

THE
INDIAN ANTIQUARY

A JOURNAL OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH

IN

**ARCHAEOLOGY, EPIGRAPHY, ETHNOLOGY, GEOGRAPHY, HISTORY,
FOLKLORE, LANGUAGES, LITERATURE, NUMISMATICS, PHILOSOPHY,
RELIGION, &C., &C.**

EDITED BY

JAS. BURGESS, LL.D., F.R.G.S., M.R.A.S.

VOL. VII—1878

Swati Publications

**Delhi
1984**

Published by Swati Publications, **34, Central Market, Ashok Vihar, Delhi-110052** Ph. 7113395

and Printed by S.K. Mehra at Mehra Offset Press, Delhi.

Authors' names arranged alphabetically.

	PAGE		PAGE
REV. J. D. BATE, Allahābād:—		XXXIX.—Inscriptions of Satyāśraya, of Vijayā-	
The WIVES of MUHAMMAD	93	ditya, Ś. 651, of Gaṅga-Kandarpa, Ś.	111
PAṆḌIT BHAGAVĀNLĀL INDRĀJĪ, Bombay:—		890, and of Vinayāditya, Ś. 608	111
The INSCRIPTION of RUDRĀDĀMAN at Junāgaḍh ...	257	XL.—W. Chalukya Grant of Mangala	161
CAPT. W. S. BROOKE, B.S.C., F.R.G.S., Bilāspur:—		XLII.—" " Vijayabhāṭṭārikā	163
NOTE on the CUSTOM of MAHĀPRASĀD in the Sam-		XLIII.—E. Chalukya Grant of Viṣṇuvar-	
bhalpur District	113	dhana II.	185
G. BÜHLER, Ph.D.:—		XLIII.—" " " "	191
The Digambara JAINAS	28	XLIV.—British Museum plates of Pulikēśi I.	206
Additional Note on Hastakavapra—Astakampron ...	53	XLV.—W. Chalukya Grant of Vikramāditya	
MSS. of the Mahābhāṣya from Kāśmīr	54	I., dated Ś. 532	217
GUMJARA GRANTS No. II.:—The Umetā Grant of		XLVI.—Early Chalukya Grant of Vijayarāja	
Dadda II.	61	found at Khēḍā, Śam. 394	241
ADDITIONAL VALABHĪ GRANTS, Nos. IX.—XIV. ...	66	XLVII.—Cancelled Grant of Vijayavarmā, Śam.	
THE THREE NEW EDICTS of AŚOKA	141	394	251
NOTE—On the Inscription of Rudrādāman, translated		XLVIII.—W. Chalukya Grant of Vinayāditya,	
by Bhagavānlāl Indrajī Paṇḍit	263	Ś. 616	300
DR. A. C. BURNELL, Ph.D., M.C.S., Tanjore:—		XLIX.—Devagiri-Yādava Grant of Krishṇa-	
WHERE WAS the SOUTHERN CHARITRAPURA, men-		dāva, Ś. 1171	303
tioned by Hiwan Thsang?	39	A Chronicle of Toragal	290
NOTE—On the Pagoda at Negapatam	227	REV. T. FOULKES, F.L.S., M.R.A.S., Bengalur:—	
NOTES—On the late F. W. Ellis's Essay on the		FAH HIAN'S KINGDOM of the DAKSHINĀ	1
Malayāḷma Language	287	PROF. B. H. JACOBI, Münster:—	
H. RIVETT-CARNAC, C.S.I., B.C.S., M.R.A.S., &c.:—		The KUDA INSCRIPTIONS	253
MARONS' MARKS from old buildings in the North-		DR. F. KIEHLHORN, Puna:—	
West Provinces of India	295	Arunad Yavano madhyamīkām	266
REV. F. T. COLE, Taljharī:—		O. S. KIRKPATRICK, B.C.S., Delhi:—	
SĀNTĀL IDEAS of the FUTURE	273	POLYANDRY in the PANJĀB	86
E. C. G. CRAWFORD, B.C.S.:—		REV. F. KITTEL:—	
PERSONAL NAMES in the southern part of the AH-		Bya	290
MADHĀD COLLECTORATE and NEIGHBOURING		G. S. LEONARD, Saīdupur:—	
COUNTRY	165	NOTES on the KĀNPHĀY-YOGIS	293
DALPATRĀM PRĀNJIVAN KHĀKAR, Kachh:—		F. M. MASCARENHAS:—	
HISTORY of the KĀNPHĀY of KACHH	47	FATHER THOMAS ESTEVÃO, S.J.	117
EDITOR:—		J. MUIR, D.O.L., LL.D., Ph.D., Edinburgh:—	
Śaka and Śaivāt dates	180	Metrical Versions from the Mahābhārata ... 137; 208, 292,	
Hiwan Thsang's account of Harṣavardhana	196	308	
Abyssinian Kings	235	Asita and Buddha	232
Hiwan Thsang's account of Pulikēśi II. and Mahā-		R. M.:—	
rāṣṭra	290	The Pāri Priesthood	263
Seals from Copperplate Grants	308	The Firearms of the Hindus (see pp. 186, 281) ...	289
SIR WALTER ELLIOT, K.C.S.I., Wolfelee:—		REV. DR. G. U. POPE, Bengalur:—	
NOTICE of a REMARKABLE HYPOTHETICAL TEMPLE in		NOTES on the KURNAI of the Tamiḷ poet Tiru-	
the Hill Tracts of ORISSA; with remarks on the		valluvar	220
IDENTIFICATION of ANCIENT SITES	19	N. L. P.:—	
THE EDIFICE formerly known as the CHINESE or		Golden Masks	160
JAINA PAGODA at NEGAPATAM	224	BĀDŪ RĀM DĀS SEN, Berhampur:—	
NOTE—On the Orissa Hypothetical Temple	263	The Firearms of the Hindus (see pp. 231, 289) ...	186
J. F. FLEET, B.C.S., M.R.A.S.:—		HIS HIGHNESS RĀMA VARMA, First Prince of	
SANSKRIT AND OLD CANARESE INSCRIPTIONS:—		Travankor:—	
No. XXXIV.—Eastern Chalukya Grant, after Śaka		Sepulchral Urns in the district of Koimbatūr	26
967	15	RĀVJĪ VĀSUDEVA TULLU, M.A., LL.B.:—	
XXXV.—Kadamba Grant of Devavarmā	38	TRADITIONAL ACCOUNT of KĀLIDĀSA	115
XXXVI. " " Mṛigeśvaravarmā	35	LEWIS RICE, Director of Public Instruction, Maisur	
XXXVII. " " Mṛigeśa	37	and Kurg:—	
XXXVIII.—Gaṅga Inscription of Mārasinhā-		CHERA or GAṅGA GRANTS of A.D. 350 and 481 ...	168
dāva, Ś. 890	101		

	PAGE		PAGE
REV. GEORGE SHIRT, M.R.A.S.:—		ARCHÆOLOGICAL NOTES: XIX.—'Passing through	
TRACES of a DRĀVIDIAN ELEMENT in SINDHI ...	293	Fire' ...	126
W. F. SINCLAIR, B.O. C.S.:—		" " XX.—Trojan and Indian	
HINDU and JAINA REMAINS in BIJĀPUR and the		pre-historic pottery, and	
NEIGHBOURHOOD ...	131	the Svastika symbol ...	176
Conti Pomiglianesi ...	202	Additions to Note XX. ...	299
The Firearms of the Hindus (see pp. 183, 239) ...	231	" " XXI.—The Old Tanjor	
Note—A Canarese Inscription ...	234	Armoury ...	193
-stān,—Dāghestān, &c. ...	235	Hypothral Temples ...	137
V. A. SMITH:—		'Contracted Burials' ...	182
Query: Śaka and Samvat Dates ...	180	Ancient Burying-ground at Mungupettā, and Crosses ...	234
SORĀBJI KĀVASJI KHAMBĀTĀ:—		MAJOR J. W. WATSON, Bājkoṭ:—	
Pārsī Funeral and Initiatory Rites ...	179	FRAGMENTS RELATING to ĀNANDAPURA in SAURĀSH-	
The Telephone ...	239	TRA ...	7
R. B. SWINTON, late M.C.S.:—		MAJOR E. W. WEST:—	
RAJMAHĀLI WORDS ...	180	Golden Masks (see p. 160) ...	26
PROF. C. H. TAWNEY, M.A., Calcutta:—		Assyrian Dress illustrated by that of the Hindus ...	181
Ancient superstitions regarding "meeting eyebrows" ...	87	PROF. MONIER WILLIAMS, D.C.L., Bodleian Prof.	
ED. THOMAS, F.R.S., &c., London:—		of Sanskrit at Oxford:—	
The Phrygian Inscriptions at Doganlu ...	228	Pārsī Funeral and Initiatory Rites (see p. 263) ...	227
M. J. WALHOUSE, late M.C.S., London:—		A Case of <i>Samiddh</i> in India ...	264
ARCHÆOLOGICAL NOTES: XVI.—Chivalry in Lower		Modern Avatāras of the Deity ...	287
India ...	21	Kabir-panthis and Sat-nāmīs—(addition to the above) ...	308
" " XVII.—Some Hindu Snake		GAIKWĀṆI:	
Notions ...	40	Query—Names of Countries ending in -stān ...	27, 235
" " XVIII.—Sepulchral Customs ...	44		

MISCELLANEA.

Buddhism in Pūta ...	29	Antiquity of Insurance in India, by R. B. Swinton,	
MS. of the <i>Pratīkhyā</i> of the Sāma Veda ...	30	late M.C.S. ...	137
Geldner and Geiger's Zend publications ...	30	Archæology in Japan ...	181
The blinding of Shāh Mansūr by his rebellious son ...	87	Banyans at Astrakhan in 1722 ...	235
The Hissarlik relics—the <i>Svastika</i> , by H. M. Westropp ...	119	Mr. Henry Blochmann ...	268
Polyandry in the Himalayas, by Dr. C. R. Stalpnagel,		Prof. Garcin de Tassy ...	292
Lahor ...	132	The Sun Worshipers of Asia ...	292
		<i>Rāmdayana</i> —Early Italian version ...	292

BOOK NOTICES.

Iter Persicum, par E'tienne Kakasch Zalonkemeny ...	30	J. G. da Cunha's Sahyādrī-Khaṇḍa of the Skanda Purāṇa ...	208
Gesta Romanorum, by Rev. C. Swan and W. Hooper,		" History of the Tooth-relic of Ceylon,—S. ...	236
B.A., by C. T. ...	31	" The English and their Monuments at	
The Ādi Granth, by Dr. E. Trumpp,—M. ...	57	Goa,—S. ...	236
Mālavikā et Agnimitra, par Ph. Ed. Foucaux,—C. T. ...	60	Dr. M. Williams's Modern India and the Indians,—S. ...	236
Beames's Comparative Grammar of the Modern Āryan		Rev. M. A. Sherring's Hindu Pilgrims,—S. ...	236
Languages of India, vol. II.,—M. ...	87	Lieut. N. Powlett's Eastern Legends and Stories,—S. ...	236
Dr. D. Wright's History of Nepāl ...	88	Morris's Descriptive and Historical Account of the	
Islamisme d'après le Coran, par M. G. de Tassy; Islam		Godavery District,—S. ...	237
and its Founder, by J. W. H. Stobart, B.A. ...	119	Histoire de l'Asie Centrale, par Mir Abdoul Kerim	
The Vedārthayātna ...	139	Boukhary,—S. ...	237
Prof. R. K. Douglas's Life of Jenghiz Khān ...	140	Viscount Strangford's Original Letters and Papers	
Prof. Dowson's History of India as told by its own		upon Philological and kindred subjects,—S. ...	269
Historians, vol. VIII.,—S. ...	182	Prof. Tiele's Outlines of the History of Religion,—M. ...	269
J. G. da Cunha's History and Antiquities of Chaul and		Prof. Whitney's Language and the Study of Lan-	
Bassein,—S. ...	183	guages,—S. ...	270
La Langue et la Littérature Hindoustanie in 1877, par		Talboys Wheeler's Early Records of British India,—S. ...	271
M. G. de Tassy,—E. R. ...	207		

ILLUSTRATIONS.

	PAGE		PAGE
1 Copper-plate Grant of the Eastern Chalukya dynasty, I. to IVa...to face p.	16	17 Western Chalukya Grant of the fifth year of Vijaya-bhattārikā... (2 pp.)	164, 165
2 " " " IVb, V. and Seal...	16, 17	18 Harihara Gaṅga Copper-plate Grant ... (2 pp.)	172, 173
3 " of the Kādamba Devavarmā ... (3 pp.)	82, 83	19 Eastern Chalukya Grant of the fifth year of Vishnu-varbhana II. ... (3 pp.)	190, 191
4 " " Mrigēśavarmā ...	85	20 Daggers from the Tanjor Armoury ...	193
5 " " Mrigēśavarmā I. to IIIa ... (2 pp.)	86, 87	21 Old Hindu Arrow-heads ...	194
6 " " " IIIb, IV. and Seal	88, 89	22 Western Chalukya Copper-plate Grant of Vikramāditya I. S. 533 ...	218, 219
7 Umeta Copper-plate grant of Dadda II. (2 sides)	62, 63	23 Ancient Tower and Images from Negapatam (2 pp.)	224, 225
8 Valabhi Grant of Guhasēna dated S. 240 (2 sides)	66, 67	24 Chalukya Grant of Vijayarāja, S. 394... (2 sides)	248, 249
9 " Dharasēna II. S. 252... (2 sides)	68, 69	25 Date of the cancelled Grant of Vijayavarmā, and five Seals (see p. 308) ...	252, 253
10 " Dharasēna II. S. 270... (2 sides)	72, 73	26 Mason's Marks ... (2 pp.)	296, 297
11 " Dharasēna IV. S. 330... (2 sides)	74, 75	27 Western Chalukya-Grant of Vinayāditya-Satyāśraya ... (3 pp.)	300, 301
12 " Kharagraha II. (S. 337) Plate I. ...	76	28 Yādava Grant of Kanharadeva, sides I. and II. ...	304, 305
13 " " " Plate II. ...	78	29 " " " " III. and IV. ...	306, 307
14 Seal of the Eastern Chalukya Grant of Ammarāja II. (see p. 308, and vol. VIII. p. 73) ...	120		
15 (1) Shaft at Bijapur; (2) Composite Bracket radiating arches ...	121		
16 Copper-plate Grant of the Chalukya king Maṅgala. (2 pp.)	160, 161		

THE INDIAN ANTIQUARY,

A JOURNAL OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH.

FAH HIAN'S KINGDOM OF THE DAKSHINA.

By THOMAS FOULKES, F.L.S., M.B.A.S., CHAPLAIN OF SAINT JOHN'S, BANGALORE.

IT was apparently Fah Hian's original intention to pass from North India to Ceylon through Southern India, but on making inquiries into the state of the country through which his route would lie, he was obliged, for some unmentioned reason, to give up this portion of his enterprise. The short report which he has left¹ of the results of those inquiries is very interesting, and contains allusions which seem to me to be capable of being developed into an outline of the condition of an important portion of Southern India during the earliest centuries of the Christian era.

He tells us that "two hundred *yeouyan* to the south there is a kingdom called *T ha - t h s e n*," and he then proceeds to describe two or three circumstances respecting it which had come to his knowledge. The object of this paper is to try to identify this kingdom by a development of the meaning of these words and their context, and by a comparison of the interpretation so obtained with other information respecting the condition of South India at the time to which his description refers.

M. Klaproth long ago recognized the word '*T ha - t h s e n*' as Fah Hian's equivalent of the word '*D a k s h i n a* ('the South'), a denomination applied to the vast country called at present the *Dakhan*, which is the vulgar pronunciation of *Dakshina*:" and no question is likely to arise

regarding the correctness of this identification.

The limitation of the word '*D a k h a n*' to that portion of South India which lies between the *Vindhya*s and a moveable line in the neighbourhood of the *Krishna*, I need scarcely say, is comparatively modern; in Fah Hian's time the word '*Dakshina*,' when used in a geographical sense, embraced the whole country between the *Vindhya*s and *Cape Kumâri* (*Comorin*). It is therefore remarkable that he should use this word as the name of a kingdom. He does not indeed say that there was no other kingdom besides this within those limits, and it is well known from other sources that the whole of that region was not in his time under the rule of a single monarch; still, what had been conveyed to his mind by his informants, who were themselves 'people of the country,' was, that there was a kingdom in the south, whatever its other name or names may have been, which was at that time sufficiently pre-eminent amongst its neighbours to be entitled to be called 'The kingdom of the south.' Perhaps it may be allowable to infer that this kingdom had received that name on account of its comparatively large extent of territory, or from having established some kind of paramount authority over the rest of the kingdoms of South India.

¹ The present paper is based on Mr. Laidley's translation of the French edition of MM. Rémusat, Klaproth, and Landresse.

Fah Hian's short description² contains several indirect indications that this great kingdom was in an advanced state of civilization:—

1. Architecture and sculpture were represented by the Buddhist monastery, carved out of an isolated rock, and containing 1500 cells, of which he gives a somewhat particular description. The rock was cut down to represent a building of five storeys rising above each other in pyramidal form; each storey was carved into the shape of an animal, or series of animals, culminating in a pigeon of sufficient size to contain a hundred monks' cells. This pigeon also held a reservoir of water, and the water was conducted from it in channels which ran round each of the five storeys in succession, and ultimately flowed out through the outer gate of the monastery. This colossal curiosity of architectural and sculptural art may very justly be regarded not as an isolated and entirely singular monument, but as a very remarkable instance or copy of a class of structural buildings of various degrees of resemblance to it, which were to be found in the surrounding country: since it can scarcely be thought probable that the architect and sculptor would rise at one bound to the conception of an edifice of this high character, to be carved, in the first instance, out of the solid rock. It may therefore fairly be regarded as an example of the style of architecture, whether indigenous or imported, which prevailed at the time of its construction, and which had existed for some time previously, in this part of South India.

² For the sake of reference we add Beal's version of Fah-hian's 35th section in full:—

"Going two hundred *yōjanas* south from this, there is a country called Ta-tsein (Dakshina). Here is a Saṅghārāma of the former Buddha Kāśyapa. It is constructed out of a great mountain of rock hewn to the proper shape. This building has altogether five storeys. The lowest is shaped into the form of an elephant, and has five hundred stone cells in it. The second is in the form of a lion, and has four hundred chambers. The third is shaped like a horse, and has three hundred chambers. The fifth storey is in the shape of a dove, and has one hundred chambers in it. At the very top of all is a spring of water, which, flowing in a stream before the rooms, encircles each tier, and so, running in a circuitous course, at last arrives at the very lowest storey of all, where, flowing past the chambers as before, it finally issues through the door of the building. Throughout the consecutive tiers, in various parts of the building, windows have been pierced through the solid rock for the admission of light, so that every chamber is quite illuminated, and there is no darkness (throughout the whole). At the four corners of this edifice they have hewn out the rock into steps, as a means for ascending. Men of the present time point out a small ladder which reaches up to the highest point (of the rock) by which men of old ascended it, one foot at a time (?). They derive the name which they give to this building, viz. *Po-lo-ya*, from an Indian word [*pārdvata*], signifying

2. The existence of this vihāra would of itself be sufficient to justify the conclusion that the Buddhist religion had taken considerable root in the 'kingdom of the south,' and that those who professed it were a respectable class of its subjects. But Fah Hian does not leave this circumstance to be merely conjectured: for he distinctly refers to the Buddhist monks, as well as to the Brāhmanas and heretics, who dwelt in this kingdom.³ Religion, therefore,—regarding it here as a mark of the civilization of the 'kingdom of the south,'—was represented by each of the highest forms of religious philosophy to which the intellect of India had then risen.

3. This last circumstance involves another mark of the civilization of this kingdom: for in the fact that Buddhist monks, Brāhmanas, and dissenters from both, lived side by side within it, there is an indication that religious toleration was both understood and practised, in some measure or other, by both the rulers and the subjects of 'the kingdom of the south.' And this is the more remarkable since Fah Hian distinctly states that the masses of the people were perversely opposed to the Buddhist religion, notwithstanding their voluntary or compulsory toleration of it.

4. The presence of these 'Samanas, Brāhmanas, and Heretics' implies the corresponding existence of the voluminous literature of each of these religious denominations in 'the kingdom of the south.'

5. Fah Hian was informed by the people

'pigeon.' There are always Rahats abiding here. This land is hilly and barren, without inhabitants. At a considerable distance from the hill there are villages, but all of them are inhabited by heretics. They know nothing of the law of Buddha, or Shamans, or Brāhmanas, or of any of the different schools of learning. The men of that country continually see persons come flying to the temple. On a certain occasion there were some Buddhist pilgrims from different countries who came here with a desire to pay religious worship at this temple. Then the men of the villages above alluded to asked them saying, 'Why do you not fly to it? We behold the religious men who occupy those chambers constantly on the wing.' These men then answered by way of excuse, 'Because our wings are not yet perfectly formed.' The country of Ta-tsein is precipitous, and the roads dangerous and difficult to find. Those who wish to go there ought to give a present to the king of the country, either money or goods. The king then deputed certain men to accompany them as guides, and so they pass the travellers from one place to another, each party pointing out their own roads and intricate bye paths. Fah Hian, finding himself in the end unable to proceed to that country, reports in the above passages merely what he heard."—Beal's *Travels of Fah-Hian and Sung-yun*, pp. 139-141.

³ This is in accordance with Mr. Laidley's version, from which Mr. Beal's differs in this particular.

of the country that a service of state-guides existed in this kingdom, and that they were paid for their services, through the government officials, at a regulated price, and that this price had to be paid in advance by the traveller on his entrance into the country. This I understand to be the meaning of his words,—“Those who desire to proceed thither should first pay a certain sum of money to the king of the country, who will then appoint people to accompany them and show them the way.”

6. This service of guides, considered, as it is by Fah Hian, as a remarkable feature in the character of this kingdom, could scarcely have arisen as a state institution in any but one possessing extensive territory. His description of the route through this kingdom implies as much also:—“The roads of the kingdom of *Ta-t-h-sen* are dangerous, toilsome, and not easy to know.” for, written as these words were after he had accomplished the difficult land-journey from China to India, he is clearly referring to an extensive tract of country abounding in mountains and deep rivers, and jungles infested by robbers and wild beasts. The same conclusion seems to arise from the context of this description of the roads: for he proceeds at once to add, first, that the traveller had to pay down “a certain sum of money to the king of the country” before he made the journey on these roads; and, secondly, that he “was unable to proceed thither.” I gather from this, first, that it was principally, if not entirely, the necessity of advancing this money which deterred him from proceeding by the land route to Ceylon: for it seems very improbable that the great zeal and intrepidity which had already accomplished the *Himālayan* journey would shrink before the lesser difficulties of the *Dakhan*, provided those difficulties were of a similar kind. And, if this was the deterring reason, I gather, secondly, that the sum of money required to be advanced was not a mere passenger's toll, but a considerable sum, which Fah Hian's purse was unable to meet, or which he did not consider advisable to spend in this manner.

7. Fah Hian, as a zealous Buddhist, looked at this institution, as he did at everything else during his sojourn in India, only as it affected himself and others of his own profession: he speaks of this service simply as one of guides, and of the persons who benefited by it as “the

Clergy of Reason of the other kingdoms,” who proceeded “thither to practise the rites.” Religious mendicants, unencumbered with property, would need nothing more than to be shown the way of their journey: but I cannot imagine a powerful state setting about the establishment of an elaborate and expensive service of this kind for the benefit of these monks alone, if their travels were made for exclusively religious purposes. If we could learn more of this institution, it would probably turn out to be the old police service of Southern India; and the persons for whose benefit it was more especially instituted, and applied in the form to which Fah Hian refers, were the merchants who traversed the *Dakhan* in those days with the lighter and most precious articles of the commerce of the East. Their valuable merchandize would need and could well pay for this kind of state escort; and the rich benefits of this commerce which they brought into the kingdom would afford efficient motives to induce the state to create or to apply a police service of this kind for their protection. This service, therefore, thus regarded, suggests another mark of the civilization of ‘the kingdom of the south,’ namely, its valuable commerce, and its inland trade-routes.

These instances of the political, intellectual, and religious condition of Fah Hian's ‘kingdom of the south,’ taken in connection with the several matters which lie beneath them and lead up to them, seem fully to warrant the conclusion that it was both extensive and powerful, and that it was advanced in the best forms of the civilization which India had worked out in those early times.

Fah Hian mentions ‘the king of the country,’ and there seem to be some considerations in his description which lead to the conclusion that this or some previous ruler or rulers of this kingdom was a patron of Buddhism, if not himself a Buddhist:—

1. The presence of Buddhist monks is sufficient to show that the rulers of the kingdom were not inimical to the Buddhist religion. *Brāhmins* and *Jains* were already on the scene, ready to take advantage of any ascendancy of their religion at court to crush their hated rivals; and the common people, in at least one part of the kingdom, were avowedly rejectors of Buddhism.

2. It is much more likely that the toleration

of these rival religions should have proceeded from a mild Buddhist monarch than from a king whose sympathies were with the party of innovation, whose earliest appearances on the stage of the history of the times which succeeded Fah Hian's days are associated with bitter controversies, and a fanatical hatred of their Buddhist opponents, which prepared the way for their general extermination.

3. It is scarcely probable that a colossal work of art, like Fah Hian's rock-cut monastery, could have been undertaken by any one but a powerful, rich, and prosperous king,* or rather, considering the time which such a work would require for its completion, by a succession of such kings. And it is similarly improbable that a costly and everlasting monument of this description would have been so undertaken unless the king or kings had religious convictions in harmony with the object for which such a magnificent building was constructed.

We may now pass on to investigate the locality of the kingdom of Tha-thsen.

Fah Hian places it "two hundred *yeouyan* to the south"—namely, to the south of the place where he was when he described it. In the preceding chapter we find him ascending the Heng (Ganges) from Palianfoe (Pāṭaliputra) until "he came to the town of Pho-lo-nai (Varanasi, Banāras), in the kingdom of Kia-shi" (Kāshi). Banāras, therefore, is the starting-point of his measurement of the two hundred *yeouyan*.

The *yeouyan*, as the equivalent of the Sanskrit *yojana*, is "a measure of distance equal to four *kroshas*, which at 8000 cubits or 4000 yards to the *krosha* or *kos* will be almost exactly nine miles; other computations make the *yojana* but about five miles, or even no more than four miles and a half." (Wilson, *Sansk. Dict.*) The Chinese appear to have used the word not so much as a definite measure of length, as to express the distance from one halting-place to another during royal progresses on the imperial highroads, and between the relays of the post; and the actual length of the different stages appears to have depended upon the level or hilly character of the country, and so to have varied much everywhere. "The translations of Buddhist works," says M. Rémusat, "distin-

guish three kinds of *yojana*:—the great *yojana* of 80 *li*, which is used in the measurement of level countries, where the absence of mountains and rivers renders the road easy; the mean *yojana* of 60 *li*, when rivers and mountains oppose some difficulties to the traveller; and the little *yojana* of 40 *li*, adapted to those countries where the mountains are precipitous and the rivers very deep." Fah Hian says that "the roads of the kingdom of the Dakshina are dangerous, toilsome, and not easy to know;" and it therefore seems natural to suppose that the little *yojana* of forty *li* would be selected by him as the most applicable in this instance. M. Rémusat, in fact, adopts the little *yojana* of $4\frac{1}{2}$ English miles as "applicable with exactness to the most celebrated localities" which have been identified in these travels of Fah Hian. For the present purpose, therefore, it seems reasonable to adopt this measurement of $4\frac{1}{2}$ miles for the *yojana* in the interpretation of Fa Hian's report; and his words then, put into plain English, will be, "Nine hundred miles to the south of Banāras there is a kingdom called 'the kingdom of the south.'"

The question now arises, What point had he in his mind at the other end of his line? He starts from a fixed point, Banāras; and it seems natural to suppose that he is referring to some equally definite spot, which it had been his wish to visit in Southern India—very probably the capital city of the kingdom which he is describing, or, possibly enough, the remarkable rock-cut Pigeon Monastery, which he immediately proceeds to describe.

One more preliminary question needs to be answered, namely, With what degree of exactness does Fah Hian indicate the directions of the localities which he mentions? What is to be understood by his expression 'to the south'? An examination of several passages of his travels leads me to the conclusion that, short only of scientific exactness, he lays down the relative positions of places very correctly, but he does not go beyond the four cardinal points of the compass and the four intermediate points. Any place, therefore, lying between south-south-east and south-south-west would be 'to the south,' within the usual meaning of his words. On a map of India I mark off by its scale a line 900 miles in length. Applying this line to the map

* Hiuen Tsaang calls the monastery *Po-lo-mo-lo-ki-li*, and says it was built by king So-to-po-ho (Śātavāhana?).—*Mém. sur les Cont. Occid.* II. p. 101.

in a southerly direction from Banâras, and deflecting it a little to the west, to keep within the limits of the land, the end of the 900 miles will be found in the neighbourhood of Madras; and, as Madras is only about $2\frac{1}{2}$ degrees to the west of the meridian of Banâras, any place in the neighbourhood of Madras will suit Fah Hian's distance and direction, according to this mode of measurement. It seems certain, however, that while we may consider Madras to be about the extreme south point to which his description can apply, Fa Hian had a more practicable route in mind than the crow-flight line; and when he says that "the roads of the kingdom of Thathsen are dangerous, tedious, and not easy to know," he seems to suggest an intricate inland route, rather than the road by the coast. If so, allowance must be made for the circuitousness and sinuosities of that route, and the end of the 900 miles will then fall a good deal north of Madras. In this long distance perhaps an allowance of about one-fourth will be sufficient to cover these deflections from the straight line; and the end of Fah Hian's line will then fall in the neighbourhood of the Krishnâ.

The result of this method of interpreting Fah Hian's 35th chapter may now be stated in these words:—Two hundred travelling stages to the south of Banâras—that is to say, somewhere between the basin of the Godâvari and the basin of the Pâlâr—lay, in the year 400 A.D., the heart of an extensive kingdom, namely, the 'kingdom of the south,' where the arts of architecture and sculpture had attained a high stage of progress; where religion, philosophy, and literature were represented by Buddhist monks, Brâhmanas, and other religious sectarians; where internal order was maintained by a well-organized police, whose services were available for the protection of pilgrims of religion, as well as for merchants and their merchandize; which possessed Buddhist monuments of sufficient interest and importance to induce "the Clergy of Reason of the other kingdoms [to] go thither and practise the rites;" whose material progress was apparently aided by a rich and extensive commerce; and which was governed by a mild and enlightened monarch, who, while he seems to have himself possessed Buddhist sympathies, was nevertheless tolerant of all other religions.

We may now proceed to compare this inter-

pretation with what is known of the history of the portion of South India to which it refers in the days of Fah Hian. The most northerly locality to which his indications have brought us, namely, the deltas of the Godâvari and Krishnâ, lies within the limits of the ancient kingdom of Vengi; and the most southern point lies within forty miles of Conjeveram, the old capital city Kâncchi, famous amongst both Buddhists and Brâhmanas as the seat of a powerful kingdom, and the centre of the civilization of Southern India, in the earliest days of its known history.

That both Vengi and Kâncchi formed portions of one and the same kingdom at the time when the grants of the kings of the Pallavas in Sir Walter Elliot's collection were issued is abundantly evident from the contents of those grants, especially when taken in connection with those of their neighbours the Chera, the Kadamba, and the Châlukya kings; and there is no likelihood of any doubt being raised, in the present position of our information, that those grants of the Pallavas which have already been published, though they bear no dates, certainly belong to the time which closely bordered on that of Fah Hian's visit. For the purposes of this paper, therefore, it amounts to the same thing whether the central spot of the kingdom of Thathsen, to which Fah Hian's information referred, lay in the basins of the Godâvari and Krishnâ, or in the basins of the Pâlâr and the Pennârs, since the whole of these localities were in his days under the rule of the kings of the Pallavas.

All that is at present known of these kings and their dominions corresponds with the interpretation which I have above offered of Fah Hian's narrative:—

1. That they were the paramount power in the Dakhan when the first Châlukya army crossed the Narmadâ, in or about the 5th century A.D., has long been known from Sir Walter Elliot's earliest papers on the Châlukya dynasties. The earliest kingdom of the Châlukyas in the Dakhan was conquered by them from the Pallavas, and their peaceable possession of it was confirmed by the marriage of the Châlukya king with a princess of the Pallavas. So that a short time after, and so, apparently, at the very time of Fah Hian's visit, the Pallava dominions extended far up into

the north-western districts of the Dakhan; while at about the same time the whole of the seaboard from the northern limits of the Chola kingdom at or about the southern Pennâr up to the southern boundary of Orissa, together with the whole of the inland country westwards as far as the borders of the Cheras and the Kadambas, was in the possession of these kings. Vengi remained in their possession for about two centuries later than the time of Fah Hian, when (about A.D. 602) it was wrested from them by Kubja Vishnu Vardhana, the younger brother of the Châlukya king; and Kânchi continued to be the capital of their curtailed but still very powerful kingdom until a much later date, and, with still further curtailment of territory, very probably, until the tenth century, when the Cholas, taking advantage of the decay of their power, and of the anarchy which resulted from it, carved the new state of Tondamandalam out of the last remnant of their possessions. They were in the height of their power in Southern India, therefore, at the time of Fah Hian's visit; and their extensive dominions were then fully entitled to be called the 'kingdom of the Dakshina.'

2. That they were at least patrons of Buddhism seems clear from the fact of the existence of Buddhists and Buddhist institutions in their kingdom and their capital city; and that they were also tolerant of the Brâhmanical religion is shown by the circumstance that all their grants of lands which are as yet known were bestowed as Brâhmanical endowments. These facts, therefore, run parallel in this respect with Fah Hian's report of the Samanæans, Brâhmanas, and Heretics living together in the 'kingdom of the Dakshina.'

3. Whether they were themselves Buddhists or not, they were at any rate patrons of Buddhist architecture. Mr. Fergusson has shown that the culminating point of Buddhist architecture was attained, or at least most prominently represented, in the Tope of Amrâvatî, on the banks of the Krishnâ, which stood in the very centre of the dominions of the Pallavas, and that the

most exquisite portions of the sculpture of that magnificent Buddhist monument were carved about the very time of Fah Hian's visit to India. And this splendid example of a Buddhist *tope* forms a fitting companion to his correspondingly grand Buddhist *vihâra*, as a twin example of the high style of architecture which prevailed in these parts in his days.

4. Hiwen Thsang³ has shown that throughout the whole course of his journey along the upper eastern coast the monasteries of the Buddhists abounded everywhere, many of them still flourishing, and many more of them in ruins; and that the greatest number of ruined Buddhist buildings, as well as the then preponderating numbers of Brâhmanical temples, lay in those parts of his route which had but lately passed from the Pallavas into the hands of the Vishnu-worshipping Châlukyas.

5. The identity of the Pallava style of architecture with that of Fah Hian's kingdom of the south is strikingly exemplified by the 'Great Rath' at Mahâmallapuram, on the seashore about 35 miles from the Pallava capital, Kâncipuram, and apparently its commercial port. Mr. Fergusson has called this Buddhist monument "a literal copy" of the Pigeon Vihâra of Fah Hian's kingdom of the south: and he regards it and the other *raths* at that place as "the prototypes of the style" of Drâvidian architecture, and "the originals from which all the *Vimânas* in Southern India were copied." Sir Walter Elliot, many years ago, connected these *raths* with the Pallavas: and Mr. Fergusson assigns them to the 5th or 6th century, "if not indeed earlier"—a date, especially when it is expressed in this tentative form, which brings their construction sufficiently near to Fah Hian's days to connect the "Great Rath" with his rock-cut monastery in point of time, as its form so remarkably does in point of architectural style.

6. While these considerations lead to the conclusion that the kings of the Pallavas were powerful, enlightened, and prosperous, the sources of their great prosperity are not far to seek. The central emporium of the whole of

³ He places the monastery in Kiao-sa-lo or Kosala, the capital of which may have been about Vairagadh or Bhândak; thence he goes south 900 *li* to 'An-to-lo or Andhra, the capital of which he calls Ping-ki-lo, from which he proceeded southwards 1000 *li* to T'o-na-kie-tse-kia (Dhanakachaka) or Ta'an-ta-lo (Mahâ-Andhra), at the capital of which were two famous monasteries, the Pârvasîlâ and

Avaraîlâ-saighârâmas. Probably this was B'jwâdâ. After another 1000 *li* to the south-west and south he came to Chu-li-ye, the capital of which Fergusson would place at Nelur on the coast, and Cunningham at Karnûl on the Tungabhadra. May it not be the Western Châlukya kingdom?—ED.

the commerce between India and the Golden Chersonese and the regions to the further East, and so of every sea-board beyond India between China and the western world, was within their territory; and all the diamond mines then known to the world were also within their dominions, and had probably supplied every diamond which up to that time had ever adorned a diadem. The bulk of that commerce went southwards from that "*locus unde solvunt in Chrysen navigantes*" in coasting vessels around Cape Kumārī to the ports of departure for the markets of the West on the western coast: but the lighter and most valuable articles, and especially the diamonds and other precious stones, would naturally find their way by the shorter land-route to those ports; and merchants laden with these precious commodities would need to be protected along the wild roads across the peninsula, and could well afford to pay for that protection Fah Hian's "certain sum of money to the king of the country."

For these reasons the conclusion seems to me to be irresistible that Fah Hian's 'kingdom called Tha-thsen' is the great kingdom of the Pallavas of Kāñchī.

If this identification is well established, it will supply an important missing link in the history

of India between the times which are covered by the classical and the Buddhist relations, and by the evidence of coins, and the dawn of the unbroken period from the 5th century downwards which is covered by Sir Walter Elliot's Chālukya inscriptions; it will prepare the way for an investigation of the next earlier link in the chain, namely, the question of the origin of these kings of the Pallavas, which will probably fill in the remainder of the gap; it will account for the possibility of the splendid commerce of these parts up through the age of Ptolemy to the times of the *Periplus*, by showing the existence of a local government sufficiently powerful for its protection; it will also, I hope, contribute something towards the completion of Mr. Fergusson's almost perfect continuity of Buddhist architectural history from the *topes* and *vihāras* of Gandhāra, through the *Topes* of Amravatī, the nine-storeyed Chaitya of the Diamond Sands, the Pigeon Monastery of Fah Hian, and the Vihāra Rath of Mahāmāllapura, down to the many-storeyed *vihāras* of Java, and the pyramidal *vimānas* and *Gopuras* of mediæval India; and it will help to restore an almost forgotten empire to its due place in the ancient history of India.

FRAGMENTS RELATING TO ĀNANDAPURA IN SAURĀSHTRA.

BY MAJOR J. W. WATSON.

The Ānandapura of Hiwen Thsang is stated by that author to be 700 *li*, or about 135 miles, to the north-west of Valabhī. General Cunningham, in his *Ancient Geography of India* (p. 493), says that the town has been identified with Barnagar (Vadnagar in Gujarāt) by M. Vivien de Saint-Martin;¹ he, however, mentions that Vadnagar is 150 miles to the east of north, and he subsequently suggests that the kingdom of Ānandapura may correspond with the triangular tract lying between the mouth of the Banās river on the west, and the Sābarmatī river on the east.

Now Ānandapura in Saurāshtra, or more correctly in the Deva-Panchāla,²

is about 64 miles to the north-west of Valabhī as the crow flies; but as the hilly country between Valabhī and Ānandapura, commencing near Gadhrā, was in former times not only covered with thick jungle, but also devoid of roads, it is not only possible, but probable, that a traveller would be obliged to make a *détour* of forty or fifty miles to reach that town, the territories subordinate to which, after making so long a *détour*, one might be apt to consider of greater extent than they really were. It is, therefore, just possible that the Ānandapura in the Panchāla is really the Ānandapura of the Chinese pilgrim. It is doubtless of very respectable antiquity, and

¹ Julien, *Mém. sur les Cont. Occid.* tom. II. p. 406. This was on the authority of Stevenson, *Kālpā Sūtra*, pp. 2, 15. Cunningham makes 6 *li* equal one mile, and so makes Ānandapura only 117 miles from Valabhī. Conf. *Archæo-*

logical Report on Kāthiāwād and Kachh, pp. 84, 85, where it was suggested that the Ānandapura of Hiwen Thsang might be that still existing.—Ed.

² The Deva-Panchāla is a subdivision of Saurāshtra.

has a fine temple, the founding of which is commonly attributed to Sidhrāj Jaysingh of Ānhiṣvādā, besides another older temple, now in ruins, which was sacred to a Nāga, or snake-deity. Three kos east of Ānandapura was a town called Dhokālvā, and east of this is a small hill called the Dhundhan town hill. Dhundhan is now waste, but its old site can be shown, and close to this spot the Bhādar river rises. At this place Dhundho Rākshasa is said to have been born; he afterwards went to Chobāri, the inhabitants of which village he devoured, and from this spot he devastated the neighbouring villages, devouring their inhabitants. So great were his ravages that he rendered the Panchāla desolate, and a vast forest sprang up there. Dhundho Rākshasa, was, however, at last slain by Rājā Risālu,* reputed to be the eldest son of Gohil Sākābandhi Śālivāhana, king of Mungipur Pātan. Rājā Risālu is said to have gone to marry at Ujjain, but there being offended broke off the match and went to Dhokā; here he played a game of chess with the Rājā for the hand of his daughter Phulmatī, and winning married that lady and took her with him to the Panchāla, then suffering from the ravages of Dhundho Rākshasa. Here Risālu heard that the Rākshasa resided at Chobāri, and an old woman informed him that the Rākshasa every morning went to the Panchmukhi Wāv at Chobāri to bathe and pay his adorations to the Sun, and that at such times his body was turned into wax. She further added that if at that time some prince of royal blood would sever his head from his body he would certainly die, though otherwise he was impervious to mortal arms. The prince accordingly, next day, went to the wāv and smote off the head of the Rākshasa while occupied with his devotions to the Sun, and slew him. After this Risālu brought Phulmatī to Chobāri and reigned there. After some time a Wanjāro (Brinjārā) named Hāthio, leader of a caravan of 900,000 beasts of burden, came to Chobāri, and an improper intimacy sprang up between him and Phulmatī. Risālu, discovering this, slew Hāthio, and a large pile of stones (ચુલ, *chag*) marks the spot between Chobāri and Ānandapura where he was buried. As far, however, as I can ascertain, Ānandapura was founded in Samvat 1124 by

Chudāsamā Ānanda, after whom it was named. This, if true, would place its foundation subsequent to Hiwen Thsang's visit to Saurashtra. The following *kavita* celebrates the founding of Ānandapura:—

કવિત.

સંવત ૧૧૨૪, માસ આસુ નરમલ;
 વાર ભોમ તથ વીજ, નરવ સુગત સકોમલ.
 પાંચાલ દેશ ઉત્તમ સ્થાન, નર નરંદ્ર ગદ પતીયા;
 રચ્યો શરેર જદુરાય, પુર આનંદ છત્ર પતીયા.
 શ્રેષ્ઠ ત્રીશ વંશ બહાર શ્રદ્ધા, કવાટ રાય કેદજ કીયો;
 અનંતરાય કનકરે, રાજ આનંદ પર રચીયો.

"In Samvat 1124, in the pure month of Āsu, On Tuesday the second day of the month in the delicate *nakshatra* of Suvāt, In that best place the land of Panchāla, the man, a king of men, the fort-lord, The Jādav Rāi founded the city, the umbrella-lord (founded) Ānandapura. Brave men of the thirty-six races standing by him, he imprisoned Rai Kawāt. Ānant Rāi, son of Kanaka, founded the kingdom of Ānandapura."

And so the following *duho*:—

દુહો.

ઓ અનંતે પાંચાલમાં, નરપત ધરીયું નામ;
 રાજ આનંદ પર રચીયો, કરીયો ઓતમ કામ.

"That Ānanta in the Panchāla Assumed the title of 'Lord of men'; He founded the kingdom of Ānandapura, And in so doing performed a most excellent deed."

દુહો ૨.

વંશ રૂપ મુજ જદુવંશી, નરપત રાજ્ય નામ;
 બેલેશ્વર આનંદમે, ધર્યું ધોરીધર ધામ.

"He, that Jāduvānśī king of illustrious family, Who assumed the title of 'Lord of men,' Built a mighty temple To Antēśvara in Ānandapura."

So far for the founding of Ānandapura by Ānanda Chudāsamā, and according to this the large temple should be attributed to this Ānanda, and not to Sidhrāj who is reputed its founder. But the custom of attributing all works of archaeological interest in Gujarāt to Sidhrāj or Kumāra Pāla is too well known to need any comment from me. And though the date forbids

* Query.—Is this the Rājā Risālu of Cunningham (*vide his Ancient Geography*) in another form?

us to think that this can be the Ânandapura alluded to by Hiwen Thsang, it is just as likely as not that the date quoted in the *duhâ* is wrong, and it may be Samvat 624, which would place the founding of the city in 568 A.D. There is, however, one great objection to this, viz. that in A.D. 568 the Chudâsamâs had not, as far as our present knowledge extends, entered Saurâshtra. Other solutions of the difficulty are—that this Ânanda of the legend following is quite another person than the Ânanda mentioned in the two *duhas*, and that the first Ânanda was a Yâdava, and the second Ânanda, though a Yâdava also, one of the Chudâsamâ branch. The following verses show that the second Ânanda imprisoned Râ Kawâd of Junâgaḍh, and in vain desired him to perform obeisance. The four *duhâs* are evidently fragments of a longer poem, and the name Ânanda, as well as the imprisonment of Râ Kawâd by a king of the name of Ânanda, corresponds to the famous story of the imprisonment of Râ Kawâd on the Shiâl Bet by a Râja of Kalyâna, and his release from bondage by Ugâ Wâlâ. As, however, the first *kavita* alludes to the imprisonment of Râ Kawâd, I give them for what they are worth :—

दुहो ३.

पाव हठ मे पीयो, हवे मुठे हाथ;
जोर सयली जाणीओ, कर मजरो कवाट.

“Thy feet are in the stocks,
What avails it now to lay your hand on your
moustache?^a
Your strength is fully known :
Make, O Kawât, a humble salutation.”^b

दुहो ४.

कवाट बोल्यो कोपकर, हठ म कर राण;
अनंत सूर उगे नही, माझ छडे मेराण.

“Kawât replied angrily :—
‘O Rânâ, do not be obstinate ;
Ânant! the sun would not rise,
And the ocean would abandon its bed (were
I to act thus).’ ”

दुहो ५.

कर मजरो कवाट, आखे राजा अनंत;
परणावी बेसाख पाट, गद थापुं गरनार पत्त.

^a To twist or curl the moustache is considered among Râjputs as a gesture of defiance.

^b The word मजरी here, means the three *salâms* made by an inferior when saluting the Râja in *kacheri*.

^c The nine divisions of Sorath, *no-khandâ-Sorath*, are

“ ‘Kawât, make your salutation,’

So Râja Ânant directs :

‘Having married you (to some one) I will
restore you to your throne,
I will establish you lord of Girnârgaḍh.’ ”

दुहो ६.

रीते बेल्यो राह, केणीपर मजरो कर;
लाजे गद गरनार, नव सोरठ नीचुं जुए.

“The Râ replied in a kingly manner,
‘How should I bow myself to you ?
Gaḍh Girnâr would be shamed,
And the nine divisions^c of Sorath would have
to look down.’ ”

This Ânanda and his successors reigned at Anandapura till Samvat 1320. It is said there were seven kings of this dynasty, of whom the last was Âmarasiṅha. After his time the Panchâla was deserted, owing first to the invasion of the emperor Muhammad Toghlak of Delhi, and afterwards to the incursions of the Sultâns of Gujarât, and Anandapura itself became waste. In Samvat 1664, however, a Châran named Budhasi, an inhabitant of a *nes*, or hamlet, in the adjoining hills, having lost his cattle in the forest which then covered the Panchâla country, wandered hither in search of them, and seeing the town wall, temple, tank, &c., on his return told the Kâthi chieftains, under whose protection he lived, of the fact of Anandapura lying thus desolate. Those chieftains, viz. Khâchars Jethsur and Miâjal, who sprang from the Khâchar house of Chotilâ, on hearing this, moved thither from their previous residence in the Thângâ range and took possession of the place, and ruled there for twenty-seven years, and their descendants are now to be found at Aniâli, under Jasdan, and other places. Now Khâchar Mulu Nâgâjan of Sejakapura was the son of their maternal aunt, and was therefore cousin of the Anandapura Khâchars Jethsur and Miâjal, and constantly used to go and stay with them at Anandapura for ten and twenty days at a time. Now there was in the ruined gate of Anandapur one stone in the archway which looked as if about to fall; when the Khâchars Jethsur and Miâjal rode under this archway they used to put their horses to a gallop for fear lest this

constantly alluded to in both tradition and bardic poetry.

^c The Thângâ range of hills is situated in the Panchâla to the south of the Râjkot-Wadhwan highroad. The range to the north of this road near Chotilâ and Thân is called the Mândhava range.

stone should fall on them. Mulu Khâchar, perceiving their lack of courage, determined to seize Ânandapura, and accordingly attacked it at the head of five hundred horse. Fearing his prowess, Jethsur and Miâjal Khâchar fled away at night with their property, and Khâchar Mulu and his brother Lâkho (sons of Nâgâjan) took possession of Ânandapura in Samvat 1691 on Sunday, on the second day of the light half of Paus. The present tálukdârs of Ânandapura are descended from the above-mentioned Mulu. After this capture of Ânandapura its former proprietors went out in *bârvatiâ* (outlawry) against Mulu Khâchar, and harassed the Ânandapura country. Afterwards Jhâlâ Khetoji of Kudni joined them, and Khetoji with the assistance of the Kâthis conquered Limbdi from the Chndâsamâs, but refused to give the Kâthis a half-share in the estate, as he had promised, and they consequently harassed and plundered the Limbdi country. Finally in Samvat 1072 Khetoji made peace with them by giving them the village of Jhobâlâ, after which they renewed their feud with Ânandapura. Khâchars Wâjsur and Râmâ, however, who were the sons of Mulu, settled the feud by giving them some land at Dhârî, and after this they went and settled at Jhobâlâ, and their descendants are called Jhobâlîâs to this day. After this, Khâchars Mulu and Lâkho enjoyed the permanent possession of Ânandapura, although they usually resided at Sejakapura. It is said that 1800 horse were under their authority, and they were the principal chiefs in the Panchâla. Lâkho was known by the name of Lâkho Khandhâr.⁹ The brothers now became very formidable, and at last Jâm Tamâchi of Navânagar, Râj Jaswantsingh of Halwad, and Salâbat Khân Bâbi combined against them and laid siege to Ânandapura, but failed to take it. The following *rupaka* is said regarding this achievement of the Kâthis :—

रूपक १.

तमज जाम राणी जसी ॥ सलबतखान तेम ॥
फोज धर देवके नके फावे ॥ नाळ गोळे पणे वदे जीता नही ॥
भाणंद पर नृप पत शाह भावे ॥
हलहर शालहर बला काठी इयी ॥ जोर बायी भटक कटक
जोडे ॥

⁹ *Khandhâr* means 'the commandant of many horsemen.'

¹⁰ Poetical license for 'Tamâchi.'

¹¹ Poetical license for 'Jaswantsinghji.'

¹² The Panchâla is called Devakâ Panchâla.

¹³ Jâm Hâlâ, who gave his name to the division of the province called Hâlâr.

हे कथारे दरग भमंगरा माहरा ॥ मोरचा गया नगरा
मोडी ॥

स बांधवे मुलवा एमल खण भखाडशध ॥ खगडा कारण रण
छत्रा मारे ॥

नगर हलवद धणी तखत तु नागरा ॥ हालीयो भागरा धणी-
हारे ॥

Jâm Taman,¹⁰ Râno Jaso,¹¹ and also Salâbat Khân,

Led an army into Devakâ,¹² but were unsuccessful;

Though they fought strenuously with cannon-balls they conquered not.

Even though these three kings came to Anandapura,

Yet the obstinate Kâthi caused the descendant of Hâlâ¹³ and the Jhâlâ offspring to turn back,

And together with them the irresistible army of the powerful Bâbi.

Against your one impregnable fort, O descendant of Râmâ!¹⁴

The three kings erected their batteries and departed.

Two such good brethren as Mulu and Lâkhâ, skilled in athletic exercises,

Would slay the enemy in the field of battle for the sake even of a deer.

The lords of Nagar and Halwad from your capital, O son of Nâga,

Turned away, as did also with them the lord of Âgrâ.¹⁵

Mulu Khâchar extended his raids to the Chunwâl,¹⁶ where he harassed Detroj, then held by the celebrated Kânji Rât, and it is said that he exacted tribute from the forty-four villages of the Chunwâl; and the following *rupaka* is said regarding his deeds there :—

रूपक २.

वढे रण ताल नाळ बंध बागा ॥ धरमाई घणा छत्र दाळ ॥

मोघा चेला कीया मुलुवे ॥ जुळा सोघा कीया चुनाळ ॥

इ देवोज तणी धर उपर ॥ हर रामे कीया छत्र होळ ॥

साडी वेच हुइ घर चीज ॥ बंगडी वेच हुभा घर बोळ ॥

नाग तणे खुटीआ नरपत ॥ सरपत भसपत काहे सुइ ॥

वणजे घर भेर बाणीआ ॥ हाण घरे मणीआर हुइ ॥

सबळा सोत कटक रण सीजव ॥ काम तणी धर घणी कीइ ॥

छळे वीया साटवे छत्र हर ॥ तणे नंग वीया साटवे नही ॥

¹⁵ This alludes to the Kâthi's ancestor Râmâ Khâchar.

¹⁶ Alluding to Salâbat Khân Bâbi being an imperial servant.

¹⁷ A district under Viramgâm, so named because it originally comprised forty-four villages.

"While fighting, the cymbals dashed on every side,
And he dashed down the umbrellas of many kings of the earth.
O Mulu, thou hast caused funeral shrouds¹⁶ to be dear,
But hast made *chudās*¹⁷ (bracelets) to be cheap, in the Chunnwāl.
On that Detroj land the descendant of Rāmā caused the umbrellas to shake.
They who sold scarfs (*sādis*) had ornaments in their houses,
While they who sold bracelets (*bangdis*) were overwhelmed with debt.
O son of Nāga, thou hast diminished the number of the lords of men,
And also, as they say, the lords of arrows and horses.¹⁸
The houses of the Wāniās¹⁹ were filled with merchandize,
While the houses of the Maniārs²⁰ were ruined.
You slew the strong together with the army in the battle-field,
In the country of Kāno you killed many;
The wives of the enemy's soldiers buy *sālu*²¹ only,
But they do not purchase bracelets."

Hearing of Mulu's fame, a bard from Chitor composed the following *kavita* in his honour:—

कविता.

मळे भोज वीक्रम ॥ मळे जगदेव जीवारण ॥
बळ मळे राठोड ॥ मळे करण राजा दोहीजो ॥
चंदण मळे परमार ॥ कंय जाणी पृथी कहाणी ॥
मळे तेवीश कोड ॥ मळे लाखो फुलाणी ॥
पांचाळ देश मुहु छपो ॥ पण दाता अधकार घणी ॥
मंडलीक²² पात्रीं एतामला ॥ तुमल ते नागा तणा ॥

"Bhoja and Vikrama may be found; Jagadeva, the preserver of life,
Bal Rāthod may be met, and so can a second Karan;
Chandan Parmār may be found, he may be met whose fame is spread over the world;

¹⁶ चेल, *cheld*, a funeral shroud.

¹⁷ Widows break their *chudās* or bracelets and do not wear others, hence they would be sold cheap; while, for analogous reasons, shrouds would be dear.

¹⁸ i.e. the bowmen and horsemen.

¹⁹ The dealers in female apparel.

²⁰ Maniārs are workers in ivory, who make armlets, bracelets, &c.

²¹ *Sālu* is a kind of muslin. The meaning is that the

Thirty-three *krors* of gods may be seen; Lākho Phulāni may be seen;

But thou, O Mulu, good lord of Panchāla, who art very charitable and invested with authority, If one meets you, O son of Nāga, then one has seen all those noble kings."

The following *duhas* are also in praise of Mulu:—

दुहो १.

गंगा जमना गोमती, काशी पंथ केदार;

मुख दीडे मुलु राजरो, ए तीरथ ए उपकार.

"Ganga, Jamunā, and Gomti²³; the pilgrimage to Kāśi and Kedārnāth;

But if you see the face of Rājā Mulu, that is the holy place, and thence you will derive advantage."

दुहो २.

मुलु मानवीये, मणी मीडवीये नही;

आरस अंद्र तणे, तो नर खवो नागाउत.

"Mulu is among men such a one that no man can be compared with him;

Only in the form of Indra, there may you see the form of the son of Nāga."

दुहो ३.

साजो सेजकपर तणो, रहो राफ झके;

वादी वलीया जेह, मरख नाखे ने मुलाव.

"The anthill of Sejakapura remained safe;

The *vādīs*²⁴ returned, O Mulu, throwing away their flutes."

Mulu had a feud with the chief of Chudā, and defeated him with the loss of three guns, as described in the following *duho*:—

दुहो.

राणारा पडीयारया, नव गाडी त्रण नाळ;

अत्रीया संग भावे नही; मुलु तणे मुवाड.

"There remained of the Rānā

But nine carts and three cannon;

These three (cannon) cannot accompany him, Because Mulu has them."

The following *duho* is said in praise of Sejakapura:—

widows bought clothes, as they needs must, but, being widows, could not buy bracelets.

²² The word *mandalika* is used here to signify a king.

²³ The Gomti is the river of Dwārka.

²⁴ Here there is a play on the word *vādi*. The couplet likens Mulu to a cobra residing in the anthill of Sejakapura. The word *vādi* means a snake-catcher, but also means 'enemy.' It probably refers to the siege of Anandapura by the Jām, the chief of Halwad, and Salābat Khān, mentioned above.

दुहो.

हीर चीरकी पनीभारीयां, गले मोतनकी माल;
पोशे जाणुं इंद्रापुरी, जहां मुलु वसे महाराज.

"The women who draw water have silken clothes,

And on their necks necklaces of pearls.

King! Sejakapura is Indravati,
Where the great king Mulu resides."

When, as above mentioned, Jām Tamāchi, Salābat Khān Bābi, and Jhālā Jaswantsinghji of Halwad attacked Ānandapura, Lākḥā Khāchar of Shāhpur assisted his brother Mulu Khāchar, and the following *rupaka* is said in his praise :—

रूपक.

पाटरीया बाद न कीजे परजे ॥ वदवादळ सामनां वहे ॥
हलवद तख्त शोशरा ॥ हेंदल काडुं तो लखधीर कहे ॥
झाले खग उठीओ झाले ॥ हालवण इलतणा हमीर ॥
मेच पछाड भाणदपरमाथी ॥ दुकां कटक उठे लखधीर ॥
उठीयो तांहां गीरणभज ओडे ॥ भजवडे हाथ मुगलां भशे ॥
बाबी खसे नही अतलीबल ॥ जसे खसे तेम जाम नाही ॥
गाजे नाल धुवके गोला ॥ खाजे भरीदल थया खेला ॥
मांणे बीजी बार माजीयो ॥ कोरव पांडव तणो कले ॥

"The Pātriās (i.e. Jhālās of Pātri) should not fight with the Parjiās (i.e. Kāthīs),
For their (the Kāthīs') army will advance to oppose them (the Jhālās).

If I lead an army of horsemen through Halwad you should call me Lakhdhir."²⁵

Having seized his sword the Jhālo arose, the commander of the chiefs of the army;
While the Lakhdhir, drawing up his army close, arose also,

To drive the Mlechhas from Ānandapura.
When he rose up, his arms reached the sky, and sword in hand he cut down the Moghuls.
Yet the Bābi, of immeasurable strength, would not move, nor would Jaso²⁶ or the Jām move either.

The cannons roared and the cannon-balls flew, and the sword made the army of the enemy as grain in the grainyard."

Rāmo Khāchar, son of Mulu Khāchar, succeeded his father in the Sejakapura and Ānandapura *girās* in Samvat 1730, A.D. 1674. The following *duho* is said in his praise :—

दुहो.

जेवो नगर जाम ॥ राखे भजे रामडा ॥
तेवो तुमुलतणा ॥ शेजक पर प्रजशाम ॥

"As the Jām holds Nagar

By (the force of) his arm, O Rāmdo,

So you, son of Mulu,

Are lord of the Kāthīs of Sejakapura."

Afterwards Rāmo Khāchar, at the request of the Chārāns of Tikar, expelled two brothers, Rādho and Jago, sons of Unad, who oppressed the Chārāns. The following *duho* and *rupaka* refer to this exploit :—

दुहो.

जो गाहर जाचण तणी ॥ धाजं कान धरे ॥
काढी कटक करे ॥ मुलरा टीकर मारवी ॥

"Thou, O descendant of Joga,

Gavest thine ear to the complaints of the mendicants ;

You assembled an army of Kāthīs,

O son of Mulu, to strike Tikar."

रूपक.

रामा खाचरे देवाण रुडे ॥ तेज धरता क्रोड ॥

पादर टीकर तणे पाडा ॥ जुजवा जोडे ॥

मुलरारे थाग मडे ॥ चोरीमां चमराध ॥

तणा उनड गया काशी ॥ भाव बनी भारथ ॥

अभंग राधो जयो भागे ॥ केतां करमाल ॥

फालीया वणगा फगता ॥ रेवतारे राल ॥

"The fortunate Rāmā Khāchar is displeased,
Who is a very haughty man.

At the *pādar*²⁷ of Tikar he scattered the two (brethren).

The famous robbers came to oppose the son of Mulu.

The son of Unad, after fighting a battle like the Bhārata, fled away.

The invincible Rādho and Jago had previously been called sword-wielders,

But now fled, turbanless, with dishonour,

Riding their horses at full speed."

In the great famine of Samvat 1787 (A.D. 1731) Rāmo Khāchar distributed much grain to the poor, and the following *rupaka* is said in his honour :—

रूपक.

प्रथी नेह युकी ॥ जद न मेघो पांतरे ॥

साधनरां भापवा सजे सजे ॥ सोर कर हांकीयो ॥

धणी पांचालरे ॥ रोरना पाधरे खेत रामे ॥

²⁵ A play on the name of Lākho.

²⁶ Jaswantsinghji of Halwad.

²⁷ The *pādar* is the open space immediately round the village.

तेम सताशीयेजी समुलुतणा ॥ बराकर धरा मज भाक वलीये ॥
मीटवी चारणे तणी दश मालवा ॥ मालवो धणी चोटिल
मलीये ॥

संवहर सतासी घणा नर छेतरा ॥ भीभण सारी जदी धान
मागे ॥

नागहर नाग गेणाग भोडे नजर ॥ थोभीभा वरण अदार
उगे ॥

"Affection had left the world when the rain
ceased to come;

Then in opposition he prepared to give good
grain,
And thus shouting he drove it (the famine)
away.

O Rāmo, lord of the Panchāla,
Thou drovest away (the famine) straight through
the fields.

Thus the son of Mulu conquered the (famine of)
Sāmvat 1787²⁸;

By giving food to large numbers you performed
incalculable good in the world.

The Chārāns thought of fleeing away to Mālwa,
But in the lord of Chotilā²⁹ they found Mālwa.
In Sāmvat 1787 many men suffered misfortune;
When the whole world was begging for food,
The descendant of Nāga, like a Nāga, had a mind
as lofty as the skies, and kept the eighteen
castes in the Thāngās.³⁰

Rāmā Khāchar was succeeded by his son
Ebbhal Khāchar, regarding whom the following
verses are said :—

रूपक.

लंक लागी जोर ॥ मरते लोमो ॥

कलजग वात छणाणी केक ॥ पंडमां धडक घणाने पेठो ॥

एभल धडक न लागी एक ॥ शामत जेम वंको गद
सजीयो ॥

काठी जाडा थाट कीया ॥ नमीभो नही वडो अणनमी ॥

गेमुके पो घणा गीया ॥

हरमुल राज न छेडे हीमत ॥ भडनी बातो न जाये भवे ॥

रामा तणी टकावी राखी ॥ खाचर भरती तेज खवे ॥

"A great dispute arose at the death of Lomā,³¹
In the Kali Yuga different rumours were spread;
Fear entered into the bodies of many,
But Ebbhal felt no fear:

Like Sāmat, who prepared his strong fort,
He assembled a vast army of Kāthi;

²⁸ This probably is the famine of A.D. 1718 = S. 1774.

²⁹ So called because he was a Kāthi of the house of Chotilā.

³⁰ The Thāngā range of hills, of which the Chotilā hill is the highest.

He, the great hero, who never bowed to any
one, did not bow now.

Many other chiefs, leaving their pride, fled
away,

But the grandson of Mularāja did not lose his
courage.

The fame of the brave is never forgotten;

You, Khāchar, son of Rāmo, supported the earth
on your shoulder."

दुहो.

तणरामा बातो नथी ॥ भरहु भाफलते ॥

अणनम काठीये ॥ छो आणंद पर एभल ॥

"Thou, the son of Rāmā, art never wearied
Of fighting with the enemy;

An unbending Kāthi

Art thou, O Ebbhal of Ānandapura."

दुहो.

ता रोजे रामा तणा ॥ कोह धो न झाले भीग ॥

आणंद पोर भरडींग ॥ छो अजराल एभल ॥

"Your powerful push,

O son of Rāmā, none can bear.

At the unconquered Ānandapura,

Thou, O Ebbhal, in the flower of thy youth,
residest."

Ebbhal Khāchar was succeeded by his son
Rāmō Khāchar, who had one hundred horse-
men under him and was called Rāmō Melikar.³²
He used to ravage the surrounding country,
but was once or twice defeated by Jasoji and
Sartānji, two brave chiefs of Kotdā Sāngāni,
who had also defeated other Kāthi raiders. Rāmō
Khāchar, however, revenged himself on them
by capturing the town of Sardhār³³ from
them and the Rājkoṭ chieftain, and made it his
capital, and thence contemplated the subjugation
of Kotdā Sāngāni. Both Rājkoṭ and Kotdā
now united against him and endeavoured to
recover Sardhār, but in vain. They, however,
gave him so much annoyance that eventually
he agreed to surrender Sardhār to them on
condition of being paid the *chauth* (or fourth part
of the revenue). The Jādejas,³⁴ however,
feeling insecure with so daring a neighbour,
determined to crush him, and consequently,
though they agreed to his terms and received

³¹ Query—Is this the Lomā alluded to in *Rās Mālā*,
vol. I. pp. 455, 456?

³² मेलिकर, *melikar*, means 'a person in command of a
large number of mounted men.'

³³ Sardhār was the joint property of Rājkoṭ and Kotdā.

³⁴ The Rājkoṭ and Kotdā chieftains are of the Jādeja clan.

possession of Sardhâr, they withheld the *chaukh*. Afterwards, when Râmâ Khâchar had gone on a distant raid, they summoned the Jâm of Navânagar to their assistance, and making an unexpected attack on Ânandapura overpowered the garrison and plundered the town, demolishing the town wall and the towers. They also carried away the western gates of the town, and placed them in one of the Sardhâr gateways, where they are to this day. When Râmâ Khâchar on his return found Ânandapura thus desolate, he commenced a warfare with Sardhâr, and harassed the inhabitants by constant raids and forays until they agreed to pay him the *chaukh*; on their agreeing to this, peace was concluded between them.

Râmâ Khâchar emulated his ancestors in plundering Halwad and Navânagar territory, as the following verses testify :—

दुहो

हलवद तणो हमेश ॥ दवियो जाणे दनी ॥

नगर तणो नरेश ॥ राहो बराबर रामडा ॥

"The whole world knows that you are the enemy of Halwad ;

But you, O Râmâ, lord of men, were equal also to Nagar."

रुपक.

केता दलमे लही लोहील काटी ॥ जाडा दल मेला जमराण ॥
झालावाड लीधी झाडेडे ॥ हलवद तल फेरो हमराण ॥
पोलुं दीये आडीयु पाटरीया ॥ हाट बजारे धीयो होकार ॥
एभलरे भजरायल आटले ॥ घणु खाडु²⁵ लीधी धरार ॥
मकवाणा राणा चडी जुवे मेडीये ॥ वगाडे जीतरा बहु वाजा ॥
हलवद तणे गौखे नागहर ॥ राणीए नरखीयो राम राजा ॥

"O Kâthi, you have assembled numerous forces. And the Rânâ had also with him a mighty army.

After causing Jhâlâwâr to shake, he (Râmâ) conquered it,

And rode his mounted bands through Halwad itself.

The Pâtîâs closed the gate against you, and confusion reigned in the shops and the bazâr,

When the young and obstinate son of Ebhal openly drove away large herds.

The Makwânâ Rânâ climbs to his upper story, and hears from thence

The music of victory loudly resounding.

From the balcony of Halwad the descendant of Nâga was looked upon by the Rânî a-Râmâ Râja."

Râmâ Khâchar was succeeded by his son Visâman Khâchar, who rebuilt the town wall of Ânandapura. The following *rupaka* commemorates his fame :—

रुपक.

आणव पोर् भुप कीयो गदइंडर ॥ घर घर सामत शौह घणा ॥
वसती गामे गाम वधारा ॥ तुं तालेवंत रामा तणा ॥
धण खाडु आगण भद्रा दुले ॥ पैयां शायन जमे वणपार ॥
कुली भरा सोवरणसे कुली ॥ बवली हाटां ठाठ बजार ॥
हर एमल भड वीठ जाहां ॥ पावर पती कर मरे पाट ॥
गुणीजन अगा, गीत गण गावे ॥ थावे रोज कचेरी थाठ ॥
वधीयो करम तुमारो वीशल ॥ घण दाता तप तेज घणे ॥
नरोयन्द्र भुप तपो कर मनीले ॥ तुंदीले गुलराज तणे ॥

"The king of Ânandapura has built a fort like Idar,

In every house there are brave men like Sâmat,

He has increased the population of every village.

Thou art fortunate, O son of Râmâ.

Herds²⁶ of cows and buffaloes and horses²⁷ stand near your dwelling,

Innumerable guests dine on your good food, Your fertile land bears flowers of gold,

In the bazâr the shops on both sides look splendid.

The brave descendant of Ebhal (reigns) there mercifully,

The throne of the lord of Pâwar is fortunate,

The poets sing poetry and praises before you, Every day the *kacheri* is well attended.

Your good fortune, O Vishâl, has increased ;

You are most bountiful, though also of a fierce temper.

King of men, like Indra, may your fortune increase,

You prince of the race of Mulu!"

The sons of Visâman are Jethsur, Desâ, Râmâ, and Mesur, and they are at the present day the tálukdârs of Ânandapura.

With our present scanty knowledge of the *Chudâsamâs* of *Junâgadh* it would be premature to pronounce with any certainty as

²⁵ *खडु*, *khadun*, is a technical word for a herd of buffaloes only.

²⁶ धण, *dhan*, means 'a herd of cows.'

²⁷ अश, *asha*, 'a horse.'

to the dates assigned to Chudāsamā Ānanda, and it is of course possible that he may have founded Ānandapura on an old site of that name, but the probabilities seem to point out that this Ānandapura is too modern to have been the Ānandapura of the Chinese pilgrim and the author of the *Kalpa Sūtra*. The dates of the

Kāthi chieftains are no doubt correct within a few years, as they synchronize with contemporary history, and the above sketch may illustrate the roving, daring lives led by the Kāthis for successive generations in times when their hand was against every man, and every man's hand against them.

SANSKRIT AND OLD CANARESE INSCRIPTIONS.

BY J. F. FLEET, B.A., M.R.A.S.

(Continued from vol. VI., p. 142.)

No. XXXIV.

I have had occasion to refer, at p. 72 of the previous volume, to the separation of the Western and Eastern branches of the Chālukya family. With the exception of Dr. Burnell's remarks at pp. 18-20 of his *South-Indian Palæography*, no account of the Eastern branch seems to have been as yet published. The Elliot-facsimile collection contains several grants of this dynasty, and I have selected from them the present inscription, the first eighteen lines of which are given as Plate xxv. of Dr. Burnell's book. In preparing my transcription, I have also consulted the original plates.

The original consists of five plates, each about 7½" long by 3½" broad. The writing commences on the inside of the first plate, and ends on the inside of the fifth plate. The ring, on which they are strung, is about ⅜" thick and 4½" in diameter. The seal is circular, about 2½" in diameter, and bears,—at the top, a boar, facing to the proper left, with the moon on its right, the sun above it, and an elephant-goad on its left; in the centre, the words 'Śrī-Tribhuvānkuśa,' i.e. 'the elephant-goad of Śrī-Tribhuvana;' and at the bottom, an ornamental device. A comparison of the facsimile plates will show that the characters of this inscription are radically the same as those of the Kadamba and early Western Chālukya copper-plate grants and stone-tablet inscriptions that I have already published in this series, and that they approximate closely to the characters of the later Western Chālukya and Kadamba stone-tablet inscriptions. But, by the

time of the present inscription, the characters used by the Western and Eastern Chālukya dynasties had diverged enough for Dr. Burnell to decide that "there is no real connexion between them palæographically, except so far as their common origin through the Cave-characters is in question." The chief points of distinction, as noted by him, are—1, the tendency of the Eastern alphabet to preserve archaic forms; 2, the greater freedom with which the Western alphabet uses cursive forms; and 3, the remarkably square and upright character of the Eastern alphabet, as contrasted with the slope given to the letters of the Western alphabet from about the sixth century A.D.

The present inscription is subsequent to the Śaka year 867 (A.D. 945-6), as it mentions that Amma II. succeeded to the throne in that year. It records a grant by a certain Vijayāditya; but it does not explain who this person was. However, Kollabhigaṇḍa-Vijayāditya was the grandfather of Amma II., and possibly the grant was made by him before his death, and was recorded in writing at the time of the accession of Amma II. Or, 'Vyayāditya' may be a second name assumed by Amma II. The grant is of the village of Paḍamkalūru, in the Pennātavāḍi district. I do not know to what part of the country these localities belong; nor have I any information as to where the plates were discovered.

A genealogy of the Eastern Chālukyas, with historical notes on them, will be furnished when more of their grants are ready for publication.

Transcription.

First plate.

[¹] Svasti Śrīmatām sakala-bhuvana-saṁstūyamāna-Mānavya-sagotrāṇām Hāri-
[²] ti-putrāṇām Kauśiki-vara-prasāda-labdha-rājyānām Mātri-gaṇa-paripālitanām

- [³] Svāmi-Mahāsēna-pād-ānudyātānām bhagavan-Nārāyaṇa-prasāda-samāsādi-
 [⁴] ta-va-va-rāha-lā[mchha¹]n-ēkshaṇa-kshaṇa-vaśīkṛit-ārāti-maṇḍalānām=aśvamēdh-ā
 [⁵] vabhṛita(tha)-suāna-pavitrikṛita-vapushām Chālukyānām kulam=alamkarishṇōḥ Sa-
 [⁶] tyāśraya-Vallabhēndrasya bhrātā Kūbjā-Vishṇuvarddhanō shtādaśa varsha(rshā)ni Vemgi-
 [⁷] [dē²]śam=apālayat || Tād-ātma-jō Jayasimbas=trimśataṁ | Tād-anuj-Ēndrarāja-na-
 [⁸] ndanō Vishṇuvarddhanō nava | Tat-sūnur=Mmaṅgi-yuvarājah pañcha-vimśatiṁ | Tat-putrō
 [⁹] Jayasimbas=trayōdaśa | Tād-avarajah Kokkilish=shaṇ=māsān | Tasya jyēshthō bhrā-

Second plate; first side.

- [¹⁰] tā Vishṇuvarddhanas=tam=uchohātya sapta-trimśataṁ | Tat-putrō Vijayāditya-bhattārakō
 [¹¹] shtādaśa | Tat-sutō Vishṇuvarddhanash=shat-trimśataṁ | Tat-sutō Vijayāditya-narēndra-
 [¹²] mṛigarājas=ch=āshṭā-chatvārimśataṁ | Tat-sutah Kali-Vishṇuvarddhanō ddhy(dhy)-ariddha-
 varsha(rshā)ni ||
 [¹³] Tat-sutō Guṇagāṁka-Vijayādityas=chatur=chatvārimśataṁ | Ta-
 [¹⁴] d-anuja-yuvarājah(ja)-Vikramāditya-bhūpatēḥ sūnus=Chālukya-
 [¹⁵] Bhīma-bhūpālas=trimśataṁ || Tat-putrah Kollabhigaṇḍa-Vijayā-
 [¹⁶] dityah shaṇ=māsān | Tat-sū[nu³]r=Amma-rājah sapta varsha(rshā)ni || Tat-sutam Vijayā-
 [¹⁷] dityam bālam=uchohātya Tālapō māsam=ēkaṁ | (||) Tam jivā yudhi Chālukya-
 [¹⁸] Bhīma-bhūmipatēs=sutah Vikramāditya-bhūpō pān=ma(mā)sān=ēkādaśa kshitiṁ | (||)

Second plate; second side.

- [¹⁹] Tatas=Tālapa-rājasya sūnus=sūnrita-vāk=prabhūḥ Yuddhamalla-dharādhi-
 [²⁰] śas=sapta varsha(rshā)gy=apād=bhuvam || Nirjity=Ārjjuna-sannibhō janapadāt=ta(tam)
 nirggama-
 [²¹] yy=ōddhatān dāyādān=ina-bhānu-līna-bha-gaṇ-ākārān=vidhāy=ētarān | Va-
 [²²] jr=iv=ōrjjita-nākam=Amma-nripatē(tēr)=bhrātā kanīyān=bhuvam Bhīmō Bhīma-parākra-
 [²³] mas=samabhunak=sa(sam)vatsarān=dvā[da⁴]śa || Tasya Mahēśvara-mūrttēr=Umā-
 [²⁴] samān-ākṛitēḥ Kumār-ābhah Lōkamahādēvyāḥ khalu yas=sama-
 [²⁵] bhavad=Amma-rāj-ākhyah || Jalajātapatra-chāmara-kalaś-āṁkusa-lakshaṇ-ām-
 [²⁶] ka-kara-charaṇa-talah | lasad-ājanv-n(ā)lambita-bhuja-yuga-pari(ri)ghō girindra-
 [²⁷] sām-ūraskah || Vidita-dharādhipa-vidyō vividh-āyudha-kōvidō vilin-āri-

Third plate; first side.

- [²⁸] kulah | kari-turag-āgama-kusālō Hara-charaṇ-āmbhōja-yugala-madhupah
 [²⁹] śrīmān || Kavi-gāyaka-kalpataru(rur)=dvija-muni-din-āndha-bandhujana-surabhiḥ
 [³⁰] yāchaka-jana-chintamanir=avanīsa-manir=mmah-ōgra-mahasā dyumanīḥ [||⁵]
 [³¹] Giri-rasa-vasu-samkhy-ābdē Śaka-samayē Mārggaśirsha-māsē smin
 [³²] kṛishṇa-trayōdaśa-dinē Bhṛiguvārē Maitra-nakshatrē || Dhanushi ravan gha-
 [³³] ta-lagnē dvādaśa-varshā(rshē) tu janmanah patam(ttam) | yō dhād=udaya-giri-
 [³⁴] ndrō(ndrē) ravir=iva lōk-ānurāgāya || Yasmin śāsati nripē(pa)tau paripakv-ānēka-
 [³⁵] sasya-sampach-chhālīḥ | satata-payōdhēnur=abhīr=nnirītir=aparuj(g)=nirasta-chō-
 [³⁶] rō dēśah || Yō rūpēṇa Manōjam vibhavēna Mahēndram=ahimakaram=uru

Third plate; second side.

- [³⁷] mahasā | Haram=ari-pura-ha[na⁶]nēna nyakkurvvā(rvva)n=bhāti vidita-dig-avani-rkl(ki)tiḥ-
 (rttiḥ ||)
 [³⁸] Sa samasta-bhuvan-āśraya-Śrī-Vijayāditya-mahārāj-ādhirājā(jah)
 [³⁹] param-ēśvarah parama-bhattārakah parama-brahmanyah Pennātavāḍi-visha-
 [⁴⁰] ya-nivāsino Rāshṭrakūṭa-pramukhān kṛtumbinas=sarvvān=ā-
 [⁴¹] hūy=ēttam=ājnapayati [||⁷] Veditam=astu vah || Jagati prathi-

¹ The *Anusvāra* and the following letter, —*chha*,—are omitted altogether in the original.

² This letter, —*dē*,—also, is omitted in the original.

³ This letter, —*nu*,—again, is omitted in the original.

⁴ This letter, —*da*,—again, is omitted in the original.

⁵ This mark of punctuation is omitted in the original.

⁶ This letter, —*na*,—is omitted in the original.

⁷ This mark of punctuation is not in the original.

DATED ABOUT ŚAKA 867.

IV b.

[illegible]

✓

[illegible]

SEAL



1

[illegible][illegible]

- [¹⁴] tan=dharâmarânâm charaṇam Vâjasaneyam=asti bhūyah | śru-
 [¹⁵] ti-chôdita-dharmma-yuktam vara-yôgîśvara-Yājñavalkya-grīhyam || Tat=âbhava-
 [¹⁶] d=Bharadvāja-gôtraḥ pātran=dvij-ôttamaḥ | Kalvatorru-nivāstavyô nāmā Pā-
 [¹⁷] liyapeddiyaḥ || Tasy=âpi Guṇḍasarmm=âsit=sūnur=ônētarah prabhuh |

Fourth plate ; first side.

- [¹⁸] guṇi ghṛiṇi dhanî dānî mânî mânava-pūjitaḥ || Tasy=âbhavat=Paṇḍi-
 [¹⁹] ya-nāmadhēyas=satām vidhēyô nuta-rūpa-dhēyah | putrô yam=atra-
 [²⁰] sta-manāḥ pavitras=trayi samāchāra-vichāra-nishtah || Tasmai madiya-
 [²¹] pād-ârādhana-tatparāya brahmachārīṇē kārppatikāya bha-
 [²²] vad-vishayô Paḍamkalūru-nāmā grāmas=sarvv-ākāra-parihāra-
 [²³] m=agrāhārikṛitya sōma-grahana-nimittam=asmābhir=ddattas=tat-kappa(rppa)ta-vimô-
 [²⁴] kshaṇam=uddiśy=ēti || Tasy=âvadhayaḥ [|] Pūrvvâ(rvva)taḥ Maṇupaḍuam tasya si-
 [²⁵] m=aiva simâ || Daksha(kshi)ṇataḥ Eṇḍalūru tasya sim=aiva simâ || Pāschima-

Fourth plate ; second side.

- [²⁶] taḥ Kāṇḍrû(?ntrû)ru tasya sim=aiva simâ || Uttarataḥ Alapūruh Dṛiṇthama-
 [²⁷] pūṇḍi(?ṇṭi)ś=cha || Íśanataḥ Nandigāmaḥ êtaḍ-grāma-sim=aiv=āsyā simâ || A-
 [²⁸] sy=ôpari na kēnachid=bādhā karttavyā yaḥ karôti sa pañcha-mahāpāta-
 [²⁹] ka-samyuktô bhavati [|] Tathā ch=ôktam bhagavāta(tā) Vyāsēna || Bahu-
 [³⁰] bhir=vvasudhā dattā bahu[bhî']ś=ch=ânupālita yasya yasya ya-
 [³¹] dā bhūmis=tasya tasya tadā phalam || Sva-dattām para-dattām vā yô ha-
 [³²] rêta vasundharām shashti-varsha-sahasrāṇi viśtāyâ(yām) jāyatē kṛimih ||
 [³³] Anyēn=āpy=uktam || Dānam bhuvô nupālanam=ity=ubbayan=dharmma-sādha-

Fifth plate.

- [³⁴] nam prôktam=iha rāgād-dadāti sarvvas=tasmād=anupālanam=mahiyô
 [³⁵] dānāt || A(ā)jñāptih Katakārājah || Kāvya(vyām) Ma(mā)dhavabhātā(tā)sya || Jô-
 [³⁶] ntāchāryya(ryyô)ṇa likhitam ||

Translation.

Hail ! Kubja-Vishṇuvardhana,—the brother of Satyâśraya-Vallabhendra, who adorned the family of the Châlukyas, who are glorious; who are of the lineage of Mānavya, which is praised over the whole earth; who are the descendants of Hārīti; who have acquired sovereignty through the excellent favour of Kanśikī¹¹; who have been cherished by the assemblage of (divine) mothers; who meditate on the feet of Svāmi-Mahāśēna; who have the territories of their enemies made subject to them on the instant at the sight of the excellent sign of the Boar, which they acquired through the favour of the holy Nārāyaṇa; and whose bodies are purified by ablutions performed after celebrating horse-sacrifices,—ruled over the country of Veṅgī for eighteen years.

His son, Jayasimha, (ruled) for thirty (years).

Vishṇuvardhana, — the son of his younger brother, king Indra,—(ruled) for nine (years).

His son, the Yuvarāja Maṅgi, (ruled) for twenty-five (years).

His son, Jayasimha, (ruled) for thirteen (years).

His younger brother, Kokkili, (ruled) for six months.

His elder brother, Vishṇuvardhana, having expelled him, (ruled) for thirty-seven (years).

His son, Vijayāditya, the venerable one (ruled) for eighteen (years).

His son, Vishṇuvardhana, (ruled) for thirty-six (years).

And his son, Vijayāditya, who was a very lion of a king, (ruled) for forty-eight (years).

His son, Kali-Vishṇuvardhana¹², (ruled) for one and a half years.

⁸ This mark of punctuation, also, is not in the original.

⁹ This mark of punctuation, again, is not in the original.

¹⁰ This letter,—bhî,—is omitted in the original.

¹¹ Durgā, Pārvatī.

¹² In verse 9 of the grant of Govinda III., Rāsthôr, published by Dr. Bühler at pp. 59 et seqq. of this volume, a similar title, 'Kali-Vallabha,' is explained to mean 'the beloved of the Kaliyuga.' But, in the southern inscrip-

His son, Guṇagāṅka-Vijayāditya, (ruled) for forty-four (years).

The king, Chālukya-Bhīma,—the son of his younger brother, the Yuvarāja, Vikramāditya, (ruled) for thirty (years).

His son, Kollabhigaṇḍa-Vijayāditya, (ruled) for six months.

His son, king Amma, (ruled) for seven years.

Having expelled his son Vijayāditya, (while he was) a child,—Tālapa (ruled) for one month.

Having conquered him in battle,—king Vikramāditya, the son of the king Chālukya Bhīma, ruled the earth for eleven months.

Then king Yuddhamalla,—the son of king Tālapa; the lord, whose speech was pleasing yet truthful,—ruled the earth for seven years.

Having conquered him, and having driven him out from the country, and having made the other claimants to assume the appearance of stars absorbed in the rays of the sun,—the younger brother of king Amma, (viz.) Bhīma, who was like Arjuna, and who was possessed of terrible prowess, ruled the earth for twelve years, just as the wielder of the thunderbolts (rules) the mighty (expanse of the) sky.

To him, who was like Mahāśvara¹³, from Lōkamahādēvi, who was like Umā¹⁴, there was born king Amma, who was like Kumāra¹⁵. The palms of his hands, and the soles of his feet, were marked with lotus-leaves and chouris and water-jars and elephant-goats¹⁶; his arms, which were as (strong and massive as) iron door-bars, were charming, and hung down as far as his knees; and his chest was as (broad as) a table-land of the king of mountains.¹⁷ He acquired the learning of kings, and was skilled in the use of various weapons; he destroyed the families of his enemies; he was versed in the treatises (relating to the management) of elephants and horses; he was a bee at the lotuses which are the feet of Hara¹⁸, and he was

glorious. He was a very tree of paradise to poets and minstrels; he was a very cow of plenty to the twice-born and holy men and the poor and the blind and his relations; he was a very philosopher's stone to those who begged of him; he was a very jewel of a king, and a very sun by reason of his fierce brilliance. Like the sun on the mountain of dawn, to the delight of mankind, he assumed the crown in the twelfth year of his birth, in the year that had the enumeration of the (seven) mountains and the (six) flavours and the (eight kinds of demigod called) Vasu, in the Śaka era¹⁹, in the month Mārgaśīrsha, on the thirteenth day of the dark fortnight, on Friday, under the constellation Maitra, under the zodiacal sign of the bow, while the sun was in the sign of the watering-pot. While he was reigning, the country abounded in many ripened grains and rice, and had cows that were always yielding milk, and was free from fear and free from drought and free from sickness, and had all thieves banished. Putting the Mind-born²⁰ to shame with his beauty, and Mahendra²¹ with his power, and the hot-rayed (sun) with his great splendour, and Hara by the destruction of the cities of his foes,—he is resplendent, having his fame recognized over the quarters of the regions and over the earth.

He, Śrī-Vijayāditya,—the asylum of the universe, the great king, the supreme king, the supreme lord, the most venerable, the worshipper of Brahma as the supreme God,—having called together the householders, headed by the Rāshṭrakūṭas, who inhabit the district of Pennāta vāḍi, thus issues his commands:—

“Be it known to you! The Vājasaṇēya charana²² of Brāhmaṇs,—full of religion that is inculcated by the sacred texts, and following the domestic ritual of Yājñavalkya, the excellent chief of ascetics,—is renowned in the world. In it there was Pāliya-peḍḍiya, of the Bharadvāja gōtra, a worthy man, the best of Brāhmaṇs, an inhabitant of (the village of) Kalvatorru

tions, the word *kali*, when used in this way, is undoubtedly the Canarese *kali*, ‘a valiant man, a hero; brave, courageous,’ and it has that meaning here. Conf. ‘*kali Sēna-bhūbhūja*,’ ‘the brave king Sēna,’ in l. 29 of No. IV, of my *Rāja* inscriptions (*Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc.*, No. xxix, vol. X., p. 218). It has the same meaning in ‘*Kali-Vikrama*,’ one of the names of Vikramāditya-Tribhuvanamalla.

¹³ Śiva.

¹⁴ Pārvatī.

¹⁵ Kārttikēya, the son of Śiva and Pārvatī.

¹⁶ These are held to be auspicious marks.

¹⁷ Himālaya.

¹⁸ Śiva.

¹⁹ i.e. in the Śaka year 867.

²⁰ Kāmadēva.

²¹ Indra.

²² Charana,—‘sect, school, branch of the Vēdas.’

And his son was Guṇḍaśarmā, the perfect one, the powerful one,—virtuous, and compassionate, and wealthy, and liberal, and highly honoured, and worshipped by men. His son was Paṇḍiṃya,—worthy to be prescribed (as an example) for good people, possessing a personal appearance that was commended, having an undisturbed mind, pure, versed in the three (Védas), and resolute in investigating proper behaviour. To him, the religious student, the pilgrim, who has devoted himself to conciliating my feet, the village named Paḍamkalûru, in your district, has been given by us, on the occasion of an eclipse of the moon, as an Agráhāra grant, with relinquishment of all dues,²³ in order to free him from (the necessity of continuing) his pilgrimages. The boundaries of it are:—On the East, (there is) (the village of) (?) Marupaḍuva; the boundary of this is the boundary. On the South, (there is) the village of Eṇḍalûru; the boundary of this is the boundary. On the West, (there is) the village of Kāṇḍrûru; the boundary of

this is the boundary. On the North, (there are) the village of Âlapûru and (the village of) Driṇṭhamapûṇḍi. On the North-east, (there is) the village of Nandigāma; the boundary of this village is the boundary of it. No molestation is to be offered to this (grant); he, who offers it, becomes guilty of the five great sins! And so it has been said by the holy Vyāsa:—‘Land has been given by many, and has been preserved (in grant) by many; he, who for the time being possesses land, enjoys the benefit of it! He is born for the duration of sixty thousand years as a worm in ordure, who appropriates land that has been given, whether by himself or by another! A gift of land, and the preservation (of a grant of land),—both of these are said to be the means of performing religious duty; as to this matter,—everyone gives from pleasure; therefore preservation is more worthy than giving!’ The specification is Kaṭakarāja.²⁴ The poetry is the composition of Mādhavabhaṭṭa. It has been written by Jñāntachārya.”

NOTICE OF A REMARKABLE HYPÆTHRAL TEMPLE IN THE HILL TRACTS OF ORISSA; WITH REMARKS ON THE IDENTIFICATION OF ANCIENT SITES.

BY SIR WALTER ELLIOT, K.C.S.I.

In the month of October 1853 I received a letter from my friend Colonel Campbell, C.B.,¹ Agent for the Suppression of Human Sacrifices, and Female Infanticide in Orissa, who had not long before returned to Russel Konda from his annual tour through the Khond Mālias, enclosing a very rough sketch of a singular temple he had met with, some months before. It exhibits an open circular temple or enclosure of plain cut stone exteriorly, the interior of the wall occupied by niches, each containing a statue or figure, which the Colonel described as “goddesses,” but of which no exact representation or description had been preserved. In the centre, fronting the single doorway, is a shrine, or maṇḍapa, covering a slab, on which is carved in relief a sitting figure, with the right foot on an elephant, the left on a bullock; but

whether Colonel Campbell meant over, or actually resting on the animals, I cannot say. The figure appeared to have three faces, in the right hand a sceptre (?), in the left a lotus, but from the imperfection of the sketch it is impossible to speak with any certainty on all the minutiae of detail. Regarding the niches round the inside of the wall, all that can be said is, that they were ranged side by side, and amounted to some sixty or seventy in number: of these the Colonel wrote, “I am not sure whether there was any ornamental work over these figures, or whether they were seated or standing.”

The following is the extract I got from Colonel Campbell’s journal, when I met him at a subsequent period, which contains all the information he was able to furnish:—

“[Wantarla], 28th January 1853. Went to see

²³ Akāra, in this sense, is a Canarese corruption of a Sanskrit word.

²⁴ Ajñāptik Kaṭakarāja; l. 68. Either Kaṭakarāja may be a proper name, of some noble or official; or it may mean ‘the king of (the country of) Kaṭaka’ (Outlack); or it may mean ‘the king (i.e. governor) of the city.’ In the last case, the expression here used may be compared with Atr=ajñāptir=durgapati. Vijayardjaśāsanakṛtā, in ll. 14-15, Pl. II., a, of the (?) Chalukya grant Jour. Bo. Br.

R. As. Soc., Vol. X., No. xxx., p. 348. The expression is one of not quite certain meaning. Conf. the amended reading (noted in the Errata to Vol. V.) of ll. 10-11 of No. XVIII. of this Series (Vol. V., p. 176).—Tatr=ajñāptik Kulaku(?)ra-bhājakaḥ, and the amended footnote to the translation of the same. Conf. also, No. XXI., ll. 12-13, ante, p. 24).—Tatr=ajñāptik Dāmaktṛiti-bhājakaḥ Jiyantāś=ch=dyuktakāḥ sarvasya=anushāhātā iti.

¹ Now Major-General Sir John Campbell, K.C.S.I.

the temple of (.....) near *Surâdd*; there and back 22 miles. About 120 temples of from fifteen to forty feet high, built on an extensive flat (area of) rock; all of cut stone, without cement. (Among them is) a circular wall (or enclosure) seventy yards round and twelve feet high, (also) of cut stone, with sixty-five or sixty-nine niches inside, containing (figures of about) sixty goddesses, and in the centre a square open place (or shrine) with a remarkable figure tolerably carved, as were all. Many of these figures were unknown to my people. There was also a large temple of bricks (or brick work constructed) without cement, and rapidly going to decay, as were the stone temples (also, many of which were) tumbling down.²

"It was a most interesting sight. The tradition is that these were built by (a people called) the——, who were driven out by the Khonds. The country has all the appearance of having been at one time prosperous and highly cultivated. On the large temple there is some writing, (apparently) in the *Dēvanāgarī* character." The next entry in the journal is "*Saturday, 29th January.*—*Tirtalgarh*,³ where there is another strange temple."

Although the foregoing description is somewhat loose and vague, it indicates unmistakably the existence of remains possessing no common interest. We must remember that it was the result of a hasty visit by an officer engaged in very harassing and important duties in an unhealthy country, that no notes were made at the moment on the spot, and that the details are given from subsequent recollection.

The place is again described in a narrative printed for private circulation in 1861, in terms differing little from the foregoing, but which enable us to fix the site with more exactness.⁴ Leaving *Goderi*, in the *Chinna Kimedi* *Zamindāri*, to the west of *Barhāmpur*, on the 12th of

January 1853, Colonel Campbell marched to *Bissām Katāka*, in the *Jepur Zamindāri*, from which he entered the *Kālāhāndi* or *Khāronḍ Zamindāri*, the capital of which is *Junāgaḍh*. North of *Kālāhāndi* is the *Pātan* or *Patana Zamindāri*, into which he had passed when he discovered the temples on the 28th of January, and from which he then proceeded to (*Madanpur*), a district tributary to *Kālāhāndi*. All of these places are shown in Walker's large Map of India, published by Allen in 1871, except *Bissām Katāka*, which appears, however, in the very defective sheet (as regards the hill tracts) of the Great Trigonometrical Survey 4-inch scale sheet No. 107. It may therefore be assumed that the proximate position of the ruins is a little to the north of lat. 20°, and about long. 83°.

One of the most obvious reflections suggested by these remains is the indication they afford of the existence at an early period, in tracts now overrun with unhealthy jungle, of a high state of civilization, of the origin and decay of which no account, nor even reliable tradition, survives. Nor is this a singular instance. Colonel Dalton describes the conquest of *Chutiā Nāgpur* by an invasion of the *Kōls* and *Hōs*, people living under a republican confederation of tribes like the *Kurumbars* of Southern India, at a period so distant that it is impossible to assign even an approximate date, but probably more than 2000 years ago. According to their own tradition, they displaced a still earlier race, vaguely called *Jains* and *Bhūyahs* (= *autochthones*),⁵ who appear to have made a considerable advance in the arts; for Mr. Vincent Ball, of the Geological Survey, in another paper describing the remains of extensive metallurgical operations, as well as remains of tanks, in *Singbhum*, found them attributed by tradition to an extinct race called *Seruks*, who

² I have supplied the words within brackets.—W. E.

³ Probably *Tirtalgaḍh*.

⁴ Narrative by Major-Gen. John Campbell, C.B., of his *Operations in the Hill Tracts of Orissa, &c. &c.*, printed for private circulation, (London, Hurst and Blackett, 1861), where at page 167 he writes as follows:—

"At some distance from a village called *Surâdd* may be seen a remarkable collection of pagodas, which I visited, and counted one hundred and twenty of various dimensions. They were built of cut stone, without cement, and most of them are in a state of dilapidation. On the largest temple is some writing in the "*Dēvanāgarī*" character, but now illegible. In the centre of this group of pagodas was a circle two hundred and ten feet in circumference, surrounded by a wall of cut stone twelve feet high, with sixty-five niches on the inner side,

containing sixty figures of goddesses in a variety of attitudes, and in the centre of the circle, placed upon a raised platform, sat a remarkable figure, tolerably carved, as were also the others, in stone. Few of these deities were recognized by my people, though among them were two *Brāhmanas*. The tradition here is, that these temples were built by magicians; and the guide, who pointed out the way, would not go within two miles of them. Even my own people were rather uneasy. The conclusion that I came to was, that this part of the country must have been occupied by a race of Hindus of whom there is now no trace. It is now thinly inhabited by a comparatively civilized people who call themselves *Khonds*, though they do not speak their dialect. Their language and dress are *Ooryah* (*Uriya*), and they are very industrious."

⁵ *Jour. As. Soc. Beng.* vol. XXXV. pt. ii. p. 164.

had been governed by a Rāja with two tongues [*do-jibh*], which Col. Dalton explained to signify that the potentate to which it alludes must have been a Nāg, or one of the serpent race.⁵ These and similar tales point to a time when Dasys, Rākshasas, Paisāchis,—monkeys, as they are contemptuously designated,—were the ruling occupants of the land, every trace of whom it is the business of the archæologist to collect and preserve.

One of the most useful functions of the *Indian Antiquary* is the preservation of casual notices of objects of interest which may serve to stimulate a more complete examination of them by those who have time and opportunity for the task. Curious and often extensive remains are found in many parts of India, an exact topographical description of which would help greatly to the identification of names and places still a puzzle to the archæologist and geographer.

The late Dr. John Wilson, when President of the Bombay Branch Royal Asiatic Society, read a memoir on the Cave Temples and other ancient remains of Western India, in 1850,⁶ in which he dwelt strongly on the importance of investigations of this description. Among other desiderata he called special attention to "the inspection of the sites of ancient towns in all parts of the country, and to the vigorous prosecution of research connected with their ruins, and relics, their wells and tanks, and even of their foundations."⁷

I can bear witness to the value of these suggestions from my own experience. Some years ago I published an inscription on copper,⁸ relating to the little-known dynasty of the Pallavas, whose capital was stated to be⁹ Vengipūram, the name and site of which were till then unknown. After much inquiry, I pitched on a place in the Masulipatam district,

which, accepted as correct by General Cunningham,¹⁰ has been considered open to question elsewhere. Subsequently I had an opportunity of examining the place in person, and satisfied myself that my first surmise was right. I found a parallelogram of considerable extent enclosed by lofty mounds within which were many ruins and the *débris* of ancient temples, &c. I regretted not being able to procure a regular plan and survey, but time and other avocations did not permit.

South of this spot on the banks of the Krishna is Dhārānikoṭa, close to the recent town of Amravati. It is probably the ancient capital of the Andhrā kings. The remains are extensive, and a survey and topographical description of them is greatly to be desired.

In Ganjam a remarkable site is found in the Pūbekondah Tālukā near the rock inscribed with another of Aśoka's celebrated edicts. It is called Jogaḍh. The grass-grown walls were of great height, and coins of a peculiar character are found in and around it. It would well repay careful examination.

I could name many other spots of historical interest of which little more is known than the name. Such are the old Chola capital of Gangondaram, in South Ārkāt; Talakāḍa, a seat of the Chēras in Maisur, now half buried in the sand; Ratnapur, in the Raipur division of the Central Provinces, where are extensive ruins; Korkei, an early Pāṇḍya city, where Bishop Caldwell has lately been making excavations¹¹; &c. &c., of all of which, and of many more that could be named, accurate plans illustrated by sketches and descriptive details would be very valuable. But my object now is only to draw the attention of readers of the *Antiquary* to objects, within the reach of many of them, possessing surpassing interest.

ARCHÆOLOGICAL NOTES.

BY M. J. WALHOUSE, LATE M.C.S.

(Continued from vol. VI. page 216.)

No. XVI.—Chivalry in Lower India.

Europeans are apt to imagine that few races are more devoid of the spirit of knight-errantry and chivalrous daring and courtesy than the Hindus, and that the feudal ideas of allegiance

and devotion are alien to their genius. Yet the knightly and noble customs and demeanour of the Rājputs, so picturesquely related by Colonel Tod, may be ranked with anything told

⁵ *Proc. As. Soc. Beng.* 1869, pp. 171-2.

⁶ *Jour. B. Br. R. As. Soc.* vol. III. pt. ii. pp. 36-107.

⁷ *Ibid.* p. 101. ⁸ *Mad. Jour. Lit. & Sc.* vol. XI. p. 304.

⁹ *Ind. Ant.* vol. II. p. 156, vol. V. p. 50.

¹⁰ *Geography of India*, p. 516.

¹¹ *Ind. Ant.* vol. VI. p. 80.—Ed.

in the chronicles of romance ; and even down in the far South, amid nations of Drāvidian descent, there are stories popularly current of champions and exploits which Don Quixote would have put on the same shelf with the deeds of Anadis and Palmerin. Some instances selected from the collection of *Oriental Historical Manuscripts*, edited by the Rev. W. Taylor, may not be uninteresting; or unbefitting the *Indian Antiquary*.

Told still under village trees and at festival gatherings is the story of king Viśvanātha, who ruled over the broad regions of Pāṇḍya-land from Ārkāt down to Travankor. His birth was not, of course, like the births of common men. In mediæval romance some faëry lady or enchanted princess would have been his mother, but in the East the tale goes that his father, Nāgama, whom Don Quixote would have called the Knight of the Serpent, was a great warrior and leader of armies, and, after being long childless, vowed to go in pilgrim guise to Kāśī, and try whether penitence and devotion would win his patron saint or god to grant him a son. So there he went, and after forty days of abstinence and prayer by the sacred stream the god vouchsafed a sign of acceptance, for, whilst bathing, his foot struck against a stone that proved to be an emerald *lingam*, and in a dream it was conveyed to him that if he returned home he should have a child. So in due time a boy was born, whom he named Viśvanātha, as a gift from the god, and who, when he was sixteen, surpassed all his peers in beauty, accomplishments, and skill in all weapons. Afterwards, when he came to the throne, he made his capital city, Mādura, a moated and walled town, building a mighty rampart round it with circular bastions at intervals, seventy-two in all. Each bastion, with its adjoining wall, he gave in charge to one of his chiefs to hold, defend, and keep in repair; and, on the further condition of their raising and keeping always ready a contingent of troops for his service in time of need, he gave withal extensive districts to the chiefs in fief-liege. This was the origin of the Pāligārs, a class well known to us in our early wars. Many of the bastions and much of the wall remain still, or did till lately, and many of the representatives of the chiefs survive on the lands then granted to this day. Here was feudal tenure and service established as firmly as by William the Conqueror and his

barons, and Viśvanātha surrounded by his chiefs recalls, not so remotely, king Arthur and his Round Table.

Of the many stories told of king Viśvanātha we will take that regarding how he dealt with five rebellious chieftains; it will perhaps be better told in minstrel measure, into which the words of the old chronicle readily slip:—

“Five chieftains in the Southland had tribute used to bring,

As vassals liege and loyal, to the great Pandion king;

But now, together banding, to their sovereign lord said they,

‘Fetch the tribute if you want it, for we will no longer pay.’

‘Is it so?’ said Viśvanātha; ‘be ye sure we’ll not be slack

To come with men enough withal to bring the tribute back.”

So with an army forth he marched, and carried war amain

O’er all those rebels’ lands; but they the contest did sustain,

For stout and fierce they were; and men on both sides thickly fell,

Till in camp and all the country round did moan and wailing swell;

And Viśvanātha heard it, and in his heart he thought

That for him and for his glory such misery was wrought.

Forthwith he wrote a letter and bade his herald go And to the rebel leader this royal message show :

‘Bethink ye now : ye are but five, and I one man alone,

Yet for our sakes ariseth up such grievous wail and moan.

This may not be; now list to me : let either force draw back

And a stone pillar build between, restraining all attack ;

And let us write a solemn pledge, and lay it on the stone,

That ye five chiefs shall thither come and fight with me alone,

And if I conquer, then all ye, with but the weeds ye wear,

Yielding to me your lands and wealth, away on foot shall fare ;

But should ye overcome, then I to you will render all

My kingdom and my riches, and abide your humble thrall.

Now let this vow be written, and on the pillar laid,

And meet me in fight before it, and so this feud
be stayed.'

The five chiefs hearkened together, and thus reply
made they :—

'For one to fight with five men it were no equal
fray ;

Better it were that one this quarrel with thee
should try.'

So answer they sent ; and thus Viśvanātha made
reply :—

'Look now ; ye are five rulers and o'er countries
five bear away,

And I, one king, come hither to force ye to obey,
And to me alone yield homage : 'tis therefore meet
and right

That ye five all together with me alone should
fight.'

Howbeit they would not hearken, but chose the
mightiest lord

In chain-mail dight, and girded with the goodliest-
tempered sword,

Mounted upon a war-steed ; and so in the midway
space

The chief met Viśvanātha by the pillar face to
face.

Lightly the great Pandion said to that champion
lord,

'Strike first,' and he smote, but deftly the monarch
turned the sword.

'Now strike in thy turn,' undaunted the rebel
foeman cried.

'Be sure thou need'st not hasten,' the warrior-king
replied,

'But three more blows yet strike thou, nor stint
to strike amain.'

And thrice the chieftain smote him, but ever the
stroke was vain.

Then the Rāja Viśvanātha spake high to the
rebel foe,

'Now take good heed,' and smote him an exceeding
mighty blow ;

No mail the dint might hinder, it clave him right
in twain,

And the sundered trunk fell right and left upon
the reddened plain.

Then their lands the four chiefs rendered, and all
in sad array,

Alone, as their oath had bound them, went wander-
ing far away."

Now this was a passage of arms hardly sur-
passed in any chronicle of romance, and instinct
with the true spirit of chivalry. The king's
compassionate feeling for the feeble, his desire
to take all the consequences of his own quarrel
upon himself, and unselfish offer to encounter
desperate odds, his courtesy and forbearance to

his opponent, all show him to have been what
old Chaucer would have called "a very parfait
gentil knight." Nor was knightly feeling
lacking in his opponents, rebels though they
were, as proved by their repeated refusal to
accept his challenge at great advantage to them-
selves, and obedience to their vow on defeat.

King Viśvanātha reigned till A.D. 1438, in the
days of our Henry VI., when, though men could
remember the heroic deeds of Jeanne d'Arc, the
institutions of chivalry were beginning to wane.

About two centuries later, when the old
Pāṇḍya dominion had become broken up into
lesser states, and the Muhammadan power had
begun to overshadow the peninsula, Śrī Rāja
Rāṅga Kṛishṇa was ruling in Trichināpalli,
which the great king Viśvanātha is said to
have first fortified. He was a gay and gallant
monarch delighting in bold and adventurous
exploits, not a little after the fashion of the fifth
James of Scotland. In those days, it is said,
the Mughul Pādishāh used to send to all coun-
tries one of his slippers, which was placed in
a state howdah on an elephant, attended by
two Nawābs and several thousand cavalry and
infantry. It was fanned by *chauris*, shaded
by a royal umbrella, and attended by banners,
kettledrums, and music. On reaching the
boundaries of the various kingdoms the pro-
cession halted, and the attendant Nawābs sent
word to the king of each country. These kings
came at the head of their troops, paid homage
to the slipper, lowered their own ensigns to it,
accompanied it to their capitals, and placed it on
their thrones. Costly presents were then made to
the Sardārs, and tribute-money delivered up to
them. The Pāṇḍya country, however, being so
far, the imperial slipper had not hitherto reached
it. Nevertheless, whilst Rāja Rāṅga Kṛishṇa was
reigning, the two Nawābs, with all the troops and
insignia attendant, set their faces thitherward,
and came to the boundary of the kingdom north
of Trichināpalli. Halting there, the Nawābs sent
chobdārs with silver sticks to inform the king
that the imperial slipper had arrived. The Rāja
having heard the message replied, "Return and
tell the Nawābs that we are unwell, and can-
not come so far, but if they and all the retinue
will come to the other bank of the Kāvéri river
outside the town we will meet them there." The
Nawābs received the answer with some
anger, but nevertheless advanced, and on crossing

the Kāvêri and still not seeing the king became excessively enraged. Messengers, however, came and appeased them, saying that the Râja, being exceedingly ill, would meet them in a palanquin just within the fort gate. Meanwhile orders had been given to the guard only to allow the elephant and slipper, with the Nawâbs and principal men, inside the gate, but not the rest of the troops. So the chief men in charge of the slipper entered, and still not seeing the king grew more enraged, but the others said, "Our king is too sick to enter a palanquin; come with us to the palace gates." Accordingly they came to the gates of the palace, but the king did not appear. Then, filled with fury at the disrespect implied, they took the slipper from the howdah and carried it into the hall of audience, where they found Śrî Râja Rânga Kṛishṇa arrayed in royal robes, seated on his throne, and surrounded by his nobles and retainers. Seeing that he did not make the least motion of respect towards the slipper or themselves, the Pâdishâh's Nawâbs and men, highly incensed, pushed roughly forward, and coming near offered to give the slipper into the hands of the king. He angrily bid them place it on the floor, but without heeding they again tried to put it into his hands. Thereupon the king called loudly and angrily for men with whips, saying, "We will see whether the Pâdishâh's people will put the slipper down or not." Then they became alarmed and threw it down, and the king putting one of his feet in it said to them, "Has your Pâdishâh lost his senses? When sending foot-furniture for us, why sends he not two slippers instead of one? Get ye back and bring another slipper." On their answering fiercely, the king had them beaten and driven out. When they got outside they began to draw up their troops threateningly, but the king sending out a great force fell on them and cut them up. When the matter came to the Pâdishâh's ears, on thinking it over he came to the conclusion that in those distant countries, if such messages were sent, the daring of one would be imitated by others; and so, after the high bearing of Râja Rânga Kṛishṇa, he ceased sending his slipper round to the different rulers.

The editor of the Manuscripts hardly knows what to make of this singular affair, and inclines to think that, if true at all, it refers to the pride of Aurangzib, who styled all native

princes merely zamindârs, and aimed at the subjugation of all the south of India. Ferishtah states that Aurangzib's general made a long journey to Trichinâpalli and Tanjor, and received tribute from the zamindârs of those capitals. This was doubtless done with all Muhammadan haughtiness, and if the long distance emboldened a native prince to offer a successful check, pride might not have tolerated so humiliating an admission by Ferishtah, who gives no details, whilst the narrative of the native historian is very minute and circumstantial, and wears much appearance of truth.

Another adventure of this gay and *débonnaire* king is thus told. One evening he mounted a very fleet horse, and going out by the eastern gate of the town turned his horse's head towards Tanjor, some thirty miles distant, and rode there at speed unattended, though he was not on good terms with the Tanjor king. Arriving after dark he mingled with the people returning into the city and entered within the gate. Proceeding up the bâzâr street he went to a shopkeeper and said, "I am just arrived, my attendants and money are coming after, meantime advance me one pagoda (3½ rupees) on the deposit of this ring, and get me needful supplies." Then, having had his horse tethered and fed, he entered a Brâhmaṇ choultry and partook of fruits and milk. Subsequently, in the first watch of the night, he disguised himself as a sepoy, entered the palace on foot in the dark, and sat down in the hall of the throne near the king, and listened to all the affairs under discussion. He then surveyed the whole of the palace, and wrote on the door of the private apartments, "To-day we, Râja Kṛishṇa of Trichinâpalli, came here, and having heard all the news of the palace left it and went away." Then quitting the palace he returned to his quarters. Early in the morning he called the shopkeeper and, said, "As our people and money have not come, we will send you your pagoda; you will then return the ring." Then mounting his horse he set off at full speed in high glee, and soon reached Trichinâpalli and entered his palace. Forthwith sending for the ambassador of Tanjor he said, "We have been to your king's town, entered the palace, surveyed the whole of it, and written our name on such a door. We also left our ring with a shopkeeper; write now to your

king to get and send it us. Your king does not keep a proper look-out. He is just and charitable, so we did him no harm, but having penetrated so far we might have slain him and thrown him out of doors. Tell him, therefore, in future to maintain a good guard." So the ambassador wrote, and the king in great amazement went to the door of the private apartments, read what was written on it, and calling the shopkeeper gave him ten pagodas, and taking from him the ring sent it forthwith to the Trichināpalli king. From that time forward he had the palace and fort gates very carefully watched.

Again it is told of Rāṅga Kṛishṇa that when a great vassal Pāligār, who lived some twenty miles from his capital, had been slow in sending, as a sort of tribute-heriot, an incomparably fine elephant which the king desired to have, the latter mounted a swift white horse and rode out fast toward the Pāligār's castle, ordering some troops to follow as fast as they might. Arrived at the castle, he rode in, thrusting aside the men who disputed his entrance, tied his horse to a pillar, and, sitting down on the high seat under the porch, bade the warders go and tell their master that the king was come. The chieftain was then bathing, but, hastily arraying himself, hastened with a golden dish of jewels and laid them submissive before the king's feet. The Rāja then demanded the wonderful elephant that had no fellow. The overawed Pāligār answered, "For such a trifle it needed not the king to have come hither. The elephant is my lord's, but now he is in a furious state, and none dare approach him; when the fit is past I will send him." "Do not think," replied the Rāja, "that we cannot rule an elephant; let it be brought." "But," the Pāligār urged, "the elephant is exceedingly furious; if he sees a white horse he will rush at it and none can stay him. Now my lord is mounted on a white horse." The Rāja, however, heeded not the caution, but commanded the elephant to be brought, and its chain cast off whilst he mounted his horse. This was done with no small danger and difficulty, and the men when the chain was loosened ran aside. So soon as the elephant saw the white horse he rushed at it furiously; but the king, eluding the attack, wheeled and galloped about with most skilful horsemanship, sometimes facing the elephant

and sometimes flying, and so drawing on the infuriated animal, till by degrees he at last brought him all the distance to Trichināpalli and within the walls, where the elephant was mastered by stratagem and bound with strong chains—an exhibition of skill and daring well calculated to impress the people. "Long he ruled," says the chronicle, "with great courage and high justice, and much beloved was he by all folk."

We will conclude with a tale of the downfall of a royal family that shows more high resolve, courage, and devotion than Western people commonly associate with Hindus. About A.D. 1680 an octogenarian king, Achyuta Vijaya Rāghava Naikar, ruled in Tanjor. He had a daughter endowed with extraordinary beauty and ability, the rumour of which reaching the neighbouring king of Trichināpalli he demanded her in marriage, but in a more brusque and peremptory way than the old king her father could stomach. So he refused in no gentle terms. Enraged at this, the Trichināpalli ruler assembled all his forces, and commanded his general to march to Tanjor, invest and storm the fort, and subdue the entire country. The Tanjor troops came out to meet them, but were defeated and driven back, and the fort invested and stormed, and the invading troops surrounded the palace of the old king. The Trichināpalli general, being a high-minded man, now sent to offer terms, and engaged to retire with his troops if the king would ask for peace. The messengers found the ancient monarch engaged in prayer to his favourite god, Nārāyaṇa. He disdained to speak or to interrupt his devotions, but merely made a gesture signifying, "Though all be lost, I will neither sue for peace nor yield my daughter." So the messengers returned and reported to the general, who then advanced his troops up to the gates of the palace. Meanwhile the aged king had finished his devotions, and ordering his daughter, crowned wives, and attendants to assemble in a hall, surrounded them with great vessels filled with powder, laid a train and commanded them to fire it on a given signal. Then he arrayed himself for his last fight, and is described as young-looking for his years, with extremely overhanging eyebrows held up by gold wires, costly robes studded with gems wrapped round him, and in each hand a long brightly burnished gauntlet sword. Most of his people had fled.

Five faithful officers of his bodyguard remained by him. It happened that some time before, in a fit of anger, he had caused his son to be imprisoned, and one of his followers, reminding him of this, said that now was the time for pardon. "It is well," said the old king, "let him be brought." On his appearance, the son, bowing to his father with closed hands, uttered this verse:—
 "The sea buries jewels and throws up a straw,
 Of the treacherous element that is the law;
 But, father and ruler, we'll show now to them
 That a straw is a straw, but a gem is a gem."

Then Achyuta Vijaya Râghava Râja embraced his son, and commanded the signal to be given to the women. Instantly a tremendous explosion took place, and the palace was filled with fire and smoke, walls fell crashing, and flames spread fast. Again the Trichinâpalli commander, coming forward, offered terms. "Once we have spoken," was the reply, "and use no double speech. Is life or honour greatest? We through all ruin will keep our honour. Cease words, and come and fight with us." Then the five devoted followers, rushing in turn before the king, fell after slaying many; and lastly the king and his son, sword in hand, attacked the foe, and were slain, after each had cut down several.

The chronicle adds a circumstance which may

interest some in the days when Spiritualism has many adherents. The old king, when his relations with the Trichinâpalli ruler were friendly, used to resort regularly and pay his devotions at Śrīraṅgam, the great temple adjoining Trichinâpalli, and on the very time of his falling in combat it is said that he appeared at Śrīraṅgam with all his children, wives, and followers who perished with him, whereat the attendant Brâhman said, "See! here is the Tanjor king come to pay his visit to the Lord of Śrīraṅgam;" and, taking them all to the inner shrine, they gave them the sacred *tulsi*, and put the customary crowns upon their heads, when the king with all his retinue, entering the inner recess, disappeared, and were seen no more. Thereupon all the Brâhman exclaimed in amazement, "Here is a miracle!"

One reflection occurs. These tales, and many like them, are told amongst the people, and the countries in which the scenes are laid now form three contiguous zillâs. Many of the palaces and forts built by those bygone kings still remain, and some are used as law-courts and dwelling-places, but though the strangers from the West who sit in them deal out peace and justice, they can hardly replace in the heart and imagination of the people the stirring times and bold deeds of the rulers of their own race.

MISCELLANEA.

GOLDEN MASKS.

The golden mask found by Dr. Schliemann at Mykênê has somewhat perplexed *savants*, who find it difficult to account for the presence of such an article where it was found. Without pretending to solve the difficulty, I wish to note a use of golden masks in this country which may perhaps give some clue. In the royal family of Kolhâpur it has been the custom to build temples, dedicated to the tutelary deity of the family, in memory of deceased Râjas. In one instance I know of a golden mask, supposed to represent the Râja whose memory was thus to be perpetuated, being presented to the temple, to be affixed to the head of the image, and I believe this instance is not a solitary one.

In Mr. Nairne's *Historical Sketch of the Konkan* (p. 72) he mentions a temple (at Sindhudurg, on the coast) dedicated to Śivâji where "the idol which represents him has a silver mask for com-

mon use, and a gold one for festivals, both bearing the semblance of an ordinary Marâṭhâ face."

Doubtless further investigation would show this custom to be not peculiar to Śivâji's family, but to be widely spread in India. We may have here the survival of an ancient Âryan practice which has died out among the Âryan races in Europe.

EDWARD W. WEST.

Sangh, 12th Oct. 1877.

SEPULCHRAL URNS IN THE DISTRICT OF KOIMBATUR.

In the *Indian Antiquary*, vol. VI. p. 279, there appeared an interesting article by the Right Reverend Bishop Caldwell on the sepulchral urns found in various parts of the district of Tinnivelly.¹ A well-informed friend, whose attention I drew to that article, has favoured me with valuable information on similar exhumations

¹ For further information on this subject see *Ind. Ant.* vol. I. pp. 150, 151; vol. II. pp. 7-10, 86-88, 223-228, 275-278; vol. III. pp. 34-36, 53, 54, 277, 278, 306-308; vol.

IV. pp. 12, 13, 305; vol. V. pp. 159, 160, 255, 256; vol. VI. pp. 41 and 230.—Ed.

made in the district of Koimbatur, a part of the Madras Presidency with which he is intimately acquainted. I subjoin it, in the hope that it will interest your readers:—

"These sepulchral urns are found in vast quantities in the Koimbatur district, but the urns are there of a totally different shape—something like this, and even more pointed at the base, and they generally have a little ornament.



"The places of sepulture are also different. Above ground the spot is marked generally by a circle of rough boulders, and in digging within the circle you come upon a massive stone chest, oblong in shape and composed of ponderous slabs. On removing the covering slab it is found that the chest is sometimes divided into two compartments by a transverse slab in the centre. One of the end slabs always has a hole of about six or nine inches in diameter cut in its centre, the edges of which are polished. In these compartments urns of sizes are found full of mould, in which fragments of bones may be discovered. Other urns contain spear and arrow heads. I think the bodies were burnt and the ashes put in the urns, as the fragments of bones seemed to me partly calcined. The local name for these places of sepulture is *Pāḍava kōji*; but, notwithstanding, the legend is that they are the habitations of a race of pygmies, and that the circular holes were the entrances to the dwellings."

RĀMA VARMA.

Queries.

NAMES OF COUNTRIES ENDING IN 'STĀN.'

We see on maps sundry countries, not now intimately connected with India, and sometimes not now occupied by purely Āryan races, but still mainly on the border-lands of the Āryan, Shemitic, and Turānian peoples, marked by names ending in 'stān.' Thus 'Dāghestān,' 'Kurdistān,' 'Lazistān,' 'Gurjistān' (Georgia), &c. The ordinary derivation of 'Hindūstān' is from 'Hindū-sthāna,' the 'place of Hindūs,' and here I believe it is universally acknowledged the right one. The same may be said of 'Baluchistān,' 'Seistān,' 'Zabulistān,' 'Afghānistān,' all of which are near enough to India for the meaning of the word to be known and applied even within historic times.

* 'Thān' is still used in India as the designation of the "place" of a horse or other animal. 'Stall' is the English equivalent. 'Stable' in English is almost identical, both in sound and meaning, with the Persian 'Istābal.' 'Thana' is Indian for a police 'station.' All are undoubtedly connected with the Āryan root 'sth' indicative of locality—including I believe, the 'stān' in question. The main point is whether the meaning of the termination

But I feel doubtful if this can be the case in the instances noted above. Does a Kurd know that 'Kurdistān' means 'place of Kurds,' or one of the Mongolian tribes of the Caucasus recognise 'Dāghestān' as the place of 'Dāghs'? (By the way, does this word indicate the appellation of some obscure or extinct tribe, or is it connected with 'Dāgh' [دَاغ], 'burnt,' or 'Dāgh' [دَاغ], 'mountain')? Are these designations now used, or not, by the present inhabitants? Or were they once in use, but are not so now, but only hold their place in maps and books? Or are they merely conventional terms invented by map-makers and authors, and used for convenience sake for indicating districts designated by other names by those who dwell in them? Does the 'stān' come from some other root, and has it been 'symmetrized' into conformity with 'Hindūstān'? Supposing these terms to be in indigenous use, do those using them retain any inkling of the fact of the word 'stān' meaning a 'place'? Are these names traces of the spread of ancient Āryan power,—'survivals,'—the signification of which is unknown to those who apply them to characterize their native countries? Or is it the case that though the exact meaning of 'stān' may be unknown to Georgian or Kurd, yet that there is enough communication with the East to enable them to understand half-instinctively that as 'Afghānistān' and 'Hindūstān' mean the 'places' of the Afghāns and the Hindūs, so 'Gurjistān' and 'Kurdistān' must mean the 'places' of the Georgians and the Kurds?

The whole subject of the names on the borderland of 'Irān' and 'Turān' is interesting, and I think, if fully gone into by a competent hand, would furnish many facts tending to form materials for another chapter in prehistoric annals, or to illustrate obscure passages of more modern history.

I believe it is pretty certain that the districts in question have had their populations repeatedly changed within comparatively modern times. Now, supposing the names ending with 'stān' to have been originally conferred by pre-historic Āryans, is not the transmission of the names by so many different races a striking instance of the vitality of designations? Or have these names been given by Āryan races first occupying them within the comparatively late historic eras only, though when 'stān' was still in use for the ordinary expression of 'place'? Either conclusion

is now understood by people of the localities indicated (either positively, as being known to mean 'place'; or indirectly from deduction and connection), and whether, if so, this knowledge is inherited from their Āryan ancestors, or (supposing a Shemitic or Turānian superposition of people so complete as to be almost a substitution) by tradition communicated from an earlier race of settlers.

if established would demonstrate an interesting example of philological phenomena.

GAIKVĀDĪ.

THE DIGAMBARA JAINAS.

At Dehli I visited the two temples of the Digambara Jainas in company with Paṇḍit Viśveś-varnātha, and was received by their chief priest, the Bhaṭṭārka, and the ascetics (who are called paṇḍits) in a very friendly manner. They readily answered my questions regarding their religion; they showed me one of their libraries which is kept in the temple near the Chāndni Chouk, gave me a list of the Bhaṭṭārka's books, and offered to copy anything I might require.

During a fortnight's stay [at Jaypur] I became acquainted with some of the best Digambara paṇḍits, and obtained through them a good foundation for a collection of the works of their sect, and more copious information regarding their faith than has fallen to the share of other Sanskritists. From the statements of the Jaypur paṇḍits, which agree in general with those of their Dehli brethren, it appears that the Digambara Jainas are scattered over a great part of eastern Rājputāna, of the Panjāb, of the North-Western Provinces, and of the Central India Agency, and have even some outlying settlements in Gujārat. They name the following towns as the locations of their *Vidyāsthānas*, or seats of learning:—1 Jaypur, 2 Dehli, and Sonpat (where a large *bhaṇḍār* is said to exist), 3 Gwālīor, 4 Ajmir, 5 Nāgar in Rājputāna, 6 Rāmpur-Bhānpur near Indor, 7 Karangi, and 8 Surat. These cities, together with Kārnāta, and a fabulous island Jainabādhri, which is placed 1500 *kos* from Jaypur, beyond Rāmeśvaram, are said to contain altogether sixteen *vidyāsthānas*, among which that at Jaypur is the principal one. The list does not fit the state of things in our days. For instance, in Ajmir and in Surat there is now no learning. There are only small Digambara communities, whose spiritual wants are attended to by very ignorant Bhaṭṭārkas. It is also clear that the author of the list had no very clear idea of the extent of the Jaina colonies of Southern India, as one *vidyāsthāna* only is allotted to the Kārnāta country. But the list seems to give the *gādis*, or seats of high-priests, correctly for Central and North-Western India. It is also indisputable that Jaypur is now the chief seat of Digambara learning. The Digambaras called themselves the *Mulasamgha*, or 'primitive church,' and assert that the Śvetāmbaras seceded from them, while the latter state exactly the opposite.

Like the Śvetāmbaras, they are divided into

ascetics and laymen, or Śrāvakas. The former are now divided into Bhaṭṭārkas, or high-priests, and paṇḍits, or common ascetics; and into four *gachhas*, sects or schools, viz., the Nandigachha, the Sarasvatī, the Bhāratigachha, and the Syenagachha. In older times the Digambara ascetics used to go naked, and from this custom they derive the names Digambara, 'sky-clad,' Nirgranthas, 'without a knot,' Nagnātas, 'naked mendicants.' Now they make a compromise with the spirit of the times and the British law. They maintain, as formerly, in theory that a man can only obtain salvation when he is perfectly *nirmama*, free from all possessions and all desire to possess, and that hence clothes ought not to be worn by a true ascetic. But the paṇḍits wear the usual dress of the country, and even the Bhaṭṭārkas cover themselves with a *chaddar*, which they put off when eating. At their meals they sit perfectly naked, and a pupil rings a bell to keep off all strangers. The laymen are divided into three *Jatis*, or sub-divisions,—Khandarwāl, Agrawāl, and Bahirwāl,—who will eat with each other. But each marries within his own class. Where, as in Dehli, a portion of the Jainas have left the faith and turned Vaishnavas, still intermarriages between them and their Jaina caste-fellows may take place. There are, besides, further sub-divisions of the three *Jatis*. Thus among the Jaypur Khandarwāls there are Viśpanthis and Therāpanthis. The former worship standing, &c., and the latter seated. The literature of the Digambaras is divided into four Vedas, viz.:—

1. The *Prathamānuyoga*, which comprises all works on their *Itihāsa*, their legends and history; to this division belong the twenty-four *Purāṇas*, which give the lives of the twenty-four Tirthankaras, the *Uttarapurāṇa*, *Harivamśapurāṇa*, &c.

2. The *Karandnuyoga*, which includes the works describing the origin and the order of the universe, e.g. *Trilokasāra*, *Tulokabhāṣana*, *Jotishasāra*, *Bijaganita*, *Chandrarprajnapiti*, *Sūryaprajnapiti*, &c.

3. The *Drasyānuyoga*, which treats of their doctrine or philosophy. Some of the chief works belonging to it are the *Jomattasāra*, *Prāvachanasāra*, *Ashṭasahasri*, *Prameyakamala-Mārtanda*, *Rājavarṭtika*, &c.

4. The *Charānānuyoga*, which treats of the *Achāra*, customs, worship, &c. To this subdivision belong the *Trivarnachāra*, *Mulachāra*, *Jogamula*, *Ashṭapādhā*, *Padmānanda-pachchisi*, &c.

These divisions are likewise known to the Śvetāmbara Jainas, though they usually prefer to classify their sacred literature as *Angas*, *Upāṅgas*,

Pāṇḍas, *Chheda*, and *Mūlasūtras*. I was particularly anxious to find out whether the Digambaras agreed with the Śvetāmbaras about any of their inspired works. I soon found that the former hold the twelve *Angas*, the *Dvādaśāṅgī*, in as high esteem as the latter. A list of the *Angas* which they gave me agreed very nearly with that of the Śvetāmbaras. But they asserted that their *Angas*, though bearing the same names as the Śvetāmbara books, differed in substance. In order to test this assertion, I handed to the paṇḍits a copy of the Śvetāmbara *Bhāgavattī*, and they at once conceded that it was the same text which they used every day. In a like manner they recognized the *Jñātādharma-kathā*, the *Upśa-kadaśāṅga*, and the *Avasyakasūtras*. But they were very positive in rejecting as spurious the Śvetāmbara *Achārāṅga*, *Sūtra Kṛitāṅga*, *Nistha*, *Rai-pasmi*, *Kalpa*, *Vrihat Kalpa*, *Nandi*, *Mahāmātiha Anuyogadvāra*, and *Vyavahārasūtras*, as well as ten *Pāṇḍas*. Of some they declared they actually possessed different versions. But, as they produced no manuscripts, I have my doubts on this subject. On the whole it would appear that their libraries are poor in *Angas* and other *Agamas*, and that they do not explain them daily, as is done by the Śvetāmbaras. But the important point which my inquiries have settled is that some of the *Angas*, at least, are common to both Digambaras and Śvetāmbaras, and that the two sects do not possess entirely different sets of scriptures, as has been hitherto supposed. I secured nearly one hundred Digambara works referring to all the four 'Vedas', and a few works belonging to their profane literature, among which I may mention copies of Jainendra's Grammar, with a short commentary and a long one. The former was written 1205 A.D. in the neighbourhood of Kolhāpur; arrangements were also made with one of the paṇḍits to get copies made of a number of works which could not be procured at once. He has since sent me several packets of manuscripts. I visited also the library of the Mahārāja of Jaypur, which is extensive, but has, unfortunately, no trustworthy catalogue. I selected a few *Nāṭakas* and astronomical works for copying. The collection is rich in the latter, as the Mahārāja Jesingh, the founder of Jaypur, was a great mathematician and astronomer, and many of his manuscripts are still extant.

The libraries of the Digambara and Śvetāmbara Jainas who live there [at Ajmir] are not considerable; still I acquired a few of the common *Sūtras* for Cambridge. On the 20th December I proceeded to Merta, the *bhaṇḍār* of which town had been mentioned to me in Bikāner as one of the oldest and best of the Śvetāmbaras. It was very

fortunate that Mr. A. C. Lyall, the acting Agent Governor General in Rājputāna, whom I met in Ajmir, had given the most distinct orders to the Jodhpur Vakil and Darbār that the *bhaṇḍār* was to be shown to me. For I have seldom met with a more obstinate and intractable set of men than the Merta *Panch*. They first tried to deny the possession of books, then they asked for several delays in order to await the return of certain *seths* who had gone on a pilgrimage, and finally they flatly refused to show their treasures. Explanations, orders, entreaties by the officials of the town, offers of money, were equally fruitless. They surrendered only when the Jodhpur Minister sent an order that if within twenty-four hours they did not show their books, the Khotwāl was to undertake the task and to open the *bhaṇḍār* on the part of the Rāja. Thus I was kept waiting for nine days, and had finally the mortification to find that the library was not worth so much trouble. It contained about 800 well-kept and well-written manuscripts, which were neither distinguished by their age nor by their contents. The only interesting news I obtained was the name of the son of the famous Bāṇabhaṭṭa, who continued the *Kādambarī* after his father's death. He was called Bhūṣhaṇa-bhaṭṭa. After copying the catalogue of the Merta *bhaṇḍār* I went straight back to Jaypur, and had again interviews with the Digambara paṇḍits, from whom I collected further information and more books. Among my visitors was also the chief disciple of the present Bhaṭṭārka, who will, in all probability, succeed his master. It is rare that such people leave their *maṭhas*, and I fully appreciated the honour which he did me, though he somewhat diminished it by giving a false name.—Dr. Bühler in Bombay Administration Report, 1875-76.

BUDDHISM IN PUTU.

A correspondent of the *North China Herald* gives an interesting account of a visit to the island of Putu, off the China coast, which is entirely given up to Buddhism. No animals are allowed to be killed there, and neither fish nor animal food may be landed. Temples occupy the most beautiful spots, and everywhere shrines are built by the roadside, or Buddhas carved upon the face of the rocks. The government of the island is in the hands of the priests, and the rents from the land all go to the temples; in fact, though presents of tea, &c. are sent to Peking, the island is more like a dependency than an integral part of China. The few graves to be seen suggested to the visitor the practice of cremation; and not far from the largest temple, and near the beach, he found one of the furnaces, which consisted of a

small room in the hill-side, arched overhead, the only peculiarity about it being an excavation in the rocky floor about the size of a small coffin, intended for the fuel, or to create a draught. The following is a brief description of the process, as given by a priest:—Three days after death, the body, seated cross-legged and enclosed in a box, is taken to the furnace. Fuel is placed round it, and after a suitable religious ceremony the torch is applied, and the whole pile is soon wrapped in flames. It requires several hours and 400 pounds of wood to complete the process.—*The Academy.*

NOTES.

Dr. A. Burnell has discovered a MS. of the long-sought *Prātisākhya* of the *Sāma Veda*. It consists of about 280 sūtras with a commentary, and is attributed to Śākatāyana; but, as it is, it is a relatively modern work, and much like the *Atharva-prātisākhya* (edited by Prof. Whitney) in style and

conciseness. The copy he has is tolerably correct, and he hopes to print it shortly. He has also ascertained the existence of a *Brāhmana*, as yet unknown, which belongs to the Jaiminiya Śākhā of the *Sāma Veda*, and expects to have a copy soon, and also authentic information respecting the chants of this Śākhā, which differ widely from those known already. What he has heard of the Jaiminiya chants makes him think that they are in reality far more simple, and perhaps older, than the others—e.g. of the Kauthumas.—*The Academy.*

Some new Zend publications have been brought out by two young scholars, K. Geldner and W. Geiger, the first of whom is a pupil of Roth, the second of Spiegel. Geldner deals with the metrical parts of the *Zendavesta*, and proposes a great many ingenious corrections of corrupt passages, while Geiger confines himself to the Pehlavi version of the first *Vendidad*. His conclusions show that this version is of no great value for the Zend text.

BOOK NOTICES.

ITER PERSICUM, ou Description du Voyage en Perse entrepris en 1602 par Etienne Kakasch de Zalankemeny, envoyé comme ambassadeur par l'Empereur Rodolphe II. à la cour du grand-duc de Moscovie et à celle de Chāh Abbas, roi de Perse. Traduction publiée et annotée par Ch. Schefer, Premier Secrétaire interprète du Gouvernement, Administrateur de l'Ecole des Langues orientales vivantes. (16mo, pp. xxii and 120. Paris: E. Leroux, 1877.)

After the treaty of Madrid, Francis I. had sought an alliance with the Porte, which power, as well as France, had a vital interest in weakening the influence of Austria (then Germany). This alliance continued, in spite of short interruptions, till the peace of Versailles in 1756, and during the reigns of Henry II. and Henry IV. the influence of France in Turkish councils was so great as to force Austria to seek alliances against them. In 1592 the Turks had commenced a war on Austria, that was still being continued in Hungary—which Turkey held from Presburg to the Theiss—when Sir Anthony Shirley appeared at the court at Prague, bearing a letter from Shāh Abbas the Great, proposing an alliance. The emperor Rudolf II. determined to accept the offer, and appointed Stephan Khakhas von Salankhomeny, a Transylvanian, as his envoy to the Shāh. Khakhas took as his secretary a Saxon Protestant named George Tectander von der Jabell, who on his return presented to the Emperor an account of the journey and mission, which he afterwards published under the title of *Iter Persicum*. The embassy left Prague 27th August 1602, and passing through Breslau, Cracow, Warsaw, Wilna, and Smolensk arrived at Moscow on the 9th November, where it was received by the

Grand Duke Boris Fedorovich. Leaving this on the 8th December, Salankhomeny and his suite proceeded by Nijni Novgorod to Kazan and down the Volga to Astrakhan, which they reached on 27th May. The author's account of Russia—then separated by the Don from the Turkish Khanate of the Crimea—and of the court of the Grand Duke is full of curious information. In August they landed at Langheran, in the province of Guilan, where, from bad food and water, all fell ill. Robert Shirley met them there to conduct them, but on reaching Lanza, two miles from Langheran, Salankhomeny died on the 25th October 1603. Tectander and George Agelastes then proceeded to carry out the mission, but the latter also died, of scarlatina, at Kasbin. Tectander found Shāh Abbas at Tabriz, which he had just taken from the Turks, and he gives an interesting account of that celebrated Sufawi ruler and his court. He accompanied the Persian army for some time during the campaign in Armenia, and then returned with a Persian ambassador through Circassia to Kois on the Caspian, and thence to Tereka and Astrakhan, finding his way back to Moscow by the route he had come. There he met Henry of Logau, the Austrian ambassador, who left Moscow with him on the 24th August 1604, when Tectander's narrative closes. An appendix of 27 pages contains two letters of Salankhomeny's from Moscow, his address to the Grand Duke Boris, a letter from Boris to Rudolf, and an extract from a report by Henry of Logau.

The original work is very scarce, and M. Schefer has done excellent service in preparing this

French version of so interesting a volume, to which he has added valuable notes, and an introduction containing a short but interesting account of the Shirleys, and a bibliography of European works on the reign of Abbas. The volume forms one of the excellent series of 18mo volumes of M. Leroux's *Bibliothèque Orientale Elzévirienne*, and is illustrated by a curious coloured map of Eastern Europe at the commencement of the seventeenth century, and a facsimile of Sadeler's portrait of Hussain A'li Beg, the Persian sent with Sir Anthony Shirley to the courts of Russia and Germany.

GESTA ROMANORUM, or Entertaining Moral Stories, translated from the Latin, with preliminary Observations and copious Notes, by the Rev. CHARLES SWAN, late of Catharine Hall, Cambridge, and revised and corrected by WYNARD KOOPER, B.A., Clare College, Cambridge. (London: George Bell and Sons, 1877.)

The only fault which we can find with this cheap and carefully annotated translation of the *Gesta* is that, as might be expected in the case of a book published in England, no illustrations whatever are drawn from Sanskrit literature. The literatures of other Oriental countries are by no means neglected. But it is quite clear that for the learned and judicious corrector of Mr. Swan's translation Benfey and Wilson and Weber have written in vain.

We proceed to mention some passages in which illustrations from Sanskrit writers might profitably have been introduced.

The first and most striking parallel that occurs to us is one between the 28th tale in Swan's *Gesta* and the story of Devasmitā in the 13th *taranga* of the *Kathā Sarit Sāgara*. This was long ago pointed out by Wilson (*Collected Works*, vol. III. pp. 220ff.). "A Buddhist priestess has been asked by four young merchants to corrupt the wife of a friend named Devasmitā. The priestess pays her a visit, and gains her confidence. On the day following she pays her a second visit, and gives a bitch which was tied up at her door a piece of meat full of pepper-dust, which made tears trickle copiously from the animal's eyes. She then enters Devasmitā's room and begins to weep. On Devasmitā's asking her the reason of her sorrow she replies, 'My friend, look at this bitch weeping outside here. This creature recognized me to-day as having been its companion in a former birth, and began to weep, which made tears of pity flow from my eyes.' When Devasmitā heard that, and saw the bitch outside apparently weeping, she thought for a moment, 'What can be the meaning of this wonderful sight?' Then the ascetic said to her, 'My daughter, in a former birth I and that bitch were the two wives of a Brāhman. And our husband frequently went about to other countries on em-

bassies by order of the king. Now while he was away from home I lived with other men at my pleasure, and so did not cheat the elements of which I was composed, and my senses of their lawful enjoyment. For considerate treatment of the elements and senses is held to be the highest duty. Therefore I have been born again in this world with a recollection of my former existence. But she in her former life, through ignorance, confined all her attention to the preservation of her character. Therefore she has been degraded and born again as one of the canine race; however, she too remembers her former birth.' The wise Devasmitā said to herself, 'This is a novel conception of Duty.'"

The 'execrable device' employed in the *Gesta Romanorum* is of a very similar character, and employed for similar purposes. The 'beldam' undertakes to corrupt the wife of a knight. Accordingly she makes a little dog, which she possessed, fast for two days, and on the third day gives it bread and mustard. The same results follow as in the Hindu tale, and the beldam expounds them in a similar manner. She asserts that her daughter was turned into this dog to punish her cruelty to her lover. The only difference in the tales is that in the Hindu tale the temptation fails, whereas in the European form of the story it is completely successful.

Another incident in the tale of Devasmitā may be paralleled from the *Gesta Romanorum*. When Devasmitā is obliged to separate from her husband, the god Śiva gives each of them a red lotus, saying, "Take each of you one of these lotuses in your hand, and if either of you shall be unfaithful during your separation the lotus in the hand of the other shall fade, but not otherwise."

A somewhat similar incident is found in the *Gesta Romanorum*, tale 69. A carpenter's mother-in-law bestows on him a shirt that possesses this singular property, that as long as he and his wife "are faithful to each other it will neither be rent, worn, nor stained." Many parallels are mentioned in Wilson's note (vol. III. pp. 217 and 218). One that he has not mentioned will be found in *The Wright's Chaste Wife*, edited for the Early English Text Society by Frederick J. Furnivall, lines 58ff. This nearly resembles the story in the *Gesta*, but a rose-garland does duty for the shirt.

Tale XI. in the *Gesta Romanorum* is an account of a superstition familiar to every student of Sanskrit literature. It runs as follows.—"Alexander was a prince of great power, and a disciple of Aristotle, who instructed him in every branch of learning. The queen of the North, having heard of his proficiency, nourished her daughter from the cradle upon a certain sort of deadly

poison; and when she grew up she was considered so beautiful that the sight of her alone affected many with madness.¹ The queen sent her to Alexander to espouse. He had no sooner beheld her than he became violently enamoured, and with much eagerness desired to possess her; but Aristotle, observing his weakness, said, 'Do not touch her, for if you do you will certainly perish. She has been nurtured upon the most deleterious food, which I will prove to you immediately. Here is a malefactor who is already condemned to death. He shall be united to her, and you shall see the truth of what I advance. Accordingly the culprit was brought without delay to the girl, and scarcely had he touched her lips before his whole frame was impregnated with poison, and he expired.' The editors of the *Gesta* illustrate this story copiously, but no parallel is adduced from Sanskrit literature. The notion is a very familiar one in Sanskrit literature, and readers of the *Mudrā Rākshasa* cannot fail to remember how the *vishā kanyā* was employed against Chandragupta. On this occasion Aristotle's place was taken by Chānakya. The king of Banāras employs similar devices against the king of Vatsa in the *Kathā Sarit Sāgara* (taranga 19, śl. 81). Numerous illustrations might be quoted to show that the story is, as the commentators on the *Gesta* seem to suspect, of Indian origin.

In the 115th tale of the *Gesta* we read of an elephant that no one dared approach, but which was lulled to sleep by two chaste virgins. The same notion of elephants being peculiarly affected by the chastity of women is found in the 36th taranga of the *Kathā Sarit Sāgara*, where a chaste woman is able to raise up the white elephant Śvetaraśmi, that had fallen down apparently dead.

The 83rd tale in the *Gesta Romanorum* contains an incident found in the *Panchatantra* :—

"A boarder devastates a garden belonging to Trajan. It is wounded three times and then killed. When the cook was preparing it for the table, he reserved the heart for his own eating. This annoyed the emperor, and he sent to inquire after the heart. The cook declared that the boar had no heart, and when called upon to justify this statement defended it in the following way :—'The boar in the first instance entered the garden and committed much injury. I, seeing it, cut off his left ear. Now if he had possessed a heart he would have recollected the loss of so important a member. But he did not, for he entered a second time : therefore he had no heart. Besides, if he had had a heart, when I had cut off his right ear he would have meditated upon the matter,

which he did not, for he came again and lost his tail. Moreover, having lost his ears and his tail, had he possessed a particle of heart he would have thought; but he did not think, for he entered a fourth time and was killed. For these several reasons I am confident he had no heart.' The emperor, satisfied with what he had heard, applauded the man's judgment."

This reminds us in the most forcible way of the second story in the 4th book of the *Panchatantra*. There a jackal persuades an ass to visit a sick lion; the lion wounds him, but the ass escapes. The cunning jackal persuades the ass to visit the lion a second time, when he is killed. The lion then goes to bathe, like a good Hindu lion, before making a meal off him. In the meanwhile the jackal devours the ears and the heart. When the lion taxes him with making his food impure in this way, the jackal replies that the ass had neither ears nor heart, otherwise he would never have run into danger after he had had one narrow escape from destruction. The same story is found in Babrius' fable 95. There the ass is represented by a deer, and the jackal by a fox. The fox devours the heart only, which makes M. Wagener remark that Babrius is *plus conséquent* compared with the Indian fabulist. The fox's defence is most triumphant :—

"Οὐκ εἶχε πάντως φησὶ " μὴ μάτην ζήτει.

"ποιὸν δ' ἐμέλλε καρδίην ἔχειν, ἥ τις

ἐκ δευτέρου λέοντος ἤλθεν εἰς οἶκους ;"

Possibly this story suggested to Shakespeare the lines

"Caesar should be a beast without a heart

If he should stay at home to-day for fear."

An incident in the 18th tale, p. 46 of the present edition of the *Gesta*, reminds us of the story of Pāṇḍu in the *Mahābhārata*; and one, in the 5th tale, p. 91, of that of Śrīdatta in the *Kathā Sarit Sāgara*, taranga 10, śloka 140-150. Numerous other parallels would no doubt present themselves to those better versed than the writer of the present article can pretend to be in Sanskrit folklore. But we have said enough to show that the fashionable neglect of Sanskrit literature which prevails in England has detracted considerably from the value of this edition of the *Gesta*.

This collection of tales must always be interesting to Englishmen, as from it Shakespeare drew the plot of at least two of his plays.

The present edition contains much curious and valuable illustrative matter, though, if it had been revised by a scholar well read in Hindu folklore, it might have contained a good deal more.

C. H. T.

¹ This trait recalls the tale of Unmādinī (*Kathā Sarit Sāgara*, taranga 16, śloka 65).

SANSKRIT AND OLD CANARESE INSCRIPTIONS.

BY J. F. FLEET, B.O.C.S., M.R.A.S.

(Continued from p. 19).

No. XXXV.

THIS and the following two inscriptions are the remaining three early Kādamba Sanskrit copper-plate grants, of which I have already made mention at p. 22 of the preceding volume. It appears that they were found in excavating the bed of a tank at Dēvagiri, in the Karajgi Tālukā of the Dhārwad District. They were referred in the first instance to Mr. Pāṇḍuraṅg Venkaṭēs Chintāmanpētkar, Canarese Translator in the Educational Department, whose paper on them, after being submitted to Government, was made over to Mr. Burgess, as Archæological Surveyor, and sent on to me to be recast for this journal. I found it necessary, however, to wait till I could obtain the originals themselves for inspection. In the meantime Mr. K. T. Tēlaṅg has published transcriptions &c., of the same plates in the *Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc.*, Vol. XII., pp. 300 *et seqq.* I have found his versions, as well as those of the Canarese Translator, useful to refer to in respect of a few doubtful points.

The present grant is on three plates, about 7"·5 long by 1"·8 broad. The ring connecting the plates is 0"·2 thick, and is an oval,—2"·4 by 1"·8. The seal, also, is oval,—1"·7 by 1"·4.

The device on it, a good deal worn, is that of some animal¹ standing towards the proper right, but with its head turned round to the left, with the figure of a god or a man leaning against it or sitting on it.

The grant is by Dēva, or Dēvavarmā, the son and Yuvarāja of the Kādamba Mahārāja Kṛishṇavarmā, and is issued at Tripurvata, a locality which I cannot identify. I place these two kings in early times, either slightly antecedent or slightly subsequent to the Kākusthavarmā and his successors of Nos. XX. to XXVI. of this Series. But I must abandon the specific argument on which, at vol. VI., p. 23, I arrived at Śaka 360 (A.D. 438) as about the date of Kṛishṇavarmā. For, in a stone-tablet inscription from Lakshmēswar, Śaka 890 (A.D. 969-8) is given as the date of Mārasimhadēva, the younger brother of the Gaṅga king Harivarmā of the Merkāra, Nāgamaṇḍala, and Mallōhaḷḷi plates. And if, as I think is the case, this date is the true one, and not that of the Merkāra and Nāgamaṇḍala plates, then it follows that the present Kṛishṇavarmā cannot be the same Kṛishṇavarmā whose sister, according to the plates, was married to Mādhaṇḍa, the grandson of Harivarmā.

Transcription.²

First Plate.

- [¹] श्री·विजया-त्रिपर्वतः स्वामी-महासेना-मात्रि-गण-अ(ः)नुदध्यत-अभिशिक्तस्य मानव्या-
सगोत्रस्य
[²] प्रतिकृता-स्वध्याया-चार्चया(रचचः)-परागस्य आदि-काल-राजारशि-बिम्बानाम् अस्मिन्-जान-
अम्बानाम्
[³] कदम्बानाम् धर्म्म-महाराजस्य आस्रमध्या-यजिनः समार-अर्जित-विपुल-आस्रव्यस्य
[⁴] सामन्ता-राजविशेष-रत्नसु(स्य)* नृगज-आनक्रम्या-दाय-आनुभूतस्य* आस्रद-अमला-

¹ The Canarese Translator takes it to be a horse or bull-dog. The head, which is the only part at all clear, seems to me more like that of a deer with short horns.

² An asterisk, attached to a letter or mark of punctuation in square brackets, denotes that such letter or mark of punctuation is not in the original at all. An asterisk, attached to a mark of punctuation not in brackets, denotes that in the original a mark is used which it is not convenient to represent in the printing, and for which the ordinary mark of punctuation is substituted.

³ This word,—*स्मिन्*,—is close to the margin of the plate; the vowel is distinct, and parts of the other two letters are clear enough to be read in the original, though not enough so to come out well in the facsimile. In No. XXXVI., l. 2, and No. XXXVII., l. 1, *विजया-वैजयन्त्यम्* is not preceded by the honorific prefix *श्री*. But the word can have no other application in the present case; and we have analogous instances in *श्री-विजया-पालसिंह्याम्*, No. XX., l. 3, and No. XXI., l. 9, and in *श्री-विजया-वैजयन्ति-निवसि*, No. XXI., l. 12.

⁴ This passage is corrupt, and is difficult to deal with.

Mr. K. T. Tēlaṅg reads *sāmantarājaviśēṣharatnasundā-jinākamyaḍāyānubhūtasya*, and does not offer any explanation of it. But he reads two letters wrongly; for, the fourteenth is *jā*, not *ji*, and the sixteenth is *kra*, not *ka*. The Canarese Translator is altogether wide of the mark,—*antāgajānākamudāyābhūtasya*. From the context of the other genitive cases, I have no doubt that we must take the eleventh letter, *su*, to be a mistake for *syā*. And the remaining letters form words intelligible by themselves, though not so as a whole, because there is no apparent reason why persons of Nāga descent should be referred to here. However, I see no other suitable way of explaining the passage. It is, indeed, just possible, as the eleventh letter may be either *su* or *a*, that—1, the *syā* of *ratnasya* has been omitted altogether,—and 2, *jā* being by mistake for *ma*, the second word should be *anāgaman-ākramya*, &c., i.e. 'a heritage, not to be arrived at by title-deeds, but possessed from time immemorial' (see Monier Williams, s.v. *anāgama*); but this is probably going too far for an explanation, and I do not know whether *āgama* is capable of being used in this technical sense, in the same way as *āgama*.

Second plate; first side.

- [⁵] nabhasy=udita-sāsi-sadṛiś-aik-ātapatrasya dharmma-mahārājasya Śrī-Kṛishṇavarmanah
priya-
[⁶] tanayō Dē[va*]varmma-yuvarājah sva-punya-phal-ābhikāmkshayā trilōka-bhūta-hita-dēśinah
[⁷] dharmma-pravartanasya Arhataḥ bhagavataḥ chaityālayasya bhagnasamskāra-ārchchana-
mahim-ārtthah
[⁸] yāpaniya[s*]ṅghēbhyah Siddhakēdārē rāja-mānēna dvādaśa nivarttanāni kshētram
dattavān [||*] Yō sya

Second plate; second side

- [⁹] apahartā sa pañcha-mahāpātaka-sa(saṁ)yuktā(ktō) || bhavati yō sy=ābhirakshitā sa
punya-phalam=aśnutē [||*]
[¹⁰] Uktam cham(cha) [I*] Pa(ba)hubhir=vya(vva)sudhā bhuktā rājabbhis=Sagar-ādibhi(bhih)
yasya yasya yadā bhūmih tasya tasya
[¹¹] tadha(dā) phala(lam) || Ā(a)dbhir=ddattam tribhir=bha(bhu)ktam sadbhiś=cha paripālitaṁ
ētāni na nivarttantē pūrvva-rāja-kṛitāni cha [||*]
[¹²] Svam dātum su-mahach-chhakyam duḥ⁹kha[m=a*]ny-ārttha-pālanam dānam vā pālanam
v=ēti dānāch=chhrēyō nupālana[m°] [||*]

Third plate.

- [¹³] Sva-dattam para-dattam vā yō harēta vasundharām shashṭim varsha-sahasrāni narakē
pachyatē tu saḥ ||
[¹⁴] Śrī-Kṛishṇa-nripa-putrēna Kadamba-kula-kētunā rāṇa-priyēna Dēvēna dattā bhūmis=
Tripurvātē ||
[¹⁵] Day-āmṛita-sukh-āsvāda-pūta-punya-guṇ-a(ē)psunā Dēvavarman-aikavirēna datta(ttā)
Jaināya bhūr-iyam ||
[¹⁶] Jayaty=Arhams=trilōk-ēśah savva(rvva)-bhūta-hitam-karah rāg-ādy-ari-harō nantō nanta-
jñāna-dṛig=īśvarah ||

Translation.

At the glorious and victorious (*city of*) Tri-
parvata⁷, through a desire for the reward of
his own meritorious act, the Yuvarāja Dēva-
varma⁸,—the beloved son of the pious Great
King⁵ Śrī-Kṛishṇavarma⁶, who was con-
secrated by having meditated on the assem-
blage of the mothers of Svāmī-Mahāsēna;
who was of the kindred of Mānavya; who
was thoroughly well versed in the system of
private study and inquiry that he had adopted;
who was the pious Great King of the Ka-
damba⁹, who (*in their achievements and behaviour*)
are the counterparts of saintly kings¹⁰ of pri-

mitive times, and who are as fathers to their
dependants; who celebrated horse-sacrifices;
who acquired great wealth in battle; who was
a very jewel among chieftains and excellent
kings¹⁰; who enjoyed a heritage that was not
to be attained by persons of Nāga descent¹⁰;
and who possessed the sole umbrella (*indicative
of universal sovereignty*), which was like (*in the
purity of its whiteness*) to the moon when it has
risen in the cloudless sky of autumn,—gave a
field, (*of the measure of*) twelve *niwartanas* by
the royal measure, at (*the village of*) Siddha-
kēdāra, to the sects of the Yāpaniya¹¹, for
the purposes of the glory of repairing anything

⁵ A correction has to be made in the transliteration table at vol. VI., p. 136. The diacritical mark of the letter used to represent the *ḥ* *Jihvāmūliya* has dropped out in printing; it should be 'h.'

⁶ There is a mark below the line, which may, perhaps, be part of this letter, —m,—the rest being effaced; but the letter seems rather to have been omitted altogether.

⁷ sc. 'the city of the three hills.'

⁸ This epithet, *dharmma-mahārāja*, is also intended to compare him with Dharmarāja, sc. Yama, and also Yudhishtira, 'the king of justice.'

⁹ *Rājārshi*,—a person of the Kshatriya, or regal and military class, who has also acquired the status of a Rishi, or saint, by devoting himself to religious observances and austerities.

¹⁰ See note 4 to the transcription.

¹¹ This word, *yāpaniya*, occurred in No. XXI., l. 9, and No. XXII., l. 17, in a way that led me to interpret it as meaning 'to be supported.' It now seems, however, to be the name of a sect, and the translations of those two passages should be altered accordingly. In the translation of No. XXI., instead of 'for the purpose of supporting the Kūrchakas, who are naked religious mendicants,' read '(for the benefit) of the Yāpaniyas, the Nirgranthas, and the Kūrchakas'; and, in the translation of No. XXII., instead of 'that ascetics should be supported during the four months of the rainy season; that the learned men, the chief of whom was Kumāradatta, * * *, should according to justice enjoy all the material substance of that greatness;' read 'that the learned men, the chief of whom was Kumāradatta, who are ascetics of the Yāpaniya sect, * * *, should according to justice enjoy all the material

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 श्री कृष्णाय नमः ॥ श्री गणेशाय नमः ॥
 श्री गुरुभ्यो नमः ॥ श्री गणेशाय नमः ॥
 श्री गुरुभ्यो नमः ॥ श्री गणेशाय नमः ॥
 श्री गुरुभ्यो नमः ॥ श्री गणेशाय नमः ॥

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 श्री कृष्णाय नमः ॥ श्री गणेशाय नमः ॥
 श्री गुरुभ्यो नमः ॥ श्री गणेशाय नमः ॥
 श्री गुरुभ्यो नमः ॥ श्री गणेशाय नमः ॥
 श्री गुरुभ्यो नमः ॥ श्री गणेशाय नमः ॥

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 श्री कृष्णाय नमः ॥ श्री गणेशाय नमः ॥
 श्री गुरुभ्यो नमः ॥ श्री गणेशाय नमः ॥
 श्री गुरुभ्यो नमः ॥ श्री गणेशाय नमः ॥
 श्री गुरुभ्यो नमः ॥ श्री गणेशाय नमः ॥

Handwritten text in a cursive script, likely from a manuscript.

KADAMBA COPPER-PLATE OF MRIGÉSAVARMĀ.

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥
 ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

that may be broken¹² and performing the worship of the temple of the holy Arhat, who points out that which is beneficial to the inhabitants of the three worlds, and who propagates religion.

He, who confiscates this (*grant*), incurs the guilt of the five great sins; he, who preserves it, enjoys the reward of a meritorious act! And it has been said:—Land has been enjoyed by many kings, from Sagara downwards; he, who for the time being possesses land, enjoys the fruits of it! That (*grant*) which is bestowed with libations of water, and that which is enjoyed by three (*generations*), and that which is preserved by good people,—these are not resumed; and, also, (*grants*) that have been made by former kings! It is very easy to bestow one's own property, (*but*) the preservation of the property of others is difficult; (*if the question is*) whether giving or preserving (*is the more commendable act*),—preservation is better than giving! He is tormented in hell for the duration of sixty thousand years, who confiscates land that has been given, whether by himself or by another!

Land was given at Triparyvata by Dêva, who was the son of the king Śrī-Kṛishṇa, and who was the glory of the

family of the Kadambas, and who was fond of war. This land was given to the Jain¹³ by Dêvavarmā, the bravest of mankind, who desired his meritorious acts and virtues to be purified by tasting the happiness of the nectar of compassion.

Victorious is the Arhat, the lord of the three worlds, the worker of the welfare of all people, the destroyer of passion and other (*mental*) enemies, the eternal one, the lord who knows eternal knowledge!

No. XXXVI.

This grant is on three plates, about 5''·2 long by 2''·3 broad. The ring connecting the plates is about 0''·3 thick, and is almost a circle 2''·3 in diameter. The seal is oval,—1''·5 by 0''·9; whatever device or writing may have been on it is now illegible. The characters are small and neatly cut, and are for the most part very well preserved.

The plates record a grant by Mṛigêśavaravarmā, the son of Śāntivaravarmā, in the third year of his reign, which was the 'Pauṣa year.'¹⁴ This Mṛigêśavaravarmā is undoubtedly the same person as Mṛigêśa, the grandson of Kākusthavarmā, who bestowed the grant recorded in No. XXI. of this Series.

Transcription.

First plate.

- [¹] Siddham || Jayaty=Arhams=trilôk-êśah sarvva-bhûta-hitô rataḥ rāg-ādy-ari-harô
 [²] nantô nanta-jûāna-ōrig-îśvarah || Svasti Vijaya-Vaija[ya*]ntya[m¹⁵] Svāmi-Mahāsēna
 [³] mātṛi-gaṇ-ānuddhyā(dhyā)t-ābhishiktānām¹⁶ Mānavya-sagôtrānām Hārīti-putrānām
 [⁴] A(ā)ṅgirasām pratikṛita-svāddhya(dhyā)ya-charchchakānā[m¹⁷] sad-dharminā-sad-āmbā-
 nā(nām) Kadambānām anēka-janmāntar-ô-
 [⁵] pārjita-vipula-punya-skandhaḥ āhav-ārjita-parama-ruchira-dṛiḍa(dṛiḍa)-satvaḥ viśuddh-
 ānvaya-

Second plate; first side.

- [⁶] prakṛity=ānēka-purusha-para(ram)parā-gatê jagat-pradīpa-bhûtê mahaty=n¹⁸dit-ôditê Kāku-
 [⁷] sth-ānvayê Śrī-Śāntivaravarmma-tanayaḥ Śrī-Mṛigêśavaravarmmā ātmanah rājasya
 [⁸] tritīyê varshê Pauṣhê saṁvatsarê Kārttika-māsa-bahula-pakshê daśamyām
 [⁹] tithau Uttarābhadrapadê nakshatrê bṛihat-Paralûrê tridasa-pati-makuta-paripri(ghri)shṭa-
 [¹⁰] chāru-charaḡebhyaḥ param-Ārhad-dêvêbhyah saṁmārjjan-ôpalêpan-ābhyarchchana-bhagna-
 samskāra-

substance of that greatness during the four months of the rainy season.' *Yāpaniya*, as the name of a sect, is not explained in Monier Williams' Dictionary. Mr. K. T. Tēlaṅg suggests that it may mean 'those who are to go away, i.e. mendicants who are going about and not stationary.' The Canarese Translator takes it as equivalent to *Kṣhapanaka*, 'a Jain mendicant, who wears no garments'; but this would only give it the same meaning as *Nirgrantha*, whereas, from the two terms being both used in No. XXI, l. 9, they must have distinct and separate meanings.

¹² *Bhagna-samskāra*, here and in No. XXXVI, l. 10, and *bhagna-kriyā*, in No. XXXVII, l. 24, seem to mean

much the same as *khaṇḍa-sphuṭita-jīm-ôddhāra* of other inscriptions.

¹³ sc. 'the Arhat.'

¹⁴ See the remarks at vol. VI., p. 22b, and p. 24a, note 1.

¹⁵ This letter,—m,—seems to have been omitted in the original, and the place left blank in which it should have been written.

¹⁶ This letter,—m,—is followed in the original by the letter na. This last is superfluous and unmeaning, and seems to have been partially erased after having been engraved.

¹⁷ The same remark as note 15 above.

¹⁸ The vowel,—u,—is faintly discernible in the original, but does not come out well in the facsimile.

Second plate; second side.

- [¹¹] mahim-ārttham grām-āpara-dig-vibhāga-sīm-ābhyantarē rāja-mānēna chatvārinīsan-nivart-
tanaṁ kṛishṇa-bhūmi-
[¹²] kshētram chatvāri¹⁹ kshētra-nivarttanam¹⁹ cha¹⁹ chaityālayasya bahiḥ ēkaṁ nivarttanam
pupp(shp)-ārttham²⁰
[¹³] dēva-kulasy-āṅganañ=cha ēkaṁ nivarttanam=ēva sarvva-parihāra-yuktam dattavān
[¹⁴] mahārājah [||*] Lōbhād=adharmmād=vā yā(yō) sy=ābhibarttā sa pañcha-mahāpātaka-
samyuktō bhavati
[¹⁵] yō sy=ābhirakshitā sa tat-punya-phala-bhāg=bhavati [||*] Uktañ=cha [||*] Bahubhir=
vvasudhā bhuktā

Third plate.

- [¹⁶] rājabbis=Sagar-ādibhiḥ yasya yasya yadā bhūmiḥ tasya tasya tadā phala[m] [||*] Sva-
dattām para-(da)ttam(ttām) vā
[¹⁷] yō harēta vasundharā(rām) shashtīm varsha-sahasrāṇi narakē pachyatē tu saḥ [||*] Adbhir=
ddattām tribhir=bhuktām
[¹⁸] sadbhiḥ=cha paripālitaṁ ētāni na nivarttantē pūrvva-rāja-kṛitāni cha [||*] Svan=dātum
[¹⁹] su-mahach-chakryam dukham=any-ārttha-pālanam dānam vā pālanam v=ēti dānāch=chhrēyō
nnpālana[m] [||*]
[²⁰] Parama-dhārmikēṇa Dāmakīrtti-bhōjakēna likhit=ēyam pattikā [||*] Iti siddhir=astu [||*]

Translation.

It is accomplished! Victorious is the Arhat, the lord of the three worlds, who delights in the welfare of all people, the destroyer of passion and other (mental) enemies, the eternal one, the lord who knows eternal knowledge!

Hail! At the victorious (city of) Vaijayanantī²¹, Śrī-Mṛigēśavaravarmā,—who was the Great King²² of the Kādambas, who are consecrated by having meditated on the mothers of Svāmi-Mahāsēna, who are of the lineage of Mānavya, who are the descendants of Hārītī, who are of the sons of Āṅgiras, who have adopted the system of private study and inquiry, and who are as good fathers to the true religion; who acquired a great quantity of religious merit in many other (previous) births; who achieved brilliant and steadfast courage in battle; and who was the son of Śrī-Śāntivaravarmā, in the family of Kākṣtha, which has been continued by a succession of many men according to the nature of a pure lineage, and which has become the lamp of the world, and is great, and has risen higher and higher,—in the third year of his reign, in the Pausa year, on the tenth lunar day in the dark fortnight of the month Kārttika, under the Uttarābhadrā-

padā constellation, at (the village of) the greater Paralūra, gave to the divine supreme Arhats, whose beautiful feet are rubbed by the tiara of the lord of the gods (who bows down to perform obeisance to them), for the purposes of the glory of sweeping out (the temple) and anointing (the idol with ghee) and performing worship and repairing anything that may be broken, a black-soil field, (of the measure of) forty *nivartanas* by the royal measure, within the boundaries of the western division of the village,—and a field (of the measure of) four *nivartanas*²³,—and (a field of the measure of) one *nivartana* outside the *chaitya*-hall, for the purpose of (decorating the idol with) flowers,—and the courtyard of the temple, (measuring) one *nivartana*,—entirely free from taxation.

He, who confiscates this (grant) through greed or impiety, incurs the guilt of the five great sins; he, who preserves it, enjoys the reward of that same meritorious act! And it has been said:—Land has been enjoyed by many kings, from Sagar downwards; (&c.)! He is tormented in hell for the duration of sixty thousand years, (&c.)! That (grant) which is bestowed with libations of water, (&c.)! It is very easy to bestow one's own property, (&c.)!

¹⁹ Probably what is intended is *chatur-nivarttanam kshētram cha*.

²⁰ This word is followed by a mark, which resembles the letter *ta*, but the meaning of which is not obvious. It may have been engraved by mistake for the letter *da*, the first of the following word, which was then repeated, and formed

correctly, in the next line.

²¹ *Vaṇavāṣ*; the modern Banawāsi.

²² *Mahārājah* has to be brought back to this place from l. 14, in order to govern the genitive case *Kādambānām*.

²³ See note 19 to the transcription.



SEAL

KADAMBA GRANT OF MṚIGĒŚAVARMĀ.

5th & 6th Divs.

[illegible][illegible]

This charter has been written by the very pious Dāmakīrtti, the *Bhōjaka*. May there be success!

No. XXXVII.

This is another grant of Mṛigēśa, or Mṛigēśavarmā, as he is here called, on four plates, about 8''·0 long by 2''·5 broad. The ring, on which the plates are strung, is rather bent, but seems to be properly circular, about 2''·5 in diameter; it is 0''·2 thick. The seal is oval,—1''·2 by 1''·0. The device on it is very indistinct, but seems to be a sitting or kneeling figure of a god or man, probably of Jinēndra. The characters are large and bold, and extremely well preserved.

The grant is dated in the fourth year of Mṛigēśa's reign; but, as in the other Kadamba grants, there is no reference to any

other era. The grant is also dated in the *eightth* fortnight of the rainy season. I have had occasion to remark on this at vol. VI., p. 28, and should have noted there the expression in No. XXII., l. 17, *vārshikānī chaturō māsān*, 'during the four months of the rainy season.' A significant trace of the primitive division of the year into three seasons only is to be found in the sacrifices called *chāturmāsya*, or 'four-monthly' sacrifices, performed on the full-moons of P h ā l g u ṇ a (February-March), Ā s h ā ḍ h a (June-July), and K ā r t t i k a (October-November).

It is worthy of remark, in passing, that,—whereas in No. XXXVI. Mṛigēśa's third year is called a 'P a u s h a year', and in No. XXI. his eighth year is called a 'V a i ś ā k h a year'—no such term is applied in the present grant to his fourth year.

Transcription.

First plate.

- [¹] Siddham || Vijaya-Vaijayantyām Svāmi-Mahāsena-mātri-gaṇ-a(ā)nuddhyā(dhyā)t-ā
 [²] bhishiktasya Mānavya-sagōtrasya Hāritī-putrasya pratikṛita-
 [³] charchohā-pāra[ga*]sya vibudha-pratibimbānām Kadambānām dharmma-mahārāja-
 [⁴] sya Śrī-vijaya-śiva-Mṛigēśavarmanah vijay-āyur-ārōgy-aiśvaryya-

Second plate; first side.

- [⁵] pravarddhana-karaḥ saṁvva(va)tsaraḥ chaturtthaḥ varshā-pakshaḥ ashtamaḥ titih
 [⁶] paurṇamāsi [| *] Anay-ānupūrvy-ānai(nē)ka-janmāntar-ōpārjita-vipula-pu-
 [⁷] nya-skandhaḥ su-viuddha-pitri-mātri-vaṁśaḥ ubhaya-lōka-priya-hita-
 [⁸] kar-ānēka-śāstr-ārttha-tatva-vijñāna-vivēchcha(cha)na-vinivishṭa-viśāl-ōdāra-matih
 [⁹] hasty-aśv-ārōhaṇa-praharaṇ-ādishu vyāyāmikishu bhūmishu yathā-

Second plate; second side.

- [¹⁰] vat=kṛita-śramah dakshō dakshinah naya-vinaya-kuśalah nai(anē)k-āha-
 [¹¹] v-ārjita-parama-dṛiḍa(dha)-satvah udāta-buddhi-dhairyya-viryya-tyāga-sampannah
 [¹²] su-mahati samara-saṅkatē sva-bhuja-bala-parākram-āvāpta-vipu-
 [¹³] laīśvaryyah samyak-prajā-pālana-parah sva-jana-ku²⁴muda-
 [¹⁴] vana-prabōdhana-śasāṅkah dēva-dvija-guru-sādhujanēbhyah gō-bhū-

Third plate; first side.

- [¹⁵] mi-hiranya-śayan-āchchhādan-ānn-ādi(dy)-nai(anē)ka-vidha-pradāna-nityah vidvat-suhri-
 [¹⁶] t-svajana-sāmāny-ōpabhujiyamāna-mahā-vibhavaḥ ādi-kāla-
 [¹⁷] rāja-vṛitt-ānusārī dharmma-mahārājah=Kadambānām Śrī-vijaya-
 [¹⁸] śiva-Mṛigēśavarmā Kālavaṅgā-grāmaṁ tridhā vibhajya dattavān [|| *]

Third plate; second side.

- [¹⁹] Atra pūrvam=Arhach-chhūlā-parama-pushkala-sthāna-nivāsibhyah
 [²⁰] bhagavad-Arhan-mahā-Jinēndra-dēvatā²⁵bhyah ōkō bhāgaḥ
 [²¹] dvitīyō Rhat-prōkta-sad-dharmma-karaṇa-parasya²⁶ Śvētapata-mahāśra-
 [²²] maṇa-saṅgh-ōpabhōgāya²⁵ tritīyō Nirgrantha-mahāśramaṇa-saṅgh-ō-
 [²³] pabhōgāy=ēti [|| *] Atra dēva-bhāga-dhānya-dēva-pūjā-bali-charu-

²⁴ Between the letters *ku* and *mu* there is the letter *da*, partially engraved and erased as being out of place.

²⁵ In the original *bhya* was first engraved, and it was then altered into *tā*, by partial erasure of the *ya* and part of the *bh*, and by the addition of the vowel *ā*.

²⁶ The meaning is clear, but the construction is bad and should be either *karaṇa-parasya Śvētapata-mahāśramaṇa-saṅghasya upabhōgāya*, or *karaṇa-para-Śvētapata-mahāśramaṇa-saṅgh-ōpabhōgāya*.

Fourth plate.

- [²⁴] dēva-karmmakara-bhagnakriyā-pravarttan-ādy-artth-ōpayōgāya étad=ēvañ
 [²⁵] nyāya-labdhām dēva-bhōga-samayēna yō bhirakshati sa tat-phala-bhā-
 [²⁶] g=bhavati yō vināsayēt=sa paūcha-mahāpātaka-samyuktō bhavati [|| *]
 [²⁷] Uktañ=cha [| *] Bahubhir=vvasudhā bhuktā rājabhis=Sagar-ādibhih yasya yasya
 [²⁸] yadā bhūmis=tasya tasya tadā phalam || Naravara-sēnāpatinā likhitā [| *]

Translation.

It is accomplished ! At the victorious (*city of*) *Vaijāyanti*, (*it was*²⁷) the lunar day of the full moon, the eighth fortnight of the rainy season, and the fourth year, productive of victory and long life and health and wealth, (*of the reign*) of the victorious and prosperous *Śrī-Mṛigēśavarmā*, who was consecrated by having meditated on the assemblage of the mothers of *Svāmi-Mahāsēna*; who was of the lineage of *Mānavya*; who was the descendant of *Hārīti*; who was thoroughly well versed in the system of inquiry that he adopted; and who was the pious Great King of the *Kadambas*, who are the counterparts of gods.

The victorious and prosperous *Śrī-Mṛigēśavarmā*, the pious Great King of the *Kadambas*,—who had acquired great religious merit in many other births antecedent to this (*date mentioned above*); who was of a pure lineage on both the paternal and the maternal side; whose great and noble mind busied itself in learning and investigating the true meaning of the many sacred writings which effect that which is pleasant and that which is beneficial in both worlds; who had properly exercised himself in manly sports, comprising the riding on elephants and horses, and the use of weapons, and other things; who was clever; who was skilful; who was expert in the art of government and in propriety of conduct; who acquired great and steadfast courage in many fights; who was possessed of noble intellect and firmness and courage and liberality; who achieved great wealth by the strength and prowess of his own arm in great stress of war; who was devoted to properly protecting his

subjects; who was a very moon to cause to blossom the lotuses which were his own relatives; who was constant in making gifts of cows and land and gold and couches and clothing and food and many other things to gods and the twice-born and spiritual preceptors and holy men; whose great wealth was being enjoyed equally by learned men and his friends and his own kindred; and who imitated the conduct of kings of primitive times,—divided the village of *Kālavāṅgā* into three portions, and bestowed it. Among them, firstly, one share was for the holy Arhat and the great god *Jinēndra*, who inhabited the supreme and excellent place (*called*) 'the hall of the Arhat.' The second was for the enjoyment of the sect of eminent ascetics called *Śvētapata*²⁸, which was intent on practising the true religion declared by the Arhat. The third was for the enjoyment of the sect of eminent ascetics called *Nirgrantha*.²⁹

He reaps the reward of that same (*act of piety*), who, on the understanding that it is for the enjoyment of the god, preserves this (*grant*) which has been duly acquired, (*and applies it*) for the use of the grain which is the portion of the god, and the worship of the god, and the oblation, and the *charu*³⁰, and the performer of the rites of the god, and the maintenance of the repair of whatever may be broken, and other objects; he, who may destroy it, incurs the guilt of the five great sins!

And it has been said:—Land has been enjoyed by many kings, from *Sagara* downwards; (&c.)!

(*This charter has been*) written by the General, *Naravara*.

²⁷ *Āsī*, or *abhāt*, has to be supplied after *paurṇamāsī* in l. 6.

²⁸ *Śvētapata*, or *Śvētāmbara*,—a sect of Jain ascetics who wear white clothes.

²⁹ *Nirgrantha*,—a sect of Jain ascetics who wear no clothes.

³⁰ *Charu*,—a preparation of rice, barley, and pulse, boiled with butter and milk, for presentation to a god.

WHERE WAS THE SOUTHERN CHARITRAPURA MENTIONED BY HIWEN THSANG?

BY A. C. BURNELL, Ph.D., M.C.S.

It is well known that Hiwen Thsang mentions¹ two ports on the Coromandel coast both of which he calls *Charitrapura*, and from which, he informs us, the traffic with the further East was conducted. The most northern of these was in the far north;² the southern *Charitrapura* has been usually asserted to have been what is now called Negapatam, but the reasons for this position appear to me to be without foundation, and the identification seems a mere guess. Hiwen Thsang describes this port as being in the north-east of the kingdom of *Malakûta* (as Stanislas Julien rightly rendered the name), but this kingdom has not as yet been identified. I shall now show that a Tamil inscription of the 11th century A.D. helps to clear up the matter in a satisfactory way; but it is first necessary to take the excellent Chinese monk's account of the kingdom of *Malakûta* and its surroundings, for his statements in this respect afford substantial proof of the correctness of the new identification which I shall here propose.

He mentions, first of all, the kingdom of *Drâvîda*, the capital of which, he says, is *Kien-chi-pu-lo*, which corresponds to *Kâñchipura* or Conjeveram. This is, therefore, the neighbourhood of the modern Madras, and corresponds to the territory of the Pallava kings, with whom Sir Walter Elliot first made us acquainted. Hiwen Thsang adds of himself: "En partant de ce pays, il fit environ trois mille *li* au sud, et arriva au royaume de *Mo-lo-kiu-ch'a* (*Malakûta*)."³

He says (p. 122): "Au sud . . . s'élèvent les monts *Mo-la-ye* (Malayas) . . . (p. 124) Lorsqu'on sort de *Malakûta* dans la direction du nord-est, sur le bord de la mer, on rencontre une ville (nommée *Che-li-ta-lo*—(*Charitrapura*); c'est la route des voyageurs qui vont dans le royaume de *Seng-kia-lo* (*Sinhala*—Ceylon), que baigne la mer du midi. Les habitants de ce pays rapportent que, lorsqu'on s'embarque pour le quitter, après avoir fait environ trois mille *li*

au sud-est, on arrive au royaume de *Seng-kia-lo* (*Sinhala*—Ceylon)."

It appears that Hiwen Thsang returned to *Kâñchipura* from *Malakûta*, and thence went to *Koñkanapura*,⁴ the modern *Koñkanahalli*, in Maisur. It is thus evident that *Madurâ* and the extreme south of India cannot be intended by *Malakûta*; and again, if this be assumed to be *Madurâ*, and *Charitrapura* be assumed to be *Negapatam*, it is difficult to understand the statement that *Charitrapura* was in the north-east of the kingdom.

No doubt the *Pândya* kings of *Madurâ* for some time held in subjection what is now the *Tanjor* provinces, and what was once the best part of the *Chola* kingdom, but how could their northern limit be ever about *Negapatam*? It must either have been north of the delta of the *Kâverî*, or have been south of the almost uninhabited country which separates the fertile parts of *Tanjor* from the fertile parts of *Madurâ*. Again, Hiwen Thsang (even making great allowances for his necessarily defective geography) could hardly have said that the *Malaya* mountains are south of *Malakûta* if the last be *Madurâ*: for if he had visited that place he would have seen them, and would necessarily have put them in the west. Orientals never err in directions, at all events.

Again, if we look at the text of Hiwen Thsang a little closely, it will be evident that in speaking of the kingdoms of the south of India he did not intend that they should be regarded as conterminous. His kingdoms—as the measurements he gives show—were composed of the deltas of rivers and similar fertile tracts; the large extent of barren and almost uninhabited land which then, as now, separated the fertile tracts was regarded by him as neutral land. Thus his *Drâvîda* is the small *Pallava* kingdom composed of the fertile territory near *Kâñchiparam*; the next kingdom would naturally be in the delta of the *Kâverî* and *Kolerûn*.

¹ *Pèlerins Bouddhistes*, tom. I. p. 184; tom. III. pp. 90, 124.

² *Che-li-ta-lo* (*Charitra*)—in Chinese *Fa-hing-ch'ing*—'the city of departure'—in the south-east of the kingdom of *U-ch'a* (*Uda*) is placed by M. de St.-Martin at the northern mouth of the *Brâhmañi* in Orissa; Cunningham supposes it was at *Puri* (*Anc. Geog.* p. 510).—Ed.

³ *Pèlerins Bouddhistes*, tom. III. p. 121.

⁴ This is much the same description as is given by Hsui Li—*ibid.* I. pp. 193-4.

⁵ *Kong-kien-na-pu-lo* (tom. III. p. 146), which Cunningham tries to identify with *Annagundi* on the *Tungabhadra* (*Anc. Geog.* pp. 553-3); Fergusson with the capital of the *Kōṅgā* kingdom (*Jour. R. As. Soc. N. S.* vol. VI. pp. 266, 396); and V. de St.-Martin, with *Banavâsi* (*Pèler. Bouddh.* tom. III. p. 401).—Ed.

Hiwen Thsang gives his measurements of distance with a great show of accuracy in li, but the great difficulty is to ascertain what li he used, for the value of this measure has varied enormously* in China at different periods. It is also unsafe to attach any great value to these distances given by him, as it is obvious that he could have had no means of accurately determining the distances he travelled, and that he must have used round terms.

Thus the only safe data to be derived from Hiwen Thsang's journal as regards the position of this Charitrapura are:—(1) It was in the north-east corner of Malakûta; (2) Malakûta was the kingdom next on the south to the Drâvida kingdom, of which the capital was Kâñchipuram. Other considerations render it very unlikely that Charitrapura is the modern Negapatam,⁷ but it is unnecessary to mention them here.

The new information that I am able to bring to bear on this question is derived from the great Tamil inscription of Kulottuṅga (Vîra) Chola which surrounds the shrine of the chief temple at Tanjor. Kulottuṅga (who reigned from 1064 to 1113 A.D.) was a great benefactor to this temple, and the inscription records gifts and endowments made by him, as well as others, from about 1067 to the end of the century. Among the endowments by others than the king we find one by the community (*Sabhaiyâr*) of Malakûtachûdâmanichaturvedimaṅgalam, which is said to be in the Avûrkûram of Nittavinodavaṇanâdu. The meaning of the name of the village is plain: the Brâhmanical settlement of Chaturvedimaṅgalam was

'Malakûtachûdâmani,' or 'an ornament of (the kingdom of) Malakûta,' and indeed it comes nearly first in the list of endowments by private persons; it was in the subdivision (*kûṛram*) of Avûr, which was, therefore, in Malakûta. Now Avûr is still a well-known place, and it is situated some five or six miles south-west of Kumbakonam. All the other places mentioned in this part of the inscription are also near Tanjor.

It follows, therefore, that Malakûta was the name of the kingdom comprised, roughly speaking, in the delta of the Kâveri; the name itself appears to be that of a former suburb of the actual Kumbakonam, which was probably then the capital; perhaps Suvâmmimalai is the modern representative of it. If, then, we look to the north-east of the Kâveri delta, and recollect that Charitrapura is a mere epithet, there can be no difficulty in identifying Hiwen Thsang's port with Kâveripattanam, the once famous port at the mouth of the Kâveri, and which is mentioned by Ptolemy (in the second century) as *Chaberis emporium*.

Legends of its importance are still current, and it was the native place of a famous Tamil poet—Pattanaattu Pillai. It seems to have finally ceased to be a place of importance in the fifteenth century, partly owing to the gradual silting up of the bed of the Kâveri; and nothing now remains but a few sandy mounds with fragments of brick strewn over them, and traces here and there of temples. The establishment of Negapatam by the Telugu chiefs of Tanjor as their chief port was probably a result of the decay of the original Pattanam.

ARCHÆOLOGICAL NOTES.

BY M. J. WALHOUSE, LATE M.C.S.

(Continued from p. 26.)

No. XVII.—Some Hindu Snake-notions.

An attempt is here made to bring together some notions and superstitions respecting snakes that I have met from time to time in India. It is not presumed to do more than touch the deep and difficult subject of the origin and meaning of the old Nâga worship, Nâga races, and Nâga sculptures and mythology. Works like Mr. Fergusson's *Tree and Serpent Worship*, and

treatises by great Orientalists, warn amateur intruders from such ground. I would only remark that the dread of the snake is as strong amongst peoples of all nations and colours as ever it was in the ages of fetish or totem worship. Amongst the civilized it is generally a sentiment of unreasoning horror at the sight or idea of any snake, whilst amongst the uncivilized,

* I owe this important information to my friend Mr. Groeneveldt.

⁷ Conf. Cunningham's *Anc. Geog.* p. 550; and *Jour. R. As. Soc. N. S.* vol. VI. p. 266.—Ep.

religious awe and veneration are superadded. In all ages and degrees of culture, however, mere observation of a snake is sufficient, to a very considerable extent, to account for this. It is seldom, perhaps, that a snake is seen, especially by Europeans, when unsuspicious and unalarmed. Notice of the neighbourhood of one is always the signal for immediate attack and pursuit. But whoever may have watched a serpent that perceived not that it was observed will know what a different feeling it excites to that aroused by any other creature, however ferocious. The presence of neither tiger, leopard, nor wild elephant calls up a like sort of apprehension. The fixed malicious intelligence of its eyes, so different from the eyes of other animals, the mystery of its motion, and the idea suggested of swift, unescapable deadly attack, all convey a peculiar thrill of alarm. There were three things that were too wonderful even for the wisest of kings, and one of them was "the way of a serpent upon a rock." Weird and unearthly indeed it is, and the serpent-priests of Epidaurus and Asia Minor watched for it as they sang their adjuration, "Come! come! come! emerge from thy cavern! Swift one who runnest without feet, captor who takest without hands! Sinuous as the rivers, coil-orbed as the sun, black with spots of gold like the sky sown with stars! Like the tendrils of the vine and the convolutions of the entrails! Unengendered! eater of earth! always young! good to men! Come! come! come! emerge from thy cavern!" Its secret and silent habits and long endurance may have inspired its ancient renown for subtlety above all beasts. From its dwelling in caves and crevices, it knew all the secrets and treasures of the under-world, and often bore the choicest gems upon its forehead; and when men saw the "quick cross lightning" of the storm, or the silent wavering streamers of the evening sky, they believed that serpents were in the gods' world too. Because the cunning of all creatures of the fields, woods, and waters was gathered together in the snake, any one who tasted its flesh or blood forthwith knew the speech of all fowls, and became wise in the ways of beast-kind. So it has always

been that men have everywhere looked with fear or veneration upon the snake.¹

The Hindus have notions of their own too. They say that snakes have twenty-four legs, which are invisible to the eye of men,—possibly taking this idea from centipedes. For twenty-six days after birth, moreover, they have no poison, but on the twenty-seventh day they spread out their hoods to the sun and dance, and the rays striking upon the four upper fangs ripen and fill them with poison. Each of the four fangs has its own name,—Kâli, Kâlâsti, Yâman, and Yâmathûtan,—all names of deadly meaning, and each inflicts its own peculiar sort of wound, and the poison from each has its own way of operation. The first-named fang leaves a mark like a cross, and a clear fluid exudes from the wound; the poison instilled (which in all cases remains stationary for a hundred seconds, except in the case of a bite from a young snake whose venom has just been animated by the sun on its twenty-seventh day, when death is instantaneous) rises in the skin. The second fang leaves a triangular wound, whence a yellow fluid issues, and the venom rises in the flesh. The fang Yâman makes a hook-shaped mark; blood comes from it, and the poison rises in the bones. The fourth fang inflicts a curved puncture, a whitish fluid exudes, and the poison goes up into the marrow. Sometimes a small sharp tooth grows with the four fangs; a wound from this, as also from the fourth fang, Yâmathûtan, is always deadly. But it is consolatory to reflect that both are imaginary, and that only two poison-fangs can be found in the jaw of the worst-disposed snake. A bite is held to be fatal on any of these places,—the head, the lip, the chin, the breast, the navel, the palm of the hand, and the sole of the foot; fatal also if inflicted in a ruined house or uninhabited place, in a temple, cemetery, or dry tank, amongst reeds or bamboos, near a banyan or tamarind tree, by an idol-car or cross-ways; at morning, evening, or during sleep. Again, a wound is fatal if, after biting, the snake spreads its hood and dances, lies motionless, or chases the man: also if the wound bleeds and the limbs tremble, it will be fatal; or if the eyes sink and

¹ When it is considered that the deaths from snake-bites officially reported in 1869 in Malabar alone were of men 186, of cattle 636, and the total number of deaths of men in British India in the same year were 11,416; that such

totals are concluded from very inadequate returns, and that it is more than probable the annual deaths from bites are not fewer than 20,000,—another great and obvious cause for the dread of serpents will be recognized.

the limbs swell, and the lips, nails, and palms grow dark, death will follow. Effects, too, depend upon the state of the snake; a bite from one laying her eggs causes the eyes of the sufferer to become red and inflamed; if the snake be a strong young female the left eye is lost; if a male, the right eye. A bite from a black snake makes the ears deaf.

