysore, and the country acquired by the Company in the late war from the Sultan, as
well as to that part of Malabar which the Company annexed to their own territories in the former war under Marquis Cornwallis," directing that "the first great and essential object of your attention should be the agriculture of the country under which your enquiries should include the following points:—esculent vegetables, cattle, farms, cotton, pepper, sandal wood and cardamums, mines, quarries, minerals and mineral springs, manufactures and manufacturers, climate and seasons and inhabitants of Mysore." These inquiries carried on during the years 1800-1 resulted in a daily journal entitled "A Journey from Madras through the countries of Mysore, Canara and Malabar" and was published in 1807 by order of the Court of Directors. In 1802 again Buchanan accompanied the embassy of Capt. Knox to Nepal and made collections of rare plants. It was to such a man that the statistical survey of the Bengal presidency was entrusted in 1807.

"The subjects of more particular inquiry were as follows: 1. A full topographical account of each district; its climate and meteorology; its history and antiquities. 2. The number and condition of the inhabitants; their food, habits, diseases etc.; education and resources for the indigent. 3. Religion; the different sects or tribes; the emoluments and power of their priests and chiefs; their feeling towards our Government. 4. Natural productions, animal, vegetable and mineral; fisheries, forests, mines and quarries. 5. Agriculture, in the most comprehensive sense of the term, including the state of the landed property and tenures. 6. The progress made by the natives in the fine arts, the common arts, and manufactures. 7. Commerce."

This work was carried on from 1807-14 during which time the districts of Gaya and Patna, Shahbad, Bhagalpur, Monghyr, Purnea, Dinajpur, Rangpur, Jalpaiguri, part of Bogra, Malda and Assam were surveyed at a cost of about Rs. 3 lakhs. The materials thus collected were forwarded by the Bengal Government to London in 1816 and did not see the light of day until published in abridged form in 1838 (nine years after Buchanan’s death) in Montgomery Martin’s "Eastern India." Martin’s abridgement was unfortunately defective, having omitted matters of considerable value. The Bihar and Orissa Research Society has therefore undertaken a very useful task in gradually publishing in full the Journals and Reports relating to the districts of Bihar. So far as the publication in extenso of the Mss. relating to the Bengal districts are concerned, only the Dinajpur Report appears to have been published in 1833. It will be a great boon to the
students of the economic and social condition of eastern India in the early years of the 19th century, if these reports too are made available in print.

Apart from the historical portions, there cannot be any word as to the great value of the Report under notice. The scientific bent of Buchanan's mind, his careful methods of investigation, his unflagging zeal which enabled him to surmount the difficulties of pioneer work,—all these have gone to make his ms., a reliable source of information. An introduction to the Purnea Report from the pen of Mr. Jackson would have enhanced the value of the present publication.

A. D.
Select Contents of Oriental Journals

Indian Antiquary, June 1931

PRANNATH.—The Date of the Compilation of Kauṭalya’s Arthaśāstra.
In support of the writer’s view that the author of the Arthaśāstra could not have been the minister of Candragupta Maurya and that the work was compiled at a time between 480 and 510 A.D., the following reasons have been put forward in this article continued to the next issue of the Journal:

(1) The references in the Arthaśāstra to seaports, ships sailing for pearl fishery and pirate vessels show that the author lived in a country situated somewhere near the sea coast. (2) The chapter dealing with the management of crown lands (svabhūmi) indicates that the king contemplated therein possessed landed properties near the Western sea, forming a political unit including Konkaṇa, Kaccha, Surāśṭra, Sindh etc., with its capital at Ujjain in Malwa. (3) Historical evidences point to the existence of a Malwa empire answering to the conditions of the supposed ‘political unit’ in Western India during the early centuries of the Christian era (from 126 A.D. to 510 A.D.). (4) The author’s references to a law punishing offences against the Hūṇas show that his work was written at a time when his country occupied a dependent position and was afraid of the Hūṇas. This was in fact the position of the Malwa empire during the last part of the 5th century.

A. Venkatasubbia.—A Buddhist Parallel to the Avimāraṇaka Story.
Parallelism between a story in the Kuṇālajātaka and the main facts of the drama Avimāraṇaka has been pointed out in this paper. Different versions of the story have also been shown to exist in the Kathāsārītāśāgara as well as in the Jayamaṅgalā commentary on the Kāmasūtra.

Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society
vol. xvi, pts. iii and iv.

K. P. Jayaswal.—Problems of Saka Sātavāhana History.—Mr. Jayaswal first states the conclusions of Dr. Sten Konow, with which
he agrees, e.g., ayasa, the date (year 1) on the Peshawar casket of Kaṇṭika Khalastse Inscription, identification of Kuyula Kaphasa, arrangement of the Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions, and Kamboja. The writer then states the points, on which he differs from Dr. Sten Konow and gives his own views. They are

Re. Śaka History:—Bhūmaka—The two Śaka Eras and the Founder of the Era of 78 A.D.—The Date of the earlier Śaka Conquest—Date of the earlier Śaka Era—Years of Gondophares—Chinese date for Kuṣāṇa Kadphises and Wima—Date of Śoḍāsa—Patika—Nahapāña—Vikrama era—Kuṣāṇas.

Re. Śātavāhana History:—Struggle of the Śātavāhana dynasty with the Śuṅgas and the Śakas—Chronology of Śātakaṇṇa II and his son Pulumāvi—Early Śātavāhana or Andhra kings—Fixed Points in the Śātavāhana Chronology—Order of the Kings—Purāṇas and Nahapāña—New Light on Nahapāña—Identification of the Nānāghat Statues—Dynasties contemporary with the Andhras—Appendix A: Extracts from Āvaśyakasūtra (uttarārdha pārvaḥāga) and Abhidhāna-rājendra—the last Kāṇṭhayana and his Śātavāhana Conqueror—Identification of Guṇāḍhya’s and Somadeva’s Vikramāditya and the Śātavāhana of 78 A.D.—Course of events after 83 A.D.—Identification of the Dynasties contemporary with the Andhras—Their Reign-Periods—Verification of the numbers of kings and reign-periods in the contemporary dynasties—The Śākas of the Purāṇas—Traikūṭa Era—The Purāṇas and the so-called Dark Period.

L. V. RAMASWAMI AIYAR.—Linguistic Analysis and Dravidian Names denoting ‘Peacock’ and ‘Bat’.—The object of the writer is to substantiate the theory propounded by Prof. J. Przyluski that there were in pre-Aryan India not only Dravidians but also a large population of Austrics by showing that there were mutual loans of words between Dravidians and Austrics. In this paper, the writer proposes “to discuss purely from the standpoint of the Dravidist, the possibilities of Dravido-Austric relationship” in connection with certain Dravidian forms denoting the names of (i) Peacock and (ii) Bat.

SYED MOHAMMAD.—Old Muslim Inscriptions at Patna.—The writer has edited and translated 112 inscriptions dating from 916 to 1276 (Hijri era). He classifies them into four sections, the first section includes those which “refer to the royalties, governors, their deputies and other servants” and fall within the time
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of Aurangzeb; the second contains the inscriptions of the weak rules who followed Aurangzeb within 50 years (i.e. up to 1757—the date of the battle of Plassey); the third speaks of the inscriptions on mosques and tombs (1757-1807) and the fourth of mosques built by barbers, drum-makers and the like (1807-1857). There is also an index to names in the above mentioned inscriptions.

N. Tripathi.—Two Sulki Plates. These records were published by Mm. H. P. Sastri in vol. II, pt. iv of this journal (JBORS.). The present writer identifies the following geographical names and titles: Kodalo, Stambha and Stambheosvar, and Gondrama. He gives the readings, in which he differs from those of Mm. H. P. Sastri.

N. Tripathi.—Jayapura Copper-plate grant of Dhruvänanda Deva. The writer gives a revised reading of this inscription first published by Dr. A. Banerji Sastri in the JBORS. 1929 with a free translation of the text and notes on the script, date, language and the identification of Jayapura and Gondrama. He has appended a note on the words. Nanda, Varnacatuslaya, Godhū, Parama Sangata, Samadhipata-pancamahāśabda and Rājanaka.

March, 1931

Binayak Misra.—Narasinghpur Charter of Uddyotakesāri Mahā-bravagupta IV. This inscription has been edited with translation and ample historical notes. It was a grant issued from Yavatnagar (=Biñkā in the Sonepur State), the donor of the grant was Uddyotakesāri, son of Yavatī II, whose reign falls between 960-70 A.C. The date of Uddyotakesāri is placed at the 11th century A.C.

Tarapada Chowdhury.—On the Interpretation of some Doubtful Words in the Atharva-veda. The writer deals with the following words:—āksu, āksya, ādrūksa, ādroghāvitā, aparāparaṇāḥ, arāṭakī, alajī, ālpaśayu, āvarjuśīnām, ásvakṣabā, asaṃsūktagilī, áhariṣta, aṇḍika, āṣūṅga, āsrāvā, uttaradrau, ōdantu, ēru, kākutsala, kanākaka, kamāla, kalmalī, kūmba, kurtra, kurūṭiṇi, khaḍgāra, khaḍgala, galuntā, gṛhastāvas, citi, jabhya, tardā, tāyādarām, tirin, turmiṣam, taimata, taulā, duradabha, dūrā, nyā, paṭūrā, parusā, pārśāna, paviṣta, pṛṣṭi, pēgā, prārtha, bhūrmalī, maṇi(n)au, madhyamaśīr, mūra, mūradeva, vrā, samuṣpalā, suśma.
Hirananda Sastri.— *Were Rāgamālas painted by the Artists of Kangara*. The object of this paper is to refute the contention of Coomaraswamy that the "Kāṅgrā painters never painted Rāgamālas." He comments also on the sense of the nomenclature ‘Kāṅgrā School’ or ‘Pāhāri School’.

Binayak Misra.— *Copper-plate Grant of Netīlabhaṇja*. "The grant records the gift of the village Stambakūralaundaka of the Olaśrīga District." The gift was made in memory of the merit of Bāṣātādevi, the deceased queen of the donor. In the introduction the writer deals with the history of the Bhaṭija family of Mayūrabhaṇja.

Sudhakar Patnaik.— *Śobhaneswar Inscription of Śrī Vaidyanāth*. This inscription contains a Praśasti and was found on the Śobhaneswar temple (near Puri). The temple was built by King Vaidyanāth.

Paramatma Saran.— *Sher Shah's Revenue System*. The object of the writer is to examine the conclusions already arrived at by Qanungo and Moreland in the light of evidences supplied by the original works. He takes up three main questions: "(1) the mode of assessment, (2) the form of payment, (3) the proportion or amount of the state share," and studies them "in respect of the two periods of Sher Shah's administration, viz., the period of his governorship of his father's jagir, and second, the period of his kingship."

Mathuralal Sharma.— *Magical Beliefs and Superstitions in Buddhism*. The writer has collected the beliefs and superstitions referred to in the early Buddhist literature as well as in the works of later Buddhism,


A. Padmanabhaya.— *Ancient Bhrgus*. In continuation of the article amplifying the theme that the Drāviḍas, Asūras and Bhrgus are identical, an account of the chief Bhrgu leaders mentioned in literature has been given here as also of their original home and their relation with the outside world.

N. Aiyaswami Sastri.— *References to Ancient Stories in the Rāmāyaṇa*.

T. N. Ramachandra.— *Madras Museum Plates of Bhaktirāja*. These dated plates of the 14th century record the grant of a village called
Kaṇḍvakolnu to Viśvanātha, a Śaiva teacher at Śrī Parvata by Bhaktirāja Coḍa who was also known by the name Kāmarāja belonging to the Sūryavamsa. The importance of the inscription lies in the fact that it gives the genealogy of an unknown line of local chiefs, who call themselves Coḍas of the solar race.

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.

G. Tucci.—Notes on the Nyāyapraveśa by Śaṅkarasvāmin. Prof. Tucci has studied the commentary of Kūei-chi on the Nyāyapraveśa recently published in the Gækwad's Oriental Series. Kūei-chi was a disciple of Yuan Chwang and had a wide knowledge of the Indian philosophy. Prof. Tucci presents in this article only those discussions which seemed to him to have elucidated the problems tackled in the Nyāyapraveśa in greater details.

S. K. De.—A Note on Pañcabūla in connection with Pañcarātra.
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Āpastamba-Śulbasūtra with the commentaries of Karpadisvāmin, Karavinda and Sundararāja edited by D. Srinivasachar and V. S. Narasimhachar. Mysore 1931.
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Mughal Bibliography

We have been requested by the well-known firm of Messrs D. B. Taraporevala Sons & Co., to announce that an annotated bibliography of books and manuscripts relating to the Mughals in India on Art, Science, Biography, History, Geography, Travels, Literature, Philosophy, Religion, Economics, Sport, etc., etc., is now being prepared and will be published by the above-named firm early next year. Every effort is being made to make the bibliography as complete as possible. Authors desirous of having their works included in the Bibliography are requested to send particulars of their books or articles to the Editor of the “Indian Literary Review,” 190, Hornby Road, Bombay, as early as possible. The full title, author’s name, number of pages and illustrations, year and place of publication should be clearly mentioned. If possible, a very short summary of the contents also should be given. If any person or Institution happens to have any unique manuscript, full particulars of the same should be given.
Finger-posts of Bengal History*

In Bengal, many historical land-marks have been completely effaced; the identity of famous cities like Pauṇḍravardhana or Karṇa-suvarga is now a matter of conjecture, and contradictory opinions prevail about the conquest of Nadia where, according to Minhaj (1260 A.D.), the king of Bengal was residing when Ikhtiar-ud-din took it about 1200 A.D. The existence of the Hindu king Gaṇeṣa, who for a short time ousted the Pathans from the throne of Gaur, is also a matter of conjecture. In fact, till Akbar came, and with the Mongolian instinct (evidence of which we see in the chronicles of the Chinese and the Ahoms) had the Ain-i-Akbari (1558 A.D.) compiled, we possess no contemporary chronicles of Bengal. We have indeed the Rāmacarita, a 12th century work brought from Nepal by MM. Haraprasād Śāstri and the comparatively modern Kulapāṭhīs of several sections of the Brāhmaṇas and the Kāyasthas, but the former is a duvarta-kāvyā, for nearly two thirds of which again, no authoritative key is available, while the latter are of a more recent date and are in conflict with certain known facts of history.

Another factor, from which the other parts of India are comparatively free, has confused the history of Bengal. Four rivers of entirely different

*Read at the Literary Conference of the Varendra Research Society, March 1931.
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characters have been at work in its bosom for ages, viz., the snow fed Ganges from the north-west, the hill torrents of the Dāmodar and the Rūnārāyaṇa bringing down heavy loads of sand in the monsoons from the hills of the west, the mighty Brahmaputra with its tributary, the Surma on the east, and the smaller and clear streams of North-Bengal, such as the Karatoya, which is represented now by the Ātreya and is realistically described in the verse sarvā raktavahā nadyah Karatoya-ndūvādhi (V. R. S. Monographs No. 2, p. 27, v. 41). The working of this hydrographical factor may be detected, even in the present days of unification, in the speech and culture of the four divisions of Bengal, viz., Varendra, Rāḍha, Vaṅga and Bagri (Pravāśī, Bhādra, 1335, p. 692; Bhāratavārṣa, 1338, p. 236), the divisions of the Bengalee Brahmaṇas into the four sections, Varendra, Rāḍha, Pāścātya-Vaidika and Dākṣiṇātīya-Vaidika and of the Bengalee Kāyasthas into the four sections, Varendra, Uttara-Rāḍha, Dākṣiṇa-Rāḍha and Vaṅga and possibly in the predominance of the Muslim population in Varendra and Vaṅga. These rivers again have changed their spheres of action from time to time effacing old landmarks, so that it is hard to trace even comparatively recent changes, e.g., the birth of the Padmā (J.A.S.B., 1924, Art. 8 and Adams Williams, Gangetic Delta, p. 1), not to speak of older landmarks, e.g., the confluence of the Karatoya and the Ganges, where Rāmapāla founded Rāmāvati (Rāmacarita, III, 10 and 31). The present hydrographical condition of Bengal has given rise to much discussions among scholars from Sir Arthur Cotton’s time to that of Sir William William Willcocks.

Thus several factors have obscured our ancient history. Bankim Chandra referred in his works to many historical incidents (of the Mughal and early British periods and of North, West and South Bengal, which he personally knew) and at places he paid glowing eulogies to ancient Hindu monuments, e.g., the Māṭyā images on the Lalitagiri hill (S. ārama, ch. 13) which are attracting the attention of archaeologists now, after forty years (Chakladar, Modern Review, August, 1928, p. 217, and Chanda, Arch. S. I. Memoir, No. 44). Since Bankim’s time much work has been put in in Bengal, by the publication of Bengali histories of many districts and several Kulapañjīs, and some parts of Mr. Nagendranath Basu’s comprehensive work on the ‘Castes and Sects of Bengal’, and by articles and discussions in the vernacular monthlies, few of which are issued now-a-days without one or more contributions of this class. Articles of a more scholarly
nature find place in the learned journals, while the two parts of Rakhaladas Banerji's Bāṅglār Itihāsa are a veritable mine of information on Bengal history down to the 16th century A.D.

But the real advance in our knowledge has been due to the discovery of numerous important inscriptions during the last 20 years or so, which has pushed back our documented history to the Gupta period (cf. Monahan, Early History of Bengal with the corresponding chapters of Banerji's Itihāsa). Our literary evidences are poor, while images and sculptures throw but an uncertain light even on art and religious movements, and the find of coins is insufficient, a few being of the Guptas and none of the Pālas or Senas. Of the Pathan Sultan, many coins have come down to us, but by themselves they do not yield history. So for 1200 years from 350 to 1550 A.D., corresponding roughly to the Middle Ages of Europe but divided in our history into the four periods, Gupta, Pāla, Sena and Pathan (i.e., Pre-Mughal Muslim), the inscriptions are the real finger-posts of history for Bengal.

Of the Gupta period some 30 inscriptions are now available, including those found in Magadha (Bihar) and Kāmarūpa (Assam) with which in this as in the next period, Bengal was linked up. The recent notable find is a plate of Samudragupta discovered at Nalanda in 1928. Some sixty inscriptions and manuscripts refer to the Pālas themselves and some twenty to their contemporaries, and they are being discovered even now; a recent addition is a copper-plate of Dharmapāla found at Nalanda in 1928. Again, one plate, the long lost Munger plate of Devapāla has been recovered in curious circumstances, 'hidden away between a beam and the roof of Kenwood house' (E.I., XVIII, p. 304). Of the Senas who wielded a shorter sway, and of their contemporaries a much smaller number is available, all of which have been brought together in the Inscriptions of Bengal, vol. III, except the one from Sāktipur, Mursidabad District recently deposited in, and published by, the Vaṅgiya Sāhitya Parishat (S. G. Patrikā, Saka 1837, p. 216).

Of the Pathan period, some 180 inscriptions have come to light, including one recently found near the Bhawanipur shrine (south of Bogra). For an authentic history of Bengal it is essential to have these 'finger-posts' presented in a connected and properly edited form. This task the Varendra Research Society began some years ago when they published in Bengali the principal Pāla inscriptions then known as Gaudālekha-mālā, vol. I, edited by the well-known scholar, the late Mr.
Akshay Kumar Maitra. The task has since vastly increased, and at the instance mainly of Mr. Nani Gopal Majumdar, sometime Curator of their Museum, the Society have decided to publish a work named the *Inscriptions of Bengal* in English, in four volumes for the four periods, of which Vol. III is the first issue. We are shortly expecting a corpus of the Assam inscriptions of the Gupta and Pāla periods entitled *Kāmarūpāśāsānavālī* from the pen of the erudite scholar MM. Padmanatha Vidyavinoda who has made a life-long study of them.

But even in their present state, these inscriptions point to several striking facts, one of which is that although some of them, such as the copper-plates, are portable, they are seldom found far removed from the localities to which they relate. Again, copper-plate grants and deeds are peculiar to Hindu India. They are all of oblong shape, but their size and seals vary. The only plate of any Gupta emperor published so far is the Gaya plate of Samudragupta, which, however, was issued by an *akṣapatalādikṛta* and is said to be spurious (Fieet, p. 254), though the Nalanda plate of the same Emperor may possibly upset this opinion. Its seal bears the figure of Garuḍa. The other plates of the period are mostly deeds of land-transfer issued by governors (*uparika* or *sāmanta*) except the Nidhanpur grant of king Bhāskaravarman. Their sizes vary from about 7" × 5" to 10" × 7". Only one seal of a Gupta *uparika* is legible. It bears the figure of a trident and the name of the bhukti. Of the plates of the *uparikas* of other kings, several bear the ‘Gaja-Lakṣmi’ seal and a few the ‘Couchant bull’ seal. The grants of the Pāla kings measure 16" × 11" or more, and all bear the ‘dharma-cakra’ seal with the king’s name. Of the contemporaries, Śrīcandra’s plates measure 9" × 8" and have the ‘dharma-cakra’ seal, Kāntideva’s plate measures 7" × 7" and its seal bears the figure of a lion *en face* below a trifoil arch, and Bhojarvarman’s one measures 10" × 10" and has a ‘Viṣṇu-cakra’ seal. The plates of the Sena kings measure about 13" × 12" and bear the ‘Sādāśiva’ seal. Of their successors, the Adavadi plate of Daśaratha is 12" × 9" and its seal bears the figure of a ‘Caturbhuja Viṣṇu’ and the Chittagong plate of Dāmodara measures 7" × 7" and is surmounted by the figure of ‘Viṣṇu riding on Garuḍa’. Regarding Kāmarūpa, all the plates found from the time of Bhāskaravarman to that of Vaidyadeva are about 10" × 7" and their seals bear the same figure of an elephant *en face* inspite of all the changes of regime.
The Gupta Period c. 350-750 A.D.

About the year 1910, a copper-plate of 433 A.D., referring to Kumāragupta and the Khātā-pādā viśaya was found at Dhanaiocaha (7 miles north of Ishurdi Ry. Sta., and near Santail) where a Kāli image is said to have preserved the memory of the Sānyāls, who dominated this tract in the seventeenth century and whose line is continued in the present Puthia house. Connecting this with other Gupta inscriptions and literature then known, Prof. Rādhāgovinda Basāk made a sketch of the condition of Bengal in the Gupta age (Mānasī of Āśādh, 1322). Since then many more antiquities of that age have come to light, enabling us to develop that sketch. Thus five copper-plates (of dates between 444 and 544 A.D.) have been discovered at Damodarpur, a Jaina copper-plate of 479 A.D. and several stone images at Paharpur (see Modern Review, 1928, p. 502 and Arch. Survey Ind. Ann. Rep., 1925-26, p. 110), and several coins, bronze images and stone carvings in and around Mahāsthāna, which some writers identify with the ancient city of Paunārāvadhāna (V. R. S. Monograph No. 2). A sand-stone image of Buddha of the Sarnath type has been found at a place bearing the significant name of Bihārīl. All these places are in Varendra.

As for other parts of Bengal, the finds reported are: a hoard of 200 Gupta coins at Kālighāṭ in Warren Hastings' time and lesser hoards near Hughli, Tanda and Muhammadpur (Allan, Catalogue, p. xcvv); a copper-plate referring to a king Jayānāga in the Mallia Indigo estate (probably near Tanda); four similar plates of Samācārādeva and others in the Koṭālāpūra tract; a similar copper-plate of Lokanātha in the Tippera state, a plate of 508 A.D., of Vainyagupta at Gunaighar, near Chittagong (I. H. Q., 1930, p. 45); inscriptions referring to king Śaśānaka in Rhotas-garh and Ganjam; a bronze cāitya (Banerji, Itihāsa, pl. 8); two grants of the Khaḍga kings at Asrālpur; and imitations of Gupta coins in the ruins at Sabhar.

In Bihār, to the inscriptions published by Fleet, there have been some important additions, such as an inscribed image of Neminātha on the Vaibhāra hill of Rajagir, which is ascribed to the reign of Candragupta II (Annual Report A. S. I., 1925-26, p. 125), a copper-plate grant of Samudragupta discovered at Nalanda in 1928, the seals, found at the same place some years before, which are ascribed to certain Maukhari and Vaiś kings and king Bhāskaravarman of Kāmarūpa. (J. B. O. R. S., 1919, p. 302), and the Nālandā stone
inscription referring to Bālāditya and Yāsovarman (E. I., XX, p. 37; Modern Review, 191, p. 306).

As regards Assam, besides the above seal and reference to Bhāskaravarmā's father in the Aphsad Inscription (Fleet, p. 206) we have his Nidhanpur grant. It is significant that all the copper-plate grants discovered in the province dating from Bhāskaravarmā's to Vaiḍyadeva's time are invariably of the Gupta type, and the Gupta era was in use as late as 830 A.D., as seen in king Harjara's rock inscription at Tezpur (J. B. O. R. S., 1917, p. 508).

Some scholars are of opinion that it is really the Guptas who under the poetic disguise of the Raghus form the theme of Kālidāsa's Rāghuvamśa, and that Canto IV of the poem is a disguised version of the conquering tour of Samudragupta, a record of whose conquest is inscribed on the pillar now in Allahabad fort (but originally at Kauśāmbī, 30 miles westward on the Junna). With regard to the eastern powers of the age, this inscription describes Samudragupta as Samatēya-Davaka-Kāmarūpa-Nepūla-Karttīpurūdi-pratyanta-mpatibhiḥ..............prāṇāmāgamanama-paritoṣita-praṇaṇa-āsanaṇaṇa (Fleet, p. 8). It may be noted incidentally that Karttīpura is identified with present Kumaon (V. Smith, J. R. A., 1897, p. 881).

Raghu's progress through Bengal is thus described by Kālidāsa (Canto IV, verses 34 to 38).

There is little agreement between the two versions. It is significant of the hydrographical condition of the time that the poet—always very accurate in his geographical details—makes the conqueror reach first the seacoast and then cross Suhma and then Vāṅga. The Hadaha inscription of 553 A.D., of Isānavarma of the Maukhari dynasty which dominated the Madhyadeśa after the Guptas also calls the Gauḍas samudrāśrayas (Banerji, Itihāsa, I, p. 94). This is the earliest record which mentions Gauḍa. It is interesting to note that different degrees of martial spirit are attributed to the three peoples by Kālidāsa who describes the Suhmas and Utkalas as tamely submitting to Raghu, and the Vāṅgas putting up a tough fight. Regarding the omission of their names in Canto VI it may be said that before
the herald reached any of their chiefs her task was cut short by Indumatī accepting Aja, as was the case with the king of Kāmarūpa who is omitted in Canto VI but mentioned as Aja's best man in verse 17 of Canto VII.

From the fact that the plates found in west Varendra refer to Gupta emperors while those found elsewhere in Bengal refer to kings of other lines, it appears that the Gupta sway in Bengal was confined to west Varendra or what was afterwards known as the kingdom of Gauḍa, while the rest of Bengal and Kāmarūpa merely adopted the Gupta script and the Gupta system of administration but were not under their sway. From the fact that none of these inscriptions go beyond Kumāragupta's time we may conclude that Bengal was included in the Gupta empire when it reached its palmy days under that emperor, as the poet Vatsa-Bhaṭṭī puts it in the verse catuh-

samudrānta etc. (Fleet, p. 82).

We also find that even in the Gupta age Nalanda in Magadha and Paharpur in Varendra were important religious centres—the latter being a Jaina one. The importance of Nalanda even in that age can be judged from the fact that about 539 A.D., a mission came there from China and after several years' stay left with a collection of Buddhist manuscripts along with the learned scholar Paramārtha (Guide to Nalanda, p. 9). In Samudragupta's Nalanda plate, Skandagupta's inscribed pillar at Bihar town, the Apshad inscription of Ādityasena, (c. 672) and the Maukhari, Vais and Bhāskaravarma seals and the inscription referring to Bālāditya (c. 530) and Yaśovarman of Kanauj (728-740) found at Nalanda, we have an almost unbroken chain of evidence of the political importance of the Nalanda-Bihar tract throughout the Gupta period.

It is difficult to say exactly which faith was professed by the Guptas or where was the capital of their vast empire. From Gauḍa standard and Lakṣmī figures on their coins some scholars infer that they were Vaishnavas,—a view confirmed by the Gauḍa seal of the Gayā plate. Their capital is said by some to have been Patna. But Kālidāsa refers to that city (or Puspapura—Raghu, VI, 24) as the capital of Parantapa, king of Magadha, and places the capital of the Raghūs i.e., the Guptas at Sāketa or Ayodhyā (Raghu, XIII, 61 and 99). According to Riys Davids the two places were close to each other (Buddhist India, p. 39). The latter name is confirmed by the Gayā plate (though V. Smith questions it, J. R. A. S., 1897, p. 24). Some scholars think that Bhitri, near Ghazipur, was the capital of the Guptas as several inscribed pillars and other relics of their sway have been found in its
vicinity, and probably it was there that the Sarayu joined the Ganges in those days (Raghu, VIII. 95). We look to the Nalanda plate of Samudragupta to throw decisive light on the above two points as also on the antiquity of Nalanda and the authenticity of the Gayā plate.

The art of bronze-casting and stone sculpture were carried to excellence in the Gupta age, as is proved by the few samples that have survived in Bengal. The gilt bronze Bodhisattva in the V. R. S. Museum is remarkable not only as a work of art but also for the skill in bronze-casting which it exhibits (Modern Review, 1926, p. 426). The engraver of the Aphsad inscription was a Gauḍa artizan (Fleet, p. 201).

**Transition from Gupta to Pāla Period**

It is not known which power rose in Gauḍa when the Gupta power fell before the Huns about the middle of the 6th century, A.D. The Mallia plates suggest the name of a king Jaya-nāga at Karkasuvarṇa, as will be discussed later. Early in the seventh century, however, the kingdom of Gauḍa with its capital at Karkasuvarṇa was under the sway of Śaṅkha. His name occurs in a seal matrix, in several coins and in the Ganjam grant of his Śimanta Mādhava-Varman (one piece of whose Puri plate is in the V. R. S. Museum, Sāhitya, 1319, p. 889) as well as in Bāṇa’s Hari-carita, and Huien Tsang’s Records. He probably succeeded king Jaya-nāga at Karkasuvarṇa. According to Mr. Allan, he reigned from c. 600 to 625 A.D. (Catalogue, p. lxiv). No virūdha of his is known but his coins as well as the seal on his Śimanta’s copper-plate bear the figure of a bull, though an image of Laks̄ṇi figures on the reverse of the coins. He is said to have been a Śaiva and a persecutor of Buddhism. He was a powerful ruler exercising his sway as far as Rhotasgarh in the west and Ganjam in the south, and though his attempt on Kanauj failed, he held his own against Harṣa-vardhana, whose sway never reached Bengal. Kanauj, it may be noted, was made a capital by the Maukharis in the 6th century, and thereafter for 600 years, until the Muslim conquest, with various names (Kuṣasthilī, Mahodaya, Gāḍhipura), and under various dynasties (Harṣa, Yaśovarman, the Ayudha, Gurjara and Gahaḍavala kings) it was the principal province of the Madhyadeśa (Pravāṣī, 1336, Bhādra p. 705).

After Śaṅkha’s death his kingdom probably passed to Bhāskara-varma of Kāmarūpa, as the latter’s Nidhanpur grant was
issued from Karṇasuvanḍā, and he appears, from H. Tsang’s account to have controlled the sea-route from Bengal (Beal’s Hiuen Tsang, p. 188), while the discovery of his seal at Nalanda and the reference to his father in the Aphiṣaṇ inscription prove that there was a close contact between Magadha and Kāmarūpa in those days. It is to be noted also that, the inscriptions so ably edited now in the Kāmarūpa-bāsanaṇavālī show that it was the Kāmarūpa kings,—both before and after Bhāskara, e.g., Bhūtivarma (5th century A.D.) and Vanamāla (9th century A.D.),—who held the Bengal Durā between the Tista and the Karatoya, calling it the Candrapuri viṣaya. At the time of Hiuen Tsang’s visit (643 A.D., Eastern Varendra or Puṇḍravardhāna formed a separate principality, but it is not known under which ruler.

On Bhāskaravarma’s death about 630 A.D. (Gait, Assam, p. 363), or on the overthow of some successor of his by Yaśovarman of Kanauj (c. 740 A.D.), as commemorated in the poem of Gauḍa-vahō, anarchy ensued in Gauḍ. His name occurs in an inscription found at Nalanda, and Yaśovarmapura close to it (Gauḍalekhamālā, p. 52) was very likely named after him. It was probably at this time that Śrī-harṣa of Kāmarūpa overran Gauḍ-Odṛādi-Kaliṅga-Kośala as recorded in the inscription (A.D. 748) of his son-in-law, king Jayadeva, at Paśupati-nāth (Nepal) (Ind. Ant., IX, p. 178).

During the transition period as in the early Gupta age, other parts of Bengal pursued different courses of history. Of the early period we have the doubtful Sisunia hill inscription near Bankura town and the Travels of Fa Hien (405-411 A.D.) who mentions Tamulk as the capital of Suhma. Hiuen Tsang (630-645 A.D.) mentions also Sāmataṭa and four principalities to the east of it, which are identified with Sylhet, Comilla, Tippera and Manipur by Mm. Padmanath Vidyavind (I.H.Q., 1928, p. 169). In the 6th and 7th centuries there were at least three principalities in Southern Bengal which though so far apart as Tanda, Koṭālipāḍa and Tippera, yet had, as evidenced in the use of their Sāmantās, the same type of seal consisting of an image of Lakṣmī with an elephant on either side pouring water on her. It may be noted that this figure occurs in ancient Buddhist architecture, e.g., on a gate at Sānci (Buddhist India, p. 279), a Barhut pillar and a Bodh-Gaya railing.

One copper-plate with this seal, found about the year 1854 in the indigo estate of Mallia and deposited in the Museum of Perth, has recently been published (E.I., XVIII, p. 60). It refers to king Jayanāga of Karṇa-suvarṇa, a Bhāgavata and records the grant of a village in the Audum-
barika viṣaya by his sāmantā Nārāyaṇa-bhadra. Mr. Banerji identified this viṣaya with sarkar Audambar or Tanda of later days (E.I., XIX, p. 285). The term gaṅgīnīka occurs in this as in two other grants viz, the Nilhanpur grant which was issued from Karṇasuvanḍa and the Khalimpur grant which was found near Tanda. Another term yānaka, meaning a channel, also occurs in the Mallia and Khalimpur grants. From these and the find of Gupta coins at Tanda, it appears that the kingdom of Karṇasuvanḍa or Gauḍ, as it was also called, centred round Tanda, and it is in that locality that we should look for the lost site of its capital. Kansat near Gauḍ suggests a clue. To this king Jayanāga Mr. Allan attributes certain coins which he left unattributed on p. 150-51 of his Catalogue, and which bear the word Jaya on obverse and prakāśa yāsah on reverse. One is tempted to go further and suggest that the same king is referred to by Jaya on the obverse of Śaśānka's coins (Allan, Catalogue, p. 147-48) and that it was under him that Śaśānka was a mahāsāmanta, as referred to in the Rhotas-ganś seal matrix (Fleet, p. 284), before he became king himself as recorded in the Ganjam plate of 620 A.D. of Mādhavavarma (E.I., VI, p. 144).

In the Koṭālipāḍā tract four inscriptions with the Gaja-Lakṣmi seal have been found, two of which refer to king Dharmāditya and uparikas Sthānulatta and Nāgadeva, one to king Gopacandra and uparika Nāgadeva and the fourth one to king Śamacārādeva and uparika Jiva-datta (I.A., 1910, p. 193; J. A. S. B., 1911, p. 475 and E.I., XVIII, p. 47). The order of succession of these kings is uncertain, but Mr. Bhaṭṭasālī attributes to the last named king two coins (Allan, Catalogue, p. 149-150) which bear the words samacha on obverse and Narendrabāṇī on reverse (E.I., XVIII, p. 80). One of these coins was found with a coin of Śaśānka at Muhammadpur, 30 miles west of Koṭālipāḍā and is pronounced to be of an earlier date, probably end of the 6th century A.D. All the four grants were issued by Uparikas of Varaka maṇḍala of which Nāvyavakṣasikā was the capital and they give no indication of either the capital or the faith of the kings over them. One of the coins, however, bears a 'bull' standard on its obverse and both of them, the figure of Lakṣmi on their reverse. Varaka maṇḍala may be identified with the present Koṭālipāḍā tract, where many Gupta coins as well as a Sena copper-plate have been found.

In the Tippera tract only one plate with the Gaja-Lakṣmi seal has been discovered, viz., that of year 44 of Lokanātha found in the Tippera State (E. I., XV, p. 301). The seal, however, is 4” in diameter,
while that of each of the other plates is 3", and in its middle the word Lohanâthasya is stamped in characters; of probably the 7th century, while the original legend Kumâramâtyâdhyakaraṇasya is of the early Gupta age. No overlord is referred to, nor has any coin been found which can be connected with this grant. There is mention, however, of a suzerain Jîvadhâraṇâ who apparently relinquished his authority over Lohanâtha and there is also mention of the latter's fight with one Jayatunga varâ. The grant begins with an invocation to Śiva and records the genealogy of Lohanâtha for six generations down to his son Lâlamânâtha, and a grant of land in the 'forest region' of Suvvunâga viṣaya to the mahâsîmanta Pradeśâ Śrîman for a temple of Ananta-Nârâyâna. Incidentally it indicates the setting of over 100 families of Brahmânas in this forest region and speaks of their mixed marriages.

In (British) Tippera a plate with a different seal and of an earlier date has been found at Gunaighar, about 18 miles N. W. of Comilla town. It is a grant of Vâînya-gupta of 188 G. E. or 507 A. D. (I. H. Q., 1930, p. 45). The seal is oval, 4" x 5" containing the figure of a couchant bull (an emblem also of the Maitrakas of Valabhi, Fleet, p. 164) with the king's name below it. The grant was issued from Kripura and conveyed land to a vihâra of Mahâyâna Buddhists. Prof. Dines Chandra Bhattacharya who has published the grant traces it several non-Sanskrit words which are in use in modern Bengali.

Two plates of the same size and with 'bull' seal but of a later date and different dynasty, the Khadgas, were found along with a small bronze caitya (Banerji, Itihâs, I, pl. 8) at Ashrafpur, in the N. E. corner of the Dacca Dist. (A. S. B. Memoirs, Vol. I, pl. 85). Both of them record the grant of land for a Buddhist vihâra, and were issued from Karmanta. They tell us of four generations of the line, viz., Khâdgo-dyama, Jata-Khadga, Deva-Khadga (whose queen Prabhâvatî's name was read on an inscribed image which has again disappeared) and Râja-râja. Mr. Bhattachariya identifies Karmanta with Kanta (12 miles W. of Comilla town and some 50 miles S. of Asrafpur) and the last named king with King Râjabhâti of Samataṭa mentioned by I-sting (673–687 A. D.) (J. A. S. B., 1914, p. 86) and connects Śrîla-bhadra, the Abbot of Nâlânda, the teacher of Huen Tsang (640 A. D.), with this dynasty.

About the same time probably another dynasty ruled at Sabhar N. W. of Dacca town. Of it, however, the only evidence are the ruins
there from which several 'imitation' Gupta coins (one of which is now in the V. R. S. Museum) have been discovered (Modern Review, January, 1929, p. 42). Some scholars hold that the renowned abbot Padmasambhava, who went from Nalanda to Tibet in 747 A. D. and initiated Lamaism there (Guide to Nalanda, p. 7), and his relative Šánta-raksīta, author of the Tattvasaṃgraha, were connected with Sabhar (Proceedings, Oriental Conference, 1924, p. 132).

From this time until about the end of the Pāla period, about 1000 A. D., the history of South and East Bengal is almost a blank.

Pāla Period c. 750–1050

It was to end the anarchy that had ensued in Bengal about the end of the seventh century that Gopāla was made king. After him, however, the succession to the throne was hereditary, as was also that to the office of minister for the first four generations.

The history of the Pālas falls into two halves, which differ not only in time but in their character and location. The first half which ended with king Nārāyana Pāla was a glorious one when the Pāla power was in the ascendant. During this period their sway was over Eastern Magadha to which practically all their inscriptions of the time relate, except notably the Khalimpur grant of year 32 of Dharmapāla’s reign, granting land in the Mahantaprakāśa vihara (probably present Manda) in Vaghratati mandala of Pauṇḍravardhana bhūtī, and the Śrī Somapura Śrī Dharmapāla leva mahāvihārīya seals at Paharpur. Somapura vihāra, it may be noted, is mentioned in an inscription on a Buddha image at Bodh-Gaya and by Tārāṇātha as well as in the Pag-sam-jon-sang, where it is said that king Devapāla founded it after conquering Varendra (Majumdar, Sāhitya Parishat Patrika, XXIII, p. 69 and p. 72). The Pāla headquarters of the period were in Magadha, first at Patna, from which the Khalimpur grant was issued and later at Munger, from which Devapāla and Nārāyaṇa Pāla issued their grants, and which was invaded by the Gurjara chief Kakka (Banerji, Itihās, I, p. 223). The second plate of Dharmapāla found at Nalanda will, it is hoped, further elucidate this point.

During this half, in king Devapāla’s reign, Nalanda reached its palmy days as a Buddhist centre, drawing votaries from far and near. King Balaputtra of Sumatra erected there a vihāra for his subjects (V. R. S. Monographs, No. 1, p. 31) in the ruins of which Devapāla’s plate and a number of bronze images have been found (A. S., I,
Annual Report, 1926-27, p. 133). Viradeva repaired here from Nagarhar (modern Jalalabad) and became, the abbot erecting shrines at Ghoswara (ancient Yasovarmanpur) near by. The attraction of Nārāyaṇapāla’s time, as we find from the inscription of Dharmanitra of Andhradesa, and even later.

The Pālas came into conflict with their neighbours at the very outset of their sway. Their first opponents were the Rāṣṭrakūṭas who contested their westward expansion. It was the Gurjjaras, however, who pressed the Pālas home and eventually their king Mahendra pāla (892-908 A.D., J.R.A.S., 1909, p. 265), whose inscriptions have been found in the Gaya-Hazaribagh tract, dispossessed the Pālas of Magadh and penetrated into Varendra, as indicated by a stone pillar inscription of year 5 of his reign turned up in the Pāhārpur mound by the ‘magic’ spade of late Rakhalidas Banerji (London News, 29th January, 1927, p. 160). This reversion to Pāla sway occurred probably at the end of Nārāyaṇapāla’s reign. The old line of ministers, who claimed to have been the power behind the Pāla throne, in the Badal inscription, probably died at this time with Gurava Miśra. According to the inscription on the Lakṣmanā temple at Śrīpur (Raipur Dt. C. P) ascribed to the 9th century A.D., there ruled in Magadh at that time a Varman dynasty to which belonged Sūrya-Varma whose daughter Vasata married the Śrīpur king and built the temple (E. I., IV, p. 196).

Then commenced the second half of the Pāla history, which witnessed a decline of their power and its final extinction and during which their dominions shrank to west Varendra or Gauḍ, to which all their three grants of the period relate. Their head-quarters too must have been in this tract and we can clearly see the precarious condition of their rule in the frequent change and obscurity of the head-quarters. Mahipāla’s Bangarh grant was issued from Vilāsapura : Vigrahamāla III’s Amgachi grant from Haradhama (E. I., XV, p. 295) while Rāmapāla overthrowing the Kaivarttas founded a new capital at Ramāvatt, from which Mādanapāla issued his Manahali grant. Between Nārāyaṇapāla and Mahipāla, an interval, according to Prof. Dines Chandra Bhattacharyya, of 90 years (I. H. Q., 1930, p. 167), no Pāla inscription has come to light. The Pāla power was evidently in an eclipse under the Gurjjaras. It reappeared with Mahipāla who, according to his own and his successors’ grants, recovered the anadhibhāṭa-vilupta rāja of his fathers (i. 13 of Bangarh, i. 15 of Amgachi and i. 14 of Manahali grant)—probably, only Gauḍ or west Varendra. It is
significant that in his Sarnath inscription of 1025 A.D., Mahāpāla is
called 'Gauḍādhapa' the only instance of a Pāla king being definitely so
called, and that it is in west Varendra that his memory is still
cherished in such sayings as dhān bhānte Mahāpāler gat, though inscrip-
tions referring to him have been found at Sarnath, Nalanda,
Bodh-Gaya and even at Baghaura (in Tippera Dtr.), the last (E.I., XVII,
p. 355) being the only Pāla inscription found in Bengal outside Gauḍ.

Even of the whole of Gauḍ, the Pālas did not have undisturbed
possession, for an inscribed pillar—the date of which is uncertain—
records the erection of a temple to Śiva at Bangarh by a king of the
Kamboja race, who claims to be 'Gauḍāpati'. But what gave the death
blow to the Pāla power was a rising of the Kaivarttas, which
drove Vīgrahapāla III from the throne. Certain drammas
are ascribed to Vīgrahapāla (V. Smith, Catalogue of Indian
Museum coins, I, pp. 223, 239) with but little probability.
After a generation of Kaivartta rule, the Pāla sway was
revived by Rāmapāla and even extended to Kāmarūpa under his
son Kumārapāla, as we learn from the Kamauli plates of Vaidyadeva.
This grant indicates that the power of the Kāmarūpa kings, who, as not-
ed before, held the Bengal Duar in the later Gupta age, had disappeared.
In this grant we find the first mention of a Bengalee Brāhmaṇa in the
role of a king and the earliest mention of Varendra. Of Kumārapāla's
son and successor, Gopāla III, little is known beyond a mere mention
in l. 24 of the Manahali grant and probably also in a cryptic stone
inscription discovered at Nimdighi, 12 miles N. W. of Manda (Sāhitya
Parīṣāt Patrikā, 1319, p. 155). With his successor Madanapāla the
line came to an end, Laksmanasena probably succeeding to the
thrones of Gauḍ, as will be seen later.

A contemporary history of the last phase of Pāla rule (Rāmapāla to
Madanapāla) is contained in the cryptic poem of Rāmarṣita and
an effort is being made by the Varendra Research Society to publish a
fully annotated edition of it, but in the absence of any authoritative key
to nearly two-thirds of the poem, it is defying the attempts of scholars
to unlock its meaning fully.

In this second period a monastery grew up at Vikramāśilā, the
site of which is identified with present Patharhghata, 24 miles east of
Bhagalpur and 6 miles north of Colgong. It is from this monastery
that Dipaṅkara is said to have carried the torch of Indian culture
to Tibet.

At this time the monastery at Nalanda appears to have declin-
ed and it is doubtful if the Pālas had any temporal authority over this tract though inscriptions referring to Mahipāla, Rāmapāla and even Madanapāla have been found there. Some scholars hold that a branch of the family continued to rule at Udantapur (subsequently named Bihar by the Pathans) until about 1200 A.D., when it was wiped off by Ikhšiari-ud-dīn.

Gaya, unlike Nalanda, was never a popular Buddhist centre, at any rate after the 7th century A.D., for the Buddhist inscriptions even at Bodh-Gaya are of earlier dates (I.H.Q., 1930, p. 26). Even in Dharmapāla’s reign a caturmukha Mahādeva with a Trimurti slab was set up there and the Vandadeva inscription of year 7 of Nārāyaṇapāla’s reign, near the Viṣṇupāda temple at Gaya records the erection of a monastery for Brāhmaṇical ascetics (Banerji, Pālas, p. 60) and later—probably as a result of the Gurjjara occupation—Gaya became a Vedic or Viṣṇuva centre—to which eloquent testimony is borne by Viśvāditya’s Viṣṇupāda temple and Kṛṣṇadvārikā temple inscriptions of year 15 of Mahipāla’s son, Nayapāla’s reign (Banerji, Itihās, i, p. 262).

All the grants of the Pāla kings bear the dharma-cakra seal and begin with an invocation to Buddha, and all of them record the samkalpa in Buddha’s name with the single exception of Nārāyaṇapāla, who in his Bhagalpur plate records it in Śiva’s name. He is credited with having erected and endowed several temples to Śiva and was probably a Śaiva, while all other Pāla kings—before and after him—were Buddhistṣ. But they evidently tolerated other faiths, for, besides the inscriptions at Gaya noted before we find Dharmapāla in his Khalimpur plate granting land for a Nara-Nārāyaṇa temple and among the inscribed bronzes of Devapāla’s reign found at Nalanda is an image of Balarāma (Annual Report A.S.I., 1927-28, p. 132fn.) while the family of their minister, Gurava Miśra, appears from the Balal inscription to have been ardent Viṣṇuvas.

The Pāla kings were married into several Cedi and Raśtrakūṭa families. Dharmapāla married Ranna-devi, daughter of the Raśtrakūṭa chief Paravāla, Vigrahapāla I married a Haihaya or Cedi princess Lajjādevi, Rāyapāla married Bhāgyadevi, daughter of the Raśtrakūṭa chief Tuṅga. Vigrahapāla III had two queens. One was the sister of Mahana, a Raśtrakūṭa chief of Aṅga, whose daughter’s daughter, Kumāradevi was married to the Gāhaḍavāla king Govindacandra as recorded in her Sarnath Buddha image inscription (D.I., IX, p. 324). The other was Yauvanaširi, daughter of the Cedi king Karna, whose other daughter Virašī was married to Jātavarma, who hailed from
Surṣṭra. The Gāhādavālas and the Varmans were Vaiṣṇavas. So these matrimonial unions indicate that a strange mingling of races and creeds prevailed at that time. It is to be noted that these unions were restricted to races indigenous to India and were not extended to the Gurjjara outlanders or the Colas of the south, though they too came in contact with the Pālas. It appears that many Rāṣṭrakūṭa families were settled in Kānauj (J.A.S.B., 1925 p. 106). Aṅga, Nepal (Inscriptions of Bengal, III, p. 44) and other places in north India and it was in some of these families and not those in the Deccan that the Pālas married.

Another evidence of the great impression that the Pālas made on their age is furnished by the fact that their family name was borrowed by other royal families, e.g., the Gurjjara king Mahendrapāla and his successors, the dynasty of Brahmapāla in Kāmarūpa and that of Jayapāla in the Punjab.

Under the Pālas, image making in Bengal as well as in Magadha assumed a new character, which it retained in the Sena period. Some examples of Bengal sculpture of this age are illustrated in the Calcutta Sāhitya Parisat Handbook, Mr. French's Pāla Art, Mr. Bhattasali's Iconography and Dr. Kramrisch's article in the Rūpam of October, 1929. The study of the technical side of the art is yet an untrodden field. Magadha artizens had probably a hand in the erection of the Lakṣmaṇa temple at Śrīpur (E.I., X1, p. 188) and one is clearly mentioned as the engraver of the Silimpur inscription (E.I., XIII, p. 295). The neighbourhood of Gaya, probably present Patharkati, was an image-making centre in this age, as Mathurā had been in the Gupta age. The art of bronze casting also thrived in Magadha as proved by the hoards discovered at Nalanda (Arch. Survey Report, 1928 p. 132) and recently at Kurkihar, where some 160 bronze images of great variety and sizes, varying from 2 in. to 4 ft, in height have come to light. It flourished also on the environs of Pāla sway as indicated by a hoard consisting of a miniature temple of Nāgara type studded with gems, and 63 images of Buddha varying in height from 2" to 15" ascribed to the period, from 7th to 10th century A.D. found at Tewri village, near Chittagong town, and the beautiful Jaina bronzes recently brought to the Patna Museum from Chausa.

Transition from Pāla to Sena Period

When the Pāla power was hastening to its end in Gauḍ, the western
part of Magadha was under the sway of the Gāhaḍavālas who had succeeded the Gurjjaras on the throne of Kanauj. This is indicated by Govindacandra’s Maner grant of 1124 A.D., and Lar grant of 1144 A.D. (J.A.S.B., 1929, p. 81 and E.I., VII, p. 98) and Jayacandra’s Bodh-Gaya inscriptions of about 1190 A.D. (I.H.Q., 1929, p. 18). Aiga or Eastern Magadha north of the Nalanda tract was held by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa family of Mahana, which was the chief support of Rāmapāla and Madanapāla (I.H.Q., 1929, p. 46) and the Yādava family of Jātavarman, which migrated afterwards to East Bengal.

In Bengal, Pāla sway being confined to Gauḍ, the rest of the country must have pursued different courses of history, of which, however, the records relating to this period are meagre and uncertain. The Silimpur inscription of Prahasa (E.I., XIII, p. 290) mentions a king 'ayapāla of Kāmarūpa, which indicates that the Bengal Duar came under Kāmarūpa sway. In Pauḍravardhana, a Nandi family appears to have risen to power as recorded in the fragmentary Mahāsthānangarh inscription (J.A.S.B., 1922, p. 439).

Rāḍh or south west Bengal appears to have been invaded successively by the Candels, Colas and Cedis. In his Khajuraho inscriptions of 954 A.D., a Candel king named Yaśovarma claims to have defeated the king of Gauḍ (Banerji, Itihās, I, p. 231). It is interesting to note that certain Brahmin families near Kandi in Uttara Rāḍh, of which the late Ramendrasundar Trivedi was a prominent member, claim to have migrated from the Khajuraho tract, and that Kṛṣṇa Miṣra who composed the play of Prabodhacandrodāya to celebrate the victory of the Candel king Kritivarma (c. 1098 A.D.) over the Cedi king Karna (Ibid, p. 260) belonged to Rāḍh—probably Uttara-Rāḍh as in Act 2 of the play he flings many cutting remarks against Dakṣiṇa-Rāḍhī Brāhmaṇa whom he personifies as Ahamkāra and Dambha. The passage Gauḍam rāṣṭram anuttamam nirūpaṁ tatrāpi Rādhapurī Bhūrīśreṣṭhike nāma dhama indicates that at that time Rāḍh was included in the kingdom of Gauḍ. Bhūrīśreṣṭhika is present Bhursut, south of Tarakesvar and the birth place of the poet Bharatcandra (18th century). There Śridhara composed his Nyāyakandali commentary on Vaiśeṣika Philosophy in 991 A.D. (Benares 1897, ed. p. 13).

Bhursut was evidently the centre of a flourishing settlement of Brāhmaṇas and Kāyasthas who probably migrated from the Madhya-deśa and settled in the valley of the Sarasvatt (which river as well as Triveni are named after their North Indian prototypes). Nyāya
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philosophy was cultivated here (culminating much later in the foundation of the school of Navya-nyāya at Navadvip). Bhaṭṭa-Nārāyaṇa, author of the Vaiśeṣika probably belonged to this tract. From this age probably dates the hydrographical change by which Tamluk ceased to be a port and Triveni or Sapta-grām took its place, and drew to it the influential Suvarṇa-vanik community. The Gupta coins found there (Allan, CXXVIII) as well as the Buddhist and Jaina relics, scenes from the Rāmāyana and Mahābhārata and other Hindu relics which occur in the Mūs-lim structures there (J. A. S. I., 1909, p. 245) testify to the antiquity of the locality. Similar remains occur at Pandua (Bengal Past and Present, Oct. 1908, p. 431).

It is significant that in the Prabodhacandrodaya as well as in the Maner and certain other grants of the Gāhāḍavālās the word Turugka occurs. After the Candels came the Cola king Rājendra who, according to his Terumalai inscription of 1023 A.D., overran Uttara and Dākšiṇa Rāḍhī (Banerji, Iṣṭhās, I, p. 247) but there is no other evidence of this raid, unless we take it that the Senas came in his train. Then came the Cedi king Karna (c. 1042 A.D.,), as a pillar bearing his name is seen at Palkor in Uttara Rāḍhī (Ibid., p. 265) along with one of Vijayasena (Ins. of Bengal, III, p. 168). The daughters of this Cedi king married king Vigrahapāla III and the Aṅga chief Jātavarma.

About this time probably occurred a migration of people from West to East Bengal, and in the Belāva plate (Ins. of Bengal, III, p. 14) we find Jātavarma's grandson, Bhojavarma ruling at Vikramapura. He came there evidently after Śrī-candra (whose grants also are issued from Vikramapura, as will be seen later) and ruled over a smaller area in the east part of Dacca district. The plate tells us that the family which professed the Vaiṣṇava faith came originally from Simhapura, where one of its members led a Yādava army to victory. This points to Surāṣṭra as their original home, Simhapura being modern Siho. Such distant migrations appear to have been common in olden days e.g., Brāhmaṇas from Lāṭa (modern Gujrat) were settled in Varendra (Khailmpur grant) and according to Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar, Nāgara Brāhmaṇas migrated to Sylhet, the very name of which is derived by Prof. Kisorimohan Gupta from Śrī-Hātakeśvara, their patron deity (I. H. Q., 1930, p. 60).

Another record which is connected with the Belāva plate is an inscription in the Ananta-Vāsudeva temple at Bhuvanesvar in Oris-a
recording the erection of that temple and the excavation of a tank for it, by a remarkable man of the age, Bhaṭṭa Bhavadeva (Ins. of Bengal, III, p. 25). The tank must be the present Vindu-sāgar, for though situated in a Śiva-kṣetra and so close to the Liṅgarāja temple, the ministry here is vested in Brāhmaṇas of a different order, and the Saṃkalpa is made in Vāsudeva’s name. The Bhaṭṭa was vastly learned and composed several treatises, some of which are extant (unlike those of Prahasa and his ancestors referred to in the Silimpur inscription). He was a Vaiṣṇava and is described metaphorically as having ‘swallowed up the Buddhists.’

The inscription tells us of the existence of Savarṇa and Vandyagṛhaṇīya Brāhmaṇas in Rādhī where they are numerous even now. Read with the Belāva plate it indicates further their emigration from Madhayadeśa to Rādhī (which is dignified by inclusion in Āryavarta probably for this very reason) and thence to East Bengal. This affinity is still recognised by intermarriage among the Rāḍhī Brāhmaṇas of East and West Bengal. According to Mr. A. K. Ray, Siddhala of Uttara-Rāḍhī, the original settlement of the Savarṇas was near Gaṅgārām on the Ajai river, in Burdwan District (Laṅkkīnt, p. 12), and that it was a Savarṇa Caudhūrī who, with the patronage of the Bansbaria family, founded the Kālīghāṭ shrine, in Akbar’s time (ibid., p. 28)—which, if true, would indicate a change from his ancestral Vaiṣṇava faith to Śāktism.

The descent of the Bhaṭṭa is traced through six generations from Bhavadeva, a Savarṇa Brāhmaṇa of Siddhala, who received the village of Hastinībhīṭṭa from a Gaunda-nṛpa. Fourth in descent from him was Ādideva, who was the chief minister of a Vaṅga-rāja, and whose grandson was Bhaṭṭa Bhavadeva who was the minister of a king Hari-varma and his son. Unfortunately there is no indication as to where this Harivarman ruled. Two manuscripts merely dated in year 19 and 39 of his reign were found in Nepal and so are of little help on this point. But Mr. Nagendra Nath Basu has published a copper-plate which was found at Samantasār (near Idilpur) and appears to have been of the same type and seal as the Belāva plate and was issued by king Harivarman, son of king Jyotinvarna from Vikramapura (Ins. of Bengal, III, p. 28 and p. 168). We may take it that all these four records refer to the same king and that he ruled in East Bengal, after Bhola-varma, who was probably the Vaṅga-rāja, whom Bhaṭṭa Bhavadeva’s grand-father served as minister. The Gaunda-nṛpa belonged probably to an earlier generation (that is, before the migration from West Bengal
which tract, as we have seen in the Prabodha-candrodaya, was included in Gauḍa.

To this age also belongs two local chiefs of Buddhist persuasion who held sway in East Bengal. One was Kāntideva, of whom a draft grant with a 'lion' seal issued from Vardhamāna in Harikela, was found at Chittagong (Modern Review, 1922, November p. 612) and is now in the Dacca Museum. Prof. Dines Chandra Bhattacharyya who edited the plate has ascertained that it came from the ruins at Italla village, 2 miles N.E. of Comilla town. He has further drawn attention to the ruins on the Lalmai and Mainamati hills, 5 miles west of the town, in which another plate, that of Rāṇavaṅkamalla of 1219 A.D., has been found, and which he identifies as the centre of ancient Harikela.

The other was Śrī-candra, whose family had migrated from Rohita-giri to Candradvīp, in Harikela, and four of whose grants—all issued from Vikramapura have been found (Ins. of Bengal, III, p. 2). From these grants it is concluded that Śrī-candra ruled over the western part of the Dacca District, from Dhulla in the north to Idilpur (now in Faridpur District) in the south. It was Śrī-candra's grand-father who turned Buddhist (though we find Śrī-candra himself offering homa). It is to these Buddhist families and the Khādgas of Karmanta (and not the Pālas who never ruled this tract) that the spread of Buddhism in this part of Bengal was due.

In fact, in the Pāla period, as in the later Gupta, Samataṇa was a noted Buddhist centre, and it was to its ruling family that the great saint Dipākara, the abbot of the Vikramaśilā vihāra who conveyed the Buddhist faith to Tibet, and Viryendra-bhadra, who helped Kṣemendra in composing the Bodhisattvavādāna-kalpalatā belonged (S. P. Patrikā, XXIII, p. 73).

These Varman inscriptions and the Śrī-candra grants indicate that a close connection existed in this age between West and East Bengal and that Vikramapura became the political centre of the whole of Southern Bengal from Rāḍh to Vaṅga. This is probably how the way was made for the spread of Sena power and why Vikramapura figures as the capital in practically all the grants of the earlier Senas.

The Sena Period c. 1050-1200 A.D.

The founder of the dynasty was Vijayasena, whose grand-father is said to have come from Karnaṭaka, the identity of which is uncertain,
So also is the caste of the Sena kings, but following Rai Bahadur Kalicharan Sen (Bhāratavarṣa, Bhādara, 1337, p. 419) we may class them as Vaidyas, of which term 'Sena' is almost a synonym in Bengal. Vijayasena's queen Vilāsadevi belonged to a Śūra-family, which one is tempted to connect with Raṇa-śūra of Rājendra Cola's Tirumalai inscription (E.I., IX, p. 231) and with Ādiśura who, as tradition goes, imported the ancestors of the Rāḍhī Brāhmaṇas and Kāyasthas. Vallālasena married a Cālukya princess, Rāmadevi. The Sena kings were Śaivas. Their seal bore an image of Sadāśiva and as the Gupta emperors had viṇudas ending with āditya, they had viṇudas ending with saṅkara; thus Vijayasena was Vṛṣabha-Śaṅkara, Vallālasena was Nīlānga-Śaṅkara and so on. It is curious to note that some Vaidya families of Bengal affect this sort of name even at the present day.

No evidence has been found of Sena sway in the whole of South Bengal from Basirhat to Tippera and the history of the Senas like that of the Pālas falls into two distinct halves. The sway of the first three kings of the line, Vijayasena, Vallālasena and Laksmaṇasena was apparently confined to Western Bengal, as all their inscriptions except one (see specially Vijayasena's Paikor pillar inscription and the Barrackpur grant of year 62) relates to this tract and are mostly found in this neighbourhood of the Ganges along its present course from Murshidabad to Calcutta and then along the Ádīgāṅgā through the Sundarvan, where the explorations of Mr. Kalidas Dutt have revealed a vast number of antiquities of this age (V.R.S. Monographs, No. 3 & 4). A Canṭi image of year 3 of Laksmaṇasena's reign is the only relic of Sena sway of this period found in East Bengal, yet all the grants, except one, are issued from Vikramapura,—which naturally raises a doubt about its identity with the East Bengal city of that name.

Laksmaṇasena's inscriptions introduce us to a new bhukti, Vardhamāna which lay west of the Bhāgirathi, and extended from Salar in the north to Baruipur in the south. North of it probably was the Kanaka-grama bhukti of the Śaktipur grant (Sāhita Pariṣat Patrikā, 1337, p. 219). The Senas made little headway into Varendra, Deopāḍā (where stood Vijayasena's lofty temple) as well as Laksmaṇavati or Gauḍ (said to have been founded by Laksmaṇasena—though it occurs in no Sena inscription) is on the southern fringe of Varendra. The only grant found in the interior of it is the Tapandighi one. The Madhainagar grant which is probably the last grant of Laksmaṇasena refers to the Sena king as Gauḍēśwara for the first time and from the passages Gauḍēśvarama-Śrī-khaṭa-haraṇa-kāla yasya kaumāra-keli appended to him in
verse II of the grant and Gauḍendrām adrovat to his grand-father in verse 20 of the Deopāḍa inscription, it is clear that the title belonged till late in Lakṣmaṇasena's reign to kings of some other line, possibly the Pālas. It seems that when the Madhainagar grant was issued Lakṣmaṇasena had lost Lakṣmaṇavati to the Pathans and retreated eastwards to the Doab between the Karatoya and the Calan bīl (the Rāvaṇa lake of the grant). Besides this grant (and a Pathan inscription) stone images, ruined tanks and buildings of the age have been brought to light in clearing the jungle in this tract and it is significant that Dhāryagrām from which this grant was issued is without the epithet of jayaskandavara.

The sway of the last two Sena kings, Keśava and Višvarūpa was confined to East Bengal as all their grants are found in the Kotālipāḍa, Idilpur and Vikramapura areas, but strangely enough none of them were issued from Vikramapura. They were issued instead from Phalgugrām which is styled jayaskandavara. Both the kings bear the epithet Garga-Yavanaudaya-pralaya-kāla-rudra which probably means that they kept the Pathans out of Eastern Bengal—as we find that even in 1283 A.D., when the emperor Balban went there in pursuit of his fugitive governor Tughril Khan, he met a Hindu Rāja of Sonārgaon, Danuja Rai, who has been indentified with Daśarattha of the Adavadi inscription who claimed to have obtained the Gauḍa rāja (Ins. of Bengal, III, p. 182).

The ministers of the first three Sena kings, viz., Vijayasena's Sāladda Nāga, Vallālasena's Hari Ghosh and Lakṣmaṇasena's Nārāyaṇa Datta were probably Kāyasthas. Vallālasena is said to have introduced Kulinism or gradation of the various families of Rādhī Brāhmaṇas and Kāyasthas. There is no reference either to this or to the Ādiśūra tradition in any inscription, but it may well be that with the growth of Hinduism there was a reconstruction of society under the Senas. To this period probably is to be ascribed the setting of religious faiths in Bengal, Rādh or South-West Bengal adopting Śiva and Kṛṣṇa worship, and Varendra or North-East Bengal developing the Tāntrik faith (which lives now in Kālí and Durgā worship), Chittagong alone retaining Buddhism.

The art of image-making in stone was much patronised in this age, and to it are to be attributed the numerous Catur-bhuja Viṣṇu images which occur all over Bengal—even in the wilds of Sundarban—as well as the 'Mother and Child' images (V.R.S. Monographs, 3, p. 19) and probably the combined icons like Viṣṇu with dhyāni figure (V.R.S.
Monographs, 3, p. 48) or Mārtanda-Bhairava (I.H.Q., 1930, p. 465). The architectural pieces and other sculptures of Vijayasena's temple found at Deopāḍā show that a class of artisans grew up in Bengal in this age and the engraver of the inscription on that temple is styled Varendraśakā ṣilpa-goṣṭi-cudāmana. Though stone carving is no longer practised in Bengal (except on a very modest scale at Dainhāṭ, near Navadvīp) the art survives in the modelling of clay images for worship, which is peculiar in Bengal.

Sanskrit literature also flourished in this age, Rādh (S. W. Bengal) leading in Kāvyā and Dāśāna and Varendra (N. E. Bengal) in Tāntrik literature and Vyākaraṇa.

Lakṣmaṇasena himself is said to be the author of two learned treatises and his minister, Halāyudha of the Brāhmaṇa-sarvasva, the Abhidhāna-ratna-māta and other works and a verse is current naming the five poets who adorned his court. Of their works, the Pavana-dātam of Dhoysi is a poetic sketch of the east coast of India and the Gīta-Govinda of Jayadeva presents the Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa cult (which was given a new turn by Caitanya in a later age). The Bengali script took its present shape in this age, as we gather from the inscriptions in early Bengali characters on the Rāmāyaṇa and Mahābhārata scenes in Jāfar khan Ghazi's tomb at Triveni (J.A.S.B., 1909, p. 246 and pl. II.), Lakṣmaṇasena is credited with introducing a new era (Ins. of Bengal III, p. 192).

But soon a foreign element—the Muslims entered Bengal and gave a shock to the system we saw growing on the soil for more than 800 years, and the government, the administrative division, the social structure, the culture and even the names of persons and places and the language of the people were thrown into confusion.

(To be continued)

Bijoy Nath Sarkar
The 'Queen's Donation' Edict

This edict on the Allahabad-Kosam pillar, which has hitherto been known as 'the Queen's Edict', should more properly be called the Edict on the Queen's Donation, so as to guard against its being taken as issued by Aśoka's queen. Verily, it is the king's edict, for it commences with the authority of his word and contains some specific direction to his Mahāmātras, viz., the direction as to how to reckon, or rather, re-reckon the gifts of his second queen. It is important to note that the words Devānampiyashā vacanenā, with which the edict begins, are as peremptory as the opening words of the Separate Rock Edicts (Dhauli), and that, like the latter, the edict is meant for his Mahāmātras (savata Mahamatāvatavijā).

The record is, as is well known, inscribed on the same (Allahabad-Kosam) pillar as bears the Kosambi text¹ of the Schism Edict as well as a version of the first six Pillar Edicts. It spreads over five lines; and, "with the other edicts, found on the same monument, it agrees only in not arranging the words in groups or separating them. Its characters show a number of cursive and otherwise peculiar forms, which are not very common in Aśoka's inscriptions."² Some of these peculiarities can be traced in the Jaugadā version of the Separate Rock Edicts, while such use of the letter sh as occurs in piyashā (l. 1) and she (l. 4) is also observable in the Kālsi version of the Rock Edicts, with which it also agrees in respect of some grammatical forms³. In the circumstances, it will be advisable, when making restoration, to adhere first to the evidence of the edict itself and then, if need be, to such records as may be allied to it in form or matter.

Although the pillar is disfigured here and there by later scribblings and incisions, the letters of our inscription fortunately for the most part remain unimpaired. In spite of the mutilation of a few letters towards the end of line 3, the words represented by them have been satisfactorily restored⁴. But Aśokan scholars have not been equally fortunate in respect of the lacuna of effaced letters at the end of line 4.

1 The other texts are on the Sānci and Sārnāth pillars.
3 Ibid.
Queen's Donation Inscription
Right-half of lines 3-5.
The lacuna after \[he\]vam is, according to Hultsch, one of three letters, of which the middle one he read \(na\), tentatively completing the whole as \(vinati\), 'request'. The reading \(ni\) seems to be all right, but \(vinati\) is doubtful, as he himself believed.

With this restoration, he proceeded to construct the concluding clause as: \(he\vam\ vinati duṣṭiyāye devīye ti Tīvala-mātṛu Kālūvākīye\), rendering it: "This (is) [the request] of the second queen, the mother of Tīvala, the Kālūvākī." Now, what is the request? The request is, as Hultsch would have it, that "whatever gifts have been made by the second queen, etc., these shall (?) be registered in the name of that queen." It is to be noted that the word which he has been forced to render 'shall be registered' is \(ganiyati\), which is clearly in the Present and not in the Future, and, therefore, means 'is reckoned'. It is evident, and important at the same time to note, that Hultsch had his doubts from the very nature of the text and could not avoid thinking that some idea of injunction was involved in the 'request', or else he would not have used the word \(shall\) within brackets, understanding \(ganiyati\) anyhow in the future sense, even though it was grammatically unwarranted. The restoration \(vinati\) is at the root of this difficulty. It gives rise to another anomaly. The donor, occupying as she did the exalted rank of a queen,—the queen of an emperor such as Asoka was, and being, as we understand her to have been, quite free under the authority of the emperor's sanction to bestow gifts\(^2\), had in all probability no need of making \(vinati\) to the Mahāmātras to have her gifts 'registered', and consequently, \(vinati\) seems to be too ill chosen a word to be attributed to her. As a matter of fact, making \(vinati\), sounds like 'imploring', 'petitioning', and does not tally with the tone of the opening words of the inscription, where the gravity of the royal word is patent (\(Devānampiyāṣā vacanenā savata Mahamatā vataviyā\)). To put it clearly, the term \(vinati\) does not possess that force of expression which is required to give to the concluding clause a tone of injunction compatible with the authoritative bearing of the edict.

The difficulty, however, disappears if we follow the procedure suggested by Bühler. According to him, there is, after \(she\vam\) (l. 4), a

---

1 Hultsch, op. cit., p. 159, n. 4.
2 See R. E. v, and P. E. vii, where Asoka's relatives are mentioned as having their own alms-houses and bestowing gifts.

LH.Q., September, 1931
lacuna of five or six letters, which "must have contained the word wanted to complete the chief clause which begins with she nāni"¹. Hultsch practically dealt with five letters, including hevan (e.g. [he]van vinati), of which the second letter had already been read va by Bühler. But his restoration is, as we have seen, untenable. Now, if we turn to the alternative of six letters, we get virtually four in all to deal with, excluding hevan, which is fairly established by Hultsch. Of these four, the first, which he doubtfully restored vi (viz. the vi of vinati), seems to be the traces of a ga, resembling the initial letter of ganīyati, which occurs in this very inscription earlier in the same line. The next letter, which he read na, is, as we have noted, all right. The last two, it must be admitted, cannot be made out at all. Thus, out of four letters, the first two, viz., ga and na are fairly certain. What about the remaining two? If we remember Bühler's suggestion that the word wanted to complete the chief clause must be found among these letters, and, if, according to him, we take the clause to begin with she nāni, we cannot resist the conclusion that this lacuna of four letters can only be filled by a verbal form, to complete the sense. And the sense is somewhat like this: "whatever gifts have hitherto been reckoned (ganīyati), as of the second queen, all those (she nāni)... thus (hevan): 'from the second queen',—i.e., 'the mother of Tīvala, the Kāluvāki'." Reading between the lines, there can be no doubt that the word of four letters which is wanted to fill up the gap means 'must or should be reckoned;' or, 'you must or should reckon'. Half our difficulty vanishes through our acquaintance with the word ganīyati, which means 'is reckoned,' and we think that a verbal form derived from √gan will fit very well here. The task is further rendered easy by the happy coincidence of our restoration, the incomplete gana—. Now, taking our cue from P. E. vii. l. 22 (vide Hultsch), where occurs the mandatory expression hevan ca paliyovadātha, addressed to the Lajukas, and, again, from the Sārnāth inscription, where occur the words nikhipūtha (l. 7), vivāsayeśa (l. 10) and vivāsāpayātha (l. 11), similarly addressed in all probability to the Mahāmātras, the presumption arises that here, too, in the present inscription which is also addressed to the Mahāmātras, we have to do with a similar verbal form in order to complete the sense. And the only way in which gana- can be completed into the required verbal form of four letters is by making it gana(yātha), 'reckon ye',

on the analogy of the examples just referred to, regard being also had to the fact that Sk. *gam* belongs to the *Curādi* or the tenth class of conjugation. In the light of this restoration, we understand the edict as follows:—

**Text**

1 Devānampiyashā v[a]canenā savata Mahamāta
2 vataviyā (:) e hetā dutiāyē deviye dāne (,)
3 aṃbā-vādikā va ālame va dāna-[gah]e [va (, e vā pi a]ṁne
4 kichi ganiyati tāye deviye (,) she nāni [he]vaṁ [ga]na(yātha) (,)
5 dutiāyē deviye ti Tīvala-mātū Kāluvākiye (,)

**Translation**

1 In the name (lit. by the word) of Devānampiyya, the Mahāmātraras have everywhere to be told:
2 what(ever) gift (has been given) here by the second queen,—
3 (whether) mango-garden, or pleasure-ground, or alms-house, or whatever
4 else is reckoned as of that queen, those reckon ye thus:
5 “Of the second queen”, i.e., “of Tivala’s mother, the Kāluvāki.”

1 There is a sense of ‘keenness’ coupled with ‘injunction’ in this expression, which imparts a peremptory character to the direction that follows. For the weighty tone of the expression, cf. Pāli *mama vacanena*, Dīgha, ii. 72; Aṅg. ii. 144; Mil. 14; PvA. 53; and also the opening words of the Separate Rock Edicts (Dhauli) and of Minor Rock Edict I (Brahmagiri and Siddāpura). I am thankful to Prof. Kshitiśchandra Chatterji for referring me to Raghu. xii, 61, where occurs the forceful expression *madvacanat*.

2 With *Tīvala-mātū* cf. Pāli *Rāhula-mātā*, the familiar name of Yāsodharā, and *jīvaputāye* in Yāsamatā’s brick-tablet inscription (ed. J. Ph. Vogel, *JRAS*, 1921, which Barua also notices, *Old Brāhmī Inscriptions*, p. 160). It is interesting to note that teknonymy, or the practice of naming parents after their children, is very old and widespread also amongst primitive tribes. I am indebted to my colleague, Dr. Panchanan Mitra, for drawing my attention to its reference in Tylor’s paper, *On a Method of Investigating the development of Institutions* (*Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, vol. xviii, p. 248) and in Lowe’s *Primitive Society* (1921), p. 102.
The restoration infinitely improves the sense. In the first place, it gives us a better substitute for Hultsch's vinati, the incongruity of which has been pointed out above. Next, it does away with the compulsion under which he was driven to render ganīyati, doubtfully though, into 'shall (? ) be registered'. Moreover, it substantiates the peremptory tone of the edict by means of a suitable word of injunction, like the one occurring in P. E. vii and the Sārnāth record, just referred to. Lastly, it further establishes by its mandatory connotation that our edict is not the queen's, but out and out the king's.

Thus it appears that the purpose of the address to the Mahāmātrās was not, as understood by Hultsch, to have the second queen's gifts 'registered (in the name) of that queen', — for these gifts are stated in the edict to have been already registered as such (ganīyati), — but to have them reckoned anew (ganayātha) by a fuller statement of the name of the donor-queen—a statement that would represent her not only as 'the second queen' as previously, but also as 'the mother of (prince) Tīvala, together with her personal designation 'Kāluvākī.' Such an alteration of epithet at the time of issuing the edict could only have been necessary if the second queen had already given birth to a child and thereby attained to the much coveted glory of motherhood. The very pith and substance of womanhood lay, in those ancient times, in becoming a mother and being known preferably by the child's name when one was born (cf. the epithet Rāhulamatā¹), and especially as the mother of living children (cf. Jīva-puṭaye rājabhariyāye Bṛhasvātimitadhiyu Yakamatāye kāritaṃ¹); and the birth of a child certainly invested the mother with incomparable rank and renown, especially among womankind, even as it does to the present day. In India, even today, the gift from a woman, not blessed with a child, hardly commends itself to the acceptance of the donee. It seems that Aśoka could not miss the blissful occasion of sharing with his second queen the merit and pride of parenthood, so that the new position the queen had acquired was thought proper to be reflected in an appropriate change of the donor's title. Evidently, Aśoka sought to attach a special importance not only to her exalted rank as his queen, but also to the glory of her personal name which had become hallowed by the birth of Tīvala, and to her relation, as mother, to a prince who, too, was his son.

¹ See p. 461, n. 2,
The edict further shows that the gifts of the second queen were many. They must have been scattered, at least, over the jurisdiction of the Mahāmātrās of Kosambi. If at all, as is quite possible, these donations were severally recorded (as we understand by ganīyati) and re-recorded (as we similarly understand by ganayūtha), e.g., by suitable labels inscribed on enduring materials, it is not unthinkable that we may be fortunate enough some day to come across at least a few, if not all, of them. That gifts were given by the members of the royal household, both in Pātaliputra as well as in the cities outside, which the Dharma-mahāmātrās were required to deliver, will be evident from R.E.v. (Pātalipute ca bāhirasu ca [nagarasu]—Girnar). The same R.E. further informs us that it was also the function of the Dharma-mahāmātrās to be occupied with the donations from the family-establishments of the king's brothers, sisters and other relatives (bhātinam me bhaigininam va amnesu va nātisu—Dhauli). Again, in P. E. vii the king has specifically mentioned, among others of his family, himself, his queens in the different royal households, and the princes of the royal blood as the persons whose grants the Dharma-mahāmātrās were required to deal with, both in the capital and outside it (hida ceva disāsu ca). Further, P. E. vii makes it clear that there were queens more than one, and the 'Queen's Donation' Edict at any rate proves by the expression dutiyāye deviye that queens there were at least two, if not more. Now, if all these various donations of the king, the queens, the princes and princesses were, as we have suggested, severally recorded by appropriate inscriptions, it is not at all difficult to understand how large the number of such donations and inscriptions would be. But the fact remains that these votive records have yet to be discovered.

Sailendranath Mitra
Studies in the Kaññiliya

I

The Methods of Self-defence in the Kaññiliya
(for an invaded weak king)

When a Yātavya¹ is being attacked by another king assisted by one or more allies (sāmavāyika), he should try to extricate himself from the difficulty by persuading one or more allies of the invader to join the Yātavya after seceding from the alliance and thus ceasing to help the Yātavya’s enemy. The means by which this is likely to be effected is by offering to one or more of the allies of the invader twice the amount of consideration which has been promised to them by the invader. At the same time, it should be made clear to the parties that if they secede from the alliance, they will not have to suffer the troubles of sojourn, losses and expenditure, and incur the sin involved in the operations connected with the war. Further, it should be explained to them that the alliance is only benefiting the other party and causing them discomfort.

Another alternative left to the Yātavya is to cause dissension among the parties to the alliance made against himself.

The measures suggested in the preceding paragraphs for adoption by a weak king when attacked contemplate combinations of kings on one or both the sides of the conflicting parties. The measures are directed principally to create a breach in the camps of the

¹ From an examination of the passages in K., VI, ch. 1, p. 259; ch. 2, p. 258 and VII, ch. 5, pp. 275f., a Yātavya appears to be a sovereign whose resources have become so much handicapped that he cannot himself recover his normal strength within a short time. The term implies that with reference to another king, the sovereign mentioned above has incurred the former’s displeasure somehow or other, but happens to be very weak at the time. This Yātavya may, of course, be helped by a king whose condition is not so hopeless as that of a Yātavya. Either for this reason or because his feeling of enmity is greater, he maintains a stiffer attitude towards the invading king even if he be afflicted with calamities.
opponents or to draw away the allies by offers of wealth and other inducements. Next comes the case of a powerful king who is supposed to be attacking a weak king without entering into combination with any ally for the purpose of the attack. The steps to be taken by the weak king have been delineated in the Kautšiliya, with a special reference to the circumstances in which he can take his position in a fort for opposing the force of the invasion. As the enemy is without any allies, the course of action suggested previously for adoption by the weak king for bringing about a disunion among them, winning over one or more of the allies to his side, or neutralizing one or more of them by various means has been left out of account. The steps that are suggested in this connection\(^1\) for adoption by the weak king comprise

(i) Combination with one or more allies,

(ii) Fighting by making a fort the principal centre of his operations,

(iii) Suing for a treaty of peace, which may or may not be accepted. In the former case, the weak king may be reduced to the position of a daṇḍopanata. In the latter, the weak king should either come out of the fort and enter into a face to face war with the enemy, or escape from the fort.

Re. (i). This line of action may consist in

(a) Taking to samŚrāya with a king more powerful than the invader in military strength and mantra-śakti\(^2\) (strength of wisdom). If there be two or more kings of equal military strength and mantra-śakti, then the one who possesses faithful or experienced counsellors should be preferred.

Should a king superior to the invading power be not available, the assistance of two or more kings equal to the latter in strength, or at least in regard to the size of the army should be utilized. From among two or more kings equal to one another in mantra-śakti and prabhū-śakti, the one who has the capacity to make preparations for war on a larger scale is to be preferred.

If no king equal to the invader be available for help, an effort

---

1 See K., VII, ch. 15.

should be made for a combination with those who though inferior to the invader in strength are his opponents and are sincere and possessed of utsāha-sakti (energy). This combination should be continued till the invaded king can overreach the invader by the application of the combined strength of mantra-, prabhu-, and utsāha-sakti. Should two or more kings of equal utsāha-sakti be there to choose from, the one whose territory can provide lands that can constitute suitable battle-fields for the invaded king should be preferred. In case there be two or more kings whose States can provide battle-fields advantageous to the invaded king, the one whose State can be reached in a season suitable for a war should be resorted to.¹ If there be two or more kings having equally suitable lands that can be used as battle-fields in suitable seasons, the one who has draught animals, weapons, and armours in plenty should be taken as superior.

Re. (ii). In the absence of help from others, the weak king should take shelter in a fort, from which the powerful enemy cannot cut off supplies of food, grass, fuel and water, but which by its position will involve him in great loss and expense in his attempt to bring it down.

In comparing between two or more forts of similar advantages, the one, from which the supply of the necessaries of life can be maintained, and which affords a means of escape when necessary, is the best. The fort must of course be a Manusya-durga, i.e., provided with an adequate number of brave soldiers belonging to the four sections of the army.²

A fort may also be resorted to by a weak king if he finds that in any one of the following situations, he will have an advantage by fixing his station in the fort:

1. He (1) can have the help of pārṣu-grāha, āśāra (i.e., pārṣu-grāhasāra), madhyama, or udāśina;
2. (2) can have the help of a neighbouring king, a chief of a wild tribe, or, any member of the family of the enemy hostile to him³;

¹ The months of Mārgaśīra, Čaitra and Jyotisha are the seasons suitable for war.—K., IX, 7.
² The speciality of a manusya-durga lies in the numerical strength of the qualified soldiers contained in it.
³ तन्तुवलीविद्वान in the text has, I think, been converted into तन्तुवलीविद्वान by a slip of the copyist’s pen. With the latter
(3) can create disaffection among the enemy's people in his kingdom, fort, or camp;

(4) can kill those who come near through secret agents using weapons, fire and poison, (mentioned in K., Book, XII : Ābalīyasam) or, through the secret means mentioned in Book XIV: Aupaniṣadikam of the Kautilīya;

(5) can cause the enemy loss of men and money through spies resorting to means other than those mentioned in (4).

(6) Can gradually cause through spies disaffection among allies or soldiers when they are worried by sojourn and losses of men and money;

(7) can cut off the enemy's supply of the necessaries of life and help, and thus subject the people in the camp to privations;

(8) can create a vulnerable point in the arrangements made by the enemy for the war by first sending some soldiers to his camp and then attacking him with all the forces;

(9) can conclude a treaty of peace with the enemy on satisfactory terms by chilling his courage;

(10) can rouse up the surrounding kings against the enemy for making the attack;

(11) can attack the capital of the enemy's kingdom with the help of the allies and the wild tribes at a time when it is not likely to receive any help from outside;

(12) can effect the acquisition and preservation of wealth within his own large kingdom from within the fort;

(13) can bring together his own scattered forces and those of his allies by stationing himself in the fort, and can make them unconquerable by the enemy by this union;

(14) can enable his soldiers expert in fighting on low grounds or trenches, or during night to shake off their fatigue by taking shelter in the fort and then commence the fight at the required time;

(15) can inflict loss of men and money on the enemy without any effort on his own part by reason of the former having to come

reading, the meaning would be 'a member of the family of the enemy confined in a prison.' To be able to render help to the weak king, he ought to be at large and hence we have to assume that he was imprisoned at some time in the past and was continuing hostile to the enemy; or, we may assume that he is 'interned' in a particular place in the kingdom.
near the fort at an unfavourable time and occupy an unfavourable position;

(16) can continue in a position of vantage by taking his station in the fort as it can be approached by the enemy only after much loss of men and money, the surrounding region being difficult to negotiate on account of the existence of several forts and forests affording means of escape, or, the surrounding region being unhealthy may cause diseases among the soldiers of the enemy, who will also be handicapped by being unable to get proper grounds for the exercise of his troops, and if by some means he enters into the place, he is not likely to come out safely.

If by reason of his occupation of a fort the invaded king does not get any of the advantages mentioned above and if the forces of the enemy be very powerful then he should, according to the Ācāryas, escape from the fort or rush into a war with the enemy. As a flame, into which a moth rushes, may be extinguished by chance, so success may be achieved by the desperate king as a chance result of his daring. Kauṭiliya differs from the Ācāryas only in regard to this point that the escape from the fort or entrance into the war should be preceded by an offer of a treaty of peace which if rejected should be followed by either of the steps mentioned by the Ācāryas. If neither of these two courses succeeds, he has to surrender everything to the enemy and accept the position of the daṇḍopanata (self-submitter).¹

II

CONSIDERATIONS ABOUT AN ATTACK UPON A YĀTAVYA

If a defeated weak king, who has entered into a treaty of peace with a powerful enemy, disregards the terms of the treaty relating to the payment of wealth, the aim of the powerful enemy would be to reduce him to the position of a Danḍopanata. He will try to march against the recalcitrant king, over lands favourable for march or fight, at a time suitable for the soldier's activities, and in a part of the country where the enemy has no fort or means of escape. The powerful king should also take precaution that at the time of the

¹ For details about the relation of a daṇḍopanata to the daṇḍopanāyin, see I. S., pp. 62-64 and 66-68.
march or the fight, no rear enemy is likely to invade his territory from the rear, and that his enemy does not receive assistance from an ally. But as all these opportunities may not be available simultaneously, the invader should adopt the necessary measures calculated to make his position secure inspite of the absence of one or more of these opportunities. These remedies consist principally in the application of one or more of the means called ṣāma, dāna, bheda, and daṇḍa to the strong or weak opponents in the first and second zones around the kingdom of the invader. Sāma may be put into effect in his dealings with a weak king through the protection of the latter’s cattle in villages and forests, the prevention of obstructions in the free use of his land-routes and waterways, and the capture of seditious or unfaithful officers and other persons who have absconded after causing him harms. Dāna (gift) may include lands, girls (in marriage), and abhaya (assurance of safety) in danger. Bheda may consist in inciting a neighbouring king, a wild tribe, a kinsman of the enemy, or a prince interned by the enemy to demand wealth, army, land, or family properties from him. Daṇḍa signifies capturing the enemy through prakāṣayuddha, kūṭayuddha, ṭuṣṇīmyuddha, or by adopting the measures mentioned in the Kauṭiliya in connection with the methods of storming a fort.

Just as before making a yāna, the drawing of powers to one’s side for material consideration is a problem, so it is also at the same time a problem as to which of the two kings, one a yātavya and another an amitra (i.e., usually a king whose kingdom is in the zone next to the dominion of the king, of whom we are speaking) should be first attacked, should they form the objects of attack simultaneously. The solution of this problem facilitates the task of the invader a good deal. The Kauṭiliya has dealt with the subject in detail, which may be conveniently put in a tabular form. The reasons why a particular time of action is preferred to another are also stated.
WHO SHOULD BE FIRST ATTACKED?

(1) A Yātavya or an Amitra
The one is as much afflicted with calamities as the other.

(2) A Yātavya in calamities much less than the Amitra;

(3) A Yātavya just in his dealings but in great calamities, the subjects being loyal because the king is just.

(4) A Yātavya whose subjects have grown greedy through impoverishment.

(5) A Yātavya comparatively stronger but unjust.

ANSWER

The Amitra first, because when he is invaded, the Yātavya may help the invading king. The Amitra will not help him if the Yātavya be attacked first.

The Yātavya first, according to a school of opinion, but according to Kauṭilya, the Amitra first, because his troubles will be increased still by an attack. No doubt, the troubles of the Yātavya will also increase by an invasion but the Amitra may, if left to himself, regain his normal strength and unite with the Yātavya, or attack from the rear the king about to commence the invasion.

The unjust Yātavya in light calamities should be first attacked, because his dissatisfied subjects will not help him. The milder section among them will be indifferent but the extreme section may go so far as to turn him away.

The formcr (in col. 1) should be first attacked according to one school of opinion, because his subjects can be easily won over or kept in check, while the oppressed subjects of the latter can be conciliated by their king by the punishment of the chief officials. Kauṭilya advises the invasion of the latter, because the subjects of the former though poor and greedy are still loyal and would stand by their king in times of invasion of the kingdom.

The former (in col. 1) should be attacked first, because his subjects will not help him.
It is evident from the statements\(^1\) in the appended Table that the discontent and disaffection of the subjects in a kingdom were recognized as a factor that exposed it to invasions, because the alienation of active sympathy of the citizens from their king was a cause for great weakness in the body politic. The Kauṭiliya lays a great emphasis on the need for the application of the causes that bring about this state of affairs. The two main causes that should be specially guarded against are the acute economic stringency, and the oppression of the people. Some other causes that operate to alienate the people from the sovereign are also mentioned. The list is of interest not merely from the historical standpoint but also as containing advice and warning, the wisdom of which has not diminished by the lapse of centuries. These are disregarding the good and favouring the wicked; unrighteous and unprecedented slaughter of animals; prohibition of salutary customs; doing improper and unrighteous acts, and neglecting to do the proper and righteous ones; non-payment of grants and dues to the people and exaction of illegal impositions; inflicting punishments more severe than what is deserved, and not punishing the culprits; recruiting the incompetent for appointment and rejecting the competent; doing works detrimental to the interests of the kingdom and ruining those that are beneficial; not protecting the people against thieves and depriving them of their possessions; not doing works requiring enterprise and chilling the enterprise of others; injuring the leaders of the people and insulting the worthy; oppressing the elders and incurring their displeasure by impropriety and untruthfulness; not rewarding the services rendered to him and not observing the established usages; and carelessness and indolence in regard to the acquisition and preservation of wealth.\(^2\)

### III

**Considerations about Helping Other Kings**

In inter-state dealings, the rendering of help to a king does not always mean loss of men and money to the helper. It has also
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another aspect, viz., that the helping king can become also a
gainer in the long run by having as his ally a
king who may more than compensate him for the
expenditure and losses incurred. The considera-
tions for which help should be extended with a
view to have the ultimate gain are:

(a) that the ally is śākyāraṁbhī i.e., engaged in an operation,
the completion of which is well within the limits of his ability;

(b) that he is Kālīsāyaṁbhī (i.e. whose undertaking is not
fraught with danger in a special degree);

(c) that he is Bhavyāraṁbhī (engaged in an undertaking which
is sure to yield a good result);

(d) that he is Sthirakarman (steady in the pursuit of his aim i.e.
will not give up a work until it is completed);

(e) that he is Anuraktaprakṛti i.e., he has his officials and
subjects devoted to him. This implies that the helper will not be
put to much loss of men and money in rendering the assistance.

Kings of these descriptions are likely to be successful in the
operations for which the assistance is given and are expected to
compensate the helper by giving him men and money in the
latter’s need.

Other considerations that may come in connection with this
subject are:

A. (i) Of the two kings each helping one other king, the one who
helps a natural friend gains more than the one who helps a natural
enemy (now an ally by virtue of the alliance). The reason is that
the natural enemy rarely continues the friendship brought about by the
alliance, after the need for help ceases. Hence the losses of the helper
are not compensated.

(ii) Of the two kings, each helping one other king, friendly to
them, the one who happens to render assistance to the king friendly
to him in a special degree (mitratara), becomes a gainer.

B. (i) Of the two kings each helping a madhyama¹ (medium).

(ii) Of the two kings, each helping a madhyama, friendly to him,
the one who happens to help a madhyama, friendly to him in a
special degree, becomes a greater gainer than the other.

C. Similarly there may be two cases in regard to the help

¹ For the meanings of madhyama and udāsīna, see I. S., pt. i,
extended to the udāsīna (superpower) in the maṇḍaḷa of each helping king. The one who helps a friendly, or a specially friendly udāsīna becomes a greater gainer.\footnote{K., VII, ch. 2.}

If both the madhyamās helped by the two kings turn false to their respective helpers, the king who had helped the inimical madhyama (temporarily in alliance with him), becomes a gainer.

The two helpers now face to face with their madhyamās turning false enter into alliance with each other in their common interest. But the one who loses the alliance with his inimical madhyamās loses less than the other who is bereft of his friendly madhyama.

Just as there may be a greater gain or a greater loss on the part of one king as compared with that of another in regard to the help rendered by each to either of two other kings selected by him, similarly there may be a greater gain or a greater loss to the side of one king in comparison with that of another in respect of the manner in which the help is rendered. As for instance, a king may have to suffer loss if in extending his help to a medium (madhyama) or a superpower, (udāsīna) he sends brave, hardy, and loyal troops well equipped with weapons instead of those of an inferior sort. The king who does not do so may stand on a better footing so far as loss is concerned. Where, of course, troop of an inferior efficiency can be of no avail in achieving the purpose for which they are sent, then he can lend out those belonging to any one of these classes viz., maula (hereditary), bhūta (salaried) śrenī (recruited from military clans), mitra (ally), ātavī (recruited from wild tribes). Should there be reason for the suspicion that the army sent out to help either the madhyama or the udāsīna will not be received back, or will be stationed on lands belonging to an inimical king or inhabited by wild tribes, or unfit habitation, or will be made to take the field during unfavourable seasons, or will not be allowed to appropriate to themselves their share in the booty, then he should avoid lending the army on some pretext or other. When no such pretext can achieve his object, he should lend an army inured to the kind of hardships to which it will be subjected and allow it to stay outside his dominion and fight up to the end of the operations for which it is taken. He will however remain watchful against any calamity befalling the army, and bring it back as soon as the need for its stay outside comes to an end. One other alternative is left to him viz., not to send any help, and strengthen
his position of entering into an alliance with the Yātavya of the king seeking such help.

Four cases are mentioned by way of illustration for guiding the kings who are approached by the Yātavya for help against a strong enemy:

(1) If the third king be diffident about the receipt of his remuneration from another king, who is invading a Yātavya and wants to break away from the alliance into which he had entered under the pressure of a need for money, and if he wishes to help the Yātavya expecting to have a large consideration from him in future, he can do so for a small one for the present expecting to cause loss of men and money to the invader of the Yātavya, to obstruct the march of his army towards the Yātavya, or to attack him within the kingdom during a march.

(2) When the third king finds that by joining the particular side he will be rendering a service to a friend and causing harm to an enemy or will be securing help from one who had helped him in the past, he should agree to render help for a lesser gain, rejecting an offer of a larger consideration.

(3) Should a king be attacked by an enemy working in collusion with the former's traitorous subjects, or by a very powerful king threatening the ruin of the former's kingdom, then a neighbouring king can help him without any stipulation for remuneration, present or future, if he has in view that he may be similarly helped in future by the king now in distress, or if he has the hope of establishing a matrimonial connection with the latter's family.

(4) If a king who has entered into an alliance with another king (marching against a Yātavya) wants to recede from the alliance, either to help the Yātavya, or to refrain from increasing the strength of the other king who may attack him after the operations are ended successfully, he can demand an immediate payment of his dues, or can demand a larger sum as his remuneration, which will serve to put a financial pressure upon the subjects (prakṛtikarṣaṇa), or incite other parties to alliances with the king to rescind their agreements following the example.

Narendranath Law
The Economic Conditions of Bengal during the Years 1793-1858

The most revolutionary change brought about in the economic system of Bengal and India during the Nineteenth Century was the new attitude towards the ownership of the soil. This new attitude was due to certain economic theories which were sharply in conflict with those of the Muhammadan and early British period.

In the Permanent Settlement of 1793, the new rulers of the country for the first time committed themselves to a definite understanding and agreement as regards the economic conditions and institutions of the country. This famous settlement, a real land-mark in Indian history, introduced factors, subtle but sure, which were to change the economic structure of large portions of India, changes which in due time made land a marketable article.

There had been sales of land also in the 18th century, even if the actual terms of buying and selling had been avoided in the documents of conveyance, but it remained for the 19th century to include land in the list of things that can be bought and sold in the open market. This makes a clear break with all previous Indian conditions.

In earlier times, before the coming of the Muhammadans, the land had often been communal property, or at least property belonging to clans, families and other consanguine groups. Later on the Muhammadan rulers had claimed to be the owners of all the land in the realm, de jure or de facto.

In addition to what I have said in my two former papers, on the Muhammadan theories and their practice in land-holding, I should like to subjoin what Bernier, the great French traveller of the 18th century, had to say on that subject:—

"Those three states of Turkey, Persia and Indostan, for as much as they have, all three, taken away the meum and tuum as to land and propriety of possessions, cannot but very near resemble one another; they have the same defect, they must at last, sooner or later, needs fall into the same inconvenience which is the necessary consequence of it, namely tyranny, ruin and desolation. Far be
it therefore, that our monarchs of Europe should thus be proprietors of all the lands which their subjects possess".  

Now land in Muhammadan times was, strictly speaking, not transferable any more than in Hindu times, with this exception, that the crown, or the state, for non-payment of land-tax, could take away land from defaulters, and grant it or lease it out to other middlemen, Zemindars, farmers and other tax collectors. But as far as these middlemen or the tenants were concerned land was not transferable property any more than in Hindu times. Just as a new Zemindar succeeding his deceased father needed a special sanad to establish him in the rights and privileges that his father had enjoyed, so probably also the tenancy of every new generation of tenants was hedged in sufficiently with restrictions to remind all concerned that the land was not their property. Land always, actually or nominally, reverted back, in the final analysis, to the state, and the state only could effect or sanction any transfer of land.

The sale of land in ancient India would have seemed as strange and impossible as the sale of air, or the sale of the water of the rivers.

By the time of British rule in Bengal we discover the first sales of Zemindari rights, the family of the Birbhum Râjâhs, selling several of their parganas to the Bose Family of Sutanuti in Calcutta, This transaction took place in 1796 A.D., involving a purchase price of Rupees 120,000 (Mitra’s Types of Early Bengali Prose).

Since that time lands have changed hands in Bengal freely and frequently. Land holding has become a profession, a business like every other business. What is actually sold, legally and technically, are still only certain rights pertaining to the holding, sub-letting and leasing of that land, yet, ipso facto land has become a personal property. Like every other possession, it is transferable, no matter by how many safeguards the transaction may be hedged in, or hidden; it is a real and actual sale. That is to say, the economic life of India in this matter has been going through a process of complete transformation during the British period, and the end is not yet.

Of course, the old is still with us in the form of joint family properties; there is perhaps little property that is not held in some joint family ownership relation. But private ownership once recognised by law,
the whole tendency during the 19th century has been towards that goal, and away from the restrictions of the older theories of property holding.

One important and disturbing factor in this devolution of property rights in the soil is the large and still growing number of really unproductive middlemen, *patnidars* of various degrees, that stand between the really large land owners and the tenants, living off the system and off the land, without making valuable contributions to the common stock of wealth in the economic system of the country.

Sir George Campbell says:—

"At the Permanent Settlement Government by abdicating its position as exclusive possessor of the soil, and contenting itself with a permanent rent-charge on the land, escaped thenceforward all the labour and risk attendant upon detailed mofussil management. The Zemindars of Bengal proper were not slow to follow the example set before them, and immediately began to dispose of their Zemindaries, in a similar manner. Permanent under-tenures, known as *patnee* tenures, were created in large numbers, and extensive tracts were leased out on long terms. By the year 1819, permanent alienations of the kind described had been so extensively effected, that they were formally legalized by Regulation VIII of that year, and means afforded to the Zemindar of recovering arrears of rents from the *patnidars* almost identical with those by which the demands of Government were enforced against himself. The practice of granting such under-tenures has steadily continued, until at the present day with the *patnee* and subordinate tenures in Bengal proper and the farming system of Behar, but a small proportion of the whole permanently settled area remains in the direct possession of the Zemindars."\(^1\)

**Relation of Land-rent to Government Revenue**

The Permanent Settlement provided \(1/10\) of the gross amounts of land-rent collected to go to the Zemindar as his share, while \(9/10\) of it was to go to the Government. (In the Statutory Commission Report, \(1/11\) and \(10/11\) are given as the respective shares).

The assessment fixed on the land was declared to be unalterable for ever, and the government specifically undertook not to make any
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demand on Zemindars, or their heirs or successors "for augmentation of the public assessment in consequence of the improvement of their estates."

This brings us face to face with a rather interesting question, namely the relation of originally tithes of the produce of the land on one hand, and a regularly fixed and settled land-rent on the other.

Since Muhammadan times, and earlier, there had been two ways in which government, could raise their revenue, either in kind as their share of the yearly produce of the land, or as a fixed amount of annual ground-rent, or land-rent, in money, regardless of crops. The Muhammadans distinguished these two totally different kinds of revenue by these terms:

mūkasumah Kirāj, or the share of the produce of the land
and wuzzaula Khirāj, or regular land-rent.

"The obligation to pay the (latter) class of Khirāj was considered a personal liability on account of a definite portion of land, depending on its actual capability, and not on its actual produce.

"It was consequently the wuzzaula Khirāj, which was imposed on conquered unbelievers." (p. 45, Arthur Phillips, Land Tenures of Lower Bengal).

Now what was the actual share which the state could or did receive of the produce of the land? In Hindu times it must have been much smaller than in Muhammadan times, when the State sometimes claimed as high as three-fifths of the income of the land (Phillips, p. 221). The question, of course, does not touch the portions of India settled by the Permanent Settlement, except as to the theory which was underlying the settlements which were made in Muhammadan, and early British, times.

Romesh Ch. Dutt states as follows:—

"In Bengal the Land Tax was fixed at over 90 per cent, of the rental (?)—and in North India at over 80 per cent, of the rental, between 1793 and 1822. It is true that the British Government only followed the precedent of the previous Muhammadan rulers, who also claimed an enormous Land Tax. But the difference was this, that what the Muhammadan rulers claimed they could never fully realize; what the British rulers claimed they realized with rigour. The last Muhammadan ruler of Bengal, in the last year of his administration (1764), realized a land revenue of £817,553; within thirty
years the British rulers realized a land revenue of £2,680,000 in
the same province."

I have not been able to verify the two figures given in this state-
ment; from another source, however, the "Musnad of Murshidabad,"
I got the assessment of Mir Kasim, the last ruler of Bengal, for the
year 1763, amounting, with abwabs (imposts) to Rs. 25,624,223.

Another set of figures, taken from Ramesh Ch. Dutt’s book, (p. 85)
gives the following amounts of land revenue, actually collected. (He
quotes from Shore):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1762-63</td>
<td>Rs. 6,456,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1763-64</td>
<td>„ 7,618,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1764-65</td>
<td>„ 8,175,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1765-66</td>
<td>„ 14,704,875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be seen that there is a wide divergency between the amounts
assessed and the sums actually realized. That even the Permanent
Settlement did not always insure a permanent revenue approximately
equal every year, is shown by the following facts.

In a list given by Romesh Ch. Dutt, of the years 1793-1837, the
land revenue realized in Bengal, varies from some 30 Million Rupees
in 1813-14, to over Rupees 70 Million in 1814-15. It then keeps on
a high level till 1832-3, after which it drops down again in 1834-35
to a little over 30 Millions.

In figures published in 1854 by M. Wylie, a judge of the Calcutta
Court of Small Causes, we find the figure of Rs. 37,596,998 as the
total revenue of Bengal Presidency as it stood then, comprising
Bihar, Orissa and Assam (also included in the previous figures).

Deducting the outlying districts, which form separate provinces
now, we get for Bengal people, as it is today, a total of Rs. 22,424,876
for that year. Compare with this the Rs. 32,700,000 of land-rent raised
from the same area in 1928-9 according to the Bengal budget pub-
lished in the Report of the Statutory Commissioner. (In all these
figures the changing value of the rupee must be taken into account,
of course).

In 1833 another important change took place in the history of
British India. The trading business of the Company was abolished,
and from now till the end of its history in 1858, the East India
Company was a pure landholding stock company, but with practically

sovereign power, controlling the whole sub-continent of India, the former great empire of the Mughals. Speaking of this latter event, the total abolition of the East India Company in 1858, Dutt says (Preface p. xiii):

"Their capital was paid off by loans, which were made into an Indian debt, on which interest is paid from Indian taxes. The empire was transferred from the Company to the Crown, but the people of India paid the purchase-money. The Indian Debt, which was £51,000,000 in 1857, rose to £97,000,000 in 1862. Within the forty years of peace which have succeeded, the Indian Debt has increased continuously, and now (1901) amounts to £200,000,000. 'The Home Charges' remitted out of Indian revenues to Great Britain have increased to sixteen millions."

In a subsequent paper I hope to deal with the industrial and commercial aspects of this period—aspects which were of the utmost significance in the economic life of the country. The year 1833, when the East India Company abolished its own trading system, is the turning point of that development.

G. L. SCHANZLIN
The Frontier Problem of the Mughals

The frontier problem of the Indian Mughals was no less complicated than that of the British. In fact the Mughals were more vitally concerned with the people and provinces of North-Western frontier, and to them, in a much greater degree, the frontier problem was the pivot of their political existence. Their home was beyond the frontier, and their ambition fondly cherished an empire in which the transfrontier provinces, once their ancestral dominions, should form a part. That was not all. The conquest of Hindustan had been achieved from a transfrontier kingdom, and throughout the existence of their empire they recruited their soldiers from those regions. Thus the love of motherland, the pride of possessing ancestral dominions, and the military needs of the empire had combined to make the frontier problem extremely consequential for the Mughals. As new tribes rose to power and endangered these interests, the Mughal empire grew nerveless and decayed. The satisfactory solution of the frontier problem in a way controlled the existence or extinction of the Mughal sway in Northern India, and hence it demands much more attention at the hands of the historian, trying to explain the downfall of the Mughal empire, than it has hitherto received.

The causes that were responsible for the flight of Bābar from his ancestral dominions, for his unsuccessful attempts at their recovery, and for the foundation of the Mughal empire in India were also the deciding factors in the frontier policy of the Mughals. The steady rise of the Uzbegs under Shaibānī Khān, and their gradual conquest of the whole Timurid kingdom compelled Bābar to run away to Kābul, and to endeavour from there, to recover his lost dominions with the help of the Persians. Since he failed in his attempts and his powerful allies, the Persians, occupied Khorasan and Bokhara he had to remain content with the poor principality of Kābul, and when opportunity arrived, turned eastward to India for fresh conquests. Thus the neighbourhood of two powerful nations, the Persians and the Uzbegs set Bābar’s foot on the road to India; for, Bābar’s relations with the former were none too friendly and the latter were his hereditary enemies. Kabul, hemmed in between the dominions of these two hostile nations, would have fallen an easy prey
to either, had it not been for the fact that they were themselves mortal enemies of each other. In their mutual enmity they overlooked Bābar, who thus had a quiet time for himself to consolidate his kingdom, and to prepare for the conquest of Hindustan, Bābar handed down to his successors his transfrontier possessions, and therefore, ruling from India, they had to face the very same problems and had to come into conflict with the very same peoples—the Persians and the Uzbegs. The diplomatic relations subsisting between the Indian Mughals, and the Uzbegs and Persians, form the foundation of the Mughal frontier problem. The course, these relations took, depended, upon the comparative strength of the parties, and varied from time to time. Under Bābar’s successors, from Âkbar to Shāhjâhân, the Persians were evenly matched, and the Uzbegs, overpowered; while before Âkbar, both the Persians and the Uzbegs were overpowering. Hence the policy of the Mughals before Âkbar was one of respectful but defensive vigilance towards the Persians and Uzbegs; while, after Âkbar it assumed a pronounced form of aggression.

The nature of the problem was also determined by the geographical situations of these nations. The physical configuration of Central Asia necessitates the mastery of Badakshan, Balkh and Kandahar for the ruler of Kābul. Otherwise there is no scientific frontier and Kābul is exposed. In the north Kabul is bounded by the lofty walls of the Hindukush penetrated by several passes, the most famous of them being the Hindukush. “This has indeed been a veritable gateway of nations. This way came Alexander with his Greek following, and it would take a chapter to record the successive tides of human migration (Scythian and Mughal) which have swept through those frozen gateways to the north of Kābul”¹ To guard this gateway of the north, Balkh and Badakshan, situated between the mountain and the Oxus river flowing westwards, should be strongly held, and to hold these two provinces the line of the Oxus must be secured. In the south Kābul is equally exposed. The magnificent heights of the Hindukush as they run in a southwesterly direction sink into lower altitudes, and “the western borders of the country maintain a general average of about 3000 ft. from Herat to Kandahar”² From Kandahar to Herat, the country is also traversed

² Ibid., p. 11.
by a number of rivers like the Helmand, the Harirud and the Khasurd, which make it fruitful. South-east of Kandahar is the desert, but north of it, as far as Ghazni and Kabul, the country is fertile, full of irrigated fields and green pastures. Once Kandahar is taken, Kabul is in a precarious position, for the distance between Herat and Kandahar is only 360 miles and takes ten days for the cavalry to cover it. "Herat was but the gateway to Kandahar and Kabul in the days when Kabul was India."

Hence the two river lines, the Oxus in the north, and the Helmand in the south, were of supreme importance to the Indian Mughals, and so long as the Uzbegs were established on the former, and the Persians on the latter, they could not rest in peace at all.

But this was only a part of the problem. Behind this outer frontier there was another the inner frontier, and the Mughals were equally concerned to hold it in strength. It lay between Kabul and the Punjab formed by a rugged stretch of mountainous country from Baluchistan to Kashmir. This is inhabited by wild uncivilized tribes and through it run the chief passes to Afghanistan—the Gomal, the Tochi, Kurram and the Khyber in succession from the south. To the north of the Khyber, there are the valleys of the Swat, Bajaur and Panjkora, affording facilities for human habitation. Still further north lies the Kashmir state, with its fascinating landscape and salubrious climate. The communication between the two parts of the Mughal empire—Kabul and Hindustan—was maintained through the passes, and their security was of as great a consequence to the internal peace of the empire, as that of the outer frontier, for the perfect mastery of the inner frontier meant the security of Kabul and sure supply of recruits for the army of the Indian Mughals.

Hence the Mughals had to tackle three problems in order to maintain their frontier defence intact. The first was to establish themselves in Balkh and Badakshan to the prejudice of the Uzbegs; the second was to establish themselves in Kandahar to the prejudice of the Persians; and the third was to keep the tribes on the Northwestern border of India under control, so as to keep the line of communication between Kabul and Hindustan open at all times.

With the expulsion of Bābar from his ancestral dominions, and with his conquest of Kabul in 1504 began the frontier problem. Till he conquered Hindustan more than twenty years later, the line of

1 Holdich, Gates of India, p. 529.
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Badakshan, Bakh, and Kandahar was of supreme importance. In 1505 Nasir Mirza took possession of Badakshan, only to be expelled by Shaibani Khan soon after. Shaibani not only conquered Badakshan, but Khorasan also. It was only after he was killed at the battle of Merv, that Shah Ismail occupied the latter province, and compelled, by his immense prestige, the Arghuns of Kandahar to recognize his suzerainty. If the death of Shaibani profited the Shah of Persia, it did Bābar no less. With the help of the Shah he recovered almost all his ancestral dominions. But his triumph was short-lived, and he was once again expelled from those dominions, which were the glory of his youth, the dream of his life, and the mission of all Indian Mughals.

This expulsion, however, did not mean the loss of all. During those memorable days, when for the last time he ruled from the capital of Taimur, he had bestowed upon his cousin Wais Mirza, the provinces of Badakshan along with Shadman and Khutlan1, and these remained to the Mughals yet. Safe from the direction of Badakshan, which he acquired after the death of Wais Mirza in 1520 and fully aware of the futility of all attempts to recover Balkh, then under the Uzbegs, he turned his attention to Kandahar. In 1522, after much worry and vigilance he conquered it from the Arghuns, who retired into Sindh. Thus of the whole line one patch had slipped off his hands, and the rest remained under his control. But Bābar was not satisfied. Six years later, when he had become the emperor of Hindustan he attempted to recover Balkh from the Uzbegs and used Badakshan as his base. Humayun had been placed in charge of the campaigns. His sudden departure for Agra, to counteract the conspiracy hatched by Khalifa and Mahdi Khwaja, to exclude him from the throne, spoiled the projects of Bābar, and caused much annoyance to him. Bābar asked his experienced minister Khalifa to take the place of Humayun in Badakshan, but he objected to go. Humayun also showed his reluctance to return to his post, and therefore, in the last resort, he deputed Suleiman Mirza, the heir-apparent, to take possession of his father's kingdom. Bābar still considered that the retention of the province was of great importance for the recovery of his lost ancestral dominions2. But he did not live to realize his ambition, and he was laid in the grave before a year was out.

1 An Empire Builder of the 16th Century, p. 104.
2 Ibid., p. 173.
On Humayun fell the burden of maintaining the double line of
defence—the inner and outer frontiers, besides a kingdom, whose
stability was extremely precarious. He lost the empire of Hindustan
by his own faults, and the most outstanding of them was his leniency
towards his brothers. Out of that leniency he divided his dominions
among his brothers, and Kamran received the whole of the trans-
frontier possessions of Bābar. Hence so long as Humayun was ruling
over Hindustan, as well as after his expulsion from India Kamran
was concerned about the frontier defence. After 1540, he was required
to maintain the outer frontier line alone. For five years more till
1545, he ruled Kabul, Kandahar and Badakshan, and successfully held
his own against the Uzbegs and the Persians. He had deprived
Suleiman Mirza of his hereditary principality of Badakshan, and had
brought it under his direct control. When in 1544 Humayun came
with Persian auxiliaries to wrest his kingdom from Kamran, he had
made an agreement with the friendly Shah of Persia, that Kandahar,
after its conquest, would be surrendered to him. Whether it was due
to the offensive attitude of the Persians or to the strategic importance
of Kandahar, whatever it be, Humayun took possession of it and broke
faith with the friendly Shah. Shortly after, he recovered Kabul from
Kamran, who fled away to Sindh. In the meanwhile Mirza Suleiman,
who had been released by Kamran at the time of Humayun's invasion
in order that he might be of some help to him, had established his
independence and taking advantage of the unsettled condition of
Humayun's affairs, had annexed the districts of Qunduz, Khost and
Anderab. These were the dependencies of Kabul under Kamran,
and when Humayun demanded them Suleiman would not part with
them. In 1547 Humayun led an army into Badakshan, and defeated
Suleiman Mirza, who fled from his country. Though for some time
the districts were annexed, Badakshan and Qunduz were bestowed
upon Hindal, Khost upon Munim Beg, and Talikan upon Bapus,
yet, political expediency dictated the restoration of the country
to Mirza Suleiman, who thenceforth remained a faithful ally of
Humayun.

But if secure from the side of Badakshan, he was not so from the
side of Balkh. It was under the Uzbegs, and they had given offence
to him by helping Kamran against him in 1548. In the spring of 1549,
therefore, he marched into Balkh, and commanded Suleiman, and
Kamran, who had in the meanwhile submitted to Humayun, to join
him with their forces. Suleiman did, and Kamran did not. In 1550
he "wandered about the country with bad intentions", and because of these bad intentions Humayun achieved nothing. On the other hand he was severly wounded in a dastardly attack by Kamran, and thus ended the Balkh expedition never to be repeated till the time of Shāhjāhān.

Until Kamran was blinded and sent away to Mecca (1553), Humayun's position in Kabul was very unsafe. Hindal had been killed (1551) and Askari, taken prisoner, was also sent to Mecca, where he died in 1557. Kandahar and Badakshan did not give him any trouble. Suleiman remained loyal to Humayun, who sealed this goodwill by giving his daughter Bakshni Banu to Suleiman's son Ibrahim. Thus free from his brothers and all frontier troubles, he invaded Hindustan, and recovered it with comparative ease. On 23rd July 1555 he sat on the throne of Delhi for the second time, and before six months were over he died by a fall from his library (27th January 1556).

Humayun left for Akbar the legacy of a contested succession in a nascent state. His minority and insecurity gave rise to all sorts of trouble on the frontier. Kandahar fell into the hands of the Persians in 1558, and Prince Suleiman assumed airs of independence. The latter went so far as to invade Kabul, owing to extreme young age of Muhammad Hakim Mirza, who was only five at the time, and retired because his own kingdom was threatened by the Uzbegs on the north west. In 1561 Munim Khan the regent for Muhammad Hakim was called to the Court, and then began a really troubous time in Kabul, Munim Khan, had been succeedecl by his son Ghani Khan, but the government was seized by Mahachuchak Begum, Hakim's mother with the help of three nobles, Shah Wali Afgan, Fazal Beg and Abul Fath Beg. When Akbar sent Munim Khan to set things right, he was defeated by the Begum. In the meanwhile she had put to death the three nobles, who had helped her in usurping power, and had taken one Haidar Kasim Kohbar, as her adviser whom she had intended to marry. At this juncture arrived the fugitive Abul Maali from India, wormed into her favour, married her daughter, and ultimately put her to death. Upon her lover also fell the same fate, and then Abul Maali seized power, and ruled like a tyrant over Kabul. Poor Muhammad Hakim fled away to the shelter of Prince Suleiman.
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who took up his cause, defeated and captured Abul Maali, and handed him over to Muhammad Hakim, who had him strangled to death in May 1564. This friendliness was cemented by the marriage of Prince Muhammad with the daughter of Prince Suleiman. On this occasion the ruler of Badakshan was given a part of Kabul in recognition of his services, but it offended the Kabulis, and there was an insurrection. In 1566 therefore, the Badakshan prince invaded Kabul with the intention of seizing his son-in-law, but failed. Shortly after died his (Suleiman's) wife, the spirited Haram Begum, and her death landed him into all sorts of troubles. He fell out with his grandson, and successor, Prince Shah Rukh, and was driven out of the kingdom. He wandered a good deal, seeking shelter first with the Uzbeel ruler of Balkh and then with the sovereign of Bokhara, Iskandar Khan, the father of Abdulla Khan Uzbeel.

But the unsettled condition of Badakshan, and the loss of Kandahar did not stand alone. Kabul went its own way, and actually became instrumental in jeopardising the safety of Akbar's empire in Hindustan. Instead of being a bulwark of Hindustan, her ruler tried to imitate Mahmud of Ghazni or Muhammad Ghori, in attacking Hindustan when Akbar was in a critical situation. Muhammad Hakim twice invaded the Punjab, once in 1567 when Akbar was exerting to crush the rebellion of the Uzbegs and the Mirzas, and again in 1581, when Akbar had, by his religious speculations, raised a whirlwind in Hindustan. Be it said to the credit of Akbar, that he repulsed his brother both the times and in 1581, actually marched into Kabul. Muhammad Hakim had fled away before him and had retired into the hills, leaving the capital to be occupied by Akbar. Though Akbar punished Muhammad Hakim by bestowing the kingdom on his sister, the wife of Khwaja Hasan, yet he realized quite well, how very dangerous it was to be deprived of the control of the frontier. For, a less capable monarch than Akbar would have collapsed in the crisis of 1581, and its dreadful nature was due to the attack of Muhammad Hakim, when the Muslims of Northern India were seething in discontent. Whatever was the result of the triumphant return of Akbar from Kabul, he became painfully aware of the fact that unless Kabul came under his control, his empire of Hindustan would be threatened from behind the frontier, the moment there was some commotion here.

Akbar's invasions of Kabul synchronised with a very dark period in Badakshan. Owing to the continuous strifes between Suleiman and
Shahrulkh "the country was now in the most lamentable confusion, the soldiery was discontented, the rayats without justice, the garrisons dismantled, and the whole country desolate." That was the opportunity of the Uzbekgs. The days were long past when they were drifting along the current like atoms of sand. Now they were thoroughly organized under their powerful leader Abdulla Khan. Born in 1533, and the son of a petty chief Iskandar Khan, he had conquered Bokhara at twenty-four, and had proclaimed his father as the Khakan of the Uzbek tribes at twenty-eight (1561). Then followed a series of victories, when Balkh, Samarkand, Taskand, Turkestan, Farghana and Audijan were conquered, and the glories of Shaibani again returned to the Uzbekgs. In 1583 his father died, and he succeeded to Khakanship. He had watched with a keen interest the civil war between the grandfather and grandson in Badakshan, and hardly a year was out (1584) when he invaded the kingdom and "without a blow struck seized the country." Fleeing for life Prince Shahrulkh met his grandfather on his way to Kabul, and the foes in prosperity became friends in adversity. They found a refuge first at Kabul, and then at the court Akbar.

The fall of Badakshan completed the loss of the whole line of the outer frontier and it was fraught with consequences for the Mughals. Kabul immediately, and Hindustan remotely, were exposed. For a moment therefore it brought about a harmony of interests between Akbar, and Muhammad Hakim. The latter applied for help to Akbar, in 1584; and Akbar promised “in the first place to despatch an embassy to Badakshan, manifestly hoping to set a bound to Abdullah’s conquest by diplomacy, and if this should fail, to follow it by an army to Kabul fully equipped and with a sum of treasure under an able general.” Akbar in fact thought, he could for the time being treat Kabul, as a buffer state, and wanted to strengthen it, so that it may be used as an outwork for Hindustan. But before any definite steps could be taken in this direction came the news of Muhammad Hakim’s death in July, 1585. This changed the attitude of Akbar, and the relative importance of Kabul. It could no more be treated as a buffer; it had to be taken under direct control at once. "No question of formal annexation arose, because the territory ruled

2 Ibid., pp. 128-29.
by the Mirza, although in practice long administered as an independent state, had always been regarded in theory as dependency on the crown of India."1 Akbar, therefore sent Man Singh with some troops so that he might maintain order till his arrival. Man Singh came not a moment too late, for "there was in Kabul a Turanian party amongst the nobles, which sought to subverse the ambitious designs by means of the young princes Kaiqubad and Afrasiab,"2 at the instigation of Abdulla Khan, and Man Singh's arrival frustrated their move. A general amnesty was proclaimed and it created a favourable atmosphere for the Emperor's rule. Having thus pacified Kabul by politic clemency Akbar started northwards, and early in December, 1585 pitched his tents at Rawalpindi. There or in its neighbourhood he lived for full thirteen years, watching the affairs of the Uzbegs and of the Persians, and conquering the countries that formed the inner frontier of Hindustan. It is a glorious period in Akbar's career of conquest and empire-building. It reveals Akbar's insight into the importance of frontier defence, as also his consummate ability to plan extensive campaigns in one of the most difficult regions of the world, and to control each minutae thereof. It is doubtful whether there is any other epoch in his life when he showed in a more brilliant way that he had the head to plan and the hand to execute, that his originality of conception and boldness of design were on a par with his eye for strategy.

Hardly a week had passed, when Akbar's ideas took definite shape. The whole of the frontier line formed by Kashmere, the tribal territory and Baluchi-tan must be brought under his control—Kashmere because it was of great strategic importance for controlling all the hinterland between the last offshoots of the Himalayas and the Hindukush forming the south-eastern frontier of Badakshan;—the tribal territory because inhabited by the most fierce and fickle Yusufzai tribes, it lay between the Khyber Pass and the Hindukush, between Chitral on the north of Kabul and Kashmere, and on its control depended the security of the pass which was the line of communication between Kabul and Northern India;—and Baluchistan, because it controlled the strategic pass and its conquest was necessary either as a precaution against the Persian at Kandahar, or as a preliminary for the subjugation of Kandahar. At a time when Abdulla Khan Uzbeg held the un-

disputed sway over Central Asia, and threatened Kabul, it was
certainly inexpedient to have the Yusufzais in open rebellion inspired by
their religious zeal, and Yusuf Khan the Sultan of Kashmere in a sulky
mood at the demand of the emperor to submit and pay homage in
person. Hence from Rawalpindi Akbar moved to Attock and thence
sent two expeditions into the Yusufzai country and Kashmere (1586).
His motive in moving from Rawalpindi to Attock was to “occupy a
position favourable for control of the operations against Kashmere
and also against the Afghans of the Yusufzai and Mandar tribes”\(^1\)
The expedition against the tribesmen was held by Zain Khan
Kokaltash, against the Yusufzais of the Bajaur country, while other
officers entered the Samah plateau, the home of the Mandar tribes.
Zain Khan was reinforced later by Raja Bir Bal and Hakim Abul Fath,
but the three commanders fell out, and could not decide upon a
common plan of operation. While retreating in despair they were cut
off by the tribesmen, and lost about half their army. Raja Bir Bal
was killed on this occasion. Then Raja Todar Mall was commissioned
to proceed against the tribesmen, and retrieved the lost prestige of the
imperial arms. “Here and there he built forts and harried and
plundered continually, so that he reduced the Afghans to great
straits.”\(^2\) Man Singh subsequently won a great victory over their leader
Jalal in the Khyber Pass. On the whole, the expeditions had a
salutary effect on the disloyalty of the tribesmen, and they proved less
troublesome, though they were never conquered. Jalal, their spiritual
leader kept up the fight till 1600, when he captured Ghazni, but he was
killed soon after.

As regards Kashmere Akbar had better success. Kasim Khan and
Raja Bhagwan Das with some other officers, had been entrusted with
the task of conquering that state. Their first contact with the
Kashmiris ended in a treaty that was not approved by Akbar. Soon
after the Sultan and his son surrendered, but being ill-treated the young
prince Yakub Khan, the son of Sultan, made his escape from the
imperial camp, and made warlike preparations in his state. Again
Kasim Khan was sent at the head of an army, and entered Srinagar
after overcoming the resistance of Yakub Khan. Kashmere was then
definitely annexed, and formed a Sarkar of the Subah of Kabul (1587-
88). Thus Akbar became comparatively free from anxiety by the year
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1581, and the next year he started to visit Kabul and Kashmere, at this time Akbar must have felt immense satisfaction to think that Kabul and Kashmere could no more afford an opportunity for the ambition of the Uzbegs, and that they now, formed integral parts of the empire.

Thus far only half the frontier line had been secured. There remained Sind and Baluchistan. Akbar left Kabul in November, 1589, in order to take in hand the conquest of Sind, and deputed in 1590, Abdur Rahim, Khanikhana for the purpose. Ever since 1574 the island fortress of Bakhar, had remained under imperial control. Now the Khanikhana was appointed Subedar of Multan, and directed to annex the kingdom of Thattah then under Mirza Jani, the Tarkhan. The latter was defeated at two places, and surrendered in 1591. With his surrender, his kingdom was annexed. Four years later in February, 1595, the fort of Siwi, to the south-east of Quetta fell to the imperialists, led by Mir Masum, the soldier and the historian. The Parni Afghans, who stubbornly defended the fort, were defeated and after their defeat, “all Baluchistan, as far as the frontiers of the Kandahar province, and including Makran, the region near the coast, passed under the imperial sceptre.” Akbar had considered the conquest of Sind and Baluchistan as a necessary prelude to the recovery of Kandahar, or to an effectual warding off of any attack from there. Here he was more fortunate than his expectations, and without a blow struck he acquired Kandahar. In April, 1595, its Persian Governor Muzaffar Husian Mirza handed over the fortress to Akbar’s officers, and thus one of the vital problems of the frontier defence was solved for Akbar.

The conquest of Kashmere, Sind, Baluchistan, the punishment of the tribesmen, and the surrender of Kandahar were great triumphs, and revealed the mighty strength of Akbar. By 1595 the inner frontier had been perfectly secured, as also the south-western part of outer frontier. These grand achievements highly impressed the contemporaries of Akbar, and specially Abdulla Khan. Now he could never entertain the idea of meddling in the affairs of Akbar’s empire. He “must rather have felt relief that Akbar did not make a common cause against him with Shah Abbas.” But that was out of the question, so long as Kandahar remained under Akbar. Abdulla Khan’s apprehensions were rooted in his enmity with Shah Abbas to

1 Smith, Akbar, p. 258.
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whom he had lost Mashad, Merv, Herat and most of Trans-oxiana before his death. Therefore he showed a good deal of concern to win the friendship of Akbar and actually proposed a matrimonial alliance between his son, and a daughter of Akbar. Akbar treated his overtures with scant attention and wrote a diplomatic letter in 1596 emphasising his great power, enormous resources and vast dominions, perhaps to convey that it was beneath his dignity to accord to his proposal. Two years later the powerful Khakan died, and thus departed the greatest enemy of Akbar. Other affairs awaited his attention, and relieved from all anxiety in the north, he returned to Agra the very same year. He had achieved much, but even with his great talents and vast resources he had not risked an invasion of Balkh and Badakshan. Perhaps even after the death of Abdulla Khan, the Uzbegs were sufficiently strong in those two provinces, and Akbar considered that a campaign would have extremely indifferent results. For a long time to come, they remained a decisive factor in the problem of the frontier defence of the Mughals.

Akbar left a powerful and progressive empire to his son Jahangir (1605) with a strong frontier and organized system of defence. Kandahar had been strengthened, and the tribal territories controlled by fortresses, built at strategic points. The Uzbegs, after the death of their leader, had become disunited, and their chiefs were fighting among themselves for supremacy. Hence Jahangir could afford to neglect them. But far otherwise was the case of the Persians. Their king Shah Abbas (1587-1629) was one of the greatest monarchs of the age. Shrewd and capable he excelled in tortuous diplomacy no less than the art of war. He had utterly humiliated Abdulla Khan, and had taken the easy Mughal acquisition of Kandahar very much to heart. He began to cast about for plans to recover it, shortly after Jahangir's accession, and did not cease until he had achieved it. Early in Jahangir's reign he secretly ordered his officers in the districts of Herat, Farra, Seistan, and Khorasan to make a surprised attack on Kandahar. But because the governor of Kandahar, constantly on the alert, had got timely information of his designs and was prepared to stand a siege, the Persians did not succeed (1607). The Shah, whose designs had thus been revealed, feigned indignation at the so-called unauthorized proceedings of his unruly officers, and sent an ambassador to Jahangir to explain and apologise. Jahangir, of

course, took it with good grace, but adequately reinforced the garrison at Kandahar, so that it might not be taken unawares again.

