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FOREWORD

The news of the sudden passing away of Dr. M. Winternitz were most painful for us, who were used to looking upon him as one of the truest and most respected friends of India in the outer world. During my long life and extensive travels, I never met a savant more worthy of respect than the learned Doctor. His deep and broad humanity, brightened as it was with his amazingly wide scholarship, his devotion to Truth and the courage with which he held fast to his idealism in the midst of a growingly hostile atmosphere in Central Europe, are his claims to our homage. In him I have lost a faithful comrade, India has lost one of its truest Pandits and best friends, and humanity one of its most sincere champions.

Rabindranath Tagore
The late Professor Winternitz

The death of Professor Moriz Winternitz in January, 1937, has removed from this world a personality that embodied in itself the best traditions of a scholarly mind imbued with an indomitable passion for knowledge and truth. To the students of Indology, it has entailed the loss of a "friend, philosopher and guide." Dr Winternitz belonged to the small band of Western scholars who devoted a life-time to Sanskrit studies and acted as brilliant exponents of the cultural heritage of India. India will ever remember with gratitude the very eminent services rendered by Dr Winternitz to her as an interpreter of her ancient civilization.

One is profoundly struck by the manner in which Professor Winternitz rose superior to the circumstances into which he was born, and all through his scholarly life maintained a unique breadth of vision and generosity of outlook that overcame all bias and prejudices. Born in 1863 in a family with commercial traditions, it was more than an accident that took him off to an entirely new career bearing not even the remotest affinity to the claims of his ancestral avocation. Even his birthplace Horn, a provincial town in Lower Austria, had nothing of the traditions of a seat of learning, and it could not, therefore, have made any tangible contribution to his intellectual make-up. The profound genius of the man early manifesting itself in the promising dawn of his boyhood which developed into a brilliant noon and eventually into a glorious evening was all his own. Yet it is true to say that his latent genius would not perhaps have unfolded itself, at least in the manner it did, had not a combination of very favourable circumstances brought him into intimate contact with some eminent Orientalists that provided the most nourishing soil for a vigorous growth. After finishing his studies at the grammar school of his native town, he entered the University of Vienna in 1880 for higher studies in classical philology.
and philosophy. Here for the first time, under the inspiring
guidance of Friedrich Muller and George Buhler, he was initiated
into the studies of classical literature and Indology that gave a definite
shape to his future academic career.

Prof Winternitz obtained his doctorate in 1885 at the age of
23, when he was still at the University of Vienna. Shortly after,
he came across the second great opportunity of his scholarly life
that marked a new phase of his chequered career. In 1888 he went
over to Oxford to join the post of an amanuensis to assist Prof. Max
Muller in the preparation of the second edition of the Rigveda.
The valuable assistance rendered by him in this connection as a
Sanskritist Research Assistant to Prof. Max Muller should have
alone won for him the distinction of a distinguished Indologist, in-
deed his contribution to the work has been referred to in very elo-
quent terms of appreciation by Prof. Max Muller himself. But Dr
Winternitz was predestined to win much higher distinctions in
life, to which his unexpected transfer to Oxford helped him in more
than one way. Of the sixteen years of his stay at Oxford he had to
devote about a decade to the preparation of the press copy of the
Rigveda. The book itself bears unmistakable testimony to Prof
Winternitz's capacity for intelligent, enthusiastic, and sustained
research in a field, where the zeal of lesser talents would have flagged
for the very magnitude of the task. The last six years of his stay
at Oxford after the completion of his work in connection with the
Rigveda attracted him to diverse fields of activities suited to his ins-
tincts, and enriched his scholarly equipments in a marked degree.
The beginning of these new activities was rather very modest and
in fact one that should have proved discouraging to many. In 1891
he was found to accept the post of a teacher at the Oxford High
School for Girls. He was even found to act as a private tutor of
German and Sanskrit. Before long, however, his services were
requisitioned for works of much greater importance, and in 1891 he
was appointed a lecturer in German by the Association for the Promotion of Higher Education of Women at Oxford and a member of the Examining Board of the Indian Civil Service. While he continued in the post of a lecturer in German till 1898, he was called upon in 1895 to undertake some very important library work. The first of these was the cataloguing of the Vedic Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library which was later continued and completed by Prof. Berriedale Keith. The second which will likewise go down in history with the name of the eminent Professor was the cataloguing of the Whish Collection of the South Indian Manuscripts at the Royal Asiatic Society, London. About the same time, Prof. Winternitz had set his hands to the task of preparing a General Index to the 49 volumes of the Sacred Books of the East Series. While one should have felt amazed at the versatility of the genius which Prof. Winternitz must have brought to bear upon such diversified tasks, it is impossible to underestimate the extent to which his instinct for research had been stimulated and enriched by the busy years spent at Oxford.

In 1899, Prof. Winternitz was appointed lecturer of Indo-Aryan Philology and Ethnology at the University of Prague, where within three years he was appointed Assistant Professor and was eventually raised in 1911 to the chair for the subject. Here, one might say that Moriz Winternitz owed as much to the University as the University owed to the Professor,—the facilities for research given him by the University being reciprocated by the heightened reputation of its Indological Section. In 1904, Prof. Winternitz was fortunate enough to receive useful patronage from the State in the furtherance of his projects, particularly in connection with the establishment of a Special Library of Indology and Ethnology at the Prague University. It is a matter of regret that the realisation of the idea of this Institution was, very materially hampered by the outbreak of the Great War, but for which, it might have blossomed into a worthy gift of
the Professor to future students of Indological studies in Europe. The Post-War period which raised him to higher rungs of eminence witnessed him elected as a Dean of the Faculty of Letters in 1921. He came down to India in 1922 at the invitation of Dr Rabindra Nath Tagore and spent a year in this country as a Visiting Professor at the Visvabharati. Long before this visit, in fact from the time of his appointment at the Prague University Prof Winteritz had been carrying on research on the Mahabharata. The work that he had done at Oxford in connection with the cataloguing of the South Indian Manuscripts of the Whish Collection created in him an irrepresible urge for bringing out a critical edition of the great Epic. During all these years, Prof Winteritz published a series of very illuminating articles on the study of the Mahabharata assigning to it a place of unique importance in the research work of Indologists and at the same time throwing a flood of light on the imperfections of the existing editions of the Epic. It was mainly at the inspiration of Prof Winteritz that the work in this connection was undertaken by the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute at Poona. About the time of his arrival at Bombay, the Research Institute had been busily engaged in the work. Prof Winteritz paid a visit to Poona immediately on his arrival to see for himself the work that had been going on. The intensity of his feelings regarding the importance of bringing out a critical edition of the Mahabharata is borne out not only by his earnestness in connection with the formation of a European Committee by the International Association of Academies for this specific purpose even before the work was actually taken up by the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, but also by the fact that he carried sentiments of eager watchfulness and expected culmination even to the last days of his life.

The one other great work which will ever remain associated with the memories of the distinguished Professor is his History of Indian Literature (Geschichte der indischen Literatur) written in 3
volumes of about 1600 pages and published over a period of 15 years, the first coming out in 1907 and the last in 1922. It is in a sense the outstanding monument of his Indological studies, and the Encyclopædic erudition evidenced in it constitutes an unmistakable testimony of the fact that none other than Prof. Winternitz could have set his hands to the stupendous task with any amount of confidence. It is as well true to say that a man of the stamp of Professor Winternitz alone could possibly be persuaded though at the fag-end of his life, to prepare an up-to-date English version of the three volumes of his History. The last 14 years of his life were devoted to this work, of which a complete fruition was denied to us by the cruel hands of death. We had only two volumes by 1934, but while Prof. Winternitz was working on the third, death took him away from our midst.

The Professor has lived a life full of years and honours. Although he was relieved of his academic duties in 1934, he never spared himself, and though his health showed marks of decline during the years of his retirement, his attachment to scientific researches never flagged for a moment. It is impossible to recount even the most important contributions made by him to the varied studies of Sanskrit literature throughout his life. The published bibliography records the total at more than 400. The number, impressive as it is, does not perhaps constitute an adequate index to their intrinsic merit. It is therefore well to point out that the writings bear a characteristic quality of the man himself, just as the Professor was naturally sparing of words, so his writings were short of superfluities, and his selection of subject was always made with a purpose. He never selected a subject that did not add to the store of our knowledge, and hardly did he ever take up one on which he has not thrown light of his own.

But great as the scholar was, the man was greater. If his researches were based on an indomitable thirst for knowledge, their
influence upon his emotions was profound. His pursuit of the studies of Sanskrit literature has not been like that of a mere intellectual. It has been reared upon a philosophical instinct that grew as his mental horizon widened, and revealed to him the fundamental unity of mankind leading him to approach the task with genuine sympathy and admiration. Even in his social life, Prof. Winternitz carried about him a profound intellectual sympathy and a striking dignity of manners brightened by an unfailing courtesy and a transparent sincerity. The writer had the privilege of coming into contact with Prof. Winternitz during his Indian tour, and he has not the least doubt that anybody having the opportunity of being acquainted with the distinguished Professor could not but have felt at once the ennobling influence of a truly great man.

Further interesting details about the life of Professor Winternitz will be found in the learned article immediately following, but before I introduced my readers to the same, I take the opportunity of paying my tribute of respect to the hallowed memory of the illustrious savant who is no more, and pray to the Almighty that the inspiration which he has imparted to all students of Indology in and outside this country by his life-long researches may endure as a living force among us and induce us all to continue the work he has handed down to posterity.

Narendra Nath Law
Moriz Winternitz

The ninth of January 1937 was a sad one for the science of Indology. In the early hours of this day, Prof Moriz Winternitz, one of the last "universal indologists", passed away peacefully, as he has been during his life, he also entered the Great Unknown peacefully. Moriz Winternitz was born on December 23, 1863, in Horn, a provincial town of Lower Austria, in the family of the merchant Bernhard Winternitz. When a little boy, he proved extraordinary intelligent and he started reading and writing even Hebrew before entering the elementary school. In 1880, after having finished the grammar-school (Gymnasium) in his native town, he went to the University at Vienna where he began to study classical philology and philosophy. But soon Friedrich Muller who lectured on comparative philology and ethnography, and particularly George Buhler who was, after his return from India, in 1881, inaugurating his indological lectures at Vienna, interested the young student in the sciences of indology and ethnology. Among his teachers, we have to mention also Eugen Hultsch, a name well-known by his activity in India, who was at that time Privatdozent in the University of Vienna. He introduced Winternitz in the Indian narrative literature and the language of the Pāli Canon. In 1886, Winternitz submitted his thesis on 'Ancient Indian marriage ritual according to Āpastamba, compared with the marriage customs of the Indo-European peoples' and got his diploma of Ph.D (Vienna).

Only two years later, Winternitz became upon Buhler's recommendation Amanuensis of Prof. Friedrich Max Muller at Oxford.

---

1 An expression used by Winternitz's great teacher, G. Buhler. Cf M. Winternitz, George Buhler und die Indologie, Munchen 1898 (an offspring from Allegemeine Zeitung, May 21st and 23rd, 1898), p. 23.
and assisted the famous scholar in preparing the second edition of the *Rgveda* with Sāyana's commentary, from 1888 to 1892. After finishing this great task successfully, he stayed some years more at Oxford till 1898. In 1891 he became a teacher at the Oxford High School for Girls, from 1891 to 1898 he acted as a Lecturer of German at the Association for the Promotion of Higher Education of Women in Oxford and as a private tutor of German and Sanskrit, for some time he was on the examining board for the Indian Civil Service. In 1895, too, he became the Librarian of the Indian Institute at Oxford. It is amazing, how many duties Winternitz took upon himself, without hampering his regular scientific work. He was a man of indefatigable activity, not only in his youthful days, but even in his old age. Surely, he had to earn his living, especially since he had married Fanny Reik in 1892 and had to support a growing family.

In 1899 Winternitz shifted to Prague which belonged to Austria at that time, and was appointed a Lecturer (Privatdozent) of Indo-Aryan Philology and Ethnology at the oldest German University. In 1902 he became an Assistant Professor and in 1911 he got the chair of these subjects. Until his predecessor, Alfred Ludwig, who was the first German interpreter of the *Rgveda*, the study of Indology was combined with that of comparative philology of the Indo-European languages at the Prague German University. Thus, Winternitz was the first professor of Indology at that University and we may call him, in the very sense of the word, the founder of indological studies at Prague. His energy was directed to the supply of means of both instruction and scientific work. Many modern indological works were at his request acquired by the Prague University Library of which he was one of the most frequent visitors. In 1904 the Austrian Ministry of Public Instruction agreed to his request to establish a special library of indology and ethnology at the Prague German
University. The great war (1914-18) interrupted the development of this institution, but twenty years after its foundation, in 1924, Winternitz was glad to see it changed into an Indological ‘Seminar’ with a separate room and with better possibilities for further expansion.

In 1905, the loss of his wife was a severe blow to Winternitz. But a good fate gave him, three years later, a second wife in Berta Nagel who was not only a true guardian angel of his home, but also a veritable second mother to his five children. Her death in 1932 was surely one of the causes of his fatal illness.

In 1921, in the month of June, being just elected Dean of the Faculty of Letters for 1921-22, Winternitz could welcome his friend, the great Indian poet Rabindranath Tagore, as a guest of the German University at Prague. A year later, in November 1922, he accepted Tagore’s invitation to spend a year as a visiting professor at his Visvabhrati in Sāntiniketan during 1922-23. There it was his aim to teach his Indian pupils what the late Sir Ramkrishna Gopal Bhandarkar pointed out as the drawback of Indian scholars and what was one of the few good things India could learn from the Western world, I mean, the critical methods which led the European science from success to success. Not only at Sāntiniketan but also at a few other academic centres he spent his time during his sojourn in India, to the people and culture of which he had devoted his life-work. His first trip after having disembarked at Bombay was to Poona to see the progress of the editorial work of the Mahābhārata. On his journeys from Kashmir down to Ceylon, he delivered lectures and speeches at many Universities and meetings of learned societies at Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, etc., and he discussed the most important problems of indological research with the Indian scholars. Always he was of good health, but on his return journey he fell sick of malaria which put the germ of death into his body.
Within the last fifteen years of his life, many honours have been conferred on Winternitz. He was elected Honorary member of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, of the American Oriental Society, of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute at Poona, and Corresponding Member of the Society of Eastern Asiatic Art at Berlin. Since the Oriental Institute at Prague had been inaugurated, Winternitz became a Fellow of this Institute and a member of the Committee. He was also a Fellow of the German Society of Sciences and Arts in the Czechoslovak Republic. In 1932 the Hardy Prize was bestowed upon him for his research work. When he celebrated his 70th birthday in 1933, many scholars, pupils and friends honoured him by a Festschrift (Leipzig 1933) as well as by a special number of the Archiv Orientální (VI, 1934, No 1) published on that occasion. He retired from his academic duties in 1934 after having discharged them fully during 35 years, his only aim was to devote all his leisure now won to scientific work. Illness, however, undermined his strength more and more, leading to his sudden death.

Winternitz's literary work was very extensive. Its bibliography\(^2\) comprises 452 items belonging to the most different branches of human knowledge. As we see from his thesis mentioned above, his first interest was devoted to the study of the ancient Indian customs and religion and their connection with those of other Indo-European peoples. At that time there were no, or at least not yet critical, editions of the Indian sources. The scholars, and among them also Winternitz, had to use often manuscripts of the texts for their work. A fruit of these studies is his first critical edition of the Āpastambhiya Grhyasūtra with extracts from the commentaries of Haradatta and Sudarśanārya, (Vienna 1887), a brilliant example of the methods of text criticism. As the Mantras

\(^2\) Published by O. Stein and the present writer in Archiv Orientální, 6, 1934, pp 275-291, and 9, 1937, pp 225-228
are not given in this Sūtra of the Āpastambins, Winternitz published them separately ten years later under the title *The Mantrapātha or the Prayer Book of the Āpastambins*. Edited together with the commentary of Haradatta and translated First Part Introduction, Sanskrit Text, Varietas Lectionis and Appendices (Oxford 1897, Anecdota Oxoniensia, Aryan Series, No III, 8) He also enlarged his thesis, based only on the Gṛhyaśūtra of the Āpastamba school, by using other Gṛhya-texts and published it in 1892 in the Transactions of the Imperial Academy of Sciences at Vienna ("Das altindische Hochzeitsrituell nach dem Āpastambini-Gṛhyaśūtra und einigen anderen verwandten Werken Mit Vergleichung der Hochzeitsgebrauche bei den uebrigen indogermanischen Voelkern") Besides these works, he wrote many other smaller essays on the ancient Indian and Indo-European religion, cult, and customs in Journals, e.g., on the sacrifice at building (Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien, 17, 1887, 37-40), on the Sarpabali (ibidem, 18, 1888, 25-52, 250-264), 'Notes on Śrāddhas and Ancestral Worship among the Indo-European Nations' (WZKM, 4, 1890, 199-212) 'On a Comparative Study of Indo-European Customs, with special reference to the Marriage Customs' (Transactions of the International Folklore Congress, 1891, London 1892, 267-291), 'Witchcraft in Ancient India' (reprinted in Ind Ant., 28, 1899, 71-83), but also in later years he returned to such topics like "on the choice of bride according to the Bhāradvājagrhyasūtra" (WZKM, 28, 1914, 16-20), or "on the doctrine of the Āśramas" (Festgabe H. Jacobi, Bonn 1926, 215-227)

During his stay in England, Winternitz was associated with the Sacred Books of the East, edited by F. Max Muller. He compiled the Indexes to G. Thibaut's translation of the Vedaṭa-Sūtras (Parts I, II, Oxford 1896, Part III, Oxford 1904). This work, however, was only preliminary to his voluminous General
Index to the Names and Subject-Matter of the Sacred Books of the East (Oxford 1910, *The Sacred Books of the East*, vol L) to which the publisher gave later the new and appropriate title *A Concise Dictionary of Eastern Religion*. Only a person who is acquainted with the hard work of compiling Indexes of so different topics of such various cultures will appreciate the enormous labour spent on this work and the ability with which Winternitz complied with his task.

In his capacity as Librarian, Winternitz was entrusted with the work of cataloguing Sanskrit Manuscripts in England. When he was leaving Oxford, the result of his work was brought to a conclusion by his successors, in 1902, "*A Catalogue of South Indian Sanskrit Manuscripts* (especially those of the Whish Collection) belonging to the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland" (*Asiatic Society Monographs*, No 2) was published in London, having been finished by F W Thomas. Another *Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library*, Vol II, begun by Winternitz, was continued and completed by A B Keith and appeared at Oxford in 1905.

While working on the Sanskrit Manuscripts, Winternitz recognised the immense value of the South Indian Mahābhārata MSS for the reconstruction of the Mahābhārata text. In his prolegomena "On the South-Indian Recension of the Mahābhārata" (*Ind Ant*, 27, 1898, 67-81, 92-104, 122-136) he indicated the way in which the criticism of the Mahābhārata should proceed. Already in 1897 he had written his "Notes on the Mahābhārata," with special reference to Dahlmann’s "Mahābhārata" (*IRAS*, 1897, 713-759). From that time till the end of his life he maintained the line of his life-work *viz*, a critical edition of the Mahābhārata. In the following year he wrote also his papers ‘On the Mahābhārata MSS in the Whish Collection of the Royal Asiatic Society’ (*IRAS*, 1898, 147-159) and...
on 'Ganēśa in the Mahābhārata' (*IRAS*, 1898, 380-384). In 1899 he made his first 'Proposal for the Formation of a Sanskrit Epic Text Society to be laid before the Indian Section of the XIIth International Congress of Orientalists held at Rome', published in the *Bulletins of the Congress*, No 3, pp 46-49. His next essay 'Genesis des Mahābhārata' (*WZKM*, 14, 1900, 51-77) dealt with the authorship of the great Epic. The plan of the Sanskrit Epic Text Society was laid before the public again in *Ind Ant*, 30, 1901, 117-120. In the same year he presented his 'Promemoria über die Nothwendigkeit einer kritischen Ausgabe des Mahābhārata, insbesondere in der suedindischen Rezension' to the Imperial Academy of Sciences at Vienna (published in the *Almanach of the Academy* 51, 1901, 206-210). Later on, he dealt with the Sahāparvan in the South-Indian Recension of the Mahābhārata (*WZKM*, 17, 1903, 70-75), 'The Mahābhārata and the Drama' (*IRAS*, 1903, 571f.), the serpent sacrifice of the Mahābhārata (*Kulturgeschichtliches aus der Tierwelt*, Prag 1904, 68-80), and the Brhaddevatā and the Mahābh (*WZKM*, 20, 1906, 1-36). Finally, in 1904 a new 'Promemoria' on the plan of a critical edition of the Mahābhā was drawn up by Jacobi, Luders and himself according to a mandate of the Academies and learned societies at Göttingen, Leipzig, Munich and Vienna on the basis of which the International Association of Academies decided to accept a critical edition of the Mahābhārata among its enterprises. A fund was established to support the collators of the Mahābhārata MSS financially. Alas, all the work was stopped by the war in 1914. Therefore, it was a great satisfaction for Winternitz, when in 1918 the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute in Poona resumed the old plan with fresh means. The papers 'The Virātaparvan of the Mahābhārata ed by N. B Utgikar' (*AbhI*, 5, 1924, 19-30), 'The Critical Edition of the Mahābhārata' (*Indol Prag*, 1, 1929, 58-68), 'Die kritische Ausgabe des Mahābhārata' (*Forschungen*
und Fortschritte, 8, 1932, 427f.), and 'The Critical Edition of the Mahābhārata Ādi-parvan' (Abhl, 15, 1934, 159-175) are his responses to the newly inaugurated work. He himself would have contributed the Sabhā-parvan to the great undertaking, but other urgent works prevented him from achieving his cherished object.

It is not surprising that a scholar who had devoted so much interest and labour to one of the most important works of the Indian literature did not reject the proposal made to him by a great publishing house at Leipzig, asking him to write a history of the Indian literature for a series known as the Literatures of the East. Thus the first part of the first volume of his Geschichte der indischen Literatur, dealing with the Veda, was published in 1905, the second part, devoted to the great Epics and to the Purāṇas, followed in 1908. The second volume was issued also in two parts, comprising the Buddhist Literature (1913) and the sacred texts of the Jainas (1920). The third and last volume (1922) contains the ornate poetry, the scientific literature, a short sketch of the modern Indian vernacular literature and additions to all the three volumes. But there is a great difference between the three volumes. It was the original aim of the publisher to bring out a literary history for the general reader. With the second volume the popular character of the description receded step by step into the background and the scientific point of view became prominent. This development was quite natural as the subject-matter of the second and third volumes offered much more tough problems which were not yet sufficiently discussed by the scholars and therefore not ripe for a popular treatment. Winternitz himself felt this dissonance and wished to reconstruct the first volume and bring up-to-date the whole work that he saw developing more and more his life-work. As the German publisher, due to the bad financial condition of the post-war Germany, was not able to bring out a revised edition, Winternitz was glad to accept the offer of the Calcutta University where he
had delivered lectures on the most important problems of Indian literary history in 1923 (published in the Calcutta Review, 1923 and 1924, and collected in book form under the title Some problems of Indian Literature, Calcutta 1925) to publish an English translation in order to make this standard work accessible to all Indian students. The first volume of this revised History of Indian Literature which—we may say—is a quite new work, appeared in 1927, the second volume in 1933. Only the first chapters of the third volume were sent to the press when the author had to leave it for ever.

When Winternitz undertook the task of writing a history of Indian literature, he was not aware of all the difficulties he would have to face. But he was the right man to fight against any and every problem. These struggles brought forth many essays, booklets and even books. It is impossible to quote them all, we shall mention only the most important ones. Thus, the result of his preliminary research into the Buddhist literature is his anthology of Buddhism in the Religionsgeschichtliches Lesebuch edited by A. Bertholet (Tubingen 1908, pp. 214-322). A new revised edition was issued in 1929 as No. 11 of the Lesebuch under the title Der ältere Buddhismus nach Texten des Tipitaka. In 1930, he added a second volume (Der Mahāyāna-Buddhismus nach Sanskrit und Prākrit texten) giving specimens of translations of the most important Mahāyāna Buddhist texts (No. 15 of the Lesebuch). He wrote also papers on the Buddhist Sanskrit literature (WZKM, 26, 1912, 237-252, and 27, 1913, 33-47), on the Jātakas (Ostas Zeitschr., 2, 1913/14, 259-265 and in the ERE, 7, 1914, 491-494), on 'Jātaka Gāthās and Jātaka Commentary' (IHQ, 4, 1928, 1-14), on 'Gotama the Buddha, what do we know of him and his teaching?' (Arch. Or., 1, 1929, 235-246), on the Pāli Canon, the earlier Buddhism and its history (Studia Indo-Iranica, Leipzig 1931, 63-72), on 'Problems of Buddhism' (The Visva Bharati Quarterly,
The study of the Jaina Canon brought him in contact with the chief leaders of the Jaina religion, the late Jaina Saint Vijaya Dharma Śūri was his friend, Winternitz was the single European who took part in the ceremonies connected with the consecration of the commemorative temple of this Saint at Shivapuri, Gwalior State, and he described them in the Zeitschrift für Buddhismus, 7, 1926, 349-377, to the regret of all, the only reminiscence of his Indian travels. In that connection, we may mention also his paper ‘The Jains in the History of Indian Literature’ (Indian Culture, 1, 1934, 143-166). The research work done with regard to the third volume of the History of Indian Literature brought forth many further essays, e.g., on the Dialogue, Ākhyāna and Drama in the Indian literature (WZKM, 23, 1909, 102-137) where he dealt with the problem of the beginnings of the Indian drama, on the Indian narrative literature (Deutsche Lit.-Ztg, 31, 1910, 2693-2702, 2757-2767), especially on the Tantrākhyāyika (WZKM, 25, 1911, 49-62), on the Kṛṣṇa dramas (ZDMG, 74, 1920, 114-144), on the Bhāsa problem (Ostas Zeitschr, 9, 1920/22, 282-299), on ‘Kautilya and the Art of Politics in Ancient India’ (The Visva Bharati Quarterly, 1, 1923, 261-267), on ‘Dharmaśāstra and Arthaśāstra’ (Sir Asutosh Memorial Volume, Patna 1926, Part I, 25-48), on new Arthaśāstra MSS (Zeitschr f Indol u Iran, 6, 1928, 14-27), on fairy-tales within the narrative literature of the peoples (Arch Or, 4, 1932, 225-249), on the Bhāvaśataka (IHQ, 12, 1936, 134-137 and 517), again on ‘Bhāsa and the Mahābhārata and Kṛṣṇa Plays of the Trivandrum Series’ (Bulletin of the Rama Varma Research Institute, vol V, 1937, Part I, 1-15), etc. His ‘Notes on the Guhyasamāja-Tantra and the Age of the Tantras’ (IHQ, 9, 1933, 1-10) offered a new insight into that difficult problem.

In his works treating Indian religion and folklore, Winternitz took always notice of the Indo-European and generally e t h n o
logical relations

During his stay in England he translated Max Muller's *Anthropological Religion* into German (Leipzig 1894) and a year later the work of the same scholar *Theosophy or Psychological Religion* (Leipzig 1895). Besides different smaller papers on ethnological subjects, we may mention his notes on the Malayan popular religion (*WZKM*, 14, 1900, 243-264). When he was appointed also a lecturer of Ethnology at the Prague German University, he wished to throw light on the mutual relations of ethnology, folklore and philology, the result of his reflexions was the paper 'Voelkerkunde, Volkskunde und Philologie' (*Globus*, 78, 1900, 345-350, 370-377). In the essay "Die Flutsagen des Altertums und der Naturvoelker" (*Mitteil d Anthrop Ges*, Vienna, 31, 1901, 305-333) he compared the myths of the deluge of many peoples of the world in ancient and modern times. His booklet 'Was wissen wir von den Indo-germanen?' (Munchen 1903, being an off-print from the *Allgemeine Zeitung*) gave a clear survey of the problem of the Indo-European people ('Urvolk') and their culture. He wrote on mankind, race, and nation (*Monatschrift d Oesterr. Israelitischen Union*, 16, 1904, 4-31) as well as on 'The Unity of Mankind' (*The Visva Bharati Quarterly*, NS I, 1935, Part II, 1-14) more than thirty years later. Even in the last years of his life he collected materials for a big work on the modern race questions.

In the very beginnings of his scientific work devoted to the marriage customs, Winternitz had to deal with woman of ancient India. He returned to this subject in his essay on the widow in the Veda (*WZKM*, 29, 1915, 172-203) and in his extensively planned work *Die Frau in den indischen Religionen I Teil Die Frau im Brahmaismus* (Leipzig 1920). Even this project could not be carried out. Surely, there is an inner and close connection of cause and effect between his scientific interest in the Indian womanhood and his courageous fighting for the emancipation of women,
not only in his country and in Europe, but in the whole world. In newspapers and reviews, in lectures and speeches, he defended the aspirations of political equality as well as the economical and cultural progress of women from his humanistic point of view. In many women’s associations he was a leading brain till his old age. In recent times, he had the satisfaction that his intentions got their realization at least in many countries of Europe.

It is easily to be understood, that Winternitz as a historian of religion became a moral philosopher too. From his treatise on the ethics in the sacred books of the Indians, Persians and Chinese (Deutsche Arbeit, 6, 1906-7, 486-489, 590-592, 619-625) a direct line leads to his booklet ‘Religion und Moral’ (Prag 1922, Schriften der Deutschen Gesellschaft fur sittliche Erziehung, No 2), here he surveys the relation of religion and ethics in the history and literature of many peoples and creates the base of the working programme of the German Society for Ethical Education, founded by him and some other friends of his at Prague. According to his ethical principles, Winternitz was a thorough pacifist and condemned the war and an exaggerated nationalism on many occasions. In this connection, we may refer to the special interest shown by him in Mahatma Gandhi and Rabindranath Tagore in a number of papers and public lectures. His booklet ‘Rabindranath Tagore Religion und Weltanschaung des Dichters’ (Prag 1936, Schriften d Deutsch Ges f sittl Erz, No 13), dedicated to the 75th birthday of the poet, was his last reverence offered to the eminent Indian spiritual teacher.

Winternitz’s style in his publications was always clear and simple. Nevertheless, he was a master of the word, and always he required of his pupils, too, to use a correct diction in their writings. There are no superfluous phrases, no vast and vague theories disturbing the logical flow of his arguments. He was a man of facts working sine ira et studio, and he never
constructed a higher building of conclusions than the substructure of facts allowed.

In personal contact, Winternitz was a gentle and noble-minded man. At the first moment, he seemed to be of a reserved nature. Yet under this hard exterior there was hidden a golden heart. Nobody asked in vain for his help or advice.

Winternitz has left this world, but his works are with us and with the future generations, as a well-known Indian saying runs, *nā hi karmāksīyate*!

W. GAMPERT.
The Relation of Hittite, Tocharian and Indo-European

The question of the relation of Hittite to Indo-European presents very substantial interest, and it is worth while examining this issue and the allied question of the relation between Hittite and Tocharian, and the place of the latter in the Indo-European family. Only the more important arguments can be considered, but it is possible thence to derive fairly definite conclusions so far as regards the evidence yet adduced.

1 The Indo-Hittite Theory

The protagonist of the view that Hittite is not to be regarded as Indo-European in the sense in which Sanskrit is, but that Indo-European and Hittite must be treated as branches of Indo-Hittite, is undoubtedly Professor Sturtevant, whose knowledge of Hittite lends special force to his contentions, and who adds weight to his arguments by their moderation. His main points may be examined briefly.

(1) The most important in his view is the retention in Hittite of a sound signified by the signs used for the Accadian spirant, which here for simplicity will be written $h$. Thus Hittite gives $hants$ 'in front' which corresponds with the Greek $anti$, and $esbarr$
'blood', Greek ἀίρ, while nebbi is no doubt the corresponding form to Sanskrit mnaya. It is true that the sound is usually written double and Sturtevant doubts the suggestion of W. Petersen\(^2\) that \(b\) is of different origin in its uses, and that after \(a\) it serves as a hiatus-filler, a use which may be compared with the regular use of \(w\) after \(u\) in this manner. This suggestion is plausible for many cases of its use, while in others it may be held that a ha thus generated was transferred to consonantal stems.

It is, however argued\(^1\) that Indo-European shows compensatory lengthening upon loss of \(b\) before a consonant, while in Indo-Hittite long vowels and diphthongs with long prior element were shortened before \(b\). But the latter proposition is not supported by any cogent evidence, and the former is equally dubious. If Hittite mahlas 'apple tree' is equated with Latin mālus and Greek mēlon, as is obvious, it is quite possible simply to assume that Hittite represented the long \(a\) sound by \(ab\), and the same principle can be applied to the identification of the Hittite denominative suffix \(ah\) and the IE \(ā\) as in newab-, Latin novāre, Greek neān. It seems quite otiose to seek to explain Greek huēi as against huetōs by the lengthening of the \(u\) on the loss of the \(b\) of an IH subbio-, and the supposed parallel with Hitt subba ‘empty, sprinkle, scatter’ and subba ‘roof’ appears singularly unconvincing. If Hitt labba ‘army, battle’ and Greek laōs are really parallel, it is just as natural to say that \(abh\) is to represent the \(ā\) as to ascribe the former to IH labom and the latter to labuos. Hitt pabs- ‘protect’ is equated with Latin pāsco, with again \(ab\) and \(ā\) as equivalents.

Sturtevant,\(^4\) at one time dubious, is now a convert to the theory started by de Saussure and developed by others including Kurylo-
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2 *AJP*, lxi 193 ff
3 *Language*, vi 115 ff
4 *Language* xii 141-4, contrast vi 149-58
wicz in the *Etudes indoeuropéennes* and E Benveniste in his *Origines de la Formation des Noms en Indo-européen*, which ascribes to primitive I.E several consonantal schwas, identified as laryngeals by Professor Sapir. Into these conjectures it is unnecessary to enter, for they do not lend any clear support to the thesis here under examination, which would set Hittite up against I.E instead of ranking it with I.E. Sapir, for example, draws no such conclusion and plainly it could not be drawn.

(2) It is contended that Hittite shows clearly the working of an I.H. rule under which *uw* and *ow* became *um*, thus creating pairs of suffixes beginning with *m* or *w* according to the character of the preceding vowel. Even accepting this not implausible theory, it is admitted that in Indo-Iranian we have traces of the rule in the distribution of the suffixes *mant* and *vant*. We are not, therefore, in any degree pressed to see anything in Hittite save the preservation of a state of things existing equally in I.E. Every I.E. speech preserved at any early date presents archaisms of an important nature.

(3) Hittite has no pronoun corresponding to the I.E. stem *to-*. Instead it has a sentence connective *ta* which, with the enclitic pronoun *-a*, gives e.g., *tan* 'et eum'. In I.E. the forms corresponding to the assumed I.H. *tom* (supposed to be the zero grade of the connective *to* plus accusative *om*, or *to* with the vowel elided) are used only as indivisible wholes, but a trace of the original sense is suggested by the fact that the 'article' takes the initial position frequently in early Greek, Sanskrit and Germanic. The argument is plainly quite unconvincing and it is rather a very significant sign of the non-primitive character of Hittite that it (1) has nothing corresponding to the irregular *so* and *sā* of I.E., and (2) it has developed a *tas* 'et *is*' which Sturtevant admits to be an innovation.
(4) In Hittite there are many stems in \( r/n- \), and from any verb there may be formed a verbal noun ending in \textit{war, mar, tar} \textit{,} \textit{the first two of which correspond with the I.E infinitives in wen and men, while the tar suffix may be connected with the I.E instrumental suffix \textit{dhero, as in the Avestan infinitive \textit{barathra}}. In I.E we have traces of neuter nouns with final \( r \) in the nominative and accusative singular and with \( n \) before the case endings as in Sanskrit \textit{abar, abnas}. But the type of formation is moribund. The conclusion that Hittite here preserves the more ancient usage is plainly quite inconclusive. We may equally well suppose that in Hittite the inherited type was developed beyond what was usual in the other speeches.

(5) Hittite has no feminine gender, but merely a distinction between animate and inanimate in the nominative and accusative. In I.E the distinction between masculine and feminine certainly existed, but it was confined to a limited number of noun types and adjectives. It is then suggested that Hittite points back to a period definitely pre-I.E when gender did not exist. The fatal difficulty here is that Armenian has no development of the feminine, and the obvious solution is that Hittite and Armenian were spoken among peoples who did not possess the distinction of masculine and feminine and so they lost the slight amount they had inherited from I.E.

(6) I.E, it is suggested possessed an extraordinary paucity of case distinctions for its personal pronouns, the forms were few and their use was vague, a situation found in Hittite. Unfortunately Hittite is definitely not primitive in its pronouns, forms like \textit{ug} for the nominative singular, \textit{amug} for accusative, and \textit{zig} in the second person are significant of contamination and analogical workings. There is nothing to suggest that here we have anything but an
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aberrant development, among people in contact with a foreign speech, of IE pronouns.

(7) Hittite is conjectured at an earlier date than our texts to have had a single plural form for each type of stem but no plural case distinctions. This, it is suggested, is a more primitive state of things than IE. The argument is far from convincing. Hittite may easily have lost what other IE speeches preserved. It must be remembered that speech does not move from the simple to the complex only, there is every reason to suppose that there is a constant movement which at one time may simplify, at another build up distinctions.

(8) In IE it is accepted that, when a dental stop came to stand next a dental stop, there was developed between them a sibilant, which produced, e.g., *tst* for *tt*. In IE speeches this is not preserved, *st* usually being recorded, as in Greek *ostha*, Gothic *uast*, for which Sanskrit has *vettha*, probably by analogical restoration, while Germanic and Italo-Celtic have *ss*. Hittite, however, in some forms preserves, in the peculiarly unsatisfactory denotation in which it is recorded, traces of the primitive form, for the various denotations of the third person of the verb 'to eat', which gives us in the first *etms*, really denote *estss*, the second *ts* being the regular development of the *t* of IE. Similarly we have *atstens* 'you eat and *etsta* 'he ate'. The point is interesting, but a *tst* was patently so unstable a sound that it is easily intelligible that the other IE speeches should not have preserved it. The development of *ts* to *tst*, it need hardly be added, is one of the many points in which Hittite is far from primitive.

(9) In Hittite we have clear cases where a labio-velar appears as *kw* before a vowel and *ku* before a consonant, e.g., *kwents* 'he

8 C.L. Petersen, *AJP*, li 259
9 I write *ts* for the usual *z* for the sake of clearness.
strikes', but kunantsi 'they strike', with which compare Sanskrit hantā and gnante. But it is impossible to base any argument on this, for the appearance of u before a consonant is far from rare elsewhere, as in Sanskrit kutra with which compare kva, Latin scumbi, Greek kúklos, where Sanskrit with the usual loss of the labial element has cakrás. In Hittite itself we find the loss of the labial element in the particle -ki or -ka, in the variant sak- or sakū- 'know' and so forth. Once more we are dealing simply with variant treatment of IE elements. There is much that is obscure in the Hittite representation of the labio-velars, thus the parallelism with Sanskrit grnāti 'he praises' of wars- 'be or become propitious', with ghr̥ma 'heat' of war- 'burn', with gā 'go' of wa-, we-, is far from convincing, but there is no reason to find any special antiquity.

(10) Hittite has an ablative in ts and an instrumental in t, which may be traced to the weak form of -tos, a suffix familiar from Sanskrit -tas and Latin -tus. From this ts we are to derive in the ablative the t of o stems on the one hand, and the s of other stems on the other. But, even accepting this theory there is nothing to divide Hittite from Indo-European. We have merely an archaism. Moreover, we are not compelled to accept the suggested origin from ts of the ablative terminations. It is ingenious, but no more than that, and other explanations are current and not less likely.

(11) Little need be said of the argument that Hittite is specially primitive because it is richer in root class verbs than in thematic verbs of either the déiketi (Latin ducit) or diketi (Sanskrit disāti) type. It is sufficient to point out that both these types are admittedly found in Hittite beside the root class, so that Hittite appears as simply one among other IE speeches.

(12) As little value can be attached to the contention that Hittite is primitive because it distinguishes the nasal infix presents

10 Sturtevant, Language VIII 1-10
and presents with suffix *nu* by placing them in the *mi* conjugation, generally with causative sense, while the *nā* presents belong to the *hs* conjugation, and have intensive force. It is plain that all three formations are I.E., and that no speech shows effective distinctions of a consistent kind between them.

(13) Hittite possesses the word *nekuts* which must be connected with the Greek *nux*, Sanskrit *naktis*, *naktam*, Latin *nox* and other words for night. Moreover it has the verb *nekutsi* 'he undresses, goes to bed', and the impersonal preterite middle *ne kutat*, meaning 'people went to bed, it was bedtime'. This suggests an older period than the isolated words in the I.E. speeches. This is ingenious, but if accepted merely shows that Hittite preserves a verbal form lost in the other speeches and, of course, the priority of the verb to the noun is open to dispute.

(14) It is claimed that Hittite *uptsi*, used of the sun, 'it comes up' is archaic. Connection with the Greek *hupó* and Sanskrit *upa* is no doubt clear, but that the formation is archaic is in no way proved. Rather it may be claimed to be a Hittite innovation of an easy kind in a language full of aberrations.

(15) Still less value attaches to the fact that while Greek *béstai* and Sanskrit *äste* 'he sits' are isolated, except for compounds and derivatives and a few Avestan forms, Hittite has *esa*, *esari* 'he sits', *estsi* 'he sets', and various other derivatives. The claim for primitive character for Hittite is very difficult to follow. It is once more merely evidence that Hittite preserves, like Indo-Iranian and Greek, I.E. material lost elsewhere. What possible conclusion in favour of constructing a theoretic Indo-Hittite can be derived from the fact that Hittite has a root-class verb related to Greek *anágke*, though no I.E. language has such a verb? Is this due to a belief that verbal roots are prior to nouns? Are we to suppose that Indo-Hittite had the verb, which in I.E. was lost? Nothing whatever can be derived from such arguments.
On the other hand, there is abundant reason to suggest that Hittite shows development of I E as established from comparison of the older I E speeches. The impression left by Hittite verb is certainly of this character. It is natural to accept the present of the *br*-conjugation as a refashioning of the I E perfect, affected strongly by the *mr*-conjugation. The use in Hittite in the true present *mr*-conjugation in the second person present of *-ts* besides *-st* certainly is most naturally explained, as was suggested by Friedrich,¹¹ as the intrusion of the perfect *-tha*, which becomes in Hittite normally *-ta*, and then takes the form *-ti* by analogy, especially to the original *-st*, which in some verbs is recorded equally as in *epst* and *epst* ‘thou takest’, *kwensu, kwents* ‘thou strikest’. The preterite active of Hittite seems to be a combination of forms of the *s*-aorist with perfect forms used historically. Thus we have in the second person singular *memista* ‘thou didst say’, *dasta* ‘thou didst place’, third person *das* ‘he took’, *nais* ‘he led’, second plural *naišten* ‘ye led’. Of this last form the *n* seems clearly analogical as against I E *-te*. These preterite forms with *s* are confined to verbs of the *br*-conjugation, and it is a reasonable assumption that I E had beside the present perfect an *s*-aorist which served to express past time for the perfect present. To the *mr*-presents Hittite has preterites without the *s*, as in second singular *daskes*, third *dasket*, which compare with Greek *élue, élue*.

In the medio-passive we find in Hittite a present tense which seems clearly a decayed form of the I E, showing a mixture of primary and secondary terminations. This point is disputed, but the probabilities in its favour are strong. Thus to Hittite *arta* corresponds Greek *órto*, Sanskrit *āra*, to Hittite *aranta*, Sanskrit *āra*. That *-ta* and *-nta* are to be traced back to I E *-tai* and *-ntai*, the primary endings, is most improbable, for Hittite as a regular prin-

¹¹ ZDMG, lxxvi 167
ciple has a for I E. o In the second plural Hittite -duma as in snyadduma is clearly to be compared with the secondary -dhvam of Sanskrit ḍhavam, giving an I E dhwem, the final -a owing its existence to the analogy of -ta and -anta. On the other hand the first plural in -wasta may have a primary ending in -was, affected by the secondary ending in I E -medbo which in Hittite would give -meta. The first person singular in -ha is as usual obscure, but it is plausible to suppose that the primary ending -ai was reduced to -a by analogy of the other endings, and the mysterious b was originally used after vowel stems to avoid hiatus, and then appended to consonantal stems. But that is uncertain, though the natural conclusion is that the present medio-passive of Hittite is less original than I E. Of the quite secondary character of the preterite of the medio-passive there is no possible doubt. It is formed by appending -t or -ti to the present, so that we have forms like estat, esantat, kisantati, syawastasi, and kisdumati, showing once more Hittite as a developed form of I E.

The -ra forms of Hittite are added without change of sense as in artatari beside arta, esantari beside esanta, syahbari beside taparha. It seems impossible to regard this as anything but a specifically Hittite development of the use of the -r termination which must have been I E, as it is found in variant forms in such various I E speeches. Anything primitive here seems quite out of place.

With this accords much else in Hittite. The substitution of a for o is clearly indicative of an important change, while the loss of the dual, and of the subjunctive and optative can be regarded as natural in a speech cut off from contact with the main body of I E speeches and developing in contact with people of alien tongues. The natural conclusion from these and the other points above noted is that Hittite broke off from I E, when the latter was in a fairly early stage of development, but that its value for the reconstruction of I E is seriously diminished by the decay which rapidly affected...
The conclusion is important in that it discounts efforts to reconstruct theories of ablaut by building on the phenomena of Hittite either as regards vowel changes or the mysterious $b$. If laryngeals are to come to honour as part of the reconstructed IE, it will be necessary to adduce much more convincing proof than conjectures based on the baffling features of Hittite, preserved as it is in a spelling offering abundant possibilities of interpretation.

II The Theory of Hittite-Tocharian Unity

Accepting, as seems inevitable, the view that Hittite is merely another IE speech, it remains to be considered whether it has specially close connections with any other member of the group. The most definite theory on this head is that of W. Petersen who has put forward (*Language*, ix) all the possible grounds for a close connection between Hittite and Tocharian, and has made out a fair *prima facie* case for his views. The essential evidence, of course, can be given only by features of common innovation. No amount of preservation of ancient characteristics is of importance in this regard.

(1) Both languages are admittedly marked by the loss of the aspiration and voice in explosives, so that in Tocharian we have nothing but $p, t, k$ to represent the rich variety of IE, except where there are secondary developments such as that of $t$ to $c$ in mācar 'mother' or $t$ for an original $dh$ to $c$ in ekācar from IE dhugāter. In the case of Hittite, however, the matter is not so simple, for we find (a) explosives written as $t$ or $d$, and so forth, and (b) explosives frequently doubled. The former feature seems to be merely graphic, and the unvoiced explosive to have been pronounced in every case. The latter presents greater difficulty, and it is a plausible view that the duplication marked out the sounds as fortes as opposed to lenes,
without any distinction of voiceless and voiced. Petersen notes, but, no doubt legitimately, rejects the conjecture of Professor Einarsson that the duplication indicates a diversity of duration, the view being that voiceless explosives are longer than voiced, for the distinction seems far too slight to have been thus appreciated in Hittite. Is there any reason whatever to assume that this change was accomplished in common in the two speeches, Tocharian later losing even the distinction of fortes and lenes? It seems clear that there is no justification for the theory. It is perfectly simple to suppose that the I E distinctions of explosives were simply lost by contact with peoples who had not the same distinction. It is quite true that the Germanic and Armenian sound changes are not parallel, because they consist of shifts of the different orders of consonants, but we have, e.g., the conversion of the consonants in Paisacı Prâkrit as a good parallel to show what might happen to I E speeches spoken in border lands.

(2) There is no doubt that it is natural to connect Tocharian *tkam* and Hittite *tegan*, genitive *taknas* 'earth', and to contrast them with the Greek *khthôn* and Sanskrit *ksā-s*. Kreis holds that the former forms point to an I E *dheghon-*-, which suffered transposition of the initial consonants in Sanskrit and Greek. If this is the case, then no argument regarding the relations of Hittite and Tocharian is possible. If on the other hand the Greek and Sanskrit show the original order, we may assume independent variation in Hittite and Tocharian of an unusual initial consonant group. It is to be noted that they differ in the essential that Hittite has a full vowel between the consonant as opposed to Tocharian.

13 *JAOS*, lxxxvi 1 ff
14 *Language*, xii 177 ff
15 Etruscan is a speech which has something like lenes
16 *Glotta*, xx 66 ff
That explanation for this reason is more plausible than the alternative views of a dialectical variation in I E or the descent of Hittite and Tocharian from a common derivative of I.E which made the change.

Another metathesis performed in common has been suggested by Petersen in the case of Hittite pakhur, Tocharian por as against Greek per, Umbrian per, Armenian hur, and against Old High German fur. He suggests an I E pu(w)ru, whence by metathesis paur, contracted to por in Tocharian, and with a hiatus—avoiding b in Hittite It is difficult to feel any confidence in this suggestion, nor is the doubt diminished by the fact that Tocharian appears also to have a dialectical variant B puwar in which the u of the word takes its normal first place.

(3) In Hittite the only case forms which can be compared directly with those believed to have existed in I E are the nominative, accusative, genitive, and dative singular, and the nominative and perhaps the accusative plural. Thus we have -s in the nominative singular, antubsas, tuzzis, assus, -n (I E -m) in the accusative, antubsan, tuzzin, assun, -as in the genitive (I E -os or -as), antubsas, -t in the dative (I E -et), antubs, assaus, -as (I E -ös or -äs), -es (I E -es or eyes), and us by analogy in the nominative plural. The suggestion therefore is that, when Hittite separated from I E, the latter had not yet developed a plural declension but used one form of all cases, unless the accusative plural is an exception. In Tocharian most of the cases of the noun, six out of nine, are patently secondary, being formed by addition of post-positions to the oblique case at comparatively late periods. In the plural the genitive, which is primary in the singular, is secondary and based on the oblique, leaving in the singular nominative, oblique and genitive, in the plural nominative and oblique, the two in many cases coinciding. The oblique may fairly be traced to the I E accusative, and the loss of the dative may have taken place in Tocharian itself, which
may indeed preserve in such a genitive as läntse ‘of the queen’ a trace of the I E. dative in -es

The argument of a common development of Hittite and Tocharian seems most insufficient. There must be remembered the contention of Sturtevant above noted which sees in Hittite signs of an ablative and instrumental from -tos, which have I E parallels. The simplification of the I E in the speeches separately seems the natural explanation of the phenomenon. Nor is Petersen’s view really strengthened by the parallel which he draws between the fact that in Hittite all genitives singular and genitives and dative plural end in -as, while in Tocharian the -is of the genitive singular is added in many cases to the common nominative and oblique form of the plural, e.g. ēmy, gen sing ēmys, plural ēmyintw-is. The parallel, though interesting, is far too distant to suggest a common historical origin.

(4) It is pointed out that Hittite has for the first person pronoun the nominative uk or ug, to which the only parallel is Tocharian ūuk, which is secondarily confined to the feminine. The strange ū is no doubt from the plural I E nos, while the u is from the second person, in which Hittite has the accusative tuk or tug, but Tocharian has not the ū. That the changes ‘must have been made in common’ is surely quite unproved. The assimilation of the vowels of the pronouns is a very natural phenomenon, and its occurrence in both speeches separately is natural enough. It would be different if the pronouns showed other important similarities of a distinctive character, but it is not claimed that this is the case nor in fact is it so.

(5) The free use in Hittite and Tocharian of the present suffix I E -sko- which appears as s besides sk in the B dialect of Tocharian

17 The suggestion that the -ntu is paralleled to Luvian -nza (-nta), and comparable to Hittite genitive plurals like kuenzan is implausible.
has slight significance, as its IE character is clear from Sanskrit gācchāmi, Greek básō, Latin cresco, but that significance is further diminished by the fact that in Hittite the tendency is to use the suffix in an iterative-durative sense as opposed to the prevalent causative sense in Tocharian. Two independent developments of an IE. inheritance may simply be postulated.

(6) We have seen that the perfect termination of the second person -tha makes its way into the present, invariably is this the case in the hi- conjugation which is derived from the perfect, but it occurs also in the mi- conjugation which is a true present. Tocharian has invariably -t as in knānat 'thou knowest', yat 'thou doest', the short vowel disappearing as is normal. Here again a common transfer seems wholly speculative.

(7) Nor is the case better with the suggestion that Hittite and Tocharian shared the important morphological innovation of the entry of forms of the s-aorist into the preterite active paradigm. The parallel forms are second singular Hittite -sta, as above, Tocharian -st, as in weñast 'thou didst say', third -s in both, Tocharian yāmas 'he made', second plural Hittite -sten, Tocharian -s, weñās 'ye said'. It is quite possible to hold that the Tocharian form in the last case goes back to -ste as does the Hittite, but it remains purely conjectural. That the parallelism should be accidental is said to be inconceivable, but this seems to overstate the position seriously. We have forms like Latin vidisti, and it has been urged with energy that there is no innovation, and no s-aorist but a morpheme intended to facilitate inflection, the use of which for phonetic reasons is restricted to certain persons. It is not necessary to adopt this doctrine to find the argument derived from the partial similarities of the two speeches quite without decisive force, even apart from the difference in usage, the Tocharian s-forms being found in every

18 Benveniste, Hirt-Festschrift, II, 230, Meillet, BSL, xxxiv 127 f
preterite, while in Hittite they are confined as mentioned above to preterites of the *h*- conjugation

(8) Still less promising is the theory of innovation in the treatment of the IE first person singular perfect Tocharian *weñä* 'I said' is said to be the result of contraction of the normal *-a* as in Sanskrit *veda*, Greek *oída*, in case of a vowel stem and the transfer of the vowel resulting to a consonantal stem. In Hittite the same *-a*, it is held, was added to vowel stems, *h* being developed to avoid hiatus, and then *-a* altered by analogy to *-i*, e.g., *memahbi* 'I say', *dabbi* 'I take'. The form, of course, in Hittite is present, in Tocharian preterite, but that can be disregarded as a secondary development. This is doubtless not impossible, but the chance of the two phenomena really going back to a common source seems negligible.

(9) The medio-passives are also called into play as an argument. Here again the divergence is as great as the similarity. Tocharian has developed the rule that *-r* forms are present in use, forms without *-r* preterite. Thus the third singular present is *kalpna:r*, the preterite *kalpät*, the third plurals are *kalpna:nar* and *kalpánt*, and so on. It seems much more natural to accept independent developments, not common innovation. Phrygian also shows a similar phenomenon of the facultative addition of *-or*.

(10) Nor is it easy to find the development of a single medio-passive, originally without tense-meaning, of forms without *r*. The resemblances between the two speeches in this regard are far from extensive. In the first person singular Tocharian has *-e*, as in *kalpe*, which looks like IE *-ai* as in Sanskrit *bruve*, Old Norse Icelandic *bæte*, while Hittite has *-ha*, as in *taparha*, which has to be explained as analogical to the other *-a* endings of the forms. The forms for the third singular and plural *kalpät* and *kalpánt* may correspond to the Hittite, but it is far from certain that the second plural *kalpác* corresponds to *-dhuam*. It is clear that the first plural of Tocharian
The Relation of Hittite, Tocharian and Indo-European

in -mat, e.g. kalpāmat, is quite distinct from the Hittite and corresponds to Greek -metba and Sanskrit -mahi, I E -medhō. In the second singular Hittite -ta as in pabhasta, and Tocharian -te are supposed to go back to a common -ta, a contamination of the two I E secondary terminations -thes as in Sanskrit ádithās, and -so as in proto-Greek epherośo. The Tocharian is held to have been affected by the -e of the first person. It is much simpler to assume that each speech had its own history, not is this probability diminished by the fact that the Tocharian uses these forms as past, Hittite as present.

(11) Two common roots are adduced which are not found at least in the same sense in the rest of the I E speeches. The first is (i)ya- 'make, do', Hittite nyazzi 'he does', Tocharian yas. The second is ar- 'give' seen in Tocharian es 'he gives', and in Hittite with the prefix pe in pe-, par- 'give', as in pebhī 'I give', país 'he gave'. It is suggested that the development of the use of this root goes hand in hand with the loss of I E dā 'give', because in both it became indistinguishable from dhā- 'place', which alone continued to exist in the sense 'take in Hittite. The latter observation should be qualified by the reminder that with the prefix ā dā- in Sanskrit denotes 'take'. The root, however, is clearly I E, for we have the Greek āisa, the lot destined, and so fate, the Oscan genitive āteīs, 'part', Avestan āta 'retribution', and perhaps the Illyrian proper name Aitor. Similarly the Hittite ekus- 'drink' is comparable with the Tocharian yok-, but we can hardly insist on dismissing connection with aqua in Latin. We have again Hittite kasza (kasts) and Tocharian kast 'hunger' with no close cognates. But Hittite papars-, Tocharian pars- 'sprinkle' remind us of Sanskrit prsat, Tocharian wārpa- 'enclose', Hittite warpa triya of Avestan varep. Without further details it is reasonably clear that there is no such close comparison in vocabulary as to cause us to postulate a common development.
There is a certain similarity between Hittite and Tocharian in the signification of participles. Thus in Tocharian those in -u may be passive or active, while those in -mam A dialect, mane B dialect are not properly middle. In Hittite participles in -nt are passive in sense where the verb is active and vice versa, pointing to an original indetermination of character. But there is no close parallel, and we need not even ascribe the uses to archaism.

III The Dialectical Grouping of Tocharian

The only conclusion possible in view of the evidence is that the idea of a common development of Hittite and Tocharian is not rendered even probable by the evidence adduced. It remains therefore to consider whether it is possible to group Tocharian, regarded like Hittite as a distinct branch of I E, more closely with some of the speeches than with others.

Nothing definite can be deduced from the fact that Tocharian shows the maintenance of velars and traces of labio-velars, as in puk as a variant form for I E pekw-, Latin coquo 'I cook', as opposed to Sanskrit pac- The advent of palatalization is a later development. There are many other survivals, for example the -wā of the first person prakwā, yāmwa, is akin to Sanskrit javānau, Latin amāvi, Armenian cnaw, and Hittite -un. The third plural weṅāre is comparable with Latin videre, but also with the -er (-er) of Hittite, -ur of Sanskrit and -ār, of Avestan. If we compare ktsa- 'grow old' with Greek phthinō as against Sanskrit kṣ-, we have another archaism. Tocharian as we have seen uses the suffix -sko mainly in a causative sense, but it preserves in a few cases traces of the iterative-intensive sense which may have been specifically I E. Archaic also is probably the existence of perfects with and without reduplication, now found dialectically divided, e.g. dialect A cacal, B cāla, A

19 Benveniste, Hitt-Festschrift, n, 227-40
śārs, B śārsa, for there is no reason to deny the existence of both forms in I E, just as Old Latin has feced and shefaked which are of distinct origin, and the Hittite br-conjugation has reduplicated as well as simple forms.

(2) Certain facts of morphology are more interesting as evidence of affinity. Thus Tocharian shares with Slav and Armenian a tendency to make participial use of the suffix -lo, especially interesting is its expansion to -lyo giving Tocharian yokalle 'to be drunk' and Armenian sireli 'to be loved.' Again, the use of the prefix p- with the imperative is held to correspond in form and function to Slav po, Lithuanian pa, the purpose being to render the imperfect perfective, but later sinking to a normal accompaniment as in br- from pa- in modern Iranian. A further point of interest is the suffix -une of abstracts, which is like the old Slav suffix of abstracts -yja, Lithuanian -une, which is differentiated from Latin pecunia by the fact that the n there is of the stem. It is also interesting that, while Tocharian is merely archaic in its use of the adjective in place of the genitive, a trait common to Slav as well as Luvian, it makes specially frequent employment of the suffix A -sr, B -sse, which is I E -skiyo, found in Armenian as -ači and in the Slav -sku, as well as in Germanic -iska. But the Slav parallel admittedly is suspect of being merely a borrowing from Germanic20 and is therefore not altogether cogent. With Hittite and Armenian Tocharian shares abstention from the use of the comparative suffix -tero, the positive of the adjective with the ablative serving to express comparison as it may in Sanskrit. It is interesting also to note that in the use of ne after the relative-interrogative as in kus ne Tocharian recalls Phrygian nos mi, but of course we have other traces of this ne as in Avestan otthe-nā, Thessalian bonē, and Latin ne.

20 There is a Ligurian suffix -aseo -asea, but that is probably not I E. Krahe, *Hitt-Festschrift*, n 252, 253.
(3) From the vocabulary we have seen that no definite affinity to Hittite can be established. Equally is it impossible to see close relations with Indo-Iranian, a case like *lam-lyam*—in B as compared with Sanskrit *layate* is isolated. On the other hand Tocharian definitely shows a general affinity to the European speeches where they differ from Indo-Iranian. Striking is A *alyak*, B *alyek* against anya ‘other’. Tocharian has por ‘fire’, salyi ‘salt’, Latin *sel*, A *was*, B *yasâ*, Latin *aurum*, Old Prussian *ausis*, Lithuanian *aiksas* ‘gold’, *kronsâ* ‘bec’, Latin *crâbro*, Lithuanian *sir suo*, Old High German *horuz*, A *maïn*, B *meom* ‘moon’, A *maïn*, B *meñ* ‘month’ from *men*- as opposed to *mes*- of Indo-Iranian but also of Slav, A *lake*, B *leke* Greek *lékhos*, Gothic *ligan*, *wal*-‘die’ Greek *onlê*, Lithuanian *velys*, Old Icelandic *valr*, Welsh *gwelt*, *wal*-‘rule’, Latin *valeo*, ‘be strong’, Old Irish *flath* ‘royalty’. Interesting also is *plâk*- ‘make accord’ with Latin *placeo*, *aks*- ‘to proclaim’ with Latin *prodigium*, Greek *ánoga*, Armenian *asem* ‘I say’, *saks*- ‘say’ is clearly parallel with Greek *ennêpo*, Latin *incece* (imperative), Lithuanian *sakyti*, and it may be with Hittite *sak*- or *saku*-.

Significant is *āre* ‘plough’ and Latin *arâre*, a word of a culture different from Indo-Iranian. The root *tak*- ‘touch’ is paralleled in Latin *tango*, Greek *tetagôn*, and Gothic *tekan* must be derived from a variant with a sonant initial *ekro* ‘poor’ compares with *egeo*, Old Icelandic *ekla* ‘privation’, and so forth.

(4) Special similarities are believed to exist in the case of Greek, Armenian, the close relation of which to Greek is often now asserted, and Thracian and Phrygian, which are probably closely akin to Armenian, in accordance with the historical tradition, Herodotus already declaring the Armenians derived from the Phrygians. The material adduced is scanty. The word for ‘hand’, A *tsar*, B *sar*, is comparable with Greek *khêir*, Armenian *yern*, but Hittite *kessera* may be cognate. *mî*, ‘town’ is reminiscent of Thraco-Phrygian *bria*

---

21 Cf. Sturtevant, *Language*, vi 219
and kerciye ‘palace’ of Phrygian Gordion, Old Slav gordǔ, Lithuanian gardas ime, equivalent of smriti, A imasu B ymassu ‘thinking’ may be akin to Armenian imanam ‘I reflect’, but possibly Latin imago and imitor are also in relation lap ‘top’ corresponds to Greek lóphos ‘crest’, A se B soya ‘son’ accords with Greek bútós, A swase B swese ‘rain’ with Greek bútis, bútós orkam ‘darkness’ seems related to Greek orphnos, and ultimately to words such as érebos which again is comparable with Sanskrit rajas épāl ‘head’ is akin to Greek keptalē, but also to Old High German gebel, and, if oki ‘and’ recalls Greek aúge, there is Gothic auk not to be forgotten. More important is the coincidence in formation of kupre ‘if’ with Greek óphra and Armenian ērb.

Taken all in all, this evidence seems inadequate to support the thesis of any close relation to these speeches, which remain as before in some measure isolated.

(5) Correspondences with Slav and Baltic are also adduced. A rake, B rekt ‘word’ correspond to Old Slav reci ṭik ‘write’, Old Slav pisati and Iranian pis-, ‘write’ are believed to be independent, and to be a cultural point of importance. B laks ‘fish’ has Slav and Lithuanian parallels but also the Old High German labs ‘salmon’. B walke ‘of long duration’ has a correspondent in Old Slav veliku ‘great’, sark ‘disease’ has Lithuanian sergu, but also Middle Irish sarg ‘malady’, pal ‘celebrate’ is cognate to Lithuanian bylā ‘voice’ but ultimately also to Sanskrit bhan.

Here again the parallels are few, and far from unique in character, and affinity with Balto-Slav must be regarded as unproved.

It is difficult then to accept Benveniste’s conclusions on the position of Tocharian. His view that connections with Italo-Celtic are remote is in accord with the view expressed by me in criticism of Pedersen’s effort to group the IE dialects. Connection with

22 Indian Linguistics, 11 1-12
Germanic is also slight, nor is it possible to ignore the great differences between Tocharian and Hittite already alluded to, to which may be added the feminine in Tocharian and the development of nominal forms. But any close connection either with the dialectical group of Balto-Slav or that of Greek-Thraco-Phrygian-Armenian seems wholly unproved by the evidence above set out, and the localisation of Tocharian sofar as it is based on the linguistic evidence seems hazardous.

We may readily believe that Greeks, Thracians and Phrygians were once in close relations to the northern regions, no one doubts that the Greeks entered Greece from the north, probably the northwest. The Thracians are known to have been settled to the north of the Carpathians, stretching east to the mouth of the Don. The Slavs are usually held to have resided at one time in the Priepet basin north east of the Carpathians with the proto-Germans on their west. But to find a like habitat for the Tocharians rests on feeble evidence. The word for ‘fish’ corresponds with that for ‘salmon’ in Baltic, Slav, and Germanic, and the salmon is unknown to the Mediterranean and the Black Sea. The word for ‘bees’ is cognate to the term for ‘hornet’ in these speeches and Latin, adopted probably because of a taboo on the true name, its existence strongly suggests neighbourhood to Slavs, Balts and Germans, as bee-keepers, since the bee is relatively a new-comer to central Asia. The word for ‘gold’ again seems to go back to was as against aus of Baltic and Italic. We are reminded of the gold of Transylvania whence the Thraco-Phrygians obtained their ornaments or the fabled riches of the Scythians in the Ural region. Armenian oski may be another hint of a former unity. The word for ‘salt’ again reminds us of the wealth of salt at the mouth of the Dnieper known to Herodotos, while Thracian

23 Herodotos, iv 104
24 Herodotos, i 115, iv 10, 71
25 iv 53
place names often contain the element sald-. Between the Dnieper therefore and the Urals once dwelt the Proto-Tocharians, which accords with the lexical correspondences with Germanic on the one hand and Finnish on the other. This area was perhaps the Indo-European home, though earlier the Indo-Europeans may have lived further to the east in the Kirghis steppes, a view which I have elsewhere discussed 26.

Ingenious as is this argument, it is right to hold that it is not made out in so far as it seeks to locate the Tocharians. The evidence, though of interest and not negligible, is too scanty to render the conclusion achieved of more than plausible character. The issue is wholly open to reconsideration. It is necessary to admit that so far as linguistic evidence goes there is no ground whatever on which we can assert with any reasonable assurance that the Tocharians ever lived in Europe or on its borders. Those who claim an Asiatic home for the Indo-Europeans are quite entitled to deny the cogency of the suggestion that we can find in the evidence above discussed any real proof of a western home. Tocharian is known at so late a date that it may easily have borrowed words from many sources and from long distances. The result reached is no doubt negative, but it is better to accept limitations of knowledge rather than adopt theories which rest on wholly inadequate evidence, and which may easily be replaced by other theories of the same unsubstantiated kind.

In the case of Hittite negation of its claim to independence is of importance, because, were the Indo-Hittite theory accepted, a wide reconstruction of Indo-European as at present understood would become necessary. We should, for example, be entitled to work out a new theory of ablaut which would differ considerably from the present doctrines, but which would take into account the vowel system of Hittite as something not to be treated as the mere dege-

26 IHQ, xiii 1-30
eration of an Indo-European speech in conditions unfavourable to its maintenance in integrity. But the latter view seems to possess greater probability, and to render the making of a new hypothesis even more than normally speculative. It is also extremely doubtful whether the evidence of Hittite can effectively be used to impugn our present theory of a rather developed Indo-European speech. No doubt there is a widespread tendency at the present to suggest that the elaborate verbal system constructed, for Indo-European on the basis of comparison of Sanskrit and Greek is a late development, a doctrine popular with those who desire to establish the essentially I E character of Germanic as the speech of the Aryan people, progenitors of the National Socialists of contemporary Germany, as against the more natural conclusion from the consonantal shift in Germanic and its simplification of the verbal system that Germanic represents a speech of I E character as affected by its adoption by a people of alien blood. Hittite, it may be said, supports the view that I E was originally much simpler than Greek or Sanskrit, but it must be noted that the vocabulary of Hittite suggests non-I E origin, and that, if this is so, it is fair to believe that a language, which could accept so largely a strange vocabulary, must have been liable to simplification in the mouths of people who must surely have been deeply influenced by non-Europeans and probably intermingled in blood.

A BERRIDGE KEITH

27 Cf Ammann, Hirt-Festschrift, II 341, A Schmitt, ibid., II 343-62
Naming a Child or a Person

Very elaborate rules are given in the Grhya-sūtras about naming a child. In this paper I propose to compare those rules with the practices deducible from the Vedic literature as also to discuss how persons were named in India from very ancient times.

In the Rgveda (VIII 80 9) we read: ‘when you give us a fourth name connected with the (the performance of) a sacrifice we long for it, immediately afterwards you, our lord, take us (forward or towards glory)’ Here is a clear reference to the fact that the performer of a yajña took a name indicative of that fact and that was his fourth name. Sāyana explains these four names thus: one derived from the naksatra (at birth), the second a secret name, the third a publicly known one and the fourth an epithet like Somayāji (due to one’s having performed a Soma sacrifice). Later works like the Vaibhānasasmārtasūtra² (III 19) prescribe that a man may assume a name after consecration of the sacred fires (such as Agnicit, Vājapeyakrit etc.) In Rv X 54 4 also there appears to be a reference to four names (though Sāyana here takes nāma as meaning śarīra or karma). Rv IX 75 2 has ‘The son has a third name which is unknown to the parents and which is in the bright parts of the heaven.’ This is a reference to the three names of a person, two being his ordinary name and his naksatra name and the third (which his parents could not foresee) was given for his performance of a sacrifice. In the Rv

1. दुरीर्य नाम यहिः वदाकरसुदुरसिः। श्राद्धतिः श्राहस्ते। श्र्यं. VIII 80 9
2. आम्यायात्मापरमाहिताग्निदर्शनमान्तः प्रकाश नाम भवेत।। वैष्णवसामार्तेशूल
3. दशार्ति पुजुष पिलोरापोत्वा नाम तुलियमधि रोचने दिवः।। श्र्यं. IX 75 2
4. Vade वैष्णवत्सामस्तः I I I 4-8 नामामेः दशार्ति नवंतमायथै।

द्वितीयमन्य नामपूर्व गुष्ठसमायादिप्रथानिमोपनयनकलामातापितरी सत्विताः भवत्।।

सोमनाथ स्त्रीली नाम कुमारिति विकायते।।
frequent reference is made to the secret name of a person 'He
does know that secret and concealed name given to these cows'"n
(Rv IX 87 3) Similarly in Rv X 55. 1-2 there is a reference to a
secret name (gubham nāma) In the Ś Br, after recommending
the consecration of fires (agnyādhāna) on the constellation of
Falgunis it is said that they are the naksatras presided over by Indra,
that Arjuna is the secret name (gubya-nāma) of Indra and that the
Falgunis are called Arjunis in an indirect (or esoteric) way The
Br Up (VI 4 26) says that the father on the birth of his son bes-
tows on him a name with the words 'thou art Veda' and that name
becomes the boy's secret name

In the Tait S (VI 3 1) it is said 'therefore a brāhmaṇa who
has two names prospers (or is successful)' In another place the
Tait S (I 5 10 1) has 'Oh Fire Jātavedas, that first name which my
father and mother bestowed on me aforetime, bear it until my return
Oh fire, I shall bear thy name " This verse occurs with several vari-
tations in other samhitās" and it is quoted in several sūtrās also In
this way reverence was paid to the Āhavaniya fire by one who was
about to go on a journey

In the Vedic literature we come across some cases of three names
for the same person In Rv V 33 8 we find 'Trasadasyu Pauruk-
kutsya Gairksita', the first being his ordinary name, the second
a derivative from Puruksutra (his father's name) and the last

5 स विन्दुवेद निहितं यदासामीत्वं गुब्यं नाम गोपाय। अथ, IX 87 3

6 ब्रजुर्नो हैं नामेनो यदुव गुब्यं नामाजुर्नो हैं नामेतत्तथा एतत्त्वोज्ज्वमाचुते
फल्य इति। तत्पथम II 1 2 11

7 तत्पथम द्विगामा ब्राह्मणोधुः। तै, सं VI 3 1 This sentence is
quoted in several Gṛhya sūtras

8 नाम नाम प्रथम जातवेदं पिता माता च दशभुवयेदने।
तत्वं विशिष्टं पुनरा मद्यीत्सवाहं नाम विभारितने। तैशे सं. I 5 10 1

9 E.g., the काठकायित्ता (VII 3) reads '.. दशभुवयेदे।
तत्वेण गोपत्य पुनवेदे ते वयस्य विभारम तद्य नाम इति.'
derived from Gunisita (a gotra) From RV VII 33 10-13 it seems to follow that Agastyia was also called Māna and Maitrāyaruna (vide also I 117 11) In the Āit Br (40 5) a king named Sutvan Kariśi Bhārgāyana is mentioned, where the second name is derived from his father’s name and the third is a gotra name. In the same Brāhmaṇa (33 5) Sunahṣepa Ājigarti (son of Ajigarta) is addressed as Āṅgrasa (a gotra name) Harisendra (a king) is spoken of (in Āit Br 33 1) as Vaidhasa (son of Vedhas) and Āiśkvāka (born in Iksvāku’s family). In the Tāṇḍya Br (XIII 3 12) we hear of a king Tyaruna Traidhātva (son of Tridhātu) Āiśkvāka (descendant of Iksvāku). In the Satapatha (XIII 5 4 1.) Indrota Daivāpa (son of Devāpi) Saunaka is said to have been the priest of Janaśeṣayā at the latter’s horse sacrifice. In the Chāndogya Upānisad (V 3 1 and 7) Svetaketu Āruneya (son of Āruni and grandson of Āruna) is styled Gautama In the same Upānisad both Indradyumna, Bhāllaveya and Budila Āsvataraśvi are addressed as Vaiyāghrapadya (a gotra name) by king Aśvapati Kaikēya (Chā V 14 1 and V 16 1) In the Kathopanisad (I 1 1) Nāciketas is said to be Vaiṣaṭra-vasa’s son and in I 11 his father’s name is given as Audḍālakī Āruni and Nāciketas himself is addressed by Yama as Gautama (a gotra name) in II 5 6 This practice of giving three names is in accordance with the recommendation of the Satapatha Br (VI 1 3 9) ‘therefore when a son is born (the father) should bestow on him a name, thereby he (the father) drives away the evil (pāpman) that might attach to the boy, (the father gives) even a second, even a third (name)’ 10 The same Brāhmaṇa has in another place ‘therefore a brāhmaṇa when he does not prosper should give to himself a second name, he who knowing thus bestows upon himself a second

10 तस्मात्शुच्चत्स जातस्त्व नाम कृष्णद्वाममनेश्वस्म तदस्यहन्यसिप्रहितीयविष्य तृतीयविष्य दृश्मायाय। शास्त्रम VI 1 3 9
name does indeed prosper (or succeed) 11 In the Drāhyāyana Śrauta sūtra (I 3 9) reference is made to the fact that a Yaśamāna (sacrificer) may have three names and that they were all to be recited at certain rites 12

Usually however a person is referred to in Vedic literature by two names. Sometimes a person is mentioned by his own name and a gotra name e.g. we have Medhyātithi Kāṇva (Ṛv VIII 2 40), Hiranyastūpa Āngirasa (Ṛv X 149 5), Vatsapri Bhālandana (Tat S V 2 1 6), Bālakī Gārgya (Br Up II 1 1), Baka Dālībhya (Chā Up I 2 13), Cyavana Bhārgava (Ait Br 39 7), Kabandhi Kātyāyana (Prāśna Up I 1), Patañcāla Kāpya (Br Up III 7 1) In other cases a person is referred to by his name and another derived from a country or locality e.g. Kaśu Caidya (Ṛv VIII 5 37), Bhima Vaidarbha (Ait Br 35 8), Durmukha Pāncāla (Ait Br 39 23), Janaka Vaideha (Br Up III, I 1), Ajātaśatru Kāṣya (Br Up II 1 1), Bhārgava Vaidarbhi (Prāśna I 1), Hiranyanābha Kausalya (Prāśna VI I) In some cases a matronymic is added to a person’s name e.g. we have Dirghatama Māmateya (son of Māmatā, in Ṛv I 158 6), Kutsa Ārjuneya (son of Ārjuni, in Ṛv IV 26 1, VII 19 2, VIII 1 11), Kaksivat Auśita (son of Uśik, in Ṛv I 18 1 and Vāj S III 28), Prahlāda Kāyadhava (son of Kāyadhū, in Tat Br I 5 10 7), Mahidāsa Aitarcya (son of Itarā, in Chā III 16 7) This practice of mentioning a man by his mother’s own name or her gotra name (derived from her father’s gotra) was continued till later times, as will be shown hereafter 13 In the vamśa

---

11 तत्स्माद् वाल्हिकोपदेशे यमाने द्वितीये नाम कर्भीतं राज्योति हेवं व एवं विद्यान् द्वितीये नाम कर्भीते। शतपथ III 6 2 24

12 प्रत्येके यह्वियायायज्ञानामास्पद्यायि यानि स्तुः। द्राह्यायायावैत्ते I 3 9, on which one interpretation in the Dhanubhāṣya is that they are श्रवणादनीय, व्याप्तार्थिक and नक्षत्रनाम।
added at the end of the Brhadāranyaka Upanisad, we have about forty names of sages that are matronymic.

The most usual method of referring to a person even in the Rgveda is to give his name along with another epithet derived from his father's name. A few examples may be given. Ambarisa, Rṣāśva, Sahadeva and Surādhas are all called Vṛśāgīra (sons of Vṛśāgīr, Rv I 100 17). King Sudās is called Pājavana (son of Pājavana) and in the same verse he is said to have been the grandson (napār) of Devavat (Rv VII 18 22). We have in the Rgveda itself such names as Trīta Vaibhūvasa (son of Vibhūvas Rv X 46 3), Trīta Āptya (Rv VIII 12 16), Dādhyan Ātharvana (Rv I 116 12), Purumilha Vaidadaśi (Rv V 61 10), Prthuśravas Kānita (son of Kānita, Rv VIII 21 24) Devāpi Ārstisenā (son of Ārstisenā, Rv X 98 5, 6 and 8), Trasādasyu Paurukutṣi or Paurukutsya (son of Paurukutsa, Rv VII 19 3 and VIII 19 36), Rjiśvan Vaidathina (son of Vidathin, Rv IV 16 13), Śrījaya Daivavātā (Rv IV 15 4). Somaka Sāhadevya (Rv IV 15 9). A few examples from other Vedic works may also be cited, Śamya Bṛhataspatya (Tait S II 6 10), Vasīstha Sātyahavya (Tait S VI 6 2 2-3 and Ait Br 40 1), Bhrigu Vāruni (Ait Br 13 10 and Tait Up III 1), Bharata Daussanti (Satapatha XIII 5 4 11, Ait Br 39 9), Kavasa Aitūsa (Ait Br VIII 1), Nābhānedistha Mānavā (Ait Br 22 9), Brahmadatta Caikītānyā (son of Caikītāṇa and grandson of Cikītāṇa, Br Up I 3 24), Satyakāma Śaibya (Praśna Up I 1).

We find that sometimes the same speaker is referred to by his own name, sometimes by his gotra name and sometimes by a name which is patronymic. For example, Nāciketas is addressed as Nāciketas (in Katha Up I 1 19, 21, 24, I 2, 3 etc.) and sometimes as Gautama (II 4 15, II 5 6). Śvetaketu Āruneya is throughout addressed as Gautama by Pravāhana Jāvali (Chā V 3ff.)

In some of the Grhyasūtras the ceremony of giving a name to the child is included in the Jātakarma rite following apparently the
passage of the *Satapatha-brāhmaṇa* quoted above (note 10). For example the *Āśvalāyana Gr S* (I 13 Trivandrum ed.)¹³ says ‘when a son has been born (the father) should, before other people touch him, give him to eat from a golden vessel clarified butter and honey in which gold has been rubbed. And let (them) give the son a name beginning with a sonant, with a semivowel in it, with a *visarga* at its end, consisting of two syllables or four syllables, of two syllables if he is desirous of firm position, of four syllables if he is desirous of spiritual glory, but in every case with an even number of letters for men, an uneven for women. And let (the father) thoughtfully find out (for the son) a name to be used at respectful salutation (at the time of Upanayana), that (name) his mother and father alone should know till his Upanayana’. This shows that the boy was to have a public name (*vyāvahārīka*) and an *abhivādaniya* name, which was to be kept secret by his parents and to be used at the time of respectfully bowing to his teacher at the Upanayana. Even now boys at the time of Upanayana have a name communicated to them which they are to keep secret. The *Āpastamba-grhya-sūtra*¹⁴ similarly prescribes that on the birth of a son the father indicates the

¹³ Kūmar Jārāṇa *Pratisthānte brahmaṇa spaṁ kṣemi hiranyamānā ca hiśey eva puraṁ vadhētvāh. 1. Nāma vā mām dṛṣṇām । धोषवत्तायंतरं स्वयंभिनिर्देशानांत्र ।* 

¹⁴ Jātva Anāśekham (infra, n. 1) । नजलों म च निर्देशंति । तद्वस्य भवति ।। दसम्यावस्थातया नाथाया पुत्रस्य नाम दशाति पिता मातिति । धुर्षार चूल्लरं वा नायक्तुङ्गानात्स्या नामप्रिनिर्देशातरं धोषवत्तायंतरं स्वयं । ऋषि वा यस्मिन्नित्यपुरस्म न्यायतद्रश्च प्रतिच्छित्ति मात्रामात्र । अधुनानां नुयाति । भागव 50 VI 1-3 and 8-11 Such names with two or four syllables would be *mōśra*, *hiranyam*, *bhīrūvya*, *mārīk-yonda*; उदर्थः।
naksatra name which is kept secret and that 'on the 10th day after the mother has risen (from the lying-in chamber) and bathed, the father and the mother give a name to the son, which is of two syllables or four syllables, the first part being a noun, the latter part a verb, it should have a long vowel in the middle, or it should contain the upasarga 'su', since such a name has a firm basis, thus it is said in a Brähmana A girl’s name should have an odd number of syllables.' The Gobhila-grhyasūtra also prescribes the giving of a secret name at the time of Jātakarma and says that the Nāmakarana is to be performed after the passing of ten nights, a hundred nights or a year from birth. It then prescribes that the name to be given on that day must be a word ending in a krt termination and must not be taddhita, the other requirements are the same except that the names of girls were to end in the syllable 'dā'. The Gobhilagṛhya (II 10 22-25) says that in the Upanayana rite the teacher asks the student what his name is and adds 'the teacher settles for him a name which he is to employ when bowing at the feet of his teacher, (a name) derived from a deity or a naksatra or also from his gotra, according to some teachers'. We know from the story of Satyakāma Jābāla that his teacher asked him what his gotra was (Chāndogya IV 4 4). It will be noted that in the Chāndogya (V 14 1, V 16 1, V 17 1 etc.), Br Up (III 7, 2), Kausitaki Up (I 17) when a person approaches another for knowledge, the latter very frequently addresses him by his gotra name such

15 पुषावति जनित्वेऽसौ नामेनि नामेय युक्ताति। चलद्व गृहयेव भवति। गोभी-लीय गुणः II 7 15-16
16 जननासः प्रजाः शापासः सचासरे वा नामेयः। ब्राह्मणे माणे। ग्रजिकासाविकासः। चलद्व धोषेवदा विक्रियान्ति कुंत नाम वानाद। एवं विद्वितन्। चुएग्रांत् ब्रांश्यम्। गोभीलीय II 8 8 and 14-16
17 के नामाशेषि नामेय घटित तस्याजाति। भविष्यद्विनाथोऽन्त्यम कृप्यतुः। चक्षुशास्त्राय वा। गोभीलीयगुणः II 10 21-25
as Vaiyaghrapadya, Gautama etc. The Śāṅkhāyana grhya-sūtra (I. 24) first prescribes the giving of a name at the time of Jātakarma almost in the same words as the Gobhilagrhyā (but adds that the name may be of six syllables also) and proceeds ‘that name only his father and his mother should know. On the tenth day a name be given common use which is pleasing to the brāhmaṇas.’ The Khādra grhya (II 2 30-31, II 3 6 and 10-12) prescribes the giving of a secret name immediately on birth, of another name after ten nights, a hundred nights or a year from birth, but adds no further details. The Khādra grhya (II 4 12) further lays down that in the Upanayana rites ‘the student who has been asked by the teacher ‘what is thy name’ should declare a name derived from (the name of) a deity or a nakṣatra, which he is to use while bowing to his teacher with the words ‘I am so and so’’. This follows the custom which is referred to even in the Br Upanayana (I 4 1), ‘Therefore even when a person is called he first says ‘here am I’ and then pronounces his name whatever it may be’. The Hiranyakesigrhya-sūtra (II 4 10-15) is silent about giving a name in Jātakarma and prescribes that on the twelfth day after the birth of a child a name is to be given to a child (and the details are the same as in Āpastamba grhyā) and adds ‘let the father and the mother pronounce that name first. For it is understood ‘my name first O Jātavedas’ (vide note 8). He should give him two names. For it is known ‘therefore a brāhmaṇa who

18 च assisting names द्राति घोषणा. चतुर्वर वातिका वा रंगते चुम चिन्मय तद्वरम्। तदस्य बिता माता च वियाताम्। दशम्य व्याहारिकः ब्राह्मणायुगलम्। शाय क्षेत्र (कोषोतक) रुपम्। 1 24

19 असावित्तम नाम द्वारात्। तदन्यायम्। खादिराज्य। II 2 31-32. The com adds नामप्रकारान्म भाष्माराजसिद्धः। कालम्। 20 के नामाल्पको देवताशयं देवताशय कामिनवधिनी नाम ग्रहायास्वेमि। खादिराज्य। II 4 12, the com स्त्रीकृतृदेव exemplifies the names derived from नक्षत्रं (such as कार्तिकेय, रीतिकेय, वैशु) and the names derived from deities presiding over नक्षत्रं (such as वैशु, याम्य, ब्राह्मणे, मेघो).
Naming a Child or a Person

has two names has success’ (note 7) The second name should be a naksatra name. The one name should be secret, by the other they should call him. He gets a third name, thus it is known (from the Vedas)” 21 The Hiranyakesi-grhya tells us that in the Upanayana rite the teacher asks the student his name and the student pronounces his name with the word ‘This’ and with the words ‘Hail, O Savitr etc.’ he mentions two names (I 5 4-6) 22 The commentator explains that these two are his vyāvahārīka name and his naksatra name. The Bhāradvāja-grhya I 26 (ed by Salomons) speaks of giving a name only in Nāmakarana and closely follows the Hiranyakesi-grhya. The Pāraskara-grhya I 17 speaks of giving a name only on the tenth day after birth, specifies the details as in Gobhila-grhya (II 8 14) and adds “with an uneven number of syllables ending in ‘ā’, with a Taddhita suffix, in the case of a girl The name of a brāhmaṇa (should end in) śarman,” 21 that of a Ksatriya in varman, that of a Vaiśya in gupta.” It will be noticed that here for the first time we come across the words śarman, varman and gupta added at the end of the names of individuals respectively belonging to the three varnas. The Mānavagṛhya I 18 1-2 says “on the tenth night (after birth) he (the father) should give

21 पुलिस्य नाम द्वारा। द्रष्टवर ...प्रतिष्ठितमिति विषंयते। पिता माते भ्रमित्यादेवरयाताम्। विषंयते च मम नामम् प्रथमं जातवदि शति। देव नामसी कुपायत। विषंयते च तत्साद्व द्विनामं ब्राह्मणोऽर्थैः केति। नवलनम् द्वितीयं स्वाद्यायतदुःधम्। अन्यत्र एवैः। भृगुवन्याजी तुतीयं नाम कुपायतिति विषंयते। हिर्रस्य-केशिकम् II 4 10-15

22 द द्रष्टवत को नामाशिकत। यसस्म इरावचिते उपायामा भवति। खल्लित देव सवितरस्मेननाशुनोधम्यन्य इति नामसी यूहुपायत। हिर्रस्य-केशिकम् I 5 3-6

23 द्रष्टवमुखाया ...पिता नाम केति द्रष्टवर चूर्तां वा वैष्य...भिनिकतं कल्ल तविति। इरावव्यास कव्यो जूतियस्य गुणोऽलोकित्त। पारस्त्रकम् I 17

24 द्रष्टवां राज्या पुलिस्य नाम द्वारा। वेषय...थम द्रष्टवर चूर्तां वा। वैष्यं दान्तं कुमारीपापम्। तेनाध्यादि थरतु वाक्य पितुरामम्पेम। वैष्यं नामेष्यदेवताध्रवं नामवाश्य देवलाश्य प्रवर्चं प्रतिष्ठितम्। मानवयुज्य I 18 1-2
Naming a Child or a Person

a name to the son, which should have a sonant at the beginning and a semi-vowel in the middle, a name of two syllables or four (the names) of girls should have three syllables and end in ‘dā,’ in order that he may bow at the feet (of his teacher), (a name should be given) avoiding the father’s (own) name, a name derived from a deity or nakṣatra tends to fade, but it is forbidden to give the name of a deity directly’ (i.e. one may be called Rudradatta but not Rudra). The Vārāhagrhyāya\(^{25}\) after stating the usual rules about the names of males on the 10th day after birth adds ‘the father’s name should be avoided, or the son should have a name derived from a nakṣatra or a deity or (any other) desirable one, but a brāhmaṇa should have two names, in this way the name of a girl should end in ‘ā’ and should have an ‘a’ intercepted, should have an odd number of syllables, and should not be the name of a river, a nakṣatra, the moon, the sun, the god Pūṣan, or it should not be a name ending in ‘datta’ or ‘raksita’ preceded by the name of a god’ Manu also recommends that one should not marry a girl who bears a name which is the name of a nakṣatra, a tree, a river (III 9) The same gṛhyaśūtra (5) refers to the abhivādaniya name in Upanayana The Baudhāyana gṛhyaśūtra\(^{26}\) (II 1 23-31) refers only to the giving of a name on the 10th or 12th day after birth, gives almost the same details as to the letters of the name (but allows even six or eight syllables) as in Ṛp Gr and adds ‘the name should show that the child is a descendant of a rṣi or connected with a deity or he should have one out of the names of the father’s ancestors’ The Baudhāyaniya Gṛhyaśesa-

\(^{25}\) एवऽवेद दराम्याः हत्ता पिता माता च पुत्रस्य नाम द्वारातापः। धोष नामानां
कृतं न तद्विं द्वाराः चन्द्रचाप वा स्वक्षििनामस्मित्वाच देवतेनामानारः। िहिमाः
तु ब्राह्मणान्यां नान्म द्वाराः अकारायकारायनां स्वाभावं सुमाक्षरं नदान्तरितं
सुप्रसेवनं देवशाक्षरं च। यभे याचार युक्तः। अनायान्यां नामानि स्थूः। चन्द्राय नामायाः।
अनायान्यः स्तुतीति।

\(^{26}\) नामान्यं द्वारां ...धारार्थवर्तमानं देवशाक्षरं च। ...प्रतिपादतिः विशेषतरे।
अनायान्यं

वी. िह. II 1 24-31
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5
sūtra\textsuperscript{27} (I 11 4-18) gives more details about Nāmakarana on the 10th or 12th day after birth. It says “he bestows on the boy a name by means of a naksatra name, he has another and a second name which is used at the time of bowing down (abhīvādaniya), which only his father and mother are acquainted with till (the boy’s) upanayana. It is known that one who performs a Soma sacrifice should take a third name. To a girl (one should give) a name consisting of an odd number of syllables and ending in a long vowel as Śrī, Somyā. They also recite—the name of a brāhmaṇa should end in sarman, of a Ksatriya in ‘varman’, of a Vaiśya in ‘gupta’ and of a ‘śūdra’ in ‘bhṛtya’ or ‘dāsa’ or it may only end in ‘dāsa’.

In the case of the naksatras Rohini, Mrgaśīra, Maghā, Citarā, Jyesthā, Śravaṇa, Śatabhisak, Revati and Aśvayuk, the first vowel undergoes ‘Viddhi’, and the name Rauhina is given after the the naksatra Rohini, others also (are similarly formed). In the case of Tisya, Āslesā, Hasta, Viśākha, Anurādhā, Asādā, Śravisthā the name is the same as the original (naksatra) as in Tisya (from Tisya), the others (also yield the same names). In Phalgunī the name of Phālguna\textsuperscript{28} (results), etc. Sankha-Likhita as quoted in Aparārka prescribes Nāmakarana on the tenth day after birth and add ‘(the father) or some other elder in the family should bestow on males a name containing four or two syllables having a sonant at the beginning and a semi-vowel in the middle, in the case of girls (a name) ending in ‘i’, if a name is bestowed in this way the family becomes pure.”

\textsuperscript{27} Vide note 4 above for a portion ‘अनुग्रहः कुमारः खलिःकोसमेति दौर्ग-वर्णान्तम्। अधामण्डरण्तिः—पूजन्तिः वायुवर्मन्तिः चतुर्वर्मन्तिः युगान्तिः वैश्योऽस्मै वर्ण-दासान्ति शूद्रस्य दासान्ति ग्रहणे वा। अथ नहलालिष्ठो रोहिणीस्मासोपकारिकायमेवम्प्रवेषणः-शतिनिहर्षी वल्लभयुक्त वर्माज्ञानुदिद्वियं तत्थितविलयति। तथेतताराति। तित्त्वा-नेव वाल्लभिविशाश्वासनानांवात्स्त्रलोकितानं प्रहृतितत्त्वविकारिताति। तथेतताराति। फल्गुनः फल्गुनान्-वेदिति। ब्र. ग. शेषपूर्व 1 11 9-18

\textsuperscript{28} ‘अन्यो वा कुलाधिभुजस्य द्वारस्य श्रेष्ठे। न्तल्यं पुस्मारोकारान्ति श्रीस्मायेव इतते नामः दुष्चिता तल्कते महति। अध्यायः य 27
The Mitāksāra on Yājñavalkya 1 12 quotes a passage of Sankha that the father should give a name connected with the family deity Baijaumāpa as quoted by Aparārka says ‘the father gives a name containing one, two, three, four syllables or more without any restriction, which (name) has a krt (termination) and is not a Taddhita, for a girl he gives (a name) ending in ‘i’’. The Vaikhānasa-smārtasūtra (III 19) after prescribing a name of two or four syllables ending in a long vowel or a past participle ending in ‘ta’ and having a sonant etc proceeds ‘(he should give) two names (of which) the naksatra name is the secret one, after a man consecrates the solemn Vedic fires he gets a public name (prakāsa) such as ‘āhitāgni’ ending in the solemn rite he may have performed’. The same sūtra (I 7) shows that in Purnāvācana when requesting the brāhmaṇas to pronounce punyāha the man’s naksatra name, gotra name, his father’s name, a matronymic name and his own name should be repeated. Some of the grhyasūtras speak of a name derived from a naksatra. In the whole of the Vedic literature hundreds of names occur, but there is hardly any name of a teacher or well-known person derived directly from a naksatra. In the Satapatha Brāhmaṇa (VI 2 1 37) we are told of a person called Āsādhī Sauśromateya (son of Asādhī and Saśromatā) for whom the heads of unconsecrated animals were put and who on account of that mistake quickly perished. Here the name Āsādhī is probably connected with the naksatra Asādhā. It appears therefore that in ancient times the Naksatra name was a secret name and so we do
not find it mentioned in most of the Vedic texts. Gradually however names derived from naksatras became very common and ceased to be used as secret names. We find that for several centuries preceding the Christian era, names derived from naksatras were very prominent. Pāṇini (who cannot be placed later than 320 B.C and may be several centuries earlier still) gives some elaborate rules about names derived from naksatras. He says (IV 3 34) that names of males (and females also) are derived from Śravisthā, Phalguni, Anurādhā, Svāti, Tisya, Punarvasu, Hasta, Asādhā, and Bahulā (i.e. Krūtikā) without adding any termination in the sense of ‘born on’. Examples would be Śravisthā, Phalgunah etc. In another rule (IV 3 36) he states that in forming names from Abhijit, Ašvayuk and Satabhisak, the termination is optionally dropped, e.g., we shall have Satabhisak, Sātabhisajah and Satabhisah. By VII 3 18 he says the name Prosthapādah is derived from Prosthapāda. He states (in IV 3 37) that terminations are frequently dropped when names are formed from naksatras, e.g. we have both Rauhinah and Rohinah from Rohini. In the Junāgad Inscription of Rudrādamān (150 A.D.), we are told that the brother-in-law of Maurya Candragupta was a Vaiśya named Pusya-gupta (EI, vol VIII, p 43). This is a name derived from the naksatra Pusya and used in the 4th century B.C. We know that the founder of the Sunga dynasty was Senāpati Pusyamitra (EI, vol XX, p 54). The Mālavikāgñimitra also mentions him and so does Patañjali on Pāṇini III 2 123. His name also is derived from Pusya. This is not the place to go into the interesting question of the formation of Buddhist names. But a few examples of Buddhist names derived from naksatras will be interesting. We have the well-known name of Moggaliputta Tissa (from Tisya) in which a gotra name and naksatra name are both combined A parivrājaka Prothapāda (Prosthapāda) occurs in Dīgha I p 187 and III p 1. In the Sānscari Inscriptions of the 3rd century B.C. (EI, vol II, p. 95) we have
such names as Asāda (from Asādhā), Phaguna (from Phalgunī), Svātiguta (Svātigupta), Pusarakhita (Pusyaraksita). In the Karle Inscription there is Sātumita (Sātumitra) from Sopara (E I, vol VII, p 54) and a nun Asādhāmita (p 56). In the Sarnāth Inscription of Kaniska’s time there is a Bhiksu called Pusyavrddhi. In the Pallan Grāha dated (Valabhi) Samvat 210 (about 529 A D) there is a brāhmaṇa named Viśākha. In the plates of Śivaraṇa dated (Gupta Samvat) 283 (i.e. 602-3 A D) we find such names as Pusyasvāmi, Rohinisvāmi, Jyesthasvāmi and Revatisvāmi (E I, vol IX, p 288). The Ājñāpti of Cārudevi, queen of Pallava Vijayabuddha-Vaivara Na man was Rohinigupta (E I, vol VIII, p 146). It is not necessary to adduce more examples.

Another rule stated about Abhivādaniya names was that they should be derived from deities. From the times of the Tait S (IV 4 10 1-3) different presiding deities had been assigned to the nakṣatras from Kṛttikā (such as Agni, Prajāpati, Soma, Rudra etc. for Kṛttikā, Rohini, Mrgaśīrṣa, Ārdrā etc.). When it was said that the name should be derived from a deity, what was understood according to the commentator was a name derived from the presiding deity of the nakṣatra on which a man was born (e.g. Āgneya for one who was born on Kṛttikā). In modern times we find people named after the names of deities (e.g. such as Viṣṇu, Śiva, Sankara etc.). But ancient works do not show that that was the usage then.

In the Vedic literature we hardly find any individual name which is the same as the names of the Vedic gods, Mitra, Indra, Pūṣan, etc. We no doubt find from the Tait Up. III 1 that Bhṛgava learnt Bhārgavi Vārūni vidyā from his father who was named Varuna. But this is a solitary instance. So also we have such names as Indrota (protected by Indra) and Indradyumna (both cited above), but we have in the Vedic literature no human being who is named Indra. In the Praśna Up. (I 1) there is a Sauryāyani Gārgya, whose first name is derived from Sūrya Grhyasūtras like the Mānava (note
24) prohibited the giving of the names of deities to human beings directly. When the practice of giving the names of gods to human beings arose it is difficult to say. It is clear however that it could not have been much earlier than the first few centuries of the Christian era. We have historic examples from the 5th century onwards where persons bore the same names as gods, e.g. in the Eran stone pillar inscription of Budhagupta of Gupta Samvat 165 (484-5 A.D.) there is a brāhmaṇa Indravisnu, son of Varuna-Visnu, son of Hari-Visnu.

There is also another way of deriving names from Nakṣatras. In some of the mediaval Jyotisa works, each of the 27 nakṣattaras is divided into four pādas and to each pāda of a nakṣatra a specific letter is assigned (e.g. cū, ce, co, and lā for the four pādas of Aśvini) from which a person born in a particular pāda of Aśvini was called either Cūdāmanī, Cediṣa, Coleṣa, Lakṣmana. Even so late a work as the Dharmasindhu (1790 A.D.) disapproves of such names, as not warranted by śruti. These names are called nakṣatranāma, they are secret and muttered into the ear of the brahmacāri at his Upanayana even now.

Manu omits all these elaborate rules about giving a name in the case of males, makes no reference to the nakṣatra name or abhināvādaniya name given to a boy, but gives two simple rules (II 31-32) viz. that the name of a brāhmaṇa should be indicative of mangala, of a Kṣatriya strength, of a Vaiśya wealth and of Śudra lowness (or contempt) and that to the name of a brāhmaṇa an upapada (addition) should be joined indicating īśarman (happiness or blessing), of a king an upapada connected with protection, of a vaiśya indicating prosperity and of a śudra indicating dependence or service. We find that the Gṛhyasūtras (except Pāraskara-grhya) are silent about these upapadas added after the names of individuals of the four varnas. Therefore it may be inferred that this practice had come into vogue only sometime before the extant Manu and long after the older
gīhya-sutras Even among the Buddhists we find names ending in Sarman e.g. in the Amarāvati Buddhist sculptures the word ‘Mugudasamaputasa’ (Mukundaśarma-putrasya) occurs (Arch S of S I, vol I, p 103) The rule of Manu was not universally observed but there were frequent breaches In the Udayagiri cave inscription of Candragupta II dated (Gupta Samvat) 82 (401-2 A.D.) there is a Maharāja Visnudāsa (Gupta Inscriptions, p 21) In El, vol X, p 71 (of 436 A.D.) we have a Visnupāltabhatta (a Brāhmaṇa whose name ends in Pālita as that of a Vaiśya should) We find that ‘Vadhana’ (Vardhana) is added to the names of Saka kings (Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, vol II, p 16) Brāhmaṇa names ending in bhūti (which should be the upapada of Vaiśyas) and dāsa are found in El, vol XIX, pp 248-49 In the Sabhāparva (30 13) both Sarmakas and Varmakas are described as Kṣatriya tribes On the other hand in the Talgunda Inscription of the Kadamba King Kākustha-varman (El, vol VIII, p 24) we find that the original founder of the family was a Brāhmaṇa Mayūra-śarman, while his son and great-grandson who had become kings had ‘varman’ affixed to their names (viz Kangavarman and Kākusthavarman)

A few words may be said about matronymics In the first place they are not at all so many nor so frequent as the other names They were probably mentioned to show the high or pure descent of the persons so described on their mother’s sides also Vaiśistha (III 19) in enumerating those who are panktipāvanas mentions one whose ten ancestors in the father’s and mother’s families were śrotiyas Similarly Yājñavalkya (I 54) lays down that the wife should be selected from a big family of śrotiyas who have been famous for ten generations In the Nasik Inscription No 2 (El, vol VIII, p 60) Sri Pulumāyi is described as Vāsiṣṭhiputa Similarly the Ābhira King Īkvaśeṇa is described as Mādhāriputra (El, vol VIII, p 88) Here the mother’s gotra names are probably
specially emphasized to show that though the paternal side may not
be of the bluest Aryan blood, the mothers were of the best Aryan
families. In the Nāgarjunikonda Inscription (EI, vol XX, p 6)
Śrī Vīrāpurīsa is said to be Mādhāripūta and his father Śrī Chānta-
mūla is said to be Vāsithipūta. We find comparatively late writers
describing the gotra of their mother’s family, e.g., Bhavabhūti says
that he was a Kāśyapa while his mother was a Jātūkarnī. We learn
from a kārikā in the Mahābhāṣya that the great grammarian Pāṇini
was styled Dāksipūtra.

In some of the later smṛtis names derived from the presiding
devities of the twelve months of the year are prescribed. The Laghu-
Āśvalāyana smṛti (published by the Ānandaśrama Press, Poona)
prescribes (VI 2-3) three names, one derived from the pāda of the
naksatra on which one is born and so called ‘Janmanāma’, another
called Samvīvāvahānika (i.e., in ordinary use) which may be the same
as the child’s paternal grandfather’s and a third name derived from
the presiding deities of the months beginning with Mārgaśīrṣa.
The Śaunaka Kārikās (ms in the Bombay University Library) quotes
Garga to the effect that a name derived from the month of birth
should be given and says that Kṛṣṇa, Ananta, Acyuta, Cakti, Vai-
kuntha, Janārdana, Upendra, Yaṇāpurūsa, Vāsudeva, Hari, Yogiśa,
Pundarikākṣa, are respectively the names of the twelve months
(Cāndra) of the year (from Mārgaśīrṣa). The Nṛnayasmīndha quotes
this verse and says that according to the Madanaratna these names
are meant for months beginning with Mārgaśīrṣa or Caitra. These
names are being given to this day in various parts but not necessarily
in accordance with the month of birth.

31 संव वर्षपदेशा राशीपुलस्य पाणिने। महाभाष्य on पाणिनि I i 20 (vol I,
p 75). Pāṇini is also called शालातुरौय VI 62, ‘शालातुरौयमत्तमेवदयुक्तमेव’ and the Nogawa plate of 649 50 A.D where the name occurs राज्यशालातुरौयतन्त्रोहम्मोहपि निध्वान (E1, vol VIII at p 192) पाणिनि (IV 3 94) derives the word
Résumé

The above discussion may be summarised thus

(1) In the times of the Rgveda and Taiti S usually two names were given to a person, one of which was a secret name (vide note 7 above), but the Rgveda was not unacquainted with even three or four names for a person (vide notes 1 and 3).

(2) Throughout the Vedic literature, the names given to a person were his own secular name and one or more other names derived either from his father’s or grandfather’s name, or from his gotra or from a locality or from the name of his mother. The Satapatha speaks of giving even a third name, but how it was to be formed is not stated. Most of the names of authors whose views are mentioned by such an ancient work as Yāska’s Nṛrukta are either gotra names or patronymics e.g. Āgrāyana, Aupamanyava, Audumbarāyana, Kauṭsa, Gārgya, Maudgalya, Vārsyāyani, Sākatāyana, Sākalya, Sthaulāsthivi, though a few like Carmasīras and Sākapūmi are probably individual names.