There are some other notions respecting snake-bites, so fantastic as to be hardly worth setting down were they not a part of folk-lore. The Tamil people have eight cardinal points, named after eight deities: to wit, *Indran* (north-east), *Varunan* (east), *Agni* (south-east), *Yâman* (south), *Kâtu* (south-west), *Śivan* (west), *Niruthi* (north-west), *Kuveran* (north). Now if a messenger bringing intelligence of any person having been bitten comes from *Indran*, *Varunan*, *Yâman*, or *Kuveran*, the snake that bit was a male; if from *Agni*, *Śivan*, or *Niruthi*, a female; if from *Kâtu*, a man has not been bitten, but a beast. If a messenger from the east begins his announcement with broad *A*, one fang has entered; if with *U* three fangs; if with long *A*, two; if with *E*, all the four; and so on, with variations according to the point from which the message came. But from whatever point an announcement may come that begins with *O* it is not to be believed. More fantastic still, it is to be understood that no one breathes through both nostrils at the same moment, but alternately, using them in turn for an hour and a half each. Now if a person announcing a snake-bite comes first on the side of the breathing nostril, and then, whilst speaking, crosses over to the other side, the bitten person will have died; if contrariwise,—that is, if the messenger approaches on the side of the stopped nostril, and, after telling his tale, crosses to the breathing side, the bitten one will recover!

There is a great deal of serpent-worship in South Kânara, on the western coast; and on one of the highest mountains of the Ghâts, named *Subramanya*, there is one of the most famous serpent-temples in India. The locality is extremely wild and feverish, excessively so during the cold and dry seasons; nevertheless great numbers of pilgrims resort thither, especially during the December festival called *Kukka Shasti*, when a great cattle-

fair is also held at the foot of the mountain. The temple has no architectural pretensions, being indeed mostly constructed of laterite, the sanctuary in the centre, containing the idol *Subbaraya*,² being of granite. It is square in form with an open cloister running round the four sides, and numbers of the 'coiling folk' reside in it in holes and crevices made for them. Numbers of persons who have made vows roll and wriggle round the temple serpent-fashion, and some will even roll up to it from the foot of the hill, a mile distant. They also take home with them some earth from the sacred serpent-holes. This earth is believed to cleanse from leprosy if rubbed on the parts affected, and to remove the stigma of barrenness from women if a little be daily put in the mouth. This serpentine body-rolling, called *âṅgâ-pratâchinam*, is practised also further south, where small snake-temples—in Tamil, *Nâga-kovil*—are not unfrequent. I have seen one not far from the town of *Madurâ*, on the bank of the *Vaigai* river; the only images in it were large painted cobras with gaping red mouths; and there are men in *Madurâ* who for payment will perform any number of rollings round it as proxies for persons who have vowed them. These rollings are done very rapidly, with great fury and vociferation. I may also mention another remarkable serpent-shrine. Deep in the *Travankor* forests, on the bank of one of the many rivers flowing thence to the western sea, there is a small granite temple wonderfully sculptured, considering its situation; and in the bed of the river opposite there rises a tall rock called *Pâmbu-pârer* ('Snake-rocks'), a glistening band, suggestive of a serpent's trail, winding round and round it from bottom to top in a very curious manner, apparently caused by micaceous veins in the rock. It is held extremely sacred, but I know not what ceremonies are practised there.

To return to South Kânara: a species of serpent-worship is in use there which I never heard of in the interior districts. The following particulars respecting it were obtained from a very intelligent native. Three afflictions are looked upon as due to the wrath of serpents for having killed a snake in a former life, namely leprosy, childlessness, and sore eyes. People so

² *Subbaraya* = serpent-lord; the image is said to be a shapeless block.

afflicted often perform costly ceremonies to remove the curse, which are superintended by the *Mādhava Brāhmaṇs*, originally fishermen, and not acknowledged as *Brāhmaṇs* out of *Kānara*. There are two ceremonies in ordinary use. The first, generally performed by a childless man, is *Sarpa Sampośkara*, or 'the serpent's funeral.' The fifth, sixth, fifteenth, or thirtieth of the month is chosen, and the family priest called to preside. The childless or afflicted penitent bathes and dresses himself in silk or linen attire, a spot in the house is chosen and the priest sprinkles some consecrated rice about it, to drive away any lurking devil, and then he and the penitent sit side by side on two wooden stools, kneading rice or wheat flour into dough. He then makes the figure of a serpent, and with many muttered holy *mantrams* is believed to animate the figure, and transform it for the time into a live serpent. Milk and sugar are then offered to it, and it is worshipped as a deity. After this other *mantrams* are said, undoing the spell previously wrought, and taking away the life that was given. The serpent being dead, the penitent assumes the garb of mourning, and shaves off his beard and moustaches. He then carries the figure on his head to the bank of a river, where he reverentially places it upon a pile. The figure is then fenced round with chips of sandalwood and camphor, and melted butter poured over all. The pile is then lit with fire brought by the penitent from his own house with a vow that it shall be used only for burning the serpent-god. When burnt the ashes are thrown into the river. The penitent is considered unholy and must not be touched for three days. On the fourth day the funeral of the serpent-god ends with an entertainment to eight unmarried youths below the age of twenty; they are held to represent eight serpents, and are treated with the utmost respect. This curious symbolical ceremony evidently denotes penitence and amends for the supposed killing of one of the sacred creatures in a former life, and the temporary ascription of serpent-nature to the young men seems a trace of the very ancient and wide-

spread idea of the transformation of men into serpents, and serpents into men, which appears almost extinct in Lower India.

The second ceremony, called *Nāgamaṇḍala*, is resorted to when that first described has failed in producing the hoped-for results. The penitent gives a great feast to his castemen and unmarried youths, who are again supposed to personate serpents. In the evening bruised rice is scattered over a spot previously selected, and the figure of a great serpent traced out in it. The figure is then worshipped, and a band of musicians summoned and well primed with toddy to sustain them in their work. They dress themselves in women's clothes and put on jewels, drumming and piping go on furiously, and the leader imitates the deity, reeling and writhing about frantically, and at times uttering words, which are devoutly attended to as though spoken by the deity; yet the musicians are low-caste people. The wild discordant music is often prolonged throughout the night.* In the *Government Annals of Indian Administration* in 1867-68 there is the following notice:— "The Manipuris are nominally Hindus, and their only priests are women called *Naibis*, who are treated as oracles. The Rāja's peculiar god is a species of snake called *Pakungha*, from which the royal family claims descent. When it appears, it is coaxed on to a cushion by the priestess in attendance, who then performs certain ceremonies to please it."

Snake-worship does not appear to be distinctively an *Āryan* cult; the *Brāhmaṇs*, who doubtless found it flourishing, allowed and adopted it to a certain extent, but grudgingly.* Indications of this may be perceived in the facts that *Brāhmaṇs* avoid the sight of a snake, and hold meeting one to be the worst of omens, sufficient immediately to stop any undertaking. No *Brāhmaṇ* acts as a priest in any serpent rites, and there are no temples where the walls and pillars are so crowded with snake sculptures as the temples of the *Jains* in Southern India, ever the deadly foes of the *Brāhmaṇs*. It is within and around *Jaina* temples, too, that the 'snake-

* Other accounts of snake-worship in India will be found in the *Ind. Ant.* vol. I. p. 6, and vol. IV. pp. 83, 196-7, where it will be seen that in *Kāthiāwād* the idea of serpent transformation is still in full force. See, too, vol. II. p. 124, and vol. IV. pp. 5-6. To these must especially be added the very full and learned account of "Serpent-worship in Western India" given by *Rāo Sāheb Viśvanātha Nārāyaṇa Maṇḍlik* at pp. 169 *et seqq.* of vol. IX. of the *Jour. Bo. Br.*

R. As. Soc.; the ceremonies detailed above are recounted by him so minutely as to render my notice superfluous but for some local variations and particulars. See, too, *Tree and Serpent Worship*, 2nd ed. Appendix D.

* Even when depicted in connection with *Brāhmanical* gods as overshadowing or guarding *Śiva*, *Nārāyaṇa*, &c., it is in a subordinate capacity.

stones,' of which a typical collection will be seen delineated at page 5, vol. IV. of the *Ind. Ant.*, are most numerous. These stones, which mostly have an appearance of extreme antiquity, were thought by the late Mr. Boswell to be possibly a remnant of the earliest tribes who preceded the Skythian invaders, and the oldest representations of native art existing in the country (*Ind. Ant.* vol. I. pp. 150, 372). However this may be,—and probably investigation and evidence would fail to support the hypothesis,—there is yet something strange and mysterious about these serpent-stones. They mostly have an appearance of extreme antiquity, blurred, worn, and mouldered by age, and though all castes regard them with some sort of awe or superstitious respect, none appear to claim them as specially pertaining to themselves. None will point at them, as it is believed the finger that so pointed would rot and drop from the hand. Women lay offerings of flowers before them and touch the sculptured heads with paint, believing they will be thereby blessed with children, but men very seldom appear to offer them any sort of adoration. They seem apart from existing systems, and, as it were, the fossils of an extinct generation. The enigmatical figure, in what Mr. Boswell called a Skythic cap and tunic, that so often accompanies the sculptured serpent, also appears to have nothing in common with Hindus.

It may be observed that in the neighbourhood of Hassan and Hâlabid, in Maisur, a frequent subject amongst the Jaina remains is the figure of a naked woman twined with a serpent encircling the right thigh. This is *always* accompanied by a smaller figure, clothed as for a cold climate, in a posture of adoration. I have more than once heard stories of snakes showing love for women, and in 1871 the following account appeared in the *Western Star* :—

“ A very extraordinary incident was lately reported to have occurred a few miles from Bêpur, in Malabar. A native female of very attractive appearance, whilst sweeping the yard of her house, heard a hissing noise behind her. Turning to see, she found to her terror a large cobra advancing towards her. Before she could fly or call for help, the snake darted at her and coiled round one of her legs, rising swiftly higher and higher till it brought its

open hood in contact with her face, there moving it to and fro like a screen. In this pitiable and frightful position she had to remain for nearly two days, without being able to lie down or sleep. None but females could approach her to feed her with milk and plantains, when it is said, the cobra turned its head to one side, allowing her to nourish herself. But on any men coming near the cobra would hiss fearfully and tighten its hold round her body in such a manner as to make her feel breathless. Many conjurors came to relieve her, but none succeeded, till a Nair from the interior, by certain charms and spells, disentangled the poor woman from her venomous lover. The snake then crept back into the bushes whence it came, and the woman is now doing well. The above occurrence is now a general talk amongst the natives.”

Such an occurrence, with whatever foundation, real or fancied, may throw some light upon the Jaina sculptures, as well as upon the stories current all over the world of serpent-husbands and serpent-wives, or deities assuming serpent-shape—“ a dragon's fiery form belied the god.” Numberless kings and conquerors, besides Alexander, sprang from such ancestry, and the mythology and folk-lore on the subject are endless.

No. XVIII.—*Sepulchral Customs, existing and prehistoric.*

Mr. James Fergusson, in the Introductory Observations to his work *Rude Stone Monuments*, insists forcibly on the unprogressive character of savage tribes, even after long contact with the white man. They are everywhere dying out, and in all the civilized parts of Europe have long been exterminated by the progressive Aryan races, who have usurped their places. The stone implements they used, and the megalithic monuments they raised, remained, and are to-day objects of deep interest to their civilized successors, as the only clues to conjecturing their habits and history. As Mr. Fergusson remarks, it is infinitely more philosophical to reason from the known backwards; and if tribes should be discovered living in primeval wildernesses, where they may well have existed from unknown ages unchanged in habits, aloof from higher races, and if moreover amongst them monuments should be in use much resembling the vestiges of what must have been similar tribes in Europe, all such monuments and ceremonies and usages

connected with them must have a strong interest, as possibly throwing a faint light on the usages of prehistoric Europe. Elsewhere (p. 478) Mr. Fergusson has indicated the central plateau of India, especially the Nizâm's dominions, as containing probably the solution of half the difficulties, ethnological or archæological, that are now perplexing us; and it is on the north and east of that region, in the same ethnic area, that Colonel Dalton, in his *Ethnology of Bengal*, has described existing customs, which may easily have come down unchanged from stone-age periods. As his magnificent quarto, published by the Government of Bengal, is not generally accessible, a few extracts may be anthropologically and archæologically interesting.

"On the death of a respectable Ho or Mûnda,⁵ a very substantial coffin is constructed and placed on fagots of firewood. The body, carefully washed and anointed with oil and turmeric, is reverently laid in the coffin, and all the clothes, ornaments, and agricultural implements that the deceased was in the habit of using are placed with it, and also any money that he had about him when he died. Then the lid of the coffin is put on, and fagots placed around and above it, and the whole is burnt. The cremation takes place in front of the deceased's house. Next morning, water is thrown on the ashes, search made for bones, and a few of the larger fragments are carefully preserved, whilst the remainder, with the ashes, are buried. The selected bones are placed in a vessel of earthenware,—we may call it an urn,—and hung up in the apartment of the chief mourner,—generally the mother or widow,—that she may have them continually in view, and occasionally weep over them.⁶ Thus they remain till the very extensive arrangements necessary for their final disposal are effected. A large tombstone has to be procured, and it is sometimes so ponderous that the men of several villages are employed to move it; and some wealthy men, knowing that their successors may not have the same influence that they possess, select during their lifetime a suitable monument, and have it moved to a handy position to be used when they die. When required for use, it is brought to the family burial-place, which with the Hos is close to the houses, and near it a deep round hole is dug for the reception of the cinerary urn. When all is ready, a funeral party collect in front of the deceased's house—three or four men with very deep-toned drums, and a group of about eight

young girls. The chief mourner comes forth carrying the bones exposed on a decorated tray, and a procession is formed. The chief mourner, with the tray, leads; the girls form in two rows, those in front carry empty and partly broken pitchers and battered brass vessels; and the men with the drums bring up the rear. The procession advances with a very ghostly dancing movement, slow and solemn as a minuet, in time to the beat of the deep-toned drums—not directly, but mysteriously gliding now right, now left, now marking time, all in the same mournful cadence—a sad dead march.

"The chief mourner carries the tray generally on her head, but at regular intervals she slowly lowers it, and, as she does so, the girls also gently lower and reverse the pitchers and brass vessels, and looking up for the moment with eyes full of tears, they seem to say, 'Ah! see! they are empty.'"

In this manner the remains are taken to the house of every friend and relative of the deceased within a circle of a few miles, and to every house in the village; and, as the procession approaches each habitation in the weird-like manner described, the inmates all come out, and the tray having been placed on the ground at their door they kneel over it and mourn, shedding tears on the remains, as their last tribute of affection to their deceased friend. The bones are thus also conveyed to all his favourite haunts, to the fields he cultivated, to the grove he planted, to the tank he excavated, to the threshing-floor where he worked with his people, to the *akhrâ* or dancing arena where he made merry with them, and each spot which is hallowed with reminiscences of the deceased. When this part of the ceremony is completed, the procession returns to the village, and, slowly circling round the great stone slab, gradually approaches its goal. At last it stops; a quantity of rice, cooked and uncooked, and other food, is now cast into the grave, and the charred fragments of bone, transferred from the tray to a new earthen vessel, placed over it. The hole is then filled up and covered with the large slab, which, however, does not rest on the ground, but on smaller stones, which raise it a little. One such slab over the grave of the wife of the head-man of the village of Pokuria measured 17 feet 2 inches in length, its greatest

⁵ The Hos and Mûndas, branches of the great Kol family, inhabit Singbhum and the hilly tracts bordering on Châtia Nâgpur.

⁶ Compare accounts of Toda funerals—*Ind. Ant.*, vol. III. pp. 93 and 274.

width was 9 feet 2 inches, and thickness from ten inches to a foot. Its weight was estimated at about six tons. This slab was procured in the bed of a river about three miles off. It was brought on a wagon constructed for the purpose, from three to four hundred men having been engaged in its transit.

Now here was a stone of truly megalithic proportions, placed over a sepulchral urn, just in the same way as so frequently occurs in the British Islands, Northern and Southern Europe, Northern Africa, Western Asia, and Southern India. In all those regions, however, such monuments are ascribed to prehistoric peoples and periods of which nothing certain is known; but in the wilds of Central India we find them used to-day, with rites nothing inconsistent with what may have prevailed in megalithic periods, by tribes who may in all probability have changed but little since those times, with which these tribes, rites, and monuments may quite possibly display an unbroken thread of connection. Neither does it seem too strained an inference that the urn-covering megaliths in Britain may have been procured and placed in a manner, and with ceremonies, nearly resembling those we hear of prevailing to-day in the most primitive region of the oldest country of Asia.*

In addition to the slabs on the tomb, Colonel Dalton reports that "a megalithic monument is set up to the memory of the deceased in some conspicuous spot outside the village. The pillars vary in height from 5 or 6 to 15 feet, and apparently fragments of rock of the most fantastic shape are most favoured. Close to the station of Chaibâsa, on the road to Keonjhar, may be seen a group of cenotaphs of unusual size—one 11 feet 2 inches, another 13 feet, and a third 14 feet above the earth, and many others of smaller dimensions. The groups of such stones that have come under my observation in the Mûnda and Ho country are always in line. The circular arrangement so common elsewhere I have not seen."

Colonel Dalton gives a sketch by Mr. Ball, of the Geological Survey of India, of a group of four such memorial stones at Pokuria, near

Chaibâsa.⁸ They are almost grotesque in appearance, the highest 8 feet 4 inches above ground; the first in the group is to the memory of K h u n d a p â t e r, the father of Paseng, the present *mânki* (head-man) of Pokuria; the next two are to the memory of Kanchi and Samâri, young daughters of the *mânki*, and the last in memory of his son. This practice of erecting memorial stones may throw some light on the origin of Menhirs and of stone-worship: for it is easy to imagine how worship might come to be paid to the memorial stone of a famous man; and indeed one of the very wildest of these jungle tribes, the Kharrias, are described as "setting up in the immediate vicinity of their houses tall rough slabs of stone, and to these, as representing the deceased, they make daily oblations."

Colonel Dalton also reports another prehistoric practice prevailing amongst the Ahors on the Dibong river, in the valley of the Brahmaputra, on the N.E. frontier of India, which European antiquaries will at once recognize as the *contracted* form of burial:—"The rugged rocky soil on which their villages are built has probably originated a unique custom of sepulture, by which very small graves are required. The dead are trussed up so that the chin rests on the knees, and are placed in the small chamber prepared for them, in a sitting posture." Could the desire to save labour, to which Colonel Dalton ascribes this now existing custom, have had any weight in determining the contracted posture and small cists of prehistoric interments in Europe? It is noteworthy that the anti-Brahmical sect known as Jangams, Vira Saivas, or Liṅgavants, also bury their dead in a sitting attitude. This is noticed by the Roman knight and traveller Pietro della Valle, who, when at the court of Venkatapa Nayik at Ikkeri, writes, under date November 13th, 1623,—"Returning home I met a corpse going to be burned without the city, with drums sounding before it. It was carried sitting in a chair, whereunto it was tied that it might not fall, clothed in its ordinary attire, exactly as if it had been

* Elsewhere Col. Dalton describes similar customs prevailing amongst the Orâons or Dhangars of Chûtîâ Nâgpur, Singbhum, and Sambalpur. After burning the dead, the fragments of bones are collected and placed in an urn. "The burial-ground is always near a river, stream, or tank. As the procession proceeds with music to this place, offerings of rice are continually thrown over the cinerary urn till it is deposited in the grave prepared for it, and a large flat

stone placed over it. Then all must bathe. The money that was placed in the mouth of the corpse, and saved from the ashes, is the fee of the musicians. The person who carried the bones to the grave has to undergo purification by incense and the sprinkling of water."

⁸ Figured in *Ind. Ant.* vol. I. p. 202, with account by Mr. Ball.

alive. The seat was covered behind and on the sides with red and other colours. It was open only before, and there the dead person was to be seen. All dead people are carried thus, as well such as are buried (as the *Lingavani*, whom they also put into the earth sitting) as those that are burned." Pietro della Valle is the first European who mentions the *Jangama*s. At *Ikkeri*, he says, "I saw also certain Indian Friars, whom in their language they call *Giangama*, and perhaps are the same with the sages seen by me elsewhere; but they have wives, and go with their faces smeared with ashes, yet not naked, but clad in certain extravagant habits, and a kind of hood or cowl upon their heads of dyed linen of that colour which is generally used amongst them, namely, a reddish brick-colour, with many bracelets upon their arms and legs, filled with something within that makes a jangling as they walk. I

saw many persons come to kiss their feet, and whilst such persons were kissing them, and, for more reverence, touching their feet with their foreheads, these *Giangamas* stood firm with a seeming severity, and without taking notice of it, as if they had been abstracted from the things of the world: just," he adds quaintly, "as our Friars use to do when any devout persons come out of reverence to kiss their habit, but with hypocrisy conformable to their superstitious religion." Whether the good knight meant to include both sorts of friars in '*their*' does not seem clear. He also says that the king, Venkatapā Nayaka, was a "*Giangamo*." So was the last Rājā of Kurg, the Rājā of Sūndā, in Kanarā, and the Rājā of Punganūr, near Chittur. In the days of Haidar Ali, Nanda Rājā, ruler of Maisur, was a *Lingavant*, and the late Rājā of Maisur is stated to have worn the *linga* and also the Brāhmanical thread.

HISTORY OF THE KĀNPHĀTĀS OF KACHH.

BY DALPATRĀM PRĀNJIVAN KHAKHAR, EDUCATIONAL INSPECTOR, KACHH.

The origin and history of the Kānphātās of this province is shrouded, like the origin and history of similar old orders of many countries, in fabulous accounts, specially invented to impose upon the credulity of the ignorant, with a view to inspire them with awe and reverence. However cautious the inventor of the legend may have been in placing the origin of these Kānphātās at a very remote period, and in ascribing to the founder of the sect the miraculous power of turning the sea between Kachh and Sindh into the present Ran, human imperfection has left its mark, to enable the present generation to fix the probable time of the origin of these, in this country at least. The history of the Kānphātās of Dhinodhar is traced to Dharmānātha, who is said to have been one of the twenty-two disciples of Machhendranātha, or Matsyendranātha, among whom was Gorakhnātha, one of the most celebrated of the nine Nāthas or ascetics of ancient India, and about whose austerities, miracles, and resignation of the world almost every Hindu in India is well acquainted, on

account of the interesting stories sung about him by the stray musician.

The genealogy of Machhendranātha is given as under:—

- | | |
|---------------------|--------------------|
| 1 Nirānjan Nirākār. | 5 Achetnātha. |
| 2 Adhika Somanātha. | 6 Ādinātha. |
| 3 Chet Somanātha. | 7 Machhendranātha. |
| 4 Omkāranātha. | |

This Machhendranātha travelled through the world, and visited many holy places, and made a host of disciples.¹ Among these was Gorakshanātha, who surpassed his *gurū*, or adopted father, in meritorious deeds. He is venerated throughout Hindustān, and there are many religious places where temples are dedicated to him. In Kāthiāwād there is a small temple called *Gorak-Madhā*, where he is worshipped; but the chief places of his worship are in Gorakhapur near Haridwār, in Nepāl and in the Panjāb. He is the eponymous deity of the Gōrkhālis, or people of Gōrkhā, in Nepāl. He came to Kachh also, where there is a well near Dhamaḍkā, called after his name. He is said to be *chiranjivi*, i.e. 'ever-living.'

The word *Kānphātā* comes from *kān*, 'the

¹ The Nepālese make him the same as Āryāvalokiteśvara-Padmapāni Bodhisatva. Gorakshanātha is said to have lived in Nepāl in the time of Rājā Baradeva or Bala-deva, about the fifth or sixth century. See Wright's

History of Nepal, pp. 140-152, where a legend of Padmapāni-Āryāvalokiteśvara-Matsyendranātha is given; Hodgson's *Essays* (Trübner's reprint), ii. p. 40.—Ed.

ear,' and *phātā*, 'to slit,' thus signifying 'a person having his ears slit.' At what time and by whom the practice of slitting the ears was introduced is not known; but most of them declare that they do it after Śiva, whose followers as Yogis they are.

Dharmanātha is said to have come from Peshāwar to Kāthiāwād, and thence to Kachh, in search of a secluded place to perform *tap* or penance. He had with him a *Sādḥaka* (or helping friend) named Sarannātha, and a disciple named Garibnātha. Another account gives the name of the latter only. He selected Ryān, on the eastern bank of the river Rukhamāvatī, about two miles north of the present town of Māṇḍavī, where, according to one account, there reigned a chief named Gadbesing, the father of the celebrated Vikrama of Ujāyanī, and according to another account one Rāmādeva, of the tribe of Chāvādā Rājputs. The former is an invention of the people, wherever old coins bearing the device resembling an ass are found; while the latter is more probable, as there appear to have been many small principalities of the Chāvādās about the time the ancestors of the present Jhādejas entered the province as adventurers, and even subsequently. This is corroborated by the Bhāts, who are said to possess some rude poetical compositions on the subject.

Having selected an umbrageous tree, as is the case with the people of his order, at some distance from the palace of the Chief, Dharmanātha made his *dhunī*, or fire, and began to perform his penance, at the same time ordering Garibnātha to go into the town with his *jholī*, or wallet, for alms; but the latter found the people so impious and hard-hearted as not to give him any countenance. There was only one woman, of the carpenter caste, who gave him a cake of bread. He had, therefore, recourse to fetching wood from the neighbouring forests and selling it in the town. From the proceeds of this he purchased corn and took it to the old woman, who prepared bread from it, and, adding to it a cake of her own, gave them to him without taking any remuneration. These he took to Dhundhūmall,²

to which Dharmanātha had changed his name, and both partook of the frugal meal. They passed twelve years in this manner, Dharmanātha believing all the while in the charitable character of the people. After the penance was over, one day Garibnātha was asleep, covered, as usual, with a cloth, to hide an ulcer made by the constant lifting of bundles of wood. The wind blew off the cover, and Dharmanātha, who happened to see it, was mortified to learn, after much persistence, the cause of the ulcer, in which maggots had begun to appear. He was all wrath, and resolved to test personally the inhospitable and impious character of the people. He found that none but the old woman would give any charitable contribution. He determined to overthrow the whole town, and bury the people in the ruins. He advised the woman to leave the town, with all that she valued. Garibnātha remonstrated with him, as the loss of so many lives would bring upon him those very sins which he had tried to wash away by penance. Dharmanātha upset his *pattar*, or alms-shell,³ and pronounced the curse "*Pattan sab dātān!*"—"Be buried all the Pattans cities!" when all the eighty-four Pattans sank underground, with all the people and valuables except the woman. On the ruins is the present village of Chotā Ryān, repopled in the time of the first Rāo, and given in charity to Chāran Bāgchand, whose descendants enjoy it to this day. For about two miles brick foundations of buildings, jars, instruments, &c. have been discovered, and I myself have purchased some old copper and silver coins found in the fields. This same story is told of all the ruined cities in Kachh and Gujarāt; but the destruction may have been caused by some violent earthquake, and, as Pattan was a seaport town, the people must have removed themselves to the present site of Māṇḍavī* when they found that the sea had receded on account of the rising of the land.

Dharmanātha appears to have repented of his rash deed, and resolved to perform a second *tap* or penance. With this view he proceeded to a hill, which could not bear the weight of his sins, and was thence called *Nanau* (ननौ meaning 'weighed down'). Then he

² Some say Dhundhūmall was Dharmanātha's fellow-disciple and companion.

³ It is the hard shell of a very large oval fruit from Zanzibar, and used by Yogis, Fakirs, and anchorites as an alms and dinner plate throughout India. Its colour is black, and it is said to be the shell of a poisonous cocconut,

called *jherī nāriyela*. It must be the fruit of a kind of palm.

* The town of Māṇḍavī was founded by Rāo Khengārji through a Bhātiā named Topan on the 11th of the month of Māgha, Samvat 1686. Before this there were some fishermen's huts on the site.

repaired to another hill, which broke down with his weight,—hence called *Jhuryo* (झुर्यो) = 'broke'. At last he came to a third hill, which could bear his weight provided he ascended it with his back turned towards it. He did so, and as the hill bore the weight of his sins he called it *Dhīnodhar* (i.e. holder of धीरना = *dhīranā*, or 'patience.' He went to the highest peak and began to perform *tap* standing on his head, which rested on a conical ball of hard stone called *Vajra Sopārī*. He continued in this state for twelve years, during which time *Garibnātha* and a *Chāran* woman called *Deval* remained beside him, the latter supplying him with milk and ministering to his other wants. When the period of his penance was drawing to a close, the throne of *Indra* began to shake, and he was alarmed. He went to *Bhagavān*, who counselled him to devise means to stop his *tap*. Thereupon *Bhagavān* himself, the nine *Nāthas*, and the eighty-four *Siddhas* assembled together and alighted on the hill. They praised the austerity of his penance and besought him to rise, when he said that in whichever direction his eyes would open, that portion of the country would be burnt. Then *Gorakhanātha*, one of the nine *Nāthas*, after consulting the others, told him to open his eyes towards the sea on the north-east. Upon this he turned towards the sea and opened his eyes, when the sea was dried up and all the animals therein destroyed, leaving nothing else but the present *Rap*. When so many lives began to be destroyed, *Dharmānātha* declared he was losing the merit of his penance, whereupon *Gorakhanātha* asked him to turn his eyes towards his foot, but instead of doing so he turned them to the hill, which split into two valleys, leaving the part obstructed by the nose entire in the shape of the nose, by which name it is known at the present day.

Then *Dharmānātha*, with the *Nāthas* and *Siddhas*, descended. While doing so they proposed to have a treat of *bhāng* (infusion of *Cannabis indica*), but no water was to be had about the hill, when one of them, *Pīr Patha* (*Gopichand*), brought out water by striking his *kunari* or dagger into the side of the hill, and prepared the 'green beverage.' The hole was shown to me by my *cicerone*, but the water does not come out till a stick is thrust into it. The stick, which is a rude branch of a tree, has a knob at

the end, which brings out the water, of which there must be a reservoir the level of which must always remain a little below the hole. Those who ascend the hill can find water on their return only when they come to this place. The water is rather brackish, being impregnated with salts. They then came to another place, where all the *Siddhas* combined got water out miraculously, and called it the *Siddh-Viḍī* (सिद्धवीडी), or 'saints' pool.' It is said never to fail, and is held in great reverence; but when I visited it there was no water. My guide looked surprised, and ascribed this to its having been polluted by a low-caste person. The *Pīr*, he said, would come there and burn incense to the *Dādā* or Father *Dharmānātha*, who would refill it. Thence they came to the foot of the eastern side of the hill, which they selected as the spot for the present establishments. The *Nāthas* and *Siddhas* departed, and *Dharmānātha* made his *dhuni* or fire, built the monastery and established the Order of the *Kānphātās*, and commenced that charitable distribution of food the refusal of which had caused the destruction of the *Paṭṭans*. Then he went away, no one knows where. He is even said to be still living.

Garibnātha, thinking that some share of the sin of destroying the *Paṭṭans* must fall to his lot, determined to perform penance by standing for twelve years in *Bhadli*, 18 miles west of *Bhuj*, in a jungle, which is even at the present day very thick and mountainous. At this time the *Jats* were powerful near the hill of *Vārār*. The children of the *Jats* harassed the ascetic and disturbed his penance by pelting him with mango-stones. Being incensed, he went in search of some warrior tribe to expel these marauders, when, fortunately, the ancestors of the present *Jhāḍejās* had just entered the province and were trying to establish their authority. According to one account, *Jām Rāyadhan*, the son of *Lākhā Jhāḍēja*, who was reigning in the small principality of *Lakhiār Virā*, went to seek his blessing, when he encouraged him by his benediction to expel the *Jats* out of the province, and in this the *Jam* was successful. This *Rāyadhan* flourished between *Saṃvat* 1231 and 1271 (= A.D. 1175-1215), and there is a couplet on the subject in the *Kachhi* language:—

गरवो गरीब नाथ. भायो सुख भावाज । कुडा जत
कादि डिजो रायधनके राज.

i. e. "Solemn Garibnātha gave utterance through the mouth, and, expelling the treacherous Jats, gave dominion to Rāyadhan."

Another account places him in the time of Jām Hamirji, the father of the founder of Bhuj, who flourished in Samvat 1528-1580 (= A. D. 1472-1524). At this time Hamirji was reigning at Lākhiār Virā, not far from Bhadli, and his brother Ajoji at Bārā, near Terā. The fame of Garibnātha had excited these predatory chiefs to obtain from him some benediction to extend their dominions. Ajoji used to minister to the wants of the ascetic, and serve him regularly. One day the latter, being pleased with his devotion, ordered him to bring a can of milk early in the morning for his benediction. This a *Langhā* or musician of Hamirji's happened to hear, and at once reported it to his master, who came to the ascetic early in the morning with the milk. The ascetic, taking him for Ajoji, accosted him as the 'Lord of Kachh.' Subsequently came Ajoji with the milk, when the deceit was discovered, but it was too late, as Garibnātha's words could not be changed; but he said that Hamirji had practised deceit and he should have deceit in exchange, and his posterity would not be able to rule the province peaceably without the aid of his *Bhāyāds*. These have reference to the murder of Hamirji by Rāval Jām, and to the privilege of the *Bhāyāds* to sit in the Jhādejā Court. This latter tradition is generally believed, and is corroborated by many facts. Even at the present day the descendants of Ajoji, who enjoy the village of Khedoi, relate the deceit played by Hamirji. Hamirji began to reign at Lākhiār Virā in Samvat 1528 (= A. D. 1472), and he could not have received benediction earlier than 1500. Therefore the time of the penance of Garibnātha being deducted, we come to Samvat 1488 (= A. D. 1432), the time when the *dhunī* and the present establishment at Dhinodhar were first instituted. After this Garibnātha is said to have buried himself alive in a standing posture up to the crown of his head at Bhadli, where is a small temple which was rebuilt recently. What they call his skull is daubed with red lead and *ghāi*, and worshipped at the present day. The temple has no inscription on it. Considering that ascetics live long lives on account of their

temperate habits, the time of the destruction of Ryān could not be earlier than 1450. Dharma-nātha, then, must have come to Kachh about Samvat 1488, and not in Samvat 790 as found from the *Pīr*'s genealogy, but he went away after laying the foundation of the present Order. He himself belonged to the sect of Santanātha, whose places of worship are in Nepāl and in the Panjāb. After the penance he desired the Chāran Deval to ask for a reward. She said she was childless; would he be gracious enough to bless her with a son? This he said was not in her lot; when she replied that his word as well as her devoted services were equally lost. On this he said he himself would be born to her from a blister in the palm of her hand, but that she should never think of marrying him. He was afterwards born, and became the celebrated Rāval Pīr, who is worshipped in a temple on the coast three miles east of Maṇḍavi.

Garibnātha obtained as a reward the villages of Bhadli, Tharāudo, Kotḍo, &c., together with some imposts on the neighbouring villages, from the Jhādejās, which his descendants enjoy at the present day. He had two disciples named Ornātha and Panthanātha. The former, becoming a Siddha (deified), has a separate temple in the monastery of Dharma-nātha; while the latter had a disciple named Bhikharinātha, who was highly revered by Rāo Khen-gārji, who installed him as the first *Pīr* in Samvat 1545, on his agreeing to leave his wandering habits and to settle in one place. He also promised to give him a village, but both died soon after. He was succeeded by Prabhātanātha, who obtained the village of Ryān, in Samvat 1665, as a grant. The village has a temple built by Rāo Bhārmalji, in which I found the following inscription:—

संवत् १६६५ ना वरषे कार्तिक सुद १५ पीर श्री
भीमारीनाथ पीर हुआ पीरपंथ नाथना चेला पीर भी-
पारीना चेला पीर परमातनाथ. सध धोरमनाथना पीर आद
नाथ आ पीर परमात राजश्री बेंगारजी सुत राजश्री
भारमलजी वारे पीर आया. गाम रायण पराजत
नुपत धीपोधरजी ये अ पादर—राजश्री बेंगारजीये सहाइ
त हिंदूआणि गाय तरकाणे सुअर जे कोई अ गामना
पचार करे तेहेने गरीबनाथना भवोभवना पाप इ राजश्री
भीमना धरम छे. आई सवो धीपोधरनो छे. श्री राजश्री ना-
He is said to have also peopled the village of Angio, which they enjoy at present. The present *Pīr*, Hanjanātha, the 25th in descent, was

installed in Samvat 1920 by His Highness the late Rāo Prāgmajji.

The hill of Dhīnodhar is situated in the thickest jungle, and surrounded by a tract of country inhabited by pastoral tribes, who are generally very poor. At the foot are situated a number of buildings intended for the residence of the *Pīr* and of disciples, who have always assigned to them some duties. Among these buildings is a small rudely built and domed temple dedicated to Dharma-nātha, on a raised platform facing the east. It is about seven feet square, and its walls are as many feet high. In the temple itself is a marble image of Dharma-nātha, three feet high, with the *darśana* or rings of the sect in the ears. There are, besides, small *lingas* of Śiva and images of gods, either of brass or stone. A lamp fed with *ghī* is said to have been first lighted by Dharma-nātha, and to have been kept constantly burning ever since. A man is appointed to make the *pūjā* twice every day, in the morning and evening; who, after washing the images and offering rice, flowers, or leaves, burns incense mixed with *ghī*, and then waves the *arti* or light amidst the sounds of bell, gong, and drum, and after prostrating himself several times he retires.

In another part is a large *paṇḍāl* in which is the *dhunī*, kept constantly burning since it was first lighted by Dharma-nātha. It is fed with large logs of wood, for which a man is specially kept. There are, besides, four very large cauldrons placed on hearths, each capable of cooking a *khaṇḍī* of food. On ordinary days these are worshipped, but on *Gokulashṭami* and *Nava-rātri* days, which are held sacred, more wood is thrown into the *dhunī*, and rice and *lāpsī* (a dish of wheat-flour sweetened with sugar) are cooked in these cauldrons, which never fail for the people who assemble on those days.

There are, besides, several temples as *sa-mādhis* or tombs of the *Pīrs*, but without any inscription, in the monastery, which is enclosed with a high wall with turrets.

On the highest peak, which is 1268 feet, is the temple of Dharma-nātha, on the spot where he is said to have done penance. It was built by Brahma Kshatri Sheṭh Sundarji Śivaji

in Samvat 1877 (= A.D. 1821), after the great earthquake. The materials used are limestone and mud, with a plaster of chunam. It faces the east. It is 6 feet high and $5\frac{3}{4}$ feet square, with a Muhammadan dome. The entrance is only $4\frac{1}{2}$ feet high and 2 feet wide, and has no door. The wall is only a foot in thickness. In the temple is a triangular concave stone, in the cavity of which Dharma-nātha is said to have rested his head at the time of the penance. It is daubed with red lead and *ghī*. Near it is a small stone fixed as a *pāliyd*. Outside the temple is the original *dhunī*, which is lighted for three days in the month of Bhādrapada, when the *Pīr* resorts thither for the annual *pūjā*, and people from the surrounding villages assemble to do homage. Those who cannot come or ascend the hill satisfy themselves by looking at the fire of the *dhunī*, which can be seen from villages several miles round. I saw that the temple was cracked in several places, and in a state of dilapidation; and on my questioning the *Pīr* about repairing it, he said it was very difficult to get water there, on account of the difficulty of access. He said Sundarji, a very rich and great man, could do it, but he himself, though possessed of twelve villages, was unable to defray the expense of the repairs, unless copious rains were sent by the *Dādd* ('Father' Dharma-nātha). The peak commands a beautiful view of the surrounding country up to the opposite shore of the Raṇ. It is composed of basalt, limestone, and sandstone.

Their tenets appear to be those of the Yoga-Śāstra, or the abstract devotion practised by the *Yogīs* of the Nātha sect, and in which Dharma-nātha and Garibnātha were well versed; but the *Pīrs* of Dhīnodhar, except the first two or three, were ignorant of their tenets. They themselves, being generally converts from the shepherd⁵ tribe, are quite illiterate and ignorant, and know nothing but the name of the *Dādd*. They worship Śiva and follow the ritual of the Mātā, whose *stotra* the *Pīr* repeats on the 2nd of every month.⁶ They are celibates, and allow no woman to enter their precincts. I could find no works like those of the Nāthas of the north and the Dekhaṇ

⁵ Formerly Meghvāls or Dheds were admitted, and one of their *Pīrs*, Meghnātha, was of this caste. The *Yogīs* are therefore regarded as very low, though the practice of adopting Meghvāls has long since been discontinued.

⁶ On the Kānpḥātās see H. H. Wilson's *Essays*, vol. I. pp. 212-13, 216-13; *Orient. Mag.* 1824, p. 11; Postans, *Jour. R. As. Soc.* vol. V. pp. 268-71.—ED.

written by them. Their great aim appears originally to have been to feed suffering humanity, to whatever caste or creed the persons might belong, and for which they had obtained from the former Râos and others villages and lands. In this respect they resemble the order of St. Bernard in Europe, and are regular hospitaliers. But after obtaining the grants they gradually lost their character as disinterested *Yogis*, and brought upon themselves, as it were, the very worldly cares they had renounced. They began to lend money at interest, perhaps originally with the object of relieving the distressed by the accommodation; but at present I found the *Pîr* involved in managing the estates, collecting revenues, litigating about boundary disputes, and collecting outstandings, which are quite incompatible with the doctrine of the *Yoga*. I noticed, however, one feature in the order of *Dhînodhar* which is wanting in all the others in Kachh. The *Pîr* is a chaste man, and enforces celibacy with strictness among his disciples, by prohibiting any female from entering the precincts of the monastery.

In the large hall of the residence recipients of charity are twice fed, the low castes and Muhammadans being served in the compound. The food consists of *bājri* (millet) bread and *khichadî* of *bājri* and *math* (*Phaseolus aconitifolius*). I saw the *Pîr* himself serving *ghî* with a ladle of a two-picmeasure. Those who cannot partake of the cooked food receive it uncooked. Besides the members of the establishment, I saw about twenty-five persons from the surrounding villages, and stray travellers, answering to the call for dinner, which is loudly made twice a day by a man from an eminence. In times of drought and famine the number increases to three hundred. Besides the food, the *Pîr*, who always sits with a copper canister of opium, treats them to a few grains of it, according to their wants. I saw one paralytic, and another lame, who had sought shelter in the asylum.

The method of adopting disciples is very simple, as may be expected from their general ignorance. Persons of indolent habits, or afflicted with domestic calamities, generally become *Yogis* at an advanced age, but parents unable to support their children give their young boys to the *Pîr*. Orphans also are received. Before giving him his name he is called *Oghad*, or novice, and his conduct is

watched for eight months. His *Gurû*, or spiritual guide, makes him wear while a novice a black *shelî*, or sacred thread of wool with *Rudra* knot, corresponding to the *Yajnopavita* of the Brâhman, round his neck, with a two-inch horn called *Śringi-nâda*, or bugle. Through this bugle he is made to say *Om-kâra*, *Upadesa*, and *Adesa*, which he has afterwards to repeat twice every day at dinner, before the god and the *Gurû*. In fact it is a form of salutation to the superior. If after the appointed period his conduct is found satisfactory, he is taken before the god Bhairava, where a brother slits the cartilage of the ears, in which circular plate-like rings of agate, glass, or horn, called *darâna*, are suspended. After the ears are cured by thrusting in a *nimb* stick, dressing with *nimb* oil, his head, beard, and moustaches are shaved, never to be worn again. The *Gurû* then whispers in his ear the *Upadesa mantra*, or mystic instruction:—"Be wise, perform religious duties, and keep yourself prompt in the service of the *Gurû*." Now he becomes a *Yogi*, and has a name terminating in *Nâtha*. He spends his life in repeating the name of the *Dâdâ*, serving his *Gurû*, and doing the duty assigned to him. The disciple is the adopted son of the *Gurû*, and he succeeds his father on his death. The *Yogi* is buried, and on the twelfth day after his death a feast is given and alms distributed by the son.

The *Pîr* cannot wear an *angarakhâ*, or coat, but he throws over his body a red shawl or brick-coloured scarf, has a turban of gold-bordered blue silk, with a *shelî*, and a *langota* with a white *digaji* over the loins. He cannot put on leather shoes, but walks in *châkhadî*, or wooden shoes. This dress is given to him by the Râo at the time of his accession to the *Pîrship*. He also wears a number of gold ornaments of great value, but of rude old fashion. His *darâna*, or earrings, are covered with gold in which precious stones are set. He is highly respected by the people, and even by the Râo, who first pays a visit to his place (where the *Pîr* has the privilege of retaining his seat) before the latter comes to him. The dress of the others is simple, and dyed with ochre, but now it appears to be going out of fashion. There are about fifty *Yogis* in *Dhînodhar*.

The head of the sect of *Dhînodharis* is called the *Pîr*, while the heads of the branches

are called *Āyesa*. There are three such branches—the *Āyesa* of Baladhīā, which is next in importance to Dhīnodhar, the *Āyesa* of Arla, and the *Āyesa* of Mathal. The *Pīr* of Shivrā Maṇḍapa, in Bhuj, is separate. The last place was built by Rāo Desalji the elder in Saṁvat 1805, and given to a *Yogi* of Dhīnodhar; while the others have received their villages from Dhīnodhar on their separation. The *Yogi* of Dhīnodhar was expelled the monastery of Shivrā Maṇḍapa, which was given in charge of Shevānātha, a *Yogi* from Śrīnagar, who was installed as *Pīr* and given a village. These also, like the *Yogīs* of Dharmānātha, are of the Saṁtānātha sect, but are Śāktas and worship the horse image of Naklank. They do not have intercourse with the *Yogīs* of Dhīnodhar, whom they consider low, but keep it with the *Ātīs*. The annual income of Dhīnodhar is about 50,000 *korīs*. There is one monastery of Dharmānātha in Jodhpur, in Mārṇāḍ, held in high honour by the Mahārāja of that place. It was established through the influence of a *Pīr* from Bhuj who had been there.

The only other monastery of Kānpḥāṭās in Kachh is that of Kanthadnātha of Manpharo. Their origin is from Kanthadnātha, who was residing in Kanthkot with his *dhunī* about Saṁvat 900. About this time Moḍ and Manāi had come into Kachh, after killing their brother Unaḍ in Sindh. Moḍ had tried to build a fortress on the hill of Kanthkot, but it was thrown down by Kanthadnātha on his being asked to remove his *dhunī* from that part of the foundation which crossed it. On the death of Moḍ his son Sād appeased the wrath of the Nātha, and built the fortress and called it Kanthkot, from the *Yogi*. He also built a large temple and dedicated it to him, which was destroyed by the great earthquake, and replaced by a small but

beautiful temple. Kanthadnātha's descendants used to tend herds of cattle wandering about the hills, which abound in grass. Generally their *wāṇḍha*⁷ was near a well called Manphariyo.

The present village of Manpharo was founded by Ude-Kanthi. The land was given to him by Rāo Bhārmalji in Saṁvat 1705-7 (A.D. 1649). When he was passing by their *wāṇḍha*, the Nātha invited him to dinner, and miraculously fed the whole army from a small dish. On this the Rāo installed him as a *Pīr*, and gave him the land about the well Manphariyo for the expense of the establishment.

The *Pīr* removed the monastery from Kanthkot to this place, and began to feed travellers and other needy persons. The monks resemble in their peculiarities, manners, and customs those of Dhīnodhar. They call each member a Kanthad, instead of Nātha; they are selected from Rājput, Ahers, &c. They worship Kanthadnātha, and repeat his name with a rosary. They also worship Gaṇeśa, and are called *Gaṇeśa upāsi*. They are sworn to celibacy, but their morality is depraved. Their chief temple is at Kanthkot, where one of the members worships Kanthadnātha's image of marble, which sits cross-legged, twice a day. Once these Kānpḥāṭās were very powerful in Kachh. Besides Kanthkot and Dhīnodhar they had the monasteries of Kotesar, and Ajepāl in Ānjār, in their possession. They caught *Ātīs* and other *Sādhus* coming on pilgrimage and forcibly slit their ears. But they were afterwards conquered by the *Ātīs* from Junāgaḍh, about three hundred years ago, who took possession of their monasteries of Kotesar from Ringannātha, and of Ajepāl from the Nāthas of the Rāval sect, which have remained in their hands ever since. Their influence declined from that time.

MISCELLANEA.

AN ADDITIONAL NOTE ON HASTAKAVAPRA--ASTAKAMPRON.

The letter of Major J. W. Watson regarding the identification of Hastakavapra, or Hastavapra, with the modern Hāthab, published in *Ind. Ant.* vol. V. p. 314, imposes upon me the duty of saying a word on the subject. In fact, I

ought to have apologized to Major Watson long ago for having omitted to mention that the identification both of Hastavapra and of Kukkata is not my property. I should have done so at once if I had not been convinced that my learned friend is fully aware that the omission of his name was due to no other cause than careless-

⁷ A temporary residence made of rushes and leaves near watering-places.

ness. In now performing this *prāyāścitta*, I beg to add a few remarks which, I think, tend to strengthen Colonel Yule's important identification of Hastakavapra with Astakampron.

Major J. W. Watson has suggested in his note (l. c.) that Hāthab once must have been an important harbour, and have taken the place which Gundi-Koliak held during the Middle Ages. I am now able to confirm this statement, and to prove that when the place belonged to the kingdom of Valabhī, it certainly was more than a small village. Both in the inscription of Dhruvasena I. and in that of Dharasena II. it is asserted that certain villages were situated *hastakavaprāharanydm* or *hastavaprāharanydm*, and I have explained these compounds to mean 'in the territorial division of Hastavapra.' I have now to add that the name occurs in a third inscription, the grant of Dharasena IV., an abstract of which has been published by Prof. Bhāṇḍārkar—*Ind. Ant.* vol. I. p. 45. There we read, instead of *Hastavaprāharant*, *Hastavaprāhāra*,¹ and it is stated that the village of Yodhāvaka was included in it. Now three unpublished Valabhī grants, which have been discovered at Alipā, in the Khedā Zillā, show the word *Khetakāhāra*, and mention three different *Pathakas* which formed parts of the *Khetakāhāra*. *Pathaka* is known from Valabhī and Chaulukya plates to have had the meaning of 'a small territorial division,' and its modern representative *pathā*, as Mr. W. F. Sinclair informs me, still sometimes occurs in the same sense. If an *dhāra* contained several *pathukas*, it is clear that it must be a larger territorial division, and corresponds to our modern *zillā*. It follows further from the *varia lectio*—*Hastavaprāhāra*, that the word *dhāraṇī* was a synonym of *dhāra*, and that the compound in the two older grants may be translated by 'in the *zillā* of Hastavapra.' This being once established, it follows also that if a *zillā* was named after Hastavapra the place must have been of some importance—that, probably, it was not a village, but a town. For territorial divisions are invariably named after the town which at the time when the name was given was the most important in it, and the seat of the local government.²

This result agrees very well with Major Watson's theory that Hāthab originally was a harbour which took the place of Gundi-Koliak. It further

makes Colonel Yule's identification also with Astakampron more plausible. For, if Hastakavapra during the first centuries of our era was a really important town and a port, it is not astonishing to find that the Greek traders knew it.

The other point to which I wish to call attention is the etymology of the two forms of the town's name. Both are compounds the last part of which is *vapra*, which means 'an embankment, an earth-wall, the steep bank of a river,' &c. The first part, *Hasta* or *Hastaka*, must be a proper noun. For it is a rule in Sanskrit that common nouns which are used as proper names may receive the determinative affix *ka*. Thus, if *asva*, 'a horse,' is used as a proper noun, it may be either *asva* or *asvaka*. As *hasta* is a common noun, meaning 'the hand,' and as in the compound both *hasta* and *hastaka* occur, it may be safely concluded that it is used as a proper noun. Possibly the whole may mean 'the embankment of Hastaka,' or 'the steep bank on the Hastaka,' according as Hastaka is taken as the name of a man, a river, or a hill. Further investigations regarding traditions or legends current at Hāthab will probably furnish certainty on this point. The Greek word *Astakampron*, I think, is not derived immediately from the Sanskrit name of the place, but from an intermediate Old Prākṛit *Hastakāmpṛa*, which had been formed by the contraction of the syllables *ava* to *a*, and the insertion of a nasal, according to the habit of the Gujarātis. The loss of the initial *h* may be explained by the difficulty which Gujarātis have now, and probably had 1600 years ago, in pronouncing the spirans in its proper place.

The modern Hāthab, for which the lower castes, as Major Watson has informed me, use an older form, Hāthap, I take to be a corruption of the shorter Sanskrit name Hastavapra.

G. BÜHLER.

MSS. OF THE MAHĀBHĀṢHYA FROM KĀSMĪR.

We have already (vol. VI. pp. 294-274) given some interesting extracts from Dr. Bühler's *Report* of his *Tour in search of Sanskrit MSS.*, and in vol. V. pp. 27-31 a general outline was given of the results; the following further extracts, however, will interest some of our readers:—

"In the collection of grammatical MSS.," says Dr. Bühler,³ "those belonging to Pāṇini's school take the precedence. Among the latter the *Vyākhyāparibhāṣādhvāṇī* (two MSS.)⁴ bears the most

मिथ्यायः । इयमस्मिन्स्वे सिद्धेयमस्मिन्सिद्धेति । किं कारणम्
अत्र हि ज्ञातपरिभाषः स्वयं शास्त्रं प्रतिपादयितुं समर्थो भवति ।
स तावत्सुखं ज्ञातपरिभाषो भवति । अतो व्याख्यानं द्रष्टव्यम् ।
तत्रादित एव तावदियं परिभाषा भवति ॥ अथेवद्वेदेष्वननयक-
स्येति ॥

End:—इति व्याडीयपरिभाषावृत्तिः समाप्ता ॥ शुभाय
भवताम् ॥—Extract by Vāmanācārya.

¹ The word is disfigured in the passage quoted by a misprint and a faulty division of the syllables, which make it *Hastava-prāhāra*.

² Compare Khedā, Bharuch, &c.

³ Detailed *Report*, pp. 69-73.

⁴ Beginning:—ओं नमो मुनिव्रयाय ।

अथ परिभाषासूचनं व्याख्यास्यामः । अथेत्ययमधिकारार्थः
परिभाषासूचनं शास्त्रमधिकृतं वेदितव्यम् । यदित उर्ध्वमनुक्त-

ancient name. The Kāśmīrian paṇḍits are unanimous in declaring it to be a production of the author of the *Samgraha*. But Dr. Kielhorn, to whom I submitted the book immediately after its discovery, tells me that he cannot discover in it any proof of great antiquity, and that it contains only the well-known *Paribhāṣhās*. He thinks it not unlikely that the title has been given to it because some paṇḍit believed the *Paribhāṣhās* to belong to Vyāḍi. I must leave the question to the decision of those Sanskritists who make the *Vyākaraṇaśāstra* their speciality."

Three incomplete Śāraḍa paper MSS. (one of I. 1. 103--2. 63, another I. 4--VI. 1) "represent the meagre result of a long and laborious inquiry regarding Patanjali's *Mahābhāṣhya*, a work which for the present is, as it were, the corner-stone for the history of Sanskrit grammar and literature. As the controversy regarding the genuineness of our present text of the *Mahābhāṣhya* had been going on for some time before my visit to Kāśmīr, I was particularly anxious to obtain a trustworthy and complete Kāśmīrian MS. of the work, in order to ascertain if Kāśmīr possessed a redaction different from the Indian one. When I began my inquiries the paṇḍits told me that the *Bhāṣhya* was not studied in Kāśmīr, and that they knew only of two complete MSS. of the work. One of these belonged to Paṇḍit Keśavram, and the other to the sons of the late Paṇḍit Sāhebrām. With some trouble I got a sight of both these copies, and found that they were Devanāgarī MSS., brought from India. Keśavram's copy had been imported into the Valley by a paṇḍit of Bāramūla who had resided for some time in Banāras. His heirs had sold it for one hundred Kāśmīri rupees (often annas each) to its present owner. After this transfer had been effected, Paṇḍit Sāhebrām also had found it necessary to procure a copy, and had finally obtained one from the Panjāb. Both these copies are new—not older than fifty or sixty years. They contain Kaiyaṭa's *Pradīpa* also. As soon as the origin of these two MSS. had been determined, I told my friends that I neither desired to acquire them nor to have them copied, and that they must hunt for Bhārja or old Śāraḍa paper MSS. They grumbled a good deal, and complained of my unreasonableness. But gradually they produced the three MSS. which now belong to the collection. Each of the three is certainly more than a hundred years old, and most probably copied from older Bhārja MSS. I sent them, immediately after I received them, to Dr. Kielhorn, for compa-

risson with his Indian MSS. He informs me that they do not differ materially from the latter. I think that this fact is not without importance for the question regarding the genuineness of the text of the *Mahābhāṣhya*, though it is desirable that it should be confirmed by the discovery and collation of an old Bhārja MS. Just when I left Kāśmīr I heard that such a MS. had been found in the library of an ignorant Brāhman, who believed it to be a MS. of the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, and used it, as is frequently done with MSS. of that work, for purposes of divination.* Efforts have been made to obtain the book, but hitherto without success.

"In connection with the subject of the *Mahābhāṣhya* I may also state that I have examined with particular care in all accessible MSS. of the *Rājataranginī* the verse I. 176, which refers to its introduction into Kāśmīr. Most MSS. read *chandrachāryadibhir labdhvā deśāttasmāt tadāgamam | pravartitam mahābhāṣhyam svān cha vyākaraṇam kṛitam*||. But some, and among them Keśavram's *codex archetypus*, read *prīmā manu, labdhvā deśam tasmāt*, &c. I think that this is the original but corrupt reading of the MS., and that the vulgate *deśāttasmāt* is purely conjectural. The Kāśmīrians felt, and now feel, that the reading *labdhvā deśam* does not readily give any sense. The attempt to restore the passage by writing *deśāt tasmāt*⁶ is, in my opinion, not a happy one. I accept Dr. Kielhorn's⁷ emendation, *deśātardāt*, as the most probable, both on account of the analogy of the passage in the *Vākyapadīya* and on account of *Rājat.* IV. 487,⁸ where *deśātardāt* actually occurs. As to the translation of the word *āgama*, I think with Dr. Kielhorn that it means 'the tradition' or 'the traditional interpretation' of the *śāstra*. I have consulted the most learned grammarians in Banāras, Indor, and other parts of India on this point. All unanimously declare that *āgama* must be taken in the sense for which Dr. Kielhorn contends, and some even go so far as to deny the possibility that *āgama* can ever mean *grantha*. Though they are undoubtedly correct as far as the usage of the *Vaiyākaraṇas* is concerned, and *āgama* is not used in the sense of a *grammatical* work, still their assertion goes too far. For the Jainas speak of their *forty-five āgamas* or sacred works, and the Śaivas recognize the authority of *eighteen āgamas*. In these two cases the word is certainly used as a synonym of *grantha*, and is frequently, by *lakṣhaṇā*, applied to designate MSS. As may be inferred from these remarks, I stand on the side of those who are

* A pin is driven into the MS., and the verse in which the point sticks is supposed to give some clue to the future fate of the inquirer. The practice is well known in Europe too.

⁶ The copy in the Government collection has *deśāt tasmāt tadāgamat*. Here the last *t* is a clerical mistake.

⁷ *Ind. Ant.* vol. IV. p. 107.

⁸ See Kielhorn, *Ind. Ant.* vol. V. p. 243.

disposed, until the very strongest proofs to the contrary are adduced, to consider the present text of the *Mahābhāṣya* to be genuine.

"My search for copies of Kaiyaṭa's *Pradīpa* were attended with still scantier results than the inquiry regarding the *Mahābhāṣya*. One MS. (No. 306) of 99 folios of 20 lines each contains a very small portion of the *Navāhnikā*. The MS. dates, I think, from the same time as the pieces of the *Bhāṣya*. The Kāśmīrians tell an anecdote regarding Kaiyaṭa, which is perhaps worth mentioning. Kaiyaṭa was, they say, an inhabitant of one of the smaller towns of the Valley,—according to some of Pāmpur, according to others of Yeṣṭgām. He lived in great poverty, and entirely gave himself up to the study of the *Mahābhāṣya* and of grammar. In this *śāstra* he acquired so great a proficiency that at last he could explain the whole *Bhāṣya* to his pupils without looking at a MS., and he understood even those passages which Vararuchi (P) had marked by *kundālas* (O) as unintelligible. Once a foreign paṇḍit from southern India, named according to one authority Kriṣṇa-m-bhaṭṭa, came into Kāśmīr and went to see Kaiyaṭa at his home. He found him sitting before his house engaged in manual labour, and explaining at the same time to his pupils the most difficult portions of the *Bhāṣya* from memory. Amazed at the paṇḍit's great learning and his abject condition, the foreigner hastened to the king of Kāśmīr and obtained from him a *śāsana* granting to Kaiyaṭa a village and an allowance of grain. But when he brought the deed to the paṇḍit the latter steadfastly refused to accept the gift, because he considered it unlawful as coming from a king. Later Kaiyaṭa left Kāśmīr and wandered to Bauṇaras. There he vanquished the paṇḍits at a *sabha* by his great learning, and composed the *Pradīpa* at the request of the Sabhāpati. According to this story the *Pradīpa* was not written in Kāśmīr, and if the statement that Kaiyaṭa lived at Pāmpur is true it cannot be older than the

9th century. For that town was built by Padma in the reign of Ajitāpiḍa, 844-849 A.D.⁹ Dr. Kielhorn has lately stated in his pamphlet on the *Mahābhāṣya* that he does not think Kaiyaṭa an old writer. I agree with him on this point, and do not believe that he is older than the 13th century A.D. The earliest Indian grammarian who quotes him is, as far as I know, Śāyana-Mādhava. I have heard it asserted by Indian paṇḍits that Kaiyaṭa was a brother of Mammata.

"The small fragment of Chandra's Grammar (one leaf) is more curious than useful. As Chandra was a Kāśmīrian, or at least taught in Kāśmīr, there is no reason to doubt of its genuineness. Dr. Kielhorn thinks that, to judge from the fragment, the arrangement of Chandra's grammar must have resembled that of the *Kaumudī*, or, as Dr. Burnell would say, that of the grammarians of the *Aindra* school.

"The MS. of the *Kāśikā-vṛitti* (No. 283)¹⁰ is a real gem. It is the most correct and best-written birch-bark MS. in the whole collection, and almost without a lacuna. I collated a small portion of its contents with Professor Bālaśāstri's edition, and found not inconsiderable differences. The readings of the Kāśmīrian MS. appeared to me the better ones. It also gives the correct statement regarding the authors of the work. In the colophons of the first four *adhyāyas* Jayāditya is named as the author, and in those of the last four Vāmana. Professor Bālaśāstri told me that he had found the same statement in one other MS.¹¹ He considers the authors to have been *nastikas* and men of small grammatical learning, who had not penetrated to the deepest depth of the *śāstra*. The Kāśmīrians think that probably Jayāditya is another name of the learned king Jayāpiḍa, and that Vāmana is his minister, who is mentioned by Kalhana. Be that as it may, the *Kāśikā-vṛitti* is not a modern work, and most probably has been written by a Kāśmīrian. The Government MS. has been made over to Professor Bālaśāstri to be used for his edition of the *Kāśikā*.

⁹ *Rājat.* IV. 693. The date is General Cunningham's correct one.

¹⁰ Beginning:—

स्वस्त्यस्तु ॥ श्रीगणनाथाय नमः ॥ ओं नमो गुरुवे ॥ श्रेयो-
स्तु ॥ ओं नमस्स्वस्त्यै ॥ ओं नमः ॥
परमात्मने ॥ ओं नमो ब्रह्मेणे नमो नमः ॥
ओं येनाक्षरसमाधायमधिगम्य महेश्वरात् ।
कृत्स्नं व्याकरणं धेक्तुं तस्मै पाणिनये नमः ॥
येन शब्दमहामोक्षं कृतो व्याकरणप्रवः ।
श— अर्थिनां लोके तस्मै पाणिनये नमः ॥
अज्ञानतिमिरान्धस्य ज्ञानाञ्जनशलाकया ।
चक्षुर्न्मूर्ध्नि तस्मै पाणिनये नमः ॥

वृत्तौ भाष्ये तथा धातुनामपारायणादिषु ।

विप्रकीर्णस्य तन्त्रस्य क्रियते च — सकृहः ॥

अथ स्रन्दातुशासनम् ।

End:—

इति काशिकायां वृत्तावष्टमस्याध्यायस्य चतुर्थः पादः ॥
समाप्ता काशिका वृत्तिः ॥ कृतिर्जयादित्यवामनयोः ॥ शुभमस्तु ॥
श्रीनृपातिविक्रमादित्यराज्यस्य गताब्दाः १७१७ श्रीसर्तपिमते सं-
वत् ३६ पौषति ३ रवौ तिथ्यनक्षत्रे संपूर्णो समासेति शु [शु] भ-
मस्तु लेखकपाठकेभ्यः ॥

¹¹ Compare also Dr. Kielhorn's pamphlet on the *Mahābhāṣya*.

"The pieces of Jinendrabuddhi's *Nyāsa* (No. 284, *adhy.* I. II. 2-4; 285, *adhy.* IV. ; and 286, *adhy.* VII.) have been transcribed from a dilapidated birch-bark volume belonging to P. Bal Kōl. Other portions of the work have been acquired in former years, in the Dekhan, in Ahmadābād, and in Bikāner. But the Government collection does not yet contain copies of the VIth and VIIth *adhyāyas*. Jinendrabuddhi lived, according to the Kāśmīrians, at Varāhamūla-Hushkapura. He was a Bauddha ascetic, and is certainly not later than the 12th century, as the *Nyāsa* is quoted by Vopadeva.¹²

"Among the smaller works explaining the appendices to Pāṇini's grammar, the *Dhātupāṭha*, the *nīpāṭa-avyaya-upasargapāṭhas*, and the *lingasūtras*, Kshīrasvāmin's treatises *Avyayavṛtti*, *Kshīratāraṅgīṇā*, *Kshīratāraṅgisāṃketa*, and *Nīpātavyayopasargavṛtti*, are of some interest, as the date of this author is known. He is, according to the perfectly credible Kāśmīrian tradition, the grammarian Kshīra, who instructed king Jayapīḍa.¹³ The *Lingānuśāsanaśikā sarvārthalakṣaṇā* (Nos. 310-11)¹⁴ shows as authors two well-known names—Śavarasvāmin, the son of Dīptasvāmin, and Harshavardhana, the son of Śrīvardhana. The latter appears to have been a prince.¹⁵ I am, however, doubtful if it is permissible to identify him with the patron of Bāṇa and Hiwen T'sang, as the latter's father is called Prabhākara var-

dhana. Still it is quite possible that Prabhākara vardhana may have had a second name. In like manner I am doubtful if the Śavarasvāmin of the *Lingānuśāsana* is the same as the famous commentator on the *Mīmāṃsāsūtras*. It is a curious fact that the name of the father of the latter is not mentioned in any of the MSS. of the *Mīmāṃsābhāṣya* accessible to me, and that the best Śāstrīs at Puṇā and Banāras do not know it. This question, too, cannot yet be decided. But I think there is a chance that the MSS. of the *Lingānuśāsana* may finally settle the date of the famous Mīmāṃsist."

In M. Rénan's Report to the Société Asiatique special praise is bestowed on M. James Darmesteter's *Ormazd et Ahriman*, in which the Mazdean dualism is accounted for by a natural development, and not by a violent rupture between the two branches of the Aryans; on M. Bergaigne's thesis on *Les dieux souverains de la religion védique*, which is a complete repertory of Vedic ideas on the physical and moral world; on M. Guyard's *Théorie nouvelle de la métrique arabe*; and the second part of M. de Vogüé's *Syrie centrale*, containing 400 inscriptions from Safa, the relation of the characters of the most puzzling of which to the Himyaritic, M. Rénan fully expects will be cleared up within another year.

BOOK NOTICES.

THE ADI GRANTH, or the Holy Scriptures of the Sikhs, translated from the original Gurmukhī, with introductory essays: by Dr. Ernest Trumpp, Prof. Reg. Orient. Lang. Munich. Printed by order of the Secretary of State for India. pp. cxxviii and 715. (London: W. H. Allen & Co., and N. Trübner & Co. 1877.)

We are very thankful for this valuable work. In the nature of things Dr. Trumpp's translation

cannot be perfect, as it is a first attempt to render a most difficult book. But it forms an excellent commencement of scientific investigation in a region in which we have hitherto had little else but

"Conjectures, fancies, built on nothing firm."

¹² Aufrecht, *Oxf. Catal.* p. 176.

¹³ *Rājat.* IV. 436: compare also S. P. Pandit, *Trans. Or. Congr.* 1874, p. 252.

¹⁴ The *Lingānuśāsanavṛtti* begins:—

श्रीगणेशाय नमः ॐ नमो विप्रहर्त्रे ॥ ओम् ।
नमो मथितदुर्वीरदैत्यचक्राय चाक्रिणे ।
सम्पुधरधारागरस्तम्बी [म्भी] भूतैकबाहवे ॥ १ ॥
मनोरमतमैश्वर्यैः सज्जनानन्दवर्धनम् ।
लिङ्गानुशासनं स्पष्टं यथाबुद्धिं विधीयते ॥ २ ॥
बहुभार्यमैव्यपि भव्यं लालित्ययोगतः ।
स्पष्टं स्पष्टीकृतैर्यैरिदं लिङ्गानुशासनम् ॥ ३ ॥
इदानीं श्रीमकरमहाकारादिक्रमेण दर्शयन्नाह ॥
आदीदूतः शिष्यां प्रायो गङ्गा लक्ष्मीभर्म्यया ।
पर्योयसाहिता भूमिबलिबिसुव्रदीदिशः ॥ १ ॥

End: व्याडे: शंकरचन्द्रयोर्वरचैर्विधानिधेः पाणिनेः
सूक्ताभिज्ञविधीभिः [न्वि] चार्यं सुगमं श्रीवर्धनस्वात्मजः ।
भव्यं व्यापि च हर्षवर्धन इदं स्पष्टीकृतप्रत्ययं

लिङ्गानामनुशासनं रचितवानर्ह्यर्थसंसिद्धये ॥ १६ ॥
सूक्ताभिज्ञविधीन्विचार्य पर्यलोच्य तेभ्यः सारं गृहीत्वा
सुगमं भव्यं व्यापि चैदं लिङ्गानुशासनं रचितवान् ।
अन्यच्च कीदृशं स्पष्टीकृतप्रत्ययम् । अस्पष्टाः स्पष्टीकृताः
प्रत्ययाः किन्धञ् इन् इत्यादयो यश्च । प्रत्ययानां सोदाहरणानां
प्रदर्शनात्स्पष्टतां पर्यलोच्य मन्दमतयो न सुब्रन्तीति भावः ।
इति भवदीप्तस्वामिसुनोर्वर्णवागीधरस्य श्वशुरस्वामिनः कृतौ
हर्षवर्धन कृतलिङ्गानुशासनटीकायां सर्ववर्णकणायां विलिङ्गप्रकर-
णम् ॥ समाप्तमिति लिङ्गानुशासनटीकायामिति शुभं भवतु शुभ-
मस्तु ॥

— — — जाप्रतिमः धुतेन न मम शीर्येण पार्थोपमः

काव्येनातिमनोरमः प्रणयिनामासन्नकल्पद्रुमः ।

जातः संप्रति हर्षवर्धन इति प्रख्यातकीर्तिः सतां

तेनेदं रचितं प्ररोपकृतये लिङ्गभिधानं शुभम् ॥ १ ॥

¹⁵ Compare concluding verse of the *Lingānuśāsana* quoted in the preceding note.

The *Adi Granth*, or *Granth Sahib* as it is often reverentially called, has a twofold claim on attention. First of all, it is invaluable in a linguistic point of view. It is a perfect treasure-house of old Hindi words and forms: It thus gives great assistance in tracing the origin and progress of the modern vernaculars of Northern India. How these arose out of the ancient Prākṛits is still a dark problem, but one on which the *Granth* throws considerable light. Secondly, it gives an authoritative statement of the teaching of the early Sikh *gurus*. Much has been written about Sikhism; but documentary proof has seldom accompanied assertion.

The Indian Government deserves praise for agreeing that the *Granth* should be translated; and it made an excellent selection when it appointed Dr. Trumpp to the performance of the task. Dr. Trumpp is not only a good Sanskritist, but he has made a special study of Sindhi and the cognate dialects of Northern India.

The labour which the rendering of the *Granth* involved was very great. Of the dialect in which it is composed—an old form of Panjābī¹—there is neither grammar nor dictionary. The interpretation is very imperfectly known to the most learned Sikh *gurus*; while the Brāhmins, whose acuteness and patience in research would have done excellent service, have never condescended to study so heretical a book. Dr. Trumpp left Germany and proceeded to India to obtain what help he could in his arduous task. He found three commentaries on the *Granth* which were of considerable use; but, on the whole, he worked, we may say, single-handed. He spent seven years in executing the translation.

We do not at present enter into any linguistic inquiries. The volume presents the *Japji* (more accurately, *Japu-jī*)—the first, and according to the Sikhs the holiest, portion of the *Granth*—in the original. Let us hope that some of the readers of the volume may overcome their repugnance to the Gurmukhī character, which looks so like a perverse metamorphosis of Devanāgarī, and work through these seven pages as a commencement in mastering the language.

In addition to a translation and sufficiently full annotations, Dr. Trumpp has given a short preface and five valuable introductory essays. Thus we have the Life of Bābā Nānak translated from the *Janam Sakhī*; which appears in two forms that are remarkably contrasted. We have next a sketch of the lives of the other Sikh *gurus*; then an outline of the Sikh religion; then a short essay on the composition of the *Granth*; and finally, a dissertation on the language and metres used in it.

¹ There are some *ślokas* of Teg Bahādur's written in pure Hindi.

Bābā Nānak² was born A.D. 1469. He was not a man of education, nor possessed of any remarkable force of mind. He was simply a devout mystic. His teaching was chiefly drawn from the writings of the celebrated Kabīr, who lived not very long before him. The sayings of Bābā Nānak, which were all preserved in verse, were collected along with those of other holy men by Guru Arjuna, who lived about a century after Bābā Nānak (1581-1606). From the time of Guru Arjuna, Sikhism sustained an important change. His predecessors had been quietists, but he was a man of capacity, who affected the pomp of a great leader, and intermeddled with political affairs. The Sikhs gradually grew into a nation of warriors, inflamed with rancorous hostility to the professors of other creeds, especially the followers of Muhammad. The most remarkable of the later *gurus* was Govind Singh, who slighted the *Granth* as infusing a tame humility into the hearts of men. He produced a second *Granth*, called "The book of the tenth king (or reign)," which breathes throughout a fierce and warlike spirit. In several points Guru Govind receded from the doctrines of the *Adi Granth* (the original *Granth*), and turned back towards Hinduism. This last of the great *gurus* died in 1708.

The *Granth* has been said to inculcate Monotheism. But this is a mistake, if the term monotheism is used in its ordinary sense. The teaching of the *Granth* is prevailingly pantheistic. It declares that God and the universe are not distinct; as "in a wave the froth and bubbles are not distinct from the water." The notion that the universe is distinct from God arises from *māyā*.

According to Dr. Trumpp there are two forms of Pantheism in the work—a finer and a grosser. The grosser holds that the universe is an expansion of God. The finer considers the universe to be an emanation from God. But the *Granth* is self-contradictory, and occasionally (for instance, when it asserts the Supreme to be distinct from the universe, as the lotus is distinct from the lake it floats in) it is not properly pantheistic. The Supreme God is never—or scarcely ever—prayed to in the *Granth*. The subordinate gods are prayed to; and so is the *guru*. Indeed, the exaltation of the *guru* is one of the most characteristic features of the system. The saints also are to be greatly revered. The chief end which man is to desire is the cessation of individual existence; and the great means of attaining this longed-for goal is the repetition of the name of Hāri. But the right knowledge and utterance of this all-powerful name can be obtained only from the true *Guru*.

² See a sketch of his life, *Ind. Ant.* vol. III. pp. 296-300.

³ It is written not in Panjābī, but Hindi.

Caste is slighted rather than attacked.

It is a mistake to suppose that Bâbâ Nânak sought to blend the chief dogmas of Islâm and Hinduism. The Sufism of the Persians is very similar to Vedantism; and the pantheism of the *Granth* may be classed with either system. Dr. Trumpp is more than half disposed to think that Kabîr was originally a Musalmân (see note, p. 682). It is a vexed question, on which we pronounce no judgment. On the whole, however, the effect of Islâm on the Sikh system has been considerable.

No reverence is paid to the holy books either of Hindus or Muhammadans. The *Granth* is an all-sufficient teacher.

It will be seen, even from what has now been said, that the *Granth* contains little or nothing that is really new. The readers of the poets—whether Hindi, Bangâlî, or Marâthî—of the Vaishnava school will very seldom come on a sentiment in this book which is not familiar to them. Indeed, several of the poems of Nâmâ, or Nâmdev, who was one of the earliest Marâthî poets, are embodied in the *Granth*. This subject deserves the attention of Marâthî scholars. In the mean time we assume that in the form in which they appear in Panjâbî these can only be translations, and are not the original compositions of the tailor poet,* (an Oriental “Alton Locke,” shall we say?) who lived at Panjharpur. Moreover, the influence of Kabîr has been very great in the Marâthâ country, as well as in the Panjâb and Northern India generally, so that the coincidences now referred to need excite no surprise.

Dr. Trumpp often speaks disparagingly of the *Granth*. He says, “It is a very big volume, but incoherent and shallow in the extreme, and couched at the same time in dark and perplexing language in order to cover these defects.” (*Preface*, p. vii.) Again he says that “as regards its contents, it is perhaps the most shallow and empty book that exists, in proportion to its size.” (p. cxii.) Certainly it cannot be rated high either as a philosophical or poetical production. Yet it has a value. These old *gurus* and devotees were feeling after God. There seems to us earnest religion in Bâbâ Nânak and several of his successors. We confess to a feeling of exceeding sadness as we read the outpourings of their hearts. They hungered for bread, and Hinduism gave them a stone. They needed union with a loving, conscious God in mind, heart, will; and Hinduism told them they must seek to be absorbed and lost in the immeasurable All.

It is difficult to read much of the *Granth* at a sitting. Its repetitions are endless;—the same

ideas and even illustrations recur perpetually. Bâbâ Nânak himself is one of the least attractive of the sages of whose sayings the book is made up, being in point of clearness and force decidedly inferior to Kabîr. We are much inclined to agree with him when he says in one place, “O Nânak, the telling of it is hard iron.” At least we have felt it oftentimes as difficult to hammer out a definite meaning from his words as to hammer out a piece of hard cold iron! But we shall let our readers judge. Take the commencement and conclusion of the *Japu*:—

“Om! The true name is the creator, the Spirit without fear, without enmity, having a timeless form, not produced from the womb.

“By favour of the Guru!

“*Japu*.—At the beginning is the True One, at the beginning of the Yuga is the True One. The True One is, O Nânak, and the True One also will be.

1. “By meditation (*and*) meditation it (*i.e.* the knowledge of the True One) is not effected, though I meditate a hundred thousand times.

“By silence (*and*) silence is not effected, though I keep a continual absorption of mind. The hunger of the hungry does not cease, though I bind together the load of (*all*) the worlds.

“There may be acquired a thousand, a hundred thousand dexterities; not one goes with (*at the time of death*).

“How does one become a man of truth (*knowing the True One*)? how is the embankment of falsehood broken?

“He who walks in his (*i.e.* God's) order and pleasure, O Nânak! (*and*) with (*whom*) it is (*thus*) written.”

* * * * *

38. “Continence is the workshop, patience the goldsmith. Understanding the anvil, the *Veda* the tool. Fear the bellows, the heat of austerities the fire. The vessel is love; in this melt Amrita (*nectar*). (*Then*) the *śabda* is formed in the true mint. This is the work of those on whom his look and the destiny is (*fixed*). O Nânak, the looker-on is happy by the sight.

“*One śloka*.—Wind is the Guru, water the father, the great earth the mother. Day and night the two are female and male nurse; the whole world sports.

“Dharma-râjâ rehearses the good and bad works in the presence (*of God*). By their own actions some are near and some are afar off (*from God*). By whom the name (*of God*) has been meditated upon, they are gone (*to the other world*), having cast off their labour.

“O Nânak, their faces are bright, and with them

* Dr. Trumpp (pp. cxix., 93) affirms that he was a calico-printer; the Marâthâs called him a *ṣimpī*.

(after them) how many people are saved (liberated)!" (p. 13)

The following two extracts will afford fair specimens of the general style of the *Granth* :—

"O beloved, mutter Hari, Hari! Having taken the wisdom of the Guru, say Hari!

"O mind, if the touchstone be applied to the True One, if he be weighed by a full weight: his value is not obtained by any one, O heart! he is a priceless gem." (p. 33.)

"The nectar-speech of the Guru is sweet. Some rare disciple has tasted and seen it. In (his) heart there is light; he drinks the great juice (of Hari); at the true gate he makes himself heard." (p. 158.)

M.

MĀLAVIKĀ ET AGNIMITRA, Drama Sanscrit de Kalidasa, traduit pour la première fois en Français par Ph. Ed. Foucaux, Professeur au Collège de France, etc. etc. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1877.

Professor Weber and Mr. Shankar P. Pandit, who have dared to reverse the decision of the late Horace Hayman Wilson, that the *Mālavikāgnimitra* is not the work of the great Kālidāsa, the author of the *Sakuntalā*, may claim M. Foucaux as an ally. He gives forth no uncertain sound on this point:—"Sans mettre Mālavikā et Agnimitra sur la même ligne que Sakountalā, nous nous permettons de n'être pas de l'avis de l'illustre Wilson. D'accord avec M. A. Weber, l'auteur d'une élégante traduction allemande du drame si sévèrement jugé; d'accord aussi avec M. Shankar Pandit, l'éditeur du texte Sanskrit de Bombay, nous dirons que dans les pensées, et jusque dans la manière de les exprimer, dans le dialogue et dans les stances tout présente avec le style de Sakountalā et d'*Ourvasf* un air de famille si marqué, qu'il est impossible de n'y pas reconnaître le même auteur."

We must confess that this profession of faith on the part of M. Foucaux gives us considerable satisfaction. We have occasionally felt twinges of scepticism on discovering some of the expressions and thoughts, on which Mr. Shankar Pandit lays great stress as characteristic of Kālidāsa's style, in Sanskrit dramas not ordinarily attributed to the author of the *Sakuntalā*. The traditional belief is the more comforting doctrine, and it is pleasant to find it supported by such good critical authority.

The translation at present before us is evidently intended for the general reader, and therefore we shall not criticize the transliteration of the Sanskrit names. The spelling 'Sakountalā' wears a somewhat unlovely aspect to a British eye, but is, we suppose, justified by sound phonetic reasons in the Gallic land. 'Tchandrikā' is, no doubt, a choice of evils, but we should prefer the other alternative, however terrible it might be.

We feel, too, that our nationality is somewhat in our way in passing judgment upon the transla-

tion itself. It seems to us to be full of point and grace, but this is a question which none but Frenchmen are qualified to decide. It is as difficult for a Briton to discover Sanskritisms in French as to point out the objectionable Patavinities in Livy. One thing, however, is certain—that it is a very faithful representation of the original. In one or two points we feel disposed to differ from M. Foucaux. For instance, on page 54 we find the stage direction *Iravati entre en simulant l'ivresse*. This does not seem to us quite literal. We believe that there was no 'simulation' in the case. M. Foucaux seems to agree with us a little further on. We find on the same page *Iravati s'avançant aussi vite que le permet son état d'ivresse*. In a note on the Intermezzo we find the Mandākinī explained as *L'un des bras du Gange*. Mr. Shankar Pandit's view seems to us the true one:—"There is no doubt that the Mandākinī of the present passage is a river of the Dekhan. And further it is probable that it may here stand for the Narmadā, in conformity with a practice, still very common all over India, of designating any sacred river by the most sacred river-name, as Gangā, &c." He goes on to observe that one of the MSS. he has used gives the Prākṛit equivalent of Narmadā. This view harmonizes better with the other geographical notices in the play. But both of the passages we have quoted may be literary 'economyes.'

It cannot be denied that, among Englishmen at any rate, there exists a belief that no Sanskrit literature will repay perusal. This is due to the fault of the Sanskritists themselves, who, as a general rule, show no judgment in selecting for translation works which possess literary merit and are of general interest. The three Sanskrit compositions which have been selected to form part of the *Bibliothèque Orientale Elzévirienne* are perhaps as favourable specimens of the Hindu muse as could be chosen. The first to appear, viz. the Stanzas of Bhartrihari, by M. Regnaud, has already been reviewed in our columns.

The *Mālavikāgnimitra*, though the plot turns on a mere palace intrigue, is interesting as a picture of Indian manners at a time when Buddhism was still a favoured religion, and the Hindu genius possessed an *élan* which is now lost. It is written in a witty and animated style, and is one of the least tedious of Sanskrit dramas. The interest scarcely ever flags, except perhaps in the third act, where the foot-painting process is rather wearisome to a European reader.

M. Foucaux has adopted the admirable expedient of enclosing those passages, which are metrical in the original, in inverted commas. This will enable his readers to form a better idea of the peculiar character of the Sanskrit drama. The notes are just what is required, without any unnecessary parade of learning. We believe that this attractive little volume will do much to interest the European public in Sanskrit literature.

GURJARA GRANTS, No. II.
THE UMETĀ GRANT OF DADDA II.

(See *Ind. Ant.* vol. V. p. 110 ff.)

BY G. BÜHLER.

THE subjoined grant of Dadda II. of Bharoch was discovered in 1875 by the Rev. Joseph Taylor, of Borsūd, in the house of a Vāṇiā at Umetā (Khedā zillā). Mr. Taylor at first presented me with a paper impression of the plates, and later very kindly moved the owner (not without considerable trouble) to lend the original for a few days. During that time I had a half-size photograph taken, which, as the plates were in a very fair condition, came out very distinct and clear. It is from a copy of this photograph that the annexed photozincograph has been prepared.

The measurements of the plates are 12 inches by 17½. The left-hand ring with the seal is still in its proper position. The latter appears to bear the same inscription as that of Dr. Burn's Khedā plates, *Śrīśāmantadaddah*. But the letters on the seal are so much corroded that it would be impossible to decipher them without the help of the earlier grants. Both the plates and the seal are very massive, and the former nearly free from verdigris. They have been well kept, and probably have been cleaned with tamarind juice. The letters are large and deeply incised, with the exception of the last line of Plate I. and of the beginning of the last line of Plate II. For in the latter the strokes intended to form the last syllables of the word *mādhava* run one into the other, and the name is not clearly distinguishable even on the photograph.

The grant itself closely resembles the Ilāo grant, likewise issued by Dadda II., which has been published by Professor Bhāṇḍārkar in the *Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc.* vol. X. pp. 19 seqq., as regards both the letters and the wording. As might be expected from the proximity of their dates—Śaka s. 400 and 417—they are both copies of the same model form. Professor Bhāṇḍārkar's remarks on the characters of the Ilāo plates are all applicable to the Umetā grant also. I have only to add that in a few

instances the elements of compound consonants are placed not vertically, the one below the other, but horizontally, side by side. Thus we find *ṇ* for *ṭta*. (Pl. I. l. 14, Pl. II. ll. 5, 13.) Worthy of notice is also the occurrence of the *virāma* in the shape of a horizontal stroke placed below the vowelless consonant (Pl. I. l. 1., Pl. II. l. 13). The peculiar shape of the letters occurring in the signature of the king have been noticed in my article on the Kāvī plate of Jayabhata,¹ and I still adhere to the opinion that these letters represent the forms used in everyday life. I may add that, since the article on the Kāvī inscription was written, I have received news of a Jaina palm-leaf MS., preserved in the Sāṅghavinā pādā Bhāṇḍār at Aṇhilvāḍ-Pāṭhaṇ, which dates from the end of the tenth century A.D., and shows the usual Jaina-Devanāgarī forms.² The lately published grant of the first Chaulukya king of Pāṭhaṇ, Mūlarāja I., which belongs to the same period, is written with the much more antique-looking Kāyastha Devanāgarī character. This fact proves that in the tenth century, at least, the characters used for literary purposes differed from those employed for official documents. It consequently confirms the interpretation which, first, Prof. Dowson, and myself later, have put on the occurrence of two alphabets in the Gurjara plates.³

The *vanśāvalī* furnishes no new information. It gives the well-known three kings of the Gurjara dynasty—Dadda or Dada I.,⁴ Jayabhata, surnamed Vitarāga, and Dadda II., surnamed Prasāntarāga, whose names were first correctly given by Professor Bhāṇḍārkar. Little information regarding the events of their reigns can be gathered from the inscriptions of Dadda II. An allusion to the war with Valabhi, of which Jayabhata speaks in the Kāvī grant, is, in my opinion, contained in the epithet *payonidhṛitobhayataṭavanalekhavihṛitanirankuśadānapravādhapavrittadig-*

¹ *Ind. Ant.* vol. V. p. 110.

² The information comes from Pandit Nārāyaṇśankar of Surat, who spent more than six months at Pāṭhaṇ and carefully examined the palm-leaf MSS. preserved there.

³ The spelling is worse in our grant than in the Ilāo *śāsana*. A good many mistakes are due to carelessness on the part of the engraver. Others, e.g. *śamaya* (Pl. I.

l. 8) for *śamaya*, *nistrimśa* (*ibid.*) for *nistrimśa*, *śameachchhara* (Pl. II. l. 6) for *śameatsara*, belong probably to the writer of the original, whose ignorance of Sanskrit is also attested by such grammatical mistakes as *grāmaḥ* - - *prati-pādītam*, *likhitamśchaitat*, &c.

⁴ I consider the latter merely a misspelling. Dadda corresponds to the modern Dādā-jī, and the first syllable ought therefore to have two consonants.

dantigunasamāhāḥ (Pl. II. II. 9-10).⁶ But it is so dark that without the Kāvi plate nothing could be made of it. My explanation of the epithet *adhikagurusnehasampatkavimaladisodbhāsitaiva-lokaḥ*, 'who possesses an exceeding store of affection for his spiritual guide, and has illuminated the world of the living by his pure precepts' (Pl. I. I. 12), especially if taken together with the preceding and following sentences, permits perhaps the inference that Dadda II. was a particularly pious ruler, and something of a religious reformer. But it is impossible to say what he really did in this direction, as it is not even clear to which sect he belonged. It is more satisfactory that the discovery of the situation of Nāndīpurī of the Gurjara plates allows us to determine the exact site of the capital of these kings. Professor Bhāṇḍārkar asserts that 'the seat of the Gurjara dynasty was Bharoch,' and adds that this appears to have been the name of the city, as well as of the country around it.⁷

The latter statement is quite correct, the former nearly so. The town and the district have, no doubt, borne the same name from very early times. But the Gurjara kings did not reside in the town itself; they lived in a fort just outside the gates. The two Kheḍā grants of Dadda II. are both dated *nāndīpurītaḥ*, 'from Nāndīpurī.' The analogy of the expression *valabhītaḥ*, 'from Valabhī,' which occurs on many Valabhī grants, led me to conjecture that this must be the name of the Gurjara capital. My inquiries for an old site bearing this appellation remained for a long time without result. At last Rāo Sāheb Gopālji G. Desai, Deputy Educational Inspector of Bharoch, learned from Bharoch Brāhmaṇas that an old fort of this name had existed just outside the Jhadeśvar gate, to the

east of Bharoch. This statement, which is said to be supported also by the *Revāmāhātmya*, fully agrees with the information regarding Dadda's residence derived from the Ilāo and Umetā plates. Both open with the phrase *Om svasti vijayavikshepāt bharukachchhapradvārandsakāt*. It cannot be doubtful that *vāsakāt* must be read for *nāsakāt*, which latter word is utterly without meaning. The document from which the coppersmith who incised the inscription copied was probably written throughout in the current-hand characters which he has preserved in the signature, and in these the *va* had, without doubt, the form *ā*, which appears in *svahasto* and *vitaraṅga* (Pl. II. I. 16) and on the Rāthor grants. Thus he came to read and to write *ā* instead of *Δ*. But, independently of this consideration, the correction is made extremely probable by the occurrence of phrases like *jayaskandhāvārāt khud-davedīyavāsakāt* or *bhadropāttavāsakāt* on the Valabhī plates. The meaning of the corrected phrase can only be "Om. Hail! From the camp of victory which dwells, i.e. is fixed, before the gates of Bharoch." This fits the fort of Nāndīpurī, outside the Jhadeśvar gate, exactly. It may therefore be considered certain that the seat of the Gurjara government was located not in Bharoch itself, but close to its eastern gate. I may add that in many other cases the palaces of Hindu rājās lie just outside the gates of the chief towns of their dominions. A particularly striking instance of this kind is the residence of the Rājā of Bikaner, which lies at a distance of several hundred yards, and entirely separate from the town, towards the north-west.

The date of the grant, Vaiśākha Paurṇamāsī or śuddha 15 of Śaka samvat 400, teaches us nothing new, as we know from the Ilāo grant that

⁶ See below, and *Ind. Ant.* vol. V. p. 111.

⁷ *Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc.* vol. X. p. 21.

⁸ See *Jour. R. As. Soc. N. S.* vol. I. p. 273, where Professor Dowson has mistranslated the word.

⁹ Professor Bhāṇḍārkar, misled by the unusual expression *vikshepa* for *skandhāvāra*, and the mistake *nāsakāt* for *vāsakāt*, changes the latter to *nāsakāt*, and translates, "Security [freedom] from interruption in the race of victory calculated to violate the gate of the city of Bharukachchha." The objections to this rendering are: (1) That *svasti* at the beginning of inscriptions is always used as an interjection, and never connected with the following words. (2) That *pradvāra* does not mean 'gate,' but 'the place in front of the gates' (vide *Pet. Dict.* s. v.), and that *pradvāra* on the plate cannot, as he thinks, be read *pū(r)dvāra* also, as *pū* on the Gurjara plates is *𑀧𑀺* (vide *pūrita*, Pl. I. I. 5). The form *𑀧𑀺* for *pū* is known to me only from the Chaḷukya and similar plates in Kāyastha-

Devanāgarī, as well as from the Śāradā and Jaina Devanāgarī MSS. (3) That *nāsakāt* does not mean 'calculated to injure.' (4) That the analogy of numerous other grants, especially of all those issued by Valabhī and Gurjara princes, requires that the place where the grant was issued should be named. With respect to my own translation, I have to state that I have been unable to find a lexicographical authority for the meaning, 'camp,' which I have assigned to *vikshepa*. I base my interpretation chiefly on the fact that the word occupies exactly the place where other inscriptions have *skandhāvāra*, 'camp.' Possibly *vikshepa* may be a hitherto untraced technical word which possesses a meaning slightly different from *skandhāvāra*. It may mean 'cantonment' or 'permanent camp.' The final decision of this question must be reserved for the future. It ought, however, to be noted that *balāṣaṇ* *nikship* is used in the sense of 'to cause an army to pitch camp' (see *Pet. Dict.* s. v. *kship* + *ni*).

Dadda II. reigned at least until Śaka saṃvat 417. I have not the slightest doubt that the Śaka era meant here is, as Professor Bhāṇḍārkar has first shown, the era beginning in 78-9 A.D., and that the Umetā plate is just 1400 years old.

The grantee was a native of Kānyakubja or Kānoj, a Bahvricha, i.e. Ṛigvedī, Bhaṭṭa Mādhava, son of Bhaṭṭa Mahidhara, who was conversant with all the four Vedas. The village of Nigūḍa was granted to him for the purpose of defraying the expenses of an Agnihotra and other sacrificial rites. It is a matter of great regret that, in spite of numerous inquiries made in Central and Northern Gujarāt, it has been hitherto impossible to identify the Bhukti and the villages mentioned in the grant. I suspect that they were situated in the Gaikvādī districts. Of some importance is the name of the official Mādhava bhaṭṭa, who wrote the grant, as the writer of the Ilāo grant was Reva, the son of Mādhava. The occurrence of

Mādhava's name on our plate is a strong proof in favour of its genuineness.

In conclusion I will repeat what I have already stated in a note to the article on Jayabhāṭa's Kāvi plate,* viz. that the Umetā śāsana possesses great interest, because it is the original according to which a Valabhī grant attributed to Dharasena II. has been manufactured. This forgery belongs to the Bombay Branch Royal Asiatic Society, and was first noticed by Dr. Bhāṇḍārkar.¹⁰ I have only once been able to get hold of it, for a few minutes. But the first glance satisfied me that it is almost an exact copy of the Umetā grant, in which nothing but the kings' names seemed to have been altered. The characters even are Garjara, not Valabhī letters. As this forgery is probably ancient, it may assist in settling the initial date of the era of the Valabhī plates. For it may be presumed that the forger chose the name of a king whose times were not too far distant from those of the real donor.

Plate 1.

- [¹] ओ स्वस्ति विजयविक्षेपात् भरुकच्छप्रद्वारावसक्तत् सकलघनपटलविनिर्गतज-¹¹
 [²] निकरकरावबोधितकुमुदधवल्यशप्रतापस्यगितनभोमंडलोनेकसमरसंकटप्रमु-
 [³] खगतनिहतशत्रुसमंतकुलावधुप्रभातशमयरुदितफलोद्गीयमानविमलनिस्तुंशप्रतापो दे-
 [⁴] वद्विजातिगुरुचरणकमलप्रणमोद्धृष्टवज्रामणिकोटिरुचिरादिधितिविराजितमकुटो-
 [⁵] द्वासितशिराः दिनानाथातुरभ्यागतार्थिजनसुष्ठुपरिपूरितविभवमनोरथोपचीयमानतृ-
 [⁶] विष्टपैकसहायधर्मसंचयः प्रणयपरिकुपितमानिनीजनप्रणामपुर्व्वमधुरावचनोपपा-
 [⁷] दितप्रसादप्रकाशिकृतविदग्धनगरकस्वभावो विमलगुणपंजरक्षिप्तबहलकलितिमिरनिचय श्री-
 [⁸] महदस्तस्य सूनु समदप्रतिद्वंद्विगजगटाभेदिनिस्तुंशविक्रमप्रकटितमृगपतिकिसोरविर्य-
 [⁹] वलेपः पयोनिधीकृतउभयतटप्ररुद्धधनलेववृद्धतनिरंकुशदानप्रवाहप्रवृत्तादिग्द-
 [¹⁰] न्तिविभ्रमगुणसमुहः स्फटिककर्पूरपिण्डपण्डुरपशश्चन्दनचञ्चिताङ्गसमुभ्रतगगनलक्ष्मीप-
 [¹¹] योधरोसंगः श्रीजयभट्टस्तस्यत्मज प्रतिहतसकलजगद्व्यापिदोषाधिकारविजिभितसं-
 [¹²] ततातमोवृत्तिरधिकगुरुस्नेहसंपत्कविमलदिशोद्वासिताजिवलोकः परमबोधसमनुगतो
 [¹³] विपुलगुर्जरनृपान्मयप्रदीपतोमुपगतः समधिगतपंचमहाशब्दमहाराजाधिराजश्रीमहद्वः

* Ind. Ant. vol. V. p. 110.

¹⁰ Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc. vol. VIII. p. 244.

¹¹ L. 1, read ओ; वासकात्. The ॐ used here is the current-hand letter: see remarks below. L. 2, read यशःप. L. 3, read प्रमुखा;—सामंतकुलवधू—समय;—निस्त्रिंश. L. 4, read प्रणामी; वज्र;—रुचिरदीधि;—मुकुटो. L. 5, read दीना;—तुराभ्याग;—क्षिष्ट; निविष्टपै. L. 6, read पूर्व्वमधुरावचनो. L. 7, read प्रकाशिकृत; नागरक; निचय. L. 8, read

सुनु; वटा; निस्त्रिंश; किशोरवीर्यो. L. 9, read कृतोभय;—प्ररुद्ध;—वनलेख according to Prof. Bhāṇḍārkar's correction;—प्रवृत्त according to the same. L. 10, read समुहः कर्पूर;—पाण्डुर. L. 11, read रोत्संग;—जयभट्ट;—स्यात्मज. विजिभित. L. 12, read तत;—वृत्तिर, according to Prof. Bhāṇḍārkar's correction; जीव. L. 13, read नृपान्मयप्रदीपतामु.

- [¹⁴] कुशली सर्वानिव राष्ट्रपतिविषयपतिग्रामकुटायुक्तकानियुक्तकाधिकमहत्तरादीन्समाज्ञपयति¹⁵
 [¹⁵] अस्तु वो विदितं यथा मय मातापित्रोरात्मनश्चैवामुष्मिकपुन्ययशोभिवृद्धये कान्यकुब्जवा-
 [¹⁶] स्तव्यतचतुर्विंशसमान्यवशिष्टसगोत्रबहुचसन्नहचारिभट्टमहिधरस्तस्य सुनु भट्टमधव

Plate II.

- [¹] वलिचस्वैश्वदेवाभिहोत्रपञ्चमहायज्ञादिकृतोत्सर्पणार्थं **कमणीयशोडशतं¹⁶**
 [²] भुवन्त्यन्तःपातिनिगुडग्रामोस्यघटस्थनानि पूर्वस्यं दिशि वधौरिग्रामः दक्षिणस्यां दिशि
 [³] फलहवद्ग्रामःप्रतिच्यां दिशि विहाणग्रामःउत्तरस्यां दिशि दहिथलिग्रामःएवमयं स्वचतुराघट-
 [⁴] नविशुद्धो ग्रामः सोदङ्ग सपरिकर सधान्यहिरन्यादेय सोल्लग्रामानविष्टिक समस्तराजकियानमप्रवेश्य
 [⁵] अचन्द्रार्केर्णवक्षितिसरित्पर्वतसमकालिन पुत्रपौत्रान्वयक्रमोपभोग्य पूर्वप्रतदेवब्रह्मदायव-
 [⁶] र्ज्जमभ्यान्तरसिद्धयशकनृपकालातीतसंवत्सरशतचतुष्टयेवैशाखपौर्णमास्यां उदकातिर्गणप्रतिपा-
 [⁷] दितं यतोस्योचितय ब्रह्मदायस्थित्या कृषतः कर्षयतो भुञ्जतो भोजयतः प्रतिदिशतो वा न व्यासेधः
 [⁸] प्रवर्तितव्य तथागाभिभिरपि नृपतिभिरस्मद्वैरन्यैर्वा सामान्यभूमिदानफलमेव्य बिन्दूल्लोलान्य-
 [⁹] नित्यान्यैश्वर्याणि तृणग्रलमजलविन्दुचञ्चलञ्च जीवितमाकलय्य स्वदायनिर्विशेषोयमस्मदायोनुम-
 न्तव्यः पा-
 [¹⁰] लयितव्यश्च तथा चोक्तं बहुभिर्वसुधा भुक्ता राजभिः सगरादिभिः यस्यस्य यदा भूमिस्तस्यतस्य
 तदा फलं
 [¹¹] यश्चाज्ञानतिमिरवृतमतिराच्छीद्यादाच्छिद्यमानमनुमोदेत वा स पञ्चभिर्महापातकैश्चरूपपातकैश्च
 [¹²] संयुक्तः स्यदिति उक्तं च भगवता वेदव्याशेन व्याशेन षष्टि वर्षसहस्राणि स्वर्गे तिष्ठति भूमिदः
 आच्छे-
 [¹³] सा चातुमन्ता च तान्येव नरके वसेत् यानीह दत्तानि पुरातनानि दानानि धर्मार्थयशस्कराणि
 [¹⁴] निर्भुक्तमाव्यप्रतिमानि तानि को नाम साधुः पुनराददीत स्वदत्तां परदत्तां वा यन्नद्रक्ष नराधि-
 [¹⁵] पः महीं महीमतां श्रेष्ठ दानाच्छ्रेयोनुपालनं लिखितंश्चैतत्पदानुजीविश्रीबलाधिकृतगिलकसू-
 [¹⁶] निना माधवभट्टेन स्वहस्तोयं मम श्रीवितरागसूनो श्रीप्रसन्तरागस्य

Translation.

Om. Hail! From the camp of victory fixed before the gates of Bharukachchha.¹⁶ There was the illustrious Dada; the splendour of his fame brilliant like the water-lily that uncloses to the rays of the regent of the night

¹⁵ L. 14, read ग्रामकुटायुक्तकानियु as dyuktakas and niyuktakas are frequently mentioned together in other grants;—समाज्ञापयति. L. 15 read मया; °पुण्य°. L. 16, read तच्छातुर्विंशसमान्य-वसिष्ठ°;—महीधरसूनुभट्टमाधवय.

¹³ L. 1, read वलि;—यज्ञादिकृत्यो;—perhaps षोडश-त°. L. 2, read °स्वाघाटस्थानानि;—पूर्वस्यां. L. 3, read प्र-तीच्यां. Possibly विन्हाणग्रामः. Read उत्तरस्यां;—राधा-टन°. L. 4, read सोदङ्ग; सपरिकरः सधान्यहिरन्यादेयः—वि-

ष्टिकः—कीयामाम°. L. 5, read अचन्द्रार्केर्णव; कालिनः—भोग्यः; पूर्व°. L. 6, read आयन्तरसिद्धयः; °संवत्सर°. It ought to be noted that the second n in पौर्ण looks like a

when he issues forth from a dense bank of clouds, veiled the firmament;¹⁶ the might of his bright sword was always loudly proclaimed by its result, the morning-wail of the wives of crowds of hostile chieftains who had gone forth to meet him in numerous battles and had been

dental n. L. 7, read दितः;—°तया. L. 8, read प्रवर्तित-व्यः—सामान्य°. L. 9, read °तृणाम°; instead of ञ is चञ्चल and other words a sign resembling ण occurs on these and on the Ilāo plates. Read यमस्मदा°. L. 11, read °राच्छिद्या° Dele ञ in °महापातकैश्च. L. 12, read स्यादिति; व्यासेन षष्टि°. L. 14, read यनाइ°. L. 15, read प नराधिप;—लिखितं चै°. L. 16, read °नुना;—mādhava looks on the facsimile and on the photo. like mala श्रीवितरागसूनोः श्रीप्रशान्त°.

¹⁶ Regarding the translation of this passage see above.

¹⁵ This and the following sentences represent each one Bahurūthi compound. Professor Bhāṇḍārkar takes yasaḥ pratāpa as a Dvandva compound, which is also possible.

புதுக்கோட்டை மாவட்டம்

[illegible]

slain;¹⁶ on his head glittered a diadem that shone with the refulgent rays of millions of diamonds, polished by his prostrations at the lotus-feet of gods, Brāhman, and other venerable persons;¹⁷ his store of religious merit, the only friend in heaven, was always being increased in consequence of his liberally fulfilling the desire for wealth of the poor, of the helpless, of the sick, of the wayfarer, of beggars, and of the distressed; he proved his cleverness and polished manners in settling his love-quarrels with proud damsels through prostrations and sweet words; and he threw the dense darkness of the Kali age into the cage of his bright virtues.

His son was the illustrious Jayabhaṭa, who showed the proud valour of a young lion, since by the strength of his sword (*nistrinśavikrama*) he destroyed troops of hostile elephants mad with rut, just as the lion with fearless stride (*nistrinśavikrama*) kills numbers of rutting elephants which attack him.¹⁸ He possessed in the highest degree the sportive qualities of the guardian elephants of the quarters of the horizon, because he made expeditions in the jungles growing on both the shores (of the gulf of Kambay), just as the elephants roam in the forests growing both on the shores (of the western and eastern oceans), and because his bounty flowed constantly and without stint, just as the elephants constantly shed copious ichor (*nirankuśadānapravāha-pravṛtta*).¹⁹ He covered with the sandal-ointment of his glory, which was brilliant like crystal or like a lump of camphor, (his own)

body and the high bosom (*samunnatapayodhara*) of Fortune who resembles the sky with its high-rising clouds (*samunnatapayodhara*).²⁰

His offspring is the great king of kings the illustrious Dadda, who has dispelled the intense darkness that had grown thick through the power of evil and had overspread the whole world²¹,—who possesses an exceeding store of affection for his spiritual guide, and has illuminated the world of the living by his pure precepts²²,—who possesses true spiritual knowledge,—who has become the luminary of the extensive Gurjara dynasty, (and) who has obtained the five great titles.

(He,) being in good health, addresses these commands to all governors of zillās, governors of tālukās, headmen of villages, officials and employes, great men, chief men, and others:—Be it known to you, that, for the increase of my parents' and of my own merit in the next world and fame, I have granted, with heartfelt²³ devotion, confirming the gift by a libation of water, on the day of the full-moon of Vaiśākha, in the year four-hundred of the Śaka era, to Bhaṭṭa Mādhaṇya, the son of Bhaṭṭa Mahidhara, an inhabitant of Kānyakubja, who belongs to the Chaturvedis of that (town), and to the Vasishthagotra in general, and studies the Bahvrīcha (*śākhā of the Veda*), for the performance of the *Bali*, *Charu*, *Vaiśvadeva*, *Agnihotra*, the five *Mahāyajñas*, and similar rites, the village of Nigūḍa, situated in the Kamanīyāśoḍaśata Bhukti, the boundaries of which are—to the east the village of Phalaḥavādra, to the west the village of Viḥaṇa, to the north

¹⁶ Professor Bhāṇḍārkar changes *phala* to *chhala*, I think, unnecessarily. His translation omits the word *pranukhāgata*. *Prabhātasamayarudita* refers both to the fact that the widows of Dadda's enemies naturally renewed their lamentations on re-awakening to a consciousness of their sorrows, and to the custom that the kings of ancient India used to be awakened by the hymns of their bards: compare, e.g., *Vikramānka-charita* XI. 73 et seqq.

¹⁷ The diamonds, I think, received an additional polish not by being rubbed against the feet of gods, &c., but by touching the ground during the king's prostrations. *Guru* includes, besides *preceptors*, parents and other persons to whom reverence is due.

¹⁸ In my opinion *nistrinśavikrama* is intended to convey a double meaning, though Prof. Bhāṇḍārkar renders one only. A *paṇḍit* would hardly allow to pass so splendid an opportunity for a pun. *Vikrama*, if referred to the lion, may either be translated by 'stride or jump,' or by 'attack.'

¹⁹ Regarding this passage see also *Ind. Ant.* vol. V. p. 111.

²⁰ Professor Bhāṇḍārkar's translation omits the word *anga*, 'body,' which must refer to the king. The links of this chain of puns are the following:—The king gained glory; according to the custom of the Kavis, glory is compared to every substance of white or brilliant colour. To the latter belongs also sandal-ointment. Sandal-oint-

ment is rubbed over the body, especially over the breast. Hence the king's body may be said to be covered with the sandal-ointment of his glory. *Lakshmi* (Fortune) is, according to Hindu ideas, the spouse of the king. In embracing *Lakshmi* the king transfers portions of the sandal on his breast to her bosom. The double meaning of *payodhara*, 'cloud' and 'bosom,' finally suggests the comparison of *Lakshmi* with the firmament, which is considered particularly fitting, because the king's glory may also be said to cover the sky (compare above, the description of Dadda I.).

²¹ *Dosha*, which I have translated, with Prof. Bhāṇḍārkar, by 'evil,' means, strictly speaking, 'faulty activity,' which prevents the attainment of final emancipation.

²² My translation differs considerably from Prof. Bhāṇḍārkar's, and this difference is partly caused by the new reading *sampatka* instead of *sampanna*. *Vimata*, which Prof. Bhāṇḍārkar leaves out, proves, in my opinion, that *dāśā* does not mean 'the quarters,' but 'precepts.'

²³ This translation is tentative, and based on the analogy of the phrase *paramabhakti* which appears on the Rāthor and later plates exactly in the position where the earlier ones have *ābhyanārasiddhi*. But I am not in a position to prove that *siddhi* is used elsewhere as a synonym of *bhakti*. Professor Bhāṇḍārkar omits the compound from his translation.

the village of Dahithali. (*The grant of*) this village—which is not to be entered by any royal officials, and to be enjoyed by (*the grantees'*) sons, grandsons, and (*remoter*) descendants—defined by the (*above-stated*) boundaries, includes the . . . , the rent paid by outsiders,²⁴ the income in grain and gold, and the right of forced labour, with the exception of former gifts to gods and Brāhmaṇas, is to be valid as long as moon, sun, sea, earth, rivers, and hills endure. Wherefore nobody is to cause hindrance to him

who, by virtue of the rights conferred by this gift to a Brāhmaṇ, cultivates (*the land of this village*), causes it to be cultivated, enjoys it, causes it to be enjoyed by others, or assigns it to others²⁵ . . . and this has been written by the servant (*of the king*) Bhaṭṭa Mādhaṇa, the son of the illustrious commander of the forces, Gilaka. This is my sign-manual, (*that*) of the illustrious Praśāntarāga, the son of the illustrious Vitarāga.

ADDITIONAL VALABHĪ GRANTS, Nos. IX.-XIV.¹

BY G. BÜHLER.

The first of the six new grants now published was made over to me by the Editor. The second, which was found in Sorath (Kāthiāvād), I owe to the courtesy of Mr. Bau'd-din, Divan of H. H. the Navāb of Junāgadh. The remaining four have been procured from a Vāṇiā in Alinā (Khedā Zillā), through the good offices of Mr. Harivallabh, Assistant Deputy Educational Inspector, Khedā and Bharuch. It is stated that these plates had been lying in the Vāṇiā's shop for some time, and that they were found either in Alinā or in the neighbourhood.

NO. IX.—A GRANT OF GUHASENA.

The plates containing this new grant of Guhasena measure 11·9 inches by 7·7. The rings and seal belonging to them are missing, and verdigris and carbonization have considerably injured them, especially the second.

The characters differ not inconsiderably from those of the other grants issued by Guhasena. They are larger and bolder, and come nearest to the style adopted in the plates of Dhruvasena I.

It is a curious fact that, contrary to the custom observed in all other Valabhī plates, the place whence this grant was issued has not been marked, and that the word *svasti* has been left out.

The *vanśāvali*, too, differs from that given on other plates. The description of Guhasena is entirely new, and runs as follows:

"(After him, Dhruvasena rules,) the ardent

devotee of Maheśvara, the illustrious Mahārāja, Guhasena, who has removed all stains by the power of his prostrations at that (Dhruvasena's) feet; who resembles Krishna, as he has defeated the armies of his enemies; who resembles the ocean, since he is replete with pure . . . and valuable gems;² who resembles the full moon, as he is lovely in the sight of all mankind."

The most puzzling point in this passage is that Guhasena's own father, Dhara-paṭṭa, is not mentioned at all, and that he is placed immediately after his uncle Dhruvasena I. This is so much the more curious as in the grants of Guhasena's son, Dharasena, Dhara-paṭṭa is not only named, but receives the title Mahārāja, and is spoken of as if he had really ruled.³ It is perhaps premature to attempt a solution of this difficulty. But from the analogy of similar cases, *e.g.* that of the omission of Vallabharāja on some Chaulukya plates, I am inclined to conjecture that Dhara-paṭṭa reigned for a very short time only, and that the writer for this reason did not think it worth while to insert his name. The date of the new grant—Samvat 240, *śrāvana* *śuddha*—is of some interest, as it reduces the gap between Dhruvasena I. and Guhasena by six years.

The grantees was the community of Buddhist monks residing in the viḥāra founded by Dhruvasena's sister's daughter Duḍḍā in

²⁴ I take *soparikara* as the correct form, and dissolve this into *upari-kara-sakita*. *Upari*, usually spelt *upri*, is a Marāṭhī revenue term which denotes 'a temporary holder who cultivates land in a village where he does not reside.' It seems to me very probable that the *upari* of the plates is the same word. Compare the Gujarātī *uparuddiā* and Hindi *uparvār*, Wilson, *Glossary Ind. Terms*, sub *vr*.

²⁵ The portion not translated contains the usual admonitions addressed to successors, and the comminatory verses against a resumption of the grant.

¹ See vol. VI. p. 9.

² One epithet of *ratna*, which follows *viśuddha* and looks like *adana* or *adina*, I am unable to make out.

³ See, *e.g.*, below, grants Nos. 10 and 11.

Valabhi. The monastery is mentioned in several other inscriptions.

The name of the village given has been lost. The purpose is the usual one for which grants were given to Buddhas, viz. repairs to the vihāra, food, clothing, &c. for the monks, and

materials for the worship of the Buddhas. In addition the 'acquisition of books of the holy faith' (*saddharmasya pustakopakra . . .*) (Pl. II. 1. 7) is mentioned.

The fact that the Valabhi monasteries possessed libraries is of some interest.

TRANSCRIPT.

Plate I.

- [1] ओं प्रसभप्रणताभिन्नाणां मैत्रकाणामतुलबलसंपन्नमण्डलाभोगसंसक्तसंप्रहारशत-
 [2] लब्धप्रतापः प्रतापोपनतदानमानार्जवोपदिजितानुरागानुरक्तमौलभूतमित्रश्रेणी-
 [3] बल[?]वासराज्यश्रीः परममहेश्वरः श्रीसेनापतिभटार्केस्तस्य सुतस्तत्पादरजोरुणावत-
 [4] पवित्रीकृतशिरादिशरोवनतशत्रुचूडामणिप्रभाविच्छुरितपादनखपांक्तिदिधितिर्दीनानाथकृप-
 [5] गजनोपजीव्यमानविभवः परममहेश्वरः श्रीसेनापतिधरसेनस्तस्यानुजस्तत्प[?]-
 [6] दाभिप्रणामप्रशस्ततरविमलमोलिमणिर्मण्वादिप्रणीतविधिविधानधर्मा धर्मराज
 [7] इव विहितविनयव्यवस्थापद्धतिरखिलभुवनमण्डलाभोगैकस्वामिना परमस्वामिना
 [8] स्वयमुपहितरज्याभिषेकः परममहेश्वरः श्रीमहाराजद्रोणसिंहस्तिह इव तस्या-
 [9] नुजस्वभुजबलपराक्रमेण परगजघटानीकानामेकविजयी शरणेषिणाम-
 [10] शरणभवबोद्धा शास्त्रार्थतत्त्वानां कल्पतरुरिव सुदृढपणयिना यथाभिलषितका-
 [11] मफलोपभोगदः परमभट्टारकपादानुध्यातः परमभागवतः श्रीमहाराजध्रुवसेन-
 [12] स्तत्पादाभिप्रणामप्रभावप्रक्षालिताशेषकृष्णः कृष्ण इव निरस्तारातिसनासंगरः
 [13] सागर इव विशुद्धाद्रणमहार्हरत्नपूर्णः पूर्णचन्द्र इव सर्वजनतादर्शनाभिरामः
 [14] परममहेश्वरः श्रीमहाराजगुहसेन × कुशली सर्वानिव -----
 [15] ----- राजस्थानीयामायायुक्तकविनियुक्तकद्राक्षिकचाटभट-

Plate II.

- [1] ----- दी[न]न्यांश्च यथा[सं]बध्यमान -----
 [2] ----- [वलभी]पुरे पूज्य दुडुकाकारितवि[हार]स्य ----- क -----
 [3] ----- प्रत्याय स्तर्ज्वहिरण्यादेयः सदशापराधः [सह] ----- र -----
 [4] ----- चरोवर्त्तेषु चतुर्षु [मा]तापित्रोः पुण्याप्यायननिमित्तमात्मनश्चैहिकामुष्मिक
 फलावा[प्तये] -----
 [5] ----- तस्य गन्धपुष्पधूपदीपतैलादिक्रियोत्सर्पणार्थं सद्धर्मस्य पुस्तकोपक्र -----
 [6] ----- नानादेशसमन्वागताष्टादशनिकाय[?] भ्यन्तरा[?]र्यभिक्षु[संघ]स्य चीविरपिण्डपा[त] -----
 [7] ----- भ-जायविहारस्य च खण्डस्फुटितविशीर्णप्रतिसंस्कारणार्थमाचन्द्रार्काण्यवक्षि[तिस्थिति]-
 [8] [सरि]त्यर्ध्वतसमकालीनः भूमिच्छिद्रन्यायेन सोदकेन कमण्डलुना विसृष्टः यतोऽस्योचित -----
 [9] ----- परिपन्थना वा कार्यागामिनृपतिभिश्चानित्यान्यैश्चर्याप्यस्थिरं मानुष्यं सामान्यं च
 भूमिदानफलम]
 [10] [वगच्छ]द्विरयमस्मदायोनुमन्तव्यः पालयितव्यश्च यश्चाच्छिन्दादाच्छिद्यमानं वानुमोदेत स [पञ्चभि]

* L. 1, several letters are indistinct. L. 2, read 'वोपा-
 जिजेता'. L. 3, read 'णावमत'. L. 4, read दीधिति'. L. 5, read
 'महेश्वरः'. L. 6, read प्रशस्ततर';—'मौलि';—'मन्वादि'.
 L. 7, delete anusvāra over मण्डल'. L. 8, read 'राज्याभिषे-
 कः'; स्तिह. L. 9, read 'नुजः';—शरणेषिणां. L. 12, read

'सेना'. L. 13, विशुद्धाद्रण' is certainly corrupt.

* L. 2, दु indistinct, but not doubtful, on account of
 parallel passages. L. 4, चरोवर्त्तेषु वतुर्षु indistinct. L. 5,
 तस्य doubtful. Only the ra is visible. L. 6, नानादेश
 doubtful; read समन्वागत'. L. 7, भवजाय indistinct.

- [¹¹] [महा]पातकैस्तोपातकैस्त्युक्तस्यादपि चात्र श्लोका भवन्ति यानीह दारिद्र्यभयान्नरेन्द्रैर्धनानि
 [¹²] [धर्माय]तनीकृतानि निर्माल्यवान्तप्रतिमानि तानि को नाम साधुः पुनराददीत विन्ध्या[टवीष्व]-
 [¹³] [तोयासु]शुष्ककोटरवासिनः कृष्णाहयो हि जायन्ते पूर्वदार्यं हरन्ति ये ॥ स्वद[त्तां परदत्तां]
 [¹⁴] [यो हरे]त वसुधरां गवां शतसहस्रस्य हन्तुः प्राप्नोति किन्विषमिति ॥ दूतको[त्र - - -]
 [¹⁵] - - - - - पुत्रविष्णुसिंहेनेति ॥
 [¹⁶] [स्वहस्तो] मम श्रीमहाराजगुहसेनस्य ॥ सं २४० श्रावण शु - - -

No. X.—A GRANT OF DHARASENA II.

This grant of Dharasena II. is written on two plates, each 12.5 inches by 8.5. The right-hand ring, which bears the seal with the usual device and inscription, is in its proper place. The characters resemble those of the grant of Dharasena, published below.

The plates are well preserved, and at present free from verdigris. But it is evident that they have been cleaned by the finder.

The execution is extremely bad and slovenly. No distinction is made between *i* and *ī*, *u* often stands for *ū*, a *d* standing before *dh* is not marked, and *visarga*, *anundika*, and *ā* are frequently left out or misplaced. Besides, there are other numerous mistakes in the spelling, and some little *lacunæ*. In their incorrectness our plates resemble those of Śīlāditya V. published in *Ind. Ant.* vol. VI. p. 16. The Sanskrit of the grant is not quite correct. The uncertainty in regard to the gender of many words, and the frequent substitution of *śa* for *sha*, show that the writer was more accustomed to Prākṛit than to Sanskrit.

The *vamsāvali* teaches nothing new. But the date—*Vaiśākha*, *badi* 15, of *Saṃvat* 252—is historically interesting. For the last known grant of Dharasena's father, Guhasena, is dated *Saṃvat* 248,¹ and the interval during which the death of the latter and the former's accession to the throne must have taken place is thus reduced to four years.

The objects granted are a field and a well in

the village of Sūryadāsa, and two more fields in the villages of Jotipadraka and Leśudaka.

As regards the geographical position of these villages, as well as of those in the other grants now published, a separate article will be published later, when the results of inquiries in Kāthiāvāḍ have been received.

The measurements of the fields are given in feet, *pāda*, just as in the grant of Dharasena IV., published in *Ind. Ant.* vol. I. p. 16. The *khaṭṭakhaṭṭādātithita* (Pl. II. l. 7) is new and unintelligible to me.

The grantees are two Brāhmanas, Dūśa and Shashṭhi (Pl. II. l. 9), belonging to the Sāṇḍilya gotra, and students of the *Chhandoga-Kaushuma śākhā*, i.e. of the Kanthuma school of the Sāmādeva, which at the present day is not unknown in Gujarāt. *Shashṭhi* occurs as a Brāhmanical name in Kāśmīrian works. *Dūśa* is not a Sanskrit word; possibly it may be a Deśī nickname.

Two sets of officials are mentioned in the list (Pl. II. l. 4), *vartmapālas* and *pratisarakas*, who do not occur in the other grants. *Vartmapāla* means literally 'a protector of the road,' and probably denotes a watchman who is stationed on the road to prevent robberies. At present, too, the highroads in Kāthiāvāḍ and Rājputānā are guarded by such men, whose huts are placed at intervals of two or three *kos*. *Pratisaraka* means 'watchman' in general, and seems to be used here to designate the night watchmen attached to the villages.

TRANSCRIPT.

Plate I.

[¹] ओं स्वस्ति वलमीतः प्रसभ प्रणातामित्राणा मैत्रकाणामतु[ल]वलसंपन्नमण्डलाभोगसंसक्तसप्रहारशतः
 लब्धप्रतापः प्र-

¹ L. 15, विष्णु° indistinct.

² *Ind. Ant.* vol. V. p. 207.

³ L. 1, the plates show no distinction between short and long *i*. Read प्रणातामित्राणाः संपहारः.

[The page contains dense handwritten text in Devanagari script, which is mostly illegible due to extreme darkness and significant damage to the manuscript.]

- [५] तापो[प]नतदानमानार्ज्जवोर्पिजितनुरगनुरक्तमौलभृतमित्रश्रेणीबलावसरजश्रीः परममहेश्वरः श्री-
सेनापतिभटर्क-
- [६] स्तस्य सुतस्तत्पदरजोरुणावनतपवित्रीकृतशिरा शिरोवनतपशत्रुचूडमणिप्रभाविच्छुरितपादनखप-
क्तिदीधितिदीनानायक-
- [७] पणजनोपजीव्यमनविभव परममहेश्वरः श्रीसेनापतिधरसेनस्तस्यनुज त्वपदपणामप्रशस्ततर-
विमलमौलिमणि-
- [८] म्मेन्वदिप्रणीताविधिविधानधर्मा धर्मराज इव विहिताविनयव्यवस्थापधातिराखिलभुवनमण्डलाभोगै-
[क] स्वमिना पर-
- [९] मस्वमिना स्वयमुपहित रज्यभिशेको महाविश्रणनावपूतराजश्रीः परममहेश्वर महाराजाश्री-
द्रोणसिंहः सिंह इव
- [१०] तस्यनुजः स्वभुजवलपराक्रमेण परगजघटनीकनामेकविजयी शरणेशिणा शरणमवबोध्या शस्त्रा-
त्यंतत्वा-
- [११] ना कल्पतरुरिव सुद्विप्रणयिना यथाभिलक्षितफलोपभोगदः परमभागवतः महाराजधुवसेनस्त-
स्यानुजः
- [१२] स्तचरणारविन्दप्रणतिप्रविधौताशेशकल्मशः सुविशुधस्वचरितोदकक्षालितासकलकलिकलंकः प्र-
सभनिजिता-
- [१३] रतिपक्षप्रथितमहिमा परमदित्यभक्तः श्रीमहाराजधरपट्टस्तस्यात्मजस्तत्पादसपथ्यावासपुणोदयः
शैशवत्पभृति खड्गद्वि-
- [१४] तीयबहुरेव समदपरगजघटास्फोटनप्रकाशितसत्त्वनिर्गमशस्तत्प्रभावप्रणतारतिचूडरत्नप्रभसंसक्तस-
रूपपादनखरश्मि-
- [१५] संहति सकलस्मृतिपिणीतमार्गसंम्यक्परिपालनप्रजद्विदयरजनादहर्त्यराजशब्दो रु[प]कांतिस्यै-
र्यगाम्भीर्य्युधिसंपद्धि
- [१६] स्मरशशाङ्कद्रिरजोदधितृदशगुरुधनेशानतिशयान शरणागताभयप्रदानपरतया तृणवदपास्ताशेषस्व-
कार्यफल प्र-
- [१७] र्यनाधिकार्यप्रदानानन्दितविद्वसुद्विप्रणयिद्विदय पदचरीव सकलभुवनमण्डलाभोगप्रमोदः परममा-
हेश्वरः श्रीमहाराजगुहसेनस्तस्य सुतस्तत्पदनखमयुखसंतननिष्ठजन्महीजलौघविशालिताशेशक-
- [१८] ल्मश प्रणयिशतसहस्रोपजीव्यभोगसंपत रूपलोभदिवन्त्रितः सरसमाभिगमिकैर्गुणै सहजशक्ति-
- [१९] शिक्षाविशेषाविस्मयिताखिलधनुर्धरः प्रथमनरपातिसमतिमुष्टनामनुपालयिता धर्म-
- [२०] दायानामपकर्ता

Plate II.

- [१] प्रजोपघतकरिणामुपपन्नान दर्शयिता श्रीसरस्वत्योरेकाधवासस्य संहतारतिपक्षल-१०
- [२] ह्मीपरिक्षोभदक्षविक्रम क्रमोपसप्रसविमलपार्थिवश्रीः परममहेश्वरोः महाराजश्रीधरसेन

* L. 2, read 'पार्जितानुरागतुः'—'वाभराज्यश्रीः' ; 'माहेश्वरः' ;
'भटार्क' . L. 8, read 'त्पाद' ; 'शिराः' ; *dele* प before शत्रु ;
read 'चूडा' ; पङ्क्ति . L. 4, read 'जीव्यमानविभवः' ; 'स्तस्यानुजः' ;
तत्पादप्र . L. 5, read 'म्मेन्वादि' ; पद्धति ; 'स्वामिना' . L. 6,
read 'स्वामिना' ; 'राज्याभिशेक' ; 'राज्यश्रीः' ; 'माहेश्वरः' ;
महाराज . L. 7, read 'तस्या' ;—'ब' घटानीको ;—'शरणेशिणा' ;
'बोद्धा शा' . L. 8, read 'नो' ; 'हृत्प्रणयिना' ; 'लवित' ;—'महारा-
ज' ;—*dele visarga* at the end of the line . L. 9, read 'स्तच-
रणा' ; 'ताशेष' ; 'सुविशुद्ध' ; 'क्षालित' . ल्मशः . L. 10, read
'रति' ; परमादि ; 'महाराज' ; 'पुण्यो' ; 'शैशवत्प' . L. 11, read

'बाहु' ; स्फोटन ; सत्त्वनिर्गम ; 'तारातिचूडा' ; 'प्रभा' सन्ध्य .
L. 12, read 'संहति' ; 'प्रणीत' ; 'सम्यक्' ; 'प्रजाहृदय-
रंजनादन्व' ; रूप ; बुद्धिसंपद्धि . L. 13, read 'कुद्रिरा' ;—
विदश ; धनेशा ; शयान ; फलः प्रा . L. 14, read 'विद्वत्सु-
हृत्प' ; 'हृदयः' ; पादचरिव . L. 15, read 'त्पाद' ; मयूखसं-
तानविष्टतजा ;—'ताशेष' . L. 16, 'ल्मश' ; 'मानभोगसंपद-
रूपलोभादिवा' ; सरस्वमा ; 'भिगामि' ; 'नैः' . L. 17, read
'विशेषाविस्मयिता' ; सृष्टा .

10 L. 1, read 'पघातका' ; 'प्लवानां दश' ; 'रति' . L. 2, read
'दक्षविक्रमो विक्रमोपसंप्राप्त' . *Dele visarga* after 'माहेश्वरो' .

- [3] ×कुशली सर्वनेवायुक्तकद्राङ्गिकः महतरचटभटधुवाधिकरणिकदण्डपक्षिकभोगाधरणिकशौ-
 [4] लिककवर्त्मपलप्रतिसरकराजस्यानीयकुमारमात्यदीनन्याछ यथासद्व्यमानका समाज्ञापय-
 स्तु वस्त-
 [5] विदितं यथा मया मत्तापित्रोः पूण्याप्यायनायात्मनश्चैहिकामुष्मिक यथाभिलक्षितफलावाप्तयेः = सुख्य-
 दासग्रामे दाक्षि-
 [6] णपूर्वसीध्रि पदावर्त्तशतद्वयः वापी च—जोतिपद्रकग्रमे उत्तरपूर्वसीध्रि क्षेत्रपादावर्त्तशतद्वयः विज्ञोत-
 [7] रः लेभुदकग्रामे खट्खट्टावत्यितपादावर्त्ताः पञ्चात्रिंशः एतसोदृङ्गं सोपरिकरं सवातभूतधान-
 हिरण्या-
 [8] देयः सोत्पद्यमानविष्टिकः समस्तराजकीयानामहस्तप्रक्षेपणीयं भूमिच्छिन्ननायेन = शाण्डिल्य-
 [9] सगोत्रच्छदोगकौथुमसन्नक्षचारित्राक्षणदुशाय तथा ब्राह्मणषष्ठये ॥ बलिचरुवैश्वदेवाभिहोत्रा-
 [10] तिथिपचमहायज्ञिकाना क्रियाना समुत्सर्पणार्थमाचन्द्रार्काणवसारीक्षितिसमकालीन पूत्रपौत्रान्व-
 [11] यभोग्य उदकसर्गोण ब्रह्मदेय निखिष्ट यतो—सोचिताया ब्रह्मदेयस्थित्या भुजतः कृशत
 कर्षयतः
 [12] प्रदिशतो व न कैश्चित्प्रतिषेधे वार्त्तव्यमगामिभद्रनृपतिभिश्चास्मद्वशजैरनितान्यैश्चर्याणस्त्यर
 मानुश्य सामान्य च
 [13] भूमिदानफलमवगच्छदिरयमस्मदायोनुमन्तव्यः परिपालयितव्यश्छ यश्चैनमाच्छिदादाच्छि-
 [14] [द्य]मान वानुमेदेत स पंचभिर्महापातकैः सोपपातकैः संयुक्त स्यादित्युक्त च भगवता वेदव्या-
 सेन व्यास्येन
 [15] वष्टिर्वर्षसहस्राणि स्वर्गो तिष्ठति भूमिदः [I]भाच्छेता चानुमतां च तानेव नरके वसेत [II] पूर्वदता
 द्विजातिभ्यो
 [16] यन्नद्रक्ष यूधिष्ठिर महीमहीमता श्रेष्ठ दानाच्छ्रेयोनुपालनम् । यानीहि दारिद्रभयाभरेन्दैर्दानानि ध-
 [17] र्मायतनीकृतानि निर्माल्यवातप्रतिमानि तानि को नाम साधु पुनराददीत लिखितस्सद्विविग्रहा-
 [18] धिकृतस्कन्दभटेन=स्वहस्तो मम महाराजश्रीधरसेनस्य ॥ दू=चिह्निर सं २५२ वैशाख
 व १५

No. XI.—A GRANT OF DHARASENA II.

The grant of Dharasena II. is written on two plates measuring 12·8 inches by 6·5. The only damage which the plates have sustained is the loss of the two rings which connected them. They were, however, covered with a thick layer of verdigris, which in some places withstood all attempts at removal, and makes a few letters doubtful.

The letters, which resemble those of the plates of Dhruvasena I. and of Guhasena's

sāsana of Samvat 240, are distinct and well incised. The number of clerical mistakes is not very great.

The *varṣāvali* is the usual one. It ought, however, to be noted that Dharasena II. receives in this grant also the epithet *mahāsāmanta*, 'the great feudal chief.' One grant of Dharasena II. being dated Samvat 252,¹¹ and one Samvat 269,¹² the new date 270 does not add much to our knowledge of the length of the reign of the donor.

¹¹ L. 3, read द्राङ्गिमहतरचाटः; दण्डपक्षिक. L. 4, read वर्मपालः; रामात्यादीनन्याः; कान्समा. L. 5, read माता; पुण्या; —भिलवित; possibly आर्यदास. L. 8, read *anusvāras* instead of the *visargas*; च्छिद्रन्यायेन. L. 9, read च्छन्दोग. L. 10, read पञ्च; यज्ञादीनां क्रियाणां; कालीन. L. 11, read भोग्यमु; देयः; दृष्ट; यतोऽरयो; भुजतः; कृशतः; कर्षयतः. L. 12, read वा; मागामि;

वैशः; व्योण्यस्थिरः; मानुष्य सामान्य. L. 13, read मवग-
 च्छिद्रि; रायो; व्यख माच्छिन्ना व्यासेन. L. 14, read मानः; युक्तः. L. 15, read षष्टि; तिष्ठति; छेत्ता; मन्ताःतान्येव;
 वसेत्; दत्ता. L. 16, यज्ञादः; युधि; मही; मतां; यानीह-
 L. 17, read वान्त; साधु; निविग्रहा. L. 18, read चि-
 ह्निरः; वैशाख.

¹² *Ind. Ant.* vol. I. p. 60.

¹³ *Ind. Ant.* vol. VI. p. 12.

The grantee is a R̥igvedī Brāhmaṇ of the Śārkarākṣhī gotra—Viśṇu mitra, son of . . . mitra, who, a native of Ānarta-pura, had settled in Kheṭaka (Pl. II. II. 4-5).

The object granted is the village of Aśilā-pallikā, in the tālukā (pathaka) of Bāṇḍari-jidri, which belonged to the zillā (dhāra) of Kheṭaka. The word dhāra, which is closely connected with the dharaṇī occurring in the śāsana of Dhruvasena I., and Dharasena II. (of Samvat 269), and which appears also in a grant of Dharasena IV. (Ind. Ant. vol. I. p. 45), is evidently a synonym of vishaya, 'zillā,' which here is added to it. Pathaka, its sub-division,

has been met with in the grant of Dhruvasena II. (Ind. Ant. vol. VI. p. 13), and in the inscriptions of the Chaulukyas.¹⁴

The purpose for which the grant has been given is, as in the case of all Brāhmaṇical recipients, the performance of sacrifices.

The officers specified by name are the Dātaka, the Sāmanta or feudal chief Śilāditya, and the sādhipigrahika and divirapati, i.e. Divān and chief secretary, Skandabhaṭa. Among the officials addressed by the king in the preamble to the grant occurs a new class, the kāthebarika. I can only register the word, as I am unable to explain it.

TRANSCRIPT.

Plate I.

- [¹] ओ ॥ स्वस्ति विजयस्कन्धावारात् भर्तृदादनकवासकात्प्रसभप्रणताभिन्नाणां मैत्रकाणामतुल-
बलसपञ्चमण्डलाभोगसंस-
- [²] कसंप्रहारशतलब्धप्रतापः प्रतापोपनतदानमानार्जवोदाज्ञितानुरागोनुरक्तमौलभृतमित्रश्रेणीबलावस-
- [³] राज्यश्रीः परममाहेश्वरः श्रीसेनापतिभटार्कस्तस्य सुतः स्तत्पादरजोरूपावनतपवित्रीकृतशिरः
शरोवन [त] शत्रु-
- [⁴] चूडामणिप्रभाविच्छुरितदादनसपङ्क्तिदीधितिः दीनानाथकृपणजनोपजीव्यमानविभवः परममाहे-
श्वरः श्रीसे-
- [⁵] नापतिधरसेनः तस्यनुजः तत्पाद[प्रणाम]प्रशस्ततरविमलमौलिमणिर्मन्वादिप्रणितविधिविधान-
धर्मा धर्म-
- [⁶] राज इव विनयविहितव्यवस्थापदतिरखिलभुवनमण्डलाभोगैकस्वामिना परमस्वामिना स्वयमुप-
हितरा-
- [⁷] ज्याभिषेक महाविभ्राणनावपूतरज्यश्रीः परममाहेश्वरः महाराजश्रीद्रोणसिंहः सिंह इव तस्यानुजः
- [⁸] स्वभुजबलपराक्रमेण परगजघटानीकानामैकविजयी शरणैषिणां शरणमवबोद्धा शास्त्रार्थतत्त्वानां
- [⁹] कल्पतरुरिव सुहृत्प्रणयिनां यथाभिलषितकामफलभोगदः परमभागवतः महाराजश्रीभुवसेनः
तस्या-
- [¹⁰] नुजः तच्चरणारविदप्रणतिप्रविधौतावशेषकल्मषः सुविशुद्धस्वचरितोदकप्रक्षालिताशेषकलिक-
लङ्कः प्र-
- [¹¹] सभविर्जितारतिपक्षप्रथितमहिमा परमादित्यभक्तः महाराजश्रीधरपट्टः तस्य सुतः तत्पादसप-
र्यावास-
- [¹²] पुण्योदयः शैशवात्मभृति खन्तद्वितीयबाहुरेव समदपरगजघटास्फोटनप्रकाशितसत्त्वानिकषः तत्प्रभाव-
- [¹³] प्रणतारातिचूडारत्नभाससक्तसह्यदादनखरश्मिसंहतिः सकलस्मृतिप्रणीतमार्गसम्यक्परिपालन-
प्रजाहृदय-

¹⁴ Ind. Ant. vol. VI. pp. 194 et seqq.

¹⁵ L. 1, read संपन्न°. L. 2, read °पार्जित°; °वात्°. L. 3, read सुतस्त°; °शिरः; शिरः°. L. 4, read °पाद°.

L. 5, read तस्या°; °प्रणीत°. L. 6, read विरि विनयः°. L. 7, read °राज्यश्रीः. L. 11, read °निर्जिताराति°. L. 12, read खड्ग°. L. 13, read °सम्यपाद°.

- [14] रंजानादन्वर्त्यराजशब्दोभिरूपकान्तस्थैर्यधैर्यगांभीर्यबुद्धिसंपत्तिः स्मरशशाकुद्रिराजोदधितृदश-
गुरुधनेशानति-
[15] शयानः शरणागताभयप्रदानपरतया तृणवदपास्ताशेषस्वकार्यफलः प्रार्थनाधिकार्थप्रदानानंदि-
तविद्वसु
[16] हृदयः पादचारीव सकलभुवनमण्डलाभोगप्रमोदः परममाहेश्वरः महाराजश्रीगुहसेनस्तस्य-
सुतस्तत्पादन-
[17] स्वमयूखसंतानविसृतजाह्नवीजलौघप्रक्षालिताशेषकल्मषः प्रणयिशतसहस्योपजीव्यमानभोगसद्रूपलोभा-
[18] विवोश्रितः सरसमाभिगमिकैर्गुणैः सहजशिक्षिशिक्षाविशेषविस्मापिताखिलधनुर्दरः प्रथमनरपति-
सृष्टानां
[19] अनुपालयिता धर्मदायानामपाकर्त्ता प्रजोपघातकारिणामुपप्लवानां दर्शयिता श्रीसरस्वत्योरेकाधिवस-
[20] स्य संहतारातिपक्षलक्ष्मीपरिभोगदक्षविक्रमः विक्रमोपसंदासविमलपार्थिवीः परममाहेश्वरः

Plate II.

- [1] महासामन्तमहाराजश्रीधरसेन × कुशली सवृन्नेव स्नानायुक्तकविनियुक्तकद्राक्षिकवाहसरभट-
[2] चारभटभुवाधिकरणिकशौल्किकचोद्वरणिकबण्डपाशिककाथेवरिकविषयपतिराजस्थानीयो
[3] परिकुमारामाखहस्त्यश्वरोहादीनान्यांश्च यथासंबद्धचमानकान्तमनुदर्शयत्यस्तुवस्तुविदितं यथा
[4] मया मातापित्रोः पुण्याप्यायनापात्मनश्चैहिकामुष्मिकयथाभिलषितफलावाप्तये आनर्त्तपुराविनि-
[5] र्गतखेटकनिवासिशार्कराक्षिसगोत्रबहुचसन्नहचारिब्राह्मण - मित्रपुत्रब्राह्मणविष्णुमित्राय स्ने-
[6] टकाहारविषये बण्डरिजिद्रिपयकान्तर्गत अशिलापल्लिकाग्रामः सोदृङ्गः सोपरिकरः
[7] सवातभूतप्रत्याय सधान्यभागभोगहिरण्यदेयः सोत्पद्यमानविष्टिकः सदशापराधः समस्त-
[8] राजकीयानामहस्तप्रक्षेपणीयः भूमिच्छिद्रन्यायेन बलिचरुवैश्वदेवाभिहोत्रातिपिपंचमहा-
[9] यज्ञिकानां क्रियाणां समुत्सर्पणार्थमाचन्द्रार्काण्यवसरिक्षितस्थितिपर्वतसमकालीनः पुत्रपौत्रान्वय-
[10] भोग्यः उदकातिसर्गोण ब्रह्मदायो निसृष्टः यतो[स्थोचि]तया ब्रह्मदेयास्थित्या भुंजतः कृषतः कर्ष-
[11] यतः प्रदिशतो वा न कैश्चिद्वाघाते वर्त्तितव्यमामाभिभद्रनृपतिभिरस्मद्देशजैरन्यैर्वानिस्त्रान्यैश्चर्याण्य-
[12] स्थिरं मानुष्यं सामान्यं च भूमिदानफलमवगच्छद्विरयमस्मदायोनुमन्तव्यः परिपालयितव्य-
[13] श्च यश्चैनमाच्छिन्द्यादाच्छिद्यमानं वानुमोदेत स पंचभिर्महापातकैस्सोपपातकैश्च संयुक्तस्यादि-
त्युक्तं च भगव-
[14] ता वेदव्यासेन व्यासेन ॥ षष्टि वर्षसहस्राणि श्रमं मोदति भूमिदः आच्छेत्ता चानुमन्ता च तान्येव नरके
[15] वसेत् बहुभिर्वसुधा भुक्ता राजभिस्तगरादिभिः यस्यस्य यदा भूमिः तस्यतस्य तदा फलं ॥ विं-
ध्याटवी-
[16] ध्वतोयासु=शुष्ककोटरवासिनः कृष्णाहयो हि जायन्ते ब्रह्मदेयापहारकाः ॥ स्वदत्तां परदत्तां वा
[17] यो हरेत वसुन्धरा गवां शतसहस्रस्य हन्तुः प्रामोति किन्विषं ॥ पूर्वदत्तां द्विजातिभ्यो यन्नादक्ष
युधिष्ठिर

¹⁶ L. 14, रंजानां; dele भि before रूप; read 'काशित';
—निदशं. L. 15, read 'फलः'; विद्वत्सु. L. 16, read
हृन्मणयिहृदयः; the upper part of the sign after hri is not
readable, the lower is ra or ri. L. 17, read 'सहस्रो'.
L. 18, read 'दिवाधितः';—'माभिगामिकैः';—'शक्तिः'; 'सम-
विधानां'. L. 19, read 'रिकाधिवास'. L. 20, read 'संपात'.

¹⁷ L. 1, read 'महत्तर'; dele 'भट'. L. 2, read 'षाट';—
दण्डः; L. 3, read 'नन्यांश्च'. L. 6, read 'टकाहारवि';—
बण्डरिजिद्रि is doubtful; possibly it may be बन्धोरिजिद्रि.
L. 7, read 'प्रत्यायः';—'प्यादेयः'. L. 9, read सरित्पर्वत-
क्षिति. L. 18, dele च after सोपपातकैः. L. 14, read स्वर्गं.
L. 17, read वसुंधरा.

- [¹⁸] महीं महिमतां श्रष्ट दानाच्छेयोनुपालनं ॥ यानीह दारिद्र्यभयानरेन्द्रैः धनानि धर्मायतनीकृतानि¹⁹
 [¹⁹] निर्माल्यवान्तप्रतिमानि तानि को नाम साधुः पुनराददीतेति=स्वहस्तो मम महाराजश्रीधरसेनस्य ॥
 [²⁰] दू=सामन्तशीलादियः ॥ लिखितं सन्धिविग्रहाधिकरणाधिकृतदिविरपतिस्कन्दभटेन ॥ सं २७०

फामुन ब १०—

NO. XII.—A GRANT OF DHARASENA IV.

The plates on which this grant is written measure 14·5 inches by 11. The rings and the seal are missing. Otherwise the plates are well preserved. The letters resemble those of the grant published in *Ind. Ant.* vol. I. p. 16, and are very clear and distinct. Very few clerical errors occur, but a considerable portion of the description of *Kharagraha* I. (Pl. I. ll. 20-23) is merely a repetition of a passage referring to *Dharasena* II. The error has been caused by the occurrence of the word *सप्तसहस्रो* in both places.

The *vanśāvali* offers nothing new. The two published grants of the supreme sovereign, great king of kings, supreme lord and emperor *Dharasena* IV. are dated *Saṃvat* 326 and 328.¹⁸ I have seen two damaged plates, one preserved at *Walā*, and one now in the collection of the Bombay Branch Royal Asiatic Society, which are dated *Saṃvat* 322 and *Saṃvat* 328. The date of our grant, *Saṃvat* 330, is probably not far distant from the end of *Dharasena*'s reign. For an unpublished grant of his successor, *Dhruvasena* III., is dated *Saṃvat* 332. The beginning of *Dharasena*'s reign is less certain, as only one grant of his predecessor, *Dhruvasena* II., dated 310, has been found.

The grantee is a *Rigvedī* *Brāhmaṇ* of the *Śārkarākṣhī* gotra, *Nārāyaṇamitra*, son of *Keśavamitra* (Pl. II. ll. 15, 16), a

native of *Ānartapura*, who dwelt in the village of *Kāsara*. It is interesting to note that he receives the epithet *Ānartapura-Chāturvidya*, 'a *Chaturvedī* of *Ānartapura*,' which apparently shows his *bheda*, or the sub-division of the *Brāhmaṇical* community to which he belonged. On other plates we have before the word *chāturvidya* the word *tat*, i.e. *tachchāturvidya*.²⁰ Our grant shows that in every case the *tat* refers to the name of the home of the *Chaturvedī*.

The object of the grant (Pl. II. l. 17) is the village of *Desarakshitiḥja*, situated in the *tālūkā* of *Simhapallikā*, and in the *zillā* of *Khetaka*. The purpose for which it is granted is the usual one. The two officers named are the *dūtaka*, the princess *Bhūpā* (Pl. II. l. 25), and the *divān* and chief secretary, *Skandabhāṭa*. The appearance of a female in an official capacity is rather startling. It is explicable only if we assume that she discharged the duties of her office vicariously.

The *Skandabhāṭa* mentioned here is not the same as the minister of *Guhasena* and *Dharasena* II., as I have formerly conjectured.²¹ The proof that they are different persons lies partly in the impossibility that one man could hold office during ninety years, from *Saṃvat* 240 to *Saṃvat* 330, and in the fact that *Śilāditya* I. had *Skandabhāṭa*'s father, *Chandrabhaṭṭi*, for his *Divān* in *Saṃvat* 286.²²

TRANSCRIPT.

Plate I.

- [¹] ओ स्वस्ति विजयस्कन्धावाराद्धर — — वासकात्प्रसभप्रणतामित्राणां मैत्रकाणामतुलबल-
 [²] [सं]पञ्चमण्डलाभोगसंसक्तप्रहारशतलब्धप्रतापात्पतापोपनतदानमानार्ज्जवोपाज्जिता-
 [³] नुरागादनुरक्तमौलभृतश्रेणीबलावासरज्यश्रियः परममाहेश्वरश्रीभटार्कदिव्यवाक्त्रिभराजव-
 [⁴] शान्मातापितृचरणारविन्दप्रणतिप्रविधौताशेषकन्मषः शैशवात्प्रभृति खड्गद्वितीयबाहुरे समद-
 [⁵] परगजघटास्फोटनप्रकाशितसत्त्वनिकषः तत्प्रभावप्रणतारातिचूडारत्नप्रभासंसक्तपादनखरश्मि-
 [⁶] संहतिः सकलस्मृतिप्रणीतमार्गसम्यक्परिपालनप्रजाद्वयरज्जनान्वर्त्यराजशब्दे रूपकान्तिस्यैर्य-
 गाम्भीर्य-

¹⁸ L. 18, read महींमतां भेष्ट; अरे, L. 20, read फामुन.

¹⁹ *Ind. Ant.* vol. I. pp. 15, 45.

²⁰ Compare, e.g., *Ind. Ant.* vol. V. p. 209, vol. VI. p. 17.

²¹ *Ind. Ant.* vol. IV. p. 173.

²² *Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc.* vol. XI. p. 362.

- [⁷] बुद्धिसम्पद्भिः स्मरशशाङ्कादिराजोदधिनिदशगुरुधनेशानतिशयानः शरणागताभयप्रदानपरतया तृणव-
 [⁸] दपास्ताशेषस्वकार्यफल प्रार्थनाधिकार्यप्रदानानन्दितविद्वत्सुहृत्प्रणयिद्वयः पादचारीव सकलभुवन-
 [⁹] मण्डलाभोगप्रमोदः परममाहेश्वरः श्रीगुहसेनस्तस्य सुतस्तत्पादनस्वमयूखसन्तानविसृतजाह्नवी-
 जलौघ-
 [¹⁰] प्रक्षालिताशेषकल्मषः प्रणयिशतसहस्रोपजीव्यमानसम्पद्रूपलोभादिवाश्रितः सरभसमाभिगामिकै-
 गुणैस्त-
 [¹¹] हजशक्तिशिक्षाविशेषविस्मापिताखिलधनुर्दरः प्रथमनरपतिसमतिमृष्टानामनुपालयिता धर्मदायाना-
 मपाकर्त्ता
 [¹²] प्रजोपघातकारिणामुपप्लवानां दर्शयिता श्रीसरस्वत्योरेकाधिवासस्य संहतारातिपक्षलक्ष्मीपरिभोगद-
 [क्ष]विक्र-
 [¹³] मो विक्रमोपसंप्राप्तविमलपार्थिवश्रीः परममाहेश्वरः श्रीधरसेनस्तस्य सुतस्तत्पादानुध्यातः सकल-
 जगदानन्द-
 [¹⁴] नायद्वुतगुणसमुदयस्थगितसमप्रदिङ्गुण्डलः समरशतविजयशोभासनायमण्डला[य]द्युतिभासुरत-
 रान्त-
 [¹⁵] पीठो व्यूढगुरुमनोरथमहाभारः सर्वविद्यापरापरविभागाधिगमविमलमतिर[पि] सर्वतस्सुभाषितल-
 [¹⁶] केनापि सुखोपपादनीयपरितोषः समग्रलोकागाधगाभीर्यद्वयोपि सुचरितातिशयमुप्यकपरमक[व्या]-
 [¹⁷] णस्वभावः खिलीभूतकृतयुगनृपतिपथविशोधनाधिगतोदयकीर्त्तिर्दम्मानुपरोधोज्ज्वलतरीकृतार्थसुखस-
 म्यदु-
 [¹⁸] पसेवानिरुद्धधर्मादित्यद्वितीयनामा परममाहेश्वरः श्रीशीलादित्यस्तस्यानुजस्तत्पादानुध्यातः
 स्वयमुपे[द्र]-
 [¹⁹] गुरुणेव गुरुणायादरवता समभिलषणीयामपि राजलक्ष्मीं स्कन्धासक्तां परमभद्र इव धुर्य्यस्तदाज्ञा-
 सप्ता [द]-
 [²⁰] नैकरसतयेवोद्वहन्वेदसुखरतिभ्यामनायासितसत्त्वसम्पत्तिः प्रभावसम्पद्व[शी]कृतनृपतिशतसहस्रो-
 [²¹] पजीव्यमानसम्पद्रूपलोभादिवाश्रितः सरभसमाभिगामिकैर्गुणैस्तहजशक्तिशिक्षाविशेषविस्मापिता-
 [²²] खिलधनुर्दरः प्रथमनरपतिसमतिमृष्टानामनुपालयिता धर्मदायानमपाकर्त्ता प्रजोपघातकारिणामु-
 [²³] प्लवानां दर्शयिता श्रीसरस्वत्योरेकाधिवासस्य संहतारातिपक्षलक्ष्मीपरिभोगदक्षविक्रमो विक्रमो-
 [²⁴] संप्राप्तविमलपार्थिवश्रीः परममाहेश्वरः श्रीखरग्रहस्तस्य तनयस्तत्पादानुध्यातः सकलविद्याधिगम-
 [²⁵] विहितनिखिलविद्वज्जनमनःपरितोषातिशयः सत्त्वसम्पदा सागौदार्य्येण च वि[ग]तानुसन्धानश-
 माहिताराति-
 [²⁶] पक्षमनोरथाक्षभङ्गः सम्यगुपलक्षितानेकशास्त्रकलालोकचरितग[द्]रविभागोपि परमभ-
 [²⁷] द्रप्रकृतिरकृत्रिमप्रश्रयविनयशोभाविभूषणः समरशतजयपताकाहरण-

Plate II.

- [¹] प्रत्यलोदग्रबाहुदण्डविध्वन्सितनिखिलप्रतिपक्षदण्डोदयः स्वधनुम्रभावपरिभूतास्त्रकौ-
 [²] शलाभिमानसकलनृपतिमण्डलाभिनन्दितशासनः परममाहेश्वरः श्रीधरसेनस्तस्यानुजः
 [³] तत्पादानुध्यातः सच्चरितातिशयितसकलपूर्वजनरपतिरतिदुस्ताधानामपप्रसाधयिता विषयाणा मू-
 [⁴] र्त्तिमानिव पुरुषकारः परिवृद्धगुणानुरागनिर्भराचित्तवृत्तिभिर्मनुरिव स्वयमभ्युपपन्नः प्रकृति-

²⁵ L. 8, read °कलः. L. 14, read °रांस. L. 20, the passage from सहस्रोपजीव्यमान down to पार्थिवश्रीः (line 23) has been repeated by a clerical mistake, while the correct

description of Kharagraha has been left out. L. 24, read समाहित°.

²⁶ L. 1, read °विध्वंसित°. L. 8, read °मपि;—विषयाणां.

- [⁵] भिरधिगतकलाकलापः कान्तिमार्भिर्विहेतुरकलङ्क × कुमुदनाथः प्राज्यप्रतापास्थगितदिगन्तरालप्रध्व-²⁵
- [⁶] न्तिस्तभ्रान्तराशिस्ततोदितसविता प्रकृतिभ्यः परं प्रत्ययमर्त्यवन्तमतिबहुतियप्रयोजनानुपन्धमागम-
- [⁷] परिपूर्णं विदधानः सन्धिविग्रहसमासनिश्चयनिपुणः स्थानेनुरूपमादेशं ददद्गुणवृद्धिविधानजनि-
तसंस्का-
- [⁸] रस्साधूनां राज्यसालातुरीयतन्त्रयोरुभयोरपि निष्णातः प्रकृष्टविक्रमोपि करुणामृदुहृदयः श्रुतवानप्य-
- [⁹] गर्वितः कान्तोपि प्रशमी स्थिरसौहृदयोपि निरसिता दोषवतामुदयसमयसमुपजनितजनतानुरा-
गपरि-
- [¹⁰] पिहितभुवनसमर्थात्प्रथितबालादित्यद्वितीयनामा परममाहेश्वरः श्रीध्रुवसेनस्तस्य सुतस्त-
त्पादकम-
- [¹¹] लप्रणा [मध] रणिकषणजनितकिणलाञ्छधनललाटचन्द्रशकलः शिशुभाव [एव] श्रवणनिहितमौकि-
कालङ्कार-
- [¹²] विधमामलश्रुतविशेषः प्रदानसलिलक्षालिताग्रहस्तारविन्दः कन्याया इव मृदुकरग्रहणादमन्दीकृतानन्द-
- [¹³] विधिर्वसुन्धरायाः कार्मुकधनुर्वेद इव सम्भावितशेषलक्ष्यकलापः प्रणतसामन्तमण्डलोत्तमाङ्ग-
धृतचूडा-
- [¹⁴] [र] त्रायमानशासनः परममाहेश्वरः परमभृशरकमहाराजाधिराजपरमेश्वरचक्रवर्तिश्री-
धरसेन × कुशली
- [¹⁵] सर्वानेव समाज्ञापयत्यस्तु वस्तुविदितं यथा मया मातापित्रोः पुण्याप्यायनायानर्त्तपुरविनिर्गत कासर-
ग्राम-
- [¹⁶] निवास्यानर्त्तपुरचातुर्विंशसामान्यशर्कराक्षिसगोत्रबहुचसन्नक्षचारित्राक्षणकेशवमित्रपुत्रब्राह्मणना-
रायणा-
- [¹⁷] मित्राय खेटकाहारे सिंहपङ्क्तिकापथके देसुरक्षितिज्जग्रामः सोदृङ्गः सोपरिककः सभूतवातप्र-
त्यायः सधान्य-
- [¹⁸] हिरण्यादेयः सदशापराधः सोत्पद्यमानविष्टिकः सर्वराजकीयानामहस्तप्रक्षेपणीयः पूर्वप्रत्तदेव-
- [¹⁹] ब्रह्मदेयब्राह्मणविशतिरहि[त]ः भूमिच्छिन्नन्यायेनाचन्द्रार्काणवक्षितिसरित्पर्वतसमकालीनः पुत्रपौत्रा-
- [²⁰] न्यभोग्यः उदकातिसर्गेण धर्मदायो निसृष्टः यतोऽस्योचितया ब्रह्मदेयाग्रहारास्थित्या भुञ्जतः कृ-
षतः कर्षयतः
- [²¹] प्रदिशतो वा न कैश्चिद्दशसेधे वर्तितव्यमागाभिभद्रनृपतिभिरप्यस्मद्दंशजैरन्यैर्वा अनित्यान्यैश्चर्याण्य-
स्थिरं मा-
- [²²] नुष्यं सामान्यञ्च भूमिदानफलमवगच्छद्विरयमस्मदायोनुमन्तव्यः परिपालयितव्यश्चेत्युक्तञ्च-
- [²³] ब्रह्मभिर्वसुधा भुक्ता राजभिस्सगरादिभिः यस्यस्य यदा भूमिस्तस्यतस्य तदा फल ॥ यानीह दारि-
द्र्यभया-
- [²⁴] अरेन्द्रैर्द्वेनानि धर्मायतनीकृतानि निर्भुक्तमाव्यप्रतिमानितानि को नाम साधुः पुनराददीत ॥ षष्ठिवर्ष-
- [²⁵] सहस्राणि स्वर्गे तिष्ठति भूमिदः आच्छेत्ता चानुमन्ता च तान्येव नरके वसेत् दूतकोत्र राजदुहितृ-
भूषा ॥ लिखितमि-
- [²⁶] दं सन्धिविग्रहाधिकृतदिविरपतिचन्द्रभट्टिपुत्रदिविरपतिश्रीस्कन्दभट्टेनेति । सं ३३० मार्गशिर शु ३
स्वहस्तो मम ॥

²⁵ L. 5, read 'प्रतापस्थगित'. L. 6, read 'प्रध्वसित';—'नुबन्ध'. L. 16, read 'शार्कराक्षि'; 'नारायण'. L. 19 read 'छिद्र'.
L. 23, read 'फल'.

NO. XIII.—THE GRANT OF KHARAGRAHA II.

The size of the plates is 15 to 15.5 inches by 12. Both are broader at the end where the rings were fixed than at the other. The rings and the seal are missing. The plates are, on the whole, well preserved, a few spots only being defaced by verdigris. The letters resemble those of the published plates of Śīlāditya II. and Śīlāditya III. With the exception of the last lines of plate II., they are clearly incised and distinct. Clerical errors are numerous. The grant is dated from 'a camp of victory' situated at Pūliṇḍaka, or perhaps Āliṇḍaka.

The *vanśāvali* offers nothing new. But the grant is important, as it is the first document issued by Kharagraha II. which has been found. Its date, Saṃvat 337, if taken together with that of the preceding grant of Dhara-sena IV., Saṃvat 330, and with those of Dhruvasena III., Saṃvat 332, and of Śīlāditya II., Saṃvat 348, shows that the reigns of the two sons of Derabhata were of short duration.

The grantee is (Pl. II. ll. 14-15) a Rīgvedī Brāhmaṇ of the *Sārkarākṣhi gotra*,—Nārāyaṇa, son of Keśava, a native of Ānandapura, who settled in Khetaka. He is also called *Ānandapura chāturvedīya*, 'a Chaturvedī of Ānandapura.'²⁰ This is of some interest, because, if this Ānandapura is the same as Vāḍnagar (*vulgo* Barnagar), we have here

the first notice of the famous Nāgara Brāhmaṇs, the most distinguished and influential caste which Gujarāt contains.

The object granted is (Pl. II. ll. 15-16) the village of Pangulapallikā, situated in the district (*bhūmi*) called Ghṛitālaya, and in the zillā of Śivabhāgapura.

The purpose for which the village is given is the usual one, viz. the performance of sacrifices.

The officials named in the grant are the *dūtaka*, *Pramātri-Śrīnā*, and the *Divān*, *Śrīmad-Anahila*, the son of *Divān Skandabhata*. The former appears to be a female, like the *rājadhutri-bhūpā* of Dhara-sena's grant. But I do not know what to make of the epithet *pramātri*, which seems to be composed of *pra* + *mātri*, 'mother,' and not to be derived from *pramā*, 'to judge rightly.' Professor Bhāṇḍārkar (*Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc.* vol. X. p. 71) gives the name of the *Divān*, which occurs again on the plates of Śīlāditya II. (Saṃvat 348), as *Madanahala*. That would be a highly indecent name. In favour of my reading, *Śrīmad-Anahila*, 'the illustrious Anahila' (instead of *Śrī Madanahila*), it may be urged that *Anahila*, or *Anahilla*, is known to have been a Gujarātī name borne by the shepherd who showed *Vanarāja* the site of *Aṇhal-vāḍa-Pāṭhaṇ*, and that it occurs among the Rajputs: see, e.g., *Tod, Annals*, vol. I. p. 708; *Mad. ed.* p. 607.

TRANSCRIPT.

Plate I.

- [¹] ओं स्वस्ति विजयस्कन्धावारात् पूलेण्डकवासकात्प्रसभप्रणतामित्राणां मैत्रकाणामतुलबलसंपन्न-
म[ण्डलाभोगसंसक्तप्रहारशत]लब्धप्रता-
[²] पात्प्रतापोपनतदानमानार्जवोपाज्जितानुरागादनुरक्तमौलभृतश्रेणीबलावापराज्यश्रिय परममाहेश्व-
रश्रीमटाकादिव्यवच्छिन्नराजवंश [त]-
[³] मातापितृचरणारविन्दप्रणतिप्रविधौताशेषकल्मषः शैशवात्प्रभृति खड्गद्वितीयबाहुरेव समदपरगजघटा-
स्फोटनप्रकाशितशतनिकषस्तत्प्र-
[⁴] भावप्रणतारातिचूडारत्नप्रभासंसक्तपादनखरस्मिंहति सकलस्मृतिप्रणीतमार्गसम्पत्परिपालनप्रजा-
हृद[यरज्जना] न्वर्त्यराजशब्दो रूपकान्तिस्यैर्यगाम्भी-
[⁵] र्यबुद्धिसंपद्भि स्मर [शशाङ्कादिरा]जोदधितृदशगुरुभनेशानतिशयानः शरणागताभयप्रदानपरतया
तृणवदपास्ताशेष [स्व] कार्यफल प्रार्थनाधिकार्यप्रदान[ना]-

²⁰ Compare also above, p. 73, note 20.

²¹ L. 1, for पूलेण्डक may be read अलेण्डक. L. 2, read

श्रियः. L. 3, read 'सत्वनिकषस्त'. L. 4, read संहतिः. L. 5, read संपद्भिः;—विदश;—फलः.

1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100. 101. 102. 103. 104. 105. 106. 107. 108. 109. 110. 111. 112. 113. 114. 115. 116. 117. 118. 119. 120. 121. 122. 123. 124. 125. 126. 127. 128. 129. 130. 131. 132. 133. 134. 135. 136. 137. 138. 139. 140. 141. 142. 143. 144. 145. 146. 147. 148. 149. 150. 151. 152. 153. 154. 155. 156. 157. 158. 159. 160. 161. 162. 163. 164. 165. 166. 167. 168. 169. 170. 171. 172. 173. 174. 175. 176. 177. 178. 179. 180. 181. 182. 183. 184. 185. 186. 187. 188. 189. 190. 191. 192. 193. 194. 195. 196. 197. 198. 199. 200. 201. 202. 203. 204. 205. 206. 207. 208. 209. 210. 211. 212. 213. 214. 215. 216. 217. 218. 219. 220. 221. 222. 223. 224. 225. 226. 227. 228. 229. 230. 231. 232. 233. 234. 235. 236. 237. 238. 239. 240. 241. 242. 243. 244. 245. 246. 247. 248. 249. 250. 251. 252. 253. 254. 255. 256. 257. 258. 259. 260. 261. 262. 263. 264. 265. 266. 267. 268. 269. 270. 271. 272. 273. 274. 275. 276. 277. 278. 279. 280. 281. 282. 283. 284. 285. 286. 287. 288. 289. 290. 291. 292. 293. 294. 295. 296. 297. 298. 299. 300. 301. 302. 303. 304. 305. 306. 307. 308. 309. 310. 311. 312. 313. 314. 315. 316. 317. 318. 319. 320. 321. 322. 323. 324. 325. 326. 327. 328. 329. 330. 331. 332. 333. 334. 335. 336. 337. 338. 339. 340. 341. 342. 343. 344. 345. 346. 347. 348. 349. 350. 351. 352. 353. 354. 355. 356. 357. 358. 359. 360. 361. 362. 363. 364. 365. 366. 367. 368. 369. 370. 371. 372. 373. 374. 375. 376. 377. 378. 379. 380. 381. 382. 383. 384. 385. 386. 387. 388. 389. 390. 391. 392. 393. 394. 395. 396. 397. 398. 399. 400. 401. 402. 403. 404. 405. 406. 407. 408. 409. 410. 411. 412. 413. 414. 415. 416. 417. 418. 419. 420. 421. 422. 423. 424. 425. 426. 427. 428. 429. 430. 431. 432. 433. 434. 435. 436. 437. 438. 439. 440. 441. 442. 443. 444. 445. 446. 447. 448. 449. 450. 451. 452. 453. 454. 455. 456. 457. 458. 459. 460. 461. 462. 463. 464. 465. 466. 467. 468. 469. 470. 471. 472. 473. 474. 475. 476. 477. 478. 479. 480. 481. 482. 483. 484. 485. 486. 487. 488. 489. 490. 491. 492. 493. 494. 495. 496. 497. 498. 499. 500. 501. 502. 503. 504. 505. 506. 507. 508. 509. 510. 511. 512. 513. 514. 515. 516. 517. 518. 519. 520. 521. 522. 523. 524. 525. 526. 527. 528. 529. 530. 531. 532. 533. 534. 535. 536. 537. 538. 539. 540. 541. 542. 543. 544. 545. 546. 547. 548. 549. 550. 551. 552. 553. 554. 555. 556. 557. 558. 559. 560. 561. 562. 563. 564. 565. 566. 567. 568. 569. 570. 571. 572. 573. 574. 575. 576. 577. 578. 579. 580. 581. 582. 583. 584. 585. 586. 587. 588. 589. 590. 591. 592. 593. 594. 595. 596. 597. 598. 599. 600. 601. 602. 603. 604. 605. 606. 607. 608. 609. 610. 611. 612. 613. 614. 615. 616. 617. 618. 619. 620. 621. 622. 623. 624. 625. 626. 627. 628. 629. 630. 631. 632. 633. 634. 635. 636. 637. 638. 639. 640. 641. 642. 643. 644. 645. 646. 647. 648. 649. 650. 651. 652. 653. 654. 655. 656. 657. 658. 659. 660. 661. 662. 663. 664. 665. 666. 667. 668. 669. 670. 671. 672. 673. 674. 675. 676. 677. 678. 679. 680. 681. 682. 683. 684. 685. 686. 687. 688. 689. 690. 691. 692. 693. 694. 695. 696. 697. 698. 699. 700. 701. 702. 703. 704. 705. 706. 707. 708. 709. 710. 711. 712. 713. 714. 715. 716. 717. 718. 719. 720. 721. 722. 723. 724. 725. 726. 727. 728. 729. 730. 731. 732. 733. 734. 735. 736. 737. 738. 739. 740. 741. 742. 743. 744. 745. 746. 747. 748. 749. 750. 751. 752. 753. 754. 755. 756. 757. 758. 759. 760. 761. 762. 763. 764. 765. 766. 767. 768. 769. 770. 771. 772. 773. 774. 775. 776. 777. 778. 779. 780. 781. 782. 783. 784. 785. 786. 787. 788. 789. 790. 791. 792. 793. 794. 795. 796. 797. 798. 799. 800. 801. 802. 803. 804. 805. 806. 807. 808. 809. 810. 811. 812. 813. 814. 815. 816. 817. 818. 819. 820. 821. 822. 823. 824. 825. 826. 827. 828. 829. 830. 831. 832. 833. 834. 835. 836. 837. 838. 839. 840.

- [6] नन्दितविद्वत्सुहृत्प्रणयिद्वयः [पादचारीव] सकलभुवनमण्डलाभोगप्रमोद परममाहेश्वरः श्रीगुहः²⁶
सेनस्तस्य सुतस्तत्पादनखमयूखसन्तानविसृतजाह्वीज-
- [7] लौघप्रक्षालिताशेषकल्मषः प्रणयिशतसहस्रोपजीव्यमानभपद्रूपलोभादिवाश्रित सरभसमाभिगामिकैः
गुणैः सहजशक्तिशिक्षाविशेषविस्मापि-
- [8] साखिलधनुर्द्धर प्रथमनरपतिसमतिस्त्रिष्टानामनुपालयिता धर्मदायानामपाकर्ता प्रजोपघातकारिणः
मुपप्लवानां [दर्शयिता] श्रीसरस्वत्यैरैकाधिवासस्य स-
- [9] [ह] तारातिपक्षलक्ष्मीपरिमोगदक्षविक्रमो विक्रमोपसंप्राप्तविमलपाथिवः श्री परममाहेश्वरः श्रीधरसेन-
स्तस्या सुतस्तत्पादानुद्भ्यात सकलजगदानन्दना-
- [10] ल्यद्भुतगुणसमुदयस्य गितसमग्रादिङ्गण्डलः समरशतविजयः शोभासनाथमण्डलाद्युतिभासुरतरासपीठो
बृहद्गुरुमनोरथमहाभारः सर्वविद्यापराप-
- [11] रविभागाधिगाविमलमतिरपि सर्वत सुभाषितलवेनपि सुखोपपादनीयपरितोष समग्रलोकागाधगाम्भी-
र्यद्वयोपि सुचरितातिशयसुव्यक्तपरम-
- [12] कन्याणस्वभाव खिलीभूतकृतकयुनृपतिपथविशोधनाधिगतोदग्रकीर्त्तिर्द्वर्मानुपरोधोज्वलतरीकृतार्थ-
सुखरपदुपसेवानिरुद्धधर्मादित्याद्वितीयनामा परममाहेश्व-
- [13] रः श्रीशीलादित्य तस्यानुजस्तत्पादानुद्भ्यातः स्वयमुपेन्द्रगुरुणेव गुरुणात्यादरवता समभिः लक्ष्मी-
यामपि राजलक्ष्मीं स्कन्धासक्तां परमभद्र इव धुर्यस्तदाज्ञासंपा-
- [14] दनैकरसतयेवोद्बुद्ध खेदसुखरतिभ्यामनायासितसत्त्वसंपत्ति प्रभावसंपदशी[कृत]नृपतिशतशिरोरत्नच्छा-
योपगूढपादपीठोपि परावज्ञाभिमानरसानालिङ्गितमनो-
- [15] वृत्ति प्रणतिमेकां परित्यज्य प्रख्यातपौरुषाभिमानैरप्यरातिभिरनासादितप्रतिक्रियोपाय कृतनिखिलभु-
वनामोदगुणसंहति प्रसभविघटितसकलकलि [विलसित] गतिर्नीच-
- [16] जनाभिरोहिभिरशेषैर्दोषैरनामृष्टान्युन्नतद्वयः प्रख्यातपौरुषास्त्रकौशलातिशयगणातिथविपक्षक्षि-
तिपतिलक्ष्मीस्वयं ग्राहप्रकाशितप्रवीरपुरुषप्रथमसंख्याधिगम पर-
- [17] ममाहेश्वरः श्रीखरग्रहस्तस्य तनयस्तत्पादानुद्भ्यातः [सकलविद्याधिगमविहितनिखिलविद्वज्जनमन
[परितोषातिशयः] सत्त्वसंपदा त्यागौदार्येण च विगतानुसन्धानाशमाहितातिपक्षम-
- [18] नोरथाक्षभङ्गः सम्यगुपलक्षितानेकशास्त्रकलालोकचरितगद्गुरविभागोपि परमभद्रप्रकृतिरकृत्रिमप्रश्रय-
विनयशोभाविभूषणः समरशतजयपताकाहरणप्रत्य-
- [19] लोदयवाहुदण्डविध्वंसितनिखिलप्रतिपक्षद्वयोदयः स्वधनुः प्रभावपरिभूतास्त्रकौशलाभिमानसकलनृप-
तिमण्डलाभिनन्दितशासन परममाहेश्वरः श्रीधरसेनः
- [20] तस्यानुजस्तत्पादानुद्भ्यात सच्चरितातिशयितसकलपूर्णरपतिरतिदुस्साधानामपि प्रसाधयिता विषयाणां
मूर्तिमानिव पुरुषकार परिवृद्धगुणानु-
- [21] रागनिर्भरचित्तवृत्तिभिमनुरिव स्वयमभ्युपपन्नः प्रकृतिभिरधिगतकलाकलापः कान्तिमान्निर्वृतिहेतुर-
कलङ्कः कुमुदनाथः प्राज्यप्रतापस्य गितादिगन्त-
- [22] रालप्रध्वन्सितध्वान्तराशिस्ततोदितस्सविता प्रकृतिभ्य परं प्रत्ययमर्थवन्तमतिबहुतिथप्रयोजनानुबन्ध-
मागम [परिपूर्ण] विदधानः सन्धिबिग्रह-

²⁶ L. 6, read 'प्रमोदः'. L. 7, read 'संपद्रुः'; 'गुणैः'. L. 8, read 'संहता'. L. 9, read 'पार्थिवश्रीः'; 'स्तस्य'; 'ध्यातः'. L. 10, read 'रसपीठोन्मूढ'. L. 11, read 'विभागाधिगमवि'; सर्वतः; 'तोषः'. L. 12, read 'भावः'; 'कृतयुग'; 'धोज्ज्वल'; सुखसंपदु'. L. 13, read 'शीलादित्यः'. L. 14, 'इहन्'; संपत्तिः.

L. 15, 'वृत्तिः'; --पायः; 'संहतिः'. L. 19, read 'विध्वंसित'; 'शासनः'. L. 20, read 'ध्यातः'; सकलपूर्व्वनर'; --कारः. L. 21, read 'वृत्तिभिर्म'. L. 22, read 'प्रध्वंसितः'; प्रकृतिभ्यः after विदधानः half a line has been left out.

- [²⁵] समासनिश्चयनिपुणः स्थानिनुरूपमादेशं ददद्गुणवृद्धिविधानजनितसंस्कारस्ताधूनां राज्यशालातु-
रीयतन्त्रयोरुभयोर्निष्णातः प्रकृष्टविक्र [मो]
[²⁴] [पि] करुणामृदुहृदयः श्रुतवानप्यगर्वित कान्तोपि प्रशमी स्थिरसौहृदय्योपि निरसिता दोषवता-
मुदयसमयसदुपजनितजनतानुराग-
[²³] परिपिहितभुवनसमार्थितप्रथितबालादित्यद्वितीय[नामा] परममाहेश्वरः श्रीधुवसेनस्तस्य सुतः
तत्पादकमल [प्रणा]मध-
[²⁶] रणिकषणजनितकिणलाञ्छनललाटचन्द्रश[कलः] शिशु[भाव ए]व श्रवणनिहित[मौक्तिका]लङ्कारवि-
भ्रमामलश्रुतविशेषप्रदान[स]लि-
[²⁷] ल[क्षा]लिताग्रहस्तारविन्द कन्याया इव मृदुकरग्रहणा[दमन्दी]कृतानन्दवि[धि]र्वसु[न्धरायाः]का[र्मु]के
धनुर्वेद इव संशोधिताशेषलक्ष्य-
[²⁸] [कला]पः प्रणतसामन्तमण्डलो[त्तमाङ्ग]भूतचूडारत्नायमानशासनः[परममाहेश्वरपरमभट्टारकम-
हाराजाधिराज[परमेश्वर]

Plate II.

- [¹] चक्रवर्त्तिश्रीधरसेनस्तपितामहभातृश्रीशीलादित्यस्य शार्ङ्गपाणेरिवाङ्गज[न्मनो भ]क्तिबन्धुरावय-³⁰
वकल्पितप्रणतेरतिधवलया दूरं तत्पादा-
[²] रविन्दप्रवृत्तया नखमणिरुचा मन्दाकिन्येव नित्यममलितोत्तमाङ्गदेशस्यागस्त्यस्येव राजर्षेर्दाक्षिण्यमा-
तन्वानस्य प्रब[ल]
[³] धवलम्रा यशसां बलयेन मण्डितककुभा नभसि यामिनिपतेर्विनिम्मताखण्डपरिवेषमण्डलस्य पयो-
दश्याम[शि]-
[⁴] खरचूचुरुचिरसह्यविन्ध्यस्तनयुगायाः श्रितेः पत्युः श्रीदेवभट्टस्याङ्गजः क्षितिपसंहतेरनुरागि-
ण्याः गुचियशोभु-
[⁵] कभृतः स्वयंवरमालामिव राज्यश्रियमर्षयन्त्याः कृतपरिग्रहः शौर्यमप्रतिहतव्यापारमानमितप्रचण्ड-
रिपुमण्डलं मण्डलाग्रमि-
[⁶] बावलम्बमानः शरदि प्रसभमाकृष्ट[शि]लीमुखबाणासनापादितप्रसाधनानां परभुरौ विधिवदाचरितकर-
ग्रहणः पूर्वमेव विवि-
[⁷] धवण्णोज्ज्वलेन श्रुतातिशयेनोद्भासितश्रवणः पुनः पुनरुक्तेनेव रत्नालङ्कारेणालङ्कृतश्रोत्रः परस्फुरत्कट-
कविकटकीटपक्षरत्नकिर-
[⁸] णविच्छिन्नप्रदानसलिलनिवहावसेकविलसन्भव शैवधैङ्कुरमिवाग्रपाणिमुद्वहनभृतविशालरत्नवलयजलधि-
वेलातटायमानभु-
[⁹] जपरिष्वक्तविश्वम्भरः परममाहेश्वरः श्रीधुवसेनः तस्याग्रजोपरमहीपतिस्पर्शदोषतगणधियेव लक्ष्म्या
स्वयमतिस्पष्टचेष्टमाश्लि-
[¹⁰] छाङ्गपट्टिमतिरुचिरतरचरितगरिमपरिकलितसकलनरपतिरतिप्रकृष्टानुरागरसरभसवशीकृतप्रणतसा-
मन्तसामन्तचक्रचूडा-

²⁹ L. 24, read 'गर्वितः'; समुपजनित°. L. 26, read विशेषः.
L. 28, read 'रविन्दः'.

³⁰ L. 3, read यामिनीपतेर्विनिर्मिता°; the vowel-signs are
very indistinct. L. 4, read 'भुवि'. L. 5, 'प्रतिहत', read

'भुवां'. L. 7, read 'ज्ज्वलेन'; परस्फुर°. L. 8, read 'सज्जिव
शैवलाङ्गकारः'—'इहन्'. L. 9, read 'नाशनधियेव'. L. 10,
read 'यष्टि'.

- [¹¹] मणिमयूखचित्रचरणकमलयुगलः प्रोद्दामोपारदोर्दण्डदलितद्विषद्वर्गदण्डः प्रसर्प्यपटीयः प्रतापश्रे-
षिताशेषशत्रुम-
- [¹²] शः प्रणयिपप्रनिक्षिप्तलक्ष्मीकः प्रेरितगदोक्षितसुदर्शनचक्रः परिद्वतबालक्रीडोन्धः कृतद्विजातिरेकवि-
क्रमप्रसाधितधनिश्चिः
- [¹³] तलोन्नीकृतजलशय्योपूर्वपुरुषोत्तमः साक्षाद्वर्म्म इव सम्यगुपस्थापितवर्णाश्रमचारः परममाहेश्वर-
श्रीखरग्रह × कुशली
- [¹⁴] सर्वानेव समाज्ञापयत्यस्तु वस्तुविदितं यथा मया मातापित्रोः पुण्याप्यायनायानन्दपुरविनिर्गतखेट-
कवास्तव्यनन्दपुरचातुर्विद्यसा-
- [¹⁵] मान्यशर्कराक्षिसगोत्रवद्वृचसन्नहचारित्राक्षणकेशवपुत्रब्राह्मणनारायणाय शिवभागपुरविषये
धृतालयभूमौ पङ्कलपल्लि-
- [¹⁶] काग्रामः सोदृङ्गः सोपरिकरः सभूतवातप्रत्यायः सधान्यहिरण्यादेयः सदशापराधः सोत्पद्यमानविष्टिकः
सर्वराजकीयानामहस्त-
- [¹⁷] प्रक्षेपणीयः पूर्वप्रतदेवब्रह्मदेयब्राह्मणविंशतिरहित भूमिच्छिद्रन्यायेनाचन्द्रार्काण्यवक्षितिसरित्पर्वत-
समकाली[नः] पुत्रपौत्रान्वयभोग्य उदकातिसर्गो-
- [¹⁸] ण धर्मदायो निसृष्टः यतोस्यो चितया ब्रह्मदेयस्थित्या भुञ्जतः कृषतः कर्षयतः प्रदिशतो वा न
कैश्चिद्वासेधे वर्तितव्यमागाभिभद्रनृपतिभिर-
- [¹⁹] व्यस्मद्वैशजैरन्यैर्वा अनित्यान्यैश्चर्याण्यस्थिरं मानुष्यं सामान्यञ्च भूमिदानफलमवगच्छद्विरयमस्म-
दायोनुमन्तव्यः परिपालयितव्यश्चेत्यु-
- [²⁰] कं च॥ बहुभिर्वस्तुधा भुक्ता राजभिस्सगरादिभिः यस्यस्य यदा भूमिस्तस्यतस्य तदा फलं ॥ यानीह
दारिद्र्यभयान्मरेन्दैर्द्वानानि धर्मायतनीकृतानि
- [²¹] निर्बुधकमाल्यप्रतिमानि तानि को नाम साधु पुनराददीत वष्टिं वर्षसहस्राणि स्वर्गो तिष्ठति भूमिद-
आच्छेत्ता चानुमन्ता च तान्येव नरके वसेत् ॥ दूतकोत्र प्रमातृश्रीना ॥
- [²²] लिखितमिदं सन्धिविग्रहाधिकृतदिविरपतिश्रीस्कन्दभटपुत्रदिविरपतिश्रीमदनहिलेनेति सं ३३७
आषाढ व ५ स्वहस्तो मम ॥

NO. XIV.—GRANT OF ŚILĀDITYA VI., SURNAMED
DEHUVASHATA.

The plates are exceedingly massive, and measure each 15 inches by 13·5. The rings and the seal which connected them are missing. The plates are not very well preserved. When I received them, they were covered with caked mud and verdigris, and not a single letter was readable. The cleaning cost, therefore, a great amount of labour and trouble. But, notwithstanding this, a great part of the first plate and the upper portion of the second plate have remained, as a whole, illegible; single letters and words are recognizable, but the context could not be made out without the help of the publish-

ed grants. Fortunately the most important part of the inscription, the lower half of the second plate, is in a better condition, and can be read with tolerable certainty.

The letters on these plates closely resemble those of the grant of Śilāditya V. published in *Ind. Ant.* vol. VI. p. 16. But they are larger and incised with more care than those of the Luṇāvādā plates. They deserve a careful study on the part of those who are interested in the history of the Indian alphabets.

The text of the grant is not so full of clerical errors as that of the fifth Śilāditya. Still a considerable number of mistakes occur, and several lines have been left out. These lacunæ corre-

²¹ L. 11, read प्रोद्दामोदारः; शत्रुवैशः. L. 12, read प्रणयिपक्षः;—प्रसाधितधनिश्चि. L. 13, read भाचारः. L. 14,

read वास्तव्यानन्दः; शर्कराक्षि. L. 17, read रहितो. L. 19, read गच्छन्ति. L. 21, read को नामसाधुः. L. 22, read मिदं.

spond exactly with those on the Luṣāvaḍā plates, and this agreement, as well as the recurrence of a number of phrases and corruptions,³² prove that both plates were copied from the same MSS. For our grant cannot be copied immediately from the earlier one, because it shows fewer mistakes.

The grant is dated from a camp of victory located at Ānandapura. The donor, Śīlāditya VI., is the 19th king of the dynasty of Bhaṭārka who has become known. Contrary to the usage prevailing in other Valabhi grants, the description of this new ruler is given in poetry. It consists of four verses in the *Vasantatilaka* metre, which are preceded by the word *paramamāheśvaraḥ*, and followed by the usual titles and the name. The former word is, I think, merely due to a mistake of the Kansār, who, in his impatience to have done, first skipped the whole description, and afterwards neglected to indicate that the word written by mistake is superfluous.

The translation of the passage referring to Śīlāditya VI. (Pl. II. II. 19-24) is as follows:—

"His (the fifth Śīlāditya's) son is the ardent devotee of Maheśvara, the supreme sovereign, the great king of kings and supreme lord, the illustrious Śīlādityadeva, who meditates on the feet of the supreme sovereign, the great king of kings and supreme lord, the illustrious Bappa. He is famous on account of his irresistible valour, he is the abode of Fortune; he strives to annihilate hell. He makes it his only purpose to save the earth; his fame shines pure as the full moon. He is made up of the qualities of the famous triad (of powers),³³ he has conquered his enemies. He gives enjoyment to the poor, he always gives happiness. He is the abode of knowledge. All the guardians of the world praise him, the Vidyādhara serve him. He is famous on earth. He is resplendent with jewels, beautiful in person, a conglomerate of jewel-like qualities. He is endowed with lordliness, valour, and (other great) virtues; he is always engaged in conferring benefits on living beings. A real Janārdana, as it were, he humbles (*urdayati*) the pride of the wicked. He is exceedingly skillful in shaking again and again in battle troops of

elephants. He is the abode of spiritual merit, all over the world his great prowess is celebrated in songs. The illustrious Dhrūbhata conquers, he who is born in the line of the kings of kings and supreme lords, he who is supremely happy."

There is only one statement in this long rigmarole which is of great importance, viz. that Śīlāditya VI. was also called Dhrūbhata. This word stands apparently for Dhruvabhata—literally 'the constant warrior.' The first part of the compound has been contracted, because the paṇḍit wanted a long syllable for his metre,³⁴ and because *Dhrū* was, no doubt, at the time of the composition of this poetry, just as now, the vernacular Gujarātī for Dhruva. Now this name Dhruvabhata resembles the form *T'u-lu-p'o-po-tu*, which Hiwen Thsang³⁵ gives as the name of the ruler of Valabhi whom he visited, more than any other royal name which has become known. As the transcription of Sanskrit *Abhidharma* by Chinese *Opi-ta-mo*, of *bhadra* by *Po-ta-lo*, and similar instances show, *T'u-lu-p'o-po-tu* may stand just as well for Dhruvabhata as for Dhruvapaṭa, the rendering which M. St-Julien has adopted. Against this it may be urged that the Chinese translation of the word 'Ch'ang-jui,' 'constamment intelligent,' does not suit the compound Dhrūvabhata. But this translation may have been caused by a mistake of Hiwen Thsang's, who may either have mixed up the two words *bhata*, 'a warrior,' and *bhaṭṭa*, 'a paṇḍit,' or have been told the name incorrectly. For the frequent mistakes on the plates by which Bhaṭārka is changed to Bhaṭṭārka, and Derabhata to Derabhāṭa, show that the Valabhiāns themselves were not very accurate in this respect. If the identity of Hiwen Thsang's contemporary and of Śīlāditya VI. could be proved for certain, we should be able to fix, at least approximately, the initial date of the eras in which the plates are dated. As our grant is dated 447, and Hiwen Thsang's visit fell in the fifth decade of the seventh century A.D., the year 1 of the era of the plates must fall either shortly before or shortly after the year 200 A.D.