But the precautionary measures of Jahangir did not escape the eye of Shah Abbas, and he sedulously set to soothe his suspicions about Kandahar. His embassies to Jahangir came pretty frequently, and conveyed professions of friendship mingled with fulsome flattery. costly and handsome presents were also not wanting. Between 1611 and 1620, there came four embassies, all of which assured the Emperor that the Shah bore sincerest regards and warmest affection for him. Deceived by these empty shows Jahangir slackened his vigilance and reduced the garrison at Kandahar. Nothing could be more welcome to Shah Abbas. He secretly prepared a strong army, besieged Kandahar in March 1622 and took it after a siege of forty days. Prince Shahjahan, who had been ordered to repulse the enemy revolted, and for the rest of Jahangir's reign the Mughal court had neither leisure nor inclination to wrest Kandahar from the Persians. Thus Jahangir lost what Akbar had gained on the outer frontier, and Kabul became exposed again on the south west.

But Kandahar was not lost for ever. In February 1638 it was again betrayed to Shahjahan, by its Persian Governor Ali Mardan Khan. Emboldened by this freak of fortune Shahjahan thought, that he might undertake the recovery of Bakh and Badakshan. Nor were the circumstances unfavourable for such a project. Imam Kuli of the Astrakhanide dynasty died in 1642 after a prosperous rule of thirty-two years, and his vast kingdom comprising Samarkand, Bokhara, Bakh and Badakshan plunged into confusion. His son Nazar Mahammad had succeeded him, but he proved a failure, and owing to his high-handed proceedings, the Uzbeg generals deposed him and set up his eldest son Abdul Aziz in April, 1645. The deposed father was assigned only a portion of the kingdom comprising Bakh and Badakshan. This civil strife resulting in the division of Uzbeg dominions was the opportunity for Shahjahan, and he planned an expedition promptly into Badakshan. In June, 1645 the fort of Kahmard was occupied, but was abandoned soon after. In October another expedition was led by Raja Jagat Singh, and it resulted in the occupation of the Khost district. After these two pioneer expeditions Prince Murad was sent at the head of an immense army, fifty-thousand strong in June 1646. Kunduz was occupied on the 22nd June, and the city of Bakh entered on the 2nd July. Nazar Mahammad fled away towards Persia leaving his treasures
to the invaders, and it appeared as if the country was conquered.

But troubles started soon enough. Prince Murad hated the hilly country and its rustic inhabitants, and longed for Hindustan. Shahjahan failed to impress upon him the necessity of remaining there. He abandoned his charge without caring for his father's wishes, and came away. Terrible was the fate of the people of the country and their new conquerors after his departure. The Uzbegs made their life miserable and the government of the Mughals fell into disorder. It was only when Aurangzeb came, defeated the Uzbegs and occupied the city of Bakh (May, 1647) that the situation was relieved. But the period of trouble had not come to an end for the Mughals. Hardly had Bakh been occupied when an army of Abdul Aziz appeared within forty miles of it. Aurangzeb repulsed it and advanced up to Timurabad amidst incessant fighting. The following week was a period of the most strenuous struggle, when the Mughal army covered itself with glory and the Mughal prince showed those sterling qualities of dogged resolution, cool courage and consummate generalship, for which he became famous later on. The king of Bokhara impressed by the bravery and skill of Aurangzeb, opened negotiation for peace. He proposed that Bakh should be bestowed upon his own brother, while Shahjahan had already promised it to Nazar Mahammad. In the meanwhile the Mughals sick of the terrible warfare, sterile country and the barbarous ways of the people, clamoured to return home. They constantly thwarted Aurangzeb's schemes for conquest, because they thought if he determined to conquer the whole of Transoxiana, of which he was not incapable, they would not return home for years. Circumstances however favoured their purpose, and by September a settlement was arranged with Nazar Mahammad, who got back the province on his recognizing the suzerainty of Shahjahan. Aurangzeb returned to Kabul by October and was followed by the whole army. The latter suffered untold hardships because of the severe winter, and lost five-thousand men. Besides these losses, the Indian treasury had spent four crores of rupees for no gains whatever. "Not an inch of territory was annexed, no dynasty changed, and no enemy replaced by an ally on the throne of Bakh." 1 The frontier line formed by Bakh and Badakshan was not recovered, and never afterwards did the Mughal emperors indulge in the vain attempt of recovering these provinces.

1 Sarkar, _Aurangzeb_, vol. I, p. 113.
Equally unfortunate was Shahjahan with regard to Kandahar. After Ali Mardan Khan betrayed it into the hands of the Mughals, Shahjahan had spared no pains to strengthen it. Nevertheless, Shah Abbas II determined to take it and made a vigorous preparation secretly. The news however leaked out, and Shahjahan began to show some concern. It had been intimated that the Shah wanted to besiege the fortress in the winter. This unnerved the carpet-knights of the Mughal court, for they defeated a campaign in the bitter cold of the frontier regions. They therefore advised that it was not likely that the Shah would choose the cold weather for a siege, and Shahjahan listened to them. He remained content after sending a reinforcement, but the Shah was not deterred from his task by the cold weather. He attacked Kandahar about the middle of December, 1648, and took it on the 11th February, 1649.

The news of the commencement of the siege came to the court on the 16th January, 1649 as an eye-opener, and Shahjahan issued immediate orders, to Aurangzeb and Sadulla Khan to proceed to Kandahar with a relieving force. Before the commanders reached Kabul, Kandahar had capitulated, and there they were detained owing to a heavy snow-fall. Consequently they reached Kandahar on the 14th May. The relieving force was employed as a besieging army, and the lack of siege-guns seriously hampered their operations. After months of futile work, they were ordered to give up the attempt and to retire (5th September, 1649), and thus ended the first Mughal effort to recover Kandahar, in cloud and smoke.

Shahjahan could not rest in peace, but neither could he rush to recover Kandahar from a foe whose strength he knew only too well. He took two years to prepare, and ordered Aurangzeb with an army of fifty to sixty thousand men and a fine park of artillery to take it. With great vigour the siege began on the 2nd May, 1652, but by the end of June it was realized that the Mughal guns would never breach the walls. Once again Shahjahan had to eat his humble pie, and order a retreat.

A year later Dara was directed to undertake the task. With a vast army seventy thousand strong, and huge field-pieces, as also with a good deal of conceit, he commenced the siege on the 28th April, and continued it till the 27th September. In spite of his equipments and unflagging zeal he failed to make an impression on the Persians, and was therefore ordered to retire. That was the third time that Shahjahan, and the last time that any Mughal Emperor attempted to recover Kandahar from the Persians.
Thus in the heyday of Mughal rule, in the regime of the glorious Shahjahan, the outer frontier of the empire could not be recovered. It betokened ill for the future safety of the Mughal rule both in Kabul and Hindustan. It was specially so when the empire was expanding southwards, and new kingdoms were being brought under the Mughal sway. It was in fact getting unwieldy, and the effects were felt during the reign of Aurangzeb. The unwieldy size undermined the efficiency of frontier defence, and soon after Aurangzeb’s succession there arose troubles on the inner frontier.

In 1667 the Yusufzais started trouble. At a time they were rapidly expanding they found a leader in Bhagu, who organized them, and sent them to attack the Mughal territory. They crossed the Indus, invaded the plain of Pakhali, and captured several Mughal outposts. The Emperor therefore planned a grand campaign, and ordered three divisions to attack the enemy one from Attock, another from Kabul and the third from the court. The last two divisions took time to arrive on the scene and therefore the Foujdar of Attock led his own division against the Yusufzais. A battle was fought on the south bank of the Indus in which the rebels were defeated, and then they evacuated the imperial territory on this side of the river. Not venturing to enter the enemy’s country all alone, the Foujdar awaited reinforcements, and when they came, Shamshir Khan of Kabul took over the supreme command. He won many victories, and made a fair headway into their country. In the meanwhile came Mahammad Amin Khan from the court with nine thousand troops, and joining Shamshir Khan, took over the supreme command from him. Under his able leadership the Mughals entered the Swat Valley, and forced the inhabitants to keep peace for some time. Strong Mughal garrisons were stationed at different points, and they kept the country under control.

“In 1672, however, began a formidable danger. The tactless action of the Foujdar of Jalalabad bred discontent among the Khyber clans. The Afridis rose under their chieftain Acmal Khan...”1 To suppress them Mahammad Amin Khan was sent in the spring of 1672, and suffered a severe defeat and heavy losses at Ali Masjid in April. It is said, forty thousand Mughals were cut to pieces, and many, including the commander, had to leave their families as prisoners in the hands of the barbarians. The disaster was aggra-

vated at the news that Khush-hal Khan of the Khatak clan had also taken arms against the Emperor. It was a national rising and the whole Pathan land from Kandahar to Attock was seething in rebellion. The Emperor deputed Mahabat Khan but he proved a failure. Then Shuja’at Khan was ordered to punish the Afghans (14th November, 1673), in co-operation with Jaswant Singh. He failed even more ignominously than Mahabat Khan, being severely defeated and killed at the Karapa pass (21st February, 1674).

The repetition of these disasters compelled Aurangzeb to come to the spot and direct the operations himself. In June, 1674 he arrived at Hasan Abdal, and remained there for a year and a half. With his arrival "imperial diplomacy, no less than imperial arms began to have effect. Many clans... were won over by the grant of presents, pensions, jagirs and posts in the Mughal army to their headmen. As for the irreconcilables, whom neither the concentration of imperial force could overawe, nor the treasures of India could buy, their valleys were penetrated by detachments from Peshwar. Thus in a short time the Gholai, Ghalzai, Shirrani and Yusufzai clans were defeated and ousted from their villages. A Mughal outpost held Bazarak, the Shirrani capital. At this the Daudzai, Tarakzai and Tirahi tribes made their submission. Muhammad Ashraf, the son of Khush-hal .... entered the imperial service. Similarly the son of Bhagu, the Yusufzai ringleader, offered to wait on the Emperor on receiving an assurance of safety. Darya Khan Afridi's followers promised to bring the head of Acmal, the Afridi pretender, if their past misdeeds were forgotten, (end of August)."

In the meanwhile the imperial armies were closing round the Mohmand tribe and their allies. They were defeated with heavy slaughter at Ali Masjid and Gandamak, but not crushed. Early in 1675 they recovered their lost ground by inflicting two defeats on the imperialists. Towards the end of the year 1675, however, the situation had considerably improved, and the Mughal outposts had been pushed forward. The Emperor returned to Delhi (March, 1676) with an easy heart. Throughout the year 1677 peace reigned, because the Mughals and the Afghans suffered from a seven months' drought and famine. In 1678 Amir Khan, a very able man, was appointed Governor of Kabul and retained the office for twenty years till 1698. He excelled in diplomacy no less than in the art of war, and he followed a policy

of "divide and rule." "Under his astute management they ceased to trouble the Imperial Government, and spent their energies in internecine quarrels." \(^1\) The Yusufzais submitted, though the Afridis remained in arms longer.

On the whole, the frontier became quiet for some time. The war had cost much to the empire. Apart from the financial loss, the political effect was grievous. "It made the employment of the Afghans in the ensuing Rajput war impossible, though the Afghans were just the class of soldiers who could have won victory for the imperialists in that rugged and barren country. Moreover it relieved the pressure on Shivaji by draining the Deccan of the best Mughal troops for service on the N. W. frontier." \(^2\) Thus the frontier trouble adversely reacted upon the stability of the empire. Already the outer frontier had been lost, and now the inner frontier became the source of all sorts of trouble for the Mughals. The cumulative effect began to be felt after the death of Aurangzeb. Hardly thirty years had passed after the frontier defence entirely collapsed, when taking advantage of it came Nadir Shah like a whirlwind, and swept off the last vestiges of the imperial prestige. His invasion resulted in the annexation of the whole country to the west of the Sutlej. The inner and outer lines of frontier were thus lost, and that was the death-knell of the Mughal empire. Loss of the Rajput adherence would have meant nothing had the frontier provinces, the prolific land of soldiers, remained to the Mughals. The loss of the frontiers was a double danger; it exposed the kingdom of Hindustan to external attack, and it weakened the kingdom in warlike resources. The rapid expansion of the empire southwards, made it unwieldy, and also weakened the frontier defence to a degree unknown before.

H. N. Sinha

---

\(^1\) Sarkar's *Aurangzeb*, vol. III, p. 278.

Buddha head in the Mathura Museum

Relief showing two Yaksini busts, in the Mathura Museum

(By the courtesy of the Museum authorities.)

I. H. Q., September, 1931
Usnisa-siraskāta (a mahapurusa-laksana) in the early Buddha images of India

1 The Mahāpadāna and the Lakkhaṇa Suttāntas of the Dīgha Nikāya (vols. II and III) refer to one of the 32 signs of the Buddha’s person as uṇāsāsita; in later Buddhist Sanskrit works such as the Lalitavistara, Mahāvyutpatti, it is referred to as uṇāṣa-siraskāta. The correct interpretation of this peculiarity of a Buddha, especially in connection with its representation in Buddhist iconoplastic art of different periods, has engaged the attention of many a scholar. Long ago, Burnouf, after a careful examination of this question, wrote, “I propose to translate the term standing for the first of the characteristic signs of a great man, as the Tibetans did and as the Buddha statues testify: ‘his head is crowned by a cranial protuberance’.”Remusat, however, some time before Burnouf, interpreted this physical peculiarity, partly after the Tibetan manner, supplying in addition a detail relating to the arrangement of the hair: “He has the hair gathered together in a knot upon a fleshy tubercle placed on the summit of his head.” The exact significance of this laksana has since then been discussed by various scholars such as Foucher, Waddell,

1 Senart pointed out long ago that the Indian conception about these Mahāpurusa-laksanas ‘went far beyond the confines of Buddhism, having taken root in older Brāhmānic myths’; Essai sur la legende du Buddha, Paris, 1882, pp. 28f. The bearer of these marks on his body was destined to be either a Cakravartti monarch or a Buddha.

2 Lotus de la Bonne Loi, p. 560.
5 Ost Asiatische Zeitschrift, 1914, ‘Buddha’s Diadem or Uṇāṣa’.

It is very difficult to accept Waddell’s conclusions on account of the fact that the premises on which he bases them do not bear scrutiny. His identification of cakravāka, the Nāgarāja at Bharhut as Varuṇa, the god of sky and ocean, is not established on solid data. Again, the six-headed figure of Mahāsenā (Skanda-kārṭtikeya) in the Yuan Kwang grottos, who can be correctly described as such from the attributes which are in his hands, viz., a Śakti and a cock, and his peacock vehicle, has been wrongly designated by him as Varuṇa.
and Coomaraswami and different explanations have been given by them.

For determining the real sense of this term, one will have to take into careful consideration the original meaning of the word Uṣṇīṣa, the interpretation of this ṭakṣaṇa by the celebrated commentator Buddhaghosa (C. 5th century A.D.), its presence or absence in the list of the Purusa-lakṣaṇas in Brāhmaṇical literature; such as the Brhat-saṃhitā of Varāhamihira and last, but not the least, the important testimony of the Buddha images of different periods, especially the early Gandhāra and Mathurā ones. From its etymological sense, “a protection from the sun, sunshade”, the term Uṣṇīṣa is interpreted as “a turban”, usually “a royal turban”, e.g. King Milinda names it among the royal insignia. The head-dress of a Brahmacārin is also referred to as Uṣṇīṣa. But, this usual sense of a turban can hardly be accepted to explain this physical peculiarity of a Buddha, for the Bodhisattvas, when they left the world to attain Buddhhatva, discarded, according to tradition, their head dress and other ornaments.

Buddhaghosa, in his Sumanḍalaviśāṣī, explains the lakṣaṇa Uṣṇīṣa-sarsa as referring to the well-developed forehead (paripūrṇanalaṭa) and the well-developed head (Paripūrṇa-saśa) of the Mahāpurusā. He develops the first part of his explanation, thus, Mahāpurisassa hi dakkhiṇa-kapya-culikato paṭṭhaya mamsapatālam utthahitvā sakalā-nalām chadiyamanāṃ pūrayamanāṃ ganivā Vāmakāṇṇa-culikaye paṭṭhitam raṅho bandha uṇhisapattio viya virocati. So, according to him, this refers to the mass of flesh which rises from the root of the right ear, extends over and thus covers the whole of the forehead.

Moreover, there is no justification for assuming that the 7 hoods of the Ādiśeṣa on whose coils Nārāyaṇa Viṣṇu is depicted in a recumbent pose, is the Uṣṇīṣa of the same god. Other objections can be raised, which make it impossible for one to accept his solution of the Uṣṇīṣa problem.

1 J. R. A. S., 1928, Buddha’s cuḍa, hair and uṣṇīṣa, crown.
3 Agnipūrṇa, ch. 90, v. 10-11:
and ends near the root of the left ear, resembling the tied turban-folds of kings; i.e. this fleshy growth is uniformly distributed over the whole of the forehead and shines forth like the front plait of the royal turban. He goes out of his way to remark that kings modelled the folds of their turban (Upīsapaṭṭa) on this characteristic of the great men. As regards the second part, the learned commentator refers to various kinds of undeveloped heads resembling those of a monkey, in shape like a fruit, and extremely bony or pitcher-like in appearance, or of the rapidly sloping type; whereas the great man's head is fully developed and rotund everywhere (sabbaṭha parimāṇḍala) like a water bubble (mahāparisassā paraṇa āraggena vattetvā ṭhapitam viya supariṇḍham udakabubbulasadosanāt sīsan hoti). Dr. Rhys Davids remarks about the explanation of Buddhaghosa, "In either case, the rounded highly developed appearance is meant, giving to the undorned head the decorative dignified effect of a crested turban and the smooth symmetry of a water bubble".¹ We should point out here that both these senses of the word were not Buddhaghosa's own invention but were current in his time. But the most important point here is that 'the bony protuberance on the top of the Buddha's skull'—a sense which is established beyond doubt in later tradition, both literary and plastic, is not referred to here.

We may enquire now about the characteristic feature of the heads of great men, as recorded in Brāhmaṇical literature. It must be observed here that the word uṇiṣaśīrśa does not occur in the Brāhmaṇical texts among the Mahāpuruṣa-lakṣaṇas, so far known to me. But the inherent sense of the word might be referred to there in a different manner. Thus, the great inhabitants of Śvetadvīpa, where Nārada went in quest of the Bhagavat, are said to have heads like 'an umbrella'² (chatrākṛṣṭiśīrṣa; not chatrākoli, as Waddell and Coomaraswamy have put it). The great gods Nara and Nārāyaṇa, visited by Nārada in the Vadariṅkārṇa are characterised with heads like umbrellas, a feature described

¹ Rhys Davids, Dialogues of the Buddha, II, p. 16, fn. 4. Dr. B. M. Barua, informs me that the force of the word c'eva in the commentary should be taken into account. Both the senses of Paripṛṣṇanalaṁataṁ and Paripṛṣṇasiso are comprised in the term uphisasiso.

² Mahabharata, xii, 334, 11.
as a *Mahāpuruṣa-lakṣaṇa.* Varāhamihira describes the heads of kings (cakravartīs) as resembling the shape of an umbrella. Utpala comments on this passage that this umbrella-like shape refers to the high broad expanse of the upper part of the head. The *Sāmudrikāsāstra* tells us that he whose head resembles an open umbrella or the breast of a young lady is destined to be a sārvabhauma (cakravartī) monarch. Thus, the Brāhmaṇical traditions about the śirolakṣaṇa of gods, great men and kings are unanimous in laying down that the outline of the head would resemble that of an expanded umbrella; i.e. here also we find a reference to ‘the rounded highly developed appearance’ of the head as is alluded to by Buddhaghosa in the term ‘udakububbulasadisa.’ As regards the first part of Buddhaghosa’s explanation (viz. *Paripūraṇamālātata*), if we refer to the section on the Sāṅkhalaśātalakṣaṇas of human beings in the *Brhat-saṃhitā* we can understand what our author means here: thus, those

1 *Mahābhārata,* xii, 343, 38:

2 *Brhat-saṃhitā,* ch. 67, v. 76:

3 *Sāmudrikāsāstra,* Venkaṭeśvara Press, Bombay, p. 78:

4 It may be objected that the umbrellas as represented in early Indian art is flat in shape and so do not show the gently rising carved out line which is necessary for the confirmation of our hypothesis. But it should be remembered that all the umbrellas are not of the flat type which is usually shown over stūpas and on Bodhi trees; partially dome-shaped umbrellas are also known (cf. *HIIA,* pi. XIII, fig. 48—a Bharhut rail medallion) and these were usually spread over honoured beings.

5 Ch. 67, v. 30-2: जन्मदिवसः (Utpala—सन्ततिदिवसः सुन्दरिविषयः संस्कृतिः त्रेतयज्ञम्)

6 भवस्तोऽवस्तुस्वसंहारम् (Utpala—अवस्तुस्वस्वसंहारश्चत्तुन्यम् सताःति धनवतं त्रेतयज्ञम्)

7 युगितविभाषणार्थं (Utpala—युगितविभाषणार्थते धनवतेः)

8 धनवतेः (Utpala—सहस्रास्त्रोऽर्थि धनवतेः)

9 धनवतेः (Utpala—सहस्रास्त्रोऽर्थि धनवतेः)

10 धनवतेः (Utpala—सहस्रास्त्रोऽर्थि धनवतेः)
with high and broad \textit{\textit{sa}nkh\textit{has} (the bone on the forehead) are (destined to be) rich (great) men; the rich (great) are characterised by a forehead like a half-moon in appearance; men with broad bu\textit{ktis} (front portion of the skull) are instructors of persons. The \textit{Samudrika\textit{astra}} tells us also the same thing.\textsuperscript{1} Thus, it appears, from all this that the parallel evidence of the early as well as the later Brahmanical texts proves that the early Buddhist writers did not mean by the term \textit{U\textit{wissara\textit{isa}} 'the bony protuberance of the head' and Buddhaghosa was quite correct in giving us the full technical sense of the term, current in his time. It is universally accepted by scholars that the Buddhists adopted these signs of the \textit{Mah\textit{apuru\textit{n}}as} from the Br\text{\-}ahmins and applied them to the person of the Buddha; so it will be natural for us to seek for their proper significance among the Brahmanical literature. Thus we must accept Senart's statement that 'this particular \textit{lak\textit{n}a} is not in the list of the signs of a Great Man in Brahmanical writings such as the "\textit{B\textit{r\textit{h\textit{at Sam\textit{hit\textit{a}}}'} with some modification.\textsuperscript{2}

But then the question may arise when did this term come to mean a 'bony protuberance?' That this sense had already come into existence when Yuan Chwang visited India in the 7th century A.D. is proved by the fact that he went on pilgrimage to the shrine of Buddha's \textit{U\textit{n\textit{\textit{iga}}-bone in Hilo, near Gandh\text{\-}ara. Two centuries earlier, the same temple enshrining the precious relic, viz., "S\textit{\textit{ak\textit{ya Julai's skull-top bone}' was seen and described by Fa-hien. It is true that this relic 'in shape like a wasp's nest or the back of the arched hand, shown to believing pilgrims in Hilo' was an imposture; but, it is interesting to note that this peculiarity of Buddha's head was understood in different manners by the two famous Buddhists of the 5th century A.D., viz., the Chinese traveller Fa-hien and the Indian commentator Buddhaghosa. This can be explained, however, by suggesting that Buddhaghosa who wrote his commentaries in Ceylon has offered us the original meaning of the term, which as has been shown by us, is borne out by the evidence of the Brahmanical texts, whereas, these Chinese pilgrims refer to the

\textsuperscript{1} \textit{S\textit{\textit{amudrika\textit{a-S}, p. 74:--

\begin{quote}

popular superstition about this supposed 'skull-top bone relic' with which Buddhism was at first little concerned. Watters remarks: "It is interesting to observe that we do not find mention of any Buddhist monks as being concerned in any way with this precious relic." Again, it seems that there was some confusion in the minds of the Chinese regarding the exact nature of the Uṣṇīṣa. "Some, like Yuan Chwang, regarded it as a separate formation on, but not a part of, the top of the skull." Yuan Chwang and the other pilgrims use the Chinese word ting-kū (bone of the top of the head) for Uṣṇīṣa; several other Chinese translations of it are ting-jou chi, i.e., "the flesh top-knot on the top of the head" and juchi-kū or "the bone of the flesh top-knot." Other Chinese methods of describing this labāṇa are: "On the top of the head the Uṣṇīṣa like a deva sunshade (a reference no doubt in a round about manner to the Chaturakṣiptiṃga of the Brāhmaṇical texts); or as having "on the top of his head the Uṣṇīṣa golden skull-top bone." Lastly, it is said that "on the top of the Buddha's head is manifested the Uṣṇīṣa, i.e., manifested occasionally as a miraculous phenomenon; and it is not visible to the eyes of ordinary beings."

But whence came this adventitious sense of this term Uṣṇīṣa, in the Indian literature? Here, fortunately, the Buddha figures belonging to different ancient and mediaeval art-centres of India will come to our aid. The Indian Buddha types of Mathurā belonging to the early Kuṣāṇa period and the early Hellenistic ones from Gandhāra supply us with much useful data regarding the solution of our problem.

But, in order to utilise the evidence of the early Kuṣāṇa Buddha-heads of Mathurā, we must first answer the question whether these are actually depicted bald except for the central snail-shell (kapardda) coil of hair on the top; because the hair-question is intimately connected with the Uṣṇīṣa one. The head, reproduced in pl. 1, fig. 1, shows a smooth highly developed cranium which rises up from the

2 Watters, Ibid., p. 196: 'this protuberance was supposed to be a sort of abnormal development of the upper surface of the skull into a small truncated cone covered with flesh and skin and hair'
a very satisfactory description of the later adventitious sense.
3 Watters, Ibid., p. 197.
hairline (keiarekhā) with the central hair-coil on the top. The smoothness of the raised cranium led scholars to think that the heads were shaven. But, there is no question that there were doubts in the minds of some of them with regard to this point. Dr. Vögel, while discussing the iconography of the sculptural specimens in the Mathurā Museum, refers to the Kaṭrā Bodhisattva-Buddha and another standing Buddha (Nos. A1 & A4 in the Museum) and remarks, "that these are indeed Buddha images of the Kuṣāṇa period in which the head is shaven." But while describing the images themselves, in the case of A1, he observes: "the treatment of the hair deserves special notice. It is not carved in curls, but it is only indicated by a line over the forehead, so as to give the impression that the head is shaven". In the case of no. A4, his remark is "the hair is treated so as to simulate the shaven head of a monk". But, in his recent publication on Mathurā sculptures, he is definite: "La tète rase porte un usṇīsa en forme de colimacon (kapāda)", i.e. the shaven head bears an usṇīsa in the form of a snail-shell. It was Mons. Foucher, however, who first definitely pointed out that the early Mathurā heads were not shaved, in these words "we want to point out this mode of stopping rigorously on the forehead the line of the hair of which the mass is indicated only by a perfectly compact smooth modelling: so well that in keeping altogether the silhouette characteristic of the chignon, the head appears entirely shaven". Dr. Codrington refers to this feature in these words: "the usṇīsa is represented as a celled protuberance something like a snail-shell, the head itself being smooth, but with the line of the forehead clearly marked." Later, his positive statement about the usṇīsa as a protuberance and further remark that 'no attempt is made to disguise it, as in Gandhāra' are not based on the correct interpretation

1 Mathura Museum Catalogue, p. A27; Vogel: "Shaven head". This may be regarded as a good representative of the early Kuṣāṇa Buddha heads of Mathurā; cf. the Kaṭrā Buddha: Coomaraswamy says about this head type: "rarely seen after the 2nd cent. A.D. and never after the fifth".

2 Mathura Museum Catalogue, p. 35.
3 Ibid., p. 47; italics are ours.
4 Ibid., p. 49.
5 Ars Asiatica, vol. XV, p. 36.
6 Foucher, L'Art Grasco-Bouddhique, etc., p. 700.
7 Codrington, Ancient India, p. 44.
of these features. A little later, in the same publication, he definitely asserts that 'at least in the early part of the Kushan century it is certain the head was left bare.' Dr. Coomaraswamy, on the other hand, was at first of opinion that the early Kuśāna Buddha and Bodhisattva type of Mathura was characterised by the shaven head'.¹ That he changed his opinion some what later is proved by this observation of his about the early Kuśāna type: 'the head smooth, with a conical, spirally twisted projection on the crown of the head; let us not take it for granted that the head is shaved, or that the projection is an Uṣṇīṣa'.² Ludwig Bachhofer, however, in criticising Mons. Foucher’s conclusion, observes: "There is no valid reason why in one place of the head, the hair should unmistakably be represented as such, while close by it should only be indicated by quite other means."³ But Mons. Foucher’s conclusion can be justified on the following grounds. If these heads were represented as shaved at all, what could have been the explanation of this distinct swell on the skull above, the hair-line? Shaven headed monks are depicted in Indian plastic art; but these do not show this distinct cranial division into two planes just near the keārekha. That the Mathurā artists of this period were in the habit of indicating the hair in this manner can be proved, if we carefully

¹ Hist. of Ind. & Indonesian Art, p. 56-7. In his Origin of the Buddha Image (M. F. A. Bulletin, vol. IX, no. 4, p. 23) however, he seems to have already changed his opinion. Referring to the great differences that are to be found in the treatment of the hair on Buddha-heads, in Gandhāra and Mathurā, he remarks: "in Mathurā, however, both Buddha and Jina images are represented at first with a spiral protuberance which is a lock of hair and not an Uṣṇīṣa; later the whole head and hair are covered with small short curls, and this type after the second century becomes the almost universal rule, the only example of the smooth head dating from the Gupta period being the Mankuwar image, 448-9 A.D."

² J.R.A.S., 1928, p. 817. He further adds in Ibid., p. 827, "that the remainder of the head is smooth does not mean that it is shaved but simply that all the long hair was drawn up close and tight over the scalp into the single stress. The thickness of this smooth hair is always clearly indicated in the sculptures."

³ Early Indian Sculpture, p. 95.
A broken Buddha head in relief in the Mathura Museum

(By the courtesy of the Museum authorities)
observe the treatment of the same in some Yakṣiṇī heads (cf. pl. I, fig. 2: the hair is treated here in a smooth compact mass shown tightly drawn upwards, without the least striation on the surface which would indicate that the raised surface consists of hair; but the raised hairline is divided here into several sections in order to give a beautifying effect to the heads of these females). Pl. II shows that, in very rare instances, the hair on the cranium is treated in a slightly different manner showing six distinct layers, beginning from the root of the ear and ending below the Kapardda hair-coil; that these are nothing but stratified arrangement of the hair¹ is proved by the distinct striation of these layers. Bachhofer's objection can be further answered by suggesting that 'the unmistakable representation of the hair as such' on the topmost coil only, in the majority of the Buddha heads of this type, probably shows an ingenious attempt on the part of the artist just to suggest that the raised mass above the forehead also was hair; had there been no striation on the former, then there might have been a greater chance for misinterpreting the whole thing (as it is, the peculiar plastic form of a head with compact smooth hair has been misread; the beautiful Yakṣiṇīs cited above were not certainly depicted with shaven heads!). In any case, Bachhofer himself has not given us any reasonable explanation of this 'rising' near the hairline.² To the artists of Mathurā as in the case of those of other localities, the Buddha was not shaven headed like his monks.³

¹ Did the artist intend to show here in a conventional manner the downward continuation of the matted spiral coil on the top?

² It cannot be suggested that this was perhaps the mamsapatala of Buddhaghosa, for he describes the latter as covering the whole of the forehead and we have already tried to explain the term with the evidence of the Brāhmaṇical texts; by the way, the 'open umbrella' like outline of these heads should be noted. The treatment of the hair of the Patna Yakṣa (P. 2, in the Indian Museum, Calcutta) should be observed. All the hair is gathered en masse upwards—the hair-ends abruptly ending near the nape. The distinct swell above the hair-line and striation (clear in the relief) preserved near the hair-ends, should be especially marked in this connection.

³ The head of the Buddha image of Mankuwar (5th century A.D.) is sui generis; it is an exception to the general rule adopted in the case of both early Kuṣāṇa on the one hand and the late Kuṣāṇa and the Gupta Buddha heads, on the other; the hair is treated here in an all
Once we accept this solution of the hair-problem of the early Kuśāṇa Buddha type of Mathurā, the determination of the question whether the Kapardda coil is to be regarded as the Uṣṇīṣa of these Buddhas is easy.¹ There is no contemporary authority which justifies us in describing this as Uṣṇīṣa; so we should be careful in using such expression as 'Spiral Uṣṇīṣa'² or Uṣṇīṣa in the form of a Kapardda.³ If there were any plastic representation of the lakṣṇa, Uṣṇīṣaśirāskatā here, and we think it was there, we ought to find it in the well rounded (sabdhaparimāṇḍala) umbrella-like (chatrākṛti) outline of the cranium and the high broad (suktiviśāla) shape of the forehead. Dr. Coomaraswamy, however, after a minute study of the earliest Indian images of Buddha entertains no doubt about the fact that they do not attempt to represent the Uṣṇīṣa, either as a turban, or until later, as a bony protuberance.⁴

Nor does the evidence of the earliest of the Gandhāra Buddhas prove that these bear the abnormal cranial protuberance. There exists, still, a great deal of difference of opinion among scholars regarding the dating of the Gandhāra sculptures.⁵ But there is some sort of unanimity among them about the relievo-representation of Buddha compact smooth mass with neither a single coil in the centre, nor short curls all over the head, but with a slight swell on the centre of the head.

¹ We can refer here to the interesting manner in which this spiral hair-coil is shown along with the folds of a turban on the head of a standing Bodhisattva (Codrington, Ancient India, pl. 22.c.). It seems that the artist means to show that the hair is drawn up together in a mass and turned round in a single coil on the top and wound up with the folds of the turban. Rudra (Śiva) is described as Kaparddi in Vedic texts on account of his identification with Agni whose flames waving upward are likened to the snail-shell-like coils gathered upward on an ascetic's head and 'the hair of the true Kapardin is long'; the attribute Uṣṇīsin was also applied to him in early and late texts: Vāj. S., XVI, 22; Mahābhārata, 13. 17, 44; Kādambarī, 220. Uṣṇīsin both in the Vājasaneyī Samhitā and the Māh. passages is explained by the commentators as biroventanavān.

² Coomaraswamy, HIIA, p. 57; but he does not describe now this Kapardda as Uṣṇīṣa; cf JRAS., 1928, p. 817; M.F.A. Bulletin, vol. IX, no. 4, p. 23.

³ Ars Asiatica, vol. XV, p. 36.

⁴ JRAS., 1928, p. 832.

... the Bimaran reliquary,—this being one of the earliest figures of the Master so far known, if not the earliest one. Bachhofer thus describes the hair on its head: "There are no spiral locks. The thick hair covering the head is twisted on the crown of the head into a large knot, which produces the effect of a loose structure (italics are ours). The coiffure of the figure of the flask-carrying Maitreya on the socle of the Buddha statue from Charsada should be studied in this connection; the hair is gathered up and tied round by a string (of hair?) at the bottom of the so-called Uṣṇīṣa bump. As a matter of fact, a very close observation of the early Hellenistic Gandhāra Buddhas in the Peshawar and Lahore Museums convinces one that the luxuriant hair of the Master is really tied up, upon the crown of the head. Mr. Hargreaves referring to the exhibit No. 1921 in the Peshawar Museum, remarks that 'the artist untrammelled by tradition, has ventured to bind the base of the Uṣṇīṣa by a jewelled band',6 But what he fails to observe is that this pearl or usually the string band is present at the base of the so-called Uṣṇīṣa bump in a large majority of the early Buddha heads of this art centre. Nor is this feature of the top-knots of hair confined to the heads of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas alone; Mons. Foucher pointed out long ago that a number of reliefs show that even ordinary mortals have such a hair-dress beneath their turbans. Semi-divine Yakṣas are also depicted with this peculiar arrangement of the hair; thus most of the children of Hārīta and Pañcika in a Gandhāra relief are shown with these top-knots.6 It is no use multiplying cases; a close

1 Early Indian Sculpture, vol. I, p. 94.
2 "Iastnagar Socle" dated in the year 384, Śel. E. or A.D. 72; cf., Ludwig Bachhofer, ibid., vol. II, fig. 143. But the dating is open to doubt; Konow dates it in 300 A.D.
4 Exhibit no. 227 in the Peshawar Museum shows the topmost hair-knot tied together by a string of pearls; similar is the case with fragmentary heads Nos. 232 and 293. In Nos. 223, 231 and 233 (all the last 5 are moustached heads) the upper knob consists of wavy curls strung together in their middle by a stringlike thin woven hair. In No. 231, this hair knob is elongated in shape.
5 Foucher, Art Graeco-Bouddhique du Gandhāra, tome I, fig. 234.
study of the reliefs alone will convince us of the truth of this statement. Now, this top-knot does not really cover any abnormal swelling of the central cranium; in its plastic form, it could not but appear as something solid with waving locks upon it. The misunderstanding of this feature was certainly the root-cause in the change of the meaning of the term Uṣṇīṣa, and once this wrong interpretation came into existence, the artists of Gandhāra began to make Buddha-heads with this top-knot having the appearance of the central bump. But even then, the procedure was certainly not uniform. With the introduction of the short-curls, turned towards the right covering the head and the bump on it, a conventional stereotyping is no doubt apparent; but cases are not wanting where the old formula was resorted to. Hargreaves remarks, "a less naturalistic but still pleasing treatment of the hair is seen in Nos. 1430 (pl. 9a, pl. III, fig. 1), 1424, 1425 where the Uṣṇīṣa is treated schematically in little loose curls". The evidence of the beautiful stucco heads of late Gandhāra period (c. 5th century A.D.) is specially interesting in this connection; in many of these, the so-called Uṣṇīṣa is disproportionately small and is shown sometimes in front and at other times in the centre of the cranium. One of these, 'of the conventionalised' type leaves no doubt in our mind about the artist's intention (pl. III, fig. 2).

Our acceptance of this solution of the origin of the so-called Uṣṇīṣa on later Buddha heads will be facilitated further, if we bear in mind that the wearing of long hair in different modes was a common custom among the males of the various social orders of the Indo-Aryans, especially of the higher ones. They not only carried these luxurious locks on their own heads in different shapes, but endowed their gods with this same characteristic. Thus, the various gods depicted in the early Indian monuments of the pre-Christian period—very few of which can however be regarded as distinct iconographic types—are shown with luxuriant hair dressed in various ways and the Uṣṇīṣa i.e., the turban is one of their most prominent

1 Handbook etc., p. 52; but where is the authority for using the word Uṣṇīṣa here? It is simply an arrangement of the locks in several tiers narrowing upwards.

2 Marshall, Guide to Taxila, p. 48, pl. VI; here the top-knot is not disproportionate.
adornment which also is worn in different manners. But, if we refer to the plastic representation of some we cannot but be struck with the idea that there could have been always the chance of misinterpreting the big knot of hair which was shown like a rounded object on the centre of the top of the cranium. A reference may be made here to the bottom row of the divine figures (whose back-view is only shown) worshiping the Master in the Trayastriṃśa heaven in the scene of the Master's descent at Saṅkisa, at Bharhut. The big top-knots of these gods could very justifiably have been interpreted as the so-called Usnīṣa bump, if we were not sure that this sense of the term was unknown in early literature. Very few reliefs of Brāhmaṇical deities like Śiva, Viśṇu and others are known, which can be definitely dated back to the pre-Christian era. But, even in the few early specimens, various elaborate modes of dressing the hair are shown; thus Śiva on the Guḍimallam Liṅgam has a thick be-jewelled plait, half-moon-like in shape sheltering as it were the whole head of the god; the same god (here four-handed) on the Mathurā Liṅgam shows all the hair tightly drawn up on the cranium as in the early Kuśāṇa Buddha-heads of Mathurā, but unlike the latter the single Jaṭā ends in two sections, one resting upon the other, the lowermost of which smaller and thinner in shape is immediately on the top of the central part of the cranium, while the uppermost one bigger and thicker in size is depicted like a cup which is caught hold of by the two back hands of the divinity. Some interesting information is also furnished in this connection by some Ujjain, Audumbara and Kuśāṇa coins where the god Śiva is figured, either as an obverse or a reverse type. A careful study of fig. 2, plate X, (Ujjain), fig. 1, plate IV, (Audumbara) in Cunningham's Coins of Ancient India and figs. 33, 36, 65, pl. XVII, (Vima Kadphises and Kaniṣka), figs. 209 and 211 (Vāsudeva) in Whitehead's Punjab Museum Catalogue, vol. I, will show how the luxuriant hair was worn by the divinity. We all know that long before the first appearance of the Buddha figure in art, he was being worshipped.

1 Cunningham, Stūpa of Bharhut, pl. XVI, Ajātaśatru pillar.
3 Coomaraswamy, HIIA, pl. XVIII, 68 ; date 2nd century A.D.
4 Note the little hair-knots on the centre of the cranium which can easily be interpreted as the so-called Usnīṣa bump.
as the highest god by his pious devotees. And in the anthropomorphic representation of the Bhagavat, the depiction of the flowing tresses was quite natural. So, there cannot arise here the question of utilising this hair-motif for the purpose of concealing 'the disfigurement of the bump of intelligence.' There was also the authority of the texts that Buddha was to have his hair of a certain uniform length on his head throughout his life (cf. the Nidānakathā, etc.). The early indigenous artists also endowed Buddha with long locks in their own way. The Gandhāra artists did not introduce any new iconographic motif in this case; what difference there was at first, was the difference in technique alone. Here with the Gandhāra as well as the Mathurā artists, the all important question was whether the Buddha-head was to be shown with hair or not. When they found that the tradition explicitly laid down that Buddha carried locks of hair of uniform length on his head, all throughout his life, it was immaterial to them whether the hair was to be shown 2 or 10 aṅgulas in length. Again, they were not representing Śākya Śimha, the man but the divine Tathāgata Sammāsambuddha the object of their piety and devotion. Lastly, the evidence of a few of the lesser signs referring to Buddha's hair, such as citakēsa (hair piled up), asamplulitakeśa (hair not dishevelled) aparunakeśa (smooth hair) etc. should be taken into account in this connection. The Mahāpadāna and Lakkhana sutlantas do not give us detailed list of these lesser signs; but they are found in the early works like the Lalitavistara and the Mahāvastu, hence it is quite reasonable to assume that the tradition about the hair was a fairly authoritative one.

That the plastic form of this top knot of hair could be easily misconstrued as covering something abnormal on the top of Buddha's skull and that in this misconstruction lay the origin of the Uṣṇīṣa bump of later age was long ago conjectured by Mons. Foucher. My close observation of the early Buddha figures in the Peshawar, Lahore and Mathurā Museums confirms my idea about the origin of this important iconographic peculiarity. Dr. Coomaraswamy also supports the main part of this conclusion in his article on 'Buddha's Ćuḍā, hair, Uṣṇīṣa, crown.' I differ from Foucher when he says that the early

I JRAS, 1928, p. 833. He incidentally remarks while noticing my article on 'the Webbed fingers of Buddha' (I,H.Q., December, 1930), that upātiṣātāsa which originally meant "destined to wear a royal turban", and later came to be regarded (through misinterpretation
Gandhāra artists avoided the representation of a protuberance for aesthetic reasons. Again, the blame for misinterpreting the Gandhāra chignon as covering a cranial bump should not be laid at the door of the ‘Indian imitators’; for, as we have seen some (not all, compare the evidence of some stucco heads) of the Gandhāra artists, themselves misinterpreted the whole thing. When, however, the convention of the short spiral curls, turning from left to right was introduced, the raised centre of the cranium was nothing but the protuberance covered with these; but even then, an unconscious reference to the original character of this abnormality is to be seen in those cases where this bump with these small spiral curls is encircled at its base by a string.¹

Now, to raise the question of interpretation again, What was the old meaning of the term *Uṭṭhīsa-sīsa*? Dr. Coomaraswamy suggests that it originally meant “destined to wear a royal turban” as *catvārimśatadanta* would mean “destined to have 40 teeth.” But where is the necessity of our having to suggest this explanation, when its original sense has been so explicitly put forward by Buddhaghosa? It is true that he ‘writes long after the practical problem of iconographic representation had been settled and had the Buddha figures with a protuberant *Uṭṭhīsa* no less than the old texts before him.” But, as we have shown before that he was relying mainly on the old orthodox and technical sense of the term *uṭṭhīsa-sīsa*—it should be noted that the word is taken as a whole here—and his authority was certainly the older Brāhmaṇical texts (*uṭṭhīsa-sīsa = chatrākṛtiśīṣya + avaktivīśalabhāla*). In commenting fully on this word, he does not find himself in difficulties and I differ from Drs. Rhys Davids and Coomaraswamy, when they say that ‘Buddhaghosa’s interpretation is not at all satisfactory.’

A brief reference ought to be made to the figure of Indra in the form of the Brāhmaṇ Śaṅti carved in high relief on a railing pillar at Bodh Gayā (c. 100 B.C.). Many scholars hold that there is a distinct protuberance on its head which is covered with short curls and they

¹ Cf. the seated Buddha, Indian Museum, Gandhāra room, No. 3936.
are of opinion that it served as the prototype of the later उष्णिः. Dr. Coomaraswamy once observed about it, “the figure of Śānti affords the earliest known example of the Uṣṇiṣa in sculpture.”

But, there is no justification for describing this cranial feature of the Bodh Gaya relief in this manner and he is now of opinion that it is not an उष्णिः. Bachhofer himself tells us that Indra is not here represented as a cakravartin and so the question of the representation of the lakṣaṇas does not arise in this connection.

In fine, it would be interesting to refer to the technical sense in which the term Uṣṇiṣa was used in Brāhmanical iconometric texts of a comparatively late period. The context, in which this term is used there, justifies us in understanding it as signifying the central part of the cranium. Referring to the measurement of the Uṣṇiṣa, the Vaikhānasāgama says that it should be 1 ātu and 3 yavas. The text is a Pañcarātra one and mentions this fact while describing the Uttamadaśatāla measure of the image of Deveśa (evidently Viṣṇu). Similar other passages in the above text lead us also to the same conclusion.

JITENDRA NATI BHANERJEA

1 Bachhofer, Ein Pfeilerfigur aus Bodh-Gaya, Jahrbuch as. Kunst, II, 1925; Kramrisch, Grundsüze der indischen Kunst, p. 83. Reference to this figure was first made by Sir John Marshall in JRAS., 1908, p. 1065, where he described it as an undoubted Uṣṇiṣa.

2 HIIA., p. 32, fn. 9.

3 But, is it really a protuberance? The swell, it should be observed is not exactly on the centre of the cranium and it has got a distinct tilt backwards, which might or might not have been due to the position of the head. Compare the head of Vessantara in a fragmentary Gandhāra relief (HIIA, pl. XXVI, fig. 93) with it. Dr. Coomaraswamy describes the former as ‘the Bodhisattva nimbate with thick curly hair etc., but does not use the word protuberance. Both these heads, however, give me the impression that they bear on them the wig-like massed arrangement of hair in two sections, the hair ending in curls.


5 श्री विद्याधिकारिविद्याधिकारिव | Ibid., p. 64.

6 श्री विद्याधिकारिविद्याधिकारिव | तथा चार्यविद्याधिकारिव चार्यविद्याधिकारिव | Ibid., p. 33-34.
Bust of Buddha from Peshawar (Hargreaves,
Handbook etc. Pl. 91)

Stucco Buddha head from Taxila (Marshall,
A Guide to Taxila. Pl. vi a)

(By the courtesy of the Director, Archaeological Survey of India)

I. II Q., September, 1931
Two Tantri Stories

Dr. C. Hooykaas has, in his dissertation\(^1\) on the Tantri, given a detailed account of the Javanese version of the Pañcatantra that is known as Candaipiûgala, Tantri, Tantri Kâmandaka, Tantravâkya and Tantri-carita. Excluding the frame-story (Esvaryapîla and his marriage with Dyâh Tantri), this version contains thirty-one stories (see App. II, op. cit.), of which twenty-two\(^2\) are found in one or more of the various Indian versions of the Pañcatantra. Of the remaining nine stories, too, it has been pointed out by Hooykaas himself (op. cit., pp. 36 and 114) that one, namely, no. 28 (Dispute between Jungle and Lion) is based on a Sanskrit stanza current in India (Ind. Sprüche, no. 3766 or 4844). And I propose now to show that two other stories also, namely, nos. 6 (The Floating Rock and Dancing Apes) and 19 (No Milk without Milking) are derived from Indian sources.

For this purpose, I give here below two stories contained in Amitagati's Dharmaparîkṣâ and in Vîrtâvîla's Kândaḍa rendering of that book together with the above-mentioned Tantri stories and the corresponding stories of the Laotian version of the Pañcatantra.\(^3\) (The stories are lacking in the Siamese Tantvrai).

---

1 Tantri, de Mukdel-javaansche Pañcatantra-bewerking. (Leiden. A. Vros, 1929).

2 Hooykaas, in op. cit., App. VI, gives the correspondences in the case of twenty-one Tantri stories only. In addition, however, it must be noted that Tantri no. 24 (Language of Animals) corresponds to Nirmala-pâṭâhaka IV. 10; see Hertel's Das Pañcatantra. Seine Geschichte und Verbreitung, p. 284.

3 In respect of the Tantri stories, I give here a translation of Hooykaas's Dutch résumé (in op. cit.) of the Javanese original, and in respect of the Laotian stories, a translation of Prof. Finot’s French résumé (given in the Bulletin de l’ Ecole Francaise d’ Extreme-Orient, 17, 1917, p. 84 ff.) of the Laotian original. The stories of Vîrtâvîla's Dharmaparîkṣâ too are similarly retold here briefly in English. This work is not printed, but the stories in question are found on pp. 463 and 503 of Prâk-kïvva-mâlikî or “Canarese Poetical Anthology of Selections from the Standard Poetical Works of Ancient Canarese Literature” published by J. P. Garrett at Bangalore in 1868.

L.H.Q., September, 1931
The *Dharmaparīkṣā* published in 1917 by the Jaina Ātmānanda-sabhā of Bhavanagar, it may be pointed out, is quite a different book. It was written by Jinamanḍanagaṇin, who lived much later than Amitagati, and is concerned with the exposition of Jaina dharma whereas Amitagati's book is more concerned with showing the falseness of Brāhmaṇical beliefs.¹

1 *Tantri* 6 (p. 88): King Sēwantara goes hunting with a single servant named Sēwaṅggara. He feels thirsty and sends the servant to search for water and fruits. The latter does not find them but sees plainly some apes dancing in the sea upon floating rocks. With this story², instead of water and fruits, he returns to the king who thereupon becomes impatient. Together they go to the place but fail to see the spectacle; for it was only an illusive representation made by the Vidyādharas. Because the servant has no witness to bear him out in this improbable story, the king's impatience turns into anger and he kills the servant³.

*Laošian Pañcatantra* II. 6 (pp. 99-100): Mūlakavi and his son, going for the purpose of trade to Majjhimapadesa, see a rock floating in the sea. On their return, the son relates this everywhere. People refuse to believe it: bets are made, and it is resolved that the case should be laid before the king and that the loser should forfeit all his wealth to the exchequer.

The king invites the young man to prove the truth of what he relates and the latter calls on his father to bear witness. But Mūlakavi, fearing that he would be accused of complicity with his son, denies it, and the son is sentenced to forfeit all his property.

While he is in despair, Mūlakavi engages himself in endeavouring that justice be done to him. He goes to the forest, sees a troop of monkeys and teaches them to dance and perform various feats at a

¹ The passages from Amitagati's *Dharmaparīkṣā* are taken from the edition of that work by Pannālāla Bākailvāla Digambari Jaina with his own *ṭikā* in Hindi published by the Jainahitaiṣī Pustakālaya at Bombay in 1901.

² The Tantri versions written in verse make the servant say to the king, “you may put me to death if this is not true.”

³ The story is, in the Tantri, followed by the (corrupt) verse: *asakṣiyāncakagatvā pratyakṣatambayan bhavet / wanaraḥ nasti sāṣṭik śilatāle madiya dālēm* in which Basuwarga sums up the story and moralises. See op. cit., pp. 88, 124.
sign from him. The king, going hunting, pursues a stag and arrives alone at the place where Mūlakavi dwells. The latter gives the signal and all the apes begin to dance before the king who forgets himself in looking at them. His suite arriving, the apes disappear. The chief officers inquire of the king what he was doing there. On his replying that he was looking at the dancing of the proficient apes, they think him mad. The next day, he goes again to the same place; the scene of the day before is repeated and again the chief officers find the king all alone but strongly affirming that he has seen the dancing of apes. 'Quite convinced this time of his madness, they put him in chains. The king protests and in support of his words calls for the testimony of Mūlakavi. The latter confirms the story of the king and adds that now he could confirm another surprising story, that which his son had related of the floating rock. The king rewards him and returns to his son all his property.

Amitagati's *Dharmaparāśitā*, XI, 63 ff. (p. 157 ff.):
Vṛttavilāsa's Dharmaparikalā (Prākāvya-mātikā, pp. 463-4): In the town Campaka-pura there ruled the king Guṇavarman. His senior minister once saw a rock that was lodged on a log of light wood floating in water and told it to the king. The king thought, “He must be mad,” and had him bound when the minister finding in how difficult a position he was, thought of a ruse, pretended that he was possessed by a brahma-rākṣasa (an evil spirit) and cried out, “I am a brahma-rākṣasa; I cannot hold out any longer, I shall go.” His bonds were thereupon unloosed.

Bearing this indignity in mind, the minister taught some apes in the park to play on musical instruments, sing and dance as soon as they caught sight of human beings. The king happening to go there once, the apes played on musical instruments, sang and danced; and the king, much surprised, told it to the minister. He cried out then, “the king is possessed by an evil spirit” and had him fumigated1 with the smoke of various things, asking in the meanwhile, “what will make you go and leave the king?”

The king after this experience, once said to the minister, “I did really see with my own eyes the apes play on musical instruments, sing and dance. Why did you then without reason have me ill-treated?” The minister replied, “āśraddheyaṁ na vaktavyaṁ pratyaśaṁ api yad bhavet| yathā vānara-saṅgitaṁ tathāiva plavate stil||”

2 Tantri 19 (p. 102): A hunter sees a Brāhmaṇa eating with so much relish that he asks what it is. The Brāhmaṇa replies that it is milk and butter and gives him some to eat and judge for himself. The hunter, liking their taste, buys the cow from the Brāhmaṇa who then goes away. The hunter then begs of the cow milk and butter. The cow does nothing and the hunter does not milk her udder.

Laotian Pañcatantra I, 16 (p. 94): A cunning Brāhmaṇa, wanting to give a high value to his cow, pretends that she gives milk every

---

1 Fumigation with smoke of certain substances is held to be one of the means for casting out evil spirits.

2 “One should not relate what is unbelievable even though one has actually perceived it through one’s senses. As there can be the music of the apes, in the same way does the rock float.”
day in a different form—as ghee (sarpis), curd (dadhi), buttermilk (sakra), butter (navanītha) and milk (kṛṣa); and in support of his statement, he showed all these different products of milk. A simple Brāhmaṇa bought this marvellous cow for a thousand gold pieces. But when he milked her, she gave nothing but milk. The Brāhmaṇa persisted, and the cow being exhausted, died.

Amitagati’s Dharmaparīkṣa, VII, 63ff. (p. 95f.):

क्रोऽहारविधो व्याति सागः सागर-वेदकः।
विषार्ध भागः सागः भविष्यते। वेदविधि।

उज्ज्वले सागरं नक्षत्रकावर्यं चकुवर।
एकदा पीतसाधक चौथासंपन्ने गत:।

वाष्पो जिनेवरसि व सुखदान-पद्मिसी।

स्मुःभूता मन्त्विंशताः तनिका चौरदैविनी।

स्वर्गारहितसि तन्नाम स्वर्गारहितसि।

प्रांभं पुरंतः कला अवदार-पद्मिसी।

चंद्रं टुः पायनि नीला गृहान्नादि सुधासिव।

त्वांगौ भविष्यन्ति कायाकल्पतातिष्ठि।

संयुज्य सन्तरेष द्रव्य शायदेनसुतंसि।

दत्ता तन्नाथभून्तुरान् ग्रीतिमव तुक्षिष्णः।

वनश्रेयोंनें शुका मिथासाहस्रं तृः。

प्रहोष्टविशाखि तौरेषु श वाष्प:।

विषार्धस्य लघु दिव्ये क्रोऽहार भविष्यति।

लेनाभिषिक्त मन्त्रें कुलदेव धृति धर्मः।

भविष्यव भो वर्मामें तनान्त् वाष्पश्रेयं।

क्रोऽहार सोवायथं भविष्यव द्रव्यं श्रेयं।

क्रोऽहार तन्नाथव:।

संक्षापव वाष्पव द्रव्यं दीवरे।

मन्त्रिवें सोव्रं श्रेयं।

संक्षापकै तनान्त् वाष्पव:।

संक्षापकै।

क्रोऽहार तन्नाथव:।

संक्षापकै।

क्रोऽहार तन्नाथव:।

संक्षापकै।

क्रोऽहार तन्नाथव:।

संक्षापकै।

क्रोऽहार तन्नाथव:।

संक्षापकै।

क्रोऽहार तन्नाथव:।

संक्षापकै।

क्रोऽहार तन्नाथव:।

संक्षापकै।
Vṛttavilāsa's Dharmaparīkṣa (Prāk-kavya-malika p. 504): A merchant named Sāgaradatta once took some milch-cows to the Nālikera island.1 A person named Tomara asked him what they were. He replied, "These, when asked, give rasāyanas."2 Tomara then said, "Let us see what they are like," whereupon the merchant put before him fragrant fresh-drawn milk, curd, fresh clarified ghee and buttermilk all which Tomara ate till he was satiated. He then asked Sāgaradatta "Who gave you these"? Sāgaradatta replied "My family-goddess (kuladevatā)." Tomara then requested the merchant to give the cows and gave him much money and took them home. When the time came for him to take food, he brought a pot, placed it before a cow, and said, "O cow, please give rasāyana." The cow stood still. He did thus for two or three days, and getting no rasāyana from the cows, drove them off.

Of the above-mentioned four books, Amitagati’s Dharmaparīkṣa was written in Saṃvat 1070 or A.D. 1013 (or 1012) as stated by the author in the verse: saṃvatāsarāṇīṁ vigate sahasre sa-saptaṭau Vikramapaṁs-parthivasya / idam niṇēvyānaya-mataṇ samāptaṇ jinendradharmam- mitavuktā śāstraṁ // that occurs at the end of the prābasti with which the work concludes. Vṛttavilāsa wrote his work in about 1345 A.D.

1 Or ‘to the island resplendent with cocoanut trees’; the text has nālikēra-vilasad-dvāpam which can be interpreted in both ways.
2 rasāyana = elixir of life; that which destroys old age and keeps one ever young.
as I have shown elsewhere; and the Javanese Tantri was written in about 1200 A.D. (Hooykaas, op. cit., p. 132). Nothing is known about the date of the Laotian Pañcatantra.

Now it is plain from the above résumés that Vṛttavilāsa’s versions of the two stories differ considerably in detail from those of Amitagati. In fact, his whole work, though professing to be a Kannāḍa rendering of Amitagati’s original, differs widely from it: the arrangement of the matter is different, new stories are introduced and some ones found in Amitagati’s book are omitted; and even in the stories that are common, there is much difference in details. All this indicates that Vṛttavilāsa, though following Amitagati’s Dharmaparīkṣā, based his book not so much on that work as on the sources of that work. And this is the reason, I conceive, why we find fresh-drawn milk, curd, butter-milk and fresh clarified ghee, mentioned (in the story of ‘No milk without milking’) in Vṛttavilāsa’s work while there is no mention of them in Amitagati’s, and why in the former we find the kathāsaṃgraha verse: aśraddhaṃ na vaktavyam...that is not found in the latter. This kathāsaṃgraha verse, it will be noted, occurs in the Tantri also (see n. 5 above) though in a very corrupt form.

Secondly, it is also evident from the foregoing that the four versions of the story of ‘The floating rock and dancing apes’ and of the story of ‘No milk without milking’ are all derived from the same source. In other words, it is plain that the Tantri stories 6 and 19 and the stories II, 6 and I. 16 of the Laotian

I In the Kannāḍa journal Prabuddha-karṇāṭaka, no. 37 A (1928), p. 212 ff. Vṛttavilāsa mentions in the beginning of his work that he was the disciple of the Jaina guru Amarākīrtī and, gives the following lineage of his guru: Keśavendu of the Balātkāra-gaṇa, Cārukīrtī, Abhayakīrtī, Vasautakīrtī, Viśālakīrtī, Subhakīrtī, Dharma-bhūṣaṇa, Amarākīrtī. Of these, the gurus Vasautakīrtī, Subhakīrtī, Dharma-bhūṣaṇa and Amarākīrtī are mentioned in an inscription at Sāraṇa-Belgollā (Epigraphia Carnatica, vol. II, 2nd ed., no. 274, p. 137) which says that Vardhamāna, disciple of Dharma-bhūṣaṇa, who was the disciple of the above-mentioned Amarākīrtī, set up a tablet to the memory of his guru Dharma-bhūṣaṇa [II] on 5th May 1373 A.D. Vṛttavilāsa was thus a contemporary of the second Dharma-bhūṣaṇa who died shortly before May 1373.
Pañcatantra are derived from an Indian source, Amitagati's work cannot be this source; for though this was written in 1013 A.D. (or 1012), it does not contain the verse *aśraddhīyam na vaktavyam...* which occurs in the Tantri. Nor can Vṛttavilāsa's work be the source; for though this work does contain the above verse, it was written, as said above, in about 1345 A.D. and is thus later than the Tantri. It follows hence that, like the stories in Vṛttavilāsa's work, the Tantri stories 6 and 19 and the corresponding stories of the Laotian Pañcatantra are derived from the same source from which Amitagati's work is derived. That this source was a written book is shown by the fact that it was available to Vṛttavilāsa who wrote more than three hundred years after Amitagati.

For the rest, in respect of the story of 'No milk without milking', though all the four versions given above preserve the essence of it, the versions of the Tantri and Amitagati do not seem to me to be so faithful to the original as those of the Laotian Pañcatantra and Vṛttavilāsa. These two versions are closely allied and make explicit mention of *sarpis, dudhi, takra* and *kṣira*, a feature which seems to me therefore to be common to them and to the original; but of these two, too, I am inclined to believe that Vṛttavilāsa's version is the more faithful.

In respect of the other story, the Tantri version has not preserved the essence of it though it contains the kathāsāngraha verse; and of the other three versions, it seems to me, again, that Vṛttavilāsa's version is more faithful to the original than the other two.

A. Venkatasubbiah
The Śāmṛajya of Yudhiṣṭhīra

I have deliberately refrained from using an English equivalent for the term ‘Śāmṛajya’. Like the English word "Empire" it stands for a variety of concepts. The basic feature of all these is the combination, whether optional or forced, of a number of states under the suzerainty of a sovereign kingdom. To-day the term "Empire" has an implication of a use, actual or possible, of force. Imperialism is a doctrine which contains a strong disagreeable odour of love of conquest, of a desire to hold nations and countries in subjection. Simultaneously with the idea that the constituent kingdoms voluntarily enter into a confederation and that they have a right, if they choose, to secede, the word "commonwealth" has of late begun to come into vogue. The idea underlying this word is not that of submission to force, but of deliberate choice on the part of the constituent states to remain in a Union.

Śāmṛajya based both on force and free will

In the Śāmṛajya of Yudhiṣṭhīra the two elements, namely, submission to superior force and free choice, were combined. The larger kingdoms of Prāgjyotisa (Assam), Cedi (Bundelkhand), Vidarbha (extending over what at present are Berar, Khandesa, Tinnevelly, and Madura), Kunti (Malwa), Harivarṣa (Tibet), Sākala situated between the Ravi and the Chenab, Māhiṣmati (Mahabaleswar), and the federation of Ānarta with its capital at Dwārāvatī joined it voluntarily, while other states, most of which were of smaller size and presumably commanded less influence, had to be brought within the Śāmṛajya forcibly. I shall enumerate all these, when indicating the boundaries of the Śāmṛajya of Yudhiṣṭhīra.

Forms of Śāmṛajya

In answer to Yudhiṣṭhīra's proposal to hold Rājasāya, by which he should become Samrāt, Śrī Kṛṣṇa enumerated to him the various

---

1 Sabha Parva, 26, 16.  2 Ibid., 29, 14.
3 Ibid., 31, 63.  4 Ibid., 31, 6.  5 Ibid., 28, 15.
6 Ibid., 32, 13, 14.  7 Ibid., 32, 14.  8 Ibid., 31, 59.
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forms of Sāmrājya, known to have been established till that time, of each of which he gave an example. Yauvanāśvi,¹ he said, became Samrāṭ by remitting taxes, Bhagiratha by giving protection (to subject states), Kārtavīrya by dint of austere life, Bharata by sheer force, and Marutta by advancing the prosperity (of the states which acknowledged him as their overlord). This distinction of varieties will give the reader an insight into the motives which led to the establishment of a Sāmrājya in those days. A common policy of frugality in the government that will lighten the burden of the tax-payer, security against foreign invasion, exemplary character of the overlord of which self-restraint is the basic feature, the necessity of submission to superior force, and economic prosperity of the combining states—these are the five objects which bind kingdoms together under a Samrāṭ. Yudhiṣṭhir’s aim was to establish a Sāmrājya that should at once achieve all these five purposes.²

The Sāmrājya of Jarāsandha

Jarāsandha, the monarch of Magadha, who was, continued Śrī Kṛṣṇa, Samrāṭ at that time, based his suzerainty on sheer force. None of the hundred and one rājās of the Aila and Aikāvākava dynasties who had acknowledged him as their overlord found pleasure in submitting to him.³ His policy was to accept the homage of powerful monarchs, whose sway extended over large territories, and to root out smaller states. For forms of government other than monarchies there appears to have been no place in his imperialistic policy. Among vassal kings whose states formed part of the empire of Jarāsandha, are mentioned Śiśupāla of Cedi, Vakra of Karuṣa, Bhagadatta of Prāgjyotīṣa, Kuntibhoja of Mālava.

---

¹ जिसे तथापि योवनशिवः पालमश समीरणः †
कार्तवीर्यवस्तिः वलतुः अर्थो विश्वः †
पशुधरः सर्वशास्त्र यथा समालमः तु—भाषये, १५, १४-१६

² शाश्वस्मार्मिक्षतः यु श्वालकां गृहिषितः —भाष, १५, १८

³ एवंस्यय ये राज्य तदद्वैकायको रुपः †
तात्त्त संसारसि विष्णु कुतासि भरतवृंद †—भाष, १४, ४
न च वैमोकायमुने कुष्ठाधिकरतः रुपः †
सः शास्तचक वस्त्रित कल्याणः कुटे कर्ति सः †—भाष, १५, २०
Vāsudeva of Puṇḍra and Bhīṣmaka of Vidarbha. These states, it will be seen, are, with the single exception of Karīṇa under Vakra, who did not voluntarily recognise the overlordship of Yudhiṣṭhira, but whose place we find filled by the powerful federation of the Vṛṣṇis and the Andhakas of Ānarta and other states of the same order which joined the new Sāmrājya of their own free will, the states which abstained from offering opposition to the Pāṇḍavas in the course of their campaign of Digvijaya. They, it appears, were glad to organise themselves into a new union, as soon as the empire of Jarāsandha was brought to an end by his death at the hands of Bhīma. Eighteen tribes of the Bhojas who lived originally in the north were expatriated by Jarāsandha. They had to fly from their original homes and seek shelter in the West. The Śūrasenas, Bhadrakāras, Bodhas, Śāivas, Paṭaccaras, Susthalas, Mukuṭtas, Kulinadas, Kuntis, Śālvāyanas, Southern Pañcālas, Eastern Kośalas and Matsyas were expelled from their former territories.

Whether these were included among the eighteen Bhoja Kulas, above referred to, or were additional to them and whether the seventeen Kulas of Muttra who voluntarily went into exile were distinct from either of these groups has been left to be guessed by the reader.

At Muttra, instead of the Saṃgha (oligarchic federation) of the Vṛṣṇis and Andhakas, he established a monarchy under Kamsa, whom he gave two of his daughters in marriage. Śrī Kṛṣṇa who had just finished his education and had returned home a Snātaka, restored unity among Bhojas and Vṛṣṇis by arranging the marriage of Akrūra, who was leading one faction, with the daughter of Ḫukka, the chief of the other party. He then killed Kamsa and re-established the Saṃgha. Then ensued the invasions of Jarāsandha whom Vṛṣṇis and Andhakas repulsed seventeen times but finding their existence at Muttra unsafe had to shift their capital to Dvārakā.

The Sāmrājya of Yudhiṣṭhira

After Jarāsandha's death the Pāṇḍavas set out on their career of Digvijaya or all-round conquest. Among the states either won
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1 समापनः, १४, १०-२२
2 नवीयाण तथा भौतिक: कुःकान्नकादव प्रभी।
   जनराशरवर्धाय प्रसीची दिशमाखिनात्: —समाप्तः, १४, २४
3 समाप्नः—१४, २६
4 समातः—१४, २१-२५
over, or brought under control are named the following:—Kulinda (Saharanpur and Garhwal); Anarta; Kālakūṭa; Śākala (Sialkot); Prativindhya; Prāgjyotiṣa (Assam); Ulīka; Five republics (Gaṇas) in the mountainous tract of the North; Utsavasaṅketa republics; Dārbhas; Kokanada; Abhisārt (Rajauri); Uraga (Hazara); Sīnhapsura (Pindadankhan); Bālāika (Jhang); Darada (Dardistan); Kimpuruṣa (Nepal); Hāṭaka (near Mānasā Sarovara); Uttara Harivarṣa (Tibet); Pāṇcālā (Rohilkhand); Videha (Tirhut); Daśārṇa (Chattisgarh); Pulindanagara (Bundelkhand and Sagar); Śrēṇīmāṇ; Malla (Malva); Bhallāṭa on the Śukrimāṇ Mt.; Malada (Shahābād Dist. and Berar.); Vatsabhūmi (Kauśāmbi); Niśāda (Marwar); Śarmaka; Varmaka; Barbaras; Seven Kings of the Kīrātas; Magadha (Behar); Puṇḍra; Kauśikacchā (Purnea); Tāmralīpta (Tamluk); Suhma (Rāḍha) and Laubhīṭya (on the Brahmputra). These states, as it will be seen, cover the whole of the present India, to which they add Afghanistān, Tibet and presumably a part of China.

Its Collapse and Revival

After the digvijaya the Rājasūya was performed. A part of the ceremony was the offering of Argha (worship) of which Śrī Kṛṣṇa was considered among the chiefs present the most worthy. This roused indignation among a number of Rājās who saw their deep humiliation in the adoration of a non-rājā—one who had killed a monarch himself, and for the murder of another made himself directly responsible, and who further presumably on account of his revolutionary propaganda against, and by his disrespectful attitude towards, the persons and crowns of ruling potentates had made himself and his Saṃgha, federation, a body of Vṛātyas, outcastes in their eyes. The murder of Śīṣupāla who gave vocal expression to his feeling of resentment simply confirmed that discontent. They swallowed their rage at the time, but as Duryodhana after his return to Hastināpura remarked to his father that tragic conclusion of the Rājasūya had simply made manifest the common danger to which the persons of Rājās, till that time considered

---

1. Kulinda (Saharanpur and Garhwal);
2. Anarta; Kālakūṭa; Śākala (Sialkot); Prativindhya; Prāgjyotiṣa (Assam); Ulīka; Five republics (Gaṇas); Dārbhas; Kokanada; Abhisārt (Rajauri); Uraga (Hazara); Sīnhapsura (Pindadankhan); Bālāika (Jhang); Darada (Dardistan); Kimpuruṣa (Nepal); Hāṭaka (near Mānasā Sarovara); Uttara Harivarṣa (Tibet); Pāṇcālā (Rohilkhand); Videha (Tirhut); Daśārṇa (Chattisgarh); Pulindanagara (Bundelkhand and Sagar); Śrēṇīmāṇ; Malla (Malva); Bhallāṭa on the Śukrimāṇ Mt.; Malada (Shahābād Dist. and Berar.); Vatsabhūmi (Kauśāmbi); Niśāda (Marwar); Śarmaka; Varmaka; Barbaras; Seven Kings of the Kīrātas; Magadha (Behar); Puṇḍra; Kauśikacchā (Purnea); Tāmralīpta (Tamluk); Suhma (Rāḍha) and Laubhīṭya (on the Brahmputra). These states, as it will be seen, cover the whole of the present India, to which they add Afghanistān, Tibet and presumably a part of China.

Its Collapse and Revival

After the digvijaya the Rājasūya was performed. A part of the ceremony was the offering of Argha (worship) of which Śrī Kṛṣṇa was considered among the chiefs present the most worthy. This roused indignation among a number of Rājās who saw their deep humiliation in the adoration of a non-rājā—one who had killed a monarch himself, and for the murder of another made himself directly responsible, and who further presumably on account of his revolutionary propaganda against, and by his disrespectful attitude towards, the persons and crowns of ruling potentates had made himself and his Saṃgha, federation, a body of Vṛātyas, outcastes in their eyes. The murder of Śīṣupāla who gave vocal expression to his feeling of resentment simply confirmed that discontent. They swallowed their rage at the time, but as Duryodhana after his return to Hastināpura remarked to his father that tragic conclusion of the Rājasūya had simply made manifest the common danger to which the persons of Rājās, till that time considered
sacred, were in that new regime subject.1 Šakuni during his return journey had enumerated the names of Rājās who would help an attempt to upset the suzerainty of Yudhiṣṭhira. The gambling match which took place in the Sabhā (assembly hall) of Duryodhana, was simply an outward ruse. The causes of the collapse of Yudhiṣṭhira's Sāmrājya were political. The offering of Argha to Kṛṣṇa, followed by the murder of Śīsupāla,2 was, politically considered, a blunder. A number of states that were already discontented found an opportunity of forming themselves into a coalition against the Pāṇḍavas. The exile of thirteen years which the latter underwent, followed by the Kurukṣetra War, was a consequence of that deep-laid conspiracy.3 After the war which ended in the victory of the Pāṇḍavas a new digvijaya took place. Strong insistence was laid this time on avoiding bloodshed.4 For royal blood special regard was shown.5 All ruling princes were assured that their persons and privileges would henceforward be respected. In the Aśvamedha, which was a successful replica of the unsuccessful Rājasuya, argha-offering was omitted at the instance of Śri Kṛṣṇa himself.6 Then was the Sāmrājya re-established.

The Character of Yudhiṣṭhira's Sāmrājya

As was remarked by Śīsupāla7 during his speech of protest preceding his murder, they had agreed to pay tributes to Yudhiṣṭhira not because they feared him or longed for his protection or bounty,
but because his mission was to foster Dharma, principles calculated to conduce to the advance of humanity. Instances of Sāmrajya, established before the time of Yudhishthira are quoted by Śrī Kṛṣṇa, but the Sāmrajya of which Yudhishthira was the overlord is the first of which something beyond its mere name and character has found record. It was sarvākūra, i.e., combined in itself the peculiarities of all the five forms of Sāmrajya to which Śrī Kṛṣṇa had referred. It was designed to fulfil at once the fivefold object of establishing a Sāmrajya. It covered the confines of the whole of India and included besides Afganistan, Tibet, Assam and a part perhaps of China. It included states of various types, viz., monarchies, republics, aristocracies\(^1\) and a federation—Sāmgha. Self-determination was thus its basic principle. Its aim was furtherance of Dharma.

The office of Smrāṭ not hereditary but confined to monarchical states

From the rapidity with which suzerainty changed hands not in one dynasty, but among members of different ruling families, it is clear that the office of Samrāṭ was not, like that of a king, hereditary. The doctrine of the divinity of kings was then an accepted principle of monarchical government, as is clear from a study of the accounts, given in the Mahābhārata, of the origin of the institution of state. Śrī Kṛṣṇa attached little value to it. When Bhīṣma took his stand on this doctrine for the vindication of his adherence to Duryodhana who was clearly pursuing the path of Adharma, Śrī Kṛṣṇa referred to his own conduct in killing Kaṁsa,

\(^1\) Among the Rājās who, as a result of the digvijaya of the Pāṇḍavas joined Yudhishthira's Sāmrajya, a few are characterised as Śrenimān, the obvious meaning of which is "head of an aristocracy." Two passages containing this designation follow:—

\begin{quote}
	ततः: कुमारविषये ये विसंसापाताश्वः।
	कोष्ठकाघिरिकैव कर्ष्ठकाघिरिकैव॥ समा, १०-१
	विजयदशृंति नीम्रविं परमेत् प्रसरं तथा।
	तर्काकालालाखु श्रीश्चित्तः व परिवर्तः॥ समा, १२-४
	पतन्त्रावृक्षालम्नयेऽपि प्रकृतिः परिप्रेक्षः।
	राजाः: ये विश्वास तथापि चवित्कृतं शूलं॥ समा, १४-४
\end{quote}
and said that way lay the path of patriotic duty.\(^1\) This attitude of Śrī Kṛṣṇa had, however, as we have seen, been responsible for deep disaffection among kings, whose mortification on the occasion of the Rājasūya brought about instant collapse of the Sāmrājya. The traditional doctrine was found to be deep-rooted in the nature of the monarchs, They could not brook the suzerainty of a non-monarch over a Union of which they were members.

**The status of Non-monarchical States**

Composed, therefore, as the Sāmrājya was of various kinds of states, monarchical, federal, aristocratic and republican, at its head it was necessary to place a monarch. The states other than monarchical could only be the members of the Sāmrājya. This may explain in part why Śrī Kṛṣṇa whose consummate statesmanship lay virtually at the root of the whole imperial edifice, served as a minister to Yudhiṣṭhira. His own Sangha could not enjoy the privileges of suzerainty. Non-monarchical states, as they are described in the Mahābhārata, were otherwise, too, on account of the dissipation of a great part of their strength in the maintenance of their internal unity, unfit to hold the reins of a Sāmrājya. Non-hereditary though it was, the office of the Sāmrāṭ had, therefore, to remain confined to monarchs.

For thirty-six years after the Kurukṣetra war Śrī Kṛṣṇa was alive.\(^2\) The death of Yudhiṣṭhira took place even later. Till that event he remained the suzerain of India. As to how he worked for the betterment of the subjects of his own state we have ample hints in the Mahābhārata. As to what measures he took for the uplift of the people of the whole of India we find no explicit account beyond a brief note in an earlier chapter which gives but a clue

\(^1\) लः मूलमञ्च सृवति कोक्ष दुर्बिधन्ति याच वपूर्वविहारी।

\(^2\) लः यवावधिक वर्षे बर्तविहि सर्वपूर्वे।
to the capability of Yudhiṣṭhira, viz., that he kept the various chiefs that were under him in peace. This was no doubt one of the objects of Śāmrāja. The real story of the Mahābhārata has ended abruptly after the Aśvamedha, in other words, with the re-establishment of the overlordship. How the fundamental mission of the establishment of a Śāmrāja was fulfilled in practice does not appear to have concerned the ancient chronicler. The description of the administration of Yudhiṣṭhira's own state, too, belongs to the period when he was simply a king, not yet the king of kings.

Chamupati

Gopāla Deva I of Bengal

Gopāla was the first king of the Pāla dynasty of Bengal. But we have, up to now, no inscription of his, no contemporary record whatsoever, from which we can ascertain the duration of his reign or the year of his accession to the throne. Evidences are not, however, wanting altogether which may enable us to find them out with some amount of probability. But it seems that these have not as yet been utilised.

Tāranātha (1608 A.C.) is a doubtful witness. Unless he is corroborated by other sources, he is not reliable. Now let us see what he tells us about Gopāla. Before narrating the legendary history of Gopāla he mentions that Vimala Candra reigned over Bengal, Kāmarūpa and Tirabhukti. He married the sister of king Bhartṛhari and had a son named Govicandra. After his death Govicandra succeeded him. Govicandra was the last king of the dynasty. After him there was no king to rule over the country. Now Gopāla was born at Pundravardhana of a beautiful Kṣatriya young woman who was in liaison with 'a Tree god'. When grown up he worshipped the goddess Cunda. He then came to the Vihāra of Ārya Khasarpaṇa and prayed for a kingdom. He received the order to go to the East. Now for many years there had not been a king in Bengal and all the inhabitants were unhappy. Then the leaders came

- Read at the 6th Oriental Conference at Patna.
together, deliberated and chose a king. The elected king, however, was eaten up that very night by a female Nāga who had assumed the form of the queen of the former king (either Govicandra or his brother Lalitacandra, according to different versions). In this way she killed all the elected kings. Gopāla was at last elected; but instead of being eaten up, he killed the female Nāga. He was chosen as a king seven times in seven days. Then he was made the permanent king and was given the name of Gopāla. He began to rule in Bengal; then he conquered Magadha. He built the Vihāra of Nalandara, not far from Odantapura. He reigned 45 years. At this time Śri Harṣa Deva ruled over Kashmir.\(^1\)

Now let us see what we can glean from other sources. It is known from the inscription of Dharmapāladeva,\(^2\) the son and successor of Gopāla, that Gopāla was elected king to remove mātsyanyāya, i.e., anarchical state in which the strong oppresses the weak. This is a partial corroboration of the statement of Tāranātha about the election of Gopāla. About the contemporaneity of Gopāla with Harṣa Deva of Kashmir, Tāranātha makes a confusion, as Harṣa reigned from 1089 to 1101 A.C.\(^3\) But he is not altogether wrong. There was another Harṣa of Kāmarūpa who has been described as Gaud-Odrādi-Kaliṅga-Kośalapati\(^6\) (the lord of Gauḍa, Oḍra etc. and Kaliṅga and Kośala) in the inscription of Jayadeva of Nepal dated 153 of an Era which might be Harṣa Era = 759 A.C. or another Era = 748 A.C.\(^4\) Now in the inscription of king Nārāyaṇapāla Deva\(^5\) the following verse occurs in praise of Gopāla Deva:

\[
\text{jitvā yah kāmakārī-prabhavam abhibhavam sāsvatīṁ prāpa śāntiṁ sa Śrīmān Lokaṁātho jayati Dośabalō'nyaś ca Gopāladevaḥ}\\
\]

Here kāmakārī has a double meaning. In the case of Buddha, Kāmakā means Māra, who is an enemy; in the case of Gopāladeva, Kāmakā means king of Kāmarūpa who is also an enemy. Now Kāmakā (with the pleonastic suffix ka) is allowed in Sanskrit by the maxim nāmakadesāgrahānam nāmanātgradhāram,\(^*\) i.e., the
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1 Schiefner, Geschichte des Buddhismus in Indien, pp. 195 ff.
2 Ep. Ind., iv, 243.
3 Smith, Early History of India, 4th ed., p. 389.
5 Ind. Ant., xv, p. 584 ; Gauḍalekhamālā, p. 56.
6 Kṛitārjunīya, i, 24, Mallinātha's Commentary.
mention of a part of a name is (same as) the mention of the name itself. This maxim has been given elsewhere thus: *ekadesena samudāyāh*,¹ i.e., by the part the whole (is to be understood). The use of a word in a double sense was a favourite rhetorical pastime with many of the court poets of the Pāla kings. Now the use of the name of the country to denote the king of that country is common in Sanskrit. So the above verse will mean in the case of Gopāla Deva as follows:

"Victory to Lord Buddha as well as to His Majesty Gopāla Deva, the lord of the world, who obtained perpetual peace by repelling the attack made by the king of Kāmarūpa, who was an enemy".

Thus Gopāla was a contemporary of Harṣa Deva of Kāmarūpa. Perhaps Kāśmira is a misreading for Kāmarūpa. We should remember that Tāranātha’s mention of the contemporaneity of Dharmapāla with Cakrāyudha has been corroborated by inscriptions.

It follows from the account of Tāranātha that Gopāla was a successor to the throne of Govinda, after some interval when his queen was believed to have been living. Now the time of Govinda can be ascertained from various sources. The renunciation of Govinda is the theme of popular ballads all over Northern India. In the Hindustani version, Gopicānd (=Govinda) is the sister’s son of Bharthhari (=Bharṭhrhari),² just as in the narration of Tāranātha. Govinda’s father Vimalacandra has been stated by Tāranātha to have been a contemporary of Dharmakīrti.³ I-tsing (673 A.C.) mentions Dharmakīrti among the great masters of Buddhism in his time⁴ and according to him Bharṭhrhari died in 651 A.C.⁵ According to Tāranātha, Bharṭhrhari and Govinda were both converted by Siddha Jālandhari.⁶ Hindi ballads state the same thing. The Bengali ballads mention Jālandhari as the guru of Gopicānd.⁷ Tāranātha explicitly says that Govinda began his reign about the time of the death of Dharmakīrti or a little later.⁸ According to Vassilief, Dharmakīrti was a contemporary

¹ Rāmacarita, i, 4, Commentary.
² Laksmana Dāsa, Gopicānd Bharthhari.
³ Geschichte des Buddhismus in Indien, p. 172.
⁴ Takakusu, A Record of Buddhist Religion, p. xxxi.
⁵ Ibid., p. lvii. ⁶ Grünwedel—Edelsteinmine, pp. 61, 62.
⁷ Durlabhā Mallik—Govinda Candra Gitā; Shukur Muhammad, Gopicānd der Sannyāsa.
⁸ Schiefner, op. cit., p. 195.
of king Sroû-bcan-sgam-po of Tibet (died 650). From all these
evidences, the time of Govicandra may be roughly put down
at 700 A.C. Then Gopāla was elected to the vacant throne of
Vaṅga some years after the abdication of Govicandra.

From the inscription of Dharmapāla we know that the queen
of Gopāla was Dedda Devi, whose son was Dharmapāla. Hari-
bhadra, a contemporary of Dharmapāla, mentions Dharmapāla as
Rājabhaṭādi-vamśa-patita, which I would take to mean descended
by the female line beginning with Rājabhaṭa, and I think Dedda
Devi was a descendant of Rājabhaṭa. The justification of our
supposition lies in the fact that no other king of the Pāla dynasty
has been called a descendant of Rājabhaṭa. From the account of
the Chinese traveller Seng-chi we know that Rājabhaṭa was ruling
in Samatāṭa (Vaṅga) between 650 and 655 A.C. So Dedda Devi
may be a grand-daughter of Rājabhaṭa. From Bengali ballads
we know that Gopicānd had his capital at Mehārkul or Pāṭikāra.
Now both are adjoining fiscal divisions in the district of Tippera
in Eastern Bengal. This is Pāṭikārā of the inscription of Raṇa-
vaṅkamalla. Tāranātha makes Chittagong the capital of Govi-
candra. It would be natural that Gopāla should enter into matrimo-
nial alliance with a neighbouring king. Afterwards he seems
to have conquered Samatāṭa and other places bordering on the

1 M. G. A. La Comme, Bouddhisme, p. 54.
2 The dates of Tibetan kings vary with different authorities.
See Lévi, Le Nepal II, 148.
3 Shahidullah, Les Chants Mystiques de Kāñhā et de Saraha, p. 28.
6 Ibid., p. 165.
7 Shukur Muhammad, op. cit.
8 Pāṭikānagara in Durlabh Mallik, op. cit.
patṭikera. The reading patṭikera is of Mr. N. K. Bhaṭṭaśāli.
Shukur Muhammad, op. cit., p. 70. Goddess Cundā was a popular
deity of the locality. (Bhaṭṭaśāli, Iconography etc., p. 13). Is it for
Gopāla that her worship became popular there?
10 Sarat Candra Das, J. A. S. B., 1898, p. 22; Grünwedel,
op. cit.
Bay of Bengal. This can be gathered from the inscription of Devapāla.¹

Gopāla’s encounter with Śrī Harṣa Deva comes after this chronologically. Perhaps Śrī Harṣa Deva occupied Gauḍa some time after the king of Gauḍa had been defeated and killed by Yaśovarman² (circa 730 A.C.). But Yaśovarman being engaged in warfare with king Lalitāditya Muktāpiṇḍa of Kashmir, by whom he was ultimately defeated and dethroned³ (about 740 A.C.), could not turn his attention to his newly conquered state. Gopāla after having consolidated his power in his own kingdom by conquering his neighbouring principalities bordering on the sea would naturally turn his attention to Gauḍa. This event must have taken place some time after 740 A.C. If we believe the treacherous murder of the king of Gauḍa by Lalitāditya,⁴ Śrī Harṣa Deva’s conquest of Gauḍa may date after that event and Gopāla’s encounter with him will be a little later. That Śrī Harṣa Deva was styled lord of Gauḍa, etc. in 759 A.C. by his son-in-law does not necessarily prove that he was then still in possession of Gauḍa. But even if Harṣa was defeated in battle, Gauḍa was not then permanently included in the Pāla kingdom. It remained, or soon became, separate from Vaṅga. When Vatsarāja, the Gurjara king, attacked the country (circa 770 A.C.) he took away two royal umbrellas, the insignias of Gauḍa and Vaṅga.⁵ It was left to Gopāla’s son and successor Dharmapāla Deva to annex

---

¹ Vijñātya yenā jaladher vasundharām vimohitāmoghparigrahāt i[1/]
sābāṃ sam udbhavapavilcanān punar vanesu bandhūn dadṛṣṇān
mataṅgajāh

Gauḍalekhāmāla, p. 35; Ind. Ant., xxi, 254; Ep., Ind., XVIII, p. 304.

² Gauḍavahō, verses 414-417.

³ Smith, Ibd., p. 386. There is nothing to prove that he was killed in the battle with Lalitāditya. Kahlana says explicitly that Yaśovarman “became by his defeat a panegyrist of his (Lalitā-
ditya’s) virtues” (Stein, Rājatarāṅgini, IV, p. 144). On the authority of the Jain tradition I believe that he reigned at least up to 751 A.C. (vide infra).

⁴ R. D. Banerji, Ibd., p. 130; R. C. Majumdar, Outline of Ancient Indian History and Civilization, p. 357.

Gauḍa permanently. Tāranātha's statement that Gopāla began to rule in Vaṅga and then he conquered Magadha is partially true. In fact, Tāranātha states that Dharmapāla conquered Gauḍa.¹

The end of Gopāla's reign will be some time before 762 A.C. According to Tāranātha the sage Śāntarakṣita died during the reign of Dharmapāla. His death is said to have happened in 762 A.C.² We may put down the death of Gopāla in 760 A.C. as a good working date. Now if we accept Tāranātha's statement of 45 years' reign for Gopāla, it would commence in 715 A.C.

This is quite in keeping with the facts we have mentioned before. It will no doubt make Gopāla, the king of Vaṅga, suffer defeat at the hands of Yaśovarman.³ According to the tradition of the Jainas⁴ after the death of Yaśovarman, Āmarāja ascended the throne of Kanauj (between 751 and 755 A.C.). Vākpati was the court-poet of Dharmapāla, king of Gauḍa; afterwards he came over to the court of Āmarāja. There was an old feud between the two kings; afterwards they were reconciled. This narration makes Dharmapāla the contemporary of Āmarāja, Their fathers Gopāla and Yaśovarman may also be contemporaneous.

We know from the Ragholi inscription of Jayavardhana II that the elder brother of his great grandfather killed the king of Pauṇḍra.⁵ This will be in the beginning of the 8th century. From the narration of Tāranātha we have seen that Gopāla was born of a Kṣatriya mother at Pauṇḍravardhana. It may be that Bapyaṭa, the father of Gopāla,⁶ was the unnamed king of Pauṇḍra. In the Ragholi inscription the king of Pauṇḍra has been styled uṛjita-vairi-

dāṟṇapatī which is equivalent to khaṇḍitārati, the attribute of Bapyaṭa in the Khalimpur inscription of Dharmapāla (verse 3). This

¹ Ind. Ant., IV, p. 366. Dharmapāla has been called Vaṅgopati in the ins. of Bhoja.—Ep. Ind., XVIII, p. 108.
² S. C. Vidyabhushana, History of the Mediaval School of Indian Logic, p. 148.
³ Gauḍavaho, vs. 819-21.
⁴ This tradition is found in the Jain works Bappabhāṭi Śūricarita, Prabandhakosa and Prabhavāśikarattra. Vide Gauḍavaho, Introduction pp. cxxxv ff.
⁵ Ep. Ind., IX, p. 44. Dr. R.C. Majumdar rightly thinks that it was followed by the invasions of Yaśovarman and Lalitāditya (Ibid., 365).
⁶ Bāṇagaḍa Ins. of Mahipāla I, verse 12; J. A. S. B., LXI, 77.
will explain why Gopāla left his country seeking adventure abroad and why Varendra was called Janakabhū (fatherland) by the Pāla kings. One thing however is definite that Bapyaṭa flourished at the time mentioned in the inscription.

We can thus reconstruct the history of Bengal from 700 to 760 A.C. In the beginning of the eighth century or some time before 700 A.C., Bapyaṭa was reigning in Puṇḍravardhana and Govicandra in Vaṅga. Bapyaṭa was killed by a king belonging to the Śaila Dynasty. About this time Govicandra, king of Vaṅga, abdicated and renounced the world. Gopāla, the son of Bapyaṭa (perhaps posthumous) had come to Vaṅga as an adventurer when he was quite young, and was elected king there (about 715 A.C.). In order to strengthen his position he married a princess belonging to the family of Rājabhaṭa, king of Saṅnataṭa. Afterwards he conquered the whole of the sea-board of Bengal. Before he could regain his paternal kingdom, king Yaśovarman of Kanauj invaded Bengal (circa 730 A.C.). He killed the Śaila king of Gauḍa and Magadha and vanquished Gopāla. Yaśovarman set up another king on the throne of Gauḍa. Gopāla, ambitious as he was, dared not offend Yaśovarman by attacking his vassal. Now Yaśovarman was attacked by Laliṭāditya, king of Kashmir and was defeated. The king of Gauḍa submitted to the king of Kashmir and was afterwards treacherously murdered. It was probably at this juncture that Harṣa Deva of Kāmarūpa conquered Gauḍa. Gopāla attacked Harṣa Deva, who was threatening the peace of his kingdom and defeated him. But he could not conquer Gauḍa. He died in about 760 A.P. and was succeeded by Dharmapāla.

MUHAMMAD SHAHIDULLAH

2 According to the Rājatarāṅgini (IV, 421ff), a king named Jayanta was ruling in Puṇḍravardhana about 775 A.C. He might have been a successor of Harṣa Deva. It is also stated that he died childless. Most probably Dharmapāla occupied Gauḍa on the death of Jayanta and thus united the two royal umbrellas of Gauḍa and Vaṅga.
The Problem of the Mahānātaka

The so-called Mahānātaka, otherwise known as the Hanūman-nātaka, occupies a unique position in Sanskrit dramatic literature. Though technically designated a nāṭaka, it evinces peculiarities which justify Wilson's characterisation of the work as a nondescript composition and which have naturally given rise to much speculation with regard to its character and origin. It is a very extensive work which plagiarises unblushingly from most of the known (and probably some unknown) Rāma-dramas and is written almost entirely in verse, with little of prose. The verse is generally of the narrative or epic, rather than dramatic, character. There is little of true dialogue; there is no Vidūṣaka nor any Prakrit; the usual stage-directions are missing; the number of characters appearing is fairly large; there is a benediction, and in one recension a curious prarocanū-verse, but there is no true prologue, and all the elements of the plot prescribed by theory are wanting; the number of Acts, at least in one recension, is beyond the usual limit; in short, this work, though nominally exhibiting a dramatic form, gives one the impression of being a narrative composition as opposed to the dramatic, and could have as well been written in the narrative or epic form. It is devoid of all dramatic action, being rather a collection of poems, descriptive and narrative, with interspersed metrical dialogues of a crude nature and quasi stage-directions.

On the strength of these peculiarities Max Müller was of opinion¹ that the work was rather an epic than a true drama, and that it carries us back to the earliest stage of development of the Indian drama. This opinion has been repeated more than once by later scholars but in a somewhat modified form. Pischel pointed out² the resemblances of this work to Subhaṭa's Dīṭāṅgada, which latter play was held by him to be an example of the so-called chāya-nāṭaka,

* Read before the XVIIth International Congress of Orientalists at Oxford, 1928.

1 *Jahrbücher für wissenschaftliche Kritik*, 1846, i, p. 472.

2 In his *Das altindische Schattenspiel* in *SBAW*, 1906, pp. 482-502.
which term he considered to be equivalent to a 'schattenspiel,' often rendered into English as 'shadow-play.' This thesis was further developed by Lüders\(^1\) who would take the Dūtāṅgada as the type of the shadow-play and then deduce that the Mahānāṭaka also belongs to the same category, of which it is supposed to be one of the earliest specimens. With this view Sten Konow,\(^2\) Winternitz\(^3\) and some other scholars appear to agree. But Keith in his recent work on the Sanskrit Drama reopens the question\(^4\) and throws doubt on the whole theory of the shadow-play and its alleged part in the early evolution of the Sanskrit Drama. He refuses to agree with Lüders in adding the Mahānāṭaka to 'the almost non-existing list of shadow-dramas' and suggests that the irregularities of this work can be explained by the assumption that it was a play never intended to be acted, and that it was a literary tour de force redacted 'in preparation for some form of performance in which the dialogue was plentifully eked out by the director and the other actors.'

The Mahānāṭaka has come down to us in different recensions. The West Indian recension redacted by Dāmodara Miśra has 54\(^3\) verses in 14 Acts and is styled the Hanūmāṇnāṭaka, while the East Indian or rather the Bengal recension arranged by Madhusūdana Miśra\(^4\) has 720 verses in 9 Acts\(^6\) and is named the Mahānāṭaka. Both the recensions agree in taking the mythical Hanūmat as the original author. In a sense, however, the work may be taken to be anonymous, for both the titles are clearly descriptive. Hanūmat, as the ally and servant of Rāma, is a legendary figure to whom it was probably

---

\(^1\) In his Die Saubhikas: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des indischen Dramas in SBAW, 1916, pp. 698f.

\(^2\) Das indische Drama (Grundriss), 1920, pp. 89-90.

\(^3\) Geschichte der indischen Litteratur (1920), iii, p. 243; in ZDMG., lxxiv, pp. 118f, he supports Lüders, but recognises the difficulties of the hypothesis.

\(^4\) The Sanskrit Drama, 1924, pp. 33f., 53f., 269f.

\(^5\) Lüders has shown that MSS. of this recension are also found in Western India; but this fact makes no difference, and there is no doubt that it prevails in Bengal.

\(^6\) The number of verses vary greatly in MSS. and editions, as discussed below. The number adopted here is Aufrrecht's (Bodleian Catalogue, p, 142b).
found convenient to ascribe a traditional work of unknown or forgotten authorship; while the title Mahānāṭaka is apparently not a designation but a description, it being the later dramaturgic technical term which, like the term prakaraṇa, indicates a type of a play containing all the episodes and possessing a large number (usually the number is ten) of Acts. It is significant that the term is unknown to Bharata and Dhanikā, the two earlier authorities on Dramaturgy. They simply lay down¹ that in a nāṭaka the number of Acts should not be less than five and more than ten; but the author of the Sāhitya darpaṇa, who flourished probably in the first half of the 14th century, defines and explains² the term Mahānāṭaka as noted above.

The association with Hanūmat is supported by a legendary account of the origin of the work. The concluding verse in Dāmodara's version states that the work was composed by the Son of the Wind (Hanūmat), but was cast into the sea by Vālmiki who deemed it to be ambrosia (amṛta-buddhyā) and that it was later on recovered by the good king Bhoja and redacted by Miśra Dāmodara.³ In his comment on this verse Mohanadāsa explains that Hanūmat wrote this work and engraved it with his nails on the rocks, but to please Vālmiki, who recognised its excellence and anticipated eclipse of his own Rāmāyaṇa, the generous Ape threw it into the sea whence it was, after ages, recovered by his avatāra Bhoja with the aid of fishermen.⁴ The Bhoja-prabandha also records⁵ the anecdote


³ racitam anilaputrenātha vālmīkinābhīhau
niḥṭitam amṛta-buddhyā prānā mahānāṭakaṃ yat /
sunati-napti-bhojenodāhitam tat kramaṃ
graḥhitam avatvā visvam miśra-dāmodareṇa //

⁴ atreyam kathā—pūrvaṃ etena nakha-raukṣair giri-nilāsu
vīlikhatam tat tu vālmīkinā dṛṣṭat etasyāti-madhuratavām ākārṇya
rāmāyaṇa-pracūrābhāva-raukṣayā hanūmān prārthitas tvam etat samudre
nidiḥkṣi tatheti tenādāhan prāpitam tadavatārenā bhohena sumatiṁ
jūlikair (the printed text reads jala-jūnāir) udāhitam iti.

⁵ Ed. Nir. Sag. Press, Bombay 1921, pp. 70f. Wilson gives a somewhat different version (Select Specimens, 2 vols. in one, Appendix
that certain fishermen once found an engraved stone in the Narmada and brought it to Bhoja who, recognising it to be the work of Hanumad, made a copy of it and had it put together by his court-poets. The two lines which were brought to Bhoja occur as the first two lines of the verse *iha khalu viśamaḥ* in the *Māhānātaka* (xiv, 49) in Dāmodara's recension, but the verse is missing in Madhusūdana's redaction. It is noteworthy, however, that the verse is an ordinary gnomic stanza which is utilised for the purpose of moralising on the death of Rāvana. In Madhusūdana's recension, on the other hand, there is after the benediction a *prarocanū*-verse in which Hanumad is said to have narrated the story at the direction of Vālmiki, and the concluding verse of each Act states that the work of Hanumad was rescued (*pratyudhikta*) by Vikrama (*vikramaiḥ*). The phrase has been explained simply as 'recovered by means of valour': but the commentator Candraśekhara\(^1\) explains that Hanumad having engraved the work on the rocks threw it into the sea through fear of Vālmiki, but later on he appeared in a dream to king Vikramāditya who, at Hanumad's bidding, had it fished out of the sea and redacted by his court-poet Madhusūdana. The commentator also refers to another version of the story, according to which the work is said to have been stolen by *rākṣasas* but recovered later on by the valour (*vikrama*) of that king.

It is not difficult to see that there is a good deal of mere fable in these accounts; but the tradition, which more or less agrees in the three versions of the story, certainly suggests the redaction of an old anonymous work, or at least the writing of a new work with the embodiment of old matter. Although a considerable number of verses is common to both the recensions, the one recension cannot be said to have been derived from the other. On the contrary, it is probable that each of them was redacted independently from some lost original, of which the tradition preserves a legendary account. Of the compilers Dāmodara and Madhusūdana we have no authentic

---

\(^{1}\) On i, 48, ed. Candra Kumāra Bhaṭṭācārya, Calcutta, 1796.
information. In the Bhoja-prabandha the poets, who are called upon to fill up the deficient verse discovered by Bhoja, are Bhava-bhāti and Kalidāsa; but one Dāmodara is mentioned elsewhere in the same work as a court-poet to king Bhoja of Dhārā, who (if he were the historical Bhoja) reigned in the second quarter of the 11th century A.D. There is nothing inherently impossible in the report of a drama in stone-inscription, for such dramas have been discovered in recent times; but we have no other historical information about the source from which both the recensions were derived. We have, however, enough indication to presume that an essential portion of the work was probably old and formed the nucleus round which was woven a large number of verses culled chiefly from various known and unknown Rāma-dramas. This may have been done in the time of Bhoja, whose energy in making cyclopaedic compilations is well known but the process of interpolation, as we shall see presently, continued for a long time, and verses from comparatively recent Rāma-dramas found their way into the compendium. The question as to which of the two recensions is earlier is not yet solved, but it seems probable that Dāmodara’s version, in spite of its 14 Acts, is the earlier, as it is also the simpler and less extensive redaction. The Vikramāditya referred to in Madhusūdana’s version may have been Lakṣmaṇa-sena of Bengal, who appears to have had also nine gems at his court and to have been known by the title of Vikramāditya. We have a verse attributed to Dhoyi in the Saduktī-karṇāmṛta, the first half of which agrees partially with the verse 101 of Dhoyi’s Pavanaitī and which makes it probable that Lakṣmaṇa-sena as a poet and patron of of poets was known by this time-honoured title.

The comparative antiquity of the Mahānātaka is sought to be established by the fact that Ānandavardhana, who flourished in the middle of the 9th century at Kashmir, and Dhanika who belonged to the end of the 10th century, quote verses which occur in the work. The three quotations by Ānandavardhana in his Dhvanyāloka are, however, anonymous and therefore not conclusive, the more so because

1 khyāto va ca śrutidharatayā vikramāditya-goshṭih-vidyā-bhartuḥ khalu vararucer āsasūdā pratiṣṭhām.

(Ed. Cintaharan Chakravarti, Calcutta 1926, p. 34, also Introd. p. 7). See also JASB, 1906, p. 15. In the verse the poet, who lived at the court of Lakṣmaṇa-sena, is speaking of himself and his patron, and there is an obvious pun in the phrase vikramāditya etc.
the *Mahānātaka* is notorious for its shameless plagiarism. The first verse *snigdha-vyāmala-kānti* (*Dhit* p. 61 = *Mahā* M v, 7) is really taken from the *Rāmābhuyudaya* of Yaśovarman; the second verse *raktas tuṁ nava-pallavaiḥ* (*Dhit* p. 90 = *Mahā* M iv, 35 = *D* v, 24) is ascribed to Yaśovarman in the *Subhūṣitāvalī* (no. 1364) and is probably borrowed from the same drama; while the source of the third verse *nyakkāro hy ayam eva* (*Dhit* p. 153 = *Mahā* M ix, 55), which is cited by a series of rhetoricians, is unknown. Dhanika quotes five verses which occur in the *Mahānātaka*, but all of them except one, are given without any indication of their source. The one exception refers to the verses *būhvar balaṁ na viditam* (= *Mahā* M ii, 14 = *D* i, 38) is quoted in the *Vṛtti* on ii, 2 with *yathā hanūman-nātaka*; but the verse is actually derived from the *Būla-rāmāyaṇa* (iv, 60). The fact that one of the remaining verses *kopo jānakīḥ* (= *Mahā* M iii, 54 = *D* i, 19) is also quoted anonymously by Rajaśekhara in his *Kāvyamāmāṇa* (p. 97) proves nothing. A large number of quotations, mostly anonymous, from the *Mahānātaka* is also found in the Sanskrit Anthologies. Of these the *Śarvagadharapaddhati* gives ten quotations as *hanūmatah*, of which nos. 83, 123, 125, 128, 133, 3418 and 4066 cannot be traced in any of the recensions of the *Mahāāntaka*. Only no. 90 (*vighneśa valā sa pāyād vihītiṣu*) occurs as, the second *maṅgala-śloka* of Madhusūdana's recension, and no. 1248 (*kūrmah pādoṭra*) is found as vi, 67 in Madhusūdana and xiv, 77 in Dāmodara. This anthology was compiled about 1363 A.D., and its quotations only prove, at best, that both the recensions probably existed in the first half of the 14th century. Even if no great antiquity can be claimed for the work itself, the presumption is permissible that a fragmentary nucleus of it existed in the time of Bhoja, or even a little earlier in the time of Dhanika, from which the later elaborate versions, which cull verses from the *Mahāvīra-carita*, *Būla-rāmāyaṇa*, *Anargha-rāghava*, *Prasanna-rāghava* and other known and unknown Rāma-plays, arose in later times and were probably in existence in the 14th century.

In order to explain the origin of the drama which the Indian tradition envelops in the mystery of legends, it has been suggested that the *Mahānātaka* belongs to the category of the so-called shadow-play, a view which envelops it equally in the mist of sheer specula-

---

tion. Although it has been held by Pischel and others to connote a shadow-play, the meaning of the term चायु-नाताक, which is nowhere connected with the *Mahānātaka* but which is used in some other plays alleged to be of the irregular type, is uncertain. It is not recognised in any Sanskrit work on Dramaturgy as designating a dramatic genre, but several dramatic compositions like the *Dharmābhyyudaya* of Meghaprabhācārya, the *Dūtāṅgada* of Subhaṭa, the *Rāmābhyyudaya*, *Subhadra-parīṇaya* and *Pāṇḍavābhyyudaya* of Rāmadeva-Vyāsa, have been designated as चायु-नाताक in their respective प्रस्तावणिः or colophons. Wilson¹ held that the term चायु-नाताक might mean 'the shade or outline of a drama' and expressed the opinion that the *Dūtāṅgada* "was perhaps intended to introduce a spectacle of the drama and procession, as it is otherwise difficult to conceive what object its extreme conciseness could have effected". Lévi² appears to leave the question open, but remarks: "Leur nom est obscur; on serait tenté de l'expliquer par "ombre de drame" si les règles de la grammaire ne s'opposaient à cette analyse du composé चायु-नाताक. Elles admettent du moins une explication voisine et presque identique: "drame à l'état d'ombre". Rājendralāla Mitra³ describes Viṭṭhala's so-called चायु-नाताक as "an outline of a drama" and suggests that the *Dūtāṅgada* "was evidently intended to serve as an entr'act to a theatrical exhibition." Other suggested but rejected explanations are "a play that is but a shadow, a play in shadow, i.e. a miniature play."⁴ Having reference to the derivative nature of such plays as the *Dūtāṅgada*, which incorporates verses from other plays, it is not impossible to hold that the term चायु-नाताक may also mean "an epitomised adaptation of previous plays on the subject," the term चायु being authoritatively used in the sense of adaptation,⁵ Pischel was originally of opinion⁶ that the term might be explained as "the shadow of a drama" (Schatten von einem Spiel) or "a half-

³ *Bikaner Catalogue*, p. 251.
⁴ See Gray in *JAOS*, xxxii, p. 60.
⁵ This word चायु is used commonly, in connexion with the question of borrowing or plagiarism, to denote likeness or resemblance between the works of two poets, and चायोपाजियिन is one who composes poems which are reflections of other poet's works. See Kṣemendra, *Kavi-kapṭhāharanya*, ii, 1.
⁶ *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1891, pp. 358f.
play” (halbes Drama), but in his well-known monograph on the Indian shadow-play¹ he attempted to show that the chāyū-nāṭaka was simply and solely what is known as the shadow-play, in which the shadow-pictures were produced by projection from puppets on the reverse side of a thin white curtain.

In order to establish the early existence of the shadow-play in India it is alleged that this form of the drama is expressly mentioned by Nilakanṭha in his interpretation of the term rūpopajīvanam occurring in the Mahābhārata xii, 294, 5: rūropajīvanam jalamanḍapiketi dāksinātyeṣu prasiddhām, yatra sūkṣma-vāstraṃ vyavadhāya-carmama-yair akārai rājāmātyādīnāṃ caryā pradarṣyate, “rūropajīvanam is well-known among the southerners as the jalamanḍapika, in which, having interposed a thin cloth, the action of kings, ministers etc. is shown by means of leathern figures.” Lüders would maintain with Pischel that rūropajīvanam refers here to the production of shadow-figures. The term rūropajīvin is used by Varāhamihira in his Brhatamahīta; v, 74, while in the Therigāthā, v, 394 and in the Milinda-paṇha, p, 344 occur the terms rūparūpakā and rūpadakkha respectively, of which the last expression is supposed to be identical with the word lūpadakkha found in the Jogimara Cave Inscription,² A suggestion has also been made by Sten Konow³ that the word rūpa used in the Fourth Rock Edict of Aśoka, where exhibitions of the spectacles of the dwellings of gods, of elephants and of bon-fires are mentioned, refers to a shadow-play; and that the expression rūpakā as the generic name of the drama is derived from such early shadow-projections. Indications of such a shadow-device are said to have been discovered in the Sitabenga Cave which has signs of grooves in front, meant (it is alleged) for the curtain necessary for a shadow-play. This theory is further elaborated by Lüders,⁴ who claims a high antiquity for the shadow-play on the assumption that it is referred to by Patañjali in his Mahābhāṣya (on Pāṇini iii, 1, 26) in his mention of the displays of the Šaubhikas or Šobhanikas, and who on this

---

1 Already cited.
4 In the article already cited.
5 Ed. Kielhorn, ii, p. 36.
basis would take it, with Pischel, as an essential element in the evolution of the Sanskrit drama. The existence of the shadow-play in early India is also supported by the analogy of the Javanese wayang purwa, a shadow-play usually dealing with the Rāma-cycle and produced by puppets of buffalo-leather.

The early evidence adduced for the existence of the shadow-play in India cannot in any way be taken as conclusive. We are not directly concerned here with Lüders’ hypothesis regarding the Śaubhikas; but the name Śaubhika or Šobhanika is, at best, an obscure term which has not been shewn to have any relation to the shadow-play and which has never been explained in this sense by any authority. Hillebrandt¹ and Keith² have very effectively criticised Lüders’ interpretation and suggested more reasonable explanations; but whether we accept their view, or agree with Weber³ that the reference here is to the pantomime, or even take the explanation of Kaiyyaṭa (a fairly late commentator) that the Śaubhikas were those who taught actors (natānām vyākhyānopādhyāyāḥ), it is clear enough that there is no real foundation for the view that the Śaubhikas discharged the function of showing shadow-figures and explaining them to the audience. The passage of Nilakanṭha, again, cannot be taken as proving conclusively the existence of the shadow-play, for he might as well be referring to the puppet-shows or marionette theatre, of whose existence we have definite record; and even if Nilakanṭha’s testimony is not contested, it only proves the existence of such plays in Southern India (dākṣinātyaṇu) at the end of the 17th century. It is not yet proved that the Javanese borrowed it from Southern India, and the fact that some kind of shadow-drama, dealing with the Rāma-legend obtained in Java has in itself nothing whatever to do with the hypothesis that its analogue prevailed in India, until it is shewn beyond doubt that the idea was really borrowed from India. Even as a parallel it is not, as Keith points out, adequate, “unless and until it can be proved that the shadow-play sprang up in Java without any previous knowledge of the real drama.” Turning to the passage of the Mahābhārata itself on which Nilakanṭha comments:

¹ ZDMG, lxii, pp. 227f; also see his Über die Anfänge des indischen Dramas, München 1914, pp. 6 f, 18 f.
² BSOS, i. pt. 4, pp. 27f; Sanskrit Drama, pp. 33f.
³ Indische Studien, xiii, pp. 488f.
we notice that the term is used in the same context with appearance on the stage, drinking, eating flesh and other objectionable practices which degrade the status of a dviya. It is quite possible to argue, as it has been argued, that the term rūpopajīvanam alludes to the deplorable immorality of the actors, who have been stigmatised more than once as jāyā-jiva, "living by the dishonour of their wives."  

The same explanation applies to Varāhamihira’s use of the term rūpopajīvin for the actor, in close proximity in the text to painters, writers and singers; while the term rūpadakkhā or tūpadakkha is capable of other explanations than the highly conjectural solution of an actor in the shadow-drama. Mrs. Rhys Davids renders the word rupparūpaka of the Therī-gātha, v. 394 by “puppet-show,” and this is probable in view of the fact that in verses 390, 391 of the text there is a mention of a puppet. Keith has already shewn that the word rūpa in Aśoka’s inscription, as well as the term rūpaka as the generic name of the drama, can have no reference to the shadow-play, and the alleged evidence of a shadow device in the Sitabengā Cave is nothing more than a mere conjecture.

As no definite reference to the shadow-play can, so far, be proved anywhere in Sanskrit literature, and as the dramatic genre is unrecognised in theory, no other evidence is left but that derived from the term chāyā-nāṭaka itself, which is used as a descriptive epithet in the prologue or colophon of certain existing plays. Of these works the most interesting, if not the earliest, is the Dharmābhhyudaya of Meghaprabhācārya, which is edited in the Jaina-Ātmananda-Granthamālā Series (Bhavnagar 1918) and of which a brief résumé is given by Hultsch. In the colophon it is styled dharmābhhyudayo nāma chāyā-nālya-prabandaḥ; but in the prologue, the Sutradhāra speaks of actors (sailusāh) and acting (abhinaya). There is, however, a definite stage-direction in it which is said to support its claim to be recognis-

1 The term silpopajīvanam is used in the preceding verse in the sense of livelihood by means of some arts.

2 Pischel interprets the word as "copyist," Boyer as "sculptor," Bloch as "one skilled in painting," while Dr. S. K. Chatterjee suggests "skilled in figures or accounts."

3 Sanskrit Drama, p. 54.  

4 ZDMG, lxxv, p. 69.
ed as a shadow-play. As the king takes the vow to become an ascetic, the stage-direction reads *yamanikantaraḥ yati-vega-dhāri putrakas tatra sthāpanīyaḥ* (p. 15) “from the inner side of the curtain is to be placed a puppet wearing the dress of an ascetic.” A reference is found here in the word *sthāpanīya* to the *sthāpaka* of the regular drama who is supposed to have been originally “the arranger of puppets.” We have no information about the date of the play, but that it is a late and obscure Jaina drama admits of little doubt, and its evidence as such is of doubtful value. One need not, however, see in the stage-direction any definite reference to the shadow-play; on the contrary, it is a puppet (*putraka*) which is directed to be placed, apparently on the stage, from the inner side of the curtain, i.e., from the *nepathya*. It is difficult also to accept the rather fanciful interpretation of the word *sthāpanīya*, which is really not necessary, as the simple meaning of the word is that which is obviously intended. Although the drama styles itself a *chāyā-nātya-prabandha* in the colophon, it is in all other respects an ordinary, if unpretentious, play of the usual type, dealing with the Jaina legend of king Daśārṇabhadra. It is a short play, which consists of one Act but three or four scenes, with a regular *nādi, pravocana* and *prastāvanā*; and we have, with the one exception, referred to above, the usual stage-directions, enough prose and verse dialogues and some Prakrit prose and verse. There is also the usual *bharata-vākyā* at the end spoken by one of the characters.

It is curious that no such stage-directions are to be found in the other so-called *chāyā-nāṭakas*, not even in the *Dūtāṅgada* which is probably the earliest of the group and which is upheld by Pischel and Lüders as the typical specimen. Of these later plays, the three dramas of Rāmadeva-Vyāsa, who was patronised by the Haiheya princes of the Kalacuri branch of Rāyapura and who thus belonged to the first half of the 13th century,¹ are not admitted even by Lüders to be *chāyā-nāṭakas* at all. The first drama, *Subhadrā-parināya*² consisting of one Act but three scenes, has a theme which is sufficiently explained by its title; the second, *Rāmābhhyudaya*,³

1 See Bendall in *JRAS.*, 1898, p. 231.
2 MS of this work noticed in Bendall’s *Catalogue of MSS in the British Museum*, no. 271, pp. 106 f; for an analysis of the play, see Lévi, *op. cit.*, p. 242.
3 MSS noticed in Bendall, *op. cit.*, no. 272, pp. 107-8; in Peter-
also a short play in two Acts, deals with the time-worn topic of the conquest of Laṅkā, the fire ordeal of Sitā and Rāma's return to Ayodhyā; while the third play, Pāṇḍavāḥhyudaya, also in two Acts, describes the birth and svayamvara of Draupadi. If we leave aside the self-adopted title chāyā-nāṭaka, these plays do not differ in any respect from the ordinary drama, and there is nothing in them which would enable us to arrive at a decision with regard to their alleged character of a chāyā-nāṭaka. The anonymous Haridūta, which deals in three scenes with the theme of Kṛṣṇa's mission to Duryodhana on behalf of Yudhiṣṭhira, is regarded as an imitation of Dūkāngada and assigned by Lüders to the class of chāyā-nāṭakas; but its story corresponds to the Dūta-vākya of Bhāsa, and it resembles in all respects an ordinary play. Even Pischel doubts whether this work can be rightly considered a chāyā-nāṭaka. These short pieces may have been meant for some festive entertainments and therefore makes some concession to popular taste by not conforming strictly to the orthodox types; but the Haridūta in particular does not describe itself as a chāyā-nāṭaka and there is no reason why we should regard it as such. The Ananda-latikā, again, which is regarded by Sten Konow as a shadow-play, is really a dramatic poem in five sections, called kusumas, on the love of Sama and Revā composed by Kṛṣṇanātha Sārvabhauma-bhaṭṭācārya, son of Durgādāsa Cakravartin. Eggeling describes it in the following words: "Though exhibiting some of the forms of a nāṭaka (and marked as such outside), the work is devoid of all real dramatic action, being rather a collection of poetry, descriptive and narrative, with interspersed dialogues and quasi stage-directions". The same remarks apply to the modern Citra-yajña described by Wilson, who is undoubtedly right in pointing out its similarities to the popular yātra, Rājendralāla Mitra also mentions a chāyā-nāṭaka by Viṭṭhala, which

son's Ulwar Catalogue, extracts, p. 72; Descriptive Cat. of Skt. MSS in the Govt. Oriental MSS Library, Madras, no. 12636. Analysed by Lévi, op. cit., p. 242.

1 Eggeling, India Office Manuscripts, vii, p. 1602, no. 4187 (2353b).


3 Eggeling, op. cit., vii, p. 1624, no. 4203 (443).


5 Bikaner Catalogue, p. 251.
he describes as "an outline of a drama founded on the history of the Adil Shahi dynasty"; but of this nothing further is known.

This leaves us with the Dūśāṅgada of Subhaṭa, which also describes itself as a chāyā-nātaka and which has been definitely cited as a typical example by the exponents of the shadow-play hypothesis. The play was produced, according to its prologue, at the court of Trībhuvana-pāla, who appears to be the Calukyan prince of that name, who reigned at Anāhilapāṭṭaka or Anhilvāḍ in Gujrat at about 1242-43 A.D. It was presented at a spring festival in commemoration of the dead prince Kumārapāladeva of the same dynasty. The event particularly commemorated appears to be Kumārapāla's restoration of the Śaiva temple of Devapattana or Somnāth in Kathiawad, and the occasion, as given in one MS (pātrāyāṁ dola-parvaṇi), was the dol or holi festival held in the month of Phālguṇa (March-April). It is a short dramatic composition in four scenes, the theme being the same as that of Act vii (Madhusūdana's version) of the Mahānātaka, which deals with the sending of Aṅgada by Rāma to demand restoration of Sītā from Rāvaṇa. The work exists in various forms; but a longer and a shorter recension have been distinguished. The shorter recension has already been edited in Kāvyamāla no. 28, 1891 (new edition, 1922). The longer recension is given by a MS in the India Office and is thus described by Eggeling: "Not only is the dialogue itself considerably extended in this version by the insertion of many additional stanzas, but narrative verses are also thrown in, calculated to make the work a curious hybrid between a dramatic piece (with stage-directions) and a narrative poem. This latter character of the composition is made still more pronounced by an introduction of 39 (12+27) stanzas in mixed metres (partly, however, placed in the mouths of Rāma and Hanūmat) referring to incidents which lead to the discovery of Sītā's hiding-place." This recension must be of later

---

1 See Bendall in JRAS, 1898, pp. 229-230, also his Catalogue of Skt. MSS in the British Museum, no. 269, pp. 105-6, and Gray in JAOS, xxxii, pp. 58-9. Analysis of the play given by Wilson, op. cit., pp. 81-2 and Aufrecht, Bodleian Catalogue, p. 139 (shorter recension); English trs. (shorter recension) in Gray, op. cit., pp. 63-77. MSS in the catalogues mentioned here and below, footnote 3.

2 The word dūśāṅgada is already used in Dāmodara's version, ed. Bombay 1909, Act xi, p. 149.

origin, for most of the supplementary verses are derived from comparatively late Rāma-dramas. For instance, verses 4 (ā dvīpāt parato' pyami) and 6 (bho brahman bhavātā) are taken from Prasanna-rāghava, while verse 5 (yad babhaṭa janaṅkūmaja-kyte), as well as the verse jayaṅi raghu-vanśa-tilakah, occurs in the Mahānātaka. The shorter recension is also in the nature of a compilation; and in closing verse, which is omitted in the longer version, the author says1 that he has not hesitated in drawing upon his predecessors for material, his chief sources being Bhavabhūti, Murāri, Rājaśekhara and the Mahānātaka. Even such gnomic verses as udvyogini puruṣa-simham uṣpaiti lakṣmī, well-known from the Hitopadeśa, is found in the work.

Pischel was undoubtedly right in calling attention to the resemblance in this and other points between the Dītāṅgada and the Mahānātaka, as distinguished from the other so-called chāyū-nāṭakas; but there is no evidence to establish that either of them is a shadow-play. The prevalence of verse, more narrative than dramatic, over the scanty prose, the absence of real prose dialogues and the omission of the Vidūṣaka are features which are shared by the Dītāṅgada with the other so-called chāyū-nāṭakas already discussed, but which are in themselves not inexplicable. The work, however, is not anonymous as the Mahānātaka; there is a regular prologue, as also some stage-directions; the theme is limited; and the number of persons appearing is not large, nor is Prakrit altogether omitted.2 To all appearances it is an ordinary, if not insignificant, play of the usual type, composed frankly for some festive occasion, which fact may explain its alleged laxity or want of strict conformity to the orthodox drama. The usual prologue consists of the preliminary benediction and conversation between the Sūtradhāra and the Naṭī, leading up to the drama. The drama consists of four scenes; in the first, Aūgada is sent as a messenger to demand Sītā; in the second, Bibhīṣaṇa and Mandodari attempt to dissuade Rāvaṇa from his fatal folly; in the third, Aūgada executes his mission, but on Rāvaṇa's endeavour to persuade him, with

1 svā-nirmitaṃ kiṃcana gadya-padya bandhaṃ kiyaṭ prāktam-sat-kavaṇ iraiḥ
   prktam ghṛṭavā praviracyate sma rasāḥhyaṃ etat subhaṭena
   nātyam

2 Keith (op. cit. p. p. 56) is not correct when he speaks of the absence of Prakrit in the Dītāṅgada.
THE PROBLEM OF THE MAHĀṆĀṬAKA

the illusion of māyā-stū, that Sītā is in love with the lord of Laṅkā, Āṅgada refuses to be deceived and leaves Rāvaṇa with threats; and in the fourth, two Gandharvas inform us that Rāvaṇa is slain, on which Rāma enters in triumph. There is no indication anywhere that it was meant for shadow-picture; and apart from the term chāyā-nāṭaka, examples of such brief spectacular plays on the well-known themes of the two epics are neither surprising nor rare.

We have already pointed out that the chāyā-nāṭaka is not a category of dramatic composition and is unknown as such to writers on Dramaturgy, early or late. These plays, on the other hand, are to all intents and purposes dramas proper, and may be classified as any other rūpaka or uparūpaka. If they lack enough dramatic action, it is a fault which they share with many other so-called dramas in Sanskrit, which are in reality dramatic poems; and there is hardly anything in them, except their self-description as chāyā-nāṭaka, which would stamp them out as irregular species. It would seem, therefore, that the term chāyā-nāṭaka, as also its equivalent ‘schattenspiel’, refers rather to the product than the process. Rājendralāla’s conjecture that it served as an entr’act to a theatrical exhibition may be easily dismissed, as there is no evidence for the existence of such entertainments as would correspond roughly to the English interlude or the Italian intermessen. In view of certain irregularities which may be discovered in such plays, the explanation that it was ‘a drama in the state of a shadow’ or ‘the outline of a drama’ has been suggested; but it is possible also to suggest that it was a chāyā or adaptation of existing works on the subject for a particular purpose. What the purpose was is not very clear, but there is nothing to shew that the compositions were meant for shadow-pictures. It is probable, on the contrary, that these works, produced for particular festivals, were composed as recitable poems which could be sung, or even (as in the case of the Dūtāngada) as a compilation from previous works; while the peculiarities of form and spirit, partly due to the nature and occasion of the composition, may suggest that the popular festive entertainments like the yātrā probably reacted on the literary drama. In any case, we are dealing here with late developments of the Sanskrit drama, and irregularities, such as they are, would not be out of place. Whatever interpretation may be urged of the term chāyā-nāṭaka, it is at least clear that the hypothesis of the shadow-play is uncalled for and without any foundation, and it would certainly not be safe to derive from these admittedly late productions any evidence for the growth of the early drama, or draw any inference
from them as to the part alleged to have been played by the shadow-play in its evolution.

Whatever may be the case with the Dūśāṅgadus and the other plays, the Mahānataka is never described as a chāyā-nāṭaka, and the shadow-play solution is still more inapplicable to its markedly peculiar features. That it is a drama of the irregular type, more than any of the plays mentioned above, is admitted on all hands. One may go further and say that it is hardly a drama at all. It may at this point be contended that the chāyā-nāṭaka has also no claim to be considered as a drama proper, and in this sense there is no reason why the Mahānataka should not be called a chāyā-nāṭaka. It may be replied that the point still remains that this work, unlike the other plays mentioned above, has never been so called, and that there is no authority or tradition for such a description. It is possible to imagine a small spectacular play being utilised for the purpose of shadow-pictures, but it is impossible to believe that an extensive work of a rambling kind, consisting of 9 or 14 Acts and ambitiously compiling and chronicling the entire Rāma-carita, could have been meant for such an object. There is nothing in the work itself nor in the trend of its plot and treatment which lends the slightest plausibility to such a view.

To suggest with Keith that here we have a literary drama, a play never intended to be acted but meant as a literary tour de force, is not to offer a solution but to avoid the question. In no sense can the Mahānataka he regarded as a tour de force, and its artistic merits, apart from the descriptive verses which are mostly borrowed, are almost negligible. It cannot be argued that its apparently immature dramatic form and treatment betoken an early age when the drama had not properly emerged from the epic condition, for, the quasi-dramatic presentation is not spontaneous but intentional. The work is undoubtedly late and highly stylised, and we are here far removed from anything primitive. That some old matter was worked up into an extensive compilation is obvious, and it is also admitted that it is not a normal drama; but to explain the purpose of the play and its irregularities by suggesting that it looks like a literary exercise is to confess one's inability to explain it satisfactorily; for there are indications, as Keith himself admits, that the work was meant and probably utilised for some kind of performance.

It is clear that the Mahānataka, as well as most of the plays discussed above, belongs to comparatively recent times, so that any data
furnished by them should be cautiously used for any theory about the origin and development of the Sanskrit drama. Nor should the character of such types of plays as the Mahānātaka be determined without any reference to the literary conditions obtaining at the period in which they could be presumed to have been put in their present form. Whether we accept the time of Bhoja as the period when one of the versions of the Mahānātaka was reducted, it is clear enough that we cannot assign any of the versions to a very early age, nor could it be shewn that it was put together at a time when the Sanskrit drama could be assumed to have been in its most flourishing period of development. On the contrary, the assumption would not be unreasonable that the Mahānātaka was reducted at a time when the classical Sanskrit drama was in its decline, and when at the break up of the old and more or less stereotyped dramatic literature, such irregular types as we are considering could easily have come into existence. We must not also forget that the Apabhṛṣṭa and the vernacular literature were by this time slowly but surely coming into prominence, and that along with them popular entertainments like the religious yātrās, with their mythological theme, quasi-dramatic presentment and preference for recitation or singing, were establishing themselves. Having regard to this fact, as well as to the peculiar trend and treatment of such works as the Mahānātaka, we find no special reason to doubt that vernacular semidramatic entertainments of popular origin must have reacted on the literary Sanskrit drama and influenced its form and manner to such an extent as to produce irregular and apparently nondescript types. It is true that the yātrā had little pretension to a literary character, while the types of plays we are discussing have a highly stylised form, but it is conceivable that these so-called plays might have been adapted and composed in Sanskrit for a more cultivated and sophisticated audience on the parallel furnished by the popular yātrā. In other words, they were something like Sanskrit yātrās, which exhibited outwardly some of the forms of the regular drama and had a mature literary style, but which approximated more distinctly towards the popular yātrā in spirit and mode of operation. As such, these apparently irregular types were not mere literary exercises but represented a living form of quasi-dramatic performance. This conjecture is perhaps more in keeping with the nature of these compositions and the period in which they were probably reducted than the unwarranted and unconvincing solution of a shadow-play theory.