(3) It is not quite clear from the Vedic literature how the secret name was given. Hardly any secret name except that of Indra as Arjuna is known as given to any person in the Vedic literature. It is natural that the names being secret do not appear in the texts.

(4) All the Gīhyasūtras (except Bṛhadāpa) insist on the name given to a boy being one containing an even number of syllables, usually two or four, though even six syllables or eight are allowed by a few sūtrakāras. This rule is deduced from the Vedic usage. Most of the names in the Vedic literature contain either two syllables (like Baka, Trita, Kutsa, Bhṛgu) or four (like Trasadasyu, Purukutsa,
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Medhyātithi, Brahmadatta, Satyakāma), though names of three syllables (like Cyavana, Kavasa, Bharata) or five syllables (Nabhānedistha, Hiranyastūpa) are not wanting.

Most of the sūtras recommend that the names should begin with a sonant and contain in the middle a semi-vowel. That this is a very ancient rule follows from the fact that even Patañjali (about 140 B.C.) in his Mahābhāṣya12 (ed. by Kielhorn vol I, p 4) mentions the rule that 'the father should bestow on the son on a day after the 10th from birth a name having a sonant at the beginning, a semi-vowel in the middle, a name the first syllable of which is not long, or which shows the descent from one of the three male ancestors (of the father) and which is not borne by the adversary (of the father).'

Some Sūtras (vide notes 16 and 23) prescribe that the name should end in a visarga or a long vowel. This rule is probably deduced from such names as Sudās, Dirghatamas, Prthuśravas (occurring even in the Rgveda), and such names as Vatsapriti Bhālandana (Tat S, V 2 1 6).

Some grhya-sūtras like Apastamba say that the name should have two parts the first being a noun and the second being a derivative from a verb (generally a past passive participle ending in 'ta). This rule is derived from such ancient names as Brahmadatta (which occurs in the Br Up, I 3 24 and which figures very much in ancient Pāli Buddhist works), Devadatta and Yajñadatta.

32 यहीं प्रकट। दशमयुतरूपां पुत्रश्र नाम विशेषार्थीवेदाध्यात्मकन्त स्थायित्वं विगुप्तासुनिमित्तित्वम् तद्यति प्रतिगुणतम् भवति इत्यत्र च उत्तरसुर वा नाम कहूँ कुर्याय तद्दर्ततमिति। महाभाष्य वोलै प 4 अधूः क्षेत्र में ‘स्वतंत्र तथा ये तबः पुर्या तानतु क्रयायि अभिधर्ये’.
(which figure very frequently in the Mahābhāṣya, *Śabarabhaṣya* as the stock names of persons)

(8) Most are agreed that a secret name is to be given to the boy by the parents (notes 13, 15, 18, 19) according to some at birth (notes 18, 19), according to others at the time of Nāmakarana on the 10th or 12th day after birth (note 21)

(9) There is some divergence of opinion as to the secret name among the sūtrakāras Āśvalāyana appears to prescribe that the name with a sonant at the beginning etc is to be one known to all and the parents have to find out at the same time a secret name which the boy is to use at the time of upanayana for respectful salutation, while the Śaṅkhāyanagrhyā prescribes that the ordinary name (which is required to be only pleasing to brāhmaṇas) is to be given on the 10th day, while the secret name is to be given at the time of birth and is to have all the characteristic details of being ‘ghosavādāś’ etc There is a further difference of views Hṛanyakṣigrhyā, Baudhāyana-grhyāśesāsūtra and Vaikhānasamārtasūtra prescribe that the naksatra name is to be the secret one (notes 21, 27, 30), while others like the Khādira-grhyā speak of a secret name but do not connect it with naksatras There is a further difficulty Several grhyasūtras like Gobhila, Khādira require that there should be an abhivyādāniya name (notes 17, 20) This is an ancient practice But these say that the Abhivyādāniya was to be derived from a

33 Vide Mahābhāṣya vol I p 38 लोकेः ताकमातापितरी पुलस्य जातस्य सत्यसेवकाः नाम कुर्वते देवधर्मं भद्यते हि ततोहवरादेशवेपं जातनाययमस्य संप्रेषित ।
This shows that in Patañjali's time the ordinary name was given immediately on birth and that was the vyāvalhārika name
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naksatra or a deity and Gobhila adds that according to some the abhvādaniya name should be derived from the gotra. This latter is supported by the usage of the Upanisads. When the abhvādaniya was a gotra name there could have been no secrecy about it.

(10) The name derived from a deity was originally derived from the deity presiding over the naksatra of birth. Later on the names of gods were directly used as the names of individuals, though this appears to have been originally forbidden.

(11) The upapadas śarman, varman, gupta, dāsa were added at a later date than most of the grhyasūtras.

(12) Some later smritis prescribe names derived from the names Krsna, Ananta etc. given to the twelve months.

(13) The names of girls were to contain an odd number of syllables, generally three, and were to end in a long letter either ‘ā’ according to some and ‘i’ according to others. Some said that it should end in ‘dā’.

P V Kani
The Vēlālas in Mohenjo Daro

Elsewhere I have shown how the Paravas, the Kolis and the Tirayars are referred to in the Mohenjo Daro inscriptions. In this paper I shall explain those inscriptions that mention another ancient tribe, well known as a caste in South India at present—the tribe of the Vēlālas.

They use two different signs to form the combination Vēlā the Ϝ vēl, 'trident' and the ṇ vēl, 'acacia'. The Mohenjo Daro people did not pay attention to the quantity of their vowels in their way of writing. But there is no doubt that they read the vowels either short or long according to the meaning of the context, for they knew metrics. Thus which originally means a quarter kāl, may also be read kal, 'stone', 'measure', etc.

This being presupposed, we shall now be able to read some of the inscriptions referring to this ancient people. The first epigraph speaks of one Vēlāla only.

---

2. Heras, 'The Kolikom in Mohenjo Daro', *The New Indian Antiquary* vol 1
3. Heras, 'The Tirayars in Mohenjo Daro', Paper read at the IX All-India Oriental Conference, Trivandrum 1BBRAS, 1938
4. Cf Heras, 'The Longest Mohenjo Daro Epigraph', *IIH*, XVI, p 236
5. Cf Heras, 'Mohenjo Daro, the Most Important Archaeological Site in India, *IIH*, XVI, pp 5-6
6. Photo, M.D., 1928-29, No 7040
ird ire vēlāl met, i.e. "the fence of the Vēlāla who is in the house"

This seal was very likely impressed over the soft clay of the fence, thus establishing its ownership.

The other inscriptions speaks of the Vēlālas in plural.

\[ \text{\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{image.png}
\caption{A section of the seal with inscriptions}
\end{figure}} \]

Vēlirr tīru min nad mala adu, i.e. "those are the middle mountains of the holy Fish of the Vēlālas" Elsewhere I have explained that the Mohenjo Daroans formed the plural of male nouns in three different ways, the most primitive form perhaps being in -ir, the numeral two, for whatever is more than one is plural in Dravidian language. Thus Vēlir means the men of the trident, just as Vēlāl means the man of the trident. But in our sign there is a double plural, for two strokes \[ \text{\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{image.png}
\caption{A section of the seal with inscriptions}
\end{figure}} \] placed on each side of any sign are the determinative of collectivity. Thus \[ \text{\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{image.png}
\caption{A section of the seal with inscriptions}
\end{figure}} \] marirr means 'the men of the tree', \[ \text{\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{image.png}
\caption{A section of the seal with inscriptions}
\end{figure}} \] ildir, "the men who are in the house".

Our sign has a double determinative of collectivity \[ \text{\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{image.png}
\caption{A section of the seal with inscriptions}
\end{figure}} \] and therefore it will read vēlirr with double plural termination. Such double plural is very common in Dravidian languages and gives more emphasis to the sentence.

7 Marshall, *Mohenjo Daro and the Indus Civilization* III, M D, No 130
8 Cf Heras, 'Karnataka and Mohenjo Daro', *Karnataka Historical Review*, IV, p 4. Heras, 'Numerals in Mohenjo Daro', *Journal of the Benares Hindu University*, III
This epigraph speaks of "the middle mountains." This expression seems to refer to some mountains placed between India and another country. If this is admitted "the middle mountains" nadumala will be the Himalayas which stand between India and China. It is interesting to notice that the sign meaning middle is found as in Proto-Chinese and in modern Chinese, both reading tshung, 'middle.'

These middle mountains are said to be of the holy Fish. This sort of genitive may be called 'a votive genitive.' The mountains are called of the holy Fish for they were devoted to the holy Fish. The holy Fish is the eighth form of God according to the Mohenjo Daro inscriptions." One of the inscriptions says

\[\text{Adu tal: pur min orda et kadavul, } 1\text{ e "that (is) the eighth (formed) god whose one side (form) is the sprinkled great Fish." Now these mountains dedicated to the holy Fish are of the Vēlirr, } 1\text{ e the Vēlālas. This is a real genitive of possession. The mountains belong to the Vēlālas. Supposing therefore that the mountains are the Himalayan range, the Vēlālas would be near, say, about the northern} \]

9 Cf. Heras, 'The Religion of the Mohenjo Daro People according to the Inscriptions,' Journal of the University of Bombay, (Hist & Econ Section), V, pp 8-9
10 Marshall, op cit., M.D., No 419
side of the present UP and the Punjab. This habitat of the Velālas will be confirmed by the following inscription

Velir vilāl et pati cum arup uyarel, i.e., "the high sun of the harvest of the linga of the eight villages of the Bilavas of the Velālas"

The expression "the high sun of the harvest" seems to refer to the time when the harvest is reaped. This harvest is said to be of the linga of the eight villages of the Bilavas. It apparently belonged to the linga worshipped in these eight villages of the Bilavas. From a number of inscriptions it is evident that temples or images of gods possessed lands or villages, the revenue of which was dedicated to the worship of the image, in the same way as the large temples of South India at present.


mila nandūr edu min adu An val, i.e., "let the Lord of the Ram and of the Fish of Nandūr that has lands be happy." Or this

cum ten adu, i.e., "that (is) the palm grove of the linga".

11 Marshall, op cit., II, No 99
12 Ibid., I, pl. XII, No 18
13 Ibid., III, M.D., No 488
14 For other similar inscriptions, Cf. Heras, op cit., p 25
That in these villages of the Bilavas the linga should be worshipped, it is but natural. For they together with the Kavals seem to have been the original worshippers of this symbol,\(^{15}\) from whom this strange cult passed to the Minas.

These Bilavas are said to be of the Vélālas, the territory of the Bilavas seems to have been towards the east of the Indus. So these two tribes might easily have lived in contiguous territories. The inscription seems to suggest that the Bilavas were subdued by the Vélālas. Later on the Bilava territory was annexed to Minād.\(^{16}\)

The following inscription will introduce a king of the Vélālas,

\[\text{pati nīla vēlvēlāl taltal mukililmukan, i.e. "the ruler (one who draws house of clouds) of the tridented Vélālas of the moon of the village"}

This was doubtless the seal of the Vélāla king. The sign for ruler phonetically reads "one who draws (rules) the house of clouds."\(^{18}\) Now the Vélālas are called in a similar way from very ancient times, kārālar, the rulers of the clouds.\(^{17}\)

In this inscription the Vélālas are called tridented. In fact their name means those of the trident as seen above. The reason of their special attachment to this weapon will be seen below. Besides these Vélālas are styled 'of the moon.' This denomination shows that there were at least two sorts of Vélālas. Some were called Vélālas of

\(^{15}\) Cf. Heras, op cit., pp. 14-16

\(^{16}\) Heras, 'Mohenjo Daro, the People and the Land,' Indian Culture III pp 709-710

\(^{17}\) Photo, H Neg 3050, No 15

\(^{18}\) Cf. Heras, 'The Story of Two Mohenjo Daro Signs,' Journal of the Benares Hindu University, II, No 1, pp 4-5

\(^{19}\) Pillai, The Tamils Eighteen Hundred Years Ago, pp 113 14
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the moon. May we not rightly deduce from the comparison of these Vēlālas with the two sorts of Paravas that the Vēlālas of the other section were called pagal velāl, i.e. “the Vēlālas of the Sun”? The inscription refers to the Vēlālas of one village, the name of which is not given.

The name of a king is actually mentioned in this inscription.

![Image of inscription]

Mūmaga kude velāir kodi, i.e. “the flag of the Vēlālas of the rule (umbrella) of Mūmaga”

The Vēlālas in plural are shown here by the repetition of the sign, according to what we have shown above. The umbrella, kude, is a symbol of authority and government, for only kings could use it. That is the reason why here umbrella means “rule”.

The first sign of the inscription phonetically reads Mūmaga, which literally means ‘third son’, i.e. ‘grand son’. But here the name Mūmaga must be taken as a proper name, and therefore, becomes the name of one of the kings of the Vēlālas.

Another inscription has an extraordinary reference to the clouds of the Vēlālas. Here it is.

![Image of inscription]

---

21 Von den Osten, *Ancient Oriental Seals in the Collection of Mr Edward T Newell*, pl. III, No. 23 (Chicago, 1934)
22 *AS of I*, Report, 1928-29, pl. XXXII, No. 1, Photo, H Neg 4394, No. 11
Vēlāl mukul adu Minan Min Kadavul adu, i.e. "whatever is of the clouds of the Vēlālas is of the God of Mina of the Minas". Let us try to disentangle this riddle.

The God is said to be of Mina of the Minas. He seems to be the king of the Minas. In another inscription he is presented as waging war against the Bilavas and capturing their king.

\[ \text{\begin{figure}[h]}
\end{figure}}

_dung vēlāl vēl re Minan Min nr mēd odu kadekodi adu, i.e. "that (is) the complete month of the Ram of the two Fishes of Mina of the Minas who has the king of the despised Bilavas"._ This king Mina, as is evident from this inscription, had two Fishes as a symbol on his flag, and therefore, as we know from another inscription, had the title of Minavan.

The other part of the inscription refers to the clouds of the Vēlālas. Since as seen above, the Vēlālas are called "the rulers of the clouds", the clouds evidently were a symbol of their power. Therefore, the inscription is a clear acknowledgement on the part of the Vēlālas of their belief that their power and strength proceeds from God. Their association with the Minas and their king Mina in this inscription, seems to point to a recognition of a supreme power. The Bilavas allied with the Vēlālas, according to the preceding inscriptions, were finally subdued by the Minas. Such seems also to be the fate of the Vēlālas themselves.

Thus union with the Minas or perhaps the above mentioned union of the Vēlālas with the Bilavas is referred to in the following inscription.

---

23 Marshall, _op cit._ III, M.D., No 87
24 Cf. Heras, 'The Minavan in Mohenjo Dāro', _op cit._ p 287
The Vēlālas in Mohenjo Daro

"orīda es arūp vēlan kalakūr, i.e. "the people of the united countries of Vēlan of the harvest counted on one side". Vēlan means "the one of the trident" and is even at present used as a name of Subrahmanya in South India. Vēlan has always been the god of the Vēlālas for he holds the vēl after which they themselves are styled. 26

Vēlan is brought forward in connection with the harvest. Did he preside over the harvest, or at least over its reaping? This harvest is said to be counted on one side. This passage is not easy to explain. The mention of one side seems to suggest the existence of another side or party, which had also to do the counting later on.

Once more Vēlan is spoken of in this inscription —

The first line of this inscription, contrary to the usage, reads from left to right and the second from right to left. Very likely, the first line of the inscription is missing. Its reading is as follows (two verses) —

Irūya Reidr/pag il cun/
Vēlanavan ven/kō nil/a

25 Marshall, op. cit., III, M.D., No. 397
26 The name of this caste is usually written as Vēlāla. Yet some times it is also spelt as Vēlāla. This seems to be the original spelling considering the meaning of the word and the signs used by the Mohenjo Daro writers.
27 Photo, M.D., 1930-31, Dk. 10551.
which means "the moon (is) over the white mountain of he of Vēlan of the linga of the divided house of the two high suns."

The inscription states that the moon is over the white mountain of he of Vēlan. The latter being a son of Śiva in the historic period, he should also be a son of Ān in the proto-historic period. Now Ān has only one son, styled Ānil, literally meaning 'the son of Ān'. This therefore is not his proper name. It is only a filial designation. Vēlan is not properly his name either. His real name is Murugan, the ancient Dravidian name of Subrahmanya found in one of the inscriptions of Mohenjo Daro, which reads as follows:

![Image]

The first sign of this inscription is a compound sign. Its elements are:

- \[\text{mū, 'three'}\]
- \[\text{ru, 'noise'}\]

A determinative of personality corresponding to the termination "-an".

Therefore this sign will read *muru an*, and finally *Murugan*.

The epigraph therefore reads *Murugan adu*, "that (is) Murugan."

Now returning to the original inscription, we may safely state that he of Vēlan (or Murugan) is Ān, the proto-type of Śiva. Quite properly the White Mountain, one of the Middle Mountains men-

---

28 Photo, M.D., 1928-29, No. 5890
29 Cf. Heras, "Karnataka and Mohenjo Daro", *op. cit.*, p. 4
tioned above, is said to belong to Ān, for Śiva is supposed to have his dwelling in Kailāsa, a peak of the Himalayas.

The linga is said to belong to Ān, which is in accordance with later developments, though this cult is connected with a house divided on account of the rites of the two suns. These two suns are also mentioned in other inscriptions. For instance,

\[ \text{nyarelīr adu, i.e. "those (are) the high suns"} \]

It is therefore evident that there was a sect who worshipped two suns instead of one. At the present state of our knowledge, it is impossible to say how this sect originated, but it seems to have been the cause of division of a house or family, as the inscription avers. Perhaps this expression refers to an event similar to the revolution caused in Minād by the introduction of the cult of the linga.¹¹

Very likely, the following inscription also refers to the division of the royal house on account of this strange practice of sun worship.

\[ \text{Kopurtr tirtādu karumukil adu Ān nyarel ārd, i.e. "In the city of the high sun of the Lord of the rain clouds, the carriers of domi-} \]

³⁰ *AS of I., Report* 1929–30, pl XXVIII, No 11466 (H) Cf Marshall, *op cit.*, M.D., No 496

³¹ Cf Heras, 'The Religion of the Mohenjo Daro People', *op cit.*, pp 14–16. These two suns may correspond to the two Egyptian forms of the sun, the Gods Khépère and Tun, or morning and evening sun.
³² Photo, M.D., 1928–29, No 7221
nation have finished (perished)" The inscription evidently refers to a change of dynasty in the city of the high sun. Notice that God is called the Lord of the rain clouds, which title discloses some sort of association between this city and the Vēlālas, "the rulers of the clouds."

These few inscriptions suffice to disclose the importance of the Vēlālas in the proto-historic period of India. Moreover, they give us some data to settle the original habitat of these people in North India before they were driven towards the south. Finally they show how ancient is the association of God (Ān, Śiva) with the Himālayas.

H. HERAS
Candra-Gomin

Of the very few early important writers who can be claimed for Bengal with great probability, it is fortunate that we possess some account, from Tibetan and other sources, of Candra-gomin, who is recognised as the founder of the Candra school of Sanskrit Grammar, and who enjoyed great reputation in the Buddhist world not only as a grammatian but also as a poet, philosoper and Tantric devotee. In his Vākyapadiya (ii 489-90) Bhartrhari mentions Baiji, Sauva and Haryaksa as grammarians who went before Candracārya and who by their uncritical methods contributed not a little to the neglect of the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali. As this observation accords well with Kahlan’s account of the fate of the Mahābhāṣya,1 as well as with the curious legend recorded in a late Tibetan work2 of the censure of Patañjali’s work by Candra-gomin, it has been assumed that this Candracārya is no other than our Candra-gomin.3 B Liebich, who has recovered and edited the Candra-Vyākarana4 (Sūtra, Unādi

---

1 It is noteworthy that Kahlan also refers (i 176) to Candracārya and his grammar and to his reviving the study of the Mahābhāṣya but he places Candracārya in Kashmir under Abhimanun (cir third century A.D). On this passage see F Kulhorn, IA, iv, 1875, pp 101-7, B Liebich, Ksna-taraṇini (Breslau 1913) pp 270-72


3 H P Shastri (Descriptive Cat of Sansk Mss in the ASB, vi, Vīyākaraṇa, Preface, p 1) does not accept this identification

4 Edited from Sanskrit Mss, as well as from the Tibetan version, with full indices, Leipzig 1902. The Gana-pātha, as well as the Langānuśāsana, which is quoted by Purusottama-deva in his Varna-deśanā (Eggenberg, India Office Mss Catalogue, ii, no 1039/1475, p 295), Ujvaladatta (ed Aufrecht, iv 1), Sarvānanda (on ii 6 62) and Rājamukuta on Amara (R G Bhandarkar, Report 1883-84, p 468), is missing. But the Candra Gana-pātha, as well as a Upasarga-vṛtti, exists in Tibetan. A short Varna-vṛtti by Candra-gomin is published by S K Belvalkar in his Systems of Sanskrt Grammar (Bombay-Poona 1915), p 117 (Appendix i). Cf IASB, 1908, pp 549f. A Pārāyaṇa by Candra is quoted by Ksira-svāmin in his Ksra-
and Dhātu-pātha), as well as its Vṛtta, is of opinion that Candra wrote both the text and the commentary and that he flourished probably in the period between 465 and 544 AD. The work is probably earlier than the Kāśkā of Jayāditya and Vāmana, for this commentary on Pāṇini appropriates without acknowledgment the thirty-five original Sūtras of Candra’s grammar which had no parallel in Pāṇini, but which Kayyata distinctly repudiates as un-Pāṇimian

tarangam (cd Liebich, x 82) Liebich has given a bibliography of Candra-Vyākarana and its accessory literature in Nachrichten der Göttingischer Gesellschaft, 1895, pp 272-321, summarised in IA, 1896, pp 103-5

5 Ed B Liebich, Leipzig 1918. In the colophon it is called the work of Dharmadāsa, but Liebich takes it as the name of the pupil who wrote down the master’s words. Liebich has given a detailed study of the Vṛtta in his Zur Einführung pt iv (Analyse der Candra vṛttā).

6 WZKM, xiii, 1899, pp 308-15 and Das Dattam Candra-gomin und Kālidās (Breslau 1903). The chief ground is that the sentence ayyayad gupto (Ms. pṛto or japto) hūnān in the Vṛtta (i 2 81, p 43) mentions the victory of the Gupta over the Hunas as an illustration of the use of the Perfect to describe an event in the life time of the author. The identity of Jarta or Japta, as given by manuscript evidence, is, however, not clear, and the conjecture that it is a mislection of Gupta is problematic. A B Keith appears to think (Sanskrit Drama, Oxford 1924, p 168) that Jarta refers to a Jāt prince! Belwalkar (op cit p 58), however, approximates Liebich’s dating further to 470 AD, assuming that the victory over the Hunas refers to their defeat by Skandagupta S Lévi (BEFEO, iii, 1903, pp 38f), relying on the mention by Yi-tsung (Takakusu, I-tsong, p 164, 183) of a great man named Candra Kouts (=official) or Candra-dāsa, who lived, like a Bodhisattva, in his time in Eastern India and composed a musical play about Viśvāntara, would identify this Candra with Candra-gomin. This identification would place Candra-gomin sometime before Yi-tsung, although it must be admitted that the reference is not free from doubt. Munayev, on the other hand, believes (Liebich, Pāṇini, Leipzig 1891, p 11) that Candra-gomin lived as early as the beginning of the 5th century N. Peri (Extrait du BEFEO, 1911, p 50, note 2) places Candra-gomin in the beginning of the first half of the 7th century while S C Vidyabhushan (loc cit) is of opinion that the Tibetan source (Tāranātha, Geschichte, p 146), in making Candra a contemporary of Śila, son of Harsavardhana, would place him at about 700 AD. But this late date would bring the Candra-grammar too near the accepted date of the Kāśkā, which makes use of the Candra-grammar. For a recent π discussion of the whole question see Liebich, Kṣra tarangam pp 264f.

7 Shown first by Kielhorn in IA 1886, pp 182-85, see Liebich, Konkordanz Pāṇim-Candra, Breslau 1928
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Candra-gomin

All accounts agree that Candra-gomin was a Buddhist, and this is supported not only by his honorific Buddhistic title Gomin, but also by the Mangala-śloka of the Vṛtti which pays homage to Sarvajña. The Tibetan tradition does not distinguish the grammarian Candra-gomin from the philosopher Candra-gomin, who wrote a work on Logic, entitled Nyāya-suddhyāloka,⁸ as well as from the Tantric writer of the same name to whom thirty-six miscellaneous esoteric texts are ascribed in the Bstan-bgyur ⁹. According to this account¹⁰ he belonged to a Ksatriya family in Varendra,¹¹ resided for some time at Candradvipa¹² and met the Mādhyamika commentator Candra-

8 S C Vidyabhusan, op cit, p 336
9 He is called Ācārya, Mahācārya or Mahāpandita. The texts include not only mystic Stotras in praise of Tarā, Mañjuśrī and other personalities of later Buddhist hagiology, but also works on Tantric Abhidāra as well as a few magical tracts apparently of a medical character (such as Jvarāraksā-vidhi, Kushta-śikṣāpāya, etc.) For the texts see P. Cordier in the work cited below, pp 11, 124, 267, 301, 302, 303, 304, 321, 331, 335, 355, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363
10 Tārānātha, Geschichte des Buddhismus, überetzt A Schiefner (St. Petersburg 1869), pp 148-58 and Sumpā Mkhān-po, loc cit But S C Vidyabhusan (loc cit) would distinguish the logician Candra-gomin from the grammarian of the same name, assign a much later date to the former, and credit the latter with some of the Tantric Stotras, although in his Mediaeval School of Indian Logic (Calcutta 1909) pp 121–23, he does not draw any such distinction. Tārānātha has much that is legendary to relate of Candra-gomin and ascribes to him a large number of hymns and learned works
11 Tārānātha (op cit, p 148) ‘born in Varendra in the east’, P Cordier (Catalogue du Fonds Tibétain de la Bibl Nationale, Pt II, p 302) ‘inhabitant of Barenda in Eastern India’, Sumpā Mkhān-po, op cit, pp xci, 95, 139 ‘born in Varendra in Bangala’. S K Chatterji believes that the surname gomīn corresponds to the modern Bengali cognomen ġīn. A A Macdonell (IA, 1903, p 376) thinks that Kashmir was Candra-gomin’s native place, but this is perhaps due to a misapprehension of Kahlana’s reference.
12 According to Sumpā Mkhān-po, Candra-gomin settled in Candradvipa after his exile from Varendra. In a work of Candra-gomin in the Bstan-bgyur (Cordier, p 362) he is expressly called Dvaipa. This place has been identified by Sarat Chandra Das and H P Shastri with Candradvipa in Backerganj, while S C Vidyabhusan and H P Shastri would place it generally in the district of Barisal, but P C Bagchi (intro to Kaśyānā-mirnaya, Calcutta 1934, pp 29–34) is in-
kirti at Nālandā, where he became a pupil of Sthiramati. Apart from the Tantric Vajra-yāna Sādhanās mentioned above, Candragomin is credited with some Sanskrit Stotras on Tārā and Mañjuśrī, a drama called Lokānanda and an elegant but insipid religious Kavya entitled Śisya-lekha-dharma in the form of a letter to a pupil. None of these works, if they really belong to the

clined to think that Candradvipa signifies the entire coast-line, but if it is taken to refer to a particular locality, he would identify it with the island of Sandwip in the district of Noakhali. There is no philological difficulty in deriving the word Sandwip from Candradvipa. See also IC, ii, pp. 150 f, where identification with Bāklā Candradvipa in Backergunj is advocated. It is tempting to suggest that the island, connected with the semi-historical Matsyendranātha and Buddhist Tantric cults, is probably mythical, but its actual location in eastern Bengal appears to be borne out by its mention as the seat of the Candras in the Rāmpal Copper-plate of Śnandha (EL, xx, pp. 136-142, N G Majumdar, Inscriptions of Bengal, pp. 2, 3, 7). Cf D R Bhandarkar in IC, i, p. 24.

13 Tārānātha (p. 155) tells us that Candra’s grammar superseded Candrakirtī’s Samanitabhadra, a grammar composed in Slokas, and made it disappear.

14 The Tārā cult, to which Yuan Chwang refers, must have been prevalent in the 6th century (see G de Blonay, Materiaux pour servir à l’histoire de la deesse Bouddhique Tārā, Paris 1895, pp. 3, 5, 17 f). Hirananda Shastri, ‘Origin and Cult of Tārā’ in Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India Calcutta 1925 thinks that the cult does not date further back than the 5th century. On Candragomin’s Āryā-tārā-antavali-vādha, see S C Vidyabhushan, Intro to (Sarvaśīmamitra’s) Sragdharā-stotra in Baudhā-stotra-samgraha (Bibl Ind., Calcutta 1908), pp. xx f.

15 M Winternitz, Geschichte d ind. Literature, iii, pp. 183, 399. A B Keith, Sanskrit Drama, p. 168. The drama is known only in the Tibetan version in Bstan-bgyur. It is a Buddhist work dramatising the story of a certain Maniśūla who handed over his wife and children to Brahmin as an act of supreme generosity. The author of this drama cannot be the same as the dramatist Candaka or Candraka who is placed by Kahlana under Tujjuna of Kashmir and who is quoted in the Anthologies.

16 Ed I P Minayeff in Zapiski, iv, pp. 29-52, with the Tibetan text added by A Ivanowski. It is said to have been written to a prince named Ratnakirti in order to persuade him to forsake the world. The Sanskrit text has 114 verses in different metres, whose chief theme is the misery of existence, written in the artificial kavya-style. It contains a verse which is ascribed to Candragomin in Vallabha-deva’s Subbāstāvali (no. 3368) but the verse is missing in the Tibetan version. This verse is attributed to Candra by Yi-tsong. See H Wenzel in IRAS, 1889, pp. 1133 f.
grammarians Candra-gomin, is of much consequence. The Candra-
Vyākarana, however, is a much more remarkable work, which had
currency at one time in Kashmir, Nepal, Tibet and Ceylon.
Although there is no material divergence nor anything original
(excepting the thirty-five rules mentioned above), it is not a mere
copy but an attempt at a recast and improvement upon the rules of
Pāṇini. As against the eight chapters of Pāṇini, it has six chapters
of four sections each, the matter of Pāṇini’s first two chapters being
distributed over the whole book. The Śūtras being derived from
Pāṇini, the work is in no sense un-Pāṇinian except in the fact that
it re-arranges the rules, occasionally simplifies their wording, reduces
and modifies the Pratyāhāras, makes some changes in the terminol-
ogy, distributes the Saṇjās and altogether omits, as Buddhist writers
do, the Vedic rules. Its want of any striking originality or inde-
pendence, however, must have proved fatal, and the system almost
disappeared in the later history of Sanskrit grammar.

S K Dl

17 In the matter of the Dhātu-pātha Candra agrees pretty closely with
Pāṇini, classifying the roots similarly into ten groups, but within the classes he
groups them according to the voices of verbs. Lubich points out the interesting
fact that the Dhātu-pātha of the Kātantra is in reality that of the Candra system as
modified by Durgāmunha, the genuine Kātantra Dhātu-pātha being preserved only
in Tibetan and lost in Sanskrit. The Unādi words are disposed of in three books by
Candra independently of Pāṇini, the suffixes being arranged according to their final
letter, and the words being sometimes derived in a different way.
Vyādi and Vājapyāyana

Vyādi and Vājapyāyana were two grammarians older than Kātyāyana, as shown by his reference to them in his Vārttika. The former was the author of an extensive work called Samgraha, no longer extant, which Patañjali mentions, and on which, as attested by long-established tradition, he based his ‘great commentary’ on Panini. These two grammarians seem to have differed from each other in their views respecting certain important details. One of the differences was in regard to the import of words and is fairly well known. In fact, it is in pointing out this divergence that Kātyāyana mentions both of them. Many writers on Sanskrit grammar since have referred to this difference, and it has also been noticed in modern works on the subject. It is proposed here to refer to a second point of divergence between them which does not appear to be so well known now. But since it relates to the import of propositions or, more strictly, sentences, it is necessary to start by restating briefly the nature of the first difference, which concerns the meanings of words.

Students of modern Logic are familiar with the question as to whether terms are to be understood in extension or in intension. A

---

1 See Vārttikas 35 & 45 on Panini, i, ii 64 (Keilhorn’s edition of the Mahābhāṣya, pp 242, 244). For some interesting remarks on the probable date of Vyādi, see Goldstucker’s Panini pp 209-11.

2 See Punyarāja’s com on Vākya-padiya, ii 484. From the way in which he introduces stanzas 267 & 268 of the second kānda of the Vākya-padiya, one would conclude that they are taken from this work of Vyādi.

3 Cf Helārāja on Vākya-padiya, vii 2, Punyarāja on Ib, ii 155 and Sarva-dārśana-samgraha, ch xii.

4 For example, in the Linguistic Speculations of the Hindus by Dr P C Chakravarti, p 185.
controversy of a very much allied character, viz., whether words mean a dravya or jāti occupies an important place in ancient Indian works. According to Vyādi, they signify dravyas, while according to Vājapyāyana they, including proper names, signify jātis. It should, however, be carefully remembered that neither view excludes from the complete significance of words either of these two aspects of things. The question, as Patañjali points out, is only which of the two aspects should bear more emphasis and which less. Those who maintain that the meaning is dravya imply that it is the primary sense of the word and that jāti is the subsidiary. Similarly those who hold that the meaning is jāti imply that that is the primary sense and that dravya is the subsidiary. By jāti is to be understood an essential quality which is common to two or more things. We may take it as equivalent to what is called a ‘universal’ in English. Some hold that this quality is only an abstraction, others regard it as objectively real, but this is a distinction which is not of consequence for us now. According to Vājapyāyana then, a word primarily stands for an attribute or visēsana. The precise conception of dravya, which is the import of a word according to Vyādi, is more difficult to determine. But we shall, for the moment, take it in the sense in which it is commonly taken, viz. a vyakti or a particular instance of a class, say, a cow called Khanda or Śābaleya. That is, a word stands for the visēsya here and not for the visēsana as in the previous view.

5 Cf Nyāya-sūtra, II ii 55-66 and Māmāśa-sūtra, I iii 30-6

6 According to Pāṇini, the meaning may be either the one or the other. See Mahābāhyasa, vol I, p 6 Kst punarakrith padārthab, ābositva dravyam? Ubbaya-mityāha


8 See Helārāja’s com on Vākya-padiya, III ii I
Vyādi and Vājapyāyana

It is natural to expect, from this divergence in their views about the meaning of words, that Vyādi and Vājapyāyana differed in their views regarding the import of sentences also, and this is what Helārāja avers in the beginning of his commentary on the third chapter of the Vākyapadīya. The former, he says, took bheda as the import, while the latter took it as samsarga. It should be observed that, as in the case of the meanings of words, neither thinker leaves out the other aspect of the import entirely in interpreting a sentence, only, in the view that holds bheda to be the import, samsarga is regarded as implicit in the sentence, and the reverse is taken to be true in the other view. Now the use of the terms bheda and samsarga for the meaning of propositions is not at all uncommon in Indian philosophical literature According to the interpretation ordinarily given of these terms in Advaitic works, both refer to relations among the things signified by the various terms constituting a proposition, but they are applicable to different types of it. The first applies to propositions like dandena gām naya, which present to the mind a manifold of inter-related things—the things being those that are denoted by the constituent words. The second applies to co-ordinate propositions like nilam utpalam

9 See com on III 5 (Benares edition, p 11) From the manner in which Helārāja speaks, in more than one place, of this kānda, it is to be regarded not as a portion of the Vākyapadīya, but as an Appendix to it. See pp 54, 73, 76 of the Trivandrum edition of it

10 We should note that this discussion has reference entirely to empirical usage. The ultimate import of a sentence according to Vaiyākaras, including presumably Vyādi and Vājapyāyana, is what is called pratibbā. Cf Pūnyaṭāja on Vākyapadīya, II 422 and Helārāja on III 5 (pp 10-11)

11 See Kātyāyaṇa's Pradīpa on II 1 1, Vārttika 2 (Benares edn vol II, p 13) Tatra bhedaḥ samsargāvijnābhināvānaḥ anumānya-samsargaḥ sāmarthyam, samsarga vā bheda-vijnābhāvyam-aryayā bhedaḥ

12 Cf Sureśvara's Vārttika on Br Up p 246, St 902, Nāskarmya-sūdhi III 26 (Bombay Sanskrit Series) and Īstā-sūdhi, p 32 (Gaekwad Oriental Series)

13 Cf com on Nāskarmya-sūdhi, III 3 Abhinna-vibhakti-nṛdīśa and not bhinna-vibhakti-nṛdīśa as in the previous case
Vyādi and Vājapāyana

which present to the mind a single thing, of which the qualifying features are indicated by the constituent words. The import here is thus an identity in difference. In the former case, the words not only retain the diversity of their meaning but also point to different objects, in the latter, the words, though they do not lose that diversity, point only to one object.

Now this interpretation will hardly hold in the present case, for, since it assumes that bheda and samsarga have reference to two distinct classes of sentences, they cannot form the basis for a difference of view between two thinkers. It is clear that, if it should constitute the basis of such a difference, each view must refer to all sentences or at least to one and the same type of them, and this is exactly what we find stated by Helarāja in the passage referred to above. According to him, the import of a sentence is bheda in Vyādi’s view and samsarga in Vājapāyana’s view. As explained, there, bheda should be understood as equivalent to ‘exclusion’ or ‘dissociation’ and samsarga to ‘inclusion’ or ‘association’. Now in Vyādi’s view, as we know, the meaning of a word is dravya, and its main function is to distinguish the thing it means from all similar things. Thus a ‘cow’ means here not so much what is characterised by ‘cowness’ as what is distinguished from a ‘horse’ (say). When words with such function combine to form a sentence, they come to signify a thing not as possessing certain attributes but rather as excluding some. In Vājapāyana’s view, on the other hand, words signify qualities, and when such words combine to form a sentence, the import becomes inclusion or a combination of the qualities which they respectively connote.

14 Attention may, in this connection, be drawn to the present writer’s note on the Nāshkaṃya-sādhi, iii 2 (p 255).
15 See Note 9 Tatra Vyādi-mate bheda vākyārthab, padavaçyānām dravyā-ñām dravyāntara-nārtti-tātparyena abhidheyatvāt lātś-vādino Vājapāyanaśya tu mate samsarga vākyārthab, sāmāyānām samśīsa-mātra-rūpaṭvāt vākyārthasya.
We get a clearer explanation of the same in Pārthasārathi Misra's commentary on the last section of the *Sloka-vārttika,* which treats of the import of sentences. In discussing this topic, Kumārila introduces the terms *bheda* and *samsarga* as representing two of the views held in regard to it, and Pārthasārathi's explanation there may be translated as follows: "(In the sentence *gaub śuklab*), according to those who hold that a word points to the universal, the first word connotes 'cowness' merely, and the second, which is syntactically related to it, signifies its association with the quality of 'whiteness.' Hence the import of the sentence is (stated to be) 'inclusion.' And as that (i.e. *samsarga*) is one, the words constitute a syntactical unity. According to those, on the other hand, who hold that a word points to the particular, since the first word itself denotes cows of all colours, viz. white, black and so forth, there will be tautology if the second word, although it does not cease to indicate the connection (of the cow) with 'whiteness', is understood as intended to signify it. It should accordingly be explained as negatively qualifying the cow in question or as denying all other colours of it. Hence, alternatively, the import of the sentence is (stated to be) 'exclusion.' One of the points to be noted here

16 See p. 854 (Bennet edition) Kumārila refutes to them here for the purpose of refutation.

17 So the aspect of 'inclusion' is not left out. Analogously we may say, as indeed Pārthasārathi himself adds immediately after the passage translated above, that in the first view, 'exclusion' is implicit, the reason being that a sentence (e.g. *gaub śuklab aniyatām*), when taken in its practical context, must necessarily refer to an *individual* as in the second view. See Note 11.

18 Patañjali also explains these two terms under II 1 1 (p. 364), but, since he is there considering the meaning of compound words and derivatives and not of sentences the explanation is not directly useful for us here. But the principle underlying it is the same. The example *gaub śuklab* selected by Pārthasārathi to illustrate both the views may suggest that they apply only to co-ordinate or appositional propositions, but the one, chosen by Patañjali, viz. *rāja-purnasab* shows that it need not be so.
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specially is the meaning of _dravya_. We tentatively took it as equivalent to a particular instance of a class. From the above explanation, it is clear that it stands really for a class, only it means not all cows but _any_ cow. In the above sentence, the first word denotes the whole class of cows, and the second, the whole class of white things. But when the two are taken as syntactically one they, by mutual restriction, signify neither any cow nor any thing that is white, but _any white cow_. These explanations of _bheda_ and _samsarga_ correspond to what in modern Logic are described as the class and the attributive views.

It will be seen that these meanings of _bheda_ and _samsarga_ especially of the former, are entirely different from those assigned to them above on the authority of certain Advaitic works. It is difficult to say how the same words came to be interpreted thus differently. We know that there were several views held by Indian thinkers in regard to the import of propositions, as in the case of so many other problems, and the interpretation in question probably goes back to a view different from those alluded to by the Vaiṣṇavakarana and the Mimāṃsakas.

M. Hiriyanna
From the Great Goddess to Kāla

The Sanskrit dictionaries distinguish kāla thus

1 kāla, dark blue, black,
2 kāla, time, fate, death, god of death.

Kāla is also an epithet of Śiva, and Kāli is a form of Durgā. The first problem is to know whether Kāla means the Black god only and Kāli the Black goddess, or if those names allude to Time also, the destroyer of everything. This question is but one aspect of a more general problem: are kāla ‘black’ and kāla ‘time, fate’ two distinct words, or are there two different senses for the same word?

This is a very important problem for the history of Indian thought. Several authors have supposed1 that Skt kāla has been borrowed from the Dravidian kār ‘black’, and thus origin is a likely one. If ‘black, time, fate, death, etc.’ were different senses of the same word, it would be necessary to ascribe a non-Aryan origin to an essential element of the religious and philosophical vocabulary.

In a recent article The name Kalki (n), published in the Adyar Library Bulletin, vol I, part I, p 21, n 1, Prof. F. Otto Schrader has clearly adopted a position.

"There is in Pāli, by the side of the Sanskrit kāla ‘time’, a non-Aryan word for ‘black’, viz., kāla. But neither this nor Sanskrit kāla ‘black’ can have a common origin with Sanskrit kāla ‘time’, because the latter word was originally (in Rgveda X, 42, v 9 and the older Brāhmaṇa literature) used only in the sense of a definite or recurrent time (like Vedic rtu) and but later employed in the abstract sense and that of the great Destroyer which led to its association with kāla ‘black’.

This reasoning is not very convincing. Kāla ‘time’ is a late comer in Vedic literature. Because it has a definite meaning in certain religious texts, one cannot assert that it may not have been given a wider sense in the spoken language. It is in the Brāhmaṇas

1 See C. Regamey, ‘Bibliographie analytique des travaux relatifs aux éléments anaryens dans la Civilisation et les langues de l’Inde’, BEFEO, 1935, index, s.v. kāla
only that kāla is used, regularly enough, in the sense of rtu. It appears only once in later Rv. But in Atharvaveda, XIX, 53 and 54, it means already Time, the power of which is connected with Fate and the order of the world.

"Kāla generated yonder sky, Kāla also these earths, what is and what is to be stands out sent forth by Kāla all worlds by the brāhmaṇa having conquered, this Kāla goes on as highest god" AV, XIX, 53, 5 and 54 in fine

‘Black’ and ‘time, fate’ are not the only senses of kāla. The Dvīvāvasāṇa, p 617, reads thus tadyathā vastraṃ apagatakālakam rajanopagataṃ rangodake praksiptam sanvāy eva pratighnhyāt evam eva prakṛtur bhikṣum tasmum evaṃsvāne nusāmā caturāryasyāṇy abhisamayati sma.

A similar formula is found again in Dīgh Nīk (I, p 110) seyyathā pi nāma suddham vattām apagatakālakam sammad eva rajanam patiganbhyya, evam eva brahmansas Pokkharasādissā tasmun yeva āsane virajam vitamalam dhamma-cakkhum udapādi.

The latter quotation has been translated by T W Rhys Davids (Dialogues of the Buddha, I, p 135) in the following way

"And just as a clean cloth from which all stain has been washed away will readily take the dye, just even so did Pokkharasādi, the Brāhmaṇa, obtain, even while sitting there, the pure and spotless Eye for the Truth"

Pāli kālaka and Skt kālaka mean not only ‘black’, but also ‘stained (adj.), a stain (nt.)’ and the extracts that we have just quoted link evidently together the notions of physical and of moral stain, of dirt and of sin. The opposition of the two colours white and black is doubled by the contrast pure and impure.

One may probably connect with the same root Skt. kalka ‘foulness, baseness, guile, sin’, and kalusa ‘dirty, impure, turbid dirt, impurity’. If the origin of those words was an Aryan one, we could not without some difficulty connect kalka with kāla, but the moment one admits as the origin of those words a non-Aryan root kāl, every obstacle disappears. the quantity of the vowels, we know, can vary in borrowed words.
'Dirty, guile, sin' suggest 'unlucky'. Kali is a die or the side of a die marked with one dot, and looked upon as inauspicious, by extension kālī means the fourth and worst age of the world and Kalki (n) is the name of a mythical personage who is to appear during the Kali age. It seems impossible not to bring back all those words to the same root. Kalki (n), by its formation, can be compared to kalka. But other ideas have intervened in the formation of this derivative.

Marc Collins has connected with the moon the Skt. words kāla, kalā, kalpa and he has explained the sense of kāla 'dark, black, god of death' in connexion with the Dravidian name of the new moon. The same semantical relation can be observed in different Indo-Chinese and Indonesian tongues. In Cham, kłam means 'evening, night, darkness' and refers particularly to the nights of the second half of the moon. One can compare to the Cham word Bahnar kłam, Dayak kalam, Malay kelam. Without entering into a discussion here about the problem of the relations between the Dravidian and the Austric languages, let it suffice to observe that a root kāl, meaning 'black, obscure' may have been used to describe the dark fortnight of the lunar month and, by extension, the ultimate age of the world, that which leads to destruction and to death. This gives us new reason to connect with kāl 'dark, black', not only kāli 'the fourth and worst age of the world', but kāla understood as Time, the destroyer and the god of Death.

In short, we find in India a dualistic system where two series of notions oppose each other:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White</th>
<th>Pure</th>
<th>Auspicious</th>
<th>Bright</th>
<th>Fortnight</th>
<th>Propitious</th>
<th>God</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Impure</td>
<td>Inauspicious</td>
<td>Dark</td>
<td>Fortnight</td>
<td>Terrible</td>
<td>God and especially the God of Death</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 'On the Octava System of Reckoning in India', *Dravidic Studies*, n 4, 1926.
If the root kāl meant all that is black and terrible, it may have served to describe the other terms belonging to the same series. The applications of such a principle in the religious domain are wider than is believed generally.

In the Aśokāvadāna, the nāgarāja Kālika is evoked by king Aśoka during his pilgrimage to the holy places. The texts say that the king of the nāga went to Śākyamuni as he sat by the Bodhi-tree and began to praise him. In the Mahāvamsa, the same dragon appears before Aśoka, who subdues it and loads it with chains, it is called "Mahākāla, king of the nāgas, the power of which is marvellous, who has seen four Buddhas and lived throughout a kalpa." Here we have a Buddhist personification of Kāla, Time, in the shape of a nāga. Unlike that of Zrvan akarana, its reign does not last for ever, but the length of it is that of a kalpa.

One could trace in Hinduism and even in Indonesia the mythical figure of Kāla personified in the shape of a serpent. It will suffice to note here that in Iran the monstrous and fiendish serpent which is put to death at the end of world can also be found. According to the Bundahish, the fight against the evil powers ends by the destruction of both Druj Angra Mainyu and the Serpent (Až, that is to say Aži-Dahāk) Chained by the means of the girdle-formula (afsāriha) the serpent is finally burnt to death in the melted metal.

In parallel with the traditions which show Kāla in the shape of the serpent, other beliefs associated him with the horse, either because the horse is his vāhana or because he appears like a horse himself.

In the first Kālasūkta of the AV, "Time drives (vah) a horse with seven reins, thousand eyes, unaging, possessing much speed.


5 Cf Mahāvamsa, V, 87-92 In another part of the Mahāvamsa, chap 31, v 17ff Kālanāga seems to enjoy sovereignty over all the nāgas

6 Analysis and critical study of the sources in Abegg, Der Messiasglaube in Indien und Iran, p 218
him the inspired poets mount, his wheels are all beings" (AV, XIX, 53, 1) In the following verse, it appears that Kāla "includes all those beings", so it is difficult indeed to distinguish the god, the wheels and the horse.

In later literature and iconography, Kalkī is pictured as a horse, as a god with a horse's head or as a god riding on a horse.

According to the Jains, wicked kings named Kalkī and Upakalkī appear periodically during the periods of decline (duḥsamā) every 1,000 years comes a Kalkī, every 500 years an Upakalkī. Here Kalkī means probably 'wicked, unlucky', that is to say, it has the same value as Skt. khaḷa 'wicked person, rogue'. We know that in borrowed words, k and kh can alternate. By their periodicity the Kalkī and Upakalkī of Jainism are evidently in relation to Kali and to the theory of the ages of the world.

In the Purāṇa, Kalkī or Kalkin is an independent personage no more he is absorbed in Visnu, an avatāra of whom he becomes. In the Visnupurāṇa, four avatāras of Visnu, named Kapila, Cakravartin, Vyāsa and Kalkī succeed one another periodically during the successive yugas. In the Kalkipurāṇa, Kalkī has become Visnu's tenth avatāra and his legend has been partly modelled upon Krṣna's. But before he has become a kind of Messiah and is identified with Visnu, Kalkī has probably had something to do with the destruction of the world, ever since the origin he is probably one of the forms of god of Death and of Time which destroys everything. And in the later forms of his legend, even, he remains connected with the Kali age and with the end of the world.

7 This extract is discussed in Lanman-Whitney's Atharva-Veda, VIII, p. 987
8 Abegg, ibid., p. 47 and plates
9 Abegg, Messiasgläube, p. 140, Bhude, 'Is Kalkuṭāja a historical personage?' l'A., 48, 1919, pp. 123 ff
10 Note that in Cham, khaḷ means 'mischievous, wicked, pernicious, fatal'; khaḷam 'illness'
11 Abegg, ibid., p. 140, n. 5, 137, 39 ff
12 Otto Schrader tries (ibid., pp. 23 ff.) to explain Kalkin by karka 'white'
In short, a non-Aryan root attested in Dravidian has been borrowed by Indo-Aryan under different forms \textit{kāl-, kāl-, khal-, kāl-}, and this diversity in sounds added to the convergency of the senses is explained by the non-Aryan origin of this root. Between \textit{kāla} 'black' and \textit{kāla} 'time, destiny', then, a series of intermediates can be exposed, which form an uninterrupted chain \textit{kālaka, kalka, kalusa, kali, kalki}, so that one passes gradually from a concrete 'dark blue, black' to abstract and general notions 'time, fate, death'.

The question remains to be answered why a non-Aryan root, probably borrowed from the Dravidian, has attained such an importance in the religious vocabulary.

In the first section of the Ādiparva of the \textit{Mahābhārata}, Saṃjaya says to Dhṛtarāṣṭra 'Time createth all things and Time destroyeth all creatures' Elsewhere I have indicated that the double figure Kāla and Kāli is similar to the couple Jara and Jarā and that these doubles, like the hermaphroditus Zrvan, are closely connected with a myth more ancient, I mean, than that of the Great Mother, goddess of reproduction and of death, all-powerful as Destiny.\textsuperscript{13} The excavations at Mohenjo-daro have proved that the Great Goddess was adored in India long before the Aryan conquest. She appears in Vedic literature at first under the name of Aditi which shows some connexions with the Near East.\textsuperscript{14}

Later on, this unique figure shows a tendency to appear in different shapes, under the influence of different cultural tides. In some societies and particularly among the non-Aryan populations, the Great Goddess was still worshipped in her feminine shape Elsewhere, under the influence of the patriarchal institutions, a mas- and 'white horse' and concludes 'Our inquiry, then, lands in the alternative either both names, Kalkī and Kalkın, have emerged through the Pākrt from a now lost Sanskrit original Karkin, or the incapability of explaining the earlier name Kalki (of Aryan or Dravidian origin) has caused the formation of its etymologically transparent double.'

\textsuperscript{13} \textit{IHQ.}, X, 1934, p 429. \textsuperscript{14} See \textit{ibid.}, pp 413-414
culine god takes her place. It seems likely that in the non-Aryan populations the Great Goddess, which orders destruction and generation, goddess of Death and of Desire, should at an early date have been given the shape of Kālī, the word being understood in its many acceptations—black, terrible, etc. On a parallel line with this, when a masculine god is seen to take the place of the goddess, Kāla is also worshipped, who is at the same time the Black, the Terrible and Time the destroyer. But notwithstanding the difference in sex, Kāli and Kāla are equivalent figures and which continue that of the Great Goddess Their identity arises from the comparison between the Buddhist texts. In the verse 12 of the Catalogue of the Yakṣa of the Mahāmāyūrī, the tutelar genius of Benares is Mahākāla whereas in the Candragarbhasūtra, 1, the patroness of the same city is Mahākāli. Kāla and Kāli appear here as local divinities. But their relation to Aditi prepared them to play the part of universal gods. In the Kālāśūkta of the AV Kāla is already the highest god. In the school of the Kālavāda he remains still an independent god, Fate or Time. Elsewhere he disappears finally in the wake of another great god among the Śaivas, Kāla has become an epithet of Śiva, in Vaisnavism, Kalki has become an avatāra of Viṣṇu.

We must refrain from simplifying this evolution where the local worships, the non-Aryan influences and contributions from the Near-East have had a share. The ideas attached to Kali and to Kalki(n) are in relation to the theory of the four ages of the world and this theory seems to have spread from the Near-East over India and over Greece. It is up to a certain point under this influence, probably, that a moral dualism, founded upon the oppositions: white—black, bright—dark, pure—impure, etc. has developed in India.

Indian eschatology includes two distinct myths: (1) the myth

---

15 It is not unnecessary to note that in AV, XIX, the Kālasūkta comes immediately after the Kāmasūkta.
16 Cf. Lévi, 'Le Catalogue géographique des Yakṣa' IA, 1915, I, p 120.
of the awful god which presides over the destruction of the world (a) the myth of the god of salvation who guides the Just to the abode of Bliss. The fact that the former god has taken the shape of a black serpent whilst the latter has sometimes been conceived as a white horse is in conformity with the principles of Indian dualism. In the most ancient texts where the name of Kalki(n) can be found, that is to say in Jaina literature, Kalki(n) is a nefarious being. This is why we have endeavoured to explain his name by the means of the non-Aryan root kāl ‘black’ and why we cannot agree with Prof O Schrader’s opinion that Kalki(n) must be brought back to karka ‘white’. Besides, we have just seen that Indian eschatology is founded upon a theory of the ages of the world where the final period, which bears the name of Kali, possesses ever since the origin a clearly marked unlucky quality. It is at a late period only that the terrible god and the solar god, the Destroyer and the Saviour have both been absorbed by the universal god. In certain texts, Kalki and the Horse are still described as two distinct avatāras of the god Visnu.¹⁰

JEFAN PRZYLUSKI

¹⁷ Cf Otto Schrader, ibid., p 23
¹⁸ Abegg, ibid., notes rightly that the records which picture Kalki as a destructive god with an animal shape come from the South of India, where the Dravidian element is predominant.
¹⁹ Abegg, ibid., p 51

I have already proposed in 1929 to bring back to the same non-Aryan root the series kālī kāla kalki, and I have noted that in Santali kal means fire, poison, snake and in general everything that is dangerous and must be avoided (RHR Jul.-Aug. 1929, pp 8-9). I gave these senses after Campbell’s Dictionary P O Boding’s Santal Dictionary (Osl. 1935) brings back Santali kal to Hindi kāl, and Prof Otto Schrader writes “Santal kāl ‘time, age’ and ‘fate, death’, etc., (see Boding’s Dictionary) and also kāl ‘snake’ (cf Sanskrit kāla-sarpa) are evidently but loanwords from the Indo-Aryan of which there are so many in Santali” (The name Kalki(n), ibid., p 21, n 1). Things are not so evident. It is possible that the Santal language may have grown poorer in the interval between the compilation of Campbell’s and Boding’s dictionaries, as the former gave a much wider sense to kāl. Any affirmation would be unwise until the comparative study of the Mundā tongues, founded upon lexicons that we do not yet possess, has thrown some light upon their relation to each other and to the Dravidian tongues.
Sanskrit Works on the Game of Chess

Though the game of chess is generally supposed by scholars to be of Indian origin and reference to the game is found in various Indian works from a very early period, Sanskrit works dealing with and describing it are comparatively rare. As a matter of fact no early Indian work on the subject is known, and until very recently the world of scholars had knowledge of very few Indian descriptions of the game. It was only in 1936 that the text of an independent treatise (the Caturangadipíka) describing the game in detail was published for the first time. But no attempt seems to have yet been made to prepare a bibliography of similar other little known works still existing in manuscript in different parts of the country. This is, however, essential for a thorough, systematic and critical study of the extant literature on the subject for investigating the origin and development of the game which enjoys a world-wide popularity. As a contribution, therefore, to such a bibliography an account is given here of the mss and printed editions of Sanskrit texts on the subject that have come to my notice.

Caturangadipíka\(^1\) and the Caturangatarangini, a ms\(^2\) of which is reported to exist in Nepal, are the two known works which deal with the earlier form of Caturanga—the four-handed chess. The former is attributed in the only known ms of it, dated 1701, Saka era (1779 A.D.), to Mahâmahopâdhyâya Sûlapâni who is supposed to have been identical with the famous Smrti writer of that name who flourished in Bengal in the 15th century.

The question of authorship of a little-known work on a popular subject of which few mss are available, has, however, to be determined with the utmost caution in view of the fact that later works are not infrequently passed under the names of earlier and more famous people with the object of gaining recognition. As an instance

\(^1\) Calcutta Sanskrit Series, No XXI
\(^2\) Op. Cit., Introduction, p \(\dagger\)
in point we might mention the names of a number of apparently late ritualistic works like the Dharma-apūjāvidhi attributed to Raghunandana, the well-known authority on Brahmanic rites in Bengal.

Besides, the work under discussion refers to and quotes from works associated with famous names like Vyāsa, Yama, Manu, Yājñavalkya, Agastya, Gautama⁵ not any of whose known works are found to have anything to do with Caturanga. Neither is there any tradition connecting any of them with the game in any way. This may appear to be rather curious and apparently raises a point of doubt with regard to the genuineness of the work.

A small work in seven verses dealing with double-handed chess for which great antiquity has been claimed is the Buddhābalasapataka⁴. It has been assigned to the pre-Muhammadan period (10th—12th century) owing to the absence of any Perso-Arabic terms in it. But more positive evidence is required before any definite conclusion is arrived at in this respect, as the use of Sanskrit terms in the place of Perso-Arabic ones may be due to late coming.

Another small work which has the appearance of old age being supposed to be in the form of a discourse given by Krsna to Rādhā is the Buddhābala or Satarāṇjakutūhala, several mss of which are found in the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal. The work complete in ten verses is being edited by the present writer in the Sanskrit Sahitya Parishat Series, Calcutta ⁵.

The work called Satarāṇjini which has been attributed to Krsnarāma and described by R. L. Mitra⁶ is a bigger one, of which a

---

3 The term Gurucarana by which the author apparently refers to his preceptor in curiously taken by the editor, Mr. M. Ghosh, as the personal name of an author who is supposed to have inserted certain prose passages in the work (Introduction to Caturangadīpikā, p. xxxiv).

4 Published along with the Vilāsamanmañjari for which see below.

5 The text accompanied by an anonymous commentary has already been published in the monthly organ of the Parishat (Vol XX, pp. 297-304).

6 Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS in the Library of His Highness the Mahārāja of Bikaner, No. 1546.
portion seems to be preserved in a ms. in the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal where the names of the work and the author are respectively given as Caturangaracana and Giridhara, son of Śankara and grandson of Śiva, the astronomer. The last two lines of the work, as quoted by Mitra, constitute the second half of the sectional concluding verse which occurs mutatis mutandis at the end of each of the three sections found in the ms of the Society. The work, which belongs to Buddhī-sāstra (fol 2B, 3A, 4A) is stated to have been composed only for children (fol 3A). The author refers to his father, uncle and grand-father as well as to his paternal home on the Godāvari. The family appears to have been a learned one. Besides the present work Giridhara was the author of at least one more work, e.g., the Gaṇijphākbelana on the game of cards, which has already been published in the Kāvyamālā (Vol XIII, pp 81-84). The Munditaprahasana of Śiva Jyotirvid and the Gotapravara-maṇjarisāroddhāra of Śankara Daivajña, son of Śiva may very likely be respectively the works of his grand-father and father. It is not known if Śankara Daivajña, author of the Sāligrāmaparakša is identical with the father of our author.

The Caturangavunoda attributed in the Catalogus Catalogorum (I 177) to the prolific writer Vaidyanātha Pāyaṇunde (18th century) appears from the name to pertain to chess. The ms referred to in

7  
8  
9 R L Mittra—Notices of Sans ms 1 125, Peterson—Report of operations in search of Sans ms 2, 83
10 Peterson—op cit, 4, 246
11 Descr Cat Sans ms Ind Office Library—III 1804
the said work, however, is noticed by Buhler\textsuperscript{12} in the section of kāvya without referring to the name of the author

The Vilāsamāniṃjaṇī, which in four chapters deals with one hundred problems of the game, is a very late work having been composed towards the end of the 18th or even the beginning of the 19th century during the time of Baji Rao II. The work, however, enjoyed a popularity not usually noticed in the case of Sanskrit works composed so late. We have clear indications of this popularity in the fact that quite a fair number of mss—larger than those in the case of any other work on the subject—are known of it. Four mss have been utilised by G R Kulkarni Haldikar who has edited the work with a Marathi translation\textsuperscript{14}. There are two mss in the library of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, both of which are incomplete containing chapters I and III with the two initial verses of chapter IV, accompanied all through by notes in Marathi. One ms. of apparently the same work was noticed by R G Bhandarkar\textsuperscript{11}. Besides, it appears to have been translated into English wholly or in part, as early as 1814\textsuperscript{13}.

Reference may be made here to a few works no details of which are available and no mss of which are known to have ever been described or noticed. Of these Caturangadipika refers to the Caturangapaddirati and the Divyamālīkā or Mālikā while the anonymous commentary on the Buddhībalasaptaka mentions and quotes from the works of Laksmana and others.

The Viśvakosa (Encyclopaedia Bengalesis) refers to three

\textsuperscript{12} A Catalogue of Sanskrit mss contained in the private Libraries of Gvpū, Kathiavār, Kacheb, Sind and Khāndec, II 84
\textsuperscript{13} School and College Book Stall, Kolhapur, 1937
\textsuperscript{14} Report on the search for Sans mss in the Bombay Presy 1882-3, No 408
\textsuperscript{15} Tregongadacharya Shastrec—Essays on chess, adapted to the European mode of play Translated from the original Sanskrit, Bombay, 1814 Referred to by Weber in Monatsberichte der Königliche Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, 1873, p 717
works of this latter type on this subject, e.g., *Caturanga-kerali, Caturangaprabha* and *Caturangakridana*. It is also stated there that one Trivengācārya Śāstri who flourished in Southern India about 700 years ago was an expert in the game who imparted much valuable instruction on the subject.

Besides these, there are works which incidentally describe the game. Of these the description found in the *Tībhi-tattva* of Raghunandana is best known. It was first brought to the notice of scholars by Sir William Jones through an English translation published in the * Asiatic Researches* (vol II, 1799, pp 159 ff.). It was translated into German by Weber. H P Śāstri published the text with a fresh English translation in the *IBORS*, (1921, pp 60 ff.) This description which is in the form of an interlocution between Vyāsa and Yudhisthira is found incorporated in the *Caturangadipikā*.

Another description appears to be contained in a ms in the Raghunāth Temple Library of Kashmir, where it is stated to have been taken from a work called the *Jayakaumudi*. This is also stated to be in the form of an interlocution between Vyāsa and Yudhisthira. A small description given by Nilakantha towards the end of his *Nīlīmayukha* was translated by Weber (op cit, 1874, pp 705 ff.)

Though the number of works noticed above is by no means encouraging, still a critical and comparative study of them is expected to throw light on the growth and development of the game in different parts of India.

**Chintaharan Chakravarti**

16 Manuscripts containing this description and apparently passing as those of an independent work are also known (R L Mitra—op cit, II 539, *IBORS*, 1921, p 60)

17 *Monatsberichte* etc., 1872, pp 59 ff

Omniscience

[In this paper the questions principally discussed are (1) whether the Yoga inference of omniscience, with sānśayatva as probans, should necessarily be discarded, (2) whether the advaitins resort to śūttis is really helpful, and (3) whether the conception of omniscience is intelligible or reconcilable with the demands of human freedom. A negative answer is given to each question. Omniscience is tenable in the last resort only through identification with the svarūpa-jñāna that is Brahman, this is really to say that everything is known since there is nothing to know.]

The creator, sustainer and destroyer of the universe seems naturally endowed not merely with omnipotence but also omniscience, for right action goes in the wake of right knowledge, and the Lord, as we conceive Him, is He who can do everything and that at once. The very texts which establish Īśvara declare His all-knowingness too. For those to whom Scripture does not count, inference may avail. If on the analogy of finite acts of complexity and skill requiring intelligent creators, we infer a supreme creator for the infinitely complex world, we have necessarily to postulate complete knowledge too as an attribute of this creator. The very existence of a creator may be denied by many. With these one need not be concerned for the moment, for their refutation in extenso may be found in the criticism of the ārambhavādins, parināmavādins, and samhātivādins. Even the Sāṅkhya-s cannot but ascribe some potency to the proximity of spirit though they deny all activity to it, and from such a position it is not impossible to argue that the more perfect the spirit’s knowledge, that is to say, the more perfectly the spirit is itself, the greater its potency to actuate matter, hence the Yoga inference of the omniscient. There are differences of degree in the apprehension of whatever is not directly presented to the senses, such differences must have an upper limit, where the maximum of apprehension is reached and there can be no further surpassing, for whatever is surpassable must have a limit of surpassability, e.g., dimension, the āmalaka is bigger than the cherry, and the bulva
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fruit bigger than the अमलaka, these increasing dimensions have an upper limit in space (अकाश) whose dimension is unsurpassable. It is not merely that we stop somewhere, but that this limit is unsurpassable; else the argument will only lead to adepts and divinities whose knowledge is much greater than that of ours, without taking us to an omniscient Lord. Where a creator is admitted, it is impossible to stop short of the grant of omnipotence and consequently also omniscience, it is not possible to do all without knowing all. It is true that the potter has perfect knowledge of the pot only in some of its aspects, he knows not who will buy it or what use it will be put to, but the potter-analogy is not on all fours, for the Lord is the creator of everything and the internal ruler in all actions, His activity unlike the potter's is unlimited, His knowledge too must therefore be unlimited. It should also be remembered that even the potter has a general knowledge of the purchaser, use, etc., only human beings are likely to purchase of him and each type of vessel is capable of only a certain kind of use, more or less restricted, with this the potter-analogy becomes much less unsatisfactory.

One may still urge that finite agents and cognisers require instruments such as the body and organs, that an omniscient Lord would similarly require instruments and that with the grant of such instruments there should be recognised limitations and defects consequent on them. No example given is intended to be unduly pressed, in so far as there is agreement in respect of being intelligent creators the analogy should be taken to have served its purpose, else there being complete identity between the illustration and what is illustrated, there could be no inference at all. Of course it is possible to differentiate the present inference from others, in the majority of syllogisms where a pervasion is asserted it is possible on the

1. See Yoga Sūtra, I, 25 together with Vyāsabhāṣya and Tattvavāśārāda, the example of supreme dimension given here is the अमलaka, अकाश is taken from the inference as given in the Tattvādīddhi, p. 20, (Madras University)
ground of experience to exclude certain attributes as otherwise accounted for, as inconstant or as contradicted by another pramāṇa, in the present syllogism, there seems to be no such possibility of exclusion, when agency in the world is seen to go with intelligence it is seen to be concomitant with parviscence as well, and there is no known means of excluding the latter concomitance from the pervasion. A possible reply is that there is contradiction of the pramāṇa that apprehends Ṣvāra, the dharmin, it is absurd to infer an attribute which conflicts with the valid knowledge of the dharmin. This, however, is unsatisfactory, since all that inference of the creator gives us is only an intelligent cause, on the ground of the world being a diversified effect, it is not as if an omniscient Ṣvāra is somehow apprehended and omniscience denied of him later. Nor is it worth arguing that an intelligent creator being granted, it is desirable because of parsimony to assume a single creator, who would thus necessarily have to know all, for, if we are going to infer from the basis of experience, we should infer a multiplicity of creators co-operating, as in making a chariot or building a house, a plurality of finite co-operating intelligences seems more legitimately inferable than a single creator, in the face of such unequal alternatives how can parsimony work?

Neglecting these unsatisfactory answers it is yet possible to go back to the original inference and maintain its validity. Parviscence as such is merely negative unlike omniscience, we have to examine its extent in every case, the parviscence of the potter is not the same as that of the carpenter, so that it is not possible to claim invariable concomitance between agency and parviscence, there is such concomitance, however, between agency in respect of some effect and knowledge of that effect, and He who creates the entire world of objects must necessarily know all that is to be known, no intelligent agent is such in respect of that of which he is ignorant. It is also possible to show conflict with Scriptural
declarations of omniscience, but if the pervasion itself has to be maintained by scripture, that is to give away the case for inference, except as subsidiary to Śrutī, and this desperate course we need not yet adopt.

The opponent may still urge that the probativeness of the probans is in doubt, we say that pots etc., have intelligent creators, is it because they are diversifled? Or is it rather because we know them to be such as can be made by people like us? This, however, is not a serious objection. No doubt our cognition primarily is of the form “Those are of the class of things which persons like us make,” but we conclude that they are such as can be made only by persons like us, i.e., intelligent agents, this restrictive pervasion can come only through analysis and the discovery of a common property in them, this property we claim is the suggested probans, vicitracācanātmakatva.

Another suggested syllogism runs thus. Merit and demerit should be perceptible to some one since they are objects of cognition like the cherry in the hand, he to whom merit and demerit are objects of perception is the omniscient Isvāra. This is not sound, since what determines perceptibility is not cognisability, but sense-contact, that is to say, the object must be capable of being perceived and must be present, merit and demerit are not capable of being in sense-contact, hence the inference must fail. An advaitin who is not interested in discrediting inference altogether may attempt to get over the difficulty by insisting on probativeness, thus. Whatever is cognisable must be immediately cognisable by some one at some time or other, we may use inference or appeal to scripture, but these are of use only as supplementing, confirming or culminating in immediate experience. Merit and demerit, which the Mīmāṃsākās admit apparently as explaining all that has to be explained, must be capable of being thus experienced by some one. Since they are not experienced by finite cognisers, we postulate an infinite cogniser,
i.e., an omniscient being. As for perceptibility being determined by sense-contact we do not admit that, what is characteristic of perception is immediacy, and such experience may come through sense-contact, or through the functioning of manas as in the immediate realisation of what is revealed by a trustworthy person, or by Scripture. Nor can it be urged that manas is a sense-organ, since we are not bound to admit this. In respect of what is perceptible by the senses manas requires their aid, but elsewhere it is capable of immediate experience in and through itself. If Īśvara were dependent on the senses there would be the difficulties consequent on the functioning of the senses only in respect of certain objects, and there would also have to be the postulation of a body, leading to the admission of samsārtva, nor could the body be alleged to be assumed at will, as for volition embodiment would be necessary and vice versa, thus involving reciprocal dependence, nor could volition and embodiment be eternal for Īśvara, since there is no pramāṇa for this, and eternal embodiment would mean eternal bondage for the Being elsewhere said to be eternally free. All such difficulties, however, are avoided where Īśvara is said to know merit and demerit which are not bāhyendriya-yogya, through the manas, which, being an 'internal sense', is not restricted in its capacity to what is present.

This is not the procedure of the author of the Tattvāsuddhi. The last of the inferences he mentions in the pūrvapakṣa is the first in the present order, the Yoga argument as indicated in the Vyāsa-bhāṣya and developed in the Tattvavaiśāradī. Perhaps the earliest advaitin to notice this argument and discard it is Prakāśātman,² who alleges inconstancy of the problems, sātiṣayatva, in respect of weight, attachment, aversion and pain. The present work omits weight, possibly on the ground that as a likely exception it has been noticed and disposed of even in the Tattvavaiśāradī. The other exceptions

² See Vivaraṇa, Vizianagaram Skt series, p 218
apparently stand. The qualities of attachment, aversion and pain, these too admit of grades each surpassing the one below. Hence there must be a supreme attachment, a supreme aversion and a supreme pain, and Iśvara must be these, an obviously absurd conclusion, for the Lord is free from all these. Since the objection appears final, our author abandons all inference, takes refuge in Scripture and appeals to texts like “yah sarvajñah sarvavid.” It is worth while investigating (1) whether the inference should really be abandoned, and (2) whether the recourse to Scripture leaves us in any better plight.

1 (a) The probans if sufficiently delimited would appear not to allow of exceptions to the pervasion. Rāga, dvesa and duḥkha are admittedly defects, the two former are classified by the Yoga under kleśas or hindrances, and the Lord in the Yoga definition is He who is untainted by kleśas. The probans may be modified in this way, kleśa-pādavācyā-bhinnatve sati sātiṣāyatvāt, i.e., since it admits of grades while being other than what is denoted by the word kleśa. The word “kleśa-pādavācyā” is used to indicate that there is at least this one element common to all the kleśas that have to be excluded from the probans. With the suggested qualifications we can avoid the threatened reductio ad absurdum.

Gurutva (weight) does not come under kleśa, but it offers no genuine exception, says Vācaspati Miśra, since it does not really admit of grades as more and less. The weight of any whole is but the sum of the weights of its parts, the result of a numerical addition is erroneously conceived as an increase of grade, each part has its own weight, not thus can it be said that for each object there is a cognition and that the cognition of all is a mechanical aggregate of the cognitions of the eaches. The latter is sātiṣāyi in a sense in

3 YS, I, 24
4 I owe this suggestion to MM S Kuppuswami Sastriar
which the former is not. Cognition is not a manifold, it is of a manifold, whose extent varies with the degree to which enveloping darkness has been overcome and the single cognitive energy is able to pierce through, the degrees of cognitive excellence are dependent not on the addition or subtraction of objects, but on the grades of removal of darkness, not thus is it with properties like weight.

Rāga, dvesa and duḥkha, being of the nature of avidyā or darkness, belong to that which is removed, not that which removes.

(b) It is arguable that even thus they may be partial manifestations of a universal rāga, dvesa or duḥkha. It may also be contended that the refusal to admit such universals betrays intellectualist bias blind to a sane psychology, which cannot but recognise the affective and conative aspects of life in addition to the cognitive. These aspects too are relative wholes not made up of parts, but revealing themselves in the parts, hence these parts too lead to the inference of unsurpassable rāga, dvesa and duḥkha. Admitting such an argument at its face-value, it is still possible to maintain that the conclusion is an istāpatti, since what Īśvara removes or helps to remove in the way of kleśas may be considered unsurpassable kleśa, so that when there is the removal, there is no fear of a fresh obstacle. There is no necessary identification of Īśvara and the kleśa, for ex hypothesi the former is the remover and the latter the removed. There is a necessary dualism here, but of this even the advaitin does not fight shy, since short of the Absolute he admits both Īśvara and Māyā. While niratīṣaya-jñāna is of the nature of the former, niratīṣaya-rāga etc. fall under the latter.

(c) Even thus the intellectualistic bias is dominant. Why should cognition be exalted at the expense of emotion? Why should the latter be removed by the former? It is not as though such a conclusion is inevitable or even desirable for advaita, for, Brahman is not merely viśīṭa, but also ānanda, and what is ānanda bereft of emotion? The thoughtful advaitin has to admit the force
of this and proceed to show that rāga and dvesa are condemned (as for duhkha it is self-condemned) not because they are emotions but because they are defective emotions. It is not love that is objectionable, but love that ties one down to more or less limited objects, fettering the flight of the soul to supreme bliss. Bliss would not be such were it not the goal of supreme love, but attachment or rāga is at a great distance from this para-ma premā because of the finitude and diversity of its objects. Once the defining walls are removed rāga may fulfill itself in premā. And since the supreme love cannot be an unsatisfied hunger, Īśvara should be conceived both as para-ma premā and para-ma premāspada, the unity of love and the beloved. Anything short of this is called rāga and treated as a hindrance (kleśa) to realisation. Rāga can be sublimated, in so far as there is sublimation, the application of inference to it to prove an unsurpassable limit therefor, and the identification of this limit with Īśvara are acceptable consequences.

The case of dvesa is different. It is based on division, its aim is not unification but the increase of multiplicity. In principle it is not different from gurutva which is disposed of in the Tattvavādārād. The hatred felt towards a community is not different from the sum of hatreds towards A, B, C, etc., the components thereof. Our emotive life like our cognitive life does not contain two faculties, one unifying and the other diversifying. It is always a reaching out for unity, coming up against and conquering a number of hindrances. Hatred and aversion are paralleled by delusion and doubt. Both pains clearly belong to the sphere of what is to be removed.

It may now be said that there is never any mechanical addition, that any whole (even an arithmetical whole) has some properties other than those of the parts added up, as otherwise the process of addition would have made no difference to the parts and would so far have been irrelevant, and that the sharp division into what removes and what is removed is inconsistent with ultimate non-dualism.
Two answers are possible. Attachments and aversions relate not to the eternal, but to products, with parts which are capable of being added to or taken away from. Where an apparently superior limit has been reached it will still be possible in theory to increase this limit by the addition of another part, the supposed kāsthā will no longer be niratisaya. Hence the inference in question is not applicable to these. But it is arguable that anavasthā which is pointed out as the defect may also apply to the indefinite addition of parts. If the addition cannot be indefinite there need be no uncertainty as to the superior limit. Further, why should it be assumed that rāga applies only to products? Is it not the expression of icchāsakti which may claim to be co-eternal with ānāsakti? This brings us to the second reply. Sublimation is possible of dvesa as well as rāga, so that in the end we are not left with a dualism, but the process takes different forms in the two cases. Attachment has to advance from the finite to the infinite, aversion has to shift its direction from the finite to finitisim. The seeker of release has to turn away definitively from samsāra. This process may be called aversion, it differs from dvesa in this, that while the latter moves away from one or other manifestation of avidyā, because of attachment to another manifestation of avidyā (i.e., one’s own finite self), the former, though a product of avidyā, moves away from avidyā, it is a case of crossing over death by means of avidyā (avidyā mrtyu-tarana). The postulation of superior limits for rāga and dvesa and the identification of these limits with Īśvara need have no terrors for the advaitin.

But it may be asked "why should the increase of excellence take the form of sublimation?" Because, we reply, any other process would be only of the nature of more or less mechanical addition and would neither support nor be supported by the inference of an un-

5 See Vyñānabhiku’s Vārthaka on YS., I 25
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excellable limit, and sublimation will not differ from addition except in so far as the latter ceases to be mechanical.

When all this has been said, it must be recognised that the ideal of omniscience involves the transcendence of the distinction of knower and known. If to know is also to be, no person can be an all-knower except in so far as objects have ceased to be as such for him, and the subject-object division has been transcended. Such a one will be an all-knower since there is nothing to know, Isvara is sarvajña because He is vedya-varjita, so long as a world of knowable objects is left over against Him, the possibility of ignorance is unresolved except through an act of faith which declares that nescience in both the causal and effected conditions is under His control, and hence cannot constitute a limitation to His knowledge.

Nor is its being an act of faith the only defect of this procedure, it conflicts with other seemingly inevitable postulates. If the Lord knows all, He knows the future too, if He knows it, it is predetermined and there is no freedom for us to choose and act whether for elevation or otherwise. The possibility of knowing the future is explained by the advaitin in this way: the future is in the womb of māyā which will evolve in accordance with the adṛṣṭa of the jīvas, the future course of evolution appears to Isvara as a preliminary plan, there is nothing inconsistent in this, since māyā is subject to the control of Isvara. The moot questions are still left unsolved, what place there is for voluntary effort to affect a course of evolution which may now seem inevitable, and whether the possibility of such change does not limit the Lord’s knowledge.

One possible development of the notion of the Lord’s control of māyā is along the lines suggested by William James. God and man are like the expert chess player and the tyro pitted against each other.
other, God's omniscience gives him the ability to checkmate the
tyro whatever move he may make, though He does not know the
particular move or moves that will be made. Even this ingenious
analogy can give no consolation to the humanist, who can and will
say that this freedom to be inevitably checkmated is but illusory free-
dom. It is also possible to urge that knowledge of the future since
it is of the future is necessarily different from knowledge of the
present and that the limitation to human freedom comes only from
conceiving the knowledge of the future on the analogy of and in
the same terms as knowledge of the present. This is on the face
of it plausible but does not take us far, the future, we hold, differs
from the present in being contingent, is knowledge of the future
also contingent? If so, the Lord's omniscience does not really
deserve the name. If the knowledge is not contingent, the content
cannot be really contingent. We have to deny either our freedom
or the Lord's knowledge of all in the sense in which we understand
knowledge. The advaitin may reply that since in the last resort
we are identical with Iśvara, the perfection of the Lord is our own
perfection and our freedom suffers no real limitation. What advaita
asserts as a rule is, however, the identity of Brahma and the Jiva.
not of Iśvara and the Jiva, some distinction being always maintained
between the latter two, whether as prototype and reflection or in
other ways, some varieties of advaita no doubt affirm that release is
the attainment of Iśvaratva, but this is irrelevant for us who are con-
cerned with the freedom of human beings here and now, not when
they have attained release. The position, however, contains the
core of the truth, that we are free to realise our oneness with the
perfectly free Iśvara, that the realisation of this oneness is inevi-
table for all, by ways more or less arduous or devious. Iśvara would
be omniscient, as aware of this inevitable end, but of the slips and
backslidings, fears, hopes and aspirations on the way, one need not
postulate knowledge for the Lord.
Even such a position is not wholly satisfactory, there is, to say the least, conflict with the usual explanation of the scriptural terms sarvajña and sarvavit, the latter being said to mean knowledge of all things in their particularity. How can there be knowledge of the future in its particularity if there be no awareness of the detailed strivings, advances and backslidings of the jīva? Such difficulties are necessarily incidental to the notion of omniscience, which, like the notion of knowership, has to be transcended by the knowledge which is the svarūpa of reality, which is necessarily of all, since it is all and there is nothing outside it.

Some advaitins have tended to identify sarvajñatā with svarūpa-jñāna. They have maintained thus that there is no unintelligibility in the Lord’s knowledge of merit and demerit or indeed of any content since his cognition does not have to depend on the senses, external or internal, or on a body, His knowledge they say is svarūpa-jñāna. Though this leads to dispensing with the notion of Him as knower (jñātṛ), knowledge of all does not become impossible, since, as the material cause of all, He is consciousness non-different from all. Here again we have a wavering between two notions—Īśvara and Brahman. The latter is jñāna-svarūpa, it is also the material cause of the universe. If in defending a certain conception of Īśvara one flies to Brahman, it is a conclusive proof of the final inadequacy of the former. It is not that Īśvara is omniscient because of svarūpa-jñāna, omniscience as a quality of one who is up against all things and is the knower of all things is a necessary postulate made by us who know little and yet are aware of our knowing little, this postulate being an extension from parviscience is necessarily defective and calls for transcendence in what is neither omniscience nor parviscience but scientia, the wisdom that is Brahman’s svarūpa. This is the truth in the waverings of the dialecticians. That is why of six

7 *Mundaka*, 1, 1, 9, Sankara’s bhāṣya
8 *Tattvaśīnddhī*, p 21
9 *Ibid*
scriptural texts quoted in the Tattvaśuddhi we find that only two are directly relevant to the topic of omniscience, and that of these, while one predicates knowledge, the other speaks of the nature of Brahman as the knowledge by whose light all else is manifest. Omniscience as knowership is not real since there is nothing to know, Omniscience as knowledge is real, but there is nothing to know. The former is not the latter, but necessarily fulfils itself in the latter.

S S Suryanarayana Sastri

10 "Tasya bhāṣā sarvam idam vibhātu" Sveta VI, 14
Indian Elements in the Coin Devices of the early foreign Rulers of India

The medley of figures used as coin devices by the Bactrian Greek kings of India and their successors, the Šakas, the Pahlavas and the Kusānas prove that these alien chiefs not only drew from the mythology of their own respective religious systems to which they belonged, but also utilised many and various deities connected with the pantheon of the people conquered by them. The gods and goddesses appearing on the Indo-Bactrian Greek coins are no doubt mainly Hellenistic in origin and decidedly Praxitelean in character as noticed long ago by Gardner. Many of the devices adopted by the Bactrian Greeks were retained by the Šakas but in most cases, these were given a new orientation which transformed their original character substantially. Gardner noticed some of these striking changes and remarked, "A careful consideration of these facts will convince us that by some means or other Maues and his race secured the services of artists who had been instructed by the Greeks, but were not restricted by Greek traditions." The Pahlava rulers, though to a certain extent imitators of the Greeks, mainly used devices which were pre-eminently Parthian in character. The Kusānas especially the Kamiska group of kings, on the other hand, brought in features in which the Hellenistic element was least recognisable. As has been shown by Stein, many of the reverse types are borrowed from Zoroastrianism, while the others are made up of Indian and Greek divinities—the term Greek, however, being applicable to the last class in name only.

1 Gardner, British Museum Catalogue of Coins of the Greek and Scythic kings of Bactria and India, p lvii
2 Gardner, op cit., p lviii
3 Thus, Salene and Helios, on the coins of Kamiska though the names
But what is of interest in the study of the reverse devices of these foreign coins is the gradual inclusion of purely Indian types among them. Sometimes, the Indian character of the type is self-evident, while at other times it can be inferred after a careful scrutiny of the device. The reason for this Indianisation is to be sought in the contact of the conquerors and the conquered as also in the custom of using the tutelary divinities of cities as devices on coins minted there. We shall pick up some of these Indian elements in the composition of the types of these rulers and try to explain their real character.

The history of the contact of the Seleukid rulers of Syria with north-western India is well-known. It is presumable that the origin of the device of the four elephants drawing a chariot used by Seleukos and some of his successors in their coins can be traced to one of the terms of the treaty of Seleukos I with Chandragupta, the founder of the Maurya dynasty. The cock on the reverse side of the coins of Sophytes (Sopeithes), the king of the Salt Range, a contemporary of Alexander the Great might have been Indian in origin, the imitations of Athenian owls on which these light weight drachmæ were based bore on them the figure of an eagle. The cock as an emblem of the Brahmanical war god Subrahmanya-Kärttikäya is well known to us and the bust of Sophytes on the obverse of these coins is shown as the bust of an warrior clad in helmet and cheek plate. As regards the coin devices of the early Bactrian Greek rulers of India, we do not find purely Indian elements till the time of Demetrios, the son of Euthydemos I. The square shape of some of his copper coins proves that it was he who for the first time introduced this of the Greek moon goddess and the sun-god respectively, really represent Mao and Muro, the Zoroastrian Moon and Sun gods, their figures being perfectly identical.
pre-eminently Indian feature in the Indo-Greek money. Again, the inauguration of bi-lingual coins which were meant for the use of their Indian as well as of the Greek subjects is to be attributed to this ruler and his younger contemporary and rival, Eukratides. Elephant's scalp worn as a head-piece by Demetrios on some of his silver and copper coins as well as elephant's head with upraised trunk and a bell round the neck in the dotted circle used as an obverse device on certain copper coins of the same king are presumably Indian features whose early appearance on this coinage is interesting. The types used by Eukratides, such as the mounted Dioskouroi, the palms and piloi of the Dioskouroi, Apollo and Nike are mainly drawn from Greek mythology, but there is one device used by him in re-striking some of the copper coins originally issued by Apollo-Workos Soter which has particular bearing on our topic. It has been described thus, 'Zeus sitting on throne to front, holds wreath and palm, to right of throne forepart of elephant and to left a pilos, above his indistinct monogram Kharosthi legend Kaviṣṭye nagara devata.' The symbol which according to Whitehead is a pilos could not be deciphered by Gardner who described it as a 'conical object', but Rapson is definite that it stands for a mountain. The two symbols, viz., the head of an elephant and the mountain accompanying the central device as well as the Kharosthi legend are of particular interest inasmuch as they can be explained by certain remarks made about the capital city of Kāpiśā by Huen Tsang. Rapson was the first to connect these two symbols with Huen Tsang's passage which runs thus, 'To the south-west of the capital (Kāpiśā) was the Pi-lo-sho-lo mountain. This name was given to the

4 The description of a certain supposedly square-shaped copper coin of Alexander the Great as his Indian issue has been rightly rejected by numismatists.


6 Cambridge History of India, vol I, p 555
mountain from its presiding genius who had the form of an elephant and was therefore called *Pi-lo-sho-lo*.' Julien thought that some such Indian word as *Pulasāra* meaning ‘elephant-solid’ (*Pihu* from Persian *bil* = elephant), was its original and Rapson explained these two symbols, one as the mountain *Pi-lo-sho-lo* and the other as the elephant-shaped tutelary god of the mountain as also of the city of Kāpiśa. If one further considers another observation of Hiuen Tsang in connection with his description of Kāpiśa and Watters’ remarks on it one can go a step further and explain the central device of the seated figure as well as the elephant head, on the coins Hiuen Tsang tells us, ‘Above forty li (roughly 6 to 7 miles) south from the capital (Kāpiśa) was the city called *Sī-pī-to-fa-la-tzu*’ Julien and St Martin suggested *Sphitavaras* and *Svetavaras* respectively as the possible Sanskrit original of the name of the city Watters says ‘The last character sse or *tsu* is probably a Chinese word in the sense of temple. The other characters may stand for *Svetavat* one of the epithets of Indra the god who rides a white (*sveta*) elephant. Thus the name of the city would be *Svetavat-ālaya*, the Abode or Shrine of Indra.’ If Watters is correct in laying down the value of the Chinese word just mentioned, it is possible to identify the central device of the coins as ‘Indra enthroned with the partial representation of his mount *Aṣīavata* (the white elephant) before him *Svetavatālaya*, according to the descrip-

7 Rapson, *op cit*, p 555

8 Watters remarks on the authority of Hiuen Tsang, ‘This was the name of the tutelary god of the mountain and of the mountain itself, and it was the name given to the *Aṣīaka* tope erected on one of the rocks of the mountain’ Watters, *Yuan Chwang*, vol I, p 129 Shall we be justified in trying to identify the conical shaped symbol, not as the mountain, but the stūpa *Pi-lo-sho-lo*, said to have been erected by Aṣīoka? The mountain is usually represented on coins as a three- or multi-peaked object, whereas this particular device appears as a mound or a stūpa In any case, Rapson was quite justified in his main hypothesis

9 Watters, *op cit*, p 126 The lexicographers lay down such words as *Svetabahu*, *Svetavaha*, *Svetavah* as epithets of Indra
tion of Hiuen Tsang, was evidently a suburb of Kāpiśā in the 7th century A.D. and its very name indicates that it had Indra as its tutelary deity. Now, in the Mahāmāyūrī list of the Yaksas it is stated in one place (v. 83) that Yaksā Lankeśvara was the special object of worship in Kāpiśā (Lankeśvarāśca Kāpiśyām) while at another place (v. 94) Yaksā Nalakuvera is mentioned as such (Kāpiśyām Nala-kuvera). Sylvain Lévi, has drawn our attention to one Chinese interpretation of Lankeśvara which is Kien tseu tsai i.e. ‘strong king’ (solide souverain). This epithet of ‘strong king’ would fit in with Indra, the king of the gods (devarāja) and thus at the same time would be attributable to the throne deity of the coin type in question. But the two Mahāmāyūrī passages prove that Kāpiśā had at least two Yaksas as its presiding deities, viz., Lankeśvara and Nalakuvera. Another passage in the same text, however, is of particular importance in this connection. The author while referring to the tutelary Yaksas of certain places in the north-west of India explicitly mentions that Indra was the Yaks of Indrapura.

The passage runs thus——

शिव शिवपुराणेश्वर शिवमभव भोमे।
इन्द्रक्षेत्रेण गुरूः पुष्पकुशे शिवापुरे।
दारको दारकुपुरे कपिलो वसलि बुधू हु।
मनिमन्दो ब्रह्मकुमार गूढंमभव भावे।
प्राणवेदनश्च गन्धारे तंबरोलायामू प्रभजन ।
खरोपोष महायाना भव (चर्च) शैले निवासिनः।

Of these localities, Varuna, Gandhāra, Taksasīlā, Bhadra (Chardha)-Saila can be definitely recognised and all of them are to be located in the extreme north-west of India. Lévi has correctly pointed out that Śivapura is mentioned as a village of the north (Udicyagrāma).

10 Journal Asiatique, 1915, p. 52.
11 Nalakuvera of the other passage cannot be connected with Indra, mythologically, he was the son of Kuvera, the Yaksāra, the guardian deity of the northern quarter.
12 Mahāmāyūrī, verses 28-33
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in Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya (on Pāṇini, IV, 2, 3). As regards, Bhisana, Indrapura, Silāpura and Dārulkapura, he says that they do not appear elsewhere. Attention, however, may be drawn to the resemblance of the name Indrapura with the Svētavatālaya of Śīyu-ki and if we are correct in assuming that they refer to the same locality, (cf Hastināpura or Gaajasāhvaya, the capital of the Kuru kingdom) we shall have no hesitation in placing this Indrapura very near Kāpiśa. On the basis of this hypothesis, our explanation of the coin device inaugurated by Eukratides will find confirmation. Rapson rightly remarks that 'the coin type, thus inaugurated became characteristic of the house of Eukratides in the Kabul valley; it is found on coins of Heliokles, Antialkidas (fig 1), Amyntas and Hermaeus. A very unique tetradrachm of Antialkidas in the collection of the British Museum has a reverse device which has a special bearing on the one in question.' Whitehead describes it thus, 'On the reverse an elephant with its trunk at the salute, Nike on its head, and a bell round its neck, walks to the left. By its side, portrayed on a heroic scale, stalks "Zeus." He further correctly emphasises that 'apparently this quaint design shows the elephant-deity and his elephant indulging in a victorious march past.' All these considerations leave little doubt with regard to the identification proposed by us of the coin type, Indra, the king of the gods, and his mount Airāvata, (in a sense, the god himself in his theriomorphic form) were specially suited to be used as a proper device of coins issued by a monarch, the former symbolising the divine royal power while the latter standing for the solid stability of the realm. That the Indra cult was not unknown in parts of northern India can be proved from literary and archæological sources. The cult of Vāsudeva Krṣṇa developed at the expense of

13 It is not in Gardner’s Catalogue, but is described by Whitehead in his 'Notes on Indo-Greek Numismatics', in Numismatic Chronicle, 1923, pp 325-6 pl xv, fig 5 Fig 2 in the accompanying plate.
various other pre-existing cults, the one of Indra being among them, and it is definitely proved by the story of Krśna's Govardhanadārana as narrated in the Harivamśa and some Purāṇaś. In the Bṛhatśambhūta chapter on Pratimālaksanam Indra's image is described thus,—

शुक्लश्यामसे द्विपो महेन्द्रस्य वज्रपाणितम्।
विपथस्तिताष्ट्रस्य वृक्षीयमपि लोचनम् बिहम्॥ ४२।

Cunningham thought he had lighted upon a very old temple of Indra (c. 5th cent. A.D.) among the ruins of numerous temples at Sirpur, C.P. 11 The vigorously carved relief of ample proportions on the right facade of the Bhaja cave showing Indra riding on his elephant holding with its trunk upraised a branch or a flower is too well-known to be mentioned in detail 15. Sakra or Indra is one of the most important acolytes of Buddha in the Buddhist mythology, in the Hellenistic art of Gandhāra as well as the indigenous one of Mathurā, he is very often (in the Indrasāla-guhā scene for example) depicted wearing a basketlike headdress and in company with his mount and other attendants.

Indra, the king of the gods, could very easily be identified by the Bactrian Greeks with Zeus of the Greek mythology. Rapson is thus quite justified in remarking "In this case, as also in others recorded by the historians of Alexander, the Greeks sought to identify the Indian divinities with their own. They evidently regarded the tutelary deity of the city of Kāpiśi as Zeus." 16 So, in the Indo-Bactrian Greek money, enthroned Zeus and devarāja Indra are often confused and it will be better to describe those figures as Indra where he is accompanied by an elephant or a partial representation of an elephant. Even in the latter case, Nike, the Greek goddess

14 ASR, VII, p. 168
15 Note the very striking similarity in attitude of the elephant here with that of the same in the coin-type of Antialkidas, mentioned above.
16 Cambridge History of India, vol. 1, p 556
of victory, is very often placed in the out-stretched right hand of this Indra-Zeus 17. Again, even in the other type, that issued by Antalkidas, noticed above, Nike is placed on the head of the elephant by whose side the deity strides to left. The Saka king Maues copied in toto the usual Indra-zeus type of Antalkidas and if one notices the description of the obverse device of coin no. 13 of Maues in Gardner's British Museum Catalogue (p. 70), one cannot but infer that it is a faithful copy of the reverse of Antalkidas a type coin. Maues, however, introduced a new orientation in this device, for, in the obverse of his coins Nos 11-13 (fig 3 of the accompanying plate) we find the same enthroned deity with a long sceptre in his left hand, while his right hand is placed on the shoulder of a human figure ('small winged female figure' according to Gardner, but the wings and the female character of the figure are not quite clear from the plate) who, as has been rightly suggested by Gardner, 'seems to be an embodiment of the thunderbolt!' This reminds us of the Indian practice of sometimes representing the attributes in the hands of divinities as personified beings, Cakra, Gada, Samkha, the usual attributes of Vasudeva-Visnu are very often depicted thus when they are known by the name of ayudhapurasas. As the weapon thunderbolt is behind its personified representation in this coin of Maues, so in most cases, the actual weapons cakra etc. are carved behind their personified representations on whose heads or shoulders the deity's hands rest.

On the basis of our main hypothesis, it will be possible for us to suggest that the device 'elephant's head with a bell round his neck' used by Demetrios on some of his copper coins and other Indo-Greek and Saka rulers like Menander and Maues (fig 4) was

17 Cf. the first three types of Antalkidas, PMC, vol I, pp 32-4; this type became so very popular with him, that he used it also as the reverse device of some of his silver drachmae which belonged to the Attic standard of weight bearing Greek legend only and which were thus meant for circulation in the Bactrian portion of his kingdom, cf. ibid., p 36, no (v).
associated with this elephant deity, peculiar to Kāpiṣa and its environs.\textsuperscript{18} We are not certain whether the elephant used as a device on so many coins of these kings is in any way connected with it, but if any connection between the two could be proved, then one could demonstrate the extreme popularity of the device. Elephant is used as a device in the coins of Antimachos Theos,\textsuperscript{19} Heliokes,\textsuperscript{20} Lysias, Antialkidas, Archebios, Apollodotos Soter,\textsuperscript{21} Menander, Zoilos, Maues,\textsuperscript{22} Azes, Azilises and Zeionises. It is worth noting that barring the satrapal coins of Zeionises elephant is not used as a device in the Indo-Parthian series of coins.

The next device of outstandingly Indian character is the so-called dancing girl appearing on the obverse of certain copper coins of identical fabric issued in the Indian portion of their dominions by Pantaleon and Agathokles. These coins are characterised not only by their complete resemblance to the indigenous double-die coins localised by Cunningham at Taxila but also by the fact of their being the only two types of early alien bilingual money having the Indian legend in Brāhmi script, Kharosthi being otherwise used in the bulk of this class of coins. Gardner describes this device as a ‘female figure with long pendants from her ears, clad in oriental dress with trousers, holds in her right hand a flower’.\textsuperscript{23} In another

\textsuperscript{18} PMC vol I, p 13, no 21, p 62, nos 507-14, p 98, nos 5-9
\textsuperscript{19} Type no 2, in PMC, I, p 19. It should be observed that while elephant appears on the obverse, Nike who is so frequently associated with the Kāpiṣa deity figures on the reverse.
\textsuperscript{20} Two types—Bust of king and elephant bull, PMC, vol I, p 29
\textsuperscript{21} Elephant Bull—used both in round silver drachm of Attic weight and square silver drachm of Persian or Indian weight. Rapson remarks that the elephant and bull ‘may have symbolised the tutelary divinities of cities.’
\textsuperscript{22} Running elephant with uplifted trunk seated king or deity and running elephant with uplifted trunk. Humped bull, note the attitude strikingly similar to the Kāpiṣa elephant.
\textsuperscript{23} British Museum Catalogue, pp 9-10, pl III, 9 & pl IV, 9. Fig 5 of the accompanying plate.
place, he remarks 'the earliest of the clearly Indian types to make its appearance is a dancing girl, wearing long hanging earrings and oriental trousers, on the money of Pantaleon and Agathocles.'\textsuperscript{21} From after this, it has been the custom amongst numismatists to describe this type as 'the dancing girl', a few scholars however, denominated it in a different manner Thus, Foucher would like to find in it Māyā, the mother of Buddha in the nativity scene,\textsuperscript{25} whereas Coomaraswamy at first suggested that it was Lākṣmī but later was somewhat sceptical about it \textsuperscript{26} Of these two suggestions, the latter is more acceptable, because the flower in the right hand of the figure, so far as it can be ascertained from the summary representation in coin, seems to be a lotus While studying a few originals of this type in the collection of the Indian Museum, Calcutta, I wondered whether these female figures did really stand for some horse-faced divinity The head seemed too longish to be a human one, if one could be sure that it was an equine head, then the figure could be correctly described as Yāksī Asvamukhi or Kinnari which is sometimes represented in indigenous art as a woman with a horse's head.\textsuperscript{27} But the representation on the not very well preserved copper coins are too indefinite to let us be sure about our suggestion In any case, it will be better to describe the figure as an Indian goddess possibly Lākṣmī, (or, if we could connect the lion on the other side with the goddess, she could probably be described as Durgā-Simhavāhini, the lotus also being an attribute of hers) perhaps, associated with Tāxila or regions near it Sri-Lākṣmī, however,

\textsuperscript{24} Gardner, op cit, p lvii

\textsuperscript{25} Foucher, \textit{On the Iconography of the Nativity of the Buddha, MASI}, No 46, p 12

\textsuperscript{26} \textit{Eastern Art}, vol 1, p 178 "The so-called dancing girl on the coins of Pantaleon and Agathocles is of the type of Lākṣmī (Padmabhatī) and may be Sri-Lākṣmī, but this by itself is hardly definitive and the movement is unusual"

\textsuperscript{27} Cf the Bodh-Gāyā representation of this motif, R L Mitra, \textit{Buddha-Gāyā}, pp 155-6 pl xxxiv, fig 2
was utilised by these foreign rulers as coin-devices and different modes of her representation have been found in the Indo-Bactrian Greek and Saka coins. The obscure king Peukolaos is known from certain copper coins, the reverse sides of which bear a figure which has been described by Whitehead as a ‘city goddess with turreted crown to left, lotus in right hand’ 28. It is very likely that it stands for Laksmi with the Hellenistic accretion of the turreted crown. The obverse device of an unique gold coin (classed as ‘Indo-Scythian, uncertain’ by Gardner) in the collection of the British Museum ought to be studied in this connection. It has been described by Gardner as ‘Greek city-goddess, clad in chiton and peplos, wearing mural crown, and holding a poppy-head’ 29. Rapson, who at first doubted the genuineness of the coin, described the same device as a ‘city goddess, wearing a mural crown and holding a lotus flower in her right hand with the Kh legend Pakhalavadi-devada meaning the deity of Puskalavati’, he also remarked ‘she wears Greek dress and the mural crown which is the emblem of a Greek civic divinity, and as guardian of the “City of Lotuses” (Puskalavati, she appropriately holds a lotus-flower in her right hand’ 30. The city divinity of Puskalavati was most likely the goddess Laksmi whose Hellenised representations we find in these two coin types (the name of the obscure Greek king Peukolaos seems to have some connection with Puskalavati, the Greek form of which is Peukelaotis), the figure of the bull with Greek legend Tauros and Kharosthi legend Usabhe appearing on the reverse side of the gold coin was also a thermo-morphic representation of a divinity presumably Śiva 31.

28 Numismatue Chronicle, 1923, p 324 & pl xv, 3
29 Gardner, op cit p 162 & pl xxix, 15
30 IRAS, 1905, p 787
31 Cambridge History of India, vol 1, p 557 Rapson remarks on this bull device—“As in the case of the city divinity of Kāpsī, the Greek artist has represented in accordance with Greek ideas an Indian deity who was supposed to bear the form of a bull. Here, Huen Tsang says, “Outside the west gate of the city (of Puskalavati) was a Deva-temple and a marvel working image of the Deva”.
Of the two goddesses appearing on the reverse sides of two types of coins of Hippostratos, one at least, viz., the cornucopiae bearing figure might have some connection with the city-deity of Puskalāvati. One of the two figures (one male and the other female, the male figure identified by Rapson as Zeus) the female one, wearing a mural crown and holding a diadem in her right hand and a cornucopiae on her left arm, appearing on the reverse side of certain silver coins of the Saka ruler Azilises was tentatively identified by Rapson as the tutelary deity of Puskalāvati. With some slight alterations, here and there, the city goddess type was utilised by Maues (PMC vol I, p 99, no 15), Azes (ibid, pp 121-122, nos 218-240, here definitely described as Demeter) and other Saka rulers. In the Hellenistic art of Gandhāra we do not fail to find plastic representations of this goddess. Thus the Loriyan Tangai relief depicting Gautama's Mahābhāskramana in the collection of the Indian Museum, Calcutta contains the figures of this goddess and Mára as also other divinities clustering round Buddha's figure on horse back, here also she is characterised by the turreted crown and a flower in her hand. A general observation may be made that in such cases, Hellenistic outer garments were used to cloak the original Indian divinity. But even these Hellenistic

(Watters, op cit, I, p 214) If we were sure about any connection of the obverse and reverse devices of this coin, we could have offered the suggestion that the goddess stood for Śiva's consort, but, the theriomorphic representation of the male deity on one side and anthropomorphic depiction of his consort on the other is a priori unlikely. We shall presently see, however, that Śiva's consort seems also to have been utilised as a coin-device by certain Saka rulers.

PMC, vol I, p 74, Nos 604-609, Whitehead describes the device as a city goddess to left, carrying cornucopiae' ibid, p 77, No 631, described as a 'city goddess to left with mural crown and palm'.