³² Compare, e.g., समावसित जयत्कञ्जवारात् Pl. I. I. 1.

³³ Compare *Kāmandaki, nṭi*, XV. 32.

³⁴ There is a fine precept which authorizes the distortion of words in order to avoid an offence against the

metre, and which deserves to become known. It is as follows:—*māśhamapi māśham kuryād vṛttibhaṅgaṁ na kṛdayet*.

³⁵ *Mémoires*, II. 163.

I am at present inclined to believe that this view is the correct one. But, as the question is by no means simple, and as a number of other points have also to be considered, I do not wish to do more, for the present, than to point out that the occurrence of the name Dhṛubhaṭa or Dhruvabhaṭa on our grant requires the consideration of those who wish to settle the beginning of the era of the plates.

The date, Samvat 447, Jyeshtha, śuddha 5, or fifth day of the bright half of Jyeshtha, 447, is given both in words and in ciphers, and is therefore indisputable. It settles definitively the question regarding the value of the Valabhi sign **U**, and proves the correctness of Paṇḍit Bhagvānīāl's and General Cunningham's explanation, who maintained that it stands for 'forty.' This date corroborates also my reading of the figures on the Lunāvādā plates issued by Śīlāditya V. as Samvat 441.

The grantee is (Pl. II. ll. 25-26) Bhaṭṭa Ākhaṇḍalamitra, son of Bhaṭṭa Viśṇu, a Rīgvedī of the Śārkarākṣhi gotra, a native of 'famous Ānandapura, and a Chaturvedī of that town.³⁰

The object granted is (Pl. II. ll. 26-27) the

village of Mahilābali, situated in the tālukā (pathaka) of Uppaiaheṭa (Upletā?) and in the zillā (ahāra) of Śrī Kheṭaka. The purpose for which the grant was made is the usual one.

The passage regarding the officials (Pl. II. ll. 36-37) is, unfortunately, not quite in order.

I think those mentioned are—

1. The *dūtaka*: the grand chamberlain (*mahā-pratihāra*) the illustrious Deṭaha.

2. The *akshapatalika*, or keeper of the records, Daftardār: *Rājakula*, the illustrious Siddhanātha, son of the illustrious Śarvata.

3. The writer: Amātya, i. e. councillor Guha, son of Hembaṭa.

The name of the 'grand chamberlain' is a curious one, and I do not consider the reading to be certain.

The word *akshapatalika* does not occur on any of the known Valabhi grants, but it is common on those of the Chaulukyas of Anhilvād.³¹ The word *Rājakula*, which is placed before the name of the Daftardār, is a title which likewise occurs on the Chaulukya plates.³² It is probably the Sanskrit form of the modern *Rāul* or *Rāval*.

TRANSCRIPT.

Plate I.

- [1] ओं स्वस्ति श्रीमदानन्दपुरसमावासितजयस्कन्धावारात्रसभप्रणता[मित्राणां मैत्रकाणामतु]लबलसं-
पन्नमण्डला[भोगसंप्रहारशत]लब्धप्र[तापा]-
[2] त्रतापोपनतदानमानार्ज्जवोपाजितानुरागादनुरक्तमौलभृतश्रेणीबलावाप्त रात्र्यभियः परममाहेश्वर-
श्रीमाटाकादव्यवच्छिन्नवंशान्मा-
[3] तापितृचरणारविन्दप्रणतिप्रविविक्ताशेषकल्मषः शैशवात्प्रभृ[ति ख]द्धितीयवाह[रे]व समदपरगजघ-
टास्मोटन[प्रकाशितसत्त्व]निकषः तत्प्र-
[4] भावप्रणतारातिचूडारनप्रभाससक्तपादनखरश्मिसंहतिः सकलस्मृतिप्रणतिमार्गा[सम्यक्क्रि]यापालनप्रजा-
हृदयरंजना[निर्यराजश]ब्दो रूपका-³⁰
[5] न्तिस्त्रैर्य्यागाम्भीर्य्यबुद्धिसंपद्धिः स्मरशशाङ्कादिराजोदधितृदशगुरुधनेशानतिशयानः शरणागताभय-
प्रदानः परतया तृणवदपा[स्ताशेषस्व]वीर्य्य-
[6] फलः प्रार्थनाधिकार्य्यप्रदानानन्दितविद्वत्सुहृत्प्रणयिहृदय पादचारीव सकलभुवनमण्डलाभोगप्रमोद-
परम-
[7] माहेश्वरः श्रीगुहसेनः तस्य सुतः तत्पादनखसंतानविसृजजाह्नवीजलौघप्रक्षालिताशेषकल्मषः प्रण-
यिषतस-

³⁰ Regarding the Ānandapura Chaturvedis see above.

³¹ See "Eleven Land Grants," &c. *Ind. Ant.* vol. VI. pp. 194 et seqq.

³² See *loc. cit.* p. 206.

³³ L. 4, read चूडारत्न°;—संस्क. L. 5, read क्लृप्तिः;—
विदश°; प्रदानप°; तृणवदपा°. L. 6, read हृदयः—प्रमोदः.
L. 7, read नखमयूखसं°; विषत°.

- [⁸] हस्योपजीव्यमानसंपद्रूपलोभादि[वाश्रितः सर] भसमाभिगामिकैः गुणैः सहजशक्तिः शिक्षा[वि]शेषवि-
स्मापि[त]योद्धधनुर्द्धरः प्र[थमन-]^{४०}
- [⁹] रपतिसमतिमृष्टानामनुपालयिता धर्म्म[दायाना]मपकर्त्ता प्रजोपघातकारिणा उपप्लवानां शमयिता
श्रीसरस्वत्योरेकाधिवासस्य स[हता]रातिप-
- [¹⁰] क्षलक्ष्मीपरिभोगदसविक्रमो विक्रमोपसंप्राप्त[वि]मलपार्थिव[श्री] परममाहेश्वरः श्रीधरसेनः तस्य
सुतः तत्पादानुद्व्यातः सकलजगदानन्दनायाडु-
- [¹¹] तगुणसमुद्रस्यगितसमयदिग्मण्डल समरशतविज[य]शोभासनायमण्डलायद्युतिभासुरान्सपीठो व्यू-
ढगुरुमनोरथमहाभारः सर्वविद्यापारपरम-
- [¹²] भागाधिगमविमलमतिरपि सर्वतः सुभाषितलवेनापि स्वोपपादनीयपरितोषः समग्रलोकागाधगाभीर्य-
हृदयोपि सच्चरितातिशयसुव्यक्तपरम-
- [¹³] कल्याणस्वभावः खिलीभूतकृतयुगनृपतिपयावि[शोधना]धिगतोदग्रकीर्तिः धर्म्मानुरोधाञ्जलतरीकृतार्थ-
संपदुत्सेवानिरुद्धधर्म्मादित्यद्वितीयनामा
- [¹⁴] परममाहेश्वरः श्रीशीलादित्यः तस्य सुतः तत्पादानुद्व्यातः स्वयमुपेन्द्रगुरुणेव गुरुः गुरुणायादरवता
स्वयमभिलषणीयानामपि राजलक्ष्मी-
- [¹⁵] स्कन्धासक्तपरमभद्राणां धुर्यस्तदाजासंपादनैकरसतयोद्वाहनखेदसुखरतिभ्यां अनायासितसंपत्ति प्र-
भावसंपद्वशीकृतनृपतिशतशिरो-
- [¹⁶] रत्नच्छायोपगूढपादपीठोपि परामावज्ञाभिमा[नर]सानालिगितमनोवृत्तिः प्र[णति]रेकां परित्यज्य प्रख्या-
तपौरुषा[भि]मा[नै]रप्यरातिभिरनासादि-
- [¹⁷] तप्रक्रितयोपायः कृतनिखिलभुवनमोदविमलगुणसंहतिः प्रसभविघटितसकलकलि[विलसि]तगतिर्भी-
----- रक्षैः देवैरनामृष्टा-
- [¹⁸] त्युन्नतहृदय प्रख्यातपारुषः शास्त्रकौशलातिशय गुणगणतिथविपक्षक्षितिपतिलक्ष्मीस्वयंस्वयंमाहप्र-
काशितप्रवीरपुरुषप्रथम[संख्या]-
- [¹⁹] धिगमः परममाहेश्वरः श्रीखरग्रहः तस्य सुतः तत्पादानुद्व्यातः सर्वविद्याधिगम-पवितनिखिलवि-
द्वज्जनमनः परितोषितातिषय सत्त्व-
- [²⁰] संपत्त्यागैः शौर्येण च विगतानुसंधानसमाहितारातिपक्षमनोरथरयाक्षभगः स[म्यगु]पलक्षितानेक-
शास्त्रकला[लो]कचरितगङ्गुरवि-
- [²¹] भागोपि परमभद्रप्रकृतिरकृतमप्रश्रयोपि विनयशोभाविभूषणः समरशतजय[पता]काहरण[प्रत्यलो]
दम् [बाहु]दण्डविध्वंसितविपक्ष-
- [²²] दर्प्योदयः स्वधनुप्रभावभूतास्त्रकौशलाभिमानसकलनृपतिमण्डलाभिनान्दितशासनः परममाहेश्वरः
श्रीधरसेनः तस्यानुजः त[त्पादानु]
- [²³] दद्यातः सच्चरितातिशयितसकलपूर्वनरपतिः दुस्साधानामपि प्रसाधयिता विषयाणां मू[र्त्तिमा]
निव पुरु[ष]कारः [परिवृद्ध] गुणानुरा[गनिर्भ-]

^{४०} L. 8, read शक्ति. L. 9, read संहता. L. 10, read नन्दनायाडु. L. 12, read कागाध. L. 13, read संपदुप-
सेवानिरुद्ध. L. 14, read तस्यानुजः;—perhaps वागुरुः;—
read लषणीयामपि लक्ष्मी. L. 15, read स्कन्धासक्ता परम-
भद्र इव शोद्धहन्.—सत्त्वसंपत्तिः. L. 16, read परावज्ञाभिमा-

नरसानालि;—प्रणतिमे. L. 17, read प्रतिक्रियोपायः—the
six syllables have not been filled in, as it seems clear that
the plate did not exhibit the usual reading. L. 18, read
हृदयः प्रख्यातपौरुषः; तिशयः;—dele गुणः dele one स्वयं.
L. 19, read धिगमविहित;—पातिशयः. L. 21, read कृति-
मः;—विभूषणः. L. 22, read प्रभाव.

- [²⁴] रचितवृत्तिः मयुरिव स्वयमुपपन्नः प्रकृतिभिरविगतकलाकलाप कान्तितिरस्कृतसलाछनः कुमुदनाथ
प्राज्यप्रतापस्थ[गित]दिग[न्तरालः]⁴¹
- [²⁵] [प्र]ध्वंसितध्वान्तराशिः सततो[दि]तसविता प्रकृतिभ्यः पर प्रत्ययमर्थवन्तमतिबहुतिथप्रयोजनानुबन्धमा-
[गम]परिपू[र्ण] विदधानः सन्धिविग्रह-
- [²⁶] समासनि[श्च]य[निपु]ण स्थानमनुपदेशं [ददतं] गुणवृद्धिराजविनितसस्कारसाधूनां राज्य[शालातुरी-
[यत] न्वयो[रुभयो]रपि निष्णातः प्रकृ-
- [²⁷] [तिवि]क्रमोपि करु[णामृ]दुहृदयः श्रु[तवान]प्यगार्वितः कान्तोपि प्रशमी शिरसौ[हार्दो]पि [निरसिता-
दोषवतामुदय]समुपजनि-
- [²⁸] [तजनानुरागपरि]बृंहितभुवनसमार्थितप्रथितबालादित्यद्वितीयनामा परममहेश्वरः श्रीधरसेनः
[तस्यसुतः तत्पा] दरदेलप्रणा-
- [²⁹] [मधरणि]कषणजनित[किणला]छन[ललाट]चन्द्रसकल शिशुभाव एव श्रवणनिहितमौक्तिकालंकारवि-
धमामलश्रुतविशेष प्रदानसलि-
- [³⁰] [ल क्षा]लिताग्रहस्तार[विन्दः व्यास इ]व मृदुकर[ग्रहणाद]मन्दीकृतानन्दविधिः वसुधरायाः काम्मुक-
धनुर्वे[द इव संभावि]ताशेषलक्ष्यक[लापप्र-
- [³¹] [णत]समस्तसामन्तमण्डलोपमनिभृतचूडामणनियमनशासनः परमेश्वरः परमभट्टारकमहारा-
[जाधिराजपरमेश्वरचक्रवर्त्ति]श्रीधर-
- [³²] [सेनः] तपिता[मह]भ्रातृश्रीशालादित्यस्य शार्ङ्गपाणेरिवाग्रजन्मनो भक्तिबन्धुरावयवरतिधव[लया]
तत्पा[दारविन्द]प्रवि[त्त्या] चरणनखमणि[रु-]
- [³³] [चा म]न्दाकिन्येव नित्यममलितो[त्तमा]गदेशस्यागस्त्यस्येव राजर्षेः दक्षिण्यमातन्वानस्य प्र[बल]धव-
लिम्बा यश[सां] वलयेन म-
- [³⁴] [ण्डित]ककुभानवयायर - - शेषः खण्डपरिवममण्डलस्य पयोदश्यामशिखरचूचुरकचि[स]द्वाविन्धा-
[स्तनयुगा]याः क्षितेः पत्युः श्री[देरभट]-
- [³⁵] स्याग्रजः क्षितिसहतेः - - - स्य शुचियशो[शुकभृतः स्वयंवराभिलाषिणीमिव रा[ज]त्रियमर्ष्य-
यन्त्या[ः] कृतपरिग्रहः शौर्यमप्रतिह[र]
- [³⁶] त[व्यापार]मानमितप्रचण्डरिपुमण्डलमण्डलाग्रमिवाल[वमा]नः शरदि प्रसभमाकृष्टशिलीमुख[बाणा-
सनापादितप्रसाधनानां]
- [³⁷] परभुवां विधिवदाचरितकरग्रहणः पूर्वमेव विधिवर्णोज्ज्वलन श्रुतातिशयनोद्भासितश्रवणयुगलः पुनः
पुनरुक्तेनेव रत्ना]
- [³⁸] [लङ्का]रेणालंकृतश्रोत्रः परिस्फुरत्कटकविकटकीटपक्षरत्रकिरणमिवच्छिन्नप्र[दान]सलिलनिवहानवसे-
कविलसन्नव[शैवलां]-
- [³⁹] कुरमिवाग्रपाणिमुद्ग्रह धृतविशालरत्नवलयजलधिवेलातटायमनभुजपरिष्वक्तविश्वम्भरः परममहेश्वरः
श्रीधुवसेनः तस्याग्रजो-

⁴¹ L. 24, read 'रिगित'; कलापः; सलाछनकुमुदनाथः.
L. 25, read, पर. L. 26, read निपुणः स्थानेनुरूपः; वृद्धि-
धानजनितसं. L. 27, read स्थिरसौ. L. 28, read श्रीधुव-
सेनः; - तत्पादकमल. L. 29, read शकलः; विशेषः.
L. 30, read 'कलापः'. L. 31, read मण्डलोत्तमांग - - मणीकि-
यमाणः; परममहेश्वरः. L. 32, read 'वाङ्मनमनो; after

रावयव six syllables have been left out. L. 33, read दक्षि-
ण्य. L. 34, read नमसि विदलिताखण्डपरिवेशः; पयोदः -
रुधिरसद्गविन्ध्य. L. 35, read स्याङ्गजः; क्षितिसं; 'गिण्याः;
शुचियशो. L. 37, read 'ज्ज्वलेन; 'शयेनो. L. 38, read
किरणविच्छिन्न; निवहनाव. L. 39, read 'मिवाग्रमुद्ग्रहत्;
तटायमान.

Plate II.

- [¹] [परमहीपति]स्पर्शदोषनाशन[धिपेव ल]क्ष्म्या स्वयमतिस्पष्टचेष्टमा[श्लिष्टाङ्गुयष्टिरतिरुचितरचरितग-
रिमपरिकलितसकलनरपतिरति]-
- [²] प्रकृष्टानुराग[सरभस]वशीकृतप्रणतसमस्त[सा]मन्तचक्रचूडामणिमयूख[खचितचरणकमलयुगलः प्रो
दामोदारदोर्दण्डदलितद्विषद्वर्ग-]
- [³] दर्पः प्रसर्पत्पटीयः प्रतापश्लेषिताशेषशत्रुवंशः प्रणयिपक्ष[निक्षिप्तलक्ष्मीकः प्रेरितगदोक्षि]समु[दर्शन-
चक्रः परि]द्वत-
- [⁴] बालक्रीडोनद्धकृतद्विजातिरेकविक्रमप्रसाधितधरित्रीतलोनङ्गीकृतजलशय्योपूर्वपु[रुषोत्तमः साक्षा. **
द्वर्म इव सम्यग्व्य]वस्था-
- [⁵] [पित]वर्णाश्रमाचारः पूर्वैरप्युर्व्वपतिभिः तृष्णालबलुब्धैः यान्यपहतानि दे[व]ब्र[ह्मदे]यानि [तेषा]म
[प्यतिसरलमना]ः प्र-
- [⁶] [स]रमुत्सङ्गलनानुमोदनाभ्यां परिमुदिततृभुवनाभिनन्दितोच्छृतो कृष्टधवलधम्मध्वजप्रकाशितानिजर्व-
शो [देवद्विजगुरुप्रति यथा]र्त्य[मनवरत-
- [⁷] प्रवर्त्तितमहोद्गङ्गादिदानव्यसनानुप[जात]सनेषोपासोदारकीर्तिः परपरादन्तुरितनिखिल[दिक्चक्रवा]
लः [स्पष्टमेव यथार्थ] धर्मादित्य-
- [⁸] द्वितीयनामा परममाहेश्वरः श्रीखरग्रहः तस्याग्रजन्मनः कुमुदषण्डश्रीविकासिन्या कलावतश्व-
न्द्रिक[येव कीर्त्या धवलितसकल]दिङ्गण्ड-
- [⁹] लस्य खडितागुरुविलेपनविडम्भामलविध्यशैलविपुलपयोधरायाः क्षितेः पत्युः श्रीशीलादित्यस्य सूनु-
[नैवप्रालेयकिरण इव]
- [¹⁰] प्रतिदिनसंबर्द्धमानहृदयकलाचन्द्रवालः केसरीन्द्रशिभुरिव राजलक्ष्मीं [स]कलवनस्यलीमिवालकुर्व्वाणः
शिखण्डिकेतन इव रुचिमचूडामण्डनः
- [¹¹] प्रचण्डशक्तिप्रभावश्च शरदागम इव द्विषतां परममाहेश्वरः परमभट्टारकमहाराजाधिराजपरमे-
श्वर श्रीवृष पादानुभ्यातः परमभट्टारकमहारा-
- [¹²] जाधिराजपरमेश्वरः श्रीशीलादित्यदेवस्तस्य सुतः परमैश्वर्य कोपाकृष्टनिस्तृशपातविदेतितारति-
करिकुम्भस्यलोलसःप्रसृत[महाप्रतापानलप्रकारपारिगत]-
- [¹³] जगन्मण्डललब्धस्थितिः विकटनिजदोर्दण्डावलंबिना सकलभुवनाभोगभाजा मन्यास्फालनविधुतदु-
ग्धसिन्धुफेनपिण्डपाण्डुरयशो[वितानेन]
- [¹⁴] विहितातपत्रः परममाहेश्वरः परमभट्टारकमहाराजाधिराजपरमेश्वरश्रीवृषपादानुद्व्यातः
परमभट्टारकमहाराजाधिराजपरमेश्वरश्रीशीलादित्य[देवः तत्पुत्रः]
- [¹⁵] प्रतापानुरागप्रणतसमस्तसामन्तचूडामारिनखमयूखनिचितखजितपादारविन्दः परमेश्वरः परमभट्टा-
रकमहाराजाधिराजपरमेश्वरश्री[वृषपादा]-
- [¹⁶] नुद्व्यातः परमभट्टारकमहाराजाधिराजपरमेश्वरश्रीशीलादित्यदेव तस्यात्मजः प्रशमिताशेष-
वलदर्पः विपुलजयमंगलाश्रयः श्रीसमा लि[गनलालि]त-

** L. 4, read 'डोनधः कृत'. L. 6, read 'विभुवना'; 'गुरुप्रति'.
L. 7, read 'किर्तिपरंपरा'; 'धर्मादित्य'. L. 9, read 'विण्डरया-
मल'. L. 11, after 'शरदागम इव' half a line has been left
out. Read श्रीवृषपादा. L. 12, after 'सुतः' two lines have
been omitted; read 'परमैश्वर्यः'; 'निस्तृश'. L. 15, read
'चूडामणिमयूखनिचित'. L. 16, read 'देव'.

- [17] वक्षा समपोदनारसिंङ्गविप्रहोर्जितोधुरशक्तिः समुद्रावविषक्षभूभृत्कृतनिखिलगोमण्डलारक्षः पु[रुषो-^{४३}
तम] प्रणतनाभूतपार्थिवकिरीट-
[18] [मा]णिक्यमसृणितचरणनखमयूखजिताशेषदिग्धूमुखः परममाहेश्वरः परमभट्टारकमहाराजा-
धिराजपरमेश्वरश्रीबष्पपा-
[19] दानुद्धरंतः परमभट्टारकमहाराजाधिराजपरमेश्वरश्रीशीलादित्यदेवः परममाहेश्वरः तस्यात्म-
जः प्रथितदुस्तहवीर्यपक्षो लक्ष्म्यालयो
[20] नरकनाशकृतप्रयत्नः[1] पृथ्वीसमुद्धरणकार्यकृतैकनिश्चः संपूर्णचन्द्रकरनिर्मलजातकीर्तिः[11१॥]
ज्ञातवयी श्रुणमयोजितवैरिपक्षः संप [न]-
[21] निर्द्धमसुखः सुखदः सदैव[1]ज्ञानालय सकलवन्दितलोकपालो विद्याधरैरनुगतः प्रथितः प्रथिव्यां
[11२॥] रत्नोज्ज्वलो वरतनु-
[22] गुणरत्नराशिः ऐश्वर्यविक्रमगुणैः परमैरुपेतः[1] सत्त्वोपकारकरणे सततं प्रवृत्तः साक्षाजनाईन
इवार्हितदुष्टदर्पः[11३॥]
[23] युदेः सकृद्रजघटाघटनैकदक्षः पुण्यालयो जगति गीतमहाप्रतापः[1] राजाधिराजपरमेश्वरवैशजन्मा
श्रीधूमटो जयति जा-
[24] तमहाप्रमोदः[11४॥]परमेश्वरः परमभट्टारकमहाराजाधिराजपरमोद्धरश्रीबष्पपापानुद्धचात-
परमभट्टारकमहाराजा-
[25] धिराजपरमेश्वरश्रीशीलादित्यदेवः सर्वानेव समाज्ञाप[य]यस्तु वः संविदित यथा मया मातापित्रो-
रात्मनश्च पुण्ययशोभिष्ट-
[26] द्वये ऐहिकामुष्मिकफलावस्यर्थ श्रीमदानन्दपुरवास्तव्यतचातुर्विदासामान्यशर्कराक्षिसगोत्रबहुच स.
ब्रह्मचारि-
[27] भट्टाखण्डलभिन्नाय भट्टविष्णुपुत्राय बलिचह्वैश्वदेवाभिहोत्रक्रतुकृयाद्युत्सर्पणावर्त्यश्रीखेटक-
हारे उपलहेट-
[28] पथके महिलाबलीनम धामः सोष्ट[ङ्ग] सोपरिकरः सोत्पद्यमानविष्टिकः सभूतपातप्रत्यादायः सदा-
शापराधः स-
[29] भोगभागः सधान्यहिरण्यादयः सर्वराजकीयानां अहस्तप्रक्षेपणीयः पूर्वप्रत्तेदेवदायब्रह्मदायवर्जं भूमि-
च्छिद्रन्यायनाचन्द्रार्का-
[30] ण्णांवाक्षितिपर्वतसमकालीनः पुत्रपौत्रान्वयभोग्य उपपातिसर्गोण ब्रह्मदायत्वेन प्रतिपादितः यतोस्योचित-
या ब्रह्मदा[यस्य]
[31] त्या भुंजतः कुषतः कर्षायतः प्रतिदिशतो वा न कैश्चिद्व्यासेधे वर्तितव्य ॥ अगाभिभद्रनृपतिभिः अ-
[32] स्मद्देशजैरन्यैर्वीनित्यानित्यान्यैश्वर्याण्यस्थिर मानुष्यकं सामान्यं च भूमिदानफलं अवगच्छद्भिः अयम-
[33] स्मदायोनुमन्तव्यः पालयितव्यश्च उक्तञ्च वदव्यासेनव्यासेनः बहुभिर्वसुधा भुक्ता राजभिः सगरादिभिः
[34] यस्यस्य यदा भूतिस्तस्यतस्य तदा फलं= यानीह दत्तानि पुरा नरेन्द्रैः धनानि धर्मायतनीकृतानि
निर्मान्यवान्त

⁴³ L. 17, read °वक्षाः समपोदनारसिंह°; तोद्धर°;—समुद्धत°;—
पुरुषोत्तमः. L. 19, read °वीर्यपक्षो. L. 20, read °कृतैक-
निष्ठः—गुणमयो. L. 21, read रत्नोज्ज्वलो. L. 22, read सा-
क्षाज. L. 28, read युद्धेसकृद्. But the sign which looks
like visarga may be intended for the avagraha. L. 24,

read परममाहेश्वरः—°पादानुच्यतः. L. 28, read संविदितं.
L. 28, read °बलीनामाः सभूतवात° L. 29, according to the
other plates. Read °प्यादेयः °वर्जं; °न्यायेना. L. 29, read
उदकाति. L. 31, read वर्तितव्यम्. L. 32, dele first नित्य°;
read स्थिरं. L. 33, read वेदव्यासेन. L. 34, read पुरा नरे°.

- [³⁵] प्रतिमानि तानि को नाम[स]धु प्रतिराददीत षष्टि वर्षसहस्राणि स्वर्गे तिष्ठति भूमिदः आच्छेत्ता**
चानुमताच्च तान्येव नर-
- [³⁶] के[व]सेत् ॥ भुषुटवीवतोपासु सुष्ककोटरवासिनः कृष्णाहयो हि जायन्ते भूमिदायं हरन्ति ये ॥
दूतकोत्रमहाप्रतीहा-
- [³⁷] रश्रीदेवहासपटलिकनराजकुलश्रीसिद्धनाथश्रीशर्वटसुतः तथा तन्नियुक्तव्रतिनानर्त्तकुलपुत्रमा-
- [³⁸] सगुहेन हेम्वट पुत्रेण लिखितमिति ॥ संवत्[स]रशतचतुष्टये सप्तचत्वारिंशदधिके ज्येष्ठशुद्धपंचम्यां
अङ्क-
- [³⁹] त सवत ४४७ ज्येष्ठ शु ५ ॥
- [⁴⁰] स्वहस्तो मम-

MISCELLANEA.

POLYANDRY IN THE PANJÂB.

SIR,—I have just read in the *Indian Antiquary*, vol. VI. p. 315, Dr. Muir's paper "On the Question whether Polyandry ever existed in Northern India," and in response to the last sentence of his postscript the making known of a few facts I have gleaned may not be without interest.

Having occasion in 1872 to visit Ropar, a town in the Ambâla District at the point where the Satlaj¹ debouches from the hills, I was induced by hearing that a *dad* of some kind was procurable at the Sirhind station of the Sindh, Panjâb, and Dehli Railway to alight there, as the most convenient place for getting across the twenty miles between the railway and Ropar. No *dad* of any kind was, however, procurable, and I was compelled to send for a common country-cart to pursue my journey in, and entered into conversation with the driver, a Panjâbi Jat, who was as good-humoured and communicative a man as the majority of his race. He let fall some remarks which induced me to question him on the subject of polyandry (of the existence of which I had not previously the faintest conception), and from his replies, as well as from subsequent inquiries, I have ascertained that there exists at this present time a system of polyandry among the Jats. The same institution is not unknown among the Chamars and other low castes at the foot of the hills and in the lower hills, and its existence in the higher hills is well known. My own inquiries have been in the Cis-Satlaj districts of Ambâla, Ludhiâna, Ferozpur, and Sirsa, and the Trans-Satlaj districts of Jalandar and Hoshiarpur.

Whether the Jats are Aryan or Turanian I do not know, but I have always remarked two distinct kinds of them—not, however, living apart from each other. One is the typical Sikh, tall and light-

complexioned, with a purely Caucasian type of face, and often with an aquiline nose; the other is shorter and darker, and essentially Tatar in feature. They are, so to speak, fused together, and the former type generally prevails, although the latter is very strong in particular families. The words of Prof. Weber, vol. VI. p. 317b, describe exactly the differences between the Panjâbi Jat and Hindustani Jat. To such an extent does the former (in every respect the superior and manlier) carry his disregard of Brâhmanism that without the slightest compunction he cuts off *pîpal* branches (*Ficus religiosa*) to feed his camels—an act the Jat would shrink from in horror as nothing less than sacrilege. My Panjâbi camel-men have often been set upon and beaten for this act by the Hindustani Jats of the Dehli, Gurgaon, and Rohtak districts.

When a Jat is well-to-do he generally procures a wife for each of his sons, but if he is not rich enough to bear the expenses of many marriages he gets a wife for the eldest son only, and she is expected to, and as a rule does, accept her brothers-in-law as co-husbands. There is no attempt to conceal the fact, and it is even a common thing when women quarrel for one to say to the other, "You are one so careless of your duty as not to admit your husband's brothers to your embraces!" It is true that Brâhmanical influence prevents open cohabitation with an elder brother's wife, but no great pains are taken to conceal it.

The custom of forcing a younger brother to take the elder brother's widow (to raise up seed to his brother) is well known. Many tribes practise it. I have even heard of the thing being done among poor Banjâs in Dehli.

C. S. KIRKPATRICK.

Dehli, 1st January 1878.

** L. 35, read साधु पुनरा°, षष्टि;—म. L. 36, read वि-
न्या°;—भुक्°. L. 37, letters 3—5 uncertain. Probably
होषपटलिकोव to be read. Rep^d नाथ. L. 39, read अ-

कृतः—read संवत्. The त of Samvat stands under the व.

¹ Always pronounced Satlaj by natives.

ANCIENT SUPERSTITIONS REGARDING
"MEETING EYEBROWS."

Sir Henry Maine's article on South Slavonians and Rājputs has recalled to my mind a curious parallel between Hindu and Slavonian folklore.

In the 20th Lambaka of the *Kathā Sarit Sāgara* a witch is mentioned who undertook to confer on her disciples the power of flying in the air, by means of the eating of human flesh (*mahdmāna*). She is thus described:—"She was of repulsive appearance. Her eyebrows met, she had dull eyes, a depressed flat nose, large cheeks, widely parted lips, projecting teeth, a long neck, pendulous breasts, a large belly, and broad expanded feet."

The only point I desire to call attention to in this inventory of the lady's charms is the fact of her eyebrows meeting. For I find that Mr. Taylor, in his *Primitive Culture*, vol. II. p. 176, speaking of Slavonian superstitions says,—“A man whose eyebrows meet as if his soul were taking flight to enter some other body may be marked by this sign either as a werewolf or a vampire.”

In both superstitions we find this notion, that meeting eyebrows are the outward sign of a predilection for human flesh.

C. H. T.

Calcutta, 15th Jan. 1878.

THE BLINDING OF SHĀH MANSŪR BY HIS
REBELLIOUS SON.

Let not thy heart the World's vain goods pursue,
For no one yet has found her promise true.

No stingless honey in her mart we buy,
No thornless dates her garden will supply.
If lamp she lights, as soon as it grows bright
The wind extinguisheth the spreading light.
Who careless doth his heart on her bestow,
Behold, he cherishes a deadly foe:
The warlike king, who made the earth his prey,
His sabre dripping from the bloody fray,
Who with one onset put a host to rout,
Or broke a centre with a single shout;
Who chiefs unjustly into prison threw,
Beheading heroes when no crime they knew;
Who made the lioness untimely bear
In deserts when his name but sounded there;
Who made Shirāz, Tabriz, 'Irāk, obey—
Succumbed at last on his appointed day:
For one who his world-scanning eye made bright
With stabbing awl destroyed that piercing sight.

Bicknell's Selections from Haddā.

A Professorship of Zend has been founded at the École des Hautes Études, Paris. It is the first chair established in Europe for the special study of the ancient language and literature of Persia. The first professor is M. James Darmesteter, the author of two works of great interest on the old Persian religion,—the first an essay on the mythology of the *Avesta*, entitled *Haurvatāt et Ameretāt*, published in 1875; and the second a volume, published last year, on the origin and history of the two principles, and styled *Ormazd et Ahriman*.

BOOK NOTICES.

A COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR of the Modern Aryan Languages of India: to wit, Hindi, Panjabi, Sindhi, Gujarati, Marathi, Oriya, and Bangali. By John Beames, Bengal Civil Service, &c. Vol. II. The Noun and Pronoun. (London: Trübner & Co., 1875. pp. 348.)

The first volume of Mr. Beames's work was reviewed at considerable length in the *Indian Antiquary* (vol. IV. p. 186). Our notice of the second volume shall be brief.

Mr. Beames speaks of the great and ever-growing pressure of work in Government offices, as “the machinery of Government becomes more complex.” This compelled him to lay aside at one time all literary work for six months together. We have reason, then, to congratulate Mr. Beames and the public that the second volume issued from the press only two years and a half after the first. On the score of this pressure of official duty the author asks indulgence for “the disjointed and unfinished appearance of some parts of the work.” Certainly there are marks of haste, and a want of artistic finish in the book; but we do not deem these to be unpardonable faults. On the other hand, the merits of Mr. Beames are great. They are such as these—extensive knowledge, great pains and patience in investigation, a quick and generally accurate perception. There are many

statements in the book the truth of which we doubt, and some which we feel disposed to deny; but, take it all in all, the production is in a high degree creditable to the author.

The volume contains Book the Second, which comprises four chapters. The three first chapters discuss the Noun; the fourth the Pronoun.

In addition to the seven dialects which formally come under investigation, we have remarks on cognate forms of speech, such as Kāśmīrī, Nepālī, and the Gipsy language. Mr. Beames thus traverses a very extensive field, in which the report of a pioneer (which in truth he is) cannot reasonably be expected to be either perfectly accurate or exhaustive. But we are very thankful for the mass of information which he has supplied.

In some of his opinions Mr. Beames strongly dissents from the Pandits and even some European scholars. For example, Bangālī has been represented as the eldest daughter of Sanskrit, and as retaining the mother's character more fully than the younger sisters. But, says he, “it is in truth one of the youngest grand-daughters.” Its phonesis and organic structure prove it to be “a very poor and rustic patois” which of late has been deluged with resuscitated Sanskrit words

and forms. We submit the interesting question to those who have studied Bangālī deeply; but meantime we hold with Mr. Beames, and with him also we reprobate the pedantry of reproducing dead Sanskrit forms in living Bangālī speech.

The presence of Arabic and Persian words in the vernaculars of India has been to many a stumbling-block, and they have proposed to weed them out as interlopers—as invaders of recent date. Mr. Beames, however, justly reminds us that many of these words were naturalized very long ago. The influence of Arabic in India began with the conquest of Sindh in the early part of the 8th century; in the 11th the expedition of Mahmūd of Ghazni extended the knowledge of Arabic (Mr. Beames should have added, 'and Persian') to all north-western India. The seven sister dialects had foreign elements thus woven into their structures from the very commencement; and often, even in sequestered rural places, the Arabic or Persian term is more familiar to the mass than any synonymous word of Indian origin.

Mr. Beames is much of a utilitarian. In the vast complications of classic grammar he has no complacency; he rejoices in the simplification which marks the modern dialects. English is "our own beautiful and practical language," which has "emancipated itself from awkward and cumbersome swaddling clothes." Thus, in regard to gender, he pities the 'stilted' Marāṭhī and Gujarāṭī for having retained masculines, feminines, and neuters;—he thinks that Hindi, Panjābī, and Sindhi have done well in rejecting the neuter; and that Bangālī and Oriya are to be congratulated on having no gender at all. We hardly know whether he prefers our English mode of designating natural (as distinguished from grammatical) gender to that which prevails in the languages which have retained the distinction he dislikes. For instance, is it better to have *horse* for the masculine and *mare* for the feminine, than with the Marāṭhī to say *ghodā*, *ghodī*? We cannot think so. Mr. Beames, it is plain, must immensely prefer the constancy with which the English article *the* does duty in all circumstances and connections; while he must pity the ever-shifting forms of its German representative—*der*, *die*, *das*, *des*, *dem*, *den*. What say the Germans to this? And will our friends in Western India rejudge his judgment when he ventures to speak of "the usual ill-luck of Marāṭhī"?

Mr. Beames in his first volume showed a good deal of 'a skipping spirit,' and refreshed himself and his readers with a very passable joke now and then. Hard official work, we fear, is taking the fun out of him; which is a pity on all accounts. In a discussion on the numerals (which, by the by,

is one of the most interesting in the volume) he suddenly asks—"Had the Gipsies only learnt to count as far as six when they left India?" This, because above six the resemblance between the Gipsy and other Indian numerals nearly vanishes. Mr. Beames's question, if seriously put, is absurd, and as a joke the thing will hardly pass muster.

But we cannot let our closing remark be one of censure. We must heartily congratulate Mr. Beames on his having, on the whole, well sustained the position—and it was a high one—which he won for himself as an Orientalist by his former volume.

HISTORY OF NEPĀL, translated from the *Parbatīyā* by Munshi Siva Śankar Singh and Pandit Śrī Guṇānand: with an introductory sketch of the country of Nepāl, by the editor, DANIEL WRIGHT, M.A., M.D., late Residency Surgeon at Kāṭhmāṇḍū. Bl. 8vo, pp. 324. (Cambridge University Press, 1877.)

Our information respecting Nepāl is still very defective, and, as Dr. Wright remarks, it is hardly possible to give it any degree of completeness "while our relations with it remain as they are at present," but for this very reason this work is all the more valuable. It is only to be regretted that the editor did not bestow more pains, while in the country, upon the revision of the *Yanśāvali* or Genealogical History of Nepāl, according to the Buddhist recension, which he has here edited with only a few notes regarding the customs and places mentioned.

Dr. Wright's sketch of the valley of Nepāl surrounding the capital, about 20 miles in length by 15 in breadth, which is the only portion of the country open to the investigations of Europeans, occupies 75 pages, but, for want of a map, is not always very intelligible. Kāṭhmāṇḍū, the capital, known also by the names of Yindēsi, Kāntipur, and Kāṭhmāṇḍū, is "said to have been founded by Rāja Guṇakāmadeva, in the Kaligat (sic, for *Kaliyuga*) year 3824 (A.D. 723)." It is built on no regular plan, and its shape is very irregular, but "is said by the natives to resemble the Khora or sword of Devi." Its population is estimated by Dr. Wright at 30,000. "The better class of buildings is elaborately ornamented with plaster and paintings, and the houses in general possess large projecting wooden balconies, which are richly carved;" the temples "are several stories in height and profusely ornamented with carvings, painting, and gilding," but the carvings on many, and even on private houses, contain most obscene groups, the only reason assigned for which filthy custom being "that such figures are supposed to protect the buildings from being struck by lightning" (pp. 9-10). The streets are narrow and the whole town is very dirty: in short "Kāṭhmāṇḍū may be said

to be built on a dunghill in the midst of latrines" (p. 12).

Pāṭan, the next city, about two miles S.E. of Kāṭhmāṇḍū, was built by Rāja Bir Deva in the "Kaligat" year 3400 (A.D. 299), and is called by the names of Yellondēsi and Lalita Pātan. Its population "is said to be 30,000" (p. 16). Bhātgāon, about nine miles E. from the capital, was founded by Rāja Ānand Malla, A.D. 865, and was at first named Bhaktāpur, but was also known as Dharma Pātan and Khopodēsi: its population is also "estimated at about 30,000."

The principal races of Nepāl are the Gōrkhās or Gōrkhālīs, Nēwārs, Gōrungs, Limbūs, Kirātīs, Bhōtiyās, and Lepchās. The Gōrkhālī is the dominant race, and derives its name, says Dr. Wright, "from the town of Gōrkhā," which is about 60 miles W.N.W. from Kāṭhmāṇḍū, but this again is derived from the eponymous deity of the royal family, viz. Gōrkhānātha. They conquered Nepāl in 1768. "The Limbūs and Kirātīs occupy the hilly country to the eastward of the valley," and are famous as hunters. "They are both short, flat-faced people, powerfully built, and decidedly Mongolian in appearance" (p. 27). Like the Nēwārs and Bhōtiyās, they are Buddhists. In very early times the chronicle relates that the Kirātīs came from the east and conquered the Ahir prince, establishing a dynasty which gave 29 princes to the throne, but was at last overthrown by the Somavaṇśī Rājputs.

The second chapter of the introduction concludes with a very brief account of 22 of the principal *jātrās*; the third gives some account of the occupations of the people, laws and punishments, trade and manufactures, agriculture, revenue, &c.; the fourth sketches briefly the history of the country during the past hundred years; and the last remarks on the political aspect of matters in Nepāl, and the penurious, avaricious, rude, and jealous character of the Gōrkhās.

The 'History' is sadly deficient in details and dates. The valley, we are told, was formerly known as Nāg Hrad—"the tank of the serpent." In the Trētāyuga, Viśvabhū Buddha came from a country called Anūpam to worship Svayambhu Buddha, and showed his disciples the place through which the waters of the Nāg Hrad should be made to run out. In later times the Rishi Nē performed his devotions at the junction of the Bāgmati and Kēsāvatī rivers, and ruled over the country, which derived its name from him. After this Manjūśrī came from Mahā-chīn, and cut through the mountain and let the water run out with several Nāgas and other animals, but he per-

sued Karkōṭak, king of the Nāgas, to remain, and pointed out to him a large tank (called Tandāh) to live in; but afterwards Dānāsuri dammed up the passage again, and Bhīmā the Pāṇḍava came from Dolkhā and amused himself in a stone boat upon the lake. Viṣṇu re-opened the passage, and a thousand years after, Rāja Svayambhāta was made king. Vir Vikramāditya took service under him, and ultimately became king and "ruled a thousand years," leaving the kingdom to his son Vikrama Kēsari. Later still Rāṇī Pingalā, the wife of Sudatta of Mārāvāda, came and performed penances to Guhaṇḍavari, but was taken back by her husband (pp. 104-5). These events, however, are all relegated to very early ages. Nē Nurmi installed a cowherd named Bhuktamāna as king, who founded a Gupta dynasty. We could have wished for a better chronology than Kirkpatrick's, but that does not seem available; in fact the earlier dynasties have either been manufactured, or, which is quite as probable, and of which the case of the Simraun dynasty is an instance, two or more of them were contemporary, and none of them of any very great antiquity. The following are the lists of the dynasties with the dates derived by Mr. Prinsep from Kirkpatrick—and his names¹—where they differ from the *Varāṇśī*—

1. Gupta Dynasty, 521 years.

B.C. 3803 Bhuktamānagata, reigned 88 years (K. Burimahāgāh, 18 years; Prinsep supposes about B.C. 844).

3795 Jaya Gupta, his son, ruled 72 years.
 3722 Parama Gupta " 80 "
 3631 Bhimagupta 93 (Śrī Harkh 67) "
 3564 Bhimagupta " 38 "
 3526 Maṇigupta " 37 "
 3489 Viṣṇugupta " 42 "
 3423 Yaksha Gupta " 71 " (Jaya-gupta II. overcame the Rājputs near Janakpur about B.C. 700 ?)

2. The Ahir Dynasty from Hindustān.

B.C. 3351² Vara Sīṃha, Ahir (Bal Sīṃha, descendant of Mahipā Gopāla).

3302 Jayamati Sīṃha.

3281 Bhuvana Sīṃha, overcome by Kirātīs from the east.

3. Kirdāi Dynasty.

B.C. 3240 Yalambara, 13 years, Yellang (Prinsep B.C. 646 ?).

3150 Pavi (Daskham), in whose reign the Kaliyug began, B.C. 3102).

—Skandhara.³

3113 Valamba (Balāncha).

3086 Hriti (Kingli).

¹ Thomas's ed. of Prinsep's *Essays*, vol. II. *Useful Tables*, pp. 268-71.

² Prinsep by a clerical error has 3211 here.

³ The names in italics are wanting in Kirkpatrick.

B.C. 3040 Humati (Henanter).
 2990 Jitédāsti (Tuskbah joined in the Mahā-
 bhārata).
 2949 Gali (Srupast).
 2910 Pushka (Parb).
 2854 Suyarma (Jetydāstri).
 2794 Parva (Panchem).
 2723 Bunka (King-king-king).
 2667 Swananda.
 2627 Sthunko (Thumu, coteremporary with Aśoka,
 B.C. 260?).
 2558 Gighri (Jaigri).
 2498 Nané (Jenneo).
 — Luk.
 2365 Thôra.
 2294 Thôkô (Thamu).
 2211 Varmā.
 2138 Guja (Gunjah).
 — Pushkara (Kashkûn).
 2065 Keśû (Teshû).
 2019 Suga (Sungmia).
 1960 Sansa (Jusha).
 1887 Gunan (Gontho).
 1813 Khimbu or Shimbu.
 — Patuka attacked by the Somavānśa Rājputs.
 1739 Gasti (Galijang subdued by the Soma-
 vānśis).

4. Somavānśa Dynasty.

B.C. 1658 Nimika or Nimisha (Nevesit, B.C.
 178).
 1608 Matāksha (Mattarātio).
 1517 Kāka-varmā.
 1441 Paśupresha-deva rebuilt the temple of
 Paśupati K.Y. 1234 (Paśupushadeva).
 1385 Bhāskara-varmā, a great conqueror.
 5. *Sūryavānśa Dynasty, ruling at Bāneśvara.*
 B.C. 1311 Bhumi-varmā, a Khetri, crowned in
 K.Y. 1389.
 1270 Chandra-varmā.
 1249 Chandra-varmā (Jaya-varmā).
 1187 Varsha-varmā (Vṛisha-varmā).
 1130 Sarva-varmā.
 1081 Prithvī-varmā.
 1025 Jyeshtha-varmā.
 977 Hari-varmā (Kuvera-varmā).
 901 Kuvēra-varmā (Hari-varmā).
 824 Siddhi-varmā.
 763 Haridatta-varmā built the temple of Nila-
 kantha Nārāyaṇa.
 724 Vasudatta-varmā.
 691 Pati-varmā (Sripatri-varmā).

* Kirkpatrick gives Bhāmi-gupta A.D. 178 as the 3rd
 Ahir king expelled by Śivadeva-varmā A.D. 218, adjusted
 by Prinsep to A.D. 470.

These dates cannot both be correct; if we accept the
 second it would tally well enough with the next date under
 Gunakāma-deva K.Y. 3824,—only that date is perhaps con-
 siderably too early.

B.C. 688 Śivavṛiddhi-varmā.
 611 Vasanta-varmā.
 550 Śiva-varmā (Deva).
 — Rudradeva-varmā.
 493 Vṛiksha-deva-varmā; Śankarāchārya visit-
 ed Nepāl.
 436 Śankara-dēva Rāja.
 386 Dharma-deva (Brahmadeva).
 335 Mān-dēva.
 297 Mahādeva.
 247 Vasantadeva-varmā II. crowned K. Y. 2800.
 190 Udayadēva-varmā.
 143 Mānadeva-varmā II.
 98 Gunakāmadēva-varmā (Sukam).
 48 Śivadeva-varmā removed the capital to Deva
 Pātan.
 B.C. 6 Narēndradeva-varmā, brother of Śiva-
 deva.
 A.D. 27 Bhīmadeva-varmā (displaced by the
 Ahirs).
 43 Vishnudeva-varmā (Vishnu-gupta).
 117* Viśvadeva-varmā contemporary with Vikra-
 māditya, gave his daughter in marriage to Ansu-
 varmā, a Thākuri or legitimate Rājput (Kṛishṇa-
 gupta).
 6. *The Thākuri Dynasty, capital Madhyalakhū* (p. 133).
 A.D. 259 Anśu-varmā (Anghu-varma). Bibhu-
 varmā built an aqueduct on the left side of the
 road leading southward to Rāni-pokhri; in his
 time 3000 years K.Y. had elapsed B.C. 101.
 301 Kṛita-varmā.
 319 Bimārjuna-deva.
 368 Nanda-dēva. Śālivāhana Śaka introduced
 into Nepāl.
 299* Vīra-deva (Śiva-deva 371) founded Lalit-
 pur.
 — Chandrakētu-deva, the country suffered
 from invaders.
 387 Narēndra-deva, 7 years (37 years).
 424 Vara-deva, 8 years (Bala-deva, 17 years);
 moved his capital to Lalit-Pātan; Gorakhnāth came
 to Nepāl; 12 years' drought; Machchhindranātha
 came to Nepāl K.Y. 3623, A.D. 522.⁵
 441 Śankara-deva, 12 years.
 453 Varddhamāna-deva, 13 years (Bhima Arjuna
 16 years).
 469 Bali-deva 13 years (Jaya-deva, 19 years).
 488 Jaya-deva, 15 years (Sribala-deva, 16 years).
 504 Bālārjuna-deva, 17 years (Kandara-deva,
 27 years).
 (807 Vikrama-deva, 12 years).⁶

* Kirkpatrick's lists supply after Kondara—A.D. 531
 Jaya-deva II.; 574 Bala-deva III.; 585 Bālārjun-deva;
 622 Baghoba-deva (said to have introduced the Newār era,
 adjusted to A.D. 890); 685 Śikar-deva; and 778 Soho-deva.
 After Vikrama he gives 808 Narēndra-deva; 810 Gunakāma-
 deva; 896 Udaya-deva; 901 Narbhay-deva.

A.D. 810 Gunakāma-deva, 51 years; founded Kāntipur or Kāthmāndu as his capital K.Y. 3824, A.D. 723.
908 Bhōja-deva, 8 years (Bhojadevabhadra).
917 Lakshmikāma-deva, 22 years.
938 Jayakāma-deva, 20 years; he died without issue, and the Vaiśya Thākuri of Noākōṭ elected from among themselves.

958 Bhāskara-deva (Udaya-deva).

966 Bala-deva.

977 Padma-deva.

984 Nāgārjuna-deva.

987 Śankara-deva, expelled by

The restored Rājput Dynasty.

A.D. 1004 Vāma-deva.

1006 Harsha-deva.

1022 Sadāsiva-deva; restored the Paśupati temple K.Y. 3851, A.D. 750.

1050 Māna-deva ruled 10 years (Indra-deva 12 years).

1062 Narasiṅha-deva 22 years (Mānu-deva 5 years.)

1067 Nanda-deva 21 years (Narendra-deva 6 years).

1073 Rudra-deva 7 years (80 years).

1153 Mitra-deva 21 years (Amrita-deva 3 years).⁷

— Ari-deva 22 years.

— Abhaya Malla, introduced the new Samvat A.D. 880?

1246 Jaya-deva Malla 10 years.

1280 Ananda Malla, brother, 25 years; founded Bhātgaon A.D. 865, where he ruled.

Kārnāṭakī Dynasty, capital—Bhaktapur or Bhātgaon.

1 Nānya-deva came from Kārnātaka, bringing Newāras from Nāyēra, and defeated the Malla rājas A.D. 889; ruled 50 years.

2 Gangā-deva 41 years.

3 Narasiṅha-deva 31 years; founded Chāpāgaon A.D. 991.

4 Śakti-deva 39 years.

5 Rāmasiṅha-deva 58 years.⁸

6 Hari-deva removed to Kāntipur; invaded and slain by Mukunda-sena, whose troops were destroyed by pestilence. Then the Vaiśya Thākuri of Noākōṭ established many petty chiefships and ruled 225 years.

Ayodhya Dynasty.

A.D. 1324, Harisiṅha-deva of Simraungarh, 28 years.

⁷ After this Kirkpatrick's lists differ greatly from these, and it is evident that previous to the time of Harisiṅha-deva, A.D. 1324, the chronology is in inextricable confusion; from that date Dr. Wright's book helps greatly to rectify our previous knowledge. This dynasty is doubtless placed three centuries too early by the *Vanśavali*, which apparently makes Gunakāma-deva of a previous list contemporary with Sadāsiva-deva of this one.

⁸ It will be observed that this Kārnāṭakī dynasty presents us with the same names in nearly the same order as they occur in the Samangarha or Simraun dynasty, viz. 1, Nānyuṇa deva, who, according to Hodgson, founded

A.D. 1352 Matisiṅha-deva 15 years.

1367 Śaktisiṅha-deva 22 "

1389 Śyāmasiṅha-deva 15 years; a great earthquake in A.D. 1408 (1398?) destroyed the temple of Machchhindranātha, &c.

Restored Malla Dynasty of Bhātgaon.

1 Jayabhadra Malla 15 years, son-in-law of Śyāmasiṅhadēva.

2 Nāga Malla 15 "

3 Jayajagat Malla 11 "

4 Nāgendra Malla 10 "

5 Ugra Malla 15 "

6 Aśoka Malla 19 "

7 1386 (?) Jayasthiti Malla 43 years, a legislator.

8 1429⁹ Yaksha or Jayayaksha Malla 43 years. kingdom divided.

9 1472⁹ Rāya Malla, eldest son of Gaksha, 15 years.

10 Suvarna Malla 15 years.

11 Prāna Malla 15 years.

12 Viśva Malla 15 "

13 Trailōkya Malla 15 "

14 Jagatjyoti Malla 15 "

15 Narendra Malla 21 "

1653 Jagatprakāśa Malla¹⁰ 21 years.

1674 Jitāmītra Malla 21 "

1695 Bhūpatindra Malla 34 "

1721 Rājayit Malla; Narbhūpāla of Gorkhā invaded Nepāl 1729.

Rāja of Banēpa.

9 Rāna Malla, second son of Yaksha Malla, 21 years.

Rājas of Kāthmāndū.

9 Ratna Malla, youngest son of Yaksha, 71 years.

10 Amara Malla, 47 years.

11 Sūrya Malla.

12 Narendra Malla.

13 Mahindra Malla; temple of Tuljādevi built at Kāthmāndū A.D. 1549, and of Nārāyaṇa at Lalit-Pātan 1566.

14 Sadāsiva Malla, expelled.

15 Śivasiṅha Malla, his brother; temple of Changu Nārāyaṇa repaired 1535, and that of Svayambhu 1594.

16 Lakshminārāyaṇa Malla, became insane.

Simraun A.D. 1097; 2, Gangā-deva; 3, Narasiṅha-deva; 4, Rāmasiṅha-deva; 5, Śaktisiṅha-deva; 6, Harasiṅha-deva.

⁹ The dates of the inscription Newār Sam. 542, the Kotyāhuti-yajna 515, and Jayasthiti's death 549 (pp. 183, 187), are probably in error by 100 years. Prinsep places the accession of Jayayaksha in Newār Sam. 371, or A.D. 1610, but this appears to be too late.

¹⁰ Three dates are cited in this reign—S. 775, 782, 787 (pp. 191-2)—but the accuracy of them is questioned by Dr. Wright; they are in accordance, however, with what follows.

17 Pratāpa Malla A.D. 1639¹¹; abdicated for a time in favour of his sons:—

A.D. 1666 Pārthipendra Malla 1 year.

1667 Nripendra Malla 1 year.

1668 Mahipendra Malla 1 year.

1669 Chakravartendra Malla 1 day—died.

1689 Mahindra or Bhūpāendra Malla 5 years.

1694 Śrī Bhāskara Malla 8 years; a plague raged for two years.

1702 Jagajjaya Malla, a distant relative.

1732 Jayaprakāsa Malla A.D. 39 years; war with Prithvinārāyaṇa, who took Kāntipur in 1768.

Kings of Pātan.

Hariharasiṅha Malla, son of Śivasiṅha, No. 15 of Kāthmāṇḍū.

1654 Siddhi-narsiṅha Malla.

1657 Śrinivāsa Malla (Nirman Indra Malla).

1702 Yoganarendra Malla.

1706¹² Mahipatindra or Mahindra Siṅha Malla of Kāthmāṇḍū,

1722 Jayayoga prakāsa Malla.

1729-31 Śrī Viṣṇu Malla, grandson of Yoganarendra.

1742 Rājya Prakāsa Malla.

— Rājajit Malla of Bhātgāon 1 year and expelled.

— Jayaprakāsa Malla of Kāntipur 1 or 2 years and expelled.

1749-50 Viśvajit Malla, grandson of Viṣṇu Malla, 4 years; murdered.

Dalmardan Śāh, a Gorkhālī of Noākôt, 4 years; expelled.

Tej Narasiṅha Malla, 3 years; expelled by Prithvinārāyaṇa.

Gorkhālī Rājas claiming descent from the Udayapur family (p. 276).

1 Michā Khān ruled at Nuvākôt. 4 Michā Khān.

2 Jayan Khān. 5 Vichitra Khān.

3 Sūrya Khān. 6 Jagdeva Khān.

7 Kulmandan Śāh ruled over Kāski.

8 Yasōvam Śāh, Rāja of Lamjung.

A.D. 1559 Śrī Drabya Śāh, subdued Gorkhā, Śaka 1481, and reigned 11 years.

1570 Śrī Purandar Śāh, his son, 35 years.

1605 Śrī Chhatra Śāh, his son, 7 months.

1606 Śrī Rāma Śāh, his brother, 27 years.

1633 Śrī Dambar Śāh, son, 9 years.

1642 Śrī Krishna Śāh, son, 11 years.¹³

1653 Śrī Rudra Śāh, son, 16 years (11 on p. 290).

1669 Śrī Prithvipati Śāh, son, 47 years.

A.D. 1716 Narbhūpāla Śāh, his grandson, 26 years 8 months.

1743 Prithvinārāyaṇa Śāh, his son, 32 years; conquered Nepāl A.D. 1768.

1775 Pratapasiṅha Śāh, son, 2 years 9 months.

1778 Rāṇa Bahādur Śāh, son, 22 years; retired to Banāras; assassinated A.D. 1804.

1799 Gīrvānyuddha Vikrama Śāh, son, 17 years.

1816 Rājendra Vikrama Śāh, son, 30 years 5 months, resigned.

1847 Śrī Surēndra Vikram Śāh, son, the present ruler.

The appendices contain lists of musical instruments, agricultural implements, coins, weights and measures, a vocabulary of Parbatiya and Newāri words, 5 Newāri songs with interlinear versions, a recapitulation of the lists of rulers, and a catalogue of about 360 MSS. procured by Dr. Wright for the University of Cambridge, some of them apparently of great age. All the older among them are on palm leaves and are dated in the Nepālese Samvat. Among them may be noted two copies of *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* dated respectively in the 3rd and 5th years of the Nepāl Samvat, or A.D. 883 and 885, and a third A.D. 1008, also a copy of the *Kāśya Kāṇḍa-kramāvalī* dated in the 10th year of the era. There is also a fine copy of Yaśomitra's commentary on the *Abhidharmakśāra* of Vasubandhu. The Tantra literature is especially well represented; and among others is a copy of the *Ārya-Manjuśrīmālātāntara*, the historical value of which was noticed by Burnouf.

The book is well got up and illustrated by sixteen plates: four are portraits from photographs of Nepālese celebrities; one double-page coloured plate gives the Five Buddhas, their Tārās or female counterparts, and Bodhisatvas, scarcely differing from the same figures as given by Mr. Hodgson;¹⁴ another double-page plate gives the prayer of Pratāpa Malla to Kālikā (dated New. Sam. 774) inscribed in fifteen different languages; a lithograph is given of the *pādukas* of Buddha and Manjuśrī (p. 78), and the rest (nine) are views chiefly of temples.

Dr. Wright, in his part of the work, does not show much acquaintance with what has been before written on the subject by Kirkpatrick, Dr. Buchanan Hamilton, and especially Hodgson. To none of these authorities does he even refer, and this must be felt as a defect by every one interested in the subject, who will have to fall back on these earlier writers for fuller information.

¹¹ Dr. Wright gives a facsimile of the Mantra composed by him and inscribed on the temple of Jagannāth, dated N.S. 774, or A.D. 1853.

¹² This date and that of his death, 1722, do not accord with the rule of Mahindra 1689-1694, but Kirkpatrick gives 1685, Nirman Indra Malla; 1689, Yoganarendra Malla;

1695, Mahipatindra; 1896, Jayavīra Mahendra; 1706, Jayendra Malla-deva; 1715, Hridiya Narasiṅha; 1716, Rishi Nirmal-deva to 1722.

¹³ Thus on p. 279, but 16 years on p. 290.

¹⁴ Trans. As. Soc. vol. II. p. 233.

THE WIVES OF MUHAMMAD.

BY J. D. BATE, ALLAHABAD.

WHEN the manner of Muhammad's relationships with persons of the gentler sex is subjected to investigation as a historical study, the topic naturally divides itself into several sections.

I. We may enumerate, in the first place, his lawfully-married wives.

1. The first of these was *Khadija*, daughter of *Khawailid*. At the time of his marriage to this lady, in 595 A.D., Muhammad was in his twenty-fifth year, and *Khadija* was a widow of forty. Before this marriage she had been twice a widow, her first husband having been *Abu Hala*, and her second *Aliq bin 'Abad*: some of the Moslim historians reverse the order of these two names. By each of her former husbands *Khadija* had borne two children,—a son and a daughter,—who had all of them died before her third marriage. By this marriage six children were born to Muhammad, the first and the last of whom were boys, and the remainder girls. There is a want of harmony in the statements of Muhammadan historians in regard to this point, some of them affirming that Muhammad had at least four sons by this marriage: the above-mentioned statement, however, is the one upon which there is a pretty general agreement, and according to that statement the names of the children, in the order of birth, are given thus:—the eldest, *Qasim*; then, the girls, *Zainab*, *Ruqaiyya*, *Fatima*, and *Umm Qulthum*; then, lastly, *'Abd-Manaf*, who is called also *'Abdul-lah*, *Tayib*, and *Tahir*. The male children died in early childhood; the girls grew up, and at length married. When Muhammad was fifty years of age he lost *Khadija*: she died at the age of sixty-five, in December 619, in the month of *Ramazan*, and was interred near *Makka*. Her tomb, which is enclosed by a square wall, is still in existence, and is regularly visited by pilgrims to *Makka*, especially on Friday morning.

Khadija is known in Moslim legend under the title of 'the chief of women,' she having been the first of her sex (as she was, indeed, also the first human being) who avowed herself a believer in the mission of Muhammad. There is also a legend that Muhammad considered her one of the only four perfect women that ever lived,—the other three being *Asia* wife of

Pharaoh, *Mary* the mother of *Jesus* and daughter of *'Imran*, and his own daughter *Fatima*.

2. His second wife was *Sauda*, daughter of *Zam'ah*. *Sauda* was a widow at the time of her marriage to Muhammad, but she had been only once married. Her husband, *Sakran bin Umar*, was her paternal cousin. Like *Khadija*, *Sauda* was of *Qoraishite* blood, but through a stock remote from that of Muhammad, and, with her husband, was among the earliest adherents of *Islam*: they were among those who, on account of the persecutions of the Muhammadans at *Makka*, fled to *Abyssinia* as exiles. *Sauda* may therefore be regarded as having been more than ordinarily devoted to the cause of the new faith. There is some uncertainty about the question of *Sauda's* offspring by the first marriage: the best authorities, however, seem agreed that she had had but one child,—a son *'Abdulrahman*, whose death is believed to have occurred before that of her husband. It is related that when her husband *Sakran* lay ill on his dying bed, *Sauda* mentioned to him one morning a dream from which she had just awoken;—'the prophet of God' had approached her and placed his foot on her neck. Her husband replied, "I am about to die; thou wilt soon be the wife of another." Her marriage with Muhammad took place in February 620, within two months of the death of his first wife. For three or four years *Sauda* continued to be the only woman with whom he cohabited. There was no issue by this marriage; though it is said that motives of affection, rather than of worldly self-interest, dictated the union. However this may have been, the Moslim historians relate that when age began to advance upon *Sauda*, Muhammad was on the point of divorcing her. It seems a doubtful point whether the desire to divorce *Sauda* was occasioned by her advancing age, or by some uneasiness in Muhammad's mind as to her fidelity. It is a somewhat remarkable circumstance that it was only a year before this time—viz. at the conquest of *Khaybar*—that he assigned to *Sauda* her portion from the revenues of this victory. The desire to divorce her arose only nine years after the marriage. One legend relates that divorce was actually effected, and this through no misde-

meanour of hers, but solely on the plea that her time of life was now such as to preclude the hope of offspring. She, however, accosted him in the public street, and entreated that she might not be cast out of house and home in her old age, and begged her husband that, if such was his desire, he would bestow upon his favourite 'Āishā her share of his company,—resorting to the society of his more youthful wife on Sauda's day. To this suggestion 'the prophet of God' magnanimously acceded; and, revoking the sentence of divorce, he permitted Sauda to continue henceforward to be nominally his wife. What may have been her age at the time of her being united in marriage to Muhammad is a point that cannot be ascertained; she must, however, have been comparatively young, for she did not die till the end of the Khilāfat of 'Umar, some ten years after the death of Muhammad.

3. Muhammad's third wife was 'Āishā, usually written *Ayeshā*, and less frequently *Ashā*. 'Āishā was the daughter of 'Abdu-l-lāh bin Uthmān Abū Qahāfa, better known in Moslim history under the name Abū Bakr (*lit.* 'the spinster's father'),—a title which was bestowed upon him in allusion, apparently, to the fact that he was the father of the only spinster whom 'the prophet of God' had taken into his *haram*. It is not ascertainable at what period this name was given to the father of 'Āishā; most probably it was not given till after the Hajira, when the marriage to Muhammad of such a large number of widows would give distinction to the circumstance of 'Āishā being the only one among all his wives who had been married to him in her virginity,—a circumstance of which 'Āishā never failed to boast. She was the most youthful of his wives, having been married to him at the age of six years, and Muhammadan historians relate that 'the prophet of God' consummated his marriage with the child when she reached her ninth year (Arab. *suhbat*, *ijtima'*, *zaji'*; Pers. *hambistar*). Some of the Moslim authorities, however, make each of these events to have occurred one year later in her life,—thus substituting seven for six, and ten for nine. What may have been the impulse which led Muhammad, then more than half a century old, to form this *outré* alliance, it is not easy to conjecture: thus much, however, may be said, that the immediate practical effect of it was to draw yet more closely the bond of friend-

ship which already existed between him and her father, Abū Bakr. Such things could not have been so revolting to the minds of the Arabians as they are to ours, for according to one authority we find that Muhammad gave his own favourite daughter, Fātima, in marriage when she was but nine years of age; some, however, say that she was about fourteen at the time. Moslim traditionists are not agreed as to the precedence of the marriage with Sauda and with 'Āishā: all of them are agreed in assigning these marriages to a period early in the same year—viz. 620 A.D. The truth seems to be that the alliance with 'Āishā was contracted first in the order of time, and that the circumstance of the marriage with Sauda having been consummated prior to that with the child of Abū Bakr furnishes the only claim in Sauda's case to priority to her in a chronological list of the nature of the present one. The marriage with 'Āishā would appear to have been suggested in the first instance by a desire on Muhammad's part to attach to his own interests her father, who was somewhat younger than Muhammad, and who, after his death, became the ecclesiastical and political chief of Islām, and first of the Khālifas. At the time of his marriage to 'Āishā, Muhammad had just turned fifty years of age, so that at the time of his death, at sixty-three, she was about nineteen. That he was influenced in this case by ordinary conjugal emotion can hardly be supposed: the disparity in the matter of age is very striking; and it is not supposable that the charms of the poor child were so duly unfolded at the age of six as to have effected a conquest over the heart of one who had already known more than a quarter of a century of married life. There seems every ground for believing that this was merely a *mariage de convenance*,—an alliance mainly designed to secure, by the strongest ties available, the attachment of her father—a powerful and well-to-do citizen—to the then wavering and doubtful cause of Islām. With but few intermissions, 'Āishā, though childless, maintained through the whole period of her married life the position of favourite wife; and the traditionists delight to relate how that it was on the floor of her house and in her arms that 'the prophet of God' breathed his last, and that her apartment in Madīna has been the one only resting-place of his remains. She lived to a tolerably

good age, for she survived Muhammad about forty-seven years, and did not die till the fifty-eighth year of the *Hajira* (= 680 A.D.), when she would be about sixty-seven years of age.

Partly on account of her having always been so great a favourite of her husband's, and partly on account of her having become after his death so great an authority for legends concerning him, 'Aishâ is known in Moslim literature as *An-nabiya*, 'the prophetess,' and *Ummu-l-Musli-min*, 'mother of Moslims.'

4. His fourth marriage was with *Hafsa*, daughter of 'Umar, the immediate successor of Abû Bakr in the *Khilâfat*. The name of this lady appears in various forms: thus, *Hafsah*, *Hafza*, *Haphsa*, *Haphza*, *Haphsah*, *Haphzah*, &c. The marriage took place in the third year of the *Hajira* (i.e. in 624 A.D.), when Muhammad was in his fifty-fifth year, *Hafsa* being from eighteen to twenty years of age. This was her second marriage, her former husband, *Khunais* the Ethiopian (some name him *Jahsh* the Egyptian), having died six or seven months before her marriage to Muhammad. Whatever may have been the real purpose of Muhammad in contracting this alliance, it had the effect of drawing into still closer friendship to himself her father, 'Umar. The course of this marriage was not unchequered; it was *Hafsa* who, on one of her own days, discovered 'the chief of the prophets' on her own bed with Mary the Coptic slave: she is, moreover, said to have been one of those two of Muhammad's lawfully-married wives whom he divorced,—the other, as we have seen, was *Sauda*. The occasion of her being divorced was his displeasure at her determination not to observe secrecy in relation to the circumstances of his amour with the Egyptian girl: afterwards, however, when 'the apostle of God' perceived the deep offence which the divorce had occasioned his friend 'Umar, the angel Gabriel was sent down with a special revocation of the sentence of divorce, the matter was made up, and the daughter of 'Umar was restored to favour. *Hafsa* died at Madîna, at the age of sixty, about the forty-first year of the *Hajira*, and was childless in both of her marriages.

5. His fifth wife was *Zainab* daughter of *Khuzaima*. This alliance was contracted in the ninth month of the fourth year of the *Hajira* (Dec. 625 A.D.). At the time of her marriage to Muhammad, *Zainab* had already been thrice married: her

first husband, *Tnfail* bin *Hârith*, divorced her; the second, 'Ubaida bin *Hârith*, a paternal cousin of Muhammad's, was slain at the battle of *Badr*; and the third, 'Abdu-l-lâh bin *Jahsh*, was slain in the battle of *Uhud*. The exact age of this lady at the time of her marriage to Muhammad does not appear to be known: she died soon after her marriage,—some say eight months after, and others say a year and a half,—and with the single exception of *Khadija* was the only one of his wives who did not survive him. *Zainab* was childless in all her marriages. She is said to have been one of the three whom Muhammad took in marriage at their own request. The beneficence of her disposition towards destitute converts won for her the epithet *Ummu-l-musâkin*, 'Mother of the poor.' Some, however, record that this epithet was applied not to this *Zainab*, but to *Zainab* bint *Jahsh*.

6. The sixth wife was a paternal cousin of his, *Umm Salama*, daughter of *Abi Umaiy-ya*. This alliance took place in the fourth year of the *Hajira*, in January 626 A.D., within one month of Muhammad's marriage with *Zainab* bint *Khuzaima*. At the time of her marriage to Muhammad she was twenty-eight years of age, and had been once a widow. Her husband, *Abû Salama*, died from a wound received at the battle of *Uhud*,—death supervening some eight months after the infliction of the wound. She brought with her four children, the offspring of her late marriage, but she had no issue by her second. *Umm Salama* had been twice to *Abyssinia* with her husband, who had emigrated thither on account of the persecutions and hardships which, as adherents of Muhammad, they experienced at *Makka*. Though not young at the time of her marriage to Muhammad, she still is said to have been very beautiful. She at first excused herself from complying with his proposal, partly on the ground of her maturity in point of age. Muhammad, however, removed her objections by urging that he too was well advanced in years, and that as for her children, they should be his care. Notwithstanding this, however, it is recorded by some of the traditionists that this lady was one of the three who were taken in marriage by Muhammad at their own request. This marriage of *Umm Salama* was consummated four months after the death of her husband, and within one month of Muhammad's marriage to his fifth wife. After

his marriage in the present instance, he remained in her society for a period of three days; and his example in this particular was ever after followed by 'believers' when they added fresh inmates to their *ḥarams*. From the circumstance that Muḥammad was wont to have Umm Salama accompany him on the march and in his travels generally, it has been inferred that she was one of his special favourites. The exact period of her death is not known: it occurred, however, at some period between the fifty-ninth and sixty-first years of the *Hajira*, when she had reached the advanced age of eighty-four.

7. Muḥammad's seventh wife was Zainab the daughter of Jaḥsh. Zainab was a cousin of Muḥammad's, being daughter of Amīna, who was a sister of Muḥammad's father, 'Abdu'l-lāh. Her former husband, Zaid bin Hārith, was at one time a slave of Muḥammad's, and, being afterwards freed by him, was adopted by him as his own child. Zainab was divorced from her husband in order that she might be united in marriage to 'the prophet of God.' This marriage was effected a few months after the former one with Umm Salama—viz. in June 626, in the fifth year of the *Hajira*, Muḥammad being then fifty-five years of age. Zainab, in common with so many of his other wives, was childless, and died at the age of fifty-three. There are certain exceptional features in connexion with this marriage: in the first place, the four witnesses required by Islamic law in order to legalize the marriage were dispensed with. The reason was that when, in consequence of the displeasure generally felt in regard to the whole transaction, the difficulty of finding witnesses in this case arose, Muḥammad declared that Gabriel had been sent down to him with a message from God,—“We have joined her in marriage unto thee.” Thus was Zainab his *divinely-appointed* bride,—a circumstance on which she was wont, on occasion, to vaunt herself in the presence of her co-wives, saying that, whereas the other wives were given away by their relatives, she had been bestowed upon 'the prophet' by an express divine revelation and behest. Another exceptional feature is found in the extreme difficulty that exists in arriving at a harmonious statement of figures. According to one account, the divorce took place a year after her marriage with Zaid, and when she was only nine years of age, or as some say seven;

according to another account Zainab was over thirty at the time of that event. Again, as to the time of her death, it is said by some that she survived till the fiftieth year of the *Hajira*; by others that she survived Muḥammad only ten or eleven years, or till about the twentieth year of the *Hajira*. It seems most likely that she was thirty at the time of her divorce; and, her age being fifty-three at the time of her death, she would have survived Muḥammad about seventeen years.

8. The eighth wife of Muḥammad was Juwairiya, daughter of Banī-Hārith, chief of the tribe of the Banī-Mustaliq. Juwairiya was a widow at the time of her marriage to Muḥammad,—her unfortunate husband, Zū-l-Shafrain, who was her paternal cousin, having just been put to death at the battle of the Banī-l-Mustaliq. On lots being cast for her as a trophy of war, she fell to the share of Thābit bin Qais. She is said, however, to have been particularly beautiful; and it is related that 'the prophet of God,' overpowered by her beauty, purchased her from Thābit for a sum of money, and without further delay consummated marriage with her. This event occurred in the fifth year of the *Hajira*, December 626 A.D.; and, as she died in the fifty-sixth year of the *Hajira*, at the age of sixty-eight, she would be about seventeen at the time of this marriage.

9. His ninth wife was a Jewess, Safia, daughter of Hayy bin Akhtub. Safia is said to have been a beautiful damsel of seventeen or eighteen years of age at the time of her marriage to Muḥammad. She had been twice married, and had been divorced by her first husband, Salām bin Shikam. Her second husband, the Jewish chief Kināna bin Rabi', was slain by the party of Muḥammad in the battle of Khaibar. On returning from the battle 'the prophet of God' seated her, as his favourite trophy in the war, behind himself on his own camel, and covered her with his own mantle, in token of having made her his wife. The marriage took place immediately after the battle in which her husband had been slain,—that is, in the seventh year of the *Hajira* (= 628 A.D.). Safia died childless in the fifty-second year of the *Hajira*, having survived Muḥammad forty years: by that time she would be about sixty-three years of age.

10. Muḥammad's tenth wife was Umm Habiba, daughter of Abū Sofiān. At the

time of her marriage with Muhammad this lady was the widow of 'Ubaidu-l-lâh bin Jalsh, by whom she had become the mother of one child,—a girl. 'Ubaidu-l-lâh was, in the first instance, a Muhammadan; but, in consequence of the growing persecution of Muhammad and his adherents in Makka before the Hajira, he removed to the Christian province of Abyssinia, where he gave up Islâm and embraced the religion of the country, and at length died a Christian. This man was one of the 'Four Inquirers,' so called,—that is, persons who are said in Moslim legend to have been in a state of expectancy of a prophet just prior to the time when Muhammad announced his mission. 'Ubaidu-l-lâh was a maternal cousin of Muhammad's,—his mother having been a daughter of 'Abdu-l-Muttalib, Muhammad's grandfather; he was also a brother of Zainab bint Jalsh, the divorced wife of Zaid. On hearing of his death, Muhammad sent for his widow, and took her in marriage. This event took place at Madina in the seventh year of the Hajira, in the autumn of 628 A.D.,—their ages being respectively fifty-six and thirty (or, as some say, thirty-five). This lady had no issue by the second marriage; she lived to see the good age of sixty-four, dying in the fortieth year of the Hajira (=632 A.D.)—thus surviving Muhammad about thirty years, and dying during the Khilâfat of her brother Mu'âviâ.

11. The lady who is generally believed to have been the last of his married wives was Maimûna, daughter of Hârith, and maternal aunt of Ibn Abbâs.¹ This was the third marriage of Maimûna,—her former husbands having been Mas'ûd bin 'Umar, and the second Bûrahm, from the first of whom, from some cause not now ascertainable, she had become separated. She was joined in marriage to Muhammad in the seventh year of the Hajira (=629 A.D.),—his age and hers being respectively fifty-eight and twenty-six. This lady Maimûna, together with Umm Salama and Zainab bint Khuzaima, are the three who are said to have bestowed themselves, unsolicited and of their own will and request, upon 'the apostle of God' to be his wives. Some of the authorities do not allow to Maimûna a place among his lawfully-married wives,—maintaining that in this instance there was no formal

marriage. At the time of his marriage to her, Muhammad had already in his *haram* eight wives, besides ladies of other descriptions: Khadîja and Zainab bint Khuzaima were the only two who had died. Maimûna lived just fifty-five years after the celebration of her third marriage, and was childless in all her marriages. Surviving, as she did, to the sixty-third year of the Hajira, and to the advanced age of eighty-one, Maimûna was thus not only the last of Muhammad's wives, but also the oldest, and the one who survived him the longest.

II. We come now, in the second place, to the case of those of Muhammad's womenfolk who do not fall under the above description of 'lawfully-married': these cases arrange themselves naturally under two heads:—

1. Those ladies with whom he shared connubial rites, but to whom he was not formally married.

In most of these cases the revolting nature of the details must be our excuse for giving no more than the bare names. The women were some of them slaves of Muhammad's household, and others were captives taken by him among the spoils of war, and appropriated for himself; others, again, were given to him as presents by persons who desired his favour and good-will. The numbers in this list do not indicate the chronological order in which the women were introduced to his acquaintance,—that is a point which it seems impossible to settle with any degree of certainty.

- (1) Khawla, daughter of Hakim.
- (2) Ribâna the Jewess.
- (3) Salama, widow of Hamza.
- (4) Umm-Râfi'.
- (5) Rizwa.
- (6) Amîma.
- (7) Umm-Zamîr.
- (8) Agîma.
- (9) Umm-îman (also called Barkat).
- (10) Umma.
- (11) Mariam Qabti (Mary the Egyptian).
- (12) Shirîn (sister of Mary the Copt).

The two last-named persons were slaves, the property of Maqauqas, king of Egypt: they had been selected by him on account of their extreme beauty, for presentation to 'the prophet

¹ It is proper to observe in this place that facts, figures, and names regarding this person are stated by different Moslim

authorities with such exceptionally strange diversity that what we give below must be received with some reservation.

of God' for his own private *haram*. Ultimately Muḥammad decided to retain for himself Mary, the more beautiful of the two, and magnanimously bestowed her sister upon Ḥassān the Poet, one of his own generals.

2. Those ladies, not lawfully married to him, whom, after having taken, he, from a variety of causes, put away without their having shared with him connubial rites :—

- (1) Fātima, daughter of Zahāk.
- (2) Malāika, daughter of Qa'b.
- (3) Lailī, daughter of 'Azīm.
- (4) Ghuzia, daughter of Jābar (surnamed Umm Sharik).
- (5) Umm Ḥānī, daughter of Abū Tālib.
- (6) Asma, daughter of Na'mān.
- (7) Anna, daughter of Zazid (of the tribe of Kunda).

It is important to observe, in regard to these lists, that no small uncertainty rests on the question as to the exact number of ladies who properly appertain to each description given in the headings. Thus, for example, as to the number of those who were formally married to him, some Moslim authorities maintain that they were not more than seven in number; others say eight; others nine; others eleven; others fourteen; others fifteen; others seventeen; others eighteen; others twenty-one; while some of them inform us that 'the prophet of God' paid his addresses to as many as thirty ladies. As to this last number it is added that with seven out of the thirty no formal marriage took place, and that Muḥammad consummated connubial rites with only twelve of the entire number. The variation in the statements of traditionists as to the number of ladies appertaining to each of the headings given above is partly owing, no doubt, to the indiscriminate mixing up of the names of the women who in the various ways above mentioned were associated with him. There is also a want of agreement among authorities as to the exact order in which the marriages took place: thus, some of them put Umm Salama *fifth*, Umm Habiba *sixth*, Juwairiya *seventh*, Safia *eighth*, Zainab bint Jahsh *ninth*, Maimūna *tenth*, and Zainab bint Khuzaima *eleventh*. Three of the lawfully-married wives of Muḥammad are said to have been taken by him in marriage at their own request, and Zainab bint Khuzaima, Umm Salama, and Maimūna are named as the persons

in question: but as to this point, again, there is the most bewildering diversity of statement. A woman thus 'self-bestowed' is technically termed in Arabic *Wahabtu-n-nafs* (Persian *Nafsbakhsht*). Several of the ladies whose names come under the different heads of our second list also are termed *nafsbakhshts*: for example, Khaula bint Hakim, Ghuzia bint Jābar, Lailī bint 'Azīm, Asma bint Na'mān, etc. Further, though the names of some of these ladies imply maternity, it must not be supposed that any of them bore offspring to Muḥammad: the circumstance shows rather that they had become mothers before they were introduced to him:

It is a remarkable fact that, notwithstanding the overflowing plenitude of his *haram*, no child was born to him after the death of his first wife,—with the single exception of Ibrāhīm, who was born of Mary the Egyptian, and who died at the age of fourteen or fifteen months. The former of the lists will show that there is no truth in the statement sometimes made, that most of the divorcees whom Muḥammad took in marriage were women whose husbands were still alive; the only case of this nature was that of Zainab bint Jahsh. The details, however, of some of these instances—notably the instances of Safia and Juwairiya,—involuntarily recall the case of Uriah the Hittite, with which the reader of the Old Testament history is familiar. Six only of Muḥammad's married wives were of his own tribe of the Qoraish—*viz.* Khadija, Sauda, 'Aishā, Hafsa, Umm Salama, and Umm Habiba,—and of the others, two were Jewesses. With the exception of 'Aishā, there was not among his wives a single spinster;—they were all of them widows excepting Zainab bint Jahsh. Moslims frequently attribute the tendency of Muḥammad to marry widows to his magnanimous compassion for their forlorn condition: however this may have been, it is to be noted that the widows he married are described as young and beautiful. If magnanimous compassion had been his only sentiment towards them, a set of almshouses and guaranteed support would have fulfilled the dictates of such an emotion; and widows who were neither young nor beautiful would have been sharers of his bounty. The first three of Muḥammad's marriages took place prior to the Hijra,—that is, they took place at

Makka,—and the remainder at Madīna. What may have been the largest number of contemporary women (wives and others included) whom he may have had at any given period of his life after the death of Khadija, it is impossible to state with certainty. It is very worthy of note that the outbreak of Muhammad's mania for women occurred at a period of his life subsequent to his announcement of himself as the chosen favourite of God; and notably after the Hajira, when his pretensions were more distinctly avowed than during the comparative quietude of his married life in Makka during the lifetime of Khadija. The exact classification of the unfortunate little girl 'Āishā is a matter which must be left to the judgment of the reader: making all due allowance for differences said to be occasioned by the climate of southern Arabia, to describe her as a spinster could hardly, without legal quibbling, be deemed an exact application of the terms of our mother-tongue,—it surely is not an application of the term which would commend itself to persons of ordinary sense of propriety. How to describe the case of Zainab bint Jahsh is, again, a problem which we must leave to the good sense of our readers. The former of our lists reveals the circumstance that Muhammad observed no rule as to any relativity between the ages of his wives and himself, nor as to any consanguinity that may have previously existed between himself and them, nor as to the elapsing of any specific period of time either between his marriages, or between the decease of a woman's former husband and her union with himself. It has sometimes been maintained that, on grounds supplied by the Qor'ān itself, some of the names mentioned in our first list belong properly to the second: thus, the Qor'ān lays down the rule that a period of not less than four months must be the minimum of widowhood. Now, this rule, as we have seen, was ignored by Muhammad in the case of both Juwairiya and Safia. Some are even disposed to include in this same category Zainab bint Jahsh. However this may be, his marriage with Zainab was a clear infringement of at least one other law of the Qor'ān, inasmuch as in this case the requisition that every marriage, to be considered lawful, must be witnessed by four witnesses, two on each side, was dispensed with. The question of the order in which Muhammad's

children were respectively born to him is still one of the unsettled points of Moslim history: the order we have given is the one generally received by learned Muhammadans.

There were certain hardships connected with the case of Muhammad's womenfolk which could hardly escape the notice of the most cursory reader. In the first place, it was not lawful for any woman who had ever been united to him to become united afterwards to any other. This is expressly taught in the Qor'ān: none, therefore, of his widows ever re-married; nor, with but one exception, did any of those whom he divorced, however brief may have been the period of their connexion with him, or however innocent they may have been as to the immediate occasion of separation. This it was, in part, that made divorce from him seem so cruel a measure to them, as we see in the case of Sanda and others. The exception we refer to appears to be the case of Laili bint 'Azim. The reason was that all those women whom Muhammad took to himself were thereafter called *Ummahātu-l-mūminīn*, 'Mothers of the faithful': the interpretation of the epithet is given in the Qor'ān,—Moslims were to "regard the prophet's wives as they would regard their own mothers." Another thing that made it hard for the unfortunate women was that Muhammad claimed the special privilege of unlimited licence,—he was authorized by Heaven to summon to himself any woman he chose. It is laid down in the Qor'ān, as one of his distinguishing privileges, that he was at liberty to appropriate to himself,—by force, if force were necessary—any member of the gentler sex whom he might take a fancy to,—and this irrespective of her own inclinations. Should he, moreover, become enamoured of any female whatsoever who chanced to be an inmate of his establishment,—whether she were there in the capacity of servant or of slave,—he was even at liberty to dispense with the formality of lawful marriage. This same privilege of his extended in all particulars to other women besides those who were inmates of his own domestic establishment. There was but one qualification in connexion with this privilege of his, and that was that no woman was to be permitted to become his until she had first acknowledged herself a believer in the divinity of his mission. He had also the express permission of God to relieve himself at any mo-

ment of the presence of any one of his women-folk, and of the burden of her support; but should any of them cease to be desirous of continuing their relationship to him, they, in like manner, were at liberty to follow their own wishes,—always bearing in mind, of course, that the law of the new religion rendered farther conjugal alliance criminal. Without intending any rudeness to the memory of the ladies, it is but natural to suppose that it was, no doubt, this circumstance that gave so much poignancy to their grief at the prospect of being separated from him, and which made them willing (as in the case of Sauda) to themselves propose the abdication of their conjugal claims provided they might be permitted to continue inmates of his *haram*. Though the rule laid down in the Qor'an for his followers was that the number of their wives was not to exceed four, yet there was no limit to the number allowed in his own case: the only passage in which there is so much as a hint on the subject of limitation in his case, was not 'revealed' till a short time before his death, at a time when the history of his relations with the occupants of his *haram* was at an end, and as an old worn-out man, exhausted and enfeebled by physical ailments, he might be supposed to have attained satiety. Special divine permission was, he assures us, granted to him ("and," as he expresses it, "to none besides") in all these particulars, as also that he was at liberty, if he were so inclined, to receive in any capacity whatever any person who might offer herself to him for the purpose of cohabitation,—a privilege of which, as we have seen in the case of the *nafsbakhshis*, he did not hesitate to avail himself. Among the spoils of the conquest Muhammad almost invariably secured in his share of the plunder the most beautiful of the captive damsels, and on his triumphal entry into Mad'na with the trophies of war the inmates of his establishment were wont to peer from their privacy to catch a glimpse of their new rival.

It will not be surprising to learn that the above lists contain what many will hold to be inaccuracies. Some of the dates we know to be disputed. There are but few points in history that are more disheartening to the student than the bewildering diversity of statement which we find in Moslim records regarding the subject of Muhammad's domestic relationships. The case

presents a very fair sample of the difficulty in which Muhammadan authorities have beclouded all subjects relating to their religion and its founder. It is only regarding the barest outlines of Muhammad's life that there is even the semblance of agreement among them; the moment the student inquires into details he perceives how loose and unsatisfactory the whole fabric is. Honest inquiry for historical fact is baffled at every turning,—and this through the inability of Muhammad's biographers to agree among themselves. Seeing that his own admirers differ so widely concerning even mere matters of fact, the impartial investigator must labour to do his best in a judgment of charity, and must give up much as hopelessly involved in contradiction. If it is difficult to arrive at anything like certainty regarding the wives-proper of Muhammad, it is still more difficult to do so in regard to those women whose intended marriage with him was broken off at various stages before consummation. To the narratives of all such cases a certain degree of doubt attaches, for the relatives of such women would naturally seek to suppress the tradition of such abortive negotiations, as not creditable to them: there seems, in fact, every reason for doubting the details of such cases as mentioned in tradition. Moslim tradition abounds in legends concerning these women, and dwells with delight upon Muhammad's relations with them. When we state that very few indeed of those legends reflect upon him other than what ordinary men would call disgrace, notwithstanding that they were written by his own admirers and adherents, we state what is merely a cold, unvarnished fact. We shall not undertake the recital of such legends, for in so doing we should surely awaken in the minds of his followers emotions of irritation; for, however paradoxical it may seem, a calm and unbiassed inspection of Muhammad's deeds, and a careful analysis of his personal character, are processes which no Moslim can endure without being irritated almost to the point of frenzy. We therefore purposely repress all those inquiries and reflections which evolve themselves out of a study of the above lists, and content ourselves with placing on record the cold facts, which no duly-informed Muhammadan will call in question. The whole subject of Muhammad's relations to his women-folk is so beset with contradiction, that any

man who is possessed of a due regard for matter-of-fact accuracy must feel the extreme delicacy of the position. No account of these ladies has ever yet been prepared which has

met with the good fortune of universal approval; and the result is the same whether the account be prepared by a Moslim or by a non-Moslim.

SANSKRIT AND OLD CANARESE INSCRIPTIONS.

BY J. F. FLEET, B.O. C.S., M.R.A.S.

(Continued from p. 88.)

No. XXXVIII.

In the Elliot MS. Collection, Vol. I., pp. 1 to 7, a copy is given of a long stone-tablet inscription at the temple called Śaṅkha-basti at Lakshmeśwar, the chief town of an outlying Tālukā of the same name of the Miraj State near the south-east corner of the Dhārwar District. I obtained also a tracing of the inscription by means of a local schoolmaster, and, by comparing this with the MS. copy, have succeeded in making a sufficiently accurate version of the text to edit it. My version may be capable of improvement here and there by personal examination of the original stone. But there are very few doubtful passages involving matters of importance.


The tablet is about 5' 2" high by 2' 3" broad, and contains 82 lines of writing in neatly formed Old Canarese characters of the tenth century A.D. I have no information as to whether there are any emblems at the top of the stone. It includes three separate inscriptions.

First Part.—Lines 1 to 51 contain an inscription of the Gaṅga or Koṅgu dynasty, which has already been introduced to our notice by Mr. Rice in the Merkāra copper-plates at Vol. I., pp. 360 *et seqq.*, the Nāgamaṅgala copper-plates at Vol. II., pp. 155 *et seqq.*, and the two sets of Mallôhalli copper-plates at Vol. V., pp. 133 *et seqq.*

The grants recorded in it were made by Mārasimhadēva-Satyavākya-Koṅgaṇivarmā, also called Gaṅga-Kandarpa, when the Śaka year 890 (A.D. 968-9) had expired, and while the Vibhava saṁvatsara was current, to a Jain priest named Jayadēva. According to the *Tables* in Brown's *Carnatic Chronology*, the Vibhava saṁvatsara was Śaka 890, and Śaka 891 was the Śukla saṁvatsara. The grants were of some lands at the city of Puligere, or 'the city of the tank of the tiger', which, I presume, must be taken as the

ancient name of Lakshmeśwar. They were made for the benefit of a Jain temple, which, being called 'the shrine of Jinendra of king Gaṅga-Kandarpa', seems to have been founded or restored by Mārasimhadēva himself.

The genealogy is given thus:—



As regards the spelling of the subsidiary title or family-name of these kings,—in l. 5 there is no *Anusvāra*, either in the tracing or in the MS. copy, and the vowel of the second syllable is *a* in both, and it reads 'Kogaṇivarmā.' But in l. 23 the *Anusvāra* is very distinctly legible in the tracing and is also given in the MS. copy, and the vowel of the second syllable is *u* in both, and it reads 'Koṅgaṇivarmā.' In the four sets of copper-plates the vowel of the second syllable is always *a*, except in the Nāgamaṅgala plates, III. b, l. 7, where, unless there is a fault in the facsimile, it is *u*. In the Merkāra plates, I. l. 4, and II. a, l. 5, the guttural nasal *ṇ* is used, not the *Anusvāra*, and it reads 'Koṅgaṇi.' The same is the case in the Nāgamaṅgala plates,—I., l. 3, where Mr. Rice transliterates 'Koḍgaṇi' in error for 'Koṅgaṇi',—and III. b, l. 7, 'Koṅgaṇi' or 'Koṅgaṇi', as the case may be. And the same is the case in the Mallôhalli plates,—in the first set, I. a, l. 3, II. a, l. 4, and III. a, l. 1,—and in the second set, I., l. 4, and III. b, l. 7, though in IV. a, l. 5, the *Anusvāra* is used. In the Nāgamaṅgala plates, II. a,

l. 6, and III. a, l. 4, there is no *Anusvāra* or guttural nasal, and it reads 'Kogaṇi.' Undoubtedly, either the *Anusvāra*, or the guttural nasal, is required before the *g*, and, when it does not occur, it is omitted through carelessness. Accordingly, I have entered it as a correction in l. 5 of my transcription. As to the vowel of the second syllable, *a* or *ā*, it is possibly liable to variation, as is the case in so many Drāviḍian words; and in one instance, referred to more particularly below, it occurs as *i*.

Down to the end of the description of *Harivarmā*, the present inscription follows very closely the wording of the copper-plates, except that the first king is not mentioned in the plates by his name of 'Mādhava.' And there can be no doubt that the first three kings are the same persons who stand first in the genealogy of the plates. *Mārasimha*, the younger brother of *Harivarmā*, is not mentioned in the plates, the direct succession being continued by the son of *Harivarmā*.

Now, however, the ever-recurring question of discrepancy of dates crops up again; and in this instance the discrepancy is a very wide one indeed. The Mallōhalli plates are not dated in any era save that of the reigning king. But the Merkāra plates purport to record a grant of the time of the great-grandson of *Harivarmā*, in the year 388, which is taken by Mr. R. G. Bhāṇḍārkar to be the Śaka year 388. And the Nāgamaṅgala plates purport to record a grant by the eleventh or twelfth in succession to *Harivarmā*, in the Śaka year 698. And, in his paper *On the Inscriptions of Southern India*, of which an abstract is given at p. 38 of the *Report of the Second International Congress of Orientalists*, Prof. Eggeling refers to a copper-plate grant, in the Elliot facsimile collection, of *Arivarmā*,—the *Harivarmā* of the Merkāra, Nāgamaṅgala, and Mallōhalli plates, and of the present inscription,—dated Śaka 169. Whereas, we here find *Harivarmā*'s younger brother making a grant in the Śaka year 890 or 891. And the date, in l. 24, is expressed in words, not in figures, and the words recording it are very distinctly legible in the tracing, though they are omitted in the MS. copy.

I am not prepared at present to suggest any explanation of this discrepancy. But, if the present inscription were a forgery, made in Śaka 890 or 891, the forgers of it would certainly have

given it a much earlier date, and would probably have endeavoured to imitate the more ancient characters. In my opinion, the date of the present inscription is more probable than the date of the Merkāra plates, if it is to be referred to the Śaka era, and than the date of the Nāgamaṅgala plates, which is expressly said to be in the Śaka era.

And we have to notice here three Gaṅga or Koṅgu stone-tablet inscriptions from the Kiggatnād forest, published by Mr. Kittel at Vol. VI., pp. 99 *et seqq.* They are inscriptions of *Satyavākya-Koṅguṇivarmā*, or '*Koṅgiṇivarmā*', as the name is spelt in one of them, No. I. The same name, '*Satyavākya*', is given to the king who stands twenty-sixth in the list made out from the chronicle called *Koṅgudēsa-charitra* and published at Vol. I., p. 361. And *Mārasimhadēva*, again, is called *Satyavākya-Koṅguṇivarmā* in l. 23 of my present inscription. Now, *satya-vākya*, 'of truthful speech', is a title, rather than a proper name. And it does not necessarily follow that *Mārasimhadēva* is the same person as the *Satyavākya* of the Kiggatnād inscriptions, or of the traditional, and possibly rather inaccurate, list of the *Koṅgudēsa-charitra*. At the same time, I consider that he is to be identified with the *Satyavākya* of one of the Kiggatnād inscriptions. I have seen the photographs of the originals, from which facsimile plates have been prepared; and I consider that they are not to be allotted all to the reign of one and the same *Satyavākya-Koṅguṇivarmā*. One of them, Mr. Kittel's No. III., at p. 103, is entirely undated. In another, No. II., at p. 102b, the date runs:—*Sa(sa)ka-nṛip-a(ā)tātā(tā)-kāla-samvatsaraṅga[=enṭu-nūṛ-ombattaneyavarsham=pravarttisuttire, i.e. "while the eight hundred and ninth year, of the years of the era which had expired of the Śaka kings, was current"; and it is further stated to be the eighteenth year of the reign of Satyavākya. This Satyavākya, therefore, commenced to reign in Śaka 791; and it follows that he cannot be the Mārasimhadēva-Satyavākya-Koṅguṇivarmā of my present inscription now published. These two inscriptions, Mr. Kittel's Nos. II. and III., are to be grouped together, the characters of both of them being of the same square and upright type and of the same age. The date of the remaining Kiggat-*

nâd inscription, Mr. Kittel's No. I., at p. 102a, is unfortunately somewhat hard to decipher in the photograph, though it would seem to be legible enough on the original stone. So much of it as can be read at first sight runs:—*Sa(śa)ka-nṛipa-kāḍ-āṭṭa-saṁvatsara-sa(śa)taṅga-! = . . . t . . . aneya Īśvara-saṁvatsaram pravartise.* The vowel attached to the ! of *śataṅga*, the *Anusvara*, if any, and the following letter, are indistinct, and the second *t* of *tia* in *taneya* is effaced. Mr. Kittel proposes to complete the passage by reading either *ombhattaneya*, 'ninth', or *embhattaneya*, 'eightieth',—it is not quite clear which,—and submits Śaka seven hundred and eighty as the translation. But there is nothing, either in the text, or in his proposed completion of it, to justify 'seven' being taken as the number of the hundreds; and, as he himself points out, the date, even if interpreted thus, does not harmonize with the date of his No. II., as it should if they are both inscriptions of one and the same *Satyavākya*. That supposition, however, is not to be made, and the dates are not to be expected to harmonize in that way. For the characters of this inscription are of a very different standard from those of his Nos. II. and III., being of a round type with a very decided slant to the right, and they belong to a more developed stage of the alphabet. As to the uncertain letters, of which the photograph shows only indistinct traces, we must of necessity read either *śataṅga*=*ombhattaneya*, 'ninth hundred', or *śataṅga*=*hattaneya*, 'tenth hundred.' It is not likely that the last expression was used; we should rather have the ordinal form of *ondu sāsira*, 'one thousand', if that were the date to be given. And, as a matter of fact, the indistinct consonant appears to me, as to Mr. Kittel, to be undoubtedly *bh*. Accordingly, I read the entire passage as:—*Sa(śa)ka-nṛipa-kāḍ-āṭṭa-saṁvatsara-sa(śa)taṅga! = ombhat-[t]aneyā Īśvara-saṁvatsaram pravartise*, i.e. "the Īśvara *saṁvatsara*, which was the ninth of the centuries which had expired of the era of the Śaka kings, being current",—sc. "the Śaka year 900, the Īśvara *saṁvatsara*, being current." And, by the *Tables* in Brown's *Carnatic Chronology*, Śaka 899 was the Īśvara *saṁvatsara*, which is close enough for the purpose. The date of this inscription being thus so near that of the inscription now published

by me, I look upon this *Satyavākya-Koṅgi(u)ṇivarmā* as in all probability identical with the *Mārasimhadēva-Satyavākya-Koṅguṇivarmā* of my inscription.

Second Part.—Lines 51 to 61 contain an inscription of the *Sēndra* family.

It commences with the mention of a *Chālukya* king named *Raṇaparākramāṅka*, and his son *Eṇeyya*. Neither of these names has as yet been met with in the genealogy of either the Western or the Eastern *Chālukyas*. But *Raṇaparākramāṅka* is perhaps intended for *Raṇarāga*, the son of *Jayasimha I.*, and the father of *Pulikēśī I.* *Jayasimha I.*, the first of the family in the Dekkan, is occasionally referred to. But I know of only four inscriptions in which the genealogy in a connected form is carried back beyond *Pulikēśī I.*;—1, the *Aihole* stone-tablet at Vol. V., pp. 67 *et seq.*,—2, the forged or copied copper-plate grant of *Pulikēśī I.* in the British Museum,—3, the *Yēwūr* stone-tablet, of which a copy is given at Vol. I., pp. 258 *et seq.*, of the Elliot MS. Collection,—and 4, a copper-plate grant of *Jayasimha-Jagadēkamalladēva* from *Miraj*, dated Śaka 946, the *Raktākshī saṁvatsara*, published by Mr. Wathen in the *Jour. R. As. Soc.*, Vol. II., p. 380, and Vol. III., pp. 258 *et seq.*;—and we may take it that the information of most people on the subject was only traditional and rather hazy.

It then mentions a certain king *Satyāśraya*. But there is nothing to show which of the several Western *Chālukya* kings who bore that title is intended.

It then mentions, as the contemporary of *Satyāśraya*, king *Durgasakti*,—the son of *Kundasakti*, who was the son of *Vijayasakti*,—of the race of the *Sēndra* kings, who belonged to the lineage of the *Bhujagēndras*, i.e. the *Nāga* family.

And it records a grant of land at *Puligere*, by *Durgasakti*, to the *Chaitya* shrine of the god called *Śaṅkha-Jinēndra*.

The inscription is not dated. It is probably one of early date, repeated here for the sake of confirmation or of preservation. I find the *Sēndrakas* referred to in one of my early *Kadamba* copper-plate grants, No. XXVI. of this series, l. 10, at Vol. VI., p. 32, and in l. 3 of a stone-tablet inscription at *Baḷagāṁve* of

Vinayāditya-Satyāśraya, No. 98 of Major Dixon's Collection.

Third Part.—The rest of the tablet, l. 61 to the end, contains an inscription of the Western Chalukya Vikramāditya II. It is dated in the second year of his reign, when the Śaka year 656 (A.D. 734-5) had expired, and must consequently have been copied here from a previous stone-tablet or copper-plate, for the sake of confirmation or of preservation. It is issued from his victorious camp at Raktapura, a city which I cannot identify.

It records that the Śaṅkhatīrtha-

vasati of the city of Pulikara,—the Puligere of the preceding two inscriptions,—and the temple called 'the white Jindlaya', were embellished and repaired, and that certain land was given for maintaining the worship of Jina.

In its genealogical portion, it agrees with the Western Chalukya inscriptions published by me, Nos. XXVII. to XXXI. of this series, in Vol. V., and it carries the genealogy two steps further, in the persons of Vijayāditya and Vikramāditya II, the son and grandson of Vinayāditya.

Transcription.

- [¹] Śrīmat-parama-gaṁbhīra-syādvād-āmōgha-lāṁchhanam jiyā(yāt)=trailōkya-nāthasya śāsanam
 [²] Jina-śāsanam || Svasti Jitam bhagavatā gata-ghana-gagan-ābhena Padmanā-
 [³] bhena [[*¹] Śrīmaj-Jāhnavē(vi)ya-kul-āmaḷa-vyōm-āvabhāsana-bhāskarāḥ sva-khaḍg-aika-
 prahāra-
 [⁴] khaṇḍita-mahā-śīlāstambha-labdha-bala-parākramō dāraṇ-āri-gaṇa-vidāraṇ-ōpalabdha-
 [⁵] bra(vra)ṇa-vibhūṣhaṇa-vibhūṣitaḥ Kaṇḍā(nvā)yaṇa-sagōtraḥ śrīmān Ko(kom*)gaṇivarmma-
 dharmamamahārāj-
 [⁶] j-ādhirāja-paramēśvara-Śrī-Mādhava-prathama-nāmadhēyaḥ || Tat-putraḥ pitur-anvāgata-
 guṇayuktō
 [⁷] vidyā-vinaya-vihita-vṛttāḥ samyak-prajā-pālana-mātr-ādhigata-rājya-prayōjanō vidvat-kavi-
 kāmchana-ni-
 [⁸] kash-ōpala-bhūtā(tō) nīti-śāstrasya vaktrī-prayōktrī-kuśalō dattaka-sūtra-vṛttēḥ=praṇētā
 śrīmān=Mādhava-mahā-
 [⁹] rāj-ādhirājah || Tat-putraḥ pitṛi-pai(pi)tāmaha-guṇa-yuktā(ktō) nēka-chā(cha)turddanta-
 yuddh-āvāpta-chatur-udadhi-saḷi-āsvādita-ya-
 [¹⁰] śāḥ śrīmad-Dharivarmma-mahārāj-ādhirājah || Api cha || Vṛtta || Āsij=jagad-gahana-
 rakshaṇa-rāja-simhaḥ kshumā-maṇḍal-ābja-
 [¹¹] vana-maṇḍana-rājahamśah | Śrī-Mārasimha iti brīmḥita-bāhu-kīrttis=tasy=ānujaḥ Kṛita-
 yuga-kshītipāla-ki-
 [¹²] rttih || Adēsād=dēva Chōl-āntaka-dharaṇipatēr=Ggaṁga-chūdāmanis=tvām vēgād=abhyēti
 yōddhum tyaja gaja-turaga-vyūha-sannā-
 [¹³] ha-darppam Gaṁgām=uttīrya gantūm para-balam=atulaṁ kalpay=ēty=āpa dūtair=vvijñaptam
 Gūrjarāṇām patir=akṛiti tathā yatra
 [¹⁴] jaitra-prayāṇē || Pād-āmbhōruha-bhṛiṅga-bhṛitya-bharāṇa-vyāpāra-chintāmaṇiḥ samtrāsa-
 graha-vihvalīkṛita-ripu-kshma-
 [¹⁵] pāla-rakshāmaṇiḥ vidvat-kaṇṭha-vibhūṣhaṇīkṛita-guṇa-prōdbhāsi-muktāmaṇir=ddēvas=saj-
 jana-varṇṇanīya-charita-Śrī-Gaṁga-chūdā-
 [¹⁶] maṇiḥ || Mandākinyā Jinēndra-snapana-vidhi-payas-syanda-sampādītāyāḥ Kālīndyās=chaṇḍa-
 vairi-prahata-gaja-mada-ēvēta-nirvarttitāyāḥ
 [¹⁷] sambhēdē Śrī-nikēt-āṁgaṇa-bhuvi bhavatō Gaṁga-Kaṁdarppa-bhūpa-vyātanyō² dig-vadhū-
 nām vidhu-vijayi yaśō hāram=ā-chaṁdra-tāram ||
 [¹⁸] Api cha || Vṛtta || Nirvvād-ōjva(jjva)la-bōdha-pōta-balataḥ=siddhānta-ratnākaram chāritr-
 ōtpluta-yānapātra-balataḥ=samsāra-mīnākaram
 [¹⁹] uttīrṇas=samadīrṇa-bhakti-vinatair=vvamdy-ābhīdhānō budhair=āsīd=Dēvagaṇ-āgrāṇir=
 ggūṇa-nidhir=Ddēvēndra-bhaṭṭārakah || Uddāma-

¹ See note 2 to Inscription No. XXXV., p. 83.

² See para. 6 of the introductory remarks.

³ The correct reading should probably be 'bhāpasy-
 ātēnē.

- [³⁰] kâma-kali-nirddalan-aika-vîras=tasy=Aikadêva iti yôgishu dēva êkaḥ śishyô babbhūva hridi
yasya dadhâti bhavyô
- [³¹] ratna-trayaṁ śirasi yach-charaṇa-dvayaṁ cha || Mahitasya tasya mahitair-mmahatām pratha-
masya cha prathama-śishyatayā Jaya-
- [³²] dēva-paṇḍita iti prathitaḥ prathamāna-śāstra-mahima-draviṇaḥ || Api cha || Gadya || Tasmai
sa bhuvan-aika-maṅgaḥ Jinēndra-nity-ābhishē-
- [³³] ka-ratna-kalāśaḥ sa tu Satyavākya-Koṁgunivarṇma-dharmamamahārāj-ādbirāja-paramēśvara-
Śrī-Mārasimhadēva-prathama-nāmadhēyaḥ Gaṅga-
- [³⁴] Kandarppaḥ ||* Śaka-nripa-kāl-ātita-samvatsara-satēshv-ashtasu navaty-uttarēshu* pravartta-
mānē Vibhava-samvatsarē Śaṁkhavasati-Tīrtthavasati-maṇḍaḥ-maṇḍa-
- [³⁵] nasya Gaṅga-Kandarppa-Jinēndra-mandirasya dāna-pūjā-dēva-bhōga-nimittam Puligere-
nagarāt=pūrvvasyām diśi tāla-vṛttim dattē sma ||* Tasyās=simā
- [³⁶] samākhyāyatē tad=yathā | Kumārī-sarasah=pūrvvasyām=āśāyām=ēka-nivarttan-āntarād=upala-
yugalād=dakṣiṇa-
- [³⁷] syām diśi Belkanūr-grāma-pāschima-simnaḥ=pāvaka-diśi Kōśi-tatāka-purō-varttinās=silā-
sarasas=samīraṇa-dik-kā(kō)nē hasti-prastarāt=pāschimasyām
- [³⁸] diśi vaṭa-tatāka-purō-nikata-nimn-ōttara-dig-varttinaḥ kṛishṇa-pāshānād=uttarasyām diśi
Nāgapura-grāma-mārggād=dakṣiṇasyām=di-
- [³⁹] śāyām Maḷigamārttaṇḍa-griha-kshêtrād=aishānyām=diśāyām=āñila-silāyāḥ=punaḥ=pāschima-
syām diśi Kṛishṇa-sarasa uttara-jala-pra-
- [⁴⁰] vāha-nirggamād=uttarasyām diśi Nilikāra-tatāk-āgata-pravāhād=uttarasyām=āśāyām=ēka-
nivarttan-āntarē vāyavya-dik-kōṇa-vartti-
- [⁴¹] rakta-pāshāna-pārśva-varttinyās=samyāḥ | pūrvva-dig-mukhēn=āgaty=ōtkīrṇnād=aruṇa-
pāshānān=Nāgapura-grāma-mārggasy=ōttara-pārśvō pūrvva-
- [⁴²] dig-mukhēna gatv=ōttara-diśam prati nivarttāt=pāschima-diśāyām=ēka-nivarttan-āntarē pūrvv-
ōttara-diśi kṛishṇa-pāshānād=dakṣiṇasyām=āśā-
- [⁴³] yām śami-kanthāri-gulm-āntarggat-āñila-silāyāḥ=pāschimatā(tah) pur-ōkta-vyakta-
pāshāna-yugalē samgatā simā ||* Prāk-prakāśita-Kṛishṇa-saraḥ-pu-
- [⁴⁴] rō-bhāga-varttini shaṇ=nivarttanāny=abhyantarī-kṛitya susṭhī(sthī)-kṛitāni shasṭhi-śataṁ
nivarttanāni || Tasmād=ēva nagarād=Varuṇa-dig-bhāga-varttinyās=ta-
- [⁴⁵] la-vrittēs=simā samāmnāyatē tad=yathā | Dēsa-grāma-kūṭa-kshêtrād=vāyā(ya)vyāyām
kakubhi tri-śamī-rakt-ōpalād=vāyā(ya)vyāyām=ā-
- [⁴⁶] śāyām=ēka-samyā Akhaṇ[ḍa*]la-diśāyām=ēka-ḍaṇḍ-āntarād=aruṇa-pāshānād=āgnēya-kōṇa-
varttinō viśāla-śami-kanthāri-jālāt=pāschimasyā-
- [⁴⁷] n=diśi śrēshṭhi-tatāka-dakṣiṇa-jala-pravāha-nirggamād=Vallabharāja-mārggāt=pūrvvasyām=
āśāyām kanthāri-gulmāt=Savasi-grāma-mārggād=dakṣiṇata-
- [⁴⁸] ś=śami-kanthāri-kumjāt=Kubēra-kakubbō vāyavyāyām=āśāyām Jyēsthalinga-bhūmi(mēr)=
nnairriri*tyām hari(ri)ti kṛishṇa-pāshānāt=pūrvvasyām diśi Valla-
- [⁴⁹] bharāja-mārggāt=pāschimasyām=āśāyām=uttara-dig-mukha-pravṛtta-mahā-pravāh-āntarggata-
Kinnara-pāshānād=dakṣiṇasyām=diśāyām=Andhakā-
- [⁵⁰] ra-kshêtrāt=pāschima-simni prāk-prakatikṛitād=dēsa-grāma-kūṭa-kshêtrād=vāyavyāyām diśi
tri-śamī-sōṇa-pāshānē simā samgatā | Evam pāschima-
- [⁵¹] dig-varttini chatvārimśach-chhataṁ nivarttanāni || Śaṁkha-vasatē=Vāsava-diśi nivarttana-
mātrah puṇpa-vāṭaḥ=pāschima-diśi cha nivarttana-dvaya-dvayadō(?) puṇpa-vāṭaḥ || Tasya chaityā-
- [⁵²] layasya pura-pramāṇam=ākhyāyatē ||* Pūrvvataḥ Bālabēśvara-pāschima-prākārah pāvaka-
diśi Charmmakāra-dēva-griha-simāntam ||* Tat-pāschimataḥ |
- [⁵³] Vārī-yāraṇa-simām kṛitvā dakṣiṇasyām=diśi puṇpa-vāt-Ām(?)ga(?)ja-chaitya-pura-pura(rah)-
Śrī-Mukkara-vasatēḥ pāschimasyām diśi gōpura-paryyantāt pāschima-dig-vartti-dē-

* For some reason or other the words *satēshv-ashtasu navaty-uttarēshu* are omitted in the MS. copy, a blank space being left as if they were illegible or doubtful, and *Prabhava-samvatsarē* is read instead of *Vibhava-sam-*

vatsarē. But in the tracing every letter of the whole passage is perfectly clear and is indubitably just as transcribed by me.

* This syllable, --ri, --is superfluous.

- [⁴⁴] *va-griha-dvayam=abhyantari-kṛitya* Marudēvi-dēva-grihasya pāśchād-bhāgād-uttarasyaṁ
diśi Chamdrikāmbikā-dēva-grihāt=pūrvvataḥ Mukkara-vasatim
- [⁴⁵] *pravishitī-kṛitya* Rāyarāchamalla-vasatim(ti)-dakṣhiṇa-prākārah tatal pūrvvataḥ Śrī-Vijaya-
vasati-dakṣhiṇa-prākārah i(ai)sānyām di-
- [⁴⁶] *śi* Karmmatēśvara-dēva-griham tad-dakṣhiṇataḥ pūrvv-ōkta-Bālabēśvara-pāśchīma-simā [||*]
Dēva-nagarāt=pāśchīma-diśi puḥpa-vāta-dvaya-nivarttana-kshētram dattam ||*
- [⁴⁷] *Tasya simā* prithāk-kṛi(kri)yatē [||*] Parava-sarasah pūrvva-diśi Tāpasi-grāma-pathād=
uttaratō puḥpa-vāta-nivarttanam=ēkam | Gaṅga-Permmādi-chaityā-
- [⁴⁸] *laya-puḥpa-vāṭād=uttaratō* nivarttanam=ēkam nāga-vallī-vanam | Ēvaṁ Gaṅga-Kandarppa-
bhūpāla-Jinēndra-mandira-dēva-bhōga-nimittam nivarttana-śata-traya-mātra-kshē-
- [⁴⁹] *tram puḥpa-vāṭa-trayam=urvviśa-dēsa-grāma-kūṭ-ākāra-vishti-prabhṛiti-bādhā-parihāram* manō-
haram=idam || Ślōka || Bahubhir=vvasudhā dattā rājabbis=Sagar-ā-
- [⁵⁰] *dibhiḥ yasya yasya yadā* bhūmis=tasya tasya tadā phalam || Mad-vamśa-jā(jāh) para-
mahāpati-vamśa-jā vā pāpād=apēta-manasō bhuvi bhāvi-bhūpāḥ yē pālaya-
- [⁵¹] *nti* mama dharmmam=ipam samastam tēshām mayā virachitō=mjalir=ēsha mūrdhni ||*
Jayaty=atisaya-Jinair=bbhāsuras=sura-vanditaḥ śrīmān=Jina-patis=syishtēr=ā-
- [⁵²] *dēh karttā day-ōdayah* || Dehahisari^o || Chālūkyā-prithivīvallabha-kuṭa-tilakēshu bahushv=
atitēshu Raṇaparākramānka-mahārājō bhavat=tad-rā-
- [⁵³] *ja-tanayah* rājita-nayō vivarddhit-aivaryyās=chatus-samudrānta-snāta-turamg-ēbha-padāti-
sēnā-samūhah Ereyya-nāmadhēyah śrīmān ||
- [⁵⁴] *Api cha* || Śāsāt=imām samudr-āntām vasudhām vasudh-ādhipē ! Satyāsraya-mahārājō rājat-
satya-samanvitē || Bhujagēndr-ānvaya-Sēndr-āvanāndra-santātāu
- [⁵⁵] *anēka-nṛipa-sattamēshv=atitēshu* tat-kuṭa-gagana-chandramāḥ bahu-samara-vijaya-labdhā-
patāk-āvabhāsita-dig-antarāla-valayah Vijayaśaktir=nnāma nṛipatir=bba-
- [⁵⁶] *bhūva* [||*] Tat-sūnur=ndita-tarūṇa-divākara-kara-sama-prabhah san(sau)ryya-dhairyya-
satva-guṇ-ōpapannah sāmanta-bṛi(vi)nda-manḍi-māl-avalīdha-charaṇah Ku'ndaśa-
- [⁵⁷] *ktir=nnāma rāj=ābhūt=tasya* priya-tanayah || Advitiya-purushakāra-sampannah | dharm-
ārttha-kāma-pradhānah anēka-raṇa-vijaya-vīra-patāk-āgrahaṇ-ō-
- [⁵⁸] *ddhata-kīrttiḥ* [||*] Tēna Durggaśakti-nāmadhēyēna Śamkha-Jinēndra-chaitya-nitya-
pūj-ārttham puny-ābhivṛiddhayō cha | Puligere-nāma-nagaras=ōttara-pārsvē pañchāśan-
nivarttana-parimā-
- [⁵⁹] *pa-kshētram dattam* || Tasya simā samākhyāyatē [||*] Pūrvvataḥ Kinnari-kshētram |
pāvaka-diśi Jyēsthalinga-bhūmih | dakṣhiṇataḥ Ghatikā-kshētram | nairityām diśi Dam(?paṁ)-
- [⁶⁰] *diśa(sa)-śrēsthī-bhūmih* pāśchimataḥ Rāmēśvara-kshētram vāyavyām Hōbesvara-kshētram |
uttarataḥ Sindēśvara-kshētram i(ai)sānyām diśi Bhattāri-kshētram | tad-dakṣhiṇataḥ
pūrvv-ōkta-Kinna-
- [⁶¹] *ri-kshētram* || Dēva-svam visham lōkēna visham na visham=uchyatō | visham=ēkākīnam
hanti dēva-svam putra-pautrikam || Svasti [||*] Jayaty=āviḥkṛitam Vishnōr=vvārāham kshōbbhi-
- [⁶²] *t-ārūṇavam* dakṣhiṇ-ōnnata-damshtr-āgra-viśrānta-bhuvanam vapuḥ || Śrīmatām sakala-
bhuvana samstūyamāna-Mānavya-sagōtrāṇām Hārīti-putrāṇām sapta-lō-
- [⁶³] *ka-mātribhiḥ* sapta-mātribhir=abhivarddhitānām Kārttikēya-parirakṣhaṇa-prāpta-kalyāṇa-
paramparāṇām bhagavan-Nārāyaṇa-prasāda-samāsādita-varāha-lām-
- [⁶⁴] *cuchha(chha)n-ēkshana-vaśīkṛit-āsēsha-mahibhṛitām* Chālūkyānām kuṭam=alaṁkarishnōr=
āsvamēdh-āvabhṛitha-snāna-pavitrikṛita-gātrasya Śrī-Polikēśivallabha-mahārā-
- [⁶⁵] *jasya* priya-sūnuḥ Śrī-^oKirttivarṇma-prithivīvallabha-mahārājas=tasy=ātma-jasya Satyāsraya-
śrī-prithivīvallabha-mahārāj-ādhirāja-paramē-
- [⁶⁶] *āvarasya* priya-tanayah(yasya) prabhāva-kuṭīsa-dalīta-Pāṇḍya-Chōḷa-Kēraḷa-Kadamba-
prabhṛiti-bhūbhṛid-udagra-vibhramasya nity-āvanata-Kānichī-pati-makūṭa-chutūbita-pā-

^o These letters are unintelligible. The MS. copy reads *chahi svasti*, of which the first word is equally unintelligible.

¹ This is the reading of the MS. copy. In the tracing

the first letter is rather uncertain, and might stand for *ma* as much as for *ku*.

^o From here down to *priya-sūnuḥ(nōh)*, inclusive, in l. 67, is omitted altogether in the MS. copy.

- [⁶⁷] d-āmbujasya Vikramāditya-Satyāśraya-śrī-prithivīvallabha-mahārāj-ādhirāja-paramēśvaraśya
priya-sūnuḥ (nōḥ) saka-ottarāpatha-nātha-mathan-ōpārjita-pāli-
- [⁶⁸] dhvaj-ādi-samasta-pāramaiśvaryya-chihnasya Vinayāditya-Satyāśraya-śrī-prithivīvallabha-
mahārāj-ādhirāja-paramēśvara-paramabhāttarakasya priy-ātmajaḥ sā-
- [⁶⁹] hasa-rasa-rasikaḥ parānmukhikṛita-śatru-maṇḍalas-sakaḥ-pāramaiśvaryya-vyakti-hētu-pāli-
dhvaj-ādy-ujva(jjva)ḥ-rājya-chihnō Vijayādi-
- [⁷⁰] tyā-Satyāśraya-śrī-prithivīvallabha-mahārāj-ādhirāja(jaḥ) [||*] [Tat*]-priya-sūnōḥ pratidina-
pravarddhamāna-yā(yau)vanō(nasya) ripu-maṇḍal-ākṛānti-rājya-ābhyndayaḥ(yasya)
- [⁷¹] kastūri-kiśōra-vikram-aika-rasō(sasya) Vikramāditya-Satyāśraya-śrī-prithivīvallabha-mahārāj-
ādhirāja-paramēśvara-bhāttarakasya vijaya-skandhāvārō Raktapuram-adhivasa-
- [⁷²] tī shat-paṁchāsād-uttara-shat-chhatēshu Śaka-varshēshv=attēshu^o pravarddhamāna-vijaya-
rājya-samvatsarē dvitīyē varitāmānē Mēgha-paurṇamāsyām Mūlasaṁgh-ānva-
- [⁷³] ya-Dēvagaṇ-ōditāḥ(tāya) parama-tapa(pah)-śrūta-mūrtti-viśē(śō)ka-Rāmadēvāchāryya¹⁰-
śiśhyō(shyāya) vijita-vipakṣa-vādi-Jayadēva-paṁḍit-āntēvāsi(sinē) samupagat-aikavā-
- [⁷⁴] ditv-ādi-Śrī-Vijayadēva-paṁḍit-āchāryyāya Jina-pūj-ābhivṛddhy-arttham Bāhubali-śrēṣṭhi-
vijñāpanēna Pulikara-nagarasya Sāmkha-Tīrttha-vasatē=mmaṇḍana-maṇḍitam
- [⁷⁵] tasya dhavaḷa-Jinālayasya jirṇ-ōddharanām kṛitvā khaṇḍa-sphutita-nava-saṁskāra-bali-
nimittam dāna-śāl-ādi-pravarttan arttham nagarād=uttarasayām diśi gavyūti-pramā-
- [⁷⁶] ṇa-vyavasthitam Karppati-tatākād=dakṣiṇasyām diśi rāja-mānēna śat-ārdha-nivarttana-
pramāṇa-kṣhetram sarva-bādhā-parihāram dattam [||*] Tasya sīmā samākhyāyatē [||*]
- [⁷⁷] Pūrvva-diśi tat-sādhita-Kinnara-pāshānād=dakṣiṇasyām=āśāyām dhavaḷa-pāshāṇa-parśva-
śamyah | pāśchimasyām diśi śvēta-pāshānād=ēka-sāmī uttarasyām
- [⁷⁸] diśi āñḷa-pāshānāt=prāk-prakāsita-tatākāt=pūrvvasayām diśi aruṇa-pāshānāt=pūrvv-ōkta-
vyakta-Kinnara-pāshāṇa-saṁgatā sīmā ||
- [⁷⁹] Svām dātum su-mahach-chhakyam duḥkham=anyasya pālanam dātū=paḷanach=ch=ēti¹¹
dānāch=chhrēyō nupālanam || Na visham visham=ity=ānuḥ dē-
- [⁸⁰] va-svām visham=uchyatē visham=ēkākīnam hanti dēva-svām putra-pautrikam || Sva-dattam
para-dattam vā yō
- [⁸¹] harēta vasuḍharām shashti-varsha-sahasraṇi viśthāyām jāyatē krimiḥ ||
- [⁸²] Prathyatām Jina-śāsanam [||*]

Translation.

First Part, Lines 1 to 51. May the scripture of the lord of the three worlds,—the scripture of Jina, which has for its efficacious characteristic the glorious and supreme and profound science of the assertion of possibilities,—be victorious!

Hail! Victory has been achieved by the holy one, Padmanābha,¹² who resembles (*in the colour of his body*) the sky when the clouds have left it!

A sun to irradiate the clear sky which is the glorious family of Jāhnavā¹³; possessed of (*a reputation for*) strength and prowess acquired by cleaving asunder a great pillar of stone by a single stroke of his sword; decorated with

ornaments which were the wounds sustained in massacring the forces of his pitiless enemies; belonging to the lineage of the Kaṇvāyanas¹⁴; (*such was*) the glorious Kōṅgaṇi-varmā, the pious Great King, the supreme king, the supreme lord, whose first name was Śrī-Mādhava.

His son (*was*) the glorious Mādhava, the Great King, the supreme king,—who was possessed of virtuous qualities that imitated (*those of*) his father; whose conduct was regulated by knowledge and modesty; who attained the objects of sovereignty only by properly governing his subjects; who was a very touchstone for (*testing*) the gold which was learned men and poets; who was skilled among those who

^o Here, again, for some reason or other, the words *shat-paṁchāsād-uttara-shat-chhatēshu Śaka-varshēshv-attēshu* are omitted in the MS. copy, a blank space being left as if they were illegible or doubtful, and *pravartamānē Vijaya-samvatsarē* is read instead of *pravarddhamāna-vijaya-rājya-samvatsarē*. But in the tracing every letter of the whole passage is perfectly legible.

¹⁰ The MS. copy reads *Rāmadēv-āchāryyāyāḥ* (sic) Jina-

pūj-ābhivṛddhy-arttham &c., as in l. 74, and omits all the intervening matter.

¹¹ sc., *dānam vā pālanam ch=ēti*.

¹² The name of an *Arhat*,—also of Vishnu.

¹³ Viśvāmitra.

¹⁴ The descendants of Kaṇva, who was the son of Ghōra and belonged to the family of Āngiras.

pronounce and those who apply the science of polity; and who was the promulgator of a treatise on the law of adoption.

His son (*was*) the glorious Harivarmā, the Great King, the supreme king,—who was possessed of the virtuous qualities of his father and his father's father; and whose fame was flavoured with the waters of the four oceans, (*the sovereignty of*) which he had acquired in many battles (*in which use was made*) of elephants.¹⁵

Moreover:—His younger brother was Śrī-Mārasimha,—who was a very lion of a king in guarding the thicket which was the world; who was a very royal swan (*of a king*) in adorning the lotus-pool which was the circle of the earth; the fame of whose (*strength of*) arm was great; and who had a reputation (*equal to that*) of a king of the Kṛita age. At his victorious journeying forth, the lord of the Gūrjaras received a rough¹⁶ command from messengers:—"O Sir!; at the order of the king¹⁷ who destroyed the Chôlas, the chief of the Gaṅgas comes quickly against thee; cease to fight with the unequalled force of (*thy*) enemy, which possesses the pride of the array and accoutrements of elephants and horses, and prepare to depart across the (*river*) Gaṅgā." A very philosopher's stone in supporting his servants, who were as bees at the lotuses which were his feet; a very amulet of protection against the hostile kings, who were disquieted by the apprehension of fear; a very pearl to make lustrous the virtuous qualities that were the ornaments of the throats of learned men; divine; performing achievements that were worthy to be praised by good people;—(*such was he*), the chief of the Gaṅgas. When he was staying in the courtyard of the habitation of the goddess of fortune, at the confluence of the Mandākinī¹⁸, which was produced by the trickling of the water (*used*) in the rite of ablution of Jinendra, and of the Kālindī, which was made to cease to be white by the rut of the wounded elephants of his fierce enemies,—the fame of the king Gaṅga-Kandarpa, which surpassed the moon (*in the purity of its lustre*), spread abroad as a

necklace for the women which are the distant regions, so as to last as long as the moon and stars might endure.

And again:—There was the venerable Dêvendra, the receptacle of virtuous qualities, the leader of the sect called Dêvagaṇa,—who traversed the ocean of the *Siddhānta* by the strength of his boat which was his knowledge that shone in deciding controversies, and the ocean of worldly existence by the strength of the boat which was the excellent result of his good behaviour; and whose name was worthy to be praised by learned people, who bowed down to his devotion when it was declared.

His sole disciple was Êkadêva, a very god among ascetics, preëminently brave in destroying the demon of unbridled lust; (*every*) worthy person bears his *ratnatraya*¹⁹ in his heart, and takes his feet upon his head.

The wise man Jayadêva, who possessed the wealth of the scriptures, which are extolled, was celebrated by being the first disciple of him, who was honoured by honourable ones, and who was the foremost of great people.

And again:—Eight centuries of years and ninety (*years*) having expired in the era of the Śaka kings, while the Vibhava *samvatsara* was current,—he, Gaṅga-Kandarpa,—who was a very jewelled pitcher wherewith to perpetually besprinkle Jinendra, who is the most auspicious (*god*) in the world; (*who was called*) Satyavākya-Koṅguṇivarmā, the pious Great King, the supreme king, the supreme lord; and who had the first name of Śrī-Mārasimhadêva,—gave to him a plot of ground, to the east of the city of Paliḡere, for the purposes of the charity and the worship and the enjoyment of the god of the shrine of Jinendra of Gaṅga-Kandarpa, which is the ornament of the circuit of the temples called Śāṅkhavasati and Tīrthavasati.

The boundaries of it are described, as follows:—On the east of the lake of Kumāri, there are two stones at the distance of one *nivartana*. On the south of them, there is the western boundary of the village of Belkanūr. On the south-east of that, there is the 'lake of

¹⁵ *Chaturdanta*, 'having four tusks', is an epithet of Airāvata, the elephant of Indra, but seems here to mean elephants in general.

¹⁶ *Akritin*, 'clumsy, uncoth.'

¹⁷ Probably Harivarmā.

¹⁸ The Gaṅgā, or Ganges.

¹⁹ The 'jewel-triad,' or three excellent things of Jainism, viz.—1, *samyak-chāritra*, correct conduct; 2, *samyag-jñāna*, complete knowledge; and 3, *samyag-darśana*, accurate perception.

the stones,' in front of the (*tank called*) Kôśi-taṭāka. At the north-west corner of that, there is the littering-place for elephants. On the west of that, there is a dark-blue stone, on the north of the depression in the ground which is close in front of the 'tank of the sacred fig-tree.' On the north of that, there is the road to the village of Nâgapura. On the south of that, there is the field of the house of Maḷigamârtanḍa. On the north-east of that, there is a slightly blue-black stone. Again on the west of that, there is the north outlet for water of the tank of Kṛishṇa. On the north of that, there is the stream that joins the tank of Nīlikāra. On the north of that, there is a Śamī tree, beside a red stone which is in the north-west quarter at the distance of one *nivartana*. Coming to the east from that, and going to the east on the north side of the road to the village of Nâgapura from the (*above-*) mentioned red stone, and turning towards the north, on the west, at the distance of one *nivartana*, there is a dark-blue stone in the north-east quarter. On the south of that, there is a slightly blue-black stone in a clump of Śamī trees and Kānthārī trees. On the west of that, the boundary joins at the two stones first mentioned and specified. Having included six *nivartanas* (*of land*) lying in front of the lake of Kṛishṇa, one hundred and sixty *nivartanas* were excellently laid out (*and thus given*).

The boundaries are recorded, as follows, of a plot of ground on the west of that same city:—On the north-west of the (*field called*) Dêśagrāmākūṭa-kshêtra, there is a red stone near three Śamī trees. On the north-west of that, there is one Śamī tree. On the east of that, at the distance of one *daṇḍa*²⁰, there is a red stone. On the south-east of that, there is a large clump of Śamī trees and Kānthārī trees. On the south of that, there are the southern outlet of water of the 'tank of the merchant' and the road of Vallabharāja. On the east of these, there is a clump of Kānthārī trees, and the road to the village of Savasi. On the south of these, there is a clump of Śamī trees and Kānthārī trees. On the north-west of the north of this, there is the land of Jyêshṭhalinga. On the south-west of this, there is a dark-blue stone.

On the east of this, there is the road of Vallabharāja. On the west of this, there is the 'stone of the Kinnara', in the large stream that flows to the north. On the south of this, there is the field of Andhakāra. On the west of this, there is the (*field called*) Dêśagrāmākūṭa-kshêtra, which has been already specified. On the north-west of this, the boundary joins at the red stone near the three Śamī trees. Thus (*there were given*) one hundred and forty *nivartanas* in the western quarter.

On the east of the Śāṅkhavasati, (*there was given*) a flower-garden measuring one *nivartana*; and on the west, a flower-garden measuring two *nivartanas*.

The measure of the city of that same Chaitya hall is declared:—On the east, the west wall of the enclosure of (*the temple of the god*) Bâlâbêśvara. On the south-east, the boundary of the temple of the god Charmakāra.²¹ On the west of that, on the south of the boundary of the enclosure of the harlots, there is the (*temple called*) Śrī-Mukkaravasati, in front of the flower-garden and the city, of the Chaitya of Âṅgaja(?). On the west of this, there is the back of the temple of (*the goddess*) Marnḍêvî, including two temples lying in the west quarter, as far as the ornamental gateway. On the north of that, there is the temple of (*the goddess*) Chandrikāmbikā. On the east of that, having entered the (*temple called*) Mukkaravasati, there is the south wall of the enclosure of the (*temple called*) Râyarâchamalla-vasati. On the east of that, there is the south wall of the (*temple called*) Śrī-Vijayavasati. On the north-east, there is the temple of (*the god*) Karmaṭêśvara. On the south of that, there is the previously mentioned west boundary of (*the temple of the god*) Bâlâbêśvara.

On the west of the city of the god, there was given a field measuring one *nivartana* and including two flower-gardens. The boundaries of it are specified:—One *nivartana* of flower-garden, on the east of the Parava lake, and on the north of the road to the village of Tapasi; (*and*) a betel-nut plantation of one *nivartana*, on the north of the flower-garden of the Chaitya hall of Gaṅga-Permadî.

Thus (*there were given*), for the enjoyment of

²⁰ Lit. 'a staff'; = 4 hastas, or cubits; = 96 finger-breadths.

²¹ Or 'of the god of the workers in leather.'

the god of the temple of Jinendra of king Gaṅga-Kandarpa, a field of the measure of three hundred *nivartanas*, (and) three flower-gardens, free from the hereditary perquisites of the king and the country and the villages, and forced labour, and other dues. This is pleasing!

Land has been given by many kings, commencing with Sagarā; he, who for the time being possesses land, enjoys the benefits of it! Those future kings, whether born in my lineage or in the lineage of other kings, who, with minds free from sin, preserve this my act of piety in its integrity,—to them I join my hands on my forehead (*in respectful salutation*)!

Second Part.—Lines 51-61.

Victorious is Jinapati, who is resplendent with (*attendant*) Jinas, possessed of superhuman powers; who is praised by the gods; who is the maker of the first creation; and who displays tenderness!²²

Many ornaments of the family of the Chālukyas, who are the favourites of the world, having passed away,—there was the Great King Raṇaparaṅkramāṅka.

The son of that king was the glorious Ereyya, who was possessed of brilliant statesmanship; whose dominion was increased; and whose array of horses and elephants and troops of foot-soldiers was bathed at the margins of the four oceans.

Moreover:—While the Great King Satyāśraya, the lord of the earth, possessed of brilliant truth, was ruling this earth, which is bounded by the ocean;—

Many most excellent kings having passed away in the race of the Sēndra kings, who are of the lineage of the Bhujagēndras²³, there was the king Vijayaśakti, who was the moon of the sky which was that family, and who irradiated the circuit of the regions with the banners that he had obtained by victory in many battles.

His son was the king Kundaśakti, who was as lustrous as the rays of the (*newly*) risen morning sun; who was endowed with the qualities of bravery and steadfastness and courage; and whose feet were touched²⁴ by the garlands on the tiaras of the crowd of chieftains (*who bowed down before him*).

His dear son was he who was possessed of unequalled manliness; who abounded in religion and wealth and pleasure; and whose fame was heightened by capturing the banners of heroes through victory in many wars.

By him, named Durgāśakti, a field of the measure of fifty *nivartanas*, on the north side of the city of Puligere, was given for the purposes of the perpetual worship of the Chaitya of Śaṅkha-Jinendra, and in order to increase his religious merit.

The boundaries of it are declared:—On the east, (*the field called*) Kinnari-kshētra; on the south-east, the land of Jyēsthalinga; on the south, (*the field called*) Ghaṭikā-kshētra; on the south-west, the land of the merchant Daṇḍīśa; on the west, the field of Rāmēśvara; on the north-west, the field of Hōbēśvara; on the north, the field of Sindēśvara; on the north-east, the field of Bhaṭṭārī. On the east of that, (*there is*) the previously mentioned (*field called*) Kinnari-kshētra.

The property of a god (*is called*) poison by mankind; poison is not called poison: poison kills a single person; the property of a god, (*if confiscated, kills*) sons and sons' sons!

Third Part.—Lines 61-82.

Hail! Victorious is the boar-like form that was manifested of Viṣṇu, which agitated the ocean, and which had the earth resting on the tip of its uplifted right-hand tusk!

The dear son of the Great King Śrī-Polīkēśivallabha,—whose body was purified by ablutions performed after celebrating horse-sacrifices, and who adorned the family of the glorious Chālukyas, who are of the kindred of Mānavya, which is praised over the whole earth; who are the descendants of Hārīti; who have been nourished by seven mothers, who are the seven mothers of mankind; who have attained an uninterrupted continuity of prosperity through the protection of Kārttikēya; and who have all kings made subject to them by the (*mere*) sight of the banner of the Boar, which they attained through the favour of the holy Nārāyaṇa,—(*was*) Śrī-Kīrttivarmā, the favourite of the world, the Great King.

His son was Satyāśraya, the favourite

²² *Dehahisari*, or *ihahi svasti*, l. 53,—not intelligible.

²³ *Bhujag-ēndra*, or *nāg-ēndra*, 'a snake king.'

²⁴ *Lit.* 'licked.'

of the world, the Great King, the supreme king, the supreme lord.

His dear son was Vikramāditya-Satyāśraya, the favourite of the world, the Great King, the supreme king, the supreme lord,—who, (*like Indra*), cleft open with the thunderbolt which was his prowess the overweening precipitation of the Pāṇḍya and Chōḷa and Kēraḷa and Kadamba and other kings, (*which was like the lofty summits of mountains*); and whose feet were kissed by the diadem of the lord of Kāñchī, who always bowed down before him.

His dear son was Vinayāditya-Satyāśraya, the favourite of the world, the Great King, the supreme king, the supreme lord, the most venerable,—who was possessed of the banner of the sword-edge²⁵ and all the other tokens of supreme dominion, acquired by crushing the lord of all the region of the north.

His dear son was Vijayāditya-Satyāśraya, the favourite of the world, the Great King, the supreme king,—who was flavoured with the quality of impetnosity; who drove back the hands of his enemies; and who possessed the banner of the sword-edge and all the other brilliant tokens of sovereignty which indicate supreme dominion.

While the victorious camp of his dear son, Vikramāditya-Satyāśraya, the favourite of the world, the Great King, the supreme king, the supreme lord, the venerable one,—whose manhood was increasing day by day; who enlarged his dominions by invading the territories of his foes; and the chief flavour of whose heroism was (*like the scent*) of musk and of the Kiśōra plant,—was located at (*the city of*) Raktapura,—six hundred and fifty-six of the Śaka years having expired, the second year of his increasing and victorious reign being current, on the day of the full-moon of (*the month*) Māgha,—having embellished the (*temple called*) Śaṅkhatīrtha-vasati of the city of Pulikara, and having repaired the white Jinālaya (*which was an outbuilding*) of it,—at the request of the merchant Bāhnbali, (*which was made*) for the purpose of increasing the worship of Jina, a field of the measure of half a hundred *nivartanas* by the royal measure, laid

out by the measure of a *gavyūtī*²⁶ to the north of the city and to the south of the (*tank called*) Karpātī-tatāka, was given to Śrī-Vijaya-dēvapāṇḍitāchārya,—who belonged to the (*sect called*) Dēvagaṇa of the lineage of the Mūlasaṅgha; who was the disciple of Rāmadēvāchārya, who performed the most austere penances, and was a very incarnation of holy learning and was free from sorrow; who was the house-pupil²⁷ of Jayadēvapāṇḍita, who overcame those that opposed him in argument; and who had attained singleness of speech and other (*qualities*),—for the purpose of repairing breakages and of making new embellishments and of providing the oblation, and in order to maintain a hall of almsgiving, &c. The boundaries of it are declared:—On the east, some Śamī trees beside a white stone on the south of the 'stone of the Kinnaṛa' already spoken of. On the west, a Śamī tree near a white stone. On the north, the boundary comes back to the 'stone of the Kinnaṛa', already spoken of, from a red stone on the east of the tank already referred to, (*which is reached*) from a slightly blue-black stone.

It is very easy to give one's own property; the preservation of (*the grant of*) another is difficult; (*if the question is*) whether giving or preserving (*is the more meritorious act*), preservation is better than giving! They say that poison is not poison; the property of a god is called poison: poison kills a single person; the property of a god, (*if confiscated, kills*) sons and sons' sons! He is born as a worm in ordure for the duration of sixty thousand years, who confiscates land that has been given, whether by himself or by another!

May the scripture of Jina become famous!

No. XXXIX.

At Vol. I., p. 22, of the Elliot MS. Collection there is given a copy of a stone-tablet inscription of the Western Chalukya Vijayāditya, also from the Śaṅkha-basti temple at Lakshmōswar. I sent for a tracing of this also, with the following results.

The tablet is about 5' 3" high by 2' 1" broad, and contains 87 lines of writing, more or less perfect, in Old Canarese characters of the tenth

²⁵ *Pālī*; the word has various meanings, of which 'the sharp edge of a sword' seems most suitable in such a passage as this.

²⁶ *Gavyūtī*, or *gavyūtī*,—a measure of length = 2000 *danḍas* or 1 *krōśa*, or 4000 *danḍas* or 2 *krōśas*.

²⁷ *Antidvāsin*, 'a pupil who dwells near or in the house of his teacher.'

century A.D. The average number of letters in the line is about fifty-four. I have no information as to whether there are any emblems at the top of the stone. The tracing is not so good as the preceding one, and only a portion of the entire inscription has been copied, and that imperfectly, in the MS. Collection. I am, therefore, unable to edit this tablet, but can give the general contents of it; which must suffice until the original can be examined by some one competent to read it, when the greater part of it can be satisfactorily deciphered. The tablet includes four separate inscriptions, which, from their varying dates and the age of the characters, must have been copied here from previous stone-tablets or copper-plates, for the sake of confirmation or of preservation.

First Part.—There are fragments of twenty lines, and seven lines, 21 to 27, perfect but very indifferently traced, of which I can only make out that it is an early Western Chalukya inscription of one of the Satyâśrayas, other than the first of that name. The name of the individual king, the date, and the details of the grant, are effaced somewhere between l. 14 and l. 20.

Second Part.—Commencing with l. 28 and ending in l. 53 is the Western Chalukya inscription copied in the MS. Collection. It is well preserved, and the whole of it could be edited from the original stone. It carries the genealogy from Polikêśivallabha, i.e. Pulikêśi I., down to Vijayâditya-Satyâśraya, and records that in the thirty-fourth year of his reign, "six centuries and fifty-one of the Śaka years" having expired, on the full-moon of the month Phālguna, while his victorious camp was at the city of Raktapura, he gave the village of Kardama, on the south of the town of Pulikara, to his father's priest Udayadêvapaṇḍita, also called Niravadyapaṇḍita, who was the house-pupil of Śrīpâjyapâda and belonged to the Dêvagaṇa sect of the Mûlasaṃgha lineage, for the benefit of the temple of Śaṅkha-Jinêndra at the city of Pulikara. The date is in ll. 42-4, and reads:—*Ēka-pañchâśad-uttara-shaṭ-chhatêshu Śaka-var-*

shêshv=atîtêshu pravarttamâna-vijaya-râjya-saṃvatsarê chatus-trimśê varttamânê Śrī-Raktapuram=adhivasati vijaya-skandhâvârê Phālgunamâsê paurṇamâsyam. The day of the week is not given.

Third Part.—Commencing in l. 53, and ending with l. 68, is another Gaṅga or Koṅga inscription of king Gaṅga-Kandarpa. Here, again, though the tracing is very indifferent, the original is evidently very well preserved. Like the first part of the preceding inscription, No. XXXVIII., it is dated in the Vibhava-saṃvatsara, "eight centuries of years, in the era of the Śaka kings, and ninety (years), having expired." It records a grant of land at the city of Puligeṛe to the same person as in the first part of No. XXXVIII., Jayadêva, on account of the temple of Śaṅkha-Jinêndra. The date is in ll. 62-3, and reads:—*Śaka-nṛipa-kâl-âtita-saṃvatsara-satêshv=ashtasu navaty-uttarêshu pravarttamânê Vibhava-saṃvatsarê.* The month, the lunar day, and the day of the week, are not given. Undoubtedly it is a grant of the same king who is called Mârasimhadêva in the first part of No. XXXVIII.

Fourth Part.—Commencing with l. 69 is another Western Chalukya inscription. Here, again, the tracing, though very indifferent, shows that lines 69 to 82 are well preserved; below that, there are marks to indicate five lines of which the characters are too faint to be traced. It carries the genealogy from Polikêśivallabha down to Vinayâditya-Satyâśraya, and records a grant made by him to some Âchârya of the Dêvagaṇa sect of the Mûlasaṃgha lineage, on the full-moon of the month Mâgha, in the fifth or the seventh year of his reign, "six centuries and eight of the Śaka years having expired", while his victorious camp was at the city of Raktapura. The date is in ll. 77-8, and reads:—*Ashṭ-ôttara-shaṭ-chhatêshu Śaka-varshêshv=atîtêshu pravartta(?râdha)mâna-vijaya-râjya-pañchama-(? sapta-mâ)-saṃvatsarê Śrī-Rakta-puram=adhivasati vijaya-skandhâvârê Mâgha-mâsê paurṇamâsyam.* Here, again, the day of the week is not given.

NOTE ON THE CUSTOM OF MAHÂPRASÂD IN THE SAMBALPUR DISTRICT,
CENTRAL PROVINCES.¹

BY CAPTAIN W. SAURIN BROOKE, B.S.C., F.R.G.S., BILASPUR, CENTRAL PROVINCES.

MAHÂPRASÂD denotes a boon or favour of the highest degree, and as such conferred by a deity. *Prasâd* is equivalent to anything given by a god, or by a *Gûrû*, and carries with it a blessing. It further signifies the food presented to a god and afterwards distributed to the worshippers. It also denotes the offerings when an idol is consulted. The prefix *Mahâ* ('great') is used to mark especially the *prasâd* of Jagannâth ('the Lord of the Universe'), to whom the great temple at Puri, in Orissa, is consecrated. The food cooked within the holy precincts at Puri, presented to the idol and sold to pilgrims, is familiarly known, not only in Orissa, but throughout India, as *Mahâprasâd*, or 'the great offering.' Hunter's *Orissa* gives a graphic account of this holy food, and mentions the large profits which accrue from its sale.

The general belief among Hindus is that the holiness and purity of the deity is imparted to the food which has been eaten, or 'smelt,' as the expression runs, by Jagannâth, and that by partaking of the *Mahâprasâd* the human soul is sanctified, and becomes in a measure impregnated with the divine essence. This being the conception, it follows that this holy food is much revered; its possession is tantamount to the spiritual and personal presence of the deity; neither putrefaction nor impurities can defile it or alter its virtue. All castes and races of men are alike welcome to the advantages which its use confers. In theory, at least, the purest Brâhman would not disdain to eat it from the hand of a Chamâr. The estimation in which the holy food is held, and the equality of all men which it asserts, present some curious marks of similarity to the highest of all rites in the Christian churches. It is well known that in an area of about five square miles surrounding the temple of Jagannâth at Puri all distinctions of caste are in abeyance within the holy limits. According to one of the *Purâṇas*, men of all nationalities, castes, and creeds may unreservedly eat together of the food which has first been offered to the god. In practice a more exclusive system has grown up. The in-

novation is said to be of recent introduction, and certain races and castes are now recognized as not entitled to the equality which in the case of all others the presence of Jagannâth demands.

It is far from easy to determine how so unique a phase of Hinduism grew up. By some it is set down as a relic of the Buddhism which once prevailed throughout Orissa. Further research would probably show that some ground exists for this explanation. By others, the more cynical view is entertained that it arose from a device of the Brâhman to widen the field from which worshippers are drawn, and with increase of numbers to swell their gains. Be the origin what it may, the loosening, under religious sanction, of the customary rules of Hindu life was probably in its inception based, and is even now maintained, on a noble assertion of the equality of man before God. The wide popularity of the worship of Jagannâth can perhaps only be accounted for by the existence of a deep-rooted feeling of this kind. The sale of the sacred food forms no mean addition to the gains of the temple servitors. Pilgrims from all parts of India purchase and carry it to their homes, where it is consumed, or distributed as a much-prized gift to relatives or friends, and even sold. An oath on the *Mahâprasâd* is considered to be more than ordinarily binding, and seems to be known and common throughout India. This form of sanction is often adopted when a mixed body of men band themselves together with the object of effecting some common purpose. The universally binding character of the oath on the *Mahâprasâd* is thus recognized, it not being believed that a Hindu when so pledged can by any mental reservation evade his self-imposed obligations.

In Orissa, including Sambalpur and the Garjat states, the sacredness of an engagement entered into on the *Mahâprasâd* has given rise to a curious and, from some points of view, a graceful custom. This consists in two persons becoming what is popularly known as *mahâprasâd* one to the other. The tie is one of a close and indissoluble brotherhood. The con-

¹ Reprinted from a Supplement to the Central Provinces Gazette.—Ed.

tracting parties consider themselves, and are thought by others, to have formed an offensive and defensive alliance. The essence of the bond is that in evil report or good report, for weal or woe, the newly created brothers are to stand by each other, and seek each other's welfare. According to the theory, loss or injury should be accepted, rather than by any action to affect adversely the interests of the brother by the sacred food. The basis of the friendship is unequivocally a religious one. Anything done to aid or help forward the aims of the 'brother' is regarded in the light of homage to Jagannâth. Like most things in India, from Fairs to Thagi, the people have, to their own satisfaction, managed to combine the service of 'God and mammon.' Friendships analogous in their features, such as those that derive their sanction from the holy water of the Ganges, the Tulâ leaf, and other sacred objects, are found elsewhere in India; but for the most part they are rather the amusement and interest of women than the business of men, and nowhere do such ties appear to have developed into an institution embracing in its effects both private relations and public affairs. Although I would be the last to urge that an unselfish longing for true friendship, strengthened by a tie held peculiarly sacred, may not often be the motive that impels to the union, its aspects as exhibited to outsiders are strictly utilitarian. There seems now none of the chivalrous spirit which still lights up the *Râkshbandan* custom of Râjputânâ. There the gift of the bracelet makes the recipient first and most important—the champion of the donor's honour and fair name, and the giver, in the highest sense, a sister. However pure the idea out of which the *mahâprasâd* brotherhood grew, the tie is not unfrequently debased to unworthy purposes. An avowedly selfish object in entering into the contract is now the rule rather than the exception. Once formed, the union is supposed to be unseverable, and should be maintained by the interchange of amenities from time to time between the 'brothers.' In practice, however, where some specific purpose was the end sought, this accomplished, the tie is commonly allowed to sink into abeyance.

I have not been able to ascertain that the custom prevails elsewhere in India, except in Lower Bengal, where it is said to occur, though

rarely. In Sambalpur it is so common and so widely spread as to engage attention from an administrative point of view. On taking charge of the district, the recurrence of the word *mahâprasâd* in official documents struck me. I was warned that one person could not be trusted in relation to some one else, because he was his *mahâprasâd*. In cases before the courts the evidence of witnesses is almost daily objected to and discredited, on the score that they are *mahâprasâds* of the persons in whose favour they are deposing. The most experienced native officials have assured me that the uncorroborated testimony of a known *mahâprasâd* must at least be looked on with suspicion. Unfortunately no individual is restricted in the number of his *mahâprasâds*; men of wealth or influence have many, and, as might be expected, native Government officials, from their position, are eagerly desired. Rumour also says that the tie is bought and sold. Instances are known of the connexion being established on the eve of a trial, to secure the neutralization of hostile evidence. Practically, then, in the daily life of the people the custom has almost come to assume the character of a business arrangement. Some warrant for this may be found in the well-known couplet—

“*Sura nara muni ki yahi riti
Svartha lage kâren saba priti,*”

which, freely translated, might run—

“Gods, men and sages to this assent,
That all love and friendship for private
ends is meant.”

In addition to purposes less excusable, the tie is often utilized for more legitimate ends, such as to make up a long-standing quarrel, or to borrow money. In the latter case the lender feels that a loan to the *mahâprasâd* has a security which an ordinary transaction would not offer. When means are available, such an application is seldom refused.

The development of the *mahâprasâd* tie as visible in Sambalpur is far from healthy, and unquestionably, in many points of view, has a pernicious effect on the habits of the people. It adds to the difficulties of the courts by contributing another to the many under-currents, the force and strength of which are difficult to stem or to gauge. The indigenous native officials seem peculiarly imbued with a lust for this sacred friendship; and it may be questioned if

among them there is a single individual whose *mahāprasāda* are not in a measure proportionate to his position and standing in the Government service. The ceremonies observed when the tie is contracted are sufficiently simple. When the position of the parties warrants it, the occasion is recognized as one of rejoicing; guests are invited, and often comparatively large sums of money are spent in largesse, gifts to Brāhmanas, and costly presents are exchanged between the *mahāprasāda*. It does not appear that any ritual or religious ceremonies are prescribed as necessary to the occasion. When two persons agree to 'sit in *mahāprasād*,' as it is called, they bathe, and the Vedic rite of *Kāśa pūjā* may or may not be performed. The parties then sit opposite one another; one holding in his joined palms a portion of the holy food drops it into the hands of the other, held below to receive it; the position of the hands is then reversed, and the first holder now receives the food from the second. This is done seven times; each person then eats a small portion of the *mahāprasād*. The new-made brothers embrace, and the ceremony is complete. The operation of passing the *mahāprasād* from the hands of one to the other is accompanied by appropriate expressions, such as 'I throw myself upon you,' 'I seek protection from you,' 'I abandon all cause of quarrel,' 'I will never cause you any harm,' 'I will aid you,' &c. &c. Even this amount of ceremony is clearly not essential to the due contraction of the tie. The commoner form is for each party to eat in company a small portion of the sacred food, and then and there each to acknowledge the other as his *mahāprasād*. The necessary condition underlying the bond is faith in the great Jagannāth, and acceptance of his presence as manifested in the

sacred food. It is said that on occasions Muhammadans have not scrupled to contract the obligation with Hindus. However repugnant to a true follower of Islām such a profession of belief in the great idol at Puri may be, in Sambalpur, and probably throughout Orissa, the bulk of the Muhammadans are strongly imbued with the spirit of Hinduism. Unconsciously perhaps, but none the less certainly, the mind often takes up much of the colour of its surroundings, and a latent belief may redeem the obligation from the grossness of open perjury. It is related that, in times gone by, a European lady, in anxiety about the health of one dear to her, was induced to propitiate Samlāi, the blood-loving goddess, at Sambalpur.

When the tie is once formed the parties cease to mention each other's names, using instead the title *mahāprasād*. Similarly the parents and relations are called *mītra bāpa*, *mītra mā*, &c.,—'friend's father,' 'friend's mother,' &c.,—and the kinsmen of each are supposed to stand in the same relation to the newly constituted brother. The connexion thus formed is said in some instances to have continued to unite families for more than one generation. Blood relations and persons of the same name are by usage debarred from contracting this friendship. On the death of a *mahāprasād* the family of the survivor not unfrequently mourn as for a relative.

Such is a brief view of this curious custom. Much may yet remain to reward inquirers more competent and with greater opportunities. As it affects public business it is doubtless of some importance, while if in describing it any light has been thrown on the inner life and feelings of the people, the sketch may in that measure be not altogether wanting in instruction.

TRADITIONARY ACCOUNT OF KĀLIDĀSA.

BY THE LATE RĀVAJĪ VĀSUDEVA TULLU, M.A., LL.B.

What little can be gleaned from popular or traditionary accounts of Kālidāsa cannot fail to interest, however inaccurate or scanty the sources of our information. For this reason, I give the following traditionary account:—

Kālidāsa was born a Brāhman, and was left an orphan by the sudden death of both his parents, when he was scarcely six months

old. In this helpless condition, he was seen by a cowherd, who brought him up as a member of his family till he was eighteen years of age. The natural beauty and delicate make of his person, distinguished him from the rest of the family, as one presumably born of superior lineage. But having had no education he was little better than the illiterate class of people among whom he was brought up.

Now the king of the country had a daughter¹ who was the most beautiful and accomplished lady of the age. Having arrived at years of discretion, she would accept no one as her husband who was not versed in all the arts and sciences. Such a man could not be found. And several kings and princes that came to ask her hand had to return disappointed, much against the will of her father, who had proposed them one after another for her choice. Thus the king got tired, and resorted to his minister for advice. The minister² said, "Your highness's daughter is impetuous and self-willed; as she has already refused so many persons, who have been proposed for her, I feel sure she is destined to be married to an idiot. If your highness permits, I will practise my art and find out a person who would suit her." The king consented, and the minister while sitting upon his terrace, saw a beautiful man in a cowherd's attire, returning home from the woods with his cows. He beckoned to him, and the man accordingly went to him. The minister was glad to see that he had lighted on the object of his search, and next day reported the event to the king, who was glad to hear it. It was afterwards communicated to the princess that a learned Brāhmaṇ had come from Bāṇās to court her, and that he had numerous pupils and followers equally learned with himself. With her permission, the new Brāhmaṇ, the minister's protégé, was brought to the palace richly dressed with a number of pupils and followers. These last were examined by the paṇḍits of the court, and were found to be invincible in their arguments. Thus the princess was deceived, and fixed her choice upon the handsome youth, who was quite illiterate. The marriage was accordingly solemnized, but, not long after, the princess discovered her mistake. Then with a sword she threatened to kill him, if he did not reveal to her the truth. This was soon told, and the bridegroom felt ashamed of his total ignorance and utter inequality with the accomplished princess. The princess was a favourite devotee of the goddess Kālī, and at her advice he proceeded to the temple of that deity, worshipped her with devotion, and ultimately promised to make an offer-

ing to her of his own head if she did not vouchsafe to bestow upon him the gift of learning. The goddess Kālī took pity on the worshipper and his bride, and marked upon his tongue the letters बीजाक्षरणि, which endowed him with a ready wit in speaking and versifying. Hereafter the young Brāhmaṇ became known to the world as Kālidāsa, or 'the devotee of Kālī,' and his original name became lost.³

Kālidāsa, with his new gift of learning, returned to the princess, who was almost in raptures at seeing her husband thus endowed. Kālidāsa also felt conscious of the great change in himself, and ascribed it all to the princess, to whom he felt very grateful for her advice, and even threats. Henceforth he regarded her as his mother and preceptor, and vowed to treat her as such. The princess grew wroth at this, and cursed him by saying, "Thou shalt meet thy death at the hands of a woman." Henceforth Kālidāsa led a single life, although it is said, he spent a great deal of his time in the company of courtezans and persons of low degree. It was here he enjoyed those pleasures he so vividly describes in his poems, and more especially in his *Ritu Samhāra* and *Śrīngāra-tīlaka*.

With reference to the 199th verse in the first book of the *Panchatantra* (Calcutta edition), it is said that Bhavabhūti, who led an ascetic life, passing by the house of a courtesan, happened to say the first half—

मधु तिष्ठति वाचि योषितां हृदि हालाहलमेव केवलम्
Kālidāsa, who was just then inside, very wittily completed the verse, saying

अतएव निषीयते ऽधरो हृदयं मुष्टिभिरेव ताडयते

With reference to verse 17 of the *Śrīngāra-tīlaka* the following is a traditionary account:—Once upon a time it happened that king Bhoja uttered the line:—

कुसुमे कुसुमोत्पत्तिः भ्रूयते न तु दृश्यते

and asked if any of his paṇḍits could complete the verse. None in the court could do it, as Kālidāsa had for some reason concealed himself in the house of his mistress, and was absent from court. A large reward was offered to any one who should complete it. Kālidāsa

¹ Vāsantī, the daughter of Bhīmasakla, king of Vārāṇasī: *Ind. Ant.* vol. IV. p. 103.—Ed.

² Vararuchi—*ut sup.*

³ This is substantially the same account as is transmitted

by Tārānātha, given in *Ind. Ant.* vol. IV. pp. 103, 104, and conf. p. 363; also vol. I. p. 245; vol. III. pp. 24, 31; vol. IV. p. 84.—Ed.

heard this, but, not choosing to discover himself in public, merely wrote on a wall the other half—

बाले तव मुखाम्भोजे कथमिदीवरद्वयम्.

His mistress read the complete verse, and wishing to appropriate the prize to herself, and to gain the credit of having completed the verse, was tempted to kill her lover, thus fulfilling the curse pronounced upon Kālidāsa by the princess.

Kālidāsa was a great traveller, as appears from his correct knowledge of places* as described in his poem of the *Megha-dūta*. Once it happened that Kālidāsa, Bhavabhūti, and Daṇḍin travelled together on a pilgrimage to Śrī-Raṅgapurī, near Trichināpalli, to see the shrine of Śrī Rāṅganātha, or Viṣṇu lying on Śeṣha. Each of them composed in honour of the deity a verse characteristic of his own peculiar style :—

Kālidāsa :—ऐंद्रो पाटलयत्यलक्तकरूचामंघ्रिनिषामकुरैः

आशा मौलिकिरीटरत्ननिकरैः पाशायुधीयामपि

पर्यङ्के पवमाननूलभरिते पारे कवेरात्मजम्

मुद्रा काचन युक्तिदानकुशला निद्राति जागति वा.

Bhavabhūti :—वक्षःपीठे किमपि रचयन्वारिधेर्विशारत्नम्
नामौ कुर्वन्निखिलजगतीनाटिकासूत्रधारम्
तल्पे तादृक्प्रदपरिमला सारगर्भेधिरङ्गम्
निद्रा मुद्रा रसमभिनयजीलिमा कक्षिदिन्धे.

Daṇḍin :—काव्या काचन कालमेघसुषुमाकळोलसद्भापिनी
पाथोराशितपःफलेन महसा कैनापि भूषावती
रंगे तुंगमुज्जंगपुंगववपुः पर्यङ्कमासेदुषी
निद्रा मुद्रितलोचना विजयते मुद्रा मुरद्रोहिणी.

On another occasion, a learned paṇḍit named Damaruka, came to the court of the king, and challenged the paṇḍits to complete a verse, the first line of which was—

अंभोधिजैलधिः पर्योधिरुदधिवारानिधिवारिधिः

None could do it but Kālidāsa, who added the following lines :—

अवा कुप्यति तात मूर्ध्नि विधृता गंगेयमुत्सृज्यताम्
विद्वन्पण्डित संततं मयि रता तस्या गतिः का वद ।
कोपाद्योपवशाद्विद्वद्भवदनः प्रस्युसरं दत्तवान् ॥

Such is the account of Kālidāsa handed down by guru-parāśara, i.e. by a line of preceptors to pupils, and generally current in Mhaisur (Mysore). I am indebted for it to Paṇḍit Rāmānujāchārya, Sanskrit Teacher in the Indor High School, who had it from his preceptor, the late Sajja-yāchārya, the well-known rhetorician of Mysore.⁵

FATHER THOMAS ESTEVAO, S.J.

BY F. M. MASCARENHAS.

According to Father Francis de Sousa, S.J. (*Oriente Conquistado*, tom. II. p. 29), Father Estevaō (Stephens, or Stevens) was a native of London, and according to the Rev. Theodre Hauser, S.J. (*Bombay Catholic Examiner*, No. 43, 1875), Father Estevaō was born in Wiltshire. His father, Thomas Stevens, was a London merchant, and sent him for his studies to New College, Oxford. In the year 1575 he was in the noviciate of the Society of Jesus at St. Andrew's in Rome, where he spent four years; during the two last he was most probably engaged in the study of philosophy. F. Estevaō was sent to Goa, which he reached on the 24th October 1579. "Thomas Stephens," says the Rev. Philip Anderson (*History of the Settlement of the English in Western India*, pp. 6, 7), "is the first Englishman of whom we are sure that he visited the western shores of India. When there he was only known as a Jesuit, but he had been originally educated at New

College, Oxford. On the 4th April 1579 he sailed from Lisbon, and the following October reached Goa, where he lived many years. A letter which he wrote to his father, a London merchant, soon after his arrival, is printed in Hakluyt's *Collection of Voyages*. It contains not only a particular and interesting description of his perilous navigation round the Cape, but many sage remarks are made in quite a mercantile spirit on the state of Portuguese trade, of which he evidently desires that his countrymen should obtain a share. The reader is surprised to find a Roman ecclesiastic entering with such eagerness and penetration into commercial affairs. Probably Stephens' advices were the strongest inducements which London merchants had been offered to embark in Indian speculations, and certainly they began from this period to fit out expeditions for the East." "The narrative of his travels," says Dr. Pope (*Text-Book of Indian History*, p. 244), "excited

* Conf. Monier Williams, *Wisdom of the Hindus*, p. 361, note.—Ed.

⁵ Lassen and Monier Williams place Kālidāsa in the third century A.D., Weber in the third or sixth, and Dr. Bhau

Dāji in the sixth. See M. Williams, *Wisdom of the Hindus*, pp. 474, 475, add Conf. *Trans. Internat. Cong. Orient.* 1874, p. 254; *Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc.* vol. VI. pp. 19, 207; Lassen, *Alterth* II. 1157 (or 2nd ed. 1170).—Ed.

immense interest in England." Mill (*History of India*, vol. I. p. 12) says that Stephens wrote an account of his voyage, which was read with avidity, and contributed to swell the general current of enterprise which now ran so vehemently towards India (Harris's *Voyages*, vol. I. p. 875). Murray (*British India*, vol. I. p. 151) states that Stevens sent home a most favourable report of the fertility of the region in which Goa was placed, the opportunities it afforded for trade, and the liberality with which the port was opened to vessels of every nation. Father Estevaõ is the only Jesuit who ever worked in the missions of India before the suppression of the Society. He represented his nation worthily, as well by his zeal as by his learning and obliging manners.

According to Anderson (p. 7), (Francis) Pyrrard de Laval, who was a prisoner at Goa in 1608, states that Stephens was then rector of a college (of Rachol) in Salsette—by which he probably means the province of that name in the Goanese territory. The English Jesuit was a kind-hearted and true friend in need to several of his countrymen, who within the space of a few years found their way to India." (*Histoire Générale des Voyages*, par C. A. Walckenaer—Hakluyt's *Voyages*.) Two English travellers, John Newbery and Ralph Fitch, were intimately acquainted with F. Stephens and received many favours from him during their stay at Goa. Their letters are dated 20th and 25th January 1584. John Hugh van Linschoten (born 1553 and died 1633), a Dutch traveller, who was a page to the Archbishop of Goa, D. F. Vicente de Fonseca, and came out with his Grace in 1583, praises very much the kindness of F. Stephens. Amongst the missionaries of those days he was one of the most distinguished, and a chief means of converting the island of Salsette, near Goa. His thorough knowledge of the Konkani language, joined to a great zeal for the salvation of souls, fitted him best for the mission of Salsette, which was considered the most difficult the Society had up to that time undertaken in any part of the world. Father Stephens must have been still young when he reached Goa, and apparently a scholastic only. He spent forty years on the mission of Goa, as Mulbauer remarks (*Geschichte der Indischen Missionen*, referring to the History of the Society by Orlandini). Father Stephens died in the year 1619, probably at Rachol, and must have reached a good age; "for if," says Father Hauser, "we suppose him to have been at least twenty-five years of age when he came to India, he was about sixty-five or about seventy years when he died." The following works were published by this English Jesuit:—




1. *Arte da Lingua Canarim*: Art of the Kanarese (i.e. Konkani) Language, by Father Thomas Estevaõ. Printed in the College of St. Ignatius at Rachol, in Goa, in 1640, with additions by Father Diego Ribeiro, S.J., and four other Priests of the same Society. Only two copies of the original edition are known to exist.



2. *Doutrina Christãa em Lingua Brahmana-Canarim* (i.e. Konkani), *ordenada a maneira de dialogo para ensinar os meninos*. Rachol, Svo. Christian Doctrine in Brâhman-Kanarese Language, arranged in dialogues to teach children. Svo, Rachol. This Catechism is a translation of that of Father Marcos Jorge, commonly known under the name of its improver, Father Master Ignacio Martins.


3. *Discurso sobre a Vinda de Jesus Christo nosso Salvador ao Mundo, dividido em dous Tratados, pelo Padre Thomas Estevaõ, Inglez, da Companhia de Jesus*: Discourse on the Coming of Jesus Christ our Saviour into the World, divided into two treatises, by Father Thomas Estevaõ, of the Society of Jesus, an Englishman. This famous book of religious instruction is a selection from the Bible. It is entitled a *Purdna*, and is an abridgment of the books, accompanied by explanatory remarks and a good account of the mysteries of the incarnation, passion, and resurrection of our Saviour. Father Thomas Estevaõ wrote his work in 1614. It was afterwards revised, in 1647, by Father Fr. Gaspar of St. Miguel, of the Order of St. Francis of Assisi. The work was printed in 1626, 1649, and 1654. In Kanara there are only a few manuscripts, of 1000 pages in folio, and it is understood by those who know the Marâthi or higher dialect of the Konkani language, in which it is written. The work was dedicated to D. Fr. Christovaõ de Sa e Lisboa, Archbishop of Goa and Primate of the East, on the 29th April 1616. All the three editions of this excellent work were approved by the ecclesiastical authorities at Goa. Father Francisco Vieira, Provincial of the Society of Jesus at Goa, approved it on the 22nd June 1615. It is divided into two treatises or *purdnas*, the first of which contains licenses, dedication, introduction, and 36 cantos. The second treatise, divided into four parts, contains 59 cantos. The whole of the work has 11,018 strophes, 4296 of which belong to the first *purdna*, and 6722 to the second. Father Pascoal Gomes de Faria, Priest of the Order and Habit of St. Peter, a native of Bathim, in the parish of N. Sra. de Guadalupe, of the island of Goa, added in the year 1722 two hundred and thirty-seven strophes to cantos 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, and 51 of the second treatise (see *Ensaio Historico da Lingua Concani*, pp. 119-120, por Senhor J. H. da Cunha Rivara).

MISCELLANEA.

THE HISSARLIK RELICS—THE SPASTIKA.¹

As the relative antiquity of the objects found at Hissarlik by Dr. Schliemann, and now exhibited at South Kensington, is under discussion, allow me to point out what is the origin and date, as I believe, of the Greek archaic cross, which so frequently occurs in the pottery found at Hissarlik, and its distinction from the Buddhist *Svastika* or Aryan symbol, so called, with which Dr. Schliemann appears to connect it. The Greek archaic cross  appears to me to be evidently derived from the punch-mark on early Greek coins. The punch-mark was originally composed of four small squares, , the centre assuming the form of a cross, but in the stamping of the coin the squares went a little on one side, and made the punch-mark take the shape of the archaic cross . In this manner it is found on the coins of Chalcedon and Cyzicus, and on early coins of Syracuse the archaic cross appears in a more definite form. This form was thence adopted as an ornamental device on early Greek pottery, as we see it on that of Athens, Samos, Cyprus, and Hissarlik.

The Buddhist *Svastika* is a monogram. According to General Cunningham, it is composed of two Pāli characters  *su*, and  *ti*, or *suti*, which is the Pāli form of the Sanskrit *Svasti*, which means 'it is well.' It is a symbol of resignation among the Buddhists. The *svastika* is almost

invariably, according to Mr. Beal, the reverse of the Greek archaic cross, thus .

The dates of the two crosses are also very different. The Greek archaic cross is found on Greek coins and pottery of the seventh century B.C., while the Buddhist symbol, the *Svastika*, cannot be earlier than the sixth century B.C., as Buddha died about 540 B.C.

At page 103 of Dr. Schliemann's work on Troy, he gives Burnouf's explanation of the origin of the *Svastika*. There is every reason to doubt his explanation; the very meaning he assigns to it, *eu éortē*, 'it is well,' shows that General Cunningham is correct in deriving it from the two Pāli characters *su*, *ti*, 'it is well,' and that it is a Buddhist symbol of a date not earlier than the sixth century B.C.

At p. 102 Dr. Schliemann tells us that the Rev. W. Brown Keer assured him that he had seen the *Svastika* innumerable times in the most ancient Hindu temples, and especially in those of Jains. According to Mr. Fergusson, the mean date of the earliest Buddhist monuments is 250 B.C., while the date of the oldest known Hindu monument cannot be carried further back than the sixth or seventh century of our era, and the oldest Jaina monument may be of the tenth century. Mr. B. Keer's assurance is, therefore, of no value with regard to the antiquity of the *Svastika* in India. HÖDDER M. WESTROPP.

BOOK NOTICES.

1. L'ISLAMISME d'après le Coran, l'enseignement doctrinal et la pratique. Par Garcin de Tassy, Membre de l'Institut, Prof. à l'école spéciale des langues Orientales vivantes. 3me ed. 8vo, 412 pp. (Paris: Maisonneuve et Cie. 1874.)
2. ISLAM and its FOUNDER, by J. W. H. Stobart, B.A., Principal, La Martinière College, Lucknow. 12mo, 254pp. (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1877.)

The first of these works is by a well-known veteran in Oriental scholarship, and contains four short treatises. The first, on the doctrines and duties of the Musulmán religion, is preceded by a collection of the texts from the Bible which the

Musulmán doctors regard as having reference to Muhammad and his mission. Their interpretations are of course forced in the extreme: thus, the "twelve princes" in *Gen.* xvii. 20 they make the "twelve imáms;" "their brethren" in *Deut.* xviii. 18, the descendants of Ishmael the brother of Isaac; "Parán" in *Deut.* xxxiii. 2 and *Habak.* iii. 3, being the generic name of the mountains round Makka, they hold that the revelation of the *Korán* is referred to, and that the Gospel was given from 'Mount Seir'; in *Isaiah* xxi. 6, 7, they make the man in the chariot drawn by asses to be Christ, him drawn by camels Muhammad; in *John* xiv.

Jaina works, is, as Mr. Beal had noted, the reverse of the old Greek cross; but there is no sufficient reason for supposing that it was first invented or introduced by the Buddhists. It is probably of far older date than the time of Buddha: it was one of the chief of the *mangalyalakshana*, or marks on his feet (Hardy, *Manual of Buddhism*, p. 367). Conf. *Ind. Ant.* vol. IV. pp. 75, 303; Burnouf, *Letres de la Bonne Loi*, p. 625; Fergusson, *Tree and Serpent Worship*, p. 246.—Ed.

¹ From the *Athenæum*, Jan. 12, 1878.

² *Bhilsa Topes*, p. 356. *Svasti* in the Vedas means 'welfare, prosperity,' &c.; its later sense is nearly the same—'happiness, bliss,' &c.; *Svastidevi* is the mythological wife of *Váyu*. Among the Jains, the *Svastika* is one of the twenty-four auspicious marks, and is the *chihna* or cognizance of *Suparāva*, their seventh Tirthankara of the present cycle (see *Ind. Ant.* vol. II. p. 135). The symbol in the oldest Buddha inscriptions, as well as in

16 and xv. 26, they change *παράκλητος* into *περικλυτός*; and apply it to Muhammad, as they make him also 'the last' who 'shall be first' in *Matt.* xx. 9, 10, 16. The other texts referred to him are—*Isaiah* xlii. 1, 7, 17, &c.; lxi. 1, 6, &c.; *Dan.* vi. 13, 14; *John* xxi. 7, 13, &c.; and *Rev.* vi. 4.

The teaching and duties are presented in a series of quotations from the Korân, classified under various heads, such as God, Angels, Inspired Books, The Gospel, the Korân, Jesus Christ, Muhammad, The worship of one God, Social Duties, Infidels, Unbelievers, Purgatory, Hell, Paradise, Prayers, &c. &c. It is evident that in such an arbitrary arrangement there is a danger of representing the religion under an aspect which is not strictly a correct one; it is apt to bring into strong prominence, for example, the ethical teaching of scattered and incidental precepts, while, unless the classification were far more comprehensive than M. de Tassy has attempted to make it, many ethically important features, such as the position of woman, slavery, the discipline of the heart and will, private virtues, &c., may be left out. Yet this treatment has its uses, as it brings together all that is said in the Korân on each of a number of important topics, from which we can at once judge of the character of its teaching respecting each individually, and, as the arrangement is pretty exhaustive of the contents of the book, we see at once the areas that it leaves entirely blank.

The *second* treatise is a translation of the Turkish *Riçâl-i Berkevi*, a religious catechism written in the sixteenth century, treating chiefly of dogma and morality, but mixed with minute details on ablutions and rules respecting prayers. The *third* section is a Sunni Euchology, translated from the *Hidayat-ul Islâm*, which is known in India both in an Arabic and a Persian version, and contains most of the prayers in use, the Suras from the Korân employed in prayer, the *Fatihas*, and special prayers used in the pilgrimages to Makka and Medinah. The *fourth* and last division of the volume is a memoir on the special features of the Muhammadan religion in India, drawn from Hindustani works, and gives a pretty full account of the feasts and principal saints of the Indian Musulmans. M. de Tassy has given us an interesting, instructive, and valuable addition to the literature of the subject, though, like most books written by those who know Muhammadanism only from its literature, the author, by dwelling principally on its better features, gives a more favourable view of it than it really deserves.

The small volume by Mr. Stobart is an excellent handbook, at once popular in its style and ac-

curate in its condensed details of facts. It opens with a brief but clear outline of the Geography, Early History, Ethnology, and Religion of the Arabian Peninsula; then the bulk of the book is devoted to the life and teaching of the "Prophet;" and this is followed by a chapter on Islâm, and another on its spread, after which the author sums up briefly and honestly on some of those features which more forcibly strike a Western observer. It is not intended as a work of original research, but the author has selected and employed the most trustworthy European authors on the subject, and by confining himself chiefly to a narrative of facts, has produced a volume full of information, and the best introduction to a knowledge of Islâm and its founder that we know of.

"However much, under the then degraded condition of Arabia," he remarks, "the code of Mahomet was a gift of value, and however much it may have succeeded in banishing those fiercer vices which naturally accompany ignorance and barbarism, still can it be forgotten at how dear a price the boon was acquired? In the place of temporary and remediable evils . . . the nation was delivered captive to the guidance of an unchangeable law, which, whatever the excellence of some of its precepts, poisons domestic life, stifles honest inquiry, crushes the right of private judgment, has hitherto been found, and is essentially, incompatible with constitutional freedom, and has been followed by that train of national degradation and evil which the story of the past and the example of the present show to be the constant, and it would seem the inevitable, attendants wherever Islam holds sway. History, indeed, but too truly records that the faith of Mahomet is altogether powerless to ennoble or to regenerate a nation. The partial and specious reforms which it may effect are vitiated by the fact that they serve to exclude the highest; and as the inner life of families, the whole tone of society, and the intellectual and moral standard of a people depend on the principles diffused by the ruling religion, it seems, from past experience, hopeless to expect that Islam will ever cease to be what it has hitherto proved, the most formidable obstacle to the dawn of a progressive and enlightened civilization."

The book is one of a series published by the Christian Knowledge Society on "Non-Christian Religious Systems," is illustrated by a map—showing the limits of the Muhammadan empire at its greatest extent under the early Khalifs in the 8th century, the present limits of the empire, and the spread of the religion, and has an excellent index, fitting it for easy reference.



SEAL OF THE EASTERN CHALUKYA GRANT
OF AMMARAJA II. WITHOUT DATE.

Fig. 1. Shaft at Bijapur.





Fig. 2. Composite Bracket-radiating arches.



HINDU AND JAINA REMAINS IN BIJÂPUR AND THE NEIGHBOURHOOD.

BY W. F. SINCLAIR, Bc. C.S.

IT must serve for excuse for the extreme roughness of the following notes that they are derived from such observations as could be made in the scanty leisure of a Famine Officer. Apology would seem almost as much required for meddling at all with a region which has already been in such hands as those of Colonel Meadows Taylor, Messrs. Fergusson, Fleet, and Śaṅkara Pāṇḍurang Pandit, but the fact is that the attention of the two former gentlemen has been chiefly attracted by the magnificent works of the Âdil Shâhi kings, while the two latter have been busied rather with inscriptions than with architecture. I hope, therefore, that I may be able at least to indicate the materials for a new and interesting chapter in the architectural history of the Dekhan.

It seems certain, from the number and variety of the remains, that the site or neighbourhood of modern Bijâpur was occupied, before the Muhammadan invasion, by a group of temples of considerable size and beauty; and that one, at least, was of high antiquity will be proved, I think, by the description of the first fragment which I have to notice. This is the shaft of a column lying outside the east gate of the citadel, nearly opposite the old Kotwâl Chauri. It is 3 feet square throughout, and 14 feet long, besides a basal tenon of 9 inches. Of this great mass 11 feet 10 inches and the tenon are in one block. Just above the moulding this is so finely united to another length of 2 feet 2 inches that the point of a hunting-knife can hardly be got into the joint; and in fact the shaft has hitherto enjoyed the reputation of a monolith.

The moulding, as will be seen from the accompanying sketch, is of a festooned pattern common to the caves of Bâdâmi and the Durga Dewal, at Aihole, only sixty-five miles away. The square massiveness of the pillar agrees with this indication; and, so far as one is justified in assigning a date to a solitary fragment, I must conclude that this pillar belonged to a building nearly contemporary with the Durga Deval—that is, certainly not later than the 7th century. It may be added that the upper end is finished with an ornamental bevel showing the distinctive double flexure of the Drâviḍian cornice; from which it is permissible to conjecture that

this form may have been used in the building, or at least that it was known to the artist as a structural device. There is also in this end a deep and wide square mortice-hole, showing that the pillar was meant to support some ponderous stone superstructure. Had it been, as has been imagined, a mere pillar of illumination (*dipmāla*), or a *lât* supporting a single figure, I should have expected a narrower hole; but at any rate I know of no *lât*, *dipmāla*, or Jaina shrine-pillar having the square and massive form of this shaft, nor do I believe that any Indian architect would have used so unsuitable a form for that purpose.

Close to this pillar stands a slightly ornamented base, generally supposed to belong to it. In proportions it is indeed suitable, being 38 inches square and 44 deep to as far as I could excavate,—probably, from the proportions, 8 or 10 more below this. Examination, however, shows on its upper surface the mark, not of such a shaft as I have described, but of an octagonal drum of 13½ inches to the side; which, after some search, I found built into a guard-house platform belonging to the inner gate of the citadel, about fifty yards off, and which, I am tolerably certain, belongs to a Chālukya building of the 11th or 12th century, which I shall have occasion to notice further on. It is indeed, not only possible, but probable, that the building, of which the great prostrate shaft is now the sole remnant, served as a quarry to the Chālukya architects; but, if so, they completely re-wrought the materials.

Their successors, however,—the earliest Muslimān invaders,—were less industrious, and erected in the citadel of Bijâpur three buildings composed as far as possible of the fragments of Hindu temples. The first of these is a small colonnade, probably meant for a guard-house, or shelter for witnesses, petitioners, and other loiterers about the citadel. It requires no further individual notice, but must be understood as included in the scope of remarks touching these appropriated materials as a whole.

The second was certainly the *corps de garde* of the main gate of the citadel. It consists of two or three arcaded chambers and verandahs, in some of which fragments of ancient Hindu

pillars support arches, while others are utilized in the trabeate Hindu style. The former method suggests what might have happened here, had it not been for the importation of a purely arcuate masonry style by the Western Aḍi Śhāhi dynasty and their foreign followers. Similar adaptations occur at one or two other places in the district, notably at Dhôlkher, on the Bhîma; but the general question can be more fitly discussed at the close of this article. This guard-house contains no less than four inscriptions in the Halle Kânaḍi, or old Kanarese character, all incised on the suprabases of columns. "The oldest inhabitant" assured me that all four had been copied for Sir Bartle Frere. Two of them are mentioned in the Architectural Committee's account of Bijāpur (p. 65)—one as recording that Mula Devara Chālukya made a grant to a temple of Narasiṅha in Śālivāhana Śake 1114 (A.D. 1192), and one to the same purport of "Śaṅkarapa Daṇḍa Nāyaka, minister to Nārāyaṇa Yadava," Ś. Ś. 1162 (A.D. 1240). I am not myself sufficiently learned in Kanarese (had even the terrible exigencies of the public service at the time of my stay in Bijāpur allowed the time) to attempt a translation on my own account, but I believe that they have attracted the attention of Messrs. Fleet and Śaṅkara Pāṇḍurang Paṇḍit, and a photograph of part of one (all I could get done) was taken. The octagonal drum of a great pillar, mentioned above as belonging to a base still standing outside this gate, is built into a platform of this *corps de garde*, on the north side of the entrance.

The third building is that known now as 'the Jaina temple,' lying between the inner citadel and the remains just described. The epithet has probably been derived from the local habit of referring all ancient buildings to 'the Jainas,' of whom, I may here remark, I found no trace whatever in the city of Bijāpur, though their remains are not uncommon in the neighbourhood. I did at one time imagine that a stone now standing outside the Juma' Masjid might have been the capital of a Jaina columnar shrine, but was subsequently obliged to admit that it must have been part of a fountain still existing within the mosque. The building now referred to has been unfortunate in its historians; for the compilers of the official volume on Bijāpur photographed it from two

different points of view, and described it as two separate buildings, viz. as a Hindu Aḡrahāra and as a Musulmān mosque (pp. 65-66). The latter is the correct designation. It consists of a rectangular courtyard, flanked right and left by blank walls, faced by a pillared façade, and having at the rear or western side a pillared wall with *mīhrāb*, or azimuth niche, and *mimbar*, or pulpit. There are fragmentary inscriptions in the Persian, Nāgari, and Kanarese characters. The Government Reporters mention the second only (or condense the whole, for they are not explicit), as expressing that in Śālivāhana Śake 1242 Mālik Karim u'd-dīn Khān built the mosque,—Revaya, carpenter of Salhaodage (probably Salotgi, tālukā Indī), being the architect. In the Persian inscription I made out the name of the Mālik in the Persian, but read it, with such assistance as I could get, "Karim u'd-daulah Khān." The point is not important; and I hope that the inscriptions, which are very rough, will ere long receive the attention of a more competent and less hampered interpreter. The hall has a trabeate stone roof covered with concrete, and a covered skylight bearing exactly the same relation to the large central compartments of Chalukya temples as the dome of a typical mosque at Ahmadābād does to the central domed compartment of a great Jaina porch. How any one could ever have taken it for aught but a mosque,—even desecrated, ruined, and encumbered with vegetation as it is—passes my comprehension. Besides these three buildings there are fragments of Hindu sculpture lying all about the city and citadel; the most notable are some broken pillars (one apparently part of a *lāt* or *dīpmāla*) lying in a corner of the Ashar Mu-bārak palace, where now is the shrine of 'the Prophet's beard.' There is a fragment of a frieze or pediment—course of elephants—built into the revetment of the inner citadel ditch; and two small stone elephants, similar to those shown in Mr. Fergusson's plate of the Temples at Somanāthpur (*Indian and Eastern Architecture*, p. 394), still survive, though mutilated. One was, in July last, lying opposite the door of Karim u'd-din's mosque. The other has been set up in a modern temple of Dattātre (the Hindu Triad), between the inner and outer ditches of the citadel, where it occupies a position similar to that of the bull Nandi in Śaiva temples.

In the whole body of remains the traces of

three distinct large buildings can be made out. The first was that of the 7th century, or thereabouts, of which nothing is now left to us but the one great shaft already described. The second was—if the inscriptions read by the (Government Reporters were identical, as I suppose, with two of my four—a temple of Narasinha, the Man-Lion incarnation of Vishnu, built probably in the 12th century, of the same dark basalt as its predecessor—very likely on its site and of its remains. It was certainly Chalukya in style, adorned with courses of figures, windows of stone tracery in geometrical and foliage patterns (I found none into which figures had been introduced), and standing on a plinth about two feet high, with small free-standing elephants at the corners. In short, the best idea of it can be obtained from the woodcut already quoted in Mr. Fergusson's work, or from the volume by the Architectural Committee of Western India upon Dhârward and Maisur, where the Chalukya style has now its best representatives. It may be added that the mixture of Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava emblems throughout the fragments of this temple (sometimes together on one column) shows a very different feeling between these two Hindu sects to that now existing in the same country, though the total absence of Jaina emblems in such a large collection of remains would lead us to infer that the *entente cordiale* did not extend to this religion; and, finally, that the work of decorating the temple was probably still in progress when the Musulmān invasion broke upon the country.