Turning to the work itself, we find that the Mahānātaka gives
us a form of entertainment not represented by any Sanskrit drama so far published, in spite of the assertion that the *Dūtāṅgada* is the nearest parallel to it. It begins with a benediction in the orthodox style; in Dāmodara's recension it is set forth within the reasonable limit of five verses, but in Madhusūdana it is prolonged and elaborated into thirteen verses, a number which is unique in Sanskrit drama. There is no *prastāvanā* or prologue, but in Madhusūdana there is the usual stage-direction *nādyante sūtradhāraḥ*, followed by one verse of *praropanā* which says that Hanūmat himself, at the direction of Vālmiki, is the *vāktṛ* of the piece, which deals with the exploits of Rāma, that the actors are all well versed in their art, and that the audience consist of men of culture,—"rejoice, therefore, O sedate audience, I shall narrate the story of the *Rāmāyaṇa*".¹ The actual drama does not yet begin, but we have some narrative verses, four in Dāmodara and six in Madhusūdana, which speak of king Daśaratha, his three queens, his four sons, Rāma's visit to Viśvāmitra's hermitage and his early exploits, thus carrying the story rapidly down to the arrival of Rāma at Mithilā. There is no agreement between the two recensions with regard to these preliminary narrative verses, which fact probably indicates their improvised character. Mohanadāsa, commenting on them in Dāmodara's recension, pointedly

¹

vālmīkier upadeśatāh svayam aho vaktā hanūmanān kapil
ōri-rōmasya raggūdvahasya caritaṁ saumyā vayāni nartakāḥ |
gostūr śvād iyaṃ samasta-sumanalḥ saṁvighena saṁveśtitā
tad dhīrāḥ kurita pramodam athuṇā vaktāsmi rāmāyaṇam ||

In Kālikṛṣṇa Deva's edition the reading is *saubhyāḥ* (and not *saubhyāḥ*) for *saumyāḥ*, but this is clearly a quaint misprint due the similarity of the Devanagari letters त and त. Lüders, however, accepts this reading and finds in it a reference to the Saubhikas. This is really an instance of misplaced ingenuity. The other three printed editions of M's version as well as the eight MSS we have consulted read *saumyāḥ*. We agree with Winternitz (*ZDMG*, lxxiv, p. 142, fn. 3) and Keith (op. cit., p. 272, fn. 1) that *saumyāḥ* is the correct reading, which is also accepted by the commentator Candraśekhara. Rāmatāraṇa Śiromāṇi in his edition of the work explains it as *abhinaya-pānditāḥ*, Jīvānanda Vidyāsāgara as *śobhanāḥ kusālā iti yāvat.*—In giving an analysis of Madhusūdana's version here, we are following Jīvānanda's text which is the longest version of this recension.
states: idānīṃ kathā-yojanīya vyākhya-kṛd ātmanaḥ śloka-catuṣṭayam avatārayati. To say that the vyākhya-kṛt refers to the commentator or the redactor would be meaningless; it probably means the person who explains, as the adhikārin or yātrā-vīlā does in a yātra, the narrative parts to the audience and thus carries on the thread of the story.

In Madhūsūdana we have, after this, five verses uttered by Vaitālikas as Rāma enters Mithilā, which panygerise the hero and his early exploits, but some of which are borrowed from plays like the Prasanna-rāghava. In these vaitālika-vākyas,¹ which are fairly frequent, one is naturally reminded of the chorus-like songs (still a feature of Bengali yātrās) of the popular yātrās, which often mark an important incident or the end and commencement of an episode. In Dāmodara's recension verses of this kind are not mentioned as vaitālika-vākyas, but the narration is anonymous, or at best imagined (as Wilson puts it) to be spoken by an indifferent person or the poet; it is highly probable that they were uttered by the director of the performance or his assistant chorus. Then follows the episode of the breaking of Śiva's bow, in which some agreement is noticeable in the verses of the two recensions, and the action is carried on by metrical dialogues between Janaka, Rāma, Sītā (monologues), Lākṣmaṇa and others. After some more narrative verses, which applaud this feat of Rāma but most of which are borrowed from Mahāvīra-carita, Prasanna-rāghava and other plays, the first Act ends in Madhūsūdana, and the second begins with Rāma's encounter with the terrible Paraśuṛama, in which the interlocutors include, beside the hero and his rival, Lākṣmaṇa and Daśaratha,

¹ Sometimes these verses are put into the mouths of groups of persons like the Pauras (paura-vākyam) or even generally anyeṣam āpi (vākyam), as we find them, e.g., at Rāma's breaking of Śiva's bow, at the commencement of Rāma's exile etc. Such chorus-like songs are still a feature of Bengali yātrās and are known in modern times as judir gūn (जूदिर गुण). Long descriptive verses, put throughout under headings like atha rāvaṇa caeṣā, atha sītānvesante rāma-caritam, atha mṛga-caritam, atha vuddhakarmanak etc, were probably utilised in this way. In Kālikṛṣṇa's edition of Madhūsūdana's version, the editor puts these descriptive and narrative passages (where they are not explicitly assigned to vaitālikas or pauras) to the Śūtradhāra but this is not warranted by MSS.
All this, however, is comprised in Act I in Dāmodara. The appearance of Paraśurāma is described in several narrative verses put into the mouth of Laksmana, and here for the first time we meet with two prose passages in the heroic strain uttered by Paraśurāma. With some more narrative verses (which are vaitālika-vākyas in Madhusūdana) leading to Sitā's marriage, ends (in Dāmodara) Act I, which is entitled Sītā-svayamvara. In the course of this we have in Dāmodara (in place of Madhusūdana's vaitālika-vākyas) descriptive headings over the narrative verses which are uttered by no one in particular; such as rāma-nālya-varṇanam (describing how Rāma took Paraśurāma's bow and threw an arrow stopping the latter's passage to heaven), sītā-nālyam (describing how on Rāma's drawing Paraśurāma's bow, Sītā was apprehensive that Rāma might be breaking another bow and winning another bride) and finally, rāma-vivāha-varṇanam, the corresponding verses of which are in part vaitālikaiḥ pathitam in Madhusūdana.

The second Act in Dāmodara is entirely undramatic, being a highly flavoured erotic description, with occasional narma-vacana, of the love-sports of Rāma and Sītā in a strain which may be an offence against decency and the drama, but which is approved in poetry and is in strict conformity with the requirements of a Kāvya. In Madhusūdana this is taken up as a part of Act II, the first half of which describes the episode of Paraśurāma. The third Act, even less dramatic than the first, is mainly descriptive, dealing with the agitation of Kaikeyi, the exile of Rāma, the sorrow of the people and the relatives, Bharata's rebuke of his mother, the residence at Pañcavaṭi and the departure of the two brothers in chase of the false deer. Here in Dāmodara the Act III ends, and the fourth Act begins with the description of the chase, in which we have the gestures of the deer delineated by the well-known verse grīvā-bhaṅgābhīrāsam from Śakuntalā. This is followed in the same Act (Act III in Madhusūdana and Act IV in Dāmodara) by the appearance of Rāvana, abduction of Sītā, Jātayu's fruitless attempt at rescue, and the story is carried down to Rāma's return after the chase to the deserted hut. In Madhusūdana, as already noted, all these incidents are comprised in the third Act.

It is not necessary to follow up the whole story to the end of this extensive work in the two recensions, for what is given above will be enough to indicate its general character. Before we comment on some of its peculiar features in relation to its resemblance to the mode of the yāstrā, we should like to deal with one very interesting
point to which Lüders refers but which he presses into the service of his inevitable shadow-play theory. There are throughout the play (especially in Dāmodara's version) elaborate descriptive stage-directions, very unlike the brief and pointed directions usual in Sanskrit plays; and these consist of several lines of florid prose and present a complete picture in themselves. Thus after the death of Rāvana we read: mandodarī sakāla-sundara-sundarībhiḥ parivṛtta galad-avirala-netra-jala-pravāhāh, sitā-pater virahinālena saha laṅkā-pateḥ pratopānalaṁ nirvāpayanti hāhākāraṁ ghora-phūtkāraṁ kurvanti jhatiti trikūṭācalū utpatya samara-bhūmau mahā-nidrāṁ gatasya nijā-prāṇa-nāthasya laṅkā-pateḥ caraṇa-kamalayor nīpatya. During the fight between Rāma and Rāvana, we have: tatrāśoka-vaniḥ-sthitā-vimānam āruhya pānakīṁ rūma-rāvaŋgayar yuddhanārāyati trijātā saramā ca/ mandodary api sundarī-parivṛtta laṅkācalā-sikharam āruhya paśyati/ rudro pi samudra-madhya ekena caraṇenopasthitō yuddhanā paśyati/ devāḥ sarve vimūnādhirūḍhā nabho-maṇḍalā-gatā yuddhanā paśyanti. Very often they are not stage-directions but descriptions which carry forward the narrative. Thus in the account of Rāma's return to Ayodhya with his newly married bride, the following lines describe Rāma's love-sick condition as a prelude to their love-sports which immediately follow: sarvālakṣyaṅopetān deva-bhūpāla-yogyaṁ medura-mandurāyāṁ turagāṁ avalokya maṇaśvarākula-citā-bhrāntyā vadhūnāraṅgāgraṁ maṅgalavandolanāyāṃ gatasya bhagavatās taraṇeḥ kirāṇa-mālinās turagāṁ ime suabhāva-tejasvinās tat-tāḍanam asoḍhāras tūḍitāṁ punah punar bhagavantaṁ bhūskaranām dṛṣṭa-gatyāstacanam mayantu iti buddhāva dāsāratir janaṅkaruṭi ca dvīptāghaṭas turagāṁs tāḍāyaṁmāsa/ niśāvyāṁ praṅkaḥyāṁ śighram āvyoh saṅgamo bhavatv ity abhīprāyaḥ.

This clumsy passage is really an expansion of the idea contained in the previous verse (Dāmodara ii, 1). In Madhusūdana, there is a fairly long prose passage which would cover two printed pages and therefore too long for quotation here, in which Rāma's search after Sitā and his sorrow are described in the familiar style of the Sanskrit prose romances. Lüders maintains that these lines of descriptive prose are really portrayals which correspond to the so-called janturan of the Javanese shadow-play, which is sung with the accompaniment of muffled music; and from this he would infer that the scenery in the old Indian drama was delivered in a similar way.

Apart from the fact, which is ignored by Lüders, that some of

THE PROBLEM OF THE MAHĀNĀṬAKA

these descriptive passages are not stage-directions, it may be pointed out that, whatever may be the value of the parallel drawn from Java, the same feature is certainly noticeable in the Citra-yajña described by Wilson. Thus at the end of the first Act of this play, the stage-direction, according to Wilson, is: “Dakṣa bows down at the feet of the gods, and puts the dust from under them upon his head, after which he propitiates them fully in the spoken dialect, and then proceeds to the place of sacrifice, reading or reciting the usual formulas, and followed by the Rṣis.” Now this Citra-yajña, which is described as a drama in five Acts dealing with the legend of Dakṣa, is undoubtedly a modern work belonging to the commencement of the 19th century, but it has many striking points of similarity with the Mahānāṭaka. The dialogue is curiously imperfect, being left to be supplied in the course of the performance. Passages of narrative are often interspersed with dialogues and elaborate stage-directions, and the work has little pretension to a dramatic character. Wilson rightly notes that it is a valuable example of the manner of the yātrās which follow a somewhat similar plan. But Wilson is hardly correct in his conjecture that the yātrā, which has through ages an unbroken tradition independent of the literary drama, and which makes still less pretension to a literary character, follows the plan of such plays as the Citra-yajña; on the contrary, such late Sanskrit plays, written for some popular festival, seem to make concessions to popular taste by adopting some of the peculiar features of the yātrā of popular origin. The lengthy stage-directions made up the want of scenic apparatus in a yātrā, as in a play of this type; while the elaborate descriptive and narrative passages were recited with a flourish by the adhikārin or director of the performance, who in this wise unfolds and sometimes explains the tenor of the play to the audience. Such highly florid prose passages are also a notable feature of the Kathākāṭa in Bengal, which is another mode of popular entertainment allied to the yārā and the pāmicālī. Examples of such passages, which became stereotyped as “set passages” in later times, will be found in Dinesh Chandra Sen’s History of Bengali Language and Literature, and we have some specimens of these in the Dacca University MSS collection. Dr. Sen thus comments on these passages: “There are formulas which every kathaka has to get by heart, set passages

2 Calcutta 1911, pp. 586-87, fn.
describing not only Śiva, Lakṣāmi, Viṣṇu, Kṛṣṇa and other deities, but also describing a town, a battle-field, morning, noon and night and many other subjects which incidentally occur in the course of the narration of a story. These set passages are composed in Sanskritic Bengali with a remarkable jingle of consonances, the effect of which is quite extraordinary." It is not known whether the yātrā adopted the plan from the Kathakas, who may be regarded as the descendants of the old Granthikas, or vice versa; but it is probable that it was a peculiar feature of most of these forms of popular entertainments, and we need not go out of our way in assuming that it had a direct connexion with the shadow-play, of which the Indian tradition knows nothing.

Informations about the yātrās of old times are rather meagre, but what little we know and what we can surmise about them from the specimens of comparatively later times confirm our conjecture that compositions like the Mahānātaka should be explained in relation to the yātrā to which it bears a distinct kinship.1 The name yātrā suggests that it might have been originally some kind of religious procession, by which term it is often rendered;2 but we have evidence to shew that in historical times it was some kind of operatic and melodramatic performance, a Volkspiel, with some dialogue and semidramatic presentation, in which improvisation played a considerable part. Its traditional existence is known to us from time immemorial, and there is no valid reason to doubt that it probably descended from earlier festive popular entertainments of a religious character.3 It is not known whether the yātrā had any direct connexion

1 It must be noted that it bears no kinship to the spectacular Rāmalīlā which prevails in the upper provinces.


3 For an account of the Bengali yātrā and its early history, see S. K. De, Bengali Literature 1800-1825, Calcutta 1919, pp. 442-54. Dinesh Chandra Sen's account (op. cit., pp. 724f.), as well as that given by Nishikanta Chattopadhyaya (The Yātrās or the Popular Dramas of Bengal, London 1882), is based chiefly on the works of Kṛṣnakamal Gosvāmin who wrote pseudo-literary yātrās about 1870-75 A.D., and therefore deals with fairly late specimens, which are not entirely free from the influence of English or anglicised theatre in Bengal.
with the literary drama, but it is probable that it was a continuation of an old type, while it is a fact that it survived the decadence of the regular drama into which it never developed, and that its even tenor of existence was hardly ever modified in form or spirit by any literary pretensions. The principal elements of the old yātrā seem to be of indigenous growth, peculiar to itself, and there is no evidence to shew that these elements, which have survived in a rough way through ages, had anything to do with the theory and practice of the literary drama. Its religious and mythological theme, no doubt, raises a presumption of its kinship with the Sanskrit drama, but it really points to a probable connexion with religious festivities of a popular character. It is true that a dramatic element always existed, but the operatic and melodramatic peculiarities prevailed over the dramatic. The religious preoccupation of these festive entertainments expressed itself naturally in song, or in recitative poetry which could be chanted, and this choral peculiarity threw into shade whatever mimetic qualities they possessed. Although the realities of scenery and character were not totally ignored, there was little dialogue, still less action, and hardly any analysis or development of character. Every representation was concerned primarily with the gradual unfolding of an epic or paurāṇic theme, a simple story often perfectly well-known to the audience; but the performance was necessarily slow and elaborate, the session sometimes occupying more than one day, because description, recitation or singing was given preference to mere action and dialogue. There was no scenic apparatus, and even no regular scene-division, which appears to have been introduced much later from the Sanskrit or English drama, and all the details were left to the imagination of the audience, the Yātrāvālā or his chorus or some individual character sketching, explaining and commenting (by means of elaborate descriptive passages in verse and prose) on the outlines of the narrative, which was eeked out by the principal characters in metrical or choral dialogues. Some of these dialogues, as well as most of the chorus songs, were composed and learnt by heart beforehand; but they must also have been developed considerably by improvisation. Wilson compares the yātrā to the Improvvista Commedia of the Italians, the business alone being sketched by the author, the dialogues supplied by the actors and the narrative details explained by the Yātrāvālā or his chorus. The Yātrāvālā, unlike the Sūtradhāra who sets the play in motion and then retires, was an important figure in the old, if not in the modern, yātrā; for
he not only controlled and directed the performance but was always in appearance, supplying the links of the story by means of the descriptive and narrative passages, explaining and expanding it with the help of his chorus, the actors making their appearance just to impart enough verisimilitude by their presence and their metrical dialogues. It was his show and he was the show-master. It is also important to add that there was in the old ātrā an exclusive preponderance of songs or recitative poetry, in which even the dialogues were carried on and the whole action worked out. In comparatively modern ātrās, no doubt, secular themes are admitted; the details of the story are more minutely and faithfully followed; there are less music and poetry and more dialogue and dramatic interest; and even lively interludes of a farcical nature are introduced to relieve their seriousness and monotony. But even these improvements made of late years could not altogether lift the ātrā out of its religious envelopment and its essentially poetic or musical structure.

If we bear these characteristics in mind, it will not be difficult to see that a work like the Mahānātaka approximates very closely to this type. The religious or mythological theme of this work, its epic or narrative character, the imperfection of its dialogues, its descriptive passages interspersed with elaborate and vivid stage-directions, its chorus-like vaitālīka-vākyas, its length and extended working out of the story,—all these peculiarities find a natural explanation when we consider that these are also the prominent features of the ātrā. As the imperfect dialogues and narrative passages were frequently supplemented, it is not surprising that a work meant for such performances increased in bulk, incorporating into itself fine poetic passages from various sources, and different versions came into existence.

Pischel has already made a very significant remark with reference to the Dūtāngada that "there are almost as many Dūtāngadas as there are manuscripts". This remark applies with greater force to the Mahānātaka. The two recensions of Dāmodara and Madhusūdana have already been distinguished; but there is a great deal of discrepancy in the different MSS and printed editions with regard to the number of verses and Act-division in each of the recensions.

1 At the present day, the Bengali Ātrā is being entirely moulded by the anglicised Bengali drama and theatre, and is therefore departing completely from the older type.
Unfortunately most of the existing catalogues of MSS give us little information on this point, for they seldom are so painstaking as to collate the different MSS or compare them with the printed editions and register the differences. But in some cases these have been noted and interesting facts have been brought to light. In one MS of Dāmodara’s recension, which contains the commentary of Balabhadra, the colophon to the commentary at the end speaks of the fifteenth prakāśa, which makes it probable that this version contained fifteen, instead of the usual fourteen Acts. Similarly in a MS, preserved at the India Office, of Madhusūdana’s recension, the last Act (IX), which is one of the longest, is divided into two, thus giving us ten Acts, probably in conformity with the Sāhitya-darpanākara’s prescription that a mahānātaka should contain ten Acts. With regard to the number of verses, the MSS vary considerably. According to Lüders, the Bombay edition of Dāmodara’s recension, published in saka 1786, gives 582 verses; but the Bombay edition (Veṅkaṭeśvara Press) of saka 1831, which we use, gives a total 578 verses. Eggeling’s three MSS at the India office give 588, 570 and 611 verses respectively. Keith gives the number in an Oxford MS as 557. The Bodleian MS noticed by Anfrecht contains 548 verses, and on comparison of this MS with the Bombay edition of saka 1831, it is found that the discrepancies occur in Acts I, III, V, VI, VIII, IX-XIV. The same kind of discrepancy is also noticeable.

1 iti……..śrī-balabhadreṇa viracitayāṃ śrī-hanumannaṭaka-dīpi- kāyāṃ paścādaśah prakāśaḥ (Bhandarkar, Report 1883-84, p. 358). Kielhorn (Catalogue of MSS in the Central Provinces, Nagpur 1874, p. 76) gives the number of ślokas in this version of Balabhadra as 2654! In another version by Nārāyaṇa the number is given as 1760!

2 One of the concluding verses of Dāmodara’s recension (xiv, 15) tells us that the number 14 was adopted on the analogy of the fourteen worlds. It was thus apparently an artificial division.

3 Tawney and Thomas, Catalogue of Two Collections of Skt. MSS at the India Office, p. 36. With this arrangement, the majority of Dacca University MSS of Madhusūdana’s recension agree.

5 Op cit., vii, pp. 1583f.

7 Bodleian Catalogue, p. 142a.
in the two fragments noticed by Weber. The following table will make the differences clear:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act</th>
<th>Bombay ed. of 1831 Śaka</th>
<th>Aufrecht</th>
<th>Weber (fragment)</th>
<th>Weber (fragment)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is said here of the recension of Dāmodara applies with equal force to that of Madhusūdana. Aufrecht's Bodleian MS gives 720 verses; but we have eight MSS of this recension in the Dacca University collection which do not agree with this MS, nor with each other, with regard to the distribution and total number of verses. The published editions of this recension will also bear out this point. The early edition of Mahārājā Kālikṛṣṇa Deva Bāhādur (Calcutta, 1840) need not be taken as authoritative, for the editor confesses in his prefatory verses that he has inserted the stage-directions, the titles of scenery etc., and it is not clear if he has followed any particular MS or groups of MSS for his edition. This edition* gives, according to the editor's own numbering, a total of 613 verses. The edition of Rāma-

---

1 *Berlin Catalogue*, I, p. 163 (no. 552); II, i, p. 157 (no. 156c).
2 It is remarkable that this edition omits the end-verse to each Act which speaks of Madhusūdana as the redactor; but in the prefatory remarks the editor speaks of Madhusūdana as such, and this leaves no doubt that he followed this recension. For the number and order of the verses in the Dacca University MSS of this recension, see Appendix, *infra*, pp. 571ff.

*II.O, September, 1931*
tāraṇa Śiromaṇi, published with his own commentary (Calcutta 1870) is based (as the editor states) on two printed texts and 9 or 10 MSS, but it notes few variants and the text is frankly eclectic. It follows generally, however, the commentator Candraśekhara’s text and gives a total of 730 verses. In the edition published by Candrakumāra Bhaṭṭācāryya, which contains the ṭīkā of Candraśekhara (Calcutta 1874) we have in all 734 verses. Finally, the edition of Jīvānanda Vidyāsāgara with his own commentary (Calcutta 1890), which does not appear to have utilised any MS but only uncritically copies the printed editions (chiefly that of Rāmatāraṇa Śiromaṇi), as well as draws verses from Dāmodara’s version, contains the largest total of 788 verses. The distribution of verses in the different Acts may be shown in a table thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act</th>
<th>Kālikṛṣṇa</th>
<th>Rāmatāraṇa</th>
<th>Candrakumāra</th>
<th>Jīvānanda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 613 730 734 788

Although Dāmodara and Madhusūdana appear to have made a final redaction of the work, it is clear that even each of their recensions was in a state of flux. The respective Act-division is more or less kept intact in each recension (with just two exceptions already noted); but there was considerable addition or omission of the constituent verses in each Act. This fate the Mahānāṭaka doubtless shares with many other Sanskrit plays, of which different recensions exist; yet with the exception perhaps of the erotic elaboration of Act III of Śakuntalā and the irregular Act IV of the Vikramorvāṣṭya, the extent of interpolation or omission in the text is never so great as we find it in the Mahānāṭaka; for here we have of each recension practically as many versions as there are manuscripts. This fact makes it probable that the work was utilised for some form of perfor-
mance in which the descriptive passages could be eked out at will, so that within the fixed outline of the accepted redactions, verses were added or omitted to suit the performance, the performers, or the audience, just in the same way as the regular plays were adapted to the requirements of stage-acting, e.g., by the Cakkyars of Malabar.

Further interesting light is thrown on the question by eight Bengal MSS of the work, which give us a version not associated with the name of Madhusūdana and which appear to confirm our conjecture regarding the origin and character of the Mahānāṭaka. These MSS do not entirely agree with each other in their texts, some being very short and others comparatively long; but taken together there is a substantial agreement, which gives us a version which may be called the textus simplicior, as distinguished from the textus ornator of Madhusūdana. The finally redacted recension of Madhusūdana, which came to prevail in Bengal and which was doubtless based on some such simpler version, regularised the work into the semblance of a drama, but these MSS tell us a different story.

We have in the following pages given a part of the text edited from these MSS, in parallel columns with the corresponding portion of the text of Madhusūdana (Acts I and II) as we find it in its longest version in Jivānanda’s edition. A detailed comparison between the two would be interesting. In Madhusūdana, we have at the commencement, 13 benedictory verses (which number appears as 10 in the texts of Rāmatārāṇa and Candraśekhara¹ respectively); but in the majority of our MSS this pseudo-nāṇḍī is kept within the reasonable limits of 4 or 5 verses. The prarocanā-verse, which names Hanūmat as the author, as well as the direction nāṇḍyante sūtradhāraḥ, is omitted in our MSS and this is obviously an after-thought of Madhusūdana’s as we do not find it also in Dāmodara’s version. Curiously enough, our MSS give here an indication of the gradual process of accretion and expansion. The two MSS marked A and D incorporate a large number of verses of a narrative or descriptive character from different sources, the latter specially interpolating more than once a large number of verses stringed together from the Anargha-rāghava and the Prasanna-rāghava. The verse

¹ Candraśekhara comments on this: nāṭake śloka trayeṇa śloka-
dvayeva vā nādi kriyate......mahānāṭake tu nāyam niyama iti bahubhīḥ, ślokair nāṇḍim karoti.
next following the benediction affords an example of this process of
amplification which must have already been in existence when
Madhusūdana took up the work. This verse (no. 6) is not uttered
by any actor but narrates the beginning of the story by telling
us all about Daśaratha, his three queens and four sons and
corresponds to verses 15-16 of Madhusūdana. But this verse is
amplified in four of our MSS by the addition of another verse
which is clearly an imitation of the first, while one MS adds
some more verses thereafter with the heading Rāma-caritam. After
this, all the MSS (with the exception of three) plunge directly
into the plot by going straight to the episode of the Sītā-svayaṃ-
vara, omitting Rāma's early exploits narrated by Madhusūdana,
but alluding to these exploits in the opening verse uttered by the
Maithila Vaitālikas, who welcome Rāma on his arrival at Mithilā.
The episode is briefly sketched in rough outline, and is not such an
elaborate affair as it is in Madhusūdana. Sātananda speaks in
one verse (borrowed from Bālarāmaṇa i, 27) of Janaka's vow,
Sītā is apprehensive in the next, and Lākṣmana follows up in
two more verses as Rāma takes up Śiva's bow. The episode is then
rounded off by a vaitālika-vākyā again, which applauds in six or seven
verses the feat of breaking the bow, which is further praised by
the Pauras and by Lākṣmana in single verses respectively. After
this come four more verses uttered again by the Vaitālikas, which
describe Rāma's marriage and return to Ayodhyā. It is not
necessary to follow up the analysis of the text further, for this
rapid account of what corresponds to the first Act in Madhusūdana's
recension and what contains no prose, little action but much more
Vaitālika-vākyā, and takes up only 24 verses as against Madhus-
ūdana's 59, will give a rough idea of the general character of this
simpler version.

In this connexion attention may be drawn to several points. In the
first place, these MSS give us a shorter and much simpler text, in
which the story is sketched in bare outline without any amplification
of matters of details. Secondly, the prarocanā-verse, as well as the
verse which occurs at the end of each Act and names Hanūmat as the
author and Madhusūdana as the redactor, is to be found in none
of our eight MSS, and there is nowhere any mention of Madhu-
sūdana or the fact of his having redacted the work. Nor is
there in these MSS any verse or any indication which asso-
ciates the work with Hanūmat. Thirdly, the stage-directions are
generally very simple and take the form of brief indications like *atha lakṣaṇa-vākyam, atha sīta-manasi paribhāvanam, atha vartmani paraśurāma-darśanam* etc. There is also throughout no Act-division, and the work is presented as a continuous whole without any break of Acts or scenes. This is an important fact, which obviously shews that the work was meant for some kind of continuous performance like the *yātra*, which knew of no Act or scene division. We are told at the end of each Act in Madhusūdana’s recension that it was Madhusūdana, who arranged the work in the form of a *śāndarbha* (*miśra-śrī-madhūsūdanena kavinā satārthya sajñākṛte* etc.). With our new material it would not be unreasonable to surmise that originally the work existed, as we find it in our MSS, in the form of a continuous narrative piece furnished with metrical dialogues, which, however, were hardly dramatic and curiously imperfect, being left to be supplied in the course of the performance; and that later on Madhusūdana redacted some such earlier version and gave it a semi-dramatic form by regular Act-division, stage-directions and some prose, and filled out the dialogues and the narrative and descriptive passages more elaborately. It must also be noted that these MSS mark quite distinctly the Vaitālika-vākyas or Pauravacanas, in which long recitative poems (which were doubtless meant for singing) were put in the mouths of groups of persons, commenting on an incident or enlarging upon a theme; and there can hardly be any doubt that these were employed in the same way as the chorus-songs in a *yātra*, which punctuated the performance in a similar manner. It is further important to note that in our MSS the prose passages, whether narrative, descriptive or conversational, are entirely omitted, a fact which is in keeping with the almost entirely choral or recitative character of the old *yātra*. It cannot be said that these prose passages are frequent or numerous in the two accepted recensions of Dāmodara and Madhusūdana, but whatever prose there is, it must have been added (in deference partly to the actual practice of the Kathaka and the Yātrāvālā) in later times when the recensions were finally redacted, so as to impart the semblance of a dramatic composition to the work.

1 The erotic elaboration of Act II is entirely omitted in our MSS (with the exception of one MS only, marked F, which places these verses in another context in Act III).

2 That our MSS are not mere abridgements or summaries of
The features noted above are really remarkable and highly significant; and from what has been said in the foregoing pages there is no special reason to doubt that, at least in Bengal, a simpler version of the work existed, of which the tradition is recorded in these eight MSS, and which, to all appearance, bears a strong kinship, in general character and structural similarity, to such works as may have been utilised for popular festive performances of a quasi-dramatic nature, in which song and recitation prevailed over real acting and the drama.

That the vernacular yātrā reacted on the literary drama at this period admits of little doubt. We have referred to the Citrayajña described by Wilson, although it is a fairly modern work from which deductions for an earlier period would not be safe. Keith really touches upon this solution of the problem when he suggests that works like the Mahānāṭaka were composed “in preparation for some form of performance at which the dialogue was plentifully eeked out by narrative by the director and the other actors”; and he rightly compares such irregular types with the Gītā-govinda of Jaydeva and the Gopāla-keli-candrīkā of Rāmaśrīna, both of which can be (and in the case of Gītā-govinda it actually is) enjoyed as lyrical poems or songs, but which are at the same time capable of quasi-dramatic presentation. Had more informations about the yātrā been available, Keith would probably have seen its close resemblance to these types instead of explaining them with the rather facile conjecture that they were merely literary exercises. In both the Gītā-govinda and the Gopāla-keli-candrīkā, however, we find a sublimated outcome of the simple the Mahānāṭaka is clear from fact that we have some other MSS in the collection at the University of Dacca which expressly call themselves sampkepa-mahānāṭaka. It may also be noted in this connection that two of our MSS of the simpler version (marked A and B) bear the same date of copying, viz., Śaka 1714 (= A.D. 1792) and appear to have been prepared by the same scribe, Purusottamadeva Sarman. A was procured from Baghia in the district of Faridpur, B from Borai in the district of Bogra. But these two MSS do not appear to have been copied from the same archetype, as A is more elaborate and has a large number of added verses, and C agrees with it more closely than B. The scribe was thus apparently copying at the same time two versions for two of his patrons.
Krṣṇa-yātrā, but in the Mahānāṭaka-type we have the adaptation of traditional matter for the purpose of such melo-dramatic and operatic performances. The date of Rāmakṛṣṇa's work is unknown, but it is apparently a late work written in Gujarāt. Caland who has edited it (Amsterdam, 1917) touches upon (p. 8f) its similarity to the yātrā; and its parallel to the Swāṃg of North-west India, which, unlike the regular drama, is metrical throughout and in which the actors recite the narrative portions as well as take part in the dialogues, is rightly suggested. But this play in five Acts, with definite stage-directions and elaborate prose and metrical dialogues, is, like the Gītā-govinda, a highly fictitious composition which cannot be classified properly with the type we are considering, although its connexion with the Mahānāṭaka is indirectly mentioned in the prologue.1 Lévi2 mentions a Tāmil version of the Śakuntalā which may be a near enough parallel to our type; and the influence of the popular theatre on the fourth Act of the Vikramorvaśīya is also probable. To this category may also belong the Ānanda-latikā already mentioned, as well as the Nandi-ghosa viṣaya noticed by Eggeling.3 This last-named work, also called Kamalā-vilāsa, is a semi-dramatic entertainment in five Acts on incidents connected with the ratha-yātrā festival (at Puri) and was composed by Śivanārāyaṇa Dāsa in honour of his patron Gajapati Narasingha Deva (of Orissa). But all these works, inspite of the undoubted influence of entertainments like the yātrā on them, can be similarly differentiated. It is indeed difficult to find a work of precisely the same pattern as the Mahānāṭaka, which thus stands unique in the whole range of Sanskrit dramatic literature; but its uniqueness makes it an extremely important production which throws, as no other work can, an interesting light on certain phases of development of later Sanskrit drama.

We are now in a position to conclude that the origin of a work like the Mahānāṭaka is not to be sought in the far-fetched shadow-play, the existence of which in ancient India is not yet beyond doubt, nor should any inference be made from an obviously late work with regard to the early evolution of the Sanskrit drama. With its highly stylish form the work has nothing primitive about it, nor can it be assigned to a very early period. It had its origin probably at a time when the Sanskrit drama was already on the decline. Such

1 p. 44, line 29.
2 op. cit., p. 244.
3 op. cit., vii, p. 1606, no. 4190 (607a).
irregular types could at this period come into existence, partly through
the influence of such choral and melodramatic performances
as the popular yātrā, which were now being brought into prominence
by the gradual rise of vernacular literature. It is not contended, in
the absence of any tradition, that such a pseudo-play was actually
enacted as a yātrā. It may or may not have been; but it is possible
to maintain that such works were not mere literary exercises but were
intended for some kind of performance of the type mentioned above.
They were, to all intents and purposes, a kind of Sanskrit yātrā
or were meant as such, composed for a more cultivated audience,
who, with the decline and fading popularity of the classical Sanskrit
drama, wanted something which would be an analogue to the looser
yet highly melodramatic and operatic popular entertainments. The
anonymity of the work and the existence of different but substanc-
tially agreeing versions are points in favour of our view. We can
also understand why the work is in the nature of a compilation
with just enough nucleus round which borrowed verses could be easily
woven.

In conclusion we should like to point out that the Mahānāṭaka
has not yet been critically edited, nor has all the MSS-material
for such edition been yet properly utilised; and that such an edi-
tion furnishing a critical text or texts, concordance and other
relevant data is a desideratum. We hope we have been able in
this essay to bring into prominence the importance of the work,
and the ample material which still exists in MSS for a study of
the problems connected with the question of its character and origin.
We regret we have had no MSS of Dāmodara's recension to utilise
for this essay, but we suspect from our study of the Bengal versions
that the examination of the MSS of the other recension may bring
to the light fresh data.
APPENDIX

In order to enable the reader to judge for himself of the value of the simpler recension of the *Mahānāma* given by our MSS, we edit below a part of the text from eight MSS in the Dacca University Manuscript collection. For convenience of comparison this text is printed in parallel columns with the text of Madhusūdana’s recension as given in Jivānanda Vidyāsāgara’s edition. Although not perfectly authentic, Jivānanda’s text is selected because it gives perhaps the longest text of this recension. We have, however, compared Jivānanda’s text with the text of the same recension given respectively in three earlier printed editions and eight MSS of the Dacca University collection, and noted the readings given by them. It appears that Jivānanda had hardly any MS as his authority but simply copied the text from Rāmatāraṇa Śiromaṇi’s edition (even noting its alternative readings) and uncritically incorporated verses from Dāmodara’s recension into Madhusūdana’s version.

The specimen-text is edited up to the end of the second and beginning of the third Act of Madhusūdana’s recension. References are noted where verses are found also in Dāmodara’s recension, as well as to such Rāma-dramas as *Mahāvīra-carita*, *Anargha-rāghava*, *Bāla-rāmāyaṇa*, *Prasanna-rāghava* etc. It is noteworthy that the majority of MSS of Madhusūdana’s recension give it in ten Acts.

Manuscripts

The text of the simpler version (called here “Our Text”) is based on the following eight MSS belonging to the Dacca University Manuscripts Library:

A = MS no. 1640, dated in śaka 1714 (=1792 A.D.). Palm leaf; fol. 123; total no. of verses 592; 3 lines as a rule on each folio. The scribe writes at the end: भोजस्यायनस्य प्रतिभासनां स्वाभाविकं इति शान्त्रोऽविदाय १७१४॥ Purchased from Indranarayan Chakravarti, Vill. Baghia, Dt. Faridpur.

B = MS no. 1581, dated in śaka 1714 (=1792 A.D.). Palm leaf; fol. 114; verses are not numbered; 2 lines as a rule to a folio. The scribe who appears to be the same as that of MS A, writes at the end: शास्त्रके शासनेन वेदेन्यत्वाण्वयते कल्पिता विश्वासं बंश दुर्ग-
Presented by Bhavadeva Bhattacharyya, Borai, Dt. Bogra.

C = MS no. 2093. No date, but is not older than the two MSS noticed above. Palm leaf; fol. 61; total no. of verses 341, but the MS is incomplete; the lines on each folio vary from 2 to 3. This MS agrees very closely with A, and is probably derived from the same archetype. Both the MSS belong to Faridpur. Purchased from Govinda Charan Bhaduri, Vill. Silangal, Dt. Faridpur.

D = MS No. 406b. No date, but not older. Paper MS; fol. 17 only, and number of verses 159; 8 lines to a folio; MS incomplete; Purchased from Vajrayogini, Vikrampur, Dt. Dacca.

E = MS no. 18c6b. No date, but not older. Palm leaf; fol. 73; 3 lines to a folio. No. of verses 281; MS incomplete. Presented by Babu Yasodakanta Chakravarti, Kashabhog, Palong, Dt. Faridpur.

F = MS no. 271c. Dated in 8 Caitra, 1139 san (=1732 A.D.). Paper MS; fol. 48 (first fol. torn in places); no. of verses 556 (but irregularly numbered at the end). The scribe’s name does not occur but he writes at the end: सन १७३२ साल = चेत्र समास || मोकाम भरतपुर, परस्परो फल्लों दिह्न || Purchased from Nalhati, Dt. Burdwan.

G = MS no. 1275. No date, but probably belongs to the same date as A. Palm leaf; fol. 56; 3 lines to a folio; no. of verses 354; incomplete beginning and end missing. Presented by Tarini Charan Bhattacharyya of Bijura, Sylhet.

H = MS no. 1364a. No date, but appearance and character old; it belongs probably to the 18th century. Paper MS; fol. 17; 8 lines to a folio. Incomplete, at the end. The verses are not numbered. Presented by Peary Mohan Goswami of Lugaon, Sylhet.

The variant readings of Madhusūdana’s text are noted from the following MSS of Madhusūdana’s recension, existing in the Dacca University collection:

A = MS no. 502b. Paper MS. No date, but probably not older than the 18th century. Fol. 49; 7 lines to a folio; total no. of verses 439, but incomplete at the end; Purchased from Rohini Chandra Bhattacharyya, Malatīnagar, Bogra.

B = MS no. 619a. Dated in Asāgha, saka 1755 (=1833 A.D.). Paper
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MS; fol. 98; complete in 10 Acts; verses numbered separately in each Act (except in Act vi, vii where the numbering is irregular), as follows: I—47; II—47; III—96; IV—67; V—124; VI—125; VII—83; VIII—30; IX—90; X—67. Marginal glosses in Acts I and II. The scribe writes at the end: धकान्त्वा: १६४३ श्रावण। नत्ता ताराप्रद्धुः श्रीगौरीवर्द्ध्याम्याय। लिखिता पुस्तकरो देन्त श्रीवर्द्ध्याम्याय। In the collection of Yadaveśvara Tarkaratna of Rangpur, purchased by the University.

C = MS. no. 623. Paper MS; fol. 82; 4 lines to a folio: incomplete, breaking off at verse 39, Act VI. The verses in each Act are separately numbered thus; I—47; II—47; III—95; IV—69; V—118; VI—39 (incomplete). No date, but the MS seems to belong to the first part of the 19th century. Occasional marginal gloss in Acts I and II. In the same collection as noted for MS, B.

D = MS. no. 662. Dated in śaka 1715 (=1793 A.D.). Paper MS; fol. 89; 5 lines to a folio; verses numbered separately in ten Acts, except Act vii, as follows; I—47; II—47; III—96; IV—67; V—119; VI—129; VII—82; VIII—32; IX—91; X—68. Occasional marginal glosses. The scribe writes at the end: सहस्रादेशेऽसर्व सप्तधुः स्त्रेदिके लिखितस्तविष्वाच। बिद्याय गोकुल-हरायचितो सिद्धस्मानाथकाव्यविद्यान्त प्रीत्यस्तत:।। In the same collection as for MSS, B and C.

E = MS. no. 1019a. Paper MS; fol. 22; total no. of verses 168; incomplete. No date, but probably belongs to the 18th century. 5 lines to a folio. Presented by Tarachand Bhattacharya and Nalini Mohan Bhattacharya, Borai, Dt. Bogra.

F = MS. no. 1049. Palm leaf; fol. 78; 4 lines to a folio; total number of verses 479; incomplete. No date, but not older than the 18th century. In the same collection as for MS, E.

G = MS. no. 1620. Paper MS; fol. 77; 9 lines to a folio. Complete in 10 Acts. Total number of verses 718 (excluding the end verse ेरा ब्रिलाहनुमताः), distributed over ten Acts thus: I—45; II—53; III—89; IV—77; V—103; VI—verses not numbered; VII—verses irregularly numbered; IX—90; X—60. Marginal glosses. At the end we have: शोका निरंकः खळू ये वस्म्पि संगमा। गृहा ये विवाहितमण्डः स्तमभवह्य सती।। In the collection of Sivaratan Mitra of Suri, Birbhum.

Purchased from Sivaratan Mitra of Suri, Birbhum.
H = MS no. 2322. Paper MS; fol. 67; 6 lines to a folio; complete in 9 Acts. The numbering of verses is irregular. No date, but the MS apparently belongs to the 18th century. Purchased from Amulyaratan Mukherjee, Majigram, Dt. Burdwan.

Of these eight MSS of Madhusūdana’s recension, close agreements of reading as well as numbering and order of verses are to be found in two groups (i) A,E,F (Bogra MSS) and (ii) B,C,D (Rangapur MSS); while G (Birbhum MS) and H (Burdwan MS) stand apart. This variation according to locality is interesting.

Editions

The following printed editions of Madhusūdana’s recension have been used for noting differences of readings:

KK = ed. Mahārājā Kālikṛṣṇa Deva Bāhādur, Calcutta, 6aka 1762 (=1840 A.D.). There is a Sanskrit metrical introduction in which the editor tells us that he is following Madhusūdana’s recension, but that he has inserted proper stage directions of his own.

RS = ed. Rāmatāraṇa Śiromaṇi, with his own commentary, Calcutta 1870.

CS = ed. with the teka of Candrasekhara by Candra Kumāra Bhaṭṭācārya, Calcutta, 6aka 1795 (=1874 A.D.).


Other Abbreviations used in the footnotes

M = Madhusūdana’s recension.


PR = Prasanna-rāghava, ed. S.M. Paranjape and N. S. Panse, Poona 1894.

BR = Bāla-rāmāyana, ed. Govindadeva Śāstrī, Benares 1869.

AR = Anargha-rāghava, ed. Kāvyamālā 5, Bombay 1894.

Our Text

विश्वेशो व: स पायातिरिक्ताचिवानं योजनम्यानुवारं
विश्वेशो विश्वेशो सृजितविश्वाम्भ: स्वेच्छाया निर्मितीमये
विश्वेशो विश्वेशो सृजितविश्वाम्भ: स्वेच्छाया निर्मितीमये
विश्वेशो विश्वेशो सृजितविश्वाम्भ: स्वेच्छाया निर्मितीमये

1. In F this part is torn, up to the end of विश्वेशो

Madhusūdana’s Text (Jivánanda’s Ed.)

विश्वेशो व: स पायातिरिक्ताचिवानं योजनम्यानुवारं
विश्वेशो विश्वेशो सृजितविश्वाम्भ: स्वेच्छाया निर्मितीमये
विश्वेशो विश्वेशो सृजितविश्वाम्भ: स्वेच्छाया निर्मितीमये
विश्वेशो विश्वेशो सृजितविश्वाम्भ: स्वेच्छाया निर्मितीमये

1 विश्वेशो A.
2 योजनम्यानुवारं A.
3 J notes the other reading निपुणात्मो, which is given also by RS and KK; निपुणात्मो: RS, CS and G; निपुणात्मो: A, E, F; निपुणात्मो: B, C, D, H.
4 A, E, F read as the first verse no. 3, which is followed by no 8, after which come nos. 1 and 2. C, D, B, H interpose nos. 1 and 2, reading 2 first, then 1.
5 Omitted in A, E, F, G.
6 विश्वेशो विश्वेशो E, A.
7 J notes two readings lōpya (KK, RS, CS and G) and हृदय (B, C, D, E, F, H, RS). A reads विश्वेशो.
8 काश्य: A, E, F.

2 All words from यत्तीति up to सङ्कु (inclusive) torn in F.

3 निपुणात्मो A, D, F.
4 पायातिरिक्ताचिवानं H.
5 क हृ A.
6 काश्य: H.
7 काश्य सृजितविश्वाम्भ: B, C, E, H.
8 विश्वेशो A.
9 This verse is omitted in F, which reads in its
Our Text

Mahānātakam

Madhusūdana's Text (Jivānanda's Ed.)

काव्यम: कापि विष्णु: कचन कमत्मु: काव्यतन्त: क च यो:।
काव्यमोऽय: कापि श्रेष्ठ: कचन मणिगण: कापि नकादी:-

जयति रघुवंशालाकः कौशल्यानन्दः 4 वर्षनो रामः।
दरवतनिधनकारी दारारी: पुण्डरीकाकः ॥ ३ ॥
नमामि देवर्त 5 सुरक्षयाट्न धरुयायः नीरवनीलाकाँम्।
गुणाभिराम कथानन्तरं ते यदापद्य न क्षणमुर्मति औः। ॥ ४ ॥
रामं कष्टमण्डूलं रघुरं सीतापति सुन्दरं
काव्यम: कौशल्यानन्दः कथानन्तरं गुणाभिरामः।
राजेन्द्र: समस्तर्त 6 दशारथनन्तरं स्वयंमं शालमिन्ति
वन्दे लोकाभिरामं रघुवंशालाकः राष्ट्रं रावणारिसं। ॥ ५ ॥

1 क श्रेष्ठ: B,C,D,H and CS.
2 मणिगण: B,C,D,H and CS.
3 This verse is quoted in Śārīgadharapaddhati as Hanumatāl (no. 90).
4 कौशल्यानन्द: in all Mss. except G, also in KK.
5 रामं H. 6 This verse is omitted in A,E,F.
7 This verse is omitted in A,E,F.
Our Text

MADHUSUDANA’S TEXT (Jivananda’s Ed.)

मनोःभिन्नम् पवित्रभिन्नम् कथोभिन्नम् अव्यावहिन्नम्।
लहोःभिन्नम् सत्यभिन्नम् बन्दे सदा दशारथिः च रामम्।।
श्रीरामचरणः सुविश्वगृहः कीर्तिप्रमुः
समेरास्यचरणः जनीचरणः
आनन्दचरणः रूपचरणः
सीतामणः कुमांचरणः नमो नमस्ते।।

कल्याणानि निधानं कल्याणानि जीवनं सजनानि
पायेः यन्त्रभीत: सपदि परिपालये प्रस्थितस्य।
विधानमेधकं कविवर्चसाः पावनं पावनानां
बीजं धर्मेऽपि गाणं प्रभवतु भवताः भूलये रामनाम।।

1 रामा B, C, D, H.
2 मनो B, C, D.
3 प्रकाश B, C, D.
4 This verse is omitted in A, E, F.
5 J notes two readings विश्व (H, KK, CS, RS) and विश्व (B, C, G and RS).
6 This verse is omitted in A, E, F.
7 All MSS. (except G) and KK, CS read चरणं मस्त्रय.
8 Dām. I, 1.

It is after this verse that D reads अयति रक्ष रक्षतिके: as noted above.

This verse is given by A, C, D, E, but omitted by B, F and H.
Our Text
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पालु ओस्तनपथस्नायसकरीमुरार्क्षितोऽस्थलो
देश: सर्वज्ञात्सतिमंधुत्कृष्णचन्द्रमनोर्दयः।
क्रीडाकोडनेश्वरनुविशदे श्रीमुः परम्परा:।
अज्ञेयते श्री महामायिनिपन्नलक्ष्मीयोज्यमुनिष्ठाकृतिः॥१५॥

षं श्रीम: समपासते पिन्व चति श्रद्धा ति वेदाँतिनो
बौद्ध युद्ध इति प्रासमस्त: कृति नैवाधिकः।

अद्वितियते जयेनास्वनरता: कृमति भौमानकः
सोद्यो वो विदितातु वाचितस्तस्ते यो विहोनियाहो इति:॥१६॥

t राम राजयार्थं दुःखाद्यतनं स्वमणायं गुणाहरुं
पूज्यं यात्रं प्रतापाविधिव जज्ञांचक्ष्य महेश्वरीसिद्धिः।

विशालन्दककरूरा कहिंस्तताग्रद्वितीयं कृमिययोऽत्यक्ष्यितेः
स्वरीमानं नमामि चिन्नुमनसरणं प्रत्येक निशपालक्ष्मु॥१७॥

एतं हि दुःखाण्तक्रियस्तिरीक्षार्थाक्षतिचिद्विषेदः
बृहदेक्षुष्ठम्भभक्षुभक्षुरजं सासनसुएक्षुभिः॥

1 This verse and nos. 10 and 11 following are omitted in all Mss and printed texts. They are given in Dāma. I, 2, 3 and 4 and are probably copied therefrom by J.
Our Text
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1. लोकश्रवणिकान्तसाखुशबन्धन: पीरभास्रोपवत्ति खुशी
   वेत्तत: वायुभिं वीराणि व: II 12

2. वाल्कीर्यतमतिन्नरोधधुर्म्भावधि प्रहतत:
   तत्रे काननसेवनावधि कुषा सुप्रीवकस्यावधि.
   भाष्या वारिधिकन्ननावधि: यशो लक्ष्मी: राजाशावधि.
   औरंगाबाद पुनातु लोकवर्तिता जानकयुपेशावधि: II 5 II

1. ताराधन B, C, D, G, H. J follows the printed texts.
2. This verse is omitted in A, E, F.
3. A, E, F, H add after this: प्रलमितिक्षतेऽकः K, K, and CS, read, after this and before no. 14, the following verse:

   वाल्मिक्येन्द्रनायायेऽशुद्धिं द्वारे पावन
   श्रात् वागस्तु विविद्यतुद्विं ये व्रतयाप्ये प्रजाति:।
   विषयोऽविवर्तितं परार्धसुङ्गो रामायणं सादार्थं
   भरविष्यता अवस्यवदि नगर्विप्लवं नारायणः ॥

4. व्यक्तो A, E, F, H.
5. कवि: A, E, F.
Our Text
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1 श्रीरामस्य रघुवरस्य च चरितं सौम्यं ॥ चर्चय नारका: ।
2 गोकुली ताविर्यं समायुक्तम् सम्बन्धेऽच सब्जित्वा
3 तद: धीरं: कृतह ममदुमात्रा वक्तस्मिन रामायणम् ॥१.१.
4 राजासीति स महाराजो दुःखाद्वयं गुणाक्ष्रयं
5 लतस्यानुसरं रमणीयं केवलं नित्यास्य महिष्यः स्यूभा: ।
6 वीरोत्तच्छवः सुतानु सुमदारे क्षत्राचुराचलवत्तायः
7 भज्ये राम इत: कनिष्ठरत्सत्सत्सात्जो लक्ष्मणः ॥१५॥

1 श्रीरामस्य H. ।
2 सौम्यः: KK only.
3 केवलं नित्यास्य B, C, D. ।
4 गुणाक्ष्रयं रमणीयं B, C, D. ।
5 कमीय B, G, KK, RS, CS.
6 राम H. ।
7 कमीयप्रचलन B, C, D.
8 All the Mss (except H), KK and CS, read:

H reads:

रुप H. ।
र्षेढः सब्जित्वम् समायुक्तम्
वीरोत्तच्छवः सुतानु सुमदारे क्षत्राचुराचलवत्तायः
भज्ये राम इत: कनिष्ठरत्सत्सात्जो लक्ष्मणः ॥
Our Text
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two lines of verse 6 of our text, the last two lines of which are omitted.

A and C read after these verses several additional verses as follows:

Kṛishṇapānāntaṁ rāmāṁ sāmīdhrīṣcāsamrodakṣaṇāt
bhavat kṛṣṇīpyaṁ bhumānīṁ lažmahānaṁ: II

Rāmacchitraṁ.

Hrīndasāti na ca rādhānāmaḥ śyāpyati na bhāṣitānām.

Vaiśravaṇaṁ nāma nāmaṁ rāmō rāmēva saṁvādaṁ II

Bhumānīṁ bhumānīṁ bhumānīṁ pāraśādāṁ: II

Vāsudevaṁ mahāvaṁ: kṛmūḍhāyaḥ mahāmanā: II

J adopts the reading of CS in the text, but this is the only authority he has in his favour.

1 Pṛiti: K.K.

2 This verse is given in the printed texts, as also by G and H: but it is omitted by all the other six Mss. A, E, F read in its place no. 5 (rāmāṁ lažmahānaṁ).

3 Kṛmagānaḥ H, CS, RS, E, F.

2 Paribhaktāḥ E,F. A reads: Kṛmagānaṁ bhāvāhinaṁ.
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ततःः¹ धीरामचन्द्रे तपोव्यं प्रक्षिपति बैतालिकवाक्यम्²।

विध्यं विषिष्टां विजयं ज्यों च

सम्प्रायं सम्यक्ष्यं नतु³ गाधिपुञ्जात।

रक्षससि हनुं कतुकन्यकःचः

समागत: सम्यक्ति रामभद्ध॥ १८॥

मारीचं निजचान राक्षससमुन्नाध्यं स्वं रापवः

सवेज्जये किं वक्षणास्य विशिष्टेयार्त्ता: कुतात्तावाहम्।

तोऽथ प्रापुरथो महापरिवहितः: सवं पुनःप्राप्याणा-

लभ्यां संयुक्तः⁴ युधितमविव⁵स्फोतिः: समासक्षयाः॥ १७॥

इते रक्ष: कुलेऽतत्र राममेण विविधवत् कलो।

निष्ठुचे कौशिके प्रायाति ताम्यं जनकपतनम्॥ २०॥

¹ Omitted in A, E, F.
² बैतालिके E,F,G; सुनिमिरसी बैतालिके B, C, D.
³ B, C, D, G, H.
⁴ संप्रमु: A, E, F.
⁵ "मिषि A, E, F."
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'ब्रह्म सीतास्वयंवरे' ैवैज्ञानिकचार्याक्ष्यात्राते।
यो दृष्ट: कुशिकात्मज्ञाय सुनने तत्तेन यज्ञोत्सव-
प्रत्युत्तरबानमात्र वर्तमानिनि हत्वा तत्ततादाक्ष्यात्राते।

1 A and C read just before this verse: ततो
विष्णुमिथि प्रार्थयो रामस्वयंवरमात्र जयामः, which is followed by
no. 17 of M (तेषा राम: कृषिकः). After this comes the
following:

'ब्रह्म वर्तमान ताठाकालिकचारा।
ततो दायाराण्यात्मा साधुः कृषिकाकालिक।
निविद्या ताठाकार्यां बालेर्मेवचित्रकालिककारात्॥

Then follows no. 18 of M, with its heading (ैवैज्ञानिक: पदति only for वैज्ञानिकचार्याक्ष्यात्राते). Then comes 'ब्रह्म सीतास्वयंवरे
जनकदृष्टिका' followed by no. 26 of M. After this we have:

तत: स्वर्यंवरे वनिस्मिद्रातुमाने नानाको रामेव वर्तत।
वासंतयामि तत्त: पद्महं नाथ दास्खटेतुत्त: का भिन्न।
मातुर्जीभिक्षरेधरुद्रति तेष पद्मोर्दिति क्रम प्रायोगसी॥

Other Mss omit these verses here: only H gives
here no. 17 of M (variant कम्यादानां A,C,H).
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'ब्रह्म मिसिलाः प्रविश्व रामेव वंस्तालिककरः पवित्र।
यो दृष्ट: कुशिकात्मज्ञाय सुनने तत्तेन यज्ञोत्सव-
प्रत्युत्तरबानमात्र वर्तमानिनि हत्वादित्यां ताठाकारात्।
कुष्ठाबासि मुनमेरेरेष्या च महां तस्यातुः। कौलकारूणे
सोय त्वमाविशि राणेश्वर: निमिपतेः प्राहेऽ पुर्वः साधुः।

आसीदुहक्ष्मूपावित्रमिन्द्रप्रोपत्रायाचित्रद्वैतोऽवै।
वर्णिवृत्तमुरिभारलेः भूरिभारवः पुजतां
यास्यां स्मयो विषयार्म भारित: भूरिभारवृत्तिः।

1 मिसिलाः अ, ए, फ, ग,
2 Omitted in A: रामचन्द्रे E, F,
3 हत्वा च ताः A, E, F: हत्वा कल: B, C, D,
4 A, E, F read this line as:
कपालसी मिसिलाधीनायाद्वैताः शराचार्य: साधुः।
5 This verse, as well as nos. 23, 24 and 25, seems
to be copied by J from दामि. १, ६, ७ and ८. They
are omitted in all our MSS and the printed texts.
A, E, F, read, after no. 21, the verse no. 33 (सम्बादृष्टि)
Our Text

४७ भाषाकारिणि मुनेरवेक्ष्य सच्चानुभावः कौण्डकारूनी
सोद्वा सम्प्रति राजको निमित्तातः प्राप्तः पुरै वाजुनः मूः ॥ ३ ॥ ॥

I. H reads after this verse no. 18 of M (विषयं विषयं ;
variant सम्प्रति or विषयं). E reads after this verse
नाटयात्रि तव प्राप्ताने (see footnote 1, p. 584 above) with
the heading बोधायकारे कादिकारीको क्लोति (variant क्रियायकस
for क्लोति करिता).

D reads after this verse a long metrical conversation
chiefly between Viśvāmitra and Janaka, extracted from
the Prasanna-rāghava and the Anargha-rāghava, as
follows:

अध्य जनकं हः प्रति विषयार्थस्य

प्रमो रजोक्ता वत (PR, iii, 7).

अध्य विषयिन्त्र हः प्रति जनकवाक्यस्य

व: कादिकारीकार्यां (PR, iii, 8).

अध्य रामविनिश्चितं हः प्रति जनकवाक्यस्य

पुत्रोऽहितार्थपर्यं (PR, iii, 19).

अध्य तं प्रति विषयार्थस्य

तत्न्य प्रतिपर्यायविनिश्चितोऽ (PR, iii, 25).
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तेवाचीध्वरनुस्पन्स्क जनवा ज्यायनमुद्रापवो

राम: सोद्वाह्य कौण्डकारेण मुनिना रघोभवाययाविषः

राजानं स यशोधानो नापिति: प्रावत्सु वां दृक्षिता-

स्तास्ये सोद्वाम प्रति दुमदाराववयाः: सौमित्र्योन्मोचयाः ॥ २३ ॥

मुन्द्रिकादम्नयमस्यदुविदादाता स्तुतिः विरोधमवर

राम: सत्यवतिः पुत्रार्थ सत्यवतार्थम् जीत्याः

हुते कौण्डकार्यानन्त च महे त्रावतान राक्षसाः

हत्यामुस्थचराः भावविविद्वै मारौचयायक्तिम् ॥ २४ ॥

पूर्ण यशस्वीय विजयारम्भस्माण सर्वायुः मुनिः

सीतासंवरणाता सत्तार्थमस्य विश्वामः

अध्य तृतीयानुस्तवं च मिथ्यायममाय तेनालक्षि

सक्तार्थार्थविनिश्चित: पुनररचाप्रभिन्न मण्डलम् ॥ २५ ॥

कृष्णनाथायं), after which comes no. 34 (कृष्ण
with the heading तेवाच वत:). B, C, D read हरिकृष्ण
गतानं साध्वायकाति and then no. 25. The other two
S G and H read, immediately after no. 24, no. 2
with the heading जनकाचारा only. The printed text
follow the last arrangement.
Our Text

(Footnotes continued)

1. Adhustdana's Tex

Anda' Ed.

1. अमृज्जः B, C, D, contrary to metr.e.
2. चापेदुः G, CS.
3. This heading is given by G, H and the printed texts- A, E, F omits it. B, C, D read here : ततः सौरा- तथवर्गे समानो राविनाशः सौरकः। श्रावः श्राविशामिश्राविश्रावः (BR i, 36), the variant in D,C being श्राविश्रावः। This is followed by सकोपः सौरकः। सार्वं हरेना etc. (no. 27).
4. This verse is from BR i, 44 and occurs as Dam, i, 17. It is omitted by A, E, F.
Our Text

(Footnotes continued)

| PR, iii, 31 |
| PR, iii, 31 |
| PR, iii, 31 |
| PR, iii, 31 |

(Mahānāṭakam)
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1. Omitted in A,E,F,G.
2. B,C,D,H,CS read जनकः। before this line and बृत्त: before the next line. G omits these but writes on the margin सयोहकतपतुकी। तत्र जनकः। बृत्त प्राहः।
3. This verse is omitted in A,E,F.
4. All passages from here up to the end of verse no. 32 are omitted in all the MSS and printed editions. They are probably drawn from Dāmodara's version by Jivānanda. The verses occur as given below.
5. Dām. i, 12 = AR iii, 44.
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पुष्प रामं प्रति ।
समर्पतुद्वाते सुरसहचरीचामरमसं- 
तरणेश्वरीः विशेषद्विजपरिपयतार्थयुञ्जिनाः ।
स्वयं पौलस्येन त्रित्रिस्वाभिनितः चैतन्ति धृता- 
मरे राम तव मा जनकपतिपुज्यायसः || 30 ||
शम्भोरावसमसमधुलक्षणं सुजुक्तोऽज्ञताः ।
माहेश्वरं दत्तं कमुङ्ख हते दशाक्षरं: || 31 ||

दृष्ट: सम्भेदः ।
माहेश्वरो दशमीवः सुद्रवास्येण महिभुजः ।
पिनाकारोपणं श्रृवं हा सते कि भविष्यति || 32 ||

इस्तुकां दृष्टे गते ।
सभायां नृपं युक्तायां जनकस्य पुरोहितः ।

1 Dām. i, 13 = AR iii, 61.
2 Dām. i, 15 = AR, iii, 50.
3 Dām. i, 16 = AR, iii, 49.
4 This heading is given only by G, H, and the printed editions.
5 राम B, C, D.
Our Text

तत्रैव शालाण्ड्यावाक्यम्।
श्रणुत जनकमुखं क्रिया: सर्व एते
दशवंदुमुखिनान्त क्षितिजः यत्र शर्कित:।
नमयति धनुषेऽयः शारारोपेन्
त्रिमुखजय्यक्षीमिचिली तस्य दारः।॥ ॥
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शतान्द्रो वचः प्राह श्रणवतः सर्वृभूमूलाम्।॥ ३२ ॥
श्रणुत जनकमुखं क्रिया: सर्व एते
दशवंदुमुखिनान्त क्षितिजः यत्र शर्कित:।
नमयति धनुषेऽयः शारारोपेन्
त्रिमुखजय्यक्षीमिचिली तस्य दारः।॥ ३३ ॥

1 This verse is omitted in A, E, F.
2 G and CS add a heading before this verse:
   तत्रैव वचः।
3 शारारोपेन् B, C, D, E, F, KK.
4 Dām. i, 18 = BR iii, 27. After this verse and before no. 35, B, C, D, read as follows:

पर्या माहेश्वरे धनुषि पौरस्त्यो न योगः।
कोचाभाषान्त्यः।
शम्भोरावसमवमेच्छेनात् etc. (no. 31)
स्तोत्रामणं गोपेशः।
ञ्जनेण्य गुलस्त्यश्च etc. (AR iii, 48).
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1 This heading is omitted in A, E, F, H reads जन्तार for जनको

2 आ द्वीपात्यतो B, C, D, H, and the printed editions: ब्राह्मणाधिलो G.

3 Dām. i, 10 = PR, i, 32.

4 This heading and the verse no. 36 which follows are omitted in all Mss, but given by the printed editions. CS reads जन्तार सखीजनो.
OUR TEXT

चथ शीतामनसि परिभावनसि।
कमठपुक्तोरमिन्दे चतु-
मंधुरभूमितसौ रुपुनन्दनः।
कथमधिज्ञमनेन विघीयता-
महह तात पण्डतव दाःरणः॥ ५ ॥

1 चथ शीतामनसि B, E: the heading omitted by F.
2 This verse is omitted in E; D and F place it after no. 11 of our text. A and C read after this verse:
   तत: शीतां प्रति वैतालिका:
   माधेश्वरो दुगजीवः (no. 32 of M).
   ततो जनकान्वयसि।
   या दीपातं पुरस्त्रोभयं तःपतवः (no. 35 of M).

F only reads या दीपात (without any heading) after no. 9 of our text, which however is placed, as already noted, after no. 11.

MADHUSUḌANA’S TEXT (Jivananda’s Ed.)

चथ शीताया मरसि भावनसि।
कमठपुक्तोरमिन्दे चतु-
मंधुरभूमितसौ रुपुनन्दनः।
कथमधिज्ञमनेन विघीयता-
महह तात पण्डतव दाःरणः॥ ३७ ॥

1 रामेन गुँधीते चतुष शीतामनसि H.
2 This heading is omitted here in all M’s except G.
3 Dām. i, 18. A, B, C, D, E, F, H, omit it here but place it later with a different heading, after no. 38.
Our Text

देव श्रीरुपनाथ सं बहुतया शूरोदिसम ते लक्ष्मणः
मेवादीनिन्ध भूयराजः गांवेच्ये जीर्णः पिनाकः कियानः
तन्मादिविषा देव यस्य मधीतो वायुवर्ध तौरकी
प्रोद्वरूः परिणामितः 5 प्रमचिरुः 6 मधुः 5 सदैव क्षमः ॥ १० ॥

1. तदाक्षरं सत्रमतःवाक्यम् A, D : देव लक्ष्मकाक्यम् E, H, F

omits this heading but places the verse, which follows, after no. 7 of our text.

2 नाथ E, बीर F.
3 प्रतारण A.
4 द्रोपित B.
5 प्रतिनामित् A, C, D : प्रविचारितुः F.
6 नमचिरुः F, प्रवलितुः E.
7 For the readings of D, see above p. 584, fn. 1.

E reads, after this, a verse which is somewhat corrupt:

इस्ति तस्माया वायुवर्ध रामनिवा (लुक ?) खेमः युद्धम युद्धम

किवैचित्कृतद्विविवर्धयष्टियं वस्तवं वस्तवं वस्तवं वस्तवं वस्तवं

यथेतरं चार्यतुः नमचिरुः शास्त्रोदिसम कोश्य क्षमः

किवै च विविवर्धयामि संतते कोद्धावलं द्वयं

यद्वैतरं परिणामवर्ध्यामित्वं संव त्यवा शायते ॥

Madhusūdana’s Text (Jivānanda’s Ed.)

भूरामे लज्जा कुर्वति सीताया उत्साह वर्धयं लक्ष्मणः

dev और जीर्णः पिनाकः कियानः

मेवादीनिन्ध न भूयराजः गांवेच्ये जीर्णः पिनाकः कियानः

तन्मादिविषा बीर यस्य मधीतो वायुवर्ध कौलकी

प्रोद्वरूः प्रचलितुः 6 नमचिरुः 7 मधुः सदैव क्षमः ॥ ३५ ॥

1 रामेव, बीर, which also add सति after कुर्वति A, E, F.

2 J notes the reading बीर, which variant is also noted by RS. A reads देव but notes on the margin बीर as a variant.

3 किवै B, C, D, contrary to metre.
4 देव A, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, किवै B, C, D.
5 यस्य E, त, त, त, त, प्रविचारितुः A, F; प्रविचारितुः B, C, D; परिचालितुः E; परिचालितुः G.
6 नमचिरुः F, प्रवलितुः E.
7 प्रवलितुः B, C, D; प्रवलितुः E; प्रवलितुः G.
8 सदैव A, त, त, त, त, त, त, किवै B, C, D, CS.
9 A, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, त, किवै B, C, D.

किवै त्रिति (no. 37)
पुनःलक्ष्मणावाक्यम्।

पृथ्वी सिध्य भव सुजन्म धार्येनां
तत्र कृधराज तद्विप्र दितयं द्विपथाः।

1. यथा रामादेवे चन्द्रेण हीतार्थं लक्ष्मणावाक्यस् A,C,D,E : D,F reading रामादेवे। यथा रामेचन्द्रेण हीते सीतावाक्यम् H.

B, C, D read here:

यथा सीतामननि से दे।

कमदनुक्रोणो इत्या (no. 37).

The reading of H, which places also no. 37 here, is already noted above p. 591, fn. i. This verse is the same as Dâm. i, ii.

1 B, C, D read before this verse ललंब।
2 Dâm. i, 20.
3 This heading is omitted in CS. B, C, D read only यथा ललंब:। A, E, F, G read ललंब: for लक्ष्मणावाक्यम्.
Our Text

Mahānātakam

Madhusūdana’s Text (Jīvānanda’s Ed.)

1. करोति D.
2. A, C, and H read after this verse (H omitting the last verse given here below):

नवन्ति यथा रसालय (no. 41 of M).

2. भयं सीतामनसि परितपाः.

तत्तत्तपरकारति ताकरारावर्गामाख्याविशालनेत्रा.

महत्त्वः समैव विदेहकन्याक्रम्य किसम्यं परिश्रयात्मोति.

गृहोते हर्कौदले (no. 38 of M).

Of these, the first two verses are given here also by F; but the first verse is placed after no. 12 of our text, while the second is placed here. C and H read as heading भयं घुड़मां: before the first of these verses. H’s variants are नव्त्व in l. 1, दृश्यति: कर्तव्ये in l. 3, and पुरति: (for च तद्धर्मे of A and C) in l. 4.

1. करोति B, C, D.
2. दाम. i, 21 = BR i, 48. A, E, F read after this verse no. 90 (कृष्णकृमलप्वया), the variants being पाशिक for पार: in I. 1; in E, F स्पष्टति विपुलकर्मो कार्यं in I. 4.
3. विन्दान्ति A, E.
4. विन्न्ति B, C, D.
5. J and RS also note a variant चर्किते which is given by A, E, KK.
6. दृश्यति A; चौज्यत E, F.
7. दाम. i, 22.
Our Text

MADHUSÜDANA'S TEXT (Jivánanda's Ed.)

तत्र २ श्रवण्टिनां चेढा।

रामे द्रव्यासानं तुद्यमिति समित्या स्थितं पारिस्थिति: अरोप्य वाक्यानुसारी किंसीं तथा गुणसृष्टि:।

उल्लिखितं सह कौशिकस्तु पुत्रं: सारं युवानामिति सहान मन्त्र भूपानां जनकस्तो संशयिष्या सारं समासाफ़ालितम्।


dh 1熱

1 Omitted in A, F, while F reads चत्र for चथ। C and H, whose readings are noted above, omit the whole line.

1, H.Q., SEPTEMBER, 1931
Our Text

MADHVA'S TEXT (Jivananda's Ed.)

1. Sahita G.
2. Dām. i, 23. The order of the following verses (nos. 44-48) is given differently in some of the Mss. A, E, F read thus: nos. 46, 44, 47, 45, 48. B, C, D, omit no. 44 but otherwise follow the order of the text. H omits no. 44 after 43 but places it after 46.

1 Sahita D; Sahita F.
2 E reads after this verse the following:

शेलोकः विद्यितं च श्रीमध्मा जानकोभुवस्;

घनुभजनव: सर्व सचेतनस्वक्षेतस्॥

F reads no. 19 of our text (with its heading) after this verse (no. 12 of our text), and then reads no. 41 of M (कृष्णी बालि)

3 This verse is omitted in F.
Our Text

1. Dropped in H.
2. This verse is placed after no. 17 of our text by F.
3. कोष्ठकः, C. H. 4 बालुः: A, B, H.
5. अभत्त्वाय: A, C, H.
6. कोष्ठकः: C. H. D, E.
7. This verse is omitted in F.
8. कोष्ठकः B. 9 मन्द्रा: B.
10. कार्यानुप्रस्तावित B, E; कार्यानुप्रस्तावित D, F; कार्यानुप्रस्तावित for कार्यानुप्रस्तावित in H.

Madhusūdana's Text (Jīvānanda's Ed.)

1. न्यूनतः च वचः: अन्तर्मिल्लर्षांति दिः: कोष्ठकः मूर्तिरस्य दल्ल्यस्य कुशल्मात्र:।
2. अनुसूची: बधिराणि पञ्चगुणान्यं च सम्पदयः न्यूनशील्त्वयमार्थादिविद्युक्तैः कोष्ठकः।
3. अधि: । 5
4. अनुसूची: सकल्मुखस्माति च दोषययः 7 शौचयः चिन्तन्त्र विद्विन्तत्कण्ठविलित्तः कमपण: सभराजम्।

1 H adds before this verse धिशि च। 2 तात्त्विकः G.
3 दोषययः E, F, H, KK.
4 Dām. i. 27 = AR, iii, 54. This verse is omitted altogether by C, D. A drops the last two lines.
5 Omitted in all Mss. 6 सन्तानो A, E, F.
6 प्राणाण्य B, C, D; कोष्ठकः E, F.
7 चल्विलितकां A, E, F; चल्विलितकां B, C, D.
8 सन्तानाम A, E, F; सन्तानाम B, C, D.
Our Text

व्यमोठ्ठीरप्रलयजलवर्धन

Madhusūdana's Text (Jīvānanda's Ed.)

व्यमोठ्ठीरप्रलयजलवर्धन

1. viśākha
2. pr. iii, 45. This verse is omitted in KK.
3. sūtra E, F, 4. viśākha B, C, D.
4. koḷaḥ: A, E.
5. sūtra B, C; sūtra A, E.
6. hi gata A, B, C, D, E; gata H, CS, RS.
7. E, F.
8. Ms and the printed edition read vṛttakavacā
9. pr ii 49. This verse is omitted in KK.

This verse is omitted in B, F, H, but given by A, C, D, E. D, however, reads, after this verse, the verse
(Footnotes continued)

Sajja Kārttikeyakatham noted below. This is followed by Praym Pairajayavay and no. 19 of our text. E reads immediately after the verse 18 of our text:

Praym Ramayya Chandivi mahr Rajayapmashe vanduvachayas.
Saray Harpaya Harikaupaya (no. 27 of M).

After this the order of our text is followed in E. H reads no. 20 in place of no. 18 of our text.

Madhūsūdana: Text va da Ed

1 ६रोदमके E, F.
2 ७सास्वेव के: B, C, D, CS. 3 Dropped in A.
4 ७समाऋत्थायलाच A, E, F. 5 Dām. i, 26.
6 ७भद्राय A, E, F, G, H, CS, RS. RS also notes the other reading. J notes both the readings. G reads before this verse: ७सय समवा!
7 ७सक B, C, D. 8 Mahāvīra-carita i, 54.
प्राय सरकारभाषा ।

dूर ध्यानध्यानत्त्वातां

वर्ष दिनह पितासमाजः।

रामसामायन्यतुर्विवाहाः

नमम म सं लोकविर्तिः कृतिमाः। ॥ ४५ ॥

1 प्राय पौराजनावकाः D: omitted in H.  2 विलास F, C.

3 लोकविर्तिः A विशिष्टिः H.

4 This verse is placed by F after no. 12 of our text without the heading. D reads after this verse.

प्राय रामसामायन्यतुर्विवाहाः

लोकविर्तिः हरसमाजः। (no. 27 of M).

1 This verse is omitted in A, B, C, D, E, F, KK.

Dām. i, 24 = AR iv, 21.

2 Dām. i, 25. This verse is omitted in all Mss and printed editions.
Our Text

Bhāṣaḥ 1. Lokamābhākṣaṇam.

दोर्विष्काष्ठितमन्त्रोपरमपुरुषौपावभवकोषगतः
हस्तार्यमनिरायवायायपत्रावनालिकिषमः।

drakṣaṃtyaṃkṣantam 2. saṃprasthitam puruṣānandābhāvakāyam
ābhāyādhikāyam karamahā nāyaṇāpi vibhāṣāyati 3. II 20 II

Bhāṣaḥ Jñānakṣetraṃ pūrṇoḥitam prāhitvāhūtātuvān
mṛdhilāmārgachchato vā ṛṣadhārāyādi vīśayā pūrva-vātālīkṣākṣayām.

Jñānakṣetra-patiṇākṣayā pūrṇaṃsvamabhyām
śaradhasmāyaṃ vṛiteṣata stānadvīptam 4.

āparaṃpi tattva-jñāna-adhyāya hātā:
śrīnārāyaṇa-patiṇākṣayā: kṛṣṇācaūḍācyuti II 21 II

Bhāṣaḥ Shatānanda-nātanāte dvārāde mirthilāṃ prabhāvat
vibhāṣāki: pārthikam 5.

Jñānakṣetra-patiṇākṣayā pūrṇaṃsvamabhyām
śaradhasmāyaṃ vṛiteṣata stānadvīptam 4.

āparaṃpi tattva-jñāna-adhyāya hātā:
śrīnārāyaṇa-patiṇākṣayā: kṛṣṇācaūḍācyuti II 23 II

1. Pūrāṇ: B, C.
2. Pārvaśṭa-kṣata: A, D, E, F.
3. H reads this verse without any heading after no. 19, which also is given without any heading.
4. Prāśāśāḥ vāḍātya A.
5. vibhāṣāki: B, C, D.
अतिथियमानसहितं मिथिलाधिनाथं:
कुत्तातिथिः द्वारार्धं प्रसातिथिः ।
खीऽव सुते अथ कुशाध्वजकान्यके च
प्रीत्या दृढः विभिन्देव तदात्मजेभ्यः ॥ २२॥

महानागकरम्

Madhusūdana's Text (Jīvānanda's Ed.)

अतिथियमानसहितं मिथिलाधिनाथं ।
कुत्तातिथिः द्वारार्धं स्वयं ।
खीऽव सुतेप्रायं कुशाध्वजकान्यके ।
प्रीत्या दृढः विभिन्देव तदात्मजेभ्यः ॥ ५४॥

निधानः ४बद्धरसाल्मारीमेरी- ।
टाण्डार ५ताल्लरकाहनादजाधः ।
पूर्ण बमूख धरणीगगनान्तराचः ।
पाणिज्ये रघुपतेजनकात्मजाया ॥ ५५॥

वेवाहिः कुरिणकनन्दनामधवन्य- ।
वाल्मीकिन्द्रामकेशपुरोहितायः ॥

1 विभिन्दातिथिः: A, E, F.
2 द: B, C, D, G, H, KK, CS.
3 मिथिलाधिनाथं: A, E, F.
4 निधानः B, C, D; निधानः KK.
5 टाण्डार: KK; टाण्डार B, C, D. 6 Dām. i, 56.
7 भार्गावावः: B, C, D.
Our Text
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रामो विषव वार्तमान शहादुर्जेश्वर
तेभ्यो दूर। बहलतयुनि तिलाथं गायनं।॥ ५६ ॥
रामो विषव वार्तमान शहादुर्जेश्वर
मनस्तद्वतविवाहमृगुः॥ ५७ ॥
तेभ्यो दूर। बहलतयुनि तिलाथं गायनं।॥ ५८ ॥
तेभ्यो दूर। बहलतयुनि तिलाथं गायनं।॥ ५९ ॥

deleted

1 Dam. i, 58. This verse is omitted in KK.
2 कौशल A, E, F.
3 जनमानवण्यस्त्र पूर्व A, E, F.
4 जनमानवण्यस्त्र पूर्व A, E, F, contrary to metre; प्रमोद KK.
5 सौमिन्त्र A, E, F.
6 Dropped in A.
Our Text
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भृगुरुप्रतिकृति पद्मादित्यानं ॥

यद्वभवति जनकायमात्रे राज्य: परुप्येक्षाेऽद्वितैहः ॥

तस्तत्त्वभा: समासः ॥

द्वितीयोः ॥

जामुनावङ्कतप्रभुरामवर्ष्णः कोजाहलामपर्मूच्छित: प्रवर- मानजो मुख्यत्वानब्याप्तिवर्गयोगानत: ॥४

स्वप्नः सोमस्मातानास्त्रजामुनोः ज्ञानांतिकीर्तितस्वरामाज्ञाम समासं युनि: ॥ ६२ ॥

1 योष्ण B; बांधित D: तत्त्वविवेचनार्थसिद्धि F; तत्त्ववित-मक्ख N H.

2 G places it after no. 26 of our text.

3 कथ पवि परशुरामिस्व तथा संसर्गः ॥

4 यद्वभवति जनकायमात्रे राज्य: परुप्येक्षाेऽद्वितैहः ।

तस्तत्त्वभा: समासः ॥ ६२ ॥

1 भीर A, E, F.

2 This passage is omitted in all Mss and printed editions, but taken from Dām. i, 27.

3 अथ पवि परशुरामवर्ष्णः B, C, D: the other Mss omit तथा ।

4 Dām. i, 28.
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ścieśa: bhūraṃ prati parbhuрагaṃ hmaṇaṃ. 1

कुर्म: कोषादुपूज्यद्विविज्ञानसारः पालल्ये धि कार्या-रथापि क्षत्रक-ग्न्युलुहत्सर्वत्तिजकां ेरुः 3

तीव्रायानां वात्: पुनः पुनः भुवनोत्सातमसूचयनम् द्राक्षे 4

गर्जन-नायकः रिति: रुकुनविजयी जामतुर्वॉजयिति 5 रिति: रिति 6

 PRICE 7

चूहानुबत्तिकुप्रभमबिलस्तूणि द्वार द्वार द्वार 8 विश्वावालक्षणम् प्रती त्वं रूपितम्।

1 bhūraṃ prati parabhurānukṣetraṃ laksñāpyakṣaṃ B, C, D. This heading is omitted in A, E, F.
2 कुर्म: A, E, F. 3 कुर्म: A.
4 भुवनोत्सातमसूचयः A, E, F.
5 मार्गनीयस्तरः H, KK, CS: गर्जन-नायकमिरः A, E, F.
6 P R iv, 2. This verse is omitted in A, E, F.
7 Omitted in A, B, C, D, E, F.
8 सत्यन्मिथ B, C, D; सत्यन्मिथ A, E, F.
This verse is omitted by F. After this verse A, B, C and E read no. 90 (कुतिकालस्याः) of M (variants ofरियत् A, C; भुविनिवित्तम् E in the last line)

2  दाससूत्वत्व दश्त् B, E, G.

This verse is omitted by H.
यत्राकामिति दुर्गास्मार्गस्य1 दुर्बार्यारास्कः 2-  
स्कुम्भः 3क्षत्रियोक्षोष्कलथिरनीरिण्यः भूस्वूतृः।

**Our Text**

**Madhuśudana's Text (Jīvānanda's Ed.)**

रेवानीरिनोयः हेतुगतं चाहोऽ सहस्रं जवालः 9  
कऽ हृ खण्डमखण्डयतः 3विटवधामर्गं वर्ण्यवसः 4 इ 6।  
वेन त्रिपस्तक्तो दृष्टबहुवसामांसमस्मितिः 12-  
प्राम्भायेकारि भूरिच्छुलकहिरसरिदारिप्रेरितिः ।  
यस्य बीचालुक्ताविधियनिषिद्धो निर्देशो विभ्रोताः  
राजन्योचास्तुक्रजनपदुस्त्रदोप्याः क्ष्टारः 5 इ 6 ।  
यत्राकामिति सर्जराजमनुवं दुर्बार्यारास्कः  
क्षुम्भः 6क्षत्रियोक्षोष्कलथिरनीरिण्यः भूस्वूतृः।

1 रेवातोषिविरोध A, E, F.  
2 बार्य A. 3 काशी काशीकरमकारण A, B, C, D, E, F.  
4 Dām. i, 32. A, E, F read, after this verse, no.  
61 (खण्डः कोपादुस्त्रद्विव, ), then no. 66 (यत्राकामिति ), then no.  
63 (प्राणमचारी ), then जाम्वुनम्य: कोंच नामबिष्ठ्या etc.  
5 This verse is omitted in all Mss and printed editions, but taken from Dām, i, 33.  
6 द्वप्यः B, D.
Our Text

Madhusūdana’s Text (Jivananda’s Ed.)

1 PR iv, 29. This verse is omitted in A, E, F.
2 Omitted in A.
3 G, H add हि.
4 वारकय सागर, A. This prose passage is given also in Dām.
5 मा यथा A, E, F, G (but G corrects the reading to मया); वहा B, C, D.
6 मया B, C, D.
7 मया B, C, D.
8 BR iv, 53; Dām, i, 34.
9 A, E, F read, after this verse, no. 74 (क्षय दासरथी राम), but without the headnote परमुराम; after which comes the prose passage ascribed to जामसुर्यम: and no. 68 etc.

1 रेघुस्त्र A, C; रेघुस्त्र D.
2 This verse is omitted by F and H,
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Omitted in A, G, H. The whole of the prose passage is omitted in B, C, D. It is given in Dām.

2 सौरकर्मकार A, E, F, G. 3 कोर for कुर A, E, F.

4 स्वर्णित A, E, F.

5 A, E, F omit कालकृत्तमाचारविन.

6 स्वर्णित A, E, F. 7 कुशल्लाभ A.

8 स्वर्णित A, E, F ; CS; A, E, F omit कोटवस्यवन.

9 स्वर्णित A, E, H; CS, RS.

10 कुशल्लाभ omitted in A, E, F; CS reads कीर्ति for लहरी G reads as in text but corrects it to कुशल्लाभ on the margin.

11 A, E, F read कुशल्लाभस्यवन.
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कार्त्तीयें इति ।
सहस्राष्ट्यस्तं त्वाहुस्त्रेण चक्रवती सुनितं नन्दद्विजस्यं ।
तव सेतुयुक्तोत्स्यं हमेकवीरस्त्रथापि नै परङ्गु तकर्मके ॥ ४६ ॥

परशुरामवनम् ॥
विष्णुमनमविरागमयेन: भूयते भोजये:
भूये चाहिः महाभिं 'पतिमिस्तेजोमस्य: ॥ साक्षिणः ।
इत्याको वया भृगोभंगवति भावी स्वयं विषयः
स्वाध्यायेन श्रमे श्रमे पर्यान्या पत्या पशुनाश्रयं श्रमे ॥ २१ ॥

1 Omitted in B, E; also in D, F, H which omit the next verse also (no. 29 of our text) D reads here no. 34 of our text (स्त्रोध प्रवीरजनली), omitting nos. 29 and 30, after which it reads no. 31 (वायोर्वल न).

2 वस्त्रे:भये E. 3 मुष्य आ, C, G.

4 This verse is omitted, as already noted, by D, F and H. A and C read ( after no. 29 but before no. 30 ) no. 64 of M (सोः व्यस्तस्वरुः ), its variants being पुत्रितमहोदयः-स्वाभृत्यां जोमस्तं in l. 1; भित्ता and कुटरेष्य y: in l. 2; कविप्रला in l. 4 (in A only ).

1 हर H. A, E, F read इति कार्त्तीयें ।
2 नप H. 3 व्युक्तोव्य H.
4 Dām. i, 35. This verse is omitted in B, C, D.
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1. क्रस्वयोक्तय गर्भास्पि शक्तयः
2. क्रस्वयोक्तय गर्भास्पि शक्तयः
3. दुध्रामाने दुध्रामाने
4. दुध्रामाने दुध्रामाने
5. महानन्दमयायमान्
6. महानन्दमयायमान्
7. कोशानि
8. कोशानि
9. कुस्तः कुस्तः
10. कुस्तः कुस्तः
11. कुस्तः कुस्तः
12. कुस्तः कुस्तः
13. कुस्तः कुस्तः

1. शक्तसं तु क्रस्वयोक्तयः, Dām, A, E, F.
2. दुध्रामाने, B, C, D.
3. क्रस्वयोक्तयः, A, E, F.
4. क्रस्वयोक्तयः, Dām.
5. महानन्दमयायमान्, A, B, C, D, E, F, G.
6. कोशानि, A, E, F; कोशानि, B, C, D, G.
7. कुस्तः, B, C, D, G.
8. कुस्तः, A, E, F.
9. कुस्तः, A, E, F.
10. कुस्तः, A, E, F.
11. कुस्तः, A, E, F.
12. कुस्तः, A, E, F.
13. कुस्तः, A, E, F.

I.H.Q., September, 1931

1, A, E.
**Our Text**

तालात्तकश्रोतिःः पितृगणीयस्य क्षणं स्वीकृतः
स्तोषेण ज्ञुप्त्या कहणया शोकेन हस्तेन वा। ॥ ३० ॥

**Madhusūdana’s Text (Jīvānanda’s Ed.)**

तालात्तकश्रोतिः । पितृगणीयस्य क्षणं स्वीकृतः ।
स्तोषेण ज्ञुप्त्या कहणया हस्तेन शोकेन वा ॥ ३० ॥

8 अश्रयं कार्तवीराः जुनसुभिपिन्चे दृष्टिकृतमभिः।
केस्यामन्यित्योतकरणं रणस्थारोऽकारः।
तेजोभिः श्रस्त्रगोत्रमधसुज्विद्वदशाक्षाकृताः।
कि न प्रसः शुलदः ॥ ॥

ते पुरस्थञ्जनमक्षुपर्युपकृतः ॥ ॥ ३१ ॥

अभ्यंदः ॥ जम्बृप्रश्रामपरोऽक भूयते श्रेयविहः।

भूषे चाहमहयुभिः परित्यज्ञत्रैभेये सादितः।

1 oṣṭāda. जस्तिः A, E, F.
2 पितृगणीयस्य क्षणं स्वीकृतः A, E, F.
3 स्वीकृतः C.
4 ज्ञानं A, E, F.
5 शोकेन हस्तेन A, E, F.
6 च H.
7 PR iv, 33. This verse is omitted here by A, E, F, but placed earlier, as already noted above.
8 शुलदः B, C, D, G, CS read चित्रः before this verse.
9 क्षणं dropped in C, D.
10 शुलदः A, E, F.
11 दाम. i, 37.
12 चार्येऽन्नः B; चार्येऽन्नः G.
13 चार्येऽन्नः B, C, D, G.
14 ब्रह्मचर्येऽन्नः B, C, D, G.
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This verse is omitted entirely in A, E, F. B, C, D omit it here but read it later after no. 78 (see B. C reads no. 74 immediately after this verse, i.e. after no. 78.

1 This verse is omitted entirely in A, E, F.

2 summary of the subject.

3 E and H omit this verse here but place it later as indicated below.

4 This verse is quoted in B, C, D, E, F.

5 J notes the reading दूरिविशिष्टिनि, which is also noted by R.S.

6 BR iv, 60; Dām. i, 38. After this verse, B, C, D read here no. 77, and then no. 75 (with the heading उत्तराभिरं), omitting no. 74 altogether.
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महानिताकम
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पुन: परशुरामवचनम् ॥

उत्सुक्योत्सुक्य गम्भीरापि शाक्तिपि: ॥ क्षत्रसंतानरोपणा
दुहामा ॥ नेकविवर्तकवनवसि शतसि: ॥ सबंती राजवर्त्यान्
पिल्यु तदक्रमुपांहस्तवनमहान्नांमन्वार्यामां
कोषालि कुवर्तो मे न कहु न विहितं: सर्वभूते: ॥ प्रभाव: ॥ ॥ ३२ ॥

1 पुन: omitted in F; अवाक्या for वचनम् in B, E, F.
This heading is omitted in C, H,

2 अलमित: A; सकलवितः (doubtless for शक्तिपि:) B, E, F; शक्तिपि: C, G; शमितः D.

3 यांशा A, C, D.

4 िविद्यति संबधीयः (?) G. F reads िवाचिति विवाचतः
(=विवाचतः)

5 सर्वेऽके: B, E.

6 This verse is omitted in H. D reads after this verse several passages from PR as follows:

यथे क इह वदुभक्षंसङ्कोचविति परशुरामे वहति शतानन्दवाक्यम्—
राजवेन विद्यविभारीकस्यायं (PR iii, 41)॥ पुन: परशुरामवाक्यम्—
पुर्वपि: छरसिद्धविभारातः (PR iv, 13)॥ ततो रामवाक्यम्—तयं हृद्ये
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परहुराम: 1
क स दुशरथि रामो महसाध्रान्तवारिः।
पुरारेः कामर्कय देव भस्मः तिष्ठति भाववे। ॥ ७४ ॥
श्रीराम: सविनयः।
स्म्र्द्वं वापि न वा स्म्र्द्वं कामर्कय पुरवेवः।
भगवन्यातंविदिष्मभज्यत करोमि किम्। ॥ ७५ ॥
हर: कण्ठे प्रभवतुतासमात्र यि वा कुटारः।
श्रीणां नेत्रात्मध्यवस्तु न: कड़ले वा जल्ले वा।

1 Omitted in H.
2 This verse is omitted entirely by B, D; A, E, F omit it here but place it, with its headnote after no. 66 (पार्थ्यमित्वकायम्). G reads it after no. 76, CS omits it here but places it after no. 72.
3 Omitted in A, E, F; इवद्वार्ति: B, C, D, which add before the verse following: चने तस्मात।
4 This verse is omitted in A, E, F.
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संपस्यामै निष्जनमुल्यं 1 प्रवाःपूर्वैं वा
यदात्ता भजतु न वर्यं व्राह्याण्यं प्रवीरोऽ॥ ७५ ॥

अष्टि ।

निहन्तु हन्त ग। निर्माणं न शुरु रघुवंशीवा: ।
आनं काग्धं ४ कुठारस्ते ५ कुहु राम यथोचितम् । ॥ ७६ ॥

1 निस्प्रभुं KK, CS, H; निस्प्रभुं छलं Dām. G reads as in text.

2 PR iv, 23; Dām. i, 44. The verse is omitted in A, B, C, D, E, F.

3 राष्ट्रवा कव्यः G, H.

4 हस्ते A, B, C, D.

5 मे for ते E, F.

6 Dām. i, 39. A, B, C, D transpose the two lines of this verse, reading the last line first.
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मुनि सातुरवासु यात्राः।
भो श्रीनाथ भवतां सर्वं न घटते संगमवातांपि न:
सर्वं हीनकः करणं कल्याणं युयति समुत्पत्ति।
यस्मातेन्द्रुणेण सरस्वतमिदं राजन्यकराणां बन्धुरः
गुप्तां विजयनां नवगुरुं यशोपवीताः कल्याणः।
॥ ३३ ॥

Madhusūdana's Text (Jivānanda's Ed.)

ग्राथ युद्धोत्ते परस्युरामे दासवर्धाः॥

मुने कल्याणः॥

भो श्रीनाथ भवतां सर्वं न घटते संगमवातांपि न:
सर्वं हीनकः करणं कल्याणं युयति समुत्पत्ति।
यस्मातेन्द्रुणेण सरस्वतमिदं राजन्यकराणां बन्धुरः
गुप्तां विजयनां नवगुरुं यशोपवीताः कल्याणः॥ ६२ ॥

1 द्वार्त: A, G, H; द्वार्त: ब्राह्म E, F. The line is omitted entirely in B, C, D.
2 Omitted in B, C, D. 3 छन्दकृत्यां A, E, F.
3 ब्राह्मकों भवत: मुनि A; ब्राह्मकों भवतां मुनि E; गुप्तां
भवतां मुनि F.
4 PR iv, 25 : Dām. i, 40.
5 B, C, D read here, after this verse, ग्राथ परस्युराम:
followed by no. 72.
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परशुराम: साम्यवस्म ।

वेन खान विनिहाय मातरभक्ति क्षत्रियमय्यातः

खाद्यधर्षणमेव विद्ये निमित्तर्या मेदिनी ।

यद्यवाणिणिश्चर्वना शिवारिणा: कौष्ठिकं हस्तवाचः

दुध्यन्यस्यकः: पल्लति स पुनः कुख्यो मुनिमर्गः ।

65 ॥

श्रीङ्गः: सविनयः।

खोपु प्रवर्जननी जननी तवद्या

देवी स्वर्ण भगवती गिरिलापि यस्ये ॥

त्वहौर्वशीलस्वर्णखुस्वालोक

श्रीदाबिनङ्गवदना ॥ ३३ ॥

1 This as well as the following verse is omitted in all Mss and printed editions: but probably borrowed by J from Dâm. i, 42.

2 AR iv, 52,

3 Omitted in all Mss and printed editions.

4 देवी A, E, F.

5 AR iv, 33; Dâm. i, 43.

6 B, C, D omit this verse and read instead अध परशुरामः
followed by no. 72, as already noted. This verse is also omitted by KK.

1 सकोपस्सा omitted by G, H. The line is entirely omitted by A, E, F. B, C, D read instead: युनिन्द्व鸟
बुद्धा सकोपस्स लक्ष्मणायाध्यायम्।

2 AR iv, 46. A, E, F omit this verse here but place it after no. 85 (तत्त्वामसनिद्धुन)।

3 After this verse, B, C, D read: श्रीराम: सामवो
लक्ष्मण प्रति। कारोऽकाण्ड न जानानि कानुं शिवा कुतं शिज्जो।। प्रभुदिव्य-चिन्तकस्ते रामो न रामानास्तब्दम्।। Then परशुराम प्रति रामः, followed by no. 84 (जातः सोहँ)।
Our Text
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1 AR iv, 35: Daṁ. i, 47. This verse is omitted in all MSS and printed editions, but probably borrowed by J from Daṁ.

2 Daṁ. i, 48. Omitted in all MSS and printed editions.

3 रामचन्द्र A, गोरामचन्द्र E, भीराम G.

4 दिवाकर A, contrary to metre.

5 गोरामचन्द्र, B, C, D.

6 The pages of KK's edition in my copy are missing from here to the end of Act II.
Our Text

अस्मिन् बंशे कङ्खयुतः जनो दुर्योधो वा यशो वा
विशं शस्त्रमहानुरुणः साहसिक्याविरेभीमि || ३५ ||

dum* जन्मानम् न शुरू राधवा वयसः
अवय श्रीः कुटारस्ते कुरु राम यथोपितसः || ३६ ||

1. जन्मचे E; कल्याण B.

2. This verse is omitted in F and H. B reads after this verse: अनन्तः ब्यापों व्याजुनयं राम: || सम्बा स्वयं न बाहुः
K Arn. (no. 75 of M), variant being सम्बा, व्याजुनयं व्यापकता in the second line.

3. A and C read before this verse: यद्यारमः
पशुरामोक्षितस्वुच्छी।

4. Shri D, F, H: Baca G.

5. A and C read after this verse: भूमात्रा किंदेवदुःखश्चमव A R, iv, 35), the variants being तविषित ह्यष्टे (A), वषष्ट (for जय: A). F reads here some of the verses which it omitted before and arranges the verses as follows: यद्य रामवाक्ष्यम्—वाचोवर्णं न विलित (no. 31 of our text) || जात: सोय्य दिनकरुः (no. 35) || पुरोज्यस्य नावसस्तिः (no. 81 of M = A R iv, 46) || लस्यासाक्ष्यितः (no. 38 of our text) || यवो रामं परिष्कर्त (no. 41 of our text) || उचिताचाबस्तयः (no. 90 of M).

1. AR iv, 49; Dām. i, 41.
OUR TEXT

1. ओरामकथावर्णम् । ओरामकथावर्णम् क शिष्य आर्यसिद्धिः।
   धर्मौपदेशिः न रामकथावर्णम्।
   अर्थात् रामचर्यम्।

MADHUSŪDANA'S TEXT (Jīvānanda's Ed.)

1. ओरामकथावर्णम् । ओरामकथावर्णम् क शिष्य आर्यसिद्धिः।
   धर्मौपदेशिः न रामकथावर्णम्।
   अर्थात् रामचर्यम्।

2. Omitted in E.

3. B, C, D read for this line: विनीतं रामचर्यं प्रविष्टं
   परशुरमाम्।

4. AR iv, 55; Dām. i. 45.

5. B, C, D, read here:

   राम: तत्त्वैं तद्वर्णस्तविं (सहस्रासनं C) च तद्वर्णस्तविं।
   तेजोभविषुं भार्तराजसौभार्तराजसौ भ्रमणं तद्वर्णस्तविं
   भवं।
   तत: परं परशुरमामश्च।

   तत: एवं कार्तिकेयं विषेषं साधनं गदायं गदायं।
   वांविश्वं समस्तं विलुप्तं जनित्वेणुर्भविः श्रविः श्रिये।
   इत्यत्रविवेचनयं: ऐतमिकस्य: चमुनां
   विश्वं वर्तमानं कौमुखां नामसंस्कृतं विगते।
Our Text

1[तत्त्वामार्कवर्त्ति तादकारावाकर्षणमकर्षणविशालनेत्रा।
सूर्य समेक्षित विदेहकन्या कन्या किमन्या
परिणामविद्यति॥ ३५॥]

कन्या काव्यिनिधिः कर्त्त्वं ग्नः स्वादिन्त्यसूर्यावसानः
सीतास्प्रप्यमृत्युमांसत्यमुक्त्योस्वाविदिः सिद्धम्॥
कर्णेन रघुदेवे कहो नारायणीयं धनु: सन्तानाय शरीरं
राष्ट्रवं सन्तान भार्तवालिचित्तवधारास्थरः॥ ३६॥

9 राष्ट्रवं सन्तानं नितान्तं सिद्धिविद्वारसयं नैव शान्तं बिद्वत्वा
वचव्य द्विद्विहिंदिजितं संभजगदीर्घवर्गमवमू।

1 B supplies a heading: तत: सीतास्मात्त्व तत्त्वामार्कवर्त्ति॥
2 This verse is given only by B, C, G here.
3 दिख्या अ।
4 रघुदेवे अ, C.
5 This verse is from AR iv, 57.
6 A and C supply a heading द्विद्विहिंदिजितं संभजगदीर्घवर्गमवमू॥

| 1 | संयुक्त G, H. | 2 विभाब्दिः A, E, F.
| 3 | श्वाध्द्य श्वाभाविः A, E, F, G.
| 4 | Dām. i, 49, This verse is omitted in B, C, D.
| 5 | लालाकार्यमकर्षणमकर्षणविशालनेत्र। A, E, F; B, C, D read
| 6 | कार्यालयार्था A, E, F; कार्यालयार्था B, C, D.
| 7 | विश्वास्मात्त्व शरीरं सन्तानं नितान्तं सिद्धिविद्वारसयं॥
| 8 | Dām. i, 50.
Our Text

Madhusūdana's Text (Jivananda's Ed.)

1 J notes the alternative reading अज्ञा, which is accepted by Dām, A, G, H; RS also notes both the readings.

2 शरात्ते B, C, D.

3 Dām. i, 51.

4 विभायजो B, C, D; दानोधक A, E, F.

5 Dām. i, 52.

This verse is omitted by D, F, H.
Madhusūdana's Text (Jivānanda's Ed.)

दिनकरकृङ्केतु: कौतुकोत्साहवाहुः

ह्रुममतिरिपकम् कामुकी चामभ्र: || ६० ||

जामदन्येकर्षे निपतिलोः रामः ।

उत्पन्निर्माणमेद्विभु: स भगवानः देवः पिनाकी गुरु- वीरे यजुः न तद्विनां पथि नन्दुः व्यक्तं हि तद्विनां पथि: ||

त्यागः समसत्तुकुद्वित्वात्रावृद्धि|निवच्छ; जामदानावचि:

सत्याग्रहान्निधेर्वभवत: कि न द्रोहोत्तरम् || ६१ ||

शात्त्वा प्रभार्य रघुनन्दनस्य तदुव्यासां | ततोअथि गादम् ।

1 AR vi, 50. This verse is omitted in A, B, C, D, E, F. Dām. reads this as xiv. 36.
2 ोवरणपिलतो A, E, E ; ोवरण पिलतो B, D : ोब्रने पलि B.
3 वज्र A, E, F वस्त्र B, C, D.
4 पदस्तु निपथि नन्दु A, E, F ; गुरो यजु नन्दु जिर्तू B, C, D.
5 व A, E, F. 6 योग: A, D, E, F.
7 Mahāvīra-carita ii, 36 ; Dām. i, 53.
8 शाल्वा भार्य ब B, C, D : शाल्वातार्य A, E, F, Dām ; G accepts the reading of the text but also notes शाल्वातार्य.
9 ततोअथि all Mss, except H.
Our Text

महानितकम्

वधार्यालम् क्षण्र परशुरामपश्चाभिः।
तथा रामेऽपरिवास्य भागोऽविष्यमाभमस्।
राजाशि सह रामाय: पुनःह्रत्तरकोशालम्॥ ४१॥

Madhusūdana's Text (Jīvānanda's Ed.)

विनयस्य तस्मान् जम्भदिस्सृतस्तोजे भद्रः।
त्रिभवखासः भागोऽविष्यमाभमस्।
राजाशि सह रामाय: पुनःह्रत्तरकोशालम्॥ ४२॥
हस्त्र गति परशुराममुने स्त्रावे
मामंत्रे सर्वसुनन्तनान् पिन्नावृवस्यन।
सम्मान्य मान्यतामिद्युलस्वजातीन्
विना सम निजपुरी द्रोगाम रामः॥ ४३॥
भेदान्तरे जनकाजनन्त्रो च
हस्त्र चिरादमुदवाणनिष्ठितानि।
गत्वात्तरितन्तुत्तरि स्वररसितानि
हस्त्रात् पपत सत्वेऽवरमस्य सिन्योः॥ ४४॥
प्राप्यायस्य तमात्तपरात्तसाधसमावनाभि
न्यंत्र मूलप्रशिक्षुरुजनान् सौतया च। ॥ ॥

I This heading is omitted by A, D, F, H. A reads after it no. 94 of M (हस्त्र गति परशुराममुने: स्त्रावे मामंत्रे सर्वसुनन्तनान्). C also gives this verse here but reads the heading after this verse and before no. 41 of our text.

1 महात B, C, D, E, F, G. 2 Dām. i, 55. 3 J notes the alternative reading परिवास्य which is accepted by A, B, C, D, E, F; RS notes both the readings.
Our Text

Madhusūdana's Text (Jivānanda's Ed.)

Ramo yama-nāyake kalyānārāma-rāma
nīlava sadya: kṣertha-turagān, tādayāmāsa dūnre: II ॥ ६ ॥ ॥ ॥

ālāv yāte sāya[2] nātha-nīmānāvayu sāya-puṣṭre

Ramo: kāmā gūrja-nīmānāvayu sāya-puṣṭa-śru
śrāvañāśātā vajakatana naiva-vana-vāgām ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥ ॥

1 This verse is omitted in all Mss and printed editions. J notes in the commentary that it is taken from the Western recension: it occurs as Dām. ii, 1.

2 śrāvañā A, E, F; śrāvañā B, C, D,

3 sāya-puṣṭre E, F; sāya-puṣṭre B, C, D,

contrary to metre. A's reading is corrupt: sāya-puṣṭa-sāya-puṣṭa-śru.

4 pāta-nāyā-sūtra E, F, which E explains in a gloss as

5 Dām. ii, 2.

(To be continued)

S. K. De
MISCELLANY

Vyosa

Quotations from Vyosa in illustration of grammatical rules occur fairly frequently in commentaries on grammar and lexicons. Some scholars led away by a mere similarity of sound, have suggested that Vyosa is merely a scribe’s error of Ghoṣa which stands for Aśvaghoṣa, but no serious attempt has ever been made to establish the identity. In the index to the Durghaṇḍavṛtti, Vyosa and Aśvaghoṣa have been regarded as the same author and the editor has gone out of his way to class a genuine verse of Aśvaghoṣa like:

प्रेष युर तेज विसर्जितं वर्ज य सर्मेव बलवितं पुराणः।
भद्रीभुते तेन हि न हि निशा पुर्ण समवता समवधे यथा दिवम्॥

after which the name of Aśvaghoṣa is distinctly mentioned, with verses from Vyosa. The late Prof. Srish Chandra Chakravarti in his Introduction to the Bhāṣāvṛtti admitted that the quotations from Vyosa could not be found in the Buddhacarita edited by Cowell but hoped that when the complete manuscript of the Buddhacarita would be discovered, “Vyosa and Ghoṣa might turn up to be the same work.”

A mere glance at the passages quoted from the Vyosa Kāvya is sufficient to show that it must have been a work illustrating rules of grammar like the Bhāṭṭi Kāvya. The Rāvaṇārjunīya is such a work, and practically all the passages quoted from Vyosa are found in the Rāvaṇārjunīya. It is difficult to say with the materials at our command how the Rāvaṇārjunīya came to acquire this peculiar designation, but one may hazard the suggestion that since it illustrates the rules of grammar, it was as unpalatable as the three bitters निधिः which is the meaning of the word ज्योध in Sanskrit.

Kshitish Chandra Chatterjee
Date of the Mudrārākṣasa

Having read with great interest the paper of Mr. S. Śrikanṭha Śāstrī on this topic in the *I.H.Q.*, VII, 163 sq., I should like to point out to the author an article which I published several years ago (*J.R.A.S.*, 1923, 585 sq.) on the date of Viśākhadatta and his drama. There I deduced from various arguments that the Mudrārākṣasa belongs to the latest period of the great Guptas, the reign of Skandagupta. This article apparently has escaped the notice of Mr. Śrikanṭha Śāstrī; nor does he seem to be aware that not only Speyer and Hillebrandt but also Professor Konow and Mr. K. P. Jayaswal (see *I.A.*, xlii, 265 sq.) tried to make Viśākhadatta a contemporary of Candragupta II Vikramādiṭya. Neither the criticism of Professor Keith (cf. *Sanskrit Drama*, p. 204) nor the attempt of Mr. Śrikanṭha Śāstrī to fix upon the year 397 A.D. as that of the composition of the Mudrārākṣasa are strong enough to shake my belief in the date fixed by me years ago. To single out a definite year—or even a day—as that of the composition of the drama is scarcely possible and presents no real interest; but there can be slight doubt that Viśākhadatta wrote his admirable play only short time before the catastrophal inroad of the Huns in the late 5th century A.D.

JARL CHARPENTIER

Suśrāstra under the Mauryas

In his article, *On some points relating to the Maurya Administrative System*, appearing in the September issue of the *I.H.Q.* (1930), Dr. U. N. Ghoshal assails certain views about the position of Suśrāstra in Maurya India expressed in Dr. H.C. Raychaudhuri’s *Political History of Ancient India*, 1927. Dr. Ghoshal does not agree with the view held by Dr. Raychaudhuri that the Suśrāstras were an autonomous people under the suzerainty of the Maurya empire.

With regard to the argument of Dr. Raychaudhuri—that the title of of rājā borne by Tuśāpsha, the ruler of Suśrāstra, in the days of Aśoka Maurya, probably indicates that he enjoyed a certain amount of autonomy,—Dr. Ghoshal observes that “Dr. Raychaudhuri himself disposes of it by pointing to the analogy of Rājā Mānsingh’s appointment as Subadar of Bīrāgal under Akbar”. Dr. Ghoshal it seems, has missed the true
import of the analogy. It is far from the intention of the author of the
Political History of Ancient India to hold up Tuśāspa as a bureaucratic
governor. What he intends to suggest is that Tuśāspa resembled Mān-
singh in having the significant title of rājā, though holding the position
of a provincial ruler through the favour of a superior authority to
which he owned allegiance. This is apparent from the immediately
following sentence in the Political History (p. 180): "His (Tuśāspa’s)
relations with Aśoka remind us of the relationship subsisting between
the Rājā of the Śākya state and Pasenadi." The relationship sugges-
ted here is not what is expected between a bureaucratic governor
and the paramount power.

Dr. Ghoshal further observes that Dr. Raychaudhuri’s "whole case
for the alleged exceptional position held by Puṣyagupta and Tuśāspa
rests upon the authority of a passage in the Arthasastra referring
to the Kāmboja, the Surāśṭra, the kṣatriya (?) and other corporations
(sanghas)". With this assertion he couples the following interroga-
tion: "Can the reference in the Arthasastra be safely taken, apart from
any corroborative evidence, to reflect the conditions of the Maurya
period?" A perusal of the Political History of Ancient India, pp.
180, 194 and 197 leads us to the conclusion that Dr. Ghoshal has
not done justice to the author even on this point. The second foot-
note appended to p. 435 of the I.H.Q. by Dr. Ghoshal himself
(misleading as it is in some respects) ought to have convinced him
that Dr. Raychaudhuri has not relied on the uncorroborated evidence
of the Arthasastra (vide Dr. Ghoshal’s paper, I.H.Q., p. 435, fn. 2).
He has accepted the testimony of the work only when it is borne
out by independent sources of information. The Arthasastra couples
the Surāśṭras with the Kāmbojas who are mentioned in R. E., XII
in a list of "various autonomous tribes" to quote the words of Dr.
Ghoshal himself. The status enjoyed by the Kāmbojas raises a
strong presumption that the Surāśṭras held a position of equal
importance. That they actually did so is rendered probable by two
pieces of evidence noted by Dr. Raychaudhuri on pp. 180 and 197 of
his book. The first is that of the Junāgaḍḥ Rock inscription of
Rudradāman, and the second is that of the fifth Rock edict of
Aśoka himself. In the Junāgaḍḥ epigraph Tuśāspa, the ruler
of Surāśṭra in the days of Aśoka, is represented as bearing the title
of rājā. The significance of this designation becomes apparent
when it is contrasted with the title anātya used in reference to
Suviśākha, the governor of Surāśṭra in the time of Rudradāman himself.
In the fifth Rock edict of Aśoka, the list of 'various autonomous tribes' includes the Rıṣṭika Petenika and the other Aparantas, and a student of ancient Indian geography need not be told that other Aparantas (i.e., Aparantas in the widest sense of the term) included the Surāṣtras.

Dr. Ghoshal suggests that the samghas mentioned in the relevant Arthasastra passage refer merely to industrial and martial corporations. But he forgets that one of these "merely fighting and industrial" corporations, viz., the Kāmbojas find explicit mention in the list of "various autonomous tribes included within the limits of the Maurya Empire". The name of the Surāṣtras, is indeed, not clearly given in the list. But such is also the case with the Gandhāras, in R. E. XIII, and, with the Andhras, Pulindas, Bhojas, etc., in R. E. V. It should not, however, be overlooked that in the last mentioned edict, after mentioning the Petenikas, Aśoka makes the significant addition anīe aparātā, "with other nations on my western frontier, (Smith), "and others on the western coast" (Bhandarkar). In view of these words of Aśoka himself one is not justified in saying that the edicts do not make 'the slightest reference to the Surāṣtras'.

We now come to the most astonishing of Dr. Ghoshal’s assertions. "The Arthasastra", says he, "mentions the Licchivikas, the Vṛjikas, the Mallakas, the Madrakas, the Kikuras (sic), the Kurus and the Pāṇcālas as examples of samghas. These, however, are not mentioned by Dr. R. in his description of Aśoka’s Empire (Political History, pp. 192-97, while other tribes like the Kāmbojas and the Surāṣtras are mentioned in this connection." Dr. Ghoshal would have done well if he had left the Vṛjikas out of the list, for they are actually mentioned on p. 194. He complains in I.H.Q. (June, 1931, p. 387) that Dr. Barnett “has done scant justice to” him. But does he not lay himself open to the same charge by making a statement which does not accord with fact? As to the Mallakas etc., and the Arthasastra statement relating to a plurality of saṅgha-mukhyas how can he, of all persons, expect the author of the Political History “to take a reference in Arthasastra (sic.) apart from any corroborative evidence, to reflect the conditions of the Maurya period’?

Dr. Ghoshal has not contented himself with mere destructive criticism. He offers his own solution of the problem presented by Puṣyagupta and Tuṣāśpha. He says that “the rāṣṭriya Puṣyagupta and the Yavanarāja Tuṣāśpha after his time held charge of small jurisdictions falling within the limits of the neighbouring Viceroyalty
at Ujjaini," Dr. Ghoshal is a careful writer on ancient Indian history and we hope that he will produce his evidence for making such a weighty statement. Meanwhile we may be permitted to point out that in the Mahābhodhivāmsa (pp. 98-99) the name of the province under the sway of the Kumāra at Ujjeni is given as Avantiraṇṭha and we know of no Sanskrit or Pāli geographical composition which includes Surāṣṭra within Avantiraṇṭha. Further, according to the Mahābhārata (XII, 85, 12) the king in Council has direct relations with the Rāṣṭrya. There is no reference to a Viceregal intermediary. Regarding the suggestion in the Political History that Puṣyagupta was a sort of Imperial High Commissioner, attention may be invited to the analogous case of the Imperial Calukya officials sent to territories of subordinate chiefs who "ruled in a dual capacity, that of customs officer and of a political agent" (Moraes, The Kadambakula, p. 266).

Bankim Ch. Ray Chaudhuri

A Note on Sureśvaracārya and Maṇḍana Miśra

The tradition about the identity of Maṇḍana Miśra and Sureśvaracārya was introduced into the field of controversy when Professor Hiriyanna contributed his paper on the subject to the J.R.A.S., 1923, (pp. 259-63). The professor has been amply corroborated by Mr. Dinesh Chandra Bhattacharya, in his article on ‘Maṇḍana, Sureśvara and BhavaBHÜTI’, (I.H.Q., VII, 2). In a little book, named the ‘Maṇimaṇjiar’,¹ written by Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍit, son of Trivikrama Paṇḍit, a disciple of Madhvācārya, Viśvarūpa and Maṇḍana are described as different persons. The writer says that Śaṅkara had a dialectical contest with Viśvarūpa, in which Viśvarūpa’s wife, who is not named, acted as judge and gave her verdict against her husband, who turned a Sannyāsin, according to the terms of the contest; that after this, Maṇḍana met Śaṅkara, and was, in his turn, vanquished. The writer also names, in a different connection, one Umbaka (Umbeka ?) as a disciple of Kumārila, but does not say whether he was the same person as Viśvarūpa. Much of the history narrated by this writer, Nārāyaṇa, is vitiated by sectarian bias, but he treads upon sure ground in differentiating the husband of Udbhayabhārati from Maṇḍana.

Amarnath Roy

¹ It is an earlier work than the “Śaṅkaravijaya” of Mādhava, which identifies Sureśvara with Maṇḍana.
Notes on the Nagarjunikonda Inscriptions

I

Nagarjunikonda and Nagarjuna

The discovery of the Prakrit Inscriptions at Nagarjunikonda recently edited and published by Dr. Vogel in the *Epigraphia Indica*, vol. XX, pt. i, is of great importance to the history of Buddhism.

Importance of the site of Nagarjunikonda

In my note on the "Discovery of a Bone-relic at an Ancient Centre of Mahayana" published in the *I.H.Q.*, (1929), vol. V, pp. 794-796, I dwelt on the importance of the site, Nagarjunikonda, as a famous resort of the Buddhists of the early centuries of the Christian era, and probably also, as an early centre of Mahayana. Just as Bodhgaya grew up on the bank of the Narañjarā as a very early centre of Hinayana and a place of pilgrimage for the early Buddhists so also did Amaravati (extending to Jaggayapeta) and Nagarjunikonda on the bank of the Krishnā (including its tributary Paler) as a flourishing centre of proto-Mahayana and Mahayana in the pre-Christian and the early Christian era and a place of pilgrimage for the later Buddhists. On the basis of the style of sculptures and the palaeographic data, Burgess, agreeing with Fergusson, holds that the construction of the Amaravati Stūpa was commenced in the 2nd century B.C., and enlarged later and decorated with new sculptures, the latest of which was the great railing erected a little before 200 A.D.¹ It was some time after the completion of this Amaravati Stūpa, that the stūpas at Jaggayapeta and Nagarjunikonda came into existence, their dates being, according to Burgess and Vogel respectively, the 3rd or 4th century A.D.² This estimate of date is based on palaeographic evidences and the mention of the king called Mahārīputra Śrī Virapurisadatta (=Mahārīputra Śrī Virapurūṣadatta) of the Ikhāku dynasty.³ The inscriptions on the

āyaka-pillars at Nāgārjunakoṇḍa contain not only the name of this king, but also that of his father Vāseṭṭhiputa Siri Caṃtamūla and his son and successor Vāseṭṭhiputa Siri Ehuvaḷa Caṃtamūla. It appears from the inscriptions that the principal donor of the subsidiary structures of the stūpa, was Caṃtasiri, the sister of the king Siri Caṃtamūla, and the paternal aunt (*pitūchā), later on, probably mother-in-law, of the king Siri Vitrapurisadata. Hence, the time of the inscriptions, mentioning the names of the kings Caṃtasiri and Vitrapurisadata, is the 3rd or the 4th century A.D. It should be remembered that the period mentioned here relates to the subsidiary structures of the main stūpa, and not to the stūpa itself—the Mahācetiya, which must be assigned to an earlier period.

_**Yuan Chwang’s testimony about Nāgārjuna’s place of residence**_

The Buddhistic remains at Nāgārjunakoṇḍa of Palnad Taluk of the Guntur District and the Tibetan tradition about the residence of Nāgārjuna at Śrī-parvata near Dhānyakaṭaka tempt us to trace some connection of Nāgārjuna, the expounder of Mādhyamika philosophy, with this locality, and have, in fact, led scholars to enter into speculations about the identification of Po-lo-mo-lo-ki-li of Yuan Chwang, with Śrīparvata.

Yuan Chwang states that from Kālīṅga he travelled north-west about 1800 li (=300 miles roughly) through hills and forests and reached southern Kośala, where he found—"an old monastery with an Abokan tope" said to be the residence of Nāgārjuna. He further states that while residing here Nāgārjuna met Āryadeva who hailed from Senkala (Simhala). About 300 li (=50 miles) to the south-west of the ‘old’ monastery of Nāgārjuna stands the mountain called Po-lo-mo-lo-ki-li (rendered into Chinese by ‘Hei-feng’ meaning ‘Black Peak’ and ‘Hei-feng-feng’ signifying ‘Black Bee mountain’). On the authority of Beal and Burgess, and

1 _Ep. Ind._, XX, p. 3.  2 _Ibid._
4 _Ibid._
Our Text

Madhusūdana's Text (Jivānanda's Ed.)

तत्र सीताद्वांस्थलस्य भ्रमरस्यलोक्यः।

मदुनिहर्यस्यप्रत्यः कान्ताकुपेन्द्रस्य-।

हंद्रे मदुयजपकुंगो गाठवद्विकिलखिः।

उपरिचिततपोऽक्ष्यते विनिमितम्।

शर इव कुमारोऽरिप पुञ्जावरोऽपि। ॥ १८५ ॥

ब्रह्मचर्यः।

पुष्पलजनभोर मदुमान्दौलित्यनी

हंद्रे राष्ट्रकृत्यकाल्या प्रस्तुतरक्षणौपूरा।

1 तत्र सीताद्वांस्थलः सानन्दमिन्द्रवर्षरस्यलोक्यः A; तत्र सीता

पञ्चस्त्र सानन्दमिन्द्रवर्षरस्यलोक्यः E, F; तत्र सीतास्तनमाध्यः चन्द्रगण्य-

पतिन्स्मादरस्यलोक्यः B, C, D.

2 कान्ति for कान्ति B, C, G. ।

3 कुमारोऽरिप पुञ्जावरोऽपि B, C, D, G, H.

4 लघ्ये कितन मस्त्र: A; लघ्ये कि निष्प्र्थः E, F.

5 कुमारोऽरिप पुञ्जावरोऽपि A, E, F.

6 Dām ii, 16.

7 Omitted in A, D, E, F; B, C read instead

कि व।
MADHUSŪDANA'S TEXT (Jīvānanda's Ed)

संस्कृतम्

प्रकटितम् 

प्रमुद्यति विना जानकी व्याजनि ॥ ११० ॥

धीरामपदा: ॥

निःस्रीनिःस्रीतिस्रीमित्रलयरथन्नीलसहारसरथवान्

लक्ष्मीपुराणलक्ष्मीतिक्षरसर: कामिनो । यामिनीहुः ।

तांद्राः ॥ पान्तकाल ॥ प्रतिमरणंगोद्वस्वद्वस्मक्षयम् ॥

वंकलामहुः। जननगिरिरविसारसं ते अयन्ते ॥ १११ ॥

जानकी प्रनुबा।

स्मृयति च विभेदि प्रेमतो बालभावा-

निमित्ति सुरतसह व्यञ्जनाकुच्यन्तसे।

1 Dām. ii, 17.
2 Omitted in A, which also omits the following verse no. 111.
3 Dropped in B, C; कामिनी G, H.
4 सात्राः A, E, F. 5 कालत A, E, F.
6 अवस्थापारभि A, E, F. 7 अद्वीतामार्गानाथयसे A, E, F.
8 Dām. ii, 19.
MADHUŚŪDANA'S TEXT (Jивānanda's Ed.)

अहह न हि न हृति व्याजमय्याल्पति
सिंतम्पुरस्त्तेश्मांवमाविष्करेति ॥ ११२ ॥

श्रीमानं जानकीवार्षिकास्य मुख्यास्यति ॥

वाचा गुरुकन्त रम्भावरकरमच्छलोदिति वाचारः
संघीतासिद्धमृतमुख्यास्यति ॥

प्रत्यमोहिन्नानाधुमुखः सुवान्नवामोदसम्मोद ॥

पात्रीभूतेन पात्रियो युक्तविल ॥ विश्वनार्थारुः रामराजी ॥ ११३ ॥

1 Dām. ii, 20. 2 Omitted in A, E, F.
3 जानकी वार्षिकास्यति B, C, D.
4 अम्मुखमरः A, E, F.
5 शतोवारः E, F; A drops these words but leaves space for them.
6 खंडद् for सम्मोद A, E, F, G, H, which reading also noted by J and RS.
7 छल्लविल A, E, F, G.
8 Dām. ii, 22. This verse is omitted in B, C, D.
OUR TEXT

MADHUSŪDANA’S TEXT (Jīvānanda’s Ed.)

अरण्य शारण: सिरिखुदरर्गभिः हरिभि-
दिशो दिष्टा शिशु: अत्रमयि अन्ने पद्मजय:।
प्रयाच्छुटेयस्यलनवदननोत्यविज्ञाति:।
सन्ताम माने सुमाने नरणमध्वारणयशारणम्॥ ११४॥

अयिव गिरिे पर्य

द्वारा मुद्रे ते सरस्वीकाणि भृक्ष्णभ्रमालां जगहुर्जापाय।
एकील्लसतुष्ट्वयबतोक्य बेली भोगं॥ भृजाश्रितस्यन्योऽः॥ ११५॥

1  Omitted in B, C, D.
2  मधवव दुर्गामम् A, E, F ; मधवव दुर्गामम् B, C, D ;
   मधवव दुर्गामम् G, H. J and RS note also the reading
   मधवसवर्गामम।
3  Dām. ii, 23.  4  चुजे A; चुजे B, C, D, E, F.
5  Dām. ii, 24.
6  After this verse, G reads रण्य द्वारः which
   occurs in BR iii, 25 (=Vid.śāsāla-bhaṅjikā iii, 27 =
   Rāja-dhāraṇa, 31.)
Madhusūdana's Text (Jīvānanda's Ed)

हस्तु गुःः। तुहे स्वदेहः विन्द्रा रयः॥ तद्वत्तपित्रम्॥

विज्ञाप्य तृणं गणितीयांगमुः पतिते विद्वेदियां-किल दुःियांमि॥ २११॥

वदनमम्यार्थम् पश्च तात्ते तवोन्नार्नुः मनिष्टुन्मदन्देनायस्य वायौ। विधानात्

स्थिखमुखदिनुः लेचरोभूङ्गुइचार्।

स्थिरपिन्निका् परिपूर्णं तत्त्वं ताता। किमेतता॥ २११॥

सीता सपिकरास्य।

रमण चरणालं तावक्क भावभित्त्वा।

मधुरगिरिसुरां रामदासी भवविषा।

कृतमः गुहु धान्यावत्स निर्योगतां।

वदनमम्यार्थमेयं न विन्याण॥ २१२॥

1 स्वदेह। A.

2 दशने मे रेहः B, C, D.

3 रयः A, E, F.

4 गणितीयांगमुः B, C, D.

5 Dām. ii, 25.

6 Cf. a similar verse in Anargha-rāghava, vili, 81.

7 This verse, with its headnote, as well as no. 117, is omitted in all Mss and printed editions. They occur as: Dām. iii, 26 and 27 from which source J probably includes them.
Madhusūdana's Text (Jivānanda's Ed.)

1 सीता मनोहरस्तरां गिरिस्वर्गिरन्तो-  
माध्वय तत्र दुवुजे परिपूर्णक्रमः।
रामस्य त्रिमुखेनेर्धिः यथा न क्षोपिः
रामः नुनकि दुवुजे न च भोक्षयिते॥ ११५॥

6 भूत्सुराभिमुखांस्फोटकशापायाः-  
हलितोभुजक्षायः सम्पुड्डालिन्कायाः।
सुरतसक्षराय राजवस्य मिथुना  
हरति हदयतापं कापि दिव्यं सतंभ्रो।॥ १२०॥
आगामिदंहि विरहं चिरमाणविरासीनः  
क्रान्तेऽरुक्ष्यवर्मेऽहुनक्रमकेति।

1 The following headnote is added before this verse: रामः सानन्दश्रू A; प्रीरामचन्द्रः सानन्दश्रू B, C, D; प्रीरामः  
सानन्दश्रू G, H.

2 मनोरम B, C, D. 3 त्रिमुखेनेर्धिः च कोपिः राम A, E, F.

4 काम A, E, F. 5 Dām. ii, 28. 6 वनसित G, H.

7 मुख्यरी: A, E, F.

8 Dām. ii, 29. This verse is missing in B.
Our Text

Madhusūdana’s Text (Jivānanda’s Ed.)

\[\text{Madhusūdana’s Text (Jivānanda’s Ed.)}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{एक शूलदुमनता विरचिते श्रीमनमहानाटके हीरप्रीयुक्तरामचन्द्रचरिते प्रत्युदूरे विकर्षे। निष्ठ्रियेत्रमुखन्तं कविना सन्दर्थः सजोक्ते वैदेशिकरतामिथिः क्र्त्र गतवान्द्रो हिम्मियो महान। इति हिम्मियोः समासः।}
\end{align*}\]

1. शूल गिरं समपुस्त्रुसस्ती B, C; शूल तथापि गिरमस्त्रि

\[\begin{align*}
\text{दुविपुमो A, E, F; शूल तथा गिरमपुस्त्रुसस्ती G, H.}
\end{align*}\]

2. Dām. ii, 36.

3. This very naming of the Act indicates that the erotic elaboration in it was a later addition by Madhusūdana.

4. E, F read only एक शूल हिम्मियि without repeating the first two lines.
MADHUSUNDANA'S TEXT (JIVANANDA'S ED.)

लुङ्कोऽस्मात्:

भृगुच्छ भोगान् सुरम्यान्। कवित्यविद्वंसान्। रावतो धर्मपत्याः सार्थं विचित्रयुक्ताः। अत्रणः मुनिनितुः। प्राण हा शापकालः।

धते्कुस्मादिवशवः महत्निकरणां हा महोपात्तेऽस्मात्।

प्रचण्डः प्रपन्तिसंभोगः कपणे भूतर्यानी।

दिश्माने धूसरोधुद्रहिति वहुतरः स्फारः तारः स्फुरन्ति।

स्वभावोऽन्निकवीर्यं प्रह्यासंस्मयं रोधिरे रक्षः।

सङ्क्षिप्तः अत्यद्विपन्नः। स्मरणहलस्वतीत्सिंहरः अ०।

वारं वारं गमीरः। प्रत्यः इत्य महाकाठोक्षायोः।

|| १९३ ||

1 धर्मान्नु A, E; भोगान् विक्षण B, C, D.
2 कवित्यविद्वंस all V ss.
3 विशारद D; ब्रह्म G. 4 Dām. iii, 1.
5 बहुतरस्फार A, E, F. 6 रक्ष B, C, D.
7 महायानोऽस्मात् A, F, F; महायानश्रवस्तिकाः G.
8 चरितकाळयाः A, E, F. 9 Dām. iii, 2.
Our Text

देव राजारिखण्डे। दुमन्त्रवचनम्।
स्वीयं जरामुपमातमलोकस्य राजा
रामे च राज्यवहनममालख्य।
राज्यारिक्षिकर्ममोत्सवमस्य। कन्नुः
मादिक्ष्यान, पुरज्जना: कुलल प्रमोदम्।। ४२।।

Madhusudana's Text (Jivananda's Ed.)