Rapson, IRAS, 1905, pp 788-89, he based his suggestion on the general resemblance of this goddess to the one on the gold coin of Puskalāvati and the possibility of the Kharosthi letter pa in the left field being an abbreviation of Pakhalavad-Puskalāvati.

Grunwedel, Buddhist Art, fig 53.
By courtesy of the British Museum authorities
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embellishments were soon to disappear and the purely Indian abhiseka-lakṣmi was to make its appearance on certain silver coins of Azilises. The motif exactly corresponds to the Indian Gaja-Lakṣmi type, so frequently to be found in early mediaeval and modern Indian art, it was also used as a device in a Kosam coin (c. 3rd century B.C.), by Ranjivula, the Śaka Satrap (c. 1st century A.D.), Sasāṅka the Gauda king (7th century A.D.) and others. Foucher would also like to find in the earlier replicas of this type, the scene of the nativity of the Buddha.

It will not be out of place here to refer to a certain goddess figure used as a device in some copper coins of Azes. The coin type is no. 30 of Azes in the Punjab Museum Catalogue, vol. I, p. 129, its obverse has been described by Whitehead as ‘Goddess Lakṣmi standing to front with flower in raised right hand’. Whitehead does not notice the lotus flower on which the goddess is made to stand and a peculiar object to her left. The identical device has been described by Gardner as ‘Female deity facing, clad in himation, holds in raised right hand, flower, stands on lotus, beside her, lion? (Lakṣmi?)’. Gardner was not quite sure whether the object to the left of the goddess was a lion or not, but the forepart of the lion is quite clear from his plate (though it is not so clear in the Punjab Museum specimen reproduced by Whitehead in pl. xii, no. 308). Copper coins nos. 133-36 in Gardner’s book (pl. xix, iv) and those nos. 220-30 in Whitehead’s Catalogue (pl. vii, 222) show on the obverse a lion walking to right and on the reverse a goddess which Gardner was diffident about describing as Demeter (Whitehead thought it was so). The coins are all of copper and thus mostly.

35 *PMC*, vol. I, p. 135 Fig. 6 of the accompanying plate. It has been described, ‘Indian goddess, Lakṣmi standing facing on a lotus flower with twin stalks and leaves. On each leaf stands a small elephant sprinkling water on the head of the deity.’


37 Gardner, *op cit.*, p. 85 Fig. 7 of the accompanying plate.
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in a very indifferent state of preservation, whatever might be the
right identification of the deity here, it is extremely probable that in
the other case the female divinity standing on lotus in a graceful
Indian pose with a lion by her side is none other than Durgâ-
Simhavâhini, the consort of Śiva. It is true that the lotus at her
feet and the same in her raised right hand would indicate the possi-
bility of her being Laksmi, but its nature is more or less the same as
that of the reverse device of the Candragupta I type coins of
Samudragupta and the Lion-slayer type coins of Candragupta II.
The composite character of the Gupta device—the goddess seated
on a lion, holding a lotus-flower or cornucopae in her left-hand,
her right hand holding a fillet and her feet sometimes resting on
lotus led Allan to describe her as Laksmi or Ambikā. In the
iconographic texts, lotus is in many cases regarded as an attribute
of Durgâ, Gauri and Ekânamśâ, in a few the original Šakti goddesses.
The description of the two handed Ekânamśâ in the Brhatsambita
(ch 57 v 37) is as follows —

many texts like the āgamas give us more or less identical descrip-
tions of two-handed Durgâ-Gauri images (Daksine cotpalam haste
vāmabastam pralambitam) We cannot but be struck with the
great similarity of the stance of the coin-device in question, with
that of the goddesses described in the texts. Lion as the mount
of Durgâ is too well-known to be commented on in detail. It is
ture that the Syran or Elamite goddess Nanaia is occasionally repre-
sented on some Kusāna coins as riding on a lion, but the mode of
her presentation there is quite different from the device under dis-
cussion. If we can further show that the cult of Durgâ Simha-
vâhini was known in the north-western region in the early centuries

38 Allan, Catalogue of the Gupta Coins in the British Museum, pp lxxii-lxxiii,
lxxxii
39 Cunningham, Coins of the Kushans, pl xxii, fig 19
of the Christian era, we shall have some further proof in support of our hypothesis. Here also Hsuen Tsang supplies us with some interesting and valuable information. He tells us—'Above 50 li to the north-east of Po-lu-sha (now unanimously identified with Shahbazgarhi) was a great mountain which had a likeness (or image) of Mahēśvara's spouse Bhūmā-devī of dark blue stone. According to local accounts this was a natural image of the goddess. At the foot of the mountain was a temple to Mahēśvara-deva in which the Ash-smearing "Tirthikas" performed much worship. It is needless to emphasise that the Chinese pilgrim, though writing during the first half of the 7th century A.D., was referring to a far earlier local custom.

Certain copper coins were issued by Maues as well as Azes with a type summarily designated by Whitehead as Poseidon with trident and Bacchante. He describes the reverse device as a 'female figure standing to front between trees (possibly a Bacchante among vines), Gardner describes it as a female figure clad in chiton and himation facing, stands between two vines (Maenad?)' None of these scholars is, thus, quite sure of his identification and from the general character of this device we feel tempted to suggest an Indian designation for it. Coomaraswamy while delineating on the iconographic features of Śrī-Lakṣmi in his learned article on 'Early Indian Iconography' refers to three varieties of Lakṣmi type, the third one, described by him, being, "as Padmavāsini Kamalālayā etc., she is surrounded by flowering stems and growing leaves, establishing her environment, and in this case she very often holds one

40 Watters, op cit., p. 221. Watters thinks that the image or likeness of Bhūmā-devī was apparently a dark-blue rock in the mountain supposed to have a resemblance to that goddess. Julien, however, understood the passage to mean that there was a statue.

41 P M C., vol I, pp. 100-101, 122, B M C., pp. 70-71, 89. This type was a favourite one of Maues. Fig 8.
of the flowering stems in each hand "42 There will be no inherent improbability if we suggest that this device is a Hellenised version of the third variety of Laksmi noted above. A glance at the plates accompanying Coomaraswamy’s article will convince one that this was a very favourite theme with the early Indian artists. We can compare this coin device with one of later period (c 6th or 7th century A.D.) appearing on an unassigned or doubtfully assigned gold coin of Gupta style and fabric. This coin was discovered at Mahmudpur (Jessore district, Bengal) and is in the collection of the Indian Museum, Calcutta. Allan describes this reverse device, thus, “Goddess Laksmi (Smith—simply ‘Goddess’), nimbate, standing left holding lotus in out-stretched right hand, behind her a lotus plant and at her feet, a hamsa (peacock according to Smith)"43 In this case, however, the hamsa at the feet of the figure would justify us in identifying her as Sarasvati, the counterpart of Laksmi.

Gardner, long ago, was struck by the peculiar form of many of these types which were ‘more distinctive than the style (Praxitelean) in which they were rendered’ He remarked, ‘To search out the reasons of these variations of type, reasons to be found probably in many instances in the influence of local Indian or Persian legend or belief, would be a very attractive task’ I have attempted in the preceding pages to partially work out the scheme hinted at by the great scholar. This subject will be more fully treated in my forthcoming work on ‘Ancient Indian Coin types’

JITENDRA NATH BANERJEA

42 Eastern Art, vol 1, p 178
43 Allan, op cit., p 150, pl xxiv, 5
Going Far or Going Beyond?

(Pāragā, Pāragū)

I know of but one scholarly critic—happily still with us¹—who has equalled Moriz Winternitz in generous recognition of those who, like myself, have been spending ourselves in research such as entitles us to doubt, that the Buddhism presented to us in most manuals on ‘Religions’, and by Buddhists of South Asia, is indeed the original New Message brought to India and the world by Gotama Śākyamuni, in the 6th century A.C. Critic, and often disagreeing critic he was His own position had largely been that of the ‘manuals’ and of Hinayāna. And was I not trying all I knew to drag him on from that position, and make him, as I saw it, grow in spiritual adolescence in his outlook on this particular religion? He claimed indeed to have been for twenty years on the side of those whom Dr. Weller called “us younger men”, ² in that Winternitz, in his History of Indian Literature, II, 1913, affirmed, that “the entire older literature of the Buddhists was nothing but a great collection of collections, and that the different portions of such collections belonged to different times” (This is repeated in the re-written English version of 1933, p 4) And indeed the historical attitude in his article to the Geiger Commemoration volume. ‘‘Can the Pali Canon teach us something about the older Buddhism and its history,’’ as well as its child, ‘‘Problems of Buddhism’’ in the Viśva Bharati of 1936, five years later, might almost deserve to be placed as the preface of every research-student’s notebooks in such studies And I would say the same of his brief introduction

¹ Professor James B. Pratt
² Asia Major, V, 1930, pp 149 ff
to the 110 excerpts given us in his *Der altee Buddhismus*, of a previous year.

I said "almost deserve", I wish I could delete the 'almost'. But, if what I have in these last years brought forward of 'left-uns', of things overlooked by scholars, let alone Buddhists, so unversed in their own Hinayāna scriptures, had sufficed to drag him almost to the standpoint of the "younger men", it wasn't far enough. Tenaciously he clung to the last to the position of the "older men" (*wir Aelteren*), who have taken their stand on the belief, that "there has never been a Buddhism without the sermon of Benares" — as it stands! — "the middle path, the four noble truths, the eightfold path, or without matri". In other words he abode in the dangerous position, that the original New Word in a gospel is to be found in church-made formulas. He admitted "the Pāli sources may give but a onesided picture," but insisted, that "without them, other sources gave us a quite distorted picture". Granted! But why lean on the *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus* of the formula?

I could illustrate this in detail by showing that, in his selection in the Bertholet Series, named above, he has not picked out a single passage I have myself found as betraying some old stone in, or under monkish superstructure,—found, I mean, as being at odds with the position that is mainly emphasized, and at yet greater odds with the later exegetic teaching. But this were here out of place, and I have done it elsewhere.

Almost does Winternitz's departure close the brave band of the pioneers, of the 'Aelteren'. By these I mean them who were not only the pathfinders but who were, in disclosing the new country unable to discriminate truly the changes that country had

---

3 Almost I think he had dropped one or more of these *Sine qua non* 's in his 'Problems of Buddhism', I have mislaid my copy.
undergone in taking on its present configuration. It is, for instance, going far in the blazed trail to say, as he did, that not only ‘collections’ differ mutually in date, but that each has a matter of different dates. But he failed to get further and see, that many technical terms in these can be shown to betray a history words like dhamma, atta, bhava, nibbāna. Herein be it for the younger men to catch up his faltering torch.

Let them for instance consider the singular evolution in values undergone by just one of those words bhava, and its verb, in the history of early Buddhism i.e., Hinayāna. For Winternitz it was just Werdelust, used, he deemed, only in the pessimistic monk-outlook on more life, not as more opportunities (khāna) in which the further to ‘become’ or grow, but as mere and deplorable repetition. Herein there arises, in Sutta-study, an interesting point. In such lines as

virayam asokam sammappajānāti bhavassa pāragā, (Ang. iii, 157)

(his knows the stainless griefless state beyond becoming hath he gone) or

bhavatthā jātimaranassā pāragā, (Itt-vutkaka, §46),

(become ye they who birth and death transcend)

and half a dozen other such, we may take pāragā (or -gā), literally ‘beyond goer’, as meaning either expert knower,' or transcend-er.

The genitive case of the object may incline the translator to choose the latter. But when the broad loose nature of the Indian genitive is kept in view, the meaning may well have been ‘in becoming’, not ‘of becoming’, just as we can say ‘versed in’, or ‘expert in’ this or that subject. Now take the earlier Buddhist, the early Upanisadic meaning of ‘becoming’, where was no worsened meaning: ‘becoming’ used for good luck, prosperity, or consummation, or for

4 E.g., of the Vedas (Digga, i, 88)?
5 E.g., in Digga, 19—’tell master Jotipala I wish him luck (bhavam hosi’)."
the further progress of the soul — ‘becomes Brahman,’ or, ‘whither, death to be attained, becomes the soul?’ — and we see that, for the early Śākyan missionaries those Pali terms might have meant ‘yon-farers in becoming’, that is, progress in the Way of the worlds towards the final goal, the paṇiyosāna, the paramattāba. However, I write not as with certainty, for the association of the word pāragū with such a monkish sentiment as that of Dhammapada 348.

Let go the past, let go the things hereafter,
Let go the middle things, yon-farer of becoming¹ inclines me to think, that pāragū may have been a later term in the sense only of transcendence.⁶

I commend my ‘yon-farer’ or ‘yonderfarer’ to the ‘Jungeren’ (our old English has ‘yongate’ ‘in such a way, in that way’) if only because it is just a literally truthful rendering, leaving it uncertain whether ‘of’ or ‘in’ becoming is preferred.

Far more earnestly do I commend to them to keep in full view the original, the Śākyan worth in bhava as ‘becoming’, as werden, not merely in this one little earth-span of life, but in life as a whole, becoming, that is, in the worlds. Herein it is that not a few pioneers in Buddhist research have been heavily handicapped. More or less agnostically handicapped themselves, they have found the modern agnosticism in today’s degenerate Hinayāna attracting them. And herein they have sorely overlooked how close was the tie in the original teaching between the Śākyan missionaries and the unseen. Seeing in the Founder of it an independent thinker, they have misjudged him as a rebel against the Immanence in the accepted religion of his day, they forget the testimony that men flocked to him to learn of him the fate of departed fellowmen,⁷ or that he spoke to them of the unseen, to encourage disciples to

⁶ Cf. hereon my To Become or not to Become, p. 61 f (1937)
⁷ Dīgha, Sra. 18.
emulate here the good example set them by some amongst those departed, that so they might hereafter share in their fate (their 'suchness') 8. They ignore the evidence that the urgently enjoined practice of Jhāna was just what is now called psychic training 9. They pass over the description ascribed to king Bimbisāra of the Founder's teaching as not of a secular but a further-world aim (an attba not attbadhamme but samparāyiko) 10. They have consented to see the Way of the worlds as a tidy set of eight moral qualities of monkish editing, when the Sutta-nipāta, credited as of early date, could have taught them better.

He who would practise as the Teacher taught,
'T is he may go from hence to the beyond
Yea, hence to the beyond 'tis he may go,
Making the Way Incomparable to become.
The Way this is for going to beyond,
And therefore is it Yonderfaring called 11.

The worthy historian of religion is the man who sees not a less, but a higher value in a man's nature, life and religious quest. To have seen a less in these, to have seen man as a creature of a little spell in one earth-life is incompatible with true greatness in the founders of world-religions. The pioneers in Buddhist research have not all or always shown themselves in this as fit men to undertake to write about religious history. They have themselves not been fully in tune with their great subject. This was the case with the fine and indomitable worker whose leaving us this volume commemorates. In the pain of bereavement he could write "as I do not believe in any mythological 'future life', there is really no reason for either rejoicing or mourning, but " And there followed a brave list of coming work to be shouldered. Well, now he knows better.

C. A. F. Rhys Davids

8 Majjhīma, Nalakapāna S 9 Cf. my art IHQ, Dec 1927
10 Vinaya, Mhv V 11 Parāyana

IHQ, June, 1938
Nāgarjuna’s List of Kuśaladharmas

The treatises of the Mādhyamika school of Buddhism, so far as available to us in Sanskrit, are mainly concerned with the fundamentals of their position and give us little idea of the minor dogmatic details in which they differed from the Hinayāna and from the other Mahāyāna schools. Particular interest therefore attaches to the list of 119 kuśaladharmas which Nāgarjuna sets out in his commentary on kāṅkā 7 of the Vīrabhivyāvartani. Till recently it was not possible to determine the precise qualities mentioned there, as neither the Tibetan nor the Chinese translation afforded certain equivalents. The former was edited by Tucci in Pre-Dīnagā Buddhist Texts on Logic from Chinese Sources (Gaekwad’s Ori Series, XLIX, 1929), where also the Chinese translation was rendered into English. Almost simultaneously an admirable French version of the Tibetan translation was published by Yamaguchi in Journal Asiatique, 225 (1929), pp. 1 ff. Since the appearance of these two works the position has been altered by the invaluable discoveries of that remarkable traveller, the Rev. Rāhula Sānkṛtyāyana, who among other treasures discovered a Ms. of the Sanskrit text of this work, this Ms. he has recently published in the Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society, XXIII, Part iii, Appendix. It is in Tibetan script and was, it seems, made by a Tibetan visitor to India early in the twelfth century, in addition to being highly incorrect, with numerous mistakes and omissions, it apparently also includes a certain number of glosses. The printed edition, wisely perhaps, reproduces the text as it stands in the Ms., and it will require much patient work on the various versions to bring it into reasonable conformity with Nāgarjuna’s original. The passage with which this paper deals is in a particular bad state, and
I have unfortunately been unable to trace similar lists elsewhere, which would have helped to disentangle the text and would also have enabled me to deal with the historical development of the category. My discussion therefore is based solely on the authorities already mentioned and is restricted to an attempt to throw some light on the nature of the textual problems raised by the Ms I refer below to the Tibetan translation by the letter $T$, to the Chinese version by $C$, to Tucci's work by $T\mu$, and to Yamaguchi's by $Y$.

$K\text{\=a}n\kappa\tilde{\text{a}}$ runs

कु\=शालना धर्मवैशिष्ट्य धर्मवैशिष्ट्यविद्या सन्नगते।
कु\=शालन जना: लमास प्रेक्षणे विनियोग।

The Ms reads $\text{\=jan}\text{\=asvab\=\=b\=\=\=b}$ in $c$, omitting $\text{\=va}\text{\=m}$, but both $T$ and $C$ read $\text{\=ja}\text{\=na}\text{\=b}$, the former construing it with $\text{\=dhr}\text{\=m}\text{\=a}\text{\=va}\text{\=s}\text{\=t}\text{\=h}\text{\=a}\text{\=\=v}$$\text{\=i}\text{\=\=da}h$, the latter nonsensically enough taking it separately as may be seen from $T\mu$. The commentary states that there are 119 $\text{\=ku}\=\text{\=s}\text{\=a}\text{\=\=la}\text{\=d}\text{\=h}$$\text{\=a}\text{\=\=r}$$\text{\=m}$$s$, and proceeds to enumerate them though a number of them certainly do not appear in the Sanskrit text, while $C$, which in accordance with usual practice numbers each quality, names only 106, its list is printed in the notes to $T\mu$'s translation, part II, pp 28 ff.

At first sight the list appears to be an odd collection, the true explanation having been overlooked by $T\mu$ and $Y$. The Ms prefaces its list with the word $\text{\=ek}\text{\=a}\text{\=de}\text{\=\=s}\text{\=a}b$ and puts all the qualities from 1 to 81 in the genitive. This is confirmed by $T$ who however places the equivalent $\text{\=phyo}\text{\=g}\text{\=s}\text{\=\=ge}\text{\=\=\=i}\text{\=g}$ after 81, so that it was mistaken by $Y$ for a part of 81 instead of as qualifying all the previous terms. $C$ has an ambiguous rendering of the expression before starting the list, which was mistakenly translated by $T\mu$ by 'they have mind as their own [$?\text{ one}$] characteristic', the correct version seems to be 'they are deemed to be $\text{\=e}\text{\=k}\text{\=a}\text{\=l}\text{\=a}\text{\=k}\text{\=s}\text{\=a}$$\text{\=n}$$a$', the wording being such as to apply to all the qualities, not merely the first eighty-one.
The point of the word ekadeśa is that qualities 1 to 81 are only kuśala in some of their aspects, in others they may be akuśala or avyākṛta, ‘indifferent’. The remaining 38 qualities are solely kuśala, and therefore must not be identified with terms which could in any aspect not be kuśala, many of them refer to special attainments on the path to enlightenment. Once this distinction is grasped, the apparent peculiarities of the list disappear.

The following table gives a comparison of the three sources, with the solution I would suggest in each case. All but a few of the qualities have been successfully identified, and it is worth noting with reference to the difficulty of determining the Sanskrit equivalents of technical terms in Tibetan with precision, how often Y, while usually getting near the original in sense, has failed to discover the word actually used. Tu’s text of T is evidently corrupt in a few places, and I have corrected these with the help of the Ms, and C, giving Tu’s reading in brackets, the mistakes, particularly the confusion of da and na, are of a type familiar to those who have had occasion to handle the Tibetan translations. C’s version has not been given in Chinese to save trouble in printing, as it is easily available in Tu as well as in the various editions of the Chinese Tripiṭaka. Its renderings are sometimes of an unusual type, the translation emanating from the sixth century school, which was first located at Lo-Yang and moved later to Yeh. Where it indicates the solution accepted in the final column, I have simply entered ‘id’ with the number of the quality, as stated in the translation, in brackets. In other cases I have put a query and discussed the rendering in a footnote. It will be observed that in three cases I have come to the conclusion that C has wrongly separated a group of characters representing one quality into two groups and that in one case I have split a group of two characters into two terms of one character each. Where the versions differ in the order of the terms, I have followed the Ms’s order.
### Nagārjuna's List of Kuśaladharmaś

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Sanskrit MS</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Suggested Original</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>vijñāṇa</td>
<td>mam-par śes-pa</td>
<td>omitted</td>
<td>vijñāṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>vedanā</td>
<td>tshor-ba</td>
<td>id (1)</td>
<td>vedanā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>samŚrāṇā</td>
<td>hdu-śes</td>
<td>id (2)</td>
<td>samŚrāṇā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>cetanā</td>
<td>sems-dpah</td>
<td>id (3)</td>
<td>cetanā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>sparśa</td>
<td>reg-pa</td>
<td>id (4)</td>
<td>sparśa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>manasikāra</td>
<td>yul-la byed-pa</td>
<td>id (5)</td>
<td>manasikāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>chanda</td>
<td>hdun-pa</td>
<td>id (6)</td>
<td>chanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>adhimokṣa</td>
<td>mos-pa</td>
<td>id (7)</td>
<td>adhimokṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>viyā</td>
<td>brt.on-hgrus</td>
<td>id (8)</td>
<td>viyā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>smṛtti</td>
<td>dran-pa</td>
<td>id (9)</td>
<td>smṛtti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>samādhi</td>
<td>tun-ne-hdzin</td>
<td>id (10)</td>
<td>samādhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>prajñā</td>
<td>śes-rab</td>
<td>id (11)</td>
<td>prajñā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>upcaksā</td>
<td>gtan-sfioms</td>
<td>id (12)</td>
<td>upcaksā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>prayoga</td>
<td>sbyor-ba</td>
<td>id (13)</td>
<td>prayoga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>sampprayoga</td>
<td>yan-dag-par sbyor-ba</td>
<td>id (14)</td>
<td>sampprayoga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>prāpti</td>
<td>thob-pa</td>
<td>id (16-17)</td>
<td>prāpti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>adhyāśaya</td>
<td>lhag-pahi bsam-pa</td>
<td>? (15)</td>
<td>adhyāśaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td>pratvi</td>
<td>khon-khro-ba med-pa</td>
<td>? (18)</td>
<td>apratīgha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>ratī</td>
<td>dgah-ba</td>
<td>id (19)</td>
<td>ratī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>vvavasāva</td>
<td>lbad-pa</td>
<td>id (20)</td>
<td>vvavasiya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>autsukya</td>
<td>'tsol-ba</td>
<td>id (22)</td>
<td>autsukya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. C's 17 does not correspond separately to anything in T or the Ms and must therefore be joined to either 16 or 18. I have preferred the former alternative, the combination meaning 'complete attainment' and translating sādha in the commentary on kānka.

2. C has bsi (Giles, 4087), which stands usually for vāsanā in the translations emanating from this school. Probably therefore it read adhyāśaya and took it in the sense of vāsanā.

3. In Tibetan khon-khro usually represents pratīgha, though I have found it in the sense of parabheda, and as gha and va are occasionally confused (another case apparently under 24), I see no reason for doubting the restoration apratīgha. C's pien ts'ai (Giles, 2909, 11996), 'talent for wrangling', recurs under 26 (see note 6), corresponding there also to T's khon-khro, presumably therefore it means pratīgha in both cases, the negative having dropped out under 18, as has happened in several subsequent cases. T does consider it equivalent to pratibbha, for which the ordinary term is lo-shna, 'joyful speaking' (cp Eitel, Handbook, and Soothill and Hodous, Dictionary of Chinese Buddhist Terms), but Soothill and Hodous mention lo-shna pien ts'ai as also used for this word, it is however difficult to reconcile pratibbha with either T or the Ms.
Nāgarjuna’s List of Kuśaladharma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Suggested Original</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>unmū</td>
<td>rmons-hbrel</td>
<td></td>
<td>? (21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>utsāha</td>
<td>ypros-pa</td>
<td>id (23)</td>
<td></td>
<td>utsāha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>avyavartya</td>
<td>gnod-pa med-pa</td>
<td>id? (24)</td>
<td></td>
<td>avighāta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>vaśūṭā</td>
<td>dban dan ldan-pa</td>
<td>id (25)</td>
<td></td>
<td>vaśūṭā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>prātipatti</td>
<td>khon-khro</td>
<td></td>
<td>? (26)</td>
<td>? prataghāta, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pratigha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>avipratisāra</td>
<td>yul-lha gcags-pa</td>
<td>id (27)</td>
<td></td>
<td>avipratisāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>med-pa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>omitted</td>
<td>hdsun-pa</td>
<td>? (29)</td>
<td></td>
<td>? parigraha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>mi-hdsun-pa</td>
<td>? (30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>dran-pa</td>
<td>? (28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>dhṛti</td>
<td>bṛtan-pa</td>
<td>id? (31)</td>
<td></td>
<td>dhṛti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>adhyayāsāya</td>
<td>lḥug-pa zhen-pa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>adhyayāsāya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>anāunvekti</td>
<td>mti-nsol-ba (3)</td>
<td>id (33)</td>
<td></td>
<td>anāunvekti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>ananumūrddhi</td>
<td>rmons-pa med-pa</td>
<td>? (32)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>anutsāra</td>
<td>spon-ba med-pha</td>
<td>omitted</td>
<td></td>
<td>anutsāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>prāpanā</td>
<td>do t-du gñer-pa</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td></td>
<td>prāthanā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>pran[dlu]</td>
<td>smon la</td>
<td>? (34)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 This word is a crux. T indicates literally *mōbasambandha* (so also Y), which at least suggests a word with the root *mub*. The negative of the word appears under 34, where the Ms has *ananumūrddhi* and T the equivalent of *anumādi* and it looks therefore as if a word such as *unmāgdbti* or *anumāgdbti* were meant, but authority for any form of this sort is lacking. C has *sun* (Giles, 10271), the equivalent of the root *CENT* and under 34 the negative of the same, possibly a mistake for *ksnu* (Giles, 5320) or *yu* (Giles, 13559), either of which would show a formation from *mub*.

5 Literally C is equivalent to *aniśya*.

6 See note 3, in view of which C would seem to have read here *upratigbhā*; *Pratigbhāta* seems slightly more probable than *pratigbhā* from the Ms’s reading.

7 For this and the next term C indicates *alpechbātā* and *analpechbātā*; T, which one would naturally assume with Y to have had *grāba* and *agrāba*, may intend *parigraba* and *aparigraba*, which agrees fairly with C.

8 C shows *upratisāra*, which occurs certainly at 73 and cannot therefore be in place here also. T literally gives *smrśtī*, which has already been enumerated under 10. The original was perhaps a formation from *smrś* signifying ‘remorse’.

9 The equivalent of C is ordinarily *upekṣā*, and if it stands here for *dhṛti*, it implies taking the word in the sense of keeping the mind in equilibrium, cp. note 35 for a similar use of the word.

10 See note 4 above.

11 C reads *apranīdhī*.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Sanskrit MS</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Suggested Original</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>mada</td>
<td>rgyags-pa</td>
<td>? (35)&lt;sup&gt;12&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>mada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>visayānām visprayoga</td>
<td>yul dan mi-ladan-pa</td>
<td>(36)&lt;sup&gt;11&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>visayānām vi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>anūryānukāta</td>
<td>ncs-par hbyum-pa ma-yin-pa</td>
<td>(37)&lt;sup&gt;14&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>anūryānukāta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>utpāda</td>
<td>skyr-ba</td>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>utpāda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>sthitī</td>
<td>gnas-pa</td>
<td>(39)</td>
<td>sthitī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>anūtyatī</td>
<td>mu-rtag-pa</td>
<td>(40)</td>
<td>anūtyatī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>samarthāgata</td>
<td>klan-pa (45)</td>
<td>(41)</td>
<td>samarthāgama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>jārā</td>
<td>rga-ba (44, dgah-ba, Tu)</td>
<td>(42)</td>
<td>jārā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>pariśāyatī</td>
<td>yons-su ghun-ba</td>
<td>(43)</td>
<td>pariśāyatī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>arati</td>
<td>mu-dgah-ba</td>
<td>(44-45)</td>
<td>arati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>vitarka (pl)</td>
<td>rtag-pa</td>
<td>(46)</td>
<td>vitarka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>prati</td>
<td>shug-pa</td>
<td>(47)</td>
<td>prati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>pramādā</td>
<td>dal-pa (dan-ba, Tu)</td>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>pramādā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>vyavihārātā</td>
<td>rks-su mu-mthun-par omitted</td>
<td>(51)&lt;sup&gt;11&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>vyavihārātā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>pres</td>
<td>hchod-pa</td>
<td>(49)</td>
<td>preman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>pratikūla</td>
<td>mu-mthun-pa</td>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>pratikūla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>pradaksināgraḥā</td>
<td>mthun-pa hzin-pa</td>
<td>(51)&lt;sup&gt;16&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>pradaksināgraḥā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>12</sup> C's text is uncertain. The first of the two characters according to the Tarsho Issakyō edition is lo (Giles, 7331), 'pleasure', and according to Tu is luan (Giles, 7458), the name of a tree, presumably a mistake for the very similar character lieh (Giles, 7154), 'tickle attachment for', 'hanker after'. The second character is shuo 'speak'. The printed edition's reading suggests pratibhāna (note 3 above), but for the other version correspondence with mada is possible, but far from certain.

<sup>13</sup> Tu omits the negative rightly read by the Tarsho Issakyō edition.

<sup>14</sup> Pu-bung 'not going'.

<sup>15</sup> This and the next three numbers are much confused in the texts, which cannot be unravelled with certainty. The Ms has before 51 aprārabdha, which in view of the words appearing again at 69 and of its not being given here in T or C must be an interpolation. Further T takes 52-53 as one term, C as two, like Y. I accept the latter, so that with the rejection of aprārabdha we can still keep the list in its full number. T's apparent equivalent for 51 comes after 54, but I cannot at present equate it with the Ms at all. Geoff should represent a form from dbon or bhr or less probably grab, not the Ms's 'hārāta'. The first part corresponds to anāukula or possibly apasavya. Y conjectures anāukula.

<sup>16</sup> C's first character, bhsu (Giles, 4716), 'necessary', 'proper', corresponds here to T's mthun-par, and its second, ch'u (Giles, 3118), to the rootgrab.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Suggested Original</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>vaisārdaya</td>
<td>mū-hūga-pa</td>
<td>id (52)</td>
<td>vaisārdaya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>gaurava</td>
<td>zhi-sa</td>
<td>id (53)</td>
<td>gaurava</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>citrikāra</td>
<td>ci-mor byed-pa</td>
<td>id (54)</td>
<td>citrikāra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>bhakti</td>
<td>dad-pa</td>
<td>id (55)</td>
<td>bhakti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>abhakti</td>
<td>ma-dad-pa</td>
<td>id (56)</td>
<td>abhakti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>suṣrūṣā</td>
<td>bsgra-bī bzhin byed-pa</td>
<td>id (59)</td>
<td>suṣrūṣā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>sādara</td>
<td>gus-pa</td>
<td>id (57)</td>
<td>ādara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>anādara</td>
<td>ma-gus-pa</td>
<td>id (58)</td>
<td>anādara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>praśrābdhi</td>
<td>śīn-tu sbyangs-pa</td>
<td>(64)</td>
<td>praśrābdhi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>hāsa</td>
<td>rgod-pa (63, rgol-pa, omitted)</td>
<td></td>
<td>hāsa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

65 vāc  
66 visāpandānā  
67 suddha  
68 aprasādha  
69 apraśrābdhi  
70 vyavahārītī  
71 dāksya  
72 saurātya  
73 vipratisārā  

\[ T \]

\[ id (61a) \]

\[ id (61b) \]

\[ omitted \]

\[ Do \]

\[ id (62) \]

\[ id (63) \]

\[ ? \]

\[ ? \]

\[ omitted \]

\[ yul-la gcags-pa \]

17 In medieval scripts sā and initial ā are often almost identical, cp the similar mistake of sa for a in 89.

18 For the translation of praśrābdhi by śīn-tu sbyangs-pa see S. C. Dav, Tibetan Dictionary, s byan-chub C’s su (Giles, 10338) might stand for pratisraya, for the various renderings of praśrābdhi see no 69, Rahder, Glossary of the Daśabhūmikasūtra, Etel, op cit Soothill and Hodous, op cit, 14b.

19 C seems to have joined two characters wrongly here. The first, fa (Giles, 3376.), can mean ‘utter’. Alternatively the two could correspond to 66.

20 The Ms has already had vyavahārātā under 51. T would ordinarily give vikāra, but in view of the Ms may signify vyavākāra, for which see La Vallée Poussin, Abhidharmakosā, ch ii, p 266. Just possibly vyavākāra is to be taken to kr, in the sense which is found at Abhidharmakosā, ch iv, p 130, n1. Y suggests visuddhi, presumably reading nnam-par byan-ba, which cannot be brought into relation with C., though it might suggest the Ms’s reading to be a corruption for vyavādānātā C’s fu (Giles, 3723) throws no light on the solution, Tu takes it as equivalent to māraṣa and translates ‘covering’, the latter being a common sense of fu in translations. Its sense of ‘over-throw’ might however be connected with the above suggestion about vyavakṛ. No adequate explanation is at present possible.

21 T may possibly stand for dāksya, though the regular equivalent would be dhārya C suggests adhirā
Nāgārjuna’s List of Kuśaladharmas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Sanskrit MS</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Suggested Original</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>śoka</td>
<td>mya-nan</td>
<td>ṭd (69)</td>
<td>śoka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>upāyāsāyāsa</td>
<td>hkhṛug-pa</td>
<td>ṭd? (67)²²</td>
<td>upāyāsāyāsa, or upāyāsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>bhu (?) ta</td>
<td>rgyags-pa</td>
<td>ṭ (68)</td>
<td>ṭ²³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>apradaksina-</td>
<td>mi-mthun-par</td>
<td>ṭ (66)²¹</td>
<td>apradaksinagṛāha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>grāha</td>
<td>hdzin-pa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>samsaya</td>
<td>tse-tsathom</td>
<td>omitted</td>
<td>samsāya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>samvarānām</td>
<td>sdom-pa yons-su</td>
<td>ṭd (70)</td>
<td>samvarānām</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pariśuddhi</td>
<td>dag-pa</td>
<td></td>
<td>pariśuddhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>adhyāyāsaya</td>
<td>nan legs-par dad-pa</td>
<td>ṭd? (71)</td>
<td>ṭadhyātmasam²⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(dan-pa, Tu)</td>
<td></td>
<td>prasāda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>rūpa</td>
<td>ḥuṣ-g-pa</td>
<td>ṭd (72)</td>
<td>bhurutā²⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>śraddhā</td>
<td>dad-pa</td>
<td>ṭd (73)</td>
<td>śraddhā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>hri</td>
<td>no-tshī ¯ux-pa</td>
<td>ṭd (74)</td>
<td>hri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>ājaya</td>
<td>gnam-pa</td>
<td>ṭd (75)</td>
<td>ājaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>avaṃcana</td>
<td>mi-hdrid-pa</td>
<td>ṭd (76)</td>
<td>avaṃcana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>upasama</td>
<td>ūc-bar zhi-ba</td>
<td>ṭd (77)</td>
<td>upasama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>ačāpala</td>
<td>ittags-bag ma-vun-pi</td>
<td>ṭd (78)</td>
<td>ačāpala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>sapramāda</td>
<td>bag-yod-pa</td>
<td>ṭd (79)</td>
<td>sapramāda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>mārdava</td>
<td>ḫjam-par (byams-par, Tu)</td>
<td>ṭd (80)</td>
<td>mārdava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>pratisamkhyāna</td>
<td>so-sor bitags-pa</td>
<td>ṭd (81)</td>
<td>pratisamkhyāna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>nirvāra</td>
<td>ṭd byun-ba</td>
<td>ṭ? (82)</td>
<td>nirvāra²⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>parādāha, or</td>
<td>vons-su gdmun-ba</td>
<td>ṭ? (83)</td>
<td>parādāha²⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nispardāhi?</td>
<td>mxd-pa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²² C implies disorder, confusion, bewilderment, and probably corresponds to the word may be simply upāyāsa, and āyāsa may belong to 76
²³ The normal equivalent of T is mada, and of C kausūda, māna may be a possible solution
²⁴ C means ‘not obtaining one’s desires’ and possibly corresponds to the word may be simply upāyāsa, and āyāsa may belong to 76
²⁵ Adhyāyāsaya is certainly wrong, as it has already appeared under 17C and the first part of which probably represents adhyātma in view of the Ms, so that T’s legs-par should apparently be corrected to ibag-par
²⁶ This seems the only way of equating the Ms with T and C
²⁷ T means ‘that which arises in the mind’, manabhava or the like, which implies the same as nirvāra C indicates vāra, but as the qualities from 82 onwards are solely kuśala, the negative cannot be omitted
²⁸ For the same reason as in the previous note, parādāha indicated by C must
Nāgārjuna’s List of Kuśaladharmas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Suggested Original</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>amada</td>
<td>rgyags-pa med-pa</td>
<td>id (84)</td>
<td>amada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>alobha</td>
<td>chags-pa med-pa</td>
<td>id (85)</td>
<td>alobha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>adosa</td>
<td>zuc-sdan med-pa</td>
<td>id (86)</td>
<td>adosa²⁹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>amoha</td>
<td>gu-mug med-pa</td>
<td>id (87)</td>
<td>amoha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>asadvat</td>
<td>thams-cad sés-pa-</td>
<td>? (88)¹⁰</td>
<td>sarvajñatā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ŋid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>apratmihsarga</td>
<td>mi-gtron-ba</td>
<td>? (89)¹¹</td>
<td>apratmihsarga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>vibhava</td>
<td>hbyor-pa</td>
<td>id (90)¹²</td>
<td>vibhava</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>apatrapya</td>
<td>khrel yod-pa</td>
<td>id (91)</td>
<td>apatrapya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>aparicchadana</td>
<td>mi-hchab-pa</td>
<td>id (92)</td>
<td>aparicchadana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>mānana</td>
<td>sms-pa mu-gtron-ba</td>
<td>omitted</td>
<td>? mānana¹³</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>kārunya</td>
<td>šrin-ic (102)</td>
<td>id (93)</td>
<td>kārt nya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>matri</td>
<td>byams-pa</td>
<td>? (94)¹¹</td>
<td>matri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>adināta</td>
<td>zhum-pa med-pa</td>
<td>omitted</td>
<td>adināta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>dirata</td>
<td>dgral bral-ba</td>
<td>? (95)</td>
<td>? aranā¹⁰</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>ma na</td>
<td>rdzu-hphrul</td>
<td>? (96)</td>
<td>?⁹⁶</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>nāha</td>
<td>khon-du mi-hdzin-pa</td>
<td>id (97)</td>
<td>anupaniḥa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>ali</td>
<td>phrag-dog med-pa</td>
<td>id (98)</td>
<td>aniyā¹⁷</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

be rejected. The Ms is probably to be understood as intending nirvanaparidadā to be divided into nirvana and nisparidadā.

The use of dosa for deva in Buddhist Sanskrit is well authenticated.

C reads asarvajñatā, which occurs as 118 and also as 105 of C’s list. T is clearly to be followed here.

C gives pratmihsarga.

Y (p 64, n 1) has misunderstood the Chinese, which takes vibhava in the technical sense of the opposite of bhava, ‘existence’.

For mānana or manyanā, which perhaps corresponds to T, see Trimūkā, kārikā 2, Ābhudharmakosa ch viii, p 192, and Viṣṇapūtanatrātāśādhi, p 225.

Y seems to have read sms-pa gton-ba.

C’s hsi (Giles, 4073) suggests priti rather than matri.

T’s term seems to indicate this solution. C’s sbē (Giles, 9796) ordinarily stands for upeksā or for ‘renunciation’, as La Vallée Poussin translated aranā by ‘absence de passion’ at Ābhudharmakośa, ch iv, p 123, sbē may signify the same here.

T and C show either reddha, prabhāya or uksaranaya, none of which correspond satisfactorily to the remains in the Ms.

C and T correspond exactly and indicate anāmyā very strongly.
### Nagārjuna’s List of Kuśaladharmas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Sanskrit MS</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Suggested Original</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>cetasopatyā-</td>
<td>sens yons-su gtugs-pa ? (99) primo 18</td>
<td>cetasoparyā-</td>
<td>dāna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>ksāntu</td>
<td>bzod-pa</td>
<td>id (100)</td>
<td>ksāntu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>vyavasadu</td>
<td>rnam-par spon-ba omitted</td>
<td></td>
<td>? 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>āsauratyā</td>
<td>des-pa (nes-pa, Tu) ma-yin-pa</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>āsauratyā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>iti bhāgānvaya</td>
<td>yons-su lons-spyod-pa rjes-su mthun-pa</td>
<td>? (101-102) 10</td>
<td>paribhogān-vaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>punya</td>
<td>bsod-nams</td>
<td>id (103)</td>
<td>punya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>asamjñīsamā-</td>
<td>hdu-śes (med) pahi sāoms-par hjug-pa</td>
<td>id (104)</td>
<td>asamjñīsamā-patti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>patti</td>
<td>nes-pa hbyun-ba-</td>
<td>omitted</td>
<td>nairīnyākata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>asarvaññatā</td>
<td>thams-cad mi-śev-pa</td>
<td>id (105)</td>
<td>asarvaññatā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>asamskrta</td>
<td>hluv-ma-byas-pahi chos</td>
<td>? (106) 11</td>
<td>asamskrtaadhar-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dharmāḥ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ma (pl?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38 C suggests cetaso vyavadāna or the like
39 Perhaps vyavasarga, cp Rahder, *op cit.*, s v
40 C’s 101, *is* properly ‘benefit’, ‘advantage’, and 102, nēng yung ‘usable’, and the two groups may possibly correspond to the suggested Sanskrit, or alternatively *is* may stand for 112 in the sense of ‘giving’
41 C literally gives anityasamādhi, which suggests a corruption in its text

E H Johnston
Indo-Arica

1. The secondary affix *-vya*

The only sure derivatives with the affix *-vya* are the Vedic *bhṛatrva-—“(father’s) brother’s son, cousin> rival,”* and the classical *pitrva-—“father’s brother.”* Cf. Pāṇini. *pitrvatulamātāmahā-pitāmahāḥ* 4 2 36

Vedic *sāravyā—“arrow-shot,”* and vedic and classical *sāravya—“target”* are not derivatives with *-vya* It is undoubtedly derived from *saru* with the affix *-ya* (PW) Similarly *dravya—“substance <wooden article, wooden”* is derived from *dru + ya* (cf *darvi—“ladle, wooden spoon”*), *savya- <ṣū + ya* and *pāsavya- <pāśu- + ya*

Note also the gerundive affix *-tavya < -tu + -ya (<sīa)

The rather late classical *mravya—“hunt,“* may be either a dialectal (MIA) variation of a derivative of *mravya—“hunter”* (PW) or a contamination of *mravya- with sāravyā-.*

The affix *-vya* stands in the same relation to the affixes *-vaya (-vāya), -viya (-vī), -vi* and *-va* as the affix *-tya* stands to the affixes *-taya, -tiya, -ti* and *-ta*

The affix *-vaya,* which has obvious affinity with *-maya* both as numerical and non-numerical affix (cf Pāṇini *samkhyāya gunasya nimāne mayat 5 2 47*), occurs in the two words, both vedic, *cāturvaya—“fourfold”,* and *druvaya—“wooden dish”* (AV) *druvaya-* can be compared with *dravya- just as gomāya- with gāvya- , nabhasmāya—“vaporous” with nabhyā—(in the adverb abhinabhyām “near the clouds”), and *sūmāya—“well-fashioned”* with *savya-.*

The affix *-paya* in *katipaya-* is probably allied to *-vaya* and *-maya*

The affixes *-vāya, -viya, -vi* are attested only in the following
derivatives from *pada- padavāyā- "leader, guide," *padaviya-"following the footsteps, or track," *pada- "leader, guide" (vedic), "way, path" (classical)

The affix -va appears only as a primary derivative, e.g., *ghrsuv- "lively", *jāgruv- "watchful" etc. Cf the primary affix -mi (mi) as in *bhūmi-, *bhūmi-, *ūrmi- etc, and the secondary affixes -vin, -min as in *vāgvin- (AV), *vāgmin- "eloquent", *rgmin- "jubilant with praise", *astrāvin- "obedient to the goad", *svāmin- (<svā-) "master", etc

The secondary affix -va occurs in the pronominal derivative eva(m) "thus, indeed", OP aeva, Av ava- "one", and keśavā- "hairy", *śraddhvā- "credible", aṁvā- "slippery" (AV), *śantvā- "friendly" (AV) etc. The allied affix -ma was much more prolific. It appears in the pronominal derivative -ma and in madhyama-, garama-, carama-, druma-, upama-, pañcama-, etc

-tya occurs in āpatya- "offspring", āvistya- "manifest", nīstya- "foreign", sānutya- "secret", etc. OP anuśiya "follower" (<*mutya). In Avestan -tya occurs as an ordinal affix too, viz., bitya- (<*dvyta) "second", etc., and so also in MIA (Aśokan ekaca-, ekārya- "some" (<*ekaty-). It occurs also in āptyā- and āptyā- "watery"

-tya occurs in dāsatya- "tenfold", cātustaya- (AV) "fourfold", and also in some classical Skt. words (cf Pāṇini, 5 2 42, 43)

-tiya occurs in the ordinals dūtiya-, trtiya-, OP dūtiya, ssthiya, and perhaps in the O I-A pronominal adjectives yāvatiya-, tāvatiya- etc

-ta (secondary affix) occurs in the numerals pankta- "fifth", saptati-, aṣṭi-, etc., in Nīya Prakīrti dūtī>bīti "second", trīti "third" (Burrow, The Language of the Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Chinese Turkestan, Cambridge, 1937, p 38) But these forms may as well go back to *dvyta- *trtya-, or to dūtiya-, triya- The affix occurs in words like bahuttha-, yāvattha- etc (Pāṇini
5 *2. 52. 53). In patti-, OP pastis ‘‘foot soldier’’ (<pad) the affix may be primary or secondary, cf also padāti-
-ta occurs in the three Vedic proper names (originally ordinals) ekatā- (VS), dutā-, tritā- (the last two occur in Avestan as well), and also in the substantives avatā-, ‘‘well’’, vasantā-, hemantā- and muburtā-

2 The Pāniniene affix -cara

In the sense of remote past Pānini prescribes an affix -cara (bhūtapūrve carat 5 3 53, sasthyā rūpya ca 5 3 54) Thus, to quote grammarians’ examples, ādhyacarah =ādhyo bhūtapūrvah, krsnacaro gauḥ =krsnasya bhūtapūrvo gauḥ cara-, however, is here the second number of compounds, and it features as the base of the derivative carama- (<cara + ma) It is a cognate of cara- and goes back to I-E qwero- The palatalized form of the I-E interrogative -indefinite pronominal base *qwe-/*qwo- occurs also in O I-A cit, ca, cana, and cara-, M I A carahi (<*carbi, cf O I-A yarbi, tarbi etc.), and Avestan cahmā (<*casmāt), cahyā (<*casya), cīs etc

3 paksati-
Pānini derives paksati- ‘‘end or beginning (mūla) of a fortnight’’ from pakṣa- with the secondary affix -ti (paksāt tib 5 2 25) The secondary affix -ti appears only in the numerals like pankti, saptati- etc (see supra) It is best to take paksati- as a result of haplology from *paksaksati- ‘‘end of a fortnight’’

4 udanta-
udanta- ‘‘news, information’’ is undoubtedly a derivative of *udan <vad- with the affix -ta, cf vasantā-, hemantā- The heteroctic base udar-/udan- ‘‘word’’ occurs in Hittite, e g., nom sing utar (ud-da-a-ar, ut-tar), gen sing utanas (ud-da-na-a-ā) (Sturtevant. A comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language, p 185).

Sukumar Sen
Mohenjo-Daro and the Aryans

It will doubtless be long before decisive conclusions are reached concerning the full significance of the Mohenjo-daro and Harappa discoveries. The most recent step forward has been taken by Dr L. Sarup, the learned editor and translator of the Nāukta, who has concentrated on the relation of the Indus civilization to the Rgveda. He asks, is it Aryan or non-Aryan in character? It has been so generally assumed that the Indus civilization is pre-Aryan and non-Aryan and that a closet examination of the relations of this culture to that of the Rgveda is very welcome.

It has further been too readily assumed that a Dravidian origin may be the explanation. The prevalence of this view has been due rather to the lack of positive evidence, so that it has not been easy to bring forward facts against it, but at least Dr. Sarup has no difficulty in showing that the anthropological data do not favour any connexion with what is known as the modern Dravidian type. He concludes that several races contributed to the Indus population, and goes so far as to call it cosmopolitan. He finds that in the statuary there are resemblances to that of Sumer, and that Mongolian types are found. This seems to exclude an Aryan origin as well. He also mentions another view, and says that Mr E. Mackay accepts the theory of ethnic relationship between the people of the Indus Valley and Mesopotamia. This is hardly fair to Mr. Mackay, for he only says that it may be "assumed provisionally that the Proto-Elamites, the dwellers in the Indus Valley brick-built cities, and perhaps also the Sumerians had a common ancestry." And he goes on to say that until further sites have been explored, it is impossible to go beyond this provisional assumption. Still, even although

1 The Rgveda and Mohenjo-daro in Indian Culture, Oct. 1937, p. 149 ff.
assumed only provisionally, it remains a possibility, which later evidence may prove. But it is remarkable that Dr. Sarup expresses no opinion on it, and gives no evidence against it.

To ask if the Mohenjo-daro people are Aryan is rather vague, as not only the Rigveda people called themselves Aryan but also the Iranians. However, no harm is done as long as it is understood that the present problem is only about the Indo-Aryans. Were they the ancestors of the Indus civilization? Evidently the Mongolian types and mixture of races which make a Dravidian origin unlikely appear to tell still more forcibly against the view that they were Aryan. But leaving that question open Dr. Sarup goes on to establish a different matter—the priority of the Rigveda civilization to Mohenjo-daro. He shows first that the Rigveda civilization was essentially a village, agricultural, and pastoral civilization. Next, that of Mohenjo-daro was a city and commercial civilization. Then he concludes that the Rigveda represents a period earlier than the Indus Valley civilization. But he has given nothing to show that Mohenjo-daro is Aryan, he has left it an open question, and if it is non-Aryan, we can infer nothing about their relative dates. A non-Aryan people may quite well have advanced beyond the pastoral stage long before the Aryans began to build cities.

So with phallic worship. The wide prevalence of the phallic cult, says Dr. Sarup, shows the posteriority of Mohenjo-daro to the Rigveda. The alternatives we have to start from are either that the Aryan cult of Rudra-Siva became combined with the phallic worship of a non-Aryan god or that phallic worship originated with the Aryans. Until that is settled nothing can be said about priority. We know that the worship of Rudra-Siva is never connected with phallic worship in the Rigveda, and that where phallic worship appears to be mentioned it is repudiated. As Dr. Sarup quotes, "let those whose deity is phallus not penetrate our sanctuary." (Rv VII, 215) Whoever there were, they were not worshippers of the Aryan
Siva-Rudra Yāska and Sāyana know so little of these śīnadevāḥ that they interpret the word as abrahmacarya. The alternative that they were phallic worshippers, who had adopted a non-Aryan practice is not met, and yet until it is answered it is merely begging the question of priority to say that Rgveda culture is earlier than that of Mohenjo-daro.

The inference from the art of writing is the same. If the Mohenjo-daro people and the Rgveda Aryans are of different races, then the art of writing at Mohenjo-daro has not the least connexion with the culture of the Rgveda. Writing may have been practised by any number of peoples before it reached the Aryans. But in this case it is a question of a kind of writing which the Aryans never used, so that it would seem to be cut off from any connexion with the date of the Aryan art of writing. The art of writing, says Dr Sarup, had not been invented during the period of the Rgveda. Rather, it had not been invented by the Rgveda people, but there may have been people all around them who had already invented it and were using it. Nevertheless, from the fact that the Mohenjo-daro people had a kind of writing and the Rgveda people had not Dr Sarup concludes that the Rgveda civilization was prior.

Dr Sarup's discussion brings out several important points. It shows that it is impossible to speak of the priority of either the culture of Mohenjo-daro or of the Rgveda until some connexion between the two is established. It also shows what kind of evidence is wanted before a connexion can be assumed. Most of all, some chronological foothold is wanted, and this is now a more hopeful possibility. We now no longer need to discuss the Aryan question in a vacuum. There are the Aryans of Iran, and the names of Indo-Aryan gods and Sanskrit names have been discovered as far away as Asia Minor. Some of these can be dated, for the chronology of Mesopotamia and Western Asia already rests on a much safer basis than the Indian. As for the language of Mohenjo-daro, Dr Sarup says that we do not
know definitely whether the script was written from right to left or from left to right, nor whether the language was agglutinative, synthetic or otherwise, nor whether it was of an Aryan or non-Aryan character. Father Heras claims to have read it as Dravidian, but has not yet published his solution, and he has evidently not convinced Dr. Sarup.

E J THOMAS
The Vāyu-Purāṇa

The original Vāyu is perhaps the oldest of the extant Purāṇas. The Mahābhārata (Vangavāsi ed., III, 191, 16) speaks of a ‘Purāṇa proclaimed by Vāyu’, the Harivamśa (Vangavāsi ed., I, 7, 13 and 25) refers to ‘Vāyu’ as an authority, Bānabhatta says in his Harsacarita that he listened to the reading of the Vāyu-purāṇa in his native village, and Alberūni repeatedly names a Vāyu-purāṇa in his account of India.

The character of the Vāyu as a Mahāpurāṇa has sometimes been called in question. The cause of this doubt is the use of the title ‘Śiva’ or ‘Śaiva’ for ‘Vāyaviya’ in the majority of the lists of eighteen Mahāpurāṇas. But this substitution, which has been taken wrongly in favour of the comparatively late sectarian Upapurāṇa called ‘Śiva-purāṇa’, is based on the Śaiva character of the Vāyu. The Skanda says: “The fourth (Purāṇa), declared by Vāyu, is known as Vāyaviya. It is also called Śaiva on account of

1 In the following pages the Anandārama edition of the Vāyu has been used.
2 Harsacarita ch. 11 (pavamāna-proktam purānam paddatha).
3 Sachau, Alberūni's India, I, pp. 41-2, 130, 168, 194, 247, 287, etc.
4 Nṛsīrṣma Vāpiṣṭiśum in the ‘Vāyu-p’ among the Upapurāṇas. See Nityācara-pradīpa, ASB ed., p. 19. Śrīdhara Śvāmin, in his commentary on the Bhāgavata-p, explains the word śavaka as Śiva-purāṇa. See his commentary on Bhāgavata XII, 13, 4. Mitra Miśra recognizes the Saiva as a Mahāpurāṇa and says

य पि विद्युत्पुरो त्र्यमालदपकाश्य बायोष्णय त्यस्य ते श्रेयमावैवेद्यवायोपरम

त्र्यमालश्च परिष्कर्ति ग्रहाद्वम्यां त्यस्य स कम्पेत्र्य व्यक्तयथोत्सव

The Vāyu-Purāṇa

its connection with (i.e., treatment of) Śiva-bhakti... It contains 24,000 ślokas. The description of the fourth Mahā-purāṇa, as given in the Matsya, Nārada, and Agni, also agrees with the contents of the present Vāyu-purāṇa. None of the Nibandha-writers, who have drawn upon the Vāyu and the Śiva-purāṇa, have been found to make any confusion between the two, for the verses quoted from the 'Vāyaviya' or 'Vāyu-purāṇa' are, in the majority of cases, found only in the present Vāyu but not in the Śiva, and those quoted from the 'Śaiva' or 'Śiva-purāṇa' are sometimes traceable in the present Śiva but never in the Vāyu. That the Vāyu was more important in the eyes of at least the Nibandha-kāras is shown by the fact that almost all of them quote verses from it, whereas the Śiva-p is drawn upon by a very few of them. Hence it seems that the attempt to raise the Śiva-p to the status of a Mahā-

6

7

§kanda-p (Vanga ed) V, 11, (Reva-khanda). 1, 33-34 These verses are also found in the Reva-māhātmya which claims to be a part of the Vāyu-purāṇa. See Aufrecht, Bodleian Catalogue, p. 65

Sec Matsya (Vanga ed) 53, 18, Nāradya (Venkat ed) I, 95 and Agni (Vanga ed) 272, 4b-5. The mention of the Śveta-kalpa as connected with the declaration of the 'Vāyaviya Purāṇa' should not create any difficulty, for the Vāyu-p seems to connect itself with the Varāha-kalpa (Vāyu 6, 11 and 13, 7, 5, 21, 12 and 23) and to identify this Kalpa with the Śveta-kalpa (Vāyu 6, 13, 23, 63 ff. and 114 ff.) Moreover, the Nāradya P whose list of contents of the 'Vāyaviya' Purāṇa agrees much with that of our Vāyu but not even partially with that of the Śiva, also speaks of the connection of the Vāyaviya with the Śveta-kalpa. The word bhāga-duaya-samanvita used by the Nāradya P with respect to the 'Vāyaviya' should not be taken to point to the Vāyaviya-sambhūta (of the Śiva-p) which also consists of two bhāgas (parts). Eggeling, in his India Office Catalogue, VI, pp. 1299-1301, describes a few mss. of a Purāṇa which is called 'vāyuproktā-purāṇa' or 'vāyu-purāṇa' in the colophons of chapters. It is generally the same as our present Vāyu, and is divided into two khandas (or kāndas) or four pādas. The ASB edition of the Vāyu also is divided into two bhāgas.

Of the twelve Sambhūtās of the Śiva-p the Vāyaviya-sambhūta only is declared by Vāyu. So, how could the words vāyaviya, vāyu-prokta etc. be applicable to the entire Śiva-p which begins with a Sambhūta other than the Vāyaviya?
The Vāyu-Purāṇa

purāṇa* was due to a comparatively late sectarian zeal. The Devi-
ūdbhāgavata (Vanga ed., I, 3, 14) and the 'Padma-p' referred to by
Gangādhara in his commentary on the Dharma-samhitā of the
Śrīva-p,¹⁰ include the Śrīva among the Upapūrāṇas.

The Vāyu consists of four Pādas—(1) Prakriyā, comprising
chaps 1-6, (2) Anusanga, chaps 7-64, (3) Upodghāta, chaps 65-99,
and (4) Upasamhāra, chaps 100 to the end. It deals with all the
five topics characteristic of the old Purāṇas. Over and above these,
there are a few chapters on Smṛti matters, viz.,
chaps 16-17 — on the duties of the castes (varṇas) and
āśramas,

chap 18 — on the penances of yāttis,
chaps 57-59 — on yuga-dharma,
,, 73-83 — on funeral sacrifices (including impurity
due to births and deaths, and purification
of things),

chap 101 — on hells and results of actions done, and
chaps 105-122 — on the glories of Gayā.

These chapters do not seem to have belonged to the present Vāyu
in its earliest form. They are in all likelihood later additions. Of
these, chaps 16-18 are comprised in the section on Pāṣupata Yoga
which betrays the influence of chaps 39-43 of the Mārkandeya-p.
In this section, which extends from chap 10 (verses 68 ff.) to 20,

In its Vāyavīya-samhitā, the Śrīva-p lays claim to the position of a Mahā-
pūrāṇa saying that the fourth Mahāpurāṇa is the Śrīva which consists of twelve
Samhitās. See Śrīva-p V, 1, 41.

The verse "... वायवीयसमनुज्जन माय-संगीतम् महापुराणम् हि..." in Kūrma I, 1, which includes the 'Śrīva among the Mahāpurāṇas, should not be
taken strongly in support of the early date of the Śrīva-p and its character as a
Mahāpurāṇa. This verse most probably means "That excellent (Purāṇa)
proclaimed by Vāyu is enumerated as the eighteenth and is known as Brahmānda,
because the Brahmānda-p also is proclaimed by Vāyu and is called 'vāyu-prokta
brahmānda' in the colophons of its chapters.

the *Vāyu* has not only a good number of verses in common with the *Mārkandeya* but has also improved upon the latter with fresh addition of chapters and verses. Now, we have seen that *Mārkandeya* 39-43 cannot possibly be dated earlier than 200 A.D. Therefore, chaps. 16-18 of the *Vāyu*-p. should be dated later still. The fact that the section on Pāśupata yoga is not found in the *Brahmānda*-p. tends to show that it was interpolated after 400 A.D., because the *Vāyu* and *Brahmānda* could not have been separated earlier than 400 A.D. Consequently, *Vāyu* 16-18 also are to be dated later than that period. As Śūlapānī quotes a verse from chap. 18 in his Prāyaścitta-uvāca, they are certainly earlier than 1300 A.D. None of the early Nibandhakāras being found to draw upon them, it is difficult to place the lower limit of the date at a still earlier period.

Chaps. 57-59, dealing with yuga-dharma, give an account of the period ranging from the reign of the Nandas to the end of theĀndhira rule in Western India. Therefore, these chapters should not be dated earlier than 200 A.D. They were, however, written earlier than 275 A.D., because the *Matsya*-p. borrowed from the *Vāyu* a good number of chapters, including the three mentioned above, in the last quarter of the third or the first quarter of the fourth century A.D. Of these three chapters, chap. 59 has been drawn upon by Devanabhātta in his Smṛti-candrikā (see Appendix).

Chaps. 73-83, on śrāddha, are included in the section ‘Śrāddha-kalpa’ (covering chaps. 71-85), the greater part of which is given as an interlocution between Brhaspati and his son Śamyu. In these chapters yogins have been given remarkable prominence as invited

---


13 See my essay on 'the Hindu society before 200 A.D. and the Purānic rites and customs in the first stage of their development' to be shortly published in the Indian Historical Quarterly.

14 See my essay on the 'Matsya-purāṇa' in ABORI, XVII, pp. 1 ff.
guests." It is said "Srāddhas should be carefully offered to yogins... What is eaten by an adept in yoga saves one from great fear. A yogin is superior to a thousand householders, a hundred forest-hermits and a thousand students." Such prominence given to yogins is not traceable in the Codes of Manu and Vājñavalkya, who do not seem to have held yogins in high esteem. On the other hand, yogins are given great prominence in the existing Pāncarātra Samhitās which are certainly later than the above mentioned Codes. It is therefore highly probable that the chapters on śrāddha in the Vāyu-pīś belong to a date not earlier than 200 A.D. This date seems also to be supported by the hatred with which the 'nagnas' (the naked) have been mentioned in chaps. 78 and 79 1b. The word nagna is said to mean those people who are without garments. Such people are clearly the Jains and the Buddhists, because the terms nirgrantha and pāsanda also have been used in these chapters of the Vāyu. The contempt shown to these religious sects could be possible only when their religions were in a decadent state. Buddhism, which found its strongest upholders in Aśoka Maurya and Kaniska, was probably in a flourishing condition at the end of the second century A.D. So the chapters of the Vāyu cannot possibly be earlier than that time. The mention of the Naksattaras from Kṛttikā to Bharani in Vāyu 82 points to a date earlier than 500 A.D. It is probable that the chapters under discussion were added to the Vāyu about the middle of the third century A.D.

Most of the above mentioned chapters on śrāddha have been drawn upon by the Nibandha-writers early and late, viz., Śūlapāṇi has quoted verses from chaps. 78 and 79 in his Prāyaścitta-uyveka (Jivānanda's ed.), Vācaspatimisra from chaps 77 and 82 in his Tīrtha-cintāmani (Bibl. Ind.), Kullukabhata from chap 78 in his.
commentary on the Manu-smṛti, Madhavācārya from chaps. 75, 76 in his Bhāsyā on the Parāśara-smṛti (edIslampurkar, Bombay), Madanapāla from chaps 75 and 79-81 in his Madanapāryāta (Bibl. Ind.), Sridatta Upādhyāya from chaps 78 and 79 in his Kṛtyācāra, (Ms No 4339, Dacca Univ Lib), Candēśvara from chap 81 in his Kṛtya-ratnākara (Ms No 1055C, Dacca, Univ Lib), Devanabhatta from chaps 75 and 78-80 in his Smṛti-candrikā (ed Govt of Mysore), Ballālasena from chap 80 in his Dānasāgara (India Office Mss) and from chap 19 in his Adbhutasāgara (ed Muralidhara Jhā, Benares), and Aparākha from chaps 74-82 in his commentary on the Yājñavalkya-smṛti (see Appendix)

All of the verses in Vāyu 73-83 do not seem to have come from the same date. Verses 14-32 of Vāyu 82 are most probably spurious. They do not occur in the great majority of mss, nor are they to be found in the corresponding chapter of the Brahmānda-p. Besides these verses, there are certain others which were interpolated later, but it is very difficult to separate them. The fact that many of the quoted verses, especially on Śrāddha, are not found in the present Vāyu, proves that the Purāṇa has undergone substantial losses also.

Chap 101, on hells and results of actions, probably comes from the same date as chaps 57-59. As there is no evidence sufficient for the determination of its date, it is impossible to say anything definitely.

Chaps 105-112, on Gayā-māhātmya, did not originally belong to the Vāyu. In many mss of the Purāṇa this Māhātmya has been omitted. On the other hand, it is often found to appear as an independent text in mss as well as in printed editions. That this appendage was attached to the Vāyu earlier than 1400 A .D is certain, for Vācaspatimisra quotes numerous verses from chaps 105 and 111-112 (see Appendix)

17 See Vāyu-p, p 426, footnote
APPENDIX

Verses quoted from the 'Vāyu-Purāṇa' or 'Vāyaviya' in

1 Aparārka's Vāyu-p

(p 258 (twice) = 78, 51b-52a and 52b-54
(except 53a)

p 387 = 77, 27
p 448 = 79, 67
pp 454-5 = 79, 68 and 78-80

Three lines 'anāśrami
tapas tepe' etc are not
found

p 473 - Of the four lines
quoted, only one
tallies with Vāyu, 78,
31b, the other three
are not found

p 475 = 74, 4
pp 487-8 = 80, 39-40, 4, 37, 2,
5-8, 16 and 19-21 74.
1-2 Verses beginning
with 'śrāddhesūpanahau
dadyāt', tūlapūrṇe tu
yo dadyāt' and 'vya-
janam tāla-uvntam ca'
are found to tally
with Brahmāṇḍa, III,
16, 8-9 and 10

p 490 = 75, 54b-55a
p 493 = 78, 48b-49a

pp 502-3 = 74, 20b-25a and
26-28 The lines
'svarga-pavarga-
sopānam' and 'bhrā-
tarab sarvabhatānām'
are not found

p 506 = 75, 43
p 551 = 76, 31-33a and 34b-c
p 553 Of the 21 lines quot-
ed, only the first three
and the last one tally

11Q, JUNE, 1938

\[\text{Vāyu-p with Vāyu, 78, 8b-3a and 78, 10b respectively. These 21 lines are the same as Brahmāṇḍa, III, 14, 8b-9, 10b-12 and 14b-20.} \]

\[\text{Adbhutasāgara of Ballālasena,} \]

\[\text{p 554 = 80, 42b-45a and 47-48} \]

\[\text{p 559 = 81, 18} \]

\[\text{p 560 = 82, 2a} \]

\[\text{p 924 = 79, 24b-25} \]

\[\text{p 506 = 19, 18} \]

\[\text{p 507 = 19, 17 and 25} \]

\[\text{p 508 = 19, 13, 27 and 14} \]

\[\text{p 509 = 19, 16, 33 and 15} \]

\[\text{The verse 'nāgam śravakam is not found} \]

\[\text{Dānasāgara of Ballālasena,} \]

\[\text{fol 187a = 80, 59} \]

\[\text{Kullukabhatta's commentary on Manu, III, 267—(Cf Brahmāṇḍa, Venkat ed., III, 14, 11b)} \]

\[\text{on Manu, IV, 49-78, 60} \]

\[\text{Smrti-candrikā of Devānabhatta, II, 589 = 79, 18 IV, 25 = 80, 45} \]

\[\text{— These verses tally with Brahmāṇḍa, III, 14, 14b-15, 16b and 17b-20} \]
\[ \text{Vāyu-} \]

\begin{align*}
208 \quad \text{twice} & \quad = 78, 31b-32a \quad \text{and} \quad 40 \\
331 & \quad = 75, 54b-55a \\
366 & \quad = 75, 43 \\
370-371 & \quad = 75, 22 \\
392-3 & \quad = 80, 2 \\
393 & \quad = 59, 49 \\
\end{align*}

\textbf{6 Kṛtyācāra}

of Sṛdatta Upādhyāya

\begin{align*}
\text{fol} & \quad 2a \quad = 78, 60 \\
\ldots & \quad 10a \quad = 79, 38 \quad \text{and} \quad 39b \\
\ldots & \quad 12b \quad = 79, 33a \quad \text{and} \quad 34a \\
\ldots & \quad 41a \quad = 79, 46b-47a \\
\ldots & \quad 64a \quad = 79, 88 \\
\end{align*}

\textbf{7 Kṛtya-rātnākara}

of Candēvāra,

\begin{align*}
\text{fol} & \quad 173b \quad = 81, 2-4 \\
\ldots & \quad 188a \quad = 81, 4a \\
\end{align*}

\textbf{8 Mādhavācārya's}

Com on the Parāśara-smṛti,

\begin{align*}
\text{vol I, part ii,} \\
\text{p} & \quad 369 \quad - \text{These verses, which} \\
& \quad \text{are not found in the} \\
\text{Vāyu-} & \quad \text{are the same} \\
\text{as Brahmadā, III, 14. pp} & \quad 280-281 \\
& \quad 14b-20 \quad (\text{except 16a} \\
& \quad \text{and 17a}) \\
\text{p} & \quad 412 \quad = 75, 54b-55a \\
\text{p} & \quad 431 \quad = 75, 22 \\
\text{p} & \quad 438 \quad = 76, 31 \\
\end{align*}

\textbf{9 Madana-pāmāta}

of Madanapāla,

\begin{align*}
\text{p} & \quad 486 \quad = 81, 2-4a \\
\text{p} & \quad 552 \quad - \text{These verses are found} \\
& \quad \text{not in the Vāyu but} \\
& \quad \text{in the Brahmadā (III,} \quad 14, 9b, 10b-12 \quad \text{and} \\
& \quad 14b-17a) \\
\end{align*}

\[ \text{Vāyu-} \]

\begin{align*}
\text{p} & \quad 558 \quad = 79, 53a \\
\text{The other two lines} \\
& \quad 'gṛhaśāhām' \quad \text{etc are} \\
& \quad \text{not found} \\
\text{p} & \quad 579 \quad = 80, 2 \\
\text{p} & \quad 581 \quad = 75, 54b-55a \\
\text{p} & \quad 591 \quad = 75, 57b-58a, \ 71-72 \\
& \quad \text{and} \quad 75b-76a \\
\text{p} & \quad 600 \quad = 75, 43 \\
\text{of Śūla-pāni,} \\
\text{p} & \quad 306 \quad = 78, 48b-49a \\
\text{p} & \quad 347 \quad = 18, 12 \\
\text{pp} & \quad 429-430 \quad = 78, 69, 79, 20-22 \\
\text{p} & \quad 474 \quad = 79, 24b-25 \\
\text{of} \\
\text{Vācaspatmiśra,} \\
\text{p} & \quad 7 \quad = 110, 2-3 \\
\text{pp} & \quad 274-275 \quad = 82, 9 \quad \text{and} \quad 43, 77, 96b-97a, 98-99, 101- \\
& \quad 103, 105-106a, \ (\text{two} \\
& \quad \text{lines 'snātovā dīna-} \\
& \quad \text{trayam', etc on p 275} \\
& \quad \text{of the Tirtha-cintā-} \\
& \quad \text{manī are not found),} \\
& \quad \text{108a and 109} \\
& \quad \text{= 108, 13a, 14-19 (one line} \\
& \quad \text{'rāmatribhe naraḥ snā-} \\
& \quad \text{tavā' is not found),} \\
& \quad 21b-23a, \ (\text{one line} \\
& \quad \text{'āgatyā ca' on p 281} \\
& \quad \text{of the Tirtha-cintā-} \\
& \quad \text{manī is not found), 22} \\
& \quad \text{and 28-30} \\
& \quad \text{= 108, 20} \\
\text{pp} & \quad 284-285 \quad = 110, 9-15b, 19-20b, \\
& \quad 20c, \ (\text{one line 'islāya-} \\
& \quad \text{dādhi' is found in the} \\
& \quad \text{footnote on p 443 of} \\
& \quad \text{the Vāyu-} \\
& \quad \text{p), 56-59a} \\
& \quad \text{and 61a} \]
The Vāyu-Purāṇa

Vāyu-p

pp 285-6 = 105, 18-19a, 26 and p 321

33

p 286 = 108, 71b, (one line 'pātab' etc is not found), 111, 17

p 288 = 110, 17 and 21-22

p 289 = 110, 23-24 and 30-32

pp 290-292 = 110, 34-42 and 44-55

p 296 = 110, 8-9, 62a and 65

pp 298-301 = 111, 1-3, 110, 21, 17-18a and 23-24, 111, 4-6b, 7, 8-10a, 12, 10b-11a, 13-14 and 15-22

Some verses, which are not found in the running text, are given in the footnote on p 443 of the Vāyu-p

p 303 = 109, 43 The other three lines are not found

p 309 = 111, 23a-b and 24-26

pp 310-312 = 111, 30a, 31-32, 35-36, 33-34 and 38-40. One line 'śrāddhāya pinda-dānāya' and one verse 'āmrāś ca saktāb on p 311 of Tirtha-
cintāmāni are not found

pp 314-8 = 111, 41, 44a, 45a, 44b, 45b-c, 46-49a, 50-52, 54a, 56b-63, 69-71a, 64-68, 73. (two verses found in the footnote on p 449 of the Vāyu-p), 74-75b

p 320 = 105, 26

Vāyu-p

= 107, 46 and 48

= 111, 77, 78a, 79

Three lines 'dṛṣṭaṁ

natvātha', 'gayaṁ

dharma-prathe' and

'gayaś-arṣa 'ksaya-vate'

are given in the foot-

note on p 449 of the

Vāyu-p 111, 76, 82-

84 and 75 109, 5b

and 7b-12 One line

'upendra tvam' on p

323 of the Tirtha-
cintāmāni is not found

= 112, 21-22b, 23-26,

(two lines are found in

the footnote on p 451

of the Vāyu-p), 34b,

44b, 46-49a, 30-31,

(four lines 'udbhīṣyāḥ'

etc are not found),

49b-53, (the lines

'srāddha nāma' etc on

p 327 of the Tirtha-
cintāmāni are not found), 56-58a, 60 and 58b-59 108, 12, 24,

(five lines 'rāme vanam
gata' etc on p 328 of

the Tirtha-c are found

in the footnote of the

Vāyu-p p 436), 43b-

44a, (Vāyu-p, pp 436-

7, footnote, verses 1-2,

5-15, 17, 16, 18-26a,

28-32, 34b-38a, three

lines 'tam dṛṣṭuṁ' etc

on p 332 of the Tirtha-
c are not found)

Rajendra Chandra Hazra
Dates of some Kākatiya Records

The recent Telugu publications Kākatiya-samcika (Andhra Historical Research Society, Rajahmundry, 1935) and Telamgānāśasamamulu, vol I (Laksmanarāya Parisodhaka Mandali, Hyderabad, 1935) are of great importance to all students of Kākatiya history. The former gives the text of 39 valuable records of the Kākatiya kings, and the latter contains the text of no less than 57 inscriptions of the family. But some 16 records are common to both the volumes. It is however a matter of regret that, excepting the facsimiles of the Kōtagiri and Malkāpura records in the Kākatiya-samcika, there are no facsimiles of the inscriptions to enable us to verify the readings of the records. I have recently studied the Telamgānāśasamamulu in which many passages appear to be wrongly deciphered. My doubts are chiefly based on the readings of dates which are generally given in Saka years and are also named according to Jupiter's Cycle of Sixty Years (Southern). There are more than ten cases of inaccuracy in the dates, the readings in many of which are undoubtedly wrong.

The present note deals with some such inaccuracies. It will be seen that some of the theories (based on such dates), advanced by Dr Rama Rao in the Kākatiya-samcika are really unwarranted.

1 Inscription of the time of Ganapatī from Kondiparti in the Warangal Dist (No 8 of Telamgānāśasamamulu) is said to be dated in Saka 1113 (p 203) and the date portion is read as sākābde tattva-rudra = mitavati rudhirōdgāri-vaiśākha-māse (p 24). The number of the Tattvas is 25 (Śāṅkhya-pravacanasūtra, I, 61), and that of the Rudras is 11. The date is therefore undoubtedly 1125 according to the formula ankasya vāmā gatis Saka 1125 (≈ A D 1203) was moreover a Rudhirōdgāri samvatsara, while Saka 1113 was a Virodhakṛt year.
2 Inscription of the time of Rudrāmba in the Narasimha temple at Būrugugadda in the Nalgonda Dist (No 32 of the same, and No 28 of Kākatiya-sameśika) is said to bear the date Śaka 1180 (p 205) and the date portion is read as sakavarsamulu 1180 lagu vibhavasamvatsara āyēṣṭha śu 10 guruvarunāmdu (p 71) This reading would suggest that the generally accepted theory regarding Rudrāmba’s accession to the Kākatiya throne about A.D. 1261 is wrong. 1 Śaka 1180 (= A.D. 1258) was however a Kālayukta year and not a Vibhava year. The correct reading is no doubt Śaka 1190 (with 9 instead of 8 in the third figure), i.e., A.D. 1268, which was a Vibhava samvatsara. The details prove that the corresponding date in English Calendar is Thursday, 24th May, 1268 A.D.

3 Inscription of the time of Ganapati in a mosque at Būdapur in the Mahaboobnagar Dist (No 21 of the same) is said to be dated in Śaka 1184 (p 204) and the date portion is read as sakavarsamulu 1184 vartim pamsānu āmgirasa-samvatsarāna śrāvana-śuddha-buddhavārāna sōma-grahana-kālamuna (p 59) Śaka 1184 was a Dundubhi samvatsara. The third figure 8 is therefore evidently a misreading for 9, and the date is Śaka 1194 (A.D. 1272) which was an Āngirasa year. The question is moreover settled beyond doubt by the fact that there was no lunar eclipse on Śrāvana-puṇināmāsī in Śaka 1184, but there was actually an eclipse of the moon on the above titthi in Śaka 1194. The corresponding English date is Wednesday, 10th August, 1272 A.D.

4 Inscription of the time of Ganapati from Vādapalli in the Nalgonda Dist (No 13 of the same) is said to bear the date Śaka 1133 (p 203) and the date portion is read as sakavarsambulu 1133 dagu pramaṇāda-samvatsaramuna (p 38). Now, Śaka 1133 was not a Pramāṇāda, but a Prajāpati samvatsara. The only Pramāṇāda year in Ganapati's reign (circa 1198-1261) was Śaka 1175 = A.D.

1 See Kākatiya-sameśika, pp 56ff. In a previous paper, I accepted this early date for Rudrāmba's accession, see IHQ, XIV, p 96.
So, either praṇāḍa is a misreading for praṇāpāti or the date 1133 is a misreading for 1175.

5 Inscription of the time of Ganaṇapati from Annavaram in the Nalgonda Dist (No. 12 of the same) is given the date Saka 1130 (p. 203) and the date portion is read as śakavarsamulu 1130 agu kālayuktaśamvatsara-māgha-śu vidyiśa śanvāramuna (pp. 37-38). Saka 1130 was however a Vībhava samvatsara and the nearest Kālayukta year was Saka 1120 = A.D. 1198 which seems to be the correct reading of the date. It is probable that the third figure in the date is to be read as 2 and not as 3. But if vidyiśa = duṣṭiyā, the details are irregular for both Saka 1130 and 1120. The reading may be wrong.

6 Inscription of the time of Ganaṇapati from Nāgulapādu in the Nalgonda Dist (No. 10 of the same) is given the date Saka 1124 (p. 203) and the date portion is read as śakavarsamulu 1124 [4] yagu kālayuktaśamvatsaramunamdu (p. 31). Saka 1124 = A.D. 1202 was however a Dundubhi year, and the nearest Kālayukta year, as we have seen, was Saka 1120 = A.D. 1198 which is possibly the correct reading of the date.

7 Inscription of the time of Rudrāmba from Pānugal in the Nalgonda Dist (No. 34 of the same) is given the date Saka 1187 (p. 206) and the date portion is read as śakavarsamulu 1187 yagu prabhavasambatsara-advhika-jyēṣṭha-bahula 13 (p. 73). Saka 1187 was however a Krōdhana samvatsara, and the nearest Prabhava samvatsara was Saka 1189 = A.D. 1267 which is evidently the correct reading. Saka 1189 had an Advhika-Jyēṣṭha which was absent in Saka 1187.

8 Inscription of the time of Ganaṇapati discovered near a ruined Siva temple at Ganaṇapavaram in the Nalgonda Dist (No. 18 of the same) is given the date Saka 1175 (p. 204) and the date portion is read as śākābdaiḥ bāna-bhuvana-vibhāvaṇipati-sudbākiranagunme śrīmukba-samvatsare māgha-śukla-āstamāṃ dinakara-dine śakavarsa.
Dates of some Kākatiya Records

1175 (p 50). Bāna = 5, bhuvana has been (wrongly) taken to represent 7, vibhāvaripati = 1, and sudhākirana = 1. According to the general formula, the date then stands as Saka 1175. But this year was actually not a Śrīmukha but a Pramādika samvatsara. The only Śrīmukha year in Ganapati's reign was Saka 1135 which must be the correct date. It is evident that the third figure in the date is really 3 and not 7. As regards the word bhuvana which stands for this figure in the date in words, it signifies 3 and 14 (Buhler, Indische Palaeographie, pp 80-81) The details are irregular for Saka 1175. The eighth tithi of the bright half of Māgha fell on Monday (not Sunday) in Saka 1135, corresponding to 20th January, 1214 AD.

Inscription of the time of Ganamrudra[de]va possibly a misreading for Ganapaddeva, (i.e., Ganapati) from Patmu in the Warangal Dist (No 31 of the same, and No 27 of Kākatiya-samcika) is given the date Saka 1156 (p 205) and the date portion is read as sakavarsamulu 1156 amdu durmukhi-samvatsara-vāśākhā-suddha 11 gu (p 68). But Saka 1156 was a Jaya samvatsara, and the nearest Durmukha year was Saka 1158 = AD 1236 which should be the correct date. The corresponding English date would be Thursday, 17th April, 1236 AD.

Inscription of the time of Pratāpurudra from Manūr in the Medak Dist (No 45 of the same) is said to be dated in Saka 1216 (p 207) and the date portion is read as sakavarsambulu veyyimni-yimnūta-payyāragunemti ānanda-samvatsara-māgha-śu 1 ādivārāṇa (p 88). The only Ānanda year in Pratāpurudra's reign (circa 1290-1330) was Saka 1236 = AD 1314, which appears to be the correct reading of the date. In place of the letter pa after veyyimni-yimnūta (i.e., 1200) I am inclined to read muppar, and for śu 1 ādivārāṇa I suggest the reading śu 7 āditya-vārāṇa. The

2 Prof Raychaudhuri first suggested to me the possibility of Saka 1135 being the correct date of the record.  
3 The figures 1 and 7 are sometimes confused, see JAHRS, vol XI, p 10.
corresponding English date appears to be Sunday, 12th January, 1315 AD

Inscription of the time of Prola from Mātēdu in the Warangal Dist (No 4 of the same) is said to bear the date Śaka 1043 (p 202) and the date portion is read as śakavarsambulu 1043 šarvari-samvatsara-caitra-suddha 3 vaddavāramunāmdu (p 4) Śaka 1043 was however a Plava samvatsara, and the previous year, i.e., Śaka 1042 = A D 1120 was a Śārvari samvatsara

Dines Chandra Sircar

4 The calculations in the present note are based on L D Swamikannu Pillai's Indian Ephemeris, vol I part (see Tables I [1] and II)
Nirnayakaustubha or Laghunirnayakaustubha of Viśvesvarabhatta

The importance of fixing approximate dates, etc., for performing various religious ceremonies and duties has been recognised by the Hindu society from time immemorial. Innumerable references and remarks about kāla lie scattered in the vast literatures of Astronomy, Purāṇa and Smṛti. But it is the Nibandha writers who devoted special treatises to this subject. Among the available treatises the earliest is Kāla-uvrēka of Jīmūtavāhana who flourished in Bengal about the 11th century A.D. Prof P. V. Kane has pointed out (Hist Db, I, p. 319) that Jīmūtavāhana names seven predecessors who dealt with the subject of kāla, cf

\[ \text{जिस्तैंत्रिक्या-रक्त स्वावतांश्च सं०यान-हरिव्रत धवल-नोगरोकः} \]

Kālavrēka, p. 8

After Jīmūtavāhana, the subject received exhaustive treatment at the hands of many Nibandha-writers. From the 11th century down to the middle of the 18th century several works have been written on this subject.

The object of this article is to present a work which probably is the last work. There is only one ms. so far known of this work and that is deposited in the Government collection of the B.O.R., Institute of Poona. Following is a short description:

No. 350 of 1875-76, size—83/8 in by 4 in Extent—45 leaves, 9 lines to a page, 27 letters to a line, Country paper, Devanāgarī characters, handwriting legible, benedictory phrase, topics and the colophon are tinged with red pigment, corrections made with yellow pigment, paper old and musty.

Begins—अष्टोत्तरसाय नमः ॥

Praṇamya janaḥṣaṁjali mahāsarvanāmaḥ ॥

Viśveswarā: सुवालानामवनोधपार्थवारात् ॥ ॥
Like other works on the subject, the Nṛnayaṇakaustubha starts with the discussion of the nature of tīthi and the divisions of the day. Then the anniversaries of ten avatāras is fixed. Next follow the important festivals like Rāmanavami, Dolotsava, Madanotsava occurring in different months. Then comes the fixing of grahana (eclipses) followed by a discussion about the sankrānti. The description of punyātīthi brings the work to a close.

Apart from its intrinsic merit, the importance of the work lies in the fact that it names about 38 authorities. The author, before finally giving his own opinion on any point, enters into a discussion and gives the views of other writers on the subject. Some of the writers are quoted as many as 24 times. These names are very helpful in determining the age of our author and in bringing together at one place the writers on the subject of kāla. I have depended upon Prof. Kane in giving the dates of the writers or works.
against their names. Figures in brackets indicate the number of times a work or an author is quoted in the Nirnayakaustubha.

1. Anantabhakha (1)—Several people of that name.
2. Aparārka (1)—Commentator on Yajñavalkyasmṛti, about 1115-30 AD.
3. Ācāryacūdāmani or Smārtācāryacūdāmani or Smarta (2)=Raghunandana Bhattacharya, 1490-1570 AD.
4. Āśvalāyana (1).
5. Kātyāyana (1).
6. Kālatattvaavavacana (9) by Raghunāthabhatta, 1620 AD.
7. Kālādaria (2) by Ādiyabhattachakavilabha, 1200—1325.
9. Kaustubha (20)=Smṛtikāustubha by Anantadeva, son of Āpadeva, about 1675 AD.
10. Govindārnava (1)=Śrītisāgara or Dharmatattvaavāloka by Śesanrāmha, between 1400-1450 AD.
11. Candrikākara (1)=Krnavabhattamaunun, son of Raghunāthabhatta, 1620 AD.
12. Tithyarka (3)=by Divākara, son of Mahādeva, about 1683.
13. Truthalisetu (1) by Nārāyanabhatta, about 1550-60.
14. Dwodārya (5) Earlier than 1500 AD.
15. Dikṣita (2) Earlier than 1100 AD.
16. Dīpikā (1)=Kālanmraya* or Tithinmraya*?
17. Nirnayaśīpa (2) mentioned in Nirnayaśīdhu.
18. Nirnayaśīdhu (13) by Kamalākarabhatta, 1612 AD.
19. Nirnayakṛt (1) same as above?
20. Nirnayaśīmrt (14) by Allādanātha, earlier than 1500 and later than 1250.
21. Purānāsamuccaya (1).
22. Pratāpamārtaṇḍa (1) by Pratiparudha, about 1500 AD.
23. Prapūtāmahacaranāḥ or Asmatprapūtāmahā-Ratnakarabhattacaranāḥ (4).
24. Prayogaratna (1) many of this name.
25. Bhāgavata (1).
26. Madanapārṣāṭa (1) by Vīśvesvarabhatta, 1360-90 AD.
27. Madanaratna (17) by Madanasmhadeva, 1300-1500 AD.
28. Manu (1).
Nirnayakaustubha or Laghunirnayakaustubha of Visvesvarabhatta

Thus we see that the Nirnayakaustubha quotes a work of so late a date as 1683 A.D. Hence, he cannot be earlier than that, and Prof. Kane is wrong in putting him earlier than 1500 A.D. (Hist Dh., I, p 742). Another statement of Prof. Kane which requires revision is that on p. 573 of his Hist Dh., I. He says that, Nirnayakaustubha is "mentioned by Raghunandana and Sankara in Samskārabhāskara." In the first place, Raghunandana (= Raghunandanabhāttacārīya, author of Smrtitattva) is very respectfully mentioned as Ācāryacāūdāmāni or Smārtacāryacāūdāmāni or Smārtta twice by Nirnayakaustubha, and the work of Sankara (= Sankarabhatta, son of Nilakantha), viz., Vratārka is also once mentioned by Nirnayakaustubha. Secondly, there is no Samskārabhāskara composed by Sankara except that what is also called Samskāramayūkha by Nilakantha revised by his son. And this is quoted 16 times in the Nirnayakaustubha.

Now we see that the only information afforded by the ms about the author Visvesvara is that he was surnamed as Mahāśabda (in the first verse) and Paundarikayājīn (in the last colophon) and that he was the great-grandson of Ratanakarabhatta. We know of one Visvesvara, of the Śāndilya gotra, surnamed Mahāśabda, who was the son of Rāmeśvara grandchild of Gangāraṁa and great-grandson of Ratnākara and who composed Pratāpārka (based on his ances-
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tor’s Jayasimha-kalpadruma) under the patronage of Pratāpasimha, grandson of Jayasimha of Amber I am tempted to quote an extract from Pratāpārka as given in Peterson’s Alwar Cat. (pp 129-30, no. 328)

...

...
Prof. Kane thinks that this work was composed about 1750 A.D. Now, it is quite evident that this Visveṣvara and Visveṣvara, the author of Nīrṇayakauṣṭubha are identical. We know that Jayasimhakalpadruma was composed by Ratnākarabhatta, son of Devabhavata. The work is in 19 chapters and it was composed under the patronage of Savai Jayasimha of Amber, who performed Jyotistoma, Vajapeya, Paundarika and Aśvamedha sacrifices. The date of completing Jayasimhakalpadruma is—

This date works out to be Saturday the 25th of July, 1713 A.D. In his note “Aśvamedha by a Mughal Satrap” (“Indian Culture, January, 1937, pp 547-8”), Mr. Jogendra Chandra Ghosh says in foot-note 3—“This research apparently refers to Jaya Sinha’s compilation on Smṛti entitled Jayasimhakalpadruma” Mr. Ghosh is wrong, for the author or compiler is Ratnākarabhatta who was a guru of Jayasimha. In Tśvaravālāsakāvyya (which has got only one ms and that is No. 273 of 1884-86 in the Govt. Mss Library at the BOR Institute, Poona), the author Kavi Krsna refers to Ratnā-
kara and other scholars at the court of Īśvarasimha, son of Jayasimha —

The point raised by Mr Dines Chandra Sircar (Indian Culture, vol III no 2, pp 376-9) has been successfully controverted by Mr P K Gode in his article “Some Contemporary Evidence regarding Aśvamedha Sacrifice performed by Sewai Jayasingh of Amber (1699-1744 A.D.)” JIH, December 1936 (pp 364-7).

It is interesting to note that references to Jayasimha’s performing Aśvamedha are found at several places in works of poets or scholars, who were almost his contemporaries. For instance, Vrajaṇātha, son of Prabhākara who was a brother of Ratnākara, says in his Padyatarangini (B O R I Mss., nos 724 and 725 of 1886-92 composed in 1752 A.D. in honour of Mādhavasimha, son of Jayasimha)—

Then Sadāśiva Sarmā, son of Gadādhara, also at Mādhavasimha’s Court ( जयति सदाशिवसर्मां मुनिजनकरस्मृतम् मुर्मामयि। माख्वसिंहसुभूमवदलि सुधेर्य नाटारम्। १३०४) quoted from Mādhavasimbhāryāsataka, ms No 436 of 1887-91 by Mr M. M. Patkar in his article “Mādhavasimbhāryāsataka—A poem in praise of King Mādhavasimha of Jaipur by Śyāma Lattu, composed in 1755 A.D.”—Poona Orientalist, vol. I, no. 4, pp 34-37), composed a work on Dharma-
Nurnyakaustubha or Laghunurnyakaustubha of Viśveśvarabhatta

śāstra, called Ācārasmrtecandrikā (Ms. No 236 of 1887-91 of B O R I) wherein he refers to Jayasimha as follows—

कशोजनपदिलयास्तुरंगमेयं सर्वमेयं च निर्माय।
भृगुदिनः कुंडलिनं कुंडलिनो केन विरचिता बुति)पुष्पं। II 7 tol 1b

Now, we arrive at the following genealogy of our author Viśveśvara

Devabhatta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratnākarabhatta</th>
<th>Prabhākarabhatta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gangārāmi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmeśvara</td>
<td>Vṛjanāth, composed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gokulanātha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Padya in 1752 A.D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viśveśvara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Maharāstriya Jñānakosa, vol 13, p 122, we learn that Pratāpasimha, died in 1803 after reigning for 15 years. So that, he reigned from 1788-1803. Therefore, Viśveśvara must have composed his Pratāparka after 1788 A.D. Nurnyakaustubha also must be placed somewhere near about this date.

Har Duti Sharma
The Problems of "Definition" and "Perception" in Sri Madhva's Epistemology

I "Definition"

According to Jayatirtha, "Definition" is (1) what is invariably present in all the defined objects and (2) absent from objects other than the defined. The term 'invariably' brings out that the distinguishing trait should be found in all the objects belonging to the same class as the defined.

If we take only one of the two factors to constitute a definition, it lands us in the fallacy of over-pervasion. (1) A cow is a 'horned-animal'. This definition includes all other horned animals, such as buffaloes, sheep, etc.

(2) Dewlap is 'what is not found in animals other than cows'. 'Tawny colour' also is not found in animals other than cows. Hence the definition is overpervasive.

So both the factors (1) invariable presence of the distinguishing trait in all the objects belonging to the same class as the defined, and (2) its absence from objects other than the defined constitute together the 'definition'.

The first purpose of a definition is to facilitate our understanding of objects in their distinctive individuality and independence. The second is to mark off one class from another, each retaining its independence. To differentiate one individual from another within the limits of the given class is the third use of a definition. It is immaterial whether these purposes are stated separately or otherwise. Some hold that the one purpose of definition is individualisation of entities. A definition synthesises the features belonging to a class and the distinctive characteristics of the individuals coming under it.
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In traditional Western logic "Definition" proceeds on the principle 'per genus et differentiam'. A definition should state the proximate genus. This fact points out that the defined is a species coming under the genus stated. The differentia consists of quality or qualities which distinguish the defined from the species that are co-ordinate with it. The purpose of a definition according to Indian logicians also is to differentiate the defined object from other members of its own class, and from the members of other classes. Definition helps us to denote the import of words.

According to the Nyāya school, "Definition" proceeds on the basis of the presence of the generic attribute in all the objects belonging to the same class as the defined. There are two jātis according to the Nyāya school. One is 'sattā' the highest universal or 'summum genus' (parā jāti), which brings all existence together, and emphasises their community of nature. The other is aparā jāti, which is many in number. The 'potness' is different from the 'clothness'. The universals are not ubiquitous like space or soul. They exist in particular individuals. Jāti is defined as 'one eternal, and inheres in many things'. It is found in Substance, Quality and Action only. It is this common element found in objects (anugata dharma) that makes us cognise all the objects belonging to the same class as the defined.

If jāti is assumed as one and eternal, what happens exactly to 'potness' when the pot is broken? The jāti cannot get destroyed because it is eternal. Nor can it be said that a part of it is lost, for it is impartite. The resourceful logician tells us that it abides in Time. The question now arises whether it was not in time the pot existed. Madhva was not the first to criticise the Nyāya view of 'Sāmānya'. The jāti of the Nyāya school is only a dharma.

1 See Mīnāmeyodaya, pp 229, 230, and Indian Culture, vol I, article on 'The Buddhist Estimate of the Universal'
There is no proof or warrant for the conception of such a common attribute. The humanity in each man is different. On the cremation of an individual the ‘humanity’ in him alone is destroyed. So the humanity in each individual is different. Madhva repudiates the Nyāya conception of jāti, and admits a number of dharmas in its place. So ‘potness’ and ‘clothness’ are dharmas, and not jāti.

Madhva holds that there are two types of relations between an attribute and a substrate. Some dharmas exist in the dharmin, till its destruction, e.g., ‘potness’ exists in pot till the destruction of the pot. Quality, Action and jāti are of the very nature of the dharma itself. They are technically called ‘yāvad-dravya-bhāvi’. The relation of the above-mentioned objects to their attributes is identity. The second type of relation that exists between a Substance and its attribute is called ‘ayāvad-dravyabhāvi’ or ‘khanditam’, e.g., the relation between (1) vikāra and the vikārin, (2) cause and effect, (3) movement and its object. The dharmas in the above examples get destroyed prior to the destruction of the dharmas.

\[2\] Narottadikam karma tattvamastchetate.
N sarvasam eva svarupam samudrayastu nityam.
Aptartham saharav adhaṃpyuṣṭham puṣṭah.
Arhica na viṇṇāpadehip yato dnyāṇbhyabhūtah.
Kūshtī bhūsanamasthaṃ nāśa puṇāntikatī.
Ekadh eva nāśa manāb bhūtanvāh sādarbhy.
Madhva’s Anuvākyāyana, p 186.

\[3\] Guṇākāra jñātāpyabhām sarvaṃphat kṛto.
Rupam eva dhīya tav yaśvanthram eva tarāntam.
Kāraṇedante meha eva yaśvanthram eva meva.
Kāraṇedante rupam eva tattvātābhāvīn pratimukṣam.
Kṣetra kṣetram eva kṣetram guṇaḥ bhūtāh.
Kṣetraḥ kṣetraṇaṃvābhaṃ tathā jñātābhāvabhavo.
Madhva’s Tattvaviveka, p 24, Daśaprakarana, vol I.
The relation between such dharmas and their dharmins is a relation of identity and difference.

It is not identity in difference. The relation of the threads to the cloth is a case of identity. This relation exists only when the cloth is existent. Supposing we take away the threads which go to make up the cloth, what exactly is the relation of the threads and the cloth? The relation now is not identity, because we see the threads, but not the cloth. The cloth belongs to the past (atita), and the threads alone are seen in the present (vidyamāna). So their relation is not identity but difference. Madhva is of opinion that at one particular time the relation of cloth to the threads was identity, but now it is difference. When the cloth and the threads were one, the relation was identity, when the threads are taken away, the relation is difference. In two different moments the substrate and the attribute are related in two different ways (1) identity and (2) difference. Madhva never says that at the same moment an attribute and a substrate are in a relation of identity and difference.

The objects of this world are entirely different from one another, and their attributes are also different. A further question crops up at this stage as to how we distinguish the various attributes which are identical with objects. It is to explain this fact Madhva brings in the category 'Viśesas'. They are many in number. They exist in every object unlike the viśesas of the Nyāya school which are present only in eternal substances. The viśesas

---

4 निम्नाद्विभस्मलोक द्राक्षार निखिलता ज्ञापि।
Madhva quotes this ārtti in Anuvāyākhyāna, p. 186, but it is not traceable

5 नेत्रहि त्वपौषे शब्दान्तरनियामः।
विशेषो नाम केपित मौलि वस्तुव्यदीपित।
विशेषाकेस परस्परविशेषिता।
सत्तुषाहस्तात्यथा सत्तति वस्तुव्यदीपित।
Madhva’s Anuvāyākhyāna, p. 165
are svatovyāvartaka. It is a dharma of every padārtha. Though there is no difference between the dharmin and the attribute, it is this viśesa that helps us to cognise the attributes which though in a relation of identity are yet different.

What exactly is the need for the assumption of viśesa? Why not say that the substance itself functions as viśesa?

A substance is an object of cognition (jñānausaya). Let us take for example a pot. We cognise it as a pot. In the cognition 'this is a pot' (ayam ghataḥ), there are three factors: (1) 'this' aspect idampadārtha, (2) ghataṭva (the prakāra), (3) the relation between them, i.e., samsarga. If our cognition can give us an apprehension of all these aspects where is then the need for viśesa? Our cognition or perception of a pot can only tell us the fact that the pot has a colour. The perception cannot tell us anything about the substrate being either different or otherwise from the attribute. Perception gives us the cognition, rūpavān ghataḥ. It never gives us the cognition, ghataṭ rūpam bhinnam. So perception can never give us the knowledge of the exact nature of the relation fixing one relatum as the substrate and the other as the attribute. When we say that perception cognises the relation between the substrate and the attribute it may be thought that the two relata are different.

Relation obtains not only between two different, but between two identities also, e.g., take the question, 'Does Time exist now?' The answer is that it exists. The relation of 'Time' as existent now, and 'Time' eternal is identity. Perception does not help us in cognising the nature of the relation. That can only be cognised on the basis of eternality and non-eternality. Certain substrates are

6 The term 'relation' involves difference of some kind or degree, without which the concept is unintelligible. Madhva's argument to establish a relation between two identicals appears specious. If it be true that our perception is of the form 'Rūpavān ghataḥ' the cognition of difference is already involved in what leads to the use of the possessive suffix.
eternal and their attributes are also eternal. Substrates and attributes are also sometimes identical. In such cases we do not have any basis of distinction to call one the substrate and the other the attribute. We cannot here say that the substance itself gives us the cognition. To say so would be to beg the question, because we do not know which is the substrate and which the attribute. In order to explain such facts Madhva posits a special potency called vīśesa which helps us to cognise the substrate and the attribute.

Madhva is of opinion that definition proceeds on the basis of similarity (sādṛṣya). When we define a cow as an animal which has a dewlap, the definition through this distinguishing quality, namely, the ‘possession of a dewlap’ helps us to cognise all cows as cows. This cognition is based on the perception of similarity abiding in different cases of having a dewlap. Similarity is an independent category. It is defined ekarrūptāpara-vṛtti, i.e., while being determined by one it is present in many, though its determinant is one, it is not one and the same in all. Its main function is the indication of difference. It always expresses itself in a relational form. It is always expressed in the form of a quality. There is no bare similarity. Madhva holds that though it is prolix to admit plurality of similarities, yet the concept of similarity is unintelligible otherwise. If A and B are similar, A’s similarity to B is different from B’s similarity to A. The argument that it is one and the same similarity that abides in both is not right. Let us illustrate it. For example, take the statement: The face is similar to the moon. The moon is the determinant. Its locus is the face. Now let us reverse the position in the analogy: ‘the moon is similar to the face.’ The face is the ‘nrūpaka.’ Owing to the difference in the determinants and their respective loci, we have to grant that the two similarities are different.

Let us now examine the axiom: ‘Things which are equal to the same thing are equal to one another, e.g., A is equal to C, B is
equal to C. So A is equal to B. When we speak of them we speak of it only with reference to some quality. Equality and similarity are not fundamentally different. The difference between them is one of degree and not of kind. Equality refers to a more precise and definite uniformity than the one referred to by similarity. On this ground we are justified in passing from equality to similarity. The similarity may be with reference to wealth or power. When A is said to be similar to C with reference to wealth or power, B is similar to C with reference to wealth. It is this property indicating similar similarity that helps us to cognise A and B as similar. This can be put in the form of an inference ‘A is similar to B, because A and B are both similar to C, like another instance.’

The function of similarity is the differentiation of the defined object from other members of its own class and from the members of other classes. This can be put in the form of an inference ‘The cow is different from other members of its own class, and from the members of other classes, because it has a quality similar to the dewlap, like another cow.

The relation of ‘word’ and ‘word sense’ too is known only through similarity. The word sense of jāti and vyakti cannot be explained through the help of the generic attribute.

According to the Nyāya school there is no jāti in jāti, and no particularity in particularity. Further the definition on the basis of generality is possible only for the first three padārthas. The padārthas that have no jāti cannot be defined in the same manner. This leads the Nyāya school to adopt two separate methods to ex-

7 This argument which is in the form of an inference would appear to involve the fallacy of petitio principi because probans (hetu) assumed is the thing to be proved.

8 इति न्यात्प्रतिर्पि हि साधस्येत्व गम्यते। सवैं छुपापच्छुद्व सर्गोद्व प्रवर्तते॥
   जातिशब्देऽक्षण तां ततु तस्म चेदनविविधताः॥

Madhva’s Anuvyākhyāna, pp 186-87
plain definition. In doing so they fall a victim to the defect of prolixity

II Perception

Perception is one of the chief instruments of knowledge. It is accepted by all the schools of Indian Philosophy. Inference and other instruments of knowledge depend on perception for their data. Perception is immediate and direct.

Madhva defines the instruments of perpetual cognition in two ways: (1) 'the instrument of perpetual cognition is the defectless sense organ.' This definition satisfies the definition of 'kārana' put forward by the ancient Nyāya school, namely, 'an instrument is a special cause qualified by a function (vyāpāravat asādhāranakāranam). In short, 'the defectless functioning organ' is the instrument of perpetual cognition.

(2) Another definition of 'kārana' put forward by the Nyāya school is 'the distinctive cause is the instrument (asādhāranakāranam). The 'distinctive cause' is that after whose operation the effect results without the intervention of any other factor (svavyavahitottarakālinakāryotpattikavam). Madhva's second definition of the instrument of perpetual cognition, i.e., 'the contract of a defectless sense organ with a defectless object,' satisfies the second view of 'kārana' put forward by the Nyāya school.

These two definitions of perception are not opposed to each other. They are so framed as to satisfy the two definitions of 'kārana.' It is only a question of the distribution of emphasis.