The third traceable building was a temple built of what is called on the spot red sandstone, though apparently belonging rather to the schists. It seems to have been of the same style and age as the temple of Narasinha, but its inferior material has suffered much more from time than the hard basalt of the latter; and the indications are in this case more scanty. Fortunately the surviving remnants include the members of a gateway high enough to admit an elephant (now utilized for its original purpose in the citadel), and the lintel of a shrine door on which Ganapati is still to be recognized. There is, therefore, no doubt that it was a Śaiva temple.

These three buildings—if one may form a conjecture from the concentration of their relics—stood, two of them, as friendly contem-

poraries upon the ground now forming the eastern or inner part of the citadel of Bijapur. How many smaller buildings of the sort may have existed in the immediate neighbourhood it is hard to say—probably a considerable number. For the earlier Muhammadan architects would naturally utilize all these within easy carriage of the city in their own buildings; and in fact it is just at a radius of a day's march from Bijapur that one begins to find such remains still *in situ*, while without that limit they are numerous in every direction. However, it is certain that they did, in the very earliest period of their rule, destroy the buildings which I have essayed to reconstruct, so as literally not to leave one stone upon another. During the past year the clearance of the citadel of Bijapur has been carried out as a famine work, and much of the oldest masonry in the place has been exposed to view; but in no single case could I find a Hindu wall, or even foundation.

Our friend Karimu'd-din and his companions built the fragments into their mosque and fortifications with so little regard to their original positions that they frequently made up one column with the *disjecta membra* of three, or filled the place of deficient members with very rough-hewn stop-gaps. It may be remarked that the pillars in the mosque have suffered more in this way than those in the other two buildings, and in examining them the more closely on this account one notices that the missing sections are the bracket capitals and square lengths of the pillars,—that is, the parts which were most apt to be adorned with figure sculpture, which of course was more particularly objectionable in the house of the One God. Still, almost every stone is used for its original purpose—base and capital, slab and lintel, support and overlie just as they had done in their original sites. A partial exception is to be found in the great skylight—I can find no better word than this for the central construction. It is not a dome or an upper storey, but simply a piece of the flat roof pushed up some eight feet, and supported in that position by great slabs which had been pilasters of the temples, and whose position is now so far altered that their uncarved side, which had originally been imbedded in side-walls, now grins in its native roughness towards the terrace of the mosque,—the sculptured side, however, remain-

ing still visible to any worshipper who might happen to look upwards from within.

One may, I think, recognize in these two buildings the work of different, though contemporary, influences and architects. It is probable that while Revaya the *mistri* was doing his best with Hindu ideas and Hindu materials to build such a mosque as might entitle him to his fee of "twelve *chavars* of arable land rent-free for ever," and the Sayyid or Maulana of the garrison was overlooking him with an iconoclastic eye, some Persian or Turkish royal engineer was at work on the fortifications close by, utilizing what materials he could, with as great a contempt for everything but economy and defence as could be produced in the 19th century by the training of Woolwich and Chatham. Our hypothetical Persian was familiar with the arch; he had very likely seen old Roman buildings in which arches were, or seemed to be, supported on pillars; so, when he ran short of stolen goods,—to wit, great slabs and complete pillars suitable to the trabeate style of his Hindu masons,—he utilized the smaller stones at hand, in accordance with the lessons of his youth, but, to the last, economized labour by supporting his arches on the stumps of Hindu columns, in some cases turning them upside down rather than go to the trouble of cutting a new capital.

We have here the *incunabula* of a distinct style of civil and ecclesiastical architecture, which would, if left to itself, have grown up much as that of Ahmadâbâd did, from a similar origin. This, however, was put a stop to by the flood of foreign influence which accompanied the Adil Shâhi dynasty which succeeded Karim-ud-din and his like as provincial governors, and eventually made of Bijâpur the metropolis of a great kingdom, and the centre of a great architectural school, essentially Western in its love for the dome and pointed arch. Considering how far they excelled all the rest of the world in their chosen style, and the distinct inferiority of the local architecture to that of Gujarât for the purpose of great buildings, we need not spend more than a passing regret upon the death in its cradle of the nascent Chalukya-Saracenic style.

¹ Ibrâhîm Adil Shâh II., said to have been nicknamed by his Musulmân subjects *Jagad Gurû*, in derision of his toleration for the Hindus. A converse modern case is that of the famous Sikh Râjâ Sher Singh Atâriwâla, who

It did not, however, die without to some extent influencing what we now know as the Bijâpur style of architecture. In the windows of many Adil Shâhi buildings the simple forms of Chalukya tracery are reproduced with good effect; and the beautiful Ibrâhîm Rozah, built by a king who did not die till 1636¹, owes much of its charm to the employment of Hindu pillars, brackets, and flat ceilings, modified indeed by the use of cement and concrete, both practically unknown to the indigenous race of architects. The Musulmâns of Bijâpur, moreover, used one architectural device which was due to the influence of their predecessors, and deserves a very distinct description. They found, as everywhere in India, the horizontal or bracketed arch. They brought with them, as everywhere else in India, the radiated or true arch, so well known to the Western world; and they used the former occasionally, the latter in a style which has seldom, if ever, been surpassed. But they alone, I think, ever combined these two forms of construction—not only in a single arch, but in a single stone. This was effected by using in their abutments, above the spring of the arch, long stones, with short elbows turned downward in the form and angle necessary for *voussoirs* (as shown in the diagram *Fig. 2*). It is obvious that an arch built in this manner contains the elements and merits of both systems, and avails itself of every element of stability which can be found in cut stone. It could not, of course, be practically applied throughout such an arch as that of the Gaggau Mahâl, 83 feet in span, but in the lower part of even such arches, and throughout those of less dimensions, it is as ingenious and efficient a structural device as can well be conceived, and has probably much to say to the wonderful vitality of the monuments of Bijâpur,—for hardly any other word is applicable to the way in which these have survived every form of ill usage, from Moghul bombardment to Marâthâ pillage, which, with a thoroughness characteristic of that predatory race, extended here even to building materials.

I have already said that the immediate neighbourhood of the city of Bijâpur is barren of Hindu and Jaina remains—for the reason, pro-

when supposed by his followers (during the first siege of Multân) to favour the English and Pathân interest, was contemptuously styled "Râja Sheikh Singh."

bably, that they were used up by the conquering race. In the course, however, of a few months' service in the country to the north-east, now forming the *tâlukâs* of *Indi* and *Śindagi*, I have come across many of both religions. Temples still stand at *Horti*, on the *Śolâpur* road, and at *Nimbâl-Khurd*, six miles east of this, which cannot date from an earlier period than the thirteenth century, and would well repay the examination of any one who may have the luck to visit them in times of leisure. There are probably others as complete as these, and as old, which I did not come across; and in almost every village there are numerous fragments, often utilized in buildings of the composite character already noticed. One of the most remarkable of these is the temple of *Khaṇḍobâ* at *Hipargi*, 2½ miles east of *Bijâpur*. The cloisters of this building surround a court cut into the side of a low hill; and some of them 'back up' into the hill itself in a way which reminds one of the caves of *Elurâ*. This impression is heightened by the square and massive *trabeate* style of these cloisters themselves, though upon examination they show plain signs of having been built long after *Musulmân* influence had become dominant; while they are faced by a set of arches which would not be out of place in any *Saracenic* courtyard in *Bijâpur*. In the centre is the temple itself, a modern building of no beauty or pretensions, but eccentric in that, though it appears to be raised upon a stone plinth two feet high, the floor of the shrine and porch is on a level with that of the court, and the approach is by a path cut down to this level through the stone work of the plinth. Opposite this a stone horse, caparisoned but unmounted, occupies the pavilion which in a *Śaiva* temple would belong to the bull *Nandi*. Above the whole, and without the enclosure, though practically belonging to the temple, stands a *dīpmāla*, or illumination-tower, unique in these parts, and worthy of description in detail. The builder had evidently in his eye the construction of the four great *minārs* which flank the tomb of king *Māhmūd* at *Bijâpur*, and he composed his tower of pierced stories closely resembling theirs. But, as a Hindu, he did not care to use true arches for his openings, which are accordingly spanned by single stones cut into a pointed arch—a common form throughout India in the

17th century, to which this building probably belongs. As his object, moreover, was not to relieve a huge square building with an almost semi-globular dome, but to bear up into the night air a column of light, he did not hold to the perpendicular form of king *Māhmūd's* towers, but tapered his away by diminishing the diameter of each successive story; and finally he departed still further in detail from his model by adorning his exterior, not only with the carved stone brackets needed for his lamps, but with the supplementary sculpture, which was almost as necessary to support the effect of these when viewed by daylight. Although all of this is coarse in execution, and some of it obscene in design, the general effect by daylight is exceedingly good, and would be more so were the building complete. Its legend says that the builder was a *Rāja* of *Sâtârâ*, that it had originally seven stories, besides the plinth and finial story (agreeing with the form of the *minārs* of *Māhmūd's* tomb, which have seven stories, a dome and plinth; further, that when the uppermost lamps were lit, their radiance lit up the tomb of king *Māhmūd*, whose ghost and successors were so much disgusted at this incidence of idolatrous 'light on the subject' that they forced the architect of *Hipargi* to truncate his tower till it was shut out from *Bijâpur* by the intervening hills of *Śivanagi*. A small pillar about two miles off upon the *Deûr* road is pointed out as being the amputated top of the tower, but upon examination turned out to be of a different style, material, and probably generation.

I could get no historical evidence whatever to corroborate or contradict this tradition. The period which it points to—i.e. the end of the 16th or the first half of the 17th century—is likely enough from the internal evidence; and though no chief could have been called '*Rāja* of *Sâtârâ*' till long after the kings of *Bijâpur* had lost the power to pull down any one's tower, the ancestor of that family, *Shâhji Bhoṣlê*, was a feudatory of the *Bijâpur* state at that very time, and may possibly be the person alluded to. At any rate, truncated by Moslem bigotry, and defaced in later days by modern Hindu vulgarity, the tower still dominates, not unpleasingly, the group of trees and temples in the hollow at its foot (for *Khaṇḍobâ* has several divine neighbours); and on the other side it

presents a resting point to the eye wearied with the dismal monotony of the ugly brown plains of Kalāḍgi.

The lower part of a smaller temple in the same village (which I used as a relief kitchen), with its plinth and well, seem to be pre-Muhammadan in style; and at Śindagi, 12 miles off, there survives a complete Chalukya temple of Khandobā, apparently of about the 13th century, but absolutely buried in whitewash, and surrounded by a bad modern wall. It has, however, an amusing gallery of sculptured figures,—gods, Rishis, and later saints, besides a whole row of *lingas* in a side chapel, and is altogether worth a visit.

At Almēla, near the Bhimā, 12 miles north of Śindagi, a very fine temple—probably of the 11th century—was destroyed by some old Nawāb to build the embankment of a tank, which was repaired this year as a famine work. The mischief done was past remedy, but I did save one fine figure of the Cobra-king, armed with sword and shield, and set it upon, not in, the dam; which is, besides, surmounted by an ugly and ruinous little temple, said to have been built by a European officer. This gentleman, it is said, being encamped under the

tamarind trees of the old embankment, thought fit to insult the image of the goddess Lakshmi, who was stuck up under another tree near the tents. She, being wroth, punished him vicariously by sending cholera upon the villagers, and refused to be appeased till he had granted a sum sufficient to erect her present fane. The hero of this legend is still alive, but, as neither the temple nor the tale (if true) says much for his taste, it is not necessary to name him here.

I have already (*Ind. Ant.* vol. VI. p. 230) referred to the erection of small dolmens by the Shepherd caste of these parts, and have since seen two a little larger—that is, about three feet cube. One of these exists near the village of Hanatgi, 12 miles east of Bijāpur; and the other just outside the Fateh Darwājā, or Victory Gate, of the city itself. Both are of the same pattern, having one back, two side, and a top stone, the fourth side remaining open, and being flanked by two small upright stones; and both now serve the purpose of shrines for Grāma devatās—in all likelihood deified ancestors, “rude forefathers of the hamlet,” whose remains may lie below, or perhaps were burnt there or thereabouts; but not even a tradition could I pick up about either.

ARCHÆOLOGICAL NOTES.

BY M. J. WALHOUSE, LATE M.C.S.

(Continued from p. 47.)

No. XIX.—‘Passing through Fire.’

Treading on fire and leaping through flames, either in honour of a deity or in fulfilment of a vow, seem to be among the most ancient and universal of superstitious customs. They exist in every part of the Madras Presidency, and doubtless elsewhere in India. Excellent accounts of the custom have been given in the *Indian Antiquary* by Mr. Stokes, vol. II. p. 190, and by Captain Mackenzie, vol. III. pp. 6-8, and are of special value, one as containing the evidence given in a judicial inquiry respecting the custom by parties concerned, the other as a detailed description by an eye-witness of a very full ceremonial of the kind at Bangalore. Both occurred in 1873. In 1854 the Madras Government called for a report from every zillā as to the prevalence of the custom, and whether it appeared to be attended with such an amount of hurt or danger as to warrant measures being

taken for its discouragement and suppression. From the replies received, it appeared that fire-treading was known in every district, but only locally observed in most, and not general in more than two or three. It was reported to be falling into disuse, practised only by the lower orders, and its performance to be unattended by danger or instances of injury sufficient to call for interference by Government, who thereupon ordered that it would be enough for European officials to use their influence in discouraging the custom, and endeavouring to obtain the assistance of the more educated classes of the native community in the same object.

When not done in discharge of vows made in time of sickness or disaster, the fire-walking seemed to be performed (generally in March or June) in most places in honour of Vīrabhadra,

the portentous flame-clad progeny of Śiva, who is especially feared as presiding over family discord and misfortune, or else of Dharmarāja, the elder Pāṇḍava, to whom there are five hundred temples in South Ārkat alone, and with whom and Draupadī the ceremony has some particular association.¹ In Ganjam and Maisur it is performed in honour of a village goddess, and everywhere seems connected with aboriginal rites and Śiva-worship, Brāhmins always disowning it. Messrs. Stokes and Mackenzie have described how it is carried out, and the reports to Government speak of the fire-pit as a narrow trench, sometimes twenty yards long and half a foot deep, filled with small sticks and twigs, usually tamarind, which are kindled and kept burning till they have sunk into a mass of glowing embers. Along this the devotees, often fifty or sixty in succession, walk, run, or leap, bare-footed; and not unfrequently the precaution is taken of forming a puddle of water at each end of the trench, for the devotees to start from and leap into. Such a trench I have seen the day after a fire-treading had been performed in it, and one of the actors went along it with a hop, skip, and jump, to show how it was done. Sometimes, to make the rite more imposing and meritorious, devotees will pierce their eyelids, tongues, the fleshy part of their arms, &c. with long slender nails having a lighted wick attached to each end, and so accoutred tread the fiery path. This seems repulsive, but there is no real danger in the ceremony, as the reports to Government were obliged to admit; and Captain Mackenzie in his account observes that there "never was, nor could be, the slightest danger to life." Nor would there be ordinarily. In the case reported by Mr. Stokes, a sickly boy fell in the pit and received burns from which he died: the accident and result were owing to his condition; and, when it appears from Mr. Stokes's paper that the practice is now prohibited in Madras, the antiquary will be inclined to regret interference with primeval customs not essentially more dangerous than hunting or racing. Amongst similar exhibitions it may be mentioned that in the demon-worship so prevalent on the western coast, when celebrations are held in honour of

Chāmūṇḍī, a much-dreaded female divinity (vide *Ind. Ant.* vol. II. p. 169), the dancer, who represents and is supposed to be possessed by her, dances and rolls upon a pile of burning embers without any injury, as is asserted. In the Nilgiri Hills, too, there is a sect of outcaste Brāhmins denominated Jumpers (*Haravar*), from a rite in which they used to leap over a fire. Though claiming to be Śaiva Brāhmins, wearing the thread and abstaining from meat, they really have no caste, but live and marry amongst the Badagas, and work as coolies.

When official inquiries were made into the fire-treading practices in Madras, surprise was evidently felt that they should turn out to be so harmless. The minds of many probably reverted to passages in the Old Testament (*e.g.* *Leviticus* xviii. 21; 2 *Kings* xxiii. 10) where children are spoken of as being passed through fire to Molech, which have been generally regarded as denoting cruel sacrifices of living children,—an idea Milton has gone far to confirm by his well-known lines—

"Moloch, horrid king, besmear'd with blood
Of human sacrifice, and parents' tears,
Though, for the noise of drums and timbrels loud,
Their children's cries unheard, that pass'd
through fire
To his grim idol."

Commentators have usually adopted the same view, and drawn frightful pictures of a huge brazen idol in whose arms, heated glowing hot, children were placed and cruelly consumed. It is most probable, however, that the rite was as harmless as the Indian fire-treading, or as when children were 'passed through fire' by their mothers, almost in our own days, on St. John's Eve in our own islands, and still in Brittany. The Rabbinical commentators have strongly repudiated the common interpretation, and insisted that in all the Scripture passages on the subject there is no word used signifying 'to burn' or 'destroy,' but 'to pass' and 'to offer,' and they ask whether, when so wise and beneficent a king as Solomon is spoken of as permitting his 'strange wives' worship of Molech, it can be believed he would have sanctioned the murder of little children. Theodore, bishop of Cyrus, in Upper Syria,

and then passing through it, slowly or quickly according to their zeal, and often carrying their children in their arms.—Tom. I. p. 153.

¹ A century ago Sonnerat (*Voyage aux Indes Orientales*, Paris, 1782) described the Indians walking on fire in honour of Dharmarāja and his wife Draupadī,—first following their images carried in procession three times round a fire,

who wrote in the 4th century, took the same view, and there is an interesting passage in his commentary on the Old Testament, where, in his 47th query on 2 *Kings* iii., as to how the expression "Ahaz made his son to pass through fire" is to be understood, he observes—"Josephus says that Ahaz offered one of his sons as a burnt-offering; but I think this is an error that has come down to our own times. I have myself seen in certain cities that once in a year fires were lit in the streets, and people leaped and bounded over them,—not boys only, but men also; and infants were carried through the flame by their mothers. It appeared to me to be an expiatory and purifying rite, and I think that this was the sin of Ahaz." Such, probably, were the Molech rites; they were condemned by the Old Testament writers as idolatrous, not as destructive, and the observances described by Theodoret were forbidden to Christians at the 6th Council of Constantinople, in A.D. 580, as superstitious follies merely.

The result of the Madras inquiries was to show that fire-walking was almost as much practised by Muhammadans as by Hindus. Indeed, in one district (Karnûl) it was only known at the Muharram; and fire-dances were reported to be regularly observed at that festival in 120 villages in Nellûr; in that district, also, Muhammadan Fakirs were said to walk and roll on fire at two places in the month Madhu, in honour of a Pir or saint named Bundar Shâh Madur. Herklots, in his *Qanoon-e-Islam*, when describing the Muharram, says that the fire-pits then used are called *allawa* ('bonfires'), and are dug annually on the same spot. Fires are kindled in them in the evening, and, "of those who have vowed, some leap into the still burning embers and out again, others leap through the flame, and some scatter about handfuls of fire." He gives, however, no account of the origin and meaning of the custom. Muhammadans are unable to explain it, and the more educated amongst them regard it with aversion, as they do many of the Muharram extravagancies. It has hence been surmised by many that such wild ceremonies may have been imitated from Hindu observances, as intimated by Mr. Sinclair in his Notes on the Muharram (*Ind. Ant.* vol. VI. p. 79). It may indeed be so, but I know not whether it would be too hazardous to refer this leaping into

and over fires to a survival of Arabian and Syrian idolatrous ceremonies, such as are described by Theodoret, older than the Prophet!² Indian Muhammadans partake largely of Arab descent, and it is no more surprising that strict Musulmâns should, though doubtless unconsciously, keep up customs of idolatrous origin, than that Christians should, up to our own times, have maintained the pagan festivities of Beltane and St. John's and St. Peter's Eves. Indeed, the coincidence is remarkable and striking. How long old customs linger, and how hard they die, is exemplified in a curious passage of Captain Frederick Burnaby's amusing book *On Horseback through Asia Minor*, vol. II. p. 201:—"I have often wondered whether something connected with the old fire-worshippers' superstition has a lurking-place in the minds of the Persians and Kurds. Day after day, and at the same hour, I have seen the entire inhabitants of a village turn out and gaze intently upon the great orb of light slowly sinking on the distant horizon. I have questioned them about this subject. They indignantly repudiate the idea of any act of worship to the sun: they say they do so because it is their habit, and because their fathers and ancestors did the same thing before them." Again, in close connection with the subject of this note, and showing how the origin of ancient observances may be forgotten, Ovid expressly mentions leaping through flames as amongst the rites of the Palilia (*Fasti*, lib. iv. 781), and then, proceeding to explain the meaning, acknowledges that the multitude of reasons popularly assigned makes it doubtful, and adduces some which only show that, even in his time, the signification of the rite was really unknown. Some instances of analogous customs may be here recounted. The late Professor H. H. Wilson, in his "Essay on the Festivals of the Hindus" (*Works*, vol. I.), when describing the wild revelries of the Holi, as observed in Hindustân Proper in the month Phâlguna, or March, says of the bonfires then lit in all the towns and villages,—“When the flames break forth, the spectators crowd round to warm themselves, an act that is supposed to avert ill-luck for the rest of the year. They engage also in some rough gambols, trying to push each other nearer to the fire than is agreeable or safe, and as the blaze declines jump over it and toss about the burning

² The Muharram existed as a feast before Muhammad, who enjoined ten additional customs during it.

embers." The following are selected from many instances of ancient customs in the British Isles. Sir John Sinclair, in the *Statistical Account of Scotland*, published in 1794, states, from the report of the minister of Loudoun, in Ayrshire, that "the custom still remains amongst the herds and young people to kindle fires on the high grounds in honour of Beltane" (vol. III. p. 105); and, again, the minister of Callander, in Perthshire, relates that on "Beltein day" (old May-day) the people kindled a fire and toasted a cake, which was divided into as many parts as there were people present, and one part blackened with charcoal; the bits were then put into a cap and drawn blindfold, and he who drew the black bit was considered devoted to Baal, and obliged to leap three times through the flame (vol. XI. p. 620). In the *Gentleman's Magazine* for February 1795, an eye-witness relates that on the 21st June 1782 he saw, from the top of the house in which he was staying in Ireland, the fires burning at midnight on every eminence for a radius of thirty miles all around, and that the people danced round the fires, and made their sons and daughters, together with their cattle, pass through them,—reckoning this to ensure good fortune during the succeeding year. The dancing round and leaping over fires probably did not survive long into the present century, but the kindling the Midsummer fires is hardly yet extinct. I remember, a few years ago, a notice of them having been seen in some of the Scottish Isles; and in 1833 there was a riot in Cork on account of some of the soldiers quartered there refusing to subscribe to the Beltane bonfires. There is not a county in England, from Northumberland to Cornwall, in which there was not some trace of the custom existing in the last century; and in Wales, Devonshire, and Cornwall it lingered to within living memory, if indeed it be yet wholly extinct. In Brittany it is still in force; there the peasantry still vigorously dance round and leap over the St. John's fires, and two years ago a fine painting by the eminent artist Jules Breton was exhibited in London, entitled *La Saint Jean*, vividly portraying the scene from life. One of the old navi-

gators, Johannes Lerius, avers that passing through fire was practised even by the people of Brazil; but, though the Rabbins trace its origin up to Ham, the idolatrous son of Noah, I have been unable to find any notice of its existence in Africa. In all the many records of exploration, from Livingstone and Burton to Schweinfurth and Baker, there is no allusion to it, albeit Africans are the most saltatory of nations. It can hardly be but that rites existing with so much likeness in far separated ages and countries must have had some common origin, and it does not seem beyond bounds to seek that origin in ages of which the Vedas are a late expression, before that Aryan dispersion which, issuing from the Central-Asian dwelling-place, may have carried these primeval observances to the confines of the Western world. But, whether in classic, medieval, or modern times,—whether Palilia, Muharram,³ Fire-treading, Holi, May-day or Midsummer festivities,—all seem vestiges of the primordial adoration of Spring, and the natural gladness that greets the revival of Nature. As religions change and fade, such observances become transferred to sun-worship, or associated with local deities, Muhammadan martyrs, or Christian saints, and ideas of expiation or symbolical cleansing by fire obscure the original motive, which would, however, be latent at no great depth, and manifest the common source of its variant forms in many points, as the seasons of celebration, making cattle leap over fires,—as Ovid, at the passage cited in the *Fæsti*, intimates was done, and as was the custom in Ireland, and in Maisur, where Captain Mackenzie saw buffaloes driven over the fire-pits; appearing also in the Irish and Indian belief that dancing round the fires ensured good fortune. Established priesthoods would sometimes sanction such customs, sometimes frown on them; as in Upper India Brâhmins bless and inaugurate the Holi bonfires, but in the south stand aloof from fire-treading, because usually done in honour of un-Brâhmanical deities. Antiquarian and mythological research is but the record of the decline, survival, transformation, and interchange of religious observances.*

³ "In the month Muharram the first rain fell, Adam and Eve descended on earth, and species were propagated."—*Herklots*.

* The sanctity of fire-treading would also be heightened by its being used as a solemn ordeal. In *Asiatic Researches*, vol. I. p. 390, there is a paper on ordeals communicated by Warren Hastings containing this passage:—

"For the fire ordeal an excavation, 9 hands long, 2 spans broad, and 1 span deep, is made in the ground, and filled with a fire of *pipal* wood; into this the person accused must walk barefooted, and if his feet be unburnt they hold him blameless; if burned, guilty." In medieval Europe accused persons walked barefoot over heated ploughshares placed in a line at unequal distances.

RĀJMAHĀLI WORDS.

BY R. B. SWINTON, LATE M.C.S.

In Dr. Hunter's *Comparative Dictionary of the Languages of India and High Asia* nearly two hundred words have been selected for comparison in more than a hundred and forty languages and dialects—one word to a luxurious page. Twenty of these dialects are bracketed together as belonging to Central India, but including the Chentsu and Yerukala of the south; and there are seventeen under the Southern India division, including Tamil, Malayalam, and Karnāṭaka, ancient and modern, Toḍuva and Toḍa. Malabar, as a dialect distinguishable from Tamil and Malayalam, has been included by mistake; neither has Siñhalese any relationship to any South-Indian language. The Keikādi dialect, wherever it may come from, has three words out of four the same as one or another South-Indian language.

The blue book entitled *Specimens of Languages of India*, published in 1874 under the authority of the Government of Bengal, has about a hundred and fifty words, and under the division appropriated to 'Central Provinces languages' twenty-two names of dialects or of selected centres. Unfortunately none of these cor-

respond in name with any of Dr. Hunter's list under the heading Central India, though some classified as belonging to Western Bengal are to be found in Dr. Hunter's list. The words in the Bengal book have been better selected than those in Dr. Hunter's, and the sentence illustrations are to be found only in the former; but, as Dr. Hunter's book was printed six years earlier, it would have been better if the same words had been adhered to in the later volume.

The dialect of the Rājmahāl hills appears in both vocabularies, and as it has been always stated to be connected with the Drāviḍian languages, though so widely separated by distance, it may be interesting to see to what extent this is borne out by vocabulary comparison.

Among the numerals, only the name for 'one' in Rājmahālī—'ort, ondong, kivong'—will bear comparison with the Tamil *onru* and the Kanarese *ondu*; all the other numerals are Hindi. The pronouns in Rājmahālī, as they are given by Dr. Hunter's informants and in the Bengal collection, are put down below for comparison with those of the South-Indian languages to which they bear any resemblance.

| English | Rājmahālī
(Bengal Book) | Hindi | Rāj. (Hunter) | South-Indian (Tamil) |
|---------|----------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|--------------------------------|
| I | Ayn | Main, ham | En | Mān or yān, Kanarese (anc.) nā |
| We | Aym | Ham, hamani | Nam, om | Nam, nangal |
| Thou | Nin | Tu, tou | Nin | Ni |
| You | Nin | Tam | | Nir, ningal |
| He | Āh | Wuh | Āth | Avan |
| They | Ahaber | We, ohney | Āsabar | Avargal, avar |
| Of me | Aynki | Mera | Ongki | Ennudeiya, Telugu Na-yokka |
| Of us | Emsubki | Hamāra, ham-sobinkaer | Emki, nāmki | Nammudeiya |
| Of thee | Ningkid | Tera | Nimki | Unnudeiya |
| Of you | Ningkid | Tohāni | | Ummudeiya |
| Of him | Abikid | Uska | | Avanudeiya |
| Of them | Ahibkid | Unka | Āsa-beriki | Avargaludeiya |
| Mine | Aynki | Hamāra | Ongki | Ennathu |
| Our | Emsobki | Hamāra | | Nammathu |
| Thine | Ningkid | Tera | Ningki | Unathu |
| Your | Ningkid | Tamāra | Nimki | Ummathu |
| His | Abikid | Uska | Āhiki | Avanathu |
| Their | Ahibkid | Unka | Āsā-beriki | Avargaluthu |

Apart from the different modes of spelling in the two Rājmahālī lists, there is an interchange of *h* for *s*, or *s* for *h*. The word 'they' has been taken down for Dr. Hunter *asabar*, and for the

other list *ahaber*. The sort of lisp which I am informed a Bhīll uses in trying to say the Hindustāni word *hāzīr* may have appeared to one hearer an *s*, and to another an *h*. The words

for 'I,' 'thou,' and 'they' are most like the corresponding words in the Dravidian languages, but it may be observed that 'thou' in Chinese also is *ní*. The mode of the addition of the post-positions is as like Hindi as Tamil or Telugu.

After the pronouns, I have gone through all the words in Dr. Hunter's lists, with the results in the small catalogue below.

List of similar words from Dr. Hunter's Dictionary.

| English | Rājmahāli | South-Indian |
|----------|-----------|---------------------------------------|
| Above | Meche | { Tamil anc. Mīsei
Tamil mod. Mēle |
| How much | Ina | Telugu Enta |
| Near | Atgi | Malayālam Atukko |
| No | Mallā | Tam. Alla |
| Within | Ule | Tam. Ullē |
| Tooth | Pāl | Tam. Pal |
| Cow | Oi | Tel. Āu |
| Eye | Kāne | Tel. Kannu |
| Ear | Khetway | Tam. Kāthu |
| Fish | Min | Tam. Min, Sanskrit Mina |
| Mother | Aya | Tam. Ayi |
| Mouth | Toro | Tel. Nōru |
| Come | Bara | Mal. Vāru |
| Tree | Man | Toḍa Men |
| Father | Āba | Kanarese Appa |

The time had not arrived when Dr. Hunter wrote, as he remarks in his preface, to render it safe to make a table of non-Āryan phonetic changes, but from the instances of changes and substitution of letters given I do not see how Telugu *nōru*, 'a mouth,' becomes *toro*, or *vice versa*. *Min*, the word for 'a fish,' is Sanskrit; 'father' is a dissyllable, with a *b*, a *p*, and an *a* in it in many languages.

The next list has been taken out of all the words in the Bengal vocabularies, with two sentences from Rājmahāli, Toḍa, and Tamil. The residuum of similar words is very small.

| | Tamil | Malayālam | Telugu | Kanarese | Toḍa | Badaga | Rāj. (Bengal Book.) | Rāj. (Hunter.) |
|--------|------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|--------|---------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Hand | Kai | Kei | Cheyvi | Kai | Kei | Kei | Tetu | Sesu |
| Foot | Adi, pādām | Kal | Pādamu | Adi or Pāda | Kāl | Kalu | Kedu | Kal |
| Nose | Mūkku | Mūkka | Mukku | Mūgu | Mituff | Muku, mugu | Muiéd | |
| Eye | Kān | Kānna | Kannu | Kannu | Kann | Kannu | Kānu | Kāne |
| Mouth | Vāy | Vāy | Nōru | Bāyi | Bāi | Bāi | Toro | Soro |
| Tooth | Pal | Palla | Pallu | Hallu | Parzh | Hallu | Palu | Pal |
| Ear | Kādu | Cheni | Chevi | Kivi | Kev | Kivi | Kaiédba | Khetway |
| Hair | Māyir | Rōmam | Vēṭrukalu | Kūdalū | Mir | Kudalu, meiru | Tāli | Tali |
| Head | Thalai | Tala | Tala | Tale | Madd | Mandei | Kuku | Kupe |
| Tongue | Nakū | Nāva | Nāluka | Nālige | Nav | Nalange | Tartay | |

² The Brāhūis of Kalat speak a language different from the Baluchi of other tribes in Makrān, and which is called Kardi or Kardgāli.—ED.

List of similar words from the Bengal Selection.

| English | Rājmahāli | South-Indian |
|----------|-----------|----------------------|
| Mouth | Toro | Telugu Nōru |
| Eye | Kānu | Tamil Kan |
| Tooth | Palu | Tam. Pal |
| Father | Abbas | Tam. Appan |
| Sun | Beru | Tam. anc. Birgh |
| I am | Ainoo | Tam. Nān irukkiren |
| Thou art | Ninoo | Ni irukkiray |
| He is | Āhoo | Avan irukkiran |
| We are | Aim Sebem | Nangal irukkirom |
| Ye are | Nin Seber | Ningal irukkirigal |
| They are | Āseber | Avargal irukkirārgal |

My father lives in that small house.

Rāj. — Na ada mākono eng ābbā doki.

Tam. — En thagappanār antha sinna vittil vāsam paṇṇukirār.

Toḍa — Yenu enin ā kinnud ārzhuḷg udi.

He is sitting on a horse under that tree.

Rāj. — Ahmon koloruo goro meche oki.

Tam. — Avan kuthirai mēl utkānthu kondu antha marathin kiḷ irukkiran.

Toḍa — Adum ā men erk kadare mok ershehi.

A comparison of the inner structure of two dialects can only be made by those (otherwise competent and) practically acquainted with both, but nobody knows both Rājmahāli on the one hand and Tulu or Toḍa (of the Nilgiris) on the other. The Toḍa would be the most interesting for comparison, as the upheaval to the tops of hills in both cases would be more likely to have given the words similar twists, supposing they started from the "one rude homogeneous dialect" hazarded first by the Rev. Mr. W. Taylor. The annexed list is interesting as comparing the changes in the South-Indian languages with the Rājmahāli.

There is a dialect called Brāhūi or Brāhūiki¹ in the extreme west of India, but in no word does it resemble any South-Indian language.

| | Tamil | Malayālm | Telugu | Kanarese | Toḍa | Badaga | Rāj. (Bengal Book.) | Rāj. (Hunter.) |
|--------|-------------|------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|-----------|---------------------|----------------|
| Belly | Vayiru | Vayara | Kaḍupu | Hoṭṭa | Bir | Hoṭṭe | Kocho | |
| Back | Mudugu | Mudhuga | Vipu | Bennu | Uf | Bēnnu | Kokeh | |
| Iron | Irumbu | Irumba | Inumu | Kabbina | Kabban | Kabbuna | Loha | Loha |
| Gold | Pon | Pon | Bangāru | I' Chinna | Chinna | Chinna | Sona | |
| Silver | Velli | Velli | Vendi | Belli | Bilti | Belli | Chandi | |
| Horse | Kudirai | Kudhira | Gurramu | Kudure | Kadare | Kudure | Ghoro | Goro |
| Cow | Pasu | Pashu | Āvu | Ākaḷu, Gōvu | Danam | Dana | Oyou | Oi |
| Dog | Nāy | Nay | Kukka | Nāy | Nai | Nai | Aleh | Allay |
| Cat | Pānai | Pācha | Pilli | Bekku | Kotti | Kotti | Bergeh | Berge |
| Cock | Sēval | Pāvankorhi | Puñju | Hunja | Huja | Hunja | Chayōkkeru | |
| Duck | Kulla vāttu | Tārāva | Bāthu, āḷabātu | Bāthu, taḷiga | Bāt | Sime batu | Batekeh | |
| Ass | Kazhudai | Kanbudha | Gāḍide | Katte | Klatte | Klatte | Gadagoro | |
| Bird | Pakshi | Pakshi | Pakshulu | Pakshigalu | Belṭ | Hakkilu | Puzu | Puj |
| Go | Pō | Pōga | Po | Hogu | Atfo | Hogu | Kālāh | Ēka, kālāh |
| Eat | Sāppidu | Tinnuga | Thinu | Unnu | Tinn | Tinnu | Lāpā | Zapa |
| Sit | Vutkāru | Irikkuga | Kūrcho | Kutukollu | Neshkir | Kuli | Okāh | Oka |
| Come | Vā | Varuga | Rā | Ba | 'twa, 'itva | Ba | Bārēh | Barah |
| Beat | Adi | Adikkuga | Kottu | Hodi | Pui | Hui | Bāja | |
| Stand | Nilḷu | Nilkkuga | Niluvu | Nilḷu | Nellu | Nillu | Elāh | |
| Die | Sāvu | Chāvuga | Chāvu | Sāvu | Ketṭ fo | Ketṭ hogu | Tādura | |
| Give | Kodu | Kōdukka | Yiggi | Kodu | Ta, kodu | Ta, kodu | Kata | Kata |
| Run | Odu | Oduga | Parugethu | Ōdu | Vodu | Vōdu | Bongah | Bonga |
| Up | Mēlē | Midhe | Paṇa | Mēle | Mok | Mel | Mainieh | Meche |
| Down | Kilē | Tāzhe | Kintha | Kelige | Erg | Kelage | Pichhi | |

POLYANDRY IN THE HIMĀLAYAS.¹

BY DR. C. R. STULPNAGEL, LAHOR.

If immorality of the worst description existed in juxtaposition with the most brilliant civilization of the Greeks, it will create surprise in no one to hear that chastity, as we understand the term, is a virtue scarcely known among the Mongolians who inhabit the northern confines of India. It is true, little is known of the Tibetans, very little indeed; and this is to be regretted, for they seem an intelligent people—capable, no doubt, of good and great things if brought under the continual influence of a higher life. But the little that is known of their state of morals does not prepossess us in their favour. When Marco Polo, in the twelfth century, reached that country, it had been recently ravaged by Manku Khān, the grandson of the great Jhangiz Khān; but though his knowledge was limited,—for he does not pretend to have travelled over the 30,000 square miles of Tibet,—he still had his attention attracted to the extraordinary immorality prevalent all over the country, so much so that he observes that no man of that country would, on any consideration, take to wife a girl who was a maid. Colonel Yule adds to that passage a learned note pointing out that similar corrupt practices are

ascribed to many nations; Martini says they prevailed in Yunnan; Garnier makes a similar observation respecting Sifan; Pallas mentions that young women among the Mongols are esteemed in proportion to the number of their love affairs; Japanese ideas of morality are not very different, and the most recent traveller in Eastern Tibet, Mr. Cooper, makes a similar observation about the people he came across.²

What has been said of the immorality of the Mongolians holds good in some respects of their neighbours the Pāhārīs, inhabiting the Himālaya mountains. Whether of Mongolian, Tatar, or of mixed Mongolian and Āryan descent, these highlanders have extremely loose ideas concerning morality generally, and matrimony especially. Obligated by their life of seclusion to adhere to the principle of absolute conservatism, it is by no means strange that their customs should still be primitive—as they may be called with a euphemistic license. But their primitiveness is not the primitiveness of innocence. 'The Abode of Snow' might lead one to expect, from a partial inspection of its fertile mountain slopes, flowing rivulets, irrigated

¹ Extracts from an article in the *Indian Evangelical Review*, vol. V. (Oct. 1877) pp. 198ff.; conf. Dr. Muir's

papers in *Ind. Ant.* vol. VI. pp. 231, 315; and Mr. Kirkpatrick's letter, vol. VII. p. 86.

² Yule's *Marco Polo*, vol. II. pp. 33, 33-40.

valleys, and wooded glens, that the people who live among them would excel the natives of the plains in body as well as mind. And though, generally speaking, natural fearlessness, frankness, hardiness, and a superior physique may be conceded to them, they are certainly far behind the people of the plains in intelligence, shrewdness, quickness of intellect, and in that virtue which ought to exist in the relation between the sexes. Although I have never found an instance of hereditary cretinism, still there is an extraordinary heaviness about the brains of a P a h á r í which makes him in many respects a totally unworthy opponent to a native of the plains when it comes to an encounter of wits. A Banyá coming from the plains has little difficulty, even without necessarily resorting to dishonesty, in enriching himself at the expense of the improvidently stupid hill-people. How far intellectual obtuseness is connected with moral unconsciousness is a question of some nicety, but the difficulty lies in striking the balance, as, after all, innumerable instances for and against such a proposition can be brought forward. However the case may be, the filth, the objectionable customs, the mental and moral obliquity of these hill tribes, attracted early the attention of Christian persons, with a view to establishing missionary centres, so as to bring them gradually to a better and nobler life. Thus Dárjiling was made a mission station in 1840, Álmorá in 1850, Sabáthu was taken up by the American Presbyterians in 1837, Chambá by the Established Church of Scotland in 1863, Kámgrá by the Church Missionary Society in 1854, and the Moravians established in Kyelang a station in 1855. But perhaps the most important seat of missionary enterprise is Kótgaḍh, situated on the extreme northern frontier of the British territory, on the highroad from the plains past Simlá to Tatary.

The deplorable state of morality obtaining among the people of the Kótgaḍh valley thirty-five years ago is graphically described in the Rev. W. Rebsch's mission report published in 1873; and, being an authentic record, it may with advantage be here reproduced:—

"The hill states prior to the British conquest had for many years been subject to all the miseries of ruthless rapine and tyranny, both under the Gurkhá rule and under the government of their own native chieftains. The prevalent superstition betrays the most extreme ignorance. No ceremony is undertaken without duly offering a propitiatory sacrifice to some *devata*. Human sacrifices in former times were not unfrequently immolated at the shrines of their temples, but it is believed that, since British sway has been established, these impious barbarities are no longer practised.

Every accident or misfortune, however trifling, is connected with the evil agency of the *genii loci*, who are very numerous, having peculiar functions attributed to each: for example, some are believed to preside over the crops, and some to exercise an influence over the heart of man, some over the summits of mountains, sources of rivers, forests, &c., and large flocks of goats are carefully kept in most villages for sacrificial purposes.

"The sale of females, for the worst purposes of slavery, though carried on with secrecy and caution, is continued in various parts of the hill territory; and a frightful evil, which will be noticed below, may in a great measure be traced to this pernicious system. It is a notorious fact that for ages past the zanánas of the rich natives of the plains have been supplied with females from the hill regions; which, together with the cruel custom of female infanticide, has caused a disproportion between the two sexes, and given rise to the monstrous evil of polyandry, a practice which obtains throughout the country. Where females are so scarce, and where they are almost sure of commanding a price, it is not difficult to trace the motive for the perpetuation of such a crime as that of female infanticide. It seems improbable that the same feelings of jealous honour and false respect for family, which actuate the mind of the high-caste Rájput in India, can in any way influence the people of the hills, whose habits and practices are at total variance with their ideas.

"The very marriages of the people are strongly tainted with slavery, for no man can obtain a wife without paying a sum of money to her father. If she be turned out without a cause assigned, the purchase-money is retained until another marriage is contracted, when the first purchaser receives back his purchase-money. Thus the females in no respect appear to be above the condition of slaves, being considered as much an article of property as any other commodity. We could adduce other facts to show that vice added to ignorance goes hand in hand in reducing this class of human beings to the lowest level of existence."

A little further on, the report states that—

"Since the influence of the English government, based largely upon Christian morality, has been brought to bear upon these tracts, the disgusting custom of polyandry has disappeared. Not a single instance can be now adduced (in Kótgaḍh of course) of many men having one wife, although increase of wealth has resulted in many persons acquiring by right of purchase more than one wife, because women, who all take their share in field work, are very valuable in these agricultural districts, where manual labour is an important consideration. But the British territory once

passed, especially towards the east, polyandry will still be found in Kanawar. The cause assigned is, however, not poverty, but a desire to keep the common patrimony from being distributed among a number of brothers. The result is that the whole family is enabled to live in comparative comfort."

Any one who has attempted to obtain original information from people who suspect evil intentions in every action or question of a European stranger will understand how difficult it is to verify statements, not to speak of collecting facts only conjectured. But, taking the observation of former travellers as a fact respecting the low state of morality among the hill people, it would be strange indeed to learn that they had become in course of a generation convinced of their pernicious practices, and had turned over a new leaf. And so it actually is. Though slavery is now abolished, the marketable value of a wife still exists. Moral perception is now no acuter than formerly, for it is nothing extraordinary to hear that two men disgusted with their wives have agreed to interchange them, hoping that a new arrangement in their domestic affairs would conduce to greater peace and comfort. But far worse, and a vice unknown to the Hindus of the plains, is the marriage within the prohibited degrees of relationship. Not that this practice is indeed very common, but its existence at all without being visited by the severest social penalties is a sign that domestic ties are not considered of a very sacred character. . . .

In a thoroughly conservative country like India, habits do not change *per saltum*, nor can much be effected in a decade; even half a century will produce no perceptible change in the more remote corners of the Himālaya. As regards polyandry, a glance at Fraser's *Journal of a Tour through part of the snowy range of the Himala Mountains* will give the reader a fair idea of its present condition. Speaking of the hill people it is stated—"Their custom of marriage and the general system with respect to their women are very extraordinary. It is usual all over the country for the future husband to purchase his wife from her parents, and the sum thus paid varies with the rank of the purchaser. The customary charge to a common peasant or zamindār is from ten to twenty rupees. The difficulty of raising this sum, and the alleged expense of maintaining women, may in part account for, if it cannot excuse, a most disgusting usage, which is universal over the country. Three or four or more brothers marry one wife who is the wife of all; they are unable to raise the requisite sum individually, and thus club their shares, and buy this one common spouse."

This account was printed in 1820. It is not surprising that when Fraser heard of this very revolting custom in the course of his travels he was further attracted, and made inquiries into the cause of the origin and continuance of so remarkable an inconsistency with all Hindu manners. He therefore relates that his informers, who were, on the whole, sensible and intelligent men, "unanimously admitted the universality of the custom, that it was usual to purchase wives, and that the zamindārs were too poor to be able to give from ten to twenty rupees for a woman, and therefore contributed their quota, and each enjoyed his share of the purchase. They often explained the modes usually adopted to prevent quarrelsome interference, and described everything as already detailed; but when I came to put questions relative to the disposal of the surplus of females they could give me no satisfactory answers whatever."

Supposing the above account to be correct,—and there is little reason to doubt it,—we have two things that require confirmation before the statement can be accepted as applicable after a lapse of more than fifty years—the universality of polyandry, and its causes. Fraser seems to think that the custom of having a community of wives would not exist but for the poverty of the hill people. But in that case it would have disappeared long since, or, if not, it could not possibly exist side by side with polygamy; whereas the fact is that instances have come to my notice of these two practices existing in one and the same family. Poor the hill people undoubtedly are, but there are few who are destitute. Ever since the English government was firmly established in the Panjāb, the inhabitants of the plains as well as the hills have benefitted by the gradual rise of the price of labour or of agricultural produce. If, therefore, any man finds that there are too many mouths to feed in his household, one or more of the grown male members must leave for a time their home and obtain work in the larger farms of a prosperous neighbour, or else go in quest of service in one of the numerous hill sanitarium. This, however, he abhors. He is constitutionally lazy, improvident, dirty, and immoral. If a crop is plentiful he will wastefully consume the whole outturn, instead of laying by a store for a possible bad season. He will not move twenty miles, as a rule, to earn a livelihood, and he does not cultivate more ground than is absolutely necessary to maintain himself and his family. Moreover, besides ploughing the fields and sowing the seed, he leaves the field work to be performed by the women—the weeding, the reaping, the thrashing, the garnering. The household duties, of course, fall upon the women.

If, then, the Pahâri is poor, it is chiefly his own fault, and the promiscuous and complicated connections he enters into cannot fairly be charged to his poverty. On the contrary, most of the cases of polyandry in the villages of the Kôtgadh district, in Bussahir and Kulu, are found among the well-to-do people; it is the poor who prefer polygamy, on account of the value of the women as household drudges.

Nothing, perhaps, will give a more vivid insight into the state of polyandry than one or two cases as they have actually occurred. In Pomelai, near Kôtgadh, there are two brothers, the elder of whom, Jhar, got properly married to his wife. Being of the Kanait caste, the ceremony was performed in the usual manner by a Brâhman. But, as these two brothers had a house and fields in common, it was privately arranged that the woman should also be the wife of the younger. The fruit of such a union does not generally give rise to disputes; the first-born child is always considered that of the eldest brother, the second that of the next. Legally, I believe, the children all belong to the eldest. No European would probably have become aware of the case at Pomelai, but for a violent quarrel which obliged Jhar to leave his wife to his younger brother, and seek for employment in the house of the missionary at Kôtgadh.

In another village, Mongsu, not far from Pomelai, there live three brothers in a family of high caste, the eldest of whom, Primu by name, married a woman who became afterwards the wife of the second, Gangâ. The third brother, on the other hand,—Ratti,—has a separate wife.

The most complicated case of polyandry that has come to my notice is that at Kilba, in Kanawar, about a hundred miles from Kôtgadh. Râm Charn, the *mukhid* or head-man of the village, had three brothers,—Khatti Râm, Basant Râm, and another,—and these four brothers had only one wife in common. Her eldest son, Premsukh, was in 1870 about five-and-twenty years old, and her youngest seven or eight. These two, besides a girl called Sundri Dâsi, were the acknowledged children of Râm Charn, the *mukhid*. Khatti Râm had no children, but Basant Râm, the third brother, had first a girl, Amar Dâsi, aged eighteen, and two boys about fourteen and eleven. All six children acknowledged Râm Charn as head of the family. When Premsukh, the eldest son, who officiated as *mukhid* in the absence of his father, was married, it was well understood that his wife

would become the wife of all the brothers as they grew up, including the child then in his infancy. I hear this Premsukh lately married a second wife, as he had no family by the first. Again, the girl Amar Dâsi, daughter of Basant Râm, was not married until she was eighteen, because her father could not find any family which contained a sufficient number of brothers to make it worth his while to part with her. Eventually, however, she was married to an only son who was wealthy.

These three instances of polyandry are culled from a large number I made a note of, and it is hoped they will afford a general insight into the working of the system. But, with all due consideration to the high authority of Mr. Fraser, it is contended that polyandry, as it now exists in the Himâlaya, is owing rather to the avarice and the brutish insensibility to, and absence of, general morality than to the poverty of the people. When several brothers agree to have a wife in common, it will be found that, though individually rich enough to keep a wife, there is some property they have, and which they do not wish to divide.

Fields, grazing-lands, or a forest, or all together, produce sufficient to keep a combined family in respectability, but if divided and again subdivided each part would at last be too small to support two or three people. Polyandry is thus in reality nothing more than a mere custom of community of wives among brothers who have a community of other goods.

Next, I must modify another statement in *The Journal of a Tour* quoted above. The practice of polyandry, so far as I have been able to learn, is not universal,—it can scarcely be called very common; and, considering what was said by the committee of the Kôtgadh Mission in 1841, there are visible signs, though small, that the custom is falling into disuse. If diligently searched, single cases of polyandry will be found in the Kôtgadh parganâ, in Kulu, in the territory of the Râjâs of Komarsen and Kaneti, and in Bussahir, and this not confined to any special caste, but among Brâhmanas, Râjputs, and Kanaitas without distinction. Though common enough in Kanawar at the present day, it exists side by side with polygamy and monogamy. In one house there may be three brothers with one wife; in the next three brothers with four wives, all alike in common; in the next house there may be a man with three wives to himself; in the next a man with only one wife.

MISCELLANEA.

THE FIREARMS OF THE HINDUS.

Many were the weapons of war in use amongst the Āryans, even so early as the Vedic period, such as the pās sela, bagra, chakra, dhanu, &c.; and many more were invented in the ages of the *Rāmāyana* and the *Mahābhārata*. The classification of these weapons, according to the *Agni Purāṇa*, is four-fold:—(1) *Yantra-Mukta*, (2) *Pani Mukta*, (3) *Mukta-Mukta*, and (4) *Amukta*.

Besides these weapons, there is mentioned another called the *Agni Astra* (firearm), but no description of it has been found in any Sanskrit work. The *Sataghni*, Professor Wilson supposes to be a firearm; but he gives no description of it. The Hindus had also another kind of weapon, called the *Mahā-Yantra*. It would thus seem that instruments like the cannon and the gun were early in use among them.

We shall describe the *Agni Astra* as given in the *Sūtra-Nīti*, a work said to have been written by the sage *Sūkra-Āchārya*; and we find mention of it in the *Agni Purāṇa* and in the *Mudra Rākshasa*. From the description we have here of the *Nalika-Yantra* and gunpowder, we are led to believe that these were in use amongst the Hindus at an early date.

Nalika Yantra.

नालिकं द्विविधं ज्ञेयं बृहत्क्षुद्रविभेदतः ।
विष्टयगूर्ध्वं छिद्रमूलं नालं पञ्चवितस्तिकम् ।

The *Nalika* is of two sizes—the larger and the smaller. It is about five spans in length, slightly bent in the middle and bored towards the bottom.

मूलामयोर्लक्ष्यभेदि तिलविन्दुयुतं सप्त ।
खन्दायातामिहून् भावचूर्णधृक् मूलकर्णकम् ।
सुकाष्ठिपादुबुध्णञ्च मध्याङ्गुलिबिलान्तरम् ।

स्वान्तेऽग्निचूर्णं सन्धात्री शलाका संयुतं वृद्धम् ।

It should have, moreover, two notches, one at the top and the other at the bottom, for securing the aim, and an ear near the bore, and the flint for striking fire inserted near it. It is set in a wooden frame which elongates into a thin blade upwards, and has a hole in it of the width of the middle finger. It has further a ramrod for beating and settling down the powder.

लघुनालिक्रमप्येत् प्रधायै पतिसाक्षिभिः ।

यथापायातु स्वक् सारं यथास्थलविलान्तरम्

यथाक्षीर्षं बृहत् गोलं दूरभेदी तथासथा ।

This is the smaller *Nalika*. It should be used by infantry and cavalry. It is as thick as it is long, and thus capable of taking a long aim.

मूलकीलं ब्रह्मलक्ष समसन्धानभाजि यत् ।

बृहत्नालिकं संयुतं काष्ठपुत्रं विवर्जितम् ।

If this *Nalika* is thick and has no wooden frame attached to it, it is called the *Brihat-Nalika*.

प्रवाहं शकटाद्यैस्तु सुयुतं विजयप्रदम् ।

It is sometimes so big that it requires to be drawn by a cart. It graces war and secures victory.

Gunpowder.

अग्नि चूर्णम् ।

सुवर्चिलवणान् पञ्चपलानि गन्धकात् पलम् ।

अन्तर्धूमं विपकार्कस्तुल्यमङ्गारतः पलम् ।

सुखासंमाह सञ्चूर्णं सम्मील्य प्रपुटेदकैः ।

स्वस्वकर्णं रसेनास्य शोधयेदातपेन च ।

पिष्टाशर्करं वचेतश्मिचूर्णं भवेत् खलु ॥

Jaba-khar (saltpetre), sulphur, charcoal of *Akanda* (*Calotropis gigantea*) (soaked in the milk of *Euphorbia nivulia*, and dried and then burned in closed pottery). All these ingredients should be reduced to powder and then mixed together in due proportions, and used as gunpowder in the *Nalika*.

गोलो लौहमयो गर्भगुदिकः केदलोऽपि वा ।

सीसस्व लघुनालार्थं खन्धायातुमनयोऽपि वा ।

लौहसारमयं चापि नालास्त्रं खन्धायातुमम् ।

नित्यं सन्मार्जनं स्वच्छमस्तं पत्तिभिर्वाह्यतम् ।

Round and made of iron and fired with smaller bullets, or it is solid. It is used in the *Brihat-Nalika*. For the smaller, one small bullet of lead or other metal should be made. The *Nala* should be made of iron or of like metal, and kept constantly clean. This instrument is for infantry and cavalry.

क्षिपन्ति चाग्नियोगान् गोलं लक्ष्येषु नालमम् ।

नालास्तं शोधयेदाशी दद्यात्तश्चाग्निचूर्णकम् ।

निवेदायेत्तद्वस्तेन नालमूले तथा वृद्धम् ।

तंतु सुगोलकं दद्यात् ततः कर्णोऽग्निचूर्णकम् ।

कर्णचूर्णमिश्रणेन गोलं लक्ष्ये निपातयेत् ।

The manner of firing the *Nalika* with bullets is as follows:—First clean the *Nalika* well, then pour in powder and shot, and stuff the bore with a little gunpowder. Thus loaded and fired, it is sure to do execution.

लक्ष्यभेदी यथा वासो धनुज्या विनियोजितः ।

भवेत्तयातुसन्धाय ———— ;

The bullet flies with the velocity of an arrow from a bow.

समं नूनाधिकैर्दशैरग्निचूर्णान्यनेकाशः ।

कापयन्ति च तद्विद्याध्वनिका भावि मन्ति च ।

Besides the materials mentioned above for preparing gunpowder, many other ingredients were also known to adepts in the art, and used in different proportions for the same purpose: *Sūtra-Nīti*, Section 4.

The ślokas, quoted here from the *Sūtra-Nīti*, do not seem mere modern interpolations; but we stop here for want of sufficient corroborative evidence.

Berhampore, Bengal.

Rām Dīś SEN.

ANTIQUITY OF INSURANCE IN INDIA.¹

SIR,—I think "Cantab" has hardly evidence for saying that "the practice of insurance was common in India for many centuries before the Christian era." The text out of the ordinances of Manu, in the translation accredited by Jones, is—"Having ascertained the rates of purchase and sale, the length of the way, the expenses of food and of condiments, the charges of securing the goods carried, and the neat profits of trade, let the king oblige traders to pay taxes." One would think that if the king or his minister had got 'the neat profits' he would not trouble himself with the details; but, says the next verse, "As the leech, the suckling calf, and the bee take their natural food by little and little, thus must a king draw from his dominions an annual revenue."

I do not think we know enough of the state of mercantile law and custom in the days of these kings to assert that anything like a modern system of insuring goods was in vogue. Manu is very general; some of his dicta are like that decree of king Ahasuerus that "All the wives shall give to their husbands honour, both great and small." Just before the order for taxing the merchants, he says—"In every large town or city let him appoint one superintendent of all affairs, elevated in rank, formidable in power, distinguished as a planet among stars."

There is one other order very similar to that cited first, establishing what indeed has descended to very modern time, called mostly a *nirakkh*:—"Let the king establish rules for the sale and purchase of all marketable things, having duly considered whence they come and whither they must be sent; how long they have been kept; what may be gained by them, and what has been expended on them." In the translations of other ordinary authorities on Hindu law there is no trace of a system of insurance of goods, though much about deposit and bailment; and in practice in modern times, apart from an occasional copying of English

practices, there is no such thing as insurance, and there are no insurance companies.

The word *Yoga-Kshemam* is in every-day use among Bráhmans for 'welfare,'—a complimentary expression,—but the dictionary also gives insurance as a meaning.

R. B. SWINTON,

Dec. 27th, 1877.

late Madras C.S.

HYPÆTHRAL TEMPLES.

There appears to be a considerable resemblance between the remarkable hypæthral temple lately described by Sir Walter Elliot (*Ind. Ant.* vol. VII. p. 19), and the Trimurti Kovil at the foot of the Anaimalai Hills in Koimbatour, noticed at page 35, vol. III. The Orissa temple is evidently much larger and more important, but the other one, so much further to the south, is situated in a locality of old doubtless equally wild, and even now sequestered and remote. The circle of images with faces turned inward—an arrangement I have never seen elsewhere—corresponds with "the open circular temple or enclosure of plain cut-stone" in Orissa, and, to the best of my remembrance, the images were backed by a low wall not reaching to their shoulders—an approach to an hypæthral structure. The principal figure in the Orissa temple "appeared to have three faces," and the figure indistinctly graven upon the great boulder overlooking the Koimbatour circle indicated three figures, doubtful whether united, but the place is called Trimurti Kovil or Temple. It had all the look of extreme antiquity, was regarded with awe by the natives, who generally disliked approaching it, and seemed something quite apart from the ordinary temples and sacred resorts of these days. It were much to be wished that the locality could be visited and accurately described; it is but a morning's ride from the tālukā Kasba town of Udumalapêta.

M. J. W.

METRICAL VERSIONS FROM THE MAHÁBHÁRATA.

BY J. MUIR, D.C.L., LL.D., &c.

*How Women ought to gain, and keep, their
Husbands' affections.*

A free translation of parts of the *Mahābhārata*.

Book iii., verses 14649-14721.

[Of the two ladies who figure in the following dialogue, the first is Satyabhāmā, the wife of the renowned Krishna, the ally of the Pāṇḍava princes; while the second is Draupadī (as she is most commonly called by her patronymic, as the daughter of Drupada, although her proper name was Kṛishṇā), the wife of the five Pāṇḍava princes,

Yudhishtīra and his brothers. Here we have a case of polyandry, which the *Mahābhārata*, in accommodation to later ideas, explains as originating in accidental and miraculous causes, although the custom is allowed, by some of the personages who appear in the poem, to have been one immemorially practised. Some indications of its (at least) occasional occurrence in the Pāṇjāb in ancient times are found in two passages adduced in two papers communicated by me to the *Indian Antiquary* (vol. VI. pp. 251f., 315).² It is

¹ From the *Times*.

² See also M. Williams' *Indian Epic Poetry*, pp. 39f.

worthy of remark that Satyabhāmā is represented in the passage before us as seeking to bring her husband, Krishna, under subjection by some of the philtres which she supposes Draupadī to have found effectual with the Pāṇḍavas, although Krishna was, either at the time when this section of the *Mahābhārata* was composed, or somewhat later, regarded as an incarnation of Vishnu, or of Brahma (the supreme Spirit), and (unless his deification was a later event, or unless his higher was not supposed always to permeate his human nature), might have been supposed, by his divine omniscience, to be incapable of deception by the wiles of his wife. I may add that, at the time when the dialogue is related to have occurred, the Pāṇḍavas were living in the forests, in pursuance of an engagement to exile themselves from their kingdom for a certain period. (See Professor Monier-Williams' *Indian Epic Poetry*, pp. 23 and 103.) The passage before us may doubtless be held to prove that in ancient days the women of India were in the habit of employing philtres of various kinds to gain or keep their husbands' affections. In other respects, and irrespectively of the dutiful, though exaggerated, sentiments which the second speaker expresses, it may possess some interest as a picture of ancient Indian manners.]

Two ladies fair, of high estate,
Long parted, now again had met.
The one herself could justly pride
On being noble Krishna's bride;
The other ruled five princes' hearts
With loving sway, by honest arts.
Rejoiced each other now to see,
They laughed and chatted, full of glee.
In thought o'er all the past they ranged,
And ancient memories interchanged.
When this at length had found an end,
The former thus addressed her friend:—

Satyabhāmā.

"How is it, dearest Krishna, say,
That thou thy husbands so canst sway,—
Those godlike princes, youthful, bold,
Strong-limbed, and proud, and uncontrolled,—
Who ever watch thy looks, to find
What thoughts are passing in thy mind,
And ne'er against thy rule rebel?
Reveal, I pray, thy potent spell.
By what devices, what finesse,
Canst thou their proud self-will repress,
And make them all thy power confess?
Where lies thy strength? What philtres rare
Avail to gain thine end? declare.
Do rites, oblations, prayers, conduce
To work thy will, or lore abstruse?
Or is thy grand success the fruit
Of any drug, or herb, or root?"

What art is thine, which fame ensures,
And full connubial bliss secures?
For I, too, seek to rule my lord:
Thy methods tell; thy help afford."

These words when noble Krishna heard,
She spake with grief and sorrow stirred:—

Krishna (Draupadī).

"Such questions vain befit not thee,
A dame esteemed so sage to be.
For all but heartless wives eschew
Those wicked arts thou hast in view.
Could any female merit praise
For acts so shameful, schemes so base?
Whene'er a hapless husband knows
His foolish wife is one of those
Who ply their lords with drugs and charms,
His soul is racked by dire alarms,
As any one is ill at ease
Who in his house a serpent sees.
How can he lead a happy life
Who lives in dread of such a wife?
How many men whose wives thus sin,—
Who seek by drugs their lords to win,—
To fell diseases fall a prey,
Grow dropsied, leprous, pine away
In sad and premature decay!
Such madness could'st thou dare to share?
For thine own lord such ills prepare?
No wife has e'er, by drugs or charms,
Won back a husband to her arms.

Now, calmly hear how I proceed,
Avoiding every tortuous deed.
I seek to win my husbands' hearts
By none but open, honest arts.
And so their willing hearts I rule:
I ne'er cajole them, or befool,
Nor e'er on charms or drugs depend,
Their independent wills to bend.
From anger, pride, and passion free,
I serve my lords most zealously.
Without parade of fondness, still,
Submissive, I their wish fulfil.
By fitting gestures, gentle speech,
And mien, and acts, my goal I reach.
Those lords, whose glance alone could kill,
I please with all my might and skill.
Though they are never harsh or rude,
But always kind, and mild, and good,
I act as if constrained by awe,
And treat their slightest hint as law.
No other object draws my love,
On earth beneath, or heaven above.
No handsome, wealthy, jewelled youth,
No god, could shake my plighted troth.
For no delight or joy I care,
Unless my lords the pleasure share.

Whene'er their home they chance to leave,
Dejected, pale, I fast and grieve.
Their homeward safe return I greet
With sparkling eyes, and welcome meet.
Till all their wants are well supplied,
I never for my own provide.
At meal times, I, without delay,
The food they love before them lay,
Served up in golden platters fair,
All burnished bright with constant care.
My house is clean, and fairly swept,
Well stocked and ordered, neatly kept.
As friends I own, and talk with, none
But virtuous women: bad I shun.¹

From all such acts I ever shrink
As wellbred dames unseemly think.
Loud laughter, foolish jests, I hate,
And constant loitering at the gate.
My lords' behests I all observe,
From these I could not bear to swerve.
Just issued from the bath, and bright
In fair attire, with jewels dight,
Before my lords' appearing, I
Delight their eyes to gratify.

Whatever usage, rule or rite,
Whatever courtly forms polite,
My husbands' sires observed of old,
And they themselves in honour hold,
All these with never-ceasing care
I carry out; no toil I spare.
And here the way their mother shows,
Who all the past exactly knows.
Her will I follow; her revere;
And hold the noble woman dear.

By constant care, alertness, zeal,
I seek to work my husbands' weal.
Base women's wicked arts I shun;
By nobler means my ends are won.

In happier days,* at sumptuous feasts
We entertained eight thousand priests.
Those Bráhmans, learn'd and grave, in state

Their food from golden platters ate.
And many other guests beside
Were every day with food supplied.
Whate'er within our household passed
Was known to me from first to last.
I knew the servants, one by one,
And all they did or left undone.
My husbands' hoards of gold I knew,
Their income, all their outlay too;
To me they left all household cares,—
A mass of manifold affairs.
On me this burthen all was thrown;
This load I bore without a groan,
And sacrificed my rest and ease,
My work to do, my lords to please.
I rose the first by dawn's faint light,
Retired the last to rest at night.
Such are the philtres, such the spells,
Whose power my husbands' love compels.
To please her lord a virtuous wife
Should deem the object of her life.
To him her thoughts should ever turn;
With love to him her heart should burn;
Her hope is he, her refuge, god;
And all her acts should wait his nod.

In vain by ease is pleasure sought;
By pains and toil alone 'tis bought.
Strive, then, thy lord's esteem to win;
A new career of love begin.
Whene'er his step without the gate
Is heard, start up, and on him wait.
With cheerful tact his wishes meet,
His palate please with viands sweet,
His every sense with pleasure sate;
Within thy home a heaven create.
So doing, thou shalt make it clear
That he to thee is very dear;
And then, thy love perceiving, he
With answering love will cherish thee.
This course will bring thee high renown,—
Thy life with bliss connubial crown.

(To be continued.)

BOOK NOTICES.

THE VEDĀRTHATATNA, OR AN attempt to interpret the Vedas (Añkas 1-11, April 1876 to February 1877). Bombay: Induprakāsa Press.

We had intended noticing this monthly publication at an earlier date, but as the commentary

and notes, as well as one of the translations, are in Marāṭhi, and only the second translation of the Vedic texts is given in English, it was difficult to find a qualified and independent critic. Scholars,

¹ Compare the Troades of Euripides, 647ff., where Andromache says of herself:—

πρώτον μὲν, ἔνθα κὰν προσῇ κὰν μὴ προσῇ
ψόγος γυναιξίν, αὐτὸ τοῦτ' ἐφέλκεται
κακῶς ἀκούειν, ἥ τις οὐκ ἔνδον μένει,
τοῦτου παρῆσα πόθον ἔμμενον ἐν δομοῖς
εἶσω τεμελάβρων κομψὰ θηλειῶν, ἔπη
οὐκ εἰσεφρούμην, τὸν δὲ νοῦν διδάσκαλον
οἶκον ἐχουσα χρηστὸν ἐξήρουν ἐμοί.

"In the first place, where (whether a slur already attaches

to a woman or not) this very conduct is sure to bring ill repute in its train, when one does not keep (literally, to her who does not keep) at home; giving up the desire of this, I used to stay within the house, and did not bring into it the clever sayings of women (i.e., their gossip, and romantic notions); but having my mind a good teacher by its own instinct, I was content with myself."—Paley.

* That is, while the Pāṇḍavas were at home, and in possession of their dominions. Some of the preceding details also, though expressed in the present tense, should—if the story is to be regarded as self-consistent—be referred to this earlier period.

both European and native, have testified their approbation of it. Its object is chiefly social and religious. "There are thousands of Brāhmanas," the editor remarks, "who know the whole of the *Rigveda* by heart, and can repeat it in Samhitā, Pada, Gatā, Ghava, and Krama, without making any mistakes [these are different methods of learning the *Veda*, by either reciting each word separately, or by repeating the words in various complicated ways]; there are probably not more than a dozen who have ever attempted to understand what the *Veda* contains. There are quite as many who can repeat the Yajus and also the Sāma Veda, though Atharva-Vedis are very few, at least in the Bombay Presidency."

Prof. Max Müller, in a paper on "The Veda and its Influence in India,"¹ taking this publication as his text, speaks of it thus:—"The translation now offered to the natives in Sanskrit, Marāṭhi, and English is chiefly intended to show what the *Veda* really contains, and especially to prove that those texts which are supposed to authorize modern rites and beliefs among the people do not authorize them. To this object the greater part of the notes are devoted. Thus the verse i. 6, 3, *Ketum kṛinvan aketave* is repeated in a ceremony now performed to avert the ill-will of the imaginary planet Ketu. An ignorant priest, who only knew how to repeat the verse, at once connected the *ketum* of the verse with the planet Ketu, and accordingly taught that all the *Purāṇas* tell about Ketu was authorized by the *Veda*. A note of the translator fully explains this, and shows the simplicity of the religious conceptions of the Vedic Rishis as compared with those of their modern interpreters.

"We are told that, if the authority of the *Veda* is regarded as invulnerably sacred, the belief that it is impossible for any human being not inspired, like the old Rishis, to interpret the *Veda*, is almost as invulnerably firm. Hence the editor has adopted the following plan. He gives first the Samhitā text of the *Rig-Veda* with the Pada text, because the Vaidik Brāhmanas regard the Samhitā text alone as quite incomplete. He then gives a translation based as much as possible on the recognized commentary of Sāyaṇa. He does not, however, follow Sāyaṇa slavishly, but if he finds that the explanation of a word which that infallible commentator gives in one passage is impossible, he takes, whenever he can do so, another explanation of the same word given by the same writer in some other passage, thus shielding his departure from Sāyaṇa by the authority of Sāyaṇa himself. This rendering of the *Veda* into Sanskrit is chiefly intended for the old Shāstris, who despise all vernacular speech, and who would be

repelled still more by English. The Marāṭhi translation will find its way to the educated classes among the natives; the English is intended for that small but important class of Indian society which has adopted the language of the ruler as the *lingua franca* of the day. It is to be hoped that this important work may be continued, though it will probably take at least ten years to finish it."

The LIFE of JENGHIZ KHAN. Translated from the Chinese. With an introduction by Robert Kennaway Douglas, of the British Museum, and Professor of Chinese at King's College, London. (London: Trübner & Co. 1877).

This little volume on the Life of the great Tatar conqueror Jenghiz Khān supplies, from Chinese sources, a record of his early life and of his victorious career in China, which are treated but cursorily in the Persian and Mongol historians, who concern themselves principally with his more western conquests. "It has been translated from the *Yuen She*, or 'The History of the Yuen dynasty,' by Sung Leen; the *Yuen she tui peen*, or 'The History of the Yuen Dynasty classified and arranged,' by Shaou Yuen-ping; and the *She wei*, or 'The Weof of History,' by Chin Yun-Seih. Each of these works contains facts and details, which do not appear in the other two,"—and the translator has judiciously woven the three narratives into one connected history. But, to make the account of the conquests of Jenghiz more complete, he has preceded it by an introduction of about twenty-five pages, giving a brief sketch of the campaigns in Western Asia and Eastern Europe, drawn principally from the third chapter of Howorth's excellent *History of the Mongols*.

The translated narrative extends over 105 pages, and is a thoroughly readable chapter of a history that, with the exception of a few incidents, may doubtless be accepted as authentic and tolerably accurate in its details of the life of the man "whose armies were victorious from the China Sea to the banks of the Dnieper." It was the march of his Mongols that displaced the Ottoman Turks from their original home in Northern Asia, and thus "led to their invasion of Bithynia under Othman, and ultimately to their advance into Europe under Amurath the First."

The Chinese materials for these annals have been already drawn upon by continental scholars such as Pauthier, Hyacinthe, D'Ohsson, Erdmann, Gaubil, Schott, Kavalevsky, and others, but this is their first appearance in an English dress. We hail the volume as an evidence of a growing interest in Oriental research, and hope Professor Douglas will be encouraged to undertake other versions.

¹ *The Academy*, Nov. 18, 1876, p. 501.

THE THREE NEW EDICTS OF AŚOKA.

SECOND NOTICE.

BY G. BÜHLER.

(See *Ind. Ant.* vol. VI. pp. 148ff.)

MY translation and analysis of General A. Cunningham's new Aśoka edicts, published in vol. VI. pp. 149ff of the *Indian Antiquary*, have called forth two reviews in the *London Academy*, one by Mr. Rhys Davids,¹ and one by Professor R. Pischel,² in which my explanations of several important words have been found fault with, and the correctness of the historical inferences drawn from the inscriptions has been disputed. Mr. Rhys Davids has also devoted a couple of pages to the new edicts in an appendix to his work "On the coins and measures of Ceylon" (*Numismata Orientalia*, Part VI. pp. 57-60). As the latter work contains an analysis of the statements regarding Buddhistic

chronology, given in the *Dīpavaṃsa* and *Mahāvamsa*, as well as a very ingenious attempt to fix the date of the Nirvāṇa somewhere about 410 B.C., the author very naturally felt it necessary to deal with the somewhat inconvenient three edicts, which, if the interpretation given by me were right, would make his deductions valueless. The importance of the questions connected with the new inscriptions, and the consciousness that in my first notice some important points have been either entirely omitted, or rather touched than fully discussed, induce me to reply to the strictures passed on my article.

For the sake of ready reference I reprint the texts of the *Sahasrām* and *Rūpnāth* edicts.³

Sahasrām.

Devānām piye hevaṃ ā[hā : sātīlekāni adhi]i-
yāni savachhalāni, am upāsake sumi, na cha
bādham palakamte.

Savimchhale sādhike, am [sumi bādham pala-
kam]t[e].

Etena cha amtalena jambudīpasi ammisam
dev[hu]sam, ta munisā misam deva katā.

Pala[kamasi hi] iyaṃ phale, [n]o [cha e]yaṃ
malatātā-vachakiye pāvatave.

Khudakena hi palakamamīnenā vipule suag-
[e] [sa]kiye ālā[dhaya]v[e].

Se etāye athāye iyaṃ sāvane :

Khudakā cha udālā cha palakamamtu, amta pi
cham

janamtu ; chilathitike cha palakame hotu.

Iyaṃ cha aṭhe vadhisati, vipulam pi cha va-
dhisati, diyādhiyam avaladhiyenā diyādhiyam
vadhisati.

Iyaṃ cha savane vivuthena ; duve sapaṃ-
nālātisatā vivuthā ti (su ṇ phra) 256.

Iraa cha aṭham pavatesu likhāpayā thāya ;
[yata] vā athi hete silāthambhā tata pi likhā-
payā thāyi.

Rūpnāth.

Devānām piye hevaṃ āhā : sātīrakekāni
adhitisāni va[sā], ya sumi pākā sa[va] ki, no
cha bādhi pakate.

Sātīleke chu chhavachhare, ya sumi haka
saṃgha-papite, bādhi cha pakate.

Yi imāya kālāya jambudīpasi amisā devā-
husu, te dāni masā katā.

Pakamasi hi esa phale, no cha esā mahatātā-
pāpatave.

Khudakenā hi kapi parumamīnenā sakiye
pipule pi svage ārodhave.

Etiya athāya cha sāvane kate :

Khudakā cha udālā cha palakamamtu ti, atā
pi cha

janamtu ; iyaṃ pakāre cha kiti ? chirathitike
siyā. Iya hi aṭhe vadhi vadhisiti, vipula cha
vadhisiti, apaladhiyenā diyādhiyam vadhisati.

Iya cha aṭhe pavatisu lekhāpeta vālata hadha
cha ; athi silāthubhe silāthambhāsi lākhāpeta
vayata.

Etinā cha vāyajanenā yāvatakatu paka abāle,
savara-vivase tavāyati. Vyuthenā sāvane kate ;
(su ṇ phra) 256 satavivāsā ta.

¹ *The Academy*, July 14, 1877, p. 37.

² *Ib.* Aug. 11, 1877, p. 145.

³ Corrections and vv. ll. :-

Sahasrām.

Savachhale — amisam, — devā, — cha janamtu, — sāvane.
Mr. Rhys Davids in addition reads *sapaṃnālātisatā*, a
correction regarding which I am still as doubtful as when
I wrote my first article. — *Num. Or.* VI. p. 57, note 1.

Rūpnāth.

sātīlekāni, — haka — pakamamīnenā, — vipule — ārodhave —
pakare ? — lekhāpeta thāyi ti — tapayati ? — tapāyati ? — vya-
thenā ? —

Mr. Rhys Davids suggests for *sa(va)ki*, *su-ko*, I think
unnecessarily. His correction *vyuthena*, is also unnecessary
as the inscriptions show three instr. in *end*. The real reading
of the inscription is *kate*, not *kapa* as he supposes. — *Num.*
Or. VI. p. 57, note 2.

In my analysis of these edicts I stated—

Firstly, that the author must be a king, because he uses the ancient royal title, *Devānāmpīye*, speaks of his greatness, and asserts that he caused a change of religion throughout India, and incised his edicts on rocks and pillars.

Secondly, that this king probably belonged to the third century B.C., and to the Maurya dynasty, on account of the title, which we know to have been a Maurya title, and on account of the alphabet employed in writing the inscription.

Thirdly, that he must have been a Buddhist, because the Mauryas were patrons of that sect, and because we have no evidence that the Jainas, the only other known sect which the terms employed in the inscriptions would fit, were patronized by a Maurya.

Fourthly, that as the author of the inscription was a Buddhist, the author of the sermon which the inscription quotes, the *Vivutha* or *Vyutha*, must be Śākyamuni Buddha, and that *vivutha* must mean 'the Departed,' or 'he who has passed away,' on account of the phrase *duve sapannāldtisatā vivuthā* (Sah. 6, 7), and that the word *probably* corresponded to Sanskrit *vivṛitta*.

Fifthly, that if the *Vivutha* was Buddha, the era used must be that of the Nirvāṇa, and that the explanation of *satavivāśā* by *śāstri-vivāśāt*, 'from the departure, i.e. the death, of the teacher,' which I regarded as *probable*, confirmed this view.

Sixthly, that as the inscription belonged to a Buddhist and Maurya king, no one but Aśoka could be the author, as no other Maurya had ruled as long as thirty-four years, or been for so long a time a Buddhist; and

Seventhly, that the statements of the *Mahāvamsā*, if correctly interpreted, showed that Aśoka had been a Buddhist for about thirty-four years, and might have been alive during the greater part of the year 257 after the Nirvāṇa.

In his first review (*Academy*, July 14th, 1877) of my article, Mr. Rhys Davids demurred to one point only, viz. to the explanation of the word *vivāśā* by 'death,' preferring to render it, 'in accordance with classical usage,' by 'abandoning his home' or 'becoming an ascetic,' and assumed that the era used was not that of Buddha's Nirvāṇa, but that of the Great Renunciation.

He further stated that even if my interpretation were correct, and the era used were that of the Nirvāṇa, the inscription would only prove that the Buddhists *believed* the Nirvāṇa to have taken place 257 years before the 34th of Aśoka's conversion, and *not* that it *actually did* take place at that time. He finally suggested that the opening sentence of the edicts might mean that the gods of Jambudvīpa, who had hitherto held aloof from men (i.e. the Buddhist deities), had been caused to mingle with them.*

Next, Professor Pischel, in a note on the inscription (*Academy*, Aug. 11, 1877) objected to my view that the edicts belonged to Aśoka. He declared my explanations of *vivutha*, *vyutha*, and *sata* to be inadmissible. The former two words he identified with the Sanskrit *vyushita*, the past part. pass. of *vivas*, 'to depart,' and translated them by 'he who has departed from life.' *Sata* he declared to be the Sanskrit *sattva*, 'life,' and explained the phrase *satavivāśā* by *sattvavivāśāt*, 'since his departure from life.' He further contended that, as neither of these terms nor any other word was clearly of Buddhist origin, nothing remained to connect the inscriptions with Aśoka. He therefore took them to be Jaina, and expressed his conviction that the *Vivutha* must be Mahāvīra, for which view he adduced a phrase, 'from the departure,' occurring in Stevenson's *Kalpa-sūtra*, p. 95. He finally ascribed the inscriptions to Aśoka's grandson Sampadī, whom, as I had stated, the Jainas represent to have been a patron of theirs.

Finally, Mr. Rhys Davids, in the appendix to the *Numismata Orientalia*, Pt. VI. pp. 57-60, once more reviews the whole question. Influenced by Professor Pischel's criticism, he no longer confidently attributes the edicts to Aśoka, but thinks that my arguments for that view are not sufficient. He repeats Professor Pischel's assertion that the terms employed in the edict may be Jaina as well as Buddhist; he also points out that *Devānāmpīya*, the Jaina form of *Devānāmpīye*, is used by the latter as a polite form of address to inferiors and women. Hence he thinks that my strongest argument for the identity of the author of the edicts with Aśoka, drawn from the fact that he was the only *Devānāmpīye* who in the third century of the Buddhist

* As I shall not recur to this remark, I may as well state that the explanation of *misam*, by *miśra*, seems to me very improbable.

era was a zealous Buddhist, and reigned more than thirty-four years, falls to the ground. He, however, does not go so far as to absolutely reject the authorship of Asoka; but he would, in case that were proved, adhere to his former explanations of *vivāsa* by *abhinikkhamana*, or 'turning ascetic,' and take *vivutha-vyutha* for an equivalent of *vyushita-vyushita*, and in the sense of *pravrajita*. He combats Prof. Pischel's explanation of *satavivāsa*, and he also gives Professor Jacobi's authentic text of the passage from the Jaina *Kalpasūtra* to which Professor Pischel had referred, and shows that it affords no countenance to the identification of the *Vivutha* with *Mahāvira* or, to call him by his correct name, *Nirgrantha Jñātiputra*.⁵ The result at which Mr. Rhys Davids arrives is that the inscriptions afford no assistance for determining the date of the Nirvāṇa, that they may be either Jaina or Buddhist, and that everything connected with them is exceedingly uncertain and doubtful.⁶

These reviews contain the following points which require consideration:—(1) whether the inscriptions really contain nothing that connects them with Asoka, and shows them to be Buddhist; (2) the etymology of the terms *Vivutha-Vyutha* and *Sata*; (3) the explanation of the word *vivāsa* by *abhinikkhamana*, 'the Great Renunciation.' To the discussion of these points I shall have to add an inquiry regarding Mr. Rhys Davids's adjustment of the date of the Nirvāṇa. For it is evident that if his deductions from the texts of the *Dīpavaṃsa* and of the *Mahāvāṃsa* are correct, and the Nirvāṇa has to be placed about 410 B.C., the Ceylonese date for Asoka's coronation, 219 A.B., with which, according to my interpretation, the date of the inscriptions agrees, must necessarily be wrong. I shall also have to consider his remark that in the most favourable case the new edicts prove only the belief prevailing in Asoka's time regarding the date of the Nirvāṇa, not the actual date itself; and to add a

few further facts bearing on the interpretation of the edicts, which I omitted in my first notice.

As regards the first point, I regret that I cannot agree either with the method employed by my critics in their discussion of the authorship of the edicts, nor with their results. In my opinion, the question if the terms *saṅgha*, *upāsaka*, *sāvaka*, *vivutha-vyutha*, *sata*, *Devānām piye* are exclusively Buddhist, or if they have been used by Jainas, Brahmans or other sects also, as well as the etymology of *vivutha-vyutha* and *sata*, affect the chief problem very little. I have myself stated that some of these words were used by two sects, and I have no doubt that all of them were current in the fourth and third centuries B.C. among the adherents of various sects. In some cases actual proof for this belief can be furnished. I have given two possible etymologies for *vivutha*, and nine for *sata*, and I now regret that I did not add two more for the former word, as my doing so might have made it clearer how little I relied on them. The chief problem—the question *who* was the author of the new edicts—has to be solved in an entirely different manner, viz. by a careful comparison of the old Asoka edicts, and of the other known Prakrit inscriptions with the new edicts. If that comparison is duly made, I think it will be found that there is a good deal to connect the new inscriptions with Asoka, and that their authorship is not even doubtful. If my critics, in answer to this defence, charged me with having neglected to state my case clearly, and to put forward in a prominent manner all the points which prove Asoka to be the author of the three edicts, I should feel obliged to plead guilty. But I should urge in extenuation that I trusted to their knowledge of the old Asoka edicts, which would enable them to recognize at once the family likeness existing between the old and new sets, and to supply my omissions. I must also confess that the decided opinion of General Cunningham, who, long before the inscriptions came into my hands,

⁵ The discovery of the real name of the founder of the Jainas belongs to Professor Jacobi and myself. The form *Jñātiputra* occurs in the Jaina and Northern Buddhist books; in Pali it is *Nātaputta*, and in Jaina-Prakrit *Nāyaputta*. *Jñāta* or *Jñāti* appears to have been the name of the Rajput clan from which the *Nirgrantha* was descended.

⁶ Mr. Rhys Davids does not discuss Professor Pischel's conjecture which makes *Sampadi* the author of the edicts. I shall follow him in this respect, and merely remark that *Sampadi* is, according to the Buddhists and

the Jainas, the grandson of Asoka, and that the first author of certain date who gives the history of his conversion to Jainism by *Suhasi* and of his benefactions is *Hemachandra*, the contemporary of *Kumārāpāla* (1173 A.D.). *Hemachandra's* account is purely legendary and unhistorical. The tradition that *Sampadi* was a protector of the Jainas is, however, old. *Sampadi* may be merely another name of *Daśaratha*, who appears in his stead in the Brahmanical *rājavalis*, or he may be a distinct person. But the information regarding him is too vague to afford a basis for any historical speculations.

recognized their origin,⁷ as well as the agreement of other eminent epigraphists with his and my conclusions, influenced the manner in which I put the case. I can now only express my regret that I have not been explicit enough, and arrange the decisive arguments in the proper manner. The case may be stated as follows:—

We possess a large number of inscriptions which, according to the *consensus communis* of all competent scholars, belong to the Maurya Aśoka. These inscriptions are written in the peculiar characters which are usually called Pali or Lāt, and which I prefer to style Maurya. These inscriptions, further, are written in a number of Prakrit dialects, which differ from all those known from other sources, and which vary according to the provinces where they are found. They are distinguished by a very peculiar style, and by their moralizing, sermonizing contents. In the latter respect they are unique, utterly different from the inscriptions of all other Indian princes. They are further incised both on rocks and pillars, in slightly varying recensions. Their author calls himself usually Devānām Piye Piyadasi, and in some cases simply Devānām Piye.

If we now turn to the new edicts, we find that they closely resemble the old ones in every one of the details mentioned. The new edicts, too, are written in the Maurya characters; they, too, show different dialects, according to the districts where they were incised. Their vocabulary is, with the exception of two or three words, identical with that of the old edicts. The grammar of the Sahasrām edict perfectly agrees with that of Aśoka's Māgadha edicts. The Rūpnāth edict, which comes from the Central Provinces, agrees in some particulars more with the Saurāshtra inscriptions of Girnār, and is in other respects independent, though it comes nearer to the Aśoka forms than to any other. As regards the style, we find the

well-known formulas and turns: "The beloved of the gods speaketh thus", "This manner of acting should be what? of long duration", and so forth. The contents, too, agree so far with those of the old pillar or rock inscriptions that they are a sermon,—not historical matter, such as we are accustomed to find in other inscriptions. The new edicts, just like the old ones, further give variations of one and the same text, and contain the explicit statement that they too were incised on rocks and pillars. Finally, their author, too, calls himself Devānām Piye.

Where we have so many points of agreement between two sets of inscriptions, the obvious inference is that both proceed from the same author. The only way to bar this conclusion would be to show that the facts on which it is based are susceptible of some other explanation. My critics have not done much in this respect. Professor Pischel is entirely silent regarding the close resemblance of the new edicts to the old ones. Mr. Rhys Davids occupies himself only with the title *Devānām Piye*, which he thinks may have been used by Jaina kings and others also. In support of the latter assertion he adduces the Jaina-Prakrit term *Devānāpīya*, which in the *Āgamas* of the Jaina sect is frequently used as a polite form of address. I, too, believe that *Devānām piye* was not a title peculiar to Buddhist kings, but one common to the Mauryas and their contemporaries, whether they were Buddhists or not. Originally, it seems to me, it must have been invented by Brahmins, because Buddhists or Jainas would hardly care much whether they were the beloved of the gods, *i.e.* of beings to whom they paid but little reverence, and whom they considered perishable like themselves.⁸

That, however, is not very important. Taken by itself the title does not prove much. It merely shows that the author was a king of the fourth or third century B.C. But it is of

⁷ See now *Corp. Inscr. Ind.* vol. I. pp. 20 *et seq.*, which were printed before my article was written.

⁸ Though I thus agree with Mr. Rhys Davids in his chief statement, I regret that I cannot see the force of the argument employed by him. I am unable to understand what the Jaina address *Devānāpīya*, which, as far as my observation goes, is invariably used by superiors speaking to inferiors,—*e.g.* by Yatis speaking to their pupils or to Śrāvakas, by husbands to their wives, &c.—is to prove with respect to the self-given title of great kings. It seems to me that the royal title, the Jaina mode of address, and the Brahmanical use of *Devānām piya* to denote 'an idiot,'

are caused by three entirely different currents of thought, and that a derivation of the one from the other is very improbable. *Devānām piya* means, etymologically, 'dear to the gods.' The early Indian kings, who elsewhere are declared to be incarnations of deities, called themselves 'dear to the gods' in order to indicate their divine right. The early Jainas employed it as a form of polite, or rather humane address, recommending thereby the person spoken to to the protection of the gods,—'you who may be dear to the gods.' Compare the use of *dyushman*, 'you who may live long.' The later Brahmins, finally, called idiots by this name, because such persons were considered to stand in the particular keeping of the gods.

great value if taken as a link in the long chain of circumstantial evidence which connects the inscriptions with Aśoka. The same remarks apply to the alphabet used. Other kings besides Aśoka did use it, and its occurrence in the new edicts shows only, like the title *Devānāmpīye*, the period to which the inscriptions belong. It may also be contended that other kings besides Aśoka used some of the words and the grammatical forms occurring in the two edicts. We have some evidence to this effect in the Khandgiri and the Daśaratha inscriptions, and the supposition is not more than reasonable. But with respect to the peculiar turns of expression and the style of the inscriptions, the same reasoning does not hold good. The style of a man reveals, as is generally allowed, his individuality as much as his handwriting or his general deportment. If, therefore, particular resemblances in this respect are observable between two sets of compositions, something more definite than a vague assertion that others too may have employed phrases like *Devānām piye havam āhā, vipule svage sakiye ārdhhave* or *iya pakāre kiti chirañhitike siyā*, is required in order to preclude the obvious inference to be drawn from their occurrence in both. In like manner, there is only one way to account for the fact that both sets of edicts contain sermons preached by a ruler of "all the Indias" to his subjects, and that both give original texts, different redactions of which were placarded, so to say, in different places and dialects on "rocks and pillars" for the enlightenment of the multitude. We have many hundreds of Indian inscriptions, issued by hundreds of different kings, but there is not one document which resembles Aśoka's edicts in this respect, and there is not one king who tried to convert his subjects to a particular creed, and to keep them in the paths of virtue and morality by means of *affiches officielles*. Here, too, the individuality of the author reveals itself, and, as long as it is not shown that others besides Aśoka actually adopted the same plan, the resemblance of the two sets of edicts in this respect admits only of one explanation, viz. that they belong to the same author. If, now, the other points mentioned above, the identity of the alphabet, of the vocabulary and grammar, and of the author's title, are taken into account, it is, I think, not too much to say that

the edicts not only contain *something* connecting them with Aśoka, but that they furnish as strong proof as circumstantial evidence can afford that they actually proceeded from the great Maurya Buddhist.

As regards the question whether the edicts contain any Buddhist terms, I will point out one word, which my critics have overlooked, viz. *ahāle* (R. 5). I have translated this by 'thought,' relying on the explanation of *āhāru* given in Childers' *Pali Dictionary*.⁹ I do not think that the passage can be taken otherwise than I have done, and the silence of my critics seems to indicate that they agree with me. But if that is so, then *ahāle* is a specially Buddhist word, which in this sense has been traced neither in Brahmanical nor in Jaina books. The matter is, however, of small importance. For, as the inscriptions belong to Aśoka, all the doubtful terms must be Buddhist. *Upāsaka* and *sāvaka* must mean 'a lay Buddhist,' *saṅgha* must denote the community of Buddhist ascetics, and the *Vivutha* or *Vyūṭha*, whatever the etymology of the words may be, must be Śākyamuni-Gautama.

In turning to the consideration of Professor Pischel's criticisms on my explanation of these two terms, I must premise that I fully agree with his assertion that Sanskrit *vyushita* and *vyushta* phonetically correspond to *vivutha* and *vyūṭha*. I may add that this phonetic correspondence was known to me from Childers' *Pali Dictionary* when I wrote my first article, as well as the phonetic identity of Sanskrit *vyūṭha* (*vi+ut+sthā+u*) with the same two terms of the edicts, and that several scholars had pointed it out to me before Professor Pischel's letter appeared. But I must demur to Prof. Pischel's statement that, on account of this phonetic identity, my explanation is "quite untenable." For, considering the fact that Prakrit words are corruptions, which may have originated in many ways, and that all Prakrits, but especially those used in the inscriptions, frequently show a want of fixedness both as to orthography and grammar, phonetic identity is neither the only nor even the chief point to look to in the interpretation of doubtful words. In attempting to explain *Vivuthenā* and *Vyūṭhenā*, the correct method is to begin, not with the etymology, but with the sentence *duve*

⁹ See also Sp. Hardy, *Manual*, pp. 499, 500.

suparindlātisatā vivuthā, in which, as well as in the parallel passage of the Khandgiri inscription, *tatho vivuthe vase*, *vivutha* is used, not as an appellative noun, but as a verbal form, and cannot mean anything but 'passed, gone.' This is a translation, with which neither Professor Pischel nor Mr. Rhys Davids finds fault. The next question is whether the same meaning answers in the case of *Vivuthend*. There can be no doubt that it does. For Buddha may fitly be called 'the Departed,' or 'he who has passed away,' since at his death he obtained freedom from future births by entering *Nirvāṇa*, whatever notion the early Buddhists may have connected with this term. This is the way in which I arrive at the meaning 'by the Departed' for *Vivuthend*, which of course must also be that of *Vyuthend*. I do not rely on any etymology, as Professor Pischel thinks. As the meaning of the term is thus fixed by the aid of parallel passages, the etymology has only a secondary importance, though, of course, it must be looked to. Now the Sanskrit *vyushita* or *vyushṭa*, no doubt, phonetically corresponds to *vivutha-vyutha*. This etymology might also suit the noun *vivutha*, but it does not fit the participle *vivuthā*, in the *Sahasrām* date. For *dve shatpanchāśadātike sate vyushite* or *vyushṭe* is a phrase inadmissible in Sanskrit, where *vivas* is not used for 'to elapse,' and *vyushṭa*—a derivative of *vas* 'to shine,'—means 'having broken or begun.' Nor has it been shown that the verb acquired this meaning in any of the Prakrits. It is therefore necessary to look for some other etymology, and the verb the past participle of which comes nearest to the two forms, is the Sanskrit *virīt*. In the Prakrits of the dramas *virīt* usually makes *vuṭṭa*, and in Pali *vutta*, *vatta*, or *vaṭṭa*. The compound verb *virīt* means in Sanskrit 'to turn round, to roll away, to pass,' and the meaning of its past participle exactly corresponds to the sense which *vivutha* has in the *Sahasrām* date, and in the passage of the Khandgiri inscription. This etymology also fits the noun *Vivutha-Vyutha* perfectly. For, though Śākya-muni is now here called *vivutta* or *vivaṭṭa*, still the neuter *vivaṭṭam*, according to Childers' *Dictionary*, means 'absence of *vaṭṭa* or transmigration, *Nirvāṇa*.' Hence the masculine

vivaṭṭo or *vivutto*, whether taken as past part. of *vivaṭṭ*, or as a compound formed of the participle *vi* and the noun *vaṭṭa*, is a suitable name for Śākya-muni, and it may be reasonably expected that a more complete investigation of the *Bauddha Āgamas* will show its actual occurrence. But, whether this expectation is fulfilled or not, the existence of the neuter affords a powerful support to the proposed etymology.¹⁰ The phonetic difficulty which the latter presents, viz. the irregular appearance of an aspirated *tha* i.e. *ttha*, instead of unaspirated *ta* (*tta*), appears less important in consequence of the following considerations. Firstly, in the various Prakrit dialects aspirated letters do frequently appear for the corresponding unaspirated ones. Secondly, there are several cases where this change is observable in past part. pass. Thus we find in Jaina-Prakrit *pasadha* for *prasrita*, *ūsadha* for *utsrita*, and *samosadha* for *samavasrita* (Müller, *Jaina Prakrit*, p. 26). Further, in modern Gujarātī there is a whole series of verbs which form their past participles in *dho*, *dhā*, *dhuh*: e.g. *khā-vuṇ*, *khādho*, *pī-vuṇ*, *pīdho*, *de-vuṇ*, *dīdho*. The last example is most to the point, as *dīdho* stands for an ancient Prakrit form *ditta*, which, though hitherto not traced, can be inferred from Kāśmīrī *dyutu*, genitive *dīl-is*, and also, from the corresponding Sindhī form. Thirdly, it must not be forgotten that in all Prakrits the letters *r* and *ṛi* cause aspiration, though the dialects of Aśoka's edicts do not usually show this influence, like the Pali and the dialects employed in the dramas and poetry. The *ṛi* or *r* which stood in the original of *vivutha* may therefore also have contributed to the development of the aspirate. Finally, the derivation of the two forms from *vivṛitta* has this advantage, that it will fit *vyuṭṭha*, which may be read, and has been read by General Cunningham, instead of *vyutha*. For we have in Jaina-Prakrit *viyaṭṭa* for *vivṛitta*. I have adopted the reading *vyuṭṭha* in the transcript of the text, because a little stroke seems to protrude under the *vy*, but the reading is not beyond doubt. I do not think that it can be settled definitively without a fresh and very careful examination of the stone. It may remain doubtful even after that has been done, as the group of letters

¹⁰ This will become clearer by a comparison of *santa* = *sānta*, the neuter of which *santam* means *Nirvāṇa*, while the masculine *santo* is used as an epithet of Buddha, and

occasionally as a proper name. Now *santam* : *santo* = *vivaṭṭam* : *vivaṭṭo*.

seems to be damaged. In concluding this discussion I will repeat that I do not consider the etymology proposed very important for my chief point, and will add that I consider it is a *pis aller*. I should prefer one where the phonetic correspondence with the Sanskrit would be exact, if it were suitable in other respects. If it could be shown, for instance, that *vivas* had the meaning of 'to elapse,' I should be ready to accept the derivation from that verb. Without that proof I feel unable to rely entirely on the phonetic laws, because, as stated above, the Prakrit dialects, and especially those of Aśoka's inscriptions, are deficient in that fixedness of orthography and grammar which is required in order to give to phonetic correspondence a paramount importance.

Professor Pischel's rendering of the last word of the Rūpnāth edict, *satavivāśā*, I am likewise unable to agree to, though I admit that *sata* does phonetically correspond to *sattva*, and ought to be added to my list of possible Sanskrit equivalents. The sense requires that the first part of the compound should contain the designation of the person whose *vivāśa* or departure is referred to. *Sattvavivāśā* would mean 'since the departure of life,' *prānasya apagamāt*, not 'since his departure from life,' as Professor Pischel renders it. The numerals together with this compound form one sentence, and are not connected with the preceding *vyūṭhenā sāvana kaṭe*. Hence the *his* does not readily suggest itself. If, however, it is considered too unsafe to interpret *sata* by *sāstri*, it may be taken as an equivalent of *sānta* or *sat*, which both suit Buddha very well, and which, according to the analogy of *pukate* for *pakrāntaḥ*, and *yāvata (kātu)* for *yāvanta*, would exactly correspond to *sata*. I, for my part, however, adhere to the explanation by *sāstri*, which, as Pali *atta* for *asta* shows, might become *satta* or *sata*.

I, now, come to the meaning of the word *vivāśa*, which Mr. Rhys Davids, appealing to classical usage, takes as an equivalent of *abhinikkhamana*, 'the departure from home,' 'the renunciation of domestic life.' I am unable to understand on what classical usage he bases his interpretation. I have never found the verb *vivas* or any of its derivatives used as a synonym for *pravraj*, nor has Mr. Rhys Davids brought forward any passages supporting his notion of the classical usage of *vivas*. As far as I know, *vivas* has only

one technical meaning, viz. 'to go into exile,' and its causative *vivāsay* accordingly means 'to banish.' If Mr. Rhys Davids is unable to bring forward passages which show that our dictionaries are defective, and that *vivas* means also 'to renounce domestic life, to turn ascetic,' his appeal to classical usage is useless. Classical usage supports neither his nor my rendering. But analogous transitions of meaning in the case of other verbs may be brought forward in support of both translations. Some Sanskrit verbs which mean 'to depart, to go forth,' acquire the secondary signification 'to renounce domestic life,' and some develop the meaning 'to die.' To the first class belong *pravraj* and *nishkram*, 'to go forth,' as well as *abhinishkram*, literally 'to go forth towards.' The second change is much more common. We have firstly *pra-i*, 'to go forth,' which is one of the commonest terms for 'to die.' There is secondly *gam*, which, like the compound *vigam*, means 'to die,' while *anugam* means 'to die after a person,' and *sahagam* 'to die with somebody.' *Prasthā*, too, and its derivative *prasthāna* are used for 'to die' and for 'death.' *Pravas* also appears to have developed the same secondary meaning (though I find no passages quoted for it), as *pravāśā*, a derivative of its causal, is stated to mean 'killing.' This list might be enlarged, but the examples quoted are sufficient to show that Sanskrit, like all other languages, uses words meaning 'to depart' for 'to die.' I may add, however, that even in the present day it is usual among Pandits, when speaking of the decease of Gurus or parents, to use the tenderer and more reverential expressions, *svargavāsi abhūt*, *kailāsaṁ gataḥ*, or *prasthitaḥ para lokam gataḥ* instead of the more matter-of-fact *mṛitaḥ*. If we now return to the phrase *sata-vivāśā*, both Mr. Rhys Davids and myself agree that the first part of the compound denotes a person—either Śākyamuṇi or somebody else. The second part cannot, therefore, have its etymological and primary meaning 'departure, or starting.' It must have been used in a secondary sense. Now, as has just been shown, on purely philological grounds two explanations are possible. *Vivāśa* may either mean 'the renunciation of domestic life' or 'death.' Which, then, is the one to be adopted? I answer the latter, because we know that both Buddhists and Jains began their eras with the death of their found-

ers. If Mr. Rhys Davids wishes to make his explanation probable, he will have to show that the Bauddhas, or at least some other Indian sect, reckoned also from the Great Renunciation of their founders. The same objection must be made to his explanation of *Vivutha-Vyutha*. Supposing it were proved that these two terms corresponded to *vyushita-vyushta*, they could only be rendered by 'the Departed,' or 'he who is dead.' These remarks will suffice to show that neither Professor Pischel's objections, which are quite worthy of his reputation as a grammarian, nor Mr. Rhys Davids' new rendering of *vivāsa*, can exactly be called unanswerable, or be said to render my explanation of the edicts untenable.

I now turn to the consideration of Mr. Rhys Davids' date of the Nirvāṇa, which, if correct, would entirely destroy the remarkable agreement between the edicts as interpreted by myself and the statements of the Ceylonese chronicles. This agreement is visible especially in two points:—

1stly, in the length of membership of the Buddhist sect assigned to Aśoka both by the edicts and by the chronicles; and

2ndly, in the fact that the year 257 A.B., which I have taken to be the date of the edicts,¹¹ apparently was, according to the statements of the *Mahāvamsa*, the last year of Aśoka's life.

The force of the former point has been acknowledged by Mr. Rhys Davids, who declares (*Num. Or.* VI. p. 59) the fact that while the Devānām Piye of the new inscriptions speaks of his having been an *upāsaka* for thirty-three years and a half, and that we know of no king of the *third century* A.B. but Aśoka who reigned more than 34 years,—to be my strongest argument for the identification of the two. I have already stated that the strongest argument for the identification of our Devānām Piye with Aśoka lies in the family likeness of the old and the new edicts. But, as we have a case of circumstantial evidence only, it is no doubt indispensable that the results gained by interpretation should agree with the facts known from other sources. I do not consider this agreement, therefore, as a matter of small im-

portance. It is, on the contrary, as essential as the arguments given above. In order to show the full importance of the fact mentioned in the edicts, that *Devānām piye*, a ruler of the whole of Jambudvīpa, was a member of an heretical sect for more than thirty-three years, I will point out that according to the Buddhistic chronicles the only kings in the *first three centuries* A.B. who reigned longer than thirty-three years were Bimbisāra and Aśoka, and that according to the Purāṇas *no Maurya king except Aśoka* occupied the throne for so long a period.

The second point, the very remarkable fact that, while the inscriptions are dated in the year 257 A.B., the statements of the Ceylonese chronicles permit us to infer that Aśoka was alive during a portion of the year 257, has not been noticed at all by Mr. Rhys Davids. The reason for this omission probably is his distrust of the date, 219 A.B., which the *Dīpavamsa* and the *Mahāvamsa* give for Aśoka's coronation. According to Mr. Rhys Davids, this is an invention of the southern Buddhists, or rather a mistake caused by an erroneous addition of certain figures in their list of *Theras*. The real distance between the Nirvāṇa and Aśoka's accession to the throne is, according to his calculation, not upwards of 218 years, but 150 years only. If Mr. Rhys Davids were right, and the genuine tradition of the southern church showed the shorter period only, the agreement between the edicts and the chronicles would certainly be of no importance for my view. It would, on the contrary, tend to prove that my explanation must be wrong. For the latter can only hold good if the date 219 A.B. for Aśoka's coronation either is really genuine, or at least is derived from a calculation made during the reign of Aśoka and before the incision of the three edicts. It must be wrong if the coronation date had been settled later in Ceylon and were based on a mistake. Under these circumstances I am compelled to examine closely Mr. Rhys Davids' chapter on the Ceylonese date of Buddha (*Num. Or.* VI. paras. 82-124), and to institute an inquiry as to whether his objections to the date 219 A.B. for Aśoka are really valid.

¹¹ I must add that the date of the inscriptions may be 256 A.B., if we assume that the figure refers to the current year. In my first article I referred it to the number of completed years in accordance with Prinsep's dictum,

Essays, II. 165, note 1. I did this, not because I was fully convinced of the correctness of Prinsep's rule, but because I wished to take the most unfavourable alternative.

Mr. Rhys Davids begins his essay by giving a few facts which make the early use of the now prevalent Ceylonese era of the Nirvāṇa, and the general acceptance of its initial date 543 B.C., somewhat doubtful. He shows that even modern inscriptions in Ceylon are not always dated in the era of Buddha, while the oldest known in which that era occurs, belongs to the twelfth century, and that the Chinese pilgrim Fa Hian, who visited Ceylon in 412 A.D., speaks of a Ceylonese proclamation or sermon in which the Nirvāṇa was mentioned as falling 1497 years earlier. Adverting, then, to the fact that the elements of the calculation for the date of the Nirvāṇa are contained in the *Dīpavaṃsa* and in the *Mahāvamsa*, he further points out that its beginning in 543 B.C. depends on three periods, viz. the period from Duṭṭhagāmini, 161 B.C., down to the present time; the period from the coronation of Devānāṃpiya Tissa, 236 B.C., to Duṭṭhagāmini, 161 B.C.; and the period from the Nirvāṇa to Devānāṃpiya Tissa, —the total of the three (236 + 146 + 161) being 543. Accepting the period which begins with Duṭṭhagāmini as correct, he proceeds to an examination of the other two. Travelling over oft-trodden ground, he shows, with the help of the Greek notices of Chandragupta and of Aśoka's inscriptions, that an error of more than sixty years exists in the Ceylonese chronology of the oldest period of 236 years, as the latter places Chandragupta's accession in 381 B.C., and Aśoka's in 325 B.C. Next, turning to the second period of 146 years, he finds that the great number of years assigned to Mutasiva and his nine sons likewise indicates the existence of a serious error,—a point which other scholars, too, have noticed,—and that the statements of the chronicles regarding Mahinda and Sanghamittā show Devānāṃpiya Tissa's reign to have been doubled. Mahinda and Sanghamittā were ordained in the sixth year of Aśoka, when they

were respectively twenty and eighteen years old, they came to Ceylon 12½ years afterwards, and died there, at the ages of sixty and fifty-nine, in the eighth and ninth years after Tissa. Hence it may be concluded that Mahinda lived in Ceylon 27½ years, eight of which were subsequent to Tissa. The reign of the latter must therefore have lasted twenty, not forty years as stated in the chronicles. Mr. Rhys Davids remarks that Turnour and his Pandits, who are apparently supported by a passage of the *Dīpavaṃsa*, have got over the difficulty with Mahinda by explaining the figures 60 and 59 to refer to Mahinda's and his sister's spiritual ages, but that under this supposition, too, there is a discrepancy of two years, as the correct number for Sanghamittā would be 61 (12 + 40 + 9). Mr. Rhys Davids next expresses a doubt regarding the correctness of the period of 218 years stated to have elapsed between the Nirvāṇa and Aśoka's coronation, because the number of kings and of patriarchs or chiefs of the Buddhist church placed between the two events is too small for the length of the period. Taking first into consideration the list of the Māgadha kings, who fill the space between Buddha and Aśoka, he admits that it involves no absurdities. But it appears suspicious to him, because a number of kings are said to have murdered their fathers, and because the years assigned to some are multiples of 4 and 8, and finally because the Purāṇas have a shorter list. The list of the kings of Ceylon between 1 and 236 A.B., which he takes up next, clearly shows traces of an undue lengthening of the reigns, as only five kings are named, the last of whom, Mutasiva, must have reached the respectable age of 147 years. After this, Mr. Rhys Davids passes to the list of the *Theras* or Buddhist patriarchs from 1 to 285 A.B. He extracts the data regarding them from the *Dīpavaṃsa*, and, reducing all the years given there according to the reigns of the Ceylonese and Māgadha kings to years of the Buddha era, he arranges them in tabular form as below:—

| Name. | Date of Birth. | Date of Upasampādā, A.B. | Age at Upasampādā of successor. | Length of Membership. | Age at Death. | Date of Death, A.B. |
|---------------|----------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|---------------------|
| Upāli..... | 44 Bcf. B. | ... | 60 | ... | 74 | 30 |
| Dāsaka | 14 A.B. | 16 | 40 | 50 | 64 | 80 |
| Sonaka | 60 " | 59 | 40 | 44 | 66 | 124 |
| Siggava | 100 " | 100 | 64 | 55 | 76 | 176 |
| Tissa | 158 " | 164 | 66 | 68 | 86 | 234 |
| Mahinda | 204 " | 224 | ... | 60 | 89 | 285 |

This table, as Mr. Rhys Davids points out, abounds in absurdities, as it places the birth and the ordination of most Theras too close together, and in the case of Sonaka the latter event before the former. He, however, thinks that the absurdities may be removed by taking the statements, which are merely based on the *Therāvali* by themselves, and by separating them entirely from those of the first two and the last columns, which depend on the *Rājāvalis* of Ceylon and Māgadha. After doing this he finds that the figures no longer involve any absurdity, and that by deducting the difference between the ages of the four Theras beginning with Dāsaka at the ordination of their pupils (col. 3) and their

ages at their death (col. 5) from the number of years during which they were members of the church (col. 4) the length of time may be found during which each was head of the church. If to the total of these figures the sixteen years are added which elapsed between Buddha's death and the ordination of the second Thera, Dāsaka (col. 2), as well as the eighteen years which lie between the sixth, Mahinda, and Aśoka's council, the interval between the Nirvāṇa and Aśoka's council is not 236, but 168 years. As the council took place after Aśoka had ruled eighteen years, the coronation falls in 150 A.B. These calculations are embodied in a second table, which, for clearness' sake, I reprint:—

| Name. | Age when he performed the Upasampadā of successor. | Age when he died. | No. of years he was a full member. | Years during which he and his successor were full members. | Years of his full membership before his successor's admission. |
|---|--|-------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|
| Upāli | 60 | 74 | ... | ... | ... |
| Dāsaka | 45 | 64 | 50 | 19 | 31 |
| Sonaka..... | 40 | 66 | 44 | 26 | 18 |
| Siggava | 64 | 76 | 55 | 12 | 43 |
| Tissa..... | 66 | 86 | 68 | 20 | 48 |
| | | | 217 | | 140 |
| Dāsaka admitted to full membership | | | | | 16 A.B. |
| The second council was in the twelfth year of Mahinda's full membership | | | | | 12 |
| Date A.B. of Aśoka's council | | | | | 168 |
| | | | | | 18 |
| Date A.B. of Aśoka's coronation | | | | | 150 |

It thus appears that in reality the *Dīpavanīsa*, in its *Therāvali* portion, allows for 168 years only as having elapsed between the Nirvāṇa and Aśoka's council. At the same time the same work places the council explicitly in 236 A.B., and Aśoka's coronation in 218 (?) A.B. The question now arises whether the shorter or the longer period is the more credible one. Mr. Rhys Davids declares himself in favour of the former, because the number of the Theras (five) is not sufficient to fill a period of 236 years; because, further, the number of the Ceylonese kings is also too small for more than two hundred years; and because, finally, the Brahmanical lists of the kings of Māgadha which place the Śiśunāgas before Bhātiya and his descendants, likewise speak in favour of the shorter interval. Mr. Rhys Davids further shows that the Buddhists possessed a number of ancient works which probably contained the *Therāvalis*, and that the latter have therefore a claim to be considered historical. He, also, points out that according to the

Ceylonese chronicles the Śiśunāgas reigned just 68 years, and that if they are placed before Bhātiya and Bimbisāra and their descendants the number of years of the Māgadha kings down to Aśoka will be exactly 150, and thus fully agree with the sum of years gained by the adjustment of the *Therāvali*. An explanation may be offered for the insertion of the longer period also. For as the sum of the figures in column 3 of the second table makes 217, it becomes not improbable that Buddhist chronologists, in calculating the distance of Aśoka from the Nirvāṇa, by mistake added up the periods during which each Thera was *upasampanna*, instead of those during which he was sole teacher of the *Vinaya*, or head of the church.

On first reading Mr. Rhys Davids' deductions, it is impossible to avoid being fascinated by his eloquent and ingenious pleading, to which my abstract does but scant justice. Still one cannot help feeling a certain distrust against so very startling results, and the discovery that the an-

cient Buddhists must have been such utter fools. A number of objections against, and difficulties with, certain details also present themselves at once. Thus, with respect to the alleged inconsistency of the chronicles regarding the ages of Mahinda and Sanghamittā and the reign of Devānāṃ-piṇḍa Tissa, one cannot help seeing that it has only been caused by Mr. Rhys Davids' method of interpretation. Both the *Dīpavaṃsa* and the *Mahāvamsa* state that Mahinda and Sanghamittā received the first or *pabbajjā* ordination at the end of or in the sixth year of Aśoka, and that Mahinda alone received the second or *upasampadā* ordination at the same time. Afterwards it is alleged that Mahinda died in Ceylon, 'having completed sixty years,' in the eighth year of king Uttiya;¹² and Sanghamittā, 'after having completed fifty-nine years,' in the ninth year of the same king. Now as Aśoka was crowned after the completion of the 218th year of the Nirvāṇa era, his sixth year corresponds to 224-225 A.B., and the eighth year of Uttiya to 284-285 A.B. The interval between Mahinda's *upasampadā* and his death is thus exactly sixty years, as stated by the chronicles. It is clear that the sixty years can only be referred, as Mr. Turnour has done, to the spiritual age, or the period after the *upasampadā*,—not to the natural age, as Mr. Rhys Davids wishes to do. This explanation is confirmed, as Mr. Rhys Davids himself has shown, by a verse of the *Dīpavaṃsa* where it is stated that Mahinda had completed twelve years when he came to Ceylon.¹³ The case of Sanghamittā is no less clear, if the statement that she died 'after completing fifty-nine years' is referred to the period after her second or *upasampadā* ordination. The interval between the sixth year of Aśoka, 224-225 A.B., Uttiya's ninth year, and 285-286 A.B., is, as Mr. Rhys Davids has stated, 61 years. But as Sanghamittā was in 224-225 only eighteen years old, she had to wait two years before she could receive the second ordination, which gave her full membership. If we deduct these, the figures agree, and she really had completed fifty-nine years after the *upasampadā* at the time of her death. There can be no doubt that this

is the correct interpretation of the seemingly inconsistent statements of the chronicles. We shall see, further on, that the latter, when speaking of the ages of *Theras* or *Upasampanna Sādhus* always refer to the period after the *upasampadā*, or, to adopt Mr. Rhys Davids' appropriate term, to the spiritual ages just as references to the *ages* of anointed kings refer to the time after their *abhisheka*.

If we now turn to the chief portions of Mr. Rhys Davids' calculations, it becomes impossible to accept without a re-examination the statements contained in his first table, though they agree with Mr. Turnour's analysis of the *Dīpavaṃsa*.¹⁴ As it has been found that the seeming contradictions in the case of Sanghamittā disappeared, as soon as the chronicles were correctly interpreted, the question arises whether a reconsideration of the text of the *Dīpavaṃsa* would not clear away the stupendous absurdities contained in the table which gives the data regarding the *Theras*. But even supposing the first table to be correct, a consideration of Mr. Rhys David's second table raises numerous difficulties. One cannot help asking how he gets the sixteen years between Buddha and Dāsaka without the help of the *Rājāvali*, which he considers to be unworthy of reliance; or how, if he gets them from that source, he can reconcile that with his promise to rely on the *Therāvali* alone. One must further ask why he adds the sixteen years in col. 5 of table II., and not in col. 3, where they are evidently also required. If he had added the sixteen years in col. 3, the total would become 233, and it would have appeared at once that the chroniclers could not have made the mistake imputed to them. (paras. 115, 116). Finally, on comparing the two tables a serious discrepancy is observable between the figures given for Dāsaka's age at Sonaka's *upasampadā* in col. 3 of the first, and col. 1 of the second table. In the former place it is stated to be 40, and in the second 45, and no explanation is offered. Similar vacillations occur, too, in the date of Aśoka's coronation, which sometimes is stated to have occurred after the completion of the 218 years of the Nirvāṇa era (i.e. in 219 A.B.), and

¹² According to the *Dīpavaṃsa*, 'when Uttiya had completed eight years': see below.

¹³ Compare also *Dīp.* VII. 27, where it is stated that Mahinda was four years of age (i.e. spiritual age) when

Aśoka had ruled ten years:—

Asokassa dassavassamhi Mahinda chatuvassiko | sabbam sutapariyattin ganipāchariyo ahu | 27 |

¹⁴ *Jour. As. Soc. Beng.* vol. VII. pp. 919 seqq.

sometimes in 218 A.B.,¹⁶ and that the latter incorrect statement is used in order to convict the chroniclers of an inaccuracy (para. 114).

These and other doubts which it would be too long to enumerate induced me to ask Dr. Oldenberg, who is preparing an edition of the *Dīpavanīsa*, for the loan of his text, and to examine the work once more. A cursory inspection showed to me that Mr. Rhys Davids' first table does not accurately represent the statements of the *Dīpavanīsa*, but, besides a number of minor inaccuracies, contains three important mistakes. The heading of col. 4 ought to be "*Chiefship of the Vinaya (vinayaṭṭhāna or pāmokkhata)*;" the heading of col. 5 should be "*Spiritual Age at Death, i. e. Age reckoning from the upasampadā ordination*," and hence the figures put against the names of the first five Theras in col. 1 ought to be removed. I found that the *Dīpavanīsa* left not the slightest doubt on the necessity of these alterations, and that, if it is interpreted rightly, its history of the Theras contains no absurdities. The text, though less corrupt in the *Therāvali* than in other portions, nevertheless shows a few mistakes in the figures which can be easily corrected. In order to enable the reader to judge if my interpretation is correct, I give the text of the chief passage, *Bhāṇavāra* V. 76-106, in full, together with a translation. The text is Dr. Oldenberg's,¹⁶ with whose permission it is published. The translation is my own:—

nibbute lokanāthassa vassāni soḷasam ahū | sama-
satthi tadā hoti vassam Upāli paṇḍitaṃ | 76 |¹⁷
Ajātasattuchatuviṣaṃ Vijayassa soḷasam ahū |
Dāsako upasampanno Upālitherasantike | 77 |
chattālīsa vassāni Dāsako nāma paṇḍito | Nāga-
dāse dasavasse Pakundakassa viṣati | 78 |¹⁸
upasampanno Sonako thero Dāsakatherasantike |
chattālīsavasso dhiro thero Sonakasavhaya | 79 |¹⁹
Kālāsokassa dasavasse Tambapaṇṇi-antarāvāse
vassam ekādasam bhava | Siggavo upasampanno
Sonakatherasantike | 80 |
Chandaguttassa dve vasse chatusatthi Siggavo
tadā | atṭhapāṇḍāsa vassāni Pakundakassa rājino |

¹⁶ The first date occurs, e.g. paras. 84, 86, and the second 114 (twice).

¹⁷ Dr. Oldenberg, very judiciously, has not attempted a restoration of the original work, but merely of the *codex archetypus*, from which the existing modern MSS. have been prepared. He has collected a good many various readings, from which I have selected a few particularly important ones.

¹⁸ Second half probably corrupt,—perhaps *samasatthi*

upasampanno Moggaliputto Siggavatherasantike | 81 |

Asokadhammassa chhavasse chhasatthi Moggali-
putto ahū | atṭhachattārīsa [vassāni] Mutasivassa
rājino | Mahindo upasampanno Moggaliputtassa
santike | 82 |²⁰

uggahesi vinayam cha Upāli Buddhasantike | Dā-
sako vinayam sabbam Upālitherasantike | uggahet-
vāna vāchesi upajjhāyo va sāsane | 83 |

vāchesi Dāsako thero vinayam Sonakassa pi |
pariyāpūṇitvā vāchesi upajjhāyassa santike | 84 |
Sonako buddhisampanno dhammavinayakovido |
vāchesi vinayam sabbam Siggavassa anuppa-
dam | 85 |

Siggavo Chandavajjo cha Sonakasaddhivihārikā |
vāchesi vinayam thero ubho saddhivihārike | 86 |

Tisso Moggaliputto cha Chandavajjassa santike |
vinayam uggahetvāna vimutto upadhisamkhaye | 87 |

Moggaliputto upajjhāyo Mahindam saddhivihari-
kam | vāchesi vinayam sabbam theravādam anāna-
kam | 88 |

parinibbute sambuddhe Upālithero mahājuti | vina-
yam tāva vāchesi tiṇsa vassam anānakam | 89 |
saddhivihārikam theram Dāsakam nāma paṇḍitam |
vinayaṭṭhāne ṭhapetvāna nibbuto so mahāmāti | 90 |

Dāsako Sonakam theram saddhivihārin anup-
padam | katvā vinayapāmokkham chatusatthimhi
nibbuto | 91 |

Sonako chhalabhiṇṇāno Siggavam ariyatrajam |
vinayaṭṭhāne ṭhapetvāna chhasatthimhi cha nib-
buto | 92 |

Siggavo āṇasampanno Moggaliputtāṇi cha dāra-
kam | katvā vinayapāmokkham nibbuto so chha-
sattati | 93 |

Tisso Moggaliputto cha Mahindam saddhivihāri-
kam | katvā vinayapāmokkham chhasativassamhi
nibbuto | 94 |²¹

chatusattati Upāli cha chatusatthi cha Dāsako |
chhasatthi Sonako thero Siggavo tu chhasattati |
asiti Moggaliputto sabbesam upasampadā | 95 |

sabbakālamhi pāmokkho vinaye Upālipaṇḍito |
paṇḍāsam Dāsako thero chatusatthārīsam cha
Sonako | panchapaṇḍāsavassam Siggavassa atṭha-
satthi Moggaliputtasavhaya | 96 |²²

Udayo soḷasa vassāni rajjam kāresi khattiyo | ehha-
vasse Udayabaddhamhi Upālithero nibbuto | 97 |

tadā hoti thero Upāli paṇḍita, or satthivasso i. h. samam
Up.

¹⁹ The first line is corrupt, see below. For *Pakunda-*
kassa, *Paṇḍurājassa* must be read, as *Pakundaka* is a name
of Paṇḍukābhaya.

²⁰ The second line is corrupt, see below.

²¹ Corrupt, see below.

²² 94b. Corrupt, see below.—v. l. *atṭhachattārīsa*.

²³ 96b. Corrupt, see below.

Susunāgo dasavassam rajjam kāresi issaro | atthavasse Susunāgamhi Dāsako parinibbuto | 98 |²³
 Susunāgass' achchayena honti te dasa bhātaro | sabbe bāvisativassam rajjam kāresu vaṇsato | imesam chhatṭhe vassānam Sonako parinibbuto | 99 |
 Chandagutto rajjam kāresi vassāni chatuvīsati | tasmīñ chuddasavassamhi Siggavo parinibbuto | 100 |
 Bindusārassa yo putto Asokadhammo mahāyaso | vassānisattatipisampi rajjam kāresi khattiyo | 101 |²⁴
 Asokassa chhavisativasse Moggaliputtasavhaya sāsanañ jotayitvāna nibbuto āyusamkhaye | 102 |²⁵
 chatusattativassamhi therō Upālipaṇḍito | saddhivihārikam theram Dāsakam nāma paṇḍitam | vinayaṭṭhāne ṭhapetvāna nibbuto so mahāgaṇi | 103 |
 Dāsako Sonakam theram saddhivihārikam anupadam katvā vinayapāmoḁkham chatusaṭṭhimhi nibbuto | 104 |
 Sonako chaḷabhiññāno Siggavam ariyatrajam | vinayaṭṭhāne ṭhapetvāna chhasaṭṭhimhi pari nibbuto | 105 |²⁶
 Siggavo nāyasampanno Moggaliputtañ cha dāra- kam | katvā vinayapāmoḁkham nibbuto so chhasa- sattati | 106 |
 Tisso Moggaliputto so Mahindam saddhivihāri- kam | katvā vinayapāmoḁkham chhāsativassamhi nibbuto | 107 |²⁷

Translation.

76. Sixteen years had elapsed after the protector of the world (*Buddha*) had entered Nirvāṇa, then the learned Upāli had just completed sixty years;²⁸

77. Then twenty-four years of Ajātaśatru's (*reign*) and sixteen of Vijaya's had elapsed, (*and then*) Dāsaka received the *upasampadā* ordination from Thera Upāli.

78. The learned Dāsaka (*had completed*), just forty years, when Nāgaśāsa (*had reigned*) ten years, and twenty (*years of*) Pāṇḍurāja's (*reign had passed*);

79. (*Then*) Thera Sonaka received the *upasampadā* ordination²⁹ from Thera Dāsaka.

The wise Thera called Sonaka had completed forty years.

80. When Kālāsoka had completed ten years, and the eleventh year of the interregnum in Ceylon was (*the current one*), (*then*) Siggava received the *upasampadā* ordination from Thera Sonaka.³⁰

81. Two years of Chandragupta's (*reign*)

had passed), then Siggava (*had completed*) sixty-four years, (*and*) fifty-eight years of Pakuṇḍaka's (*reign had elapsed*). Then Tissa-Moggaliputta received the *upasampadā* ordination from Thera Siggava.³¹

82. When Dharmāsoka had (*reigned*) six years, (*then*) Moggaliputta had completed sixty-six years, (*and*) forty-eight years of king Mutasiva had passed. (*Then*) Mahinda received the *upasampadā* ordination from Moggaliputta.

83. And Upāli learned the *Vinaya* from Buddha; Dāsaka, having learnt the whole *Vinaya* from Thera Upāli, recited (*it*) like (*his*) teacher in the Faith.

84. Dāsaka, the Thera, instructed Sonaka also in the *Vinaya*, (*and he*), having mastered it, repeated it before his teacher.

85. Sonaka, endowed with intelligence and acquainted with the law and the *Vinaya*, taught Siggava the whole *Vinaya*, sentence by sentence.

86. Siggava and Chandavajja (*were*) the pupils of Sonaka. The Thera taught both his pupils the *Vinaya*.

87. And Tissa-Moggaliputta, having learnt the *Vinaya* from Chandavajja, was emancipated by the destruction of the *substrata* (*i.e. became an Arhat*).

88. Moggaliputta, the teacher, taught Mahinda, his pupil, the whole *Vinaya*, the whole, entire doctrine of the Theras.

89. After the Sambuddha had entered Nirvāṇa, Thera Upāli, endowed with great lustre, taught the whole *Vinaya* during thirty years.

90. Having appointed his pupil, Thera Dāsaka, to the office of (*Chief of the*) *Vinaya*, that high-souled man entered Nirvāṇa.

91. Dāsaka made his pupil, Thera Sonaka, in his turn, Chief of the *Vinaya*, and died in (*his*) sixty-fourth year.³²

92. Sonaka, possessed of the six supernatural faculties, appointed Siggava, of honourable descent, to the office of (*Chief of*) the *Vinaya*, and died in (*his*) sixty-sixth year.

93. Siggava, possessed of (*true*) knowledge, made Moggaliputta, the youth, Chief of the *Vinaya*, and died after (*completing*) seventy-six years.

94. And Tissa-Moggaliputta made his pupil Mahinda Chief of the *Vinaya*, and died in (*his*) sixty-eighth year.³³

²³ The first line seems to be corrupt, as the figure is wrong. Perhaps *attha cha* has to be read for *issaro*.

²⁴ Probably 'Dh. masoko' should be read.

²⁵ Perhaps *Moggali-savhaya* is to be read.

²⁶ Probably *nibbuto* to be read.

²⁷ Corrupt, see below. v. l. *asttivassamhi*.

²⁸ The construction is apparently a mixture of the loc. and gen. absol., and occurs frequently.

²⁹ *Upasampadā*, i.e. second or full ordination.

³⁰ Regarding these dates more will be said below.

³¹ Pakuṇḍaka is another name of Pandukābhaya.

³² The years are to be counted from the *upasampadā*: see below, v. 95.

³³ v. l. in his 38th year.

95. And Upāli seventy-four, and Dāsaka sixty-four, Thera Sónaka sixty-six, but Siggava seventy-six, Moggaliputta eighty (that is, the number of years elapsed between) the upasampadā ordination of each (Thera and his death).

96. The learned Upāli is chief of the Vinaya for all time. Thera Dāsaka (held that office) fifty (years), and Sónaka forty-four, Siggava fifty-five years, and he who is called Moggaliputta sixty-eight.

97. The Kshatriya Udaya reigned sixteen years; when Udayabhadra had (completed) six years, Thera Upāli died.

98. Śīśunāga, the lord, reigned ten (?) years; when Śīśunāga had (completed) eight years, Dāsaka died.²⁴

99. After Śīśunāga's death came those ten brothers; according to hereditary custom, they reigned all (together) for twenty-two years. In the sixth year of their (reign) Sónaka died.

100. Chandragupta reigned twenty-four years; when he had (completed) fourteen years Siggava died.

101. Famous Dharmāsoka, the son of Bindusāra, of royal race, reigned thirty-seven years.

102. When Āśoka had (completed) twenty-six years, he who is called Moggaliputta died of old age, after having exalted the Faith.

103. The learned Thera Upāli, the great chief of the school, died in his seventy-fourth year, after appointing the learned Thera Dāsaka, his pupil, to the office of (Chief of the) Vinaya.

104. Dāsaka, in his turn, made his pupil, Thera Sónaka, Chief of the Vinaya, and died in (his) sixty-fourth year.

105. Sónaka, endowed with the six supernatural qualities, appointed Siggava, of honourable descent, to the office of (Chief of the) Vinaya, and died in (his) sixty-sixth year.

106. Siggava, possessed of (true) knowledge made young Moggaliputta Chief of the Vinaya, and died, having (completed) seventy-six years.

107. Tissa-Moggaliputta made his pupil, Mahinda, Chief of the Vinaya, and died in (his) eighty-sixth year.²⁵

This passage contains:—1. the dates of the upasampadā of each of the five Theras, from Dāsaka to Āśoka's son Mahinda, according to the chronology of Māgadha and of Ceylon, together with the spiritual age of the teacher who performed the ordination—vv. 76-82.

²⁴ See note to text. ²⁵ v. l., in his eightieth year.

2. A statement of the teachers under whom each of the six Theras studied the Vinaya—vv. 83-88.

3. A statement regarding the persons who appointed each to the office of Chief of the Vinaya, or head of the church—vv. 89-94.

4. A statement of the number of years which elapsed between the upasampadā ordination and the death of each, i.e. the length of the life of each while full member of the Saṅgha—v. 95.

5. A statement of the number of years during which Dāsaka, Sónaka, Siggava, and Tissa were Chiefs of the Vinaya or heads of the church,—which must be completed as far as Upāli is concerned from v. 89-96.

6. The dates of the Māgadha kings in whose reigns the five Theras died, together with the year of the death—vv. 97-102.

7. A repetition of the information given above under 3 and 4.

Two other passages of the *Dīpanīsa* (IV. 27-46 and V. 69-73) give the same details,—the first regarding Upāli, Dāsaka, Sónaka, Siggava, and Chandavajja; and the second regarding the last two teachers and Tissa-Moggaliputta. These two passages mostly agree word for word with that given above. But they add a few particulars and show some variations, which it will be necessary to quote. Firstly (IV. 31), it is said that Buddha himself appointed Upāli to be Chief of the Vinaya:—

*saṅghamajjhe viśākāsi Buddho Upālipanditam |
aggo vinayapāṇmakkho Upāli mayha sāsane | 31 |*
Secondly, it is stated (IV. 41) that Dāsaka's spiritual age was forty-five years, instead of forty, when he ordained Sónaka. Thirdly, the date of the ordination of Siggava is specified more exactly as having taken place ten years and half a month (according to the *varia lectio* of bad MS., 'and eight months') after Kālāśoka's coronation:—

*chattārisēva vasso so thero Sonakasavhaya |
Kālāsokassa dasavasse addhamāsaṇ cha sesake²⁶ | 41 |*

A corrupt verse adds the statement that at that time eleven years and six months of Pakuṇḍaka—Pandukābhaya's interregnum had elapsed,—

²⁶ v. l. *addhamāsaṇ cha sesake*.

sattarasannāṃ vaṣṣānāṃ therō āsi paṇṇako |³⁷
atikkantekūdasavassāṃ cchamāsaṃ chāvasesake
 | 42 |

The information regarding the career of Aśoka's son, Mahinda, finally, is completed in the following passages :—(1) VI. 20, where his birth is stated to have taken place after 204 years of the Nirvāṇa,—

dve vaṣṣasatāni honti chatuvassāṃ paṇ'uttari |
samantaramhi so jāto Mahindo Asokatrajo | 20 |

(2) VII. 21-24, where it is said that Mahinda became an ascetic when he was full twenty years old, and when Aśoka had reigned six years (after his coronation); that Mahinda received the *upasampaddā* ordination at the same time; and that Moggaliputta was fifty-four years old when Aśoka's coronation took place, and sixty-six (?) when Aśoka had reigned six years. The last verse is, however, corrupt, and must be corrected as proposed below :—

paripunnāṇisativasso Mahindo Asokatrajo |
Saṅghamittā cha jātiya vassāṃ aṭṭhārasāṃ
bhane | 21 |
*chhavassamhi Asokassa*³⁸ *ubho pabbajitā paja* |

tatheva upasampanno Mahindo dipajotako | 22 |
Saṅghamittā tadd yeva sikkhāyo vasaṃ ādiyi |
*ahu Moggaliputto va theravādo*³⁹ *maṇḍani* | 23 |
chatupaṇḍāsavassamhi Asokadhammo abhisitto |
*Asokassa'ābhissittato chhasaṭṭhi*⁴⁰ *Moggalissavhayo* |
tato Mahindo pabbajito Moggaliputtassa santike
 | 24 |

(3) XVII. 91-93, where the date of his death is given as occurring after the completion of the eighth year of Uttiya, and of the sixtieth year after his ordination,—

Uttiyo dasavassamhi rajjāṃ kāresi khattiyo | 91 |
aṭṭhavassābhissittassa nibbuto dipajotako |
akāsi sariravikkhepaṃ Tissadrāme puratthime | 92 |
paripunnādvādasavasso Mahindo cha idh' āgato |
saṭṭhivasse paripunṇe nibbuto Chetiyapabbate | 93 |

The contents of these passages are most easily intelligible if they are given in tabular form, and it is therefore advisable to imitate Mr. Rhys Davids in this respect. It will also be advisable to exhibit the information of the *Dīpavaṃsa* exactly in that form in which it is given, without correcting any of the inconsistencies of the text. If that is done we obtain the following results :—

| Name. | Date of Upasampaddā. | Spiritual Age at Pupil's Upasampaddā. | Spiritual Age at Death. | Date of Death. | Length of Chiefship of Vinaya. |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 1. Upāli | " | 60 years [D. IV. 27, V. 76]. | 74th year [D. V. 103].
74 years [D. V. 95]. | Udayabhadra 6 = 30 A.B. [D. IV. 38, V. 97]. | 30 years [D. IV. 34, V. 89]. |
| 2. Dāsaka | Ajātasatru 24 = Vijaya, 16 = 16 A.B. [D. IV. 26, 27; V. 76, 77.] | 40 years [D. V. 76].
45 years [D. IV. 41]. | 64th year [D. V. 91, 104; IV. 43].
64 years [D. V. 95]. | Sisunāga, 8 = 80 A.B. [D. V. 98.] | 50 yrs [D. V. 96]. |
| 3a. Sonaka | Nāgadāsa 10 = Paṇḍurāja 20 = 58 A.B. [D. IV. 41; D. V. 78, 79.] | 40 years [D. IV. 44; V. 70]. | 66th year [D. V. 92, 105].
66 years [D. V. 95]. | Nandas 6 = 124 A.B. [D. V. 99.] | 44 yrs [D. V. 96]. |
| 3b. Chandavajja | The same. | Not stated. | Not stated. | Not stated. | Not stated. |
| 4. Siggava | Kālasoka 10, or 10 + ½ month = Inter-regnum, 11 or 11 + 6 mos. = 100 A.B. [D. IV. 44, 45; V. 80.] | 64 years [D. V. 69, 81]. | 75 years [D. V. 93, 106]. | Chandragupta 14 = 176 A.B. [D. V. 73, 100.] | 55 yrs [D. V. 96]. |
| 5. Tissa - Moggaliputta. | Chandragupta 2 = Pa-kunda 58 = 164 A.B. [D. V. 69, 81.] | 66 years [D. V. 82, VII. 24]. | 86th [D. V. 94, 107].
80th [D. V. 95, 107].
38th [D. V. 94]. | Aśoka 26 = 244 A.B. [D. V. 102.] | 68 yrs [D. V. 96]. |
| 6. Mahinda, 204 A.B. [D. VI. 20.] | Aśoka 6 = 224 A.B. [D. V. 82, VII. 22-24.] | Not stated. | 60 years [D. XVII. 93]. | Uttiya 8 = 284 A.B. [D. XVII. 93.] | Not stated, but may be calculated at 40 yrs. |

³⁷ Dr. Oldenberg's very probable emendation is, *choro āsi Paṇṇako*.

³⁸ The genitive stands for the locative, as above.

³⁹ v. l., and the correct one, *theravādo*.

⁴⁰ Dr. Oldenberg proposes *Asokābhissitte chhavasse*, and I read in addition *saṭṭhi* for *chhasaṭṭhi*, as required by the metre and the sense.

⁴¹ Not stated, but 44 before B. may be obtained by deducting length of chiefship from spiritual age.

The first glance at this table shows that the figures given there are intended to form a chain, each link of which is closely connected with some of the others. The connexion is established in this wise, that the difference between the dates of each teacher's and his pupil's *upasampadā* gives the age of the former at the latter ceremony; that, further, the difference between the date of the *upasampadā* and of the death gives the length of the spiritual life; and that finally the difference between the dates of the teacher's and the pupil's death gives the length of the latter's chiefship of the *Vinaya*. But the most cursory inspection also shows that some of the figures given are corrupt and do not answer.

In the case of Upāli the date of the *upasampadā* is not given, but may be calculated by deducting the length of time during which he was Chief of the *Vinaya* after Buddha's death from his spiritual age: $74 - 30 = 44$. His spiritual age at the *upasampadā* of Dāsaka, sixty years (col. 4), is given, and the correctness of the statement can be controlled by the dates for his own and his pupil's *upasampadā*, the difference between which—44 B.B. and 16 A.B.—must, and does give exactly 60. The length of his spiritual life, which is once given as full seventy-four years and as the seventy-fourth year, *i.e.* seventy-three years *plus* an indefinite number of months, can be tested by the figure given for his spiritual age at Sonaka's *upasampadā* and the difference between the date of the latter and the date of Upāli's death, which together amount to $60 + 14 = 74$. The discrepancy between the two statements which mention both the seventy-fourth year and seventy-four years, may be got over by assuming that he died in his seventy-fourth year, but that his death took place towards the end of the year. As the author of the *Dīpavaṃsa* nearly throughout uses round figures, he found it more practical to substitute in his calculation seventy-four full instead of seventy-three full years. This explanation applies also to the spiritual ages of Dāsaka, Sonaka, and Tissa. In the case of Siggava seventy-six complete years (*chhasattati*) are given everywhere. Hence it may be concluded that his death occurred either exactly at the end of the seventy-sixth year or in the beginning of the seventy-seventh. The same remark holds good for Mahinda, whose age is always given as sixty years.

In the case of Dāsaka, the date for his spiritual age at Sonaka's *upasampadā* has not been given correctly in the text, which in one passage reads forty years, and in the other forty-five years. The correction can be made only with the help of the dates of Dāsaka's own and Sonaka's *upasampadā*. The former is placed in Aḡātaśātru 24 = Vijaya 16 = 16 A.B., and the three periods agree exactly. The date of Sonaka's *upasampadā* is given as having taken place Nāgadāsa 10 and Paṇḍurāja 20. The former date corresponds with 58 A.B., and the latter, if it is taken to refer to completed years, with 59 A.B. For Vijaya ruled full thirty-eight years; after his death came an interregnum of one year, and then only followed Paṇḍuvāsa's *abhisheka*.⁴² The *Dīpavaṃsa* (XI. 10) says also expressly that Nāgadāsa had completed twenty-one years when Paṇḍuvāsa died; *ekavisaṃ Nāgadāso Paṇḍuvāso tadā gato*. The text of the *Dīpavaṃsa* does not seem to be corrupt in the two passages which contain the equation $Nāgadāsa\ 10 = Paṇḍuvāsa\ 20$ (IV. 41 and V. 78, 79). Still the date 58 A.B. is required for Sonaka's ordination, as he is said to have died at the end of Nandas 6 = 124 A.B., and the difference between 58 and 124 A.B. exactly agrees with the length of his spiritual life, or nearly sixty-six years. The discrepancy therefore, must be, either real and owing to a slip of the author, or it may have been caused by his using round numbers instead of exact dates in his calculations. An author who talks as loosely as the Ceylonese chroniclers do might perhaps say that at the close of Buddha 58 Nāgadāsa had ruled ten years, and Paṇḍuvāsa twenty, though in reality the former counted three or four months in excess of ten years, and the latter seven or eight months less than twenty. He further might assert that eleven years later, at the close of 69 A.B., ten years of Nāgadāsa's reign had elapsed, and that Paṇḍuvāsa died after ruling thirty years. This explanation appears to me the most likely. For it may be considered certain that in very few cases only the initial dates of the reigns of the Māgadha kings and of the Ceylon kings fell on the initial dates of the corresponding years of Buddha. It seems also, from the case of the date of Siggava's ordination, which will be discussed below, that the chroniclers possessed more exact figures, but

⁴² *Dīpavaṃsa* IX. 42, XI. 2, X. 6, and XI. 3-10.

most thought it unnecessary to use them. If now the ordination of *Sonaka* must be placed at the end of 58 A.B., and that of *Dāsaka* fell at the close of 16 A.B., the age of the latter at *Sonaka's upasampadā* must have been forty-two years, not forty or forty-five. The number 42 has therefore to be entered in col. 4, and in the text of the *Dīpavaṃsa dvechattālīsa* has to be written for *pañchattālīsa* (IV. 41) and for *chattālīseva* (V. 76). The emendation suits the metre in both passages.

The length of *Dāsaka's* spiritual life, (nearly) sixty-six years, corresponds with the difference between the dates of his *upasampadā* 16 A.B. (col. 3) and of his death 80 A.B. (col. 6). The length of his chiefship of the *Vinaya*, too, agrees with the difference between his own and *Upālī's* death: 80 A.B. — 30 A.B. = 50 years (col. 7).

In the case of *Sonaka* all the figures agree, with the exception of that for his spiritual age at the *upasampadā* of *Siggava*, which, though twice given as forty, must be forty-two. For the difference between the dates *Nāga-dāsa* 10 = *Paṇḍurāja* 20 = 58 A.B., and *Kālāśoka* 10 = *interregnum* 11 = 100 A.B., is 42 years. The text of the *Dīpavaṃsa* again may be altered accordingly, viz.—

IV. 44. *dvechattālīsavasso so thero sonasaka-savhayo*, instead of the nonsensical *chattālīseva vasso so*, &c.

V. 76. *dvechattālīsavasso so thero sonakasa-vhayo* | instead of *chattālīsavasso dhāro thero*, &c. The latter alteration recommends itself, because corresponding passages are mostly given in exactly the same words.

As regards *Siggava* the date of his *upasampadā* requires a remark. In one passage (V. 80) we have the equation *Kālāśoka* 10 = *Interregnum* (Ceylon) 11: in the other passage (IV. 44-46) *Kālāśoka* 10 + $\frac{1}{4}$ month = *Interregnum* 11 + 6 months. Immediately after the last verse it is further stated that "But at that time, forsooth, one hundred years after Buddha's death," the *Vesāliya* schism occurred.⁴³ It seems, therefore, that the author meant to place *Siggava's* ordination just at the end of the first century after Buddha. The discrepancy in the dates of the kings may be adjusted by assuming that the beginning of *Kālāśoka's* reign, as well as that of the *Interregnum*, did not fall exactly in the beginning of the ninety-first

and of the ninetyeth year of Buddha, but that the former began fifteen days, and the latter six months, after the beginning of the corresponding year of Buddha. If that was the case, it would seem that the author gave in the first passage the exact figures, and in the second, according to his usual manner, round figures only. The difference between *Siggava's upasampadā* (100 A.B.) and *Tissa's upasampadā* *Chandragupta* 2 = *Pakundaka* 20 = 164 A.B., is exactly 64, and agrees with the number of years allotted to him in col. 4. The length of his spiritual life (seventy-six years) likewise corresponds with the difference between the dates for his *upasampadā* and for his death. But he cannot have been Chief of the *Vinaya* for fifty-five years, as the difference between his death and that of his predecessor amounts to fifty-two years only. It seems certain that in this case also we have to deal with a corruption of the text only. Besides the total of the figures entered in col. 7 for the first five Theras must agree with the date of the last in col. 6,—244 A.B. This agreement can only be obtained if we substitute 52 for 55. If the latter number is retained, we get 247 = 244, which is obviously nonsense. Finally the half-verse (V. 96b) in which the date occurs is obviously corrupt. I propose to read for

pañchapaññāsavassam Siggavassa añṭhasatṭhi Moggaliputtasavhayo |
paññāsavassam Siggavo añṭhasatṭhiṃ Moggali-savhayo |

In order to make out the metre, it is necessary to elide the first syllable of *añṭhasatṭhiṃ*, and to make a disyllable of *Moggali*, as has to be done in other cases.

In the case of *Tissa* the figure given for his spiritual age at the *upasampadā* of *Mahinda* is wrong. For the difference between *Chandragupta* 2 = *Pakundaka* 58 = 164 A.B. and *Aśoka* 6 = 224 A.B. is sixty years, not sixty-six as given in the text and in the table. Though the faulty figure occurs in two passages (V. 82 and VII. 24c), still the latter verse 24a contains a certain proof that the mistake belongs to the copyists, not to the author, of the *Dīpavaṃsa*. For in that line it is explicitly stated that *Moggaliputta* was fifty-four years old at *Aśoka's* coronation. It is obvious that six years later he could not be sixty-six years old, but must be sixty.

⁴³ *tana kho samayena vassasatam hi nibbuta bhagavato vesālīkā Vajjiputtakā, &c.*

The length of his spiritual life (col. 5) is given variously as 86, 80, and 38 years. The second date is the correct one, because this figure agrees with the difference between the dates for his *upasampadā* and for his death. The dates given

for Mahinda all agree, and require no remark or rectification. The subjoined second table gives a summary of this discussion, and shows the corrected figures, as well as the faulty ones in brackets.

| Name. | Birth. | Date of Upasampadā. | Spiritual Age at Upasampadā of Pupil. | Spiritual Age at Death. | Date of Death. | Length of Chiefship of Vinaya. |
|---------------|-------------|---------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------|
| Upāli | Not stated. | 44 bef. B. | 60 | cir. 74 years. | 30 A.B. | 30 years. |
| Dāsaka | Do. | 16 A.B. | 42 years (40, 45). | cir. 64 years. | 80 A.B. | 50 years. |
| Sonaka | Do. | 58 A.B. | 42 years (40) | cir. 66 years. | 124 A.B. | 44 years. |
| Siggava | Do. | 100 A.B. | 64 years. | 76 years. | 176 A.B. | 52 years (55). |
| Tissa | Do. | 164 A.B. | 60 years (66). | 80 years (86, 88). | 244 A.B. | 68 years. |
| Mahinda | 204 A.B. | 224 A.B. | Not stated. | 60 years. | 284 A.B. | 40 years. |

If we compare the above passages of the *Dīpavaṃsa* with Mr. Rhys Davids' first table and his remarks thereon, the mistakes which I imputed to him, and to Mr. Turnour before him, are perfectly clear. The terms *Vinayapāmosakkha*, 'Chief of the Vinaya,' and *Vinayatthāna*, the office (of Chief) of the Vinaya, occur frequently, and in V. 96 the former is expressly connected with the periods of 50, 44, 52 (55), and 68 years which occur in col. 4 of his first table, and in col. 3 of his second table. Farther *Dīp.* V. 95 precludes the possibility even of a doubt whether the natural or the spiritual age of the Theras is indicated by the figures in col. 5 of Mr. Rhys Davids' first table. The period after the *upasampadā* ordination alone can be referred to. Hence the whole basis for Mr. Rhys Davids' deductions, by which the chronicles are shown to give really 150 years, not 218 years, as the interval between the Nirvāṇa and Aśoka, disappears. The *Dīpavaṃsa* gives, on the contrary, a very simple history of six Theras, the fifth of whom was a contemporary of Aśoka, and died about the middle of his reign. If the four corrections proposed by me are accepted, the story shows not only no absurdities, but not even the slightest inconsistency. As regards the date of Aśoka's coronation, 219 A.B., it is clear that it cannot be the result of an absurd mistake in addition, made, as Mr. Rhys Davids supposes, by the Ceylonese Buddhists.

It is no less evident that this date is the only one for the coronation of Aśoka which the Ceylonese tradition supports, and that the *Dīpavaṃsa* does not contain any evidence in favour

of a shorter interval between the Nirvāṇa and Aśoka's accession. Nor do I think that the other points which Mr. Rhys Davids brings forward in order to show its incredibility carry much weight. When he points out that the number of Theras enumerated in the *Dīpavaṃsa* is too small to fill a space of more than two hundred years, the obvious answer is that the correctness of this list is by no means proved, and that, as Mr. Turnour** has pointed out and he himself admits, another and longer list is in existence. But even if the shorter list were proved to be correct, it could not be said that the account of the *Dīpavaṃsa* involves impossibilities. If we assume that each of the five Theras received the *upasampadā* ordination at the legal age of twenty, the longest-lived among them would have reached the age of one hundred years, and the shortest-lived the age of eighty-four. The succession of five very long-lived Chiefs of the Vinaya would certainly be something remarkable, but it is not absolutely impossible. Again, Mr. Rhys Davids' objection drawn from the small number of Ceylonese kings (para. 107) who are stated to have reigned between the Nirvāṇa and Aśoka has very little weight. He himself, like all other scholars who have written on the subject, has seen that the Ceylonese history from Vijaya to Duṭṭhagāmini is untrustworthy. It is impossible that Mutasiva lived to the age of 147 years, and that his sons reigned after him, with interruptions, 102 years. Hence no portion of a story which contains such statements can be used in order to discredit another independent tradi-

** *Jour. As. Soc. Beng.* vol. VII. p. 791; compare also Lassen, *Ind. Alt.* vol. II. p. 92, 2nd ed.

tion, or to support an adjustment. It is quite true that the number of kings is too small for the interval of 236 years stated to lie between Vijaya and Devânâmpiya Tissa. But instead of reducing that interval, we may just as well assume that Vijaya's invasion falls later than the Nirvâṇa, or that the chroniclers did not possess the names of all the princes who ruled between Vijaya and Duṭṭhagâmini, and were tempted by the legend of the synchronism of Vijaya's conquest and Buddha's death to spread the scanty materials over too large an area. Finally, it seems inadvisable to bring forward (para. 110) the Brahmanical tradition in order to prove that Siśunâga, Kâlaśuka and his ten sons reigned before Bhâtiya, and to allow the number of years given by the Buddhists to stand. An indiscriminating combination of portions of two contradictory traditions, however much its results may agree with preconceived notions, has not hitherto been recognized as being in accordance with the principles of historical criticism.

These remarks may suffice to show that hitherto no evidence, be it external or internal, has been brought forward which proves the date 219 A.B. for Aśoka's coronation to be spurious. It may, therefore, be either really historical, or at least go back to Aśoka's own time, i.e. have been calculated by the Indian Buddhists from the Māgadha *Rājavalis* and their *Therāvalis*, when Aśoka became a patron and adherent of their faith, and have been carried by the missionaries to Ceylon. Several points can be adduced in favour of the latter hypothesis. Firstly, it seems only reasonable to suppose that the Buddhists, who, through Aśoka's protection, obtained a fresh start in the race for spiritual influence, should have tried to ascertain the distance of the royal *dāyāda* or 'relative' of their faith from their first teacher. If their account of this period is at all to be trusted, their sect was, just about the time of Aśoka's conversion, in a somewhat fallen condition. Quarrels had taken place among the Bhikkhus, and not less than eighteen mutually hostile sects had arisen. Aśoka's conversion at first made matters only worse, as it induced numerous followers of other faiths to pass themselves off for disciples of Buddha in order to participate in Aśoka's bounty, and to create confusion in the Buddhist doctrines. The resistance of the or-

thodox ascetics against this state of things led to the council in Aśoka's seventeenth year. Its immediate consequence was a purification of the Buddhist Church from the foreign intruders, and a new redaction of the sacred texts. Another result was the appointment of missionaries for the conversion of foreign, and even Mlechchha, countries,—an undertaking which in later times gave to Buddhism a place among the great religions of the world. It seems only natural that the Buddhist Theras, at such a period, the importance of which for their faith they must have fully felt, should have revised, together with their sacred books, the lists of their teachers, and of the data referring to the chief events of their spiritual career, and that they should have connected the history of their patron and of his predecessors in Māgadha with the history of their sect. These considerations make it, in my opinion, more probable that a *Therāvali* and a Māgadha *Rājāvali* similar to, if not identical with, that which the Ceylonese chronicles give, were arranged in India and carried to Ceylon by the first missionaries, than that fragmentary materials only, out of which the Ceylonese later manufactured their account, came over from the continent. This hypothesis, though it would not prove that every one of the figures and events contained in the Ceylonese chronicles has remained unchanged, would make it probable that some considerable portion of the southern tradition might be ancient and of Indian origin. The date of Aśoka's coronation, against which no particular objection can be urged, would probably have to be included in the latter category.

Secondly, a much stronger argument for the Indian origin of the same date is furnished by a fact which first has been brought forward by M. Burnouf (*Introd. à l'Hist. du Bouddh.* pp. 432-36), but has received little attention. This is the statement of a fragment of an *Avadāna*, entitled *the Council*,—that Aśoka lived not, as the northern Buddhists usually assert, one hundred, but *two hundred* years after the Nirvâṇa. The story begins: "Deux cent ans après que le bien-heureux Buddha fut entré dans le Nirvâṇa complet régnait dans la ville de Pâtaliputra un roi nommé Aśoka." It contains in the sequel an account of the birth of Kuṇḍala and the story of Sundara, which agrees with the common northern traditions. M. Burnouf

has pointed out that this fragment shows that the northern Buddhists, too, originally recognized two *Āśokas*, of whom most of their books have made one person, and that it confirms the authenticity of the southern tradition. I do not see how this conclusion can be avoided, and how it can be denied that the date for *Āśoka's* coronation, according to the era of the *Nirvāṇa*, must have been settled in India before Buddhism was introduced into Ceylon. As the assertion of the southern Buddhists that the conversion of the Ceylonese took place during *Āśoka's* reign has not been doubted, and as there is no reason to doubt it, the date, if calculated in India, must have been calculated just during *Āśoka's* own reign, and must be, as far as the belief of those times is concerned, perfectly genuine. The effect of this conclusion on the question of the authorship of the new edicts is obvious. As the date of the edicts agrees with the date for the coronation of *Āśoka* in 219 A.B., and as the latter is shown to have been settled during *Āśoka's* reign, the agreement of the dates itself becomes

a strong additional proof for the correctness of the proposed interpretation of the edicts.

I do not see that there is at present any possibility of saying whether the belief, prevailing in *Āśoka's* time, that between the *Nirvāṇa* and the king's coronation upwards of 218 years had elapsed, deserves implicit credence or not. That would depend on a knowledge of the nature of the materials which were at the disposal of the Buddhist chronologists, and this knowledge we do not possess. Mr. Rhys Davids is therefore right in pointing out that the new edicts do not absolutely prove the length of the interval between the *Nirvāṇa* and *Āśoka*, but merely the belief on this point entertained by *Āśoka* and his contemporaries. But the smallness of the period, sixty years of which are besides covered by the reigns of Chandragupta and Bindusāra, where Brahmans and Buddhists agree in the figures, makes a considerable deviation from the truth improbable, and for practical purposes the number of years given by the Buddhists may be accepted as a fact.

MISCELLANEA.

GOLDEN MASKS.

Major West, in the *Indian Antiquary*, vol. VII. p. 26, expresses his belief that the practice of using golden masks will appear on further investigation to be widely spread in India. He is right in his conjecture as far as Gujarāt is concerned; for, being myself a native of this province, I can say with some confidence that the practice of using masks is here prevalent to a great extent. There is hardly a temple of Śiva in Surat which does not possess a mask, and though the practice is not so general in Ahmadābād or Khēdā, masks are by no means uncommon there, being found even in village temples. In this part of Gujarāt also the practice prevails, and but a few days ago I had occasion to see it at Rājkoṭ.

I may note that the practice is confined to the temples of Śiva only, and the masks are only gilt or plated—evidently on account of the poor endowments in Gujarāt. There is, however, one circumstance connected with this practice which inclines me to believe that it has been imported from the Dakhaṇ into Gujarāt. Whenever the masks are used, a turban like that of a Marāṭhā Brāhmaṇ is always placed over its head, and the practice appears to be more prevalent as we advance towards the Konkanā.

As in the Dakhaṇ, they are here used only on festive occasions. The idea that a mask represents the founder of a temple is here entirely

unknown, it being looked upon as an image of Śiva only. Masks with five faces are also to be seen here and there, and I hear the practice is common enough with the Marāṭhās. If such be the case, it is most likely that the masks are only intended to image forth the idea of the Five-faced god (Śiva) in a more tangible manner than is done by the *liṅga*. This also leads me to suspect the high antiquity assigned to the practice, and to look upon it as a very late innovation. The *Dharma Sindhu*, a standard work upon Hindu ceremonies, seems to be ignorant of the existence of such a practice. I simply mention this fact for what it is worth, without laying any undue stress upon it, as I am aware that numerous works must be consulted before one can build any argument upon their silence to prove the non-existence of this practice among the old Āryans.

N. L. P.

Rājkoṭ, 14th March 1878.

The third and concluding volume of Spiegel's *Iranische Alterthumskunde*, a work worthy to rank by the side of Lassen's great work *Indische Alterthumskunde*, has appeared. Besides concluding the Eranian history, it describes the political and family life, and the state of knowledge and art. In a lucid chapter the author gives his results as to the origin and date of our text of the *Avesta*.—*Academy*, March 9th.

SANSKRIT AND OLD CANARESE INSCRIPTIONS.

BY J. F. FLEET, B.O. C.S., M.B.A.S.

(Continued from p. 112).

No. XL.

IN the *Jour. Bo. Br. E. As. Soc.*, Vol. III., Part II., p. 203, there is a paper by Major-General Sir George LeGrand Jacob on seven copper-plate grants dug up in April, 1848, at Nêrûr in the 'Kûdal' division of the Sâwant-wâdi State. The originals belong to the India Office Library, from which I have obtained them to prepare revised transcriptions and translations.

The third of these grants is the earliest of the set. It consists of three plates, about 6½" long by 3" broad. They have no raised rim for the purpose of protecting the writing, such as is spoken of by Dr. Burnell in his *South-Indian Palæography* (p. 72, para. 4). The ring connecting the plates is uncut. It is about ½" thick, and 2" in diameter. The seal of it has the representation of a boar, facing to the proper right. The language is Sanskrit. The characters are square and upright, and of the same standard as those of my Kadamba grants (*Ind. Ant.* Vol. VI., p. 22), agreeing most closely with the characters of No. XXV. (*id.*, p. 30).

The grant is one of the early Chalukya dynasty,

nasty, anterior to the separation of the Western and the Eastern branches. The name of the dynasty is here spelt 'Chalikya.' The first king mentioned is Vallabha,—the Pulikêsi-Vallabha or Pulikêsi I. of my previous inscriptions of this dynasty. The second is his youngest son, Maṅgala,—the Maṅgalîsa or Maṅgalîsvara of my previous inscriptions. No mention is made in this grant of Maṅgala's elder brother Kîrttivarmā I. The donor is Maṅgala; and the grant made is of the village of Kuṇḍivâṭaka in the district of the Koṅkaṇas.¹

The grant is not dated in any era. But Maṅgala is spoken of as having driven out king Buddha, the son of Śaṅkaragaṇa, and having slain king Svāmî of the Chalikya family; and as these facts are not referred to in his stone-inscription (*Ind. Ant.* Vol. VI., p. 363) dated in the twelfth year of his reign, when Śaka 500 had expired, I would place the present grant slightly subsequent to that inscription. Who these two kings, Buddha and Svāmî, were, I am not at present able to suggest.

Transcription.

First plate.

- [¹] Svasti Śrīmatām Svāmi-Mahāsēna-pād-ānudyātānām Mānavya-sagô-
 [²] trāṇām Hārīti-putrāṇām Chalikyānām vamsē sambhūtaḥ Mānava-pu-
 [³] rāṇa-Rāmāyana-Bhārat-ētiḥāsa-kuśalaḥ nītan Brihaspati-samaḥ
 [⁴] agnishtōma-vāṇapēya-paundarika-bahusuvarṇa-āśvamēdh-āvabhṛitha-
 [⁵] snāna-pavitrikṛita-śārīraḥ sva-guṇair-llōka-vallabbhō Vallabbhaḥ [⁶] Tasya pu-
 [⁶] traḥ parama-brahmanyah para-rāshṭr-āvamarddi sva-rāptrē (shtrē) nyāy-ānuvartti dēva-dvija-
 [⁷] guru-pūjā-nirataḥ sakala-mahī-maṇḍala-vyāpi-vimala-yaśāḥ

Second plate; first side.

- [⁸] sva-bhuja-bala-parākkra(kra)m-ōpārjīti-ānya-rāja-vittah vṛishabha-gamana-nayana-ninā-
 [⁹] dah samada-vara-vāraṇa-vilāsaḥ simha-vikramah naya-vinaya-dāna-dayā-
 [¹⁰] dākshīnya-satya-sāmpad-ōpētaḥ śakti-traya-sāmpannah parama-bhāgavataḥ
 [¹¹] Maṅgala-rājah [¹²] Babhau sa Vainya-pratimāna-kīrttis=tamah-pramāṇat-eva-
 [¹³] guṇ-āmsu-jālah [¹⁴] Tēna rājūnā Śaṅkaragaṇa-putraṁ gaja-turaga-padāti-
 [¹⁵] kōśa-bala-sāmpannam Buddha-rājāṁ vidravya Chalikya²-vamsa-sambhavam ashtā-
 [¹⁶] daśa-samara-vijayinam Svāmi-rājāṁ cha latvā samvatsara-pūjyatamāyām

Second plate; second side.

- [¹⁷] Kārttika-dvādaśyām kṛit-ōpava(vā)sēn-ārchchita-Vishṇunā Kāśyapa-sagōtrasya veda-

¹ The Koṅkaṇas were seven in number,—*sapta-Koṅkaṇa*. The word is used in the plural, though without the numeral prefixed, in *transcr.* I. 10 of No. XIII. of this Series, Vol. V., p. 67.

² The first syllable looks somewhat like *chā*, but this is owing, I think, only to a slip of the engraver's tool. The vowel is properly short.

- [¹⁶] vēdāṅga-viduṣaḥ Sumati-svāmināḥ putrāya vēda-vēdāṅga-pāragāyaḥ(ya)
 [¹⁷] Priya-svāminē kula-śīla-vṛitta-saṁpannāya Koṁkaṇa-vishayē niśrē-
 [¹⁸] yasam=udaka-pūrvvaṁ Kuṇḍivāṭaka-grāmō dattāḥ [||*] Uktam cha tēna rājā [||*]
 [¹⁹] Yō smat-kul-ābhyanarō nyō vā rāga-dvēsha-lōbha-mōh-ābhībhūtō hi(him)ayā
 [²⁰] sa pañcha-mahāpāṭak-ōpapāṭakais=sam'yuktas=syāt [||*] Dharmma-sāstrēshv=apy=uktam [||*]

Third plate.

- [²¹] Bahubhir=vvasudhā bhuktā rājābhis=Sagar-ādibhiḥ yasya yasya yadā
 [²²] bhūmiḥ tasya tasya tadā phalam [||*] Sva-dattām para-dattām vā yō harēta vasu-
 [²³] ndharām shashtīm varsha-sahasrāṇi viśṭhāyām jāyatē krimiḥ || Shashtīm
 [²⁴] varsha-sahasrāṇi svarggē tishṭhati bhūmi-daḥ āchchhētā ch=ānumantā
 [²⁵] cha tāny=ēva narakē vasēt || Svan=dātum su-mahach-chhakyam duḥkha-
 [²⁶] m=anyasya pālanam dānam vā pālanam v=ēti dānāch=chhrēyō nupālanam=iti[||*]

Translation.

Hail! Born in the family of the Chalikyas, who are glorious, and who meditate on the feet of Svāmi-Mahāsēna, and who are of the lineage of Mānavya, and who are the descendants of Hārītī; conversant with the code of laws of Manu and the *Purāṇas* and the epics of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Bhārata*; equal to Bṛihaspati³ in philosophy; having his body purified by ablutions performed after celebrating the *Agnishōma* and *Vājapēya* and *Paundarika* (sacrifices) and horse-sacrifices that cost much gold; the favourite of the world on account of his meritorious qualities,—(such was) Vallabha.

His son (was) king Maṅgala, who was an excellent worshipper of (the god) Brahmā; who devastated the countries of his enemies; who adhered to justice in his own country; who delighted in worshipping the gods and the twice-born and spiritual preceptors; whose pure fame pervaded all the countries of the earth; who acquired the wealth of other kings by the strength and prowess of his own arm; who had the gait and the sight and the voice of a bull; who had the actions of a choice elephant infuriated with passion; who had the valour of a lion; who was endowed with the wealth of statesmanship and modesty and charity and tenderness and sincerity and truth; who was possessed of the three constituents of power; and who was an excellent worshipper of (the god) Bhagavān.⁴ He was glorious,—being possessed of fame that resembled (the fame of) Vainya⁵,—with the rays of his virtues, which dispelled the darkness (of sin).

By that king,—when he had driven out king Buddha, who was the son of Śamkara-gaṇa, and who was possessed of the power of elephants and horses and foot-soldiers and treasure; and when he had slain king Svāmī, who was born in the family of the Chalikyas, and who had been victorious in eighteen battles,—having fasted on the twelfth day of (the month) Kārttika, which is the most worshipful (lunar day) in the year, and having done worship to (the god) Viṣṇu, the village of Kuṇḍivāṭaka, in the district of the Koṇkaṇas, was piously given, with libations of water, to Priyasvāmī, who was thoroughly conversant with the *Vēdas* and *Vēdāṅgas*, and who was possessed of character and behaviour such as is honourable to a family, the son of Sumatisvāmī, of the Kāśyapa-gōtra, who was acquainted with the *Vēdas* and *Vēdāṅgas*.

And it was said by that king:—"He shall incur the guilt of the five great sins and the minor sins, who may injure (this grant), being overcome by envy or enmity or avarice or folly, whether he be born in my family, or whether he be another person!"

Moreover, it has been said in the sacred writings:—Land has been enjoyed by many kings commencing with Sagarā; (&c.)! He is born for the duration of sixty thousand years as a worm in ordure, (&c.)! The giver of land abides for sixty thousand years in heaven; the confiscator (of land), or one who connives (at such an act), dwells for the same number of years in hell! It is easy to give one's own property, but the preservation of (the grant of) another is difficult; (&c.)!

³ The preceptor of the gods.
⁴ Viṣṇu.

⁵ Vainya, or Vainya,—a patronymic of the Pāṇḍic king Prithu.

No. XLI.

The first of the Nêrûr inscriptions is the next in point of age. The plates are three in number, about $7\frac{1}{2}$ " long by 3" broad. They seem to have a very slightly raised rim to protect the writing; but it is not very decided, and may have been accidentally caused in beating out and shaping the copper. The ring, which is uncut, is about $\frac{1}{4}$ " thick and 3" in diameter. The seal has, as before, the representation of a bear, facing to the proper right. The language is Sanskrit. The characters are decidedly rude and irregular, compared with the usual standard of the Chalukya alphabet of this period. The most noticeable points are:—1, The triangular shape of the *va*; 2, the method of marking the vowel *ê* by a stroke above the consonant, instead of at the side of it; and 3, the form of the *tha*, which,—instead of being like *dha*, with a side stroke inside it, as in other early instances, or with a *bindu* inside it, as in later instances,—is like *dha* with a loop formed on the bottom stroke. These three special peculiarities may be seen distinctly in, for instance, the words *prithivî*, l. 10, and *paramêśvara*, l. 11. Though only a few letters are absolutely illegible, yet the plates are so very much worn and abraded that, but for the recurrence of well-known expressions, many passages must have remained doubtful.

This grant gives us two new names in the Western Chalukya genealogy,—*Chandrāditya*, the eldest son of *Pulikêśi II.*, and the elder brother of *Vikramāditya I.*,—and his wife *Vijayabhattachārikā*. Some doubt may be felt as to the name of *Vikramā-*

ditya's brother. The reading, in l. 14, is undoubtedly *Śrindrāditya*, which, if divided as it stands, would give '*Śri-Indrāditya*.' But this person is mentioned again in the '*Kochrê*' grant, which is given by General Jacob after the Nêrûr series, and the reading there seems quite plain:—*Anivārita-Vikramādityas=tasya jyêshthô bhrātâ Śrī-Chandrāditya-prithivīvallabha-mahārāj-ādhirājas=tasya priya-mahishê Kalikāla-pratipaksha-bhūtâ Śrī-Vijayamahādêvî* (four letters uncertain) *sarvân-ājñāpayati*. Had the name been '*Indrāditya*,' the composer of the inscription would certainly have avoided an awkward coalescence of vowels by writing *Śrīmad-Indrāditya*, just as in *Śrīmad-Upendra*, which occurs in l. 32 of another of the Nêrûr grants to be noticed below. I myself feel confident, with General Jacob, that the name is really '*Chandrāditya*,' the first syllable, *cha*, being omitted here through carelessness on the part of the engraver.

The grant is not dated in the Śaka era; but the details of the date,—at the autumnal equinox, on the second day after the full-moon of the month *Āśvayuja*,—may perhaps suffice, if a calculation is made, to fix its date in that era. If this grant stood alone, the expression *svarājya*, in l. 15, might indicate the reign of *Vikramāditya*, as much as that of *Vijayabhattachārikā*. But, taking this grant with the '*Kochrê*' grant, it appears that *Vijayabhattachārikā* did reign after her husband's decease,—probably as regent during the childhood of a son, whose subsequent death led to the accession of *Vikramāditya I.*

TEXE

First plate.

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| [¹] Svasti | Śrīmatām | sakala-bhuvana-saṁstūyamāna-Mānavya-sa- |
| [²] gōtrāṇām | Hārītī-putrāṇām | sapta-lōka-mātṛibhis=sapta-mātṛibhir=abhi- |
| [³] rā(ra)kshītānām | Kkâ(kâ)rttikēya-parirakṣhaṇa-prāpta-kalyāṇa-param[parâ*]ṇām | |
| [⁴] bhagavan-Nārāyaṇa-prasāda-samāsādita-varāha-lāñchhan-êkṣhaṇa-kṣha- | | |
| [⁵] na-vaśīkṛit-âśêsha-mahibhri(bhri)tām | Chalukyānām | kulam=alaṅkarishṇôr=âsvamê- |
| [⁶] dh-âvabhṛitha-anāna-pavitṛīkṛita-gātrasya | | Śrī-Pulakêśi-Vallabha-mahārāja- |

Second plate; first side.

| | | |
|---|------------|---|
| [¹] sya | prapautrah | parākkra(kra)m-âkkrâ(krâ)nta-Vanavāsy-âdi-para-nripati-maṇḍala- |
| | | pranibaddha- |
| [²] viśuddha-kīrtti-Śrī-Kīrttivarmma-prithivīvallabha-mahārājasya | | pautras=sama- |
| [³] ra-saṁsakta-sakal-ôttarâpṛi(pa)th-êśvara-Śrī-Harshavarddhana-parājay-ôpalabha- | | |
| [¹⁰] paramêśvar-âpara-nāmadhēyasya | | Satyâśraya-śrī-prithivīvalla- |

- [¹¹] bha-mahārāj-ādhirāja-paramēśvara-bhatā(tā)rakassya(sya) priya-tanayō
 [¹²] rājā ripu-narēndrā[n*] hatvā diśi [diśi*] jivā sva-va[śśa-jānām] lakshmīm prā(?)pya

Second plate ; second side.

- [¹³] prāpya cha paramēśvaratām=a-nivārīta-Vikramādityaḥ [||*] Tasya jyēsthā-
 [¹⁴] bhrātuh Śrī-[Cha*]udrāditya-prithivīvallabha-mahārājasya priya-mahi-
 [¹⁵] shī Vijayabhaṭṭārikā [||*] Sva-rājya-pañchama-ssam(sam)vatsara A(ā)śva-
 [¹⁶] yuja-pauruṣamāsasya dvitīyāyām vishuvē bahu-puny-ārttham(rttham)
 [¹⁷] Na(?)rakāgāharē Vatsassa(sa)gōtrāyāḥ(ya) Gṛīhapatēḥ putrāya Svāmi-Cha-
 [¹⁸] turvēdasya putrāya Āryasvāmi-dikshītāya Pāliya-

Third plate.

- [¹⁹] pa(?)thadigi(?)ri(?)kā-prabhri(bhri)ti-dakshinē pārisvashta(?)shu)ddē-kshētrāḥ?ndaka-pū-
 [²⁰] rvaṁ dattāḥ [||*] Tasya vaśśa-jō nirvīśēsham pari(ri)pālā(la)yati* sa
 [²¹] dātuh punya-phala-bhāg=bhavati yō sy=āpabarttā sa pañcha-
 [²²] bhir=mmahāpātakais=samnyuktō bhavati [||*] Uktañ=cha bhagavatā Vyā-
 [²³] sēna [||*] Sva-dattām para-dattām vā yō harēta vasundharām shashtīm varsha-
 [²⁴] sahasrāṇi visbhāyām jāyatē krimih ||

Translation.

Hail! The great grandson of the Great King Śrī-Pulakēśi-Vallabha, whose body was purified by ablutions performed after celebrating horse-sacrifices, and who adorned the family of the Chalukyas, who are glorious, and who are of the lineage of Mānavya which is praised over the whole world, and who are the descendants of Hāriti, and who have been preserved by seven mothers who are the seven mothers of mankind, and who have attained an uninterrupted continuity of prosperity through the protection of Kārttikēya, and who have had all kings made subject to them on the instant at the sight of the sign of the Boar which they acquired through the favour of the holy Nārāyaṇa;—the grandson of the Great King Śrī-Kīrttivarmā, the favourite of the world, whose pure fame was established in the territories of the hostile kings of Vanavāsi and other countries that had been invaded by his prowess;—the beloved son of the favourite of the world, the Great King, the supreme king, the supreme lord, the venerable one, Satyāśraya, who was possessed of the second name of 'Supreme Lord,' acquired by defeating Śrī-Harshavardhana, the warlike lord of all the country of the north;—

(was) the king Vikramāditya, the unpulsed, who, having slain the hostile kings, and having conquered in country after country, recouped the fortunes of those of his family, and attained the supreme lordship.

His elder brother (was) Śrī-Chandrāditya,* the favourite of the world, the Great King; whose beloved queen was Vijayabhaṭṭārikā.

In the fifth year of her reign, on the second day after the full-moon¹⁰ of (the month) Āśvayuja, at the equinox, for the sake of much religious merit, at (the village of) Narakāgāhara, the fields of¹¹, to the south of Pāliyamapathadigirikā &c., were given (by her), with libations of water, to Āryasvāmidikshita, the son of Svāmi-Chaturvēda, and the son's son of Gṛīhapati of the Vatsa gōtra.

He of that (king's) lineage, who preserves (this grant) without distinction, enjoys the reward of the religious merit of the giver; he, who confiscates it, incurs the guilt of the five great sins! And it has been said by the holy Vyāsa:—He is born as a worm in ordure for the duration of sixty thousand years, who confiscates land that has been given, whether by himself or by another!

* See para. 2 of the introductory remarks.

General Jacob's Pandits read Pāliyamapathadigirikā-prabhritidakshinēpārisvashtāddēkshikā, and translate "the privilege of supervision (i.e., benefice) of the eight markets, Pāliya, Adigirikā, &c." I do not quite see how that translation is made out of that reading. I cannot much improve on their reading; but the last two syllables seem to me kshētrā, not kshikā.

* There are perhaps two letters, now illegible, after this word.

* See note 6 above.

¹⁰ Or, perhaps, "on the second day of the fortnight of the full-moon, i.e., of the bright fortnight."

¹¹ See note 7 above. Pārisvashta(?)shu)ddē is unintelligible, but perhaps contains the names of some fields, since kshētra, which is a neuter noun, is used in the masc. or fem. nomin. plural.

[The image shows a highly degraded, high-contrast scan of a document page. The text is illegible due to extreme noise and contrast. A large white circular artifact is visible near the bottom center.]

[illegible]

11b

Handwritten text in an ancient script, likely Sumerian, on a clay tablet. The text is arranged in several lines, with a large circular hole visible near the bottom center.



III.

Handwritten text in an ancient script, likely Sumerian, on a clay tablet. The text is arranged in several lines, with a large circular hole visible near the bottom center.

PERSONAL NAMES IN THE SOUTHERN PART OF THE AHMADABAD COLLECTORATE AND NEIGHBOURING COUNTRY.

BY C. E. GORDON CRAWFORD, B.C.S.

This is a revision of the lists published in the *Indian Antiquary*, vol. IV. p. 236, with additions. The gathering-ground may be said to be now Gohilwād, Jhālāwād, Kāthiāwād proper, and the Bhāl; the former list was pretty nearly confined to the talukās of Dhandhukā and Goghā, which are arbitrary political divisions.

Experience having shown that attempts at classification are premature, one list in dictionary order has been substituted for the four lists formerly given. In it the specification of caste is only meant to show the uses which have come under the compiler's observation, without implying that other uses are non-existent.*

Abhe-sing, Gr.; -chand, W.; -ji, Kāth.
 Abuji, Mol.
 Adā, Ko. Ch.; -sing, Gr. Ādit, Bā.
 Agābhāi, Gr. Agarsing, Gr.
 Ājā, Ko. Wāg.; -bhāi, Mol. Akubhā, Mol.
 Ālā, Kāth. Bh. Ko. Dh.
 Alaiyā, Kāth.
 Alek, Kāth.
 Amābhāi, Gr.
 Ambā, Ko. Kum. Kan.; -lāl, Ksh.; -rām, Kan.
 Ambaidās, So.
 Ami-ji, Mol. V.; -chand, W.
 Amrā, Kāth. Bh. Ko. Kum. Dh. Wāg.; -sing, Gr.;
 -si, Sut. Sat.; -chand, W.
 Ānand, Khaḍ. Khojā; -ji, W.; -rām, Br.
 Anda, Ko. Kum. Dh. Mā.
 Anubhāi, Gr. Aprub, Ko.
 Arjan, Wāg. Ko. R. Kum. Sut. Kath. Lā.; -lāl, Br.
 Āshābhāi, Gr. Ātābhāi, Gr.
 Bahādar, Ko. Bakā, Bā.
 Balaibhāi, Gr. Bāpji, Gr.
 Banā, R.; Bane, Bā.; -sing, Gr.
 Bāpu-bhāi, Gr.; -miān, -sāheb, Mol.
 Bāwā, Kāth. Ko. Bh. Wāg. Kum. Dh. Lā. W.
 -ji, Gr. Mol.; -miān, Mus.
 Bechar, Wāg. Ko. Jogi, Bhau. W. Kan. Kum.
 R. Sat. Kh. Bhang.; -sing, -ji, Gr.
 Bhābhā, Ko. R. Bhai-ji, Ko.; -chand, W. Kum.
 Bhagā, Bhagu, Ko. Ch. Cham. R.
 Bhagwān, Ko. D. Br. Kum. R. Bh. Sat.
 Bhalā, Ko.
 Bhāpā, Kāth. Kan. Ko. Kum. Mā.; -ji, R.

Bhānkhar-ji, R. Bhārā, -mal, Ko. Mus.; -ji, Gr.
 Bhāthi, Ko. Bhāwā, Ko. R.
 Bhattā, Ko. Bhāusing, R.
 Bhawān, Kan. Rāw. R. W. Ko. Mus.
 Bhāyā, So. Ch. Kāth.; -ji, Gr.
 Blimā, Bhim, Ko. Kāth. Bh. R. Kan. Kum. Rāw.
 Sat. D. W.; -ji, Gr.
 Bhojā, Ko. Kāth. Rab. Cham.
 Bholā, Lr.; -bhāi, Gr.
 Bhupat-sing, Gr. Bhurā, W.
 Bijai, Wāg. Ko. Rab. Āh. Dh. Bhang.
 Boghā, Ko. Jogi, W. Kum. Wāg. Bh. R. Sat.
 Butā, Bh. Ko.
 Chhagan, Ko. Br. Chaku, Ko. W.
 Chāmpā, Kāth.; -si, W. Chelā, Kāth. Wāg. Dh.
 Chauthiyā, Ko.
 Chikā, Ko. W. R. Chomla, Kāth. Chonḍā, Ko.
 Dādā, Kāth.; -bhāi, Mol. Gr.; -ji, Gr.
 Dāji, R. D. Ch. W. Bhang.; -bhāi, Gr.
 Dalā, Ko.; -bhāi, Gr.
 Dūnā, Ko. Kāth. Āh. Kh. R.; -sing, Ko.
 Dasā, Kāth. Dayā, Kan. Ko.
 Depālji, Gr. Desal, R.; -ji, Gr.
 Devā, Wāg. Kāth. R. Kum. Cham. Ko. Sat.; -dān,
 Wāg.; -rāj, Rājgar; -ji, -bhāi, Gr.; -karan, Ch.;
 -si, -chand, W.; -shankar, -ji, Br.; -dās, Rab.
 Devi-sing, Gr. Desā, Āh. Kāth.; -bhāi, Gr.
 Devit, Kāth. Dewul, W.
 Dhanā, Kan. Bh. Jogi, D. Ko. Ch. Kum. R. Sat.
 Dhārsi, W. Dipā, W.
 Dosā, Ko. R. Kāth. Kh. Sat. Bhang.; -ji, Gr.;
 -bhāi, Gr.; miān, Mus.
 Dudhā, Ko. Kan. Kum. Sat.; -bhāi, Gr.
 Dungar, -ji, Gr. Dyālā, Bh. D.
 Ebhal, Kāth.
 Gadhā, Ko.
 Gagā, Wāg. Ko. Bhau. Rāw. Gagū-bhāi, Mol.
 Gagal, W. Galā, Ko. Gajā, R.; -bhāi, Gr.
 Gāndā, Ko. D.
 Ganesh, Kan. Ko. Kum. Sat. Bhang.
 Gaṅga-bhāi, Gr.; -ji, Gr. Gemalsing, Gr.
 Ghehelā, Wāg. Kāth. Ko. W. Kan. R.; -bhāi, Gr. Bā.
 Giga, Kho. Meh. Ko. W. Kāth. Sut. Rāw.
 Gobar, Ko. Āh. Kum. Godaḍ, Kāth. Godbhāi, Gr.
 Goitā, Kh. Gokal, Ko. Kum. Sat. Ch.
 Golap, Kāth. Gopā, Ko.
 Gopāl, W. Ko. Kan. Lā.; -ji, R.; -sing, Gr.