अवान्तौ दशरथस्य वेद्यः।
रामे नववर्ग दर्दा तोक्षमसहि च यत्॥
व्यवारसाम्बिकेयं नूपे मनिरसूतम्॥ ११५॥
हनन्यो बहिनिस्मृत्य नागरानू प्रति॥
स्वीयं जरामुपमातमलोकस्य राजा
रामे च राज्यवहनममालख्य।
राज्यारिक्षिकर्ममोत्सवमस्य कन्नुः
व्यादिक्ष्यान, पुरज्जना: कुलल प्रमोदम्॥ ११६॥

1 This line is omitted in A, E, F, G, H; B, C, D read अवान्तौ दशरथ।
2 तोक्षमसहि च यत् B, C, D.
3 This verse is omitted in A, E, F.
4 Omitted in A, E, F; H reads हानन्यो नागरानू प्रति।
5 This verse is omitted in A, E, F.

S. K. De
Kulasekhara Alvar and his date

1

Sir R. G. Bhandarkar observes in his *Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism and Minor Religions* that 'there is nothing to show that Vaiṣṇavism had not penetrated to the Tamil country about the first century after Christ.' If, as I have attempted to show elsewhere, some of the extant Saṅgam works are not posterior to the second century A.C., we may make the affirmative statement that among the religions prevalent in South India in the first century after Christ, Vaiṣṇavism was one of the most prominent, *Tol Kōppyam*, which is generally regarded as supplying the basic grammar for the works of the Saṅgam period in Tamil literature, and consequently as the earliest Tamil work in existence, has a section devoted to *Agattinai*, or the grammar of subjective life with special reference to love and happiness in the Tamil country; and there we are told that one of the regional varieties of the Tamil country is *Mullainilam* or pastoral land, of which the guardian deity is *Māyōn* or Viṣṇu. In *Paripādal*, a collection of ancient Saṅgam lyrics, which, thanks to the indefatiguable zeal and labour of the great Tamil scholar, Mahāmahopādhyāya V. Svāminātha Aiyar, has been published though not in its complete form; six out of the twenty two lyrics now available are devoted to the praise of Viṣṇu. Other evidence from early Tamil literature may also be cited; but this will suffice to show that Vaiṣṇavism was among the accepted religions of the Tamil population in the first century of the Christian era.

South Indian Vaiṣṇavism has produced great men at different epochs. In the words of Guizot, 'no one can say why a great man appears at a certain epoch; that is a secret of Providence, but the fact is not, therefore, less certain.' The agency of great men has been, from the earliest days of history, among the most important of the civilizing agencies of the world; and among the great men who have contributed to the cultural development of South India, there is none whose name is more reverently cherished than the Śaiva and the Vaiṣṇava saints of the Tamil country. These saints come from both sexes and from all castes, the *Pañcama* included; and this interesting fact establishes that Hinduism in South India recognises, not only
in theory but also in practice, that access to sainthood and spiritual union with God by way of faith and discipline could not be foreclosed by hereditary caste disabilities. The Vaiṣṇava saints, who are twelve in number, are collectively known as the Āḻvārs, a term which literally means those who are drowned (in devotion to or love of God). As their writings show, their devotion was of an absorbing character, and in it they found the fulfillment of life. Their poems, which are among the most moving and most musical songs of devotion in Tamil, are collectively called Nālāyira-Prabandham or the four thousand lyrics of divine praise.

Kulaśekhara was born in Tiruvāńci-Kālam, the ancient capital of the Cera kingdom, and the Vaiṣṇa of the classical Tamil writers. He is the saint that the Bhāgavatam alludes to in the following sloka as having his birth place in the country through which the 'westward flowing Mahānādī' or Periyār, as it is locally called, runs:

श्रीमः काशिकादारा न द्विप्पे न तिरिष्यः।
तालपाटे गठी यम कठमाला पविष्टिनी॥
साविरीच सम्भुवशा प्रतेरीच च महानसी।

(Bhāgavata, xi, 5. 39-40).

He was the only kṣatriya among the Āḻvārs, and was a reigning king of Kerala. We learn from Perumāl-Tiru-Mōli, the section of Nālāyira-Prabandham consisting of his lyrics, that in course of time he became, besides being the lord of the Cera kingdom, also Kolli-Kāvalan, Kūdal-Nāyakan and Koḷi-Kōn; in other words, he became the suzerain of the whole of South India, including the kingdoms of Pāṇḍya and Cola. (Vide Perumāl-Tiru-Mōli, I. II; II. 10; VI. 10; IX. 11; X. 11). It is not so much as a victorious warrior and conqueror of kingdoms that he has been remembered by posterity; it is as a Vaiṣṇava saint that his name “shines with prevailing glory in the world.” The Bhāgavata-Māhātmya, which according to Grierson is of considerable authority, states that Southern India is the birth place of the religion of Bhakti; and even in the birth place of Bhakti, Kulaśekhara’s faith and devotion were regarded as so great that he, alone among the Āḻvārs, has been honoured with the title of Perumāl. Even when in the plenitude of regal power and circumstance, he realized that all worldly pomp and splendour was but vanity of vanities and vexation of spirit, and yearned with unconquerable fervour to be with God.
Like all truly devotional people, Kulaśekhara Śivar was a mystic. It has been well said by a writer that mysticism is a temper rather than a doctrine. It is a state of feeling which shows itself in man’s endeavour to grasp and enjoy the divine essence, and feel the beatitude of actual communion with the Supreme Being. It is the state of feeling that one experiences when one realizes that man in God is one with God in man. To the mystic, God is an experience; and his aim is to become like God and attain the bliss of union with Him. Life is to him a constant endeavour and aspiration to live in God; and such was it to Kulaśekhara Śivar. There is a very beautiful and interesting story told about him. The Rāmāyaṇa was his favourite study, and Rāma as God incarnate was the deity he adored. One day, when the court pandit was expounding the portion of the epic which describes the fight of Rāma with Khara and his Rākṣasa hordes, the king cried in frenzy: ‘My Rāma is fighting alone, Rise, my valiant soldiers, and march with me, to help him on the field of battle’. On another occasion, when the portion relating to the carrying away of Sītā by Rāvana was read, the king was so much beyond himself with righteous wrath, that he exclaimed: ‘How can I rest idle here? I shall forthwith cross the ocean, slay the wicked Rāvana, and restore my mother Sītā to her lord.’ Our critical intellect will rail at such exhibitions of emotion as indications of incipient insanity; and that is because the merely intellectual man fails to appreciate or understand the mystic’s intensity of feeling. The man that is proud of his intellect is unfortunately a stranger to transcendental feeling. He can chop logic; but what Schelling calls intellectual intuition is unknown to him. Even to him, however, come periods of life when, in spite of his preconceived derision for spiritual experiences, the ‘mystic germ’ in him asserts itself. William James writes: “Especially in times of moral crisis, it comes to me, as the sense of an unknown something backing me up. It is most indefinite, to be sure, and rather faint. And yet I know that if it should cease, there would be a great hush, a great void in my life.” Let us recognize that intellectual perception can apprehend only material objects, but spiritual experiences can be apprehended only by spiritual vision. Kulaśekhara was drowned in God-love, which alone was real to him. To him, the patent of kingship was derived, not from the prowess of his arms or the extent of his empire, but from lowly service rendered to God and His devotees.

Filled with God-love as he was, it is no wonder that Kulaśekhara
yearned, amidst the distracting duties of his kingly office, for
the day when released from his responsibilities as a temporal monarch,
he might consecrate his life entirely to the service and glory of the
Lord in the humility of devotion and in the hallowed company of
the blessed devotees. In the opening section of the Perumāl-Tiru-Moli,
he expresses his longing in these plaintive words:

When will the day arrive for me to see
With melting heart the shining moon-like face
And lotus eyes of Him, the ocean-hued,
Who on the serpent couch in Raṅgam lies,

Perumāl-Tiru-Moli, I. 6.

The day did at last come. His infatuation for Vaiṣṇava-bhaktas
which was daily growing in intensity, at last drove his minister to the
verge of despair; and with the object of redeeming him, as they
thought, from his religious craze, they adopted the subterfuge of
falsely accusing some Vaiṣṇavas, who were the king’s guests, of
theft of a crown jewel. The stratagem failed, however; for it is
said, Kulaśekhara vindicated his invincible faith in the rectitude of
the Vaiṣṇavas by boldly going through the dangerous ordeal of
plunging his hand into a pot containing a live cobra and drawing out
the venomous reptile, without himself sustaining any injury. The con-
duct of the ministers hastened his renunciation. He gave up his ‘power,
pre-eminence, and all the large effects that troop with majesty’, and
exchanged the sceptre for the pilgrim’s staff. He set out for Śrī
Raṅgam and other holy places, and did not return to his royal city;
and he passed away in his 67th year at Mānār-Koil, near Brahma-
dēsām, a few miles from Ambāsamudram, a station on the South
Indian Railway in the Tinnevelli district. It may be that we know
little of Kulaśekhara as a king; but as a Vaiṣṇava saint, the Perumāl’s
name will burn for ever on the leaf of fame.

II

When did the Āḻvār live? Dr. S. Krishnaswami Aiyengar places
him in the 6th century; the late Mr. Swamikannu Pillai assigns
him to the 8th century; Mr. Gopinatha Rao and Mr. Ramanatha
Aiyar seek for him in the 9th century, each, however, for a different
reason. The subject obviously requires further examination.

I.H.Q., DECEMBER, 1931
Fortunately, epigraphy fixes the lower limit of the Alvar's date. An inscription of the 18th year of the Cola king, Kulotunga I, i.e., of 1088 A.C., makes provision for the recital, at the Vaishnava temple at Sri Raṅgam, of section 2 of Perumāl-Tiru-Moli, which begins with the expression Tettarum Tiral-Teninai, and another inscription of 1050 A.C. belonging to the reign of Coja Keraladeva, also provides for a similar recital from the Alvar's lyrics. At Mannar-Koil where the Alvar breathed his last, there exists a temple known as Kulaśekhara-Alvar-Koil; and the mural inscriptions there show that the temple was consecrated to the memory of 'Alvar Sri Kulaśekhara Perumāl' by one Vāsudevan Kesavan of Mullappalli in Malai-mandalam. The earliest of these inscriptions is of the 4th year of Rājendra Coja, or circa 1015; but we have no materials for saying how long before that inscription the temple was built. To have deserved the honour of a public temple dedicated to him in the early years of the 11th century, not to speak of the arrangements made by the Colas for the public recital of his devotional lyrics in temples, about the middle of the century, the Alvar's reputation must have been established in the land a considerably long time before that period. The Bhāgavata refers, as we have seen, in terms of the highest praise to the Alvar, and the latest attempt has been to assign that work to the 10th century; and I am informed of the existence of a Hindi translation of the work by Bhuali which is said to give the information that the translation was made in Saṃvat 1000 or 943 B.C.

There is good reason to believe that the Bhāgavata had become well-known in the beginning of the 10th century. It is mentioned in Alberuni's list of Purāṇas; and Alberuni's work on India is said to have been completed in 1030. Abhinavagupta refers to the Bhāgavata in his commentary on the Gitā and he flourished in the last decade of the 10th century (Duff's Chronology of India; also J.R.A.S., 1908, p. 59). We may, therefore, conclude that the Alvar's date was considerably anterior to the 10th century.

Did he live in the 9th century, as Mr. Gopinatha Rao and Mr. Ramanatha Aiyar say? The former bases his view on a fancied reference to the defeat and death of a Pallava king at Māmalla-puram in the words Mallai-Mānagar, k. Kiṟaiyavanantani Vān Selutti which occur in Perumāl-Tiru-Moli. The reference here is to the death of Kamsa at the hands of Krṣṇa; and Mallai-Mānagar here denotes Mathurā, the capital of Kamsa. The words occur in section 7 of Perumāl-Tiru-Moli, which expresses the surging emotion of Devaki
at the sight of her beloved son Krṣṇa who had been lost to her since the day of his birth, and who after putting to death the cruel Kaṁsa had returned to her in her prison and released her. It is strange that Mr. Gopinatha Rao should have misunderstood the passage as he has done, and tried to make history, relying on such a hopelessly broken reed. Mr. Ramanatha Aiyar has rejected the latter's attempt as futile; but he has himself, as the result of his investigation of the problem, come to the definite conclusion that the approximate date for the Āḻvār is 823-850. The reasoning on which this conclusion is based may be summarized as follows. The Travancore State Manual, vol. II (not III) states, that one Vāsudeva Bhāṭatātīrī lived about the beginning of the Kollam or Malabar era, and he wrote two Kāvyas, Yudhiṣṭhīra Vijayam and Tripuradahana. The former work is seen to have been written when a Kulaśekhara was king. The latter work states that its author was a son of Ravi; and a commentator, Nilakānta (c. 18th century) identifies 'son of Ravi' with a Vāsudeva. Mukunda Mālā is admitted by all to be Kulaśekhara Āḻvār's work; and the verse in that poem that mentions the author's name also gives, according to the reading found in the copy of the work preserved in the Trivandrum Palace Library, the information that a Ravi was the author's friend. On these premises, Mr. Ramanatha Aiyar assigns Kulaśekhara Āḻvār to the beginning of the Kollam or Malabar era.

It seems to me that every link in this chain of reasoning is weak and unsubstantial. In the first place, the only authority for the date is a statement in the Travancore State Manual. Mr. Ramanatha Aiyar relies on a story given in that work for such an important matter as the date of the Āḻvār. There is absolutely no other authority mentioned. Then there is no indication at all that the Kulaśekhara of Yudhiṣṭhīra Vijayam is Kulaśekhara Āḻvār. Naturally one would expect that in any eulogy of the Āḻvār, his devotional fervour, and his irrepressible aspiration to live in God would be the first qualities to be mentioned; but the Kāvyā tells us nothing about them, but it takes care to inform us that his terrible battle fields were extolled by poets as 'hovered over by vultures.' Then again, 'a son of Ravi' who wrote Tripuradahanam waits to be equated with a Vāsudeva for nearly four centuries, when a commentator comes to our assistance; but who this Vāsudeva and this Ravi are, the commentator does not tell us; nor does he tell us the source of his information. The editor of Yudhiṣṭhīra Vijayam in the Kāvyaṇāla series suggests
that the author of that work and the king it mentions belonged to North India; and he notices the fact that a copy of the work was discovered in Kashmir, and that a North Indian poet, Rājānaka Ratnakaṇṭha has written a commentary on it, but this suggestion of the learned editor is lightly brushed aside as erroneous, because the Travancore State Manual says otherwise.

Then, finally there is the link sought to be obtained from Mukundamālā, which we are naively told is admitted on all hands to be the composition of the Cera king Kulaśekhara Varma alias Kulaśekhara Āḻvār! Supposing that a Cera king, Kulaśekhara Varma, was the author of Mukundamālā, it would be incorrect to say that it is admitted on all hands to be the composition of Kulaśekhara Āḻvār. As a matter of fact, there are even among orthodox Viṣṇu scholars several who deny that the Āḻvār composed Mukundamālā.

For example, Prativādi-bhāyaṅkara Anantācārya of Kāṅci expresses that view in his introduction to his edition of the poem; and he further tells us that many other scholars are of the same view. This poem has never been regarded as among the canonical books of the Śrī Viṣṇavas; and this omission is inexplicable if the Āḻvār were the author. Again the Viṣṇu commentators of Nālāyira-Prabandham have freely quoted from Śrī Stotra Ratna, Pañcāstava, Śrī Raṅga Rājastava and other stotras to elucidate the verses of Nālāyira-Prabandham; but they have not quoted from Mukundamālā which again is inexplicable if the Āḻvār had written it.

It is also reasonable to suppose that if it was the work of the Āḻvār, the Viṣṇu Ācāryas would have written commentaries on it, as they have done in regard to Śrī Stotra Ratnam. Mukundamālā is not among the poems ordained for recital in temples and at religious and other sacred functions. Divya-sūri-Charita by Garuḍavāhana, a contemporary of Rāmānuja, which is more than 9 centuries old and is the earliest work extant on Śrī Viṣṇava hierarchy, mentions only Perumāl-Tiru-Moli as the work of the Āḻvār. It is silent about Mukundamālā, and so too is Vedānta Deśīka, who, however, mentions Perumāl-Tiru-Moli. Accounts of the Āḻvār tell us that his devotion to Śrī Rāma amounted almost to a frenzy; and if he was the author of Mukundamālā, it is reasonable to expect to find in that poem, at least a few ēlokās in praise of Śrī Rāma. There is not, however, one such verse, while we find many verses in praise of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. In one of the ēlokās the author uses the expression Rāmānuja to denote Kṛṣṇa. The allusion is, of course, to Kṛṣṇa as the younger brother
IV

Pasādakānaṃ

In the second Apsidal Temple inscription F, the following words occur at the end of l. 1:


It has been translated by Dr. Vogel thus: “For the benefit of the masters and of the fraternities (of monks) of Tambapāṃṇa (Ceylon) who have converted Kashmir, Gandhāra Cīna, Cilāta (Skt. Kirāta), Avarānta (Sk. Aparānta), Vaṅga, Vanavāsi, Yavana (?), Damila (?) Palura (?) and the isle of Tambapāṃṇi (Ceylon).”

The gift has been made by an upāsikā Bodhisiri for the benefit of her husband Budhajīnikā, and of her father, the householder Revata residing at Govagāña; as also for many others.

Our object is to see how far Dr. Vogel is justified in making such an assertion, unknown in the history of Buddhism, as that “the fraternities of Ceylonese monks had converted Kasmir” and other places named in the inscription. His sole authority for this statement is the word “pasādakānaṃ” in the line quoted above. Childers explains “pasādaka” by ‘causing serenity and happiness’ and then refers to its use as dīppopasādako thero (Mahāvaṃsa, XX, 8) which literally means that “the priest who brought peace or pleasure to the island,” from which Childers gives the secondary meaning “the priest who converted the island.” Childers made himself quite clear in his notes sub voce pa-ādo, but probably Dr. Vogel did not care to go through them, having in his mind a meaning which satisfied his new theory. The Pāli word for initiation into Buddhism is “pabbājanam” (becoming a Buddhist monk) or periphrastically, “saraṇasīleṣu patiṭṭhapanaṃ” (Mah., XII. p. 19). The distinction made between pasādanam and pabbājanam is made clear in the verses 42 and 43 of the Mahāvaṃsa (ch. XII) relating to the mission of Majjhima to Hiṃavanta:

Visūm te pāñca raṭṭhāni pāñca therā pasādayunā,
purisā satasahassāni ekekasseva saṅkhe
pabbajīṇsu pasādena sammāsambuddhasāsane,

1 See Ep. Ind., XX, pp. 22, 23.
2 Ibid., pp. 7, 23.
The five (i.e. Majjhima and his four companions) gladdened the five kingdoms separately, each of them ordained (lit. brought out from the world) 100,000 persons, believing (as they did) in the doctrine of Buddha.

In the Mahāvaṃsa, it is said in connection with Mahinda that he was waiting for a suitable time for "pasādetum Laṅkāditaṃ" (XIII, vs. 2). This passage may admit of the secondary meaning "for converting the island of Laṅkā" but in verse 64 (of ch. XIV), "pastidiṃsu nāgarā" clearly means "the city people became faithful."

Without further multiplying the instances of the use of the word Pasādaka' (for which see P. T. S., Pāli Dictionary) I may make myself clearer by pointing out that in Hinayāna (specially Pāli) Buddhism, 'conversion' has no sense unless a person is admitted into the Order. Anyone, even an animal or a spirit or a Nāga may develop faith (pasāda) in Buddha, his Dhamma and his Saṅgha, but that does not make the being a Buddhist; so also any non-Buddhist may be believers (pasādaka) in Buddhism, but unless and until he is either established in the Trisaraṇas and Pañca-sīlas or admitted into the Order as a Samaṇa, he cannot be called a person 'converted'. Hence, strictly speaking, "pasādakaṃ" can never mean "conversion" The entry of any saint into a country gladdens the hearts of the people of the country. It is in this sense that the word "Pasādakānaṃ" in the inscriptions should be understood, and the passage: Kasmīra...Tambapaṇṇi-dīpasādakānaṃ theriyānaṃ should be translated thus: Those nuns (not monks, as Dr. Vogel writes, for the word is theriyānaṃ) who gladdened the hearts of the people of Kasmīra...Tambapaṇṇidīpa. The inscription, I think, refers in a general way to the nuns of all countries who by their saintly lives bring joy and peace to the people of the countries visited by them. The reason for glorifying the nuns only is probably due to the fact that the donor is an upāsikā, and as such she wanted to eulogize the bhikṣuṇis alone.

Dr. Vogel takes the theris to whom the gift is made as all belonging to Tambapaṇṇi, following the grammatical construction of the sentence, Kasmīra...Tambapaṇṇidīpasādakānaṃ theriyānaṃ Tambapaṇṇnakām suparīgahe, etc. He shows no hesitation in remarking in the introduction (p. 7) that "the fraternities of Ceylonese

1 Not 'converted' as Prof. Geiger translates.
2 Every chapter of the Mahāvaṃsa is ended by the line "Sujana-paśādasaṃvagattāya etc."
monks who had converted Kashmir...the isle of Tambapaṇṇi (Ceylon). But as this statement is not supported by any data, not even by the Ceylonese Chronicles, one should think twice before coming to any conclusion. In Sanskrit, the genitive is sometimes used for specifying (nirdhāraṇe) one out of many, and therefore, the passage may very well be translated as “Among the nuns who have brought joy and peace to the people of Kasmira...Tambapaṇṇikī, the gift is made for acceptance by the nuns of Tambapaṇṇi alone.” It has been already pointed out that Dhānyakaṭaka, Śāparvata and other places in the neighbourhood became very important as holy centres of Buddhism, and as such they were visited every year by a large number of pilgrims which fact is borne out by Yuan Chwang’s records,¹ Hence it may safely be stated that nuns congregated there from various countries, and rich devotees hailing from a particular country quite naturally erected establishments for the residence of monks and nuns of their own country; in this particular case, an upāsikā of Ceylon² provides a Caitya hall for the nuns only of her own country.

Another reason why Dr. Vogel’s interpretation that Ceylonese monks (theriyā?) converted the Indian provinces cannot be accepted is the significant silence of the Mahāvaṃsa about such a fact of momentous importance to Ceylon. The Mahāvaṃsa, on the other hand, speaks of the conversion of Ceylon and the Indian provinces by Indian monks and even refers to various centres of Buddhism in India,³ wherefrom went monks in large number to attend the ceremony of consecration of the Mahāthūpa of Duṭṭhadāgāmaṇī. Hence, Dr. Vogel’s rendering of the passage in question cannot be accepted as correct unless more evidences are forthcoming regarding the activity of the Ceylonese monks in the conversion of places in India as far north as Kashmir.

Nalinaksha Dutt

¹ Watters, op. cit., II, p. 214.
² As Dr. Vogel admits that this is a donation of a Ceylonese devotee, cannot Govagama, the home of the donor’s father, be identified with Govagama of the Mahāvaṃsa (ch. VIII, 24), according to which it was a port of Ceylon where landed Bhaddakaccāna, grand-daughter of Amitodana Sākyā?
The “Webbed Fingers” of Buddha

Dr. Coomaraswamy, writing “on the Webbed Fingers of Buddha” (in I.H.Q., June, 1931 pp. 365-65), refers to an article on ‘Le jālalakṣaṇa in Acta Orientalia (vol. VII, 232ff.) in which the writer, Dr. Stutterheim seeks to prove that the “jālalakṣaṇa” means ‘the thin lines of rosy light which may be seen between the fingers when they are in contact, and the hand is held up against the light.’ For this interpretation Stutterheim relies on the well-known verse of the Abhijñāna-śakuntalā:

laying much stress on the words vibhāti and iddharāga, and the simile of the fingers with the petals of a half opened lotus. Dr. Coomaraswamy disagreeing with my view and that of Mons. Foucher about the original significance of jālalakṣaṇa preferred the interpretation of Stutterheim. I am afraid I cannot accept the interpretation.

In explaining the word jālagrahitāṅguli, the force of the word grathitā should not be overlooked and the whole expression should be interpreted in relation to the poetical comparison of the boy’s fingers with the petals of a partially opened lotus-flower in the early dawn. Drs. Böhtlink and Roth correctly take note of these points in their respective translations of this verse and refer to the fingers as joined. When the poet purposely makes this comparison, we are to understand that he has in his mind the idea about the jointure of the fingers, especially at their lower ends. The expression iddharāga refers to another of the Cakravarti-lakṣaṇas. Rāghavabhaṭṭa, while commenting on this verse of Kālidāsa, quotes this from the Puruṣalakṣaṇa in the Sāmudra:

In this verse, as many as four auspicious signs, viz., raktakara, grathitāṅguli, myḍukara, and cāpāṅkuśāṅkštakara, are mentioned; king Duṣyanta sees only two of these—and these, the first and the second are the only two that are visible from a distance—and Kālidāsa naturally refers to these very same in a manner particularly befitting one of the foremost poets of India.

Again, the early Buddhist texts refer to this sign as jālahatthapādo (Mahāpadāna- and Lakkhanasuttāntas), jālāṅgulihastapādo (Lalita-
vistara), and as jāla (Mahāvasti—this work does not give us the full names of all these 32 lakṣaṇas and simply refer to them in a curt manner); the Mahābhārata also describes this lakṣaṇa as jālapāda-bhujau (xii, 143, 36; this term most likely connotes the same thing as jālahastapāda) while enumerating the characteristic signs of Nara and Nārāyaṇa, the two gods and Mahāpuruṣas at the same time. The jālalakṣaṇa of the toes can certainly not be explained in a manner in which Stutterheim interprets the same in the case of the fingers. ‘The feet held up against the light’ and thin lines of rosy light infiltrating through the interstices of the toes in contact with one another’, would indeed be a curious explanation of the term jālāngulipāda or jālapāda! I need hardly point out that it would be quite unjustifiable to explain the lakṣaṇa in different ways—once in its relation to the fingers and secondly in connection with the toes.

It appears that in Kālidāsa’s time, the adventitious sense of this sign as ‘webbing of the fingers’ (to the poet this was partial) has already been introduced. So I modify my previous statement that the misinterpretation of the term did not take place till a period much later than the 5th century A.D. Buddhaghosa and Dharmapāla refer to the original interpretation of the term in the sense of regular parallel lines on the fingers and toes of the palms and soles, whereas the poet refers to the other meaning (the poet is naturally silent about the toes, for king Duṣyanta sees the extended hand of Sarvadamana and does not look at his feet). That the sense of ‘webbing’ had made its appearance as early as the closing years of the 4th century A.D. is proved by the Madhyamikā text (Taisho ed.; vol. I, p. 393) translated into Chinese by the Kashmirian Gautama Saṅghadeva in 397-8 A.D.; here, this sign was rendered into Chinese in the following manner—‘the feet and the hands of the Mahāpuruṣa are netted like those of the harṣasārāja—the golden mallard.’ (I am indebted to Dr. P. C. Bagchi of the Calcutta University, for this reference).

Dr. Coomarawamy is definitely of opinion that Buddhaghosa in his explanatory note on this lakṣaṇa means the same thing as was according to Stutterheim meant by the poet Kālidāsa. But, in the comment of Buddhaghosa, which was quoted by me in full in my first article, there is nothing that could justify us in drawing the above conclusion. The commentator begins with the statement that this lakṣaṇa does not mean that the fingers were joined by a
web, and that this kind of webbing between the fingers will define a peculiar kind of inauspicious hand, in shape like that of the hood of a snake (phañahathako), which will be a fault in the figure of the man (purisadosa). Then he refers to the four (not five, evidently leaving out the thumb which being in a much lower plane than the other four fingers cannot have its lines touching those of the others) fingers of the hand and five toes of the feet which are of uniform or regular size (ekappamāna), their uniformity or regularity being indicated by the auspicious sign of the jūlas which remain touching each other (āhīnamāhiṃ paṭivijjhitvā titṭhanti). Lastly, he uses the simile of the lattice of a window. All this, if it means anything, can only mean 'the fingers and toes are marked with jūlas or uniform and parallel lines as are to be found in the lattice of a window'.

Dr. Coomaraswamy's other objection against this interpretation of the lakṣṇa 'that the palms and soles of the Buddha, as Mahāpurusa, being marked with a cakkha and so represented in very many sculptures of an early date, there can be no reference to another lakṣṇa in the same places' can be met by saying that the palms of the hand and especially the soles of the feet are marked by more than one auspicious characteristic; that those of many of the Buddha images (specially of the Mathurā ones belonging to the Saka-Kusāna period, and the mediæval ones) bear not only the cakkha, but also nandipūda, triṣula, svastika (and some mediæval ones, dhvaja, yugmamāna, padma and such others in addition; cf. the inscribed Buddha image set up by Dattagalla, now in the Indian Museum) on them; that these symbols are carved on the palms (rarely) and soles, and not on the fingers and toes; that the reference in the case of this lakṣṇa is to the lines on the fingers and toes (in some texts, cf. Lalitavistara); that these could not be shown there by the artist 'in plastic or pictorial representations without marring their beauty'; that a good many of the 32 major signs as well as most of the 80 minor ones could not be plastically; or pictorially represented in Buddha figures.

JITENDRA NATH BANERJEA
Notes on Asoka Rescripts

ETADATHĀ—We have seen that although there is a close rapprochement of form between etadathā of P. E. vii and etadathā at Ang. i. 198, the construction of the P. E. passage becomes rather clumsy with etadathā as adjective. A better use of the word is at Mil. 31, in an adverbial sense, which also appears to be the sense expressed by etadathā of the inscription. In the Pāli passage the word occurs as a correlative, or rather, complement of kinti (‘how’, ‘in order that’) and necessarily means ‘to that end’, being, therefore, equivalent to etadathāya, as the following quotation from the Milinda will show:—

"Rājā āha: ‘Kimatthiyā bhante Nāgasena tumhākaṁ pabbajjā, ko ca tumhākaṁ paramattho’ ti. Thera āha: ‘Kinti mahāraja idam dukkham nirujheyya añña ca dukkham na upajjeyyā ti etadathā mahāraja amhākaṁ pabbajjā, anupāda' parinibbānaṁ kho pana amhākaṁ paramattho’ ti.——’Kim pana bhante Nāgasena sabbe etadathāya pabbajanti, ti" etc. etc. [pp. 31 (=65-6)—32].

[For the correlation of the terms, cf. also R. E. xiii. i, 11 : etaye ca athaye ayo dhramadipi nipista kiti putra papotra me........(Shahbazgarhi)].

The theme of P. E. vii is ‘anulupā dhamma-vādhi’. When Asoka says etadathā me esa kate (‘to this end has it been done by me’), the end or intent is ‘that men may conform to this besetting pursuit of Dhamma’ (Imaṁ ca dharmānupāṭipati anupāṭipajantu ti. Cf. the concluding portion: se etaye athaye iyaṁ kate..............tathā ca anupati-pajantu ti. Cf. also P. E. ii). And this conforming to the besetting pursuit of Dhamma is, as the context in P.E. vii shows, calculated to ensure ‘anulupā dhamma-vādhi’. The idea of ‘vādhi’ or spiritual thriving also runs through etadathā of the Pāli passage quoted above (cf. also Pāli pitu-athā, J. iii, 518, which the scholiast explains as ‘pitu vaddhi-athāya’).

Thus it appears that etadathā at Mil. 31 is a better parallel than etadathā at Ang. i. 198; and it is infinitely better than Hultsch’s bhojanathā, for the simple reason that besides being strikingly similar in form, it agrees with the P. E. term in inner meaning, namely, ‘vādhi’, ‘furtherance’, ‘increase of merit’.

SAILENDRANATH MITRA

Continued from the March number, 1931.
Some Notes on Ownership of the Soil in Ancient India

While reviewing my *Agrarian System in Ancient India* (Calcutta University Readership Lectures, 1930) in the current number of the *JRAS*, Dr. L. D. Barnett has raised afresh the controversy about the king's title to the soil in Ancient India. His views on this important question which differ materially from mine are particularly welcome as they enable me to test the validity of my conclusions. In the present paper I shall consider the arguments advanced by him in support of his contention.

Dr. Barnett mentions "two distinct lines of theory and practice" bearing upon the present problem, one tending to establish, and the other to disprove, the ownership of the crown. It is important to remember that even in the January number of the *JRAS*, (p. 166) Dr. Barnett recorded without any qualification whatever his long-cherished opinion that "in Ancient India the crown owned the land." If the array of arguments advanced in my work under notice has led him now to modify his earlier opinion to the extent just indicated, it has not been given in vain. Now what are the "two distinct lines" of evidence which Dr. Barnett claims to bring before us in his present article? They may best be stated in his own words as follows. "In favour of the theory of Crown ownership of the soil we have:—(a) the express statements of Kātyāyana, Gautama, Manus (with Medhātithi) and Bhāṭasvāmin, (b) the evidence of Megasthenes and the Chinese travellers, (c) the cases where kings actually resumed grants of land made to Brahmans (the Bahur grant *SII*, ii, p. 513 ff.) or reserved to themselves the right to do so in the event of misconduct (as in the Chammak grant *CII*, iii, p. 235) and (d) the fact that the British found no private ownership of land and practically had to invent it. Against this we have (e) the dictum of Jaimini, VI, vii, 2, that the land is 'unreserved for all', *sarvān pratyaviśātavāt*, which a series of later writers—Śābara, Mādhava and Khaṇḍadeva *in loco* as well as Nilakaṇṭha in his *Vyavahāra-mayūkha*—explain to mean that the king is not the owner of the soil, but only its guardian; (f) the references of the Śṛptis and Kauṭalya to alienations of land, and (g) the records of such alienations in inscriptions."

1 In the above extract there are two 'very unfortunate' slips, *cnass* for cases and *CII ii* for *CII iii*. These have been corrected in my quotation.
With regard to the above I may first mention that I have treated all of them (except c and d) in my work, though my interpretation of the same is different from that of Dr. Barnett. I shall now consider these items anew in the light of Dr. Barnett's observations.

As to (a) the "express statements" of Kātyāyana and other authorities are not connected with any specific rights of ownership belonging to the king, but are used (as I indicated in my Agrarian System) solely to explain or justify the king's right to levy certain revenues from land. Another proof of the inconclusive character of these "statements," as I further mentioned, is that Manu, e.g., in the same context advances for the Brāhmaṇas the still more sweeping claim to be the owners of everything (sarvasyāḍhipatiḥ—a claim which indeed may be traced back to the later Vedic Saṃhitās). But then, argues Dr. Barnett, doubtless with an eye to (f), these authorities introduce the doctrine of royal ownership "check by jowl beside the alienation of real ownership by private persons." Does not this very fact corroborate our view of the inconsequential character of the statements of royal ownership of the soil mentioned above? On the whole it seems that Dr. Barnett has been misled by the supposed analogy of similar statements of an extreme school of jurists in the feudal ages of Western Europe.

As to (b) Dr. Barnett quotes a passage from my work (Ibid., p. 78) to show, as he thinks, that I have "explained away Megasthenes by a not very probable supposition." This criticism, I may justly complain, is extremely unfair to me. For the passage to which Dr. Barnett takes exception occurs in an altogether different context (Lecture IV) where I attempted a historical retrospect of the various aspects of the Ancient Indian land-revenue system. On the other hand, while discussing the question of ownership of the soil in the last lecture (Lecture V), I admitted in full the evidence of Megasthenes and I brought forward the apparently corroborative evidence of the Chinese pilgrims which I believe, was explained for the first time in my Hindu Revenue System. Nevertheless I was unable to accept this evidence as a valid statement of facts. "Megasthenes's statement," I wrote, "has not obtained much credence even from those who believe in the State ownership of the soil in Ancient India, while the testimony of the Chinese pilgrims is only implicit in its character." As Dr. Barnett has not challenged

1 Agrarian System, pp. 98-9.
2 Ibid., p. 98.
3 Ibid., p. 99.
these arguments, they may properly be regarded for the present as holding the field.

As to (c) it is difficult to understand the relevancy of Dr. Barnett's argument. Cases of actual or potential resumption of endowments of land made by the kings in favour of Brāhmaṇas, as Dr. Barnett well knows, are altogether exceptional in character. But even if they were very much more numerous, the conditions of their tenure would apply only to the fiscal or other rights emanating from the Crown.

As regards (d) it would have little relevancy, even if it were a fact. For, admitting that the British in the late 18th and early 19th centuries "found no private ownership of land," it would prove nothing regarding the absence of this right in the ancient times extending back to the 4th century B.C. and further. As a matter of fact, however, Dr. Barnett's statement is altogether disproved by the evidence of some eminent British administrators who had unrivalled opportunities of studying the problem during their long and distinguished service in this country in the early part of the 19th century. Beginning with the territories comparatively untouched by the Muslim invaders I refer in the first instance to Col. Wilks whose well-known History of Mysore contains an extremely valuable chapter (vol. I, ch. v) with the title Landed Property in India. In the course of this chapter which, as the author tells us in his Preface, he wrote very early so as to subject it to "the most rigorous test," he examines the state of the question in his own time in the wide extent of the country between the Ghats and the sea extending from 13½ lat. on the east coast round Cape Comorin to 15° lat. on the western coast. The result of this luminous survey is stated by him in the following emphatic words, "We have now passed over the tract which I had proposed to trace, and, as I hope, have proved to the satisfaction of every impartial mind the positive and unquestionable existence of private landed property in India. After proving its distinct recognition in the ancient Śāstras (sic) or sacred laws of the Hindoos, we have clearly deduced its derivation from that source, and its present existence in a perfect form in the provinces of Canada and Malabar and the principalities of Coorg and Travancore which have longest evaded the sword of the northern barbarians; we have found it preserved in considerable purity under Hindoo dynasties and comparatively few revolutions in Tanjore until the present day; we have traced its existence entire but its value diminished in Madura and Tinnevelly which had experience of numerous revolutions and had long groaned under the Muhammadan yoke. In the provinces adjacent and west
of Madras which had sustained the close and immediate grip of these invaders, we have shown by ancient documents its immemorial existence in former times, and even at the present day the right is generally clear and distinct, but in value approaching to extinction." From Southern India we turn to Rajputana which like it has remained largely untouched by the Muslim invasions. In his classical *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan*, Col. Tod whose thorough acquaintance with his subject few have equalled, writes, "The *ryot* is the proprietor of the soil in Mewar. He compares his right therein to the *aksay duba* which no vicissitudes can destroy. He calls the land his *bapota*, the most emphatic, the most ancient, the most cherished and the most significant phrase his language commands for patrimonial inheritance." And again, "Besides the ability to alienate, all the overt symbols which mark the proprietary right in other countries are to be found in Mewar, that of entire conveyance by sale or temporary alienation by mortgage."

Turning to the parts of country which were more or less thoroughly subdued by the arms of Islam, we find on equally unimpeachable evidence abundant traces of private ownership at the beginning of British rule. Thus Forbes in his valuable *Annals of Gujerat* called *Räsmālā* by the author, writes with reference to a particular class of land-holders in the province. "It is difficult to make out a better title to land than that which was possessed by the *Grassias* of Gujerat," Malcolm in his valuable *Memoir of Central India* (1880 vol. II) writes, "The settled and more respectable hereditary cultivators of Central India have still many privileges, and enjoy much considera-

---

1 Similarly Wilks writes in course of his survey of South Indian tenures above-mentioned, "Private property in Malabar and Travancore is distinguished by the emphatical word *junnam* a term having the express significance of birth-right." Even with regard to Madras and the adjoining districts he noted how the Muslim rulers could not but adopt the vernacular term 'Cawney Atchey' (*sic*) meaning 'independent hereditary landed property'.

2 These rights have survived down to our own times. Thus we find in the Gazetteers of the Mewar Presidency (Rajputana Gazetteers Vol. II, A, Ajmer, 1908) that the *bapoti* tenure "gives the occupant rights of mortgage and sale and an indestructible title to the land so long as he pays the assessments upon it."
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tion, their title to the fields their forefathers cultivated is never disputed while they pay the Government share. In general a fixed known rent and established and understood dues or fees are taken from such persons, beyond which all demands are deemed violence and injustice." Even with regard to Bengal we find Verelst at the beginning of the Company's administration writing with reference to the district of Chittagong that the people possessed the right of transmitting and alienating their landed property by inheritance, mortgage, sale or gift. We also find the magistrate of the district in 1801 mentioning "a numerous body of land-holders unknown elsewhere who consider themselves as actual proprietors of the soil."

From the above authoritative list of opinions it follows that the conditions of land-tenures in India at the beginning of British rule, so far from proving "the Crown-ownership of the soil" in ancient times, furnish a strikingly corroborative body of evidence in favour of the former prevalence of private ownership on an extensive scale.

Coming to the group of points (e), (f) and (g) it appears that while Dr. Barnett admits the validity of the first in its entirety, he thinks himself justified in whittling down the force of the other two practically to nothing. He explains the cases of (f) and (g) to refer to "alienations of usufruct" only. At most he is prepared to allow that (f) "was derived in principle from an early age when the Crown was not yet universally recognised as the land-owner." These suppositions are open to exception on the following grounds:—

(1) To admit the validity of the Mimamsa rule expressly denying to the king the ownership of the soil and in the same breath to interpret the Smrta law as referring to alienation of usufruct only on the supposed ground of royal ownership is to overlook the important place which the Mimamsa occupies as the acknowledged basis of interpretation on the Sacred Law.

(2) Dr. Barnett's whole case for referring the Smrta rules and the inscriptive evidence to cases of alienation of usufruct alone evidently rests upon his assumption of the validity of his arguments under (a), (b), (c) and (d). As these last have been shown above to be untenable, the conclusion drawn by him naturally falls to the ground.

(3) By confining the data of the Smritis and Kautilya to cases of alienations of land alone Dr. Barnett has altogether excluded other

\[1\] For references, see Wilks Vol. I, ch, X.
and equally relevant branches of the evidence which are absolutely necessary to consider in forming a proper estimate of their significance. Such are the ideas of these authorities regarding ownership in general as well as the essential qualities and attributes of private ownership of land, which have been duly dealt with in my work. ¹ When Dr. Barnett imagines that (f) "was derived in principle from an early age when the Crown was not yet recognised as the land-owner" he overlooks the fact that the authors of the great mediaeval Digests of the Sacred Law, like Jīmūtavāhana, Nīlakanṭha and Mitramisra have, next to the Mīmāṃsā authorities, the clearest notion of the concept of ownership.²

To sum up the results of the above discussion, Dr. Barnett has failed to prove out of his first group of points that the Crown was the owner of the soil while his attempt to whittle down the evidence of the last two points has met with no better success. From this it follows that his belief in an "irreconcileable antagonism" between two groups of evidences is without foundation. Thus there remains in the field the view which I advocated in my work, namely, that of the private ownership of land.

A word may be said finally about the reconstruction of the history of land tenures in Ancient India that is attempted by Dr. Barnett in the concluding part of his review. In so far as the Vedic evidence is concerned I agree with Dr. Barnett that originally the land was held in private ownership.³ But I emphatically dispute his assertion that thereafter the Crown began to claim the ownership of all lands and that it remained "the real owner of the soil" until the beginning of "baronial feudalism". For as I have shown in my work from an exhaustive and detailed survey of the literary as well as North Indian epigraphic evidence⁴ that while the prerogatives of the Crown developed side by side with private ownership, this never amounted to the king's becoming the owner (in theory or in practice) of the land. In particular a specific group of rights claimed for the king in the Arthaśāstra and Smṛtis and referred to in the inscriptions formed, as I showed for the first time, the true counterpart of the regalian rights of the Crown in Mediaeval Europe and like the latter served to restrict, but not to supersede, the private rights of ownership.

U. N. Ghoshal

¹ Agrarian System, pp. 84-89. ² For references see Ibid., pp. 85-86. ³ For the present I ignore the question whether and how far the land was held in individual or collective ownership. ⁴ Agrarian System, p. 81.
Nālandā Stone Inscription of Yaśovarmadeva

In the last number of *Epigraphia Indica* (vol. xx, part I, p. 37) Paṇḍit Hīrānanda Śāstri has published, with a facsimile, the Nālandā Stone Inscription of the reign of Yaśovarmadeva. He has identified this king with Yaśodharmanadeva of the Mandasor Inscription on the ground that the record mentions a temple built by Bālāditya at Nālandā. This Bālāditya, argues Mr. Śāstri, "must be identified with the homonymous chief whom Huen Tsang eulogises as the subduer of Mihiakula and the founder of the grand temple at Nālandā". As Mr. Śāstri infers from the record that "it was written when Bālāditya was ruling and when king Yaśovarmadeva was holding the reins of sovereignty", he feels no difficulty in identifying Yaśovarmadeva of this inscription with Yaśodharmanadeva who was a contemporary of Mihiakula, and, therefore, also of Bālāditya.

Mr. Śāstri's argument is vitiated by the fact that the record simply refers to a temple built by Bālāditya, and there is no warrant for the assumption that Bālāditya was ruling at the time the record was set up.

The palæography of the record, however, is quite decisive on this point. Any one who even cursorily glances at the facsimile of the inscription will be satisfied that it cannot possibly belong to the age of Yaśodharman. As this point is not likely to be disputed, I do not enter into a minute and detailed discussion of the subject. Mr. Śāstri himself admits that the characters of the inscription resemble largely those of the Āphsaḍ Inscr. of Ādityasena. As a matter of fact, any one who compares the letters n, bh, y, h, and ṣ of the inscription will regard it as perhaps even somewhat later than the Āphsaḍ Inscript. of Ādityasena. The reasonable inference is, therefore, to identify Yaśovarman of the inscription with the emperor of Kānauj who flourished towards the close of the seventh or the beginning of the eighth century A.D. And there is nothing in the inscription which would induce us to give up this natural inference in favour of Mr. Śāstri's theory, which is not only in conflict with the plain epigraphical data, but also forces us to equate Yaśovarman with Yaśodharman for which there is no apparent justification. The present record should, therefore, be regarded as the first inscription of the emperor Yaśovarman who was hitherto known only from literary sources such as the Rājatarāṅgini and the Gauḍovahu.

R. C. Majumdar
Sailodbhava Rulers of Kongada

It is seen from the appended table that the geographical places in the Koṅgada-maṇḍala mentioned in the copper-plate grants of the Sailodbhava rulers, and of Śubhākaradeva and Dāṇḍmahādeva of the Kara family are now identified in the Ganjam district or in the neighbourhood of its border. From the identification of the Śālimā of the Grant no. 2 with Śāliā in Banpur in the Puri district, we can determine the northern boundary of the Koṅgada. The hill-ranges running from Kaluparāghāṭa towards west seem to have demarked its northern limit. There is no pass through these ranges of hills which reach a point in the south-west frontier of the Nayagarah State.

The Mahendra hill which runs towards west from the coast of the Bay of Bengal in the east, probably formed the southern boundary line of Koṅgada. Again the hills, now demarcating the eastern boundary of the Kalahandi State, may be supposed to be the natural western limit of the same Koṅgada.

The Grant no. 2 was issued from the place on the bank of the Śālimā. It is, therefore, tempting to localise the capital of Koṅgada in Banpur. But there is no place in Banpur, which would recall the description of Koṅgada by Hiuen Tsang. The Chinese pilgrim describes that the capital of Koṅgada, 20 li in circuit, is situated on an angle of the sea and there are many Deva temples. The situation of Ganjam, a petty town, where the ruins of temples are found in large quantity, recalls exactly Hiuen Tsang's description. I, therefore, think that the capital of Koṅgada with Ganjam and should be identified that the place of issue of the Grant no. 2 was a temporary camp established on the bank of the Śāliā in Banpur.

The panegyrical text of the Grant no. 4 is a copy of that of the Grant no. 3 and it contains an additional eulogy of a further generation. The donor of the Grant no. 4, appears to my mind, was the son of the donor of the Grant no. 3.

The scholars would no doubt accept my view that the donor of the Grant no. 5 was the son of the donor of the Grant no. 4, if they compare the texts of these Grants. The text of the former Grant has been reproduced in the latter Grant and again an eulogy of a further generation has been added.

The text of the Grant no. 5 is a replica of that of the Grant no. 6, and it, therefore, appears that the donor of the latter Grant is not different from that of the former Grant.
The complete set of plates of the Grant no. 7 have not been found. But the eulogical text of Madhyamarāja of this plate is an exact copy of that of the king of the same name of the Grant no. 6. Evidently Dharmarāja son of the Madhyamarāja of Grant no. 7 is not different from the donor of the Grant no. 6. We may, therefore, put the Śailodbhava rulers mentioned in the Grants nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 in the following chronological order.

Śailodbhava (mythical)

Araṇabhīta

Sīrī Sainyabhīta

Ayaśobhīta

Sīrī Sainyabhīta (alias Mādhavavarman)

Ayaśobhīta (alias Mādhavarāja I)

Dharmarāja

Madhyamarāja II

(Grant No. 7) Raṇakṣobha

Paṭṭavyālopa

Tailapa Yuvarāja

Madhyamarāja III (Grant No. 7)

The Grant no. 2 was issued in 619-20 A.D. But the dates of other Grants are not known. It is stated in the Grants nos. 5 and 6 that after the accession of Dharmarāja to the throne, Mādhava, probably Dharmarāja's younger brother, raised the standard of revolt to wrest the regal power from his elder brother and was defeated at Fāsikā. Thereafter Mādhava sought the aid of Tivaradeva and again fought. He was also defeated with his ally this time whereupon he passed his days at the foot of the Vindhya. This Tivaradeva was no doubt the same Tivaradeva of Ratnapura in the southern Kośala.

Candragupta succeeded his elder brother Tivaradeva to the throne and he was the contemporary ruler of Govinda III. We know that Govinda II, the elder brother of Govinda III's father, was ruling in
Saka 785 or A.D. 783. Hence the initial year of Govinda III’s reign cannot be supposed to be earlier than 784 A.D. It is recorded in the inscription that Candragupta was defeated by Govinda III before the birth of his son Amoghavarṣa who ascended the throne in 815-16 A.D. It is therefore probable that Candragupta suffered defeat by Govinda III before 800 A.D. In that case, Tivaradeva may be supposed to have ruled some time between 760-90 A.D.

Dharmarāja was 6th in descent from his ancestor Aranābhitā. If we now allot 25 years of reign to each of the rulers, who preceded him, we get altogether (5 × 25 = ) 125 years, covered by their reign. Now calculating from the date of the Grant no. 2 we get 745 A.D. (620 + 125) as the initial year of Dharmarāja’s reign. There is now a margin of 15 years between the result of the calculation of the preceding para and that of present calculation (i.e. 760 A.D. and 745 A.D.) which can be allotted to the donor of the Grant no. 2. In that case Mādhavarāja II of the above Grant can be taken as Aranābhitā of our foregoing chronological table. If it be untenable, we may hold that another generation ruled between Mādhavarāja II of the Grant no. 2 and Aranābhitā of the chronological table given before. The supposed ruler must have assumed the Viruda Āyasobhitā.

The virulas of this family alternated between Āyasobhitā and Aranābhitā, or Śrī-Sainyabhitā. If Aranābhitā of the chronological table be not accepted as the son of either Āyasobhitā of the Grant No. 2 or of supposed Āyasobhitā, two further generations, namely Aranābhitā and Āyasobhitā, would be supposed again to have preceded Aranābhitā of the given chronological order. This supposition seems to be plausible, because 75 years reign of 3 supposed generations put the initial year of Dharmarāja’s reign in 820 A.D. when Tivaradeva was certainly not alive. It, therefore, appears that the supposition of one generation is sufficient.

The text of the Grant No. 1 is quite different from that of all other Grants. The donor of the Grant No. 1 claims supremacy over the whole Kaliṅga while the donor of the Grant No. 2 is indicated to be a feudatory of Śaśāṅkarāja. I, therefore, hold that the former

1 History of Deccan by R. G. Bhandarkar, p. 117.
2 See E. I., vol. XIII, p. 253 for Candragupta’s defeat and Ind. Ant., vol. XII, p. 216 for the initial year of Amoghavarṣa’s reign. His 52nd year reign falls on Saka 788 or A.D. 816.
Grant is earlier than the latter. This assertion can also be corroborated by the palæography. Mādhavarāja I of the Grant No. 2 is identical with Mādhavarāja of the Grant No. 1. We may reconstruct the complete chronological table of the Śailodbhava rulers:

Śrī Sainyabhīta I (Grant No. 1)
  | Ayaśobhīta I ("")
  | Mādhavarāja I (Grants Nos. 1 & 2)
  | Ayaśobhīta II (Grant No. 2)
  | Mādhavarāja II (720 A.D.)
  | Ayaśobhīta III (supposed)
  | Araṇḍabhīta I
Śrī Sainyabhīta II
  | Ayaśobhīta IV
Śrī Sainyabhīta III (alias Mādhavavarman)
  | Ayaśobhīta (alias Madhyamarāja I)
  | Dharmarāja (circa 780 A.D.)
  | Madhyamarāja II

(Grant No. 7) Raṇakīśobha
  | Paṭṭavyālopa
  | Tailapa Yuvarāja
  | Madhyamarāja III (Grant No. 7)

Vinayak Misra
The hair and the Usnīsa on the head of the Buddhas and the Jinas

The disposition of hair and the representation of the so-called Ūṣṇīṣa, 'turban', on the head of the image of the Buddhas and the Jinas (Tīrthaṅkaras) are the most puzzling questions of Indian iconography. In an article entitled "The Buddha's āṇḍā, hair, Ūṣṇīṣa, and Crown" Dr. Coomaraswamy has dealt with the questions in detail (J. R. A. S., 1928, pp. 815-840). Without going over the whole ground covered by that essay I shall venture to suggest other solutions of the puzzles.

The literary evidence for the hair on the Buddha's head relied on by modern scholars is a passage in the introduction to the commentary on the Pāli Jātakas known as the Nīdānakathā which is thus translated by Rhys Davids:

"Then he thought, 'These locks of mine are not suited for a mendicant. Now it is right for any one else to cut the hair of a future Buddha, so I will cut them off myself with sword.' Then, taking his sword in his right hand, and holding the plaited tresses, together with the diadem on them, with his left, he cut them off. So his hair was thus reduced to two inches in length, and curling from the right, it lay close to his head. It remained that length as long as he lived, and the beard the same. There was no need at all to shave either hair or beard any more." 1

The Bodhisattva (future Buddha) Guatama then threw the hair and diadem together towards the sky. Sakka received them into a jewel casket, and enshrined them for worship in a caitya (temple) in the heaven of the Thirty-three gods.

This narrative reads like an expansion of the legend briefly told in the Lalītavistara and the Mahāvastu, and illustrated in a bas-relief on one of the pillars of the southern gateway (c. 50 B. C.) of the great stūpa of Sānci, 2 and in a panel on a corner pillar of the great rail of the stūpa of Bharhut 3 (c. 125 B. C.). The term āṇḍāmāha, "worship of hair", not only occurs in the inscription on the Bharhut

---

3 Coomaraswamy, History of Indian and Indonesian Art, London, 1927, pl. xii, fig. 44; Bachhofer, Early Indian Sculpture, Paris, 1929, pl 24.
rail pillar, but also in the Lalitavistara and the Mahāvastu. But this legend is unknown to the Pāli Nikāyas and must have originated after their compilation. In the life of Vipassi in the Mahāpadāna-sutta of the Dīgha-Nikāya, the framework of which is the common factor of the biographies of all the Buddhas including Gautama, it is narrated that when the future Buddha (Bodhisattva) was driving in a chariot towards the park he saw a shaven-headed (bhaṇḍu) man, a pravrajita (wanderer) wearing yellow robe. When the Bodhisattva was told by the charioteer who the shaven-headed man was and had a talk with the latter, he said:—

"Come then, good charioteer, do you take the carriage and drive it hence back to my rooms. But I will here cut off my hair and beard (kesamassum oṭṭavo), and don the yellow robe, and go forth from home to homelessness."

A somewhat different story is told of the renunciation of the Bodhisattva Gautama in four of the Suttas of the Majjhima Nikāya (Nos. 16, 36, 85 and 109). The charioteer and the shaven-headed monk in yellow robe have no place in the narrative. We are simply told:—

"There came a time when I, being quite young, with a wealth of coal-black hair untouched by grey and in all the beauty of my early prime—despite the wishes of my parents, who wept and lamented—cut off my hair and beard, donned the yellow robes and went forth from home to homelessness."

In the Subha-sutta (99) of the Majjhima Nikāya a Brahman Saṅgārava calls Gautama Buddha a mūḍaka sāmāpa, "shaven-headed monk." So by the time when the sculptors of Mathurā began to carve images of Gautama Buddha there were two rival traditions relating to hair on the Buddha’s head: an older one now preserved in the Pāli Nikāyas represented Gautama as mūḍaka or shaven-headed monk; and another tradition preserved in the Mahāvastu, the Lalitavistara and the Nidānakathā represented him as having cut his hair with his sword leaving part of it intact on the head. The

shaven-headed images of the Buddha found at Mathura, Mankuar and Sarnath represent the older tradition, and the images of the Buddha with hair on the head arranged in ringlets represent the other and more popular tradition, because it is found both in Sanskrit and Pāli texts.

Gautama Buddha was not an ordinary monk. He was born with the thirty-two marks of a Mahāpuruṣa (superman). These marks distinguished the Bodhisattva Gautama from the ordinary Arhats. These marks are fully described in two of the Suttas of the Dīgha Nikāya (Mahāpadāna-suttanta and Lakkhana-suttanta) and the Lalitavistara. Two of these marks that relate to the head are uṇāṣa-sīrṣa, “having a head like a royal turban,” and pradakṣināvarta-kēdāh, “having hair (arranged) in ringlets turning to the right.” The commentator Buddhaghosa in his Sumaṅgala-vilāsini (Mahāpadāna-sutta-vānapāna) says that the term uṇhisāsīsa (uṇāṣa-sīrṣa) may be explained in two different ways either denoting the fullness of the forehead or the fullness of the head. The fullness of the forehead may be caused by a strip of muscle (maṃsapātala) rising from the root of the right ear, covering the entire forehead, and terminating in the root of the left ear. As a head with such a strip of muscle on the forehead looks like a head wearing a turban, it is therefore called a turban-like head or turban-head. The other explanation defines the turban-head as a fully round head symmetrical in shape like a water bubble.¹

The smooth head without any mark of hair like the head of the well-known colossal Bodhisattva dedicated by the Friar Bala in the third year of Kaniska at Sarnath, the head of the Bodhisattva image from Katra in the Mathura Museum,² the head on the fragment of the Buddha-Bodhisattva image from Mathura in the Museum of Ethnology at Munich,³ and of other images of the same type, shows slight elevation above the forehead. This elevated part reaching from the root of the right ear to that of the left appears to me to be the plastic representation of the maṃsapātala, the strip of muscle on the forehead of the turban-head, spoken of by Buddhaghosa,

¹ Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol. V, no. 4, Supplement, p. 77.
² Vogel, Catalogue, plate VII; Coomarswamy, History of Indian and Indonesian Art, Fig. 84; Bachhofer, Early Indian Sculpture, plate 81.
³ Bachhofer, Early Indian Sculpture, plate 82.
The thick lock of curled hair on the top of the head of the Katra and the Munich images is curled like the snail shell (*kaparda*). Coomarswamy observes, "That the remainder of the head is smooth does not mean that it is shaved, but simply that all the long hair was drawn up close and tight over scalp into the single tress." This single curled tress is marked by parallel lines indicating individual hairs of which it consists. If the sculptor had intended to represent hair on the rest of the head, he would certainly have adopted the same convention instead of leaving the area smooth. Smoothness therefore indicates that the rest of the head is clean-shaven. One standing image of the Buddha with smooth head in the Mathura Museum has a smooth bump. The tress of hair curling like a snail shell on the top of the head of the images of the Buddha referred to above evidently represents *tikka* or top-knot. Gautama prescribes in his *Dharmasūtra* (iii, 14,23) that an ascetic "may either shave or wear a lock on the crown of the head."

The artists of Mathura in the Kushan period produced another type of the Buddha head with short hair arranged in ringlets turning to the right and a bump or fleshy protuberance on the top covered by hair arranged in the same way. All the Buddha images of the post-Kushan period with the exception of the Mankuar image have a head of this type. The term *upāiga* is usually applied to this bump. Is it correct? As we have stated above, *upāiga-śāla*, turban-head, is a head which is either round in form like a turban, or has the appearance of a head wearing a turban even when bare on account of a strip of muscle covering the upper part of the forehead. Head of either type is turban-like in outline only. A very important part of the royal turban is the crest. A head, turban-like in outline, but without crest, cannot be recognised as a turban-head in the strict sense. Therefore the addition of a bump or fleshy protuberance on the top was evidently thought necessary to turn the head of a Mahāpurūṣa to a perfect turban-head. The so-called *upāiga* on the Buddha's head is the crest of the *upāiga* and not the *upāiga* itself. So it should be termed crest instead of *upāiga* to avoid misunderstanding.

The early Jaina literature, so far available, does not render us much help in solving the puzzles relating to the head of the images of the

Jinas. In the Ācārāṅga-sūtra it is said that when the Jina Mahāvīra turned an ascetic—

"Mahāvīra then plucked out with his right and left (hands) on the right and left (sides of his head) his hair in five handfuls. But Śakra, the leader and king of the gods, falling down before the feet of the Venerable ascetic Mahāvīra, caught up the hair in a cup of diamond, and requesting his permission, brought them to the milk ocean."¹

In the Kalpaśūtra it is said that Mahāvīra as well as his twenty-three predecessors did the same—plucked hair in five handfuls and turned shaven-headed monks. Only the image of one of the Jinas, Rṣabha, the first in the series, is shown as wearing matted locks like the Brahman Jaṭila monks carved on the Śuṅga monuments. The images of the other twenty-three Jinas mostly show heads with bump covered by hair arranged in ringlets becoming the Mahāpuruṣa. But images of the Jinas with shaven head are not unknown. Coomarswamy has published a seated image of the Jina Pārśva with smooth head from Mathura² where the different types of the images of the Jinas were carved for the first time.

Ramaprasad Chanda

² Coomarswamy, The Origin of the Buddha Image, fig. 43.
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DURGACHARAN CHATTERJII.—The Problem of Knowledge and the Four Schools of later Buddhism. Mr. Chatterji introduces his paper by a paragraph on pramāṭy, prameya, pramiti and pramāṇa and then presents an exposition within a short compass of the views of the Vaibhāṣikas, Sautrāntikas, Yogācāras and Mādhyamikas. He concludes his article by saying that “the first two (schools) admit the reality of an external objective world which enters into our cognition, but the last two do not admit such a reality”.

R. GANGULI.—Cattle and Cattle-rearing in Ancient India. He deals with this topic under the following heads:—Cattle as objects of great care and religious veneration—keeping and employing cattle—diseases and their treatment—feeding and stock breeding.

CHIARU CHANDRA DASGUPTA.—Some Notes on the Ādi-Bhaṇjas of Khiijiṅga-Kolta, Earlier Bhaṇjas of Khiṅjali-Maṇḍala, Bhaṇjas of Bauda and Later Bhaṇjas of Khiṅjali. According to the writer there were four different Bhaṇja dynasties. He deals with the tables of genealogy furnished by the various inscriptions so far discovered and edited, concluding his paper by a few paragraphs on the chronological position of the four Bhaṇja dynasties.

K. B. PATHAK.—Jinendra-buddhi, Kaiyaṭa and Haradatta. The object of this paper is to show the relative positions of the three commentators mentioned above. By profuse quotations from the Mahā-bhāṣya, Kāśikā, Bhāravi, Padamāṇi and other works Dr. Pathak fixes the date of Jinendrabuddhi at 700 A.D., and that of Jayāditya at circa 661 A.D. He assigns Kaiyaṭa to the close of the 11th century and Haradatta to the 13th century.

S. SRIKANTHI SASTRI.—Vidyānanda and Saṅkara Mata. The writer is of opinion that Vidyānanda uses the term ‘Saṅkara’ in his Āptaparīkṣā as an epithet of Śiva, Śambhu, Maheśvara, etc., and not for referring to Saṅkarācārya. He says that “Vidyānanda criticises not the Advaita of Saṅkara but a theistic creed of the Māheśvaras, partly based on the Vaiśeṣika philosophy”. He then proceeds to ascertain the time, identity and the contemporaries of Vidyānanda,
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N. B. Divatia.—*Certain Fractional Numerals in Gujarati.* The writer shows “Doḍha (G), diḍha (M) is derivable from adhyardha, divya-diḍha, and aḍhi (G) aḍica (M) from ardhatṛśya.

D. R. Mankad.—*The Arctic Regions in the Rgveda.* Mr. Mankad is neither a supporter of Tilak’s theory of the Arctic Home of the Aryans nor an opponent of Dr. Das’s view that ‘Sapta-Sindhu’ was their original home. The object of his present paper is mainly to refute the arguments advanced by Dr. Das in support of his opinion that in the Rgveda there is no reference to the Arctic Regions.

A. N. Upadhye.—*Kanarese words in Desi Lexicons.* The writer gives a short list of such words with their meanings and philological notes.

N. B. Divatia.—*The Khazars: Were they Mongols?*

P. K. Gode.—*Notes on Indian Chronology.* Date of Vicārasudhākara of Raṅga Jyotirvid—śaka 1687 (=A.D. 1765)—Date of “Kaṅkāli Grantha” attributed to “Nāsīrsāha”, A.D. 1500–1510—Dates of the Commentaries on the Tarkabhāṣā or Tarkaparibhāṣā of Keśavamīśra by Govardhana, Mādhavabhaṭṭa, Balabhadra, Nārāyanabhaṭṭa and Murāribhaṭṭa—Date of Jvaratīmīrabhāṣākara of Kāyastha Cāmūṃḍa and Identification of Rājamalla, his patron.

**Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies**, vol. VI, pt. 2

H. W. Bailey.—*The Word “But” in Iranian.* The words But, vXṣ and Bodīṣat occurring in a passage of the Iranian text of the Bundahīṣṇa have been interpreted here as signifying Buddha, spirit and Bodhisattva respectively, and their corresponding forms have been traced in languages like Sogdian, Manichæan, Middle Iranian, and Pahlavi.

L. D. Barnett.—*Pramnaï.* The identification of the Pramnaï (mentioned by Strabo as philosophers ‘addicted to wrangling and refutation’) as distinguished from the Brāhmaṇas has been attempted in this note. The view that the word represents the prāmāṇikas, the followers of the various philosophical systems, each having a distinctive view as to what constitutes pramāṇa, has been opposed, while the position that the word is a corruption of Sramnaï (Śramaṇas) has been rejected by Dr. Barnett. He thinks that pramnaï signifies the prajñā, who, for their exclusive adherence to
prajña ("an intellectual and moral attitude") were disliked by the Brähmanaśas.

JULES BLOCH.—Āsoka et la Magadhi. The author has tried to show the relation between the Aśokan dialects and the Māgadhī Prākṛt by taking up the use of final 'e' nom. sing, as distinguished from final a.

W. CALAND.—Corrections of Eggeling's Translation of the Śatapathabrāhmaṇa. It contains a list of corrections of Eggeling's English translation of the Śatapathabrāhmaṇa in the Sacred Books of the East Series.

JARL CHARPENTIER.—Antiochus, King of the Yavanas. It is contended that Aṃtiyoka mentioned in the Aśokan Rock Edict XIII as the king of the Yavanas is Antiochus I (280-261 B.C.) and can be neither Antiochus III nor Antiochus II as suggested by previous scholars. The other four kings named in the same Edict are identified as follows:

Turanāya = Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285-246 B.C.)
Aṃtikini = Antigonus Gonatas (276-239 B.C.)
Maka = Magas of Cyrene (c. 300-3. 250 B.C.)
Alikasundara = Alexander of Epirus (272-c. 255 B.C.)

The assumption of Prof. Charpentier that Antiochus I is the Vonaraṇja mentioned in the Edict has influenced his inference as to the date of Aśoka's coronation. He follows Senart in thinking that all the edicts in their present shape were issued at one and the same date. As two of the edicts, viz., the third and the fourth, record that they were promulgated when Aśoka had already been anointed twelve years, the date of the Rock Edict mentioning Antiochus falls in the year 12/13 after the abhiṣeka of Aśoka. The death of Antiochus occurring, as it did, between October, 262 and April, 261 B.C., the latest date possible for the issue of the edict will not be far removed from the date of the demise of Antiochus. The year of the coronation, therefore, would be calculated by adding 12/13 years to this date pointing to 273 B.C. as the latest possible date of the abhiṣeka.

G. COEDE'S.—A propos de l'origine des chiffres arabes. There are two theories regarding the "Arabic" figures and place value of zero. Some affirm its Indian origin while others have tried to find in it a Western invention. Mr. G. R. Kaye is the supporter of the second theory, but he has been refuted by many scholars, notably
by Mr. W. E. Clark. The presence of these figures in the Sanskrit inscriptions of Indo-China and Insulindia has led Mr. Kaye to suppose that they were introduced into India from the Extreme Orient. This has been criticised by Mr. Clark, but none of the scholars have cared to ascertain at which epoch and at what condition the figures with the place-value of zero appeared in the inscriptions of Indo-China and Insulindia. It is this desideratum that the present writer removes by collecting the inscriptions with their dates, and he is inclined to the view that the figures were in use in India before they were introduced in the Extreme Orient.

Gabriel Ferrand.—Les grands rois du monde. Mons. Pelliot has recently published in the T'oung-pao (xxii, 1923, pp. 97-125) an article entitled "the theory of the four sons of the heavens", in which he has collected information from the Chinese sources and some Arabic texts. The present note is only an addition to the article of Mons. Pelliot. The following information is given in this paper from the Chinese and Arabic texts:

1. 245-250, K'ang T'ai knew China, Ta-t'sin = Orient méditerranéen and Yue-tc.te = Indocythès.
2. 3rd or 4th century, Che-eul-yeou-king mentions China, India, Ta-t'sin and the home of Yue-tche.
3. 646, Biuen-tsang cites 4 sovereigns of India, home of the Iranians, Tokharians, the land of the Turks and China.
4. 645-67: Tao-siuan cites 4 kings of China, Persia, India, and home of the Turks.
5. 851, the merchant Sulaymān knew four kings of Arabia, China, Byzance and India.
6. Circa 872-5, Ibn Wahab reports that there are 5 kings, viz., of Irak, China, Turks, India and Rūm.
7. 11th century (1029-70) Abīl-Kāsim knew five kings, viz., of China, India, Turks, Persians, and Rūm.
8. The author of the book of 101 nights announces 5 great kings but names the following six: the king of the Arabs, Persians, Turks, India, Egypt and Rūm.

George A. Grierson.—Conjunct Consonants in Dardic.
E. Washburn Hopkins.—Hindu Salutations.
Hermann Jacobi.—Sind nach dem Sāṅkhya-Lehrer Pāñcaśikha die Puruṣas von Atomgrösse?
A. Berriedale Keith.—The Doctrine of the Buddha. The writer

J.H.Q., September, 1931
thinks that the doctrine of the denial of Ātman presented in the Pāli texts was not propounded by Buddha himself. The doctrines of retribution and transmigration accepted by Buddha are Brāhmaṇical, conflicting with the Buddhist doctrine of “Nirvāṇa as the end of striving, and not as the foundation of existence, the Absolute.” Buddha taught neither annihilation nor selflessness which were the products of later scholasticism.

Sten Konow.—*Note on a Kharoṣṭhī Akoṣa.* The note deals with the interpretation of a sign found in the Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions discovered in Chinese Turkestan. The sign has been differently deciphered to be a compound letter standing for *tśa* or *tśa*. Prof. Konow inclines to the view that the shape of the letter represents *tś* rather than *ts* as understood by Prof. Rapson.

L. de la Vallée Poussin.—*À propos du Cittaviśuddhiprakaraṇa d’Āryadeva.* Prof. Poussin discusses in this paper some important doctrinal matters mentioned in the work *Cittaviśuddhi* of Āryadeva published by Mr. H. P. Sāstrī in the *J.A.S.B.*, lxvii, pt. i, pp. 175-84 (1898).

Sylvain Lévi.—*Un nouveau document sur le bouddhisme de basse époque dans l’Inde.* Prof. Lévi secured a fragmentary ms. containing an account of the rituals of the Tantrik cult of the Vajrayogini. The ms. furnishes us with some information about the teachers and their disciples through whom the cult has been transmitted. This serves as a source of information to Tāranātha’s history of Buddhism. The fragment reproduced in this paper with its translation gives important information about Nāgārjuna.

G. Morgenstierne.—*The Name Munjān and Some Other Names of Places and Peoples in the Hindu Kush.*

Peter S. Noble.—*A Kharoṣṭhī Inscription from Endere.* Notes and comments are made on the words of the inscription no. 661 in the second volume of the *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions.*

C. M. Ridding.—*Professor Cowell and his Pupils.*

Kasten Rönnow.—*Viśvarūpa.* This is an attempt at ascertaining the character of Viśvarūpa Tvāṣṭra on the strength of the Vedic passages containing his name. The writer concludes: “The name Viśvarūpa, an appellative of Tvāṣṭra and of certain serpent demons alike, must allude to their power over the cattle and its procreative activities.”

Aurel Stein.—*On the Ephedra, the Hūm Plant, and the Soma.* The view is expressed that although the broken twigs found as
burial deposits in the various graves of the Lop desert in Central Asia have been identified to be the fragments of the twigs of *Ephedra* known by the name of *Hūma* in the border tracts of Persia and Afghanistan, and although the same plant is now used as the sacred *Homa* in the rituals of the Parsis of India, *Ephedra* cannot be the *Soma* of the Veda and *Haaoma* of the Avesta, because of its bitter taste with no exhilarating effects mentioned in those ancient texts. It is conjectured that the wild rhubarb growing on the highest portions of the ranges stretching along the border of Northern Baluchistan and the Afghan provinces of Kandahar and Ghazni may have yielded the Soma drink of the ancient Aryas.

E. J. THOMAS.—*Gandhayukti in the Lalitavistara*. The item *gandhayukti* in the list of arts found in the *Lalitavistara* and some other works is, according to the present writer, a 'half-Sanskritised Praēkṛt form' of *granthayukti* meaning book-making. The expression should not be taken to signify 'odour-mixing' as generally done.

R. L. TURNER.—*The Future Stem in Aśoka*.

J. PIH. VOGEL.—*The Head-offering to the Goddess in Pallava Sculpture*. That the sacrifice of one's own head to a goddess was a well-known motif both in Sanskrit literature and Pallava sculpture is shown from stories in works like the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, and also from the figures found in temples like those of Māmallapuram. A figure kneeling at the feet of a goddess grasping a tuft of hair with its left hand and holding a sword with the right is interpreted to be in the attitude of offering its own head to the goddess.

M. de Z. WICKREMASINGHE.—*On the Etymology and Interpretation of certain Words and Phrases in the Aśoka Edicts*.

A. C. WOOLNER.—*The Rgveda and the Punjab*. The view that the principal settlements of the Aryans were in the country of the Sarasvati south of the modern Ambala and that the bulk of the hymns of the Rgveda was composed there is controverted here on the grounds that the phenomena described in the Rgvedic hymns are equally visible in the other parts of the Punjab. That the Aryans knew the whole of the Punjab and occupied its best parts is regarded possible by the writer of the note.

*Indian Antiquary*, September, 1931

W. H. MORELAND.—*Notes on Indian Maunds*.

BIREN BONNERJE.:—*Prāyaścita, or Hindu Ideas on the Expiation of*
Sin. In this article, which is continued from the preceding number of the Journal, various forms of prāyaścittas are described with the remark that the Hindu modes of expiation of sins reveal their magical character having nothing to do with true repentance.

A. Venkatasubbia.—Athabhūgīya. This is the first instalment of a paper attempting at an explanation of the word athabhūgīya occurring in Rummindëi Pillar Inscription of Asoka.

Pran Nath.—Was the Kauṭaliya Arthāśāstra in Prose or Verse? According to the writer the original text of the Arthāśāstra was in verse.

Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society,

vol. XVII, 1931

G. Ramadas.—Mandasa Plates of Anantavarmadeva, Śaka 913. These form a set of copper-plates of the time of Anantavarmadeva (which, according to the writer, is not the name of a king but an imperial title), of the family of the Gaṅgas. The gift is made by Dharmakhedi of a village called Madhipatharakhanda in Mahendrabhoga to an individual called Erukulajādān. The characters of the inscriptions present a mixture of Nagari, Grantha, Telugu and Oriya. The part of the inscription is given with an English translation.

N. Tripathi.—The Jaypura Copper-plate Grant of Dhruvānanda Deva. The writer gives only a list of corrections of the reading of the text of the above grant published in the JBORS, XVI, pp. 457-72.

J. C. De.—A few Observations on the Hindol Plate of Subhākara-deva.—Mr. De suggests some improvement on the reading and translation of the above inscription published in the JBORS, March, 1930, pp. 69-83.

L. V. Ramaswami Aiyar.—Dravidic Names for 'Palm'. Mr. Aiyar has shown "how far one set of Dravidian forms for 'palmyra' and 'palm-like trees' may be regarded as native" and "the connection between Indo-Aryan tāla (palmyra) and the Dravidian forms with the same meaning."

Umesa Misra.—Mimamsāśāstrasarvasva of Halāyudha. This issue contains an edition of the text up to the 3rd adhikaraṇa of 2nd pāda of the 2nd chapter.
Journal of the Bombay Branch of Royal Asiatic Society,

vol. VII, nos. 1 and 2

SIR CHARLES FAUCETTE.—*Geralt Aungier's Report on Bombay*. This is a report of the earliest British administration in India in the form of a letter addressed by Gerald Aungier, Governor of Bombay, in 1673 to the Court of Directors of the East India Company in England. It presents a statistical and descriptive account of the Island of Bombay, and its inhabitants, fortifications, systems of government, trade resource etc.

PADMANATHA BHATTACHARYVA.—*Pañcamahāśabda in Rājarāṅgiṇī*. In support of Sir A. Stein's view that the expression “pañcamahāśabda” in the Rājarāṅgiṇī means five offices distinguished by the term “great,” this note supplies evidences from the work itself and opposes Dr. S. K. Aiyangar who, on the strength of the evidences of the Southern usage of the expression, has taken it to mean five great sounds, i.e., a band playing on five musical instruments, accompanying a high official.
The Sea and Land Travels of a Buddhist Sadhu in the Sixteenth Century

Modern researches have shown that Mahāyāna Buddhism continued to exist in India up to quite recent times. Mr. N. N. Vasu, Mm. Haraprasāda Śāstri and others have pointed out the existence of Buddhist schools in Orissa and Bengal up to the XVIIIth century; the dharma-worship in some parts of Bengal and Behar betrays even now its Buddhist origin. The Bengali literature of the XVth and XVIth centuries contains a large number of texts which testify to the existence at that time of various, more or less degenerated, Buddhist centres in Bengali countries. Caitanya himself is said to have converted large communities of Buddhists. If the authenticity of the Karcā of Govinda Dāś was beyond any doubt, we could prove the existence of Buddhist schools and pāṇḍits in South India at the time of the great Bengali Vaiśṇava mystic. His discussion with the Buddhist pāṇḍit Rāmagiri and the latter's conversion is in fact reported there.¹ It will not appear out of place to have recourse to a Tibetan source of the XVIth century which brings in some new information about these later periods of Mahāyāna Buddhism and at the same time gives us an idea of the geographical knowledge of Indian and extra-

Indian countries as it circulated among the Tibetan monks. I refer here to the biography of Buddhagupta (Sāṅś rgyas sbas pa) the guru of Tāranātha. Tāranātha himself collected the materials for his book from his master during the latter's travels to Tibet, and embodied them in a short biographical note called: Grub c'en ou-ddha-gu-pñahi rnam t'ar rje brtsun hdi bül nas gṣan du rnal vrtog gi dri mas ma spags pñahi yi ge yam dag pa, the importance of which is chiefly geographical.

Buddhagupta was, as many of the Indian sādhus always have been, a great traveller. He visited many places in India and even outside India in far away countries in order to find traces of Buddhism and of Buddhist remains. We cannot say that his information is always exact; in this kind of writings we cannot expect to find everywhere that historical preciseness of detail which we demand from modern authors. These Indian and Tibetan saints lived in a kind of mythical atmosphere which gives a peculiar colour to all their experiences; the truth for them is not about external facts but rather about the meaning that they have for them or the ideal significance that they attach to them. Anyhow this biography is the first Tibetan document that we came across up to now in which information is found about a large number of countries outside India proper, and in a certain way it sheds some side-light upon the geographical knowledge and the trade routes of India in the XVIth century.

The importance of our text for the history of the geographical notions of the Tibetans seems therefore to be of no little moment. It is perhaps the only Tibetan treatise, at least to our knowledge, in which we find a great deal of direct information about some places in India and chiefly outside India proper which are not usually connected with Buddhist canonical tradition. This explains why Blo bzān dpal Idan ye ṣes, while writing his Šam-bha-latḥi lam yig, practically copies from our text when he mentions countries as a rule not registered in the canonical literature, proving indirectly that he considered the little book of Tāranātha as the most complete and reliable treatise on the subject. I must also add that the readings of our text are generally more correct than those of the Šam-bha-latḥi lam yig, which are therefore to be accordingly modified.¹ Our source moreover shows

¹ The geographical literature of Tibet concerned with India and foreign countries has not yet been studied chiefly on account of the scarce materials available in European libraries. Many of the gswi
that at the time of Buddhagupta India had not yet forgotten those
great links of cultural relations which Buddhism had established be-
tween her and far away countries from Africa to Java.

The Buddhist culture of Buddhagupta was exclusively Tantric;
no mention of a śāstra whatever is to be found in his biography.
We must reasonably expect that at a later date, as that of
Buddhagupta, the inter-connection between the Buddhist and Śaiva
sects was even greater than it had been before. It must have
been very difficult to draw a line of distinction between the
followers of the two schools. The Siddha-sampradāya is common to the
Buddhists as well as to the Śaivas, and Gorakṣa is even now a great
saint for both the communities. Characteristically Hindu gods and
ideas were creeping into declining Buddhism. This fact is worthy of
notice because it will help us very much when we want to ascertain the
peculiarities of the system of Tāranātha, inasmuch as there is no
doubt that, whatever might have been the further developments of

ḥbum or collected writings of the Tibetan polygraphs contain some
sections geographically very interesting, e.g., the very important
chapters on China included in the writings of the fifth Dalai Lama,
the Šam-bha-la-hi lam yig edited by Grünwedel and included in the
works of the great Pa-di-c'en blo bzaṅ dpal ldan ye sles. Gloṅ c'en is said
to have written a general description of India, which I have not been
able to see as yet and which anyhow must be a compilation because
the author never went to India. Geographical information is also
contained in the astrological works such as the Vaiḍūrya dkar
po and the Vaiḍūrya gya' sel. Nor must we forget the various rnam
par's or biographical accounts, chiefly, of the locāvas or translators
who came down to India. Some of them contain real itineraries
such as the rnam par of Ur gyen pa or of Stag tsaṅ ras pa.
Many a useful information can be gathered from the guides for
pilgrims such as the Jam bu gliṅ sp yi bīad (on which see Waddell,
Lamaism, p. 307 and Proceedings, Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1893)
or the other one for the visitors of Nepal: bal yul mchod rten ḫ'ags
pa bīn kun daṅ dehi gnas gaṅ rnam s kyi s dkar c'ag mdor sdbus.

I must add to the list the geographical dictionary in six languages
printed in China by order of K'ien lung called K'iu-ting sī yu tīng
wen chi upon which see Von Zach, Lexicographische Beiträge, I, p. 83
and III, p. 1c8 and Laufer, Loan words in Tibetan, p. 434.
his school, he meant to reform and impart a new life to Tibetan Buddhism. It is quite certain that his meeting with Buddhagupta exercised a great influence upon the formation of his mind. The learning and the experience of his Indian guru, and his explanation of some of the most sacred rituals and a great deal of the esoteric literature of Mahāyāna as expounded in India, impressed the young lama and gave the first impulse to a new line of thoughts. It seems to me that his coming across Buddhagupta represents a moment of the foremost importance in the mental and religious evolution of Tāranātha. Blo bzaṅ dpal ldan ye sses also calls him the disciple of the Indian yogin (Śam-bha-laṅi lam yig, pp. 29, 49). Tāranātha himself begins his Bkaḥ babs bdun ldan by invoking with great reverence his great guru (Edelstein, p. 9, cf. p. 116) of whom mention is also to be found in another work by the same author, viz., the Gsas bahi rnam 'tár in which the dream is narrated that foretold his imminent meeting with Buddhagupta. There can hardly be any doubt that many an information embodied in the Bkaḥ babs bdun ldan is directly derived from the teachings of Buddhagupta who is there considered as belonging to the Gorakṣasampradāya. This connection between Tāranātha and the Nāthapanthins, though of a specific Buddhist branch, is worthy of notice. Through Buddhagupta, one of the last if not the last of the Buddhist apostles into Tibêt, Śaivaism more than Buddhism was finding its way into the “country of the snows.” I shall not translate the entire text but shall give its résumé rendering into English those portions only which have a larger interest for us.

Buddhagupta was born in Indraliṅga near Rāmeśvara in South India, in the family of a rich merchant, whose name was Kṛṣṇa. He was initiated into the yoga by an ascetic called in our text Tīrthinātha, a name which must be corrected into Tīrthanātha as evidenced by its Tibetan translation hbaṅ stegs mgon po to be found in the Bkaḥ babs bdun ldan, p. 16. This Sādhu is said to have been a contemporary of king Rāmarāja, who may be identified with Rāmarāja of Vijayanagara (1542-1565) of Talikota fame or rather with his cousin Rāmarāja Viṭṭhala, who was Viceroy in the South and a contemporary of Viśvanātha, the Nāyak of Madura. It was Tīrthanātha who initiated him into the doctrines of the Siddha Gorakṣanātha together with two other nāthas, Brahmanātha mentioned also in the Bkaḥ babs bdun ldan (p. 116) and Kṛṣṇanātha whom he met in North India during his pilgrimage to Delhi (ṣi li) Vikrama-
Haridwār (Ha ri dhā ra = Haridvāra). 1 He learned and practised the mahābaddhā and the svasambaddhā mudrā (see Gorakṣa-saṁhitā, 1, 66, 67 and Haṭhayoga-pradīpikā, Bengali ed., III, p. 111) that is those special methods of prāṇāyāma, which were expounded in the Haṭhayoga and those Tantras, Śaiva as well as Buddhist, which are connected with the same order of ideas. I refer chiefly to the Sahaja-siddhi class of Tantras which were specially followed by the Siddha-sampradāya and through this and its texts exercised a great influence upon Lamaism. At the time of Buddhagupta it seems that the school of Gorakṣa was greatly flourishing in India, though it was divided into a series of sub-sects, the peculiarities of which we are not yet in a position to determine. Their names are preserved in our text, and so far as I know some of them have not yet been met with in other sources:

(a) Nāṭhapāphantin which has many followers in India even now.
(b) Bakṣapāphantin.
(c) Gopālapāphantin.
(d) Pāgalapāphantin (pa ga la) from pāgal (mad man) which may have been suggested by the strange ways of these yogins, cf. the Bāuls of Bengal perhaps from vātula.
(e) Āyi-pāphantin.
(f) Colipāphantin (tso ū), viz., Coliyāphantin (vide Akṣaya Kumar Datta, Bhāratavarṣiya-upāsaka-sampradāya, p. 119).
(g) Hodoṣapāphantin (ho du).
(h) Dhvajapāphantin (dva za).
(i) Veragipāphantin (bhe ra gi) from Vairāgin, ascetic. Cf. the name of Vairāginātha given in the list of the Siddhas up to Āryadeva.
(l) Maṅgalanāṭhapāphantin.
(m) Pathopāphantin (pa tho).
(n) Sattanāṭhapāphantin (from saṭpa?).

There was also another rather dissident sect more strictly Buddhist called Naṭesvariyoṅgins (nā. ṭe so ri) to which Tīrthanaṭha, Brahmanāṭha and Kṛṣṇanāṭha, the gurus of Buddhagupta belonged, and which must therefore also be connected with Tāranāṭha.

1 The spelling Haridhāra shows that Tāranāṭha followed the spoken pronunciation and that even Sanskrit names were reproduced as they sounded in the vernaculars. Cf. also diṇḍa often used in our text for diṇḍa, bheragī for vairāgin; naṭesōri for naṭesvari suggests a Bengali pronunciation.
Then the account of the travel begins. From the Himalaya, where, as we saw, he had been on pilgrimage, he went down to Māru (Rājputana) and spent some time in Rāṭhor (ra thor). Then we find him in Nagaratā, and in Mūlasthāna (mo la tā na, Multān) and to the north up to Kābul (ka bhe la), Khorāsān (quo ra sā na) and a place called in our text ba. ja. sa. na, Goṣa,¹ Urgyan, which corresponds, as is known, to Uḍḍhyāna of the Sanskrit sources. The question concerning the localization of this country has been recently summarized by Dr. Bagchi in an article which gives the actual state of our knowledge about this province which played such an important part in the history of Buddhism and Tāntrism.² Without anticipating the results of my further investigation of the problem in the light of very important Tibetan itineraries recently found by me in some Western Tibetan monasteries I shall only say that Buddhagupta locates Urgyan, Uḍḍhyāna in Ghazni. Then he went to Urgyan in the west. The Sanskrit name of the country is Au ṭi ya ᵇa, but in the original language is Or gyen; since the pronunciation of ṭa and ra is similar it becomes like Or-ya-na. Now in the country itself in the language of the Muhammadans (kla klo) it is known to every body as Ghaznī (ga dsa ni). He went to all the great places such as the cave of Kambala-pā, the ruins of the palace of Indrabhūtī,³ the mountain ìlo.⁴ Then he stopped for one month in the town of Dhāmasthira—in Tibetan, the place of the smoke (du

¹ Goṣa is perhaps Khost, kuo.si.to, of Yuan Chwang. Bajasān, which might also be a clerical mistake of the copyist for Bajastān, suggests Bagistān a town in the province of Khorāsān in Persia. It is difficult to understand how these countries are in the north while Urgyan is said to be in the west. Did Buddhagupta go to Persia before and then, after returning to India, proceed to Urgyan? We should expect otherwise, east instead of west of Khorāsān.

² Indian Historical Quarterly, vol. vi, no. 3, pp. 580ff.

³ The story of Kambala and Indrabhūti is narrated in the life of the eighty-four Siddhas (translated by Grünwedel, Geschichten der vier und achtzig Zauberer and in the Bhā ṃ bās bdun ldan translated by the same author.

⁴ The form Ilora parvata found in the Sam-bha-lahi lam yig is manifestly wrong and is not supported by any source. Cf. Edelstein-mine, p. 58.
baḥi gnas) in the very centre of the country. Generally speaking, the surface of this valley in the centre of Orgyan which is surrounded by the ravines and the woods of the mountains is large enough for two days' march from west to east and for four days' march from south to north. This country is surrounded by three lakes in the east, south and north. Then he proceeded to the north to Balkh (Bha, lag. kha), Kashmir (Kha che) where he visited some sacred places of pilgrimage for the heretics such as Saradāṭirtha and Nāradāṭrtha (na ra dha), then he travelled up to Dā ra ta bo ṭa, viz., Dard-Tibetan country and to Kas kā ra, i.e., Kashgar. The Dard-Tibetan country must be the district of Kargil (Purig) and Ladak. It is therefore evident that Buddhagupta crossed the Zojila, visited the district of Purig which quite possibly was not yet at that time completely converted to Islamism as it is now, went westwards to Leh, a purely Buddhist country and through the Kardog Pass and Nubra reached Kashgar. The Sanskritic name for Purig and Ladak shows that even when referring to countries well-known to Tibetans, Tāranātha strictly followed the information of his guru, preserving the Indian name of provinces which were under the direct influence of Tibet. The name for Ladak is, as is known, either Mar yul, or in recent sources, Maṇ yul.

Back to India he met his guru and passing through Delhi he proceeded to Bhīmeśvara where he stopped for some time in a ruined temple of Iśvara (dbaṅ phyug). After having visited some other

1 The central lake is called Dhanakoṣa in other sources.—de nas nub phyogs Orgyen du phebs/ sans kri taḥi skad du Au ṭi ya na/ raṅ bzin skad du Orgyan zer/ ṭa daṅ ra ḫdon tshul ḫdra min yod pas/ (I think that ‘min’ is out of place here) or ya na zer ba ḫdra cig yod,.....da lta de phyogs raṅ na Kla kloḥi skad du grags pa kun gyi go ba la/ yul ga dza ni zer ro/ grub chen lva baḥi na bzaḥ can gyi phyug pa daṅ/ rgyal po yin ta bhu taḥi pho braṅ gyi sul daṅ/ ilo par ba ta ḫes bya baḥi gnas chen nhams su phebs/ Ur gyan gyi gnas mṭhil dhu ma sti ra ste du bai gnas ḫes bya baḥi groṅ khyer ḫig zla gcig tsam bžugs/ spyiṛ Orgyen gyi gnas mṭhil der ṭoṛa daṅ nags ḫṭhug poṣ skor baḥi dbus na ḫaṅ khor tsam šar nub du ūn lam gños tsam/ lho byaṅ du bzi tsam/.....gneš ḫdi ūṅ daṅ lho daṅ nub nhams mṭsho gsum gyis bskor.

2 On Saradāṭirtha cf, Rājātaranāṅgiṭ translated by Stein, II, pp. 280, 486 and passim. Nāradāṭrtha is unknown to me.
small places in the south he started again for Räputäna (Māru) where he saw the temple of Hevajra founded by Padmavajra; then we find him in Ābu, Saurāṣṭra, Kaccha (ka tsa), then back again to Saurāṣṭra and properly in Somanātha where he visited the Śiva-liṅga and a statue of Virūpa. Then he turned his steps towards the south and peregrinated through Marāṭhā, Khāndesh (khā na de sa), Tam pa la, Vijayanagara (very often in India itself written Vidyānagara), Karpāṭa, Trilīṅga, Trimalla, Kāncī (tsan tsi), Malabar (ma lyaar), Koṅkāṇa, tsa ī drā, Marvār, tsai va la, (corr: ra for va: Ceralam, Kerala), ni tsa ma ra (but Śambhalaṭi lam yig: Nicambara, ni tsa mbra la), tsan dra du ra, Paṇcābhratāra (paṇca-bha tā ra) that is Paṇcacārāṁśa, Cola-maṇḍala (tsa ra maṇ ṭa la), (Mora maṇḍala) Molār maṇḍala, Jalamaṇḍala, Talamaṇḍala, Toṇḍaimaṇḍala (tunṭa maṇ ṭa la), Bhogamalabar, Ṛaliṅga.

Then in Koṅkāṇa he embarked and went to the west up to an island called Ḩgro ling in Sanskrit Dramiladvipa. In the language of the Muḥammādāns, the barbarians, and [the inhabitants] of the small island, it is called la sam lo ra na so (in Sansh: sam lo ra na so). In that island he received the teachings of the guhya-mantras; teachings of the Sāṃvara (tantra) and of the Hevajra (tantra) and then he learnt the detailed explanation of the Hevajranattra. This Hevajranattra belongs to the system of the Ācārya Padmasambhava. Generally speaking, the tradition of the fourfold tantra is still uninterrupted in that island, and if we except the sublime and largely diffused Kālacakra tantra, whatever is in India is also there such as the (Vajra-) kilatana and the Tantra of the daśakrodhas, many Hevuka-tantras, Vajrapāṇi, mkhā ldiṅ (Guruḍa) Māmāki, Mahākāla, etc. Then the sublime order of Hayagriva which is largely spread in India is to be found there. Moreover there are many sacred teachings (chos) belonging to the Tantras expounded by Padmasambhava. Though the community is numerous, the rules of the discipline are not so pure. The monks wear black garments and usually drink intoxicating liquors. . . . . . Then he embarked again with some merchants and went to Śañkhadvipa (in Tibetan, duṅ gliṅ, the island of the conchshell). There he remained some time in a mountain, rich in medicinal herbs and called bde Ḩbyuṅ gi gnas (Śambhusthāna). There he saw many men with human face and the nose [big] as that of the elephant coming from an island called Gajanāsa.
Then he went to the south to the island Pa la ta, and from there sailing again towards the east, he reached Sinhaladvipa (Ceylon) where he remained five years. In a plateau in the country called Kan ṭa la (kandi) in the middle of a thick forest there is a cave in a rock. There the great ācārya Śāntipā, when he went to Sinhaladvipa, practised the mystic exercises. His name is Yaśākāraśānti which in Tibetan means glory-mine-peace.

Where Buddhagupta embarked is not mentioned in our text; perhaps it was in Goa or in Choul or in Dabul which are known to have been harbours on the mercantile route on the Koṅkaṇa shore. Nor can the islands that he touched be easily identified for the simple reason that their names are not to be met with in other sources known to us.

Our difficulty is increased by the fact that the distance is not given
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nor the days he spent in the sea are recorded. But if we consider that he sailed in Koṅkaṇa and that he landed at Ceylon we have a line of navigation which either went along the coast or passed through the Laccadives; but I think that this second alternative is less probable, because it would imply a rather long deviation.¹

Nor can I suggest any definite identification as regards the first island alluded to in our text, called Dramiladvīpa, the island of the Dravidians or Samloranaso; we must not necessarily think that this island is in the middle of the ocean and far away from the coast. It may as well be one of the small islands along the Koṅkaṇa country. One may think of Goa itself where traces of Buddhism are to be found up to recent times and which was known to Arab sailors under the name of Sindabūr or Sandabūr.² The mention of Muhammadan inhabitants of the country does not contradict this identification because we know that even before the time of Buddhagupta they had settled there. What on the other hand we know from Ibn Batuta about Islamism in the Laccadives seems also to exclude a priori that we have to search there for the island Samloronaso spoken of by Buddhagupta as a good centre of Buddhist studies. All these facts seem therefore to point out that the islands visited by our Śādhu are to be searched for along the coast from

¹ Śaṅkadvīpa.

The Laccadives and the Maldives were known to Chinese sources as "the islands of the ocean of the streams". They were not rarely touched by the ships of foreign traders. Cf. also Ibn Batuta who speaks of the goods exported from these islands to China, India and Arabia.

² I am afraid that the followers of Padmasambhava in black dress have no connection whatever with Buddhist sects. There is in fact no trace of such a black colour being used by Buddhist priests. It is perhaps not impossible that some Christian monks, probably Portuguese, were mistaken by Buddhagupta for Buddhist śramaṇas. It is to be noted in this connection that even Buddhagupta does not fail to remark a great discrepancy in the monastic rules between the usual Buddhist monks and the so-called disciples of Padmasambhava. Moreover they are clearly said to belong to an order. Drinking of wine, if now common among the rām ma pas in Tibet seems, so far as we know, to have been not practised in India except for ritual purposes.
Goa to Cape Comorin. From there [Ceylon] he went to a small island called Uliṅga and then joining some merchants of this place he proceeded to another small island called Amuga at a distance taking about one month of navigation from Ceylon. There he embarked on a big boat having five thousand men on board; this is at least the number we read in the text, but it is evident that we are confronted either with an exaggeration of the narrator or of the writer or with a clerical error. No vessel was able to carry more than some hundred men. After about four months of navigation to the south he reached a country called Dzhā mi gi ri (Jhāmigiri).

There are two towns, one in the north and one in the south, the distance between them being of about seven days for a traveller. Between these two towns there are three mountains and on the top of one of them there is a golden cave which spreads light at night. He remained there one year. In that island there is the throne of ācārya Nāgārjuna said to have been used by him when he went there. There are also many images of the Blessed One and many temples.

“Thence he joined some merchants going to some small islands to the east and after one month of navigation he reached an island in which there was Potala, the king of the mountains. According to some this is the small Potala. Anyhow it is evidently the Potala on the land accessible to men. There he visited a rock-crystal cave, the place sacred to Mañjībhadra-kumāra, then the place sacred to Bhrūkuṭi, the cave of the golden face of the Asura, the place sacred to Tārā and the places sacred to Brahma, Viṣṇu, Mahendra, each one with a self-created temple in the mountain. Moreover he visited the place where it was possible to have the vision (of the god).

\[1\] For Uliṅga Sambhalai Pam yig reads Umāliṅga, Buddhist-gupta adds that he was the only Indian to be there; anyhow, it seems to me that these two islands, we do not know (in what direction from Ceylon), must have possessed rather big harbours and been on the trade route if Buddhagupta was able to embark there on a big ship.

\[2\] Groṅ K'yer c'en po lho byaṅ gūṅ snaṅ śiṅ / de gūṅ re rei sraṅ bar lam bī ma bdun tsam re’gro ḅgos pai lam yod pa / groṅ k'yer gūṅ gūṅ kyī par na ri lho byaṅ du gsum tsam ẑig ẑug paī ḅcig gĩ rtses mo na mts'an mo ḅod ’p'ro bai gser gyi brag c'uṅ du ẑig kyan snaṅ gsuṅ / der lo ḅcig ḅlag tsam bʐugs śiṅ śiṅ de na slob dpun klu sgrub p' ebs pai bʐugs k'ri daṅ becm ldan ’das kyi rdo sku c'en po maṅ po daṅ lha k'au maṅ du yod/
He also made the *pradaksīṇa* of the mountain. There was the celestial wood famous as the place of Mañjuśrī and the water falling down from that was really running there. He bathed in this water and made the *pradaksīṇa* of the various places round the top and the neck of the mountain. There are also one hundred mountains with rock-crystal peaks and caves of diamond the height of which cannot be imagined. When one comes to this island all impurities are so to say purified. The people of this island have no Buddhist or non-Buddhist religion nor are they Muhammadan. With the exception of the little ones there are no towns. There is a temple of Buddha which was made in former times. For protecting the boundary of the houses there are many yantras made by magical art which do not exist in India. In this island he saw men whose body was covered by their ears. They came from other islands’.

*Jāhāmigiri* is one of those adaptations of foreign names to Sanskrit or pseudo-Sanskrit forms which are so common in the geographical terminology of India. If we do not take into consideration the word, *giri*, mountain, which, just as *kūṭa*, generally means a hilly country...
and cannot therefore be considered as an essential part of the word, the element Jhāmi is left. If we remember the direction of the travel of Buddhagupta and the duration of his navigation we are bound to admit that the place where he landed and was called Jhāmi must be somewhere in the African shore or near to it. The name Jhāmigiri points out unmistakably to the country of the Zanj, that is, Zanzibar known also to Chinese sources as Ts’ong pa, which played a prominent part in the commercial communications of the period with which our source is concerned; but we must not forget that the “country of the Zanj” was generally called the eastern African shore.¹ One may object that even the people of Madagascar are in some Arabian writings referred to under the general designation of Zanj, the common name for “the black people”; but Zanj is nowhere given as the name peculiar to the island as is the case with Zanzibar or Eastern Africa. Moreover the country of Jhāmi is here described as being rather small, its length not exceeding seven days’ journey. On the contrary, the next island on the south of Zanzibar where Buddhagupta proceeded and which is described as being very great seems to correspond even in its geographical position with Madagascar. If this identification is, as I think, correct, it will be interesting to note that at the time of Buddhagupta, Madagascar was known in India as Potala, though its being considered as the abode of Avalokiteśvara and heard of as a kind of a fairy-land seems to show that the intercourse between that island and India was indirect and very rare. It will not, in this connection, appear out of place to remember that the researches of Ferrand have shewn that Indian culture left its traces in Madagascar and that even Sanskrit elements were introduced into Malgash language through the intercourse of sailors and settlers from Java. This means that for some time the island was within the reach, direct or indirect, of Indian culture. It also supposes that some information of the country reached India. It is quite possible that in the course of the centuries Potala as the seat of Avalokiteśvara shifted to this or that place, according to the beliefs of the various communities and the spreading of the geographical knowledge; but we cannot a priori exclude that Potala of the Buddhist tradition

was originally connected with some real island, even if afterwards
the legendary character of the country took the upperhand. In the
present case we are not in a position to establish how an island known
to India through sailors and semi-Indian colonies turned into the
abode of the god. Anyhow we find even in our text mention of some
features which in various and independent traditions are connected
with Potala and Madagascar at the same time. The rock-crystal
cave in the centre of the island may perhaps be connected with the story
told to Yuan Chwang by some Ceylonese monks, and according to
which some thousand ści to the west of Ceylon, there was the “great-
precious-substance-island” where there is a bright shining mountain;
but we have seen that our text knows of a similar mountain in the
country of Zanzibar already alluded to. As we saw, Potala is the name
of the country, but chiefly of the mountain which is the abode of the
god; now according to the Arabic sources in Madagascar there is the
famous mountain of Komr which gives the island its name and from
which the Nilus was supposed to spring forth. We find the same men-
tion of a holy river running down from Potala in our text as well
as in the description of Potala as we read it in Yuan Chwang. The
existence of a sacred mountain and a sacred river seems therefore
to be intimately connected with Potala, or rather the various Potala.
In Potala Buddhagupta embarked again and after a very long
navigation he reached Javadvipa whose name is translated in our text
as “the island of the barley” (nas). This means that the two places
were connected by usual sea-routes and therefore proves once more
the proposed identification of Potala of Buddhagupta with Madagas-
car, because we know the regular intercourse which took place
between the two islands through the medium of Malasian sailors.
There existed a permanent sea-trading intensified by the Portuguese
linking Java, Madagascar and Zanzibar.

In Javadvipa he found the followers of the Śrāvaka Sendhapa
and then he proceeded to a small island in the middle of the sea
called Vanadīpa (Baṅka?) where he saw the cave of Padmavajra
and found traces of many Tantras. Then he sailed to the north for
Ceylon and afterwards to Konkan.

“There is (in Konka) a self-created image of Mañjuśrī in the
middle of a pond. It is called Jñānakāya. The measure of the
body is like a small hill and it represents the god in the reclining
position. Then he saw also the bimbakāya which looks like a rainbow
raising the stūpa of the accumulated vapour beyond touch.” “Then
he embarked again and went to the south to Malabar and to a country near to it called Sambhudatta where he heard the Buddhist-sancāra-tantra and the Saṃvaravikrīḍita Haridarisaṅgiti and the Sahajatattva from the king Hariprabha (p'rog byed 'od) who had forded the ocean of the Vajrayāna and possessed all of the vidyās of the usual siddhas. He met again his gurus since he wanted the abhiṣeka in some other Tantric systems, but as money was required for that, he undertook a collecting tour in Trillūga, Trimalla and Kārṇāṭaka, gathering a good amount of donations.

"Then he started again with the purpose of visiting the small islands of the east; so through Jārikhāṇḍa and Jagannātha he went to Khasarpāna in Buntavarta (sic) where he spent in prayer about twenty days....Then he went to Tipura and to the highland of Tipura where there is Kasaraṅga or Devikoṭa. For some days he remained in the temple erected by the Mahāsiddha Kṛṣṇācārya, Thence he proceeded to Ra k'ān and to its places Harībhaṇja, Bu k'ān and Bal gu. In all these countries there is a great community of monks and the Buddhist teaching is widely spread. He stopped there for a long time and heard many treatises of the sūtra class and as far as possible the law of the secret mantras from paṇḍita Dharmikṣaghoṣa of the big stūpas in the temple of Harībhaṇja and equally from the lay paṇḍit Parhetanandaghoṣa in the country of Bal gu. Those gurus were the followers of the Mahāsiddha Śāntipāda. Then he embarked again and went to the island of Dhanaśri. In this island also there are very many monks. There is a great stūpa of immense proportion which is called Śrīmad-dhanyakaṭaka

I de nu koṅka nai gliṅ du p'ebs te/ dzña na kāya źes bye ba mts'o ni na' 'jam dpal gyi sku raṅ 'byui sku ts'ad ri c'uṅ tsam yod po ni stabs su gnas pa daṅ/ bimba kā ya ź'es bya ba nam mk'a la 'ja' ts' on šar ba lta bu me' od rten gyi gzung brian šin tu c'e ba źiṅ gsal ba dpal du ba 'k'rigs pa reg pa med pai mc'od rten du grags pa de yin te/......slar gru btaṅ nas lho p'yogs su ma lyār p'ebs 'di daṅ še bai yul p'ran šam bhu datta źes bya ba ni rdo rje t'eg pa rgya mts'o p'a rol soū ba/ t'un moṅ gi grub pai rtags ci rigs pa daṅ ldan pai rgyal po p'rog byed 'od źes bya ba la saṅs rgyas mنشأ 'byor gyi rgyud daṅ sdom pa rnam par rtsen pa/ daṅ lhan gcig skges pai de źid daṅ hāri darii glu dbyaṅs la sogs pa c'os maṅ du gsan/
or the stūpa with the offering or astukabhāya. Its basement has the same shape as the stūpa itself, it is surrounded by two rails in stone. It takes about one day for its pradakṣīṇa. On the east there is a very big town where there is enormous assemblage of merchants coming from different countries such as China, Europe (p'ren gi) and India. When he visited the asparāda pratibimbastūpa he saw the maṇḍala of the five kulas with Vairocana as their central essence, in the Jñānakāyastūpa the maṇḍala of the five kulas with Amitābha as the central essence, and in Śrimad-dhanyakālakṣa the maṇḍala of the five kulas with Akṣobhya as the central essence. Then together with some merchants he visited some very small islands such as another island in the middle of the sea called Potala, the island Paigu, an island occupied by the Europeans in which many medicinal herbs such as jāti and lesi are produced. Sadhadipa the great Suvarṇadvīpa, the small Suvarṇadvīpa, Sūryadvīpa, Candradvīpa, Sarvadvīpa.¹¹ Sāgara-

I de na (read de nas) sar po'yogs kyi gliṅ p'ran rnams gzigs par bṣes nas dsā ri k'anta dañ dsa gaṅ nā tha rgyud nas bhaṅga lal p'ebs/ yul bu ṇṭa bharta ru k'a sarba na mjal/ zag ni šu tsam gsol la adebs kyin žugs/........de nas Ti pu rar p'ebs/ ti pu rai yul gyi p'u ka sa ram ga'm devi koṭai gnas yod pa mjal bar mūzad ciṅ grub c'en po spyod pas bzhńs pai gtsug lag k'aṅ du ṣag šas bzhṅgs/ de nas ra k'aṅ gi yul gyi naṅ mts'an ha ri paṅja dañ bu k'an dañ sal gu rnams su p'ebs/ yul 'di rnams na dge sloy gi dge 'dun c'es maṅ ziṅ/ bstan pa lhag par dar ba yod pas/ yun riṅ rab re bzhṅgs siṅ/ ha ri bhaṅ jai gtsug lag k'aṅ mc'od rten c'en po žes bya ba žig nas dhamā kṣa gho ša žes bya bai paṇḍita c'en po žig dañ de bžin du bal gui yul du bzhṅgs pai par he ta nanda gho ša žes bya ba dge sjen paṇḍita c'en po žig la gsaṅ sṅgas kyi c'os kyaṅ ci rigs pa gсан mdo lugs kyi gāṅ maṅ po žon ṇan du mdad bla ma 'di kun yaṅ grub c'en bzi bai žabs kyi slob ma 'ba' žig yin gṣun de nas gru btaṅ sthe dha nā śrī gliṅ du p'ebs gliṅ 'di na'n dge 'dun śiṅ du maṅ si żin dpal dan abras spuṅ ņam mc'od rten dpal yon can žes kyaṅ bya ast ka kā ya žes bya ba mc'od rten c'en po no ho śin tu rgya k'yon c'ei bai brag ri mc'od rten gyi dbyibs can/ p'yi la rdo yi leags ri brag ri adra ba śiṅ rim kyis bskor ba/ śi ma goig la bskor ba t'ebs tsam/ šar du groṅ k'yer śin tu c'ei ba/ rgya nag daṅ p'ren gi dañ rgya gar la sogs pai yul t'a dad pai t'soṅ pa śin to maṅ bai t'soṅ 'dus c'en po 'dug gṣun/ daṅ po rīg pa med pa gzugs brāṅan gyl mc'od rten mjal bar
dvipa is further mentioned in connection with the younger Kṛṣṇācārya Bhubaripa and Bhubamati (bhu ba blo-Idan). We find him again in India studying Vajrayāna at the school of various Siddhas such as Gambhīmati, Ghanatapā, Siddhigarbha, Betatikṣaṇa, Vīrabandha, Gaṅgāpā. After having spent some time in Bodh-Gaya, Banda (bam dva) where he met the king Kumārapālabhadra, and Prayāga where he saw the great yogin Śubharakṣita, he proceeded to Jagannātha, Tipura and Bhīmeśvara. “He went again to Bhaṅgala or Tipura and Ra k'an and he spent in Assam (Kāmarūpa) about one year.

Afterwards he proceeded to Tibet and went to Lhasa passing through the monastery of bSam yas; then he visited the province of gTsan where he met Tāranātha. Having explained to him various Tantric texts and rituals, he took leave from his pupil and returned back to India passing via Kirong (skyid groi) on the Nepalese Himalayan range. From Nepal he came down to Bhanṣyaya (Bhainsi-duhan near Bhinyashedi) in Champaram (Bštiaḥ, tsam bā raṇa), the hill Khagendra and then through Magadha to Bengal and Tipura. While Tāranātha was writing his biography he heard that his guru was still living in Devikoṭa or in some other place near it.

These long travels towards the east are not less important than the previous ones in so far as they not only show a strong survival of Mahāyāna Buddhism but also seem to indicate that the sea-relations with Insulindia were at the time of Buddhagupta not yet interrupted.

We can quite easily follow the itinerary of the Indian sādhu from South India to Orissa where Jārikhanḍa or Jarakhanda and Jaganṇātha are located. Buntavarta is evidently a corruptio for Punḍravardhana corresponding to the districts of Bogra and Rājshahi. Khasarpāja cannot be exactly located, but its name seems to suggest that it is a high mountain. In fact Khasarpāja is known also to Tāranātha who takes it to be the seat of Avalokiteśvara but
locates it in South India perhaps wrongly identifying it with Potalaka. The fact that Puṇḍravardhana indicates the country bordering on the sub-Himalayan range seems to point out that Khasarpana was a general designation for the mountains bordering on the north Bengal. The identification of Tipura with Tipperah is self-evident. Kasaraṅga betrays in its Sanskrit form the name of the Khasi tribes populating the Khasi hills. Devikoṭa is the temple of Kāmākhyā near Gaulāṭi one of the greatest centres of Tantrism in India usually included among the four foremost pīṭhas and connected in the Buddhist tradition with the Mahāśiddha Kṛṣṇacārya. Buddhist images on the road leading to the temple are visible up to now.

Ra k'an is, as known, the general designation for Burma while Haribhaja is evidently a corruption for Haripūnja, north of Menam near Lamphūn, Bu k'an, which can also be Pu k'an (because in the manuscript at my disposal the two letters are often interchanged). Pu k'an corresponds to Pagan, Pukam, in the Cam inscriptions, P'u kan of the Chinese travellers and writers. It is at the same time the name of a district and of a town. the ruins of which are still to be seen on the left side of Irrawaddy. Bal gu, or Pal gu is Pegu in Burma. The information which Buddhagupta gives about Burmese Buddhism is of some interest because it is a new proof that even after the conversion of King Anuruddha of Pagan, the conqueror of Pegu, Mahāyāna flourished for long time in Pagan.

Dhanaśri corresponds to Tenasserim, Dahrasari of the Āin-i-Ākbār. It belonged, as is known, to Siam up to the middle of the xvith century and it was one of the most important trade centres in the Far East. It had a Portuguese settlement till 1641.1 The name

1 p'ren gi=later Sanskrit: phiraṅga, Hindi: pharaṅga is not given in our dictionaries (the usual forms being p'e ran, p'i liu, p'a ran, p'o ran, on which see Laufer, Loan words in Tibetan n. 141) Its mention here has some importance in so far as it seems to us that the form was probably introduced into Tibet from India rather than from Persia. As regards the form p'i liu, which is now very common in Tibetan for "foreign country" or "Europe," I fully agree with Laufer that it cannot be considered as the popular pronunciation of p'yi liu, but it is quite possible that it took the place of the original p'ren gi under the influence of that form. P'yi liu pa is not only a foreigner but also is opposed to naṅ pa, "the man of the inside"
of the pagoda or stūpa which was seen by Buddhagupta near the town, is worthy of notice; in fact Śrīdhānyakaṭaka was the name, as it is known, of a famous Buddhist place in Orissa which was held in a very high estimation by Mahāyana schools. It was after that place that one of the most famous monasteries of Tibet was called, I mean the dPal ldan ḷbras spuṅs (Mt. Debung) near Lhasa. On the other side modern research seems to show that the influence of Orissa was specially felt in Siam. Nor is it out of place to notice that even our text points out the existence of a land route connecting Kāmarūpa or northern Assam with Burma. Unfortunately we find no mention as regards the itinerary followed by Buddhagupta from Gauhāṭi to Pagan, but it seems to me that the road must have passed between the Mikir and the Jaintia hills and then reached Upper Burma through Manipur. This appears to have been the shortest and the safest since it avoided the violent rivers of the Lushai hills and the head-hunting tribes of the Nāgās. Of the remaining islands only Suvaṇṇadvīpa may be identified with Sumatra though the problems connected with this identification are complicated by the fact that Buddhagupta knows two Suvaṇṇadvipas, a small one and a big one. The mention of bSam yas is interesting in so far as it shows that Buddhagupta went into Tibet via Bhutān. This is suggested by the previous mention of Assam and by our knowledge of the roads between Tibet and India. It is generally believed that the usual intercourse between these two countries took place along the route, Darjeeling (rdo rje gling) and Gyantze (rgyan tshe) But this is wrong. This route is a new one as it was regularly opened in quite recent times and acquired its importance after the last Anglo-Tibetan war. But in former times there is no mention of it. There are good reasons for its being unknown in older texts. This road passes through Sikkim, and this country, populated chiefly by Lepchas, was converted to Buddhism by Lha brtsum c'enpo in the xvith century. The wild people of the country, the thick jungle which covered the hills and the absence of any Buddhist centre are the main reasons why the Sikkimmes road, though the shortest, was not used up to the end of the xvith century.

"the believer," it implies therefore not only a geographical difference but also a spiritual demarcation. Cf. in Chinese Buddhist texts nei and wei.
when Buddhism was firmly established in the country. In former
times the usual route of the Indian paññits to Tibet or of the Tibetan
lokāvas to India was through Nepal (Kirong and Kuti) where Marpa,
Ras ībyun, Rva lokāva travelled or through the Sutlej and Kulu as
in the case of Ur gyan pa and Stag gtsan ras pa. Eventually even
the Ladak route through the Zojila was followed, though, it appears
to me, not so common as the other routes. But in all rnam thars and
other Tibetan sources accessible to me no mention whatever is to be
found of the Sikkimese route. On the other hand, the fact, that in
our text mention of bSam yas is made, excludes the probability that
Buddhagupta went into Tibet via Nepal, that is, along the route which
he followed when coming back to India as it is expressly stated in our
text. If he had gone to Lha sa by this way he could not have reached
bSam yas without deviating from his road, since we know that
bSam yas is on the road to Bhutan, a country very early converted
to Buddhism and a great centre of Tibetan learning. It was in fact
there that one of the most important branches of the Bkaḥ īgyur ba
sects, that of the īBrug pa, had its origin and wide diffusion.
Anyhow, as stated before, the mention of Assam without referring
to any further movement of Buddhagupta to other places makes us
believe that he started just from there. We know that there was
such a route from Bhutan to Assam through Devaṅgiri and that
this route was largely followed by the Tibetans coming down to
India to visit the place of the Mahāparinirvāṇa of Buddha. It is in
fact well established that according to some Tibetan traditions,
accepted also by the author of the Šam bha laḥi lam yig (but the origin
of which we are not yet in a position to trace), Kuśinagara was in
Assam. The place seems to be, as pointed out by Waddel, the
village Salkusa some nine miles north-west from Gaunāṭṭi on the
northern bank of the Brahmaputra. Unfortunately no mention of
Kuśinagara is in our text, so we cannot say whether the location of
Kuśinagara, the place of the Mahāparinirvāṇa, in Assam was current
among the Indian Buddhists of the 16th century.

GUISEPPE TUCCI
Fire-arms in Ancient India

(1) Introduction

There has been a great deal of uncertainty regarding the nature of the weapon of offence called āgneya-astra, frequently mentioned in the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata. Many have taken it to mean a gun. We shall see that it was no doubt a fiery arm, but not a fire-arm. The latter i.e., a weapon whose charge is expelled by fire, while the former might be a fiery arrow. The word, 'astra,' means a missile, and 'āgneya,' of fire. There was another weapon called śataghnā, also called śataghniḥ, which has been interpreted as a cannon. The word literally means a weapon that can kill a hundred at one time. It was not a cannon originally, but the name was applied to it in later times. Another weapon called, nālīka, underwent similar change. Originally it was a tubular arrow, but subsequently it meant a gun. It will be further seen that there was a large number of weapons of various names, all apparently belonging to the āgneya-astra class. They were all projected by means of a bow.

(2) Classification of arms

Before we proceed to enquire into the nature of āgneya-astra, it will be well to take a broad view of the 'āyudha,' the weapons of offence in use in ancient India. A well-known classification consists of (1) astra, which is discharged, and (2) śastra, which is not. This is the primary classification adopted in the Agni Purāṇa, and the Śukra-Nitisāra.¹ This Purāṇa as well as the Vaśiṣṭha Dhanurveda classify them into (1) yantra-mukta, discharged from a machine, e.g.,

¹ The editions of texts used in this article are: Purāṇas, Rāmāyana and Mahābhārata, Calcutta edition; Śukranītisāra by Jivananda, Calcutta; Kautilya's Arthasāstra, Sanskrit Text, (1st edition) by R. Šāmasāstrī. My translations of Kautilya passages differ in many places from those of the translator.
stone from a kṣepanī (projector) and arrow from a bow; (2) hasta-
mukta, discharged from the hand, e.g., stone and javelin; (3) mukta-
amukta, thrown and brought back, e.g., a spear; and (4) a$mukta,
which never leaves the hand, e.g., a sword. This classification based
on the manner of use of the arms takes no account of the weapons
of defence such as the shield and coats of mail. It should be noted
that there is no mention anywhere of any weapon projected by
means of fire.

Kauṭilya (p. 101) gives a mixed scheme based on construction
and use. It is as follows:—Heavy stationary engines, e.g., (1) Jāma-
dagnya, known also as mahāsara-yantra, or simply as mahā-yantra,
for shooting heavy and long range arrows; (2) Parjanyaka, a water
machine, probably a water-tower with hose to put out fire;
(3) Portable or hand weapons with obtuse or blunt ends, e.g., gadā,
a mace, triṣūla, a trident, śataghnā, explained by the commentator
as "a big pillar with immense number of sharp points on its surface
and situated on the top of fort-walls"; (4) Long weapons with lance-
shaped heads, e.g., śūlā, a lance, kuntā, a spear, śakti, a heavy dart;
(5) Bow and arrow, (6) Swords; (7) Flat weapons with keen edge,
e.g., kuṭhārā, an axe, paraśu, a scimitar; cakra, a disc, &c. (8) stones,
hurled by hand or machine.

(3) Divine Weapons

There was another classification of weapons into 'divya,' divine, and
'mānava,' ordinary. The divya-āstras were uncommon weapons deadlier
than the ordinary, the construction of which was known only to a few
who possessed godly power. Divya-āstras were also known as 'māntrika',

1 This description agrees with accounts found elsewhere. Sāb.la-
kalpa-druma quotes an authority to say that śataghni is a large piece
of stone having iron spikes fixed into it. So also Vaijayantī kosa.
From the Matsya Purāṇa (ch. 117) we learn that it used to be placed
in large numbers on the tops of fort-walls. Evidently it was let
fall on enemies attempting to climb the wall. But in that case
Kauṭilya would have placed it in the first class. The Mahābhārata
(Droṇa P.) informs us that it was carried on wheels. It is perhaps
on account of its portability that Kauṭilya put it under the third
class. It is, however, clear that śataghni, whether stationary or port-
able, had nothing to do with fire.
requiring 'mantra' to be uttered before its use. There was another class of weapons called 'āsura,' demonical, the construction and use of which were known to the Āsuras. In later times when guns and cannons were invented, Śukra classed them as āsura. These could neither be placed among the divya-astras, which were secret, nor with the mānava-astras which were too common. In the above list Kauṭilya has mentioned only the mānava astras. There was yet a fourth class, the Rākṣasa-astras, the weapons of the wild aborigines, consisting of stone and branches of trees thrown by the hand. This class was not recognised as worthy of study.

(1) The bow and arrow

The bow and arrow were the most important weapons of offence dating back to the time of the Ṛg-veda, and continuing down to the sixteenth century. They figured side by side with guns for at least four centuries and are still in use among the aborigines of India who cannot procure guns for hunting. Books on archery were written in ancient times and were known as Dhanurveda, the science of the bow. The science was regarded as an off-shoot of the Yajurveda and taught by Brahmān experts to their Kṣatriya pupils, who alone could lay claim to it on account of their military profession. Brhaspati and Śukra, Viśvāmitra and Vaśiṣṭha, Vaiśampāyana and Śārīrogadharā and perhaps many others wrote on Dhanurveda, but unfortunately most of them have been lost, and only one, that by Vaśiṣṭha, has been lately published.1 It is to a certain extent a modernised edition of an older treatise on archery bearing the name of Vaśiṣṭha who was a celebrated teacher and said to have been the foremost writer on Dhanurveda. Fragments of the science of archery are found in many books, such as Vyaktikalpataṇu by Bhōjarāja, Niśāra by Śukra, The Agni Purāṇa has given in three short chapters a more detailed account which agrees in most parts with Vaśiṣṭha. Both of them appear to have borrowed their accounts from an older source.

The common name for bow was 'dhanus.' But there were distinctive names. Kauṭilya calls one made of Tāla (Palmyra palm)

---

1 The Sanskrit text has been edited and translated into Bengali by Iśvara Chandra Śāstrī and published by Arun Chandra Sinha, Calcutta.
wood a 'kārmuka', of Cāpa (a bamboo) a 'cāpṝ', and also 'kodanda', of Dhanvan wood (lit. the dhanus wood, Dhāman of our vernacular, species of Grewia and perhaps also of Cordia) 'dronga', and of Śrıṅga (horn) a 'śāruṇa.' The famous bow of Arjuna was gāṇḍiva, so-called because it had prominent knots. It was probably made of bamboo. The bow of Śrīkṛṣṇa was of horn. The wood of the Dhanvan tree is flexible and straight-grained and fit for a bow, whence the name. From Vāsiṣṭha we gather that the bows were usually four cubits or six feet long. Hence a 'dhanus' became a standard measure of length. The dhanus of the gods were longer. That of Mahādeva was five and a half cubits long. The horn bow of Viṣṇu was five feet long. But the horn bows as used by men were a little shorter. These bows were used by elephant-men and horse-men, those of bamboo by chariot-men and infantry. Besides bamboo and horn, metals and other kinds of wood were used in making dhanus. The metals used are said to be gold, silver, copper and steel. Perhaps these were used to embellish the bows. The horn was procured from buffaloes and a kind of antelope called Rohiṣa and a wild animal called Śarabha.¹

¹ The animal is thus described in the Vāsiṣṭha-dhanurveda. "It has eight legs, four of which are upwards. Its horns are long. It is as high as a camel, lives in forests and is well known and hunted after in Kashmir." It is believed to be a fabulous animal, because of its so-called eight legs. This part of the description is a fiction, but there cannot be the least doubt of the existence of the animal whose flesh was eaten and which furnished horn for bows. The horn of wild buffaloes may measure more than eight feet along the curve. The question is what other animal could supply the horn for bows? It is obvious, the horn must be hollow, and we should therefore search among the family of Bovidae. We gather from other books, that its eyes are situated higher up the head, it can be seen only in forests and can dare attack a lion and is strong enough to kill it, 'simaḥghatīn'. From Rājanighanṭu we gather that it looks like a lion (mahiḥ-simha), has enormous horns, black shoulders, (perhaps black hair on the neck), is very intelligent and lives in mountainous regions. This description would tempt one to think of bison which might have been found in Kashmir. Possibly the name Śarabha was Sanskritized from 'sar', a common name for the deer in use among the natives of the Himalayas. The horn of Rohiṣa and Śarabha need not be very long.
Of the various kinds of wood, Vaśiśṭha mentions candana (sandal), vetra (rattan cane), dhanvan (dhāman), śāla, sālimali (Bombax), śāka (teak), kakubha (Terminalia arjuna), bamboo and aśjana (?). But it is difficult to see how efficient and lasting bows could be made of trees like candana, śāla and śāka. Probably they were used in making maha-yantra, the machine for hurling stones, etc. It may be noted that Tala (Palmyra palm) is not included in the above list. Bhojarāja names only horn and bamboo. Agni Purāṇa tells us that the maximum length of a bow is six feet, medium length five feet and the minimum length four and a half feet.

For strings of the bow Kauṭiliya mentions fibres of mūrvā (Sansviera), arka (Calotropis), ṣaṇa (Crotonaria), gavethu (Coix), venu (strips of bamboo), and snāyu (gut). Vaśiśṭha recommends silk cord as thick as the little finger, and in its absence snāyu (gut) of deer, buffalo, and goat, or strips of mature bamboo tied with silk, or fibre of arka (Calotropis). Agni Purāṇa mentions cotton thread, muṇja (the muṇja reed), bhāṅga (Cannabis hemp), and snāyu (gut).

Arrows are called 'iṣu' by Kauṭiliya. The word is derived from the root 'iṣ' to move. The shafts of the arrows were made from venu (bamboo), śara (the reed, Saccharum arundinaceum), ṣālaka (thin stick), dāṇḍāsana (?), and nārāca (of iron). The points were made of iron, bone, and wood, so as to cut, pierce and thrust. It is to be noted here that the word, 'bāṇa', is not used for an arrow. Similarly Vaśiśṭha speaks of śara (arrows) and not bāṇa, because śara was the chief material of the shaft. It is also called kāṇḍa, the reed. The reed measured two cubits or thirty-six inches, and was as thick as the little finger. The points were given various shapes for piercing, cutting, etc. They had special forms for opposing and cutting bāṇa on its way. Nārāca was a bāṇa made entirely of metals. Bhojarāja uses the word bāṇa as a general name for arrows and insists on the lightness and stiffness of the shaft, and sharpness of the point. According to him a nārāca is ribbed and the point is either sharp or rough. Vaśiśṭha also describes nārāca which is entirely made of iron, five sided and five feathered. It is said that very few succeed in shooting a nārāca.

It seems agni-bāṇa was the result of fastening to nārāca inflammable materials. The modifications of the agni-bāṇa or āgni-āstra were known under various names. All were 'divya-āstras', that is to say, uncommon weapons. Vaśiśṭha names seven classes of divyā-āstras. They were Brahmāstra, Brahmāndaṇḍa, Brahmaśīra, Pāśupata,
Vāyavya, Āgneya and Nārasiṃha, and we are told that they had numerous forms. Unfortunately the construction is kept secret. But they were all known as 'bāṇa' and not 'śara', and required careful handling. Before discharging the arrow, concentration of attention was secured by repeating Tāntrika mantras. As to the effective range of common arrows, we are told that for the best archer it is sixty dhanus or 120 yards, for the next best 80 yards and for the worst 60 yards. But for nārāca, the distances should be 80, 60, and 32 yards respectively. A man who could pierce through metal plates half a finger in thickness, or twenty-four layers of leather was considered proficient.

(To be continued)

JOGESH CHANDRA ROY
MADHYASUDANA'S TEXT (Jivänanda's Ed.)

pračīnāmāgā sarāṇām dharmāvirāhārīni kṣetraḥ śruṇā māhātā sūdā
nīdānām narājājām vicaksitā śruṇā māhātā nirmākāre bhrāmāre
ākāraśāvarāṇām tattvāt śāmbhitā kośātākāre sarvāke
kāntāṃ mānḍūrāṃ vitarkitā kārṇāna śāvarāṇaśāhāṃ: 118-51

*The text is continued from the previous issue, p. 627.

1 Here before this verse, A, E, F add prāśavāsāra; B, C, D, prāśavāsāra.

2 śrāddhe B, C, D.

3 ārāme C.

4 uttarāvirāhārī B, C, D; dharmāhāritkaṇṭaḥ E, F.

This is omitted in A, but space is left for these words.

5 nidānā B.

6 prākṛtyānātmaḥ B; prākāraḥ prāntaṃ B, C, D.