Jayatirtha, after defining the instrument of perpetual cognition as the 'contact of a defectless sense organ with a defectless object' proceeds to enumerate the defects of objects and the defects of the sense organ. We find a similar list of the defects in the Sāṅkhya-

9 Madhva's Tattvanirnaya, p 15 10 Madhva's Pramāṇalaksana, p 1
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kārikā of Isvarakrsna 11 The defects of objects are (1) being too distant (2) being too near, (3) being obstructed, (4) being indistinguishably mixed with similar things. These defects prevent us from knowing the objects, and distort our knowledge of them. 12 The sense organs which help us in cognising objects are of two kinds (1) physical sense organs (prakṛti indriya) (2) witness consciousness (sākṣa). The witness consciousness cognises the following objects (1) the pure existence of the Ātman, (2) its attributes, (3) its nescience, (4) manas and its modifications, (5) pleasure and pain, (6) time and space. 13 The physical sense organs are six in number (1) smell, (2) taste, (3) sight, (4) sound, (5) touch, (6) manas. The sense of taste tastes all the six rasas. The sense of touch and sight cognise the following objects (1) objects that have size and colour, (2) some attributes, (3) movements and jāti. The sense of touch feels the air about us. The sense of hearing has sound for its object. The defects of the senses are (1) non-contact of the organs with the mind, (2) affections of the sense organ such as jaundice, cataract (kāca), etc.

Manas cognises all the objects through the instrumentality of the outer senses. Its independent function is to be an aid to recollection. Its defects are attachment, etc.

Perception is of four kinds (1) Īśvara’s perception, (2) Laksmi’s perception, (3) Yogic perception, and (4) Ayogic perception. The perceptions of Īśvara and Laksmi are of the very nature of their selves,” 13 (sva-rūpendriyātmakam). In the case of the other two, cog-

---

11 अतिदृढः नामस्थसिद्धिर्यापातान मनोकरमस्थानात् स्तोधाद्बध्यायथानात् अभिभवत् समनाभिहाराः।
12 (Non-perception may be) because of extreme distance, (extreme) proximity, injury to organs, non-steadiness of mind, subtlety, veiling, suppression, and blinding with what is similar—Sāṅkhya-kārikā of Īśvarakrsna v. 7, p. 25 translated by S. S. S. Sastri (Madras University)
13 Pramāṇapaddhati, chap I, sec 23, p 124
14 Ibid, chap I, sec 24, p 126
15 Ibid, chap I, sec 25, p 128

1 H.Q., June, 1938
nitions are partly derived from Svarūpa indriyas and partly from the outer sense organs. The objects of these various types of perception are the same as those of the respective cognitions, i.e., they are just as extensive as the object of Īśvara’s jñāna, Lakṣmi’s jñāna, etc.\(^{15}\)

The outer sense organs are of three kinds: (1) divine, (2) demonic and (3) that kind of sense organ which shares the nature of both the divine and the demonic. The cognition by the divine senses is mostly valid, by the demonic senses mostly invalid, and that by the third type of sense organ is partly valid and partly invalid\(^{16}\).

The svarūpendriya of the Mukti yogins cognizes correctly the that as well as the what of an object. The Nityasamsārins and Tamoyogyas cognize correctly the ‘that’ of an object. Their cognition of the ‘what’ of an object is sometimes wholly erroneous and sometimes a mixture of validity and invalidity.

The Nyāya school enumerates six types of contacts between the sense organs and the object, these bring about perception. They are (1) conjunction (samyoga), (2) inherence in what is in conjunction (samyukta-samavāya), (3) inherence in what is inherent in what is in conjunction (samyukta-samaveta samavāya) (4) inherence (samavāya), (5) the relation of the subject and attribute (viśesana-viśesyabhāva).

The contacts of the senses of touch and sight with objects like the pot, and the contact of mind with Ātman are examples of ‘samyoga’. The contacts of the senses of touch, sight, and mind with the attribute, movements, and jāti of the object are examples of ‘samyuktasamvāya relation’. The contacts of the senses of smell and taste with the odours and tastes of objects, and the contact of mind with the senses of taste, sight and smell, and touch with the

\(^{15}\) Pramāṇapaddhati, chap I, sec 27, p 142
\(^{16}\) Ibu, chap I, sec 28, p 146
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jāti abiding in the quality and movement of objects are examples of the 'samyuktasamaveta samavāya relation.' The contact of the senses of hearing with sound is a case of samavāya relation. The contact of the sense of hearing with the jāti element in sound is a case of 'samaveta samavāya relation.' The contacts of the above mentioned senses with inference, and non-existence of objects are instances of 'viśesana-viśesa-bhāva.'

Further the Nyāya school enumerates two distinct kinds of perception (1) the indeterminate perception (nirvikalpaka), (2) the determinate perception (savikalpaka). Nirvikalpaka is the primary stage of non-relational perception. When the sense perception is differentiated and interpreted, we have a determinate perception. Though indeterminate perception cannot as such be shown to be experienced, it is proved to exist as a necessary presupposition of our determinate knowledge of objects. The Nyāya school holds 'that the cognition of the attribute is the cause of the cognition of the qualified object (viśistajñānam pratviśesananajñānam kāranam.) Hence there must be stage of cognition which is not of the viśista, i.e., (nirvikalpakapratyaksa) stage in perception.

According to the Nyāya school there are eight types of determination of an object, viz., (1) substance (2) quality, (3) action, (4) jāti, (5) particularity, (6) inference, (7) non-existence and (8) name 17

Madhva holds that all perception is determinate and perception 'is the concrete apprehension of an object with all its determinations.' Madhva refutes the nirvikalpaka stage of perception. The Nyāya view that there are six types of contacts is also refuted by him.

There is nothing to prevent the sense from cognising the object as well as the attributes at the first contact. Further if the 'conjunc-

17 Bramānapaddhati, chap I, sec 29, p 151
tion type of contact' cognises the object only, and 'inherence in what is conjunction' type of contact cognises the attribute only, how are they synthesised? The Nyāya school cannot hold that the 'inherence in what is conjunction type of contact' is an imperative cognition, because that line of interpretation is not in accordance with its principles. The cognition that arises is one, and it is needless to postulate two contacts as its cause.

Madhva rejects the two categories of the Nyāya school, namely, 'inherence' and 'particularity'. After the rejection of these two categories there remains only one type of contact, i.e., conjunction, and that Madhva accepts.

Inherence (samavāya) is a type of inseparable relation elevated to the rank of a distinctive category by the Nyāya school. It exists among certain objects alone and is technically called 'ayutasiṣṭha'. They are (1) substance and attribute, (2) substance and movement, (3) particular and universal, (4) ultimate things and viśesa, and (5) whole and part. The 'samavāya' relation does not obtain between normally separable things. The attribute and the substance are related by the independent category of 'samavāya'. At this stage a question crops up as to what relates the 'samavāya' to the quality and the substance. This 'samavāya' needs another samavāya and so the argument lead us on to infinite regress. If it is said that 'samavāya' needs no other 'samavāya' to relate it to the attribute or the subject, we could as well have assumed that substance itself can get related, to its attribute without any aid. The principle of parsimony requires us not to postulate a separate category called samavāya.

The category of 'viśesa' postulated by Madhva to differentiate the attribute from the substance is different from the 'viśesa' of the Nyāya school. According to the latter 'viśesa' is the differentia of

18 Vedāntasūtra, chap II, pp 2 and 13
ultimate things (nityadravyas) Madhva believes that ‘viśesa’ helps us to differentiate all things (not only ultimate things) ‘Viśesas’ are infinite in number. The viśesa in each is unique fact It is a self-differentiating principle 19

Madhva does not admit a non-relational attributeless indeterminate perception With him perception is always concrete and determinate The chief function of perception is to give us a classified presentation of an object with its attributes.

P. Nagaraja Rao

19 Madhva's Anuvyākhyāna, chap I, vv 21, 22, p 161
The Kautiliya Arthaśāstra on Forms of Government

1

In Ch 2, Bk VIII, of the Kautiliya Arthaśāstra, entitled rājarājyayor vyasanacintā, we come across a discussion of two forms of government called respectively dovarājya and varājya. In order to comprehend the nature of the discussion we must first of all understand what K means by rājarājyayor vyasanacintā. Vyasanacintā is thus explained in the preceding chapter.

The expressions dana, mānusa, naya, anaya and apanaya are explained in VI. 2

Generally, therefore, vyasanā may be rendered as 'destruction of well-being,' and vyasanacintā takes account only of that kind of vyasanā which may be described as mānusa (caused by human agency) or drstakārīta (of which it is possible to see a cause). Vyasanacintā arises when simultaneous vyasanās require consideration, that is to say, when there is vyasanā to two objects, and we have to choose between two alternatives and mould our actions accordingly. Rājarājyayor-vyasanacintā thus arises when there is vyasanā to rāj as well as to rājya, and we are faced with alternatives requiring us to make our choice and act according to it.

Let us see, first of all, what the terms rāj and rājya denote here. The initial sūtra of the chapter (VIII 2) helps us to see rāj rājyam iti prakṛtisanksepah. This has often been misunderstood but is clearly explained in Śankarārya's commentary to the Kāmandaṇīya Nītisāra.
The Kautuliya Arthashastra on Forms of Government

Text

व्रम्मलराध्मुद्गविल कोऽश्र दहुध पत्रमे ।
एवं प्रहुवभधज्जीविीगींवेराहता ॥
एवं श्रेष्ठ वत तथा मिलेस सामग्र: गृहविद्योतिः ।
सर्वप्रकृतिको राज्यविद्युताच वहस्तिः ॥

Commentary

व्रम्मलादित्युको साहोल चिन्तनविद्युत्कम्।
तत् राज्यादित्यादिप्रकृतवाच (चा)नयोः कस्थ प्रधानमुद्नाभ: हवाण व्रम्मलादित्यादि।
एवं प्रहुवर्यहितिः ।

द्रव्यप्राक््रियताद: एवं श्रेष्ठ विज्ञानः क्षतिवेदितता।
भवसं राजप्रकृतिको प्राकृतिकावन्तमात्रमू।
तेन सत्वप्रकृति: राजार्थबेदाद: द्विधासचित्ताः।

तत्कालोक्त—राजा राज्यविद्यु राजप्रकृतिकस्तुल्लक्ष्य:। (Kaut VIII 2)

तत् राज्यम् व्रम्लादिप्रकृतिपवक्तां।

शेष्या राजप्रकृति ।

सर्वप्रकृतिको राज्यविद्यु। एवं वनवृत यथा राज्यमिलवमिघानप्रकृतशयो: प्रश्नर्निमित्त

द्रव्यप्राक््रियताद: एवम् राजप्रकृतिर:।

तस्मात् प्रश्नर्निमित्तमेव राज्यविद्यु ॥

The gist of this gloss is that, in the Kautuliya formula rājā rājyam iti prakṛtisaṅkṣepaḥ, out of the seven elements of State viz. amātya, janapada (or rāstra), dūrga, koṣa, danda, svāmi and misra, the first five are together termed rājya, while the remaining two (svāmi and misra) are together termed rājā, because svāmi ('head') and misra ('ally') are akin to each other and come under the same class. The first five are denominated dvayapraṅkaratayab, apparently because they form the ingredients composing the rājya, and the last two are denominated rājapraṅkarib, apparently because they form the sovereign element in the State. Brhaspati, however, employs the term rājya to denote all the seven elements from a point of view expounded by the commentator, and we need not go here into the question of terminology preferred by Brhaspati. That K distinguishes between dvayapraṅkarib and rājapraṅkarib, is evident from the Arthaśāstra VI. 2, where we find, immediately after the passage
cited above (terminating with अचिन्त्यम् देवमिति), the following statement

राजा आलंकरणमक्तिसम्बन्धी नयनपरिवर्तनम् विजितिं। तत्स समस्तत: मण्डलोप्युता
भूम्यनन्तरा श्रविचकृति। तत्वेतृ भूम्यपक्षान्तरा भिन्नकृति।

And we are further told

एव च सुसूनं। "द्वादश राजप्रकृति," "विशिष्ट्व्यप्रकृति" संस्कृतेन द्विसमिति।

We are now in a position to appreciate the nature of the discussion in the K chapter entitled rājarājayor vyasanacintā. A State being composed of rāja and rājyam—the sovereign element and the subject element—the ruler and the ruled—what are we to do when there is simultaneous vyasana to ruler and ruled? In brief, what is to be our course of action in case there is revolution affecting the form of government?

K, conformably to tradition, stands forth as an advocate of monarchy, but he devotes a small part of the discussion to two other forms of government named dvāramāya and vāraṇāya. These two forms are, however, discussed incidentally as offering themselves for consideration when we have to consider vyasana to rājya. But K first discusses the situation arising out of vyasana to the rājā from the point of view of the rājā. He is concerned here only with internal revolution, and vyasana to mitra as coming under rājaprakṛti is considered separately in ch. 5, Bk. VIII. Let us follow K textually (VIII. 2)

राजोस्यन्तरो वाषो वा कोष द्वाति।
श्रियभाद्व्यन्तरः कोषो बाष्कोपातः पापीयान्।
अन्तर्मास्कोयपातः कोषात।
तस्मात् कोषद्वारशिक्षामांस्तरो बुस्तित।

This is further explained in IX. 3

मन्त्रयुक्तसहायतापतिवेशराजानम्यन्ततरकोषोस्यन्त्यन्त्रकोषः। मन्त्रयादिविज्ञायान्तरमार्यार्यान्यकारन्तरकोषः।

राष्ट्रसुभाषान्तरकोषान्तरकोषान्तरकोषान्तर्मालयकोषः।

With these definitions of bāhyakopa, abhyantarakaṇa and antaramātyakopa, it is easy to see that the intention in ch. 2, Bk. VIII,
is to record the opinion that the gravest danger to the king proceeds from disaffection of interior officers other than *mantripurohitasena-patiyuvārya*, and he suggests, as a genetal precaution, that the king should keep under his own control the power of *kośa* and *danda*, Treasury and Army. All this is from the point of view of the rājā K now changes to the point of view of the rājya and proceeds

"Of dvārājya and varājya, dvārājya is destroyed by reciprocal likes and dislikes of the parties (belonging to the two rulers) or by mutual friction (between the rulers themselves), varājya, however, caring to make itself attractive to the prakṛtis, is in truth enjoyed by the others (i.e. by all)—thus the authorities (But) K dissents (and says) a dvārājya of father and son, or of two brothers, entailing equal security of possession (to both rulers), remains under the control of high State officers (amātyāḥ) A varājya, on the other hand, is wrested from one who lives (by another who), thinking "this is not mine," oppresses (the prakṛtis) and ostracizes them or sells it (to the opposite party), or, disregarding the disaffected, disappears"—In thus rendering the latter portion of the text here, I have kept in mind a passage in IX 4

Prākritartha karartheṣvaya, ṛṣabhaḥvyaya, ṛṣabhośanā bāraśaḥvyayaḥ vā...pratiṣṭhe vā ṛṣabho pṣayave karartheṣvaya. ²

It will be perceived that dvārājya means "government by two"

1 Ganapati Sāstrī reads tulyayoga-kṣmamātīvāvagraham which is probably correct (Cf XIII 1 tulyayogakṣmamātīvāvagrahambhīyāṃcā kathayeyubh)
2 Ostracism (āpatahāna) is referred to by Aristotle (Politics, III) as having been instituted by democratic States, and is said to have been practiced on a large scale by great powers, by Babylonians, Medes and the Persian king Āpatahāna was associated with Mauryan conquests, as attested by Aśoka in the Fourteenth Rock Edict, section XIII, Aśoka heartily disliked the practices

IHQ, JUNE, 1938
Dvāraṇāya is referred to at some length by Kālidāsa in Mālavikāgnimitra, Act V, and is also mentioned as do-rāja in the Jaina Āyāranga-sutta, ancient history furnishes two typical instances, one at Sparta, the other at Rome. Varāṇya certainly denoted to the pre-Kautūliya authorities a form of government dependent on popular will, as the expression prakṛticittāgrabanāpeksa implies, and its defence by the authorities on the ground that it is in truth enjoyed by everybody (yathāsthitam anyar bhūyate) shows its democratic character.

The picture drawn by K belongs however, to a degenerate form of government in which, owing to a split between the ruler and the ruled, the State is, as it were, cut up into two hostile sections, and whichever be in the ascendant, there being no feeling of unity or common possession, the State suffers. As Plato remarks when criticizing oligarchy (Republic, VIII) that "such a city is not one, but of necessity two, one consisting of the rich, the other of the poor, dwelling in one place and always plotting against one another," and again (Ibid, V) when pleading for unity and community, that, "if some citizens are grieved and others glad at the same sufferings of the city, and all do not say 'mine' and ‘not mine' at the same time with regard to the same objects, it is an evil state of affairs." Aristotle (Politics, V) characterizes as absurd Plato's view that an oligarchy consists of two cities, and asks "Is not this just as much the case in the Spartan constitution, or in any other in which either all do not possess equal property, or in which all are not equally good men?" This is significant as showing that, in oligarchies as well as democracies, even in a dvāraṇāya like Sparta, the State is cut up into two innumical sections. As Aristotle himself remarks (Ibid) There is an error common to both oligarchies and to democracies—in the latter the demagogues, when the multitudes are above the law, are always cutting the city in two by quarrels with the rich, whereas they should always profess to be maintaining their cause, just as in
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oligarchies, the oligarch should profess to maintain the cause of the people, and should take oaths the very opposite of those which they now take. For there are cities in which they swear—"I will be an enemy to the people, and will devise all the harm against them which I can," but they ought to exhibit and to entertain the very opposite feeling, in the form of their oath there should be an express declaration—"I will do no wrong to the people."

Upon the position of varājya in pre-Mauryan times the Ait Br throws some light. In a coronation-ceremony, the prospective ruler is called upon to consecrate himself to five types of earthly government, viz., rājya (found in the Madhyadesa among Kuru-Pāncālas, etc.), sāmrājya (found in the East among Prācyas), bhaujiya (found in the South among Satvants), svārājya (found in the West among nicas and apācyas, explained by Śayana as 'inferior in race' or 'inferior in manners') and varājya (found in the North, beyond the Himālayas, among Northern Kuruś and Northern Madras). It is noteworthy, as was long ago pointed out, that, in a strictly symmetrical enumeration, we read of rājānab ('kings') being consecrated to rulership in forms of government denominated rājya, sāmrājya, bhaujiya and svārājya, while we read of jana-padāb ('peoples') being consecrated to the form of government denominated varājya, so that we must hold varājya to have been distinctively a non-monarchical form of government,—an inference harmonizing with what the Kautuliya tells us regarding pre-Mauryan varājayas.

Etymologically, the term varājya has been explained variously. Śayana, commenting on the Ait Br text, explains it in one place, as vīsesena rāpatum, and in another place as starebhyo bhūpatibhyo vāistyam. Martin Haug, K. P. Jayaswal and R. C. Majumdar equate it with 'kingless government.' R. Shamashastri takes it to mean 'foreign rule.' If, however, we look to Vedic uses of vi-rāj, we get at its primary meaning 'to shine, to be illustrious.' That
this meaning is appropriate to the *Ait Br* text we are discussing follows from Rgveda, I 188 4 5 6.

Here we find the term *virāt, samrāt* etc associated with *virāj* meaning 'to shine, to be illustrious,' so that the same meaning should be applicable to the text of the Rgvedic *Ait Br* wherein *samrāt, virāt* etc are spoken of together *Vairāya* therefore denoted primarily a form of government in which the ruling element ruled by reason of its shining or illustrious character—an Aristocracy, as Greek philosophers would call it. The aristocratic element ruled under authority from the *janapada* or the entire body of the people, and this representative or universal character of the rule finds its analogue in the parallel conception of the Universal Virāt figuring in the famous Purusa-sūkta (*RV* X, 90).

The *Ait Br* throws some light also on a dominant characteristic of *vairāya* government. In treating of food suitable to various kinds of rulers (*VII 5 6*), *udumbara* (*Ficus glomerata*) is declared to symbolize food and drink and is assigned to *bhaumya, aśvatttha* (*F religiosa*) is stated to stand for prowess and is assigned to *sāmrāya*, while *plakṣa* (*F infectiva*) is held to signify glory and is assigned to *svārāya* as well as to *vairāya*. It would appear therefore that, in a *vairāya* or *svārāya*, glory was prized, and Plato would describe such a form as a *Timocracy*, the next best to his ideal Aristocracy.

II

It will be interesting to compare the classification of governments by Plato with the classification contemplated in the Kautaliya. In the *Statesman*, Plato adopts, as one basis of division, that of the
number of persons exercising supreme authority—a basis, as Dunning remarks, already common in Greek thought and employed by Herodotus (III. 80). According to Plato, when subject to Law,

The rule of One is Royalty
The rule of the Few is Aristocracy
The rule of the Many is Democracy

The Indian classification does not recognize any essential difference between the Few and the Many, it proceeds on what may be called the basis of grammatical number—Singular, Dual and Plural. Thus,

The rule of One is Rājya
The rule of Two is Dvairājya
The rule of More than Two is Vairājya

This is, logically, a comprehensive classification, since any government must be either by One, or by Two, or by More than Two.

Aristotle (Politics, V) conceives of the rule of Two (dvairājya) as a kind of limited Royalty. "The more restricted the functions of kings, the longer their power will last unimpaired, for then they are moderate and not so despotic in their ways, and they are less envied by their subjects. This is the reason why the kingly office has lasted so long among the Molossians. And for a similar reason it has continued among the Lacedaemonians, because there it was always divided between two, and afterwards further limited by Theopompus in various respects, more particularly by the establishment of the ephorality." Aristotle (Ibid, III) likewise asserts that the best government is "that which is administered by the best, and in which there is one man, or a whole family, or many persons, excelling in virtue, and both rulers and subjects are fitted, the one to rule, the others to be ruled, in such a manner as to attain the most

2a Political Theories, p 36
eligible life” Virtue he places above everything else, so much so that we find him advocating *(Ibid*, III) rule by One individual or One family which “happens to be so pre-eminent in virtue as to surpass all others,” after stating that “a people who are by nature capable of producing a race superior in virtue and political talent are fitted for kingly government” Elsewhere *(Ibid*, VII), he cites Scylax as affirming that, among the Indians, kings had marked superiority over their subjects Scylax explored the Indus shortly before 500 B.C., he was probably describing the conditions prevailing then in areas watered by the Indus

III

Returning to the Kautilya text, we find the author of the *Arthaśāstra* launching into a discussion as to what kind of king is preferable to what other kind It will be observed that the alternatives discussed are not simply theoretical but such as must have presented themselves in practical politics already when the book was written, the ideal king’s accomplishments having been previously recounted in Bk VI, Ch 1. In fact, as we have seen, the very title of the chapter *rājarājyayor vyasanacintā*—implies consideration of measures to be taken in order to preserve the well-being of the State. We here get a glimpse into the state of affairs obtaining in the world of politics immediately before K and may realize to ourselves the type of king favoured by K against his predecessors in politics Three pairs of alternatives are discussed

(Which is better), a king with no eye or a king deviating from śāstra? The authorities say A king with no eye, that is, with no eye for śāstra, acts arbitrarily and is obstinate or, guided by
others, injures the kingdom by injustice. But a king deviating from šāstra is, where he is inclined to deviate, amenable to persuasion — Not so, says Kautalya A king with no eye is, with liberal assistance (of officers) capable of collecting himself (against improper conduct) everywhere But a king deviating from šāstra deviates deliberately and, by injustice, injures the kingdom as well as himself

This attitude becomes intelligible when we recall the concluding verse of the Kautalya

\[ \text{वेन शाख्र् व शाख्र् च नन्दराजगता च भूः ।} \\
\text{अम्यैशिदव्यायः वेन शाख्रिकं क्रुद्यम्।} \]

The Nanda kings who had preceded Candragupta are here represented to have appropriated šastra ('Law'), śastra ('Army') and bhū ('Earth') to themselves, and the author of the treatise is said to have, from a feeling of resentment (amarsena),² forthwith (āśu) rescued (uddhrtāni) these from them In the body of the treatise we find that the king has control over śastra and bhū but not over śōstra which is left to qualified State-officers called amātyāḥ This is clear from a comparison of K’s enumeration of the ideal king’s accomplishments (Bk. VI, ch 1) which has no reference to mastery of śastra (although, of course, a prince is required to learn śastra as part of his training, Bk I, chs 1-5) with his enumeration of the ideal amātya’s accomplishments (Bk I, ch 9) which require an amātya to be caksusmān, his śastracaksusmatā being declared ascertainable from equals in learning (samānānvīyebhyah) The concluding portion of the last-named chapter sums up K’s entire attitude ⁴

3 On amarsa the Nāṭyaśāstra cites the śloka

\[ \text{वार्तिष्ठसना सभायाय सिद्धैष्ठर्यवताभिष्क:।} \\
\text{नुषासुतसहस्सम्भो गम्यं नाम जापते। Nāṭ S., VII 77} \]

⁴ Bhandarkar (op cit., p 109) thinks that the verse refers to the rescue of Arthaśāstra from oblivion, but the context contains no such idea and clearly implies that K rescued the śātra, and bhū from the Nanda kings’ control The Purānas also speak
The king is here represented as dependent on his purohita even like a pupil on a teacher, a son on father, a servant on master, and the qualifications of the purohita enumerated here include, besides his priestly skill, a special training in dandaniti. Then comes the verse

"A prince (ksatra), brought up by a brahmana, well-advised by ministers, following śastra and provided with śastra, attains complete success, being invincible." The king therefore had to follow śastra or Law but had control over śastra or Army. He was thus not a tyrant, but a constitutional monarch.

The next alternatives in K's discussion are

- Vāyūḥsenaḥ śatam (or śatam) 2 Vāyūḥsenaḥ (or śatam) Raṣṭrahastānabhāvam (or śatam) Raṣṭrahastānabhāvam (or śatam) Navastu Raṣṭraśvāravastādharmaśānaśmaraḥ (or śatam) Prakṛtaśvāraśāstraśास्त्रा

"(Which is better), a diseased or a new king? The authorities say In a diseased king's rājya, either the rājya suffers on account of Officers (upon whom the king has to rely), or the king loses his life on account of the rājya (i.e. the five dravyapakrtis). But a new of Mahāpadma and his line being in possession of "the earth which K 'will rescue" (uddharnyam) for the Mauryas, and reference is made to Mahāpadma's čāsana being absolute (anulanghita) see Pargiter, Dyna Kali Age, pp 25-6. According to tradition, K., who was a proud of his learning, wanted to occupy a seat of honour in the Nanda court, and, being insulted, swore to destroy his dynasty. The tradition is known to the Brhatkathā. 5 Cf. Mudrā Rāksasa, Act IV 15—Maurye nave rājans Visākhadatta depended on incorrect tradition. See my paper 'Was Candragupta low-born?' in IHQ VIII, pp 466 ff.
king pleases and benefits the (dravya)prakrtis by favour, remission of
taxes, gift and honour according to his own dharma. But Kautilya
dissents and says: A diseased king performs his kingly duties as
directed. But a new king, thinking 'this kingdom, obtained by
force, is mine,' behaves arbitrarily and without restraint, or, being
under the clutches of those who elevated him to the throne, suffers
the kingdom to be oppressed, and, being unpopular, is easily up-
rooted. There is, however, a distinction among diseased kings,—
the disease may be pāparoga or aparoga, also among new kings,—
the king may be high-born or low-born.'

The term nava means 'not hereditary' and is used antithes-
tically to pitrapātāmaḥa in Bk I, ch 8 where Kaunapadanta is stated
to have recommended hereditary Officers (pitrapātāmahān amātyān),
while Vātavyādhī is represented as opposing this view and re-
commending instead the appointment of new men (navān amātyān
kurvita) to these offices, and Kautilya himself a 'new man' (cf. Roman
novus homo), characteristically approves of the appointment of able
Officers, irrespective of their being 'new' or hereditary, descent from
a high State-officer being in his eyes no qualification. Concerning,
however, the desirability of having a 'new' king, it is to be noted
that the question raised is not the theoretical question: Which is
better? A new king or a hereditary king? The question is:
Which is better? A new king or a diseased king? By implication, of
course, this 'diseased king' could not be a 'new king', for, there can
be no sense in calling for choice between a 'diseased new king'
and simply a 'new king' free from disease. The question there-
fore amounts to this: Which is better? A diseased monarch
ruling by hereditary right, or an undiseased monarch having no

6 K distinguishes mantrinah from amātyāh in Bk I, ch 8 as 'advisers' from
'executive officers.' An amātya could be a mantrī only when he had passed three
tests imitated by the purohita (ch 10) whose qualifications (detailed in ch 9) in-
clude training sadange vede davie nmitte dandānyāṃ ca. K sets no limit to the
number of mantrins constituting the mantriparśad.
hereditary right to the throne? The question is raised not for the first time by K it had been raised by his predecessors denominated vaguely as \textit{ācāryāḥ}. They had evidently been faced with a situation which left them to choose between a diseased king and a new king. In other words, a ruling king of an established dynasty was afflicted with disease, and the appointment of a new king had to be contemplated. The pre-Kautaliyan authorities sanctioned the overthrow of an existing dynasty, because the king was diseased, and favoured the appointment of a king having no hereditary right to the throne. We are most forcibly reminded of Mahāpāda, his dynasty is designated \textit{nava-Nanda}, apparently as distinguished from his predecessors, the \textit{pūrva-Nandas} from whom according to the \textit{Brhatkathā}, Candragupta was descended. And when we reflect on K’s adverse remarks relating to the behaviour of \textit{nava} kings and to their being ‘easily uprooted’, the traditional picture of K uprooting the overbearing and arbitrary \textit{nava-Nandas} gains in definition. The picture stands out in vivid relief as K. goes on to discuss the next pair of alternatives.

"(Which is better), a weak and high-born king, or a strong and low-born king? The authorities say. In the case of a weak and high-born king, the prakṛtis (i.e. the dravyaprkṛtis having regard to his weakness, endure with difficulty (i.e. hardly tolerate) his secret measures, and, in the case of a strong and low-born king, they,

7 In place of \textit{अनुयोग साहुराम्यम्} we should perhaps read \textit{अनुरागे साहुराम्यम्}—cf Bk VII ch 5—\textit{चण्डेलिन्या हि प्रक्रते भद्धरि जिन्म्या भदृशिते तिनिन्या} \textit{उपजापम्} \textit{वा विसंवादतमित्} \textit{अनुरागे साहुराम्यम्} \textit{इति}.

8 Cf Mindrāraksasa II

\textit{अपि चमन्ते} समीक्षुप्रजाय चन्त्र्य्य्यप्रकर्ते? \textit{चाहे} चमन्ते यथार्थप्रकाशांभवगुरुः च.
having regard to his strength, endure with ease (i.e. submit to) his secret measures. But Kautilya dissents and says, The prakṛtis spontaneously submit to a weak and high-born king, for it is a characteristic of power to attach itself to high birth. And (the prakṛtis) baffle the secret measures of a strong and low-born king, for, the character of virtue (is revealed) in enquiry.”

It will be observed that, in these combinations of the categories of birth and strength, the pre-Kautilya thinkers emphasize the importance of strength and pass over the factor of birth, whereas K. considers high birth to be more important than strength, consistently with his view expressed in Bk VI ch I that the king should be mahākulinah, “of high family.” This is significant as showing that K.’s master was of high birth and displaced a line of strong but low-born monarchs whose elevation to the throne had met with approval from the pre-Mauryan politicians whom K. calls the ācaryāḥ. Those politicians seem to have found Mahānanda, the last member of the well-born dynasty of earlier Nandas (pūrva-Nanda), weak (durbala), diseased (vyādhita) and having no eye for Law (andha or śāstracaksus), and decided to sanction the transference of royalty from Mahānanda to Mahāpadma, a new nava and low-born anabhījatā monarch, described in the Purāṇas as a son of Mahānanda by a Śūdra woman, who made himself powerful (balavān) by securing control over śāstra, śastra and bhū, i.e. over Law, Army and Land. The relation headed by K. overthrew Mahāpadma’s line and re-established on the throne the high-born Candragupta, a scion of the earlier Nanda dynasty, who changed his dynastic designation apparently because ‘Nanda’ had become a hated name. K. instituted a reform in the constitution by taking away from the king all real control over Law.

HARIT KRISHNA DEB

9 Or, if we emend the text as suggested above (note 7), — “for, all virtue is comprised in devotion.”
The Beginnings of Intercourse between India and China

In his epoch-marking paper entitled *Deux Itinéraires de Chine en Inde* Prof. Paul Pelliot discussed the various views put forward in modern times on the origin of the name China, and reached the conclusion that the hypothesis put forward in 1655 A.D. by Father Martini deriving the name from that of the first Ts'in dynasty (249-207 B.C.) was the most satisfactory explanation so far known. He said that this etymology was satisfactory from the standpoints of phonetics and geography, historically probable and still attested by indigenous Chinese tradition. This was in 1904.

When the *Arthasastra* of Kautilya came to light some years later, the late Prof. Jacoby stood up for its authenticity and a fourth century date for the present text, and he did not shrink from the logical results that followed from his stand. Two of the theses put forward by him are of interest to the subject of this paper. One of them relates to the name of China. In *Kautilya*, II, 11 we have the expression, *kaus-yam cinapatāsa* *cinabhūmyāb* This is a clear reference to varieties of Chinese silk. If the name China is tightly derived from Ts'in, then the occurrence of this name in a work professedly of the late fourth or early third century B.C. renders it suspect, and this is, in fact, the ground taken by some scholars who assign the work in its present form to a date much later than the reign of Candragupta Maurya. But Jacoby follows the other alternative and says: "The name *Cina* is hence secured as a designation for China in B.C. 300, so that the derivation of the word China from the dynasty of Ts'in (B.C. 247) is definitely ex-

1 *BEFEO*, iv, p. 149
2 Jacoby renders *cinapatta* into ribbons of silk, and Pelliot objects to it with reason. *Toung Pao*, xxi, p. 728 n.
ploded. On the other hand, this notice is of interest also as proving the export of Chinese silk into India in the fourth century B.C. 3

This position of Jacobi was discussed soon after by Laufer and Pelliot in the *Young Pao.* 4 The former accepted Jacobi’s arguments as conclusive and even suggested that the Chinese Buddhists of later times first encountered the name *Cina* in Sanskrit texts and then by a most happy chance read the word *Ts’in* into the word *Cina.* He said that the Chinese were not known to have called themselves ‘the people of Ts’in’ and added, ‘There is no reason to believe that the word *Cina* had its origin in China or in its foundation in a Chinese word. It is very possible that it arose in India or in Farther India.’ He then made the interesting observation: ‘the fact clearly stands out that the series of names headed by *Cina* or *Tsina* and followed by the classical names *Thina* or *Sina* and finally ending in our word China spread along the maritime route of the Indian ocean, in opposition to the names Seres and Serike by which China became known in the West overland.’ He concluded by suggesting that as I-ts’ing says that *Chi-na* more specifically related to Canton, *Cina* might have been the ancient (perhaps Malayan) name of this part of the Chinese coast in times anterior to the settlement of the Chinese in those regions.

Pelliot on the other hand was much more critical of Jacobi’s arguments on the age of the *Kautiliya,* but proceeded to show that the connection between *Ts’in* and China could still be maintained even with a 300 B.C. date for Kautiliya. He set aside Laufer’s view that the name *Cina* reached India along the sea route, he said, ‘It is only in the second half of the third century B.C. that the influence of the Chinese reached Kuang-tong, and there is no trace of a navigation which might have placed Southern China in commercial relations with the Indian ocean from this period.’ When,

3 *SKPA,* 1911, p. 961, as translated by Laufer in *TP,* xiii, p. 719
4 xiii (1912), pp. 718-42
towards 128 A.D., Chang Kien, being the first to traverse the route across Chinese Turkestan, sojourned in Bactriana, he saw there Chinese products which had come by way of India, but these products were textiles and bamboos of Sseu-Ch’uan, and for going from China to India they did not make use of the sea route by Canton or Tonkin, but the land route by Upper Burma. It is very probable that it is by this way also that the Hindus gained their first knowledge of the Chinese world. That this knowledge might go back to the fourth century B.C. is not absolutely impossible. Indeed from this time, the kingdom of Tch’ou, which was not Chinese by its origins but already moved in the Chinese orbit, extended up to Yunnan, communications, very precarious, might from this period have revealed to each other the two great civilizations of Eastern Asia. But there is nothing to show that such was in reality the case. It seems much more probable that the first relations were a reaction to the formidable shake by which Ts’in Che-houang-ti galvanized all the peoples to the south of the Blue River. We thus think it quite possible that the Chinese were known in India under the dynastic title of this sovereign, who was no doubt abhorred by his countrymen, but who was probably the most magnificent leader of men his country had so far produced, and who knew how in a few years to extend considerably to the south and to the north-west the prestige of his race and name’’.

Pelliot then cited two passages from the Ts’ien han chou relating to the first century B.C. in which the Chinese are called ‘people of Ts’in,’’ and showed that among the Hiong-nu as in India the most ancient name for China and the Chinese was derived from Ts’in. And he added ‘‘If by chance the date 300 B.C. is confirmed for the appearance of the name Cina in India in the sense of China, we should then suppose that it was the state of Ts’in,
The Beginnings of Intercourse between India and China

antior to the dynasty of Ts'in Che-houang-ti, that gave rise to it. This state is found in Chàn-si in the N W of China, in contact with the populations of Central Asia," but like the name Khitai in later times the name Cina began to be applied to China first in Central Asia from that of the principality by which one entered China from there. But as there is as yet no decisive evidence of such a high antiquity for the name Cina, he concluded, the view that the name is a memento of Ts'in Che-houang-ti seems still to be the most probable. This view holds the field and is followed unreservedly by Cordier in his Histoire Générale de la Chine.

The second thesis of Jacobi that concerns us is his view that the Kautiliya throws light on the age of the Hindu colonisation of the East. He suggested that the phrase abhūtapūram janapadam in the chapter on Janapadaniveśa (II, 1) must be taken to refer to Indo-China, as by Kautilya's time the whole of India had become fully Hinduised. Accordingly he concluded that the spread of the Brahminical religion and the Sanskrit language in Indo-China must have begun many centuries earlier than is usually supposed. Both Louis Finot and Pelliot are inclined to dismiss the argument as of no value. They are impressed by the fact that the Chinese evidence on Fu-nan does not take us further back than the third or second century A D, and feel that we should have much more direct evidence before we can proceed to date the beginning of the Hindu expansion to the East earlier than the commencement of the Christian era. Finot has argued that, though Brahminised, Dekkan still offered vast spaces for settlement, and that Kautilya must have had them in mind, rather than thought of distant Indo-China. And he brushes aside the reference in the Mahāvamsa to Aśoka's missions to Suvarnabhūmi as religious history having nothing to tell us on the history of colonisation.

6 Pp. 213-4
7 BELFOE, XII (1912) No 8, pp 1-4. TP, XIII (1912), p 729 8 XII 44
Blagden, on the other hand, is inclined to a less sceptical estimate of the value of the Mahâvamsa story. He says: "The precise position of Suvannabhûmi is not beyond doubt, but its early missionaries, Sona and Uttara, have long been claimed by Burma as the founders of their branch of the Church, and though the tale has been embellished with many legendary accretions in the course of ages, it can hardly on that account be dismissed as being altogether devoid of foundation. Evidence is gradually accumulating from various different quarters which tends to show that Indian influence made itself felt in Indo-China from about the beginning of the Christian era, or possibly even two or three centuries before that date, and there seems to be nothing antecedently improbable in the story of a Buddhist mission being sent there at a relatively early period, though it may well be hazardous at present to attempt to fix that date exactly."

For the contacts established in these very early times it is not surprising that we lack more direct evidence and are thrown on guesses based on slight hints derived from different quarters. But there are two pieces of evidence bearing directly on the antiquity of maritime relations between India and China, which confirm each other and together seem to constitute as direct an evidence of these contacts as we are ever likely to get. One of them we owe to Pelliot himself. It is a passage from the Ts’ien han chou of Pan Kou, a Chinese writer who lived not later than the first century A.D. The passage is as follows:

"From the gates of Je-nan, from Siu-Wen and Ho-p’ou travelling by boat for five months we reach the kingdom of Ton-Yuan. After a further journey of about four months by sea is reached the kingdom of Yi-lou-mo. By sailing still further for a period of over twenty days, the kingdom of Chen-li is reached.

9 Ep. Burm, iii, pp. 83-84
10 Upper Annam, at the interior of the Gulf of Tonkin"
From there you travel more than ten days by land to the kingdom of Fou-kan-tou-lou. From the kingdom of Fou-kan-tou-lou, going by boat for more than two months you reach the kingdom of Houang-tche. The habits of the people there generally resemble those of the people of Tchou-yai. These are extensive and populous lands, full of strange products. From the time of Emperor Wou (140-86 B.C.) all of them have been sending tribute. There are official interpreters who belong to the (administration of the) palace houang-men (yellow-gate), with the recruits they go by sea to buy shining pearls, glass, rare stones and strange products, giving gold and silks in exchange. In the lands to which they go, the people supply them with food and join them in their repast. The merchant ships of the foreigners take them to their destination by turns. These foreigners also profit by the trade, (besides) they also plunder and kill people. Moreover (the passengers) have to be afraid of tempests which drown them. If nothing happens, they take many years to go and come back. The large pearls measure up to seven fingers. In the period of Yuan-che (1-6 A.D.) of the emperor P'ing, Wang Mang desired to transform the government and manifest stately power. He sent rich presents to the king of Houang-tche and asked him to send an embassy bringing a live rhinoceros as tribute. From the kingdom of Houang-tche, going by boat for about eight months, we reach P'i-ts'ong. Travelling again by sea for about two months, we get to the frontier of Siang-lin in Je-nan. They say that to the south of Houang-tche lies the kingdom of Ssen-tch'eng-pou, whence the interpreter envoy of the Han return.

11 Pagan—Ferrand—JA, 11, 14 p 47
12 I.e. have had trade relations with China. See Colas, ii, p 25
13 p'i—hiong-li, sometimes taken to be vaisiura
14 Pelliot himself expresses a doubt about his translation of this sentence.
15 Pisang island on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula. JA, 11, 14, p 47
16 Pelliot in Toang Pao xiii (1912), pp 457-9, cf IA, 11, 13, pp 451-5
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It is seen, observes Pelliot, that Pan-Kou has joined two series of data, one going back to the period of the emperor Wou (140-86 B.C.), and the other coming from the envoys of Wang Mang in the initial years of the Christian era. He also points out that in this passage, in spite of its obscurities, we are in the realm of history, not legend. Now the country which is reached after a year’s voyage from the coasts of Indo-China, and from which pearls and glass were procured, must have been in the midst of the Indian Ocean, possibly even at its western end. Herrmann locates Houang-tche in Abyssinia and Laufer in Malaya. Ferrand rejects these identifications with good reason, and says “Phonetically, the equivalence Houang-tche < Kāṇci is satisfactory for the epoch of Han, historically it is possible” that China had relations with Kāṇci in the second century B.C. Let us note also this: A Cōla embassy of the eleventh century from Coromandel to Canton took eight months to complete the journey. Pan Kou gives ten months to one year for the same voyage, nearly a dozen centuries earlier. Chinese vessels, it should be noted finally, had not yet begun to sail to India, they began to do so only much later. And the Chinese are distinctly stated by Pan Kou to have depended for their transport on foreign ships. But he makes it no less clear that from the first century B.C. the products of Southern India had begun to reach China by sea, and that at the beginning of the Christian era, under orders of the Court, a Chinese mission traversed the entire Indian Ocean.

Thus we have good reason to think that the maritime contacts between China and Southern India reach as far back as the second century. This is confirmed by a curious find of a Chinese coin, most probably of the second century B.C., from Mysore. This coin was discovered in 1909 by R.A. Narasimhachar in the

17 Pelliot, ibid., p 460
18 IA, 11 13, p 453 n 2
19 IA 11 4, pp 45-6
20 TP, xiii, p 461
Candrawalli site, and Taw Sein Ko to whom the coin was referred made the following observations on it:

"There are four Chinese characters on the coin, of which three are very much blurred. The following dates have been suggested: 138 B.C., 502 A.D., and 886 A.D. The first appears to be the most appropriate, because in the second century B.C., during the reign of Emperor Han Wu-ti, the limits of the Chinese Empire almost coincided with its present boundaries and Chinese arms were carried to Korea in the north, to Tibet in the west, and to Annam in the south. Most probably, Chinese merchants visited Southern India during that period, and they came from Canton or some other southern port bringing with them Chinese brass coins of low value. It is on record that, during the early centuries of the Christian era, there was a brisk commerce carried on between China and Southern India and Ceylon."

If the Chinese traversed the entire Indian Ocean at the beginning of the Christian era and used foreign vessels earlier in the second century B.C. for travelling to and from Kāśi, it is not unreasonable to suppose that the eastern expansion of Hinduism began much earlier than is commonly believed.

The antiquity of land contacts again does not rest only on the texts of Kautilya discussed by Jacobi. The term Cina occurs in many early Sanskrit texts, the Mahābhārata and the Manusmṛti, as is well known, but the trouble is that there is no general agreement on the exact age of the particular texts that enter into such discussions, but it seems that the prevailing views err by underrating the antiquity of the contacts between India and China both by land and sea, and that, on the whole, Jacobi and Winternitz were nearer the truth in their estimates of the chronology of Indian literature and culture than others have found it possible to concede.

K A Nilakanta Sastri

21 Mys Arch Rep for 1910, pp 44
Jambudvīpa-praживti-samgraha of Padmanandi

Indian cosmography is a subject by itself. Many Jaina texts, earlier and later, both in Prākrit and Sanskrit, treat this subject in an exhaustive manner giving many a minute detail. In the Ardhamāgadhi canon, works like Sūrapannatti, (Skt Sūryaprajñāpīti), Jambudīva-pannattī (Skt Jambudvīpa-prajñāpīti) and Camdapanattī (Skt Candra-prajñāpīti) are devoted to this subject. An excellent account of Jaina cosmography is given by Dr W Kierfz in his work Die Kosmographie der Inder (Bonn u Leipzig, 1920, pp 208-340). Many Svetāmbara texts, both canonical and non-canonical, are used by him. Among the Digambara works Indravāmadeva’s Trailokyadīpikā and Nemicandi’s Trailokyasāra (Prākrit) are drawn upon. With the Digamaras Tiloyapannattī (Skt Trilokaprajñāpīti) of Jadivasaha (Skt Yatiyrsabha) and Jambuddivapannattī (Skt Jambudvīpa-prajñāpīti) of Paumanamdi (Skt Padmanandi) are considered as the most important Prākrit works dealing with cosmography. So far as I know, no commentaries are available on these texts, and further the obscurity of the subject-matter and the unsatisfactory preservation of the text only heighten the difficulties of a student who wants to wade through the technical details of these works. From the linguistic point of view these two texts are very important, as they contain much additional matter for the student of Prākrit grammar. Tiloyapannattī is being tentatively edited by me in the Jaina Antiquary (Arrali, Bihar), and I propose to discuss in this article some important details about Jambuddivapannattī, a Ms of which has just reached my hands.

The paper Ms, measuring 14 by 8½ inches, is a recent copy (Vaisākha śu 1, Samvat 1971), and belongs to the Aitaka Pannālala Digambara Jaina Pāthaśālā, Sholapur. It has 84 leaves in double
Jambudvipa-prajñapti-samgraha of Padmanandi

folios Though carefully copied in bold Devanāgarī script, there are scribal errors here and there.

The copyist calls it Jambudvipa-prajñapti, but the actual title of the text, as mentioned in the colophons of various Uḍḍeśas, is Jambudvipa-prajñapti-samgraha. The word samgraha indicates that the author is compiling the contents from some earlier source, whose name was perhaps Divasāgarapannatti, as indicated by the following two verses:

दे वनिन्दुक्षा निर्मा बौद्धधीमि जहा-संगेरा जिविन-हिर ।
श्रवणियपरमपरा परमानि दीवि जलयोग ॥

वायुरिय-परमपरा सायर दीवि तहा व पवणसो ।
सर्वेनेषा समधि बौद्धधीमि जहाणुपुव्याए ॥

The contents are attributed to Mahāvīra, they were codified into texts by Ganadharas, and handed down by succeeding teachers (I 8 etc & XIII 141 etc). Padmanandi says that he is writing 'down a summary of what was traditionally handed down:

आयरिय-परमपरा य सायर व आयपय समाय ।
उनाहरिय लिहि समासदो सि गायबं ॥

In all there are thirteen Uḍḍeśas, and the total number of gāthās comes to 2426, as seen from the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the Uḍḍeśas</th>
<th>No of gāthās</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The line appears to be defective
2 Is it upodbhāta-prastāvah?
3 The last word appears to be corrupt
4 The last word looks like -vačhāro as well
Name of the Uddeśas                      No of gāthās.

X     लक्षण समुद्र वातावरणो .......................... 102
XI    बाहिर उद्दर दीप दोसाय दरस्वारं ५-नरयागदि-सिद्धकेत वर्णणो 365
XII.  जोइसलोंय वर खाणो ................................ 113
XIII. पमाण-परिश्लेषणी .................................. 176

The names of the Uddeśas, read in the light of Dr. Kufel’s account of Jaina cosmography, give a fair idea of the contents of the work. As far as I have seen, the whole work is written in gāthā metre, and the Prākrit dialect used by Padmanandi is Jaina Sauraseni. Now and then there are descriptions of some regions which remind us of the long compounds in the Ardhamāgadhī canon.

Though no date of the composition is mentioned, Padmanandi has supplied us with some information about his spiritual genealogy in the concluding verses. There was a great saint Viranandi who was endowed with five Mahāvrata, pure in faith, possessed of knowledge and the merits of self-control and penance, free from attachment etc., heroic, full of five-fold conduct, kind to six classes of living beings, free from infatuation, and above pleasure and pain (XIII 158-9). His great disciple was Balanandi, who was well-versed in the Sūtras and their interpretation, who was of deep wisdom, who abstained from scandalising others, who was free from attachment, and who was endowed with faith, knowledge and conduct (XIII 162-1). And his disciple was Paumanamdi (Skt Padmanandi), endowed with many a virtue, free from three Dand as, pure with reference to three Salyas, free from three Gāravas, who had reached the other end of Siddhānta, who was endowed with penances and other vows, who was devoted to faith, knowledge and conduct, and who was free from preliminary sins (XIII 162-3). Padmanandi tells us that he received instructions in the scripture from Śrī Viṣay (Šrī Śrīviṣay), also mentioned as Rāsi Viṣay (Skt

5 The reading is not satisfactory.
Rsi Vijaya), who was a great monk of spiritual virtues and a great teacher of Paramāgama (XIII 144-5, 164) There was a famous and learned monk Māghanandi, he had a well-disciplined and wise pupil Sakalacandra, his disciple was Śrīnandi, and it is for the sake of Śrīnandi that Padmanandi wrote this work The work was written when Padmanandi was staying in Bārā-nayara, i.e. the town of Bārā, in the country of Pariyatra, the contemporary king of which was Śaṅti-bhūpāla (Vāra-nayarassa pahū naruttamo Sā[m]ti-bhūpālo, 166) who was respected by the sovereign king (Narapati), who was heroic, who was endowed with many religious virtues, and who was devoted to Jainism To state the bare facts in brief, Padmanandi was a monk, his immediate predecessor was Balanandi, the pupil of Viranandi He studied under Śrivijaya, and composed or compiled this work for Śrīnandi, the disciple of Sakalacandra, the pupil of Māghanandi The work was composed in the town of Bārā in the country of Pariyatra, when the contemporary chief was Śaṅti

To commemorate the memory of Winternitz who has so much obliged the students of Indian literature by his authoritative studies, I have just introduced this work to the students of Prākrit literature. An attempt to discuss the date and other details will be made at a later stage as I am in search of some more Ms material

A N Upadhye

6 The Ms reads Sati, apparently a scribal error for Śānti—Śānti
Gaudapāda

“The net of words is not said by the Buddha.”

The following is the last but one kārikā of the fourth or last chapter of Gaudapāda’s Agamaśāstra

The following is the last but one kārikā of the fourth or last chapter of Gaudapāda’s Agamaśāstra

कम्ये नस्ति बुद्धम् ब्राह्मण परमेशु ताचिन् ।
सर्व धर्मस्य ब्राह्मण नेतृत्वं बुद्धेन सावितम् ॥

Literally it says that according to the Buddha who instructs the way known to him (tāyin) pñāna ‘knowledge’ does not approach the dharmas ‘elements’ of existence (i.e. it does not relate itself to the objects). But all dharmas and pñāna—this is not said by the Buddha.

1 The word tāyin is thus interpreted by Prajñākaramatī in the Bodhicaryāvatāra p. 75: tāyinām ēśāḥ, śvabhāvātām Āpānvedaśākām । यदुकम ।

This word is widely used in Buddhist texts e.g. Laktavistara, ed Lefmann, p 421, Bodhicaryāvatāra III 2, Saddharmapundarika (Bib Bud.) pp 25, 57, 67, etc. and Jaina texts e.g. Hemacandra’s Yogaśāstra, (Bib Ind., vol I, pp 1, 47). Daśavakālīka (Devacānd Lalbhai Jami Pustakoddhāra, No 49, p 115) works and is misunderstood. Sometimes it is read as trāyin ‘protector,’ and tāpin, as in the present case. As a name for Buddha it is translated into Tibetan by Skyob pa (Mahāyutpati) b 1 15) which suggests its Sanskrit equivalent trāyin ‘protector’. See IRAS, 1910, p 140, IPTS, 1891-1893, p 53, IA, 1912, p 243, Proceedings and Transactions of the Second Oriental Conference Calcutta, 1922, pp 450-1.
It has been repeatedly shown in the Āgamaśāstra² (specially in IV 96) that $\text{pñāna}$ is asanga ‘free from attachment, i.e. free from any relation to its objects’, as the dharmas or objects have no reality. Here the author refers to that fact and concludes showing the supreme truth that according to the Buddha there is neither $\text{pñāna}$ nor dharmas as he has said neither of them naitad buddhena bhāsītam.

What does the last line mean? Scholars of the orthodox school interpret it in various ways, but without sufficient justification. In this paper an attempt will be made to throw some new light on the line.

In one way it can be said that there are only two things, $\text{pñāna}$ ‘knowledge’ and $\text{pñeyya}$ ‘knowable’ or dharmas ‘elements of existence’, ‘objects’. Here we are told that neither of them is said by the Buddha. But how? Has he ever said anything? The Buddhists would give the answer in the negative. According to them the Buddha has never uttered a single word, as the following quotations will show.

Nāgārjuna in his Madhyamakakārikā, XX, 25

मोहेम्मोहगंधर्मम् प्रवृत्तोपराशिव।

न कपित्त कस्यचित्त कविष्ठः पत्मो बुद्धेन देवित॥

Tathāgataguhyasūtra quoted in the Madhyamakavrtti on the above.

यथा राजिष्ठतथागतोकुत्तराम्य प्रमोक्षिपिनिहंस्यन्त्रो यथा राजिष्ठतथागतो येदं एकमयं कर्त्ति नोदाहरूं न व्याहए नापि प्रवत्तिर्भवति नापि प्रवत्तिर्भविति।

---

2 See IV 72 चित्र निर्विशेष निलम्बस्ते देवन कीर्तिमाण।
See also IV 97, 79 (nihsanga). cf III 32 (agraha)
4 See our text, IV 1

IHQ, June, 1938
Lankāvatāra, ed. B Nanjio, 1923, pp. 142-3:

वाष्प राष्ट्र तत्त्वादोभिच्छुद्वो वाष्प राष्ट्र विचित्रं शर्माविष्कारं तत्त्वादोन्न स्वयमानं ह | अवस्था इति. नाग कुमार्यः | ।


नायको हय विषये रस्वस्वरुप्यादिट्य चिन्तति ।
कृत्वा वै खेलगुजनो धम्मकथारणं तत्त्विति।

Bhagavat quoted in Madhyamakavrtti, p 264, and Bodhicaryāvatāra-paṇḍita, p 365 (with a slight change)

अनुभव्यं धर्मं धृतं का देवानं चका ।
भूयते द्वर्यदेवतां चापि समारोपादनचरः।

Lankāvatāra, p. 137

न से यां सहायतां न घोवो न च अज्ञानं ।
तत्त्वे वाणर्चितस्य | Op cit, p 48
निर्मलत्वार्थस्य | Op cit p 190

Vajracchedikā, ed Max Muller, p 24

तत् कि मन्ये सुभूते ब्रापि न्यायं स क्षविद्यां यस्त्वादगतेन देशित।।
एवं युक्त वायुपन्न नृत्यित। साधनमययक्ष्यार्थमार्जितम्।
यदाहं समयं भगवेन भावितत्वाद्विजाज्ञानम्
नाति स क्षविद्यां धम्मं स्यथाबद्धतानुवत्तारं सम्प्रक्ष्याद्विन्धिरित्वभिच्छुद्वो नाति धम्मं
यस्त्वादगतेन देशित।।

तत् कि मन्ये सुभूते ब्रापि न्यायं स क्षविद्यां यस्त्वादगतेन भाषित।।
सुभूतिर्महं नो होदं भगवन नाति स क्षविद्यां यस्त्वादगतेन भाषिन ।

Lankāvatāra, p 144

यस्त्वाद राजस्यं धम्मं यस्त्वाद राजस्यं परिनित्तूऽ ।
एवं समस्यन्ते नास्ति सवा किष्मितः प्रकाशित्त।।

Madhyamakavrtti, p 539

अवच सुन्दरः सर्वं श्रव्यं शापतादिनिमेल।
व एवं जानित्व प्रमाणं कुमारी कुद्र सोष्यस्य।।

5 Cf Āgamaśāstra, IV 60 यथं वणं न वरँस्य च
The passages quoted above show that the Buddha has said nothing. Let us now try to understand what it signifies. This statement is based on two grounds (i) pratyātmadharmatā, i.e., the nature of the highest truth that it is realised in one's own self, and (ii) paurānasthitidharmatā, i.e., the nature of the elements of existence that remains from the past. This requires some explanation.

As regards the first, it is held that the transcendental reality (paramārtha) springs up only as an inward conviction (pratyātmavedya), it cannot be attained through an instruction from others (aparapratyaya = paropadesāgamya), for it cannot be expressed by any speech or word. So we are told that for the noble the transcendental truth is silence. This is well-known in the Vedānta. Candrakīrtti writes in his Madhyamakavṛttī, p. 493:

सबं एकायमभिन्नानामितिषेयसाको वाच्यव्यवहारोरोगों लोकशस्त्रितस्वभिमानवते। नाहि परमार्थं एवं तत सम्बन्धित। कृतसत्त परमार्थं यथा प्रकटः कुलोऽथ शान्तस्तः। स हि परमार्थं परमार्थव्ययं शान्तं शम्भवं शम्भवस्य आयोगः सर्वस्पर्शवातीत। स नेरस्विरे न चापि शान्तवे।

Thus the Buddha did not say anything in fact, yet the people according to their own dispositions think that he did so. We read therefore in a text, Tathāgataguhyaśūtra, quoted in the Madhyamakavṛttī, p. 539, just after the passage, No. 2, cited above:

श्रवन च वृत्तायमिति सर्वस्थैर्नानाधिशास्त्रवाहत तथा विषयवाच तथा तथागतवाच निकाशति। तत्तत्वं तथर्यस्य भवति। अथ भगवान् अश्वम्यभिम अर्थे श्रवस्य। तत्तवात् न अर्थात् न विक्लपयति। सन्यस्कृतविविक्लपत्तात्त्वानानाप्रयत्नो श्रवस्य। तत्ततं तथागत इति बिस्तर।

यदि तत्तत् तथ। श्रवस्य च तथ श्रवस्य। तथ। एतेऽतु विक्लप श्रवस्य च तथागतवाच अर्थात्। उच्चते। श्रवस्य श्रवस्य अपिन्यतात्ता देवगणं श्रवस्य श्रवस्य अपिन्यतात्ता।

6 Madhyamakavṛttī, p. 56. परमार्थं हि प्रार्थियोऽऽृत्वं।

7 Tattvartha Upanisad, II 4. सत्ती वाच्यं निवृत्तं अर्थप्रयं समस्त।

See also Katha Upanisad II 3, Brāhmaṇasūtras with Sāṅkara, III 2-17. The Basic Conception of Buddhism pp. 19 ff.
The following may also be cited here from the *Lankāvatāra*, p. 194.

न च महामते तथागते अवबिपलितत्व धर्मं देशयति।

And the conclusion arrived at here is that one should rest on the meaning and not on only letters, for one who rests on letters not only ruins oneself, but also cannot make others understand.

This second ground is this. The Buddha has said nothing because what he is reported to have said was from the past. Nothing depends on the birth or absence of birth of the Tathāgatas, the true nature of elements of existence remains always the same. This is meant by the statement that the speech of the Buddha is no speech (अवचन बुद्धवचनम्).

Taking both the grounds together the *Lankāvatāra* says (pp. 143-4)

यदृकः भगवद्य यात्र राज्य, तथागतोऽमितसम्बुद्धो यात्र राज्य परिनिर्वाचित अवसानतर

8 In such cases other texts read *pratisarana* for *pratisarana*
The following may also be quoted here from the Vapaccheda-dīkā, p 24, just after the passage, No 9, cited above

तत् कथय हेतो। योडङ्गी तथागदेश धर्मेऽदधिमसंबुद्धो देशितो वा अभ्राणा सोदनमिलित्। न स धर्मेऽ नापरं। तत् कथय हेतो। अरसंहस्त्वभाविता द्वायुर्द्वला।

This is the significance of the passage under discussion (i.e. तत्त्वं धर्मालयं श्रानं नैदवं बुद्देन मानितम्, IV 99), and it is reasonable that the author who begins the chapter (IV) with jñāna and dharma should state in conclusion the transcendental truth about them.

Vidhushekhara Bhattacharya
A Tun-huang Prelude to the Karandavyūha

Manuscript No 241 of the Pelliot Tibetan Collection of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, deserves to be studied thoroughly. Here is, in the meantime, a brief analysis.

The title, in Tibetan, which can be translated, or restored in Sanskrit bhūta-mārga-nirdeśa (अभिनिर्देश भूतं) is followed by a few lines of Buddhist invocation. Then an instruction anonymous and without any localisation, addresses the dead man in a direct speech (कृपाकर्जन्यंतमा सुप्रथितः | "O Dead One! Listen!"). The anonymous instructor describes the Great Hell (गोगधर्म), the world of the preta and the world of the animals, that is to say the three evil gati, and then the 'land of the gods' (स्वदेश)

The Great Hell lies 8,000 yojana below the Jambudvipa. The dead man who falls (चीर्द) into it can be saved by Avalokiteśvara if he takes refuge in this Bodhisattva by means of the formula ōṃ hri hun pad ma pri ya sva hā

The world of the preta is 500 yojana below the Jambudvipa. In case he has fallen there, the dead being who calls upon Gaganagāṇja is saved by the formula ōṃ ga ga na sam ba ba yra ho da ba sa

Out of the world of the animals, which lies between the Great Ocean, the Great Iron Mountain and the four dvīpa, the deceased is rescued by Nan-can-sbyon (*Durgatisodhana) through his propitiatory formula na ma sa rba dur ga de/ ba ri zo da ni/ ra ya ya da

1 Eighteen sheets of paper measuring 7 cm 8 to 31 cm. The end decorated with a flower and a scaly dragon.

2 I have quoted faithfully the spelling of the Tibetan ms.
If the dead man manages to escape those three dangers he goes then to the land of the gods, on the Meru, north of the Jambudvipa. The description of the abode of the gods and of its inhabitants contains nothing unusual, save this indication Śākyamunī and the dharmayuvarāja (धर्मयुवराज) Ārya Maitreya reside in the dwelling place of the Tusita deva, surrounded by the Bodhisattva Vasumitra (Bāsu-myi-tra), Simhāntariksa (सिम्हांतरिक्ष) etc and innumerable devaputra.

After these descriptions of the three evil regions that the dead man must contrive to avoid and of the divine land which he must endeavour to reach, following the instructor’s exhortations, come six paragraphs, separated by small drawings. One of them, bearing the title (धर्मयुवराज) can be easily identified, notwithstanding the difficulties which the writing and the spelling of the manuscript offer it is a version, notably shortened, of the Balahaṭātaka.

In short, the Tun-huang manuscript offers a type of popular text which exalts the Bodhisattvas of salvation, and Avalokiteśvara in particular. It is this kind of literature, amplified, much adorned, and above all crowdéd with ready-made ‘clichés’ of the decaying Mahāyānism, which is recognizable in the Karandavyūha in prose. This compilation develops, in order to illustrate Avalokiteśvara’s liberating influence, the three themes which are also connected with this Bodhisattva in the Tun-huang manuscript—salvation of the beings who have sunken in the Great Hell, miraculous formula, description of a previous life in the shape of the horse saver Balaha.

This comparison between the sūtra of the Mahāyāna and the popular text suggests another point in the Tun-huang manus-

---

3 It is the essential formula of the Sarvadurgatipesodhana-nāmadhāranī of Sanskrit collection of the Bibliothèque Nationale, No 62, text 25.
cript, Avalokiteśvara's miraculous formula isṃ hṛi būḥ pad ma
pri ya, whereas in the Karandavyūha, it is the famous mantra in six
syllables om mani padme hum But M Pelliot notes that
this magical formula is not attested prior to 1000 A D Moreover,
there is not a single instance of its appearing upon the thousands of
Tibetan sheets and rolls (though many of these are covered with
graffiti) found in the Tsien fo-t'ong and which are kept in Paris.

It seems likely that the Tun-huang manuscript is anterior to
the period when the mantra om mani padme hum was used, that
is, anterior to 1000 A D, and of course, anterior to the redaction of
the Karandavyūha in prose where this mantra holds an outstanding
place, because, if the manuscript was a shortened reading of the
Mahāyānist text, the famous formula would without any doubt have
been quoted instead of om hṛi būḥ pad ma pri ya

Marcelle Lalou

4 Toung Pao, XXXI, 1934, 1-2, pp 172-76 or Bibliographie Boudhique,
VI, No 173 bis
Advaitācāryas of the 12th and 13th Centuries

In the history of the development of the various Advaitic Schools, the period which witnessed the rise of Viśistādvaīta and Dvaita is of importance, because it shows the state of the Advaita philosophy and the criticisms provoked by it. The two main schools of Advaita-Vivarana prasthāna and Bhāmati prasthāna had already secured adherents throughout India, Vācaspati had been criticised by the Prakārthakāra as a follower of Mandana who had criticised Śankara. Therefore it is important that we should note the relative chronological position of the various outstanding authors after Śankara.

Śankara, as I have pointed out elsewhere, cannot be placed later than 620 A.D. since he is later than Dinnāga and far earlier than Bhavabhūti-Srikantha (720 A.D.) and was the older contemporary of Dharmakirti. Mr Kunhan Raja has doubted the testimony of I-tsing as to the date of Bhartrhari and gives evidence to show that Bhartrhari must be assigned to an earlier date probably the 5th century. Śureśvara, the disciple of Śankara is earlier than Pātrakeśari Vidyānanda, the disciple of Akalanka (c. 600 A.D.)' Sarvajñātman can no longer be assumed to be the disciple of Śureśvara, as he mentions Dēvēśvara, Dēvānanda and Śresthānanda as his guru, parama guru and parātpara guru. Sarvajñātman is later than Vīmuktātman, the author of Iśasiddhi, who was later than Bhāskara. Bhāskariya Vēdāntins are mentioned by Prabhācandra, who is a pupil of Akalanka and Vidyānanda. Therefore Bhāskara cannot be placed later than the middle of the 7th century. Moreover Śāntiraksita and his disciple Kamalaśīla (740 A.D.) criticise...

* The paper was read in the 8th All India Oriental Conference, Mysore, and now revised.

1 QJMS 1930 Proc. VII Or Confec 1935, p 562
2 S K Iyengar Comm. Vol
3 An Bh Or Inst., 1931
4 Pramāṇa Laksana, JOR, 1937, Mad Uni Journal, 1937
5 Iśasiddhi, GOS., p 375
6 Prameya Kamala Mārtanda
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the Advaita doctrine' and Ubëyaka is criticised by Kamalaśīla and Vimuktātman.

Then comes another great figure, Vācaspati (841 AD), who is followed by the Prakatārthakāra. The Pañcapādikā-uvācarana was written by Prakāśatman, known also as Svyam prakāśanubhava, a disciple of Ananyānubhava. Prakāśatman implies that Ananyānubhava wrote on Ātma Sambuddhi probably referring to the work Ātmatattva mentioned by Jñānaghana. Jñānaghana was the disciple of Bōdhaghana and wrote his Tattvānukta on the basis of 'ananyānubhavānandādviṣya ātmatattvam', (which probably implies that Ananyānubhavānanda wrote a work called Ātmatattva), prior to Jñānaghana. Therefore Jñānaghana was a contemporary of Prakāśatma Yati who was a disciple of Ananyānubhava guru. But the Śringā era list gives early dates for Bōdhaghana and Jñānaghana.

Sankara

| Sṛṣṭīvarō |
| 1295-777 AD |

Nityābōdhaghana 773-848 AD

Jñānaghana 848-910 AD

Jñānottama Śiva 910-953 AD

Jñānagiri 953-1038 AD

Nṛsimhagiri 1038-1107 AD

Īśvaratīrtha 1098-1146 AD

Nṛsimhatīrtha 1146-1228 AD

Vidyātīrtha 1228-1333 AD

Bhairavi Krsnatīrtha 1333-1380 AD

Vidyārānya 1380-1386 AD

7 Tattvasamgraha, GOS, Intro

8 वे तमामसंबुधसुरदृढबक्षोभि । यवविषेषिति न नामेव योः नानवानन्यातुभवो गुरुः ॥ Pañcapādikā Vivaranam

9 शश्वौवधवनस्य यस्य गुरवे तस्मै नाम भ्रेयसे ॥
If we can safely accept these dates, Jñānaghana must be placed before 910 A.D. Therefore Ananyānubhava's date also falls in the 9th century and his disciple the Vāvraṇakāra must be a contemporary of Jñānaghana. The Vallāla-cantā says that one Bhatta Simhagiri became the preceptor of Ballālasena and that for this Mahārajaguru a Math was constructed at Pradyumnēśvara. Mr. J.C. Ghosh\(^{10}\) thinks that this Simhagiri is the same as Gaudēśvarācārya. But in the Śrīṅgāra list Jñānottama Śiva was the successor of Jñānaghana and is placed between 910 and 953 A.D. But the Bhatta Simhagiri is either Nṛsima or Simhagiri (1038-1107 A.D.) or Nṛsighatiritha (1146-1228 A.D.) most probably the latter, who was the contemporary of Ballālasena (c. 1150 A.D.). Therefore it is not possible that Simhagiri was also known as Gaudēśvarācārya. If Jñānottama Śiva is the same as Jñānottama Gaudēśvarācārya, he must be the contemporary of some ruler of Bengal in the 10th century.

Moreover, there seem to be two Jñānottamas—one a native of the Chola country who wrote commentaries on the Naïskarmya and Iśtasiddhi granthas, and the other Gaudēśvarācārya who is the author of Nyāyasudhā, Iśnasiddhi and Iśnasudhā. The first Jñānottama, of the Cola country was not an ascetic and mentions only his father as his preceptor. Also he had the appellation 'mīra', showing his connection with Bengal. The guṇa of Citsukha on the other hand was probably known as Satyānanda also.\(^{11}\) Another disciple of Jñānottama was Viśīnātman.\(^{12}\)

\(^{10}\) L.H.Q., Dec. 1937

\(^{11}\) (Bhāsyabhāva Prakāśaka of Citsukha)

\(^{12}\) Śvetāsvatārāpanśudbbāṣyatikā of Viśīnātman
Citsukha is the author of Bhāsyabhāva Prakāśika and Tattvavardipikā. His disciple was Sukha-prakāśa the author of Adhikaranaratnamāla and Tattvapiadiśikā-Vyākhyā. Sukha Prakāśa’s disciple Amalānanda is the author of Kalpataru (1247-1260 A.D.). Another disciple of Sukha Prakāśa was Ānanda Jñāna, the author of Tarkasamgraha. The date of Citsukha is therefore c. 1200 A.D. and that of his guru is probably c. 1180 A.D.

If we investigate the inscriptions at Simhācalam and Śī lāyukālā, we have—

Narasimhamahāmuni § 1152, 1168
Nāthārātira Śī ṣāda (Māṇḍīva) § 1186, 1193, 1200, 1213, 1214, and 1215
Narasimha Bhārati § 1278, 1280, 1281, 1283
Jagannāṭhatīrtha Śī ṣāda § 1295
Vāsudēva Bhārati (disciple of Narasimha Bhārati) § 1310
Rāghava Bhārati (disciple of Vāsudēva) § 1312
Narasimha mahāmuni is no other than Citsukha Bhattāraka of the inscription of § 1142, (1220 A.D.). The inscriptions also mention a Vāsudēva Yati in 1255 A.D. and a Nātāsīma Bhattō paddhyāya—a family man in 1283 A.D. A Citsukha Sāmayājin is mentioned in the years 1266 and 1284 A.D. therefore there were at least two Citsukhas separated from each other by an interval of about half a century.

Sukhaprakāśa the disciple of Citsukha I. was also a pupil under Ānandātman Amalānanda in his Kalpataru says that Sukhaprakāśa was his vidyāguru, and his dīksāguru was Svayamprabha Anubhavānanda (probably identical with Ānandānubhava) whose

13 Kalpataru, सुलभ्याशरणन्त स नौमि विवायशुहम् ||
14 ŚI, V and VI
15 MER, 134 and 365 of 1899
16 स्वयम्भु मुखम भय दर्शित्रितिविश्वेष ||
    स्वयम्भु नम ||—Kalpataru
guru was Anadatma Yati. Anandānubhava was the pupil of Nārāyana Jyotisa and wrote a commentary on the Iṣṭasuddhi and Nyāyaratnadipāvali, and is later than Anandabodha the pupil of Ātmāvāsa and the author of Nyāyamakaranda and Pramānamāla.

Another disciple of Anadatman was Sankarananda who wrote Dīpikās on the Upanisad Bhāsyas. Sankarananda was the teacher of Bṛhatikrsna-tirtha and Vidyāranya. Mr Tripathi regarding Anandagiri says that he is the same as Ananda Jñāna and in his previous āśrama he was known as Janādana and wrote Tattvāloka under the guidance of Anubhuti Svarūpa. Later Anandagiri became the disciple of Sudhānanda. One Sudhānanda is mentioned along with Kaivalyananda and Saccidananda as guru of Svayamprakāśa who wrote commentaries on Advaitamakaranda of Lakṣmidhara and on Harimīśa stotra Svayamprakāśa is later than Vidyāranya and Bhoganaṭha, and must be assigned to the 16th century. Therefore this Sudhānanda is different from the guru of Anandagiri.

Anandagiri is as we have seen, was also known as Janādana in his previous āśrama. The son of Janādana is Sarvajña Visñubhāttopādhyāya the author of Rūmvarana on the Pañcapādikā.

17. आनंदानुभव तमनश्च वदे गुरुगृहम्।

18. —Kalpataru

19. मार्गस्मृतिपृष्ठवर्णितं करिष्ये पद्यवाक्योऽपि।

20. श्रीपादमध्योपसरीवस्य विलासहीनोढङ्गस्त्रोतसेवते॥

21. ब्रह्मचायद्ययापविद्यान्तम्।

(Pañcadasi)

Introduction to Tarkasaṅgraha (GOS)

(Māndūkyopanisadbhāsyatā)

(Māndūkyopanisadbhāsyatā)
This Sarvaṇa Visnu calls himself a disciple of Indrapūrna Pūjyapāda, (who was probably a pontiff of the Kāmakōtipitha) Now the great Vidyāśāṅkara was the son of Sārangapāṇi and was born at Bilvāranya In his previous āśrama he was known as Sarvaṇa Visnu and was initiated by Candrasekharā according to the Kāmakōtipitha tradition If Sārangapāṇi and Janārdana are the same, the author of Ṛju-vivarana is no other than the great Vidyāśāṅkara Vidyātīrtha in his Rudrapraśnabhashya however mentions Pāmātmātīrtha as his guru, while the Śringārī list makes him the successor of Narasimhatīrtha. But it is not improbabale that Vidyāśāṅkara studied under more than one teacher Sāyana in his Sānkara Darśana mentions Sarvaṇa Visnubhātōpādhyāya as the author of a Vivaraṇa on the Vivaraṇa (evidently Ṛjuvivarana) Mr R Narasimhaṇārāyaṇa thought that Sarvaṇa Visnubhatta is the father of a Sarvaṇa and Cennubhatta.

We have to distinguish this Ānandaṇārāyaṇa from a later Ānandaṇārāyaṇa Lakṣmidhara the author of Advatamakarananda (on which Svayamprakāśa wrote a commentary) says that his guru was Anantāṇārāyaṇa. This Brahmavid Lakṣmidhara is probably identical with the patron of the Kannada poet Madhuna in the time of Deva Rāya I (1406 A D). Lakṣmidhara was the son of Singalā, the sister of Vidyāranya, Sāyana and Bhogānātha. Therefore

22 This Sarvaṇa Visnu calls himself a disciple of Indrapūrna Pūjyapāda, (who was probably a pontiff of the Kāmakōtipitha).

23 The great Vidyāśāṅkara was the son of Sārangapāṇi and was born at Bilvāranya.

24 This Brahmavid Lakṣmidhara is probably identical with the patron of the Kannada poet Madhuna in the time of Deva Rāya I (1406 A D).

25 Mr R Narasimhaṇārāyaṇa thought that Sarvaṇa Visnubhatta is the father of a Sarvaṇa and Cennubhatta.

26 Therefore

27 Advatamakarananda
Anantānandagiri must be placed in c 1380 A.D. Several works attributed to this Ānandagiri like Praśnabhāsyatikā, Astāreyōpanisadbhāsyatikā, Sankaravāyā quote from the works of Sankarānanda, Sāyana, and Bhōganātha.

A pupil of Ānandagiri I was, according to Mr Tripāthi,27 Akhandānanda the author of Tattvadipana and Rjurpakāsikā the Tattvadipana mentions Ratnācala (gīrī), his disciple Bodhaprthvīdhara (gīrī) and then salutes Ānanda Sāla (gīrī). But in the colophon Akhandānanda calls himself the disciple of Akhandānubhūti. The author of Rjurpakāsikā says that he was the pupil of Svayamprakāśa. He belonged to the Nalagantu Vamsa, and his parents were Kālaḥastyaadhvari and Yajñāṁbā. His previous name was Ranganātha. At the request of Imadi Jagadēkarāya, he wrote Rjurpakāsikā. This Imadi Jagadēkarāya was a chief of Chennapatna near Bangalore (c 1600 A.D.)28 Therefore his guru Svayamprakāśa must be placed in c 1580 A.D. Therefore Mr Tripāthi’s contention that Akhandānanda or Akhandānubhūti, the author of Tattvadipana was a pupil, of Ānandagiri I is wrong.

The father of Akhanda Yati, Kālaḥastyaadhvari is the author of Ratnakosaprakāśikā and he is probably identical with Kālaḥasti yajvan who wrote a commentary on the Bhādadbikāra of Nrismhāstamin29 and calls himself the disciple of Raghunāthaspāramin. Akhandānanda also wrote a commentary on Goverdhana’s commentary on the Tarkabhāṣā of Kēśavamātra. Goverdhana’s date is c 1560 A.D.30 Svayamprakāśānanda, the guru of Akhanda Yati was also the guru of Mahādēva Sarasvati, the author of Tattvānusandhāna.

S Srikanttha Sastri

27 Tarkaismgraha GSO Introduction
28 Vijayanagar Comm Vol p 323
29 Bheda-dbikkāra Mad Uni Series, Intuo
30 Tarkabhāṣā of Kēśavamātra
Gilgit Ms. of the Vinaya Piṭaka

The Gilgit mss, so far dealt with by me in this Quarterly, belong mostly to the later period of Mahāyāna Buddhism. Since the discoveries of the fragments of the Sanskrit Sūtra and Vinaya texts in Eastern Turkestan and the neighbouring places, the Buddhist scholars have been eagerly hoping to obtain more information about the activities of a Hinayāna sect which attained prominence in India in the post-Asokan, and particularly, in the Kushan period. The history of Buddhism as also the history of India of the few centuries before and after the Christian era are still incomplete and await the discovery of further materials, and so it is a matter of gratification that Gilgit has yielded some, which will throw light on a hitherto unknown aspect of Indian culture, for which the world of Indologists should be grateful to H H the Maharaja of Kashmir, his present Prime Minister and the Chief Secretary for their appreciation of the importance of these finds and taking up the work of their publication in right earnest.

A few leaves of the ms, of which a preliminary account is being given here, passed into the hands of Sir Aurel Stein, who handed them over to the British Museum, the authorities of which again passed them on to the late Prof. Sylvain Lévi. Professor Lévi published two leaves (49b—51a) with the errors and omissions along with a facsimile of a leaf of the ms in the IA, CCXX (1932), pp. 26-36. The remaining leaves (i.e. from leaf no. 55) have been kindly placed by the Kashmir Government at my disposal for an emended edition.

Many leaves of this ms have been lost or destroyed or have passed into different hands. A fragmentary leaf of this ms has been preserved at the St Xavier's College, Bombay, by Prof. Heras who was kind enough to show it to me when I was last in Bombay.
In the present ms there are many leaves which do not bear the leaf mark and it is only with the help of the Tibetan version that the leaves can be placed properly. The few leaves published here are without any mark but they correspond to leaves 14-17 of the Derge edition of the Kanjur. The Sanskrit text corresponding to the first 3 leaves is lost and so it has been restored by me. The first and last lines of many of the leaves have been destroyed and so these omissions have also been restored. The restorations are printed here in smaller types. Our ms begins at leaf 55 and ends with the words Samghabhedavastusamâptam, but with omissions here and there.

The first leaf of the Dulva (see p. 411) furnishes us with a list of the chapters of the first book of the Vinaya Pitaka, from which it is evident that the present ms represents the original of the first four volumes of the Dulva (Narthang edition, see Asiatic Researches, XX, pp 45-78). The Sanskrit Vinaya is divided into four books entitled (i) Vinaya-vastu, (ii) Prâtimoksa-sûtra and Vinaya-vibhanga, (iii) Vinaya-ksudraka-vastu and (iv) Vinayottara-grantha corresponding to the four divisions of the Pâli text, viz., (i) Mahâvagga, (ii) Sutta-vibhanga, (iii) Cullavagga and (iv) Parivâra-pâtha. The present ms therefore contains the whole of the Vinaya-vastu i.e. the Mahâvagga of the Pâli text. There are many agreements, sometimes verbatim, between the Sanskrit and Pâli versions but there is a wide divergence in the contents. Our text is composed in the style of the Mahâvastu, the first book of the Vinaya Pitaka of the Lokottaravâdins of the Mahâsanghikas, both the texts containing several stories relating to the anterior births of Sâkyamuni and his noted disciples including the famous upâsakas and upâsikâs. The agreement between the Mahâsanghika Vinaya and our text presents a new problem, I mean, the probable form of the original Vinaya Pitaka and the relation of the Pâli Pitaka to the same.

In the present ms, there is a large number of quotations from the Dînghâgama, Madhyamâgama and Ekottarâgama, and these
when published, we hope, will contribute substantially to our knowledge of the Sanskrit Śūtra Pitaka

With the find of this ms, and the Prātimoksa-sūtra we may say that almost half of the Sanskrit Vinaya has been recovered and we may hope to find the rest if the Kashmir Government carries on further excavations in the region where these mss have come to light

Prof. Lévi announced that he had in his possession leaves 43-53 of the present ms and we have got the leaves from 55, the first four leaves are published here, and 2 or 3 leaves exist in fragmentary condition. There is thus a gap of about 30 leaves. The restoration of this portion from the Tibetan version has been entrusted to my student Mr. Anukul Chandra Banerji who has already completed the translation. As the work of editing the ms proceeds, I hope to publish further materials on the subject in question. Thanks are due to Pandit Shiv Nath Sastri Sahityabhūsana for transcribing the ms.

TEXT

नमः राजत्रयाः। नमः विनाशाल्पः। नमः स्वेतैःविवुष्टिः-मार्तासः-प्रमेयाः।
नमः कौशिकाः।
शास्त्रागर हितवा दुवरो प्रवर्जः। प्रवर्जः च पुनःकरो जनपदवर्धिनांवन्दः।
कथमान्यमोदपति:। दुवरा सम्भविक्षया। दुवर्कर काश्यवच्छासः। सुसुक्तः कुशलः
शीलकर्मितिसिद्धिः।

अथ बिनवस्वविभागः—प्रवर्जास्वः प्रवर्जास्वः चम्हवस्वः भैरवावर्कमिन्नासः
कौशिकीविन्नासः पाणिलोहितकर्णः पुरवस्वः पारिवारिककर्णः पोषयकर्णः संबोधकर्णः चेति।
अथ प्रवर्जास्वः सङ्गमभागः—शारीरूपः-शीलः। द्विभाषारी। ब्रह्मद्वाततः। कुष्ठः
—सवैमिदं समासं: शारीरभ्रमणः हृतः। उपसम्प्रज्ञानामः। उपसेनाद्य हृतं समासं: पद्विभागः।

अथ भौतिसल्लुपितिलं वस्तिः। देश समेयेन भ्रातेशर राजाधिराज हृतं नाम
राजा राज्यं करोति स्म श्रुं च स्फीतं च कुश्चिं बहुजनास्फः। मधुभेषे महापचा
इति नाम राजा राज्यं करोति सम षष्ठं च स्पीतं च शुभवं बहुजनाकामिनं। एकसिनं
समवे भद्राराजस्य बलकायो महान्। एकसिनं समवे च राजस महायुगस्य बलकायं।
यदा भद्राराजस्य बलकायो महान्। हृदिनायोष्ठकायो रथकायं पलिकायं इति
चतुरसमन्वितं तदा राज्यां भाषियं सम्पदेशसमित्य निवर्तते सम्। युधीः
यदा राजस महायुगस्य बलकायो महान्। हृदिनायोष्ठकायो रथकायं पलिकायं इति
चतुरसमन्वितं तदा रथा भाषियं सम्पदेशसमित्य निवर्तते सम्। अर्थाः समयेन
महायुगं चतुरश्चकायो महायुगकामिनुमार्धं। महायुगमारौक्षण्यामाधु।
'देव भद्राराजे चतुरश्चकायसमित्येन महायुगं समाकातं'।
राजा महायुगं एतदुःखं धूला। चतुरश्चकायपरिसुतोडराजेशाशिमंपुर्यं अवतं।
अथ महायुगम्य श्रुतयथाधिकायं भद्राराजे यहींतं। राजा स्मृतिप्रस्तरास्यीती
महायुगीयोष्ठकायं। अपरेषपर चतुरश्चकायं प्रवेष्यं पलिकायं।
भवेते विशिष्यं तद्य द्वार वचनं तत् प्राकारे। परिख्ययमाणं।
भद्राराज महायुगम्य लेकेस्तुवं पित । \( य \) च नै वहिरागध्यासि इति कुरङ \( ग \) नोहिंदे वहिरागच्छिन्ते आकारां गमिःप्रसि शरेरे पातिख्याम।
तवेच चैत धर्मवतरानदि \( प \) \( च \) \( य \) दितियेऽि तत्तापि ते नात्मरश्चन्तिमि।
राजा महायुगं एतं लेख पतिवा व्यक्ति चेरे करोल दृष्या
विलापरवक्त्वस्य तृतं द्वितियांवत। अथ सोमावलानामस्य एतदुःखं 'भवतं परं-
इराज गरन्ती निद्ररी महायुगकायक्रमादं प्रस्माकमेत लेख ऋषिवानं।
किमिद्वानी
विशेषामिनि।
ते गायत्र्याः अभावनां।
मंडिरामते विपरीत्य प्राणे च रथः प्राणे भवेत्।
ऐतिहासिक दृष्या राजा करते अभिर बचनं बहिर्गत्। अभिसाराजस्य वार्त्तं
शृङ्ग निर्दीर्णं प्रकटं।
तेन समयेन बोधिसिद्धतुवितालम् निपयं पधमहाविविकसितिमि विनिकारं
सम। कामावचरानं प्रदेविकायानं लिखितबो भाषायं स गजअभामारां मात्र
कुलदस्यवल्लभमि सम। समन्तश्चकायिते च बोधिसिद्धे महान्। भूमिकालं अभूत।
सर्वं राज्यानुवाचार्याखंतं तस्य कर्मप्रवेतास्य अभावामिताभयमुः परिकुटः।
श्रवं लोकाभाषान्ति अनुरूपन्तरं योगस्माहुभावं बोधिसिद्धोपलितविविक्षायः चातमनं च अभवकार-
तदमि स्तुतं तदे स्वभावं उपवर्तकैः निर्मानिमि बहुहुः प्रसारितं न परस्मात।
अथ तेन अभवाणेन ते चायोपय परस्मानि सम अन्यों संज्ञाते सम। एवधारुपन्ये-
पि किल भो सच्चा इहोपप्रमा इति।
राजा महात्मार्धिन्तयान्। सम पुनः जात: लोकातः उद्भासकः इव समुज्ज्वलोद्वारः महाध्य विध्वासिनन्तं प्रतोद्वाय विभिम्सारं इति नाम कार्यम्। राजा ब्रह्मर्थान्तिन्तयान्। सम पुने जाते लोकातु प्रकटपरिसुद्धोद्वामस्मिन्नाभवत्। प्रतोद्वाय प्रसेनविविधम् नाम कार्यम्। राजा ब्रह्मममविन्तिन्तयान्। सम पुनः जाते लोकातु उद्भासकः इव समुज्ज्वलः। प्रतोद्वाय प्राकृति इति नाम कार्यम्। राजा शान्तार्थान्तिन्तयान्। सम पुनः जाते लोकातु उद्भासकः इव समुज्ज्वलः। प्रतोद्वा उद्यमः इति नाम कार्यम्। अध प्रभुसङ्गाये विभिम्सार्य आतिमह क्वा गोस्यातुषै fares, व्यय्यंचित्तम्। विरिष्टारः कुमारोद्वारयो धारीयोनुवन्तकः। व्यय्यं फांश्यान्तिप्रेमाया धारीयोनुवन्तकः। हृषोद्वाराक्रियाया धारया शीर्ष्यारोद्वारया धारया मलयाक्रियाया धारया कोव- निकायाया धारीयायाम्। ताम्याविविधिर्गैरजसः नवनीतेऽविद्या सरपिंक्ते शिभे प्रभुशि न्यायविद्यार्थी उत्तारांवर्गनिपत्तिकुत्तुषाय वर्ते बदस्मिन एकाकुम्भमः। यथा स महान । सहः नवनीतेऽविद्या शिभे प्रभुशि न्यायविद्यार्थी उत्तारांवर्गनिपत्तिकुत्तुषाय वर्ते बदस्मिन एकाकुम्भमः। संस्कृत्यां गणनाया मुर्गाया यथा च तातिसः राजा क्षयिणाया हिक्यथ्यान्तिमथ्यान्तिम। तथया हिक्यथ्यान्तिमथ्यान्तिम च। तत्सारी अनुसारे यथायथे नियमार्ये अनुशास्त्रे पाश्चात्यो नोर्मार्ये। तत्सारी अनुसारे यथायथे नियमार्ये अनुशास्त्रे पाश्चात्यो नोर्मार्ये। तत्सारी अनुसारे यथायथे नियमार्ये अनुशास्त्रे पाश्चात्यो नोर्मार्ये। तत्सारी अनुसारे यथायथे नियमार्ये अनुशास्त्रे पाश्चात्यो नोर्मार्ये।
अंतोऽस्य अर्णेयो विभिन्नसार इति कथयित। ततोपरिप्रेयः समवेन न हसितस्कन्धाधिको जनपदार्णिणीचिति। तेन त एवः अकृत्य राजः पौर्णेयः कर्मधयायनुद्वाहयः। स कथयित। भवतः कस्येति कर्मधयायनुद्वाहयः। ते कथयित। अञ्ज्ञराजसायित। स कथयित। किन्न आसाक्षितित। ते कथयित।

dेव कर्त्त्रः। स कथयित। भवतः शास्त्येतात्। पौर्णेयान्तित। ते शाखितः। स कथयित। भवतः सोऽपि राजा श्रेणियो मूर्धिंभिविवो वयमपि राजान्तः चूः वूः मूर्धिं भिन्नविभिन्न। ततः कामुद्वाहयः। इति परं मा उद्वाहित्यथेति। ते सत्कर्ष्यान्तः। अर्हक्षंकोऽयो कुमारः। मंगःचं वयम्। महापरश्या राज्ञो गतवा आरोऽयायः। ते राज्ञो महापरश्या सक्कायासमंकातः। उपसंहक्ष्य कथयित।

dेव वयमकर्त्तरक्ष्या गौरेषा विचित्रार्णेतु कुमारेन्द्र कर्मधयायनुद्वाहितं निवारितः। किन्न ताल्लूकाति नेत। स कथयित। भवतः अर्हक्षंकोऽयो महाकृत्ययः। इति कुमारः। यथैव यूः मूलः कर्मधयायनुद्वाहितं तथेऽवैते। यथः ते पुनः कर्मधयायनुद्वाहितं जनपदेऽयो विवारिता दृष्टः। उक्तः। भवतो न मथा यूः निवारितः। सा भूतः कर्मधयायनुद्वाहितः। कस्मादयः पुनः कर्मधयायनुद्वाहितः। यद्य तावलिकाः इवेन्द्रे। कुलः। यदि न तीव्रः तदा सामी-व्रमणः कारयायः। ते अहंकातः। कुमारो व्याहो विकालः। स्थानमेत्येतरं यदनवं कर्ष्षणितः। ते कृष्णस्य राजः सक्कायासमंकातः। उपसंहक्ष्य कथयित। देव महापरश्या राज्ञो विचित्रार्णेतु नाम कुमारः कर्मधयायनुद्वाहितं निवारितः। यथे-पेत्रप्रियते स्थानमेत्येतरं यक्ष्लेश्न महानवं कर्ष्षणितः गायथं आपनेन। देवः कर्मधयायनेन यवः बालो हि पापः।

dेव एव बुधः तुच्छचं परमाणां वातेर्पीत।

अथ अल्पराजेन महापरश्या लेखः ग्रंम्हितः। विभिन्नसारः कर्ष्षणुः वयम्। प्रेश्य वस्योगायमान वा सजीकुः। एकोमहामध्यान्तित। महापरश्या राजः देखः मुंखः व्यथितः। तेन विविल्कः कुमारः शाखापितः। उक्तः। पुनः कस्मादः कर्मधयायां कृष्णस्य राजः। पौर्णेयः निवारितः। स कथयित। देव कस्मादः परस्त्रा कर्मधयायनुद्वाहितयः। पुनः कर्ष्षणित। यथैव यूः निवारितः। स कथयित। देव सोऽपि राजा श्रेणियो धृष्टंभिन्निकः। कस्मादः कर्मधयायनुद्वाहितयः। क्वेवलः मम देव चतुःगं बलकायामाहः। वयमकर्तारेन तस्म सर्वाम महाकाम। अथ महापरश्या राजा देखः-नुष्मितो यथे शक्तिः स्वयं पराक्रमस्तं हृदयीत्यन्ति। स धृतवा विभिन्नोजातायामन्त्रयते। समाहयन्तु भवतो चतुःगं बलकायम्।
तेन वल्कायेन मण्डविषय भाक्मित्वम्। अथ स बुद्धवल्कायं समाहित्यं हेतुकायं मथ्वार्यं र्यान्यं प्रतिकायं मण्डविषयं नास्तिवितुसारश्च नास्तिवेदित्वम्। मण्डविषयविविक्तविनाशिनः जनसमायेन महाप्रस्तुत राज उद्भव्यक्ति। देव अधूराजेन मण्डविषयं भाक्मित्वम्। तत्तुल्खि राजा महाप्रस्तुत करे कपोल देस्व निर्माणप्रयासंविषयं। अथैतन विकिर्षितां कुमारं शाक्तिप्रियां तस्य बन्तुर्यो बलकायो अनुवेदित:। विचित्सार: कुमारस्तानं सब्राह्मणु कुमारानं सनिपात्यं कथ्यति। अहं मः स्वातं राजश संध्यां संध्यामिष्यामि। कि कर्णायम्। ते कथ्यति। देव भवता यथावस्था श्रावस्यं श्रावास्यं तथैव भवति। अथैतन ईस्मां गार्भं भाप्तिः।

यस्मिन मनुष्ये रमते कुलश्री: स सर्वनं संपरिरिष्टित्वम्।
	तस्मिन पितुह्रे निलिप्ति सर्वं दानेत्विनाशायिव वसित्वम्।

अहं प्रायः सर्वेन: संपिरिष्टित्वम्। यह भवत् पारदी ततन न शिरासि। अथ स बुद्धप्रस्तुतकायसि राजसाधितयतां। तेन समयेन राजा महाप्रस्तुतकायसि परिवर्त उपरि प्रासादस्वामत्वतिपक्तिः। तेनाशै निग्रंहुन् दश:। सोमालययानं नामस्वते। भवतं: कर्पेयं निलेति। ते कथ्यति। देव विकलिताः सकुमारस्तात्वम्। स कथ्यति यहै प्रसुध्वल्कायो श्रावास्यं विनाशित:। केवलु, अतिर्यो विकलिताः। केवलु विकलिताः। भवतं: कर्पेयं हृित:। साताः विचित्सारसि।

विचित्सार: कुमारं कुमारानामन्त्रये। भवतोधमः राजा उद्दीपनविवाह:। न शक्तुम: बलसेन पराजेहुम्। अन्तोधम सर्वसन्तोषं दुर्गमाक्यं उपयोगाश्चाय्यं हेतुविषयं मिता। ते तस्य मुक्तसन्धृश्यं श्राविरे निपितताः। तेनक्सः राजान् प्रायातित:। अहं प्रायः सुर्यं तस्य तन्तुस्य विनाशित:। अहं प्रायः सुर्यं तस्य तन्तुस्य विनाशित:। अहं प्रायः सुर्यं तस्य तन्तुस्य विनाशित:। अहं प्रायः सुर्यं तस्य तन्तुस्य विनाशित:। अहं प्रायः सुर्यं तस्य तन्तुस्य विनाशित:। अहं प्रायः सुर्यं तस्य तन्तुस्य विनाशित:। अहं प्रायः सुर्यं तस्य तन्तुस्य विनाशित:।
गिल्गिट मसूर जीतका ।

परिमाणमाति। महापर्वो रजा तुः। तेन तस्य पहुचिलिङ्गः
सम्पुन्नजितम्। पुरु स्वतः सैल राज्यं कार्य। अहमः वह राज्यं कृत्यामिति
इति लेकोकुड़े पित। ततो देशी विष्मिसाः राजा राज्यं कार्यति
कृत्यं व स्फोटं व क्षेमं व सुमिष्टं चार्कियांवजहुजजमुख्यं व। अन्यथा
महापर्वो रजा राज्यं कार्यति कृत्यं व स्फोटं व क्षेमं व सुमिष्टं चार्कियां-
वजहुजजमुख्यं व। अपरेन सम्पन्न राज्यं देशी राजपर्वो रजा कार्यत।
अमार्द्विसारस्य रजा। सतिदम्। देव पिता तेन कार्यत। आगच्छ राज्यं
प्रतीच्छित। स आगत। ततो देशी विष्मिसाः राज्यं चार्कियां व। अपरेन
सम्पन्न राज्यं देशी राजपर्वो रजा कार्यत। त च सुमिष्टं चार्कियांवजहुजजमुख्यं
च।

मध्यदेशाध्यायमें माण्डो चार्किय्यं मध्यदेशी दशिणाध्यायमुक्ताः।
दशिणाध्यायमें दशिणाध्यायमुक्ताः वेदवशास्त्राः। स तस्य संकारामुक्ताः।
उपासनाय भवानां कुत्वा तस्य पुरुत प्रागायं कथयति। दशिणाध्यायमु-
कार्यायं वादवेशायं पावदृश्यायं कर्मु। कार्यायं। वेदस्वरुपायं कर्मेऽ
कथयति। एवं कुरुष्येऽऽ। स तस्यार्थस्तु वेदस्वरुपायं कर्मज्ञानः।
आचरिते तेन माण्डो माण्डो। स तेन अवस्थेऽविधा। वेदोऽविकारं
स्वात्मिकं सम्प्राप्ताः। माण्डो अवस्थेऽविधा। अथ अवस्थाः अविनाशित:
तदात्माः भविष्यति तदात्माः भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति भविष्यति।
अतः अवस्थाः अविनाशितः अतः अविनाशितः अतः अविनाशितः अतः
अविनाशितः अतः अविनाशितः।

दक्षिणवायु दक्षिणवायु दशिणाध्यायः।

dलेख।

मध्यदेशोऽस्माकमिति दश:। कीवर्धो माण्डो मध्यदेश:। मध्यदेशोऽस्माकमिति
देशानाम:। इत्यहऽस्माकमिति देशानामः। महाकालिकाः इत्यहऽस्माकमिति
देशानामः। अर्थात्कालाणी विश्रुत्यानन्दिनेऽविश्रुत्यानन्दिनेऽ। जय नवी गंगा पुण्या मंगलाः
शुचिविश्वेषस्यसंबंधः उभयः कृतार्थोऽभिव्यक्त्यमानः आवश्यितः। अभ्यासः नाम
गुलिका म्स ऑफ द विनय प्रतिको
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विभूषण कल्याणिति । तत्त: स राजा अमायणामक्षते । असि भवन्त: कविप्रववान्न विजिते बाद्री प्रतिवशिति । अमायणं कथयिन्ति । देवति नालद्रामके मानीर नाम ब्रह्मणो वेदेवाश्च मर्गागो भिन्नसिद्धः क्रय ब्रह्मण । तेन मार्गान नाम शाब्द्र प्रणीतिर्मिति । राजा कथयिन्ति । आहूयतां स उपाख्याय इति । अमायणारा: । सोपि राजानं ज्ञेयनानु-युष्मं अथ वर्णनाय अनुप्रस्तावितः । ततो राजामनिति । 'वहोरिष्ट तस्य अध्ययन ब्रह्मण ब्रह्मणं सर्वं मयं पुरस्ताक्याविभूषण कल्याणिति ।' स कथयिन्ति । राजामनिति तेषा भाषिज्ञ विभूषणिति । ततो वाद्विष्णवाद समाप्तम् । प्रशापवपस्ती व्यवसायितो । राजा कथयिन्ति । कथ्यं भवन्तु पूर्णमच्छ इति । अमायणं कथयिन्ति । देवायं सर्वं जानानि । तद्भवं भवन्तु पूर्णमच्छ इति । तस्य पूर्णमच्छो दुः । तेन पर्वतारितको दानं: समुखानि: । मारोण मन्त्रयथा दोषो दुः: । इति ते अयुतसमस्त्रामु इति नोपपदायां इति । स तृणीमस्थिति । इति नवं प्रतिष्ठानेन नव्यतत्त्वानाना यदुनानाते विभाषातिर्मिति । राजा अमायणामक्षते । कार्तरोज्ज भवन्त: शोभत इति । तेन कथयिन्ति । देव उपाययो दानं निर्मिति इति । ततो राजा आचमन: सब्रूतः । तस्य मे माहास्युलक्षणं: यस्य मे विजिते परम्परिह वाद्विष्णवो निमित्ति: । अभिरपनाथं: स उवाच 'शाब्द्र ब्रम्ह ब्राह्मणम भवन्तृ निमित्ति। देव नालद्रामके । गच्छ स एस्ते वाद्विष्णवो भवन्तु । स तस्य वाद्विष्णवो दुः: । सप्तिकायो लोको विपस्वितितकृत: । लोकं श्रीराण्यानेन साधारणिकस्तथा प्रायंते । तस्य क्रीडो रमणास्य परिचारयं पुरुषो जात: । कौरं धर्माधारों कोषाण्यां तस्य विस्तरणो जातस्य जातिमाह इत्यादि कौर्षमि इति नामार्थे व्यवस्थापितम् । कौर्षलो दाप: उत्तिते भवरे दृष्टे सारे नवनीतेन सार्पी श्रीर्षिणेन्द्रा स्वर्णसुधारसार्जयो मोहों श्रीर्षिणेन्द्रा कौर्षलो दाप: उत्तिते भवरे दृष्टे । स यदा महां सब्रूतः तदा लिपिमुख्यस्य: । स सहस्यक्रो मण्डलायां ब्रह्मणाकाराम्बरीयाः कौर्षाया शैव समाचारे भरस्माहु शैवकाराहु भोकोरे भोकोरे ज्ञेयवेदे यजुदेवेदे ज्ञेयवेदे सामवेदे यजने यजने अध्ययने अध्ययने दुःल प्रतिश्रुते दृष्टे मनुष्यान श्रीर्षान: सब्रूतः । भूस्त्रस्य क्रीडतो रमणास्य परिचारयो दारिका जाता । तस्य: शारिकाया या द्वारे अवभूषणं इति तस्य: कालितिभि: शारिकायेऽ व्यवस्थापितम् । यावदपरेण कालेनारितते सामवेद: स हर्षिता महसूल सब्रूत: । सा शिखरपाराण्यां सागरं भाषा सार्व सब्रूत: । स तस्य कृपहते। तत्त: विश्रामिति । पुत्र कथ्यं लङ्के पुरुषो भूर्वा खिया पराजित: । मथि कलप्ते वाद्विष्णवो विमलस्य: ।
bras ga S braddheya vamakarya mrsiha dshanhapadyaya dharmamunamat: | dharsaparviny

vishnuh nam shannah lokeayarh shanta: | satya sakshayam parrakant: | up-

sakshayabhawadn hruvaka karyati: | ghrasamapadhyaya svarudhurya kruvam: | karnayat: |

lokayatyakshamudhahayami: | eva kruvayati: | sat sakshayakriyayatva murohmara: |

aaharti tayya shanakalayam: | yadda apadha bhavnat tatha kushacchithiyaappayaka

gaapam karbikaapalokakarh kushacchithinakarh: | yavadrreya samade 

apadha shanta tath saha eva sakshayakarh: samparsyata: | tayya sakshayakarh

sakshayabhawadn varamrutpoornah antraryaktasa murohmara: | bhoh kariya vaata: 

shandilya brahma: pachaka upachaka: ko va karnayatshaanidhi: | tadake karyakara 

vay paryadevayadhi: | abay karyakara vay pashatya 

adhi: | apariv bhramara karyadhi: | s shanakal karyadhi: | abh shadhyayadhi: 

na karyadhi: | sa eva bhaktho bhakthiyambarah dha: shru tad na tu shadbhava: 

bhraparsy likhn sh praya dshahadri dshahnah.
लोकोः संस्कृता:। पुजाः कि यावध्यूतते तावता गम्यते। अपि तु भूतसिम्यया देवा: भोजया नो तु गतःस्या:। उपाध्याय एव मात्रः कथयति। मध्यदेवों ताहोः वाचिवृत्ताः: सति भेषजपञ्चायतो मुखापि न रक्तयार्नु खंडःस्तिति। पुजाः ताहा: स एवेक: पुष्योऽसौ नाल्या: कातिकस्तिति। बहुजात्रम बसुप्चरा पूर्णा महासुन्दरसर्गानम्। उपाध्याय गच्छताः। सतौ तावदु देवावकोऽष्ट्रः इत्थि अविच्छिन्नतिः श्रीपुरस्यां च। तेः च वाचिवृत्ता: पर्यावशतिः भविष्यत्रीति कादिन निम्नाहृत्याः। देवसां च पश्चायाः लाभं च निम्नाहृत्याः इति। श्रीपुरस्याः स श्राहणोऽप्रपरिशिष्टस्य। स तान मात्रयाकान्तिद्वयोऽजृतः। पुजाः यथेऽं गुणोऽति अविच्छिन्नतिः कुकस्थलीप्रपत्तिः समभाजनानि। गच्छताः मध्यदेवोऽसौ तैहःस्तिताः। स कृत्यां समभाजनानि। स जातिवृत्तां निगृहूत्या वादिस्ते योज्यति। केषपिविभूतिममपरिकाशित्या शिरः श्रीमन्ति। केषपिविभूतियाः शाब्दि च आयत्तिः आयत्तिः योज्यति। केषपिविभूतियाः प्रति वर्णमात्रकाभि: प्रतीः। केषपिविभूतियाः युक्तस्तिति। संस्कृतोऽनुभग्ययाः आयत्तिः नरीमणपिभविहकारयुतेऽहृत् च चूर्यमायोऽनुपूर्वेऽराज्यावृद्धियाः। स श्राहण: संस्कृतमस्य। यावत् क्षत्यु प्रपवेशस्त्यातः। सचं तेऽराजः तावदृष्टि। तत्कालिकोऽसौ पूर्वस्तेयास्म। स तस्तेऽराजः सचा चूर्यमास्तस्तितममध्यमः। स राजः सचारूस्तस्तितममध्यमः। श्राहण: कथयति। उपाध्याय एव यथेऽत्र यूनोऽकाराकारोऽप्रपरपयोऽभिभाष्यमेति। स तस्तेऽराजः सचारूस्तस्तितममध्यमः। श्राहण: कथयति। उपाध्याय एव यथेऽत्र यूनोऽकाराकारोऽप्रपरपयोऽभिभाष्यमेति। स तस्तेऽराजः सचारूस्तस्तितममध्यमः। श्राहण: कथयति। उपाध्याय एव यथेऽत्र यूनोऽकाराकारोऽप्रपरपयोऽभिभाष्यमेति। स तस्तेऽराजः सचारूस्तस्तितममध्यमः। श्राहण: कथयति। उपाध्याय एव यथेऽत्र यूनोऽकाराकारोऽप्रपरपयोऽभिभाष्यमेति। स तस्तेऽराजः सचारूस्तस्तितममध्यमः। श्राहण: कथयति। उपाध्याय एव यथेऽत्र यूनोऽकाराकारोऽप्रपरपयोऽभिभाष्यमेति। स तस्तेऽराजः सचारूस्तस्तितममध्यमः। श्राहण: कथयति। उपाध्याय एव यथेऽत्र यूनोऽकाराकारोऽप्रपरपयोऽभिभाष्यमेति। स तस्तेऽराजः सचारूस्तस्तितममध्यमः। श्राहण: कथयति। उपाध्याय एव यथेऽत्र यूनोऽकाराकारोऽप्रपरपयोऽभिभाष्यमेति। स तस्तेऽराजः सचारूस्तस्तितममध्यमः। श्राहण: कथयति। उपाध्याय एव यथेऽत्र यूनोऽकाराकारोऽप्रपरपयोऽभिभाष्यमेति। स तस्तेऽराजः सचारूस्तस्तितममध्यमः।
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Tib is more diffuse here
किमयं तिथ्यो माण्वो जानीते। लोकायतम्। कुञ्ज भवतो लोकायतं शास्ते। 

दुधिरणये। सोदुरुवृणं दुधिरणयप्रमुन्तात्। स तत्स गव्या पूर्वत्तिः। को आत 

भवतो लोकायतमभिम्। सन्ति kun-tu-rgyu। स तेसं सक्रायतसतान्तः। उपसंक्षण्य 

कथयति। इस्स्मायम् उपायकं पादुपुंशू पां कर्तुम्। कस्यायोः। लोकायतसुमू- 

प्राणोः। ते कथयति। न वय्यात्मारिकस्य लोकायतसुपुद्दिसाम। स कथयति। 

यदि स वय्यात्माम्। प्राणशयन्ती न तांक्रंज्ञ्यामीति शास्त्रमया 

लोकायतसुपर्यातं मवनीति। त्रोपेयेत्रिसिन्ध सन्नानि दोषोऽवलः 

परिवाजः कर्तितं संहार उपाधि। 

शास्त्रिकश्च तिथ्योऽशा योगेन सार्थं वार्त्तं शारोपयसि। निम्येन सा निग्रहोऽत्। तिथ्य- 

माण्वेण शास्त्रिकया सार्थं कृतितं रामसं परिचयितत। अन्यतरान्न लक्ष्यमर्मभिकात् 

बहतित्यो गृहोमोक्षगममाण्वमाण्वलिखिता बहूमुः। संसारादन्तिक्। सब्जम्यतिः। 

युक्तुपतितच्युतमेहारी अन्यतरस्थारिति। बनिकायात। विद्वाना शास्त्रिकया 

मवमकातं। शास्त्रिकया धन्ति रघु। उपाधान धुरूणं धन्ति धुरूणं धन्ति। महाशैलपविस्तयो राम- 

पर्वतमितिराहम्। उपरि विहारस्य गंधामि। महाजनकायं मे प्रणाम 

करोतीति। तथा तिथ्यस्य शास्यस्य निवेदित्वम्। इद्भं वेदशं न मयं कर्तो 

हि ति। सन्यासायनां लेतन्येयासिपि सन्यासायनायऽकान्ता श्रावणां 

निवेदित्वम्। मम श्रावण्या भुदायास्य स्वयो ट्र्यं तस्ति। ते कथयति। उपाधाय 

शोभनः स्वयं शक्तयति। उक्षतस्तौ मे पुरुषं धुरूणं बिहिता प्रविधिः। सा पुल 

प्रमूहते। स वर्गाहृत मन्त्रायाकृतिमधीय लक्ष्यमाहिनो निधोष्ण्यति। 

वक्तयति। महाशैलपविस्तयो राहमि। उपरि विहारस्य गंधामि। महाजन- 

कायं मे प्रणाम करोतीति। प्रवजित्यति च सम्यमिदि च श्रायमादि लम्बएति। 

शाख्यपरं सम्मेध्यं तिथ्यो शास्यं साध वार्तं करोतीति। तथास्ती 

निग्रहते। स संक्षयति। को योगः: पुरवहसितान्तं निग्रहति। साम्प्रतिमहमानं निग्रहे। 

इद्विशास्या प्रभावं नाप्नु। यत सत्रा अस्य उक्तिमकात्: 

तस्यैवोऽनुभाव तस्ति। सा अश्वानं नवानं वा मासामस्वातमत्सृता। द्वारको जातं: 

अभिरूपो दर्शनीयः प्रातारिको गोरः: कनकरणस्य: छ्राकारसितः। द्विषाय बहुः 

विकावयेः। ललाट: युगमः उन्न्यन्तमा ॥ इत्यत: संगमे समाम्य विस्तरेण जाती जातिमयः 

इत्यं नामक्षे ग्यविस्वापितासि ॥ कि भवतु माण्वस्य नामिति। तिथ्यो 

1 Tib differs here
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माणवकमुपालामये मातामहेश्वरशाम। सः प्रचिनयत। माणवस्त्रोऽनं भवितैः नाम इति। स संलक्षयति। अथा माणवस्त्रायस्य श्राहणस्य नूतनः। भवतु माणवस्त्र उपलियं इति नामेति। तिथ्यो श्राहणः कथयति। कौशः माणवस्त्र आर्येष्वानां नाम व्यवस्थापितस्यत्वम् इति। स संलक्षयति। मातामहेश्वरशाम नाम पितुः नामतः। इति। अहमस्य मातुः नामेष्वाय अवस्थापिताम। अथा माणवः शारिकायाः पुनः भवतु माणवस्त्र शारिपुत्रः इति नाम इति। ततः केविचारिपुषो माणव इति संज्ञाते। केविचारिपुषो माणव इति। स ब्राह्मणः। भागीवः प्रदत्। स दार्शः। कौण्डेऽरुपा। नवनिहृतः लिपिः। सर्पिणेन सर्पिणमेकान्यैः। उत्तरस्तोत्रायेश्वरश्राहणकथोपरस्य वधः। कड़स्य पञ्चजम्। स यदा महासंवृः। तदा लिपयमुपस्यतः। स लिपिः पारम्परः।। संवार्याः गणनायः चतुः शौचे समाचारे भस्मेणुः चूरिकाणूः आकाशैः। आकाशेः यज्ञवेदे अवर्वैः सामवेदे यज्ञे यज्ञे अध्याये अध्याये यज्ञे अध्याये। प्रतिवेदे प्रकर्मिनितों श्राहणं। सन्धूः। स दिता सर्वविद्याधानाती। वस्मेद्रूपेन ऐनृत्वास्याः पतिता सर्वविद्याहृति। अपरेण सामेन दिता सर्वध्यायं कुर्वन्येनाराह। तात कौस्यै भविष्यायां। पुजा कहां न जाने कौस्यार्थायां। इति आप लेवमेतानां मंद्रपदाने पुर्वैः। श्रीमत्वत्तानां गीतानि समायुक्तानि। यायेताः। ब्रह्माण्डायुक्तानां। भाषाने। स कथयति। न सलो तात निरर्कायेतानां मंद्रपदाने पुर्वैः। श्रीमत्वत्तानां गीतानि समायुक्तानि यायेताः। ब्रह्माण्डायुक्तानि। भाषाने।। तेव्रायोऽवै इति संलक्षः। कसः सेव्य।। स कथयति। अर्थायस्य अर्थमेव। तिथ्यायां भाषाय आलमान:। संवृः।। स संलक्षयति। एकसाध्याः। कार्याय।। यदुः पैड़के वा पुरा उद्यामविभाय उद्योऽः वा विशेषोपविभाय। स तुलना माणवेन उद्योः विशेषोपविभाय।। स प्रकर्मातिः। ब्रह्माण्डायुक्तानां। तेव्रायोऽवै तात तुवनायुक्ताः। द्वितीयोपोपों। माणव:। पुनर्कारणाती। मणिः। ब्रह्माण्डायुक्तानां। ब्रह्माण्डायुक्तानां। ब्रह्माण्डायुक्तानां।। तेन द्रं द्रं द्रं द्रं। देवादत्तेश्वर पत्तनों। व्यज्ञनातः।। स तेन ।

1. According to the Tib, the first chapter ends here.
सारं राजेन्द्र कोडिने रमणयोग विपरितार्कित। तस्य दीखो रूपमाणस्वरूप परिपार्ष्ठो न पुजाः न दुहिता। सोपुजाः पुष्पामिनन्दी व वरणकुड़ेशरामास्त्राहीनायमें उदेश्ये। विरोधार्कार्याहि। तथास आराध्यादेवता व व्याज्यावतार्त्वादेवता। संग्रामदेवता बलप्रियता प्राप्तिकाः। दैवता। सहित्स: सहभागिन्या। त्यात्मायुक्तः अत्र देवता आयावते। अस्ति बैयं लोकेष्वराः प्रवचः। यद्यायुक्ताः जायस्ते दुहितरर्षेति। तथु नाते। यथोऽपि ममधिन्यतो एकत्स्य गुंगाकोपमममातिविधयू। तथास राजसंख्यात्स:। अथि न प्रयाया। स्थानाः समुद्रजावात्सप्ताः। जायते। दुहितरस:। कार्येऽगत्यायाम्। मातापितरो रक्तः। संप्रागितो। माता एव कल्याणज्वाति मृत्युमाती। गण्यज्वाण प्रत्युपस्थितो भवनि। वैष्णव ज्वाणम्।

Nalinaksha Dutt

1 Here ends one complete leaf perhaps the 6th and the following leaf has not yet been traced
A Pre-Mughal Citrapata from Gujarat
A pre-Mughal Citrapata from Gujarat

A fairly large number of illustrated manuscripts has been found in Gujarat. Most of these manuscripts are Jaina Kumārapāla the famous Jaina ruler of Gujarāt is said to have employed hundreds of writers to copy out in golden ink some important Jaina works for free distribution. Vastupāla the multi-millionaire of Gujarāt spent, according to the Upadesatarangini, seven crores of rupees on this pious work of copying books for the use of scholars. Other rich Gujarātis who followed these noble examples are also known. Manuscripts were written on palm-leaf, cloth or paper, generally. Pictures or illustrations were drawn on wooden tablets, palm-leaves, cloth, leather and paper, as we learn from the several specimens which have been brought to light. Pre-Mughal specimens of painting on cloth are rare and one is ever anxious to see another work of the type of the Vasantavilāsa, written in Ahmedabad in the year 1508 of the Vikrama era (=1451 A.D.), on account of the various secular pictures it contains. One religious citrapata of the pre-Mughal times has been seen in Pātan, the old capital of Gujarāt, and my learned friend Muni Punyavijayaji of the Sāgar kā Upāsārā there has kindly lent it to me for publication. A note on it in Gujarati was contributed to the Atmaram Commemorative Volume conjointly by me and my pupil Mr. Sarabhai. Owing to the importance of its pictures, however, I think it would be advantageous to publish a note on it in English for the benefit of the scholars not conversant with Gujarati. Accordingly I have drawn the following account of it in honour of the late Professor Winternitz as a mark of respect for and admiration of his scholarship and of the splendid work he did as a great Indologist.
A good deal of admixture is seen in the tāntric systems of Buddhism, Jainism and Hinduism, the three great religions of India, and there can be no denying the fact that this is the result of borrowing from one another. When a certain system proves successful the followers of the rival faiths would adopt and incorporate it into their own cults so that there may be no reason or justification for the wavering minds to go over to the other sect on that account. In the tāntric side Hinduism and Buddhism are greatly indebted to each other. It is not yet established how much Jainism gave in return for what it took from Hinduism as far as the tāntric phase is concerned. As it not infrequently happens, when a sect loses its original vigour and becomes decadent, it imitates the ideas of other religions. The Jinas, in imitation of Hindu and Buddhist ideas, created mystic diagrams or yantras. Of such diagrams the two, namely the Suddhāyantra and the Rśimandala have been very popular with them. Many varieties of both these yantras are known to us. The citrapata I am noticing here, illustrates the Rśimandala-yantrāmnāya as is stated in the words ‘ści śri-Rśimandalayantrāmnāyaḥ’ of the scribe written on the picture itself. The pata further informs us of the name of the Jaina muni who got it prepared under his instructions. The text given in the pata is as under——

"संवत् १५७१ वर्षं व्री(व्री)शाक मासे शुक्लमेघ व्री(व्री)लीलायाः तिथिः कौमकारे रोह(रोऽ)शो नवम्माननाति योगे उपासमध्ये सिद्धाचार्यांसतामे पूवायो जयस्ल-मृति-श(श)भय ५० हर्षलगाशोना परिवारस्थ का(का)ति लक्षमैै वृत्तं मति कुऽ २ स्वाहा।"

Here we are told that the yantra-pata was prepared in Sam 1571, on the 3rd day of the bright half of Vaisakha for the prosperity of the followers of Pamnāsa Harsaratnagani, a disciple of Jayaratnasūri who belonged to the direct line of disciples of Siddhācārya.