* The following abbreviations are used:—

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|----------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|-------------|
| Āh. Āhir | Ch. Chāran | Ko. Koli | Ksh. Kshatri | Mol. Molesalām | So. Soni |
| Bā. Bārot | Cham. Chamār | Kh. Khawās | Lā. Luwānā | Mus. Musalmān | Sut. Sutar. |
| Bh. Bharwād | D. Darzi (Sāi) | Khaḍ. Khaḍak | Lr. Luwār | R. Rājpūt | V. Vohra |
| Bhang. Bhangiyā | Dh. Dhoḍ | Kho. Khojā | Mā. Māli | Rab. Rābāri | W. Wāniyā |
| Bhau. Bhausār | Gr. Grāsīā | Kum. Kurūbhār | Meh. Mehman | Rāw. Rāwal | Wāg. Wāghri |
| Br. Brāhmaṇ | Kāth. Kāthi | Kan. Kaṇbi | Mo. Mochi | Sat. Satwārā | |

- Gordhan, W. Lr.
 Govind, Wág. Ko. Kum. Bh. Lr. Sat.; -ji, W.
 Goyá, Kan. Dh. W.; -bhái, Gr.
 Gumán, Ko.; -bhá, Mol.
 Gultán, Bhang. Gumánbhá, Mol. Gusá, Bh.
 Hada, W. Hadbhái, Gr. Hagábhái, Gr.
 Hájá, Ko. Wág. R.
 Haká, W. Kh. Br.; -bhái, Gr. Hála, Ko.
 Háubhái, Gr. Hámá, -ji, Ko. Bh.; -bhái, Gr.
 Hamir, R. Ko. Káth. Áh.; -ji, Gr. R.
 Hanji, -bhái, Gr. Bá. Hansráj, W.
 Hanubhái, Gr. Harbham, Ko.; -ji, Gr.
 Hari, Ko. R. Kan. Br. W. D. So. Wág.; -sur,
 Káth. Ch.
 Harji, Ko. W. Kum. Lá.
 Harkhá, Má. So.; -ji, W. Kan.
 Hathi-yá, Ko. R.; -bhái, Gr.
 Háthi, Ko. Bh. Káth. R. Kan. Bhang.; -ji, R.
 Hima, Ko.; -chand, -ráj, W.
 Hirá, Ko. R.; -ji, Sut. Hothi, Bh. Mol.
 Ichehá, -ji, R.
 Jádrá, Káth. Jágá, Ko.
 Jagá, R.; -malji, Mol. Gr.
 Jagubhái, Gr. Jáita, or Joitá, Káth.
 Jalu, W. Jámá, Ko. Jamábhái, Gr.
 Jasá, Ko. R. Wág. Káth. Sat. Ch.; -ji, -bhái, Gr.;
 -ráj, W.
 Jasmát, Ko. Kum.; -sing, Gr.
 Je-ráj, Ko. Bhang.; -malji, Gr.; -sing, R. Ko. W.
 Kan.; -chand, W.; -shañkar, Br.; -karan, Ko.;
 -rám, Kan. Br.
 Jesá, Ko. Jet, R.
 Jetlá, Kan. R. Ko. W. Kum. Káth. Khad. Má.
 Dh. Cham.; -súr, Káth.; -si, W.
 Jetli, R. Mus.; -sing, -bhái, Gr. Jhálálá, Wág.
 Jhálam, Wág.; -sing, Gr.
 Jhaver, Kan. W. Lá.
 Jhiná, Bh. Mus. Ko. Bhang.; -bhái, Gr.
 Jhunjhá, Wág. W. Bhañ.
 Jiji-bhái, Gr. Chá. Jibáwá, Gr.
 Jivá, Ko. Káth. Bh. Mus. Kum. Áh. Cham. Sat.
 Dh.; -bhái, Gr.; -ráj, Ko. W.
 Jivan, Mus. R. Ch.; -ji, Gr.; -á, Káth.
 Jodhá, Ko. R. Mo.; -bhái, Bá.
 Juthá, Kan. Káth. W.
 Kabá, Ko. R. Kábhái, Ko.
 Kadwá, Wág. Dh. Ko. W.
 Káhaná, Wág. Ko. Bh. Kan. Kum. Kh.; -ji, So.
 Káká, Kan. Ch.; -bhái, Gr. Kákal, Ko.
 Kalá, Ko. W. Kum. Kan. Cham. Sat.; -bhái, Gr.
 Kálá, Ko. Káth. Kum. R. Bhang.
 Kálu, R. Ko. Mus.; -bhái, Gr.
 Kalyán, Ko. W. Br. Sut.; -sing, Gr.
 Kamá, Ko.; -bhái, -jibhái, Gr.
 Kanthad, Káth. Áh.; -bhái, Gr.
 Karamsi, Sat. Lá. Karmal, Rab. Karná, R.
 Karsan, Ko. Kan. W. Kum. R. Lá. Bá.
 Kaslá, W. Ko. Mus. R. Dh. Bhang. Kan.; -bhái,
 -sing, -ji, Gr.
 Káwá, Ko. Kayábhái, Gr.
 Kesá-bhái, Gr. Kesar, R.
 Kesav, Ko. So. Lr.; -ji, So.; -lál, W. Ksh.
 Késáji, R.
 Kesri, -sing, Gr. Kheñgár-bhái, Gr. Kheñg, Bh.
 Khetá, Ko. Bh. Sat.; -si, W.
 Khimá, Ko. Cham. Dh. W.; -bhái, Gr.; -chand, W.
 Khimá, Ko. Cham.; -chand, W.; -bhái, Gr.
 Khođá, Ko. W. Lr. Kan. Káth. Sat.; -bhái, Gr.
 Khumásing, Gr.
 Khuśál, W. Kan. Kuber, So. W.; -ji, Br.
 Kiká, W.; -bhái, Gr. Kurupá, Káth.
 Kumbhái, Gr.
 Kuniwará, Ko. Kan.; -ji, W.; -sing, Mol.
 Ládhá, Kum. Ladhá, W.; -bhái, Gr.
 Lagdhir, Káth. Lakhá, Ko. Kh. Meh.
 Lákhá, R. Ko. Bh. Kum. Káth. Ch.; -bhái, Gr.
 Lakshman, Káth. Sut. R.
 Lála, Ko. Mus. Kum.; -chand, W. Lalu, So.
 Lomá, Káth. Luná, Áh. Káth.; -vir, Káth.
 Máchá, Káth. Madársing, Gr.
 Mádhá, Ko. Sat. Kan. Sut.
 Mádhav-ji, W. Kho.; -sing, Gr.
 Maghá, Ko. Sutár. Makan, Lá. W. Sat.; -dás, Kan.
 Málá, Ko. Bh. Wág. R. Kum. Bhang.
 Mámáiyá, Káth.
 Máná, Ko. R. Bhang.; -sing, R. Ko. Wág.; -ji,
 Gr.; -súr, Káth.
 Mándan, Ko. Kum. Sut., Káth. Wáland.
 Mangá, Ko. Manor, Br. D.
 Mánsiyá, Káth. Manubhá, Gr.
 Masru, Ko. Káth. Mathura, Br. W. Má.
 Mátrá, Káth. Máu, Ch.
 Máwá, Ko. R. Kum. Cham.; -ji, W. Sut. Kan.
 Sat.; -singji, -bhái, Gr.
 Mechar, Ch.
 Meghá, Ko. Cham. Bhang. R. Sat. Ch.; -ji, Kho.
 Koligor; -rájji, -bhái, Gr.
 Mehá, Káth. Mehtáb, Bá. Meká, Ch.
 Melábhái, Gr.
 Mepá, Ko.; -ji, -bhái, Gr. Merám, Ko. Káth.
 Meru-bhái, Gr.; -ji, R. Mesur, Káth. Ch.
 Miṭhā, Ko. W. V. Modbhái, Gr.
 Mohon-ji, Gr. Moti, Kum.; -bhái, Mol. Gr. -lál, W.
 Moká, Káth.; -ji, Gr. Mujájal, Ch.
 Mulá, Ko.; -ji, Sat., Ko. Lr.; -chand, W.
 Mulu, Ko. Káth. Khad.; -bhái, Gr. Mol. Bhát. }
 Nág, Káth. Bh.; -ji, W. Ko. Gr.; -jan, Káth.
 Nágá, W.
 Nájhá, Wág. Ko. Bh. Káth. Rab. Wáland.
 Náná, Ko. So. Kan. D. Cham. W., Káth. V.; -bhái,
 Gr.; -ji, Sat. Gr.
 Nanu, Ch. Nápá, Káth.
 Náran, Bh. Br. Ko. Dh. R. Cham. Wág. Kum.
 Kan.; -sing, Gr.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| Narsi, Kan. D. Kum. | Sârâ, Ko. Sartânsing, Gr. | Satâbbhai, Gr. |
| Nârsingji, Gr. | Sawâ, Ko. Bhang. Bhau. Cham. Wâg. ; -bhâi, Gr. | Selâr, Kâth. Sesâ, Kâth. Sibhai, Ko. |
| Nâtha, Ko. Kum. Kan. Sat. Bhang. ; -ji, Mol. Mus. ; -bhâi, Gr. | Somâ, Ko. Somlâ, Kâth. Subhâg, -chand, W. Sujâbbhai, Gr. | Sundar, -ji, W. |
| Nathu, R. Kâth. Mus. W. Ko. Jogi, Kum. Dh. Koligor, Bâ. D. Mo. Bhang. Wâg. ; -râm, Br. ; -bhâi, Gr. | Surâ, Ko. Kâth. Rab. Cham. ; -sing, Ko. | Surang, Kâth. Surbân, Ko. |
| Noghanbhâi, Gr. | Takhâ, Ko. | Takhtsing, Gr. |
| Odha, Kâth. Ko. | Tejâ, W. Ko. Bh. Kum. Sat. R. ; -bhâi, Gr. | Thâkar, -si, W. Kan. |
| Oghad, Kâth. R. Bâr. | Therbâ, Kâth. | Thobhan, Wâg. Ko. Sut. |
| Pachân, Bhang. ; -ji, Gr. | Tida, Ko. | Trikam, Dh. Sat. Khoja ; -ji, Br. |
| Panâ, Cham. ; -ji, W. | Ugâ, Kâth. | |
| Pânchâ, Ko. Bh. Kum. | Ukâ, Wâg. Dh. Ko. W. Kan. Rab. Sat. Bhang. | |
| Parmâ, Ko. Ch. Kum. | Unaç, Kâth. | |
| Parâottam, W. Sut. Kan. | Vehelâ, Kâth. Ko. ; -si, W. | Vikamsi, Kâth. |
| Pâthâ, -bhâi, Gr. | Vijâbbhai, Gr. | Vikabbhai, Gr. |
| Pathâ, Ko. R. Wâg. ; -bhâi, Gr. | Virâ, Ko. R. Sut., Kâth. Kum. Lr. ; -bhâi, Bhât. ; -ji, Sat. | |
| Pathu, Ko. ; -bhâi, Gr. | Visâ, Ko. Rab. ; -bhâi, Gr. | |
| Petha, Kum. Châ. | Vithal, Lâ. Kan. | Voldân, Kâth. |
| Phaijibhâi, Gr. | Wâghâ, Kâth. R. Ko. Kum. Ch. W. Rab. ; -ji, W. ; -bhâi, Gr. | |
| Pitâambar, Ko. Lâ. | Wâhâlâ, Ko. ; -ji, W. | Wajâ, Bh. Ko. Wâg. Sat. R. ; -bhâi, Gr. |
| Pitha, Dh. | | |
| Prâg, Kan. Ko. Mâ. Sat. | | |
| Prabhâtsing, Gr. | | |
| Pratâp-sing, Gr. | | |
| Punâ, Ko. Jogi, Bh. | | |
| Punjâ, Ko. Kum. Kâth. R. Rab. ; -bhâi, Gr. | | |
| Râghâ, Bh. Ko. | | |
| Râghâ, Ko. W. ; -nâth, W. Kh. ; -bhâi, Gr. | | |
| Râghav, Kan. | | |
| Râjâ, Ko. Rab. Ch. ; -sur, Ch. ; -bhâi, Gr. | | |
| Râm, Râmâ, Ko. R. Kum. Bhau. Wâg. Kâth. Bhang. ; -bhâi, -sing, Gr. ; -ji, Br. ; -ji, -sing, R. Ko. Ch. Mo. ; -si, Rab. ; -râo, -sur, -dâs, Ch. ; -chandra, Br. | | |
| Ramtu, Ko. | | |
| Rânâ, Kân. Kâth. Ko. Bh. ; -bhâi, Gr. | | |
| Ranchhod, Ko. R. Kum. Kan. W. Wâg. ; -ji, Gr. | | |
| Râning, Kâth. | | |
| Râsâ, Kh. Ko. ; -bhâi, Gr. | | |
| Ratnâ, Bh. Ko. Rab. R. Mo. ; -sing, Gr. ; -ji, Br. -si, W. | | |
| Râwâ-bhâi, Gr. | | |
| Rayâ, Ko. | | |
| Rudâ, Bh. Jogi, Ko. Dh. Sat. ; -bhâi, Gr. | | |
| Rukhad, Ko. Kâth. Rab. ; -bhâi, Gr. | | |
| Rupâ, Ko. Rab. ; -sing, Ko. R. ; singji, Gr. | | |
| Sadâ, Jogi. | | |
| Sagâ, Bh. | | |
| Sagrâm, Ko. Bh. Gr. } | | |
| Sâjan, Ch. | | |
| Sâunâ, R. Kum. Sut. Bhang. W. Dh. Cham. ; -ji, So. Lâ. Br. | | |
| Sâmbu, Kan. | | |
| Sâmtâ, Sâmat, Ko. Kâth. Cham. | | |
| Sângâ, Ko. Kâth. ; -bhâi, Gr. | | |
| Sângâ, Ko. ; -ji, W. ; -jibhâi, Gr. | | |
| | Sârânsing, Gr. | Satâbbhai, Gr. |
| | Sawâ, Ko. Bhang. Bhau. Cham. Wâg. ; -bhâi, Gr. | Selâr, Kâth. Sesâ, Kâth. Sibhai, Ko. |
| | Somâ, Ko. Somlâ, Kâth. Subhâg, -chand, W. Sujâbbhai, Gr. | Sundar, -ji, W. |
| | Surâ, Ko. Kâth. Rab. Cham. ; -sing, Ko. | Surang, Kâth. Surbân, Ko. |
| | Takhâ, Ko. | Takhtsing, Gr. |
| | Tejâ, W. Ko. Bh. Kum. Sat. R. ; -bhâi, Gr. | Thâkar, -si, W. Kan. |
| | Therbâ, Kâth. | Thobhan, Wâg. Ko. Sut. |
| | Tida, Ko. | Trikam, Dh. Sat. Khoja ; -ji, Br. |
| | Ugâ, Kâth. | |
| | Ukâ, Wâg. Dh. Ko. W. Kan. Rab. Sat. Bhang. | |
| | Unaç, Kâth. | |
| | Vehelâ, Kâth. Ko. ; -si, W. | Vikamsi, Kâth. |
| | Vijâbbhai, Gr. | Vikabbhai, Gr. |
| | Virâ, Ko. R. Sut., Kâth. Kum. Lr. ; -bhâi, Bhât. ; -ji, Sat. | |
| | Visâ, Ko. Rab. ; -bhâi, Gr. | |
| | Vithal, Lâ. Kan. | Voldân, Kâth. |
| | Wâghâ, Kâth. R. Ko. Kum. Ch. W. Rab. ; -ji, W. ; -bhâi, Gr. | |
| | Wâhâlâ, Ko. ; -ji, W. | Wajâ, Bh. Ko. Wâg. Sat. R. ; -bhâi, Gr. |
| | | |
| | Wâjâ, -sur, Kâth. | Waju, Ko. R. ; -bhâi, Gr. |
| | Wakhtâ, R. ; -sing, bhâi, Gr. | Wanmâli, Sut. |
| | Warjâng, Bh. | Warsâbbhai, Gr. |
| | Warsi, Ko. | Warsing, R. |
| | Wasâ, Ko. | Wâsan, Kan. |
| | Wasrâm, Ko. D. Ch. Kum. R. Sut. Mâ. Rab. Cham. W. | |
| | Wastâ, Ko. Khad. Khoja, Sat. W. | |
| | <i>Names of Females.</i> | |
| | Ajubâ, Gr. ; Ambi, So. ; Andibâ, Gr. ; Bâjirâj, Gr. ; Bâkunwar, Gr. ; Bâlubâ, Gr. ; Benâ, Ko. ; Devdebâi, Kâth. ; Dhani, Ko. ; Dhanubâ, Gr. ; Godâvari, Lâ. ; Harakh, Mâ. ; Hari, Kan. ; Hirbâ, Gr. ; Jekor, Br. ; Jhâkal, Sat. ; Kâsi, W. ; -bâ, Gr. ; Kasli, Sut. ; Kanû, Mâ. ; Kesar, Ko. ; Lâdu, Ko. ; Lakshmi, Ko. W. ; Lâkhu, Ko. Rab. ; Mâidebâ, Kâth. ; Mâjibâ, Gr. ; Me, Âh. ; Moinghi, Gr. ; Nânibâ, Gr. ; Pâmbâ, Gr. ; Pân, Ko. Kum. ; Pârvati, W. ; Phaibâ, Gr. ; Photri, Ko. ; Phul, Kum. ; Pân, Ko. W. ; Punji, Ko. ; Râdhâ, Kum. ; Râju, Kum. ; Râni, Ch. ; Shambâ, Gr. ; Sujâbbâ, Gr. ; Tâjubâ, Gr. ; Teju, Ko. ; Uji, Br. ; Wakh-tubâ, Gr. ; Walu, Ko. | |

The following names were collected by the compiler in the northern talukâs of Ahmadâbâd (Daskrohi and Parântij) :—

Andâ, Agrâ, Alu, Bhâiji, Dosâ, Gobar, Gokal, Hari, -bhâi, Hira, Hamir, -ji, Hema, -chand, Jagu, -ji, -Jodhâ, Jumâ, -ji, Kâlâ, Kamâ, Kâhânâ, Kishor, Magâ, Mânâ, -sing, Râghu, -ji, Ranchhod, Sagâ, Virâ, Ko.

The following names were collected by the compiler in the northern talukâs of Ahmadâbad (Daskrohi and Parântij):—

Ançâ, Agrâ, Alu, Bhâiji, Dosâ, Gobar, Gokal, Hari, -bhâi, Hira, Hamir, -ji, Hema, -chand, Jagu, -ji, -Jodhâ, Jumâ, -ji, Kâlâ, Kamâ, Kâhânâ, Kishor, Magâ, Mânâ, -sing, Râghu, -ji, Ranchhod, Sagâ, Virâ, Ko.

Banâ, -ji, Jâmâ, -ji, Thâkarâ, Ko.; Bechar, Ko. Kan. W.; Dâdâ, Desâi, -bhâi, Kan.; Dev-karan, Bâ.; Gopâl, Lr.; Kâlidâs, Kan.; Kuber, Bhan.; Mulu, -ji, Gr.; Nâhâlâ, Bâ.; Nâthâ, Bhan.; Nathu, Kan. Ko.; Paśwâ, Bhoi (this is a diminutive of Parśotam); Raiji, Bâ.; Râmâ, Bhan. Ko.; Wakhtâ, -chand, W.; Wâsâ, -ji, Gr.; Wâsrâm, Bhoi; Wasta, Bhoi; Leju, a Koli woman.

Experience justifies the following notes and hints:—

Of affixes, *lâl*, *chand*, *râm*, *dâs*, are high-caste; *ji* is universal, *bhâi* and *sing* are chiefly used by the Râjpût Grâsiâs; aspiring Kolis also use *sing*, or *saing* as it is locally pronounced. The diminutives *lû*, *âd*, *iyâ* are usually appended to the names of Kolis, Dheds, Wâghris, and the like, by members of other castes; *kû* is used for boys.

Only such Musulmân names are given as are plainly Hindu. These are found very numerous among the Molesalâm Grâsiâs, and point to the imperfect character of their Muhammadanism.

In many cases final *o* is represented by *â* in these lists; it often disappears before an affix.

Such uncomplimentary names as Gândâ and Juthâ may be given to denote the qualities of their bearers. In one instance I had a name before me which was certainly due to such a cause,—a deaf and dumb Bharwâd boy was called Mugâ.

By Rajput all through, as opposed to Grâsiâ, is meant the non-land-owning Rajputs—mere cultivators, servants, and hangers-on.

Does not the affix *-sur*, which is used only by Kâthis and by the Chârans of Kâthiâwâd proper, point to sun-worship?

The Kâthis always prefer the forms Bhim, Bhoj, Râm, Bhan, &c. to Bhimâ, Bhojâ, Râma, Bhanâ. Nor do they ever use affixes such as *-sing*, *-bhâi*, *-ji*, but are always spoken of with the name of their tribe, as Alâ Khâchar, Bhoj Khâchar, Bhan Khâchar; Jivâ Dhândhal, or 'dhal; Rukhâd Khawad.

A correspondent of the *Bombay Gazette* took exception to *-sing* on the Delhi banners of some chiefs, saying it should be *-sinh* or *-singh*. Doubtless, but the Gujarâtis at least always write it *-sing*, or even, as it is often pronounced, *-saing*.

Sawa is sometimes pronounced Śawa, and with the diminutive Śivla. Is then Śawa a form of Śiv, and another instance of Gujarâti fondness for changing *i* into *a*?

The following, which have been given above as independent names, would seem to be, in origin at least, diminutives:—

Jasâ for Jasmat = Jaswant; Kalâ for Kalyân; Lakhâ for Lakshman; Bhagâ and Bhagu for Bhagwân; and Gopâ for Gopâl.

CHERA OR GAṅGA GRANTS OF A.D. 350 AND 481.

BY LEWIS RICE, BANGALOR.

Two more important inscriptions have come to hand relating to what have been denominated the Chera kings, but whom it seems more correct to call the Gaṅga kings,—a designation given to them in all the inscriptions yet discovered, not one of which contains any mention of the title Chera.

The first of these inscriptions was produced at Harihara before Major Cole, Superintendent of the Inâm Settlement, in support of an alleged endowment by Bukka Râya of Vijayanagar (!)—a sufficient evidence that its possessor had not the remotest notion of its contents, for they purport to be a thousand years older than Bukka Râya, and relate to a part of Maisur diametrically opposite to Harihara. The grant is engraved on three copper plates (6½ in. by 2½ in.), which are in a fair state of preservation. They

are strung together on a metal ring, secured by the figure of an elephant, about an inch long, the ring passing between the four legs, which are closed together below. The most remarkable feature about this inscription is the singular admixture of characters in which it is written. There are certainly two, if not three, alphabets used; the chief one, which appears to me of much importance, a very primitive form of Hale Kannada; another a slightly later form, but only used in a few letters; the third a form of Devanâgarî.¹

The date of this inscription, it is calculated, must be A.D. 350. It is therefore 116 years older than the Merkara plates, and—with the exception of one, mentioned by Prof. Eggeling as contained in Sir Walter Elliot's collection—the oldest yet discovered of this line.

The second grant was found among the old

¹ The accompanying facsimile plate will best exhibit the characters in which these plates are inscribed.—Ed.

ALPHABETS OF THE HARIHARA PLATES (A.D. 350).

| I | II | III _a | á | í | u | ú | ri | e | ai | o |
|-----|-------------------------------|------------------|---|---|---|---|----|---|----|---|
| | | अ | | इ | उ | | | ए | | ओ |
| k | क ₁ | क ₂ | क | | क | | | क | | क |
| kh | ख | | | | | | | ख | ख | ख |
| g | ग | | | | ग | | | ग | ग | ग |
| ñ | ङ | | | | | | | | | ङ |
| ch | च | | | च | | | | | | |
| chh | छ | | | | छ | | | छ | | |
| j | झ | | ज | झ | | | | झ | | |
| t | ट | | ट | | ट | | | ट | | |
| d | ड | | ड | | ड | | | ड | | |
| n | ण | | ण | ण | | | | ण | | |
| t | त ₁ | त ₂ | त | त | त | | | त | | |
| d | द | | द | द | द | | | द | | |
| dh | ध | | ध | ध | ध | | | ध | | |
| n | न | न | न | न | न | | | न | | न |
| p | प ₁ प ₂ | प | प | प | प | | | प | | |
| b | भ | | भ | भ | भ | | | भ | | |
| bh | भ | | भ | भ | भ | | | भ | | |
| m | म | म | म | म | म | | | म | | |
| y | य | य | य | य | य | | | य | | य |
| r | र ₁ र ₂ | र | र | र | र | | | र | | |
| l | ल | ल | ल | ल | ल | | | ल | | |
| v | व | व | व | व | व | | | व | | |
| ś | श | श | श | श | श | | | श | | |
| sh | | ष | ष | ष | ष | | | ष | | |
| s | | स | स | स | स | | | स | | |
| h | ह | ह | ह | ह | ह | | | ह | | ह |
| l | ळ | | ळ | ळ | ळ | | | ळ | | |
| r | ॠ | | ॠ | ॠ | ॠ | | | ॠ | | |

Doubtful characters:— ऋ, ॡ, ॢ, ॣ Unless included in the foregoing, the following letters do not occur:—gh, ñ, th, dh, th, ph.

It is conjectured that the following letters show the original forms of vowels in combination with consonants:—

च ra, ण si, च va, के bhe, ग gai, ल lo.

records of the Assistant Commissioner's Court in Bangalor, while removing to new premises, and has been placed in the local Museum. It consists now of four copper plates ($7\frac{3}{4}$ in. \times $2\frac{1}{4}$ in.) a good deal worn, strung on a metal ring as usual, but the seal is gone, and a fifth plate—the last—has evidently been abstracted. The inscription is very lightly engraved in thin but distinct and well formed Hale Kannada characters. The last side, however, is quite illegible. There is no information as to how, when, or whence the plates found their way to where they were discovered.

In the first inscription we have the record of a gift of land in the village of Devanûru, in Karenâḍ, within the government of Talavana pura, made by the ruler of that district, a prince who was the son of Vishṇu Gopa, and whose name was apparently Râja Malla. The endowment was a reward for a gallant exploit performed by Râma Deva, the son of a Gavuda, a village chief or head-man, of the Yera-kula caste, in rescuing the prince's wife and attendants from the hands of some enemy and conducting them in safety to the capital. The date of the transaction is given, as far as I can make out, according to the *Saka*, here written *Saga*, or era of Śālivāhana, followed by the name of the cycle year, which is Sâdhârana.² Guided by this I calculate that the date is S. Ś. 272 (A.D. 350)³; but some of the characters used in this part are so strange and unfamiliar that I am uncertain whether they are numerals or letters, or the latter used for the former. An old cavenumeral occurs in the Merkara plates, but the characters here do not correspond with any of the old numerals that have been published. The letters *nayana*, which if 'eyes' would stand for 2, alone seem plain. If the next word is *gîr*, 'language,' it would be 3. But, I have failed to decipher this sentence to my satisfaction, and possibly it may not be a date at all.

But, in whatever way this may be read, there is little doubt that the date above given must be arrived at. For we are limited to the year Sâdhârana, and, according to the only information we have, Vishṇu Gopa's predecessor on the throne, Hari Varmma, was reigning in

288, and the reign of Mâdhava, his successor on the throne, ended in 425. The Sâdhârana in question must evidently be one falling between these two dates as extremes, and it will thus be found that we have only two years to choose from,—either S. Ś. 272 (A.D. 350) or S. Ś. 332 (A.D. 410). That the former is the right one seems to me antecedently more probable. For between 288 and 425, taking it for granted we know of all the kings who ruled then, we have to allow, first, for the conclusion of the reign of Hari Varmma, already for certain at least 41 years on the throne; second, for the entire reign of Vishṇu Gopa, which must have been a very long one, for the expression regarding him in the first of the grants of this line last published by me (*Ind. Ant.* vol. V. p. 137), that "his mental energy was unimpaired to the end of life," seems only consistent with a career prolonged beyond the usual limits; third, for the reign of Mâdhava. Now the donor in the present grant is the son of Vishṇu Gopa, and we may conclude from the way in which he is mentioned that he was a provincial governor under his father, who was still alive. Assuming that Vishṇu Gopa came to the throne about 290, he would in 350 have reigned 60 years. If, on the other hand, the date 410 is adopted, we must keep him on the throne 120 years! Whether Mâdhava, declared in the various inscriptions to have been the son of Vishṇu Gopa, was the same as this Râja Malla seems very doubtful. The Tamil chronicle relating to these kings describes a break in the succession after Vishṇu Gopa, and, although the inscriptions hitherto found give no countenance to such a break, there certainly seems room for one or more kings between him and Mâdhava, and Râja Malla may have so intervened. The second of our present inscriptions abstains, it will be noticed, from calling Mâdhava the son of Vishṇu Gopa, but the next king is also treated in the same way, though there seems no doubt that he succeeded his father.

The genealogy of the kings is not given in this inscription, which mentions only the founder of the line, and the donor's father. The royal

² It is pretty generally agreed that the cycle of sixty years is a comparatively recent invention, and was not used before the tenth century: see *Jour. As. Soc. Beng.* vol. II. p. 57; Reinand, *Frag. Arab. et Pers.* p. 140. The *samvatsara* year Vîbhava is given in the British Museum

plates professing to be of the reign of Pulikeśi I. and dated Saka 411; but that grant is a forgery—probably of the tenth or eleventh century.—Ed.

³ Though I once thought 332 might be made of it, or even 989 forced out.

prince, Rājā Mallā, as we have assumed, has among others the title 'lord of Kōḷālapura' or Kōlar, and this title continued to be borne by the same line of kings long after, as may be seen in the Coorg inscriptions of the 9th century,* one of the kings in which was also called Rāchā Mallā.

The site of the grant can be easily identified. The village Devanūru is still known by the same name, and is situated about fifteen miles south-west of Talavanapura or Talakāḍu. It now forms one of the endowments of the temple of Chāmarājesvara at Chāmrājnagar. It is interesting to note that the subdivision to which it belonged was called Karenāḍ, literally 'black country,'—no doubt on account of the black cotton soil which there abounds—for this is exactly the form conjectured by Dr. Gundert to be the original of Karṇāṭa, and he gives the same reason for the name. Another village, that of Badanevāla, mentioned in describing the boundaries, is close to Devanūru, and still bears the same name. The grant is witnessed by the Head of the Edenāḍ Seventy. This sub-division has already been identified in connection with two inscriptions (*Ind. Ant.* I. 362, V. 135), but in the first of them, owing to a slight mistake of the engraver of the grant, it was described as *saptari*, 'seven,' instead of *saptati*, 'seventy.' The latter is undoubtedly correct, as we have similar divisions mentioned in various parts of Maisur in old grants, such as the Jiddudige or Jiddulige Seventy, the Arabela Seventy, &c.

But, as before stated, the great peculiarity of this inscription, and what seems to me to constitute its chief interest, is the primitive old characters, different from any yet published that I have met with, in which it is mostly written, and the singular changes from that to Devanāgarī, apparently without any rule. I think this may perhaps be partly accounted for on the ground that the grant was not one made, as usual in such cases, to a temple, a Brāhmaṇ, or a member of a learned class, but to a Gaṇḍa's son. He probably knew as little of Sanskrit or the orthodox forms adopted by the genealogists of the court as the same class do now: hence a sort of patchwork introduction, contributed it

may be by different persons, themselves imperfectly acquainted with the forms and language. On the other hand, the exploit of which he was the hero, and for which he obtained the reward, is described in the most straightforward manner, in the plainest Kannada: for this part he could fully comprehend, and there was no mistake about it. The boundaries again run off into Sanskrit, and were perhaps written down by some Brāhmaṇ *shānbhog*.

The primitive old character, to which I have referred, evidently has an affinity to those used in the edicts of Aśoka, but still does not correspond with either the earlier or the later alphabets employed in them. I am strongly inclined to believe, from the uniform reference in the inscriptions of these Gaṅga kings to the first Koṅgaṇi's achievement in overthrowing a certain pillar, that one of those columns erected by Aśoka and inscribed with his edicts, of which several have been found in the north, may be referred to, and still awaits discovery in the south. The pillars were called *śīla stambha*, or 'virtue-pillars,' and on referring to the Merkara plates I find that *śīla* is the term most distinctly there used. It is true it is written *śīlā stambha* in the present grant but one peculiarity of this is that no distinction is made between long and short *i*, and no conclusion, therefore, can be founded on it. The term *śīla stambha* would be unintelligible, as a rule, to Brāhmaṇs and the uninitiated, and hence its conversion into *śīlā stambha*, as used in nearly all the grants—the most natural in the world.

Having gone so far as to hazard the prediction that a pillar inscribed with the edicts of Aśoka may yet be found in the south, it may be allowable to venture a step further, and anticipate that the most ancient alphabet used in the present grant may prove to be the one in which it is written, so much does it resemble in general style those deciphered by Prinsep.

The second inscription attached to this paper records a grant by a king whose name is generally given as Avinīta or Durvinīta, but who is here simply styled Koṅgaṇi Mahārājā. In the second of the grants last published by me (*Ind. Ant.* vol. V. p. 133), most of the

* Published in *Ind. Ant.* vol. VI. p. 109. Mr. Kittel will no doubt permit me to suggest a correction in the third inscription, line 5, which should read *Ereyanga Gāmunḍana*

magange, 'to the son of Ereyanga Gāmunḍa.' The word *gāmunḍa*, 'a village chief or headman,' has passed through *gaunḍa* into the modern *gauḍa*.

particulars of which are confirmed by this one, he was called *Koṅgaṇi Vṛiddha*. The present grant was made in the third year of his reign, which, according to the calculations in connection with that one, gives us the year A.D. 481, and consisted of a gift to the *Soma-yāji Vāsa Śarmmana*, a resident of *Mahāsenapura*. The particulars of the gift are totally illegible, and the conclusion is missing. There is no clue, therefore, to the situation of *Mahāsenapura*.

The description of the various kings corresponds with that given in the chief grants already published. But with regard to *Mādhava II.*, *Koṅgaṇi II.*, and *Avinīta*, or *Koṅgaṇi III.* (as it now seems we should call him), fresh information is supplied, confirmatory of what was obtained from the grant of A.D. 513 already referred to. Such are the Brāhmaṇical revival under *Mādhava II.*, the coronation of *Koṅgaṇi II.* while an infant on his mother's lap, and the romantic attachment which gave *Avinīta* his wife. Regarding this king it is further added that "though not matured in age, yet he was ripe in virtue," than which no expression could more fully confirm the accuracy of the calculations as to his age made in connection with the grant above mentioned.

Our advancing knowledge regarding the reigns of the *Gaṅga* kings of *Maisur*, as I will now call them, may be summed up as follows:—

| | |
|----------------------------------|--------------|
| <i>Koṅgaṇi I.</i> | A.D. 188-239 |
| <i>Mādhava I.</i> | 239. |
| <i>Hari Varma</i> | -247-288. |
| <i>Vishṇu Gopa</i> | -350- |
| ? <i>Rāja Malla</i> | |
| <i>Mādhava II.</i> | 425 |
| <i>Koṅgaṇi II.</i> | 425-478 |
| <i>Avinīta, Koṅgaṇi III.</i> ... | 478-513- |
| <i>Mushkara</i> | |
| <i>Śrī Vikrama</i> | -539 |
| <i>Bhū Vikrama</i> | 539. |
| <i>Vilanda, Śrī Vallabhākhyā</i> | |
| - <i>Nava Kāma, Śivamāra,</i> | |
| <i>Koṅgaṇi IV.</i> | -668. |
| ? <i>Bhima Kopa</i> | |
| ? <i>Rāja Kesari</i> | |
| <i>Prithivi Koṅgaṇi</i> | 727-777- |

* Among the epithets applied to him is also *nanniya Gaṅgā*, 'a *Gaṅgā* of truth,' which bears an evident reference to the title of *Satya Vākya* given to one or two of these kings.

| | |
|---------------------------------|-----------|
| <i>Rāja Malla Deva</i> | |
| <i>Gaṇḍa Deva</i> | |
| <i>Rācha Malla, Satya Vākya</i> | |
| <i>Koṅgaṇi</i> | 857-869 |
| <i>Permanāḍi, do.</i> | 869- |
| <i>Malla Deva II.</i> | -878-894. |

About this time the dynasty was overthrown in *Maisur* by the *Cholas*, and not long after the *Hoysala Ballālas* of *Dorasamudra* rose to power in this country. Of the inscriptions at the foot of the statue of *Gomatesvara* at *Śrāvana Belgola*, one which precedes a *Ballāla* grant informs us that a *Gaṅga Rāja* built the *sut-tālayam* or enclosure. An inscription at *Nir-gunda*, dated A.D. 1065, exhibits a *Gaṅgarasa* still retaining the sounding titles of *Koṅguḷi Varma Dharma Mahārājādhirāja*, but as a petty officer of the *Hoysala Ballālas*, ruling the *Arabela* Seventy. About the same time the *Hoysala* king *Ereyanga* assumes the name of *Vīra Gaṅga*; and *Udayāditya*, at first a general and then governor of *Banavase* under the *Chalukya* king *Bhuvanaika Malla*, 1069-1076, calls himself a *Gaṅga*, "lord of *Koḷālapura* (*Kolār*) and *Nandagiri* (*Nandidurga*), and possessor of the elephant crest."*

It thus appears that when the final catastrophe occurred the family dispersed to the northwards. Some members of the same line, I think it is evident, founded the *Gaṅgavāṁśa* dynasty of *Orissa*, acknowledged to have come from *Karṇātaka*, and also called *Gajapatis* or the elephant lords, which, commencing at the end of the 11th century, ruled that country till subdued by the *Muhammadans* in 1534. *Wilson* shows (*Macken. Coll.* vol. I. p. cxxxviii.) that the founder was *Ananta Varma*, "also called *Koḷāhala*, sovereign of *Gaṅgarāhi*." This I am convinced should be "lord of *Koḷāhala* (the same as *Koḷālapura*) and sovereign of *Gaṅgavāḍi*."

The province of *Gaṅgavāḍi*, or the *Gaṅgavāḍi* Ninety-six Thousand, occurs so frequently in the *Maisur* inscriptions as to be as familiar to me as the name *Maisur* itself. I have also determined its limits as embracing almost the whole of the southern half of *Maisur* westwards. It formed a principal province under

* It is true that *Wilson* seeks to bring them "from the low country on the right bank of the *Ganges*, or *Tamluk* and *Midnapur*," but this is untenable in the face of the evidence we now have. Cf. *Dr. Hunter's Orissa*.

[illegible]


//a.

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय
श्रीकृष्णाय नमः
आत्मनो ह्यस्यामबलप्रसादात्
मात्रं ज्ञायामीत्यादि

[illegible]

HARIHARA GANGA COPPER-PLATE GRANT.

III.









the Gaṅga kings, and may be the same as the Gaṅgākunḍa mentioned in the *Vikramānka Deva Charita*: the curious Begur stone in the Bangalor Museum, which may belong to the interval between the overthrow of the Gaṅgas and the rise of the Hoysalas, presents us with a king* ruling Gaṅgavāḍi as an independent sovereign (*eka chhatra chhāyeyō!*): an inscription at Kandeia describes the Hoysalas as originally kings of Gaṅgavāḍi; and the Gaṅgavāḍi Ninety-six Thou-

sand is afterwards enumerated among the provinces of their empire. The large body of Gaṅgadikāra rayats are, it is conjectured, the old subjects of this territory.

The Gaṅgas eventually turn up again in their old dominions in the sixteenth century, in the persons of the Gaṅga Rājas of Śivasamudram, the island at the Falls of the Kāvēri, about twelve miles north-east of Talkād, and the line was here extinguished in the third generation.

HARIHARA PLATES.

Transcript.

- I. 'Śvaṣṭi * Jitam bhagavatā gata gaganābhenā Padmanābhenā śrī-
maj Jāhnaviya kuḷāmala bhyomāvabhāśana bhāśkara śva kha-
ḍa  gaika prahāra khaṇḍita mahā śilā śtambha labdha ba-
 la parākrama [kanni kshura * śya] lalātakatṭodbhāśita śrī-
mān Ko[n]guli Varama Dhīrama mahārājādhirāja tāśya putra Vi-
ṣṇu Gopa mahārājādhirāja tāśya putra Kolālapūra varādhiśva-
ra Gaṅga kuḷa mārattanda madha gajendra lā[n]chhana Padmavati
- IIa. Deviya labdha vara prasādha tadanāgāltāda parama Talavanapura
madye Śaga [* nayana gi * neyā] Śādhārana śammachchharāda Palgu-
pa  mā amavāse Adivāradandu Kārenāda Dhevanuranu-
 la gge Yarakuladha Madhi gavudana śu-putta Rāma Dhevanu
He * ran iṇḍhu Raja Maḷana henḍati bhaṇṭar avanu ba-
l valātind oppiśidh allige mechchhu goṭṭa bhūmi pū-
IIb. rubbaśyāndiśi krishṇa mrittikāhākorbba* chiñchā vrik-
ksha tatākadahākorbba kāvalastāna Devanura dvisa-
ndiya vaṭa vriksha dakshināśyāndiśihākorbba kupa tatāka
 la chiñchā vriksha prālgola Kaḷkontina Devanura dviśandhi-
ya kapit vriksha pachchimaśyāndiśahākorbba chiñchā vriksha Bade-
navāla Devanura dviśandiya chiñchā vriksha uttarāśyā-
III. ndiśihākorbba chiñchā vriksha krishṇa muttike Alaṇi-
vañchiya Devanura dviśandiya iśānām ānduḍuttā.
 Śākshinām Eḍenāde Eppattga śākshi.

Translation.

May it be well! Success through the adorable Padmanābha, resembling (in colour) the cloudless sky.

A sun illumining the clear firmament of the Jāhnavi kula, of mighty valour acquired by the great pillar of stone divided with a single

stroke of his sword, resplendent as a jewel on the forehead, was Śrīmān Konguli Varmma Dharmma mahārājādhirājā.

His son was Viṣṇu Gopa mahārājādhirājā.

His son, the lord of Kolālapura, a sun to

The sign * indicates a letter not deciphered. Words in brackets doubtful.

* The characters read rbb are precisely the same as bbe, but the word must be 'orbba,' one.

* Named Ereyappa, and described as 'brilliant as lightning descending among the stars in the clear firmament of the world-renowned Gaṅga kula', by which it is perhaps to be understood that he was an usurper.

* s is used throughout for ś, except in one word, stana.

the Gaṅga kula, having the sign (or crest) of a lusty elephant, having received a boon from the goddess Padmāvatī,—in the middle of the excellent Talavanapura which he was then ruling, [in the Saga year, 'eyes'] the year Sādhārana, the month Phalguna, full-moon day, being Sunday,—within Devanūru in Karenād,—Rāma Deva, the good son of Madi Gavuda of the Yarakula (caste), having slain⁹ He and with great devotion conducted Rāja Malla's wife and guards thither, (he) being pleased thereat bestowed the following land :—

The eastern boundary runs along a field of black soil, a tamarind tree and a pond, to the

banyan tree at the common boundary of the guard-house and Devanūru; the southern boundary runs by the tamarind tree of the shining pond and the old watercourse to the wood-apple tree at the common boundary of Kalkonte and Devanūru; the western boundary runs by a tamarind tree to the tamarind tree at the common boundary of Bade navāla and Devanūru; the northern boundary runs by a tamarind tree and field of black soil to the common boundary of Alañi vanchi and Devanūru, and thus ends on the north-east.

Witnesses :—He of the Eḍenād Seventy, witness.

BANGALOR MUSEUM PLATES.

Transcript.

- I. Jitam bhagavatā gata ghana gaganābhena Padmanābhena. Śrīmaj Jā-
Svasti. hnaveya kulāmala vyomāvabhāsana bhāskarasya svaja java ja-
ya janita janapadasya dāruṇāri gana raṇālabdha (v)raṇa vi-
bhūṣaṇa bhūṣitasya Kānvāyanasa gotrasya śrīmat Koṅgaṇi
Varmma Dharmma mahādhīrājasya. Putrasya pituranvāgata guṇa
IIa. yuktasya vidyā vinayā. sya samya prajā pāla matrādhiga-
ta rājya prayojanasya vidvat kavi kañchana nikashopala bhūṭasya
viśeṣhatopy anaviśeṣhasya niti śāstrasya vaktri prayoktri kṣā-
lasya suvibhakta bhakta bhṛitya janasya dattaka sūtra vritti prapāi-
na śrīmat Mādha va mahādhīrājya. Putrasya pitrupaitāmaha guṇa
yuktasya aneka chaturddanta yuddhāvāpta cha'tur udadhi salilā-
IIb. svādīṭa yasasah sama dvirada turagādhirohaṇātīśayotpanna tejaso
chatur abhiyoga sampādita sampad viśeṣhasya śrīmadd-Hari Varmma mahādhīrāja-
sya. Putrasya gurn go brāhmaṇa pūjakasya Nārāyaṇa charanānūdyāta-
sya śrīmad Viśhṇu Gopa mahādhīrājasya. Triyambaka charanā(m) bhoruḥa rāja
pavitrīkṛitātmāṅgasya vyāyāmodvṛitta pīna kṛbhina bhuja dvayasya sva bhu-
ja bala parākrama kraya kṛita rājya chira pranaṣṭa deva bhoga brahmāḍeyāneka sa-
hasra visarggāgṛayana. . . . kāriṇa parabhaya harīṇa vitata kārṁuka
IIIc. ghātikiṇa maṇih vidyottamana bhuja yugasya kumudī dalabhikara śīśira kara kiraṇa
samudaya bhavad utara yaśa pratāna vibhāsyamāna jātaḥ śrīmat Mādha va mahādhīrāja-
sya. Avikalāśvamedbhāvabhrīdābhishikṭaḥ śrīmat Kadamba kula nabhastala gabhasti māli-
na śrī Krishṇa Varmma mahādhīrājasya priya bhāgīneyasya janani devatānka pariya(n)-
ka ta-
Ia samadhīgata rājyābhishekasya parasparānavamarddopabhujamāna tri vargga sārasya
vidyā vinayāti śampanna paripūtāntarātmanah aneka vara vijayopājjita vipula yaśa
kshīrodaikārṇṇavikṛita jaga trayasya samadana śara patana vidhura vanitā nayana ma-
dhukara kulākula krupāravinda jalāsāyasya kavi janāgraganasya ati paṭushu
IIIb. paṭutasya śrīmat Koṅgaṇi mahādhīrājasya. Putreṇa tad guṇānugāmīna pitrāpara-
(t) suyārthe samājjitayāpilashya sagrahanālingita vipula vaksha stalena
vijimbhamāna śakti trayopanamita samanta sāmanta maṇḍalena niranta-
ra prema bahumānānuraakta prakṛiti maṇḍalena nīṣita nistṛimśa kara
karārdḍita bhujonmūlitāri maṇḍalena prati dinābhivarddhyamāna puruṣha
vara guṇa maṇi sanātha satvṛittābharanāvabhāsyamānavapurushā a-

⁹ Literally, 'stabbed' or 'pierced.'

parinata vayo vilāsenāpityaparinata satva sampadā prāthitāneka
 gaṇa gaṇa nidhāna bhūtena yathārha daṇḍatayānukṛita Vaivasvate-
 IVa. na varnāśramābhilakṣhaṇa dakṣiṇā diśābhigoptum pariyāptavatā prātijana-
 tena suprajasā parama dhārmakena bhagavan Kama lodara charaṇanudhyātēna kim
 bahunā khali yugena Yudhishtirana śrīmatā Kōṅgaṇi mahārājēna ātmana
 pravarddhyamāna vipulaisvareyē tritiyē savatsare Śrāvaṇe māse tithā vāma . . .
 syāyā āhitāgnaye Mahāsonapura vastavyāya Vāsa Śarmamane mathu. . . .

IVb. (totally illegible).

V. (wanting).

Translation.

May it be well! Success through the adorable Padmanābha, resembling (in colour) the cloudless sky.

A sun illumining the clear firmament of the Jāhnavi kula, master of countries born from the rapidity of his own victories, adorned with the ornament of a wound obtained in war with hosts of terrible enemies, was Śrīmat Kōṅgaṇi Varma Dharmma mahādhirāja, of the Kānvāyanasa gotra.

His son, inheriting all the qualities of his father, possessing a character for learning and modesty, having obtained the honours of the kingdom only for the good government of his subjects, a touchstone for (testing) gold the learned and poets, skilled among those who thoroughly expound and practise the science of politics in all its branches, preserving due distinction between friends and servants, author of a treatise on the law of adoption, was Śrīmat Mādhava mahādhirāja.

His son, possessed of all the qualities inherited from his father and grandfather, having entered into war with many elephants (so that) his fame had tasted the waters of the four oceans, of a glory acquired from the equal skill with which he rode on elephants and horses, of enormous wealth acquired by the practice of the four modes of policy, was Śrīmad Hari Varma mahādhirāja.

His son, devoted to the worship of gurus, cows and Brāhmins, praising the feet of Nārāyaṇa, was Śrīmad Viṣṇu Gopa mahādhirāja.

His head purified by the pollen from the lotuses the feet of Tryambaka, his two arms grown stout and hard with athletic exercises, having purchased the kingdom with his personal strength and valour, the reviver of many thousands of long-ceased donations for the festivals of the gods and endowment of Brāhmins, performer of the offering of firstfruits

(āgrayana), both his arms shining with the gems of hard knobs produced by the drawing of his bow for the destruction of (or against the deer) the fear of the enemy, his race illuminated by his great and widespread glory, was Śrīmat Mādhava mahādhirāja.

The beloved sister's son of Śrī Kṛishṇa Varma mahādhirāja—who, being anointed with the final ablutions of a completed āśvamedha, was the sun to the firmament of the auspicious Kadamba kula—having obtained his royal anointing (or coronation) on the couch of the lap of his divine mother, enjoying the essence of the three objects of worldly desire without one interfering with the other, of a mind purified by the acquisition of learning and modesty, his fame acquired by the conquest of many mighty kings surrounding the three worlds like the unbroken expanse of the milk ocean, a lake to the lotus of compassion for the bees the eyes of fair women disturbed by the shower of Kāma's arrows, reckoned the highest theme of poets, the ablest among the most able, was Śrīmat Kōṅgaṇi mahādhirāja.

By his son, successor to the qualities of his father, his broad chest embraced by the arms of one who desired him though assigned by her father to the son of another, surrounded by bands of feudatories from all sides subjected by the growth of the three powers of increase, having parties of counsellors attached to him by constant affection and gifts, having with the sharp sword in his hand cut down the hosts of his enemies and with his arms plucked them up by the root, of a form glorious with virtue and set with the gems of the daily improving qualities of the best of men, though not matured in age yet possessed of ripe virtue, a mine of clusters of distinguished qualities, in punishing according to desert the superior of Vaivasvata, able in protecting the castes and religious orders which prevailed in the south, a

friend to all, of good descent, of the highest religious merit, praising the feet of the adorable Vishnu,—what more? the Yudhishtira of the Kali yuga, Śrīmat Kōṅgaṇi mahārājā,

in the third year of the great wealth increased by himself, the month Śrāvaṇa. . . . to the Somayāji Vāsa Śarmāna, a resident of Mahāsenapura. . . .

ARCHÆOLOGICAL NOTES.

BY M. J. WALHOUSE, LATE M.C.S.

(Continued from p. 129.)

No. XX.—*Trojan and Indian Prehistoric Pottery, and the Svastika symbol.*

While lately looking over the extraordinary collection of antiquities disinterred by Dr. Schliemann at Hissarlik, the supposed site of old Troy, now in the South Kensington Museum, I was struck by likenesses between some of the pottery and the earthenware found in Indian cairns. In some remarks on "Miniature and Prehistoric Pottery," chiefly from graves in Coorg, in vol. IV., pp. 12 and 13, of the *Indian Antiquary*, I have mentioned certain urns or jars standing upon three or, occasionally, four legs,—specimens are figured in the plate at the place referred to,—and observed that modern Hindu pottery is generally without feet. Indeed I knew of no other prehistoric pottery with any but the slightest indications of feet, and that very rarely. But in Dr. Schliemann's collection one is struck by the number of vessels, of all shapes and sizes, that are supported on legs. Three or four large urns, figured at pp. 152-3 of the doctor's book, *Troy and its Remains*, especially recall the legged Coorg vases, differing chiefly in the legs being longer and the bodies rounder and fuller, and moreover in being furnished with a loop-handle, a feature never seen in Indian cairn-pottery, and very rare in European. In the Trojan collection, however, legged vessels are most abundant and various in shape, and frequently have handles on one or both sides. Some of the most striking are figured at pp. 166, 229, 282, 285 of the doctor's book. Even miniature vessels no larger than coffee-cups are furnished with legs; but, as far as I could see, the number never exceeded three, whereas the Indian urns not unfrequently have four.¹

Another resemblance was the large amount of miniature pottery: cups, jugs, and vases no larger than walnut-shells are exhibited in

numbers; and miniature urns and utensils have also been largely found in the Coorg graves. Examples are figured in the *Indian Antiquary* above referred to, and a passage is quoted from Mr. Fergusson's *Rude Stone Monuments*, in which he observes that such miniature pottery was probably made and placed in the tombs as symbols of traditions and primeval usages that had died out. I ventured rather to dissent from this hypothesis, which hardly seems strengthened by the quantity of miniature vessels discovered in ancient Troy. They are smaller even than the Indian dwarf-ware, and their use more problematical, unless indeed they were the toys of Astyanax and his playmates! *Châtis* of the true Indian form also appear in the Schliemann collection, and there is one medium-sized black *châtî* perfectly corresponding with those often found in Madras cairns. There are also two or three vessels with side-spouts like that numbered 7 in the plate in the *Indian Antiquary*, vol. IV. previously mentioned. Earthenware platters or saucers, so abundant in Indian cairns, are also frequent, of the same shape and size, amongst the pottery from Hissarlik, as well as heads of oxen and other animals in terra-cotta; and similar objects of the same size have been found in scores in the cairns on the Nilgiri Hills; while the quaint pieces in the Museum, termed by Dr. Schliemann "Juno and Minerva idols", strongly recall some clay figures depicted by Captain Congreve and Mr. Breeks in their works on the antiquities of the Nilgiris.

Far surpassing the rest of the fictile assemblage in bulk and height, a very Ajax Telamon in earthenware, an immense jar is conspicuous in the Museum. Nearly six feet high and tapering from the shoulders, where it is 4½ feet across, to a point at bottom, it is marked as




¹ Vessels standing on round bottom-rims, as in modern basins, occur in the Trojan ware,—never, I think, in Indian, ancient or modern.

probably a "substitute for a cellar," and considered by Dr. Schliemann to have been used as a magazine. He gives an illustration (p. 290) of a row of these colossal jars, found side by side underground, as though used for storing wine, oil, and perhaps grain. Such indeed may have been their intention. Huge jars have served such purposes in the East long before the days of Ali Baba. This Trojan example, however, reminded me of the great burial-jars often found in the south of India, which it resembled in size, shape, and general appearance. These have been lately touched upon by Bishop Caldwell in the *Indian Antiquary*, vol. VI. p. 279, and a further notice of them may be read in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, N. S. vol. VII. p. 31. I have often found them, buried with the mouths at no great depth underground, and a large flat stone laid above; they were of coarse red ware, five feet or more high, tapering to the end, and within filled with earth, and pieces of bone at the bottom. In Travankor they are said by the natives to contain the remains of virgins sacrificed by rajas, on the boundaries of their estates, to protect them and confirm their engagements. Near Chaughât a large vault was found full of these jars, which recalls the row of jars underground depicted in Dr. Schliemann's book. Upon this subject, and with reference also to Bishop Caldwell's remark that from the smallness of the mouths of the urns it would seem the bodies must have been put in piece-meal, I beg to subjoin a curious communication which appeared in the *Athenæum* in February 1876, and shows that the idea of burying in earthenware vessels was not unknown in Rome:—

"I cannot yet state anything definitely about the beautiful ruins found in the 'Villa Aldobrandini,' for their name, their destination, is still a mystery to the topographers. I shall simply mention, as a matter of curiosity, the discovery of a common wine *amphora* of terracotta, which had been used as a receptacle for a human skeleton of mature age. As the orifice of the jar was simply three inches in diameter, the different parts of the body, and especially the largest bones, had been cut, and forced through the opening. This strange process had certainly some connexion with sorcery, or rather with the superstitions of the lower




classes in the fifth and sixth centuries; for I have gathered myself among the bones one of those thin rolled sheets of lead containing a formula of imprecation on a matter of love. The document, written in Greek, has not yet been deciphered, and probably will not be, owing to the corrosion of the lead, but there is scarcely any doubt of its design. This reminds me of the discovery related by Count Caylus—a discovery of the same nature, but on a gigantic scale. About the middle of the last century, he says, under the walls of the Pincio, facing the Villa Borghese, a subterranean corridor was found containing some thousand *amphoræ* still fixed in the earth. In each was the most strange collection of objects—human bones mixed with those of horses, oxen, and monkeys, teeth, lizards, coils of serpents, and small hands of wax. No satisfactory explanation has ever been given of this discovery, and I hope that the recent instances of the same kind will turn the attention of the archæologist towards the study of this very peculiar ancient custom."

Lastly, the extraordinary frequency with which the Svastika symbol ☸ appears on the Trojan prehistoric pottery gave occasion to Dr. Schliemann obtaining a remarkable and striking communication from the distinguished Orientalist E'mile Burnouf, author of *La Science des Religions*, &c., which he prints in the earlier part of his book. M. Burnouf holds that this mysterious and much-debated symbol is intended to denote the invention of the fire-drill, and preserve the sacred remembrance of the discovery of fire by rotating a peg in dry wood. It represents, according to him, the two pieces of wood laid cross-wise, one upon another, before the sacrificial altar, in order to produce the holy fire. The ends of the cross were fixed down by arms, and at the point where the two pieces are joined there was a small hole in which a wooden peg or lance (*pramantha*, whence the myth of Prometheus the fire-bearer) was rotated by a cord of cow-hair and hemp till the sacred spark was produced. The invention of the fire-drill would doubtless mark an epoch in human history. Mr. Tylor, in his *Early History of Mankind*, has largely shown its use at some period in every quarter of the globe, and it is conceivable that its invention would be commemorated by a holy symbol.

But in the *Athenæum* of 12th January last² Mr. Hodder Westropp altogether discredits the origin assigned to the symbol by M. Burnouf, and considers the Greek archaic cross, as he terms it, to have been evidently derived from the punch marks on early Greek coins, which marks were originally composed of four small squares, , the centre assuming the form of a cross; but in the stamping of the coin the squares went a little on one side, and made the punch mark take the shape of the archaic cross , so found on old Greek coins, and thence adopted as an ornamental device on early Greek pottery, as in Samos, Cyprus, and Hissarlik. Mr. Westropp goes on to remark that the Indian or Buddhist *svastika* is almost invariably drawn , the reverse of the Greek archaic cross, and is a monogram or character composed, as General Cunningham has pointed out, of two Pāli characters, signifying 'it is well.' As a Buddhist emblem it cannot be older than the 6th century B.C., Buddha having died about 480 B.C., and the earliest Buddhist monuments are placed by Mr. Fergusson at about 250 B.C.

There appears, however, reason to think that on the first appearance of the symbol in Europe it was used not merely as an ornament, but as an emblem peculiar to some deity, generally connected with the air, or sometimes water; Mr. Newton of the British Museum designated it the Mæander, and considered it emblematical of water. Its first appearance is on the pottery of archaic Greece, as on that in the British Museum ascribed to between the years 700 and 500 B.C., and now on that discovered by Dr. Schliemann on the site of Troy. On all this pottery and on its earliest examples the sign occurs profusely, and is found drawn *both* ways, occurring so on the same archaic Greek urn in the British Museum; hence the distinction made by Mr. Westropp between the Greek and Buddhist forms hardly seems tenable, especially as it is found drawn *both* ways in India, as well as all over Europe. As an emblem it appears to have been associated with the Sky-god Zeus, the chief deity of the archaic Greeks, and to have symbolized his thunderbolt, as subsequently in Scandinavia it was called the hammer of the Thunder-god Thor,—nor is this the only indication of a

common origin of the early Greeks and Norse. After the 6th century it disappears from Greek earthenware, and is found on early Latin, Etruscan, and Sicilian ornaments, coins, and pottery, as well as in Asia Minor and North Africa, especially where there had been Phœnician colonies. It is remarkable that the symbol is not found on Egyptian, Babylonian, or Assyrian remains: crosses are frequent, but not the *svastika*; neither does it occur on Mexican monuments.

In the museums of Sweden and Denmark there are several hundred gold *bracteates*, which appear to have been worn as amulets or medals, and, according to Professor Stephens of Copenhagen, belong almost without exception to the heathen period of Scandinavia, ranging from the 3rd or 4th to the 7th or 8th century of our era. They are mostly after Byzantine models, and many of them have a marked Indian character. They frequently bear the *svastika*, drawn *both* ways, and Professor Stephens remarks that in the earliest runes the letter G is drawn thus , and appears so on grave-slabs in Denmark of the 8th or 9th century. He also calls attention to the resemblance between the runes and the Himyaritic alphabet, used in Arabia during the first six centuries. A character, , nearly resembling the runic G, occurs in a Pāli inscription, and reversed, , in a rock-inscription at Salsette: see *Jour. R. As. Soc.* vol. XX. page 250, &c.

In the Roman Catacombs the *svastika* occurs not unfrequently, so placed as to have been then evidently adopted as a Christian symbol, and is seen in Roman mosaic work in England, France, Spain, and Algeria. It is abundant on pottery, ornaments, and weapons of Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon times, and of corresponding periods in Scotland, Germany, Switzerland, and Denmark. A sepulchral urn found at Shropham, Norfolk, and another preserved at Cambridge, bear the *svastika* in continuous lines; the latter urn is peculiarly interesting as exhibiting the symbol surrounded by almost every other device of cross, circle, and solar emblems, and occupying, as it were, the place of honour. As Christianity spread the *svastika* disappears, and when found again has been adopted as a Christian device. It is so used in heraldry, where it is termed the *croix cram-*

² Reprinted ante, p. 119.—ED.

ponne. Planché, in his *Pursuivant of Arms*, says of it: "It is a mystic figure called in the Greek Church *gammadion*. It is very early seen in heraldry, and appeared in the paintings in the old palace of Westminster. Its significance is at present unknown." It was constantly introduced in ecclesiastical vestments, and, doubtless with a belief in its talismanic efficacy, is often found on ancient bells in parish churches,—so keeping up its connection with the air, our forefathers, firmly believing that demons—the 'powers of the air'—were driven away by the clang of church bells. In our own day it has become a favourite ornamental device,—we may be sure with no thought of symbolism,—and the archæologist returning from India may observe it covering ceilings, cornices, fenders, and other iron-work.

In India the *svastika* is found on Buddhist coins referred by Mr. E. Thomas to about 330 B.C., and also appears in Prinsep's engravings of Hindu coins. It is a sacred Buddhist emblem in Tibet, is the *chinha* or device of Supârśva, the seventh Tirthaṅkara of the Jains,³ and is said to be used by the Vaishnavas also as a mark on their sacred jar. (Moor's *Hindu Pantheon*.) But probably its most remarkable existing use is in China and Japan, respecting which we will quote a passage from a very interesting article on Japanese Heraldry in Volume V. of the *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan*, premising that heraldry has existed in Japan from a period far earlier than 900 A.D., and every *daimiō* family had its own cognizances. At page 12 we read that the *svas-*

tika "is the *Manji* badge of the Hachisuka family, Daimiōs of Ava, sometimes drawn 卐, and sometimes, but less frequently, 卐. It is taken from a Chinese character meaning 'ten thousand,' and is a Buddhist symbol supposed to be emblematic of good luck. It is frequently to be seen on Buddhist temples as a sign of Fudō Sama, or 'the motionless Buddha.' It is often marked upon the lids of coffins, being supposed to act as a charm to protect the corpse against the attack of a demon in the shape of a cat, called *Kin'asha*, which is said to seize and mangle the dead bodies of human beings." In China it is common, enters largely into ornament, and is often worn as a charm. It is curious indeed to find the same symbol used with a mystic meaning both in English and Japanese heraldry, and, for the same office of repelling demons, on Japanese coffins and English church-bells! But, whatever may have been the origin of this most archaic and wondrously wide-spread symbol, there seems little to support the theories of Messrs. E'mile Burnouf and Westropp. Mr. E. Thomas (*Jour. R. As. Soc. N.S. Vol. I. p. 486*) thinks it may have been a mere ornamental variation of the simple cross, that might have suggested itself anywhere, without any definite meaning, but singular enough in outline to attract professors of magic and cabalistic rites. Still this hardly explains its adoption in countries so widely separated as Norway and Japan, and its strange defect in the far older intermediate lands of Egypt and Mesopotamia, the very nurseries of magic and mysticism.

CORRESPONDENCE AND MISCELLANEA.

PÂRSÎ FUNERAL AND INITIATORY RITES.

SIR,—Allow me to correct a few errors in the valuable paper that appears in the *Indian Antiquary*, vol. VI. pp. 311-315, on "Pârsî funeral and initiatory rites, and the Pârsî religion," by Prof. Monier Williams.

It appears that the learned professor was wrongly informed that the priestly race among the Pârsîs is divided into three classes of Dasturs, Mobeds, and Herbad. Herbad, or Erwad (𐬥𐬀𐬎𐬌) as it is more commonly called, is no separate division of priests, but a mere generic

term for Dasturs and Mobeds. The title of Herbad is affixed to the name of one who has passed the Nâvar ceremony, to distinguish him from Ostâ (𐬥𐬀𐬎𐬌 or non-Herbad. Thus, a Dastur as well as a Mobed is a Herbad, which is not, as Professor Williams says, the name of the lowest order of priests. Pârsîs are divided into Herbad and Ostâ, according as they have or have not performed the ceremony called Nâvar (𐬎𐬀𐬥𐬀). Again, Herbads are either Dasturs or Mobeds by virtue of their office, the former being superior to the latter.¹ But these divisions do not engender any

ing a *mantra*.—Ed.

¹ Some Herbads are neither Dasturs nor Mobeds, for they do not choose to enter the holy order.

³ Poor worshippers in Jaina temples may often be seen laying down a few grains of rice before the image, and arranging them into the form of the *svastika* while repeat-

difference in civil or social rights, as is the case among the Hindus. Females are all Ostâ. They cannot be Herbad so long as they are not eligible to the holy order.

In another place the learned writer confounds the corpse-bearers with Nasasâlârs. The former are called Khândhiâs (𑀘𑀓𑀭𑀯𑀭𑀮), from *khândh*, meaning 'a shoulder,' and their office is to carry the bier on their shoulders from the door of the deceased's house to that of the Tower of Silence. They are held inferior to Nasasâlârs, who cannot strictly be called corpse-bearers.

When a Pârsi dies the Nasasâlârs bring an empty bier from the *Nasâkhânâ* (𑀮𑀓𑀭𑀯𑀭𑀮)—a house where they and Khândhiâs are required to be present to attend any instantaneous call for service—to the house of the deceased. An hour before starting for the Tower, they enter the room where the body is deposited on a smooth slab of stone. The Nasasâlârs take up the body from the slab and place it on the bier, which then rests on the slab. Then, after the Mobeds have chanted some prayers, the Nasasâlârs remove the bier to the entrance door of the house, where the Khândhiâs wait to receive it. This delivered, the Nasasâlârs, who are always two, except when the corpse is very heavy, walk with the bier, one on each side to the door of the Tower. Here the Nasasâlârs again receive the bier and carry it into the inner part of the Tower. The Khândhiâs are on no occasion permitted to enter the Tower. None but Nasasâlârs can do so. The Khândhiâs are "well cared for and well paid;" but to say that they "are not associated with by the rest of the community" is far from true. They associate freely with the rest of the Pârsis, can reside in the same house with them, can eat at the same table—in fact there is nothing to prevent them from so associating with the other members of the community.

Prof. Williams considers feeding the dog with bread a part of the ceremony called *Sag-dîd*. In this also he is mistaken. The ceremony of *Sag-dîd* is nothing more than showing the corpse to any dog, and not necessarily a white one or a 'four-eyed' one. The very etymology of the word fully explains the ceremony. It is derived from Persian *sag*, meaning 'a dog,' and *dîd*, from *didan*, 'to see.'

Again, "the fire sanctuary of the *sagri*," as the writer says, "has a window or aperture so arranged that when the sacred fire is fed with sandalwood fuel by the veiled priest, just before the corpse-bearers enter the Tower, a ray from the flame may be projected over the dead body at the moment of its exposure." This is not correct. With no such design is the *sagri* built. The pro-

fessor himself admits that "a ray from the sacred fire had barely opportunity to fall on the corpse at all."

The bread with which the so-called funeral dog is fed is supposed by Prof. Williams to be a substitute for the flesh of the dead body. Here, too, he is mistaken. Nowhere even in the whole of the *Zand Avastâ* is bread ever supposed to be a substitute for the flesh. To feed a dog at the Tower of Silence is a practice sanctioned by convention, rather than by religion. Of all animals the dog is most dear to the Pârsis, on account of its undeviating faithfulness, and consequently they keep up the practice of feeding a dog as almost a sacred obligation.

In another place the learned professor has said that the soul of the deceased man is supposed to hover about in a restless state for the three days immediately succeeding death, in the neighbourhood of the *dakhmas*. This is not quite correct. Only the soul of a sinful man is supposed to do so.

Again, it is not necessary that the initiatory ceremonies on admitting a young boy into the Pârsi religion should take place in a fire-temple. For this purpose, a private dwelling is as good as a fire-temple. Nor is it necessary that the ceremony should be performed by a Dastar presiding over several Mobeds. In many cases, when the parents are not well off, only one or two Mobeds perform the ceremony.

About the bull whose urine is drunk at the initiatory ceremony I have to add that the bull is called *Varasô* (𑀮𑀓𑀭𑀯𑀭𑀮), and must be of a white colour: if a single hair on its body be found other than white, the animal is rejected as unfit for the purpose. I will conclude with the remark that I cannot discover what Prof. Williams means by "the second shirt."

SORÂBJI KÂVASJI KHAMBÂTÎ.

ŚAKA AND SÂMVAT DATES.

SIR,—Some authorities give 79 A. D., and some give 78 A. D., as the date of commencement of the Śaka era; and similarly the Sâmvat era of Vikramāditya is by some dated from 57 B. C., and by some from 56 B. C. Which is the correct date in each case, and why?

2. What is the correct method for converting Sâmvat and Śaka dates into years A. D.? Ordinarily the conversion is made by simply adding 57 (56), or subtracting 79 (78), to or from the date A. D., as the case may be; but, since the Sâmvat, Śaka, and Christian years do not begin on the same day, I do not understand how the ordinary simple method can be correct.

3. What rules fix the day on which the *Samvat* and *Śaka* years respectively should begin?

4. Does a year *Śaka* comprise the same number of days as a year *Samvat*? and what is the exact length of a *Samvat* year?

V. A. SMITH.

Hamirpur, N.W.P., 22nd April 1878.

The Hindu *Śaka* year is properly sidereal, commencing with the sun's entry into the sign *Mēsha* or Aries, and, as its length is 365 days 6 hours 12·6 minutes, its commencement moves very slowly forward on the European solar year. Thus the epoch of the *Śaka* era was 14th March 78 A.D., but the sun's entrance into *Mēsha* now falls on the 11th or 12th April, so that the *Śaka* year 1800 began on Thursday, 11th April 1878,—the sidereal year having gained 28 days on the solar one in 1800 years.

From this it will be seen that, for the approximate conversion of a date,—if it fall within the first three months of the Christian year,—we find the *Śaka* year by subtracting 79; if in the last nine months, by subtracting 78. The first nine months of the *Śaka* year correspond to the last nine in the Christian, and the last three in the former to the first three in the succeeding year of the latter reckoning, making the approximate equation to the *Śaka* era $+ 78\frac{1}{2}$ to bring it to the Christian date.

The *Samvat* year is reckoned exclusively by the *Chandra-māna* or luni-solar system, and over Northern India begins with the new-moon which immediately precedes the sun's entrance into *Mēsha*. But, as twelve lunar months (354 days 8 hours 48½ minutes) fall about 11 days short of the sidereal year, an intercalary or 'lound' month is supplied, on a particular principle, about thrice in eight years—making such years consist of 383 days 21 hours 32½ minutes. The epoch of this era was the new-moon of March 57 B.C., whence its equation is $- 56\frac{1}{2}$; or we subtract 56 from the *Samvat* date during the first nine or ten months of the year, but 57 during the last two, to obtain the year A.D.

In Gujarāt and south of the *Narmadā*, however, the year commences with the new-moon of *Kārttika* (Oct.-Nov.), whence we have an equation of $- 56\frac{1}{2}$; or we subtract 57 from *Samvat* dates falling in the months of *Kārttika*, *Mārgaśīrsha*, and part of *Pauṣa* (to 31st Dec.), but 56 for dates falling within all other Hindu months, in order to obtain the Christian year, and *vice versa*. For fuller information on details Warren's *Kāla-Sankalita*, Jervis's *Weights and Measures of India*, &c., Prinsep's *Useful Tables*, and Cowasjee Patell's *Chronology* may be consulted.—En.

ASSYRIAN DRESS ILLUSTRATED BY THAT OF THE HINDUS.

In reading lately Rawlinson's *Five Great Monarchies of the Ancient World* I came across a passage describing the dress of the Assyrian foot archers (vol. I. p. 430), part of which is as follows:—

"Their only garment is a tunic of the scantiest dimensions, beginning at the waist, round which it is fastened by a broad belt or girdle descending little more than half-way down the thigh. In its make it sometimes closely resembles the tunic of the first period, but more often it has the peculiar pendent ornament which has been compared to the Scotch phillibeg (*Layard's Nineveh and its Remains*, vol. II. p. 336), and which will here be given that name."

On this passage I would observe, firstly, that 'tunic' is a misnomer as applied to the garment in question, as the word is more properly used of a garment covering the body, whereas the article of dress in the illustration is fastened round the waist and falls over the thighs. Secondly, I think that any resident of India, looking at the illustration given on the page from which the quotation is taken, would at once remark the similarity of the archer's solitary garment to the Indian *dhōti*. For those readers who have not been in this country, I may explain that the *dhōti* consists of a strip of cotton cloth wound round the waist, the outer extremity being gathered into a thick fold or pleat, of which one end is tucked into the cloth that has been passed round the waist, while the rest of the fold hangs down in front or at the side, looking exactly like the so-called 'ornament' which is supposed to resemble a Scotch phillibeg. The same pendent fold is to be seen in the illustrations on pp. 436 and 477 of the same volume.—E. W. W.

ARCHÆOLOGY IN JAPAN.

Japan has an active archæological society, bearing the title of *Kobutzu Kai* (Society of Old Things). Its members, numbering 200, are scattered throughout the land, but meet once a month in Yeddo. They consist chiefly of wealthy Japanese gentlemen, learned men, and priests; the latter especially have been the means of bringing before public attention a vast number of ancient objects which have been hidden in the treasures of the temples, or preserved in private families. H. von Siebold, Attaché of the Austrian Embassy at Yeddo, and a member of the society, has lately published a *brochure* which will serve as a guide for the systematic archæological study of the land. Von Siebold has lately made a most interesting discovery of a prehistoric mound at Omuri, near Yeddo, containing over 5,000 different articles in stone, bronze, &c. In a recent communication

to the Berlin *Anthropologische Gesellschaft*, he describes the origin of the terra-cotta images found in old Japanese burial-grounds. It appears that up to the year 2 B.C. it was the custom to surround the grave of a dead emperor or empress with a number of their attendants, buried alive up to their necks, their heads forming a ghastly ring about the burial spot. At the date referred to, the custom was abolished, and the living offerings were replaced by the clay figures which have hitherto attracted so much attention.—*Nature*.

'CONTRACTED BURIALS.'

With regard to the remarks at page 46 of the current volume on the practice of contracted burials existing amongst the Abors of the Brahmaputra valley, where the dead are placed in very small graves in a sitting posture, it may be noted that Herodotus (IV. 190) reports that in his time "all the Libyan Nomads, except the Nasamonians, bury their dead sitting, as the Greeks do." This is curiously confirmed by the research-

es of Dr. Schliemann at Mycenæ, who found skeletons compressed into extremely narrow graves—not, he thinks, as some have surmised, by way of insult, though it is difficult to conceive the cause, as there was no apparent necessity for such a habit. However, in pre-historic interments both in Great Britain and Germany, bodies are not unfrequently found in large graves placed on one side, or huddled up in a corner, in sitting postures—certainly through no lack of space. Bodies, too, are frequently found in roomy barrows compressed into "the attitude of one who curls himself up to sleep," and it has also been proved that bodies were placed in the contracted position for burning, as well as for burial. If the Abors of the Brahmaputra have any reason, traditional or otherwise, for their custom of putting their dead 'trussed up,' face and knees together, in such small graves, it might throw some light on the origin of this very wide-spread, ancient, and unintelligible practice. Perhaps some archaeologist, who has an opportunity, might inquire.—W.

BOOK NOTICES.

THE HISTORY OF INDIA as told by its own historians: the posthumous papers of the late Sir H. M. Elliot, K.C.B., edited and continued by Prof. John Dowson, M.R.A.S., Staff College, Sandhurst. Vol. VIII. London: Trübner & Co., 1877.

The volume before us completes one of the most valuable contributions ever made to Oriental science. Eleven years, says Professor Dowson, have now passed since he took up the work of editing Sir Henry Elliot's reliques.

The labours of his predecessors in possession of those papers, though not without value, were unimportant as compared with what remained to do; for the MSS. left by Sir Henry were quite insufficient for the accomplishment of his great design. The labours of the editor, therefore, have been to a great degree original; and he is entitled to far greater credit than might be supposed from the title of the work.

This, as it now stands, contains at least a notice of every Muhammadan chronicle relating to India known to be worth the trouble of opening, with extracts of greater or less bulk from most; so that the student is not only presented with a tolerably complete History of India from the Musulmân point of view and knowledge, but is also furnished with a valuable guide for individual research. It to be regretted, indeed, that in a work with such a title there should be no extract from any Hindu or Buddhist author writing in his own sacred or vulgar tongue,—e.g. the *Mahāvanasa* or the *Rājatarāṅginī*,—and still more that the arrangement of the extracts is sometimes confus-

ing; though this latter fault is to a certain extent remedied by the excellent double Index which accompanies the present concluding volume. This contains also the Musulmân authorities for the decline and fall of the Mughal Empire (some of the writers are Hindus, but they all affect the style of Islām). The decay of literary power was, unfortunately, as marked at this period as that of political and military talent; and the best of the later native chronicles, the *Siyarū'l muta akhkhirīn*, is excluded from the volume, because it was impossible to devote much space to a work, however excellent, which is elsewhere attainable to the student. Probably the most interesting extracts given are those relating to the miseries suffered by the last puppet emperors before our entry into Delhi, those showing the native opinion of the invading English and French, and the accounts of the last battle of Panipat. None of these equal in value that of "Kasi Rai," in the *Asiatic Researches*, but several of them confirm it, and mention the writer in terms which show that he has not at all exaggerated his own opportunities of observation.¹

Oriental students will be glad to hear that Prof. Dowson has been commissioned to supplement the valuable work now completed by two volumes on the southern Musulmân states of Bijāpur, Ahmadnagar, &c., and we may express the hope that those possessed of rare MS. histories of any of the Bahmani dynasties will communicate with him respecting them.

¹ Prof. Dowson, under one of these accounts, devotes a note (p. 154) to Ibrahim Khān Gārdī, and quotes (it does not appear from where) a statement that that commander "in times of yore ran with a stick in his hand before the palankin of M. de Bussy" at Pondicherry. Unless this means that he was a *chobdār*, or mace-bearer, an office of

considerable respectability, it is probably incorrect, as Ibrahim was a Sayad. His family still hold a small *jāghir* near Panā, and are highly respected. Prof. Dowson rightly derives the word *Gārdī* from 'guard,' but does not seem to know that it is still in occasional use, and so derived by natives.

NOTES ON THE HISTORY AND ANTIQUITIES OF CHAUL AND BASSEIN, by J. Gerson da Cunha, M.R.C.S., &c., &c. Bombay: Thacker, Vining, & Co.

"Save me from my friends," says a Spanish proverb, with which Dr. Da Cunha, as a member of a kindred race, is doubtless acquainted, and which must have recurred to him pretty often since the demand for his monographs upon the two most ancient ports of the North Konkan induced him (as he tells us in his preface) to unite them in a serious volume, apparently with some slight alterations, and the addition of 26 illustrations and a map. The result is that we have, in an unhandy and costly volume, a large amount of information upon the cities of Chaul and Bassein, "and the domains which there adjacent lie," which would have been far more convenient to the few inquirers interested in the matter in the form of two octavo pamphlets. The illustrations might well have been left out. The photographs, as Dr. Da Cunha seems to be aware, are execrable; the engravings mostly very little better; and the map, with its orthography of no system (and generally different from that used in the body of the work), and its scanty and incorrect topography, is, if possible, worse; and there is no index.

The public (of Bombay at least) has heard so much, and yet so little that was pleasant, of Dr. Da Cunha's method of using his authorities, that we would not willingly enter upon the subject if we were not forced to do so by the fact that we have ourselves been worse handled by him than almost anybody else. A writer on scientific subjects necessarily, and by his own act of publication, places his ideas or opinions (let the value of the same be more or less) at the disposal of other inquirers; and a compiler who does not quote authorities wrongs rather his readers than his informants, though his conduct is reprehensible enough. But when the *ipsissima verba* of any writer are used by another, the former is entitled, by the courtesy of letters, to inverted commas and a marginal citation; nor is his right to be avoided by a mere mutilation or paraphrase of the passage. Of this rule, we regret to say, Dr. Gerson da

Cunha is either ignorant or negligent. To quote one instance out of many, an editorial note has been bodily 'conveyed,' including a misprint, from *Ind. Ant.* vol. III. p. 182, to his p. 88,¹ and enriched with a pleonasm, but acknowledged in no way whatever.

There is some pleasure in turning from the demerits of an old contributor to his virtues, and there is no doubt that Dr. Da Cunha's work is a better guide to the Portuguese remains around Bombay than any other yet accessible. He troubles himself little with the Hindu period, of which we have, indeed, no very authentic records. The name of Bassein we know to have been from its earliest mention *Wasai*, which title it retains in modern Marāṭhi. Nor does it appear at an earlier period to have been so well known or prosperous as might be expected from its position.² Chaul, on the other hand, has been known for about two hundred years as a great port, and apparently always under its present name. Dr. Da Cunha speaks of "the ancient city of Chaul, now called *Rewadāṇḍa*"; but the fact is that Chaul is still a recognized name for the whole ancient city, which encloses two sides of *Rewadāṇḍa*, as the sea does the other two, and is now chiefly covered with palm gardens. The relation between the two would seem in their best days to have been that of London in general to the parts 'below bridge.'

Chaul, says our author (restricting the name to the parts without Portuguesified *Rewadāṇḍa*), was originally called *Champawati*. Be this as it may, the Greek name was certainly *Simylla*³; the modern Marāṭhi name (चिचल) is (Jonesically transliterated) *Chenwal*: the local pronunciation may be best phoneticized to the English ear as 'Tsemwūl'. It is impossible to conceive a modern Greek getting much nearer to the native orthoepy than by using his ancestors' phrase; and the later writers who called it Chivil, Chivel, Cheul, &c., as exhaustively enumerated by Dr. Da Cunha, were evidently all aiming at the same pronunciation, and led Colonel Yule to an identification of which there can now be no doubt.⁴ The second syllable, *wal* or *wali*, is

¹ Our note runs as follows:—"***** A very large gun is said to have been given by the English Government to the Habsbi of Ziujira from the Pusaṇti Būrij or S.E. Bastion. The Pāṭil family of Korlê still worship the remaining guns once a year," &c. Dr. da Cunha inserts 'as a present' after 'given'. Pusaṇti is a printer's devilry for Pusaṇti.

² Probably deeper water then rendered *Thānê* and *Kalyāṇ* more approachable. Dr. Da Cunha falls into the common error of attributing the gradual shoaling of their approaches to 'silt'. But the fact is that the constant encroachment of man on the Konkan creeks has a tendency to narrow the channel, create 'scours,' and prevent 'silt'. We have no scientific records as to the rise of the west coast by upheaval, though observations are now in progress; but that excellent observer Mr. Thomas, late Collector of Malabar (in his work on Indian angling), and most

coast officers, believe in it. From a letter of Mr. Farmer, B.C.S., dated from Poona, and quoted by Grant Duff, vol. II. p. 348, it may be concluded that about 1790 Chaul bar had 4 fathoms of water. Horsburgh in 1817 gives 3 only; and we think the present depth is 2½ on rock.

³ Cf. Ptolem. *Geog.* VII. i. 6, VIII. xxvi. 3, and I. xvii. 3, 4. In the latter place, speaking of the mistakes of Marinus, Ptolemy says: "He places *Simylla* (τὰ Σιμύλλα), a seaport and commercial city of India, to the west, not only of Cape Komara, but even of the river Indus. Yet that city is mentioned only as south of the mouths of that river by those who have sailed to that country and spent much time there in those parts, and by those who have returned we have been informed that the natives call it *Timūla* (Τίμουλα)."—Ed.

⁴ See *Ind. Ant.* vol. IV. p. 282.

common in the nomenclature of Western India, as 'Virāwal,' 'Bhusāwal,' 'Lākiw'li,' &c., and apparently means 'a street of huts.' The first or characteristic syllable is more mysterious, but our author's conjecture that it designates "Chinna Deva Śilāhāra" is as unlikely a derivation as is possible to conceive, seeing Chhittadēva (as his name is now properly deciphered) lived long after the name had become well-known. 'Choul' is modern 'Cheechee' language, and it is most unfortunate that this 'pigeon' term should have been selected for 'Hunterization' and official and scholastic use as 'Chaul.'

Dr. Da Cunha, however, as we have said, troubles himself comparatively little about the early Hindu period, and, indeed, is hardly the safest guide upon it. For instance, on the authority (apparently) of the Bhāṇḍūp plates, he says that the Śilāhāra family reigned 'at Śrī Sthānaka,' which, as far as nomenclature can be trusted, must be the modern Ṭhānê or Tanna, the capital of the island of Salsette. Now there is no evidence in the plates that they reigned at Śrī Sthānaka at all, but merely over it; and the grantee is called 'sovereign of 1,400 villages'; whereas Salsette or Shaṭṣhaṣṭi seems never to have contained more than 66 (as its name implies), so that it was but a small part of his dominions, and Ṭhānê was but the head-quarters of the sub-division in which the grant was made; strictly analogous are the cases of the Portuguese and English, under both of whom grants have been made of land in Salsette by authorities not ruling in Ṭhānê, in which the latter refer, like the old copper-plate grantors, to the local authorities of Ṭhānê. The conjecture therefore taken up by Dr. Da Cunha, that Puri, which the Śilāhāra plates mention as their capital, was Ṭhānê, 'the capital *par excellence*,' has no foundation; and, as most authorities are agreed in the opinion that Ghārapuri, 'Elephanta,' never can have been the site of a capital city, Rājapūri, which was, within our own days at least, the capital of a tālukā in the North Konkan, under the Marāṭhās and English, may be taken as the most likely place, the more so as there is some shadow of royalty hanging about the name.⁵

A still more obvious improbability attaches to the identification (p. 167) of Kalyāṇ in the Konkan with the capital of "Rāja Bhavar the Solankhi, in the year of Vikrama 752", derived from the *Ratnamālā*. Surely Dr. Da Cunha knows that the name of the royal Solankhi race conjures up no memories of the western sea-board.⁶ Similarly the observations on cave-temples at

p. 255, and particularly the use of the name 'Vira Chola' for Elāra, rest on obsolete surmises of Dr. Wilson's, and are of no value.

Leaving, however, this ground, we come to the Portuguese period, in respect to which, probably, Dr. Da Cunha's opportunities are only equalled by those of some of the Catholic clergy, one of whom, we believe, assisted him somewhat in his labours. It is a pity that none of the reverend Fathers of the Company of Jesus have as yet favoured us with any treatise upon subjects which must be amply treated of in their own archives. For there is no chronicle of Portuguese India which does not bear witness to the unceasing activity of the Paulistines (Indian Jesuits), and even now their position in the Presidency of Bombay is one which must give every opportunity for research.

An error may be noted at p. 181, where our author quotes (without acknowledgment) from this journal certain fortifications near Bhiwandī as 'built by the Portuguese at Ṭhānê.' They are ten miles from that place, and stand to it as Kars or Batoum, and not as the castles of the Dardanelles, do to Constantinople. It is quite evident the doctor has either not seen them, or not studied military engineering and topography. The forts built 'at Ṭhānê' were doubtless those still visible from the railway bridge. The great fort there, now the jail, was begun after 1728, and was still incomplete in 1739.

The late English and French authorities are available to most students on the spot; and Dr. Da Cunha would seem not to have been particularly well qualified to deal with the latter, since he speaks, apparently on his own authority, of 'the *spiritueux* Du Perron,' a term not admitted by the Academy as applicable to any wit—except perhaps 'Monsieur Ponch.'

It is unnecessary, therefore, to follow him further, and most of his readers will, we think, agree with the conclusions that he could have done a good deal more if he had tried to do less; and that it is a great pity he did not, as we have certainly no other work on the subject equal to his; and he blocks the way so effectually that unless he should take advice, cut his book again into the original two portions, and substitute for his useless illustrations some sort of an index, and a few notes on the Hindu and Muhammadan periods approaching the present state of knowledge on the subject, we are not likely to get anything better for a good while.

S.

⁵ Conf. *Ind. Ant.* vol. V. pp. 276, 277.

⁶ Conf. *Ratnamālā* in *Jour. Bo. B. R. As. Soc.* vol. VIII. p. 76, where Bhavad is distinctly said to have come from

Kanyakubja; and *Ind. Ant.* vol. III. p. 41, vol. IV. p. 146, vol. VI. p. 183.—Ed.

SANSKRIT AND OLD CANARESE INSCRIPTIONS.

BY J. F. FLEET, B.O. C.S., M.R.A.S.

(Continued from p. 164.)

No. XLII.

AT p. 15 of the present volume, I gave a copper-plate grant of the Eastern Chalukya dynasty. I understood, at that time, that this dynasty had been noticed in print only by Dr. Burnell in his *South-Indian Palæography*. But I now find that an earlier account of it by Sir Walter Elliot is to be found in his second paper on *Numismatic Gleanings at Madr. Jour. of Lit. and Sc., N. S., Vol. IV, p. 75.*

I find, also, that the first of two copper-plate grants published by Bâl Gaṅgâdhar Śâstri at *Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc., Vol. II., p. 1*, is a grant of the founder of this dynasty, Vishṇuvardhana I., or Kubja-Vishṇuvardhana, or, as he is named on the seal of the grant, Śrî-Bittarasa, i.e. the king Śrî-Bittā or Bittī. It deduces his genealogy from his grandfather Raṇavikrama,—the Pulikêśī I. of the Aihole inscription at Vol. V., p. 67, and his father, Kirttivarmā I. The donor is Vishṇuvardhana. But he is only styled Yuvarāja; and the grant is dated on the day of the full-moon of the month Kârttika in the eighth year of the reign of the Mahārāja, and without any reference to the Śaka era. The Mahārāja must be Kirttivarmā I., or Maṅgalīśvara, or Pulikêśī II. If it is Kirttivarmā I., the inference would be that the formal division of the Chalukya kingdom into the Western and Eastern territories was carried out before the death of Kirttivarmā, and that his youngest son, Vishṇuvardhana I., was his Yuvarāja for the Eastern division. This inference might be drawn without necessitating any conflict with the statement of the Aihole inscription that Maṅgalīśvara became king on the death of Kirttivarmā, and that the succession afterwards went back to Pulikêśī II., the son of Kirttivarmā, because he was preferred by the people to the unnamed son whom Maṅgalīśvara destined to succeed himself. But it is hardly compatible with the statement of the Yêwâr inscription that, in con-

formity with the custom of the Chalukyas, Maṅgalīśvara assumed the government only because Pulikêśī II. was of too tender years to be recognized as king at the death of Kirttivarmā I., and that he voluntarily restored the throne to Pulikêśī II., as soon as the latter became of mature age. Whatever may be the circumstances under which Maṅgalīśvara succeeded,—whether as a usurper, or as regent,—the facts that he, by the Bâdâmi inscription at Vol. VI, p. 363, succeeded in Śaka 488 or 489, and that Pulikêśī II. (by No. XXVII. of this Series at Vol. VI., p. 72) did not succeed till Śaka 531 or 532, and (by the Aihole inscription) was still reigning in Śaka 556,¹ show,—1, that Pulikêśī II. must certainly have been of very tender years at the death of Kirttivarmā I., and,—2, that, consequently, Vishṇuvardhana I., being his younger brother, must have been a mere infant at that same time, and cannot have been installed as Yuvarāja. I would therefore hold,—1, that the formal separation of the Western and the Eastern branches took place at some time after the accession of Pulikêśī II., and also after the date of this grant; 2, that the Mahārāja of the grant now noticed is Pulikêśī II., though he is not mentioned in the genealogy; and 3, that, in accordance with this, the date of the grant is Śaka 539 (A.D. 617-8) or 540. The full titles of Vishṇuvardhana I. in this grant are Śrî-prithivīvallabha, or 'favourite of the world'; Yuvarāja; and Vishamasiddhi, or 'he who is successful under difficulties.' The last was adopted as one of the standard mottoes of the Eastern Chalukyas, and appears on the seals of some of the grants of subsequent kings of that dynasty.

Another copper-plate grant of Vishṇuvardhana I. is given as Plate xxiv. of Dr. Burnell's *South-Indian Palæography*. The only other name mentioned in this grant is that of his elder brother Satyâśraya, i.e. Pulikêśī II. An explanation of the title Vishamasiddhi is given in l. 3, in the words *sthala-jala-vana-girivishama-durggêshu labdha-siddhitpad=Vishama-*

¹ I shall shortly explain my reasons for altering my reading of the date of the Aihole inscription from "when Śaka 506 had expired" to "when Śaka 556 had expired."

siddhi, i.e. '(he who is called) Vishamasiddhi, because he acquired success by land and by sea, in the woods and on the mountains, under difficulties, and against fortresses,' or, perhaps, 'because he acquired success against fortresses, difficult of access, (which were situated) on land and in the sea and in the woods and on the mountains.' In these plates Vishnuvardhana I. is styled *Mahārāja*; the grant must, therefore, be subsequent to the formal establishment of the Eastern branch of the dynasty. It was made on the occasion of an eclipse of the moon in the month Śrāvaṇa. And the date, though it is not referred to the Śaka era, is specified more fully in numerical symbols in the last line, in the words *saṁ 16 mā 4 di 15*, i.e. 'in the sixteenth year and the fourth month (of his reign), and on the fifteenth day (of the month).'

Also, translations of two more copper-plate grants of this dynasty have been given at *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. II., p. 175.

The inscription now published is another Eastern Chalukya grant, from the original plates, which belong to Sir Walter Elliot, and are marked as having been obtained from J. R. Pringle, Esq. I have no information as to where they were found.

The plates are seven in number, about 7½" long by 2½" broad. The ring connecting them had been cut before they came into my hands; it is about ⅜" thick, and 3½" in diameter. The seal is rather oval than circular, and has,—at

the top, the moon; in the centre, the motto *Śrī-Vishamasiddhi*; and at the bottom, a lotus.

The plates are well preserved, except towards the ends of the lines, where they are rather corroded, though they are sufficiently legible.

The language is Sanskrit,—ungrammatical in the details of the grant. The characters are of the usual early Eastern Chalukya type. The *Anusvāra* is written usually above the line, but is sometimes irregularly placed; and in a few cases it is written on the bottom line,—e.g., in *Chinlārbōyasya*, l. 24, *Añjāsarmmaṇa*, ll. 28 and 29-30, *Vaiññisarmmaṇa*, l. 34, and *Mum-dubōyasya*, l. 59.

It is a grant of Vishnuvardhana II., the grandson of Vishnuvardhana I., with whom the genealogy commences. It is dated on Wednesday, the tenth day of the bright fortnight of the month Chaitra, under the *Maghā nakshatra*,² in the second year of his reign. The date is not referred to the Śaka era, but it must be somewhere about Śaka 590 (A.D. 668-9).

This grant, and No. 5 of Major Dixon's copper-plates,—a grant of the Western Chalukya king Vinayāditya-Satyāśraya, which is dated "when Śaka 614 had expired," in the thirteenth year of his reign, on Saturday, at the time of the sun's commencing his progress to the north, under the *Rōhiṇī nakshatra*,—are the earliest instances that I have as yet met with of the day of the week being named

Transcription.

First plate.

[¹] Svasti Śrīmatām sakala-bhuvana-saṁstūyamāna-Mānavya-sagōtrāṇām Hāriti-putrāṇām sa-

[²] pta-lōka-mātribhir-mātribhir-abhivarddhitānām³ Kārttikēya-parirakṣaṇa-prāpta-rājya-vi-

[³] van-Nārāyaṇa-prasāda-saṁ(sa)vā(mā)sādita-varāha-lāñcha(ñchha)n-ēkṣaṇa-kṣaṇa-vaśikṛit-

[⁴] tām mahi(hi)-bhṛitām-iv-āchala-sthitinām aśvamēdh-āvabhṛita(tha)-snān-āpanita-Kali-

[⁵] kyānām kulam=alaṁkarishṇuḥ(shṇōḥ) anēka-samara-sāṁghatt-ōpalabdhā-vijaya-patāk-

[⁶] g-maṇḍalasya Vishnuvarddhana-mahārājasya pantraḥ sakal-āvatī(ni)pati-makuta-

ta[ta*]-ghatita-maṇi-mayūka(kha)-puñja(?) -

Second plate; first side.

[⁷] mañjarita-charaṇa-sarōruhasyaḥ(sya) samādhi-kṛi(kri)yā-samāsādita-sarvva-siddhēh

Jayasimha-Vallabha-ma-

² Perhaps two letters, containing the name of another *nakshatra* also, have been broken away after the word *Maghā* in l. 66.

³ Here, and in a few places below, the mark over the line seems to be, not the *Anusvāra*, but the final form of *m*.

- [⁸] hārājasya(sya) priy-ānujasy-Ēndra-sama-vikramasy-Ēndra-bhaṭṭārakasya priya-
tanaya(yah) śakti-tray-ānamit-ā-
[⁹] nēka-rājanya-mukha-kamala-sabb-ābhyarchchita-charaṇa-yugaḷaḥ chatuṛ-udadhi-vēlā-
valaya-pa-
[¹⁰] ryyanta-prāpta-kīrtiḥ Maṇv-ādi-praṇīta-dharma-śāstra-pracharita-sarvva-lōk-āsrayaḥ
Chakrā(kra)dhara iva
[¹¹] chakravarttita(tā)-lakṣaṇ-ālamkārita-śarīra(rah) parama-māhēśvarō mātā-pitri-pād-
ānudhyātāḥ Śrī-Vishṇuvarddhana-
[¹²] mahārāja(jah) sarvvān-ēvam-ājñāpayati [^{*}] Viditam=astu sarvvēśhām [^{*}]
Karmmarāshtra-vishayē Paṣiṇḍi-Paṇṇunidu(?lu)-

Second plate; second side.

- [¹³] Mrānumi(?) Delkontha-Rāvinūyu ity-ētasya grā[ma*]-madhyamasya Rēyūru-nāma-
grāma(mah) Bhāradvāja-gō-
[¹⁴] trāya Nāgasarmmaṇaḥ paṭrāya Agnisarmmaṇa(ṇah) putra(trā)ya Kuṇḍisarmmaṇē
dvādaśaśāśa(śah) [^{||} *] Bā(bhā)radvāja[ja*]-gō-
[¹⁵] trāya Nāgasarmmaṇa(ṇah) paṭrāya Śaṅkarasarmmaṇaḥ putraya Maṇḍasarmmaṇē
[¹⁶] daśaśāśa [^{||} *] Puna Bhāradvāja-gōtrāya Nāgasarmmaṇaḥ putrayaḥ(ya) Kumārasarmmaṇē
[¹⁷] aṣṭaśāśa || Kuṇḍilya-gōtrāya Śaṅkarasarmmaṇē dvayaśāśa || Kuṇḍilya-gōtrāya Kumā-
[¹⁸] rasarmmaṇē dvayaśāśa [^{||} *] Tasy-ānuja Agnisarmmaṇē dvayaśāśa || Ālabōyasya
Kuṇḍilya-

Third plate; first side.

- [¹⁹] gōtrasya Kattisarmmaṇa putra Kandasarmmaṇa putra Kappasarmmaṇa chatāri
aśāśa [^{||} *] Puna
[²⁰] Kappasarmmaṇa ēka aśāśa [^{||} *] Puna Rēvasarmmaṇa dvē aśāśa [^{||} *] Puna
Kandasarmmaṇa dvē
[²¹] aśāśa [^{||} *] Puna Kandasarmmaṇa arddhāśāśa || Kōyilabōyasya Bhāradvāja-gōtra Bā-
[²²] disarmmaṇa mūyārdhāśāśa || Utpitorubōyasya Kāpva-gōtra Pālasarmma-
[²³] ṇa ēkaśāśa || Kavilabōyasya Gautama-gōtra Kuṇḍisarmmaṇa ekaśāśa || Āla-
[²⁴] buṇnabōyasya Kāśyā(śya)pa-gōtra Pā(bā?)disarmmaṇa ēkaśāśa || Chintḥūrbōyasya

Third plate; second side.

- [²⁵] Bhāradvāja-gōtra Sarvvasarmmaṇa ekaśāśa || Mudubambōyasya Kuṇḍilya-gōtra Sarvvaśa-
[²⁶] rmmaṇa putra Jetṭisarmmaṇa ekaśāśa [^{||} *] Puna Kuṇḍisarmmaṇa ekaśāśa [^{||} *]
Puna Śaṅkarasarmmaṇa ekaśāśa
[²⁷] śāśa [^{||} *] Puna Sarvvasarmmaṇa ekaśāśa [^{||} *] Puna Luddasarmmaṇa ekaśāśa [^{||} *]
Kattisarmmaṇa putra
[²⁸] Amjasarmmaṇa putra Kattisarmmaṇa ekaśāśa [^{||} *] Puna Sarvvasarmmaṇa
tiṇṇi aśāśa [^{||} *] Dēva-
[²⁹] śarmmaṇa putra Samudrasarmmaṇa ekaśāśa [^{||} *] Puna Jetṭisarmmaṇa
ekaśāśa [^{||} *] Anantasarmmaṇa putra A-
[³⁰] mjasarmmaṇa ekaśāśa [^{||} *] Pālasarmmaṇa putra Rēvasarmmaṇa tiṇṇi
aśāśa [^{||} *] Paḷolūrbōyasya

Fourth plate; first side.

- [³¹] putra Vasusarmmaṇa ēkaśāśa [^{||} *] Benbidibōyasya putra Āruvasarmmaṇa
ekaśāśa [^{||} *] Puna Vēda-
[³²] śarmmaṇa ekaśāśa [^{||} *] Penbidibōyasya Kuṇḍilya-gōtra Jakṛisarmmaṇa
ēkaśāśa [^{||} *] Kēsavabōyasya Vē-
[³³] basarmmaṇa ekaśāśa [^{||} *] Bhāradvāja-gōtra Agnisarmmaṇa putra
Vināyasarmmaṇa putra Sarvvasarmma-

* śā was first written and then corrected into da.

* The final form of n is used here, though it is in the middle of a word.

- [³⁴] ñê dvayañśaḥ || Kaṇḍīlya-gôtra Venṇīśarmmaṇa putra Nandīśarmmaṇa putra
Vāsudēvaśarmmaṇē
[³⁵] dvayañśaḥ || Kaṇḍīlya-gôtra Vināyaśarmmaṇa putra Nandīśarmmaṇa [putra*]
Nāgaśarmmaṇē dvayañśaḥ [||*]
[³⁶] Paummuddibōyasya Kaṇḍīlya-gôtra Dēvaśarmmaṇa dvayañśaḥ [||*] Puna
Bādīśarmmaṇa ekkamśaḥ ||

Fourth plate; second side.

- [³⁷] Dādibōyasya Kaṇḍīlya-gôtra Gabōtaśarmmaṇa êkamśaḥ | (||) Tonḍadûrbōyasya
Kauśika-gôtra Rê-
[³⁸] vaśarmmaṇa êkamśaḥ || Chēyûrbōyasya Kaṇḍīlya-gôtra Rēvaśarmmaṇa
muyyard-dhamśaḥ || Mīribō-
[³⁹] yasya Kāśyâ(śya)pa-gôtra Anantaśarmmaṇa dvayañśaḥ || Mudugonthabōyasya Bhāradvā-
[⁴⁰] ja-gôtra Duggaśarmmaṇa ekkamśaḥ [||*] Chanthrûrbōyasya Kāśyâ(śya)pa-gôtra
Pālaśarmmaṇa chatā-
[⁴¹] ri amśaḥ || Māratabōyasya Kaṇḍīlya-gôtra Venṇīśarmmaṇa ekkamśaḥ || Muddamûrbōyasya
[⁴²] Kāśyâ(śya)pa-gôtra Rēvaśarmmaṇa ekkamśaḥ [||*] Puna Rēvaśarmmaṇa ekkamśaḥ ||
Boppibōyasya Kāśyâ(śya)-

Fifth plate; first side.

- [⁴³] pa-gôtra Kumāraśarmmaṇa ekkamśaḥ | (||) Ponnalûrbōyasya Kāśyâ(śya)pa-gôtra
Sarvvaśarmmaṇa dvayañśaḥ [||*]
[⁴⁴] Vēgimbōyasya Kāśyâ(śya)pa-gôtra Kuṇḍīśarmmaṇa ekkamśaḥ | (||) Kutmurbōyasya
Bhāradvāja-gôtra
[⁴⁵] Iuddaśarmmaṇa ekkamśaḥ | (||) Kondālībōyasya Kāśyâ(śya)pa-gôtra Kuṇḍīśarmmaṇa
ekkamśaḥ | (||) Mu-
[⁴⁶] ttiñtibōyasya Kaṇḍīlya-gôtra Venṇīśarmmaṇa ekkamśaḥ | (||) Alabunabōyasya Kau-
[⁴⁷] ṇḍīlya-gôtra Bhattīśarmmaṇa arddhamśaḥ | (||) Kēsavabōyasya Bhāradvāja-gôtra
Vināyaśarmmaṇa
[⁴⁸] ekkamśaḥ [||*] Puna Vināyaśarmmaṇa ekkamśaḥ | (||) Râ(rām)puṇ(pu)rbōyasya
Kaṇḍīlya-gôtra Jeṭṭīśarmmaṇa êkamśaḥ [||*]

Fifth plate; second side.

- [⁴⁹] Pulkonthabōyasya Kāśyâ(śya)pa-gôtra Rēvaśarmmaṇa ekkamśaḥ | (||) Pandiribōya[sya*]
Bhāradvāja-gôtra Pavvaśarmmaṇa e-
[⁵⁰] kkamśaḥ | Kēsavabōyasya Vināyaśarmmaṇa ekkamśaḥ [||*] Puna Vināyaśarmmaṇa
ekkamśaḥ | (||) Māratabōyasya
[⁵¹] Kaṇḍīlya-gôtra Chāmūṇḍīśarmmaṇa ekkamśaḥ [||*] Puna Śivva(va)śarmmaṇa ekkamśaḥ ||
[⁵²] Rēkādibōyasya Kāśyâ(śya)pa-gôtra Dōṇaśarmmaṇa ekkamśaḥ || Puna
[⁵³] Rēkādibōyasya Rēvaśarmmaṇa ekkamśaḥ || Munikolbōyasya Bhāradvāja-
[⁵⁴] gôtra Kandaśarmmaṇa ekkamśaḥ || Chēbumdōthibōyasya Kāśyâ(śya)pa-gô-

Sixth plate; first side.

- [⁵⁵] tra Virāśarmmaṇa ekkamśaḥ || Eḍḍoṇḍibōyasya Kāśyâ(śya)pa-gôtra Nāga-
[⁵⁶] śarmmaṇa ekkamśaḥ || Iṇṭtalûrbōyasya Kāśyâ(śya)pa-gôtra Nāga-
[⁵⁷] śarmmaṇa ekkamśaḥ || Chichechakudibōyasya Kāśyâ(śya)pa-
[⁵⁸] gôtra Nandīśarmmaṇa ekkamśaḥ || Sama*tibōyasya Venṇīśarmma-
[⁵⁹] ṇa ekkamśaḥ || Mamdubōyasya Bhāradvāja-gôtra Kattīśarmmaṇa dvayañśaḥ

Sixth plate; second side.

- [⁶⁰] Bala-vijay-ârōgya-nimittam=asmābhīḥ saṃprāpta(ptaḥ) [||*] Gamyā rāja-va-
[⁶¹] llabhaḥ(bhāḥ) sarvva-parihārai(rāḥ) pariharantu parihārayantu [||*]
[⁶²] Api cha tēshāḥ(shām) ślōkāḥ [||*] Bhūmi-dānāt=paran=dānam na bhūtan=na
[⁶³] bhavishyati tasy=aiva haraṇāt=pāpan=na bhūtan=na bhavishyati ||

* Mma was first engraved, and the lower m was then partially erased.

Seventh plate.

| | | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|
| [66] Bahubhir=vyasudhā | dattā | bahubhiś=ch=ānupalitā | yasya | yasya |
| [66] yadā bhūmi(mil) | tasya tasya | tathā(dā) phalam | Varddhamāna-rājya-dva(dvi)[ti]- | |
| [66] ya-saṁvatsarē | Chaitra-māsē | śukla-pakṣhē | daśyamyām | Maghā ⁷ |
| [67] nakṣatrē | Budha-vārēshu | sva-mukh-ājñā(jñā)ptā[d*] | Dirgôchâyī ⁸ | |
| [68] velayilkanmarakunḍi | Erasya | putra | Vinayākasya | likhitam śāsanam=idam |

Translation.

Hail! The grandson of the Great King Viṣṇu vardhana who illumined all the territories of the regions with his banners of victory acquired in the contest of many battles, and who adorned the family of the Chalukyas, who are glorious; who are of the lineage of Mānavya, which is praised over the whole world; who are the descendants of Hārītī; who have been nourished by mothers who are the seven mothers of mankind; who have acquired the dignity of sovereignty through the protection of Kārttikēya; who have had all kings made subject to them on the instant at the sight of the sign of the Boar, which they acquired through the favour of the holy Nārāyaṇa; who are of immovable stability like the mountains; and who have had the guilt of the Kali age removed by ablutions performed after celebrating horse-sacrifices,—the dear son of Indra, the venerable one, who was equal in prowess to (the god) Indra and was the dear younger brother of the Great King Jayasimha Valabha, whose feet, which were as lotuses, were covered with clusters of flowers which were the rays of the jewels set in the tiaras of all kings (who bowed down before him), and who attained success in all things by practising profound meditation,—(viz.) the Great King Viṣṇu vardhana,—whose two feet have honour done to them by the court of the lotuses which are the faces of the numerous kings who are bowed down by his (possession of the) three constituents of regal power; whose fame extends up to the circuit of the shores of the four oceans; who practises being the refuge of all people in accordance with the sacred writings composed by Maṇu and others; who,

like the Wielder of the discus, has his body decorated with the marks of the status of a universal emperor; who is a zealous worshipper of Mahêśvara; and who meditates on the feet of his mother and his father,—thus issues his commands to all people:—

Be it known to all! The village of Rēyūru, in the midst of the villages of Paṣiṇḍi and Paṁruṇidu and Mrānumi and Delkontha and Rāvinūyu, in the district of Karmarāshṭra, has been apportioned⁹ by Us, for the sake of strength and victory and freedom from sickness, (in the following manner). Twelve shares to Kuṇḍiśarmā of the Bhāradvāja gōtra, the son's son of Nāgaśarmā and the son of Agniśarmā. Ten shares to Maṇḍaśarmā of the Bhāradvāja gōtra, the son's son of Nāgaśarmā, and the son of Śaṁkaraśarmā. Again, eight shares to Kumāraśarmā of the Bhāradvāja gōtra, the son of Nāgaśarmā. Two shares to Śaṁkaraśarmā of the Kaṇḍilya gōtra. Two shares to Kumāraśarmā of the Kaṇḍilya gōtra. Two shares to his younger brother, Agniśarmā. Four shares to Kappaśarmā of (the house of) Ālabōya¹⁰ and of the Kaṇḍilya gōtra, the son of Kandaśarmā who was the son of Kattiśarmā. Again, one share to Kappaśarmā. Again, two shares to Rēvaśarmā. Again, two shares to Kandaśarmā. Again, half a share to Kandaśarmā. Three and a half¹¹ shares to Bādiśarmā of (the house of) Kōyilabōya and of the Bhāradvāja gōtra. One share to Pālaśarmā of (the house of) Utpitorubōya and the Kāṇva gōtra. One share to Kuṇḍiśarmā

⁷ There may be two letters broken away here; see note 2.

⁸ Two or three letters are broken away here.

⁹ Samprāpta(ptaḥ), l. 60, lit. 'effected, accomplished.'

¹⁰ Bōya appears to be some surname or class-name. Since it occurs in ll. 32, 47, and 50 affixed to the proper name Kēśava, probably all the names to which it is affixed are proper names,—so ... of them being taken from names of villages.

¹¹ Mūyya-ardha; a hybrid word, mūyyu being Canarese, and ardhā Sanskrit. Mūyyu, 'three', is not given by Dr.

Caldwell in his *Grammar of the Dravidian Languages*; but it is one of the forms given by Mr. Kittel in his *Notes concerning the Numerals of the ancient Dravidians* (Ind. Ant., Vol. II., p. 24). Sanderson's *Dictionary* gives two words containing it,—mūyy-erad-adi, 'the carpenter-bee, which has six feet' (or lit., 'three twos of feet'); and mūyy-tr-moga, 'Shanmukha, the god of war, who has six faces' (or lit., 'three twos of faces'). On the analogy of these two words, mūyy-ardha may possibly mean 'three halves', i.e. 'one and a half'; but it seems to me to be used in the sense of mūru-vari, 'three and a half.'

of *(the house of)* Kavilabhôya and the Gantama gôtra. One share to Pâdisarmâ of *(the house of)* Alabunnabhôya and the Kâśyapa gôtra. One share to Sarvasarmâ of *(the house of)* Chinthûrbôya and the Bhâradvâja gôtra. One share to Jettisarmâ of *(the house of)* Mudubambôya and the Kauṇḍilya gôtra, the son of Sarvasarmâ. Again, one share to Kuṇḍisarmâ. Again, one share to Śamkaraśarmâ. Again, one share to Sarvasarmâ. Again, one share to Luddaśarmâ. One share to Kattisarmâ, the son of Añjaśarmâ who was the son of Kattisarmâ. Again, three shares to Sarvasarmâ. One share to Samudraśarmâ, the son of Dêvaśarmâ. Again, one share to Jettisarmâ. One share to Añjaśarmâ, the son of Anantaśarmâ. Three shares to Rêvaśarmâ, the son of Pâlaśarmâ. One share to Vasuśarmâ, the son of Pulolûrbôya. One share to Âruvaśarmâ, the son of Benbidibôya. Again, one share to Vêdaśarmâ. One share to Jakkiśarmâ of *(the house of)* Penbidibôya and the Kauṇḍilya gôtra. One share to Vêbaśarmâ of *(the house of)* Kêśavabhôya. Two shares to Sarvasarmâ of the Bhâradvâja gôtra, the son of Vinâyaśarmâ who was the son of Agniśarmâ. Two shares to Vâsudêvaśarmâ of the Kauṇḍilya gôtra, the son of Nandisarmâ who was the son of Vinâyaśarmâ. Two shares to Dêvaśarmâ of *(the house of)* Paumnudibôya and the Kauṇḍilya gôtra. Again, one share to Bâdisarmâ. One share to Gabôtaśarmâ of *(the house of)* Dûdibôya and the Kauṇḍilya gôtra. One share to Rêvaśarmâ of *(the house of)* Tonḍadûrbôya and the Kauśika gôtra. Three and a half shares to Rêvaśarmâ of *(the house of)* Chêyûrbôya and the Kauṇḍilya gôtra. Two shares to Anantaśarmâ of *(the house of)* Miṇibôya and the Kâśyapa gôtra. One share to Duggaśarmâ of *(the house of)* Mudugonthabhôya and the Bhâradvâja gôtra. Four shares to Pâlaśarmâ of *(the house of)* Chanthrûrbôya and the Kâśyapa gôtra. One share to Venṇisarmâ of *(the house of)* Mâratabôya and

the Kauṇḍilya gôtra. One share to Rêvaśarmâ of *(the house of)* Muddamûrbôya and the Kâśyapa gôtra. Again, one share to Rêvaśarmâ. One share to Kumâraśarmâ of *(the house of)* Boppibôya and the Kâśyapa gôtra. Two shares to Sarvasarmâ of *(the house of)* Ponnadûrbôya and the Kâśyapa gôtra. One share to Kuṇḍisarmâ of *(the house of)* Vêgimbôya and the Kâśyapa gôtra. One share to Luddaśarmâ of *(the house of)* Kutmurbôya and the Bhâradvâja gôtra. One share to Kuṇḍisarmâ of *(the house of)* Kondâlibôya and the Kâśyapa gôtra. One share to Venṇisarmâ of *(the house of)* Muttinthibôya and the Kauṇḍilya gôtra. Half a share to Bhaṭṭisarmâ of *(the house of)* Alabunnabhôya and the Kauṇḍilya gôtra. One share to Vinâyaśarmâ of *(the house of)* Kêśavabhôya and the Bhâradvâja gôtra. Again, one share to Vinâyaśarmâ. One share to Jettisarmâ of *(the house of)* Râmpurbôya and the Kauṇḍilya gôtra. One share to Rêvaśarmâ of *(the house of)* Pulkonthabhôya and the Kâśyapa gôtra. One share to Pavvaśarmâ of *(the house of)* Pandiribôya and the Bhâradvâja gôtra. One share to Vinâyaśarmâ of *(the house of)* Kêśavabhôya. Again, one share to Vinâyaśarmâ. One share to Châmaṇḍisarmâ of *(the house of)* Mâratabôya and the Kauṇḍilya gôtra. Again, one share to Śivaśarmâ. One share to Dôṇaśarmâ of *(the house of)* Rêkâdibôya and the Kâśyapa gôtra. Again, one share to Rêvaśarmâ of *(the house of)* Rêkâdibôya. One share to Kandaśarmâ of *(the house of)* Munikolbôya and the Bhâradvâja gôtra. One share to Vîraśarmâ of *(the house of)* Chêbumdôthibôya and the Kâśyapa gôtra. One share to Nâgaśarmâ of *(the house of)* Eddonḍibôya and the Kâśyapa gôtra. One share to Nâgaśarmâ of *(the house of)* Luttaûrbôya and the Kâśyapa gôtra. One share to Nandisarmâ of *(the house of)* Chichchakudibôya and the Kâśyapa gôtra. One share to Venṇisarmâ of *(the house of)* Samatibôya. Two shares to Kattisarmâ of *(the house of)* Mandubôya and the Bhâradvâja gôtra.

Let future favourites of kings treat *(this grant)*, and cause it to be treated, with all

EASTERN CHALUKYA GRANT OF THE FIFTH YEAR OF VISHNUVARDHANA. II.

1a.

೧ ಶ್ರೀಪತಂ ಸ ಕವ್ಯಾಕಸಸಂಸ್ಥಾ ವಪಾಸಾಸತ್ಯ ಸಂಗ್ರಾಹಂ
 ಸ್ತುತಿ ಕಾರಿತೃತ್ವಾಂ ಸದೃಶಕ ಕಾತ್ರ ಸಿಪ್ಪತ್ವಸಿ ಸಿಪ್ಪತ್ವಾ ಸಾಪ್ತ
 ಸ್ತುತಿ ಸಂಗ್ರಾಹಕಾತ್ಯಾಂ ಸದೃಶಕ ಕಾತ್ರ ಸಿಪ್ಪತ್ವಾ ಸಾಪ್ತ
 ಸ್ತುತಿ ಸಂಗ್ರಾಹಕಾತ್ಯಾಂ ಸದೃಶಕ ಕಾತ್ರ ಸಿಪ್ಪತ್ವಾ ಸಾಪ್ತ
 ಸ್ತುತಿ ಸಂಗ್ರಾಹಕಾತ್ಯಾಂ ಸದೃಶಕ ಕಾತ್ರ ಸಿಪ್ಪತ್ವಾ ಸಾಪ್ತ

1b.

೨ ಶ್ರೀಪತಂ ಸ ಕವ್ಯಾಕಸಸಂಸ್ಥಾ ವಪಾಸಾಸತ್ಯ ಸಂಗ್ರಾಹಂ
 ಸ್ತುತಿ ಕಾರಿತೃತ್ವಾಂ ಸದೃಶಕ ಕಾತ್ರ ಸಿಪ್ಪತ್ವಸಿ ಸಿಪ್ಪತ್ವಾ ಸಾಪ್ತ
 ಸ್ತುತಿ ಸಂಗ್ರಾಹಕಾತ್ಯಾಂ ಸದೃಶಕ ಕಾತ್ರ ಸಿಪ್ಪತ್ವಾ ಸಾಪ್ತ
 ಸ್ತುತಿ ಸಂಗ್ರಾಹಕಾತ್ಯಾಂ ಸದೃಶಕ ಕಾತ್ರ ಸಿಪ್ಪತ್ವಾ ಸಾಪ್ತ
 ಸ್ತುತಿ ಸಂಗ್ರಾಹಕಾತ್ಯಾಂ ಸದೃಶಕ ಕಾತ್ರ ಸಿಪ್ಪತ್ವಾ ಸಾಪ್ತ

11a.

ಪ್ರಮತನಮಃ ಸುಪದಿಗತಬಜ್ರಪತನಃ ಸುಕಬಿತ್ತರಿಸುಕರವಾದಿ
 ಕ್ರಾಂತಿಬ ಸ್ತುತಿಗ್ರೀವಸಃ ಕ್ರಿಪಾಸ್ತುತ್ಪನ್ನಪ ಕಾರಣಃ ಗ್ರಾಹಕಃ
 ಲಿಖಾ • ವಾಕ್ರಪ್ರಕೃತ್ಯಾಕ್ರಮಬ ಕ್ಷಿಪದಗ್ರಾಪಪದಿಸುಕಃ
 ಪುತ್ರಸಕಪದಬಮತಿಪದಾ ಪ್ರಸುಗಬ್ಬರವಸ್ತು ಪ್ರಸುಗಬ್ಬರವಸ್ತು
 ಪ್ರಸುಗಬ್ಬರವಸ್ತು ಪ್ರಸುಗಬ್ಬರವಸ್ತು ಪ್ರಸುಗಬ್ಬರವಸ್ತು

11b.

ಸುಪುರಾಣಾ ಮಾನಕಂ ಪುಣ್ಯವಿಃ ಪ್ರಗೃಹ್ಯತಾದಿವಿಗ್ರಹಿರಬ
 ಪುಣ್ಯವಿಃ ಪ್ರಗೃಹ್ಯತಾದಿವಿಗ್ರಹಿರಬ ಪ್ರಗೃಹ್ಯತಾದಿವಿಗ್ರಹಿರಬ
 ಪ್ರಗೃಹ್ಯತಾದಿವಿಗ್ರಹಿರಬ ಪ್ರಗೃಹ್ಯತಾದಿವಿಗ್ರಹಿರಬ ಪ್ರಗೃಹ್ಯತಾದಿವಿಗ್ರಹಿರಬ
 ಪ್ರಗೃಹ್ಯತಾದಿವಿಗ್ರಹಿರಬ ಪ್ರಗೃಹ್ಯತಾದಿವಿಗ್ರಹಿರಬ ಪ್ರಗೃಹ್ಯತಾದಿವಿಗ್ರಹಿರಬ

W. KRUGGS PHOTO-LITH. PECKHAM



exemption (from taxation). Moreover, there are these verses for them:—There has not been, and there shall not be, any gift better than a gift of land; there has not been, and there shall not be, any sin worse than confiscating such a gift! Land has been given by many, and has been continued in grant by many; he, who for the time being possesses land, enjoys the benefits of it!

This charter is the writing of Vināyaka, the son of Dirghôchāyi,velayilkanmarakunḍi-Era, from Our own word of mouth (given) in the second year of Our augmenting reign, in the month Chaitra, in the bright fortnight, under the Maghā nakshatra,¹² on Wednesday.

No. XLIII.

This is another Eastern Chalukya copper-plate grant, from the original plates, which belong to Sir Walter Elliot, and are marked as having been obtained from Mr. Porter. I have no information as to where they were found.

The plates are about 6½" long by 2½" broad. They are numbered; and, contrary to the usual rule, the writing commences on the first side of the first plate. Two plates only are now forthcoming; the rest of the grant has been lost, and seems to have been already missing when it

was forwarded by Mr. Porter. The ring connecting the plates had been cut before they came into my hands; it is about ½" thick, and 3½" in diameter. The seal is circular, about 1½" in diameter, and, as in the preceding case, has,—at the top, the moon; in the centre, the motto Śrī-Vishamasiddhi; and at the bottom, a lotus. The language is Sanskrit. The characters are of the usual early Eastern Chalukya type. The *Anusvāra* is written above the line,—except in *védāṅga*, l. 17, and *saṁvatsara*, l. 20, where it is on the line from want of space in which to insert it above the line.

The genealogy commences with Kīrttivar-mā I. It is another grant of Vishṇuvardhana II., and is dated in the fifth year of his reign. Here, again, the date is not referred to the Śaka era. But, the statement, that the grant was made on the occasion of an eclipse of the sun, which occurred on the day of the new-moon of the month Phālguna, enables us to determine that the date of it is probably Śaka 581 (A.D. 659-60). The details of this calculation will be explained fully hereafter.

This inscription gives the earliest instance that I have yet met with of the use of the epithet *śamadhigata-pañcha-mahāśabda*, and the only instance in which I have as yet found it applied to a paramount sovereign.

Transcription.

First plate; first side.

- [¹] Svasti Śrīmatām sakala-bhuvana-saṁstūyamāna-Mānavya-sagôtrāṇām
 [²] Hārīti-putrāṇām sapta-lōka-mātrībhir=mmātībhir=abhivarddhitānām¹³ Kārtti-
 [³] kēy-ānugrah-āvāpta-kalyāṇa-parampara(rā)nām bhagavan-Nārāya¹⁴ṇa-pra-
 [⁴] sād-āsādita-varāha-lāṅghana-ātmikrit-āsōsha-bhūbhṛitām bhū-bhṛitām=iv=āchala-sthi-
 [⁵] tinām āsvamōdh-āvabhṛitha--snān-āpanīta-Kali-malānām Chalukyānām kulam=a-

First plate; second side.

- [⁶] laṅkarshnôh(rishnôh) Śrī-Kīrttivarmanṇaḥ pranaptā sakal-āvanipati-makuta-tata-ghaṭita-
 [⁷] maṇi-mayūkha-puṁja-pi(pim)jam(ja)rita-charaṇa-yugalasya Śrī-Vishṇuvarddhana-
 [⁸] naptā śakti-traya-sa¹⁵masādīt-āsōsha-bhū-maṇḍal-ādhipatēh mahārājasya
 [⁹] nurakta-prakṛiti-sāmpādita-sarvva-sāmpadaḥ Śrī-Jayasi(sim)ha-Vallabha-va(ma)hārājasya
 [¹⁰] priya-bhrātur=anō¹⁶ka-yuddha-labdhya-vijay-ālamkṛita-śarirasya=Ēndra-bhattāarakasya

Second plate; first side.

- [¹¹] priya-tanayaḥ śamadhigata-pañcha-mahāśabdaḥ sakal-ēndur=iva sakala-kal-ādhi-
 [¹²] shṭhānō Vi¹⁷shṇur=iva Śrī-nivāsaḥ śrīmūn=Vishṇuvarddhana-mahārājah Gudrahāra-

¹² See notes 2 and 7.

¹³ Here, and in *amāvāsya*, l. 20, the mark on the upper line is probably, not the *Anusvāra*, but the final form of *m*.

¹⁴ *Yā* was first engraved, and then the stroke denoting the *ā* was partially erased.

¹⁵ In the same way, *sā* was engraved and corrected into *sa*.

¹⁶ This letter, *ni*, was first omitted, and then inserted above the line, with a cross-mark to indicate the omission.

¹⁷ Between the *vi* and the *shṇu* is a faint *sha*, where *shṇu* was commenced and then partially erased through want of room because of the hole for the ring.

| | | |
|--|---------------------------------|---|
| [¹³] vishayê | Arutañkû ¹⁸ r-âsrayê | Pañi(? ddi, or ddi)vâda-grâman=âdhivasatah |
| [¹⁴] sarvvân=êvam=a(â)ññāpayati | yathâ | [*] Asana-pura-va(vâ)stha(sta)vyasya |
| | | Ka(kâ)śyâ(śya)pa-gôtrasya |
| [¹⁵] Nûvuchûtti-trivêdasya | Taittiriya-sa-brahmachâriṇah | vêda-vêdâṅg-êtibâ- |
| | Second plate; second side. | |
| [¹⁶] sa-purâṇa-nyây-ânêka-dharmma-sâstra ¹⁹ -vidah | | agnishôm-âdi-paundarika-pa- |
| [¹⁷] ryyant-ânêka-kratu-yashtuḥ | Dhruvaśarmmanah | pantrâya vêda-vêdâṅga-vidah |
| [¹⁸] Dôchisarmmanah | putrâya | adhîta-vêda-dvayâya Dhruvaśarmmanâh |
| [¹⁹] asmin=grâmê | asmat-puṇy-âbhivirddha(ddha)yê | a(â)tmanô vijaya-pañcha- |
| [²⁰] mē | samvatsarê | Phâlguna-mâsê amâvâsyâyâm sūryya-gra[ha*]ṇa-nimi- |

Translation.

Hail! The great-grandson of Śrî-Kîrtti-
varmâ who adorned the family of the Cha-
lûkyas, who are glorious; who are of the
lineage of Mânava, which is praised over
the whole world; who are the descendants
of Hârîtî; who have been nourished by
mothers who are the seven mothers of man-
kind; who have attained an uninterrupted
continuity of prosperity through the favour of
Kârttikêya; who have had all kings made
their own (*feudatories*) by the sign of the
Boar, which they acquired through the favour
of the holy Nârâyana; who are of immova-
ble stability like the mountains; and who have
had the guilt of the Kali age removed by
ablutions performed after celebrating horse-
sacrifices,—the grandson of the Great King Śrî-
Vishṇuvardhana whose feet were made
to appear of a reddish-yellow colour by the
rays of the jewels which were set in the diadems
of all the kings (*who bowed down before him*),
—the beloved son of Indra, the venerable
one, whose body was adorned with victory
acquired in many battles, and who was the dear
brother of the Great King Śrî-Jayasim-
ha-Vallabha who acquired all the regions
of the earth by means of the three constituents of

power, and who achieved all prosperity through
his subjects being devoted to his virtuous
qualities,—(viz.) the glorious Vishṇuvar-
dhana, the Great King,—who has attained
the five great sounds (*of musical instruments*),
and who possesses all accomplishments, and
who, like (*the god*) Vishṇu, dwells with the
goddess of fortune,—issues his commands to all
who reside at the village of Pañivâda in the
district of Gûdrâhâra and in the vicinity²⁰
of (*the village of*) Arutañkûr:—

At this village, in the fifth year of Our
victorious reign, in the month Phâlguna, on
the day of the new-moon, on account of an
eclipse of the sun, [*there has been given*] to
Dhruvaśarmâ, who has studied two Vêdas,
—the son's son of Dhruvaśarmâ, who in-
habited (*the city of*) Asanapura, and who was
of the Kâśyapa gôtra, and who was a fellow-
student of Nûvuchûtti, the knower of three
Vêdas, in the school of the Taittiriya, and
who knew the Vêdas and the Vêdâṅgas and the
epics and the Purâṇas and the Nyâya and the
numerous sacred writings, and who performed
many sacrifices commencing with the Agnishô-
ma and ending with the Paundarika,—the son of
Dôchisarmâ, who knew the Vêdas and the
Vêdâṅgas.

ARCHÆOLOGICAL NOTES.

BY M. J. WALHOUSE, LATE M.C.S.

(Continued from p. 179.)

No. XXI.—The Old Tanjor Armoury.

Mahârâja Sivâji, the last king of Tanjor,
died in October 1855.

An eye-witness has recorded the stately and
solemn spectacle of his funeral, when, mag-
nificently arrayed and loaded with the costliest


jewels, his body, placed in an ivory palanquin
was borne by night through the torchlit
streets of his royal city amid the wail of vast
multitudes lamenting the last of their ruling
race. The change of death, it was said, cast an

¹⁸ The curve in the vowel-stroke attached to the k is in-
tended to make it equivalent to a repetition of the stroke
itself, and thus to give the long form of the vowel.

¹⁹ Strâ was first engraved and then altered into strâ by
partial erasure of the stroke denoting the â. In all such

cases, where the correction is made by paring down the
copper on each side of the wrong stroke or strokes, the
facsimile will, and can only, show the mistake of the en-
graver, and not his method of correcting it.

²⁰ Âsraya.



DAGGERS FROM THE TANJOR ARMOURY.

air of power and majesty over the old king's features, so that he almost seemed to acknowledge the salutations of the crowds as he passed in state for the last time through the embattled gateway of those wide-circling ramparts round which so many famous commanders and the armies of so many races have met in fight. There, on the bank of the sacred river, without the walls, a huge pile of sandalwood was laid, and with great weeping the royal robes were taken off one by one, and the body, wrapped in a simple muslin garment, placed upon the pile, and heaped over with the fragrant fuel. The nearest descendant, a boy of twelve, was carried thrice round the pile, and at the last circuit a pot of water was dashed to pieces on the ground, emblematic of the life of man. The boy then lit the pile, and the loud long-sustained lament of a nation filled the air as the flames rose.

With this king the *rāj* became extinct, but eventually all the personal and landed property, the palace, treasury, jewels, &c., were made over by Government to the chief Rājā,—everything in the palace, except the contents of the old armoury, which, as useless to the family, the Government decided to remove and disperse. The need of preparation for war and all its pomp and circumstance had long since disappeared from Tanjor, and the 'armoury' consisted of great heaps of old weapons of all conceivable descriptions, lying piled upon the floor of the *Sangita Mahāl* = 'music-hall,' a large detached building within the precincts of the palace, entered by a low massive antique portico. The floor of the interior was sunken, much resembling a huge swimming-bath, and a covered gallery ran round the wall above, whence, it was said, the ladies of the court in old days used to look down upon games, wrestling-matches and the like. But the bottom had long been occupied by many tons of rusty arms and weapons, in confused heaps, coated and caked together with thick rust. Hundreds of swords, straight, curved, and ripple-edged, many beautifully damascened and inlaid with hunting or battle scenes in gold; many broad blades with long inscriptions in Marāṭhi or Kanarese characters, and some so finely tempered as to bend and quiver like whalebone. There were long gauntlet-hilts, brass or steel, in endless devices, hilts inlaid with gold, and hilts and guards of the most tasteful and elaborate

steel-work. There were long-bladed swords and executioners' swords, two-handed, thick-backed, and immensely heavy. Daggers, knives, and poniards by scores, of all imaginable and almost unimaginable shapes, double- and triple-bladed; some with pistols or spring-blades concealed in their handles, and the hilts of many of the *kuttars* of the most beautiful and elaborate pierced steel-work, in endless devices, rivalling the best medieval European metal-work. There was a profusion of long narrow thin-bladed knives, mostly with bone or ivory handles very prettily carved, ending in parrot-heads and the like, or the whole handle forming a bird or monster, with legs and wings pressed close to the body, all exquisitely carved. The use of these seemed problematical: some said they were used to cut fruit, others that they had been poisoned and stuck about the roofs and walls of the women's quarters, to serve the purpose of spikes or broken glass!

Eventually the whole array was removed to Trichinapalli and deposited in the arsenal there, and after a committee of officers had sat upon the multifarious collection, and solemnly reported the ancient arms unfit for use in modern warfare, the Government, after selecting the best for the Museum, ordered the residue to be broken up and sold as old iron. This was in 1863. Being on the spot at the time, I was able to inspect and purchase a quantity of the weapons. A curious point about them was the extraordinary number of old European blades, often graven with letters and symbols of Christian meaning, attached to hilts and handles most distinctively Hindu, adorned with figures of gods and idolatrous emblems. There was an extraordinary number of long straight cut-and-thrust blades termed *Phirāngīs*, which Mr. Sinclair, in his interesting list of Dakhaṇi weapons (*Ind. Ant.* vol. II. p. 216) says means 'the Portuguese,' and were "either imported from Europe by the Portuguese, or else made in imitation of such imported swords." Mr. Sinclair adds that both Grant Duff and Meadows Taylor have mentioned that the importation was considerable, and that Rājā Śivāji's favourite sword *Bhavāni* was a Genoa blade. This sword is figured in the *History of the Mahrattas*, and is said to be still preserved as a sacred relic in the Sātārā family. It is curious to note how ancient and wide-spread the custom of giving names

to favourite swords has been; there was the Prophet's sword Zualfakir, the Cid's Durindana, King Arthur's "brand Excalibur," the Dwarf-sword Tirling of Scandinavian Sagas, and many another celebrated in the annals of chivalry. The Tanjor armoury strongly confirmed the statements of the great importation of European blades; it contained hundreds, whole or in pieces. Two *phirāngīs* in my possession have double-channelled blades, one set in a beautiful hilt of copper inlaid all over with ornamentation in gold, including four figures of griffins and ten of gods, the blade bearing on one side this inscription, repeated in each groove,

× C K N E O S O E N V S ×
and on the other side the letters

O E N B C F

also twice repeated. The blade of the other *phirāngī*, set in a hilt covered with tasteful gold foliage-work, spread also over hold-fasts prolonged four inches up the blade, bears these symbols and letters in one line on each side

* * × N O V A E × * *

These, as well as scores of others, were evidently European blades, and the signification of the letters may probably be obvious to antiquaries conversant with old weapons. And besides these there were multitudes of *kuttars* with handles of very exquisite pierced steel-work, in which were set blades evidently formed of pieces of European swords bearing various inscriptions. I have seen no medieval or modern steel-work surpassing these Hindu hilts in excellence of workmanship, artistic ingenuity, and tastefulness of design and ornament. The fancy shown is endless, and the execution minute and admirable. The sides of the handles, the cross-bars between for grasping, the tops of the handles, and the hold-fasts running from them up the blades, are all wrought in steel, generally pierced, and hardly any two designs the same. All the mass of weapons when taken from the armoury were thickly caked over with rust, and too many lamentably corroded and destroyed. It was only after great and persevering labour that the incrustations, perhaps of centuries, were more or less successfully removed, and the designs and inscriptions disclosed. One *kuttar* of fantastic design now by me has the grasp covered by a shield-shaped guard of pierced steel, bearing a griffin on each outer

rim, from whose backs small blades project on each side at right angles to the central blade, which bears this inscription on both sides:—

× × I N T I × × D O M I N I × ×

(See *Fig. 6* in the first of the accompanying plates.) Another fantastic dagger has three long narrow blades parallel to one another, the middle one longest, and on it are the letters E D R O. A *kuttar* (*Figs. 3, 3*) with a handle throughout of beautiful workmanship, the open-work sides an arrangement of griffins, phoenixes, and clustered fishes, and the hold-fasts of the blade each four fancifully grouped parrots, bears on one side the blade, which is broad and three-channelled, the letters S. M. V. N., and on the other C. V. M., with a human face in a crescent further up. A second *kuttar* (*Fig. 5*)¹ has the handle of fine pierced steel-work covered with a guard representing a cobra with expanded hood between two rampant griffins; the long narrow blade exhibits a single deep groove, in which on one side are the letters I O H A N I S * V L L, and on the other four or five indistinct letters and then A L I V N. A third, with a handsome well-wrought steel hilt, after the thick layer of rust that coated it had been removed, disclosed, to my surprise, in two deep channels on each side the blade, the well-known name

A N D R E A

F E R A R A (*sic*).

It seemed strange to meet the famous Italian swordsmith of three centuries ago in such an association, but Sir Walter Elliot has informed me that when a notorious freebooter was captured in the Southern Marāṭhā Country many years since, his sword was found to be an "Andrea Ferrara." So widely have these old European blades been spread over India; whether frequently found in Bengal and the North-West I do not know; but in the extensive collections of Eastern weapons in the India, South Kensington, and Bethnal Green Museums there are very few—less than a dozen—blades that appear unmistakably European, whereas in the Tanjor armoury they were numbered by scores; perhaps they had been collected there for a long period. One noticeable feature was the immense number and variety of arrows and arrow-heads: the former, as usual, of reeds, with bone or ivory nocks and spike-heads of all possible

¹ 1, 1, are the side and front of one handle; and 2, 2, and 4, 4, on the plate represent two others.




PLATE XXXV

OLD HINDU ARROWHEADS

ACCORDING TO SIZE

shapes, short and lengthened, rounded, three- or four-sided, channelled, or bulging in the centre; many were barbed, and many flat-tipped or ending in small globes,—perhaps for killing birds without breaking the skin; and there were some headed with hollow brass balls perforated with three or four holes, which were said to be filled with some inflammable composition and shot burning on to roofs and into houses. (See No. 13, on the accompanying plate of Old Hindu Arrow-Heads.) Under the head each arrow was elaborately gilt and painted for six inches down the stem, and also for the same length above the nock, and each bore above the feathers an inscription of two lines in Marāthi characters, in gold.

But besides the arrows there were extraordinary quantities of detached heads embedded in the mud of the floor, apparently of more antique types and still more fantastic forms, some not a little elegant: for example,—No. 4 on the same plate,—two paroquets joined beak to beak and breast to breast, their tails meeting in the point; No. 12, a flat blade with both edges rippled; No. 10, a double prong with barbed points; Nos. 3, 5, 6, 9, and 16,—several heads broad and tapering to a point, with curious open-work centres, sometimes all the centre open, the head indeed being merely a steel rim drawn to a point; these open-work heads were declared to be peculiarly dangerous, the flesh closing into them, and rendering extrication very painful. Some long spike-heads (Nos. 8, 14, and 15) were grooved on the sides or roughened under the point, for the purpose, it was said, of carrying glutinous poison. There were also crescent-heads (Nos. 1 and 7), a very antique form, used in the Roman circus-games; with such an arrow Anantaguna-Pandion, the king of Madurā, is said to have destroyed an Asura sent in the form of a striped serpent by the Samunals or Jains to devour the inhabitants of Madurā. Some small elegant heads inlaid in gold (No. 11), with an elephant and monograms, appeared intended for royal use. A considerable number of the large heavy arrow-heads used by native hunters was also found, some four or six inches long and more than an inch wide. Several were identical in form with arrow-heads brought by Commander Cameron from the interior of Africa; a barb with only one tang is common to both continents, and so is the crescent shape.

The demand for blades of European make

formerly existing in India seems rather strange when it is remembered how skillful Indian smiths were, and how famous Indian steel has been from remote antiquity. The workmanship of the native hilts can scarcely be surpassed, and it might be supposed that the smiths who made them could also have forged blades as good as those of European origin which they actually bear; moreover, the districts of Salem, Koimbatūr, and North Arkat, in which the best Indian steel has been manufactured from time immemorial, are almost contiguous to Tanjor, where so great a collection of European weapons had been assembled, and the name of Arunāchellam of Salem has been known all over India for the last fifty years: the *shikār*-knives and spear-heads made by him could not be excelled, hardly equalled, in temper and finish by any English smith, and the same might be said of him in all iron and steel work wrought by hand. It is in this region that the famous *ferrum Indicum* was probably produced, a hundred talents of which was held a fitting present to Alexander the Great: for, though the now well-known fusing and smelting process is said to be practised all over India, it is in these southern districts that the ore is richest and most magnetic, and hence the much-prized grey-steel ingots, whose production was so long a puzzle to the scientific, were exported far and wide to Damascus and Europe. There are many casual allusions which show how highly Indian steel was estimated in antiquity; for example, Clemens Alexandrinus, discoursing of luxury, observes, "One can cut meat without Indian iron." And when, in venturing some remarks (*Ind. Ant.* vol. V. p. 239) upon the occurrence of Roman coins in the neighbourhood of aqua-marina mines in Koimbatūr, and observing that I knew of nothing they were likely to have been used in purchasing except the gems, I might have added the steel so abundant and excellent both there and in the bordering district, Salem. When at the end of the past century some pieces of Indian steel were sent to the Royal Society, none could conjecture the method of their preparation, and it remained long unknown; even now somewhat of the more delicate manipulation is a secret amongst the native smiths, but the general method is understood, and may be read, well described, in Ure's *Dictionary of Arts and Manufactures*, art. 'Steel,'

and elsewhere. Nothing can be more simple and primitive than the native process, which, albeit involving a recondite chemical application, is probably the same now as in the days of Alexander the Great. The ore used is the magnetic oxide of iron, which, though sometimes forming small hills, is generally dug out from various depths. Occasionally it forms regular octahedrons yielding 72 per cent. of iron. The furnace is formed of clay, four or five feet high, cone-shaped, with a hearth at the bottom, round, and about twenty inches in diameter, the mouth at the top half that breadth. A pipe is inserted at the bottom of the cone, the outer end of which is connected with a pair of bottle-shaped skin-bellows. A layer of charcoal is placed at the bottom of the furnace and lit, on that a layer of ore, and this is repeated till there are seven layers of charcoal and as many of ore. Two men then work the bellows for two hours, when all the ore fuses, and the metal runs together in a mass. It costs less than a rupee to construct a furnace, and about thirty rupees' worth of iron can be made in it in a year. But a further process is necessary to convert the iron into the famous steel, and that process hardly yet seems thoroughly understood; its success probably depends upon a manual instinctive dexterity handed down from generations. The iron cake is again fused, and some uncharred wood and green leaves of the *Asclepias gigantea* are enclosed with it in the crucible. The fusing takes twenty-four hours, and on breaking the crucible the steel is found in a sort of button, the surface radiated as though crystallized. It has increased in weight, is extremely hard, of compact texture, and brilliant white colour at the fracture, and requires to be annealed three or four times, and exposed to a red heat for twelve or sixteen hours.

This is the far-famed 'wootz,' or Indian steel, whence were forged those Damascus blades that would shear asunder fine muslin webs floating in the air, and sever sheets of paper drifted against them on running water. The success of

the forging is said to depend on the due application and proportion of the *Asclepias* leaves. This plant grows, dock-like, in profusion over the plains and waste ground of the dry central districts of Madras. In Malabar and on the rainy western coast it is hardly ever seen, and there, though the laterite soil is richly charged with iron and extensively smelted, the Malabar smiths cannot produce the steel,—they lack the secret of the mysterious leaf. The *Asclepias* plant throughout its stem and broad blue-green leaves is filled with a milky juice, and its effect on metal depends on a recondite chemical cause, very far from obvious; and it is difficult to imagine how it could have been discovered in an unscientific age and country: its use and application were probably hit upon by accident, like the making of glass and the Tyrian dye.

But the Indian steel has one defect which goes far to explain the rarity of its appearance, and the profusion of European steel, in great armouries of old date, like that in the Tanjor palace, and that defect is its exceeding brittleness. Worked up in the European style it would break like glass. Hence, doubtless, the preference shown for the tougher and more enduring European blades. Moreover, the ancient Indian smiths seem to have had a difficulty in hitting on a medium between this highly refined brittle steel and a too-soft metal. In ancient sculptures, as at Śrīraṅgam, near Trichinapalli, life-sized figures of armed men are often represented bearing *kuttars* or long daggers of a peculiar shape; the handles, not so broad as in later *kuttars*, are covered with a long narrow guard, and the blades, $2\frac{1}{4}$ inches broad at bottom, taper very gradually to a point through a length of 18 inches, more than three-fourths of which is deeply channelled on both sides with six converging grooves. There were many of these in the Tanjor armoury, perfectly corresponding with those sculptured in the old temples, and all were so soft as to be easily bent,—recalling the fault noted by Tacitus and Cæsar in the weapons of the ancient Gauls and Germans.

MISCELLANEA.

HIWAN THSANG'S ACCOUNT OF HARSHAVARDHANA.

The reigning king is of the *Fei-she* (Vāṣīya) caste; is surnamed *Ho-li-sha-fa-t'an-na* (Harsha-

vardhana);¹ he rules over and holds the whole country. They reckon three kings in two generations. His father's surname was *Po-lo-kie-lo-fa-t'an-na* (Prabhākara var-

¹ In Chinese *Hsi-tseng*, 'increaser of joy.' See note 9 below.

dhanā),² his elder brother was called *Ho-lo-she-fa-tan-na* (Rājyavardhana). *Wang-tseng*³ ascended the throne as eldest son, and ruled in a virtuous way. At that time *She-shang-kia* (Śāśāṅka),⁴ king of the realm of *Kie-lo-na-su-fa-la-na* (Karnasuvarṇa) in Eastern India, said daily to his ministers: "When there is a wise king in the neighbourhood it is dangerous for the state." Upon that he treacherously invited him to a meeting and killed him (Rājyavardhana).⁵ The inhabitants (of Kanyākubja) having lost their prince, the state became a prey to disorder. Then a minister named *Po-ni* (Bhāṇi),⁶ who enjoyed much authority, spoke thus to his colleagues: "The fate of the kingdom should be decided to-day. The (eldest) son of our first king is dead; the brother of that prince is benevolent and humane, and Heaven has endowed him with filial piety and reverence. From the impulse of his heart he will revere his parents and have confidence in his subjects. I desire to see him inherit the throne. What think you of it? Let each speak his own opinion."

As all admired his virtues, no one had a different opinion. Then the ministers and magistrates besought him to ascend the throne: "Royal prince," said they, "condescend to listen to us. Our first king had accumulated merits and amassed virtues, and he reigned with glory. When *Wang-tseng* (Rājyavardhana) succeeded him, we thought that he would continue to the end of his career. But by the incapacity of his ministers he has gone and fallen under the sword of his enemy; that has been a great disgrace to the realm. It is we who are to blame. The opinion of the public is manifested in the songs of the people, and all the world sincerely submits to your resplendent talents. Rule, then, gloriously over the country. If you can avenge the injuries of your family, wipe out the disgrace of the state, and render illustrious the heritage of

your father: what merit will be comparable to yours? We supplicate you, do not spurn our wishes."

"In all times," replied the royal prince, "the inheritance of a kingdom has been a heavy load. Before mounting a throne one ought to consider maturely. For myself, in truth, I have only moderate ability; but now, that my father and my brother are no more, if I decline the inheritance of the crown, shall I thereby do any good to the people? It is right that I should obey public opinion, and forget my weakness and incapacity. Now, on the banks of the Ganges there is a statue of *Kwan-tseu-ts'ai-pu-sa* (Avalôkitêśvara, Bôdhisattva).⁷ As it works many miracles, I wish to go and pray to it." He went at once to the statue, fasted, and made fervent prayers. The Bôdhisattva, touched by his heartfelt sincerity, appeared to him in person and asked thus: "What do you ask for with such pressing importunity?"

"I have done nothing but accumulate evils," replied the royal prince; "I have lost my father, who was good and affectionate, and my elder brother, a pattern of gentleness and kindness, has been shamefully massacred. Their death has been to me a double affliction. I perceive that I have but little ability; however, the inhabitants of the state wish to raise me to honours, and require that I should succeed to the throne, to render famous the heritage of my father. But, as my mind is dull and devoid of knowledge, I venture to ask your holy opinion."

The *Pu-sa* (Bôdhisattva) said to him: "In your previous life you dwelt in a forest: you were the Bhikshu of a hermitage, and you discharged your duties with indefatigable zeal. By the effect of that virtuous conduct you have become the son of this king. The king of the state of *Kin-eul* (Karnasuvarṇa) having destroyed the law of Buddha,

² In Chinese *Tso-kwang-tseng*, i.e. 'the increase of that which makes light.' In place of *Po-lo*, *Po-lo-p'o* (Prabha) is required. He is also called *Pratāpāsīla* by Bāna, — see note 6.

³ The Chinese translation of Rājyavardhana, i.e., 'increase of the king.'

⁴ In Chinese *Yuei*, 'moon.' This is Śāśāṅka Narendragupta of Bāna's *Harshacharita*.

⁵ *Kin-eul*, 'golden-eared' or 'having gold in the ears.' The town of Rangāmatti, 12 miles south of Murshidābād, stands on the site of an old city called Kurasōna-ka-gadh, supposed to be a Bengālī corruption of the name in the text: *Jour. As. Soc. Beng.* vol. XXII. (1853) pp. 281, 282; *Jour. R. As. Soc. (N. S.)* vol. VI. p. 248.

⁶ From the incomplete *Harshacharita* of Bāna, a poet who seems to have lived at the court of Harshavardhana, we learn that *Pashpabhūti*, a native of the country of Śrīkṣāṇṭha, in which was the town of Sthānvisāra, that is, Thānesar, was the ancestor of *Pratāpāsīla* or *Prabhākara* vardhana, king of Kanauj, who is said to have subdued the Hūnas, with Sindhu, Gūjara, Lāṭa, and Mālava. He married *Yasôvatī*, and "his family consisted of three children: two sons, Rājyavardhana and Harsha," and a daughter, Mahādevī

or Rājyasrī. To Bhandī, a subject of high rank, Rājyavardhana and Harshavardhana were entrusted for their education. Rājyasrī was married at Kanyākubja to *Grahavarṇa*, the son of *Avantivarṇa*, of the *Maukhara* family; but on the day of *Prabhākara* vardhana's death *Grahavarṇa* was massacred by the king of Mālava, and Rājyasrī carried off. Rājyavardhana, taking Bhandī with him, and an army of ten thousand horse, followed the king of Mālava and slew him; but he himself was defeated and killed by Śāśāṅka Narendragupta, king of Gauda or Bengal, and succeeded by his younger brother *Harsha*, whom his officers urged to avenge his brother's death. But the Hindu epic breaks off on the recovery of Rājyasrī among the Vindhya mountains. — See Hall's *Vāsavadattā*, pp. 51, 52; *Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc.* vol. X. pp. 38-45.

⁷ Bhandī — according to Bāna.

⁸ The *Padmapāni* of Nepālese Mythology, and *Kwan-lin* of the Chinese. Conf. Burnouf, *Introd. à l'Hist. du Bouddh.* 2me ed. pp. 101, 121, 196-206, 212; Vassilief, *Le Bouddh.* pp. 125, 175, 178, 186, 197; *Jour. R. As. Soc. (N. S.)* vol. II. pp. 136ff. 418ff.; Hodgson's *Illustr.* pp. 68, 78, 135, or reprint, pt. i. pp. 47, 54, 85; Laidlay's *Fuh-hian*, pp. 115-117; Beal's *Buddhist Pilgrims*, pp. 60, 167; *Journal of Philology*, vol. VI. (1876) pp. 222-231.

it is right that you should succeed to the crown, to restore the splendour of the kingdom. If you fill your heart with affection and compassion, if your mind sympathize with distress, before long you will rule over the five Indies: If you wish to prolong the duration of your dynasty, it will be necessary to follow my instructions. Through my secret protection I will obtain for you distinguished honour, and no neighbouring king will be able to resist you. But do not ascend the *Sīṃhāsana* (throne), nor take the title of *Mahārāja*."

Having received these instructions he returned. He then accepted the inheritance of royalty, called himself by the name of prince royal (*Kumārārāja*), and took the title of *Shi-to'-o'-lie-to* (*Śīlāditya*).⁹ Thereupon he gave the following orders to all his subjects:—"The death of my brother is not yet punished, and the neighbouring states are not obedient to my laws; I do not know when I shall be able to eat in peace. Let all you magistrates unite your hearts and arms."

Immediately he collected all the troops of the kingdom, and caused the soldiers to be exercised. He had an army of five thousand elephants; the cavalry numbered twenty thousand horse; and the infantry fifty thousand men. He marched from west to east to punish the insubordinate kings. The elephants did not put off their housings, nor the men their cuirasses. Finally, in the middle of the sixth year, he made himself master of the five Indies. After increasing his dominions, he still further added to his army; the elephant corps was raised to sixty thousand, and the cavalry to a hundred thousand. At the end of thirty years the war ceased, and, by his wise administration, he spread union and peace everywhere. He applied himself to economy, cultivated virtue, and practised doing good at the risk of neglecting food and sleep. He forbade throughout the five Indies the use of meat, adding that if any one slew a living being he should be condemned to death without hope of pardon. Near the banks of the Ganges he caused to be raised many thousands of *Stūpas* that were each a hundred feet high. In the cities, large and small, of the five Indies, in the villages, in public places, and at the crossing of roads, he caused almshouses¹⁰ to be built, where are placed food and drink and medicines to be given in charity to travellers, the poor, and

the indigent. These benevolent distributions never cease. Wherever the Saint (Buddha) had left the mark of his feet, he erected *Kia-lan* (*Saṅghārāmas*). Every five years he convokes an assembly called *Wu-che-ta-hoei* (the great assembly of Deliverance—*Mōksha mahā parishad*). He empties the treasury and state stores to do good to everybody; he only reserves the arms, which are not suitable to give in alms. Every year he collects the *Shamen* (*Sramanas*) of the various kingdoms. On the third and seventh day he makes the four offerings. He decorates richly the *Chair of the Law*, and causes *seats of exposition*¹¹ to be arranged in great numbers. He orders the monks to argue together, and judges of their force or weakness. He rewards the good and punishes the evil, degrades the ignorant and promotes men of ability. If any one faithfully observes the rules of discipline, if he is distinguished by the purity of his morals, the king makes him ascend the *Sīṃhāsana* (lion's seat—on his throne), and himself receives from his lips the precept of the law. If any one, however, who leads a pure and irreproachable life be deficient in knowledge and learning, he is pleased to give him proofs of his esteem and regard.

If a man forget the rules and discipline, and allow his vices to appear in open day, the prince expels him from his kingdom, and wishes to see or hear no more of him. When the petty kings of the neighbouring states, their ministers and their principal officers, unweariedly practise good, and strive after virtue with unabated zeal, he takes them by the hand, makes them sit on his throne, and calls them his 'good friends.' As for those who pursue a different course he scorns to speak to them face to face. If he require to consult any one about a matter, he puts himself in connection with him by means of a continual exchange of couriers. Often he himself visits his dominions, and examines the manners of the inhabitants. He has no fixed residence; wherever he stops, he causes a cottage to be constructed and there stays. Only in the three months of the rainy season (*Varshās*) he suspended his excursions. Daily at his travelling abode he caused choice victuals to be prepared to support men of different creeds, namely, a thousand monks and five hundred *Brāhmanas*. He divided the day into three parts: in the first he was engaged with public affairs and the government; the second he devoted to meritorious deeds,

⁹ In Chinese *Kia-ji*, 'sun of moral conduct.' Hall remarks that he has not found this title in *Bāpa's Harsha-charita*, and questions its accuracy, because the titles of *Kshatriyas* only end in *ditya*, whilst Hiuan Tshang informs us that Harsha was a *Vaisya*—*Vāsav*, pp. 53, 54. But in Reinand's *Mémoire sur l'Inde* the first sentence of this extract is translated thus:—"The actual king is of the *Vaisya* caste; the (late) king bore the honorific title of Harsha-Vardhana (the increaser of joy); he reigned over that country." As Hiuan Tshang wrote after his return to

China in A.D. 648, when Harsha was dead and a usurper had seized on the government, this very slight alteration in the translation removes all difficulty.

¹⁰ In Chinese, *T'sing-lu*—'pure rooms,' *Puṇyasālās*.

¹¹ We may here understand the seat of the president charged to expound the *Law* (or teaching), and the seats of the clergy who should assist or take part in the exposition of the texts. In Chinese these are *i-yen*, 'the mats of sense' (*vulgo* justice).

and cultivated goodness with unremitting fervour: the entire day is not sufficient for him.

At the beginning (Hiwan Thsang) having received an invitation from the king *Kew-mo-lo* (Kumâra), he replied, 'I go from the kingdom of *Mo-kie-t'o* (Magadha) to the kingdom of *Kia-mo-liupo* (Kâmarûpa).'

At that time the king *Kiaï-jî* (Śīlāditya) was visiting his states. As he was in the kingdom of *Kie-chu-u-ki-lo*¹² (Kajûghira), he gave this order to the king *Kew-mo-lo* (Kumâra): "Come with the foreign monk from the convent of *Nolan-t'o* (Nâlanda) and see me at once."

The above (monk) in company with *Kew-mo-lo* (Kumâra), proceeded to the king. After refreshing himself from his fatigue, the king *Kiaï-jî* (Śīlāditya) said to him: "From what kingdom do you come; what do you seek for?"—"I come," answered the traveler, "from the kingdom of the great *Thang*, and ask your permission to inquire after the law of Buddha."—"In what country is the kingdom of the great *Thang*?" asked the king; "how far is it from this?"—"It is situated," replied he, "to the north-east from this country, and is distant many tens of thousands of *lis*. It is the country which the Indians call *Mo-ho-china* (Mahâchina)."—"I have heard it said," rejoined the king, "that in the country of *Mo-ho-chi-na* (Mahâchina) there is an emperor called the king of *Thsin*. In his youth he distinguished himself by marvellous sagacity; having become great, he displayed a remarkable ability in the art of war. During the preceding reign the empire was the prey of anarchy; it was divided and fell to pieces; every one flew to arms, and people were immersed in misfortune. But the emperor, styled the King of *Thsin*, who at a fortunate moment had devised great plans, manifested all his kindness and tender mercy. He saved the people from shipwreck, and stilled the interior of the seas (the empire). His laws and benefactions were spread abroad. The peoples of other countries and strange lands received his reforms with delight, and avowed themselves his subjects. The multitude which he generously supported sang musical pieces in honour of the victories of the King of *Thsin*. For a long while past I have heard his praises celebrated. Has the commendation of his splendid virtues a real foundation? Is that indeed what is called the kingdom of the great *Thangs*?"

"Yes," was the reply, "*Chi-na* is the name of the dominion of our first kings, and *Ta-thang*

(the great *Thangs*) is that of the ruling dynasty. Now, before the sovereign had inherited the throne, he was called the 'King of *Thsin*'; now that he enjoys the supreme power, he is called *Thien-tseu* (the son of heaven—the emperor).

"At the termination of the preceding dynasty¹³ the people were without a master; civil war prevailed and men were slain. The King of *Thsin*, who had received from heaven a great soul, manifested his good will and mercy. Thanks to the power of his arms, the wicked were destroyed, the eight regions began to breathe, and the ten thousand kingdoms came to offer him tribute. Bountifully he sustains all creatures; he reverences the three precious things; he lightens the taxes and mitigates punishments; the realm has superabundant resources, and the people enjoy undisturbed peace. It would be difficult to enumerate completely his great views and his grand reforms."

"Wonderful!" exclaimed *Kiaï-jî* (Śīlāditya): "the peoples of that country (China) owe their happiness to their saintly king."

At this time king *Kiaï-jî*, being about to return to the city of *hunchbacked maidens* (Kanyâkûbjâ), summoned an Assembly of the Law. Preceded by a multitude of several hundreds of thousands, he stopped on the south bank of the Ganges. The king *Kew-mo-lo* (Kumâra), preceded by a multitude of some tens of thousands, occupied the northern bank. Then the troops, separated by the river which flowed between them, advanced at the same time by water and by land. The two kings opened the procession. The four corps of the army formed an imposing escort. Some on boats, others on elephants, advanced to the sound of drums, marine conches, flutes and guitars. At the end of ninety days they arrived at Kanyâkûbjâ, in the middle of a great forest of trees in blossom, on the west bank of the Ganges. At this juncture twenty kings of different districts, who had previously received the orders of Śīlāditya, each brought the most distinguished *Sha-men* (Śramanas) and *Po-lo-men* (Brâhmanas) of their kingdoms; magistrates and warriors had come to join the great assembly.

The king (Śīlāditya) had already constructed an immense *Kia-lan* (Saṅghârâma). On the east of the Saṅghârâma he had raised a tower richly ornamented and nearly a hundred feet high. In the middle was a golden statue of Buddha, of the same size as the king. To the south of the tower

¹² Another form of the Chinese is *Kie-shing-kie-lo* (Kajûghira); the geographical list in the *Mahâbhârata* mentions the *Kajingras* among the people of Eastern India (Wilson's *Pishnu Purâna*, 4to ed. p. 196, note 163, and in the *Singhalese chronicles* mention is made of *Kajanghêlê-Niyangamê* (Upham's *Sac. and Hist. Books*, vol. II. p. 144). The place mentioned above must have been somewhere

about Râjmahâl, which district went by the name of Kânk-jol (Gladwin's *Ayeen Akbery*, vol. II. p. 178; Hamilton's *Gazetteer*, s. v. 'Râjmahâl'), from a town 18 miles south of Râjmahâl (Cunningham, *Anc. Geog.* p. 479); conf. also *Jour. R. As. Soc.* (N. S.) vol. VI. p. 237; M. Julien, *Mém. sur les Cont. Occid.* tom. II. p. 387.

¹³ The dynasty of the *Sui*.

he had set up an altar made of precious materials, where to bathe the statue of Buddha.

Fourteen or fifteen *li* to the north-east of this place he made also a travelling palace. It was then the second month of the spring season. From the first day he had delicious viands presented to the *Sha-men* (*Śramaṇas*) and *Po-lo-men* (*Brāhmaṇas*). On the twenty-first day, from the travelling palace to the great *Kia-lan* (convent), he caused tents to be placed on both sides of the road, which shone bright with the richest ornaments. Musicians who stayed there constantly made concerts of harmony in turns. The king sent out from his travelling palace a golden statue, hollow inside and in *alto-relievo*, about three feet high. It was carried on a huge elephant covered with a lousing of great value.

King *Kiai-ji* (*Śilāditya*), in the character of *Ti-shi* (*Indra*), carried a precious parasol and went on the left of the image. King *Kew-mo-lo* (*Kumāra*), in the character of *Fan* (*Brahmā*), took a white fly-flap in his hand and went on the right. Each of these had for escort a body of five hundred elephants covered with armour. Before and behind the image of Buddha were a hundred great elephants. They carried musicians who beat the drum and filled the air with sounds of harmony. King *Kiai-ji* (*Śilāditya*) scattered at every step fine pearls, precious stones of every sort, and flowers of gold and silver, in honour of the *three precious things*. Forthwith he stood on the altar, made of precious materials, and bathed the image with perfumed water. The king took it himself upon his shoulders and carried it to the top of the western tower. Then, to do it honour, he offered tens, hundreds, thousands of vestments of silk decked with all sorts of precious stones. At that time there were only twenty *Śramaṇas* who followed the statue; the kings of different countries acted as an escort.

When they had done eating, the king re-assembled (in a conference) the men of different studies (the monks and the *Brāhmaṇas*), who discussed the most abstract expressions and handled the most recondite principles. Towards evening the king returned to his travelling house. Daily the statue was thus conducted and accompanied in great pomp as at first. But when the last day of the assembly had come, all at once the great tower took fire, and the double-storeyed pavilion which rose over the gate of the convent became a prey to the flames. The king then said: "I have spent the wealth of my kingdom in alms. After

the example of our ancient kings I have built this convent, and have desired to distinguish myself by meritorious acts; but my weak virtue has found no support. At the sight of such calamities, and so sad omens, why should I care to live?"

Then he burnt perfumes, addressed humble prayers to Buddha, and pronounced these words:—"Thanks to the good deeds of my previous life, I have become king, of the five Indies. I desire by the power of my virtue to extinguish this terrible fire. If this vow be without effect, may I die at this instant!"

At these words he threw himself before the gate; the fire was extinguished as if it had been at once smothered, and the smoke disappeared. The kings, witnesses of this marvel, felt redoubled fear and respect; but he, without change of countenance, and in the same tone of voice as before, questioned the kings in these terms:—

"This fire suddenly has reduced to ashes the work which I had succeeded in making. What do you think of this event?"

The kings prostrated themselves at his feet, and answered him with tears in their eyes. "We hoped," said they, "that the sacred monument you had finished would last to future ages. Who would have imagined that on the first day it would be reduced to ashes? Add to this that the *Brāhmaṇas* might rejoice at it in secret, and are congratulating one another."

The king said to them: "By what has happened one may see the truth of Buddha's word. *Brāhmaṇas* and men of other studies obstinately hold that all is eternal." But our great master (the Buddha) has shown us the impermanency (of all). As for me, I have completed my alms and have fulfilled the wish of my heart. In seeing this fire quenched, I recognize anew the truth of the words of *Ju-lai*. Here has been great happiness, and there is no cause to yield to tears."

Having finished these words, he followed the kings and ascended by the east side to the top of the great *Stūpa*. Having reached the summit, he looked around, then he descended the steps. But all at once a strange man ran to meet him with a dagger in his hand. The king, closely pressed, retreated some steps and remounted the stair, then descending he seized the man to give him over to the magistrates.

At this moment the magistrates, filled with fear and dismay, did not delay to run to his aid. All the kings demanded that the man should be killed. But king *Kiai-ji* (*Śilāditya*), without showing in his

and to be renewed without interruption." In this passage, the king undoubtedly alludes to works made by man, namely, to the tower and pavilion which the fire had destroyed.

¹⁴ The Chinese has here *Chi-ch'ang-kien*, 'upholding the idea of the eternity (of men and things)'. The Dictionary *San-thsang-fa-su* (lib. vii. fol. 7) thus explains this expression: "*Ch'ang-kien* signifies, for example, that our body is born again after death; since it continues to die

manner the least anger, prevented his being put to death. The king himself questioned him thus:—"What wrong have I done to you, that you should make such a criminal attempt?" "Great king," said he, "your goodness is free from partiality, and men from within and from without owe to you their happiness; but I, fool that I am, and incapable of forming noble aims, I have allowed myself to be duped by a word from the Brâhmanas. All at once I have become an assassin, and bound myself to kill your Majesty."

The king said to him: "Why have the Brâhmanas formed so wicked a purpose?"

"Sire," answered he, "after bringing together the princes of all kingdoms, you have emptied your treasury and stores to honour the *Sha-men* (*Sramanas*) and to make a statue (*in gold*) of Buddha; but the Brâhmanas, whom you have made come from far, have received no mark of attention from your Majesty. They have felt greatly disgraced by it, and charged the madman with whom you speak to make this shameful attempt."

Further, the king severely questioned the heretics and their partizans. There were five hundred *Po-lo-men* (Brâhmanas), all endowed with superior talents, who had presented themselves at the call of the king. Jealous of the *Sha-men* (*Sramanas*), whom the king had loaded with honours, they had thrown a fire-arrow which had set the precious tower in flames. They hoped that during the efforts that would be made to extinguish the fire the crowd would be scattered in disorder, and they would take advantage of the occasion to kill the king. Having missed the opportunity they hoped for, they had hired this man to run upon him in a bye-path and stab him.

At this moment the ministers of all the kings demanded the extermination of the Brâhmanas. The king punished the chiefs of the plot and pardoned their partizans. He banished five hundred Brâhmanas beyond the limits of India, and returned to the capital.¹⁵

On the north-west of the city is a *Stûpa*, built by king *Wu-yew* (*Asoka*). At this place *Ju-lai* (the *Tathâgata*) had expounded the most excellent laws.

Near by are places where the four past Bud-

dhas had sat, and where they had walked in exercise. There is, besides, a small *Stûpa* which contains the hair and nails of *Ju-lai* (the *Tathâgata*), and another called the *Stûpa* of the Exposition of the Law.¹⁶

On the south side and close to the Ganges are three *Kia-lan* (*Saṅghârâmas*), which have walls alike and the gates different. The images of Buddha are of striking beauty; the monks are grave and given to silence; they are served by many thousands of Brâhmanas. In a casket ornamented with precious stones, which occupies a pure house (*Vihâra*), there is a tooth of Buddha, an inch and a half long. It is of remarkable brilliance and extraordinary colour which changes from morning to night. It is visited from everywhere; the magistrates and representatives of the people unite in giving their homage to it. The daily crowds are reckoned by hundreds and thousands. The keepers, observing the noise and confusion increasing daily, have imposed a heavy tax, and have made it known everywhere that whoever wishes to see Buddha's tooth must pay a large gold piece. Nevertheless the devotees who come to see and worship the tooth are still as numerous, and willingly pay the tax of the piece of gold. Every fast-day it (*the box?*) is brought out and placed on a raised pedestal. Hundreds and thousands of men burn perfumes and offer handfuls of flowers. But though they do so the tooth casket never disappears under the heap of flowers.

Before the *Kia-lan* (*convent*), right and left, there are two *Vihâras*, each nearly a hundred feet high. The foundations are of stone, and the building of brick. The statues of Buddha which are set up inside them are decked with many precious stones. They are cast partly of gold or silver, and partly of yellow copper. Before each of these two *Vihâras* is a small *Kia-lan* (*convent*) to the south-east, and at a little distance from the *Kia-lan* is a great *Vihâra*, built of brick on stone foundations. In the middle of it is the image of *Ju-lai* (the *Tathâgata*), represented standing. It is nearly thirty feet high. It is cast of brass, and decked with precious stones of exquisite beauty.

On the stone walls which surround the *Vihâra*

successor of *Hiranya*, is represented as having been placed on the throne by *Harsha-Vikramâditya* of *Ujjain*, who is described as ruling over all India (*ib.* III. 125, 242, 265, 281-2, 285, 307, 323). And *Harsha's* son and successor is called *Pratâpasîla* and *Śilâditya* (*ib.* III. 325). This *Śilâditya* of *Mâlava* seems to be the same as is spoken of by *Hiwan Tshang* (*Vie et Voyages*, pp. 204-206; *Mém.*, tom. II. p. 156) as having lived sixty years before his time, and who had reigned fifty years,—probably about A.D. 530-580,—but who must not be confounded with *Harshavardhana* of *Kanauj*. *Conf. Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc.* vol. VI. p. 226; *Ind. Ant.* vol. II. pp. 128, 194, note; vol. IV. p. 365.

¹⁶ A *stûpa* raised in the place where the law had been expounded.

¹⁵ *Hiwan Tshang* tells us that, in accordance with a prediction made ten years previously, "the king *Kiai-ji* (*Śilâditya*) died at the end of the period *Tong-hoei*," or A.D. 650 (*Vie et Voyages*, p. 215); *Ma-twan-lin* places his death, however, in the 22nd of the years *Ching-kwan*, or A.D. 648 (*Pauthier's Examen*, pp. 53, 54, or *Jour. Asiat.*, 3e sér., 1839, pp. 309, 310); and, as he had probably ruled upwards of forty years, we may place the beginning of his reign about the same time as that of *Pulikēśi's*, or a little before it, in A.D. 607,—the date given by *Reinaud*, *Mém. sur l'Inde*, pp. 136-143; *Frag. Arab. et Pers.*, p. 139, note 1. *Cunningham* (*Bhilsa Topes*, p. 164) places *Toramâna* in A.D. 520 to 550, while *Bhâd Dâji* (*Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc.* vol. VIII. p. 249) places him about 500. There seems little reason to doubt that this was the brother of *Hiranya* (*Râjatarangini* III. 102-104, 122). *Mâtṛigupta*, the

clever sculptors have represented in full detail all the acts of the *Ju-lai* (the Tathâgata) whilst he led the life of a *Pu-sa* (Bôdhisattva).

A short distance south of the stone Vihâra is a temple of the Sun-god.

To the south, and not far from this monument, is a temple of the God *Ta-tseu-ts'ai* (Mahêśvara-Dêva). These two temples are constructed of a blue stone, beautifully bright, and ornamented with wonderful sculptures. They are of exactly the same form and dimensions as the Vihâra of Buddha. Each of these temples has a thousand attendants to water and sweep it. The sound of the drum and of chants accompanied by the guitar are continued day and night without interruption.

Six or seven li to the south-east of the capital, and on the south of the Ganges, is a *Stûpa* about two hundred feet high, which was built by king *Wu-yew* (Aśoka). Formerly in this place *Ju-lai* (the Tathâgata) preached for six months on the non-eternity of the body,¹⁷ and on the emptiness (uselessness) of mortifications of it, and its inherent impurity.¹⁸

Near by are various places where the four past Buddhas had sat, and where they had walked in taking exercise. There is, besides, a small *Stûpa* which contains the hair and nails of *Ju-lai* (the Tathâgata). If a sick person reverently makes the circuit of it with active faith, he never fails to recover health and to secure felicity.—From Stanislas Julien's *Mémoires sur les Contrées Occidentales*, tom. I. pp. 247-265.

CONTI POMIGLIANESI.

"Pomigliano d'Arco is a large village lying at the foot of Mount Vesuvius, on the road from Naples to Nola," which, moreover, has an illustrious citizen, Signor Vittorio Imbriani, not above collecting and publishing the folklore of his neighbourhood, and has further had the good fortune to attract the notice of Signor De Gubernatis and M. Marc Monnier, to the latter of whom (*apud* the *Revue des deux Mondes* of 1st November 1877, pp. 133ff.) I am indebted for the above information, and for the two stories appended. The resemblance of one to the *Râmâyana* is commented on by the authors quoted; that of the other to the story of Turi and Basanta (*Ind. Ant.* vol. IV. p. 260) is almost as striking; but for my part I am shy of drawing conclusions.

¹⁷ We know that, according to the Buddhists, man rous ceaselessly through the circle of transmigration (*Dict. San-thsang-fa-su*, bk. iv. fol. 27): see above, note 14.

¹⁸ The *Dict. San-thsang-fa-su*, bk. xlv. fol. 1, enumerates thirty-six sorts of impure things inherent in the human body, e.g. tears, spittle, perspiration, urine, fæces, &c.

*The story of the prince who had an ill step-dame, and who slew the giant with ten heads.*¹

In the days when all men were healthy, wealthy, and wise lived a great king 9000 years old. His first wife had left him a fine brave son. But having wed a second queen he had in a loving moment promised her a boon, be it what it might; and she required that the eldest son should be banished, and her own son have the crown.

Expelled by his cruel stepmother, the prince fled to the greenwood with the princess his wife. But one day that he had chased a deer till he was a long way from his hut the ten-headed monster carried off the princess.

The prince, not finding her on his return, was in a bad way, and set off in pursuit. After a long tramp he met the king of the monkeys, who complained to him of being vexed by a monster. (In those days beasts had speech.) To do him a good turn, the prince faced the monster and slew him. In those days beasts had gratitude too; the king of the monkeys, having learnt that the ten-headed monster had carried off the princess, sent his subjects to see what had become of her. The monkeys lost their way and were famished, but a good fairy gave them victuals and put them in the way.

They seek long and hard; at last they meet the vulture, who tells them that the ten-headed monster has carried off the princess beyond the sea. But how will they cross the ocean? The monkeys, in their distress, seek the king of the bears; he is too old, and advises them to apply to the *son of the wind*. This last flies over the sea, sees the princess and brings back news of her. Then the prince, by means of a marvellous bridge, crosses the sea himself, meets the ten-headed monster, himself slays him, and brings back his unlucky wife.

*The story of two boys who ate the heart and liver of a fowl, whereby the first became a pope, and the other won a purse of fifty ducats daily.*²

Once upon a time there was a man who, having naught to do in the streets, set off for the country. He chanced to look up at a tree and saw the nest of a certain fowl. He climbed up and took the mother-bird and two eggs, whereon was written, "Whoso eateth the heart of this fowl will become a pope, and whoso eateth its liver will win a purse of fifty ducats daily;" but he saw naught of all that. He went home and said to his wife, "What shall we do with this fowl? Our children perish of hunger.

¹ *Revue des deux Mondes*, tome XXIV. (1 Nov. 1877) p. 164.

² *Sic in "francisco."* If the definite article or an equivalent is used in the original Italian or patois, it is a curious testimony to the wide-spread renown of Râvana.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 147ff.

I will carry it to our gossip, and we will make a trifle of porridge for the weans." He went to his gossip, and quoth he, "Gossip, I bring you this fowl and her two eggs to amuse your children." The gossip said he wanted none of it; but, as the other insisted, at last told him to be off with his bird. The man took it and went off in a huff, forgetting the two eggs on his gossip's table.

He, looking on his table, finds the two eggs, reads the inscription, and says he, "Bad luck to it! what have I done? I let my little gossip carry off the fowl, and here's all this written on the eggs." He runs to the other and says that his children are crying for want of the fowl. "Then the man answered him, 'You are late, the fowl's eaten.' His gossip went home and took counsel of his wife, and said, 'What shall we do now, old woman?' She said that he should take the things (the poor man's children) and say that he'd rear them; and that was what the gossip did. He went to the man and says he, 'Little gossip, I want your two youngsters because you can't feed them; and I'll rear them.' He brought them home and put them to school; and every morning his wife made their bed, and every morning she found in it a purse of fifty ducats; and she used them right well. After six or seven years the gossip had laid in lots of money, and the weans were well grown. One morning the two lads set to playing one with the other in their bed, and if they did, out fell the purse of fifty ducats. When they saw that, they said, 'This is no place for us now; our father's gossip has put the purse here to see if we'd take the money'; and that same day they said to him that they would be off. Now he wasn't willing to let them go, but after many words he gave them two hundred du-

cats apiece and let them go. Off they went, and as they went they found themselves that night in a wood, and for want of better shelter they sat themselves down under an oaktree. When they got up in the morning, down fell the purse of fifty ducats. 'Ah, ha! that's why our dad's gossip wanted to have us at home—for this luck that's in us.' And off they went again, and came to cross-roads; and if they did, it chanced that one was behind just then; and they were parted and couldn't find each other. He who should win the purse of fifty ducats every morning got to one town, and he who should be pope to another; and he was on the street, for naught had he to eat; so to win his living he would be sexton of the church. Now one day there was a pope to be made in that town, and they loosed a dove; and when she lit on that sexton's head they made him the pope.

"Voilà," says M. Marc Monnier, "un nouveau genre de conclave qui se retrouve dans plus d'un conte populaire au Italie et d'ailleurs? Pareillement quand les rois sont embarrassés pour trouver un gendre, ils laissent tomber du haut d'un tour un mouchoir sur la foule," &c.

In India we should have let out the late lamented's elephant to find his successor in the first case; and in the second we have the Svayamvara. In both, the Eastern procedure seems the more dignified, and in the latter it has the additional merits of chivalry and common sense—things more easily combined than most people seem to think.

To cut a long story short, after adventures of little import to the purpose of this note, the brothers met at the court of him who had become pope, and lived happily ever after.

METRICAL VERSIONS FROM THE MAHĀBHĀRATA.

BY J. MUIR, D.C.L., LL.D., &c.

(Continued from p. 189.)

VIDULĀ AND SANJAYA.

A Kshatriya heroine's exhortation to her son.
Mahābhārata, vv. 4494-4637.

There lived a Kshatriya queen of old,
Well known to fame, far-sighted, bold,
Who sate in councils, heard debate
Proceed on grave affairs of state,
Who, studying much and long, a store
Possessed of rich and varied lore.
She dwelt with joy 'mid war's alarms,
And loved to hear of feats of arms,
How Kshatriyas' power the proud subdued,
And blessed the subject multitude.
It chanced, a foe's superior might
Once overcame her son in fight;

And, all his host dispersing, drove
The prince in foreign lands to rove.
There, stunned by fortune's crushing blow,
He lived, and pined, in want and woe.
Desponding, sad, he deemed it vain
To seek to raise his head again.
His spirit seeing so depressed,
The mother thus her son addressed:—

Vidulā.

"Of all thy friends the grief and bane,
Of all thy foes the joy and gain,—
No real son art thou of mine,
No scion of the kingly line.
A Kshatriya thou wast never born;
Of every warrior thou the scorn.

Whence spring'st thou P from what outcast race?
 All nobler sires thou would'st disgrace.
 Who can of thee with honour speak?—
 In spirit faint, in act so weak.
 Desponding thus, hast thou no care
 Thy shattered fortunes to repair?
 Contemn thyself no longer; rise,
 Awake to deeds of high emprise.
 Why liest thou prone, as if the dread
 Forked bolt of heaven had struck thee dead?
 Start up, aspire to high renown;
 By knightly deeds regain thy crown.
 By force of will respect command;
 Blaze fiercely, like a glowing brand.
 Like smouldering chaff, that only smokes,
 A weakling men's contempt provokes.
 Whoever strikes a manly blow,
 And strives to lay his foeman low,
 Has done his duty: though he fail,
 That failure let him ne'er bewail.
 For duty wage a constant strife;
 Than this, what other use has life?

Thy pious acts have borne no fruit;
 And cut is now thy welfare's root.
 If all thy hopes of good are gone,
 In life why should'st thou linger on?

Though hardly pressed, a warrior ne'er
 Should yield to sad and weak despair.
 Though fell'd to earth, a man should seize
 With deadly grasp his foeman's knees,
 Should drag him down with all his might,
 And, smiting, end the deadly fight.

The sons who earn no honoured name
 Can bring their mothers only shame.
 Whoe'er in splendour, valour, lore,
 Stands forth all other men before,
 He justly claims—no other can—
 The high and noble name of man.
 He's falsely called a man whose heart
 Is weak, who plays a woman's part.

On this our sad condition think:
 We stand on utter ruin's brink,
 From home and country driven, laid low,
 Of joy bereft, and plunged in woe.
 And wilt thou, nerveless, thus lie low,
 Nor dare to strike another blow?

I called thee son, but now I see
 I bore the Kali age in thee.¹
 May woman never bear again
 A son so base, so dire a bane!

¹ The Kali, which is the present Yuga, is the last of the four immense periods into which the Indian system of cosmogony divides the duration of the existing creation. The first, or Satya Yuga, was the age of perfection; and during those which have followed, the world is conceived to have been undergoing a gradual course of deterioration to the extent of one-fourth in each succeeding Yuga. In

Submission, meekness, ne'er can raise
 The sunk, or bring them happier days.
 Fierce, energetic, strife alone
 Can win thee back thy father's throne.
 Ambition only, restless, proud,
 Can lift a man above the crowd.
 Steel, then, thy heart:—a hero grown,
 From haughty foes wrest back thy own."

Sanjaya.

"What worth has earth, its wealth, its joys,
 Its power, its state, its glittering toys,—
 What worth has even life,—for thee,
 My mother, if thou hast not me?
 Then urge me not to peril life,
 In fruitless, bootless, desperate strife."

Vidul.

"Their lot is base who once were great,
 But now have fallen from high estate,
 Who, masters once, dependent now,
 To others' wills must humbly bow,
 Whom none regards, and who, by need
 Constrained, on others' bounty feed.
 To such a servile life as now
 Thou lead'st, my son, no longer bow.
 Win back those days,—alert and brave,—
 When thou wast lord, and not a slave,
 When all men watched thy kingly nod,
 And bent before thee as a god.
 Like heavenly bliss is kingly sway,
 Like hell their lot who must obey.²
 The prince whose arm his rule assures,
 And well his kinsfolks' weal secures,
 He during life enjoys renown,
 And earns at length a heavenly crown.
 Yet thou continnest faint of heart,
 And wilt not act a hero's part.
 But know, whene'er from love of life,
 A Kshatriya shrinks from battle's strife,
 With no fierce warlike ardour burns,—
 His tribe that recreant soldier spurns.

Yet why should I my speech prolong?
 No pleas of mine, however strong,
 Can sway, poor youth, thy wavering mind,
 To all bold action disinclined.
 Just so, no drugs his death can stay
 Whose life is ebbing fast away.

Yet hear another reason why
 Thou still in war thy chance should'st try.
 The foe who now usurps thy throne
 The peoples' love has never known.

the Kali age corruption and calamity are thus regarded as attaining their climax. The word Kali as used in the text may thus be considered as denoting an impersonation or incarnation of all evils.

² This line, which has nothing corresponding to it in the original, is given as a counterpart to the preceding.

Too weak to rise,—with none to guide,
They watch the turn of fortune's tide.
But if men saw thee bent on war
Allies would flock from near and far.
With these combined, thy plans prepare,
Thy standard raise, and war declare.

Thy foe is mortal, bears no charm
To guard his life from deadly harm.
Go forward, then; to battle stride;
Successes yet thine arms abide.
Thy name is Victor;^a prove thy right
To bear it: triumph now in fight.

Whilst thou wast but a child, of old
A Bráhmaṇ seer thy lot foretold,
That after dire reverses thou
Once more in pride should'st rear thy brow.
The sage's word remembering, I
Expect thy coming victory.

But what a life is this we lead,
Starvation dreading, sunk in need!
What sad vicissitudes I've seen!
A princess born, a wedded queen,
Resplendent once with jewels bright,
My husband's joy, my friends' delight,
In splendour nursed, I knew no care;
And now!—but yet I'll not despair.

Should'st thou continue still to see
Thus plunged in woe thy spouse and me,
What joy could life then have for thee?

Our servants, all attached and good,
Have left us, forced by lack of food.
Our honoured teachers, Bráhmaṇ priests,
Enjoy no more their former feasts.
What comfort have I yet in store?
Shall glad bright mornings dawn no more?
It rends my heart, augments my woe,
To say a needy Bráhmaṇ "no."
In happier days my spouse and I
A Bráhmaṇ's suit could ne'er deny.

We stand before a trackless sea,
We have no raft, no guide but thee:
Be thou our pilot, steer us o'er,
And land us on a happier shore.
A dying life is this we live;
Do thou full life and vigour give.

What joy have I if thou disgrace
By shrinking fear thy fathers' race?
I could not bear to see thee act
A flatterer's part with servile tact.
A manly Kshatriya, highly born,
All base unworthy arts should scorn;
By fawning, cringing aspect meek

For others' grace should never seek.
Think what our race's law requires,—
A law observed by all our sires,
On all their hearts inscribed, divine,
And why not, too, engraved on thine? —
A Kshatriya hold, with lofty brow,
To lower men should never bow,
But always grandly stand erect
With conscious, noble, self-respect.
And even when nought can doom forefend
Defiant let him meet his end;
By force be broken,—never bend.

To duty, Bráhmans, gods above,
A Kshatriya bows with reverent love:
To these alone he homage pays;
All humbler men he lord-like sways."

Sanjaya.

"Thou hast a hard, an iron heart,
And play'st no loving mother's part,—
True daughter of a warrior line;
A fierce unbending soul is thine.
To all thy Kshatriya instincts true,
Thou dost not yield to love its due;
Nor seek to guard me as thy one
Supreme delight, thine only son!
But spurr'st me on, devoid of ruth,—
As if I were an alien youth,—
To join again in hopeless strife,
And all in vain to peril life.
What worth would earth, its wealth, its joys,
Its power, its state, its glittering toys,—
What worth would life,—possess for thee,
My mother, if thou hadst not me?"^b

Vidula.

"Life has two aims,—with zeal pursued
By thoughtful men,—the right, the good.^c
These worthy ends of life to gain
I've urged thee on, as yet in vain.
The time has come, the favoured day
For action,—long it may not stay;—
Improve it e'er it pass away:
Thy fame is perilled by delay.
Should I to warn thee now decline,
I'd show a fondness asinine."^d

Thou cravest love, then prove thy right
To be indeed my heart's delight.
When thou shalt play the hero's part,
I then will clasp thee to my heart.

The Kshatriya race was formed for fight,
In martial deeds should take delight;
For heaven is earned by warriors all,
By those who conquer, those who fall."

^a His name, "Sanjaya," means "victorious," or "victory."

^b In the original these ideas are repeated here.

^c *Dharma* and *Artha*, or Duty and Prosperity.

^d This follows the original: "Were I not to address thee when thou art affected by infamy, this would be the weak, causeless fondness of a she-ass."

Sanjaya.

"I lack all means, have no allies,
To aid my hostile enterprise.
From home and empire rudely driven,
My forces into fragments riven,—
How can I face my conquering foe,
Or think, unhelped, to lay him low?
Alone, could even a giant hope
With fierce embattled hosts to cope?
But thou art fertile in resource;
Do thou direct and shape my course.
Thou bidd'st me now the strife renew;
What thou commandest, I will do."

Viduld.

"Let not thine ancient ill success
In war, my son, thy soul depress.
To self-distrust no longer yield;
Once more thy sceptre hope to wield.
Misfortune lasts not always long;
The strong grow weak, the weak grow strong.
But trust not chance; by strife alone,
And toil, canst thou regain thine own.

Heroic men, awake, alert,
Spring up, and all their force exert.
Resolved to win, with stubborn will,
Despising risk and braving ill,
They never rest, but struggle on
Till all the good they seek is won.

A well-starred prince, religious, wise,
To high estate must surely rise.
On such Śrī⁷ smiles, benignly bright,
As rising suns the Orient light.

But listen yet, while I reveal,
How thou with other men should'st deal;
How thou with art, and tact, and skill,
May'st always mould them to thy will,
By varying means may'st all persuade,
Thy will to work, thy schemes to aid.
Men's several natures sharply note,
The various loves on which they dote,
Gold, splendour, pleasure, honour, fame,
Revenge, and every other aim;—
These mark, indulge, to these give scope;
And, swaying all by fear and hope,
Their passions use to serve thine ends,
To thwart thy foes, attach thy friends.
By such means, too, the wise man knows
To sow dissension 'mong his foes.
And never, son, evince alarm,
Whate'er may rise to threaten harm.

⁷ The goddess of good fortune.

⁸ The original verse (4634), literally translated, runs thus:—"This earth must be supported in the water. I must die, (plunging) down into an abyss, or precipice." This is thus explained by the Commentator: "This land, my paternal kingdom, sinking as it were in the water. . . .

A ruler fear should never know,
Or, if he feels, should never show;
For if he shows he danger dreads,
O'er all his host a panic spreads.
I've shown thee how, if thou wilt dare,
Thou may'st thy losses yet repair.
I've stirred thee up to flee from shame,
To gain thyself a glorious name.
I've sought thy soul with hope t' inspire,
With martial glow thy breast to fire.
I've told thee how, though now forlorn,
Thou wast for future glory born.
And now, my son, at length arise,
Arise, and snatch the envied prize.

Now, last of all, my secret hear,
That thou no more may'st doubt or fear.
We yet possess, to thee unknown,
Large treasures, known to me alone.
And many hundred friends remain,
Good friends, who've borne misfortune's strain,
Whom no reverse of ours could shake,
Who common cause with us will make,—
They surely will not leave us now,
When fortune comes to crown thy brow.
What need for more, my son, what need?
So on to fight, and victory speed!"

Sanjaya.

"O thou, thy race's joy and pride,
Heroic mother, sagest guide,
Fond prophetess of coming good,
How thou hast roused my timid mood!
Whilst thou didst strive, in long discourse,
My languid soul to nerve with force,
In war of words I strove in vain
O'er thee the mastery to gain.
For thou couldst all my pleas refute,
And leave me stunned, abashed, and mute.
With thee to lead, sustain, and cheer,
How can I longer shrink or fear?
Drunk with the nectar of thy word,
To superhuman valour stirred,
I must, with thee to show the way,
Impossibilities essay.
I will not see the ocean whelm⁸
My own, my dear, paternal realm,
But lift it high above the wave,
Yea, death itself with joy will brave
My cherished heritage to save."
Thus by his mother's tauntings stung,
By these her exhortations fired,
Away the youth his weakness flung,
And snatched the prize her soul desired.

must be supported by me, or the sunken kingdom must be raised; or I must die in the gulf called battle; and not thus remain inactive." Supposing the word "earth" to stand for the world, the phrase might perhaps be understood of a superhuman effort, as I have done in the lines which precede.

The women of Rājputāna, as represented by Colonel Tod in his *Annals and Antiquities of Rājasthān* (see chapter xxiii. vol. I. pp. 607ff.), maintain in more recent times the character of heroism ascribed to Viṣṇu in this passage of the *Mahābhārata*. I give a few extracts. Vol. I. pp. 609f. (Madr. ed. pp. 523, 526, 528, 530, 537, and 543):—"C'est aux hommes à faire des grandes choses; c'est aux femmes à les inspirer," is a maxim to which every Rājput cavalier would subscribe, with whom the age of chivalry is not fled, though ages of oppression have passed over him. He knows there is no retreat into which the report of a gallant action will not penetrate, and set fair hearts in motion to be the objects of his search." P. 610:—"Like the ancient Germans or Scandinavians, the Rājput consults her in every transaction; from her ordinary actions he draws the omens of success, and he appends to her name the epithet of *devī*, or godlike." P. 613:—"Nor will

the annals of any nation afford more numerous or more sublime instances of female devotion than those of the Rājputs; and such would never have been recorded were not the incentive likely to be revered and followed." P. 614:—"The annals of no nation on earth record a more ennobling or more magnanimous instance of female loyalty than that exemplified by Dēwaldē, mother of the Binafur brothers," &c. P. 617:—"Dēwaldē says, 'Would that the gods had made me barren, that I had never borne sons who thus abandon the paths of the Rājputs, and refuse to succour their prince in danger.'" P. 633:—"The Rājput mother claims her full share in the glory of her son, who imbibes at the maternal fount the first rudiments of chivalry; and the importance of this parental instruction cannot be better illustrated than in the ever recurring simile, 'Make thy mother's milk resplendent,'" &c.