7 nāgālāke RS, CS; nāgālāke B, C, D, G, H.

8 viśeṣāke B, C, D, E, F read lokākāraṇapāke. A drops this line as well as the next, but space is left in the Ms for them.

9 Dām, ii, 3.
Our Text

Madhusūdana's Text (Jivānanda's Ed.)

स्वेतं कृत्तवृक्षोक्तान् विद्वद्वन्द्वं यूनस मनः स्वेतयम्
अम्मोजानिनि निनीदिनां सुगुणां मानन सखुमूलयन。

ज्योतिष: कन्दर्यक्तम: कवलयम्मोजानिनीमुदितयन्
कोकनाष्ठयन्त्र दिशो चक्षुषविषं पञ्चिमकिन्तु: सङ्कुज्जायते ॥१६॥

अध्यापि तन्त्रोद्दगविषये रूपमः हृदि
स्थातु वात्सलित मान एव धिगिति कोपाधिवालोप्तिः।
प्रोष्ट दूरा ॥६॥तरप्रसारितकाः कर्त्तवसो तत्त्वेनान्
पुक्तकृपक्षोपनित्तः सर्वस्तिचिन्होक्षण शारी ॥१०॥

यात्स्याःतात्मानान्तर दिन्नक्तो वेरोते रामानित्वः
स्वेतं श्रीत्कारे: करै कमलिनिमालिबिं नोजयन।

1 स्वेतयम् in all Mss, except G, H.
2 PR vii, 60; Dām. ii, 4. The first line of this verse is dropped in A, but space is left for it.
3 A, E, F read प्रचिते before this verse.
4 स्तन्तरमाचारीसेवे A, E, F, G, H.
5 वामेकाळान्तर A, E, F.
6 उच्चन दूरा A, E, F; प्रोष्ट १० B, C, D.
7 Dām. ii, 5.
8 रोषेश, all Mss, except H.
MAHĀṆĀṬAKAM

MAHDUSŪDANA'S TEXT (Jīvānanda's Ed.)

शीतपर्यंतवायः सम्प्रति तथा गुणे ९ सुखाम्योहे
हसेनैव ८ कुमारतीवि नित्या वेद्यपण्यविषुः। ॥१०१॥

भोरामः सलीं प्रति।

कर्तिष्ठमि: किमपूर्वि किं मठयजयः रोपिः किं पारदेः
रक्षाति स्वविकल्पाति: किमपूर्वि यावः यथवभियोऽपूः। ॥

एतत्त्वं करे रविमहे श्यायार्द्वादि रूपे
किंकान्तायुः चकोरसहि गृहे तुर्यार्थविष्ये। ॥१०२॥

पञ्चरथ्यासारिकः सभीनां स्वमन्त्रामाधवाधिपः पदति।

जहाँ कीदाशतान्तिकतिमिर्जवचासुव्यासंहारेकः।

1 ॐस्तवेऽम्येत्वा A.
2 स्त्रे A; सुधे E, F.
3 हर्षयेषु B, C, D.
4 Dām. ii, 6.
5 चाथ सलीं प्रति भोरामः B, C, D.
6 Dām. ii, 7.
7 मन्दिरासारिकः G, H.
8 स्वपुरुषागमनव्याजाधिपः B, C, D; स्वमन्त्रामाधवाधिपः A, E, F.
9 धर्मोः E, F.
10 चकः D.
Our Text

Madhusūdana's Text (Jīvānanda's Ed.)

काल्यासियोगः साही गगनसरसिजो राजते राजहसः।
सम्भोगारसमकुमा:ः क्रुदवध्वनवधौरोतःनिर्दारतिर्दोः।
देवः क्षीरोदजन्मा जयति रतिपत्तेवार्णनिर्माणः।
शणः ॥ ११०३॥

1. J notes the alternative reading सम्भोगः, which is given only by H and RS.

2. गारसम्काले A, E, F.

3. क्रुदवध्वनवधौरो B, C, D, G.

4. Is it possible that this verse is composed by the poet Nidrādaridra? One verse of this poet is quoted in Subhāṣītāvali no. 1362—Śārāgadhara-paddhati no. 3454, and this verse also bears the poet's signature in the same manner as in the verse under consideration. This trick is not unusual: cf. Kavīndra-vacana nos. 274, 518.

5. निर्वाणः B, C, D, G.

6. Dām. ii. 9. After this verse, A, L have the following comment: जन्त्रविभवायायोतीम् कामवात्सा कीताराम- पन्नः प्रविष्टा इति ध्वनिः ॥
महिनातकम्

मधुसुदनास टेक्स्ट (जिवनंदास एड.)

खलो गतां ॥

अष्टेछ कुस्त जनकतनम् द्वारकोमयानंतरं
पर्यंतरं विपुलपुञ्जकां रायवो नवरामकाम।
बाणान पथं प्रवदति जनं पञ्चवणोप्रमाणी-
वाँपि चं मां प्रहरति षानेव्याहरश्राविनाय॥१०५॥

अन्त्येऽन्त्येऽ बाहुपरशमरंसंसरसीशिष्टोतथा युनो-
भूयो भूमः प्रभुभिभिमतभेषु जोतोन्तजः एव।
संसारो गर्भसारो नव इव महुराल्पीनः काहिनोभा
गाढः चाहिंय गाढः स्वपिडः न हि न हीति चुनो बाहुल्यः॥१०४॥

वर्णः तत: फणिवलम्बीविष्टिकं स्वे
विनयस्य चान्त्रनथानासुपुरुषगर्भं।

1 Omitted in B, C, D.
2 द्वारकोमयानतरं B, C, D.
3 पर्यंतरं B, C, D, G ; पर्यस्तालं A.
4 प्रभुभीति A.
5 व्याहरसु व्याविनाय A, E, F; खलो व्याहरस्तव विनाय
B, C, D.
6 Dām, ii, 10.
Our Text

Madhusūdana's Text (Jīvānanda's Ed.)

रामोज्जश्वीरि गृहाण सुखेन वाले
तच्छ्यान्ना तत्थर्ग मधुरि प्रसादुम्।१०५॥
मन्दे मन्दे जनकतनया तां चतुर्वां विषय
स्वें जहे तद्धरमधू प्रमतो मीलानि।
मेरे तस्यात्तदतु कवलानु धर्मकामायार्यमोक्षान्।
राम: कामे मधुरमध्य्रेण ब्रह्म पीतवापि तस्याः।॥ १०७ ॥
ख्यां सीतार्या रामः। २
भालिस्म वित्तस्यत्र प्रमतो जय्याहुश्येव।
स्तनोपरि स्थापितपाणिपर्व चछवासनिष्ठा। हरिणण्यतानि।॥ १०८॥

1 Nos. 105, 106, 107 = Dām. ii, 12, 13, 14. These verses are omitted by all Mss and printed editions, but are probably taken from Dām. by J.
2 Omitted in B, C, D.
3 RS notes also the reading वित्तस्यत्र।
4 चछवासनिष्ठा B, C, D; चछवासनिष्ठा F, F.
5 Dām. ii, 15.
Fa-hien's Parvata-giri, Watters with some hesitation restores it as Bhramara-giri, and identifies it with Śriparvata,¹ where, according to the testimony of Tibetan writers, Nāgārjuna spent the latter part of his life.² Yuan Chwang, however, does not state clearly that Nāgārjuna lived at Po-lo mo-lo-ki-li, which may have been a Buddhist establishment built at his instance within the province of Dākṣiṇa Kośala. To identify this mountain with Śriparvata, which, if identified with a mountain near Dhanakaṭaka, must have been more than 50 miles distant from any part of Dākṣiṇa Kośala, seems to me to be wide of the mark.

Tibetan and Sanskrit Traditions

Yuan Chwang's mention of Nāgārjuna in connection with Dākṣiṇa Kośala and the identification of this country, as suggested by Cunningham, with "the ancient province of Vidarbha or Berar, of which the present capital is Nagpur"³ reminds us of the Tibetan tradition which says that Nāgārjuna was born of a brahmin family of Vidarbha.⁴ The Lawāvatāra could have been pointed out as the source of this tradition if the "Vedalyāṃ" of the undermentioned verse could have been shown to be a locality in Vidarbha or if the word had been a variant for Vaidarbha,"⁵

1 Watters, op. cit., p. 207.
2 Tāranātha, op. cit., pp. 71, 81, 303; dPag. bsam. ljon, bsaṅ, p. 86: dPal. gyi. ri=Sriparvata or Śriśaila.
3 Cunningham, op. cit., p. 595.
5 Laṅkāvatārā, Sagāthakaṁ, p. 286:
\[
\text{द्रविधायवेदल्यां भिप्पम्: योमान्त सहायश:।} \\
\text{स्नात: स साहा तु सद्वस्यवेदार्जः॥} \\
\]
[At Vedali in the south, there will be the renowned monk known by the name of Nāga, supporter of the doctrine of both existence and non-existence].
6 The reading 'Vedalyāṃ' of Nanjio, followed by H. P. Śāstri, (Buddhistic Studies, ed. by B. C. Law, p. 853) is not warranted by the Tibetan version of the verse, which is as follows:

\[
\text{Iho-phyogs Vedahi yul du ni} \\
\text{dge-sloṅ dpal-klan ches grags-pa // etc.} \\
\]

The *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa* furnishes us with a few particulars about Nāgarjuna corroborating the *Laṅkāvatāra* but does not mention his birth-place or the chief centre of his activities. It says,—

[In the fourth century after my parinirvāṇa,¹ there will be a monk known by the name of Nāga engaged in doing good to the Faith. By attaining the Muditā stage (i.e. the first of the ten bhūmīs) he will live for 600 years. He will attain perfection in *Māyurīvidyā.*² That master of the knowledge of the various *śāstras* and *dhāṭus,* and of the non-reality of all things, will after demise be reborn in the Sukhāvatī, and will in due course attain Buddhahood].

*The Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa* confused with the Tāntrik-Nāgarjuna

The *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa*, belonging to a date prior to the 11th century A. D.,³ has very probably mixed up the traditions relating to more than one person bearing the name Nāgarjuna. It corroborates the *Laṅkāvatāra*⁴ when it states that Nāgarjuna will be the master of the

---

1 In the Appendix to Tāranātha, *op. cit.*, pp. 301, 303, Wassiljew writes that according to Sumbum of Toguan chutuktu, Nāgarjuna was born in Vīdarbha in the 400 years after Buddha's parinirvāṇa. See also *dPa*g. *saw.m. ljon. bca*ṅ, p. 83.

2 Nanjio speaks of six *Mahāyāmārājeyātis* (nos. 306-311). The earliest translation, dated 317-420 A.D., is attributed to Poh Śrīmitra, the next in order being that of Kumārajīva. See also *As. Researches, XX*, p. 516; R. L. Mitra, *Nepalese Buddhist Literature*, pp. 173, 292.

3 Its Tibetan translation was made in the 11th century. See Czoma Körösi, * Asiatic Researches*, vol. XX.

4 As the passage occurs in the last chapter (Sagāthakam) of the *Laṅkāvatāra*, the date of the tradition may be taken to be as old as
doctrine of existence and non-existence and that he will after attaining the *Mudita* stage (i.e. Pramudita, the first of the ten *bhūmis*), be reborn in Sukhāvatti, but it omits the prophecy that Nāgārjuna will propagate the Mahāyāna doctrine of Buddhism. On the other hand, it says that he will attain perfection in the *Māyūri-vidyā* and will live for 600 years. To attribute mastery of the *Māyūri Tantra* to the expounder of Mādhyamika philosophy looks absurd on the face of it, hence, it may be unhesitatingly stated that the *Mañjuśrī-mūlakalpa* makes a confusion between the traditions about the Mādhyamik-Nāgārjuna and the Tāntrik-Nāgārjuna. That there was a Tāntrik Nāgārjuna is proved by the tradition preserved in the dPal-bsam-ljon-bsaū (p. 86), in which it is recorded that, according to the account of the 84 mahā-siddhās (grub-chen-gya-bshi), one Nāgārjuna was born at Kāhara, a part of Kačī, was educated at Nalanda, where he learned the Śāstras, practised the Siddhis and visualized the goddess Tārā. He lived for some time at Gaṇṭāśaila and thence came to Śrīparvata.

Of the two traditions mixed up in the *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa*, I think, one originated in the *Lāhūvatāra* and the other in the *Mahāsiddhi-Vṛttiśnta*. Taking Nāgārjuna to be a single person, his span of life has been supposed to be of 600 years. Tāranātha obtained much of his information from the *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa* and gave currency to the view that Nāgārjuna lived for 600 years, or more correctly, 529 or 571 years. Though the author of the dPal-bsam. ljon. bsaū has recorded the traditions separately he was not sure about the fact that there were two Nāgārjunas, as he described the first Nāgārjuna as successful in the sādhana connected with the goddesses Mahāmāyūrī and Kurukullā. In the Tibetan tradition, how-

the 5th century A. D., because the Chinese translations of this chapter were made by Bodhiruci (513 A. D.) and Śiksānanda (704 A. D.). See also J.R.A.S., 1925, p. 835; Walleser, Life of Nāgārjuna (Hirth Anniversary volume), pp. 20, 21.

1 *Lāhūvā*, p. 286; प्रकाश नीति सन्दर्भ महायात्मादत्तरसि।
2 This has been pointed out by Dr. B. Bhattacharya in his Intro. to the Sādhanaṃalā, vol. II, p. xlv.
4 pp. 85, 86
5 For particulars about these Tāntrik goddesses, see Dr. B. Bhattacharya’s Preface to the Sādhanamalā, vol. II.
ever, one Nāgārjuna is counted as a Tāntrik guru, being the disciple of Saraha\(^1\); hence it is quite possible that the incidents of the life of the second Nāgārjuna have been mixed up with those of the first. Confusion was further helped by the fact that this Tāntrik Nāgārjuna had as his disciple one Kaṇaripa, who was also called Āryadeva \(^2\)

**Tāranātha's statements utilised for entangling the traditions**

For disentangling these traditions, we may utilise Tāranātha's division of Nāgārjuna's life of 620 years into three periods, viz., 200 years in the Madhyadesa, 200 years in the south, and 129 or 171 years on Śriparvata.\(^3\) Tāranātha linked up the life-span of the first Nāgārjuna with that of the last, and as the belief in the capacity to prolong life through Tāntrik methods was then current, he did not think it absurd in any way that a person should live for about 600 years. Nāgārjuna of Madhyadesa was very probably the student of the Prajñā-pāramitās and the expounder of the Śūnyatā philosophy, while the Nāgārjuna of Śriparvata was born in the south probably 400 or 500 years after the first Nāgārjuna and spent the latter part of his life on

---

1 *dPags. sain. lyon. byaṅ*, p. 124, based on the account of the 84 *Mahāsiddhis*. See also *Śādhanamālā*, II, intro., p. xli. Tāranātha (p. 105) also mentions him.

2 *Ibid.*, p. 124. It is not unlikely that this is also a confusion made by the Tibetan writers with Āryadeva of the Mādhyamika school.

3 Tāranātha, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

4 It may be shown from traditions of these two Nāgārjunas that the Mādhyamika Nāgārjuna lived in or about the first century A. D. The second Nāgārjuna, whose disciple met Yuan Chwang, may be placed in the beginning of the 6th century A. D. If the total length of time from the birth of the first Nāgārjuna to the death of the second Nāgārjuna be taken as 529 or 571 years, as Tāranātha states, then the date of the first Nāgārjuna is to be taken back to just the beginning of the Christian era or a few decades earlier. The latter alternative fits in with the prophecy as recorded in the *Laṅkāvatāra* and the *Mahāvīrāṃalakalpa* that Nāgārjuna will come into existence in the fourth century after Buddha's death. Some may say that Nāgārjuna, the Mādhyamika expounder, lived in the first century B. C. In another paper, this point will be dealt with,
Śrīparvata, converting it into a centre of Tārā worship. In all probability it was the Tāntrik Nāgārjuna, who was regarded as the great alchemist. Yuan Chwang says that he met a disciple of Nāgārjuna and that the first Nāgārjuna lived somewhere in Dakṣinakośala at a place consecrated by an Aśokan tope, which perhaps will come to light at some future date. In his Geographical Dictionary, Mr. De writes that there is near Nāgpur a place called Rāmagiri (mod. Rāmtek) where a temple is said to have been dedicated to Nāgārjuna. Taking into account all these evidences, it may be stated that the first Nāgārjuna had nothing to do with the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa, Śrīparvata, or Dhānyakaṭaka, and that his activities were confined to Dakṣinakośala. The Sanskrit inscription at Jaggayyapeta recording the establishment of a Buddhapatimā by the donor and his aspiration to Buddhhatva cannot but be a record of a comparatively late date and hence its reference to Nāgārjunācārya is evidently to the Tāntrik Nāgārjuna.

The Gauḍāsyaṇḍha, a work of about the 2nd or the 3rd century A.D., speaks of Dhānyakara as a great city of Dakṣināpatha and a seat of Maṇjuśrī, who lived in an extensive forest at Māla-dhuvajayāhacaitya and converted a large number of Nāgas and other inhabitants of that place, but refers neither to Nāgārjuna nor to Śrīparvata. It is in the Maṇjuśrīṃulakalpa that Śrīparvata and Dhānyakaṭaka find mention as important centres of Buddhism, and hence these should be associated with the second Nāgārjuna rather than with the first.

1 The conversion of a centre of Tārā worship into that of Durgā or Pārvati is not uncommon. There is now a Śivadurgā temple at Śrīparvata (See De, Geog. Dict., p. 193). This fact has led Beal to identify Po-lo-mo-lo-ki-li with Śrīparvata.

2 This raises the question, as to the contemporaneity of Nāgārjuna with Sātavāhana; the authorship of the Suhriltekha (JPTS, 1886); the discoverer of the so-called elixir of life, and the identity of Nāgārjuna about whom fresh information has been supplied by Prof. Sylvain Lévi in his article “Sur le Buddhism de basse époque dans l’Inde” in the Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, vi, pt. 2. As these topics fall beyond the scope of this paper, I wish to deal with them in a subsequent issue of the Quarterly.

3 Watters, op. cit., i, p. 287. 4 Sv. Rāmagiri.
5 Burgess, op. cit., p. 112. 6 A. S. B. Ms., leaf 21b.
7 Maṇjuśrīṃulakalpa, pp. 88, 628.
II

PA'i\u0161C\u0161A-M\u0161TUKAS

The occurrence of the terms 'Pacanekayika,' 'Sutantika,' Trepi\u0161aka, Sut\u0103\u0161ikin\u0161,' 'Petakin', Vinayamdhara in Barhut, S\u0161\u0103\u0161i and other inscriptions, has been generally accepted to imply that the Buddhists of the 3rd or 2nd century B.C. had a Tripi\u0161aka, one of which was the Sutta Pi\u0161aka, divided into 5 Nik\u0161yas, just as we have it today. Until the discovery of the inscriptions at N\u0161g\u0161\u0103juni\u0161\u0103\u0161a we had not come across any epigraphic record specially naming the Nik\u0161yas.

Vinayadharas and Sa\u0161yuktabh\u0161\u0161akas of Mah\u0161avanasa\u0161a

On the pillar of an outer railing of the Amaravati Stupa there is an inscription which describes some nuns as Vinaya\u0161hara\u0161as, and another inscription which speaks of the monks of Mah\u0161avanasa\u0161iya as Mah\u0161avina\u0161dharas. These two inscriptions distinctly prove the existence of a Vinayapi\u0161aka at that time.

An inscription on one of the slabs found near the central stupa of Amaravati refers to a monk of Mah\u0161avanasa\u0161a (Mah\u0161avanasa\u0161vathavasa), who was a pupil of the Sa\u0161yutabh\u0161tuka mah\u0161atheras [Sa\u0161yutabh\u0161tuk\u0103nan mah\u0161\u0103th(e)\u0161anam]. Burgess translated the word "Sa\u0161yutabh\u0161tuka" as "the brother of Sa\u0161yutaka," The letter "ta" of "bh\u0161tuka" in the plate is distinctly "na," Burgess probably was not aware of the use of the word 'bh\u0161\u0176aka,' a term not rare in the inscriptions, and read it as 'bh\u0161tuka.' It is only in the works of Buddhaghosa, we find that monks were used to be grouped as "D\u0161ghabh\u0161\u0161akas," "Majjhimanabh\u0161\u0161akas," "Sa\u0161yutabh\u0161\u0161akas" or "A\u0161guttarabh\u0161akas."

Now, the Sa\u0161yutabh\u0161\u0161akas of the above mentioned inscription.

1 Vogel, Ep. Ind., VIII, pp. 173, 196; Bloch, J. A. S. R., 1898, pp. 274, 280; Stede, Pƣi Dic\u0161t., sv. Pi\u0161aka; L\u0161ders' List.
2 Burgess, op cit., p. 37.
3 Ibid., p. 102.
4 Burgess, op. cit., p. 91 (Plate xliji, no. 35), see also p. 105.
5 See Index to L\u0161ders' List.
6 Sum. Vil., p. 15; Visuddhimagga, pp. 74, 76, 77: A\u0161guttara-bh\u0161\u0161ak\u0161; pp. 36, 266, 275, 286: D\u0161ghabh\u0161\u0161ak\u0161; pp. 275, 286, 431: Majjhimanabh\u0161\u0161ak\u0161; pp. 275, 431: Sa\u0161yutabh\u0161\u0161ak\u0161.
are associated with the Mahāvanasaṇa. Burgess adopts the reading ‘śāla’ for ‘sala’, and I think, he would have no objection if one adopted the reading ‘sela.’ From the Gāndavyūha we learn that on the east of the great city Dhanyakara, there was a great forest called Vicitramālaadhunājavyūha. So it is very likely that there was a series of forest-covered hills which went by the name of Pūrvasaila or Pūrvamahāvanasaṇa and Aparasaṇa or Aparamahāvanasaṇa, and these are referred to in Nāgārjunakoṇḍa inscriptions as Aparamahāvinasela.

From what has been said above as also from the Amarāvati inscriptions it may be inferred that there were, on the forest-covered hills near Dhanyakara, a few Buddhist establishments with a large number of monks and nuns, the latter being much in evidence as donors and donees of gifts. The establishments belonged to a Buddhist sect which had a Piṭaka divided into Sūtra and Vinaya, the former having sub-divisions, one of which was the Saṃyukta.

**Dīgha-Majhīma-Nikāya-dhara**

It is for the first time in the inscriptions at Nāgārjunakoṇḍa that we get the use of the words, Dīgha, Majhīma and Matyā, in passages like Dīgha-Majhīma-pa[m]ca-mātuka-osaka-vācikāṇamu and Dīgha-Majhīma-nikāya-dharena in the Āyaka-pillar C₁ and “Dīgha-Majhīma-paṁda-m[ā]tukadesa[k-a-vā]ca-kāṇamu” and “Dīgha-Ma-nigayadharena” in the Āyaka pillar C₂.

Any comment on the expressions “Dīgha-Majhīma” or “Dīgha Majhīma-Nikāya-dhara” is hardly necessary except this that the use of such appellations is not usual in the Pāli literature, where the appellations “dhamma-cathika,” “dhammadhara” are very

1 See Burgess, *op. cit.*, p. 105.
2 A. S. B. ms., leaf 21A: dhammakaram mahāvanasaṇa puṇḍra vijitavahāra uḍānāmaṃ paraṃ
3 *Ep. Ind.*, XX, p. 4.
4 See infra, for Dīgha and Majhīma.
5 Dhammakathikas, according to Buddhaghosa, are really Abhidhammikas, but he further says that ordinary Dhamma preachers are also called Dhammakathikas. *Attha*, p. 29.

Saṃyutta, III, pp. 162ff: See the answer given to the question, “kittavatā nu kho bhante Dhammakathiko hoti’ti”?

Its use is found also in the Amarāvati and other inscriptions. See Burgess, *op. cit.*, p. 24 and Index to Lüders’ List,
commonly found. The Pāli expressions which repeatedly occur in every Nikāya for referring to the masters of the various branches of the Buddhist literature are, "bahussuta āgatāgama dhammaddhara vinayadhara mātikādhara",¹ and not Nikāyadhara. The slight difference noticed in the sets of such appellations in the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa inscriptions and the Pāli texts tends to show that the inscriptions were concerned with a Buddhist sect which was not exactly the Theravāda (the Pāli School) but had a literature and tradition very similar to those of the Theravāda School.

We now pass on to the next expression 'Pimca-mātuka' which also points to the inference that the inscriptionsal records are concerned with a sect other than the Theravāda. The word 'mātuka' is evidently a corrupt form of Sanskrit mātrkā or Pāli mātikā. The common explanation of mātikā as given in the Pāli texts is Abhiddhamma. By the term mātikādhara, the Pāli texts refer to a master of the Abhidhamma Piṭaka. The interpretation has its origin in the tradition that Buddha preached Abhidhamma to his mother in Tāvatīṃsa heaven and gave its mātikā (= substance or main themes) to Sāriputta among his disciples, and that Sāriputta later on expanded the mātikās and developed them into the Abhidhamma piṭaka; hence the Abhidhamma has become synonymous with mātikā. The older of the Sarvāstivāda traditions, as preserved in the A-yu-wang king (Āsokarāja sūtra) and A-yu-wang-tehouan (Āsokarājāvadāna sūtra),² while giving an account of the First Council, says, that Mahākāśyapa, after completing the recitation of the Vinaya with the help of Upāli, proceeded to recite the Mātrkā or Mātrkāpiṭaka. Kāśyapa said to the bhikṣus that by the mātrkā or mātrkāpiṭaka one is to understand the following topics: 4 smṛtyupasthānas, 4 samyak-pradhānas, 4 rdīhipādas, 5 indriyas, 5 balas, 7 bodhaṅgas, aśūṅgika-mārga, (i.e. the 37 Bodhipakkhiyadhannas) as also the 4 Pratisāṃvits, the Samādhis; in short, the exposition of the precepts and the dharmas constitutes the mātrkā. In the Pāli texts also, these 37 Bodhipakkhiy-

¹ Majjhima, I, p. 223; CV. i 11; Aṅguttara, III, p. 78: dullabho bahussuto, dullabho dharmakathiko, dullabho vinayadharo; Attha., p. 15: Ānandatthero li bahussuto tipiṭkadharo. For further references, see P.T.S. Pāli Dictionary, s.v.

² J. Przyluski, Le Concile de Rajagṛha, pp. 45, 334; cf. Rockhill, Life of the Buddha, p. 160: mDo (Sūtra), Dulva (Vinaya) and Ma-mo (Mātrkā).
dhammas are often pointed out as the essentials of Buddhism. Though mātikā came to mean the Abhidhammapitaka in the Pāli texts, its use in its original sense is not excluded. While discussing whether the Kathāvattu can be regarded as 'Buddhabhāsa', it is contended by Buddhaghosa that Moggaliputta Tissa did not compose the work from his own knowledge but from the mātikā given by the Teacher (sattā dinnanamena ṭhapitamātikāya deseti). In support of this contention Buddhaghosa adds that the Madhupiṅढicasuttanta is regarded as Buddhavacana though it was Mahākaccāna's composition on the ground that it was only an exposition of the mātikā given (ṭhapitamātikāya) to him by Buddha. It is also in this sense that we find its use in the Vinaya texts, but there are a few passages in which mātikā means the Pātimokkha-Sutta. Later on, however, Mātikā more properly Dve-mātikā, became a technical name for the Bhikkhu-pātimokkha and Bhikkhuṇi-pātimokkha. Without multiplying

1 Dīgha, II, p. 119-120: (Mahāparinibbānasutta): Katame ca te bhikkhave dhammā mayā abhināya desita...? Seyyathidaṃ cattāro satipaṭṭhānā, cattāro sammāpadhānā, cattāro iddhipādā, pañc' indriyāni, pañca balāni, satta bojjhāni, ariyo aṭṭhaṅgiko maggo. In the Majjhima Nikāya (II, p. 245), Buddha just after enumerating these asked Ānanda if there were any two monks who held different opinions about them (imesu dhamesu dve pi bhikkhū nānavāde ti?), to which Ānanda answered in the negative. This conversation was concluded by the remark that there might in future be difference in opinion relating to minor rules of discipline (ajjhājīve adhipati-mokkhe) but not to these essentials. 2 Attha., p. 4.

3 E. g. Vinaya, Mv., I, p. 98:
Khandhake Vinaye c'eva Parivāre ca Mātike /
Yathathakāri kusalo paṭipajjati yoniso //
See also Vidhushekhara Śāstri, Pātimokkhasutta, p. 12-13: Naiva mātikāya na padabhājane vuttaṃ (Kālikā-Vitāraṇī Pāc. 19), in which mātikā means pada, i.e. of the Pātimokkhasutta.
4 See Mabel Bode, Pāli Literature of Burma, p. 6. She says in the footnote that her attention was drawn by Dr. Barnett to a book re-edited in Burma as Dve-mātikā, which included Bhikkhu- and Bhikkhuṇi-pātimokkha, Kammākammavincchaya, extracts from the Parivāra and other Vinaya texts, and a Pātimokkhuṃdesa,
instances, it may be stated that even in Pāli literature,  Mātikā means not only the Abhidhamma-piṭaka but also the Pātimokkhasutta, and for the matter of that, the Vinaya Piṭaka. Childers in his Pāli Dictionary (s.v. Mātikā), writes on the authority of Burnouf’s translation of the Saddharma Pundarīka, that it means “the list of the Vinaya precepts, omitting all the explanations and other details”. The “mātuka” of the Nāgārjunikōṇḍa inscriptions may therefore be taken to mean both Vinaya and Abhidhamma.

**Paṇca of Paṇcamaṭukā**

Now let us turn to the significance of the numerical adjective paṇca in the expression ‘paṇca-mātuka.’ The Pāli Vinaya-Piṭaka is usually regarded as consisting either of 4 parts or of 5 parts thus: (i) Pātimokkha, (ii) Vibhaṅga, (iii) Khandhakas, and (iv) Parivāra, or, (i) Pārājikā; (ii) Pācitītyā, (iii) Mahāvagga; (iv) Cullavagga and (v) Parivāra.1 The latter division is more common, and hence paṇca-mātuka may be taken to refer to the Pāli Vinaya or a version very similar to the same.

Much information is now available from the Chinese sources about the Vinaya texts of the different schools,2 and a flood of light has been thrown on them by Mons. Przyluski in his “Le Concile de Rājagṛha.”3

Among the Vinaya texts in Chinese, catalogued by Nanjio, we notice that four works have ‘māṭhya’ as a part of their names, viz., Sarvāstivāda-nikāya-vinaya-māṭhya, (1132); Mulasarvāstivāda-nikāya-

---

1 The corresponding Sarvāstivāda titles are,—(i) Vinaya-vastu, (ii) Prātimokṣa-sutra; (iii) Vinaya-vibhāga; (iv) Vinaya-kṣudrakavastu, and (v) Vinaya-uttara-grantha, see my Early History etc. pp. 283 ff.

2 For Dharmagupta Vinaya, see Journal Asiaticque, 1916; and for the Mulasarvāstivāda Vinaya, see Ibid., 1914; also Csoma Kūrösi in the Asiatic Researches, XX summarised in my Early History etc., pp. 282 ff.; see also my introduction to the Bodhisattva Prātimokṣa Sūtra (I. H. Q., June, 1931).

3 A work though published in 1926-28 is not widely known even among scholars writing on the first two Buddhist Councils, the main source of which are the Vinaya texts of different schools. They depend for their information on the paper by Prof. La Vallee Poussin published two decades ago, See Buddhist Studies (1931), Ch. II: Buddhist Councils, p. 26.
mātrkā (1134); Vinaya-mātrkā-sāstra (1138) of the Dharmaguptas,¹ Mulasarvastivāda-nikāya-vinaya-nidāna-mātrkā-gāthā (1140). Of these, the Vinaya-mātrkā-sāstra furnishes us with the information that the Vinaya Piṭaka (i.e. of the Dharmaguptas) consisted of five parts, viz. Khaṇḍa (kaṭhina, etc.), Mātrkā, Ekottara, Bhikṣu-Prātimokṣa and Bhikṣuṇī-Prātimokṣa.² Likewise, we are told that the Vinaya Piṭaka of the Mahāsaṅghikas was also divided into five parts and that the Mahāsaṅghikas had a particular fancy for the number 'five', specially in connection with the Vinaya, for they have repeatedly mentioned this number while speaking of the divisions of the Vinaya rules.³ We have seen that the mātrkā has been used to denote the Vinaya Piṭaka as much as the Abhidhamma; hence, the Pāriva-mātuka of the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa inscriptions may be taken to mean either a Vinaya-Piṭaka or an Abhidharma Piṭaka, in five divisions, Now, let us see if any school had the Abhidhamma Piṭaka in five divisions. The Abhidhamma Piṭaka, so far as is known to us, consists of seven texts whether in Pāli⁴ or in Sanskrit,⁵ and the Mahāsaṅghikas, so far as the traditions go, did not recognise the seven texts of the Theravadins as Buddhabhāsita,⁶ but had an Abhidharma Piṭaka of their own according to the testimony of Yuan Chuang,⁷ who further supplies us with the information that he himself studied certain Abhidharma treatises of the Mahāsaṅghika

1 Przyluski, op. cit., pp. 169, 316. "The title Piñi-mou (Vinaya mātrkā) indicates that this work is a mātrkā of a Vinaya, and at the end of the fragment translated, it is written that the Vinaya appertains to the Haimavata school.

2 Przyluski, op. cit., pp. 177, 353.

3 Ibid., pp 212: "Il y a cinq règles de la pureté"; p. 215: "Dans le Vinaya cinq choses sont relatées; p. 216: "Il ya a cinq Vinaya"


6 See Dipavamsa, ch. v, 32-38.

7 Watters, op. cit., II, pp. 161, 217.

I.I.Q., September, 1931
school with two monks at Dhanakāṭaka. If it could have been ascertained that their Abhidharma had five divisions, we would have no hesitation in stating that the Paṃca mātuka referred to the Abhidharma Piṭaka of the Mahāsaṅghikas. The only Abhidharma Piṭaka existing in five parts, as far as we know, is that of the Dharma-guptas, whose Vinaya-Piṭaka was in four parts, but as the inscriptive and literary evidences do not point to the existence of that school in this locality, they may be left out of account.

Coming to the Vinaya Piṭaka, we find that five of the principal schools, viz., Theravāda, Mahāsākya, Haimava, Sarvāstivāda and Mahāsaṅghika had their Vinaya Piṭakas in five divisions, and in view of the fact that the appropriate place of the Vinaya Piṭaka is after the Nikāyās, the term ‘paṃca-mātuka’ refers, I think, to the Vinaya-Piṭaka and to the one belonging to the Mahāsaṅghikas, because the inscriptive and literary evidences, as we shall see presently, suggest it.

III

SCHOOLS OF BUDDHISM CONNECTED WITH NĀGĀRJUNIKOṬA

The testimony of Yuan Chhwang about the schools of Buddhism prevalent in Dhanakāṭaka and its neighbourhood is our best guide in this enquiry. He says that in the twenty monasteries existing at the time, there were the monks of the Mahāsaṅghika School, and that on a hill to the east of Dhanakāṭaka stood the Pūrvaśaila monastery, and on a hill to the west, the Aparaśaila monastery. The inscriptions so far discovered in this locality nowhere mention the name of the Mahāsaṅghikas, as we find in the Karle Caves (Mahāsaṅghiyas). The names of schools, rather local schools, that are mentioned in these inscriptions are:

(i) Haṅghī (Burgess, op. cit., p. 105).
    Ayira-haghana (Ep. Ind., XX, pp. 17, 20).

(ii) Caityikas (Burgess, op. cit., pp. 100, 102).
    Cetiavadakasa (Ibid., p. 102).

1 Przyluski, op. cit., pp. 353, 357, 359.
2 Ibid.
3 See infra, p. 649.
4 Watters, op. cit., II, pp. 214, 217.
5 For references, see my Early History etc., p. 243.
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(iii) Aparamahāvinaseliya (Ep. Ind., XX, p. 41).
Mahāvanaseliyāna (Burgess, op. cit., p. 105).

(iv) Puvaseli (used not as a sect but a place-name, see Ep.
Ind., XX, p. 22).

(v) Rājagiri-nivāsika (Burgess, op. cit., p. 53).
Rājaśaila (Ibid., p. 104).

(vi) Sidhathikānaṇā (Ibid., p. 110).


(viii) Mahīśāsaka (Ibid.).

Drs. Burgess and Vogel have drawn our attention to five of the above-
mentioned schools, viz., (1) the Caityikas, comprising (2) the Apara-
svēyas and (3) Puvaseliyas, and (4) Bahusutiyas and (5) Mahīśāsakas. Of
these the Mahīśāsakas need not be taken into account, first because,
the donor who makes the gift to this sect hail from the distant province
of Vanavāsa, and secondly because it is a branch of the Sthaviravādins
and not of the Mahāsaṅghikas. All the other sects mentioned in
these inscriptions are branches or sub-branches of the Mahāsaṅghikas,

Āryasamgha = Mahāsaṅgha

My first object is to show that the Mahāsaṅghikas have been here
referred to as Ayira-hanḍha or simply, Hanḍha, for reasons stated
below. Whenever a sect is named in the inscriptions it is preceded
by the expression ‘Ācariyānaṇām,’ e.g., Ācariyānaṇām Aparamahāvin-
seliyānaṇām; Ācariyānaṇām Bahusutiyaṇāna; Ācariyānaṇām Mahīśāsa-
kanāṇām, hence Ācariyānaṇām Ayira-hanḍhānaṇaṇa refers to the sect of Ayira-
hanḍhas or simply Hanḍhas. In the Chinese titles of the Vinaya
texts, the Mahāsaṅghikas is sometimes shortened to Saṅghika,¹
and it is quite natural. The use of the term ‘Hanḍhi’ before “gaha-
patiputasa Dusakasa”² is significant. Burgess takes Hanḍhi as a
proper name, whereas, I think, it means ‘one belonging to the Hanḍha
(Saṅgha) sect.’ It is still more significant that a householder (gahapati)
is pointed out as belonging to the sect, a thing rather unusual in

¹ See Nanjio, 1159 [Prātimokṣa-saṅghika(saṅ-khi)-vinayamūla],
an extract from the text no. 1119 Mahāsaṅghika (Mo-ho-saṅ-khi)
vinaya).

² Burgess, op. cit., p. 105. See also pp. 72, 78, 90, 91.
Buddhism, but it should be remembered that the Mahāsaṅghikas, as the forerunners of the Mahāyānists, were the first Hinayānists to give a place to the laity in the Buddhist dharma. The derivation of the term 'Mahāsaṅgha', as offered by Yuan Chwang is as follows,—“And because in the assembly, both common folk and holy personages were mixed together, it was called the assembly of the great congregation”\(^1\). Hence, we should take 'Haṅgha' or 'Sāṅgha' as a proper name and a shortened form of Mahāsaṅgha. Then the use of "ārya" for "mahā" is not uncommon in Sanskrit or Pāli; hence "Āryasaṅgha" may well be taken to mean the 'Mahāsaṅgha'.

All the Andhakas (=Pubbaseliyā, Aparaseliyā, Rājagiriyā, Siddhatthikā) are specifically named in the inscriptions

The Caityikas were a branch of the Mahāsaṅghikas. Probably a section of the Mahāsaṅghikas attached great importance to the worship of the stūpa or caitya as is to be found in the Mahāvastu,\(^2\) and got the appellation of Caityika. But it is doubtful whether the Aparaseliyas or Pubbaseliyas were independent sects, though the commentary on the Kathāvatthu attributes to them some differences of view in regard to doctrine, and psychological analysis. In the Mahāvamsa\(^3\) it is stated that in later times, some (local) schools came into existence in India, viz., Hemavatī, Rājagiriyā, Siddhatthikā, Pubbaseliyā, Aparaseliyā and Vājiriyā.\(^4\) Four of these sects, viz., Rājagirikas, Siddhatthikas, Aparaseliyas and Pubbaseliyas are collectively called the Andhakas.\(^5\) The members of the Mahāsaṅghika sect, it seems, came to be known after the names of the hills, on which they had their monasteries, without probably vital differences in doctrinal and disciplinary matters. Yuan Chwang remarks that he saw only the Mahāsaṅghikas in the existing monasteries of Dhana-kaṭaka, and specifically refers to two monasteries, one on the Aparāśiḷā and the other on the Pūrvaśīḷā, without pointing out that they were two independent sects. Mrs. Rhys Davids infers from the statements of Buddhaghosa in his commentary on the Kathāvatthu

\(^1\) Beal, Records of the Western Countries, II, p. 164.
\(^2\) Mahāvastu, 11, pp. 362ff.
\(^3\) Mahāvamsa, p. 29.
\(^4\) Points of the Controversy, Intro,
that the Mahāsaṅghikas were not actually existing at Buddhaghosa’s time. Buddhaghosa, however, speaks of the Andhakas as existing in his time. The inference that can be drawn from these statements is that either the Mahāsaṅghikas came to be called by their prolonged residence in the Andhra country as the Andhakas or the four sects that issued out of the Mahāsaṅghikas were, by their residence on the hills of the Andhra country, called the Andhakas. To reconcile the statements of Yuan Chwang and Buddhaghosa, we may say that the Mahāsaṅghikas residing within the Andhra country were known as the Andhakas.

Dr. Burgess overlooked the fact that the terms, Rājagiri or Rājasaśīla and Sidhatthika, so often mentioned in the Amarāvati inscriptions, refer in some cases to the local sects as much as the Puvaseliya and Avaraseliya do. Sidhatthika is not in all instances the name of a person as Dr. Burgess supposes it to be. Except the Mahāsiṣakas, all the sects named in the inscriptions are branches or sub-branches of the Mahāsaṅghikas, hence it may be concluded that the whole Buddhist establishment at Nāgārjunikoṇḍa belonged to the Mahāsaṅghikas though visitors came there from far off countries for the great sanctity of the Stūpa, containing as it did, the bone-relic of Buddha. It follows therefore that ‘Dīgha-Majhima-Nikāyadhara’ or ‘Paṃcamaṃtukadesakāvācaka,’ mentioned in the inscriptions belonged to the Mahāsaṅghikas or the Andhakas as they were later on called.

Doctrinal Evidences point to the Andhakas

A remarkable aspect of the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa inscriptions is the mention of a few points relating to the Buddhist doctrine. Buddha is described as jita-rāga-dosa-moha (one who has conquered attachment, ill-will and delusion) and dhātuvaraparighita (possessed of the excellent dhātu), and the donor expects as a result of his or her gifts merits which he or she can transfer (pariṇāmetuṃ) to his or her relatives and friends—an article of faith not recognised in the Pāli works.

1 Points of the Controversy, p. xxxiv.
where attaṅga attasaranā is the maxim. The fruits expected are (i) religious merits, for himself, his relatives and friends resulting in their happiness in this world and the next (ubhaya-loka hita-sukhava-hanāniya), — a merit which reminds us of the Asokan inscriptions: esa bāḍha dekhiye iyaṁ me hidatikāye iyaṁmanā me pālatikāye ti and (ii) Nivāṇa-sampati (nirvāṇadom) for himself or herself.¹

The recording of the view that gifts may bring happiness to all, but nirvāṇa only to oneself, deserves our careful consideration. The distinction drawn in this way is rather uncommon and is not made even in the inscriptions recording the gifts of the Queen of Vanavasi to the Mahāsākas² or in the long inscription of the Sinhalese donor.³ This may well serve as an evidence to prove that all the inscriptions of Nāgārjunikonda except the two mentioned above belong to one sect, viz., the Mahāsaṅghikas or their sub-sect, or in other words, the Andhakas.

Then the expressions ‘dhatuvara-parigahita’ or ‘nivāṇa-sampati-sampādaka’ raise the presumption that the Andhaka-conception of Nirvāṇa was different from that of the Theravadins or their sub-sect the Mahāsākas. In the Kathāvatthu, there are two controversies (ix, 2; xix. 6), relating to the conception of Nirvāṇa as prevailing among the Andhakas. The one attributed to the Puvaseliyas is that the Amatapada (= Nirvāṇa), is “an object of thought of a person not yet free from bondage”,⁴ and the other attributed to the Andhakas is that “the Nibbānadhātu is kuśala (good)” in the sense in which mental states are spoken as kuśala (good) and it is a faultless state.⁵ Both these statements bear the implication that the Mahāsaṅghikas or the Andhakas conceived of Nirvāṇa as a ‘positive faultless state’ — a conception which can hardly be accepted by the Theravādins, who speak of realizing the Nibbāna within one’s own self (paccattaṁ veditabbo viññūhi) and not of grasping the same as some object producing pure happiness.⁶ Hence, the expression nivāṇa-sampati-sampādaka (the obtaining of the wealth of Nirvāṇa) cannot be the utterance of an adherent of a sect other than the Andhakas.

¹ Ep. Ind., XX, pp. 16, 18, 19, 20, 21: “atano” or “apano.”
³ Ibid., p. 22.
⁴ Mrs, Rhys Davids, Points of the Controversy, pp. 231-3.
⁵ Ibid., p. 339.
⁶ See Majjhima Nikāya, Mūlapariyāyasutta.
of Balarāma; but the use of the word Rāmānuja to denote Kṛṣṇa is not, so far as I have been able to discover, found prior to Śrīmad Bhāgavat. Indeed, it does not appear that even in later works this usage is common; for the Nighaṇṭus and dictionaries do not give this meaning. In Vaiṣṇava parlance, Rāmānuja usually denotes Lakṣmaṇa, the younger brother of Rāma; and the great Vaiṣṇava reformer of that name was himself so-called, because his actual name was Lakṣmaṇa. The use of the term Rāmānuja to denote Kṛṣṇa may suggest the inference that Mukundamālā was posterior in date to the Bhāgavat. In an inscription discovered in Pagan, which is of the 13th century, Mukundamālā is found quoted. In all probability Mukundamālā was composed in the 11th or 12th century; and I think that it was not and could not be the work of the Ālvar.

The particular verse of Mukundamālā, in which the name of the author is given, is not found in all editions, for example, in the Brhatstotra-ratnākara, though that collection purports to give the entire poem. In the editions of the poem by Prativādi-bhayaṅkara Anantācārya of Kānci, Ilayavilli Śrīvīvāsācārya of Kunṇapākkam, and Cinnāmī Raṅgācārya of Kumbakonam, theāloka, which appears as the concluding verse of the poem, is given as follows:—

वस्स भिधी ग्रु. तिष्ठरी कविवीक्षरी नियाधि विज्ञायसप्रयाराम्भसुतामः।
तेनाः दानयशे अवदय्येन राशा ज्योत्करिस्व द्वितिष्ठिवः॥

A manuscript in the Trivandrum Palace Library gives the first two padas thus:—

वस्स भिधी ग्रु. तिष्ठरी कविवीक्षरी नियाधि विज्ञायसप्रयाराम्भसुतामः।

and the passage is explained as meaning that a Brāhmaṇa named Ravi and a Pāraśava or Vārīyar called Lokavīra were the friends of the royal author, Kulaśekhara. It seems to me that this reading is due to the ingenuity of the commentator, who, perhaps, was not able to understand the passage as it originally stood. In the first place, it is clear from the various editions of the poem, that there is no means of determining which and how many of theālokas found in each edition were really composed by the author; for the editions do not contain the sameālokas nor even the same number ofālokas. Thus, the Trivandrum Palace Library manuscript contains only 24ālokas, and though each of the printed editions I mentioned contains 40ālokas, as many as 13 of the verses found in the Trivandrum manuscript are not found in those publications. It is also seen that in regard to theālokas that are common to all the editions, there are variations
in reading. We cannot, therefore, say that this particular śloka which is differently given in different copies and is absent from some editions of the work, had actually formed part of Mukundamātā as originally composed. The Trivandrum Palace Library manuscript contains after this śloka another śloka as phalāsruti, which is not found in the published editions. We may, therefore, easily conclude that considerable liberty has been taken with the original text by various persons. But supposing this śloka was in the original Mukundamātā, I see no reason why the reading found in the Trivandrum manuscript should be preferred to that given in the printed editions. To my mind the Trivandrum reading seems to carry with it its own condemnation. Look at the flagrant asāl ativām patent in the use of ṣava in the word pāraśava! Again, one of the two persons whom the king proudly proclaims as his friends is announced to be a pāraśava, by name Lokāvira. The annotator explains the term Pāraśava as meaning Vāriyar, a caste-name in Kerala. There is no authority for that meaning in Sanskrit usage; and Mukundamātā is a Sanskrit work. In Sanskrit Pāraśava means the son of a Brahmāṇḍa by a Śūdra woman; it also means a bastard. It is a well-known term in Sūrti literature. This is how Manu explains it:—

व ब्राह्मणम् गुहायां कामपुशपस्य पुत्र ।
व पाराशवेऽव शेषार्जुणार्जुनः स्वतः ॥ (ix. 178).

Sir William Jones translates the placitum as follows: “A son, begotten through lust on a Śūdra by a man of the priestly class, is even as a corpse, though alive, and is thence called in law a living corpse.” It is evident that man so begotten is a mere corpse or ṣava in the eye of the law. It is highly improbable that a king or a saint to choose him for close comradeship. Further, the śloka describes both friends as Śrutidharāv; what is the appropriateness of the epithet when applied to a Pāraśava, even understanding the term to mean a Vāriyar? The reading seems to me to be fanciful. My conclusion is that Mukundamātā is of no use whatever in determining the date of the Āvār. It will thus be seen that the whole ground work on which the Āvār has been sought to be placed at the beginning of the Kollam or Malabar era is unsound.

It is possible to aver that the Āvār must have flourished before the commencement of the Malabar era. The commendatory verses in regard to Perumāl-Tiru-Moli are written by Maṅakkāl Šambi, who according to Vaishnava accounts was born in Kali-year 3933
or 832 A.C. There is no valid reason for rejecting this date, as Vaiśnava hagiology came to be written within a century of this date. Maṇakkāl Nambi was 50 years senior in age to Ālavandār, whom he preceded in the spiritual headship of the Śrī Vaiśnavas. Between Ālavandār and Rāmānuja, there were three generations and Rāmānuja was born in c. 1015. The middle of the 9th century is, therefore, not an improbable date for Maṇakkāl Nambi; and the Ālvār, who is the subject of commendatory verses by the Nambi, must have lived before the 9th century.

Mr. Swamikannu Pillai, professing to act on the astronomical data supplied by the Gurnparamparās fixed 767 A.C. as the date of Ālvār's birth. He seems to have himself rejected this date afterwards; but be that as it may, the postulation of this date ignores the important historical fact that Kulaśekhara, though by right of birth only a king of the Cera country, was able, as we see from frequent statements found in Perumāḻ-Tiru-Moli, to acquire overlordship over the Coḷa and Pāṇḍya kingdoms and other territories in South India. These statements occur in the closing stanzas of various sections of Perumāḻ-Tiru-Moli; and a suggestion has been made that these terminal verses are not the composition of the Ālvār, but are additions spuriously made. This is an unwarranted suggestion. The Ālvār has been descriptively referred to by the hagiographers as cemcol-moli-nūṟṟaiyum-ceppinān i.e., he who spoke the one hundred and five faultless verses; and Vedānta Deśika writes, referring to him: Naṉ-porulēr Tiru-moli nūṟṟaiitu-pūtu Nairīka enakkarul-šei-naliki Niye, i.e. you have graciously sung 105 stanzas of Tiru-moli of good import. These citations make it clear that the Perumāḻ's composition consists of 105 stanzas; and this number can be obtained only by including the last stanzas of all the sections of his Tiru-moli. Indeed, it is the practice of all the Ālvārs to place their name or mudrā in the closing verses of their songs; and we can obtain the 4000 stanzas of Nāḷāyira-Prabandham only by including in our calculation all the mudrā stanzas. A similar usage is also seen among the Šaiva Nayanmars. I see no reason, therefore, for regarding the mudrā stanzas in Perumāḻ-Tiru-Moli which contain the name and description of Kulaśekhara as interpolations. These stanzas clearly show that the Ālvār was, besides being a king of the Cera country, also an over-lord of the Pāṇḍya, Coḷa and Kongu kingdoms.

When was it possible in the political history of South India for the Cera to have gained ascendency over practically the whole of the
southern peninsula? Not certainly in the latter half of the 8th century, which was the period of Nandi Varman Pallavamalla, Mara Varman Rājasimha Pāṇḍya and Jaṭila Varman Parāntaka Pāṇḍya. It must have been before the 7th century; for the Pallavas became powerful about the close of the 6th or the beginning of the 7th century, and they maintained their ascendancy for a long time; and after the battle of Tiru-parambian, the Colas under Vijayālaya and his successors gained ascendancy and they further transferred their capital from Koḷi or Uraiyar to Tanjore. In the centuries immediately before the 7th, the position of the Coḷas and the Pāṇḍyas appears to have been precarious. After the destruction of Puhār, there was a civil war in the Coḷa country, and this led to an invasion by Ceran Šenkuttuvan, who defeated the united forces at Nerivāyil, and placed his relation as the ruler of Coḷa Nādu. This, as I have endeavoured to show elsewhere, (I.H.Q., vol. I) was probably in the 2nd century; and since then, for a long time we know nothing of the Coḷas, with the exception of Ko-Ceṇa-Kannan. As regards the Pāṇḍyas, the Velvikudi and Cinnammānār plates help us to get some idea of their activities from Māran, the victor of Nelveli, onwards; but before him, there is a dark period, which except for the occurrence of two names after Kadunko, the restorer of the Pāṇḍya dynasty after the Kalabhra interregnum, is a blank. It may not, therefore, be unsafe to conclude that during the period we are considering, the kingdoms of Pāṇḍya and Coḷa were insignificant politically and could be overthrown by a powerful invader. We may thus look for Kulaśekhara's conquest of these kingdoms somewhere before the 7th century.

The upper limit of his date is supplied by the Āḻvār himself, for he quotes in his Tiru-Molī (v. 3) from the well-known Kural (chap. 55, 2); and his prosody shows that he came some centuries after the Saṅgam period. The guruparamparā state that he was born in Kali 28, jovian year Parābhava in the month of Masi on Friday, Śukla dvādasi, Pūnarvasu asterism. Perhaps Kali 28 denotes the 28th year of the Kali century current when the Āḻvār was born. If so, Kali year 3628 will suit all the conditions. The year was Parābhava. The 12th Masi of that year was Friday; and from about 4 A.M. onward that day, the star was Pūnarvasu and from 10 A.M. the tithi was Sukla-dvādasi. The corresponding English date will be 29th January 527 A.C. Hence we may hold, till a more probable date is established, that the Āḻvār was born on 29th January, 527 and as he is said to have lived 67 years, his death must have taken place in 594 A.C.
Early Viṣṇuism and Narayaniya Worship*

III

In the Nārāyaṇiya itself (xii, 334-351), which has been called the Pañcarātra Upaniṣad, we have accounts of the origin of the system as well as of the name Ekānta-dharma given to it, enveloped though these descriptions are in the mist of legend. In the first place, we have the description of a direct communication of the doctrine, with its purāṇa (ancient tradition), its bhaviṣya (future development) and its rhāṣya (secret),¹ to Nārada in ch. 339 (ṣl. 108f.) by Nārāyaṇa himself, who vouchsafes to him as a reward for his devotion a vision of his divine self in Śvetadvipa. The doctrine is described here as "the great Upaniṣad (mahopaniṣad) coming out of the mouth of Nārāyaṇa himself (nārāyaṇa-mukhodgīta), connected with (samanvita) the four Vedas and shaped or employed by Sāmkhya-Yoga (sāmkhya-yoga-kṛta)". It was named Pañcarātra by Nārada² and was repeated accurately by him (yathā-srutam) in the abode of Brahmā, his father, to the Siddhas


¹ sa-rhāṣya sa-saṁgrahah in 346, 11. The rhāṣya, of course, refers to its mysteries or esoteric doctrines, its upaniṣad; but does saṁgraha mean "a summary", an abstract, or does it signify totality of the doctrines as in the term karma-saṁgraha in Bhagavad-gītā, xviii, 18? An attempt is made to raise the religious teaching, as revealed to Nārada, to the dignity of a Upaniṣad by an injunction (339, 126) similar to what is found in some Upaniṣads (cf. Śvetāsvatara Up., vi, 22) that it is parama-guhya (cf. 334, 28), "the essence of all narrations" and should not be imparted to one who is not a bhakta of Vāsudeva (nāvāśudevabhatīya tvayā deyam karmaṁ). Also cf. Bhagavad-gītā xviii, 67.

² tena pañcarātrānuśabdītam, 339, 111. The phrase anuśabdita is obscure. Does it mean Nārada repeated the name which he heard, or does it signify that he named the Śāstra Pañcarātra after the Pañcarātra devotees of Nārāyaṇa? It is declared as nāradokta (ṣl. 137) in the sense that, although coming ultimately from Nārāyaṇa, it was promulgated by Nārada to whom it was communicated in Śvetadvipa.
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assembled there. The account is here called ancient or legendary history conformable to the Veda (purāṇam veda-sammitam). It is the essence of all narrations, just as āurta is the essence derived from the churning of the ocean (ib. 127). Śūrya, the sun, having heard it on this occasion, repeated it to the sixty-six thousand pīṭh or sages in his train, who related it to the deities assembled on the mount Meru. Asita, the great sage1 having heard it from these gods, told it to the fathers (pīṭh). Bhūṣma, who is now telling it, learnt from (the Pīṭh?) Śāntanu, his father. Its traditional character is clearly acknowledged here by the statement that this legend, connected with the sages (ārgeyam ākhyānam), is “handed down in regular succession” (param-parayāgatam, ib. 125, 137, 141). It must also be noted that later on in 346, 10-11 and 348, 53-54 we are informed twice in exactly the same words that the dharma which Nārada received with its mysteries and abstracts from Nārayaṇa himself is already told concisely in the Harigītās (harigītās), which (in spite of the plural number) is apparently intended to refer (as one can presume from 348, 8) to the Bhagavadgītā.

The second account occurs in ch. 335 (ib. 16f.) in the course of Yudhiṣṭhira’s enquiry about the strange people in the Śvetadvīpa and Bhūṣma’s relation in this connexion of the legend of king Uparicara-Vasu who, in former times, was a friend of Indra and was devoted to Nārāyaṇa-Hari. Here we are told that Uparicara-Vasu in his worship of Nārāyaṇa followed the Sātvata rule (sātvatam vidhim āsthāya), which formerly issued from the mouth of Śūrya (prāk śūrya-mukha-niḥṣṛtam), and offered oblations, with the remainder of which he pleased the fathers (pīṭh) and the Brahmins, himself partaking of

---

1 This may be, as Grierson notes, Asitā (-Devala), the ṛṣi of Rg-Veda ix, 5 and 24. See Erhad-devata, ed. Macdonell, ii, 157. In the Epic, however, Asita, Asita-Devala or Devala figures as a divine sage (ṛṣi) who is Śiva’s brother-in-law, having married Ekaparṇa, one of the three daughters of Himavat and sister of Aparṇa-Umā. He recites the Pañcarātra to the Pīṭhs. He is mentioned in xii, 318, 59 in the list of the teachers of the Twenty-fifth Principle (oddly combined with Sāṃkhya-Yoga) which he teaches to Nārada in xii, 274. See Hopkins, Great Epic, pp. 155f. The story of Asita-Devala and Jaigīrvya is told in ix, 50.
what was left over. He owed his kingdom to Nārāyaṇa's favour (nārāyaṇa-varāt) and considered all he possessed as bhāgavata or coming from the Bhagavat himself. It is again repeated that following the Śātavata rule (sātvatam vidhina āsthāya) he performed all the optional (kāmya) and occasional (naimittika) sacrificial acts. The leading exponents of the Pañcarātra system (pañcarātra-victa mukhyāḥ) used to eat eagerly the food consecrated to the Bhagavat (bhāgavata-proktam) in his house. The narrative proceeds to relate how Uparicara-Vasu came to be instructed in the system. The supreme scripture (śāstram uttamam), apparently of the Pañcarātras, was compiled and uttered with an unanimous mind (eka-matibhiḥ) by the seven sages (ṛgīs), known as the seven Citraśikhaṇḍins, who were well-versed in austerities (tapas), and who, after worshipping Nārāyaṇa-Hari with penances for a divine thousand years, were possessed, for the good of the world, by Śarasvati, at the direction of Nārāyaṇa himself.

These sages were Marici, Atri, Aṅgiras, Pulastya, Pulaha, Kratu and Vaśishṭha; with them was also the Svāyambhuva i.e., Manu. The seven holy sages, who are really the seven prakṛtis, were the receptacle as well as the promulgators of the Śastra, which is described as connected with the four Vedas (vedais caturbhīḥ samitam) and honoured with the sound of the sacred syllable Om (ōṅkāra-svara-pūjitam). They composed the Śastra after considering the world (lokān) and reflecting well in their minds that this was the highest good (śreyas), this was Brahma (neuter), this was incomparably the highest well-being (hitam anuttamam). The invisible Nārāyaṇa within them, after hearing it, was pleased and declared that these hundred thousand excellent ślokas would form the source of the dharma of the entire course of the world. He further certified that they were in complete accord with the four Vedas, and that they determined the path of action (pravṛtti) and inaction (nivṛtti). He also prophesied that it would be authoritatively taught by Manu Svāyambhuva, as well as by Uśanas and Bṛhaspati, of whose teaching

1 Cf. ṣāstram citraśikhaṇḍijam 337, 3. It is curious that in Nārada's prose hymn to Nārāyaṇa (ch. 338), the deity himself is addressed also as Citraśikhaṇḍin.

2 As also in xii, 340, 34-35.

3 kṛṣṇam kṣata-sahasraṁ hi slokānāṁ idam uttamam/
loka-tantrasya kṛṣnasya y asmād dharmah pravartate ||
it would form the basis. Uparicara-Vasu would learn it from his preceptor Bṛhaspati, but after Vasu, the doctrine would disappear.

In this strange account which is described as "the essence of all narratives", there are many things which are of interest, and we shall revert to them in their proper places; but one notable feature is the omission of Nārada's name as one of the original expounders of the system to the world. It is perhaps implied that all these happened even before Nārada visited the Śvetadvīpa, the mythical abode of Nārāyaṇa, and received an exposition of the system anew from Nārāyaṇa himself. That the system was taught in different ways at different times is clear from the third account which occurs in ch. 348, 11f, where, curiously enough, Nārada himself is made responsible for the description of the modes in which the system was taught. It is strange, however, that in this account also Nārada is never mentioned as a recipient of the doctrine, until towards the end where an attempt is made to remove the inconsistency by adding that the system, whose several appearances and disappearances at different times are described here, is the same as that which Nārāyaṇa himself communicated to Nārada in the Śvetadvīpa.

Nārada is said to have declared this third account before an assembly of sages in reply to Arjuna's enquiry, and Kṛṣṇa-Dvaipāyana having heard it there, explained it to Vaiśampāyana, who now relates it to Janamejaya. In this mythical account seven different births of Brahmā are mentioned, and at the creation of each Brahmā, different modes of revelation of the system from Nārāyaṇa are distinguished, the dharma having been lost at the end of each Brahmā. These are: (i) At the first mental birth (mānasāṁ janma) of Brahmā from Nārāyaṇa's mouth, Nārāyaṇa himself performed the rites of the religion. From him the religion was first received by the Phenapa (lit. 'froth-drinking') sages, who handed it to the Vaikhānas,1

1 The tradition of Nārada's connexion with the bhakti-doctrine and with the Pañcarātra survives in the ascription to him of the apocryphal Nārada-Sūtras on Bhakti and in the Nārala-Pañcarātra.

2 The seven births of Brahmā are also mentioned in 347, 40-43.

3 Grierson is inaccurate in translating the substance of the lines (phenapa ṭṣaṇayā caiva tamo dharmaṁ pratipedire vaikhānasāḥ phenape-bhyo dharmaṁ tamo pratipedire/) as "the latter (i.e., Nārāyaṇa) imparted
who gave the teaching to Soma, and then it disappeared. (ii) At the second birth of Brahmā from Nārāyana's eye (cākyayānā janma), Brahmā received it from Soma, who gave it to Rudra, who in the Kṛta-yuga taught it to the Vālakhilya¹ sages. Then it again disappeared. (iii) At the third birth of Brahmā from Nārāyana's word (vācikāna janma), the sage Suparna received it from Nārāyana himself. As he recited it (parikrāntavān) three times (a day),² it came to be known by the name Trisuparna. From Suparna it went to Vāyu, and from Vāyu to the Vighāsin sages,³ who gave it to Mahodadhi (Ocean?). It once more disappeared and became merged (samāhita) in Nārāyana. (iv) At the fourth birth of Brahmā from Nārāyana's ear (brāvanajā srutiḥ) Brahmā at the direction of Nārāyaṇa, received the dharma called here by the name of Sātvata (348, 29-34) with its mysteries (rāhasya), its compendium (samgraha) and its āraṇyaka, issuing from the mouth of Nārāyana. With it he proceeded to create and arrange the Kṛta-yuga, and the Sātvata-dharma having been established pervaded the world. Brahmā then taught it to Manu Svarocīṣa (the second Manu), who taught it to his son Śaṅkhapāda, who taught it to his son Suvarṇābha, the Dikpāla. Then the Tretā-yuga came, and the doctrine disappeared. (v) At the fifth birth of Brahmā,⁴ from Nārāyana's nose (nāsalya-janmani) Nārāyana recited it himself to Brahmā and the teaching was then handed down in succession from Brahmā → Sanatkumāra → Viraṇa the Prajāpati (at the beginning of the Kṛta-yuga) → the muni Raibhya → his son Kuksi, the Dikpāla. It it to the Vaikhānasas, who drank foam⁵. Hopkins (Epic Mythology, p. 172) is correct, but the dharma is not, from the context, “the tenets of Nārada.”—Nārada in xii, 338, 4 addresses Nārāyaṇa as Vaikhānasa and Phenaapācārya.

¹ Candramas (= Soma) and Vālakhilya are Nārada's epithets of Nārāyaṇa (338, 4).

² So Nīlakaṇṭha. As this difficult vow (vratam) is said to be ṛgveda-pūlha-paṭhitam (a phrase which is obscure unless it refers to the general conformity of the doctrine to the Veda), Nīlakaṇṭha refers to Ṛgveda, x, 114, 3-5 where the word suparṇa (= bird) occurs; but the relevancy of the reference is not clear.

³ Hopkins (op. cit., p. 179) is perhaps more accurate in regarding this as a proper name, instead of translating it literally with Grierson as “the Rṣis who ate the residues of oblations”,
then disappeared. (vi) At the sixth birth of Brahma from the egg (aṇḍaja janmāni), Brahma again received it from Nārāyaṇa’s mouth, and it was taught in succession thus: from Brahma→Barhiṣad sages→Sāmavedāntaga Jyeṣṭha→King Avikalpana (v, l. Avikampana). It then disappeared. (vii) At the seventh and last birth of Brahma from the lotus (padmajanam janma), which is the present dispensation, the system was communicated by Nārāyaṇa himself to Brahma, and from Brahma it passed in succession to Dakṣa→the eldest son of Dakṣa’s daughter, Āditya (who was older than Savitṛ)→Vivasvat. In the beginning of the Tretā-Yuga, Vivasvat gave it to Manu, who passed it on to his son Ikṣvāku, by whom it was spread and established over the worlds. At the dissolution of the world, it is predicted, the dharma will go back to Nārāyaṇa.

This account is obviously mythical, although some of the names may be traced in Vedic and Purāṇic literature. But to this is added a further statement which is interesting. We are told that this

1 barhiṣadbhyaś ca samprāptaḥ (dharmaḥ from previous stanza?) sāmavedāntagam dvijam/ jyeṣṭham nāmnābhivikhyātan jyeṣṭha-sāma-vrato hariḥ/ (348, 46). The passage is obscure, but Hopkins’ interpretation (Great Epic, p. 143, followed by Grierson) as “a priest who was acquainted with (Jyeṣṭha) Sāman (and) Vedānta; his name was Jyeṣṭha” is not convincing. Might not sāmavedāntagam dvija, which qualifies jyeṣṭha (a proper name) mean a Brahman who, has mastered the whole of Sāma-Veda.)—Hari in this passage is called Jyeṣṭha-sama-vrata, just as Nārāyaṇa (=Hari) is addressed as Jyeṣṭha-sāmaga by Nārada in 338, 4.

2 yasyāṁ cāpi yo dharmaḥ sa te pūrvam nṛpattama/ kathito hari-gilāsu sanūsa-vidhi-kalpitaḥ/ nāradena su-samprāptaḥ sa-rasasyaḥ sa-saṃgraḥah/ eṣa dharmaḥ jagannāthāt sākṣān nārāyaṇān nṛpa/ eva eṣa mahān dharma ādyo rājan sanātanah/ durvijñeyo duṣkaraś ca sātvatair dhāryate sadā/ (348, 53–55)

[It is not clear what is implied by the phrase “religion of the Yatis” here, as well as in 348, 85 unless the intention is to identify the Nārāyaṇiya (as well as the Sātvata) faith with the orthodox religion of austerities. The word Yati, however, is used in the Bhagavadgaṇḍāra (v, 26) to describe the spiritually purified Yogin, who practises Karma-
dhārma of the Yatis is already given in a compendious form in the Hari-gītās (plural); that it is the same as the doctrine which was revealed directly to Nārada by Nārāyaṇa with its mysteries and compendiums; that this great, original and eternal persuasion, characterised by the teachings of ahimsā, vyāha, bhakti etc. (348, 56f.) is almost incomprehensible and difficult to practise, but it is always maintained by the Sātvatas; and lastly, that it is in fact the Sātvata dharma (eṣa te kathito dharmah sātvatah 348, 84). The obvious intention of this passage is to emphasise, lest one should doubt it, that the Nārāyaṇiya system is identical with the Sātvata or Bhāgavata faith expounded in the Bhagavad-gītā. The intention of connecting the Nārāyaṇiya doctrine with Bhāgavatism also appears in a similar passage (346, 10-11) which we have already referred to. There we are told in almost the same words (3) that the system, which was revealed directly to Nārada by Nārāyaṇa, with its mysteries and compendiums, had already been given in a compendious form in the Hari-gītās. What these Hari-gītās are (3) is not clear; but from 348, 8, which tells us that the religion of the Ekaṇṭin followers of Nārāyaṇiya is the same as that recited by the Bhagavat himself to the cheerless Arjuna in the battle-field of the Kuru-Pāṇḍavas, we can infer a clear reference to the Bhagavad-gītā. With this object in view the traditional succession of the system from Vivasvat to Yoga and attains the final peace in Brahma. But in Mbh. 348, 5 the process of emancipation of the Yatis, as well as of the orthodox students of Vedas and Upaniṣads, is described as different from, and inferior to, that attained by the Ekaṇṭins.—S.K.D.]

1 It is remarkable that there is no reference in this account to the promulgation of the doctrine by the Ciraśikhaṇḍin sages and to the legend of Upanicara-Vasu.

2 nārādeṇa su-samprāptah sa-rahasyah sa-saṁgrahah /
   eṣa dharmo jagannāthūtāt sākṣān nārāyaṇan mrīpa ///
   evan eṣa mahān dharmaḥ sa te pūrvam nṛpottama /
   kathito hari-gītās u samāsa-vidhi-kalpitaḥ /// (346, 10-11)

3 Hopkins (Great Epic, p. 53) suggests, without much ground, that these were Gāthās recited by a divinity.

4 samuṣṭhaṁ guṇavānaṁ kuru-pāṇḍavānaye mrīde /
   arjune viṁanaṁ ke ca gītā bhagavatā svayam ///
Ikṣvāku and the prediction of its subsequent disappearance are also made to conform to the account of the traditional handing down of Bhāgavatism from Vivasvat to Ikṣvāku and its subsequent loss, mentioned by Bhagavat himself in Bhagavad-gītā, iv, 1-2.

With these declarations must also be connected the stray references to Sātvata as the name of a manifestation (prādurbhāva) of Nārāyaṇa in the form of Kṛṣṇa (339, 104), as well as to the Sātvata rule (vidhi) which Nārāyaṇa’s early devotee Uparicara-Vasu is said to have followed (335, 19 and 24).\(^1\) It is also stated that at the fourth birth of Brahmā, this religion was named and established as Sātvata (348, 29-34) with its mysteries, compendiums and āranyakas.

It is curious, however, that in the two places in the same account (348, 29-34 and 348, 53-55) where the Nārāyaṇiya system is expressly identified with the Sātvata, two different modes of revelation from Nārāyaṇa are mentioned, viz., to Brahmā in the Kṛta-Yuga and to Nārada in Śvetadvipa respectively. This was admittedly at different ages, viz., at the fourth and seventh birth of Brahmā respectively, but in both cases it is not clear why the system is called Sātvata. No particular reason can indeed be perceived except the obvious intention of establishing the identity of the two systems, even at the risk of anachronism and inconsistency. The same remarks apply also to the reference to the sātvata vidhi mentioned above in the passages where Uparicara-Vasu, for no other particular reason, is said to have followed the Sātvata rule in offering oblations and performing orthodox Śrauta sacrifices. The passage is remarkable because it makes a rather unwarranted and inconsistent attempt to connect the so-called Sātvata rule of Uparicara-Vasu with sacrificial religion. It is unwarranted and inconsistent because the Sātvata-dharma or Bhāgavatism (as we have it in the Bhagavad-gītā) does not indeed reject sacrifice as sacrifice but it either pays little respect to it (ii, 42f.), or symbolises it,\(^2\) or else subordinates it to its doctrine of selfless work. At any rate, the

\(^1\) The phrase sātvatam vidhim āstāya occurs also independently in vi, 66, 40, where, however, there is an apparent allusion to the Vyāha-doctrine of the Nārāyaṇiya (not found in the Bhagavad-gītā).

\(^2\) The idea that human life is itself a sacrifice is not new, and is more than once expressed in the Upaniṣads; but such an idea tends to lessen the importance of sacrifice as sacrifice.
'Sātvata-rule' does not interpret sacrifice in the narrow ritualistic sense, nor does it prescribe any definite regulations for offering oblations or making sacrifices. There is hardly any point, therefore, in saying that Uparicara-Vasu in performing his optional and compulsory sacrificial acts followed the Sātvata rule, which has no direct concern with such sacrificial acts.

Not much capital, again, need be made of the use of word bhagavat for the supreme deity: for this is done rarely in the main narrative of the Nārāyaṇīya (where it is not necessary to make it bear the denotation of a proper name for Vāsudevakṛṣṇa), but chiefly in the somewhat irrelevant and loosely fitted digressions in chs. 340-342, where the whole topic is deliberately put in the mouth of the Bhagavat. Nor should the fanciful etymology of the term Sātvata (as a proper name) in one of these chapters (342, 77-78) or the inclusion of Sātvata (Kṛṣṇa) in the list of Nārāyaṇa's manifestations (prādurbhāva) present serious difficulties; for the supreme divinity is named throughout Nārāyaṇa or Hari (and in one passage as Viṣṇu, 343, 20) and never, except in these extraneous passages, as Kṛṣṇa or Sātvata. In Nārada's long list of names and epithets, neither Kṛṣṇa nor Viṣṇu occurs as a name. The references to Vāsudeva occur only in connexion with the Vyūha doctrine, and an etymology is furnished by interpreting the word (as a name of the supreme god) as "dwelling above (adhivāsa)" or "enveloping all creatures (sarvāvāsa)." The Bhagavad gītā ignores the Vyūha-doctrine, which speaks of four mystical cosmic forms of Nārāyaṇa and says nothing about Vāsudeva in this connexion; if it was aware of the legends of Vāsudeva, Saṃkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna and Aniruddha, it does not appear to have subscribed to the mystical interpretation of these persons as related to Vāsudeva in successive cosmic emanations.

1 e.g., 335, 24; 339, 1, 12 and 134; 343, 22, 54 and 55; 344, 12 and 23. It has not been proved that the term bhagavat in the Epic always denotes Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa and that it does not apply honorifically to other gods, as well as to demi-gods, sages and respectable persons of religious merit. The name itself, as we have already discussed before, was originally perhaps an epithet, like the Buddha. See Hopkins, JRAS., 1911, pp. 727 f.
It is not necessary to anticipate here what our enquiry in the following pages will attempt to bring out, but it may be stated generally that the Bhāgavatism of the Gītā and the Ekānta-dharma, which Uparicara-Vasu professed or which Nārada observed and received at Śvetadvipa, could not have been in their origin identical; nor can the one be said, inspite of many points of contact, to have been a direct development of the other. There are many points of resemblance, but the many points of divergence are also interesting and significant. As different expressions of a bhakti religion of an originally non-orthodox character, there is of course much agreement in the fundamental tenet of bhakti with its important implications; but neither is the teaching nor the environment the same in detail. There is throughout the Nārāyaṇiya an anxiety to connect and identify its Ekānta-dharma with the Bhāgavatism of the Gītā; but the connexion is, on the face of it, slight and artificial. The passages where the identity is expressly declared are either loosely joined to the main narrative by way of addendum or an after-thought (as in 346, 10-11 and 348, 53-55), or are introduced incongruously and ab extra (as in 335, 19 and 24), or are not of such importance as to be taken seriously. It would at least not be critical to accept them as bearing undoubted testimony to the original identity of the two currents of an early bhakti-religion. One need not go so far as to hold with Hopkins¹ that the Nārāyaṇyas were originally hostile to the Kṛṣṇa (or Sātvata)

¹ The evidence adduced by Hopkins (Epic Mythology, p. 214) is slight and inconclusive. In vii, 17, 31 and vii, 18, 7 the Nārāyaṇyas (or more accurately Nārāyaṇas) are represented as battling against Arjuna and Vāsudeva; but this is because they were Gopas or Gopalas (apparently a tribe of cowherds) who were also warriors offered by Kṛṣṇa to Duryodhana (v, 7, 18f.) and accepted by the latter. There is nothing to show that they were the Ekāntins of the Nārāyaṇiya, Rönnow (BSOS., v, p. 281) expresses his approval of Hopkins' remarks and cites in support xii, 339, 101, where, according to him, "it is announced that Nārāyaṇa will send a terrible visitation upon the Sātvata princes and upon Dvārakā"; but this is a misunderstanding of the text, which does nothing more than refer, in a prophetic strain, to the well-known story of the destruction of Dvārakā and the Sātvata princes, and does not give expression to "any Paścarātra disapproval of the Kṛṣṇa cult."
cult, but there is a strong probability that the Nārāyaṇīya faith had an
origin which was independent of Bhāgavatism, although in the end
they were amalgamated and to all appearance presented one system of
bhakti-religion.

The highly fabulous account of the origin of the Nārāyaṇīya
Ekānta dharma given above may be rightly taken as furnishing extreme-
ly dubious material for a sober reconstruction of its early history.

But even admitting its obviously mythical garb, it would
not be paradoxical to state that this fantastic account
probably bears testimony to the high antiquity of the
faith. It is not unusual in Indian literature to fabricate
piously such legendary accounts where the actual origin
is lost and forgotten in the mist of remote antiquity.

It is possible that the account betrays the common tendency of the
Indian author towards glorifying his system by ascribing to it not only
divine origin but also ancient and unquestionable authority by associat-
ing its promulgation with legendary saints and sages; but it is also
possible that it embodies a current tradition of the actual existence of
the system from time immemorial. Possibly it had no early expounder
whose historicity was beyond doubt, unless it be a mysterious sage
Nārāyaṇa, semi-historical or entirely mythical, to whom all the three
accounts of origin agree in assigning the honour by raising him to the
dignity of the supreme god of the system.¹ But even if there were
some historical founders of the system, their names apparently perished
and had to be made good by those of frankly mythical personages.

One may indeed legitimately doubt the value of the narrative as an
historical document, but its importance and interest as a document of
culture-history cannot be so easily denied. It does not give us
chronological facts or the exact lines of development,
but it gives us the probable surroundings out of which
the system emerged, as well as the ideas and senti-
ments which produced and shaped it. The Nārāyaṇīya
faith could not have been a deliberate philosophical
or historical religion, promulgated or preached by a
definite expounder, but it must have grown naturally
out of floating myths and legends and naive speculations, on which

¹ In 349, 68 Nārāyaṇa is declared to be the Knower of the entire
Pāñcarātra (pāñcarātrasya kṛtyaṇasya vettā nārāyaṇaḥ svayam; v.
l; vettā tu bhogavān svayam).
popular faiths feed and grow, the philosophical doctrines with their technicalities (such as we find in it) having coalesced with it in comparatively historical times. We shall see presently that there is in the Nārāyaṇīya system a curious reconciliation of Brāhmaṇic ritualism, Upaniṣadic monism, quasi-Sāṁkhya dualism and Yogic mysticism with the popular worship of a personal god in an ardently devotional atmosphere and with all its paraphernalia of mythological fancy. But the speculative side, which is meant to supply a philosophical background to the religion, is an inadequate medley of varied ideas, sometimes unrelated and incongruous; it could not have formed the essence of the deep and fervid religious feeling on which alone the system bases itself. For a proper insight into this religious feeling, therefore, we must look to its mythical side, even if it is bizarre and confusing. The myths form a part and parcel of its popular theology, and even throws interesting light on its process of absorption of independent philosophical or religious ideas. Indeed, some points characteristic of the Nārāyaṇīya theology can be best understood not by a reference to its extraneous philosophical ideas but by a recognition of its popular mythical fancy, strangely blended as it is with such philosophical ideas.

Two accounts of the teachings of the Nārāyaṇīya, as R.G. Bhandarkar pointed out long ago,¹ can be distinguished in the above narrative. The first gives us the legend of king Uparicara-Vasu and of the partly fruitless journey of the three ascetics to the mysterious Śvetadvīpa; while in the second we have the story of Nārada's successful visit to the same island and his vision of Nārāyaṇa who revealed the doctrine to him. In both these mythical accounts² the Brāhmaṇic tendency is clear. Apart from its borrowings of orthodox theosophical ideas, we find the anxiety of the faith to name some of the orthodox saints and sages, as well as the partly orthodox Nārāyaṇa himself, as sponsors of its theology; it also betrays a great respect for sacrificial acts and a clear belief in austerity (tapas) and yoga, in spite of its exaltation of bhakti. Does not

¹ Vaiśṇavism etc., p. 7.
² Both the accounts are clearly mythical and must be recognised as such. R.G. Bhandarkar asserts the greater historicity of the second account, because he thinks it is directly connected with Vāsudeva and identified with the Gītā religion. But while the religion of Uparicara-Vasu in the first account is also connected with the Sātvata
Nārāyaṇa himself observe the daily rites (534, 19-22) and perform perpetual austerities at this hermitage at Badarī winning reputation as khyāta-tapas and mahā-yogin (345, 3 ; 349,17). In the cosmic form in which Nārāyaṇa appears to Nārada he is described (339, 6-10) as an ascetic and as uttering the syllable Om, the Gāyatrī, the four Vedas and the Āraṇyaka. King Uparicara-Vasu, one of the legendary patrons and promulgators of the doctrine, is reported to have been a great sacrificer. He performs not only his optional and occasional sacrificial acts and offers daily oblations, but under the superintendence of Bṛhaspati, arranges a great Aśvamedha sacrifice in accordance with the rules ascribed to the Āraṇyakas, but without any offering of sacrificial animals. It is also related that his precipitation to an underground cavern was due to his advising animal sacrifice, of which the gods were in favour but of which the sages disapproved. The gods (including Nārāyaṇa at their head) could not, of course, save him from the ascetics’ curse of “the fall”, but they carried nourishment to the condemned devotee who was ultimately rescued by Nārāyaṇa himself. The seven Citraśikhaṇḍins were also well versed in tapas and received the revelation after performing severe austerities. The three sages Ekata, Dvita and Trita obtain a vision of Śvetadvipa, if not of its presiding god, after having performed tapas for a thousand years, just in the same way as Nārada does by his Yoga-powers (yoga-yuktah).

No doubt, these legends are meant to enunciate the Nārāyaṇiya conception of the higher worth of bhakti as a means of divine grace and the inadequacy of mere tapas and yoga. Nevertheless, they rule, we have already dwelt upon the slight and external character of this connexion in both the cases.

1 On whose efficacy he waxed eloquent in ch. 345, which is however an irrelevant digression.

2 Not so in the Bhagavat’s theophany to Arjuna. Nārada describes (343, 60-61) that the deity whom he saw at Śvetadvipa was practising severe austerities there, having constructed an altar, measuring eight fingers’ height, standing on one foot, with hands uplifted and face directed towards the north! The popular belief is Yogic powers must have been at the root of such descriptions.

3 i.e., apparently of the Brāhmaṇas, of which the Āraṇyakas form later sections.
inculcate respect for *veda-kalpita vidhi*, as well as for the efficacy of *tapas* and *yoga*, up to a certain point. On the doctrinal side *nivṛtti* is praised and inculcated, but an emphasis is laid throughout on *pravṛtti* or activity in pious sacrificial works in accordance with the Brāhmaṇic rule, although it is clearly laid down that animals should not be sacrificed in the Kṛta age (340, 82) and that *bhakti* supersedes everything. Not only in the legend of Uparicara-Vasu⁰ but also in the discussion on *pravṛtti* and *nivṛtti* in ch 340, to which we shall revert later on, the sacrificial rites are not rejected as sacrificial rites; on the contrary, their necessity to a certain extent is enunciated, and the supreme god in one passage declares himself pleased with a sacrifice which the gods arrange in his honour in accordance with the Vedic rules (*veda-dṛṣṭena vidhinā*), and lectures on its usefulness. In these tendencies the influence, either direct or indirect, of the orthodox Brāhmaṇical religion is evident, but there is also a great deal more in the faith which does not come, either directly or indirectly, from that source, and this element is certainly of greater significance.

1 R. G. Bhandarkar is right in stating that in the earlier stage of Nārāyaṇīya worship, as indicated by the legend of Uparicara-Vasu, the religion had not thoroughly emancipated itself from the religion of sacrifices; but it is difficult to maintain his suggestion that in the second stage it did. In both the stages the connexion is clear.

2 It is not that “reform” on conservative principles began within the Brāhmaṇical fold (Bhandarkar, *op. cit.*, pp. 7-8); but more likely, these tendencies indicate, as we have attempted to explain before, mutual influence between the hieratic and the popular religion and the result of an ultimate compromise. [It is noteworthy that even in much later times Saṅkara does not admit the orthodoxy of the Pañcarātra system, and yet its orthodoxy is admitted by the recognition of the Epic itself. It is true that we have no direct evidence of the existence of popular sectarian religions except at a comparatively later period in the evolution of Indian religious thought, but it does not follow that the popular conception of a personal god and all its implications are later in date to the Brāhmaṇic and Upaniṣadic conceptions of a sacrificial or theosophical religion. Nor is the inference justified that the more vivid popular faith was merely grafted on the Brāhmaṇic ritual or on its impersonal and negative theology, thus introducing “a reform” in its out-of-date ideas, or that the popular faith with its superior vitality absorbed
One of the most important mythical elements of a popular character consists of the narratives of the two visits (which practically agree) to the Śvetadvipa, once by Nārada at the instance of Nārāyaṇa himself, and again at a presumably earlier time by the three ascetics Ekata, Dvita and Trīta on their own account. Since the time of Weber who appears to have started the theory by his critical investigations into the Kṛṣṇa legend, the story has been utilised by some scholars for asserting the indebtedness, even if veiled, of early Indian bhakti-religion to Christianity; but as criticism has now shewn how difficult it is to maintain the theory or attain any certain result, it is not necessary for us here to advert to it and reopen the contro-

into itself whatever there was of living force in the other. In all probability the two lines of religious ideas existed side by side, and the epic religious systems are the fruits of an inevitable mutual compromise in which the more human element came naturally to predominate.—S.K.D.

1 Chiefly in his classical essay on the festival of Kṛṣṇa's birth, _Über die Kṛṣṇa-Janmastāmi_, 1897, pp. 318-324 (Eng. trans. in _IA_, 1873-74, vols. iii-iv); also in _Indische Studien_, i, p. 400, ii, pp. 166, 398f., _Die Rāmatāpanīya Upaniṣad_, 1864, pp. 277-78 and _Die Griechen in Indien_, 1890, p. 930. Also Lassen in _Indische Alterthumskunde_, 2nd ed. ii, pp. 118-19. The question was revived by Hopkins in his essay on Christ in India in his _India, Old and New_, 1902.

2 For references to the literature on the subject see the works of Raychaudhuri, Hopkins and Garbe, and the articles of Clark and Rönnow. But see especially Grierson (art: "Modern Hinduism and its debt to the Nestorians") in _JRAI_, 1907, pp. 317f., also _IA_, 1908, p. 373 and the article on "Bhakti-Mārga" in _ERE_, ii, pp. 459f. (somewhat modified); Kenedy in _JRAI_, 1907, pp. 481f. and 951f.; Garbe, _Indien und das Christentum_, 1914, pp. 196f. and in _Die Bhagavatīta_, 2nd ed., 1921, p. 47.

3 See the fairly full summary of the general question of Christian influence in Raychaudhuri, _op. cit_, pp. 76-97, and the most recent review in connexion with the Śvetadvipa problem by Clark in _JAOS_, 39 (1919) pp. 230f. and by Rönnow in _BSOS_, v, (1929), pp. 253f. In addition to the arguments adduced in these writings against the theory of Christian influence, Jacobi (_ERE_, vii, p. 196) would exclude Weber's theory by chronological considerations; for the Jaina Canons, which
versy. Clark and Rönnnow, who have recently reviewed
the question in special connection with the Śvetadvipa problem
and negatived the Christian hypothesis on that basis, have,
however, made certain other points clear, which former studies
of the subject obscured, because of the uncritical position they had
assumed either in favour of, or against, the asserted connexion with
Christianity. These two critics have brought forward enough evidence
to demonstrate that the Śvetadvipa is an entirely Indian
conception of a purely mythical land of blessed existence.
They have also drawn attention to certain peculiar features of this popular mythical conception
which have a direct bearing on some characteristics
of the Nārāyanīya religion.

The description of the Śvetadvipa as the abode of Nārāyaṇa and
its strange inhabitants is interesting from this point of view. The
Śvetadvipa or "white island", where Nārāyaṇa resides
invisible even to the gods, is conceived as an earthly but
mythical region, situated in the milky sea at a fantastic
distance (32,000 yojanas) to the north of Mount Meru,—a
mysterious and inaccessible god-land, which is peopled
by popular fancy with strange supernatural beings and
illuminated by dazzling supernatural lights eventually emanating from

are prior to the Christian era, build up their entire hagiology on the
model of the history of Kṛṣṇa, assuming nine Vasudevas, Vāsudevas,
Baladevas and Pratīvāsudevas. It has now been generally admitted that
the word bhakti in its religious application is pre-Christian and that the
ideas that it connotes need not have been a foreign importation. The
theory that the phase of the early bhakti movement originated through
or was influenced by contact with Christian communities in the north-
west of India can no longer be maintained. The only question at
issue is whether Christian ideas, chiefly from South Indian sources,
influenced the much later development of the cult after the
Christian era. On this question the data are scanty and hardly satis-
factory. They show parallelism, but do not prove direct influence; at
least, they scarcely support the hypothesis of a Christian settlement
with sufficient energy to stimulate a greater religious movement which
had originated and developed independently. See Carpenter, Indian
Theism (1921) p. 264 n., 521-4.

References as above.
the deity himself. It is parallel to the Buddhist Sukhāvati and the Purānic Amarāvati or Uttara-kuru, and forms the Nārāyaṇiya version of the popular mythical conception of paradise, where the best of the Nārāyaṇiya devotees live in bliss and have a direct communion with their object of ekānta bhakti or monotheistic religious emotion. It is indeed the ordinary epic or purānic conception of heaven, but the Nārāyaṇiya theology of exalting bhakti over other means of salvation caused considerable modification. This is clear from the story of the expedition of the three sages, Ekata, Dvita and Trita (336, 20f.), which is really the Nārāyaṇiya version of a Rgvedic legend with a different motif. The three ascetics make an attempt to penetrate this inaccessible god-land by means of extraordinary penance lasting over thousands of years. They are successful in obtaining a dazzling vision of the wonderland and of the refugent devotees who worship the god there with great adoration; but their principal object of beholding the deity himself, who is hidden from them by the effulgence of a thousand suns, is denied to them. They are informed by a divine voice that the great god is not to be seen by any one who does not possess bhakti: “That god is not to be seen by one who is destitute of devotion (abhakta); that lord, invisible by a halo of light, can be seen only by those who through long years have attained a state of exclusive devotion (kunam mahatā kālena ekānti
tvam upīgataih).” The story is obviously intended to inculcate that neither austerities on which the ascetics depended, nor yet sacrifice by which Bṛhaspati sought to obtain the sight of the god, is of any avail. These means are not rejected up to a certain point, but they must be leavened by exclusive devotion (ekānta-bhakti) which alone makes beatific vision possible.

1 Clark, loc cit. p. 233, note 91 ; Rönnow, loc. cit., p. 279.
2 Clark, ibid., p. 228 ; Rönnow, ibid., pp. 256f., 272.
3 See Rönnow, ibid., pp. 260f.
4 In v. 111, 19-20 (story of Ġalava) the god-land in the north is declared inaccessible. In xii, 344, 4 Nārāyana declares that even by tapas and such other means the deity is unattainable. The earlier way of approach, as is apparent from the description of India’s Amarāvati in iii, 43, 4-6, was through sacrifices and austerities. The Nārāyaṇiya discovers a new way of approach through
This is one of the central doctrines of the Nārāyaṇīya worship. The point is also evident in the story of Nārada’s visit to, and vision of, the deity. A concession is made indeed to the time-honoured belief that those who have practised much tapas and yoga can win entrance and see the holy land (343, 22); but it is also expressly stated that Nārada was in a happier position because of his intense bhakti to Nārāyaṇa by which alone the vision of the deity was vouchsafed to him (339, 13; 344, 1-3). The extreme difficulty of seeing the god is emphasised by the statements that he is invisible in his essence, not only to the three ascetics but also to the gods, and even to Brahmā who is born from himself. The privilege of seeing him in certain forms is given only to the bhakta whom he loves (344, 3), to the Ekāntins, to Nārada, Arjuna and Vyāsa,¹ who adore him with whole-hearted love and devotion. Spiritual exercises prepare them to it, but the idea underlying the whole conception is that the mortal eye is not able to endure the divine brilliancy, nor even the “eye of knowledge” which Vyāsa attains, but that they must be endowed with “a divine eye”, acquired through bhakti, such as Arjuna receives in the Bhagavad-gītā xi, 8 for a vision of the cosmic form of the Bhagavat.

The description of the inhabitants of the Śvetadvīpa (335, 9-11; 336, 28-30; 339, 19-20; 343, 53f.) who perpetually see, sport with and worship Nārāyaṇa with ekānta-bhakti, also makes the point clear. These Ekāntins are, however, described as strange beings endowed with strange peculiarities. They are devoid of sense organs (anindriyāḥ, sarve-nādriya-vivarjītaḥ) and live without taking any food (anāsanāḥ, nirā-hārāḥ); but they are said to possess winkless eyes (spanda-hīnāḥ), bhakti. The idea is so firmly established that in other parts of the Epic (e.g., iii, 163, 17-24) we find that Nārāyaṇa’s abode is invisible even to the gods and accessible only to the Yatis who have prepared themselves by bhakti as well as by tapas, good works and yoga. Nārāyaṇa himself explains to Nārada (339, 12-13) that the three ascetics could not see him because he is visible only to the Ekāntika, of whom he praises Nārada as the greatest.

¹ Vyāsa also appears to have visited the Śvetadvīpa, worshipped the god (339, 135-136) and received illumination on the shores of the Milk Ocean after undergoing severe austerities (340, 25-27).
heads shaped by umbrellas (chatrākṛtī-sīrṇāḥ), a white complexion¹ like the lustre of the moon (candra-varcasāḥ), voices like that of a mass of thunder-clouds (meghaugha-ninādāḥ), bones and bodies as hard as adamant (vajrāṣṭhi-kāyāḥ), four symmetrical muskars³ each (sama-muṣka-catuṣkāḥ), soles of feet marked by hundreds of lines (rājiva-chata-pādāḥ),³ sixty white teeth (daṇṭa), eight tusks (daṇḍṭrā)⁴ and many tongues with which they lick the whole sun-face.⁵ They always emit a fragrance and blast the eyes of sinners with their radiance which is like that of the sun at the dissolution of a yuga. The description has puzzled many critics; but it is frankly fabulous and its fantasies are eccentricities of popular imagination. The clue is probably furnished by the further statement that the white islanders are “endowed with all the lakṣaṇas” (sarva lakṣaṇa-lakṣaṇīāḥ); and Clark and Rönnow are probably right in regarding these extraordinary peculiarities as the traditional lakṣaṇas or marks of blessedness of an emancipated, supernatural or god-like being,⁶ or of a Mahā-

---

¹ Śvetā, explained by Nilakanṭha as buddha-sattva-pradhānāḥ. Whiteness of complexion is attributed to dwellers of many mythical regions in the Epic and has obviously a symbolic meaning; see Clark, op. cit., p. 233, note 92. It need not be taken literally as referring to any white people actually living in the north,—a supposition which has misled some scholars to imagine a white continent of Christian worshippers. It must be remembered that Nārāyaṇa is a white god in the Kṛta-Yuga; so is Viṣṇu. Whiteness is associated with light or purity, but it is also the colour of meditation.

² For the meaning of this obscure term, which literally signifies a testicle, see Clark, op. cit., p. 232.

³ So Nilakanṭha. The other reading is rājiva-ccada-pādāḥ, “having feet like lotus-leaves”.

⁴ Tusk or daṇḍṭrā seems to be mythically associated with cosmic forms of the divine deity, e.g., in the Boar Incarnation (a cosmogonic myth) and in Bhagavat-gītā, xi, 23 and 25.

⁵ The line is obscure. It reads: jihvābhīra ye viśva-vakratan leihyante sūryaprakhyayam.

⁶ They are called muni-gaṇāḥ in 336, 50 and buddha-yonayah in 336, 49, as well as muktāḥ and sidhāḥ (see below), ‘liberated’ or ‘perfected’.
puṣa. The Lord is also said to possess the same lākṣaṇas of a Mahāpuṣa (343, 36-38), and the devotees whose appearance is said to be celestial (dīvya-vāya-rūpa) seem to be either copies or images. These material characteristics of the white radiant beings, however, hardly agree (as we shall see presently) with their immaterial nature. These are, therefore, residues, not very well fitted into the spiritual scheme, of purely popular fancies of the god and his god-like saints. Their very grotesque and fabulous character would easily point to such a popular connexion.

As to their spiritual characteristics, we are told that these divine beings are high-souled, cleansed from every sin, freed from the three guṇas, indifferent to good and evil, fully awakened (pratibud-dhāh), possessed of auspicious strength (subha-sāro-petāh) and every mark of blessedness. Elsewhere they are identified with the 'perfected' (śiddha) or 'emancipated' (mukta) souls. Their worship is vividly reported (336, 36f.) by the three ascetics who visit the island, and is important from our point of view. When the three ascetics saw them, their hands were ever joined in repeating prayer (japa) to Brahma (neuter), and their faces were turned, some towards the east and some towards the north. The japa (or repeating prayers or names of the deity) performed by these high-souled beings was a mental (mānas) japa, with which (Nārāyaṇa-) Hari became very pleased, since their minds were entirely fixed on him (ekāgra-manastvena). Suddenly there appeared a light like the effulgence of a thousand suns. The white beings, full of joy, ran towards the light, their hands folded, uttering the one word nama (we bow to thee). Then a loud cry was heard, as though they were occupied in offering a sacrifice (vali) to the great god; but nothing could be seen by the ascetics who were dazzled by the lustre and deprived of their senses. Only a great exclamation of adoration was heard: "Victory to thee, O thou of eyes like the lotus-petals! Obeisance to thee, O Creator of the universe! Obeisance to thee, O Ṣrīkeśa, the great Puruṣa, the First-born (pūrṇa)!

1 There is no need to read, with Nilakaṇṭha, the specialised sense of Yogic powers into this phrase, as Rūmī does (p. 279).

2 The supreme god Nārāyaṇa is also called sahasrārācis or sahasra-rockis, the thousand-rayed one—obviously a distant reminiscence of Viṣṇu as a sun-god.
fragrance of celestial flowers was wafted by the unsullied breeze. These men of the island, the Pañcakālajñas,1 endowed with the highest love of the god (paramā bhakti) and entirely devoted to him, were worshipping Hari with mind, word and action. Undoubtedly the god appeared in the place whence the sound arose, but the ascetics were stupefied by his illusion (māyā) and could not see him. Then a voice told the ascetics that those white men alone, devoid of their five outward senses, were able to behold Nārāyaṇa, that the great deity could not be seen by one destitute of bhakti and that hidden by his halo of light, the lord could not be seen except by those who through long years have come to a state of exclusive devotion (ekāntitva).

There is little of deliberate metaphysics in all this, but a great deal of genuine religious emotion. The narrative, as well as the religious sentiment contained therein, is evidently the product of popular fancy and belief about the existence and godhead of a personal god, his paradise, his favoured and devoted saints and their emotional worship of love and joy. Apart from other considerations, the superficial resemblances to Christian ideas and ideals (resemblances which may not be due to direct or indirect plagiarism) need not be emphasised. The religious beliefs and their expression, in spite of their similarities, lie on different planes of thought. The mythical and religious elements in the narrative are entirely Indian and are already stereotyped in the mass of such mythical descriptions in the Epic and elsewhere. But several features of the Nārāyaṇīya belief involved therein are noteworthy, and they consist of the superimposition of the Nārāyaṇīya bhakti and other ideas on this general mythical conception. Apart from the extraneous idea of the impersonal neuter Brahma, to which we shall return later, the emphasis is laid mainly on ekānta-bhakti for a personal god. The offering of sacrifice is indeed mentioned, but the mode of worship is entirely emotional. The folding of hands, burst of joy, uttering of namas and hymn of adoration are all indicative of a personal feeling of intense affection or love, for which later bhakti theology uses the

---

1 On the meaning of this obscure term see S. K. De in J.R.A.S., 1931, p. 415.
words anurakti, rūga or prīti. The mention of mānasa japa is also significant; for this japa, in which is involved the idea of the efficacy of mantra (repetition of holy words or syllables), form an important element of worship in later sectarian cults. The mention is not casual, for in 344, 26, Nārada in his worship of Nārāyaṇa is said to have performed duly a great many jāpas relating to Nārāyaṇa (jāṣa vidiḥvān matriṇ nārāyaṇa-gatīn bahūn), just as Uparicara-Vasu in 306, 64 is said to have performed nārāyaṇa-jāpas. Similarly when Yudhiṣṭhira and his brothers became devoted to Nārāyaṇa on hearing Bhīma's narrative, they were engrossed in regular jāpa (nityaṃ japa-parāh) and uttered the name of Nārāyaṇa (nārāyaṇam udiṣṭayān). The necessity of meditation (samādhi) for a bhakta is stressed in the Bhagavad-gītā. There are expressions in the Nārāyaṇiya also pointing to the same direction. The highest devotee is said to be saṃhīta-manaska (344, 19) or ekānteṣu saṃhītaḥ (339, 129); and japa is probably one of the means for the attainment of such meditative concentration.

The qualification of moral purity, in addition to such spiritual exercises, is of course demanded, and the highest devotee must be freed from every sin; but the highest qualification that is insisted upon is ekūntitva (334, 44; 336, 54; 346, 1), ekūnta-bhāva (336, 28 and 50; 339, 129; 344, 19; 349, 72) or ekūnta-bhakti (348, 71), all of which signify paramā bhakti (336, 47) or the highest love of god and give the name Ekūntin or Ekūntika (336, 50; 339, 13, 20 and 49; 341, 34; 343, 64; 348, 1-6, 62 and 68) to Nārāyaṇa's devotees and the designation ekūnta-dharma (348, 61) or ekūnta-gati (348, 85) to the religion itself. Four kinds of bhakta are

1 This need not involve any condition of yoga or Yogic samādhi, such as Rönnow supposes (p. 270).
2 339, 134-135. So also Vyāsa here, and Brahmā in the story of Haya-śīras in 347, 37.
3 Which may or may not involve technical yoga.
4 The jāpa of Viśṇu's name is inculcated in connexion with the list of his thousand names (xiii, 149), where of course the names Nārāyaṇa, Kṛṣṇa and Vāsudeva also occur.
5 As well as ekūnta-gata-buddhi (339, 107; 343, 67) and ekāgra-manastva (336, 37; 339, 19).
distinguished in a passage which, occurring in the course of a long digression, may however have been expressly meant to conform to the Gītā-doctrine. It speaks of the Ekāntikas as the first and best, while the remaining three (not described by any classificatory epithet) include generally those who do good works for their fruits (phalakāma). This last phrase and description anticipate the central Gītā-doctrine of selfless work dedicated to the Bhagavat; but as the doctrine, unless implied in the very idea of ekāntitva, is nowhere so evident, one may be justified in regarding it as extraneous. But the best devotees, the Ekāntins, with whom we are directly concerned here, are defined as those who have no other god (ananya-devatāḥ) and whose actions are directed solely towards Nārāyaṇa; they alone are fully awakened (pratibuddha, 341, 45; also 343, 53 and 65; 348, 75) and they are exceedingly rare in the world (348, 62). They are specially favoured and are dear to the god (343, 53-55 and 65; 344, 3), to whose grace alone (prasāda) is due their condition of religious devotion. They ultimately enter the deity and yet live with him in bliss in his paradise. The characteristics of the ideal devotee thus detailed are not inaptnly summed up in the verse (344, 19):

samāhita-manaskā ye nityāḥ samyatendriyāḥ
ekānta-bhāvopagata vāsudevaṁ viśanti te||

which insists upon spiritual meditation, moral purity and devotional concentration as three primary requisites, of which the last appears to be the highest. The word ekāntin is often translated by the term

---

1 This passage occurs in the long digression on the etymology of the Lord's name, which has no connexion with the main narrative. [The word śrutam, however, in this passage (341, 33, catur-vīdhā mana janā bhaktā eva hi me śrutam) probably indicates that the classification was traditional. The Gītā (vii, 16) mentions four kinds of bhakta viz., ārta, jijnāsu, arthārthīhin and jñānin, of which the jñānin is supposed to be the best. Such a scheme appears to be independently referred to in another passage in 339, 130, where, however, only the ārta and jijnāsu are mentioned.—S.K.D.]
In what sense an Ekāntin is a monotheist.

The Ekāntins are monotheists who possess not only intellectual conviction or belief, but also an ethical-emotional attitude of love or devotion. The ekānta bhākτi is not merely intellectual satisfaction, nor even moral elevation, but emotional exaltation. This is the centre of gravity towards which all other elements of the Nārāyaṇiya theology move; and if we bear in mind this ideal of emotional realisation we can understand why the systems of Bhāgavatas and Śaivas in general are declared elsewhere (xiii, 14, 198) as "freed from philosophical disputation" (hetu-vādair vinirmuktam).

The characteristics of the ideal devotee, typified by the Ekāntin inhabitants of Śvetadvīpa appear also to be the characteristics of the emancipated souls in the Nārāyaṇiya theology. The white men are called not only siddha, ‘perfected’ (339, 49) but also mukta, ‘liberated’ (335, 41; 339, 25 and 43; 340, 9). The word iha (here) employed in these verses seem to imply both ‘on earth’ as well as ‘in Śvetadvīpa,’ so that there cannot be any doubt that the mythical island is the Nārāyaṇiya paradise where the liberated souls, housed in grotesque bodies, go and become the white men, who thus represent the mythical as well as the theological conception of the liberated soul. That the ideal devotees, when released, are numbered among the white islanders appears to be expressly stated, not only in 335, 14 which declares that the labhaṇas of the emancipated souls are those of the white men, but also in 339, 129 which states that the ideal devotee, after liberation, reaches the Śvetadvīpa.

We can now understand why the inhabitants of the mythical god-

To render the term ekāntin by "unitarian" (Hopkins, Religions of India, p. 413) is inadequate and misleading; for here the one god is a one-god of many forms. We have already explained the peculiar character of early popular monotheism in which one god stands at the head, without excluding the possibility of his having many real forms or of the existence of other inferior deities either independently or as a part of himself. The emphasis is undoubtedly on oneness and unity, but in practice the early monotheistic religions allied themselves with an almost endless variety and multiplication of gods and goddesses of every rank and order,
land are conceived with grotesque peculiarities and are described as
radiant beings who have no external organs of sense. These peculiarities are not mere levities of imagination
but represent symbolically the theological ideas of the
Nārāyaṇīya. They are intended to describe the in-
describable, viz., the liberated soul, and are therefore haltingly grotes-
que; but they are also meant to emphasise that the manifestations
are entirely spiritual and beyond material description. In the passages
referred to above the ideal or emancipated devotee, as well as the
white men, are said “to enter” the deity; but in fact they are not
absorbed but dwell like copies or images of the divine person him-
self, who condescends to sport with them.

(To be continued)

Mrinal Dasgupta

King Nānyadeva of Mithila

King Nānyadeva played an important part in north Indian politics
in the first half of the twelfth century A.D. He was of Karpāṭic
origin, but founded an important ruling family in Mithilā (N. Behar)
and Nepal. Mr. M. Rāmakṛṣṇa Kavi has recently published an
account of a Commentary on Bharata’s Nāṭyaśāstra (Chs. xxviii to
xxxiv, dealing with music) which was written by Nānya¹ (This book
is hereafter referred to as ‘Commentary’). The king must, therefore,
have distinguished himself in arts of war as well as of peace. Some
passages of the Commentary throw an interesting light on the life
and reign of the great king. Mr. K. P. Jayaswal has contributed an
article on Nānya,² but as he had no knowledge of this manuscript;
and his general view of the political situation of the time is vitiated.

¹ Quarterly Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society,
October, 1926, pp. 55-63.
I.H.Q., December, 1931
by a wrong assumption about the chronology of the Sena kings of Bengal, the subject requires a fresh discussion.

The colophon of the Commentary refers to the author as Śrī-Mahāsāmanādhipati-dharmaivalokasa Śrī-man-Nānyaopati. Here the title 'Mahāsāmantādhipati' indicates that Nāya had been a feudal chief or viceroy of some king before he assumed the position of an independent sovereign. In the body of the Commentary, however, Nāya refers to himself as Mihilēśvara and Karnatākulaḥṛṣya, and uses the titles Dharmaḍhārābhūpati, Rājanārāyaṇa, Nīpamalla, Mohanamūrāri and Pratyagrawāṇipati. In addition to the general and vague references to his prowess in war, he is specifically referred to as having 'extinguished the fame of the king of Mālava,' 'defeated the heroes of Sauvīra,' and 'broken the powers of Vaṅga and Gauḍa.'

In order to understand properly the value and true meaning of these interesting data we must have an idea of the date of king Nāya.

The Nepalese chronicles have preserved conflicting traditions about the time of Nāya. But M. Sylvain Lévi was the first to establish, on a satisfactory basis, that the accession of the king falls in 1097 A.D.1 This statement, which is found in a drama, Mudita-kuvalayāsva, has since been confirmed by a memorial verse, preserved in the Puruṣa-Parīkṣā of Vidyāpati,2 and is corroborated by a Ms. written in 1097 in the reign of Nāya. The question may, therefore, be regarded as finally settled.

The duration of the reign of Nāya is, however, more difficult to determine. The Nepalese chronicles assign to him a reign of 50 or 36 years.4 According to a tradition, preserved in Vidyāpati's Puruṣa-Parīkṣā,4 a son of Nāya was a contemporary of king Jayaccandra who ascended the throne in 1170 A.D. If this tradition is to be believed we shall be inclined to accept the longer period of 50 years.6 Nāya's reign may, therefore, be placed between 1097 and 1147 A.D.

1 Le Nepal, vol. II, pp. 197, f.n. 3.
5 Puruṣa Parīkṣā, I, 3.
6 But see fn. 2, p. 688 below.
The lower limit of the date of Nānyadeva may, perhaps, be fixed with the help of the colophon of a book noticed by Bendall. This colophon, dated Sāṃvat 1076, refers to Tirhut as being ruled over by "Mahārājadhirāja Puṇḍāvaloka Somavāṇīdodbhava Gauḍadhvajo Śrīmad-Gāṅgeyadeva." Bendall referred the year 1076 to Vikrama era and identified the king with Kalacuri Gāṅgeyadeva, father of Karṇa. M. Sylvain Lévi has expressed his doubts about this identification mainly on the following grounds:

(a) The titles ending in "Avaloka" are more characteristic of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, and are not known to be used by the Kalacuris.

(b) The title Gauḍadhvaja indicates some political authority in Gauḍa, and there is no evidence that the Kalacuri king Gāṅgeyadeva had any pretensions to suzerainty over Bengal.

(c) Kalacuri king Gāṅgeyadeva is not known, from any other evidence, to have ruled over Tirhut.

These objections are serious, and to the last point may be added the fact, brought out by Mr. R. Chanda, that Magadha being under the Pālas and the territory to the west under the Chandellas, it is difficult to believe that the Kalacuri Gāṅgeya could rule over Tirhut.

I think the date of the manuscript should be referred to the Śaka era, and the king should be identified with Gaṅgadeva, the successor of Nānyadeva, according to Nepalese chronicles. The title Dharmāvaloka and the reference to the conquest of Gauḍa by Nānya in his Commentary, referred to above, would remove the first two objections. If this view be accepted, then Nānyadeva must be regarded as having died before 1154 A.D., when his son was on the throne.

Nānyadeva originally belonged to Karṇāṭa country. This is expressly referred to in the Nepalese chronicles and clearly appears from the title Karnāṭakulabhūṣya occurring in the Commentary composed by Nānyadeva, referred to above. We know from Deopārā Inscription that about the period when Nānyadeva was ruling in Mithilā, Bengal was conquered by Vijayasena who also belonged to the Karṇāṭa race. It would appear, therefore, that somehow or other.

1 J. A. S. B., 1893, p. 18.
3 Gauḍa-rāja-mālā, p. 42 fn.
the Karṇāṭas had gained a prominent footing in the eastern part of Northern India towards the close of the eleventh century A.D.

Various suggestions have been made to explain this sudden intrusion of the Karṇāṭas as a political factor in Northern India. According to Mr. Jayaswal, "The Karṇāṭa settler out of whom the Simraon dynasty (i.e. of Nānyadeva) arose was either a remnant of the Rājendra Cola’s army as Mr. R. D. Banerji thinks or more likely a remnant of the Karṇāṭa allies of Karṇa, the Cedi king......who overran nearly the whole of India about 1040-60 A.D."4

Mr. Banerji’s theory of the ‘Cola’ origin of the Bengal Karṇāṭas9 should never have been seriously taken by anybody and has been thoroughly refuted by Prof. S. K. Aiyangar. 3 Mr. Banerji himself seems to have given it up, as it does not find any place in his discussion on the origin of the Sena kings in the second edition of his ‘History of Bengal’.

As to the second theory of Mr. Jayaswal, it undoubtedly finds some support from the fact, stated in the Commentary (see above), that Nānyadeva defeated the Mālavas and Sauvīras, for Mālava was certainly among the countries conquered by Karṇa. It must be remembered, however, that the victorious expeditions of Karṇa were over about forty years before the accession of Nānyadeva. As Nānyadeva was himself the founder of a new dynasty, and was merely a Mahāśāmantādhipati to start with, he could not possibly have been a leader of the Karṇāṭas who accompanied Karṇa about forty years before his accession. The long reign of fifty years (which Mr. Jayaswal also accepts) assigned to Nānyadeva renders the view untenable.

The most reasonable view seems to be to connect the rise of the Karṇāṭaka power in North India with the victorious military expeditions of the Karṇāṭa emperors Someśvara I and his valiant son Vikramāditya VI of the Cālukya dynasty. We learn from Bilhana’s Vikramānukadeva-carita4 that Someśvara I (1040-69 A.D.) stormed Dhārā, the capital of the Paramāras in Malwa, from which king Bhoja had to flee, and that he utterly destroyed the power of Karṇa,

2 Pālas of Bengal, p. 99.
4 Cf. Bühler’s Introduction to Vikramānukadeva-carita.
king of Dāhala. His son, prince Vikramāditya, led victorious expeditions against Gauḍa and Kāmarūpa. Vikramāditya VI led victorious expeditions against Northern India at least twice during his reign. A record of A.D. 1088-89 speaks of Vikramāditya VI crossing the Narmadā, and conquering kings on the other side of that river. And another of A.D. 1098 shows that then, again, he was in the northern part of the kingdom on the banks of the Narmadā.  

It would thus appear that the two Kārṇāṭa kings played an effective part in North Indian politics during the latter half of the eleventh century A.D. That they had pretensions of suzerainty not only over the states named above but even over distant Nepāla follows from an inscription of Someśvara III, the son and successor of Vikramāditya VI, in which the king is said to have placed his feet upon the heads of the kings of Andhra, Drāvida, Magadha and Nepāla.

Now there is no record of Someśvara's military expedition to the north, and, as Fleet remarks, with the exception of a Southern expedition, "the records do not seem to mention any campaigns made by him; and his reign seems, in fact, to have been a very tranquil one." We must hold, therefore, that his pretensions of supremacy over the northern states, whether nominal or real, must have been derived from his father or grandfather.

The downfall of the Cedi king Karna, and the Paramāra king Bhoja, caused by Someśvara I, must have paved the way for Kārṇāṭa supremacy in the north, and ushered in a new epoch in north Indian politics. An inscription of the Gāhaḍavāla kings definitely asserts that Candradeva founded the kingdom of Kanauj "when kings Bhoja and Karna had passed away." Candradeva, the founder of the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty, flourished about 1090 A.D. Within a decade of that, two Kārṇāṭa chiefs, Vijayasena and Nānyadeva,

4 Supremacy over Nepāla is also claimed by the Cālukya king Taila II in his records. But Fleet thinks it is an invention of the poets. I should rather take it as a belated reference to an old glory, which had no longer any reality (cf. Bombay Gazetteer, vol. I, part II, p. 431).
founded the kingdoms of Gauḍa and Mithilā. It is, therefore, permissible to hold that the deluge of Karnaṇta invasion, which had swept away the two mighty kings, Bhoja and Karna, also ushered in the three dynasties at Kanauj, Mithilā and Bengal.

We have seen above that the Karnaṇta emperors of the Cālukya dynasty boasted of supremacy over Bengal, Bihar and Nepāla, and of the three new ruling dynasties, the two that ruled over Bengal, and Bihar-cum-Nepal, definitely belonged to the Karnaṇta country. It is, therefore, only natural to hold that, like the later Mahratta principalities of Northern India, the two Karnaṇta kingdoms of Bengal and Bihar-cum-Nepal were merely offshoots of the Karnaṇta expeditions.

1 As to the Gāhaḍavālas, it is not unlikely, though it is difficult to assert it positively, that they too came from the Karnaṇta country like those ruling in Bengal and Bihar. I propose to treat this subject in a separate paper, and must content myself here with only a few observations. Tradition and inscriptions alike give the appellations Raṭhor and Raṭṛakāṭa to the Gāhaḍavālas (cf. Sir Asutosh Mookerjee Silver Jubilee Volumes, vol. III, pp. 259-66). The Raṭhors have always been regarded as the same as Raṭṭas, Raṭras and Raṭṛakāṭas. Now the Raṭṭa country is frequently referred to in the inscriptions of the eleventh century as Raṭṭappādi and it included the Bombay Presidency south of the Vindhyas (Aiyangar, Ancient India, p. 22). The Raṭṭas of Saundatti (in Belgaum) formed an important clan under the Cālukyas of Kalyāṇa (Bombay Gazetteer, vol. I, part II, pp. 549ff.). The Gāhaḍavāla clan of the Raṭhors or Raṭṭas may therefore belong to the Raṭṭa country proper in the Deccan, and Candradeva Gāhaḍavāla of Kanauj may thus be of Karnaṇṭaka origin like Nānyadeva and Vijayasena. It is interesting to note that a Kanarese inscription at Gāwarwāḍ dated 994 Śaka (1072 A.D.) in front of the temple of Daksīṇa Nārāyaṇa refers to the famous town of ‘Gāvarivāda’ (Ep. Ind., vol. XV, p. 337; Bombay Gazetteer, vol. I, part II, p. 441, fn. 3). Gāvarivāda—Gāwarwāḍ, may be easily recognised as the origin of the name Gāhaḍavāda of the family, and although it may be purely accidental, we have, corresponding to the Daksīṇa-Nārāyaṇa of the southern town, reference to ‘Ādikeśavadakṣipāṁśūti’ in an inscription of the Gāhaḍavāla king Candradeva of Kanauj (Ep. Ind., vol. XIV, p. 197). I do not press this point further here, and while there is as yet no positive evidence to show that the Gāhaḍavādas were a Karnaṇṭaka family, the possibility of their being so should not be overlooked.
in Northern India led by the Cālukya emperors Someśvara I and his son Vikramāditya VI. We may note in passing that the title, Mahāśāmantādhipati, assumed by Nānyadeva, was actually applied to the Viceroy and Governors of Vikramāditya VI.¹

We have already remarked above that in the Commentary, Nānyadeva is credited with victories in Mālava and Sauvīra. This is easily explained if we accept the view propounded above. For we have seen that the Cālukya king Vikramāditya VI conquered the kings on the northern side of the Narmadā river, and Bilhana says that Vikramāditya VI helped a king of Mālava to regain his throne. Nānyadeva, in his earlier life, probably accompanied one or more of these victorious expeditions and hence took the credit of victory in wars against those countries. Otherwise, it is difficult to believe, that as a ruler of Mithilā he could have carried his arms so far to the west, with such powerful neighbours to his immediate west and south-west.

Among the other achievements of Nānya, the Commentary mentions his victories against Gauḍa and Vaṅga. This is interesting in more ways than one. From the Deopāra Inscription of Vijayasena we know that he defeated Nānya,² This has usually been taken to refer to an aggressive invasion of Mithilā on the part of Vijayasena. In the light of the new evidence, it seems more likely, however, that the dissensions between the two Karnāṭa kings took place over domination in Gauḍa and Vaṅga. At the time when Nānyadeva ascended the throne of Mithilā, the political condition of Bengal was such as to tempt a foreign invader. Rāmapāla had just put down a revolt of the Kaivartas and re-occupied Varendra, and the country was necessarily unsettled. Eastern Bengal was under a new dynasty, the Varmaṇs, while the Senas were a rising power in Rāḍha or South-west Bengal. Besides these, there were probably other minor chiefs all over the country who enjoyed either full or limited independence, such as those mentioned in the Rāmacarita. It is quite probable, therefore, that Nānyadeva, after having settled himself in Northern Bihar would turn his attention to Gauḍa and Vaṅga (N. and E. Bengal). The ambition of the Senas, however, lay in exactly the same direction. Whether the two Karnāṭaka chiefs pursued in concert a common policy of conquest, and fell out later when the prize was

within their grasp, or whether they came into conflict because each wanted the other to leave him alone in what he regarded as his own sphere of influence, cannot be exactly determined. But the one sure conclusion that follows from a study of the contemporary records is that there were two streams of Kārṇāṭaka invasion that overwhelmed Bengal, one from north-west and another from south-west under the leadership of Nānya and Vijayasena. Nānya, however, ultimately failed, whereas Vijayasena succeeded. Foiled in the east, Nānya turned towards the north and succeeded in conquering Nepāla.

In his elaborate discussion about the general political situation in North India at the time, Mr. Jayaswal has upheld the view that Nānya allied himself with the Gāhādavāla kings against the Senas; and further that the Pālas in South Bihar also joined this confederacy against the rising power of the Senas.1

Mr. Jayaswal has, however, reconstructed the narrative of the struggle between this confederacy and the Senas on the theory tenaciously upheld by Mr. R. D. Banerji that Lakṣaṇaṇasena ascended the throne in 1119 A.D. This view, however, seems untenable, and is rarely accepted at present by any scholar who has made a special study of the subject. But even Mr. Banerji, who was the great champion of this view, maintained that Lakṣaṇaṇasena died before 1170 A.D. This would be hardly compatible with Mr. Jayaswal's view that 'it was in the time of Nānya's grandson Narasipphadeva (1174-1205) that Mithilā leaned towards the Sena power and it would be then that the Lakṣaṇaṇasena era would come into vogue in Mithilā'.2

As a matter of fact, there can hardly be any doubt now as to the true dates of the Sena kings. Since I wrote my paper on this subject,3 several scholars have made further contributions to it and all these confirm in the main the chronology then suggested by me in opposition to the views of Mr. R. D. Banerji whom Mr. Jayaswal has taken as his sole guide.

These further contributions of scholars mainly turn on two important points: (t) the genuineness of the dates 1082, 1090, 1091 Śaka for Vallālasena's reign as given in Dānasāgara and Abhutasāgara; (2) the date given in the colophon of Saduktikarpanīmṛta.

As to (1), reference may be made to the writings of Mr. Chinta-

---

3 J.A.S.B., 1921, pp. 7ff.
haran Chakrabarty, and Mr. Dinesh Chandra Bhattacharyya. To these I may add another argument in favour of the genuineness of the dates of Vallālasena found in his literary works. This is furnished by a “reference in the Ṭodarānanda-Saṃhitā-Saukhya about the position of constellation of the Great Bear according to the Ādhutasāgara in the Śaka year 1082 (1160-61 A.D.) while Vallālasena was ruling.” Ṭodarānanda is an extensive encyclopaedia of civil and religious law, astronomy and medicine, composed by Rājā Ṭodaramalla, the celebrated finance minister of Akbar. The reference in this book to the dates of Ādhutasāgara undoubtedly goes a great way to confirm their genuineness. As Mr. Chakrabarty has pointed out, the dates are not merely given in the introductory verse, which Mr. R. D. Banerji regarded as later interpolation, but that “in the Ādhutasāgara itself, in more than one place, explicit reference is made to the year of commencement of the work, which agrees with what is given in the introductory verse; further, in several sections astronomical calculations are made from the year when the book was commenced.” In the face of all these it would be difficult not to regard 1090-91 Śaka (1168-69 A.D.) given in Dānasāgara, as a date falling; in Vallālasena’s reign.

This view is further confirmed by the date given in the colophon of Saduktikarṇāmyta. Mr. Chakravarty has restored the correct reading of the colophon by a collation of the different manuscripts. According to this colophon the accession of Lakṣīmaṇa Sena falls in 1100 Śaka (1178 A.D.)

As I pointed out in my paper, these dates are in full accord with the other data known from Indian and Muslim history. Thus, the probable dates of accession of the first three great kings of the Sena dynasty may be laid down as follows with a fair degree of certainty:

Vijaya Sena —1095 A.D.
Vallāla Sena —1159 A.D.
Lakṣīmaṇa Sena—1178 A.D.

4 Ibid., p. 421.
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As in the case of the date of Lakṣmaṇa Sena, Mr. Jayaswal has been misled by Mr. R. D. Banerji into the belief that the Gāhaḍāvāla king Candra of Kanauj helped Madanapāla against Vijayasena. Mr. Banerji’s theory rests upon a passage in Rāmacarīta (Canto IV, verse 20) which describes “Candra” as a friend of Madanapāla. There is nothing to indicate that Candra helped Madanapāla against the Sena king, or that he was a king of the Gāhaḍāvāla dynasty. On the other hand, Mr. Banerji’s view, that in his wars against Vijayasena Madanapāla was helped by king Candra of Kanauj, rests upon his theory that Lakṣmaṇasena ascended the throne in 1119 A.D. which, we have seen above, is untenable.

All the same, the rivalry between the Senas and the Gāhaḍāvālas is undoubtedly a fact. But there is no evidence to connect either the Pālas or Nānyadeva with this struggle. So the picture which Mr. Jayaswal has drawn of the balancing of powers in Nānya’s time does not appear to have any sure basis to stand upon.

On the other hand, Nānyadeva seems to have been effectively checked by Vijayasena. According to the Deopārā Inscription he was even taken prisoner by the latter. This serious reverse seems to have finally shattered his ambition and he left the field free for the two combatants, the Senas and the Gāhaḍāvālas. According to the Deopārā Inscription, Vijayasena sent a flotilla of boats along the Ganges with a view to conquer the western regions. This would hardly have been possible if the ruler of Mithilā had not been previously rendered incapable of rising against him. The scheme of

1 Pālas of Bengal p. 103.
2 Mr. Jayaswal has laid some stress on the fact that Malladeva, a son of Nānyadeva, took service under Jayaccandra of Kanauj. The story is given by Vidyāpati, and according to him, Malladeva was killed in the war when only sixteen years old (J.A.S.B., 1915, p. 408). Now as Jayaccandra ascended the throne in 1170 A.D., Malladeva could not have been born before 1154 A.D., if Vidyāpati’s story were true. The death of Nānyadeva would then have to be placed after 1154 A.D. He would thus have a reigning period of about 60 years, far more than the longest period assigned to him in Vamśāvalis. Thus reasonable doubts can be entertained regarding the truth of Vidyāpati’s story, at least, in all its details.
3 Cf. verse 21
4 Cf. verse 22.
western expansion was steadily pursued by the Senas, though the strong arms of Govindacandra of Kanauj did not enable them to reap any immediate success. But the ambition of the Senas was realised to a great extent when, after the death of Govindacandra, king Lākṣmaṇasena planted pillars of victory at Benares and Prayāga, probably some time between 1180 and 1190 A.D. During the whole of this period the rulers of Mithilā, Nānya and his successors, were negligible factors in north Indian politics. Even their policy of expansion towards Nepāla did not meet with great success. According to M. Sylvain Lévi, Nānya and his immediate successors exercised but little real authority in that country. They remained as local rulers of Tirhut with Simraon as their capital. The only epigraphic record of their rule is furnished by the Andharā-Thāphi inscription of Śrīdhara, the minister of Nānya.

R. C. Majumdar

The Coins and Weights in Ancient India

The intimate connection between the coinage and the weight-system of a country is well-known. Everywhere the standard unit of weight for precious metals became the standard unit of value, and this became ultimately coin when stamped with the royal insignia. The very names of the coins indicate this relation in good many cases.

In the Manusāṁhitā is found a table of weight-metres of the Hindus which have remained almost the same as the basic system of weights and measures in India up to date. The subsequent alterations by the Indians as well as the non-Indians may be regarded as mere superimpositions on the original structure of the great law-giver. Still the actual unit of measurement for precious articles in India, is


2 This inscription has been edited by Mr. Jayaswal in *J.B.O.R.S.*, vol. IX, pp. 300ff. It does not contain any historical information of real value.

3 Jevons, p. 35; Kinley, p. 48.
the traditional rati kṛṣṇala (kuṁj-seed)\(^1\); and still the actual weights in the order of ascending scale bear the names given to them by the ancient Rṣi, and indicate the same significance as in his time. The minute subdivisions of the kṛṣṇala, as given below, are used merely for the purpose of accounting and have no practical significance:

| 8 Trasa-reṇu | = | 1 Līkṣa (egg of louse) |
| 3 Līkṣas    | = | 1 Rāja-sarṣapa (black mustard) |
| 3 Rājasarṣapas | = | 1 Gaura-sarṣapa (white mustard) |
| 6 Gaura-sarṣapas | = | 1 Yava (barley corn) |
| 3 Yavas      | = | 1 Kṛṣṇala (berry, rati) |

\[\bullet\bullet\bullet\bullet\bullet\bullet\]

| 5 Kṛṣṇalas | = | 1 Māṣā (bean seed) |
| 16 Māṣās   | = | 1 Suvarṇa (weight and coin of gold) |
| 4 Suvarṇas  | = | 1 Niśka or Pala |
| 10 Palas   | = | 1 Dharaṇa\(^2\) |

As distinct from the above table of Manu, the following may be considered indicating alterations and super-impositions on the original structure:

| 6 Rājikas | = | 1 Māṣā, luna or vanaka |
| 4 Māṣās   | = | 1 Taṅkā, sala or dharana |
| 2 Taṅkās  | = | 1 Koṇa |
| 2 Koṇas   | = | 1 Karṣa |

\[\bullet\bullet\bullet\bullet\bullet\bullet\]

| 108 Suvarṇas | = | Śurubhuṣana, pala or dināra\(^3\) |
| 20 Kapardakas (shells or cowries) | = | 1 Kākinī (buri, 5 gaṇḍās) |
| 4 Kākinīs   | = | 1 Paṇa, kāṛṣīpaṇa or karṣikā |

\[\bullet\bullet\bullet\bullet\bullet\bullet\bullet\bullet\bullet\bullet\]

| 16 Paṇas (purna of shells) | = | 1 Bherma of silver |
| 16 Bhermas               | = | 1 Niśka of silver |

---

1 Colebrooke, Prinsep, I, 212.
2 Manu VIII, 131-38, Hopkins & Burnett.
3 Gopāla Bhaṭṭa, 122.
5 Kraṇalas = 1 Maṣa
16 Maṣās = 1 Karṣa, aksa-tolaka or suvāraṇa

5 Suvarṇas = 1 Pala

Manu's table, quoted above, primarily refers to gold. The subsidiary copper-table is similar, but silver has a peculiar table of its own:

2 Kraṇalas = 1 Silver maṣaka
16 Maṣakas = 1 Dharaṇa or pūraṇa
10 Dharaṇas = 1 Satamāna

88 White mustards = 1 Silver maṣa
16 Silver maṣas = 1 Dharaṇa

It may be granted that primarily from Manu's table of weights the following table for coins was constructed in ancient India:

1 Pala (gold) = 5 × 16 × 4 = 320 Ratis.
1 Niṣka " = 5 × 16 × 4 = 320 "
1 Suvarṇa " = 5 × 16 = 80 "
1 Kārṣaṇa " = 5 × 16 = 80 "
1 Maṣa " = 1 × 5 = 5 "
1 Karṣa, kraṇala, (kārṣaṇa, kahāna, kāhana) of (gold) = 1 Rati.
1 Satamāna (gold) = 100 Ratis.