In the centre of the pata is drawn the letter bṛīm in five colours. The painter has drawn the word Om in the Jaina style on the right
of the top of bṛiṁ, and namah on its left. Thus the artist has painted the words Om bṛiṁ namah which form the bijāksara or the initial portion of the Rṣumandalayantra.

In all the three main systems named above, bṛiṁ is the māyā-bija or the sacred symbol which controls this illusory world. The Jaina teachers have based on it a separate treatise called Hṛiṁkārakalpa. This syllable bṛiṁ is painted in five colours and thus represents the twenty-four Tirthankaras in the traditional manner laid down by ancient Jaina Ācāryas. It is divided into five parts, viz., br, i, the crescent or siddhāsilā above i and the bindu over the crescent which is divided into two parts by a horizontal line drawn through it. Hṛ is drawn in yellow and is meant to represent the sixteen Tirthankaras who are said to be of that colour. These Tirthankaras are—(1) Rśabhadeva, (2) Ajitanātha, (3) Sambhavanātha, (4) Abhinandanāsvāmi, (5) Sumatinātha, (6) Supārśvanātha, (10) Sitalanātha, (11) Śteyāmsanātha, (13) Vimalanātha, (14) Anantanātha, (15) Dharmanātha, (16) Sāntinātha, (17) Kunthinātha, (18) Aranātha, (21) Neminātha, and (24) Mahāvīrāsvāmi. It is painted blue which is the colour of the 19th Tirthankara Mallinātha and the 23rd Tirthankara Pārśvanātha. Its connection with Mallinātha is significant for it represents Śakti and Mallinātha is believed to have been a woman. The crescent-shaped Siddhāsilā drawn over bṛi is red which is the colour of the sixth Tirthankara Padmaprabhu and the twelfth Vāsupūjya. The bindu over the crescent is divided into two parts by a horizontal line drawn through it. The upper portion of the bindu is white which represents the 8th Tirthankara, Candraprabhu, and the 9th Suvīdhinātha. The lower portion of the bindu is painted black and stands for the 20th Tirthankara Munisuvrata and the 22nd, Neminātha who also shares the same colour. Thus the painter has represented all the Tirthankaras in the syllable bṛiṁ and has thus supplied us with a specimen of pre-Mughal portraiture of the religious type.
Round bṛiṁ the artist has drawn four concentric circles. In the innermost circle the painter has drawn a lotus of forty-eight petals. In twenty-three of these petals he has written the mantraśaras or syllables used in spells or charms. They are the twenty-three consonants beginning with $k$, $m$, $l$, $r$, vyūṁ and ending with $b$, $m$, $l$, $r$, vyūṁ. After every four consonants and two petals $v$ has been inserted. In the first petal $v$ is written thrice while in the second it is written four times. The painter has written $p$, $m$, $l$, $r$, vyūṁ twice and $v$ seven times. Thus the circle has been completed. I am unable to explain why the mantraśaras have been arranged by the painter in this way.

In the next circle the painter has drawn blue lines which stand for water.

In the third circle are depicted eight lotus-petals to show the eight cardinal points. (1) Om bṛiṁ arhādbhyāḥ śībhyo namah. Ravi bṛiṁ Śrī dhṛit Śīrṣā-pūrvā-di is written in the petal in the east. The Arihaṇta is white in colour, so the painter has drawn a white figure of Arihaṇta as also of the superintending deity (Adhisthāyaka) of the post of Arihaṇta.

(2) In the south-east petal is written Om bṛiṁ siddhebhyo namah/ Agho, Soma, Lakṣmī, Umā, Gauri, etc. The Siddha is red. So a red figure of the Siddha and of the Adhisthāyaka of his post is drawn after the petal. (3) In the southern petal Om bṛiṁ sarva-sūryabhyo namah Yama Mangala Sarasvati Jayā Ambā, has been written. Ācārya is of yellow colour, so a yellow Ācārya and the Adhisthāyaka of his pada is painted after him. (4) In the south-western petal we have Om bṛiṁ upādhyāyebhyo namah Budha Nara(r)to, Viśyā, Nityā, Klīmā. The Upādhyāya is of blue colour but the painter has drawn him as well as the Adhisthāyaka of his post as yellow. (5) In the western petal we find Om bṛiṁ sarvaśādhubhīya namah Varuna Guru, Aṃtā, Madhavā, Kāmānā. The Śādhu is of dark colour. Hence a dark figure of a śādhu.
and of the Adhisthāyaka of his post are drawn after the petal (6) In the north-western petal we notice Om hriṃ jñānibhyo namah/Vāyu, Sukra, Kamabāna Śanandānandānim (bhyo) namah Jñāna is of a bright or white colour Still through oversight the painter has drawn a figure of a yellow sādhu and of the Adhisthāyaka of his post (7) In the northern petal we have Om brauṃ tattvadṛṣṭibhyo namah Dhanada Śanī Māyā Māyāvī Raudrī Gurubhyo namah Tattvadṛṣṭi or Darśanapada is white or bright Still as in the previous case, the painter has drawn a yellow figure of a sādhu and of the Adhisthāyaka of his post Thus the third circle is completed

(8) In the north-eastern petal we read Om hriṃ cāṅtrebhyo namah Iśāna, Rāhu, Ketu, Kalā, Kālī, Kalpr(ri)yā, etc Though cāṅtrapada is of white colour, the painter has, as before, drawn a yellow figure of a sādhu and of the Adhisthāyaka of his post Thus the fourth or the outermost circle we read the inscription beginning with Samvat 1571 which I have given above in full After this inscription are written all the vowels from a to ah, the consonants from ka to kṣa and at the end the words itī Rṣimandala- mantrāmnāyāḥ Thus the yantra is completed

The whole of this mystic diagram is drawn inside a pūrṇakalāsa, i.e., an entire pitcher Thus the twenty-four Tīrthankaras are included in the syllable hriṃ which is in the middle of the kalāsa This syllable hriṃ is encircled by four concentric circles which are described above At the mouth of the kalāsa we have again the syllable hriṃ The yantra is surmounted by the ānkuṣā-biṣa krom

The kalāsa has an eye painted at each of its two sides Kalāsa, also called mangala-kalāsa or ghata, is a symbol which is sacred to all the three main religions of India The speciality of Jainism, however, lies in associating it with two divyacaksus or divine eyes In the four corners of this citrapata the figures of Dharanendra, Padmā-
vati, Gurumurti and Vairatyadevi are to be seen. Dharanendra is painted yellow. There are six hoods over his head. He holds a noose in his right hand and a goad in the left. His lower hands are shown empty. He is seated in the bhadrasana posture. Beneath his left thigh is shown an elephant, his cognizance. (2) Padmaavati has the colour of burnished gold. She has three hoods over her head. She holds a goad in the upper right hand and a noose in the upper left hand. Her lower right hand is in the varada (boon-giving) pose and the lower left hand is the abhaya pose. A cock is shown as her cognizance. (3) Gurumurti is seated on a square wooden seat in the padmasana posture. His hands are in the pravacana-mudra or teaching attitude. His complexion is yellow and he wears white garments. He has placed his sacred broom on his right thigh. (4) Vairatyā’s complexion is dark. She has three hoods of a snake over her head. Her upper hands hold snakes. Her lower right hand is in the varada pose, and the lower left hand is empty. She is seated in the bhadrasana pose without her emblem.

Besides these portraits in the corners, the artist has drawn pictures of the Nava-grahas, the Nava-nulbis and their guardian deities. These are detailed as below —

At the top of the pata Sūrya is drawn on the right and Candra on the left. On the left side of it we have Mangala and Budha. Guru and Śukra are accommodated at the bottom of the pata, and its right side makes room for Śani, Rāhu and Ketu. Near the bottom of the Mangala-kalasa, the Nava-nulbis are represented in the form of nine small pitchers. Nearby is the five-hooded Śesa who guards them. The figure of Ganesa and the representation of leaves of a kalpa-vrksa above the mouth of the kalasa complete the picture.

In conclusion it may be observed that the artist who prepared the citrapata under notice had to work in accordance with the canonical injunctions regarding the representations of the divinities of
the Jaina religion. He is not accurate in one or two cases as I have shown above. But that might have been due to his ignorance, or perhaps, he followed some new school of orthodox Jaina painting. In any case the citrapata under notice possesses considerable value for the comparative study of the three main tantric systems of India. Moreover, it is one of the rare specimens of pre-Mughal ecclesiastic pictures requiring attention of scholars interested in Indian pictorial art.

Hirananda Sastri
The Title Dasavaikālika Sūtra

Even from the earliest times, it appears, there was no agreement among the traditional writers about the form and the interpretation of the name of the work usually known as the Dasavaikālika Sūtra. Like many other works of the Ardha-Māgadhi canon there is no occasion to give the title name either in the introductory or concluding portions of the text. References in other works and the comments upon it are also not unanimous.

In the Nandi Sūtra,1 where a list of the works forming the canon is given, we find the name of the work in the form Dasaveyāliya, and stands at the beginning of the Ukkāliya section of the Suyanāna Bhadrabāhu, the oldest commentator of this text, used in his Niṣjjutī2 the form Dasakāliya six times (vv 1, 7, twice, 12, 14, 25) and the formDasaveyāliya twice (vv 6, 397). Of these two forms of the title, he decidedly favours the first as the name of the work and he used the second only incidentally. This will be clear from the fact that in all the three places (vv 7, 12, 15) where an attempt is made to explain the name the form is invariably Dasakāliya and not Dasaveyāliya. Jinadāsāmahattara in his Cūrṇī on the text, however, and following him Haribhadra in his Sanskrit Tikā, usually use the form Dasaveyāliya, even though the other form is found in their works incidentally (Cūrṇī, p 4, Hari p 1). They have not seen any discrepancy between the two names and explain the title always in the form of Dasaveyāliya.

No material help can be derived from the names of the other books of the canon. Even though the first word of the name, Dasa

1 Ed Āgamedaya Samitī p 2016
2 Ed Prof Abhayankara at the end of his edition of the text. The numbers of the Niṣjjutī gāthās refer to his edition
3 Ed of Jāmnagar 1933
occurs in many names of the canonical works, and according to W. Schubring all these works form a group by themselves, the meaning of the word is clear and it always refers to the number of the chapters found in the particular book. It is only in case of the Vanhidasão that we find a disagreement between the title and the number of the chapters. In the present case also, there is no objection to take the word to mean ten chapters, because the additional two sections are expressly called Cūlikās and are clearly intended to be later additions. The second element of the name Veyāliya occurs in only one other text of the canon, viz., the Tandulaveyāliya a book included among the Patannas but also in the Ukkāliya section along with the Dasaveyāliya. But there the name means a calculation (veyāliya = vicāra) of the number of rice grains, and cannot have anything to do with the second element of the name of Dasaveyāliya.

A correct interpretation of the name is equally hard to find out. In this connection it is difficult to decide what meaning of the title was intended by the author of the Nījuttī, in spite of the three different attempts made by him to explain the name. In the introductory portion of the Nījuttī we find the analysis of the title as dāsa and kāla both the words receiving further elucidation. To explain the import of the word Dasa the author was led to explain the word ekka. On this verse the Cūrmi has preserved an interesting passage which runs:

एष्ठ कतेरेण इक्गेण ब्रह्मारो। भद्रायर्महाक्षेत्स्युमध्ये दस एष्ठ पजाव-ब्रह्मद्विद्यां शिष्ठीयम् तस्मा श्रेष्ठेष्ठा एष्ठ ब्रह्मारो। दत्तात्रिष्ठोरवस्ये शिष्ठम् तस्मा मुखायम् शत्रीयसमायेह विश्वद्र (ः १०७ १०८) तस्मा भावक्षे एष्ठम्। दोष विए एष्ठ शास्त्राय प्रकृतम्। भाव एष्ठ ब्रह्मारो॥ (p 4)

In spite of the assurance of the author and his own inclination towards the second view, it is undoubtedly the first which is historically correct and offers one more proof to say that the present work is
After the explanation of the number ‘one’ the Nijjutti goes to explain the number ‘ten’, and after that it states:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>vam</th>
<th>bhāvaḥ</th>
<th>bhāvam evaṃ dēs-kālāḥ kāle ṣ.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tathā yā yamasyo vā rayo bhavāḥ pargjatu tu bhāveṣaṃ. II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here it clearly states nine different senses of the word kāla and points out that in the present context the bhāva sense is applicable. What is meant by the bhāvakāla we are left to guess. The explanation of Haribhadra that it refers to ksāyika and other bhāvas of the soul is of no great use and like the above one of the Cūrmi on ekka is a convenient way for the commentators to pass over the difficulty. In fact Haribhadra has noticed the discrepancy between the words of the Nijjutti and his own explanation, and so he remarks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>yuddhaḥ</th>
<th>pargjatu bhāveṣeṃ tathā tathā kau n vishuddhate ihā.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>uvachyaḥ, tvāyān páyamkamkāloṣṭe stāttaṃbhāvai niṣṭhāv aṣṭādhaṇāḥ ṭaṅkātārāḥ ṭaṅkātārāḥ ṭaṅkātārāḥ ṭaṅkātārāḥ ṭaṅkātārāḥ ṭaṅkātārāḥ ṭaṅkātārāḥ ṭaṅkātārāḥ ṭaṅkātārāḥ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The remarks are sufficient to point out his inability to explain the intention of the author. The Cūrmi offers no more light on the point.

That Bhadrabhaḥu really meant to explain by the present remark the title of the work and was not merely speculating about the bhāva meaning of the word can be proved from many other places in the Nijjutti. While explaining the word mabhāgāra he remarks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ibhayam puna abhīgāro viśāyagamanāhi bhamarēḥm/117</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>While explaining the title of the third chapter he says paśkuddaṇa pagayam/185 So also we find him remarking ettham puna abhīgāro nīkāyakāena hara suttammas/289 ettham davaṇaṇāḥ abhīgāro/304 nīddesapasaṃsāḥ abhīgāro etthā aṇhayane/316 and in all these cases he is perfectly right.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are two more verses in the Nijjutti which offer another interpretation of the name. Verse 12 runs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sāmādhyavibhāṣyataḥ sayogāḥ, śīmavibhāṣyaḥ &amp;.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>niṣṭhāṁ fiṁreṇa bhāvamabhāvaṃ vasantālīṁ teṣaḥ II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This suggests that the work was called Dasakāliya because it was composed or culled out by Sejambhava when the period of time called Paurusī was over. Verse 15 of the same text runs

मण्डरण पद्व्य देशायन्वय निपुज्युत्तिया दसरकाल्यांः
बैरालियास ठावया तथावा बृक्षकाल्यां् नाम इि

Here also a nearly identical explanation is offered. Because the ten chapters which he culled out were placed at the time of Vikāla the work was called Dasakāliya. Besides the apparent disagreement between the two words of explanation ुगयापोरिस and ुवेयालियā with the title dasakāliya, there are two interpretations of the word vikāla possible. It may mean the time of the evening, as the commentators take it or it may mean an improper time, as is suggested by some modern scholars 6. The choice between the two for Bhadrabāhu's own interpretation cannot be decided on the mere authority of the commentators.

The Cūrṇī throws very little additional light on the question of interpreting the title. It remarks

विश्वनाथ कालो विश्वात्। अथवा विवेकाद्वाल विश्वविश्वविश्वात्तमादि
विश्ववत्तानाथ परभागम् बैकलिकम्। अथवा विवेकाद्वाल श्वात्त्रत्व बैकलिकम्। अथवा
दशानात्म अथवानान अथवाते दिने क्षतानात्म दशावैकालिकम्। (p 5)

Here he accepts the usual interpretation but makes a new suggestion in the form that because it is studied at an improper (or evening time) it is called Vaikālika. Haribhadra only accepts the usually accepted explanation that it was written in the evening and tries to explain the text of the Nījuttī according to it. After him both the form of the title and its interpretation were settled once for all and all later writers follow him closely.

Now all these explanations except the first obscure one of the Nījuttī are based upon the traditional story about the composition

6 Cp for a discussion of the title M V Patwardhan The Daśavakālikā A Study, pp 9-10. He himself accepts the traditional explanation

7 Cp Hema Pari V 86 Samayasundara, p 1
of the work. But even taking the story as it is, it is difficult to see how such a small detail, that the work was written in the evening, should give the title to it. This is much more striking in face of the fact that there was nothing abnormal about the time itself. It is true that the Uttarāddhyayāna prescribes the first and the last watch of the day and night for study (XXVI 12, 18) and the Čūrṇī remarks that the work was composed in the third Porisi, a little earlier. But Sejjambhava could have well waited a little more, and it would have made little difference, as Managa was to live six months more. The suggestion of the Čūrṇī is more to the point. The story tells us that Managa was to live only six months and it was not possible for him to complete the study of the scriptures in the usual method which extended over a very long period. We know that the Pūrvas can be studied by a monk in the 19th year of his Paryāya" and it was impossible for Managa to study them. This naturally led Sejjambhava to have selections from these works for the benefit of his short-lived son and he taught them to him irrespective of the time which are prescribed for the study of these works. As such the work would well receive the name Vaikālīka. In this very sense we can understand the words of the Njūttī ‘veyāhīyaḥ thavīyā’ (15). In fact, all these extractions from the Pūrva books were intended to bring the important contents of the works within the province of study of monks who cannot wait for the regualr period of time prescribed for their study. In this connection one remark in the Prakrit story as preserved in the Čūrṇī is instructive. For pointing out the motive of Sejjambhava to cull out these texts from the Pūrvas he remarks:

त छोटमुख्यों काहे पि कारणे समुपर्णे निजवहृद्।
दस्मपि धर्म अपपद्ध्वनो अपवस्था
मेव निजवहृद्॥

So, this rule has same value when we consider that the earlier monks were not allowed to violate the rules of study unless some specific
cause was available. But when the knowledge of the Purvas began to grow scarce it was allowed for the few who knew them to make extractions from them with the intention of preserving whatever little they can. It can be easily seen that these statements confirms the view of Charpentier\textsuperscript{9} that the Purvas were lost on account of their study being placed late in the regular plan of mastering the scriptures. I cannot see any strong reason to suppose that the work got the name Vaikālikā because it was culled out against the rules of doing so.

All these explanations however, accept the name to be Daśavaikālikā and see no contradiction between it and the other form Daśakālikā. But as seen above, the older name appears to be Daśakālikā and not Daśavaikālikā. The story itself, probably gave greater currency to the second form of the title.

To explain the title Daśakāliya we must try to know the meaning of the word kāliya. Two meanings of this word are of importance to us. There is a method of dividing the canon into four Anuyogas and it is common to both the sects of the Jaina community and as such must be very old. The very first of these Anuyogas is called the caranakaranānuyoga and the Daśavaikālikā Cūmi remarks tatsaba caranakaranānuugo nāma kāhyasuyum p 2. From this it appears that the canonical works dealing with carana or rules of good conduct and karana or rules of begging food were called by the name Kālika Śruta. This description passes very well with the contents of the Daśavaikālikā. We have further the authority of the Nijjutti to group the present work in this Anuyoga, because it remarks

\textit{अभ्युहलुहुत्तादि निदिष्टौ, एत्थ हृद अहियाः।।}
\textit{वर्णकर्माणि क्षेरों तस्स दारो इमे होतिन्॥}

There is, however, another meaning of the word kālika in connection with the texts of the canon. In the Nandi we get the older

\textsuperscript{9} Uttarāddhyayana, Intro pp 23 ff
classification of the canon into those into Angas and Angabāhiras, the second of which is divided into Āvassaya and Āvassayavairutta. The last is divided into Kāliya and Ukkāliya. The explanations of the two terms is given by Malayagiri,\textsuperscript{10} which runs

\begin{quote}
तत यद्विनिर्विषाधिकारसंबंधवाच्यं सर्वसिद्धं वि
यव गोकलतन्त्रिकूम्।

यत् पुनः कालवेलाभनि पतिते तत् उद्दालिकूम्॥
\end{quote}

and quotes a passage from the Cūrmi to the same effect. This second meaning also harmonises with the one suggested above. But this meaning of the word kālikā cannot be seen in the title because the text is included in the Utkālikā section and stands first in that list and not in the Kālikā one, which we should naturally expect if the word has this meaning in the title.

From the facts stated above we can conclude something about the real state of facts at different times in the history of the text, even though it must be admitted that it is something of a convenient supposition to explain the conflicting facts. To my mind, originally the work was called Daśakālikā and not Daśavaikālikā, as is amply proved from the words of the Nijuttī. Thus it really meant ‘ten chapters dealing with the rules of conduct and of begging food’, the word Kālikā being used in the sense of a part of the canon called caranakaranānuyoga or kālikāśruta. Later on when the book was canonised, as is suggested by the story, it was included in the Utkālikā group of the texts because it could be studied at any time of the day, though taken from the Pūrvas and at any year of the monk’s paryāya. Here, there must have arisen some confusion about the name Kālikā which, in close connection with the name of the group Utkālikā, was taken in the sense of a book to be studied at the prescribed time, as there was the other group of texts in contrast with it, even though the word was used in the title in quite a different sense, namely to mean a kind of part of the canon dealing

\textsuperscript{10} P 203b
with rules of conduct. Naturally to overcome the supposed discrepancy the title was changed to Daśavaikālika, a term identical in meaning with Utkālika and a trace of which meaning is preserved in the remark of the Cūrṇi. Later on the title was explained in the light of the story to mean the book composed at the time of the evening, another meaning of the term vikāla. This was tried to be supported by the facts of the story as best as they could, and thus both the name and its interpretation were settled in a form quite different from their original nature.

A M Ghataf
Origin and Early History of Caityas

Sanctuaries of different kinds are frequently met with in the Buddhist literature. "The most general name for a sanctuary as Kern says is Caitya (Pāli, Cetiya), a term not only applying to buildings, but to sacred trees, memorial stones, holy spots, images, religious inscriptions. Hence all edifices having the character of a sacred monument are caityas, but not all caityas are edifice." As I have said elsewhere, the custom of worshipping foot-prints was in vogue before the time of the Buddha, and so also it will be seen that the worship of caityas was in existence long before the epoch of the Buddha. Its probable origin can be traced to the Vedic ritual of cayana. The term caitya does not occur in the Samhitās. The earliest work in which the term occurs is the Āśvalāyana Grhyasūtra, assigned generally to the sixth century B.C., but probably belongs to a much earlier date. Before we proceed to examine the use of this term caitya in the Āśvalāyana Gr Sū or other works of equal authority, let us examine it etymologically. The expression admits of several etymological transformations and one is citiya idam = caityam.

Now 'What is caitya?' The Satapatha Brāhmaṇa explains caitya as that which could be used for cayana, or more appropriately, that which is fit for cayana. Though the term caitya as such does not occur in the Aitareya or Satapatha Brāhmaṇa, still it is significant.

1. Manual of Indian Buddhism, (1896), p 91
2. Proceedings of All-India Fifth Oriental Conference (1930)—'The History of Early Buddhism in India' p 930
3. See in this connection the Indian Antiquary, vol XI, pp 20-22
4. For an explanation of Agni-caitya see Martin Haug—Transl of Art. Br., V Note 28
5. चोद्वैव विषय अवासित । चेतन्यो वास्तवितस्मातस्माचिलविविध ३ एवार्थ यज्ञार्थमभवति । चेतन्यो वास्तवित तस्मात एव विषय ॥ VI 1 2 16 (Bib Indica)
to note the use of the expression *cātya* from which the original expression caitya has been undoubtedly derived. In the older Sāmhitās we find the use of the term *cātya*. In the *Taittirīya Sāmhitā*, in the fifth kānda, we have the following lines:

*Rūpāṇi|sarvāṇi|rūpāṇi*  
*agnau|cītye|kṛiyante|tas-māt|etāḥ|agneh|cītyasya*  

Thus we hear of an Agni-cītya to which offerings are made. The term *cītyam* again occurs in the *Atharva Veda* but it is doubtful whether here an Agni-cītya is meant. Whatever this may be, there is clear evidence of an Agni-cītya and its use in the Vedic sacrifices. And this may be regarded as the origin and commencement of Caitya cult which reached very large dimensions in the post-Vedic period. But there are other derivations of the word caitya. First is *cītyāyā idam*. Secondly, the commentator on the *Amara* derives it thus:

*cīyate pāsānādīnā cātyam*

This is supported by Mitāksara where, in commenting on the term cātya in *Yājñāvalkya*, II 151, it is rendered *pāsānādi bandhyah*. This means that which is built of stone. Thirdly, caitya may be from *cīt* or *cīta*, where the terminations *ti* and *ta* are added to *cīt*. These can be interpreted as funeral pile or Agni. In this case *cīta + ya* makes it *cīt + ya* which leads to the form cītya. Sometimes the use of the term *cīta* is extended to *śmaśānam*. In commenting on the text of the *Rāmāyana—cītya mālyānulepa*, the commentator Govindarāja observes thus:

*cītā śmaśānam tatra bhavam cītyam tādṛśam mālyam*:

The expression *cātyāṣṭhāna* in the *Arthasastra* (Bk V 2) refers to the burial ground. In all these derivations it must be remembered...
that every expression is ultimately derived from the root *cit* meaning to collect, to pile up or to build. This furnishes the certain clue that the original term was *citiya* as we saw it used in the Samhitās and Brāhmanas and by the time of the Āśvalāyana Gr Sū, the ancients have developed what is known as *caitya yajña*. Thus we see both the terms *citiya* and *caitya* are correlated and connoted one and the same thing in the second half of the Vedic period. Thus the *Sabdakalpadruma* quotes an ancient text of Bharata to indicate that *caitya* is *Yajñasthāna* or *Yajñāyatana*. This is a sacred place set apart for the performance of *Yajñas*. It may possess *citiya* or it may not possess one. Still it went by the name of *caitya*.

In the Vedic literature we find two uses of *cayana*. One form is that it was a sacrifice in itself. There are several kinds of *cayana* sacrifice, and one of them too familiar to students of *Yajur-Veda* is the Garudacayana-yāga. In this yāga, special *Istakas* or bricks are made with given dimensions, and these are spread in the form of a Garuda as if lying down on the earth. On it different *bomas* or oblations are performed. The other was that it formed part of a great sacrifice like the Aśvamedha. Here it was not an independent yajña. The *caitya* ritual consisted in collecting the sacred ashes and the sacrificial utensils, towards the very end of the sacrifice, and piling them up in a certain place apparently fenced with walls of stone, brick or even mud. The idea underlying was that things used in a Vedic yajña ought not get defiled by the village or stranger or by any animal or beast. It is pointed out in the text quoted above.

---

9 यास्थान कैचिनु मुखरहित देवकलपरस्य यज्ञयतन सविलमयिलमपीयायुः।
10 Readers of this paper will learn with interest that the yajña was performed on Vedic lines within last thirty years by two eminent pandits of Tanjore District. The late Pandit Bāskrūsha Sastriar of Tiruvādi did it at Tiruvādi, and after the yajña he got the whole place fenced with brick wall, so that the place may not get contaminated with any impurity. The other was my oldest brother Rāmaswamī Dikshitar of Vighnampet who performed it on the banks of the Vaishālī river at Tiruvadamarudur, a village very near Kumbakonam.
that such yajñâyatana was devoid of mukha (mukha-rabitam). In other words there was no opening that led into it. It was a kind of enclosure all round. It resembled in shape and size a devakula, by which Hindu temples were meant in ancient India.

In this connection we must not fail to take note of the fact that not only in later Vedic literature but in the Mahabharata and Ramayana, we find a combination so to say of caitya and yūpa. Yūpa, it is too well known, is the sacrificial post to which the animal to be sacrificed was generally tied. And no one can dispute that wherever yūpa is mentioned, there emerges the fact of Vedic yajña being performed. It is the unquestionable emblem of denoting that some yāga had been performed there. We shall examine this further.

Taking up the Mahabharata we find the interesting statement "caitya-yūpa-satāṅkita" in the Adiparva, meaning the region made sacred by the caitya and yūpa. It needs no stretch of imagination to infer that caitya and yūpa under reference were found in one and the same place. Conclusion is, therefore, irresistible that caitya was intimately associated with the place where Vedic yajña had been performed. In another place the epic refers in glowing terms that the country is full of caityas and yūpas" implying again that caityas were places of sacred yajñas. If we turn next to the Ramayana, we meet with the same description. When Rāma went through the Kosala en route to the Dandaka forests, he found the whole country decked with caityas and yūpas. Vālmiki mentions in another
place¹⁴ that the whole region was spotted with hundreds of caityas. In these places the reference is undoubtedly to yajñasthāna, and the particular combination of caitya with yūpa deserves to be particularly noted. Add to this the evidence of the Mrocha-katika.¹⁵ In the tenth Act Cārdātta recalls to his mind how he and his ancestors have performed hundreds of yajñas when the Vedic chanting of Brāhmaṇas in the caityas of the yajñamandapa rent the air. The association of caitya with brahmaghosa is noteworthy.

Proceeding to examine the evidence of the Aśvalāyana Gr Sa, we find for the first time the mention of a caitya sacrifice. Whether the reference to the caitya by Aśvalāyana is a reference to the Vedic caitya, or yajñasthāna, or to something else, is the question. H. Oldenberg who has translated this and other Grhyaśūtras,¹⁶ agrees with Professor Stenzler who renders it “Denkmal” or any religious shrine. The caitya sacrifice is thus described.¹⁷ Before the Svistakṛt offering, one should offer a bali to the caitya. If the caitya

¹⁴ कष्णिकाब्रह्माण्डस्य धुमिकितमनाशक ।

devstānāṁ prānaprasa tatrākhyopahosāyaḥ || 1b 100 44

The term caitya (also caitya) is commented upon as follows.

अष्टेश्वरजनादीवण्डनस्यदेशसमग्रे ।

它们的组合方式以 yūpa 为例值得注意。

महाशत्तपरिणामो गोकुलद्रामीति मे

它们的组合方式以 yūpa 为例值得注意。

सदस्य-निबिडः वैनमण्डलयोः पुरस्तात् ।

它们的组合方式以 yūpa 为例值得注意。

तमस्मि वर्षादाय वर्षामनस्य पत्रे

它们的组合方式以 yūpa 为例值得注意。

स्तस्यस्तदससक्सैृष्टि ध्यते योप्यमानं ॥

Act X 12

¹⁵ SBE, vols 29 and 30

¹⁶ यदृ ये विद्विधम्

पलाशाश्च यति ये वक्ता किस्मा हर्षमयं दुःखधर्मम् हृदिन्तः ग्रज्जये स्वाभवात दुःखधर्मम्

तस्मि बलिः ह्रदेते चैन यौगिकं तुम्यमिति यो दुःखधर्मम् ॥ २ विद्विधम् वेदन्तस्तरम् विविधम्

तति चैन यौगिकं तुम्यमिति यो दुःखधर्मम् ॥ ३ नाम्या वेदन्तस्तरम् विविधमिति किविभवेन तत्रित्यमिति ||

(Anandāśrama ed.)

This text forms the tenth Kanda of the Trivandrum edition with the commentary of Haradarśanacārya, edited by Dr. T. Ganapati Sastri. There it is divided into 8 parts, unlike four in the Anandāśrama edition.
is situated at a distant place, he should send the bals through a leaf messenger. This messenger takes it on a carrying pole. If the caitya were situated at a place which could be reached by fording a river or crossing a dangerous path, suitable means were arranged to get at the caitya. There are two views on this sacrifice. One is the view of the commentator Nārāyana according to whom caitya is derived as citte bhava. He explains that a man makes a vow to a certain deity that if his wish be granted he would offer a sacrifice, and this sacrifice, according to Nārāyana, is the caitya sacrifice. The other view is that of Oldenberg who thinks whether or not the whole rite was not purely symbolical. One thing is certain that this sacrifice was not done at residential quarters. It was done in the place where the caitya was situated. The text is very clear about this. Another thing we note here is that the caitya was no more yajña-sthāna. For do we not hear of caitya yajña in the text of the Āsvalāyana? This yajña is an orthodox sacrifice performed by the followers of Vedic cult. From the time of Āsvalāyana onwards we find the use of the application of the term caitya extended. There is a transition from Agni-caityas to Anagni-caityas, or in other words, from a fire cult to a fireless cult. We read in the epics and especially in the Rāmāyana of caitya grhas,19 caitya prāśadas,20 and caitya vrksas. It is difficult to arrive at a correct explanation of these terms. Caitya grha is explained by some caityasya samīpe grham.

18 Cp Bhāg Purāṇ, III 26 70
19 भृसीधाहेश्वरदायातखरावेशकानिधि । V 12 14
ैविाव्यासारमान्तु मेह-प्राप्ततत्तमं । V 43, 3
20 It is worth while to read the whole chapter. It is said that Hanumān set fire among others to caityaprāśada, when the guards of caitya attacked him in vain.
21 श्रुतं पतल्लित चेतास्मिन् मायेतु न गरेणु च ।
नौलङ्कोहितपिताधि भवत्वमिहः नो दिनेन् ॥ Mbh VI 3 40

See also Rāma II 6 11

See again in this connection Suddhānta, The Heroic Age of India, pp 205-9
and by others catuspatha mandapa. We have the use of catuścātya also. It seems to be a primitive practice to have some apology for a shrine at the termini of four streets or four roads and offer worship at that shrine. Such temples are mentioned in the Sangam literature of the ancient Tamils also. Perhaps in this sense Vālmiki uses it when Daśaratha is said to have distributed food to the poor from caityas on the eve of Rāma's coronation as Yuvarāja. Vālmiki describes caityaprāśāda as situated in Lankā, supported by a thousand columns and majestic in appearance. It is quite reasonable to assume that a temple is under reference. It was perhaps the biggest temple in the whole of Lankā and richly furnished by Rāvana. It must be noted that the term prāśāda means ordinarily a shrine. Next caitya-vrksas are alluded to in the epic. For example when Vālmiki describes that Rāvana was as fearful looking as śmaśāna-caitya, it only means the caitya or tree growing in the burial ground. Some lexicons appropriately give among other meanings to the caitya, devatāru, uddeśavrksa. In the Sabdakalpadruma we read under caitya-vrksa Caityastadākbyayā prasiddho vrksah. It further enlightens by saying that it was Aśvattha tree. The worship of trees was an age-long practice in India, and latterly some trees became demarcated caityas, and worship was offered to them. In certain cases, as we see in the law-books of Manu and Yājñavalkya, they were trees generally in the burial ground which marked the boundary limits of the village. According to Manu, underneath

22. See for instance Sabdārthaṃjñānam. We have Vedic authority to show that sacrifice was performed at catuspatha.

23. For a combination of devāyatana caitya see later ch. 71, 41.

24. The Arthāśāstra refers to such trees—Bk V 2 and Bk XIII 2.
their shade Candāla and similar castes were to find their residence 25. Yājñavalkya definitely places the caityas as serving the boundary limits of a grāma or janapada 26. In some cases they were boundaries of gardens and fields 27. In these cases it may be a tree or even a building. But the trees of the caitya or caitya trees are certainly alluded to in another place where the same law-giver forbids cutting of the branches of those trees under heavy penalty 28.

Perhaps in this sense the great poet Kālidāsa uses the expression in his immortal Meghasandeesa 29. The fact then that Daśaratha's queen and Rāma's mother, Kaushalyā, sent forth her prayer, on the eve of Rāma's departure to Dandaka forests, to the caityas 30 and invoked their choice blessings to protect him from all dangers natural to a forest zone, shows that they were also regarded as fit places for worship. In more than one place Kautalya refers to caityas as houses of gods 31. Kautalya refers to caitya-pūjā in peculiar circumstances.

---

25 Bhālavā mṛtyuprāṇeṇa śāleputrakeṇa च।
कमेयुंश्रेष्ठ विष्णुवर्त्तकं कल्पेभि। X 50

26 के येवले संसार वर्त्तातीते तुप्रेषुम। संभवस्मीकायन्नाथपत्ता रस्वलचिताम्। II 151

27 See Kaut Artha, II 4 and 35

28 वैश्वस्नायास्मादू पुष्यभाने दुराय।
जातदं भवण द्रुपो दसो विवेशे च। विवुङ्ग।। Yajña. II 128

The Viṣṇu Pūrāṇa associates trees with caityas, (III 12 13). It prescribes in the preceding chapter that a householder should avoid caityas [Ib, II 122]. This prescription demonstrates that caityas are no more Vedic places of worship,—yet another stage in the history of caityas.

29 पार्वत्यमयोपनन्दन्त भैरवे सुविभवते
मीरवर्धपूर्वै हरिलिपुजामाकलामाषै।
तब्यासने परिशातकस्यामज्ञववान्ता
संस्तनं ते हरिविद्विदन्यमयो दराय।। 23

30 जेवम प्रायमध्ये पुल जैनस्वरत्तनेतु च।
ते च त्वामिरधन्तु वसे सह महविभी। II 25 4

31 Arthaśāstra, Bk I 20, Bk XII 5
In those days when people were much more superstitious, they believed in demons and the harm done to them by them. In order to avert the evil attacks of demons, the people offered puja to the caityas. The method and time of offering are prescribed. On full and new moon days the caitya was propitiated by offering at the altar an umbrella, a small flag and goat's flesh. Kautalya speaks of caitya-devata and davata caityam. Thus we see the prominence given to caitya worship in the Arthaśāstra. Hence these were known also as devakula or devāyatana, and devavāsa. From that of the shrine the application of caitya was extended to a bumba or deity in the shrine. We hear of this more in the Buddhist and Jaina books.

The foregoing survey establishes beyond doubt that caityas are a pre-Buddhist institution. The Buddhists and Jains found that the masses of the land looked upon these as sacred altars and venerated them highly. They therefore thought, to venture a conjecture, better to give the old name to their sanctuaries instead of inventing a new one. Hence the caitya was adopted as the name of their sacred shrines, whether they contained the images of the Buddha or Jina or their relics. This is the last phase in the history of the word caitya. It is said that in Buddhist books the term is also applied to a tree as well as to a stūpa. The term in Pāli is as already seen cetṣya and in Tamil also it is cetṣyam. The worship of the Buddhists became so much identified with the caitya that we have an interesting precept.

Cetṣyam vandeta, meaning that one is expected to offer his worship to the caitya or in the caitya. In the course of a learned disquisition on svārgakāmo ṣajeta, the Bhāmati of Vācaspati on Śankara's Brahmaśūtra-bhāṣya refers to this precept, as a side issue, as construing the relation of the imperative suffix to the unseen.

32 Bk IV ch 3 33 Bk I ch 20 34 Bk V ch 2
35 See, for instance, the Vācaspatyam
36 Pampa, Adi Purāṇam, X st 241 vacana (Mysore Oriental Library)
potentiality, while in fact the Buddhist precept does not have the least implication of desire for heaven." In a note to the above statement the editors remark as follows: "It would appear from the Rṣyaprakāśika that the statement is 'Caityaṃ vandeta,' not 'Caitye vandeta,' so that the obeisance is to the caitya, not in the caitya. Conformably to this, caitya would mean not a shrine, but the consecrated fig-tree which Buddhists offer worship." But one has to point out that the statement 'caityam vandeta' would itself admit of both interpretations, namely, obeisance to the caitya or in the caitya. It may also be pointed that the caitya need not necessarily be the consecrated fig-tree but any shrine sheltering a relic of the Buddha or even his image. Before we proceed further, attention may be drawn to the fact that the consecrated fig tree which the Buddhists worship is the sacred Aśvattha of Sanskrit literature. How the Aśvattha has been an object of veneration and adoration by the Hindus can be seen from a single soul-stirring stanza of the Bhagavad Gītā. It means 'They say the inexhaustible Aśvattha has its roots above, its branches below the chandas are its leaves. He who knows it knows the Vedas. Upwards and downwards extend its branches which are enlarged by the qualities and the sprouts which are sensuous objects.' Thus it is seen that even in the choice of their sacred tree, the Buddhists took to the tree traditionally venerated by their Hindu ancestors.

38 Ibid., p. 303.
39 उपेयमुलयशाखामबल्यां प्राहुर्व्ययम्।
बन्धुरस्ति यथपरिन्यर्लम वेद शेषप्रतिम्।। XV I

Even to-day circumambulating this tree daily or on certain fixed days is considered to be a meritorious deed by the Hindus. Not only it cannot be used for fuel but it is the only tree from which the fire for a Vedic Yajña can be got by churning, and its twigs used as oblations to the sacred fire.
Remark has already been made that the caityas had either the images of the Buddha or Jina installed in them or contained the relics dhātu—in the Buddhist parlance. The dhātus or relics are of three kinds. First there were corporeal relics or sarira-dhātus. It is said that the neckbone of the Buddha was enshrined in a caitya in Ceylon. Secondly, there were paribhogika-dhātu, or relics which were actually used by the person (paribhoga). These may be clothes, ornaments, alms-bowl etc. used by the Buddha. Thirdly, there were the uddeśika-dhātu, which has been rendered indicative relics. Under this category may come images etc. of the person worshipped. Thus the caityas of the Buddhists were mostly relic-shrines, though ordinary shrines also went by that name. The Buddhist legends attribute to king Asoka the building of as many as 84,000 caityas. Though this may not be literally true, still it is reasonable to suppose that he, a tolerant monarch, would have encouraged building of some caityas in his time, whether Buddhist or Hindu. The story of the Buddha’s great decease, the cremation of the corpse, the distribution of his corporeal relics and their enshrinement in caityas and stupas are all elaborately narrated in the Mahāparinibbāna-sutta, an ancient Pāli work of perhaps the fourth century B.C. Thus there is ample evidence which elucidates that Buddhist stupas and caityas were shrines which sheltered the three kinds of relics referred to above. This does not mean that there were no caityas or stupas before the Buddha. We have seen a number of references in the Vedic and epic literature of the existence of such institutions in ancient India, which evoked religious awe from the masses. It is not, therefore, surprising.

40 IRAS, 1907, pp 343-44
41 Cp the reliefs on the rails of the Bāhirāt Stūpa
See the preamble to the Kalha-bodhi Jātaka
42 IRAS, 1916, p 883
43 See ch 26 of the Dṛyāvadāna, a Sanskrit Buddhist work
44 See for details Dr Fleet’s article in the IRAS, 1906, p 657
to read in the *Mahāparinibbānasutta* that the Buddha spoke of the efficiency of erecting dhātu-caityas, and himself visited caityas like Udena, Gotama, Sattambaka, etc., while the *Dīgha Nikāya* bears testimony to the fact that the Buddha lived at the Ānanda-cetiya in Bhojanagara. As these and other references to the Caitya in the Buddhist literature have been elaborately examined by Dr. B. C. Law, I do not propose to traverse the same ground. Suffice it to say that this is an additional proof to demonstrate that the caityas were pre-Buddhistic institutions and the Buddhists as well as Jains gave the same name to their sanctuaries.

V R Ramchandra Dikshitar

45 Chap. III, secs. 36-47 and especially 47
46 'Idān' eva kho tāham Ānanda ajja Cāpālam cetiyam āmantesam
47 Ramanyā Ānanda Ve ti, ramanyam Udānam cetiyam, tamanyam Gotamakam cetiyam, ramanyam Sattambam cetiyam, tamanīyam Bahuputram cetiyam, ramanyam Sārandadam cetiyam, tamanyam Čāpālam cetiyam
48 See also Dr. B. C. Law, *History of Pāli Literature*, p. 100
Identification of the Siddharāja-Saras

In a work called the Sarasvatipurāṇa, devotéd mainly to the description of holy places or tirthas associated with the river Sarasvati in Gujarat falling into the gulf of Kutch, there is a good deal of description of a lake called सिद्धराजसर. This lake, the Sarasvatipurāṇa tells us, was formed from the river Sarasvati itself — Folio 110a (of Ms No 429 of Viṣ I) —

"एवं सरस्वती भ्रमणं प्राचीनभ्रमा सरिद्रा ।
महता च जलाभिनि मस्तकमछुच्चपनाहिना ॥१२४॥
हसमानेन फेनोधः रावतन्तुः लक्ष्मी सा ।
ताक्ष्या सरिद्राया सहिता पूर्योमास तत्त्वम ॥१२५॥

1 MSS of the Sarasvatipurāṇa mentioned by Aufrecht are —
Part I p 699—"Kh 64 B 2, 34; BL 2, Gu 3, Bhk 14, Poona 429 (a Śradāpurāṇa is frequently quoted by Hemādu) Out of these MSS the MS available to me is "Poona 429 which is the same as No 429 of Viṣ I in the Govt MSS Library at the B.O.R Institute, Poona

2 See N L Dey's Geographical Dictionary (London, 1927) pp 180-181 where various identifications of the river Sarasvatī are recorded. We are concerned here with the river Sarasvati which is an affluent of the river Kuwarkā falling into the gulf of Kutch

3 Hemacandra, a contemporary of Siddharāja refers to this lake as follows in verse 114 of canto XV of the Dvyāśrayakāvyā

"श्रवणक्षेत्र युद्ध सरस्वतिः तु कृतकु ।
प्राप्तेविरिध्यं स पूतं चक्षु महासर ॥११४॥"

Abhayatilagani who wrote his Commentary on the Dvyāśrayakāvyā in Sam 1312 AD 1256 comments on the above verse as follows —

"स राजा सहस्राशिद्राय राजासर: एवं चक्षु कारयाव"
(Vide analysis of this Kāvyā in IA, IV, p 269) cf also verse 117 of canto XV of the Dvyāśrayakāvyā —

"श्रीमोः सहस्रपदों च श्रायतनानि सरस्वति"
Identification of Siddharāja-Saras

This lake, thereafter, became the abode of all heavenly beings as Siddharāja established one thousand lingas of god Śiva all round it —

"तथा नागा सुपर्णांश् सिद्धराजस्वराध ये।
सरित रामरा सं बुधविकाशलायः।।३।।
शहस्त्र यज्ञ लिङ्गानां सीतेन प्रतिगुः।
निवारणं रोचयामधुः।।१२।।"

The place in course of time attained great celebrity as a centre of religious purification —

"एकसिद्धेव शिवकृष्णेश्वरे। मुक्तिदेव उपायम्।
कि पुनर्वासहस्त्र लिङ्गानां पुरत् शिवम्।।१३॥

तिष्ठु लोकेन्द्र विषयत सिद्धराजस्वरः।।४०॥"

It became pre-eminent among the holy places owing to the presence of 1000 Śiva lingas —

"सब्यासेव तीर्थानामः स्थापनाविश्वेत्।
सहस्त्र यज्ञ लिङ्गाना विषयत् देववर्धः सह।।१४॥

Even god Keśava made this place his abode to please king Siddharāja —

"भ्रोष्ण शिवराजस्वर्या पुलेक्ष्वरस्वागरे।
सहस्त्रायं जगधोरै तस्मिन्निविभिइ कैशवः।।१५॥

यद शैवे स भवसनां ॥ योगसनां समाविष्ठ ॥
तस्यात् सुकिंद्र ब्रह्म षडविकाशान्तिस्वयम्।।१६॥

भारत तीर्थेन्त्र यज्ञ परियति जलसाधिनम्।
सवेशांबनिविजयम् हृदेवस्तु प्राप्तविष्ठे।।४०॥"

4 About the temple in the centre of the Sahastaling Talav Burgess observes — "In the centre was an island on which stood the temple of Rudrśvara destroyed of course by the Muslims, who raised a large octagonal Rauzah on its ruins, but of this only the dilapidated remains now exist.” It appears from verses 48, 49, 50 of the Sarasvatipurāṇa quoted above that the central temple was of Keśava or Viṣnu.
Identification of Siddharāja-Saras

In front of god Keśava is situated the दशावतारक तीर्थ in the Siddharāja lake —

“तत्स्म देवस्य पुरात तस्मिन सरस सद्दिशितम्।
दुष्टवतारकं नाम...प्रजाशानम्॥१४॥”

The ten images of the ten incarnations of god were established at the दशावतार तीर्थ by Siddharāja himself. These ten images are of the ten avatāras viz —

(१) मन्द्य (२) कृष्ण (३) वराह (४) सरस्वती (५) वासु (६) नारायण (७) दशरथ (८) कुष्ण (९) चुबं and (१०) कल्यन (verses 61 and 62)

Another तिर्थa called the दशावतारिक तीर्थ is situated in front of the image of वामनावतार —

“वामनस्यामात्रलं कुरुचेल सदस्दिशितम्।
दशावतारिकं तीर्थं तद्यथैर पुरात सिद्धिम्।
. नामांकेलाना यत् हवात् फलं लमेतं।॥५॥”

Sumati now asks Mārkandeya to explain to him the genesis of the 1000 Śiva lingas which is then explained in a mythical style as follows

“श्रीकृष्ण यानि लिङ्गानि विस्मृक्षानि तदानज्ञे।
तेवा सहस्र्युद्ध सिद्धा समान्यत ॥२॥
स्थायितं सिद्धाराजनं तस्मिन् पुराणरोचे।
सहस्र बाणिज्याना ्षुगमश्रृंखितां ॥०॥

The purificatory powers of a single Śiva linga have been mentioned by god Śiva himself, in the शिवशास्त्र. What can be the power of 1000 Śiva lingas? —

“एषु पृथिवीसः श्रुः शिवरम् कथित सद्यम्।
सहस्र दशयते यस ्ष कि ताभये सया।॥०॥”

Siddharāja practised penance on a mountain called the अमरावतेक and then took his bath in the waters of the river

and not of Rudresvara and this fact is consistent with the दशावतारक तीर्थ in front of the god Keśava in the same lake containing the images of the 10 incarnations of god Visnu as described in detail by the Sarasvatipurāṇa (verses 61-62 of chap xvi)
Narmadā (v 90) God Omkār was pleased at this and granted Siddharāja a boon, promising that he would thenceforward reside permanently on the embankment of the Sahasralinga Lake —

“तथा सहस्लिन्धाना स्थायित तत्सरस्ते।
लब कुस्मायस्या नित्यं स्वर्गं ते श्रीरिकामसं। ॥१२७॥”

Then follows a long फल्प्रतिष्ठाति dealing with the effects of religious rites performed at the Sahasralinga tirtha, followed by the following praśasti of king Siddharāja and his Lake —

“न सिद्धराजस्मो राजा न सरस्लादवं क्रियत ।
समं सहस्लिन्धेन तीर्थं मन्त्रं ( । ) दर्ये ॥१२१॥
वद्रागरास्थि तेनेव स्थायितस्दिन सरस्ते ।
श्रीवालोणा यतिना च तुप्यं च तपसिन ॥१२१॥
सर्वकामस्मदवानि शोभायेन तामि सुवर्त ।
श्रीवालोणां देवाना लोके सिंवं इव स्थित ॥१२२॥
उनमति चैव निशा च श्रीसमस्तेन प्रकाशित ।
सिद्धराजेन वदेन स्वेत ता स्वायम सोहदी ॥१२२॥
सिद्धराजस्मो राजा न भूतो न भविष्यति ।
सहस्र चेन लिन्धाना कुपश्वयंश्च स्वर्यं ॥१२४॥”

Chapter XVI from which the above information has been extracted is designated सिद्धराजमाहातम्यवर्णेन and it ends with the following verses —

Folio 121b “इदं छ य शिष्यन्यथं जन्मा
स्वयंति भक्तया पुर्वोत्तमस्ति ।
प्रामोदी कामानस्तलानितिैव
प्रतांति किम्यो परमं पदं स ॥१६६॥
ये सिद्धराजस्य चरितमेतत
पदन्ति स्वयंवति च सूलवन्ति ।
ते सिद्धकामा सुलिनो सुनुक्षा
स्मुक्षपायाय सदा संवुद्धान्ति ॥१६६॥”

I shall now record the description 5 of the Sahasralinga Talāv the construction of which has been ascribed to king Jayasimha Siddha-

5 Burgers and Cousens ‘Architectural Antiquities of Northern Gujarat’ (Arch Survey of Western India, vol IX), London, 1903, pp 38-39
rāja of Gujarat (AD 1093-1143) Various artificial lakes or reservoirs in Gujarat are ascribed to Siddharāja. "One of the largest of these was the Sahasralinga tālāv, or tank of the thousand Śaiva shrines at Pattan the remains of which are still pointed out to the north-west of the town. It must have been a reservoir of immense size, and derived its name from the numerous little temples containing lingas, placed on the steps around it. In the centre was an island on which stood the temple of Rudrēśvara destroyed of course by the Muslims, who raised a large octagonal Rauzah on its ruins, but of this only the dilapidated remains now exist." "The basin of the lake is now converted into little fields. The great embankment surrounding it appears to be composed throughout of solid brick-work and this was once faced with solid masonry forming flights of steps to the water's edge. On and above these steps stood the thousand shrines of which fragmentary remains are still found buried in the debris of the embankment." "This tank is said to have been begun by Jayasimha Siddharāja shortly before he set out against Yaśovarman, the sovereign of Mālava and is the theme of legend and song."

A historical incident associated with this tank is the stabbing of Bairām Khān, the famous minister of Humayun, when alighting from a boat after a sail on the tank on Friday the 31st January 1561. Bairām Khān rebelled against Akbar and was sent to Makka. He came to Patan and was hospitably received by Musā Khān Fūlādi the

6 Vide pp 973-977 of Dynamic History of Northern India by Dr Hem Chandra Ray, vol II (1936)—Jayasimha was a great builder. Besides the Sahasralinga Tālāv the temple of Rudramahākala at Siddhapur is also ascribed to him. (The Sarasvatēpurāṇa contains a description of this temple and some genealogy of Siddharāja but I shall deal with this material in a separate paper.) Jayasimha appears to have been a devotee of the Śaiva faith. The era known as the Simha era was already in use in Jayasimha's reign (Vide Atru Stone Inscription dated in the year 14 of this era as also Mangrol inscription of Kumārapāla dated in the 32 year of this era). One sorrow viz. the want of a son gnawed at his heart. Dr Ray (p 975) gives a table showing the relationship of Kumārapāla with his predecessor Jayasimha.
Governor, but was stabbed by Mubarak as described above. Burgess further remarks that during the 14th century all the rich shrines of the Hindus (Brahmanical or Jain) were desecrated, plundered and demolished at the will or caprice of the Moguls. If this statement is applicable to the Sahasralinga Talav we may presume that the shrines on the embankment of this talav may have been destroyed in the 14th century. I am of opinion that the Sarasvatipurana was composed at a time when the tirthas associated with the river Sarasvati had attained so sacrosanct a character as to necessitate the creation of a special purana like the Sarasvatipurana. It would also be reasonable to suppose that when this purana was composed all the tirthas on the banks of the river Sarasvati were quite in a flourishing condition, free from the ravaging hands of the Moguls.

The Bombay Gazetteer records the following information about the Sahasralinga Talav —

"The Schesling or Sahasraling Talav, the tank with the thousand shrines, was dedicated to Shiv by Sidh Raj just before he set out on his expedition against Yashovarman, king of Malava. A merchant left nine lakhs of Balotras with a certain banker and died. The heirs of the latter knew nothing of the sum and refused to take it. Jai Singh Sidh Raj decided that the money should be spent in building a reservoir, and it was done, "the finest in the world, hitherto unsurpassed by all that the cleverest and wisest have executed or imagined, and it remains to this day (AD 1200-1230)"."

I believe the foregoing description of the Sahasralinga tank if compared with that given in the Sarasvatipurana leaves no doubt that the Siddharaja Saras described in the latter work is exactly identical.

7 Hemacandra, a contemporary of Siddharaja Jayasimha informs us (in chapter xv, verse 118 of the Dvayosraya Mahakavya) that Siddharaja Jayasimha caused to be made the Sahasralinga tank and established also schools for learning Nyaya-sastras, Nyaya-sastras, and the Puranas. Perhaps the Sarasvatipurana may have been the outcome of the study of Puranas instituted by Jayasimha.

8 Bombay Gaz. vol VII (Baroda) p 600
with that now known to history and archaeology. It appears, however, that though the tank was called a Sahasralinga-saras the actual number of Śaiva shrines on the bank of this lake was one thousand and eight as stated by Hemacandra. The testimony of Hemacandra being contemporary must be taken as conclusive on the question of the exact number of the Śaiva shrines on the bank of the Siddharāja lake.

P K Gode

9 Vide BSS, LXIX (Dvīpārāya Kāvya), canto XV, v 117
10 I take this opportunity of thanking Mr. Ambalal B. Jani (Assistant Secretary, Forbes Gujarati Sabha, Bombay) at whose request I began my study of the historical material in the Sarasvatipurāṇa in April 1937. Mr. Jani was also kind enough to keep the contents of this paper in May 1937 at the disposal of the scholar entrusted with the work of editing the Sarasvatipurāṇa. I am not aware to what extent the contents have been useful to the above editor in the preparation of his proposed edition of the work. I await with eagerness this edition of the Sarasvatipurāṇa for which I have supplied to the Forbes Gujarati Sabha a copy of the BOR Institute MS No 429 of Viś 1 (from the Vishrambag Collection of the Peshwas in the Govt MSS Library)
Hāthigumpha Inscription of Khāravela
(Revised Edition)

[The Hāthigumpha inscription of Khāravela, as is well-known, is the main old Brāhmī inscription in an open cave on the Udayagiri hill which is situated three miles due west of the Bhubaneswar temple. The record which was first noticed by Sterling is engraved "on the overhanging brow of a natural cavern, very little improved and enlarged by art." It is, as observed by Indraji, "in seventeen lines occupying a space about eighty-four feet square." "The face of the rock does not appear to have been well smooth for the work, but the letters are large and deeply carved. Time and weather have wrought ravages. The first six lines are well preserved. The last four, partly so. The greater part of the intervening space has been much spoilt, portions of it being entirely weather-beaten, while in other portions single letter or groups of letters can still be made out. The left corner of the inscription, in especial, has been greatly injured, and the initial letters of eight lines in that direction are entirely lost."

K P Jayaswal, who together with R D Banerji made the decipherment and interpretation of this historical record his life-work and greatly succeeded in achieving it, remarked to the same end, as early as 1917, "The rock was roughly dressed on the right-hand side. The chisel marks of the dressing are misleading; they tend to produce misreadings. These long and irregular marks left by the original dressing, are not the only pitfalls. Rain-water which trickles down the roof of the cave has cut into the letters and produced a few letter-like marks. Natural decay produced by time has given misleading turns to numerous letters, even hornets like to take the liberty with the record of the emperor Khāravela with perfect impunity and have added a few irregular marks on it.
The inscription is weather-beaten. The first four lines have about 13 syllables obliterated by natural decay. Half of the record of the 6th year (l. 6) and the entire record of the 7th year (l. 7) have disappeared. From the 8th up to the 15th lines, every line has got large gaps wrought by decay. The 16th and 17th lines are comparatively well preserved except for the loss of about 12 initial syllables. There are visible signs of a progressive decay.

Its chief value as an historical record lies in the fact that up till now there is no other record which can vie with it in antiquity as an epigraph in the ancient kingdom of Kalinga set up by its own independent king. Even in respect of antiquity, it stands next to none but the two sets of rock inscriptions left by Aśoka who conquered Kalinga in the third century B.C. and annexed it to his empire as an eastern province ruled by a viceroy. The forms of its letters suggest a stage of development of the Brāhmī alphabet, which is almost on a par with that represented by the Nānāgāhāt cave inscription of Nayanikā, widow of the Andhra king Sātakarni I (R. D. Banerji’s Mem. ASB, vol XI, No 3, on “The palaeography of the Hāthigumpha and the Nānāgāhāt inscriptions”). But in the opinion of Rai Bahadur Ramaprasad Chanda, from the palaeographic point of view, the Hāthigumpha inscription deserves to be placed not only after the Besnagar Gauda inscription of the year XII after the installation of Mahārāja Bhāgavata, and the Nānāgāhāt cave inscription of Nayanikā, but after the Bharhut gateway inscription of Dhanabhūti, it deserves at the same time to be placed before the Sañci gateway inscriptions. Even the Bodhgayā railing inscriptions of Kurangi and Nāgadevi appear to have been somewhat earlier as regards their alphabet than the Hāthigumpha inscription. So far as its language goes, the Hāthigumpha inscription is the only Indian inscription, the diction of which is not only Pāli but the sonorous and rhythmic Pāli of the Milindapañha, an extra-canonical Buddhist work which cannot be dated earlier than the 1st century.
A D The importance of the epigraph lies also in the fact that as a raja-praśasti in Prakrit, it is, perhaps, posterior to no other inscription than the Nānāghāt cave inscription of Nayanikā. As for the bibliography, the reader may be referred to my Old Brāhma Inscriptions in the Udayagiri and Khandagiri Caves, published by the Calcutta University, 1929, pp 45. Here I am to refer only to two subsequent publications, viz., R D Banerji’s Monograph—‘The Palaeography of the Hāthigumpha and the Nānāghāt inscriptions,’ Mem., ASB, vol XII, No 3, and a finally revised edition of the Hāthigumpha inscription by K P Jayaswal, Epigraphia Indica, vol XX.

TEXT

[The asterisk prefixed to a footnote indicates that the correctness of the reading suggested may be tested here by the facsimiles reproduced in the accompanying plates.]

||| Namo araha(m)tānam || Namo svasidhānam ||

1 Atreṇa mahārājena Māhāmeghavāhanena2 Cetirājava [m] sa1 -vadhanena1 pasatha -subhalakhanena3 caturamta-luthana4 -guna-upetena5 Kalim-

1 Cf Jaina formula of namokkāra or nokāra
Namo vihariśtanam, namo sīdhānana||
Namo āyariyānam, namo uvajhāyānam||
Namo lo-t svva sāhūnana||
Buddhust formula of vandanā in the Petakopadesa
Namo sammāsambuddhānam paramatthadassinām
silādiguna-pārampattānana||

*2 Cf Inscription of Kūdepa IHQ, vol XIV, p 160

*3 The choice lies between Cetis and Cetas

4 Cf Pāli Sakyānam nandi-vaddhano as a word of praise for the Buddha, Nandi-vaddhano being the same in meaning as barsa-vardhanab

5 pasathā=Pāli pasattthā, cf atta-satā pasattthā Khuddakapātha, Ratana-sutta, Jayaswal, “lakbanena

*6 Jayaswal, luthita But the r-stroke over the letter th is absent, and the third letter, as made out by Prinsep, Cunningham, and also by Jayaswal before is na

*7 Jayaswal, gunopahitena I must accept Chanda’s guna-upetena for the reason
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that the second letter is distinctly na and not no For the whole phrase, cf Pâli Caturanta-uptyâni

8 The name of Khâravela was correctly made out for the first time by Indrají
9 The typical Oriyâ word for fifteen is pandara
10 Pâli kadâra, cf Kalâra-janaka, Kalâra-mattuka, Skt Kadâra-jamini Cf also Prakrit Sûri-kadâra
11 Pâl-vâbâra
12 Jayaswal, pasântam, which, too, may stand as a correct reading
13 I now accept Jayaswal’s tadâni in preference to my so dâni
14 Jayaswal, vadhamanasesayo Venâbbhiyayo According to this reading, vadhamânasa-sesayo = varddhamânah ãsasâvah, and Venâbbhiyayo means a conqueror like Vena, a Vedic personality In accepting this reading, my first objection is due to the uncertainty of the à-stroke over the fourth letter n Secondly, nowhere in the language of the Hâtvikumbha inscription y is substituted for v, and thirdly, the letter after yo may not only be read as ve but also as vo The reading vadhamânasa-sesayoovanabhivyayo must be preferred as referring to Khâravela’s career after his 24th year, while, according to Jayaswal’s reading, Khâravela proved to be a conqueror like the Vedic mythical hero Vena from his very boyhood, which he did not

15 For purisa-yuga cf Mañjîma-nilîya, II, p 75, Samanta-pâsâdika, vol I, p 190, Mabâvasta, ed Senart, I, p 1
16 Jayaswal, mâhâ¹
17 For the whole statement, cf Makhadeva-lâtaka, (Fausboll, No 9) Atite Vibeja-ratthe Mithilâyam Makhadevo nàma râjâ ahô dhammiko dhammarâjâ So caturasfit-vassa-sahassîn kumâra-kilam tathâ opraçānam tathâ mabârañam katvâ Cf also Mañjîma-nilîya, II, p 76

Also verses quoted by Hoernle from the Jana Vikramaprabandha, IA, vol XXI, p 67

Sattan cadasata-patto tina-kâle Vikkamo havai yemmo|
atha-varama cala-lîlā sodasa-vase bhavmmse dëse||
Rasapana-vasa râjâm kunamuc mecbâvâdena sampatto|
Abhisitamato ca padhame vase vāta-vihata-go-purapākāra-nivesanam patisāmīkhārayati Kalimga-nagari -Khi(b)ira(m)\textsuperscript{18} [.] sītala\textsuperscript{19}-cadāga-pādīyo ca bamdhāpayati [.] savūyāna-patisamthapanam ca [l.3] kārayati panatīsāhi sata-sahasehi\textsuperscript{20} [.] pakatiyo ca ranjayati [ ]

Dutiye ca vase acītayitā Sātakanum\textsuperscript{21} pachimadīsam haya-gaja-nara-radha-bahulam damdam pathāpayati\textsuperscript{22} [.] Kanhabemnamgatāya\textsuperscript{23} ca senāya vitāsītī\textsuperscript{24} Asika-nagaram\textsuperscript{25} [ ]

Tatiye puna vase [l.4] Gamdhava-veda-budho dapa-nata-gitā-vādita-samdasanāhi\textsuperscript{26} usava-samāja-kārāpanāhi kidāpayati nagari(m) [ ]

\*18 I regret my previous reading \textit{gabhra}, for the first letter is definitely \textit{khi}, the \textit{u}-stroke in \textit{pu} of \textit{sampuna} in l.2 and the \textit{i}-stroke in \textit{khi} of \textit{khibra} in l.3 being joined together by rain-water trickling down. The second letter may also be read as \textit{bhi}. Jayaswal reads \textit{Khibra}, taking it to be the name of a \textit{rū} after whom the tank was called \textit{Khibra-sītāla-cadāga}. I cannot but think that \textit{Khibra} represents the name of the then capital of Kalinga. The scribe allows a space between \textit{Khibra} and \textit{sītāla} as he has systematically done in l.3 for separating two distinct words or expressions. One may tempt also to read \textit{Khivra}.

\*19 Jayaswal, \textit{sītāla}, which must be discarded for a twofold reason (1) that the letter \textit{i} at the beginning of the word is highly doubtful, and (2) that the fancied \textit{a}-stroke over the letter \textit{a} is uncertain.

\*20 I have fully stated my reasons for connecting this expression with the preceding statement, and not with \textit{pakatiyo ca ranjayati}. See my \textit{Old Brāhmi Inscriptions}, p 41, fn 6.

\*21 Jayaswal, \textit{kammm}

\*22 This has determined the usual Orīyā phrase, \textit{damda pathāyo-ch}, "I have caused the army to march."

\*23 Jayaswal, \textit{Kanhabemnāgatāya}

\*24 Jayaswal, \textit{vitāsītī}

\*25 Jayaswal, \textit{Musika}. It will be seen that the right vertical stroke and the intervening space between the two arms fulfil all the requirements of the letter \textit{a}. But \textit{Asika} may be just a variant of the name \textit{Musika}. Cf Pāli \textit{Alaka} as a variant of \textit{Mulaka}, \textit{Suttampāta}, Bk V, \textit{Alakassa samasame}.

\*26 Jayaswal, \textit{samdasanāhi}
5 Tathā cavuthe vase Vījādhārādvāsam ahata-puvam⁵⁷ Kalimga-puvarājan(ivesitam)²⁸ vitadhamakute²⁹ ?? ?? ?? te³⁰ nikhta-chata -[l 5] bhimgāre hita-ratana-sāpateye sava-Rathika-Bhojake pāde vamdāpayati [ ]

6 Pamcame cēdāni¹¹ vase Namdarāja-ti-vasa-satā-oghātitam Tanasuliya-vatā panādi[m] nagaram pavesa(yati) so ¹² [ ]

7 Abhisito¹¹ ? ¹¹ rājaseyam¹⁵ samdamsayamto¹⁶ sava-kara-vana¹⁷ [l 6] anugaha-ane-kānu sata-sahasāni visajati pora-jānapadam¹⁸ [ ]

8 Satame ca vase (a)sasa¹⁰ -vajiraghara¹⁰ -khatiya⁻¹¹

*27 I have to abandon the reading āhata-puvam

*28 Indraju, -namamstām, Jayaswal, -nvesitam

*29 Jayaswal, vitadha-makuta correcting his previous reading vitadha-makute

*30 Jayaswal (sa) bilambiste, which is highly problematic. The first letter looks indeed like a sa. One may be tempted to read the second letter as bi, but none may be certain about it. The third letter, as made out by Indraju, is pu or, it may even be pra, but certainly not la. The last three letters should better be read as either wdpate or vadhite, but not as mdhite. Is the intended word sabspravājite, which is=Skt saduspavārtan

*31 Jayaswal, ca dāmi

*32 Jayaswal would take the record of the 6th year to begin with so I think, here is an expression denoting the amount which had to be spent on the work mentioned in the record of the 5th year

*33 Jayaswal makes out the beginning of the 6th year record to be. So bhisito

*34 The gap may, perhaps, be supplied by the expression ca chathē vase

*35 I accept Indraju’s reading, rejecting Jayaswal’s rajasuyam, the former being precisely what is intended by the scribe

*36 Indraju, smandamsanato, Cunningham, smadasanato

*37 Jayaswal, *sanam

*38 Jayaswal poram jānapadam

*39 Prinsep and others, pāsāsato, which is neither unlikely nor inappropriate

Jayaswal, satamam ca vasam pāsāsato

*40 I accept Jayaswal’s reading in the absence of anything better I myself can suggest

*41 See foot-note 42
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-sata-ghatani⁴² Samataka⁴¹ -padasamna⁴⁴ samtpada⁴⁵ ?? [ ]⁴⁶

9 Athame ca vase mahatā senāya (apati)hata- (bh)-
iti⁴⁷ -Goradhagurum [17] ghātāpayitā Rāja-
gaha(m) upapidapayati⁴⁸ [ , ] etinam¹⁰ ca kamma-
padāna-panādena⁵⁰ pabamta⁵¹ -senavahane⁵² vipa-
mucitum⁵⁹ Madhuram apayitō⁵⁴ Yavana-rājā
ymi?? sati?? (a)mo, dati⁵⁶ ?? ?? Sava(ra-rā)
jāna⁵⁷ ca ga(cha)ti⁵⁸ [18] palavabhāra-⁵⁹

*⁴² Jayaswal, -vatu-gusata-gharim, which is far from correct I think, my reading sata-ghatani is free from doubt
*⁴³ Jayaswal, samatuka
*⁴⁴ Jayaswal, padapumna desamna obviously scribe's mistake for dasamna
*⁴⁵ Jayaswal, (ku)ma Prinsep and Cunningham, savata-kahadapana narapa
One might be tempted even to read savatka-padephāna-samtpada (?)

⁴⁶ Both the reading and purpose of the record of the 7th year are problematical
The above text may just make some sense out of a nonsence
*⁴⁷ Jayaswal, mahata-bhuti The first letter rather looks like a
*⁴⁸ Prinsep, Rājagabham upapidapayati, Cunningham, Rājagambhu upapida-
payati, Indrajit, Rājagabha-napam pidāpayati, Sten Konow has no objection to the
the reading napa
⁴⁹ Jayaswal, etunā, which, too, is a likely reading
*⁵⁰ Jayaswal, sam añāna
*⁵¹ Jayaswal sambita Prinsep reads pambāta
*⁵² Jayaswal 'senavāhano, which will deprive the transitive verb vipamucitum
of its object He finally reads väbhe
⁵³ Jayaswal, vipamucitum
⁵⁴ Cf Nasik Cave inscription, No 10 (EI, vol VIII)

Bhatāraka amātya ca gatosmim verss-ratūm
Mālaye bhudham utamabhdram
mocayitum ca Mālayā pranāden eva apayātā

*⁵⁵ Tentatively read Dimita by Dr Sten Konow To read Dīmita or Dīmita with
Jayaswal will be to go too far But the reading Yavana-rājā is certain
⁵⁶ The reading is pretty certain
*⁵⁷ The reading suggested is doubtful
*⁵⁸ Jayaswal, yacati
*⁵⁹ Jayaswal, palava.
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[18a] Kaparukha⁶⁰-haya-gaja-radha-saha yamt
[1]⁶¹[,] sava-ghararāvāsa-pa ?? ?? ya⁶² savagahānāṃ ca kārayitum⁶³ bramanānāṃ⁶⁴ ja(y)a-⁶⁵
parihāra[m] dadāti , Arahata-⁶⁶[ ]
10 vasuvijaya-⁶⁷ [l.9] te ubhaya⁶⁸-Praci-tate⁶⁹
(rāja-) nivāsani⁷⁰ Mahāvijaya⁷¹-pāsadām kārayati
athatisāya sata-sahasehi [ ]
11 Dasame ca vase dada-ni?dhita (bhisa)mayo⁷²
Bharadhavasa-pa?nam⁷³ > hi-?yanam⁷¹⁷¹ kārāpayati .⁷⁶ [ ]

60 Jayaswal, kaparukke,
61 Jayaswal, sahayamte, Indraj, saha-yata
*62 Prinsep, gharavasa, Cunningham gharavasa-anyaikagavaya, Indraj,
gharvasadham, Jayaswal, gharavāsa-parvanesi aginathiyā Nothing can be
definitely made out
*63 Correctly read by Jayaswal
*64 Correctly read by Indraj Jayaswal, bambahānāṃ The first letter is not
only ba but bra
*65 Prinsep, yata, Jayaswal, jātum parhāram The first letter is indeed i ja, the
second letter is uncertain jata-paribhāram or jati-paribhāram conveys a definite sense,
cf Pāli gabbha-parihāram But I would like to read jaya-parihāram Cf Pañca-
sūdani, pt III, so 'pi ya gubha-rājyāh brahmānānām dinna-paribhāro tam
ahāpetvā pakata-nīyām'eva akāsi, tathā gahapatikānam
*66 Jayaswal, Arabata (va?)
*67 The beginning of the record of the 9th year cannot be traced The last
four letters of l 9 may be read as suvijaya Jayaswal reads (gri)ya(to)
*68 The first letter appears to be te, the second letter, u the third, bha, and
the fourth ya ba, or ga May they not be read as te ubhaya? Jayaswal finally
reads krī mānāti
*69 The choice lies between Praci-tate and Puti-tate or between Puti-tate and
Puri-tate
*70 Jayaswal, -samnvāsam
*71 Jayaswal, Mahāvijaya
*72 Cunningham, datubhassara , Jayaswal, damda-samdhīsamamayo correcting
his previous readings damdasa-nadasa, mabhadhi'bhisamayo
*73 Cunningham, pa na, Indraj, pathānam, Jayaswal, pathānam
74 Cunningham, mahayana, Jayaswal, mabi-jayanan
75 Nothing can be definitely made out
76 The concluding words of the record of the 10th year cannot be traced
12 .. 77 ?? ?? tānam"[8] mani-ratanāhī-saha yāti,"[1 10] —?80 puvaraṇa81-nivesitam Pithudagadabha Nagale nekāsayati82 [,] janapada-bhāvanam83 ca terasa-vasa-sata-katam bhidati81 tamiradaha85 -samghātām [ ]

13 Bārasame ca vase ?S(i)?kā(nam)86 sa(ha)-sehi87 vitāsayamto88 Utarāpadha-rājano [1 11] —Māgadhānam89 ca vipula(m) bhayam ājeto hathasam Gāmghāya90 pāyati [.] Mā(gadham) ca rājānam Baha(sa)tumita(m)90a pāde va(m)dāpa(ya)-

77 The beginning of the record of the 11th year cannot be traced.
78 Jayaswal, muniya-uyātānam, the propriety of which is not intelligible to me. He finally reads p(a)yātānam.
79 Jayaswal, "upaalabhate 80 Jayaswal, mamdam ca
81 Jayaswal, Avarāga, which must be discarded for the reason that the first letter is by no means a, it is pu

82 Jayaswal, Pithumdam gadabha-namgalena kāsayati. But it will be seen that the letter is not na but ne, and that the scribe connects it with kāsayati. The propriety of Jayaswal’s reading depends upon the correctness of his reading Avarāga. If one fails, the other fails. There is no reason why Kāravela should plough Pithuda with an ass-plough, if it was founded by a former king of Kalunga.

83 Jayaswal, janasa dabbāvanam, but he suggests that the intended reading is janapada-bhāvanam.

84 Sten Konow, terasa-vasasa-kata bh(i)dat, Jayaswal, terasa-vasasa-tukam abhimātati which is rather fantastic.

85 Indrajit, tamara-dehasamghātām, Jayaswal, Tramira-desa-samghātām. The choice really lies between -dāha- and -deha-.

86 Jayaswal, -basa-ke. The intended word appears to be Svākānām.

87 Jayaswal, sabasehi. 88 Or, vitāsayato 89 Jayaswal, Magadhamān

90 Jayaswal, bathi Sugamgiyā(m), abandoning his previous reading bāthi Gāmghāya, bāthi Gāmgiya. The Maurya palace is called Sugānga in the Madhā-rākṣasa, a Sanskrit drama of the 4th or of 6th century A.D. Jayaswal has evidently tended to suggest a reading which will bear out the name of the palace as given by Viśākhadatta. Had the name of the palace been intended, the word would have been either Sugange or Sugangapāśāde, and not Gāmghāya[m], the locative sing form of the feminine stem, Gāmghā. Moreover, the i-stroke is absent, the word is bāthasam, a Sandhi of bāthi and anā. It is important to note that Prinsep read bāthasam gamgasa, and Cunningham, bāthasam Gāmghāya.

90a Correctly read by Jayaswal
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(Khāra)vela-sirinā jivadeha\(^{115}\) -ʔkā\(^{116}\) tā\(^{17}\) [\ 1]\(^{18}\) [l 14]

15 ———\(^{119}\) sakata\(^{120}\) -samana-suvhītaṅnam ca sata\(^{121}\) -diṣānam nā? nam\(^{122}\) (sama)pasi(nam)\(^{123}\) (bhī)\(^{124}\) samgh(i)yana(m)\(^{125}\) arahata-nisidhiya sampe pabhāre\(^{126}\) varākara-samuthāpitāhi an(c)-ka-yojanāhitāhi pakva-sischi\(^{127}\) sata-(sahasā)hi\(^{128}\) silāhi sīpaja\(^{129}\) -thabha-(ni)vadh-asayanā(sa)-nāṁ\(^{130}\) va——\(^{111}\) patālāke\(^{122}\) caturē\(^{111}\) ca vedutiya-gabhe thabhe\(^{111}\) patthāpayati panatarīya\(^{111}\) -(sata-sahaschi) [\ (ma) khiya\(^{116}\) -kala\(^{117}\) -vochine\(^{118}\)

\*115 Prinsep, \(\pi\) deta, Cunningham yuvamaka

\*116 Jayaswal, -sāka I am for sāka

\*117 Prinsep and Cunningham rikhita, Jayaswal, parikhita abandoning his previous reading rikhita Is it panikhīta?

118 The record of the 13th appears to have been closed here

119 The beginning piece of 116 is missing

120 Jayaswal reads sukata\(^{121}\) Definitely sata, and not sava

\*122 The choice lies between nāmnām and nātānam, both of which are suggested by Jayaswal

\*123 Cunningham rightly noticed four letters after nā?nam, which he reads as simpusa while I propose to read samapasi At first sight, they seem to yield the reading tapasa Jayaswal makes out tapasa-ssnam

\*124 Left hitherto unnoticed

\*125 Jayaswal, samghayanām

126 Jayaswal, pabhāre

\*127 Or, panatasissehi

128 The reading seems to be certain

\*129 Prinsep, sapopa, Cunningham, bhagapa, Jayaswal, simhapa*

\*130 Prinsep, (sapapatha) -dharā st dhasaya, Jayaswal, (Simhapattha) rāṇī Simhālāya, which is quite fantastic

131 The beginning piece of 116 is lost

132 Prinsep, patālāke, Cunningham and Indrai, patālāke Jayaswal, patalako

133 Jayaswal, caturī Jayaswal, thambhe 135 Jayaswal, pānatarīya

136 Prinsep niya, Cunningham, ya, Indrai and Sten Konow, Mwrya It is after a prolonged examination of the first two letters in stone and in the facsimile that I came to detect that they are ma and kha, and not ma and ri

\*137 The word must be read as kala, and not as kāla To read kale with Indrai and Fleet is to go far away from kala, correctly read by Cunningham

\*138 Jayaswal, vochinam
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cā coyatha-amge\textsuperscript{139} satikam\textsuperscript{110} turīyam\textsuperscript{111} upāda-
yati [ ]

16 Khema-rājā sa [,] vadha\textsuperscript{112} -rājā sa [,] bhukhurājā sa [,] dhama-rājā pasamto sunamto anubhavamto kalānāni [116]—\textsuperscript{113} guna-visesa-
kusalo sava-pāsamda-pūjako\textsuperscript{111} sava-devāyatanasa(m)kāra\textsuperscript{112} -kārako apatihata-caka -vāhana\textsuperscript{116}-
balo caka-dhara\textsuperscript{117} guta-cako pavata-cako rājisi-
vamsa-kula\textsuperscript{118} -vin(ś)ito\textsuperscript{119} mahāvijayo rājā
Khāravela-siri [ ]

2 TRANSLATION

Obedience to Arhats, the Exalted Ones, obedience to all Siddhas, the Perfect Saints

By His Graceful Majesty Khāravela,\textsuperscript{130} the great Aīrā\textsuperscript{111} king, the Sovereign lord of Kalinga,\textsuperscript{112} the scion of the Mahāmegha

\*139 Pūrṇap, ca coyatha age, Cunningham, ca coyatha age, Indraj, ca coyatha age, Jayaswal, ca coyatha Amge. The stone does not show any i-stroke over thān
\*140 Pūrṇap and Cunningham, satika, Indraj, satiku. Steen Konow, satikam
\*141 I cannot but accept Jayaswal’s turīyam as correct reading
\*142 Jayaswal, vadha
\*143 The beginning piece of 117 is lost
\*144 Cunningham, pūjako
\*145 Jayaswal, samkhāra
\*146 Jayaswal, caka-vāhini-
\*147 Jayaswal, caka-dhara-
\*148 Jayaswal, rājasa- Vasū-kula-
\*149 Cunningham, umgato. R D Banerji confirms the correctness of Jayaswal’s reading

150 Cf Pāli Kālavela as the name of a Yakkha in the Mahāvamsa, IX. 23, as the name of a place in Faussboll’s lātaka, vol VI, p 30. Cf also Sanskrit Karvela as a personal name, Monier Williams, Sanskrit English Dict., sub voce Karvela

151 Jayaswal treats it as a patronymic derived from Ilā. But the usual patronymic from ilā is not Aīlā, it is Aśleṣa. I am still inclined to think that it is the same word as the Pāli ayyra, which is explained in the sense of sāmi. Cf Faussboll, lātaka, vol VI, p 300. ayyra bhādassa yamndā sāsaro ayyro’ti sāmiko. Jayaswal’s first note on aīra (IBORS, vol III, pt IV, p 434) seems more to the point. “This word occurs in a Sātavāhana inscription and has been translated by M. Scnart by ‘noble’ “

152 In the inscription of his chief queen, Khāravela has been represented as Kalinga-cakavattī, “the overlord of Kalinga”
family, the increaser of the Ceti Royal House, who is possessed

153 Mābāmeghabāhāna is a patronymic derived from Mahāmeghabāhāna, a
dynastic name similar to Sātavāhana. The Mahāmeghabāhāna kings of Kalinga
including Khāravela were the contemporaries and powerful rivals of the Sātavakarnīs
of Andhra. The inscription itself refers to a Sātakarnī who had his kingdom to
the west of Kalinga. According to the Purāṇas, amongst the local dynasties which
arose during the Andhra period, there was the dynasty of Kośāla (i.e., South Kośāla)
who were commonly known as the Meghas (obviously a shortening from Megha-
vāhana), who were very powerful and intelligent, and who were nine in number

Kośālayāṃ tu rājano bhauvyanti mahābalah,
Mēgbā tu samākhbyātā buddhimanto navavat tu

—Pargiter, Dynasties of the Kali Age, p 51

154 Whether one reads Cetatrā or Cetrā, the meaning is the same Ceti=Ceti,
and Ceta=Cetiya, Skt Caudya. In the Pāli Vessantara-Jātaka (Fausboll,
No 547), Cetiyaraththa denotes the same kingdom as Ceta-raththa Rṣi Brahmayuthi
of the family of Kāna sings the praises of king Kāsu, the Caudya, in a Vedic
hymn addressed to the Aśvinī (RV VIII 5). Here the Cedi-king Kāsu is re-
presented as a powerful monarch who was capable of making a gift of rājas as slaves.
His soldiers were dressed in cuirasses of leather. In the Mahābhārata, Ādi-parva,
the Kuru prince Vasi Uparicara is said to have conquered the beautiful and excel-
lent kingdom of the Cedis on the advice of the god Indra whose staunch worshippers
he was. His son Matsya by an apārā, named Adrikā, founded the kingdom of
Matsya. His other sons, Bhāradvāja, Pratāgraha, and the rest also founded king-
doms. The Vaiyura-Purāṇa repeats the tradition of the conquest of the Cedi kingdom
by Vasi, the Paurava. According to another account, the Kuru prince Vasi conquer-
ed Ceti, originally a Yādava kingdom, and established himself there, whence he came
to be known as Caudya—Uparicara. His capital was Sukutmati (Sotthivati, accord-
ing to the Pāli Cetiya-Jātaka, Fausboll, vol III, pp 454-61) on the river Sukutmati.
His five sons were established in the five kingdoms of Magadhā, Cedi, Kauśāmbi,
Kuśā, and Matsya. According to the Cetiya-Jātaka, however, among his five sons,
one who went to the east, founded Hatthupura (i.e., Hastinapura or Indraprasthā),
one who went to the south, founded Assāpura (i.e., Aśvaka or Aśaka on the
Godāvari), one who went to the west, founded Sihapura, one who went to the north,
founded Uttara-Paṇcāla, and one who went to the north-west, founded Daddarapura.
The Mahābhārata introduces us also to the most powerful but wretched Cedi king
Śisupāla, son of Damaghosa, who made an alliance with the great Jarāsandha of
Magadhā and made a common cause against the Yādavas and Pāndavas. After
killing Śisupāla, Kṛṣṇa installed his (Śisupāla’s) son Dhṛṣṭaketu in the sovereignty of
the Cedis. Dhṛṣṭaketu fought on the side of the Pāndavas in the great battle of
Kurukṣetra. According to the Agnī-Purāṇa (IV 14), Śisupāla was the son of
Damaghosa by Śrutiśravā, sister of Vasudeva,—a Sātvata or Yādava princess. In
the Mahābhārata, Udyogaparva (ch 74), Saḥaja of the Cedi dynasty is mentioned
among the 18 kings who by their great strength, ruined their friends and relations.
In the Aśvamedhaparva of the same epic (chs 83-84), we have mention of Sarabha
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of the noble and auspicious marks,\textsuperscript{133} who is gifted with\textsuperscript{134} the attri-
as a son of Sīsupāla, who was defeated and subdued by Arjuna. The same epic
groups the Cedis, in one context, with the Pañcālas and the Kaikēyas, in another,
with the Kāsīs and the Kārūras, in a third, with the Maryas and the Karūras,
in a fourth, with the Kārūras and the Kośalas, and in a fifth, with the Pañcālas, the
Kārūras and the Matsyas. The Bhismaparva (ch 6) describes the Sūktimātī as one
of the rivers in Bāratavarsa.

In the Pāli Anguttara-nikāya (IV, pp 252, 256, 260) and the Jaina Bhagavati-
sūtra, Ceti, the land where the Ceti founded their kingdom and settled, is men-
tioned as one of the sixteen mahājanapadas. In the Pāli list, the Cetas as a people
are grouped with the Vamsis or Vatsas. The Ceti kingdom with Sahajāṭi (modern
Bhuta) as its principal town is located to the east of Vatsa, the land of the Vatsas.
According to Professor D R Bhandarkar, the Ceta or Cetya rattha corresponds
roughly to modern Bundelkhand. In the opinion of Rapson, Cedi occupied in the
post-Vedic period the northern portion of the Central Provinces. With Pargiter Cedi
lay along the south of Jumna. Rhys Davids inclines to think (Buddhist India, p 26) that the Cetti
had two distinct settlements, one, properly the older, was in the mountains, in what is now called Nepal, the other
probably a later colony, was near Kausāmbī to the east.

The inscriptions of the Kalacuri or Huhaya dynasty of Cedi go to prove that the
rulers of this dynasty assumed the title of “Lords of Kālanjapura and of
Tīr-Kalanga, Kālanjara being the well-known hill-fort in Bundelkhand. For these
and other details regarding the Cedis, their kingdom and kings, see B C Law’s
Ancient Mid-Indian Kṣatriya Tribes, ch V. H. C. Raychudhuri’s Political History
of Ancient India, Rhys Davids in the Cambridge History of India, vol 1, p 84.

In the Hāthigumpha inscription itself, Kharavela is connected with the Ceti
royal house, which may indicate that the Ceti kings had, in course of time, estab-
lished their suzerainty also in Kalanga. In it, he is represented as a scion of a line
and family of royal sages (rāja-vamsakula-vamsīrīta) in spite of the fact that the
Cedi kings do not figure as rājarṣis in their tradition preserved elsewhere. In the
Pāli Vessantara-jātaka Kalanga, Śivi and Cedi are described as three contiguous
kingdoms, the Śivis being matrimonially allied with the Cedis. It goes to show
that the way to the Himalayas, both from Kalanga and the Śivi kingdom by
through the kingdom of the Cedis. The distance between the Śivi kingdom and the
Cedi is said to be 30 yojanas (about 240 miles). Mt Suvannagiri, the river
Konnārā, Mt Anjanagiri, and the Brahmin village called Dunnavithanālāndi
are interposed between Jêtuttara, the capital city of the Śivis and the kingdom of
the Cedis. The Cetysa-jātaka, on the other hand, describes the journey of a person
from Benares to the Cedi kingdom along a route through the hills, which was
risky owing to the mischievous activity of the pesanaka-coras.

\textsuperscript{135} Le mahāpurusa-laksanas according to the laksana-pāthakas or readers of
signs or marks. Cf Mahābima-nikāya, II, p 134

\textsuperscript{136} Whether one reads guna-upetena or gunāpabhitena, the meaning is the same.
butes (of one capable) of subduing the earth extending as far as the four seas,\textsuperscript{157} were played for fifteen years the sports befitting the young age of the prince with a handsome body of 'fair brown complexion'\textsuperscript{11,15} Thereafter, for nine years, just the office of a Crown Prince was administered by (His Royal Highness) who was well-versed in (matters relating to) writing, coinage, accounting, procedure, and approved principle of action, whose self was purified by proficiency in all (Indian) 'polite learning'\textsuperscript{11,19}. Having then completed twenty-four years, he who, as he waxed great, passed the rest of his manhood in making notable conquests,\textsuperscript{160} gained the high state implied by the coronation of a great king in the third royal dynasty of Kalinga,\textsuperscript{161} in regular linear succession\textsuperscript{162}.

\textsuperscript{157} The adoption of Jayaswal's reading luthia makes no difference to the sense.