(To be continued.)

BOOK NOTICES.

LA LANGUE ET LA LITTÉRATURE HINDOUSTANIE EN 1877: Revue annuelle. Par M. Garcin de Tassy, membre de l'Institut, professeur à l'école spéciale des langues orientales vivantes, président de la société asiatique, &c.

The venerable M. Garcin de Tassy has again inaugurated the advent of another year by issuing his *Revue annuelle* of the past. As the first and great event was the Imperial Assemblage of Delhi, some space is allotted to the description of the literary productions connected with it. The chief publications of the year are a canto of the *Rāmāyana* of Tulsi Dās, printed with the greatest care and an accurate translation by Mr. F. S. Growse; the *Adi Granth* of the Sikhs by Dr. Trumpp, consisting of cxxxviii. and 716 pages; the *Grammar of Oriental Hindi* by Dr. A. F. R. Hoernle; and a Hebrew Grammar in Urdu by the late Dr. Warren. These appear to have been the only works published by Europeans, all the others being by natives, except Eastwick's *Kaṭgar-nāma-i Hind*, which, however, is only announced as being in course of preparation.

The Pandit Pyari Lal, well known by his numerous publications, has now issued a complete Urdu translation of the *Bhagwat Purāṇa* in twelve *skandas* or parts. The Hakim Amanat A'li, Rais of Sahāranpūr, has produced a History of the Khalifa—*Tasṭīr al-khulafā*—in Urdu verse, according to the *Futūḥ us-shām* of Wāqidi and other celebrated works. The titles of three works useful to Government servants are:—The *Uṣūl-i-akhḥār-o-Qawānīn*, treating on general principles of law, on civil tribunals, and on police; the *Qānūn-i-rusūm-i a'dālathā-i Hindī*, or Code of usages in the Law Courts of India, and the *Sharḥ-i qānūn-i*

shahādāt, or Explanation on the Law of Testimony.

Some polemical works have also made their appearance, and the most important of them appears to be the *Khutbat-i Ahmadiyah*, or "Addresses of Ahmad," written by the eminent Sayyid Ahmad Khān, who some years ago published an English work under the title of *A Series of Essays on the Life of Muhammad, and subjects subsidiary thereto*. This Urdu work, M. Garcin de Tassy thinks, has for its chief object to refute *The Life of Muhammad* of Sir W. Muir, which has been very well received, and of which a new abridged edition has just come out. According to Sayyid Ahmad, the work of Sir William is based on the recital of Wāqidi, who, he says, is a much-esteemed author, but undeserving of any credit—a somewhat dubious criticism.

The number of books, of all sizes and subjects, is as large as ever, and we must refer the reader desiring to learn their titles, &c. to the *Revue* itself, as there is no other work which summarizes the publications of the whole peninsula. Besides the various notices scattered about in the *Revue*, there are seven special lists, namely,—1st, works printed in the N.W. Provinces; 2nd, in Lakhnau and Oudh; 3rd, in the Panjāb; 4th, books lately published in Calcutta and other towns of Bengal; 5th, in Bombay; 6th, the works of Muḥammad Nusrat A'li Qaṣīr; and 7th, the list of Musulmān polemic works by the same.

Due notice is taken of independent native schools, such as the Aligarh College, Sir Salar Jang's Female College at Haidarābād, and the Pāt-

śākhā of Allahābād established by Nārāyaṇa Singh, for teaching the *Vedas* in Hindustāni; also various associations, such as the British Indian, the Anjuman-i Panjāb, the Sarvajani Sabha of Punā, &c., are commented on.

In the necrology for the past year the first notice respects Mr. A. H. Bleeck, a former pupil of the author's, devoted to Oriental literature, and well known to the Pārsis of Bombay as the author of an English version of the *Zend-Avesta* from the German translation of Dr. Spiegel, made and printed at the expense of Mr. M. H. Cama.—Sir Jang Bahādur, the prime-minister of the Rāja of Nipāl, died on the 25th February 1877; he was personally acquainted with M. Garcin de Tassy.—The Qādi A'bd-ulbāri, President of the Muslimān Literary Society, expired in Calcutta on the 9th April 1877, at the age of 79 years.—The Rev. Dr. R. C. Mather, formerly editor of the *Khair Khwāh-i Hind*, or "Well-wisher of India," died on the 21st April; and on the next day Mr. Allen, the proprietor of *Allen's Indian Mail*, expired.—Miss Mary Carpenter, the philanthropist, well known and remembered all over India, to which she paid no fewer than four visits within a few years before her death, died on the 15th June, aged 71 years.—Almost simultaneously with hers, the death of the Maharāja Rāmanāth Tāgor, the brother of Dwārkanāth, took place at Calcutta, at the age of 77 years. He was a member of the Viceroy's Legislative Council, and a C.S.I.—The death of J. C. Marshman, at the age of 83 years, took place in England, whither he had retired. He is chiefly known by his *History of India*, which has become a text book. He established the first Bengālī journal at Serampūr,—the *Samāchār Darpan*,—as well as the *Friend of India*. On account of his proficiency in several Oriental languages, he was for many years the official translator to the Government of India.—Lastly, Miss Toru Dutt left this world at Calcutta on the 31st April, aged 20 years. She was a poetess of great promise, and, besides the pieces scattered in various periodicals, is known as the authoress of *A Sheaf gleaned from French Fields*. She had just obtained permission from the authoress of *La femme dans l'Inde antique*, or *Woman in ancient India*, to translate it, when she was overtaken by death.—E. R.

THE SAHYĀDRI-KHĀṇḌA OF THE SKANDA-PURĀṆA: a Mythological, Historical, and Geographical Account of Western India. First edition of the Sanskrit text, with various readings. By J. Gerson da Cunha, M.R.C.S. &c. Bombay, 1877.

Our actual knowledge of Pauranic literature is still very fragmentary and unsatisfactory. Of the eighteen chief Purāṇas, only two, the *Vishṇu* and *Bhāgavata*, have hitherto been made accessible through editions published in India, and by the

translations, either complete or partial, of Wilson (and Hall) and Burnouf. Portions of the others, more or less considerable, have, it is true, been published; but it is to be hoped that complete editions will in course of time appear of all of them, to enable us to extract from these texts what useful matter they contain. Though we cannot, perhaps, expect from the as yet unpublished Pauranic literature much actual gain of trustworthy historical and geographical knowledge, we must not forget that these works constitute a by no means unimportant chapter of Sanskrit literature, and that a much fuller acquaintance with them is required to fill up many blanks in the history of religious and speculative thought in India. Of the great mass of separate treatises that claim to form part of the *Skanda-Purāṇa*, the most extensive of these medieval depositories of Brāhmanical lore, comparatively little has hitherto been published. Dr. Haas, in his *Catalogue of Printed Sanskrit Books in the British Museum*, mentions fifteen separate titles under this heading, most of them consisting of single *māhātmyas* or *kāthās* contained on a few leaves. A few more treatises have been noticed and analyzed in Prof. Aufrecht's *Catalogue of the Bodleian Sanskrit MSS.* Under these circumstances Sanskrit scholars cannot but feel grateful to Mr. Da Cunha for his convenient edition of a complete *khāṇḍa* of the work, together with the supplementary *māhātmyas* bearing on the foundation of temples along the Sahyādri range. To Western archaeologists especially the book cannot fail to prove very useful and interesting, and they will look forward with interest to the appearance of the translation which Mr. Da Cunha promises. That the edition cannot be regarded as a critical one, in the strict sense of the word, the editor himself must be quite aware. The various readings of the MSS. announced in the title-page extend only over a small portion of the work: with the exception of one solitary note at p. 369, no *variae lectiones* have been noted from p. 78 to p. 490. There are also a good many mistakes in the text. Thus some couplets of the seventh *adhyāya* at pp. 23 and 24 are unintelligible as they stand; moreover, there seems to be a half-*śloka* wanting somewhere in the beginning,—at any rate the verses from 2 to the end have been wrongly divided: thus the second half-*śloka* of couplets 9-11 should form the first half of couplets, and in each of them *tasmat* should be changed to *yasmā*. If we might venture to make a suggestion to Mr. Da Cunha, we would advise him to go again carefully over his text, and print a list of errata along with his translation. He would thereby do more justice to himself, and save a good deal of trouble to those who make use of his edition.

E.

SANSKRIT AND OLD CANARESE INSCRIPTIONS.

BY J. F. FLEET, B.A., M.B.A.S.

(Continued from p. 192.)

No. XLIV.

THE date that has hitherto been accepted by Sir Walter Elliot and other authorities, for the era of the early Chalukya king Pulikēśī I., is Śaka 411 (A.D. 489-90), based on a copper-plate grant presented by Captain T. B. Jervis, of the Bombay Engineers, to the British Museum. A transcription of this grant is given at Vol. I., p. 9, of the Elliot MS. Collection, and has also been published, with an abstract translation, by Mr. Wathen, at *Jour. R. As. Soc.*, Vol. V., p. 343. The authenticity of this grant has been questioned by Mr. Fergusson and Dr. Eggeling. I now reedit it with the object of dispelling any doubt that may remain as to its being really a fabricated document of comparatively modern date.

The plates are five in number, each about $8\frac{1}{4}$ " long by $4\frac{1}{2}$ " broad. The edges of the plates are raised into rims to protect the writing. Dr. Burnell tells us, at p. 72, para. 4, of his *South-Indian Palæography*, that the earliest instances of this practice belong to the ninth or tenth century. But I find it, accidental or not as the case may be, in the plates of the grant of Vijayabhataṭṭārikā, No. XLI. of this Series, at p. 163 above; and two other sets of the Nerūr grants, which, also, I have no reason for assuming to be forgeries, have very decided raised rims, undoubtedly intentional. The ring on which they are strung is about $\frac{1}{2}$ " thick and $3\frac{1}{2}$ " in diameter. It has the appearance of not having been cut; but, as both photographs and casts have been taken of these plates, it must have been cut and very carefully joined again. The seal of the ring is oval, and has the representation of a boar, facing to the proper right. I have no information as to where the plates were found, except that it was somewhere in the Southern Marāṭhā Country, or in the Kaṇṇāṭaka.

The grant gives the genealogy of Pulikēśī, from his grandfather Jayasimha, and his father Raṇarāga. In ll. 7-9 occurs the passage, *Jayasimhasya rāja-simhasya sūnuḥ . . . Raṇarāgō bhavat*,—from which Sir Walter Elliot, at *Madr. Jour. of Lit. and Science*, Vol. VII., p. 200, deduced, but doubtfully, 'Rājasimha' as a second name of Raṇarāga. If *rāja-*

simhasya had to be interpreted as a proper name at all, it would be a title of Jayasimha, not of Raṇarāga.

The grant then mentions a feudatory of his, Sāmiyāra, of the Rundranīla-Saindraka family, who was his governor for the Kuṇḍi district. It then purports to record that Sāmiyāra built a Jain temple at the city of Alaktakanagara, which was the chief town of a circle of seven hundred villages in that district, and, with the permission of the king, made grants of certain lands and villages to the temple on the occasion of an eclipse of the moon on the day of the full-moon of the month Vaiśākha in the Vibhava *samvat-sara*, when the Śaka year 411 had expired.

It is just possible that Śaka 411 is the correct date for Pulikēśī I. But I am inclined to doubt even this. For, he was succeeded by his son Kirttivarmā I.; and he, again, by his younger brother Maṅgalīśvara, at whose death the succession went back to Pulikēśī II., or Satyāśraya, the son of Kirttivarmā I. I know of no other inscription purporting to be of the time of Pulikēśī I., and of none of the time of Jayasimha, Raṇarāga, or Kirttivarmā I. Of the time of Maṅgalīśvara, there is only one that bears a date,—the stone-tablet inscription in Cave No. III. at Bādāmi, my transcription and translation of which are published at Vol. IV., p. 363. It is dated in the twelfth year of his reign, "when Śaka 500 had expired." This makes his reign commence in Śaka 488 or 489. Of his successor, Pulikēśī II., again, there are two inscriptions with dates;—one, a copper-plate grant, No. XXVII. of this Series, at Vol. VI., p. 72, dated in the third year of his reign, "when Śaka 534 had expired"; and the other, the stone-tablet inscription at the Mēguṭi temple at Aihole, No. XIII. of this Series, at Vol. V., p. 67. When I published this latter inscription, I took the date of it to be "when Śaka 506 had expired"; but, for reasons that I shall explain on a future occasion, I now hold, and will show, that it is dated "when Śaka 556 had expired", and that Pulikēśī II. did commence to reign in Śaka 531 or 532. From the mention in l. 8 of the Aihole inscrip-

tion of a *chhatra-bhaṅga*, or 'interruption of the succession',—lit. 'a breaking of the umbrella (of sovereignty)',—it would seem that a period of anarchy ensued between the death of Maṅgalīśvara and the accession of Pulikēśī II. But it follows, from the above dates, that Maṅgalīśvara reigned for at least forty years. He cannot, therefore, have been much over thirty years of age, if indeed so old, when he succeeded. Taking him to have been then thirty years old, he was born in Śaka 458. And then, even if we assume that Pulikēśī I. was not more than twenty years of age when he succeeded, and that Śaka 411—the date of the present grant—was the very year of his accession, it follows that he was at least sixty-seven years old when his second son, Maṅgalīśvara, was born to him. And this, I apprehend, is hardly probable.

But, apart from any such argumentative reason, there are substantial grounds for disputing the date assigned to Pulikēśī I.—1, The plates are more numerous, and the language is more prolix, than is usual in grants of this early date.—2, The name of the dynasty is written 'Chālukya', in l. 5, with the vowel of the first syllable long. Whereas, in all genuine grants of early date, it is written either 'Chalukya', or 'Chalikya' and 'Chalukya', with the vowel of the first syllable short. Now, Sir Walter Elliot, in his paper *On Hindu Inscriptions at Madr. Jour. of Lit. and Science*, Vol. VII., p. 193, tells us, and on ample authority, that from the middle of the eighth to about the middle of the tenth century A.D., "the power of the Chalukyas was alienated for a time, or suffered a partial obscuration." It was restored in the person of Tailapa II., in Śaka 895 (A.D. 973-4) or thereabouts. And I find from inscriptions that, unless metrical reasons required the use of the form 'Chalukya', he and his successors are always called 'Chālukyas', and that this form of the name is peculiar to them. There seems, too, to have been a special reason for this; inasmuch as 'Chālukya' means 'the descendant of a Chalukya', this second derivative form points, not only to a temporary eclipse of the Chalukya power, but also to an actual break in the direct line of hereditary succession.—3, In l. 15, Pulikēśī I. is called 'Satyāśraya-Pulakēśī', and, in l. 31, he is called simply

'Satyāśraya.' In no other inscription is this title applied by itself to anyone anterior to Pulikēśī II., who, as we learn from the Aihole inscription, was the first to acquire the name. And only in No. XXVII. of this Series, transcr. l. 5, is it elsewhere applied to Pulikēśī I. at all; and it is coupled there with his own proper name, and, I suspect, is introduced by the writer without any authority, save that it was one of the titles of the similarly-named grandson, Pulikēśī II.—4, The mention of the horse Chitrakaṇṭha, in l. 11, is at variance with all the other inscriptions, which tell us that it was Vikramāditya I. who was the owner of "a horse of the breed called Chitrakaṇṭha", or "of an excellent horse named Chitrakaṇṭha."—5, The mention of the Kuhnūḍi district in l. 22 is another anachronism. For in l. 27 of No. II. of my *Raṭṭa Inscriptions at Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc.*, Vol. X., p. 194, we are told that it was the Raṭṭa Great Chieftain Kārtavīrya I., about Śaka 970, who, "when king, fixed the boundaries of the country of Kuhnūḍi"; and I have not found this district spoken of in any other early inscription.—6, This grant is dated in the Vibhava *samvatsara*. By the *Tables* in Brown's *Carnatic Chronology*, the Vibhava *samvatsara* would be Śaka 410,—quite near enough for the purpose. But, let the time at which the cycle of sixty *samvatsaras* was first devised and used by astronomers be what it may, the cycle was not in use in public documents in the Chalukya kingdom at the date to which these plates purport to belong. The earliest instance of its use that I have met with is in an Old Canarese inscription on stone at Nandwāḍige in the Kalādgi District; part of the name of the king, and the word expressing the centuries in the date, are unfortunately effaced, but I shall show hereafter that it is an inscription of the Rāshtrakūṭa king Dhāravarsha-Kalivallabha, or of his son Gōvinda-Prabhūtavarsha or Gōvinda III., and that the date of it is Śaka 722, the Dundubhi *samvatsara*. The earliest indisputable instance to which I can refer is an Old Canarese copper-plate grant of the Rāshtrakūṭa king Gōvinda III., dated Śaka 727, the Subhānu *samvatsara*; the original plates belong to Sir Walter Elliot and are now with me, and a transcription of

the first plate is given by Dr. Burnell at p. 88 of his *South-Indian Palæography*. I am inclined to think, *en passant*, that it was the Râshtrakûṭa kings who first introduced the use of this cycle into the Chalukya dominions.—7, Śaka 411 is A.D. 489-90. Mr. Burgess informs me, as the result of calculation, that no lunar eclipse such as that spoken of occurred in A.D. 489, 490, or 491.—8, The almost invariable use of *l*, whenever it can be used in the place of *l̥*, is quite opposed to ancient orthography, and is in itself a strong indication of the modern composition of the inscription.—And finally, 9, The characters, instead of belonging to the fifth century A.D., are fully developed Old Canarese characters of at least the tenth or eleventh century A.D. I have no published fac-

simile to which I can refer for purposes of comparison. But, out of the unpublished materials that I have on hand, the characters of this grant resemble most nearly the characters of two grants of the Chôḷa successors of the Eastern Chalukya dynasty; one is a grant of Râjarâja II., dated Śaka 944, and the other is a grant of Kulôttuṅga-Chôḷa-deva II., dated Śaka 1056. Among all the inscriptions of the Western dynasty, I can find none with the characters of which those of the present grant may suitably be compared.—In fine, I place the composition of this document at certainly not earlier than the tenth century A.D.

I have not succeeded in tracing on the map the localities referred to in the grant.

Transcription.

First plate.

- [¹] Svasti || Jayanty=ananta-saṁsâra-pârâvâr-aika-sêtavah Mahâvîr-âha(rha)taḥ=pûtâś=charaṇ-
âmbu-
[²] ja-rêpavaḥ || Śrîmatâm viśva-viśvambhar-âbhisaṁstûyamâna-Mânava-sagôtrâṇâm Hârîti-
[³] putrâṇâm sapta-lô(lô)ka-mâtrîbhis=sapta-mâtrîbhir=abhivarddhitânâm Kârttikêya-
parirakṣaṇa-prâ-
[⁴] pta-kalyâṇa-paramparâṇâm bhagavan-Nârâyana-prasâda-samâsâdita-varâha-lâṁchh-
[⁵] n-êkṣaṇa-kṣaṇa-vaśîkṛit-âśêsha-mahîbhṛitânâm (sc. °bhṛitâm) Châlukyânâm kulam=
alâṁkarishuḍḍi || sva-bhuj-ô-
[⁶] pârjita-vasundharasya nija-yasâś-śravana-mâtrêṇ=aiv-âvanata-râjakasya kîrtti-patâ-
[⁷] k-âvabhâsita-dig-antarâlasya Jayasîmhasya râja-sîmhasya sūnus=sūṇṛita-vâ-
[⁸] g=anavarata-dân-âdrîkṛita-karas=sura-gaja iva prasama-nidhis=tapô-nidhir=iva dri-
[⁹] pta-vairishu prâpta-raṇa-râgô Raparâgô bhavat [||*] Tasya ch=âtma-jê svamêdhat-
âva(sc. °mêdh-âva)bhṛita(tha)-snâna-pavi-
[¹⁰] trîkṛita-gâtrê pranata-para-nṛipati-makuta-tata-ghatita-batan-mani-gaṇa-kirana-vâr-ddhâ-
[¹¹] râ-dhanta-chârṇa-charaṇa-kamaḷa-yugalê Chitrakaṇṭh-âbhîdhâna-turamgama-kaṇṭhîravêṇ=
ôtsâri-
[¹²] t-ârâti-stambhêrama-maṇḍalê varṇ-âsrama-sarvva-dharma-paripâḷana-parê Gaṁgâ-
Sêtu-madhyâ-
[¹³] vartti-dêś-âdhîśvarê śakti-traya-pravarddhitâ-prâjya-sâmrâjyê Gaṁgâ-Yamunâ-
pâli-

Second plate ; first side.

- [¹⁴] dhvaja-dadakk-âdi-paṁcha-mahâśabda-chihṇê karadîkṛita-Chôḷa-Chêra-Kêraḷa-Sîmhala-
Kalîm-
[¹⁵] ga-bhûpâlê daṇḍita-Pândy-âdi-maṇḍi(ṇḍa)likê a-pratisâsanê Satyâśraya-Śrî-
Pulakêśy-a-
[¹⁶] bhîdhâna-prithivîvallabha-mahârâj-âdhirâjê prithivîm=êk-âtapatram śâsati
sati [||*] Râjâ Rundra-
[¹⁷] nîḷa-Saindraka-vamśa-śasâṁkâyamânaḥ=prachaṇḍa-dôr-ddaṇḍa-maṇḍita-maṇḍal-âgrô Goṇḍa-
nâma-
[¹⁸] sît [||*] Aya-naya-vinaya-sampannas=tauayô sya ssa(sa)mara-rasa-rasikas=
Sivâr-âkhyayâ
[¹⁹] khyâtaḥ [||*] Putrô sya bhûtâ(tô) dhâtri-tîḷakâyamânaḥ=parâkram-âkrânta-vairi-
nikurumbaḥ

- [²⁰] avāryya-vīryya-samanvitah kār̥y-ākār̥y-ya-nipūṇah Hanūmān=iva Rāma-
 [²¹] sy=ābhirāmasya tasya bhṛityas=satya-sandhō dhārm̥mikas=Sāmiyāras=sambhūt [||*]
 Sa tat-prasā-
 [²²] da-samāsādita-Kuhundi-vishayas=tam paripā[la*]yam tad-antarbhūt-Ālaktak-ābhidhāna-
 nagaryya(ryyām)
 [²³] grāma-saptaśata-rājadhānyām=asēsha-vishaya-viśēshakāyamānāyām śāli-vrih-
 ikshuvana-cha-
 [²⁴] naka-priyamgu-varak-ōdāraka-ēyāmāka-gōdhūm-ādy-anēka-dhānya-samṛiddhāyām tad-dēsa-
 [²⁵] vilāsini-mukha-kamalam=iva virājamānāyām dhana-dhānya-paripūrṇa-kṛishivāla-
 [²⁶] prāyāyām || Aindryām diśi Mahēndr-ābhah=prāsādam pravaram=mabat
 Jinēndr-ā-

Second plate; second side.

- [²⁷] yatanam bhakty-ākārayat=su-manōharām || Prōttunga-prāsādam Tribhuvana-
 tilakam Ji-
 [²⁸] nālayam pravaram nānā-stambha-samuddhṛita-virājamānam chiram jagati || Śaka-nrip-
 ābdēshv=ē-
 [²⁹] kādas-ōttarēshu chatuś-śatēshu vyatītēshu Vibhava-samvatsarē pravarttamānē || Kṛitē cha
 Jināla-
 [³⁰] yē | Vaiśākh-ōdita-pūrṇa-punya-divasē Rāhō(hau) vidhau(dhōr) maṇḍalam
 ślēshvēndērtthika¹-majjanād=u-
 [³¹] pagata(tam) snēhād=griham bhūbhujam Śrī-Satyāśrayam=āśrayam guṇavatām vijñāpayā-
 [³²] m=āsa sa taj-Jainālaya-pūjan-ōchita-nuta-kshētrāya dharmma-priyā(yah) || Āyu-
 [³³] r=jjanmavatām=idam nanu tadi(di)t-sandhy-ēndrāchāp-ōpamam jñātvā dharmma-ma(dha)n-
 ārjjanam budha-ja-
 [³⁴] nair=mmārtya(rtyai)h=phalam manyatē ity=ēvam pravibōdhyā sabhya-janatām Satyāśrayō
 vallabhō bha-
 [³⁵] ktyā taj-Jina-mandir-ōpama-kriyē kshētram dadau śāsanam || Vaiśākha-paurṇamāsyām
 Rāhan vi-
 [³⁶] dhu-maṇḍala(lam) pravishṭavati Śrī-Satyāśraya-nripatis=tribhuvana-tilakāya dattavā[n*]
 kshētram ||
 [³⁷] Kanakōpaḷa-sambhūta-vṛiksha-Mūlagan-a(ā)nvayē bhūtas=samagra-rāddhāntas=Siddha-
 nandi-mu-
 [³⁸] n-īśvarah || Tasy=āsīt=prathamās=śishyō dēvatā-vinuta-kramah śishyaih=pañcha-satair=
 yukta-

Third plate; first side.

- [³⁹] ś=Chitak-āchāryya-sa(sam)jñitah || Śrīmat-Kākōpaḷ-āmnāyē khyāta-kīrttir=bahu-śrutah
 lakshmivā-
 [⁴⁰] n=Nāgadēv-ākhyās=Chitak-āchāryya-dikshitah || Nāgadēva-gurōś=śishyah=prabhūta-guṇa-
 vāridih
 [⁴¹] samasta-sāstra-sambōdhi(dhi) Jinanandih=prakīrttitah || Śrīmad-vividha-rājēndra-
 prasphuran-makut-ā-
 [⁴²] libhīh nighṛishṭa-charan-ābjāya prabhavē Jinanandinē || Jinanandy-āchāryya-sūryyā-
 [⁴³] ya duśchara-tapō-viśēsha-nikashōpaḷa-bhūtāya samadhigata-sarvva-sāstrāya naga-
 [⁴⁴] rāms=taḷa-bhōgāmś=cha pradadau [||*] Tatra taḷa-bhōga-simāny-āha [I*] Chaityālayād=
 vāyavyām
 [⁴⁵] diśi tatākam tatō riju-sūtra-kramēṇa paśchim-ābhimukham gatvā patnam tasya madhyē
 [⁴⁶] nikhāta-pāshānam tasmād=dakshīṇ-ābhimukham=anu-patham gatvā pravāham tasyam(sya)
 madhyē nikhāta-pā-
 [⁴⁷] shānam pūrvv-ābhimukham gatvā tūntriṇika-vṛiksham yāvat=tasmād=uttar-ābhimukham
 gatvā pūrvv-ō-

¹ Probably the correct reading should be *ślēshvē nvarthika-mojjanād*.

- [⁴⁸] kta-tatākam | yāvat=sthitam ōtan=nagara-nivēśana-kshētram [|*] Tatra tala-bhōga-
kshētra-sīmāny=āha [1*]
[⁴⁹] Nagarasya dakshinasyām diśi sētu-bandhāt=prabhṛity=anu-jala-vāhaḥ pūrvv-
ābhimukham ga-
[⁵⁰] tvā yāvad=anūchhika-kshētram tat-pāschima-simni nikhāta-pāshānam yāvat=tasmād=
anu-sīm=ō.

Third plate; second side.

- [⁵¹] ttar-ābhimukham gatvā yāvach=chhami-valmīkam tasmāt=punah=pūrvv-ābhimukham
gatvā yāvat
[⁵²] sthala-giri tasmāt=punar=anu-giryy=uttar-ābhimukham gatvā yāvad=girēr=uchcha-
pradēśam tasmāt
[⁵³] pāschim-ābhimukham gatvā yāvad=giri tasmāt=pāschim-ābhimukham gatvā yāvat=
ta(stha)la-giri
[⁵⁴] tasmād=dakshin-ābhimukham gatvā yāvat=sētu-bandhana(nam) sthitam rāja-manēna
pañchāśat n(sc. °śad-n)ttara-
[⁵⁵] nivarttana-satam tala-bhōga-kshētram chatus-simā-viruddham || Narindaka-nāma-
grāma(mē) nairṛityām
[⁵⁶] diśi Narindaka-Sāmarivāda(ḍa)-grāma-pathi madhya-varṭti-Singatēga-tatākā-
[⁵⁷] d=riju-sūtra-kramēna Narindaka-grāma-patham yāvat=tāvat=sthitam chatvārimśat
[⁵⁸] ni(sc. °śan-ni)varṭtanam kshētram dakshina-diśi rāja-mānēna || Kīṇayige-nāma-grāmē pū-
[⁵⁹] rvasyām diśi aśīti-nivarttanam kshētram rāja-mānēna Piśāch-ārāmām=nairṛityām
[⁶⁰] diśi yāvach=chham i-jhāta-valmīkam tasmāt=pūrvv-ābhimukham gatvā yāvat=patham
tasmā-
[⁶¹] dakshin-ābhimukham gatvā yāvat=sthala-giri tasmāt=pāschim-ābhimukham=anu-stha-
[⁶²] la-giri gatvā yāvach=chhami-sthalaḥ tasmād=uttar-ābhimukham gatvā yāvach=chha-
[⁶³] mi-jhāta-valmīkam sthitam chatus-simā-viruddham || Pantiganage-nāma-grāmē

Fourth plate; first side.

- [⁶⁴] nairṛityām diśi mānyasya kshētra uttarasyām diśi chatvārimśat(n)-nivarttanam kshētram
rāja-mā-
[⁶⁵] nēna pāschimām(masyām) diśi sthala-giri tasmād=anu-simam pūrvv-ābhimukham gatvā
yāvach=chhami-
[⁶⁶] valmīkam tasmād=dakshin-ābhimukham gatvā Kōmarameche-grāma-sima tasmāt=pū-
[⁶⁷] rvv-ābhimukham=anu-simam gatvā yāvaj=jala-vāhaḥ tasmād=uttar-ābhimukham=a-
[⁶⁸] nu-vāhaḥ gatvā yāvach=chhami-jhāta-valmīkam tasmāt=pāschim-ābhimukham gatvā
[⁶⁹] yāvat=tatāk-ōttara-kōḍi(?) tasmād=dakshin-ābhimukham=anu-sthala-giri
[⁷⁰] gatvā yāvat=tāvat=sthitam chatus-simā-viruddham || Maṅgali-nāma-grāma-
[⁷¹] pāschima-diśi rāja-mānēna chatvārimśat(n)-nivarttanam kshētram tasya simā
[⁷²] ny=āha sthala-girēr=pāschim-ābhimukham=anu-patham gatvā yāvad=Rūvika-grāma-si-
[⁷³] ma tasmād=uttar-ābhimukham=anu-sima gatvā yāvat=sthala-giri tasmāt=pūrvv-ābhi-
[⁷⁴] mukham=anu-sthala-giri gatvā yāvat=sthala-giri tasmād=dakshin-ābhimukham=
anu-
[⁷⁵] sthala-giri gatvā sthitam chatus-simā-va(vi)ruddham || Karandige-nāma-
grāma(mē) pa-

Fourth plate; second side.

- [⁷⁶] śchimasayām diśi Chandavura-Paṇdarīgavalli-nāma-grāma-mārgga-madhyē aśvattha-
[⁷⁷] tatākā(kād) vāyavyām diśi rāja-mānēna pañcha-viṃśati-nivarttanam kshētram ||
[⁷⁸] Dāvanavalli-nāma-grāma(mē) pāschimasyām diśi Alaktaka-nagara-Kumba-
[⁷⁹] yija-nāma-grāma-mārgga-madhyē Bimbālaya-Piśāch-ārāmāt=pāschimē rā-
[⁸⁰] ja-mānēna chatvārimśat(n)-nivarttanam kshētram || Punar=api tasminn=ēva grāma(mē)
dakshi-

- [⁵¹] nasyām diśi Himṅtī-tatākād=uttara-samīpa-sthaṁ rāja-mānēna śa-
 [⁵²] taṁ ni(sc. śata-ni)varṭtanam kshētram || Nandinige-nāma-grāma(mē) pūrvvasyām
 diśi Bara-
 [⁵³] vulika-sīma-Śrīpura-mārgga-madhyē rājamānēna chatvārīṁsat(n)-nivarṭtanam kshētram ||
 [⁵⁴] Śrīpattī-nāma-grāma(mē) paśchimasyām diśi Śrīpura-mārggatō dakṣiṇatō rāja-
 [⁵⁵] mānēna chatvārīṁsat(n)-nivarṭtanam kshētram || Arjunavāda(da)-nāma-grāma(mē) pa-
 [⁵⁶] śchimasyām diśi Śrīpura-mārggatō uttaratō rāja-mānēna pañchāśat(n)-niva-
 [⁵⁷] rṭtanam kshētram || Grāma-nāmāny=āha || Kumbayīja-dvādaśasy=ō(ā)ntaḥ Rūvikō nāma

Fifth plate.

- [⁵⁸] grāmāḥ prathamāḥ || Sāmarivādo(dō) nāma grāmāḥ dvitīyāḥ || [Badhamāle-dvādaśasy=āntaḥ
 [⁵⁹] Laṭṭivādō(dō) nāma grāmāḥ tri(tri)tīyāḥ || Śrīpura-dvādaśasya madhyē Pellidakō nāma
 [⁶⁰] grāmāḥ chaturtthaḥ || Ity=ētē chatvārō grāmāḥ chatuḥ-simā-va(vi)ruddha-kshētrāḥ
 [⁶¹] sōdraṅgāḥ sa(so)parikarāḥ a-chāta-bhaṭa-pravēśyāḥ [|*] Tad=āgāmibhir=asmad-vaṁ-
 [⁶²] śyair=anyais=cha rājabhir=āyur-aiśvaryyā[dī*]na(nā)m=bi(vi)lāsitaḥ=achhirāmśu-chaṁ-
 [⁶³] chaḥam(la)m=avagachchadbhir=ā-chandr-ārka-dhar-ārṇava-sthiti-samā(ma)kāla(lam)
 yaśam(śa)ś=chi-
 [⁶⁴] chi(chi)shubhiḥ sva-datti-nirvviśēshaṁ paripālaniyam=uktam cha Manv-ādibhiḥ ||
 [⁶⁵] Bahubhir=vvasudbā bhuktā rājabhiś(s)=Śa(sa)ka(gā)r-ādibhir=yyasya yasya yadā
 bhūmim(mih) tasya
 [⁶⁶] tasya tadā phaḥam | Svam dātum sumahad(ch)-śa(chha)kyam duḥkham=anyatra(sya)
 pālanaṁ dānaṁ vā pāla-
 [⁶⁷] nam śrēyō śrēyō dānasya pālanaṁ || Sva-dattam(ttām) para-dattam(ttām) vā yō
 harēti(ta) va-
 [⁶⁸] sundharām shashtīm varsha-sahasrāpi viśṭhāyām jāyatē krimiḥ ||

Translation.

Hail! Victorious are the pure particles of pollen of the lotuses which are the feet of the Arhat Mahāvira²,—which are the sole bridge for crossing from bank to bank of (the ocean of) endless existence!

The son of Jayasimha,—that lion of a king, who adorned the family of the Chālukyas, who are glorious, and who are of the lineage of Mānavya which is praised over the whole earth, and who are the descendants of Hārīti, and who have been nourished by seven mothers who are the seven mothers of mankind, and who have attained an uninterrupted continuity of prosperity by the protection of Kārttikēya, and who have had all kings made subject to them on the instant at the sight of the sign of the Boar which they acquired through the favour of the holy Nārāyaṇa; and who acquired the earth by his own arm; and who had kings bowed down before him by simply hearing of his fame; and who irradiated the intermediate spaces of the regions with the banner that was his fame,—was Raṇarāga, of true yet pleasing speech, whose hands were moistened by his ceaseless

charities, thus resembling the elephant of the gods, whose trunk is moistened by the ceaseless flow of his rut; who, like an austere devotee, was the receptacle of tranquillity; and who acquired a fondness for war against his proud enemies.

And while his son, the favourite of the world, the Great King, the supreme king, who was named Satyāśraya-Śrī-Pulakēśi,—whose body was purified by ablutions performed after celebrating horse-sacrifices; and whose beautiful feet, which were like lotuses, were cleansed by the trickling drops of water which were the rays of the many sparkling jewels that were set in the diadems of the hostile kings who bowed down before him; and who drove away the troops of elephants of his enemies by a very lion of a horse that was named Chitrakantḥa; and who was intent on preserving all the regulations of the (four) classes and the (four) stages of life; and who was the supreme lord of the country lying between the (river) Gaṅgā and the Bridge (of Rāma); and whose mighty universal sovereignty was increased by (his possession of) the three regal attributes; and who possessed

² The last of the twenty-four Jain teachers of the present age.

the signs of the banners of the Gaṅgā and the Yamunā and the sword-edge, and the five great sounds of the *Daḍakka*³ and other (musical instruments); and who made the kings of Chōḷa and Chēra and Kēraḷa and Siṃhala and Kaḷiṅga to pay tribute; and who punished the Pāṇḍya and other chieftains; and whose commands were unresisted,—was governing the earth under one umbrella;—

There was a king named Goṇḍa, who was the moon of the family of Rundranīla-Saindraka, and whose scimeter was adorned by his mighty arm. His son,—who was endowed with good fortune and skill in polity and modesty, and who delighted in the flavour of war,—was renowned by the appellation of Sivāra. His son was the truthful and pious Sāmiyāra, who was the forehead-ornament of the earth,—who attacked the assemblage of his enemies with his prowess,—who was possessed of bravery that could not be withstood,—who was well versed in what things should be done and what should not be done,—and who was the servant of him, (*Pulakēśī*), as Hanūmān (*was the servant*) of Rāma.

Having acquired the district of Kuṇḍi through his favour,—while governing it, he, who was as glorious as Mahēndra, in his piety caused to be made an excellent and large and very charming temple, a shrine of Jinēndra, in the east quarter, in the city which was named Alaktaka and was included in that (*district*); and which was the chief town of (*a circle of*) seven hundred villages; and which was the glory of the whole district; and which abounded in *śāli*-rice and *vrihi*-rice and groves of sugar-canes and chick-peas and *priyaṅgu*-plants and *varaka*-beans and *udāraka*-grain and *śyāmāka*-grain and wheat and many other kinds of grain; and which shone like the lotus which is the fan of the lovely woman which is that district; and which was full of husbandmen who abounded in wealth and grain.

The excellent shrine of Jina (which was thus constructed),—that very lofty temple, (*named*) 'the ornament of the three worlds', decorated with many columns,—(*endures*) for a long time in the world.

³ I do not find this word in the dictionaries. But Monier Williams gives *dhakka*, 'a large or double drum'; and Sanderson gives the same, and also *ḍakka*, *ḍakki*, or *ḍakke*, 'a small drum, shaped like an hour-glass.'

And this shrine of Jina having been built,—when four centuries and eleven (*years*) had elapsed in the years of the Śaka king; while the Vibhava *samvatsara* was current; on the holy day of the full (*moon*) of (*the month*) Vaiśākha; when Rāhu had closed upon the orb of the moon,⁴,—he, who was fond of religion, asked the king, Śrī-Satyāśraya, the asylum of virtuous people, who through friendship had come to his house, for a field fit for the worship of that shrine of Jina.

Having known that the life of those that are born is (*transient*) like the lightning and the evening rainbow, and having impressed on his courtiers that the acquisition of religion and wealth is esteemed the (*only true*) reward by wise people, who are but mortal,—the lord Satyāśraya in his piety bestowed a field (*and*) a charter, worthy of that shrine of Jina. On the day of the full-moon of (*the month*) Vaiśākha, when Rāhu had entered the orb of the moon,—the king, Śrī-Satyāśraya, gave a field to 'the ornament of the three worlds.'

In the lineage of the (*sect called*) Mūlagaga, a tree which sprang from Kana-kōpaḷā⁵, there was born that lord of saints, Siddhanandi, who possessed (*a knowledge of*) all demonstrated truths. His first disciple was Chitakāchārya, whose observances were praised by the gods, and who was attended by five hundred disciples. He, whose name was Nāga-dēva,—who was renowned in the traditions of the glorious Kā-kōpaḷa; and who possessed much (*knowledge of*) sacred lore; and who enjoyed good fortune,—was initiated by Chitakāchārya. The disciple of the preceptor Nāga-dēva was the famous Jinanandi, who was a very ocean of meritorious qualities, and who was acquainted with all the sacred writings.

To the excellent master Jinanandi, whose feet, which were as lotuses, were chafed by the glittering diadems of many glorious kings, (*who bowed down before him*),—to Jinanandi, a very sun among *Āchāryas*, who was the touchstone by which to test the value of penances that were hard to be performed, and

⁴ *Nārttika-majjant*, or perhaps *navartika-majjant*, l. 30; meaning not apparent.

⁵ This must be the founder of the sect.

who had mastered all the sacred writings,—he gave towns and the enjoyment of sites of land.

There he declares the boundaries of the (*right of*) enjoyment of sites of land.—On the north-west of the *Chaitya*-hall, there is a tank. Going in a straight line to the west from there, there is the road, in the middle of which there is a stone set up. Going to the south from that, along the road, there is a stream, in the middle of which there is a stone set up. Going to the east (*from that*), as far as a tamarind-tree, and then going to the north, there is the tank mentioned above. That which is thus situated is the field of the entrance of the village.

There he declares the boundaries of the fields (*which are the objects of the right*) of enjoyment of sites of land.—Starting from the bridge on the south of the city and going along the stream to the east as far as the gleaning-field, on the west boundary of it there is a stone set up. From that, going along the boundary to the north, there is an ant-hill near a *śamī*-tree. From that, again, going to the east, there is the *sthaḷa-giri*.⁶ From that, again, going to the north along the hill, there is the high part of the hill. From that, going to the west as far as the hill (*extends*), and then to the west as far as the *sthaḷa-giri*, and then to the south, (*we come to the place where*) the bridge stands. (*Thus is constituted*) the field (*which is the object of the right*) of enjoyment of a site of land, (*measuring*) one hundred and fifty *nivartanas* by the royal measure, and encompassed by its four boundaries.

At the village of *Narindaka*, in the south-west quarter, (*there was given*) a field, (*of the measure of*) forty *nivartanas* by the royal measure, in the south quarter, encompassed by its four boundaries, and constituted (*by a boundary-line drawn*) up to the road to the village of *Narindaka* in a straight line from the *Siṃgātēga* tank, which is in the centre of the roads to the villages of *Narindaka* and *Sāmarivāḍa*.

At the village of *Kiṇayige*, in the east quarter, (*there was given*) a field (*of the measure of*) eighty *nivartanas* by the royal measure, encompassed by its four boundaries, and lying thus:—At the south-west of the grove of the

*Piśācha*⁷, there is an ant-hill at a clump of *śamī*-trees. From that, going to the east as far as the road, and then to the south as far as the *sthaḷa-giri*, and then to the west, along the *sthaḷa-giri* as far as the place of the *śamī*-trees, and then to the north, (*we come*) to the ant-hill at the clump of *śamī*-trees.

At the village of *Pantigaṇage*, in the south-west quarter, and in the northern quarter of the *mānya*-field, (*there was given*) a field, (*of the measure of*) forty *nivartanas* by the royal measure, encompassed by its four boundaries and constituted thus:—On the west there is the *sthaḷa-giri*. Going along the boundary to the east from that, as far as the ant-hill near a *śamī*-tree, and from that to the south as far as the boundaries of the village of *Kṣmarāñche*, and from there along the boundary to the east as far as the stream, and from that along the stream to the north as far as an ant-hill near a clump of *śamī*-trees, and from that to the west as far as the northern weir⁸ of the tank, and from that to the south along the *sthaḷa-giri*.

In the west quarter of the village of *Mañgali* (*there was given*) a field, (*of the measure of*) forty *nivartanas* by the royal measure. He declares the boundaries of it. Going to the west from the *sthaḷa-giri* along the road as far as the boundary of the village of *Rūvika*, and from there to the north along the boundary as far as the *sthaḷa-giri*, and from there to the east along the *sthaḷa-giri* as far as the *sthaḷa-giri* (*extends*), and from there to the south along the *sthaḷa-giri*,—(*thus is it*) situated, and encompassed by its four boundaries.

In the village of *Karandige*, in the west quarter, (*there was given*) a field, (*of the measure of*) twenty-five *nivartanas* by the royal measure, on the north-west of the tank of the *āvattha*-tree between the roads to the villages of *Chandavura* and *Pandarigavaḷli*.

In the village of *Dāvanavaḷli*, in the west quarter, (*there was given*) a field (*of the measure of*) forty *nivartanas* by the royal measure, on the west of the grove of the *Piśācha*, *Bimbālaya*, between the roads to the city of *Alaktaka* and the village of *Kumbayija*. And again, in that same village, in the south quarter, (*there was given*) a

⁶ *Sthaḷa-giri*, 'a hill on the plain', perhaps denotes one of those isolated masses of heaped-up boulders that are to be found all over the black-soil fields in the eastern part of the Dhārwar District, and probably still further inland.

⁷ The name of a class of demons.

⁸ If the reading is *kōḍi*, it is the Canarese word meaning a 'weir, outlet of a tank.' If the reading is *kōḍi*, the translation will be 'the northern edge, i.e. bank.'

field (*of the measure of*) one hundred *nivartanas* by the royal measure, situated close to the north of the *Hingutitank*.

In the village of *Nandinige*, in the east quarter, (*there was given*) a field (*of the measure of*) forty *nivartanas* by the royal measure, between the boundary of (*the village of*) *Baravulika* and the road to (*the village of*) *Śrīpura*.

In the village of *Siripaṭṭi*, in the west quarter, (*there was given*) a field (*of the measure of*) forty *nivartanas* by the royal measure, to the south of the road to (*the village of*) *Śrīpura*.

In the village of *Arjunavāḍa*, in the west quarter, (*there was given*) a field (*of the measure of*) fifty *nivartanas* by the royal measure, to the north of the road to the village of *Śrīpura*.

He declares the names of the villages.—The first village is *Rūvika*, in the *Kumbayija* Twelve. The second village is *Sāmarivāḍa*. The third village is *Laṭṭivāḍa*, in the *Badhamāḷe* Twelve. The fourth village is *Pellidaka*, in the *Śrīpura* Twelve. These four villages (*were given*), together with their fields encompassed by the four boundaries, and with the *udraṅga* and the *uparikara*, and not to be entered by irregular or regular troops.*

This grant should be preserved as long as the moon and the sun and the earth and the ocean endure, just as if it were a grant made by themselves, by future kings, desirous of acquiring fame, whether they are of my lineage, or whether they are others,—bearing in mind that the charms of life and riches, &c. are as transient as the lightning! And it has been said by *Manu* and others:—Land has been enjoyed by many kings, commencing with *Sagara*; (&c.)! It is very easy to give one's own property, but the preservation of (*the grant of*) another is difficult, (&c.)! He is born as a worm in ordure for the duration of sixty thousand years, (&c.)!

No. XLV.

Sir Walter Elliot's date of Śaka 514 (A.D. 592-3) or 515 for the accession of the Western Chalukya king *Vikramāditya I.* is based on a copper-plate grant, said to have been discovered in digging the foundations of the house of a *Kuḷkarni* at *Kurtakōṭi* in the *Gadag Talukā* of the *Dhārwaḍ District*, and

presented by him to the Royal Asiatic Society. In the genealogy at *Jour. Madr. Br. R. As. Soc.*, Vol. VII., p. 199, he gives Śaka 514 as the commencement of his reign. In describing the grant, at *id.*, p. 201, he writes, "It bears date the thirty-second [year] of his reign, Śaka 530; and his accession is thus fixed as having occurred in [Śaka] 515." The first part of this statement is owing to some confusion on the part of his Pandit in interpreting the date. In a footnote to the latter passage, he speaks of it again, and as being dated "in Śaka 530, on the eighth day of the sixteenth royal victorious year." Dr. Burnell, again, has given the first side of this grant as Plate xxii. in his *South-Indian Palaeography*, and, in transcribing it, at p. 87, has entered the date as A.D. 608, which would be Śaka 530. The real date, as will be seen from the facsimile and transcription, ll. 20-21, is "when Śaka 532 had expired, in the sixteenth year of his victorious reign."

I have obtained the original plates to edit from. Only two plates are forthcoming; the third, probably the last, is missing. They are rather thick plates, not very regularly shaped, and with several flaws in the copper; they measure about 12" long by 5½" broad. They have a peculiarly high and broad raised rim to protect the writing. The ring connecting them had been cut before it came into my hands; it is about ½" thick, and 3½" in diameter. The seal, which is very massive, is square,—about 1¼" each way; it has the representation of a boar facing to the proper left, with the sun and moon above it. Through some mistake the seal properly belonging to the grant of *Rājaraḍja II.* has been printed off with the facsimile of these plates. A facsimile of the right seal will be supplied hereafter.

It is unnecessary to offer a full translation of so inaccurate and mixed-up a document as this is; and there are, in fact, several passages in it of which no sense can be made at all. I shall confine myself to giving an abstract of its contents. Down to the commencement of the details of the alleged grant, in l. 20, it follows, or rather tries to follow, the corresponding portion of the other copper-plate inscription of *Vikramāditya I.* already published, No. XXVIII. of this Series, at Vol. VI., p. 75. It

* *A-chōta-bhata-pravēṣyāḥ*. The meaning of this term is disputed. I follow the translation given by Dr. Bühler at *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. VI., p. 71.

first mentions Pulikêśi I. or Polekêśi-Vallabha, as he is here called; then his son, Kîrttivarmâ I.; then Satyâśraya, *i.e.* Pulikêśi II., the son of Kîrttivarmâ I.; and finally Vikramâditya-Satyâśraya, or Vikramâditya I., the son of Pulikêśi II. It then purports to record that, when five centuries and thirty-two years of the Śaka era had expired, on Sunday, the day of the new-moon between the months Vaiśâkha (April-May) and Jyaishtṥa (May-June), under the constellations Rôhîṇî and the Great Bear, when the sun was in the sign of the Bull, and at the time of a total¹⁰ eclipse of the sun, Vikramâditya I., in the sixteenth year of his reign, while residing at the city of Kisuvôl, ¹¹ bestowed upon Raviśarmâ of the sect called Basari-saṃgha and the Agastya *gôtra*, the son of Jayaśarmâ who was the son of Mâdhavaśarmâ, the village of Kûrutakûṇṭe, ¹² which was in the Belvola country and in the centre of the seven villages of Beneyitavura, Anṇigere, Ittage, Pasundi, Muguli, Paranti, and Mulgundu.

According to this inscription, therefore, the reign of Vikramâditya I. commenced in Śaka 516 or 517.

But I reject it entirely, as a forgery and of no authority, on the following grounds.—1, The date is completely at variance with the dates of all the other early Western Chalukya inscriptions. For, Pulikêśi II., the father of Vikramâditya I., commenced to reign in Śaka 531 or 532, as in No. XXVII. of this Series, at Vol. VI., p. 72, and was still reigning in Śaka 556. And Vinayâditya, the son of Vikramâditya I., commenced to reign in Śaka 600 or 601, by Nos. XXIX., XXX., and XXXI., at Vol. VI., pp. 85, 88, and 91, and by the Fourth Part of No. XXXIX., at p. 111 above, which is probably dated in the *seventh* year of his reign. And Vijayâditya, the son of Vinayâditya, commenced to reign in Śaka 617, 618, or 619, by the Second Part of No. XXXIX., and by three unpublished inscriptions that I have in hand. And Vikramâditya II., the son of Vijayâditya, commenced to reign in Śaka 654 or 655, by the Third Part of No.

XXXVIII., at p. 101 above.—2, As in the case of the forged grant of Pulikêśi I., published immediately above, the name of the dynasty is spelt, in l. 4, 'Châlukhya', *sc.* 'Châlukya', with the vowel of the first syllable long.—3, The word *ba-trîṃśa*, 'thirty-second', used in expressing the date, is a hybrid word, part Prākṛit and part Sanskrit, and I have not found an analogous instance of such a word in any other early grant.—4, Whereas Śaka 532 is A.D. 610-11, Mr. Burgess informs me, as the result of calculation, that no solar eclipse did occur, on the date given, in A.D. 610, 611, or 612.—5, The language and orthography are far more inaccurate than I have ever yet found to be the case in any other grant of early date. But this, of course, might by chance be due to the ignorance or carelessness of a copyist or the engraver.—And finally, 6, In the letters *ja*, except in l. 1, and *ga* and *ka*, an attempt is made to imitate the ancient forms. But, with this exception, the characters are fully developed Old Canarese characters of at least the ninth or tenth century A.D. And I have to draw especial attention to the fact that, except in the words *paramêśvara*, once in l. 7 and twice in l. 8, and *turaṅgamêna*, in l. 9, there is used for the letter *ma* a character which, with the corresponding forms of *ya* and *va*, is purely mediæval. The earliest genuine instance in which I have found this form of the *ma* used is the copper-plate grant of the Râshtrakûṭa king Gôvinda III. spoken of above,—*e.g.*, in *para-dattam=bâ*, *sc.* *para-dattâm vâ*, l. 14, Pl. II. b. The corresponding forms of *ya* and *va*,—the former, however, not very clear,—may be seen in the Munôli stone-tablet inscription, Pl. LXXIV. of Mr. Burgess' *Second Report*, in *Balligereyal*, l. 55, and *Bainnivûral*, l. 56.

After rejecting the present plates, we have no dated inscription of the time of Vikramâditya I. Consequently, and because we do not know how long his father, Pulikêśi II., continued to reign, and whether his elder brother, Chandrâditya, did actually reign or not, his date cannot be determined with much certainty. I would place him, however, somewhere about Śaka 580 (A.D. 658-9). We have not to search far, I think, for the reason

¹⁰ The literal reading in the text is *sarvamâsi(st)-bhâtâ*, 'lasting for a whole month.' This, of course, is only a mistake for *sarvagrasî-bhâtâ*, 'swallowing or engulfing all', which is the usual expression for a total eclipse.

¹¹ The Pattada-Kisuvôl of other inscriptions, and the modern Pattadakal on the banks of the Malaprabhâ in the Bâdâmi Tâlukâ of the Kârdgi District.

¹² The modern Kurtakôti.

[illegible]

why there is no dated inscription of his time, and why probably none such will be found. For, as I have previously had occasion to point out, Nos. XXVIII. to XXXI. of this Series indicate very plainly that, after Pulikēśī II., the succession was interrupted by the hostility of the Pallavas of Kāñchī, and by a confederacy of the three kings of Chōḷa and Pāṇḍya and Kēraḷa, and that, at least, Vikramāditya I. did not immediately succeed his father, but was ousted for a time. The authority of him and of his elder brother,

Chandrāditya, must have been confined, at the best, to the country of the Koṅkaṇas. Both Vikramāditya I., and his son, carried on the war against these enemies. But, though Vikramāditya I. seems to have been to a certain extent successful, it was probably not till the time of Vinayāditya that the Western Chalukya power was thoroughly restored, and the kingdom consolidated again, in such a way that the head of it could refer to any specific date as the commencement of his reign.

Transcription.

First plate.

- [¹] Jayaty=āvishkṛitām Vishṇōr=vvārāha(ham) kshōpi(bhi)t-ārṇṇavan=dakṣiṇ-ōnnata-
dram(dam)shṭr-āgrām(gra)-viśrāntām(ṇta)-bbuvanaṁ vapuḥ [||*] Śrīmatām sa-
[²] kaḷa-bhuvana-[sam*]stūyamāna-Mānavya-sagōtrāṇām Hārīti-putrāṇām sapta-lō[ka*]-
mātrībhis-sapta-mātrībhir=abhiva-
[³] rddhitānām Kārtti(rtti)kēya-parirakṣhaṇa-prāpta-kalyāṇa-paraniparāṇān=Nārāyaṇa-prasāda-
sama(mā)sādītānām(sc.°sādita)-varāha-lāmcha(chha)-
[⁴] n-ēkṣhaṇa-kṣhaṇa-vaśa-vaśīkṛit-āsēsha-mahābṛitanām(sc.°bṛitām) Chāḷukhyā(kyā)nām
kulam=alaṅkarishṇōr=aśvamēdh-āvana-padēpadē Gaṅgā-ja-
[⁵] la-snāna-pavitrikṛita-ghā(gā)trasya Śrī-Polekēśī(sī)-Vallabha-mahārāj-ādi(dhi)rāja-
paramēśvara-paramabhaṭṭāraka[sya*] [pautrasya*] para(rā)-
[⁶] kram-a(ā)krānta-Ba(va)nava(vā)sy-ādi(di)-para-nṛpati-maṇḍala-praṇī(ṇi)baddha-viśuddha-
[kirttēh*] Kirtti(rtti)varmma-śrī-pṛithu(thi)vivallabha-mahārāj-a(ā)-
[⁷] di(dhi)rāja-paramēśvara-paramabhaṭṭāraka[sya*] putraḥ(trasya) samara-saṁsa(sa)kta-
sakaḷ-ōttara(rā)path-ēśvara-Śrī-Harīsha(harsha)varddhana-parāj-
[⁸] y-ōpalabdha-paramēśvara-parama-nāmadhēyasya Satyāśraya-śrī-pṛithu(thi)vivallabha-
mahārāj-ādi(dhi)rāja-paramē-
[⁹] śvarasya pṛi(pri)ya-tanayaḥ Chitrakāṇṭa(ṇṭha)-pravara-turāṅgamēṇ=aikēn=aiva
pratītā(prēritō?) nēka-samara-mukhē ripu-nṛpati-rn-
[¹⁰] dhira-jala-svādana-rasa-nāya-māna-jvalana-niśita-nistṛimśa-dhārā(ra)ya(yā) da(a)vabhṛita-
dharanīdhara-bhu-

Second plate; first side.

- [¹¹] jaṅga-bhōga-sadṛīsa-nija-bhuja-vijita-viju(ji)gīshu(shuḥ) ātma-kavacha-
mavady(sc. magn)-ānēka-praha(hā)rah sva-guru-śrī(śrī)yā(ya)m=avani-
[¹²] pati-tritay-āntarita(tā)m=āta(tma)sāta(tkṛi)tya kṛit-ē(ai)ka(kā)dhishṭhit-a(ā)sēsha-rājya-
cha(bba)rah tasmin rājya-trayō(yē) rāṇa-si(sī)rasi ripu-narēndra(ndrān) di-
[¹³] śi [diśi*] jītvā sa(sva)-vaṁśa-lakṣmīm(kṣhmīm) prāpta[vān*] paramēśvaranā(tā)m=
a[ni*]dhā(vā)rita-Vikramādityam=(tyaḥ) [||*] =a(ā)pi ta(cha)
mṛidita-Narasimgha(ha)-yaśēnā(yaśasā) vihita-Ma-
[¹⁴] hēndra-pratāpa-vilayēna nayana-vijit-ēśvara-raṇa-praṇṇa-Śrī-Vallabhēna jita(tab) kṛita-
Pallav-āvamarddana(nō) dakṣiṇā(ṇa)-dit(g)-ya-
[¹⁵] vatim=āpta[vān*] Kaṁch-īsa-kayōnvaśōmasiravayān=api sutarām Śrī-vallabhatvam=
itaḥ vahati śramalavanta
[¹⁶] rē(ra)ṇa-rasika-śrīyāgurupara-skandha(udhē) yō rājamalla-sē(śa)bda-vihita-mahā-Pallava-
kula-nāśaḥ [||*] Durilamgha(ghya)-
[¹⁷] dusva(sta)ra-vinē(bhē)da-visāla-śāla(lā) durnāma(durggāḍha)-dusṭha(sta)ra-bṛihat-
pariṇita(parikhā)-pari(rī)tā [a*]bhrā(grā)hi yēna Jayatēśvara-pōta-rāja-

- [¹⁸] Kārch=ivara(sc. īva) dakṣhiṇa-diśaḥ kṣhitipēna [kārchī*] [||*] Vikram-a(ā)krānta-sakaḷa-mahimaṇḍal-ādi(dhī)rājya(jyō) Vikramāditya-Satyā-
 [¹⁹] śrē(śra)ya-śri-prithu(thi)vivallabha-mabārāj-ādi(dhī)rāja-paramēśvara(rah) sarvva=ēva
 ājñā-

Second plate; second side.

- [²⁰] payati [| *] Viditam=astu sō(vō) smābhi(bhiḥ) ba-trimś-ōttara-pañcha-śatēshu
 Sa(śa)ka-varshēshv=ā(a)tītēshu vijaya-rājya-
 [²¹] samba(mva)checha(tsa)ra-shōsha(ḍa)śa-varshē pravarttamāna(nē) Kisuvolai-mahā-
 nagara(rē) vikhyāta(tē) sthitvā tasya Vaiśākha-Jē(jyai)shthā(shthā)-māsa-ma-
 [²²] dhyam-a(ā)ma(mā)vāsyā(syā)-Bhāskara-dinē Rōbiṇya Rī(Rōbiṇy-Rī)kshē madhy-āhna-
 kālē Vikra[mā]dityasya ātmā cha ātma-vinīte nāma
 [²³] mahā-dēvi(va)tayōḥ(yō)r=nbhayōr=Vṛishabha-rāsau tasmin Vṛishabha-rāsau sūryya-
 grā(gra)hāṇa(nē) sarvva-mā(grā)si(sī)-bhūtē gavās(gāvas)=cha nara(rā)-
 [²⁴] ś=cha na charanti tavandhā(?nvā)madbhūtn sarvva-jiva-diśā-mu(?)davabhavuh
 mahāvismam cha asthamānavabhavuh iti ga-
 [²⁵] vām grāma(mam) praviśanti tasmāt tadā kālē śrēshṭi-sēnāpati-sachiva-nētāḥ
 kumāra-pārtti(rtthi)v-ānikam=a-
 [²⁶] dhyaksha-sahitam tadā Basuri-saṅgham=A(saṅgh-Ā)gasthi(stya)-gōtra(trasya) Sāmavēda-
 pāragsya tasya Mādhavasa(śa)rmma(rmma)(nāḥ
 [²⁷] tasya putrasya(sya) Jayaśarmmanah tasya pri(pri)ya-tanaya(yāya) shāshāṅga(shaḍaṅga)-
 vidē Raviśarmmanah(nē) tasya(tasmai) Vikramāditya(tyāḥ) pūrvva-
 [²⁸] m=udakam pāda-prakshālanaṁ kṛtvā Śrī-Belvola-vishay-ābhyantara(rō) Beneyitavuraṁ
 Annigere Ittāge
 [²⁹] Pasuṇḍi Muguḷi Paranti Mulgundu ētēshām saptama(sapta)-grāma(mānām)
 madhya-sthitē Śrī-Kūrutakūṇṭe-grāma(mē) nāmasya
 [³⁰] tasya adēyam dattam [||*] Dhā(dha)rmma-yaśō-vṛishdhi(dhī)r=astu [||*] Dānam=
 atty(ty)-uttaram śrī(śrī)y-āyur(yū)-rājya-varddhanam śrī-yuktam [||*] Tasya tadā

NOTES ON THE *KURRAL* OF THE TAMIL POET TIRUVALLUVAR.

BY G. U. POPE, D.D., M.R.A.S., and of the German Oriental Society, and Fellow of the Madras University.

No. I.

The name 'Kurral' is given *par excellence* to a very celebrated poetical composition in the Tamil language consisting of 133 chapters, each containing 10 couplets or *kurraḷs*. It thus numbers 2660 lines.

Kurral means 'anything short'; (✓ *kurr*, S. ✓ *krit*, Lat. *curt-us*, Gr. *kers*. A. S. *scor-t*), and is properly the name of the couplet, as being the shortest species of stanza in the Tamil language.

Tiruvalluvar's poem is thus by no means a long one; though in value it far outweighs the whole of the Tamil literature, and is one of the select number of great works which have entered into the very soul of a whole people, and which can never die. According to a custom not unknown in Europe, a series of verses bearing the names of all the great Tamil poets is prefixed to the *Kurral* under the name of 'The garland of Tiruvalluvar,' and exhausts

the subject of his excellence with every variety of hyperbole.

Several of these are neat. One says that as Vishṇu, when he appeared as Vāmana or the dwarf, strode in two steps over heaven and earth, so with the two lines of his diminutive verse has Tiruvalluvar transcended the universe.

Complete in itself, the sole work of its author, it has come down the stream of ages absolutely uninjured, — hardly a single various reading being found, — and every rival sect in the Tamil country claims the *Kurral* as its own.

Meanwhile Tiruvalluvar furnishes another illustration of the saying that the world knows nothing of its greatest men. The name even of the great bard is unknown, for *tiruvalluvar* means sacred priest, and is simply his title, as priest of the Pariah class. Tradition makes him the son of a Brāhman father and a low-caste woman, and represents the poetess

A v v a i as his sister, while several other poets, a few of whose verses are preserved, were his brothers. There is no foundation for these stories. He certainly was a Pariah, lived at St. Thomé, or Mayilâpûr, and appears to have had an intimate friend, probably a patron, called Elêla-Sing an, a sailor.

He is said to have composed his *Kurral* at the request of his neighbours, that the Tamil people might have a *Vêdam* of their own. It was doubtless intended to become the authority on all ethical subjects for the Tamil country. The author must have already possessed a great reputation, or this request would not have been made; yet there are no traces of any other writings of his.

The *Kurral* when finished is said to have been taken by its author to Madurâ, where there was a college of learned Tamil scholars. Lists are given of the forty-eight members of this academy, but there are no genuine remains of their writings. The result of the appearance of Tiruvalluvar is variously stated. The general idea is that the high-caste assembly would not permit him to take his seat on the bench with the learned paṇḍits, on account of his want of caste, but that, meekly acquiescing in his own exclusion, he simply requested permission to lay his book on the end of the seat. On this being granted, the book was placed where the poet should have been seated, and the whole bench at once disappeared, leaving the learned professors afloat in the Lotus-tank. This story is inconsistent with the idea, which is equally prevalent, that the president was Kapilar, himself a Pariah, and a brother of Tiruvalluvar.

The truth seems to be that the southern school of Tamil literature was supreme till the advent of the St. Thomé poet, whose fame eclipsed that of the southern sages.

There are no data whatever which may enable us to fix the period at which our poet flourished. I think between A.D. 1000 and 1200 is its probable date. The style is not archaic—far less so than that of the *Śivaga Chintāmaṇi*. Remembering that its author was not fettered by caste prejudices, that his greatest friend was a sea-captain, that he lived at St. Thomé, that he was evidently an ‘eclectic,’ that Christian influences were at work in the neighbourhood, and that many passages are strikingly Christian in

their spirit, I cannot feel any hesitation in saying that the Christian Scriptures were among the sources from which the poet derived his inspiration. I think that even Muhammadan influences are not to be excluded.

The edition published by the late Dr. Graul, in Leipzig and in London, in 1856, is likely to be in the hands of all who care to read this paper. Dr. Graul has incorporated Beschi's Latin translation.

Mr. F. W. Ellis, an Oriental scholar of extraordinary ability, a member of the Madras Civil Service, printed a large portion of the *Kurral* with copious notes and illustrations. The sheets of this unfinished work can still be had. The Rev. W. H. Drew, a missionary of the London Society in Madras, published an edition with the Tamil commentary of Parimēlaṟagar. This is the best edition.

The purely native editions issued under the editorship of the late learned paṇḍit Sarvaṇaparamālayar of Madras are very correct and valuable.

Twelve native commentators have illustrated by verbal commentaries the whole text; but the student will do well to disregard the meanings read into the verses by persons, native or European, who are anxious to prove that the Tamil sage taught their own favourite dogmas.

Tiruvalluvar is generally very simple, and his commentators very profound.

In regard to the philosophico-theological system taught in the *Kurral* various opinions have naturally been held. Of course every Hindû sect claims the great poet, and strives to interpret his verses so as to favour its own dogmas. The Jainas especially claim him, and he has used several of their terms. He seems to me to have been cognizant of the latest developments of that system.

Dr. Graul's account of the spirit of the work is fair and accurate. He says: “The *Kural* breathes throughout the atmosphere of Buddhism, or rather Jainism, although the Brâhmanas have thought fit to appropriate it to themselves, by making Tiruvalluvar an incarnation of Śiva.

“The monotheism taught in it is that of the later Buddhists or Jainas, who acknowledged an Âdibuddha or Âdîśvara, called sometimes even Âdîdēvan, ‘primordial god.’ Nothing is said about the dignity of Brâhmanas, who are

not even mentioned by their exclusive official name; the real greatness of man is independent of birth, and rests on purely moral grounds. Among the four Brāhmanical stages of life we see only those of the householder and of the ascetic treated of; the Brāhmanical pantheon retreats to the background, and, when made to advance on the stage, sometimes appears in the garb of allegorical figure, and sometimes even is lightly spoken of. Besides, the poet lavishes praise beyond measure on the ascetic life; absolute abstinence from destroying any animal life in a direct or indirect way (*ahinsā*) is enforced; only general rules for moral conduct are given, while no mention is made of any special caste-rules. Such is the character of the *Kuraḷ*, and every single feature of it testifies to its essentially Buddhistic or Jainistic spirit."

There is one couplet, however, that is quite destructive of the idea that Tiruvalluvar was a Jaina. In ch. III., fourth couplet, a story regarding Indra is referred to as proving that ascetics have power over the gods. The sage was Gautama, who cursed Indra for deceiving the sage's wife, Ahalyā. Now according to Jaina ideas a sage could have no wife, nor could he feel the emotion of anger, nor had he the power to inflict punishment. A Jaina would not believe the story, nor use it as the author of the *Kurraḷ* has done.

Dr. Caldwell says: "The *Kuraḷ* contains no trace of the distinctive doctrines of Śaṅkara Ācārya. It teaches the old Sāṅkhya philosophy, but ignores Śaṅkara's additions and developments, and would therefore appear to have been written before the school of Śaṅkara had risen to notice, if not before Śaṅkara himself, who lived not later than the ninth century.

"There is no trace in the *Kuraḷ* of the mysticism of the modern Paurāṇic system; of *Bhakti*, or exclusive, enthusiastic faith in any one deity of the Hindū pantheon; of exclusive attachment to any of the sects into which Hindūism has been divided since the era of Śaṅkara; or even of acquaintance with the existence of any such sects. The work appears to have been written before Śaivism and Vaiṣṇavism had been transformed from rival schools into rival sects; before the *Purāṇas*, as they now stand, had become the text-books of Hindū theology; and whilst the theosophy of the early Vedānta

and the mythology of the *Mahābhārata* comprised the entire creed of the majority of Hindūs. The author of the *Kuraḷ* is claimed with nearly equal reason by Śaivas, Vaiṣṇavas, and Jainas. On the whole the arguments of the Jainas appear to me to preponderate, especially that which appeals to the Jaina tone that pervades the ethical part of the work:—e.g., scrupulous abstinence from the destruction of life is frequently declared to be the chiefest excellence of the true ascetic. Nevertheless from the indistinctness and undeveloped character of the Jaina element which is contained in it, it seems probable that in Tiruvalluvar's age Jainism was rather an esoteric ethical school than an independent objective system of religion, and was only in the process of development out of the older Hindūism."

These reasons led the learned writer to assign to the *Kurraḷ* a date not later than "the ninth century A.D." He adds, however, that "the reasons for this conclusion are rather negative than positive."

To my own mind the internal evidence is all in favour of a much later origin. I understand that Śaṅkara's chief work (as appears from the only real authority on the subject, the *Śaṅkara digvijaya*) was, in the words of Dr. H. H. Wilson, to secure "the recognition of Brahme Para Brahme as the sole cause and ruler of the universe." He left other things untouched. I know of no other doctrines taught by him which Tiruvalluvar could have recognized than this, which is implied throughout the *Kurraḷ*. Tiruvalluvar's teaching is just such as the study of Hindūism, in the light of Śaṅkara's reforms, combined with that of the Jaina system in its later developments, and of the *Bhagavadgītā*, might have produced.

There is no trace in the *Kurraḷ* of many things current in South India at different periods, because, I suppose, they had been eliminated from the sage's own eclectic system of faith and practice, and because his work is didactic, and not controversial.

I cannot subscribe to the statement that "it teaches the old Sāṅkhya philosophy;" for I find in it no hint of *puruṣa* or of *prakṛiti*, or anything that looks like a reproduction of any of the Aphorisms of Kapila. What philosophy he teaches seems to me to be rather of the eclectic school as represented by the *Bhagavadgītā*.

Of *Bhakti*—that compound of *πίστις* and *δύαμις*, the introduction of which into India I think (with Weber) is due to the influence of Christianity—the first chapter of the *Kurral* is a beautiful exposition.

These topics will be further illustrated when we proceed to the consideration of the text itself.

The *Kurral* owes much of its popularity to its exquisite poetic form. A *kurral* is a couplet containing a complete and striking idea expressed in a refined and intricate metre. No translation can convey an idea of its charming effect. It is truly an 'apple of gold in a network of silver.' Something of the same kind is found in the Latin elegiac verse. There is a beauty in the periodic character of the Tamil construction in many of these verses that reminds the reader of the happiest efforts of Propertius. Probably the Tamil sage adopted it as being the best representative in Tamil of the Sanskrit *śloka*.

The brevity rendered necessary by the form gives an oracular effect to the utterances of the great Tamil 'Master of the sentences.'

The choice of the most difficult metre in the language for a long work showed that the author intended to expend upon it his utmost of power, and to make it a 'possession for ever,' a 'delight of many generations.'

Of the laws of this metre, as a great curiosity, and as being quite unique in prosody, I will try to give the English reader some general ideas. I venture to refer the student of Tamil to my *Third Tamil Grammar* for a more complete exposition. In the *Clavis humaniorum litterarum sublimioris Tamulici idiomatis*, by the great Beschi, the whole subject of Tamil poetry is discussed. Dr. A. C. Burnell, M.C.S. (among his very many benefactions to Oriental learning), has issued a reprint of this valuable work, which is most faithful to its native sources, some of which I have printed in my *Third Grammar*.

A. The feet admissible in the *kurral* metre are called—

- | | | |
|-----------------------------|---------|----------------------|
| I. 1. <i>tēma</i> | — — | a spondee. |
| 2. <i>puḷimā</i> | υ υ — | an anapaest. |
| II. 3. <i>kūvilam</i> ... | — υ υ | a dactyl. |
| 4. <i>karuvilam</i> ... | υ υ υ υ | a proceleusmaticus. |
| III. 5. <i>tēmāngāi</i> ... | — — — | a molossus. |
| 6. <i>puḷimāngāi</i> . | υ υ — — | an ionicus a minore. |

IV. 7. *kūvilangāi* . — υ υ — a choriambus.

8. *karuvilangāi* υ υ υ — the same with first long resolved.

V. The last foot in the second line of a *kurral* may be

9. *nāli* : a single long syllable.

10. *kā su* : the same with a very short *ū*.

11. *mālār* : a pyrrhic.

12. *pūpū pū* : the same with a very short *ū*, hardly sounded at all.

B. Of these feet the former line of the *kurral* contains three, which may (observing the proper sequence—see I. below) be any of those numbered 1—8; the latter line consists also of three feet, of which the last must be one of the short feet numbered 9—12.

C. Classical ideas of *arsis*, *thesis*, and *ictus* must be dismissed; each metrically short or long syllable is simply pronounced, without any accent, a slight pause marking the end of each foot. The voice lingers on the long syllable, and hurries over the short, but with no inflexion or emphasis, except that of the tune or chant.

D. There must be no *cæsura*: in no part of a line can the end of a word coincide with the middle of a foot. Very closely related words—words in construction with one another—may be taken as one word; but every foot is, with this explanation, a single word.

E. The difficulty arises that a word may consist of three short syllables, or of a long syllable followed by a short (*trochee*). What feet are these? The former is *puḷimā*, the latter *tēma*: every *tribrach* is treated as a *dactyl*, and every *trochee* as a *spondee*—the single short syllable is lengthened in the pause.

The first *kurral* of Tiruvalluvar transliterated runs thus:

āgārā' | mūdālā | ērūt' ellām; | ādi
pāgāvān | mūdāttē | ūlāgū |

This is scanned—

puḷimā | puḷimā | pulimāngāi | tēma
puḷimā | puḷimā † pirappu |

The rhythm is anapestic.

F. Syllables are not generally long or short, in Tamil, by position; the vowel alone counts.

G. Tamil verse has a rhyme at the beginning, never at the end—a peculiarity found in some Celtic poetry.

H. There must also be, in general, an assonance or alliteration in each line, as in Saxon and Scandinavian poetry. To this the Tamil

car is very sensitive. This has many rules, with which I need not weary the reader.

Here the first foot begins with *a* and the third with *ā*, which is a sufficient assonance.

I. There still remains to be considered the *talai* (= bond, S. *dhar*, L. *firm-us*), or sequence of feet.

The rule for this is: "The two feet ending in *mā* (1, 2) must be followed by a foot beginning with a short syllable (2, 4, 6, 11); the other feet (3-8) must be followed by a foot beginning with a long syllable (1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 10)."

This gives an inexhaustible variety to the rhythms.

THE EDIFICE FORMERLY KNOWN AS THE CHINESE OR JAINA PAGODA AT NEGAPATAM.

BY SIR WALTER ELLIOT, K.C.S.I.

Till within the last few years there was to be seen on the Coromandel coast, between one and two miles to the north of Negapatam, a tall weather-beaten tower, affording a useful landmark to vessels passing up and down the coast. It went by various names, as the *Puduvēli-gōpuram*, the old pagoda, Chinese¹ pagoda, black pagoda, and in the map of the Trigonometrical Survey (sheet 79) it stands as the Jeyna (Jaina) pagoda. But save in name it has nothing in common with Hindu or Muhammadan architecture, either in form or ornament. Tradition is silent as to its origin or purpose, and, although it has been the subject of frequent speculations, no satisfactory theory has been formed to account for it.

In the year 1846 I took a sanitary trip on board the Government steamer *Hugh Lindsay*, ordered down the coast to touch at several ports on the public service, which gave me an opportunity of seeing the great temple at Rāmesvaram and other places of interest. On the way back we touched at Negapatam for treasure, and I gladly embraced the occasion to pay a hasty visit to the old pagoda. I found it to be a somewhat four-sided tower of three stories, constructed of bricks closely fitted together without cement, the first and second stories divided by corniced mouldings, with an opening for a door or window in the middle of each side. At the top of the lowest story were marks in the wall, showing where the floor of the second had been fixed. The top was open. The base of the ground-story was worn at the angles, from collision with passers-by and cattle, but the structure was solid and firm. No trace of sculpture or inscription was visible.

Hard by, in a small building, I found several French Jesuits, who had established themselves on some waste ground near the tower when the Order was expelled from the French territory at Pondicherry some time before. On my expressing surprise at their scanty accommodation, the superior—a gentleman-like, intelligent man—informed me that they intended to build a college on the same site, of which the apartments I saw formed a part, and he showed me a plan and elevation of an extensive building which they hoped to complete in time, and meanwhile all their work was constructed in subordination to the general plan.

Before returning on board I met a sergeant of the Department of Public Works, a good draughtsman, who undertook to make a sketch of the tower for me. (*Fig. 2.*) This I showed afterwards to Col. Yule, who has introduced it into the first edition of the *Travels of Marco Polo* (vol. II. p. 273, 1871).

Several years later—in 1859—the Jesuit Fathers presented a petition to the Madras Government representing the tower to be in a dangerous condition, and requesting permission to pull it down and appropriate the materials to their own use. This was referred to the local officers, and soon afterwards (in June 1859) a report was received from Captain Oakes, the District Engineer, who stated that the building was an old ruin, crumbling to decay, which did not deserve the name of an ancient monument, for it had neither sculpture nor inscription, and the tops of the doorways and windows had been supported by timber, which was still remaining in some places.² He therefore recommended that an estimate of Rs. 400 which had been

¹ It is mentioned under this (*Pagood China*) name by Valentyn (1725), vol. vii. p. 21.

² That this circumstance does not militate against the antiquity of the building is proved by the preservation

of the timber remaining in the Kārlē cave, where the climate has not the dryness of the coast of Coromandel. See Mr. Fergusson's remarks, *Hist. Ind. Arch.*, pp. 119 and 120, note.

sanctioned for its repair should be cancelled, and the building demolished.

Against this proposal, being then in Council, I protested; and the Governor, intending shortly to visit the southern districts, agreed to suspend the issue of final orders until he should have an opportunity of seeing it himself.

Meantime I left India, and Sir Charles Trevelyan went to Negapatam. He does not appear to have been impressed with a high opinion of the antiquity of the structure, and considered that any expenditure on its repair would be a waste of public money. At the same time he did not concur in the recommendation for its demolition, but directed that it should be fenced round with an enclosure, to secure it from wilful injury, and that good photographs should be taken of it in its present condition.

These orders were never carried out, owing to obstructions thrown in the way of their execution by the Jesuit missionaries,³ and the building remained *in statu quo* until 1867, when the Fathers renewed their application for leave to remove it, on the following grounds⁴: "1st, because they considered it to be unsafe in its present condition; 2nd, because it obstructed light and sea-breeze from a chapel which they had built behind it; 3rd, because they would very much like to get the land on which it stood; and 4th, because the bricks of which it was built would be very useful to them for building purposes."

The Chief Engineer, who meanwhile had himself examined the edifice, and had directed the District Engineer to prepare a small estimate for its repair, reported that the first only of the above reasons had any weight, and that it would be met if Colonel O'Connell's estimate, prepared under his own orders, received the sanction of Government. He therefore recommended that this should be given, and the tower allowed to stand, since, he added, "there is no doubt that it is used as a landmark

for vessels approaching the Negapatam roadstead."⁵ The Master Attendant of the port, however, was of opinion that the inconvenience would be diminished by sighting the five white columns at Nagore, four miles further north, but, he added, "the native population objected to its removal, and if it be ordered would petition against it."

The Chief Engineer's proposal did not meet with approval, and on the 28th August 1867 the following order was made on the Jesuits' petition:—"The Governor in Council is pleased to sanction the removal of the old tower at Negapatam by the officers of St. Joseph's College, at their own expense, and the appropriation of the available material to such school-building purposes as they appear to have in contemplation."

The Fathers were not slow in availing themselves of this permission. The venerable building was speedily levelled, and the site cleared. Some time afterwards, when Lord Napier visited Negapatam, they presented him with the bronze image represented in Fig. 3 of the plate, which had been found in making excavations connected with the college. It represents a Buddhist or Jaina priest in the costume and attitude of the figures in wood and metal brought from Burma. A band encircles the neck, and the lobes of the ears are pendent and elongated, as if by wearing heavy earrings. The hands are open, the right upraised, the left turned down, as if in the act of preaching. On cleaning the pedestal some ancient Tamil characters were discovered, occupying the greater part of the front and right sides, which are represented in the plate as Fig. 4. These have been deciphered by Dr. Burnell, who writes—"The inscription is Tamil of the 12th century, or perhaps the beginning of the 13th. It runs *Seasti śrī* [This] *Āgamapaṇḍita* [dedicated] *Uyyakkonda Nāyak*. There are only two words, the first in the 2nd (accusative) case, the second in the 1st (or nominative) case. The meaning is plain; but who was

³ Chief Engineer's Report, para. 4, in Cons. 28th Aug. 1867.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 7.

⁵ From the last edition of Horsburgh's *Sailing Directory*, 1874, p. 458, it appears that Negapatam being now the terminus of the Great South Indian Railway, the trade, which was before considerable, has greatly increased, bringing a large number of ships and steamers to the roadstead. The anchorage is from 1½ to 2 miles off shore, the flagstaff bearing W. or W. ½ S. in 6 or 7 fathoms. To the south of the anchorage is an extensive shoal of hard sand or stones, with a depth of 19 to 24 feet water. It is between

6 and 7 miles in length, running N. and S., and from 8 to 4 miles distant from the shore. Ships bound to the north must not come into less than 7½ fathoms until the Negapatam flagstaff or the Black Pagoda bears NW. by W. The town lies to the N. of the Fort near the entrance into a little river; and about 1½ miles NNW. from the fort stands the old Black Pagoda, which is one of the most conspicuous objects in approaching this part of the coast, the whole of which has a low, drowned aspect when first seen from the offing, consisting as it does of a sandy, barren soil planted with coconut trees; &c. &c.

Āgama paṇḍita? I took the image some years ago to be Buddhist. There was, however, a Śaiva teacher Umāpatiśivāchārya, also called Sakalāgama paṇḍita, and it may represent him."

It can hardly be doubted that the statuette is connected with the character of the building, and the purpose for which it was erected. Now the general aspect of the figure, the loose mantle, the crisp *chevelure*, the conical head-ornament, the pierced and elongated ear-lobes, savour strongly of a Buddhist (or Jaina) origin,⁶ which would imply a corresponding relation between the structure and that faith. Granting this, it may be set down as a Vihāra, or as a memorial of some holy man.

I did not omit to consult Mr. Fergusson on the subject, but he finds a difficulty in pronouncing a decided opinion from a mere sketch without plan or measurements, and adds, "The only buildings I know in India at all like it are the tombs of the Jaina priests at Muḍubidri (*Hist. of Ind. Arch.*, p. 275, woodcut 154). If it be not a tomb I do not know what it is."

The fate of this "interesting building," as Col. Yule calls it, strikingly illustrates the importance of forming an Archæological Survey Department for the Madras Presidency, as has been done for every other part of India and for Ceylon. It cannot be supposed that the Government would have thus ruthlessly consigned to destruction a monument unique of its kind, which had never been carefully examined by a competent observer, if they had been aware of its claim to protection. Nor is this a solitary example. The work of demolition is daily going on, and too late it will be found that other precious relics of the past have been lost for ever through simple ignorance of their value.

I am convinced, from my own observation, that if this one had only been left to itself it would have stood for years. All that was wanted for its protection was to enclose it with a substantial wall, at the cost of a few rupees, to hinder cattle and passing vehicles from destroying the angles at its base. The state in which I saw it, as depicted in the plate, *Fig. 2*, twenty years before it was reported to be in danger of falling, shows that the lower story had

only suffered externally from the attrition to which its exposed situation made it liable, without damaging the stability of the structure.

Since the foregoing was written I have received a photograph of the College taken in 1866 by Mr. Middleton Rayne when employed on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway.⁷ In this the tower appears in the background (as represented in *Fig. 1* of the plate) to the left of the College, which has now assumed an imposing appearance.

A *livraison* of the 1st volume of the *Athènes Oriental* (Paris, 1871) has likewise come to hand, in which (at pp. 79-86) there is an article entitled "La Bouddha Sakya Mouni," by M. Ph. Ed. Foucaux, Professor of Sanskrit in the College of France. In this he has introduced woodcuts of three Buddhist images found in the grounds of the College of St. Joseph at Negapatam, copied from sketches communicated by the Academic Society of St. Quentin, through the kindness of M. Textor de Ravisi, late Governor of Karikal, whose acquaintance I had the pleasure of making at the International Oriental Congress of 1874.

The circumstances under which the images were discovered are stated in the following extract from a record made at the time:—

"Not far from the tower is an old Mohwa tree (*Bassia latifolia*, L.⁸), the diameter of which above the root is more than a *metre*—indicating, according to the usual growth of the tree, an age of 700 to 800 years.

"In March 1856 the missionaries, having cut it down for the requirements of their work of construction, discovered five small Buddhist idols at a depth of somewhat more than a yard below the surface.

"From the position in which they were found, they appear to have been concealed, with a view of being again used in religious worship, for they were carefully placed in a chamber under a covering of bricks arranged for their protection.

"Four of the idols are of bronze, the fifth of a mixture of porcelain and clay, of exquisite workmanship."

M. Foucaux adds that one of the idols had been retained in the College, and that the fifth had been sent to Rev. Fr. Carayon, in Paris, but he does not state what became of the remaining three. One of these, No. 16, is almost identical with that figured for our article (*Fig. 3*), differing only in the absence of the square pedestal bearing the inscription, which, however, forms a separate piece from the lotos stand common to both, and in the disposition of the mantle, which is pendent from the

⁶ See Moor's *Hindu Pantheon*, p. 251, plates lxx.-lxxi.

⁷ Mr. Rayne at present fills the post of Chief Engineer

of the Sindh and Panjāb Railway, and is now at Multān.

⁸ The Tamil name is *Iuppai-maram*.

4. INSCRIPTION ON THE PEDESTAL OF NO. 3.

4. INSCRIPTION ON THE PEDESTAL OF NO. 3.



THE TOWER AS IT EXISTED IN 1846.

ANCIENT TOWER AT NAGAPATNAM.

BRONZE IMAGE, PRESENTED TO
 LORD NAPIER IN 1868.






FIG. 5. INDIAN BUDDHA.



FIGS. 6, 7. BAUDDHA IMAGES.

left shoulder only, and not from both as in ours. The left hand, also, is held up, instead of pointing downwards. In all other respects they are identical.

It is probable that these three (*figs.* 5, 6, 7) have been deposited in the Academy of St. Quentin, and that the one retained by the Fathers is that which was given to Lord Napier.

No. 5 represents Buddha, seated in the usual attitude under the sacred tree. No. 7 appears to be a female devotee, of very rude workmanship. Copies of the three are introduced into our plate.

The discovery of these relics places the Buddhist origin of the tower beyond dispute.

Note by Dr. Burnell.

As I several times in 1866 visited the ruin referred to, I may be permitted to say that it had become merely a shapeless mass of bricks. I have no doubt that it was originally a *vimāna* or shrine of some temple; there are some of precisely the same construction in parts of the Chingleput district.

Sir Walter Elliot's remarks about the destruction of ancient monuments in the Madras Presidency must be a source of great satisfaction to all interested in South-Indian antiquities: for my own part, I am confident that, if something be not soon done, there will not be anything left in a few more years that has the least historical inter-

est. I may mention a lamentable instance of the destruction of a relic of much interest which occurred some four years ago: I refer to the blowing up of the flagstaff tower at Cochin. This was the tower of the old Church of the Cross (afterwards the Cathedral of Cochin), where St. Francis Xavier preached, and was the last known building that could be connected with the history of a man whose name will always survive in South India. The cathedral was once a very fine church (see the view in Baldæus); the Dutch used it as a storehouse, but it remained for the English to destroy the body of the church early in this century, and then (in 1874) to remove the still remaining tower. (See, as regards the first, Mr. Anstey's indignant remarks in Lord Stanley's *Three Voyages of Vasco da Gama*, Hakl. Soc. 1869, p. 429).

I have searched, and had search made, to ascertain if *Āgama paṇḍita* can possibly be a Buddhist or Jain title used in South India, but cannot find the least trace of such use. It is tolerably certain that the image is that of a Śaiva devotee, and it certainly was the practice to dedicate such images in temples (see, *e.g.*, the great inscription at Tanjor). I may remark that the Śaiva monks (*Tāmbirāṇ*) in this district are hardly to be distinguished from Buddhist monks, except by the ashes they smear on their foreheads and by their matted hair.

Tanjor, 27th June 1878.

CORRESPONDENCE AND MISCELLANEA.

PĀRSI FUNERAL AND INITIATORY RITES.

I am glad my paper on the above subject has at length elicited a little criticism.¹ My intention was to give a lecture or lectures on the Pārsi religion before the University of Oxford immediately after my return from my second Indian journey. But on referring to my notes I found that so many different opinions existed on various knotty questions that I felt obliged to postpone the fulfilment of my design till I had gained further information, or, at least, cleared up some of my chief doubts.

Of course, I know that the researches of German scholars are at my command, but I am most desirous to examine the Pārsi religion from the point of view of the Pārsis themselves, and to ascertain the opinions of their most learned men in regard to all controverted points.

My article in the *Indian Antiquary* was intended to provoke criticism. Of course, therefore, I feel grateful to Mr. Sorābji Kāvasji Khambātā for setting me right in matters about which he is

likely to be better informed than I am. If I now criticize some of his criticisms, it is not so much with a view of vindicating my own accuracy as of stimulating further discussion, that the real truth may be ascertained in regard to certain points which evidently admit of some difference of opinion.

For in the course of my inquiries into the religions of India few things surprised me more than the difficulty of obtaining a satisfactory explanation of many ambiguities in the creed and practice of modern Indo-Zoroastrians. Though no class of Indians can boast better educated or more cultivated and enlightened men than the Pārsi community, very few have studied their own religion in the original documents, and even those learned men to whom I appealed confessed their inability to answer some of my queries. While, therefore, I willingly defer to Mr. Khambātā's superior knowledge of his own religion, I feel bound to suspend my judgment in regard to questions still at issue among the Pārsis themselves.

¹ *Vide* vol. VI. pp. 311-315, and vol. VII. p. 179.

Let me take Mr. Khambâtâ's criticisms in order. He says I have been wrongly informed that the priestly race among the Pârsis is divided into three classes of Dasturs, Mobeds, and Herbadâs. But, according to his own showing: "Some Herbadâs are neither Dasturs nor Mobeds, for they do not choose to enter the holy order." Is not this tantamount to a division of the priestly race into three classes?

In the next place Mr. Khambâtâ says that I am wrong in calling the Nasasâlârs "corpse-bearers." Yet again, according to his own showing, they are quite as much corpse-bearers as the Khândhiâs: "The Nasasâlârs," he writes, "take up the body from the slab and place it in on the bier" "The Nasasâlârs again receive the bier and carry it into the inner part of the Tower." It appears that I ought to have distinguished more clearly between the Nasasâlârs and the Khândhiâs or bier-bearers. But I must here observe that my description of a Pârsi funeral in my letter to the *Times* of 28th January 1876 was reprinted with alterations by the Pârsi Panchâyat, yet no corrections in regard to that point were made. The following sentence was also allowed to stand:—"As the bearers are supposed to contract impurity in the discharge of their duty, they are forced to live quite apart from the rest of the community."

Mr. Khambâtâ says: "Professor Williams considers feeding the dog with bread a part of the ceremony called *Sag-dîd*. In this also he is mistaken." No, my only mistake has been in expressing myself too loosely. It should be observed that the hyphen in *Sag-dîd* was mine. I knew I was writing for Oriental scholars, and the hyphen seemed to me quite sufficient to indicate that *Sag-dîd* meant 'dog-gaze.' In my *Times* letter I said: "The corpse is exposed to the gaze of a dog, regarded by the Pârsis as a sacred animal. This latter ceremony is called *Sag-dîd*."

Again Mr. Khambâtâ takes exception to my words, "The fire sanctuary of the *sagri* has a window or aperture so arranged that when the sacred fire is fed with sandal-wood fuel by the veiled priest, just before the corpse-bearers enter the Tower, a ray from the flame may be projected over the dead body at the moment of its exposure." Mr. Khambâtâ says "this is not correct. With no such design is the *sagri* built." But what I stated was that the aperture (not the building of the *sagri*) was arranged with that design. This, however, was not my statement, but that of the Secretary to the Panchâyat, who

attended me on both occasions of my visit to the Towers.

With regard to the bread with which the funeral dog is fed, I owe the rational explanation I have given of this remarkable custom to a well-known scholar and distinguished living authority, Mr. K. R. Kâmâ. Let others judge if Mr. Khambâtâ's explanation is preferable.

Again, Mr. Khambâtâ calls in question my assertion that the soul of the deceased man is supposed to hover about in a restless state for the three days immediately succeeding death, in the neighbourhood of the *dakhmas*. Mr. Khambâtâ informs us that the souls of only sinful men are supposed to do so. Will he tell us what becomes of the souls of the righteous during these three days?

As to the initiatory ceremonies, I must remind Mr. Khambâtâ that my description had reference to the highest form of these ceremonies. This is what I meant by their "due celebration."

I quite admit that I ought to have mentioned the white colour of the bull.

In conclusion I must express my surprise that Mr. Khambâtâ should not have divined from the context that 'second' was a mere misprint for 'sacred'; still I do not excuse myself for having overlooked this error in the proofs.

MONIER WILLIAMS.

Oxford, 28th July 1878.

THE PHRYGIAN INSCRIPTIONS AT DOĞANLU.

SIR,—The question of the geographical course, advance, and development of the Aryan languages will have so much interest for your Indian readers that I venture to ask for a small space, in your close columns, to originate a new line of inquiry, which has lately presented itself to me, in the interpretation of the Phrygian inscriptions at Doğanlu, near the old Nacoleia. The site of Doğanlu lies S.E. of the prominent town of Kutaiya: it is more immediately associated with the traditional *Metropolis*, which is identified, in Smith and Grove's *Atlas*, with *Gurdjaro Kaleh* (Lat. 39° 18' N., Long. 30° 36' E.), Doğanlu being placed in the same map, under the designation of *Castellum et sepulcra regia*, in about Lat. 39° 8' N., Long. 30° 53'.

H. Kiepert's map, attached to the valuable work of P. de Tchihatcheff, *Asie Mineure* (Paris, 1860),—gives the emplacement of the three sites of Kumbet, Yaponluk, and Doğanly, the position of the latter being defined as Lat. 39° 16' N., Long. 30° 37' E.¹

¹ The proximity of these historical remains to the ancient Synnada (Afum-Kara-hissar), Lat. 38° 43' N., Long. 30° 31' E., is also noteworthy.

I must frankly tell you that these inscriptions have been copied, recopied, and commented on from the days of Walpole, Leake, &c., and, as I now find, put under critical solution in Rawlinson's translation of Herodotus.¹ I am glad to say that I was altogether unaware of this last *excursus*, or perhaps I should not have undertaken a new and independent examination of these archaic writings. Nor do I wish now to controvert other people's readings, but to suggest the exercise of free thought: to which end I shall be prepared to submit to your readers the full text of some ten or eleven inscriptions with the derivation and associate adaptation of other forms of the old Phœnician alphabets. In the mean time, perhaps, you will allow me to give a general outline of the results I have arrived at. These inscriptions are written in an early form of Greek character very little removed from the archaic type of the Phœnician alphabet on the *stèle* of Mesha of Moab (B.C. 896), and are arranged, in the *boustrophédon* form, reading from right to left and from left to right. The alphabet when compared with the full scheme of the Greek series of 25 letters is found to be deficient in the letters θ , χ , and ω ; the ϕ seems to have been a subsequent incorporation, and the indeterminate use of the ζ , ξ , and σ indicates a very imperfect appreciation of the true value of the adopted letters. One very significant sign of the adaptation of the Semitic alphabet to its new requirements is seen in the simple elaboration of the ordinary $\text{F} = \text{E}$ into $\text{F} = \text{H}$ by the convenient addition of a fourth side-stroke. The E is the Latin Æ , distinguished from the F , for which it might otherwise be mistaken, by the retention of the down-stroke of the latter in a directly perpendicular line, as opposed to the slope given to the down-strokes of the E and F . This peculiarity is preserved in the formation of the contrasted F and E of the Etruscan alphabets.

The $\text{F} = \text{v}$ (*vau*) of the Semitic series seems to have held an anomalous position in its new place, having to do duty for *f*, *v*, *p*, *ph*, as well as sometimes serving as an accent, and being occasionally employed also as a means of separating vowels, as in the Carian tongue, where vowels were so persistently severed and isolated, as opposed to ordinary Greek rules.²

¹ W. Hamilton, *Ægyptiaca*, London, 1809.
Chandler's *Asia Minor*, 1817, p. 272.
Travels in the East, edited by R. Walpole (London, 1820), p. 207.
Journal of a Tour in Asia Minor, by W. M. Leake (London, 1824), p. 21.
Keppel's *Journey*, 1831, vol. ii. p. 117.
Cramer's *Asia Minor*, 1832, vol. ii. p. 5.
Grotefend, *Transactions R. As. Soc.* (1885), vol. iii. p. 328.
Ancient Monuments with Inscriptions still existing in Lydia and Phrygia, by J. R. Stuart: London, 1848.
C. Texier, *L'Asie Mineure*, Paris, 1848, vol. i. p. 210.

But the main point for consideration for Aryan scholars is the curious predominance of *Latin* forms and inflexions in the texts themselves, which, as affecting the affiliation of languages, is of the highest importance in the present state of our philological knowledge. The alphabet in like manner abounds in many of the early identities which were retained intact in the Etruscan and other Italian alphabets.

The texts themselves, as I read them, result in the preservation of the names of several of the old kings of Phrygia, endorsed on the tombs or rock-cut surfaces wherein their ashes may have been enshrined, or in secret places around. The names appear in the following order:—

a. *Manes* (in the Latin form of BABA MEMEFALE).³

b. A second king called B a b a M a n e s, discriminated by a different title.

c. *Atys*.

d. *Midas*, and

e. EPEKYN, or preferentially FPEKYN ($\Phi\epsilon\kappa\upsilon\nu$?).

But by far the most important contribution to ancient archæology which these epigraphs permit me to cite are the dates, which have been hitherto consistently ignored or misunderstood. We have in the first place a distinct record of a life $\Lambda\Lambda\Upsilon\Upsilon\Upsilon$, *lapsit* (گرس), ending at the age of 23 ($\Gamma\Lambda$). Next we meet with a specific date in the form of $\text{AT} = 301$, which is appended to the name of a certain Chersonesian, *outside* the rock-cut face of the earliest temple front, which bears on its *frieze* the name and titles of FPEKYN.

The date itself will not therefore apply to the epoch of any given king, but it may be freely accepted as a record made subsequent to the execution of the possibly votive sculpture, and thus indicates the priority, recent or remote, of the ornamental device within whose pattern the leading designation is engraved. The inquiry may now be raised as to what era these latter figures refer. To my understanding there can be but one system of reckoning at all applicable to the circumstances in the race which made its mark and held its continuity from father to son for 505 years, as Herodotus tells us was the case with the proximate Phrygian Heraclidæ,

Asia Minor, Pontus, &c., by W. J. Hamilton (London, 1842), vol. i. p. 489.

Asia Minor, Mesopotamia, &c., by W. F. Ainsworth (London, 1842), vol. ii. p. 59.

The History of Herodotus, by G. Rawlinson (London, 1858), vol. i. note p. 665.

Manual of Oriental History, by F. Lenormant (London, 1870), vol. ii. p. 73.

³ "Kavvaia = Cave-ne-eas," Cicero *De Div.* ii. 40.

⁴ The Latin text given by Cory from the Armenian version, with variations from the old Latin version of Hieronymus, uses 'Mames' as the equivalent of the Greek Μήννης . See also Eusebius, p. 95.

whose dynasty was finally extinguished on the accession of Gyges, in 716 B.C.⁵

The dates, therefore, arrange themselves thus :— $716 + 505 = 1221$ B.C. for the accession to power of the Lydo-Phrygian kings. The recorded date of $505 - 301 = 204$ amounts to $204 + 716 = 920$ B.C., or so much before the anomalous reckoning by the Olympiads of 776 B.C., or the local era of the foundation of Rome, A.U.C., which dates only from 754 B.C.

There is one possible objection to the reception in full faith of the initial date of the Heraclidæ as the determining epoch of the period to which we are to assign the execution of these monuments—that is, the highly advanced stage of the alphabetical characters, as opposed to the retarded progress, in that direction, of the Greeks of the islands.

I am not disturbed at all upon this point. If the Egyptians recognized the Phrygians as older than themselves, there must have been some very civilized focus in the latitude in which these rock-cut frontages are preserved to the present day. Mr. Fergusson, as the latest commentator from the architectural point of view, pronounces them to be the very earliest examples of quasi-wooden designs extant!⁶

In regard to the more matured forms of the alphabetical characters at Doganlu, it is to be remarked that, although they are obviously very much in advance of the Greek of the Homeric development, there is nothing inconsistent with an earlier local civilization, and a more direct land intercourse with the nations who used Phœnician writing as their ordinary method of literary communication. In this respect we may continue the comparison with the Phœnician record on the *stèle* of Mesha. This document is now generally conceded to belong to the close of the 9th century B.C., and to exhibit the alphabet in an advanced stage of maturity.⁷ But with the exception of a natural advance upon the special exigencies of a Semitic language, and a mechanical re-adaptation of the outlines of the normal forms, there is nothing in the Phrygian alphabet that is inconsistent with the immediate improvements necessitated by the larger requirements of Aryan speech. Those who care to compare a parallel rate of progress may find identities in the development and adaptation of the Baktrian Semitic alphabet of Asoka's inscrip-

tions,⁸ and see how readily an Aryan tongue improved upon its Semitic teachings, and advanced towards a more perfect, though utterly inconsistent and unsuitable alphabet, in respect to the configuration of the outlines of its letters.

I need not say that this subject is likely to attract much attention among the critical classic authorities of the present day, who may be disposed to agree with Max Müller, who seeks to reduce Greek literature to as comparatively low a level as he assigns to Vedic writing and Indian alphabets.

Indeed, signs of opposition have already manifested themselves, but I have been, strange to say, greatly strengthened in my leading argument by one of the primary objections, which took this form—"How do you know that the letter τ was the recognized letter equivalent of 300 in these early times?" It is confessed freely that the later Greek numeral τ stands, in figures throughout, for 300, and has never meant anything else in their arithmetic; but how, it is added, can I establish so primitive an application of the use of the letter for the purposes of dates? My reply is, simply, that the Phrygian dates—in their double entries—were clearly well-understood records, where letter figures sufficed for all purposes of identification without further definition.

As regards the doubt about the τ and its value then and afterwards as 300, a most curious and instructive piece of consecutive evidence crops up.

The learned world who rely upon Greek priority have long ago admitted that the drop or loss of the Φ , or digamma, amid the early numbers of the Greek numeral system, afforded conclusive evidence of derivation from the consecutive order of the Phœnician alphabet.

That is clearly so, but a new proof of the antiquity of the Phrygian epigraphs may probably be established from the contested τ .

Perhaps your readers are not in possession of all the data which I hope to submit to them, but I may prepare the way by saying that in the Moabite stone and in the Phrygian inscriptions, with which we are more immediately concerned, there is no such letter as the Hebrew τ , *teth*, or the corresponding Greek Θ , and the same remark holds good in regard to most of the Aramaean alphabets.⁹

g. teth, remarks.—Ante tria lustra hujus litteræ figuræ Palæographis ita ignotus erat.

M. de Laynes (Prinsep, pl. ix a), has only one *teth*, that under Sidon, from Sargon to the epoch of the Romans 145 B.C.

Madden, *Coins of the Jews*, 1864, finds no such letter in the "Assyrian Lion weights," nor in the "old Hebrew from Coins." M. de Vogüé, *Mélanges*, 1868, has none in his Phœnician Archæque, but plenty in the Egyptian Alphabets.

⁵ Herodotus i. 7. See also i. 14, 85, 94; iv. 45; viii. 138.

⁶ *History of Architecture*, vol. I. p. 224:—They may have been dated as far back as 1000, and most probably 700 years, at least, before the Christian era."

⁷ F. Lenormant, *L'Alphabet Phénicien*, Paris, 1872, tom. I. p. 128.

⁸ Prinsep's *Essays*, vol. ii. p. 144; *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1868, p. 225.

⁹ Gesenius (1857), p. 30, speaking of the Phœnician

In these cases, therefore, the *final* letter of the alphabet counts as 21, and not as 22. No. 21, in the ordinary course of Eastern letter notation, is equivalent to 300, and as such the Greeks received the T, out of its regular Phœnician order, and adopted it into their own system, which goes far to suggest that this Phrygian medium was the true channel of communication, in opposition to the tentative numerals of the Egyptians, which the Phœnicians perhaps suggested to the Latins. So much avowedly depends upon the sequent order of the letters that we find in the proper Hebrew alphabet the *n tau* = 400, and where the current Hebrew adds a second *n p* (= *pf*), the *n* grows into 500.

To reiterate somewhat, in order to test and check the dates bearing upon the mechanical adaptation of letter figures. I will re-state the case from another point of view. The missing Θ of the Aramæan writing regains its place in the accepted Greek scheme under the Phœnician influences, to which it was so largely indebted, and from whose alphabetical notation the letter perhaps had never been absent. So also the Hebrew *yod* = 10 is constant in the Greek series of letter numbers. The Greek scheme of amalgamation evidently experienced a second jerk in the number of 90, where it had to supply a figure like a reversed P or a revived γ (*koph*), as inconsecutive a form as the revised equivalent of the *six*, in order, perchance, to retain or bring back the γ = P to its proper numeral position as 100, the fixed succeeding Σ to its ancient function as 200, and the T to its coincident value of 300, from which, as the 21st letter of the primitive Moabite and Phrygian order of notation, it ought never to have been displaced.

E. THOMAS.

THE FIREARMS OF THE HINDUS.

SIR,—Under the above heading Bâbu Râm Dâs Sen (*ante*, p. 136) appears to claim for the Hindus of some unknown but very ancient period a knowledge of military projectiles at least equal to that possessed by their descendants in the last century. He speaks of the Agni-Astra as mentioned in the *Agni Purâna* and *Mûdra Râkshasa*, and as more particularly described in the *Śukra-Nîti*, a work said to have been written by the sage Śukra-Āchârya; from which he quotes descriptions which as translated undoubtedly refer to true firearms.

M. Lenormant detects no *teths* in the Moab stone, in the Lions of Nimrud, or the Inscriptions in Cyprus and Malta, nor is the letter entered in any of "the four varieties of Hebrew Archaïque" in Pl. vii., though he discovers the letter in some *pierres gravées*, the *nidus* of which is not defined.

But, in the first instance, all the external evidence goes to show that no foreign invaders found the Hindus in original possession of anything of the sort. The scanty records which we have of Greek and Roman contact with ancient India may be ransacked in vain for any positive evidence on the subject, while their silence is strong negative testimony *per contra*.

No Muhammadan historian mentions gunpowder before A.D. 1317; and Sir H. Elliot thinks the earliest date at which it can have got to India A.D. 1400, and does not put much faith in a Chinese account of something like a firearm in A.D. 1259 (Elliot and Dowson's *Hist. Ind.* vol. VI. pp. 455, 459, 460). Col. Yule, referring¹ to a 'Fire-Pao' used in China in the 13th century, agrees with MM. Favé and Reinaud that it was probably a sort of rocket. Now, if the Hindus ever had anything of the sort, how did they come to forget all about it before they came in contact with Western races capable of bearing testimony to the fact? or, if they had not forgotten it, how is it that Greek, Arab, and Persian are equally silent on the subject? The Hindu armourer is conservative enough. The sword, the battle-axe, the war-quoit, are the same to-day in steel that they are in the stone of sculptures 1200 years old; and, in respect of the first weapons, the Muslim invaders had no sooner settled in India than they adopted the peculiar and inconvenient Indian hilt. It is hardly likely that so important an art as that of the artillerist would have dropped out of sight, and its only record be found in a Sanskrit manuscript not very well known; and this is the next point to which I wish to draw attention.

"The sage Śukra Āchârya" has already appeared in these columns as the contemporary of the Vâman Avatâr and of Brihaspati (*Ind. Ant.* vol. IV. p. 243, vol. V. p. 5). Was he the author of the work quoted by Bâbu Râm Dâs Sen? And if not, who was? The Bâbu says that the *ślokas* quoted do not seem mere modern interpolations. His authority upon this point is superior to mine, and I must bow to it till some scholar of weight has examined the MS. and given his opinion on it. But, from the evidence above given, it seems to me that if they are not such interpolations the whole work must be a forgery of, at best, the 17th century—a period which I am led to select by the mention of the flint.

W. F. SINCLAIR.

Finally, under the Italian aspect, though the Umbrians and Etruscans used the Θ , the Romans and Oscans made up the letter of the ordinary combined TH.

¹ Marco Polo, vol. I. p. 334.

ASITA AND BUDDHA, OR THE INDIAN SIMEON.

In the *Lalita Vistara*—a legendary history in prose and verse of the life of Buddha, the great Indian saint, and founder of the religion which bears his name—it is related that a Rishi, or inspired sage, named Asita, who dwelt on the skirts of the Himālaya mountains, became informed, by the occurrence of a variety of portents, of the birth of the future lawgiver, as the son of king Suddhōdana, in the city of Kapilavastu, in Northern India, and went to pay his homage to the infant. I have tried to reproduce the legend in the following verses. The similarity of some of the incidents to portions of the narrative in the second chapter of St. Luke's Gospel, verses 25ff., will strike the reader.

I may mention that the Buddhist books speak also of earlier Buddhas, that the word means 'the enlightened,' or 'the intelligent,' and that Buddha also bore the appellations of Gautama, and of Śākyasiṃha, and Śākyamuni—i.e. the lion, and the devotee, of the tribe of the Śākyas, to which he belonged.

That I have not at all exaggerated the expressions in the text which speak of Buddha as a deliverer or redeemer, or assimilated his character more than was justifiable to the Christian conception of a saviour, will be clear to any one who can examine the original for himself. Kumārila Bhaṭṭa, a renowned Brāhmanical opponent of the Buddhists, while charging Buddha with presumption and transgression of the rules of his caste in assuming the functions of a religious teacher (with which, as belonging to the Kshatriya, and not to the Brāhmanical class, he had no right to interfere), ascribes to him these words—"Let all the evils (or sins) flowing from the corruption of the Kali age" (the fourth, or most degenerate, age of the world) "fall upon me; but let the world be redeemed!" If we might judge from this passage, it would seem that the character of a vicarious redeemer was claimed by, or at least ascribed to, Buddha. I was informed by the late Mr. R. C. Childers, however, that in his opinion the idea of Buddha's having suffered vicariously for the sins of men is foreign to Buddhism, and indeed opposed to the whole spirit and tendency of the system.

Another esteemed correspondent is unable to think that the sentiment ascribed to Buddha by Kumārila is foreign to his system, as it is thoroughly in accordance with the idea of the six *pāramitas*. He does not understand it as implying any theological notion of vicarious atonement, but rather the enthusiastic utterance of highly-strung moral sympathy and charity, and would compare it with St. Paul's words in *Romans* ix. 3, and explain each in just the same way as, he thinks, Chrysostom does. He further refers to the existence of numerous

Buddhist stories in the *Kathāsarit-sāgara*, among which is one from lvi. 153, viz. the story of the disobedient son with a red-hot iron wheel on his head, and he says—"Pāpino 'nye 'pi muchyantām prithavyām tat-pātakair api! ā pāpa-kshayam etad me chakram bhrāmyatu mūrdhani," "Let other sinners on earth be freed from their sins; and until the removal of [their] sin let this wheel turn round upon my head." In either case it is only a wish, and it is not pretended that it really had, or ever could have, any effect on other men. It only expresses a perfection of charity. The same idea (borrowed, as the writer supposes, from Buddha) comes in in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, ix. ch. 21.

On Himālaya's lonely steep
There lived of old a holy sage,
Of shrivelled form, and bent with age,
Inured to meditation deep.

He—when great Buddha had been born,
The glory of the Śākya race,
Endowed with every holy grace,
To save the suffering world forlorn—

Beheld strange portents, signs which taught
The wise that that auspicious time
Had witnessed some event sublime,
With universal blessing fraught.

The sky with joyful gods was thronged:
He heard their voice with glad acclaim
Resounding loudly Buddha's name,
While echoes clear the shouts prolonged.

The cause exploring, far and wide
The sage's vision ranged; with awe
Within a cradle laid he saw
Far off the babe, the Śākyas' pride.

With longing seized this child to view
At hand, and clasp, and homage pay,
Athwart the sky he took his way
By magic art, and swan-like flew

And came to King Suddhōdan's gates,
And entrance craved—"Go, royal page,
And tell thy lord an ancient sage
To see the King permission waits."

The page obeyed, and joined his hands
Before the prince, and said—"A sage,
Of shrivelled form, and bowed with age,
Before the gate, my sovereign, stands,

"And humbly asks to see the King."
To whom Suddhōdan cried—"We greet
All such with joy; with honour meet
The holy man before us bring."

The saint beside the monarch stood,
And spake his blessing—"Thine be health,
With length of life, and might, and wealth;
And ever seek thy people's good."

With all due forms, and meet respect,
 The King received the holy man,
 And made him sit; and then began—
 "Great sage, I do not recollect
 "That I thy venerable face
 Have ever seen before; allow
 Me then to ask what brings thee now
 From thy far-distant dwelling-place."
 "To see thy babe," the saint replies,
 "I come from Himālaya's steeps."
 The King rejoined—"My infant sleeps;
 A moment wait until he rise."
 "Such great ones ne'er," the Rishi spake,
 "In torpor long their senses steep;
 Nor softly love luxurious sleep;
 The infant Prince will soon awake."
 The wondrous child, alert to rise,
 At will his slumbers light dispelled.
 His father's arms the infant held
 Before the sage's longing eyes.
 The babe beholding passing bright,
 More glorious than the race divine,
 And marked with every noble sign,¹
 The saint was whelmed with deep delight;
 And crying—"Lo! an infant graced
 With every charm of form I greet!"
 He fell before the Buddha's feet,
 With fingers joined, and round him paced.*
 Next round the babe his arms he wound,
 And "One," he said, "of two careers
 Of fame awaits in coming years
 The child in whom these signs are found.
 "If such an one at home abide,
 He shall become a King, whose sway
 Supreme a mighty arm'd array
 On earth shall stablish far and wide.
 "If, spurning worldly pomp as vain,
 He choose to lead a joyless life,
 And wander forth from home and wife,
 He then a Buddha's rank shall gain."
 He spoke, and on the infant gazed,
 When tears suffused his aged eyes;
 His bosom heaved with heavy sighs;
 Then King Suddhōdan asked, amazed—

"Say, holy man, what makes thee weep,
 And deeply sigh? Does any fate
 Malign the royal child await?
 May heavenly powers my infant keep!"
 "For thy fair infant's weal no fears
 Disturb me, King," the Rishi cried;
 "No ill can such a child betide;
 My own sad lot commands my tears.
 "In every grace complete, thy son
 Of truth shall perfect insight³ gain,
 And far sublimer fame attain
 Than ever lawgiver has won.
 "He's such a Wheel⁴ of sacred lore
 Shall speed on earth to roll as yet
 Hath never been in motion set
 By priest, or sage, or god before.
 "The world of men and gods to bless,
 The way of rest and peace to teach,
 A holy law thy son shall preach—
 A law of stainless righteousness.
 "By him shall suffering men be freed
 From weakness, pain, and grief,
 From all the ills shall find relief
 Which hatred, love, illusion, breed.
 "His hand shall loose the chains of all
 Who groan in fleshly bands confined;
 With healing touch the wounds shall bind
 Of those whom pain's sharp arrows gall.
 "His potent words shall put to flight
 The dull array of leaden clouds
 Which helpless mortals' vision shrouds,
 And clear their intellectual sight.
 "By him shall men who, now untaught,
 In devious paths of error stray,
 Be led to find a perfect way—
 To final calm⁵ at last be brought.
 "But once, O King, in many years,
 The figtree⁶ somewhere flowers perhaps;
 So after countless ages' lapse,
 A Buddha once on earth appears.
 "And now, at length, this blessed time
 Has come: for he who cradled lies
 An infant there before thine eyes
 Shall be a Buddha in his prime.

¹ Certain corporeal marks are supposed by Indian writers to indicate the future greatness of those children in whom they appear. Of these, thirty-two primary and eighty secondary marks are referred to in the original as being visible on Buddha's person.

² The word here, imperfectly translated, means, according to Professor H. H. Wilson's *Dictionary*, "reverential salutation, by circumambulating a person or object, keeping the right side towards them."

³ The term here translated 'insight' is derived from the same root as the word 'Buddha,' and means 'intelligence,' or 'enlightenment.'

⁴ The term thus rendered, *dharma-chakra*, expresses a somewhat singular figure. It denotes the 'wheel of the law,' or the 'wheel of righteousness,' or the 'wheel of religion.'

⁵ The word in the original is *nirvāṇa*, a term of which the sense is disputed—some scholars esteeming it to mean absolute annihilation; others explaining it as the extinction of passion, the attainment of perfect dispassion. Mr. Childers considers *nirvāṇa* to signify active bliss on earth for a brief period, followed (upon death) by total annihilation.

⁶ The tree referred to in the original is the Udumbara, the *Ficus glomerata*.

"Full, perfect insight gaining, he
Shall rescue endless myriads tost
On life's rough ocean waves, and lost,
And grant them immortality.

"But I am old, and frail, and worn,
I shall not live the day to see
When this thy wondrous child shall free
From woe the suffering world forlorn.

"Tis this mine own unhappy fate
Which bids me mourn, and weep, and sigh;
The Buddha's triumph now is nigh,
But, ah! for me it comes too late!"

When thus the aged saint, inspired,
Had all the infant's greatness told,
The King his wondrous son extolled,
And sang, with pious ardour fired—

"Thee, child, th' immortals worship all,
The great Physician, born to cure
All ills that hapless men endure;
I, too, before thee prostrate fall."

And now—his errand done—the sage,
Dismissed with gifts, and honour due,
Athwart the æther swan-like flew,
And reached again his hermitage.

J. MUIR.

ANCIENT BURYING-GROUND AT MUNGAPETĀ, AND CROSSES.

It is well that officers of geological surveys who are working in unfrequented districts should keep their eyes open to any prehistoric remains which may come under their notice. Mr. W. King, of the Indian Survey, has shown himself fully alive to the value of archæological observations, by the notes which he has recently communicated to the Asiatic Society of Bengal. These notes describe a prehistoric burial-place, which he visited in the course of his geological work, near MungapetĀ, in the Nizām's dominions. The cemetery consists of an assemblage of about 150 stone cists, enclosed in megalithic rings, with four large monoliths in the shape of crosses. Each tomb is formed of four upright slabs of stone, with another for a covering-lid, the largest cist measuring 9½ feet in length by 9 feet in width, with a height of about 5 feet. The stone slab which forms the floor of each cist is hollowed into one or more cavities for reception of the bodies, which were probably embalmed. The surrounding circle of stones is in some cases 30 or 40 feet in diameter; and one of the crosses measures 16 feet in height. The cists and crosses are all of dressed stone, the material being the sandstone of the country. It is suggested by Mr. King that this burial-place is of pre-Āryan age, or belongs to Hindu-Kolarian times. Ruder remains of

similar style are scattered over the surrounding country, but the group of tombs which he describes is of special interest from the presence of the crosses, which is quite an exceptional feature.—*The Academy*, 29th December.

Mr. King observes that the crosses are distinguished from those of Christian origin by the different size of the limbs, and by the curved junction between the arms and the lower limb. Another similar cross is reported to exist in the Hazaribagh district at Basatpur, near Leiyo, in the valley of the Bikaro river. Near it there are a number of *dressed* memorial stones of truncate pyramidal shape.

It is not clear whether the MungapetĀ group of crosses are the same with those at Katapur and Nirmal, in the Nizām's country, described and figured at pp. 486-8 of Fergusson's *Rude Stone Monuments*. Mr. Fergusson inclined to ascribe them to a Christian origin; see too *Ind. Ant.* vol. IV. p. 306, where the same view is taken, and the circumstance of their being of *dressed* stone tells against their belonging to a prehistoric period. But Mr. King does not appear to regard the MungapetĀ crosses as Christian, and the pyramidal memorial stones accompanying another cross are also spoken of as *dressed*, and they would not be claimed as Christian; the localities, too, of these crosses in only recently penetrated jungles seems against Christian derivation, and it must be remembered that the cross-shape is a pre-Christian symbol, seen on the breasts of Assyrian statues, and among the ruins of Palenque, in Mexico. Meanwhile it seems strange, considering how long these venerable Indian crosses have been known, that the question of their association has not been decided.

W.

NOTE.—CANARESE INSCRIPTION.

In February 1874, rambling about Chaul, the old Greek Simylla, (or Τιμυλλα) I came upon an unfinished Śaiva temple, commenced, it was said, *in memoriam* of one of the Northern or Kulābā branch of the pirate house of Angria. Just to the east of this, beautifully embosomed in the cocoanut orchards, was a fine temple of the 18th century, with tank and *ghāṭa*, of which I was told the following legend:—

"In the *quasi*-reign of one of the earlier Peshvās a Drāvidian Brāhmān dwelling at Chaul was warned in a dream, by I forget what god, that he should proceed to Punā and demand from the Government money wherewith on this spot to dig a tank and build a temple. He obeyed, found that a corresponding dream had simultaneously visited the ruler, and faithfully applied the grant;

"and the bricks are there to this day to testify of it."

Between the temple and the cenotaph toddy-drawers were whetting their knives at the time of my visit, upon a loose slab bearing a Kanarese inscription—a thing of itself (philologically speaking) very remarkable in so thoroughly Marāṭhā a country as the North Konkāṇa. A little money and a good deal of diplomacy enabled me to place it in the collection of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, where it has remained unheeded from that day to this, upon a landing-place, where scholars pass it every week.

W. F. SINCLAIR.

ABYSSINIAN KINGS.

The following is a list of the kings of Abyssinia during the greater part of five centuries from B.C. 139:—

| B.C. | A.D. |
|---|----------------------------------|
| 139 Menilek or Ibn' Hakim reigned 29 yrs. | 70 Za-Malis ... 6 yrs. |
| 110 Za-Hondedyu 1 yr. | 76 Za-Hakale...13 " |
| 98 Awda11 yrs. | 89 Za-Demahé, 10 " |
| 87 Za-Awsyu ... 3 " | 99 Za-Awtet ... 2 " |
| 84 Za-Tsawe...3y. 10m. | 101 Za-Elawda, 30 " |
| 80 Za-Gesyu, half a day. | 131 Za-Zigen and Rema40 " |
| 80 Za-Maute ...8y. 4m. | 171 Za-Gafale... 1 yr. |
| 72 Za-Bahse ... 9 yrs. | 172 Za-Bæsi-Serk 4 yrs. |
| 63 Kâwuda..... 2 " | 176 Za-Elas-guaga 76 " |
| 61 Kanazi10 " | 252 El-Herka ...21 " |
| 51 Haduna 9 " | 273 Za-Bæsi Tsa-wesa 1 yr. |
| 42 Za-Wasih ... 1 yr. | 274 Za-Wakens. 2 days |
| 39 Za-Awzena. 1 yr. | 274 Za-Hadus ...4 mts. |
| 38 Za-Berwas...29 yrs. | 275 El-Segel..... 2 yrs. |
| 9 Za-Mabasi... 1 yr. | 277 El-Asfeh ...14 " |
| 8 Za-Bæsi-Bazen, 16 yrs. | 291 El-Tsegaba 23 " |
| A.D. 8 Za-Senatu, 26 " | 314 El-Ahiawya 3 " |
| 34 Za-Les10 " | 322 El-Abreha and El-Atzbeha, |
| 44 Za-Masenh ...6 " | or Aizana and |
| 50 Za-Sutuwa ...9 " | Sajzana, bro- |
| 59 Za-Adgaba...10½ " | thers26½ " |
| 69 Za-Agba6 mts. | |

In the 8th year of Abreha, A.D. 330, Christianity was introduced into Abyssinia. There is some confusion in the lists as to the rulers between Tsegaba and Abreha.

Za-Hakale, who ruled A.D. 76-89, is in all proba-

bility the Zōskalēs mentioned by the author of the *Periplus Maris Erythræi*, § 5.

The Axomites are correctly distinguished from the Homerites by Philostorgius, by the appellation of Æthiopes; and Procopius (*De Bello Persico*), Cedrenus (*Hist. Comp.* p. 364, Paris, 1647), Cosmas, and John Malala (*Hist. Chronica Joannis Antioch.*, Oxon. 1691, p. 163), though all apply the word Indi to both people, confine the epithet Æthiopes to the Axomites. The term Ethiopians, too, or Itiop-jawān, is the favourite appellation by which the Abyssinians designate themselves. (Conf. Salt's *Abyssinia*, pp. 460ff.; Ludolph, *Histor. Æthiop.* II. 4; *Corpus Inscrip.* III. p. 513; Tellez, *Travels of the Jesuits*, Lond. 1710, p. 74.)

STÂN.—DĀGHESTĀN, &c.

It may be interesting to 'Gaikwāḍi'¹ to know that a century and three quarters ago, and on the spot, Dāghestān was considered to be derived from Dāgh, "which in their language signifieth a mountain." My authority noted below,² always calls it "the Dagestan," and the inhabitants "the Dagestans" or "Dagestan Tartars." He states that they spoke in his time (1722) the same language as the neighbouring Tatars of the plains.

W. F. S.

BANYANS AT ASTRAKHAN IN 1722.

The Banyans "are a sort of pagan Indians whose principal pursuit is trade, and have their factory within the city (of Astrakhan). One of their chief merchants dying at this time (1722), his widow desired leave of the emperor to burn herself with his corpse, according to the custom of their country; but his majesty, unwilling to encourage so barbarous a custom, refused her request, and the Indian factory withdrew from the city with their effects. His majesty, finding no argument could prevail on the woman to alter her resolution, at last gave them leave to do as they thought proper. The corpse, being dressed in his clothes, was carried to some little distance from the town, where a funeral pile of dry wood was raised, and the body laid upon it; before the pile were hung Indian carpets, to prevent its being seen. The wife, in her best apparel, and adorned with earrings, several rings on her fingers, and a pearl necklace, attended by a great number of Indians of both sexes, was led by a Brahman, or priest, to the

¹ Ante, p. 27.

² *Memoirs of Peter Henry Bruce, Esq., a Military Officer in the service of Prussia, Russia, and Great Britain*, 1 vol. 4to, London, printed for the Author's Widow, and sold by T. Payne and Son, Newgate, &c., 1782. A second edition, in 1 vol. 8vo, was published by Sheppard, Colles, and Co.,

Dublin, 1783. Bruce was of Scotch descent, born in Westphalia in 1692. Among other details, he says he surveyed the Caspian for Peter the Great, and expressly mentions the Oxus (4to ed., p. 814), "a river both large and rapid, and a musket-shot broad at its entrance," as flowing into that sea.

funeral pile, which on her approach was kindled; she then distributed her upper apparel and jewels among her friends and acquaintances, of whom she took her last farewell with a great deal of ceremony, and the pile being in full flame, and the carpets taken down, she leaped into the midst of

the fire; her friends then poured quantities of oil over her, which soon suffocated her, and reduced both corpses to ashes, which were carefully gathered and put into an urn, to be conveyed to their relations in India."—*P. H. Bruce's Memoirs*, 4to ed., pp. 252, 253.

BOOK NOTICES.

MEMOIR on the HISTORY of the TOOTH RELIC of CEYLON, with a preliminary Essay on the Life and System of Gautama Buddha. By J. Gerson da Cunha, M.R.C.S., &c. Bombay, 1875.

Dr. Da Cunha's Memoir on the Tooth Relic of Ceylon is now two years old—which is as much as to say that in the light of later researches there is no difficulty in finding faults, particularly with the chronology. It is, however, a useful little pamphlet for any one approaching the subject as a beginner; and the conclusion, viz. that the tooth is 'bogus,' is incontrovertible except by a good Buddhist relying upon faith as against reason. The photographs, though not original, are good enough; and the index is more than we usually expect in so modest a work.

THE ENGLISH and their MONUMENTS AT GOA. By J. Gerson da Cunha, M.R.C.S., &c. Bombay, 1877.

Dr. Da Cunha has compiled into a pamphlet of 28 pages an account of transactions almost forgotten, although they took place within the memory of men still alive. His knowledge of the Portuguese language gives him an unusual advantage in this ground, of which he will, no doubt, be found in sole possession if the course of political events should ever bring the subject before the public.

MODERN INDIA AND THE INDIANS: being a series of Impressions, Notes, and Essays. By Monier Williams, D.C.L. London: Trübner & Co., 1873.

Professor Williams has collected and remodelled a number of papers communicated to this and other less exclusively Oriental periodicals in a modest octavo volume—perhaps, of all works of recent Indian tourists, that most suitable for the 'Griffin' who is not also a 'Philistine.' His long study of Oriental subjects has enabled him to assimilate and reproduce with unusual success his *impressions de voyage*; and no Old Indian who remembers how little he knew of the country after an equal time spent in it will be hypercritical in respect of the errors into which our author has here and there fallen. We are glad to see a book so different from most of the rubbish with

which the press was inundated immediately after the Prince of Wales's tour, and shall be prepared to welcome the further volume which Professor Williams promises us, as the result of his "researches into modern Indian religious life." A good many of us know too well the extreme difficulty that attends such inquiries to hope for any very important results from those of Professor Williams, conducted under the least favourable circumstances; but we can rely upon his recognition of the danger of hasty generalizations, and may fairly expect that his forthcoming volume will be suited for students of a somewhat larger growth than those for whom the present work has been written.

THE HINDOO PILGRIMS. By M. A. Sherring, M.A., &c. London: Trübner & Co., 1878.

The title of this work led us to expect a treatise upon the curious phenomena of the Hindu mania for pilgrimage—the contrast between isolated expeditions undertaken in consequence of a vow, or even to spend a holiday, and the lives of travel spent by regular devotees in wandering from end to end of the peninsula; the strange ceremonies of the holy places; and the legends which account for or create their sanctity. The subject would be most interesting, and Mr. Sherring has already given proof that he could deal with at least a portion of it. It is not, therefore, without considerable disappointment that we find his pilgrims and their travels a mere connecting thread for a series of legends interesting themselves, but conveyed in the most prosaic verse imaginable, and supposed to be recited over the camp fires of their nightly halting-places. Our readers would hardly thank us for samples.

EASTERN LEGENDS and STORIES in English verse. By Lieut. Norton Powlett. London: H. S. King & Co., 1873.

This modest little collection of poems does credit to the author, and is a good sign of the times. There is perhaps hardly a classical scholar in England who has not tried to render in verse the Odes of Horace; and the young Artillery Officer

who has made the same attempt upon tales from the *Anwar i Suhaili* and other Persian and Arabic stories was evidently not merely cramming for an examination when he sat with his Munshi. Such books, too, do some good in familiarizing the English public with the lighter forms of Oriental literature, and may stimulate a few young scholars to make themselves acquainted with the original; while the metrical talent of the translator is certainly much better employed in such exercises than in writing slangy 'Lays.' Some of the translations are very spirited; and the following extract is interesting as exemplifying a curious system of mnemonics not yet entirely superseded by the drier methods of our Government schools. The subject is a young Tatar learning his alphabet.

"He marked the ranked letters go
In ordered lines as warriors do.
* * * * *
There Alif lifted high the spear,
And Ha the moony shield did bear,
And Ba his bended bow.
The crooked sabre Lam did wield;
And Mim, conspicuous in the field,
His helmet crest did show."

The allusion, of course, is to the forms of the characters.

The worst fault of the book is that some of the pieces show the influence of too severe a course of the *Ingoldsby Legends*, the style of which is hardly congenial to the subject.

A DESCRIPTIVE AND HISTORICAL ACCOUNT OF THE GODAVERY DISTRICT, in the Presidency of Madras. By HENRY MORRIS, formerly of the Madras Civil Service, author of "A History of India for the use of Schools in India," and other works. (London: Trübner & Co. 1878.)

It is much to be regretted that the time, trouble, and cost which have been spent on the work under notice have been almost wasted. Mr. Morris's book abridged by two-thirds and bound in paper would have been valuable to subordinate officers in the collectorate of which he has constituted himself the *vates sacer*. It contains a great bulk of tabulated returns,—which no one will ever read who has not equal access to the original materials in the Collector's office,—a great many quotations from works equally accessible to any one ever likely to want them, and no spark of original matter worth reading at all.

All this would be nothing if the book was not published in an expensive form at a first-rate publisher's, and under the supposed patronage of the India Office, instead of getting its deserts at a Secretariat press in Madras. The general public,

or even Orientalist students, can find no possible interest in the matters which seem to Mr. Morris of first-rate importance—the exact gate of a town where the police-barrack or school is situated, or the wreck of an ill-managed steamer near Cocanada, and the suspension of its skipper's certificate.

On the other hand, writing of the great Eastern Chalukya dynasty, and of their very capital (Rājamaṇḍri), he thinks that there "would be little use in giving here the bare list of these sovereigns," though he does bestow upon the site a notice which seems to have been translated from a Tehsildar's report—a remark which applies more or less to the whole of this bulky volume except a few extracts from the Madras and India Office records. As long as any encouragement is given to the compilation of district manuals in this Philistine style the Government of India need not be surprised to find few scholars among its servants.

HISTOIRE DE L'ASIE CENTRALE depuis les dernières années du règne de Nadir Chah (1153) jusqu'en 1233 de l'Hégire (1740—1818). Par Mir Abdoul Kerim Boukhary, publiée, traduite, et annotée par Charles Schefer, premier secrétaire interprète du gouvernement pour les langues orientales, &c. &c. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1878.

Mir Abd'ul Karim Bukhārī, it appears from the preface to the translation of the work before us, was a Sayyid of Bukhārā in the diplomatic service of the Amīr Shāh Maḥmūd of that Khānate. In this character he visited Kāśmīr, European and Asiatic Russia, and a large part of the intervening countries. Finally, in company with Mirza Muḥammad Yusuf, Ambassador of Bukhārā, he arrived, in September 1807, in Constantinople. In one year more he was the sole survivor of the embassy, and apparently took this as a hint from Providence that he had wandered far enough, took to himself a wife (he does not say whether he had left any at home), and settled in the village of Beshik-Tash, in Roumelia, "whereof the charms are equal to those of Paradise."

While here he became acquainted with Arif Bey, then master of the ceremonies at the Porte. For him the Mir compiled a sort of joint Gazetteer and Almanach de Gotha of Central Asia, of which a single manuscript exists. This, at the sale of the Bey's library in 1851, fortunately fell into the hands of a worthy possessor, M. Charles Schefer, who has had the text printed at Bouliak, and now publishes it with a French translation, numerous and valuable notes and appendices, and a tolerable map. It is much to be regretted that there is no index—a capital fault in a work purely of reference.

The author, after a short preface, enumerates the districts of Afghānistān,¹ and gives tables of

¹ Of these he treats Laghmān, Jelālābād, and one or two others which we consider extra-Indian, as 'in Hindu-

stān.' The same view may be traced in several of the earlier Muslimān authors quoted in Elliot.

their revenues in rupees, and of the principal routes in *farsakhs*. He then proceeds with the history of the Saduzai dynasty, which he brings down to the date of writing, A.H. 1233 (A.D. 1817), and concludes with the question, "What will happen next?" To which the answer of Time has been strange enough.

Next follows a similar account of Bukhârâ, which is very full, the author being naturally well up in his subject. Thirdly, Khiva is described in the same way. Fourthly, Khokand, a good deal mixed up with Kâshgâr and Yârkand. Fifthly, Khurassân, Tibet, and Kâsmir divide a chapter among them. Here ends the work of Mir Abd'ul Karim, but not that of M. Schefer, who has, to supply the deficiencies of his author, added 52 pages of appendices, consisting of translated extracts from original Asiatic works,² except only a short notice of the citadel of Kâbul taken from Mason.

Mir Abd'ul Karim seems to have been a diligent observer and collector of materials, and, when not blinded by his religious passions (like most Tajiks of the Khânates, he was a violent Sunni), to be a tolerably candid and trustworthy historian. His great fault is that he hardly ever gives a date. Several of his geographical statements are corroborated by more recent European travellers, and he deals little in the marvellous. The following account of the *Yak* seems worth transcribing:— "There is found in these mountains an ox called *Kûthâs*; it hath a great brush like a fox's, whereof the hairs are as long as those of women, and which is used in Turkistân to mount upon the *Tugh*s.³ These oxen are found in great numbers all along the route from Tibet to Yârkand. In Tibet they are tamed and used for burden; they work as well as buffaloes; their flesh and milk have a very sweet savour. * * * * On the road to Tibet I caught a young *Kuthâs* napping, and slew him with a pistol-shot; his flesh was delicious." 'Delicious' as the *yak* veal is the Mir's brief and candid account of his sporting feat. A real Persian would have given a chapter to the chase, and finally shorn off the head of the 'mighty mountain bull' with one sweep of his *shamsker*. His historical style is equally brief and matter-of-fact, bar a few pious remarks and indifferent verses; and he gives few anecdotes.⁴ One is introduced in illustration of the character of the Yomud Turkomâns,

on whom so much sympathy has of late been expended. Abd'ul Karim would have wasted little on them; he calls them 'perverse brigands,' whose habits 'reminded him of those of the Janissaries' (it will be remembered that he wrote for an officer of the court of Mahmûd the Reformer), and says, "A preacher was describing paradise. There was in the congregation a certain Turk, and quoth he, 'Do they go on *alamân* (foray) there?' 'No,' was the answer. 'Then,' retorted the Turk, 'would I liefer be in hell.' The Yomuds are of his opinion." A much worse infidel, however, was 'Alam Khân of Khokand, whose seal illustrates M. Schefer's title-page. "It is related," says the Mir, "that a certain Shaikh had many disciples in Khokand, and asserted that his holy life had procured him the privilege of revelation, and the power of thaumaturgy. One day, 'Alam Khân, who was sitting by a cistern,' bade stretch a rope across it and call the Shaikh. The latter came, with some disciples, and sat down before the Khân. After a short time, 'Alam Khân said, 'O Shaikh! Shortly, on the day of resurrection, thou wilt pass thy disciples over the bridge Al Sirat, under which is hell. At present do thou walk along this rope, that I may be witness to one of thy miracles.'" The Shaikh protested, the Khân insisted; and the end of it was that the holy man made the attempt, failed ignominiously, and got not only a ducking, but such a thrashing, in the character of a detected impostor, that he died of the effects. "Whenever 'Alam Khân caught a dervish he seized him and set him to drive camels." This irreligious prince, naturally, was dethroned and murdered by his brother and uncle.

We give the following genealogies of the reigning families:—

The House of Saduzai is said by Abd'ul Karim to have come from Multân. Though they were certainly powerful there during the time of the last Nawâbs and the Sikhs, this is unlikely, and it is more probable that their settlement there dates from 1731 A.D., when Nâdir Shâh banished their chiefs thither.⁵

The following is the genealogy of the family:—

Zamân Khân Abdâli Durâni Saduzai came from Afghânistân proper to Herât about 1708, and joined his tribesman Asad u'lla Khân,⁷ governor of Herât for Shâh Husain

² To wit, Khurassân, from the *Fihrist u't Tawârikh* of Rîzâ Kuli Khân, tom. IX.; Turkestan (Khokand), from the end of the *Tarikh-i Ahmad* of Munshi Muhammad Abd'ul Karim Turkistân and Desht (i. kiptchak) from the *Jahân Nâmâ* of Hâjî Khalîfa; the Kalmaks, Tibet, Kâshgâr, the Kazaks, and Tura, from Saifi's *History of the Kings of Hind, Sind, Khita, Khoten, &c.*
³ *Tugh* = the famous 'horse-tails' of Tatar armies.

⁴ On the other hand he records the devices of a great many coins and seals.

⁵ Probably one of those which are common in court-yards and gardens all over the East. The locale indicates that the Khân was taking his ease, and very likely drunk.

⁶ Elphinstone's *Hist.* (1st ed.) p. 542.

⁷ Elphinstone calls him Abd'u'lla.

Safavi: killed about or after 1760. His brother was Muḥammad Khān.

Zamān Khān's sons were: (1) Zu'lfikar Khān—end uncertain. (2) Aḥmad Khān, afterwards Aḥmad Shāh, became chief of the tribe; followed Nādir, founded the Durāni empire on Nādir's death in 1747; died at Murgha, Toba hills, Achakzai country, June 1773. He had eight sons:—

(1) Timur Shāh, succeeded 1773, died 20th May 1793 at Kābul.

(2) Suleimān made an abortive attempt to secure the succession, and was imprisoned for life in the Bala Hissar or citadel of Kābul, where he died about 1796, leaving four sons.

(3) Maḥmud, (4) Gohar, (5) Humāyūn,—all died in confinement in the citadel of Kābul.

(6) Sikandar—strangled in the citadel of Kābul, in consequence of a plot in his favour, 1779. (Elphinstone, however, says he was spared.)

(7) Darāb—escaped from the Bala Hissar with other confined princes about 1809, but afterwards returned to Kābul of his own accord, and died there before 1818.

(8) Shahāb—was alive at Kābul in 1818.

Timur Shāh had 300 wives, all foreigners; the seraglio was maintained on the revenues of Jelālābād, amounting to four lakhs of rupees per annum. He had thirty-six sons:—

(1) Humāyūn, endeavoured to succeed his father, defeated by his brother Shujā 1793, captured near Leia 1795, blinded and confined in the citadel of Kābul. His son Aḥmad was killed in battle 1793.

(2) Maḥmud, assumed royalty in Herāt on his father's death in 1793; expelled by Shāh Zamān 1797; returned and expelled Shāh Zamān 1800; expelled by Shāh Shujā 1803; escaped from Kābul in the same year; returned and reconquered the kingdom 1803-9; was still in power 1818 (?) Had one son, Kamrān, who was in power in Herāt in 1841.

(3) Zamān, succeeded his father 1793; de-throned and blinded 1800; was in Baghdād in 1817. He had four sons,—Kaisar, murdered in prison by his cousin Kamrān 1800; Haidar, Mānsur, and Fāghfūr.

(4) Shujā, expelled and succeeded Maḥmud 1803; expelled by him 1809; returned with the English; defeated and murdered by his nephew Sultān Jān 1841 (P).^a

(5) Firāz u'd-dīn, turned out of Herāt 1797; regained it; defeated by the Persians at Chade

1807; made prisoner and confined in the citadel of Kābul 1816. Had one son, Malik Kāsim, and a daughter who poisoned herself rather than marry a Shiah, 1807.

(6) Abbas: Abdu'l Karīm says he was remarkable for courage, strength, and skill, in the use of the sword. Strangled in prison in the citadel of Kābul, under Zamān Shāh.

(7) Shāpur, poisoned in the citadel of Kābul. These two princes were children of the daughter of Sharbat 'Alī Khān Jindawūl, Kazalbāsh, the chief Sultāna of Timur. Abdu'lla Khān, styled Jān Nisar Khān, governor of the citadel, paid improper addresses to her in the time of Zamān Shāh. Shāpur stabbed Jān Nisar to avenge his mother's honour, and was murdered in consequence at the same time with her and Abbas.^a

(8) Jahān Wālā; (9) Ayub; (10) Hasan; (11) Hamid; (12) Gohar; (13) Kaisar; (14) Akbar; (15) Ālamgir; (16) Aḥmad; (17) Yakub; (18) Salim; (19) Fāghfūr; (20) Jahān; (21) Shāh Rukh; (22) Muḥammad; (23) 'Usmān; (24) 'Umar; (25) Kanvar; (26) Rustam; (27) Daryā Dil; (28) Kohan Dil; (29) Rahmat; (30) Farukh; (31) Aurangzib; (32) Sābir; (33) Tipt; (34) Darāb; (35) Zakariā; (36) not named. Abdu'l Karīm says that the 35 survived their father.

Names of the Amīrs murdered by Zamān Shāh and his vazir, Rahmat ulla Khān Saduzai, in 1799, which massacre led to Zamān's downfall:—

(1) Payanda Khān Bārakzai,^a father of Fateh Khān, Dost Muḥammad, and 20 others, and grandfather of Sher 'Alī Khān now reigning.

(2) Hukumat Khān, governor of Balkh.

(3) Rahīm Dād Khān, (4) Kamar u'd-dīn Khān, (5) Amir Arslan Khān, (6) Jāfar Khān, (7) Shakar Khān Jindawūl.

(8) The son of Mir Hazar Khān 'Alīkuzai, (9) Muḥammad A'zam Khān, (10) Zamān Khān, (11) Zabād Beg 'Alīkuzai, (12) Rahīm Khān Nūrzai, (13) Aḥmad Khān Pannī.

Mangit Dynasty of Bukhārā.

Khudayar Beg, Mangit Uzbek, claimed descent from Toktamish, who was defeated by Timur Lang. Had two sons:—(1) the father of—

I. Muḥammad Rahīm Beg, an officer in the service of Nādir Shāh, detached by him to assist Abu'l Faiz Khān walad Subhān Kuli Khān—a chief of the White Bone ruling as Nādir's tributary in Bukhārā—against Ibadu'lla Khān, an Uzbek plunderer. On hearing of Nādir's death

Mukhtar u'd-daula; rebelled against him afterwards, and was killed in action. His son Atta Muḥammad was viceroy of Kāsmīr for Shāh Shujā after the death of Abdu'lla Khān. He made himself practically independent, but was eventually conquered by a joint invasion of Ranjit Sing and Fateh Khān walad Payanda Khān Bārakzai (his own maternal uncle).

^a But see Vincent Eyre's account for this last event.

^a Abdu'l Karīm contradicts himself about this, saying in one place that Abbas was spared; and in another that he was strangled, which is more likely.

^a Shāh Wali Khān Bārakzai was vazir to Shāh Aḥmad. His son Sher Muḥammad took a principal part in enthroning Shāh Shujā, and was vazir to him; is called by Elphinstone

(1747) he dethroned and expelled Abu'l Faiz, and seized the sovereignty. Issue—two daughters. (1) married to Abdu'l Momin walad Abu'l Faiz, who was murdered by Muhammad Rahim: she had a son. (2) The other daughter had also a son.

II. Dānyāl Beg, succeeded his nephew Muhammad Rahim Beg. He had ten sons:—

III. (1) Shāh Murād Beg, Amir Ma'sum, superseded and succeeded his father, June 1784.

(2) Mahmud Beg, living in exile in Khokand in 1818.

(3) 'Umar Beg and (4) Fāzil Beg, put to death with their families by their nephew Amir Haidar Turē.

IV. (4) Sultān Murād Beg, died at Mas-kāt on the Haj, 1803. He had three sons (*see inf.*).

(5) Rustam Beg, died at Bukhārā.

(6) Ganj 'Alī Beg, alive in 1818.

(7) Rajab 'Alī Beg: insane.

(8) Toktumish Beg, died at Kābul in the reign of Timur Shāh; i.e. before 1793.

Shāh Murād Beg had three sons:—

V. Sayyid Haidar Turē, styled Amir Sayyid,* succeeded his father Sultān Murād Beg 1803. He had six sons:—

(1) Muhammad Husain, by a Sayyid lady.

VI. (2) Bahādur Khān Nasirū'lla succeeded his father 1826. He murdered Stoddart and Conolly. His son—

VII. Muza'ffar u'd-dīn succeeded him 1860.

(3) Abdu'lla, (4) 'Umar,—sons of a slave woman.

(5) Zābair.

(6) Jahāngir, son of a lady of the Khwājahs of Juibar.

Dīn Nasir Beg, second son of Sultān Murād Beg (*supra*), was an exile in Russia in 1818. Muhammad Husain Beg, third son, an exile at Shahr-i Sabz.

Kungusāt Dynasty of Khiva.

I. Ahmad Beg Ināk (=chief) of the Kungusāt' Uzbaks in 1717 (period of Bekovitch Cherkaski's expedition), had at least one son,—

II. Muhammad Amin Beg, succeeded 1755, had sons,—

(1) Fāzil Beg, blind from disease, was alive in 1818, and

III. (2) 'Iwāz, succeeded his father, died in 1804.

IV. (3) Iltūzar, succeeded Ivāz; superseded the Khāns of the White Bone, under whom his predecessors had been *maires du palais*, and was the first Kungusāt Khān killed in battle, with Amir Haidar Turē of Bukhārā.

(4) Muhammad Rahim, succeeded Iltūzar; was still reigning in 1818.

(5) Niyāz Muhammad and (6) Muhammad Rizā, put to death by Muhammad Rahim before 1818.

(7) Jān Murād and (8) Hassan Murād, killed with Iltūzar in 1806.

(9) Muhammad Niyāz, died a natural death before 1818. (10) Kutli Murād, alive in 1818.

Uzbek Dynasty of Khokand.

I. Nar Būta Beg, Uzbek, governed Khokand in the time of Shāh Murād of Bukhārā. Did not strike money or put his name in the *khutba* subsidized by the Emperor of China. Had three sons:—

II. (1) 'Alam Beg, succeeded him, struck money and read the *khutba* in his own name; had one son,—Shāhrukh, murdered by his uncle 'Umar Beg.

III. (2) 'Umar Beg, defeated, killed, and succeeded 'Alam Khān. Still reigning in 1818.

3. Rustam Beg, murdered by his brother 'Alam.

Of a different character was the pious Shāh Murād, our author's own first patron. He was the son of a rough but good-tempered soldier, Dānyāl Beg, Amir of Bukhārā, who was so lost to all sense of religion that he allowed Persians openly to smoke 'hubble-bubbles' in the court and city. Horrified at this and similar enormities, Shāh Murād became the disciple of a Shaikh, who imposed upon him during his novitiate the duties of a bazār porter. From this point on, his career presents a singular analogy with that of the hypocrite Aurangzib. The penitent waded through blood and intrigue, till he superseded his good-tempered sinner of a father. Only—to the credit of both be it spoken—the father exacted, and the son kept, an oath not to shed the blood of his brethren. This was an isolated instance of mercy in the history of Shāh Murād, and indeed in the whole book, in which almost every page has its tale of blood or treachery, related as naively as the surprise of the Yak calf, and often immediately before or after a general certificate of the virtues of the 'first murderer. It is not the province of a scientific journal to digress upon the politics of the day, but the student of history may be permitted to regard with satisfaction the fate of these cut-throat little dynasties, which are now falling, one after another, under the heavy hand of a civilized power.

W. F. S.

* Haidar Turē was the son of a lady of Abu'l Faiz Khān's family, which must have been Sayyid, as he thus styles himself for the first time in the pedigree.

'Kungusāt, i.e. Chestnut Horse, was the name of a great Mongol class under Jingsis Khān, probably inherited from them by the Uzbek tribe.

SANSKRIT AND OLD CANARESE INSCRIPTIONS.

BY J. F. FLEET, Esq. C.S., M.R.A.S.

(Continued from p. 220.)

No. XLVI.

THE copper-plate grant, of which a revised transcription and translation are now given, has been published by Professor J. Dowson at *Jour. R. As. Soc.*, New Series, Vol. I., p. 247. It appears that this grant,—with two of the Gúrjara king Dadda II. or Prasāntarāga, and one more, the details of which are not specified,—was found, about A.D. 1827, in the town of Khêdā or Kaira. “The river ‘Watrua’ runs close to the walls on the north-west side, and was the cause of the discovery, by washing down the walls and earth.” The original now belongs to the Royal Asiatic Society’s Library, whence I obtained it to edit from.

The plates are two in number, about 13½” long by 8½” broad. Their edges are slightly raised, so as to form a rim to protect the writing. They are pierced with holes for two rings; but the rings are not now forthcoming, and I cannot trace any mention of them, or of the seal that must have been on one of them. The language is Sanskrit. The characters are radically the same as, and differ but very little from, those of the early Chalukya and Kadamba copper-plate grants which I have published in this Journal. The chief points of difference are:—1, The letters are slightly cursive, which is not the case in the earliest grants from the south;—2, The vowel *ê*, as attached to a consonant, is carried rather lower down than in the southern grants, and the curve is sometimes continued up to the consonant again, e.g., in *anvayê*, l. 3, *nyâyêna*, l. 10, and *vridhdhayê*, l. 11; and the same remark applies to the lower stroke of *ai*, e.g., in *Vaiśākha*, l. 11;—3, The subscribed *v* is more like a subscribed *y* cut short, as with the subscribed *v* and *ck* in the grant of Dêvavarmā at p. 33 above;—and 4, The *ta* has a more decided horizontal top-stroke than it has in the southern grants.—It is also to be remarked that the rule of doubling consonants after the letter *r* is not adhered to as regularly as in the southern grants. The *Anusvāra* is written above the line.

¹ He is called Vijayavarmā in l. 7 of the cancelled inscription on the backs of these plates, No. XLVII. below. With this we may compare ‘Kirtirāja’ as a varying form,

The charter is issued from the victorious camp at the city of Vijayapura, a place which I do not know. The grant is made by Vijayarāja¹, the son of Buddhavarmā, who was the son of Jayasimha of the Chalukya family. It confers the village of Pariyaya upon the priests and religious students of Jambūsara. This is the modern Jambūsar, almost in a direct line between Kaira and Broach, about fifty miles to the south by east of Kaira, and twenty-five miles to the north by west of Broach. I cannot identify Pariyaya. The grant is dated in the year three hundred and ninety-four, on the day of the full-moon, or the fifteenth day of the bright fortnight, of the month Vaiśākha.

The date is first given in words in l. 32, and is then repeated in figures in l. 34, where we have the numerical symbols for 300 and 90 and 4, whereby to express the year, and for 10 and 5, whereby to express the lunar day. The symbols used here agree, except the 4 and the 5, with the Valabhi and Chalukya numerals given by Pandit Bhagwānīal Indrajī in the table that accompanies his paper *On the Ancient Nāgarī numerals* at *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. VI., p. 42. As in the instances given by him; the lower part of the 4 is the letter *ka*. It is difficult to say what the upper part is meant for; but it certainly is not *na*, *sha*, or *h*, and it resembles *ya* more than any other letter, though it is not exactly the *ya* of the rest of the inscription. The symbol for 5 is theoretically the same symbol that is given by him. He gives three forms of the Valabhi 5, and remarks that “the first figure is clearly *trā*,” and,—on the assumption that “the loop” [which introduced a varying form of the *ta*] “was no doubt caused by hasty writing,”—that “the following two signs, which look like *nā*, are mere corruptions of *trā*.” But, as will be further exemplified by the recurrence of the same symbol in a slightly different form in No. XLVII. below, it is really *nā*; and the Pandit’s erroneous explanation of it is due to his having had before him three instances in which the

in one of the Nertr plates, of the name of the Chalukya king Kirtivarmā I.

form of the *na* used in composing it was the form with a loop, whereas in the present instance the form used is, as throughout the body of the inscription, that without the loop. Originally, neither the *ta* nor the *na* was formed with a loop; but in later times the distinguishing feature of the two letters was that, in the south the *ta* was formed with a loop and the *na* without, whereas in the north, as is clearly shown by the modern *Dēvanāgarī*, though not so clearly by the modern *Baṅgālī*, alphabet, the process was the reverse of this, and the *na* was developed by the loop, while the *ta* retained substantially its original form without a loop. In intermediate times there appears to have been considerable hesitation in determining the distinguishing forms of *ta* and *na*, and the same forms were used for each other indifferently; see, for instance, my remarks at *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. V., p. 176, note †. In his paper referred to above, the Pandit remarks of the symbol for 4, that "the lower part always shows the figure of that form of *ka* which is used in the alphabet of the period." The same rule applies to the symbol for 5; whichever form of the *na* is used in the body of the inscription, the same form is used in the *nā* employed to represent the 5.

The era to which the date of this grant is to be referred is not stated. Prof. Dowson took the use of the word *saṁvatsara* by itself as indicating that the era referred to was that of the *Saṁvat* of *Vikrama*, and he read the date as *Vikrama-Saṁvat* 394, or A.D. 338. But Mr. K. T. Tēlaṅg, in a dissertation on this same grant in his paper *On a new Chalukya copper-plate* at *Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc.*, Vol. X., p. 348, points out,—that *saṁvatsara* is a common word for 'year,' and refers to no particular era whatever,—that even the word *saṁvat*, an abbreviation of *saṁvatsara*, is not by any means used to designate exclusively the era of *Vikrama*,—and that such of the other known grants of the *Chalukya* dynasty, as bear any date at all, are expressly dated in the *Śaka* era. On these grounds, he draws the conclusion that the era intended in the present grant, also, is that of the *Śaka*. In addition to the reasons brought forward by him, I have to adduce the following. In the comparison of the *Gūrjara* family with the ocean; in the titles of some of the officials addressed; in some of the conditions and privileges attached to the grants; in the

names of many of the grantees; in the address to future kings on the subject of continuing the grants; and in their characters, closely allied, though with distinctive features of their own,—the two *Kaira* grants of *Dadda II.*, given with facsimiles in Prof. Dowson's paper, bear so close a resemblance to the present grant of *Vijayarāja* that, being grants of a different dynasty, they must be almost synchronous with it, and very possibly all three grants were composed by one and the same person. These two *Kaira* grants of *Dadda II.* are dated in the same way in words and in figures, one in the year 380, and the other in the year 385; and here, again, the word *saṁvatsara* is used without any specification of the era to which it refers. In their case, however, this point is made quite clear by a third grant of *Dadda II.*, from *Ilâḥ*, published by Professor R. G. Bhāṇḍārkar at *Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc.*, Vol. X., p. 19, which, like Prof. Dowson's two grants, was written by *Rēva*, the High Minister for peace and war, and which is dated, in words only, in specifically the year 417 of the *Śaka* era; the expression in the original, in l. 18, is,—*Śaka-nripa-kāl-ātīta-saṁvachchha(ṭa)ra-śata-chatusṭayē sapṭadaś-ādhikē*. And the same precise specification of the era, in words only,—*Śaka-nripakāl-ātīta-saṁvatsara-śata-chatusṭayē*, i.e., 'in (the year) 400 of the years that had expired in the era of the *Śaka* king',—is given in l. 22 of a fourth grant of *Dadda II.*, from *Umētā*, published, with facsimile, by Dr. Bühler at p. 61 above. On all these grounds, there can be no doubt that the same era is the one intended in the present grant of *Vijayarāja*. The date of it, therefore, is *Śaka* 394 (A.D. 472-3), and it is the earliest *Chalukya* grant that we as yet know of.

After expressing their opinions as to the date, Prof. Dowson and Mr. K. T. Tēlaṅg have entered into lengthy disquisitions with the object of making the genealogy and date of this *Chalukya* grant from the north fit in, in direct lineal succession, with the genealogy and dates of the other *Chalukya* grants from the south. Their views are so radically wrong on this point, that it is undesirable to allow them to remain without refutation. To enable me to refute them, I must point out the errors on which they are fundamentally based. In doing so, I must be held excused for occupying

space and attention with matter which would otherwise be quite foreign to the subject in hand. Their remarks extend over a considerable portion of the Chalukya genealogy; but it will suffice for me to confine myself here to the first three generations.

As originally given by Sir Walter Elliot in his paper *On Hindu Inscriptions*, first published at *Jour. R. As. Soc.*, Vol. IV., p. 1, and afterwards reprinted with corrections and emendations at *Madr. Jour. Lit. and Sc.*, Vol. VII., p. 193, the genealogy commences with,—

Jayasimha I.

Rajaraga, or (?) Rajasimha.

Pulakesi I.
(Saka 411.)

At a later period, in his second paper on *Numismatic Gleanings* at *Madr. Jour. Lit. and Sc.*, New Series, Vol. IV., p. 75, he inserted another step, and commenced the genealogy with,—

Jayasimha I., or Vijayaditya I.

Rajaraga, Rajasimha, or Vishnuvardhana I.

Vijayaditya II.

Pulakesi I.
(Saka 411.)

And in the same paper he gives the following narrative:—"Previous to the arrival of the first Chalukya in the Dekkan, the Pallavas were the dominant race. In the reign of Trilochana-Pallava, an invading army, headed by Jayasimha, surnamed Vijayaditya, of the Chalukya-kula, crossed the Nerbudda, but failed to secure a permanent footing. Jayasimha seems to have lost his life in the attempt; for, his queen, then pregnant, is described as flying after his death, and taking refuge with a Brahman called Vishnu-Somayaji, in whose house she gave birth to a son named Rajasimha, who subsequently assumed the titles of Rajaraga and Vishnuvardhana. On attaining to man's estate, he renewed the contest with the Pallavas, in which he was finally successful, cementing his power by a marriage with a princess of that race, and transmitting the kingdom thus founded to his posterity.

His son and successor was named Pulakesi; and his son was Vijayaditya. A copper *śāsana*, recording a grant made by Pulakesi which bears date Saka 411 or A.D. 489, is extant in the British Museum." There is a mistake here in the fifth sentence, which makes Pulakesi the son of Rajaraga, and Vijayaditya the son of Pulakesi. The genealogy represents correctly the order of succession that was intended.

Starting with this second genealogy of Sir Walter Elliot, including A.D. 489 as the date of Pulakesi I.; assuming that the Jayasimha of the Kaira grant, and the Jayasimha of Sir Walter Elliot, were one and the same person; interpreting the date of the Kaira grant as Vikrama-Samvat 394, the consequence of which was that, "the date of this grant being A.D. 338, a period of about two hundred years intervenes between Jayasimha and the grant of Pulakesi in A.D. 489, and to fill up this period Sir Walter Elliot gives only three names, Pulakesi standing fourth in the list"; and making the assumption, quite opposed to fact except in the case of a few documents which show their own want of value, that "the loose and varying nature of the genealogies in these grants" is such that "it would seem, indeed, that the word 'son' meant nothing more than 'descendant' in many cases, and that the writers, either from ignorance or from utter indifference to the truth, frequently confined themselves to the recital of some of the more prominent and best-remembered names", and, again, that "the order of the names is sometimes found inverted, and other discrepancies are met with which show that the Chalukyas were but poorly informed about the history of their line";—Prof. Dowson deduces the following genealogy,—

Jayasimha I., or Vijayaditya I.

Buddhavarmā

Vijayaraja (A.D. 338)

Rajasimha, Rajaraga, or Vishnuvardhana I.

Vijayaditya II.

Pulakesi I. (A.D. 489.)

Starting with the same second genealogy of

Sir Walter Elliot, but rejecting 'Vijayāditya' as a second name of Jayasimha, and 'Rājasimha' and 'Vishṇuvardhana' as second names of Raṇarāga; making the same assumption with Prof. Dowson as to the identity of the two Jayasimhas; interpreting the date of the Kaira grant as Śaka 394; and concluding "from the substantial identity of the names, and from the agreement of the dates, that the Vijayarāja of the Kaira grant is the same person as the Vijayāditya [II.] of Sir Walter Elliot's list",—Mr. K. T. Tēlaṅg deduces the following genealogy,—

Jayasimha I.
|
Buddhavarmanā, or Raṇarāga.
|
Vijayarāja, or Vijayāditya I. (Śaka 394.)
|
Pulakēśi I. (Śaka 411.)

I have now published the British Museum plates as No. XLIV. of this Series, and have given in detail ample reasons for holding conclusively that the grant is a forgery of not earlier than the tenth century A.D. I have shown at the same time that, though it is just

possible, if we assume Śaka 411 to be the very first year of his reign, yet it is hardly probable, that the date given in it is the correct date for Pulakēśi I. I am willing, however, to concede that the forgers of the grant may have hit upon the correct date.

'Rājasimha', as a second name of Raṇarāga, which Sir Walter Elliot himself accepted with hesitation, is based only on a mistaken rendering of a passage in the British Museum plates, to which I have drawn attention in my paper on them.

The additional name and titles in Sir Walter Elliot's amended list are founded on the narrative passage which I have quoted. The original of this narrative is in a copper-plate grant of Rājārāja II., one of the Chōla successors of the Eastern Chalukya kings, who, according to the grant, ascended the throne in Śaka 944. I have now examined the original plates. The grant commences with the mention of Nārāyaṇa or Viṣṇu, from the water-lily which grew in whose navel Svayambhū or Brahmā was born. It then traces the genealogy, after the Purāṇic fashion, from Brahmā, through Attri and the moon, down to Udayana. It then continues:—

Text.

(Pl. II., a; l. 19).—Tataḥ param tat-prabhṛtiṣv=a-vichchhinna-[sa*]ntānēṣhv=Ayōdhyā-ismhāsan-āsinēṣhv=ākād-na^a shashṭi-chakravarttiṣhu tad-varṇasyō Vijayādityō nāma rāj=āpajigishayā dakṣhiṇāpatham gatvā Trilōchana-Pallavam=adhikshipya daiva-durīhayā lē(lō)k-āntaram=agamat [||*] Tasmin=samkulē purōhitēna sārddham=antarvratni tasya mahādēvi Muḍivēmu-nām-āgrahāram katipayābhīr=antahpura-kāntābbih kamchukibhiś=cha sah=ōpagamya tad-vāstavyēna Vishṇubhaṭṭa-sōmayājina dūhitri-nivvi(rvvi)sēsham=abhirakshitā satī Vishṇuvarddhanan=nandanam=asūta [||] Sā tasya cha kumārakasya Mānavyasagōtra-Hāritiputra-dvi-paksha-gōtra-vra(kra)m-ōchitāni karmāni kārayitvā tam=avaddha(rddha)yat [||*] Sa cha mātṛā vidita-vṛttāntas=san=nirggatya Chalukya-girau Nandām bhagavatīm Gaurim=ārādhyā Kumāra-Nārāyaṇa-Mātriganāms=cha samitapya(rpya) śrētātapatr-aikaśamkha-pamchamahāsābda-pālikētana-pratidakkā-varāhalāmchhana-pimchha(pichchha)-kuntha(nṭa)-simhāsana-makarātōraṇa-kanakadaṇḍa-Gaṅgā-Yamun-ādini sva-kula-kram-āgatāni nikshipta(ptā)n=iva sāmbrā(rā)jya-chihnnāni samādāya Kaḍa(da)mha-Gaṅg-ādi-bhūmipān=nirjjitya Sētu-Narmmadā-madhyam s-ārdha-sapta-lakṣam dakṣhiṇāpatham pālayām=asa [||] Ślōkah [||] Tasy=āsīd=Vijayādityō Vishṇuvarddhana-bhūpatēh Pallav-ānvaya-jātāyā mahādēvyās=cha nandanah [||*] Tat-sutaḥ Polakēśi-Vallabhah [||*] Tat-putra(trah) Kirttivarmanā [||*] Tasya tanayah [||*] Svasti Śrīmatām sakala-bhuvana-samstūyamāna-Ma(mā)navya-sagōtrānām Hāriti-putrānām Kauśikī-vara-prasāda-labdhā-rājyānām=Mātri-gaṇa-paripālītānām Sva(svā)mi-Mahāsēna-pād-ānudhyātānām bhagavan-Nārāyaṇa-prā(pṛ)asāda-sama(mā)sādita-vara-varāha-lāmchhan-ēksapa-kṣhaṇa-vasīkṛit-ārāti-maṇḍalānām=āsvamēdh-āvā(va)bhṛita(tha)-snēna-pavitrīkṛita-vapushām Chālu-kyānām kulam=alamkarishṇōs=Satyāśraya-Vallabhēndrasya bhrātā Kubja-Vishṇuvarddhanō shtādaśa varsha(rshā)ni Verṅgi-dēsam=apa(pā)layat [||*]

* The usual reading would be *āk-āna-shashṭi*; by Prof. Monier Williams *ākād-na shashṭi* is Vēdic Sanskrit.

Translation.

"After that, sixty emperors less by one, commencing with him, in unbroken lineal succession, having sat on the throne of Ayôdhya, a king of his lineage, Vijayâditya by name, went to the region of the south from a desire for conquest, and, having attacked³ Trilôchana-Pallava, lost his life⁴ through the evil influence of fate. While he was in difficulties, his queen, who was pregnant, came with the family-priest and with a few of the women of her bed-chamber and with her chamberlains to the *agrahâra*-(village) named Mudivemna, and, being cherished just like a daughter by Vishṇubhaṭṭa-Sômayâjî who dwelt there, brought forth a son, Vishṇuvardhana. And, having caused to be performed the rites of that prince, such as were befitting to his descent from the two-sided *gôtra* of the lineage of Mânava and of the sons of Hârîti, she reared him. And he, being instructed in history by his mother, went forth, and,—having worshipped Nandâ, the holy Gaurî, on the Chalkya mountain⁵; and having appeased Kumâra and Nârâyana and the Mothers (of mankind); and having assumed the emblems of universal empire which had descended to him by the succession of his family, and which had been, as it were, (voluntarily) laid aside, (viz.) the white umbrella, and the single conch-shell, and the five great sounds (of musical instruments), and the banner of the sword-edge, and the *pratiḍakkâ*⁶, and the sign of the bear, and the (banner of the) feathers of peacocks' tails, and the (banner of the) spear, and the throne, and the garland in the form of a sea-monster, and the golden sceptre, and the (signs of the river) Gaṅgâ and the (river) Yamunâ, and other (such emblems); and having conquered the Kadambas and the Gaṅgas and other kings,—he ruled over the region of the south, lying between the Bridge (of Râma) and the (river) Narmadâ, and containing

seven and a half *crores* (of villages). The son of king Vishṇuvardhana, and of his queen who was born in the family of the Pallavas, was Vijayâditya. His son was Polakêśi-Vallabha. His son was Kirttivarmâ. His son,—Hail!, Kubja-Vishṇuvardhana,—the (younger) brother of Satyâśraya-Vallabhendra who adorned the family of the Châlukyas', who are glorious, and who are of the lineage of Mânava which is praised over the whole world, and who are the descendants of Hârîti, and who acquired dominion through the excellent favour of Kauśikî, and who have been nourished by the assemblage of the Mothers (of mankind), and who have meditated on the feet of Svâmi-Mahâsêna, and who have had the territories of their enemies made subject to them on the instant at the sight of the sign of the bear which they acquired through the favour of the holy Nârâyana, and whose bodies have been purified by ablutions performed after celebrating horse-sacrifices,—ruled over the country of Veṅgî for eighteen years."

After this passage, the inscription continues the genealogy, in the usual style of the Eastern Châlukya grants, down to Râjarâja II., who seems to have also borne the name of Vishṇuvardhana.

It will be seen at once that the names of Jayasimha, Râjâsimha, and Raṇarâga are not mentioned at all in this grant; and that it is only by pure supposition that the first Vijayâditya of this grant is to be identified with Jayasimha, and the first Vishṇuvardhana with Raṇarâga, and that the second Vijayâditya is to be inserted between Raṇarâga and Pulikêśi I. If any such identification of persons had to be made at all, the simpler and more natural course would be, to identify the second Vijayâditya (the father of Pulikêśi by this grant) with Raṇarâga (the father of Pulikêśi).

³ *Adhikshipya*; lit., 'having insulted.'

⁴ *Lit.*, 'went to another world.'

⁵ This mountain seems to exist only in the imagination of the composer of this inscription.

⁶ This must be some variety of drum (*dhakkâ*). The emblems on the seal of this grant,—which has been wrongly attached in printing to the forged grant of Vikramâditya I., No. XLV. above,—are;—In the upper compartment, a bear facing to the proper left, with the sun, moon, two umbrellas, a double drum, a conch-shell, and something

close to the moon that may be the head of a spear (*kunta*); in the centre, the motto *Sri-Tribhuvan-Ankusa*; and in the lower compartment, a floral device which is probably a lotus, an elephant-goad, a sceptre (*kanaka-danda*), and something-like the letter *gâ*, which may be the *makara-tôrana*, or may be the *pâli-kêṭana* (see p. 111, note 25), if we take *pâli* in the sense of 'bridge.'

⁷ We have here the later form of the name, which is properly used only by the Western Châlukyas after the restoration of their dynasty; see the introductory remarks to No. XLIV., para. 6.

kêśi by other grants),—to identify the first Vishṇuvardhana with Jayasimha,—and to insert the first Vijayāditya at the head of the genealogy, as the newly discovered father of Jayasimha. But the authentic portion of this grant,—authentic as being copied from other similar grants of the same dynasty,—only commences with the words *Svasti Śrīmatān, &c.*, in Plate II., b; l. 31. All that precedes is a mere *farrago* of vague tradition and Purānic myths, of no authority, based on the undoubted facts that the Chalukyas did come originally from the north, and did find the Pallavas in possession of some of the territories afterwards acquired by themselves, and on a tradition of the latter Kādambas that the founder of their family was named Trilôchana or Trinêtra. Quoting the *Mackenzie Collection*, Mr. Rice, in his *Gazetteer of Mysore and Coorg*, Vol. I., p. 204, tells us that “A Trinêtra-Pallava is said to have introduced Brâhmanas into his territory; but, as this event is placed eleven thousand years B.C., it may be dismissed as a fabrication.” I know of no other grounds for allotting the name of Trilôchana or Trinêtra to any member of the Pallava family.

Accordingly,—expunging ‘Râjasimha’ as a second name of Raṇarâga, and marking the date of Śaka 411, allotted to Pulikêśi I., as rather doubtful,—Sir Walter Elliot’s first list of the first three generations is the one that stands correct. It was based then only on the plates in the British Museum and on the Yêwûr tablet. It has now the authority of the Aihole inscription at Vol. V., p. 67.

As it is thus apparent that there are no grounds for taking ‘Vijayāditya’ as the name, or as a name, of the father of Pulikêśi I., Mr. K. T. Têlaṅg’s proposal,—evidently based chiefly on the supposed similarity* of the name of Vijayarâja with the name of this phantom Vijayāditya,—to make Vijayarâja the father of Pulikêśi I., falls to the ground. He gives no very clear reason for identifying Buddhavarmâ with Raṇarâga, except that *Raṇa-râga* “may be regarded as a mere epithet meaning ‘lover of war.’” So, also, may *Jaya-simha*, ‘the lion of

victory’; *Saty-âśraya*, ‘the asylum of truth’; *Vikram-âditya*, ‘the sun of valour’; *Vinay-âditya*, ‘the sun of modesty’; and many other such names, be regarded as mere epithets. But these are, nevertheless, the names by which those kings were known in history and in official documents. Probably enough they had also household names of a more simple nature. Witness, for instance, the titles of Anṇana-siṅga, ‘the lion of Anṇa’, and Mâvana-siṅga, Sêna-na-siṅga, and Boppa-na-siṅga, which were borne by some of the feudatories of the later Western Châlukya kings, and which, when compared with Jagadêka-dâni, ‘the rutting elephant of Jagadêka’, in transcr. l. 9 of No. I. of this Series, at *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. IV., p. 179, point to Anṇa, Mâva, Sêna, and Boppa being, as much as Jagadêka, names of the paramount sovereigns. Witness, also, the motto *Śrī-Biṭṭarasa*, ‘the king Śrī-Biṭṭa, or, Śrī-Biṭṭi’, which is on the seal of a copper-plate grant of the Eastern Châlukya king Vishṇuvardhana I., published at *Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc.*, Vol. II., p. 1. Mr. K. T. Têlaṅg refers to the fact that *raṇa-vikrânta*, ‘he who is valorous in war’, is one of the epithets applied to Buddhavarmâ; but he does not seem to rely much on this in his identification of the two persons. And rightly so; for, precisely the same epithet, *raṇa-vikrânta*, is applied to Maṅgaliśvara in l. 5 of the Bâdâmi inscription, at *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. VI., p. 363; and in l. 4 of the Eastern Châlukya grant, of which I have just spoken, the father of Kirttivarmâ I. is mentioned, not under his proper name of Pulikêśi, but under the name, or epithet, of *Raṇavikrama-nripa*, i.e., ‘king Raṇavikrama’, or ‘the king who was possessed of valour in war.’

As regards Vijayāditya II., Prof. Dowson’s genealogy falls through in the same way. As regards his insertion of Buddhavarmâ and Vijayarâja between Jayasimha and Pulikêśi I.,—which was necessitated by the length of time to be accounted for that resulted from his reading the date of the grant as Vikrama-Samvat 394, and was justified, to him, by the assumption as to the vague and unsatisfactory nature of the ‘genealogies of

* *Râjan* is not synonymous with *âditya*, ‘sun’; but, in the sense of ‘moon’, it is synonymous with ‘*chandra*.’ Therefore, if at all we want a name differing from, and yet

similar to, ‘Vijayarâja’, we ought to have ‘Vijayachandra’, not ‘Vijayāditya.’

copper-plate grants in general,—it falls through, because the necessity ceases if we interpret the date as Śaka 394, and because the assumption is not warranted by facts.

That *Buddhavarma* is to be identified with *Raṇarāga*, or that he and *Vijayarāja* are to be foisted into the direct line of descent before *Raṇarāga* and *Pulikēśi I.*, I do not believe for a moment. If *Buddhavarma* and *Raṇarāga* were closely connected at all, they were brothers. As to the identity of the two *Jayasimha*s,—I am strongly inclined in favour of it, though I would not speak with absolute conviction at present. On the one hand, the difference in their dates is somewhat against the hypothesis that *Vijayarāja*, or *Vijayavarma*, and *Pulikēśi I.*, were of one generation, being grandsons of one and the same *Jayasimha*. On the other hand, the present grant is from the north; and there are the facts that the *Chalukyas* of the south always represent themselves as having come originally from the north, and that they commence their genealogy with a *Jayasimha*, as does the king for whom the present inscription was composed. And the characters of this grant connect it palæographically very closely with the southern grants.

Now,—except in the preamble of the grant of *Rājārāja II.*, of which, I trust, I have said quite enough above,—it is nowhere stated that *Jayasimha I.* of the *Chalukyas* of the south, or his son, *Raṇarāga*, did actually rule in, or even did invade, the south. And the negative evidence is opposed to any such supposition. For, the *Aihole* tablet and the *Miraj* plates,—the two^o authentic sources of information for this period,—do not speak of any of the royal families of the south, the *Kadambas*, the *Pallavas*, the *Gaṅgas*, the *Mauryas*, and the *Nalās*, as having been conquered by *Jayasimha I.*, or by *Raṇarāga*; nor does even the forged grant of *Pulikēśi I.* And I know of no other inscription which takes the genealogy back beyond *Pulikēśi I.*; which fact suggests the inference that he, the con-

queror of *Vātāpi* or *Bādāmi*, came subsequently to be looked upon as the real founder of the dynasty. Further, on reconsidering the verse that describes *Pulikēśi I.* in 1.3 of the *Aihole* inscription, I consider that the epithet *śrī-ṇḍu-kāntiḥ* applied to him there, and contrasted by the word *api* with the statement *ayāśid=Vātāpi-purī-vadhā-varatām*, indicates that, before he acquired *Vātāpi*¹⁰, he had a capital named *Indukānti*, which must be looked for somewhere in the north. Finally, after the present grant of *Vijayarāja*, we have no mention of any *Chalukyas* in the north until we come to the *Chalukyas* of *Aphilwāḍ*, the accession of the first of whom, *Mūlarāja I.*, is placed by Dr. Bühler at A.D. 941-2, though he speaks also of an ancestor of his, named *Bhūpati*, who is said to have been reigning in A.D. 695-6.

Taking all these indications together, the conclusion at which I arrive is that, at the death of *Vijayarāja*, or possibly by an invasion of his kingdom which resulted in his defeat and death in battle, the power of the *Chalukyas* in the north was subverted, and the family expelled, by the *Gūrjara* kings, or by the kings of *Valabhi*, the other most powerful rulers of those parts; that his cousin, *Pulikēśi I.*, was the only surviving representative of the family; and that, in his flight, directing his course to the south, *Pulikēśi I.* was attended by a band of adherents sufficiently numerous and strong to enable him to invade, and conquer a part of, the dominions of probably the *Pallava* king¹¹, and, by wresting the city of *Vātāpi* from them, to establish for himself a new seat of government there. Or, taking into consideration also the close resemblance of the style of this grant of *Vijayarāja* to the style of the grants of *Dadda II.*, as noticed above and in the notes to the Text below,—it is even possible that the *Chalukyas* were originally feudatories of the *Gūrjara* kings, but, in the person of *Pulikēśi I.*, threw off that yoke, and, emigrating to the south, established an independent sovereignty of

^o I have spoken of the *Miraj* plates at p. 103 above. I have now found that this is the identical copper-plate grant from which the genealogy of the *Yēwūr* tablet is taken, down to the notice of *Jayasimha-Jagadēkamalla*. Accordingly, for that part of the genealogy, the *Miraj* plates are entitled to be quoted in preference to the *Yēwūr* tablet. I shall shortly give a full account of these plates and the tablet combined.

¹⁰ *Lit.*, 'went to the condition of being the bridegroom of the bride which was the city of *Vātāpi*.'

¹¹ This fact is nowhere expressly stated. But I discovered at *Bādāmi* itself a rock inscription, unfortunately very fragmentary, but of early though uncertain date, which mentions *Vātāpi*, and also "the *Pallava*, the foremost of kings",—*kṣatibhujām-agrēśarah Pallavaḥ*. I have little doubt that *Vātāpi* was originally a *Pallava* capital.

their own. And to reconcile the dates of Vijaya-rāja and Pulikēśīl, on this supposition that they were grandsons of one and the same

Jayasimha, we have only to assume that, of two brothers, Rāṇarāja was the younger by some considerable difference of years.

Transcription.

First plate.

- [¹] Svasti Vijaya-skandhāvārāt Vijayapura-vāsakāt śarad-upagama-prasanna-gagana-tala-vimala-
vipulś vividha-purusha-ratna-guna-
[²] nika-āvabhāsītē mahā-satv-āpāsraya-durlamghyē gāmbhīryavati sthity-anupālana-parē mah-
ōdadhāva-iva Mānavya-sagōtrānām Hā-
[³] riti-putrānām Svāmi-Mahāsēna-pād-ānudyātānām Chalukyānām=anvayē vyapagata-sajala-
jaladhara-pātala-gagana-tala-gata-siśirakara-
[⁴] kirāṇa-kuvalayata-ra-yāsasah(sc. yāsāh) Śrī-Jayasimha-rājah [||*] Tasya sutah prabala-
ripu-timira-pātala-bhiduraḥ satatam=udaya-sthō naktan-diva-
[⁵] m=apy=akhaṇḍita-pratāpō dī(di)vākara iva vallabha-rāṇa-vikrānta-Śrī-Buddhavarma-
rājah [||*] Tasya sūnuḥ pri(pri)thivyām=a-pratirathah chatur-udadhi-sahil-ā-
[⁶] svādita-yasō(śā) Dhanada-Varuṇ-Endr-Āntaka-sama-prabhāvaḥ sva-bāhu-bal-ōpāt-ōrjita-
rāja(jya)-śrīḥ pratāp-ātiśay-ōpanata-samagra-sāmanta-ma-
[⁷] ṇḍalah paraspar-āpīdita-dhamm(rmm)-ārtha-kāma-nimō(rmō)chi prapāti-mātra-suparītōsha-
gambhīr-ōnnata-hridayah samyak-prajā-pālan-ādhipataḥ diu-ā-
[⁸] ndha-kripana-bhē(śa)raṇāgata-vatsalah yathābbilashita-phala-pradō mātā-pitri-pād-ānudyātah
Śrī-Vijayarājas=sarvvān=ēva^{1*} vishayāpati-rāshtra-
[⁹] grāmamahattar-ādhi-kārik-ādīn=samanudarsayaty=astu^{2*} vas=samviditam=asmābhīr=yathā
Kāsākūla-vishay-āntargataḥ Sandhiyara-pūvvi(rvvi)na^{3*} Pariya-
[¹⁰] ya ēsha grāmaḥ sōdraṇ(ōdraṇ)gaḥ sōparikarāḥ sarvva-ditya-viṣṭi-prātibhēdikā-
parihṇah bhūmi-chhi(chchhi)dra-nyāyēn=ā-chāta-bhaṭa-prāvēśyah^{4*} Jambūsa-
[¹¹] ra-sāmānya-Mā(vā)jasandya-Kānv-ādharīya(ryyu)-sābrahmachārī(ri)nām mātā-pitūrō-ātmānā-
cha punya-yasō-bhividdhayē Vaiśākha-pūṇnamāsyām=udak-āti-
[¹²] sarggēna pratipāditaḥ [||*] Bharadvāja-sagōtr-Ādityaraviḥ(vēḥ) pattikē^{5*} dvē Indrasūrya
pattikā Tāvisōrāya dvy-ardha-pattikā Īśvarasy=ārdha-pattikā
[¹³] Dāmāya pattikā Drōṇāy=ārdha-pattikā Atta(Prta)svāminē=ārdha-pattikā Māḷāy=ārdha-
pattikā Shashthidēvāy=ārdha-pattikā Sōmāy=ārdha-pattikā Rāmāsa-
[¹⁴] rmmānē=rdha-pattikā Bhāyyāy=ārdha-pattikā Drōṇadharāy=ārdha-pattikā [||*] Dhūmrā-
yana-sagōtr-Āvukāya div-ardha-pattikā Sūrāy=ārdha-pattikā || Daundakiya-
[¹⁵] sagōtra-Bhaṭṭhah pattikā Samudrāya div-ardha-pattikā Drōṇāya pattikā-trayam
Tāvisarmmanē pattikē dvē Bhaṭṭinē=rdha-pattikā Va(pcha)trāya pattikā
[¹⁶] Drōṇasarmmanē=rdha-pattikā dviṭṭiya-Drōṇasarmmanē=rdha-pattikā || Kāśyapa-sagōtra-
Vappasvāminē tīrah patṭikā Durgasarmmanē=rdha-pattikā Dattāyā-
[¹⁷] y=ārdha-pattikā || Kaundina(nya)-sagōtra-Vādāy=ā^{6*} . . . v-ardha-pattikā Sēlāya pattikā
Drōṇāya pattikā Sōmāy=ārdha-pattikā Sēlāy=ārdha-pattikā
[¹⁸] Va(pcha)trāsarmmanē=rdha-pattikā Bhāyisvāminē=rdha-pattikā || Mādharā-sagōtra-
Viśākhāya pattikā Dharāya pattikā Nandinē pattikā Kumārāya pattikā
[¹⁹] Rāmāya pattikā Bāsasy=ārdha-pattikā Gaṇāy=ārdha-pattikā Kottuvāy=ārdha-pattikā
Bhāyiva(bha)ṭṭāy=ārdha-pattikā Narmmanē=rdha-pattikā Rāmāsarmmanē=rdha-
[²⁰] pattikā || Hārīta-sagōtra-Dharmmadharāya div-ardha-pattikā || Vaishnava-sagōtra-Bhaṭṭinē
pattikā || Gautama-sagōtra-Dharāy=ārdha-pattikā Ammadharā-
[²¹] y=ārdha-pattikā Sēlāy=ārdha-pattikā || Śāṇḍīla-sagōtra-Dāmāy=ārdha-pattikā [||*]
Lakshmana-sagōtra-Kārkkasya pattikā [||*]

^{1*} This letter, va, was at first omitted, and then inserted below the line.

^{2*} In the two Kaira grants of Dadda II., l. 32 in each grant, the corresponding words are sarvvān=ēva rāja-sāmanta-bhōgika-vishayāpati-rāshṭragrāmamahattar-ādhi-kārik-ādīn-samanudarsayaty=astu. In the Ilāo grant of Dadda II., l. 11, and the Umētā grant of Dadda II., l. 14, the words are sarvvān=ēva rāshṭrapati-vishayāpati-grāmakūt-āyuktaka-niyuktak-ādhi-kā-mahattar-ādīn-sa-māpāyati astu; where ādhika, in each plate, is doubtless a mistake for ādhikārika.

^{3*} The marks over this letter, va, are a fault in the copper.

We have similar faults over, e.g., the vai of Vaiśākha and the rina of pūṇnamāsyām, l. 11.

^{4*} In the two Kaira grants of Dadda II., l. 33 in each grant, the corresponding words are sōdrangah sōparikarah sarvv-āddāna-saṅgrāhyah sarvva-ditya, &c., as in our text. In the Ilāo grant, l. 16, and the Umētā grant, l. 20, the words are sōdranga-sa(sō)parikara-sadhānyahiranyādēya-sōtpadyamānavishṭika(kah) samasta-rājakyānām=a-prāvēśyah.

^{5*} See note 27 below.

^{6*} One letter here is quite unintelligible.

[illegible]

[illegible]

Second plate.

- [²²] Vatsa-sagôtra-Gôpâdityâya pattikâ Visâkhây=ârdha-pattikâ Śūrây=ârdha-pattikâ Bhâyi-
svâminê=rdha-pattikâ Yakshaśarm=â-
[²³] rdha-pattikâ Tâvisûrâyâ pattikâ Karkri(rkka)sy=ârdha-pattikâ Tâvisamma(rmma)nê=rdha-
pattikâ Śarmmanê=rdha-pattikâ Kumârây=ârdha-pattikâ
[²⁴] Mâtrîśvarây=ârdha-pattikâ Bâtalây=ârdha-pattikâ [||*] Êtêbhyah sarvvêbhyah bali-charu-
vaiśvadêv-âgnihôtr-âdi-kriy-ôtsarppan-ârtham¹ ā-chandr-ârk-ârpava-kehi-
[²⁵] ti-sthiti-samakâlinah putra-pautr-ânvaya-bhôgyah yata(tô)=smad-varṣyair=anyair=v-âgâmi-
bhôgapatibhis=sâmânya-bhû-pradâna-phal-êpsubhih nala-vênu-kadali-
[²⁶] sâram samsâram=ndadbi-jala-vichî-chapalâms=cha bhôgân prabala-pavan-âhat-âśvâttha-patra-
chamchalâm cha śriyam kusumita-śirisha-kusuma-sadri-
[²⁷] ś-âpâyam cha yauvanam=âkalayya ayam=asmad-dâyô=numantavyah pâlayitavyas=cha [||*]
Yô v-âjñâna-timira-patal-âvrita-matir=âchchhidya(dyâ)d=âchchhi-
[²⁸] dyamânâṁ v=ânumôdêta sa pañchabhir=mmahâ-pâtakais=samyukta(ktah) syât [||*] Uktam
cha bhagavatâ vêda-vyâsêna Vyâsêna || Shashtim varsha-sahasrâni sva-
[²⁹] rggê vasati bhûmi-dah âchchhêtâ chy(ch)=ânumantâ cha tâny=êva narakê vasêt [||*]
Vindhy-âtavishv=atôyâsu śushka-kôṭara-vâsinah kṛishṇ-âha-
[³⁰] yô hi jâyantê bhûmi-dâyam haranti yê || Bahubhir=vvasudhâ bhuktâ râjabhih
Sagar-âdibhih yasya yasya yadâ bhûmiḥ tasya
[³¹] tasya tadâ phalam || ūrva-dattâm dvi-jâtibhyô yatnâd=raksha Yudhishtira mahim
mahimatâm śrêshṭha dânach=chhrôyô nupâlanam || Yân-iha
[³²] dattâni purâ narêndraiḥ dânanî dharmm-ârtha-yâsas-karâni nirvânta-mâlya-pratimâni
tâni kô nâma sâdhuh=punar=âdâṭa [||*] Samvatsara-sa-
[³³] ta-trayê chatur-mnavaty-adhikê Vaisâkha-paurṇamâsyâm Nannavâ(Phâ)śâpaka-
dâtakam likhitam mahâ-sandhi-vigrah-âdhikritêna Khudda(Pdâ)svâ-
[³⁴] minâ || Samvatsara || 394 [||*] Vaisâkha-śu 15 || Kshatriya-Mâtrîśimbhê=
ôtkirṇâni [||*]

Translation.