1 Satamāna (silver) = 2 × 16 × 10 = 320 Ratis,
1 Dharaṇa or pūraṇa (silver) = 2 × 16 = 32 "
1 Kārṣaṇa (silver) = 80 "
1 Karsapaṇa (silver) = 32 "
1 Niṣka " (4 suvāraṇa in weight) = 320 "
1 Suvarṇa " = 80 "

1 Līlavatī.
2 Kauṭilya calls a Suvarṇappala (Arthasastra, p. 127).
3 Kauṭilya calls a dharaṇa or pūraṇa of silver of 32 ratis a kārṣaṇa.
4 Kauṭilya calls a silver dharaṇa or pūraṇa of 32 ratis a Kārṣāpaṇa.
5 The silver satamāna has also the same weight.
Most of the above coins had also their sub-divisional varieties, such as, ardhakāṛṣāpana, pada-kāṛṣāpana.

It is rather difficult to reconcile the discrepancies in the above tables regarding the denominations, weights, and basic metals.

According to Manu, silver māsaka is equal to 36 gaurasarāpanas. But according to Kauṭilya it is equal to 88 gaurasarāpanas.1 Again Manu’s silver dharaṇa or pūraṇa is equal to 32 ratis, that of Kauṭilya is equal to 80 ratis and Gopāla Bhaṭṭa’s dharaṇa is equal to 24 ratis.

Still there is another variety of the dharaṇa which is equal to 1200 ratis.

Manu’s silver māṣa is 5 ratis; Kauṭilya’s 5 ratis; and Bhaṭṭa’s 6 ratis.

\[
\begin{align*}
5 \text{ Kṛṣṇala} & = 1 \text{ Māṣa}. \\
6 \text{ Māṣa} & = 1 \text{ Suvarṇa}. \\
4 \text{ Suvarṇa} & = 1 \text{ Pala or niśka}. \\
10 \text{ Pala} & = 1 \text{ Dharaṇa}.
\end{align*}
\]

Is it possible to reconcile the discrepancies? Are they in any way due to the varying ratios between gold and silver at different times? May it be conjectured that when the ratio was 1 : 8, two rati māṣaka of silver was the unit and when it changed into 1 : 12, three or six rati māṣakas had to be introduced as the unit?

With regard to the coins of gold similar discrepancies puzzle an enquirer:

\[
\begin{align*}
1 \text{ Suvarṇa (Manu)} & = 80 \text{ Rati}. \\
1 \text{ Pala (Kauṭilya)} & = 80. \\
1 \text{ Kāṛṣāpana or kāṛa} & = 80 „. \\
1 \text{ Kāṛṣāpana or kāṛa} & = 96 „. (Gopāla) \\
1 \text{ Kāṛṣāpana} 4 \times 8 & = 32 „. \\
1 \text{ Kāṛṣāpana, karhāpana or kahana} & = 1 \text{ Rati}. \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
1 \text{ Pala} \ldots 4 \text{ (suvarṇa)} \times 80 & = 320 \text{ Rati} \\
1 \text{ Pala} \ldots 5 \times 16 & = 80 „. \\
1 \text{ Niśka} & = 320 „. \\
1 \text{ Śatamāna (gold)} & = 100 „. \\
1 \text{ Śatamāna (silver)} & = 320 „. \\
1 \text{ Niśka (silver)} & = 320 „.
\end{align*}
\]

1 Bhandarkar, p. 93. 2 Cunningham, p. 41.
The suvarṇa and the kārṣāpaṇa are sometimes identical in weight in the case of gold. Suvarṇa, the generic name of all sorts of gold coins derived from their basic metal, came to be applied not only to a particular weight of gold (80 rati) but also possibly to a silver coin of the same weight. Kārṣāpaṇa, the full-weight unit of gold money, was also called Suvarṇa. But there were 96 rati kārṣāpaṇa of gold, 32 rati kārṣāpaṇa of silver and 1 rati kārṣāpaṇa-kahāpāna or kāhānā which was the smallest unit for counting value as well as the smallest coin (yava-traya-parimita).

The pala and the niṣka were the two different names of gold coins of the same weight. The silver coin of the same weight was called niṣka, but strangely its other name was šatamāna.

"In Yājñavalkya, Niṣka of silver is mentioned which is equal to 4 suvarṇas or one pala of gold (in weight of course)."

This is queer, as the māna is a rati, and so the šatamāna should be 100 rati as in the case of gold. The māna in the case of silver apparently indicates different measure as the māṣā.

"Mention is also made of silver šatamāna of 57·6 grains. As the word means 100 mānas or measures, the single māna must have been 576 grs. = 3 ratis spoken of as silver māṣaka."  
Manu's māṣā (gold and copper) is five ratis and (silver) 2 ratis, and Gopāla's 6 ratis.

Prinsep notices four varieties of māṣās of 5, 4, 16, 2 ratis. Other varieties have been noticed by other authorities.

The māṣā in its importance has been regarded as the second of the monetary measures in India. It is, like the krṣṇala, a kind of seed, and its average weight has been ascertained to be 3'625 grains and near about that of the silver māṣā of 2 ratis. But unlike the krṣṇala it has no absolutely definite significance and its weight has been mentioned as widely different in different cases and by different authorities.

It may be imagined that while the rati or the krṣṇala provided for the primary weight-unit for gold, the māṣā served the same purpose for silver, the lighter metal. Both the seeds are readily available in India and are sufficiently uniform in size and weight to serve as the necessary units. The rati is the sub-division of the māṣā in the case

1 Cunningham, p. 47. 2 Cunningham, p. 47. 3 Prinsep, p. 212, Cunningham, Gopāla Bhaṭṭa, Raghunandana, Colebrooke.
of silver and there is a nice adjustment between the weights. One silver māśā is about 3'625 grains or roughly 3'50 grains, while a rati has sometimes been mentioned as 1'83 and on the average as 1'75 grains, and the 2 ratis are equal to a silver māśā. In the case of gold the māśā is five times a rati. The reason seems to be that a minuter subdivision was necessary for the more valuable metal of which the primary unit of weight or currency was a rati which was of sufficient value to serve as a medium of exchange.

But there is mentioned another kind of māśā of silver, of which the weight is 8 rati or 14'64 grains.¹ This may be the quadruple piece of the silver māśā, two rati in weight. This 8 rati māśā might have been the smallest practical unit of silver coin while the 2 rati piece was a mere weight or money of account. This 8 rati māśā was one fourth of a dharaṇa which was 32 rati in weight. The one rati gold piece was coined as money, but it may be imagined that the 5 rati gold māśā was much more convenient as money. Similarly the 8 rati silver māśā was more prevalent as money than the two rati silver māśā of very low value which might have been useful only for the purpose of accounting.

But the other varieties of māśā such as 4, 16, 3, 6 ratis in weight have also been mentioned.

"According to Kātyāyana...a māśā or paṇa (is) one-twentieth part of kārṣāpaṇa in value."

It is therefore 4 rati in weight and one-eighth of a silver dharaṇa or pūraṇa. If there were a 16 rati māśā also it was one half of the punch-marked silver coin so famous in ancient India.

Is it possible that the māśā came to be the general name for all fractional money, particularly in the case of silver? If so, the full silver table was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fraction</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>32 rati (kārṣā-paṇa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the fractions of the full weight silver coin (pūraṇa or kārṣā-paṇa) came to be called māśā. But the word was also applicable to gold and copper for measuring the fractions of the full weight gold.

¹ N. Orientalia.
Did the māśā, whatever might be its origin, a seed of 3.5 or 14.6 grains (the small bean or the big bean), come in course of time to mean a fraction of the standard gold, silver and copper piece? The silver māśā starts with 2 rati or $\frac{1}{8}$ of the full-weight silver money, and the gold or copper māśā is the same in relation to the full-weight gold or copper money, and even today the significant fraction of the rupee is its $\frac{1}{16}$th part, the anna.

A māśā has been called by Kātyāyana, a paṇa. A paṇa is an anna or $\frac{1}{16}$ of a kāhana (kahāpana or kārsāpana). Thus it fits in well with the present system in which an anna is $\frac{1}{16}$th of a rupee. But Kātyāyana regards a paṇa as $\frac{1}{16}$ and not $\frac{1}{16}$ of a rupee. Subsequently, it has been discussed that the kārsāpana, when of gold, might have been used indifferently for two different varieties of weights and coins, 80 rati suvarṇa and the 1 rati kṛṣṇa or kaśā. The modern kāhana, which is equal to $1 \times 16 \times 80$ cowries, is derived from the latter specie, of which the copper value is equal to 1280 rati, if the ratios between gold, silver and copper be taken to be 1:16:80, as mentioned in the Śukra-niti. A kārsāpana has sometimes been designated a kaśā or a rati. It may not be altogether fantastic to imagine that the 80 rati copper kārsāpana was so named because it contained 1 paṇa (80) kaśā in weight and in value (1 rati copper=1 cowri). Thus the 80 rati paṇa (copper) was $\frac{1}{8}$ of 1 rati (gold) kārsāpana or kāhana, and Kauṭilya’s 4 rati paṇa was only $\frac{1}{4}$ of a kārsāpana (copper) and equivalent to the modern “buri” or 5 gaṇḍās or 20 cowries in the Bengal system of Arithmetic.

We frequently meet with instances of loosely using the same word for denoting different conceptions. This is a common error even today, and most probably was much more so in ancient India. It may be also that in the widely distant parts of such a vast country the same name denoted different things. The word “tiṅkā” has different significance in the different parts of India in modern times. In the up-countries it is often used to mean a “Double-pice”. Again a seer weight may be 60, 80, 100 and 120 tolas, according to the location of the market.

It has been supposed that the māśā was originally a bean seed and also that there were two varieties of it, the small one weighing 3.5 grains and the big one weighing 14.6 grains, both approximately. If so, how the other sorts of māśās of 3, 4, 5, 6, ratis etc, can be explained?

I.H.Q., December, 1931
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“Nārada says, a māśā may also be considered as \( \frac{1}{2} \)th of a kārṣāpana and Brhaspati describes it as \( \frac{1}{2} \) of a pala. Hence we have no less than four māśās, not taking into account the māśā used by the medical men consisting of 10, 12 ratis which may be the same as the jeweller’s māśā of six double ratis, because it has been explained as being measured by 8 silver rati in weight, each twice as heavy as the seeds”.¹

This supports the above suggestion that māśā was a generic name for all fractional weights.

Finally, it may be said that the māśā was a secondary unit and not the primary one like the rati, and its significance was not so precise as that of the rati which was the only absolutely and universally definite weight in the Indian system of weights and coins.

The krśnala or the rati has a unique position in the Indian system, as the primary unit for the measurement of value as well as of weight. Perhaps the attractive appearance of the seed, its abundant and wide supply and uniformity in weight as well as in shape led to its adoption by the people of India for the above mentioned useful purposes. The krśnala came to be recognised by the early Hindus as the “balance or scale of a seed,” and was able to maintain its position under the Muhammadans as the surkh or “red.” Its weight has been carefully tested by the European numismatists, some of whom are inclined to estimate it to be 1.83 grains but the concensus of opinion is that, on the average, it may be taken to be 1.75 grs.²

The rati, no doubt, is the starting point in weight-measurement and money-account. It is very significant that unlike the māśā it has only one and a precisely definite connotation regarding weight which makes it serve without any possibility of confusion as the basis for the monetary and weight calculation of India.

But the rati was not merely a weight. It was also a coin. The unit of weight, in course of time, became unit of money and more or less current in the case of gold. Historical evidence may be quoted to support this view that the one rati piece was current as medium of exchange in the shape of “scales of gold” or bags of gold dust. These pieces were too small to be counted³ and were measured in pots.⁴

1 Colebrooke, I, p. 531.
2 N. Orientalia, pp. 10-11, 14, 65; Rapson, p.2; Prinsep, I, p.212; Colebrooke, I, p. 529.
3 “Suvarṇa salākāni yava traya-parimitāni.”
4 N. Orientalia, p. 14; Cunningham, pp. 7, 21; Colebrooke, p. 530; Bhandarkar, p. 179.
It may be that the "bags of gold-dust", in which revenue was paid to the Persian Darius, and which have puzzled the ingenuity of the European numismatists so much, were bags of the star-like kṛṣṇala coins.

A rati has also been called a kārsa, and the one rati gold star, a kāṛṣāpana or the modern kāhana of 1280 cowries.

The smallest gold coin in India is the rati. Then comes the māṣā of 5 ratis; after that the suvarṇa, the full-weight unit coin of gold, weighing 80 rati and prevalent as the most widely current coin under different denominations, such as the suvarṇa, kāṛṣāpana, and pala. The suvarṇa was a generic name for all kinds of gold coins as well as bullion. The original significance of the term was possibly the metal only. In course of time the ideas of a particular weight and definite inscription were associated with it and it came to mean the standard gold coin, 80 rati-kāṛṣāpana.¹

Suvarṇa was originally simple gold, afterwards, a particular measure of gold, contained in a bag serving as a convenient

¹ Cunningham, p. 7: "The gold standard coin, the suvarṇa of 80 rati." Also Rapson, p. 2.
Bhandarkar, p. 91: "Suvarṇa being intended as the gold kāṛṣāpana."
Yājñavalkya, Smṛti, p. 432; Bhandarkar, pp. 103, 184: "Pieces of gold in point of value are suvarṇas mentioned in the Vedas."
Cunningham, p. 22: "The suvarṇas gradually became the name of coins from the original name of weight."
N. Orientalia, p. 81. "The Buddhist legends abound in mentioning suvarṇas."
Cunningham, p. 22: "The suvarṇa was a single bag of gold dust."
Bhandarkar, p. 58: "Suvarṇa must denote a coin and not simply gold."
Yājñavalkya, Smṛti, (Pāṇini office) p. 434: "According to Viṣṇu-gupta another name of suvarṇa is kārsa". See also Bhandarkar, pp. 183, 184.
Cunningham, p. 22: "The gold of India, always noted for its yellow hue, received its common name suvarṇa which at last became the name of a piece of gold."
Arthaśāstra, p. 102; Bhandarkar, p. 71: "Suvarṇa weighs 80 ratis. Kauṭilya gives the same information. Another name of suvarṇa is karṣa, the gold kāṛṣāpana."
Cunningham, p. 50: "Han and hun, the same as son, the spoken form of suvarṇa, gold."
Bhandarkar, p. 184: "The Gupta inscriptions may have used suvarṇa also synonymously with dināra."
unit of payment; then a definite measure of coined gold as money which following the indigenous method came to be of 80 rati weight. In course of time all gold coins came to be known as suvarṇa irrespective of weight, from the rati kṛṣṇa or star to the pala of 320 ratis or even more. But the full-weight suvarṇa coin was 80 rati specifically. Its another name was kāṛṣā-pana, which was also the generic name of all full-weight coins, irrespective of their basic metals, gold, silver or copper.

Now, the exhaustive list of coins may be given here:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gold Coins</th>
<th>1 rati (kāṛṣā-pana)</th>
<th>96 rati (kāṛṣā-pana)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 &quot; (ropaka)</td>
<td>100 &quot; (ṣatamāna)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 &quot; (māṣā)</td>
<td>320 &quot; (niśka)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80 &quot; (kāṛṣā-pana)</td>
<td>320 &quot; (pala)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80 &quot; (pala)</td>
<td>400 &quot; (pala)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Silver Coins</th>
<th>32 rati (dhāraṇa or purāṇa)</th>
<th>Kāṛṣā-pana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 rati (māṣā)</td>
<td>... Ardha-kāṛṣā-pana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 rati (māṣā)</td>
<td>... Pada-kāṛṣā-pana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 rati (māṣā)</td>
<td>... (\frac{1}{16})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 rati (māṣā)</td>
<td>... (\frac{1}{32})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Copper Coins</th>
<th>80 rati (pana)</th>
<th>Kāṛṣā-pana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 &quot;</td>
<td>(\frac{1}{16})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 &quot;</td>
<td>(\frac{1}{32})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 &quot;</td>
<td>(\frac{1}{64})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 &quot; (māṣā)</td>
<td>(\frac{1}{128})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By comparing these three tables some striking uniformity of principle can be found out. The smallest fraction, except in the case of gold, is a māṣā which is always \(\frac{1}{16}\) of a standard coin. The exception in the case of gold may be due to high value in small bulk and also silver being 16 times lower in value as mentioned in the Śukra-niti.

All fractional coins have the general name of māṣā. All the standard coins are 16 times the māṣā. In the case of silver it is \(2 \times 16\). One rati silver piece being of too low a value would not be of practical use, and the 5 rati copper piece was merely money of account and possibly never coined as actual money. Cāṇakya mentions the smallest variety of copper coin as pada-kāṛṣā-pana which was 20 rati in weight and valued at 20 cowries or 5 gāṇḍās or a buḍi which in the indigenous system of accounts today is regarded as equivalent to 1 pice. The bigger fractional
coins are the multiples of the smallest māṣā following the quadruple principle so indigenous and enduring in the Indian mode of calculation and measurement. The Śatamāna is an exception due to its exotic origin.¹

\[
\begin{align*}
16 \text{ chattacks} &= 1 \text{ seer} \\
16 \text{ paṇas or bisās} &= 1 \text{ kāhana (paddy)} \\
16 \text{ chattacks} &= 1 \text{ cottah} \\
16 \text{ paṇas} &= 1 \text{ kāhana (cowrie)} \\
16 \text{ annas} &= 1 \text{ rupee} \\
\end{align*}
\]

and so on.

The generic names of all the full-weight standard coins were kāṛṣāpaṇa. Thus the golden suvarṇa is kāṛṣāpaṇa, the silver dhārāṇa is kāṛṣāpaṇa and the copper paṇa is kāṛṣāpaṇa.²

It is a mistake to regard the kāṛṣāpaṇa as merely or pre-eminently a copper coin, following Manu’s phrase “tāmrīkāḥ kāṛṣīkāḥ paṇāḥ”, and to conclude from this that copper was the standard of value in ancient India.

The kāṛṣāpaṇa was the name of all standard money. It derived its name from 80 rati which is a paṇa even now. It was the mostly current form of coin. The suvarṇa is much more mentioned than the pala or the niṣka. But in course of time the pala also came to be called kāṛṣāpaṇa. The dhārāṇa has been called kāṛṣāpaṇa. It has been regarded as the standard coin (the famous “punch-marked” one).

The kāṛṣāpaṇa became kahāṇa in Pāli and kāhana in Bengali. Its symbol is always 1 or a full unit and its fraction is a (1) paṇa which is converted into kāṛṣāpaṇa by multiplying the paṇa by 4 or 16. The maund is 1, the rupee is 1, and the kāhana is 1. All these are 16 times of the fractional unit and represented by the symbol 1.

Thus in the metric system the position of the kāṛṣāpaṇa is as important as that of the krṣṇala.

Two important questions remain to be discussed in connection with the kāṛṣāpaṇa:

1. Was the kāṛṣāpaṇa coin merely or predominantly of copper as suggested by some?

---

¹ *N. Orientalia*, p. 12.

2. Was the golden krṣṇala coin also called a kāṛśāpaṇa with a very important and particular significance along with the standard full-weight unit of gold, silver or copper—the suvarṇa, the dhāraṇa and the paṇa?

There can be no doubt as to the existence of an 80 rati gold piece. With reference to its metallic basis it was called suvarṇa and was extensively mentioned in the ancient literature including the Vedas. It must have been the full-weight monetary unit and the standard of value; and from both these points of view it was called kāṛśāpaṇa.

"Amarakoṣa distinguishes between kāṛśāpaṇa and paṇa. Both are kāṛṣika, i.e., 1 kāṛṣa in weight, but paṇa alone as tāmrika, i.e., made of copper. His commentators infer that kāṛśāpaṇa was silver. The author of the Kāśikā speaks of kāṛśāpaṇa as being hāṭaka, i.e., made of gold."\(^1\)

"According to Viṣṇugupta another name of suvarṇa is kāṛṣa."\(^2\)

The kāṛśāpaṇa has also been extensively mentioned in the Jātaka literature where it connotes a current monetary unit irrespective of its metallic basis.\(^3\)

In fact, Manu's śloka in question refers to only a particular variety of kāṛśāpaṇa, the copper one and in no way denotes the non-existence of any other variety.\(^4\)

Thus the specific name of a copper kāṛśāpaṇa is a paṇa; and Amarakoṣa distinguishes between kāṛśāpaṇa and paṇa. Both are kāṛṣika but paṇa alone is tāmrika.

In fact, Manu's śloka can never suggest that the Indian standard was at any time based solely on the copper kāṛśāpaṇa.

The second point to be discussed is what is a kāṛṣa. Can the golden rati or krṣṇala coin be also called a kāṛṣa?

The word kāṛśāpaṇa is apparently a compound of 'kāṛṣa' and 'paṇa'. Kāṛṣa has reference to both weight and value, and paṇa to number.

---

\(^1\) Bhāṇḍārkar, p. 92-3; see N. Orientalia, p. 22: "There was a suvarṇa or golden kāṛṣa which was simply a suvarṇa or given weight of gold, in the form of coin."


\(^3\) Bhāṇḍārkar, p. 50, 78, 80, 81 etc.

\(^4\) "Tāmrikaḥ kāṛṣikaḥ paṇaḥ"

"A copper paṇa weighing a kāṛṣa should be known as a paṇa."
The kārṣāpaṇa has been taken to be of 80 rati weight, except in the case of the silver dhāraṇa which came to appropriate the name common to the other standard coins without any specific significance either regarding weight or value. The Kārṣa was practically the smallest weight used; it was also termed raktika.1 "Thus kārṣa signifies 80 rati as well as one rati."

Mr. Prinsep in writing about this discrepancy, says: "It is now the 80th part of a paṇa, but similar discrepancies are common throughout."2

The key to the solution of the discrepancies may be found, as has once before been suggested, in the loose use of the term to denote different conceptions. But a method may be found in this particular case. Kārṣa is a weight. It is the weight of a coin. It is the weight of the standard unit of money, the smallest to start with for calculation and accounting, as well as the fullest to be conveniently used as a medium of exchange. This explains the existence, side by side with 1 rati gold kārṣāpaṇa, 80 rati gold and copper kārṣāpaṇa and the 32 rati silver kārṣāpaṇa.

But what is the significance of the other half of the compound word, the paṇa or the apaṇa?

Paṇa alone is tāmrika or paṇa is coin made of copper. The paṇa was sub-divided into fanams or kas-fanams or more properly paṇam is identical with the word paṇa, now applied chiefly to ascertain measure of cowries or copper money.3

The original name of the coin was kārṣāpaṇa, from kārṣa a weight and a paṇa (custom) or use meaning that they were pieces of one kārṣa weight as established by use or custom—kārṣa of commerce or of common use or in other words the current kārṣa.4

Thus according to Cunningham the second half of the compound word is not paṇa but apaṇa. But this goes against the classical view and can hardly be warranted from the textual use of the term in Manu and other authorities. It is safer to use paṇa in the sense of a particular number, 80 (rati). Eighty still makes a paṇa and a copper paṇa is nothing but 80 rati. But there is another 80 rati coin associated with paṇa, the golden kārṣāpaṇa. Still there is another gold coin the one rati star-like piece which is also a kārṣāpaṇa because of its value

---

1 See Colebrooke, p. 531.
3 Prinsep, Useful Table, p. 18.
4 Cunningham, p. 18.
being reached through 80 rati of copper. One rati copper, when
cowrie came to be the prevalent medium in petty exchanges, was
equivalent to 1 cowrie. It is quite likely that at that time the ratio
of gold, silver and copper came to be established at 1 : 16 : 80.
Thus 1 rati gold was equal to 16 × 80 rati copper or 1280 cowries.
This is today called a kāhaṇa, the Bengali word for kārśāpaṇa or
kahāpana.

"The value assigned to the kārśāpaṇa in the ancient law-book
agrees with that of the kāhaṇa of the present day."1

There can be no doubt about the existence of a variety of golden
kārśāpaṇa of which the value was paṇa of copper or 1280 cowries.
But was it ever a coined money?

In the Indian Numismatics are several times mentioned minute
coins of gold, bags of gold or gold dust. Also up to very recent
times actually current gold coins of very small size have been found
to exist.

"Suvarṇa-śalākāni yava-traya-parimitāni" clearly indicates the
existence of 1 rati gold pieces. In Manu's system the kṛṣṇala or the
rati was the smallest coin or weight. Long afterwards it was found to
be current as "the minute gold coins of the south, the gold stars, just
like little scales of gold." Mr. Bhandarkar himself found in the
Piprawa stūpa such pieces impressed with symbols, which according
to him, indicate that these might be the kṛṣṇala coins.

Thus the idea that the kārśāpaṇa had a unique position in the
system of the Indian currency is corroborated. It is the standard and
current money. It is also the money of account and the unit to start
with in the construction of the monetary table.2

A. K. Sarkar

1 Cunningham.
2 The following abbreviations have been used in this paper:
   Colebrooke for Colebrooke's Essays.
   Cunningham for Cunningham's Coins.
   Rapson for Indian Coins.
Finger-posts of Bengal History*

II

Pathan Period, c. 1200 1550 A.D.

The word 'Pathan' is used here in the popular sense of pre-Mughal Muslim invaders of India, who were mostly Turks by race and are called so in the Sanskrit literature and epigraphs of the time. These Turks had little culture of their own, and long after their conversion to Islam (c. 1000 A.D.) they continued to be rude soldiers who cared little for art or literature. They have left no literary records and the only notable monuments of their sway in Bengal are the ruins of Gauḍ and Paṇḍuā which bear the stamp of Hindu workmanship, and their coins which have the distinction of being practically the first ever minted in Bengal. No land-grant of their time has come to light and their inscriptions which were mostly engraved on mosques are only partially explored as yet. Most of the published ones have been utilised in R. D. Banerji's Bāṅglār Itihās, vol. 2, but few in the Cambridge History. Recently Mr. S. Sharaf-ud-din of the Varendra Research Society has made a list of over 180 of them for inclusion in the Inscriptions of Bengal, vol. IV. This list has been utilised by me for some of the points noted below.

Ikhṭiyyar-ud-din, the founder of Pathan rule in Bengal, came from Afghanistan and so did several of his successors, and there were also some who came to Bengal from Western India, e.g., Malik Jiwan of Multan, who has left an inscription at Bangarh. It was in the Pathan period that Bengal was linked once again with Magadha (or Bihar, as it was then named). With Orissa or rather the Gaṅga kings of Jaipur, the Pathans were in conflict from the time they entered Bengal, and the conflict continued, through Caitanya's days, until at a time when their rule was about to end in Bengal, the Pathans secured the northern part of Orissa, and took there refuge from the advancing Mughals.

Pathan sway in Bengal was centered in West Varendra where the Malda and Dinajpur Muslims still form distinct racial groups. The

* Continued from p. 457.

I.H.Q., December, 1931
earliest Pathan inscription in Bengal, viz., the Malda one of 1232 A.D. (which is 10 years earlier than the earliest Muslim inscription in Bihar) is in this tract, and so also is the majority of their inscriptions and monuments. In this tract also are

1. Gauḍ which was their capital till the very end of their rule, as also
2. Pāṇḍuā, which dates from Ilyas Shah's time, about 1340 A.D. (Banerji, Itihās, II, p. 108),
3. the fort of Ekdala which baffled the attack of Emperor Firuz Shah Tughlak, about 1350 A.D. (Ibid., pp. 116-42) and which is identified with Kasba in P. S. Bansihari, by Mr. Stapleton; and
4. Devkot or Bangarh where after an unsuccessful raid into Tibet, Ikhtiyar-ud-din met with his death1 and which figures so largely in the early history of Pathan rule in Bengal, although the earliest Muslim inscription found in it does not go beyond 1297 A.D. (V.R.S. Monographs No. 4, pp. 25-28).

The Pathans appear to have followed the retreating Senas into the Madhainagar tract. A Pathan inscription (not yet read) has been found recently at Gulta, five miles south-west of the Bhavanipur shrine and said to be the original site of the shrine (Bagudār Itihās, p. 114), and some coins of Danujamardana have been found near Madhainagar itself. Tradition goes that Rāja Ganeś, identified with Danujamardana, as will be noted later, had his home in this locality before he seized the throne of Gauḍ (Banerji, Itihās, II, p. 187), and the colossal Śivalīga at Talum and the ruins at Satpāḍa near it are attributed to the Ek-ṭākiā Bhāduries who dominated this part of the country in the 17th century and whose line is said to be continued by the Tahirpur house.

Pathan sway did not spread to the rest of Varendra till about the middle of the 15th century when there was a Pathan expansion following on the short Hindu regime of Danujamardana and Mahendra.

1 Evidence of this raid through Kāmarūpa is furnished by an inscription dated 13th Caitra, 1127 Śaka, or 27th March 1205 A.D. on the Kanaibarasi hill on the north bank of the Brahmaputra, opposite Gauhati town, which reads: Śuke turaga-yugmese Madhumāsa-śayovo- dāke Kāmarūpaṃ samāgatya Turuṣka ṇayamāyayah (I.H.Q., 1927, p. 843).
The Pathan coins found at Mahāsthān date from Mahmud Shah’s time (r. 1442-59 A.D.) (V.R.S. Monographs No. 2, p. 32); the earliest Mahisantosh inscription is of 1460 A.D.; a Pathan inscription at Kantaduar, P. S. Pirganj, Dist. Rangpur, (only one half of which has been found by Rai Bahadur Mritunjay Ray Chaudhuri) records the erection of a mosque in the reign of Husain Shah ‘the conqueror of the rebels of Kāmarūpa and Kamta’ c. 1502 A.D. (Ann. Rep. A.S.I. 1924-25, p. 89). The other Pathan inscriptions in Varendra belong to about the end of Pathan rule—the Bagha mosque inscription is of 1524 A.D. (Pravāśī, Āśvin, 1326, p. 553), the Dhurali Bridge inscription (in Sanskrit) is of 1533 A.D. and the Kusumba mosque and the Sherpur (Boṣra) dargah inscriptions are of 1558 A.D.

Pathan sway spread early to Dakṣiṇā Rādh, as an inscription of 1298 A.D. (a year after that of the Bangarh inscription) records a victory of the Pathans over the Hindus at Triveni (Banerji, Itihās, II, p. 87), but it did not extend to Pāṇḍuā (Hughli) till 1477 A.D. (Ibid., p. 216).

The first notable Muslim to appear in the Dacca area was Emperor Balban, who went there, in 1283, in pursuit of his rebellious governor Tughril Khan and met the Hindu Rājā Danuj Rai, as already noted. Some writers think that this Rājā is referred to in Hari-Mitra’s Kārikā as well as by Kṛttivāsa (Vasumati, Caitra, 1337, p. 940). Muslim sway is said to have been imposed soon afterwards on East Bengal (Banerji, Itihās, II, p. 89) but the earliest Muslim inscription of Dacca does not go beyond 1457 A.D., while that in the famous Baba Adam’s tomb at Rampal is dated 50 years later.

To the rest of East Bengal, Muslim influence spread even later and judging from similar legends about its origin every where, it appears to have been confined at first to isolated pirs. The earliest dates recorded are 1459 A.D. at Bagerhat, 1466 at Hakerganj, 1473 at Chittagong, about 1480 at Sylhet and Lāuria (though Ibn Batuta is said to have visited the pir Shah Jalal at Sylhet in 1340) and about 1486 at Mymensingh.

Pathan sway does not seem to have ever reached South Bengal and it was there that Pratāpāditya (1555-1611, Modern Review, March, 1923, p. 316) sprung from the family of the revenue minister of the last Pathan Sultan, migrated after the downfall of the Pathan Sultanate and set up an independent state.

The most striking feature of their history in Bengal is that the Pathans could not establish settled rule. They were no doubt numerically very weak, and without any superior arms, but they were also
torn by dissensions themselves—no less than fifty rulers belonging to ten different dynasties and various races, including Abyssinian and even Hindu, covered the 300 years of their sway in Bengal. Within 120 years of Ikhtiyar-ud-din’s death the kingdom is said to have broken up into three parts with their capitals at Gauḍ, Satgaon and Sonargaon. They were brought under one sceptre by Ilyas Shah (r. 1340-58) and the State was raised to prosperity by his son Sikandar (r. 1358-89) who built the Adina mosque at Pāṇḍuā.

But dissensions soon reappeared and in 1417 a Hindu chief, Danujamardana, seized the throne. His reign was short, but he appears to have issued coins bearing legends in the Bengali script from three mints, Pāṇḍunagar, Sonargaon and Chatgram, and to have been succeeded by his son Mahendra, who is said to have afterwards turned Muslim. Following Mr. Bhattasali (Modern Review, 1929, January, p. 44), we may take these two Hindu kings as identical with Ganes and Yadu of Bengal tradition. According to MM. Haraprasād Sāstrī, Vṛhaspati, surnamed Rāya-mukuta, wrote his commentary on on the Amarakoṣa under the patronage of these two Hindu kings (Banerji, Itihās, II, p. 175).

The Pathans soon recovered the throne, and then ensued a period of their expansion, as referred to before. The most notable king of this period was Husain Shah (r. 1493-1519) who, judging from the number of his inscriptions had a prosperous reign—raiding Kamta and Kāmarūpa (as recorded in his Malda and Kantaduar inscriptions) and even attacking the Ahoms¹ and carrying on war with Pratāparudra of Orissa (1504-1532). Recently four more of Husain Shah’s inscriptions have been discovered, one in Begu Hajjam’s mosque in Patna city (J.B.O.R.S., 1930, p. 340), one on a mosque near Barh (Patna Dt.), one at Gadh Mandaran (Hugli Dist.) (Pravāsi, 1326, Jyaiṣṭha, p. 133), and one near Kandi (Mursidabad Dist.) (Sāhīya Pariṣāt Patrikā, 1337, p. 81).

Husain Shah’s son and successor, Nusrat Shah (r. 1519-1532) had a prosperous reign until 1529, when Babar, who had ousted the Pathans from the throne of Delhi, turned his victorious arms against Bengal, where the Delhi Sultan’s brother, Mahmud Lodi had found refuge. He advanced as far as Maner, where a peace was concluded. Eight

¹ The Ahoms entered the Assam valley about the same time that the Muslims entered Bengal, and ruled for 600 years, for which period they have chronicles called Buraṭjis.
years after this there was a Pathan revival under Sher Sur who seized Bihar and Bengal. This drew Humayun to Gauḍ where he is said to have enjoyed himself for six months. Gauḍ was named Jannatabad or Heavenly city by the Pathans. The name occurs on some coins of Ghiyas-ud-din Azam Shah (r. 1389-96) (Banerji, Itihās, II, p. 155) and on a canon of Sher Shah which is now in V.R.S. Museum. On Humayun's way back, Sher Sur inflicted on him a crushing defeat at Chausa and afterwards drove him out of India and became Emperor with the title of Sher Shah. He ruled for five years only (1540-1545) but has left a brilliant record of achievements among which are the Grand Trunk Road, and the revenue settlement of the empire which was afterwards incorporated in the Ain-i-Akbari. To him also is to be ascribed a novel form of inscription in Bengal, viz., on bronze guns, some of which have been found in Malda and some in western Kāmarūpa (V.R.S. Monographs No. 3) and one recently in the North East frontier tract of Sadiya (Report of Kāmarūpa Anusandhān Samiti, 1931, p. 53). With the passing away of this great ruler, dissensions again appeared among the Bengal Pathans, and though Sulaiman Karnani (r. 1564-72) who removed the capital to Tanda, is said to have seized a part of Orissa (Banerji, Itihās, II, p. 367) and to have beaten back an invasion from Kuch-Bihar (Ibid., p. 368), Bengal finally passed under Mughal sway with the overthrow and death of his grandson Daud Shah in 1576. Some Pathan chiefs of local origin Muslim and Hindu, held out,—one of them, Masum Khan being dignified with the title of Sultan in the Chatmahar mosque inscription of 1582 A.D. (Blochmann, Ain-i-Akbari, I, p. 631) but eventually they all had to yield to Akbar's steady pressure (Bhattasali, Bengal Past and Present, 1928, Nos. 71 & 72).

Many places in Bengal—notably Gauḍ Pānduā, Bangarh and Triveni—bear witness to the iconoclastic zeal of the Pathans. Probably the predominance of Muslim population in North-East Bengal dates from their time. Some of the Muslims in this tract, as can be easily seen from their features and culture, are no doubt descended from converted Hindus or foreign settlers of this or a later period, but from the fact that Pathan sway was so feeble and late in this area, that we may conclude that the bulk of them owe their origin to mass conversion of indigenous tribes which had been outside the pale of Hindu society, by the influence of the pirs who were settled among them and not, as some people suppose, to conversion of Hindus by political pressure or allurements. This view is supported
by the marked difference as regards physique and culture as well as social status and wealth, between the Muslims and the Hindus, and the practical absence, till recent years, of religious ministration and houses of prayer for the former. The queer tribal names Manguli and Quanksal of some of the Pathan opponents of Akbar in Bengal seem to point to their indigenous origin. We see a parallel to this process in the present day mass conversion to Christianity of certain backward tribes in Assam (Pravāst, 1337, Bhādra, p. 655), Chota-Nagpur and North Bengal.¹

Though ever since the end of Hindu rule, the Hindu society of Bengal has languished for want of royal support and direction, the Pathan rulers themselves do not appear to have exerted any pressure on it. In fact, they appear to have honoured the leading Hindu families of the time with such non-Sanskritic titles as Raya, Majumdar, Sarkar, Mallick and even Khan. Nor did they close the high offices of state to the Hindus or make any foreign tongue their official language. Their inscriptions are indeed mostly in Arabic language and Tughra characters, but even as late as 1533 A.D. we find an inscription in Sanskrit language and Bengali script set up by a Pathan minister of a Pathan king (I.H.Q., 1931, p. 17). And it was during the Pathan period that Navadvip became a noted Hindu centre—to which learned and pious men flocked from all over Bengal and even from Sylhet,—where the school of Navya-Nyāya was evolved,—where Raghunandana composed his 28 codes of Hindu laws and rites and Ānanda Bhaṭṭa his Vallāla-carita (1510 A.D.) and,—where Caitanya (1485-1534) preached

¹ The 'communal' map based on the census of 1921 which faces p. 149 of the Report of the All Parties Conference, 1928 shows that a 'neutral' zone passes from Dinajpur to Khulna through Malda, Murshidabad, Nadia and Jessore districts (probably along the Mahānandā river and the old course of the Bhairav). West of this zone the Hindus predominate with an average of 77 per cent (maximum 88 in Midnapur) and the Muslims also are of a type different from those in N. E. Bengal. East of the zone, the Muslims predominate with an average of 73 per cent (maximum 83 in Bogra). Again a zone of about 65 per cent Muslim passes from Sylhet (53) to Khulna through Dacca and Faridpur districts (probably along the Surma, Meghna and Madaripur rivers) and separates two distinct types of Muslims. An investigation of these figures may throw some light on Muslim origins as well as on the old hydrography of Bengal.
his new Vaishnavism, while Tantrik literature and practices flourished in Varendra. It was also in this age that Caitanya and his followers laid the foundation of modern Bengali literature.

Meanwhile, west of India, the Turks had been overthrown by another tribe, the Mughals who, described as 'infidels' by Minaj in the 13th century had adopted Islamic religion with Persian culture before the 16th century when they burst into India and very soon wrested Bengal from the Pathans, as noted above. Their racial and cultural difference from the Turks is recognised in Sanskrit writings by their being designated Yavanas (e.g. Ahom cannon inscriptions in Assam). With their advent a momentous change was inaugurated—the Hindu or indigenous culture was superseded in Bengal, as elsewhere in Northern India, by the adoption of a foreign language (Persian) as the official language, and a foreign (or Persian) culture as state culture, and by the muslimization of the higher state services—and even the centre of government was shifted from West to East Bengal.

Such is the light which we derive from even a cursory view of these finger-posts of history. When they are published in a connected and properly edited form and studied together by scholars they will not fail to give us an authentic history of Bengal for the somewhat obscure period of 1200 years which preceded Mughal rule.

Bijay Nath Sarkar

Studies in the Kautiliya*

IV

The various aspects of Invasion from the Rear

The circumstances in which an attack is to be made upon a kingdom from the rear, when the sovereign of this kingdom is invading another king, should be carefully examined to find out the advantage that accrues from the rear-attack. The advantages derived from such invasions from the rear vary a good deal, and unless the circumstances are probably weighed, there may be losses or positive disadvantages. An omission to make an attack upon a State from the rear at a time when the sovereign of the State is engaged in an invasion

Continued from p. 474.
upon another State may, on the other hand, give an opportunity to the other sovereign to grow into a very powerful neighbour without much difficulty if the invasion, upon which he has launched himself, be not thwarted by a rear-attack upon his State and for that reason his victory over the enemy in front be comparatively less difficult. Thus, there are many factors that should be taken into consideration to decide whether or not a rear-attack should be made. The circumstances become more complicated when in addition to the existence of three kings within the range of our consideration (viz., a king invading another, and a third king attacking the former from the rear), there is a fourth, who though inimical to the third king has entered into an alliance with him for mutual help, and two other kings, one proceeding to invade the territory of the other. In other words, two sets of two kings are supposed, and in each set one king is out for an attack upon the other; and two other kings are also supposed to play a part in the situation. They are 'natural' enemies but are now in alliance for mutual benefit. Each of these two allies is to attack one or another of the two kings, who have resorted to yāna against their respective enemies. One of the reasons for attacking from the rear is to curb the power of the king thus attacked, it being of course understood that the kings being neighbours or having States within the same maṇḍala, the sudden increase of power of one of them was looked upon as a menace to the existing equilibrium of power within the maṇḍala and specially to the secure enjoyment of power by his immediate neighbours. The comparison of the gains and advantages likely to be acquired by each of the two aforesaid allies from their respective rear-attacks upon the two kings out to invade their enemies is the subject-matter of the chapter in the Kauṭiliya on pāṛṣṇigrāha-cintā. It also deals briefly with ways and means by which a king whose State has been attacked from the rear should try to extricate himself from the difficulty. The principal object of the chapter is, however, the comparison of the advantages derived from the rear-attacks upon the States of kings who are already launched upon invasion upon their neighbouring States. The derivable advantages may not be palpable, and hence in the choice of the State against which each of the two allies will direct his activities, one may have more chances of acquisition of gains than the other. There are also the dangers, patent or hidden, incidental to all hostile operations

1 K., VII, ch. 13
between any two states, or peculiar to the circumstances existing at the time. The consideration of these advantages and disadvantages derivable by each of the two allies from the rear-attacks as mentioned above is the principal object of the chapter. It is noticeable that the existence of the two allies to whom the advantages or disadvantages accrue is not essential to the estimate of the advantages or disadvantages or to the consideration of the circumstances from which they are calculated to issue. For the purpose of such comparison, mere hypothetical cases comprising a set of three kings (the rear-invader, the invader, and the king invaded) supposed to be in the midst of varying situations could have served the same purpose without introducing the complications brought about by the existence of six kings within our view. But perhaps the Kaut̄iliya wants also to make a pointed reference to the gains or losses likely to accrue to the two allies from the rear-attacks, and hence what could have been explained with a lesser amount of complication has to be done with two sets of six kings.

The circumstances in view of which the Kaut̄iliya offers directions for the guidance of a king bent on taking to the appropriate course of action when a neighbouring king inimical to him is out or about to be out on an expedition against his enemy, are:

(a) If there be two kings, one strong and the other weak, and it both are out on expedition against their respective enemies, then of the two kings who are enemies (of the invading kings) in alliance in the rear, the one who attacks the strong king becomes a gainer, because the strong king after defeating his enemy in front would have grown stronger, and consequently could have brought about the ruin of his rear-enemy if he had not been thwarted during his expedition against the frontal enemy; while the other rear-enemy who attacks the weak king during his operations against the enemy in front does not make any gain, because left to himself, these operations alone would have weakened him further leaving in him no desire to make an attack upon the rear-enemy.

(b) The other circumstances being the same as above, if the two kings invading their enemies be of equal strength, the rear-enemy who attacks the rear of the one who has made preparations on a vast scale (as opposed to the other who has made small preparations) becomes a gainer, the reason being the same as given above.

(c) The other circumstances being the same as in (a), if the strength and preparations of two kings invading their enemies be
equal, the rear-enemy who attacks the rear of the one who brings all his forces to bear upon the invasion becomes a gainer, because the capital remains unguarded and the defeat becomes easy.

(d) The other circumstances being the same as in (a) if, the strength, preparations, and the numerical strength of the army of two kings invading their enemies be equal, the rear-enemy attacking the king out on an expedition against a calāmitra (an enemy without forts) becomes a gainer, while the rear-enemy who attacks the king invading the territory of a sthitāmitra (i.e. an enemy with forts) does not make any gain, because the king who invades a calāmitra can be easily successful and can turn round to attack his enemy in the rear after the acquisition of strength by his success, while the other king who attacks an enemy possessing forts has no prospect of acquiring additional strength through success as he is sure to be repulsed by his enemy; further, he may come back without waging any war at all and therefore without having the occasion to suffer any loss of men and money. He is thus in a position to retaliate if his rear be attacked.

2 There being the two sets of three kings as supposed already, the rear-enemy attacking the king who is out on an expedition against a king who happens to be dhārmika (righteous) becomes a gainer, because an attack from the rear upon such a king meets with the disapprobation even of his own men.

In similar circumstances, an advantage is also gained by the king who makes a rear-attack upon another inimical king who is out on an expedition against his enemy and is unpopular by reason of being (i) a spend-thrift in regard to patrimony (mūlāhara), (ii) a squanderer of wealth acquired from time to time during his reign (tādātvika) or (iii) an accumulator of wealth by oppressing the officials and relations (kadarya).¹

3 In a similar situation comprising two sets of three kings, the one who makes a rear-attack upon another who is invading the territory of the third king who was a mitra (friendly) but has now turned hostile to him, becomes a gainer because the hostility between the second and the third king was not likely to last long and hence he would have turned to fight with the enemy in the rear (i.e. the first king) shortly after, had he not been brought to bay beforehand in the present plight with one enemy in front and another in the rear.

¹ For the meanings of the terms, see K., II, ch. 9, p. 69.
4 In this case the two sets of three kings are there, but in one set, the pāśāṇigrāha is attacking a king who is invading a mitra i.e. one who was friendly but is now hostile to him, while in the other set, the pāśāṇigrāha is attacking a king who is invading an amitra (i.e. a natural enemy). Here, the latter pāśāṇigrāha is a gainer, because by the ruin of an enemy the invader could have increased his strength and turned round towards the king who is now his pāśāṇigrāha to fight him perhaps successfully on account of his increased power, but by the rear-attack in the midst of his invasion against his enemy, an effective check can be put upon his power, reducing him to a weakened position. In regard to the former pāśāṇigrāha, the state of things is different, because he is attacking a king who is waging a suicidal war with his former friend whose ruin would but serve to make the former weak and therefore unable to turn round to fight against the king who is now his pāśāṇigrāha.

5 Of two kings (in the two groups of three kings each as mentioned already), the one attacking from the rear another king who has returned unsuccessful (on account of the rear-attack) in his military operations against a third sovereign though he had expected much gain from same, or has suffered much loss in that unsuccessful attempt, becomes a gainer as contrasted with the other pāśāṇigrāha of another king who had not much expectation of gain even if he had been successful in his operations against his enemy and has actually returned unsuccessful but has not suffered much loss in this unsuccessful attempt on account of the rear-attack. The point to be noticed in the two cases is that the former pāśāṇigrāha is a gainer, because he had as his neighbour a strong enemy who could have reduced the inimical king in the rear to a humble position if he had been allowed to grow stronger by defeating his frontal enemy without any hindrance being put in his way by a rear-attack. The thwarting of this powerful king is therefore a distinct gain to the rear-invader; while in the other case, the king out on an invasion upon his enemy’s territory had not much expectation of gain even if he had been successful and could not therefore have added much to his strength. Hence, he had not been so much a menace to the security of position of the pāśāṇigrāha and therefore the rear-attack does not confer upon him a real benefit as it does in the case of the other pāśāṇigrāha.

6 Of the two pāśāṇigrāhas of two other kings out on expeditions against their respective enemies, the pāśāṇigrāha of the king who comes back successful in his expedition inspite of the rear-attack
but has lost much in men and money, gains "more than the other pārṣṇigrāha of the king who comes back successful from his expedition in spite of the rear-attack and has suffered a much lesser loss in men and money.

7 Of the two pārṣṇigrāhas of two other kings out on invasion against their respective enemies, the pārṣṇigrāha of the king whose enemy is able to cause him much harm becomes a gainer as compared with the other pārṣṇigrāha who does not have this advantage.

8 Of two pārṣṇigrāhas of two other kings engaged in attacks upon their enemies, the one who possesses a larger and more efficient army, and is fighting with a fort as his base of operations, or has his kingdom situated on either side (pārāvasthāyin) of that of the king attacked and is therefore near the yātavya (i.e. the yātavya of the king whose territory is invaded from the rear) becomes a gainer as compared with the other pārṣṇigrāha who does not possess these advantages. The advantages enjoyed by a pārāvasthāyin rear-invader is that being near the aforesaid yātavya, he can easily combine with him and make a raid upon the capital (of the king whose rear has been attacked).

9 Of two kings attacking the rear of a Madhyama (a State of medium power within the maṇḍala) during its hostilities with its enemy, and coming back successful after such rear-attack, the one who has been able to alienate from the Madhyama a State friendly to it, or to convert an enemy of his own into a friend becomes a gainer than the other.

This also applies to the rear-invader of an Udāśīna (i.e., the Super State within the maṇḍala).

According to the Ācāryas, success in both frontal invasion and rear-attack is achieved through mantrayuddha, i.e., causing losses to the enemy through secret agents and informants. A face to face fight in the open field brings about such a loss of men and money that a victory turns out to be a defeat in reality. Kauṭilya is of a different opinion and holds that the enemy should be put down at any cost. He, however, suggests one or two aspects of the question which should be kept in view by the two parties engaged in a fight. If the losses of men and money sustained by both the parties be equal, then the one who has first fought with the help of the dūṣya-bala (army composed of recalcitrant men) and has lost it, loses less than the one who has not done so. Should both the parties have taken to this course, the one who has lost the dūṣyabala stronger and more recalcitrant than that of the other is a gainer. The same is the
case in regard to fights with the help of the amitra-bala and the aṭavī- bala.¹

The rear invaders are of three kinds, viz.

(a) Sāmantas i.e., those kings whose kingdoms are contiguous to the territory of the king attacked from the rear.

(b) Prṣṭhatovarga, i.e., those kings whose kingdoms are separated from the territory of the king upon whom the rear-attack is made by reason of the existence of one or more other kingdoms.

(c) Prātiveśas are those kings whose kingdoms are situated on either side of the king upon whom the rear-invasion is made.

Antardhi is a weak king with its territory intervening between those of two other powerful kings. Weak as he is, he is unable to make a rear-invasion. When attacked, he can be only on the defensive by stationing himself in a fort or a forest.

From what has been said above, it will be noticed that a king can either be an abhiyoktr, a yātavya or a pāraṇigrāha, i.e., an invader, the king invaded, and the rear-invader with reference to one who has already proceeded against his frontal enemy. The following suggestions for the guidance of the aforesaid kings are offered:

As an abhiyoktr, he can have recourse to causing a fight to take place between his pāraṇigrāha (rear-enemy) and ākranda (rear-friend) and also between his pāraṇigrāhāsāra (friend of the rear enemy) and ākrandāsāra (friend of the rear friend). In front, he can also bring about a fight between his ari-mitra (friend of the enemy) and mitra (friend), and also between mitra-mitra (friend's friend) and ari-mitra-mitra (friend of the enemy's friend).

As a yātavya, he can cause his mitra to attack the rear of his enemy, and his mitra-mitra to face the ākranda of the enemy.

As a pāraṇigrāha, he can reduce his difficulties by bringing about a conflict between his pāraṇigrāhāsāra and ākranda.

In conclusion, the Kauṭiliya recommends to every king the stationing of envoys and secret agents in all the States of his maṇḍala and thus keep himself and his principal officials informed of what is going on in those States. It is also maintained in inter-state relations though inimical measures may have to be taken in secret.

NARENDRA NATH LAW

¹ The amitra-bala is obtained from a former enemy and the aṭavī-bala is recruited from the forest tribes (see K., IX, 2).
On Some Castes and Caste-origins in Sylhet

The bulk of the sources of information about castes is of the nature of tradition. The epigraphic records constitute the most authentic evidence, but their number is very few and the references contained therein are indirect. The literary accounts, such as the Dharmaśāstras (specially, the Parāśara-saṃhitā, and the Vyāsa-saṃhitā), the Purāṇas (specially, the Brahmanaivarta and the Padma), the Kulagramhas or Kulapañjikās etc., are vitiated by partiality, fabrication of facts and lack of historical sequence and criticism. In the genealogical accounts (vaṃśāvalī) of some of the prominent families of Bengal and Sylhet we have another source of information, but these accounts too, in most cases, contain unauthentic history.

Castes and sub-castes are still in the process of formation, and confusion of castes is but a normal though slow phenomenon of present day social life. Two typical cases of caste-formation in the present generation are known to me. In the Jaintia pergah a Brāhmaṇa family from the Brahmanbaria sub-division of the Tippera district settled down some seventy years ago on a Brahmottara grant of the Jaintia rāj. Two brothers only now survive in the family, and as its habitat is situated in a very out of the way place, matrimonial relations cannot be easily effected with other Brāhmaṇa families of the same status. The elder brother set up sometime ago a sort of marital relation with a female member of the Kumār caste living in the neighbourhood. As a result of this the family is now reduced to the position of a Varṇa Brāhmaṇa. In the other case, a 'Brāhmaṇa' Manipuri of Srimangal has introduced

1 The following abbreviations have been used in this paper:

the Bengali system of naming in his family, inasmuch as he calls himself a 'Chatterjee.' In course of the second or the third generation, I am sure, the family will merge itself into the Bengali Brāhmaṇa community, claiming descent from some mythical ancestor.

Brāhmaṇas

The brāhmaṇas may be considered under four different sections viz., the Vaidika with its sub-group, the Śampradāyika; the Rādhī and the Varendra; the Varna-Brāhmaṇas; and the Grahavipras or Gaṇakas. None of these sections with perhaps the exception of a few classes of Varna-Brāhmaṇa claims to have originated in the district. Most believe themselves to be settlers from outside.

The Vaidika-Śampradāyikas are regarded as the earliest of the Brāhmaṇa settlers of Sylhet and the tradition goes that they migrated from Mithilā (North Behar). As a matter of fact they follow the Smṛti of the Mithilā school in preference to that of the Bengal school. It is significant in this connection to mention that the Mithilā school is the older of the two. Three Kulagramantas—Vaidika-sanvādini, Vaidikapurāṇīta, and Vaidika-nirṇaya—written in modern times allege that a king of Tripurā named Ādi-dharmaphā brought five Vaidika Brāhmaṇas from Mithilā in 641 A.D. in order to assist him in his performance of a Yajña ceremony. The king finally persuaded the Brāhmaṇas to settle down in Brahmatararas granted by him. This gift, it is further alleged, was recorded in a copper-plate now lost. We are further told that in 1195 A.D. another migration from Kanaūj followed and a king of Tripurā granted by a copper-plate charter extensive lands to one Nidhipati. But there is no evidence to show that the copper-plate ever existed, although it is possible that a historical background lies behind this tradition. New light is however thrown on the problem of migration of the Vaidikas to Sylhet by the

1 Baṅger Jaṭiya Itihās (Brāhmaṇakandha) by N. N. Vasu, part II, 185-186; SL, bk. II, pt. I, pp. 56 and 64; Gait's History of Assam, 268.

2 SL, bk. II, ch. I, 67; Vaidika-samasyā by Mahendra Chandra Kāvyatīrtha (Silchar).
discovery of a series of copper-plates in the Pañcakhaṇḍa perganah of the Sylhet district. The students of Indian history are grateful to Mm. Pandit Padmanath Bhattacharyya Vidyavinod for publishing the inscriptions in the Epigraphia Indica. The Nidhanpur copper-plate inscriptions of King Bhāskaravarman of Kāmarūpa, dated circa 650 A.D., record the renewal of the grant of an extensive Brahmottara to some 200 Brāhmaṇas of different gotras and padavīs (family titles) by king Bhūtivarman, great-grandfather of Bhāskaravarman, about 500 A.D. For reasons stated in the appendix I take it that the inscriptions relate to the settlement of a big batch of Brāhmaṇas in and about modern Pañcakhaṇḍa in Sylhet about 500 A.D. and onwards.² The kings of Kāmarūpa which included Sylhet (see appendix), seem to have adopted a systematic policy of inviting brāhmaṇas to their kingdom. It is apparently for this reason that Kāmarūpa became a centre of Brāhmaṇical faith, and the Chinese traveller Hiuen-Tsang, writing in the seventh century A.D., informs us that the devas were worshipped there and Buddhism had no hold whatever.³ Now, wherefrom did the Brāhmaṇa settlers come? From an examination of the names of the donees we come across the following padavīs: Ghosha, Deva, Datta, Dāma, Sena, Soma, Pālita, Kuṇḍa, Pāla, Dāsa, Bhaṭṭi, Bhūti, Nāga, Mitra, Nandī. Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar tells us that most of these padavīs are still to be found among the Nāgara Brāhmaṇas of Gujarat and that the padavī Nāgara is to be met with in the name of a Sylhet Brāhmaṇa of the 15th century A.D.⁴ We further note that the tutelary deity of the Nāgara Brāhmaṇas was, and still is, Hāṭakeśvara.⁵ It is highly interesting to note that in several places in Sylhet, e.g., at Churkhai, Pañcakhaṇḍa and Gutāṭikar Hāṭakeśvara-sīva is worshipped.⁶ Hāṭakeśvara-sīva is also known as Haṭṭa-nātha or Haṭṭanātha-sīva, and I have no doubt that the very

1 *EI.,* XII, 65:79; XIX, 115-125, 245-250.
2 After having written this paper I came across Mr. Ghosh's valuable contribution on the grant of Bhāskaravarman and the Nāgara Brāhmaṇas published in *I. H. Q.*, 1930, No. 1, pp. 60-71. I am agreeably surprised to find out that our conclusions are materially the same; there are however certain new matters which I have tried to bring to light.
6 *SI.,* bk. 1, ch. 9, 128.
name Śṛihaṭṭa (Sylhet) is derived from the name of this sept-deity of
the Nāgara Brāhmaṇas. The conclusion is irresistible that the emperors
of Kāmarūpa pursued a systematic policy of colonising Sylhet with
Nāgara Brāhmaṇas and thereby introducing orthodox Hinduism1
in the outlying parts of the empire. The original seat of the Nāgara
Brāhmaṇas was the Sapādālakṣa (Siwalik) hills in the Punjab and
it is likely that they were settled in Mithiā about the time of
Bhūtivarman.

As a matter of fact among the Maithil or Tirhutiya Brāhmaṇas
of Behar there is a section called Nāgar.2 It is thus highly
probable that the Nāgar Brāhmaṇas of Mithiā colonised Sylhet.
A section of the Vaidik Brāhmaṇas of Sylhet calls itself Sāmpradāyika.
As far as I know there is no special significance of this expression.
I have therefore a suspicion that it is only a modern literary infiltration
of the long-forgotten significant term Sapādālakṣa, Sapālalakṣa
Brāhmaṇas, we note, are mentioned in the Karatoyā-māhātmya.3

The Rāḍhi Brāhmaṇas of Sylhet, as can be gathered from the
genealogical accounts of some families, migrated to the district from
Rāḍhi (roughly Burdwan and Hooghly). The small community of the
Varendra Brāhmaṇas similarly migrated from Varendra-Bhūmi (North
Bengal). No definite date can be assigned to these migrations. In a
few cases genealogy takes us back to the 15th or 16th century A.D.
but perhaps the Marhaṭṭā raids, popularly known as ‘Bargir-hāngāmā’,
of the 18th century caused these migrations. The Varna-Brāhmaṇas
are those brāhmaṇas who cater for the religious and spiritual needs
of the so-called depressed classes. This group consists of two sections,
one formed by the selection of certain persons by a particular caste, and the other is that of the brāhmaṇas who have degraded
themselves to the extent of attending to the needs of the low castes.
This latter class is also known as ‘Patita-Brāhmaṇas’ or sometimes
as Śrotṛiya-Brāhmaṇas. The Nāthas or Yugīs (Yogīa) who at one
time were regarded as a weaving caste, select even now from
amongst themselves their own priests whom they called Mahāntas or
Mahātmās. Some of the Yogī-Brāhmaṇas are now claiming themselves
to be of a different origin and are assuming the padavis ‘Śarmā’

---

1 Cf. Avakīrṇa-varṇāśrama-dharma-pravībhāgāya in line 35 and
prakāśitāyadharma-mālakāh in line 37 of the Nidhanpur Plate of Bhās-
kara-varman (EI., XII, 75).
2 P.I., 163 ; ŠK., XV, 405.
3 I.H.Q., 1930, no. 1, 70.

I.H.Q., December, 1931
Cakravarti etc. Similarly, a body of Māli-Brāhmaṇas are calling themselves simply brāhmaṇas and are trying to merge themselves into the higher caste.¹ The small community of the ‘Gour-Govindi’ Brāhmaṇas attached to the ‘Patar’ caste of the Sadar Sub-division has been probably formed by selection. Most of the Varna-Brāhmaṇas are apparently indigenous. There is no evidence to show that they migrated here from some other place.

The Grahavipras or Gaṇakas or Ācāryas who pursue Astrology (including Astronomy) and kindred mystic lore for their main occupation claim to be brāhmaṇas, and are also known as Śākadvipī Brāhmaṇas, that is, Brāhmaṇas of Śaṅka origin. According to tradition Gaṇaka was born of a Śākadvipī father and a Vaiśya mother.² The Śakas penetrated into India from the North-west from about the middle of the 2nd century B.C. onwards.³ The route of migration followed by the Śākadvipī Brāhmaṇas from Western India to Sylhet was probably through Bengal. The Hindu society required and still requires their services for multifarious ceremonies and rites. In the caste-scale the Gaṇakas and Grahavipras occupy a low position among the brāhmaṇas. As they are claiming rank with high caste brāhmaṇas, their number is diminishing.⁴

Vaidyas and Kāyasthas

The distinction between the two castes, however wide it may be in Bengal, is not at all noticeable in Sylhet, and free marital relations are established between them. This is very significant from the standpoint of history. The intelligentsia of the two communities are trying to establish claims to be regarded as Brāhmaṇas or Kṣatriyas⁵, and in their attempts to study history from their own particular viewpoint, important facts of social history have been either lost sight of or twisted. Thus, in spite of the fact that the

² VK., V, 196-197; Sl., bk. I, ch. 7, p. 71; Jāti-purāṇa by Paṇḍit Sūryakumār Tarka-sarasvatī (Silchar), 93; Sambandha-nirṇaya by Lalmohan Vidyānīdhī (Calcutta, 1909), 557.
³ B/I. (Brāhmaṇa-kāṇḍa), bk. II, pt. 4; IA., XL, 18.
⁵ VK., III, 578 and XIX, 528, B/I., Kāyastha-kāṇḍu; Vaidya-pātrī Itihās by Basanta Kumar Sen-Gupta; Kāyastha Purāṇa by Sasibhusan Nandi.
Sena kings of Bengal call themselves 'Brahma-Kṣatriyas', they are regarded as Kāyasthas by one class of writers and as Vaidyas by another class. Now, we note that all over the Punjab, Rajputana, Kathiawar, Gujerat and the Deccan there is a caste called 'Brahmakṣatra', which as pointed out by Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, was originally constituted of Nāgar Brāhmaṇas. We may thus regard a section at least of the Vaidyas and Kāyasthas as belonging to the same stock, that is, Nāgar Brāhmaṇas. If the arguments put forth above are sound, the Brāhmaṇas, Vaidyas, and Kāyasthas should be regarded as originally belonging to the same stock. It is very well-known that the terms 'Kāyastha' and 'Vaidya' at one time indicated only two functional groups of scribes or royal courtiers and physicians respectively. Speaking about Sylhet we thus note that in the Nidhanpur copper-plate inscription the word 'Kāyastha' is used in the sense of a scribe or some royal functionary, and no caste is meant. It is also a matter of common knowledge that nowhere except in Bengal the Vaidyas are regarded as a distinct caste. The second Bhatera copper-plate inscription, dated circa 11th or 12th century A.D., tells us of one Vanamāli-kar, “the light of the Vaidya-vanśa.” The expression ‘Vaidya-vanśa’ does not necessarily imply ‘Vaidya-jāti’ or Vaidya caste, but apparently a family that produced physicians. Inspite of his family-tradition to be a physician Vanamāli, however, served the king as ‘Rāja paṭṭalika’ (Keeper of Royal Documents), an office akin to that of a Kāyastha. In Sylhet thus no clear-cut distinction between Vaidyas and Kāyasthas grew up from historical times. Sylhet was also unaffected when in the twelfth century A.D. king Vallālasena of Bengal introduced ‘Kulinism’ to prevent confusion of castes. This accounts for the reason as to why the Vaidyas and Kāyasthas of Sylhet are looked down upon by the Bengal castes.

The padavis of the Vaidyas and Kāyasthas are also to some extent the same. Thus, to mention a few instances, Sena, Gupta, Dutta, Nāg, Dās, Pałat, Candra, Kar, Nandī, Kuṇḍu, Pal, Dhar, Deva, Som,

---

1 Or, Karnāṭa-Kṣatriyas. *IB*, III, 46, 110. 2 See p. 720, n. 5.
5 *EI*, XII, 75, line 49 (Cf. Lekhayitā in line 50).
6 *PASB*, 1880, 153, lines 24-25; Rājapaṭṭalikaḥ kṛti vaidya-vanśa-pradipah Śrī-vanamāli-karaḥ. I intend to publish a revised reading of the inscription. For a discussion of the date of the Bhatera plates see *EI*, XIX, 278.
Rakṣit, Āditya, Indra, Ādyā, Viśvās, Rājavanaśī and Guha are looked upon as both Vaidya and Kāyastha titles. It is noteworthy that most of these surnames with the additional common epithet 'Śvāmī' were in vogue among the Brāhmaṇas of Sylhet of about 500 A.D. Even now the above-mentioned titles (without the epithet 'Śvāmī') prevail among a certain section of the Vaidika Brāhmaṇas of Cuttuck Midnapur and the Deccan. This coincidence of padavīs or paddhatis among the Brāhmaṇas, Vaidyas and Kāyasthas may be accounted for thus: originally the same caste, the Nāgar Brāhmaṇas, pursued the three respectable professions of priest-craft, medicine and government service. But the functional differences created a tendency towards a split specially when people of the Dāsa caste (see below) began to be admitted into the ranks of royal courtiers. The situation was accentuated by the 'hypogamous' marriage-custom (anulomavivāha) that, I suppose, prevailed among the Nāgara or Vaidika Brāhmaṇas of Sylhet. We notice that the males of the Maithil or Tirhutiyā group of Nāgar Brāhmaṇas are even now allowed to marry the females of a lower caste under the 'Anuloma' custom. The issue of such marriages occupy a lower rank than their fathers 'but a higher rank than their mothers'. Such a sociological phenomenon may have slowly taken place through the centuries that passed between circa 500 A.D. and our own times. Movement of families or individuals from one place to another combined with the drawing up of faked genealogies easily covered up, as they do now, such caste-origins. The real padavīs, Sena, Datta, Soma, Pālita etc., were transferred from fathers to sons, while fathers themselves retained in contradistinction only the epithet 'Śvāmī' or its equivalents Gospāmī,

2 EI., XIX, 121-125 and 248-250. Compare the state of things in Bengal about the 11th century A.D. In the Rampal copper plate of Śrīcandra the padavī of a Brāhmaṇa family is Gupta-Šarman (IB., 5, lines. 27-28). In the Belāva plate of Bhoja Varman, dated c. 11th or 12th century A.D. we find the name of a Brāhmaṇa family with the title Deva Šarman (IB., 21, ll. 43-45). See also I, H. Q., 1930, No. 1, p. 68.
3 VK., XIX, 487, 490; the titles in vogue in these places are Kar, Dhar, Rath, Nandi, Dasa, Pati, Bhadra etc.
4 PI., 215; VK., XV, 405.
Bhattācharyya, Cakravartti etc. It is exceedingly interesting to note that even now a section of the Kāyasthas (or Vaidyasing) of Sylhet uses the padavīs, Svāmī and 'Gosvāmī.' In the padavī 'Purakāyastha' or 'Purkāit' (meaning the head scribe or chief courtier),¹ which is so common among the Brāhmaṇas and Kāyasthas of Sylhet, there is probably a survival of the caste-affinity described above. It is possible that the disciples of the Brāhmaṇas mentioned in the Nidhanpur plates, whatever their caste might have been, assumed the padavīs of their preceptors, who, in contradistinction to their clientele, called themselves 'Svāmī' or its variants.

Finally, we should note that the migrations of Vaidyas and Kāyasthas from Bengal as well as close association with Bengal have been accentuating the distinction between the two castes.

*Dāsas and their sub-castes*

It has been pointed out above that in early times (between circa 500 A.D. and 1100 A.D.) the distinction between the Brāhmaṇas, Vaidyasing and Kāyasthas was not acute and was based more or less upon functional differences. The ranks of the Vaidyas and Kāyasthas, on account of their respectability and professional value, were swelled by accretions from the lower ranks through the adoption of certain common padavīs, such as, Datta, Dāsa, Sena. In earlier times, I think, the humbler ranks went by the general name 'Dāsa, i.e., of the 'Dāsa-kula' which stood in contrast to the Deva-kulas or Devas or the twice-born formed by the above-named three castes. In the 2nd Bhatera copper plate inscription we read of the 'conscientious Śrī Mādhava the scion of the Dāsa-kula' and of 'Śrī-Vanamāli-kar, the light of the Vaidya-vānśa.'² In these expressions it is noticeable that Śrī-Mādhava does not bear any family surname. We only know that he belonged to the Dāsa caste or clan. He was however an educated man as the expression 'conscientious' (vivekt) implies. In the

¹ The Purakāyasthas of Sylhet seem to correspond to the Jyeṣṭha-Kāyastha or Prathamā-Kāyastha of the Damodarapur plates (*EI.*, XV), or of the Pāla inscriptions (see Gauḍalekhamāli). Compare also “Mahākāyastha” of the Ramganj Copper plate of Īsvaraghoṣa (*IB.*, 153, l. 15).

case of Śri-Vanamāli-kar his family surname as well as his family-rank is mentioned. Evidently there is an indirect reference to their belonging to the two ‘kulas’, one to the Dāsa-kula and the other to the Deva-kula. An interesting survival of this broad distinction between the two kulas is still noticeable. In Hindu marriages or other religious ceremonies either of the expressions ‘Deva’ or ‘Dāsa’ is used according as the performer of such ceremonies is a twice-born or not, in connection with the uttering of sacred formulas (mantras).

A Dāsa in Sylhet nowadays may be a Vaidya (with the additional padavī Gupta), a Kāyastha, a Kaivartta (or Jalika), a Māhiṣya (or Āśi-Kaivartta) or Hālika, a Sāhā, and a Śūdra. Under what category then shall we reckon an educated man like Śri-Mādhava of of the Bhatera plate? It is thus apparent that the Dāsakula or Dāsa clan or tribe or caste was sub-divided into a number of sub-castes whom we may consider under the following five groups:

1 The wealthy and the educated among the Dāsakula sought rank among the Vaidyas, Kāyasthas or even among the Brāhmaṇas as Varna-Brāhmaṇas (e.g., the Dāsa-Brāhmaṇas). The padavī ‘Dāsa’ was and still is a convenient doorway to allow passage to these ranks. This also explains why a section of the Dāsas of Sylhet claims rank above the Kāyasthas.

2 Sāhās and Śūndis: The trading section came to be called Sāhās or Sāhus (Sāu) as well as Śūndis. The words ‘Sāhā’, ‘Sāhu’ are connected with the words ‘Śādhu (and ‘Śārthavāha’) implying traders. When the appellations Sāhā and Sāhu, so widely in vogue in Bengal and other parts of India from early times were adopted by the Dāsas, it was not difficult for the authors of the Kulapaṭijikas to connect them with some ancient Indian caste or sub-caste. Thus a section of the Sāhās still carrying on trade call themselves Vaiṣyas or Vaiṣya-Sāhās, while others identify themselves with the Kāyasthas or even with the Vaidyas. The Śūndis occupy a lower rank than the Sāhās, wine-distillation being their main occupation. There is however a tendency among them to use the padavī ‘Sāhā’ and to claim rank with the Vaiṣya-Sāhās. According to tradition the Śūndis were born of a Vaiṣya father and a Tīvara mother or of a Kaivartta father.

1 The word may have been derived from Ṣaṇḍa (bull or bullock) as well. See VK., XXI, 527. 2 VK., XXI, 526. 3 SI., bk. I, ch. 7; 80; V/I., Vaiṣya-Kandha, vol. I, 358-363. 4 Apparently derived from Śuṇḍa, liquor (Jātipurāṭattva, 112),
and a Gaṅikā (harlot) mother. It is reasonable to think that this section received accretions from time to time from other parts of India through Bengal and Assam.

3 Cāṣṭi-Kaivarttas or Māhiṣyas or Ḥālika or Ḥāluū-dāsas: The section that took to cultivation came to be called the Ḥālikas or Ḥāluū-dāsas or Cāṣṭi-kaivarttas or Māhiṣya-dāsas or simply Māhiṣyas. As Māhiṣyas, this section claims descent from the Māhiṣaka tribe referred to in the Mahābhārata; the Māhiṣakas however appear to be Mlecchas, that is, non-Aryans. Nevertheless they were a very powerful caste or clan, and so far as Bengal is concerned they are strongly represented in Midnapur, North Bengal (specially Rajshahi and Pabna), East Bengal (specially Mymensingh), Jessore and Nadia. From historical times the Māhiṣyas occupied an important position. Students of Indian history are well acquainted with the successful rebellion led by the Cāṣṭi-kaivartta caste under Divya or Divyoka against King Mahipāla II of Varendra (North Bengal) about 1080 A.D. One of their royal lines ruled at Tamluk as late as 1654. Some of the leading families of Sylhet claim to represent the old Māhiṣya caste. It is quite possible that some migrations took place specially from Mymensingh which is so contiguous to the district. Some of the Pāṭnis who happen to be cultivators are calling themselves Māhiṣya-dāsas to the considerable chagrin of the educated section. The Jāliā-Kaivarttas are also adopting this padavī. The number of the Māhiṣya-dāsas are apparently on the increase. The decennial Census operations have been accelerating the speed of this upward movement.

4 Kaivarttas or Jālika or Jāluū-dāsa: The Kaivarttas or Kaivarta-dāsas have been following the profession of fishing and, to some extent, that of boatman. They have their counter-part in the Mahimāls or Maimāls among Muhammadans of the district. The Kaivarttas are mentioned in ancient Indian literature as of mixed origin; and in the Manusamhitā (X. 34) they are given the epithet ‘Dāsa.’ From their ethnographical distribution it appears that

1 SL., bk. I, ch. 7, 80 ; VK., XXI, 527.
3 VK., IV, 497-498 ; XIV, 700.
4 EH., 415-416 ; Gaudarōjamūla, 48. 5 VK., IV, 498.
6 VK., IV, 495-500.
along with the Namasūdras they were the earliest inhabitants of Bengal and of Sylhet. A section of the Kaivarttas of Sylhet are gradually becoming Vaisānavas, a sectarian caste. The Jālikas occupy a lower rank than the Hālikas.

5 Sūdras: A non-descript body under the name Sūdras or ‘Sūdra-dāsas’ may also be regarded at belonging to the Dāsa-kula. It is justly pointed out that the term ‘Sūdra’ is now used ‘to denote a considerable number of castes of moderate respectability, the higher of whom are considered ‘clean’ Sūdras, while the precise status of the lower is a question which lends itself to endless controversy’. In Sylhet 166,000 were reported to be Sūdras in the census of 1921. This large number, we note, was due to many Pātnis, Jāliā-Kaivarttas and others having assumed this caste-name. As far as I know some Namasūdras are also assuming the padavī ‘Sūdra-dāsa’.

A Sūdra group known generally as ‘Golāms’ (domestic slaves) owes its origin to a sort of concubinage between a high caste male and a low caste female employed as a maid-servant. These assume the padavīs Singh, Dāsa, De, Deb, Pāl, Pait, Sena, Dutta, Raksīta, Bhāndāri etc. and often bear the family cognomen of ‘Puti’, ‘Dādi’ etc. They were known at one time as Sūdras, and though this epithet still survives, to some extent, the general tendency on their part is to call themselves Kāyasthas. With the progress of education and culture, the ‘Golām’ class is fast disappearing.

As compared with the Sūdra-dāsas, Kaivartta-dāsas or Namasūdras the Golām caste is considered ‘clean’.

K. M. GUPTA

---

1 CR., 1901 (Ethnographic App.). For their transformation from a tribe into a caste see PI., 126. Cf. the tradition preserved in the “Datta-Vaṃśāvalī” by Kavi Gopināth Datta of Sylhet (18th century):

कान्ह श्रीशंकनाथ आचे पुरुषदेशः।
कुटुंबपूर्व पुरुष ह्या आचे सर्वेशाः।
श्रीशंक नाही केही सकल कैव्यसः।
श्रीशंके बसगिरि करेन एह लोक बहतः।

चक्रपाणिनि by बनशंकुमार सेन (p. 82).

2 PI., 114.


4 Cf. the Sūdra caste of Bengal and the Shagirdpesha of Orissa (PI. 84). See Sambandha-nirṇaya (Lalmohan Vidyanidhi), 209.
The Ohando-Vedāṅga of Piṅgala

1 Identification of the Work

The date of the work on Sanskrit prosody which is ascribed to Piṅgala is uncertain. Weber who made a very thorough and extensive study of ancient Indian metres assigned it to 'a period simultaneous with the close of the Vedic Sūtra literature, or the commencement of the astronomical and algebraical literatures'. His principal argument for placing this work at such a late date seems to have been that Piṅgala treated of highly elaborated metres found in the post-Vedic Sanskrit poetry. After Weber had dealt with the subject the Bharata-Nāṭyaśāstra which deals with metres in one of its chapters came to light. The treatment of Sanskrit metres in this work is less developed than that of the extant Piṅgala-sūtras. Both these works have metres under the three principal heads such as jāti, viśama (ardhasama) and samavṛtta. But the number of metres which the two works have under these principal heads differs very much. Their number in the Bharata-Nāṭyaśāstra is much smaller than that in the Piṅgala-sūtras. A comparative table given below will make it clear.¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of metre</th>
<th>Number in Bharata NŚ.</th>
<th>Number in Piṅgala</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jāti metres</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viśama (Ardhasama)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samavṛtta metres</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In view of these figures one can place Piṅgala after the Nāṭyaśāstra. This brings down the date of Piṅgala to a time after 400 A.C.-700 A.C.³


² The Chowkhāṁbā Edn. of the Nāṭyaśāstra has been used for this table as also the edition of Piṅgala-sūtras occurring in a work on ancient Indian prosody by one A. B. published in 1882.

³ Bharata-Nāṭyaśāstra has been assigned to various dates by different scholars. Vide Winternitz's Geschichte der indischen Literatur, Band III, p. 8; and S. K. De, Sanskrit Poetics, pp. 23ff.
But such a late date for Pīṅgala creates one difficulty. Of the six works which treat of Vedic metres, the treatment of the subject in the Pīṅgala-sūtra and the Śāṅkhāyana-brāhmaṇa-sūtra appears to be rather crude and inadequate when compared with the rest. Now such an inadequate treatment of Vedic metres at an age when works like the Nidānasūtra, Rk-prātiṣākhya, and Anukramaṇas have already made more elaborate studies of the subject cannot be satisfactorily explained. That the person who could make an exhaustive treatment of classical metres should have perfunctorily done his part while handling Vedic metres does not seem to be plausible. The degree of plausibility further diminishes when it is remembered that Pīṅgala's sūtras have been traditionally known as the Chando-Vedāṅga. One may therefore be inclined to surmise that the treatment of Vedic and non-Vedic metres in the Pīṅgala-sūtra is not by the same author. And indeed when Weber thought that Pīṅgala's chapters II & III on the Vedic prosody were more ancient than the remaining parts and they might belong to the original Pīṅgala-sūtras, he probably lent support to such a view.

A careful study of the extant Pīṅgala-sūtra is likely to confirm one's belief in the possibility of the dual authorship of the work. The first thing that will strike a careful observer is that chapters II & III dealing exclusively with Vedic metres bear no organic relation with the rest of the work. If they are taken out, chapters I, IV-VIII (excepting the first seven sūtras of the chapter IV) will make a perfect treatise on metres of classical Sanskrit. The existence of these seven sūtras in chapter IV will be accounted for later on.

Writers on Vedic prosody without a single exception ignore the rules of sequence (i.e. the scheme of short and long syllables). The only thing which concerned them was classifying metres according to the number of syllables in a foot in a stanza and giving names to them. This latter characteristic is to be found in chapters II and III of the Pīṅgala-sūtras. They do not at all trouble themselves about the quantity (shortness or length) of syllables in a pāda of any Vedic stanza. Thus the chapter I of the Pīṅgala-sūtra which invents technical terms to designate different metres of three syllables, and describes measures used in scanning syllabic verses does not bear any organic relation to chapters II and III of this work. It may therefore be

concluded that these chapters II and III of the Piṅgala-sūtras constitute the original sūtra-work of Piṅgala on Chando-Vedāṅga (Vedic prosody). It may be argued that saṅhās and purībhasās are always placed in the beginning and hence these definitions of technical terms have been, as a matter of course, placed at the beginning of the work. But this argument probably does not apply here. For, Pāṇini, the author of the very type of sūtra-works, has definitions at the beginning, because they relate to all sections of the work. So it is to be expected that definitions placed in the beginning of Piṅgala’s work will be related to all the following sections. But this is not actually the case.

There is, however, one difficulty in our taking the two chapters as a separate work; for there remain still seven sūtras (in the beginning of chapter IV) which deal with Vedic metres. But on a closer examination of chapter III one discovers that the six closing sūtras of chapter III bear unmistakable indications that the author has brought his subject of treatment (of Vedic metres) to a close with the last sūtra of the chapter. These six sūtras together with a translation of them (according to authoritative commentaries) are given below:

61. āditaḥ, sandigdheḥ—When a metre is doubtful, the first foot determines it.

62. devatāditaśca—Also the deity etc.

63. agniḥ savitā somo brhaspatir mitrāvaruṇā indro viśvedevāḥ—Agni, Savitṛ, Soma, Brhaspati, Mitrā-Varuṇā, Indra and Viśve-devaḥ are respectively the deities of the seven metres (such as Gāyatrī etc., vide II, 1 and 14).

64. svarāḥ gajjādayaḥ—The seven notes such as gajja and the rest are respectively the notes of the seven metres.

65. sita-sāraunga-piṣaṅga-kṛṣṇa-nilalohita-gaurā varṇāḥ—White, variegated, brown, black, blue, red and golden are the colours of the seven metres.

66. āgniveśya-kāśyapa-gnutamā-ugirasa-bhūrgava-kausika-vūṣīḥāni gotrāpāti—The seers of the seven metres respectively belong to these seven families.

Now from an examination of the above six sūtras it is evident that the author ends the treatment of his subject (Vedic metres) with the close of the chapter III. Hence the sūtras (on the Vedic metres) coming after this may be presumed as spurious or later
additions. An examination of the first seven śūtras of chapter IV of the extant Piṅgala-sūtra also shows that they are not from the hand of the author of chapters II and III. These seven śūtras of ch. IV simply give the number of syllables that super-sized Vedic metres like atiśakvarī and atyaśī etc. contain. They, unlike śūtras of chapter III, do not give us any information regarding the length and number of pādas (feet). Hence, they may be regarded as later additions but still are much anterior to the work on classical prosody ascribed to Piṅgala.

Now in spite of all these facts it may be asked why and how the original Piṅgala-sūtras came to be dovetailed in a treatise on classical Sanskrit prosody. The answer would probably be that the author of chapters I, IV-VIII of the extant Piṅgala-sūtra with a view to claim a greater antiquity and authority for his work and to give it a wider currency introduced the work of Piṅgala in his own work.

1 Assumption of the existence of new metres is not at all indispensável in dealing with Vedic poetry. An atiśakvarī stanza can be called, according to chapters II and III of Piṅgala, the combination of Gāyatrī and Brhatī. Piṅgala (in chapter III. 61) says that when the metre is doubtful, the first foot determines it. Similarly an atyaśī stanza is a combination of jagati and Brhatī (vide Macdonell’s Vedic Grammar for Students, pp. 444 5). Thus the treatment of Vedic prosody in the Rāg-prātisākhya and similar works, which deal with metres other than those mentioned in chapter II of Piṅgala, makes no real advance on Vedic prosody.

2 Every one knows that the work—śūtra-work too—on Prākṛta prosody going by the name of Piṅgala belongs to a different author and to a different period. If this work had not been on the prosody of Prākṛta poetry we would possibly have found it along with the Śūtra-work on Vedic and classical metres.

3 Instances of such joining together of works on the same subject written at different times were not at all rare in ancient India. Satyavrata Sāmāśrānti is of opinion that the Nighantu and the Nirukta proper are two different works. See his Niruktālocaṇa, Cal. 1907 p. 15. This has also been made patent by Prof. Sköld. And his suggestion that the Pūrva and the Uttara Sātakas of the Nirukta were compositions of different times may not be dismissed lightly (vide his Nirukta: Its place in the old Indian Literature, Its Etymologies, 1926).
Therefore it may be concluded that chapters II and III of the extant *Piṅgala-sūtras* constitute the original work of Piṅgala on the Vedic prosody. This view is further strengthened by the first sūtra of chapter II which is really the beginning of the work. For it reads ‘chandah’ which means that the work is to discuss Vedic metres.\(^1\) This is an additional reason why one should challenge the position of chapter I. For, will not the sūtra reading ‘chandah’ find a better place in the beginning of the whole work?\(^2\) That a *pāda* has been defined long after the word occurs in the beginning of ch. II, in the tenth sūtra of chapter IV, very clearly shows the separateness of the two portions of the work dealing with Vedic and Classical prosody. Thus it may be concluded that chapters II and III of the extant *Piṅgala-sūtras* constitute the original *Vedāṅga Chandāḥ-sūtras* of Piṅgala, while the chapters on classical metres a much later work.

2 The Date of the Work

The study of prosody began indeed very early in India. “The singers of the (Vedic) hymns,” says Weber, “most naturally have been cognisant of the metrical laws observed in them.” The technical names of some of the Vedic metres are found even in the later *sūktas* of the *Rg-veda*. And in the *Brāhmaṇas* the oddest tricks are played with them.\(^3\) The earlier portion of the *Rāmāyaṇa* (II-VI), which has been assigned to 400-300 B.C., several times mentions *Chandus* as well as the *Vedāṅgas* which included them.\(^4\) The mention of the *Śikṣā*, one of the six *Vēlāṅgas* in the *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka*, enables us to trace the existence of a *Chando-Vedāṅga* even before 500 B.C.,—a date fixed by Prof. Macdonell as the lowest limit of the

---

\(^1\) In taking the word ‘chandas’ in the sense of ‘Vedic metre’ one has the authority of Pāṇini who metonymically used the word to mean the Vedas. That the word subsequently came to be applied to classical metres does not, however, invalidate this earlier sense. Also see Macdonell, *op. cit.*, p. 436 l.n. 1.

\(^2\) This first sūtra introduces the subject. Similar phenomenon is observed in other sūtra-works.

\(^3\) *History of Indian Lit.*, London, 1914, p. 23.

date of the Brāhmaṇa literature. For, there is every reason to believe that the study of prosody synchronised with, if not preceded, that of phonetic studies.

But in spite of a very clear indication of the fact that the Vedic prosody came to be studied during the first half of the millennium before Christ we do not possess any definite knowledge about any work of any author of this period. Works (excepting Piṅgala and Śāṅkhāyana Śr. Sūtras) which deal with the Vedic prosody are in the opinion of scholars to be placed between 500 B.C. and 200 B.C. Rk-pratisākhya which treats of Vedic metres in much greater detail than Piṅgala, is evidently posterior in time to the latter. Vedāṅga Chandas-sūtras may be assigned to a period between 600 B.C. and 500 B.C., if not earlier. But fortunately for us the lower limit of the age of Piṅgala's Vedāṅga Chandas-sūtras can be pushed further back.

The Nirukta of Yāska explains the etymology of the word pipilika-madhya a word which is not to be found in the Vedas but has been used by Piṅgala as the name of an irregular metre. And this word is not to be found in the Rk-pratisākhya. This makes it probable that Yāska deals with the very word of Piṅgala and in that case Piṅgala may be anterior to Yāska, the author of the Nirukta. This view seems to receive further corroboration from another fact which is discussed below.

The Nirukta of Yāska mentions 'Pārṇadāni' a word which evidently stands for Pārṇada Sūtras, alias the Rk-pratisākhya of the Śaunaka school. Now the Nirukta has been placed in 500 B.C., i.e., a century earlier than Pāṇini who according to scholars has mentioned Yāska the author of the Nirukta. But as we shall see afterwards, Yāska mentioned by Pāṇini was probably not the reputed author of the Nirukta but a predecessor of his, belonging to the same gotra. Hence Yāska of the Nirukta did not probably belong to so early an age and his date might be fixed at 400 B.C., if not later by a century or so. This date for Yāska would place the Rk-pratisākhya in 500 B.C.

2 Works like the Nidāna Sūtra, Rk-pratisākhya, Anukramanīs of the Rk and the Yajur-veda are assigned to a period between 500 B.C. and 200 B.C., vide Macdonell—Hist. of Sanskrit Lit., chapter IX.
3 Nirukta, ch. VII, 8-9, 6; ch. II, 57.
5 Macdonell thinks that the Pratisākhya in an older form were known to Pāṇini. See his Hist. of Sanskrit Literature, p. 266.
the Vedāṅga Chandas-sūtras of Piṅgala will tentatively have to be assigned to about 600 B.C.\textsuperscript{1}

The personality of Piṅgala is more obscure than his time. There is no means of knowing either his parentage or his native place. "The name of Piṅgya," says Weber, "belongs to one of the sages mentioned in the Brāhmaṇa (Śatapatha) of the White Yajus and elsewhere, from whose family Yāska Pāṅgī was descended, and probably also Piṅgala, the author of a treatise on metre."\textsuperscript{2} From all that has been said above about the date of Piṅgala this surmise of Weber seems to be plausible. The name Pāṅgī which is undoubtedly connected with that of Piṅgala is frequently mentioned in early writings, and a Pāṅgī-Brāhmaṇa must still have been in existence even in Śāyana's time, for he repeatedly refers to it. The Pāṅgī-kalpa is expressly\textsuperscript{3} referred to by the commentator of Pāṇini. Besides this, Pāṅgī appears in the Kāṇḍānukrama of the Ātreya school where he is described as the pupil of Vaiśampāyana and the teacher of Tittiri,\textsuperscript{4} and in a Śāma Sūtra (Anupāda Sūtra) Pāṅgins are mentioned as one of the schools of the Rg-veda.\textsuperscript{5} All these facts make it very probable that Piṅgala, the author of the Vedāṅga Chandas-sūtras, did flourish at a time in the latter half of the Brāhmaṇa period when names like Pāṅgīya and Pāṅgīn were common. Thus no serious objection can probably be raised against a tentative date of 600 B.C. for Piṅgala. The difficulty which the mention of Yāska by Piṅgala creates may be explained by the fact that there is nothing to show that this prosodist Yāska is to be identified with the author of the Nirukta, and moreover, this later Yāska was already shown to be posterior in time to Piṅgala.

There is still one objection against the antiquity of Piṅgala. That in his Sūtras Piṅgala has expressed numerals by words has been considered by Weber to be the reason why the work should be of recent origin.\textsuperscript{6}

---

\textsuperscript{1} Śaṅguruśiśya (1200 A.C.) the commentator of the Anukramaṇī records a tradition to the effect that Piṅgala was either a younger brother or a descendant of Pāṇini. This appears to be impossible. But 700 B.C. has been the date of Pāṇini according to R. G. Bhandarkar. In spite of this it is not safe to rely on this very late tradition.

\textsuperscript{2} Weber, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 46. \textsuperscript{3} Ibid., p. 46.

\textsuperscript{3} Ibid., p. 41, f.n. 30. \textsuperscript{4} Weber, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 80 81.

\textsuperscript{5} Op. cit., p. 60.
But such a reason seems to be futile. For, though he has admitted that this manner of expressing numerals was peculiar to Indians, yet he could not cite any positive proof to the effect that Indians were incapable of developing this art at a very early date. That eight Vasus, eleven Ādityas and twelve Rudras were mentioned in the earlier portion (iii 22, 15) of the Āitareya Brāhmaṇa\(^1\) (circa. 800 B.C.) makes it extremely probable that at about 600 B.C. Indians were in a position to use \(\text{rtavah}, \, \text{tayah}, \, \text{vasavah}, \, \text{rudrāḥ}, \, \text{and ādityāḥ}\) in the sense of 6, 7, 8, 11 and 12 respectively. There being nothing within the view to bar this probability, one may place Piṅgala in 600 B.C. at the latest.

MANOMOHAN GHOSE

---

\(^1\) See p. 22 of Haug's edition.
MISCELLANY

On the origin of the Aryan word īṣṭaka

"Brick" is of great importance in the history of Indian civilisation on account of its use in the architecture and the ritual. To search for the origin of the word 'brick' would therefore result in throwing some light upon the origin of Indian civilisation. S. C. Sarkar in his work, Some Aspects of the earliest Social History of India"1, has tried to prove that the word is of Dravidian origin. This opinion has recently been criticised by Otto Stein.2 My object here is first to give an exposition of the two contradictory opinions, and then to suggest a new solution.

In the Origin and Development of the Bengali Language, I, p. 324, S.K. Chatterji gives īṇḍā-, īṇḍha-, īḷḷ(ḥ)ā- = īṣṭa-ka. In Hindi, there are the forms āṇḍ, āṭh and āṇḍh. In consequence of this, S. C. Sarkar sees in īṣṭakā a Sanskritisation of īṭa, īṭa, which he connects with the Dravidian root īṭ(ḍ)ā, signifying "to dig, scoop out, hollow." From the same root, he derives the Dravidian name of brick, īṭṭikā. To the word īṭa in the Ath. V., v, vi, 14, 3, he assigns the meaning of 'clay' and recognizes the same root in diverse toponymy: Īṭli, Īṭārsī, Īṭāwā, etc. From these he concludes that the Dravid of the Ganges valley have bequeathed to the Aryans the art of manufacturing and utilizing bricks.

The arguments of O. Stein are as follows: The Dravidian etymology must be rejected, because a root signifying "to dig" could not have given the name of 'brick.' Dravidian īṭṭikā is without doubt a loan word from the Indo-Aryan. Lastly, the Indo-European character of īṣṭakā is undoubted as is proved by its comparison with the Avestic īṣṭya.3

1 London, Oxford University Press, 1928.
2 Neuere Forschungen zur altindischen Sozialgeschichte, Rechts- und Staatsrechtsschriftur, in Archiv Orientalni, III, i, pp. 67ff.
3 The diversity of the etymologies proposed shows the difficulty of the authors. According to PW, īṣṭakā is derived from yaj; others connect it with *aīdh (cf. Walde, Lat. Etym. Wb, s.v. aedes; Johansson, IF, 19, 1906, 136). Uhlenbeck tries to explain it by the root *ais.

I.H.Q., DECEMBER, 1931
I admit with Sarkar the non-aryan origin of the name of “brick” and I am disposed to see in \( iṣṭakā \) the Sanskritisation of an ancient word. In regard to the origin of the word \( godhkūna \),\(^1\) I have tried to establish that the presence of forms comparable in Vedic and in Avestic is not sufficient to prove the Indo-European character of a word. On the other hand, O. Stein appears to have reason for his not accepting the derivation of \( iṣṭakā \) from a Dravidian root meaning “to dig.” It is therefore necessary to search for the origin of the word in some other direction.

In Pāli we have \( lēṭhu \) and \( leṭhuka \), “a clod of earth”, to which corresponds Sanskrit \( leṣṭu \). After proving the absence of aspiration in Pāli, Geiger (Pāli, Literatur and Sprache, § 62) gives \( ḍeṭhū, ḍeṭhī, leṣṭu \). The Prakrits offer a large variety of forms: \( leṭhū, leṭhī, leṭhūna, leṭhukka, leṭu, leṭua, leṭukka, lelu \) (Pischel, Gr. Pkt. Sp., § 324). On the side of Sanskrit \( leṣṭu \), we find again \( nesṭu \). The words \( loṣṭu, losṭa \) have, in any case, the same sense, and the Prakrits further present us with a series of words \( loṭha, loṭhaka \) etc. (Pischel, ibid.). I have often observed that the mutability of forms is an index to the non-aryan origin of words; in this case, their multiplicity is really amazing.

The Santali, one of the well-known Munda languages, has exactly an adjective \( leṭko \), “sticky, adhesive, as some kinds of clay” and a verb \( leṭkom \), “to stick to, to adhere.” To these, one can add \( leṭe leṭe \) “soft, mud-like, moist”; \( leṭa \) “dusty, covered with mud or dust, to plaster, to smear” (Campbell, Santali-English Dictionary). The existence of a root common in Munda, viz. \( leṭ \), accounts for the Indo-aryan word \( leṣṭu \), etc. signifying “clay, clod of earth.”\(^2\)

It is well-known that the drop of the initial is frequent in the Indo-aryan words of non-aryan origin.\(^3\) The change from \( leṣṭu \) to \( leṣṭa \) can be regarded as regular\(^4\) and by apophesis it becomes \( eṣṭa \). \( Iṣṭa \) can be a Sanskritisation made upon a Middle-Indian form with \( e \) (cf. \( leṭhū \), etc.). Lastly, the transition of “clod of earth” to “brick” semantically does not present any difficulty.

---

2. Cf. the compound \( loṣṭumaya \), “made of clay, earthy.”
4. *Bull. de la Soc. de Linguistique*, XXXI, ii, pp. 47ff. \( eṣṭa \) is to \( leṣṭu \) as \( losṭa \) to \( loṣṭu \).
There can be no doubt about the non-aryan origin of the root *leś*, if we compare Santali *leśa* "to plaster, to smear," Mon *leś* "to plaster, to smear," and Semang *li†-li†* "smeared"; Santali *leś leś* "soft, mudlike, moist," Malay *liat* "soft, malleable"; Semang *te liat* "soft earth, clay," Malay *tänah liat* "clay"; Khmer *dei ét* "clay" and Khmer *êt* "brick." One may, however, raise the objection that the modern Mundas are not aware of the use of bricks. To that my answer would be that it is due to the fact that these people, impoverished as they were being driven back by the Aryans, have been in decadence for a long time. Nothing prevents us to hold that the degenerated Santals are the descendants of the people who built Harappa and Mohen-jo Daro. In Indo-China, the Chams are in an analogous situation. They have also a word *akiak* for designating brick, but they have forgotten the art of manufacturing those large and solid bricks, with which their ancestors constructed so many admirable monuments. Here and there, however, through impoverishment resulting from foreign invasion, the ancient technique has disappeared.

If one admits that Sanskrit *ỉशका* is non-Aryan, it is undoubtedly necessary also to assign the same origin to the Avestic *įšya*. The conclusion that may be drawn therefrom is that we must suppose the existence of a common linguistic substratum both in India and in a part, at least, of Iran. I hope to show later on that this hypothesis can account for a large number of facts.

Jean Przyluski

An Inscription of Aśoka discovered at Yerragudi

More than two years ago, we learnt of the discovery of an inscription of Aśoka, the great Maurya emperor of India, at a place named Yerragudi in the Kurnool District of the Madras Presidency. Since then, I have never seen it edited. Some days ago, I found a photograph of the inscription in the Telugu Magazine Bhāraṇī (September, 1929).1 published from Madras. There were some notes by Mr. Mallampalli Somaśekhara Sarmā on the find and the findspot of the inscription.

1 Professor D. R. Bhandarkar of the Calcutta University kindly lent me a copy of this issue.
This inscription is not altogether new. It is only another version of the so-called "Minor Rock Inscriptions," which have been found at seven different places in Northern and Southern India. The three copies found in the north are at Sahssaram in the Shahabad District, Bihar, at Rupnath in the Jubbulpore District, Central Provinces, and at Bairat in the Jaipur State in Rājputānā. In the Deccan they have been found at Siddāpur, at Jaṭinga-Rāmeśvar and at Brahmagiri, all close to one another, in the Chitaldurg District of Mysore. Another Southern version was discovered in 1915 at Maskī in the Raichur District of the Nizam's dominions. So, our version found at Yerragudi, not very far from Maski, is the eighth version of the "Minor Rock Inscriptions." At Maski and the three places of Northern India, however, only the first part of the epigraph, i.e., the so-called "Minor Rock Edict I", is engraved.

The left side of the first part of the inscription is in an extremely poor state of preservation; but the second part is in a much better condition. Unfortunately the letters are so carelessly engraved that it is extremely difficult to follow the lines, which are at some places hopelessly confused. (cf. ll. 8-12). There is the other great difficulty that after one line is finished, sometimes the next line is not begun from the usual place, but from a place below the middle of the preceding line or from about the end of it. Now, the letters of these sub-lines are sometimes hopelessly mingled with the letters of the "next" line, begun from the usual place (cf. l.8, where "Tā" of "Aṃtā" is engraved below "Aṃ"; the sub-line beginning with "cakā" etc. should, I think, be the continuation of the line ending with "Aṃtā").

I have deciphered the lines as follows:—

I

1 Devānaṃ pīye [hevamāha] (ṣa kā nā ?)
2 • • • vasān [i] kho tu • si sa pā u ka ha pa ?)
3 husā || Sātirekaṃ [tu kho] Savachare ye ṣ mayā Sanghe
   upayi...
4 misā1 manisā • • (le ka ca • mā ite kapame vaṭhathite ?)

1 From a comparison with the words of the other versions it is clear that the word should be "asmisā"; the missing "a" seems to have been the last letter of the preceding line.
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(By kind permission of the Editor, Bhārati, Madras)
5 * * * * * * devehī te dānī misibhūtā ॥ Pakamasa hi
6 * * mī * * (dhatame e khuyeki savane apamaya ?)
7 * * * sakiye vipule svage ārātāyeva ॥ Aṭhāya iyam’
8 [sā] vane sāvī [te] ॥ Atha khudakamahadhana1 imaṁ pacaka
mevu ॥ Aṃtā,
8a (cakā gi ṭhi ravivunajame ?)
9 Iyam’ pakama ho [tu] vipule pi ca vaśhasitā aparādhiyā
diyadhā...
10 * ke ānapitaviye hcvam’ Devānaṁ devanam’ piyāne vasāvuya...

II

12 ......mātāpitūsu...
13 sitaviye ॥ Hcvam’ garusu sususitaviye ॥ Prānesu dayitaviye2 ॥
saca vataviye ॥ Na ?
14 susuma ॥ Dhau mā [gu] nā pavatitivā ॥ Hcvam’ tuphe āna-
payātha Devānapīya vacanena he
15 * tha hathi * rohāni kāranakāni ygayā cariyāni Baṃbhānāniva
tuphe hcvam’...
16 tha añavāsiniya’ * sā porāṇa pakiti ॥ Iyam’ sususitaviye apa-
cāyanāya vā ācarisa va me...

1 The word, used in other recensions relatively with “Khudaka,”
is “mahat” or “mahatpa,” has been taken by some scholars to mean
“superior officials.” As “mahādhana” (wealthy) cannot possibly mean
“superior official,” the reading of this version, I think helps us in
understanding the passage correctly.

2 In l. 18 I have read “Prānesu dayitaviye” (one should be kind
to living creatures) where Drs. Hultsch and Bhandarkar always
read “Prānesu drahyitavyam” (respect for living creatures should be
made firm). In this photograph “dayitaviye” is quite clear and
Hultsch’ plates support this reading. (cf. Plates in the Corp. Inscr.,
Indicarum vol. 1) The duplication of the word “devānaṁ” in l. 10
is I think, due to the engraver’s inattention. Another interesting
feature of the epigraph is that almost in every line we find reversed
forms of letters, like “la” “pa” etc., which are thought to be remini-
scences of the old practice of writing Brāhmi also, from right to left
like her sister Kharoṣṭhī.
Bodhicitta-vivaraṇa of Nāgarjuna

Dr. Nalinaksha Dutt has published in the *Indian Historical Quarterly*, (VII, p. 259ff.) the ‘Bodhisattva-Prātimokṣa-sūtra’ with an interesting study on it. His edition of the text is based on a manuscript preserved in the Cambridge University Library. Dr. Dutt has rightly pointed out that the last leaf of the text has no bearing on the Prātimokṣa-sūtra and seems to contain the beginning of a new text.

The opening line bears testimony to such a hypothesis—*Namo Buddhāya Bodhicittavivaranaṃ vakṛṣye*. The title of the text was evidently Bodhicittavivaraṇa. It is preserved in the *Bstan hgyur* in two Tibetan translations. There is besides the Tibetan translation of a commentary attributed to Smṛti-jñānamitra. The work is attributed to Ārya Nāgarjuna (*klu sgrub*).


The first translation, that of Guṇākara, is not a literal one and is oftentimes only explanatory while the second, that of Jayānanda closely follows the text. As regards the date of the text it is for the present impossible to say whether the author is the same as the great
founder of the Mādhyaṃkika philosophy or a later personage of that name. The style and the quality of the Sanskrit in which the text is written would not go against its attribution to the authorship of the famous Nāgārjuna. But the absence of any reference to it in the works of Śāntideva, particularly in his chapters on Bodhicitta, may go against such an antiquity of the text.

The commencement of Jayānanda’s translation is as follows:

Da nas byaṅ chub kyi sems sgom pa’i ’greł pa bṣad par bya’o l bcom ldan ’das kyi schos thams cad sems kyis rnam par brtags pa’o žes i gsuṅs pas ri zig sems ni de ŋid kyi raṅ būṅ ci zig žes Ńes pīr rtog pa rcan l dṇos pa thams cad daṅ bral ba phun i po kḥams daṅ skye mched daṅ gzuṅ daṅ ’jan ba rnam par spaṅs l, ches bdag med par mṇam ŋid pas l, raṅ sems głoṅ nas ma skyes pa l, ston pa ŋid kyi raṅ bzin no l, žes gsuṅs so l, smras pa ’di yi don ci yin ze na l, brjod pa dṇos po daṅ bral žes te l.

वैधिविष-विशवर्षि यदि। विनिबिनिता यथसत् दृष्टां भगवता। ईश्वरविष्णु विनिबिनिते (१)।

विनिबिनिति भाषा-विशवायितं ज्ञातवाजन-वाक्यायितं वेनयेतराययमत्वः। श्रवणाध्यापुष्पं

युवता अभाविति। कोष्ठ वचनायायः—सर्वभाविनितमिति।

This is sufficient to point out to the close agreement of the text and the translation of Jayānanda. The text deals with one of the most important Mahāyāna doctrines. The discovery of the complete manuscript of the text will, therefore, be eagerly looked for.

P. C. Bagchi

On the antiquity of the name "Kāsthāmandapa or Katmandu"

According to the Nepalese Vāṃśāvalīs the ancient name of Kātmaṇḍu was Kāntipura. It was founded by king Guṇakāmadeva who ascended the throne in the Kali year 3824 = 724 A.D. Later on in 1595 A.D. the name of the city was changed into Kāṭhāmaṇḍapā during the reign of Laks̄mi-Narasimhamalla. The legendary portion of the tradition says that a certain citizen had cherished the desire of building a temple with the wood of a single tree for the use of the wandering ascetics. During the procession of Matsyendranātha he suddenly discovered the Kalpavrksa in person, got hold of him and asked for the boon. The Kalpavrksa became pleased with him and he thus
succeeded in building the temple with the wood of a single tree. 1 The said temple is still shown in front of the old palace of the Mallas at Kāṭmaṇḍu. It is still used by wandering ascetics.

Though it is a pure legend the date 1595 A.D. had to be retained for want of further information about the name of Kāṭmaṇḍu. During my last stay in Nepal I came across a manuscript in the Darbar collection which contains some information about the name of the city.

It is the ms. of the Lakṣṇahomavidhi of Śaivācārya Tejabrahma. Its colophon runs thus:

श्रीयोग, संवत १३१९ देशांत्य विलासयातान्त्री लिखितं हृद श्रीकायासान्त्य नगरे श्रीमणद्र श्रीमणसेवा लिखितमिति ।

The city of Kāṭamaṇḍapa is no other than Kāṣṭhamaṇḍapa, the confusion made by the copyist being a very common one in the Nepalese manuscripts. The name Kāṣṭhamaṇḍapa, therefore, had come into use already in the Nepal era 531 i.e. 1411 A.D., 200 years before the time of Lakṣṇī Narasiṃha Malladeva.

The name Kāntipurā was also in use at that period as is evident from the colophons of mss. 2 Thus it seems probable that both the names, Kāntipurā and Kāṣṭhamaṇḍapa were simultaneously in use during a certain period and subsequently the former became more popular and the latter fell into disuse.

P. C. Bagchi

---

1 S. Lövi, Le Nepal, I, pp. 52-54.
2 The Late MM. H. P. Śāstri in his Catalogue of Palm Leaf and Selected Paper Mss, belonging to the Durbar Library, Nepal II, p. 48 has also described these mss., but the colophon given there contains a number of mistakes—“Śrīyāstu sāṃvat 531 Vaisākhasya Śitanavamīyaḥ tīθau likhitāmāṃ Śrīkūṭamāṇḍapa nagare Śrī-Dhimadatta somaśarmāṇo-aliṅhit.
3 See Śāstri, ibid., p. 190 Pārthivārcana Cuḍāmaṇi (copied in 1715) Nepāle bahupūṭhamaṇḍitaśive Kāntipurī rājate; p. 196 Pūjākalpalātā (copied in 1669 A.D.)—“Kāntapurī rājā Pratḍapamallera Guru Nārāyana Bhāhuṣek puthi”; p. 233 Pīṭhābhakti Tārāṛiṇī (copied in 1674 A.D.)—Kāntipur nagare likhitaiṣā.
Identification of Brahmottara

(mentioned in the Nidhanpur plates)

As the Nidhanpur copper-plate inscriptions form an important landmark in the early social and political history of Sylhet and the editor is disposed to believe that the donated land lay not in Sylhet but somewhere in North Bengal, a discussion on the issues raised seems necessary. The Brahmottara was situated in the Candrapuri-Visaya and was named Mayura-salmalagrahara. In the description of the boundaries we come across the names, Gangañikā or Gāngiṇī and Kośikā. For reasons stated below, we are convinced that the grant relates to a place in and about modern Pañcakhaṇḍa where the plates were discovered.

First, it is well-known that the find-spot of a copper plate charter is almost invariably the locality of the grant made therein.

Secondly, it is true that the charter was issued from the Mahārājā-dhirāja’s camp at Karnasuvarna and the word ‘Gāngiṇī’ occurs in another inscription, referring to a locality in Karnasuvarna, but it does not follow from this that the grant under consideration should therefore belong to a region near Karnasuvarna. It is noteworthy that in North Sylhet which includes the perganah of Pañcakhaṇḍa, there are at least nine or ten places named Candapur (Candrapur) within a radius of about 20 miles from the headquarters station. This raises a presumption that the ancient Candrapuri-Visaya, that is, the division or district of Candrapuri included a portion of the modern district of Sylhet. The river ‘Kośikā’ is very likely represented by the modern Kuśiyārā which passes by Pañcakhaṇḍa, the findspot of the plates. There is also a place called ‘Gāngiṇī’ (colloquially, Gāngiṇī) on the river Kuśiyārā in the same perganah and near Nidhanpur. About six or seven miles from Pañcakhaṇḍa there is also a watery marsh called ‘Gāngiṇī-vil.’ The inscriptions nowhere state that

1 See ante, pp. 718 ff.
2 EL, XIX, 118, lines 57.
3 EL, XII, 75, lines 45 and 47 with footnote 19. I accept the reading Kośika. EL, XIX, 120, lines 53-54.
4 Ibid.
5 The name Kuśiyārā may have resulted from a combination of the names Kośika and Barak, names of the same river at two different places (Kośi + Barā = Kuśiyārā).
Gāṅgīṇī was a river and not a ‘vils’. During the rainy season such ‘vils’ (also called locally ‘hāor’s, if sufficiently big) become vast sheets of water. When the water recedes at the end of the season, considerable quantity of land becomes available for cultivation. This is apparently referred to in the expression gāṅgīṇy-upacitaka kṣetram.\(^1\) As to the name of the village ‘Mayūra-sālmalāgrahāra’ it is well-known that in making an ‘agrahāra’ grant (i.e., grant to Brāhmaṇas) a new name was sometimes given to the village or villages alienated.\(^2\) Such a name is, therefore, likely to exist in documents only. But even then analogous names are still to be met with in North Sylhet. Thus in the Bhatara copper plate inscription we read of Mahurāpura (modern Maurāpur).\(^3\) A village named ‘Śimuliā’ also exists here. On the strength of similarity of place-names thus we may take it that the grant relates to a locality in Sylhet.

But why should Mahārājādhirāja Bhāskaravarman issue the edict from Karṇasuvarṇa (part of North Bengal)? It appears that while the emperor was camping here very possibly about 650 A.D.,\(^4\) Mahārāja-Yeṣṭhabhadra,\(^5\) the local governor who had apparently the Candrapuri-viṣaya under his control, informed his suzerain about the loss of the charter granted by Bhutivarman.\(^6\) The emperor accordingly issued his commands to the Viṣayapati or Viṣaya-nāyaka Śrīkṣi-kunḍa and other officials (adhikarāṇas) of Candrapuri to renew and execute the grant in the then prevalent scripts which were different from those of Bhūtivarman’s time.\(^7\) This interesting picture of an well-ordered administration (where the official gradation was Mahārājādhirāja, Mahārāja, Viṣayapati or Viṣayanāyaka and the Adhikaraṇas which included the Nyāyakaraṇika, Vyavahārī, Kāyastha, Bhāṇḍāgārādhikā, Mahāsāmanta, etc.) shows us that the emperor

1 *El.*, XIX, 120.
2 *El.*, XV, 70ff. (pt. II); *SII*, III, 307 note 1; *SII*, II, no. 76; *SII*, III, no. 205. This subject is discussed in detail in my forthcoming work, ‘Land-system in South India between c. 800 A.D. and 1200 A.D.’ (Punjab Sanskrit Book Depot).
3 *El.*, XIX, 281, line 30.  
4 *El.*, XII, 66.
5 Bhāskaravarman as Yeṣṭhabhadra’s sovereign had the title ‘Mahārājādhirāj’ (*El.*, XIX, 118, line 4).
6 *El.*, XIX, 118 lines 7 and 8. I accept the reading Mahārājā Yeṣṭhabhadravijñāpṭyā (*Ibid.*, 121, footnote 2).
7 Cf. *El.*, XII, 76, line 54.
need not have been present on the spot of the grant, especially as it was a mere renewal of an old grant and it could have been carried out from anywhere. Thus the order issued from the camp at Karṇasuvāra does not signify that the locality of the grant should be sought there.

Thirdly, was Sylhet included in the empire of Kāmarūpa? Apart from the evidence of the find-spot of the copper plates there is a tradition widely prevalent about the inclusion of Sylhet, Tippera and part of Mymensingh and Dacca in Kāmarūpa, and people point to certain places in these districts as king Bhagadatta’s place.¹ The boundaries of the empire of Kāmarūpa as given in the Yogini-tantra,² a work of a very late date no doubt, seem to include Sylhet. To explain it away as indicating the scriptural region of Kāmarūpa is not sufficient. There is every likelihood of the tradition having historical and political background. I fail to find the mention of Śrīhaṭṭa in the Yogini-tantra as an ‘independent political entity’ as the editor would have us believe.³ The name occurs in the Yogini-tantra, Uttarakhaṇḍa, Paṭalas 1 (p. 112), 2 (p. 119), 6 (p. 179) and 9 (p. 215), but in none of these places any political entity is implied. The contention that Hiuen-Tsang, by referring to Shihihchatolo meant the independent kingdom of Śrīhaṭṭa has to be given up as being absolutely devoid of reason in view of Mon. Finot’s revelations.⁴ From a ninth century Tantra Manuscript we learn that Matsyendranātha (Mīnanātha) was an inhabitant of Candradvīpa (Eastern Bengal) and from an 11th century commentary on a Tantra we note that the Saint came from Kāmarūpa (I.H.Q., 1930, no. 1, pp. 178-181). This discrepancy can be explained by taking Eastern Bengal (Candradvīpa) as belonging to the Empire of Kāmarūpa. It should be remembered that Matsyendranātha lived much earlier than the 11th century A.D. (probably in the 9th century A.D.).

As to Paṇcakhaṇḍa belonging to the kings of Tripurā in 641 A.D.⁵ it is to be noted that the copper-plate grant that is alleged to have been issued never saw the light of day.⁶ Even if we take it

¹ EL., 68 ; SL., Bk. II, Ch. I, 10-II.
³ EL., XII, 68.
⁴ Cf. Watters, Yuan Chwang, II, 188-189 ; EL., XII, 67 ; JRAS., 1920, 1-6.
⁵ See JRAS., 1920, 451-452.
⁶ EL., XII, 67 ; SL., Bk. II, Ch. 4, 56 note.
⁷ Vaidik-samāsya ; SL., Bk. II, Ch. 5 notes pp. 67-73 ; Indian Historical Quarterly, 1930, No. 1, 64-66.
for granted that a king of Tripurā made a grant in 641 A.D., it does not preclude the possibility of the emperors of Kāmarūpa possessing Pañcakhaṇḍa about 500 A.D. (the time of Bhūtivarman), losing it about 640 A.D. and regaining it a few years after. As to the argument that the name 'Śrihaṭṭa' is not to be met with in the Nidhanpur plates, all we may say is that Śrihaṭṭa was not yet an independent State, and the name, if existent at all, did not signify much. The first mention of Śrihaṭṭa as an independent state, as one may say in the existing state of our knowledge, probably occurs in the Bhatera copper-plate inscription of about 1049 A.D.¹ It is also to be noted in this connection that the name 'Śrihaṭṭa' apparently originated from the name of Haṭṭa-nātha-Siva or Haṭṭakesvara-Siva, the sept-deity of the Nāgara-Brāhmaṇa settlers of Syllhet. The Nidhanpur plates need not thus mention Śrihaṭṭa. For other points of interest see Mr. J. C. Ghosh's paper in the Indian Historical Quarterly, 1930, No. 1 (pp. 60-71).

K. M. GUPTA

Merada

Merada means the fire proof earthen superstructure of ordinary thatched houses in rural tracts in Orissa. A temple of this structure was constructed in a certain village in the Atagada Zamindari of the Ganjam District in the midst of forests. The temple was constructed with such huge stones that one wonders how such huge stones could be raised to such a height. As the temple was constructed like merada or fire proof earthen superstructure of an ordinary thatched house, it was known by the name of Merada. There are three big pedestals in the temple. The temple was occupied temporarily by the three idols from the celebrated temple of Jagannath of Puri, during the time of the Musalman invasion. The Musalman invader was Muhammad Taki Khan who was the deputy governor of Orissa. He interfered greatly with the worship of the temple of Jagannath at Puri during the time of Rāmacandra Deva, the Rājā of Khurda, who ruled from 1732-1743 A.D. The idols were therefore removed temporarily from Puri to Merada. The removal of these idols entailed a loss of nine lakhs of rupees per annum from the revenue of Orissa, this being the amount collected from the pilgrims visiting the shrine. During the

¹ EI., XIX, 280, lines 5 and 29.
time of the Musalman invasion, Rāmacandra Deva not only removed the three idols from Puri to Merada, but himself took shelter in Rummagoda (fort) in the Atagada Zamindari for 3 ¾ years under the Atagada king Jagabandhu alias Jagannātha Haricandana who was the Nawab of Northern Ganjam under the Mughals collecting the land revenue from Khalikote, Dharakote, Shergad, Bodogad, Surada Mohuri, Biruli, Palur, Aska etc. of the Zamindari parganas. On the death of Muhammad Taki Khan in the year 1734 Murshid Kuli Khan succeeded him as the deputy governor of Orissa under Muhammadans. At the instance of Rāja Jagabandhu alias Jagannātha Haricandana the ruler of Atagada, Murshid Kuli Khan induced Rāja Ramacandra Deva to bring back and reinstate the three idols at Puri. Thus the three idols were brought back to Puri and were reinstated in the Jagannath temple at Puri. Though the Idols were removed from Merada temple yet the seats of the three idols are still worshipped regularly up to this day by the priests appointed by Rāja Jagabandhu alias Jagannātha Haricandana of Atagada. A hamlet known by the very same name of Merada was carried out from the neighbouring forest and its income was set apart for the conduct of worship in the Merada temple. Rāja Jagannātha Haricandana was the 19th ruler of the Baghale dynasty of the ancient Atagada Zamindari ruling from 1732-1748 A.D. For his act of extreme piety in thus offering shelter to the glorious Orissan idols as well as the king of Orissa or Khurda, the Rāja of Atagada was honoured greatly by the kings of Orissa, or Khurda.

Mr. Sewell in his list of Antiquarian Remains in the Presidency of Madras, vol. I, p. 3 mentions Merada and gives a very short but incorrect note thereon. The temple is thus of some antiquarian interest.

LAKSHMINARAYAN HARI CHANDAN JAGADES

Origin of the Lotus-capital

I have read carefully Mr. Mitra's reply to my note on this subject, but am not convinced by any of his arguments. I will discuss here only a few points, as the problem will be taken up in relation with the whole environment in my contribution to the forthcoming Survey of Persian Art.

First to make a few corrections. I did not say that "the lotus supports of (the chamfer reliefs) at Bhārhut had been meant
to represent pillars" (p. 215 of Mr. Mitra's paper), but that both
the pillars and the chamfer reliefs illustrated the use of the lotus as a
support. As to the variations from the standard form, I am very far
from denying that the Maurya architects "were fully alive to the deco-
rative significance of the bell capital"; decorative variations on the
simpler themes of the Plant style are fast developing in early Indian
art, and such subordination of meaning to ornament is a part of the
normal development that takes place in any art. I did not say that
the Vedic lotus symbolism had a direct bearing on the animal stan-
dards, but only that the lotus must have been used as a general support-
symbol in and before the Maurya period; I think it is only in connection
with Śrī-Lakṣmī that the early use is definitely iconographic. My view
has nothing to do with a "world lotus." As to the fact that the lotus
is not mentioned in connection with any of the dhvaja-stambhas, or the
military standards, this is only what we have to expect on my theory,
which regards the lotus capital as simply the termination of a shaft,
and not as a cihna. My view would rather lead one to suppose that
such a termination may have been found on all or any of the Epic
animal standards carried in a battle; and this is precisely so in the case
of the two garudā-standards borne by equestrian figures at Bhārhat.

I did not say that the lotus capital was a form "of west Asiatic
origin" at some pre-Achaemenid period; lotus motifs may have been
common to India and Assyria before the fall of Babylon, without
necessarily being of Assyrian origin in India. Incidentally I may
remark that M. de la Vallée Poussin not long since expressed views
which coincide with mine to this extent, that "the differences between
the Aśokan and Persian capitals are sufficiently marked to exclude
idea of direct imitation," and though the prototype may have
reached India from the west, it had already assumed in India "an
Indian form destined to become (qui sera) that of the Aśokan period."

The differences between Indian and Persian columns and capitals,
just alluded to have been emphasized elsewhere; here I shall refer
only to one aspect of this side of the question. The practice of build-
ing up tall stone columns by the superposition of cylindrical sections
shows that in Persia we are dealing with a mason's, not a carpenter's
tradition; this method had been practised long ago in Egypt, but it

1 L'Inde aux temps des Mauryas, p. 161.
2 Chanda, The Beginnings of Art in Eastern India, Mem. ASI, 30.
never reached India. On the other hand, the two dominant types of the early Indian column, viz. the smooth cylindrical monumental form and the octagonal (chamfered) constructional type with square base, are immediate reproductions of wooden forms, and show no knowledge of masonry technique, such as could have been learnt from Persia.

Thus the masonry tradition of Persia in the fourth century B.C. represents an art technically far in advance (aesthetic judgments are here beside the mark) of the carpenter’s tradition in India in the third century B.C. Are we to infer that India was taught by Persia to work in stone, explaining the absence of direct imitation by an invocation of Indian “originality”? No doubt Maurya India may have been well aware that stone had been used for building purposes in other countries, let us even suppose that the idea of using stone at all proceeded from this knowledge. We are forgetting our material. Persian masons may have been expert in the working of limestone, but how could they have handled the sandstones of the Ganges Valley, which are so hard as to put even the best modern tools to a severe test, and yet in early India were wrought with exquisitely finished surfaces, and sharpest detail? It is far more plausible to connect the early use of stone in India with the discovery of steel; there is good reason to think that steel may have been invented in India; archaeological evidence takes us back to the second century B.C., and literary evidence to the fourth, when Alexander, amongst other valuable gifts, received from the Malloi and Oxydrakai of the Pāñjāb, a hundred talents of steel. Thus provided with the necessary tools, the Indian vaddhaki, who had been hitherto a tuchaka or woodworker, and sometimes a bricklayer, itthaka-vaddhaki, now began to function also as a mason, sili-vaddhaki. There is nothing to show that he had reason to, or actually did, adopt new formulae or methods of construction; on the contrary, all the architecture shows the clearest signs of its immediate origins in carpentry.

Finally, I present one a priori consideration. Alexander had destroyed Persepolis in 331. Under the Seleukids new Hellenistic fashions came into vogue. Aśoka came to the throne in 272. The contradiction consequently found in the current theory has been neatly stated by A. W. Lawrence in the new Encyclopedia Britannica, under Persia, Archaeology, as follows:

“the Achæmenian palace was imitated (in India) during the Hellenistic age, while in Mesopotamia and Persia it was ignored in the fashion for Hellenism.”
Mr. Mitra's theory requires, apparently, that Aśoka should have sent his architects to the ruins of Persepolis, burnt down more than sixty years earlier, there to obtain material for the construction of "period architecture" in India. On the other hand, if an architecture related to the older art of Western Asia had already been current in India before the Maurya period, it can be well understood that it might have survived there, longer than in Persia.

Ananda Coomaraswamy

The Guḍimallam Lingam

Attention was first called to this magnificent and in some respects unique example of Indian stone sculpture by the late T. A. Gopinath Rao in his Elements of Hindu Iconography, 1914.15, (see also Indian Antiquary, XL, 1911, pp. 104-114). In my History of Indian and Indonesian Art, p. 39, I endorsed Mr. Rao's view that it should be dated in the first or second century B.C. Now Mr. A. H. Longhurst, in his Pallava Architecture, III (Mem. ASL.), 40, p. 21, dates it not earlier than the temple in which it is now enshrined, i.e. eighth or ninth century A.D. A difference of nearly a thousand years is rather serious, especially in the case of such an important figure, and one with such strongly marked characters.

There can be no doubt that the earlier dating is approximately correct. I will first ask the reader to compare the Guḍimallam lingam with the pillar relief J2 in the Mathurā Museum; the two sculptures are respectively figures 66 and 59 in my History. Not merely are both figures stylistically related in the closest manner, but both are supported by a crouching dwarf Yakṣa vāhana like that of the well-known figure of Kupiro Yakkho at Bhārhat: The Mathurā figure has, in the lunette above, a representation of a scene from the Mahābodhi Jātaka, and this fact alone would suggest a pre-Gupta date. In any case, the Śunḍa style of both figures is unmistakeable; not only is the treatment of the folds of the drapery still archaic, as at Bhārhat, but nothing is more characteristic of late Śunḍa art than the peculiar manner of representing the sexual organs as if nude, though really covered by the dhoti, cf. figs. 54, 57, 58, 60 in my History. The fact that the lingam rises directly from the earth, without any definite representation of a yoni, is an additional evidence for the early date.

Ananda Coomaraswamy
Gopāla

The chronology of the Pāla kings is a knotty question, and has baffled the skill of many scholars. Our object here is simply to state a few facts for the consideration of scholars.

Gopāla is the founder of the Pāla dynasty. His grandfather is described as ‘the progenitor of the foremost line of kings’. His father Vapyāta is said to have ‘embellished the earth with massive temples, and became famous as the destroyer of adversaries’. He himself is described as ‘the crest-jewel of the heads of kings’. He was made king by the people to put an end to the lawlessness under which the people of Bengal were then groaning. He married Daddadevi, ‘a daughter of the Bhadra king’ (Ep. Ind., vol. IV, pp. 243-254).

It appears that Gopāla was no common man, nor his family a common one. As Daityaviṣṇu is said to be ‘the progenitor of the foremost line of kings’, we may presume that kingship commenced with his son Vapyāta. He was, perhaps, a sāṃanta king. Gopāla seems to have succeeded his father before he was made by the people the king of Bengal. He must have given some proof of his capacity to govern a country, otherwise, the choice of the people would not have fallen on him. In the Khālimpur grant of Dharmapāla, mention of only two names of the predecessors of Gopāla, the founder of the Pāla dynasty, led Mr. R. D. Banerjee to the hasty conclusion that the family must have been of humble origin, as they could not remember more than two names of the ancestors of the founder (A.S.B. Memoir, No. V, p. 45). Vijñāneśvara in his commentary on the verse 318, chap. I of the Yājñavalkya-Saṃhitā writes:—“kārpāṣike pāhe phalake vā ātmano vaṃśiyān pra-pitāmaha-pitāmaha-pitṛn bahu-vacanasy-ārthavattvāya vaṃśa-viryaārūt-ādi-guṇ opavarṇana-pūrvakam abhilekhya-ātmānaḥ ca &c,” i.e. in the grants only the exploits of great-grandfather, grand-father, father, and of self are to be recorded. This, I think, makes Mr. Banerjee's remark unwarrantable.

We have seen that Daddadevi has been described as ‘Bhadrāmajā’. Kielhorn translated it as the daughter of the Bhadra king meaning thereby that the queen’s father was the king of the Bhadra country. Mr. A. K. Maitra objected to this translation, saying that it had no historical allusion. It simply means that Kuvera’s wī Bhadrā was the daughter of Bhadra (Gauḍa-lekhamāla, p. 20n.), but he did not
refer to any Purāṇa or Itihāsa. It may, however, also mean that Daddadevi was the daughter of a person whose name or surname was Bhadra. And that the latter was the case we shall presently see. In the Nidhanpur copper-plate grant of Bhāskaravarman (Ep. Ind., vol. XII, p. 79) we find an officer named Gopāla as the 'issuer of hundred commands and the receiver of five great sounds' (ājñā-sata prāpayitā prāpta-paśca-mahāsabdah Śrī-Gopālah ). Generally the sāmantas are honoured with paśca-mahāsabdhas (J.A., vol. V, p. 354), so this Gopāla was a sāmanta under Bhāskaravarman. The occasion for the mention of Gopāla's name in the charter seems to be that he was the sāmanta of the district to which the donated land belonged. In another portion of the same grant (Ep. Ind., vol. XIX, p. 118), we find in line 8—'Mahārāja Jyeṣṭha-bhadra vijñāpya.' As the construction is faulty, the editor of the plate, suggested two alternative readings: (1) 'Mahārājena jyeṣṭhabhadrān vijñāpya' i.e. Mahārājā having informed senior respectable persons; (2) 'Mahārāja-Jyeṣṭhabhadra-vijñāptya' meaning at the request of Mahārāja-Jyeṣṭhabhadra (p. 121, n. 2). The editor seems to have preferred the first reading. But we are inclined to think that the second one is more appropriate. Firstly because, it necessitates a small change in a letter only, while the other reading requires changes in the case-endings of two words. Secondly, the officers who are to be informed according to custom had already been so notified in the previous lines. It was unnecessary, therefore, again to inform the Jyeṣṭhabhadras. The fact seems to be that while Bhāskaravarman was at his camp at Karnasuvarna, the applicant Brahmins approached Mahārājā Jyeṣṭhabhadra, who was, as the epithet Mahārājā indicates, the Sāmanta of Karnasuvarna, and requested him to bring to the notice of Bhāskaravarman their grievances. And it was at his intercession that Bhāskaravarman ordered the renewal of the grant.