\textsuperscript{158} Stein Konow is led to think that Sri-kadāra is the lover of Sri, i.e., Krishna', and that 'Khāravela's boyish games are compared with Krishna's pranks and sports in Vindīvās.' This would seem too far-fetched to be acceptable. Here sri-kadāra is used as an adjective qualifying Khāravela's sannā and not his sports.

\textsuperscript{159} See for notes on lekha, rūpa, etc., Barua, Old Brāhmi Inscriptions, pp. 240 ff.

\textsuperscript{160} The word abhivyaya is used in this very sense in the Mahābhārata-nākāya

Adopting Jayaswal's reading vadhamāna-sesaya Venābhiṣayaḥ one must translate the text 'he who had been prosperous since his infancy (?) and who (was destined) to have wide conquests is that of Venā'.

\textsuperscript{161} Jayaswal aptly observes 'In the third line the details about Khāravela's ancestry are made clear. He was born in the royal line of Ceti and was the overlord of Kalinga, but the dynasty to which he belonged was the 3rd dynasty of the kings of Kalinga.'

\textsuperscript{162} Jayaswal would have us understand by the word pursa-yuge 'at the proper age of the man.' He says in so many words 'Evidently the throne had been vacant and Khāravela ascended it after completing his 24th year. According to the Brhaspati Sūtra, for a prince playing and learning were enjoined up to the 24th year and after that, politics.' I differ, for the inscription clearly tells us that he acted as yuvāraja for nine years, from which it is difficult to suppose that the throne had remained vacant. As for pursa-yuge, it is precisely in the sense of regular or unbroken linear succession that the word has been used in the Mahābhārata-nākāya, II, p. 75. Yasmin pursa-yuge vattamāne evārūpasa kalyānassa ratthasa samuccredo hoti, so tesam antima-puriso hoti. In this context, Buddhaghosa ex-
And as soon as he was anointed, in the very first year, (His Majesty) caused the Kalinga-city Khibira in which the gates, walls and residential houses were damaged by stormy wind, to be repaired, and caused the embankments of the cool tanks to be made, and (also) caused the work of restoration of all the gardens to be done at the cost of thirty-five hundred thousand (pieces of the standard coin), and (thereby) pleased the subjects.

plains the word purisa-yuge as signifying—uamsa-sambhavae purse, "in the time of the person (who comes to reign) by linear succession.

The statement in the inscription admits of another rendering, namely "during the third period of reign of the royal dynasty of Kalinga", which, too, may be supported by usages and explanations in Buddhist literature. First, the Lalita-vistara mentions the following characteristics of an ideal royal family:

Purusayuga-sampannam tatkalam bhavati
Puruapurusayuga-sampannam ca tatkalam bhavati
Abhirita-purusayuga-sampannam ca tatkalam bhavati
Abhilaksita-purusayuga-sampannam ca tatkalam bhavati
Maheshakhyya-purusayuga-sampannam ca tatkalam bhavati

"Such a family is remarkable for having a continuous succession of generations of men. It has the contemporaneity of two previous generations. It has the contemporaneity of two living generations. It has the contemporaneity of two coming generations. It has a continuous succession of mighty persons.


Here the implication is that two generations living at the same time constitute a period. In this very sense, Buddhaghosa explains the word purisa-yuga in the Samanta-paadika (I, p. 190). According to the Pali scholiast, the life-time of Buddha which also covers the career of his immediate disciples constitutes one purisa-yuga or period, and the career of his immediate disciples and later followers since his demise constitutes the second purisa-yuga or period. Similarly, the expression satta-piitamaha-yuga means the seven grandfathers, each grandfather standing for a distinct period, the grandfather's life-time including that of the father.

163 R C Panda takes the word to mean 'springs' (The Mayurbhanj Gazette, 1938, p. 16). Reading the text as Kalinga-nagar-Khibra-sita-tadaga-padiyo bham-dhapayati, Jayaswal translates it "in the city of Kalinga (he) causes the erection of the embankments of the lake (called after) Khibura Rsi, (and) of (other) tanks and cisterns." Note that according to grammatical construction, the adjectival compound vata-usbata-gopura-pakara-vaivannam requires a noun, such as Kalinga-nagar-Khibram, after it. Cf. haya-gaya-nara-rasha-bahulam qualifying dam-dam.

164 Jayaswal translates "and (he) gratifies the People."
And in the second year, not (at all) bringing Sātakarni\textsuperscript{165} into (his) thought, (His Majesty) caused a multitudinous army (consisting of) horses, elephants, foot-men and chariots to march in a western direction, and with the aid of the army that reached (the bank of) the Krśnavenā (river),\textsuperscript{166} struck terror into the city of Asika (Musika?\textsuperscript{2})

Again, in the third year, (His Majesty), who was a master of the science of music—the Gandharva lore, caused the capital to be entertained by the display of combats,\textsuperscript{167} dancing, singing, and instrumental music, and (no less) by the arrangement made for festivities and convivial gatherings

Likewise, in the fourth year, (His Majesty caused to be done his duty to) the home of the Vidyādhāras,\textsuperscript{168} founded by the former kings of Kalinga, which was not invaded before, compelled

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{165} According to Jayaswal, Sātakarni referred to in this inscription is 'evidently Śi Śatākarni, the third king of the Śatavahana dynasty, the husband of queen Nayanikā of the Nānāghāt inscriptions in the Junnār Tāhuk of the Poona district'. For the paleographic similarity between the inscription of Khāravela and those of Niyānākā, queen of Śi Śatākarni, see R D Banerjee's monograph—Palligraphy of the Hāthugumpha and Nānaghat Inscriptions, \textit{Mem. ASI}, vol X. All that the inscription itself clearly proves is that one king Sātakarni was "the only powerful rājā on the western border of Kalinga," and that his kingdom included the city of Asika (Śkt Raika or Arsika) on the river Krśnavena. The Nāsik cave inscription of queen Gauṭami expressly mentions Asika as one of the places included in the dominions of the Śatākarnis. See \textit{El}, vol VIII, p 60. Asika heads the list of places.

\item \textsuperscript{166} According to the \textit{Mārkandeya-Purāṇa}, LXVII, 26-27, the Krśnavenā, like the Gāḍāvati, the Bhimārātha, and a few other rivers, took its rise from the Vindhya range.

\item \textsuperscript{167} \textit{dapa} is either the \textit{darpa-krīḍā} mentioned in the \textit{Arthaśāstra}, III 3 58, or the \textit{davakamma} or 'cōmes' mentioned in the Pāli \textit{Mahāniddesa}, p 379.

\item \textsuperscript{168} The home of the Vidyādhāras appears to have been situated somewhere in the Central Provinces. The inscription seems to indicate that it was invaded or encroached upon at the time by the two neighbouring ruling tribes, viz., the Ķātikas and Bhojakas, and accordingly their chieftains were punished by Khāravela.
\end{itemize}
all the Rathikas and Bhojakas\textsuperscript{169} who were deprived of their wealth and jewels, whose royal insignia consisting of umbrellas and vases had been cast away, who were abandoned by good brahmins (?), and whose crowns were rendered meaningless, to bow down at (his) feet

6 And then, in the fifth year, (His Majesty) caused the canal opened out by King Nanda\textsuperscript{170} three hundred (or 103) years back to be brought into the capital from the Tanasuliya road \textsuperscript{171}

\textsuperscript{169} Jayaswal's note on the Rathikas and Bhojakas is worth quoting here. "Rathika-Bhojake stand for the Maharathas and Mahabhogas of Satarāhāna inscriptions of the same period at Kanheri and Belsa. The Rathikas are mentioned as Rattikas in the Gunar, Rathikas in the Shabbazgari and Rathakas in the Manscha version of the edict of Asoka. In the 13th edict we find the Bhojakas mentioned with the Pittakas. For the use of the word Rathika in the general sense of local chiefs or subordinate potentates, see the Yevγιγιδη copy of Asoka's Minor Rock Edict, Anguttara-nikāya, III, pp 76, 78, 300, and Barua's Old Brāhmī Inscriptions, p 211.

\textsuperscript{170} Jayaswal points out "King Nanda is mentioned in two places in this inscription, once in 16 and again in 112. The date in this line apparently refers to a king founded by king Nanda. His mention in connection with Magadhā fixes his identity with the Magadhā Nanda dynasty." There is no evidence as yet to prove that any king of the Maurya or of the Nanda dynasty who may be called a predecessor of Asoka's had either conquered or held sway over any part of Kalinga. The clear evidence of the 13th Rock Edict of Asoka belies that theory or surmise Kalinga had remained unconquered (avāpta) till the 7th year of Asoka's reign. We need not attach any importance to the name Nanda because it finds mention in this inscription which is but a royal panegyric composed to flatter Kharavela. Mi R C Panda seems to have misconstrued the account of Megasthenes about the connection of Sandrakottos (Candragupta Maurya), or, a priori that of his Nanda predecessor, with Prasun and Gangarāda. In the Indika Candragupta Maurya is described as the king of Prasun or Prācyā, which excluded Gangarāda (McCindde's Ancient India Frag I, art 37). It is evident from Asoka's edicts that the Province of Kalinga in his time had two main political divisions, the southern with its headquarters at Samāpā in Ganjam district, and the north-eastern with its headquarters at Tosah, the seat of the Maurya Viceroy.

\textsuperscript{171} This statement in the Häthigumpha inscription is not without its significance. The location of the capital of Kharavela's Kalinga kingdom is to be determined not only with reference to the river Prāci on which he had built the Great-victory Palace in his 9th regnal year but with reference as well to the Tanasuliya Road from which...
7 And in the sixth year, (His Majesty) while displaying his royal prosperity, bestowed (unprecedented) favours on the inhabitants of towns and districts by remitting all taxes and duties amounting to many hundred thousand (pieces of the standard coin).

8 And in the seventh year, (His Majesty caused) compact groups of hundreds of horses (portable) ‘diamond chambers’ and warriors (to proceed to) the tranquil spot adjoining the foot of the Samataka (hill) (?).

9 And in the eighth year, having stormed with a mighty army (the fortress of) Gorathagiri of invulnerable wall, (His Majesty) brought a pressure to bear upon Rājagṛha, and the Yavana king retreated to Mathurā in order to release the

the canal opened out by king Nanda was extended up to the capital of Kalinga.

172 The word which definitely occurs in the inscription is rājaseyam (Skt rāja śrīyam), and not rājasīyam to justify Jayaswal’s interpretation.

173 None should so stretch with Jayaswal the sense of the two words, Pora and lanapada, as to obtain from it the idea of a ‘City-corporation’ and a ‘Realm-corporation’.

174 According to Jayaswal’s reading—Satamam ca vasam pasāvato, the translation shall be: ‘And while he was reigning for the seventh year’, or simply, ‘in the seventh year’, or simply, ‘In the seventh year of his reign’.

175 I am just imagining here that, perhaps, in his seventh reign year, Khāravela organized a pompous religious procession for visiting the holy spot on Mt Samataka or Samata (modern Pareshnāth hill), which may not at all be correct.

176 Both the text and translation offered are hypothetical. Nothing can or should be construed definitely from either. Jayaswal would make out a text yielding such a fact as that in the seventh year of Khāravela’s reign, his famous wife of Vijayaghara ‘obtained the dignity of auspicious motherhood’, which on the face of it, is too fantastic to deserve credence.

177 The same as what is called Khalatisa-pavata in the Barābar Hill cave inscriptions of Aśoka, and Pravarasagiri in some of the medieaval Sanskrit inscriptions Modern, Barābar hills.

178 The name of the Yavana king cannot be definitely made out. Even it is uncertain whether it consists of three or six syllables.

179 Mathurā was till then under the sway of the Greek kings.
troops and vehicles restlessly moving on account of the uproar of reprisal on His (Majesty's) part returned (to Kalinga), marched back with Kalpavrksa, the Wishing Tree, burdened with foliage, and (the troops of) horses, elephants and chariots, (did something for) all householders, and to captivate all (he) offered the gift of victory to the Brahmins, (offered something to) the Ṛṣhitas (recluses)

10 And in the ninth year, (His Majesty) caused the royal residence Mahāvijaya-prāsāda, the "Great-Victory-Palace", to be built on both the banks of the Prāci at the cost of thirty-eight hundred thousand (pieces of the standard coin)

11 And in the tenth year, well-read and experienced in the principles of polity, (His Majesty) proceeded on a campaign for the conquest of countries in Bhūratavārsa (?

12 And in the eleventh year, (His Majesty) went in procession with jewels and gems caused the grassy overgrowth of Prthudakā, founded by a former

---

180 Adopting the reading sambhita, Jayaswal translates it—demolished
181 Whether one reads pānādēna or samānādēna, the meaning is the same
182 Whether the reading is etnam or etnā, the sense remains the same
183 It is still an open question whether the Great-victory-Palace was built in the then capital of Kalinga or elsewhere. The record of the 9th year shows that it was built on both the banks of the Prāci, an ancient river, the nearest distance of which from Bhubaneswar is 12 to 13 miles. This river, as pointed out by Mr R C Panda, traverses a course of 30 miles before it empties itself into the Bay of Bengal. Both the banks of the Prāci abound in old ruins of temples, wells and tanks, and in mounds that await excavation. I am not, however, quite sure of the reading of the name of Prāci. The intended name may as well be Pūrī or Purūrī.
184 Here as Jayaswal aptly points out, the name Bhūratavārsa is not used to denote the whole of India but a certain portion of it. It excludes, for instance, the region called Uttarāpartha.
185 Nothing can be definitely made out from this record of the 10th year.
186 According to Jayaswal's reading, the name of the place is Prthumā which is no other than what is called Pihunda in the Uṣṭrādhyayana-sūtra. Prthumā is probably the city mentioned by Ptolemy as Pitunda. According to Ptolemy, Pitunda was a city in the upper part of the Coromandel coast.
king\(^{187}\) to be let out into the Lāngala (river)\(^ {188}\) and destroyed the accumulation of dark swamps\(^ {189}\) that grew up in thirteen-and-hundred years (and) became a cause of anxiety to the country.

13 And in the twelfth year, with the aid of thousands of the Śivis (?), (His Majesty) produced consternation among the rulers of Uttarāpatha,\(^ {190}\) while generating an immense fear among the people of Magadha, caused the elephants and horses to drink in the Ganges,\(^ {191}\) and compelled Bṛhaspatmitta,\(^ {192}\) the king of the Magadha people, to bow down at his feet, (did something in

\(^{187}\) Jayaswal forcibly reads Āvarāja and explains it as meaning the king of the Avas or Andhras.

\(^{188}\) The sharp difference between the two readings offered by Jayaswal and myself lies in the fact that according to one, Khāravela caused Puthumāla, founded by an Ava or Andhra king, to be ploughed with an ass-plough (i.e., to be utterly destroyed), and according to the other, he caused Puthudakā, founded by a former king of Kalinga, to be reclaimed. According to my reading, for which credit must go either to Sylvan Lévi, the Nagala, Namgala or Lāngala was the name of a river, the river Nagāvali bearing also the name of Langula. See for details, Barua’s Old Brāhma Inscriptions, pp. 106 ff.

\(^{189}\) According to Jayaswal’s reading Tramra-desa-samghātaṃ, the rendering is “the confederacy of the Tramra (Dramra) countries.”

\(^{190}\) According to the Kāvya-mimāṃsā, p 93, Pribudakāt paratah Uttarāpathah “Uttarāpatha is (the north-western region) which lay beyond Pṛthu-dakā (now Thānswar) Dhammapāla in his commentary on the Peta vatthu, locates Mathurā in Uttarāpatha (Uttara-Madhura-Uttarāpatha). According to the Mahābhārata XII 207 43, the Yavanas, Kambojas, Gudhāras, Kṛātas, and Barbaras were all peoples of Uttarāpatha.

\(^{191}\) Neither the reading nor the grammatical form of the word Gamgāya justifies Jayaswal’s or Dr Sten Konow’s suggestion that here is a reference to the palace of Cunragupta Maurya which Viśākhadatta, the author of the Mudrārakṣasa, knew to be Sugāṅga. The reference is obviously to Pātaliputra, the last capital of Magadha which was on the Ganges. See McCrindle’s Ancient India, Frags XXV-XXVI.

\(^ {192}\) All the arguments hitherto put forward by Jayaswal for the identification of Bṛhaspatmitta, the contemporary king of Magadha, with Pusyamitra, the founder of the Śunga-Mitra dynasty are plausible but unconvincing. He may certainly be identified with Bṛhaspatmitta, nephew of king Asādhasena of Ahicchatra, during whose reign the Pābhosā caves were excavated and donated.
connection with) the settlements of the Kalinga people subjugated by king Nanda, carried the wealth of Anga and Magadha with the aid of persons skilled in clever tactics, caused to be erected towering temples and gates with figures of the goddess of Luck in their niches, procured at the cost of a hundred viṣās\(^1\) (of gold) the rare and wonderful trappings\(^1\) of elephants, the king of Pāṇḍya, rich in mettled horses, elephants and jewels and gems, supplied here hundreds and thousands of apparel (?), pearls, gems and jewels, subdued (some people).

14 And in the thirteenth year, on the Kumārī hill\(^1\) in the well-founded realm of victory,\(^1\) were excavated\(^1\) the āvadehaśrayakas\(^1\) by His Graceful Majesty Khāravela, devoted to the worship of those who depended on royal patronage,\(^1\) those who had fulfilled their (religious) vows,\(^2\) (and) those sought shelter during the rains\(^2\) for use as comfortable resting places\(^2\) by the Ārhatā (recluses), the cause of whose future gliding in the course of transmigration had

193 The viṣā is a measure, of which two varieties, viz. Kataki and Bāhūsree, are prevalent in Orissa up till now.
194 The word nāvata or navata means trappings of elephants. Jayaswal reads mūṣa and equates it with mūṣa, which, as he points out, is used in the Sukraniti in the sense of an enclosure for entrapping elephants. The correctness of this interpretation depends upon his reading of the next word as paṃsara, which is evidently paṃharati, a verb having also bāya, bāthi and ratana-mānīka for its objects.
195 Modern, Udayagiri, the Khandagiri hill being referred to in the inscription of Udyotakesari as Kumāra-parvata.
196 supavata-viṣaya-cake = supravartta-viṣaya-cakre
197 I assume the word to be paṃskhāti.
198 i.e., the caves serving as shelters for living selves.
199 rājabhrtnāya = rāja-bhrtnām
200 cīna-vatana = Pāli cīnavatānām, Jayaswal interprets it in the sense of 'Chuni clothes' (Cīna-vattra), which is far from correct.
201 vasārītānām = vasārītānām
202 kāya = kāya or kalya, Pāli kalla = tuttha kayyanisidhi—seems to be just another word for Aśoka's tutbhāyatanām.
been greatly extenuated (and) who were (there) for fulfilling the yāpa (Rainy season vow).

15 For the honoured recluses of well-established reputation, and the Jnātrkas (and) viewing all things alike (and) the monks (and) belonging to (different) orders (and) coming from a hundred directions, with hundreds and thousands of stones quarried out of excellent quarries (and) collected from (an area extending over) many yojanas by expert heads, (His Majesty caused) indeed (to be made) sleeping-and-sitting-accomodations fitted with artistic pillars on a slope near the Arhata resting place. and caused the columns to be set up in a beryl-set hall with an ornamental courtyard at the cost of seventy-five hundred thousand (pieces of the standard coin), and in sixty-four panels, intersected with sculptures, caused to be produced (the scenes of) peaceful music.

- 203 pākhina-samstebi=praksina-samskritah 204 yāpavākebi=yāpa-udyāpakah
  Jina Vijay Suri inclines to think that the Jaina recluses referred to in the inscription belonged, in all likelihood, to the Yāpana-samgha.

205 Reading the word as sukhata-samana-suvibhātānam, Jayaswal translates it ‘The monks of good deeds and who have fully followed (the injunctions)’. According to my reading, sakata=Pāli sakkata For suvibhātaṃ cf Aśoka’s RE VII yasam vā pi suvibhātānam

206 The reading is either nātānam or nānānam Accordingly the rendering must be either the jnātāras or the wise.

207 Or, men with bent heads, (panata-ssebi) Jayaswal reads tāpasa-issinam samghayānam and translates it ‘a Council of the wise ascetics and sages’ etc. I think the statement is not intended to say that Khāravela brought together the śramanas and wise ascetics in a Council convened for the purpose.

208 Pāli senasana nu See Pāli-English Dict, for the technical meaning of the word Jayaswal reads nissayāni (‘shelters’)

209 According to Jayaswal, “near the Rūha Depository of the Arhat” I do not think the reference is to the Rāmi Nūr on the Udavagiri hill but to some other edifice not far from it.

210 Jayaswal reads patalako catuwo (“four columns”), in which case the reading would have been patalakā catuwo

211 According to Jayaswal, “of sixty-four (letters)”

212 The word makhya is to be derived from makha or mankha which signifies, according to the Jaina Bhagavati sūtra, a picture in a frame

213 tūrya=Skt tūrya
16 The king of security, the king of prosperity, the king of renunciation, the righteous king, (capable of) perceiving, hearing and experiencing things that are conducive to welfare was His Graceful Majesty Khāravela, the mighty conqueror, the upholder of the realm of royal command, the protector of the realm of royal command, the repairer of all abodes of the gods, the worshipper of all sects accomplished by virtue of the possession of certain special qualities

3 OLD ORIYĀ MANUSCRIPT

The ślokas cited from an Oriyā Manuscript by Jayaswal in IBORS, 1917, p 482, and reproduced by Dr Sten Konow in Acta Orientalia, vol 1, and also by me in my Old Brāhmi Inscriptions, p 183, have misled the world of scholars. No credence is to be placed on it on the authority of Jayaswal's statement that the MS is lying unedited in the archives of the Indian Museum, Calcutta. The MS is no other than that of the Brāhmāṇḍa-purāṇa. It was the property of Pandit Chintamani Misra of Bhubaneswar who was both a Sanskrit composer and an expert calligraphist. The relevant

214 According to Jayaswal, "the king of peace
215 Vadharāja or vadharāja may also be rendered "the king of experience"
216 Literally, "the king of the bhikṣus"
217 See the Rājāvagga, Anguttara nikāya, for the description of duties of a righteous king
218 The five mahākalyāṇas, according to the Jaina, consist of the Descent, Birth, Initiation, Attainment and Final Deliverance in the life-history of a jina. But the kalyāṇas in this inscription may be taken to represent such good principles of human action as those mentioned by Aśoka in his Pillar edicts
219 Jayaswal translates simply by "the prosperous"
220 The epithet saha-devāyatana-samkāra-kāraka is important as indicating that various temples of popular Hindu deities had then existed in Khaling. As a Jaina king, Khāravela had not taken the initiative in erecting but helped others only in repairing them
221 Here he followed in the footsteps of Aśoka. See Rock Edict XII
222 Jayaswal appropriately renders it "accomplished in extraordinary virtues"
portions of the MS were kindly read out to me by his son, the present owner of it. In it, Khāravela figures as the national hero of Kalinga. He is credited with the erection of the Bhubanewar temple, the excavation of Bindu Sarovar, and the conquest of Nepal and many other places in India, northern and southern, eastern and western. All that I can or should say at present regarding this MS is that before it is subjected to a careful scrutiny and passed by a body of experts as ancient and authentic, its evidence must not be brought in to bear upon the historical interpretation of the Hāthigumpha inscription or any part thereof.

4 RESULTS

The nett results of this revised reading and interpretation of the Hāthigumpha inscription are substantially the same as those obtained before. The changes in reading in several instances are not such as to yield or suggest a different sense. Khāravela’s personal history, too, remains much the same as outlined in my Old Brāhmī Inscriptions. Among the new points to be noted in this edition, the first is the name of the capital of Kalinga. The inscription may be taken to mention Khibira as the name of the capital, or more accurately, that of the city of Kalinga. Unfortunately, this name is not met with either in literature or in any of the inscriptions. The location of the capital will remain a matter of dispute up till the discovery of a definite evidence setting the question at rest. But one will look in vain for the site of the capital of Khāravela’s kingdom in the south, whether in Kalingapatam or near Chicacole. The inscription itself furnishes us with two data, only one of which is definite, while the other is tentative. It records the extension of the canal opened out by king Nanda into the city of Kalinga from the Tanasuliya Road. Here, too, our difficulty is that we do not know the specification of the road in question. Apparently Tanasuli is the same name as Tosali, though
both in the earlier inscriptions of Asoka and in the later inscriptions of the Ikkhākus at Nāgājuni-konda the spelling of the name is Tosali. Khāravela had built a new royal palace on both the banks of the river Prācī, the nearest distance of which from Bhubaneswar is 10 to 12 miles. But there is nothing to show definitely that the palace was built in the city of Kalinga itself. The statement can at the most support a presumption in favour of the location of the capital of Kalinga in Khāravela's time somewhere on the banks of the Prācī, and not far from Bhubaneswar and the Udayagiri and Khandagiri caves.

Bṛhaspatimitra was certainly the contemporary king of Magadha, presumably also of Anga. A Yavana king was powerful in the region of Mathurā, whose name was doubtfully suggested by Dr. Sten Konow to be Dīmita and definitely read by Jayaswal as Dīmita and equated with Demetrius. The name of the Greek king, is still to be ascertained. It does not seem to be any of the earlier Greek kings of Mathurā.

The reading Mūrula-kāla must be ruled out of order, as the letters clearly yield the reading mabhya-kala instead. It is only by a confusion between the Pāli Sangāyana and the inscriptive word Sanghryana or Sanghayana that Jayaswal was led to believe that Khāravela convened a council of the Jainas. It is also by a misinterpretation of the meaning of the statement coyatha-amge satikam tunyam upādayati that he came to suggest that Khāravela “compiled expeditiously the text of the sevenfold Aṃgas of the sixty-four (letters)” The statement intends mentioning certain scenes of music produced among the decorative sculptures in an edifice which was erected at the cost of seventy-five hundred thousand coins.

The record of the twelfth year has been misread by Jayaswal so as to show that it actually mentions the name of the Maurya Palace which is described in the Muddrārāksasa by the name of
Sugānga. Similarly, the misreading of Kalingajana-samnvesa for Kalinga-jina-samnvesa led Jayaswal to think that king Nanda took away “the image of the Jina of Kalinga” which is far from the historical truth.

In 116 (may be, in the record of the 14th regnal year), Khāravela speaks of a certain edifice which he had built on a slope in the neighbourhood of the resting place of the Ārhatas with hundreds and thousands of stones collected from the best of quarries from an area extending over many yojanas. Jayaswal has taken it to be a reference to the Rāni Nūr excavated on a slope of the Udayagiri hill. But this would seem rather wide of the mark, inasmuch as the Rāni Nūr is just a highly ornamented cave excavated in a single piece of rock or boulder, and not an edifice with hundreds and thousands of separate pieces of stone. The reference must, therefore, have been to some other edifice in the vicinity of the Udayagiri hill. It is not unlikely that some such edifice was built by him at Bhubaneswar. It may even some day be proclaimed that Khāravela was the builder of the first great temple at Bhubaneswar. Anyhow, his statement concerning the edifice on a slope near the Udayagiri hill awaits a careful elucidation.

B M Barua
Chinese-Indian Contacts

[PRIOR TO THE LATTER HALF OF THE FIRST CENTURY]

To the present time, so far as the writer is aware, the subject whose title appears above has not been dealt with, for its own sake alone. Most of the general works on Chinese and Indian history have been satisfied to refer to such a work as the Milinda-panha, or to the Memoirs of Chang Ch’ien and thereby leave the impression that there was a considerable amount of intercourse between the two countries too detailed to be further outlined. A few of these works have resorted to linguistics to further illustrate their point. In addition to such general works, there have been numerous studies conducted on the relations of China with Rome on the one hand, and the relations of India with Greece and Rome on the other. Such studies make greater use of the Indian-Chinese implications than the general histories, yet one cannot but feel that such references are wholly secondary to the point involved in these works and so, in many cases are rather carelessly investigated. Only one important contribution of a comprehensive nature has been made to this subject to date, namely Konow’s introduction to his volume of the Corpus Inscriptioinum Indicarum.

Roughly speaking, the first-hand sources at our disposal can be divided into three chief groups, namely, Indian, Classical (Greek and Roman), and Chinese. Of these, the Indian sources possess little practical value because of the chronological uncertainty involved.

1 The present writer does not propose to bring forward new material of recent discovery in this short paper, but to correlate the widely scattered material which has previously been brought to light, chiefly through purely linguistic research. There will, therefore, be no attempt to do more than compare linguistic evidence where conclusions have been disputed.
in all of them. The Classical evidence may be divided into two categories as follows: (1) Accounts of historians, geographers, and traders, (2) Literary allusions. As is the case with the Indian sources, the entire value of these Classical texts hangs upon the correct interpretation of certain words. Chief among these are the words *Seres* and *Serica*, *This*, *Thinae Tzmitza*, and *Sinae* are others occurring less frequently.

The words *Seres* and *Serica* are used most often and, more important, they are used by sources dating earlier than the Christian era. The word *Serica* is commonly accepted as the Greek and Latin equivalent for China, while *Seres* refers to the inhabitants of *Serica*, or the Chinese. Therefore *Serica*, derived from *Ser* (silk), would mean originally silk-cloth country. No one has seriously attacked this etymology and it has been repeated in substantially the same formula as now quoted from Coedès.

"Le Chinois See, le Coréen Sir le Mongol Sirkek, et le Mandchou Singhe ont les noms de la soie."

But on the other hand, while the above etymology has not been attacked, there have been strong exceptions taken to certain specific passages in which the word *Seres* is employed; questioning, for instance, the usage of *Seres* when applied by Pliny to "some *Seres* of unusual height, who had red hair, blue eyes, and harsh voices," and who lived, "beyond the Emodi mountains."

---

2 I am speaking of those sources which carry the words *cina* *cinapatta* *lau̍pia* and its Pali equivalent *kossiyam* etc. The chief literary works in question are the *Mahābhārata*, *Kautuṅya’s Ārthaśāstra*, the *Mbhandaṇhāba*, and the *Dīgha Niśāya*. Other works in which *cina* etc. appear are unquestionably of later date than the 1st century A.D.


5 See also J. G. Frazer, *Pausanias Description of Greece IV*, 110.

6 J. Kennedy, *Seres or Chera* (IRAS, Apr. 1904), 359-362.
Further illustration of the unsatisfactory character of the implications of the Classical references which depends solely upon the words Seres and Serica may be illustrated from the following statement of Alfred Herrmann:


Mehr an Westchina denkt P. Vidal de la Blache, Les voies de commerce dans la géographie de Ptolémée. MemAcInsc, 1896, 480.


This disagreement among nineteenth century scholars has in no wise been narrowed down in the twentieth. Herrmann himself, writing in 1910, refused to commit himself beyond saying that western knowledge of the East prior to Ptolemy was so imperfect as to make impossible any geographical location of Serica. Perhaps the only safe conclusion that one can make on this subject is that since the Graeco-Roman world got foreign silk from the East and named the Eastern people from this commodity, the people they called Seres were either all or one of the people who used such a name (i.e. Chinese, Manchus, Mongols, Koreans) for silk. The only exception taken to this view, if one omits Kennedy's Cheras, is that the

7 Herrmann, Die alten Seidenstrassen zwischen China und Syrien, 20, n 4.
country of Kāśmir is meant, as was held by Gosslin in 1813 and by Vivien de St Martin in 1860. 8

The second group of Greek words, This, Thinae, 9 Tzinitza, 10 and Sinae, 11 have not led to as many differences of opinion as Seres and Serica, though even here there is some dispute. Tzinitza and Sinae are used by writers too late to have a bearing on our period and besides have been identified variously as Burma, North China, and Yunnan 12

The *Periplus Erythraei Maris*, in which the words *This* and *Thinae* occur, is usually dated in the last quarter of the first century AD and so may be regarded as a primary source relating directly to our period. Schoff identifies *This* with the north-west Chinese state of Ch'in, and *Thinae* with its capital Hsien-yang; later Ch'ang-an and Sh'-ngan-fu. This identification has not been seriously challenged and the contents of the original text bear it out.

The various authors and works mentioning the *Seres* and *Serica* have already been enumerated by Coedès.

The third division, the Chinese source material, again hinges upon linguistic interpretation of certain words and names. These names are Chi-pin (Ki-pin), T'ien-chu, and Shên-tu. 13 Chi-pin, which name occurs most frequently has been variously identified with Kāśmir, 11 Kābulistan, 14 and with a less defined region somewhere north-west of India. 16 Internal evidence of the Ch'ien Han

---

8 Hermann, *Die alten Seidenstrassen zwischen China und Syrien*, 20-21
9 Found only in the *Periplus Erythraei Maris*
10 Ptolemy's Geography
11 Cosmas Indikopleustes
12 Schoff, *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea* 273 ff
13 I am indebted for my Romanizations of Chinese characters to the aid of my friend and colleague Dr Knight Biggerstaff
14 Edouard Chavannes, *Les Pays d'Occident d'après le Heou Han Chou. (T'oung Pao, Série II, viii, 1907, 175)*
15 A Wylie *Notes of the Western Regions*, trans from the *Tseen Han Shoo*, Book 96, pt 1, (Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland, x, 1881, 33-35)
16 Sten Konow *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, II, pt 1, xxiii-xxiv
Shu, which contains the earliest mention of Chi-pin, suggests the third region as the safest identification, because the Chinese of this period hardly seem to have been sufficiently intimate in their knowledge of trans-Pamir countries to have used a term like Chi-pin for any region of well marked political boundaries, particularly of such contracted boundaries as either Kasmir or Kabaistan.

The names T'ien-chhu and Shên-tu are by common consent identified with each other and both with India. No further proof of this assertion need be sought than an examination of the annals themselves which say,

"Le royaume de T'ien-tchou (Inde) s'appelle aussi Ch'en-tou (Shên-tu), il est à plusieurs milliers de li au Sud-Est des Hong-nu."

The identification with India has been attested by Chavannes, Burgess, etc. The most recent equivalent given is the Sanskrit sindhu which, as may be seen, is almost perfectly duplicated by the Chinese word Shên-tu, ordinarily pronounced Shên-du, could scarcely be more accurately borrowed by Chinese, who, it would seem, only learnt of the word by hearsay.

The Chinese works in which this name appears in reference to our period are the Ch'ien Han Shu, covering the period from 206 B.C. to 25 A.D., the Hou Han Shu from 25-220 A.D., the Shib Chi of Ssu-ma Ch'ien, and the great history of Ma Tuan-lin which was not written till after the first millennium A.D. Of these the most important for the present investigation is the Shib Chi, containing the first account of the Memoirs of Chang Ch'ien, who, perhaps, was the first Chinese, at least the first historical Chinese to hear the name India. Other Chinese works of less repute have been cited by a number of Western scholars, who have attempted to build upon the exaggeration, found therein a framework of fact with which,

17 Chavannes, op cit., 192-3
in some cases, there is an attempt to prove a number of rather fantastic sequences 18

Books 61, the Memoirs of Chang Ch’ien, and 96, Notes of Western Regions, are the only sections of importance to this subject in the Ch’ien Han Shu. The former duplicates Su-ma Ch’ien’s account of what seems clearly to have been the first historical journey of a Chinese to the region of the Pamirs. The original Memoir is found in the last chapters of the Shih Chi. The above are the sources at our disposal in entering into a discussion of the actual knowledge possessed by India and China of one another prior to a date approximating 65 AD. The Chinese historical tradition seems too firmly rooted to make their annals subject to much scepticism in essentials, though in some particulars they have been subjected to the usual historical criticism. The section on Chang Ch’ien, for instance, which enumerates an almost impossible number of plants, animals, and other commodities brought back by him from the West, seems to smack of the eponymous culture hero rather than of actual fact. These passages, like the Psalms of David, and compass of Huang Ti must be taken as later accretions by which the first man who went to the West must be given credit for all things Western regardless of when they were actually introduced.

By way of introduction to the first century B.C., brief reference ought to be made to the works of numerous scholars who have asserted that contact existed between China and India prior to the first century B.C. Detailed criticism of these assertions, however, seems out of place in the present discussion since it would really amount to little more than a rehearsing of outworn arguments dealing with points of very doubtful authenticity 19

18 Of the works so affected, that of Terrien de LaCupeere, entitled, The Western Origin of Chinese Civilization from 2,300 B.C. to 200 A.D. is perhaps the most fantastic.

19 A summary list here will indicate the titles of some of the works in which such references are to be found. Sufficient it to say that the writer has satisfied himself
The actual beginning of a widening of the Chinese geographical horizon took place, it would seem, from the commencement of the reign of Wu Ti (140-87 B.C.) of the former Han dynasty. At the beginning of his reign this energetic monarch busied himself with the affairs of the Hsiung-nu, who, like others of their stock in later days, were constantly making raids on China's western frontier.

"At that time (140-134 B.C.) the Son of Heaven made inquiries among those Hsiung-nu who had surrendered (as prisoners) and they all reported that the Hsiung-nu had overcome the king of the Yue-chi and made a drinking vessel out of his skull. The Yue-chi had decamped and were hiding somewhere, all the time scheming how to take revenge on the Hsiung-nu, but had no ally to join them in striking a blow. The Chinese wishing to declare war on and wipe out the Tartars, upon hearing this report, desired to communicate with the Yue-chi, but, the road having to pass through the territory of the Hsiung-nu, the emperor sought out men whom he could send 20

That the above is a story told by actual Hsiung-nu prisoners seems difficult to doubt in view of the fact that they might naturally, expect a tribe whose chief had been so badly treated to seek revenge. That such a consideration was far from Yueh-chiuh intentions is seen from the story told by them at a later date to the envoy selected by Wu Ti.

Chang Ch'ien, the envoy, began his journey in 138 B.C., accompanied by a small detachment of troops. Almost immediately that none of the assertions alluded to below present sufficient evidence to prove connection between the two countries prior to the first century A.D.

a Terrien de LaCuperie, _The Western Origin of the Early Chinese Civilization_, passim
b Rawlinson _Intercourse between India and the Western World_, pp 9, 43
c T W Rhys-Davids, _Buddhist India_ 90
d _The Cambridge History of India_, I, 213
e George Rawlinson _Bactria, a Forgotten Empire_, 74, 77, 125
f Rudhakumud Mookerji _Indian Shipping_, 53-4, 163, 114
g J Kennedy _The Early Commerce of Babylon with India_, 700-300 B.C (_IRAS_, 1898, 241-288

h Srinwasa Iyengar _Trade of India_, (IHQ I, II, 1925-26, II, 43-44, 291)
20 Hirth, Friedrich _The Story of Chang Ch'ien_, (_JAOS_, XXXVII, pt 2, 93)
he suffered the misfortune of falling into the hands of the very Hsiung-nu against whom he was commissioned to find an ally. His almost marvellous steadfastness in duty over a period of ten years' detention among the Hsiung-nu, during which time he married a wife and reared a family, almost borders on the miraculous, but it is hard to doubt the historicity of his tale, appearing as it does among documents of the greatest reliability. At the end of the ten years Chang Ch’ien escaped to the Yueh-chih, who were then living west of the Pamirs and north of the Syr Darya (Jaxartes river).

No success obtained in the attempt to persuade the Yueh-chih to return, but Chang Ch’ien gained a geographical knowledge of considerable proportions which he communicated to Wu T’i after his return, which took place in a year's time, after a second captivity. Chang Ch’ien must have returned, therefore, about the year 126 B.C. to give his official report.

"The following counties were visited by Chang Kien in person Ta-yuan (Feighian), Ta-yut-chi (Indocythia), Ta-hua (Bactria), and K’ang-ku (Soghdiana). There were besides, five or six other large adjacent countries concerning which he gained information and on which he reported in the following terms."

To the southwest of it (Bactria) is a country called Shon-tu (India). Chang Ch’ien says (in his report to the Emperor) ‘When I was in Ta-hua I saw there a stick of bamboo of Kung (Kuang-chou in Ssi-ch’uan) and some cloth of Shu (Ssi-ch’uan). When I asked the inhabitants of Ta-hua how they had obtained possession of these, they replied ‘The inhabitants of our country buy them in Shon-tu (India).’ Shon-tu may be several thousand li to the south-east of Ta-hua. The people there have fixed abodes, and their customs are very much like those of Ta-hua, but the country is low, damp, and hot. The people ride on elephants to fight in battle. The country is close to a great river. According to my calculations, Ta-hua (Bactria) must be 12,000 li distant from China and to the southwest of the latter. Now the country of Shon-tu being several thousand li to the south-east of Ta-hua, and the produce of Shu (Ssi-ch’uan) being found there, that country cannot be far from Shu. Suppose we send ambassadors to Ta-hua through the country of the K’iang (Tangutans), there is the danger that the K’iang will object, if we send.

21 The term Indocythia, as well as other identifications, are Hirth’s. It probably refers to the Kusànas, one of the five tribes of the Great Yueh-chih
22 Hirth, op cit., 95. No clearer statement of Chinese ignorance of these countries prior to Chang Ch’ien could possibly be given.
them but slightly farther north, they will be captured by the Hsiung-nu, but by
going by way of Shu (Sui-ch’uan) they may proceed direct and will be unmolested
by robbers.”

This account, the first in Chinese annals, evidently refers to
the India of the Panjab and possibly Sind. Some have taken it as
the Ganges country, though it would seem to be a less certain
identification. It is clear that Chang Ch’ien got his information of
India wholly by hearsay and his conjectures show him, at least, to
have been entirely ignorant of India prior to his arrival in Bactria in
128 B.C. Chinese annals do not support any hypothesis for earlier
knowledge of the West and particularly of India.

A number of hypotheses have been made about the Sze-
ch’üanese goods which came through India, and from the descrip-
tion of the bamboo, experts have identified the sample found by
Chang Ch’ien with the Sze-ch’üanese species. This fact has been
taken as proof of the trade route referred to throughout La’s
Couperie’s work, which ran through Sze-ch’üan, Yunnan, Upper
Burma, Assam, and on to India. While such a route may well have
existed by which a few Chinese goods were sent to India and even
beyond into Bactria, the geography and population of the country,
which not only turned back several expeditions of the Emperor
Wu Ti, but also certain fully equipped British expeditions of more
recent date, forbids any assumption of a ‘through route’ hypothesis.

Beyond the mere mention of the name India (Shên-tu) it may
be assumed that Chinese were still unacquainted with India even
after Chang Ch’ien reported in the year 126 B.C. It is also of in-
terest that the above quotation is apparently the sole authority for all

23 Hirth, op. cit., 98
24 At least according to present translations
25 I have been unable to find documentary evidence of this statement but
have it on the oral testimony of the late Berthold Laufer as quoted by Dr Walter
E. Clark
later Chinese descriptions of India till the time of the Later Han Annals. The Ch’ien Han Shu (206 B.C.—25 A.D.) repeats the above information with very slight modification.

That the India discovery (i.e., the hearsay of India) loomed important in Chinese official eyes may be seen in the sequel to Chang Ch’ien’s report, but one will likewise observe that India becomes important wholly as a possible highway to Bactria and in no sense because it was itself known to be a region rich in all sorts of valuable produce. This makes even more evident the obvious conclusion that India and Indian goods alike were unknown to China prior to the first century B.C.

“The Son of heaven, on hearing all this, reasoned thus: Ia-Yuan and the possessions of Ta-hia and An si are large countries full of rare things, with a population living in fixed abodes and given to occupations somewhat identical with those of the Chinese people, but with weak armies, and placing great value on the rich produce of China, in the north the possessions of the Ta Yueh-ch’u and Kang-kü, being of military strength might be made subservient to the interests of the Court by bribes and thus gained over by mere force of persuasion. In this way a territory of 10,000 li in extent would be available for the spread among the four seas of Chinese superior civilization by communicating through many interpreters with the nations holding widely different customs. As a result the Son of Heaven was pleased to approve Chang K’un’s proposals. He then, upon giving orders that, in accordance with Chang K’un’s suggestions, exploring expeditions be sent out from K’un wei of the Shu kingdom (the present Su chou in the Upper Yang tsé) by four different routes at the same time, one to start by way of Ming, one by way of Jan (both names referring to barbarous hill tribes on the southwestern frontiers (cf. Shi-kü, chap. 116 p. 2) one by way of Shu (or Si) and one by way of Kung (Kung chou) in Su ch’uan and Po (the present Yü ch’ou). These several missions had each travelled but one or two thousand li when those in the north were prevented from proceeding further by the Ti and Tso tribes, and those in the south by the Su and K’un ming tribes (placed by the commentators in the southwest of Su chou (su) who had no chiefs and, being given to robbery, would have killed or captured the Chinese convoys. The result was that the expedition could not proceed further. They heard, however, that about a thousand li or more to the west there was the “elephant riding country” called Tién-Yue (possibly meaning the Tién, of Yunnan, part of Yué or South China), whether the traders of Shu (Shu-ch’uan) were wont to proceed, exporting produce surreptitiously. Thus it was that by trying to find the road to Ta-hia (Bactria) the Chinese obtained their first knowledge of the Tién country (Yunnan).”

26
Clearly this passage indicates, not only Chinese ignorance of India to the south-west, but also of Yunnan itself. That Chinese produce in great quantity could have passed through the maze of jungled mountains separating Sze-ch’uan and India seems incredible. The four expeditions were completely stopped in both the northern and southern sectors. This illustrates likewise the futility of trying to prove a Tibetan route as early as the time of Chang Ch’ien as indicated vaguely in certain of the secondary works listed above. Had such a route been known, it is hardly possible that it would not have been resorted to by the northern expeditions.

But Chang Ch’ien’s interest in this project was not dampened by these failures. After a temporary degradation in office due to an error in the field of battle against the Hsiung-nu, he was again commanded to lead an expedition to the West, this time to persuade the Wu-sun to return to a region nearer China so that the combined peoples might offer a better resistance to the Hsiung-nu assaults. Being unable to persuade the Wu-sun, any more than he had previously persuaded the Yueh-chhih, Chang Ch’ien prepared to return again to China. Before undertaking this journey he sent ambassadors out to all known regions as indicated in the following excerpt:

"The population of Wu-sun was thus divided into three parts, and notwithstanding that the majority were under his (the old ruler’s) authority, the K’un-mo (King of Wu-sun) did not dare take it upon himself to conclude that treaty with Chang K’ien. Chang K’ien therefore sent ambassadors in several directions to the countries of Ta-Yuan (Pershina), Kang-ku (Soghdiana), Ta-Yue-chi, Ta-hua (Bactria), An-si (Parthia), Shen-tu (India), Yu-tien (Khotan), Ham-nu and the adjacent countries. Wu-sun furnished guides and interpreters to accompany Chang K’ien on his return, and the latter, travelling with several dozen natives and as many horses sent by the people of Wu-sun in acknowledgement (of the Emperor’s gifts), and thereby afforded them the opportunity to see China with their own eyes and thus to realize the extent of her greatness.""26

Did the ambassadors reach India (Shên-tu) and if so, which part?

These questions prevent any positive conclusions on the score of the
testimony just quoted India provides no answer, and Chang Ch’ien makes no further remark about this particular ambassador’s return to China. The Ta-hia (Bactrian) ambassadors returned after a year, accompanied by a native of the region, but nothing beyond the sending is recorded of the ambassador to India. The difficulties of the journey may have overcome any ambassador despatched to so distant a region, or perhaps, having arrived in some one of the small kingdoms south of Bactria, the envoy may have concluded that this was a sufficient representation of India. It is possible that Chi-pin was reached, because in subsequent notices from the Ch’ien Han Shu, that region receives sufficient notice to be reckoned as more important than India itself, if one can judge by the space devoted to each. Of course it is possible that the Shên-tu envoy actually did penetrate into India, but such a thesis cannot be proved.

This expedition was Chang Ch’ien’s last. He died soon after in the year 115 B.C. His importance as one of the world’s earliest explorers can hardly be overestimated as it created the Chinese knowledge of the West, which, in turn, led to the acquisition of Chinese Turkestan in the Han regime and even of Bactria and Sogdiana in T’ang days. The reduction of these regions to stable and peaceful conditions were primary factors in the great cultural and commercial intercourse which subsequently took place between India, Persia, and the Roman Empire on the one hand and China on the other.

Without dwelling on the phases of this Central Asian conquest with which both the Ch’ien Han Shu and Hou Han Shu are concerned in certain chapters, an examination may be made of both of these works and the epilogue of Chang Ch’ien’s Memoirs for notices of India.

Shortly after Chang Ch’ien’s death, a further group of ambassadors (ca 112-166 B.C) were sent to all Western countries including

29 Supra, 4
30 Edouard Chavannes Documents sur les Tou-kins (Turcs) Occidentaux, 276 ff
Shên-tu, but again no report of the journey or experiences of those despatched to India is forthcoming. The fact that no further description of India, as if given by an eyewitness exists in any subsequent account in the Chʻien Han Shu convinces one that none of the Chinese sent abroad reached India proper, but the careful geographical data provided in the Chʻien Han Shu on Chi-pin may indicate that our 'Indian' embassies arrived in this extreme north-western portion. Confirmation of this in India is not to be expected in view of the fact that even Alexander the Great was passed over in silence, but the detailed information given in the Chinese records on Chi-pin is practically conclusive evidence. As the description of this country is too long to quote in full the following digest will supply the chief essence of the information. Chi-pin is described as being 12,000 lǐ from Chʻang-an, the Chinese capital. It is reckoned as a first-rate kingdom of considerable extent and population and is not ruled by the Chinese 'Governor General.' It joins the Ta-Yueh-chih on the north-east. This indicates a southward movement of the Yueh-chih into Bactria, which, if Chi-pin is Kābul and its environs, would fit fairly accurately. 'The country of Chi-pin is flat, and the climate is mild and agreeable.' Perhaps Chavannes' location of Chi-pin in Kāsmīr is better fitted to this description than Kābul. Chi-pin produces sandal-wood (known only along the Malabar coast in India), bamboo, the varnish tree, the five grains, grapes, and other fruits. On the low ground rice is cultivated and raw vegetables are eaten in the winter.

Of primary importance is the notice taken of the skill in 'ornamenting, engraving, and inlaying building palaces and mansions, net weaving, ornamental perforation, and embroidery.' These references suggest either the continued existence of Greeks in the region of Chi-pin or else the Greek art and coinage which were

taken over by Sakas and Parthians after Greek rule had disappeared. The fact that Gandhāra sculpture, so far unearthed, does not ante-date the Kuśāṇas is no proof that such art did not exist earlier. As a matter of fact the general opinion is that it was begun by the Bactrian-Greeks themselves. The above chance excerpt, dated certainly prior to 25 A.D. and probably several years earlier than the Christian era, can safely be interpreted as proof of pre-Kuśāṇa art in Čhi-pin, whether that place is Kāśmīr, Kapīsa, or Kābul.

That the first information of Chi-pin came not long after Chang Ch'ien's death in 115 B.C. is seen in the following short passage: "From the time that Wu Ti opened up communications with Čhi-pin, the rulers of that kingdom, in view of the extreme distance, had considered themselves safe from the intrusion of a Chinese army." This certainly cannot have been later than 87 B.C., the date of Wu Ti's death. No further description of Čhi-pin as a country is vouchsafed to us in the lengthy section devoted to its affairs, but a detailed discussion of the perfidy of its ruler, which extended to the execution of several Chinese ambassadors, reveals the fact that China far from being able to reach India proper was wholly unable to trust her emissaries to the wholly irresponsible Chinese, and what was worse, no redress for such grievances was possible, even as late as the reign of Ching-te (32-7 B.C.) who made a speech to the ambassadors from Čhi-pin on the subject of why China must withdraw recognition of Čhi-pin because of past outrages.

References to Shēn-tu (India) are scattered throughout the 96th book of the Ch'ien Han Shu as geographical location notices only. As a typical example, the location of 'Pi-shan' may be cited: "The country joins Shēn-tu on the south, and is distant from Koo-mik on north 1,450 li. The road to Čhi-pin and Wu-yih-shan-li lies to the south-west. Such notices are of little value except to show that India, though not yet reached by Chinese, had not been forgotten."

33 Wyhe, op. cit., 36-38
34 Wyhe, op. cit., 30-31
The above observations exhaust the reliable sources which relate to evidence of Chinese-Indian contacts in first century B.C. Of the spread of Buddhism we have as yet learned nothing, though de LaCouperie's works and others who follow him, contain sufficient material drawn from various spurious sources to maintain a theory of the introduction of Buddhism into China prior to the reign of Ch'in Shih Huang-ti. Certain it is that Chang Ch'ien or the Chinese annalists had taken no notice of such a religion even in the West.

Turning to the beginning of the first century A.D. our sources are the Hou Han Shu, Ma Tuan-lin, and various references contained in post-Christian Classical sources. Ma Tuan-lin's work, being really only a condensed version of the contents of the earlier material, contains nothing new. The value of Pliny's contribution concerning "fair-haired, blue-eyed Seres north of the Emodi" has been commented upon above, but a further reference made by him to "Seric iron" is of some interest.

"But of all the different kinds of iron, the palm of excellence is awarded to that which is made by the Seres, who send it to us with their tissues and skins, next to which, in quality, is the Parthian iron."

No other reference to Chinese iron is found anywhere in western sources, nor are the Chinese themselves in the habit of mentioning its supreme excellence. What Pliny refers to, therefore, is wholly a matter for conjecture.

The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea provides the definite information that Chinese silk could be bought at the three ports of Barbaricum near the mouth of the Indus, Barygaza (Broach) where "ancient drachmæ are current," and Barkas which is within the Pândya kingdom in southern India. Obviously the silk which arrived at the two west coast ports came through the Kābul valley or over one of the Pamir passes and then down the Indus, but the origin of the silk in Barkas is less certain. The text explains "Besides

35 Pliny, xxxiv, 41
36 Schoff, op cit, 38 Periplus, 39
Chinese-Indian Contacts prior to first century

...there are exported great quantities of fine pearls, ivory, silk cloth, spikenard from the Ganges, malabathrum from the plains in the interior etc." The common interpretation has been that silk arrived at Barkere from the Ganges region, having reached that port either by way of the same north-west passes or else by the Yunnan-Burmese route. The latter, as has been shown, was extremely precarious as a means of transporting a commodity to a steady market, the former is more plausible. The important question relative to these silk ports is the time of their establishment as such. Is it not possible, if China got Indian goods in Chi-pin, that Chinese goods might have been exchanged for them and thus have reached Indian ports even a century prior to the Periplus' certification of it? While this is possible it can only remain a conjecture till fresh evidence is forthcoming.

Most important in the Periplus for our purposes is the kingdom of This[7] (China?) described as the last known land.

"After this region (the East coast of India to the Ganges delta) under the very north, the sea outside ending in a land called This, there is a very great inland city called Thinae (Chang-an), from which raw silk and silk yarn and silk cloth are brought on foot through Bactra to Barygaza, and are also exported to Damirica by way of the river Ganges. But the land of This is not easy of access, few men come from there, and seldom. The country lies under the Lesser Bear, and is said to border on the farthest parts of Pontus and the Caspian Sea, next to which lies Lake Maeotis, all of which empty into the ocean."

This passage clarifies the previous reference to silk from the Ganges and also makes it evident that the only recognized route of silk, even in the first century A.D. was that from Chang-an (if that is Thinae) westward through Chinese Turkesthan and (for India) south through the passes of the north-west and down the Indus or Ganges to the various ports from which silk could be shipped to the Roman market. It is probable that much was also consumed by an Indian market, though no evidence for such a conclusion exists except in references to China etc. referred to above as being present.

37 Scrof, op cit., 48-49 Periplus, 64-65
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in sources of such doubtful date as the Mahābhārata, Milindapañha, and the rest

This additional knowledge of China attained in the West by the end of the first century is sufficient to introduce the following passage from the Hou Han Shu which will serve both as an illustration of the tremendous advance in geographical knowledge gained by the Chinese during the first two hundred and twenty years of the Christian era and as a fitting termination of a paper rather barren in positive testimony

"Le royaume de T'ien-tchou (Inde) s'appelle aussi Chen-tou, il est à plusieurs milliers de li au Sud-Est des Hong-nu. Ses meurs sont semblables à celles des Hong-nu, mais le pays est bas, humide, et chaud. Ce royaume est sur les bords d'un grand fleuve. Ses habitants montent sur des éléphants pour combattre, ils sont plus faibles que les Yue-tche, ils pratiquent le religion du Bouddha, aussi est devenu chez eux une habitude de ne pas tuer et de ne pas batailler.

Quand on part du royaume de Kao-tou (Kaboul) qui appartient aux Yue-tche et qu'on se dirige vers le Sud-Ouest on arrive à la mi-Occidental, à l'Est, on parvient au royaume de P'an-k'i, tous ces pays sont partie de Chen-tou. Le Chen-tou a plusieurs centaines de villes autres (que la capitale), dans chaque ville on a mis un gouverneur, il a plusieurs dizaines de royaumes autres (que le royaume principal) dans chaque royaume il y a un roi. Quoiqu'on remarque dans chaque de ces royaumes quelques petites différences tout cependant se nomment le Chen-tou. A cette époque, ils dépendaient tous des Yue-tche, les Yue-tche avaient tué le roi et avaient installé un chef pour gouverner cette population.

Ce pays produit des éléphants, des rhinocéros, de l'écaill de tortue, de l'or, de l'argent, du cuivre, du fer, du plomb, de l'étain. Du côté de l'Ouest, il est en communication avec le Ta Ts'in, aussi y trouve-t-on les objets précieux de Ta Ts'in. On y trouve aussi de toiles fines, des tapis de laine de bonne qualité, des parfums de toutes sortes, du sucre, du cani, du poivre, du gengembre, du sel noir.

Elmer H Cutts

38 This statement would hardly indicate more than hearsay knowledge of India even by 200 A.D., were it not qualified below
39 About 125 A.D. Chavannes, op. cit., note, 192
Glimpses into the Ancient History of Cochin

The history of the Perumpatappu Svarūpam,¹ the present royal family of Cochin, during the pre-Portuguese period is shrouded in darkness. On the basis of certain literary references, an attempt was made by the present writer to reconstruct the chronology of the Cochin kings for the period 1342-1500 A.D.² Some information is available from literary sources regarding two of her sovereigns of the middle of the 14th century who were responsible for shifting the family headquarters from Mahodayapuram to Cochin, and this is the theme of the present paper.

The transfer of the traditional headquarters of the royal family is an event of great significance in the history of any royal family and it was particularly so in this tradition-ridden corner of India. This step certainly demands more than ordinary grit and calibre in the kings who effected it, and this event has been commemorated by the founding of an era,¹ called the Cochin Era. It is only after this event that the Perumpatappu Mūppil has come to be called the King of Cochin. The kings who made this transfer are held to be two Rāma Varmās, the Maharaja and the heir-apparent, who are

¹ This is the traditional name by which the royal family of Cochin was known in ancient days, and this name persists even to-day in orthodox communications.
⁴ Another name for this era is the Putuvappu Era, and it is under this name that the era is mentioned in the Dutch treaty of 1663. This name is more popular and refers to another important effect of the great floods, namely the land accretion along the coast.
⁵ Some hold that this name was given by the Portuguese; this is wrong, for we find that the name is mentioned by Bālakavi of the latter half of the 15th century, almost fifty years before the advent of the Portuguese.
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described in the following verse, occurring in the Tenkalanāthodaya of Nilakantha.

This citation shows that the Rāma Varmās possessed those virtues to a remarkable extent—an aspect that will be made clearer in the citations following. One interesting feature that may be noticed here is the fact that the Rāma Varmās are mentioned together, and it may be taken as indication that they were together responsible for the transfer of the capital.

Two Rāma Varmās again figure prominently in the Sanskrit Kāvya, called the Śravulāsa, written by one Dāmodara Cákyar, a protégé of king Kerala Varma of Kāyankulam. This chief had a daughter, named Unniyati, born of his wife Guptā,—born late in life as a result of praying to god Śiva enshrined in the family temple of Kandiyūr. The girl was given an education worthy of her birth.

6 Vide the paper mentioned in note 2 ante. The conclusions, set forth in that paper have been questioned by Mahīkāvi Ullur S P Iyer vide his Introduction to the edition of the Bhāsinassadbacampa. Vide also the Bulletin of the Sir Rama Varma Research Institute Trichur. These views are controverted in the paper 'The Date of Nilakantha's Chronology' contributed by the writer to the Quarterly Journal of the Keralaśāhityaparipāda.

7 Vide page 3 verse 6 in the Malayalam Improvement Committee's edition of the Tenkalanāthodaya.

8 Here are given the particular features of the kings mentioned they are both endowed with noble virtues, are bold and enterprising, have destroyed their enemies and are deep and dignified like the ocean.


10 Compare, e.g.,

11 Compare, e.g., the following verses

पवादर्दानात तपस्वी पुत्र: क्रिप्तमीलातिवाद ल।
वर्ण: च श्रवसुध्रये ग्राम बालक्षविप: शिब्राहु।
नास्ते नानामनारंगस्मृतेनकृपास्तक्तातु केशवेनाभवाते।
भूषणामदशीशापि रामचरितमाला॥
Even when the girl was but twelve, she became fully grown up and so her father, being anxious to get her married to one worthy of her, decided upon holding a Svayamvara, possibly the only instance of the kind in all-Kerala, which literature has so far preserved for us. Elaborate preparations were made for the function, and all the eligibles of the land were informed. Many were the aspiring candidates who attended the function, and among them was the twenty-five year old heir-apparent Rāma Varmā of the Perumpatappu Svarūpa, who came accompanied by his uncle Rāma Varmā, the Perumpatappu Mūppil. One after another the candidates were presented and they were rejected till the bride reached Yuvarāja Rāma Varmā. This prince was introduced and the bride chose him. We quote below the extract which describes the Rāma Varmās of Cochin.

It is interesting to notice the attainments of the daughter of the king of Kiyankulam, the heroine of the poem. Her education comprised the subjects of dancing and music, literature, and literary criticism, grammar and philosophy, particularly Vedānta and Mīmāṃsā.

12 Vide the following

13 Vide citation 94 following.
We get from the description certain interesting historical details. In the first place the Perumptappu Müppil was then holding court at Mahodayapuram, modern Cranganore, and he was

14 This expression is a literal Sanskrit rendering of the Malayalam expression Perumpatappu, which means extending wide.
15 Mr. U. S. P. Iyer understands that Yuvarāja Rāma Varmā was the son of Laksma Rāni. This is wrong.
16 Vide citation given above.
then having some sort of all-Kerala supremacy, though the extent of it is not clear. Secondly, the name of the then reigning monarch was Rama Varma, the son of Rama Laksmi and that he had a nephew Rama Varma who was the Yuvaraja. Further, we also know that these kings were contemporaries of Kerala Varma of Kayankulam.

We shall now try to see if it be possible to fix up the dates of these Rama Varma's with some degree of approximation at least. It is said that three ladies of Kandiyur are mentioned in the Unnini-lisansanda, one of the greatest Sandešakāvyas of Malayalam literature and possibly the best of the type, and one among them is a Unniyati. This work is said to have been written about 1374 A.D. when the king of Kayankulam was a Ravi Varma who is described as an aged king. There is nothing improbable in identifying the Unniyati of the Kavya with the Unniyati of the Sandesā. We also know from the Kārāyamakkarana of the Óralars of the Iriñjalakkuda temple that the king of Kayankulam in 1341-42 was a Ravi Varma.

17 Mr Iyer concedes this point in his article on the subject. He says that the Poonthadiappu Muppi holding court at Mahodayapuram was the Emperor of Kerala, thereby suggesting that he had some sort of all-Kerala overlordship vide pp. 38 & 39, and further substantiates his position with reference to Viraṅghavacakavarti. This view is perfectly in keeping with the view we have already elaborated in our paper 'Kings of Cochin versus Emperor of Kerala, published in the Maharaja's College Magazine', vol IX, no I, pp 11-13.

18 Vide citations u & x given above
19 Vide citation x given above
20 Vide citation x above
21 Vide the Journal quoted in note 9 ante page 24
22 Ibid
23 Vide the Bulletin of the Ss Rama Varma Research Institute, Trichur
No II Temple Studies Iriñjalakkuda Temple We give below a literal rendering of the Kārāyamakkarana —

"The Kārāyama died written in the month of Thulam 517 M.E. The agreement entered into between the people of the nine families who own Kārāyama rights in the Iriñjalakkuda-Ksetra and who took the Mānukka gem on Kārāyama and Ravi Varma who is the lord of Onattu-Kara and who gave the Mānukkaratna av Kārāyama"
who may be identified with the Ravi Varmā of the Sandeśakāvyā. If these identifications are correct, then the father of Unniyati, the consort of Yuvarāja Rāma Varmā of the Perumpatappu Svairūpam must be the immediate predecessor of Ravi Varmā who was the king of Kayankulam in 1342 A.D. In which case the two Rāma Varmās, the Perumpatappu Mūppil and his nephew, must be contemporaries of both Kerala Varmā and Ravi Varmā of Kayankulam, and that means they are the Rāma Varmās who are mentioned as being the first kings of Cochin in the Tenkailanāthodaya.

This conclusion finds some support in the circumstances leading to the execution of the Kārāyakkarana of the Mānīkkaksetra of Iriñjalakkuda. The Perumpatappu Mūppil had already been granted by the year 1336 large powers in the temple and yet no reference is found made in the temple chronicles to this suzerain lord either in the matter of loaning the gem, or in the execution of the Kārāyakkarana, by which two very important rights were granted to the king of Kayankulam, namely the right of appointing the

Referring to the Mānīkka-ratnam received on Kārāyama, the people of the nine families gave in writing to accompany of Nirudaka as Kārāyama right in the Mānīkka-ksetra the Kārāyama-melāyama-sthānam and the Sri-kovil-pani-taccuta-kammal-avarodha-sthānam to be conducted without deviating from the customary usages obtaining in the Sanketa to keep the Bhāndāra and render accounts to the Sāhāyogam in the Vātalmādham of the temple. Similarly, giving to the nine families the Mānīkka-ratnam as Kārāyama, Ravi Varma received in writing to the accompaniment of Nirudaka as Kārāyama right the Samadāya-melāyama-sthānam and the Sri-kovil-pani-taccuta-kammal-avarodha-sthānam in the Mānīkka-ksetra, belonging to the people of the nine families who received as Kārāyama the Mānīkkakatnam in return. In this way receiving the Mānīkka-ratnam as Kārāyama gift and giving back in writing to the accompaniment of Nirudaka the Samadāya-melāyama-sthānam and receiving this in writing by Ravi Varma from the nine families, attesting witnesses Tarannallūr Nampūthri, Akor Nampūthri, Matiyatt Tānni and Pāmbum Mekkatt. Written with their knowledge and in the hand-writing of Turunthatt Kural.

This is no doubt a very interesting document for more reasons than one, and particularly to the students of language and of history, particularly of the temple at Iriñjalakkuda.

24 Vide article mentioned in note 23 ante.
the Samudāya Melayma and the temple architect. According to our interpretation of the references in the Śiva-vilāsa, this lack of reference is easily explainable. It must have been at the instance and with the cognisance of the Perumpatappu Mūppil that the loan was made and the document executed. We, therefore, hold that the Rāma Varmās mentioned in the Kāvya must have been living in 1342 AD.

From what has been said it will be clear that these two Rāma Varmās can with a fair degree of accuracy be ascribed to the middle of the 14th century AD and that means they can be identified with two Rāma Varmās mentioned in the Tenkailanāṭhodaya, who are described as the first kings of Cochin.

Vitanidrābhānam,25 of an unknown author, mentions a Rāma Varmā, at whose instance was the work written and compare the following extracts:

प्रहो चूरुणसकश्चूरकल्हफ्लितिहिताकारामेखलाया केळकलकराजपनाया। ग्रीरामवमेम-परिपालिताया महोदयपुरयो हल्लादि।

Also compare:

याका, लंबडेनुमस्ति, अर्हति विनितत्वा याबद्धमुं गुरारे।
वजलब्रह्मसमांशिष्यार्थिनां गुरुलाम्राजनाम।
याबद्धे हु मैलीमुषनवति गिरामीररी पदपवि।
तावद तपस्विवदिति स्वयंमतु शुभ्राम्रामवर्ण नरेन्द्र।

Here again the Rāma Varmā is described as holding court at Mahodayapuram and as the son of Laksmi Rāni. The latter of these two facts is a clue which justifies our identification of this Rāma Varmā with the Perumpatappu Mūppil who figures in the Kāvya.

25 Mr U S P Iyer’s dating of these kings is evidently wrong. Vide note 6 ante.

26 Vide Vijnānādiṣṭur, part IV, p. 207, also History of Sanskrit Literature in Kerala. The former writer forgets that the poet has mentioned this Rāma Varmā as holding court at Mahodayapuram and therefore has tried to connect this king with the king who reigned between 1565 and 1600. This, it needs scarcely be said, is totally wrong.
and the elder Rāma Varmā who is mentioned as the founder of the city of Cochin.

We may here sum up the characteristic features of the hero panegyrised in the works mentioned above. The Perumpatappu Mūppil described in the Śravatīśakāvyā is the king of all-Kerala who held his court at Mahodayapuram, which was then the premier city in all-Kerala, he was a brave king and heroic warrior, graced with all regal qualities. The Yuvarāja Rāma Varmā was equally great as a warrior—adorned with physical strength and valour which are toned down by patience and forgiveness, with knowledge which is enhanced by kindness and sweetness of disposition, and with charity which is characterised by selflessness and religiosity. He is described as the flash of lightning which roots out the darkness of ignorance and the divine tree which supports the creeper of fame. Even when due allowance is made for the imagination and exaggeration of the poet, enough yet remains in the poem which would show that these two Rāma Varmās were very eminent kings, an aspect which is also borne out by the description given by Nilakantha. They were both great warriors and statesmen, well versed in the arts, both of peace and of war.

K. Rama Pisharodi
Army and War in Mediaeval Ceylon

Mercenaries and militia were the two constituent parts of the Sinhalese army in the mediaeval period (Cf H W Codrington, Short Hist of Ceylon, pp 64-70, G C Mendis, Early Hist of Ceylon, pp 83-85) Terms for, soldier 'are yodha, bhata, and if their bravery is to be emphasised by the poet sūra hero'. A peculiar term for 'mercenary' is āyudhiya (Mbus, 61 69) or āyudha-jīvin (66 67), one who is living by bearing arms or by military service.

The mercenaries got payment from the king. They were Sibhas or more frequently people who came over to Ceylon from Southern India Damilas, Keralas and Kannatas (desāntarani-vāsino yodhā soldiers domiciled in a foreign country, 69 18). In the old Mahāvamsa neither Keralas nor Kannatas are named at all, and the Damilas were but the hated enemies of the Sinhalese people. For the first time at the end of the 3rd cent A.D. Damilas occur as soldiers in the service of a Sinhalese ruler (36 49). Abhayanāga, the younger brother of Vohārikatissa was forced to take flight to main India owing to a crime he had committed at court. He returned afterwards to Ceylon at the head of a Damila army, defeated and killed his brother and ascended the throne.

In the 7th cent King Aggabodhi III was supported in his war with Jetthatissa by Damila troops he had hired in India, and Jetthatissa’s dignitary Dāthāsiva also had Damila soldiers in his service when he himself took the crown from Aggabodhi (44 105, 125). It seems that at that time the mercenary system was already established or at least not unknown in Ceylon. The kings could not dispense with it though it sometimes caused serious troubles.
We are told in 55 1 sq that King Mahinda V, 981-1017, was unable to satisfy his troops by giving them their pay. Therefore a mutiny broke out, and when the king had taken refuge in Rohana in the remaining parts of the country the brutal soldiery of Sihalas, Keralas and Kannātas carried on the government as they pleased. On hearing this the Cola king sent an army to Ceylon and made it a province of the Cola empire (H W Codrington, II, p 40, G C Mendis, Early Hist of Ceylon, p 55). A public calamity befell the Kerala mercenaries during the reign of the usurper Māgha, 1214-35. They oppressed and harassed the people in a terrible manner, plundered their houses and took away their possessions, and Māgha himself, whose power was depending on this soldiery, had delivered up to the Keralas whatever else belonged to the Sihalas (80, 61-77).

Later on the Velakkāra mercenaries played an important rôle in the king's army. They were, no doubt, a warlike tribe or clan or a military community of Dravidian origin and may be compared with similar communities within the Cola army as the Mara-varas (76 130, 246) or the Kallaras, the Golihalas and the Kunta-varas (76 246, 259) who are mentioned in the description of King Parakkamabahu's campaign against the Cola king Kulaśekhara.

We learn from South Indian inscriptions that they for the first time came to Ceylon with king Rājendra I by whom the conquest of Ceylon mentioned above was completed in the first half of the 11th century (Wickremasinghe, Epigr. Zeyl, II 247). Since that time they had great influence in the island serving as mercenaries to the king. But they appear to have been a rather tumultuous element within the army. Already about the year 1089 we hear that they rebelled against king Vijayabahu I. The revolt was put down and the leaders were punished with bloody cruelty (60 35-44). Half a century later they, suborned by Kittisirinmeha and Sirivallabha, deserted king Gajabahu and, supported by their
defection, the two brothers attacked Rājarattha. But the king defended his dominion successfully. We may assume that in this case also a severe punishment of the mutinous mercenaries took place (63. 24 sq.)

Even during the reign of Parakkamabahu we hear of a Velakkāra revolt. When the king began his campaign against Rohana the Velakkāras banded themselves together with the Sihala and Kerala mercenaries and revolted in order to profit by this opportunity and to take possession of Rājarattha. However the mutiny was suppressed by the king, the leaders were killed and the landed property formerly granted to the mercenaries as payment was withdrawn from them (74. 44 sq.)

There is in Polonnaruva a fine slab erected by the Velakkāras with a Tamil inscription which, as I believe, must be dated immediately before the revolt that took place at the beginning of King Gajabahu’s reign in the year 1137. The Velakkāras at that time, as the self-confident and proud tone of the inscription shows, were on the summit of their wealth and power, having regained their former influence after the first rebellion against Vijayabahu in the year 1089. In the inscription they declare their agreement to protect the temple of the Tooth Relic, though they were themselves adherents of a Śaiva sect. But on undertaking the control of that sacred shrine they were so bold as to call it the property of the Velakkāras and regarded it as their own charitable institution under their entire support. So they assigned to it lands, guards, etc., for its maintenance (Wickremasinghe, Ep. Zeyl., II, p. 247).

In the later chapters of the Mahāvamsa we do not hear any more of the Velakkāras, but in the 13th century Āryyas, i.e., Rāiputs were serving as mercenaries of the Sinhalese king side by side with Sihalas. Their leader bore the interesting name Thakuraka which corresponds to the modern family name Tagore (Yule and Burnell, Hobson-Jobson s.v. Thakoor). He is said to have
killed the usurper Mitta with his own hand, and after this resolute deed the mercenaries banded themselves together and reinstated the legitimate king Bhuvanekabahu in the royal dignity (90 12 sq.)

3 The militia is called ‘the army dwelling in the country’ (ratthavasika sena Mbus 70-89, 75 102) and were agriculturists who were tilling and watering their fields and waiting for the harvest in perpetual fear of demons who might annihilate the whole work, the Sinhalese were never warlike people. The militia was, therefore, of no great military value. Cordier, in his description of Ceylon, as it was shortly after its occupation by the Englishmen, says ‘An attempt was made some years ago to train a body of them (i.e. the Sinhalese) as soldiers, but, after great perseverance, it completely failed of success. A life of military discipline proved, in the highest degree, irksome and uncongenial to their habits. They deserted in great numbers, and examples intended to terrify, only stimulated those who remained to abandon the service’ (Ceylon, I, pp. 92-3.) In mediaeval times the Sinhalese were hardly better soldiers. We often read in the chronicle that the soldiers are running away on all sides as soon as they see themselves exposed to an unexpected danger (Mbus, 66 89-90, 104, 67 48) Such passages are met with chiefly in that part of the chronicle the favourite hero of which is Parakkamabahu, and it may sometimes have been the unsophisticated chronicler’s intention to exalt the king’s heroism in comparison with his suite. But we also hear that a general of king Gajabahu owing to an inauspicious dream fell from his bed and ran away into the forest where he was wandering about during the whole night, until at daybreak he reached his village. His men too, when they heard of the general’s flight, left their weapons behind and followed their lord in bewilderment (66 47 sq.) So much seems to be certain that such scenes were by no means strange or unusual, much less contemptible in the chronicler’s eyes.

General Gokanna’s army which was made ready by him in all
haste for warding off Parakkamabahu’s general Mayageha consisted of the troops sent to him by king Gajabahu, of his own former army and of the army dwelling in the country, that is, of regular troops and militia. Apparently the militia was the last hope. The minor Manabharana is said to have armed the able-bodied inhabitants of his two provinces, the two portions of Rohana Atthasahasaka and Dvadasahasasaka (balm ratthaduvaanvarasnam 70 187, cf 70 260) in order to be ready for war, if Parakkamabahu should succeed in conquering Pulatthinagara and then menace Rohana. In the ensuing war two generals of Parakkamabahu, Deva and Kittti, who had too far penetrated into the province of Rohana, were encircled by the hostile army together with the militia-men (sakalärati-
vāhini sa-ratthavāsikā 72 127). In the later war when general Rakkha attacked the Rohana troops in the flank near Simatälaththali, his unexpected appearance caused surprise and terror among the rebels and they called upon the militia for assistance in this dangerous situation (75-102).

As militia men the Vyādhās took a particular position in Parakkamabahu’s army (69 20, cf below) The word is here, no doubt, the Pali equivalent of the modern Vaddā, the name of the wild tribe of huntsmen who are believed to be the remnant of the aboriginal population of Ceylon. It is obvious that these people who were intimately acquainted with the wilderness, could be of good service to a commander of troops as scouts or guides. In a similar connection the word kirāta occurs in 72 208. It is said here that the Kirātas were skilled in wandering by night in the wilderness of forest and mountain and slew many people by night and day. In Sanskrit and Pali kirāta denotes a wild jungle-man of dwarfish stature. Can it be that the Mbus 72 208 preserves the memory of a race of pygmies formerly living in some districts of S E Ceylon? Traditions concerning such a race are mentioned in Journal R A Soc, Ceylon Br XXIII, no 67, 1914, p 288 sq.
Even professional thieves practised in house-breaking (samdhībhedassa kusalā corā 70-168) were employed in war by Parakkamabāhu. They were sent by him in the middle of the night to a fortified camp (dugga) erected by the enemy to undermine it with sharp antelope horns (migasingāni) and so to take it. Antelope horn was perhaps the name of an iron-instrument comparable to a miner's pick. Coras were also engaged in the siege and capture of Pulatthinagara (70 285).

The traditional name in India for a complete army is the four-membered army (senā caturangini in the ancient Mahāvamsa, 18 29 etc., and in its mediaeval portion, 70, 217 etc.), because it is composed of elephants, horses, chariots, and foot soldiers. In the 13th century the four constituent parts of the army of Parakkamabāhu II were the viramahāyodhā, the great warriors, i.e. the foot soldiers, battāspakā, the elephant drivers, turangāsādī, the horsemen, and rathino, the charioteers' (88 34). This however seems to be but a poetical paraphrase of the traditional name which in fact hardly suits the mediaeval Sinhalese army, for I believe that H W Codrington (11 p 69) is right, when he says, 'In the twelfth century there is no indication of the existence of organised units of elephants, chariots, or cavalry in Ceylon, indeed the thickly wooded nature of the country, in which the operations took place, renders it very doubtful whether they could have been used to any extent.'

It is true that in the earlier centuries of the mediaeval period elephants were used as animals for riding in battle by kings or their substitutes (41 23, 47 sq., 50 21 sq.) But otherwise elephants are never mentioned in the description of a battle. In 70 228 sq. we hear that king Gaṇabāhu's generals when preparing the final resistance placed in readiness well-armoured elephants but this is hardly more than a poetical phrase, for in the following chapters we do not learn anything about their employment. Parakkamabāhu is said
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(69. 22-3) to have brought up many sons of distinguished families in his own palace with the wish that people skilled in the art of riding elephants and horses should increase in number. This notice, however, does not concern but sport, and bodily training in general, not military exercise especially. The Ramanas contrary to the Sinhalese were using elephants in war. When, therefore, Parakkamabahu prepared the Ramañña campaign, he provided his soldiers with a peculiar sort of arrows for the defence of those animals (76. 48)

As to horses, in one case only it is related that a royal prince, Kassapa, the younger brother of king Sena I, was on horseback, in battle (50. 26-28) but we may infer from the narration itself that this was something extraordinary. In the Cola army cavalry was numerous and the report in the Mahavamsa on Parakkamabahu’s war with Kulaśekhara clearly shows how much the Sinhalese were impressed by this fact. The capture of many horses in the various battles is repeatedly exalted by the chronicler (76. 100, 298, 331).

The bulk of the mediaeval Sinhalese army consisted of foot soldiers with the baggage train (bala-vahana). Even the officers (sāmantā) were never on horseback. Their conveyance was a palanquin, on the march as well as in battle, as we may infer from 72-100 (Cūlavamsa, trsl I, p 328, n 2, H W Codrington, 11, p 75). We must, therefore, also translate the word yāna, generally meaning a vehicle, in this connection with palanquin, not with chariot (70. 85, 122). The badge of the officers was an umbrella of different colour (66. 49, 70. 122), as the white umbrella was that of the king.

Trumpets and drums are frequently mentioned in the chronicle. It is shown by the word sankha (85. 113, 89. 46, Sk Sankha) that what we call trumpets were conches. They are often called victorious or auspicious shells (jayāsankha 65. 27, 88. 75, mangala-
sankha 74 222) From 72-119 pańca-mahāsadda-sankha-nāda (filled) with the din of the five loud clanging conches we may perhaps infer that so many forms or kinds of conches were in use.

The words for 'drum' are more various. It is a well-known fact that the Sinhalese people are very fond of drumming and beating the drums with admirable rhythmic art. More than sixty sorts of drums exist now in Ceylon, of large or small size, one-headed or double, narrow or wide in the middle, each bearing a peculiar name. It must have also been the same, or nearly the same in the mediaeval period. The most common name for a military drum is bheri (Sk id., Sinh beraya), also ranabheri battle drum or jaya-bheri victorious drum (70 227, 75-104, 76-161 88 75) Other words are kāhala (74 222, 75 104, Sk and Sinh loanword id.), dundubhi (85 113, Sk, Sinh id.), ālambara (69 20, Sk ādambara) and, mentioned in the latest part of the chronicle, madā, dala (96 15, 99 46, Sk mardala). We may notice here that in time of peace drum-beating and blast of trumpets were never lacking on festive occasions (72 315, 74 221), and that public proclamations used to be made by beat of drum.

Flags (dhaya 85 114) were also in use in the Sinhalese army. King Gajabāhu boasts that all his enemies were taking to flight because they could not behold his victorious flag (jayaddhajam 70 225, cf 88 75). According to a later passage (99 44, 18th cent.) we may assume that the militia contingents of the different districts were distinguished by different flags, probably by flags of different colours.

5 In the Mahāvamsa five kinds of weapons (pańcāyudha or āvā 41 48, dasaddhāyudha 70 229) are distinguished, but they are never enumerated. Clough in his Sinhalese Dictionary s.v. says they were sword, spear, bow, battle-axe, and shield. This is hardly correct, for the shield cannot be called āyudha which always denotes an offensive weapon, nor do I know whether the
battle-axe was ever in use among the Sinhalese. I think that *pañcâyudha* was simply a traditional name similar to *caturangini senā*, and used by the chronicler without considering the actualities.

The first and foremost weapons were *bow* (*cāpa, dhanu*) and *arrows* (*sara, bāna, usu, salla*). The archer is called *dhanuggaha* (70 116, 72 244, Sk *dhanurgraha*), *dhanuddhara* (83 45, Sk *dhanurdhara*) or *issāsa* (72 245, Sk *isvāsa*), the archery *dhanussappa*.

It is a phrase often met with in the chronicle that the archers rained an uninterrupted shower of arrows on the enemy (*saravassa 66 27, 70 114, 72 134, 246, 250, saravutthi 74 96, bānavutthi 74 117*). Whether poisoned arrows were ever used by the Sinhalese is extremely doubted. It is true that poisoned arrows are mentioned in the chronicle but only among the Ramanas and the Jávakas. Parakkamabāhu had provided his soldiers whom he sent to Rāmaṇa, with medicine, preserved in cow horns for the healing of venomous wounds caused by poisoned arrows (*visa-pitasalla- 76-49*).

And the Jávakas who had invaded Ceylon in the 13th century are said to have harassed the people with their poisoned arrows (*visa-diddhehi bānehī 83 38*) likened to terrible snakes, they even shot such arrows swiftly one after another from a machine (83 44). It appears from the tone of these reports that here the chronicler is touching a strange foreign custom which was unknown and unheard of to the Sinhalese people and looked to them like a diabolic practice.

A peculiar kind of arrows is called *gokannaka*, probably after their form. The word corresponds to Sk *gokarna* which occurs in the *Mahābhārata* in the same meaning. Such sharp-pointed (*sikkhagga*) arrows were used for defence against elephants (76 48).

Archery was highly developed and esteemed in India as well as in Ceylon. Kitti, afterwards king Vijayabāhu I, is praised for his skill in the use of the bow already in his thirteenth year (57 43). In the army raised by Parakkamabāhu there was a troop of excellent
archers, called, moon-light archers (candālokaṇadhanuddhavaśa 69 19) because they were versed in night-fighting. In the ancient Mahāvamsa 23 86 archers are mentioned who hit their mark guided only by sound (sadda-vedhino) and others who were able to hit a hair (vāla-vedhino) and others who hit their mark by the light of a lightning (vañja-vedhino). The last group is mentioned in the medieval period also akkhanavedhino issāśa (72 245), and we shall be allowed to assume that the other groups were not unknown at the same time.

6. For the sword we come across the names asi, khagga (Skt asi, khadga) and less frequently tharu (Mahāb. 69 22, Sk tsaru), but it does not seem that different forms of the sword are denoted by those words. They are merely synonymous. The sword was used in hand-to-hand fighting, and sparks were flying from the clash of swords in such a combat (72 84). Training in the manipulation of the sword as well as in that of the bow belonged to the education of princes and sons of noble families (64 4, 69 22). The Sihas, after having vanquished the Jávakas, got as booty their elephants and horses, their swords and many other weapons together with their trumpets, drums, and flags (88 74). The sword was the principal weapon in the hand of the king (66 24, 31, 108), and two royal swords are distinguished in 72, 102 sq., one being called the Jambudipa blade and the other the Sihala blade. The latter appears to have been the more terrible weapon. The dagger (churika 39 27, asippataka 41 24, nikkarani 44 112) is mentioned as royal weapon. It was also weapon of the Kerala mercenaries (55 6) and among the different regiments of Parakkamba-bahu's army there was also that of the dagger bearers (churikaggābaka 69 24).

The heavy lance (kunta) is often mentioned in the chronicle. In ancient Ceylon a lance with a relic was the badge and standard of king Dutthagāmani (25 1, 26 9 sq.). In the 17th cent
bows, swords, lances, etc (dhanukhaggakuntādīnī 96 14, cf 99 49) were the weapons of the foot soldiers. The spears given by Parakkamabahu to the Vyādhas (69 20) were probably javelins. The word sattikā used in this passage is Sk  śakti + suff  ka. Another word for a dart or some other light missile is samara. Parakkamabahu’s warriors who had taken up a position in the stronghold of Āligama killed many enemies with arrows, darts and javelins (usu-tomara-sattihī 110 116) which they flung from the turrets of the gate. The meaning of satttha is doubtful. The pursuers of king Bhuvanekabahu are said to have pierced the king’s litter tikkha-sattthetī so that everything was in tatters. The king sprang to the ground from his litter and fled by foot (90 7–8). My translation was, ‘with their pointed spears’ (Cūlavamsa, trsl II, 11), but, with their sharp swords (Cf Sk  śastra) would perhaps be better. We have seen above that light missiles were shot by the Jāvakas from a machine (yanta). Such a machine from which stones were hurled, apparently something like a catapult, was also in use among the Sinhalese (72 251).

An ancient and primitive weapon was the club (muggara). It is however remarkable that even Parakkamabahu enrolled in the army raised by him several thousand soldiers, tall men and strong, who were armed with clubs (muggarike yodhe 69 17). The most ancient weapon was, therefore, not yet out of use in the 12th century.

Among the defensive arms (kavacānī 69 7, 38, or vamma 76 47, opposite to āyudhāni) the shield (phalaka) must be mentioned. It was probably made of wood but it is doubtful whether it was always worn and by all soldiers. When Parakkamabahu was attacked in the wilderness by a dreadful bear he forced the beast down with the edge of his shield and killed it with his sword (67 42). In 74 73 it is said that two generals of Parakkamabahu provided for their troops arrow protective consisting of buffalo-skin’
It seems that leathern doublets are meant by this expression, but their use was apparently an isolated case.

When war is imminent it is necessary first of all to provide the food supply for both the army in the field and the population at home. Therefore Parakkambāhu, ere he began the campaign against Rājaratthar, took care in every possible way to enlarge the cultivable area of his province so that he might be able to store a large quantity of grain (Mbus, 68 7-53). His financial reform served the same purpose (69 27 sq.). We need not add that also stores of armour and weapons of every kind and many other things formed parts of the war material (yuddhōpakarana 69 5, 14). For the war in Rāmanāña the king had supplied for his army not only the iron arrows against elephants and medicine for the healing of venomous wounds, but also armour and weapons in abundance, and provisions for a whole year such as rice and the like, as well as all kinds of remedies for curing the poison of infected water in the many swampy stretches of the country, also iron pincers for extracting arrow-heads which are difficult to move when they have pierced deeply and the shaft has broken. The army was also accompanied by skilful physicians and serving women (shiyō paricārika) who were to attend sick and wounded soldiers (76 47 sq.).

The soldiers themselves were trained for the military profession already at peace by manoeuvres. Parakkamabāhu in order to test the fitness of his men arranged fights on the street, sifted out the most skilled people and dismissed those unfitted for fight. They were to till the fields and perform other works living at home (69 37-8). Sham-fights (yodhakila) in which the soldiers could show their skill in handling the weapons were also in use (89 26, 31).

Before the beginning of the war against Rājaratthar Parakkamabāhu is said to have worked out with ingenuity in a way suited to the locality and the time, and the plan of campaign. He did so
with careful study of literary works valuable for carrying on war, such as the text-book of Kotalla, i.e. the Kautaliya Arthaśāstra, and the Yuddhannava, probably a part of the Agnipurāṇa which bears the separate title Yuddhajāyārṇava. The plan was written down and handed out to the officers with the strict order not to swerve by a hair’s breadth from the king’s instruction (70 56-8).

It is however impossible to carry through a war successfully without an accurate knowledge of the military power of the hostile king and of the political and financial situation of his country. Such a knowledge must be acquired by espionage. Prince Parakkamabahu is said to have done so (66 126 sq.) during his sojourn at king Gajabahu’s court in Pulatthinagara. We must not accept this report as historical in its details, for the chronicler followed here, as I have shown in Beitrage zur Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte Indiens (in honour of H. Jacobi), p. 418 sq., the text of the Kautaliya. He wished to describe his hero as a ruler who in all his qualities corresponded to the ideal of an Indian king who is versed in the nīti.

The prince is said to have sought out clever and astute men and sent them forth in various disguises in order to become acquainted with the people in the outlying districts, whilst he himself confined his observations and inquires to the town and its inhabitants. In the enumeration of these spies in the Mahāvamsa the ascetic (tāpasa 66 135) corresponds to the tāpasa in the Kautaliya, the poisoner (rasakriyābhiśīna 66 138) to the rasada, the sorcerer and fortune-teller (bhūtavijāvīdu 66 138, sāmuddikādikānekalakkhanañnu 66 132) to the sāmedhika (cf. angavidyā), and the itinerant trader selling glass bangles and similar trifles to the vaudebaka (Kaut., I 11 and 12). In order also to find out among the king’s dignitaries those whom he could win over and to apply the right method for doing so he tried to distinguish between those who were ambitious (abhimānino), those who nursed a grudge (sakuddhā), those who
were afraid (*bhīṭā*), and those who were avaricious (*luddhā* 66 142) These four-groups exactly correspond, even in wording, to the *mānvarga*, *kuddhavarga*, *bhīṭavarga* and *luddhavarga* in the *Kautaliya*, I 14

There are some more spies of other character mentioned in the *Mahāvamsa* as well as in the *Arthaśāstra*. But so much seems to be certain that the *Kautaliya* and perhaps also other works of the Indian *nīti* literature were well-known and eagerly studied in medieval Ceylon, and what they taught was probably also applied by the kings as far as it was possible or advisable. It is however very improbable that Parakkamabāhu personally practised espionage at Gajabahu’s court, as it is described in the chronicle, for such an activity was too risky and could hardly be kept secret.

8 As to the war itself four ‘means of success’ (*upāyā*) are mentioned in the chronicle 58 3 The same distinction occurs in the Indian śāstras. In the *Kautaliya* the four stratagems are enumerated (II 10, Shamasstry, ed 2 p 74, trsl 84) *bheda* division of the enemy, *danda* open war, offensive, *sāma* friendly negotiations, *dānām* gifts or bribes. The character of the war itself was mainly depending on that of the country. In the medieval times Ceylon was, for the greatest part, thickly covered with forest, and frequently the assistance of scouts (*carā* 66 99, 75 64) was necessary to show to the soldiers a road leading through the wilderness. They were probably recruited from the local militia, perhaps also from forest tribes (see above in 3). Often the war was hardly more than a guerilla (*corayuddha* 75 135). In this respect the description of the beginning of the second Rohana campaign is very interesting (75 1-18).

In the first campaign the sacred relics of the *dāvēdḥātu* and the *pattadḥātu* had been captured by Parakkamabāhu’s generals (74 138) That was certainly an important moral success. But in order to achieve the main object of the whole undertaking, the
subjection of the province, the king was forced to begin a new campaign. He first intended to invade Rohana from north-east through the districts of Dighavāpi and Guttasālā, now Buttala. The resistance offered by the Rohana people was apparently weak, but when it seemed to have been suppressed at one place, it at once broke out anew in another. In spite of the victories reported by his generals the king gave up his plan and decided to attack the province from its north-west frontier. After the first defeats in this final phase of the terrible war, the Rohana people themselves proclaimed the guerilla. They said 'Save the wilderness, there is for us no other protection. In every way our land is furnished with mountain wildernesses and the like. Therefore at all inaccessible places let us throw up many entrenchments, make all the well-known high ways impassable, lay down many robbers' paths (coramagge), and when our land has been made impassable let us gather ourselves together and open battle' (75 31-33).

An ambuscade is described in 66 72 sq. Prince Parakkama-bāhu on his way to Pulatthinagara was pursued by his uncle's officers and their troops who had been sent forth to bring him back. When he heard at Buddhagāma that they were approaching, he left in front space for the advancing army and placed his bravest men in ambush on both sides of the road. Then when the whole of the hostile force had advanced to the centre he suddenly fell upon them and had numbers of soldiers cut down. In a similar manner when Gajabāhu's troops approached the stronghold of Mihirabibbila, the warriors of Parakkamabāhu feigned as if they were giving way, and thus enticed the enemy into an ambush of soldiers who had been hidden in the forest and suddenly made a dash on them (72 246 sq.)

The tactics of outflanking the enemy were also known. We can hardly understand the undertakings of the Damiladhikārin Rakkha against Mahānāgahula in the final stage of the Rohana
campaign, if we do not assume such a method of warfare (75. 83 sq.) The basis of Rakkha’s operation was Donivagga, that is the district round Pelmadulla. S E of Ratnapura, from here he first tried to advance directly to Mahārāgahula along the road which at present runs through primeval forest from Madampe to Ambalantota. But he realised that a break through along this highway was impossible and we hear in v. 98 that he marched with a strong force to Śūkarālihberipāsāna That is a place near the modern Deniyaya, south of the Rakvana mountain range. Obviously Rakkha had crossed this range on the Bulutota pass and thus made on outflanking manoeuvre. The enemies were surprised and alarmed, for they had not expected an attack from this side because the road leading from Donivagga to Navayojana, i.e. the Bulutota pass was very difficult (75 72) to negotiate and they had not sufficiently secured their left flank. Rakkha won the ensuing battle and was able to advance to the hostile capital.

The descriptions in the chronicle of a battle are of no great interest. They are always made according to a certain poetical model. The simile is generally a thunder-storm. The soldiers are pouring out a rain of arrows or the arrows are the cloud by which the heavens are darkened. The battle-cry of the warriors is compared to the thunder, the sparks flying from the clash of swords are like the lightnings (72 84, 75 63, 110-11, 131-32 etc.) In a very artificial and fictitious passage (76 160-61) the battle-field is compared to the ocean in a heavy storm. Often a general is said to be a lion that has broken into a herd of elephants or gazelles (72 2-3, 69).

A peculiar heroic feature in battles of ancient times was the single combat between the leaders of the two armies. That of Dutthagāmanī and Elāra near the southern gate of Anurādhapura (25 67 sq.) is a classical example. In the mediaeval period such a combat is mentioned between Dāthāpabhūti and his brother Moggallāna,
6th c (41-49). In later times we do not hear any more of such heroic deeds. King Vijayabahu I, 1059-1116, is said, it is true, to have challenged the Cola king (60-30 sq), but this was rather a theatrical pose or a poetical exaggeration. The single combat never took place. In his adventurous youth Prince Parakkamabahu sometimes is reported to have personally taken part in fighting (66 103-4, 67 48), if this is not simply an embellishment of the narration made by the chronicler who wished to exalt the bravery of his favourite hero. After he had become king, Parakkamabahu in all his wars generally remains behind the army in the headquarters or in the capital sending therefrom his commands to the generals in the field. Once when he was present in the most critical phase of a battle against Mânâbharana he cried for his sword (72 102). However he made no use of it, but looked significantly at the faces of his generals who had given way, but turned now again towards the enemy and flung themselves into the midst of the hostile army.

The victory (jaya, opp parâjaya, parâbhava) was celebrated by a festive entrance into the capital of the victorious army. When the dignitaries of Parakkamabahu had finished the Rohana campaign and occupied the whole province they marched at the head of their troops to Pulatthinagara. Accompanied by the dwellers of the city who played music, shouted with joy and waving cloths let their cries of victory resound, they drew near the palace and rendered homage to the monarch (75 220 sq).

After a successful war the heads of the hostile officers who had been killed in battle together with their umbrellas and palanquins, the weapons captured during the campaign, and the captives caught alive were sent to the king (70 122), and the victorious generals were honoured by titles and ornaments (āhbaranāṁ 72 320) corresponding to our medals.

Naval battles are mentioned at the beginning of Parakkamabahu’s war with Gajabahu and were fought by the king’s generals,
in the middle of the sea 'near a place called Muttākara.' This name and the fact that pearls were captured as booty seem to prove that the Gulf of Mannar was the seat of this naval war (70 63 sq., 91 sq.) Some of the Sinhalese kings also sent ships across the sea to Southern India to wage war with the Pāndus and Colas. Thus did Sena II in the 9th cent., Kassapa V and Udaya IV in the 10th cent., and Parakkamabāhu I in the 12th cent., (51 22 sq., 52 70 sq., 53 46 sq., 76 86 sq.) The latter even is said to have made an enterprise against Rāmaṇa (76 44 sq.) In none of these cases we hear that a naval battle was given by the enemies in order to repel the aggressors. When Parakkamabāhu sent many hundred ships, which sailed a day and a night on the back of the ocean, to Southern India the Damilas restricted themselves to defend the coast and to prevent the Sinhalese army from landing (76 89 sq.) As the ships had to lie in deep water the Sinhalese commander made the troops get into hundreds of boats of small size. In order to protect them from the rain of arrows that came flying from the Damilas who were standing on the coast, he had shields made of leather set up in front of the soldiers. Thus he landed on the coast and after putting to flight the Damilas he took up a firm position near the harbour.

9 Fortified camps or temporary fortresses (H W Coddington, 11 p. 70) played a great part in the wars in mediaeval Ceylon. The same was the case in main India since ancient times. The first chapter of the tenth book, on war in the Kautaliya contains the rules concerning the laying out of a fortified camp (skandhāvāra-νveśa S h a m a s a t r y, ed. 2 p. 363, trsl. p. 437). In the Mahāvamsa the word for such a fortress is khandhāvāra exactly corresponding to the expression used in the Kautaliya. It is met with already in the oldest part of the chronicle (10 46, 25 20, 37 19), and in the fifth century king Dhātuseṇa waging warfare with the Damilas who at that time had ravaged Ceylon, is said to have laid
out such camps in the Island, twenty-one in number (khandhāvāre nvesetvā 38 36) But the expression khandhāvāra rather occurs seldom in later chapters (70 138, 161, 167), it is replaced by dugga (cf 55 28, 58 42) This word corresponds to durga in the Kautaliya (e.g. durga-nveṣa 2 4 s f, td 2 p 57') which however here as well as in the Mahābhārata appears to denote a permanent rather than a temporary structure (cf Kaut 2 2, ed 2, p 114 durgavidhāna)

Fortified camps were constructed wherever the army had reached an opportune position in order to serve as entrenchments against sudden attacks and as basis for further operations In the history of Parakkamabahu’s campaigns against Rājarattha and Rohana many duggas are enumerated, and the names of the places where they were laid out sometimes enables us to state the vicissitudes in war which so often are veiled in the chronicler’s report

As an example I shall excerpt the description of the military operation of Senāpati Deva who commanded the troops in the district Giriṇa, south of Kalāveva He first raised an encampment on the bank of the Kālavāpi river Then he threw a bridge across this river, marched off and built a new encampment near Angamu and took up a position there The leader of the hostile army did the same at a place called Senāgama After it had been captured by Deva the enemy built four encampments more, apparently in order to stop the advance of Deva, but they were all successively taken away by Parakkamabahu’s general (79 123-136) The word for, ‘encampment’ is always dugga, one only which was erected by Gajabahu’s officers near Tergama is called (v 138) khandhāvāra

When after the death of Mānabharana the Rohana people wished to save their independence and were expecting the invasion of Parakkamabahu’s army, they built at each difficult spot as far as the frontier of the province many camps, had trenches dug everywhere, placed there barricades and made the roads in-
accessible with felled trees. Then they took up their place in one of those camps (74 31-35). But the general Rakkha having broken through three different fortifications advanced up to a big forest where the Rohana people had laid out one behind the other seven fortified camps (74 55-66). Here Rakkha's advance came to a standstill, and the seven strongholds were conquered only when his army had been enforced by the troops of the general Bhūta (74 75-6). In this passage the term dugga is used for all those camps and fortifications.

Such a temporary fortress which was erected by Parakkama-bāhu's officers near Mihiranabibbila is described (72 232-53) in detail. They had stakes made like spear-points and driven into the ground. Outside these they had stakes of greater size driven in and had them interwoven with branches. Between the two rows of stakes they had a trench dug with pitfalls, and similar trenches at other places also. Then they had the big forest felled round the camp over a tract two or three bow-shots in extent. The footpath leading through the wilderness was made impracticable by sharp thorns which were covered with sand and withered leaves. In the middle of the fortification (dugga-mañhambi, v 244) a structure of four storeys was erected, from which when the enemy approached the archers rained a hail of arrows and stones, and burning sharp-pointed bamboo rods were hurled from engines.

10 Imposing strongholds were built in Ceylon on some of those isolated gneiss rocks which rise abruptly from the lowland and form such a characteristic feature of the landscape. The most famous example is the Sigiri rock (Sihagiri) with its stronghold erected already in the 5th century by king Kassapa I (Mahā, 39 2-3). A similar stronghold was that on the Vatagiri, now VāKirigala in the Kegalla district (58 31, 60 39), built in the 11th century. Others were erected in those times of terrible perturbation when Māgha was reigning in Ceylon 1214-35, by Sinhalese noblemen.
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who wished to maintain their independence, as in Dakhinadesa on the Subha mountain, now Yäpahu (= yasa-pabbata), and on the rock of Jambuddani, modern Dambadeniya, and in Rohana on the Govindasela rock which is now called Westminster Abbey (81 2-6, 15-16)

The big towns, especially the capital cities of Anurādhapura and Pulatthinagara, were fortified with wall and moat, with turrets and bastions (cf below) Defence and besiege of strongholds are described often enough in the chronicle but generally in a conventional form The defence of a fortified camp has been quoted above in 9 In a similar manner the stronghold of Aligāma was defended by general Rakkha When Gajabāhu's troops attacked it, the Sihala archers standing on the gate-turrets, slew numbers of the foe with various missiles Other warriors took up their position at the gates which the enemy tried to blow up The combat ended with a sally of the Sihalas who suddenly burst forth and cut down the foe (70 112 sq )

The stronghold Semponnāri in the Pāndu country was captured by the Sihalas within half a day After they had broken through two outer-walls and four gate-towers, they penetrated into the interior of the fortress and slew there the Damilas, many thousands in number (76 241 sq ) When Parakkamabāhu after many actions approached Pulatthinagara and had sent in advance his light troops, the Vyādhas and Kirātas, the dwellers in Pulatthi- nagara were living as in a besieged town As circulation on all the roads leading to the city was stopped by those troops they dared not even by day leave their houses and go outside the gate when they wanted supply of water and wood In the shops here and there on the outskirts of the town the various businesses were completely given up (72 209 sq ) When captured by storm the towns were plundered and destroyed in the most reckless manner

W Geiger
The Early Home of the Imperial Guptas

I-Tsang visited India in A.D. 671 or 672 and returned to China in A.D. 693-694. In his Kau-fa-kao-sang-chuen, an account of fifty-six Buddhist pilgrims, who visited India, he narrates that about forty stages to the east of the temple of Nalanda, descending the Ganges, one arrives at the temple of Mrgasikhavana. "Tradition says that formerly a Mahārāja called Śrī-Gupta built this temple for the use of Chinese priests. He was prompted to do so by the arrival of about twenty priests of that country who had travelled from Szchuen to Mahābodhi Temple to pay their worship. Being impressed by their pious demeanour, he gave them the land and the revenues of about twenty villages as an endowment. This occurred some 500 years ago.""1

I-Tsang's report places Mahārāja Gupta some time between A.D. 173 and 194. The grandfather of the Mahārāja Mahārājā Mahārāja Candragupta I was, as is known from the Gupta inscriptions, the Mahārājā Śrī-Gupta.2 As Candragupta ascended the throne in A.D. 319, Gupta is to be placed in the second half of the third century A.D. Fleet remarks that "as it is now certain that the era used by the early Guptas commenced from A.D. 319-20, the Mahārāja Śrī-Gupta, mentioned by I-Tsang and referred to him to about A.D. 175, cannot be identified with the founder of the early Gupta family, who lived in the fourth century A.D." Allan is on the other hand, inclined to identify I-Tsang's Śrī-Gupta with the grandfather of Candragupta I, "considering the lapse of time and the

1 Chavannes, Voyages des Pèlerins Bouddhistes, p. 82. A plus de quarante relais (yoganas) il est du temple Ni-lan-t'ouo (Nalinda), en descendant le K'iang-kia (Gange), on arrive au temple Mi-li-kia-si-kia-po-no (Mrgasikhavana). Beal, Life of Huen Tsiang, Introduction xxvi
2 CII p. 15
3 Ibid, p. 8, fn 3
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fact that the Chinese pilgrim gives this information on the authority of a tradition, handed down from ancient time by old men. Following this identification Allan concludes that Pātaliputra had been in the possession of the Guptas since the time of the Mahārāja Śrī-Gupta

Needless to mention that the traditional report generally lacks precision. Huen Tsang, depending on the traditional report places Budhagupta (A.D. 477) in the pre-Christian era. He also places Śilāditya, king of Mālava, sixty years before his visit to Mālava i.e. in A.D. 580. But a record of the Maitrakas establishes that Śilāditya was ruling in A.D. 609. Hence Allan’s view that I-Tsang’s Gupta is identical with Guptā, the founder of the Gupta dynasty, cannot be rejected simply on the ground that the tradition removes one from the other by nearly one hundred years.