Hail! From the victorious camp, located at
(the city of) Vijayapura²⁰ :—

In the family of the Chalkyas, who are
of the lineage of Mânava, and who are the
descendants of Hârîti, and who meditate on the
feet of Svâmi-Mahâsêna,—(which family),
like the great ocean, is as pure and extensive
as the expanse of the sky which is pellucid at
the approach of autumn; and is made radiant
by the mass of the virtuous qualities of various
jewels of men; and is hard to be crossed,
through being the place of refuge of great
beings; and is possessed of profundity; and is
intent on preserving stability,—(there was) the
king Śrî-Jayasimha, whose fame was just
like a blue water-lily under the beams of the
cold-rayed moon in an expanse of the sky from
which the veil of clouds laden with water has
passed away :—

His son (was) the king Śrî-Buddhavar-
mâ, the lord, the valorous one in battle,—who,

like the sun, dispersed the canopy of the
darkness which was his enemies, and was al-
ways rising (higher and higher), and was
possessed of brilliance which was undiminished
both by night and by day :—

His son, Śrî-Vijayarâja,—who is with-
out an opponent in the world; whose fame is
flavoured by the water of the four oceans; who
is equal in prowess to (the gods) Dhanada
and Varuna and Indra and Antaka;
who has acquired great regal fortune by the
strength of his own arm; who has bowed down
the assemblage of chieftains by the excess of
his splendour; who liberates (from their con-
stant conflict) religion and wealth and passion
which mutually annoy each other; whose pro-
found and noble heart enjoys proper satisfac-
tion merely by (the performance of) obeisance
(to him); who is devoted to properly governing
his subjects; who is full of compassion for the
poor and the blind and the wretched and those
who go to him for refuge; who gives rewards

¹ In the first of the two Kaira grants of Dadda II., l. 42,
the corresponding words are châturvidyâ-parikalpanâ-
pârvaṁ bali-charu-vaiśvadêv-âgnihôtra-pañchamahâ-
yajñ-âdi-kriy-ôtsarppan-ârtham. In the second of these
grants, l. 41, in the Hâo grant, l. 14, and in the Umêṭā
grant, l. 17, they are simply bali-charu-vaiśvadêv-âgnihô-
tra-pañchamahâyajñ-âdi-kriy-ôtsarppan-ârtham.

²⁰ This mark of punctuation is wrongly placed here,
instead of after the numerals.

²¹ The construction is Vijaya-skandhâvdrât Vijayapura-
vdsakê Śrî-Vijayarâja=sarvudâ-êva
samantakurjayati. The genealogy
prior to the mention of Vijayarâja is by way of a paren-
thesis.

such as are desired; and who meditates on the feet of his mother and his father,—issues his instructions to all the lords of districts and the *Mahattaras*²¹ of countries and villages and the *Ādhikārikas* and others:—

Be it known to you that, on the day of the full-moon of (the month) *Vaiśākha*, in order to increase the religious merit and the fame of Our mother and father and of Ourselves, the village of *Pariyaya*, which was formerly (called) *Sandhiyara*²², included in the district of *Kāśā kūla*, has been given by us with plentiful libations of water,—with the *udraṅga* and the *uparikara*, and free from all the *ditya*²³ and (the liability to) forced labour²⁴ and the *prātibhédikā*, and (to be enjoyed) by the rule of *bhūmi-chekhidra*²⁵, and not to be entered (for the purpose of billeting) by the irregular or the regular troops²⁶,—to the general body of officiating priests and religious students of (the village of) *Jambūsara*, who belong to the *Vājasaneyā* (sect) and the *Kāṇva* (school of the *Vēda*). (The shares are):—Of *Āditya-ravi*, of the *Bharadvāja gōtra*, two *pattikās*²⁷; to *Indrasūra*, one *pattikā*; to *Tāvisūra*, two and a half *pattikās*; of *Īśvara*, half a *pattikā*; to *Dāma*, one *pattikā*; to *Drōṇa*, half a *pattikā*; to (?) *Attasvāmī*, half a *pattikā*; to *Māila*, half a *pattikā*; to *Shashthidēva*, half a *pattikā*; to *Sōma*, half a *pattikā*; to *Rāmaśarmā*, half a *pattikā*; to *Bhāyya*, half a *pattikā*; to *Drōṇadhara*, half a *pattikā*.—To *Āvuka*, of the *Dhūmrāyaṇa gōtra*, two and a half *pattikās*; to *Śūra*, half a *pattikā*.—To *Bhaṭṭi*, of the *Daundakīya gōtra*, one *pattikā*; to *Samudra*, two and a half *pattikās*; to *Drōṇa*, three *pattikās*; to *Tāviśarmā*, two *pattikās*; to *Bhaṭṭi*, half a *pattikā*; to

(?) *Vatra*, one *pattikā*; to *Drōṇaśarmā*, half a *pattikā*; to the second *Drōṇaśarmā*, half a *pattikā*.—To *Vappasvāmī*, of the *Kāśyapa gōtra*, three *pattikās*; to *Durgaśarmā*, half a *pattikā*; to *Dattāya*, half a *pattikā*.—To *Vāda*, of the *Kauṇḍinya gōtra*,²⁸, half a *pattikā*; to *Sēla*, one *pattikā*; to *Drōṇa*, one *pattikā*; to *Sōma*, half a *pattikā*; to *Sēla*, half a *pattikā*; to (?) *Vatraśarmā*, half a *pattikā*; to *Bhāyisvāmī*, half a *pattikā*.—To *Viśākha*, of the *Mādhara gōtra*, one *pattikā*; to *Dhara*, one *pattikā*; to *Nandī*, one *pattikā*; to *Kumāra*, one *pattikā*; to *Rāma*, one *pattikā*; of *Bāśra*, half a *pattikā*; to *Gaṇa*, half a *pattikā*; to *Korṭṭuva*, half a *pattikā*; to (?) *Bhāyivattā*, half a *pattikā*; to *Narmā*, half a *pattikā*; to *Rāmaśarmā*, half a *pattikā*.—To *Dharmadhara*, of the *Hārīta gōtra*, two and a half *pattikās*.—To *Bhaṭṭi*, of the *Vaiṣṇava gōtra*, one *pattikā*.—To *Dhara*, of the *Gautama gōtra*, half a *pattikā*; to *Ammaḍhara*, half a *pattikā*; to *Sēla*, half a *pattikā*.—To *Dāma*, of the *Śāṇḍila gōtra*, half a *pattikā*.—Of *Kārka*, of the *Lakṣhmaṇa gōtra*, one *pattikā*.—To *Gōpāditya*, of the *Vatsa gōtra*, one *pattikā*; to *Viśākha*, half a *pattikā*; to *Śūra*, half a *pattikā*; to *Bhāyisvāmī*, half a *pattikā*; to *Yakṣaśarmā*, half a *pattikā*; to *Tāvisūra*, one *pattikā*; to *Karka*, half a *pattikā*; to *Tāviśarmā*, half a *pattikā*; to *Śarmā*, half a *pattikā*; to *Kumāra*, half a *pattikā*; to *Mātrīśvara*, half a *pattikā*; to *Bātala*, half a *pattikā*.

This, Our gift,—(which is given) to all of these for the purpose of maintaining the *Bali* and the *Charu* and the *Vaiśvadēva* and the *Agnihōtra*

²¹ The precise meaning of *Mahattara* and *Ādhikārika*, as classes of officials, is not very well settled as yet.

²² *Sandhiyara-pūrvanā*, l. 9. But the meaning is very doubtful. Perhaps it should be, "which was the ancestral property of the *Sandhiyaras*." Prof. Dowson reads wrongly *Sandhiyan-privyina*, and does not suggest any explanation, except that some name or descriptive title of the village granted must be intended.

²³ Prof. Dowson derives *ditya* from *dā*, *dā*, 'cut, split', and *prātibhédikā* from *prati* + *bhid*, 'break, tear', and suggests 'cutting and hewing (of wood)' as the translation.

²⁴ *Viśhi* is the Sanskrit equivalent of the Canarese *bitti*, 'compulsory and unrequited labour.' We have had it also in l. 49 of the *Lakṣmīśwar* tablet, at p. 101 above.

²⁵ No satisfactory explanation of this term has been suggested.

²⁶ *A-chāta-bhaṭa-pravēśyaḥ*. The explanations of this term are various. Prof. Dowson adopts as the translation "into which the entrance of cheats and outcasts is interdicted"; and he quotes, as translations by others,—1, "there shall be no passage for troops", Sir Charles Wilkins; 2, "the

village is not to be entered into by the troops and followers of the king", Bāl Gaṅgādhara Śāstri; and 3, "exempt from the ingress of fortune-tellers and soldiers", Prof. FitzEdward Hall. I follow the translation given by Dr. Bühler at *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. VI., p. 71. It is borne out by the expression *samasta-rājakiyānām-a-pravēśyam*, 'not to be entered by any of the king's people', in the *Ilāo* and *Umētā* grants of *Dadda II*.

²⁷ Except in one instance in l. 16, where it is written *pattikā*, this word is always written in the present inscription with the dental *t*,—*pattikā*. On the other hand, in the cancelled inscription at the back of these plates, No. XLVII. below, it is invariably written *pattikā*. There is no doubt that *pattikā* is the correct form; though, at the same time, *pattikā* may be an authorized variation of it. Prof. Dowson translates it by 'shares', and suggests that it may be connected with the *paṭṭi* of the joint-tenancy villages in the North-West Provinces. I prefer rendering it by 'strip of land.' Conf. *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. VI., p. 23, note 1; and *Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc.*, Vol. XII., p. 395, note 16.

²⁸ See note 17 above.

and other rites, and which is to continue as long as the moon and sun and ocean and earth may last and is to be enjoyed by sons and sons' sons in succession,—should be assented to and preserved by future governors²⁹, whether of my lineage or others, who are desirous of the general reward of bestowing a grant of land, having taken into consideration that worldly existence is as (*frail as*) the pith of a reed or a bamboo or the stem of a plantain-tree, and that pleasures are as transient as the waves of the ocean, and that fortune is as unsteady as the leaves of the sacred fig-tree when struck by a strong wind, and that youth fades away like the flowers of a *śirīṣa*-tree in bloom. He shall incur the guilt of the five great sins, who, having his mind obscured by the thick darkness of ignorance, may confiscate (*this grant*) or assent to its confiscation! And it has been said by the holy Vyāsa, the arranger of the *Vēdas*;—The giver of land dwells for sixty thousand years in heaven; but the confiscator (*of a grant*), and he who assents (*to such confiscation*), shall dwell for the same time in hell! They, who confiscate a grant of land, are born as black snakes, dwelling in the dried-up hollows of trees in the forests of the *Vindhya* mountains, destitute of water! Land has been enjoyed by many kings, commencing with *Sagara*; he, who for the time being possesses land, enjoys the benefits of it! O *Yudhishthira*, best of kings!, carefully preserve land that has been previously given to the twice-born; the preservation (*of a grant*) is better than making a grant! Those gifts of land, productive of religion and wealth and fame, which have been made by kings in former times, are like the unused remnant of garlands (*offered to an idol*); what good man would take them back again?

(*This charter*) has been conveyed as a message³⁰ by *Nannavāsapaka*, and written³¹ by *Khuddasvāmī*, the High Minister for peace and war, on the day of the full-moon of (*the month*) *Vaiśākha*, in the year three hundred and ninety-four. The year 394; the

fifteenth (*day*) of the bright fortnight of *Vaiśākha*. Engraved by the *Kshatriya Mātrisimha*.

No. XLVII.

It remains to add of the *Kaira* grant of *Vijayarāja* that it is in a way a palimpsest. The backs of the plates contain a cancelled inscription, which was evidently intentionally hammered down after heating the plates. This cancelled inscription commences on the second plate; there are twenty-three lines of writing on the back of that plate, and sixteen on the back of the first plate. It is, of course, very indistinct and difficult to read, and no facsimile can be made of it; but careful cleaning of the plates has made a good deal of it legible, with the help of the inscription in favour of which it was cancelled. The characters in which it is engraved differ from those of the extant inscription in only three points;—1, The vowels *é* and *ai* are marked by strokes above the line;—2, The letter *na* is invariably formed with a loop;—and 3, The letter *va* is more of a triangular shape. In these three peculiarities, which happen to be illustrated by one of the passages containing the date of which a facsimile is annexed, they agree with the characters of the two grants of the *Gārjara* king *Dadda II.*, which were found at the same place and time, and also with those of the *Umētā* grant.

I have transcribed as much of this cancelled inscription as is legible, and can be supplied, without any doubt. It commences:—

[?] *Svasti Vijaya*-[*vi*]kshēpān=*Na*(?*nā*)³².
yā(?)pāpu(?)dhu)ra(?)ka)-vāsakēn=*Mdnavya*-sagōtrā
[*nā*] *Hārī*(?*ti*)-putrānām *Svāmi*-*Mahāśēna*-pā[*d*-
ānūdhya][2]tānām *Kālu*(?*li*)kyānām=*anvayē vya*-
pagata-*sajala*-*jaladhara*-*pātala*-*gagana*-*tala*-*gata*-
kīrākara-*kirāna*-*kuvala*-*yātara*-*ya*[*sāh*] *Śrī*-*Jaya*-
simha-*rājāh* [||*] *Tasya* [*su*]tāh *prabala*-*ripu*-
timi[*ra*]-*vi*[*pa*]tā(?)*la*-*bhidura*h *satatam*=*udaya*-
sthō *naktan*-*divam*=*apy*=*akhandita*[4]prātā[*pa*]-³³
. *divakarō* *vallabha*-*ranavikrānta*-
Śrī-*Buddha*[*va*]rm[*m*]-*a*-*rājāh* [||*] *Tasya* [*su*]tāh.

In the remainder of this line, the whole of ll. 5 and 6, and the greater part of l. 7, only a

²⁹ *Lit.*, 'lords of possession',—*bhōga pati*.
³⁰ *Dātaka*. Conf. the statement *Dātakō* *Śtra mahāśām*-*dhivigrahika*-*śrī-Chandakarmmā*, Pl. II., l. 11, of the second of the *Chaulukya* grants published by Dr. Bühler at *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. VI., p. 180; the third, and the fifth to the eleventh, of the same set of grants, have each a similar statement. Conf., also, *Śrī-Kandakanaka-dātaka*, in l. 24 of the *Kāvi* grant of the *Gārjara* king *Jayabhata*, the father of *Dadda II.*, published by Dr. Bühler at *Ind. Ant.*,

Vol. V., p. 109. The *Dātaka*, 'messenger', must be the official to whom the charter was entrusted to be conveyed from the court, where it was issued, to the local authorities concerned.

³¹ *sc.*, 'caused to be written, by an engraver employed in his office.'

³² One letter, or perhaps two, is quite illegible here.

³³ Four or five letters are quite illegible here.

few detached letters are legible with any certainty. The only entire words I can make out are [āsvā]dila-yaśāh, parājaya, and nya-lakṣhaṇa-parā; and I cannot complete the passage, since the remaining scattered letters show that it differed substantially from the corresponding passage of the extant inscription. The name of the son of Buddhavarma is at the end of l. 7, in the words—

[pā]d-āvanatah Śrī-Vi[ja]yavarmma-rā[jah]. It continues:—[8]sarvān=ē[va] vishaya-[pa?]-ti(?)³⁴.

... vas=samviditam=astu(?)
ya[thā] Kāśākulā-vi[śay-ā][9]ntarggatah Sa-
dhiyara-pūrvvina-[Pari?][ya[ya?][ē]śha grā[mah]
[māta-pitrōr=ā]tmanas=cha punya-yaśō-bhi[er]
ādhyāś Jambūsara³⁵.

The first six or seven letters of l. 10 are not legible with any certainty; but then come the words [Bha]radvāja-sagōtrasya Ādityaravēh, which show that the specification of the grantees and their shares commences here. Several of the names and shares are distinguishable; thus,—

l. 10, again, Indrasūtrasya
Tāvisūtrasya div-arddha-pa[11]ttikā³⁶;—l. 11,
again, Īśvarasy=arddha-pattikā
... nya-sagōtrasya[di]v-arddha-pa-
ttikā.
... Drōnasya pattikā;—l. 12, Śē(?)śāsya
arddha-pattikā Sōmasy=arddha-pattikā Kāśyapa-
yana-sagōtrasya(?)-kasya div-arddha-
pattikā;—l. 13,-sagōtrasya Dharm-
madharasya di[v-arddha]-pattikā Vaiśnavā-
sagōtrasya Bhāttēh pattikā Daundakt[14]ya-sagō-
trasya Bhāttēh pattikā Sanvudrasya div-arddha-
pattikā Drōnasya pattikā-tra[yaṁ];—l. 15 to 22,
the words arddha-pattikā, pattikā, and div-arddha-
pattikā are of frequent occurrence, but no names can be read with certainty;—l. 23, Mātrīśvarasya
arddha-pattikā Shashthi-[dēva]sy=arddha-pa[ttiki-
kā];—l. 24, Dāmasya pattikā. In l. 26 com-
mences the sentence Etēbhyaḥ sarvābhyaḥ bali-
charu-vaiśvadev-ā[27]gnihōtra-kriy-ōtsarppaṇ-ārt-
tham Vaiśākha-[pū]-rṇnamasyām=udak-ātisarg-
gēṇa pratipādītō yam=asmad-vamśyair=anyair=svd.

And so on, in much the same words as in the extant inscription, down to pañchabhir=mmahā-pātakaiḥ samyuktah syāt, in l. 32. Then,—prefaced by the words Uktāṇ=cha bhagavatā veda-vyāsēna Vyāsēna,—come the same five verses as in the extant inscription;

l. 32, Shashthiḥ varsha-sahasrām, &c.; l. 33, Vindhy-āfaviśhv=atōyāsu, &c.; l. 34, Bahubhir=vasudhā bhuktā, &c.; l. 35, Pūrva-dattān dvi-jātibhyō, &c.; and l. 36, Yān=īha dattān purā, &c. At the end of this verse, in l. 37, it continues:—

Samvatsara-kāta-trayē [38]chatur-nnavaty-adhikē Vaiśākha-pūrvnamasyām Nannavā(?)cha)sāpaka-dātakam likhitam mahā-samāhi-vigrah-ādhiprītē [39]na Hari(?)da(?)tt[ē]na || Samvatsara 394 Vaiśākha-śu 15 [||*]

It is thus seen that, with some slight variety of construction, this cancelled grant of Vijayavarma is substantially the same as the extant grant of Vijayarāja on the insides of the plates.

Like the Umêtā and Ilâô grants of Dadda II., it is issued vijaya-vikshēpāt,—not vijaya-skāndhāvūrāt, as in the extant grant. As Dr. Bühler has pointed out, at p. 62 above, note 8, vikshēpa, in such a passage as this, must have much the same meaning as skāndhāvūra, 'camp', though there is no lexicographical authority for it. The name of the vikshēpa is unfortunately in part quite illegible. But the first syllable is undoubtedly na or nā. Now, the two Kaira grants of Dadda II. are issued Nāndipuritah, 'from Nāndipurī', which place Dr. Bühler, at p. 62 above, has identified with a fort of the same name just outside the Jhadēsvar gate of the city of Broach. It is just possible that this cancelled grant commenced,—whether intentionally, or by a mistake of the composer of the inscription in following too servilely a model that he had before him,—as if it was issued from the same place, and that the text ran =Nāndipurī-vāsakān=, &c.

In the name of the dynasty, in l. 2, the first syllable is undoubtedly kā; the second may be either lu or lī. This may be a mistake of the composer or of the engraver of the inscription, or it may be an early varying form of the name.

The names of the first two kings are just the same as in the extant grant,—Jayasimha, and Buddhavarma. The son of Buddhavarma is called 'Vijayarāja' in the extant grant; but his name is here given as 'Vijayavarma.' With this we may compare 'Kirttirāja' as a varying form, in one of the Nerūr

³⁴ About eighteen letters here are not legible with any certainty. The words would seem to differ from those in the extant inscription.

³⁵ Four or five letters here, at the end of the line, are illegible.

³⁶ See note 27 above.

plates which remains to be published by me, of the name of the southern Chalukya king who is elsewhere always called 'Kīrttivar-mā' I. And in my Kadamba grants at *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. VI., p. 22, and at p. 33 above, other instances will be found in which the termination *varman*, in the names of kings, sometimes is used and sometimes is omitted.

The date of this cancelled grant is precisely the same as that of the extant grant,—the (Śaka) year 394, and the day of the full-moon, or the fifteenth day of the bright fortnight, of the month Vaiśākha. And, in the same way, it is given in both words and figures. The accompanying facsimile of the passage containing the figures has been made from a careful hand-drawing, directed by myself. The broken appearance of some of the letters and symbols is due to the way in which the inscription was hammered down; and, though the last few lines are comparatively well preserved, this specimen will serve to give an idea of the fragmentary nature of the characters of this cancelled grant, as they now stand. With the exception of the symbol for 90, which has a projecting stroke on the right side as well as the left,—these symbols agree with those which are given in Paṇḍit Bhagwānlāl Indrajī's paper at *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. VI., p. 42. Here, again, the symbol for 5, the letter *nā*, illustrates what was evidently an invariable rule in the use of alphabetical characters to form numerical symbols, viz., precisely the same form of *na*, with the

loop, is used in composing it, as is used in the body of the inscription.

It is difficult to say why this grant was cancelled. But the characters, besides having slight differences of type, as noted above, are not nearly so neat as those of the extant grant; they are rather sprawling, and they have wider intervals between them than is usually the case. And, though it was conveyed by the same *Dūtaka* or messenger, Nannavāsāpaka, it was prepared in the office of a different minister; for, in the last line, the first syllable of his name is undoubtedly *ha*, the penultimate consonant is *tt*, and the last syllable is *na*, and, though the second and third syllables are rather indistinct, the name seems to be 'Haridatta.' At any rate, it certainly is not 'Khuddasvāmī', as in the extant grant. And the name of the engraver is not given at the end. And, finally, the names of the sharers seem to be not so full as in the extant grant. Bearing in mind how repeatedly the word *paṭṭikā* occurs, any one acquainted with the capabilities of the average Hindu copyist will understand at once how often he would lose his place, and become confused, in copying such a document. If, therefore, I may hazard a conjecture, it is that the grant, when first engraved, was too full of errors to admit of correction as it stood, and accordingly it was cancelled, and a fresh copy was prepared, in a different office, and by a different engraver of more skill in writing and fidelity in copying.

THE KUḌĀ INSCRIPTIONS.

BY PROFESSOR H. JACOBI.

The Kuḍā inscriptions have already been edited by the Rev. Dr. J. Stevenson—*Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc.* vol. V. pp. 169-174. But as his translations are not trustworthy, and sometimes rather fanciful,—with the assistance of Dr. G. Bühler I have made the subjoined transcripts and translations according to Mr. Burgess's facsimiles.

There is no clue to the date of these inscriptions except the general resemblance of their letters and of their style to those of the Kaṇhêrî, Kârlên, Junnar, and Nâsik inscriptions which belong to the times of the Andhra-bhṛityas.

Inscription No. 1 in Cave I.

Mahabhojiya Saḍageriya Vijayâputasa | Mahābhōjasa Maṇḍavasa Khaṇḍapālītasa lekha-
Sulasadataputasa Utaradātāputasa cha | Sivabhūtisa saha bhayaya Nandāya deydharma (leṇam).

Sanskrit of No. 1.

¹ Mahābhōjyāḥ Sāḍagairya vijayāyāḥ putrasya Mahābhōjasya Maṇḍavyasya Skandapālītasya
lekha (sya)

² Sulasadattaputrasya Uttaradattāputrasya cha Sivabhūteḥ saha bharyayā Nandaya deydharma
[*layanam* ||]

Translation of No. 1.

This cave is the benefaction of Sivabhūti [Sivabhūti], son of Sulasadatta [Sulasadatta], and of Utarādatta [Uttarādatta] the writer of Mahābhōja Mandava [Māndavya] Khandapālita [Skandapālita], son of Mahābhōji Sadageri Vijayā [Satagiri Vijayā] together with his wife Nandā [Nandā].

Remarks on No. 1.

1. The correctness of the way in which the two parts of this inscription have been connected is proved by the statements made in No. 3 regarding Khandapālita and Sivabhūti.

2. Mahābhōja and Mahābhōji are evidently titles, as the words immediately following them have to be taken for family names. Bhōjaka commonly occurs in the inscriptions with the meaning of 'a priest in charge of a temple.' Another meaning, 'great prince', is given to Mahābhōja in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* (see the *Petersburg Dictionary*, s. v.). Bhōja, too, is used as a royal title in the *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa* VIII. 12. Mahābhōja occurs also in the Bedā inscription No. 2, *Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc.* vol. VIII. p. 222. As the persons bearing this title seem to have occupied a high position, the second meaning is the more appropriate one, and we may assume that Vijayā was the wife, if not of a sovereign king, at least of a Sāmanta, and that Khandapālita ruled over some district or province. This explanation is also confirmed by the construction of inscription No. 8.

3. Sadageriya would be in Sanskrit *Sātagairyā* or *Sātagairyā*, i.e. belonging to the family or to the country of Sātagiri or Sātagiri. Sata and Sāta are mentioned as proper names by Pāṇini, IV. 3, 52. Dr. Stevenson's conjecture, according to which Sādagiri would correspond to Salsette, does not appear tenable, as the ancient name of Salsette is *Shatshashṭi*, 'containing sixty-six villages.'

4. Mandavasa probably corresponds with the Sanskrit *Māndavyasya*: compare also below, No. 3. The Māndavyas are enumerated (*Bṛihatsaṃhitā* XV. 2) among the nations of Central India, together with the Medas or Mers, who probably then, as at present, resided in southern Rājputānā—Medapāṭa or Mewād. Mandaviya occurs also in the Bedā inscription No. 2.

5. The name Sulasadatta is of some in-

terest, as (according to Dhanapāla's *Pāṇiyachchhā*) Sulasā and (according to Hemachandra's *Deśikōśa*) Sulasamanjari are names of Viṣṇu's sacred basil-tree, the *tulsi*. The proper name Sulasadatta means therefore 'given by Tulsi', and corresponds with the modern Tulsidās, and seems to indicate that the worship of the plant dates from early times.

Inscription No. 2 in Cave V.

Siddham therāṇa bhadata Pātāmītāna bhadata Agimitana cha bhāgineyya pāvayitikāya Nāginikāya duhatuya pāvayitikāya Padumanikāya deydhamam leṇa poḍi sahā atavāsiniya Bodhiya saha ātivāsiniya Asalhamitāya.

Sanskrit of No. 2.

Siddham sthavarāṇām bhadanta-Pātramitrāṇām bhadanta-Agnimitrāṇām cha bhāgineyyāḥ pravrajitikāyā Nāginikāyāduhituḥ pravrajitikāyāḥ Padminikāyā deydharṃ layanām poḍi cha saha antevāsinyā Bodhiyā saha antevāsinyā Ashāḍhamitrayā [II]

Translation of No. 2.

Hail! This cave and tank are the benefaction of the female ascetic Paduminikā (Padminikā), daughter of the female ascetic Nāganika (Nāginikā), the sister's daughter of the Theras Bhadata Pātāmīta (Bhadanta Pātramitra) and Bhadata Agimita (Bhadanta Agnimitra), together with her disciple Bodhi, and her disciple Asalhamitā (Ashāḍhamitrā).

Remarks on No. 2.

1. Siddham has been misunderstood first by Dr. Stevenson, and later by Dr. Bhāṭ Dāji and Professor Bhāṇḍārkar, who all translate it by "to the Perfect One." If this meaning were intended it would be either *siddhasa* or *siddhāya*. Siddham is really the neuter nominative singular of *siddha*, and, like *siddhi*, a synonym of *svasti*.

2. The plurals Pātāmītāna(m) and Agimitāna(m) are plur. *majestatis*: compare below in inscription No. 9; see also Stevenson, *Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc.* vol. V. p. 173.

3. For the name Naganikā compare 'Devī Nayanika' over one of the figures of the Nānāghāt cave.

Inscription No. 3 in Cave VI.

| | | | |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|
| Mahābhōjiya | Sādageriya | Vijayāya | putasa |
| Mahābhōjasa | Māndavasa | Khandapalitasa | upajivinaṃ |
| Sulasadatasa | Utaradatāya | cha putānaṃ | bhātūnaṃ |
| kā Sivabhūtimhā | kanethasa | Siva[sam]asa | dhayadhamam |
| | | | leṇa |

saha bhayāya Vijayāya putānam cha sa° Sulasadatasa Siva-
pālitasa Sivadatasa Sapilasa cha selarūpakamañ duhutūnañ
Sasapāya Sivapālitāya Sivadatāya Sulasadatāya cha thambhā.

Sanskrit of No. 3.

Mahābhōjyāh Sādagairyā Vijayāyāh putrasya
Mahābhōjasya Māndavyasya Skandapālitasya upajivinañ
Sulasadattasya Uttaradattāyāścha putrāpāñ bhrātṛiṇāñ lekha
kāch Śivabhūteḥ kanishṭhasya Śivaśarmaṇo deyadharmo layanañ
saha bhāryayā Vijayayā [] putrāpāñ cha sa° Sulasadattasya Śiva-
pālitasya Sivadattasya Sarpilasya cha śailarūpakarma [duhitiṇāñ
Sasyapāyāh Śivapālitāyāh Śivadattāyāh Sulasadattāyāś cha athambāh ||

Translation of No. 3.

This cave is the benefaction of Siva(sa)ma (Śivaśarmaṇ), after the writer Sivabhūti (Śivabhūti), youngest amongst his brothers the sons of Sulasadata (Sulasadatta) and Uttaradattā (Uttaradattā), servants of Mahābhōja Māndava (Māndavya) Khanda-pālita (Skandapālita), son of Mahābhōji Sādagari Vijayā (Sādagairi Vijayā), together with his wife Vijayā; and the decoration of the rock (is the benefaction) of their sons (whose father is alive) Sulasadata (Sulasadatta), Sivapālita (Śivapālita), Sivadata (Śivadatta), and Sapilā (Sarpilā); and the pillars (are the benefaction) of their daughters Sasapā (Sasyapā or Sasapā), Sivapālītā (Śivapālītā) Sivadatā (Śivadattā) and Sulasadatā (Sulasadattā).

Remarks on No. 3.

1. The change of *Sivamasa* to *Sivasamasa* is supported by Junuar inscription No. 7, *Ind. Ant.* vol. VI. p. 40, and by the fact that *Sivama* gives no sense.

2. The *sa* in the phrase *putānam cha sa Sulasadatasa* is probably an abbreviation for *sanātha*, which we find in No. 4: *putasa cha sandthasa Isirakhitasa*. Professor Bhāṇḍārkar (Nāsik Inscriptions, No. 24, *Transactions Or. Cong.* 1874, p. 347) thinks that either *chasa* may be traced to *śasya*, or if read as *vasa* to *vasu*, and translates it by 'worthy.' In his inscription, as well as in all the Kuḍā inscriptions where it occurs, the *cha* must necessarily be taken in the sense of 'and.' *Sanātha* if applied to females means one whose natural protector, i.e. husband, is alive; if applied to males it probably denotes that the father was alive, though I am unable to produce any authority for the latter interpretation. The ulterior meaning of the term is probably 'worthy', as conjectured by Professor Bhāṇḍārkar.

Inscription No. 4 in Cave VII.

Māmakavejīyasa vejasa Isirakhitupāsaka-
sa putasa vējasa Somadevasa deyadhamma lepañ
putasa cha sanāgasa Isirakhitasa Sivagho-
sasa cha
duhutuya cha sa° Isipālītāya pusāya dham-
māya sapāya cha.

Sanskrit of No. 4.

Māmakavaidīkasya vaidyasya Rishirakshito-
pāsaka-
sya putrasya vaidyasya Somadevasya dēya-
dharmo layanañ
putrasya cha sanāthasya Rishirakshitasya Śi-
vaghosasya cha
duhituścha sa° Rishipālītāyā | Buddhāya dharmā-
ya saṅghāya cha ||

Translation of No. 4.

This cave is the benefaction of the physician (vaid) Somadeva, son of the Baudha devotee Isirakhita (Rishirakshita) Māmakavejīya (Māmakavaidīka), a physician, and of his sons (whose father is alive) Isirakhita (Rishirakshita) and Sivaghosa (Sivaghosha), and of his daughter (whose father is alive) Isipālītā (Rishipālītā), for Buddha, the Law, and the Fraternity.

Remarks on No. 4.

1. *Māmakavejīyasa* apparently corresponds to a Sanskrit *Māmakavaidīkasya*, and may mean 'belonging to the country or town of Māmakavaidya', though such a name is not known from other sources.

2. *Sanāthasa* looks like *sandgasa*, but that reading would give no sense.

3. *Pusāya* and *Sapāya* do not readily give any good sense; one is tempted to read *Buddhāya dharmāya saṅghāya cha*.

Inscriptions No. 5 and No. 6 cannot be translated with any confidence—the stone is much abraded.

Inscription No. 7 in Cave XIV.

Karahādakasa lohavanīyasa Mapikasa[mahika-
kasa]deyadhammaṃ leṇa.

In Sanskrit.

Karahādakasya lohavanījo mahikasya deya-
dharmaṃ layanam ||

Translation of No. 7.

This cave is the benefaction of Mahika, an
ironmonger of Karahāda.

Remarks on No. 7.

1. It ought to be noted that the first six as
well as the ninth letters of this inscription re-

semble those used in Aśoka's edicts, and differ
considerably from the rest.

2. *Mapika* gives no sense; it must be changed
into *Mahika*. Dr. Stevenson reads *Mohika*—*Jour.*
Bo. Br. R. As. Soc. vol. V. p. 171.

3. *Lohavanīyasa* would be in Sanskrit either
lohavarṇīkasya or *lohavanījīyasya*. I prefer the
latter etymology, because the former gives no
sense.

4. Dr. Stevenson has already recognized in
Karahādakasa the name of 'Karhād, a town on
the Kṛishṇā, nearly in a direct line south from
Satārā.'

Inscription No. 8 in Cave XV.

Mahābhojē Mādātē[maṇḍavē] Kohiputē Malidātē Apilase putasa sudhagachhakasa Rāmadata-
sa deya
dhema[dhamma]cha bhichhaghara[bhichhughar] uyāraka cha bhayāva sa° Velidatāva deya-
dhammaṃ uyāraka.

Sanskrit of No. 8.

Mahābhojē Māṇḍavyē Kohiputrē Mallidattē apilāsa putrasya śuddha gotrasya Rāmadattasya
deya.
dhammaścha bhikṣugrihaṃ uyārakaścha bhayāyāḥ sa° Velidattāyā deyadharma uyārakaḥ ||

Translation of No. 8.

While Māṇḍava (Māṇḍavya) Mali-
data (Mallidatta) son of Kēhi (rules as)
Mahābhoja, a dwelling for the ascetics and an
Uyāraka [has been dedicated as] a charitable
gift by Rāmadata (Rāmadatta) of pure
family, son of Apila, and an Uyāraka [has been
given] as a charitable gift by his wife Veli-
datā (Velidattā), whose husband is alive.

Remarks on No. 8.

1. *Uyāraka* apparently corresponds with the
avaraka of Nāsik No. 24, *Transactions Or. Congr.*
1874, p. 347, which Professor Bhāṇḍārkar renders
by 'apartment'. Childers' *Pali Dict.* gives *avaraka*
with the meaning of 'inner or store room', and
this explanation fits here also very well.

2. Mallidatta looks a Jaina name, as *Malli* is a
name of one of the Tīrthāṅkaras.

3. For the forms *bhayāva* and *Velidatāva* com-
pare *Purīṣadatāva*, Nāsik 24. I think *va* is merely
a substitute for *ya*, just as in *Tavatīṣa* for
trayastrīṣa dvudha āyudha, &c.—compare Kuhn,
Beitrage Paligram. p. 42—and forms like *aldha-*
yevu for *drādhayevu* in the Aśoka inscriptions.

Inscription No. 9 in Cave XVII.

Siddha therāṇa bhayata
Vijayāna ativāsiniya
pava-itikaya Sarpilāya
deyadhammaṃ leṇam saha sā-

lohitāhi Vēphuyāhi. sacha
ātivāsiniya Bodhiya.

Sanskrit of No. 9.

Siddham sthavarāṇām bhadanta-
Vijayānām antevāsinyāḥ
pravrajitikāyāḥ Sarpilāyā
deyadharmaṃ layanam saha sa-
lohitābhiḥ Viṣṇu-kābhiḥ sa[ha]cha
antevāsinyā Bodhiyā ||

Translation of No. 9.

Hail! This cave is the benefaction of the
female ascetic Sarpilā (Sarpilā), disciple of
the Thera Bhayata Vijaya (Bhadanta
Vijaya), together with her venerable kinswoman
Vēphuyā (Viṣṇū), and her disciple Bodhi.

Remarks on No. 9.

1. *Salohitā* is a not unusual Pāli word, equiva-
lent to the Sanskrit *Salohitā*. The plural *salohi-*
tāhi Venhuyāhi may be explained as plur. majes-
tatis. *Viṣṇū* probably was a paternal or maternal
aunt, and as such entitled to particular respect.

No. 10 on a Well south of Cave XVIII.

Mālākārāsa Muguṇa . . . [de]¹
yadhamatha-

Sanskrit.

Mālākārāsa Muguṇa[pālītasya de]
yadharmaḥ stambhaḥ ||


¹ In the first line of the inscription four akṣaras have
been lost, the last of which must have been *de*. As the

half-defaced letter before the lacuna seems to be *pā*, the
whole name was most probably Muguṇapālita.

DATE OF THE CANCELLED COPPER-PLATE GRANT
OF THE CHALUKYA KING VIJAYAVARMĀ.

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ श्री कृष्णाय नमः ॥

1. SEAL OF THE COPPER-PLATE GRANT
OF VIKRAMĀDITYA I. DATED ŚĀKA 532.



2. SEAL OF THE COPPER-PLATE GRANT
OF KANHARADĒVA. DATED ŚĀKA 1171.



1. SEAL OF THE COPPER-PLATE GRANT
OF RÁJARÁJA. DATED SAKA 944.



2. SEAL OF THE COPPER-PLATE GRANT OF
KULÓTTUNGA-CHÔDADÉVA II. DATED SAKA 1056.



3. SEAL OF THE HARIHARA GRANT
OF VINAYÁDITYA, OF S. 616.



Translation.

This pillar is the benefaction of the gardener
Mugupālita.

Inscription No. 11 on back wall of the Verandah
of Cave XVIII.

..... no sathavāhasa Nāgasa leṇam
deyadhammam.

Sanskrit of No. 11.

..... no sārthavāhasya Nāgasya
layanam deyadharmaḥ ||

Translation.

This cave is the benefaction of Nāga, leader
of a caravan.

Inscription No. 12 in Cave XIX.

Sethiṇo Vasupaṇakā
sa deya dhammam leṇa.

Sanskrit of No. 12.

Śreṣṭhino Vasupaṇaka-sya deydharma
layanam ||

Translation of No. 12.

This cave is the benefaction of the merchant
Vasupaṇaka.

THE INSCRIPTION OF RUDRADĀMAN AT JUNĀGADH.

BY BHAGAVĀNLĀL INDRAJI PAṆDIT AND DR. G. BÜHLER.

From the following inscription it appears that an artificial lake, called Sudarśana, was situated at the foot of the Girnār. It had first been dug by the brother-in-law of the Maurya king Chandragupta, a Vaiśya called Pushyagupta, and had been adorned with outlets by Tushāspa, the Yavana governor of Āśoka.¹ In the seventy-second year of Rudradāman's reign, on the first day of the dark half of Mārgaśīrsha, a heavy storm, attended by a copious rainfall, happened, quite out of season, and so much increased the force of the current of the rivers which flowed through the lake that it destroyed a great portion of the embankment which enclosed the latter. The water of the lake ran off, and its loss no doubt caused great inconvenience to the inhabitants of Junāgadh. A little later the dyke was repaired by the Pahlava Suviśākha, who, as Rudradāman's governor of Sorāṭh and Anarta, resided at Junāgadh.

No tradition even of the former existence of the Sudarśana lake survives in Junāgadh. But it seems to me that it must have been situated to the east of the Girnār hill, on the site which is now called 'Bhavanātha's pass' (*bhavanāthnūn nākun*).

This narrow valley or ravine extends in length from east to west a little more than a mile, and is about as broad. On three sides it is enclosed by high hills; and on the fourth, towards the west, a narrow passage leads from it to the town. Two small perennial rivers, one of which is called Sonārekha, flow through it; and in the rainy season numerous other brooks, which

come from the surrounding hills, carry abundant water into it. The valley looks as if were destined by nature to be made a *talāo*. All that is required to convert it into an enormous reservoir is to close up its mouth on the west by an embankment. In favour of the identification of this valley speak the resemblance of the modern name of one of the rivers, Sonārekha, to the Suvarṇasikatā of our inscription, and the fact that the foundations of an ancient wall or embankment are still extant on the side of the hills in the narrow opening of the valley, a little above the so-called Dāmodar Kuṇḍa, and opposite the sanctuary of the Musalman *fakīr* Jarāśā. These foundations I believe to be a remnant of the old embankment.

The inscription states that the dyke was destroyed in the seventy-second year of Rudradāman. But it seems altogether improbable that Rudradāman should have reigned for so long a time, and it is still less probable that he should have had a still longer reign, as the fact that the inscription was written after the completion of the long and difficult work of restoration would force us to assume. It seems therefore necessary to assume, as has been done by the former translators of the inscription, that the figure seventy-two refers not to the years of Rudradāman's reign, but to the era used on the Kshatrapa coins. This explanation is confirmed by the fact that the coins of Rudradāman's son, Rudrasimha, are dated between the years 102 and 117 of the same era. The same circumstance indicates also that Rudradāman's

¹ As the text calls Tushāspa *te(na)*, 'that'—i.e. 'the celebrated'—Yavanarāja, it is not improbable that he was

more than a mere official. Perhaps he was the Sāmanta or feudal lord of Sorāṭh.

reign must have come to an end about the year 100. The reign of Rudradāman must have been a long one, and cannot be estimated at less than thirty years. He therefore probably mounted the throne about the year 70. If this was the case, the inscription cannot have been written immediately after the destruction of the lake in the year 72. An interval of at least eight or ten years must lie between the two events. For, on the one hand, it is said that the work was abandoned after the first beginning by the king's ministers, because it was found too difficult, and that later only Suviśākha succeeded in completing it. On the other hand, the numerous exploits of king Rudradāman which the inscription enumerates cannot have been performed in a few years. It is said that he conquered the Yaudheyas, who lived in the extreme north of his dominions; that he twice completely defeated Śātakarṇi, who ruled over the Dekhaṇ; and that he reinstated kings who had lost their thrones. Such a career requires at least ten years. I therefore conclude that the date of the incision of the inscriptions falls in the year 80 of the Kshatrapa era, or even a little later.

The name of Rudradāman's father, which has been effaced in our inscription, was, according to Mr. Burgess's inscription from the Junāgaḍh cave², Jayadāman. The *visarga* before *putrasya* is a remnant of the genitive *jayadāmanah* which doubtlessly preceded it.

The three inscriptions of the Kshatrapas which have been hitherto discovered all begin the dynasty with Chashtana. Not one of them gives the name of Chashtana's father. The reason for this omission seems to be that Chashtana really was the first of the Kshatrapas, and that his father possessed no such title. The name of the father occurs on Chashtana's coins. But it is to be regretted that no really good specimens have been found, and that for this reason the name cannot be read with certainty. As far as I can make out, the legend on the coins is *rājño mahākshatrapasay samotikaputrasa, chashṭanasa*, "(the coin) of the king, Mahākshatrapa Chashtana, son of Ysamotika." The latter name is very curious, and the initial combination *ysa* altogether without analogy.

Perhaps it may have been intended to indicate that the *ysa* is to be pronounced soft, as *za*.

Be this as it may, Chashtana certainly was the first of his family who bore the title Kshatrapa. Before him it had been borne by another lord of western India, Nahapāna, who belonged to the family of Kshaharāta. This ruler, whose priority to Chashtana follows from a comparison of the types of their coins, or his immediate successor, was destroyed by the Āndhra king Gotamīputra, as we learn from the Nāsik inscriptions. Shortly afterwards Chashtana must have obtained the dignity of Kshatrapa, and seems to have retaken some of Gotamīputra's conquests from the latter's son Vāsisbthīputra. The word Kshatrapa has been identified by Mr. Prinsep with the Persian Satrap, and it has been conjectured that originally the wearers of this title were governors of some paramount king in the interior of India. It seems to me that the correctness of this conjecture, as far as Nahapāna, Chashtana, and Jayadāman are concerned, is corroborated by the fact that the coins of the first two show, besides the Nāgarī (or Pālī) characters, Bactrian Pālī legends also. The occurrence of the latter unmistakably points to a connection with the north, where this alphabet was in general use. Besides, the epithet *svayamadhigatamahākshatrapanāmnā*, 'by him who himself has earned the title Mahākshatrapa,' which is given to Rudradāman in our inscription, indicates that he had become free, and perhaps had freed himself, from subjection to a lord paramount.

It is not certain who the Śātakarṇi was whom Rudradāman conquered. For Śātakarṇi is not a name, but a title which probably belonged to all the kings of the Āndhra dynasty. My conjecture regarding the question is that the person intended is either Maḍharīputra or Gotamīputra II., as the letters in the inscriptions and coins of these two kings belong to the same time as those of Rudradāman's inscription. Further details regarding the Āndhra dynasty have been given in my papers in the *Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc.* vol. XII. pp. 303ff.³

As regards the names of the countries

² Second Report of the Archæol. Survey of Western India, pp. 140, 141.

³ See also Archæol. Survey Report on Kāthiawād and Kachh, pp. 131-133.—ED.

mentioned in the inscription, I offer the following identifications:—

(a) *Pūrvāpara Ākarāvanti* I take to be the names of the two ancient divisions of *Mālavā*, and I construe *pūrvā*, 'eastern,' with *ākara* and *apara*, 'western,' with *Avanti*. This identification may be supported by a passage from the commentary in Vatsyāyana's *Kāmasūtra* (*adhikaraṇa* 3), where it is said that western *Mālavā* (which the text mentions) is *Ujjayinī*, and eastern *Mālavā* is *Mālavā* properly so called.* The latter would correspond with the *Bhilsā* district, the ancient capital of which was *Vidiśā* (now the deserted town of *Besnagar*), on the *Vetravati*. That *Avanti* is another name for *Mālavā* is well known.

(b) *Anūpa* means literally 'a well-watered country,' and *nūrit* 'country' in general. I take the two words as a compound, and the first part as a proper noun. I therefore translate 'the *Anūpa* country.' But I am unable to identify it.†

(c) *Ānarta* is known from the *Mahābhārata* and the *Purāṇas*. It corresponds to northern *Kāthiāvāḍ*. Its capital was *Kuśas-thali*, the modern *Dvārakā*.

(d) *Surāshṭra* was the name of southern *Kāthiāvāḍ*, which has been preserved in the form *Sorath* as the designation of the *Junāgadh* territory.

(e) *Śvabhra* is either the country on the banks of the *Sābharmatī*, in Sanskrit *Śvabhramatī*, in northern *Gujarāt*, or the old name of *Sāmbhar* (*Sāmbar*), in the *Ajmir* territory.

(f) *Maru* is, of course, a portion of modern *Mārvāḍ*; and *Kachha* the province north of *Kāthiāvāḍ*, still called so.

(g) *Sindhu-Sauvira* probably com-

prises modern *Sindh* and a portion of the *Multān* districts. The two names are very commonly mentioned together, and the *Jainas* name *Vitabhaya* as its capital (*Pravachanēsāraddhira*, *dvāra* 12).

(h) *Aparānta* is, according to *Varāhamihira* (*Bṛhatsaṃhitā* XIV. 14. 20), a western country, and, according to the commentary of the *Vātsyāyana Kāmasūtra*, the coast of the western ocean.‡ It corresponds with the modern *Konkarna*, the district extending from *Gokarna*, in the *Karwar* Collectorate, to the *Damān Gangā*, the frontier river of *Gujarāt*, or perhaps even farther north to the *Tāpī*. This identification is supported by a passage of the *Arjunatīrthayātrā* in the *Ādiparva* of the *Mahābhārata* where it is asserted that *Arjuna*, after going to visit the sanctuary of *Paśupati* at *Gokarna*, travelled to all the *tīrthas* in *Aparānta*, and, following the sea-coast, finally arrived in *Prabhāsa* (*Somnāth* *Paṭṭan* in *Kāthiāvāḍ*).§ *Raghuvamśa* IV. 53, too, *Aparānta* is described as the country between the *Sahyādri* range (the western *Ghāts*) and the ocean; and *Mallinātha*, in his commentary on the verse, quotes the *Viśvakosha* to the effect that *Śūrpāraka* was the capital of *Aparānta*. This town is the modern *Sopārā*, near *Bassein* (*Vasai*), in the *Thānā* districts, as has been shown by Mr. J. Burgess.¶

In my opinion the Greek name of the western coast of India, *Αριακή*, *Ariake*, is a corruption of *Aparāntikā*, which in *Prakṛit* may have become *Abarātikā* or *Avarāikā*.

Regarding the other countries mentioned I am unable to say anything, nor am I able to decide where *Rudradāman's* capital was. On the latter point I will, however, say thus much, that it was not in *Kāthiāvāḍ*, as this province was ruled by a governor.

[1] 'सिद्धे ॥ इदं तडाकं सुदर्शनं गिरिनगरा (त्रिपादरम) ————— (मु)त्तिकोपलविस्ता-

रायामोक्षयनिःसन्धिबद्धदृढसर्वपाळीकृत्वात्पर्वतपा-

* *Ujjayintideśabhavyāstā evāparamālavayā mālavaya itī purvāmālavabhavāḥ.*

† Professor *Bhāndārkar* has shown that the capital of *Anūpa* was *Māhiśmatī*, and that it consequently corresponds with *Nimād*.

See *Trans. Or. Cong.* of 1874, p. 313.—G. B.

‡ *Vātsy.* *adhik.* 3: *aparāntikā itī paścimasamudratīre aparāntadeśas tatrābhavāḥ.*

§ *Gokarnamābhito gatam* ||

|| *ādyam paśupate sthānam darsanādeva muktidaṃ* ||
|| *yatra pāpōpi manuṣaḥ prāpnotyābhayaṃ padam* ||

soparānteshu tīrthāni puṇyānyāyatanāni cha |
sarvānyevānupūrvyena jagānāśaitavikramah |
samudre paścime yāni tīrthānyāyatanāni cha ||
tāni sarvāni gatvā sa prabhāsam upajagmivān |

¶ *Ind. Ant.* vol. I. p. 321; vol. IV. p. 232; conf. *Second Archaeol. Report*, p. 131.—Ed.



¶ Various lectiones:—


L. 1, गिरि is distinct, though faint, on the stone. The reading °रति is very improbable. *Bhagavānlāl's* पाळीकृत्वात्पर्वतपा is doubtlessly the correct reading. But the stone has: *tpā* for *tud*.—G. B.

- [²] दप्पतिस्पर्दि सुस्तिष्ठ(बन्ध) ----- वजातेनाकृत्रिमेण
सेतुबन्धेनोपपन्नं सुप्पतिविहितप्पनाळीपरीवाहं
- [³] मीढविधानं च त्रिस्क(न्ध) ----- नादि-
भिरनुप्रहैर्महत्युपचये वर्त्तते तदिदं राज्ञो महाक्षत्रपस्य सुगृही-
- [⁴] तनाम्रः स्वामिचष्टनस्य पौत्र ----- पुत्रस्य
राज्ञो महाक्षत्रपस्य गुरुभिरभ्यस्तनाम्रो रुद्रदाम्रो वर्षे द्विसप्ततितमे ७२
- [⁵] मार्गशीर्षवह्लप्र[तिपदि] ----- (सु) सृष्टवृष्टिना
पज्जन्येन एकार्णवभूतायामिव पृथिव्यां कृतायां गिरेरूर्जयतः सुवर्णसिकता-
- [⁶] पलाशिनीप्रभृतीनां नदीनां अतिमात्रोदृत्तैर्वैः सेतुम ----- [का]र्यमाणानुरू-
पप्रतीकारमपि गिरिशिखरतरुतटाट्टालकोपतल्पद्वारशरणोच्छ्रयविश्वसिना युगनिधनसदृ-
- [⁷] शपरमघोरवेगेन वायुना प्रमथितसलिलविक्षिप्तजर्जरीकृता(व) ----- क्षिप्ताश्मवृक्षगु-
ल्मलताप्रतानं आनदीत(लादि)युद्धाटितमासीत् चत्वारिहस्तशतानि वी (विं)शदुत्तराण्यायतेन एतावन्त्ये-
व विस्तीर्णेन
- [⁸] पंचसप्ततिहस्तानवगाढेन भेदेन निस्सृतसर्वेतोयं मरुधन्वकल्पमतिभृशं दुर्द[र्शनं] -----
(स्या)यै मौर्यस्य राज्ञः चंद्रगु(तस्य)राष्ट्रियेण (वै)श्येन पुष्यगुप्तेन कारितं अशोकस्य मौर्यस्य
ते[तत्]यवनराजेन तुषास्पेनाधिष्ठाय
- [⁹] प्रनाळीभिरलंकृतं तत्कारितया च राजानुरूपकृतविधानया तस्मि[न्]भेदे दृष्टया प्रणाळ्या वि(स्तृत)
से(तु) ----- नो आगर्भोत्प्रभृत्स्यविहृतसमु(दित)राजलक्ष्मी(धार)णागुणतस्तत्त्वैर्वर्णैरभिगम्य
रक्षणार्थं पतित्वे वृत्तेन आप्राणोच्छ्वासात्पुरुषवधनिवृत्तिकृत-
- [¹⁰] सत्यप्रतिज्ञेन अन्यत्र संग्रामेष्वभिमुखागतसदृशशत्रुप्रहरणवितरणत्वाविगुणरि -----
(धृ)तकारुण्येन स्वयमभिगतजनपदप्रणिपत्ति[विशे]वशरणदेन दस्युव्याळमृगारोगादिभिरनुपसृष्टापूर्व-
नगरनिगम-
- [¹¹] जनपदानां स्ववीर्याजितानामनुरक्तसर्वप्रकृतीनां पूर्वापराकरावन्त्यनूपनीवृदानर्त्तसुराष्ट्रध(ध)मरूक-
च्छ(सि)न्धुतौवीरकुक्कुरापरांतनिषादादीनां समग्राणां तत्प्रभावाद्य ----- कामविषयाणां
विषयाणां पतिना सर्वक्षत्राविष्कृत-
- [¹²] वीरशब्दजातोत्सेकाविधेयानां यौधेयानां प्रसह्योत्सादकेन दक्षिणापथपतेस्सातकर्णेर्द्विरपि नीर्व्याजमव-
जीत्यावजीत्य संबंधावदूर(त)या अनुत्सादनात्प्राप्तयशसा मा(द) ----- (त्त)विजयेन भृष्टराजप्र-
तिष्ठापकेन यथार्थहस्तो-

L. 2, the letters तम, visible in the photograph, have been left out by Bh. परी⁰ for परिवार^ह is doubtful.—G. B.

L. 3, probably न. [Bhagavānlāl.] Eggeling's त्रिस्कन्द is, I suppose, a misprint. The stone shows faintly Bh.'s reading.—G. B.

L. 4, यस्तकात्रो for *मात्रो is caused by a fissure in the stone, which has come out too clearly in the photograph. The down-stroke in the figure  which appears on the photograph is caused by an accidental fissure. The mason incised  only.—G. B.

L. 5, Bhagavānlāl's प्र[तिपदि] is by no means certain. I think that the reading of the stone is प।. The stone has clearly  (r) above the ज, which is not clear in the photograph.—G. B.

L. 7, Bhagavānlāl's kshiptāśma* is certain from the stone, though only the right-hand portion of the first akshara has been preserved.—G. B.

L. 8, the ai of vaiśyena is clearly visible on the stone. But the lower part of the akshara has completely peeled off. I think Bh. is right in his conjecture.—G. B.

L. 9, the akshara over रलंकृत is not clear on the stone. A letter has been lost after this word, perhaps e. Bhagavānlāl's restoration, samudita, is doubtful.—G. B.

L. 10, the marks on the photograph after निगम are fissures or scratches, not letters.—G. B.

L. 11, only the ra of the syllable म in svabhra is quite clear. Ma in maru is certain even from the photograph.—G. B.

L. 12, for नीर्व्या⁰, जीत्य, read निर्व्या⁰, जित्य. [Bhagavānlāl.] The क in प्रतिष्ठापकेन and the ज in राज are doubtful; न and ज्य may be the correct readings.

- [13] छ्याजितौजितधर्मानुरागेन शब्दार्थगान्धर्वन्यायादानां विद्यानां महतीनां पारणधारणविज्ञानप्रयो-
गावाप्तविपुलकीर्तिना तुरगगजरथचर्यासिचर्मनिबुद्धाद्या - - - - - परबललाघवसौष्टव-
क्रियेण अहरहर्दानमानान-
[14] वमानशीलेन स्थूललक्षणेन यथावत्प्राप्तैर्बलिशुल्कभागैः कनकरजतवज्रवैदूर्यरत्नोपचयविष्यन्दमानकोशेन
स्फुटलघुमधुराचिकान्तशब्दसमयो दारालंकृतगदपद्य - - - - - न प्रमाणमानोन्मानस्वर-
गतिवर्णसारसत्वादिभिः
[15] परमलक्षणव्यञ्जनैरूपेतकान्तमूर्तिना स्वयंमधिगतमहाक्षत्रपनाम्ना नरेन्द्रकन्यास्वयंवरा नेकमान्यप्राप्तदाप्ता
महाक्षत्रपेण रुद्रादाप्ता वर्षसहस्राय गोत्राद्वा - - - - - त्थं धर्मकीर्तिवृद्धयर्थं च अपीड-
यित्वा करविष्टि-
[16] प्रणयक्रियाभिः पौरजानपदं जनं स्वस्मात्कोशात् महता धनौघेन अनतिमहता च कालेन विगुणदृ-
ढतरविस्तारायामं सेतुं विधाय (सर्व)नगर - - - - - सुदर्शनतरं कारितमिति-
(त)स्मिन्नर्थे
[17] महाक्षत्रपस्य मतिसचिवकर्मसचिवैरमात्यगुणसमुद्युक्तैरप्यतिमहत्त्वाद्देदस्यानुत्साहविमुखमतिभिः प्रत्या-
ख्यातारंभं
[18] पुनः सेतुबन्धनैराश्याद् हाहाभूतासु प्रजासु इहाधिष्ठाने पौरजानपदजनानुप्रहार्थं पार्थिवेन कृत्तनाना-
मानर्त्तसुराष्ट्राणां पालनार्थंभियुक्तेन
[19] पल्लवेन कुलैपपुत्रेणामात्येन सुविशाखेन यथावदर्थधर्मं व्यवहारदर्शनैरनुरागमभिवर्द्धयता शक्तेन दान्ते-
नाचपलेनाविस्मितेनार्येणाहार्येण
[20] स्वधितिष्ठता धर्मकीर्तियक्षांसि भर्तुरभिवर्द्धयतानुष्ठितमिति

Translation.

To the Perfect One¹⁰! This Sudarśana lake¹¹. possesses a well-joined construction rivalling the spurs¹² of the mountain, because it is entirely enclosed by a¹³ embankment without holes, broad, long, and high, (made of) mud and stones. which is endowed with a natural¹⁴ embankment, where outlets for the water have been made by means of conduits, the outline of which runs in curves like a stream of urine,¹⁵ and which is divided into three parts. is through the benefactions such as in the most excellent condition. This same (lake) (was destroyed) in the seventy-second year of the great Kshatrapa, king Rudradāman, whose name is repeated by great men, son of (Mahākshatrapa Jayadāman),

and grandson of Mahākshatrapa, king Svāmī Chashṭana, whose name is of auspicious import, on the (first day) of the dark half of the month of Mārgaśīrsha When, in consequence of the rain which had fallen very copiously, the earth had become, as it were, one ocean, by the excessive swelling of the currents of the Palāśini, of the Suvarṇasikātā, and of the other rivers which (come) from Mount Ūrjayat, the embankment in spite of suitable devices employed, an extremely furious hurricane, similar to the storm (which rages) at the Deluge, throwing down hill-tops, trees, rocks, terraces, (pieces of) the neighbouring ground, gates, houses, and pillars of victory, violently stirred the water, which (in its turn) displaced and broke (thus

L. 13, read हस्तोच्छ्रया.—

L. 15, the form of the ḍa [ट] in अपीडयित्वा shows that Bhagavānśā's reading of the sign in *pramāṇibhiḥ*, &c. as *j* is correct.—G. B.

L. 19, °धर्म should be °धर्म, as the stone and photograph read.—G. B.

¹⁰ All translators have copied Dr. Stevenson's old mistake. The meaning of *siddhant* is the same as that of *svasti*, 'hail'!—G. B.

¹¹ Add '(which is situated near) the foot of the Girinagara hill.'—G. B.

¹² *Parvatapāda* are probably the spurs at the bottom of the hill, which in Gujarātī are called *धर* or *पाँड*.—Bh.

¹³ Add 'solid' before 'embankment.'—G. B.

¹⁴ 'Natural' refers to the hills which surrounded it on three sides: see below, Remark I.—Bh.

¹⁵ *Mātrarekhā* is a common expression in Gujarātī for 'crooked.'—Bh.

this lake,) into which stones, trees, bushes, and tangled creepers had been thrown, was opened down to the bottom of the river. As all its water escaped through the rent (*in the embankment*) one hundred and twenty ells long, as many (*ells*) broad, and seventy-five ells deep, it resembled a desert and became exceedingly unsightly for the sake of . . . the Vaisya Pushyagupta, the brother-in-law of the Maurya king Chandragupta, had caused to be constructed. It had been adorned with conduits¹⁶ that Yavanaraja Tushâspa (*the servant*) of the Maurya (*king*) Aśoka. With the conduit made by him, the construction of which was worthy of a king, and which was visible in that rent, an extensive embankment

He whom men freely elected their lord for their protection on account of this quality, that from his birth he bore the indelible and greatest (*marks of*) Royal Fortune; he who took, and kept to the end of his life, the vow to stop killing men except in battle; he who showed a compassionate disposition to slay foes (*of*) equal (*strength*) that came to meet him, to surpass . . . he who afforded special protection, on account of their submission, to people that came to him of their own free will; he (*who is*) the lord of eastern and western Âkarâvati, of Anûpadeśa, Ânarta, Surâshtra, Svabhra, Maru, Kachha, Sindhu,¹⁷ Sauvîra, Kukura, Aparânta, Nishâda, and other territories, in which the people of new towns (*even*) and bâzars are not attacked by thieves, snakes, (*wild*) beasts, diseases, and the like, which he has gained by his own valour, in which all people are loyal, (*in which*), in consequence of his power (*are found all*) objects of enjoyment; he who annihilated the Yaudheyas who had become arrogant and disobedient in consequence of their receiving from all Kshatriyas the title 'the heroes'; he who has obtained glory because he did not destroy Sâtakarpi, the lord of the Dekhan, on account of his near relationship, though he twice really conquered him; he who has gained victorious; he who has restored

to their thrones deposed kings; he who by raising his hand not in vain (*i.e.* by giving religious gifts) has earned the affection of *Dharma*; he who has gained great fame by studying to the end, by remembering, understanding, and applying the great sciences such as grammar, polity, music, logic; (*he who*) the management of horses, elephants, and chariots, fighting with the sword and the shield,¹⁸ &c.; he who easily and fully conquers hostile armies; he whose nature it is to give daily presents to, to confer honours on, and not to slight (*his servants*); he who possesses large views; he whose treasury overflows with gold, silver, diamonds, lapis-lazuli, and quantities of (*other*) precious objects, which he has obtained in a righteous manner as presents, dues, and (*royal*) shares; (*he whose*) prose and metrical compositions are clear, (*distinguished by*) brevity, sweet, admirable, lovely, remarkable for grammatical correctness and embellished by (*rhetorical*) ornaments.; he whose beautiful frame is endowed with the most excellent marks and signs, such as proper size (*in height and breadth*), (*proper*) weight, (*due*) proportion (*in the limbs*), (*a pleasing*) voice, (*majestic*) gait, (*a beautiful*) complexion, strength and prowess; he who himself has earned the title Mahâkshatrapa; he who has obtained numerous garlands at the *svayamvaras* of kings' daughters;—he, the Mahâkshatrapa Rudradâman, for the sake of a thousand years, for the sake of cows and Brahmans, and for the increase of his merit and fame, has rebuilt the embankment three times stronger in breadth and length, in a not very long time, expending a great amount of money from his own treasury, without oppressing the people of the town and of the province by (*exacting*) taxes, forced labour, acts of affection,¹⁹ and the like,—the whole town (*and*) has made the lake more beautiful (*or* more worthy of the name Sudarsana) (*than before*). When in this affair the Mahâkshatrapa's advisers and engineers, though possessed of the qualifications of ministers, lost heart on account of the enormous size of the gap and gave up the undertaking, and when the people, despairing of seeing the em-

¹⁶ Insert 'under the superintendence of.' I regret that I cannot agree with Bhagvânâlâl-Bhâû Dâjl's conjecture *tena* or *tat* ('that'). I believe there is some greater corruption in the original.—G. B.

¹⁷ The reading *Sindhu* has been suggested to me by Dr. Bühler.—Bh.

¹⁸ I propose 'to use the sword and the shield, (*the science of*) pugilism, &c.'—G. B.

¹⁹ Probably a kind of tax like the modern *priddân*?

bankment rebuilt, began to lament, (*the work*)²⁰ was accomplished by the minister *Suvisākha*, the son of *Kulāipa*, a *Pahlava*, who has been appointed by the king, out of kindness towards the town and country people, to protect the whole of *Ānarta* and *Surāshtra*, who by the proper dispensation of justice in temporal and spiritual affairs increases the affection (*of the subjects*), who is able, of subdued senses, neither hasty nor wanting in presence of mind, of noble family and unconquered, who governs well and increases the spiritual merit, fame, and glory of his master."

NOTE by Dr. G. BÜHLER.

The Gujarāṭī original of the above article was made over to me for translation by Pandit Bhagavānlāl in the end of May 1877. Various personal reasons prevented my going to work on it at once. But even now, after Professor Eggeling's revised transcript and version of the inscription has appeared in Mr. Burgess's *Report of Kāthiāwād*, I do not think that the publication of Bhagavānlāl's paper will be deemed superfluous. Mr. Burgess's facsimile, it is true, is a very good one, and Professor Eggeling's work shows great progress as compared with Dr. Bhāt Dāji's. Still a repeated and careful comparison of the stone with the photograph from Mr. Burgess's paper cast, which I made in December 1876, has yielded a few better readings in such places where the faintness of the letters, or accidental scratches, necessarily made

the readings from the photograph doubtful. Most of these have also been given by Bhagavānlāl, but I have once more pointed them out in the notes to his transcript.

I fully concur in most of the Pandit's important new readings and new renderings. One of his remarks also I recommend to special notice, the identification of the Greek name of the western coast, Arabike or Ariake, with *Apārāntikā*. I have no doubt that he is right, and that the reading Arabike (APABIKH) in the *Periplus*²¹ has to be altered to *Abaratike* (ABAPATIKH). The identification of *Apārānta* with the *Konkana* has been made first by Prof. R. G. Bhāṇḍārkar, *Trans. Or. Cong.* p. 313. The same gentleman's identification of *Kukura* with Hiwan Thsang's *Kiu-che-lo* cannot stand, as *ku* is never represented by Chinese *che*, and the identification with *Gujjara* is perfectly unobjectionable. Mr. Burgess's identification of *Nishāda*²² with *Berar* rests on a mistake. *Nala*'s kingdom is called *Nishadha*, not *Nishāda*. It would seem that there were several districts in ancient India which bore this name. In our inscription, probably, the north-western *Nishāda*, which, according to a passage of the *Mahābhārata* (see the *Pet. Dict.* s. v. *Nishāda*), corresponded with the *Hissār* and *Bhatnār* districts, is meant. Bhagavānlāl's *Śvabhara* is a bold conjecture which is not sufficiently supported. But he is right in not accepting the form *Aśvaka* which former decipherers have imported into the text.

CORRESPONDENCE AND MISCELLANEA.

THE PĀRSĪ PRIESTHOOD.

To the Editor of the "*Indian Antiquary*."

SIR,—The communication from Mr. Sorābji Kāvasji Khambātā in the *Indian Antiquary*, vol. VII. p. 179, pointing out some errors in the information which Prof. Monier Williams had received regarding the Pārsī religion and rites, shows that there are still some obscurities with respect to the classification and titles of the Pārsī priesthood, which it ought not to be difficult to clear up.

Mr. H. G. Briggs, in his work on *The Parsis or Modern Zerdustians*, says, on the subject of the priesthood (p. 45)—"*Mubed* is the general term, and tantamount in acception to our word

Clergy. The learned among them, and those who hold spiritual dignity, are denominated *Dasturs* or *Andhiārus*, almost significant to our *Doctors* and *Bishops*. *Herbads* are the inferior clergy."

This is not the same as the account given by Prof. Monier Williams. Mr. Sorābji Kāvasji's differs from both. And it might be assumed that his is correct, were it not that it has an appearance of being a little at variance with itself. *Herbad*, it says, is "a mere generic term for *Dasturs* and *Mobeds*," while a footnote says, "Some *Herbads* are neither *Dasturs* nor *Mobeds*, for they do not choose to enter the holy order."

The account of this priesthood would be made more distinct if, in addition to a statement of the

²⁰ *Karma* must be added in the text.

²¹ *Apiax* occurs in the *Periplus*, §§ 14, 41, and 54; in

the second, the reading *Ἀπαβκη* occurs in the codex, but is generally regarded as corrupt.—Ed.

²² *Report on Kāth.* p. 131.

classification and titles, and of ceremonies regulating admission (to which your correspondent briefly refers), it embraced also some notice of the several qualifications required and duties performed.

R. M.

A CASE OF SAMĀDH IN INDIA.

By MONIER WILLIAMS, D.C.L., BODEN PROFESSOR OF SANSKRIT AT OXFORD.

It may interest some of your readers if I give a brief account of a case of *Samādh* which has recently occurred in the district of Kaira (Khedā), in Gujarāt. The particulars were furnished to me by Mr. Frederick Sheppard, the energetic Collector, in whose camp I stayed twice during my Indian travels. Permit me, however, to introduce the narrative by a few remarks about sacrifice, immolation, and self-torture, all of which were once common in India.

In what may be called the Brāhmanical period, which succeeded the Vedic period of Hinduism, human sacrifice must have prevailed. This is sufficiently evident from the story of Śunahśepha in the *Āitareya-brāhmaṇa*. It is even believed by many that the sects called Śāktaś (or Tāntrikaś) formerly ate portions of the flesh and drank the blood of the victims sacrificed at their secret orgies. Human sacrifices, however, were probably rare, while the sacrifice of animals became universal. The first idea of sacrifice seems to have been that of supplying the deities with nourishment. Gods and men all feasted together. Then succeeded the notion of the need of vicarious suffering, or life for life, blood for blood. Some deities were believed to thirst for human blood, and the blood of animals was substituted for that of men. One of the effects of Buddhism was to cause a rapid diminution of animal sacrifice. It is now rarely seen except at the altars of the goddess Kālī, or of forms and near relations of Kālī (such as the *Grāma-devatās* (village mothers), and at the altars of the tutelary deity Ayeṇār,¹ and at devil-shrines in the south. I myself saw very few animals sacrificed even to the bloody goddesses, though I took pains to visit them on the proper days.

Other forms of immolation were once common in India. The Thags maintained that they sacrificed their victims to the goddess Kālī. Now that Thagism has been suppressed by us, a good deal of *datura*-poisoning is practised by the same class of people. The killing of female infants once prevailed extensively in the Panjāb and Rājputāna, owing to the difficulty of providing daughters with suitable husbands, and the immense expenses entailed by nuptial festivities.

Again, in former days self-immolation was common. Many immolated themselves at the great car-festivals, voluntarily throwing themselves under the enormous wheels, not only of the car of Jagānnāth at Puri, in Orissa, but of other idol-cars also.

I found similar cars attached to every large pagoda in the south of India. Some of them are so large and heavy that they require to be supported on sixteen wheels, and on a particular day once a year they are drawn through the streets by thousands of people. Every now and then persons are crushed under the wheels; for our civilization has tended to the increase of religious gatherings among the natives, by creating facilities of communication, and the best government cannot always prevent accidents.

Self-immolation in other ways was once extensively prevalent. Arrian, it is well known, describes how, in the time of Alexander the Great, a man named Kalanos—one of the sect of Indian wise men who went naked—burned himself upon a pile.² This description is like that of the self-cremation of the ascetic Sarabhaṅga in *Rāmāyaṇa* iii. 9. There are some sand-hills in the Sātpura range dedicated to the god Śiva,—supposed as Mahākāla to delight in destruction,—from a rock on which many youths have precipitated themselves, because their mothers, being without children, have dedicated their first-born sons to the god.

With regard to the immolation of the faithful wife (commonly called *sattī*) who followed her husband in death, and burned herself on his funeral pile, everywhere in India, I saw scattered about in various places monuments erected over the ashes of *sattīs*; and everywhere such monuments are still regarded with the greatest veneration by the people.

Happily we put a stop to this practice in 1829, though we had previously sanctioned it under certain regulations, believing that we ought not to interfere with an ancient religious custom. In one year an official report of 800 widows burnt was received at Calcutta. Between 1815 and 1828 the average varied from 300 to 600 per annum.

We have also prevented the burying alive of lepers, and others afflicted with incurable diseases, which was once universally prevalent in the Panjāb, and common in some other parts of India.

Of course, leprosy in India, as in other Eastern countries, is a kind of living death. Lepers are excluded from society, and can get no employment; and they often gave themselves up of their own accord to be buried alive, the motive simply being

¹ The son of Śiva by Mohini, also called Hari Hara.—Ed.

² *Ind. Ant.* vol. VI. pp. 245-6, 334-5; and Plutarch's *Alexander*, 65.—Ed.

a desire to be released from physical suffering. This was called performing *samādhi* (Sanskrit—*samādhi*, suspending the connexion between soul and body by religious abstraction).

Sleeman describes how he once knew a very respectable Hindu gentleman who came to the river Narmadā, attended by a large retinue, to perform *samādhi*, in consequence of an incurable disease under which he laboured. After taking leave of his family, he entered a boat, which conveyed him to the deepest part of the river. He then loaded himself with sand, and stepping into the water disappeared.

In most of these cases the laudable humanity of our Government in preserving human life has given rise to fresh evils and difficulties.

In the first place, population is increasing upon us in a degree which threatens to become wholly unmanageable. Then, widows never marry again; not even if their boy-husbands die, leaving them widows at the age of six. A woman is supposed to be sacramentally united to one husband, and belongs to him for ever. Every town, every village, almost every house, is full of widows, who are debarred from all amusements, and converted into household drudges. They often lead bad lives. Their life, like that of the lepers, is a kind of living death, and they would often cheerfully give themselves up to be burned alive if the law would let them. Only the other day in Nepāl, where our supremacy is still barely recognized, the widows of Sir Jang Bahādur became *satis*, and burned themselves with their husband.

Then, again, the increase in the number of girls who cannot find suitable husbands is now causing much embarrassment in some districts; and even the lepers, whose lives we preserve, involve us in peculiar difficulties. These unfortunate creatures often roam about the country, exacting food from the people by threatening to touch their children.

Here and there we have built leper-villages—rows of cottages under trees, devoted to their use; and we make the towns contribute from local funds to support them, while charity ekes out the miserable pittance they receive.

As to the practice of self-torture, this cannot be entirely prevented by our Government, but it is rapidly dying out. Formerly, it was possible for devotees—with the object of exciting admiration, or extorting alms, or under the delusion that their self-torture was an act of religious merit—to swing in the air attached to a lofty pole by means of a rope and hook passed through the muscles of the back. Such self-inflicted mutilation is now prohibited. Yet, even in the present day, to acquire a reputation for sanctity, or to receive homage and offerings from the multitude, or under

the idea of accumulating a store of merit, all sorts of bodily sufferings, penances, and austerities, even to virtual suicide, are undergone—the latter being sometimes actually perpetrated out of mere revenge,—as its consequences are supposed to fall on the enemy whose action has driven the deceased to self-immolation.

I saw a man not long since at Allahābād who has sat in one position for fifty years on a stone pedestal exposed to sun, wind, and rain. He never moves except once a day, when his attendants lead him to the Ganges. He is an object of worship to thousands, and even high-caste Brāhmins pay him homage.

I saw two *Urdhva-bāhus*, one at Gayā and the other at Banāras,—that is, devotees who hold their arms with clenched fists above their heads for years, until they become shrivelled and the finger-nails penetrate through the back of the hands. Another man was prostrating himself and measuring every inch of the ground with his body round the hill of Govardhan when I passed.

Two attempts at *samādhi* occurred in Mr. Sheppard's district. A devotee announced his intention of adopting this extraordinary method of securing perfect abstraction and beatitude, and was actually buried alive in the neighbourhood of a village. His friends were detected by the villagers in pouring milk down a hollow bamboo which had been arranged to supply the buried man with air and food. The bamboo was removed, and the interred man was found dead, when his friends opened the grave shortly afterwards.

The other attempt is still more recent, and I will conclude this communication by giving Mr. Sheppard's own account of it, almost in his own words:—"As I was shooting near my camp one evening, a mounted orderly came up with news that a Bhāt had performed *samādhi* that afternoon in a neighbouring village, and that there was much consequent excitement there. Not having a horse with me, I directed the orderly to ride off to the village (picking up my police escort as he passed through my camp) and to dig up the buried man, taking into custody any persons who might endeavour to oppose the execution of my orders.

"On returning to my camp, I ordered the apprehension of all those who had assisted in the *samādhi*, and soon afterwards received a report that the man had been actually buried in a vault in his own house, but had been taken out alive. He was, however, very weak, and died the following morning. It was then reported to me that the limbs, though cold, had not stiffened, and the people—ready, as of old, to be deceived, and always inclined to attribute the smallest departure from

the ordinary course of events to supernatural agency—declared that the Bhât was not dead, but lying in the *samâdh* trance. There was, however, no pulse, and as it was clear that, even if the supposition of the villagers was correct, medical treatment would be desirable, I sent the body in a cart to the nearest dispensary, distant some six or seven miles, and in due time received a certificate of death from the hospital assistant in charge of that institution, together with a report of a *post-mortem* examination of the body, which showed that death had resulted from heart-disease.

"Meanwhile I visited the village and ascertained the following facts:—The deceased was a man in fairly comfortable circumstances, and with some religious pretensions. It was well known that he aspired to a still higher reputation for sanctity, and that, with this view, he had for several months been contemplating *samâdh*. The proper date for this rite had been finally settled, after many solemn ceremonies and the due observance of fasting, prayer, and charity.

"On the afternoon fixed for the *samâdh* he assembled the villagers, and told them that it had been imparted to him in a vision that the Deity required him to pass six weeks in religious abstraction, and that he felt compelled to obey the divine command, and to remain in the vault prepared for him during that period. He then produced and worshipped a small earthen vessel containing the sacred *Tulsi* plant, and afterwards carefully planted therein twenty grains of barley, telling the villagers to watch for their growth, as it had been revealed to him that the grains represented his life. If at the end of the six weeks the grains had sprouted, the villagers were to understand that the Bhât was still alive. He was then to be removed from the vault, and worshipped as a saint. If, on the other hand, germination had not taken place, they were to understand that the Bhât was dead also, and the vault was in that case to be permanently bricked up, and the *Tulsi* planted over the grave.

"After giving these directions, the devotees recited some *mantras* and entered the vault, bidding farewell to the world, and declaring his belief that his life would be miraculously preserved. The vault was then roofed over with boards, and plastered thickly with mud. About two hours after this event, he was removed from the vault by the police under my orders, and placed in the verandah, the house itself being locked up.

"After ascertaining the above particulars, I caused the house to be opened, and then discovered that a gross attempt at imposture had been practised. The grave was about three feet deep, being a hole dug in the floor of the inner room of the house.

The wall of the room formed one side of the vault. The roof over the latter was a clumsy structure, and had been partly demolished to allow of the removal of the devotee. As usual in India, the only light admitted to the room was through the door, and the unsubstantial nature of the roof was not likely to attract the attention of the villagers. But I satisfied myself that the occupant of the vault might, with great ease, have demolished the covering which was supposed to shut him off from the world.

"The vault itself was somewhat dark. I entered it in order to ascertain how much space had been allotted to the occupant. I found therein the rosary of the deceased, and the chaplet of flowers which he had worn before his self-immolation. There was sufficient room for me to sit in tolerable comfort. On one side of the vault I felt a small wooden plank apparently let into the wall, and on obtaining a light I found that a trap-door about a foot square had been ingeniously contrived to communicate with the other room of the house. The trap-door was so hung as to open inwards, towards the vault, at the pleasure of the inmate. On going into the outer room, into which communication had thus been opened, I found that a row of the large earthen jars, which Horace would have called *amphoræ*, and which are used in India to store grain, had been arranged against the wall. The trap-door into the vault was effectually concealed by them, and the supply of air, food, and water to the impostor within, thus cleverly provided for. The arrangement was neatly contrived, and was not likely to have attracted suspicion. Had the Bhât been a strong man, and in good health, he might, without any danger to life, and with only a minimum of discomfort, have emerged triumphantly after his six weeks' *samâdh*, and have earned a wide reputation. But the excitement and fasting were too much for him."—*Athenæum*, August 4th, 1877.

ARUNAD YAVANO MADHYAMIKÂM.

Mr. Carlleyle's and General Cunningham's remarks on pp. 201–205 of Vol. VI. of the *Archæological Survey Reports* induce me to state that the oldest and best MSS. both of the *Mahâbhâshya* and of the *Kârikâ Vṛtti* on P. III. 2. 111 read अहमयवन्नो मध्यमिकाम् (and not माध्यमिकान्). A marginal note in one of the MSS. of the *Mahâbhâshya* states that *Madhyamikâ* was a town (नगरी); Nâgajibhatta on P. VI. 3. 37 likewise says मध्यमिका नगरी; and in the *Gaṇaratnamahodadhi* we read मध्ये भवा मध्यमिका नगरी, तस्यां भवो माध्यमिकीयः.

I leave it to General Cunningham to decide whether this correct reading *Madhyamikâ* is of any

value for the interpretation of the legend on the coins found by Mr. Carlleyle, and whether the ancient city of Nāgari may originally have been called *Madhyamikā*. To me it would seem that the *Majhamikāya* of the coins might well be the oblique case of a feminine noun in *d*, equivalent to a Sanskrit form मध्यमिकायाः.

Later writers have freely copied Kātyāyana's Vārttika on P. III. 2. 111, and in some cases also Patanjali's instances. The author of the *Prasāda* (a commentary on the *Prakriyā-kaumudī*) quotes अरुणयवनः साकेतम्; the same instance we find in the *Jainendra-mahāvṛtti* of Abhayānandin, who instances besides अरुण-महेन्द्रो मधुराम; and in the *Śabd-draṇava-chandrikā*, another commentary on the *Jainendra-vyākaraṇa*, we read अदहयवनः साकेतम्. But the most interesting instances are no doubt those which Hemachandra in his Sanskrit grammar gives for his rule स्याते वृत्त्ये, viz. :—

अरुणसिद्धराजो स्वचीन् (sic), and अजयसिद्धः सौराष्ट्रन्.

According to the late Dr. Bhāu Dāji, Hemachandra lived 1088-1172 A.D., and Siddharāja reigned some time during the first half of the 12th century (Lassen, vol. III. p. 567).

F. KIELHORN.

HALLE MAKKALU.

From inquiries lately made I find that the Morasu Holiyars are the Halle Makkalu—old (adopted) sons—of the Morasu Wakligas.¹

"In former times" the Morasu Holiyars had the following privileges :—

(i.) Carrying the Wakliga bride's box in which her trousseau was placed;

(ii.) Washing the feet of the Wakliga bride and bridegroom;

(iii.) Assisting to carry to its grave the body of a deceased Wakliga;

(iv.) Partaking of the *piṇḍa*, i.e. the food prepared on the third day after death, and of which, as a rule, only members of the family can partake.

Of these four privileges the first is now the only one universally admitted and exercised. Individual Wakligas deny that the Holiyars exercised all these privileges, but a very little cross-examination soon brings out that the denial is confined to the privileges being exercised with regard to the individual and his own relations; that he is aware the Holiyars are said to have had these privileges in former times, and believes that here and there even now they occasionally exercise them. This is only what is to be expected. Each individual tries to make the most of his own family, and denies any relationship with a lower caste. There

is sufficient evidence to prove that the Morasu Holiyars are affiliated to the Morasu Wakligas.

Why this took place I have been unable to discover, but a more than ordinarily intelligent head-man said that he thought the Holiyars had been adopted because they assisted the Wakligas when they first came to the country.

The Morasu Holiyars are the only Holiyars who weave cloth.

What is the meaning of Morasu? I think it must have been the old name of that part of the country where the Morasu Wakligas are to be found.

Among the Wakligas of Maisūr the following appellatives are to be found :—Morasu, Hali Gaṅgādīkar, and Nonaba, and the same appellatives are to be found among the Holiyars. Now the Gaṅgādīkar and Nonaba Wakligas evidently derived their respective appellative from the old name of that part of the country where to this day they are to be found in the largest numbers. The Gaṅgādīkar Wakligas are chiefly in the south and west of the Maisūr district, and this part of the country was formerly called Gaṅgāvāḍī. In the same way the Nonaba Wakligas are found in the west of the Tumkur district, which part of the country was formerly known as Nonambavāḍī. Reasoning by analogy, the ancient name of those parts of the country where there is an appellative common to both Wakligas and Holiyars ought to be the appellative. The Morasu Wakligas are to be found principally in the Bangalor district, the Hale Wakligas in the Hassan district. Perhaps some of the readers of the *Antiquary* in those districts could help in clearing up this point.

I can add little or nothing about the Kongaru Holiyars. The term Kongaru is applied by the Kanarese-speaking people to the Tamil-speaking camp followers of regiments. I saw an old man the other day at Tyamgondla, Nelamangla Talukā, who said he was a Kongira Holiya; he came up to this part of the country with the commissariat elephants. He eats with the Holiyars of this country, but he told me that among the Holiyars of Madras there is a sub-division who correspond to Halle Makkalu. They are called Puli Kutti pariahs of the Vellalas. He would not eat at the houses of any of this sub-division, but they would in his. Some of your Madras readers ought to be able to say if the old man is right or not.

J. S. F. MACKENZIE.

Bangalore, 9th May 1878.

¹ Conf. Ind. Ant. vol. I. p. 33; vol. II. pp. 29, 50, 170; vol. III. pp. 8, 191, 197.

NOTE ON THE ORISSA HYPÆTHRAL TEMPLE.

After the notice of the remarkable temple discovered by the late Sir John Campbell in Orissa had appeared in the *Antiquary* (ante, page 19), I met with the description of a somewhat similar structure in General Cunningham's *Archæological Reports*, vol. II. (for 1864-5).

It was found among the ruins of Khajuraho, an ancient site in Banderkhand, between Chhatrapur and Panna, which in more recent times was the capital of the Chandel Rājputs, who flourished from the 9th to the 14th century.

By the present inhabitants the building is known as the Temple of the Chaonsat Yôgini, or "64 female demons," and consists of a massive oblong enclosure constructed of granite and open above, the length of which is 102½ feet, and the breadth 58½ feet. The exterior is simply ornamented with three broad flat horizontal mouldings, but round the inside are 64 cells or niches, 22 on each side and 10 at each end (exclusive of the entrance and a larger cell opposite), each cell 36½ inches high by 23½ broad, intended apparently for the reception of an image which no longer exists.

At what period the Yôginis were worshipped, why their number is fixed at 64, and what place they hold in the Saiva theogony, is not clear.¹ It may even be doubted whether they belong to any of the recent forms of superstition with which we are acquainted. The temple at Khajuraho bearing their name is evidently of greater antiquity than the neighbouring buildings. It is the only one constructed of granite, all the others being built of a light-coloured fine sandstone, quarried hard by, and it is the only one not placed due north and south—all pointing to a different age and a distinct race of worshippers.

On these points, however, we may hope to be further enlightened shortly. A late letter from General Cunningham states he has discovered a third example of the same kind of structure, which he is now engaged in describing,—viz. a circular cloister containing the 64 Yôginis, with several other statues, most of them accompanied by inscriptions, which will doubtless indicate their precise character.

WALTER ELLIOT.

MR. HENRY BLOCHMANN.

Oriental literature has sustained an irreparable loss by the death of Mr. H. Blochmann, Principal of the Muhammadan College at Calcutta, and for many years the active Secretary of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. Cut off at the early age of

forty, ere he had attained the full maturity of his powers, he has left behind him a rich store of early gathered fruit, the earnest of an abundant harvest never to be garnered. Mr. Blochmann's acquirements in Arabic and Persian, and the accuracy and soundness of his knowledge, marked him out for a teacher. In early life his desire to become personally acquainted with the East led him to enlist as a soldier; but arrived in India his scholarship soon became known, and he was appointed to a subordinate position in the college of which he died the chief. In this office he had peculiar opportunities of extending his knowledge, and he was indefatigable in turning them to account. He enjoyed the society of learned Musalmāns, and the stores of public and private libraries were at his command. They were well used. Few men had a more intimate acquaintance with Muhammadan life, and none surpassed him in his knowledge of Arabic and Persian MSS. A living catalogue, it was seldom that an inquiry about books was addressed to him in vain. The pages of the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* attest the activity and diversity of his researches. Literature and lexicography, coins and inscriptions, in turn engaged his attention. But two subjects he made peculiarly his own—Persian prosody, the difficulties and mysteries of which he has done much to unravel; and the life and reign of the great emperor Akbar. The translation of the *Ain-i-Akbari*, the Institutes of Akbar, is Blochmann's *magnum opus*, and on this his reputation will mainly rest. He has published a large portion of the Persian text, but unhappily only one volume of the translation has appeared. It is greatly to be hoped that the MS. of the remainder is in a forward state of preparation, for who would venture to take up the pen which his hand dropped? The translation of a Persian book into English may not seem a great and arduous work to those who have no knowledge of the original text. But this book deals with intricate and technical subjects, and is written in a style which native writers consider as abstruse and difficult. With all his knowledge, and with the great sources of information at his command, there are passages which Mr. Blochmann could not interpret, and he has shown the manliness and honesty of the true scholar in saying so. In this translation he has inserted a series of memoirs of the great men of the days of Akbar,—a peerage, in fact, of the Moghul Empire, comprising more than four hundred names. This was entirely his own compilation, and it supplies a most interesting and instructive series of pictures of the life and manners of the time.—JOHN DOWSON. (*The Academy*.)

¹ Wilson renders Yôgini by "a female send or sprite attendant on and created by Durgā; in some places eight Yôginis are enumerated by name": *Sans. Dict.* s. v. This supports Mr. Walhouse's suggestion, at p. 137, regarding "the eight stone images facing inwards" at the Tri-

murti Kōvil in Koimbatūr. These female demons may have some connection with the Turānian deities described and figured by Pallas in his *Sammlungen historischer Nachrichten über den Mongolischen Völkern* über P. T. Pallas, St. Petersburg, 1776.

BOOK NOTICES.

ORIGINAL LETTERS AND PAPERS of the late Viscount Strangford upon philological and kindred subjects. Edited by Viscountess Strangford. (8vo, pp. 284.) London: Trübner & Co. 1878.

The late Lord Strangford, condemned by his father to the diplomatic career in which the latter had risen to eminence,—for which the son seems to have had no taste—consolated himself with philological studies more extensive and profound than those of any other Englishman of his day not being a professional scholar. Fate or temperament prevented him from ever embodying the results in anything that could be called a book; but fortunately his widow is fitted by her own talents and acquirements to select and edit the present volume, which with the two published by Bentley in 1869 are enough to show what he was and might have been.

The volume under review contains notes and reflections upon almost every language under the sun, of which a couple attacking the "Dog Persian" of the Government of India will perhaps be the most interesting to our readers. But the special value of the work consists first in the intense scorn of theorism and sciolism which pervades these miscellaneous selections as thoroughly as if they formed a single treatise written for the express purpose of keeping philological and ethnological sciences from running off the rails; and secondly in the astonishing wit and humour of almost every sentence.¹

One cannot close the book without thinking how much happier and more useful might have been the career of the noble writer—noble more by nature than by race—if the lines had fallen for him in places a little further East; and if, instead of the cramping, disheartening influences of a diplomatic chancery, he had grown up under those of early power and responsibility, which form the best men of the Indian services.

S.

OUTLINES of the HISTORY of RELIGION to the Spread of the Universal Religions. By Professor C. P. Tiele, D. Th., Professor of the History of Religions in the University of Leiden. pp. 249. London: Trübner & Co. 1877.

Professor Tiele states that the time for writing an elaborate history of religion has not yet come. He does not pretend to supply more than outlines, mere "pencil-sketches," helpful towards the full picture which will in due time be drawn. This "little work," as he modestly calls it, contains an introduction and five chapters. It traverses an

immense extent of ground, without seeking to describe with minute accuracy any part of it. We are very far from accepting all the Professor's inferences from facts, or even all his supposed facts; but the work supplies evidence both of extensive reading and of careful reflection.

Professor Tiele² belongs to the advanced school of "liberal" theologians. He does not believe in Revelation—at least in the sense in which the term is usually applied to religion. In all religions we trace, according to the professor, only a process of development or natural growth. He thus comes to enunciate, especially in treating of the faith of Israel, opinions which violently conflict with the belief of nine-tenths, or more, of Christendom. The professor is, of course, aware of this; but he goes on in serene self-confidence, making one bold asseveration after another, hardly condescending to refute his opponents, or even to supply evidence of the truth of his own positions.

We intend to enter into no contest with Professor Tiele. We simply bring under the notice of our readers the views of a good representative of a certain school. Besides, our author is professor of the History of Religions, and on his own special subject he deserves an attentive hearing.

He holds that the earliest religion has left but few traces behind it. It was followed by Animism, or the worship of spirits. This stage is represented by the polydemonistic tribal religions, which, among civilized nations, were soon developed into polytheism resting on traditional doctrine. Nomistic religions followed—that is to say, systems grounded on sacred books, and superseding polytheism by pantheism or monotheism. Out of these, again, sprang the universal religions—Buddhism, Christianity, and Muhammadanism—"which start from principles and maxims."

Leaving the reader to form his own opinion of this nimble generalization, we follow Prof. Tiele into his account of Animism. This is a belief in the existence of spirits, of which the powerful become objects of worship. When the spirits take up their abode in any material object, which thus becomes endowed with power, we have Fetishism. Animism is unorganized polydemonism. It does not exclude belief in a supreme spirit. It is accompanied by a belief in magic, which seeks to obtain power over the spirits by spells. Fear is the ruling power in all Animistic worship. The spirits and their worshippers are alike selfish.

¹ The very device on the cover is a philological joke, being the writer's signature Russified, "Astrangford," with an initial *af* for the benefit of the Asiatic, who would not otherwise have 'got round it.' It reminds one of that Bombay billiard-marker who, having to score for a gentle-

man named Scott, wrote 'I' on the slate, to represent "Iskhât Sâheb."

² The author of *De godsdienst van Zarathustra van haar ontstaan in Baktrië tot den val van het Oud. Perzische Rijk* (Haarlem, 1864).

Animism has little or no moral character. Its doctrine of a future state contains no idea of recompense—i.e. of punishment or reward.

Over a large extent both of Asia and Europe the Aryans, and perhaps the Semites, were preceded by Turanian races, whose religion was purely Animistic, and under the influence of a belief in magic. The religions of America exhibit Animism at various stages. Those of Mexico and Peru reached the extreme limit of Animism, and would probably have risen above it if the Spanish conquest had not checked their development.

This outline of Prof. Tiele's views regarding the lowest existing form of religion, out of which all the higher forms, according to him, have proceeded, must suffice for the present. We may simply mention that he touches on the religions of the Chinese, of the ancient Egyptians, of the Babylonians and Assyrians, of the Phœnicians, of the Israelites, Islam, Brahmanism, Pārsism, the systems of the Lëtto-Slavs, the Germans, the Greeks and the Romans.

Our author is always suggestive; but we are frequently startled by his cool dogmatism. Take one example:—"The Egyptian religion furnished to Roman Catholic Christendom the germs of the worship of the Virgin, the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, and the type of its theocracy." Let us add, however, that this is one of the most unguarded assertions in the volume; it is not a case of *ex uno disce omnes*.

M.

LANGUAGE and the STUDY of LANGUAGE: Twelve lectures on the Principles of Linguistic Science. By William Wright Whitney, Professor of Sanskrit, &c., Yale College. 3rd Edition, augmented by an Analysis. (London: Trübner & Co.)

It is not easy to bring a work which

"With extensive view

Surveys mankind from China to Peru" within the exclusively Oriental scope of the *Indian Antiquary*, and Professor Whitney's lectures, though necessarily not exhaustive in detail, deal with the general features of speech and writing, so far as at present known to science. In such a work, however, it is impossible for the writer to avoid devoting some of his most important chapters to the languages of the East. Moreover, the Orientalist—proudly conscious that "in his father's house" the science of Comparative Philology was, if not born, at least weaned—may fairly claim not to be considered a meddler if he occasionally notices the progress of this now independent branch of knowledge. We cannot better support this claim than by quoting Professor Whitney's own words:—"Stripped of all exaggerations, and making all due allowances, the Sanskrit is still the mainstay of Indo-European philology; it gave

the science a rapid development which nothing else could have given; it imparted to its conclusions a fulness and certainty which would have been otherwise unattainable."

The closely printed table of contents of the volume under review occupies two pages and a half of small type.

It will easily be inferred that no abstract of it worth reading could be crowded into these pages; and we must therefore be content with noticing its most salient features. First of these, as might be expected from its place of birth, is an extreme independence of thought and expression. Professor Whitney is "*nullius addictus in verba jurari*," and no amount of respect will induce him to give the least quarter to what he holds to be errors. For example, though most fully acknowledging the services of Bopp to his science, he does not hesitate to hold up that writer's studies upon the Malay-Polynesian and Caucasian languages as "a striking example and warning," and "an utter caricature of the comparative method" (p. 245, note); and his discussions with Professor Max Müller, while too well known to be repeated here, are really a higher compliment to the German scholar than the servile reverence with which he is sometimes treated in England.

If Professor Whitney had thought fit to take a classical motto, it would certainly have been "*Hypotheses non fingo*." For him the science which he prefers to call "linguistics" (he considers the term "comparative philology" already outworn) is still in its youth, if not infancy; and he denounces most strongly the practice of drawing hasty conclusions, and of inferring affinities from arguments often delusive in themselves, and still more frequently based upon a *petitio principii*. The theory of a common origin of the Semitic and Aryan (in his terminology—Indo-European) languages seems to him to have as yet no basis at all; nor does he less object to the term 'Turanian' and the signification usually attached to it—the former as too local and narrow, the latter as too wide, and including in one class languages and races whose affinities are not yet sufficiently proved, or even investigated.

Whether his specific conclusions be accepted or no, it is sufficiently obvious that this is the right frame of mind in which to approach the subject. In India, particularly, we have suffered extremely from the habit of talking as if the Aryan immigration was a thing as well understood as the English conquest; and the absurdity and mischief of such hasty generalization is not now for the first time reprobated in these pages. It is satisfactory, at least, to know that whatever assistance we may hereafter obtain from beyond the Atlantic

will be rendered by scholars trained to take nothing for granted.

In the meanwhile, the work under review may safely be recommended as a text-book fully equal to any that we possess, and especially suited to those students, sufficiently numerous in Anglo-Indian society, who are striving to make up in the leisure hours of manhood for time wasted by themselves or their teachers in youth. It is, though much larger, more simple than Mr. Peile's little hand-book of Philology, which lands the beginner rather too abruptly among such terrible words as 'agglutinative' and 'analytic'; and it is written in a style always clear, and sometimes, where the dignity of the subject requires it, rising to eloquence. Take, for example, the fine passage (p. 231) describing the rise to importance of the European races and tongues. It has, besides, not only a good index, but an exhaustive analytic table of contents, most useful to the student. At the end of the book, indeed, Professor Whitney seems to leave his safe ground, and to abandon for a moment, when contemplating the future, the reserve and caution which characterize him in dealing with the past.

He expresses (with many saving clauses, it is true) an idea that English may yet become "a world language," by which we presume that he means, if not the universal speech of civilized man, at least one as generally intelligible as Hindustani is in a great part of India. And, with a view to this glorious future, he thinks that we should seriously consider the phonetic reform of our orthography. If other proof were wanting of the baselessness of such a dream, it would be found in his own work. He states expressly that it is in the communion of literature, and of the cultivated classes, that the hope of preserving one common language to England and the United States must be based. Of those classes we could find no more competent representative than himself; yet so far has the disintegrating influence of altered circumstances and of separate national life gone, that the English reviewer cannot help remarking, here and there in his work, differences of expression, at which, indeed, we have no right to cavil, but which indicate that the thing which has been shall be, and that English must submit to the fate which has already overtaken Greek and Latin. The most striking instance is the use of the word 'doughfacedness' as an example. This may have been introduced half in jest, to recall the flagging

attention of the class. But its mere presence in this book is significant; and if we go further, to such a work as General Sherman's Autobiography, which may be taken as fairly representing the speech of educated Americans, we shall find similar new expressions in every page. It is to be hoped that when the American language does become a separate tongue its literature will contain many works as useful as Professor Whitney's.

EARLY RECORDS OF BRITISH INDIA; a History of the English Settlements in India, as told in the Government Records, &c. &c. By J. Talboys Wheeler, late Assistant Secretary to the Government of India in the Foreign Department, &c. (8vo, pp. 391.) London: Trübner & Co. 1873.

Mr. Wheeler, he tells us in his preface, "was originally employed to report upon the records of the Home Department in Calcutta, and intended to confine his extracts to the papers preserved there. As, however, he proceeded with his task," he found that it was not enough for him; the papers of the earliest period had been destroyed by a storm in 1737, or in the sack of 1756. In Madras, however, he found a more perfect and valuable series of documents, and has already given the substance of them to the world in three volumes, under the title of "Madras in the Olden Time", of which the part of the present volume relating to the affairs of "the coast" appears to be a judicious condensation. With Bombay he does not appear to have any acquaintance, and contents himself with giving a few extracts from Mandelslö, Fryer, and Khafi Khân,¹ the only authorities upon the early affairs of that Presidency of whose existence he appears to be aware.

Although, therefore, Mr. Wheeler speaks of his volume as compiled from original and half-forgotten sources, it is obvious that a good deal of it is already before the world in one form or another. Perhaps the most interesting extracts are those from the records of Bengal of the period following the battle of Plassey; the Company's negotiations with the Râja of "Meckley" (Manipur); their refusal and subsequent acquisition of the Divâni, and their disputes with the second Nawâb of their own creation, Mir Kâsim, and the massacre at Pâtnâ. Upon this last subject Mr. Wheeler quotes "the journal of a gentleman at Pâtnâ" and "the journal of an English prisoner at Pâtnâ," but very provokingly denies us the name of either diarist, and leaves us to guess even whether they are identical (the entries extracted are for different days). He also gives extracts from the diary of

¹ The last named, fannily enough, is brought in under head "Madras under the Moghuls." Khâfi Khân was condemned by Mr. Wheeler, and without a hearing (in his *History of India*), as a "type of the flatterers who flourished during the Moghul period." Now that Mr. W. has read some portions of Khâfi Khân's invaluable history

in Prof. Dowson's version, he withdraws his condemnation (p. 110, note, and conf. *Ind. Ant.* vol. VI. p. 331). If we compare his quotation p. 110 *ad inf.* with the version he abridges from in Elliot and Dowson's *History*, vol. VII. p. 353, we may form a fair idea of the freedom with which he treats his originals.

Dr. Fullarton, whom he calls "the sole survivor of the massacre," which is hardly correct, as the doctor was confined apart from the other prisoners, and was not even a witness of their fate. The 13th chapter is interesting for some quotations from the minutes of Mr. Verelst, which show the commencement of the science of internal administration in Bengal. Verelst, as Mr. Wheeler truly observes, was a man very much ahead of his time. He administered with considerable success the districts of Bardwân, Midnâpûr, and Chittagong, which with Clive's *jâghir* form the earliest territory of that youngest Presidency which has since so much outgrown its elder sisters. His remarks upon points of principle can in few instances be contradicted even now; and if they appear to us to be verbose and full of platitudes it must be remembered that Verelst was laying the foundations of a system, and was forced to dilate upon what a modern writer may safely take for granted. Mr. Wheeler does not mention, but our readers will not be sorry to know, that Mr. Verelst, after holding the highest offices in days when the pagoda-tree daily quivered to its root under English hands, retired from the service a poor man, but acquired the fortune he well deserved along with the hand of an heiress.

After Verelst's papers no extract in the Bengal section of the work under review is so curious as one from a memorandum submitted, in 1746, by a Colonel James Mill to the Emperor Francis, consort of Maria Theresa, urging him to the conquest of the Lower Provinces. Colonel Mill, says Mr. Wheeler, had been twenty years in India; and his memoir is an appendix to "Bolt's Affairs in Bengal." We would like to know more of the man who, at so early a date, planned a conquest which was only forced upon the Company by stress of circumstances. "It is a miracle," he says, "that no European prince with a maritime power has ever attempted the conquest of Bengal. By a single stroke infinite wealth might be acquired, which would counter-balance the mines of Brazil and Peru. The policy of the Moghuls is bad; their army is worse; they are without a navy. The empire is exposed to perpetual revolts. Their ports and rivers are open to foreigners. The country might be conquered or laid under contribution as easily as the Spaniards overwhelmed the naked Indians of America. A rebel subject, named Aliverdi Khân, has torn away the three provinces of Bengal, Behar, and Orissa from the Moghul empire. He has treasure to the value of thirty millions sterling. His yearly revenue must be at least two millions. The provinces are open to the sea. Three ships

with 1500 or 2000 regulars would suffice for the undertaking. The British nation would coöperate for the sake of the plunder and the promotion of their trade. The East India Company should be left alone. No company can keep a secret. Moreover, the English company is so distracted as to be incapable of any firm resolution."

Reading these spirited sentences, and admiring the grasp of his subject displayed by the writer, we cannot enough regret that Mr. Wheeler vouchsafes so little information about him, and wonder whether he had no share in the realization, by his own nation, of his splendid dream. Or is it possible that our author has been deceived by a fabrication of some pamphleteer writing after the event?

The extracts relating to Madras have apparently, as already mentioned, appeared in a former work of Mr. Wheeler's, which is probably in the hands of those interested in the subject. The most interesting are those relating to the internal government and social life of the settlement; in particular the will of a young writer named Davers, dated 1720, and a letter to the Court of Directors dated 14th October 1712, respecting the trade in English woollen cloths.

So far Mr. Wheeler's extracts—by far the most important part of the work. The connecting text is by no means so valuable. It contains little new information, and is written in a jerky, slipshod style, painful to read, and often puzzling to make out the meaning of. To take, as an example, the first sentence in the book,—“The three English Presidencies of Madras, Calcutta, and Bombay were founded in the 17th century, during the reigns of Charles the First, Oliver Cromwell, and Charles the Second.” Now, any one reading this and new to the subject would suppose that a Presidency of Madras was first established during the reign of the first-mentioned monarch, one of Calcutta under the Commonwealth, and one at Bombay under the “Merry Monarch,” Bombay being consequently the junior Presidency. But Mr. Wheeler must know that there was no such thing as a Presidency of Bombay until 1687, when that of Surat, the oldest permanent establishment of the English nation in India (founded in 1612), was transferred to the island acquired by the English crown as part of the dowry of Katharine of Braganza, and subsequently granted to the Company, to be held “as of the Manor of East Greenwich,” for a yearly rent of ten pounds in gold. Our author's references to authorities, too, are amazingly scanty, and his Index illusory—as a help, at least, to the systematic reader.

SÂNTÂL IDEAS OF THE FUTURE.

BY REV. F. T. COLE, TALJHARI.

SOME Sântâls believe that after death they at once enter another world, while others imagine that the spirit hovers about near the place where it left the body. Others, again, fancy that the spirit is born anew in another person. In proof of this they tell the following story :—

Once a lad of five years old was presented with a bracelet by his mother. While out one day shepherding, he took off this bracelet and hid it in the hollow of a tree. Soon after he got home he fell ill, and died without mentioning what he had done. His spirit entered a woman in the same village, and in the course of a year he was born again. When he attained the age of five, he recollected that during a former sojourn in the world he had bidden a bracelet. He mentioned the fact to his mother, and begged her to accompany him to a certain spot. At first she refused, saying it was all nonsense, and that she had never given him a bracelet. However, afterwards, upon his repeated entreaties, she consented to go with him; and, sure enough, upon arriving there, the boy at once found the bracelet where he had deposited it. His former mother, happening to see it, claimed it as having belonged to her dead son, but the boy declared it was his own, and so it was concluded that the boy had been born a second time.

The Sântâls also believe that our spirits very frequently change their abode, entering at will into the bodies of men or of animals. A favourite resort of the departed spirit is in the body of the large red lizard. Cows and buffaloes, dogs and pigs also become abodes of the spirits. Very quarrelsome people are said to be possessed with the spirit of a dog. It is supposed by some that the spirit of a man leaves the body in the form of a lizard. In proof of this the following story is told :—

One day a man fell asleep, and becoming very thirsty his spirit left the body in the form of a lizard to obtain water from a pitcher close by. It so happened that just as the lizard entered the pitcher the owner of the water covered it, not knowing what had happened: consequently the spirit could not return to the man's body, and he died. While his sorrowing friends and

relations were making preparations for burning the corpse, some one uncovered the pitcher to get water. The lizard immediately escaped, and returned to his abode in the body of the dead man. At once the man arose, to the great astonishment of the by-standers, and asked them why they were weeping. They answered that they thought he was dead, and were preparing to burn his body. The man told them that he had been down a well to get some water to drink, but had found it difficult to get out again, and that he had just returned. The truth now dawned upon their minds that the well was the pitcher of water, and that, on account of its having been covered, the man had not been able to escape, but that as soon as he did escape he recovered.

The people say that if they push wood into a fire with the feet they will have to suffer the penalty of having their feet burned in the next world. And if they see a piece of grass or straw on a man's head they immediately remove it, or they will have to carry large bundles of grass on their heads hereafter.

In the next world there will be nothing but hard work, their principal occupation being to grind dead men's bones day and night in a mortar, using the stalk of the castor-oil plant as a pestle. They will have but one chance of getting a little rest—that is, the men, if they can chew tobacco, can sometimes beg for a few minutes' respite under the excuse of preparing their tobacco. When the taskmaster calls them to return to their work, they say, "Wait a moment, Sir, I have not quite finished preparing my tobacco." Then they make pretence of rubbing it to a powder in the palm of the hand (mixing a pinch of lime with it, to give it pungency) as vigorously as possible, but as soon as the taskmaster turns his back they will again prepare it very slowly. In this way they manage to prolong their rest. But woe to those who cannot chew tobacco or smoke the *hukah*! For this reason every Sântâl makes a point of learning the practice in this world. Women who have children can also obtain a little rest, under the plea of feeding them. When told to return to work, they say, "Oh! wait a few minutes longer, Sir, my child is very hungry," while really the child is but nestling in her bosom.

But sad is the lot of poor women who have no family! When a man's *ser* (two lb. weight) is completed—that is, when his allotted time on earth is past—the king of death sends his messengers to convey him to his presence. He employs certain beetles as his spies. The beetle plucks out a hair from the head of his victim, and if it is not white with age he will wet it and roll it in white ashes, and then, showing it to the king, will say, “The owner of this hair is a very old man. Your Highness, is it not time you sent your messengers to fetch him?” The king, not wishing perhaps to call such a one just yet, takes the hair, washes it, and says, “Take the hair back to the owner; he may remain a little longer, his *ser* is not yet completed.”

When a *Sântâl* dies, all his possessions are placed by his bed, and some rupees too, if any are in the house, as it is supposed he will have to buy everything in the next world; and as he will have to provide himself with all kinds of necessaries he must take his weapons also with him, so his bow and arrows are carefully laid by his side.

If any one should enter the next world in a human form the inhabitants of that land would devour him. A child was in great trouble, they say, at losing his mother. Every day he visited the place where her body had been burnt. The Sun (the Supreme Being of the *Sântâls*), seeing the boy's grief, asked him whether he would like to see his mother again. So he took him up, telling him not to speak or to show himself, or he would be devoured. He placed him in a hole, which he covered up so that the boy could see without being seen. Presently his mother passed by and began to sniff, saying to her companion, “I smell a man, where is he?” The Sun said to her, “You must be mistaken, how can there possibly be a man here?” The woman having left the place, the Sun asked the boy if he had seen his mother, to which he replied, “Yes, please take me away, I have seen quite enough.” From that day he never again longed for his mother.

The *Sântâls* are mortally afraid of a certain

class of women, believing that after death they are always on the watch for men. They are supposed to lick their victims to death, filing off the flesh with their rough tongues. When any of these women die, the survivors stick thorns into the soles of their feet, thus rendering them lame and powerless to pursue their victims, as they suppose. All whose bodies are properly burnt and whose bones have been thrown into the river *Damudâ* (the *Sântâl* sacred river) become good spirits, the others become demons. The funeral pyre, which is always placed near water, consists of a large heap of wood, upon which the body is placed; then the eldest son, or the nearest relative, sets fire to the wood, having first placed the torch near the dead man's mouth. If the hand or the foot move during the burning, it is a sure sign that others of the family will soon be called away. To propitiate the king of death, frogs are thrown on to the burning pile, and sometimes small images of clay in the shape of a man are placed beside the corpse. If the body is not consumed quickly, it is pierced with a spear or chopped in pieces with an axe. It is said that misers burn very slowly, but that generous men are quickly consumed. So, to avoid such a disgrace, the body of a rich man is smeared over with *ghî* and oil, to expedite its combustion. After the body is consumed, search is made for the collar-bones. These are washed in turmeric water and deposited in a new earthen jar, and then taken to the *Damudâ*. When the ceremony of throwing the bones into the river is completed, all the relations assemble at the village of the deceased to offer sacrifices to his memory. Goats and sheep are killed, and a feast is prepared. Several questions are asked of the departed spirit, such as “Are you angry with any of us? If so, please forget it. Did any one injure you in your lifetime? if so, accept these sacrifices and forgive the offender.” Then the sacrificer addresses the other spirits in these terms: “We consign the departed to your care, make him one of yourselves. We have now done our part, let us go in peace.”

THE LATE F. W. ELLIS'S ESSAYS ON SOUTH-INDIAN LANGUAGES.

To the Editor of the *Indian Antiquary*.

SIR,—In the *Indian Antiquary*, vol. IV. p. 219, you reprinted a letter I communicated to the *Athenæum* on the Tamil MSS. in the India Office

Library, in which, among a few remarks introduced incidentally regarding that eminent Orientalist, the late F. W. Ellis, of the Madras Civil Service, I stated that he had written essays on the Tamil,

Malayālam, Telugu, and probably the Canarese languages, of which the third only—that on Telugu—had been preserved, having been printed by Mr. A. D. Campbell in his *Telugu Grammar*, about 1816, with the author's permission.

I have lately discovered the proof-sheets of the second and third of the above treatises, among some papers brought from Madras, which fell into my hands when examining the books of the College of Fort St. George. Mr. Ellis was the first Principal of the Board of Superintendence of that institution, and printed such papers as he published before his death at the college press. It was among a heap of corrected proofs and manuscript that I discovered these papers when I was a member of the Board.

The essay on the Malayālam language seems well worthy of preservation, and I beg therefore to offer it to you for publication in the *Antiquary*. The *Telugu Grammar* is so rarely met with that it is worthy of consideration whether the third essay may not be reprinted also. I therefore submit it likewise for your opinion.

I made many inquiries for the Tamil treatise which doubtless was the first of the series, but I could obtain no tidings of it. Among the *fragmenta disiecta*, however, I found two MS. books filled with rough copy of a *Treatise on Tamil Prosody* by Mr. Ellis, and abounding in extracts from the Southern poets, which were probably connected with the missing essay. These I showed to the late Rev. T. Brotherton, a distinguished Tamil scholar, who stated that he "thought they would be very useful if published. . . . We have no separate English work," he added, "on Tamil prosody, that I am aware of."

The difficulty will be to find a competent editor. The MS. occupies upwards of 100 pages of foolscap in the rough, and is apparently unfinished.¹

In addition to the enumeration of Mr. Ellis's writings given at pp. 220-21 of vol. IV., I should specify his paper, "On the discovery of a modern imitation of the Vedas," in the *Asiatic Researches*, vol. XIV. pp. 1ff.

WALTER ELLIOT.

DISSERTATION ON THE MALAYĀLMA LANGUAGE.

BY THE LATE F. W. ELLIS.

The country of Malayālam, lying on the west coast of the Indian peninsula, is, according to the *Kēraḷōtpatti*, divided into four *Khaṇḍam* or provinces. The most northern, commencing at Gōkarnam and extending southward to Perumbūla, near Mangalore, is called Tuḷu-rājyaṃ,

'the kingdom of Tulu': from Perumbūla to Pudupattanam, near Nilésaram, the country is called Kūpa-rājyaṃ; thence to Kanuērpi, near Kollam (Quilon), lies Kēraḷa-rājyaṃ; and thence to Kanyākumāri (Cape Comorin) Mūshika-rājyaṃ. The Malayāla, or more properly the Malayāḷma, is at present the language of the two last provinces. It is spoken likewise in Kūpam, but in this province and in Tuḷu, which constitute the district on which, in recent times, the name of Kanara has been imposed, the Tuḷu, a distinct dialect, though of the same derivation as the Malayāḷma, prevails among the aborigines, and a variety of tongues among the Haiga, Konkapa, Kannaḍa, Telugu, and other tribes who have long colonized the country. There is a certain variation in dialect between the language of Kēraḷam and Mūshikam, and, indeed, in the several *nāḍus* into which they are divided, but none of sufficient importance to require particular notice: in the latter province affairs of state are conducted in the Tamil language, which is there, consequently, much more prevalent than in the former.

The Malayāḷma is, like the Kōḍun-Tamil, an immediate dialect of the Śēn-Tamil: it differs from the parent language generally in the same manner as the Kōḍun; it differs from the Kōḍun in pronunciation and idiom, but more especially in retaining terms and forms of the Śēn-Tamil which in the former are obsolete. But its most material variation from its cognate dialects is that, though deriving from a language superfluously abounding in verbal forms, its verbs are entirely devoid of personal terminations, the person being always indicated by the pronoun. It is this peculiarity which chiefly constitutes the Malayāḷma a distinct tongue, and distinguishes it in a peculiar manner from all other dialects of Tamil origination. (See Note A, p. 287.)

The Malayāḷma is written in three different characters, namely the Āryaṃ, the Kōlōḷuttu, and the Vattōḷuttu, or, as it is called in the more southern districts, Malayāla Tamil. The Āryaṃ, a variation of the Granthaṃ, has the same number of letters as the Nāgarī, and is derived intermediately from the Tamil alphabet: in this character all books, whether Sanskrit or Malayāḷma, are written, correspondence conducted, and business transacted. It is considerably varied in the form and mode of writing in different parts of the country: to the south of Calicut it is written square and distinct, and then, with the exception of a few characters, approaches nearer to the Granthaṃ: as written to the north of Calicut, however, its variation from its primitive

¹ I shall be happy to place these papers at the disposal of any Tamil scholar who will undertake to edit and publish them within a given time.

form is very considerable; the angles are rounded, and the vowel signs and compound consonants more irregularly connected, so that a person acquainted with Grantham, and consequently able to read the square Āryam character, can scarcely decipher the round hand. As the Grantham was originally formed for writing the Saṅskṛit only, all letters purely Tamil, and consequently not found in the Nāgarī, were rejected, but these have been necessarily restored in the Āryam, and retain nearly their proper Tamil form: these letters are R, L, and N only used as a final, or in connection with r. Separate forms, which do not exist in the Grantham, have also been devised for the finals R, L, and N, on account of their frequent occurrence.¹

The Kōlēluttu is, as its name imports, the writing of the palace, *kōlu* in Tamil being equivalent to the Hindustānī term *darbār*; in this character all grants, patents, decrees, and, in general, all papers that can be considered records of Government are drawn up. While Kēraḷam was independent these papers were in the Malayāḷma; but in M ā s h i k a m, the country at present under the dominion of the Travankor Government, Tamil is, and always has been, used for this purpose. The Vattēluttu, the clipped or abbreviated letter, is the writing of the forum; conveyances, bonds, legal instruments, and, generally, all transactions between man and man, necessary to be recorded, are written in this character. The two characters have each the same number of letters as the Tamil alphabet; the forms of the letters are nearly the same in both, and are either variations, all angles being rounded, or, as the name of the latter imports, abbreviations of the Tamil,

but they differ from each other and from the Tamil very materially in the mode of joining the signs of the vowels to the consonants, and in the manner of writing.* (Note B, p. 287.)

To exhibit with precision the difference between the Malayāḷma and the Śēn and Kōḍun Tamil, I shall make the following comparisons:—*Of terms derived in the two modern dialects from the pure or ancient Tamil; Of words derived from the Saṅskṛit; Of the declension of the noun; Of the conjugation of the verb; Of idiom.* This arrangement will comprehend every variation, whether in the pronunciation or forms of words, in the idiom, or in the use of terms by those which are obsolete in one dialect being retained in the other.

Comparison of terms in the two dialects derived from pure Tamil.

Like the other dialects of Southern India, the terms of the Malayāḷma might be arranged under the three principal classes of *Tatsamam*, pure Saṅskṛit terms, *Tadbhavam*, Saṅskṛit derivatives, and *Deśyam*, native terms, and the latter might be again subdivided into *Tamil Tatsamam*, pure Tamil, and *Tamil Tadbhavam*, Tamil derivatives. In the *Dissertation on the Telugu*, the *Tadbhavam* terms of that language are distributed into classes, according as they are derived direct or through the medium of the several Prākṛits; of the latter there are few, if any, in Malayāḷma, and the former do not abound. Those which occur may be more properly referred to the Tamil than the Malayāḷma; thus *simhah*, the sign Leo, becomes in Tamil, by the necessary substitution of *g* for *h*,—the latter not being found in the language,—*siṅgam*, and in Malayāḷma *siṅgam* and *chiṅgam*; thus, also, *vrishā-*

¹ The Tamil character, though perfectly competent to the expression of the language to which it belongs, is incapable of representing with precision the sounds and combinations of sound of the Saṅskṛit. To remedy this defect, the Brāhmins, on their establishment in Southern India, had but two methods at their option—to introduce the Nāgarī, if it then existed, or to invent a new character. They preferred the latter. (*An error.*) They analyzed the Tamil characters, and supplied the symbols wanting by recombining the lines and curves of which they were formed. The alphabet thus constructed they called Grantham, which, derived from *grath*, 'close-shut,' among other significations means 'a collection of words, a writing,' and is synonymous also with the term *sāstram*, 'a science,' or 'a treatise on any science.' The Saṅskṛit language is by Tamil writers, whether Brāhmins or Śādras, always called *vāda mōli*, 'the northern speech,' but it is universally known by its appropriate epithets Saṅskṛit and Gīrvāna; if, however, a Tamil Brāhmin is asked, in what language a Saṅskṛit book is written, his answer will invariably be 'in the Grantham,' alluding to the character, and conceiving that the inevitable deduction must be that the language is Saṅskṛit. Hence the mistake of Europeans who speak of the Grantham language and the *Grandonico lingua*, and among others of Ziegenbalg, who in general is accurate, when he says in a letter to La Croze, "*Brāhmanum linguæ propriæ nomen est Grantham, neque a Brāhmanibus ipsis unquam aliter vocatur.*" In the dissertation prefixed to his Saṅskṛit grammar, entitled *Siddharāgam*, p. 7, Paulinus à St. Bartholomæo says, "Ultimum denique alphabetum est Samscrudamico-Malabaricum nostrum anno 1772 Romæ typis

St. Congregationis impressum. Hoc obtinet in Regio Canara, Carnate, Concam, Maypoor, Madure, Tanjaur, in tota ora Malabarica et Coromandelica, et hoc soli linguæ sacre Samscrudamicæ proprium ibidem est, ac in libris Brāhminicis reperitur." This Paulinus asserts of the Āryam character of Malayāḷam, which obtains only in Kanara and Malabar; he evidently confounds it with the Grantham, from which it is indeed derived, but from which it materially differs. From the Grantham may also be deduced the Singalese and Burma alphabets; while the origin of the Kōlēluttu, Vattēluttu, and the characters of Java and Sumatra, all nearly connected, is referable immediately to the Tamil.

I am not aware that any European writer has ever given the Kōlēluttu or Vattēluttu alphabets: Anquetil Duperron notices them both, but with so little intelligence that, though he gives a copy of the ancient plates containing the privileges granted to the Jews, which is written in the Vattēluttu, he does not recognize the character, and affirms that he could procure no person capable of deciphering it. That Duperron might know the names of these alphabets, without being at all acquainted with the characters themselves, is very probable, but it is somewhat surprising that he should have found any difficulty in procuring the explanation of a document written in a character so generally known. A transcript of a letter in the Vattēluttu taken from the preface to Van Rhee's *Hortus Malabaricus* is engraved in the *Alphabetum Grandonico-Malabaricum*, where it is ridiculously called 'infimum scribendi genus,' because not applicable to writing the Saṅskṛit, but no explanation of the character is given. Vide p. 12. [See *Ind. Ant.* vol. I. p. 229.]

śāh, by the usual Tamil substitutions of *i* for *ri* and *ā* for *śā*, becomes *iḍāḍam*, and in Malayāḷma *iḍavam*. In these instances, however, and in most others of a similar nature, the proper *Tatsamam* term may be optionally used for the derivative. (Note C, p. 287.)

The changes by which the *Deṭyam* terms of the Malayāḷma are distinguished from those of pure Tamil, though they are mostly such as indicate a lapse from primitive forms, yet, being regular in their occurrence, may be regarded as dialectic differences rather than corruptions. The principal of these changes are as follows:—

The *u* of the pure Tamil in nouns is always converted to *u* (*u*), though this vowel never occurs as the final of any noun, either in *Śēn* or *Kōḍun* Tamil; the *u* so substituted, however, is subject to the rules which govern the *u* in the parent language, and is liable to elision, consequently, before all vowels: *a* and *ā* in the nominative, and *e* in the oblique cases, is substituted for the final *u*; *śā* and *s*, as the mute of the second series is pronounced in pure Tamil, in Malayāḷma becomes *ch*: when the nasal of the third series is followed by the mute of the same series, the compound thence arising, *ṇḍa*, is changed into *ṇṇa* if preceded by a short vowel, and *ṇa* if by a long one; so likewise the similar compound *aṇḍa* becomes *ṇṇa* and *ṇa*: the double mute of the fourth *tt* is often converted to *chcha*; the compound formed by the consonant and nasal of this series, *nda*, sometimes becomes *ṇna*, sometimes *ṇja*, and for the latter the double nasal *ṇṇa* is frequently substituted, as is the double nasal of the first *ṇṇa* for the compound *ṇ-ga*: *la* sometimes becomes *la*.³

These observations are exemplified by the following terms:—

| Pure Tamil. | Kōḍun Tamil. | Ma. Tamil. | English. |
|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| Vil | Villu | Villu | a bow. |
| Malei | Malei | Mala | a hill. |
| Kaḷutei | Kaḷatei | Kaḷuta | the neck. |
| Oḷḍu | Onṇu | Onnu | one. |
| Irāṇḍu | Rāṇḍu | Rāṇḍa | two. |
| Mūṇḍu | Mūṇṇu | Mūṇṇu | three. |
| Attan | — | Achchan | father. |
| Maṇḍa | Maṇḍa | Maṇṇa | forgotten. |
| Irundu | Irundu | Irunnu | being. |
| Aindu | Aḷḷu | Aḷḷu | five. |
| Kareinda | Kareṇṇa | Hareṇṇa | dissolved. |
| Nān-gaḷ | Nāṇ-gaḷ | Nāṇṇaḷ | we. |
| Puḷaḷ | Puḷaḷ | Puḷaḷa | praise. |
| Kēḷkkudaḷ | Kēḷkiradu | Kēḷkuna | to hear. |

³ Notwithstanding the Malayāḷma alphabet has, like the Nāgarī, five mutes in the five first series, the aspirates are never used except in Sanskrit words, and the third in each — *g*, *ḍ*, &c.—but seldom; the first mute in each series, therefore, as in *Śēn* and *Kōḍun* Tamil, has two sounds,

NOTE.—The peculiar letter *ḷ* [or *z'h'*] is generally pronounced in the districts to the south of the Coleroon *l*; this conversion in Malayāḷma is very arbitrary: for example, they say *ḷḷ*, 'below,' but, in a compound form, *ḷḷ āṇḍil*, 'in the last year.' The occurrence of this letter is generally the cause of some variation in all the Tamil dialects, an idea of which may be given by a single etymology: *pōḷḷu* [pron. *pōz'hudu*] in pure Tamil signifies 'time,' and the prefixing to this term of the demonstrative particles *i*, 'this,' *a*, 'that,' and *e*, 'what,' forms the temporal adverbs *ippōḷḷu*, 'now,' *appōḷḷu*, 'then,' and *ēppōḷḷu*, 'when,' according to the Southern pronunciation *ippōḷḷu*, &c.; in Kōḍun Tamil these words become respectively *ippō*, *appō*, and *ēppō*, and in the Malayāḷma *ippōḷ*, *appōḷ*, and *ēppōḷ*.

Comparison of terms in the three dialects derived from the Sanskrit.

The Malayāḷma being written in a character accommodated to the expression of the Sanskrit, the sounds of *tatsamam* terms are more accurately represented by it than they can be by the Tamil alphabet. In the mouth of Brāhmins of either tongue the pronunciation of words of Sanskrit origin is equally correct; but, as the written must always influence the spoken language, the Śūdras of Malayāḷam pronounce these with greater propriety than those of the Tamil countries, as the following terms will show:—

| Pure Tamil. | Kōḍun Tamil. | Ma. Tamil. | English. |
|-------------|---------------|---------------|------------|
| Śamudiram | Śamudiram | Samudram | the sea. |
| Virukkam | Virusām | Vriksham | a tree. |
| Mirugum | Mirugam | Mṛigam | a beast. |
| Āgāyam | Āgāsam | Ākāśam | the æther. |
| Siṅgam | Siṅgam | Simham | a lion. |
| Irāśīyam | Rāśīyam | Rājyam | a kingdom. |
| Manudan | Manushan | Manushan | a man. |
| Puḷi | Bāmi | Bhūmi | the earth. |
| Śiṭṭidal | Śiṣṭṭikkiradu | Śriṣṭṭikkunnu | to create. |

Of the Declension of the Noun.

In comparing the declension of the noun, I shall observe the grammatical arrangement of the *Śēn* Tamil: both this and the *Kōḍun* Tamil have a variety of forms to the several cases, from which I shall select such as serve to show their connection with the Malayāḷma. There are some peculiarities in the declension of nouns in the high language, which it will be necessary to explain to account for this variety, and to show in what the modern dialects differ in this part of grammar from their

being pronounced without the laryngeal compressor when initial, and with it when medial and final.

The Tamil *ḷ* is generally but not uniformly represented by Mr. Ellis as *z'h'*, but as *l* is its usual representation, that symbol is substituted throughout the paper.—ED.

parent. The Sēn Tamiḷ has two primary forms, the nominative and the oblique, the latter derived from the former variously according to the termination: the oblique form has its appropriate grammatical uses in the superior dialect, but in Kōḍun Tamiḷ it serves only as a genitive; in both, however, the terminations of the cases are added either to the nominative or oblique form, in the former at pleasure, in the latter under certain restrictions. The term I have selected for the following comparison has its nominative form *Vil*, its oblique form *Villin*, and the variations of the fifth or genitive case in Sēn Tamiḷ are—1st *Villadu*, 2nd *Villādu*, 3rd *Villanadu*, 4th *Villinādu*, before words

in the singular number; 1st *Villa*, 2nd *Villina*, before the plural number. The variations in Kōḍun Tamiḷ are—1st *Villin*, 2nd *Villudaya*, 3rd *Villinadaya*, without discrimination before singular and plural. The Malayāḷma takes its genitive from the third form of the Sēn Tamiḷ, expunging the penult *a*, converting the final *u*, as usual, to *y*, and, according to the rules of Tamiḷ etymology, substituting *r* with the sound of *ḍ* for that letter after a final *n*; *villinadu* thus becomes *villinṛḍ*, pronounced *villinḍḍ*. The variations of the other cases from their prototype, where they exist, might be similarly traced, but they are too minute to render this necessary.

| | Sēn Tamiḷ. | Kōḍun Tamiḷ. | Ma. Tamiḷ. | English. |
|-------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| N. S. | Vil. Pl. Villugaḷ | Villu-Villugaḷ | Villu-Villukaḷ | a bow, bows. |
| A. | Villaneḷ - gaḷei | Villei - gaḷei | Villine - kaḷe | a bow. |
| 1.Ab. | { Villināl - gaḷāl | Vilāl - gaḷāl | Villināl - kaḷāl | by a bow. |
| | { Villinōḍu - gaḷōḍu | Villōḍu - gaḷōḍu | Villinōḍu - kaḷōḍu | with a bow. |
| D. | Villukku - gaṭku | Vilukku - gaḷukku | Villina - kaḷukka | to a bow. |
| 2.Ab. | Villil - gaḷil | wanting | wanting | from a bow. |
| G. | Villinadu - gaḷadu | Villin - gaḷudeiya | Villinḍa - kaḷude | in a bow. |
| 3.Ab. | Villukkan - gaṭkan | Villil - gaḷil | Villil - kaḷil | of a bow. |

The *k*, though written, has in pronunciation, as is usually the case in Malayāḷma, the sound of *g*.

The fifth case or second ablative of the Sēn Tamiḷ is supplied in the Kōḍun and Malayāḷma by particles: the more general use of this case in the high language is to indicate motion from a place, and to compare the qualities of things, for which in English the prepositions *from* and *than* are employed, and in the latter sense the causal form is occasionally used in both dialects, though it is more generally expressed by the verbal form *kāṭṭilum*, meaning 'though shown,' preceded by an ac-

cusative; as, Kōḍun, *Idai kāṭṭilum adu nalludu*; Malayāḷma, *Ida kāṭṭilum ada nalla*, literally, 'though this be shown that is good.' The first meaning of this case is expressed in Kōḍun and Malayāḷma Tamiḷ respectively by the gerunds *ninḍu-ninnu*, 'standing,' after the seventh case.

The pronouns in each dialect are declined nearly as the nouns: the Sēn Tamiḷ, as in the nouns, has one or more oblique forms to which the causal terminations are added. The following comparison will show the variations of the three dialects:—

| | Sēn Tamiḷ. | | Kōḍun Tamiḷ. | | Malayāḷma. | | |
|-----------|------------------|---------|----------------|-----------------|-------------|---------|------------|
| | Sing. | Plu. | Sing. | Plu. | Sing. | Plu. | |
| Nom. | Nān, Nām | Nān-gaḷ | Nān, Nām | Nān-gaḷ | Nān, Nām | Nānnaḷ | I, we. |
| Obl. form | Ēn, Ēm | Nam | Ēn-Nam. | | | | |
| Ac. | Ēnnei, Ēmmei | Nammei | Ēnnei- | Ēng-gaḷe | Ēnne Namme | Nānnaḷe | me, we. |
| Nom. | Nī, Nīr | Nīn-gaḷ | Nīy - Nīr | Nīn-gaḷ | Nī . . . | Nīnnaḷ | thou, ye. |
| Obl. | Un, Nin . . | Um | Un - Um. | | | | |
| Ac. | Unnei Ninnei . . | Ummei | Unnei-Ummei | Un-gaḷei | Ninne Niye- | Nīnnaḷe | thee, you. |
| Nom. | Tān, Tām | Tān-gaḷ | Tān, Tām | Tān-gaḷ | Tān, | Tānnaḷ | he, they. |
| Obl. | Tan, Tam | | Tan, Tam. | | | | |
| Ac. | Tannei, Tammei | | Tannei, Tammei | Tān-gaḷei Tanne | . . . | Tānnaḷe | him, them. |

Tān, which in High Tamiḷ is equivalent to the Latin *ipse* or the English 'himself,' is so used also in Kōḍun Tamiḷ; but more generally in that dialect the plural number of this pronoun, and both the singular and plural in Malayāḷma,* usurps the

place of the second person singular in addressing those to whom the speaker owes respect or reverence. The demonstratives *M. avan*, *F. avai*, *N. adu*, 'that man,' 'that woman,' 'that thing;' *ivan*, *iva*, *idu*, 'this man,' &c.; *ēvan*, *ēvai*, *ēdu*, 'which men,' &c.;

* The Latin and Sēn Tamiḷ reject with the sternest rigidity the discrimination of persons by adulatory phrases; in all the modern dialects of these languages such phrases

abound. It is curious to trace a like aberration of the human mind, through correspondent periods, in countries so distant.

and the general interrogative *dr*, 'who? which?' with the usual changes, are common to the three dialects. The demonstrative letters *a*, 'that,' *i*, 'this,' *e*, 'what? which?' when they precede a consonant, are sometimes, as in Tamil, short and double the following consonant, and sometimes long: when they precede a vowel they are always long, as in Telugu, and require the letter *y* to be inserted before the vowel.

Comparative Conjugation of Verbs.

The several forms of the verb in pure Tamil are derived from the crude root by a method extremely artificial, and, as respects the permutation of letters, refined to the last degree of nicety; this artifice and this minuteness pervade and govern the variation of the verb in the Kōḍun and Malayāḷma dialects, though the rules which direct them, and the reason on which they proceed, can be learned only from the grammarians of the Śēn Tamil. Hence the only distinctions in the verbal systems of the three dialects are, as in the noun, that the Kōḍun Tamil selects one from the many personal terminations, and that the Malayāḷma rejects them altogether. The pure Tamil has three indefinite tenses for the three times formed from the root; the definite tenses and, to use an expression of European grammar, the moods of the verb, except the imperative, infinitive, and subjunctive, are supplied by auxiliaries; the third person of each tense is declined through the three genders; each tense has an indeclinable participle, which becomes declinable by affixing the first demonstrative pronoun in the three genders; and a gerund of most extensive use serves for all times, and for every person, until the suspended sense is closed at the close of the sentence by the conjugated verb in its proper form: this is the idiom of the verb in every dialect of the Tamil. The Malayāḷma from this extensive scheme selects for its present and future the third persons neuter

of those tenses; the former with slight change, the latter without alteration; and the gerund, with or without alteration, for its past. The gerund is either the same as the past tense, or another form is borrowed from the many it assumes in the parent language; the present and past participles are retained, the future being supplied, as is frequently the case in Kōḍun Tamil, by a compound.

In Tamil there are three classes or conjugations of verbs, principally distinguished by the variation of the gerund and past tense. The rules for each, as far as connected with the formation of the Malayāḷma, I shall explain. In the first class the gerund is formed simply by the duplication of the consonant of the final syllable, which is always either *gu*, *du*, or *ru* preceded by a short syllable; this is the root, which serves for the imperative; in the present tense it is followed by a single *g*, and the third person future neuter is formed from it by the addition of *um*, the preceding *u* being lost. In the second class the gerund is formed by the elision of the *u*, with which the root invariably ends, and the substitution of *i*: the present and future forms are the same as in the former class, unless the imperative ends in double *k*, in which case it is double also in the present. The third class requires *du* to be added to the root to form the gerund, but it is duplicated, or changed to *ndu*, *ṇdu* or *ṇdu* (*ṇru*), under the general rules for permutation, according to the letter in which the root ends: when the *d* is duplicated in the gerund, or when the root has a final *a*, the present requires a double *k*, and the third person future is formed by adding *kkum* to the root; in all other cases the characteristic letter of the present is a single *g*, and the future is formed by *um*.

The application of these rules to the two dialects of the Tamil and the Malayāḷma is exemplified and explained in the following synopsis:—

Derivation of the Malayāḷma Present.

| | Sēn Tamil. Kōḍun Tamil. | Malayāḷma. | | |
|---------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|------------|-------------|
| Common Roots. | Person Neuter, Present Tense. | First Class. | | |
| | | Pugugiṇradu—Pūgudu | Pūgunnu | |
| | | Paḍugiṇradu—Paḍudu | Paḍunnu | |
| | | Pēṇugiṇradu—Pēṇudu | Pēṇunnu | |
| | | Second Class. | | |
| | | Kaṭṭugiṇradu—Kaṭṭudu | Kaṭṭukunnu | I, thou, |
| | | Nikkiṇradu—Nikkudu | Nikkunnu | she, it, |
| | | Third Class. | | |
| | | Śēygiṇradu—Śēyudu | Chēyyunnu | they, we, |
| | | Kōḍukkiṇradu—Kōḍukkudu | Kōḍakkunnu | enter, |
| | | Kadikkiṇradu—Kadikkudu | Kaḍikkunnu | suffer, |
| | | Aṇigiṇradu—Aṇiyudu | Aṇyunnu | obtain, &c. |
| | | Kōḷḷugiṇradu—Kōḷḷudu | Kōḷḷunnu | |
| | | Niṇkiṇradu—Niṇkudu | Niṇkunnu | |
| | Present Tense. | | | |

| Derivation of the Past. | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|-----------------------------|----------|--|
| Sēn and Kōḍun Tamil. | | Malayāḷma. | | |
| Gerund. | First Class. | | | I, thou, he, &c. entered, suffered, removed. |
| | Entering | Pukku | Pukku | |
| | Suffering | Paṭṭu | Paṭṭu | |
| | Obtaining | Pēṭṭu | Pēṭṭu | |
| | Second Class. | | | |
| | Tying | Kaṭṭi | Kaṭṭi | |
| | Removing | Nikki | Nikki | |
| | Third Class. | | | |
| | Doing | Śēydu | Chēydu | |
| | Giving | Kōḍuttu | Kōḍuttu | |
| | Biting | Kaḍittu and in K.T. Kaḍiśśu | Kaḍiceu | |
| | Knowing | Aṇindu | Aṇiñṇiya | |
| | Taking | Kōṇḍu | Kōṇḍu | |
| | Standing | Niṇḍu | Ninnu | |
| | Derivation of the Past. | | | |
| Sēn and Kōḍun Tamil. | | Malayāḷma. | | |
| The Third Person Neuter of the Future and the Future Participle. | First Class. | | | I, thou, he, &c. will enter, suffer, obtain, &c. |
| | It will enter. | Pugum, K.T. Pūgum | Pūgum | |
| | It will suffer. | Paḍum | Paḍum | |
| | It will obtain. | Pērum | Pērum | |
| | Second Class. | | | |
| | It will tie. | Kaṭṭum | Kaṭṭum | |
| | It will remove. | Nikkum | Nikkum | |
| | Third Class. | | | |
| | It will do. | Śēyum | Chēyum | |
| | It will give. | Kōḍukkum | Kōḍukkum | |
| | It will bite. | Kaḍikkum | Kaḍikkum | |
| | It will know. | Aṇiyum | Aṇiyum | |
| | It will take. | Kōḷlum | Kōḷlum | |
| | It will stand. | Niṇkum, K.T. Niṇkum | Niṇkum | |

In the present tense the Malayāḷma differs from the Kōḍun Tamil in the final syllable only, *nnu* being substituted for *du*; the present participle is formed by changing the final *u* to *a*, as *nikkuma*, 'removing,' &c.; this in Sēn and Kōḍun Tamil respectively is *nikkinda*, *nikkra*. In forming the past tense the Malayāḷma makes no alteration in the two first classes, the third of the third class assumes the colloquial form of Kōḍun Tamil, the fourth is corrupted by an easy permutation of consonants, and the last is formed by the usual change of *d* into *n*: the verbs which take these corrupted forms constitute the greater number in the language. It will be observed that the various terminations of the gerund, which in the parent language depends on the primitive form, or artificial preparation of the root, are invariably followed in the Malayāḷma: this agreement is constant even in anomalies. In the future tense of the Malayāḷma there is no alteration.

The variation between the two dialects, produced by the default of the Malayāḷma in personal terminations, will appear from the comparison of

the past tenses of the verb *nikkudal*, or *nikkunnu*, 'to remove.'

| S. & K. Tamil. | Malayāḷma. | English. |
|----------------|------------|----------------|
| Nikkinēn | Nān nikki | I removed. |
| Nikkināy | Ni nikki | thou removedst |
| Nikkinān | Avan nikki | he removed. |
| Nikkināḷ | Avaḷ nikki | she removed. |
| Nikkirṭu | Adu nikki | it removed. |

As simplicity would appear to indicate originality, the defect of the Malayāḷma verb in personal terminations, to cursory consideration, would seem to declare this to be the parent of the Tamil dialects: the superior richness of the Sēn Tamil in tenses, in the variety of idiom, and in the artifice of language, arising possibly from superior cultivation, affords no refutation of this notion; for cultivation will soon exalt a subordinate dialect above its neglected parent. But analogy sufficiently demonstrates that such has not been the general progress of human speech, and there is no reason to believe that the Tamil dialects constitute an exception; as far as history can ascend, language will ever be found more artificial,

more fertile in terminations, more abounding in inflections, and more copious in terms, in proportion to its antiquity; and during the last fifteen hundred years every progressive change in language, either from desuetude or intermixture, in Asia as well as in Europe, has invariably tended to reduce this exuberance. Throughout every dialect, from the confines of China to the shores of the Atlantic, the ancient structure of language has been gradually dissolved; the cases of nouns have either been reduced or entirely obliterated by the substitution of prepositions; the many moods and tenses of the primitive languages have disappeared, and the various incidents of action are now expressed by a few terminations and a multitude of auxiliaries; and the desire to vary the recurring monotony of a modern sentence compels the employment of a cumbrous circumlocution, instead of permitting the more elegant recourse to correlative terms. The perfection of the Sēn Tamiḷ, therefore, not the defects of the Malayāḷma, indicates the parent of the dialects of Southern India. This deduction is confirmed by the fact that in the higher style of composition the Malayāḷma still uses, though sparingly, the personal terminations of the original language: the extracts I shall hereafter make will afford many instances of this, and the following short example from the invocation to the *Rāmāyaṇa* will, therefore, for the present be sufficient:—

Vishṇu tan māyāguṇachariṭram illām kōṇḍu

Kriṣṇan am purāṇakarttāvine vanni chōṇṇē,

"I have related the whole of the wonderful history of Vishṇu, reverencing Kriṣṇan, the ancient lord."

Vanni chōṇṇē, literally 'I have told reverencing;' *chōṇṇē* is in the Kōḍun Tamiḷ the form of the first person past of the verb *chōḷudal*, 'to tell;' in colloquial Malayāḷma it would be *nān chōḷli*.

Comparison of Idioms.

All that belongs to the comparison of the idiom of cognate dialects may be included in the examination of the construction of sentences and the use of terms. The language of verse in the Malayāḷma dialect differs much less in idiom from the pure Tamiḷ than the language of prose; the rules of prosody are the same, and there is sometimes so near a coincidence that the Malayāḷma will become pure Tamiḷ by the change of a few letters; but the reverse does not obtain, for no verse of pure Tamiḷ could be made Malayāḷma without an entire change of its terms and structure.

This I shall presently exemplify, but first give the following specimens of Malayāḷma prose, distinguishing the Sanskrit words by a variation of type, and adding such remarks as may tend to elucidate the idiomatic difference of the two dialects.

Extract from the Kēraḷōtpatti.

Śrī Parasurāman Kēraḷattinkal Brāhmaṇareuṇḍāki—*paladikkinnu* Brāhmaṇare *kōṇḍu vannu* Kēraḷattinkal *vēchchu*—*adiṇṇē śēsham avar drum uṇachch'* *iruvana illa*—*avar ōkkō tanṇē tanṇē dikkil tannē pōy-kalaṇṇu*—*adiṇṇē hētu Kēraḷattil sarpaṅgal vannu nṇi-gāde pōy*—*avaruḍē piḍa kōṇḍu arkkum uṇappichcha nīpḍa vaṣam illa*—*adiṇṇē śēsham* Śrī Parasurāman *nīrḍipichchu* *uttarabhūminīkalinnu* Āryya Brāhmaṇare *kōṇḍu pōṇṇu vēchchu*—Āryya Brāhmaṇare *nāḍē* Āhichhatram *ākunna dikkinna purapaṭṭa* Syamanta panchakam *ākunna kshētrattinkal iruvnu*—*ā kshētrattinna guruksheṭram ēṇa pēr uṇḍu*.

"Śrī Parasurāman caused Brāhmaṇas to be in Kēraḷam; he brought Brāhmaṇas from various quarters and placed them in Kēraḷam; after that they were all without confidence: all of them returned, therefore, each of his own accord, to his own quarter. The cause of this was that serpents came into Kēraḷam and remained without removing; from the distress they occasioned it was not possible to cause any (of the Brāhmaṇas) to have confidence or to stay. After that, Śrī Parasurāman, having formed his determination, carried Ārya Brāhmaṇas from the northern land and placed them here. The Ārya Brāhmaṇas came first from Āhichhatram and remained in the Kshētram Syamantapanchakam; that Kshētram is called, therefore, the principal Kshētram."

This passage, broken into short sentences and unconnected by any of the usual artifices of language, exhibits the most material difference between the construction of the Malayāḷma and pure Tamiḷ; this arises from the former having no connectives to supply the want of the indefinite gerund, which it uses for the past tense—an imperfection which prevents the continued flow of the sense, as in pure Tamiḷ, to the natural period of the sentence. The past tense in Malayāḷma sometimes assumes its primitive functions and is used as a gerund, though this cannot always be done without confusion: there are several instances of this in this example, as *kōṇḍuvannu* and *nīrḍipichchu*, which, from the context, must signify 'having brought' and 'having formed his determination,' instead of 'he brought' and 'he formed his resolution,' which are their meanings when used as tenses.

The most remarkable difference in the two dialects in the use of terms is in the application of the gerund *uṇachchu*, as used in the Malayāḷma: the neuter form *uṇēidal* in pure Tamiḷ means 'to thicken, to become firm,' and is generally restricted to the thickening or curdling of milk; in the active form, *uṇēttal*, it almost entirely loses its radical meaning in the Kōḍun Tamiḷ, except in the compound *uṇēttukōḷḷudal*, when it signifies 'to act firmly, to

have confidence.' In the foregoing extract this word occurs twice, once in the active form, *uraccu*, and once in the causal, *urappiccū*, and in both cases retains the radical signification, to convey which in Malayāḷma it is not necessary that it should appear in a compound form.*

Mal. Śrīmaṇ Śaṅkarāchāriyudei charitram churukki yēḷudi yirikunnu. Āyada: Keraḷa khaṇḍattinḱal Tam. Śrīmaṇ Śaṅkarāchāriyudeiya sarittiram surukk' ēḷudi yirukkiyadu. Ad'avadu: Keraḷa kaṇḍattil Ālavāyḱka kiḷakka Kāḷaḱi yēṇna deṣattil Kaipalli yēṇna 'taravāḱāya 'illattil kaliyugam Ālavāyḱḱu kiḷakke Kāḷaḱi yēṇra deṣattil Kaipalli yēṇra piṇanda viḱatt' āgārattil kaliyugam mūvāyirattāññūṭṭ' ōṇāmāḱil 'chīṅgañāyaṇil śrāvāṇanākshatrattinḱal avadarichcha, muppatt' ēṭṭa mūdāyiratt' aiṇūṭ' ōṇ' dēadil dēvāni masattil tīrūvōṇaṇāṭṭattirattil avadarittu, muppatt' ēṭṭu 'vayasinagam smārtta matatte pramāṇichchu, dikka' vijayam 'kalichchu tiriye keraḷattinḱal śrīśiva-vayasinūḷḷe smārtta madattei pramāṇittu, tikkuviḱayam kōṇḱu tīrumbā keraḷattil tīrūśiva-pērūril mahāḱēvanṇē kshetra munbil irikkunna māṇḱabatinḱal ninna 'tīpattā 'kaivālyā pērūril mahāḱēvanadu kshetra munbil irukkiṇṇa māṇḱabattil ninṇu devigamdy moṭsa padavikk' ēḷunṇ' 'allogayum cheydu. appōl tīrūvāyasa muppatt' ēṭṭ' atre yāgunnu. ēṇṇada 'kōṇḱu padavikk' ēḷunṇ' aḱuttār. appōḷuḱu tīrūvāyasa muppatt' ēṭṭumatram āgudu. ēṇḱadāṇḱil ikkeraḷarāyjam nāḷa khaṇḍattilum brahmākshatriyavāisya sūdra nāḷu varṇapattinnum idil 'kuraññi ikkeraḷarāyjam nāḷu kaṇḍattilum pīrama sattiriya vāisya bādīra nāḷu varṇattilum idil tāḷṇda kiḷ 'parishagalkkum 'innāṇē sakala prajāgalkkum jaga guru nāthanāy irikkunna Śrīmaṇ Śaṅkarāchāri kiḷ kulāṅgaluk-kum sagala prajāgalkkum jaga guru nāḱḱandy irukkiṇṇa Śrīmaṇ Śaṅkarāchāri kalpichch' irikkunna āchāravum anāchāravum ariññu nāḱḱakunavarkk' allāḱe mōksham 'lābhikḱa ill' kalpitt' irukkiṇṇa āsāramum andsāramum ariṇḱu nāḱḱakkiṇṇavarkk' allāḱe moṭsam aḱēiyavillei ēṇṇ' 'atre nīschayam. yēṇḱadu tāṇe nīssayam.

A summary of the history of the prosperous Śaṅkarāchārya.

"It is in this wise. He became incarnate in the province of Kēraḷam, in the Dēśam called Kāḷaḱi, to the south of Āḷavāy, in the Illam of the place of his birth, called Kaipalle, in the 3501st year of the Kaliyugam (A.D. 400—too early), in the month of August, and under the Lunar constellation Śravanam; within the age of thirty-eight years he established everywhere the Smārta sect, having travelled through every quarter; returning he

To exemplify further the differences here noticed, and to enable the Tamil or Malayāḷma scholar to compare the two dialects, I add another extract from the *Keraḷāṭṭipatti*, with an interlined translation into Tamil. The figures refer to the variation of the two languages noticed in the remarks.

departed this life and ascended to the joys of Heaven from the Maṇḱapam in the front of the holy place of Mahāḱēva in Śrīśiva-pērūṇ in Kēraḷam; at that time the age of the holy man did not exceed thirty-eight years. Thenceforth in the four provinces of the kingdom of Kēraḷa the four castes of Brāhmanas, Kshatriyas, Vāisyas, and Sūdras, have obtained salvation by observing that which should be done and that which should not be done as taught by the prosperous Śaṅkarāchāri, the chief teacher of the world, and by no other means."

* Similar variations are common in all languages; they have been too frequently overlooked by grammarians; and the principles of etymology, therefore, capable as this science is of precision, and leading as it does to the most interesting results, are still too obscure to invite research, too indefinite to inspire confidence. He who shall conquer the difficulties which the absurd speculations of the idle or the ignorant have thrown in his way, and establish etymology on the firm basis of truth and reason, will suggest to the philosopher new and important speculations on mankind, and open to the historian views of the origin and connection of nations, which he can derive from no other source. The European etymologist must not, however, content himself with extending his researches to the Latin, the Greek, or the Teutonic only, nor must he amuse himself and mislead his readers by theories founded on fancied resemblances to Hebrew and Arabic roots: for with these languages neither the ancient nor modern dialects of Europe have any radical connection. It is in India that he must seek the foundation of etymology, being assured that it is on this alone that any durable structure can be erected. It is not intended here to enter further into this subject: that the assertion is generally true will be now admitted by many, though the extent to which it is true is known but to few. A single instance may illustrate it. By what possible interchange of letters can *bis*, though the connection in sense is evident, be derived from *duo*? or, rather, how can any radical connection between them be shown? The real

etymology of the word *bis* can only be known by reference to the Sanskrit, and by the application of rules which govern the permutation of letters in the Prakrits. The crude form, frequently used in composition, of the word signifying *two* in Sanskrit is *dvi*, composed of the radical letters *d*, *v* (which before vowels changes regularly to *v* or *w*), and *i*: when this crude noun is declined, *dva* is substituted for it, and its proper form, therefore, in the nominative dual feminine is *dvau*, which in Prakrit, in which this word has also several other forms, becomes *do*, and in Latin *duo*. This establishes the natural connection between *dvi* and *duo*. In some instances *dvi* loses its first letter, as in the word meaning *twenty*, which, formed from it by the affix *viṣati*, is not *dvivṣati*, but *viṣṣati* (*viginti*). One of the leading canons of permutation in the Prakrits is *vabayoṇ abhedam*, 'between *va* and *ba* there is no difference,' and in these dialects the latter is constantly substituted for the former, *viṣṣati* becoming under this rule, and by the omission of the nasal and of the final syllable, *visa*. From the crude noun *dvi* is derived the adverb *dvih*, 'twice,' the final aspirate of which is substituted for *s*, so that the primary form, used also under certain rules in composition, is *dvīs*. Hence the derivation of *bis* is clearly indicated, and there can be no doubt but that it is formed, first, by dropping the *d* of *dvīs*, which then becomes *vis*; secondly, by changing *v* into *b*, whence *bis*. To prove that *twice* and *dis* are not only of the same derivation, but the same as *bis*, would now be superfluous.

Remarks.

1. The compound *taravāda*, which in Malayāḷma signifies, not generally the town or district, but the actual 'place of birth,' is not, as far as I am aware, used in either dialect of the Tamil; the terms, however, of which it is formed are *taravu*, signifying 'the sinciput,' and *ādu*, as a verbal root, 'to move': the whole implies, therefore, 'the place where the head first moved.' The first member of this compound is used neither in Kōḍun Tamil nor Malayāḷma, and it would be impossible, therefore, for any person acquainted with these dialects only to trace its derivation. 2. *Ilam*, used in this extract as synonymous with *agraharam*, 'the residence of Brāhmins,' means in Tamil simply 'a house.' 3. *Chinnā-ndyaru*, 'the month when the sun enters the sign Leo'; it is compounded of the terms *cinna*, corrupted from the Sanskrit *siṃha*, 'the sign Leo,' and the Tamil *ndyaru*, 'the sun'; but, as it cannot be so used in Tamil, it is rendered by the name of the month, *Avanimsam*, with which it corresponds. 4. *Vayasinagam*, the last term, or in the oblique *agattu*, might have been used in the Tamil version instead of *uḷḷe*, but it would savour of the high dialect. 5. *Vijayam* properly signifies 'conquest,' but here 'a journey, travel'; *kaṭṭal* signifies in Tamil 'to take away,' but in this place *kōḷḷudal*, which has nearly the same sense, must be used for it. 6. *Tippaṭṭa*, from *tṭ*, 'fire,' and *paṭṭa*, 'suffering,' is employed in Malayāḷma when speaking of the decease of persons entitled to respect; but, though the terms from which it is derived are Tamil, this compound does not belong to that language, the Sanskrit *devigam*, 'the act of God,' being generally used in this sense. 7. This Sanskrit word is used only in high Tamil, and it is rendered here, therefore, by another, of the same derivation, more commonly received. 8. *Allugunu* and *aḷuttal* with the dative both mean 'to reach, arrive at'; they are derived from the same root *al*, which in Malayāḷma takes the affix *u*, and in Tamil *du*, converted, according to the general rules of grammar, with the final *l* to *du*; it would be better Tamil to use in this place *aḷeital*, also from the same root, 'to repair to, to obtain.' 9. *Kōṇdu*, the gerund of *kōḷḷudal*, 'to take,' may be used in Tamil, also, with the meaning of the prepositions 'by,' 'with,' but the termination of the regular case is generally preferable. 10. *Kureinda* and *tāṇda* both signify in Tamil 'lessened,' but the latter only can be used in the sense here belonging to *kurañña*, 'inferior.' 11. *Parisham*, of Sanskrit derivation, is not used in either dialect of the Tamil. 12. *Ṇṇāṇē* has the same meaning in Tamil, but it is here superfluous to the sense. 13. This Sanskrit derivative from the root *labh*, 'gain, profit,' cannot be used in Tamil. 14. *Atra* is

a Sanskrit adverb, and cannot be used, therefore, in Tamil. With these exceptions and a few dialectic permutations of letters, the Malayāḷma in the preceding extract and its Tamil version are word for word the same.

The near coincidence which I have stated to exist in the idiom of measured language, and the agreement of the rules of prosody in these dialects, may be exemplified by the translation of a verse from the Malayāḷma into pure Tamil, retaining the terms, their position, and the measure.

From Elutt' Achchan's translation of the
Rāmdyaṇam.

¹Nānmārā ²nērāy ³Rāmāyāṇā ⁴chāmākkālāl
⁵Nānmukhan ⁶uḷḷil ⁷bahumānatta ⁸valartt'oru
⁹Vānmiki ¹⁰kavi ¹¹śrēṣṭhan ¹²āgiya ¹³mahā ¹⁴muni
¹⁵Tān ¹⁶mama ¹⁷varam ¹⁸tarik' ¹⁹ēppōlum
²⁰vannikkunēn.

Translation into pure Tamil.

¹Nānmārāi ²nērām ³Rāmāyāṇā ⁴sāmēikkālāl
⁵Nānmugan ⁶uḷḷil ⁷vagumānattai ⁸valartt'oru
⁹Vānmiki ¹⁰kavi ¹¹śrēṣṭhan ¹²āgiya ¹³mahā ¹⁴muni
¹⁵Tān ¹⁶varam ¹⁷taruga ¹⁸vēppōl ¹⁹udilum
²⁰vandikkunēn.

Translation into English.

"For the purpose of ¹composing the ²Rāmdyaṇam equal to the ³four Vēdams, the ⁴four-faced deity caused his ⁵gifts to ⁶flourish in the ⁷mind of ⁸a Vālmiki; ⁹this great ¹⁰Muni thus ¹¹became ¹²the chief ¹³of poets; may ¹⁴he ¹⁵bestow ¹⁶on ¹⁷me ¹⁸endowment and I will ever reverence ¹⁹him."

Vagumānam, *śrēṣṭhan*, and *mahā*, derivatives from the Sanskrit, though often used in colloquial language, are not received into high Tamil, and would not by choice be admitted into metric composition, for Tamil poesy is nicer even than the English in selection of expressions; the elegance only is lost, the sense being exactly retained. I doubt much if the derivation of the term *nānmaya* could be traced by any person, however well versed in Malayāḷma, unless he were acquainted with the parent language: it is a compound formed of the terms *nāl*, 'four,' and *mayai*, in its primitive sense signifying 'a word,' in its secondary senses 'doctrine, the Vēdam'; by a grammatical rule of Sēn Tamil, *l* before *m* changes to *n*, whence the compound *nānmayai*, 'the four Vēdams'; *nānmukhan* is similarly formed. The translation as it stands cannot be assigned to either dialect of the Tamil, the terms noticed precluding it from ranking as Sēn Tamil, and others, as well as its structure, removing it from the Kōḍun; the fourth term of the first line, for example, radically signifies 'to prepare,' and is here appropriately used in this sense, but in Kōḍun Tamil it is restricted to the preparation or dressing of food. The language

of Malayāḷma poetry is in fact a mixture of Saṅskṛit, generally pure, with Śēn and Kōḍun Tamil.

In this verse not only the laws, but even the licenses, of Tamil metre are observed. It belongs to the *Alavāḍi* or *Kaliviruttam* of Tamil prosody, and its common measure is four feet, thus expressed by the usual marks (— ∪ ∪ — — ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∪), the first syllable in the first, second, and fourth foot, and the two long syllables in the third foot, being at pleasure resolvable each into two short. This rule is strictly observed in this verse, the first syllable of the fourth foot being resolved in every line, as are the first syllable of the third foot in the second line and the first syllable of the second foot in the third and fourth lines; in translating into Tamil I have followed not only the law of this species of verse, but have been able to preserve even the quantity of the syllables, except in the third foot of the last line, where a syllable is resolved, though not so in the Malayāḷma. According to the strict laws of Tamil prosody, the fourth syllable in the third foot of the second line (*bahumduatte*) ought to be long, being preceded by a long syllable and followed by a double consonant; for a similar reason every syllable in the fourth foot of the last verse (*vannikkunnēn*) ought also to be long, but in the several species of verse classed under the general term *Viruttam* it is an allowed license to shorten such syllables when followed by double consonants or a nasal and consonant of the same class; this license the Malayāḷma also assumes, and it is retained, therefore, in the same places in the translation. The rules by which the length and shortness of syllables and initial rhyme are governed are the same in both dialects.

In rendering this verse into Tamil the second term of the last line (*mama*) has been omitted; this term is the sixth or genitive case of the

* This profuse intermixture of the grammatical forms of the Saṅskṛit in the higher order of Malayāḷma composition would seem to have led certain recent Italian writers into strange misconceptions. Though one of them, Paulinus à St. Bartholomæo, has composed a Grammar of the Saṅskṛit, he does not seem quite clear that there is any radical distinction between what he calls the *lingua Sanscredamica-malabarica*, and the *Samscredamica* (vide 16 and following pages of the Preface to the *Sidharubam*); and the author of the introduction to the *Alphabetum Grandonico-Malabaricum sive Samscredonicum*, by which he means the Arya character of the Malayāḷma, though he be sadly puzzled to discover whether the *Samscredonica lingua* be the mother of the *Grandonica*, or vice versa (vide p. 6, sec. VI.), expressly says (p. 10, sec. X.):—"Lingua igitur vulgaris Malabarica, ea nempe quæ usurpat a Gentibus littoris Malabarici insolis, a Promontorio Comorino usque ad montem Deli prope Regnum Canara, nil nisi dialectus est Sanscredonica Lingua." From his invariably giving to Saṅskṛit words Tamil terminations, and from his distinguishing three dialects, *Grandonica*, *Samscredonica*, and *Malabarica*, it might be conceived that he applied the second epithet to the metric language of Malayāḷma, but he does away with this distinction by stating it as his opinion that the *Grandonica* and *Samscredonica* may be the same (see p. xi.). I cannot, however, conclude this note without making

pronoun of the first person in Saṅskṛit, and cannot be used in Tamil, as declined or conjugated forms from the Saṅskṛit are not admissible into that language. They are not admissible, also, in Malayāḷma prose, but in verse they are often used with such profusion as to give it the appearance of that fanciful species of composition called in Saṅskṛit *Mani-pravāḇam*, and in English 'macaronic verse,' rather than the sober dress of grammatical language: often, indeed, the whole verse is pure Saṅskṛit, connected or concluded by a few words of Malayāḷma. The following stanzas will exemplify these peculiarities: in the two first the grammatical forms of the Saṅskṛit are intermixed with terms of Saṅskṛit and Tamil derivation; in the last nearly all the terms are Saṅskṛit.

A stanza from the *Vyavahāra Samudra*: a treatise on law.

Atṭipērāy nīraṅg' ōruvanōḍ'ōruvan janmam ēkam
disāyām
Dṛisṭānmār āru pēr unḍ' aḷukiya vidhi yēnnu
kēlppuṇḍu sāstram
Sajjāti bandhu putran narapati likhitan tatra sam-
bandhi
Yēnn'ittham chōllullavar ōḷiga kōḷḷōḷā dhātri-
channam.

"At the place where one takes from another the Janmam, or proprietary right in the soil, by the water of the Atṭipēru obligation,

"The prescribed law is, that, according to an excellent rule, six descriptions of persons should be present;

"People of pure caste, relations, a son, the prince, a scribe, and persons connected with the parties;

"Unless such as are here mentioned be present, a portion of land must not be purchased."

an attempt to relieve one of the writers I have mentioned, Paulinus, from the consequences of a note to one of the articles of the *Asiatic Researches* (see "Dissertation on the Language and Literature of the Indo-Chinese Nations.") In the general intent of this note, and in the facts it states, I agree; but I much doubt whether Paulinus is to blame for the substitution of the Tamil termination "ā" in his *Sanskrit Grammar*, in the place of the regular Saṅskṛit affix *āt*, or whether this be anything more than a typographical error. It is shown in this note that this substitution, *l* for *t*, takes place in many other instances wherein Paulinus could not have been misled by the resemblance of the vernacular dialect, and I have had occasion to remark that it is universal in all works printed in the Arya character at the Propaganda press. In this character the mute *l* and *t* resemble each other so nearly that it is not at all surprising that they should be mistaken by a compositor ignorant of the language; but the fact would rather appear to be that the fount was without the latter letter. The work of Paulinus to which I refer is the *Sidharubam*, seu *grammatica Samscredamica*, in which Saṅskṛit terms are written in the Arya character only, not in the Latin, and in which the substitution noticed invariably takes place; I have never seen his other work, *Vyakarana*, &c. referred to in the text of this dissertation, (See Note D, *infra*, p. 237.)

Stanzas from the *Rāmdyaṇam*.

*Paramātmānam mama hridayarahasyam id'
 Ōruṇḍum me bhaktihīnamā mēv' idum
 Naranmātrōdu paramān' arayikk' arud' edō
 Paramam upadēsam ill' idin mīdē yōnnum.*

"This is the secret of my heart, the supreme mind; at all times it is improper to converse or have communication with men who are united in friendship with the disparagers of my worship; behold the height of instruction, nothing is above this."

*Sarvādhānam sarvavyāpinam sarvātmnam
 Sarvajñam sarvāvarām sarvasakshinam nityam
 Sarvād sarvādhānam sarvābhātmam
 Nirvikāratmā Rāmadēvanēn ayika nē.*

"The cause of all; the omnipresent; the universal soul; the omniscient; the Lord of all; the eternal witness of all; the giver and supporter of all; inscrutable even by the gods, Rāmadēvan, the soul uninfluenced by passion, know thou to be."

In the first stanza the term *dīśdyam* is the seventh case of the Sanskrit noun *dīś*, and *tatra* and *ittham* are Sanskrit adverbs used as such without alteration or addition. In the first verse from the *Rāmdyaṇam*, *mama* and *mē* are genitives of the pronoun of the first person, and in the second every term except the three last is the Sanskrit accusative governed by the Malayāḷma imperative *ayika*. In each example the Sanskrit terms intermixed retain their primitive form, and, with one or two exceptions, reject the Malayāḷma termination; there is no instance in them of a conjugated verb, though this form is occasionally introduced.

This hybrid language is not exclusively confined to the Malayāḷma; it is in use in other parts of India, though it nowhere else constitutes the customary garb of poetry. It is an invention far beneath the ancient Tamil writers (*Note E*), and they have, therefore, left no specimens of it; but compositions in the Mani-pravāḷam are now common throughout the countries where the Tamil and its dialects are spoken. The *Bhāratam* was a few years ago translated into Tamil Mani-pravāḷam, from which I shall give a single extract to compare with the Malayāḷma:—

*Arumbuppōlā tāvā dantāpāṅktī
 Kurumbēippōlā kuchhamaṇḍaladevayam
 Karumbuppōlā madhura cha vānē
 Irumbuppōlā hridayam kim dātē?*

"Like young buds are the even rows of thy teeth,
 Like tender cocoanuts the two orbs of thy bosom,
 Like the sugarcane thy honeyed words,
 Like iron why then is thy heart?"

Here the first part of each line is pure Tamil, and the second pure Sanskrit; the terms of each language are, however, more usually intermixed

with each other, each retaining its own form and idiom. In the present instance the verse, as in Malayāḷma, follows the rules of Tamil prosody, the first syllable of *paṅktī*, *dātē*, &c., though in Sanskrit invariably long, becoming short because preceded by an unconnected short syllable. Sanskrit metres of all kinds are, however, often composed in Mani-pravāḷam.

The Malayāḷma has never been cultivated as an independent literary language, nor does the Tamil literature, notwithstanding the length of time the country was subject to the kings of Śēram, appear to have been extensively known here, or at least has not survived that dynasty. This is the more extraordinary as some of the earliest and best of the Tamil works were composed in Śēram. This remark, however, applies more to Kēralam proper than to Māshikam or Travankor; the residence of the Śēram Viceroy was in this province, and a knowledge of pure Tamil has always been more prevalent here than in the northern districts.

Parasurāman, as it is fabled in the *Keralōtpatti*, of Mayūra Varma, as stated by other, and probably better, authority, in endowing the Brāhmanas with land, condemned them to perpetual inactivity, and indolence and luxury are now the proverbial characteristics of the *Nambūris*. The following stanza contains a short satire on them, which at the present day they certainly deserve, and which probably is not inapplicable to their character as formed at an early period by the extraordinary institutions of the country:—

Indra-vajra Vrittam

*Prātāḥ pāyōnām pārātō yāvōgūr
 Attāḷam abhyāṅgam ath'ōṇṇi yappam
 Muttiāḷam antō vṛishālāshu bhogaḥ
 Nambūrtinam janma sujanna manyē.*

"In the morning milk and rice, then rice gruel; after the table is removed (!?) and the body anointed, then the eating sweet cakes, and after dalliance (?) the enjoyment of Śūdra women! The life of the Nambūris, methinks, is an excellent life."

I have introduced this stanza partly on account of the contrast it forms with those previously quoted; this verse is a species of Mani-pravāḷam, the construction and metre of which are entirely Sanskrit, and so are all the terms except the few printed in Roman, which are of Tamil derivation, though here strictly subjected to the laws of Sanskrit grammar: thus *ōṇṇi yappam* are both Tamil terms, the former being the gerund of *unnāḷ*, 'to eat,' the initial vowel with the final of the preceding word being changed by the Sanskrit rules for Sandhi to *ō*, and governing the following substantive, *yappam*, 'a cake,'—a mode of construc-

* This verse enumerates the *Gundastakam* or eight attributes of the Deity.

tion admissible in Sanskrit, but incompatible with the Tamil idiom, the proper collocation being *ap-pam unni*.

It is, however, generally true that the Sanskrit has ever been the language of science and literature, as far as science and literature have existed in Malayāḷma; but even in this language no composition of any importance is referable to this country, with the exception perhaps of the works of Saṅkarāchārya, though these can scarcely be ascribed to Malayāḷma, as it is certain that he left the country at an early age (the *Saṅkaraviḃaya* says when only eight years old), and there is no reason, notwithstanding the positive assertion of the fact in the *Kēraḷōtpatti*, to believe he ever returned to it.⁹ In the Tamil countries there has ever been a contention for preëminence of knowledge between the Brāhman and the inferior castes; when the former established themselves in Southern India they found a native literature already existing, which, though they introduced the language and science of the north, they were compelled, during their long contest with the Jains, to cultivate in their own defence. The Tamil was used, both by Brāhman and Śūdras, in commentaries on the *Vēdam* (Note F) and original compositions on theology; one of these, the *Tiruvāymōḷi*, was adopted by Rāmānujāchārya as the foundation of a new sect, and the authors of it, the holy Āḷvārs, all of them Śūdras, are now worshipped by the Brāhman, his followers, as saints. In many of the temples of Śiva also the presiding pontiff is a Śūdra, the officiating priests Brāhman. Nothing of this kind has ever taken place in Malayāḷma; the worship of Śiva and his attributes has generally prevailed, undisturbed by innovation, from the first establishment of the Nambūris until the present day, and, notwithstanding those extraordinary institutions, which, by making the women of all castes, excepting those of a very inferior order, common to them, has in effect peopled the country with their race, these Brāhman, as such, have kept themselves haughtily distinct from their descendants, and preserved with jealous circumspection all their preëminent privileges.

Under these circumstances it was scarcely to be expected that the Nambūris would cultivate the Malayāḷma; religious or philosophical controversy (as applied to India either epithet is correct)

has in all times and in all countries been the great instigator to literary emulation, and, as this stimulus was altogether wanting, the neglect of the Śūdras is easily accounted for, and the non-existence of a native literature in a dialect but one remove from a highly cultivated language ceases to be surprising. There exists in Malayāḷma, as far as my information extends, no work on language, no grammar, no dictionary, commentaries on the Sanskrit *Amarakosha* excepted. The principal work in prose is the *Kēraḷōtpatti*, which is also said to be translated from the Sanskrit, though the original is now nowhere to be found. The poetical compositions, some few detached poems perhaps excepted, are all translations from the Sanskrit; these in fact constitute the whole of Malayāḷma literature, and among them will be found all the works of note in the original language. Tradition attributes the composition of the whole of these to one man, of whom the following account is given:—

The customs of Malayāḷma permit but one male in every Brāhmanical family to marry, whose descendants maintain the caste, the progeny of the rest belonging to the tribes of their respective mothers: it hence follows that great numbers of Brāhman women remain unmarried, and—as they are strictly precluded from participation in the license of the Nāyari chchis—in celibacy. As an entire community of other women is allowed, there thence arises a peculiar distinction between the Brāhman and the Śūdra: the former knows his father, the latter does not: a Brāhman without a father must be born of an unmarried female of that tribe, whose celibacy ought to have been inviolate; he is considered, therefore, illegitimate, and has scarcely an assignable place in society.¹⁰ Eḷutt' Achchan, or 'the Father of Letters,' was a Brāhman without a father, and on that account has no patronymic. (Note G.) The difficulties with which he had in consequence to struggle gave him an energy of character which it is probable he would not have possessed had his caste been without blemish. The Brāhman envied his genius and learning, and are said to have seduced him by the arts of sorcery into the habit of ebriety, wishing to overshadow the mental powers which they feared. The poet, however, triumphed on his habits, though he could not abandon them, and, in revenge against those whom he considered the

⁹ The *Kēraḷōtpatti* attributes to Saṅkarāchārya the existing religious institutions, but the fact is he knew well the truth of the Jewish proverb that a prophet is never without honour except in his own country, and passed the whole of his life in traversing other regions of India, inhabited by tribes less obstinate than the Nambūris.

¹⁰ A similar slur attaches to Saṅkarāchārya himself: this is not even alluded to in the *Saṅkaraviḃaya*, a Sanskrit work which contains his life and transactions, and is con-

sidered as his true history; but it is noticed in the *Kēraḷōtpatti*, where it is stated that, in consequence of the refusal of the Brāhman to attend his mother's obsequies he burned her in his own house, which has since become a general practice throughout Malayāḷam. This story is incompatible with that which represents him as quitting the country while yet a child and never returning, and is rejected as a calumny by the Smārtas, as those belonging to the sect founded by this teacher are commonly called.

cause of his debasement, he opposed himself openly to the prejudices and the intolerance of the Brâhmanas. The mode of vengeance he chose was the exaltation of the Malayâḷma tongue, declaring it his intention to raise this inferior dialect of the Tamiḷ to an equality with the sacred language of the gods and Rishis. In the prosecution of this purpose he enriched the Malayâḷma with the translations I have mentioned, all of which, it is said, he composed while under the immediate influence of intoxication. No original compositions are attributed to him.

This story, though obscured by the mist of fiction with which the Indians contrive to envelop every historical fact, shows with sufficient distinctness that the Nambâris have discouraged the cultivation of the Malayâḷma. Their success in this respect is to be ascribed to the influence which the peculiar institutions of the country give them over the minds of the inferior castes, and to this cause the neglect of Tamiḷ literature during the supremacy of the Chêram kings is in all probability referable, as it could not have been introduced without endangering the existence of the mental tyranny which it was the interest of the Nambâris to maintain.

The *Râmâyaṇam*, from which the preceding quotations are made, and which is one of the numerous works attributed to Ēḷutt' A chchan, is not translated from Vâlmiki, but from the *Adhyâtma Râmâyaṇam*, attributed to Îśvara himself, and said to have been revealed for the entertainment of Pârvati. The *Vyavahâra Samudram*, from which I have taken a single extract, professes, in the commencement of the work, to have been collected from Nârada and the other Rishis; but after a short exposition of the legal constitution of courts, of the rules of evidence, and of the eighteen titles of law, as usual in other law-books, it is confined exclusively to the local usages of Malayâḷam, which are often in direct opposition to the *Smyitis*. The language of this work is sometimes entirely pure, and sometimes so intermixed with declined and conjugated terms from the Saṅskṛit as altogether to lose its native idiom.

NOTES BY DR. BURNELL.

Note A.—Mr. Ellis has gone too far in deriving Malayâḷam from the Śēn Tamiḷ; for it is now pretty well certain that the latter is, to a great

extent, an artificial, poetical dialect, though it has preserved some old forms.

Note B.—Mr. Ellis's derivation of these alphabets is not correct, and he afterwards appears to have given it up (see *Madr. Jour.* vol. XIII. pt. ii. p. 2). For the present state of the question see my *Elements of South-Indian Palæography* (2nd ed.), pp. 33-52. The final forms of R, L, and Z are merely the ordinary forms of the letters combined in a peculiar way with *virâma*.

Note C.—Mr. Ellis's transcription is very irregular and full of uncorrected misprints; as far as was possible, it has been here restored to the orthography as settled by Dr. Gundert and other scholars. In a few instances it has been doubtful what words he intended.

Note D.—The people of Malabar (even in reading Saṅskṛit) substitute *l* for *t*, and *ḷ* for *ḍ*, in certain cases: e.g. *tasmāt* is pronounced *tasmāl*.

Note E.—It seems that Mr. Ellis was wrong in supposing that the Tamiḷ Maṇi-pravâlam compositions are recent; one is quoted in a work of the 11th century A.D.

Note F.—I have never seen, or even heard of, Tamiḷ commentaries on the Vedas.

Note G.—Ēḷuttachchan lived in the 17th century; there is no reason for supposing that he was a Brâhman female's illegitimate son; he was certainly an Ēḷuttachchan (or schoolmaster) by caste.

The above dissertation is of remarkable historical interest, for (taken with the essay on Têlugu) it proves that before 1816 Mr. Ellis had already foreseen the possibility of comparative philology, not only as regards the so-called Âryan tongues, but also in respect of the Drâviḍian. Now it was not till 1816 (so Brunet says, and I must take his assertion, for I cannot refer to the original) that Bopp published his *Conjugations System*, which was the beginning of comparative philology in Europe. Ellis could (considering the means of intercourse available in those days) hardly have seen or heard of this work at all, for he died early in 1819. He must then, in future, be considered one of the originators of one of the most remarkable advances in science in this century. His unfortunate end—he was poisoned by accident—prevented his doing much, for he was only forty when he died, but he cannot be robbed of his due fame by the success of others more lucky than he was.

CORRESPONDENCE AND MISCELLANEA.

MODERN AVATÂRAS OF THE DEITY.

Most readers of the *Indian Antiquary* must be aware that the great leaders of religious movements in India are believed by their followers to be descents (*Avatâra*) of portions (*anśa*) of the

Deity. The Hindûs are generally ready to acknowledge that Christ Himself was an *Avatâra*. The god supposed to be most addicted to these descents is, of course, Viṣṇu.

When I was in Gujarât a man named Ku v ê r a

(familiarily Kuber) was living in a village called Sârsâ (for Sârasâ), near Ânand, a station on the Bombay and Baroda railway. He belongs to the Koli caste and I believe, is still alive, but if so must be very old. As a youth he displayed much energy of mind and singularity of character. One day, after long fasting, abstract meditation, and religious ecstasy, he announced to those about him that a portion of the Supreme Being had descended in his person. His next idea was to proclaim that he had a direct mission from God to make a new revelation of the truth. Very soon he attracted a number of admiring hearers, who in due course of time proceeded to worship him, and present him with daily offerings.

I have been told by my friend Judge Gopâl Râo Hari Deshmukh that his followers, who call themselves Hari-jana, and are known by the name of Kuber-bhaktas, are very numerous. They are variously reckoned at about eighteen or twenty thousand persons, and are regularly divided into holy men or clergy (*adhu*) and laity (*grihastha*). The former either itinerate as missionaries, or preside over the temples of the sect, many of which are found in the villages around Neriâd, in Gujarât. I ought to state, however, that I spent a long day at Neriâd but met with no proofs of the existence of any large numbers of the sect in the town itself. Each temple has two teachers, who collect a certain number of disciples every day and read to them extracts from the *Purânas* or other writings prescribed by their leader. The doctrine they inculcate is, I believe, a purified form of the Vaishnava creed.

Other bodies of sectarian religionists exist throughout India, who are unable to hold together as distinct sects for any considerable time after the death of their leaders. I saw the shrine of a man, described to me as a saint, named Parinâma, at Kaira. It contained no image, but simply his couch or seat (*gaddi*) and the vestments worn at death. No one could tell me much about him, but I was made to take off my shoes on entering his sanctuary. Only a few hundreds of his followers remain, and these are gradually being re-absorbed into the vortex of Hinduism.

The same applies to the disciples of a man named Hari-krishna, who laid claim to great sanctity of character. He died not long ago in Gujarât, and is said to have attracted a large number of adherents during his lifetime, but I could obtain very few particulars about his life or doctrines.

This kind of religious hallucination, however, is not confined to the inhabitants of Asia. In the *Times* of August the 24th and 27th there is a curious account of a man named David Lazzaretti, who was killed a few days before in an encounter

with the Italian police. He lived somewhere in Tuscany, and was called by his followers "David the Saint." This man gave himself out to be Christ descended upon earth. He chose twelve apostles, and surrounded himself by a large number of disciples, who built for him a kind of half hermitage half church, on the summit of Monte Labro. His followers are called Lazzarists.

Perhaps the most interesting instance of alleged *Avatâra* is that of a celebrated Brâhmanical saint or ascetic (*sannyâsi*) named Dattâtreyâ—supposed to have lived in Central India about the 10th century of our era. He is believed to have been a manifestation of the Hindû trinity in human form. Portions of the essences of Brahmâ, Vishnû, and Siva became united, and descended, it is alleged, in his person. Many temples dedicated to his honour are scattered over the Marâthâ Country. I saw one much frequented by pilgrims at Wâi, near Mahâbalesvar. It contained the image of a man with three heads. I observed that many persons were worshipping with apparent devotion at the shrine. I spoke to one or two of the most intelligent, and questioned them as to the precise nature of their creed, but could get no satisfactory reply. Dattâtreyâ is the name of a well-known sage mentioned in various Sanskrit writings, as well as in modern vernacular books; but any information about his worship as at present conducted in different parts of India would be highly interesting. Whether it is possible to furnish any trustworthy details of his real history may be doubtful, but legends about him still current among the people might be collected, and if collated with earlier legends would be full of interest. An account of other modern reformers or revivalist leaders who claim, or are believed by their disciples, to be partial *Avatâras* of the Deity, would also be acceptable as illustrating the present condition of the Indian mind.

Again, can no one improve our knowledge on the subject of animal worship, plant worship, pebble worship, and the existing state of such superstitions in India? I have been told that there is a temple in Bengal dedicated to a cat. Are cats in that part of India believed to be pervaded by portions of the essence of Deity? Has any one seen actual *pâjâ* performed to a cat? Many interesting articles on Indian folklore and religious life have appeared in the columns of the *Indian Antiquary*. May they be continued! I would not undervalue the good work done by those scholars who are devoting themselves to the deciphering of inscriptions, but the whole life of a people is not inscribed on these ancient monuments.

I appeal to all readers of the *Indian Antiquary*—especially to all who are, or have been, resident in

districts of the Maráthá Country and Central India, and in districts not much frequented by Europeans—for assistance in throwing more light on the religious idiosyncrasies of our Indian fellow-subjects.

MONIER WILLIAMS.

Oxford, September 1878.

ADDITIONS TO ARCHÆOLOGICAL NOTE

NO. XX. (*supra*, page 176).

In further illustration of the use of miniature or toy pottery in prehistoric times, Canon Greenwell, in his very elaborate work, *British Barrows*, describes "very diminutive vessels of pottery an inch high" found in Yorkshire barrows (p. 317), and again observes, "toy weapons and implements are sometimes found in barrows, and commonly in Denmark" (p. 361). Dr. Ferdinand Keller, in his work on *The Lake Dwellings of Switzerland and Europe*, translated by J. E. Lee,—a complete repository of all that is known on the subject,—estimates the number of earthenware vessels found at Möringen, on the Lake of Zug, at several hundreds; "the smallest are only as big as a walnut-shell, and have been used as children's playthings, or as vases for perfumes" (p. 175). Some of the vessels figured (plates 24, 30, 88) perfectly correspond with archaic Indian forms, with round or pointed bottoms; and earthen circlelets or rings for supporting or keeping them upright, which are so abundant in Indian cairns, are equally numerous in the lake-dwellings.

The remarks in the 'Note' under review, that handles to cairn-pottery are a feature very rare in Europe will not hold good, at least as regards the lake pottery, in which handles are rather the rule than the exception in the lake-remains on both sides of the Alps. Vases with four short legs have also been found (*Lake Dwellings*, plates 106, 151), and vessels on four short feet have been discovered by Canon Greenwell in British barrows (pp. 88, 89). It may be added that rude clay figures of animals are found in the lake-dwellings (plate 158), as well as in Nilgiri cairns and the site of old Troy; and further, with respect to the strange custom of disjoining bodies for burial, Canon Greenwell's researches show that bodies were very frequently laid in the barrows piecemeal, and Colonel Meadows Taylor remarked the same appearances in cairn burials in Central India.

In the 'Note' the *svastika* is mentioned as first appearing on the pottery of archaic Greece and the Hissarlik relics, but it must now be pushed back to probably earlier times, for it has been found stamped on clay remains in a lake-dwelling on the Lake of Bourget, in Savoy, together with the

stamp or seal with which the impressions were made; the seal is a clay cone $1\frac{1}{4}$ inches long; a copy of the bottom, taken from plate 161 of Dr. Keller's work (see page 339) is annexed; the stamps and impressions are in the French Exhibition now open. This ubiquitous symbol must now also be extended to America, for a 'counter' or 'roundel,' either of bone or horn, has been discovered in one of the low mounds near St. Louis, U.S., on which within several concentric circles there is "a regular *croix gammée*," or *svastika*; hence the remark in the 'Note' that the *svastika* is unknown on Mexican remains may any day be set aside.

London, 3rd August 1878.

M. J. W.

THE FIRE-ARMS OF THE HINDUS.

To the Editor of the "*Indian Antiquary*."

SIR,—The letter from Mr. Sinclair (*ante*, p. 231), and the previous communication from Bâbû Râm Dâs Sen to which it refers, raise an old question respecting the use of fire-arms at an early period by the Hindus. In support of what Mr. Sinclair has observed with regard to the absence of trustworthy evidence of the knowledge of fire-arms (in the sense in which we use the term) in India in the early times referred to,—that is, before the use of gunpowder in Europe,—reference may be invited to an article on the subject in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, 1876, Vol. XLV. Part I. No. 1, where, at page 44, ancient Hindu fire-arms are noticed. There seems every reason to believe that they were missiles carrying fire, discharged by ordinary mechanical appliances.

R. M.

THE TELEPHONE.

SIR,—I beg to suggest, through the medium of your valuable journal, a Gujarātī word for the newly invented 'telephone,' and hope it will meet the approval of the students of philology.