Can this Gopāla be the founder of the Pāla dynasty, and his queen Daddadevi, a daughter of this Jyeṣṭhabhadra? It is not at all unlikely that Gopāla, himself a Sāmanta, married the daughter of another Sāmanta, under the same overlord. That there existed a Bhadra family of Sāmanta kings in the sixth century also at Karnasuvarna is proved by the Bappaghośavāṭa grant of Jayanāga. The object of the grant was to specify the bounds of a certain village named Vappaghośavāṭa granted to Brahmacārvāmin by the Sāmanta Nārāyaṇabhadra. The record is of the reign of Mahārājā-
Early Capital of the Gurjara Pratihāras of Mahodaya

Where was the capital of the Gurjara Pratihāras of Mahodaya before they established themselves at Mahodaya or Kanauj from the time of Bhoja I? Some scholars thought that it was at Bhimnāl in south Rājputānā.¹ But Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar² and with him Dr. R. C. Majumdar³ hold that it was in Ujjain. In coming to this conclusion they have relied on the following two verses:—

(1) Hiranyagarbham rājanyair-Ujjaya(ī)nāṃ yad-āśītam /
Pratihārikṛtāṃ yena Gurjar-eś-ādi-rājakam //9

(Ep. Ind., vol. XVIII, p. 243)

(2) Śākeś-vabdaśateṣu sapatasu dīsam pānic-ottareśuttarām
Pānt-Indrāyudha-nāmni Kṛṣṇa-nṛpaje Śṛt-vallabhe daksinām /
Pūrvām Śrīmad-Avanti-bhūbhṛti nṛpe Vatsādī(ṛ)dīrāje' parāṃ
Śauryā(rā)nāṃ-adhimanḍale (laṁ) jayavyate vire Varāhe' vati //

(Jinasena's Harivaṃśa-Purāṇa, 66, 52)

Commenting on the first verse Prof. Bhandarkar writes:—“Verse 8 tells us that Indrarāja was succeeded by Dantidurga, who, as the next verse says that when in Ujjain the various Kṣatriyas performed ceremony, namely, of the great gift of Hiranyagarbha, made the Gurjara and other lords his door-keepers (pratihāras). The verse evidently means in the first place that Dantidurga either performed or took a prominent part in this Hiranyagarbha ceremony

¹ J.R.A.S., 1909, p. 57; Smith’s Early His. Ind., p. 378.
³ Ibid., p. 102.
in Ujjain. And this receives confirmation from a stanza occurring in the Daśāvatāra Cave temple inscription at Ellorā. This inscription gives Mahārāja-Sarva as another name apparently for Dantidurga, and claims that in that very Ujjain, in order to enjoy a diversion with other princes, he instituted a mahā-dāna worthy of kings, and poured all kinds of wealth and precious stones on the suppliants. There can, therefore, be no doubt that Dantidurga had gone to Ujjain and performed the Hiranyagarbhā ceremony. Secondly verse 9 of our grant also implies that at Ujjain was then ruling a Gurjara dynasty called Pratihāra. There can be little doubt that this must be the Pratihāra dynasty that became supreme after seizing the throne of Mahodaya. We know for certain from epigraphic records that their capital became Mahodaya or Kanauj from the time of Bhoja I onwards. But we did not know with certitude where they were actually ruling before they became rulers of Kanauj. And it was a mere surmise when some scholars thought that it was Bhilmāl or Bhinmāl in South Rājputānā. Our grant, however, enables us to say definitely that their original seat of power was Ujjain. It also enables us to interpret properly the third line of the stanza so often quoted from the Harivanśa of Jinasena. We can have no doubt now as to the correctness of Dr. Fleet's translation, which makes Vatsarāja king of Avanti. This Vatsarāja, of course, is the Vatsarāja of the Imperial Pratihāra dynasty, and the Jaina Harivanśa may be regarded as strengthening the inference that the Pratihāras were established at Ujjain and not Bhilmāl before they transferred their capital to Kanauj”.

Now let us see how far Prof. Bhandarkar is right in his conclusion that the Pratihāras were established in Ujjain before they transferred their capital to Kanauj. He admits that ‘Dantidurga either performed himself or took a prominent part in’ the Hiranyagarbha ceremony at Ujjain. But from the Ellorā inscription referred to above it is clear that he himself was the performer of the mahā-dāna. This being so, is it not natural that he would perform it in his own dominion? This receives confirmation from the same Ellorā inscription which states that Dantidurga among other countries conquered Sindh and Mālava. Ujjain was the capital of the latter. If he himself was not the performer of the mahā-dāna, the fact that he made the other kings his door-keepers loses its force. Further it should be remembered

that the verse was written to eulogise the exploits of Dantidurga and not of other kings. We may also point out that if Ujjain was the capital of the Gurjara-Pratihāra king, it is difficult to believe that he should be made a door-keeper in his own capital. Taking Ujjain to be not within the dominion of Dantidurga, does it prove that it was the capital of the Pratihāra king? It may, in that case, be the capital of any other king present at the ceremony. So the verse relied on by Prof. Bhandarkar does not at all help us to arrive at the conclusion that Ujjain was the capital of the Gurjara-Pratihāra kings before they established themselves at Kanauj. On the other hand pratiḥārikītaṃ and Gurjareśa indicate that the Gurjara-Pratihāra king was prominent among the invited royal guests. And Gurjareśa means not only the lord of the Gurjaras but also of the Gurjara country, which included the present Rājputānā and also a portion of modern Sindh. In fact the earliest inscription of this dynasty, viz. the Buchkalā inscription (V. 872) was found in Rājaputānā but not in Mālava (Ep. Ind., vol. IX, pp. 199 ff).

Prof. Bhandarkar relied on the Harivanśa of Jinasena as a confirmatory proof. Although he now accepts the translation of Dr. Fleet, he gave a different interpretation¹ before. Dr. Fleet translated it as follows:—"In the north, Indrāudha; in the south, Śrīvallabha; in the east, Vatsarāja, king of Avanti (Ujjain); and in the west, Varāha or Jayavarāha, in the territory of the Sauryas." According to this translation Vatsarāja is the same person as Avanti-pati. If so, why nrpe has been used after bhūbhṛte. Both the words mean king, and therefore one is redundant. This alone is sufficient to show that two different persons were meant. Now we shall give Prof. Bhandarkar's interpretation wherein he differs from Dr. Fleet:—"In the east, the illustrious king of Avanti; in the west king Vatsarāja; (and) in the territory of the Sauryas, the victorious and brave Varāha." Looking at the construction and the order of the stanza, Prof. Bhandarkar's interpretation seems to be preferable. It appears that the poet after naming the kings which ruled in the four directions from the place of his residence at Vardhamānapura (modern Wādhāwan in the Jhālāvāḍ division of Kathiāwār), lastly named the king and the country of his seat, where he wrote the book. It was formerly in Saurāṣṭra (Bomb. Gaz. vol. I, pt. I, p. 176). This country of the Sauryas is perhaps Saura-rāṣṭra i.e. Saurāṣṭra. This Varāha might be a

¹ Ep. Ind., vol. XVIII, p. 102,
predecessor of the Cāpotakaṇa prince Dharaṇivarāha, who issued a charter from Vardhamāna in Saka 836. (Ind. Ant., vol. XII, p. 193). The country to the west of Saurāṣṭra, which was ruled by Vatsarāja, is perhaps Sindh, which is though not exactly in the east, is in the north-east. We need not be precise about the directions given by Jinasena, for Kanauj, the country of Indrāṇdhva was not exactly in the north but in the north-east. And it is corroborated by the fact that Vatsarāja was driven by Dhruvarāja to the deserts (Maru-madhyaṃ).1 This Maru has been interpreted by scholars to be Mārwaḍ. But we think ‘Maru-madhyaṃ’ here means ‘into the deserts’. He was perhaps driven to the deserts of Sindh, a continuation of the deserts of Rājaputānā. That it was at one end of the quarters is corroborated by the words—‘Kakubhāṃ prānte sthitam.’2

Even if the interpretation of Dr. Fleet is accepted, it proves at best that Avanti was temporarily occupied by Vatsarāja. Any how the evidence adduced is not sufficient to warrant the conclusion that Ujjain was the early capital of the Gurjara Pratihāras.

In conclusion, we would bring to the notice of the scholars that the word pratihārakrtam in the first verse might have a second meaning, besides the ordinary meaning given by Prof. Bhandarkar. Among other meanings the word pratihāra has the meaning, ‘an agreement for return of assistance, alliance, confederacy.’ (Wilson). So it may be that Dantidurgā formed a confederacy with a view to withstand the Arab expeditions from Sindh, which he most probably apprehended as he conquered that province also. There are evidences to show that the Arab raids took place before and after Dantidurgā (753 A. D.). Dr. Majumdar has shown that the Arab expeditions mentioned in the Nausari plates of the Gujarāt Cālukya Pulakesirāja took place between 731 and 738 A. D.3 We also know that the overthrow of the Valabhi dynasty was due to these Arab expeditions some time after 766 A. D., the last known date of this dynasty.4 It is not at all likely that the Arabs remained idle during the intervening period. It can, therefore, be presumed that Dantidurgā assembled the princes at Ujjain with the main object of forming the confederacy, under the plea of the Hiranyagarbha mahā-dāna.

JOGENDRA CHANDRA GHOSH

1 Ep. Ind., vol. VI, p. 242.       2 Ibid.
The St. Thomas Tradition and Recent Discovery in Travancore

Scholars have been divided in their opinions as to the scene of the evangelistic labours of St. Thomas the Apostle, in India; and numerous attempts have been made to demonstrate, beyond possibility of question, that, if the Apostle came to India at all, he could not possibly have avoided Malabar; and the Christian community of the west coast claims St. Thomas as its founder; and its existence can be traced back to the early centuries of the Christian era. There is the evidence of an early Muhammadian writer that Mani, the founder of Manichæism (born 215 A.C.) visited India to spread his rival creed and succeeded in winning some Christians over to his faith; and the suggestion has been put forward recently whether there cannot be some association of the well-known Manigrämakāra with the Malabar Christians and the Manichæans. Apart from the strongly-rooted Malabar tradition of the Apostle himself having propagated the faith on the west coast and founded seven churches in the neighbourhood of Cranganore, there is another tradition that St. Thomas himself set up stone-crosses for worship in the above seven churches and that when the Saint was actually praying in front of one such stone-cross, he suffered martyrdom from the enemies of his faith. The Cross came to be popularised as a symbol of Christian salvation only in the reign of the Emperor Constantine the Great and representations of crosses are not found in the Roman catacombs older than the fourth century A.D.; and stone-crosses could not consequently have been fixed by the Apostle himself about the middle of the first century A.D. There have been discovered, till now, three altar-crosses bearing an almost identical Sassanian-Pahlavi inscription, viz., one which was discovered by the Portuguese on the St. Thomas’ Mount in 1547 and fixed up in the wall of the church on it; and the other two originally belonged to the ruined church of Cranganore and have been set up on either side of the entrance into the sanctum of St. Gabriel’s Church at Kottayam. According to the Travancore Archæological Series, VII, i, which was recently published, a similar bas-relief cross with a Pahlavi inscription, was discovered recently at Kadamaṟṟam, a village in the Kottayam Division, embedded in the wall of the sanctum of the Jacobite-Syrian Church of that place. This new tablet resembles the cross on St. Thomas Mount and the bigger one at Kottayam in its sculptural
details, being of the Greek type, with *fleur-de-lis* extremities, equal-armed and standing on a pedestal of three steps. It is flanked by two detached pilasters with two couchant *makaras* (fish-monsters) on their capitals and supporting a semi-circular belt arching above the cross. The portion containing the Pahlavi writing, is a narrow ribbon of stone rising from either extremity of the base and enveloping in an arch the top of the cross and its halo-circle. The inscription has been deciphered by Dr. Sir J. J. Modi of Bombay, thus—

I, a beautiful bird from Nineveh
(have come) to this (country).

Written Mar Shapur.

I, whom holy Messiah, the forgiver,
freed from thorn (affliction).

The reference to the bird, appropriately agreeing with the sculptured detail of a dove hovering, as a symbol of the Holy Ghost, over the upper limbs of these crosses, and the reading of Mar Shapur in the middle short sentence are the two new departures in Dr. Modi’s reading from the previous readings of the inscriptions on the other crosses. If accepted, this reading will become an important landmark. Mr. A. S. Ramanatha Iyer, the Editor of the *Travancore Archaeological Series*, in this part, says that this Mar Shapur who is said to have landed in Quilon in 825 A.D. and erected churches, may be identical with Maruvān Sāpir Īso who has been prominently mentioned in the Kottayam Copper-plate Charter of the time of King Sthānu-Ravi (*cir. A.D. 870*). The date of the Kadamarram Cross thus becomes definitely computable as the end of the 9th century, *i.e.*, about two centuries and a quarter later than the earlier Kottayam and St. Thomas’ Mount Crosses which have been assigned to about the middle of the 7th century; and it might well be possible that the cross was the one set up by Maruvān Sāpir Īso in the Tarisa’ alli Church, which is mentioned in the Kottayam Plates, *Possibly* owing to some vicissitudes, the cross drifted into the Kadamarram Church at a later date.

The ornamentation of the Cross, as well as that of the St. Thomas Mount and Kottayam Crosses, was evidently designed by Indian sculptors who were permeated with Hindu architectural traditions; and the Pahlavi inscriptions were also engraved by them under instructions from their foreign Christian employers. The sculptural
background of these crosses is consciously Hindu in character; and "in their familiar setting these crosses did naturally evoke a readier acceptance from the converts, recent or otherwise, for whose adoration they were perhaps consecrated at the time." The discovery of this Kadamarram Cross may be regarded as indicating an important landmark in the history of Christianity as it grew up in the Malabar Coast.

C. S. Srinivasachari
REVIEWS

INDICES AND APPENDICES TO THE NIRUKTA by Lakshana Sarup, M.A., D. PHIL. Pp. 76+393. Published by the University of Punjab, Lahore, 1923.

The work under review is the last of a series of volumes by the same author on Yāska’s Nirukta, the oldest Indian work on etymology, philology and semantics. Professor Lakshana Sarup undertook the study of the Nrikuṭa more than fifteen years ago in Oxford and published in 1923 his ‘Introduction to the Nirukta’. In the same year appeared for the first time his complete English translation of the work with exegetical and critical notes. Constant and diligent work by the Professor has resulted in the publication of three other volumes on the same subject: (i) an edition of the Nighaṇṭu and the Nirukta, (ii) Fragments of the commentaries of Skandaśāṁvin and Maheśvara on the Nirukta, and (iii) the present volume—Indices and Appendices. We are promised that other fragments of the commentary of Skanda-Maheśvara will be published in due course.

The value of the Nirukta in the history of philological speculation in ancient times is admitted on all hands. Its importance from the point of view of exegesis and grammar is much greater. Its worth as the oldest specimen of Sanskrit prose of the classical type is also by no means negligible; yet until recently Yāska’s Nirukta failed as an independent subject of study to attract the attention of a sufficient number of competent scholars who could concentrate their mind and energy on this particular subject. No doubt the editio princeps of the Nirukta without any sanskrit commentary but with valuable notes of the editor was published at Göttingen as far back as 1852 by that great Vedic scholar Rudolph Roth, and since then there have appeared various editions of the work including those of the Bibliotheca Indica (edited by Satyavrata Sāmaśram with the commentaries of Devarājayajvan and Durgācārya on the Nighaṇṭu and the Nirukta respectively), the Ānandaśrama Sanskrit Series (edited by Rajwade with Durga’s commentary), the Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series (only first seven Books edited by Bhadkamkar with Durga’s commentary) and the Veṇkaṭeśvara Press Series (edited by Śivadatta with Durga’s commentary). Besides the edition in the Bibliotheca Indica, Samaśram brought out a dissertation on the subject called the Niruktālocaṇa dealing with various topics connected with the date, contents, author-
ship and commentaries of the Nirukta. This was the condition of the Nirukta literature when Professor Sarup was engaged in its study. At present the works of Dr. Sarup together with that of Professor H. Sköld who has recently published his work, *The Nirukta, Its Place in Old Indian Literature, Its Etymologies*, form a comprehensive study of the problems connected with the Nirukta.

Dr. Sarup's edition of the Nighañṭu and the Nirukta is certainly an improvement upon those of his predecessors including Roth who had to work with scanty materials at his disposal at a time when the modern Vedic scholarship itself was in its infancy. Dr. Sarup has adopted the text of the shorter recension in his edition instead of the longer one accepted by Roth and others, and has adduced evidences to prove that his text represents the original work of Yāska. Durga seems to have followed this recension; but as there are passages in Durga's commentary which lend support to the opposite view, the text of this commentary should have been critically edited along with the Nirukta.

Dr. Sarup has brought out for the first time the fragments of the commentaries of Skandāsvāmin and Maheśvara on the Nirukta. He thinks that Maheśvara's notes are a śākā (sub-commentary) on the bhāṣya (the commentary) of Skanda. But these notes are too fragmentary to enable one to come to a definite conclusion.

The volume of *Indices and Appendices to the Nirukta* contains an elaborate Introduction dealing mainly with the dates of various scholiasts; three Indices—Index to the Nighañṭu, Index to the quoted passages occurring in the Nirukta, Index Verborum to the Nirukta; a list of Etymologies of the Nirukta; six lists of passages of the Nirukta quoted in six different works and two lists of quotations occurring in the Nirukta.

As to the dates of the scholiasts it must be stated that in some cases the conclusions reached by Dr. Sarup can in no way be regarded as final. With the growth of our knowledge consequent on the new discoveries of MSS., dates of some of the commentators are expected to be fixed with more precision. Even now some of the conclusions of Dr. Sarup are being controverted. Skandāsvāmin, about whom Dr. Sarup (p. 28) could only make a general statement that he was earlier than the first half of the 12th century A.D., is now assigned by Dr. C. Kunhan Raja (see *Journal of Oriental Research*, vol. V, pt. iv, p. 325) to about 600 A.D. on good grounds. Since the publication of Dr. Sarup's work, a portion of the Rg-veda with the commentaries of Skandāsvāmin and
Veṣṇaṭamādhava has been published in the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series. Another recension of Skandavämin’s commentary as also a second commentary by Mādhava (other than Veṣṇaṭamādhva) is expected to come out shortly.

As a result of the publication of these new materials we have now at our disposal definite proofs showing that Mādhava who is taken for Veṣṇaṭamādhva by Devarāja in his commentary is really a different person.

The indices appearing in Dr. Sarup’s work betoken a good deal of labour and are very useful. As regards the list of etymologies, the one appearing in Prof. Sköld’s work is more helpful to the Vedic students on account of its exhaustive character covering not less than 180 pages.

In conclusion, I want to refer to a passage in the Nirukta which has been made the basis of some divergent inferences by scholars. This passage relates to Kautsa declaring the meaningless character of some of the Vedic Ṛks. From this it has been concluded that the volume of heterodox views was large in Vāsaka’s time, and therefore it had to be given a place in the text (vide Dr. Sarup’s Introduction to the translation of the Nirukta, pp. 71ff.). In regard to this inference it may be said that the introduction of pūrvaapakṣa and uttarapakṣa was a common practice in Sanskrit literature in order to put before the readers all the aspects of a question. Hence the existence of a large volume of opinion adverse to the Ṛks does not necessarily indicate the existence of a large number of people holding the same opinion.1 Another inference that has been drawn from the same passage is that a long time intervened between the Ṛṣis and the early interpreters of the Vedas. This also does not stand on a solid footing as has been pointed out by Dr. Sarup (Ibid.).

The Nirukta with its commentaries is a store-house of materials from which many a gap in the history of the stages of Vedic interpretation can be filled up. Much work has been done in this direction by European scholars like Roth, Ludwig, Pischel and Geldner. The indices and appendices provided in Dr. Sarup’s work will prove helpful to those who will be willing to utilise the text further for this purpose. This, we hope, will be attractive enough to scholars to turn their labours to this field from which additional valuable results may be expected.

D. BHATTACHARYYA

SĀMKHYA OR THE THEORY OF REALITY (a critical and constructive study of Īśvarakṛṣṇa's Sāṁkhya-kārikā) by J. N. Mukherji, M.A. Published by S. N. Mukherji, M.A., 5/I, Nepal Chandra Bhattacharya Lane, Calcutta. xii+6+102 pages.

In this thought-provoking treatise on Sāṁkhya philosophy, the author presents an able exposition of a school of thought, which is a bold departure from the traditional Sāṁkhya. At the outset, the author falls foul of the commentators Gauḍapāda and Vācaśpati Miśra who, he thinks, have in many places, sacrificed reason at the altar of tradition and religion. The author asserts that the first 52 Kārikās of Īśvarakṛṣṇa contain the essence of Sāṁkhya philosophy, while the remaining Kārikās 53-70 are later additions because the themes in the two portions are inconsistent. The traditional Sāṁkhya as expounded by Gauḍapāda, Vācaśpati Miśra and others, and followed by the present day writers is based rather on the last 16 Kārikās than on the first 52. The object of the author is to give a logical interpretation of the philosophy embodied in the first 52 Kārikās untrammelled by the influence of the ancient commentators, who were, according to him, Sanskritists rather than philosophers. He wants to show that the outlook of the true Sāṁkhya philosophy is logical, and not naturalistic, psychological, theistic or dualistic. A systematic explanation of the world of everyday experience is its object and not to propound a theory of the origin of the universe or ascertain the means for attaining salvation.

In this new interpretation of Sāṁkhya philosophy, pessimism (duḥkha) has no place, and hence, according to the author, the original Sāṁkhya teaches us to welcome worldly life and not to seek retirement from the world. In the 1st Kārikā, the author suggests that duḥkha should be replaced by bandha which means “erroneous view of the reality” (p. 6).

The Reality, according to the author, is not the Puruṣa or the Prakṛti alone but the unity of Vyakta, Avyakta and Jña, the three constituting a dynamic order. This dynamic order comprises innumerable units, each of which is an individual with his world. The Reality is, therefore, a “world of man-worlds.” The author distinguishes Jña from Puruṣa, taking the former to signify the Vyakta-vyakta-jña or the ‘system of man-worlds’ and the latter a liṅga-puruṣa or an individual with the world of his own. To the author, therefore, Jña is one while Puruṣas are many. Avyakta, according to him, cannot exist without
Vyakta, and Jīna though virtually one, becomes many by combining with Avyakta when each of which should have the appellation of Puruṣa or Liṅga-Puruṣa.

Unlike other schools of Indian philosophy, Sāmkhya, according to the author, does not teach that Avidyā, Māyā, or Vāsanā is the cause of the evolution of the world, and hence knowledge in Sāmkhya does not mean the removal of Avidyā. Knowledge, he says, consists in Puruṣa's (i.e., Liṅgapuruṣa's) capability to construct the personal-objective order and ultimately to distinguish Jīna from Avyakta, i.e., to ascertain the differences in a unity and not the complete separation of Puruṣa from Pradhāna as the traditional Sāmkhya asserts.

Coming to Satkāryavāda, the author rejects the interpretation of Vācaspati that the effect pre-exists in the cause, and explains it as the causal-objective process. He means to say that Vyakta is real as much as its cause the Avyakta, and Satkārya signifies that "the Pāncabhautika causal-objective order is real." The author really strikes a new key when he says that real, according to Sāmkhya, is not the unchanging and unchangeable but that change, if it be systematic, is real.

In Chapter III, he disapproves the comments of Vācaspati on the Kārikās dealing with Pramāṇa, on the ground that Vācaspati "has been totally misled by the Nyāya phenomenology of knowledge". This he has tried to show in the course of his explanation of Perception, Inference and Āptavacana. To him, Pramāṇas are "modes by which the necessary and universal objective order is constructed".

The twenty-three tattvas, according to the author, are not so many elements into which a being is analyzable but constitute the individual and his world. Each individual in Sāmkhya (as it is in Viśiṣṭavāda), is a man-world, an instance of subject-object or unity in continuity. The distinctive feature of this philosophy is that there are as many worlds as there are men-worlds and it is this feature which, he says, has given rise to the common erroneous notion that the Puruṣas are innumerable. The author has substantiated his new interpretation of Sāmkhya by commenting on the Kārikās from his new standpoint. In this, however, he has laid himself open to the charge that in his comments he has been more a philosopher than a Sanskritist.

The author has tried to draw support for his own theory from conflicting comments of Gauḍapāda and Vācaspati Miśra on tathā ca in Kārikā II. Gauḍapāda while commenting on these two words writes "anekaḥ vyaktam ekam avyaktam, tathā ca pumānapyekāḥ". But
the same Gauḍapāda again writes while commenting on Kārikā 18: tasmāj janmamaraṇakarāṇānām pratiniyamāt puruṣabahusvaṇaṃ siddham". The author wants to make Gauḍapāda consistent by holding that Gauḍapāda means by 'pumān', in kārikā 11, the Jīva which, according to the writer, is the "transcendental unity" while by puruṣa in kārikā 18 Gauḍapāda means 'Līnga-Puruṣas' which is an 'empirical instance of unity' (p. 60). The distinction the author wants to draw between 'Pumān' and 'Puruṣa' is, however, unwarranted by any of the Kārikās.

We appreciate the author's independent way of thinking, and not following, without any question, the comments of persons who were certainly not infallible. The commentators might have been great Sanskritists, but at the same time, it is a fact that their minds were so moulded by the influences of their time, e.g., an unquestioning respect for tradition, that it is on most occasions futile to expect from them a radically new viewpoint. It is difficult to see eye to eye with the author about the meaning of the Sāṅkhya Kārikās, but, in any case, we welcome efforts to make interpretations that may be bold departures from the traditional groove but are kept within the bounds of reason and probability.

N. D.


Although a late work, the Bhāva-prakāśa or Bhāva-prakāśana of Śāradātananaya, who belonged probably to the middle of the 13th century, is by far the most exhaustive and remarkable of later treatises on Dramaturgy, Rasa and kindred topics. The work has been edited with great care and scholarship from four South Indian manuscripts.¹ Although a commentary on this work appears to

¹ The present reviewer possesses a copy of the ms. of this work through the kindness of K. Rama Pisharoti of Cochin State. It agrees substantially with the manuscript B of the edition. A careful collation could not yet be done, but the present reviewer hopes to publish such material differences of reading as he may notice in the ms. in his possession.
exist, no commentary is given here with the text. One of the editors, His Holiness Yadugiri Yatiraja Śvāmi of Melkote (Mysore), is already well-known for his Sanskrit scholarship and for his learned editions of the Tāpasa-vatsarāja (from the imperfect Berlin ms.) and of a part (chs. 22-24) of Bhoja’s Śrūgāra-prakāśa. The value and accuracy of this edition of the Bhāva-prakāśa are thus guaranteed by the names of its editors, but this value is also enhanced by the addition of full indices and a fairly comprehensive introduction in English on the author and his work, his date, his indebtedness to earlier authors, special points of interest in his work, and its place in the history of the Rasa school. The work consists of ten Adhikāras, treating respectively of Bhāva (I), Rasa (II-III), the Hero, Heroine, their adjuncts etc. (IV-V), Śabda and Artha (VI), Nātya and Itivṛtta (VII), the ten varieties of the drama (VIII), Nṛtya (IX) and Nṛtya-prayoga (X). There are references to a very large number of dramas and dramaturgic works, some of which are now lost. Among the dramas cited are Amṛta-mathana (Samavakāra, Indulekha (Vīthī), Udātta-kuṇḍara (Ullopyaka), Kalikeli (Prahasana), Kusumaśekhara (Ihāmga), Kṛtyā-rāvana, Keli-raivata (Hallīsa), Gaṅga-bhagiratha (Uṛṣṭāṅka), Tārakoddharana (Dima), Tripura-mardana (Prekṣāṇaka), Devi-parināya, Vāli-vadha (Prekṣāṇaka) Devi-mahādeva (Ullopyaka) Nandimāli (Bhāṇa), Nala-vikrama, Nṛsiṃha-vijaya (Prekṣāṇaka), Padmāvatī-parināya (Prakaraṇa), Paṇḍavaṇanda, Maṇikya-vallikā, Taraṅgadattā, Madalekhā, Gaṅga-taraṅgikā, Rāmabhuyadaya, Menakānaha (Toṭaka), Rāmāṇanda (Śrigadita), Śakti-rāmānuja (Uṛṣṭāṅka), Viṇāvatt (Bhāṇikā), Viṭṭrodharaṇa (Dima), Śrūgāratilaka (Prasthāna), Sugriva-kelana, Mārica-vančita, Vakula-vīthī (Vīthī), Sāgara-kaumudi (Prahasana), Sairandhrikā (Prahasana) and Stambhībhamaka (Toṭaka). Among the authors and works on dramaturgy, we find the names of Āṇjaṇeya, Kohala, Drahūni, Padmabhū (Brahma? as the creator of Nātyaveda), Mātrgupta, Sādhāiva, Subandhu and Harṣa. A Svapna-vasavadatta is also quoted, but the passage has been already discussed in connexion with the Bhāsa-problem by K. Rama Pisharoti in BSOS, iii, p. 639. While the latter half of the Bhāvaprakāśa deals with the topics of dramaturgy, the first five chapters are devoted to the more general subject of Rasa and Bhāva, and are therefore interesting for their bearings on general poetic theories. Although the work borrows very freely ideas and passages from earlier treatises, and is always careful in stating previous opinions, there is yet considerable independence of treatment,
even if marked originality is rare except in matters of detail. As some of the previous works utilised by the author no longer exist, and as there is an attempt to present the subject in a clear and comprehensive form, the work deserves a close study and occupies an important place in the history of Sanskrit Poetics.

S. K. De


The importance of Megasthenes for the history of India cannot be overestimated, and yet little has been done to clear up the mist which shrouds the person and writings of that Greek ambassador since the days of Schwanbeck, who collected all the scattered fragments of the writings of Megasthenes. Almost every writer on the subject has tacitly taken it for granted that the text of Megasthenes as handed down by later historians is in every way dependable. The authoress of the volume under review has, therefore, earned the gratitude of all Indologists by this penetrating study, the purpose of which is to determine in which way Megasthenes collected materials for his book on India and how far we can rely on the text as it has come down to us.

The first part of the book is wholly devoted to text criticism. The authoress has collected all that is known about the person of Megasthenes. The few passages that she has brought together relating to this point, however, do not yield much information of value. Excepting Arrian, Anab. v. 6, 2, no other passage gives any new information about Megasthenes. Here Arrian suggests that Megasthenes came to India several times and our authoress seems to favour this idea, although neither Megasthenes himself nor any other later author has spoken of such a thing.

In the second chapter of the first part, which is very important for the purpose of the whole study, the writer has tried to find out which authors have had direct access to Megasthenes and which of them have quoted him only indirectly. Our authoress comes to the conclusion that Diodoros, Arrian, and Strabo have used Megasthenes directly and are therefore more or less dependable. However, here too, in our opinion, a more critical attitude should be taken, e.g., Arrian Ind. v. 3 says of Megasthenes, that he has been with Sandrakottos, the greatest king of the Indians, and also with Porus, who was still more powerful.

I.H.Q., December 1931
Such a statement is wrong because Porus could never have been more powerful than Candragupta Maurya. The Schwanbeck reveals another difficulty viz., that even the text of Arrian has not been handed down to us in its original form. Moreover, we shall have to consider that Megasthenes' text might (or must) have undergone much mutilation and distortion during the period separating him from the later historians.

In the third chapter of the first part, our authoress has tried to reconstruct the original arrangement of the contents of Megasthenes' work and in the fourth she has given some very fruitful general ideas regarding the criticism of Megasthenes. By comparing Megasthenes with contemporary Indian sources, the writer rightly points out that in the latter, the Indiar society is represented as it should be and not as it actually was. Megasthenes too is not free from this foible, but his idealisation is more in the nature of uncritical generalisation.

In the second part of the work, which covers by far the greater part of the volume, our authoress is on fairly familiar ground. Here she has dealt in detail with the fragments of Megasthenes about the customs and the social organisations of India. Fragments relating to the magnitude and nature of India as well as those on divine service and mythology have been left out of consideration. On every point falling within the plan of the work, the writer has collected the fragments of Megasthenes as handed down by Greek and Roman writers and has added to each a Dutch translation. Then follow detailed discussions on the point in which all relevant Indian sources have been used. Naturally, the Kauṭilya and the Smṛtis have been very much requisitioned and the Buddhist literature too has been given all due consideration.

In short, this book is hard to beat “in übersichtlichkeit” and a glance at the mass of foot-notes in almost every page will convince the reader that the writer has spared no pains to bring the work into line with the latest researches. It ought to be carefully studied by every student interested in the social history of India.

BATAKRISHNA GHOSH
Select Contents of Oriental Journals

Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute,

vol. xiii, pt. i (Oct., 1931)

Pralihad C. Diwanji.—Kṛṣṇakutūhala Nāṭaka. This analysis of a manuscript of the Kṛṣṇakutūhala Nāṭaka shows definitely that the work is not a composition of Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, the famous author of the Advaitasiddhi as has been believed up till now. The poet of the same name who wrote this drama was a son of Arundhati and Nārāyaṇa of the Śaṅḍilya, Gotra and a disciple of Kṛṣṇa Sarasvatī, while the author of the Advaitasiddhi is known to have been a son of Purandarācārya Miśra of the Kāṭyāpa Gotra and a disciple of Viśveśvara Sarasvatī.

K. B. Pathak.—The Text of the Jainendra-vyūkaraṇa and the Priority of Candra to Pūjyaśīkṣa.

A. N. Upadhye.—Subhacandra and his Prakrit Grammar.

B. N. Krishnamurti Sarma.—An Attack on Śrī Madhvācārya in the Saurapuruṣa. The scurrilous description of Madhvācārya and the adverse criticism of his systems as found in the 39th and the 40th chapters of the Saurapuruṣa have been regarded as spurious interpolations showing historical blunders and metaphysical untenability.

Durgacharan Chatterji.—Buddhist Logic (an introductory survey).

A. N. Upadhye.—An Old Prefatory Gloss on Ḫoḍapadeśā.

—Authorship of Svaṃpasambodhana. The Svaṃpasambodhana, a short discourse on the Jain concept of the path of Liberation, is here fathered upon Mahāśena against its traditional ascription to Akalāukā.

P. K. Godse.—The Bharata-Ādibharata Problem and the Ms. of Ādibharata in the Government Oriental Library, Mysore. Some data bearing on the Bharata-Ādibharata problem have been recorded here and the information has been given that the manuscript described to be a copy of the Ādibharata deposited in the Mysore Govt. Oriental Library is really a fragmentary copy of Bharata's Nātyaśāstra.
Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies,
London, vol. vi, pt. 3

S. K. DE.—Bhāgavatism and Sun-worship. Without denying the influence of the solar myths or solar cults on the Pāncarātra religion or Bhāgavatism, the writer opposes the arguments put forward by Grierson in favour of his theory that the Monotheistic Bhakti-doctrine of the Bhāgavata religion is a direct development of or was originally connected with the Sun-worship.

T. N. DAVE.—Notes on Gujrāṭi Phonology.

dian Antiquary, October, 1931

W. H. MORELAND.—Notes on Indian Maunds. The Southern maund forms the subject-matter of this instalment.

KALIPADA MITRA.—The Gāyḍāṇ Festival and its Parallels. This continued paper begins with a description of a cattle festival held in Bihar every year on the day following the Divāli in the month of Kārtik. The principal item of the festival is the killing of a pig (tied with cords) by setting cows on it.

ANAND KOUL.—Lallā-vākyāṇi (the wise sayings of Lal Ded.)

HIRA LAL.—Place Names. This is an attempt to unravel the mysteries surrounding some names of places in the Central Provinces of India. In this portion of the article, it has been shown that some place-names are related to the names of trees or a combination of names of trees and animals coupled with some terms indicating water. The names noticed here owe their origin to Gondī, the principal language of the Dravidians living in the Central Provinces.

ibid., November, 1931

W. H. MORELAND.—Notes on Indian Maunds. Delhi Maunds have been dealt with in this instalment of the article.

A. BENKATASUBBIAH.—Aṭhabhāgiye. This continued paper concludes with the suggestion that the word aṭhabhāgiye occurring in the Rummindeli Pillar Inscription of Aśoka may have a reference to the
possession of the following eight objects of enjoyment viz., nīdhī, 
nikṣepa, jala, pāśāna, akṣaras, agāmi, siddha and sādhya. That they 
may be the meaning is inferred from a scrutiny of a few later 
inscriptions, containing the expression āstabhoga-tejassāmya.

HIRA LAL.—Place Names. This part of the article deals with the 
names of the villages derived from a variety of causes, e.g. the nature 
of the sites they occupy, the temples of gods they possess, and the 
names of castes of the people dwelling there.

Ibid, December, 1931

W. H. MORELAND.—Notes on Indian Maunds. It treats of Agra 
Maunds.

KALIPADA MITRA.—The Gāyadāṇḍ Festival and its Parallels. This is 
the second instalment of a paper continued from the October 
issue of the Journal. It contains a description of the Soharai 
festival of the Oraons and mentions some other instances of festivals 
held in different parts of India in which the pig-sacrifice forms 
an important item, similar to that of the Gāyadāṇḍ Festival of Bihar.

JOGENDRA CHANDRA GHOSH.—Paḍihārś. The author is of opinion 
that the Paḍihāra clan of Rajputana is of foreign origin.

Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society, 
vol. VI, pt. i (July, 1931)

C. NARAYANA RAO.—A Study of the Telugu Roots.

M. RAMA RAO.—Political History of the Kākutiyas. This portion deals 
with the reigns of Rudra, Mahādeva and Gaṇapati (1158-1261 A.D.).

L. V. RAMASWAMI AIYAR.—Dravidic Word-Studies.

A. SUBBARAYA CHETTY.—New Light on Tippu-Sultan. The writer 
expresses the opinion that Tippu was a “broad-minded benevolent 
ruler, animated with the noble ideals of religious toleration and 
national unity” and was not a religious fanatic as some have de-
scribed him to be.

K. VENKATAPPAYYA.—Education in Ancient India. This is a small 
portion (2 pp.) of a continued article dealing with the system of 
education prevalent in the Buddhist period and showing that 
the curriculum of study adopted at the Buddhist seats of learning, 
as described in the early historical records, did not differ much 
from the curriculum adopted in the Brāhmaṇical institutions.
R. Subba Rao.—The History of the Eastern Gaṅgas of Kaliṅga, Continued.

Journal of the American Oriental Society,
vol. 51, no. 3 (September, 1931)

George W. Briggs.—The Indian Rhinoceros as a Sacred Animal.

It has been shown that the rhinoceros is known in India from very early times, and the literary references and the customs current even now suggest the sacred character of the animal.

Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society,
vol. XVII, pt. IV (December, 1931)

Jivanji Jamsheedji Modi.—Śakastān, the Country of the Śakas: Its Possession by the Ancient Persians. From references to the name of Śakastān in the ancient literature of Iran as also the occurrence of the word Śaka in the Behistūn inscription of Darius (d. 445 B.C.), the writer reaches the conclusion that Śakastān or Seistān on the frontiers of the ancient Hindustan “was under the sway and influence of the ancient Iranians for a long time anterior to 160 B.C.”

Jadunath Sarkar.—A Contemporary Picture of the Mughal Court in 1743 A.D. Nineteen sheets of new-letters (containing 36 days' occurrences) of the Imperial Court of Delhi, 1743, during the reign of Muhammad Shah have been translated here into English. These letters deposited in the Bibliotheque Nationale of Paris furnish us with a vivid picture of the lifeless condition of the Mughal Court of the time and contain details of some important events connected with the Maratha history.

Sarat Chandra Roy.—The Effects on the Aborigines of Chota-Nagpur of their Contact with Western Civilisation.

Sarat Chandra Mitra.—Further Notes on the Kolarian Belief about the Neolithic Celts.

K. P. Jayaswal.—Purāṇa Coin and the Date of the Mānava-Dharmaśāstra. It has been suggested that the Purāṇa coin mentioned in Manu but unknown to the Pāli Buddhist canon and the Kauśiṭṭiya was so called from the time when a new style of coinage with royal names on the coins was introduced in Magadha and the Middle country under the Śuṅgas. So the term indicates indirectly the time of the Mānava Dharmaśāstra.
"—*Kumārāmātya.* The object of the note is to show that the expression *Kumārāmātya* occurring in the Hindole Plate refers to the position of the grantee on whom the dignity of a kumāra (prince) was conferred, though he did not come of the royal stock.

"—*An Exact Date in the Reign of Aśoka.* A traditional account of the redistribution of Buddha’s relics by Aśoka is recorded by Yuan Chwang. He says the relics were redistributed all over India at a time when the face of the sun darkened. M. Robert Razy (*Journal Asiatique*, 1930) suggests that the darkness of the sun indicates a solar eclipse. T. R. Von Oppolzer calculating the dates of solar eclipses for over thirty centuries in his *Kanon der Finsternisse* points out the 4th May, 248 B.C. as the date of a solar eclipse. So the writer of this note takes 248 B.C. as the year when the relics were distributed by Aśoka throughout his empire.

S. Patnaik.—*Additional Notes on the Śobhanakarwar Inscription of Śrī Vaidyanātha.*

R. Ch. Panda.—*Note on an Oriya Copper-plate Inscription of Rama-
chandra Deo, Śaka 1728.*

A. Banerji-Sastri.—*Two Brāhmaṇ Seals from Buxar.* The legends of these two private seals in Māgadhī Prākṛt read *Śadāśanaka* and *Hathikaṇa*, their script suggesting, according to the writer, a pre-Mauryan date for the seals.

Umesa Misra.—*Munālaśāstraśrvasva of Halāyudha.* This instal-
ment of the edition begins with the last portion of the 3rd Adhi-
karana of Book II, pāda ii and ends with the beginning of the 4th pāda of the 2nd Book.

*Journal of Indian History*, vol. X, pt. ii (August, 1931)

S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar.—*Abul Hasan Qutub Shah and his
Ministers, Māḍāna and Akkanu*. An analysis of the historical
data of the time of Abul Hasan, the last Sultan of Golkonda,
who appointed two Brāhmaṇa brothers as his chief minister and
controller of the military administration, shows that neither was the
ruler incompetent as ordinarily supposed nor was the ministers
guilty of maladministration as hitherto believed. The overthrow
of Golkonda resulting in the absorption of the kingdom into the
empire of the Mughals under Aurangzeb was, according to the
writer, due to "the machinations of a greater power, fanatic in the extreme in regard to a Shi'a sovereign and his Brāhmaṇa ministers".

K. M. SHENBAVNEKAR.—A Puzzle in Indian Epigraphy. The expression Mālavagāṇasthitī occurring in the Mandalsor Inscription has been given here a new interpretation. It signifies 'the system of reckoning (time) prevalent in the Mālava country'. The authority of a kōba has been cited in support of the writer's view that gana in the expression means ganaṇā (reckoning) and has no reference to a tribe or clan with its republican constitution of government. In the light of this new interpretation of the word gana, the theory that the Vikrama Era was founded by Mālava clan in commemoration of its republican form of government has been opposed. Evidences have been adduced to prove that king Vikramāditya of the Hindu legend was an historical personage with his capital at Ujjayantī and founded the era which bears his name. Arguments have been put forward against the view that the era, because of its mention in the earlier inscriptions without the founder's name, can be taken to have been adopted and designated by Candra Gupta II of the Gupta dynasty.

C. S. SRINIVASACHARI.—The Historical Material in the Private Diary of Ānanda Raṅga Pillai (1736-61).

SAILESWAR SEN.—The Historical Origin of the Distinction between Svārthānumāna and Parārthānumāna.

GEORGE M. MORAES—Sindābūr of the Arab Writers. The object of this paper is to show that the identification of the town of Sindābūr (mentioned by the Arab writers of the Middle Ages) with Candrapur as suggested by Colonel Yule is confirmed by facts now brought to our notice in connection with the history of Koṅkaṇ.


K. A. SUBRAHMANYA IYER.—Some More Nyāyas. Four 'popular maxims' not included in the Laukikanyāyāññjali compiled previously by Colonel Jacob have been explained here.

N. VENKATARAMANAYYA.—A Note on Śrī Virūpākṣa. Regarding the reason why the emperors of Vijayanagara used to affix the words Śrī Virūpākṣa to their dānānuśūsanas instead of their names, the writer thinks that because Harihara and Bukka fought a battle and saved the kingdom from an external invasion with the help
of the money belonging to the temple of Virūpākṣa, the god was supposed to have become the legal owner of the state and therefore the name of the god was affixed to every document.

N. AYYASWAMI SASTRĪ.—*Bhavasamkrāntisūtra.* This Mahāyāna text is restored from the Tibetan version with an English translation. It deals principally with the transitoriness of *Karman* and its relation to rebirth.

T. R. CHINTAMANI.—*Some Minor Works of Śrī Citsukhācārya.* Citsukha’s *Adhikaraṇamanājari* a short compendium of the *adhikaraṇas* (sections) of the *Brahmasūtra* is edited here for the first time.

P. S. SUBRAHMANYA SASTRĪ.—*History of Grammatical Theories in Tamil and their Relation to the Grammatical Literature in Sanskrit.*

T. N. RAMACHANDRAN.—*The Bānas.* The paper deals with the history of the people called Bāna or Vāṇarāyars who played an important part in South Indian politics either as officials or as feudatories of the ruling powers.

C. KUNHAN RAJA.—*Mādhava: an unknown Bhāṣyakāra for the Ṛgveda.* The Adyar Library of Madras possesses a fragmentary Ṛgveda-bhāṣya by a Mādhava, who is different from both Sāyaṇa-Mādhava and Veṅkaṭa-Mādhava, two other known commentators of the Ṛg-veda. As pointed out by Dr. Raja, Devarāja quotes from this Mādhava in the Nighaṇṭu-bhāṣya, but wrongly identifies with Veṅkaṭa-Mādhava. The writer inclines to assign this new Mādhava to a date anterior to 600 A.D., and expresses the intention to bring out an edition of the available portion of the bhāṣya.

M HIRIYANNA.—*Īṣṭa-siddhi: an Old Advaitic Work.* This is an account of the Īṣṭa-siddhi, a Vedānta treatise in eight chapters referred to by Madhusūdana Sarasvatī. The limits to the date of the work have been fixed between 850 and 1050 A.D. It is being edited in Gækwad’s Oriental Series.

T. N. RAMACHANDRAN.—*Note on the Madras Museum Plates of Bhaktirāja.*
Obituary Notice

The death of Mr. Rakhal Das Banerji has removed one of the leading figures in the field of Indian Archaeology. He was born on the 13th April, 1885, and educated in the Presidency College, Calcutta. When studying for the B.A. degree he came under the influence of Mahâmahopâdhyâya Haraprasâd Śâstri, C.I.E., then Professor of Sanskrit, and was later on introduced to Dr. Theodore Bloch, then Superintendent of Archaeology, Bengal Circle. Mr. Banerji attached himself to Dr. Bloch as an honorary worker and accompanied him in his tours of exploration and co-operated with him in his excavations. Mr. Banerji obtained his B.A. Degree in 1907 and was appointed to compile a Catalogue of the Archaeological specimens in the Lucknow Provincial Museum. His researches in the Lucknow Museum enabled him to make important epigraphical discoveries that formed the basis of his first two important papers,—(1) "Scythian Period of Indian History," published in the Indian Antiquary, vol. XXXVIII, 1908, pp. 25-75; and (2) "New Brâhmi Inscriptions of the Scythian Period" (Epigraphia Indica, vol. X, pp. 106-121). Soon after the death of Dr. Bloch, Mr. Banerji was appointed Excavation Assistant to the Director General of Archaeology in India in February, 1910 and attached to the Archaeological Section of the Indian Museum. The Archaeological Section was placed under the control of the Director General of Archaeology in India in December, 1910. In November, 1911, Mr. Banerji was promoted to the grade of the Assistant Superintendent of Archaeology. In this capacity Mr. Banerji worked in the Indian Museum till he was appointed Superintendent of Archaeology, Western Circle, Poona, in August, 1917. During his service in the Indian Museum he contributed a large number of papers to the Journal and Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, the Epigraphia Indica and the Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India. Two of his most notable publications of this period are "The Pâlas of Bengal" published in the series of Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal (Vol. V, No. 3), and his "History of Bengal" in the Bengali language in two volumes. It was also while working in the Indian Museum that Mr. Banerji collected materials for his Monograph on "Eastern Indian School of Mediæval Sculpture" now in the press.
As Superintendent of Archaeology of the Western Circle, Mr. Banerji began the excavations at Mohenjo-Daro in the Larkana District in Sind in 1922-23. The story of the excavation is thus told by Sir John Marshall in his monumental work *Mohenjo-Daro and the Indus Civilization* (pp. 10):

"The site had long been known to district officials in Sind, and had been visited more than once by local archaeological officers, but it was not until 1922, when Mr. R. D. Bonerji started to dig there, that the pre-historic character of its remains was revealed.

"His primary object was to lay bare the Buddhist remains, and it was while engaged on this task that he came by chance on several seals which he recognised at once as belonging to the same class as the remarkable seals inscribed with legends in an undecipherable script which had long been known to us from the ruins of Harappa in the Panjab. As it happened, the excavation of Harappa itself had at my instance been taken up in the year previous by Rai Bahadur Daya Ram Sahni and enough had already been brought to light to demonstrate conclusively that its remains, including the inscribed seals, were referable to the Chalcolithic Age. Thus, Mr. Banerji's find came at a singularly opportune moment, when we were specially eager to locate other sites of the same early age as Harappa. Mr. Banerji himself was quick to appreciate the value of his discovery, and lost no time in following it up.

"With the hot season rapidly approaching, Mr. Banerji's digging was necessarily very restricted, and it is no wonder, therefore, that his achievements have been put in the shade by the much bigger operations that have since been carried out. This does not, however, lessen the credit due to him. His task at Mohenjo-Daro was far from being as simple as it may now appear. Apart from the discoveries at Harappa, which he had not personally seen, nothing whatever was then known of the Indus civilization. The few structural remains of that civilization which he unearthed were built of bricks identical with those used in the Buddhist Stūpa and Monastery, and bore so close a resemblance to the latter that even now it is not always easy to discriminate between them. Nevertheless, Mr. Banerji divined, and rightly divined, that these earlier remains must have antedated the Buddhist structures, which were only a foot or two above them, by some two or three thousand years. That was no small achievement! Naturally, some of his conclusions have required modification—it
could hardly have been otherwise—but in the main they have been proved by our subsequent researches to be remarkably correct.

"For another reason also Mr. Banerji’s work at Mohenjo-Daro is deserving of special recognition; for it was carried through in the face of very real difficulties, due in part to lack of adequate funds, in part to the hardships inseparable from camp life in such a trying climate. With the comfortable quarters for the officers and staff which I took steps to have erected at Mohenjo-Daro between 1925 and 1927, excavation there has become a very much easier and more pleasant task than it was in the first three seasons, when Mr. Banerji and his successors were living under canvas. The fact that two out of these three officers—Messrs, Banerji and K. N. Dikshit—completely broke down in health before their labours were finished is proof enough of the many privations they had to endure."

Ill health compelled Mr. Banerji to leave the Western Circle in May, 1923 on long leave. During his tenure of office as Superintendent of that circle, he compiled two important monographs, Bas-reliefs of Badami that has been published as one of the Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India (no. 25) and The Haihayas of Tripuri and their Monuments (M.A.S.I, no. 23). In June, 1924, Mr. Banerji was placed in charge of the Eastern Circle of the Archaeological Survey of India and held charge of the Circle for over two years till his retirement in August, 1926. His most notable work in the Eastern Circle is the clearance of the great Buddhist temple at Paharpur. The excavations at Paharpur were inaugurated by the Director General of Archeology in India in 1923 at the instance and with the financial assistance of Kumar Sarat Kumar Roy of Dighapatiya, President of the Verendra Research Society, and the work was placed under the charge of Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar. Prof. Bhadarkar worked for one season only and cleared a part of the rampart of the old fortified city.

After his retirement Mr. Banerji was appointed the Nandi Professor of Ancient Indian History at the Benares Hindu University and held this appointment till his death in 1930. His comprehensive History of Orissa in two volumes written during this period has appeared after his death. All the writings of Professor Banerji are informative and singularly free from bias. His memory will ever remain associated with the epoch-making discoveries at Mohenjo-Daro and Paharpur.
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Ein Monotheistischer Traktat Altindiens (Śvetāsvatara Upaniṣad)
ANINGYAM

EDITED BY
V. VENKATARAMA SHARMA
VIDYĀBHŪṢĀNA
Aningyam

Aningyam is the name of a small work hitherto not published. It is one among the works on Vedalaksana (works describing the characteristics of Vedas). The present work has been written with reference to Taittiriya school of the Black Yajurveda. Aningya means undivided (words) or avibhakta (pada). It does not mean a single (word) or asamasta (pada), because compound-words (samasta) like 'Saciipati' 'Bhhaspati' etc. are considered among the words of Aningya. The derivation of the word is as follows: ḍiṅyate vibhāgenoccūryateि Aningyam; na ḍiṅyam aningyam. From this derivation, it is easy to understand that the name of the work given is something significant. Aningya words are numerous and all of them are not the subject matter of this work. But it is intended only to give a clear idea in a conclusive manner regarding the words which will give doubt whether they are aṇiṅgas or ḍiṅyas.

The work contains 99 verses in different metres. It is divided into two parts; the former describing 49 general rules regarding the words of aṇiṅga in 24 verses, and the latter giving a list of the same words in Sanskrit alphabetical order, which are dishevelled in the Vedic text, and not included in the general rules of the first part (with some exceptions), in 75 verses.

In making an edition of this work, I have consulted three Mss. (two in palm-leaves and one in paper), which belong to the Oriental Mss. Library of the Theosophical Society at Adyar, Madras. The first is a paper Ms: (No. 20. G. 21. 7=), written in Devanāgarī script, and contains the text and a commentary also. But it is full of errors, and omissions of passages (of commentary) and verses (in the text) in several places. The second is a Ms. of the text alone, written in Grantha script. The last (No. xxii. B. 39. 49) is also in the same script, and mostly resembles the first in correctness. But the commentary is slightly different. These are designated as A.B.C. respectively. As the condition of the Mss. is unsatisfactory

1 'Vibhāgena cālyate stiṅgyam, Vide "Vaidikābharaṇa" of "Taittiriya-pratiśākhyā" on Viṣṇu "Nāma-pada-vat śiṅgyam asaṁkhyātām"
2 Vide verse 1, part 1, and verse 75 in part II
it is not possible for me to give a commentary on the text in a
correct and complete method, from the Mss. So, after a careful study
of these Mss. I have added a ġīkā to the text.

Eśāniṅgacyadānāṁ padavī sandarśitā viśuddhadhiyā/
Devamanīṣisutena Śrīvatsāṅkena Taittirīyaṅāṁ//

From this closing verse, we understand that one Śrīvatsāṅka
son of Devamanīṣi is the author of the work. There is no doubt
that these two names which occur in this verse are fictitious and not
original. But this verse is to be seen at the end of the commen-
tary in two Mss. and at the end of the text in another Ms., hence
there is difficulty to infer, whether Śrīvatsāṅka is the author of the text
alone or the commentary or both.

I am greatly indebted to Dr. C. K. Raja, M.A., PH.D. for allowing me
to use the Mss. of the Adyar Library.

ANĪGYAM

Śrīhayagrīvāya namāh.

Munimānasamanthānampatithāgamaraśgarat/
Uditāya namo bhūyād amṛtāya murāraye//1//
Guṇatravyahīnāya jagatravyavidhāyine/
Śrutitravyadrśe saśvat puratrयama(a) namāh//2//
Namaskṛtya vinetāraṁ vighnānāṁ anuśisyate/ 
Anīṅgayānāṁ saśrṣṣyad yat saññēṣpadam padam//3//
Śruti-śruc-chabda-nirdiṣṭam vikṛtaṁ cāpadātmakaih/
Syād ananyavad

Śruti, śrut, śabda, ityēṣāṁ anyatamena nirdiṣṭam, yac chabda-
rūpaṁ tad apadātmakair varṇaih (pratyayādibhiḥ) vikṛtaṁ kiṁciṁ
nyānādhiḥkabhāvena kiṁcid anyathābhūtam api ananyavat syāt anyathā
na bhavati (anīṅgaim bhavati).

yathā—atithiśrutīḥ (vide 1p. 2. v. 8).
āyuṣaśrutīḥ (p. 2. v. 12).
ājiśrut (p. 2. v. 12).
ārttaśrut (p. 2. v. 13).
uḍumbaraśabda (p. 2. v. 21).
tūparatvotaśabda (p. 2. v. 34).

1 P.—part. V.—verse.
ANIŃGYAM

tasmāt tūparā (p. 2. v. 34) (vikṛta).
tāvatīḥ saṃvatsarasya (p. 2. v. 33).
pautudravān paridhīn (p. 2. v. 47).

ankārdyakārdi ca yat padam//4//

Ankārādi vā akārādi vā sat vikṛtam, tad api ananyavat syāt (aniṅgyam bhavati).

yathā—anāmayac ca me.
anamivo bhavā naḥ.
anapā vyayantaḥ.
aparāvipiṣṭham (akārādivikṛtam).
avimuccyamānaḥ.

Bhir-bhyāṃ-bhyas-subhir arvāg obhāvaṃ hrasvabhāg
adṛghaṃ ca/

Nityaṃ vihāya neṅgyaṃ


yathā—mavam jaṅghābhiḥ.
mana uśriyāṣu,
santanūbhis somo rudrebhiḥ.


Arvāg iti kim ? su āghrayano jinva.

1 See sūtra 1. Addhyāya iii. of "Taittiriya-prātiśākhya".
go gīs sura dundu ōeti bhiśrutyā||5||

Bhiśrutyā saha 'goḥ', 'gīḥ', 'sura', 'dundu' ityetāni neṅgyāni bhavanti.

yathā—agne gobhiḥ.
gīrbiḥīḥ nabhaḥ.
surabhir vasānāḥ.
surabhīno mukhā,
surabhīṇi viyantu.
dundubhir vavāditi.
yā dundubhau.
dundubhīn samāghnanti.

Arvāk sarvam śuṇā

'Su' ityanena saha arvāk sarvam neṅgyam bhavati.

yathā—puro yāvānam ājīṣu, paṣaṣu.

mēṣiṣu, pāṣiṣu, citiṣūpa.

tadvat syādi-smādyakṣaraṁ avai/

Syādyakṣaraṁ smādyakṣaraṁ saha tadvat pūrvavat arvāk sarvam vi' ityetasmad anyan neṅgyam bhavati.

yathā—yad apa syād upa dadhāti.
avasyur asi uvasvān.
agnes tvasyena.

katamasmai parasmāt,
Aviti kim? visyūtam iti vi syūtam.

Vaikārādipadam vaiṣṇavaśvāyuk

'Vaiṣṇā', 'vaiṣva' ityetābhyaṁ ayuktam vaikārādipadam neṅgyam.
yathā—tā vai dehyo'bhavan, vaibhītaka idhmaḥ.
yad vai kaṅkatam. vaibhūdhāya.

Vaiṣṇāvaiśvāyug iti kim? vaiṣṇā vāruṇīm. vaiśvadevīṁ āmikṣāṁ.

vaiśvakarmanā ni juhoti.

sāsahūdi ca //6//

'Sāsaha' ityevamādipadam neṅgyam.

yathā—sāsahyāma pṛtanyataḥ.
vājēṣu sāsahat.
pṛtanāsu sāsahim.

Saukārādi

Saukārādipadam neṅgyam bhavati.
yathā—sauvarcanaśaḥ. sauśravasāya. sautrāmaṇyā yajeta.
sauhārdena, te saudhanvānāḥ.

saparyādi

Saparyādipadāṁ neṇgyam.
  yathā—saparyantaḥ puru priyam,
   sa urī saparyāt.

niyavīyāmayādi ca/

  yathā—vā eṣa niyate. mṛtyave niyamanam,
   yasya jyogāmayati. āmayāvi.

Traikārādi

Traikārādipadāṁ neṇgyam.
  yathā—yat traidhātavīlam.
   Indrāya traśṭubhāya,

   kukārādi naso-go. vintam vma //7//

Nasogopoyutam vinā kukārādi neṇgyam.
  yathā—kusvinda Audjālākīh. kulayinām.
Nasogopoyutam vineti kim ? kumbhinasaḥ. kulagopo yat.

Araṭyādi ca

Araṭyādipadāṁ neṇgyam.
  yathā—araṭṭiyantam. araṭṭiyato hanta. araṭī vā,
   vāvādi

Vāvādipadāṁ neṇgyam.
  yathā—vāvadato abhriyasya. vāvātā jccaṁ vāvasane.
   vāvasatiḥ. vāvṛdhānāḥ.

   jaśabdāyuk prathādi ca/

Jašabdāyuk ‘pratha’ ityevamādipadaṁ neṇgyam.
  yathā—mitram prathiṣṭham. prathimā ca. prathimānam.
   ye sprathetām. uru prathasva. dharmānī prathamānī.
Jašabdāyug iti kim ? prathamajā ṛtasya.

Dhūrvatisthādikāṁ

‘Dhūrva’, ‘atiṣṭha’ ityevamādipadaṁ neṇgyam.
  yathā—dhūrva dhūrvantam. asmāṁ dhūrvati. vayaṁ
   dhūvama. yajñayatiṣṭhamānā. yajñaḥ
   pratyati atiṣṭhipām.
गाष्ठाहु तर्यां दित्यां व्याथादि ओ।//8//
’गाष्ठाहु’, ‘तर्यां’, ‘दित्यां’, ‘व्याथा’ इत्येवमादिपदां नेंग्यां
यथां—गाष्ठाहु हि का मे. तर्यां हि. दित्यां हि.
दित्यांभ्यासता रुद्रानां, अवतां मा व्याथितं.

इदुपाद्यक्षांम त्य ओद एकव्यानि जानमाद्यांगमहि।
यासय पदश्यद्यक्षांरां अनान्तरांक्षांम रकारस तद इदुपाद्यक्षां
रांम. तांकोपाद्यक्षांम एकाव्यांरायर व्ययानांयर माद्यांगातां में नेंग्यां.
यथां—अजिपाता. अववरांता. अमिमादांता पिरांहां. अतित्रे पांता.
इदुपाद्यक्षांम इति किम्? ओंसम्न नवावद्यहांम. अनुपुरवान्त वियुयां.

मेग्हास्तिक्षांदिषांबद्यां एव वर्जयितवा द्वितीयाकालाः//9//
’मेग्हा’, ‘शिका’ इत्येवमादिशिषांबद्यां द्वितीयाकाल वर्जयित्वायान्यत सर्वां 
नेंग्यांभवाति.
यथां—मेघायिष्याते. शिकायिष्याते.
वर्जयितवा द्वितीयाकावैं इति किम्? मेघायिष्याते, शिकायिष्याते.

मामूढि
’मामा’ इत्येवमादिपदां नेंग्यां.
यथां—मामात्यांते अग्नेता. अधि मामाहानांही. मामाकानानां.

cाकतायानि त्रिकां

नेंग्यां.
यथां—काताया सवाहा. द्विताया सवाहा. त्रिताया सवाहा.

इद्र्यु इति त्रिकां।

इद्र्यादिपदांम त्रयां नेंग्यां.
यथां—इद्र्यु वै रास्त्रांम. अन्यादिरु. एतदिरु.
त्रिकां इति किम्? प्रतिदिरु.

प्रत्यन्ताहादिकतास्कां

नेंग्यां.
यथां—प्रत्यन्तां. पुर्वतां. विसवां. इमांतां.
कतुस्कां इति किम्? जिज्ञेष्ठतत्ताम.

सोद्र्यादिकतास्रुटीह//10//

इद्र्यादयाः कतुस्तुतो नेंग्याः. इद्र्याः. किद्र्याः. ताद्र्याः. साद्र्याः.
यथां—मृताता इद्र्ये.

साद्र्यां त्रामानी. तस्मात्साद्र्यांनाम.
कतुस्रूतिः इति किम्? वि साद्र्याः. सु साद्र्याः.

---
Rudreṣu ca dvitīyādiśv aṣṭasv anupasargayuk/
Bhave-mate-kaṛāya-nye-bhiṅkṣa-go-pūrva-vāstvayuk///11///
Apaṅcaśākṣaraḥ śabdaḥ
yathā—vabhluśaya vi vyādhine. rohitāya sthapataye. mantriṃe vāṇijyaṃ. bhuventaṃ. kakubhiyaṃ. namo giriśāyaṃ sāṅka-ṛāya ca. jjyeṣṭhāyaṃ. kaniṣṭhāyaṃ.

niśā-sū-sas-sahādayaḥ/
Nīpyāyudhāśaṃśātāvatyaṅaṃvāyādiśabdavat///12///
yathā—niśādebyaḥ. sūdyāya ca. sūmyāya ca. . . . spīṅjarāḥ. sahamānāya. nīpyāya ca. āyudhine ca. āśave ca. āśine- bhyaḥ. avatyaḥ ca. avāryāya ca.

İkārādāv īm avāpopasamnyud-
viṃprāyuḥ yā sa śrutih prothate ca/
İkārādāv anuvāke ‘Īm’ ‘ava’ ‘apa’ ‘upa’ ‘saṃ’ ‘ni’ ‘ut’ ‘vi’ ‘pra’ ity- etair ayuktā yā śrutis sā ca prothate śrutiḥ ca neṅgyā bhavati,
yathā—pālīyātyaṃ svāhā. āsiṣyate svāhā. prothate svāhā. pro-
that śāvāḥ.
İm avādyayug iti kim ? ikṛṭāyetiṇikṛtya svāhā. ava krandate svāhā, apa anāya svāhā. upa rāṃsyate svāhā. niśaṅṇaṃ svāhā. niviṣṭāya svāhā. utthāsyate. vi iksiṣyate. pra bhottsyate.

Urdhve pakṣe datvatādāv adādir
hitvā’ retaskāya ca’prāṇate ca///13///
Datvata ityanuvāke urdhve pakṣe aretaskāya aprāṇate iti ca hitvā adādir akārādāśrutir neṅgyā.
yathā—aprāṇāya. alomakāya. alomakā amidhyā. anasthiṅkaśa svāhā. tasmād anasthiṅkena.
Ürdhve pakṣe iti kim? aruṇvate svāhā.
Adādir iti kim? prajananāya svāhā.
Hitvā' retaskāya cāprāṇate ceti kim? aretaskāya svāhā. aprāṇate svāhā.

Ekākṣarādyaditpūrvam mānamāṇaṣtrud antakam/
Bahīḥ satopasargāyug vinā sātmānām ity api//14//

Ekam evaśaram ādiḥ pūrvaṃ yābhyaṃ mānamāṇaṣtrudbhyaṃ
akāra ikāro vā yābhyāṃ ca pūrvas te tathokte. Ekākṣarādī aditpūrve
vā mānamāṇaṣtrutāv ante yasya padasya tat tathoktam. 'Bahīḥ', 'sata'
ityetābhhyāṃ upasargāiḥ cāyuktam sātmānām iti padam vinā yad ekā-
kṣarād yad itpūrvamānamāṇaṣtrudantakaṃ tat padaṃ neṇgyam bhavati.
yathā—bhūmānām. somānām. premānām. sahāsā gāhamānāh.
ahṛṇīyaṃnaṃah. mahimānām. jarimaṇām.
Ekākṣarād iti kim? tāvanamānaṃ syāt.
Bahīḥ satopasargāyug iti kim? bahīḥ pāvamānāḥ. sātamānām bha-
vatī.
Vinā sātmānām iti kim? yaḥ sātmānām iti sā ātmānāṃ cinute.

Śṛtam daśa puro dakṣa svagā tvad upasargayuk/
Vihāya tāraśabdāntam

Śṛtam', 'daśa', 'puraḥ', 'dakṣa', 'svagā', 'tvat' ityetaip anuṣ,upasargaś
cayuktam vihāya tāraśabdāntam padaṃ neṇgyam bhavati.
yathā—te vayaṃ tarpayitāraḥ. dadiṭāras syāma. janitāram
gre.
Śṛtamādi vihāyeti kim? śṛtam karttāraḥ. daśa hotāram apaśyat.
pura etāraḥ. asya dakṣāh. yajūasya svagākarticāram. tvatpitāraḥ. ava
gamayitāraḥ. upa gātāraḥ. prati harttāraḥ.

tathā tavyaśrudantakam //15//

Tavyaśrudantakaṃ padaṃ pūrvavad upasargayutam vihāya ne-
gyam bhavati śṛtamādibhir yogābhāvāt.
yathā—agnis cetavyah. adhvanttavyah.
Upasargayug iti kim? na pravastavyam.

Supraṣyug vāṃsaśabdāntam

'Su', 'pra' ityetābhhyāṃ ayuktam vaṃsaśabdāntam padaṃ neṇgyam
bhavati.
yathā—jakṣivāmsah. papivāmsah.
Supraṣyug iti kim? su vidvāmsah. vitenire pra viśvāvamsa.
asuyuk cīrūd antakam/

'Su' ityanenāyuktam cīrūdantakam neūgyam bhavati,
yathā—prāti. pratāti.
Asuyug iti kim? su prāti. su pratāti.

Dhṛtāntāv iṣṭhayantāntakasāblāv anupasargakau//16//

Dhṛtāntau pracayantau 'iṣṭha', 'yanta' ityevamantau upasargaraha-
tau ca aniṅgyau bhavataḥ.
yathā—yavasām pathiṣṭhah. subhaṃ gamiṣṭhau. avṛkā āsrami-
ṣṭhāḥ. bhūyīṣṭhāṃ te. kayā saciṣṭhayaḥ. abhivājayantah. 
dīvā patayantah pathibhiḥ. pārayantā. abhrayantī.

Dhṛtāntāv iti kim? ajā asi rayiṣṭheti rayiṣṭhāḥ. kucaro giriṣṭhā iti 
giri sthāḥ. amitra yantam.
Anupasargāv iti kim? ā yajīṣṭha. svasti abhīvarttayantah. śatūn 
anapa vīyantāḥ.

Nissāmvyukthermavīrāsah pūṃṣāyuk tricatussvaram/
Etaikādyapi vāsōntam

'Nīḥ', 'sam', 'vī', 'uktha', 'irma'. 'vīrāsah', 'pūṃṣa' ityetai ayuktam 
tryakṣaram caturkṣaram vā 'etā', 'eka' ityevamādi ca aso'ntam padam 
neūgyam bhavati.
yathā—maghavānān. sutāsah. atandrāsah. kitavāsah. apsuṣa-
daḥ.

Nir ādyayug iti kim? niḥ yāsah. sam itāsā ca naḥ. vi śikhāsah. 
ukthaśūsah. īrma antāsah. svā virāsah. pūṃṣamāsah.
Tricatussvaram iti kim? tu vimrakṣāso divyāḥ. aviduṣṭarāsah.
	tathā yāṃsāsrud antakam//17//

Yāṃsāsrudantakam padam tathā pūrvavat tricatussvaram cen neū-
gyam bhavati.
yathā—bhūyāṃsah asūrāḥ. atho iti raghiyāṃsah. pakṣau dra-
gbhīyāṃsah.

Stān-masyantam

'Stāt', 'masi' ityevamantam padam neūgyam bhavati.
yathā—parastāc ca. avastāc ca. mintimā. carāmāsi.
svata-svanta-smata-smantaśrud antakam/

'Svata', 'svanta', 'smata', 'smanta' ityevāṃśrundantam padam neūgyam 
bhavati.
yathā—piśīvāṃsaman sarasvataḥ. sūryāya tvā bhrājasvate. paya-
svatir oṣadhayaḥ. sārasvatau homau, ūrjasvamantam, 
vivasvamantam. jyotiṣmate. haviṣmantah. jyotiṣmantah.

Tvata-tvanta-śyata-śyanta śrūdantaṁ nopasargayuk//18//
‘Tvata’ ‘tvanta’ ‘śyata’ ‘śyanta’ ityevamā śrūdantaṁ na ced upasarga 
yuń neūgyam bhavati.

yathā—Indrasya vai marutvataḥ. marutvantaṁ viśabham. sta-
naviṣyate. khaniśyantah.

Nopasargayug iti kim ? vāyave ni yutvate, ni yutvantam, sam pro-
ṣyate. parā bhaviṣyantah.

Tavai-tave-mahai-mahi-mahi-dhvaṃmantakoṁ tathā/
pūrvaṁ na ced upasargayuṁ neūgyam bhavati.

yathā—yātavai. jivātave. aśnavāmahai. śapāmahe. sakṣīmahai. 
śundhāvam.

Tatheti kim ? anu etavai. prati dhātave. sam avadyāmahai. anu 
ārabhāmahai. sam adhadhāvam.

Ukaśrūdantaṁ yad apyabhāvukopasargayuk//19//
Bhāvukasabdena upasargaiś ca yuktāṁ anyad yad ukaśrūdantaṁ 
tad api neūgyam bhavati.

yathā—urvārūkam ivā. gāvithukam carum.

Prān-vāgayug ag āg aṁ aṁ antaṁ cen na catussvaram/
padam caturakṣaram na cen neūgyam bhavati.

yathā—ānūṣaṁ jujoṣat. prāk. apāk. adharāk. viśvāṁ. paraṁ. 
Prāṁ vāgayug iti kim ? su prān. su vāk.
Na catussvaram iti kim ? asma driyak. upa avāsrāk.

Tvān-śāṅkantam

yathā—cikītvān. marutvān. turāṣāt. rtāsāt.

sāsopetam vi-vad-vān-mān-madantakam//20//
Sakāreṇa śakāreṇa vā saṁyuktaṁ ‘vi’, ‘vad’, ‘vān’, ‘mān’, ‘mat’ itye-
vamantam padam neūgyam bhavati.

yathā—rakṣa vi rakṣāṣṭi. aṅgirasvat. ūrjasvān. payasvān, 
āyuṣmān.
Saṣopetam iti kim? saḥ pratnavat. anśumadyat. gāmān agne, idāvān eṣaḥ.

Cināṇācāncaśvināntaśrut

'Cina', 'aṇca', 'aṇca', 'svina' ityevamantaśrun neṅgyam bhavati.
yathā—pratīcinam vṛjīnam. parācina mukhā. visūcīnān vyasyatām. pātāmā pratyāṅcam. tīrṣaṅcam. parāṅcaḥ. naraṃ-svinaḥ. manasvine.

tvāntam mahyabhīyug vinā/

'Mahi', 'abhī' ityétābhyāṃ yuktaṃ vinā tvāntaṃ padaṃ neṅgyam bhavati.
yathā—uditvā. mathitvā.
Mahyabhīyug vineti kim? antarikṣam mahī tvā. abhī satvā.

Apidvādiś ca saṃkhyāśrut vihāya paraniprayuk//21/

'Para', 'ni', 'pra' ityetair yuktaṃ vihāya saṃkhyāvācini śrutir neṅgyā bhavati. Apidvādiś ca sa neṅgyaiva. Apidvādiś ceti vacanaṃ saṃ-

khyāntarādeḥ saṃkhyāśabdasya parisaṃkhyānārtham.
yathā—yad viṃśatih. triṃśat. catvāriṃśat.
Vihāya paraniprayug iti kim? para ardhaśa svāhā. niyutāya svāhā.
Apidvādiś ceti kim? pāccadaśa śāmīdhemiḥ. caturviṃśatim anu brāyāt.

Agre bhāgā bhagaśrut giri hari sam anīkārabhadvārdri

ṛtrāvarttinn āśāśu rāpśinn uda sadha sahasā
dhūs svadhā tāna rūpa/

Deva tvāṃ dānava vāḍa uru puru mahaso vājīnī vāja viśvā-

śrūj jātaśrut vasā vasv ṛta ghnītsa śata
gātvagnī mitra tri loka//22//

Pate mate śacī śipī satya cakaṃkṣa pītāyo rayi rīśi
candra cāriṇī/

Bhavo uge' dhvara magha yajīna vahanaṃprasātayo huta
tama tīgha ai pra niḥ//23//

Ebbhir yuktaṃ hrasvabhāg yuk bahusvar

yodūdantaṃ devatādvandvakaṃ ca/

Hitvā sarvam nīcam anyasvaram cēn

nīcam tae cāpy evam evahantyam//24//


Hrasvabhāg avagrahayuktaṃ hitveti kim? suddhā yuvaḥ. omāası caṣaṇaḥ dhṛtaḥ.


Anyasvaranāṃ cena nicaṃ tac cāpyeṇa evaḥanīyam iti kim? Kvačin nicaṅtvena dṛṣṭam padam anyatra ntcād anayair udāttādibhir yuktan cet tac cāpy evam eva neṇyam iti ēhanīyam.

yathā—gopāya naḥ svastaye. chaṇḍāṁsyāsan.

Harīḥ om.
Anīṇγyam

Athānamitrānyantarāmbariṣaśrutovadhiśmāśvataro'navadyam/
Avākayāṅkāṅkām asūṣudantāvayātaviyān avatād
avadhyam//1//

Apasprādhetām apanāgrhitaśrur abhyasetām arapā arepāh/
Apiprayaṃ cāpsaraśrur asasya apasyuvo'nubhaṇam
asravantim//2//

Avattasaśado'paśavo'paśavyaśrud asvako'didyutad apnavānah/
Apadyamānāntarato'pavitrāv apāram anvīpam apestase ca//3//
Anuṣṭuyānīśtrto'niṣṭakābhīṣṭēr abhiṣṭaye'bhīravo'bhīvato
'bhītyai/

Aneusānehasānāgasāvarttiśruto'po'repasāv anya-
thānguṣṭham//4//

Alajo'tkāśēcchhavākaśrud avocāmājuṣṭānīṣṭēh/
Ahabhūno'vāgrāgo'nāsīvān adadṛmhaṅto'naḍvāhaśrur//5//
Ajagarasābdo'vadyād aramatir apuvāyata' puvāyeta/
Apaṣur akūpārasyānāsirkeṇānyake'nāyakeśām ca//6//
Areḍatāvaro'vātaśrutā v apūpam anākupam/
Areṇaṃ'vākārκāvasāpasaśruto'gadam//7//
Aḥimsantam asuvantam aditsantam ayācitam/

Anavāram anarvāṇam atharvāno'tāthiśrutiḥ//8//
Adhvaryaṃto'ntam (ā? a)yakṣmāyasmayāmivaśabdavat/
Adhvaryaśrut abhiṣke'todhy aksītāṅghārisadavat//9//
Ajarēbhīr antījānam avamā cāvamo'vamam/

Acchalēbhīr abhiśūṇām asnuvītāśamanta ca//10//
Aplōyosriśvir anyāśām anaśan napariṣu ca/
Avāre'pravatāvātāvitāśrud anavo'dhamam//11//

Anamitra—Anamitraṁ ca me.
Anamitrāya suvadhvam,

Anyatarā—Anyatarāṁ ca na.
Anyatarasyāṁbah.

Ambariṣa—Ambariṣād annakāmasya.
Ambariṣe vai.

Avadhīṣma—Avadhīṣma rakṣāḥ.
Aśvatarā—Aśvataro'tyapalavata.
Anavadyaṃ—Anavadyam yuvānam.
Avākayā—Samudrasya tvāvākayā.
Aṅkāṅka—Aṅkāṅkaḥ chandaḥ.
Asūṣudanta—Asūṣudanta yajñaḥ.¹
Avayā—Śuṣmin navayā,
Ataviyān—Tamasam ataviyān.
Avatāt—Avatān mā nāthitam.
Avadhyaṃ—Aṃkṛṇod avadhyaṃ.
Apaśṛṇdhetām—Yad² apasṛṇdhetām.
Apatha—Apathena pratipadyate.
Apathāt,
Agrḥīta—Agrḥītaḥ dromaṅkalaśaḥ.
Yasyāgrḥītā abhi,
Abhyasetām—Rodaśi abhyasetām.
Arapā—Arapā³ edhate.
Arepāḥ—Tanūr arepāḥ.
Apiṃrayaṃ—Apiṃrayaṃ codana.
Apsarasa—Oṣadhayo'psarasah.

Apsarasaḥ sarpāḥ. Apsarasau yātudhānāḥ.⁴
Asyasi—Perum aṣasya arjuni.
Apaṃyuvaḥ—Apaṃyuvo vasānaḥ.
Anulbaṇaṃ—Anulbaṇaṃ vayata.
Asravantim—Asravantim āruhema.
Avatta—Svagākṛtyai catur avattam.
HAVIR vai catur avattam.
Paśavaṣ catur avattam.
Apaśavaḥ—Rṣabhasyāpaśava vai.
Apaśavya—Apaśavyoʿpašuḥ.
Aśvakaḥ—Sasasty aśvakaḥ.
Adidyutat—Praddidyutat.
Apaṇavānaḥ—Savimantyaṃ apaṇavānaḥ.
*Apadyamānā—Apadyamānā prthi⁵.
Antarataḥ—Pāyayaty antarataḥ.
Apaṃitrau—Yad ubhāv apaṃitrau.
Apaṃraṃ—Apaṃraṃ praplavante.
Anvīpaṃ—Yad anvīpaṃ tiṣṭhan.
Apeṣase—Peśo maryaḥ apezase.

1 C yaṃiyya  2 C viṣṇo yaḥ apasprī  3 C pām edha
4 C nānām  5 C ṛyaṃ apa.  6 C thīvī.

* Apadyamāṇeti padam mānāntam apy upasargayuktasaṅkā ma bhūd iti grḥitam.
Anuṣṭuyā—Anuṣṭuyā kṛṣṇuḥi.
Aniśṭtaḥ—Vardhataṁ te aniśṭtaḥ.
Aniśṭaka—Eṣo'nirṣṭaka sûruhūtram.
Abhiśṭhaḥ—Pṛtanā abhiśṭīr upasadayaḥ.
Abhiśṭaye—Sumṛḍikām abhiśṭaye.
Abhiravaḥ—Abhiravo vṛde, ābhīvataḥ—Abhīvato vṛṣṭyā.
Abhittyai—Pari dadāmy abhittyai.
Anenasā—Karotu mām anenasam.
Anehasā—Anehasaṁ suṣarmāṇam.
Anāgasā—Svaritrām anāgasam.
Suvatād anāgasah.
Avartti—Avarttim pāpmānam.
Manyunā yad avarttyā.
Apa—Saṃyor arapaḥ.
Arepā—Samokasāv arepasau.
Anyathā—Na hy etēṣām anyathā.
Aṅguṣṭhami—Sarvāsv aṅguṣṭham.
Alaja—Alaja āntarikṣaḥ.
Atīkāsa—Atīkāśān karoti.
Atīkāśas tad vai,
Acchāvāka—Tāṁ vā etām acchāvākah.
Acchāvākāyānaḍvāham.
Avocāma—Avocāma kavaye.
Ajuṣṭa—Guhatām ajuṣṭa.
Aniṣṭā—Aniṣṭā devata āsan.
Ahabhūna—Ahabhūna rśīḥ.
Avāśṛṅga—Avāśṛṅga bhavati.
Anāśvān—Yadi nāśvān upavaseta.
Adāmrṛhanta—Adāmrṛhanta pūrve.
Anaḍvāha—Trayo'naḍvāhāḥ.
Anaḍvāham agrīḍhe.
Anaḍvāhau vārunṭ.
Ajagara—Balāyajagaraḥ.
Ajagareṇa sarpān.
Avadyāt—Mitrāṁ aho avadyāt.
Aramati—Aramatir vasūyuh.
Apuvāyate—Evāsyāpuvāyate.
Apuvāyeta—Apuvāyeta saumyarca.
Apaśuḥ—Apaśur bhāvukaḥ.
Akūpārasya—Te'kūpārasya vāce.
Anāśirkeṇa—Anāśirkeṇa yajñena.
Anyake—Nabhantām anyake same.
Anyakeśām—Nabhantām anyakeśām.
Areṇatā—Areṇatā manasā.
Avara—Manojavā avaraḥ.
Avaraiḥ paraś ca.
Avaṇa—Sīcāmahā avatam.
Evāvaṭeṣu.
Apūpa—Ekāṣṭakāyām apūpam.
Āṅkupam—Āṅkupam chandah.
Areṇavaḥ—Areṇavo vitatāḥ.
Avakā—Avakām anūpadadhāti.
Śaro'vakāḥ.
Avakā aśramiṣṭhāh.
Avṛkā—Avṛkebhir varūthaiḥ.
Avṛkā ṛtajñāḥ.
Avasā—Devā avasāgamaṁ tu.
Tenāvasena paraḥ.
Avasena dhītmahi.
Avasāya padvate.
Pate'vasaṁ karoti.
Pitur yathāvasaḥ.
Apasa—Apasacchinasmahī.
Bhuvo devānāṁ karmanāpasā.
Agadam—Me agadaṁ kṛti.
Ahiṁsantam—Prajāḥhyo hiṁsantam.
Asunvantam—Asunvantam ayajamānām,
Adītsantam—Adītsantaṁ dāpayatu.
Ayācitam—Tisṛdhvanvam ayācitam.
Anavāram—Ete 'navāram apāram.
¹Anarvāṇam—Anarvāṇam ² rathe śubham,
Athravāṇa—Athravāṇo bhṛgavaḥ.
Atithi— Indrasya gharmo atithih.
Yathātithaya āgatāya.
Adhvaryanta—Adhvaryanto asthuḥ.
Antam—a Yadantam amaṅgāram
Nāntam āvahantiḥ.
Ayakṣma—Ayakṣmaṁ ca me.
Ayakṣmā māvah.
Ayasmaya—Ayasmayam viṟtā.
Amīva—Asmadyuyavam anamvāḥ.
Anamivo bhavā naḥ.
*Adhvaryo—Ghṛtavatīṁ adhvaryo.
Adhvaryo veh.
Abhirke—Niṣiktam dyaur abhirke.
Abhirke ci u
Atodhi—Yad ato 'rdhyarciṭāraḥ.
Aksita—Aksīto'sya ksīttyai.
Aṅghāri—Aṅghārir asi.
Aṅghāre bāmbhāre.
†Ajarebhīḥ—Ajarebhir nānadadbhīḥ.
Anijānam—Ijānād anijānam.
Avamā—Avamā yā madhyamā.
Avamaḥ—Avamo bhavoti.  
‡Avamam—Yo vai stomānāṁ avamam.
Acchalābhiḥ—Achalābhiḥ kapīṇjālaṁ.
Abhiśūnāṁ—Abhiśūnāṁ mahimānāṁ.
Aṣnuvīta—Yad aṣnuvītāndho'dhvaryuḥ.
Aṣamanta—Yajñam aṣamanta devāḥ.
Apciya—Priyas strīṇāṁ apiciyah.
Asrivi—Asrivi chandaḥ.
Anyāsāṁ—Kṣeme'nyāsāṁ.
Anaśan—Anaśan vyavasphūrjan.
Aparīṣu—Ye aparīṣu paśyāṇ.

1 A Dandra.  
2 C ma.  
3 C nānta.  
4 C ta.  
5 C robhī.
* Adhvaryo iti nicam api bahuṃ varṇodantam iti gṛhitam.
† Ajarebhīḥ ityetad ajetyatra vibhāgaśaṅkā mā bhūḍ iti gṛhitam.
Evam īḍrīṣu draṣṭavyam.
‡ 'Avamā cāvamo'vamam' iti rūpatrayam āvamāsabdasyārthah, evam īḍrīṣu draṣṭavyam.
Avāra—Avāra ikṣavaḥ.
*Apravata—Āsvataraṇya-pravata.
    Pravata tasyānunbhāvya.
Avāta—Nanvannavātah.
Avitā—Tābhīr no'vītā bhava, Dhinām avityāvatu.
Ānavaḥ—Ānavaḥ ca me.
Adhamam—Asmad avādhamam.

Ātmāmusyaśāyaṃ ārsyeśāmikṣaṅgeṣyy āyuṣāśrutih/
Āmāndājiśrud āṇāra āraṇyādityaśabdarvavat//12/
Āpta-jigarttim ārātiśrud vinārttor ārtaqavāsrutih/
Āpyānāṁ āśvinīśvatthāsāruṭav āspātram āpsyatha//13/
Āvithātharvaṇās cāka ākhur ātithyasaśabdarvavat/
Āvinnāvaśrud āśūnāṁ śātādyājyāttaśabdarvavat//14/
Āpyam āntyāyanaś cāyan anandodāttam āsani/
Āsanyād ānāśānāś caśītimne caśīyam āsuyā//15/
Āmānāṁ śāhuvalaḥyai cāsāmahai cadbhur ākṣisuh/ Āngiraśy āntarikṣa caśūṣṭaṃś caubhūyaṃś caubhūyaṃ//16/
Ār-bhur cārcur āpayitāyīr āyinam
    āyava āyavase ca/
Āsitam āśiram āsurasmarādānasur
        āgrayaṇaśrutitr ācchat//17||
Āsandyevādakām āvir āgundrā indriyāvy api/
Ātma—Ātma prajāpatih.
Āmuṣyāyaṇa—Āmuṣyāyaṇaṃ anamitrāya.
    padaikadeśe—Āmuṣyāyaṇasyāmmadnyam.
    Āmuṣyāyaṇo'syām.
Āṛṣye—Catvāra āṛṣyeḥ.
    Āṛṣyeṃ vṛūte.
Āmiṅkāḥ—Pīyuṣa āmiṅkāḥ astu.

* 'Apravata' ityetaṃ nīcam api prayuktaśaṅkānirāsārthaṃ grhītam.
Āgneyī 1—Āgneyīs triṣṭubhaḥ.
Āyuṣa—Āyuṣo'ntah.
Āma—Tasmād āmāpakvam uhe.
Āmā supakva 2maireyah.
Āṇḍa—Vyuddham āṇḍam ajāyata.
Āṇḍābhyaṁ svāhā.
Āji—Dhanvanājīṇi jayema.
Ājīṁ dhāvanti.
Puro yāvānam ājiṣu.
Āṇāraḥ—Etaṁ vai para āṇāraḥ.
Āranya—Indriyam vā āranyaṃ.
Ya 3 āranyāḥ
Āditya—Ādityaṁ garbham.
Ādityebhyo bhuvadvadbhyāḥ.
Āptā—Teṣām evaisāptā.
Ājigarttim—Śuṇaḥśepam ājigarttim.
•Āṛtta—Āṛttaṁ vai.
Yajñasyaiva tad āṛttyā.
Āṛttava—Āṛttavo'dhipatir āsīt.
Tad āṛttavānām āṛttavatvam,
Āpyānāṁ—Varṣīṣṭham āpyānāṁ.
Āśvina—Āśvinaḥ dhūmralalāmam.
Tad āśvinir upa.
Āśvattha—Āśvatthe pātre.
Āśvatthī havirdhānai ca.
Āspātra—Āspātraṁ juhūḥ.
Āpsyatha—Ātha pravāpsyatha (neṅgyāḥ).
Āvitha—Tvam sakhyam āvī(śa 4)thā.
Āṭharvaṇaḥ—Dadhyaṅī āṭharvaṇaḥ.
Āka 5—Ma ākaśyati.
Ākhu—Ākhus te rudra pasūḥ.
Ātithya—Ātithyaṁ grhṇyāt.
Ātithyasya kriyate (neṅgyāḥ).
Āvinna—Āvinnaḥ pūṣā.
Āvinnau mitrāvaruṇau.

1 C neya. Example according to this reading “Āgneyam aṣṭākapūlam”.
2 C merayah.
3 C yad āra.
• Vinārttōr iti kim? Āṛttim.
4 C vitha.
5 C Kha.
Āva—Suruco vena āvaḥ.
Āvaṁ devānām.
Āśūnāṁ—Āśūnāṁ vrīhitāṁ.
Āśā—Āśā dīśa āprīṇa.
Samid diśām āśayā.
Ādya—Ādyam asyānnaṁ.
Nādyā pra-jāpateḥ.
Agner anādyam.
Ājya—Ājyaṁ asi.
Yad ājyena.
Āttā—Āttāḥ somah.
Asurāttaḥ sindhuḥ (neīgyāḥ).
Āpyaṁ—Āpyaṁ vā ēṣaḥ.
Āntyāyana—Āntyāyanaḥ ca.
*Āyan—Suvaṛgaṁ lokam āyan.
Āsani—Śrīṇiśa āsani.
Āsanyāt—Asanyān mā mantrāt pāhi.
Ānasānāḥ—Suvar ānasānāḥ.
Āsitimne—Āsitimne svāhā.
Āśyam—Tasmād dvāśyam.
Āsuyā—Āsuyā patanti.
Āmbānāṁ—Āmbānāṁ carum.
Āhuvaddhyai—Āhuvaddhyā ubhā.
Āsāmahai—Āsāmahā evemau.
1Ābhuh—Ābhur asya niśāṅgathīḥ.
Ākṣiṣyuh—Yad ākṣiṣur divyam.
Āṅgirasi—Ūrg asyaṅgirasya āryamradāḥ.
Āntarikṣaḥ—Alaja āntarikṣaḥ.
Āsusānāḥ—Rtam āsusānāḥ.
Āsusukṣanī—Tvam āsusukṣanīḥ.
Āṅrbhu2—Na vasūny āṅrbhūḥ.
Āṅrcu—Yad āṅrcus tena,
Āpayitā—Anāptasyāpayitā.
Āyo—Āyos tvā sadane.
Āyinam—Śyenaṁ āyinam.
Āyava—Pratibhūṣat yāyavaḥ.

* Anantodāttam iti kim? Āyan pra candramāḥ, ādyasvarāṃ cen nicaṁ tac cāpity asyāpavādo'yaṁ.

1 C āhuḥ. Example of this reading—Enaśīhuḥ, Sanāhuḥ, etc.
2 C nṛhu.
3 C nṛhu.
4 C śaṁtya.
Āyavase—Āyavase ramante.
Āśitaṁ—Āśito bhavati.
Āśira—Āśiram abanayati.
Āsura—Nāmāsūrā āsti.
Ārāt—Ārāc cid dveśaḥ.
Āre asme ca.
Ānāśu—Mahīmānam ānāśuḥ.
Āgrayaṇa—Yad āgrayaṇam grhītvā.
Ācchat—Ācchac chandaḥ.
Āsandī—Āsandī sādayati.
Ādakām—Ādakāṃ khādena.
Āvīḥ—Āvīkṛṣṇuṣva.
Āgnendrāḥ—Āgnendrāḥ kṛṣṇalāmāḥ.
Indriyāvi—Indriyāvi paśumān.
Iśṭarga—Iśṭargo vai.
Iśṭaka—Iśṭakā upadadhāti.
Ilānda—Ite iṣṭake ilāndam bhavati.
Iḍāvatsareṇa—Iḍāvatsareṇa namaskaromi.
Iḍenya—Agnim Iḍenyo gīrā.

Devām ṛde'ṇyān.
Udaryena—Nabha udaryena.
Udara—Udaram sadaḥ.
Samudraṁ udareṇa,
Upasti—Stomasyopastir bhavati.
Upastim kurute.
Uṣīja—Acchidṛa uṣijāḥ.
Uṣijāṃ kavikratum.
Udāra—Śrīnām udāraḥ.
Urvarām—Urvarām prabhindanti,
Utsa—Utsam uhrate.
Udīca—Udica utsrjati,
Uṣṇiḥā—Uṣṇiḥā chandaḥ.

Bṛhaspatīr uṣṇiḥāḥ.
Upahatnum—Upahatnum ugram.
Upānahau—Kārṣṇī upānahau.

Note—(1) Anudāttam iti kim? udyata ity ut yate svāhā. Ayam apy antyasvarṣaṁ cen ničam ity asyāpavādaḥ.
Upāka—Upāka a rocate.
Upariṣṭāt—Upariṣṭād ānayati.
Upareṇa—Prthivim upareṇa drṣṭha.
Uttaredyu—Uttaredyar upatiṣṭhate.
Udbhayādat—Nirvape ubhayeśat.
Udaṇka—Udaṇkaḥ saulbāyanaḥ.
Uḍrīṇam—Uḍrīṇaṁ sīnca aksītam.
Udbhayataḥ—Udbhayataḥ prati tiṣṭhanti.
Udaka—Sthalayodakam (?).
Udyate—Vyākṛtā vāg udyate.
Uditam—Pūrvam evoditam.
Uḍāsānaktā—Yonā uḍāsānātka.
Uḍukhalaṁ—Uḍukhalaṁ ca
Uccāvacāṁ—Uccāvacāṁ hi
Uḍāvartah—Uḍāvartaḥ praṇāḥ.
Uditā—Tasya bhāga uditaḥ.
Uḍumbarā—Uṛg vā udumbarāḥ.

Uḍumbareṇorjam.
Uśmaṇyā—Uśmaṇyā pidhānā.
Uṃṇāyu—Iṃmā ẓāṃṇāyum.
Uṃrimt—Ṛtāvarīṛ uṃrimtḥ.
Ṛnadhate—Ṛnadhate sa jivāt.
Ṛkvatā—Ṛkvatā gaṇena.
Ṛdudareṇa—Ṛdudareṇa sakhyā.
Ṛtusthāḥ—Ṛtusthā yajña yajāyena.
Ṛtvīyat—Tasmād ṛtvīyat.
Ṛksama—Jagatya ṛksamaṁ ṛksamaṁ.
Ṛkmīyāṇi—Ṣad ṛkmīyāṇi.
Ṛtvīja—Ṛtvījas ta enaṁ.

Devam ṛtvījam.
jahṛṣāṇaś ca¹ jabhṛṛāṇā ca jambhayoh/30/
Janatā jivātuśruj jamadagnijāmadagnyau² jahakāḥ /
Janitā jīmūtaśruj janimā jañjabhyate jaritre ca /31/
Juhurāṇam jujuśāṇā³ jyeṣṭhajaraṇyuvārtau⁴ jantitram ca /
Jāmbilena janitvair jāye'nyasyāpi jīvānasthāyai /32/

Jahṛṣāṇaḥ—Jahṛṣāṇo'yam vājam.
Jabhbṛṇa⁶—Jabhbṛṇā⁷ caranti,
Jambhayoḥ—Tāṃs te dadhāmi jambhayoḥ.
Janatā—Vīryeṇa janatām eti.
Jivāṭu—Jīvāṭuṃ na marāmahe,
Jivāṭave jīvānasthāyai.⁸
Jamadagni—Jamadagniḥ puṣṭikāmah,
Jāmadagnya⁹—Pālītau jāmadagnyau.¹⁰
Jahakā—Jahakā saṃvatsarāya.
Janitā—Yo nāḥ pitā janitā,
Jīmūta—Jīmūtasya eva.
Jatavo jīmūtān,
Janimā—Janimā vivakti,
Jañjabhyate—Yaj jañjabhyate.
Jaritre—Mrṛḍā jaritre,
Juhurāṇam—Juhurāṇamenaḥ,
Jujuśāṇā—Jujuśāṇā ghṛtāci,
Jyeṣṭha—Jyeṣṭhāḥ ca mantrāḥ,
Jyeṣṭhāṃ putram.
Jyaiṣṭhyam ca me,
Jarāyu—Jarāyu tad eva tat.
Jarāyunā,
Janitram—Agner janitram asi,
Jāmbilena—Araṇyam jāmbilenā.
Janitvaiḥ—Bhināda urjanitvaiḥ,
Jāye'nyasya—Tāj jāye'nyasya,
Jīvānasthāyai—Jīvāṭave jīvānasthāyai.

¹ C jārbhūrākṣa
² C gniyau
³ C jyaiṣṭhyaja
⁴ C śrutā
⁵ B C nasyāyai
⁶ 6 & 7 C jārbhūrākṣa
⁷ 8 C nasyāyai
⁸ 9 & 10 C gniyau
Tattvāya tāvataśrut tāḍṛk tvaṣṭīmati tuviṃṣaṇasam /
Tredhā ca tetijānas tatṛṣāṇas tārakās1 tanayitnoḥ //33//
Turanyatas turīpaśrut trasadasyus tamasvariḥ /
Tūparatvotaśabdau ca triṣṭubhaśrut taritrataḥ //34//

Tattvāya—Tattvāya savitā dhiyāḥ.
Tāvata—Tāvato vāruṇān.
Tāvatī saṃvatsarasasya.
Tāḍṛk—Tāḍag eva tat,
Tvaṣṭīmati—Tvaṣṭīmati te.
Tuviṃṣaṇasam—Tuviṃṣaṇasam.
Tredhā—Sa viṣṇus tredhā.
Tetijānaḥ—Svadhitis tetijānah.
Tatṛṣāṇaḥ—Tatṛṣāṇo ajarah.
Tārakā—Tārakā asthāni.
Tanayitnoḥ—Tanayitnor acittāt.
Turanyataḥ—Ivatas turanyataḥ.
Turīpa—Tan nas turīpam. Tvaṣṭre turīpāya.
Trasadasyuḥ—Trasadasyuḥ paurukutsyah.
Tamasvariḥ—Tamasvarīrundatiḥ,
Tūpara—Yat2 tūparaḥ.
Tasmāt tūparaḥ,
Tvota—Manasā tvotaḥ.
Sadhanyas tvotāḥ,
Triṣṭubha—Āgneyīs triṣṭubhāḥ.
Triṣṭubhā pari dadhāti.
Taritrataḥ—Sahorjā taritrataḥ.

Didyudduhitarasabdau draviṇasyur dṛṣṭkavaḥ /
Dūṣṭkābhiś ca devāccya dātyū1 haś ca dāvidyutat //35//
Darvidā devikā devatāśabdavad-
       drāghyā itī didhītim didivam2 didivān /
Dvāparo3 duṣṭaram duṣṭaritnar dṛṣad-
       dyumnaduryāśruto4 dandāṣukaśrutiḥ //36//
Dyutāno dadhitco daridraddritya śrutiḥ
Didyut—Didyud varṣan,
Duḥitara—Duḥitara āsan. Suryasya duhitā,
Draviṇasyu—Draviṇasyur vipanyakā.
Dṛṣṭikāvah—Te ye bāhyā dṛṣṭikāvah,
Dūṣṭikābhīḥ—Dūṣṭikābhīr hrādūnīm.
Devācyā—Devācyā kṛpā,
Dātyāḥ—Dātyāḥāḥ te.
Davidyutat—Davidyutad ādhaspadam.
Darvidā—Darviṣdate vāyavyā,
Devīkā—Devīkā nir vapaṃ,
Devata—Agnir devatā.
Drāghuyā—Drāghuyā ca me.
Dīdhitim—Dīdhitim ukthaśāsah,
Dīdivim—Gopāṁṛtasya dīdivim.
Dīdivān—Dīdivāṃ sadat.
Dvāparah—Dvāparo yānām,
Duṣṭaram—Duṣṭaram astv ojah.
Duṣṭarītuh—Duṣṭarītur adābhyah,
Dṛṣṭat—Dṛṣac copalā ca,
Dyumna—Dyumnaṃ citraśravastamam,
Dyumnasya prāsahā,
Durya—Duryān adityāḥ.
Duryā dyāvāprthivyoḥ.
Dandaśūka—Dandaśūkās tām samām,
Dyutānāḥ—Dyutānās tvā.
Dadhīcaḥ—Dadhīcaḥ asthabhiḥ.
Daridra—Daridraṃ nilalohitam,
Dvitiya—Dvitiyorddhamāsānām,
Yā dvitiyā yajñaṃ tābhīḥ,
dhāṇikā ca dhrajitvaṃśe ca dheṣṭhā./

Dhāṇikā—Nijalgulīti dhāṇikā,
Dhrajīyān—Vāta iva dhrajīyān,
Dheṣṭhā—Uṣate dheṣṭhā.

Narāśmaśabdo navedā navāgyā
napātko napātam ca nakṣatraśabdoḥ///37///
Naktayā navyasešrun-
nāraśamśaśrunindo nannamīti/
Naiyagrodho nānadan nītaṁma-
śrūnivārā nāthitaśrun nabhantām//38//
Nīhāraśrun nahanā nanda3 ghumā nīkanam ca nīlāmgoh/
Nīnmanīnātanaśabdau nāivārasrūn nilāyata nyanukh//39//
Nīskāvaṁ nīskāse nīkevalyam niṣaṅga4 thir nīvih/
Niṣṭarkkyaṁ niṣṭy5 āyai nyagrodhasrūn naraṁdhiṣaśrūc ca//40//

Naraśamśa—Naraśamśena vai.
Naraśamśasyāhāṁ,
Navedā—Na vedā yaśasvatīḥ.
Navāgyā—Na vāgyā vaśvananti.
Napātkāḥ—Napātko vai.
Napātam—Apānnapātam.
Nakṣatra—Kṛttikānaksatram.
Yāṁ nakṣatránī,
Naktoṣāśa—Naktoṣāśa saamanasa,
Naktayā—Dadṛṣe naktayā,
Navyase—Suṣvitāya navyase,
Nārāśamśa—Pitrāṁ nārāśamśaḥ,
Nārāśamśena stomena.
Nidaḥ—Druho nidaḥ.
Nannamīti—Nannamīti viśvāḥ,
Naiyyagrodha—Naiyyagrodha audumbaraḥ,
Nānadat—Nānadad rāsabhahāḥ.
Nīṭa—Nīṭasu dakṣīṇaśu,
Nṛṇṇasya—Nṛṇṇasya manhā,
Nīvāraḥ—Nīvāraś ca me.
Nāthita—Avatān mā nāthitam.
Nabhantām—Nabhantām anyakeśam,
Nihāra—Nihāreṇa prāvṛtāḥ.
Nihāraya svāhā,
Nahanā—Nahanā vyasyan,
Nanda4 ghumā—Ānandaṇa nanda5 ghumā,

1 Csā naktā na
2 B ārudo
3 C datunā
4 B gadhir
5 C styāya
6 A thunā
ANİŞGYAM

Nikşanam—Yan nikşanam.
Nilaŋgo—Nilaŋgo krmih.
Nimima—Dakşiňan na nimima.
Nütana—Nütanena šrkşimahi.
Pyraňa ye ca nütanah,
Naivära—Naivärań carum.
Nilaẏata—Sa nilaẏata.
Nyamku—Pitvo nyańkuň,
Nişkäväm—Nişkäväm ādan,
Nişkäsa—Nişkäsa udayaniyam.
Nişkevalyam—Nişkevalyam uktham.
Nišaṅgathi—Abhurasya nišaṅgathiḥ.
Nivi—Nivir oşadhinäm,
Niştarkeya—Niştarkeyań badhnätä.
Niştyäya—Niştyäya saha vasati,
Nyagrodha—Nyagrodhaś camasaih.
Nyagrodhena vanaspatän.
Narandhişah—Narandhişah prodyamanaň.

Pṛtsutih puritata pṛtanyataḥ pruñate pṛsatayah pariśkṛtaḥ / Patvane paramatām pṛtanyakah paspaśe pataỹiṣṇu pāyavah \[41//

Praugam prayasaḥ prajäpater hṛdayenäpi pitāmaḥaśrutih / 6 Paramesiṭhipatatiʂruṇiḥ pṛtanā hy ēṣu ca pundraśrajäm \[42//
Pataṅgam ṗiśaṅgāśrutih pārvatyeyi parācaḥ pratīciṣrutiḥ pākalāya /

Purandhiḥ puroḍāśaśabdaḥ pariṣṭau pṛdākuḥ pāṛke ca paplūlanena \[43//
Paryāriparyāriniḥ paryaiṣṇuh pauruseyaśrutih prāṕrśa parvatih \[44//

Prośisyatepi pratipam parīṭkaśrutih prāṃśtaṇya śrutih prāsaçañya \[44//

1 C sakṣi 2 C ‘Prohy’ 3 B ‘yavaňha’ 4 B ‘će ca pa’ 5 C ‘neti’ 6 C ‘ṭhi ca pa’ 7 B C ‘nā jeytu’ 8 C ‘gaśru’ 9 B C ‘ṃrutiḥ pau’ 10 C ‘tiś ca’ 11 C ‘pratikaṃ pratipa’
Prāyaścitiśrat prākaśau prāśrūgaśrut pūrvedyus ca /
Pūtudrusrūt prāśnam pracchat\(^1\) Prattapratnaśruci ca
pathīśam ///45 ///

Prānāyaṇāḥ piśangilī prāvāhaṇīḥ pilippilā /
Praiyyaṅgavam priyaṅgavah\(^3\) pāvīravī pavīravam ///46 ///
Premāṇam prāṇie preṇā pretā pautudravaśrutiḥ\(^3\) /
Purūravah\(^4\) parucchepeḥ paramaśrut pravatviti ///47 ///
Prātaḥ purodāśinyāḥ ca pārayāḥ pāpyasāśrutiḥ /
Poṣayitnu ca prīvāṇāḥ pāvakā pājasāśrutiḥ /// 48 ///
Prācaḥ prakṣaśrutiḥ plākṣah\(^6\)

Prātsutih—Prātsutir martyānām.
Puritatā—Antarikṣam puritātā.
Prātanyakāḥ—Śāsahmaṇ prātanyakāḥ.
Prusñate—Prusñate svāhā,
Prātatah—Marutāṃ prātatah.
Parīśkrtaḥ—Virīdutaḥ\(^6\) parīśkrtaḥ.
Patvane—Śyenāya patvane.
Paramatām—Paramatām gamayati.
Prātanyavah—Ye prātanyavah.
Paspāse—Vratāni paspāse.
Patayiṇṇu—Patayiṇṇu arvan.
Pāyavah—Ye pāyavah.
Praugam—Praugam ukti,am.
Prayasaḥ—Mandrāsu prayasaḥ.
Prājāpater hṛdayenāpi—Prajāpater hṛdayenāpi pakṣam.
Pitāmaha—Pitāmahaḥ puṇyaḥ.
Pitarāḥ pitāmahaḥ.
Parameśṭhi—Parameśṭhi adhipatiḥ.
Parameśṭhinā kā eśa yajñaḥ.
Patatriṇāḥ—Śyenena patatriṇo vṛṣṇā.
Prātanā hyeṣu\(^8\)—Ugraḥaḥ prātanā hyeṣu.\(^9\)

\(^1\) B C 'ttām pra'
\(^2\) C 'vam pā'
\(^3\) B 'vāśrutiḥ'
\(^4\) C 'puru'
\(^5\) C 'hṛṣam'
\(^6\) C 'ḍūṭaḥ'
\(^7\) C 'nāpi'
\(^8\) C 'nājyeṣu'
\(^9\) 'nājyeṣu'
Puṇḍarīsrajaṃ—Puṇḍarīsrajaṃ prayacchati,
Pataṅgaṃ—Patayantaṃ pataṅgaṃ.
Juḥvā pataṅgaṃ.
Piśaṅgā—Piśaṅgās trayah.
Pārvateyi—Dhiṣaṇāsi pārvateyi.
Paṛcaḥ—Ye paṛcaḥ,
Paṛcitbhih stuvate.
Pratīcī—Yatprattco rakṣāṃsi hanyuḥ.
Pratīcī dik.
Pākalāya—Pākalāya svāhā.
Purandhiḥ—Purandhir yoṣā.
Puroḍāśa—Puroḍāśam aśṭākapālam,
Puroḍāśena vai,
Paṇiṣṭau—Sahasāvan paṇiṣṭau.
Prākūḥ—Prākūḥ práci nāmāsi.
Parāke—Asya rajasaḥ parāke.
Papūlānena—Papūlānena vāṣaḥ.
Paryāri—Paryāriwa hy etasya.
Paryāriṇī—Paryāriṇī bhavati,
Pārayiṣṇu—Virudhaḥ pārayiṣṇavḥ.
Acchidām pārayiṣṇum.
Pauruṣeya—Pauruṣeyaḥ vadhaḥ.
Pauruṣeyena dāivyena a.
Prāvṛṣā—Viśvedevāḥ prāvṛṣā.
Parvatīḥ—Parvatir vettu.
Prāśiṣyate—Prāśiṣyate svāhā.
Prattpam—Prattpam tiṣṭhan.
Prattka—Bhavati pratikaṃ yad varmi.
Sa tvam agne pratiṅkena.
Prāvṛta—Prāvṛta jālpyā ca.
Prāvṛtasya rātrim.
Prāsacāya—Prāsacāya svāhā.
Prāyaścitti—Prāyaścittir ye paṣum.
Prāyaścittim aicchat.
Prākāṣau—Prākāṣāv adhvaryave.
Prāṣūga—Prāṣūgam ālabheta.
Prāṣūgo bhavati.
Pūrvedyuh—Pūrvedayuh prakṛmaṭi.
Pūtudru—Pūtudruvattavat.
Tām pūtudrau.
Praśnam—Praśnamai tām.
Pracchat—Pracchac chandaḥ.
Pratta—Prattā vai gauḥ.
Pratna—Tam pratnathau.

Pratna ṣūḥ.
Patbiśam—Arvantam patbiśam.
Prāṇāyaṇaḥ—Vasantāḥ prāṇāyaṇaḥ.
Piśāṅgilā—Kiṃsviś āṣīl piśāṅgilā.
Prāvāhaṇi—Prāvāhaṇir akāmayata.
Pilippilā—Āsit pilippilā.
Prāyyaṅgavam—Prāyyaṅgavam carum.
Priyaṅgavah—Priyaṅgavaś ca me.
Pāvīravi—Pāvīravi kanyā.
Pāvīravam—Lāṅgalam pavīravam.
Premaṇam—Premāṇam eva.
Prāṇine—Prāṇine svāhā.
Preṇā—Śrītvā preṇā nu.
Pretā—Prīneḥ pretā.
Pautudrava—Yat pautudravāḥ. Pautudravān paridhiḥ.
Purūravāḥ—Purūravā gṛtena.
Parucchepa—Paruṣeṇoḥ bhyavadat.
Parama—Paramaḥ catuṣṭomaḥ.

Paramā vā eṣā vāg.

Pravat—Pravatim ahnā.
Prātāḥ—Ekādaśa prātāḥ.
Puroḍāśinyah—Puroḍāśinyā upakhadaḥ.
Pāryāḥ—Yat pārā yunajate.
Pāpīyasī—Pāpīyastī prajā bhavati.

Pāpīyasā ca.
Pōṣayitnu—Aḥa poṣayitnu.
Pīvāna—Pīvānaḥ putrāḥ.
Pāvaka—Pāvako asmabhyaṃ.

Agnaye pāvakāya.
Pājasā—Vi pājasā prthunā.
Prācaḥ—Tānyatṛḥ prācaḥ (?).
Prakṣa—Sa prakṣo bhavati.
Plakṣa—Tat plakṣasya. Plakṣa itidhmaḥ.

1 C 'pohyava'  2 C 'pasadaḥ'  3 C 'yat pra'

* Note—Etan nicam api prayuktaṣaṇākā mā bhūd iti gṛhītam.
phaligam phaliniśrutih. /  
Phaligam—Phaligam ravena.  
Phalini—Phalinir aphala uta.  
Phalinyo na oṣadhayah pacyantām.  

Bṛhaspatiśrutis tadvad bandhutā balbajāśrutih ///49///  
Bārhaspatyaśrud balākā bahiśṭhād bāṁbhāriśrud  
brāmhaṇācchāṃsine ca /  

Bārhiṣyaśrud bārhatasārud balakṣi  

* Bṛhaspati—Dhatta Bṛhaspate.  
Bandhutā—Bandhutā vacsobhiḥ.  
Bandhutāṃ veda.  
Balbaja—Balbaja udatiṣṭhan.  
Balbajān api.  
Bārhaspatya—Bārhaspatyaś caruḥ.  
Bārhaspatyaṃ sītiprśtham.  
Balākā—Saurī balākā.  
Bahiśṭhāt—Dvaum dvau bahiśṭhāt.  
Bāṁbhāri—Bāṁbhārir avasyuḥ.  
Aṁghāre bāṁbhāre.  
Brāmhaṇācchāṃsine—Brāmhaṇācchāṃsine vāsasi.  
Bārhiṣya—Bārhiṣyam dattam bhavati.  
Bārhatā—Bārhato vai śukraḥ.  
Balakṣi—Balakṣi tāḥ sārasvatyah.  

bhṛātrvyasaśrud bheṣajaśrud bharibhrat ///50///  
Bhālandano bharadvajō bhura1 nyuṣrue ca bhauvanaḥ /  
Bhauvāyano bhīṣayanto bhaisi2jyam api bhāmitaḥ ///51///  

Bhṛātrvyā—Bhrātrvyo bhavati.  
Agner bhṛātrvyah.  
Abhṛātrvyo yad Indrāya.  
Bheṣaja—Bheṣajam gave.  
Aṣmabhīyam bheṣajam.  
Bharibhrat—Arusam bharibhrat.  
Bhālandanaḥ—Bhālandano'gneḥ.  

1 B 'nyāyau'  
2 B C 'ṣajyam'  
* Note—Etan niṃcam api pateyuktam iti grhītam. Patigrahaṇam api Bṛhaspatir naḥ pārityādiśvaniyatvārtham.
Bharadvāja—Bharadvāja ṛṣiḥ.
Bhurāṇy—Madhyamāruḥad bhurāṇyuh.

Arūṣaṁ bhurāṇyum.

Bhauvana—Bhauvanaś ca bhauvanaś ca.
Bhauvāyana—Bhauvāyano vasantaḥ.
Bhiṣajyantaḥ—Tad bhiṣajyanto bhītayo.
Bhaiśijyam—Tredhā bhaiśijyam.¹
Bhāmita—Kudra bhāmi² tāvadhiḥ.

Mālaṅgā madirā mudgā māndā madhyamaśabdat / Mamattu ca manīśānām³ muskarā márutasrutiḥ //52//
Mārjālītyamanotāyai⁴ marutvatīyasruto matasnābhyān / Madhyandine maghonī⁵ madhyandinamātariśvāsā- bdau ca //53//

Mithuyā mrādayantaśrun mumucānā mādayiśṇavo madguḥ / Mahimā⁶ matintamaśrun mahinā mānthīlavo malimlusrūt //54//

Mastiśkaśrun maspaśā māṁspacanyā mānavyaśrun mahimam mādayadhyai /

Mālaṅgāḥ—Mālaṅgās tūparāḥ.
Madirāḥ—Madirā mādayiśṇavaḥ.
Mudgā—Mudgāś ca me.
Māndā—Māndā vāsāḥ,
Madhyama—Vi madhyamāṃ śrathāya. Madhyama upayāti

Mamattu—Mamattu naḥ.
Manīśānām—Manīśānām prārpaṇaḥ.
Muskarā—Ye muskarā.
Māruta—Māruto’si marutāṃ.
Māruta phalguḥ.
Mārjālītya—Hotriyo mārjālītyaḥ.
Dāsyomārjālīyam,
Manotā—Sahaso yā manotā.
Manotāyai haviṣāḥ.

¹ C ‘gaṭyam’
² B ‘ṇā ma’
³ B ‘nī syāma’
⁴ C ‘tova’
⁵ C ‘yam ma’
⁶ B C madinta’
Marutvattiya—Marutvatiyam uktham.
    Marutvatiyae ca me.
Matasnābhyām—¹ Sarvaṃ matasnābhyām.
Madhyandine—Grisme madhyandine.
Maghonī—Maghonī juṣṭir asi.
Mādhyandinam—Mādhyandinamā savanam.
    Mādhyandine savane.
Mātariśvā—Bṛhaspatir mātariśvā.
    Mātariśvāno gharmaḥ.
Mithuyā—Mithuyākarbhāgadheyam.
*Mrḍayanta—Bhavata mṛḍayātaḥ.
Mumucānāḥ—Yathā bandhān mumucānāḥ.
Mādayiṣṇavāḥ—Madirā mādayiṣṇavāḥ.
Madgūḥ—Udro madgūḥ.
Mahimā—Saṃvatsaro mahimā.
*Matintama—Indriyāvān matintamaḥ.
Mahinā—Mahinā viśvaśaṃbhūḥ.
Mānthīlavāḥ—Kāso mānthīlavāḥ.
Malimlu—Ye janesu malimlavāḥ.
    Malimluṃ jambhyaḥ.
Mastiśka—Aśaṃ bhūn mastiśkeṇa.
    Mastiśkāya svāhā.
Maspasa—Maspasa kuru yam.
Māṃspacanyāḥ—Māṃspacanyāḥ.
Mānavya—Mānavyo hi prajāḥ.
Māhina—Māhimnāṃ datram.
Mādayadhyai—Saha mādayadhyai.

Yuṣmānīto yādṛśo yātuṣūṇā² yāvad yajñīya³ yajñāśrud
    yavāgūḥ //55//

Yāyāvaro yunajate yuvāno* yajathaśrutih /
Yoyupyeta yajatraśrud yuktvāyā pi ca yavyudhaḥ //56//

    Yuṣmānītah—Yuṣmānīto abhayam.
    Yādṛśa—Yādṛśe punaḥ.

¹ C ‘sarvaṃ’  ² C ‘nām yā’
³ B C ‘jñāya yajñīyaśru’  ⁴ B ‘nām ya’
* Note—1 Etad drīḍtantam na bhavātī gṛhitam,
* Note—2 Etat tamayuktam iti gṛhitam.
Yātujañā—Yātujañān jāmim,
Yāvat—Yāvān evāsyā prāṇaḥ.
   Yāvanto vai.
   Yāvad etat.
Yajñīya—Yajñīya yajñīyaṃ pucchaṃ.
Yajña—Yajñīya yajñasya stotre.
Yavāgū—Yavāgū rājanyasya.
Yāyāvaraḥ—Tasmād yāyāvaraḥ.
Yunajate—Yunajate dhiyas tāḥ.
Yuvānaḥ—Etam yuvānam.
Yajathā—Yajathāya sukratuḥ,
   Yajathā yad eva.
Yoyupyeta—Yoyupyeta stṛtiḥ.
Yajatra—Amaṇcatā yajatrāḥ.
   Saṃyajatrair aṅgāni,
Yuktvāya—Yuktvāya manasā devān,
Yavyudhāḥ—Ailabḍāyavyudhāḥ.

Rukmantam rādhayisyāno rājanayaśruc ca rukmate /
Raivataśruti

Rukmantam—Rukmantam svena,
Rādhayisyāma—Yad imam rādhayisyāma iti,
Rājanya—Rajanyo'bhitaḥ. Rājanyāj jāyamānāt,
Rukmate—Rukmate puroḍāsam,
Raivata—Trayastrīṃśāya raivatāya,
   Yad Indrāya raivatāya,
   lapsudino lopāśo¹ lomaśaśrutih //57//

Lapsudināḥ—Urukramāya lapsudināḥ.
Lopāśāḥ—Loḍāśāḥ simhaḥ.
Lomaśa—Lomaśaṃ vai nāma.
Paśavo lomaśāḥ.

Vatsataraśrud varivo varimā vasatīvart varūtriśruti² /
Vipravipaścicchhabdau viveśavārdhrāṇaso varatrās ca //58//
Viḍitavaḍabavanaspitvānaspatyaśruto vasavyaśruti /
Vāsiṣṭhaś ca vaniṣṭhur vasyāṣṭir viṣṭapam vyacīṣṭham ca //59//
Więśadāṁśo viduṣaśrudp viṣuṇasya vidīgayovo vidānaśrut /
Vividāno vidathānāśrudp vīdhuro viṣpatniyai viṣuṇaśrut ///60///
Vāyavyaśaśyāśvānaravīryavidyā₁vasantavāśantikavārṣikāśrut /
Vṛtvāya vālmikavārāhasabdau vītho vāppavyāghravārya-
yasśrutiḥ² ///61///
Vāśavo vāṃsagovo vāhaso vāyavo vasyasiśabdadvad vīrudho
tyām /
Vāghato varttikā viśvato viṣpatiśruc ca vācyāyano
viśvavātāsṛutiḥ ///62///

Vatsatara—Daśabhīr vatsataraiḥ. Vatsatari dākṣiṇā.
Varivaḥ—Sakhabhīyo varivaḥ.
Varimā—Varimā ca me.
Vasattivrī—Vasatīvarīr abhavan.³
Tad vasatīvarīnām.
Varūtri—Varūtryastvetyāha.
Viprāḥ—Vipro ṃutaḥ.
Viprā viprasya.
Vipaścit—Bṛhato vipaścitaḥ.
Bhrājamāno vipaścitā.
Vīveṣa—Viveṣayan ma.
Vārdhrāṇasah—Śitikakṣi vārdhrāṇasah.
Varatā—Saṁ varatā dadhātana.
Viditā—Tigam maḥīddham viditam.
Vaḍāba—Pumāṁsann vaḍabah,
Tasmād vaḍabād dviretaḥ.
Vanaspāti—Vanaspātir devalokam.
Ye vanaspātīnāṁ,
Vānaṃspātyah—Adhir asi vānaṃspātyah.
Vānaṃspātyaḥ khalu.
Vasavya—Bahubhir vasa (vyaiḥ ? khyaiḥ).
Vāsiṣṭhaḥ—Vāsiṣṭho ha sātyahavyaḥ.
Vāniṣṭhuh—Vāniṣṭhurandhābheḥ.⁴
Vāsyāṣṭi—Vāsayāṣṭir asi,
Viṣṭapam—Bradhnaśya viṣṭapam.
Vṛcīṣṭham—Vṛcīṣṭham annam.

₁ C ‘vāṇa’
₂ B ‘śrut’
³ C ‘vat’
⁴ C ‘dhābeḥ’
Vṛṣadaṁśa—Vṛṣadaṁśas te dhātuh
Viduṣa—Viduṣa ete dhayaḥ,
Viduṣa bahiśpavamānah.
Viṣunāsya—Viṣunāsya cāruḥ.
Vidīgayah—Kīkidīvir vidīgayah.
Vidānaḥ—Hotṛṣadane vidānaḥ.
Rabhasam vidānam,
Vividānaḥ—Vasu vividānaḥ.
Vidatha—Ākṣeti vidathā kaviḥ,
Vidathe antareṣām.
Vidhura—Vidhureva rejate.
Viṣpatniyai—Tasyai viṣpatniyai haviḥ.
Viṣūca—Viṣūcīnāni tasya.
Viṣūca evāsmān.
Viṣūcī praharati.
Vāyavya—Vāyavyāḥ kāryāḥ.
Vāyavyaṁ ṣvetam.
Vaiśvānara—Vaiśvānaro naḥ.
Vaiśvānaram dvād asakapālam,
Vīrya—Indriyaṁ vīryam.
Vīryāṇi samārabhya.
Vidyā—Vidyā vai dhīṣaṇā vidyābhiḥ.
Vāsanta—Vāsantās sāraagāḥ.
Vāsantāyāṣṭākapālaḥ.
Vāsanti—Vāsantikāv ṛtū.
Vāṛṣika—Vāṛṣikāv ṛtu.
Vṛtvāya—Tūnyā vṛtvāya.
Valmīka—Yad valmīko‘gnim puriṣyam.
Varāha—Varāho‘yam.
Vītho—Vītho ghṛtasya.
Vapā—Yad vapāgram oṣadhīnām
Vapām ekaḥ.
Vyāghra—Sa yathā vyāghraḥ.
Vyāghrenāranyān.
Varīyasī—Varīyasīṁ evāsmai.
Vasava—Ā yasmin sapta vasavaḥ.
Vamśa—Tigmayūgo na vamśaḥ.
Vāhasa—Pratiśrutkāyai vāhasaḥ.
Vāyavaḥ—Vāyavastha.
Vasyasi—Vasyasiṁ saṁsadam.
Suśrūṣeṇyāṁ śiśriyāṇah śaravyāḥ sabdau śag 1 māṁ sā-ra ṛdaśṛuc chavartāu /
Śrāyantiyaṁ śiṁśumārah 2 samīvāṁ sabdau śundhyāṁ
śambarasya śvitiṅgāḥ / / 63 / /
Sakuntika śayaṇḍakaś ēravasyavaś ca suśruvān /
Śikhaṇḍasaiśiraśrutiś saśipatiś ca sitputaḥ //64//
Śunaśsępam śuṇāśtrā śīrṣaṇyā śuṣmīṇaśrutiḥ /
Śaulbaṇyaṇaś śamayitoś sārdūlāya ca śuṣmayaṁ //65//
Śaucyaśa śoṣucchanaś ca śīśaṇaś 3 sāradaśrutiḥ /
Subhitaṁ sarabhaṁ śryaiṣṭhyam Śreṣṭhaśyāmāka-
sabdavat //66//
Śvitaṇāś śūrathaś 4 śvātṛa 5 sāmitre sākvarasṛutiḥ /
Śaṇḍāya

Suśrūṣeṇyāṁ—Suśrūṣeṇyāṁ manusyebhīyaḥ,
Śiśriyāṇah—Kakubhi śiśriyāṇah. Śiśriyāṇaṁ
vane vane,
Śaravya—Śiva śaravyāya.
Tasya tisrah śaravyāḥ.
Śagmāṁ—Śagmāṁ no vācam,
Śārada—Śāradāv ṛtu,
Prśnayasa trayaś śaḍarāḥ.
Śavartta—Śavartṭāṇuvaddhyena.
Śrāyantīyaṁ—Śrāyantīyaṁ brāhmaśāma,
Śiṁśumāraḥ—Sindhoś śiṁśumāraḥ,

1 B ‘gmam’
2 C ‘śimi’
3 B C ‘śara’
4 B ‘śurudhaḥ’
5 B C ‘trādāmi’
Śamivān—Dhuniś śamivān,
Śamivato bhāminah.
Śundhyūḥ—Uvasvāṃ cchundhyūḥ.
Śambarasya—Daṇḍhitāśā sambarasya.
Śvitiṅga—Saumyās trayaś śvitiṅgāḥ.
Śakuntikā—Iyaṃ yakā śakuntikā.
Śayanḍaka—Saī jáyā śayanḍakah.
Śravasyavah—Śravasyavo ghṛtasya.
Śūśruvān—Śūśruvān grāmaṇīḥ.
Śikhaṇḍa—Indrāgni śīkhaṇḍabhyāṃ.
Śīkhaṇḍebhyas svāhā,
Śaiśira—Śaiśirāv rūṭu.
Śacipati—Krītvā śacipatiḥ.
Śītpuṭa—Bṛhaspataye śītpuṭāḥ.
Śunahśepam—Śunahśepam ājīgarttiḥ.ś
Śunāśirā—Sunāśirāśunam,
Śīrṣaṇyā—Śīrṣaṇyā raśanā. Śīrṣaṇyā niṣpataḥ.
Śuṣmīnāḥ—Anamīvasya śuṣmīnāḥ.
Śaulbāyana—Udaṅkāśa śaulbāyanah.
Śamayitoḥ—Yajamānasya śamayitoḥ.
Śārdūlāya—Śārdūlāya rājne.
Śuṣmayaṃ—Madaṃ ca śuṣmayaṃ.
Śauceyaḥ—Śārvaseniś śauceyaḥ.
Śośucānāḥ—Prthunā śośucānāḥ.
Śīsānaḥ—Śīsāno vrṣabhāḥ.
Śīsāno'gniḥ.
Śāradā—Śāradam rūnāṃ.
Śāradā tvartunā.
Śubhitam—Śubhitam ugra-vr̥tam.
Śarabham—Śarabham aranyam.
Śyaśīṣṭhyāṃ—Śyaśīṣṭhyāṃ samanānāṃ.
Śreṣṭha—Yac chreṣṭho bhavati.
Śyāmāka—Yac chyāmākaḥ.
Śyāmākaṃ carum,
Śvītānāḥ—Sa śvītānas tanyataḥ.
Śūrathāḥ—Śūra'thaś candrāgrāḥ.
Śvāṭrā—Śvāṭrāstha.
Śamitre—Śamitre. Śamita,
Śākvara—Saptapadā Śākvarī.
Yad indrāya Śākvarāya,
Śaṇḍāya—Śaṇḍāya tvā.