The scholars, though they differ from one another in regard to the identification of the two kings as one and the same, agree in thinking that I-Tsang’s Guptā ruled in Pātaliputra, the capital of Magadha. But the discussions made below will prove that their location of Guptā’s kingdom is faulty.

According to I-Tsang, as has already been noticed, the temple of Mṛgāśīkhāvana is forty stages east of Nalanda, descending the Ganges. Shortly after this statement I-Tsang lays down that Nalanda is seven stages north-east of Mahābodhi. Cunningham’s map places Nalanda forty miles north-east of Bodh Gaya. This makes one stage of I-Tsang equal to nearly six miles (5 5/7 miles) Mṛgāśīkhāvana, which is, according to the above calculation, two.

4 Gupta Coins, Intro p. xv
5 Bcl’s Life, p. 110
6 Bcl’s Recit as II, p. 261
7 Bom Gaz vol I, pt I
8 Voyages des Pèlerins Bouddhiques p. 84—A plus de sept relais (yojanas) au nord est du temple de la Grande Intelligence (Mahābodhi), on arrive au temple Na-lan-t’ouo (Nalanda)’
9 ASI, XV, pl I
hundred and twenty-eight miles east of Nalanda, following the bank of the Ganges, is to be placed in the Murshidabad District, Bengal. That Gupta held sway over at least some part of Bengal, finds corroboration in another statement of I-Tsing. I-Tsing states that the land, which the king Gupta granted to the temple of Mrgaśikhāvana, "has now reverted to the king of Eastern India, whose name is Devavarma, but he is said to be willing to give back the temple-land and the endowment in case any priests come from China."  

I-Tsing's report places Magadha in Mid-India, and lays down that Tamralipti and Harikela (Ho-li-ki-lou) are respectively the southern and eastern limits of Eastern India. Harikela is the other name of Vanga, modern East Bengal. Dr R C Majumdar identifies Devavarma with the king Devakhadga of the Khadga dynasty of East Bengal. In this circumstance the temple-land, which reverted to Devavarma, does not seem to have been situated in Magadha, but in East India.

The above discussion leads to a definite conclusion that I-Tsing's Gupta held sway over the Murshidabad District.

If Allan is right in identifying I-Tsing's Śri-Gupta with Śri-Gupta, the founder of the Gupta dynasty, doubt may be reasonably entertained whether Magadha was an early possession of the Imperial Guptas. Possession of Magadha by Śri-Gupta would imply that his kingdom extended from the District of Shahabad, Bihar, to the District of Murshidabad, Bengal. The Gupta inscriptions describe Śri-Gupta as a Mahārāja, a title indicative of lower political status. It is unlikely that a petty ruler of Śri-Gupta's status held sway over an extensive territory, comprising the Districts of Shahabad, Patna,
Gaya, Monghyr, Bhagalpur, and Murshidabad, including Santal Parganas. Moreover the evidence, hitherto available, will not support the conclusion that Sri-Gupta’s kingdom extended beyond Murshidabad.

Thus the early home of the Imperial Guptas is to be located in Murshidabad, Bengal, and not in Magadha.

Some coins bearing the legend Candra (gupta I) are known. They demonstrate the marriage between Candragupta I and the Licchavi princess, Kumāradevī V A Smith, while discussing the importance of these coins, remarks—‘It seems probable that at the time of this fateful union the Licchavis were masters of the ancient imperial city (Pātaliputra), and that Candragupta I by means of his matrimonial alliance, succeeded to the power previously held by his wife’s relatives.” Allan criticises Smith’s view by pointing out that “I-Tsung’s evidence suggests that Pātaliputra was in the possession of the Guptas even in Gupta’s time.” In his opinion Candragupta conquered Vaisāli from the Licchavis, and “that his marriage with Kumāradevī was one of the terms of the treaty of peace.”

But the above discussions show that Smith’s view, viz that the Licchavis were in possession of Pātaliputra in the early part of Candragupta’s reign, cannot be rejected simply on the ground that the city was in the possession of the Guptas from the time of Sri-Gupta.

If Smith’s view proves to be true, it will follow that Candragupta I transferred his capital from Bengal to Magadha, where his successors ruled for a long time.

D C Ganguly

16 Gupta Coins
17 Early History of India Second ed., p 265
18 Gupta Coins Intro p xix
The Dutch in Bengal after Bedara

Dependence of the Dutch on the English

The defeat of the Dutch at Bedara in November, 1759, dealt a crushing blow to their hopes "to rival the political power of the English in Bengal," and henceforth their existence in Bengal became entirely dependent on the goodwill of their rival, the English. The Nawab of Bengal began to look on them as "an unloved guest," whose departure, rather than existence, he now desired most. The Dutch traveller Stavorinus, who visited Bengal during 1769-71 A.D., has thus described the situation of the Dutch after 1759—"Since the unfortunate issue of our expedition to Bengal in 1759, the reputation of our countrymen has been on the decline, and we are obliged to be not a little dependent upon the English, with respect to the piece-goods wanted for our cargoes, both for Batavia and for Holland. In the beginning of the government of the Director V—(Vernet), in the year 1765, or 1766, when Lord Clive was still in Bengal everything seemed to take a friendly aspect, and arrangements respecting trade were about to be made to mutual satisfaction and advantage. Both these gentlemen came to an agreement, that all the aurungs, or weaving manufactories in Bengal, should be numbered, in order that a repartition might afterwards be made for so many aurungs to each nation for the purpose of weaving the goods they wanted, and two Commissioners were appointed, to this end, respectively, by the English, the Dutch and the French, to go through the whole country and ascertain the number of manufac-

1 The importance of the victory of Bedara for the English was aptly hinted at by Clive in the following sentence—
"Thus ended an affair which, had the event been different, threatened us in its consequence with utter destruction, for, had the Dutch gained the same advantage over us, we have now the most convincing proofs to conclude that the remembrance of Amboyna would have been lost in their treatment of this colony."
But these excellent arrangements were all broken, by the departure of Lord Clive from Bengal, his Lordship was succeeded by Mr. Verelst, with whom the Director V—shortly afterwards fell out, and their disagreement was carried to such a point, that upon paying the customary annual national visit to Calcutta, Mr. V—was treated in a most improper and humiliating manner, whence, in the end, so great a breach arose between these two chiefs that the above arrangements were, much to our prejudice, entirely set aside. The English had equally, on their sides, much reason to be discontented with Mr. V—as he had used his utmost endeavours to favour the French in all things, notwithstanding they (the French) had no power to render our Company any service or even to help themselves, and the English were much hurt at this conduct especially at Mr. V—’s selling all the Japan copper, which the Dutch ships brought to Bengal, to the French, without allowing them the opportunity of purchasing a single pound, for a considerable time, although they offered a higher price than was obtained from the French. This was evidently not only unfriendly but wholly incompatible with the interests of the Company, which appears the more strongly if we consider that, upon the least difference with the Moors the Council at Hugli were obliged to have recourse to the mediation and protection of the government at Calcutta, as was the case, two or three times, while I was in Bengal. ² The Dutch commerce in Bengal, formerly very profitable, now ceased to be so. ³

² Struverius, *Voyage to the East Indies* vol. I, pp. 499-501
³ *Ibid.,* pp. 324-25
formerly nab of the faujdar of Hugli, and an inhabitant of that village, had connived at this encroachment of the Dutch for the sake of their protection. Muhammad Reza Khan, nab Nazimi of the minor Nawab Saif-ud-daulah, visited Hugli in February, 1768, argued before the Dutch Director Mr. G. L. Vernet, that Partabpur was within the area of Hugli and was "never annexed to Chinsurah" and "wanted him to restore it to the Nawab." We do not know if it was actually restored or not. There were also other faults on the part of the Dutch which excited the displeasure of the Nawab's government against them. The Dutch Company had to pay certain duties to the Nawab for conveying goods up and down the river Ganges, but these had not been paid by Mr. Vernet for several years. The Nawab thereupon ordered the faujdar of Hugli to exact his lawful dues in a forcible manner, and the latter accordingly sent a chubdar to the Dutch Governor demanding the money and threatening him that "in case it were not paid, he would not suffer any more goods belonging to the Dutch to pass." The Director took umbrage at this peremptory message, and after having violently abused the poor chubdar, sent him to the fiscal De Saunière, and had him bound to the whipping post and unmercifully flogged. At this the faujdar of Hugli detained all callicoes and other piece-goods intended for cargoes for the Dutch ships, which were to sail for Europe in the month of November 1768, and he also invested Chinsurah on the land side on 31st October 1768, with ten or twelve soldiers. All the "approaches and barriers were so closely guarded, that no one could go in or out. This occasioned in the ensuing days such a scarcity of provisions, among the inhabitants of the village that many of them perished for want. Besides this blockade in the land side, the Moors (the Muslims) had also beset the river,

---

4 Calendar of Persian Correspondence, vol II, pp. 231-32
5 Stavroulakis, op. cit., vol I, p. 115
6 Ibid
7 Ibid
above the village, so that nothing would be brought down the water, and from below, there was little to be obtained, while there was any rice, seven pounds weight were sold for a rupee, but it was soon consumed. On a reference being made by Mr Vernet, the Dutch Council thought it useless to use force and decided to settle the matter amicably through the mediation of the English. A Dutch deputation consisting of Mr Ross, the Chief Administrator, and Mr Van Braam, the Controller of Equipments, settled the affair with the English Council in Calcutta and Muhammad Reza Khan. On their promise that the Nawab’s duties should be quickly paid, the Dutch goods were released, the Nawab’s soldiers left Chinsurah on the 15th October, and the navigation of the Hugli river was opened.

Dutch actions during the administrations of Carter and Hastings.

But both the English and the Nawab’s government kept a strict watch on the movements of the Dutch. They were required by the Naib Nazim “not to send more than one European with a fleet.” Officers were appointed at Kalpi to inspect their ships as also of the other Europeans like the French and the Danes, to take strict account of the cannon, arms and military stores on board their ships and to prevent them from sailing up the Kalpi with more than 24 guns and stores in proportion and 250 men in one ship, which were considered sufficient for a merchant ship. These officers were ordered “not to use violence without just cause” and on no account to receive gratuities from anyone. The regulations of the Nizamat were, however, scarcely obeyed by the Dutch, the French and the Danes. On the other hand, they obstructed the business of the faujdar, and oppressed the people. In 1771 the

8 Stavrimus, op cit vol I, p 115
10 Calendar of Persian Correspondence vol III, p 27
12 Ibid
13 Ibid, p 138
9 Ibid
11 Ibid, p 42
14 Ibid, pp 249-50
Director of the Dutch Company committed a murder, and the victim's heirs petitioned to Sayyid Muhammad Ali Khan, faqdar ofHughli for redress 11. Mr John Cartier, the Company's Governor in Calcutta, thereupon, authorised the Naib Nazim, Muhammad Reza Khan, to write to the faqdar of Hughli, to put a stop to the illegal actions of the Director of the Dutch Company 16. Further, disputes generally took place between the Director of the Dutch Company at Chinsurah and the officers of the Nizamat on the question of respective rights and privileges. Considering it desirable to put a stop to such disputes, Warren Hastings, who succeeded Mr John Cartier as the Governor of Bengal, wrote to Nawab Mubarak-ud-daulah and his guardian Muni Begam, on the 11th May, 1773, to call upon the Director of the Dutch Company to produce copies of firman by virtue of which his Company claimed privileges in Bengal 17. The Nawab acted accordingly. It is not known if the Nawab's orders were complied with by the Dutch or not. But the Dutch Director defied the authority of Khan Jahan Khan, the faqdar of Hughli, who thereupon requested the Company's Governor to "give him definite directions for his guidance and to ask the Nawab at Muishidabad to reprimand them and issue a paranab empowering him to stop their boats of grain, etc." 11 As desired by the English Governor, 19 the Nawab issued a paranab to the faqdar of Hughli asking him "to stick to the privileges of his office and not to give up his authority. 120

In course of a few years, the Anglo-Dutch relations in India turned to be hostile under the influence of extra-Indian politics. The adhesion of Holland to the league against England during the

15 Calendar of Persian Correspondence vol III 16 Ibid., p 255
17 Ibid., vol IV, p 56 18 Ibid., p 149 and p 168
19 Ibid., pp 161-62 20 Ibid., p 168
War of American Independence was followed by a declaration of war on the part of England and seizure of Dutch colonies. In pursuance of this policy, Lord Macartney, Governor of Madras, drove the Dutch out of Madras and Pulicat, and in November 1781 captured the Dutch settlement of Nagapatam. The Dutch forts and factories in Bengal and Bihar were also seized by the English without much difficulty, as the English, apprehending a rupture with the Dutch for some time, had not allowed them to maintain strong garrisons in their settlements. But after the termination of the War of American Independence by the Peace of Versailles in 1783, the Dutch got back most of their possessions in India, and in the year 1778 the Dutch settlement of Baranagar was exchanged with the English territories contiguous to their factory at Hugli.

Anglo-Dutch alliance during the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars.

The Dutch power was badly affected in Europe during the Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars. On the conquest of Holland by France in 1795, the Dutch possessions in India were placed under the protection of the English for their safety against the French, and the English issued the following proclamation: "Whereas armed force acting under the pretended authority of the persons now exercising the powers of Government in France, has entered into the Territories of His Britannic Majesty's ancient allies, their High Mightinesses, the States General of the United Provinces, and has forcibly taken possession of the seat of Government, whereby the stadholder has been obliged to leave his own country and to take refuge in Great Britain, We do by this Proclamation..."

22 Siwa-al-Mutasabin (Eng transl.) IV, pp. 118-19
23 Consultations, 23rd Nov 1784 (Imperial Records Dept., Foreign Branch)
24 Consultations, 12th Jany 1789 (Imperial Records Dept., Foreign Branch)
25 Letter from G. Hay, Secretary to Government, to Henry Douglas, Magistrate of Patna, 14th August, 1795 (Patna District Judge Court Unpublished Records)
26 *Ibid*
issued in virtue of his Majesty's Commands, invite and require all Commanders and Governors of Settlements, Plantations, Colonies and Factories in the East Indies, belonging to the said States as they respect the sacred obligation of honour and allegiance and fidelity to their lawful sovereigns (of their adherence to which they have at all times given the most distinguished proofs) to deliver up the said Settlements, Plantations, Colonies, and Factories into his Majesty's possession, in order that the same may be preserved by his Majesty until a general Pacification shall have composed the differences now subsisting in Europe, and until it shall please God to re-establish the ancient constitution and Government of the United Provinces, and in the meantime we do hereby promise upon the assurance of His Majesty's Royal Word that so long as the said Settlements, Plantations, Colonies, and Factories shall continue to be possessed by His Majesty, they shall be held and treated upon, the same Terms with respect to all advantages, privileges, and Immunities to be enjoyed by the respective Inhabitants upon which the Settlements, Plantations, Colonies and Factories in the East Indies are held and treated which are now subject to his Majesty's Crown, or are otherwise possessed by the Company of Merchants trading from England to the East Indies under His Majesty's Royal Charter."

"Loss of Dutch possessions in India"

The Dutch gradually lost all their possessions in India during the first three decades of the 19th century. The Marquis of Wellesley contemplated an expedition against the Dutch at Batavia, as the Dutch were then in alliance with the French, but it could not be carried out. When Mr. Sohnlein, the Chief of the Dutch factory at Patna, died in May, 1803, his effects were sent by Mr. Henry Douglas, Magistrate of Patna, according to the desire of the

27 *Journal of Indian History*, 1932, p. 52
The Dutch in Bengal after Bedara


deceased, to his executors. Messrs Bowman of Chinsurah and Ullman of Fultah. During the Governor-Generalship of Lord Minto (1807-13), the Dutch lost Cape of Good Hope, the Spice Islands and Amboyna. But Java and the Dutch possessions within the jurisdiction of the Madras Government were restored to the Dutch by Lord Hastings. The territories of the Dutch in moujah Octler Nowapore in paragana Sonhit near Balasore, from which the Dutch agent at Balasore had been dispossessed, were also given back to them in 1820.

During the Governor-Generalship of Lord Amherst, a treaty was concluded between England and Holland with a view "to place upon a footing mutually beneficial to their respective possessions and the commerce of their subjects in the East Indies so that the welfare and prosperity of both Nations may be promoted in all time to come, without those differences and jealousies which have, in former times interrupted the Harmony which ought always to submit between them, and being anxious that all occasions of misunderstanding between their respective agents may be, as much as possible, prevented."

The important terms of the treaty were the following —

Art 8—His Netherlands Majesty cedes to His Brittanic Majesty all establishments on the continent of

28 Letters from Messrs Playdell and D V Kewini to H Douglas, dated 23rd May and 24th June, 1803 (Puna District Judge Court Unpublished Records)
29 Thornton, History of the British Empire in India IV, pp 181-95
30 Consultations, 26th October and 17th December, 1816 (Imperial Records Department, Foreign Branch)
31 Letter from D A Overbeck, Resident at Chinsurah, to W L Melville, Judge and Magistrate of Cuttack, dated Chinsurah, the 2nd February, 1820 (Cuttack Unpublished Records) Copies of these records were lent to me by Principal K P Mitra of Monghyr, for which I thank him sincerely
32 Proceedings of the Right Honourable the Governor-General in Council in the Foreign Department, under date the 14th October, 1824 (Cuttack Unpublished Records)
India, and renounces all privileges and exemption enjoyed or claimed in virtue of those establishments.

Art 9—The Factory of Fort Marlborough, all the English possessions on the island of Sumatra are hereby ceded to His Netherland Majesty, and His Britannic Majesty further engages that no British settlement shall be formed on that island, nor any treaty concluded by the British authority with Native Prince, chief or state therein.

Art 10—Town and fort of Malacca and dependencies ceded to Britannic Majesty.

Art 11—His Britannic Majesty withdraws objection to the occupation of the Island of Billiton and dependencies by agents of Netherland Government.

Art 12—His Netherland Majesty withdraws objection to occupation of the Island of Singapore by subjects of His Britannic Majesty. No British establishment to be made on the Carimon Island and Island of Baltam, Bintang, or other islands.

Art 13—Delivery of all possessions on the 1st March, 1825.

Art 14—Inhabitants for 6 years of the date of ratification of the Treaty may dispose of property as they like.

Thus by the year 1825 vanished all the possessions of the Dutch in India.

Kalikinkar Datta
Nawab Muhammad Ali and the Siege of Arcot (1751)

Introductory

The contemporary historian, Robert O'Byrne, wrote in 1764 that Captain Clive, on his return from Trichinopoly in the beginning of August 1751, proposed as the only resource left to the English, to attack the possessions of Chanda Sahib in the territory of Arcot. "offering to lead the expedition himself which he doubted not would cause a diversion on the part of the enemy's force from Trichinopoly". Following him, other writers of eminence have given Clive the whole of the credit for conceiving the idea of the diversion on Arcot. Sir George Forrest repeats the same in his Life of Lord Clive (1918) and says that Clive, on his return to Fort St. David, made "a proposal which was an example of daring and military sagacity", viz., if a swift dash should be made on Arcot, Chanda Sahib would be bound either to lose the seat of his government or send a large portion of his besieging force from Trichinopoly to protect it or recapture it. A study of the records of the English Presidency and of other indigenous sources will, however, point to the fact that it was Nawab Muhammad Ali, the son of the martyred Nawab Anwaruddin Khan, who was besieged in Trichinopoly by Chanda Sahib assisted by the French, that insisted, almost from the very beginning of the siege operations at Trichinopoly, on the necessity for, and the importance of, an attack on Arcot, and the English Governor Saunders wholly approved of the plan and supported it from the first.

Muhammad Ali on the Importance of Arcot

Nawab Muhammad Ali who had taken shelter in Trichinopoly after the assassination of Nasir Jang, in December 1750, had all along been urging on the English the necessity of their promptly
sending reinforcements to him. He assured Governor Saunders, in his letter to Fort St. David (received 2/13th March 1751), that Mir Asad of Chetpat, Mutabir Khan of Ranjangudi, Hirasat Khan and Murtaza Ali Khan of Vellore were all his friends and his troops could take shelter in their forts whenever they might be sent to take possession of the Carnatic country. Muhammad Ali thus gave out his plans: “I do therefore give it as my opinion that it is highly necessary to strengthen the affairs of Trichinopoly Fort, re-take Madura (from Alam Khan, an adherent of Chanda Sahib who had to come to be in possession of it in the beginning of 1751) and settle Tinnevelly, but at the same time we ought to be mindful of the affairs at Arcot, and use our endeavours to weaken the enemy, for if we proceed to Arcot before we re-take Madura, Alam Khan will grow powerful. On the other side, if we neglect Chanda Sahib on account of Madura, it will prejudice our affairs. We must therefore be mindful of both these affairs and to that end I think it requisite to send a part of my army with a detachment of your troops to Madura and the other part of the army shall be commanded by my brother Abdul Vahab Khan who in conjunction with your troops are abroad upon the expedition to Arcot.”

Writing a few days later, the Nawab was sanguine that Madura could be easily re-taken and it should be secured. “before we think of settling the affairs of Arcot.” Governor Saunders appreciated the wisdom of the plan of the Nawab, but he deprecated the sloth of his movements. He thus wrote to Muhammad Ali on the 30th April/11th May 1757 — “Am doubtful whether you have come to a final resolution. Our troops have been abroad above a month, when

1 No 29 of Country Correspondence, Public Department Records of Fort St George (1751)
2 Letter No 59 of Muhammad Ali to Fort St David received 20th April 1751—For Cape’s Failure before Madura see Orme, vol I, pp 169-170 and Orme Mss O V (India Office) Hill’s Catalogue — O V 14, 21
they first went out Chanda Sahib had gained no advantage and it was thought your joining us would entirely frustrate his designs. On receipt of your letter, I wrote to the Deputy Governor of Madras to send a detachment to Vellore, but the affair was finished. It is my opinion that if you don't attack Chanda Sahib in this province, he will attack you, if his forces come into your country they will plunder and ruin it, but if yours enter his, it will be the contrary. The friendship and regard I have for you induce me plainly to tell you what I think.

Muhammad Ali was apprehensive of Chanda Sahib's march on Trichinopoly and was chagrined when Cope had to send away a detachment to Fort St. David under definite instructions from Saundes. He could only repeat his firm conviction that "if this (Trichinopoly) is preserved, we shall be enabled to retake Arcot."

*Muhammad Ali repeats the urgency of a diversion on the Arcot country*

But the nearer Chanda Sahib approached Trichinopoly, the more frightened Muhammad Ali came to be, for his own safety. The latter was prepared to deliver up the districts of Trichinopoly, Madura, and Tinnevelly to the English, provided they allowed him 2 lakhs of Madras pagodas every year for his expenses. As an alternative, he desired the English to negotiate with the French and conclude a peace between him and Chanda Sahib so that "each of us may remain in peaceable possession of his respective country, that is, I in Trichinopoly and its dependencies, and Chanda in Arcot."

At the end of the letter containing the above alternatives, Muhammad Ali wrote in his own hand thus — "Please raise as great a disturbance as possible in Conjeevaram etc. countries." Muhammad Ali was already getting to be suspicious of the English and could

---

3 The Nawab's letter to Governor Saunders received on the 29th July/9th August 1751 (No 103—Country Correspondence, Public Department 1751)
be easily persuaded into believing that they were ready to abandon him. So when Governor Saunders wrote to Chanda Sahib taxing him with having unjustly seized the Trichinopoly country, advantage was taken of his sealed letter to prepare an inner slip as though addressed by Saunders to Chanda Sahib offering to deliver up to the latter the Fort of Trichinopoly and the person of Muhammad Ali on certain conditions. A letter of Muhammad Ali to Governor Saunders received on the 15/26 August, discloses how he did not feel very secure in the possession of English friendship, he thus began his letter—"I have had the pleasure to receive a letter from you wherein you are pleased to intimate that affairs in this World are not always upon the same footing so that I should by the help of God continue to be mindful of my own affairs. I do not doubt but you will be mindful of the friendship between us according as you have wrote to me." 

Nawab Muhammad Ali had, for some months past, been stressing on the value of a diversion in the country of Arcot. He had all along been holding that if troops had been despatched from Madras, they could have taken possession of several places in the Arcot country and the enemy might have been obliged to desist marching on Trichinopoly. At first Governor Saunders and his

4 Dodwell remarks that this was "a device characteristic of Duplex no matter whether proposed by him or not." For the reply of Chanda Sahib to Saunders see No. 109, Country Correspondence, 1751, Public Department, letter received on 20/31 August.

5 Vide para 4 of the Nawab's letter received at Madras on the 26th May/6th June (No. 74 of Country Correspondence, 1751) Again in his letter to Saunders received on the 27th June/8th July 1751, the Nawab reiterated his advice in the following words—"Be pleased also to send a proper assistance and a supply of warlike necessaries. Sometime ago I desired you by several letters to send a small force from Madras to assist my amaldars to take possession of the several districts lying that way, if this had been done the enemy might have been deprived of the revenues of the country which in all likelihood would have obliged them to decline their march this way and then our troops would have fought them to their entire defeat in that country."
Council thought that this might be effected by Captain Gingehs leaving sufficient number of men in Trichinopoly and marching with a detachment into the Arcot country.

Rightly therefore does the contemporary annalist of the Carnatic, Burhanu’d-din, in his Tuzuk-i-Walajabi, write thus — "When weakness overtook the besieged at Natharnagar, (Trichinopoly) on account of the protraction of the seige and the stubbornness of the enemy, Hazarat Aala (Muhammad Ali) devised to divide the attention of the enemy and thus to remove the weakness of his own men and to clear the roads for the coming in of provisions. Accordingly Hazarat Aala despatched Muhammad Madinah Ali Khan and Mr. Clive, the Sirdar of the English army, with sepoys who bore hatred to the enemy to subdue the town and the fort of Arcot and thus to exhibit their courage."

*Governor Saunders appreciates the Nawab’s idea*

Governor Saunders now began to appreciate the value of the Nawab’s proposal. At first he was very hesitating. He wrote to the Nawab on the 23rd August thus — "As I judge a diversion in the Arcot country may be serviceable to your affairs. I have sent a party of men with good officers to Madras to be reinforced with more, these are to raise money for you whatever is got is entirely for you, but in case of hostilities the plunder is to be half yours, the other half to the officers and men, as soldiers who venture their lives ought to be rewarded." The Nawab responded to this letter by writing to his Diwan, Sampat Rai, who was at Madras to send Wali Muhammad Khan or some other officer along with the English troops and also to write to Bommarazu and other poligars.

6 From the manuscript translation by Mr. Muhammad Husain Naimar, Senior Lecturer in the Islamic section, Oriental Research Institute, University of Madras. This translation (in process of publication by the Madras University) has been annotated by the writer with historical notes.
for help. He then envisaged the consequent happenings in the following words: “As soon as our troops have begun incursions in the Arcot country it will hinder the enemy from receiving the revenues which will weaken them greatly and they cannot divide their troops in case they march with their whole army towards Arcot, my troops shall pursue them jointly with yours and those of Mysore and Tanjore. If it happens that the enemy retreat and our troops pursue them, I shall then be able to collect money from different parts which will be a means to gain our ends. You will in no way neglect to disturb the Arcot country and take possession of the several districts. This may probably withdraw the enemy’s troops from this (Trichinopoly) country.” Muhammad Ali urged thus in a subsequent letter, in reply to Governor Saunders, after Arcot had been actually taken from the enemy and before its full significance had been grasped by the English, and when Clive actually proposed to abandon Arcot and to strengthen himself in Tinir — “It is highly necessary for us to take care of this place, it has pleased you to fortify the fort at Vridhachalam. I cannot omit writing to you that Arcot is the metropolis of the Carnatic country so that the fort will be of better use to us than Vridhachalam. I must repeat you will take care to make it strong by demolishing all the buildings which may be destructive to it. By the blessing of God the present success will procure you a great name in the Deccan and Hindustan countries and also in Europe. Please to take diversions in the several districts round your place.”

7 Saunders felt that though the English and the Nawab’s forces might be strong enough to keep Arcot, they would never be able to collect the revenues from the poligars, without some of the Trichinopoly troops joining them. The enemy was strong in cavalry while they had none and therefore when they were beaten, they could not be pursued. He added “It is thought this will not divert Chanda Sahib from his enterprise on Trichinopoly, there is no time to lose, exert yourself, engage Chanda, if possible and send some horse to Arcot.” (Letter No. 193, Country Correspondence of 1751)
The immediate effect of the capture of Arcot

Actually the English capture of Arcot\(^8\) did not make any great impression on the country, nor did it much disturb the minds of the Pondicherry people. News of the English march to Arcot did not reach Dupleix for a week, and Polur Muhammad Ali Khan, a brother of Chanda Sahib who was the Killedar at Arcot and evacuated it after a little or no resistance, was promised reinforcements from Pondicherry where the crafty Madame Dupleix gave out as her advice that it would not be advisable to recall Chanda Sahib's troops or the French troops from before Trichinopoly.\(^9\) The two sons of Bangaru Yachamay Nayak of Venkatagiri, whose vakils were at Pondicherry, soliciting Dupleix's favour, were written to immediately to send troops for the help of Polur Muhammad Ali Khan. It was, however, Dupleix that realised the seriousness of the event, he became greatly put out and urgently wrote to Chanda Sahib who had already despatched 1,000 horsemen, to write to his son Raza Sahib to march at once to Arcot with another body of 1,000 horse, and that Chanda Sahib himself should immediately cross the Cauvery and deliver an assault on the Tichinopoly fort.

Nawab Muhammad Ali rightly cautioned Governor Saunders to urge Clive and Muhammad Hamid to fortify Arcot and endea-
vour to get in provisions and also to send reinforcements to Arcot from Madras and Fort St David. The English troops and the Nawab's troops were very deficient in cavalry, their sallies could not be long, and Clive's assault on Timiri was unsuccessful (17th September). A week later, the reinforced enemy took up a stand within 3 miles of Arcot, and then Clive could only make a feeble attack upon him. The latter seized the big pagoda of Conjeevaram, and Clive had to use great skill in conveying safely the two eighteen-pounders that were sent to him from Madras. Raza Sahib finally began the famous siege of Arcot which lasted from the 4th October to the 25th November. Even when the siege was raised after the failure of a final attack, Governor Saunders did not seem to have valued much the undisturbed possession of Arcot and the neighbouring forts of Timiri and Kaveripak, as in his opinion "it will only weaken our small force greatly to leave men in them."

Thus it will be seen that the credit for the initiative of the idea of diversion made on Arcot should go in a very large measure to Nawab Muhammad Ali whose repeated requests opened Governor Saunders' eyes to the possibilities of success attendant on the plan, while Clive eagerly took advantage of the opportunity offered by it and persuaded Saunders that he could do it, when Captain Gingens doubted his own capacity for the task.

C S Srinivasachari
Seated Sūrya at Ünzi
North Gujarat
Trilokyanath
A rare image of Visnu with 16 hands
(according to Rupamandana)
A rare image of Vishnu from Gujarat
A woman with a child (in black granite)
(from Kotyārka Vipapur Taluka Baroda Territories)
Gujarātī or the Western School of Mediaeval Indian Sculpture

The Western School of Mediaeval Sculpture

The Western School of Indian Sculpture flourished in three ramifications of which one lies to the west of a line which begins at the latitude of Delhi and may be drawn through Ajmer southward to the river Tāpti. Some of the best-known monuments lie in Gujarat, and so the westernmost branch of Mediaeval Indian Sculpture should better be styled as “Gujarātī”.

Nomenclature “Gujarātī”

The nomenclature of the Mediaeval Sculpture and Architecture presents considerable difficulty. In any case, a sectarian classification (such as that forms the main defect of Fergusson’s work), is quite misleading. For just as in the case of Sculpture and Painting, there are no Buddhistic, Jaina or Brāhmaṇical “styles” of architecture, sculpture and painting, but only Buddhistic, Jaina and Brāhmaṇical buildings, paintings and images, in the Indian style of their period.

The Indian painting, architecture and sculpture is one but there are provincial variations in its formal development, existing side by side with the secular variation in pure style. Hence, in respect of these, the only adequate classification is geographical “Gujarātī” is therefore the apt name for the Western Indian School.

Gujarat, an art-province

Gujarat—the mediaeval Gujarat of the days of the Solankis and Vāghelās—in her palmest days, say from the 10th century to the

---

1 Cf Indian Sculpture (Heritage of India Series, Calcutta 1933) by Dr Stella Kramrisch, p 105
end of the 13th, had evolved a provincial school of sculpture, the existence of peculiar specimens of which have been recorded in the dhyānas (descriptions) of the images by Sūtradhāra Mandana (circa 1450 A.D.) in his three compendiums on the subject the Rūpa-Mandana, the Rūpāvatāra and the Devatā-Mūrti-prakarana.

Gujarat enjoyed political tranquility in the reign of the Solanki kings—in the time of Mūlarāja, Bhimadeva, Siddharāja, Kumārapāla and some others of the Vāghela branch, though occasionally it was disturbed by the inroads of Moslem iconoclasts. And this was the time when art, literature, etc., could flourish in Gujarat.

Gujarat deserves, therefore, to be considered as an art-province, with a dialect of its own, although it is related to that of the contemporary currents in the other two branches of the Western school of sculpture. It can be said that mediaeval craftsmen from Gujarat to Orissa share common traditions.

Contemporary Mediaeval Art in India

The best period of mediaeval art in India, ranged from the 9th century onwards to the 13th century, before the general conquest of the various provinces by the Mahomedans, when the Hindu artistic talent got a set-back and soon degenerated into a decadent art. This is the period when the Pāla and Sena schools of art flourished in Bengal, and reached its zenith. The Utkal and the Kalinga art flourished in Orissa, as manifest in the temples at Puri, Konārka and Bhuvanesvara.

Indian architecture and sculpture, in a way, illustrate the background of philosophy and religion, that are still blended together in this country. Sculpture and pictorial representations of our different gods and goddesses are significant inasmuch as that a kind of symbolism meant for meditation attaches to them. This gives a peculiar importance to the different texts on Silpa.

2 Published as No XII in the Calcutta Sanskrit Series, (1936)
In the Indian idea, the artist, the Śilpin, is not a peculiar individual with special gift of experience, but simply a tradesman meeting a general demand. His vocation is hereditary, and he receives his education in the workshop. His genius is not an individual achievement, but it manifests the quality of the society at any given period in the work of a single school. Therefore practically the same grade of vitality appears everywhere, and the workmanship of individual is only to be distinguished in the Hindu and the Jaina temples of Gujarat and in the style of miniature-painting in Jaina and non-Jaina MSS of the Gujarati school which bear out this truth.

Śilpaśāstras

These Śilpa-śāstras, as far as they are known hitherto, deal either with image-making with regard to iconography and iconometry, or else with the theory and practice of painting, but not with the theory and but little with the technique of sculpture as a plastic art. The artist in India is not the master of his own theme, nor does he choose his own problems. For him they are laid down in the Śāstras or canonical prescriptions, which lay down instructions to make such and such images in such and such a fashion.

Abnormal forms

At times changes in the prescribed abnormal forms of images are done at the instance of a certain class of donors, who do not like such grotesque forms with a large number of heads, and accordingly by reducing the number of faces make the image as natural as possible. Moreover, much depends on the stone they work upon. If the stone is weak at certain spots, the sculptor fashioned it according to convenience, and thus either reduced the number of heads or changed the order of symbols—and these naturally constituted the iconographic peculiarities of these images.
Harmonizing the abnormal

Sometimes the texts prescribed abnormal descriptions of images, but, here the individual talent of the Śilpin is found to come to his help. In the creation of abnormal types (in case of image having more than one head or more than two hands or having non-human form) the idea is new and the conception bold. Here the clever artist is found able to harmonise the seemingly impossible theme into a graceful work of art. Several artistic examples of the important deities in the Brāhmaṇical pantheon—Visnu, Ganeśa, Sakti, etc. are found in Gujarati sculpture.

Artistic peculiarities

The artistic peculiarities of Gujarati sculptures bear a close resemblance to the specimens hailing from Bengal in the Pāla and Sena periods. The delicate ornamentation, artistic expression, boldness of outline, definiteness of detail and the pleasing effect produced on the minds of every onlooker make the images of the mediaeval period the product of the best days of Hindu art, particularly in Gujarat. The execution of these images seems to be perfect, but gaudy and much detailed. The figures are beautifully and yet delicately ornamented, the expression is natural, serene and peaceful. The frame of the body, the garments, the various ornaments and the symbols are found depicted faithfully, according to the dhyānas in the texts.

Characteristics of the Gujarat branch

In the Gujarati branch of Western Indian Sculpture, a strained motion (instead of the easy and swaying state of poise in which classical reliefs had dwelt) in its nervy elegance, overstresses the curves, so that they have a tendency to become angular, not far remote from that of the Gujarati paintings of the same age. Such

3 Cf Indian Sculpture, Plate L, fig 114
vestiges as there are of modelling in this region are laid flattened and angular, with an acute and fantastic outline.

A beautiful variation of the Āryāvarta or Indo-Aryan style, found in Rajputana and Gujarat is characterised by a free use of columns, carved with all imaginable richness, strut brackets and exquisite marble ceilings with casped pendants.

By an unfortunate error Fergusson described this Western or Gujarati style as the “Jaina Style.” In reality it has no concern with any special kind of religion, and is Jaina merely because Jainas were numerous and wealthy in Western India in the late mediaeval period as they are still. When power passed into Muslim hands the so-called Jaina style, i.e., to say the local style was applied with the necessary modifications to the needs of Mahomedan worship. We need hardly mention the two temples at Mount Abu as being unsurpassed models of this wonderful style.

Sūtradhāra Mandana

Both Mandana and his father Śrī Ksetra were under the patronage of Mahārāṇā Kumbhakarna, the celebrated king of Mewar (Mḍapāta), and an outstanding personality of the middle of the 15th century (reigned 1419-1469 A.D.) Rānā Kumbha was a distinguished hero, a man of letters and a noted builder of monuments. His Kumbha-merū-prāśāda at Chitor is well known. It, therefore, stands to reason that Mahārāṇā Kumbha should be a patron of architects and sculptors, just like king Bhoja of Dhārā to whom goes the credit of the compilation of Samarāṅgana Sūtradhāra (G O Series, vol. XXV), a work on mediaeval architecture, and like king Someśvaradeva who compiled his Mānasollāsa, an encyclopaedia on useful topics (G O Series, Vol. 28).

Thus it is evident that Mandana’s handbooks on architecture and sculpture enjoyed considerable popularity with artists and crafts-
men. The Oriental Institute collection of MSS at Baroda alone includes 7 MSS of Rūpamandana and about 5 MSS. of Rājavallabha Mandana, some of these embellished with running translations in Gujarati prose, some centuries old. Mandana seems to have been a prolific writer of treatises on architecture and sculpture. The following is a list of works ascribed to him, the titles ending with his name, viz., Vastu-mandana, Prāsāda-mandana, Rājavallabha-mandana, Rūpamandana, etc.

Mandana’s works seem to have enjoyed wide popularity throughout the length and breadth of India. In the unique library of Kāvindrācarāya, a Deccan Brahmin, and a very learned man, the head of the Pandit community of Benares of his time (17th century) who ultimately took Sannyāsa, copies of Mandana’s works were deposited. Thus within two centuries after compilation, we find copies of Mandana’s texts deposited in Benares, the great centre of Indian culture. From Benares Mandana’s works probably spread to other places, westwards as well as eastwards. MSS of his works are also met with in the South.

Variety of forms of Visnu

From the original form, developed many other forms of Visnu, according mostly to the individual taste and conception of the authors and sculptors or the donors of the different images. When the worshipper thought that with four arms his god does not become powerful enough, he increased the number of hands from two to four, six, eight, ten, twelve, fourteen, sixteen, twenty, or more. When, again, the sculptor thought that his god with one face was not able to display all his might or illustrate the mythology connected with the god, he went on adding faces.

4 G O Series No 17 (1921) ‘Kavindrācarāya Grantha Śūci’
5 Vide T A Gopinath Rao’s Elements of Hindu Iconography
one after another till he was satisfied. Sometimes new forms are described in the dhyānas or executed in actual sculptures and then the authors on Śilpa enjoined the execution of such images in that fashion.

Visnu being one of the chief deities of the Hindu Pantheon, is very frequently represented in sculpture. He is conceived in various forms, and the sculptures of all these forms are found in temples in North and South India. Usually Visnu’s symbols are the Conch and the Disc, but when four-armed he carries in addition the Lotus and the Mace. The conch-shell is symbolical of eternal space, the wheel of eternal time, the mace of eternal law and the unfailing punishment consequent on its breach, and the lotus symbolizes the ever-renewing creation and its beauty and freshness.

By way of illustration as to the uniqueness of iconographical materials in Gujarat we mention the iconographic characteristics of certain Visnu and Śakti images found alone in Gujarat, and nowhere else. These are described in the Rūpamandana and not in any other Śilpa work. Images like those of Acyuta (four-armed, with its 24 varieties due to the permutation and combination of the four symbols held in the four arms), of Vaikuntha (one-faced, eight-armed and seated on Garuda) and of Viśvarūpa (four-faced, twenty-armed, and mounted on Garuda) are thus unique and rare in the history of Indian sculpture.

*Their variations from Rūpamandana*

Sometimes, however, images are met with in Gujarat, which are in the main in accord with the descriptions in the Rūpamandana, but differ in certain details from the same. And it is very probable that the sculptures of the mediaeval period had kindred texts to guide their artists, which canons were, however, modified or changed by the time of Mandana.
Mandana's compilations on sculpture are more interesting in that they contain descriptions of certain rare and abnormal images of Visnu and varieties of Gauri, which are found nowhere else in India. It is for the same reason that T. A. Gopinath Rao has drawn upon the text of Rûpamandana in his *Elements of Hindu Iconography* (1916, 4 vols.) for description of rare and unique images. However, he has not been able to support the text from Rûpamandana with adequate photographs of actual images. Dr. B. Bhattacharya's paper on 'Eight mediaeval images in the collection of Prince Pratâp Sinh'⁶ although based on a study of actual images, could not be illustrated.

**Discovery of rare Visnu images**

I have, however, been able to take photographs of some of the rare Visnu images, mentioned in the Rûpamandana during my research tours in North Gujarat, at the instance of the Bombay University, (see Illustrations)

**Section in Rûpamandana on Jaina Iconography**

The other noteworthy feature of the Rûpamandana is that different forms of Hindu and Jaina images have been described along with Āyatanas or the companion deities or the attendant Yaksa and Yaksinis, as the case may be. This is explained by the fact that the rich Jaina community in Western India was very influential at the court of Râjput kings. The warlike Jaina ministers and merchants were also great patrons of art. They were great builders. Hence the section on Jaina iconography in Mandana's work is highly justified, as it was principally designed to guide the artists and craftsmen of Rajputana and Gujarat.

⁶ *Indian Culture*, vol. 1, no 3
Soma (Moon)
(from the Sūrya-Kunda at Madberā 11th century)
Gujarat is a rich mine of fine sculptural remains, in spite of this fact nobody has attempted a detailed and intensive study of such artistic specimens of the mediaeval period. Whenever the detailed series of sculptures from Gujarat shall be reproduced, it will be invaluable as a key to Brahmanical and Jaina iconography. It is also likely that such a study would contribute to the history of art, in its aesthetic aspect as well.

M. R. Majmudar
Kulatattvārṇava—a spurious work?

This work has been published by the Midnapore Prādeśika Brāhmaṇa Sabha. The single Ms is said to have been taken from Vikrampur to a Navadvipa tola from where it travelled to Midnapore. The authorship has been attributed to Sarvānanda, son of Dhruvānanda of Mahāvamśa fame. The following reasons make us question its genuineness.

(a) No book of this name and of this author was known before. This is no doubt an argument ex silentio. But in case of the Kulāśāstras this argument has some weight. Very few Kulapañjikās have been published or read by few. But many have heard the names of the important works. They are generally transmitted from generation to generation. Before the publication of Dhruvānanda’s Mahāvamśa, it was known that there was a work of this name and author. The works of Harimśra and Edumśra have not yet been found. But they exist in quotation of later authors. It is rather strange that so important a work as Kulatattvārṇava by the son of a celebrated ghataka was never heard of before.

(b) Every important event in this work is dated. We have got dates for the introduction of Kulinism by Vallālasena, Danujāmādhava’s Śrotṛiya divisions, for Dattakhāsa’s reforms and for Devivara’s mela-bandhana. The curious fact is that all these dates tally with the results of the recent historical researches. So far as we know, no Sanskrit work gives so many correct dates, not even the Rājatarangini (all of the dates in it have not proved to be accurate). If the Kulatattvārṇava proves to be a genuine work, it must be regarded as a unique work, so far as its dates are concerned.
(c) Dattakhāsa’s reforms are narrated in the book, against which a section of the Śrotṛyās revolted. They refused to accept his decisions and left Bengal and settled in Midnapore and became known as Madhyāśreni—a section of the Brāhmanas found only in that district (ślokaś 380-396). It may be that Dattakhāsa was an amātya of Rājā Ganeśa during whose rule there was a Hindu revival. It is now held by competent scholars on numismatic grounds that Rājā Ganeśa had the viruda Danujamardana. But in the Kulatattvārvana his viruda is Kamsanārāyana. Kamsanārāyana of the Varendra Kulapaṇṭikās flourished in the latter half of the sixteenth century while Ganeśa ruled in the beginning of the fifteenth. The real cause of this confusion in this book is, it is to be suspected, due to Mr N N Vasu’s article in the Sāhitya Parishat Patrikā, (vol IV, p 146). Those who are responsible for this part of the Kulatattvārvana will do well now to revise it, because Mr Vasu has changed his opinion Rājā Ganeśa and Kamsanārāyana are two different persons and flourished in two different centuries. The revolt of a section of the Rādhiya Śrotṛyās against Dattakhāsa’s reforms and the rise of the Madhyāśreni have been given undue importance in the book. This revolt is not mentioned in any other book. Is it because that it has been published from Midnapore?

The reading of the book leaves the general impression that it is a recent compilation, based on the Kārikās of Harimśra and Edumśra and Dhruvānanda’s Mahāvamśa, as published in the Vanger Jātiya Itihāsa, vol I. Modern researches about the chronology of the royal dynasties of Bengal have been utilised.

Prāmode Lal Paul

1 Dr N K Bhattasali, Coins and Chronology of the Sultans of Bengal, Intro
2 Sāhitya Parishat Patrikā, 1341 B.S., p 16
The Māndūkya Upanisad and the Kārikās of Gaudapāda

The question of the relation of the Gaudapāda Kārikās to the Māndūkya Upanisad has been engaging the attention of the present writer ever since Mm Professor Vidhushekhara Bhattacharya raised a discussion over it.¹

The Māndūkya is traditionally regarded as one of the ten major upanisads, and the kārikās of Gaudapāda are supposed to be explanatory verses thereon. The Muktikopanisad names 108 upanisadas and holds that the Māndūkya alone is enough to liberate a man.

There is a good deal of controversy over the extent of the Māndūkya, which is set forth in Professor Bhattacharya's paper referred to above. While present-day Advaitins are unanimous that the twelve prose passages found interspersed in Gaudapāda's work constitute the upanisad, most Vaisnava commentators of it since the days of Madhvācārya have, on the other hand, held the kārikās of the first book also to have been a part of the upanisad, Purusottama, the grandson of the suddhāadvaitin, Vallabhācārya, going further and holding the entire work of Gaudapāda as a part of it. It has also been pointed out by Bhattacharya that all the four books of the kārikās have been severally held by others as distinct upanisads, while some latter-day advaitins have accepted the Vaisnava view. Mr B N Krishnamurti Sarma has pointed out² that kārikā I. 17 is referred to in Sūta-sambhāti, IV, 55, as Sruti, and he has further attempted without success to prove that both

Sankara and Sureśvara knew the kārikās of BK I to have been a part of the upanisad. All that he has succeeded in proving is that a few of these kārikās have been mentioned as śruti in Sankarācārya Apocrypha like the ‘Visnusahasranāma’ commentary, the ‘Nṛśimhapūrtvānapāniya’ commentary, and the ‘Vivekacūḍāmani’ Bhattacharya has pointed out that Sankara, in his commentary on BS, II 1 9, distinctly refers to kārikā I 16 in the following terms —ataktaṃ vedāntārthasampradāyaviḍbhṛacāryaiḥ. It is also found that in his Brahmāsiddhi, Sankara’s senior contemporary, Mandanamisra, quotes kārikā, I 11, but does not mention it as śruti. Nor does Sureśvara refer to kārikās BK I as such. He refers to them as ‘āgama-mātraṃ’ or ‘vedāntotkta, but that is because the entire work of Gaudapāda is described as the ‘Āgamaśāstra’ and the first book is particularly named the ‘āgamaparaparana’.

So there can be no doubt that Sankara and his contemporary advaitins did not look upon the kārikās of BK I as part of the Māndūkya Upanisad. If the prose passages and the kārikās had been works of the same author, there is no reason why the prose passages should use the terms ‘vaiśvānara’ and ‘turiya’, while the kārikās vary them as ‘viśva’ and ‘turya’, nor should we expect in such a case a difference of opinion as between prose passage 9 and kārikā 19, BK I Madhva, however, anticipated these difficulties when he said that Varuna, in the shape of frog, saw the passages while he introduced explanatory mantras in the shape of the verses which had been seen by Brahmā, the creator, a view which he supports by quotations from certain Purānas which, according to Bhattacharya, cannot be traced in the printed editions thereof. This practically amounts to an admission that the prose and the verse portions of BK I are not works of the same author.

3 Brahmāsiddhi, ed by Mm S Kuppuswami Śastri, p 150
Prof Bhattacharya thinks that the twelve prose passages are a later work than the kārikās of Gaudapāda, and that probably it is a post-Śankara work, since Śankara is not found referring to them, even where one would expect him to do so, in this recognized commentaries. He is also of opinion that the author of the commentary on the Māṇḍūkya and kārikās is not really Śankara, but somebody else assuming that great man’s name,—a view which it should be possible to accept in spite of tradition and the opinion of such a distinguished scholar as Mm Prof S Kuppuswami Śastri to the contrary.

One may also readily accept Bhattacharya’s view that the kārikās are by no means what they are supposed to be, namely, a sort of vārtika on the Māṇḍūkya Upanisad, since they have no characteristic of a vārtika which consists in discussing what is said, what is not said and what is badly said (uktānukta-durukta-cintā vārtikam—Rājaśekhara). The reasons set forth by Prof Bhattacharya need not be repeated here.

But one cannot help joining issue with this erudite scholar when he insists that the Māṇḍūkya Upanisad, that is, the twelve prose passages, is a post-Śankara or even a post-Gaudapāda work. First, the tradition that the Māṇḍūkya is one of the ten major upanisads cannot be discarded without adequate reason. Secondly, Y. Subrahmaniyar Sarma has pointed out$^5$ that Sureśvara actually quotes from this upanisad and names it—

एषो द्वित्योऽन्येष भोजिः सर्वेश्य प्रभवतायथे ।
मायाः कैय-भृतिवन्धश शिष्याम्बरीयते ॥

Thirdly, Māṇdanamisra, who like Sureśvara, was a senior contemporary of Śankara, quotes the Nṛsimhottaratāpaniya passage ekam amrtaṃ aṣam, and the Māṇḍūkya words—sarvaṇṇah, sarveṣ-

$^4$ Sir Ashutosh Silver Jubilee, vol III, pt 2, pp 101-110
$^5$ Review of Philosophy and Religion, IV, p 220
Fourthly, Sankara’s commentary on Brhadāranyaka Up, IV. 2 3 and 4, leaves hardly any doubt in one’s mind that he is referring therein to the Māndukya, though not expressly naming it. I refrain from quoting the relevant commentary in extenso, and hope that my readers will take the trouble of reading the commentary at first hand. Swami Mādhavananda, in the excellent translation of Sankara’s commentary on this Up, appears to have come across references to the Māndukya in the bhāsyā for he names this Up, in the list of abbreviations, prefixed to his work, but I have unfortunately failed to trace the references. Then, again, in view of Sureśvara’s quotation of the Māndukya passage containing the expression, prabha-vāpyayau, it seems likely that Sankara, too, had this passage in mind when he used the expression in his BS, I 1 9, commentary and not Katha, II 3 11, as Bhattacharya contends, for the expression appears to have a somewhat different import in the latter context. Lastly, Bhattacharya has himself shown that the terms ‘Vaisvānara’ and ‘Turiya’ are older than ‘Viśva’ and ‘Turya’ found in the kārikās, and also that the prose passages have a tinge of the language of the Brāhmaṇas. For all these reasons it would be legitimate to hold that the Māndukya is a pre-Sankara and pre-Gaudapāda work and that it would be wrong to reject the tradition that it is one of the ten major upanisads. Even Nāgārjuna might have borrowed the word ‘prapañcopāsa’ from it.

We shall now proceed to discuss the real problem before us, viz., what is the relation of the kārikās to the Upanisad. In agreement with Bhattacharya, I have already said that the kārikās of Gaudapāda are not a vārtika on the Māndukya. What, then, is the relation between the two? To come to a finding on this point, it is necessary to examine first what it is that the kārikās aim at. Are they pure Vedaṇta as the orthodox commentators would have

6 Brabmasiddhi, pp 4, 127
us' believe? Most probably not. It stands to the credit of Poussin and Bhattacharya that they have been the first to tell us what the kārikās really aim at. The kārikās of the first BK establish non-dualism of the Māṇḍūkya type, the second and the third BKs, have, to use Poussin's words, a double entendre or, in the language of Prof Bhattacharya, they begin with the Vedānta and end with Buddhism, while the kārikās of the fourth BK confine themselves to the exposition of Mahāyāna Buddhism, mainly of the Viśnūnavāda but partly also of the Mādhyamika variety. Bhattacharya points out how, in this book, the terminology used is entirely Buddhistic, such upanisadic terms as 'ātman' and 'brahman' being discarded, how the word 'agrayāna' (which means 'Mahāyāna') is used and how the author begins by saluting the Buddha and ends by telling us what the Buddha did not teach. Any one having a moderate acquaintance with Yogācāra and Mādhyamika literature, who goes through the kārikās dispassionately, will have little doubt left in his mind that the sole object of Gaudapāda in writing this prakarana work was to show, first, what Vedāntic non-dualism really stood for and, next, to make out that Yogācāra and Mādhyamika Buddhism could be reconciled to it and placed on an upanisadic basis.

The question which now confronts us, and which should not be difficult to answer, is how the Māṇḍūkyopanisad came to have a place at the head of the kārikās. Even in the case of an upanisad, we know that the Nṛṣṭhamapurvātāpanīya quotes almost the

7 'Vedanta and Buddhism,' JRAS, 1910, pp. 129-40
9 According to Poussin and Bhattacharya Kārikā 99, BK, IV, tells us what the Buddha did not teach. I am inclined to think however, that the Kārikā tells us what the Buddha taught, it repeats what has been said in the introductory Kārikā I, viz., that 'jnēya' is not different from 'jnāna'. This, however, does not affect the conclusions arrived at in this paper.
whole of the Madhukya. Now, Gaudapada, in order to show that his views had the support of the Shruti could do no better than to begin his prakarana work of four Books with the quotation of the Madhukya passages. After quoting six prose passages, Gaudapada introduces some of his verses with the words, Atraste sloka bhavanti, and the process continues till the entire Upanisad is exhausted. The introductory words do not mean, in this case at least, that the verses are older than the prose passages. Gaudapada evidently preferred the Madhukya to any other Upanisad because this very brief and unambiguous work was best calculated to support his own point of view, and he has distributed the prose passages just as they suited his purpose.

The commentator of the Upanisad and the Kairikas, whoever he might be, was, therefore, perfectly right when he said that this "prakarana" work of four Books began with the words "Om ity etad aksaram". But this does not certainly mean that the entire work is Gaudapada's in the sense that there is no such thing as a Madhukya Upanisad, as Dr Venkatasubbiah contends. The entire work is Gaudapada's, but he has quoted the entire Madhukya in support of his thesis. This seems to be the right solution of the problem before us.

Amarnath Ray

---

10 See his paper in the Indian Antiquary, 1933, pp 181-193
Sūrjanacarita of Candrasekhara

(A mahākāvya of the sixteenth century)

A complete ms of this mahākāvya is contained in the Government collection of mss deposited in the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, and has been noticed by Rajendra Lala Mitra, Theodor Aufrecht, and Hara Prasad Shastri. It is written on country made paper in Nāgara character. There are 87 folios, each containing ten lines. The appearance of the Ms is old and its extent in ślokas is 2200. The work consists of twenty sargas and contains 1446 verses.

Its contents

After a few invocatory verses, the author states that Diksita Vāsudeva was the first amongst the princes of the Cauhāna-vamśa (I, 9). He lived in the city of Vṛndāvati (I, 19) and his activities were restricted mainly to the banks of the river Cārmavatī (I, 18). His son was Naradeva (I, 20), his son Śricandra (I, 21), his son Ajayapāla (I, 22). He built the fort named Ajayamurī (I, 23), his son Jayarāja (I, 24), his son Sāmantasmha (I, 25), his son Gūrjakā (I, 26), his son Candana (I, 27), his son Vajra (I, 29), his son Viśvapati (I, 30), on the advice of his spiritual preceptor's son Sunaya (II, 13) he set out to worship the goddess who is described as sakalārthadātri and sumberaprasamani in the Sākambhari janapada. Accompanied by Sunaya, the king arrived at the temple.

1 Notices of Sanskrit Mss., Calcutta, vol I, 1871, No LXXVI, pp 42-43
2 Catalogus Catalogorum, Part I, Leipzig, 1891, p 181
3 Catalogue of Sanskrit Mss., Government Collection, pp 8-9, No 3084
4 She is also called Astamūrtchakutumbini (III, 11), Bhavāni (III, 26), Girirājaputri (III, 37), Nāgarāja-kanyā (III, 36), Ambā, Ambikā, Gauri, Śankara-priyā Acalaputri, Sumbhadārtya-dalani, Andhaka-vatunjāyā, Indūṛa, etc
5 Also called Sākambhari-deśa (III, 9)
of the goddess and Visvapati worshipped her by undergoing many austerities. The goddess being pleased gave him her blessings and directed the prince to rule over that janapada which was named after her (IV, 25). After this king Visvapati brought the whole world under his yoke. His son was Hariraja (IV, 43), a devotee of Hari. The Yavanapati, feeling encouraged by the death of the "son of Vajra", invaded the Cauhanā territories by crossing the Sindh. But Hariraja soon defeated the Parasika army which consisted of Hūnas, Madras, Cinas and Mlecchas and celebrated his victory by building the Yodhapuradurga near Mandapapura at the sight of which the Turuska lords trembled in fear (IV, 47-53). His son Simharaja was childless, so to save the Cauhāna kula-rājadhāni Vṛndāvati from falling into the hands of enemies he crowned his nephew Bhima (V, 30). In the course of his (Bhima's) diguṇaya, he passed through Magadha, Gaudopakantha, Vanga, Kalinga, Karnāṭa, Kuntala, banks of the rivers Pampa, Godā, Tāpi, Tāmrarpāṇi and the city of Dvāravati, he defeated the Khasas, the Sakas, living on the banks of the river Sindh, and the Kāmbojas, after extending his power to the Hīmādribhūmi and Kāmarūpa, he returned to his capital Vṛndāvati (V, 41-63). His son was Vignahadeva (VI, 1). He defeated the Gurjaras and annexed their extensive kingdom (VI, 3). His son was Gundadeva (VI, 15), his son was Vallabha (VI, 16) who defeated the Cediśāla and the Bhoja-bhūpati and having imprisoned the latter entered Śakambhari-pura, after some time he sent him back to his own country with gifts and presents (VI, 18-31). His son was Rāmanātha (VI, 33), his son Cāmunda (VI, 35) was a great votary of Vṛṣaṅka. He defeated the Yavanānika-nayakas and threw the lord of the Sakas into prison (VI, 42). His son was Durlabhārāja (VI, 43), and the latter's son was Dusala-deva (VI, 44). His son was Visala (VI, 45) who defeated king, Karna and entered Avantinagara. Several verses are devoted to a prāṣasti of this city and references are made to the god Mahākāla and
the river Sipā (VI, 49 ff) After bathing in this river and having worshipped Pramathanātha (VI, 63), he made the Mālava prince his tributary and returned to his own city (VI, 81) His son was Prthvirāja (VI, 82), his son Valhana (VI, 83), his son Anāladeva (VI, 86) to whom are devoted the whole of the 7th and the first twenty-five verses of the 8th sarga. The poet however devotes his labours not to record the king’s victories but to a description of the seasons and of Puskara. On the advice of his Purodhas, the king went to this sacred tīrtha and built a magnificent temple of Hari and constructed a garden round it. The son of this king was Jagadeva (VIII, 26) and his son Visaladeva (VIII, 28). His son Ajayapāla (VIII, 29) married Vijayā. The poet then seems to describe the viṇayāṇa of this prince and incidentally gives a description of many flowering plants and trees. In the course of his travels the king notices a beautiful girl on the side of a tank. It was a case of love at first sight but before the king could approach her she disappeared in the water of the lake. The prince however meets a Siddhapurusa and is informed that she was named Vijayā and was the daughter of the Vāsuki-vamśaja Nāga Sudāma. On his advice he worshipped the god Ananta and having dived into the tank went to the Phaniloka. The poet devotes a number of verses to a fanciful description of the land of the Nāgas and then describes how the prince met its king Vāsuki and the Nāga Sudāma. The Siddha now makes his appearance and through his intercession the king succeeds in marrying Vijayā. With the permission of the lord of the Pannagas, he then returned with his queen to his capital. In course of time he adopted the life of a Vānaprastha after placing his son Gangadeva on the throne (IX, 73). His son Someśvara married Karpuradevi, a daughter of the king of the Kuntalas (X, 4). He had two sons of whom the elder was Prthvirāja and the younger Mānikya. The whole of the tenth sarga is nearly devoted to the career of the former prince (X, 10ff). While he was resting in a pleasure garden outside the city of Vṛndāvati, a female messenger
(dāti) came to see him. She said that she came from Kānyakubja, the capital of the king who was followed in war by 9,00,000 horsemen (āśvavāra-navalaksa-sankhyā). He had a beautiful daughter named Kāntivati who had fallen in love with Prthvirāja on hearing his praise from the cārana who visited her father's court. Seeing no hope of union with her beloved, she began to languish. Her condition became desperate when she heard that her father was thinking of marrying her to another prince Prthvirāja tells the messenger that the father of Kāntivati was his sworn enemy but still he would devise some means to help her. He then visits the great city of Kānyakubja (Kānyakubjam nagaram gariyāh), ingeniously comes into touch with his beloved princess, and secretly entering the female quarters of the palace of Jayacandra, the father of Kāntivati, unnoticed by the guards, (Pratihāras) eloped with her. Though pursued by the army of theirate Jayacandra, he succeeded in reaching Indraprastha (also called Hariprastha) with his bride. He then attacked the pursuing Kānyakubja army and destroyed it in the waters of the Yamunā. We are next told that Prthvirāja conquered all the quarters and though he defeated and imprisoned Sāhāvadina 21 times, he released him each time. But the ungrateful Yavana by some means having once defeated and imprisoned him carried him to his own country and blinded him. While in this condition he was discovered by a cārana, whom he had once befriended. On the advice of this vandi, he gave up all ideas of putting an end to his life by prāyopaveśa and having formed a secret plot with this minstrel succeeded in killing Sāhāvadina during a tournament. The Muslim prince was shot through his tālumūla by a śabdabbedi-vāna. In the confusion which followed, the vandi and Prthvirāja both escaped on a

---

6 This king was named 'Jayaccandra' and not 'Jayacandra' as in the text Sec. Ray, Dynastic History of Northern Ind. a, vol I, 1931, pp 536 ff
fleet Persian horse (vanāyaka) to the Kuruñgala. The Cāhamāna prince died in this Punyaksetra. He was succeeded by his son Prahlāda (XI, 1) and he by his son Govindarāja (XI, 3). The latter was succeeded by his son Nārāyana (XI, 4) and the latter by his son Vāgbhata (XI, 5) who captured Ranastambhapura by defeating the Yavanas. The latter's son Jātrasisma (XI, 6) built Simhapuri and was succeeded by his powerful son Hamiradeva (also called Hammiradeva) (XI, 7, 12 & 14). Except the first few verses of canto XI, practically the whole of this sarga and the next one (XII) are devoted to the career of this prince. We are told that he conquered the whole earth and fought with the Tūrusskas. He captured Ranastambhapura having expelled the Yavanas from the city (XI, 17). The poet then gives an elaborate description of the king's journey to a city named Pattana accompanied by his Pattarāṇī, Purobhita, feudatory princes, sadasya, vayasya, sacrva, cavalry and elephants. He arrives at the banks of the river Tiladroni and bathed in its waters. Then follow the descriptions of forests and Pāryātrāgiri and other mountains, the king saw the god Viśeśvara (Mahādeva) and worshipped him. After some time he entered the above-mentioned Pattanākhyam nagaram whose praise was sung by the Carmanvati. He bathed in this river and not only worshipped Mrtyuṇjaya and performed the Tulādāna but also a big Saptatantra (Yajña). While engaged in these Alavadina finding him away from Ranastambhapura, started with a powerful cavalry force to attack his capital. The front portion of his army was under the command of his dear brother Ullūkhāna (XI, 65). Hearing of this invasion, the Cāhamāna prince consulted Vidyaabhata and other Mantrimukhyas and began to move his cavalry and elephants in the direction of the enemy. His Senāpati attacked and routed the Yavana encampment at Jāgarapura which was under the direct charge of Ullūkhāna. The latter appeared before the Sārvabhauma of the Śakaś and told him of the disaster. The lord of the Pāraśikas then besieged the city of the Cāhuvāna.
(XI, 71). In the meantime "the son of Jaitra" had also entered his city. While the outer ramparts of the fort (durgānta) were being attacked by Muslim artillery (XI, 73), a messenger (sandeśabara) came to the court of the Cāhamāna prince bearing a proposal from the Sākādhīpa. It amounted to this,—(i) Giving up of those who had taken shelter with him from the fury of the Yavana prince and (ii) submission and payment of tribute. Unless Hammira accepted this sandhi, he would meet with the same fate that had overtaken Gayāsadina (XII, 21). In reply the Cāhamāna prince told him that it was inconsistent with the traditions of his line either to humbly pay tribute or to hand over those who had been granted asylum. One of his predecessors Haritāja after defeating the Pārāśikas had built the formidable fort of Upasodhapura (XII, 27), another, Cāmunda after defeating the Saka-cakravartin brought him in chains to his capital, a third Jaitrasimha bravely defended Yoginis-pura when Gayāsadina went to the land of Indra (XII, 28-29). He denied all liability for the looting of the Yavana camp at Jagarapura and in the end proudly refused to submit, and challenged Allāvdina to do his worst (XII, 33-38). The Muslim dūta left the Cāhamāna court in high dudgeon and told Hammira that he would soon die like a fish caught in a net (XII, 40-42). After the departure of the messenger, the Cāhamāna prince accompanied by his mantrins got up on the top of his fort and noticed the constantly increasing and numerous forces of his enemy. Then thinking as follows —

सम्मे शुभायति वैरिष्ट्यानवस्त्र जीवनमेव यापनति।
इह काव्यन चाहुऽभानवशि विधिता नैव हि पद्ति स्वर्त्तीया॥
(XII, 49),

he took leave of the ladies of his household and his Purohita and surrounded by his followers and those whom he had given refuge,

7 Same as Cāhamāna. See Ray, *Dynastic History of Northern India*, vol II, 1936, p 1052, fn 1
8 *Mahimā-Sāhīmukhāns Tursaka-mukhyān* (XII, 10 & 30), also Ray *ibid* p 1102
9 Sometimes spelt 'Alāvadina', see XII, 4
issued out of the fort and engaged the Muslim forces in furious combat. The battle rages for some time outside (XII, 75) the fort and Hammira is killed (XII, 76-77), in the meantime, the Mahsis had burned themselves in fire.

The next canto (XIII) begins with the name of a prince called Māṇikyarāja who is described as the younger brother (jagbanya) of Prthvirāja, the seventh predecessor from Hammira (XII, 1-2). Māṇikya’s son was Candarāja (XIII, 6), his son Bhimarāja (XIII, 7), his son Vijayarāja (XIII, 8), his son Rayana (XIII, 9), his son Kolhana (XIII, 10), his son Vanga (XIII, 12), his son Deva (XIII, 13), his son Samarasimha (XIII, 14), his son Narapāla (XIII, 15), his son Hammira (XIII, 16), his son Varasimha (XIII, 17), his son Bhāramalla (XIII, 18), his son Narmada (XIII, 19), his son Arjuna (XIII, 23), his son Śūrjana (XIII, 49) by his queen Jayanti, daughter of Daśaratha (XIII, 28) Arjuna obtained this son as a special favour from the god Śauri (Visnu) whom he worshipped. The remaining portion of canto XIII (verses 49-80) and sargas XIV to XIX are devoted by the poet to the career of this king. Some 20 verses (XIII, 59-70) describe the beauty, gifts and prowess of Śūrjana. He owned the city of Vrndāvati by hereditary rights and captured many other durgas. The poet then gives us an account of his victorious campaigns (āṣāṅatra-yātra) (XIII, 72ff). By defeating the lord of Mālava (Mālavānāṃ-adhīśam) he captured Kotākhyam durgam (XIII, 76). He also conquered Telanga, Kerala, Andhra, Karnāta and Lāta (XIII, 79). Then follows an elaborate description of the king’s marriage with Kanakāvati, the daughter of Jagamāla (XIV, 1ff). The latter is described as a bhūbhṛt (king) and lord of Vamśavahalā, Jagamāla-pattana is mentioned as his capital. Śūrjana goes to this city and marries Kana-

10 See, canto X, 7 —तुस्पस्योऽपि गृहीताराज स माणिक्यमथायुजस्तम्.

11 Sometimes spelt ‘Śūrjana’
kāvati. Many verses describe the beauty of the bride, the ceremonies and the pleasures of the married pair (XIV, 6-88) With Jāgamāla’s permission the Cāhamāna prince then arranges to start for his own city. The mother of the bride gives her daughter advice on her duties and responsibilities (XV, 16-33) After reaching his capital Sūrjana passes some time in pleasure with his wife in a pleasure garden (XV, 34ff.) The poet describes the king’s pleasures in summer in a dhārāgrha. Women dressed in dukūla and kaṅcūka and with their lips coloured (ayāvakaṃ dantačchadāṃ) (XV, 70, 73) took active part in water sport. In course of time a son named Bhoja was born to the king by his Pattamāhī Pattamāhī Kanakāvati (XVI, 1) The poet then again describes Sūrjana’s wars and victories Akavara is introduced and praised, we are told that this prince who lived in Dhillinagara and had brought the whole world under his power, besieged the capital of Sūrjana. The attempts of the Yavana generals however, did not meet with any success King Sūrjana defeated the Turuska and Pārasīka hosts thirteen times. Then the Humātma (Akbar) himself came to battle with the Cāhamāna prince (Jāngala, XVI, 11) In the preliminary engagements which seem to have taken place on the banks of a tank or lake (sant, brada, tatini) Akbar’s hosts were defeated in spite of the personal encouragements of the Muhammadan emperor. The Muslim army rallied a little towards evening, but soon darkness descended and the armies were separated. The valour of Sūrjana drew unstinted praise from the Humātma and next morning before the battle began, the latter sent a sacīva to the fort of the former to open negotiations for peace. Led by the Pratihāra of the Cāhamāna prince, he came to the royal presence and eloquently pleaded for the conclusion of peace which would lead neither to loss of glory nor material loss. The proposal of the emperor was that he should receive from the Cāhamāna prince Ranastambha-durga in exchange of territories on the banks of the

12 See Kumārasambhavam, V, 11
Sacred rivers Narmadā, Yamunā (Mathurā-mandala) and Jāhnavi. After some deliberation Sūrjana accepted the peace proposals of the Saka king and started on what looks like a pilgrimage. Leaving Ranastambhapura, he pitched his camp on the Narmadā and after subjugating the neighbouring regions went to Madhupuri on the banks of the Kalinda-kanyā. After passing the rainy season in Vrndāvana, he started for Vārānasi, halting on his way at the junction of the Yamunā and the Gangā (i.e. Prayāga) to perform suitable religious ceremonies. Starting from here in the month of Māgha (tapasi) (XIX, 7) he reached Vārānasi and from the Vyāsa Gopāla got a graphic account of the excellence of the place (XIX, 9-34) The rest of the sarga is devoted to a description of the many meritorious acts of Sūrjana viz., gifts to many yācakas, Brāhmaṇas, excavation of tanks, tulāpurusa etc. In the end he attains Sthānutvam in Kāśi and Kanakāvatī and his other wives burned themselves on his funeral pyre. The last canto opens with a note of sorrow at the death of Sūrjana (XX, 17) His son Bhūja conquered Gurjararāgabhūmi (XX, 9) On the occasion of his coronation Vyāsa Gopāla’s son Cakradhara stood in front of the Cāhamāna prince. Description of the ceremonies connected with this event and his praśasti takes us practically to the end of this sarga and the mahākāvya. We are told that he was Dillīśena-puraskṛta (XX, 63) and he defeated the Suhmas, Vangas, Vaidarbhas, Traigartas, Mālavas and the Gāndhāras. He is still called Vrndāvatī-nāyaka. His death seems to be referred to in the penultimate verse (XX, 68) of the last canto of the work.

Its author

Unlike some other historical kāvyas, the Sūrjana-carita does not give us any information about the author in the colophons at the end of each sarga. The only information about the author which we can gather from the internal evidence of this big work is in the last verse of the last sarga (XX, 64) It runs as follows —
Surjanacarita of Candrasekhara

Kavi Candrasekhara is described as Gaudiya and the son of Jitamitra who was an ornament of the Ambastha family. We are further informed that he composed this grantha at the request of Nṛpa Surjana in the Pattana of the ruler of this Vṛṣa (Vārānasi). Several authors with the name Candrasekhara are known. One was the author of the Smrīratnākara. But he belonged to the 14th century and as such cannot be identified with our author. As Surjana and Candrasekhara were apparently contemporaries of Akbar (1536-1605 A.D.), we must try to find out an author of the 16th century. The Caitanyacaritāmṛta of Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja refers to one Jitāmitra as a disciple of Śrī-Gadadhara Pandita, a contemporary of Caitanya. The same work also refers in another place to the Vaidya Candrasekhara. We are told—

This Candrasekhara was a Bengali Vaidya resident in Benares. As Caitanya was born about 1498 A.D. and entered into the Sannyāsa āśrama about the end of the first quarter of the sixteenth century, his disciple Candrasékhara was certainly a contemporary of the emperor Akbar and the Cāhāmāna prince Surjana. It is thus probable that our author is identical with this disciple of Caitanya. But as yet I am unable to produce any evidence that

13 Keith, *A History of Sanskrit Literature*, p. 448
14 P 82 Adulīlā, XII
14a *Ibid*
this *bhakta* was also a poet and an author or that *Jitāmitra*, the disciple of Gadādhara, was the father of Candraśekhara, the disciple of Caitanya

*A Historical *Kāvya*

The generally accepted view that ancient and early medieval Hindu authors were not familiar with the true conception of real history must be considerably modified in the light of the following statement of Kalhana —

अय ए व गुप्तवान् रागदेवबहिष्कृत ।
भूतार्थर्थने नय भयस्येव सरस्वती ॥

But unfortunately, with the exception of the last four cantos of the *Rajatarangini*, we have not yet discovered many historical works written in the spirit and with the historical detachment of the Kashmirian author. We are however long familiar with the historical *kāvya* 16. Though their authors could never afford to be really impartial and take a detached view of events, yet as contemporary documents they cannot be ignored by the student of history. The present *kāvya* shows that the work begun by Harisena, Bāna, Padmagupta, Bilhana, Vākpati, Sandhyākara Nandi, Hemacandra and others was continued by their successors at least up to the 16th century A.D. We must also remember that with the exception of the *Rāmacarita* of Sandhyākara Nandi we are not familiar with any other work by a Bengali poet which can be called a true historical *kāvya*, though we know a number of Bengali authors of the 15th and the 16th centuries who composed poetical works which can be called non-historical *kāvyas*. The *Harcarita* of Caturbhuj (1493 A.D.), Murāri Gupta’s *Castanyakarita* (c. 1528 A.D.), and Rūpa Gosvāmi’s *Uddhava-sandesa* and *Hamsa-dūta* (c. early 16th century) may be

15 *Rajatarangini*, I, 7
16 Keith, *op cit*, pp. 144 cf., also Keith, *Classical Sanskrit Literature*, pp. 61 ff
mentioned in this connection 17 Umāpati Dhara's Deopara Prāṣasti, though scanty, may however, be included in the list of historical kāvya by a Bengali author of the first half of the 12th century A.D. 18

H C Ray

17 I am indebted to Dr S Sen of the University of Calcutta and Mr C Chakravarti, of the Bethune College, Calcutta for some suggestions in this paper.

18 See my Dynastic History of Northern India, vol 1, 1931, p 362. Bhūtta Bhavadeva's Prāṣasti is really a record of a Brāhma family and as such cannot be properly called a historical kāvya, see ibid, p 255.
The Date of the Kaumudimahotsava

Since the late Dr K P Jayaswal wrote on the "Historical Data in the Drama Kaumudimahotsava" in the ABORI, vol XII, pp 50-56, the drama has attracted considerable attention. Jayaswal (henceforth abbreviated as J) took it as a work of the early Gupta period and he drew from it a good deal of material for the reconstruction of the early history of the Guptas. Several scholars have accepted the historical conclusions of J without properly examining whether the text of the drama really supports them or not. The highly speculative character of these deductions did not, however, escape the critical eyes of the late Prof Winternitz, who said that "there is no justification at all for assigning this Kaumudimahotsava

1 History of India 150 AD to 350 AD (IBORS, Vol XIX), pp 113-121
2 See, e.g., E A Furse, The Maukhans, pp 25-35
drama to 340 A D. Winternitz, however, did not make a detailed refutation of J's views and Mr Dasharatha Sharma found fault with him and supported J. In view of the important character of the historical deductions of J, the question of the date of the Kaumudimabotsava (henceforth abbreviated as Km) needs be re-examined, though from the literary point of view the drama is not of much value.

The author's name has not been fully preserved, not also in the colophons of the unique manuscript on which M Ramakrishna Kavi and S K Ramanath Sastri based their editions. The author's name appears in the prologue of the drama but a part of it is missing. Its conclusion -kāyā (nibaddham nātakam) makes it certain that the writer was a female whose name ended with the syllable kā. Mr Kavi says that he noticed traces of "a part of jā underneath the worm-eaten portion" and a suggestion has been made that the name of the authoress was Vṛjikā. J however, ignored this and inferred from the verse (Prologue, v 3) that her name was Kisorikā, daughter of Krsivala. No Sanskritist familiar with prologues in the Abhijnāna-śaktakāntala, the Venisambhāra and other Sanskrit dramas will take this verse as conveying any sense other than that of ṛtu-varnana

कुष्माण्डका कस्तादेहा कुष्माण्डकिन्तोरिका ।
करोत्तेषा करापेश्च कथेन कलमसजरीम् ॥

In autumn the young girl (kisorikā) of the peasant (krsivala) is placing sheafs of paddy on her ears. There is no reference to the authoress.

3 Krishnaswami Aiyangar Commemoration Volume, p 362
4 JBORS, vol XXII, pp 275-282
5 Dakshina-Bharat Sanskrit Series No 4. Madras, 1929
6 Introduction, p 3
6a Mr Kavi must be wrong in his view that the writer was not a woman (Introduction, p 2)
7 ABI, XII, p 50, n 1
8 Cf Winternitz, op cit, p 361, n 10
J inferred from the undermentioned words of the Stage-Manager in the prologue that the authoress was a contemporary of the characters in the drama —

> तदानी ( तवद्यमी ॥ ) तत्त्वनायः पाठसिन्याचितते। नुमेहत्तमाहे देवस वर्षायाम- 
> वर्णः। प्रक्तिमार्यादमितीविभाजितसमस्तकल्लोकारिः। राजकुमारो पुनर्मवर्षः। 
> प्रक्तिमार्यादा तत्त्वस्वर्गस्योऽस्तिः। चतुर्वित्तममितीविभाजितसमस्तकल्लोकारिः। 
> ( प्रविष्ट्यः ) प्रमुखातुषु पूर्वसूरस्तु कविविद्वेदु का पुनर्मवर्षसमीया कुलिन्धि- 
> मेन्याः। वर्षाणां वालस्वाय राज्य समस्ती चतुर्वित्तममितीविभाजितसमस्तकल्लोकारिः। 
> तदानी- 

If the above be compared with the prologues in other Sanskrit dramas, J’s conclusion cannot be regarded as the only possible one. In the prologue of the Uttarārāmacarita the Sūtradhāra says

> एषोदिक कार्यवशायाय-भक्तद्वीपनात्मक संग्रहः। ( समान्तातीतिकः ) भो भो । 
> यदा तावद्वानाय चौस्तपुरक्षोदेशाराजस्यायमितीविभाजितसमस्तया चतुर्वित्तममेंतानन्द- 
> नायि चतुर्वित्तम विभाजितसमस्त चतुर्वित्तमानाः। … एहि। राज्यस्वाय अनुसरणमे 
> सिास्याथ्येषांप्रत्येकाः।

Here also the Stage-Manager affects to be a contemporary of the characters in the drama. With the exception of the sentence एषोदिक कार्यवशायाय-भक्तद्वीपनात्मक संग्रहतः., the Stage-Manager’s words in the Uttarārāmacarita are similar to those in the Kṛ. In the prologue of the Venisamhāra we have the same affectation of contemporaneity without even a qualifying sentence as in the Uttarārāmacarita. As soon as the Stage-Manager has introduced the names of the drama and its author to the audience, some one shouts from the green-room,

> भान, लघुत्वो लघुत्तामः। एते अत्याच्चकिरुपरायनो युधिष्ठिर शक्तमेव शैलस्याः व्यायाति — (प्रक्तिमार्यादाङ्गमकामकोषविलिपिम्) कथा विषयः। 
> प्रवेशकलां कितं तत्तवस्फ पारायणार्यार्याज्ञानविशिष्टिः। निवेदनदानकृतम् समस्तमाय भरतकुलहिताकामयाः खर्च 
> प्रतिप्रवैद्यस्य प्रक्तिमार्यादानं देवस्यीत्वानामार्यामहाराज्यांचाथि विभाजितसमस्तोऽपि प्रति भरताकामयेः। इति।

The Stage-Manager then joyously says,

> उर्विष्णु मूर्ति भो, मघवता सकलब्धस्वायत्वितिनिरूपमहादित्युषुकाण्डः। भरतकुलः सकलः च 
> राजकुमारो मुख्याध्यक्षवस्तु राज्यवर्त्ति राज्याला भवयोगिः। अतः अतिरिक्त भाषाये 
> संग्रहो श्रद्धार्याः। तत्क्रियानुसारः नामः शक्ति श्लोकेऽपि सह संग्रहे।
The Assistant now enters and the two carry on conversation in the same strain, as if they are contemporaries of the Kauravas and the Pāṇḍavas.

In the Mrçchakatika the Stage-Manager in course of his talk with his wife flares up and curses that his friend who has enjoined a costly vrata on her should receive capital punishment at the hands of king Pālaka, as if they were all contemporaneous with that king. The Manager also holds a dialogue with Cārudatta's friend, Maitreya, "in the sky." In the Vikramorvaśiya while the Stage-Manager is talking with his Assistant, cries of help are heard from behind the Stage and the Manager feigns that he does not know what they mean and then after affected reflection says that Urvāšī is being carried away by Asuras and her friends are crying for help. In the Mudrārāksasa (as in the Venisambāra), while the Prologue is in progress, the character in the opening scene, Cānaka (like Bhima in the Venisambāra), takes serious exception to the words falling from the lips of the Stage-Manager and begins his angry speech. Similarly in the Ratnāvati, Yaugarādhāyana, the first speaker in the Prelude to Act I, takes up with approval from behind the stage a verse uttered by the Stage-Manager while the Prologue is still continuing. Of the so-called Bhāsa dramas each one (with the exception of the Cārudatta which is only an abridged version of the Mrçchakatika) includes within the Prologue the first sentence of the first speaker of the opening scene.

All this shows that our dramatists often put anachronous words in the mouths of the Stage-Manager and his assistants. The words of the Stage-Manager in the Prologue of the Kīrn, therefore, need not necessarily make him or the authoress a contemporary of Kāliyānavarman.

We cannot thus assume that the date of the work is the same as that of the story. If, however, the story is historical, its date will give the uppermost limit of our drama. But is the story
historical? None of the characters of the drama are known to us from inscriptions, coins or literary references. J. equates Candasaena, the villain of the drama, with the famous Candragupta I of the Gupta dynasty. This Candasaena was the adopted son of Sundaravarman, king of Magadha, but he got estranged from his adoptive father probably when, as J. plausibly supposes, a son (Kalyānavarman) was born to him, which probably made Candasaena suspicious about the chance of his succession to the throne. Candasaena allied himself with the Licchavis, the enemies of the house of Magadha, and attacked Pātaliputra. Sundaravarman is said to have been victorious in the battle. He spared the life of Candasaena but disinherited him and banished him to the Licchavi territory (p. 30). But Sundaravarman himself died soon after, seemingly of wounds received in the battle, and Candasaena came back and occupied the throne of Magadhā. Kalyānavarman, the young son of Sundaravarman, had been removed to safety by his partisans and he grew into manhood, when a coup was arranged which installed him on the throne of his father and Candasaena was killed.

J thinks that this Candasaena is the historical Candragupta I because both of them had connexions with the Licchavis and had accession of territory through their help. There is no doubt that Candragupta I married a Licchavi princess, Kumāadevi, through whose right he and his son Samudragupta ruled over lands that did not originally belong to them. But about Candasaena we are only told that he had connexion (sambandha) with the Licchavis—

तत सः तम मण्डकुलम व्यपविशाखाय मण्डकुलवैचित्रितम्। सह सम्बन्धेन हर्षवल्लभसंवर्धना। (p. 30). Nothing is said here about

9 अप्रहस्तः पिता in the text. This rendering is suggested by MM Dr Ganganatha Jha.
a marriage relation which J. naively assumes. The context rather suggests that it was only a political alliance.

It is difficult to understand why Candragupta I, supposed to be the same person as Candasaena, should become the adopted son of another king, when his father, Ghatotkaca, was already a king. The Gupta inscriptions from the time of Samudragupta and the coins of Candragupta I and Kumārādevi suggest that Candragupta I succeeded to the dominion of the petty kings (Mahārāja, which does not necessarily mean ‘feudatory king’), Gupta and Ghatotkaca, and became an emperor (Mahārājādhirāja) when he received considerable addition to his territory through marriage with the Licchavi princess. Candasaena’s rule, on the other hand, was only through the usurpation of Sundaravarman’s throne. If the Licchavis had kept him on the throne of Magadhā, Kalyānvarman would have had to cross swords with them when he conquered Candasaena and the Km must have mentioned this feat of the new king.

Then the drama distinctly says that Candasaena was killed after the coup of Kalyānvarman विद्वाने दानी प्रतिविरुद्धराज्याधिकारी देश कल्याव्रम्भी निम्नदेशविचारक विद्वाने वत्सालवन्ने निम्नदेशविचारक विद्वाने वत्सालवन्ने निम्नदेशविचारक विद्वाने वत्सालवन्ने निम्नदेशविचारक । (p 36) The meaning of वत्सालवन्न is not very clear. But the only way in which it can be construed is as a Bahuvi and compound adjective to वत्सालविचारक meaning ‘along with his issue.’ This meaning is made quite explicit by the following verse

प्रकटितेऽरम्भक्तमुखस्थः समस्तेऽरम्भक्तमुक्तम् न ॥

So the entire family of Candasaena was uprooted by Kalyānvarman. But Candragupta I seems to have had a peaceful end and certainly left sons, the great Samudragupta and other princes of equal birth (tulyakulaja-) referred to in l. 7 of the Allahabad Pillar Inscription of Samudragupta (Fleet, No 1) J.’s assumption that "Candra-
gupta I who was dying either of wounds or of a broken heart on his expulsion from Pātaliputra, addressed Samudragupta, one of his younger sons, with tears in his eyes, and with the tacit consent and approval of his Council of Ministers,—‘You now, my noble sir, be the king (‘protect the kingdom’) and expired’” goes against both the Km and the Allahabad Inscription. The Km shows that Candasaņa, the alleged counterpart of Candragupta I, was not expelled from Pātaliputra when Kalyāņavarman became the king but was killed (mūriyāh). He could not, therefore, have the time to give the alleged charge to one of his sons in the presence of the “Council of Ministers.” Then, what “Council of Ministers” could sit in deliberation or even give “tacit consent” near the death bed of a king who had been dispossessed of his realm? Then, the tears in the eyes of the historical Candragupta I as recorded in the genuinely historical Allahabad Inscription (ll 7-8), which J ascribes to Candasaņa, are clearly tears of affection and not of sorrow. The words in the inscription are

आयामं होत्युष्यश्च भाविन्युत्थानस्करिते रोमिनि:
सम्बुच्छितायुतु तुष्यकुलमुलानानन्दप्रियः.
श्रेयस्यालंतिः ज्ञायुष्यश्च तत्त्वेनिस्वः च श्रुयः।
व छत्रालंशितो निर्द्विंच्य निनिता पाश्चेष्वचामिति ॥

“whom his father embraced, saying ‘verily, noble thou art,’ with his hairs, indicative of affection, standing erect, while the members of the court heaved with joy but (princes) of equal pedigree looked on with pale features, and then scanning him with eyes rolling with affection and laden with tears (of joy) and penetrating into (his) true nature, said ‘Thus protect all this earth’” We have here very clearly the words of a prosperous king, seated in state in his court, naming a successor and charging him to protect the earth as he did it (एक्षम) and not the plaintive words of a king, lying

11 JBORS, XIX, p 119
mortalv wounded in the field of battle, who has lost his all and asks one of the sons to regain the lost dominion. The other princes could not have turned pale because they were not given charge of an extremely difficult and hazardous task, a life and death struggle against tremendous odds. Actually the inscription refers to a peaceful succession. J’s interpretation of these lines makes a travesty of the actual text. We must, therefore, conclude that the end of Candasa’s career as given in the K’s makes his identification with Candragupta impossible.

Then there is the difference in name J finds no difficulty in taking Canda- as the Prakrit form of Sanskrit Candra- and Dasharatha Sharma supports it. Candra- of Sanskrit becomes Canda- and not Canda- in Prakrit. A preceding and not a following -r- ordinarily cerebralizes a dental. It is only in Jaina Prakrit (Ardhamâgadhi and Jaina Mahârâstri) that -dra- sometimes becomes -dda-. Even in Ardhamâgadhi Candra- becomes Canda- and not Canda- and the form Canda- is extremely rare in Jaina Prakrit.

12 *IBORS*, XIX, p. 113
13 *IBORS*, XXII, p. 276
14 Dhánapâla, *Pâlalacchinâmâmâlā* v. 5. The grammarians add an alternative form Candra- without assimilation (Vararuci, III 4, Hemacandra, II 80, Markandeya, III 4. Grîvâkrama, I 4, 80) Canda is not vouched for by any grammarian or lexicographer.
18 *Ibid.*, p. 392a. The author has cited an illustration from Kirfel, *Die Kosmographie der Inder*. The reason for Candra not becoming Canda is not far to seek: the preceding -n- protects the dental -d- from change. The alleged instance of Candra- becoming Canda- in Prakrit in the Kôdâvali Well Inscription of Vâsishthiputra-sâmisuri-Cadasätt (i) (*IBORS*, XIX, p. 113, n. 4) is extremely doubtful for there the Sanskrit form of the king’s name seems to be Vâsishthiputra Candrasvâts and not V Candrasvâts, (Cf Sten Konow, *ZDMG*, LXII, p. 591) a form favoured by the
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... Dasharatha Sharma says "The Prākṛta name Chandasena is turned into Chandrasimha by Ksemendra Somadeva, however, gives it as Chandasena in his Sanskrit version of Bṛhatkathā. This shows that the Prākṛta Chanda has been always regarded as the equivalent of not merely Chanda, but also of Chandra." The fact stated here is not correct. It is true that in the Nirmay Sagar edition of the Bṛhatkathāmaṇḍyaṇi of Ksemendra the name of the king of Tāmrālīpta in the eighth story of the Vētāla in the Saśānkapati-lambaṇa twice occurs as Candra-simha (verses 420 and 430) corresponding to the consistent reading Canda-sena in the Kathāsaritsāgara of Somadeva, but it also occurs there as Canda-sena for the same individual within the self-same story (vv 446, 449, pp 323-4), which shows that Canda-sena is the form of the name in the Bṛhat-kathāmaṇḍyaṇi also and Candra-simha is only a wrong reading confined to two places. Nowhere else in the Bṛhatkathāmaṇḍyaṇi does Canda- in a proper name show the variant Canda- in the Kathāsaritsāgara.

majority of the Pūrāṇa manuscripts, the Vāyu, the Brahmāṇa and most manuscripts of the Matsya supporting Candārī Sātakarna and only the Viṃsa and stray manuscripts of the Bhāgavata and one manuscript of the Matsya favouring the spelling Candārī (Cf F E Pargiter, Pūrāṇa Text of the Dy of Kali Age, p 43 and fn 19, 22). It is true that Rapson read the legend on the coins of this king as Raño Vāṣṭhiputasa Sinī Cada-Sātisa with a dental -d- Cat Coins of the Andhra Dynasty, pp 30-1) But the letter which he reads as -da- is hardly different from the letter in the coins of a different fabric, seemingly of the same king, to which he gave the value of -da- (Cat Coins of the Andhra Dynasty, pp 32-3, pl VI). If the legend on the coins of this Vāṣṭhiputra (Rapson, nos 117-124) must be read with a dental -d- so can be read the name in the Kodevali Well Inscription (Cf H Krishna Sastri in E1 XVIII, p 317.

19 Jbors, XXII, p 277, n 1.

20 Lambaka, XII, Taranga, XIV (Nirmaya Sagar edition, pp 421 ff.) It is the seventh story according to the order in the Kathāsaritsāgara.

21 Critical editions of the Bṛhatkathāmaṇḍyaṇi and the Kathāsaritsāgara based on very thorough examination of all available manuscripts are a great necessity. Study of these two texts will then be placed on a scientific basis.
In the Km we find that Candra- appears as Canda- (p. 7, ll. 11, 14, 19, p. 14, l. 14, p. 21, l. 2, p. 28, l. 2, p. 46, ll. 11, 13). On the other hand, Candasea’s name always appears in the Sanskrit passages as Canda-sena and not as Candra-sena (p. 29, l. 8, p. 30, l. 9, p. 32, l. 5 and p. 36, l. 13). Consequently the text of the Km goes against the phonetic equation proposed by J.

It is thus clear that the Km cannot be taken as referring to Candragupta I.²² Nor can we determine the date or the historicity of Kalyänavarman, Candasea and Kirtisena. Consequently the story cannot help us in fixing the upper limit of the date of the drama.

Now let us look for other indications in the work for the date.

The very first verse which gives a clear indication is as follows:

श्रीमद्भाष्यभाष्यानिनित्यं विनयिणि सन्निपत्तः
कृत्वा परमेश्वरं फणमित्यिकियोऽधृताय तां तत्त सत
नानात्मानिनिर्विकिः विनयिणि विकर्त्रण दस्तसन्तं विनित्यम
ब्रह्मचार्यां धर्मनित्यं भवतु तम हस्ते हस्तिनासाः

The authoress is here paying obeisance to Śiva (Kṛtvāvasas).
The second half of the verse uses two adjectives for Kṛtvāvasāḥ which are remarkable (1) nānātmanīniḥśāstro vibhāyāḥ vibhāyāḥ vibhāyāḥ vibhāyāḥ daksinātmāḥ (“spreading, as it were, in the form of the luster of his teeth, the knowledge that cuts the knot of duality”) and (2) bhāṣyābhāṣyāṁ.

The second

²² It is surprising how Jayaswal could gather from Km, IV 6

(कारनिकोपपादकुक्षोरेकाकार निरोपिनिकरा प्रकटीविनमार।
कारकृत्वश्रीमद्भाष्यभाष्यां निनित्यसंप्रतिविचित्वे II)

that Candasea was a Kāraskara (=Dhanri Jat of the Punjab) by birth. The last line of the verse means that in course of his oppressions Candasea has now (sampratit) become a “veritable Kāraskara among kings.” Āryāraṅka is explaining to Vardhamānaka how Candasea has become unpopular among his subjects. To take Candasea as a born Kāraskara from this passage is doing violence to the text. J is wrong in taking the Kāraskaras as a northern people. They seem to have belonged to the Deccan (Matsya Purāṇa, Ch 114, vv 45-49). But kāraskarab in Km IV 6 seems to mean a poison tree (Pāṇini, VI 1 156, Bhāgavata Purāṇa V 14 12 and Rājamahānta, IX 142). Candasea had thus become a “poison tree” among kings by his misdeeds.
adjective is striking. Why is Śiva connected with brahma-vyākhyāna (exposition of Brahman)? Is it not very strange? If, however, we suppose that the authoress was thinking of the great Śankarācārya, believed to be an avatar of Śiva, both the adjectives become appropriate. The whole energy of Śankarācārya was spent in establishing the advaita doctrine and refuting dualism and he is known as the commentator of the Brahma-sūtras, at least among Advaitins. Brahmavyākhyānanāsthab would admirably suit the well known teacher of Brahma-udyā—gṛhastha-yādā vaśāyaḥ (the) śiṣṭa = śravīcan tattvāvadhayaḥ, “who is always engaged in the exposition of Brahman.” For Śiva the construction is not easy. It will have to be something like this—gūḍha-yādā vaśāyaḥ (the) śiṣṭa = śravīcan tattvāvadhayaḥ, “who is the end of expositions of Brahman.” It is more usual to have a Bahuvrīhi compound of nīstā with a word in the locative than with one in the genitive. Similarly the adjective nāṇātāvābhūtiḥ bhavānir bhavānir would refer to Śankarācārya more directly. In the case of Śiva the interpretation will have to be a little round about—Śiva is supposed to give higher knowledge, which an Advaitin will assume to be a dispeller of dualism. As regards the adjective in the first half of the verse the portion from śrimāṇā-pramāṇamārthačitamal to pṛṣṭha-prastuḥ will suit Śiva and his incarnation equally well, for Śankarācārya as a Śannyāsin must have used a seat of tiger skin when engaged in yogic contemplation. It is only śrāvīcakārāṇavāpaṇa that creates some difficulty in the case of Śankarācārya, for it is not easy to believe that he used an actual snake for tying himself fast (paryanka-bandha). Is taksaka in his case to be understood as the T-shaped wooden rest, called tākhā in Hindi, much used by Sādhus? It may have had a sharp metallic end for splitting firewood. Even then śrāvīcakārāṇavāpaṇa remains unexplained. What-

22a This suggestion has emanated from a friend of mine, who is not only a good student of yoga but a practical yogin him elf.
ever that may be the other adjectives clearly suggest that the author is referring here together to Śiva and his incarnation Śankarācārya. Compare the words of Śāyanācārya at the beginning of his Vedic commentaries,

यस निष्कृतिः वेदा यो वेदेयोदितिल जगत्।

निम्नेसे तमाः वन्दे विश्वातीश्वरेष्टसृ॥

Here Śāyana has identified Brahman, his ista-devatā Śiva, and his guru Vidyātīrtha. Our authoress seems to have held Śankarācārya in similar regard. In any case, the idea नागात्मानिन्दे विश्वमिव विचिन्द्र hardy be understood before Śankarācārya popularised the advaita doctrine.

The work is then to be assigned to a date not earlier than that of the great Vedāntist Śankara is usually believed to have lived between 788 and 820 A.D. but this date now appears to be too late. In any case, this much can be safely said that he lived sometime between 650 A.D. and 800 A.D. This would then represent the upper limit of the date of the Kām.

As one carefully goes through the drama one finds that this upper limit is confirmed by the borrowings of the authoress. Dashārātha Sharma and D R Mankad have shown the influence of Kālidāsa’s writings in this drama. One can considerably add to their lists. Thus

Kām. p 4, II 14-15 (निमित्त सूचिता) कर ये वस्तु स्फुरति द्रविषयो भे वाहु.

This is clearly suggested by Abhijñānaśākuntala. Act I (निमित्त सूचिता) शास्त्रिदर्मारथमपश्च स्फुरति च वाहु कृत्ति फलमहाय. Ed Patankar, Poona 1902, p 11). It should be noted that the throbbing of

23 K B Pathak, IA XI, pp 174-5, XLII, p 235. IBBRAS. XVIII, 218, D R Bhandarkar, IA, XLI, 206 etc. K T Tulang pleaded for an earlier date in IA XIII, 95-103 and Introduction to the Muddrākṣaṇa (B S S), pp xxxix ff. See also J F Fleet, IA, XVI 41-2


24 IHQ. X, pp 763-6, XI, pp 147-8. ABI. XVI, pp 155-157
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Dusyanta's right arm soon secures him a good damsel, whereas Kalyāṇavarman gets Kirtumati after a long time.

P 6, l 1 एवदेवा (=by the Asoka tree growing wild in the forest) पञ्चाविण्डा दासिणि पवनवाचाय पतिणि समिद्रीः Cf Abb I 17 cd, इदोहिता खलु गृही-हस्यालिता कल्लताम्भीः (p 11)

P 10, ll 1-2 कथाय पक्षाविक्षोपं सृष्टिपुजयातः लिंगालिङ्गदेवे विवाहारासारां द्विध्रुवम्। प्रत्यक्षं समयमलोलिताविलासपदेवे निबासण्णी II

The underlined expressions are identical. It is more natural that a line in verse should have been copied in prose than the other way about.

P 11, ll 5 ff The discovery of the pearl necklace inadvertently left by Kirtumati was probably suggested by the mṛṇāla-valaya left by Śakuntalā in Act III of Abb according to not only the long addition in the Bengali recension but also verse 25 (p 76) of the Devāgari text.

P 15, ll 25-26 ब्राह्मणिः साधवी नेवारशस्त्रोकारारुपस्वन्धम्। स्तरस्त्रीयो लभते निष्ठितिमारकहते बय। reminds one of the talks between Anasūyā, Priyamvādā and Śakuntalā in Act I of Abb (pp 15-16) about the navamālāka Vanayotsnā. The mādhavī creeper is named just before this in the Kashmiri recension (ed K Burkhard, p 28) and immediately after in the Bengali text (ed Permchand Tarkavāgīśa, pp 14-15).

P 22, l 16 तत प्रियपरिशत वामस्यमार्थसवः कुमार। Cf Abb Act III तत्तम प्रियपरिशत वामस्यमार्थसवः राज। (p 53) using a form (kāmayamāna-) which is unusual in classical texts, though grammatically correct.

P 44, ll 18-19 स्मदेविविविधांतो मनसि ने वियोगोष्टिवस्त्रायाः। The underlined expression seems to have been suggested by रस्म भृति etc in Abb VI 5 (p 150).

P 48, ll 7-8 The Vidūṣaka's mistake a picture-roll thrown in that direction by Nipunikā for a serpent seems clearly to have been suggested by the incident of Irāvati's maid Nipunikā throwing a stick at the sleeping Vidūṣaka in Act IV of the Mālavikāngñittra and his mistaking it for a real snake (ed S P Pandit, p 121, ll 158 ff). It is more natural to mistake a stick as a serpent than a picture-roll.
The Date of the Kaumudimahotsava

If Kālidāsa be assigned to the reign of Candragupta II Vikramāditya (c. 380-c. 415 A.D.) or of Kumāragupta I Mahendrāditya (c. 415-455 A.D.) or his son Skandagupta Vikramāditya (455 A.D. - c. 467 A.D.), the Km cannot be dated as early as c. 340 A.D. I am, however, of opinion that Kālidāsa lived before Aśvaghosa (second century A.D.) who borrowed from him and not vice versa. If my view about the date of Kālidāsa (not later than 100 A.D.) is correct, there will, of course, be no difficulty in dating the Km at about 340 A.D. on account of borrowings from Kālidāsa. But there are works of dates later than 340 A.D. whose influence we can trace in the work.

The proclamation under orders of the minister Mantragupta for the celebration by the citizens of Pātaliputra in Act V of our drama (p. 39), an incident of no importance in the plot, seems clearly to have been suggested by a similar order of Candragupta Maurya in Act III of the Mudrārāksasa (and its forbiddance by Cānakiya), a very important event in the development of the plot of that drama. If the Mudrārāksasa be assigned to the time of Candragupta II, the Km cannot be assigned to a period even before the accession of Samudragupta, a predecessor of Candragupta II. According to J's theory the reign of Candasena = Candragupta I was followed by the accession of Kalyānavarman and his brief rule, after which Samudragupta came to power and ruled long enough to complete his extensive conquests. The rule of Candragupta II, therefore, would thus begin at least 20 to 30 years after the alleged date of the composition of the Km.

But the Mudrārāksasa cannot be assigned to even such an early date as the reign of Candragupta II. The evidence of manuscripts is more in favour of the reading पाधिभोजस्तिवर्म्म for the close of the

last verse than फारिन्धन्तम्. Consequently we should assign Viśākhadatta to the time of Avantivarman, very likely the Maukhari king, father of Graharvarman. This Avantivarman we should place in the second half of the sixth century and that is very likely the date of the Muddrārāksasa.