The word is ફરારૂ, from Persian دور meaning far, and گو from گفتن to speak. The word literally means *speaker from a distance*, and is coined on the analogy of ફરારૂ (‘telescope’), which literally means *observer from a distance*. Like ફરારૂ, the word ફરારૂ I trust will be equally acceptable to the Marāthī, Hindustānī, and Persian languages, and also to the vernaculars of Bengal and Madras if they can allow the infusion of the Persian element in them.

SORĀJĠ KĀVASJĠ KHAMBĀTĠ.

Malabar Hill, September 25th, 1878.



BÔYA.

The *Bôya* in the interesting Chalukya grant published by Mr. Fleet, *ante*, p. 189, is a Telugu term adduced by Mr. C. P. Brown in his *Telugu-English Dictionary*. *Bôya*, or its fuller form *Bôyaḍu*, is explained by *Kirda*, *Śabara*, and *Mātaṅgasādriśa*, 'a forester, a mountaineer.' Mr. Brown knew also the form *Bôyidu* (the shorter form being *Bôyi*), which he explains as follows:—"*Bôyidu*, a Boyid or mountaineer: this title was borne by some chieftains, as *Avare bôyidu*, *Mdra bôyidu*, *Goṇḍlaprôti bôyidu*."

F. KITTEL.

Esslingen (Württemberg), 30th August 1878.

A CHRONICLE OF TORAGAL.

SIR,—At *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. V., p. 33, under the title of *A Chronicle of Toragal*, I published a translation of a Canarese document, part of which was evidently drawn from some copper-plate grant or stone-tablet inscription. This part of the document commences with the words "May it be well! Reverence to *Śambhu*", &c., p. 34 b, l. 20, and extends to the end of my translation.

I have not yet met with the original inscription; nor have I as yet been able to satisfy myself as to the identity of king *Jayaśekhara*, the maker of the grants recorded in it.

But I find that a translation of the same inscription is given by Mr. Wathen as No. 5 of his *Ancient Inscriptions on stone and copper*, at *Jour. R. As. Soc.*, Vol. II., p. 386, and Vol. V., p. 173. He calls it 'Mr. Munroe's *Dānapatra*', and states, 'It was taken, I believe, from some ancient building in the *Karnātaka*, and was translated by the late Mr. Munroe, of the Madras Civil Service.'

This Mr. Munroe is probably the Sub-Collector of *Sholapur*, who, with Mr. Thackeray, the Political Agent and Principal Collector of *Dhârward*, was killed in 1824 in the insurrection at *Kittur*. (See Mr. Stokes' *Historical Account of the Belgaum District*, p. 81; where, however, the name is spelt 'Munro.') If so, the temple from which the inscription was taken, must be somewhere in the *Belgaum*, *Dhârward*, or *Kalādgī*, Districts.

The translation given by Mr. Wathen agrees substantially with mine. But mistakes are made in it in respect of many of the proper names. Thus, notably '*Powali*' is written instead of '*Pūvalli*', and the name of the king is given as '*Jayaśamkara*' instead of '*Jayaśekhara*.' I have no doubt that the names, as written in the

copy supplied to me, are correct. The details of the date, — *Śaivāhana-Śaka* 1008, the *Kṣhaya samvatsara*; Sunday, the tenth day of the bright fortnight of the month *Pushya* or *Pausha*; under the *Bharaṇi nakshatra*; at the time of the sun's commencing his progress to the north,—are given correctly in the translation published by Mr. Wathen.

J. F. FLEET.

20th July 1878.

HIWAN THSANG'S ACCOUNT OF PULIKESĪ II. AND MAHĀRĀSHTRA.

The kingdom of *Mo-ho-la-ch'a* (*Mahārāshtra*) is nearly six thousand *li* (1200 miles) in circuit. The capital, towards the west, is near a large river; its circumference is thirty *li*.¹ The soil is rich and fertile, and produces abundance of grain. The climate is warm; the manners are simple and honest. The natives are tall, and haughty and supercilious in character. Whoever does them a service may count on their gratitude; but he that offends them will not escape their revenge. If any one insult them, they will risk their lives to wipe out that affront. If one apply to them in difficulty they will forget to care for themselves in order to flee to his assistance. When they have an injury to avenge, they never fail to give warning to their enemy; after which each puts on his cuirass and grasps his spear in his hand. In battle they pursue the fugitives, but do not slay those who give themselves up. When a general has lost a battle, instead of punishing him corporally, they make him wear women's clothes, and by that force him to sacrifice his own life. The state maintains a body of dauntless champions to the number of several hundreds. Each time they prepare for combat they drink wine to intoxicate them, and then one of these men, spear in hand, will defy ten thousand enemies. If they kill a man met upon the road, the law does not punish them. Whenever the army commences a campaign these braves march in the van to the sound of the drum. Besides, they intoxicate many hundreds of naturally fierce elephants. At the time of their coming to blows they drink also strong liquor. They run in a body, trampling everything under their feet. No enemy can stand before them. The king, proud of possessing these men and elephants, despises and slights the neighbouring kingdoms. He is of the race of the *Ts'a ti-li* (*Kshatriyas*); his name is *Pu-lo-ki-she* (*Pulikesī*). His ideas are large and pro-

destroyed. Mr. Wathen died at the Cape of Good Hope in 1866.—ED.

¹ Was this *Vātāpūm* now *Bādāmi*—*Ind. Ant.* vol. V. pp. 68, 71.

¹ It is greatly to be regretted that no trace can be found of Mr. Wathen's copper-plates. Inquiry has been made in vain for them, and it is feared they have shared the fate of all others in private hands—been lost or

found, and he extends widely his sympathy and benefactions. His subjects serve him with perfect self-devotion. At present the great king Śīlāditya³ carries his victorious arms from the east to the west, he subdues distant people and makes the neighbouring nations fear him; but the people of this kingdom alone have not submitted. Although he be often at the head of all the troops of the five Indies, though he has summoned the bravest generals of all the kingdoms, and though he has marched himself to punish them, he has not yet been able to vanquish their opposition. From this we may judge of their warlike habits and manners. The men love study, and follow at the same time the teachings of heresy and of truth. There are a hundred convents, which contain nearly five thousand devotees, and where they study alike the *greater* and *lesser vehicles*.⁴ They reckon a hundred temples of the gods; the heretics of various sects are exceedingly numerous.

Within and outside the capital are raised five *stūpas*. In all these places the four past Buddhas have sat, and in performing their exercises have left the marks of their feet. These monuments were constructed by king Wu-yeu (Aśoka). There are other *stūpas* in stone and brick, but they are so numerous that it would be difficult to mention all.

A short distance to the south of the town there is an ancient convent, in the middle of which is seen a stone statue of *Kwan-tseu-tasai-p'u-sa* (Avalôkitêśvara Bôdhisattva).⁵ The effects of his divine power are manifested in secret: those who apply to him obtain for the most part the objects of their vows.

On the eastern frontiers of the kingdom there is a great mountain which shows summits heaped one upon another, chains of rocks, peaks in double rank, and scarpred crests. Of old there was a convent there, which had been formed in a gloomy valley. Its lofty walls and deep halls occupied large openings in the rocks and rested against the peaks; its pavilions and its two-storied towers were backed by the caverns and looked into the valley.⁶

This convent had been built by the *Lo-han* 'O-che-lo (the Arhat Âchâra).⁷ This Arhat originally belonged to Western India. His mother being dead, he watched in what class of beings she should be re-born. It appeared that in this kingdom she had received the body of a woman. The Arhat speedily went thither with the object of

converting her and to assist her as circumstances might require. Having entered the village to ask alms, he reached the house where his mother had been born. A young girl took some food and went to give it to him. At the same instant milk escaped from her breasts. This proof of her relationship did not seem to him a good omen. The Arhat related to the young girl the history of her previous life, and she saw at once the holy fruit of Buddha. Touched by the goodness of her who had brought him into the world and fed him, and thinking with emotion on the result of the actions of her previous life, he caused this monastery to be built in thankfulness for his great blessings.

The Vihâra of the convent is almost a hundred feet high. In the centre is raised a stone statue of Buddha of nearly seventy feet. It is surmounted by seven stone caps which are suspended in the air, without any apparent attachment. They are separated from each other by an interval of about three feet. According to the old accounts of this country they are upheld by the power of the vows of the *Lo-han* (the Arhat). According to some people this prodigy is owing to the efficacy of his supernatural powers; and according to others, it is due to the potency of his medical knowledge. But we have inquired in vain into its history: it is impossible to find the explanation of this marvel. All round the Vihâra the rock walls have been carved, and on them are represented the events of the life of *Ju-lai* (the Tathâgata) in all the places where he filled the rôle of a Bôdhisattva, the happy omens which indicated his elevation to the dignity of Arhat, and the divine prodigies which followed his entry into the *Nirvâna*. The chisel of the artist has figured all these circumstances in their most minute details, without omitting one.

Outside the gates of the convent, to the south and to the north, right and left is an elephant in stone. I have heard say by the people of the country that at times these (four) elephants give vent to terrible roars that make the earth tremble. In old times *Ch'in-na-p'u-sa* (Jina Bôdhisattva) often stopped at this convent.

On leaving this kingdom he (Hiwan Thsang) travelled about a thousand *li* (200 miles) to the west, crossed the river *Nai-mo-tho* (Narmadâ), and arrived in the kingdom of *Po-lu-kie-ch'e-p'o* (Barughachhêva).—*Mémoires de Hiouen Thsang*, liv. xi, vol. II. pp. 149-153.

³ This is Harshavardhana of Kanauj, of which Hiwan Thsang's account has already been given, *ante*, pp. 196-202.

⁴ The *Mahâyâna* and the *Hinayâna*.

⁵ Vide *ante*, p. 197, n. 8.

⁶ This seems to refer to the Ajanîs Rock Temples.

⁷ Rather Atharya, vide *ante*, vol. IV. p. 174; vol. VI. p. 9; and *Archæol. Surv. of W. India* (vol. II.), *Kâpîśodâ and Kachh*, p. 84.

METRICAL VERSIONS FROM THE
MAHABHARATA.

BY J. MUIR, D.C.L., LL.D., PH.D.

(Continued from p. 207.)

ABILITY NECESSARY FOR ACQUIRING KNOWLEDGE.

Mahābhārata, ii. 2845; x. 178f.; ii. 1945.

No teaching e'er a blockhead shows
What's right, what's wrong, or makes him sage;
No child in understanding grows
Mature in sense with growing age.
The wise who proffer learning's boon
To stupid men, their labour waste;
Though filled with juices sweet, a spoon
Their pleasant flavour cannot taste.
But able men, though taught in haste,
Truth, right, and wrong, can quickly learn.
The feeling tongue and palate taste,
And flavours sweet and sour discern.

GOOD PRACTISED BECAUSE IT IS DUTY.

Mahābhārata, xii. 5906. (Compare xii. 1327.)

'Tis not for gain, for fame, from fear,
That righteous men injustice shun,
And virtuous men hold virtue dear;
An inward voice they seem to hear,
Which tells that duty *must* be done.

EFFORT, NOT SUCCESS, THE TEST OF GOODNESS.

Mahābhārata, v. 3313.

The man who toils with all his strength
A high and righteous end to gain,
May fail,—but has not wrought in vain:
His merit gains its meed at length.

DISREGARD OF GOOD ADVICE.

Mahābhārata, v. 4348.

That self-willed man his foes delights
Who, ill advised, the counsel slights
Of those sage friends who wish him well,
And how to help him, best can tell.

NECROLOGY.

It is quite probable that the masterly Annual Review of the Hindustāni language and literature which appeared with great punctuality during the past twenty years will no longer be published, as its gifted and experienced author is now no more. M. Héliodore Garcin de Tassy died on the 2nd of September, in his 85th year; he was a member of the Institute, President of the Asiatic Society of Paris, professor in the school of living Oriental languages, and member of the principal learned societies of Europe and of India; a Knight of the Legion of Honour, Commander of the Order of St. Jacques of Portugal, Cavalier of the Pole Star of Sweden, &c., &c.

When the French Asiatic Society was established in 1821, under the presidency of the great Orientalist, Baron Silvestre de Sacy, M. Garcin de

Tassy acted as its Secretary, and afterwards contributed valuable papers to the Journal. His services to Oriental literature are well known. From his published writings and translations it appears that he was not only well acquainted with Hindi and Urdu, which he taught in his capacity of professor, but also with Arabic, Persian, and Turkish; indeed specimens of all these occur in his *La Rhétorique et la Prosodie des Langues de l'Orient musulman*, as well as in his *Allégories, récits poétiques et chants populaires*, &c., but he appears to have devoted himself chiefly to the first mentioned two languages. Thus he wrote a history of the Hindi and Hindustāni languages, edited and translated the works of Wali, a celebrated poet of the Dekhan, as also the *Adventures of Kamrup* and the *Chronicle of Shīr Shāh, Sultan of Dehli*. He wrote Rudiments, Crestomathies and Dictionaries of the Hindi and Hindustāni languages, &c. He produced a French edition of Sir W. Jones's *Persian Grammar*, edited and translated the Persian text of Farid u'd-dīn Attar's *Mantiq-ut-tair*, or 'Language of Birds,' and based thereon his work on the philosophical and religious poetry of the Persians. His *Islamism according to the Kūrān* appeared in 1874, but some of his older works, e.g. the *Memoir on the Musalmān Proper Names and Titles*, his edition and translation of the *Bāg o Bahār*, or 'Garden of Spring,' &c., have lately been republished.

M. G. de Tassy had absolutely no rival on the continent in the special branch of Hindi and Urdu literature, and the vacuum left by him can be neither easily nor quickly filled. E. R.

NOTES.

The Sun Worshipers of Asia.—This is the title of a lecture by Chas. D. Poston, the materials for which were collected during an official visit to India. It is a neat little volume of 106 pages, and, while it does not pretend to give more than a brief review of the ancient Persian creed, it contains sufficient information for all practical purposes. We would commend its perusal to all who desire to become acquainted with the religion of Zoroaster. It is published by A. Roman & Co. of San Francisco.

The Revue Politique et Littéraire announces the discovery by M. de Gubernatis of several unpublished translations in Italian of Sanskrit writings, including two cantos of the *Rāmāyana* by Marco della Tomba, a Capuchin missionary, who resided in Bengal and Nepāl from 1758 to 1770. M. de Gubernatis was charged by the Minister of Public Instruction to publish a part of these translations for the meeting of Orientalists at Florence in September.—*Trübner's Literary Record*.

TRACES OF A DRĀVIḌIAN ELEMENT IN SINDHI.

BY REV. GEORGE SHIRT, M.R.A.S.

MUCH has been done of late years to elucidate the nature and structure of the Sindhi language; but the labours of those who have written with authority—among whom Dr. Trumpp stands “*facile princeps*”—still leave a large and most difficult field open for further investigation.

It is quite true that Sindhi is a daughter of the Sanskrit language, but at the same time it must be borne in mind that it is not altogether of pure blood. The essential parts of its grammar are undoubtedly of Sanskrit origin; but one very important property—its use of pronominal affixes—connects it with the Iranian languages, though it far outstrips them in the use of them. Most of the words that are from Sanskrit we can easily trace to their source, and the same may be said of the words brought in from Arabic and Persian by the Muhammadans; but when all the Sanskrit, Arabic, and Persian words have been eliminated there is still a large residuum of such words as Mr. Beames, in his *Comparative Grammar*, calls *deshists*—so large, in fact, that it would almost be possible to compose a discourse and use only this class of words. Whence have these words come? There can, I imagine, be little doubt that they are a remnant of the language spoken in Sindh before the Aryan immigration, which probably drove the Brahuis to the hills, and incorporated some of the inhabitants of Sindh into its lowest caste. If so many pre-Sanskritic or *deshist* words are to be found, it becomes an important and interesting question whether Sindhi grammar shows any traces of a similar influence. I believe such traces are to be found.

1. Every word in Sindhi must either end in a vowel or a very slight nasal. This vowel is a very short one, and is hardly perceptible to foreign ears—at least Englishmen and Persians generally fail to pronounce it. The existence of such a thing becomes palpable enough when a Sindhi speaks English, unless great pains have been taken with his pronunciation. He cannot tell you that he has studied in the Government

school without pronouncing the last two words *Governmenta iskūla*. The following Sindhi sentence will illustrate my statement:—*Mān sānusī anjāmū kiyo*, ‘I entered into an engagement with him.’ Here we see that each word ends in either a nasal or a very short vowel; and if sentences were to be accumulated a thousand fold the result would be the same, without a single exception. Bishop Caldwell, in his *Comparative Grammar of the Drāviḍian Languages*, makes the following statements:—“In grammatical written Telugu every word without exception must end in a vowel; and if it has not naturally a vowel of its own *u* is to be suffixed to the last consonant. This rule applies even to Sanskrit derivatives * * * Though this *u* is always written, it is often dropped in pronunciation. In modern Canarese a similar rule holds * * * The Tamil rule with regard to the addition of *u* to words which end in a consonant accords with the rule of the ancient Canarese.”¹ On the same authority I learn that this vowel is extremely short, as it is in fact in Sindhi, where, however, it may be *ā*, *ī*, or *ū*. The principle is apparently one and the same both in Sindhi and the Drāviḍian languages: but it is all the more remarkable that in Sindhi it has survived the combined influence of the Aryan, Iranian, and Semitic tongues.

2. There are some neuter verbs in Sindhi which perform the office of passives, though they are not constructed upon the same principle as passive verbs in Sindhi generally are. The passive voice in Sindhi is formed in the same way as it is in Sanskrit, only that Sindhi makes *j*, not *y*, the sign of the passive; but this is merely following out a general law in the language, as *y* in Sanskrit becomes *j* in Sindhi. The following verbs, however, are exceptions to the general rule:

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| <i>pirpāñū</i> | to be found, to be obtained. |
| <i>jāpāñū</i> | to be born. |
| <i>dhopāñū</i> | to be washed. |
| <i>māpāñū</i> | to be measured. |
| <i>khāpāñū</i> | to be expended. |
| <i>dhāpāñū</i> | to be satiated. |
| <i>chhupāñū</i> | to be touched (by any polluted thing). |
| <i>dhāpāñū</i> | to issue (as milk from the breast). |

¹ Dr. Caldwell's *Comparative Drāviḍian Grammar*, 2nd ed. p. 17.

In this list it will be noticed that *p* is the consonant immediately preceding the infinitive termination *nū*, and not *j*, as is usually the case, notwithstanding that some of the roots are Sanskrit. This *p* I believe to be connected with the Dravidian root *po*, 'to go,' which may be used in that class of languages to help to form the passive voice. That *p* should have this meaning would be strictly analogous to the supposed meaning of the Sanskrit *y*, and to the use of *shudan* in Persian, which of old meant 'to go,' as does the same word in Baluchi, an ancient sister of Persian. Hindustani passives, it need hardly be mentioned, are formed by the use of *jānd*, 'to go.'

3. Sindhi dislikes double letters, except it be the same consonant that is doubled, or one of the double letters be a liquid. A comparison of the following Sanskrit words with the same in a Sindhi dress will exhibit this dislike:—

| Sanskrit. | Sindhi |
|-----------|--------|
| ātma | ātīmā |
| strī | isītrī |
| vastū | vāthū |
| prāṇin | pīrāṇf |
| tvart | tūrītū |

This tendency is illustrated in the modification which some English words undergo in passing into Sindhi, e.g.

| English. | Sindhi. |
|----------|----------|
| school | isikūla |
| street | isītrīṭa |

This dislike to double consonants is very marked in the Dravidian languages, though it is only fair to confess that it is not by any means confined to them: it is, however, decidedly non-Sanskritic.

4. The postpositions used to serve the office of case-terminations are, as Dr. Trumpp shows, beyond a doubt from Sanskrit; but I believe it will be found upon examination that they were made to fit a Dravidian mould. *Khe* is the sign of the dative, and is from the Sanskrit *kṛite*; but suppose the Dravidian *ku* or *kū* (for Sindhi is fond of aspirates) to have been known before the Hindus brought *kṛite*, it is easy to understand that in the struggle of these two forms for existence the resultant was *khe*.

Again, the sign of the ablative is *ān*, though *kānā* is frequently used, being a compound of *khe* and *ān*; but this *ān* is traceable to the

Sanskrit ablative termination *āt*. Still in Brahui the sign of the ablative is *ān* or *iān*, and, as Brahui has a large and important Dravidian element in it,—scarcely anything else, in fact, in its grammar,—it is not likely that it owes its ablative termination to any Sanskrit influence whatever. It is therefore, I think, highly probable that the Hindus found some such affix as *ān* or *iān* already doing duty for their *āt* in the Indus Valley; and so their dental was displaced by a nasal—an operation probably requiring some little effort on their part, but natural enough to the sons of the soil.

5. The following words will, most of them, I believe, show their parentage to be unmistakably Dravidian:—

| Sindhi. | | Dravidian. |
|----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| pīrāṇū | to obtain | per |
| solāṇū | to divulge | śol (Tamil) |
| kūrāro | old | kīru |
| kauro | pungent | kārū (Tamil) |
| kudāṇū | to leap | kūdi (do.) |
| khotāṇū | to dig | kott (do.) |
| mānjī | a stool | māṇṇī (do.) |
| kārāṇḍi | a ladle | kārāṇḍī (do.) |
| tārī | a stake | tārī (do.) |
| veṇū | abuse | vei |
| orābhū, ārābhū | unfathomable | ār (Tamil) |
| tīrāṇū | to open (as a flow-
er) | tīrāppū (do.) |
| khātā | a cot | kāttū |
| nīrū | forehead | neṇṇi |
| vāi | speech | vāy (mouth) |
| soṇho | narrow | śūrrākkū |
| pūrū | hale | pirei (waxing
and waning
moon) |
| mūṇḍhū | beginning | mūṇḍū (front) |
| oḍhūnū | to dress | ūḍa |

6. The following list of words which are neither of Sanskrit, Irānian, nor Semitic origin, and yet are common to Sindhi and Brahui, is interesting:—

| Sindhi. | | Brahui. |
|-----------|-----------------|--------------|
| manjbandī | midday | manjan |
| kopiri | skull | kbopri |
| pinī | calf of the leg | pināṇī (leg) |
| khūrī | heel | kuri |
| thāṇṭhi | elbow | tāt (cubit) |
| thūmā | garlic | thām |
| khārī | a hamper | khārī |
| gothīrī | bag | gothrī |
| dhāggi | a kind of cow | dhāggi |
| ojhīrī | tripe | ojārnīk |
| kākīrā | cotton-seed | kākrā |

| <i>Sindhi.</i> | | <i>Brahui.</i> |
|----------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| rāmbi | <i>a chisel</i> | rāmbi |
| jhūrū | <i>cloudiness</i> | jūr (<i>mist</i>) |
| lākū | <i>a mountain pass</i> | lāk |
| ārmānū | <i>anxiety</i> | ārmān |
| tanwārā | <i>chirping of birds</i> | tāwār (<i>voice</i>) |
| khābārū | <i>Salvadora obooides</i> | khābār |
| bholīro | <i>monkey</i> | bolū |
| gūngo | <i>dumb</i> | gūng |

This list might easily be extended, but it is already long enough for our purpose.

7. It remains for me to try and account for these apparent traces of Drāviḍian grammar and words in Sindhi, and for a certain almost common vocabulary in Sindhi and Brahui. A glance at the map will show that the Brahuīs and Sindhis are close neighbours,—their borders, in fact, touch each other,—and imagination might easily be tempted to lay hold of this fact as a sufficient solution; still, if it did, it would be wrong. The English and Welsh have been equally close neighbours for centuries, and on the borders of the two countries there have been many people who spoke the two languages, yet the vocabularies of these two nations will afford no such common meeting-ground

as is to be found in Sindhi and Brahui. Moreover, the Brahuīs and Sindhis have had little intercourse with each other for centuries—one being a fierce marauding people; and the other tame and peaceable, given to the gentle arts of trade and agriculture.

There is another point in connection with the Brahuīs which ought to be mentioned, though it will not furnish us with the explanation we are in search of. In some parts of Sindh there are scattered members of the Mari tribe of Brahuīs, but these are neither numerous nor influential, and they have left their mother-tongue for the language of the country.

If the grammatical points noticed above are Drāviḍian, and the first list of words be from the same source, it cannot be that Sindhi has received them through the Brahui language; for these laws do not obtain in Brahui, neither are the words of the first vocabulary to be found in that language.

They are a pure inheritance of the Sindhi people; and I believe they point to the fact that the Indus Valley was a home to some part of the Drāviḍian race before the Āryan immigration.

MASONS' MARKS FROM OLD BUILDINGS IN THE NORTH-WEST PROVINCES OF INDIA.

BY H. RIVETT-CARNAC, Esq., B.C.S., C.I.E., M.R.A.S., F.S.A., &c.

The accompanying notes and sketches of masons' marks to be seen on stones of the ancient buildings of the districts through which I have marched during a recent tour may perhaps be of interest to some of your readers.

Without searching through the many volumes that have been written on Indian antiquities, to which I cannot refer whilst in camp, it is not easy to say whether these marks have ever been described or figured before. I may perhaps be going over the ground which in this respect has already been explored more carefully than I can pretend to attempt to do. But even if the work has been done before, the information may be contained in volumes to which all of your readers have not ready access, and the present notes may perhaps, therefore, be considered worthy of a place in the *Indian Antiquary*.¹

The subject has not, I am aware, escaped the attention of General Cunningham, of the

Archæological Survey of India. In his paper on the ruins of Sarnāth (published in the *Jour. As. Soc. Beng.* vol. xxxii.) the existence of these marks is noticed, and in his instructions to his Assistants (published in vol. III. of his *Reports*) is the following paragraph:—“The stones should also be carefully examined for masons' marks, which are seldom absent from old buildings, and which, if numerous, will serve to give a tolerably complete alphabet of the characters in use when the structure was erected.”

Sketches of the masons' marks are not, however, to be found in General Cunningham's account of Sarnāth above referred to, nor have I been able to find any notes or sketches of them in his well-known volume on the Bhilsa Topes, or in the published *Reports of the Archæological Survey*. Whilst marching about, I hope by degrees to qualify for the grade of Honorary

¹ See a paper by Mr. Walhouse, *ante*, vol. IV. pp. 302-305.—ED.

Assistant to the Director General in his valuable efforts to collect information regarding all matters of antiquarian interest scattered over India. I have therefore observed his instructions, and now send you the result.

Masons' Marks at Sarnâth.

The first group of sketches on the accompanying plate contains some of the marks to be seen on the sandstone blocks of what is known as the "Dharmek Stûpa," at Sarnâth, near Banâras. These interesting remains have often been described, and chap. III. of Fergusson's *History of Indian Architecture* contains two engravings of the stûpa.

Wilford, in *As. Res.* vol. ix. quoted by Fergusson, gives the tradition that the stûpa was erected by the sons of Mohipâla, and destroyed or (as suggested by Fergusson) interrupted, by the Muhammadans in 1017, before its completion (*History of Indian Architecture*, p. 68). General Cunningham, on the other hand, infers from the characters of an inscription found within the stûpa that the building belongs to the sixth century of our era. Perhaps the marks, some of which appear to be letters similar to those of the Bhilsa inscriptions, may be of help in determining the question of the date of the work. The outer facing of the building has in many places been stripped off by decay, or by Muhammadan iconoclasts, leaving exposed the solid blocks of sandstone of which the lower part of the stûpa is built.

It is on these inner blocks that the masons' marks, here figured, are found. Each stone has most probably on one of its sides a mark of some sort or other, made by the mason or the contractor, for ready recognition, after the stone was quarried or shaped. Only such marks as are on the outside faces of the stones exposed are to be seen; and those now noticed do not, perhaps, represent one-thousandth part of the marks on the stones composing the building. The same marks recur often, suggesting that the stones on which they are cut are the work of the same mason. The characters or symbols are generally about four inches in length, and from two or three inches in breadth. The sketches in the accompanying plate show them in the position in which they are seen *in situ*, but many of them were most

probably inverted at the time the stones were placed in position. Thus Nos. 1 and 4 of the Sarnâth series are evidently the same symbol, one or other of which has been turned upside down.

A rough attempt has been made to group the marks according to classes: thus Nos. 1 to 7 show the triangle,² a favourite masons' mark, and one which can easily be cut with a chisel on soft sandstone. These marks are, if I remember right, the most common at Sarnâth.

The next group, comprising the marks from 8 to 18, consists of symbols formed of rectangles.³ In most of the remaining marks two symbols will be noticed, as indicating, perhaps, that two masons shared in the working of the stone.

The most noticeable of the marks are those figured at the commencement and at the end of the Sarnâth group (No. 1). Thus, Nos. 1 to 4 (No. 4 being No. 1 inverted) will be found to resemble the symbol of Dharma given in Fig. 6, pl. 32 of Cunningham's *Bhilsa Topes*.

No. 49 is the well-known *svastika*, a favourite symbol on Buddhist remains. And here it may be noticed, *en parenthèse*, that M. Bertrand, the Director of the National Museum at St. Germain-en-Laye, recently sent me a model of a small altar found in the Pyrenees on which is the *svastika* exactly similar to No. 49.

No. 50 is probably intended to represent the Buddhist sacred tree; whilst No. 51 is perhaps meant for the platform and tree so common on Buddhist coins. On a visit lately to Âjudhiâ (Faizâbâd) I obtained a large number of these coins, the rough tree symbols of which bear a resemblance to the marks given at No. 51.

In Nos. 52 to 61 several of the letters found in old inscriptions will, I think, be recognized. Thus 52 and 53 are the *t* (turned sideways) of Âsoka's edicts, as given by Prinsep at p. 53, vol. II. of his *Essays on Indian Antiquities*, edited by Thomas. The second symbol of No. 54 is the *n* of the same alphabet.


No. 55 is also an *n* from the same plate of Prinsep. The first figure of No. 56 is *v*, but the symbol is inverted on the stone.

It may be noticed that this letter resembles the symbol of Mahâdeva to be seen drawn in many places in Banâras, and which Mr. Camp-

² The Pâli letter *ñ*.—Ed.

³ No. 8 may possibly be *ñ*, and No. 14, *ñ*;—see vol. V. p. 304, plate, fig. 6.—Ed.

1. MASONS' MARKS AT SARNATH.




Of Ashoka's Edicts (vide Thomas' Prinsep, Vol. II, p. 53)

58
J. of Western Cam.
(vide Prinsep as above)


59
Mankhyala
Inscription,
Prinsep.

60
Cunningham's Bhilsa Times.


2. JAUNPUR, JUMA MASJID.



3. LÂL DARWÂZA MASJID.



4. MASONS' MARKS.— ATÂLA MASJID, JAUNPUR.



bell of Islay found at Âjudhiâ—see *Jour. As. Soc. Beng.* January 1877. In a paper in the same journal, I have noticed the resemblance between this symbol and the marks found on many of the monoliths of Europe.

No. 57 is the *n* of the alphabet of Âsoka's edicts (with the horizontal lines considerably lengthened) as given by Prinsep in the volume above quoted. No. 58 is the *j* used in what Prinsep calls the alphabet of the Western caves, but turned with the right side down. No. 59, a rough cross, will be found figured in Prinsep, in one of his plates of the Manikyâla inscription and relics.

The triangle and upright, the last of the two symbols in No. 60, and the lower one,—the circle with a line through it—in No. 61, resembling the Greek ϕ , may both be found in the letters of the inscriptions given in the plates of Cunningham's *Bhilsa Topes*. Practised eyes, and readers who have other books of reference at hand, may perhaps be able to recognize other letters and symbols among the marks herein given.

A further and more careful examination would doubtless show many more marks on the stones of Sarnâth than I have been able to notice here. At Jaunpur, as will be seen from the other groups on the plate which accompanies this paper, the marks are much more elaborate and varied.

At Jaunpur.

From Banâras I marched to Jaunpur, and there I had an opportunity of examining and noting some of the masons' marks on the buildings for which the ancient capital of the Sharki kings is celebrated.

A description of these buildings, illustrated by plans and engravings, will be found in *Fergusson's Indian and Eastern Architecture*, book VII. chapter iv.; and General Cunningham, in his *Archæological Reports*, vol. III. notices the "Jaunpuri Pathân" Architecture under his sixth group of the Muhammadan period.

The chief buildings now remaining are the fort (partly demolished), containing a small mosque and other buildings, a bridge which in 1871 withstood one of the most extraordinary floods on record, and the Jumâ' Atâlâ and Lal Darwâzâ masjids.

The masons' marks figured in the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th groups on the accompanying plates were found on the pillars and stones of the cloisters adjoining the masjids.

The peculiarity of these buildings is the mixture of two styles of architecture, Hindu and Muhammadan, regarding which Fergusson, at p. 520 of his work noticed above, remarks as follows:—"The principal parts of the mosques, such as the gateways, the great halls, and the western parts, generally are in a complete arcuate style. Wherever, indeed, wide openings and large internal spaces were wanted, arches and domes and radiating vaults were employed; and there is little in those parts to distinguish this architecture from that of the capitals. But in the cloisters that surround the courts, and in the galleries in the interior, short square pillars are as generally employed with bracket capitals, horizontal architraves, and roofs formed of flat slabs, as was invariably the case in Hindu and Jaina temples. Instead of being fused together, as they afterwards became, the arcuate style of the Moslems stands here, though in juxtaposition, in such marked contrast to the trabeate style of the Hindu, that some authors have been led to suppose that the pillared parts belonged to ancient Jaina or Buddhist monuments which had been appropriated by Muhammadans and converted to their purposes."

This view, Fergusson adds, was advanced by Baron Hugel, and has since found supporters in Mr. Horne (*Jour. As. Soc. Beng.* vol. XXXIV.), and in the Rev. Mr. Sherring in his *Sacred City of the Hindus*. Fergusson, although he admits that the Muhammadans may have utilized some Jaina or Hindu buildings, holds that at least nine-tenths of the pillars in the mosques were made at the time they were required for the places they now occupy. Cunningham, on the other hand, seems to differ from Fergusson on this point, and to support the views of Baron Hugel and his followers.

At page vi. vol. IV. of the *Archæological Reports* General Cunningham refers to an inscription on one of the pillars of the Atâlâ Masjid, "which is known to have been originally a Hindu temple converted to Muhammadan use by Ibrâhim Shâh Sharki between the years 1403-1440 A.D."

The masons' marks which I have now to notice may perhaps be of some use in determining the class of buildings to which the stones utilized by the Muhammadans for their mosques originally belonged.

Commencing with the marks on the Jumâ'

Masjid (2nd group), I would draw attention to No. 1, in which I think may be recognized a rough representation of the Buddhist tree and platform, with the cobra erect to the right of the tree. These marks were noticed on a stone building built into the gateway of the Jumâ' Masjid. On the block a figure had been carved, but the carving had been partly defaced and the figure turned inwards.

In 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, also the Buddhist tree may, I think, be traced in the rude symbols. But 5, it is true, is not unlike the trident of Śiva, and the accompanying circle may perhaps be intended to represent a Mahādeva. But I have, in the first instance, suggested the tree, as the conventional renderings of the tree on Buddhist coins obtained recently at Ajudhiā are not unlike the markings here figured.

No. 7 is the *svastika* again, similar to the markings on the Buddhist Stūpa at Dhamek, Banāras. This symbol was, I understand, originally Buddhist, but was eventually adopted by the Hindus and Jains, so the stone may have been the work, I suppose, of either a Buddhist, a Hindu, or a Jain. In 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, may be recognized, I think, attempts to represent the cobra.

In No. 8 the cobras are intertwined in the well-known form of the *caduceus*, and cobras in this position are to be found carved on a stone at the Nāga (or Cobra) well at Banāras. In 8 and 9 the symbol has been turned upside-down, the original position of the stone having been altered on its being placed *in situ*.

The circles of 13, 14, 15, 16, and the symbol on the right-hand side in No. 8, represent perhaps

the Mahādeva and Yoni. In the double triangles of Nos. 17 and 18 will be recognized the favourite masons' mark, or Solomon's seal. The other marks do not call for special notice, save that there is apparently an absence of any attempt at written characters as opposed to symbols.

The tree and leaves or buds as in Nos. 19 to 23 are common enough. The only marks bearing any resemblance to letters are those of 24 to 27.

Taking next (group 3) the marks on the stones at the Lāl Darwāzā Masjid, the most remarkable is the combination of symbol No. 1, in the third series,—the triangle,—then a spear-head, then the snakes intertwined, and lastly what would seem to be the representation of a bow and arrow. The *svastika* appears again in Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, the tree in No. 7. Nos. 8 to 15 seem to be intended for leaves or buds. No. 16 is quite a new symbol, of a somewhat elaborate type.

The stones of the Atāla Masjid are much richer in marks (group 4). But many of them are of types already noticed (see the second page of the plate).

The familiar triangle recurs in Nos. 1 to 4. No. 7 is undoubtedly intended for the snakes. No. 8, which I at first took to be intended for the same symbol, is perhaps meant for a bird.

A peculiar Buddhist symbol similar to that on many coins found at Ajudhiā will be seen in the centre of Solomon's seal of No. 44. No. 30 is the sacred goose, perhaps.

In 39 will be seen the cobra surmounted by the Buddhist symbol noticed in the Dhamek markings.

NOTES ON THE KANPHĀTĀ YOGĪS.

BY G. S. LEONARD, SAIDPUR.

THE acknowledged head and guide of this religious sect of Yogīs is said to have been one Gorakhor or Gorakhnātha.¹ The sect was originally designated by the name of Nāthas, or leaders, from their founder, Adinātha. The name Adinātha means 'a leader or guide,' from whom most of the succeeding *pīrs* of this order had the agnomen of Nātha affixed to their proper names. In Upper Hindustān this word Nāthji is used to denote indiscriminately a spiritual guide of any order, just as Gurū and Āchārya are used in Bangālī

and Saṅskṛit. In its theological sense it is restricted to a Śaiva preceptor, as the surname of Gosain is confined to the professors and guides of the Vaishṇava faith. It was, however, gradually extended to a cognomen of the deity Śiva, whether worshipped in the form of a human statue, or that of his more common prototype the *liṅga* or *phallus*, as the emblems of Badrinātha, Śambhunātha, Paśupati-nātha, and the equally far-famed *liṅga* of Somanātha.

The Kānphātās were afterwards denomi-

¹ For a valuable paper on the history of the Kānphātās of Kachh *vide ante*, vol. VII. pp. 47ff.—Ed.

nated the Gorakhpānthis, or followers of Gorakhnātha, the renovator of their creed and doctrines,—in the same manner as the disciples of Dādu, Kabir, and Nānak were designated by the appellations of Dādūpanthis, Kabirpanthis, and Nānakpanthis. Gorakhnātha, the acknowledged founder of the order, is recorded in a Sanskrit treatise on *Yoga* philosophy, called the *Hathadīpikā*, by Ātmārām, to have been the eighth in succession to Adinātha, the originator of the sect, and to have transmitted his doctrines in Sanskrit to posterity. The names of the leaders of this sect are thus given in the treatise:—Śrī Adinātha, Matsyendra, Sambara, Ananda-bhairava, Chandrangi, Mena, Goraksha, Virupāksha, Velassayan, &c.

Gorakhnātha, according to the authorities of this sect and the *Rekhtas* of Kabir, is reckoned to be one of the nine eminent teachers of the *Yoga* system; and he is still more conspicuous than the others from his having left written documents of his faith and precepts in some works of his composition in original Sanskrit, which no other of his sect had done either before or after him. Dr. H. H. Wilson has given a list of thirty teachers of this faith from the *Hathadīpikā* cited above, and fixed the date of Gorakhnātha in the fourteenth century, by assigning only the space of fifteen years to each of his successors (*vide* Wilson's "Sketch of the Religious Sects of the Hindus" in vol. XVII. p. 190, of the *Asiatic Researches*). In the *Rekhtas* of Kabir, however, printed in the *Hindi and Hindustāni Selections* by Captain Price, there occurs a distich in a controversial dialogue between Kabir and Gorakhnātha which makes them contemporaries at the commencement of the fifteenth century, and states that Gorakhnātha was the son of Matsyendra, and grandson of Adinātha.

The word *kānphātā* literally means 'ear-split,' and is, like *nakṣi*, 'nose-clipt,' a vernacular term of reproach, applied contemptuously to this sect by the victorious Muhammadans, who in the same way made use of the epithet *hind*, 'black,' to the inhabitants of this country, and called every one *kāfar*, or 'infidel,' who professed a faith different from their own. The practice of boring holes in the ears (*karna-bhedha*) is an essential religious ceremony among the Hindus of all castes and tribes in general, but the

custom of making a slit in the cartilage of the ear, and inserting rings or cylinders made of horn, agate, or glass in the perforated part, as necessary for the initiation of a disciple, is an institution originating with Gorakhnātha, who for this reason is styled the founder of the Kānphātās. This practice was borrowed from a custom prevalent among all classes of *yogis* of suspending rings to the ears, in imitation of the Jainas and Buddhists, who in their turn had derived it from Śiva, the lord of the *yogis*, who is often represented in a posture of deep meditation with similar rings pendent in his ears, as in an image in the Dumar Lenā at Elura, or in the vestibule of the Elephanta cave. These rings, called *mundre*, from the Sanskrit word *mundras* or circlets, which from their immense size painfully distort the cartilage of the ear, have often been made objects of ridicule by the Muhammadans in their popular songs. Hence Kabir, although a convert from Muhammadanism to Hindu Rāma-worship, does not omit the opportunity of deriding the earrings of Gorakhnātha while discussing with him his religious opinions and principles; a tetra-stich in the *Bāgh-o-Bahār* also accuses the Kānphātās, and all other classes of *yogis* and hermits, of cupidity and greediness, notwithstanding their professions to the contrary.

The Kānphātās are mentioned in Lallu Lal's *Tables of Hindu Sects and Tribes* as having originated from the *yogis* and *jangams* of the Śaiva faith, and this statement is corroborated by the account which Dr. Wilson has given of them in his "Sketch of the Hindu Sects" in the *Asiatic Researches*, vol. XVII.

The devotees of Śiva (perhaps the only remnants of ancient *yogis* in India, except the Pāramhansa of Śankarāchārya's Vedantism) are religious recluses from the world, and wholly devoted to abstract meditation. The Kānphātās are of the same persuasion, with this difference between them and other Śaivas, that, while all orders of *Sanyāsīs* are at liberty to visit holy places and perform distant pilgrimages, the Kānphātās are constrained to remain within their *maṭhas*, or monasteries, and sometimes are even closely confined in their *guhās*, or cells, for intense application to meditation. A reference to this peculiarity occurs in the *Hathadīpikā*, and is thus translated by Dr. Wilson:—

"The Hatha-jogi should dwell in a well go-

verned and properly regulated country, which is fertile and free from disturbances, within a solitary cell within the precincts of a *maṭha* or sanctuary."

A *Kānpātā* is not allowed to lead a solitary, independent, or vagrant life, like the *Paramhāṇsas* or *Paribrajakas* of the Vedic religion, or that of a mendicant enjoined by the *Smṛitti śāstras*. He is strictly prohibited, according to the *Hathadīpikā*, from having communication with the wicked, from sitting beside a fireplace, from walking in bye-ways, from early baths and fasts, and from all bodily austerities and penances enjoined in the *śāstras*. In contradistinction to the practices of the *Kānpātās* it may be mentioned that early baths, and sitting by the fireplace, as also offering oblations to fire, are positive injunctions of the *Vedas*, and are extensively practised by Hindus, and a large number of itinerant and vagrant *Sanyāsīs* of other sects. The main object of the superiors or heads of a *Kānpātā* monastery is the attainment of spiritual perfection in the close recess of his solitary cell; while the chief employment of the novices is the practice of acts of charity and benevolence to every one within the circuit of their monastery.

The religion of the *Kānpātās*, as professed by their founder and preceptor, Gurū *Gorakhnātha*, is similar to that of all other Śaiva sects—the monotheism, otherwise called Brahmanism, of the *Upanishads* and *Vedānta* philosophy, which was widely propagated afterwards by its great champion, the venerable Śaṅkarāchārya, and his disciples, Ānandagiri and others, and now upheld by the Brāhma *Somāj* of Calcutta. The only authentic account we have of *Gorakhnātha's* religious teaching and principles is contained in the religious debates (*goshtis*) held between him and *Kābir*, and preserved in the *Rskhta* verses of the latter, published in the *Hindi and Hindustāni Selections*

of Captain Price. The one incomprehensible Supreme Being, who is devoid of or beyond all attributes, is the object of their adoration. But as a being whose nature and properties are inconceivable and inscrutable, and of whom nothing can be predicated compatible with the finite and imperfect notions of humanity, can hardly be made an object of meditation or worship, certain attributes and properties were required for the purpose of meditation and imitation. To supply this want *Gorakhnātha* wrote a work, called the *Goraksha-Sahasranāmā*, containing a thousand attributive appellations of God, for the contemplation of his disciples. This book forms the creed of the sect, and requires not only the firm belief of its votaries in these attributes of the deity, but their *jap*, or repeating of those names in secret, and *dhyān*, or meditation on their import in silence. In the same manner the *Vaishnavas* have their thousand appellations of *Vishṇu*, and the *Śāktās* a hundred and eight names, and sometimes more, for the goddess *Śakti* (*potentia*), whom they adore. The two Hindu sects known by the names of *Satnāmīs* and *Dasnāmīs* have respectively a hundred and ten epithets for their deities; and the Muhammadans a hundred names of God and ninety-nine of *Muhammad*, which they mutter while telling their beads, and utter during their prayers and devotions. But the mere *jap*, or muttering of these names, or the *dhyān*, meditation on their significations, is not enough to acquit the *Kānpātā* of his responsibility as a *yogi*. He must endeavour to apply to himself the archetypes of divine perfection, and to accustom himself to imitate, resemble, and approximate them in his spiritual nature, until he finds himself assimilated into the divine essence, by his attaining to a state of clairvoyance and ecstasy which liberates him from the vicissitudes which mortal existences are subject to.

SANSKRIT AND OLD CANARESE INSCRIPTIONS.

BY J. F. FLEET, B.A., M.R.A.S.

(Continued from p. 253.)

No. XLVIII.

At *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. VI., p. 91, I published (No. XXXI. of this Series) a copper-plate grant of the Western Chalukya king Vinayāditya. My transcription was made from No.

3 of the photographs of copper-plate grants at the end of Colonel Dixon's Collection. The photograph was on too small a scale for a lithograph facsimile to be prepared from it. But this want has now been supplied through

[illegible][illegible]

[illegible]

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥ १ ॥
 श्रीकृष्णाय नमः ॥ २ ॥
 श्रीगुरुभ्यो नमः ॥ ३ ॥
 श्रीपुत्राय नमः ॥ ४ ॥
 श्रीपुत्राय नमः ॥ ५ ॥
 श्रीपुत्राय नमः ॥ ६ ॥
 श्रीपुत्राय नमः ॥ ७ ॥
 श्रीपुत्राय नमः ॥ ८ ॥
 श्रीपुत्राय नमः ॥ ९ ॥
 श्रीपुत्राय नमः ॥ १० ॥

the kind assistance of the Rev. T. Foulkes of Bengalûr, who obtained the original plates on loan from the owner of them, and transmitted them to England. This has enabled me to give the details of the plates, and to correct and complete my transcription and translation of them.

Mr. Foulkes does not give the name of the owner of the plates; but states that he is the astrologer of the temple of the god Harihara at Harihar, and,—though the grant was made to a member of the Vâtsya gôtra,—that he belongs to the Kâśyapa gôtra. It is not known where the plates were found, or how they came into the possession of the family that now owns them.

The plates are three in number, about 10½" long by 4½" broad. They have very decided

raised rims to protect the writing. The inscription commences on the inside of the first, and ends on the inside of the third, plate. The ring had not been cut when the plates were received in England; it is about ½" thick, and 4½" in diameter. A facsimile of the seal has been given in the Plate at p. 253 (No. 5) above; it is slightly oval, about 1½" by 1½", and has the representation of a boar, facing to the proper right, in relief on a countersunk surface.

The grant was made by Vinayaditya himself, at the request of the king of the Âlûvas, and seems to have been made to celebrate a victory over that family. It is dated in the fourteenth year of his reign, on the day of the full-moon of Kârttika, when Śaka 616 (A.D. 694-5) had expired.

Transcription.

First plate.

- [¹] Svasti [†*] Jayaty=âvishkṛitām Vishṇôr=vvārāham kshôbbhit-ârṇavam dakṣiṇ-ônata-
damshṭr-âgra-viśrânta-bhu-
[²] vanam vapuḥ [†*] Śrīmatām sakala-bhuvana-saṁstūyamāna-Mānavya-sagôtrānām Hārītī-
putrānām
[³] sapta-lôka-mâtṛibhis=sapta-mâtṛibhir=abhirabhi¹varddhitānām Kârttikēya-parirakṣaṇa-
prâpta-kalyāṇa-
[⁴] paramparānām bhagavan-Nârāyaṇa-prasāda-samāsādita-varāha-lâṅchhan-êkṣhaṇa-kṣhaṇa-va-
[⁵] śikṛit-âśēsha-mahābhṛitām Chalukyānām kulam=alam(la)ûkarishṇôr=aśvamêdh-âvabhṛitha-
snâna-pa-
[⁶] vitṛikṛita-gâtrasya Śrī-Pulī²kēśi(śi)-Vallabha-mahārājasya sūnuḥ parākram-âkrânta-Vanavā-
[⁷] sy-âdi-para-nṛipati-maṇḍala-praṇibaddha-viśudḍha-kirttiḥ Śrī-Kirttiyarmma-
prithī(thi)vīvala-
[⁸] bha-mahārājas=tasy=ânma(tma)jas=samara-saṁsakta-sakal-ôttarâpath-êśvara-Śrī-
[⁹] Harshavarddhana-parājay-ôpalabdha-paramêśvar-âpara-nāmadhēyaḥ Satyâ-
[¹⁰] śraya-śrī-prithī(thi)vīvalabha-mahārāj-â³dhirāja-paramêśvaras=tat-priya-su-
[¹¹] tasya Vikramāditya-paramêśvara-bhaṭṭarakasya mati-sahāya-sāhasa-mâtra-sa-

Second plate; first side.

- [¹²] madhigata-nija-varṇsa-samuchita-chita-rājya-vibhavasya vividha-rasita-sita-samara-mukha-
[¹³] gata-ripu-narapati-vijaya-samupalabdha-kirtti(rtti)-patāk-âvabhāsita-digantasya himakara-
[¹⁴] kara-vimala-kula-paribhava-vilaya-hêtu-Pallavapati-parājay-ânantara-parigrihita-
[¹⁵] Kāñchī-purasya prabhāva-ku⁴lê(li)śa-dalê(li)ta-Chôla-Pāṇḍyâ(ṇḍya)-Kêraḷa-dharaṇi(nī)-
dhara-tû(tra)ya-māna-māna-śrīm⁵-
[¹⁶] gasya an-anya-samavana[†*]-Kāñchipati-maṇi-makuta-kuta-kirāṇa-salil-âbhishikṭa-chara-
[¹⁷] ṇa-kamalasya tri-samudra-madhya-varṭti-bhuvana-maṇḍal-âdhiśvarasya sūnuḥ pitu-
[¹⁸] r-ājñayā Bālī(lê)ndusêkharasy=êva Sēnāni(nī)r=Daditya-balam=ati-samuddhataṁ
trairājya-Pallava-

¹ These two letters, rabhi, are an unnecessary and unmeaning repetition.

² It is somewhat doubtful whether li is intended, or le. But, collating all the other passages in which this name occurs, I find the rule to be that, when the vowel of the first syllable is o, then the vowel of the second is e, and when the vowel of the first syllable is u, then the vowel of the second is i or, in later times, a.

³ Here, and in *âjñāpayati*, l. 23, and *viññāpanayā*, l. 26,

and *jāyitê*, l. 41, the vowel *ê* is irregularly attached to the top stroke of the *ja*, instead of to the centre stroke, in the usual manner, as in *mahārāj-âdhirāja*, ll. 22-23.

⁴ The upper part of the *ka* has not come out in the facsimile. A few similar instances of imperfect letters, and of a failure of the *Anusvāra* to appear in the facsimile, will be found further on.

⁵ In the facsimile, the top stroke of the *śa* has run up into the *Anusvāra*, so as to read like *śrīḥ*, instead of *śrīm*.

- [¹⁹] balam=avashṭabhyah(bhya) samasta-vishaya-prasamanād=vihita-[ta*]n-manō-
nuraṁ(ra)ñjanaḥ atyanta-vatsala-
[²⁰] tvād=Yudhisṭhi(shṭhi)ra iva Śrī-rāmatvād=Vāsudēva iva nṛp-āṁkuśatvāt=Parasurāma
iva rāj-āśrayatvā-
[²¹] d=Bharata iva Pallava-Kaṣāṁ*bhra-Kēraḷa-Haiḥaya-Viḷa-Maḷava-Chōḷa-Pāṇḍy-ādyāḥ
yēu=Āḷuva-Gaṁ(ga)ṅg-ādyai-
[²²] r=mmaulais=sama-bhṛityatān=nitāḥ Vinayāditya-Satyāśraya-sri-prithivīvallabha-ma-

Second plate; second side.

- [²³] hārāj-ādhirāja-paramēśvara-bhaṭṭāraka's=sarvva(rvva)n=ēvam=Ājñāpaya*ti [| *]
Viditam=astu vō=smābhi(bhiḥ) shōḍaś-ōttara-
[²⁴] shach(t)-chhatēshu Śaka-varshēshv=atitēshu pravarddhamāna-vijaya-rājya-samvatsarē
chaturddasē varitamānē
[²⁵] Harē(?ri)sha-pura-pratyāsannē Karañjapatra-grāmam=adhivasati vijaya-skandhāvārē
Kārttikē(ka)-pauruṣa-
[²⁶] māsyām śrīmad-Āḷuva-rāja-vijñāpanayā Vātsya-sagōtrasya Śrīśarmmaṇaḥ sōma-yā-
[²⁷] jinaḥ pautrāya Māraśarmmaṇaḥ putrāya Īśānaśarmmaṇē vēda-vēdāṅga-
[²⁸] pāragāya Vanavāsi(si)-maṇḍalē Ede(?ḍe)voḷal-bhō(bhā)gē Kīru-Kāgāmāsi-
[²⁹] nāma-grāmas=sa-bhōgas=sarvva-bādhā-parihār-ōpētō dattaḥ [| *] Per-Ggāga(gā)māsi-
[³⁰] grāma-pāschima-bhāga(gē) krit-ākṛita-kshētraṁ [| *] Cha(ē)tasya kshētrasya
[³¹] si(si)mā [| *] pu(pū)vv(rvva)-ōttara-di[g*]-bhāgē Sirigōḍu(?ḍu)-grāma-si(si)ṁmi Pāli-
[³²] vu(?)tu | tata āgatya [¹⁰ Karvvasurigoḷa | tata(taḥ) Perbu(?)tu | tata

Third Plate.

- [³³] Ālgi(lge ?)re | tata [¹⁰ Āḷgoḷa | tata(tō)¹⁰ Nittakalā | tata(taḥ) [¹⁰ prāg-gatvā [¹⁰
Nērilgi(lge ?)-
[³⁴] re | tata(taḥ) [¹⁰ Kurupakere | tata(tō) [¹⁰ dakṣiṇa-diśam=āvṛitya Arakatta (| |)
[³⁵] Tad=āgāmibhir=asmad-vamśyai[r=a*]nyaiś=cha rājabhir=āyur-aiśvarya-ādīnām vilasitam=
achirāṁsu-chañcha-
[³⁶] lam=avagachchadbhir=ā-chandr-ā[rkka]-dhar-āṇṇava-sthiti-samē(ma)-kālaṁ yaśāś-
chichi(chi)shubhis=sva-datti-ni-
[³⁷] rrvīśēśam paripāliyam=uktañ=cha bhagavatā vēda-vyāsēna Vyāsēna[| *] Bahubhi-
[³⁸] r=vvvasudhā bhuktā rājabhis=Sagar-ādibhir=yyasaya yasyā(sya) yadā bhūrmī(mi)s=
tasya tasya
[³⁹] tadā phalaṁ [| *] Svan=dātum su-mahach-chhakyam duḥkham=anyasya pālanam
dānam vā pāla-
[⁴⁰] nam ch=ēti dānāch=chhrēyō=nupālanam [| *] Sva-dattam para-dattam vā yō
harēti(ta) vasundharām sha-
[⁴¹] shṭi-varshsha(rsha)-sahasrāṇi viśṭāyām jāyatē krimiḥ [| *] Mahā-sa(sā)ndhivigrahika-
[⁴²] Śrī-Rāmapuṇyavallabhēna likhitam=idam śāsanam [| *] [| *]

Translation.

Hail! Victorious is the body, which was that of a Boar, that was manifested of Viśṇu, (&c., as in No. XXIX., at Vol. VI., p. 87)!

The son of the great king Śrī-Pulikēśi-Vallabha,—whose body was purified (&c., as in No. XXIX.)—(was) the great king Śrī-

Kīrtti-varmā, the favourite of the world, (&c., as in No. XXIX.).

His son (was) Satyāśraya, the favourite of the world, the great king, the supreme king, the supreme lord, (&c., as in No. XXIX.).

His dear son (was) Vikramāditya, the supreme lord, the venerable one,—who acquired (&c., as in No. XXIX.).

* The photograph distinctly shows the *Anusvara* over the *ka*; but it does not appear in the facsimile. I have found the same name in the same context in two more Western Chalukya grants, but in both of them the text is unfortunately not quite clear enough to decide satisfactorily whether the second syllable is *ka* or *ka*.

* This letter, *ka*, was omitted in the original, and was then inserted below the line.

* This letter, *ya*, again, was at first omitted and then inserted below the line.

* This syllable, *re* or *ri*, is rather doubtful, being crowded from want of space.

¹⁰ These seven marks of punctuation are unnecessary.

His son, Vinayāditya-Satyāśraya, the favourite of the world, the great king, the supreme king, the supreme lord, the venerable one,—who, having at the command of his father (&c., as in No. XXIX.), (*was*) like Bharata, on account of his being the refuge of kings, and by whom the Pallavas, the Kālam-bhras¹¹, the Kêralas, the Haihayas, the Viṣas, the Maḷavas, the Chôḷas, the Pāṇdyas, and others, were brought into a similar state of servitude with the Āḷuvas¹², and the Gaṅgas, and others, who were hereditary (*servants of him*),—thus issues his commands to all people:—

“Be it known to you! Six hundred and sixteen years of the Śaka (*era*) having elapsed, in the fourteenth year of (*Our*) augmenting and victorious reign, at (*Our*) victorious camp which is located at the village of Karañjapatra in the neighbourhood of (*the city of*) Harêshapura¹³, on the day of the full-moon of (*the month*) Kārttika, at the request of the illustrious king of the Āḷuvas, the village of Kīru-Kāgāmāsi¹⁴, in the Edevoḷal¹⁵ division in the Vanavāsi district, is given by Us, with the right of enjoyment, and free from all opposing claims, to Īśānaśarmā, who is thoroughly well versed in the *Vēdas* and the *Vēdāṅgas*, the son's son of Śrīśarmā, who performed the Sôma sacrifice, of the Vātsya gôtra, (*and*) the son of Māraśarmā. (*Also there is given*) a (*partly*) cultivated and (*partly*) uncultivated field on the west of the village of Per-Gāgāmāsi¹⁶. And the boundaries of that field (*are*):—On the north-east, (*the ? hamlet of*) (?) Pūlivutu in the boundaries of the village of Sirigōḍu¹⁷; coming thence, (*the village of*) Karvasurigola; thence (*the village of*) Perbutu; thence (*the village of*) Ālgire¹⁸; thence (*the village of*) Ālgoḷa; thence (*the village of*) Nittakalā; thence, going to the east, (*the village of*) Nêrilgere¹⁹; thence (*the village of*) Kurupakere; thence, turning to the south, (*the village of*) Arakatta.

¹¹ Or, perhaps, ‘Kalabhras’; see note 6.

¹² In l. 9 of the Aihole inscription (Vol. V., p. 67), we have, as my revised version of it will show hereafter, *Gaṅg. Āḷup-ēndrāḥ*, ‘the princes of the Gaṅgas and the Āḷupas.’ The Āḷupas are probably the same as the Ālupas, who are mentioned again, as the enemies of the Chālukyas in later times, in l. 12 of No. 2 of my second series of Kādamba inscriptions, at *Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc.*, Vol. IX., p. 278.

¹³ Or, perhaps, ‘Harishapura.’

¹⁴ i.e., ‘the smaller, or more modern, Kāgāmāsi.’

¹⁵ Or perhaps, ‘Edevoḷal.’ *Voḷal* is the form in compo-

This (*grant, or charter*) should be preserved by future kings, who are desirous of acquiring fame, whether they belong to Our lineage or to other families, &c.! And it has been said by the holy Vyāsa, the arranger of the *Vēdas*:—Land has been enjoyed by many kings, from Sagarā downwards; &c.! It is a very easy thing to bestow a grant oneself, &c.! He is born as a worm in ordure for the duration of sixty thousand years, &c.! This charter has been written by Śrī-Rāmapuṇyavallabha, the Great Minister who is entrusted with peace and war.”

No. XLIX.

This is a copper-plate grant of the Dêvagiri-Yāḍava king Kṛishṇa, otherwise called, as here, Kanhara or Kanphāra,²⁰ and also Kandhara or Kandhāra. Another form of the same name is Kannara; but I have not found it used in the case of this particular king.

The plates were found at Chikka-Bāgiwādi, in the Belgaum Tālukā of the Belgaum District. They are three in number, each about 7½" broad by 10½" long; they have raised edges to protect the writing. The ring connecting them had not been cut when the grant came into my possession; it is about ¾" thick, and 3½" in diameter. The seal, of which a facsimile has been given (No. 2) in the Plate at p. 252 above, is circular, about 2½" in diameter; it has, in high relief on a countersunk surface, a figure of the god Hanumān, with the sun and moon. The language is Sanskrit. The characters are Nandināgari. In this inscription the letter *ba* is usually distinguished from *va*,—by means of a small circle inside the loop of the letter; but the engraver has not always made this distinction, and in some instances, where he has, it has failed to appear in the facsimile. Thus, the facsimile reads *pratibi(vūh)vild*, l. 2, and *Vich-āgrajah*, ll. 13-14; whereas the original has distinctly *pratibi(vūh)bitā*, and *Bich-āgrajah*. On the other hand, this mark, distinctive of the

sition of the Canarese *hoḷal*, *hoḷalu*, ‘a city.’ The first part of the name may be *ede*, ‘place, abode, &c.’; great, much’, or *ede*, ‘the bosom, heart; courage.’

¹⁶ i.e., ‘the larger, or older, Kāgāmāsi.’

¹⁷ Or, perhaps, ‘Sirigōḍu.’

¹⁸ Or, perhaps, ‘Ālgere.’

¹⁹ Or, perhaps, ‘Nêrilgere.’

²⁰ The transcription and translation of this grant have been given, with some others of the same dynasty, at *Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc.*, Vol. XII., p. 25; they are now repeated to accompany and explain the facsimile, which has not been previously published.

ba, is shown clearly enough in the facsimile in, e.g., *Bāgavāḍi*, l. 26, and *brāhmaṇēbhyas*, l. 28.

The grant records that, in the Saumya *saṁvatsara*, when Śaka 1171 (A.D. 1249-50) had expired, on Saturday the day of the full-moon of Āshāḍha, the minister²¹ Mallisaiṭṭi, with the king's permission, bestowed upon thirty-two Brāhmanas, attached to the shrine of the god Mādhaḥva, certain lands at Santheya-Bāgavāḍi, in the Huvvalli Twelve in the Kuhnūḍi district; and that the grant was subsequently confirmed by Mallisaiṭṭi's son, the minister Chaunḍisaiṭṭi.

The Huvvalli spoken of here must be Mughaṭkhan-Hubballi in the Belgaum District, about five miles to the south-east of Bāgiwāḍi. *Santheya* is evidently intended for the Canarese *sanleya*, 'of the market', a common prefix to the names of villages in the Canarese country. The Santheya-Bāgavāḍi of the grant is probably the modern Bāgiwāḍi, or Hirē-Bāgiwāḍi,—a market-town, and of much more importance than Chikka-Bāgiwāḍi, which is close to it. *Saiṭṭi*, at the end of the two ministers' names, probably represents the Canarese *setti*, 'a merchant', and indicates the class to which they belonged by birth.

Transcription.

First Plate.

- [¹] || Chha || Ōm namaḥ Śivāya || Śrī-Gaṇādhī-
 [²] patayē namaḥ || Pāyād=ādyah sa vah pōtri ya(yad)-damaṣṭrā-
 [³] pratibi(bim)bitā | agād=iva dhritā dbātri harshā(rshād)=dviguṇa-pu-
 [⁴] shtatā(tām) || Asti svasty-ayanō rājā Simhaṇō Yadu-vaṁśa-jah yasya kīrti(rtti)-
 [⁵] s=tri-bhuvanē prathitā Hari-kīrti-vat || Yō rājā Jaitugir=nāma Simha-
 [⁶] n-ākhyām(khyān)=nripāt=tataḥ || () janitō Yadu-vaṁś-āvdhan(bāhan) payōdhāv=iva
 cha(cham)dra-
 [⁷] māḥ || Tasya putrō mahā-tējāḥ Śrī-Kaṇhāra iti śrutah | yad-ājām(jām)
 [⁸] śirasā dhritā(tvā) bhavanti sukhinō nripāḥ || Jayati jagati rājā sa-
 [⁹] rva-bhūpāla-mauli-prathita-parama-ratna-prōllasat-pāda-padmaḥ | Ya-
 [¹⁰] du-kula-chira-līlō Vāsudēvē janānām nayana-kamala-sū-
 [¹¹] yah(ryah) pritimān=Kaṇhar-ākhyah || Tasy=ānyah(nya)-kshitipāla-mauli-
 [¹²] makuda(ta)-pratyupta-ratnaiś=chiram nīrājach-charaṇ-āraviṁda-yugalaḥ
 [¹³] śēśhasya prithvipatēḥ | śūrō=mātya-dhūri sthitō vijayatē Bī-
 [¹⁴] ch-āgrajah saṁtataṁ Mall-ākhyah kila Chikkadēva-tanayah pra-
 [¹⁵] khyāta-kīrti(rtti)=bhūvi || Tasya putrō mahā-tējāḥ Śrī-Kaṇhāra i-
 [¹⁶] ti śrutah || () yō jidvā(tvā) prithiv-īśasya yō rājō(jō) dakṣhiṇō bhē(bhu)-
 [¹⁷] jah || Prasām(sa)sy(sty)=arām(rī)n=yah pragrihita-chāpō dadāti ch=ārthān=kṛipa-
 [¹⁸] yā dvijēbhyah | Śrā(śrī)-Sōmanāth-āmgri-yug-āvanatyā pravarddhi-
 [¹⁹] t-āsēsha-vibhūti-rām(ra)myah || Chha || Svasti || Eka-saptaty-uttara-sat-ā-
 [²⁰] dhē(dhī)ka-sahasra-saṁkhyēshu Śak-āvdē(bdē)shv=atitēshu pravarttamānē Saum(sau)mya-
 [²¹] saṁvatsarē tad-amta(tar)-gat-Āshāḍha-paurṇamāsyām Śanaishara-vārē Pū-
 [²²] rv-Āshāḍha(dhā)-nakshatrē Vaidhriti-yōgē(ga) ittham-bhūta-puṁ(pu)nya-kālō
 rājah(jāḥ)
 [²³] sarba(rva)-rda(dē)ś-ādhikāri | sah | Mallisaiṭṭi-nām-āmatyah(tyō) Mudugala-grā-
 [²⁴] mē vasam(sa)n | tad-anuja(jña)yā sva-dēv-ārochana-samayē Śrī-Sōmanātha-
 sa(sam)nidhan
 [²⁵] mahādharma-Vīraṇāyaka-vijñāpanayā sv-ādhikāra-vishayē Kuhnū-
 [²⁶] ḍi-dōśō Huvvalli-dvādaśa-gga(grā)m-ābhyanātarē Santheya-Bāgavāḍi-saṁjña-
 [²⁷] kē grāmē bhagavam(vach)-Śrī(chhri)-Mādhaḥva-dēva-pura(rah)sarēbhyō dvā-trimśat-saṁkhyā-
 [²⁸] kēbhyō nānā-gotrēbhyō brāhmaṇēbhyas=na(ta)d-grāma-dakṣhiṇa-digu(g)-bhāgē-

Second plate; first side.

- [²⁹] shat pāshāṇa(shat-pāshāṇa)-mudritām bhu(bhū)min dhārā-pūrba(rva)kaṁ datta-

²¹ Amātya.

॥ क॥ ॐ त म ः शि ॥ ॥ वाय॥ अ० ग० ग० धि
 प० न० य० न० म० ॥ पा० य० दा० म० ॥ दा० र० र० ३० पो० वी० य० दं० षु
 प्रतिविदिता० म० ग० दि० व० क्ष० म० ता० म० वी० द० षा० दि० गु० ण० पु०
 क्ष० ता० ॥ स० सि० ख० स्त्र० य० मे० रा० डा० सि० द० ॥ मे० य० द० र० क० अ० य० स० की० वि०
 क्षि० तु० व० ल० प० वि० ता० ह० रि० का० र्ति० व० त्वा० यो० रा० डा० कि० तु० मि० नी० म० सि० द०
 ॥ ल० यो० त० पा० व० त० ॥ इ० ति० तो० य० दु० वं० रा० वी० पा० यो० ध० वि० व० च० दु० म०
 मा० ॥ त० सा० पु० मे० म० हा० त० डा० ॥ श्री० क० ह्यार० द० ति० भू० त० ॥ त० दा० की०
 शि० र० सा० धृ० त० त० वं० ति० सु० खि० ना० नृ० पा० ॥ इ० य० ति० इ० ग० ति० रा० डा० स०
 वं० नृ० पा० ला० मो० लि० प० धि० त० प० र० म० र० त० पो० ल्ल० स० त्या० दं० प० द्म० ॥ य०
 दु० कु० ल० वि० र० ली० ल० वा० सु० द० वि० क० ना० ना० न० य० न० क० म० ल० स०
 यः० प्रा० ति० मा० क० ह्य० रा० ख्य० ॥ त० स्या० न्यः० कि० ति० पा० ल० मो० लि०
 म० कु० द० प० त्यु० प० र० नि० शि० रं० नी० रा० इ० च० र० ॥ रा० र० वि० द० यु० ग० लः०
 रा० ष० स्य० पृ० ष्ठी० पा० तः० श० रो० मा० त्थ० धृ० रि० क्षि० ता० वि० क० य० त० वी० म०
 चा० ग्र० कः० सं० त० तं० म० ल्लो० र० ख्यः० कि० ल० वि० क० द० व० त० न० यः० प्र० म०
 र० ख्य० त० की० वि० त्नु० वि० ॥ त० स्य० पु० मे० म० हा० त० डा० ॥ श्री० क० ह्यार० द०
 ति० शु० त० ॥ यो० डि० वा० पृ० धि० वी० रा० स्या० या० रा० डो० द० कि० गो० से०
 इ० ॥ प० शो० स्य० री० न्यः० प० गृ० ढी० त० वा० पा० द० दा० ति० वा० र्घी० कु० प०
 या० दि० इ० न्यः० ॥ श्री० सो० म० ना० धी० धि० यु० गा० व० न० त्या० प्र० व० दि०
 ता० शे० ष० वि० त्नु० ति० रं० म्यः० ॥ क॥ स० सि० ॥ च० क० स० म० त्यु० त० र० रा० ती०
 धृ० क० स० ह० स० सं० र० ख्य० पु० रा० का० द्वे० ष० ती० त० षु० पु० व० र्त्त० मा० न० सौ० म्य०
 सं० व० सा० र० त० दं० त० ग० ता० षा० दा० पो० र्मी० मा० स्या० रा० ने० श्व० र० वा० ऐ० पू०
 वी० षा० ठ० न० द० वि० धृ० ति० यो० गो० इ० सं० क० त० पु० ण० प० का० ले० रा० इ०
 स० र्ब० र्द० शा० धि० का० री० सः० म० लि० सि० दि० ता० मा० मा० त्थः० मु० दु० ग० ल० ग०
 मे० व० सं० नृ० त० द० नृ० ऊ० या० ख० दे० वा० र्ब० न० स० म० ये० श्री० सो० म० ना० ध० स० नि० धो०
 म० हा० ध० र्मि० क० वी० र० ता० य० क० बि० द्वा० पु० न० या० स्वा० धि० का० र० वि० ष० ये० कु० दु०
 डि० दे० रो० ह० व० लि० द्वा० द० श० ग० मा० स्य० त० वे० सं० धे० य० बा० ग० वा० दि० सं० ह०
 के० ग्या० मे० न० ग० वं० री० मा० ध० व० दे० व० पु० र० स० रे० स्यो० हा० वि० रा० सं० वा०
 के० त्या० ना० ना० गो० वे० ती० बा० हा० गो० नृ० रू० दा० म० द० कि० ण० दि० गु० ला० गी०

षट्पाषाणमुद्रितां शुभ्रं धरापत्रं कंदन
 वीनं त्रयं सगवतः श्रीमाधवदेवस्य
 योगरुग्गंगादिसकलं पुत्रार्थं सहस्रकंठपरिमितं
 देवदेवी श्रीमाधवदेवस्य वैबाह्याणो रुक्मा उरातद्व
 यं कंठपरिमितं देवदेवतदितरं तु देवश्रीमाधवदे
 ववं ह्यपुत्री वर्विस्तु स्त्रे स्त्रे बाह्याणो स्त्रे दत्तं तस्यार्ध
 मे वतद्दामपुर्वदिगुमशेषतद्वयं कंठपरिमितं शालि
 देवदेवतदत्तं तस्यार्धमे वतद्दामो त्रदिगुमशेषा
 यकान्ते पुरुषादिगुमशेषतद्वयं कंठपरिमितं दत्तं तस्य
 माधवदेवस्य वैबाह्याणो रुक्मा उरातद्वयं कंठपरिमितं
 शुभ्रं स्त्रे नैव दत्तां क॥ अंतर्गतं तस्य पुत्रार्थं विंशति
 मामाद्यः पितृकृतं तदर्थं परिपालनायास्मिन् धृतं
 गवन्माधवदेवदेवपुरस्येत्यस्तस्यैवा बाह्याणो स्त्रे
 वरासतद्वयं पितृकृतं सुदृढं तं कृतवान् क॥
 तेषां पुत्रिगृहीतानां उगुणनामानि लिख्यंते क॥
 आत्रेयाणां त्रीयस्य मावदिविंशति हो पाध्यायसुतस्य
 रुद्ररिदरसाहायाध्यायस्यैका वृत्तिः कौशिकणां त्री
 यप्रसाकरत्रिंशति सुतदामोदस्य त्रिंशति तस्यैका
 वृत्तिः कौशिकणां त्रीयस्य दत्तस्यैका पाठकसुतस्य
 दत्तस्यैका पाठकस्यैका वृत्तिः वसिष्ठाणां त्रीयस्यैका
 पाठकसुतस्यैका पाठकस्यैका वृत्तिः दत्तस्यैका
 यवामे मण्डवदत्तसुतस्यैका वृत्तिः मण्डवदत्तस्यैका
 त्रिंशति शोडिताणां तस्यैका वृत्तिः हो पाध्यायसुतस्यैका
 पाठकस्यैका वृत्तिः रुद्ररिदरसाहायाध्यायसुतस्यैका
 वृत्तिः रुद्ररिदरसाहायाध्यायसुतस्यैका वृत्तिः
 उकेशस्यैका वृत्तिः मण्डवदत्तस्यैका वृत्तिः दत्तस्यैका
 वृत्तिः वसिष्ठाणां त्रीयस्यैका वृत्तिः शोडिताणां तस्यैका
 वृत्तिः पाठकस्यैका वृत्तिः मण्डवदत्तस्यैका वृत्तिः
 दत्तस्यैका वृत्तिः रुद्ररिदरसाहायाध्यायसुतस्यैका
 वृत्तिः रुद्ररिदरसाहायाध्यायसुतस्यैका वृत्तिः

- [³⁰] vān | (||) Tatra | bhagavataḥ Śrī-Mādhava-dēva²³śya aṁga-
 [³¹] bhōga-raṁgabhōg-ādi-sakala-pu(pū)j-ārtham sahasa(sra)-kāmba-parimitam
 [³²] kshētram dattam. | Śrī-Mādhava-dēva-satrē brāhmaṇa-bhōjan-ātha(rtham) śata-dva-
 [³³] ya-kāmba-parimitam kshētram dattam [*] Tad-itarā(ram) tu kshētram Śrī-Mādhava-dē-
 [³⁴] va-Braṁ(bra)hmapurī-varvi(rti)bbyas=nē(tē)bhyō brāhmaṇēbhyō dattam | Tat-satr-ārtha-
 [³⁵] m=ēva tad-grāma-pu(pū)rva-digu(g)-bhāgē śata-dvaya-kāmba-parimitam śāli-
 [³⁶] kshētram tēna dattam || Tat-satr-ārtham=ēva tad-grām-ōta(tā)ra-dig-bhāgē Vinā-
 [³⁷] yaka-nairuru(rī for rura)nya(tya)-digu(g)-nā(bhā)gē śata-kāmba-parimē(mi)tam
 [kshētram*] dattam [||*] Iti Śrī-
 [³⁸] Mādhava-dēva-satra-brāhmaṇa-bhōjan-ātham(rtham) pa(pam)cha-śata-kāmba-parimitā
 [³⁹] bhu(bhū)mis=nē(tē)n=aiva dattā || Chha || Am(a)namtaram tasya putrō=sau
 Chaumdisaṁti-nā-
 [⁴⁰] m-āmānyaḥ(tyaḥ) pitṛi-krin(t)-aita(tad)-dharma-paripālanāy-āsmīn(nn)-arthē bha-
 [⁴¹] gavan-Mādhava-dēva-dēva²³pura(rah)sarēbhyas=ta(tē)bhyō brāhmaṇēbhyas=tām-
 [⁴²] vra(bra)-śāsana(nam) danga(ttva) pitur=dhha(dhha)rmaṁ su-dṛḍhatarāṁ kṛtavānu(n) ||
 Chha || ||
 [⁴³] Tēshām pu(pra)tiḡrīhṛī(tī)nam(nām) gōtra-guṇa-nāmāni likyāntē || Chha ||
 [⁴⁴] Ātrēya-gōtriya-Sāmavēdi-Vishṇubhaṭṭ-Āpādhyāya-suta-Sarva-
 [⁴⁵] jña-Harīharabhaṭṭ-Ōyā(pā)dyāsy=aikā vṛittih || Kausika-gōtri-
 [⁴⁶] ya-Prabhākara-Trivāḍi-suta-Dāmōdaya(ra)-Trivāḍih tasy=ē(ai)kā
 [⁴⁷] vṛittih || Kanika-gōtriya-Madanāi(yi)ta-Pāthaka-suta-Rāma-
 [⁴⁸] dēva-Yā(pā)thakasy=aikā dṛi(vṛi)ttih || Vasishṭha-gōtriya-Jayita-Pā-
 [⁴⁹] ṭhaka-suta-Kēsaka(va)-Pāthakah ||²⁴ tasy=aikā vṛittih || Harita-gōtri-
 [⁵⁰] ya-Vāmama(na)-Pāṭṭavaddha(rddha)na-suta-Trivikrama-Pāṭṭavarddhanasy=ārdha-vṛi-
 [⁵¹] ttiḥ || Sāṁḍilya-gōtrasya Vishṇubhaṭṭ-Āpādhyāya-suta-Pēṭṭa-
 [⁵²] ṇa-Pāṭṭavarddhanasy=ārdha-vṛittih || Harita-gōtra-Dāmōdara-Pāṭṭa-
 [⁵³] varddhanasuta-Tā(nā)gadēva-Pāṭṭavarddhanasy=ārdha-vṛittih || Harita-gō-
 [⁵⁴] tra-Kēsava-Pāṭṭavartṭa(rddha)ma(na)-suta-Dāmōdara-Pāṭṭavarddhanasy=ārdha-vṛittih || Va-
 [⁵⁵] sishṭha-Maitrāvaruṇa-Kan(kaum)ḍinya-gōtra-Ādityabhaṭṭa-suta-Mali-
 [⁵⁶] dēva-Tha(u)pādhyāsy=ārdha-vṛittih || Maudu(d)galya-gōtra-Nārāyaṇa-

Second plate; second side.

- [⁵⁷] Upādhyāya-suta-Rudr-U(ō)pādhyāsy=ārdha-vṛittih || Ta-
 [⁵⁸] sya trā(bhrā)tā Gōvīnd-U(ō)pādhyāsy=ārdha-vṛittih || Bhāra-
 [⁵⁹] dvāja-gōtra-Kalidēva-Pāṭṭavarddhanasuta-Śrīdhara-Pāṭṭava-
 [⁶⁰] rddhanasy=ārdha-vṛittih || Gautama-gōtra-Maha(hā)dēva-Pāṭṭavarddhanasuta-Kā-
 [⁶¹] va(ma?)dēva-Kramitasy=ārdha-vṛittih || Kāśyapa-gōtra-Maṁchyana-Pāṭṭavarddhanasuta-
 [⁶²] suta-Vra(bra)hmadēvabhaṭṭ-Āpādhyāsy=ārdha-vṛittih || Da(ha)rita-gōtra-Gōvī(viṁ)da-
 [⁶³] suta-Rāyihē(dē)vabhaṭṭ-Āpādhyāsy=ārdha-vṛittih || Sāṁḍilya-gōtra-Hidya(?)-
 [⁶⁴] ṇa-suta-Śrīra(ram)gasy=ārdha-vṛittih || Kāśyapa-gōtra-Atyām(?)pa-suta-Madhuva-
 [⁶⁵] ṇa-Pāṭṭavaddha(rddha)nasy=ārdha-vṛittih || Bhāradvāja-gōtra-Maha(hā)da(dē)va-suta-
 Malidē-
 [⁶⁶] va-Ya(gba)lisasy=ārdha-vṛittih || Rathītara-gōtra-Sōmanātha-suta-Va(ba)savaṇa-Ghali-
 [⁶⁷] sasy=ārdha-vṛittih || Ātra(trē)ya-gōtra-Gōpāla-su(su)ta-Malidēva-Ghalisasy=ārdha-
 [⁶⁸] vṛittih || Vishṇuvarddha-gōtra-Mādhava-Pāṭṭavarddhanasuta-Malidēva-Pāṭṭavarddhanasy=ā-
 [⁶⁹] rddha-vṛittih || Ātrēya-gōtra-Nārāyaṇa-suta-Va(ba)savaṇa-Kramitasy=ārdha-vṛittih ||
 [⁷⁰] Tā(bhā)radvāja-gōtra-Nāra(rāya?)ṇa-suta-Jātavēda-Pāṭṭavarddhanasy=ārdha-vṛittih ||
 Bhāra-
 [⁷¹] dvāja-gōtra-Śrīdhara-su(su)ta-Hāśvara-Ghalisasy=ārdha-vṛittih || Śrīvatsa-gō-
 [⁷²] tra-Māyidēva-suta-Gōvī(viṁ)da-Ghaisāsasy=ārdha-vṛittih || Kāśyapa-gōtra-A-

²³ This letter, *va*, was omitted in the original, and was then inserted above the line.

²⁴ This repetition of the word *dēva* is unnecessary.

²⁵ This mark of punctuation is unnecessary.

- [¹⁸] ditya-suta-Malidēva-Ghalisasy=ārdha-vṛittih || Vasistha-gōtra-Tākhūra-
 [¹⁹] Ghalisasy=ārdha-vṛittih [|*] Kāśyapa-gōtra-Vishnu-Ghalisasy=ārdha-vṛittih [|*]
 [²⁰] Kausika-gōtra-Viśvanātha-Ghē(ghai)sasy=ārdha-vṛittih || Ātra(trē)ya-gōtra-Malidē-
 [²¹] va-Ghalisasy(sy)=ārdha-vṛittih || Kāśyapa-gōtra-Svamidēva-Ghalisasy=ārdha-vṛittih ||
 [²²] Kau(kauṁ)ḍinya-gōtra-Narasimha-Ghalisah || Kausika-gōtra-Dāmōdara-Ghalisah
 [²³] || Viśga(śvā)mitra-gōtra-Malidēva-Ghalisah || Mūka-gōtra-Kāyapa-Ghali-
 [²⁴] sah || Kāśyapa-gōtra-Ma(mā or na)rasi(sim)ha-Ghalisah || Śā(śām)di(di)lya-gōtra-Nāgadēva-
 [²⁵] Ghalisāsah(sah for sāsaḥ) || Agastya-gōtra-Kalidēda(va)-Ya(pa)ttavarddhanah || Ātrēya-gō-
 [²⁶] tra-Vishnu-Pattavarddhanah || Bhāradvāja-gōtra-Dāsa-Malidēva-Ghalisah || Kā-
 [²⁷] śyapā(pa)-gōtra-Vāsudēva-Ghalisah || Harita-gōtra-Śrīdhara-Pattavarddha(rddha)nah |(|)
 [²⁸] Kāśyapa-gōtra-Dēvaṇa-Ghalisah || Śō(śau)naka-gōtra-Mādhava-Ghalisah [|*]
 [²⁹] Ētāpā(shām) praty-ēkam=ārdha-vṛittih || Kāśya[pa*]-gōtra-Cha(ja)gadē(ddē)va-
 Pāthakasya ||³⁰
 [³¹] pād-ōna-vṛittih || Itah param=anyēshā(shām) yu(pra)ty-ēka(kam) pāda-vṛittih ||
 Viśi(śvā)mi-
 [³²] tra-gōtra-Rāmadēva-Ghalisah || Gōtama-gōtra-Malidēva-Ghalisah ||
 Third plate.
 [³³] Bhāradvāja-gōtra-Vē(vai)janātha-Ghalisah || Śrīvatsa-
 [³⁴] gōtra-Rāmadēva-Ghalisah || Bhāradvāja-gōtra-Kā-
 [³⁵] lidāsa-Ghalisah || Kāśyapa(pa)-gōtra-Gōyā(pā)la-Ghalisah
 [³⁶] h || Tasya bhrātā Kalitē(dē)va-Ghalisah || Kāśya[pa*]-gō-
 [³⁷] tra-Nāgadēva-Ghalisah || Bhāradvāja-gōtra-Voppadēva-Gha-
 [³⁸] lisah || Viśvāmītra-gōtra-Lakshmidhara-śu(su)ta-Gōpāla-Ghalisah ||
 [³⁹] Kāśyapa-gōtra-Narasimhabhaṭṭah || Kauṁḍinya-gōtra-Nāga-suta-Vishnuḥ ||
 [⁴⁰] Jāmadagnya-vasa³⁰-gōtra-Dēvaṇa-Ghalisah || Kō(kā)śyapa-gōtra-Udayabhaṭṭah ||
 [⁴¹] Kausika-gōtra-Dēvaṇa-suta-Mamchyaṇa-Ghalisah(sah) || Kāśyapa-gōtra-Ha-
 [⁴²] tta(?)pa-Pattavarddha(rddha)nah || Bhāradvāja-gōtra-Malidēva-suta-Kalidēva-Pattava-
 [⁴³] rddha(rddha)nasy-aikā vṛittih |(|) Vasistha-gōtra-Vādya(?)pa-suta-Janārdha(rdda)na-
 Ghali-
 [⁴⁴] sasy=ārdha(rddha)-vṛittih || Vilusuka-suta-Padmanābha-Pattavarddha(rddha)na-
 [⁴⁵] sy=aikā vṛittih [|*] Tasya suta[sya*] Sōmanāthasy=aikā vṛittih ||
 [⁴⁶] Ittham dvā-tri(trim)śad=vṛittayō vibhajya vrā(brā)hmaṇēbhyō dattah(ttāḥ) |(|) Chha ||
 Tad=Āgāmibhi-
 [⁴⁷] v(r)=śēsha-bhūpālai(laiḥ) sva-datta-nirviśēsham paripālanīyam=iti bhagava-
 [⁴⁸] tā Vēda-Vyāsēn=ōktam | Va(ba)hubhir=vasudhā bhuktā rājābhi(bhiḥ) Sagar-ādibhi(bhiḥ)
 [⁴⁹] yasya yasya yadā bhūā(bhū)mis=tasya tasya tadā phalam |(|) Sva-dattam para-
 [⁵⁰] dattam vā yō harēta vasumdharam | shashtim varsha-sahasrāṇi vi-
 [⁵¹] shthāyām jāyatē kriā(kri)mih || Rō(rā)maḥ | Sānānyō=yam dharma-sētur=nri-
 [⁵²] pa(pā)ṇām kālē kālē pālanīyō bhavadbhiḥ | sarvān-ē-
 [⁵³] tāt-bhāvīnaḥ pāthivēmdrān=bhūyō bhūyō yāchatē Rāmachaṁ-
 [⁵⁴] draḥ || Dāna-pālanayōr=mā(ma)dhyē dānāt(ch)=śrē(chhrē)yō=nupālanam |
 [⁵⁵] dānāt=svargam=avāpnōti pālanād=achyutam ya(pa)dam ||
 [⁵⁶] Māṅgala-mahā-śrēṭh(śrīḥ) |(|)

Translation.

Om! Reverence to Śiva! Reverence to
 Śrī-Gaṇādhīpati! May he³¹, the first boar,
 protect you,—reflected on whose tusk, the
 earth was upheld, and, through joy, attained,
 as it were, twice as great prosperity (as before)!
 There was the prosperous king Simhāṇa,

³⁰ This mark of punctuation, again, is unnecessary.

born in the race of Yādū, whose fame was
 celebrated throughout the three worlds, like
 the fame of Hari.

As the moon (was created) in the ocean, so,
 in the ocean which is the family of Yādū,
 there was born from the king Simhāṇa
 the king who was named Jaitugi.

³¹ These two letters, *vasa*, seem to be superfluous and
 unmeaning. ³² Vishnu.

[illegible]

///.

[illegible]

लि स॥ श्री वस
कारवाकगोत्रका
गायालपलिस
आश्यागा
पादवप
नेरा॥
विष्णु॥
तट्ट॥
पोरुद
एव
नि
त
मि
ति
अति
नि
उय
वि
तर्त्
न
मुचं
न।
इ दं॥

His son was that glorious one, who is renowned under the name of Śrī-Kaṇhāra, and whose commands kings bear upon their heads and thus become happy. Victorious in the world is the king called Kaṇhāra; the waterlilies, which are his feet, shine brightly among the famous choice jewels in the diadems of all kings (*as they bow down before him*); he is the sun of the white waterlilies, which are the eyes of mankind; he is full of affection for Vāsudēva²², who disported himself for so long a time in the family of Yādū.

Ever victorious is he, the hero, renowned in the world, who has the appellation of Malla, —the elder brother of Bīcha, and the son of Chikkadēva,—who, filling the post of minister of that eminent king, has the waterlilies, which are his feet, always made radiant by the jewels inlaid in the diadems of other kings; and who is the right arm of the victorious lord of the earth, the king, who was his²³ glorious son and was renowned under the name of Śrī-Kaṇhāra. Armed with the bow, he chastises his enemies; through charity, he gives wealth to the twice-born; and he is pleasing by reason of his perfect prosperity, which is nourished by obeisance performed to the feet of (*the god*) Śrī-Sōmanātha.

Hail! One thousand one hundred and seventy-one of the Śaka years having elapsed in the Saumya *saṃvatsara*, on Saturday the day of the full-moon of (*the month*) Āshāḍha of that (*year*), under the Pūrva-Āshāḍhā *nakshatra* and the Vaidhṛiti *yōga*,—at this sacred time, while residing at the village of Mudugala, he,—the minister called Mallisaiṭṭi, who was entrusted with authority over all the dominions of the king,—with his permission, and at the request of the most pious Viranāyaka, at the time of worshipping his own deity, in the presence of (*the god*) Śrī-Sōmanātha, gave, with libations of water, at the village called Santheya-Bāgavāḍi in the Huvalli Twelve-villages in the country of Kuhuṇḍi, which was a district subject to his own authority, some land, marked out by six stones and situated in the southern part of that same village, to thirty-two Brāhmaṇas of many *gōtras*, together with the god, the holy Śrī-Mādhava. A field of the measure of one

thousand *kambas* was allotted for the *aṅgabhōga*, the *raṅgabhōga*, and all the other rites of the god, the holy Śrī-Mādhava. A field of the measure of two hundred *kambas* was allotted for the purpose of feeding Brāhmaṇas in the charitable dining-hall of the god Śrī-Mādhava. And another field was given to those Brāhmaṇas who dwelt at (*the town of*) Brahmapurī, which belonged to the god Śrī-Mādhava. And a rice-field of the measure of two hundred *kambas*, situated in the eastern part of that same village, was given by him for the purposes of that same charitable dining-hall. And, for the purposes of that same charitable dining-hall, there was given a field of the measure of one hundred *kambas* on the south-western side (*of the land*) of Vināyaka. Thus there was given by him land of the measure of five hundred *kambas* for the purpose of feeding Brāhmaṇas in the charitable dining-hall of the god Śrī-Mādhava.

And after that, his son, the minister Chāṇḍisaiṭṭi, for the purpose of continuing the religious act performed by his father, gave, with reference to that same subject, a copper charter to the god, the holy Mādhava, and to those Brāhmaṇas, and thus made permanent the religious act of his father.

The *gōtras* and the virtues and the names of those recipients of the gifts are now written. (*From here,—line 45,—to line 99, the inscription records the names, &c., of the grantees, and the share allotted to each. It is unnecessary to translate this portion in detail. In line 100 the inscription continues:—*

Thus thirty-two allotments were portioned out and given to the Brāhmaṇas.²⁴

It has been said by the saintly Veda-Vyāsa, that this (*grant*) should be preserved by all future kings, precisely as if it were a grant made by themselves, (*in the words*):—"The earth has been enjoyed by many kings, commencing with Sāgara; he, who for the time being possesses land, enjoys the benefit of it"! He is born for the duration of sixty thousand years as a worm in ordure, who confiscates land that has been given, whether by himself or by another! (*Therefore has*) Rāma (*said*):—"This general bridge of piety of kings should at all times be preserved by you,—thus

²² Krishna.

²³ Sc., Sindhava's. The construction is very bad.

²⁴ The shares, however, if added up, amount to thirty-four and a quarter allotments.

does Râmachandra make his earnest request to all future princes." In (*discriminating between*) giving a grant and continuing (*the grant of another*), continuing (*the grant of*

another) is the better; by giving a grant a man attains paradise, but by continuing (*the grant of another*) a man attains an imperishable state! (*May there be*) the most auspicious prosperity!

MISCELLANEA.

SEALS FROM COPPER-PLATE GRANTS.

(See Plates, pp. 120, 252-3.)

Besides the seals from the copper-plate grants of Vinayâditya (alluded to above, p. 301) and of Kanharadêva (p. 303), we have given on the same plate (at p. 252) three others from the collection of Sir Walter Elliot: viz.—No. 1, the seal of the copper-plate grant of Vikramâditya I. dated Śaka 532, which grant has already been given (at p. 217); No. 3¹ is from an Eastern Chalukya grant of Râjarâja dated Śaka 944; and No. 4¹ from another Vengi grant of Kulôttunga-Chôdadêva II. dated Śaka 1056. These last two grants will be given in volume VIII. of the *Indian Antiquary*, with full-size facsimile plates.

An impression of a seal of Ammarâja II. of the Eastern Chalukya dynasty is given on the plate facing p. 120. A transcription and translation of the plates to which it belongs will be given early in next volume.—Ed.

KABÎR-PANTHIS AND SAT-NÂMÎS.

(Addition to the paper, ante, pp. 287-289.)

Much has yet to be learnt about the Kabîr-panthis and the teaching of Kabîr, the great leader of Indian reform in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. His sayings and precepts are innumerable, and many of them have still to be translated.

The Sat-nâmîs, too, are an interesting sect, and very little has yet been written about them or their leaders. Is there not more than one branch of this sect to be found in different parts of India? And if so, how do they differ?

MONIER WILLIAMS.

Oxford, November 8th, 1878.

METRICAL VERSIONS FROM THE
MAHÂBHÂRATA.

BY J. MUIR, D.C.L., LL.D., PH.D.

(Continued from p. 292.)

BROKEN FRIENDSHIPS NEVER THOROUGHLY CEMENTED.

Mahâbhârata, xii. 4167.

Things well compact are hard to crack,
And broken things are hard to mend;
So shattered friendships, patched up, lack
The love that marked the former friend.

THE IGNORANT MAN'S PRAISE AND BLAME WORTHLESS.

Mahâbhârata, xii. 4217.

What boots the censure or applause
Which undiscerning men bestow?
Who ever heeds the senseless crow
That in the forest harshly caws?

DISHONEST EULOGISTS.

Mahâbhârata, xii. 4421.

The men who praise you, bland and bright,
Before you,—rail behind your back,
Are dogs that dread a front attack,
But slink behind, your heels to bite.

EVIL OF REVENGEFULNESS.

Mahâbhârata, xii. 4225.

The injured man who weakly longs
To pay base slanderers back their wrongs
Is like the ass which loves to lie
And roll in ashes dirtily.

THE EFFECT WHICH SOCIETY PRODUCES ON THE FOOLISH
AND THE WISE RESPECTIVELY.

Mahâbhârata, i. 3077.

The fool who listens day by day
To all that men around him say,
Whate'er is worst drinks in with greed,
As pigs on garbage love to feed.
But hearing others talk, the wise
The precious choose, the vile despise;
Just so do swans, with innate tact,
From milk and water, milk extract.

EFFECTS OF ASSOCIATING WITH THE WISE AND THE
FOOLISH.

Mahâbhârata, iii. 25.

To herd with fools delusion breeds,
To error, vice, and misery leads;
While those who wait upon the wise,
On virtue's ladder ever rise.
Let men who covet calm of mind,
The old, the sage, the righteous find;
From such the way of duty learn;
Thus aided, truth and right discern.
Such men's example, influence, looks,
Teach better far than many books.

(To be continued.)

¹ The first two seals on the second page of the plate have been wrongly numbered as 1 and 2, instead of 3 and 4.

INDEX.

| | | | | | |
|---|---------------|--|-------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| Abaratikā, d.* | 259, 263 | dharaṇi | 71 | Ānandagiri | 300 |
| Abbās | 97 | Āhichhatra | 281 | Ānanda Malla, k. | 89, 91 |
| 'Abd-Manāf | 93 | Ahira | 89 | Anandapura, c. | 7-15, 76, 80, 81 |
| Abdul Karim Bukhārī's Hist.
de l'Asie Centrale | 237 | Ahmadābād, personal names
in | 165ff. | Anantaguna-Pandion, k. | 195 |
| 'Abdu'l-lāh | 93 | Aḥmad Beg Ināk | 240 | Ananta Varmā | 172 |
| 'Abdu'l-lāh bin Uthman (Abū-
Bakr) | 94-5 | Aḥmad Shāh | 239 | Ānarta, d. | 257-8, 262-3 |
| 'Abdu'r-rahmān | 93 | Aihole tablet 103, 121, 185, 209-10, | 247 | Ānartapura | 71, 73 |
| Abora | 46, 182 | 'Āishā | 94, 98-9 | Āndhira | 6, 21 |
| Abreha, k.* | 235 | Ajanṭā caves | 291 | Āndhrabhṛityas | 253, 258 |
| Abū Hālah | 93 | Ajātasatru | 153, 155-6 | Āngas | 28-9 |
| Abū Sofān | 96 | Ajepāla | 53 | Ānga-bhōga | 305 |
| Abyssinian kings | 235 | Ajitāpiḍa, k. | 56 | Āngaja (P), g. | 109 |
| achāra | 28 | Ājmir, c. | 28 | Āngiras | 36 |
| Achāra, Atharya | 291 | ājñapti | 17 | Ānḥilvādā Pāthan, c. | 8, 61, 76 |
| Achārādya Sūtra | 29 | Ājudhiā | 215, 297-8 | Aniāli, v. | 9 |
| a-chāṭa-bhōṭa-pravēśya | 214, 248 | ākāra | 17 | animal worship | 288 |
| Achetanātha | 47 | Ākarāvanti, d. | 259, 262 | animism | 269 |
| Achyuta Vijaya Rāghava Nai-
kar, k. | 25-6 | Ākhaṇḍalamitra | 81 | anivārīta | 163-4, 219 |
| adāna | 248n. | ākshapātātika | 81 | Āujār | 53 |
| adbhāṭa datta | 34 | Ālaktakanagara, c. | 109, 215-16 | Anna bint Zazid | 93 |
| adēya | 220, 248n. | 'Ālam Beg, k. | 240 | Ān-nabīya | 95 |
| Adhikārika, o.* | 248 & n. | 'Ālam Khān | 238 | Annagundi | 39 |
| Adhika Somanātha | 47 | Ālapāru, v. | 19 | Āṇana-siṅga | 246 |
| adhīrāja 16, 104, 107, 164, 211, 219,
220, 301 | | Ālavarāṭ metre | 284 | Ānnigere, v. | 218 |
| Adhyātmaka Rāmāyana | 287 | Alexander | 31-2, 44 | Ānśu-varmā, k. | 90 |
| Ādibuddha, Ādidēvan | 221 | Ālgire (P), v. | 303 | Antaka, g. | 249 |
| Ādi Granth | 57-60 | Ālgola, v. | 303 | Anteśvara, t. | 8 |
| Ādil Shāhi kings | 121-2 | Ālinā, v. | 54, 66 | An-to-lo, Āndhra | 6 |
| Ādinātha | 47, 298-9 | Ālindaka | 76 | anushyāta | 16, 33, 35, 37, 161, 187,
248, 251 |
| Ālthiopes | 235 | Aliq bin 'Ābad | 93 | Anūpa | 89, 259, 262 |
| Afghānistān | 237-8 | Almela, v. | 126 | Anuyogadvīra sūtra | 29 |
| Āgamas | 29 | alphabet (Persian) | 237 | Anwar-i Suhaili | 237 |
| Āgamāpandita | 224-5, 227 | Ālupas, Āluvas | 303 & n. | Aparānta, d. | 259, 262-3 |
| Āgīma | 97 | Āluvāy | 282 | Āpila | 256 |
| Āgimīta | 254 | Ālvar | 286 | 'Āpaṣṭh | 263 |
| Āgni, g.* | 42 | Āmarasiūha, k. | 9 | Ārakatṭa, v. | 303 |
| agui-astra | 136 | Āmātya, o. | 304-5 | Archaeological Notes 21, 40, 44, 126,
176, 192, 289 | |
| agūhōtra | 249 & n., 252 | Āmbāla | 86 | Archæology in Japan | 181 |
| agūshkōma | 162, 192 | Āmīma | 97 | arhat | 35-6, 38, 214, 291 |
| Āgrā | 10 | Āmīr Sayyid, k. | 240 | 'Āpiakḥ | 259, 263 |
| Āgrahāra | 19, 244, 283 | Āmma (E. Chalukya) | 15, 18 | Aristotle | 31-2 |
| Āgrawāl, s.* | 28 | Āmmārāja II. (East Chalukya),
seal of | 308 | Arivarmā, for Harivarmā
(Gaṅga) | 102 |
| ahāle | 145 | Āmrāvati | 5, 7 | Arjuna | 18 |
| Ābalyā | 222 | amukta | 136 | Arjuna Guru | 58 |
| āhāra | 54, 71, 81 | Ānand, v. | 288 | Arjunavāda, v. | 217 |
| āhara | 164 | Ānandabhairava | 299 | Ārkāt, c. | 22 |
| | | Ānanda Chudāsamā | 8, 9, 15 | | |

* Abbreviations:—

c. = city. g. = god or goddess. l. m. = land-measure. mot. = motto. r. = river. t. = temple.
d. = district. k. = king. m. = mountain. o. = official. s. = sect. v. = village.
The dynasties in brackets after the names of kings are given on first occurrence only in full, and then in abbreviated form.

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Arla, v. | 53 | Bālabēśvara, g. | 109 | Bhāṭṭarika | 164 |
| arms | 192ff. | Baladhiā, v. | 53 | Bhāṭṭārka | 28-9 |
| Arrian | 264 | Bal Rāthod | 11 | Bhavabhūti | 116-17 |
| arrows | 195 | Baldæus | 227 | bhayaḍa | 256 |
| Arunad Yavano Madhyamikām. | 266 | Bālēnduśōkhara, g. | 301 | Bhīma (East. Chal.) | 18 |
| Arutankūr, v. | 192 | Bālī | 37, 249, 252 | Bhīmaśukla, k. | 116 |
| Āya-Manjuśrimalatantra | 92 | Bāna | 57, 197 | Bhivandī | 184 |
| Āryam | 275-6 | Bārabhaṭṭa | 29 | Bhōḍika, o. | 248 |
| Asalbamitā | 254 | Banās, r. | 7 | Bhoja, k. | 11 |
| Asanapura, c. | 192 | Banawāsi, v. | 36n. | Bhijata | 37 |
| asha | 14 | Banqurijidri | 71 | Bhujagōndras | 103, 110 |
| Ashtapādha | 28 | bang'ls | 11 | Bhuktamānagata | 89 |
| Ashtasahasri, -kā | 28, 92 | Ban'-Mustaliq | 96 | Bhukti | 63, 65 |
| Asia, wife of Pharaoh | 93 | Banyans | 235 | Bhūmi-cchhītra-nyāya | 248 |
| Asie Centrale, par M. Abdoul | | Bappa | 80 | Bhūpā | 73, 76 |
| Kerim | 237 | Baratalika, v. | 217 | Bhushonabhaṭṭa | 29 |
| Asīlāpallika, v. | 71 | Barhāmpur, v. | 20 | Bhuvad, k. | 184 |
| Asita | 232-4 | Barnagar (Vadnagar), c. | 7 | Bhuvanaiko Malla, k. | 172 |
| Asmā bint Na'mān | 98 | Bassein | 185-4 | Bhu Vikrama | 172 |
| Asoka, k. and edicts, 141-5, 148, | | Bussia latifolia | 225 | Bhūyahs | 20 |
| 151, 154-60, 171, 201, 257, 262, 291 | | Basuri-saṅgha, s. | 213, 223 | Bīcha | 307 |
| Asraya | 192 | B-t-rimīa | 218, 220 | Bijagavita | 28 |
| Assyrian dress | 181 | Beames's Comparative Grammar | 87 | Bijāpur, c. | 121ff. |
| Astakampron | 53-4 | Beḍsa ins. | 254 | Bikāner, c. | 29 |
| Astrakhan, c. | 235 | Begur ins. | 173 | Bili-ūr, or Bāli-ūr, tablet | 102 |
| Āśvaka | 263 | Bejwāda, c. | 6 | Bimbisāra | 148 |
| Āśvamedha, 16, 33, 106, 161, 163, | | Belkanūr, v. | 103 | Bināfur | 207 |
| 186, 191, 211, 219, 244, 301 | | Beltane | 129 | Bindasāra, k. | 143, 154, 160 |
| Atālā Masjid | 297 | Belvola, d. | 218 | Bir Deva, k. | 89 |
| Attri | 244 | Beneyitavura, v. | 213 | lis | 282n. |
| Atys, k. | 229 | Bēpur | 44 | Bissām Kāṭāka, v. | 20 |
| Atzbeha, k. | 235 | Bergaigne's Les dieux souver- | | Bīṭha, Bīṭṭi (East. Chal.) | 185, 246 |
| Aurangzib | 24 | ais | 57 | Bīṭī | 250n. |
| Āvalōkīteśvara | 47, 197, 291 | Besnagar, c. | 253 | Bleek, A. H. | 208 |
| Avārāika | 239 | Bhādar, r. | 8 | Blochmann, H. | 268 |
| Avārāika-saṅghārāma | 6 | Bhadata Pātamita | 251 | Bodhi | 254, 256 |
| Avare bīyī lu | 290 | Bhadrinātha, g. | 298 | Bombay | 272 |
| Avasyasūtras | 29 | Bhāḍa | 302 | Boppa-siṅga | 246 |
| Avatāras | 237-8 | Bhagavān, g. | 162 | bīya, bīyā lu ... | 187, 183, 139n., 280 |
| Avinīta | 171-2 | Bhigovita Purāṇa | 232 | Brahmā, g. | 162, 200, 244 |
| Āvūr, v. | 40 | Bhigavall | 29 | Brahmapuri, v. | 307 |
| Avvaf | 221 | Bāgiwādi | 301 | Brāhui | 131, 293-5 |
| Axomites | 235 | Bhīṅga-kriyā | 35n., 38 | Brihaspati | 162 |
| Ayenār, g. | 264 | Bhāṅga-saṁskṛta | 34, 35n. | Brihat | 36 |
| Āyesa | 53 | bhaki | 222-3 | brihat-nalika | 136 |
| Āyōdhya, c. | 245, 297-8 | Bhāndak, c. | 6 | British Museum plates ... | 103, 209, 244 |
| Ayuktaka, o. | 243 | Bhandin | 197 | Bruce, P. H. | 235-6 |
| ayushman | 144 | Bharata | 302 | Buddha, 142, 145-6, 151, 153-4, 156, | |
| | | Bhāratigacchha | 23 | 179, 199-201, 225, 232-4 | |
| Bādāmi | 247, 290 | Bharoch | 61-2 | Buddha, k. | 161, 162 |
| Bādāmi tablets | 183, 209, 247 | Bharngacchha, Bharuga- | | Buddhavarmā (Early Chal.) | 241, |
| Bāderavāla | 171, 173-4 | chheva, c. | 64, 291 | 246-7, 249, 251-3 | |
| bādhd | 107, 302 | Bhāṭārka | 80 | Buddhism | 29 |
| Badhamāle, v. | 217 | Bhāṭgāon, c. | 89 | Buddhists | 2, 3 |
| Bāgavādī, v. | 307 | Bhāṭiya, k. | 139 | Budhasi | 9 |
| lagra | 136 | Bhāṭṭārka ... | 16, 107, 164, 187, 191, | Bukhārā | 238-9 |
| Bahirwāl, s. | 28 | | 302 | | |

- Bukka Rāya, k. 168
 burials 182
 Burnell, Dr. A. C. 223, 227
 Burying-ground at Munga-
 pettā 234
 Bussahir 135

 Canarese inscription 234
 Cardinal points 42
 Carpenter, Miss M. 208
 cat-worship 288
 Chaberis emporium 40
 Chaibāsa 46
 Chaitya 36, 103, 109, 110, 216
 chākhadī 52
 chakra 136
 Chakradhara, g. 187
 Chakravartin 187, 244
 Chālikya 161, 162, 210
 Chalkya 210
 Chalukya 164, 186, 210, 248
 Chulukya 192, 301
 Chulukya 17, 18, 103, 244
 Chūlukya 110, 210, 211, 219
 Chālukya-Bhima (East Chal.) 18
 Chālukyas 103, 110, 121
 Chalukyas, Early 5-7, 161, 209, 241,
 251
 Chalukyas, Eastern ... 15, 185, 191,
 308
 Chalukyas, Western 163, 217,
 300, 308
 Chalukya Mountain' 245
 Chanārs 86
 Champāvatī 183
 Chāmundi, g. 127
 Chānākya 32
 Chandan Parmār 11
 Chandarajja 153-5
 Chandavura, v. 216
 Chandrabhatti 78
 Chandraditya (Western Cha-
 lukya) 163-4, 218-9
 Chandragupta, k. 32, 149, 153-5,
 157, 160, 257, 262
 Chandrangi 259
 Chāndraprajñapti 28
 Chandrikāmbikā, g. 109, 192
 Chaonsat Yōginī 263
 Charandmuyoga 23
 Charaṇa, Tūttiriya 192
 Charaṇa, Vājasanāya 18, 250
 Charitrapura, c. 39, 40
 Chermakāra, g. 109
 Charu 38, 249
 chasa 255
 Chashtana 258, 261
 Chāturmāsya 37
 Chāturvidyā 249n
 Chaul, Chenwal 183-4, 234
 Chaundisaiṭṭi 307
 Chāvaḍas 48
 cheld 11
 Chentsu 130
 Chēras 5, 6, 21, 163, 215
 Chēram 287
 Chet Somanātha 47
 Chhatrapur 268
 Chheda 29
 Chhittadēva, k. 184
 China Kinnedi, d. 20
 chiranjivi 47
 Chitrakāṭṭha 210, 214, 219
 Chivalry in S. India 21
 Chobāri, v. 8
 Chōja 211
 Chōjas 301, 303
 Chōḍadēva (Chōla) 6, 39, 108, 111,
 172, 211, 215, 219
 Chotilā 9, 13
 Chikka-Bāgiwāḍi plates 303
 Chikka-Bāgiwāḍi 304
 Chikkadēva 307
 Chulds 11
 Chuḍāsamās 8-10, 14, 15
 charu 252
 Chryse 7
 Chu-li-ye (?) 6
 Chuwāl, d. 10, 11
 Chūtiā Nāgpur, d. 20, 46
 Clemens Alexandrinus 185
 'Conti Pomiglianesi' 202
 Contracted burials 182
 Copper-plates, Chōla 214
 Copper-plates, Early Chalukya
 161, 209, 241, 251
 Copper-plates, Eastern Cha-
 lukya 15, 185, 186, 191
 Copper-plates, Kadamba ... 33, 35, 37
 Copper-plates, Western Cha-
 lukya 163, 217, 300
 Copper-plates, Yādava 303
 Copperplate-grants 308
 Da Cunha's *Chul and Bassein* 183-4
 „ *Monuments of the*
English at Goa ... 236
 „ *Sahyādri Khaṇḍa* 208
 „ *Tooth-rod* 206
 Daṭṭaka 215
 Dadda, k. 61-5
 Dādupanthis 239
 Dāghestan, &c. 27, 235
 Dabithali 66
 Daityas 301
 Dakhap, Fab Hian's km. 1-7
 Dakhap 214, 258, 262
 Dukka, dakkī, dakke, dhakka... 215n
 dukkmas 180, 238
 Dakshināpatha 244
 Dāmān Gangā, r. 259
 Damaruka 117
 Damudā, r. 274
 Daṇḍa, l.m. 109
 Dānyāl Beg, k. 240
 Darmesteter, J. 57, 87
 dārāṇa 52
 Dāsaka 149-51, 153-8
 Daśaratha 143
 Dasnāmis 300
 Dasturs 179, 228, 263
 Dates, in numerical symbols 186,
 241-2, 251-2
 Dates, in numerical words ... 18
 Date, in words 18, 36, 33, 102,
 103, 108, 111, 112, 162, 164, 185,
 191, 192, 215, 218, 241-2, 251-2,
 303, 307
 Dattātreyā 9, 122, 238
 Dāvanavullī, v. 216
 ddyāda 159
 Days of the week, earliest use
 of 186
 De Gubernatis, M. 292
 Delhi, c. 28
 Delkontha, v. 189
 Della Tomba, M. 292
 Della Valle, P. 46-7
 Derabhata, k. 76, 80
 Dēsa 16, 105, 106, 244, 304
 Deśādihikārin, o. 304
 Dēsa-kāṭṭa, o. 109
 Desurakshitiṭṭa, v. 73
 Deṭaha 81
 De Tassy's (Garcin) *L'Islamisme* 119
 De Tassy, *Langue et Littéra-
 ture Hindoustani* 207
 De Tassy, G. 292
 Detroj, v. 10, 11
 Deūr 125
 Dēva, Dēvavarmā (Kadamba) 33-5
 Dēva-bhūga 37
 Dēva-bhūja 38
 Dēva-gaṇa, s. 108, 111, 112
 Dēvagiri plates 33, 35, 37
 Dēvalde 207
 devdampiye 142, 144-5, 148
 Devānāmpiya Tissa 149, 159
 devānappiya 144
 Deranūra 170-1, 174
 Deva-Panchāla, d. 7, 10
 Devasmitā 31

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------|--|---------------|--|---------------|
| Dhamadka, v. | 47 | <i>Doddosangi</i> | 29 | Gaṅgādikar | 267 |
| Dhamek Stūpa | 298 | Dvārakā, c. | 259 | Gaṅgākūṇḍa | 173 |
| ghan | 14 | <i>Eastern Legends, &c.</i> , by N. Powlett | 236 | Gaṅgarārhi, Gaṅgavādī, d. | 172-3 |
| <i>Dhanada</i> , g. | 249 | Etihal Khāchar | 13, 14 | Gaṅgavādī | 267 |
| Dhangar custom | 46 | Eclipses, lunar... 19, 186, 211, 215 | | Gaṅgodaram | 21 |
| <i>dhana</i> | 136 | Eclipses, solar | 192, 218 | Gānjām | 21 |
| Dhāranīkoṭa | 21 | Edevolal (?), c. or v. | 303 | Garibnātha | 48-51 |
| <i>Dhārd-pūrvaka</i> | 304 | Elēla-Singan | 221 | Gauḍa | 197 |
| Dharapatṭa | 66 | Ellis's Essay on the Mala-yāḥma Language | 274-87 | Gaurī, g. | 245 |
| Dharasena, k. 54, 63, 68, 70-1, 73, 76 | | Eluttachchan | 283, 286, 287 | Gautama | 222 |
| Dhārāvarsha (Rāshṭrakūṭa)... | 210 | Emblems on seals 15, 33, 37, 161, 163, 186, 191, 209, 217, 245, 301, 303 | | <i>Gavyūtī</i> , l.m. | 111 |
| Dhari, v. | 10 | Endalūru (?), v. | 19 | Geldner and Geiger | 30 |
| <i>dharmachakra</i> | 233 | English at Goa | 236 | <i>Gesta Romanorum</i> | 31 |
| <i>Dharma-mahārāja</i> ... 34, 37, 104, 105 | | Equinox | 164 | <i>Ghaisa</i> | 305, 306 |
| Dharmanātha | 47-53 | Ereyya (Chālukya) | 103, 110 | <i>Ghaisāsa</i> | 305 |
| Dharinarāja, g. | 127 | Ereyanga, k. | 171-2 | <i>Ghalisa</i> | 305, 306 |
| Dharmāsoka | 153-4 | Ērwad or Herbad | 179 | Ghṛitālaya, d. | 76 |
| <i>Dhātupāṭha</i> | 57 | Estevas, T. | 117-8 | Ghuzia bint Jābar | 98 |
| Dhīnodhar | 47, 49-53 | eyebrows | 86 | Gilaka | 66 |
| Dhokaltā, v. | 8 | Fahian | 1-7, 149 | Girnārgadh | 9 |
| Dhūlkher | 122 | Fātima | 93, 94 | Girnār ins. | 144 |
| <i>dhōḷ</i> | 181 | Fātima bint Zahāk | 98 | Goa | 236 |
| Dhrūbhata, Dhruvabhata, k. 79-81 | | Ferishtah | 24 | <i>Godavery District</i> , by H. Morris | 237 |
| Dhruvasena, k. 54, 66, 73, 76 | | firearms | 136, 231, 239 | Goderi, v. | 20 |
| Dhundhan, v. | 8 | Fire-treading | 126ff. | Gokarna, c. | 259, 275 |
| Dhundho Rākshasa | 8 | Firūzu'd-dīn, k. | 239 | Gomateśvara | 172 |
| Dhundnimall | 48 | Foucaux's <i>Mālavikā et Agnimitra</i> | 60 | Gomti, r. | 11 |
| Dibong, r. | 46 | Foucaux, Ph. Ed. | 225 | Gonḍa, k. | 215 |
| Digambara Jainas | 23-9 | Fraser's <i>Journal in the Himala Mountains</i> | 124-5 | <i>Gopuras</i> | 7 |
| <i>Dipavāṁśa</i> | 149-52, 155-6 | Fudō Sama | 179 | Gorakh-Maḥṭī, v. | 47 |
| Diptasvāmin | 57 | Future State | 273-4 | Gorakshanātha... 47, 49, 89, 90, 298, 299, 300 | |
| <i>disā</i> | 65 | <i>gachhas</i> | 28 | Gorakhpanthis | 299 |
| <i>Ditya</i> | 248 | Gadhasing | 48 | Gorakhapur | 47 |
| Doganlu inscrip. | 228-9 | Gadhrā, v. | 7 | Gōrkhās | 89 |
| <i>do-jibh</i> | 21 | <i>gammadion</i> | 179 | Gōrkhālis | 47 |
| Dolkha | 89 | <i>gāmūṇḍa</i> | 171 | Gotamiputra | 258 |
| <i>dosha</i> | 65 | <i>gana</i> | 108, 111, 112 | Gōtra, Agastya | 218, 220, 306 |
| Douglas's <i>Life of Jenghiz Khan</i> | 140 | Gaṇādhipati, g. | 306 | " Atrēya | 305, 306 |
| Dowson's <i>History of India</i> ... | 182 | Gaṇa Deva, k. | 172 | " Bhāradvāja 18, 189, 190, 250, 252, 305, 306 | |
| <i>Drasyānuvyaḍ</i> | 23 | Gandhāra | 7 | " Daundakiya | 250, 252 |
| Draupadī | 127, 137-8 | Gaṅga or Chera grants ... 163, 172 | | " Dhūmrāyana | 250 |
| Drāviḍa, d. | 39, 40 | Gaṅgā, r. ... 108, 214, 215, 219, 245 | | " Gautama | 190, 250, 305 |
| Drāviḍian | 130-2 | Gaṅga-Kandarpa (Ga.) 101, 108, 110, 112 | | " Gōtama | 306 |
| Drāviḍian Element in Sindhi. 293 | | Gaṅga-Permāḍi (Ga.) | 109 | " Hārīta | 250, 305, 306 |
| Drew, Rev. W. H. | 221 | Gaṅgas 101, 102, 108, 112, 245, 247, 303 | | " Jāmadagnya | 306 |
| Drinṭhamapūṇḍi (?), v. | 19 | | | " Kāṇva | 189 |
| Duddā | 66 | | | " Kanvāyana | 107 |
| Duperron, Anq. | 276n. | | | " Kāśyapa... 162, 190, 192, 250, 305, 306 | |
| Durānis | 238-9 | | | " Kāśyapāyana | 252 |
| Durgasakti (Sēndra) | 103, 110 | | | " Kaundilya | 189, 190 |
| <i>dūrgā</i> | 189 | | | " Kaundinya | 250, 306 |
| Durvinīta | 171 | | | " Kauśika | 190, 305, 306 |
| Dōśa | 68 | | | " Lakshmana | 250 |
| <i>Dātaka</i> , o. 71, 73, 76, 81, 249, 251n., 252-3 | | | | " Mādhara | 250 |
| Dutt, Miss Toru | 208 | | | | |
| Duṭṭhagāmini | 149, 158 | | | | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <i>Gotra Mānavya</i> 17, 34, 36, 38, 110,
162, 164, 189, 192, 214,
219, 245, 249, 251, 301 | Halwad, d. 10, 12, 14 | Ibrāhīm Ādil Shāh, k. 124 |
| „ <i>Mandugalya</i> 305 | Hamirji, k. 50 | Ibrāhīm Khān Gārdi 182 |
| „ <i>Mūka</i> 306 | Hanatgi, v. 126 | Ibrāhīm Rozah 124 |
| „ <i>Rathītara</i> 305 | Hanūmān 215 | Ibrāhīm Shāh Sharki 297 |
| „ <i>Śāṇḍila</i> 250 | Hara, g. 18 | Idar, c. 14 |
| „ <i>Śāṇḍīlya</i> 305, 306 | <i>haram</i> 94, 96-8, 100 | Ikkeri 46-7 |
| „ <i>Śaunaka</i> 306 | Haravars, s. 127 | Ilāo plates 61-2, 242, 252 |
| „ <i>Śrī-Vatsa</i> 305, 306 | Harēshapura (?), c. 303 | <i>illam</i> 282-3 |
| „ <i>Vaishnava</i> 250, 252 | Hari, g. 306 | Iltūzar Beg, k. 240 |
| „ <i>Vasishṭha</i> 305, 306 | Haridatta (?) 252-3 | <i>Iluppai-maram</i> 225 |
| „ <i>Vasishṭha-Maitrāva-</i>
<i>ruṇā-Kaundīnya</i> ... 305 | Haridattavarmā, k. 90 | Indi, v. 125 |
| „ <i>Vatsa</i> 164, 250 | Harihar 301 | <i>India, History of</i> , by Elliot and
Dowson 182 |
| „ <i>Vāteya</i> 303 | Harihar plates 300, 301 | <i>India and the Indians</i> , by Mon.
Williams 236 |
| „ <i>Vishnuviddha</i> 305 | Harihara, g. 264 | Indra, g. 42, 189, 200, 222, 249 |
| „ <i>Viśvāmitra</i> 306 | Harihara plates 168ff. | Indra (East: Chal.) ... 17, 189, 192 |
| <i>Gōtrīya</i> 305 | Hari-jana, s. 288 | Indravati, c. 12 |
| <i>Govardhan</i> 263 | Harikṛishna 288 | Indukānti, c. 247 |
| <i>Gōvinda, Gōvinda-Prabhūta-</i>
<i>varsha (Rāsh.)</i> 210, 218 | Harisimbadeva, k. 91 | insurance 137 |
| <i>Govind Singh</i> 58 | Hārīti 36, 38, 162, 164, 189, 192 | Irān 27 |
| <i>Grahavarmā, k.</i> 197 | Hārīti 17, 110, 214, 245, 249, 251 | Isirakhita 255 |
| <i>Grāma devatas</i> 126 | Hārīti 9, 301 | <i>Isām</i> 119 |
| <i>Grāma-kūta, o.</i> 109, 248n. | Harivarmā (Ga.) ... 83, 90, 101, 102,
108, 170, 172, 175 | Īśvara, g. 219, 287 |
| <i>Grāma-mahātara, o.</i> 248 & n. | Harsha-deva, k. 91 | <i>Iter Persicum</i> 30 |
| <i>Grantham</i> 275-6 | Harsha, Harshavardhana, k. 57,
164, 196ff., 219, 291, 301 | <i>Itihāsa</i> 28 |
| <i>Graul, Dr.</i> 221 | Harsha-Vikramāditya 201 | Itiopjawan (Ethiopians) 235 |
| <i>Gudrahāra, d.</i> 192 | Hassan, c. 44 | Ittāge, v. 218 |
| <i>Guhajēsvari, g.</i> 89 | Hassān 48 | 'Iwaz Beg, k. 240 |
| <i>Guhasena, k.</i> 66-8, 70 | Hastakavapra, Hāthab, v. ... 53 | Jādav Rāi 8 |
| <i>Gujjara, d.</i> 263 | <i>Hathadīptka</i> 299 | Jādejās 13, 48-9 |
| <i>Gunagāṅka-Vijayāditya (East.</i>
<i>Chal.)</i> 18 | Hemachandra 267 | <i>Jagadēka-dāsa</i> 246 |
| <i>Gunakāmadēvavarmā</i> 90, 91 | Herbads 179, 228, 263 | <i>Jagad Guru</i> 124 |
| <i>gundashṭakam</i> 235 | <i>Hidayat-ul Islam</i> 120 | Jagadeva 11 |
| <i>Gundi-Koliak, v.</i> 54 | Himalayan Polyandry 132-5 | Jagannāth 113-15, 264 |
| <i>gunpowder</i> 136 | <i>Hindoo Pilgrims</i> by M. A. Sher-
ring 236 | Jāhnavā 107 |
| <i>Guptas</i> 89 | Hipargi, v. 125 | Jaina, g. 35 |
| <i>Gūrjaras</i> 62, 108, 247 | Hiranya 201 | Jaiminiya Śākhā 30 |
| <i>Gurjaro Kaleh</i> 228 | Hirē-Bāgēvādī 304 | Jainas 20, 28-9, 43, 195, 221 |
| <i>Guyard's Théorie métrique</i>
<i>Arabe</i> 57 | Hissarlik relics 119, 178 | Jainas, Digambara 28-9 |
| <i>Gwalior</i> 28 | Hiwen Thsang 7, 9, 15, 39, 40, 57,
80, 196ff., 290 | Jainabadhri 28 |
| <i>Habshi</i> 183 | Ho custom 45-6 | Jaina pagoda 224-7 |
| <i>Hafiz by Bicknell</i> 87 | Hōs 20 | Jainendra's <i>Grammar</i> 29 |
| <i>Hafsa</i> 95, 98 | Hobēsvara, g. ? 110 | Jaitugi (Yādava) 306 |
| <i>Haiga</i> 275 | Holi 129 | Jambūsara, v. 241, 250, 252 |
| <i>Haihayas</i> 303 | Holiyars 267 | Janakpur, c. 89 |
| <i>Hajira</i> 94, 98-9 | Horsburgh's <i>Sailing Directory</i> . 224 | Jang Bahādur 208 |
| <i>Hālabid</i> 44 | Horti, v. 125 | Jangams, s. 46-7 |
| <i>Hālā Jām</i> 10 | Hoysala Ballālas 172-3 | Japanese Archaeology 181 |
| <i>Hale Wakligas</i> 267 | Huvvalli, v. 304, 307 | <i>Japu-ji</i> 58-9 |
| <i>Hali Gaṅgādīkar</i> 267 | hypæthral temple 19, 137, 268 | Jarāsā 257 |
| <i>Halle Makkalu</i> 267 | Ibn' Hakim, k. 235 | Jasdan, v. 9 |
| | Ibrāhīm 98 | Jaswantsingh, k. 10, 12 |
| | | Jats 49, 86 |
| | | <i>jatis</i> 28 |
| | | Jaunpur 297 |

- Java 7
 Jayabhata, k. 61, 63-4
 Jayadaman 258, 261
 Jayadeva, k. 90
 Jayaditya 56
 Jayagupta, k. 89
 Jayapida 56-7
 Jayapur, c. 28
 Jayaprakāśamalla, k. 92
 Jayasamkara, k. 290
 Jayasekara, Jayasekara, k. 290, 293
 Jaya-simha 246
 Jayasimha, Jayasimha-Vallabha
 (Early Chal.) 209, 214, 241,
 246-9, 251-2
 Jayasimha, Jayasimha-Vallabha
 (East. Chal.) 17, 189, 192, 243-4,
 247
 Jayatesvara-potaraia, k. 219
 Jenghiz Khan 182, 140, 240
 Jesuits 224
 Jethsur Khochar 9, 10
 Jhalawar, d. 14
 Jhobala, v. 10
 Jina, g. 107, 110, 111, 215
 Jina Bodhisattva 291
 Jindlaya 104, 111
 Jinapati, g. 110
 Jinendra, g. 38, 108, 110, 215
 Jinendrabuddhi 57
 Jndtdharmakatha 29
 Jnatiputra 148
 Jodhpur, c. 53
 Jogadh 21
 Jogamula 28
 Jomattasdra 28
 Jotipadraka, v. 68
 Jotishasdra 28
 Junagadh, c. 14
 Junagadh insc. 257
 Junagadh (Kharon) 20
 Juwairiya 96, 98-9
 Jyeshthalinga, g. 109, 110

 Kabir 58-9, 308
 Kabir-panthis 299, 308
 Kabul 238
 Kachha 47, 259, 262
 Kadambas 5, 6, 33-38, 111, 245, 247
 Kadambas 246
 Kāgāmāsi, v. 303
 Kaiyar-nāma-i-Hind 207
 Kaipalle 282
 Kaira plates 241-251
 Kaiyata 56
 Kajanghelé-Niyangamé 199
 Kajiūgara, Kujingas 199
 Kajūghira, d. 199
 Kākōpala 215
 Kākustha, Kākusthavarmā (Kad.)
 33, 35, 36
 Kāladi 282
 Kālāhāndi, d. 20
 Kalambhras (P) 303
 Kalanos 264
 Kālāsoka 153-5, 157, 159
 Kālasti 41
 Kālayāngā, v. 38
 Kālī 41
 Kālī, g. 9, 116, 264
 Kālīdāsa 115ff.
 Kālikya, Kālukya 251-2
 Kālindī, r. 108
 Kalinga 215
 Kālī-Vallabha (Rāsh.) ... 17n, 210
 Kālī-Vikrama (West. Chal.) ... 17n.
 Kālīviruttam 284
 Kālī-Vishnuvardhana (East.
 Chal.) 17
 Kāliyuga 204
 Kalkonte 174
 Kalsa-puja 115
 Kalvatogru, v. 18
 Kalyāna 9, 184
 kamba, l. m. 307
 Kamran Shāh, k. 239
 Kanait 135
 Kanaka, k. 8
 Kanakōpala 215
 Kanara 275
 Kanāwar 134-5
 Kāñchi, c. 5-7, 39, 40, 111, 219, 220,
 301
 Kāñchipura, c. 39, 40
 Kandeya insc. 173
 Kandhara, Kandhāra (Yā.) ... 303
 Kāñdgru, v. 19
 Kanhara, Kanhāra (Yā.) 303, 307, 308
 Kāñji Rāt 10, 11
 Kāñjōl 199
 Kannara 303
 Kāñphātās, s. 47-53, 298-300
 Kanthadnātha, g. 53
 Kanthkot 53
 Kāñtipur 68, 91
 Kanyākūbjā, c. 63, 65, 184, 199
 Kapila 222
 Kapilar 221
 Kapilavastu 232
 Karandnuyoga 28
 Karandige, v. 216
 Karangi, c. 28
 Karāñjapatra, v. 303
 Kardama, v. 112
 Kardī 131
 Karenād 170-1
 Karhād 256
 Karimū'd-dīn Khān 122-3
 Karkōtaka 89
 Kārī 224
 Karmarāshtra, d. 189
 Karmaśésvara, g. 109
 Karna 11
 Karnasuvāna, d. 197
 Karnāta 171
 Karnūl, d. 128
 Kārtavīrya (Rajta) 210
 Kārttikēya, g. ... 110, 164, 189, 192,
 214, 219, 301
 Karvasurigoja, v. 303
 Kāsākūla, d. 250, 252
 Kāsara, v. 73
 Kāsi, c. 22
 Kāsikāvritti 56
 Kāsyapa Buddha 2
 Kātaka-rāja 19
 Kathāsaritasāgara ... 31-2, 67, 232
 Kāthmāñdā 88
 Kātu, g. 42
 Kausikī, g. 17, 245
 Kauthuma 30, 68
 Kāveripattanam 40
 Kawād Rāi 8, 9
 Keikādī 130
 Kēraja 275, 281-2, 285
 Kēralas 111, 215, 219, 301, 303
 Kēralotpatti 275, 281-2, 285-6
 Kesari, k. 172
 Kesavamitra 73, 76
 Khāchars 9, 10, 12
 Khādija 93, 97-9
 khadun 14
 Khāfi Khān 271
 Khaibar 93, 96
 Khajuraho 268
 Khandapālita 253-4
 Khandarwāl, s. 28
 Khanda-sphuṭa-jīva-ōddhura . 35n.
 Khāndhiās 180, 228
 Khāragraha 73, 76
 Khāula bint Hakim 97
 Khawailid 93
 Khēdā plates 62, 241-251
 Khēda 264, 288
 Khengār, k. 50
 Khetaka 71, 73, 76, 81
 Khetaji Jhālā 10
 Khiva 238, 240
 Khokand 238, 240
 Khonds 20
 Khopodēsi (Bhātgaon), c. 89

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------|--------------------|--|-----------------|
| Khudayar Beg, k. | 239 | Krishna, Krishnavarmā (Kad.) | 33-5, 175 | Lākhā Phulāni | 11 |
| Khuddasvāmī (?) | 251, 253 | Krishna (Ya.) | 303 | Lākhiār Virā | 49, 50 |
| Khunais | 95 | Krishnambhaṭṭa | 56 | Lakshmēśwar, v. | 101 |
| Khurasān | 238 | Kṛitāṅga | 29 | Lakshmēśwar tablets 33, 101, 111 | |
| Khuzaima | 95 | Kshaharāta | 253 | Lakshmi | 65 |
| Kiggaṭṇād tablets | 102, 103 | Kshapanaka, s. | 34n. | Lalita Vistara | 232 |
| Kināna bin Rabi' | 96 | Kshatrapas | 259, 261-2 | Langhā | 50 |
| Kin'asha | 179 | Kshatriya | 249 | Lattivāda, v. | 217 |
| Kinayige, v. | 216 | Kshirasvāmin | 57 | Lazzaretti, D. | 288 |
| Kinnara-pāśāṇa | 105, 107 | Kuber-bhaktas | 238 | Leśudaka | 68 |
| Kinnari-kshētra | 106 | Kubja-Vishnupardhana (East. | | Limbdi, v. | 10 |
| Kirātis | 89 | Chal.) | 6, 17, 185, 245 | Limbua | 89 |
| Kirāta | 290 | Kudā insc. | 253-7 | Lingānūśāsana | 57 |
| Kirttirāja, Kirttivarṃā (Early | | Kudni, v. | 10 | Liṅgavants, s. | 46 |
| Chal.) | 241n. | Kuhundi, d. | 209, 210, 215, 307 | Lōkamahādēvi (East Chal.) ... | 18 |
| Kirttivarṃā (Early Chal.) 110, 164, | | Kukka Shasti | 42 | Lōka-mātri...15, 106, 163, 186, 191, | |
| 185, 191, 192, 209, 218, 219 | | Kukkaṭa | 53 | 211, 219, 301 | |
| 241n., 245, 253, 302 | | Kukura, d. | 262-3 | Lomā | 13 |
| Kirū-Kāgāmāsi, v. | 303 | Kulābā | 234 | Lunāvādā plates | 81 |
| Kisavoja, c. | 218, 220 | Kulaipa | 263 | | |
| Kittūr | 290 | Kulōttuṅga-Chōḍadēva (Chō.) | 211, | | |
| Kia-che-lo | 263 | | 308 | | |
| Kōchrē, or Kōchrēm, plates ... | 163 | Kulu | 135 | macaronic verse | 284 |
| Kodun Tamil | 276-87 | Kumāra, g. | 18, 245 | Machchhindranātha | 90 |
| Kohi | 256 | Kumārāpāla, k. | 8 | Madanpur | 20 |
| Kokkili (East. Chal.) | 17 | Kumārārāja | 198-9 | Madhariputra, k. | 258 |
| Kōls | 20 | Kumāri Cape | 1 | Mādhava, g. | 304, 307 |
| Kolāhala | 172 | Kumārila | 232 | Mādhava, Mādhava-Kōṅgani- | |
| Kōlālapura (Kolār) | 171-3 | Kumbakonam | 40 | varṃā (Ga.) 33, 101, 102, 107, | |
| Kōlōluttu | 275-6 | Kumbayija, v. | 216 | 170, 172, 175 | |
| Kolhāpur, c. | 29 | Kumbet, v. | 228 | Mādhava Brahmins | 43 |
| Kollabhiṅgaṇḍa-Vijayāditya (East. | | Kupāla | 159 | Mādhavabhaṭṭa | 63, 65-6 |
| Chal.) | 15, 18 | Kundaśakti (?) (Sēndra) .. | 103, 110 | Madhyamikām, c. | 266-7 |
| Koluttuṅga Vira Chōla | 40 | Kundivātaka, v. | 161, 162 | Madina | 94-5, 99, 100 |
| Kōmarāñche, v. | 216 | Kungusāt dynasty | 240 | Madurā, c. | 22, 39, 42, 221 |
| Kōṅgani-varṃā | 101, 107 | Kūpa-rājyam | 275 | Magadha | 199 |
| Kōṅgani, k. | 171-2, 175-6 | Kūrchaka, s. | 34n. | Mahābalēśvar | 288 |
| Kōṅgaru | 267 | Kurds | 128 | Mahābhārata | 32 |
| Kōṅgani-varṃā | 102 | Kurraḷ | 220-24 | Mahābhārata— | |
| Kōṅgira Holiya | 267 | Kurtakōṭi, v. | 218 | i. 3077 | 308 |
| Kōngu, d. | 39 | Kurtakōṭi plates | 217 | ii. 2845 and 1945 | 292 |
| Kōngu dynasty | 101, 102, 112 | Kurumbars | 20 | iii. 25 | 308 |
| Kōṅgudēsa-charitra | 102 | Kurupakeṛe, v. | 303 | iii. 14649-14721 | 137 |
| Kōṅguli Varmā | 173 | Kūrutakūṇṭe, v. | 218 | iv. 4494-4637 | 203 |
| Kōṅguli-varṃā | 101, 108 | Kuśasthali, c. | 259 | v. 3313 and 4348 | 292 |
| Kōṅkanas, d. | 161, 162, 219 | Kāṭa, o. | 16, 18, 109, 248n. | x. 178 f. | 292 |
| Kōṅkanahalli, Kōṅkanapura, c. | 39 | Kāṭhas | 238 | xii. 4167, 4217, 4225, 4421. 308 | |
| Kōṅkani lang. | 118 | Kāṭhā | 193-4, 196 | xii. 5906 | 292 |
| Kōrkei | 21 | Kuvēra, g. | 9, 42, 287 | Mahābhāshya | 54-6 |
| Kosala, d. | 6 | | | Mahābhōja | 253-6 |
| Kotā Sāṅgāni, v. | 13 | | | Mahāmāllapuram | 6, 7 |
| Koṭesar | 53 | | | Mahāmsiṭha sūtra | 29 |
| Kōṭgaḍh | 133, 135 | | | Mahāprasāda | 113ff. |
| Kōṭūr tablet | 102 | | | Mahārāja 16, 33, 34, 37, 104-7, 163, | |
| Kramita | 305 | | | 164, 185-7, 191, 211, 219, 220, 301, 302 | |
| Krishnā, r. | 1, 5, 6 | | | Mahārāshtra | 290 |
| Krishna | 137-8 | | | Mahāsandhi-vigraha-ddhikṛita, o. 249, | |
| | | | | 252 | |
| | | | | Mahā-sandhivigraha, o. | 302 |

- Mahāsēna, g. 17, 34, 36, 38, 162, 245, 249, 251
 Mahāsenapura 172, 176
 Mahattara, o. 248 & n.
 Mahāvamsa 142, 148
 Mahāvira 142-3, 214
 Mahāyājña 65, 249n.
 mahā-yantra 136
 Mahēndra, g. 18, 215
 Mahēndrapratāpa, k. 219
 Mahēśvara, g. 18, 189, 202
 Mahika (Mapika) 256
 Mahilābali, v. 81
 Mahinda 149-51, 158-8
 Māhishmati, c. 259
 Mahmud Shāh, k. 239
 Maimūna bint Hārith 97-8
 Makka 93, 99
 Makwānā Kāna 14
 Malaiika bint Qa'b 98
 Malakūṭa, d. 39-40
 Mālārā, d. 259
 Malavas 303
 Mālavikā et Agnimitra 60
 Malayas, d. 39
 Malayāḥma lang. 275-87
 Malidata 256
 Malla, Mallisattī 304, 307
 Malla Vāja 170-2, 174
 Mallōhalli plates 33, 101, 102
 Māmakavejiya 255
 Mammata 56
 Mandākini, r. 60, 108
 Maṇḍala 302
 maṇḍalika 11
 Māna-deva, k. 90, 91
 Mandava 253-6
 Māṇḍavi, v. 48, 50
 Māndhava, m. 9
 Manes, k. 229
 Maṅgala, Maṅgalīśa, Maṅga-
 līśvara (Early Chal.) 161, 182,
 185, 209, 246
 Maṅgali, v. 216
 Maṅgi (East. Chal.) 17
 Maṅgit dynasty 239
 Maṇḍras 11
 Maṇipravāḥam 284, 287
 Manjuśrī 89
 mānki 46
 Manku Khān 132
 Manphariyo, v. 53
 Mansūr (Shāh) 87
 Mānya 216
 Maqauqas 97
 Mārasimha, Mārasimhadēva (Ga.)
 33, 101, 102, 103, 108, 112
 Mariam Qabti (Mary the Copt) 93,
 95, 97
 Marshman, J. C. 208
 Maru, d. 259, 262
 Marudēvi, g. 109
 Marupaḍuva (?), v. 19
 Māsa, Āśhādha 307
 „ Āśrayuja 164
 „ Chaitra 189, 191
 „ Jyāishtha 218
 „ Kārttika... 36, 162, 185, 303
 „ Māgha 111, 112
 „ Mārgaśirsha 18
 „ Phālguna 112, 191
 „ Pushya 290
 „ Śrāvana 186
 „ Vaiśākha 215, 218, 250, 252
 Masons' Marks 295
 masks 26, 160
 Mātāṅgasadrīśa 290
 Mathal, v. 53
 Mather, Dr. R. C. 208
 Mātṛi-gaṇa 33, 35, 37, 244
 Mātṛigupta 201
 Matsyendranātha 47, 299
 Marco Polo 132
 Ma-twan-lin 201
 Mauryas 142, 144, 247
 Māvana-siṅga 246
 Mayilāpār 221
 Meḍas 254
 Meḍapāta, Mewād 254
 Meghavāls, s. 51
 Mēguṭi tablet 103, 185, 209, 210,
 247
 mētkar 13
 Mena 299
 Menilek, k. 235
 Merta, c. 29
 Merkāra plates 33, 101, 102
 Mesha 229-30
 Mhowa tree 225
 Miājal Khāchar 9, 10
 Michā Khān, k. 92
 Midas, k. 229
 Mill, Col. Jas. 272
 Miraj plates 103, 185, 247
 Mir Kāsim 271
 misam 142
 Mobeds 179, 228
 Mod 53
 Moggaliputta 153-5, 157
 Mōksha mahā parishad 198
 Morasu Holiyars 267
 Morris's Godavery district 237
 Mottoes on seals 15, 185, 186, 191,
 245n., 246
 moustache 9
 Mrānumi (?), v. 189
 Mrigēśa, Mrigēśavarmā, Mrī-
 gēśavaravarmā (Kad.) 35-38
 Muāvia 97
 Mudivēmu, v. 245
 Muḍra Rākshasa 32, 231
 Muḍubidri 225
 Muḍugala, v. 307
 Mughatkhan-Hubballi, v. 304
 Muḡūli, v. 218
 Mugupālita 256-7
 Muhammad 300
 Muhammad's wives 93ff.
 Muhammad Amīu Beg, k. ... 240
 Muhammad Rahim Beg ... 239-40
 Muhammad Toghlik 9
 Muharram 128-9
 Mukta-mukta 136
 Mukkara-vasati, t. 109
 Mukundasena, k. 91
 Mulāchāra 28
 Mula Devara Chālukya 122
 Mūla-gaṇa, s. 215
 Mūlarāja, k. 61
 Mūla-saṅgha, s. 28, 111, 112
 Mūlasūtras 29
 Muḡgunda, v. 218
 Mulu Nāgājan 9-13
 Mūnda custom 45-6
 Mungapeṭṭā burying-ground. 234
 Mungipur Pātana, c. 8
 Munōli tablet 218
 Murād Beg, k. 240
 Murād Uzbek 240
 Munroe's Dānapatra 290
 Mūshika-rājyam 275-6, 285
 Mushkara, k. 172
 Mutasiva 149, 153, 158
 mūtrarekha 261
 Muzaffaru'd-din, k. 240
 Mykōne 26
 Nacoleia 228
 Nādir Shāh, k. 239
 Nafsbakhshī 98
 Nāgas 21, 34, 40, 89, 103, 257
 Nāga deity 8
 Nāga well at Banāras... .. 298
 Nāgadāsa 153, 156-7
 Nāga-kovil 42
 Nāgama, k. 22
 Nāgamāṇḍala 43
 Nāgamaṅgala plates ... 33, 101, 102
 Nāganikā 254
 Nāgapura, v. 109
 Nāgar, c. 28

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| Nāg Brād..... | 29 | Nepāl, Wright's <i>History of</i> ... | 88 | Pāligārs | 22, 25 |
| Nagnātas | 28 | Nērilgīre (P), v. | 303 | palimpsest | 251 |
| Nahapāna | 258 | Nerār plates | 161, 163 | Pāliyamapathadigirikā (P) v. P | 164 |
| <i>Nakshatra</i> , Bharanī | 290 | Newārs | 89, 91 | Pallavas 5-7, 21, 39, 219, 245, 247, | 257, 263, 301, 302, 303 |
| „ Māgha | 191 | Nigūḍa, v. | 63, 65 | Pallivāḍa (P), v. | 192 |
| „ Meitra | 18 | Nilgiri cairns | 289 | Pāmbu-pārer | 42 |
| „ Pūrvashādhā | 307 | Nimika, k. | 90 | Pāmpār, v. | 56 |
| „ Riksha | 218 | Nirānjan Nirākār | 47 | Pāṃṇunidu (P), v. | 189 |
| „ Rōhini | 164, 218 | Nirgrantha, s. | 28, 34n., 38 | Panchāla, d. | 7-11, 13 |
| „ Uttarābhadrapada. | 36 | Nirgrantha Jñātīputra | 143 | <i>Pāñcha-mahāśabda</i> | 191, 211, 244 |
| Nūlas | 247 | Nirgunda | 172 | <i>Pāñcha-mahāyājña</i> | 249n. |
| Nūlanda | 199 | nirmama | 28 | <i>Panchatantra</i> | 32, 116 |
| <i>nalika-yānta</i> | 136 | Niruthi, g. | 42 | Pandarīgavallī, v. | 216 |
| Nāmādeva | 59 | <i>Nirvāṇa</i> | 142, 146, 148, 160, 233 | <i>Pāṇḍava kūji</i> | 27 |
| Namburis | 285-7 | Nishāḍa, d. | 262-3 | Pāṇḍya, d. | 23 |
| Names (personal) | 165ff. | Nishadha, d. | 263 | Pāṇḍyas 39, 111, 215, 219, 301, 303 | |
| Nānak | 58-9 | <i>nishkram</i> | 147 | Pāṇḍharpur, c. | 59 |
| Nandā, g. | 245 | Nisītha | 29 | Pāṇḍurāja | 153 |
| Nandas | 156 | Nittakalā, v. | 303 | Pāṇḍuvāsa | 156 |
| Nanda-deva, k. | 90 | <i>Nivartana</i> , l.m. 36, 109, 110, 111, | 216, 217 | <i>Pani-mukta</i> | 136 |
| Nandagiri | 172 | Niyuktaka, o. | 248n. | Panjāb | 86 |
| Nandigachha | 28 | Nonaba | 267 | Panna | 268 |
| Nandigāma, v. | 19 | Numerical symbols 186, 241, 251, | 252, 253 | Pantiganage, v. | 216 |
| Nāndinige, v. | 217 | Numerical words | 18 | Paralūra, v. | 36 |
| Nāndipuri, c. | 62, 252 | Nuvākot, c. | 92 | <i>Parama-bhāḡavata</i> | 161 |
| <i>Nandi sātra</i> | 29 | <i>Nyāsa</i> of Jinendrabuddhi | 57 | <i>Parama-bhaṡṡdraka</i> ...16, 107, 219 | |
| Nandwāḍige tablet | 210 | <i>Oghad</i> | 52 | <i>Parama-brahmaṇya</i> | 16, 161 |
| Nannavāsāpaka (P) | 251-3 | Omkananātha | 47 | <i>Parama-māhāśvara</i> | 187 |
| Nānya deva, k. | 91 | Orāon custom | 46 | <i>Paramēsvara</i> 16, 104, 105, 106, 107, | 164, 219, 220 |
| Nārada, g. | 287 | Orissa | 113 | Paramhaṇsa, s. | 299-300 |
| Narakāgāhara (P), v. or d. ... | 164 | <i>Ormazd and Ahriman</i> , by Dar- | mesteter | Paranti, v. | 218 |
| Narasimha, g. 122-3 | k. P 219 | mesteter | 57 | Paraśurāman | 281, 285, 302 |
| Naravara-Senāpati | 38 | orthography | 211, 218 | Pariahs | 267 |
| Nārāyaṇa, g. 17, 110, 164, 189, 192, | 214, 219, 244-5, 301 | Ostā | 179 | <i>Paribhāḡśās</i> | 55 |
| Nārāyaṇamitra | 73, 76 | <i>ovaraka</i> | 256 | Paribrajakas, s. | 300 |
| Nārāyaṇa Yādava | 122 | Paḍaṅkalūru, v. | 15, 19 | <i>Parihāra, parihāra</i> 17, 36, 107, 302 | |
| Narbhūpāla, k. | 91 | <i>pād-dmūḡhyāta</i> ...16, 161, 187, 244, | 248, 251 | Parimēlaragar | 221 |
| Nar Būta Beg | 240 | <i>pād-dvānata</i> | 252 | Parināma | 288 |
| <i>Narendra-mrigardja</i> | 16, 17 | <i>Padmānanda-pachchisi</i> | 28 | Pariyaya, v. | 241, 250, 252 |
| Nariād, v. | 288 | Padmanābha, g. ... | 107 | Parjās = Kathīs | 12 |
| Narindaka, v. | 216 | Padmapāni | 47, 197, 291 | Pārsi rites | 179, 227-8, 263, 292 |
| Narmadā, r. | 60, 245, 291 | Paduminikā | 254 | <i>parvatapāda</i> | 261 |
| <i>udākt</i> | 62 | Pahāris | 132-3 | <i>pāḡ</i> | 136 |
| Navasālār | 180, 228 | <i>Paṇḍa</i> | 29 | Pasiṇḍi, v. | 189 |
| Nasirū'lla, k. | 240 | <i>Paksha</i> , Varshā, <i>chaturtha</i> | 37 | Pasūṇḍi, v. | 218 |
| <i>Naṡakas</i> | 29 | Pakundaka, k. | 153-4, 157 | Pasūpati, Pasupatinātha, g. 259, | 298 |
| Nātaputta | 143 | Pakungha | 43 | Pasūpusha-deva, k. | 90 |
| Nāthas | 47, 49 | Palāśiat, r. | 261 | Pātan in Nepāl | 89 |
| Navakāma, k. | 172 | palaeography 15, 161, 163, 186, 191, | 211, 218, 241-2, 251, 253 | <i>Pāthaka</i> | 305, 306 |
| Navānagar | 10, 14 | <i>Pāli-dhvaja, pāli-ketāna</i> . 111n., 211, | 244-5 and n. | <i>pāthaka, pathi</i> | 54, 71, 81 |
| <i>Nāvar</i> | 179 | | | Pātriās = Jhālās | 12, 14 |
| Nāyarichchis | 286 | | | Paṡṡadakkal, v. | 218n. |
| Nē | 89 | | | Paṡṡada-Kisuvōjel (v.) | 218n. |
| Negapatam | 40, 224-7 | | | Paṡṡana, d. | 20 |
| Nelār | 128 | | | | |
| Nepāl | 265 | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|----------------------|--|----------------|
| <i>Pattan sab dāttan</i> | 48 | <i>Prātisākhya of the Sāma Veda.</i> | 30 | <i>Rāma Khāchar</i> | 12-14 |
| <i>Pattānatta Pillai</i> | 40 | <i>Prāvachanasāra</i> | 28 | <i>Rāmanujāchārya</i> | 286 |
| <i>pattar</i> | 48 | <i>pravraj</i> | 147 | <i>Rāmapunyavallabha</i> | 303 |
| <i>Paṭṭavardhana</i> | 305, 306 | <i>Prithvinārāyaṇa Śāh</i> | 92 | <i>Rāma-sētu</i> | 245 |
| <i>paṭṭikā</i> | 250, 252, 253n. | <i>Prithivī-vallabha</i> 106, 107, 163, 164,
211, 219, 220, 301, 302 | | <i>Rāmadāya</i> | 281, 283, 285 |
| <i>Paulistines</i> | 184 | <i>Pābekondā</i> | 21 | <i>Rām Dās Sen</i> | 231 |
| <i>Paṇḍarika</i> | 162, 192 | <i>Puduvēli-gōpuram</i> | 224 | <i>Rāmeśvara, g.</i> | 110 |
| <i>Pauruṇomāsa</i> | 164 | <i>Pulakēśi, Pulakēśi-Vallabha (Early
Chal.)</i> | 164, 201, 243-4, 290 | <i>Rāmeśvararam</i> | 28 |
| <i>Pausa</i> year | 35, 36, 37 | <i>Puligere, c.</i> 101, 103, 104, 108, 110,
112 | | <i>Rāmpur Bhānpur, c.</i> | 28 |
| <i>payodhara</i> | 65 | <i>Pulikara, c.</i> | 104, 111, 112 | <i>Rānaparakramāṅka (Chāl.)</i> 103, 110 | |
| <i>pebble worship</i> | 288 | <i>Pulikēśi, Pulikēśi-Vallabha (Early
Chal.)</i> 112, 161, 170, 209, 218,
246-8, 302 | | <i>Rānarāga</i> | 246 |
| <i>Peggu-ūr, or Perga tablet</i> | 102 | <i>Pulikēśi, Pulikēśi-Vallabha (West.
Chal.)</i> 163, 185, 209, 210, 218, 245 | | <i>Rānarāga (Early Chal.)</i> 103, 209,
214, 243-4, 247-8 | |
| <i>Pellidaka, v.</i> | 217 | <i>Puli kuttī Pariahs</i> | 267 | <i>Rānavikrama (Early Chal.)</i> ... | 185 |
| <i>Pennar, r.</i> | 6 | <i>Pūlindaka, v.</i> | 76 | <i>Rāna-vikrama</i> | 246 |
| <i>Pennātavādi, d.</i> | 15, 18 | <i>Pūlivuti (?), v.</i> | 303 | <i>Rāna-vikrānta</i> | 246, 251 |
| <i>Perbutu ? v.</i> | 303 | <i>Pangulapallikā, v.</i> | 76 | <i>Rāṅga-bhōga</i> | 305 |
| <i>Per-Gāgāmāsi, v.</i> | 303 | <i>Punyaśāśis</i> | 198 | <i>Rāṅga-Krishna, k.</i> | 23-5 |
| <i>Periplus</i> | 7 | <i>Puri, c.</i> | 39, 184 | <i>Raṅgāmatti</i> | 197 |
| <i>Permādi (Ga.)</i> | 109 | <i>Pūrvāpura, d.</i> | 259 | <i>Rāshṭra</i> ... 16, 161, 187, 248 and n. | |
| <i>Perminanāli</i> | 172 | <i>Pūrvāsilā-saṅghārāma</i> | 6 | <i>Rāshṭra-grāma-mahattara, o.</i> | 248 |
| <i>personal names</i> | 165ff. | <i>Pusauti (burj)</i> | 183 | <i>Rāshṭra-kūṭa, o.</i> | 16, 18 |
| <i>Phalahavdra, v.</i> | 65 | <i>pusāya</i> | 255 | <i>Rashtrakūtas</i> | 17n., 210, 218 |
| <i>phirangis</i> | 193-4 | <i>Pushpabhuti</i> | 197 | <i>Rāshṭra-pati, o.</i> | 248n. |
| <i>Phrygian inscriptions</i> | 228-9 | <i>Pushyagupta</i> | 257, 262 | <i>Rāśi, Dhanus</i> | 16, 18 |
| <i>Phulmatī</i> | 8 | <i>Putu</i> | 29 | „ <i>Vṛishabha</i> | 218, 220 |
| <i>Pigeon monastery</i> | 2, 4, 7 | <i>Pāvalli</i> | 290 | <i>Rāṭhor grants</i> | 62 |
| <i>Pingala Rāni</i> | 89 | <i>Qanun-i-Islām</i> | 128 | <i>Ratna Mailla, k.</i> | 91 |
| <i>Ping-ki-lo</i> | 6 | <i>Qāsim</i> | 93 | <i>Ratnapur</i> | 21 |
| <i>plant worship</i> | 288 | <i>Qorān</i> | 119-20 | <i>Rāval</i> | 81 |
| <i>Pokuria</i> | 46 | <i>Rachol, v.</i> | 118 | <i>Rāval Pfr.</i> | 50 |
| <i>Polekēśi, Polekēśi-Vallabha (Early
Chal.)</i> | 218, 219, 245 | <i>Rāhu</i> | 18, 215 | <i>Rāvāna</i> | 202 |
| <i>Polikēśi, Polikēśi-Vallabha (Early
Chal.)</i> | 110, 112 | <i>Raipasēni Kalpa</i> | 29 | <i>Rāvindya, v.</i> | 189 |
| <i>Po-lo-ya monastery</i> | 2, 4, 7 | <i>Rājakiya, o.</i> | 248n. | <i>Rāyadhau, k.</i> | 49 |
| <i>polyandry</i> | 86, 132-5 | <i>Rājakula</i> | 81 | <i>Rāyarāchanalla-vasati, t.</i> | 109 |
| <i>Pōta-rāja</i> | 219 | <i>Rājapūri</i> | 184 | <i>Rēva</i> | 63, 242 |
| <i>pottery, miniature</i> | 289 | <i>Rājarāja (Chō.)</i> | 211, 244, 308 | <i>Rēvadaṇḍa</i> | 183 |
| <i>pottery, Indian and Trojan</i> ... | 176 | <i>Rāja-simha</i> | 209, 244 | <i>Rēyōru, v.</i> | 189 |
| <i>Powlett's East. Legends and
Stories</i> | 236 | <i>Rājasimha (Early Chal.)</i> | 243-4 | <i>Ripāl-i-Berkevi</i> | 120 |
| <i>Prabhākaravardhana</i> | 57, 198-7 | <i>Rāj-dārayata</i> | 302 | <i>Rihāna</i> | 97 |
| <i>Prabhāsa, c.</i> | 259 | <i>Rājatarangini</i> | 55 | <i>Rims of plates, raised, or not</i> 161,
163, 209, 217, 241, 301, 303 | |
| <i>Prabhātavarsha (Rāsh.)</i> | 210 | <i>Rājarttika</i> | 28 | <i>Risālu (Rasālu ?), k.</i> | 8 |
| <i>Pradipa</i> | 55-6 | <i>Rājmahāli words</i> | 130 | <i>Ritu Samhāra</i> | 116 |
| <i>Prākṛit</i> | 218 | <i>Rājyaśrī</i> | 197 | <i>Rizwa</i> | 97 |
| <i>pradvāra</i> | 62 | <i>Rajyavardhana, k.</i> | 197 | <i>Rudradāman's Inscrip.</i> | 257-263 |
| <i>Pramātri-Śrinā</i> | 76 | <i>rdakshadan</i> | 114 | <i>Rudrasimha</i> | 257 |
| <i>Prameya kamala-Mārtanḍa</i> ... | 28 | <i>Raktapura, c.</i> | 104, 111, 112 | <i>Bugaiyya</i> | 93 |
| <i>Prasād</i> | 113 | <i>Rāma, g.</i> | 215 | <i>Rukhamāvatī, r.</i> | 48 |
| <i>Prasāntarāga</i> | 61, 66 | <i>Rāmadata</i> | 256 | <i>Rundranīla-Saindrakas</i> ... | 209, 215 |
| <i>Pratāpamalla, k.</i> | 92 | <i>Rāmadeva</i> | 48, 285 | <i>Rāpnāth edict</i> | 141ff. |
| <i>Patāpaśila, k.</i> | 197, 201 | <i>Rāmadeva Gayuḍa</i> | 170, 174 | <i>Russelkonda</i> | 19 |
| <i>Pruthamānuyoga</i> | 28 | | | <i>Rūvika, v.</i> | 216, 217 |
| <i>Prātibhēdikā</i> | 248 | | | <i>Ryān, v.</i> | 48, 50 |
| <i>prati-lakkā</i> | 245 | | | <i>Śabara</i> | 290 |
| <i>pratisarakus, o.</i> | 68 | | | <i>sabhd</i> | 56 |

- Śābharṃatī, r. 259
 Śaḍ 53
 Śāḍagerī Vijaya 253-5
 Śaduzai dynasty 238-9
 Saffa bint Haqq bin Akhtab 96, 98-9
 sagḍid 228
 Sagotra 15, 33, 85, 37, 104, 106, 161, 163, 164, 186, 191, 211, 219, 244, 247-3, 251-2, 301-2
 sagri 228
 Sahasrām edict 141ff.
 Sahyādri, m. 259
 Sahyādri Khaṇḍa of the Skanda Purāṇa 208
 Saindrakas 209, 215
 St. Thomé 221
 Śaka era 180-1
 Śaka Śaga 170
 Śaka dates 18, 101, 102, 103, 104, 108, 111, 112, 161, 185, 191, 209, 210, 211, 215, 244, 290, 301, 303, 307
 Śākābandhi Śālivāhana 8
 Sakalāgamapaṇḍita 225
 Śaktā, Kāṇva 250
 Sakrān bin 'Umar 93
 Śaktas 264
 Śākyamuni 142, 145-6, 232-3
 Salābat Khān Bābi 10, 12
 Salama 97
 Sa'em 195
 Śālivāhana, k. 8
 sālōhitā 256
 sālū 11
 Salsette (Shatshashṭi) ... 118, 254
 samādhā 264-6
 Samadhigata-paṇḍa-mahāśabḍa 191
 Sāmanta 248n.
 Sāmarwāḍa, v. 216
 Samasta-bhuvan-dēraya 16
 Sāmat 14
 Sāma Veda Prāśākhya 30
 Sambalpur, d. 113-15
 Sambarānātha 299
 Sāmbhar, c. 259
 Sambhu 9, 290
 Sāmbhunātha 258
 Saṃgha 34, 37, 111, 112, 220
 Sāmiyāra, k. 209, 215
 Śāmkaragapa, k. 161, 162
 Śāmkarānti, Uttarāyana ... 164, 290
 Samlai, g. 115
 Sampadi 143
 Samunals or Jains 195
 Samvat era 180-1
 Samvat, samvatsara 242, 249, 252
 Samvatsara, Dundubhi 210
 Samvatsara, Kshaya 290
 „ Subhānu 210
 „ Vibhava 101, 108, 113, 215
 Samvatsaras, use of cycle of sixty 210
 Sanūtha 255
 Sāndhivigrahika, o. 302
 Sandhi-vigrah-ādhikṛita, o. 249, 252
 Sandhiyara, v. ? 250, 252
 Sāṇḍilya gotra 68
 Sanghamittā 149, 151
 Saṅghā dmas 158-201
 Sanjaya 203-6
 Śānkara Āchārya 222, 282, 286, 299, 300
 Śāṅkarapa Daṇḍa Nāyaka... 122
 Śāṅkara-vijaya 286
 Śāṅkha-basti. tablets 101, 111
 Śāṅkha-Jinēndra, g. 103, 110, 112
 Śāṅkhatīrtha-vasati, t. ... 104, 111
 Śāṅkha-vasati, t. 108, 109
 Sāntāl ideas of the Future... 273-4
 Santanātha 50
 Santheya-Bāgavāḍi, v. ... 304, 307
 Śāntivaravarmā (Kad.) ... 35, 36
 Saunyasīs 299, 300
 sapāya 255
 Sapta-lōkamātī 15, 106, 163, 186, 191, 211, 219, 301
 Sarabhangā 264
 Sarannātha 48
 Sārāsā, v. 288
 Sarasvatī gachha 28
 Sārdhār, v. 13, 14
 Śārkarākshi gotra 71, 73, 76
 Sarman 18, 187, 188, 192, 220, 248-9, 302
 Sarnāth 296
 Sarpa Samposkara 43
 Sarpilā 256
 Sarva-dēs-ādhikārin, o. 304
 Sarvaṇaparumālaiyar 221
 Śāsāṅka Narendragupta 197
 Sataghni 186
 Sātakarni, k. 258, 262
 Sātavāhana ? k. 4
 satavivāḍā 142-3, 147
 satī 235-6, 264-5
 Satnāmis 300, 303
 Sātpura, m. 264
 Saty-dēraya 246
 Satyāśraya (Chālukya) ... 103, 110
 Satyāśraya, Satyāśraya-Puln-kēśi (Early Chal.) 210, 214, 215
 Satyāśraya, Satyāśraya-Vallabhēndra (West. Chal.) 17, 110, 164, 185, 209, 218, 219, 245, 302
 Satyāśrayas (West. Chal.) 17, 104, 110, 111, 112, 164, 185, 186, 209, 218, 219, 245, 302, 303
 Satya-vākya 102
 Satyavākya-Konganivarmā (Ga.) 101, 102, 108
 Sauda 93, 98
 Saurāshṭra, d. 7
 Sauvira 259
 Śavarasvāmin 57
 Savasi, v. 109
 Sāyana-Mādhava 56
 Sayyid Haidar Turē 240
 Seals of plates 15, 33, 35, 37, 161, 163, 185, 186, 191, 209, 217, 241, 246, 301, 303, 308
 Sejakapura, v. 9-12
 sela 136
 Śuana-singa 246
 Śen Tamil 276ff., 287
 Sēndras 103, 110
 Sēndrakas 103
 sepulchral customs 44
 sepulchral urns 26-7
 Sēram, Cheram 285, 287
 Seruks 20
 Sētu 244
 Shah Abbas 30
 Shāhji Bhonslē 125
 Shāhpūr, v. 12
 Shashṭhi, Shatshashṭi 68, 184
 Sher Singh Atāriwāla 124
 Sherring's Hindoo Pilgrims ... 236
 Shiāl Bēt 9
 Shirin Qabti 97
 Shirley, Sir A. 30
 Shujā, k. 239
 Siddhakēdāra, v. 34
 Siddham 254, 261
 Siddhas 49
 Siddharāja, k. ... 8, 267
 Siddha Vāḍa 49
 Siddhivarmā, k. 90
 Siggava 149-50, 153-8
 Śilāhāra 184
 Śilāditya 68, 71, 76, 79-81, 198-201, 251
 Simhala 89, 215
 Simhapa (Yā.) 306
 Simhapallikā 73
 simhāsana 198
 Simraun dynasty 89, 91
 Σιμύλλα, Τίμωλα, Simylla. 183, 234
 Sindagi, v. 125-6
 Sindēśvara, g. 110
 Sindhi language 293
 Sindhudurg, t. 28

- Sindhu, Sauvira, d. 259, 262
Singa 246
 Singhbhum 20
 Sirigōdu (P), v. 303
 Siripatti, v. 217
 Siśunāgas 150, 154-5, 159
 Śiva, g. 306
 Śivabhāgapura 76
 Śivabhōti 253-5
 Śivadatā 255
Śivaga Chintamani 221
 Śivaghosa 255
 Śivaji of Tanjor 192
 Śivamāra, k. 172
 Śivanagi, m. 125
 Śivapālita 255
 Śiva-perūr 282
 Śivāra, k. 215
 Śivasamudram 173
 Śivavarmā, k. 90
 Skandabhāta 71, 73, 76
Skandāvāra 107, 112, 248, 252, 302
 Smārtas 286
 Snake notions 40ff.
 Solāpur 125
 Somadeva 255
Sōma-yājñ 244, 302
 Somayāji Vāsa Śarmmana ... 176
 Somanātha 122, 298, 307
 Sonaka 149-51, 153-8
 Sonārekha, r. 257
 Sonnerat's *Voyage* 127
soparikara 66
 Sorath 9, 257
 So-to-po-ho, Śātavāhana, k. P. 4
 Spiegel's *Eranische Alterthums-*
kunde 160
 Śrī 206
Śrī Bīṭṭarasa, mot. 246
 Śrīkantha 197
 Śrīmad-Anahila 76
Śrīngāra-tīlaka 116
 Śripura, v. 217
 Śrīrangam, c. 26
 Śrī Rangapuri 117
 Śrī Sthānaka 184
Śrī-Tribhuvandīkūśa, mot. 15, 245n.
 Śrī-Vallabha, k. 219
 Śrīvardhana 57
Śrī Viśamasiddhi, mot. 185, 186,
 191
-stān 27, 235
 steel (Indian) 196
 Stephens, Father 117-18
Sthala-gīri 216
 Sthānviśvarā 197
 Sthunko, k. 90
 Stobart's *Islam* 119
 Stoddart 240
 Stone-tablets, Bhujagēndra ... 103
 „ Chālukya 103
 „ Gāṅga 101, 102, 112
 „ Pallava 247
 „ Sēndra 103
 „ Western Cha-
 lukya. 104, 111, 112
 Strangford's Letters 269
stūpa 200-2
 Subbaraya, g. 42
 Subramanya, m. 42
 Sudarśana lake 257, 261-2
 Sudatta, k. 89
 Suddhōdana, k. 232-3
 Suhasti 143
 Śukra Āchārya 232
Sukra-Nīti 136, 231
 Sulasadatta 254-5
sulasamanjari 254
 sun 274
Sun Worshipers of Asia 292
 Śunahśepha 264
 Sundara 159
 Supārśva 119, 179
 Surādā, v. 20
 Sūrāshtra, d. 259, 262-3
 Surat, c. 28
 Surēndra Vikrama Sāh, k. ... 92
 Sūrpāraka, c. 259
 Sūryadāsa, v. 68
Sūryaprajñapti 28
 Suvānimalai 40
 Suviśākha 257-8, 263
 Śvabhra, d. 259, 262-3
 Śvabhramati, r. 259
Svāmīn 162, 164, 248-9
 Svāmī (Chalikya) 161, 162
 Svāmī-Mahāsēna, g. 17, 31, 36, 38,
 162, 245, 249, 251
svasti 62
svastika 119, 176-9, 289
 Svastidēvi, g. 119
 Svayambhū, g. 244
 Svayambhata, k. 89
svayamvaras 203, 262
Śvētāmbara, s. 28-9, 38n.
Śvētāpata, s. 38
 Syamantapanchakam 281
 Syenagachha 28
 Ta'-an-ta-lo (Mahā-Āndhra) ... 6
tadbhavas 276
 Tāhir 39
 Talakāda 21, 173
 Tālāpa (East. Chal.) 18
Tala-bhōga 212, 213
 Tāḷavanapura 170-1, 174
Tāḷa-vṛtti 105
 Tāmāchi Jām 10, 12
 Tambirān 227
 Tami 130ff., 275-87
 Tanjor, c. 24-6, 40
 Tanjor armoury 192ff.
 Tāntrikas 264
 Tapasī, v. 109
 Tāṭānātha 116
Tārda 92
tatsamas 276-7
 Ta-thsin (Dakhan) 1-3, 7
 Tayib 93
 telephone 289
 Thābit bin Qais 96
 Thānē 184
 Thang (China) 199
 Thāngā, m. 9, 13
 Tha-thsen, Ta-thsen (Dekhan) 1-7
 Theodoret, Bp. 127
 Theras 148-9
 Therāpanthis 28
 Tiele's *History of Religion* 269
 Tīkar, v. 12
 Τιμούλα, Simylla 234
 Timur Shāh, k. 239
 Tintalgaḥ, v. 20
 Tirthaṅkaras 28
 Tirtha-vasati, t. 108
 Tiruvalluvar's *Kurral* 220-24
 Tissa 149-50, 153-8
Tīthi, Amāśyā 192, 220
 „ Daśamī 35, 139, 290
 „ Dvādaśī 161
 „ Dvitiyā 164
 „ Paurṇamāsī 37, 107, 112, 186,
 212, 248, 249, 252, 302, 305, 307
 Toda 130-1
 Toḍuva 130
 T'o-na-kie-tse-kia Dhanaka-
 cheka 6
Tooth Relic, Da Cunha on the... 236
 Toragal chronicle 290
 Toramāna, k. 201
Trairājya-Pallava 301
 Trajan 32
 Travankor 285
Tribhuvān-dīkūśa, mot. 15, 245n.
 Trichināpalli, c. 23-25
 Trilōchana (Kad.) 246
 Trilōchana-Pallava 245
 Trimurti-Kovil 187
 Trinētra (Kad.) 246
 Trinētra-Pallava 246

| | | | | | |
|--|------|--|-----|--|-----|
| Tripavata, c. | 33-5 | Ūrjayat, m. | 261 | Verelst's <i>Affairs in Bengal</i> ... | 272 |
| Triṇḍī 305 | | uyaraka 256 | | Vesāliya 157 | |
| Trivarnachāra 28 | | Uzbek dynasty..... 240 | | Vetravati, r. 259 | |
| Trumpp's <i>Adi Granth</i> 57 | | | | Vidiśā, c. 259 | |
| Tulokabhāshana 28 | | <i>Vāda</i> 192, 213, 214, 216 | | Vidulā 203-6 | |
| tulsi tree 254, 266 | | <i>Vādi</i> 11, 16 | | <i>Vidyāsthānas</i> 28 | |
| Tulsi Dās 207 | | Vadnagar, c. 7, 76 | | Vihāna, v. 65 | |
| Tulu 131, 275 | | Vaigai, r. 42 | | vihāra 56-7 | |
| T'u-lu-p'o-po-tu 80 | | Vaijayantī, c. 36, 38 | | <i>vijayam</i> 283 | |
| Tulu-rājyam 275 | | Vaiya 162 | | Vijaya, k. 153, 156, 158-9 | |
| Turān 27 | | Vairagadh, c. 6 | | Vijayā 254-5 | |
| Turkestan 238 | | Vaisākha year 37 | | Vijayabhāṭṭārikā, Vijaya-mahā- | |
| Tushāspa 257, 262 | | <i>Vaisvadeva</i> 249 and n., 252 | | dēvi (West. Chal.) 163, 164 | |
| | | <i>Vajrapāya</i> 162 | | Vijayāditya (Early Chal.) ... 243-5 | |
| 'Ubaidu-l-lāh 97 | | <i>Vajra Sopāri</i> 49 | | Vijayāditya (East. Chal.) 15, 17, 18 | |
| U-ch'a (Uda), d. 39 | | Valabhi, c. 7, 61, 66-7 | | Vijayāditya, Vijayāditya-Sat- | |
| <i>Udaka-pūrva</i> 162, 164 | | Valabhi grants 66 | | yāśraya (West. Chal.) 104, 111, | |
| <i>udak-ātisarga</i> 244, 252 | | Valabhi kings 247 | | 112, 218 | |
| Udaya 154 | | <i>Vallabha</i> 17n., 106, 112, 161, 163, | | <i>Vijaya-kara-samvatsara</i> 37 | |
| Udaybhādra 154-5 | | 186, 191, 219, 244, 248, 251, 301 | | Vijayamahādēvi (West. Chal.) 163 | |
| Udayāditya, k. 172 | | <i>Vallabha</i> (Early Chal.) ... 161, 162 | | Vijayapura, c. 241, 249 | |
| Udayana 244 | | <i>Vallabha, Vallabhendra</i> (West. | | Vijayarāja, Vijayavarmā (Early | |
| <i>Udraṅga</i> 217, 248 and n. | | Chal.) 17, 245 | | Chal.) 241-2, 246-9 | |
| <i>Udumbara</i> (<i>ficus glomerata</i>).... 233 | | <i>Vallabhākhyā, k.</i> 172 | | <i>Vijaya-rājya-samvatsara</i> 107, 112, | |
| Ugā Wāla 9 | | <i>Vallabharāja</i> 66, 109 | | 220 | |
| Uhud 95 | | <i>Vallabhendra</i> 16, 244 | | Vijayaśakti (Sēndra) 103, 110 | |
| Ujjain, Ujjayīni, c. 8, 259 | | Vāmana 56 | | <i>Vijaya-samvatsara</i> 192 | |
| Umā, g. 18 | | Vanarāja 76 | | <i>Vijaya-skandhāvāra</i> ... 107, 112, 248, | |
| Umaina 97 | | Vanavāsi, c. ... 36n., 164, 219, 301-3 | | 252, 302 | |
| Umāpatīśivāchārya 225 | | Van Rheede 276n. | | Vijayavarmā (Early Chal.) 241n., | |
| 'Umar 93, 95 | | <i>Vāra, Bhāskara</i> 218, 220 | | 247, 252 | |
| Umar Beg, k. 240 | | „ Bhṛigu 16, 19 | | Vijaya-vasati, t. 109 | |
| Umētā plates 61-3, 242, 251-2 | | „ Budha 189, 191 | | <i>Vijaya-vikshēpa</i> 251-2 | |
| Ummādīni 32 | | „ Ravi 290 | | Vikrama 48 | |
| Umm Habiba 96, 98 | | „ Śanaishchara... 186, 305, 307 | | Vikramāditya 89 | |
| Umm-Hānī 98 | | Varāhamūla-Hushkapura..... 57 | | <i>Vikram-āditya</i> 246 | |
| <i>Ummahdu-l-mūminīn</i> 99 | | Varanuchi 56, 116 | | Vikramāditya (East Chal.) ... 18 | |
| Umm-Iman 97 | | Varasinha, k. 89 | | Vikramāditya, Vikramāditya- | |
| Umm Qothūm 93 | | <i>Varasio</i> 180 | | Satyāśraya (West. Chal.)... 104, | |
| Umm-Rāfi' 97 | | <i>Varman</i> 34, 35, 37, 102-6, 185, 191, | | 111, 163, 164, 217-19, 302, 308 | |
| Umm Salama 95-8 | | 209, 219, 253, 301 | | Vikrama-Samvat 242 | |
| <i>Ummu-l-musākin</i> 95 | | <i>vartmapālas, o.</i> 68 | | <i>vikshēpa</i> 62, 251, 252 | |
| <i>Umm'l-Muslimīn</i> 95 | | Varuṇa, g. 42, 249 | | Vīlas 303 | |
| Umm-Zamīr 97 | | <i>Vasati</i> 104, 108, 109, 111 | | <i>vil, villin</i> 278 | |
| Unaḍ 12 | | Vāsantī 116 | | Vilanda, k. 172 | |
| <i>Upādhyāya</i> 305 | | Vāsishthīputra 258 | | <i>vimala</i> 65 | |
| Upāli 149-50, 153-8 | | Vāsudēva 302, 307 | | Vinayāditya, Vinayāditya-Sat- | |
| Upangas 28 | | Vasupānaka 257 | | yāśraya (West. Chal.) 104, 111, | |
| <i>Upa-ikara</i> 217, 248 and n. | | Vātāpi, c. 247, 290 | | 112, 186, 218, 219, 300, 301, 303, | |
| <i>Upśakadasāṅga</i> 29 | | <i>Vāṭaka</i> 161 | | 308 | |
| Uppalabeta 81 | | Vattēlutta 275-6 | | <i>Vinay-āditya</i> 246 | |
| urns 26-7 | | Vatsa, k. 32 | | Virabhadra, g. 126 | |
| Utarādata 253-5 | | Vāyu, g. 119 | | Vīra-deva, k. 90 | |
| Uttarāpatha 107, 163, 219, 301 | | <i>Vedas</i> 28-9, 140 | | Vīra Ganga, k. 172 | |
| <i>Uttarapurdāna</i> 28 | | <i>Vedārthayātina</i> 139 | | Vīramgām, v. 10 | |
| Uttiya 151, 155 | | Vengī 5, 6, 17, 21, 245, 308 | | Vīrasaivas, s. 46 | |
| Urdhva-bahus 265 | | Venhuṣā 256 | | Vīrṇpāksha 299 | |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--|------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|
| Viśāman Khāchar | 14 | vyūthend | 141, 145-6 | Yaudheyas | 258, 262 |
| viśā kanyā | 32 | Wahātu-n-nafs | 98 | Yechgām, v. | 56 |
| Viśama-siddhi, mot. | 185, 186, 191 | Wāi | 288 | Yerukala | 130 |
| Viśaya 16, 17, 162, 187, 191, 212, | | Wakligas | 267 | Yēwūr tablet | 103, 185, 247 |
| 220, 248 & n., 252, 304 | | Wanjāro (Brinjārā)..... | 8 | Yindesi (Kāṭhmāndū) | 88 |
| Viśaya-pati, o. | 248 & n., 252 | Wathen | 290 | Yodhāvaka, v. | 54 |
| Vishnu, g. 110, 162, 192, 244, 287-8, | | Wheeler's <i>Early Records of</i> | | Yōga, Vaidhriti | 307 |
| 301 | | <i>British India</i> | 271 | yōga-kshemam | 137 |
| Vishnu Gopa, k. ... | 170, 172-3, 175 | Whitney's <i>Language and Study</i> | | Yōginis | 268 |
| Vishnugupta, k. | 89, 90 | <i>of Language</i> | 270 | yojana | 4 |
| Vishnuvardhana (Early Chal.) 243, | | Williams's (M.) <i>Mod. India and</i> | | Ysamotika | 258 |
| 245 | | <i>the Indians</i> | 236 | Yuddamalla (East. Chal.)..... | 18 |
| Vishnuvardhana (East. Chal.) 17, | | 'wootz' | 196 | Yudhishthira | 137, 302 |
| 185, 186, 191, 192, 245 | | Wright's <i>History of Nepal</i> | 88 | Yuvardja | 17, 18, 33, 34, 185 |
| Viśti, viśtika | 106, 248 & n. | Yādavas | 303 | Za-Bæsi-Bazen, k. | 235 |
| Viśva | 164 | Yadu-vaṁśa | 306 | Za-Bæsi-Tsawesa, k. | 235 |
| Viśpanthi, s. | 28 | Yājñavalkya | 18 | Za-Elasguaga, k. | 235 |
| Viśvabhu Buddha | 89 | yajnopavita | 52 | Za-Gafale, k. | 235 |
| Viśvanātha, k. | 22-3 | Yak..... | 238, 240 | Za-Hakale, k. | 235 |
| Vitabhaya, c. | 259 | Yaksha Guptā, k. | 89 | Zaid bin Hārith | 96, 97 |
| Vitarāga | 61, 66 | Yaksha Malla, k. | 91 | Zainab | 93, 95-99 |
| vīdśa | 147 | Yāman | 41 | Zaloukemeny, E. K. | 30 |
| vīvūtha or vyūtha | 142-3, 145-8 | Yāmathūtan | 41 | Zamān Khān, k. | 238 |
| Vogue's <i>Syrie Centrale</i> | 57 | Yamunā, r. | 215, 245 | Zend | 87 |
| Vṛihat Kalpa | 29 | Yantra-mukta | 136 | Zulfakir | 194 |
| Vyādhya paribhāṣhāvṛtti | 54 | Yāpaniya, s. | 34 | Zωσκαλῆς | 235 |
| Vyavahāra-Samudra | 284, 287 | Yapouldak, v. | 228 | | |
| Vyavahārasūtra | 29 | | | | |

ERRATA IN VOL. VII.

- p. 15a, ll. 14 and 40, and p. 15b, l. 12, for Chālukya read Chalukya.
- p. 15b, l. 35, for 'Vyayāditya' read 'Vijayāditya.'
- p. 16, transcr. l. 30, for chintamanir read chintamanir.
- p. 16, transcr. l. 36, for uru read uru.
- " " " l. 40, for sarvân=ā= read sarvân=ā=.
- p. 17, transcr. l. 54, for Alapūruḥ read Ālapūruḥ.
- p. 17b, note 12, for this volume read Vol. VI.
- p. 18b, l. 35, for Rāshṭrakūṭas read head-men of countries.
- p. 19a, note 24, for ante, p. 24, read Vol. VI, p. 24.
- p. 28a, l. 14, after require insert . . .
- " l. 30, for Sonpat read Sonpat.
- " l. 33, for Karangi read Kāranji.
- " l. 53, for Mulasamghu read Mūlasamghu.
- p. 28b, l. 2, delete comma after Bhaṭṭārkaś.
- " l. 3, delete comma after paṇḍits.
- " l. 23, for Jatis read Jāts.
- " l. 32, for Vispanthis and Therāpanthis read Vispanthis and Therāpanthis.
- p. 28b, l. 44, for Chandrarprajñapti read Chandrarprajñapti.
- p. 28b, l. 45, for prajñapti read prajñapti.
- " l. 49, for nasara read nasāra.
- p. 29a, ll. 36, 37, for Grammar read Grammar.
- " l. 52, for there [at Ajmir] read at Ajmir.
- p. 29b, l. 2, for Governor General read for the Governor General.
- p. 33b, ll. 24 and 26, for Nāgamaṇḍala read Nāgamaṇḍala.
- p. 34, transcr. l. 9, delete || after samyuktō.
- " " note 5, delete ḥ before Jihvamūlīya, and in the last line for ḥ read h.
- p. 34b, l. 38, for Siddhakēdara read Siddhakēdāra.
- p. 35, note 14, for p. 24a read p. 25a.
- p. 36, transcr. l. 14, for samyuktō read samyuktō.
- " " " l. 16, for para-(da)ttam(ttām) read para-dattam(ttām).
- p. 36, l. 19, for nūpālana[m] read nūpālanaṁ.
- p. 37, transcr. l. 14, for gō-bhū read gō-bhū.
- " " " l. 21, for dvitīyō read dvitīyō.
- p. 38, transcr. l. 26, for samyuktō read samyuktō.
- p. 91b, l. 17, for Gaksha read Yaksha.
- p. 102b, l. 38, for ombhattaney avarsham read ombhattaney varsham.
- p. 105, transcr. l. 33, for paśchimatā(tah) read paśchimatā(tah).
- p. 105, transcr. l. 36, for Akham[ḍa*]la read Ākham[ḍa*]la.
- p. 106, transcr. l. 59, for Purvvataḥ read Pūrva-tataḥ.
- p. 109a, l. 35, and 109b, l. 6, for the (field called) Dēśagrāmakūṭakshētra read the field of the head-men of the country and the villages.
- p. 110a, l. 5, for and the country and the villages read and the head-men of the country and the villages.
- p. 110b, l. 14, for Jyēshṭhalinga read Jyēshṭhalinga.
- p. 112a, l. 36, for years" having expired read years having expired."
- p. 136b, l. 23, for fired read filled.
- " l. 34, for bullets read balls.
- " l. 41, for bullet read ball.
- " l. 42, after from a bow add with unerring aim.
- p. 156b, l. 8, for Agātāsātru read Ajātāsātru.
- p. 161a, l. 9, for Nērūr read Nerūr.
- p. 162, transcr. l. 19, for hi(him)syā read hi(him)syāt.
- p. 162, note 5, for Prithu read Prithu.
- p. 163a, l. 2, and 163b, ll. 6 and 16, for Nērūr read Nerūr.
- p. 164, transcr. l. 12, for lakshmīm read laksh-mim, and cancel the word prā(p)pya.
- p. 183a, note 2, after Malabar add asserts that it is so.
- p. 183b, l. 34, for वेङ्कट read वेङ्कट.
- p. 188, transcr. l. 38, for muiyard-dhamśah read muiyarddhamśah.
- p. 189, transcr. l. 66, delete || after śukla-pakshā.
- " " l. 68, for Vinayākasya read Vināyakasya.
- p. 190b, l. 39, for Chēbundothibōya read Chēbundothibōya.
- p. 191, transcr. l. 9, for va(ma)hārājasya- read va(ma)hārājasya.
- p. 192, transcr. l. 13, for ādhivasataḥ read adhivasataḥ.
- p. 192b, l. 16, after all accomplishments insert like the moon which is possessed of (all) its digits.

- p. 210a, l. 22, for the date assigned to Pulikāśī I. read the genuineness of this grant.
 p. 211, transcr. l. 17, for nāmā= read nām=ā.
 p. 212, transcr. l. 33, for êndrâchâp- read êndra-châp-.
 p. 212, transcr. l. 38, for satair read êatair.
 p. 213, „ l. 51, for punah= read punah=.
 „ „ l. 60, for chham f-jhâta read chhamf-jhâta, and for tasmâ- read tasmât.
 p. 213, transcr. l. 66, for sîma read sîma(mâ).
 „ „ l. 71, for sîmâ read sîmâ-.
 „ „ ll. 72-3 for sîma read sîma(mâ).
 p. 214, transcr. l. 92, for achhîrâmsû read achî-râmsû.
 p. 215a, l. 42, for fan read face.
 p. 215b, ll. 27-8, for Kanakôpa!â read Kana-kôpa!a.
 p. 218a, l. 16, for Kisuvolal read Kisuvolal.
 p. 218a, l. 18, for Basari-samgha read Basuri-samgha.
 p. 219, transcr. l. 17, or visâla read visâla.
 p. 220, transcr. l. 18, for [kâmchi*] read kâm-chî*].
 p. 220, transcr. l. 26, for (rmma)nah read (rmma)nah.
 p. 229a, ll. 33, 34, for The E is the Latin Æ, read The E (or rather the ~~E~~) is the Latin Æ.
 p. 244, text, l. 2, for ismâsan- read smâsan-.
 p. 248, transcr. l. 1, and p. 249, note 20, for Vijayapura-vâsakât read Vijayapur-âvâsakât.
 p. 248, transcr. l. 10, for châta read châta.
 „ „ l. 13, dele = between svâminê and arddha.
 p. 249, transcr. l. 31, for ârvva read Pârvva.
 p. 261a, transcr. l. 4, for a¹³ embank- read an¹³ embank-.
 p. 261b, note 14, for see below read see above, p. 257, &c.
 p. 268a, l. 7, after (for 1864-5) add p. 416.
 „ ll. 8 and 27, for Khajurâho read Khajurâho.
 p. 268a, l. 11, for Chandel read Chândel.
 „ l. 37, after states add that.

Erratum in Vol. VI.

p. 315a, l. 19, for second read sacred.