śoḍaśaśruo ca

śoḍaśa—Vaijas śoḍaśaḥ.
Indrāya tvā śoḍaśine,
Na vai śoḍaśi.

susāva samayā svarīḥ //67//
Svaśāryas svaraṇam1 sagdhīs svaśārasūtīt sasasti ca /
Sanutas sanitā sakhyam sakhaīyas salilaśrutiḥ //68//
Saceram sūkharas sūcyā sutaumī sumanayāśrutiḥ /
Sālāvṛkṣi sinivāli sāmānyasthāvaramāśrutiḥ2 //69//
Samanā samane samyak somendram sānagast sūrānasūrut3 /
Śṛjñayān śṛmaras sānge śāyuṣyam sādhuyā śīśasāntīḥ //70//
Susupuṣita susuvāṇasamāvatī svarusadasyasamudriya-
śabdavat /

Svadayitā ca sanemisavāmanisthavimatas sarirasya
saniṣyavah //71//

Satrasyardhyān sagarasūrīrasvārasaṅgaṇaśabdāḥ
śabdās subdhān sanavathā sakṛt svānkṛtās4 samśkrtaṁ ca /

Suṇavanyābhīyāṁ savanasadanasvāduśabdāṁ sanīyān
sarnākāya5 svaditasuṇvasvastisābdāṁ svaṃpanam //72//
Sādhāraṇāṁ sardīgṛdīṁ ṣaheyaś sālāvṛkhebhīyaś ca
śarīraḥ pebhīyaḥ /
Samśkrtya sutyān stanayitmusabdāṁ svättam sanānatra
samasya sanāḥ //73//

Sāhantyaśāvītrasapataunsunṛtāsruto7

Susāva—Yam te susāva,
Samaya—Samaya vipṛktah.

1 C 'ṇam śindubh'
2 B C 'vaśru'
3 C 'śṛtrīthī'
4 B 'vākṛ'
5 B C 'sarqūl'
6 B C 'sabbe
7 C 'tā śabdā śruto'
Śvarīḥ—Śvaruraṃatraḥ.
Saśvatiyaḥ—Saśvatiyo survāṇāṃ.
Śvaraṇāṃ—Somānaṃ svaraṇāṃ.
Sagdhī—Sagdhiś ca me. ¹
Svasā—Devānāṃ asi svasā.
Trīṃṣat svasārāḥ.
Sasastī—Sasastyaśvakaḥ.
Sanutaḥ—Sanutar yuyotu.
Sanitā—Sanitāsi saneyam.
Sakhyam—Martaro vṛṇīta sakhyam.
Sakhāyaḥ—Avase sakhyāḥ.
Sakhāyaṃ pariśasvajā.
Salilam—Salilam chandaḥ.
Saceran—Rakṣāṃsi saceran.
Sūkaraḥ—Indrāya rājāe sūkaraḥ.
Sūcyaḥ—Sūcyaḥ chidyamānayaḥ.
Sutānām—Pradivas sutānām.
Sumnayaḥ—Dhīrā deveṣu sumnayāḥ.
Salavṛkī—Sa Indras salavṛkī.
Sinvālī—Sinvālī paurṇamāstī.
Sinvālyai carum.
Sāmānya—Sāmānya āco bhavanti.
Sthāvara—Varuṇaṅghita vai sthāvarā.
Yas tāvarāṇāṃ.
Samanā—Te ācarantī samanā.
Samane—Jayā īyāṃ samane.
Samyaḥ—Amṛtam amṛtena samyaḥ.
Somendram—Etaṃ somendram.
Sānaga—Sānaga ṛṣiḥ.
Suvāna—Suvānas somaḥ.
Śrījayān—Yat śrījayān,
Śrmaraḥ—Aranyāya śrmaraḥ.
Saṅge—Samatsu vṛtrahā (?),
Śāuyjyam—Devatāṇāṃ sāuyjyam gacchati.
Śādhuyā—Rūpam kṛpotu sādhuyā.
Siśasantī—Śrūgaṇī siśasantaḥ,
Suṣupuṣa—Suṣupuṣa indriyam.
Suṣuvāṇa—Varuṇaṁ suṣuvāṇam.
   Diśas suṣuvāṇena.
Samāvati—Tathān¹ samāvattī.
Svaru—Svaruṁ yūpasya.
   Svarum ayajñaveśasāya.
Sadasya—Yāvanto vai sadasyaḥ.
   Sadasyaṁ eva tat pṛṇāti.
Samudriyam—Balam asi samudriyam.
Svadayitā—Pavayitā svadayitā,
Sarnemi—Sarnemy asmat,
Savitmani—Savitmani hiranyapāṇīḥ.
Sthavimataḥ—Sthavimato bāhīḥ.²
Sarirasya—Vi bhrājamāṇas sarirasya.
Saniṣyavah—Medhāsā tā saniṣyavah.
Satrasyardhyā—Satrasyardhyāhavanīyasya.
Sagara—Sagaras sumekah,
   Sagaro vajrīṇo nāmastha.
Suṣira—Yad venos suṣiram,
   Suṣirābhīr bhavati,
Svāra—Svāraṁ svārāt,
Sāraṅga—Sāraṅgās trayāḥ.
Sabda—Sabdas sagaraḥ.
Subdha—Tān subdhān yat,
Sanavatha—Sanavatha pūrṣam.
Sakṛt—Sakṛdyatvā manasā,
Svāṃkṛta—Svāṃkṛto’śi,
Sanaskṛtam—Tan nas saṃskṛtam.
Snāvanyābhyyām—Santatiṁ snāvanyābhyām.
Savana—Mādhyaṁdnaṁ savanam.
   Mādhyaṁdine savane.
Sadana—Sadanaṁ kṛtvā.
   Arṇave sadane sīdā.
Svādu—Svādūḥ.
   Svādiyaḥ.
Svādunā.
Sanīyāṁ—Pracētā amutas sanīyāṁ.
Sarnīkāya—Sarnīkāya tvā.

¹ C ‘tathān’
² C ‘bāhīḥ’
Svadita—Svaditāni vakṣat.
Suvita—Suvitan no astu.
Svasti—Rayīṁ naśate svasti.
Spādyas svastīḥ.
Pramuñcā svastaye (?).
Svapantaṁ—Svapantam vai dikṣitam.
Sādhāraṇam—Sādhāraṇam kurute.
Sardigṛdim—Sardigṛdim parāvadhit.
Sabheyaḥ—Sabheyo yuvā.
Sālavṛkebhyaḥ—Indro yatīṁ sālavṛkebhyaḥ.
Sarīṣpṛebhyaḥ—Sarīṣpṛebhyaḥ svāḥā.
Sāṃskṛtya—Sāriram evo sāṃskṛtya.
Sutyaḥ—Sutyaḥ sampadyate.
Sutyaṁ sampādayati.
Stanayitnu—Arvāṁ tena stanayitnunā.
Svātaḥ—Svāttaṁ citsadevam.
Samānatakaḥ—Tasmāt samānatakaḥ.
Samasya—Manas samasya uḍhyāḥ.
Saṅkāḥ—Isudhis saṅkāḥ,
Sāhantya—Agni eva sāhantyam,
Agnye sāhantyāya,
Viṣvajītsāhantyaḥ.
Sāvitraḥ—Sāvitrām āgrāyāṇāt.
Sāvitrāṇī juhoti.
Sapatna—Sapatnam durmarāyum.
Pranuḍānas sapatnāṁ,
Sūnte—Yajñō vai sūnte.
Yo vai sūnteīai.

haviṣyāṁ ca halīkṣpaśabdaḥ¹ /
²Hemantahotriyahiraṇmayāśruto³ haimantikaśruco ca
hikaṁ hiraṇmayām⁴ //78//

Haviṣyam—Yad dhaviṣyam rtuṣaḥ.
Halīkṣpaḥ—Ūlo halīkṣpaḥ.
Halīkṣpān pāpavātena.
Hemanta—Griñmo hemantaḥ.
Hotrīya—Hotrīyo mārjāltyah.
Hiraṇmayaḥ—Hiraṇmayena savitā.
Yonir hiraṇmayi.
Haimantika—Haimantikāvṛtū.
Haimantikā avaliptaḥ,
Hika—Rājāhikāṃ bhuvaṇānām
Hiraṇmayam—Hiraṇmavaḥ tāna dakṣiṇā.

* Prapāñcaatvād anīṅgyānām dīnmatrām iha darśitam /
Ato’nuktaṃ ca yatkiścid unneyaṃ tan maṁśibhiḥ //75/

* Note—After this the following is written in A and C :
'Eśāniṅgyapadānāṃ padavī sandarśitā 'subhagadhiyā/
Devamāntiśisutena āśīrvaṭsāṅkena taittirīyāṃ//
After this C. reads :
Binduduralipisargavīcikā-
pāṅktibhedapadabhedadūṣaṇām/
Hastavegajam abuddhiprāvakaṃ
kṣantum arhatha saṁkṣya sajjanaḥ//

Śrī guru bhūyo namaḥ.
The Scripts on the Indus Valley Seals
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(containing extracts from the Sumerian and Indian literature throwing light upon the words occurring in the Inscriptions of the Indus Valley, Elam and Crete)
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The Scripts on the Indus Valley Seals

I

Prefatory

The paramount importance for the history of ancient Indian civilization of deciphering the signs, or scripts, engraved upon the large number of seals found at Harappa in the Punjab and Mohenjo-daro in Sindh, as also in Irān and Sumer, had long impressed itself upon my mind. I made up my mind to try and see whether I could discover a clue. I was encouraged from the beginning by my old English friends, and received much help from them, Messrs. Sidney Smith and Gadd of the British Museum were good enough to give me advice, and Prof. S. L. Langdon kindly allowed me to go through a manuscript in which he had already pointed out that the Indus script appeared to be in some way connected with the Brāhmi script of the Aśokan period. This view encouraged me greatly because I had come to the same conclusion though working on different lines. My researches have convinced me that what have previously been regarded as pictographs or ideographs are actually letters or monographs based on characters (Akṣara). I published my first note in the July (1931) issue of the JRAS. As I proceeded with the work I found more and more grounds for the view that the signs on the Indus seals as well as on the inscriptions of Elam and Crete, are merely monograms and could be deciphered if we knew the language in which they are written and the phonetic value of the syllables. As I gained further experience of the signs, I gradually began to improve my readings of the inscriptions. If I venture to suggest a system for deciphering these inscriptions, my only excuse is to invite the co-operation of other scholars. There is for solution a good number of technical questions regarding the monosyllabic nature of the language, phonetic complements, dīngir (god) signs, and the order in which the different syllables in a complicated monogram should be combined as well as others concerning the monograms and the symbols of gods and goddesses which appear to have been borrowed by the Indus people from their neighbours. Though the latter are few, still their origin may prove to be of great value,
I am confident that the Brāhmī script, as far as its origin is concerned, has nothing to do with the Phœnicians. Nor was it imported from Asia Minor. Similarly, the scripts of different parts of India cannot all be traced to the Brāhmī of the Aśokan period. It would be as absurd to do this as to derive all the Prākṛta languages of India from the Prākṛta of Aśoka's time. The origin of the Brāhmī script current in the different provinces of ancient India probably dates from pre-historic times. Some of the characters appear to be closely connected with symbols which were used as far back perhaps as 4,000 B.C. They are closely connected with the proto-Elamite signs, and their phonetic values would not appear to differ very much.

II

THE SIGNS ON THE INDUS SEALS AND THEIR CLASSIFICATION ON A SYLLABIC BASIS*

A close examination of the Indus signs discloses that they may be much reduced in number, provided the radical signs and the strokes are indexed separately. When this is done, the strokes show a remarkable resemblance to the vowel signs used in the earliest Brāhmī writing of southern as well as northern India. We find the same type of resemblance between the Brāhmī consonants and the radical signs of the Indus script. In my paper in the JRAS., I have attempted to show that the signs on the Indus seals could be classified on a script basis, and when reduced to their simple forms they showed a remarkable similarity with the characters known as Brāhmī. I prepared a key also for the guidance of scholars interested in the decipherment of the Indus script. For the last six months I have been struggling to identify the signs on the Indus seals with the help of the proto-Elamite inscriptions. During this interval about 500 punch-marked coins were also examined. One of them contains in pure Indus seals script an inscription reading ni (ya)-Rāma-Raghu-Dusuluda, and one of much later date, an inscription which reads Šrī-Rāma-

* I am thankful to the publisher Mr. Arthur Probsthain for kindly giving me permission to publish the hand-sketches of scripts and other portions of the illustrations contained in the Mohenjo-daro and the Indus Civilization.
Symbols or monograms of the Lord Krishna are numerous.

The sign \( \sigma \) occurs frequently in the Indus inscriptions. On the Nal pottery we also find a somewhat similar sign, \( \Lambda \). In Babylonia a like sign in a reversed position, like \( \Lambda \), was considered one of the most sacred symbols of the Earth-goddess. Prof. Langdon writes in his *Semitic Mythology* that "the supreme importance of this goddess is obvious by the place and nature of her symbol among the emblems of the gods. On Fig. 51 her throne follows those of the trinity, Anu, Enlil, Ea, and supports a curious object, a broad band shaped like the Greek letter \( \Omega \) Omega inverted. On one throne, where it follows the symbols of Marduk and Nebo (first two symbols in third register here), this band lies flat on the throne with ends coiled inward, not outward as here. On other monuments, the Omega symbol stands alone without a throne, and in a position exactly like Omega. This symbol is called *markasu rabu*, 'the great band' of the Esikilla, 'holy house.' The word *markasu* 'band,' 'rope' is employed in Babylonian philosophy for the cosmic principle which unites all things, and is used also in the sense of 'support,' the divine power, and law which hold the universe together. It is employed more often of the god, the first principle, water, Enki-Ea, and of his sons Marduk and Nebo". (p. 109).

In the Minoan inscriptions the symbol is given the pictorial form of a cow's head [ see *ME*, p. 168 (p. 89 G) ]. A similar symbol, like \( \sigma \) occurs widely in the Vedas. The old Vedic school pronounces it *gum*. This pronunciation has no direct connection with any known script of modern times. It led me to take the radical sign \( \sigma \) as *ga*, and the remaining two circles as representing the vowel sign *u*. A careful examination of the northern script of the early period seemed to support the conclusion. The following table may give an idea of how far the identification of the Indus sign \( \sigma \) with *go* is borne out by the Brāhmi scripts current in different provinces. The reference numbers within brackets refer to Bühler's Tables, and the other numbers to the Tables given by Burnell in his *South Indian Palaeography*. 
Table I

Showing how the Indus sign \( \mathfrak{u} \) may be identified with \( \text{gā} \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \mathfrak{u} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \mathfrak{u} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \mathfrak{u} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \mathfrak{u} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \mathfrak{u} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \mathfrak{u} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The identification of \( \text{na} \) with three lines is also based on a comparative study of different scripts current in India. The same method was applied in finding out the values \( \text{sa}, \text{ja}, \text{ra}, \text{la} \), etc. Besides the identification of consonants, I have done my best to identify the vowel signs; but here there is much still to be done. Further it may be noticed that the sign \( \mathfrak{E} \) occurs frequently on the Indus seals, but there it does not give satisfactory results if taken as \( \text{ja} \), whereas in the case of the punch-marked coins this value seems to be applicable. I still hope to solve this difficulty with the help of the proto-Elamite inscriptions. Comparative tables upon which the identification of certain...
Indus signs is based are given below. The numbers in brackets refer to Bühler's Tables, the other numbers refer to the plates in Burnell's *South Indian Palaeography*.

**Table II**

Showing how the Indus signs ▲ and ▼ may be identified with $s$, and the signs ▲ and A with sa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indus</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>Ū</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ⅱ]</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ⅲ]</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indus:</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table III

Showing how the Indus signs ăr and א may be identified with \(\mathfrak{r}\) and \(\mathfrak{l}\).

\[
\begin{array}{cc}
\text{IX} & \mathfrak{r} \\
\text{XII} & \mathfrak{l} \\
\text{XIII} & \mathfrak{r} \\
\text{XIV} & \mathfrak{r} \\
\text{XV} & \mathfrak{r} \\
\text{XVI} & \mathfrak{r} \\
\text{XVII} & \mathfrak{r} \\
\text{XVIII} & \mathfrak{r} \\
\end{array}
\]

**INDUS:** ăr, א

### Table IV

Showing how the sign \(\mathfrak{E}\) found on the punch-marked coins may be identified with \(\mathfrak{p}\).

\[
\begin{array}{cc}
\text{I} & \mathfrak{p} \\
\text{II} & \mathfrak{p} \\
\text{III} & \mathfrak{p} \\
\text{IV} & \mathfrak{p} \\
\text{V} & \mathfrak{p} \\
\text{VI} & \mathfrak{p} \\
\text{VII} & \mathfrak{p} \\
\text{VIII} & \mathfrak{p} \\
\text{IX} & \mathfrak{p} \\
\end{array}
\]

**INDUS:** \(\mathfrak{E}\)
By means of the identifications indicated above, I was able
to read some of the inscriptions on the Indus seals. As I proce-
ded I found that the seals contained the names of gods and goddess-
es, some of which are well-known in Sumerian mythology and
some in the Paurāṇika and the Šāktika cults of India. The
application of these identifications to the reading of the signs on
some of the punch-marked coins convinced me that the method
I was following could not be altogether wrong. The progress made
in this direction may be seen from the following tables. The work is,
however, still far from being complete, owing chiefly to the paucity of

---

**Table V**

Showing how the three big lines and the three small lines found
on the Indus seals may be identified with ṣa (?) and ṇa respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Sign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ūō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>ṇ</td>
<td>ṇ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>ṇa</td>
<td>ṇa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>ṇa</td>
<td>ṇa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>ṇa</td>
<td>ṇa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>ṇa</td>
<td>ṇa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**INDUS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Sign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
THE SCRIPTS ON THE INDUS VALLEY SEALS

materials available. It takes much time to examine the punch-marked coins thoroughly, as they have to be cleaned carefully before an accurate facsimile can be prepared. The syllabary and the system of indexing or classifying the signs upon which my decipherment of inscriptions on the Indus seals is based are given in the following tables (Tables VI and VII). For purposes of transliteration, the Sumerian and Sanskrit equivalents have been noted beneath.

**Table VI**

Indus vowels, consonants and 'god signs.'
Table VII

Indus signs, with components and decipherment suggested.

Notes.—(1) The small Roman figures in the first column represent my serial numbers.

(2) The large Roman figures in the second column refer to the numbers in the sign-list in Sir John Marshall’s volume *Mohenjo-daro and the Indus Civilization*.
III

ANCIENT INDIAN PUNCH-MARKED COINS

Before discussing the decipherment of the inscriptions of the Indus basin as well as those of other countries it is desirable to note a few facts regarding the punch-marked coins which have been found throughout India in considerable quantities. These coins are many thousands in number. The British Museum alone has a collection of more than two thousand. For the history of India they are probably as important as the finds in the Indus basin. My researches lead me to assign these coins to different, and probably widely separated, periods of history. Some of them appear to contain monograms prepared from the syllabic signs current in the later period in Elam. There is a good number of punch-marked coins which bear signs found in the Indus script. The following table will show how the sign $gu$ or $go$ in the Indus script has been preserved on the punch-marked coins.

**Table VIII**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Br. M. Cl. III No. 1</th>
<th>Br. M. Cl. III No. 2</th>
<th>Br. M. Cl. III No. 3</th>
<th>Br. M. Cl. III No. 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image 1" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image 2" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image 3" /></td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image 4" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Br. M. Cl. III No. 5</th>
<th>Br. M. Cl. III No. 6</th>
<th>Br. M. Cl. III No. 7-8</th>
<th>Br. M. Cl. No. 17-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Image 5" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Image 6" /></td>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="Image 7" /></td>
<td><img src="image8.png" alt="Image 8" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Br. M. Cl. III No. 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image9.png" alt="Image 9" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Br. M. Cl. 2, G. II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V. 5, 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Br. M. Cl. 2, G. I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Var. a. No. (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Image 10](image10.png)
There is a large number of coins in the British Museum which bear the 'homo-sign' found in the Indus script; and one homo-sign on a punch-marked coin is exactly the same as those on some of the Indus seals. The following table shows some examples of such signs.

**Table IX**

_Homo-signs as found on the punch-marked coins._

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image of symbols" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image of symbols" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image of symbols" /></td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image of symbols" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Br. M. Cl. 2. G. I. Var. No. 69</th>
<th>Br. M. Cl. 2. G. II. Var. No. 57</th>
<th>Br. M. Cl. 2. G. II. Var. C. M. No. 15</th>
<th>Br. M. Cl. 2. G. II. Var. F. No. 27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Image of symbols" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Image of symbols" /></td>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="Image of symbols" /></td>
<td><img src="image8.png" alt="Image of symbols" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A certain number of punch-marked coins appears to suggest intercourse between India and the western world. Sir Arthur Evans has discussed in his work on the Minoan script a peculiar type of homo-sign which he found to be a popular item on the Egyptian pottery as well as on that of Asia Minor. The following comparative table will give an idea of the importance of the punch-marked coins.
Table X

The homo-sign as found in Asia Minor compared with similar signs found on punch-marked coins

![Diagram showing script comparisons](image-url)
The following punch-marked coins contain what I read as inscriptions.

**Table XI**

Punch-marked coins which appear to contain inscriptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>श्रवण ।</td>
<td>र ।</td>
<td>र ।</td>
<td>र ।</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>र ।</td>
<td>र ।</td>
<td>र ।</td>
<td>र ।</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>र ।</td>
<td>र ।</td>
<td>र ।</td>
<td>र ।</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>र ।</td>
<td>र ।</td>
<td>र ।</td>
<td>र ।</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>र ।</td>
<td>र ।</td>
<td>र ।</td>
<td>र ।</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.*
P.T. refers to the private collection of Mr. Thorburn;
Br.M. refers to the collection of punch-marked coins in the British Museum.

**IV**

**Decipherment of the Linear Inscriptions**

(a) _Decipherment of about eighty Indus Inscriptions_

Before taking up the decipherment of the Indus inscriptions it may be pointed out that there are a few signs, the phonetic values of which have yet to be ascertained. In some cases the Indus inscriptions do not help because the sign occurs only once or twice in them. The method usually followed by me hitherto in identifying doubtful signs has been to compare them with the signs found in the proto-Elamite inscriptions, Fortunately the script of the Indus
basin is not wholly isolated. It appears to have characters derived from the proto-Elamite script.

It may be added that wherever \( a \) is given in the decipherment, its value is uncertain. Similarly the value of \( r \) is doubtful. If the sign in question were read as \( h \) it would give a known word. Signs formed by either one or two big lines sometimes seem to represent \( i \) or \( \bar{i} \) respectively, and sometimes \( a \) and \( \bar{a} \). When these lines are small they always represent the sounds \( i \) and \( \bar{i} \). Similarly there occurs in some cases a very small stroke, I have taken this to represent \( h \). The sign occurring in seals Nos. 199, 188, 135, etc., which has been deciphered as \( sarr \) or \( sarra \) would be more intelligible if it could be read as \( sri \). One bent stroke would in that case represent \( r \) and another \( i \); but I cannot be sure about the latter. Difficulties of this nature will have to be cleared up by future workers. Much depends upon the values to be assigned to the small strokes. Other technical points I shall discuss in a subsequent article, in which I shall attempt to edit the rest of the Indus inscriptions hitherto published. The decipherment of some eighty inscriptions now proposed will serve, I hope, to show the practicability of the system adopted. (See Table XII).\(^1\)

\(^1\) The numbers in the Table refer to the numbers on the plates in Sir John Marshall's *Mohenjo-daro and the Indus Civilization*. 
### Table XII

Selected inscriptions on Indus seals and sealings, with proposed decipherment in Roman characters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Decipherment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>गु-निन-सिना</td>
<td>गु-सिनी</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऋ</td>
<td>गु-निन</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गु-निन-सिना</td>
<td>सिनी</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऋ</td>
<td>गु-निन</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गु-निन-सिना</td>
<td>सिनी</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऋ</td>
<td>गु-निन</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>गु-निन-सिना</td>
<td>सिनी</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऋ</td>
<td>गु-निन</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- The inscriptions are transcribed and translated into Roman characters for easier comparison and analysis.
- The table provides a selection of inscriptions and their proposed decipherments.
- The characters are presented in a format that allows for a clear comparison of the original inscriptions and their translations.
The decipherment of the Indus inscriptions given in the above Table contains only the names of gods and godesses worshipped by the Indus people. It seems that in Sumer, as in India, a god was hardly ever named without some particular epithet. Even in modern times we always say Lord Kṛṣṇa, or Bhagavān Buddha, etc. Removing the epithet, we have the actual name of the god or goddess left. The tradition in this respect seems to have been much the same in Sumer as in India. For instance, the god Lila that appears in the Sumerian pantheon under the name En-Lil, appears in the Indus inscriptions as Go-Lila. If we understand the words go and en to be epithets we can identify the god. The following words often appear before the names of gods and goddesses:

(1) go; (2) nin, ni; (3) nun, nu, no; (4) nana, nanar, na; (5) en, ena; (6) isa, isar, isara, isana, isan, isi, isani; (7) gur, guru; (8) ma; (9) gula. (For the meaning of these words see Appendix, Extract No. VIII).

If the meanings of the words as given in the Appendix be taken into account it will become easy to recognise the proper names of gods and goddesses occurring in the Indus inscriptions. The following comparative table may give some idea of the links between Indian mythology and that of the western countries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indus inscriptions as deciphered by me</th>
<th>Names of gods and goddesses probably referred to</th>
<th>Names as found in Sumerian mythology</th>
<th>Names as found in Indian literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>123 d. Gu-nin-sina</td>
<td>Nin-sina</td>
<td>Ninsinna</td>
<td>Nicīna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229 Sini-isar</td>
<td>Sini</td>
<td>Sin</td>
<td>Sini-vali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Ísal-Nagesa-ninini-isar</td>
<td>Nagesa</td>
<td>Innini</td>
<td>Nageša</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 Sissnah-suresar</td>
<td>Sissna</td>
<td>.........</td>
<td>Śiśna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>465 Gu-nina-isar</td>
<td>Nina</td>
<td>Nina</td>
<td>(Nainā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217 Gu-sasi</td>
<td>Sasi</td>
<td>.........</td>
<td>Śaši</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460 Gula-ni</td>
<td>Gula</td>
<td>Gula</td>
<td>Gula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405 Gu-nura-si* u-isana</td>
<td>Gunura</td>
<td>.........</td>
<td>(Gunūra)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>479 Ni-isa-sarra(srih)</td>
<td>Sarra</td>
<td>Sarra</td>
<td>Śara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Indus inscriptions as deciphered by me</td>
<td>Names of gods and goddesses probably referred to</td>
<td>Names as found in Sumerian mythology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Ni-isar-uo (Gana)</td>
<td>Niśa or Gana</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243, 249</td>
<td>Sinna</td>
<td>Sinna</td>
<td>Sin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541</td>
<td>Gu-issa-nagesa</td>
<td>go-issa</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Guri-nini-muisisih</td>
<td>Guri</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ninisa-isara-ila-i sanbhū</td>
<td>Ila-isa</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>d. Sini-isana</td>
<td>Sini</td>
<td>Sin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>Sini-isar</td>
<td>Sini</td>
<td>Sin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>d. Bau-san-isar-isar</td>
<td>Bau</td>
<td>Bau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Gu-sivah</td>
<td>Siva</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>Gur-līla-sasi</td>
<td>Līla, Sāsi</td>
<td>Līl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>d. Gu-līla-mah</td>
<td>Līla</td>
<td>Līl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Isana-isar</td>
<td>Isana</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Diu-(Du)-sarramu-isar</td>
<td>Diu-(Du)-sarra</td>
<td>Dusar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>Ena (Ea-na)</td>
<td>Ena</td>
<td>Ea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Ma-gah-i</td>
<td>? (Maga, Ma-Gei)</td>
<td>Ge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>Sini-isa.-d. magur</td>
<td>Sini, Magur</td>
<td>Magur, Sin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>Gu-sar-isarra</td>
<td>Isarra, Sa</td>
<td>Isar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>556</td>
<td>Gu-siva-gu-isah-ma</td>
<td>Siva, Guisah</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Sini-isar</td>
<td>Sini</td>
<td>Sin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indus inscriptions as deciphered by me</td>
<td>Names of gods and goddesses probably referred to</td>
<td>Names as found in Sumerian mythology</td>
<td>Names as found in Indian literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Gu-lisar-mama-?</td>
<td>Gulisa</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>Gorisa, Gauriṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220,270 Si-na</td>
<td>Sina</td>
<td>Sin</td>
<td>Šina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154 Gu-sarra-ma</td>
<td>Sarra (Sri)</td>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>Šara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414 Gu-ninini nagesa-mah</td>
<td>Ninini, Nagesa</td>
<td>Innini</td>
<td>Nageṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211 Gu-bu-ninah-mara-isar²</td>
<td>Bu, Nina, Mara</td>
<td>Nīna, Bau</td>
<td>Bhū, Nina, Mara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 Isi-ninih-ma-nagesa (ganesa)</td>
<td>Nini, Nagesa or Ganesa</td>
<td>Ini, Nina</td>
<td>Nini, Nageṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236 Gu-se(sah)</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>Sa, ša</td>
<td>Ṣa, Ṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188 Gula-sama-sarra-</td>
<td>Sama-sarra</td>
<td>Samasa</td>
<td>Camasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 Gu-Ninsara-Ninsala</td>
<td>Ninsara, Ninsala</td>
<td>Ninsala</td>
<td>Šara-ṇi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158 Du (Deva, Dyu-)sarra-(sri)-me (mah)-isar</td>
<td>Du-sarra (Dyu-sri, Deva-sri)</td>
<td>Dusar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>472 Ilamma</td>
<td>Ilamma</td>
<td>Gaga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>476,477 Isar-ga-ga</td>
<td>Gaga</td>
<td>Gaga</td>
<td>Gargara, Ga, Gaganā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Gu-Lila</td>
<td>Lila</td>
<td>Lil</td>
<td>Lila (Lileṣa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Gu-d, Bu-mu (a)-mē-(a)-isar</td>
<td>Bu-mami, Bu-ma</td>
<td>Bau, Mami</td>
<td>Ma-bhū, Bhūmi, Bhūma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Isa-ma-na-isar</td>
<td>Na</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>ṅa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143 Isah-nagesah-mah-isar</td>
<td>Nagesa</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>Nageṣa, Mahēṣa, Mahiṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>537 Sisnna (Isa-sina)-gusa (sri)-isar</td>
<td>Sisnna</td>
<td>......</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Sinna (Sinnisa)</td>
<td>Sinna, Sinnisa</td>
<td>Sin</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316 d, Mah (Ni-Mah, Mah)</td>
<td>Mah</td>
<td>Mah</td>
<td>Mā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>466 Gu-nin-sina-isar</td>
<td>Nin-sins</td>
<td>Nin-sinsna</td>
<td>Nīcina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267 d, Gira</td>
<td>Gira</td>
<td>Gir</td>
<td>Girijā, Gir, Šiva, Maheṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433 Gu-sivah-mah-isar</td>
<td>Siva</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 Ni-sarra-mah (me) ni</td>
<td>Mahni</td>
<td>Mana, Mena</td>
<td>Meni, Mana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indus inscriptions as deciphered by me</td>
<td>Names of gods and goddesses probably referred to</td>
<td>Names as found in Sumerian mythology</td>
<td>Names as found in Indian literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269 Du (Ud)-sarra-mah</td>
<td>Udsarra</td>
<td>Udsar</td>
<td>Mah (Can dra-mas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383 Risi</td>
<td>Risi</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>Risi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447 Du-sarra-mah-mu-sarra</td>
<td>Dusarra-mah</td>
<td>Dusar</td>
<td>Mah, Doga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382 d. Nini (Ninisi, Sinini)</td>
<td>Nini, Sini</td>
<td>Innī, Sin</td>
<td>Sint (Ninā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126 Gu-sinni (sinini)-sasi-isana</td>
<td>Sinni, Sasi</td>
<td>Sin</td>
<td>Sint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Gu-Sesa-isani-isar</td>
<td>Sesa, sini</td>
<td>Sera, sin</td>
<td>Seṣa, Sin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78 Gu-isar-ila-isar</td>
<td>Ila</td>
<td>El</td>
<td>Ila, Ílā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122 [Gu-anu (nu)-iluīh (lūhh) gu-nu ? or d. Gu-d. lūh gu-nu ?]</td>
<td>Guru, Iluīh</td>
<td>Ilōhi</td>
<td>Guru, Anu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199 Gu-sarrā (sṛi)-mah</td>
<td>Sarra</td>
<td>Šara</td>
<td>Sarā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468 Gu-nu-ra-ma-ma (i)-i-ana</td>
<td>Gunura, Mami</td>
<td>Gunur</td>
<td>(Gunūrā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>374 Gu-ri (si)-nini-mah</td>
<td>Gori, Nini</td>
<td>Innī</td>
<td>Gaurī, Nīvā, Nainā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160 Gu-si* (Nin)-gu-Ela</td>
<td>Ela or Ila</td>
<td>El</td>
<td>Ila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168 Isa-na-ge-i</td>
<td>Gei, Naga</td>
<td>Ge</td>
<td>Gir, Naga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234 Gu-Ninnin-gur (h)-Ela</td>
<td>Ninnin, Ela</td>
<td>Innī, El</td>
<td>Ila, Nīnā, Nainā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sarā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350 Nu (sini) *ra-sarra</td>
<td>Nura</td>
<td>Nur, Sara</td>
<td>Indu, Mah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169 Nin-du-sarra-ma-mah</td>
<td>Nindu, Sarra, Dusar</td>
<td>Isar</td>
<td>Īśvara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244 Duva (u)r-Sinna</td>
<td>Duvar, Sinna</td>
<td>Duvar, Sin</td>
<td>Šīna, Śina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440 Bu-Gur-Nu (Guruna)</td>
<td>Bu, Gurnu, Na</td>
<td>Bu, Gurnu</td>
<td>Bhū, Guruv-Ṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107 Gu-sarrā (sṛi)-ma-gu-risa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Gu-i-sa-isa-ah-nagesa</td>
<td>Nagesa</td>
<td>Nagesa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Gu-lisar-Nin-nirisai-isana</td>
<td>Gulisar,</td>
<td>Innī</td>
<td>Gaurīśa,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Gu-lisar-mah-ma-gurila-lu</td>
<td>Golisar,</td>
<td>Magur, Illlu</td>
<td>Gaurīśa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.**—For details in connection with the above names, see Appendix.
The names of gods and goddesses occurring in these inscriptions have been arranged according to Sumerian and Indian mythology, and the references bearing on these names have been appended. What relation the language represented by the Indus seals inscriptions bears to Sanskrit must be left to competent scholars to decide.

(b) A glance at the proto-Elamite and Minoan inscriptions

As far as my researches go, I am inclined to regard the script of Elam as having been the original source of the Indus as well as of the Minoan script. There is no doubt that the proto-Elamite script is more complicated than that of the Indus valley and of the Minoan seals. Want of time has prevented me from devoting more attention to the decipherment of the proto-Elamite inscriptions, which appear to be very important. These inscriptions appear to be written according to a syllabic form of writing, in which each character represents a syllable. According to this system the name Viṣṇu would be written Va-i-sa-na-u. It must be clearly stated that the proposed decipherment of the proto-Elamite and the Minoan inscriptions given in the tables below is purely tentative. I have added in another column some Sanskrit words which seem to bear a resemblance to some of the proto-Elamite and the Minoan words as deciphered by me. It would be quite premature to suggest that a linguistic connection has been disclosed; but if such connection is shown to exist as a result of further research, no documents could be more important for the cultural history of the ancient world than those discovered by the French mission in Elam and by Sir Arthur J. Evans in Crete.
# Table XIII

Proposed decipherment of certain proto-Elamite inscriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Decipherment</th>
<th>MP. PL.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BU-VA-L-SA-NU-SESAM</td>
<td>III, 134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BU-MAMA-SINI-BARRA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM-NA[NI]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-SA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAMA-LILA-ISASPI-SRI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARRA-MM-NOH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BU-BUAH-SVAAH-BARR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-LAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHU- BHU.-SAH.-BARRAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP. PL. II, 154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BU-BU-A-BARRAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHU- BHUH - BARRAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI-NIMA NA SINDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BU-SUA TA TA NA-NIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIN-NINI-NAI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BU-BARRAHMM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHU- BARRAH[MM]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP. PL. IV, 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NINH-ISA-NINHIN-NISA-NIN-NINI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIN-ISA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NINIAA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP. PL. VII, 442</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARRAHM-NILLAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP. PL. IX, 65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-ILA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M- ISA (M- ISALMA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP. PL. VIII, 542</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Table XIV

Proposed decipherment of certain Minoan inscriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Tentative decipherment</th>
<th>Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PL. I. P. 1, c.</td>
<td>गुर्गुर्वु</td>
<td>गुर्गुर्वु</td>
<td>गुर्गुर्वु</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL. I. P. 1, c.</td>
<td>गा. जस</td>
<td>गा. जस</td>
<td>गा. जस</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL. I. P. 2, a.</td>
<td>सानलीसील</td>
<td>सानलीसील</td>
<td>सानलीसील</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL. I. P. 2, c.</td>
<td>सुरीसील</td>
<td>सुरीसील</td>
<td>सुरीसील</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL. I. P. 3, c.</td>
<td>सानसानसार सानसार</td>
<td>सानसानसार सानसार</td>
<td>सानसानसार सानसार</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL. I. P. 1, a.</td>
<td>वी.हरुवी.हरु</td>
<td>वी.हरुवी.हरु</td>
<td>वी.हरुवी.हरु</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL. I. P. 6, a.</td>
<td>वारालविनीवारालविनी</td>
<td>वारालविनीवारालविनी</td>
<td>वारालविनीवारालविनी</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL. I. P. 7, a.</td>
<td>सुर-सुरा सुर-सुरा</td>
<td>सुर-सुरा सुर-सुरा</td>
<td>सुर-सुरा सुर-सुरा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL. I. P. 14</td>
<td>सुर-सुरा</td>
<td>सुर-सुरा</td>
<td>सुर-सुरा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL. I. P. 11, c</td>
<td>सिसा.लावी सिसा.रावी</td>
<td>सिसा.लावी सिसा.रावी</td>
<td>सिसा.लावी सिसा.रावी</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL. I. P. 5</td>
<td>माम.नाना माम.नाना</td>
<td>माम.नाना माम.नाना</td>
<td>माम.नाना माम.नाना</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME. P. 163</td>
<td>बु.सुराम.बु.सुराम.</td>
<td>बु.सुराम.बु.सुराम.</td>
<td>बु.सुराम.बु.सुराम.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME. P. 163</td>
<td>सासी सासी</td>
<td>सासी सासी</td>
<td>सासी सासी</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME. P. 163</td>
<td>लिलाविसा लिलाविसा</td>
<td>लिलाविसा लिलाविसा</td>
<td>लिलाविसा लिलाविसा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME. P. 163</td>
<td>ना.ना निना</td>
<td>ना.ना निना</td>
<td>ना.ना निना</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME. P. 163</td>
<td>इस्सार-वु.दा</td>
<td>इस्सार-वु.दा</td>
<td>इस्सार-वु.दा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Inscription</td>
<td>Tentative decipherment</td>
<td>Suggestions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME.P.163</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>ISI-GULA-9</td>
<td>ईसी-गुला-नीति</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME.P.164</td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>NA-SIN[NI-NISA] NA[NI]-SIN-VA-SU VA(SU)[VI ISA]</td>
<td>स्ना-सिन-वस-सु वसु-सु[विसा]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME.P.164</td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>UILA-155A-1A</td>
<td>उलिया-155-आ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME.P.164</td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>S-I-NA; SANI SINA[S]I</td>
<td>सीश; सानी, सिनाई</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME.P.164</td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>SARRA-BÀ-NI SARRA-BHAHÀ- HI</td>
<td>सार्कर-नी सार्कर-भाई</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME.P.164</td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>SALL[RR]A</td>
<td>साल-, रर</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME.P.164</td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>LILA: LI(A)?-LILA-A LI(A)?-LILA-11 ILA-A BISA A LILA BISA-LILA ISALLU ILLISA</td>
<td>लिला-लिया लिला-लिया लिला बिसा लिला बिसा-लिला इसल्लु इल्लिसा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME.P.165</td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>NI-SI-YUVAI NA SI-VAI LÀ</td>
<td>नी-सी-युवा-ई ना सी-वाई-ला</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME.P.165</td>
<td><img src="image9" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>SASA-M</td>
<td>सासा-म</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME.P.165</td>
<td><img src="image10" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>NI[NA]-M- SIN-ISA-NO?</td>
<td>नी[ना]-म- सिन-इसा-नो?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME.P.166</td>
<td><img src="image11" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>SINA[IN] MÀ SINA[MÀ</td>
<td>सिना[इन]-मा सिना[मा]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME.P.166</td>
<td><img src="image12" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>MINI-I-IA-NI-INI- [MINI]-SA-NINI ILANISA MINI</td>
<td>मिनी-इ-आ-नी-इनी- [मिनी]-सा-निनी इलानिसा मिनी</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME.P.171</td>
<td><img src="image13" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>NA[M]I[SASI] NI[NA]-MÀ</td>
<td>ना[म]ी[सासी] ना[ना]-मा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME.P.174</td>
<td><img src="image14" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>MIR KUR KUR</td>
<td>मिर कुर कुर</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table contains references and inscriptions from the Indus Valley Seals, with tentative decipherments and suggestions in both Roman and Devanagari scripts.
V

The Indus Culture

The question naturally arises, what new light would be shed by the decipherments proposed in Table XII? It appears that a new era in the whole field of research will be started if the system of decipherment suggested can be established to be on the right lines. As illustrating my meaning I may cite the following few points, further research in regard to which is likely to yield far-reaching results.

(1) In the Appendix it is shown how some of the Indian gods like Sina, Sini, Nina, Bhu, Lila, Ila, Isara, etc., bear names similar to certain Sumerian gods and goddesses. This opens a new vista.

(2) The Vedic as well as the Īaurāṇika pantheon will have to be re-examined. When the decipherment of the proto-Elamite inscriptions is accomplished, we shall be in a better position to understand the origin of the Indo-Aryan languages and of the system of writing which has been handed down to later generations.

(3) Hitherto the punch-marked coins of India have not played a part in building up the history of our motherland. This is a field in which the Archaeological Department of India can help much. It is for consideration whether an officer conversant with the details of the proto-Brāhmī script should not be deputed to prepare a correct and complete sign-list, which could be circulated among scholars interested in the work of decipherment. On examining the punch-marked coins in the British Museum, I was much impressed with their value and the important part they may yet play in elucidating the early history of India and the development of the Brāhmī scripts; and I hope the few examples I have cited in this paper will suffice to justify this view. My researches have tended to convince me that the history of the Brāhmī script goes as far back as 3000-4000 B.C., and that its origin is ultimately connected with that of the proto-Elamite script.

(4) The cults of Śiva and the Mother-goddess had already been shown to be very old. It is interesting to find them current as far back as 3000 B.C. In the Purāṇas it is clearly mentioned that the worship of Śiva at one time extended throughout Jambudvīpa; but this statement was little credited. Sir Aurel Stein, in his Archaeological Tour in Gedrosia, referring to figures of humped bulls (the vāhana of Śiva) which he discovered in large numbers at several prehistoric sites in southern Baluchistan, writes as follows:—“Consider-
ing the numbers of these representations of the humped bull and the uniformity of the type throughout all Chalcolithic sites of Markân and Jhalawân it seems difficult not to believe that this animal was, like its Indian counterpart, the ‘Brahmani’ bull, an object of popular reverence, if not of actual worship. If this assumption is right the temptation is obviously great to seek some connexion between that prehistoric worship of the population which occupied the extreme western marches of India before the ‘Aryan’ invasion of Vedic times, and the great rôle played by Śiva’s bull in the Indian cult from a very early period. There is scarcely any indication of such a cult to be found in the oldest Vedic literature. This might lead us to infer that it was an inheritance from much earlier times to which the autochthonous population of northern India with its deeply rooted archaic bent has clung notwithstanding the great transformation brought about in its civilization, racial constitution and language by the triumphant invasion of its northern conquerors. But the subject touched upon is too wide and at present still too speculative to be pursued here further in what is meant for a plain record of antiquarian facts”.


That the Indus inscriptions when deciphered according to the system evolved by me should present the names of gods and goddesses well-known to Sumerian mythology was a matter of astonishment to me, specially to find many of these names in the Vedas. (See the extracts from the texts given in the Appendix). The connection between the Indus basin culture and those of countries much further west seems to be corroborated to some extent by the view expressed by Mr. Ernest Mackay in a paper published in the *Antiquity*. He writes: “The close association of the dove with the cult of the Mother-goddess in Crete, Sumer, and elsewhere in the Near and Middle East, in Sardinia, and even further west, together with the fact that so many models of this bird are found at Mohenjo-daro, leads us further to believe that the goddess whose semi-nude, be-jewelled pottery images are such a feature of Mohenjo-daro and Harappa was also a Mother-goddess. The great respect in which the dove is held even at the present day in Northern India by Muhammadans and Hindus alike is quite possibly a survival of this cult. Perhaps there was a closer connexion than we at present know of between the Sumerian goddess Ninkharsag and the goddess of the Indus Valley people”. (*Antiquity*, Dec. 1931, p. 467).
APPENDIX

I

Names of gods and goddesses occurring in the Indus inscriptions

I GU-NIN-SINA (123); GU-NIN-SIN (466)
    SINA (220); SINA (270); SINNA (243);
    SINNA (249); SINNA (7);
    SIN (112); SIN (91);
    SINI (537); SINI (76); SINI (395);
    SINI (279); SINI (382); SINI (22); SINI (126)
    SASI (217); SASI (224)
    d. MA-GUR (3); GUR-MA or d. SIN-GUR-MA (3)
    d. SIN-GUR (3); SIN-GULA (459)

I UD-SARRA (95); DU-SARRA (158);
    UD-SARRA (350) DU (UD ?)-SARRA (447);
    DU-WARA (244)

I(b) El (40)
    E (I ?) LOIH

EXTRACTS

( 1 )

Sin

"In Accadian it is the Sumerian name of the Moon-god which is
invariably used from first to last in their inscriptions, namely Zu-en,
commonly pronounced Sin. There is no doubt at all concerning the
Sumerian derivation of this name. It occurs twice in Hymyaritic
inscription written S-i-n, clearly the god Sin, where it cannot possibly be
an Arabic name, but an importation from Babylonian...............If
the name Sin is the origin of the word Sinai, Mount Sinai, which
occurs in early documents of the Hebrew scriptures, not earlier than
1000 B.C.; then this mountain range in the extreme north-western
part of Arabia and especially its principal mountain, Horeb, connected
with the worship of the Hebrew gods Yaw and Elohim, must have been an ancient North Arabian centre of Moon worship, and the name itself is taken from the Sumero-Babylonian Sin, after the name had been transmitted to Arabia, and replaced some older Arabic name for 'moon' as the name of these mountains. In any case this Sumerian name of the Moon-god was known to the Hebrews; for it occurs in the names Shenazzar (sixth century) and Shinab, king of Admah; and the Canaanitish cult of the moon was actually favoured by the kings of Judah before the reign of Josiah". (L.S., pp. 5-6).

( 2 )

_Innana, Nanna, Nannar, Ma, Magur, Magulaanna_

"The Sumerian Moon-god, Sin, originally Zuen, 'Knowing lord,' belongs like Utu to the Enlil pantheon. The original and oldest name was Nanna, or Innana, "Lord of Heaven," and written ideographically ses-ki, 'brother of the earth.' The Accadians by false etymology with their word _nannaru_, 'light,' always called this god Nannar. Besides these two titles, which are based upon the moon as a luminary and on his character as god of divination or deity by whose appearances and relations to the stars, omens were derived (Sin), there are other titles, of which the following are of most importance: Udsar, 'the crescent,' the 'new-moon,' hence also 'god of the Boat,' Ma, Magur, and Magula-anna, 'Great boat of Heaven.' 'As god of the new moon the title Asimur is common."—(L.S., p. 152) ; for further information, see L.S., pp. 153-154.

( 3 )

_Dhusurā, Esh-sharā, Dušurā_

"Babylonian influence becomes particularly prominent in the great Nabataean kingdom whose principal capitals were Petra and Damascus and whose history can be traced from their first mention by Ashurbanipal in the middle of the seventh century B.C. to their absorption into the Roman Empire in 106 A.D. They were a North Arabic race who used the Aramaic script, and their principal male deity is Dušurā, rendered into Greek as Dousares, and identified by the Greeks with Dionysus. The name means 'he of Shara' (dhu bārā), i.e., 'he of the mountain range esh-sharā, at Petra, and he is a Sun-god according to Strabo."—(L.S., pp. 15-16).
(4)

Dusares

"As an Arabian Bacchus, Dusares is a Greek and Roman deity; as a god of Fertility, represented by a bātīl, he is a local Arabic Earth and Sun deity; and, as son of virgin Earth-goddess, he is a Babylonian deity."—(L.S., pp. 17-18).

(5)

Ishtar

See L.S., 'Maid of Sin, as cow,' 97, 395 n.25. "Symbol, a star with seven or more rays, 150. As female principle of Anu in founding government, 167 and in the highest heaven, 173. Weeps for destruction of men, 220. Story of her love for Gilgamiš, 256 ff."

(6)

Sin

See the myth concerning the birth of divine calf Amarga from the cow or the Maid of Sin the Moon-godd.—L.S., pp. 96-97.

(7)

Ilāh, II, EL, Elōhim

"According to D. Nielsen the South Arabian deity Ilāh, or II, which is also the common Semitic word for 'god,' and corresponds to the Hebrew and Aramaic deity EL; Elōhim is one of the names of the Moon-god."—L.S., p. 5.

(A)

सिनीवाली

(1) According to Böhtlingk und Roth "सिनीवाली f. 1) N. einer Göttin, welche fruchtbar macht und die Geburt erleichtert ;...मलिनी

वाली जनवति TBr. 1. 7. 2, 1............या पूर्वावाल्म्य सा सिनीवाली योचरा सा कसूँ........

सिनीवालीकसूँवाणित्ति..." See also in the same dictionary the words सिनवालु, सिनीपलि, सिनीवाळक।
(2) According to Monier-Williams “सिनवाळी सिनवाली, f. (of doubtful derivation) N. of a goddess (in R.V. described as broad hipsed, fair-armed, fair-fingered, presiding over secundity and easy birth, and invoked with Sarasvati, Rākā etc.; in A.V. she is called the wife of Viṣṇu; in later Vedic texts she is the presiding deity of the first day of new moon, as Rākā of the actual day of full moon), the first day of new moon when it rises with a scarcely visible crescent, R.V. &c.; N. of a daughter of Āṅgiras, MBh.; of the wife of Dhāṛi and mother of Darśa, BhP.; of Durgā L.; of a river, Mārk P.—Kuḥāśānti, f. N. of a religious ceremony (for averting the evil effects of being born on Siminvali and Kuḥa days), Sanskārak.” [A Sanskrit English Dictionary]. He writes about Sina “सिन. Sina,......provision, store......f. = Siminvali, Kāsikh ;”

(B)
शिन, सिनि

(1) See Böhtlingk und Roth for शिन, सिनि, शिनिवादेशिय, प्रेमिय, प्रेमि, शिनिवाद, शिनिवास, शिनिवास, शिनिवती etc.

(C)
Siminvali
सिनवाली प्रथमके या देवाणामसि स्वस्ता ।
चूल्य ऋष्यमाहं प्रजा देवी सिद्धिनिविनः ॥१॥
या छावायु स्वतंत: छावृम्बा बुढ़ू तुवरी ।
तस्ये विदुरपत्ये दुविः सिनवालेये जुहोतन ॥८॥
व्रतस्वेच्छ ।

(D)
Śina
बैन i.e., बिनाय स्वाहा बैन i.e., बैन प्रस्तवानाय स्वाहा...... । पुज्यदु । स्मृति ॥
स्मृति २० ।

(E)
Maṅgha.

माछी “the day of full moon in the month of Maṅgha” [M. Ws.] see also माश पुरुष, माश माषाय, माष मा, माषवत, माषवन, मा, माषदु ।
THE SCRIPTS ON THE INDUS VALLEY SEALS

(F)  
Dūsara [ =दोर-र ]  
शोक: "दोरा dosha, m. evening, darkness (only Bhp., where personified as one of the 8 Vasus and husband of night, vi, 6, 11, 14)" [M. Ws.]  
श: 'Raz-ra, mfn. (vrā)—n. brightness, splendour" [M. Ws.]  

(G)  
Nānānam Nanā Nānāṃdari.  
नानाम वा उ नै—यहरेद ६. १९०. १.  
कालवंत ततोभिः गुप्तमार्गियो न ता—यहरेद ६. १९२. २.  
नानांदरि सत्राजी—यहरेद. १० इक. ४०.  

II  
Names of gods and goddesses occurring in the Indus inscriptions  

II BU (211); BU (14); BAU (84)  
MA (374); MA (199); MA (414);  
MA (374); MA (433); d. MA (316);  
MA (158; 269); MA (202)  
MAMA (468); MA-MA-A (14);  
MAMA (350)  
MAR (208); MAAR (211)  
NININI or INNINI (3);  
NIN-NIN (234)  
GAI (202);  
GU-LILA (224)  

EXTRACTS  

( I )  

"The order in the official Assyrian theogony places the Earth-mother-goddess dingir-Mah immediately after the Earth-god Enlil, and she was in fact his sister. The supreme importance of this goddess is obvious by the place and nature of her symbol among the emblems of the gods. On Fig. 51 her throne follows those of
the trinity, Anu, Enlil, Ea, and supports a curious object, a band shaped like the Greek letter \( \Omega \), Omega inverted. On throne, where it follows the symbols of Marduk and Nebo (first symbols in third register here) this band lies flat on the throne, ends coiled inward, not outward as here. On other monument Omega symbol stands alone without a throne, and in a position exactly like Omega. This symbol is called markasu rabi, “the great band”, of the Esikilla, “holy house”. The word markasu, “band” “rope” is employed in Babylonian philosophy for the cosmic principle which unites all things, and used also in the sense of “support”, the divine power and law which hold the universe together. It is employed more often of the god of the first principle, water, Enki-Ea, and of his sons, Marduk and Nebo. Ninlil, wife of Enlil, frequently identified with Mah, ruled the constellation Margidda, Ursa Major, the wagon star, which was also called the “band of the Heavens”, because it remains fixed at the pole of the Heavens”. (L.S., p. 109).

\( 2 \)

Ninanna, Nininni, Innini, Aruru, Ninasianna, Ninsianna, Ninsinna, Ninisinna, Gula

“The Earth-goddess, as female principle of An, received the title Ninanna, Nininni, Innini, but, as goddess of child-birth, Nintud, Aruru, Ninhursag, Ninkarrak, and as the planet Venus, Ninanastanna, Ninsianna, Ninsinna, Ninisinna, “Heavenly lady, light of heaven”; as patroness of medicine she was Gula.” (L.S., p. 91).

\( 3 \)

Ninanna, Innini, d.Mah

“In religion and mythology of even greater importance than these three heads of the trinity, Anu, Enlil, and Enki, is the Sumerian Mother-goddess, whose character was so manifold that she became many distinct goddesses. The great and ubiquitous cult of the virgin Earth-goddess in Canaan, Phoenicia, and Syria seems to have been entirely borrowed from Babylonia. As already suggested, the primitive name of this Sumerian goddess seems to have been Ninanna, Innini, “Queen of Heaven”, but the pictograph first used
to write her name represents a serpent twining on a staff. The name probably rests upon the primitive identification with the planet Venus, and upon the theological principle that she was created by Anu, the Heaven-god, as his female counterpart. Three main types of the Earth-goddess, together with their minor manifestations, are clearly recognizable, Innini, the Semitic Ishtar, Mah, 'the mighty goddess,' Accadian Belit-ili, "Queen of the gods," and the underworld goddess Eresh-kigal.

The order in the official Assyrian theogony places the Earth-mother goddess dingir-Mah immediately after the Earth-god Enlil, and she was in fact his sister." (L.S., pp. 108-109).

( 4 )

Gula, Bau, Nin-mah, d. Mah, Ninhursag, Ninmea, Nunusesmea, Nesu

"After the multifarious activities of the Earth-goddess were apportioned to the three major types, for Mah or Belit-ili was reserved in particular the protection and increase of animal life. It was she who, in the teaching of the great theological school of the cult of Enlil and Ninlil of Nippur, created man from clay, and her salient character is the goddess of child-birth. Under a minor form (Gula) she became the patroness of medicine. Essentially an unmarried goddess, her minor types, Bau, Gula, became wives of the sons of Enlil, Ningirsu Ninurta, as Erishkigal became the wife of Nergal, son of Enlil. The official pantheon gives forty-one names for dingir-Mah, among which the scribes indicate five as the most important, These are Ninmah, "Mighty queen," Ninhursag, "Queen of the earth mountain," Nintur (dialectic Sentur), "Queen, the womb," Ninmea, or Nunusesmea, "Queen who allots the fates," and Ninsikilla, "the pure Queen." Under the last title she was the wife of her son Nesu (dialectic Lisi). The god Nesu is known almost entirely by his star Antares in Scorpio, which was also identified with Nebo." (L.S., pp. 109-110).

( 5 )

Arru, Mama, Mami

"Among other titles which appear in the myths are Arru, Nintud, "Queen who bears," Amatudda, "Bearing mother," Amadubad, 'Mother who opens the lap (womb)," and Mama, Mami." (L.S., p. 110).
The Sumerian Earth-mother is repeatedly referred to in Sumerian and Babylonian names as the mother of mankind—Ninmar-ama-dim, "Ninmar" is a creating mother; Amanumunzid, "the mother legitimate seed (has given); Bau-amamu, "Bau is my mother." (L.S., p. 12).

Aruru, Gula, Ishtar, Asdar

According to Professor Langdon the doctrine of Mother-goddess is thoroughly accepted in Babylonian religion. "A poem has the line: 'All creatures with the breath of life are the handiwork of Aruru,' and a prayer begins: "O Gula, the mother, bearer of the dark-headed people." In early Accadian, this mythology is already firmly established among the Semites, although it does not appear to belong to their primitive religion. Ummi-tabat, "My mother is good," Ummu-tabat, "the mother is god" occurs in the fifth century in Babylonia. Asdar-ummi, "Ishtar is my mother"; the latter name is common in Babylonia. Belit-umma-nu, "Belitis is our mother", has the same meaning as "Sarpanit is our mother." Istar-ummi-sarri-ni, "Ishtar is the mother of our king"; Mannu-ki-ummi, 'Who is like the mother?' (L.S., pp. 12-13).

In West Semitic this mythology is apparently almost unknown. In Canaanitish there is only the Phoenician name 'Am, 'Ashtart, "the mother is Ashtoreth." In Hebrew there is no evidence at all. But names of deities in Phoenicia like Melk- 'Ashtart, at Hammon near Tyre, Eshmun-'Ashtart at Carthage, 'Ashtar-Kemosh, of the Moabites, clearly prove that the mother-goddess of the West Semitic races held even a greater place in their religion than the local gods of their most important cults." (L.S., p. 13).

Ininni, Enlil, Lil, Aruru, Gula, Bau, Ilani, Ninlil, Zamama

The entire mythology of Astarte goes back to the Sumerian Ininni-ashdar-Ishtar, goddess of Venus and mother, wife, and lover
of the Sumerian dying god Tammuz. This is inextricably united with the other fundamental Sumerian mythological concept of the Earth-god Enlil, father of mankind, and his sister the Earth-goddess Aruru, Gula, Bau, Ninhursag, Nintud, commonly called in Babylonia Bēlit-ilāni “Queen of the gods”. In certain cults she is also the wife of the Earth-god, as Ninlil, wife of Enlil, at Nippur, or Bau, wife of Ningirsu, son of Enlil, at Lagash, or Zamama, son of Enlil, at Kish". (L. S., p. 14).

(10)

_Innini ; Ninsianna ; Gē ; Uranus_

“In Western Semitic religions ‘Ashtar represents the Sumero-Babylonian Mother-goddess, Gula, Bau, Aruru, etc., rather than Innini-Ninsianna-Ishtar, who is both Venus and the Mother-goddess.’ In Canaanitish religion ‘Ashtar is not the planet Venus. That is clear by the Greek identifications of this goddess with Gē, the earth, sister of Uranus, in Sanchounyathōn, and the regular identification of Astarte with Aphrodite, who is never identified with the planet Venus”. (L. S., p. 15).

(A)

_Mā_

उमाहिषुःभोि श्रारः........ | युजङ्गः | ब्राह्माय ८ | मन्त्र २२ ||

_Māki_

माकी “heaven and earth” [M. Ws.]

_Bhū_

भृष्यं स्त्रृ [Gāyatrī hymn]

_Bau-mā_

मूम is one of the nine Grahas

(B)

_Ni-ma-iṣā, Ni-r-ni-ma-iṣā, Mā-na-gē_

मात्रकभिष्णमावृत्तेन कलिते श्रेष्ठ १ ॥

निमेशा निमेशा च मानसी........ ॥ ६ ॥

श्रीकालोष्टास्तम्नस्रस ३७-३८ ॥
(C)

Bhūma, Bhūmi, Bhūra

मूम, भूमि, भूष all these words occur frequently in the Rgveda. For compare the following verses:

समाने देवाँ इहा वह सादुया योनिन्द्र ग्रिहु।
परि मूम जिव ग्रहतु। श्रृ. 1. 14. 4

See also ग्रहेद, ७ ६२, १ ५, ६६, १२।

Bhūṣan

See Rgveda, १.१७०,२ १, २, २४२ २, २८२, २ ६, ६४, २ १, १५१, २ १०, ४४, २।

III

Names of gods and goddesses occurring in the Indus inscriptions

SISSNA(८९) ;
SIWA(२१०) ;
NAGA-ISA(४१४) ;
GAGA(४७६,४७७)

EXTRACTS

(A)

Śūna

It is mentioned in the Rgveda that Indra destroyed śūna-devas.

चन्द्रवो वच्छत दुरुस्थवेदो अन्निच्छेदः
चतुर्वर्षम्भूत || ग्रहेद. १०. ६५, ३।

Gur

न यात्र इहुः जू जुबुलो न वंदना बतिः वेदानः।
स शर्धवर्णो विजयक्षण स्तोत्राम् स्वस्वेक्षा प्राप्त शुभं नः ||
ग्रहेद ७. २१, २।

(B)

Śiva

The word शिव occurs many times in the Rgveda and the Yajurveda. Examine the passages with a view to see whether it could be taken for a proper name in certain places.
For विष see Rgveda.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>सात</th>
<th>सुफ़</th>
<th>मन्त्र</th>
<th>सात</th>
<th>सुफ़</th>
<th>मन्त्र</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>१८</td>
<td>२६६</td>
<td>२३३</td>
<td>५</td>
<td>६</td>
<td>३</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>१</td>
<td>३११</td>
<td>२६७</td>
<td>१</td>
<td>१६१</td>
<td>१०</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>१</td>
<td>२६७</td>
<td>२६७</td>
<td>२</td>
<td>२</td>
<td>८</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>४</td>
<td>२०</td>
<td>३</td>
<td>५</td>
<td>५</td>
<td>४</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>५</td>
<td>१९६</td>
<td>५</td>
<td>६</td>
<td>६</td>
<td>३</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>६</td>
<td>१९६</td>
<td>५</td>
<td>४</td>
<td>५</td>
<td>३</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>७</td>
<td>६</td>
<td>२३४ १</td>
<td>१०</td>
<td>२४ ६</td>
<td>६</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'७'</td>
<td>१६१ ६</td>
<td>'७'</td>
<td>'७'</td>
<td>'७'</td>
<td>'७'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gaga

Ga-ga:—messenger of Anu (see L. S., p. 298)

Ga

ग : “ग ३. ga ... m. a gandharva or celestial musician” [M. Ws.]

“ग १. ga ... N. of Gaṇḍa” [M. Ws.]

Gaṇa

गाण: “Gaṇa ... a single attendant of Śiva, ... N. of Gaṇeṣ ... troops or classes of inferior deities ...” [M. Ws.]

Gaga-nā, Gagalaisa-iva

गिरोज़ गिरिवा गल्वा मलना गाणासवरी || १३ ||

शीतलाचिन्तनम् || द्व || वाह ३६-३८ ||

Go-śa

Go-śa occurs frequently in the Indus inscriptions. We find similar words occurring in the Rgveda.

Go-śa: —x2,1,1; 10,19,2; 8,21,2; 8,40,2; 5,24,20.

Gauri

The word गौरी also occurs in the Rgveda. Examine the following stanza.

मद्य्यूत्सेवि सादने नागलोकमय बिपरितु।
सोमो गौरी वाचित्वि || मृ. ६, १२, २ ||
IV

Names of gods and goddesses occurring in the Indus inscriptions

SARRA (154); SARRA (199);
SARRA (136); SARRA (188);
SARA (479); SARA or SALA (182);
SARRA (96, 158, 269, 447).
ISAR; ISSURA (169)
ISUM;
NINSAR (3); NI ?-SARRA (135); NIN-SARA (83);
NIN-SALA (83);
GU-NURA (468); NURA-SARRA (136);
d. GIRA (267)

EXTRACTS

(1)

Ishura, Asaru

“Marduk owes his prominence in Babylonian religion and his wide influence upon West Semitic mythology entirely to the political importance of the city Babylon, which became the capital of Sumer and Accad after the Sumerians had almost entirely disappeared. In the ancient pantheon his title was Asar, of unknown meaning, but certainly a minor deity of Eridu, where the ideogram employed in writing his name also had the value ishura, a name of the Grain-goddess. His augmented title Asarri was commonly pronounced Asaru, and explained as ‘the bestower of husbandry’. By origin a vegetation deity and son of the Watergod Enki of Eridu, his sudden appearance at Babylon under the new title Marduk as a Sun-god is still unexplained”. (L.S., p. 155).

(2)

Gira, Ira, Irra

“Under the title Gira, Ira, Irra, Nergal appears in a long Accadian myth known as ‘King of all habitations’ or the ‘Series Irra’, said to have been revealed by night to a scribe Kabti-iläni-Marduk............
THE SCRIPTS ON THE INDUS VALLEY SEALS

It was Ishum, messenger of Irra, who revealed the poem to this scribe". (L.S., p. 137).

For characteristic of Ishum see L.S., p. 148.

(3)

Gir, Girra

Gir, Girra, title of Nergal (early), 93. Word means “fire,” 136. Mythical poem of Gira, 137 ff. See also Irra.

(4)

Ninā, Nanā, Ishara, Istar

L. TI. “It is probable that Ninā gave rise to the name Nanā, who is on this assumption ultimately identical with Ishara, but a divergence in pronouncing the name gave rise to a distinction in attributes. Under the name Ishara the Sumerians retained the ophidian aspects of the old water goddess, and under the name Nanā they retained her as a patroness of flocks and irrigation. At any rate in the period of the dynasty of Ur, Ishara and Nan-a are distinct deities. The name which appears more often is Nanā, and she became under this title one of the most important of the deities”. (p. 48)

(5)

Es-Ha, Es-Ha-NA, Esha, Nanā, Ishara, Scorpio

L. TI. ‘Hommel is, I believe, correct in assuming that the ideogram for Nina was also pronounced ṇs-ha, but the form ṇs-ha-na probably arose by adding an ‘heaven’ to esha, as in the case of Gestin, Usungal, and many other deities who had been identified with stars. The evidence for the pronunciation Ninā is too strong to be rejected, and if Nanā be a corruption of Ninā the evidence is conclusive. The Sumerians pronounced her name both ways, viz. Nin-ā, ‘lady of waters’ which survived as Nanā, and Esha, ‘goddess of the fish-house’, i.e. the sea; after the identification with Scorpio she became Ishana, ‘Heavenly goddess of the fish-house’, a word which survived as Ishara”. (p. 47)

(6)

Ishara, Nina-Ishara, Scorpio

L. TI. “In any case Ishara is a water deity, even in her astral form, since the constellation Scorpio is called ‘Ishara of the sea’,
and in the chapter on the ophidian deities we shall find her connected with the python of the sea. Ninâ-Ishara is, therefore, a type of Mother-goddess connected not only with fresh water but with the ocean as well”. (p. 48)

(7)

Serah, Sahan, Šah'an, Širu

L. TI. “The Sumerian word for serpent is mus, but the theologians give the pronunciation of the ideogram, employed in writing the name of this god, as Serah, which the Semites translated by Šahan or Sah'an, a word for fire. For some obscure reason, the serpent god became a fire-god, for not only was Ningishzida also a sun-god, but a seal cylinder represents the god Širu with rays from his shoulders”. (p. 120)

(A)

Šara

According to the hymns quoted above the fathers of Šar were Šažâpî, Šîtrun, Šatâ, Šunun and Šur. He was also termed Ša, as is clear from Šažâpî. His mother was Šàhurâ the earth-goddess. Whitney has translated Šar as ‘reed,’ The meaning ‘reed’ is not convincing.
(B)

Śera

The following hymn of the Atharva-veda throws further light on the Sumerian serpent-god Śerah’. In the hymn cited below Śerabhaka is clearly mentioned as सप्तासप्तः.


(Ś)

(C)

Giriśa, Giriśa

गिरीश गिरीशा गन्धा......भीकालेविस्तात्मकः।

प. ३६-३७

(8)

“Very primitive seals represent a male deity whose upper parts are human, but whose lower parts are a long coiled serpent, undoubtedly the serpent deity Mush, whose Accadian names Sherah, ‘grain’, ‘vegetation’, and Shahan, ‘fire’ clearly reveal his connection with the generative powers of the earth and the heat of the sun”. (L.S., p. 99).

(9)

Anu, Ninsar

“When Anu had created the heavens,.............He created the Corn-goddess, the goddess of flocks and wine, Ningishzid, Ninsar...... as those who enrich the fixed sacrifices............(L.S., p. 104).
(10)

_Nurra_

_Nurra_ is the god of potters (see _L.S._, p. 105).

(11)

_Ea_

_Ea_ is the god of all mystic learning and the _Mummu_ or creative Word (_L.S._, p. 104).

(12)

_Gu-nura_

L. TI. "For Gunū as a grain, see Ungnad _Orientalische Literaturzeitung_, 1912, 447; Jastrow, _Die Religion Babyloniens und Assyriens_, vol. II, 713.” (p. 11).

L. TI. "Tammuz occurs once again in the same list as Damu of the floods, where his consort is named Gu-nura, probably a type of Ninā, since Gu-nura is the daughter of Ea (SBH, 93, 6). She is called ‘sister of Damu’ in Zimmern, _Kultlieder_, 26, ii, 13” (p. 53).

(13)

_Gu-nura in Bhāgalpur_

I have learned from a reliable authority that a goddess named ‘Gunura,’ or ‘Gunurāy’ is worshipped in the district of Bhāgalpur. From the description given to me it appears that she is an agricultural goddess connected with fertility.
V

Name of a goddess occurring in the Indus inscription

MENI (135)

EXTRACT

(1)

Meni

"A goddess of Fate, whose name is based upon the verb m-n-w, or m-n-j, can be traced throughout Semitic mythology. She appears in Hebrew as Meni in the post-exilic accusation of Deutero-Isaiah:

'As for you who abandon Yaw, forgetful of my holy mount,
Preparing for Gad a table, and filling for Meni spiced wine.'

Etymologically, the form Meni is masculine, but the deity is a goddess and belongs also to the Assyrian pantheon, where Ishtar has the titles 'goddess Minu-anni,' 'Minu-ullu,' she who 'apportions unto men sanction or denial.'—(L.S., p. 21).

(2)

Manajja

"The Nabataean goddess Manawatu, plural of the form Manat, which occurs in Thamudic, i.e., before the Nabataean period, consequently belongs to the old South Arabian pantheon. The Koran writes the name Manatun; and manijat, plural manaja, is an ordinary Arabic word for 'fate,' 'death.' Also zawwa-al-manijat, 'the shears of fate,' supports the evidence from early Arabic and Nabataean inscriptions for assuming that the Arabian Mother-goddess was a goddess who fixed the fates of mankind, of cities, and of nations.'—(L.S., pp. 20-21).

(3)

"In Assyria, at least after the ninth century B.C., and in Babylonia, perhaps from the early period, Ishtar was regarded as the goddess of F. under the title Shimiti, a word for "fate" peculiar to the Accadian language."—(L.S., p. 21).
(4)

"All Mother-goddesses in Babylonian religion appear in this role as Moira, and Bau is addressed, ‘Fate of kings, Lady of Adab.’"

(A)

Meni

मेनि: वलवाघि हि सा महायक्ष्म्य ज्ञिलिहि सा II १४०.६ (४) —१६
मेनि: वरुणा...... II ४००.५ (५) —५५
मेनिराशमन...... II १४०.६ (६) —३६

(B)

कतरे मेनि प्रति से घुमाते य हैं बहाते य हैं वा थरवातु II १००.३६.११.

Mena-kā

मेनका माधवि मद्या मानसी मनोहरिनी II ३ II
भोकालिविलासतन्नम् IIप. ३६-३६ II

VI

Names of gods occurring in the Indus inscriptions

SAN (84) ; SAMA (37) ; GU-SAM (No. XLIX. T. 15)
NI-SAR-GANA or NI-ISAR-GANA (46) ; MAHISAR (143)

EXTRACTS

(1)

"Shamash, Sun-god, 2 ; Shamsu, 2, 4 ; Samsu, 377, n. 7. As female, 4. Rising, fig. 36. God of Justice, 139, 150" etc.—(see L.S., p. 450).

(2)

GADD : SANGU, a class of priests.
(A)

Mahīṣa, Srīṁ, Saṁ, Ga

In the above text हृ and ह are seem to be the same as srīṁ (of the punch-marked coins) and saṁ (of the Indus inscriptions) respectively. Change of sa into ha is not very uncommon. It may be noted that in many of the punch-marked coins ह्र is written ह्र.

(B)

Sa

श-कारण महीशाश्व \( \text{कथितो वकः} \) । २७ ।

Ibid., p. 23.

(C)

Ha

हृ शिशो गर्गवे \( \text{ईतो नामलकोशबिकापत्ति} \) । १२ ।

Ibid., p. 21

(D)

Māra

Māra a well-known god in the Buddhist literature.

VII

Names of gods and goddesses occurring in the Indus inscriptions

Ilamma (412);

d. Sing-gur (3);

Sing-gula (459)
EXTRACTS

(1)

[Ind. Ant., vol. X, 1881, pp. 245, 246]

"As far as I can ascertain, the worship of Hinglās¹ seems to have been the most widely extended of all in Western India. The present Admiralty Chart of the Persian Gulf shews a temple of Hinglās on the Mekran coast which seems to be a well-known landmark. Tod² speaks of this as a favourite resort for pilgrims among the old Rājpūts, and also refers to a place of the same name in Rājputana, which was taken by Lord Lake's army.³ Coming down to the Dekhan we find in the Kolhāpur State a Māmlatdar's district called Gaḍh Hinglāz, so named from the headquarter station, which derives its name from a shrine of the goddess. From a recent paper in this journal⁴ it appears that Hinglāj is the favourite goddess of the Talirājās."

"Yellamma or Ellemma is a very favourite goddess in the Canarese country, and judging from the company she keeps, or rather from the classes that worship her,⁵ she is not a very reputable one. In a list of the wandering tribes of Kolhāpur given at p. 130 of the work above quoted, she is described as the patron goddess of no less than three of these tribes, viz., the Dombaris, the Gols and the Ganthi-chors. I subjoin a cutting from a newspaper regarding a temple of this goddess, which I find in a note-book. Is the extraordinary practice therein referred to still kept up? I remember reading of a similar practice observed by women in Maisur or Kodag (Coorg) which is noted by Mr. R. H. Elliot in his Experiences of a Planter, but I have mislaid the reference:—

"A Hindu Temple is the Jat Jahāgīr.—A correspondent of a mofussil paper states that there is a temple of the goddess Ellamma about a mile distant from the town of Jat, in the Jat Jahāgīr. An

1 It seems possible that Hinglāz may have been not an indigenous, but an imported deity, introduced by the Kshattriyas.
2 Rajasthan, vol. II, pp. 5 and 572 (Madras reprint).
3 Ibid., p. 658.
4 IA, vol. IX. p. 280.
5 She is the same as Reṇukādevī of the Marāṭhās etc., Ed., IA.
annual fair is held in honour of this idol at which about ten thousand people assemble. It has been held there for the last fourteen or fifteen years. Fifteen years ago a Mali or gardener set up the idol⁶ and began to cheat the people by stating that it had appeared there of its own accord. Both men and women visit the temple and worship the idol. The very strange fact regarding this worship is, says the writer, that the worshippers, before commencing their worship, strip naked, apply powdered sandal wood, to their whole bodies, put on the ornaments they may have, hold a small branch of the nimbat tree in their folded hands, and leave their places of residence to visit the idol. After visiting the idol, they go round the temple for a certain number of times. They then leave the temple to bathe in a neighbouring tank. After bathing, they return to the temple, worship the idol and return home."

(Extract from a manuscript note by the late Mr. Robert Sewell, I. C. S.)

"BOUNDARY GODS.—Ellamma or Edai devata worshipped largely through out the whole of southern India. The Tamil Brahmana do not join in this worship. So in the Tamil districts the non-brahmin population alone worships these gods or goddesses. In the Telugu and Kanarese districts, mostly in the latter, the Brahmana join very largely in this worship. Every village has a goddess which has a special name or is called after the village. Patniammman is the goddess of Negapatam; Mundakakanni for Mailapur; Hosuramman for Hosur, etc. Sudra priests enjoy manyams, grants of land, for the worship of the village goddess. Whenever epidemics break out, or once a year before the agricultural operations commence, the Boundary Goddess is worshipped on a large scale. The villagers assemble near her temple and conduct worship for several days—10, 12, 20, 22, as their funds afford, and on the last or closing day, sacrifice of animals is largely made. At midnight the chief priest starts with cooked rice and blood mixed together and goes on distributing these in small balls throughout the

---

1 The principal shrine or temple of Ellamma is at Ugargol near Saundatti in the Belgaum district, and is certainly a very old one, and so probably is the idol. It would be interesting to know the details of its history within recent times. Ed., IA.
village. Before starting on this expedition, the priest gets himself shaved completely and starts naked. On his return he bathes and gets a new cloth.

"When epidemics occur, the Mariyamman’s image, in the form of a palm-leaf image or mud image, is dragged in a village and left at the end at the boundary-limit of the village; then the adjoining village takes it up and drags the chappar in that village and leaves the same at the end of the village. Thus the god or goddess is worshipped in every village on all special occasions."

Man or Manna

Professor Langdon writes:

"An incantation for child-birth contains this same legend of angels descending from heaven with jars of oil and water to lave the body of the ‘hand-maid of the Moon-god’, when in pain she bore the divine calf Amarga.........This myth of the water of life, bread of life, plant of birth, and probably that of the plant of life, also current in Sumerian mythology, is surely the origin of the manna in Hebrew mythology said to be the exudation of the tamarisk. Yaw rained bread from heaven, which the Israelites called man during their wanderings in Sinai; it must have occurred to a people familiar with this Babylonian myth to call the food so miraculously sent by nature ‘bread from Heaven’." (L.S., p. 96, 97).

VIII

Words occurring in the Indus, proto-Elamite and Cretan Seals:

(1)

Gu, Go, Gau

Go has got many meanings in Sanskrit literature. In the Indu inscriptions it seems to convey some lofty or exalted sense. In Sanskrit go-loka means heaven. The most popular name of the god Mahādeva is Gaurīka. This word occurs frequently in the Indus inscriptions. It may refer to a similar god.
(2)

Nin, Ni

According to Mr. Gadd, Nin means "lady, mistress (beltu); but can also be masc. lord, cf. d.nin-gir-su." (SRB., p. 189).

In the Vedas instead of Nin the word ni is frequently used in some cases in the sense of 'lord.' Hitherto this meaning of ni has not been generally recognised. The common custom is to connect it with the predicate. A careful examination of Vedic passages shows that this practice is not always satisfactory; in some cases it spoils the meaning and in others it makes ni practically superfluous. In the Atharvaveda we find mention of Arbudi and Nyarbudi. The prefix ni in Nyarbudi seems to have the meaning of 'lord.' The following passages may be examined:

ति गाबो गोरे असदृशी सुगातो अविष्ठात्।
न्यास्यो नदीं न्यद्या असलिप्तात्। यथवेदौ ६, ५२, २
अर्बुदिनांस यो देव ईशानां मयः। यथवेदौ ११, ६, ४
निवें जज्रे नवति...यथवेदौ ५, १६, ४
निवय: भंज्यो मनसा चरामि। यथवेदौ ६, १०, १४/१
निवों स्मृत्या दुहितरो...यथवेदौ २, १४, २.

Ni [Bhūrṇi]

See Rgveda: १, ४५, २; २, ५२, १४; ६, ५५, १; ६, ५४, २;
६, १७, १; ६, ४१, १; ६, ७२, ४;
१, ६५, २; ३, ५३, २;
३, ५३, २; ६, ५९, ४.

(3)

Nun, Nu, No

According to Mr. Gadd, Nun means "prince, lord (rubū); adj. great, noble, goodly" (SRB., p. 189). In the Vedic literature the words nu and no occur. They are generally taken as personal pronouns. I have seen many passages in which the meaning 'lord' gives better sense. On the punch-marked coins the so-called 'elephant sign' reads to me something like no or nun.
(4)  
*Nama, Nanar, Na*

According to the Sumerian mythology the words *nama* and *nanar* denote some lofty ideas (see Appendix, Extract no. 1-2) In the Paurāṇic and Tāṇtrik cults *Na* is a proper name of the god Śiva.

Originally it may have had some similar meaning. I have not been able to go into the question fully for want of time. The word *nama* is current in Indian languages, and in Hindustani *nānā* is applied to the mother's father. What is its origin? (see also Appendix, Extract no. I-G)

(5)  
*En, Ena*

According to Mr. Gadd, *en* means "lord (belu); adj. noble; abstr. Nam-en, lord-ship (belātū)." The word *ena* occurs frequently in the Vedas. There are passages where it may well be taken in the above sense.

(6)  
*Iśa, Iśar, Iśara, Iśan, Iśana, Iśi, Iśani*

These words are current in the Sanskrit language under slightly different forms. For the meaning of these words current in the Sumerian mythology, see Appendix, Extract no. IV-5.

(7)  
*Gur, Guru*

According to Mr. Gadd, the meaning of *gur* when used as an adjective is 'huge', 'mighty.' The meaning of *guru* in Sanskrit is exactly the same.

(8)  
*Ma, Mu, Mo*

Sumerian *mu* and the Sanskrit *mo* and *ma* do not differ materially in their meanings.

(9)

**Gula**

In the Sumerian language *gula* means ‘great’ or ‘mighty’. It occurs in the Vedas, but its meaning is not well understood. Lord *Kṛṣṇa* is called *Gulā-keśa*. The following passages may be examined:

उद्धुकल सतालात्मरेदद्व जलमुलः।

धर्मवै १.२८. ४।

उद्धुकलाय हुदिता। धर्मवै २, १३, २०।

(10)

**Sīsa**

According to Mr. Gadd, *sī-sa* means “straight, just” (*SRB*, p. 190. see *SI*). It occurs frequently in Cretan as well as in Indus inscriptions. The following passages may be examined:

वेसनावत्न्यार स्थिरयुक्तप्रवृक्षमविचः।

प्रसिद्धुजीतो वादुहृतो व्रतार्थनमिति व्रतवेदः ॥ १ ॥

सीसायावर्गः सीसायाधिपति।

सीसेस म हृत्या प्रायण्णवदुप्र वादुहृतात्मनस् ॥ २ ॥

... ... ... ...

त्यस्य न सीसेन विष्यामो............. ॥ ४ ॥

धर्मवै १, १६।

हृत्य ५ तर्क ५ सिवास्ताम ॥ २ ॥

तैत्तिरीयस्थां तैत्तिरीयस्थां काठ ३, प्र १२, धा ६, वा २६९

वार्षिकास्ति सिवास्ताम ॥ ६ ॥

तैत्तिरीयस्थां काठ ३, प्र १२, धा ६, वा २६६

जपेतु ‘सासी’ त्यस्य मन्त्रे...प्रेत विनियोगाधिकः ॥

तैत्तिरीयस्थां-बाल्यः काठ ३, प्र ७, धा ६, वा २६६

नवमासे रोहे न ते प्रत्र लोक हृद सीस भागवेदः त पुष्पः।

धर्मवै १२, २, ५।
"Sisara. m. N. of a mythical dog (the husband of Saramā), Pār Gr."—M. Ws.

"Iltibasa, as, m., N. of a demon conquered by Indra, Rv. i, 33, 12."—M. Ws.

"Sarabhā, m. a kind of deer or (in latter times) a fabulous animal."—M. Ws.

Sima

1. Sim Pron. Unādis. i, 143 (Sim)... Simḥ. Simṛ े े Simṛmāṣamṛtā े Simṛ Śaṇa on Rv. 8. 4. 1 [Bhōtingk and Roth]

2. See Bhōtingk and Roth for Sim, Simīka, Simīśa, Simirṛtu, Simirṛtritva etc. On Simirṛtritva Bhōtingk and Roth write "Simirṛtritva was bedeutenden könnte Werke nicht anfeindend Tait. Ār. i. 9. 3".

3. Sim I. Simā, mfn. (prob. connected with i. Sama; abl. Simasmāt, dat. Simasmāi, voc. Simā [Padap. Sima, Rv. viii, 41]; n. pl., Sīme) all, every, whole, entire (according to some—Śrestha; according to others=ātman, 'one's self') Rv. [M. Ws. A Sanskrit-English Dictionary.]

ABBREVIATIONS

L. S. = Semitic Mythology by Professor S. H. Langdon (1931).
L. Tl. = Tammuz and Ishtar by Professor S. H. Langdon.
MP. = Mémoires de la Mission Archéologique de Perse, Tome XVII Mission en Susiane sous la direction de MM. R. de Mecquenem et V. Scheil, Textes de Comptabilité proto-Elamites.
Rv. = Rgveda.
GADD. = A Sumerian Reading Book by C. J. Gadd (1924).
INDEX

Abdulla Khan, powerful leader, 488f.
Abdur Rahim, Subedar of Multan, 491
Abhidhamma Piṭaka, 642 ff.
Abhidhāna-ratna-mālā of Halāyudha, 457
Abhijñāna-sakuntala, jālalakṣaṇa in, 654
Abhinavagupta, commentator of Nāṭyaśāstra, 190, (648) 728
Abul Maali, usurper of Kabul, 486f.
Ācāryas, 390, 399, 468 (714) 794
Āḍhaka, a unit of measure for grains, 27 fn.
Āḍideva, minister, and grandfather of Bhaṭṭa Bhavadeva, 453
Āḍi-dharmaphā, king of Tripurā, (717) 797
Āḍiśeṣa, 7 hoods of, 499 fn.
Āḍiśura, 455
Afganistan, (703) 783
Afsal Khan, 362
Agastya, uncle of Viṣavanātha, 339
Agni, Kumāra a form of, 314ff.
Agni Purāṇa, reference to Saṭṭaka in, 170
Agricultural implements, construction of, 22-23
Ahobalapanḍita, nephew of one Mādhavaśārya, 89
Ahobalīya, Telugu grammar, 89
Ahoms, 435, (766) 786
Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, 311, (734) 814
Āïn-i-Akbari, 435
Ajantastru, 310
Ajayasiṃha, son of Laksmaṇa-siṃha, 298 fn.
Akbar, 192, 435, 486ff., (708) 788
attack on Citođ by, 287
Ākand, 404
Ākrūra, son-in-law of Āhuka, 525
Alamgir (Aurangzeb), 56
Alaṇkāra and Guṇaś distinguish- e.l, 58ff.
Alarkand, Arabic translation of Khanḍakhādyaka of Brahmagupta, 147
Alauddin Khilji, 46f.; causes of Citođ expedition 299-300; conquest of, 290f.; his expedition to Citođ, 299; Hindu and Moslem sources for the chronology of the expeditions of, 294-295; rearrangement of the chronology of, 295-96
Al Fazari, writer of Sind-hind, 149
Ali Mardan Khan, Persian Governor, 493
Allahabad, Bell-Capitals at, 216f.
Allahabad-Kośam pillar, edict on, 458ff.
Ālvaśra, meaning of, (645) 725
Amarakoṣa, 315
Amaravati, 633ff.; reliefs of, 224; stūpa of, 640
Ambābāl temple, 198f.
Ambangaṅgā, river in Ceylon, 361
Amīr Khan, Governor of Kabul, 497
Amīr Khusrāw, 248f.
Amitagati, author of Dharmaparikṣā, 515ff
Amitra, considerations for attacking, 470
Amoghavarsa, son of Govinda III 667
Ānandacandra, king of Tāmrapaṭṭana, 38ff.
Ānanda latikā, dramatic poem, 548
Ānandavardhana, author of Dharmaṅyāloka, 541
Ananta Gumphā, decoration of, 224
Ananta-Nārāyana, temple of, 445
Anavasita-Sandhi, meaning of, 359
Ancient India, Coins and Weights in, (689) 769—(702) 782; cultivation in, 19-27; Fire Arms in, 703-8; Notes on ownership of soil in, 658 63
Āṇḍāl, Vaṅgavā poetess, 423
Andhakas, 524 ff.
Andhradeśa, 335, 340; Dharmaṅitra of, 447
Ānṭga, 152
Anunyāsa, authorship of, 418 9
Anuruddha, king of Pagan 700
Anuśāsanaparva, Skanda in, 318
Aparaśīla, 641, 464
Āpastamba Śulva sūtra, 422
Arakan, Candra dynasty of, 37-40, kings reigned in, 37
Āraṇabhitā, ancestor of Dharmarāja, 667
Arjuna, 242; pilgrimage of, 248-50
Arms, classification of 703f.
Arthaśāstra, 381f., 385-6, 389ff.
6 0, 631
Arthavyakti, explanation of, 70-71
Āryabhata, astronomer, 144ff.
Āryabhata II, writer of Mahāsiddhānta, 147
Āryadeva, 634, 638
Arjuna, 353, 353 fn., 372f.
Āryāvarta, boundaries of, 164
Asaf Khan, son of Itmad Dola, 192
Āsana, various forms of, 392-93, 398
Āsana-Simhakośa, Simhakośa king, 153
Ashrafpur, discoveries at, 445
Asita, sage, (656, 736
Āśmaparānta Country, 157
Āśoka, 193-5, 367f., (749) 829f., events contemporaneous with 150-6; rock edicts of, 458f.; Schism pillar edict of 369; Tusaspha’s relation with, 630
Āśoka Rescripts, notes on, 193-5
Asrafpur, discoveries at, 439
Assam, 439f.; land route from Bhutan to, 702
Astronomy, Buddhist priests prohibited from studying, 141-42; studied by Jaina priests, 141
Āsvaghosha, 381 ff., 628
Āsvapati Kaikeya, kṣatriya teacher, 310
Āsvatārāśvi, Buḍila, brahmin disciple of Janaka-Vaidheka, 310
Atisamhitāḥ, meaning of, 405
Ati sandhi, 255
Aurangzeb, 494 ff.
Avadānas, 156
Avalokiteśvara, 695 f.
Avantivarman, 163 ff.
Avatāras, 331-2
Ayaśobhita, 667
Babar, 481ff.
Bakshni Banu, wife of Ibrahim, 486
Bālacandra, son of Śiṃhacandra, 39
Baladeva's pilgrimage, 248-50
Bālāditya 440f.; temple built by, 664
Bālākī, brahmin teacher, 310
Bālakṛṣṭā, Viśvarūpa's commentary on Yājñavalkyasamhitā, 305f.; cow-killing in, 366-7
Balaputra, king of Sumatra, 416
Bala-ārī, mother of Gautamīputra, 117ff.
Bagri, a division of Bengal, 436
Bahadur Shah, Sultan of Guzrat, 287
Balban, emperor, 456
Bākūkin Candra, 436
Bapyaṭa, king of Pūṇḍravardhana, 536
Basarh Capitals, 216ff.
Begar, forced labour, 56
Bell-capital, Assyrian origin of, 226; origin of, 213-45 morphology of, 216-8; Persian origin of, 226-7; theory of the collateral origin of, 236-8; significance of, 222-4
Beluchistan, 489
Bengal, 699; divisions of, 436; (1793-1858), Economic Conditions of, 475-80; Gopāladeva, ruler of, 530-6; 'Kathakatā' in, 558; land-tax in, 478-80; Moslem influences on, (709) 789; use of non-Sanskritic titles in, (708) 788; Raghu's march through, 440; Vijayaśena, ruler of, (761) 681
Bengalee Brāhmaṇas, divisions of, 436
Bengal History, Finger-posts of, 435-57, (703) 783-(709) 789; four periods in, 437 f.; Guptas in, 439-42; Moslems in, 457; Pālas in, 446-50; Senas in, 454-7
Beinier, 475 f.
Bhaddakaccāna, 653 fn. 2
Bhadra, Buddhist monk, 159
Bhadrā, wife of Kuvera, (751) 831
Bhadrabāhaviya Saṃhitā, Jain astronomical work, 139f.
Bhadrabhāhu, preceptor of Candragupta, 139
Bhagadatta, king of Prāgyotisa, 524 (745), 825
Bhagavat-gītā, 95, 96 u., 97f., 358, (656) 736; Vyūha doctrine ignored in, (663) 743
Bhagavadajjukam, 187 ff.
Bhagavat, derivative meaning of 98 fn.
Bhāgavata, Abhinavagupta refers to, (648) 723
Bhāgavata Māhātmya, (645) 725
Bhāgavatism, 96 fn.
Bhagavati sitra, date of, 141
Bhāgavṛtti, 413-19
Bhāgyadevi, daughter of Tuṅga and wife of Rāyapāla, 449
Bhakti, in the Epic, 345-5; *japa* as means to, (676) 756; sense devotion and erotic mysticism in relation to, 346; idea of prasāda and prapatti in, 346
Bharata, 380 ff.; Samrāṭ, 524
Bharata and the Gunaḥs, 77
Bharata-Nāṭyaśāstra, 188
Bharatavākya, 165; Bhagavad-ujjukam and, 187-90; note on, 190-1
Bharatcandra, poet, 451
Bhāratītīrtha, disciple of Vidyātīrtha, 85-7, 91
Bhāmaha, see Bhāravi
Bhāravi, posterior to Bhāmaha, 167-8
Bharhut, Garuḍa-dhvajas in, 238ff.; figure of Kupiro Yakkha at, (750) 830; lotus supports at, (747) 827; lotus symbols in, 214-6
Bhatṭhari, king, 530, 532; grammarian, 414; an author, 413ff.
Bharukaccha, 154
Bhāsa, 329
Bhāskara (astronomer) 146
Bhāskaravarman of Kāmārupa, 439ff.
Bhāskaravarman, (744) 824, (752) 832ff.; Nidhanpur grant of, 439ff.
Bhāsvati, work of Śatānanda, 148
Bhaṭṭa Bhavadeva, persecutor of Buddhism, 453
Bhaṭṭa-Nārāyaṇa, author of Venti-samhāra, 452
Bhavabhūti, 304-5, 307-8, 329, 541
Bhāvanāviveka, Maṇḍana's work, 303 ff.
Bhāvaprakāśa 171; work of Śāradātanaya, 190, (765) 845
Bhavyārāmbhin in Kauṭilya, 472
Bhikṣuṇī-Prātimokṣa, 259
Bhikṣuṇī-Vibhaṅga, 259
Bhilmāl (or Bhīmāl), place name, (753) 833f.
Bhilsa, 15f.; Persian Inscription at, 56
Bhīmasimha, husband of Padmim, 303
Bhimesvarā, 689
Bhīmaka, king of Vidarbha, 525
Bhoja I, 541, 833 (753)f.
Bhoja-prabandha, 539ff.
Bhojarāja, an astronomer and king of Dhāra, 148; an author, 705f.
Bhojavarmān, plate of. 438
Bhūmicchidranyāya (in Kauṭilya) significance of, 385-86
Bhūmisandhī (in Kauṭilya), 394-95
Bhūrīśreṣṭhika, birth place of poet Bharatcandra, 451; Bhursat identified with, 451
Bhuvanesvar, Ananta-Vāsudeva temple at, 452-53
Bhūtivarman, (744) 824; great-grandfather of Bhāskaravarman, (718) 798f.; king of Kāmārupa, 443
Birbhum Rajahs, Zemindari rights of, 476
Bodicitta-vivaraṇa 285; work of Nāgarjuna, 740 (820) 741 (821)
Bodhi Gayā, 699, figure of Indra at, 513f.
Chausa, battle of, (707) 787
Chāyā, meaning of, 543 fn.
Chāyānākā, interpretations on, 543ff.
Chittagong, capital of Govicandra, 533
Cítan-Tārā, identified with Ekajaṭā, 2ff.
Citoḍ, First Sākā of, 287-300
Citrasena, personification of śakti, 129
Citra-śikhaṇḍins, Nārāyaṇa revealed to, (657) 737 ff.
Citra-yajña, drama, 558
Dhanyākara, city, 641
Dhanaśri, 697; identification cf, 700
Dhānyakaṭaka, 639ff., 697ff., 701
Dharmābhuyadaya, work of Meghaprabhācārya, 543, 546ff.
Dhārmāditya, 444
Dharmakirti, 532
Dharmākṣaghosa, 697
Dharma-mahāmātras, 463
Dharmapāla, 532ff., 655; copper-plate of, 437; king of Bengal, 446ff.
Dharmapāla Deva’s inscr., Gopāla mentioned in, 531
Dharmaparīkṣā, work of Amitagati, 515ff.
Dhoyi, author of Pavanadūta, 457; court-poet of Lakṣmaṇasena, 541ff.
Dīgha-Majjhima-Nikāya-dhara, 641ff.
Dīkṣit, age of the Vedas fixed by, 138
Diodorus and Strabo, land-revenue passages in, 387-9
Dīpankara, 448, 454
Divine Weapons, 704-5
Drama, features of Saṭṭaka form of, 169-73
Dramiladvipa, 690, 692
Dravidian, notes on, 176-86; R-sounds of, 176-8
Durvinita, contemporary of Bhāravi, 167
Dūṭāṅgada, work of Subhaṭa, 537ff.
Dvīṭhagāmaṇṭi, Mahāthūpa of, 653
Dvaidhibhāva, 253ff., 396; some advantages of Sandhi in, 254
Dvārāvati, capital of Anarta, 523
Dvyartha-kvāya, 435
Dacca, Balban at, (705) 785
Daddadevi, wife of Gopāla, (750) 830ff.
Dakṣiṇa Kośala, 635ff.
Dakṣināpatha, 639
Dāmodara, Chittagong plate of, 438
Dāmodara Miśra, 538ff.
Danuj Rai, Hindu Rājā, (705) 785
Danḍin, 57f., 329
Danḍopanata, 468
Danḍopanāyivṛttam, English rendering of, 403-4
Dantidurga, successor of Indrarāja, (753) 833ff
Danujamardana, king, (704) 784ff, (706) 786ff.
Danuja Rai, Hindu Rājā of Sonārgoan, 456
Daśāvatāra Temple (Pagan), Śūrya Icon from, 331-333
Daśakrodhas, Tantra of, 690
Daśaratha Adavadi plate of, 438
Daud Shah, last Pathan king of Bengal, (707) 787
Delhi Empire (pre-Mughal period), administration of, 41-54
Devapāla, Munger plate of, 437
Devapāla, Somapura vihāra founded by, 446
Devikoṭa, place name, 697, 699; identification of, 700
Early Viṣṇuism and Nārāyaṇiya Worship, 93-116, 343-58, (655) 735—(679) 759
East Bengal, Muslim influence in, (705) 785
Ekāṁtins, characteristics of, (672) 752f.; religious system of, 357-8
Ellora, Skanda mentioned in a relief at, 309
Emperor Muhammad Shah, an inscr. dated in the reign of, 410-12
Epic, ‘bhakti’ in, 345-6; on Viṣṇu or Vaiṣṇava sect in, 344; Viṣṇu-worship in, 97f.; 113, 115, 343
Fa Hien, 503f.; Tamluk mentioned by, 443
Firuz Shah Tughlak, (704) 784
Gopāla Deva of Bengal, 530-6
Gāhādvālas, 449f.; matrimonial Union of Varmans with, 400
Gajanāsā, island of, 690
Gauḍavyūha, 641; Dhānyakara mentioned in, 639
Gandhāra, Buddha images in, 500ff.
Gaṅgā, 315, 361; significance of, 358ff.
Gaṅgādeva, successor of Nāṇya-deva and identified with Gaṅgeyadeva, (681) 761
Gaṅgādevi, wife of Virakampana, 338-9
Gaṅgādhara, father of Viśvanātha, 339
Gaṅgeyadeva, father of Karna, (681) 761
Gaṅgini, location of, (743) 823f.
Guruḍa, 438, 690; Viṣṇu associated with, 219; as a yakṣa, 219 fn.
Guruḍavāhana, contemporary of Rāmānuja, (650) 730
Gaud, 435, (683) 763f., (704) 784, (706) 786f.; conquered by Harṣadeva, 536
Gautama Gaṅghadeva, translator of Madhyamāgama, 655
Gautamiputra, 117ff.
Gayā, a Buddhist centre, 449; Kṛṣṇadvarikā temple inscr. at, 449; Vanadeva inscr. at, 449; Viṣṇupāda temple at, 449
Ghoswara, Buddhist shrines at, 447
Gītā, date of, 311-12; Skanda in, 311
Gītā-Govinda, 457, 568f.
Goa, a Buddhist centre, 692-3
Goṇagāma, port of Ceylon, 653 fn. 2
Gopacandra, 444
Gopāla, king of Bengal, 446f., 530f.; (751) 831-(753) 833
Gopāla III, son and successor of Kumārapāla, 448
Gopāla-keli-candrikā, work of Rāmakṛṣṇa, 568
Gopikābhīṣeka, author of, 340
Gorakṣa-sampradāya, 686
Govindačandra, son of Vimala Candra, 530, 532f.
Govindacandra, Gāhaḍavāla king, 449
Govindacandra, king of Kanauj, (689) 769
Govindacandra Haricandra, Inscriptions of, 34-6; a short account of, 34f.
Govinda III, regnal year of, 667
Govinda Das, Karcā of, 633
Govagāma, 653 fn. 2
Guḍimallam Liṅgam, (730) 830
Guhilotes, a tribe of Rajputana, 298fn.
Gulta, Pathan inscr. at, (704) 784
Gūnas, Daṅḍin’s conception of, 57-7
Gūnābhīnivesa, rendering of, 392
Gūnākara, translator, (740) 820
Gūnavarman, king of Campakapura, 518
Gupta coins, 437, 439
Guptas, capital of, 441-2; religion professed by, 441
Gurava Miśra, Pāla minister, 447
Gurjjaras, Pālas defeated by, 447
Gurjara Pratihāras, (753) 833ff
Gwalior State, Persian inscriptions in, 55-6
Haidar Kasim Kohbar, 486
Haimavata, 616
Halāyuḍha, minister of Laksmana-sena, 457
Hāluḍ-dāsas, account of (725) 805
Hanūmān nāṭaka, same as Mahānāṭaka, 537ff.
Haridatta, author of Padmamāṇjari, 417

Hardwar, location of Veṅkaṭācala from, 245-53
Haribhaṅja, temple of, 697
Hari Ghosh, minister of Vallālāsena, 456
Harihara II, 78ff.
Harikela, a place name, 453f.
Harinegamasi, identified with ‘Nemaso’ in Mathura plate, 313
Harivarman, king of Bengal, 453
Hṛṣa, king of Kāmarūpa and contemporary of Gopāla, 531
Hṛṣādeva, king of Kashmir, 531
Hastiśaila, 246
Hāṭakesvaraśiva, (718) 798
Hayagriva, 690
Heruka-tantras, 690
Hevajra, temple of, 690
Hevajratantra, 690; Lāmās in, 7
Hīna-sandhi, 253f.
Hīnayāna Buddhism, ‘conversion’ in, 652
Hindu Revenue System, some technical terms in, 384-9
Hiranyagarbha, gift of, (753) 833f.
Hiuen Tsang, 443, 798 (718); Koṅgada described by 665; Samatata visited by, 443
Humayun, 484f., (707) 787
Hūṇas, 166
Husain Shah, inscriptions of, (706) 786
Ibn Batuta, 692, 692fn.
Ikhtiyar-ud-din, 435, 449; founder of Pathan rule in Bengal, (703) 783ff.
India and Hellenistic countries, cultural relation between, 227-9
Indian art, Persepolitan influence on, 231-2
Indian Astronomy, a short chronology of, 137-49; foreign influence on, 148-9, 164, 311
Indra, author of Anunyāsa, 418
Indrabhūti, palace of, 688
Indraliṅga, birth-place of Buddha-gupta, 686
Indrapāla grant, ‘uparikara’ mentioned in, 384-5
Indus Valley culture, 421ff.
Institutes of Akbar, nine of the Siddhāntas mentioned in, 141-2
Iṣṭakā, origin of, (735) 815 (737) 817
Itmad Dola, father of Nur Mahal, 192
Jacobi, date of Mahāvīra’s death fixed by, 140
Jaggayyapeta, stūpas at, 633
Jahangir, 492ff.
Jaintia perganah, Brāhmaṇa family settled in, (716) 796f.
Jālalakkhaṇa, meaning of, 366
Jālandhara, centre of Tantrik activity, 5
Janaka-Vaideha, Kṣatriya king, 310
Jarāsandha, Bhogas defeated by, 525; Sāmrājya of, 524-5
Jātavarman, Yādava family of, 451
Jayaccandra, king, (680) 760, (688) 768fn.
Jayadeva, Gīta-Govinda of, 457, 568f.; inscr. of, 443
Jayanta, king of Puṇḍravardhana, 536fn.
Jayadratha Yāmala, Saṭaka, III, text of, 12-15
Jayānanda, translator of Bodhipuṭṭhavaraṇa, (740) 820f.
Jayanāga, king, 439, 442, (753) 833
Jayadratha Yāmala, Tāntrik schools mentioned in, 5ff.
Jayatuṅga varṣa, 445
Jinas, hair and Uṣṇīṣa on head of, 669-73
Jivasiddhi, Lagna in the opinion of, 169
Jānakāśyapastūpa, 698
Jyoṭisa Vedāṅga, earliest Hindu astronomical work, 138f.
Kaḍalvaṇan, epithet of Viṣṇu, 370f.
Kahora, birth place of one Nāgārjuna, 637
Kaivarttas, 447f.; account of, (725) 805f.
Kālacakra-tantra, 690
Kālāmukhas or Kāpālikas, 131, 133
Kālidāsa, 365fn., 541, 655
Kāluvāki, mother of Tīvra, 459, 462
Kalyāṇadhana, technical term of revenue, 389
Kamalā-vilāsa, work of Śivanārāyaṇa, 569
Kāmandaki, Buddhist nun, 305
Kāmarūpa, 443, 448, (683) 763, (718) 798f., (745) 825, Brahmāpāla dynasty in, 450; centre of Tantric activity, 5; inscriptions of, 437f.
Kāmarūpasāsana-vati, 443
Kanāripa, disciple of Tāntrik Nāgārjuna, 638
Kanauj, capital of Maukharis, 442; Rāṣṭrakūṭa families settled n, 450
Kandahar, 482ff.
Kāñhoji Jēdhé, deshmukh of Bhor, 362
Kāntideva, persecutor of Buddhism, 454; plates of, 438
Kāntipurā, ancient name of Kāṭ-
manḍu, (741) 821ff.
Kāpālikas, Lokāyatas and, 125-
37; Rāmānuja's account of, 131-2
Karavīra-Mahātmya, 199
Karcā, work of Govinda Das, 683
Karna, a Cālukya king, 199 242; a Cedi king, 449, 451ff.; Mālava
conquered by (682) 762ff.
Karṇāṁṛtam, work of Lilāśuka,
327
Karṇāsuvarṇa, 435ff., 442. 444, (743) 823, (745) 825, (752) 832
Karpūramaṅjarī, 170
Kārṣāpana, (693) 773ff.
Kārttikeya, 314ff.
Karttipura, identified with Kum-
on, 440
Kāśīka, 415ff., 419ff.
Kāśmir, 489ff., 653, 706 n. (650)
730 Ānandavardhana flourished
at, 541
Kāśikāvivaraṇapaṇiṣṭikā, 413, 418
Kāṭhamaṇḍapa (or Kāṭmanḍu),
name of, on antiquity of 741
(821)—742 (822)
Kātantarapiśīṭa, work of Śripati-
datta, 417
Kathāvatthu, 643ff.; age of, a few
evidences on, 367-70; traces
of Mahāyānic influence in, 369
Kāṭmanḍu, Mallas at, 742 (822)
Kāṭyāyana, 658ff.; Māṇḍa as under-
stood by, (695) 775
Koṭālipāḍā, discoveries at, 444
Kauṁudi-mahotsava, 164
Kauśikī, identified with Kośī, 250
Kauṭiliya, Studies in, 464-74;
(709) 789-(715) 795; dvaidh-
bhāva in, 253-8; English trans-
lation of 389-410; weapons
mentioned in, 704ff.
K'ien lung, Chinese king, 684fn.
Kṛttivarman, a Candel king, 451
Kolīs, Hindu weaver class at Bhil-
sa, 56
Kondāna, date of Maratha acquisi-
tion of, 363-4
Koṅgada, Sailodbhava rules of,
665-8
Koṅgada-maṇḍala, 668
Koṅkaṇa, 690ff.
Kośikā, location of, (743) 823
Kotwal, function of, 49
Kriyāsaṅgrahapaṇiṣṭikā, 262
Kṛśāśva, 380ff.
Kṛṣṇa. Viṣṇu in the form of, 152
Kṛṣṇā, river, 633
Kṛṣṇācārya, 697
Kṛṣṇala, (696) 776ff.
Kṛṣṇa Miśra, author of Prabodha-
candrodaya, 451
Kṛṣṇanātha, author of Ānandā-
lakikā, 548; follower of Siddha-
sampradāya, 686
Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva worship, 343ff.
Kṣāra, technical term of revenue,
389
Kṣatrapa-Kuṣāṇa pillars, decora-
tion of, 224
Kubjikā-tantra, 2-3
Kulapāṇiṣṭ, 435ff.
Kumāragupta, 439, 441
Kumbhalgaḍh Praṣasti, an account of the first Moslem invasion of Citoḍ, 288f.
Kulaśekhara, problem of, 319-30
Kulaśekhara Aṭavār, 321, 342; date of, (644) 724—(654) 734
Kumāradevi, wife of Govinda Candra, 449
Kumārapāla, son of Rāmapāla, 448
Kumārapālabhadra, a king, 699
Kumārapāladeva, a Cālukyan prince, 549
Kumārila, 304, 325f.
Kuntibhoja, king of Mālava, 524
Kusumapura, 164ff.
Kuśinagara, location of, 702
Laghu-māṇasa, work of Muṇjāla, 147
Lajjadevi, wife of Vigrahapāla I, 449
Lakkhaṇa Suttanta, thirty-two signs of Buddha mentioned in. 499, 512
Lakṣmaṇasena, king of Bengal, 448f., 155f., (686) 766f.
Lakṣmaṇasinha, successor of Ratnasinha, 298f.
Lakṣmi, 158, 164, 443-4
Lakṣmi Narasimhamalla, king, 741 (821)f.
Lakṣmīnātha, 445
Lalitāditya Muktāpīḍa king of Kāśmir, 534
Lalitagiri hill, Māṭrēkā images on, 436
Lalla, a disciple of Āryabhāṭa 146
Lāmās, language of, 9f.; originally Tāntrik adepts but later on converted into goddesses, 8 practices of, 6f.
Lāṅgalavenṭi, fort of, 34ff.
Lāṭa, brāhmaṇas from, 452
Leḍḍu, derivation of, (736) 816
Leh, Buddhist country, 689
Lha-mo, Tāntrik goddess, 7-8
Lilāsūka, 334f., 339f.; contemporary of Kulaśekara, 327f.
Lokanātha, 444f.; copper-plate of, 439
Lokavīra, friend of Kulaśekhara, (651) 731
Lokāyatikaś and Kāpālikas, 125-37
Lotus-capital, origin of, (747) 827-(750) 830
Lotus supports morphology of, 216-8
Kāveripaṭṭana, 178f.
Kāvyā-māṁśā, work of Rājaśekhara, 542
Kāvyasaṅhāra, meaning of, 188fn.
Kelāniyā, town in Ceylon, 361
Kerala, 335f.; Kulaśekhara of, 319-30
Keśava, a Sena king, 456
Khalimpur grant, 444, 446, 448ff.
Khaṣarpāṇa, 530; seat of Avalokiteśvara, 697, 699f.
Khirāj, 478
Khorasan, 481, 484
Madagascar, 695ff.
Madanapala, 447ff., (681) 768
Madanotsavā, Lokāyatika festival, 136
Madhainagar grant of Lakṣaṇasena 455f.
Mādhava, younger brother of Dharmarāja, 666
Mādhavācārya, 336; Vidyāranya and, 82-3, 88-92
Mādhavavarman, Ganjam plate of, 444
Mādhava-Vidyāranya theory, origin of, 78-92
Mudhasūdana Miṣra, 538ff.
Mādhurya (guṇa), explanation of, 65-8
Magadha, ancient Pāla headquarters, 446ff.
Mahājanakajātaka, Maṇimekhalā in accounts of, 174
Mahāmāyūrī, goddess, 637
Mahān, Rāṣṭrakūṭa chief of Aṅga, 449ff.
Mahānātaka, Problem of, 537-626
Mahāpurūṣa, identified with Viṣṇu-Nrāyaṇa, 348, 351
Mahāpurūṣa-lakṣaṇas, 499ff., 654
Mahāsaṅgha, note on, 647-8
Mahāsaṅghikas, 370, 645ff.
Mahāsenā, 313ff., six headed figure of, 499 fn.
Mahāsthāna (=Paṇḍravaradha), discoveries at, 439
Mahāsthānagah inscr., 451
Mahāvāṃśa, 369, 651ff. centres of Buddhism mentioned in, 653
Mahāvīra, 313, death of, 140
Mahāyānists, Prātimokṣasūtra of, 260
Mahendrapāla, 450; Magadha conquered by, 447
Mahipāla, Bangarh grant of, 447
Mahīśāsaka, 64f.
Māhīśyas, account of, (735) 805
Mahmud Lodi, (706) 786
Mahmud Shah, Dhorail inscr. of the reign of, 17-8
Mahodaya, Early Capital of Gura Pratihar of, (753) 833° (756) 836
Malladeva, son of Nāṇyadeva, (688) 768 fn.
Mallia plates, 339, 442
Maṇḍana, Suresvara and Bhavabhūti: the Problem of their Indentity, 301-8
Maṇḍana Miṣra and Suresvarācārya, note on, 632
Maṇimaṇjarī, work of Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍit, 632
Maṇimaṇjarībhedini, 81
Maṇimekhalā, information about, 173-5, 371f.
Maṇjuśrīnūlakalpa, 636ff.
Māṅgala, Nambutiri, name of, 465fn.
Manuṣa, Parāśara on, 18; preparation and application of, 18-22; Bhūtasaṃhitā, Agnipuruṣa, Arthaśāstra etc. on, 20-22
Manusāṃhitā, weight-metres in, (689) 769ff.
Māsa, varieties of, (633) 773: importance of, (693) 773ff.
Matsyendranātha, (741) 821, (745) 825
Maukharī dynasty, Iśānavarman of, 440
Mauryan art, Hellenistic influence on, 234-6
Megasthenes, 387, 658ff., (767) 847f.
Meghaprabhācārya, author of Dharmabhūyadaya, 543
Meherunnis and Jehangir, note on, 191-2
Merada, (746) 826-(747) 827
Mihirakula, 166, 664
Mir Kasim, 479
Mithilā, king Nānyadeva of, (679) 759-689 769
Mohammed Ibn Ibrahim Al-Fazari translator of Brāhmaśphuṭasiddhānta, 147
Muditakuvalayāśva, drama, (680) 760
Mudrārākṣasa, residence of the author of, 163-4
Mudrārākṣasa, date of, 163-9, 629
Mughals, 480; Frontier Problem of, 481-98
Muhammadans, land-holding under, 475
Muhammad Ādil Shāh, Sultan of Bijapur, 362
Muhammad Shah, Mughal emperor of Delhi, 411
Muhammad Taki Khan, deputy governor of Orissa, 826 (745f.)
Muhammad Tughlaq, Delhi Empire during the reign of, 44ff.
Mukundamāla, work of Kulaśekhara, (650) 730ff.
Muñjāla, an astronomer, 147-8
Murshid Kuli Khan, deputy governor of Orissa, (747) 827; Nadia Conquest of, 435
Nāgara Brāhmaṇas, original seat of, (719) 799
Nāgārjuna, 693; Bodhicittavivarana of, (740) 820; date of, 638 n.; place of residence of, 634-6
Nāgārjunikoṇḍa inscr., notes on, 633 53; Andhaka schools mentioned in, 648 9; doctrines in, 649-50; pañcamālukas men-
tioned in, 640-6; Schools of Buddhism mentioned in, 646-8
Nāhāpana, date of his reign discussed, 118-24, extent of his kingdom, 121
Nālandā, 441, 446f., 637; plates discovered at, 437, 439, 443f.; temple at, 664
Nānāghiāt Cave inscr., 'Cāṇḍasatānaṃ' in, 412
Nānyadeva, king of Mithilā, (679) 759ff.
Nārada 501; Nārāyaṇīya and, (655) 735f. (658) 738f., (672) 752f., (696) 776
Nāradatirtha, a heretical teacher, 689
Nara-Nārāyaṇa, 349, 350ff.
Narasīnhadeva, 569; grandson of Nānyadeva, (686) 766
Nārāyaṇa, 161-2, 347, 351, 501; explanation suggested of, 348-9; origin and history of, 346-7; significance of the compos- site origin of, 354-5
Nārāyaṇabhadra, sāmanta, 444 (752) 832
Nārāyaṇa Datta, minister of Laksmaṇasena, 456
Nārāyaṇapāla, king of Bengal, 446ff
Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍit, son of Trivikrama Paṇḍit and author of Maṇi- mahājari, 632
Nārāyaṇīya, antiquity of, (665) 745; bhakti in, (671) 751; Christian ideas in, (669) 749; historical backgrounds of, 101-11; Ekānta-dharma in, (664) 744f.; teaching of, (666) 746f.; uparicara-
vasu in, (656) 736f.; worship in, 343f.
Nāstikas, identified with Lokāyatikas, 132
Naṭasūtras, 380f.
Naṭeṣāvariyogins, 687
Nāṭ-hlaung Kyaung temple, Viṣṇu
Sūrya icon in, 331
Nāṭhapanthins, 686ff.
Nāṭyaadarpāṇa, Saṭṭaka defined in, 171-2
Nāṭyaśāstra, problems of, 380-83
Neminātha, inscribed image of, 439
Nidhanpur grant, 444
Nidhanpur plates, Brahommottara
mentioned in, (743) 823
Nighaṇṭu, 378; Nirukta different
from, (730) 810 fn.
Nirukta, (760) 840; see Nighaṇṭu
Nṛsiṃha, commentator of Sūrya-
siddhānta, 147
Nurjehan, 192
Nur Mahal, daughter of Itmad
Dola, 192
Nusrat Shah, son and successor of
Husain Shah, (706) 786
Nyāyakandalt of Śrīdhara, com-
mentary on Vaiśeṣika Philo-
sophy, 451
Ojas, note on, 72-3
Pabbajjā and Upasampadā, in
later Buddhist works, 262-5
Padmapāda, older than Śaṅkara, 326
Padmapādacārya, disciple of Śaṅ-
kara, 335, 341
Padmanābhasvāmi, worshipped as
god, 335
Padmasambhava, abbot of Nāland-
ā, 446, 690
Padmavajra, founder of Hevajra
temple, 690, 696
Padminī, Alaudūn demands
surrender of, 297-9
Paddy, two kinds of, 25-6; plan-
tation of 26; water in the
growth of, 26-7; reaping and
storing of, 27
Pāgalapanthin, 687
Pahlarpur, a centre of Jainism, 441
Paiṅga, pupil of Vaiśampāyana
and teacher of Tīttrī, 733
(813)
Pālas, coins of, 437; image-
making under, 450; transi-
tion from Gupta period to that
of, 442-6
Pāli, original form of Pāli, 379
Pāli Vinaya Piṭaka, divisions of,
644-5
Pāṇca-Mātukas, 640ff.
Pāṇcarātra, 347; origin of, 355-
7, religious system of, 357-8
Pāṇcatantra, date of, 166; versions
of, 515f.
Pāṇini, 380f., (729) 809f.
Parāśara, author of Jyotīsa Saṃhi-
tās, 142
Paravāla, Rāṣṭraṅga chief, 419
Pāsādakānaṇu, Notes on, 651-3
Patañjali, Skanda mentioned by,
312, 315
Pāṭikkāra, capital of Gopicānd,
533
Pathan Sultans, coins of, 437
Pathan period, inscriptions of,
437
Pavanadūta, work of Dhoyī, 457,
541
Pauṇḍravardhī, identity of, 435ff.; Nandi family in, 451
Pauliša Siddhānta, not derived from the works of Paulus
Alexandrinus, 144
Permanent Settlement (1793), 475ff.
Piṅgala, Chando-Vedāṅga of (727)
807—(734) 814; Tāraka mentioned by, (733) 813
Piṅgalaśūtras, 727 (807)ff.
Pinākīni (= present Penner), 240-50
Pischel, Chāyā-nāṭaka interpreted by, 543ff.
Planting, Bṛhat Saṃhitā and
Agāpurāṇa on, 25
Ploughing, rules about, 23
Prabhākara, 320, 324f.; disciple of
Āryabhāta, 145-7
Prabhodhacandrapada, 451; 'puruṣkā' in, 452
Prajñāpāramitās, 638
Prakṣaṭaprākṛtāmayā, meaning of, 171
Prasāda, explanation of, 63f.
Poetry and its embellishments, 57ff.
Potala, identified with Madagascar, 695ff.
Pulumāyi, 127ff.
Punjab, Jayapāla dynasty in, 450
Pauṇḍravardhana, birth place of
Gopāla, 530, 535
Purāṇas, Topography in, 245-53
Purāṅgīrī, centre of Tantrik activity, 5
Pusyagupta, 630, 632
Puruṣākāram, work of Viḷva-
maṅgalavāmin, 336
Puruṣamedha, Nārāyaṇa's performance of, 347
Pre-Mughal Period, administration of Delhi Empire in, 41-54;
army during, 46-9; function of Kotwal in, 49; Land revenue
in, 41-3; merits and demerits in the administrative system
of, 51-4; Provincial administration in, 436; system of
Dak-Chauki in, 49ff.
Purvaśailas, 641, 646
Queen's Donation Edict, 458 63
Rādhā, 436, 451; Sāvarna and
Vandyagahlīya brāhmaṇas in,
453
Rajabhāta, king of Samataṭa, 533
536.
Rāji Ganeś, home of, (704) 784
Rājāśekhara, 172-3, 542
Rāji Māsingh, Subadar of
Bengal, 629
Rākinīs, female Tantrik goddesses, 81.
Rāmābhyudaya, work of Yaśo
varman, 542, 545f.
Kāmacarita, 435, 448, 566
Rāmadevi, Cālukya princess and
queen of Vallalasena, 455
Rāmapāla, 436, 447ff.
Rāmarāja, king of Vijayanagar
and contemporary of Tirtha-
nātha, 636
Rāmarāja Viṭṭhala, Viceroy in
South India and contemporary of Viśvanātha, 686
Ramāvatt, capital of Rāmapāla,
456, 417
Rambhāmaṇjarī, work of Naya-
candra, 172
Rannadevi, daughter of Paravala and wife of Dharmapala, 449
Rantivarman, 163ff
Rāṣṭrakūṭas, Pālas defeated by, 447
Ratnasingha, son of Samarasimha and ruler of Mevād, 290ff; his surrender to Alauddin, 292-3
Reviews: An account of the district of Purnea, 425-7; Bhāvaprabhakāśana of Śāradātānaya, (765) 845—(767) 847; Die Kulturden Persischen Golf und ihre ausbreitung, 421-2; Indices and Appendices to the Nirukta, (760) 840—(762) 842; History of Kerala, 201-7. History of Pre-Musalmān India, vol. I, 196-3; History of Rajputānā, 420 21; Megas-thenes en de Indische Maatschappij, (767) 847— (76) 848 Notes on Shri Mahā-Lakṣmī Temple, Kolhapur, 198-200; Sāṃkhya or the Theory of Reality, (763) 843—(765) 845; Studies in Tamil literature and history, 423-4
Ig-veda, Rudra in, 313; Viṣṇu in, 102f.
Rudra, 313f., 508fn.
Rudradāman 122; Junāgaḍah Rock inscr. of, 630
Rūpa in Aśoka's inscr., 545
Sabhar, ancient capital in East Bengal, 415-6
Ṣaḍguruśīya, commentator of Anukramani, (733) 813 fn.
Sāḍikā (in a Bharhut inscr.) means music or dances, 169
Sadukti-karṇāṃṛta, Dhoi mentioned in, 541
Sāgaradatta, a merchant, 520ff.
Sigaradvipa, 698 9
Sāhās, trading section in Bengal, (724) 804f.
Sahaja siddhi, class of Tantras, 687
Sāhitya-darpaṇa, Mahānātaka explained in, 539
Śailodha bhava rulers, chronology of, 665, 668
Śaiva Samayācāryas, biographies of, 423
Śaktas, mentioned in Mudrārākṣasa,
Western Kṣatrapas identified with, 166
Śākyārambhin, 472; English rendering of, 397
Śāladda Nāga, minister of Vijayasena, 456
Samācārādeva, 444; plates of, 439
Samādhī (a guṇa), note on, 75 6
Samaṭā (a guṇa), explanation of, 64f.
Sammoha Tantra, enumeration of Tantrik Zones and its literature in, 3-5
Samrāj, nature of the office of, 503-9
Samudragupta, Copper-plate grant of, 437ff., 442
Samudrikanāstra, 532f.
Śaṁvara (tantra), 690
Śaṁyuttabhāṣyas, 640ff.
Sanatkumāra, identified with Skanda, 309ff.
Sandhi, 233f., 393f.
Śaṅgams, origin of, 423f.
Sankara, 79ff., 301, 324ff., 339, 341, 632
Sanskrit dramas, types of, 188-9
Santarakshita, 535; author of Tattvasamgraha, 446
Santinandagana, commentator of of Jambudvipa prajñapti, 141
Saradatatanaya, author of Bhava- prakasa, 171, 190, (765) 845ff.
Sarngadhara-padhati, 542
Sarvastivada, 646
Sashanka, king of Bengal, 439, 442, 444
Satakarni, king of Dakshinapatha, 122
Satananda, 566; Indian Calender maker, 148
Satapatha Brahmana, 106; Narayana in, 347
Sattavahanas, 130ff.; 639ff.
Sattaka, form of Drama, 169-73
Sattavatas (=Bhagavatas), same as Narayaniya faith, (661) 741—(662) 742
Senas, 454ff., (685) 765; image-making under, 4567; growth of literature under, 457
Senkuttuvam, Cera king, (654) 734
Setu, meaning of, 385
Shahjahan, 493ff.
Shahji Bhonsle, life long friend of Randaula, 362
Shaibani Khan, Uzbegs under, 481ff.; death of, 484
Shivaji, early supporter of, 3624
Siamese Ramayana, story of Manimekhala in, 372-3
Siddhanta, short account of different works under the name of, 141-5
Siddha-sampradaya, 685ff.
Siddhanta-ekhara, work of Muhammad, 147
Silahara, abbot of Nalanda, 445
Silanin, Natasutras of, 380ff.
Silapakathaa, work of Vasubandhu, 28-33; Tibetan text of, 29-31; Sanskrit reconstruction of, 31-32
Silasthambhas, 215, 222
Simhapura, 452
Sindabur (Sandabur), another name of Goa, 692
Sindhind, an Arabic translation of Brhamasphutasiddhanta, 147
Sisnadevas, 125ff.
Sisupala, king of Cedi, 524, 527ff.
Sitt, technical term of revenue, 389
Siva, disciple of Skanda, forms of, 162, 309, 316
Sivanarayana Dasa, emperor of Kamala-vilasa, 569
Skanda-Karttikeya, some note on, 309-18
Sleza, explanation of, 62-63
Smritijananakirti, author of Bodhicittavivarana-tikaa, 740 (820)
Soil, question of, ownership of, 387, 658f.
Solomon's explanation, story of, 297
Somagiri, courtier of Prabhakara, 330
Someśvara I, Karnataka emperor, (682) 762ff.
Someśvara III, son and successor of Vikramaditya VI, (683) 763
Śrīdhara, author of Nyāyakanda-li, 451; minister of Nānya, (689) 769
Śrīṛharasena, patron of Bhaṭṭi, 414
ŚrīKrṣṇakarṇaṁṛta, author of, 338-39
Śrīparvata, 634, 637f.; location of, 249
Śrīpur, Laksamaṇa temple inscr. at, 447
Śrīśaila. 252-53
Śṛṣṭidhāraśāraya, writer of the 17th century, 414
Standard emblems, various beliefs relating to, 241f.
St. Thomas, 837 (757)
Strabo and Diodorus, land revenue passages in, 387-89
Subhadra parinaya, drama, 547
Subhaṭṭa, author of Dūṭāṅgada, 537. 543
Śūdras, account of, (726) 806
Sukumāratā (a guṇa), explanation of, 69-70
Śūra-family, 455
Sura Singha, king of Bikaner, 192
Śrī-harṣa, king of Kāmarūpa, 443
Surāśṭras, in Aśoka’s Edicts, 630ff.
Sūrya image, of, 322f.
Sūryaprajñapati, date of, 139-41
Sūrya-Varma, 447
Suresvara, 326f.; disciple of Śaṅkarā, 301f., 335; note on Maṅḍana Miśra and, 632
Suvanapūpa, identification of, 701
Suvanamukhari identified with Suvanamukhi, 246-47
Śvāhā Skanda-Kārttikeya, originated from, 315
Śvāmiyūr, birth place of, 340-42
Śveta, significance of, (673) 753
Śvetadvipa, 501, (655) 735f., (672) 752f.; story of, (69) 749f.
Śvetaketu, 310
Sylhet, Brāhmaṇas in, (717) 797—(720) 800; Vaidyas and Kāyaṣthas in, (720) 800—(723) 803; Dāsas and their sub-castes in, (723) 803—(726) 806; Castes and Caste-origins in Sylhet, (716) 795—(726) 805
Tādātvika, explanation of, 401
Tatttirīya Aranyaka, 346f.; Nārāyana in, 350
Talakkulattūr Bhaṭṭatiri, astrologer of Kerala, 336
Tamil Grammars, description of r-sounds in, 178-81
Tanjore, Nāyaks of, 683 fn.
Tantra, foreign elements in, 1-16; four important centres of, 5
Tāntric Stories, 515-22
Tāranātha, 637f., 699, disciple of Buddhagupta, 684ff.
Tantrākhyāyikā, date of, 166
Tantrapradīpa, work of Maitreya Rākṣita and different from Anunyāsa 418-19
Taxila, Aramaic inscr. of, 228
Tcheon Pei, old Chinese astronomical work, 141
Thibaut, date of Composition of Sūryaprajñapati surmised by, 140
Tikkanṇa Somayājin, court poet of a Telugu-Coḍa chief, 339
Tikkaya, identified with Tikkanṇa Somayājin, 339
Yaśovarman, 440ff., 534f.; a Can-
del king, 451
Yaśovarmadeva, Nālanda Stone
inscr. of, 664
Yaśovarman, Yaśodharman not to
be identified with, 664
Yeṛṛagūdi, inscription of Aśoka
discovered at, 737 (817)—740
(820)
Yudhiṣṭhira, character of Sāmrā-
jya of, 527–8; Sāmrājya of,
523–33
Yudhiṣṭhira Vijaya, Kulaśekhara
of, (649) 729; patron of Pra-
bhākara, 320
Yuktikalpataru, work of Bhoja-
rāja, 705
Yusuf Khan, Sultan of Kashmere,
490
Wais Mirza, Bābar's cousin, 484
Western Kṣatrapas and Andhras,
chronology of, 117–24
Wilson, Chāyānāṭaka interpreted
by, 543
Zahar, Hebrew Cabalist compen-
dium, 149