There are still later works whose influence we can discern in the Kṛm. The Nāgānanda, passing in the name of king Harsavardhana (606-647 A.D.), has supplied three motifs to our authoress (1) The first one is the manner of the first meeting of the hero and the heroine. In the Nāg, Jimūtavāhana comes to the Malaya mountain and meets Malayavatī in the temple of Gaurī, after she had worshipped the goddess. There is love at first sight on both the sides. Malayavatī feels so bashful that she cannot directly face Jimūtavāhana but slightly turns her face and feels like getting away from the place. Soon a hermit comes and calls her away. While going she keeps on slyly looking at Jimūtavāhana. In the Kṛm. Kirtimati comes to pay her respects to Candi Vindhyavāsini and after coming out of the temple sees Kalyānavarman. Here also there is love at first sight and the same bashfulness on the part of the heroine, who sits behind her friend Nipunikā but keeps on sending stealthy glances at the prince. A maid now announces that her place for residence has been got ready and she should now go there. Kirtimati leaves the place with difficulty, again and again looking at

26 Sten Konow's recent attempt at securing support for his view (Das indische Drama, pp 70-1) that Viśākhadatta lived in the reign of Candraguptra II from the title Devi-Candragupta of the author's other drama (IBORS, XXIII, pp 450-1) is unconvincing.

27 The foreigner I-Tsung, who came to India after the time of Harsa, naturally knew the work as Harsa's, as it circulated in the king's name. But there is internal evidence in the Ratnāvali (Prologue, verse 5 and the whole trend of the Stage-Manager's speech) showing that the Ratnāvali was written by a person who wanted to please the king. The Priyadarśikā and the Nāgānanda seem to have been written by the same courtier-Pandit.
Kalyāṇavarman and tarrying on various pretexts. The agreement of the two motifs is striking.

The sense of one verse in our drama,

याता नितम्भगृही याब्ध्यवस्थोऽज्ज्ञति दूरम्।
चिम्बितगालीवान्तलव्यवधवांडि मे॥

uttered by Kalyāṇavarman after Kirtimati leaves his company, becomes clear when we place before us the corresponding utterance of Jimūtavāhana.

अन्यत्र जननाभोगभरम्भर्या तया।
अन्यतोष्णिष्ठशन्या मे हदये निहित परम्॥ (Nāg I 19)

The last line of the latter verse explains the corresponding line of the former. We are to supply हदये after अवगाहा मे in Km I 26d. The two verses have other points of contact.

2 There is another partial agreement between the two works. In the Nāg, the heroine is appraised in her dream by the goddess Gauri about her coming marriage with the hero (Act I) and in Km the nun Yogasiddhi makes the false claim before the king of Mathurā that the goddess Candi has enjoined her in a dream about the marriage of Kirtimati with Kalyāṇavarman (p 38, l 9 to p 39, l 3 and p 39, l 21 to p 40, l 3). This ruse of Yogasiddhi is an absolutely unnecessary one. As Kirthena was a friend of Kalyāṇavarman's father (p 40, l 17) and Kalyāṇavarman is now established on his father's throne, there is no reason why the king of Mathurā should not readily agree to marry Kirtimati to Kalyāṇavarman, the moment such a proposal was made by Yogasiddhi or by Kalyāṇavarman himself.

3 The third motif agreeing in the two works is this. In the Nāg, Act II, the next meeting of the hero and the heroine takes place thus: Jimūtavāhana enters a sandal bower with his confidant and Malayavati and her maid who were already there now move away and watch them from behind a tree. Malayavati overhearing
their talk only from the middle supposes that the prince is in love with some other woman about whom he is talking and whose portrait he has just painted on the floor of the bower. She is deeply hurt, leaves the place and tries to kill herself. Ultimately she is saved and she is told that the person Jimūtavāhana was talking about was her own self and all doubts are dispelled when she is shown the picture he has painted. The marriage of the pair comes immediately after this event. In the \( Km \), Act V, we have some of these elements partly reproduced. The meeting of the hero and the heroine here is not their second one, though it is certainly their second appearance on the stage together. But their marriage and final union are to come just after this. Kalyānavarman, now the established king of Magadha, is conversing with his confidant in a bower in his palace garden and Kirtimati, sent by her father for marriage with him, is approaching that spot along with her friend Nipunikā. Nipunikā shows her the joint portrait of Kalyānavarman and Kirtimati which has played an important part in the development of the plot. Kirtimati does not look at the whole of the picture and supposes that the woman painted by the side of Kalyānavarman is some other girl with whom he is in love and is deeply tormented at the thought. Nipunikā makes her look carefully at the picture and she realises with joy that it is her own self that is painted by the side of her lover. Nipunikā throws the picture inside the bower and the king and the Vidūsaka come out when the lovers meet. The mistake of Kirtimati about the female companion of the king in the picture, though short-lived, is extremely unnatural.

We then, find the influence of another work contemporaneous with the \( Nāgānanda \), viz., the \( Harsacarita \) of Bānabhatta. After Kalyānavarman is firmly seated on the throne, Kirtisena, the

28 Verses 26 and 27 in Act V show that the lovers had met after Act I and the incidents described in Acts II and III and not “seen each other only once before the marriage” as hastily supposed (\( ABI \), XII, 52)
king of Mathurā, sends to him along with his daughter a wonderful necklace of gajamukta, tracing back its origin to the Mahābhārata War, which was kept in the family as a precious heirloom (Km, p 42). It seems that our authoress was influenced here by two incidents described in the Harsacarita, the gift of a wonderful umbrella sent by Bhāskaravarman, king of Kāmarūpa, to Harsavardhana soon after his accession, to secure his political friendship (Ucchvāsa VII) and of a pearl necklace of alleged mythic origin which was once in the possession of the historical Nāgarjuna who gave it to his friend, king Sātavāhana, which in course of sīya-parampara reached the hands of the Buddhist teacher Divākaramitra, who gave it to Harsavardhana after he rescued Rāyastrī (Ucchvāsa VIII).

There are also traces of the influence of a still later writer, viz., Bhavabhūti, who is assigned to the end of the seventh century A D. 29 In Act V of the Km when Kiritmani is approaching the bower in the garden of Kalyānavarman already occupied by the king, as soon

29 S K Belvalkar, Rāma’s Later History, H O S., vol XXI, pp xli-xlvi Some scholars now suppose from the joint testimony of a manuscript of the Mālatimādbhava (S P Pandit, Gandavabho B S S, p ccxi) and the Pratyakṣāttvapradīpa of Cīrṣukha with its commentary, the Nayanāprāśādīni, by Pratyaṅgriya (Nirmaya Sagar edition, p 265) that Bhavabhūti was the same person as Umbeka, commentator of Mandana’s Bhāvanāviveka, and very likely one of the pupils of Kumārila Bhaṭṭa. This identification, if accepted, would corroborate the latter half of the seventh century as the date of Bhavabhūti. I am myself not convinced about the identification. I fear that though Pratyaṅgriya definitely identifies Umbeka with Bhavabhūti, Cīrṣukha’s own words—

न हि पुराण एव सन्त नाटकात्तिकाय प्रभवविरचनात्मको नामस्य भवति भवमुक्ति | यह चैतुद्देश्के यदासिंहपि क्रमस्वपुर्दिशिति न लयानुभुमताधिषय वाक्य प्रवृत्तमध्य यथाशुचयो इत्यत्वप्रतस्मात्माति |

definitely suggest that he distinguished between Bhavabhūti and Umbeka. If he had identified them he would have said उह चैतुद्देश्के न ‘सन्त’ chitabdeshke instead of उह चैतुद्देश्के जस्ता after referring to Bhavabhūti. The style of Umbeka, as far as it can be judged from his commentary on the Bhāvanāviveka, appears to be different from that of Bhavabhūti’s dramas and it shows no sign of the well-known self-consciousness of Bhavabhūti.
as she hears his voice, she gets horrripilations all over her body. She asks Nipunkā to stand in front covering her from the sight of the king, when the maid says jestingly भिन्नवसिंहे, किंसे मये वारस ब्राह्मेश (सी) अख्त । गा तुंए एव अनयूणागो आपुशि रोमण्डुंहो। Kirtumati feels ashamed at this physical manifestation of her sentiments and says हत्र कि में नला में (p 46) This last sentence immediately reminds us of a passage in the Third Act of the Utára-Rāmacarita. Rāma has fallen into a swoon and the invisible Sitā touches him at the bidding of Tamasā to bring him back to consciousness. Rāma regains consciousness and catches hold of the invisible hand of his beloved Sitā gets very much agitated and it is some time before she can withdraw her hand. Tamasā wistfully looks at her and says

स्वयंदेवोरामाखुल्मपताकी जाता वियासपरेश्न बाला।

महनाम्भ-प्रविभूष्टिसिस्मा वर्ममयशि सुपुरोक्षेकं।

(v 43), when Sitā is filled with shame and says to herself अभ्यस्ये। अवरंस्य एदेश रुतास्याय नालाविद्रमित्व सज्जाने। तमसाहे। This speech of Sitā has clearly suggested Kirtumati’s words. Kirtumati has no reason for feeling any shame particularly before her confidante Nipunkā. But Sitā has good reason for feeling ashamed at the words of the goddess Tamasā, for, she adds herself, कि कि किला एसा भिन्नवसिंहे। एसे दे परिवर्तीयाः एसे अहिष्टास्थिति। (Utára-Rāmacarita, S K Belvarkar, p 45) Then again in the same Act of the Km when Kalyāna-varman comes out of the bower, he unexpectedly finds Kirtumati in his front and he takes her into his arms and congratulates himself on his good fortune, but says to the Vidūṣaka that he can hardly believe his eyes.

पस्यतोपिनि न विकाम स्वलक्ष्य स्वल्पे मम।

सहनमाध्यम् देव्या बहुरो विविदा वस्य। (verse 29)

The second half of the verse immediately reminds us of Rāma’s words in the Third Act of the Utára-Rāmacarita.

सवेश्य स एवम् भगवानेनक्रसपरिस्वरामानिनित्तो विश्वतथ पुनुपनुरुत्साहिति माम।

(p 46) Rāma’s supposition is justified by the fact that though he
felt the touch of Sītā he could not see her nor did his companion Vāsanti have any experience of her presence. Hence he thought that he had an illusion. In the case of Kālīṇavarman, he saw, heard and touched Kirtimati, who was accompanied by her maid, and his companion, the Vidūsaka, also saw the two ladies. Under the spell of the words of Bhavabhūti ringing in his ears, our authoress has failed to realize the absurdity of Kālīṇavarman’s apprehension of illusion.

The Uṭṭararāmacarita may not be the only work of Bhavabhūti to which our authoress is indebted. The Buddhist nun Kāmandaki in the Mālatimādhava, equally interested in Mālati and Mādhava, who helps in bringing about their mutual love and subsequently contrives their marriage, seems to be the original of the nun in the Kālīṇi who was once the nurse of Kālīṇavarman, but turned a nun after the death of Sundaravarman and his queens and became attached to Kirtimati. She too played an important part in the development of their love and later arranged their marriage. Painting of the picture of an absent lover or beloved for finding a little solace in separation was popularised by Kālidāsa (Abhijñānasākuntala, Act VI, Meghadūta, ed. Nandargikar, Uṭṭaramegha, verse 44) Bhavabhūti has introduced in the Mālatimādhava (Act I) the motif of the hero and heroine painting each other’s portrait on the self-same canvas. Mālati who had seen Mādhava earlier and had already fallen in love with him painted his portrait to divert herself. After their meeting was arranged in a garden through the intrigues of Kāmandaki, Mādhava also fell in love with her. Shortly after this, his servant Kālahamsa brought to him the portrait painted by Mālati which he had obtained through two intermediaries. Mādhava painted on it the portrait of Mālati at the suggestion of his friend Makaranda and the picture was conveyed to Mālati through the same channel. Kāmandaki had a secret hand in the whole affair. We can trace the influence of this motif in the Kālīṇi. After the first meeting.
of Kalyānavarman and Kirtimati, the latter pines for the prince and in trying to divert herself paints his picture. The portrait is conveyed by a happy accident to the nun, Yogasiddhi, from whom Kalyānavarman's friend, the Vidūsaka, receives it (Act II). Under her instructions, he conveys it to the prince. He makes him paint on it the picture of Kirtimati (Act III). This joint portrait is then carried to the nun and is subsequently utilised by her for bringing about the marriage of the two lovers (Act V).

There are some differences in the details of the two motifs, e.g. (1) Mādhava writes on the completed picture the verse अग्निः जिविनते ते भावा &c (Māl, I 39) but Yogasiddhi writes the verse शीतक्षिति बल्कुमती (Km, II 15) when only the prince has been portrayed on the canvas by Kirtimati and (2) the completed picture returns to Mālati in Bhavabhūti's drama but goes to Yogasiddhi in the Km to be shown to Kirtimati only in Act V. Still the general agreement of the two motifs is quite manifest. The indebtedness of the Km to the Mālatimādhava in this respect cannot be proved but appears to be likely on account of the certain influence of the Uttararāma-cānta pointed out above and Yogasiddhi's agreement with Kāmandaki.

This motif of a joint portrait is also found in the Ratnāvali ascribed to Harsa (Act II) and in the Daśakumāracarita (Ucchvāsa V) of Dandin (circa seventh century A.D.). It is, not impossible that our authoress got a clue from Dandin. The Daśakumāracarita also shows a nurse of a prince turning a nun out of sorrow after she lost trace of the prince in her charge and her royal master lost his kingdom (Ucchvāsa III). The resemblance of Kālyānavarman's nurse, Vinayandharā, later becoming the nun Yogasiddhi, in the Km with woman may not be accidental.

Then the motif of the growing in the Vindhya forest of Rājavāhana, son of the dispossessed king of Magadha, and his subsequent attainment of the ancestral kingdom in the
romance of Dandin may have suggested to our authorress the secret rearing up in the Vindhyā forest of Kalyānavarman, prince of Magadha, and his subsequent return to Magadha as its king. The story may thus have absolutely no basis in history.

We thus see that we cannot place the Kaumudimahotsava earlier than 700 A.D. This is the upper limit for its date. Can we fix a lower limit? Unfortunately we have no means at our disposal to do that. We may, however, become more precise about the date of the work if we can be sure about the name of the authorress. A suggestion has been made that it is Vījikā. Vījīkā or Vījakā is well known as a poetess, whose verses are preserved in works on anthologies and whose name is variously given as Vījakā, Vījikā, Vījā or Vīdyā. The extant verses of this Vījakā make it extremely likely that she is the Vijayānka (or Vijayā?) of Karnaṭa country named by Rājaśekhara,

सरस्वतीव वास्तो विजयानक जयमानि ।
शैर्बर्मिरा वास्तो वालिदासादनंतरम् ॥

because they are all in good Vaiśārddhi style and we know that the poetess called herself Sarasvatī,

नीलोतलस्तर्यामा विजयान्क समाजाताः ।
दुधेभ दुधेप्रीति सवैशुक्ता सरस्वती ॥

(Saṅgadharapaddhati, no 180)

It is, however, extremely doubtful if we should follow Mr P V Kane12 in further identifying her with Vijaya-mahādevi or

---

30 Subhāstivālī, ed. Peterson and Durgāprasāda, nos 158, 1141, 1175, 1523, 2099, 3137, 3138, Saṅgadharapaddhati, ed. Peterson, nos 180, 451, 509, 582, 1003, 1131, 3746, 3769, 3794, Kavindravacanasamuccaya (?), ed F W Thomas, nos 298 and 500, Sadukitekārnāmīra, ed Rāmāvatāra Sarmā (Lahore, 1933), I 23, II 12, 131, 141, 214, 564, 1032, 1402, III 71, 91, 151, 284, IV 493, V 74

31 No 184 in the Saṅgadharapaddhati, where it is anonymous. The verse is ascribed to Rājaśekhara in Jalhana's Saṅkṣimuktavālī (P V Kane, Sābityadarpana, Introduction, p xli)

32 Sābityadarpana, Introduction, p xli
Vijaya-bhattārikā (the queen of Candrāditya, son of the Cālukya Pulakesin II), who calls herself kālskāla-pratipaksabhūtā in her Kochrem plates (Kielhorn's List of Southern Inscriptions, no. 24) and whose Nerūr plates (Kielhorn's List no 23) give the date of 659 A.D. It is difficult to believe that the royal panegyrics भुगा शरिमास्त्रानवयुव (Saduktwksarnāmrt, III 15. 1) and सष्ठुष्त्र देव &c (Ibid, III 28 4) could have been written by a queen or a princess. If it is justified to infer from the missing letters in the name of the authoress in the prologue of the Km that it was Vijjakā or Viṣṇakā, Vijjakā's date would be the date of our work.

Vijjakā is either later than Dandin or is his contemporary, because of her proud assertion, नीलोत्पललश्रामाकं &c referred to above, in which she clearly refers to Dandin's Kavyādarśa I 1'd The question of Dandin's date is a vexed problem in the history of Sanskrit literature 33 He is perhaps later than Bhāmaha but there is nothing to show that Bhāmaha's date is as late as 700 A.D. Bhāmaha's alleged borrowings from Dharmakīrti really appear to be borrowings from Vasubandhu and Dinnāga 34 Consequently it may be possible to assign Dandin to the seventh century A.D. In any case he is not later than the eighth century. The seventh or the eighth century would thus represent the upper limit of Vijjakā's date, which we have already found to be the upper limit of the Km on account of

33 Appendix to LI, vol VII, p 5, n 9
35 Batuk Nāth Sarmā and Baladeva Upādhyāya, op cit pp 40-55, H R Rangaswamy Iyengar, Proceedings and Transactions of the Eighth All-India Oriental Conference, Part II, pp 419-424 I would myself place Dinnāga, who is, according to Buddhist tradition, the paramā-guru of Dharmakīrti (seventh century A.D.), in the sixth century and his teacher Vasubandhu in the time of Narasimhagupta (c 473 A.D.), the only Bālāditya, son of a Vikramāditya, known to history.
the reference to Śankarācārya and on account of the borrowing of ideals from other authors. The lower limit of Vijjakā is supplied by the quotation of her verse श्रद्धे हे प्रतिरोचिनि etc (Śarngadhara-paddhati) no 3769, Kavindravacanasamuccaya, no 500, Sadukti-karnāmṛta, II 14, 1) in the Daśarūpāvaloka of Dhanika (II 21) whose date is the tenth century 17 and in the Abhīdāvarttimātrkā (p 12) of Mukulabhatta who lived in the first half of the tenth century 17 Consequently Vijjakā is to be assigned to a date between the seventh and the ninth centuries A.D. Vijayā named by Rajaśekhara certainly lived before 900 A.D. If the authoress of the Km is Vijjakā or Vidyā she has to be placed between the seventh and the ninth centuries A.D.

But can we be sure that she is Vijjakā? Till other manuscripts are discovered and they clearly shows the reading Vijjakā, we must take the guess with extreme caution, particularly as there is no clear evidence in favour of Vijjakā’s authorship of the Km. None of the verses in our drama can be traced among the verses ascribed to Vijjakā in the anthologies. 18 The style of Vijjakā is definitely Vaidarbbha but the same can hardly be said of the Km which seems to use the Pāncāli style. There is also greater grace and much higher poetical quality in the preserved verses of Vijjakā than in our drama. Then Rajaśekhara’s statement shows that she belonged to the south (Karnāta), whereas our authoress who knows not only Kauśāmbi but also Suyāmuna = modern Sujāwan on the Jumna, near Allahabad (I 11), 19 was pro-

36 S K De, op cit., pp 131-4, P V Kanu, op cit., p lxxvii
37 S K De, op cit., p 76, P V Kanu, op cit., p lxxvi
38 I have also not been able to find the verses in the Km quoted in any of the anthologies or works on alankāra
39 Sujāwan is on the right bank of the Jumna, a few miles above Allahabad and very near Bhita. The Archaeological Department of India is to be congratulated for starting excavation at Kauśāmbi and resuming operations at Bhita. The Department should also pay attention to Sujāwan, which is sure to yield a rich harvest to the spade of the excavators.
bably a northerner. Her identification with Vijjakā is, for these reasons, extremely doubtful.

Consequently in the present state of our knowledge we fail to fix the lower limit of the work or to settle its approximate date. The only definite conclusion we have been able to arrive at is that it was not written before Śankarācārya. This serves at least one useful purpose, viz., the rejection of the inferences about the early history of the Guptas made by Jayaswal on the basis of this work.

खर्गोसो निबुधः सोडयं भिन्तनिर्क्रियासाधनः ।
प्रोपतामनया कुला चेलेशचन्द्रशाम्भेः ॥

K Chāgopadhyaya

49 It is sad that the great scholar Jayaswal is no longer living to reply to my criticisms or to accept my findings.
The Causeway of Giants at Angkor Thom

Everybody knows that the bridges, which cross the moats of Angkor Thom and give access to the five gates of the city, are decorated by balustrades, constituted by two huge nâgas with hoods turned outside and with bodies supported by giants in stone which represent on one side the Devas and on the other the Asuras.

This motif which is found also in other monuments of the same period (end of the 12th century A.D.) is generally interpreted¹ as the representation of the churning of the ocean, an architectural symbolism of which there are other examples². In a remarkable article entitled "Angkor in the time of Jayavarman VII" and published in the Indian Art and Letters³ my friend and collaborator M. Paul Mus gives a quite different interpretation of these bridges with balustrades of nâgas supported by the giants, and I propose to confirm his interpretation with new arguments and make his information more complete on certain points.

M. Paul Mus finds in these bridges of Angkor Thom a representation of the rainbow which according to Indian tradition is the link of union between the world of men and the world of gods which is materialised on earth by the royal city. His interpretation is based on a verse contained in the Sanskrit inscription dedicated by Jayavarman VII at the south-western corner of the outer walls of Angkor Thom. These verses are:

Vilasita-vyâlikbacchhrnga eko
bhujgasadanasangâgâdhatanyâ pi tena
anukuruta ime te nimmite cîramâcîri-
jayagrîyasindhû tadbrhâkritikitoim

¹ Cf. BLFEO, XII, 9, pp 181-182
² Among the first works in which this hypothesis has been formulated, C. J. Commaille, Guide aux ruines d'Angkor, p 110
³ Vol XI, 1937, pp 65-75
"One scraped the bright sky with its pinnacle and the other in its unfathomable depth reached the world of serpents, the Čri-mahâjayagiri and the Črimahâçćrījayasindhu erected by Jayavarman both emulated the arc of his mighty glory."

I have proved already that Jayagiri and Jayasindhu are the names given respectively to the outer wall and the moat of the city. "According to this poetical comparison, says M. Mus, the Mountain of Victory and the Sea of Victory emulate the Arc of glory of the King. But the meaning of the latter term is not questioned: a king’s arc of glory is the representation of the Arc of Indra, or in other words the rainbow, itself symbol of the divine power of sovereigns. Let us now take our stand before the actual landscape of Angkor Thom. The Mountain of Victory and the Sea of Victory here become before our eyes, if we may so put it, a rampart and a moat. The third expression is missing. This should be a materialisation of this same rainbow which we learn from elsewhere to be a divine bridge. The conclusion is obvious: the Arc of Glory of Jayavarman VII, vying in splendour with the rampart and the moat, is the bridge which is the worldly representation of the rainbow."

M. Paul Mus has interpreted the expression anukurutah as meaning that the rampart and the moat "rivalled in splendour" with the bridge, but I do not think that this is exactly what the poet wanted to say. The poet wanted probably to note that the glory of the king, poured out in the universe from the heaven up to the under-world, was exalted in the architectural complex comprising, in the sky, the rampart that reaches the heaven and, below, the moat which in its depth reaches the world of serpents. This is at least the first interpretation which occurs to anybody who may be a little acquainted with the style of the Sanskrit inscriptions of

4 BETLO, XXVIII, p 88                      5 Ibid                      6 IAL, p 70
Cambodia. But one is never sure of having exhausted all the niceties of a Kāvyā stanza even though he may have drawn two or three meanings from it, because the subtleties of the court poets are infinite, and in the present case M. Paul Mus is certainly justified in drawing a third meaning relating to bow, and in discovering in it an allusion to the rainbow of which the material representation is the bridge of giants.

I can besides furnish another argument in favour of his interpretation. The five gates of Angkor Thom are decorated at their angles with gigantic heads of tricephalic elephants. One of these elephants at least (the Gate of Victory, north-east corner) still bears an image of Indra holding the Vajra and it is not too much to suppose that each of these elephants bore a similar image. The rainbow is the bow of Indra and the presence of that god at the end of the bridge in the axis of the nāgas certainly confirms the hypothesis of M. Paul Mus.

On the other hand I am not quite in agreement with him when he writes "The plastic motif of the churning, in which the great serpent already appeared, was no doubt, through association of ideas the first model for this new construction." If the giants of the bridges may be an innovation of Jayavarman VII, the motif of nāga as balustrade of the bridge is much more ancient and goes back to the beginning of the classical Khmer art. The oldest example of it is found at Bakong which is dated from 881 A.D. Now there is no necessity of bringing in the myth of the churning to explain the architectural motif of the bridge with the double nāga-balustrade. The rainbow theme is sufficient, and to the arguments cited by M. Paul Mus I may add another which is more actual. In the popular Siamese and Cambodian imagery.

7 H Marchal, Guide archéologique aux Temples d'Angkor, p 85
8 IAL, p 71
9 G Caëdès, Inscriptions du Cambodge, I, p 31
10 IAL, pp 70-71
The Causeway of Giants at Angkor Thom

the rainbow staircase by which the Buddha descends from the heaven of the Thirty-three is always represented with two handrails in the shape of nāgas of which the heads touch the ground.

It is not without interest to note that the first occurrence of this motif at Bakong, towards the end of the 9th cent., belongs to a period in which some Javanese influence is recognisable in the Khmer art, as a consequence of the reign of Jayavarman II who came back from Java.

This influence is manifested amongst other things in Cambodia in the introduction of the Kālamakara-torana motif with divergent heads of makaras. Its connection with the nāga-balustrade on one hand and with the rainbow on the other is apparent. This evidence goes to strengthen the thesis of M. Paul Mus but it places the introduction of the architectural motif in the Khmer country several centuries earlier.

It is not therefore the myth of the churning of ocean which has furnished the Khmer architects with the nāga motif for the decoration of the balustrades of their bridges, although this myth had certainly inspired the constructors of the causeways of Angkor Thom and contaminated the more ancient theme of the rainbow bridge.

It may be noted in this connection that the presence of the two serpents does not in any way stand in the way of our recognising in the causeway of giants a plastic representation of the churning, as M. Paul Mus thinks. "At Angkor Thom, he says, there is not one serpent, there are two". Gods and Titans each carry their own. Further instead of pulling against each other, they are in two parallel lines facing those who arrive. It is quite clear that they

11 G. de Coral-Rémy, "Influences javanaises dans l'art de Rolúoh," JA CCXXIII, 1933, p. 190
12 G. de Coral-Rémy, "Animaux fantastiques de l'Inde," BEFEO, XXXVI, p. 430
ate churning nothing"'1" This last remark is as judicious as the explanation which he gives a little later of the presence of the two serpents. It cannot be however denied that the representation of the churning at Angkor Vat' and Bayon'' contains two serpents one coiling around the mountain as a cordon to make it revolve, and the other reposing in the bottom of the ocean. Evidently the latter is so to say caught in the arms of the Asuras of the causeways at Angkor Thom and even if in this position the Asuras and the Devas cannot be regarded as churning anything, the two rows of the Asuras, the two serpents, the outer wall Jayagiri and the moat Jayasindhu do not constitute any less the essential elements of the churning, as it is represented in the bas-reliefs of the 12th century.

Why has this motif been added to that of the rainbow represented in a more simple way by a bridge with two hooded serpents? This innovation being no doubt due to Jayavarman VII, all that we know of the psychology of this great mystic supplies with a twofold reply to this question.

In the first place by having a representation of the churning of the ocean at the gates of his capital Jayavarman VII emphasised its divine character, because the Jayagiri and the Jayasindhu of which the names reminded his own thus became the cosmic mountain and ocean.

In the second place it was common literary theme abundantly exploited by the court poets to compare the battle with the ocean churned by the king in order to win Laksmi, the fortune, and also the amrita of Victory,'7 or again to compare the world with a mountain which the king revolves to get

---

13 IAL, p 69
14 Le temple d’Angkor Vat (Mém Arch EFEO II), 3e partie, II, pls 351-370
15 H. Dufour, Le Bayon d’Angkor Thom, inner galleries, pls 78-81
16 G. Coedès, Un grand roi du Cambodge Jayavarman VII, Phnom Penh, 1935
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the ambrosia of prosperity 18  Jayavarman VII, the protegé of the Victory, has given his name to the mountain of the outer wall and to the ocean of the moat. That will not perhaps be the proof of an exaggerated subtlety if we try to discover in the plastic representation of the churning, effected with the moat as the ocean, and the outer wall as the pivot, a kind of magic operation destined to produce the Fortune and to assure to the country the nectar of Victory and Prosperity *

G. COEDES

18 Inscription of Thnal Bâly, south-east angle, st B XXI, ISCC, pp 435-445
* Translated by Dr P. C. Bagchi, M.A., Dr ès lettres (Paris)
Struggle for Supremacy in the Deccan

The Cālukya Taila II defeated and overthrew the Rāstrakūtās in 973 A.D. and the Cālukya kingship was once again revived in the Deccan. It reached its full glory during the reign of Someśvara I (1042-1068 A.D.). The accession of Someśvara II, son of Someśvara I, marked the beginning of the fratricidal war between Someśvara II and Vikramāditya (VI), and the decline set in. The feudatory states were the worst disintegrating forces in the body politic of those days. The feudal princes always enjoyed vast political powers and privileges and were waiting for an opportunity to declare independence. Whenever the sovereign authority was weak, they rose in rebellion and often declared independence.

The fratricidal war between Someśvara II and Vikramāditya (VI), two sons of Someśvara I, broke the unity of the Cālukya empire and it was divided into two hostile camps. This also gave the important feudatory princes an opportunity to enhance their power. The Cālukya empire was reunited by Vikramāditya VI when he ascended the throne in 1076 A.D. after overthrowing his brother, but the solidarity of the empire could not be restored. The feudatory princes, the Hoyaśalas, the Yādavas, the Kadambas and the Silhāras strengthened their position. The Hoyaśalas twice rebelled against their sovereign and inflicted severe losses to the emperor, but they were suppressed.

The successors of Vikramāditya VI, however, were incapable rulers and they could not check the Hoyaśalas from capturing the whole of the southern part of the Cālukya dominions. Besides the Hoyaśalas, other feudatories had also begun minor conquests and annexations at the cost of their sovereign.

When Taila III came to the throne in 1151 A.D. the condition in the Cālukya dominions was in a deplorable chaos. The feudatory
Princes were busy in asserting their power. The important feudatory princes, the Hoyasalas, the Kadambas, the Silhāras and the Yādavas practically became independent and severed their connections with the central government. Taila III was left to look after his own fate. The Kākatiyas had established their power in the eastern side of the Cālukya dominions and the Kākatiya Prolarāja inflicted a crushing defeat on Taila III. The Kalacurya Bījala, who was appointed the commander-in-chief of the Cāluykan forces, was himself waiting for an opportunity to occupy the throne at Kalyāni. As revealed by many inscriptions, his authority had overshadowed that of Taila III and when the latter suffered defeat at the hands of the Kākatiya Prolarāja, Bījala made full use of this event. Inscriptions from 1156 A.D. show that the Kalacurya Bījala had begun the work of usurpation and Taila was made a puppet in his hands. The defeat of Taila III at the hands of the Kākatiya Prolarāja brought the crisis to the pitch, and the death of Taila in about 1162 A.D. left Bījala ultimately supreme in the Cālukya kingdom. He occupied the throne and assumed full paramount titles. He was also helped in effecting the coup-de-etat by the Silhāra prince.

**Beginning of the Struggle**

The fall of the Imperial Cālukya power created an utter political chaos in the Deccan. The usurpation of Bījala was quite sudden, he could not be acknowledged as the sovereign by other feudatory princes and they themselves began a hard struggle to strengthen their position and capture Kalyāni, if possible.

Bījala, soon after accomplishing the coup, opened his campaigns to subjugate other feudatory chieftains. He had not to face any trouble in the north. The Silhāras were already friendly to him.

1. *B.G.*, vol 1, pt ii, p 475, fn 6

2. Ibid
it was from the south that he apprehended danger. The death of
the Hoyasala Visnuvardhana stopped the northward expansion of
the Hoyasalas and his successor Narasimha I could not continue his
aggressive policy. The Pândya and the Kadamba territories, which
served as the buffer principalities for the Câlukyas in the south,
were subjugated by the Hoyasala Visnuvardhana, but just at the
height of his success Visnuvardhana died. The Kadambas and
the Pândyas, immediately after the death of Visnuvardhana asserted
their power and carried on their struggle with Narasimha I, suc-
cessor of the Hoyasala Visnuvardhana.

The fall of the Câlukya power threw the feudatories in a fit of
indecision. The Pândyas and the Kadambas were fighting against
the Hoyasalas with the Câlukya help on their back, but now they
were fighting for their own existence against the Kalacuryas and the
Hoyasalas. Inscriptions dated 1165 A.D.1 and 1182 A.D.1 show
that the Pândya chieftain Vijaya Pândya recognised the Câlukya
Jagadekamalla, probably a brother (?) of Taila III as their sovereign.
The Nidugal chief Mallideva Cola Maharâja also recognised the
Câlukyas as his sovereign in an inscription dated 1169 A.D.2

Bijjala seems to have begun the drive against the Kadambas
before the usurpation. In 1109 A.D. he attacked Billaya, the
senior general of Banavâsi-nâd, appointed by the Kadamba Mahâ-
mandalesâvara Kumâra Kirtti-deva.3 He besieged the fort of Gutti
and conquered it. Another inscription of about the same date re-
records: “when Kirttideva’s great minister Bammârâsa was ruling
the kingdom in peace and wisdom, Bijjana-Deva’s minister Soyâ-
vamarasa was fighting, saying, ‘I will besiege Gutti’.”4 Bijjala was ultimately successful in suppressing the Kadambas before

3 EC, vol XI, Dg No 77
5 SIE, AR 1917, No 733, HISI, p 116
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1163 A.D. The Pandyas also could not hold against Bijnala and accepted him as their overlord, though sometimes they mentioned the Calukya Jagadekamalla as their king.

The Hoyasalas were trying to continue their advance towards the north and led expeditions against the Kadambas. An inscription dated 1161 A.D. states that "Narasimha who astonished the world, when on hearing that a Kadamba army was at Bankapura, being raised for assault, he crushed that force and won all its spoils, bringing glory to his father." Yet another inscription records another conflict between the Kadamba and the Hoyasala forces. A third inscription dated 1161 A.D. reveals that the Mandalikas of the Kadamba Kirttideva were fighting against the Hoyasalas and besieging the fort of Gunnalagundi. Kirttideva ultimately seems to have gained some success against the invaders, but the conflict between the Kalacuryas, the Kadambas and the Hoyasalas could not be decided finally. The Kadambas unable to fight two powers accepted the authority of the Kalacuryas and then a struggle between the Hoyasalas and the Kalacuryas began. They had already fought a battle on the banks of the river Tungabhadrā, before Bijnala usurped the Calukya throne. The Hoyasalas had captured the fort of Gutti from the Kadambas and began raids into the Kalacurya territory.

In 1164 A.D. a Hoyasala general raided the Keriyakāśive Agrahāra. In 1164 A.D. Bijnala ordered his subordinate Talevūr Hendi Sovavarman (?) and other chieftains to attack the fort of Gutti and the invaders besieged the fort. The fort of Gunnalagundi, which was under the possession of the Hoyasalas was also besieged by Bamarasara and Virarasa in 1166 A.D., but the Hoyasala general
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was successful in driving away the invader by stratagem, as he had not sufficient force to fight openly. 18

These facts indicate that the struggle between the two powers continued without any final decision. Neither side was able to continue the struggle vigorously, because of the internal troubles. Not long after his accession Bijjala had to face a religious revolution in the capital and he was compelled to abdicate in favour of his son Soyideva in 1168 A.D. 19 Rebellions had broken out in the different parts of the Hoyasala kingdom because of the weak rule of Narasimha. He had to abandon his campaigns in the north to find time and means to curb the rebellions.

The internal disturbances compelled the Kalacurysas and the Hoyasalas to stop the struggle. The Hoyasala Narasimha was dethroned by his son Ballala II. He rebelled against his father and captured the throne 20 in 1173 A.D. 21 For a couple of years after his accession, he seems to have been busy in restoring peace and order in his dominions. Narasimha had lost much of the Northern territories conquered and annexed by the Hoyasala Visnurvardhana. The Kadambas and the Pandyas had again asserted their authority, and sometimes acknowledging the Kalacurysas and sometimes the Calkukyas, they were strengthening their own position. Ballala immediately after restoring peace in his kingdom started towards the north and invaded the Pandyar principality, which had its capital at Uccangi.

Ballala after making full preparations marched on to the Pandyar kingdom in or before 1177 A.D. 22 The Hoyasalas captured the fort

18 M.A.S.R., 1928 No 81
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of Devadurga and were then opposed by the Pandyas at Ummadur, where a fierce battle was fought. Ballala showed great personal bravery in the battle and gained complete victory. Ballala attacked the fort of Uccangi, which was the centre of the Pandyas power. The fort of Uccangi was very big and strong "with a moat like Patala, as broad as the eight cardinal points, high as the sky, extending in both directions, so that it was famed in the three worlds. The fort was besieged and stormed. The Pandyas chieftains, "King Kama and the famous Odeya and their treasury, women and troops of horses were captured." Ballala now acquired the titles Girdurgamalla and Sanivarasiddhi as the fort was captured on Sanivara (Saturday). The Pandyas chieftains Odeya or Udayaditya and his father Kavadeva or Vijaya Pandyas submitted to Ballala for protection, who taking pity restored them to their principality. It seems very probable that they gave a princess of their family in marriage to Ballala.

Ballala now faced the Kalacuryas and the Kadambas, who had acknowledged the former as their sovereign by the year 1163 A.D. When the Kadambas were attacked by the Hoyasalas, the Kalacuryas came to their rescue. The Kalacurya Sankamadeva sent his general Kavanayya in 1179 A.D. He pitched his camp at Bettaur, but he seems to have gained no success and therefore Sankamadeva
personally came down to the south to direct the campaign. From the inscription it appears that a battle was fought at Madavalli in 1179 A.D. between the armies of Sankama and Ballāla. The battle of Madavalli does not seem to have been decisive and the two faced each other on the field of Hadadeyakuppa. The Hōyasala Ballāladeva ordered the van of his army to attack the Kalacurya forces commanded by Murāri Keśava-Narasimha and the general Gandava Canna-kālam Sāhani. The Kalacuryas were probably defeated and they made peace as they were threatened by the Cālukya Someśvara IV, who seems to have been making an effort to regain the throne.

The withdrawal of the Kalacuryas with discomfort left the Kadambas all alone at the mercy of the Hōyasalas. During the campaigns against the Kalacuryas, Ballāla seems to have captured the Kadamba fortress of Udhare. It was under the command of the Hōyasala general Toya Singeyama-dannayaka in 1181 A.D. The Kadamba Kāmadeva who had succeeded his father Kirttideva in 1180 A.D. sent his generals Gāngeya-Sāhani, Beyama-Sāhani and Javaneya-Nāyaka to recapture the fort of Udhare. They “coming with all the appliances” laid siege of the fort. The Hōyasala general seems to have been killed and the fort was surrendered to the Kadambas. In 1181 A.D. Ballāla seems to have defeated the Kadambas. The struggle so far placed Ballāla in no territorial advantage.

The Cālukya revival

When this struggle was lingering on, suddenly the Kalacuryas were overthrown and Kalyāni was captured by the Cālukya Someśvara, one of the sons of Taila III in 1183 A.D. This again
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changed the political condition of the Deccan. The change did not wipe out the political chaos, but on the other hand made it all the more worse. The Cālukya Somēśvara IV, as the inscriptions show, was greatly helped by his general Brahma. He is styled as “the estab-
lisher of the Cālukya sovereignty” and “the chief of all the leaders
of the army”31. Another inscription records that Brahma “having
vowed that he would uproot the destroyers of his masters, and make
the Cālukyas again lords of the earth, became the destroying fire of
the Kalachurya—(Kalacurya) kula”32.

Ballāla II wanted to take full advantage of the situation arising
out of this restoration and change. A blow at this time, when
Someśvara IV was not in a settled condition, would give an easy suc-
cess. He, leaving the struggle with the Kadambas undecided, rushed
to the north and invaded the Cālukya kingdom. An inscription
dated 1183 A.D. of the reign of the Cālukya Someśvara IV records
that Mahāmandalesvara Ballāla’s force was unloosing the waists of
women.33 Brahma seems to have been an able general. He drove
away the Hoyasala raiders and the inscription records about Barma-
devarasa as “a venomous serpent to the strong hill-fortress of the
Hoyasalas, a thunderbolt of the king Bhuvanaikamalla” i.e.,
Someśvara IV34.

The revival of the Cālukya sovereignty by Someśvara IV only
served as a passing episode in the then disturbed political condition
of the Deccan. It was in a state of transition. The Hoyasalas were
making a desperate struggle for northward expansion. The Yādavas
in the northern part of the Cālukya dominions had also commenced
their struggle for expansion towards the south. They were already
fighting against the Kalacuryas. The Yādava Mallugi, predecessor
of Bhillama V (1183 A.D. – 1194 A.D.) had been fighting against
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Vijjana, probably a Kalacurya prince and Dāda, his general, also claims to have defeated an army led by a Kalacurya prince. After the fall of the Kalacuryas, the Yādavas continued their hostility against the Cālukya Someśvara IV.

In these circumstances, when the resources of Someśvara IV were crippled and few, the two strong powers advancing with grim determination to overthrow him, and the minor feudatories vacillating in their support and making their own position strong, it was not possible for the Cālukya Someśvara to hold his position for a long time. Inspite of all the heroism and superb generalship of the general Brahma, the odds were tremendously against him.

*Fall of the Cālukyas*

Ballāla seems to have prepared to strike the final blow. If possible, with his army he started towards Kalyāni. He was opposed by the Pāndyas on the way. The Pāndyas had always sympathy towards their sovereign, the Cālukyas. They had no doubt submitted to the Hoyasala Ballāla, but when Someśvara IV came to the throne, the Pāndya chieftain Kāmādeva immediately transferred his allegiance to him. Ballāla defeated Kāmadeva and killed him in battle in 1187 A.D. The Kannada poet Rudrabhatta in his Jagannātha-Viṣṇu gives the title ari-kāma-dhvamsi (i.e. destroyer of the enemy Kāma) to Ballāla. He then invaded the Cālukya dominions. The general Brahma opposed him with his force but suffered a crushing defeat. The Gadag inscription records about the battle in the following words: "And by force, he, the strong one, defeated with cavalry only, and deprived of his sovereignty the general Brahma whose army was strengthened by an array of elephants with a single
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tuskless elephant, when, on account of an insult to his father, he was tearing the royal fortune from the family of the Kalacuryas. 48

This sealed the fate of the Câlukya Someśvara IV. His power was shattered and he left Kalyâni at the mercy of the invader and fled away to Jayantipura, where he was residing on the 19th September 1187 A D. the date recorded in an inscription 49 Mahâmandalesvara Vijaya Pândya was supporting him even there. Someśvara seems to have continued—for sometime more. The Kadambas seems to have transferred their allegiance also and it was with them that Someśvara took shelter. An inscription dated Dec 25, 1189 A D reveals that Someśvara IV was continuing his sovereignty with the help of the Kadamba Kâmadeva. 50 This is the last known date of Someśvara IV.

Fall of Kalyâni

The victory of Ballâla over Brahma seems to have left him master of the situation and the country, but the overwhelming success was, not long after, eclipsed by another competitor, who was also advancing towards Kalyâni. The Yâdava Bhallama came to power in 1183 A D. 51 He was as ambitious as the Hoyasala Ballâla II and has been striving hard to gain territorial advantage out of this political confusion. He was also advancing towards Kalyâni. Ballâla after defeating the general Brahma, probably, captured Kalyâni, but immediately he had to face the opposition of the Yâdava Bhallama. Bhllama defeated the Hoyasala Ballâla II and deprived him of the territorial advantages he had gained. Kalyâni was also captured. An inscription dated 1189 A D records that Bhllama "had become the beloved of the goddess of sovereignty of the Karnâta country and was reigning over the whole kingdom." 52

48 El, vol VI, p 92 Vs 35-36
49 EC, vol XI, Cd No 33
50 ibid, vol VIII, Sb No 129
52 BG, vol I, pt ii, pp 518-19
Hemādri also states that Bhullama "having attained the sovereignty of Kalyāṇi put to death the Hoyasala king." Hemādri is definitely wrong in stating that the Hoyasala king was put to death as it is known from various sources that Ballāla continued the struggle for a long time. But Hemādri makes it clear that Bhullama attained the sovereignty of Kalyāṇi from the hands of the Hoyasalas. Having captured Kalyāṇi Bhullama pushed on at the heels of the Hoyasalas. They were compelled to vacate all the territory formerly included in the Cālukya dominions. The Yādavas even entered the Hoyasala dominions and a battle was fought between the two forces at Alūr in the Hassan district of the Mysore state. Bhullama carried on his conquests vigorously and Hemādri states that Bhullama having become master of the country north of the river Kṛṣṇā founded the city of Devagiri and crowned himself a king. The Gādag inscription dated June 23, 1191 A.D. also suggests that Bhullama had his supremacy established and he was residing at his victorious camp at Herūru.

Turn of the tide

The events had moved with a dramatic rapidity. The Hoyasalas had been for years past making constant struggle for supremacy. They had fought against the Kadambas, Pāṇḍyas, Kālacuryas, and the Cālukyas. They were on the point of success, when suddenly the Yādavas deprived them of all territorial advantages and they were driven away almost to the south of the river Tungabhadrā. It seemed that the Yādavas had established their supremacy and for about four years, no doubt, they maintained it, but after that the tide again turned.
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Battle of Sorātur

The Hoyasala Ballāla silently made preparations and organised his forces for another conflict. He marched with his army towards the north and the Hoyasala and the Yādava armies faced each other on the battle-field of Sorātur. The Yādava Bhillama arrayed a vast horde of 200,000 foot soldiers armed with thunderbolts and 12,000 cavalry. After a 'fierce' and 'bloody' battle the Yādava army was completely routed and annihilated. Bhillama himself fled away from the battle-field with the remnants of his army. He was hotly pursued by the Hoyasalas up to Belvola and the Kṛṣṇā river with a terrible massacre. The Vyavahāraganita, describing the battle, records that out of the 12,000 cavalry of Bhillama five parts fell into the river, six fled away in all directions, four fell in the battle, four returned back and Bhillama fled in confusion from the battle-field with the remaining six hundred horsemen. But as pointed out by Mr Venkatasubbiah, the testimony of the inscriptions and the Vyavahāraganita clearly show that Bhillama was not killed in this battle as taken by almost all scholars. The battle of Sorātur was fought before December 23, 1190 A.D., the date recorded in an inscription which also states that 'Ballāla put them (Yādavas) to flight and slaughtered them from Sorātur to the banks of Kṛṣṇa veni.' Ballāla having defeated Bhillama captured the forts of Kurugod, Sorātur, Erambarage (modern Yellburga in the Nizam's dominions), Guttī, in the Bellary district of the Madras Presidency, Bellittige, Rattihalli, Hangal and Lokkigundī in the
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Struggle for Supremacy in the Deccan

Bombay Presidency and Ballale (Bellary), Haluve, Mānnūr, Malanga hill Dhorevadi, Gttavalalu, Udhare and Kaladi.

When Ballāla was busy in capturing these forts, Bhillama once again reorganised his forces, and with a fresh army he again crossed the river Kṛṣṇā and as his Gadag inscription dated June 23, 1191 A.D. shows, he pitched his camp at Herūru, 30 miles north of Gadag. This inscription again indicates that Bhillama had once again recaptured a part of the lost territory.

Death of Bhillama

The Hoyasala Ballāla lost no time to check Bhillama. The two armies again met in the neighbourhood of Gadag, possibly at Herūru, where Bhillama, as stated above, had pitched his camp. In this battle the Yādava Bhillama lost his life and Ballāla gained a signal victory once again over the Yādava army. After the death of Bhillama, as indicated by the Gadag inscription of Ballāla II dated November 21, 1192 A.D., the command of the Yādava forces was taken by Jaitrasimha or Jaitugi, son of Bhillama. The Gadag inscription states that Ballāla had his victorious camp at Lokkigundi and had defeated Jaitra-Simha, i.e. Jaitugi, "right hand of Bhillama." Jaitugi, successor of Bhillama, continued the struggle and was fighting from the fort of Lokkigundi. Ballāla defeated Jaitugi and recaptured the fort. An inscription of later date records that by "plunging it into water, namely, the blood of the enemy, Pāṇḍya king so that it hissed and splitted, Vira Ballāla whetted the sword, which he bore in his valorous arm, on the whetstone, namely the head of Bhillama and sheathed it in the lotus mouth of Jaitugi." Again Ballāla II is referred to as the "smiter.
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on the cheek of Bhillama's army' "driver of Jaitrahuta". An inscription dated 1194 A.D. records the capture of Lokkigundi from Jaitugi as follows: 'when he (Ballala) fought Jaitugi, who was with an army in the great fortress, which with high ramparts, lofty bastions, mounted with astonishing flag-staves, even combined masses could not attack and escape, he soon captured Lokkigundi' Ballala again recaptured the fort of Kurugod in 1195 A.D. and was residing at Erambarage, modern Yellurga in 1196 A.D.

In the meantime Ballala had also defeated the Pandyas. The last known date of the Pandyas Udayaditya, also known as Tribhuvanamalla, is January 24, 1194 A.D. The province seems to have passed in the hands of the Hoyasalas as an inscription records "Thrashing the Pandyas king on the field of battle, terrifying and putting to flight hostile kings, by the might of his arm, (Ballala) ruled the celebrated Nolambavadi". Another inscription records that Ballala had his capital in the Nolambavadi country. Ballala also defeated the Kadambas for rebelling against him. The fort of Udhare was besieged and captured. Having captured this Kadamba outpost, the Hoyasalas advanced towards Hangal, the Kadamba capital in 1196 A.D. Ballala pitched his camp at Muttala-Keregeri and the city was besieged. He was opposed by the Kadamba general Sahan, but he was defeated and killed in the battle. Hangal was also besieged, but there is no evidence to show that it was captured. The Kadambas were subdued at least for some years, though they continued raids in the neighbouring territory.
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Ballāla seemed successful in establishing his supremacy. The Yādavas were defeated and driven away and the Kādambas and the Pāṇḍyās were compelled to submit. The Hoyasalas gained possession of all the territory up to the Kṛṣṇā and the Mālaprabhā rivers.

The last phase

The Yādavas had suffered crushing defeat and retired from the field. Jaitugi had not the generalship of his father. The Hoyasalas, when their boundary reached the Kṛṣṇā and the Mālaprabhā rivers, did not press their victories further northward. Both sides stopped the struggle. But the struggle was not finally closed. Though the main struggle between the Yādavas and Hoyasalas was closed, the Kadambas continued to maintain a suppressed hostility, and the inscriptions suggest that raids were carried by the Kadambas into the Hoyasala dominions in 1203, 1207 and 1208, but the Hoyasalas could not be exterminated from their territory. Dr Fleet also thinks that the Kadambas were subjugated by the Hoyasalas after 1196 A.D., but they continued to carry raids. Mr Moraes seems to be opposed to this view, but his arguments are not conclusive. Ballāla also defeated the Kadamba Vijayāditya of Goa and exacted tribute, but shortly after that he seems to have freed himself from all obligations.

The Yādava Jaitugi was succeeded by his son Singhana. The date of his accession is still a matter of dispute among scholars. The available epigraphic evidence is also very meagre and conflicting. Some inscriptions would suggest that Singhana came to power in 1197 A.D., and another inscription may suggest that Jaitugi was killed by Ballāla in about 1197 A.D. Contemporary inscriptions
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also show that Ballāla was in possession of the territory upto Kalyāṇī in the north, but the city itself was not included

For some years Singhana seems to have consolidated and organised his kingdom after the severe disruption caused by the constant Hoyasala aggression and with the opening of the 13th century, he began his invasion of the south. The accession of Singhana marks a new epoch in the Yādava regime and the political and diplomatic history of the Deccan. The southward drive had begun in full swing and Singhana personally seems to have conducted the campaign. Raids by freebooters for plunder and loot specially of the cows and the young girls was a conspicuous dark trend of the early mediaeval political condition of the Deccan. From an inscription dated 1206 A.D., it seems, that Singhana had recaptured all the territory upto the Bijapur district, and Keśavadeva Dandanātha, governor of Tāravādi 1000, was governing over that part.85 Another inscription dated 1211(?) records that when Ballāla was at Hallevūr i.e. Vijayasarudra Singhana carried raid upto that part86 (i.e modern Hassan district, Mysore State). In 1212 A.D. the Yādavas raided Bandalike in the Shimoga district and seized the people and the cattle and closed the stores of grain.87 Singhana carried a second raid in the same year.88 Ballāla does not seem to have been able to put a stiff resistance and Singhana slowly maintained his advance. Before 1215 A.D. Singhana was able to reconquer Banavāsi and other territories, lost by Bhillama. A Belgaum inscription dated Thursday, September 24, 1215 A.D. clearly designates him as the ruling sovereign. It records that having accomplished conquest over many kings Singhanadeva gave charge of the kingdom to his minister Sarvādhikārī Rāya-nāyaka Nārāyana and himself was engaged in various pleasures. The minister also claims to have defeated many enemies.
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and granted some taxes and tolls on silk and two oil mills to the Brāhmaṇas. Singhana had thus recovered all the lost territories before 1215 A.D. The Udri inscription dated 1217 A.D. states that Singhana defeated Ballāla and captured Banavasi. A part of the Kadamba territory was also incorporated into the Yādava dominions.

Complete supremacy over the Deccan was established by Singhana by the year 1215 A.D. The Kadambas resented an encroachment on their territory, but their resistance was broken down.

When Singhana was busy in his bitter struggle against the Hoyasalas, his generals were waging wars against minor feudatory chieftains.

Bhoja, a Silhāra prince, was ruling over the Konkana country. The famous fortress of Panhāla, then known as Pannāla or Ponnāla, was included in his territory. Bhoja had gained independence in 1179 A.D. and during the turmoil, he is said to have attained great power. Singhana invaded his territory and Bhoja shut himself in the Panhāla fort. It was stormed and Bhoja had to fly away. As a result of this victory, all the Silhāra territory was annexed by the Yādavas and an inscription dated 1217 A.D. in the
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Parähāḷā fort indicates that the conquest took place before 1217 A.D. 97

Singhana appointed his general Vicana to conduct military campaigns in the southern part of his dominions. He was appointed Viceroy over the southern provinces. His father's name was Cikka and he had a brother named Malla. Vicana in one of his campaigns defeated 98 and overthrew the Kadamba Sovadeva Tribhuvanamalla 99 of Goa, whose known date is 1218 A.D. 100 The Kadamba principality was also annexed but later on it was restored to the Kadamba Sasthavarman 101. The Ratta chieftain Laksmideva II, who had succeeded his father Kārtavira IV in about 1218 A.D. 102 was also defeated by Vicana 103 and the Ratta territory was incorporated in the Yādava dominions. The Guttas, who were ruling in the present Dharwar district of the Bombay Presidency were also defeated, but they were not exterminated and allowed to govern their principality 104. Vicana also claims to have erected a pillar of victory on the banks of the river Kāveri 105 and relieved Singhana of the anxieties from the southern part of his dominions. Vicana extended the frontier of the Yādava kingdom so that in the south it reached the river Tungabhadrā and to the west it was bounded by the Arabian Sea.

The struggle closed

By the middle of the second decade of the 13th century the Yādava Singhana established his complete supremacy over the Deccan. The Hoyasalas, who were the only powerful competitors in the field were driven away. The Hoyasala Ballāla II also realised
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that any more fighting on that front was a mere waste of energy. His family had made a hard struggle, but in 1215 A.D. they had not an inch of that territory. This probably cannot be taken as the only reason for the termination of this long-drawn and bitter struggle.

A peep into the history of the southern India gives a more definite and weighty cause. The Cola kingship had slowly begun its decline. The Pāṇḍyas of Madurā, their feudatories, had begun to strengthen their position, while the king of Ceylon was waging war with the Colas. Jatavarman Kulāśekhara was followed by Māravaram Sundara Pāṇḍya in 1216 A.D. 106 and the Cola Kulottunga was succeeded by his son Rājarāja III in the same year 107. The Pāṇḍyas had sufficiently strengthened their position by this time, while Rājarāja III was an incapable ruler. As suggested by Mr. Nilakantha Shastri, ‘old memories of help by Kulottunga to Vikrama Pāṇḍya vanished away during the new reigns of Rājarāja III and Sundara Pāṇḍya’ and according to ‘the law of life in those days among Indian kings that he who could not be a hammer had to be an anvil.’ 108 Sundara Pāṇḍya became hostile to the Cola Rājarāja III Māravaram Sundara Pāṇḍya had no obligatory scruples towards the Cola Rājarāja III and immediately after his accession, he invaded the Cola country. Now began a bitter struggle between the Colas and the Pāṇḍyas. The Cola empire had clearly begun to show signs of disintegration. The Hoyasalas grasped the situation rightly. The policy of expansion towards the north met with an utter failure. The south now afforded a better and lucrative field for expansion. The Colas were fighting a defensive game against the Pāṇḍyas, who were very aggressive. If the Colas could be helped against the Pāṇḍyas some territory may be gained.
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for this and the Hoyasalas immediately took the side of the Colas
and they now began their struggle in the south. The Yādava
Simhana also did not continue the struggle when the Yādava domi-
nions touched the river Tungabhadra. He had also better attractions
in the north. The Paramāra kingdom of Mālava and the Caulukya
kingdom of Gujrat had merged into chaos and became weak. After
he had attained his objective in the south, Simhana turned towards
the north. The two combatants, the Hoyasalas and the Yādavas,
in this way began their struggle in different fields and closed their
struggle for supremacy in the Deccan.

SANT LAL KATARE
Contributions to the Bhāsa Question

It is a matter of regret that the evidences in Indological studies are still so unreliable that the age of a certain pièce de literature cannot be placed even between centuries, still more regrettable is the persistency with which the literary productions in India try to camouflage the age of a specific work. The plays, ascribed in the years of their discovery to the poet Bhāsa, have been enquired into from the linguistic, grammatical and literary points of view but practically with no definite result. The opinion favoured mostly is that Svapnavāśavadatta and Yaugandhārayana are works from the pen of Bhāsa, and these two dramas, as they are preserved, may be regarded as adapted copies not deviating much from their originals. While for the other plays there seems to exist no sufficient reason to ascribe them to Bhāsa. The main argument advanced against this assumption, consists in the agreements in style and language, repetition of phrases and stanzas. The late Prof Winternitz tried to show the differences between the plays, the subject of which was borrowed from the Mahābhārata with regard to their style, metrics, literary merits, and general character. It seems, however, that also these arguments are more or less the outcome of subjective reasoning. Nobody will or can deny that the Īrubhanga is superior in language, using the kāvyā style, to the other one-act-plays, thus creating a gap between the former and even plays like Bālacarita, Pañcarātra.

There exist some possibilities with regard to the claim of originality and adaptation respectively. First, these plays believed to be of high quality, like Y, Sv, Ū, are well written originals, the other plays are not well written, but they are also originals.

1 Bulletin of the Rāma Varma Research Institute, V, 1937, 1ff.
Secondly, as for the hypothesis that the plays are adaptations and compilations, it must be concluded that these supposed adapters and compilers have in some cases maintained (Y, Sv, D) the beauty of the original, but not so in all cases, in other words, some plays represent the originals fairly well, but not all. Thirdly, the plays believed to be written by a poet of great literary merits are not adapted, the other plays of less literary value are adapted versions, and even the contrary is possible, i.e., the merits of the better plays are due to able adapters. Thus the view, brought forward by Dr. Sukthankar,² that Y, and Sv are by the same author while the authorship of the rest of the dramas is still quite uncertain, is contradicted by the same scholar's list of common passages, in verse and prose, of longer and shorter extent. The explanation that "the coincidences in formal technique are almost certainly to be explained as due to the activity of adapters" leads to the conclusion that the plays, other than Y, and Sv, may represent originals in some way adapted as Y, and Sv, and that becomes obvious if the conspectus of common passages is arranged not only according to the wording, but according to the relation between the single plays. Not only in different plays occur common places, but also in the very same play the wording is repeated verbatim in different places. This feature seems to be in accordance with the assumption that the plays are adaptations by some literateurs whose poetical wealth might have been not great and is responsible for these repetitions. Then, of course, the originality of none of these plays can be maintained. To quote some instances:

Sv, 21, 6f = 34, 5f, 43, 10f = 58, 14f³
Dūtav, 32, 5 = 34, 6f

² JBRAS, N S 1, 1925, 143 ³ ABORS, IV, 1923, 167ff
⁴ JBRAS, I, 139
⁵ Quotations for convenience according to the edizioni princeps
Pratim, 11, 1f = 12, 12f, 67, 3 = 93, 2, 17, 1 = 102; 7,
12, 2f = 14, 2f, 63, 17f = 109, 2f, 29, 16 = 31, 1
Cārud, 40, 12f = 46, 13f
Pañcar, 9, 9 = 42, 20
Abās, 15, 2 = 56, 6f 11, 9 = IV, 15

One could object and explain these repetitions by pointing out that they are merely stereotyped formulas originating from a given situation. This argument, however, loses its weight in view of a case like that in Pratim, 66, 8-11 = 110, 10-13, where a whole verse is repeated, or, in view of U, verses 41 and 62

Still more the homogeneous wording becomes evident from a conspectus of identical passages in two or more plays

Avim, 45, 1f Bālac, 10, 1f
Abhis, 27, 4f 71, 15f U, 95, 18/96, 1 99, 16f /100, 1
110, 13 Dūtav, 28, 4f Karnabh, 72, 8f Pratim, 91,
9-11 Pañcar, 5, 9-11 Cārud, 8, 1
Abhis, 23, 1of Sv, 25, 9 56, 5 (S u k t h , 38)
Prat, 63, 15 65, 15 U, 99, 15 Sv, 1, 12 2, 6 (46),
Sv, 66, 15 Abhis, 42, 16 (8)
Bālac, 7, 7-10 Cārud, 17, 8-10 (39)
Abhis, 6, 3 U, 103, 4 Prat, 17, 9 Bālac, 6, 9 Sv,,
9, 5 (49)
Abhis, 30, 15 59, 5 Pañcar, 30, 5 31, 22 32, 1 Bālac,
58, 1, 11f (29 58a)
Abhis, 27, 1f Pañcar, 24, 8 (20)

6 The numbers in brackets refer to Dr. Sukthankar’s numbers in his “List of Recurrences and Parallelisms” in ABORS, IV, 170ff
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Sv, 24, 5f 28, 5 Avim, 105, 15 Pratim, 5, 2, 58, 1.
Abhis, 66, 5 Prat, 63, 3.
Dūtav, 31, 18 Sv, 7, 9
Prat, 25, 19 Abhis, 43, 14 (60)
Abhis, 16, 11 Bālac, 8, 2
Avim, 54, 3 Sv, 56, 8 (40)
Abhis, 62, 3 Ü, 87, 14 88, 15 (47)
Abhis, 54, 12f Dūtav, 30, 20 (cf Bālac, 22, 11)
Pañcar, 39, 12 Bālac, 61, 7 (43)
Pratim, 42, 18f Abhis, 3, 14f (124)
Pratim, 86, 6f Abhis, 10, 11f
Pratim, 86, 11f Abhis, 10, 14
Dūtagh, 52, 4 Pratim, 58, 2f
Abhis, 12, 4 Ü, 114, 10 Pratim, 38, 14
Pratim, 73, 3f Madhy, 25, 1-3 (45)
Abhis, 26, 3f Pratim, 90, 8f cf Abhis, 52, 3f (31)
Dūtagh, 69, 8 Pratim, 20, 11 (56).
Prat, 62, 8f Pratim, 25, 10 86, 13f 113, 9f
Karnabh, 71, 14 72, 2 Dūtagh, 49, 14 Pañcar, 23, 9
45, 3 Pratim, 60, 16-61, 1
Avim, 107, 5 Ü, 93, 3
Cārud, 8, 10 Sv, 64, 12 cf 69, 4 Avim 83, 1f (42),
Pañcar, 48, 9 Dūtagh, 66, 1 Prat, 67, 8 71, 14 (41)
Madhy, 12, 4 13f Dūtav, 32, 5 36, 4f.

Apart from the recurrences of verses or parts of them at the end of the plays, passages of the sthāpana or stage directions, the list shows that practically all the plays are interconnected by repetitions of the expressions of some length. Thus it seems unfound.

7 Sukthankar’s List, ABORI, IV, 1923, Nos 1 2 5 6 17
8 Ibid, No 23
9 Ibid, p 179ff
ed to assert any difference between certain plays like Prat, and Sv, and the other plays

A further argument raised against the authorship of Bhāsa are passages quoted in sources other than dramas of the same title as the printed texts, but missing in the latter. It must, however, be stated that prejudice or subjective reasoning may have influenced the decision. The materials can be classified under these heads

A references to Bhāsa or works ascribed to Bhāsa in the printed texts
B quotations from his plays which are not found in the published texts
C quotations which occur in the published texts
   (a) without being ascribed to Bhāsa or
   (b) a play ascribed to Bhāsa or a specific work
D Uncertain allusions

A 1 A reference to Bhāsa ascribed to Rājaśekhara in the Sūktimuktāvali (1)
2 Kālidāsa mentions Bhāsa in Mālavikāgnimitra (3)
3 Features of Bhāsa’s works are described in Harsacarita (5)
4 Bhāsa is called a “friend of fire” in the Gaudavaha (10)
5 Bhāsa is mentioned along with other poets like Urvā, Bhāravi, Bhavabhūti in Somadeva’s Yaśastilaka, IV (vol II, p 113)
6 A reference to kridā in Sv, in Abhinavagupta’s Commentary on Nāṭyaś, and to a nāṭaka Sv, (11) (13)

10 Collected in C R Devadhar’s edition of the Bhāvanātakacakra. Plays ascribed to Bhāsa (Poona Oriental Series—No 54), Poona 1937, Appendix C, pp 573-577 to the numbers of this list mention the numbers given above in brackets. On the verses ascribed to Bhāsa in Anthologies see App D, pp 578-580. These verses are not considered here.

11 Ed GOS 36, p 39, 1, 106 (?), p 87 respectively. For an explanation of the word kridā cf a forthcoming paper of the late Prof. Winternitz in the Woolner Comm. Volume.
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7 A reference to the artha- and kāmaśringāra in the Tīkāsarvasva of Sarvānanda 12 (18)

8 The same reference, nearly verbatim, is found in the Nātaka-laksanaratnakosa (ed. Dill, p. 117, lines 282ff.), but Sv. is not mentioned there (21)

9 An identical verse, occurring twice in Kaumudīmahotsava,13 II. 15 and V. 9, mentions the hero Avimāraka and the heroine Kurangi, but refers perhaps only to the story, and not to the play Avimāraka (24)

10 Commentary on Sākuntala, attributed to the 14th century A.D.,14 says that the Sūtradhāra in the play Cārudatta uses Prākrit, a fact found in the edition of this play (25)

11 The Nātyadarpana (p. 53) mentions a play Darida Cārudatta

B 1 A verse quoted by Abhinavagupta from a work of the "great poet Bhāsa" in his Commentary on Nātyaśāstra (ed. Gos. No. 36) p. 320. The verse is defective in its first pāda and seems to refer to a play the plot of which is the abduction of Sitā by Rāvana, the verse contains the prediction of Rāma's revenge. Such a verse could have had its place in Pratim, VI, 16 where Bharata is mobilizing all his forces to help Rāma as well as in Abhis, II, 15 where Hanūmat gets enraged against Rāvana 15 (11)

2 A passage, occurring in Abhinavagupta's Commentary on Nātyaśāstra, p. 251, seems to quote a poet Hāsa, for which Bhāsa has been proposed as an alternative reading by the

12 No edition of this Commentary on Amarakośa is at my disposal, Dvadhara quotes under No. 18 from p. 147, under No. 21 the same passage from the Nātakalaks

13 Ed. Dakshina-Bharati Sanskrit Series, 4, Madras 1929

14 IHQ, V, 1929, 726

15 Less probable is the passage in Abhis, III, 21, as Hanūmat here is addressing Rāvana directly
Editor, and a verse of his "in some nātaka". This is quite uncertain.

3. The verse, quoted by Abhinavagupta on Dhvanyāloka, III, 14, is not found in Sv, but could have stood before V, 7 in Sv. This verse shows some similar expressions niskṛman, dvārapaksena, tāditah correspond to the words of the quoted verse pravista, saṃcitapaksamakapātam nayanadvāram, svarupatādanena udghātya (18).

4. The verse mṛteśe etc in Kāvyādāra, II, 230 and Bhojadeva’s Sarasvatikanthabhārana refers to a scene like that in Sv, V where Udayana meets Vāsavadatta, but it is not stated that the verse is taken from Sv, though it would fit in the episode (14).

5. The verse quoted in Nātyadarpāna from Sv. (GOS No 48, p 84) is not found in the printed text, but fits in the surroundings of Sv, IV. Both śilātala and sephaktā-blossoms have been mentioned in the dialogue between Padmāvati and her maid already, and by the Vidūṣaka addressing king Udayana (20).

16 This reading has been accepted by P. V. Kane, Pathak Comm. Vol., 394.
17 The verse runs "न श्राब्धस्यान्तर्यामेन कलिन्ति एवाभिवर्तेत् अश्रयतमयं पुरातोस्माताम्।"
18 The common picture to both the passages is the hṛdayagrha, not the door of the samudragrha, as the late Ganapati Śāstri explained in his Commentary, the latter building had hardly any doors. For the beginning of the verse see F. W. Thomas, JFRAS, 1925, 100ff.
19 See Sukthankar, JBRAS, NS 1, 1925, 136ff.
20 A similar incident with the contrary conclusion is found in Sv, V, after verse 3, when the Vidūṣaka observes that Padmāvati must have been in the samudragrha and left, the king answers she cannot have been there and explains the reason for this surmise by the verse V, 4.

शाप्या नाभन्त्य वेषात्मुदस्मिन् न म्याथक्षमर्वदे
न किंचर्थ दि विशरोधव्यवस्थर्थं चिन्तामैत्रीषये॥
6. In the Nātakalaksanarātanaśca a verse is quoted (p. 41, line 970/2) from Cārudatta

शुष्क्रु मगोऽ रूपः ॥ भाविक्षिप्त।
कः ब्यवहारितं मे वायस्यो भावप्रभुत।

The contents of this verse appear in the monologue of Cārudatta in the 9th Act of Mrchak in a more detailed description of bad omens accompanying him on his way to the court. The second of the verses there (IX, 11) runs

शुष्क्रु प्रसिद्धो व्याथा भाविक्षिप्त।

The words vāyasa, animitam and mama are found in the preceding verse (IX, 10) in Mrchak

श्रव्याप वायाति वागमोऽथमात्मवेतो मुहुर्ताप्नित।
हरं च नेत्र शुरुति प्रस्थि ममाविभिनि दि केदविनि।

It is nowhere said that the verse belongs to Bhāsa, but it is quoted from a play Cārudatta which, as the printed text of this drama shows, is somehow connected with Mrchak. The contents of the verse have to be derived from a general belief in omens like those in Bhṛatsamhitā, 95 (vāyasaruța) where verses as 2, 19, 38 express similar views about the bad omen of a crow sitting on a dry tree or facing the sun. The verse, however, points to the conclusion that a play Cārudatta existed, of which the edited text would represent a torso only, as Sāgaranandin in other places refers to the Mrchak or to acts 5 and 8 of the same play under special names like Dūrṇāṇka and Motakāṇka (p. 118, lines 2857 ff., p. 130, lines 3122 ff., 3130 f.) But Bhāsa is not mentioned as the author (23).

7. A verse quoted by Somadeva in his Yaśastilaka, V (II, p. 251) under the name of the mahākavi Bhāsa is found in a
slightly different version in the Mattavilāsa (p. 7, lines 3ff.) Whether this quotation, attributed to Bhāsa, has anything to do with the poet and does not merely range with the alleged quotations of his in Anthologies cannot be decided.

1. The verse in Prat., IV, 3 which occurs in Kaut., Arthaś., X, 3, 150-52 and the last pāda of which is quoted in Vāmana's Kāvyāl., V, 2, 28, might have been so famous that it formed a common-place, neither the authorship of Bhāsa is stated nor is the source, while the Nayacandrikā (p. 180) ascribes the verse to a Manuniti (2 and 7).

2. The verse Bālac., I, 15 and Cārud., I, 19, quoted by Dandin, Kāvyād., II, 226 and found again in Mrčchak., I, 34, seems to be of a general character and is so well known that no author had to be stated. At least neither Bhāsa nor a play of his is mentioned in connection with this verse (6).

3. In Bhojadeva's Sṛṅgāraprakāśa XII the scene is described as found in Sv., V and takes place in the samudra-grbaka (16).

4. Vāmana quotes without stating his source in Kāvyāl., V 1, 3 a verse found in Cārud., I, 2 in a slightly different version which, however, is nearer to Cārud., than to Mrčchak., I, 9 (8).

5. Vāmana quotes in the same work IV 3, 25 again without indicating the author the verse found in Sv., IV, 7 (9).

6. Saradātanaya does not mention Bhāsa in his quotation, Bhāvaprakāśa, VIII (GOS No 45, p. 239), referring to the incident in Sv., how the king recognizes a peculiar ornament on Padmāvati's forehead which induces him to

believe that Vāsavadattā is still alive. The explanation must be that only Vāsavadattā could have done this ornament, a similar scene is found in Kathāsarits, III, 16, 31ff 70 101-103 This scene could have had its place in the last scene of Act IV in Sv, where Udayana meets Padmāvati, in IV, 5 the king agrees with Vasantaka’s words that Vāsavadattā is no more (17)

7 In the Bhāvaprakāśa (p 239) the author quotes from Sv, the words ehi Vāsavadatte, kva kva yāsi?, a passage which is not found in the printed text, though it corresponds to the prose before Sv, V, 7 Vāsavadatte, tistha tistha, hā dhik It is, therefore, possible that Śaratātanaya has not quoted verbatim, as both versions have eleven syllables, but that in Bhāvaprakāśa fits in the Sloka, it may be that metri causa its author has changed the wording, or, the quotation is taken from another source or version of Sv, (17)

8 Sāgaranandin quotes in the Nātakalaksanaratnakosa (p 51, lines 1203 ff ) from Sv, the words of the Sūtradhāra after he has heard behind the scene shoutings for help, in a different, more detailed wording than found in the printed text (20)

C b 1 Sāgaranandin quotes from Sv, the verse VI, 3 (17)

2 The Commentary on Śākuntala22 gives the contents of the beginning of Ācūrādatta where the Sūtradhāra on account of the wish of the Nāti who likes to have a meal after her fast, looks for some Brāhmaṇa to invite him and seeing Ācūrādatta’s friend Maitreya approaches and invites him This is in accordance with the sthāpanā of the published text, the Nāti has undertaken a vow, called abhirūpapati,

22 IHQ, V, 726
and wants a Brāhmaṇa who is fit for a meal with people like her, i.e. who is poor, to be invited. The Śūtradhāra is looking for a poor Brāhmaṇa (daridrabhamaṇa) and meeting Maitreya invites him for dinner. His words nimantido st, āmantanassa mā daridda ttu mam avamannahi are reflected in the Commentary’s āmantranimantranārtham, i.e., for addressing and invitation.

3 The same Commentary\(^{21}\) quotes the verse 2 from Dūtagh, attributing it to the Śūtradhāra in the sthāpanā, the author is not stated.

4 The Commentary\(^{24}\) quotes the words of the Śūtradhāra from Sv.

D As uncertain allusions must be considered the following

1 The verse in Bhāmaha’s Kāvyaḥ, IV, 40ff seems to contain a reminiscence of Prat. I, prose after verse 8, but no reference is given nor is it certain that the Sanskrit verse has anything to do with the Prākrit prose-passage (4)

2 The verse in Bhoja’s Sarvasatikanthābharana, V, 411 has nothing to do with the plays ascribed to Bhāsa (15)

3 The reference in Sarvānanda’s Tikāsavaśva (on Amarakośa, p 305) kūnam bāhuyugam itti Bhāsakavib is in this form not quite intelligible, as in Amarakośa kūna does not occur and Bhāsa could not have explained like a lexicographer a word by a synonym (19)

The conclusions arrived at by these references are

1 A poet Bhāsa is known since Kālidāsa (A 1 2 B 1 [2 doubtful] 5 D 3).

2 His works are known since Bana (A 3 4), expressis verbis ascribed to him is Svapnavāsavadattā (B 3).

3 Among the works which have been published the title

23 IHQ, V, 727

24 Ibidem.
of the following plays, without giving the name of the author, are mentioned in the sources

Sv , (A 5 6 7[?] B 5 [see under] C. a [7, 8 b 1 4]
Cārud (Daridra°) (A 9, 10 B 6)
Dūtagh , (C b 3), cf. below.
Avimāraka and Kurangi may refer to a play Avim. (A 8)
Avim, is referred to along with the titles Pañcar, and
Bālac° in the Commentary on Śākuntala, without the author's name

Some verses are quoted which are not found in the printed texts (B 1 2 3 4 5 6, C a 7, 8) but are not entirely out of place, a scene is referred to, also not found in the present text of Sv , (C a 6)

References to characteristics of the plays, contents, and quotations of prose passages and verses are in agreement with the respective passages in the printed (A 5 6 7 C a 3 4 b 1 2 3 4)

From the quotations in the Śākuntala-Commentary can be concluded that there existed a play Cārudatta which comprised more acts than the printed text has preserved (B 6)

From the quotation in Nātakalaksanaratnakośa is to be seen that there existed a version of Sv , with a different sthāpanā at least (C a 4 but cf C b 4) To a more extensive text of Sv , point also the quotations not contained in the printed

25 IHQ, 725
26 There exists, however a play Bālacanta dealing with the story of the Rāmāyana, mentioned in Sāhityadarpana, VI, 35, the same verse in Nātakalaksanaratnakośa, p 26, lines 611-13, but further quotations p 23f, lines 540 ff, p 32, lines 751-53
text (B 3. 4 5, C a 5 7) Finally a scene missing in the published version (C. a 6)

That the printed texts are not the only existing versions of the plays is to be seen further from the statement in the Śākuntala-Commentary (p 726) according to which the Sūtradhāra appears in one-act plays like Dūtagh, without an antagonist like a nata, etc., but also in plays comprising more than a single act as in Kalyāna- saugandhika,\textsuperscript{27} in Pañcar, and this play is not considered to be a nātaka,\textsuperscript{28} in Bālācarita. The Commentary refers to the sthāpanā in Bālac, and Sv, and to Avimāraka, in the latter, however, the dialogue between the Sūtradhāra and Nati is called āmukha, as in the play Tapaṭisamvarana,\textsuperscript{29} which does not correspond to the printed text. The circumstance that with two exceptions (B 1 5) the author Bhāsa is not connected with the quotations or plays does not speak against his authorship as the same attitude has been taken and had to be asserted for other authors too, as the Commentary on Śākuntala does not give the name of the author in connection with his quotations, and so does the Nātayalaksanaratnakośa too. Lastly, the published texts cannot be taken as the only existing versions.

It has to be borne in mind that the editions are based on a few manuscripts and further finds of them may lead to more complete texts. But even with the material at disposal it can be shown that the existing editions offer some verses missing in the editio princeps. Thus Pañcar, (ed 1917), I contains 57 verses against 55 verses of the first edition (1912), verses 13 and 14 are new. In Act II of the same play verse 57 reads in the 2nd edition yotra-

\textsuperscript{27} Cf IHQ, V, 726, note 2, where reference is made to the edition of the play by Dr Barnett in BSOS, III, 33ff and to a (not yet published) re-edition by Mr V Venkataram Sharma, this play, however, contains only a single act. This points again to a different version of this play also\textsuperscript{1}.

\textsuperscript{28} It is a samavakāra

\textsuperscript{29} Published in TSS, XI
yiitvā against tulayitvā of the first edition. Verse 72 of the 2nd edition is new. Whether Pratā, IV in the prose portion at the beginning an Āryā is hidden, is doubtful, it would not change the text. In Madhyā, (ed Devadhar) verse 50 is not found in the previous editions.

श्राणात् तु मया पूर्वं यद् भवान् नाभिवाचितः
ब्रह्म पुजापराधस्य प्रसादं कतु महिसे ।

It is doubtful whether this verse is necessary as its second line expresses the same contents as the following prose: putracāpalam ksantum arhast, and as uncertain is whether the verse, is not modelled in accordance with the prose or vice-versa, though the prose fits closer in with the admonition of Hidimbā: abhivādehi pidaram aham sa abhivādaye. Moreover, Ghatotkaca was under the conditions of his meeting the father unable to salute him, still less in the manner appropriate for a son towards a father, in the prose version. Therefore, Ghatotkaca does not beg his father’s pardon for not having saluted him, only for his rashness, and now, at his mother’s admonition he salutes his father. This passage is too insignificant to allow conclusions, nevertheless, it shows the incompleteness of the manuscripts, the unreliability of the editions and gives some insight into the relation of prose and verse, the fabrication of which was so easy.

Unsatisfactory as the result may be, in the present stage of knowledge no more can be asserted. It seems, however, that there exists a possibility to ascertain from the cultural data the standard of life, religion, state organization, science, etc. By comparison with the corresponding conditions in other sources which can be dated definitely or approximately, an upper limit for the age of the plays, an indication even of their genuineness—with regard to the hypothesis of their adaptation in circles of actors—could be arrived at.

One of the most striking features in the plays is the pratimā-grha, after which the Pratimānātaka got its name. The pratimā-grha is a temple-like special building, containing a central hall (garbha-
grha) In this central hall there are nest pigeons, as to-day in the Gopuras of South-Indian temples. The outer walls are marked with pañcāngulas of whitewash mixed with sandal, the doors are festooned with garlands of flowers, fresh sand is strewn on the floor, in front of the building, flowers and fried grains before the entrance indicate an oblation by pious hands. While other temples have as an external sign emblems like weapons and banners, this building has nothing of this kind. The statues within the hall are made of stone. A devakulika is in charge of the pratimāgrha, a priest. These statues represent deceased kings, but of a king during his lifetime no statue is made.

The custom to imprint the hand with five fingers spread upwards is known from the Buddhist literature in Pāli and "mixed Sanskrit," in Brāhmanical literature the custom is mentioned in Mṛcchakaṭaka, X 4, Kādambari, 224, 16, the term occurs in Harsac, (ed. Fuehrer) 92, 2, 201, 3f., Vāsavadattā, (ed. Hall) 183, 3, in Somadeva's Yaśastilaka, I, p 49, 1, 490, 4, it is known from the basement of a Stūpa- and cankrama- relief of Barhut. New, as it seems, is the cult of ancestors by erecting statues of them. The fact that the statues are executed in stone refers to a time which cannot be much earlier than the beginning of the Christian era. In the Nānāghāt cave inscriptions the names of members of the Andhra dynasty are mentioned above the position of heads of what were


31 Sivarāma's Darpana gives the vernacular word cutaka and says at festivals they paint the walls for ārāpana.

32 Vogel 222f. and Plate.

33 Coomaraswamy, Geschicht der Kunst 47 refers to the wooden image of Ketu mentioned in the Khāravela Inscription of the Hāthugumpha as to the earliest human image. No passage of this sense is found in the inscription as the corrected reading of line 11, against JBORS, VI, 155f. 337ff., has been established by Steen Kono, Acta Or., I, 22 and accepted in Fp Ind., XX, 79.
relievo figures now entirely destroyed, of the king Simuka-
Sātavāhana Srimat, of the queen Nāganikā, of king Sri-Sātakani,
of prince Bhāga, of the prince Hakusiri, and of the prince Sāta-
vāhana Here are no ancestors represented, as the father of the
queen Nāganikā, the mahārathī Tranakayira is found among the
names, and contemporary personages, apart from the fact that these
figures are no statues and not erected in a special building. His-
torical personages, however, are represented in large statues found in
the mound Tokri Tilā near the village Māt, nine miles north of
Mathurā, the inscriptions on which disclose them as Kaniska, in
the inscription on the pedestal of the second statue of Vima who is
titled as mahārāja rājātirāja Devaputro Kusānaputro Sahi Vema
Taksama, a bakanapati Huma ksa mentions to have erected a
devakula, garden (ārāma), tank (puskarnī), and well (udāpāna)
Prof Vogel has found the remains of the foundation walls and plinth
of a building made of large bricks, about the centre of the building
the main body of the statue, the head of which is missing, was dis-
covered. Near the seated statue of Vima the standing statue of
Kaniska was found inside the building. Close by, an inscribed
pedestal of another statue was recovered. This inscription mentions
that a bakanapati Saukra, son of the mahādandanāyaka Masa, ordered
for the increase of the life and strength of the mahārāja rājātirāja
Devaputra Huviska, the devakula of the grand-father of Huviska to
be repaired which was in ruins. Lastly, in the same temple the statue

34 Luders = List Nos 1113-1118, Smith, ZDMG, 56, 653ff quotes the
late Bhagavan Lāl Indrājī, JBRAS, XIII, 311, on the custom of Jains and
Nepalese Buddhists to have the figures of members of their families carved in their
temples known by the name of Sālika The order father, mother, himself, wife,
brathers, sons, etc., nearly agrees with the order in the Nānāghāt inscriptions
35 Vogel, Verslagen en Meded, R IV, D 12, 1913, 272ff, recently La
sculpture de Mathura, 21ff, Pls. 1-III
36 For the reading cf AR, ASI, 1911/12, 120ff, Vogel, Versl 297, Jyāswal, JBOF, VI, 1920, 12ff
37 Daya Ram Sahni, JRAS, 1924, 40ff
of Castana has been found. Thus the *devakula* of the Kuśāna rulers seems to have contained statues of Vima, Kaniska, and Huviska erected or repaired by a *bakanapati*, besides the statue of Castana the identity of which has not been established as yet with certainty. The term *devakula* appears in a Śārada inscription from Hund, which record written in a barbaric Sanskrit mentions that the queen Śrikāṃśvaridevi has caused to be erected something (sātka) in a *devakula*, the name of the architect and of the scribe of the inscription are given, further, the time within which the building was constructed (168-169, probably of the Harsa era, i.e. 774-775 A.D.), but no clue as for the character of the *devakula* itself is found therein.

The Morā well inscription mentions the erection of the *pratimā* of five heroes (*pañca virānām pratimā*) by a Bhagavat Vrśna in the time of the Mahāksatrapa Rājūvula’s son, the name of which is not preserved, these five viras are hardly ancestors of a ruling dynasty Reliefs of two kings of the Pallava dynasty, of Mahendravarman I and of his son Narasimhavarman Simhavisnu I, each of these rulers accompanied by two queens, have been executed and labelled with inscriptions in the rock-cut temple of Ādivarāha-Perumāl at Mahābalipuram which may belong to the time of Parameśvaravarman I, i.e. end of the 7th century A.D. Though these kings are grand-father and father of Parameśvaravarman, the reliefs cannot be called ancestor-statues as also their two queens represented, as the reliefs are found, in a temple dedicated to Visnu-Ādivarāha. In the temple at Tiruvaṅčikulam, a suburb of

38 Benoytosh Bhattacharyya, JBORS, VI, 1920, 51ff.
39a Edited by Ru Br Daya Ram Sahni, Ep Ind., XXII, 97f.
39 Vögel, Catalogue of the Archaeological Museum at Mathura, 184
30 Sir John Marshall, JRAS, 1912, 120 believes this expression of heroes to refer to the five Pāṇḍavas.
41 RB H Krishna Sastri, Memoirs ASI, No 26, 1926
42 See Ep, Ind., XIX, 112
Crahanore the statue of Bhāskara Rāvarman is set up and worshipped. It has been objected that such a statue cannot be compared with those of the pratimartha. This is true, as there exists a difference within the locality, a Śaiva temple, containing the statue of one ruler and his consort, on one hand, and a special building containing the statues of all male ancestors of the visiting prince, on the other hand. The custom to install statues of deceased kings in temples is known from South India and countries with Indian culture. Into the 17th century leads the statue of king Tirumal (1623-1659), a Nāyak of Madura, who for the reception of the presiding deity of the place built the Vasanta or Pudo Mandapa (New Hall) the erection of which took more than twenty years (1623-1645). His statue is found in front of the great (eastern) Gopura of the Sundaresvara temple, Madura. The hall has four rows of pillars, and at each side of the central corridor are five pillars representing ten of the Nāyak's dynasty. Tirumalla is distinguished by having a canopy above his statue and two figures at his back, the figure at the left is his consort, a princess of Tanjore. Thus it seems that in later times statues of kings, accompanied by their consorts, and ancestors were erected in temples of deities. This custom of erecting the statues in temples seems to be connected with and based upon a conception according to which the deceased

43 A K Pisharoti and K R Pisharoti, BSOS, III, 108, n 2 Ci
Mennon, History of Kerala, I, 309
44 T Ganapatia Sastri, ibid., 629f
45 Fergusson-Burgess, History of Indian Archit., I, 386ff, with plans and a photograph of the building. For the reign of the Nāyak see R Sathyamatha Aiyar, History of the Nayaks of Madura, Madras, 1924, 110ff
46 Jouveau-Dubreuil, Archeologie du Sud de l'Inde (Annales du Musée Guimet 26) I, 147ff., photograph of the entrance and interior of the "Tirumalla-choultri" Pl XLVI, XLVII A, of the statues Pl XLVII B Sc ewell, List of Antiquarian Remains in the Madras Presidency I, 292—On horseback is the figure of Āryanātha, the Madaliyar, the prominent general of Viśvanātha who erected the thousand pillar Mandapa in the shrine dedicated to Sabhāpati
king becomes deified after his decease and identified with the deity of the temple

Such a custom can be traced in Kamboja from the 9th century to the 12th century A.D. 47 Not only deceased rulers, their ancestors, even living kings, erecting their own statues, were worshipped, or their consorts, or nobles who had sacrificed their life for the king, were honoured in this way, the identification of the royalty with the god, kamraten jagat ta rāya, the god is the kingship, led to the cult of deification of the king in the form of idols, Lingas, statues of Visnu, Buddha, and Bodhisattvas, according to the often tolerant faith of the dynasty. Besides the temples of Bako and Lolei, the Bayon in Ankor Thom represent Hindu deities, Buddha and tutelary deities the majority of which were deified men in two forms as portraits and as deities the names of which they had received posthumously, thus forming a real gallery of historical portraits and a national pantheon. 48 The same custom prevailed in Java for which the best example is the statue of king Erlangga (1010-1042), worshipped as Visnu at Belahan, erected in 1043 49 besides other kings. 50 In Campā the kings associated their names with Lingas or

48 Coomaraswamy, lec. 213ff.
49 Coomaraswamy, ibid., 209, Fig. 360
50 Chatterji, lec. 245 For the Javanese and Balinese custom of installing the image of a deceased king in a temple as a god of which the royal personage was considered to be an incarnation, see Stutterheim, JAOS, 51, 1931, 1ff. The author is not right in declaring (p. 4) "that in India there has never been found any statue of a deceased king in the guise of a god which was worshipped." On the divinity of kings cf. Hopkins, ibid., 309ff.
51 R. C. Majumdar, Champa (Punjab Oriental Series 16), Lahore 1927, 184ff.
52 Ep., Ind., XIV, 283, lines 20ff Rāchamalla I, in the time of Rāchamalla II, Śaka 1103 = 1181 A.D. A Linga was adored probably in the Bayon under the title of kamraten jagat ta rāja or devarāja. On the Linga in this meaning cf.
Contribution to the Bhāṣa Question

gods, kings and nobles associated the names of their relatives with the gods of temples founded by them, according to inscriptions from the 5th to the 13th century A.D., they identified or associated themselves with the gods by adding their names to that of the god, and also at times by making the image of the god resemble their own. There are instances of identification of deceased rulers with gods in India also, though statues of the king-god are not used, but they occur in the form of Lingas, other instances are met in the time of the Candella king Prthvideva, and two queens of the Cālukya king Vikramādiya II, Lokamahādevi and Trailokyamahādevi, installed images of Śiva called Lokeśvara and Trailokyēśvara respectively, the Rājaratangini furnishes instances where temples were dedicated to gods named after their founder. In the year 1274 king Narasihapati of Pagān finished the Mengala-dzedi (Mangalacaritika) where besides holy relics, golden images of the disciples of the Buddha, golden models of the holy places, golden images of the king's fifty-one predecessors in Pagān and of the king and his family were deposited. The custom to install Lingas of deceased Gurus called according to their names in a guru(v)āyatana perhaps with the portraits of the deceased is testified by a Mathurā inscription of the year 380 A.D.

Bosch, Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde uitg d het K. Bataviënsch Genootschap LXIV, 1924, 236ff, who establishes a unity of nuli Linga and purt the latter being the Purohita of the king and high-priest of the devarāja in Kamboja, the author believes that the texts refer to an "original" Linga in Southern India (p 278ff) Majumdar, 186, Elliot, Hinduism and Buddhism, III, 116, Ep Ind., III, 1ff

53 Majumdar, 186, Elliot, Hinduism and Buddhism, III, 116, Ep Ind., III, 1ff

54 Marco Polo, 3rd ed., by Yule & Corder, II, 114, for the date of the king the 13th century, cf vol. III, 87ff

55 Ep Ind., XXI, 1ff Prof D R Bhandarkar believes (pp 4ff) the guru-āyatana adverts to in the inscription to resemble the pratimāgṛha, but in the latter are to be found statues of the ancestors, in the former portraits of Lingas only, a carving of an ascetic, perhaps representing Lakulīśa, is found on the pilaster, and a trident, one would expect the portraits of the teachers mentioned in the inscription.
The fact should not be overlooked that, though there exists a similarity of ancestor-worship, the pratimāgrha is a special building with statues of deceased rulers, even if the mythological character has to be taken into consideration. This institution of a special hall in a temple without any identification of the ancestors with deities is referred to in Haribhadra’s Nemināhacarīa Prthivipāla erected in Vimala’s temple a Mandapa in which the statues of seven of his ancestors were represented riding on elephants. The hall and the elephants are still to be seen in the hāthī khānā or elephant room of the Dilwārā temple at Mount Abu, but there are only nine elephants of white marble, the figures of which have been explained to represent Seth Vimala (who had built in 1031 the Vimala vasati under Bhima 1022-64), and his family going in procession to the temple, they are destroyed and an equestrian statue of Vimala of stucco and painted has been placed in the doorway. The names of nine of the riders are carved on their seats, six are dated in 1149, and three in 1180. Rāṇā Kumbha (1433-68) erected, as Tod relates, a citadel on a peak of Abu, within the fortress of the ancient Pramara, in a rude temple the bronze effigies of Kumbha and his father Mokal (1397-1413) received divine honours. It is well known that in Rājputana States the chattris or “umbrellas” are erected, of kings, of illustrious dead people and more specially of those who fell in battle. Royal cemeteries, sometimes containing the statues of the deceased, are set apart at one place, as at Jaipur, Jodhpur and Udaipur, in Bikaner the place containing the royal chattris is called devagadh where statues of all the Bikaner rulers are found, from the fourth downwards, being worshipped every day and food being offered to

56 H Jacob, Sanatkumāracantam, ein Abschnitt aus Haribhadras Nemināhacartam (Abhandl d Bayer. Akad d Wissensch., Philos.—philolog u. hist. Kl XXXI, 4, 1921) XI, 36b
57 Tod, Annals (ed Crooke, London 1920) I, 336
But the pratiṃāṛhṛta is not a cemetery, nor are there chattras. Statues of ancestors, however, are found at Mandor, the former capital of Marwar, 5 miles north of Jodhpur, where, besides some deities, the ancestor-statues are cut out of the rock, but entirely detached from it. with their horses, weapons, all painted.  

Another saloon, of similar architecture and still greater dimensions, adjoins that just described, it is termed Tantis kula devata ra than, or ‘abode of the (tutelary) divinities of the thirty-three races’ in short, the Pantheon of the Rajputs. In a cave in the ground where the statues are installed, there is an altar sanctified by the name of Nahar Rao, a Nai, or barber, performs worship to the manes of this Rajput, while the ancestor-statues seem to be under the care of a priest.

The archaeological instances prove the existence of a custom to erect statues of ancestors and sometimes of their worship. The most fitting parallel to the pratiṃāṛhṛta dates from the time of the Kusānas, but the customs prevailed till Rājput times in a modified way.

The literary references not so numerous are still not insignificant. To mention first a less important passage in Dharma-candra’s Malayasundarkathoddhāra, a Jaina work of the 14th century, the story is told how king Satabala, instructed by the nun

58 Mm Haraprasad Shastri, JBORS, V, 1919, 559. cf Tod, Annals, I, 325 on Raghudevā “His image is on every hearth, and is daily worshipped with the Penates. Twice in the year his altars receive public homage from every Scodia, from the Rana to the scf.” Further wc II, 678 on the worship of the ancestral manes by the Rānā in the cemetery at Ara (Udaipur), the cenotaphs of which are described II, 912ff.

59 A description and reproductions of all the figures are given in Tod, Annals, II, 842ff.

60 Tod, ibid., 844, this pantheon is more correctly called setus karor devatan sūhān “the abode of the 330 millions of gods.”

61 The date of the Mandor statues seems to be unknown—Newspapers brought not long ago a notice that Sardar Chandroji Rao Angre who is in charge of the Foreign and Political Portfolio, Gwalior intends to erect an imposing statue in memory of his ancestor and founder of the Angre family, Kanoji Angre, on the Kasa Rock, Bombay harbour.
Malayasundari comes to know that his father has attained *mukti*, he orders a temple to be erected in the place where his father has attained *mukti*, and an image of his father to be installed. More important is the passage in the drama Kundamalā, Act I, Sitā, who after her return from Lankā is led into a forest on the Ganges by Laksmana and informed that she has been exiled on account of her residence in Rāvana's palace, she asks her husband's brother taking leave from him to salute Ayodhyā and to wait upon the king who is embodied in a statue (sussūsiduva patimāgada mahārājo). This points to a statue of Daśaratha, Sitā who did not know personally the other ancestors had no reason to mention them, except her father-in-law. It is curious that Bharata in the Pratim is not acquainted with the custom of erecting statues of the deceased rulers, the explanation that he lived since his childhood in his uncle's house (Act III), practically as an exile (Act VI, dialogue between Bharata and Kaikēyi), is not quite convincing as the young prince could have learnt even there something about the custom observed in his family, but from the dramatic point of view the author of the play had to eliminate such a knowledge of the prince whose surprise at his return is as great as the reader's impression of this scene. In Varāhamihira's

62 According to the German translation by Her t e l, Indische Marchen, 267. The devakula in Mṛcchak, II, is an empty temple in which the Samvāhaka tries to pose as a praśmā, an idol of a deity, Māthura and his partner discuss the question whether the statue is of wood or of stone.

63 Ed by Jai Chandra Shastri and translated by Veda Vyasa and S D Bhanot, Lahore 1932, p 36, cf p 10 of the translation and p 14 of the Notes. In the edition of the Daśkīnā-Bharati Series No 2 by M Ramakrishna Kavi and S K Ramanatha Sastri p 10. The date of the drama the author of which is supposed to be Dinnāga, in the Mysore Ms, Dhiranāga in the Tanjore Ms, is dated by the former Editors in the 5th century A.D. For a discussion on this passage which indicates nothing more than stated above in the text, cf ABORI, IX, 333f, X, 155, 157, XII, 97f, on the date Woolner, ibid, XV, 236ff, S K De, XVI, 158. The expression praśmāgata is found in connection with the Ayodhyādevatā which were worshipped in the prescribed temples (praśastayanārcaśāh) in Raghūv, XVII, 36. It would go too far to see in this passage a hint to the praśmāgrha.
Brhats, 58, 3 the size of a statue (pratimā) of Rāma is prescribed: Daśarathanayo Rāmo balis ca Vairocanib śatam umśām i.e. the statue of Daśaratha’s son Rāma and that of Bali, Virocana’s son, should be 120 angulas in height. Though Rāma’s shrine has to be built in the South-eastern corner of a Visnu temple, thus indicating Rāma as an incarnation of Visnu, there existed sculptures and bronzes of Rāma, of Sitā, and of Laksmana. The identification of Rāma and Visnu caused the similarity of their representation. The Śilpaśāstras do not mention the statues of Rāma’s ancestors as they are not understood as deities the abodes of which belong to the topics of this discipline, the term pratimāgāra, pratimāmandapa occurs in Mānasāra, 34, 24, 27f, a kind of pavilions, where the idol of a god is to be installed. In 34, 24, however, this pavilion (pratimāgāra) is mentioned as the fourth among seven pavilions to be erected in front of a prāśāda, as the fifth the sthāpanamandapa is prescribed which is again a room for installing the idol of a deity. The pratimāgrha of the Pratīm appears not only to the returning of Bharata like a temple, it is higher than a palace (Act III), the man in charge of it is called devakulika who has to fulfil his duty (nātyaka), consisting probably in daily offerings. The devakula is according to the Śilpaśāstra the private temple of the king (Samarāṅganas 15, 45) to be built in the North-eastern or South-western corner of the palace, with high pillars and vedikā (platform or balustrade?). In the palace of the king representations of all the gods are permitted (34, 5), as in devakula also (34, 1) only the god to which the ruler is devoted and

64 Gopinath Rāo, Elements of Hindu Iconography, I, 191, Mānasāra, IX, 132
65 Rāo, I, 186ff
66 Bhojadeva’s Samarāṅganasūtradhāra, 77, 40 (in 42 Bali is mentioned as in Brhats) prescribes Daśarathi Rāma to be made with two or eight arms, cf. Rāo, I, 203
67 The translation by P. K. Acharya (p 340) takes pratimāgāra as a pavilion “for the image (chapel)”
the *kuladevatā* can be represented (34, 21) The term *devakula* used in the Mathurā inscriptions proves that a building like the *pratimāgrha* could be called a temple, but the Śilpaśāstra do not know a special building with statues of ancestors

Incomplete as this survey may be, it shows that the custom to erect statues of ancestors, of historical personages, of rulers was known in Northern India since the 3rd century AD, since the 5th century AD the custom is found in Campā, and later on in other countries which were influenced by Indian culture. The custom of erecting statues was prevalent in mediaeval India as well, monuments and literary sources prove that the custom was not so strange as it appears, though an exact date of the use of a *pratimāgrha* is not yet possible.

Another custom which occurs in the same play, in the Pratim , seems to be in some way surprising, it is the veiling of women of high rank. Sitā (Act I) is ordered by Rāma when leaving the town with her for his exile, to take off her veil (*avagunthana*), as Rāma puts it (verse 29) “He, he, you citizens! Listen! Listen!”

“Gaze freely on this my wife with your eyes full of tears, for without offence women can be looked at during a sacrifice, a wedding,” when in calamity and in the forest.”

68 *bhārtrkuladevatā* are mentioned in *Śākunt., V* when Śakuntalā appears before her husband *devakulika* occurs in the *Mahāvyutpatti*, 186, 78

69 D R Bhandarkar, Ep Ind XXI, 5 points out that there is a difference between the Kusāna’s *devakula* and the *pratimāgrha* as the former was ‘a cluster of *devakulas*’ commemorating the different Kusāna rulers, if one should be so rigorous at all, though the statues seem to have stood on the same ground (see *JBORS*, VI, 53), their purpose was hardly different from that of the *pratimas* in the Pratim.

70 At the wedding ceremony the bride is covered with a new garment, cf Winteritz, Das altund Hochzeitsrituell 45 and 47 (for modern times). With the verse above may be compared Rām., VI, 114, 28

In Rām VI, 111, 61f. Mandodai, Rāvana’s first queen, lamenting in view of her husband’s body, mentions that she is not veiled and the other females have also put off their veils with their shyness.

58
• The widowed queens of Daśaratha, when entering the pratimā-grha (Act III) and meeting Bharata there, put off their veils, the prince reflects upon this gesture "The presence (of yours, i.e. Sumantra) at every conduct (of them) reveals you to me"71. The use of veils by Indian women is known since the classical drama In Kālidāsa's Śākuntala, V, Śākuntalā appears veiled before her husband, king Dusyanta, who does not recognize her, even when Gautami unveils her with the words "Don't be ashamed for a moment!" Perhaps the veiling of Śākuntalā serves the dramatical purpose as the king, though admiring the beauty of his consort, does not recognize her, neither the veiled nor the unveiled. In Mālavikāgīnī, V, Mālavikā is veiled with a silken veil to give her the position equal to that of a consort of the king (devī). An explanation of the value of the veil offers the scene in Mrucchak, IV when Vasantasenā releases Madanikā, giving her the status of a free woman enabling her to enter matrimony with a Brāhmaṇa, her becoming husband Śārvilaka says that the veil by which Madanikā is entitled to be looked at as a free woman, is difficult to obtain. The same role is played by the veil at the end of the drama where the king confers upon Vasantasenā the title vadhū, i.e. lady, free woman, and Śārvilaka veils her. While in Mrucchak, Vasantasenā gets the veil bestowed upon her by the king as an ornament of her ladyship, she possesses a veil already in Act IV (beginning), may be that this veil is used only for going out by a palanquin. Just so in Cārud, IV (ed. 1922, p. 89) the mother of the courtesan asks her by a maid to put on the veil after having done her finery along with the ornaments. On the other hand, in this play Vasantasenā presents her ornaments to Madanikā, she calls her an āryā, neither the courtesan nor Sajjalaka mentions the veil. Perhaps there existed veils

71 Woolner-Sarup translate (Thirteen Trivandrum Plays I, 177) "So intimate on all occasions, that tells me something." Perhaps instead of mām sūcayati should be read tvām.
of different kinds, one for private use, one bestowed upon a woman of lower rank by the king electing her to the status of a free woman, and one belonging to high class women by birth. The scene in Ratnāvali, III where Vāsavadattā unveils herself, has no deciding value. The avagunthana, worn over the garment, is mentioned in Kādambari (ed. Peterson), 10, 20, not only the Candāla girl, the cloth of which may be used to cover her, the woman of good family uses her veil when meeting secretly her lover (Sāhityad 3, 77 and verse before). On the other hand, within the house or palace women move freely, at least in the presence of the members of their family or well known officials and friends. Vāsavadattā, still a young princess uses an open palanquin when she left with her nurse as there is no offence for a maiden to be seen in public (Prat, III). When Udayana meets her as his wife (Sv, VI), he sends her to the abhyantara, the rooms for the queen (Prat, Act II end).

It would exceed the frame of these lines to give a comprehensive picture of the cultural life as offered by the plays. But just such an enquiry could bring some results as for the question of the homogeneous character of the plays. To quote only one instance in Prat III the palanquin is carried on shoulders by men, in Cārud Vasantasenā uses a palanquin on wheels (Act IV). It may be that both kinds existed or that ladies of the court did not use the latter kind of palanquins. The palace, town, the formulas of addressing, law, art, literature and religion, all that needs a careful consideration and comparison with corresponding sources. At least the discussion on the age and authorship of the thirteen plays would be brought in this way on a more objective ground than that on which it took place hitherto.
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